

आगम-प्रामाण्यम्①

यामुनः

Table of Contents

ॐ	2
०० मङ्गलादि	3
०१ पूर्व-पक्षः	5
०१ प्रामाण्यम्	5
सापेक्षता	6
पौरुषेयता	7
०२ प्रत्यक्षादिभिर् आगमोक्तार्थासिद्धिः	8
साधारण-प्रत्यक्षम्	8
नार्वाचीन-गोचरम् फलादि	10
भगवत्-साक्षिकत्वम्?	10
भगवन्-निरतिशय-प्रत्यक्षत्व-तिरस्कारः	13
सातिशयस्य निरतिशयाप्राप्तिः	15
व्योम-निर्दर्शनं नोचितम्	19
अतिशायित-प्रत्यक्षेनापि न	20
०३ नानुमानम्	21
०४ न शब्दः	22
वेदादौ न विधिः	22
न मूलागमानुमानम्	24
पौरुषेय-शब्दतो न	25
न श्रुति-सिद्धिः	26
नोपमानात्	26
नार्थपत्तेः	27
अष्टकादौ भेदः	30
भगवतानाम् अब्राह्मण्यम्	37
लौकिकाः	40
अब्राह्मणेषु रूढिः	41
अद्विजत्वं शास्त्रोक्तम्	44
वृत्ति-भेदः	48

शिष्ट-गृह्यता	52
०५ बाह्य-परिग्रहः	56
०६ वेद-तिरस्कारः	58
०७ पृथक्-संस्कर-लिङ्गम्	60
०८ १४-विद्यास्थानेष्व अनन्तर्भावः	62
०९ बादरायणोक्तिः	63
१० क्षुद्र-विद्या-परता	64
११ वेद-तुल्य-प्रमाणत्वं न	68
पूर्व-पक्षः (नैद्यायिकः)	68
पौरुषेयत्वम्	68
धर्म-साक्षात्-कारः	72
जगत्-कार्यता	75
सृष्टे: सकर्तृकत्वम्	78
अपूर्व-निर्वाहिः	81
पाञ्चरात्रस्य साक्षात् प्रणयनम्	85
वेदापौरुषेयत्वम्	87
धर्म-प्रामाण्यता-हानि-प्रसङ्गः	89
अकर्तृक जगत्	90
अपूर्व-निर्वाहानपेक्षा	93
धर्म-साक्षात्-काराभावेऽपि सृष्टिः	97
अकृतं जगत्	98
अनुमनम्	98
महत्त्वादिना न कृतत्वम्	101
अनिष्ट-गुणापत्तिः	102
कल्पना-गौरवम्	108
सृष्टि-कारणाभावः	109
वेद-कर्त्-अस्मरणम्	114
न तुल्या ऽपौरुषेयता	116
निगमनम्	119
१२ ईश्वरे शब्द-प्रमाणं न	120
पूर्वपक्षः	120

प्रमाणान्तर-गोचरता-सम्भावना न बाधते	121
निगमनम्	125
कार्य-सम्बन्धे हि व्युत्पत्तिः	127
उपनिषद्-वाक्यावगतिः	139
उपसंहारः	143
सिद्ध-वस्तु-परत्वेऽपि नेश्वरः	144
१३ नेश्वर-प्रणीतता	148
सर्व-ज्ञ-वादि-नैकान्तता	149
श्रुति-विरोधः	159
मोहनोद्देशः?	161
वैदिकैर् अनङ्गीकारः	162
न मन्वादि-स्मृतिवत्	163
१४ तान्त्रिकतायाः बाह्यम्	164
१५ जीव-जन्मोक्तिः	168
१६ नापौरुषेयता	177
१७ पाशुपतादि-समता	177
पौरुषेयत्वम्	177
अनुदय-विपर्यास-विशयाः	178
१८ उपसंहारः	179
०२ उत्तर-पक्षः	183
०१ निर्दोष-ज्ञान-जन्यतया प्रामाण्यानुमानम्	183
प्रतिज्ञा	183
अनुमानय् अवयवाः	183
०२ पक्ष-सौष्ठवम्	185
प्रसिद्धिः	185
न सिद्ध-साधनम्	185
न प्रत्यक्ष-विरोधः	186
नानुमानतो विरोधो बाहुत्वादिभिः	186
न बाहुत्वाद् अप्रामाण्यम्	186
वेद-भिन्नत्वान् नाप्रामाण्यम्	189
अ-वेद-मूलत्वान् न	193

नागम-विरोधः	197
न स्व-व्याघातादि	197
०३ हेतु-सौष्ठवम्	201
नानैकान्तिकः	201
न साधारणत्वात्	203
नासाधारणत्वात्	203
न विरुद्धः	204
न कालात्ययः	204
नासिद्धः	205
पौरुषेयस्यापि ग्राह्यता	207
०४ सिद्ध-वस्तुनि शब्द-प्रामाण्यम्	210
प्रतिज्ञा	210
पुत्र-जन्मोदाहरणम्	211
विधि-पक्षेऽप्य आवापोद्वापक्रमः	215
न कार्यान्विताभिधान-मात्रम्	218
व्युत्पन्न-प्रयोगे कार्यनपेक्षा	223
नदी-तीर-फलम्	226
मानान्तरानपेक्षा	226
अपूर्वे शक्तिः	228
साध्य-द्वयापत्तिः	239
नियोग-स्वान्तर्न्यम्	240
निमेषादि-साधनता	243
निगमनम्	244
अनुमान-मूलता न लौकिक-शब्देषु	245
शब्द-शक्तिर् अप्रतिहतैकत्र दोषेऽपि	249
मूल-ज्ञानापर्याप्तता	251
उपसंहारः	254
वेदान्तोक्त-पुरुषः	255
सम्भावितानुवाद-विपर्ययै	256
उपसंहारः	260
०५ सार्वज्ञम्	260

शब्द-प्रमाणम्	260
नार्थवादः	262
न प्रत्यक्षतः	263
नानुमानतः	264
न यूपादित्यवत्	265
न कल्पित-विधेः	267
विध्य-अनपेक्षा	268
निगमनम्	271
०६ विष्णुः परमः	272
श्रुतिः	272
इतिहास-पुराणादि	275
निगमनम्	283
न शिवादिः	283
पुराण-वाद-निर्वाहः	286
वेदानुकूल-पुराणानि	287
०७ पाज्चरात्र-दानम्	292
०८ तन्त्रान्तराद् भेदः	294
कापालिकाः	297
कालामुखाः	300
पाशुपताः	301
मुक्ति-कल्पना	305
तन्त्रान्तर-मूलम्	308
शिवाप्रणीतता	308
प्रमादः	309
मोह-शास्त्रम्	309
विरुद्धाचरणम्	313
न वेदाः, न प्रत्यक्षम्	319
परतोऽप्रामाण्यम्	320
नामादि-साम्यम्	321
०९ श्रुत्य-अनुवादौचित्यम्	322
१० न वेद-बाह्यम्	322

वेद-मूलता	323
न वेद-निन्दा	327
दीक्षादौ	334
विद्या-स्थान-परिगणना	337
व्यासेनाङ्गीकारः	337
११ ब्रह्म-सूत्रे इनिराकारः:	345
जीवाद्य्-उत्पत्ताव् आपत्तिः पूर्व-पक्ष-मात्रम्	345
उत्पत्त्यसंभवात्	345
व्यूह-प्रयोजनम्	347
निर्वाह-सूत्रान्तरम्	353
न च कर्तुः करणम्	355
व्यूह-रूप-भगवत्त्वय् उत्पत्ति-करण-सम्भवै	358
विज्ञानादि-भावे वा तद्-अप्रतिषेधः	358
चतुर्धा-भाव उपपन्नः	358
शब्द-विप्रतिषेधो न	363
१२ ब्रह्म-सूत्रे इङ्गीकारः:	366
सन्दर्भः	366
जीव-करणोत्पत्त्य-अर्थेन	367
पूर्वपक्षः	368
उत्तर-पक्षः - व्यूह-ब्रह्मत्व-मात्रेण	371
विज्ञानादिः	372
करणोत्पत्तिः - विप्रतिषेधात्	375
उत्तर-पक्षः - युक्त्या करणोत्पत्ति-सिद्ध्या	376
उत्तर-पक्षः - ब्रह्म-कर्तृत्व-निश्चयेन	378
विज्ञानम्	379
आदि	380
विप्रतिषेधात्	381
विरुद्ध-प्रमित्य्-उत्पत्त्य्-अर्थेन	382
पूर्व-पक्षः	383
उत्पत्त्य्-असम्भवात् पाञ्चरात्राप्रामाण्यम्	383
न च कर्तुः करणं वेदः	385

उत्तरपक्षः	387
१३ वेद-तुल्य-प्रामाण्यम्	390
इतर-निरपेक्षता	392
आप्ति-निश्चयो नापेक्षितः	397
हानोपादानादि	399
(अ)कर्तृवत्ता	400
ईश्वरकृततया दोषाभावः	401
सापेक्षता न बाधिका	403
कर्ता	405
निगमनम्	413
१४ अमोहकता	413
नाकारणम्	415
स्वरूप-विरुद्धम्	416
दोषास्परणम्	417
महाजन-गृहीतता	419
१५ विरोधाभासे तारतम्यम्	425
१६ शिष्ट-बाह्य-ग्रहणे	427
बाह्यत्वे गृहीतत्वे च विकल्पाः	428
वेद-भिन्नैर् अधीतता ज्ञातता	429
वेद-भिन्नैः क्रियमाणार्थता	430
प्रतिषिद्धार्थ-कर्तृत्वे	430
वेद-द्वेषि-ग्रहणम्	431
अनधिकारि-ग्रहणम्	434
अनधिकारः क्व?	435
अनधिकारो ऽखिले	435
अनधिकार एकदेशे	437
कारणदोषः	438
शिष्ट-परिग्रहः	439
श्रेयस्-साधनता	441
भागवत-परिग्रहे ऽदोषः	442
नात्रैवर्णिकत्वात्	443

१७ भागवत-ब्राह्मण्य-प्रमाणम्	444
शिखादिभिः	445
यजनादिभिः	445
गोत्रतः	447
देवता-विवेकतः	449
निर्णय-प्रकारः	450
प्रत्यक्षे शङ्का	451
अनुमाने शङ्का	452
अर्थापत्तौ शङ्का	453
प्रत्यक्षम्	454
सन्तति-कार्यत्वम्	461
वैश्य-व्रात्य-मूलं न	463
प्रयोगान्तराणि	464
आचार्य-शब्दादौ व्यभिचारः	467
अवयव-रूढिः	471
वृत्तिसाम्यान् न व्रात्यत्वम्	476
रथ-कारे न व्यभिचारः	478
अवयव-शक्ति-प्राधान्यम्	483
निगमनम्	484
पृथङ्-निर्देशः	485
वृत्त्या	488
देवालकता	493
देवतान्तर-वृत्तौ	493
दीक्षा-हीनाः	494
निगमनम्	497
निर्माल्योपयोगाद् अशिष्टता	497
कौमारीलादि-पक्षे	498
पाज्चरात्रिक-पक्षे	502
निगमनम्	503
पाज्चरात्रे ऽनिषेधः	504
निषेधाभासाः	504

विलम्ब्य प्रयोगः	508
अनधिकारिभ्यो निषेधः	509
पावित्र्यम्	514
तैष्वक्सेने निषेधः	516
देवतान्तर-निर्माल्ये	518
निगमनम्	519
शब्द-प्रमाणम्	519
प्राणाग्निहोत्रे नैवेद्यम्	525
वैदिक-कर्मातिरस्कारः	529
एकायन-शाखा	530
इतरे भागवताः	534
१८ समाप्तिः	534
Appendix - +Dyugangā द्युगङ्गा	537
Goals ध्येयानि	537
संस्कृतानुवादः	537
Contribution दानम्	538

ॐ ①

श्रीः

श्रीयै नमः

श्रीधराय नमः

भगवते यामुनमुनये नमः

श्रीमते रामानुजाय नमः ॥

श्रीभाष्यकाराणां परमगुरुणा श्रीयामुनाचार्यस्वामिना प्रणीतम् ।

आगमप्रामाण्यम् ।

(श्रीपञ्चरात्र-तन्त्र-प्रामाण्य-व्यवस्थापन-परम्)

▼ यामुनस्तुति:

नमोनमो यामुनाय

यामुनाय नमोनमः ।

नमोनमो यामुनाय

यामुनाय नमोनमः ।

▼ Buitenen - विश्वास-टिप्पनी

साधु प्रयतमानेनापि बहुत्र van Buitenen-नाम्ना पाण्डितेन दोषाः कृताः, ते च यथासम्भवं मार्जिताः। यथाऽस्य श्लोकस्यानुवादावृईक्षेताम् -

स्वर्ग-सिद्धिं विना किं नु
नियोगस्य न सिध्यति ।
नाधिकारो न विषयो
न चान्यद्-विध्-अपेक्षितम् ॥

०० मङ्गलादि①

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

जगज्-जन्म-स्थिति-ध्वंस-
महानन्दैक-हेतवे ।
करामलकवद् विश्वं
पश्यते विष्णवे नमः ॥

▼ Buitenen

1. Homage to Visṇu, 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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

येऽमी केचन मत्सरात् स-वयसो दुर्-मान-सारा नरा
गभीरां गुणशालिनीम् अपि गिरं निन्दन्ति, निन्दन्तु ते ।
सारासार-विचार-कौशल-दशा-पारे परे ऽवस्थिताः
सन्तस् सन्त्य् अनसूयवो ऽपि बहवः शंसन्ति ये मद्-गिरम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

This verse brings out the disdain of our author towards some of his contemporaries, who, out of jealousy, were too critical in their attitude towards his works. Also compare in this connection, the two concluding verses of this text.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अभिनिवेश-वशी-कृत-चेतसां
बहु-विदाम् अपि सम्भवति भ्रमः ।
तद् इह भागवतं गत-मत्सरा
मतम् इदं विमृशन्तु विपश्चितः ॥(5)

▼ Buitenen

- 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.

▼ नरसिंहः

भगवतं ... The term 'bhāgavata' refers to the Pañcarātra system of thought. Another term used generally is 'sāttvata'. For names applied to adherents of this religious school, see the Pādma Saṃhitā (Tantra) IV. ii. 88:

sūrissuhṛt bhāgavataḥ sāttvataḥ pañcakālavit
aikāntikah tanmayaśca pāñcarātrika ityapi.

See article on the 'Pāñcarātra' in JRAS for 1911, p. 936.

विपश्चितः ... Yāmuna in this verse appeals to scholars for an impartial scrutiny of the Pañcarātra religion.

०१ पूर्व-पक्षः①

०१ प्रामाण्यम्②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इह केचिद्
यतस्-ततो-ऽवगत--कतिपय-कुतर्क-कल्क-विस्फुर्जित-विजित-मनसस्
त्रयी-मार्ग-संरक्षण-व्याजेन निज-विमर्श-कौशलातिशयम् उपदर्शयन्तः
परम-पुरुष-विरचित-निरतिशय-निश्रेयस-गोचर-पञ्चरात्र-तन्त्र-प्रामाण्ये विप्रतिपद्यन्ते ।(5)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ नरसिंहः

See JRAS (1911), pp. 940-41, for various definitions of the term 'Pāñcarātra'. See also the latest article on the meaning of the term by Dr. V. Raghavan, JAOS, Vol. 85, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1965), pp. 73-79. The Mahāsanatkumāra Saṃhitā, Indrarātra section, ch. III, offers the following explanation for the term "sāttvata":

sa punassāttvate yasmāt kule jātassureśvaraḥ,
tasmātu sāttvatāṁ nāma purāṇam kovidā viduḥ
upadīṣṭam pañcarātram tena lokahitaiṣiṇā,
āhukāṁstu samuddiśya tena sāttvatamucyate

(Adyar edn. p. 245, śls. 79-80)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वदन्ति च ।

▼ Buitenen

And they contend:

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṁsaka is the pūrvapakṣin here.

सापेक्षता③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

द्वेधा खलु प्रमाणत्वं
वचसाम् अवसीयते ।
एकम् मानान्तरापेक्षम्
अनपेक्षम् अथेतरत् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

shabda, and its synonyms, have been translated variously as Verbal Testimony, Verbal Evidence in general, or Scripture in

particular, depending on the context.

पौरुषेयता④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्रापि ।

▼ Buitenen

These two kinds are thus distinguished:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न तावत् पुरुषाधीन-
रचनं वचनं क्वचित् ।
आसीदति प्रमाणत्वम्
अनपेक्षत्व-लक्षणम् ॥(4)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā II. 19:

वाक्यं हि पुरुषाधीन-रचनं लौकिकं सदा ।
शङ्क्यमानायथार्थत्वं नार्थ-निश्चायकं स्वतः ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पौरुषेयं हि वचः प्रमाणान्तर-प्रतिपन्न-वस्तुपरस्थापनायोपादीयमानं
वक्तुस् तद्-अर्थ-सिद्धिम् अनुरुद्धयमानम् एव प्रमाण-भावम् अनुभवति ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

prāmāna has generally been rendered with "means of knowledge," sometimes with "criterion."

०२ प्रत्यक्षादिभिर् आगमोक्तार्थसिद्धिः②

साधारण-प्रत्यक्षम्③

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

न च पञ्चरात्र-तन्त्र-प्रतिपाद्यमान-विलक्षण-दीक्षा-पूर्वक-
भगवद्-आराधनाभिलिष्ट-
स्वर्गापवर्गादि--साध्य-साधन-संबन्धं प्रत्यक्षादीन्य् आवेदयितुं क्षमन्ते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Now, Perception and the other means of knowledge which involve Perception,
cannot produce the knowledge
that the Pañcaratra Tantra does indeed set forth that the desired heaven, release and other supernatural ends can be attained by means of such ritual acts as Consecration and such devotional acts as worship of the Bhagavan etc., for this relation of means and ends is not of the order of Perception.

▼ *नरसिंहः:*

"Dīkṣā" or Initiation is one of the cardinal principles of the religious conduct of the Bhāgavata system. It consists of five main

sacraments, barring a few details that are peculiar to particular sections of the followers. These sacraments are:

tāpaḥ puṇḍrastathā nāma mantro yāgaśca pañcamah
pañcasamāskārādīkṣaiṣā devadevapriyāvahā
pañcasamāskārādikṣāvān mahābhāgavatassmrtaḥ

(Viṣṇutilaka Saṃhitā IV. 189-90)

- (i) “tāpa” : branding the two arms with the conch and discus emblems,
- (ii) “puṇḍra” : marking the forehead and other parts of the body with particular tilaka-materials,
- (iii) “nāma” : taking a new name, with the suffix ‘dāsa’, etc.
- (iv) “mantra” : taking the ‘aṣṭākṣarī’ (the eight-syllabled) and such other esoteric formulae, and
- (v) “yāga” : performing different kinds of worship of the Lord.

All are eligible for this Initiation, irrespective of sex, caste and such other considerations. Cf. Īśvara Saṃhitā:

svasvavarṇāśramācārasadṛśākṛticeṣṭitān
lāñchitān cakrasaśāṅkhābhyaṁ bhujayor dakṣināditaḥ

(VIII. 179)

sarve samānāścatvāro gotrapravaravarjitāḥ
utkarṣo nāpakarṣaśca jātitasteṣu sammataḥ

phaleṣu niḥspṛhāssarve dvādaśākṣaracintakāḥ
mokṣaikaniścayāśāvasūtakāśaucavarjitāḥ

(XXI. 40-41) (*JRAS* for 1911, pp. 946-47)

न हि प्रत्यक्षेण दीक्षाऽराधनादीनि निरीक्षमाणास्
तेषां निश्चयस-साधनतां प्रतिपद्यामहे ।

▼ *Buitenen*

For if we consider Consecration, worship etc. merely with the aid of Perception,
we cannot say that they are means to realize the *summum bonum*.

नार्वाचीन-गोचरम् फलादि③

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

न चार्वाचीनाः केचिद् अतिमानुष-शक्तयो
अभिलषित-साधनताम् अध्यक्षितवन्त
इति प्रमाणम् अस्ति,
यतस् तेषाम् अपि चक्षुरादीन्द्रियं दृश्यमानम् इन्द्रिय-स्वभावं नातिक्रमितुम् उत्सहते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Not only, therefore, is Perception of an ordinary kind unavailing,
but there is also no way to know that there have been recently
certain persons of superhuman sensibility
who would have had perceptual evidence
that such acts really are means of attaining the desired ends;
for the sense-organs of such persons, too,
cannot surpass the boundaries of sensitiveness as we know it
commonly.

भगवत्-साक्षिकत्वम्?③

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

ननु च -

प्रकृष्टमाणं प्रत्यक्षं
दृष्टम् आश्रय-भेदतः ।
अतस् तद्-आश्रये क्वापि
ध्रुवं परिनितिष्ठति ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

5. An objection may be raised here:

However, perception of a superior kind is possible, depending on its percipient.

Perception, therefore, may become perfect if the percipient is perfect.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

This is the view entertained by the Naiyāyika, as also by the Siddhāntin.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

सर्वं हि सातिशयं निरतिशय-दशाम् अनुभवद् दृष्टं
वियतीव परिमाणं, (4)
सातिशयं च काकोलूक-गृध्रादिषु प्रत्यक्षम् ईक्षितम्

इति तद् अपि तथा भवितुम् अर्हति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

इयं च ज्ञानस्य परा काष्ठा
या सर्वगोचरता।
अधिक-विषयतयैव हि जगति ज्ञानानि परस्-परम् अतिशेरते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

This indeed is the uppermost limit of knowledge
where it encompasses every knowable thing;
for we know from experience
that knowledges exceed one another as their contents exceed one
another.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इत्थम् ऐश्वर्य-वैराग्य-
सामर्थ्यादि-गुणा अपि ।
निरस्तातिशया: पुंसि
क्वचित् सन्तीति सूरयः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतो यस्यैतद् अ-खिल-भुवनावलम्बि--भाव-भेद--साक्षात्-कारि-प्रत्यक्षं
स तत्-समीक्षित-दीक्षाऽराधनादि-धर्म-भावो भगवान्
एवं व्याचष्टेति किम् अनुपपन्नम्

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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).

भगवन्-निरतिशय-प्रत्यक्षत्व-तिरस्कारः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तन् न प्रत्यक्ष-विज्ञान-
प्रकर्षः कल्पितोऽपि वः ।
स्व-गोचरम् अतिक्रम्य
नान्यद् आस्कन्दितुं क्षमः ॥

▼ Buitenen

6. This objection is thus refuted:

The supreme perceptual knowledge which you assume is just a fancy.

Perceptual knowledge can never go beyond its own sphere and trespass on another.

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṃsaka refutes the above view. For a detailed discussion see the Siddhitraya: Īśvara-siddhi, p. 226 ff.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि -

रूप-रूपि-तद्-एकार्थ-
समवायिषु चाक्षुषः ।
प्रकर्षो भवितुं युक्तो
दृश्यमान-प्रकर्षवत् (न तु स्पृश्यमान-प्रकर्षवत्)॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

रूपे, तद्वति घटे, तथा रूपेण सह एकस्मिन् अर्थे घटे समवाय-सम्बन्धेन विद्यमानेषु संख्या-परिमाणादिष्व् एव नियतः चक्षुः-प्रकर्षः न तु स्व-भिन्नेन्द्रिय-ग्राह्ये स्पर्श-गन्धादाव् इति भावः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एवम्

इन्द्रियान्तर-विज्ञानं
विश्वं गोचरयेन् न तु (तद-भिन्नेन्द्रिय-विषय-सद्-भावात्) ।
कथं प्रत्यक्ष-विज्ञानं
विश्वं बोधयितुं क्षमम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[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?

▼ नरसिंहः

ज्ञानम् एव विज्ञान-शब्देनोक्तम्।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु तत् (भगवत्-प्रत्यक्ष) कूप्त-सामर्थ्यं
विद्यमानोपलभ्ने ।

7. The objector resumes:

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

▼ नरसिंहः

“ननु” इति “प्रत्युत्” इत्य् अथे प्रयुक्तः।

सातिशयस्य निरतिशयाप्राप्तिः⑥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अ-सति हि (प्रत्यक्ष-स्व-भावानुबन्धिनि विद्यमानोपलभ्ननत्वे
(प्रत्यक्षस्य) प्रत्यक्षतैव परावर्तते।
न ह्य् अ-जात-मति-वृत्तं वा ऽवगमयद् अनुमानादि
प्रत्यक्ष-पक्ष-निक्षेपं क्षमते।
तेन

अशेष-विषयिता-लक्षण-प्रत्यक्ष-प्रकर्षः
स्व-भाव-नियम-निर्मूलितोदय

इति न हृदयम् अधिरोहति ।

▼ Buitenen

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,
defined as encompassing all objects,

is a priori impossible
because it is limited to being Perception!

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इदम् अपि सातिशयेन निरतिशयम् अनुमिमानः
पृष्ठे व्याचष्टं -

सातिशय एव किन् नु तां दशाम् अनुभवति
यतः परं न संभवति महिमा -

इत्य् अभिनिविशसे
बाल इव स्थविर-भावम् ।

▼ Buitenen

8. The objection is refuted:

If from finite Perception you conclude to infinite Perception,
then I ask you to explain:
can a finite quantity ever attain to such expansion that it cannot be
further expanded?

You insist, as it were, on full maturity in a little boy!
even as a boy, after attaining the full growth, cannot grow
physically further?'

▼ Buitenen - Notes

Punctuate after iti which closes the question introduced in prsto
vyācastām;

abhi-ni-vis "to stick to a partisan view (in the teeth of contrary
evidence)."

I take bala iva as sandhi for bāle iva,
the meaning being that the objector takes the view that
something limited (the boy) is really unlimited (mature adult).

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṃsaka poses three alternatives against the Naiyāyika's theory of "Supreme Person" of which this is the first alternative.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथैकस्मिन् सातिशये
केनाप्य् अन्येन निरतिशयेन भवितव्यम् इति
आहोस्वित् समान-जातीयेनान्येन निरतिशय-दशाम् अधिरूढेन भवितव्यम् इति ।

▼ Buitenen

There are two possibilities:
either the infinite exists in the finite,
or the finite gradually becomes infinite.

▼ नरसिंहः

अथ एकस्मिन् ... - This is the second alternative.

अहोस्वित् ... - This is the third one.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न तावद् अग्रिमः कल्पः
कल्पते ऽनुपलभ्तः ।
न हि दृष्टं शरावादि
व्योमेव प्राप्तवैभवम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

The former cannot stand,
for there is no Perception to support it:
we have never seen a bowl or a similar finite object
which had the same expansion as space.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यदि च तद् (परिस्मिन्-वस्तु) एव सातिशयम् असंभावनीय-पर-प्रकर्षं परिनितिष्ठेत्,
हन्तः! तर्ह्य् एकैकेन घट-मणिकादिना ब्रह्माण्डोदर-विवरम् आपूरितम्
इति तत्-प्रतिहततयेतर-भाव-भङ्ग-प्रसङ्गः

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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!

▼ नरसिंहः

गणिको महा-कुम्भः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

व्योम्नैव लब्ध-साध्यत्वान्
मध्यमः सिद्ध-साधनः ।
कल्पान्तरेऽपि दुर्-वारं
प्राग्-उदीरित-दूषणम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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:

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Manuscript V₁ starts from "dūṣāṇam", the preceding text being lost. See Critical Apparatus.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

विभु-स्तम्भान्त-व्याप्त-
स्तम्भस् सातिशयो न हि ।
दृष्ट-पूर्वस्, तथाऽन्योन्य-
व्याघातः स्थित एव सः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

vibhu in the sense of "omnipresent, infinite."

व्योम-निर्दर्शनं नोचितम्⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् अपि वियति परिमाणम् इह निर्दर्शितं
तद् अपि विमर्शनीयम् एव -
परिमाणं हि नाम देशावच्छेदः, इयता-परितोभाव-वेष्टनम् इति यावत् ।

▼ Buitenen

Let us also consider your illustration,
namely that in space we have an example of a finite extent
becoming infinite.

Extent is by definition a limited extension of space, a relative
quantity,
something that can be entirely circumscribed.

▼ नरसिंहः

Veṅkaṭanātha in his Nyāyasiddhāñjana, ch. VI. p. 170, quotes from “yadapi” to “nirdiśyate”

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च नभसि तद् अस्तीति
कथम् इव तद् इह निदर्शनतया निर्दिश्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

Extent in this definition does not subsist in space as such,
so how can you adduce it as an example?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि च नभसि तद् अनुमन्वीत
तद् अपि तर्हि सम्भाव्यमान-पर-प्रकर्षम्
इति पुनर् अपि साध्य-विकलता ।

▼ Buitenen

Besides, if one were to infer extent in space,
one would simultaneously infer the possibility that space might be
surpassed in extent by another quantity.
And so the illustration again falls short of the thesis.

अतिशयित-प्रत्यक्षेनापि न⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च

अतिशयितेन प्रत्यक्षेण
दीक्षाऽऽराधनाऽऽदयो धर्मतया अवबोधिता

इत्य् अपि प्रमाणम् अस्ति।

Nor is there any evidence for the thesis
that a superior perception reveals that Consecration, worship etc.
are actually dharma.

०३ नानुमानम्②

तस्माद्
अस्मद्-आदिष्व अनालोचित-पर-चेतनातिरेक-परिकल्पना इत्यीयसीति,
नाभिप्रेत-साध्य-साधन-सम्बन्धे प्रत्यक्षं प्रमाणं,
नतरां तन्-मूलतया पञ्च-रात्र-स्मृतिः प्रमाणम् ।

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.

[[6]]

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

means leading to the summum bonum.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च करण-पथ-दूर-वर्तिनि प्रस्तुत-वस्तुन्
(धूम-वह्योर् इव) अविनाभावाधारणाधीनोदयम् अनुमानम् उत्पत्तुम् अलम्-
न ह्य अ-दृष्ट-चर-वह्यस् तद्-अविना-भावितया धूमम् अनुसंदधति ।(5)

▼ Buitenen

9. Not only is there no Perception,
but there cannot possibly be an Inference to support the thesis in
question,
for it is wholly suprasensible:
and Inference, of course, can only take place
after an invariable concomitance has been observed by means of
Perception.

If no fires have ever been observed before,
they cannot prove that smoke is invariably concomitant with
them."

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide Siddhitraya: Īśvara°, pp. 233-34, for almost parallel
statements.

दीक्षाराधन-स्वर्गादीनां साध्य-साधन-भावे इत्य् अर्थः।

०४ न शब्दः②

वेदादौ न विधिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चागमस् सात्त्वत-समय-सिद्धं क्रिया-कलाप-कर्तव्यतोपस्थापन-परः परिदृश्यते,
येन तन्-मूलतया पञ्च-रात्र-स्मृताः प्रमाणं स्युः।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

Yamuna throughout treats Satvata and Bhāgavata as synonymous.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चादृश्यमानो (विधिर) उप्य (निगमतः) अनुमान-गोचरः,
यथैव हि तन्न-प्रसिद्ध-दीक्षाऽराधन--तत्-फलाभिमत-स्वर्गादि-साध्य-साधन-भावो नानुमान-
गोचरः - सम्बन्धावधारण-विरहात्।

▼ *Buitenen*

Nor is it possible, in the absence of explicit revelation,
to infer such evidence from Scripture.
For just as the relation of means to certain ends which are their
fruits, e.g., heaven, as Pañcarātra maintains Consecration, worship
etc. to be,
does not allow of being inferred
because no such relation can be (determined) ~~verified by~~
~~Perception,~~

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Tantravārtika, p. 70.

न मूलागमानुमानम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवं तन्-मूलागमोऽपि तत् एव नानुमातुं शक्यः ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चागमेनापि प्रस्तुत-स्मरण-मूल-भूतागमावगमः सम्भवति।
स हि द्वेधा पौरुषेयापौरुषेय-भेदात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

pauruṣeya 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
cotemporal with that person,
and the purvapaksin does not admit the existence of an eternal
personal deity.

पौरुषेय-शब्दतो न④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न तावत् पौरुषेयेण
वचसा तस्य सम्भवाः ।
विप्रलब्धुम् अपि ब्रूयुर्
मृषैव पुरुषाः यतः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अद्यत्वेऽपि हि दृश्यन्ते केचिद् आगमिकच्छ्लात् ।
अनागमिकम् एवार्थं
व्याचक्षणा विचक्षणाः ॥(5)

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् इह

पञ्च-रात्र-ग्रन्थ-प्रबन्धूणाम् अपि -
तन्-मूल-भूतागमावगम-पुरःसरी किं स्व-निबन्धनानां वेद-मूलत्व-प्रतिज्ञा?
किं वा यथा-रुचि रचयतां प्ररोचनाय तथा वचनम्?

इति शङ्कामहे ।

▼ Buitenen

[[7]]

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!

▼ नरसिंहः

Manuscript M, starts from “vagama” See. Critical Apparatus.

न श्रुति-सिद्धः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तावता च प्रमाणत्वं
व्याहन्येत समीहितम् ।
न हि (पाञ्चरात्रप्रतिख्यापको) नित्यागमः कश्चिद्
अस्ति तादृशगोचरः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Tantravārtika, p. 70.

नोपमानात्⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न चोपमानात् तन्-मूल-
श्रुति-सिद्धिर् - अ-सम्भवात् ।
कथं ह्य अ-दृष्ट-पूर्वा सा (श्रुति-सिद्धिर्)
स-दृश-ज्ञान-गोचरा ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

नार्थपत्तेः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न चार्थपत्तिस् तन्-मूल-श्रुति-सिद्धिः,
अनुपप्रत्य-अभावात्
स्मरणान्यथाऽनुपप्रत्या हि
तत्-कल्पना प्रादुर्-भवति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

The argument is as follows,
circumstantial Implication must prove the tradition,
as it cannot be proved otherwise.

...

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

Implication - namely, the relation of being a means to a certain end.

arthapatti, throughout translated "circumstantial-implication".

It is a kind of inference

by which is established something

that must be established,

yet is not established by another means of knowledge; for

example:

"Devadatta, who is well-fed,

does not eat by day:"

since he cannot be well-fed without eating at all,

it is deduced, by circumstantial implication, that he eats by night.

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṃsaka anticipates this argument from the Siddhāntin.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

समरन्ति हि पञ्च-रात्र-प्रणेतारः दीक्षाऽराधनाऽदिधर्मतया

अष्टकादीन् इव मन्व-आदयः ।

▼ Buitenen

the authors of the Pañcaratra, clearly have this tradition

that Consecration, worship, etc. are dharma

and this tradition is comparable to the tradition of Manu and

others

that certain non-Vedic rites, as the astaka etc., are dharma;

▼ Buitenen - Notes

KMS 1.3.2 api od kartrsamanyāt pramāṇam anumānam syat -

"smṛti is authoritative, because both smṛti and Veda have the same agent performing its mandates,"

astaka is the name of the 8th day after Full Moon in the winter and

śiśira months,

on which an oblation is performed for the deceased (Manu 4.119; 150).

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| न चाननुभूते वस्तुनि स्मरण-शक्तिर् आविर् भवति,

▼ Buitenen

now there can be no tradition of a fact unless that fact has been cognized before;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| अनुभवश् चेन्द्रिय-लिङ्ग-शब्द--स-दृशानुपपद्यमानार्थ-पूर्वकः,

▼ Buitenen

but here we have the tradition of a fact
that cannot be proved by Perception, Inference, Verbal Testimony
or Analogy;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| इदृश-विषये ऽनुभवः प्रमाणान्तरेभ्यो ऽनाविर्भवश्
चोदनाम् एव मूलम् उपकल्पयतीति

▼ Buitenen

therefore the cognition of the fact can only have originated from
Scripture...

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सिद्धेद् अप्य अयं मनोरथः
यदि हि यथार्थत्व-नियमो ऽनुभवानां प्रामाणिकः स्यात्,

▼ Buitenen

[[8]]

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

▼ नरसिंहः

The above argument is refuted as untenable by the Mīmāṃsaka.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदा पुना राग-द्वेषाभिनिवेशादि-वशी-कृतान्तः-करणानाम्
अ-यथाऽर्थानुभव-भाविता भावनाः
स्वानुरूपाः स्मृतीर् आरचयन्ति,
कथम् इव तदा स्मरणानुपपत्तिः
प्रमाण-भूता श्रुतिर् उपकल्प्यते -
अन्यथाऽपि स्मरणोपपत्तेः।
मन्वादि-स्मरणेष्व् इदानीं का वार्ता ।

▼ Buitenen

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 cognitions,
could these traditions possibly be true?

▼ नरसिंहः

अन्यथा ऽपि — अयथाऽर्थानुभव-भावित-भावनातो ऽपीति भावः।

the Siddhāntin poses this question to the Mīmāṃsaka.

अष्टकादौ भेदः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु तत्रापि प्राग्-उक्ता युक्तयः पराक्रमन्ते - न ह्य् "अष्टकां दृष्टवताम् इष-
साधनम्"
इति मतिर् आविर् अस्ति ।

▼ Buitenen

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 perceptual knowledge that this rite is indeed a means to realize the postulated end.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चानुमार्णं संबन्धादर्शनात्,
न च शब्दः तद्-अनुपलभ्यात्।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चानुपलब्धो इनुमातुं शक्यः संबन्धादर्शनाद् एव,

▼ Buitenen

Nor again can such evidence be inferred from Scripture where it is not found explicitly, because no relation is perceptually given.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चोपमेयः सदृशानिरूपणात्,

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| न च कल्पयितुं शक्यः, अनन्तरोक्तत्वात् स्मृत्य्-अन्यथोपपत्तेः ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वेद-संयोगि-पुरुष-
स्मरणानुपपत्तिः ।
कल्प्यते चेच् छ्रुतिस् तत्र
ततोऽन्यत्रापि कल्प्यताम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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, ...

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यतो नारद-शाण्डिल्य-
प्रमुखाः परमर्षयः ।
स्मर्यन्ते पञ्चरात्रेऽपि
संप्रदाय-प्रवर्तकाः ॥(4)

▼ Buitenen

great sages are traditionally known
as the founders of the sacred transmission,

sages like Narada, Sandilya and others.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. the following verse quoted by Bhāṭṭāraka Vedottama in his Tantra-śuddha, from some unknown source, p. 21:

nāradah sumahadbhūtaṁ lokānugrahakāmyayā
vāsudevādavāpyedaṁ sañcikṣepa mataṁ param.

The names of the teachers that promulgated the Pāñcarātra excepting those of Lord Nārāyaṇa and Nārada are given in the Īśvara Saṃhitā (Ch. I, śls. 38-41): Saṅkarṣaṇa, Śāṇḍilya, Sumantu, Jaimini, Bhṛgu, Aupagāyana and Mauñjyāyana.

Vide JRAS for 1911, foot-note on p. 942:

The descent of the Bhāgavata religion is, in the Kṛta age, from Nara-Nārāyaṇa to Nārada, and at the end of the Dvāpara, from Saṅkarṣaṇa to Śāṇḍilya and in the Kali, from Viśvaksena to Śaṭhakopa.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ततश्च -

तुल्याक्षेप-समाधाने
पञ्च-रात्र--मनु-सृती ।
प्रमाणम् अप्रमाणं वा
स्यातां भेदो न युक्तिमान् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

त्यज्यतां वा प्रमाणत्वं
मन्दू-आदि-समृति-गोचरम् ।
विशेषः पञ्च-रात्रस्य
वक्तव्यो वा, (येन) स (भेद) उच्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[9]]

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

This is the reply given by the Mīmāṃsaka.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि वा "कर्तृ-सामान्यात्
प्रमाणम्" इति सूत्रयन् ।
सूत्र-कारः (जीमिनि:) स्फुटी-चक्रे
वैलक्षण्यं विवक्षितम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

"Tradition is also valid,
because it has the same agent as Scripture",

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide Pūrva Mīmāṃsā I. iii. 2. The full aphorism is :

api vā kartṛṣāmānyāt pramāṇam anumānam syāt.

It is this sūtra that sanctions validity to the smṛtis, provided the rites enjoined by them are performed by the śiṣṭas, who also perform the other duties laid down in the Vedas.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि श्रुति-विहितानाम् अग्नि-होत्र-दर्श-पूर्ण-मास-ज्योतिष्-टोमादि-कर्मणां
स्मृति-विहितानाम् अष्टकाचमन-संध्योपासनादि-कर्मणां च पित्राद्य-उपदिष्टत्वात्
परम-हित-बुद्ध्या त्रैविद्य-वृद्धानां निर्विशेषमनुष्ठानं दृष्टम्。(5)

▼ Buitenen

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, ivolistoma,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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

The morning and evening oblations, the New and Full Moon oblations, and the soma sacrifice, examples respectively of nitya (daily recurring), naimittika (occasional) and kamya (desiderative) rites.

sandhya worship = the crepuscular observances.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तेन तादृश-शिष्ट-त्रैवर्णिक-परिग्रह-द्रढिम्ना
स्पष्ट-दृष्टाष्टकादि-कर्तव्यता-प्रतीतिः

स्वोपपादन-पटीयसीं श्रुतिम् एव मूलभूताम् अवलम्बते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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 that rites of this kind, astaka etc., obviously found to exist, are mandatory ultimately derives from Scripture itself.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

न चैवम् आचमनोपनयनादीन् इव
श्रुति-विहितानिहोत्रादि-पदार्थनुष्ठायिनस्
तान्त्रिकाचारान् उपचरतः पश्यामः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

On the other hand, we find that those who observe the scriptural rites of agnihotra etc. do not observe the Tantric customs in the same manner as they observe such traditional customs as acamana investiture with the sacred thread etc.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

प्रत्युतैनान् विगर्हन्ते कुर्वणान् वेद-वादिनः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

On the contrary, the Vedic experts condemn those who do.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

तस्माद् यत्-कर्तृ-सामान्यात्
प्रामाण्यं स्मृतिष्ठूदितम् ॥
नैव तत् पञ्चरात्रादि-
बाह्य-स्मरणम् अर्हति ।

न हि त्रैवर्णिकाः शिष्टास्
तदुक्तार्थान् उपासते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

It follows that the validity which we attribute to different Traditions "because", as the Sutra says, "they have the same agent as Scripture", cannot well apply to heterodox Traditions as the Pañcaratra; for exemplary exponents of the three estates do not accept the doctrines of Traditions of this kind.

▼ नरसिंहः

'तत्' इति पदेन पूर्व-पङ्क्त्य-उक्तं प्रामाण्यं परामृश्यते । 'पञ्च-रात्रादि-बाह्य-स्मरणम्' इत्य् एतत् कर्तृ-पदम्; तद् इति द्वितीयान्तम् ।

भागवतानाम् अब्राह्मण्यम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु तत्रापि श्रुति-स्मृति-प्राप्त-शिखा-यज्ञोपवीतादि-धारयद्धिर्
भागवत-ब्राह्मनैर् अहर्-अहर्-अनुष्ठायमानार्थत्वेन
चोदना-मूलत्त्वे संभाव्यमाने
कथम् इव प्रामाण्य-प्रत्यनीक-भूता भ्रम-विप्रलभादयः
स्मरण-कारणतया कल्प्यन्ते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

13. OBJECTION:

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?.

▼ नरसिंहः

The Siddhāntin questions.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

उच्यते ।

हन्तैवं-वादिना साधु
प्रामाण्यम् उपपादितम् ।
यत् त्रैवर्णिक-विद्विषाश्
शिष्टा भागवता इति ॥

▼ Buitenen

14. REFUTATION:

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

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṃsaka replies.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु ते कथम् अ-शिष्टा
ये त्रैवर्णिकाग्रगण्या ब्राह्मणाः?

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तन् न - तेषां त्रैवर्णिकत्वम् एव नास्ति, दूरे ब्राह्मणभावः,

▼ Buitenen

Refutation:

Brahmins? Far from it!

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हीन्द्रिय-संप्रयोग-समनन्तरं

केषुचिद् एव देह-विशेषेषु अनुवर्तमानम्

अन्यतो व्यावर्तमानं

नरत्वातिरेकिणं ब्राह्मण्यं नाम जाति-विशेषम् अपरोक्षयामः,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसंहेतुः

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā III. p. 30:

न हि क्षत्रियादिभ्यो व्यावर्तमानं, सकल-ब्राह्मणेष्व अनुवर्तमानम् एकम् आकारम्
अतिचिरम् अनुसन्दधतोऽपि बुध्यन्ते ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

शिखा-यज्ञोपवीतादयस् तु ब्राह्मणदीनां विधीयमाना

न तद्-भावम् आपादयितुं क्षमन्ते,

नाप्य् अवगमयन्ति,

दुष्ट-शूद्रादिषु व्यभिचार-दर्शनात्,

अतोऽनिर्विवाद-सिद्ध-वृद्ध-व्यवहार एवात्रावगम-निदानम् ।(5)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

शिखा-यज्ञो ... Cf. Tantravārtika pp. 5-6.

दुष्ट ... Duṣṭāśūdras could be those śūdras, who, being other than the three higher castes, pretend to be one among them by wearing marks like the sacred thread. If the word drṣṭāśūdras is taken to be correct it would then refer to those people of the śūdra-community who are also entitled to have sacred thread and such other marks.

लौकिकाः ⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च भागवतेषु ब्राह्मण-पदम् अविशङ्कं लौकिकाः प्रयुज्जते ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

भवति च भेदेन व्यपदेशः - "इतो ब्राह्मणा, इतो भागवता" इति ।(५)

▼ *Buitenen*

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

अब्राह्मणेषु रूढिः⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

स्याद् एतद्
ब्राह्मणेष्व एव कुतश्चिद् गुण-योगात्
सात्त्वत-भागवतादि-व्यपदेशः
यथा तेष्व एव परिव्राजकादि-शब्दा

इति ...

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तन् न ।

▼ Buitenen

REFUTATION: The argument is false.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

रूढ्या सात्वत-शब्देन
केचित् कुत्सित-योनयः ।
उच्यन्ते तेषु सत्स्व एष
शब्दो नान्यत्र वर्तते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

रूढि-शक्ति-प्रतिद्वन्द्वि-
योग-शक्ति-परिग्रहः ।
अ-युक्त इति युक्ति-ज्ञा
रथ-कार-पदे तथा । (5)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपरथा कथम् इव रथ-कार-शब्दो
ऽथ्यन-सिद्ध-बुद्ध्य-अङ्गत्व-भङ्गेनापि
यौगिकीं वृत्तिम् अपहाय
जाति-विशेषम् अभिनिविशते ।

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

अपरथा ... There is a Vedic statement "varṣāsu rathakāra ādadhiṭa",
which enjoins Installation of fire on a Rathakāra. Etymologically the
word 'Rathakāra' can refer to any person that belongs to the three
higher castes, viz., the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣatriya and the Vaiśya. But
conventionally this term refers to a particular community bearing
the name 'rathakāra'. The Pūrva Mīmāṃsā, in a separate section
called the Rathakāra Adhikaraṇa [VI. i. 44-50] discusses the matter

and concludes that the term 'rathakāra' occurring in the above Vedic text refers only to one belonging to a separate community called 'Saudhanvana', which is another name for the 'rathakāra' community. This community is a distinct one, neither Śūdra, nor Vaiśya, nor Kṣatriya.

Certain Mantras of the Rgveda indicate that the terms 'rathakāra', 'saudhanvana' and 'ṛbhava' applied to persons of this community, are all synonymous. See Śabara's commentary on Pūrva Mīmāṃsā VI. i. 50.

अध्ययन-सिद्ध-ज्ञानानाङ्गकत्वं अग्न्य-आधानस्य । तद् अपि भङ्गकत्वा , इति योजना । अग्न्य-आधाने वेदाध्येतार एव अधिकृता इत्य् अयम् अंशस् तावत् सर्व-सम्मतः । निसर्ग-सिद्धम् अपि अध्ययन-ज्ञानाङ्गकत्वम् आधानस्य, 'वर्षासु रथ-कार आदधीत' इत्य् अनेन विशेष-विधानेन बाध्यते । तथा च रथ-काराख्यस्य ब्राह्मण-क्षत्रिय-वैश्य-वर्ण-विभिन्नस्य, शूद्र-वर्ण-विभिन्नस्य च जाति-विशेषस्य बोधकत्वम् इति रूढिः-समाश्रयणेन निर्वाहः ।

अद्विजत्वं शास्त्रोक्तम्^⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सन्ति च सात्त्वता नाम उपनयनादि-संस्कार-हीना वैश्य-ब्रात्यान्वयिनो ऽवर-जन्मानः केचिद्

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ नरसिंहः

For an explanation of the term 'vrātya' see Manusmṛti II.38, 39:

ā śoḍāśāt brāhmaṇasya sāvitrī nātivartate ।
ā dvāvīṁśāt kṣatrabandhoḥ ā caturvīṁśater viśāḥ ॥
ata ūrdhvam trayo'pyete yathākālamasaṁskṛtāḥ ।
sāvitrīpatitā vrātyā bhavantyāryavigarhitāḥ ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथाऽह मनुः -

वैश्यात् तु जायते व्रात्यात्
सुधन्वाचार्य एव च ।
भारुषश् च निजङ्गघश् च
मैत्र-सात्त्वत एव च ॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Manu (Manu 10.23.) says:

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Manusmṛti X-23.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

भागवत-शब्दश् च सात्त्वतेषु वर्तते इति नात्र कश्चिद् विवादः ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[12]]

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स्मरन्ति च -

पञ्चमः सात्त्वतो नाम
विष्णोर् आयतनानि सः ।
पूजयेद् आज्ञाया राजां
स तु भागवतः स्मृतः ॥

इति

▼ Buitenen

Smrti has it that

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

the term "by royal decree" shows that it is a caste profession.

Quotation not identified

▼ नरसिंहः

To be traced out.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा चोदीरित--व्रात्य-प्रसूति-वृत्त्य-उपायतयेदम् एव स्मरन्ति यद् अमी ह प्रत्यक्षम् एव वृत्त्य-अर्थम् अनुतिष्ठन्ते दृश्यन्ते

▼ Buitenen

The Smrti thus describes which profession the descendants of the said vratya vaisya pursue

and with our own eyes we indeed see them pursue this profession.

▼ नरसिंहः

यत् कर्म देव-पूजन-रूपं, अमी पाज्चरात्रिका इह अनुतिष्ठन्ति, तत् स्मृतिषु व्रात्यापत्य-
वृत्तितया प्रसिद्धम् एवेति भावः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा चोशना

सर्वेषां कृषि शस्त्रोपजीवनम्
आचार्य-सात्त्वतयोर् देव-पूजनम्

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Thus Uśanas:

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

not found in Ausanasasmṛti (AAS 48).

▼ नरसिंहः

Passages to be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा ब्राह्मे पुराणे

विष्णोर् आयतनानि स पूजयेद् आज्ञया राजाम् ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Similarly, in the Brahma Purāṇa-

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथाऽन्यत्रापि

सात्त्वतानां च देवायतन-शोधनं
नैवेद्य-शोधनं प्रतिमा-संरक्षणम्

इति,

▼ Buitenen

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."

वृत्ति-भेदः⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा चेदृशसंदेहव्युदासाय मनोर्वचः -

प्रच्छन्ना वा प्रकाशा वा
वेदितव्याः स्व-कर्मभिः ।

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

Manusmṛti X. 40.

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि चाचारतस् तेषाम्
अब्राह्मण्यं प्रतीयते ।
वृत्तिं देवता-पूजा
दीक्षा नैवेद्य-भक्षणम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

See foot-note on p. 3 above.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

गर्भाधानादि-दाहान्त-
संस्कारान्तर-सेवनम् ।
श्रौत-क्रियाऽननुष्ठानं
द्विजैस् सम्बन्ध-वर्जनम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

By "sambandha" here is meant the matrimonial alliance—"yauna-sambandha."

▼ Buitenen

observe deviating sacraments-
from the prenatal garbhadhāna rite to the funerary rituals-,
omit to perform the shrauta ritual
and avoid contact with Brahmins.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इत्यादिभिर् अनाचारैर् अब्राह्मण्यं सुनिर्णयम् ।

▼ Buitenen

These and other habits show conclusively that they cannot be Brahmins.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स्मरन्ति हि वृत्तितो देवपूजाया
ब्रह्म-कर्मस्व अनधिकारहेतुत्वं, यथा -

▼ Buitenen

Smritis declare that the reason of their disqualification for Vedic rites

is this that they perform pūjā to the Deity in order to earn a living:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ये षां वंश-क्रमाद् एव
देवार्चा-वृत्तितो भवेत् ।
तेषाम् अध्ययने यज्ञे
याजने नास्ति योग्यता ॥

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

Passage to be traced out.

▼ Buitenen

[[13]]

"Those who from generation to generation have worshipped the Deity professionally are disqualified for the study of the Veda,

for participation in the sacrifices
and for officiating in sacrifices."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा च परमसंहितायां तेषाम् एव वचः -

आपद्य् अपि च कष्टायां
भीतो वा दुर्गतोऽपि वा ।
पूजयेन् नैव वृत्त्य्-अर्थं
देवदेवं कदाचन ॥

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

Paramasamhitā XXVIII : 33b-34a. Also Cf. ibid.:

annapānam dhanam putramāyuraisvaryamāspadām
āpadyapi na yāceta pūjakah puruṣottamam.

▼ Buitenen

Their own Parama Samhita states the same prohibition:

"Whether in disaster or emergency,
in terror or in straits,
one must never worship the God of gods for a living."

▼ Buitenen - Notes

This point is detailed upon infra § 134 f

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् अपि समस्त-विशिष्ट-विगर्हित-निर्माल्य-धारण--नैवेद्य-भक्षणाद्य-अनुष्ठानं
तद् अपि तेषाम् अब्राह्मण्यम् एवाभिद्योतयति
इति ।

▼ Buitenen

Such habits as wearing the garlands that are offered to the God and eating the food that is presented to the idol and other practices of that kind, which are condemned by all right-thinking people, shows plainly that they are not Brahmins.

शिष्ट-गर्हता⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च यद् अवलोकनादाव् अपि
विशेषाश् चान्द्रायणादि-प्रायश्चित्तानि विदधति
कथं तत्-परिग्रहः श्रुति-मूलत्वम् अवगयतीति संभावयामः?

▼ Buitenen

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 candraayana

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स्मरन्ति हि देवलकावलोकने प्रायश्चित्तम्।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

देवलकाश् चामी देव-कोशोपजीवित्वाद्
वृत्त्यर्थं देवपूजनात्।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

'अमी' भागवता इत्य् अर्थः।

देवकोशो ... Passages to be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा च देवलः -

देवकोशोपजीवी यस्
स देवलक उच्यते ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Thus Devala:

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

not in Devalasmṛti.

▼ नरसिंहः

Passages to be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा,

वृत्यर्थं पूजयेद् देवं
त्रीणि वर्षाणि यो द्विजः ।
स वै देवलको नाम
सर्वकर्मसु गर्हितः ॥

इति ।

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

To be traced out. Cf. Bhaviṣyapurāṇa ch. 139, śls. 18, 21 and 22 :

yadi devārthatadānam syāt tato devalakā dvijāḥ
devadravyābhilāṣaśca brāhmaṇyam tu vimuñcati

dvijo devalako yatra pañkyām bhūnkte mahipate
annānyupasṛṣṭennīcā sā pañktih pāpamācaret
dvijo devalako yasya saṃskāram samprayacchat
so'dhomukhān pitṛn sarvān ākramya vinipātayet

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अमी पुनर् वंशानुपरम्परया वृत्त्य-अर्थम् एव देवम् आराधयन्तो दृश्यन्ते,
अतो देवलकत्त्वम् अकामेनाप्य् अभ्यनुज्ञातव्यम्

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा च ।

विड़-वराहं च षण्डं च
यूपं देवलकं शवम् ।
भुज्जानो नेक्षयेद् विप्रो
दृष्ट्वा चान्द्रायणं चरेत् ॥

इति प्रायश्चित्तं स्मरन्ति,

▼ Buitenen

Passage to be identified. Cf. Sāttvatasamhitā XXI. 20 :

nagarāpaṇavīthīṣु tasya devalakasya ca
darśanam sparaśanam caiva kuryāt saṃbhāṣanam na hi

Also cf. Paramasamhitā III.47 :

pāṣāṇḍasamayasthāmśca devakośopajīvinah
nāstikān ninditān duṣṭān na spr̄ṣenā ca samvadet

▼ Buitenen

The rite of expiation is set forth in the precept:

"A Brahmin who is taking his meal should not look at ordure, a pig, a eunuch, a sacrificial pole, a devalaka or a corpse;
if he does he must observe the candrayana."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा च विषदतरम् अमीषाम् एवोपब्राह्मणं वर्णयत्यत्रिः ।

अ-वालुका देवलका: कल्प-देवलका गण-भोग-देवलका भागवत-वृत्तिर् इति
चतुर्थः - एते उपब्राह्मणा (5)

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Atri, too, very explicitly declares that they are not Brahmins:

"The Avalukas, Devalakas, Kalpadevalakas,
Ganabhogadevalakas and fourthly those of the
Bhagavata profession are corrupt Brahmins." "

▼ Buitenen - Notes

not in Atrismṛti:

Avaluka is unknown to me.

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

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा च भगवान् व्यासः -

आह्वायका देवलका
नक्षत्र-ग्राम-याजकाः ।
एते ब्राह्मण-चण्डाला
महा-पथिक-पञ्चमाः ॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

[[14]]

Also the venerable Vyasa:

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

▼ नरसिंहः

आह्वायका ... Mahābhārata XII. 76.6.

'महा-पथिकाः' शव-वाहका इत्य् अर्थः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवं जात्या कर्मणा च
त्रयी-मार्गाद् अपश्रष्ट-भागवत-जन-परिग्रह एव
पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्र-प्रामाण्य-प्रतिक्षेपाय पर्याप्तो हेतुः,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि -

विवादाध्यासितं तन्नं
न मानं पुण्य-पापयोः ।
त्रयी-बाह्यैर् गृहीतत्वाच्
चैत्य-वन्दन-वाक्यवत् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'विवादाध्यासितं', प्रामाण्य-विषये विप्रतिपत्ति-समाक्रान्तम्।

'पुण्य-पापयोर्' इति विषय-सप्तमी।

चैत्यवन्दन ... Bhaṭṭa Medhātithi, commenting on Manusmṛti, XII. 95, quotes from some unknown source, the following:

| nodanāḥ caityavandanataḥ svargo bhavati.

०६ वेद-तिरस्कारः②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि च तेषां
त्रयी-मार्ग-त्याग--पुरस्-सरः सर्व-धर्मोपदेश
इति स्व-वाक्यान्य् एव उपख्यापयन्ति

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

चतुर्षु वेदेषु परं श्रेयोऽलब्ध्वा
शाण्डिल्य इदं शास्त्रमधीतवान्

इत्यादीनि

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

This objection is raised by Śaṅkara in his commentary on the
Brahma-sūtra: II. ii.45: "vipratiṣedhācca". Cf. his commentary:
'vedavipratiṣedhaśca bhavati; 'caturṣu vedeṣu param śreyo'
labdhvā śāṇḍilya idam śāstramadhibhigatavān'
ityādivedanindādarśanāt", etc.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् इह

कथं चतुर्णाम् अपि वेदानां निश्रेयस-साधनावबोधकत्व-व्युदासेन आरभमाणः
तत्-प्रसादावगतम् (मोक्षात्प्रयम्) अर्थ
पुम्-अर्थतया कथयतीत्य् उत्त्रेक्ष्येत् ? (५)

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

मन्व-आदयो हि
विवक्षित-सकल-समीहित-साधनावबोधकम्
आगमैक-मूलम् अभिदधाना दृश्यन्ते ।

▼ Buitenen

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:

'वेदो धर्म-मूलं', 'तद्-विदां च स्मृति-शीले'

▼ नरसंहेतु:

Gautamadharmaśūtra: I. 1-2.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वेदोऽखिलो धर्ममूलं
स्मृतिशीले च तद्विदाम् ।

▼ Buitenen

"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";

▼ नरसिंहः

Manusmṛti: II. 6a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितो धर्मः ।

▼ Buitenen

"the Law is enjoined by Scripture and Tradition";

▼ नरसिंहः

Vasiṣṭhasmṛti: I. 2.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

स सर्वोऽभिहितो वेदे
सर्व-ज्ञानमयो हि सः ।

इति च ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Manusmṛti: II. 7b.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् अपरम्
उपनयनादि-संस्कृतानाम् अधिकृतानां च
अग्नि-होत्रादि-समस्त-वैदिक-कर्मसु
पुनर् अपि भगवद्-आराधनाधिकार-सिद्ध्ये
दीक्षा-लक्षण-संस्कार-वर्णनं,
तद् अवैदिकताम् एवानुकारयति,

▼ Buitenen

[[15]]

Further, the assertion that those who have already been consecrated by the sacraments of Investiture etc. and are thereby qualified for all the Vedic rituals, agnihotra etc., must yet undergo another sacrament, called Consecration (namely, dīkṣā), in order to be qualified for the worship of the Bhagavan, demonstrates that the system is non-Vedic;

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Pādmasamhitā Caryāpāda: I. 8b-10a:

naivādhikāriṇaste ca dīkṣāsaṁskāravarjitāḥ ॥
yathaiva dīkṣāṇīyeṣṭyā jāyante brāhmaṇādayaḥ ।
tathaiva dīkṣāvidhiñā jāyamānā yathoditāḥ ॥
pūjāvidhau bhagavataḥ prakalpante 'dhikāriṇaḥ ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वैदिकत्वे हि तैर् एव संस्कारैर् भगवद्-आराधनादाव् अय्य अधिक्रियेन् ।

▼ Buitenen

for if it were Vedic,
they would be qualified for Tantric ritual by the regular
sacraments.

०८ १४-विद्यास्थानेष्व अनन्तभावः②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् अपि धर्म-प्रमाणतया
समस्तास्तिक-जन-परिगृहीतेषु चतुर-दश-विद्यास्थानेष्व अपरिगणनं
तद् अप्य अवैद्यकत्वे लिङ्गम् - अन्यथा हीदम् अपि तद्-अन्यतमत्वेन स्मर्येत् ।

▼ Buitenen

Again, another indication of its non-Vedic character is the fact that the system is not included among the fourteen sources of knowledge, which all orthodox people recognize as giving authoritative information on the Law.
If it were authoritative, then it would have been recognized as such by tradition;

▼ Buitenen - Notes

fourteen sources of knowledge - namely, the four Vedas, six Vedāngas, the Purāṇas, Mimansā, Nyāya and Dharmasāstra.

▼ नरसिंहः:

Vide Yājñavalkyasmṛti: I. 3:

purāṇanyāyamīmāṃsādharmaśāstrāṅgamiśritāḥ ।
vedāssthanānāni vidyānām dharmasya ca caturdaśā ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च स्मर्यते,
तद् अवसीयते - "अ-वैदिकम् एवेदं पञ्च-रात्र-स्मरणम्" इति ।

▼ Buitenen

but as it is not so recognized, this proves that the Pañcarātra tradition is non-Vedic.

०९ बादरायणोक्तिः②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अत एव च भगवता बादरायणेन
 त्रयी-मार्ग-प्रत्यनीक-भूत--कण-भुग्--अक्ष-चरण--सु-गत-मतादि--
 बाह्य-समय-निरासावसरे
 इत्य तन्त्रस्य निरासः ।
 "उत्पत्त्य-असंभवात्" इति ।

▼ Buitenen

For this reason the venerable Badarāyaṇa,
 when he has occasion to refute the heterodox doctrines of Kanāda,
 Akṣapada, the Buddha etc. as inimical to the Way of the Veda,
 also refutes the Pancarātra in his Sutra (BrS. 2.2.42.):
 "Because of the impossibility of origin.

▼ नरसेहः

अत ... This is the contention of the Advaitins. The entire
 Utpattiyasambhava or the Pāñcarātra section of the Brahmasūtra
 [II. ii. 42-45] consisting of the four aphorisms:
 "utpattyasyaṁbhavāt", "na ca kartuḥ karaṇām", "vijñānādibhāve vā
 tadapratiṣedhaḥ" and "vipratiṣedhācca" had been interpreted by
 Śaṅkarācārya as refuting the validity of the Pāñcarātrāgamas.

उत्पत्त्यसम्भवात् ... Brahmasūtra: II. ii.42. This sūtra is the 42nd one in
 the second Pāda of the second Adhyāya, according to Śaṅkara. But
 according to Rāmānuja, this is the 39th aphorism.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

त्रयी-विदाम् इत्थम् अ-सङ्ग्रहेण
 तथा त्रयी-बाह्य-परिग्रहेण ।
 अनन्तरोक्तैर् अपि हेतुभिस् तन्
 न मानवादि-स्मरणैस् समानम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

Therefore, as the Vedic experts regard the Pañcaratra doctrine as non-Vedic since it is not included among the Vedic systems and because of other reasons which will be advanced in the sequel, it cannot be compared with the Tradition of Manu etc.

१० क्षुद्र-विद्या-परता②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवं सति

यान्य् अपि लोकं व्यामोहयितुं

विद्वेषणोच्चाटन-वशीकरणादि--क्षुद्र-विद्या-प्रायम् एव बहुलम् उपदिशद्विर्
भगवद्-आराधनादि--कतिपय-वैदिक-कर्मणि पाञ्चरात्रिकैर् निर्दिश्यन्ते

तान्य् अनुपयोग्यान्य् अविसम्भणीयानि च

श्व-दृति (=bag)-निक्षिप्त-क्षीरवद्

इति मन्यामहे !

▼ Buitenen

In view of all this it is our opinion that such infrequent good rites- e.g., the worship of the Bhagavān - which are described by the Pañcaratricas

(who teach a good many others,

mostly black arts of exciting hatred, haunting a person out of his occupation, envoutement etc.)

are merely added to deceive people about their real attentions and do not deserve our faith or consideration: they are like milk that is put in a dog's bladder !

[[16]]

▼ नरसेहः:

Cf. Tantravārtika under I. iii-4 : pp. 114-115 :

यद् वा यान्य् एतानि त्रयी-विद्धिः न परिगृहीतानि, किञ्चित्-तन्-मिश्र-धर्म-कञ्चुक-च्छायापातितानि लोकोपसङ्ग्रह-लाभ-पूजा-ख्याति-प्रयोजन-पराणि त्रयी-विपरीतासम्बद्ध-दृष्टि-शोभादि-प्रत्यक्षानुमानोपमानार्थापत्ति-प्राय-युक्ति-मूलोपनिबद्धानि सांख्य-योग-पाञ्चरात्र-पाशुपत-शाक्य-निर्ग्रन्थ-परिगृहीत-धर्माधर्म-निबन्धनानि विष-चिकित्सा-वशीकरणोच्चाटनोन्मादनादि-समर्थ-कतिपय-मन्त्रौषधि-कादाचित्क-सिद्धि-निर्दर्शन-बलेनाहिंसा-सत्य-वचन-दम-दान-दयादि-श्रुति-स्मृति-संवादि-स्तोकार्थ-बन्ध-वासित-जीविका-प्रायार्थन्तरोपदेशीनि, यानि च बाह्यतराणि म्लेच्छाचार-मिश्र-भोजनाचरणानि निबन्धनानि, तेषाम् एवैतच-छुति-विरोध-हेतु-दर्शनाभ्याम् अनपेक्षणीयत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते।

It may be noted that the passage quoted above mentions Pāñcarātra along with other non-Vedic schools like Buddhism and Jainism, and it is the nucleus of the anti-Pāñcarātra arguments advanced by the adherents of other schools of thought, from time to time.

In the Tantra-terminology, “*vidveṣaṇa*” etc. are technically called “*śaṭkarmas*”. Vide Liṅgādhāraṇacandrikā: p. 285, foot-note. These “*śaṭkarmas*” are : “*māraṇa*” (destruction), “*uccāṭana*” (driving away), “*stambhana*” (arrest, that is, staying a storm, striking a man dumb etc.), “*vaśīkaraṇa*” (bringing under control, which includes hypnotism), “*vidveṣaṇa*” (causing antagonism between persons) and “*svastyayana*” (curative and healing power in disease, misfortune and danger).

A number of Pāñcarātra works describe in detail the ways and means of achieving mundane pleasures, effecting enmity, attracting and subduing persons and even the minor gods, curing or healing poisons of insects and reptiles and so on. The Kāśyapasamhitā, for instance, is a work entirely devoted to the delineation of the curing of various sorts of poisons.

For “*vidveṣaṇa*”, see Kāśyapasamhitā: III. 32; Śrīviṣṇutilakasamhitā: IV. 640-643; and the Hiranyaagarbhasamhitā: XIX.

For “uccāṭana”, see Kāśyapasamṛhitā: III. 26-28; V. 12, 42, 45; Śrīviṣṇutilakasamṛhitā: IV. 634-639; Hiranyaagarbhasamṛhitā: XIX and Īśvarasamṛhitā: XXV. 115b.

For “vaśīkaraṇa” see Agastyasamṛhitā: XV. 8-11, 49-51 and XXXI; Kāśyapasamṛhitā: III. 8, 21-24; Śrīviṣṇutilakasamṛhitā: IV. 415-422; 430-454; Sāttvatasamṛhitā: XVII. 440 et passim; Hiranyaagarbhasamṛhitā: XIII. 3 ff; Īśvarasamṛhitā: XXV. 115a.

By the term ‘ādi’ mentioned in the text “vaśīkaraṇādi”, are understood “māraṇa”, “viśaharaṇa”, “viśacikitsā”, “unmādana”, “ākarṣaṇa”, “stambhana” and the like.

For “māraṇa”, see Hiranyaagarbhasamṛhitā: XIX; Agastyasamṛhitā: XXXI; Śrīviṣṇutilakasamṛhitā: IV. 645-666 and the Īśvarasamṛhitā: XXV. 115b.

For “viśaharaṇa”, see Śrīviṣṇutilakasamṛhitā: IV. 488-490; and Kāśyapasamṛhitā: Chs. VI to XII.

For “unmādana”, see Kāśyapasamṛhitā: III. 33-36; and Īśvarasamṛhitā: XXV. 116a.

For “ākarṣaṇa”, see Kāśyapasamṛhitā: III. 1-3 and Īśvarasamṛhitā: XXV. 115a.

For “stambhana”, see the Īśvarasamṛhitā: XXV. 116a.

Thus, though apparently, the Pāñcarātrasamṛhitās pour down instructions and incantations to be followed and applied, so as to achieve some mundane pleasures, the attitude of a Pāñcarātrin to this question is an altogether different one. According to him, all such Āgamas which are found to give instructions regarding the achievement of some mundane pleasure or other, are intent upon advising men against such pursuits, rather than prescribing such pursuits. Thus, for instance, the Paramasamṛhitā, one of the oldest and the most authoritative Āgamas of the Pāñcarātra literature,

also refers to the ways and means of attaining earthly pleasures in chs. VI, XIII, XV and XVI. But it spares no effort to stress upon the futility and undesirability of such pursuits.

Thus it says in VI. 60-61a:

nānyaḥ siddhyati kāmena tasmāt kāmo nirarthakaḥ
tasmāt sarvaprayatnena muktvā kāmamanoratham
bhagavantamupāśīta sarvam tenaiva siddhyati.

Unflinching devotion to God will itself bring to a man all material prosperity, even if he does not himself pray God for it.

Also cf. ibid : XXXI. 69 :

tasmādanena mārgeṇa pūjayed madhusūdanam
aiśvaryamapavargam vā nirvyājamadhigacchati.

Also cf. ibid : XXX. 100-101a :

tasmādubhayamevātra pumṣāṁ bhavati sammataṁ
aiśvaryamapavargo vā višeṣeṇa pitāmaha
madgaṭā bhaktirevedamubhayam sādhayiṣyati.

This is the norm of all the Pāñcarātra texts. The main concern of their teaching is unflinching devotion to the Lord and the methods of translating that devotion into acts of worship, which are divided into five types: “abhibgamaṇa”, “upādāna”, “svādhyāya”, “ijyā” and “yoga”, to be performed in different parts of the day.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतो न वेद-मूलत्वं
पञ्चरात्रस्य युज्यते ।
प्रामाण्यं प्रतिपद्यते
येन मन्त्र-आदि-शास्त्रवत् ॥

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.

११ वेद-तुल्य-प्रमाणत्वं न②

पूर्व-पक्षः (नैय्यायिकः)③

पौरुषेयत्वम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अत्र कश्चिद् आह

कामं कक्ष्यान्तरित-प्रामाण्येषु मन्व-आदिस्मरणेषु कारणतया वेदाः
परिकल्प्यन्ताम्,
पञ्च-रात्र-स्मरणस्य तु किं वेदेन?

▼ नरसिंहः

The Naiyāyika now argues with the Mīmāṃsaka. His contention is that the Vedas and the Pāñcarātra texts are utterances of one and the same Supreme Being, Who is also the Omniscient Designer-Architect of this wonderful cosmos. He forms the second critic to be refuted by the Siddhāntin, only in so far as the authorship of the Vedas is concerned. For the Siddhāntin, as for the Mīmāṃsaka, the Vedas are revealed, "apauruṣeya", not composed even by the Supreme.

▼ नरसिंहः

कक्ष्यया एकया अन्तरितं प्रामाण्यं मन्वादि-शास्त्राणाम्। वेदानां प्रामाण्य-सार्वभौमत्वात्, तद्-
अनुसारणाच् च सर्व-स्मृतीनाम्। पञ्च-रात्रं तु वेदवद् एव निरपेक्षतया सर्वोत्कृष्टतया च प्रमाणं,
तत्-समान-योग-क्षेमत्वाद् इति हार्दम्।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

तन्-मूलतया वलम्बितेन
वेदानाम् अपि यद् (इश्वर) अनुभव-निबन्धनं प्रामाण्यं
तद्-अनुभव एव हि पञ्च-रात्र-स्मरणस्य निदानम्

▼ *Buitenen*

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 authority
and supported authority which characterizes typical smarta injunctions,

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

न खलु तुल्य-मूलयोर् अष्टकाचमन-स्मरणयोर्
मिथो-मूल-मूलि-भावः ।(5)

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

परस्-परम् अपेक्षेते
तुल्य-कक्षये न हि स्मृती ।
पञ्च-रात्र--श्रुती तद्वन्
नापेक्षते परस्परम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

Similarly, Pañcarātra and Scripture are not interdependent.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वेद-मूलत्व-हानेन
पञ्चरात्रे इवसीदति ।
कुतस् तन्-मूलता-हानाद्
आगमो नावसीदति ॥(5)

▼ नरसिंहः

पञ्च-रात्रस्य वेद-मूलत्वाभावाद् यदि अप्रामाण्य-प्रसवितः, तर्हि पाञ्चरात्र-मूलत्वाभावात् वेदस्याप्य् अप्रामाण्य-प्रसङ्ग इति समानर्थम्। उभयोर् अपि वेद-पञ्च-रात्रयोः भगवद्-अनुभवैक-मूलतया तुल्यत्वात् तद्-अन्तरे एकतरामूलत्व-प्रयुक्तम् अप्रामाण्यम् अन्यस्य न शक्य-शङ्कम् इति निष्कर्षः।

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

आह - "किम् एवं वेदा अपि पुरुषानुभवाधीनप्रामाण्याः पौरुषेया एव?"

▼ नरसिंहः

This is the objection raised by the Mīmāṃsaka to the above view.

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कस्य संशयः?
वाक्यत्वं हि पराधीन-रचनत्व-स्वभावम् उपलभ्यमानं
कथम् अपरथा इवतिष्ठेत?

▼ नरसिंहः

The Naiyāyika meets this objection.

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वेदनाम्नो ग्रन्थस्यायं महिमा -
यत् केनचिद् असन्दृढ्यो इपि वाक्यत्वेनावतिष्ठत
इति चेत्

▼ Buitenen

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;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

हन्त तहि पर्वत-वर्तिनो धूमस्यायं महिमा
यज् ज्वलनम् अन्तरेणानुच्छिन्न-सन्तानो गगन-तलम् अधिरोहतीति
किम् इति न स्पात्? (5)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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.

धर्म-साक्षात्-कारः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु कथम् अतिक्रान्त-मानान्तरावतारे धर्मे
ग्रन्थः सन्दृश्यते?

मैव - यतस् सहज-संवेदन--साक्षात्-कृत-धर्माधर्म एव
भगवान् जगद्-अनुकम्पया वेदम्-अनामानं ग्रन्थम् आरचयतीति ।

▼ नरसिंहः

'संवेदनं' ज्ञानम्; तच् च भगवतस् सहजम्। इन्द्रिय-निरपेक्षं तस्य प्रत्यक्षम् इति भावः।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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 incarnation) is suprasensible, there can be no other authority for it than Scriptural authority.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किम् अस्ति धर्माधर्म-गोचरम् अपि प्रत्यक्षम्?

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| बाढं कथम् अन्यथा तनु-भुवनादि-कार्यम् उपजनयति?

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| स हि तत्र कर्ता भवति
यो यस्योपादानम् उपकरणज् च साक्षात्-कर्तुं प्रभवति।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| धर्माधर्मो च जगद्-उपकरणम्
इति मीमांसकानाम् अपि सम्मतमेव ।

▼ Buitenen

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

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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.

जगत्-कार्यता④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यस्तु ब्रूते
"गिरि-भुवनाऽऽदयो भावा न कार्यं" इति,
प्रतिब्रूयादेनम् -

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

विवाद-गोचरा भावाः
कार्या (भू=)विश्वम्-भरादयः ।
विचित्र-सन्-निवेशत्वान्
नरेन्द्र-भवनादिवत् ।
तथा सावयवत्वेन
विनाशोऽप्य् अवसीयते ॥

▼ नरसिंहः

'विचित्र-सन्निवेशत्वात्', सावयवत्वाद् इति यावत्।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

विनश्यन्ति च ये भावास्
ते तत्-साधन-वेदिना ।
विनाशयन्ते यथा तज्-ज्ञैर्
अस्माभिः (कमण्डलु=) करकादयः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ये पुनर् अ-परिदृष्ट-बुद्धिमद्-अधिष्ठान--तरु-पतनादि-शकलिता भावाः
तेऽपि विमत्य्-आक्रान्ता
इति नानैकान्तिकत्वम् आवहन्ति ।

▼ नरसिंहः

'विमत्याक्रान्ता' पक्षे क्रोडी-कृता इत्य् अर्थः। पक्षे व्यभिचारशङ्का तु न दोषाय, अपरथा अनुमान-व्यवहार-स्थैर्योच्छेद-प्रसङ्गात् इति आशयः।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किं च -

महत्तया सनाथेन
स्पन्दमानत्व-हेतुना ।
उत्पत्ति-भङ्गौ भावानाम्
अनुमातुम् इहोचितौ ॥

▼ नरसिंहः

'महत्त्वे सति क्रियावत्त्वाद्' इति यावत्।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् एवम् उदीरित-न्याय-प्रसिद्धे विश्वम्-भरादि-कार्यत्वे
सिद्ध्यत्य एव भगवतस् तद्-उपकरण-धर्माधर्म-साक्षात्-कारित्वम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि -

विवादाध्यासिता भाव
येऽमी भू-भूधरादयः ।
ते यथोक्तावबोधेन
कर्त्रा केनापि निर्मिताः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

उत्पत्ति-नाश-भागित्वाद्
यद् उत्पत्ति-विनाशवद् ।
दृष्ट्वा तत्, तादृशा कर्त्रा
निर्मितन् - तद् यथा गृहम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

सृष्टे: सकर्तृकत्वम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च वाच्यं -

कर्मणाम् एव स्वानुष्ठात्-पुरुष-समीहितानि संपादयताम् अन्तरा
नान्तरीयकं (\rightarrow नाविना-भूतं) तनु-भुवनादि-कार्य-निर्माणम्

इति ...

▼ नरसिंहः

एव-कारेण ईश्वरो निषिध्यते।

▼ नरसिंहः

यद् विना यन् न भवति, तत् तस्य नान्तरीयकम्।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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,

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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 Mimimsaka 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 Bhitta view. [[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 Bhāṭṭa view.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यतश् चेतनानधिष्ठितानि तानि
न कार्याणि जनयितुम् उत्सहन्ते
अ-चेतनत्वाद् वासीवत् (=क्षुरवत्)

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide Prakaraṇapañcikā; VII. P134:

न खल्व् अनधिष्ठिता वर्धकिना वासी वर्धनाय प्रवर्तते।

Also cf. Nyāyakusumāñjali: V. P51:

परमाण्व-आदयो हि चेतनाधिष्ठितः प्रवर्तन्ते, अचेतनत्वात् वासीवत्।

Also cf. Śaṅkara's commentary on Brahmasūtra: II. ii-1 : P221 [Nirṇayasāgara Edition]:

न ऽचेतनं लोके चेतनानधिष्ठितं स्व-तन्त्रं...दृष्टम्।

▼ Buitenen

for these acts are unable to produce anything unless they are used as an instrument by a spiritual being,
since they are non-spiritual themselves, like an adze:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि चेतनेन तक्षणाऽनधिष्ठिता वासी
स्वयम् एव यूपादीन्य आपादयितुम् अलम् ।(5)

▼ *Buitenen*

without the operation of a spiritual being-- the carpenter-an adze is incapable of effecting by itself such objects as a sacrificial pole,

अपूर्व-निर्वाहः④

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

न चापूर्वाण्य अधिष्ठाय
वयं निर्मातुम् ईश्वराः ।
न हि कर्मोदयात् पूर्व
साक्षात्-कर्तुं क्षमामहे ॥(5)

▼ *Buitenen*

And we are not able to create through the instrumentality of apurva factors:
for before the actual fruition of the ritual act we cannot know their instrumentality,

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

apūrva lit. "that which is unprecedented, not known before, se. by other means of knowledge" in Mīmāṃsā it describes especially that suprasensible power inherent in the act which makes it produce its result.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

उक्तं हि उपादानोपकरण-साक्षात्-कारिण एव
तत्र तत्र कर्तृत्वम् इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

and it has been said that only a person who has actual knowledge of the material and instrumental causes can be a maker with respect to these causes.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च कर्म-जन्यापूर्व-साक्षात्-कार-क्षमः क्षेत्र-ज्ञः कश्चित् प्रज्ञायते प्रतिज्ञायते वा,

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतः क्षेत्र-ज्ञ-तद्-उपभोग--तत्-साधन-धर्माधर्मादि--
निखिल-लोकावलोकन-चतुरः कोऽपि निरतिशय-शक्ति-वैचित्र्यः पुरुषो
ऽभ्युपगन्तव्यः,
तस्य चाप्रतिघ-ज्ञानत्वादयस् सहजाः ।

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide Doctrine of Śakti in Indian Literature, P42:

God in the conception of the Naiyāyikas is one that is not only the efficient cause and supreme agent of the world,

but possesses innumerable qualities such as knowledge, activity, desire, etc.

Cf. Vātsyāyana's commentary on the Nyāyasūtra, IV. i.21, P. 292:

guṇaviśiṣṭamātmāntaram īśvaraḥ.

Cf. also ibid: P293 :

na tāvadasya buddhim vinā kaścidharmo
liṅgabhūtaśśakya upapādayitum.

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

यथाऽहुः -

ज्ञानम् अप्रतिधं तस्य
वैराग्यज् च जगत्पते: ।
ऐश्वर्यज् चैव धर्मश् च
सहस्रिद्वं चतुष्टयम् ॥

इति,

▼ *नरसिंहः*

To be identified. This verse is quoted by Sucaritamiśra in his commentary on the Ślokavārtika, P.110 [Trivandrum Skt. Series No. 90].

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इमम् एवार्थं मन्त्रार्थवादेतिहास-पुराण-वादा उपोद्गतयन्ति -

▼ Buitenen

Mantras, arthavadas, epic and purana corroborate this point; e.g.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

mantra and arthavada: the terms indicate that the Naiyayika continues to address the Mimimsaka, for these of course are Mimāmsā terms, mantra being the Vedic formula used at the ritual, arthavada the descriptive, noninjunctive passages of Brahmana and later Vedic texts.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

द्यावा-पृथिवी जनयन् देव एकः ।
प्रजापतिर्वेदानसृजत ।

इत्य् एवम् आदयः ।

▼ नरसिंहः

Mahānārāyaṇīya Upaniṣat: II. 2.

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ Buitenen

"The one god, Prajapati, creating heaven and earth, created the Vedas," etc. (RV. 10. 90. 14)

पाञ्चरात्रस्य साक्षात् प्रणयनम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स चायम् आदिकाले भगवान्
प्रलीन-निखिल-करण-कलेवरादि--भोगोपकरण--
चेतनेतरायमाण-जीव-जालावलोकन-जनित-महानुग्रहः (5)...

▼ राममिश्रशास्त्री

आदिकले - प्रलयकाले।
यथा हि जडास्
तथैव चेतना अपि करण-कलेवर-विकला भोग-भाजोनाभूवन्
इति ते चेतनेतरायमाणा इत्यु उच्यन्ते ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सकलम् अपि जगद् उपजनय्य
तद्-अभिलिषित-समस्त-सांसारिक-सम्पत्-प्राप्त्युपाय-प्रकाशन-बहुलां त्रयीम्
एकतो निर्माय

▼ नरसिंहः

'एकतः' कारन्यैनेति यावत्। [[??]]

▼ Buitenen

[[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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पुनर् अपि विविध-दुरित--(तरङ्ग-)परम्-पराऽकीर्ण--भवार्णव-निमग्नान् उद्दिग्नान्
अवलोकयन्

▼ Buitenen

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,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

परम-करुणतया तप्त-मानसः:
परम-निश्चेयस-साधन-स्वाराधनावबोध-साधनी-भूताः पञ्च-रात्र-संहिताः सनत्-
कुमार-नारदादिभ्यो ऋथ्यवोचद्

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इति त्रयी-समान--स्व-तन्त्रानुभव-मूलानि तन्त्राणि
कथम् इव यादृश-तादृश-मन्त्र-आदि-स्मरण-गोष्ठीम् अधितिष्ठन्ति ? (5)

▼ Buitenen

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?

वेदापौरुषेयत्वम् ③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स्याद् एवं यदि वेदानां
निर्माताऽपि प्रमाणतः ।
कुतश्चिद् उपलभ्येत -
न चासाव् उपलभ्यते ॥

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṃsaka raises his objection again.

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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 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⁾

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च वाक्यत्व-लिङ्गेन
वेद-कारो उनुभीयते ।
अभिप्रेत-विशेषाणां
विपर्यास-प्रसङ्गतः ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वाक्यं हि यत् पराधीन-
रचनं संप्रदृश्यते ॥
शरीरिणैव तत् सर्वम्
उच्यमानं विलोक्यते ।(5)

▼ Buitenen

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 ...

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पुण्य-पाप-निमित्तज् च
शरीरं सर्व-देहिनाम् ॥
एवं पुण्येतराधीन-
सुख-दुःखस्य देहिनः ।
अनीश्वरस्य निर्माणं
वाक्यत्वम् अनुमापयेत् ॥(5)

▼ नरसेह:

पुण्यवद् इतरा(पापा)धीनेति भावः।

"निर्माणं" निर्मातृत्वम् इति भावः।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[21]]

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

धर्म-प्रामाण्यता-हानि-प्रसङ्गः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि चैवं प्रमाणत्वं
वेदानाम् अपि दुर्लभम् ।
न हि मानान्तरापूर्वे
धर्मे तस्यास्ति संभवः ॥

▼ नरसिंहः

'तस्य' निर्माणस्येत्य् अर्थः।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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 pertaining to dharma.

अकृतं जगत् ③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु कर्थं मानान्तरापूर्वो धर्मः,
उक्तं हि

साक्षात्-करोति धर्माधर्मौ -
कथम् अन्यथा तद्-उपकरणं जगज् जनयति

इति।

▼ नरसिंहः

This is the contention of the Naiyāyika.

▼ Buitenen

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 adharma are the instrumental causes?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सत्यम् उक्तं - "कोऽपि निर्माता
तद् (=ततः) विश्वस्य जगतो", न हि ।
विद्यते कोऽपि निर्माता
येनैवम् अपि कल्प्यते ॥

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṃsaka refutes the above contention of the Naiyāyika.

Vide Śaivasiddhānta, P.74 ff, for the following:

It may be noted that even the Lokāyata (Cārvāka) entertains similar view regarding, the world's creatorship, i.e., that there is no creator for it.

▼ *Buitenen*

REPLY.

That has indeed been asserted,
but the assertion is fallacious:
for no creator of the entire universe can be found
of whom this can be assumed.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*:

(लोकस्य→) विचित्र-सन्निवेशत्व-
युक्त्या यद् अपि साधितम् (सकर्तुकत्वम्) ।
तत्रोच्यते त्रिधा भावा
लौकिकैः परिलोकिताः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

To your argument that the world must be effected because it has a complex construction can be objected that empiricists distinguish three kinds of entities:

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*:

प्रत्यक्ष-दृष्ट-कर्तारः
केचिद् एते घटादयः ।
अ-विद्यमान-निर्माणास्
तथाऽन्ये गगनादयः ॥
सन्दिह्यमान-निर्माणाः
केचिद् विश्वम्-भरादयः ।

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Pāṇini's sūtra: "nadyṛtaśca" (V. iv-153) would require this to be "pratyakṣadrṣṭakartṛkāḥ", since the compound intended by the author here is of the Bahuvrīhi-type. But according to the well-

known saying "sthitasya gatiḥ kalpanīyā", the term "pratyakṣadr̥ṣṭākartāraḥ" can be interpreted as a Karmadhāraya compound, thus: "yatṛa pratyakṣadr̥ṣṭāḥ kartāraḥ, ete kecit ghaṭādayaḥ", in which case, the expression necessarily has to be split into two parts.

▼ *Buitenen*

Those whose makers are evident to perception, e.g. pots and the like;
those which are not found to be made at all (the individual soul)
(e.g. sky);
and those whose creation remained doubtful, like the earth etc.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

तत्र प्रथम-सन्दर्शित-राशि-द्वये इनवकाश एवेश्वर-व्यापारः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

In the two first-mentioned cases
there is no room for God's activity.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

अद्यवद् एव विश्वम्-भरादयः क्रम-प्राप्तागन्तुकोपचयापचययोर्
न युगपद् उदय-विलय-भागिनः।

▼ **नरसीहः**

Cf. Īśvarasiddhi, P.241, where the same sentence occurs.

▼ *Buitenen*

As to the third, the earth etc. are not involved in a total origination or disintegrations,
but merely, as now, subject to varying degrees of increase and decrease which are adventitious.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ईदृशोत्पत्तिभङ्गौ मीमांसकानाम् अपि सम्मताव् एवेति सिद्ध-साधनत्वम् ।

▼ Buitenen

To say that the Mimāmsakas accept origination and annihilation in this sense is to prove the proved.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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.

अपूर्व-निर्वाहानपेक्षा ③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

बुद्धिमत् कर्तृता याऽपि
प्रयासेन समर्थिता ।
साध्यते साऽपि सिद्धैव
बुद्धिमन्तो हि चेतनाः ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यागादिभिः स्व-भोगाय
तत् तद् उत्पादयन्ति नः ॥
युक्तज् चोभय-सिद्धानां
तत्राधिष्ठान-कल्पनम् ।
वयञ्च याग-दानादि
साक्षात् कर्तुं क्षमा यतः ॥

▼ नरसिंहः

यागादिभिः ... Vide Karmamīmāṃsā, P.61:

Though the Mīmāṃsā is so deeply concerned with the sacrifice, it has no belief in the doctrine that the rewards of offering are to be expected either from the deities to whom the offerings are directed to be made, from a God as Creator or apportioner of reward and punishment. The sacrifice generates an unseen potency, whence the goods desired by sacrificers are obtained.

नः ... “नः” अस्मद्-इष्टाः चेतना इत्य् अन्वयः।

युक्तं ... Cf. Īśvarasiddhi, P.240:

“yuktāṁ caitat yadubhayavādisiddhānāmeva cetanānāṁ
kartṛtvābhupagamah, lāghavāt; na
copādānādyanabhijñatayā tatpratikṣepaḥ।

upādānāṁ pṛthivyādi yāgadānādi sādhanāṁ।
sākṣātkartum kṣamante yat sarva eva hi cetanāḥ॥

सिद्धानां ... उभय-वादि-सम्मतानां जीवानाम् इति भावः।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

कर्मणः शक्ति-रूपं यद्
अ-पूर्वादि-पदास्पदम् ।

**मा भूत् प्रत्यक्षता तस्य
किन् तेनाध्यक्षितेन नः ॥**

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Īśvarasiddhi*, P.241, where this verse is reproduced almost as it is, but for a slight change in the second half of the second line, which reads as “śaktimaddhyakṣagocaraḥ”.

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न खलु कुलालादयः
कुम्भादि-कार्यम् आरिष्मानाः
तद्-उपादानोपकरण-भूत--मृद्-दण्ड-चक्रादि-कार्योत्पादन-शक्तिं साक्षात्कृत्य
तत् तद् आरभन्ते ।(5)

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Īśvarasiddhi, P.242, for identical statements.

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यदि परं (उच्यते) शक्तिम् अ-विदुषाम् (कुम्भकारादीना) अभिलषित-साधनाय तद्-उपादानादि-
व्यवहारो उनुपपन्नः।
इह तु नित्यागम-जन्मना प्रत्ययेन संप्रत्य-आकलित-यागादि--तत्-तद्-उत्पादन-पाटवा:
पुरुषास् (←अनीश्वरा देवा अपि)
तैर् एव विश्वम्-भरा (=भूडिभावान् आविर्भावयन्ति,

▼ नरसिंहः

यदि परं ... 'यदि परं' इत्य् अस्य , 'यदि यत् किञ्चिद् विवक्षितं, तर्हि एवं वक्तव्यम्' इत्य्
अर्थः।

इह तु ... Cf. Ślokavārtika, Saṃbandhākṣepaparihāra: śl. 75:

kasyacit hetumātratvarṁ yadyadhiṣṭhānatocyate
karmabhiḥ sarvajīvānām tatsiddheḥ siddhasādhanam.

The same idea is expressed in the Īśvarasiddhi, P.242:

āgamādavagamyante vicitrāḥ karmaśaktayah
tena karmabhirātmānah sarvam nirmimatām pr̄thak.

प्रत्ययेन ... "Pratyaya" here means "jñāna".

सम्प्रत्याकलित ... "Samprati" is used in the sense of "samyak". Also see the following verse "kṛtārthatvāt krīḍā" etc. where also the word "samprati" occurs.

▼ Buitenen

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.

धर्म-साक्षात्-काराभावेऽपि सृष्टिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा च प्रत्यक्ष-प्रकृति+++ (=उपादान)-++++-करणः कर्म-करण-
प्रवीणो, नैवान्यः क्षम इति च नास्त्यत्र नियमः ॥

▼ नरसिंहः

By “prakṛti” is meant “upādāna” and by “karaṇa” is meant “nimitta” and the like.

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अ-पश्यन्न एवायं प्रकृति (=उपादान)-करणे स्वात्म-मनसि
ननु जाने कर्ता भवति पुरुषस् तत् कथम् इव ।
विनाशीदं विश्वं जगद् अवयवित्वाद् इति च यद्
बलीयः प्रत्यक्ष-प्रतिहत-मुख्त्वेन तद् असत् ॥
स एवायम् मेरुर् दिवस-कर-बिम्बज् च तदिदं
धरित्री सैवेति स्फुटम् इह यतो धीर् उदयते । (5)

▼ नरसिंहः

अपश्यन्नेवायं ... Cf. Īśvarasiddhi, P.246: "na copādānādisākṣātkāriṇa eva kartṛtvamityapi niyamaḥ; upādānamupakaraṇam ca aviduṣa evātmano jñānādiṣu kartṛtvāt".

विनाशीदं ... Cf. तथा सावयवत्वेन etc., above.

▼ *Buitenen*

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.'

अकृतं जगत्③

अनुमनम्④

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

शक्नोति हि प्रत्यभिजैव
समस्त-काल-सम्बन्धम् एषाम् अवगमयितुम्
सन्ति हि पूर्वापर-कालयोर् अपि तादृशाः पुरुषाः,
प्रादुःषन्ति येषाम् इदृश-प्रत्ययाः,
प्रयोगश्च भवति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

मही-शैल-पतङ्गादि-
प्रत्यभिज्ञानवन् नरः ।
(नरः→) अतीत-कालः, कालत्वाद्
इदानीन्तन-कालवत् (←सनरः) ॥ (5)

▼ नरसिंहः

This long compound qualifies the term "atītakālah".

▼ Buitenen

To put it in syllogistic form:

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवम् अनागतेऽपि प्रयोगो दर्शयितव्यः ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चेदृश-प्रयोगेण
घटादेर् अपि नित्यता ।
प्रसञ्ज्यते यतस् तत्र
प्रत्यक्षौ भङ्ग-सम्भवौ ॥ (4)

▼ नरसिंहः

'सोऽयं घट' इति प्रत्यभिज्ञया घटादेर् अपि नित्यत्वं न शङ्कनीयम् इति भावः। तत्र कारणम् आह 'यत्' इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

विरोधे सति येनात्मा (\rightarrow तर्क-फलम्)
हेतुना नैव लभ्यते ।
न लभ्यते ऽविरोधेऽपि
तेनात्मेत्य् अस्त्य् असम्भवः ॥

▼ *नरसिंहः*

'विरोधे सति, येन हेतुना आत्मा नैव लभ्यते [हेतुत्वं हीयत इति यावत्], तेन अविरोधे ऽपि सति, आत्मा न लभ्यतय् इत्य् एतत् न सम्भवति ।' इति श्लोकस्यास्य पदान्वयः ।

Cf. Tantravārttika under I. iii. 51-54, 55:

na hi yena pramānatvāṁ labdhapūrvam̄ kadācanāl
tena tat sarvadā labhyamityājñāpayatīśvarah॥
na ca yad balavadruddhamātmānam naiva vindati l
avirodhe 'pi tenātmā na labdhavyah kathāmcana॥
na cāpi bādhakābhāvāt labdha ātmeti sarvadāl
labdhavyah sa virodhe 'pi pūrvasāmānyadarśanāt॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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 eternity of pots) cannot be proved by a ground (recollection)

because this ground contains a contradiction
(it is recollected that pots having existed cease to exist),
this does not prove that the same ground (recollection) cannot prove the eternity of earth, mountains, etc., when there is no contradiction contained in it (nobody has recollection of a vanishing mountain).

महत्त्वादिना न कृतत्वम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

महत्त्वे सति स्पन्दमानत्व-युक्त्या
जगज्-जन्म-भङ्गश् च यः प्रत्यपादि ।
स च प्रत्यभिज्ञा-बल-ध्वस्त-हेतुर्
न हृद्यत्वम् अद्य प्रपद्येत युक्त्या ॥

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. महत्त्या सनाथेन etc., above.

▼ Buitenen

The other inference that has been given to prove that the world is subject to origination and annihilation,
namely on the ground of motion when there is mass,
is likewise incorrect;
for this ground, too, is cancelled by the greater cogency of
recognition.

Consequently, inference cannot provide positive proof
that the world is subject to origination and annihilation.

अनिष्ट-गुणापत्तिः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च (कर्त्रन्नानेऽपि) धर्मि-विशेष-विरुद्धश् चायं (ईश्वरात्म्यो) हेतुः कार्यत्वाद् इति
कार्यत्वं हि
(कर्त्-स्वभाव--दृष्टि-विग्रहवत्त्व-+अनाप्त-कामत्व-+अनीश्वरत्वासार्वज्ञादि-
व्याप्ति-वित्त्य-उपयुक्ततारानेक-विशेषानुषक्तं,

▼ Buitenen

[[24]]

28. Further, you contend that there is a God, on the ground that
the world is a product;
but this ground precludes a specially qualified producer.
For a product generally implies on the part of its producer
a number of properties which are natural to him
and therefore indispensable for the precise knowledge of the
concomitance between him and his product -
Properties like being in possession of a body,
having something left to desire,
being deprived of omnipotence and omniscience, etc.

▼ नरसिंहः:

Vide Karmamīmāṃsā*: pp. 61-62:

Experience, Prabhākara urges, shows us the bodies of all animals being produced by purely natural means; we can argue hence to the facts of the past and future and need invoke no extraneous aid.....Supervision (by God) also is impossible, even had God the necessary knowledge; it must take the form either of contact, which is impossible as merit and demerit being qualities are not subject to contact, or inherence, and plainly a man's qualities cannot inhere in God. If the argument is adduced on the analogy of the carpenter, it may be replied that on this

basis, the creator would have to be an embodied spirit, and no embodied spirit can effect such subtle things as the atoms or merit and demerit.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कथम् इव तत्-प्रत्यनीक-भूताशरीर-नित्य-तृप्त-सर्वज्ञत्वाद्य्-अभिमत-विशेषान् साध्य-धर्मिण्य्
अवगमयति? (5)

▼ Buitenen

How, then, can the fact that the world is a product convey to us the knowledge that the producer proposed for it possesses the postulated properties, of being bodiless, eternally satisfied, omniscient etc., properties, that is, which are the opposite of what would naturally follow?

▼ नरसिंहः

'सिसाधयिष्ठे कर्त्तरि' इत्य् अर्थः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स्व-शरीर-प्रेरणम् अपि शरीर-सम्बन्धासमवायि-कारणक-प्रयत्नवतो नान्यस्येति
न कथंचिद् अशरीरिणः कर्तृत्व-संभवः ॥

▼ Buitenen

The production of a product requires the activation of the body, which requires on the producer's part an effort whose inherent cause is his relation with a body and is impossible of any but just such a producer. It follows that under no condition bodiless person can be an agent.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथैतद्-दोष-हानाय
देहवान् इत्य् उपेयते ।
स देहो जन्मवान् मा वा?

जन्मवत्त्वे नवस्थितिः ॥
नित्यत्वेऽवयवित्वज्च
स्याद् अनैकान्तिकन् तव ("सावयवम् अनित्यम्" इति वदतः) ।(5)

▼ Buitenen

Or if, in order to remove this fault from the argument,
it is assumed that the producer indeed possesses a body,
then the question arises,
Is that body itself subject to origination or not?
If it be subject to origination,
there is infinite regress.
If it be eternal, then your contention that
whatever has parts must come to an end is not universally true.

▼ नरसिंहः

तावद्-उक्तस्य सावयवत्वहेतोर् नैकान्तिक-दोषो भवेद् इत्य् अन्वयः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यद् अप्य् एतेऽवोचन्
"अधिकरण-सिद्धान्त-बलतो विशेषास् सिध्यन्ती" त्य्
अयम् अपि च पन्था न घटते ।

▼ Buitenen

The solution of others, namely that God's special properties can be demonstrated by an ad-hoc conclusion, does not hold good either.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

adhikaranasiddhanta is a conclusion which, as soon as one thing is established (e.g., that there is a world creator), establishes another topic discussed (e.g., omniscience). On this question, cf. Tarkabhāṣā 43.

▼ नरसिंहः

"Adhikaraṇasiddhānta" or "Doctrine resting on Implication", is defined in the Nyāyasūtra under I. i. 30 as "yatsiddhau anvayaprakaraṇasiddhiḥ, so'dhikaraṇasiddhāntaḥ". Cf. Vātsyāyana's bhāṣya on it: "yasya arthasya siddhau anye arthāḥ anuṣajjyante, na tair vinā so'rthaḥ siddhyati, te arthāḥ tadaḍhiṣṭhānāḥ, so'dhikaraṇasiddhāntaḥ". So, Adhikaraṇasiddhānta can be explained as the principle by which, when a certain thing is known or accepted, certain other things automatically follow, by reason of their dependence upon the former. This Adhikaraṇasiddhānta in modern logic is known as "pakṣadharmaṭā". Since the fact of earth, etc. having a creator cannot be proved unless that creator is also accepted as a direct perceiver of all entities including the atoms (the material cause of the cosmos), the admission of such a power of all-round perception in that creator follows by the principle 'Adhikaraṇasiddhānta' (Implied Doctrine).

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स हि न्यायो जीवेद् अपि यदि च मानान्तरकृतो ।
विरोधोऽस्यादृष्टः, पुनर् (अत्र) अपि विरोधः स्फुटतरः ॥

▼ Buitenen

For that rule holds only of a case where
a conflict follows from a means of knowledge
but does not actually exist.

In our case, however, the conflict is plain enough.

▼ नरसेहः:

"अपि च धर्मि-विशेष-विरुद्धश्च चायं हेतुः" इति पूर्वम् एव (पु.32) हेतु-विरोधः प्रपञ्चितः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु च अवधूताविनाभाव-नियमम् अपि यदि
न विश्वम्-भरादि-बुद्धिमन्-निमित्तताम् अवगमयति
प्रत्यस्तिम् इतस् तर्ह्य् अनुमेयव्यवहारः।

अथावगमयति - अवगमयत्य् एवासाव्
अ-खिल-त्रैलोक्य-निर्माण-प्रवीणन् तमपि कर्तारम्

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'अवधृताविनाभाव-नियमम्' इत्य् एतत् 'कार्यत्वम्' इत्य् अस्य पदस्य अध्याहृतस्य विशेषणं भवितुम् अर्हति। अथवा [[??]]विश्वम्-भरादि इत्य् अस्य वा विशेषणत्वेन स्वीकर्तु शक्यते।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न ब्रूमो नावगमयतीति -
किन्तु, यावन्तो (स-शरीरत्वादि-)विशेषाः व्याप्ति-ग्रहण-समय-संविदिताः
तान् अप्य् अ-विशेषेणोपस्थापयतीति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च तावताऽतिप्रसङ्गः

▼ *Buitenen*

Nor do we carry our point too far.

▼ नरसिंहः

यत्र धूमस् तत्र वह्निर् इति व्याप्तिर् महानसादौ गृहीता। पर्वते धूमं दृष्ट्वा वह्निम् अनुमातुं प्रवृत्तस्य पुरुषस्य, तत्रत्योऽपि वह्निः महानसादाव् इव फूल्कारेणैव प्रवृद्ध इति, स च पाकार्थम् उपयुज्यत इत्य्-आद्याः सम्भावनाः सम्भाव्यमाना अत्र अतिप्रसङ्ग-शब्देन सूचिताः। एतेषां विपरीत-विशेषणानां प्रत्यक्ष-प्रमाण-बाध्यत्वम् आह प्रमाणान्तरेत्य्-आदिना। तथा च पर्वतं गत्वा तत्रत्यो वह्निः कीदृश इति विचारे क्रियमाणे, पूर्वं वह्नि-विषये सम्भावितान् फूल्कार-प्रवर्धन-पाकोपयोगादीन् अतिप्रसङ्गान् प्रत्यक्ष-प्रमाणम् एव निवारयेद् इति भावः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

प्रमाणान्तर-गोचरे हि लिङ्गिनि
लिङ्ग-बलाद् आपततो विपरीत-विशेषांस्
तत्-प्रमाणम् एव प्रतिरुणाद्वि

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अत्र पुनर् अतिपतित-मानान्तर-कर्म-भावे भगवति सिषाध्यिषिते
यावन्तो इन्वय-व्यतिरेकावधारिताविनाभाव-भाजो धर्मास्
तान् अप्य् अ-विशेषेणोपस्थापयतीति,

▼ *Buitenen*

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,

▼ नरसिंहः

अत्र ... Cf. Íśvarasiddhi, P.244.

कर्मभावे ... 'सकल-प्रमाणान्तरानवगते' इत्य् अर्थः।

स्थापयतीति ... कर्तृत्वम् इव अनीश्वरत्वादिकम् अपि धर्म-जातं व्याप्ति-बलेन व्यवस्थापयतीत्य् अर्थः।

कल्पना-गौरवम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा च प्राङ्गण-निकट-वर्ति-दूर्वाङ्कुरादिष्ट् अनवसित-पुरुष-व्यापार-जन्मस्व् अनैकान्तः, तत्राप्य् अतीन्द्रिय-पुरुषाधिष्ठान-कल्पना कल्पना-मात्रम् एव ।(5)

▼ Buitenen

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,

▼ नरसिंहः

तथा च ... अत्र सन्दर्भानुरोधेन 'तथा च' इत्य् अस्य 'किञ्च' इत्य् अर्थो वर्णनीयः।

सृष्टि-कारणाभावः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

कव वा देशे तिष्ठन्, अनवरत-तृप्तिः किम् इति वा
कदा वा निशेषज् जनयति तद् एतद् विमृशतु ॥
कवचित् तिष्ठन् इष्टं, किम् अपि फलम् उद्दिश्य करणैः
कदाचिद् यत्-किञ्चिज् जनयति कुलालादिर् अखिलः ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Nyāyamañjarī Vol. I, P.191:

kim kimapi prayojanamananusandhāya jagatsarge
pravartate prajāpatirevameva vā ? niṣprayojanīyāṁ
pravṛttāvaprekṣāpūrvakāritvāt unmattatulyo'sau bhavet.

Vide Śaivasiddhānta P.83 ff.

To create the world, the Lord should have occupied some place, but where is it exactly, when we definitely know that by then, space itself has not been created ?

Kumārila is the most relentless and vehement critic of the divine origination and dissolution of the universe. Creation of the world is refuted in

Ślokavārtika, under 1-i-5; śl. 47:

pravṛttiḥ kathaṁ ādyā ca jagataḥ sampratīyate!
śarīrāder vinā cāsyā kathamicchāpi sarjane ?

Dissolution, likewise, is refuted in śl. 68:

pralaye 'pi pramāṇam naḥ sarvocchedātmake na hi!
na ca prayojanam tena syāt prajāpatikarmanā॥

For a detailed refutation of the creative activity of God, at a time when space itself did not exist, see ibid. śls. 45, 50-51:

yadā sarvamidaṁ nāśit kvāvasthā tatra gamyatām!
prajāpateḥ kva vā sthānam kim rūpam ca pratīyatām॥

sādhanam cāsyā dharmādi tadā kimcinna vidyate!
na ca nissādhanah kartā kaścit sṛjati kiñcanā॥
nādhāreṇa vinā srṣṭirūrṇanābherapīṣyate!
prāṇinām bhakṣaṇāccāpi tasya lālā pravartate॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कृतार्थत्वात् क्रीडा, न च भवति हेतुर् यदि खलु
स्व-भाव--स्वातन्त्र्यं प्रकटितम् अहो सम्प्रति विभोः ॥
अभिप्रेतं किञ्चिद् यद् अयम् असमीक्ष्यैव कुरुते
जगज्-जन्म-स्थेम-प्रविलय-महायासम् अवशः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

कृतार्थत्वात् ... Vide Ślokavārtika under I. i. 5, śls. 54-56:

tathā cāpekṣamāṇasya svātantryarṁ pratihanyate |
jagaccāsrjatastasya kiṁ nāmeṣṭarṁ na siddhyati ?
prayojanamanuddiśya na mando 'pi pravartate |
evameva pravṛttiścet caitanyenāsyā kiṁ bhavet ?
krīḍārthāyāṁ pravṛttau ca vihanyeta kṛtārthatā |
bahuvyāpāratāyāṁ ca kleśo bahutaro bhavet ||

Also cf. ibid: śl. 57, ff.

Cf. Nyāyamañjarī, Vol. I, P.192:

atha krīḍārthe jagatsarge bhagavataḥ pravṛttirīdrśā ca
śubhāśubharūpeṇa jagatḥ srṣṭena krīḍati parameśvara ityucyate,
tarhi krīḍāśadhyasukharahitatvena srṣṭeh
pūrvamanavāptasakalānandatvāṁ nāma tasya
svarūpamavahīyate;

na ca krīḍāpi niśšeṣajanatātaṅkakāriṇī |
āyāsabahulā ceyam kartum yuktā mahātmanah ||

tasmānna jagatām nātha īśvaraḥ sraṣṭā samāhartāpi bhavati.

Also cf. ibid: P.194:

ata eva nirīkṣya durghaṭāṁ jagato
janmavināśāḍambaram |
na kadācidanīdṛśāṁ jagat kathitam nītirahasyavedibhiḥ ||

'सम्प्रति' सम्यग् इत्य् अर्थः। जगत्-सृजनं भगवतः स्वभावश् चेद् उच्यते, तर्हि सम्यग् एव तस्य स्वातन्त्र्यं प्रतिपादितं भवद्विर् इति सोपालभ्म् आह। तदा तु भगवान् परतन्त्र एव स्याद् इत्य् आशयः।

असमीक्षयैव ... स्वभावत्वाद् एव असमीक्षोपपद्यते।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अनुकम्पा-प्रयुक्तेन सृज्यमानाश् च जन्तवः
सुखिनः किन् न सृज्यन्ते तत्-कर्मपिक्ष्या यदि ॥
ततः स्व-तन्त्रता-हानिः, किञ्च तैर् एव (कर्मख्यैरु) हेतुभिर्
उपपन्नेऽपि वैचित्र्ये किन् तत् (ईश्वर इति) कल्पनयाऽनया ॥(4)

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ नरसिंहः:

अनुकम्पाप्रयुक्तेन ... Vide Ślokavārtika, under I. i-5, Śls. 52, 53:

abhāvāccānukampyānāṁ nānukampāsyā jāyate |
srjecca śubhamevaikāṁ anukaṁpāprayojitaḥ ||
athāśubhād vinā srstih sthitirvā nopapadyate |
ātmādhīnābhupāye hi bhavet kiṁnāma duṣkaram ?

Cf. Īśvarasiddhi, P.244-245:

svārthakāruṇyābhāvena vyāptāḥ prekṣāvataḥ kriyāḥ |
īśvarasyobhayābhāvāt jagatsargo na yujyate ||

avāptakāmatvānna tāvadātmārthe sṛjati; pralayasamaye
pralīnasakalakaraṇakalebarādibhogopakaraṇatayā ca cetanānāṁ
duḥkhābhāvāt duḥkhidarśanajanitakṛpāprayuktirapi nāstīti
vyāpakabhūtasvārthakāruṇyanivrtteḥ vyāpyabhūtāyā
prekṣāvatpravṛttyāpi nivartitavyam;

sukhaikatānāṁ janayet jagat karuṇayā sṛjan |
tatkarmānuvidhāyitve hīyetāsyā svatantratā ||

Cf. Nyāyamañjarī, Vol. I. P.192:

avāptasarvānandasya rāgādirahitātmanah |
jagadārabhamāṇasya na vidmaḥ kim prayojanam ||

anukampayā pravartata iti cet, maivam —

sargāt pūrvam hi niśšeṣakleśasāṁsparśavarjitāḥ |
nāsyā muktā ivātmāno bhavanti karuṇāspadam ||

.....
karuṇāmr̥tasāṁsiktaḥṛdayo vā jagat sṛjan |
katham sṛjati durvāraduḥkha prāgbhāradāruṇam?

ततः ... Cf. ibid*:

nānātma-gata-śubhāśubha-karma-kalāpāpekṣaḥ sraṣṭā
prajāpatiriti cet karmāṇyeva hi tarhi sṛjantu jaganti, kim
prajāpatinā ? athācetanānāṁ cetanānadhiṣṭhitānāṁ
sraṣṭṛtvamaghaṭamānamiti teṣāmadhiṣṭhātā cetanaḥ kalpyata iti
cen na; tad-āśrayāṇām ātmanām eva cetanatvāt ta evādhiṣṭhātāro
bhaviṣyanti; kimadhiṣṭhātrantareneśvareṇa kāryam ?

हेतुभिः — कर्म-स्वभावादिभिः।

अतो नास्ति तादृशः पुरुषः
यस् समस्त-जगन्-निर्माण-क्षमः
साक्षात्-कृत-धर्माधर्मो वेदान् आरचयति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

वेद-कर्त्र्-अस्मरणम्③

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

अपि च यदि वेदाः केनचिद् असृज्यन्त
ततस् तेनामी विरचिता इति
तत्-कर्ता स्मर्येत ।

▼ *Buitenen*

31. Moreover, if the Vedas were created by someone,
this creator would be remembered:
'He is the one who has composed them.'

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

न च जीर्णकूपादाव् इवास्मरणं युक्तम्
युज्यते हि तत्र (कूपादि-)प्रयोजनाभावात् कर्तुरस्मरणम्

▼ *Buitenen*

It is not proper to assume
that he has been forgotten,
just as the digger of an exhausted well is forgotten.
The latter is justifiable
because the well no longer serves a purpose.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Śābarabhāṣya under I. i-5; P.12:

na ca himavadādiṣu kūpārāmādivat asmaraṇam bhavitumarhati..

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

वेदे त्वं

अनेक-द्रव्य-त्यागात्मक--बहुतरायास-साध्यानि कर्माणि
प्रत्ययिततर-निर्मातृ-स्मरणम् अन्तरेण के वा श्रद्धीरन्,

▼ Buitenen

But in the case of the Vedas, who,
without remembering that the author was reliable,
would give credence to all the Vedic rites
which are to be performed at the expense of great trouble
involving the loss of various properties?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा हि नित्या वेदाः

अ-स्मर्यमाण-स्मरणार्ह-कर्तृकत्वात्।

ये यथोक्त (\leftarrow ईश्वर-कर्तृत्व)-साध्या न भवन्ति,

ते यथोक्त (\leftarrow सूत-कर्तृकत्व)-साधना अपि न भवन्ति

यथा भारतादयः।

अमी (β ारतादयः) तु यथोक्त (\leftarrow सूत-कर्तृ)-साधना इति यथोक्त (\leftarrow ईश्वरतर-कर्तृक)-साध्या एव,

▼ Buitenen

Consequently, if it cannot be proved of the Vedas
that they have been composed by a person,
because this person, however worthy of remembrance, is not
remembered,
they can no more prove that God was their author
than the Mahabharata and similar books can.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तस्माद् अ-पौरुषेया वेदा इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Therefore the Vedas do not originate from a person.

न तुल्या अपौरुषेयता③

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

स्व-सिद्धान्ताभिनिवेश-व्यामुध-बुद्धिभिर् अभिहितम् इदम् -
यद्-अनुभव-निबन्धनं वेद-प्रामाण्यं
तद्-अनुभव-निबन्धनं पञ्च-रात्र-प्रामाण्यमिति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

ननु च किम् इदम् अपौरुषेयत्वं वेदानाम्?
यदि नित्य-वर्णारब्धत्वं, समानम् इदं पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्राणाम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

If it consists in this that the Vedas are composed of eternal words, the same holds true of the Pañcarātra Tantra.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ नरसिंहः

The Naiyāyika tries to examine the revealed character (apauruṣeyatva) of the Vedas, which the Mīmāṃsaka so zealously champions.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| अथ पदानां नित्यता, सापि समानैव।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| न चानुपूर्वी-नित्यता, न हि नित्यानाम् आनुपूर्वी-स्वभाव उपपद्यते।

▼ Buitenen

It could not be the eternity of the word-sequence, for sequence cannot be natural to eternal entities.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

Sequence, of course, supposes priority and posteriority of the entities in sequence, while eternals are co-eternal.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

"उच्चारणानुपूर्व्याद् आनुपूर्वी वर्णनाम्" इति चेत्
सा तर्हि तद् (=आनुपूर्वी)-अनित्यत्वाद् एव अनित्येति
कः खलु विशेषः पञ्चरात्रश्रुत्योः ।

▼ Buitenen

If it is said that it is the sequence of the sounds in so far as these sounds are pronounced in one particular sequence,

then we reply that since a sequence of pronunciation is non-eternal,
the sequence of the sounds pronounced cannot be eternal.
So where does the difference lie between Pañcaratra and Vedic
revelation?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अयमेव विशेषो यद्
एकत्र स्व-तन्त्र एव पुरुषस् तां ताम् आनुपूर्वी रचयति
इतरत्र पर-तन्त्रो नियमेन पूर्वाध्येत्-सिद्धाम् एव विवक्षति, (4)

▼ Buitenen

[[28]]

REPLY.

The difference lies herein that in the case of the Pañcaratra the sequence is created by an independent person, whereas in the case of the Veda, a dependent person invariably wishes to repeat the exact sequence which had been laid down before him by students who preceded him.

▼ नरसिंहः

This is how the Mīmāṃsaka vindicates his contention.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

(अथयन-परम्परा-) क्रमावान्तर-जातिश् च प्रत्यभिज्ञा-बल-प्रतिष्ठिता नापलापम् अर्हतीत्य अलं प्रविस्तरेण ।

▼ Buitenen

A category of a different degree
which is established on the strength of recognition

should not be denied.

And with this we conclude our lengthy disquisition.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

kramāvāntarajati; the difference resides in the createdness of the Pañcarātra and the uncreatedness of the Veda, which introduces a difference of degree between the word sequences of both corpora of verbal statements.

▼ नरसिंहः

'अवान्तरजातिर्' इत्य् अस्य वैलक्षण्यम् इत्य् अर्थः। क्रम-नियमानियमाभ्याम् एव वेद-पञ्चरात्रयोर् वैलक्षण्यं सुस्पष्टम् इत्य् आशयः।

निगमनम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

सिद्धम् इदं न विलक्षण-पुरुषानुभव-निबन्धन-प्रामाण्य-वर्णनं साधीय इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

33. The preceding has proved that the proposition that the Pañcaratra is authoritative because it is based upon an immediate cognition of a person categorically different from other persons, is not viable at all.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यतो न साक्षात्-कृत-पुण्य-पापः
पुमान् प्रमाण-प्रतिपन्न-सत्त्वः ।
अतो जगन्-मोहयितुं प्रणीतं
नरेण केनापि हि तन्त्रम् एतत् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

Since there is no means of knowledge
by which the existence of a person who has immediate knowledge
of good and evil can be proved,
it follows that this Tantra must have been promulgated
by some human being with the purpose of deceiving the world.

१२ ईश्वरे शब्द-प्रमाणं न②

पूर्वपक्षः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु च केवल-तर्क-बलाद् अयं
यदि सिषाधयिषा-पदम् ईश्वरः ।
भवतु नाम तथा सति दूषणं
श्रुति-शिरः-प्रमितो हि महेश्वरः ॥

▼ Buitenen

34. OBJECTION. This would be true if proof of the existence of the Lord
could only be sought on the strength of logical argumentation.
As it is, this is a fallacy,
for the great Lord is known on the authority of the upaniṣads.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

This is Yamuna's objection, which states the extent to which he concurs in the preceding Mimāṃsā argument against Nyaya.

▼ नरसिंहः

The Naiyāyika tries to uphold the validity of the Āgama, on the ground that its author, the Supreme Person, is glorified in the Upaniṣads.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदा तु सकल-भुवन-निर्माण-क्षम--
सर्व-ज्ञ--सर्वेश्वर--परम-पुरुष-प्रतिपादकानि नित्यागम-वचनान् एव बहुलम्
उपलभ्यन्ते
कथं तदा तद्-अनुभव-मूल-स्मरण-प्रामाण्यानङ्गीकरणम्?

▼ *Buitenen*

When we hear the multitudinous statements of the eternal
Scriptures
which set forth the existence of an omniscient and omnipotent
supreme Personality
who is capable of creating the entire universe,
how then can we refuse to accept the authority of a tradition which
derives from His immediate cognition?

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Vātsyāyana's commentary on the Nyāyasūtra, under IV. i. 21,
P.291:[[??]]

āgamācca draṣṭā boddhā sarvajñatā īśvaraḥ.

▼ नरसिंहः

The Prābhākara's position with regard to the authority of
statements speaking of a past event (siddha or pariniṣṭhitavastu)
is criticised by the Naiyāyika here.

प्रमाणान्तर-गोचरता-सम्भावना न बाधते④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च (इश्वर-निभ) सिद्धे वस्तुनि
(तद-वस्तु-साधक-बाधकयोर् अन्यतरोपनिपात-सम्भव-प्रसक्तेऽर्
(तद-वस्तु-भावितानुवाद-विपर्यय-पर्यालोचनया
तद्(वस्तु)-गोचर-वचसः प्रामाण्य-प्रच्छुतिः
(समिद-आहरणादि-)कार्य-निष्ठस्यापि तत्(←प्रच्छुति)-प्रसङ्गात्,

▼ *Buitenen*

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*.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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*. 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.

Another proving factor, c.g., the means of knowledge Perception, may turn up conceivably 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.

Scriptural validity, i.e., Scripture's being a means of knowledge, is to the Prabhakara Mimimsaka, its being the sole means of knowing a particular thing. To the Prabhakara this validity is ideal in the case of injunctions concerning actions which, suprasensibly, lead to a certain desired end.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

(लौकिकं) कार्यम् अपि हि मानान्तर-वेद्यम् एव ("ओदनेन होतव्यम्" इत्यत्र) लौकिकं समिद्-आहरणादि, तत् च मानान्तरेणापि वेद्यम् ओदन-पाकवद् इत्य् अभ्युपगमात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

(The injunction concerning the odana oblation includes an injunction concerning the preparation of the odana and the fetching of firewood for the cooking. Since experience shows that for a cooking fire one needs firewood, this karya is not strictly known on scriptural authority.)

▼ नरसेहः

\$ Vide Prakaraṇapañcikā II, p. 180-

" कृतिसाध्यं प्रधानं यत्,
तत् कार्यम् अवसीयते । तत् मानान्तरेणापि
वेद्यम् ओदन-पाकवत् ॥ "

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ विलक्षणानि-होत्रादि-विषय-कार्यस्यासम्भावित-मानान्तरतया
तत्-प्रतिपादयद् वचः प्रमाणम्,

▼ Buitenen

Or if it be claimed that, inasmuch as a karya concerning a categorically different thing like the agnihotra etc. cannot conceivably find any other authority,

therefore the verbal testimony which sets forth such a thing must needs be its authority,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

हन्त तर्हि निरतिशयावबोधैश्वर्य-महाऽनन्द-सन्दोह-वपुषि भगवति
न मानान्तर-गन्ध-सम्बन्ध
इति सर्वं समानम् अन्यत्राभिनिवेशात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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 beatitude; 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!)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च प्रवृत्त-प्रमाणान्तरम् अपि
स्व-गोचरं तद्-गोचरतया नावभासयतीति
परम् अपि प्रमाणम् एव
कुतस् तद्-उपनिपात-सम्भावनया ऽनुवादत्वम्,

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कथं वा प्रत्यस्तमित-समस्त-पुरुषाशय-दोष-संस्पर्श--नित्यागम-भुवः प्रत्ययस्य
पूर्वोपमर्दकतयनीयमानस्य
सम्भाव्यमान-विविध-विप्लवैः प्रमाणान्तरैर् अपवादापादनम्
इति यत् किञ्चिद् (क्षुद्रम्) एतत् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

This objection ignores the priorities among pramanas, or means of knowledge; for the Prabhakara, Perception, etc. are prior to, take precedence of, Scripture in case of perceptible, etc. contents. Generally Perception is prior to Inference. To Yamuna, therefore, no priority of Perception to Scripture is given, which is expected since in his view Scripture may also be an account of (God's) Perception, as in the case of Pancaratra.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

पूर्वम् अवगतस्य तन्त्र-सामान्य-ज्ञानस्य उपमर्दकतया इति यावत् ।

निगमनम्④

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

इत्थज् च श्रुति-शत-समधिगत--विविध-बोधैश्वर्यादि-वैभवे भगवति
सामान्य-दर्शनावसितासार्वज्ञ्य-विग्रहवत्तादयो दोषा
नावकाशम् अश्रुवते हुत-भुजीव शैत्यादयः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Thus, therefore, the imperfections that necessarily follow from the induction, e.g. absence of omniscience", possession of a body etc., find no room in the Bhagavan whose supernal manifestation of miraculous knowledge, supremacy and so forth is known from hundreds of shrutis,
just as cold can find no place in fire.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

ततश्च -

श्रुति-मूर्ध्नि प्रसिद्धेन
सर्वज्ञेनैव **निर्मितम् ।**
तन्त्रं मिथ्येति वक्तुं नः
कथं जिह्वा प्रवर्तते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

And, in consequence,

How can our tongue endeavour to state that the Tantra is false,
while it is composed by the Omniscient One Himself
who is known through the Upanisads?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अहो मन्दस्य मीमांसा-
श्रम-हानिर् विजृम्भते ।
मीमांसा-मांसलज् चेतः
कथमित्थं प्रमाद्यति ॥

▼ Buitenen

Alas for the fool's grand exhibition of labour in Mimāmsā!
How can a mind schooled in Mimāmsā be so mistaken?

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ नरसिंहः

The Prābhākara explains his position at great length.

कार्य-सम्बन्धे हि व्युत्पत्तिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कार्ये मानात्तरापूर्वे
समस्तं वैदिकं वचः ।
प्रमाणम् इति हि प्राज्ञाः
मन्यन्ते मान्य-बुद्धयः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā V, P.93:

sarvapadānāmeva hi svābhāvikī vṛddhavyavahārasiddhā
kāryaparatā, lākṣaṇīkī ca siddhaparateti.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पदानां तत्_(→प्रमाणान्तरागोचर-कार्य)-परत्वेन
व्युत्पत्तेर् अवधारणात् ।
न खल्व् अन्य-परे शब्दे
व्युत्पत्तेर् अस्ति सम्भवः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि वृद्धयोर् व्यवहरतोर् एकतर-वृद्ध-प्रयुक्त-शब्द_(← "गाम् आनय")-श्रवण-समनन्तर--
जनितान्यतर-वृद्ध-समवेत-चेष्टां दृष्ट्वा
अन्यथा_(→ कारणान्तरैर्) नुपपत्त्य-उन्नीयमाना शब्द-शक्तिस्
तद्-उपपादक-कार्य-पर्यवसायिन्य्_(इत्य) एवावसीयते,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

"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,

or (but this is not strictly "true" denotation) through repetition of otherwise knowable facts.

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.

A child learns what certain sentences 'mean'

by observing the action which his elders take upon hearing these sentences,

When he knows no language meaning (vyutpatti),

he may acquire knowledge by first hearing one adult tell another to "get the cow,"

and subsequently observing that the other is getting the cow:
by associating the two events he knows that an order to get the cow

was the content of the first adult's statement "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.

The process of the child knowing the sentence meaning

is here described as arthapatti "reasoning by circumstantial implication;"

since there is no other ground for the second man's getting the

COW,
it must have been the first man's statement.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रतीता हि स्व-कार्य-सन्ताने
कार्य-संविद् एव तत्-तद्-विशेष-चेष्टा-हेतुतया।
तद् अयम् इहापि तादृशीं प्रवृत्तिं पश्यन्
एवम् आकलयति -
"नूनम् इतस् सकाशाद् अस्य कार्य-संविद् आविर् आसीत्
यद् अयम् एतदनन्तरं प्रवर्तत" इति,

▼ Buitenen

The very awareness of karya
is known to relate to one's own karya;
so the onlooker, observing the same process in the present case,
realizes that the one person's action has been caused by the other
person's variously differentiated behaviour.

"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."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवं च
समस्त-व्यवहारानुगत-प्रवृत्ति-निमित्त--कार्य-प्रतिपादन-परतया व्युत्पन्ने शब्दे
यत् पदावापोद्धारानुयायिनो ये ऽर्थ-भागास्
ते प्रथमावगत-प्रधान-भूत-कार्यानुगुणतया
तैस् तैर् अभिधीयन्ते इत्य् अध्यवस्थति,

▼ Buitenen

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 karya

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

That is to say that the denotativeness of the words composing the statement
is dependent upon the injunctive denotation of the statement as a whole.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

तत्र च लिङ्-आदयो
इव्यभिचरित-कार्य-संविदः कार्य-शरीरम् एव
साक्षात् समर्पयन्ति।
तिङ्-आदयस् तु
तद्-अपेक्षिताधिकाराद्-अनुबन्ध-प्रतिपादन-मुखेन
तत्-समन्वयम् अनुभवन्तीति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

In such a statement the imperative and optative verbal terminations,
which unvaryingly give rise to a knowledge of karya,
convey by themselves the body of the karya,
whereas the indicative etc. terminations are subject to a contextual relation with the karya
by describing consequent matters which required by the karya,
e.g. a person's qualification to accomplish it etc.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

[[131]]

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā* V, P.91:

tatra liñādipratyayo niyogārthaśarīramevābhidhadhāti,
prakṛtistadviṣayam; padāntarāṇi ca viṣayavišeṣaṇāṁ nāmadheyāṁ
niyojyāṁ ca abhidhadhātīti.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च पुत्र-जननादि-स्वरूपावेदन-पर्यवसायिनः पद-निचयस्य
अविरल-पुलकोदय--वदन-विकासादिभिर् अभिमत-सुत-जन्मादि-प्रतिपादन-शक्ति-निश्चयः

अजातातिवृत्त-प्रत्युत्पन्न-विविध-हर्ष-हेतूपनिपाते "ऽयम् अमुने" ति निर्धृत्य
प्रतिपन्नम् अशक्यत्वात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ *नरसिंहः*

न च ... Cf. ibid* V, P.93:

tathāpi putraste jāta iti vākyasya
putrajanmākhyaharṣahetupratipādakatā harṣahetūnāmānanyāt
duranumānā; na ca pāriśeṣyeṇa tatpratipādakatvādhyavasāyah;
bhūtabhaviṣyadvartamānānāṁ sannihitavyavahitānāṁ
pāriśeṣyāvadhāraṇāyā atyantaduṣkaratvāt.

हेतूपनिपातेयममुनेति ... 'अयं हर्षः अमुना हेतुना जात' इति निर्धारयितुं शक्यम् इति।

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

एतेन ("स्वर्गकामः सोमेन यजते" →) व्युत्पन्नेतर-पद-समभिव्याहृत--वर्तमान-निर्देशेऽपि
कार्येदम्पर्य-विरहित-पद--शक्ति--निश्चय-प्रतिविधिर् (लिङ्ग-आक्षेपण) अनुसंधातव्यः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā* V, P.92:

vyutpannetarapadavibhaktearthāḥ kāṣṭhaiḥ pacati iti
vartamānopadeśe'pi yat pāke karaṇāṁ, tat kāṣṭhaśabdena
pratipādyata ityavagamya pratyakṣeṇa kāṣṭhānāṁ
karaṇabhāvamavagacchantaḥ kāṣṭhaśabde vyutpadyante.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

"पदान्तराणि यादृक्षि
व्युत्पद्यन्ते च तादृशम् ।
इदं च पदम्" इत्य् एव
तत्र व्युत्पद्यते नरः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. *Prakaraṇapañcikā** II, P.179:

śabdāntarāṇi svārtheṣu vyutpadyante yathaiva hi॥
āvāpodvāpabhedena tathā kārye liñādayaḥ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तानि कार्यान्वित-स्वार्थ-
बोधकानीति साधितम् ।
अथ तद्-बुद्धि-हेतुत्वात्
प्रामाण्यं भूत-गोचरम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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*.

▼ नरसिंहः

अथ ... The Mīmāṃsaka poses two alternatives to refute the validity of statements referring to existent factors.

"Tadbuddhihetutvāt" means
"bhūtavastuviṣayakajñānajanakatvāt".

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

इष्टते तद्^(→कर्य-बोधन) अनेकान्तं^(=क्वचित्ता)
पदेष्व इति न शोभते ।

अथ तत्_(→कार्य-बोध)-परता हेतुस्_(व्युत्पत्तः),
ततश्च स्याद् आसिद्धता ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ नरसिंहः

“Tatparatā” means “bhūtavastuparata”.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न ह्य अकार्यरूपे वस्तुनि क्वचिदपि शाब्दी बुद्धिः प्रर्यवस्थति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

या: पुनर् लौकिक-शब्द-श्रवण-समनन्तर-भाविन्यो इन्वयावगतयस्
ता आनुमानिक्यो इभिहिताः,
न शाब्द्य
इत्य् उपपद्यत एव तासाम् अ-तत्-पर्यवसानम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

According to the Prābhākara, all statements made by human beings are only inferential in character and as such, cannot be primarily valid.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि तत् (=कार्य) - परता - ग्राहः
शब्दानां नैव विद्यते ।
"अग्निहोत्रज् जुहोती" ति
विधिः कस्माद् उपेयते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ नरसिंहः

Taittirīya Saṃhitā* V. 9. 1.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अथ तत्र प्रमाणत्वे
संवृत्ते ऽपि च तावता ।
पुरुषार्थत्व-लाभाय
विधिर् अभ्युपगम्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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 purpose,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् असन् - न प्रमाणानां
प्रयोजन-वशानुगा ।
प्रवृत्तिः, किन्तु तन्-मूलः
प्रयोजन-परिग्रहः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न खलु कनकम् अभिलषतः
शिलावलोकनम् अनभिमतम्
इति कनकावलोकनता ऽश्रयितुम् उचिता ।

▼ Buitenen

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!

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Tantravārtika under I. ii 1, P.2:

na hi loṣṭam paśyataḥ taddarśanam niṣprayojanamiti
suvarṇadarśanāt kalpyate.

Veṅkaṭanātha quotes this passage in his Śeśvaramīmāṃsā under I. ii. 1, P.57.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तात्पर्यम् एव शब्दानां
यावत् कार्ये न कल्पितम् ।
न तावद् वर्तमानादि-
निर्देशे विधि-कल्पनम् ॥(5)

▼ Buitenen

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)

उपनिषद्-वाक्यावगतिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एवज् चोपनिषदाम् अपि
तत्र-तत्राम्नायमान-ज्ञानोपासनादि-विधि-शेषतया ऽथो व्याकरणीयः,
तद् अयम् अर्थः "सर्वज्ञम् आनन्दम् आत्मानं जानीयात्" इति ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

This is again the Prabhakara view. The Bhatta view is somewhat different;
according to the latter the upanisads are arthavadas (subsidiary substantive statements laudatory of elements of injunctions) to the eternity of the performer's personality (atman),⁽⁵⁾ which eternity 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.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā* V, P.93, ff:

ataśca vedāntānāmapi ātmā jñātavya ityapunarāvṛttaye
samāmnātena vidhinā ekavākyatāmāśritya kāryaparatvameva
varṇanā�am....api ca siddhārthaparative'pi śabdasya na
vedāntānām paramānandādirūpatve brahmaṇah
prāmāṇyamavakalpate; tatra hi
brahmaśvarūpānuvādenānandādirūpavidhirāstheyah.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

न च तावता स्वरूपम् अपि सिद्धतीत्य् अध्यवसेयम् -
अ-सत्य् एव रूपे तादृशि
तथा विधानोपपत्तेः ।⁽⁵⁾

▼ *Buitenen*

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;

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṃsakas do not accept the existence of any deity that receives the offerings of the votaries and rewards them.

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā V, P.94:

brahmaśvarūpāṁ ca pramāṇāntarasiddhamevāśrayanīyam;
brahmaśabdasya ca loke pramāṇāntarasiddhātmavācitvena
siddheḥ vede'pi sa evārthaḥ; tathā ca sati
nityaprakāśaparamānandādirūpavidhiḥ sakalapratipattiviruddhaḥ;
sarvapratipattiṣu hi pramāṇasmṛtibhūtāsvātmā prakāśate; na ca
tatram paramānandaḥ sarṇvedyate; na ca
sāṁsārikaduḥkhābhībhūtavāt tasyāprakāśaḥ,
abhibhavānupapatteḥ; avacchinnaṁ hi duḥkham
anavacchinnaṁ nanda iti nālpīyasā mahataḥ abhibhavaḥ
sarṇbhavati; svaprakāśasya ca
abhibhavāvaraṇānabhivyaktinām[[??]] asambhava eva;...
sakalavikāraśūnyatāpi vijñānādīvikārotpatteḥ
pramāṇāntaraviruddhaiveti parasparānvayāyogyatayā
nānandādiparatvāṁ; ajarāmaratvayostu
pramāṇāntaraprasiddhereva anuvādatvāt aprāmāṇyam iti.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथैतद् अ-पितर्य् एव "पितरज् जानीयाद्" इति
तथा चानुद्वीथ ओङ्कार उद्वीथ-विधानम् इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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]])

▼ नरसिंहः

अपितर्येव ... लौकिकम् इदम् उदाहरणम्। वैदिकम् अपि दर्शयति 'अनुद्रीथ' इति।

तथा च ... See Chāndogyopaniṣad I. 5: atha khalu ya udgīthaḥ sa praṇavo, yaḥ praṇavaḥ sa udgītha iti. See Raṅgarāmānuja's commentary on it.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यानि पुनर् आत्म-सत्यत्व-नित्यत्व-वादीनि वाक्यानि
तान्य् (विध-वाक्ये→) अ-विशेषित-काल--कर्म-विधानाक्षिप्यमाण+
+आमुष्मिक-फल-भोगोचित-चेतन-कर्तृ-प्रतिपादन-पराणि (5)

▼ Buitenen

All statements that set forth the reality and the eternity of the soul only serve to convey that there is a spiritual agent, who is required in order to experience the otherworldly fruits that are mentioned in ritual injunctions where the time of fruition is not specified.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अतो न किञ्चिद् अपि वचो भूते (←सिद्ध) इर्थे प्रमाणम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतः सर्वार्थवादानाम् अपि
परिनिष्ठित-रुद्र-रोदनादि-प्रतिपादन-परता-वारणोपपादनेन
विदूरतर-वर्ति-विधि-पदान्वय-स्तावकतयाऽपि प्रदर्शितः

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

I read *ata avarthavādānām*.

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

▼ नरसिंहः

For instance, for the arthavāda statement “so 'rodīt yadarodīt tat
rudrasya rudratvam” (Taittirīya Saṃhitā : I. v. i. 1), the
corresponding vidhi-sentence is “barhiśi rajatam na deyam” (Ibid: I.
v. i. 2).

उपसंहारः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तस्माद् अ-पर्यालोचित-पूर्वपर-पद-तात्पर्याणाम्
आपातायात-श्रद्धा-विरचित-विग्रहोऽयम् उद्ग्राहितः पुरुष
इत्य् अलम् अतिविस्तरेण ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सिद्धम् इदं - न श्रुतितो ऽप्य अभिमत-पुरुषातिशयः सिद्धतीति ।

▼ Buitenen

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

सिद्ध-वस्तु-परत्वेऽपि नेश्वरः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च भवतु भूतम् अपि वस्तु शास्त्रस्य विषयः,

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ च कथम् इव चोदना-जनित-धियम् **अवधीर्य**
धर्माधर्मैः विजानाति कश्चिद् इत्य् अभ्युपेयते?

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सर्वज्ञता हि प्रसिद्धैर् एव प्रमाणैः यथा-यथम् अर्थान् अवगच्छतोऽपि संगच्छते,

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Ślokavārtika under I. i. 2, śls. 111b-117:

yadi ṣaḍbhiḥ pramāṇaissyāt sarvajñah kena vāryate ?
ekena tu pramāṇena sarvajño yena kalpyate |
nūnam sa cakṣuṣā sarvān rasādīn pratipadyate ||
yajjātiyaiḥ pramāṇaistu yajjātiyārthadarśanam |
bhavedidānīm lokasya tathā kālāntare 'pyabhūtī ||
yatrāpyatiśayo dṛṣṭāḥ sa svārthānatilāṅghanāt |
dūrasūkṣmādīdṛṣṭau syānna rūpe śrotravṛttitā ||
bhaviṣyati na dṛṣṭām ca pratyakṣasya manāgapī |
sāmarthyām nānumānāder liṅgādirahite kvacit ||
sarvajñakalpanādyaistu vede cāpauruṣeyatā |
tulyatā kalpitā yena tenedām sampradhāryatām ||
sarvajño dṛsyate tāvannedānīmasmadādibhiḥ |
nirākaraṇavacchakyā na cāsīditi kalpanā ||

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि तद् अस्ति वचनं
यद् अस्य
प्रसिद्ध-बुद्ध्य-उत्पादन-हेतु(←श्रम) हान-मुखेन
सार्वज्ञं ज्ञापयति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. ibid., śl. 118.

na cāgamena sarvajñastadīye 'nyonyasamśrayāt!
narāntarapraṇītasya prāmāṇyaṁ gamyate katham ?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यद्यु अपि किञ्चिद् अभविष्यत्
तथाऽपि परस्परान्वयाऽनुचित-पदार्थतया
अर्थवादतयैव समर्थनीयम्

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

▼ नरसिंहः

यद्यपि ... The Mīmāṃsaka has in mind, statements like "yassarvajñah
sarvavit" (Muṇḍaka : I-9) and "na tasya kāryam karaṇam ca
vidyate, svābhāvikī jñānabalakriyā ca" (Śvetāśvatara : VI-8), which
declare that there does exist an Omniscient Being and that His
Omniscience is natural but not due to any extraneous factor.

अर्थवादतयैव ... Cf. Ślokavārtika, I. i. 2, śls. 118-120:

na cāgamena sarvajñastadīye 'nyonyasamśrayāt |
narāntarapraṇītasya prāmāṇyam̄ gamyate katham ||
na cāpyevam̄paro nityah̄ śakyo labdhum ihāgamah̄ |
nityaścedarthavādatvam̄ tatpare syādaniyatā ||
āgamasya ca nityatve siddhe tatkalpanā vṛthā |
yatastam̄ pratipadyante dharmameva tato narāh ||

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रमाणान्तरावगत-योग्यतादि-पुरस्-सरी
पदेभ्यो वाक्यार्थ-बुद्धिर् उपजायमाना -
प्रथमतर-निपतितापेक्षित-प्रमाणान्तर-विरोधे
कथम् इव जनिम् अनुभवतीति सम्भावयामः ।

▼ Buitenen

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!

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

प्रमाणान्तरावगत ... By the term "pramāṇāntara" here is meant "śabda".

विरोधे ... The term "pramāṇāntara" here means "pratyakṣa".

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रत्यक्षादि-प्रतिक्षिप्त-

गोचरं वचनं यदि ।

अपि को नु तादात्म्यं

विहन्त्य् आदित्य-यूपयोः (यद्-विषयकार्थवादः प्रसिद्धः) ॥ (5)

▼ *Buitenen*

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)

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa: II. i.5.2 : “ādityo yūpah”.

The argument is that if perception were not taken as the guiding principle in ascertaining the connotation of passages, one would have to literally identify the Sun and the sacrificial post on the authority of the text “ādityo yūpah”, which is a eulogistic passage. But their identity is disproved by perception itself. Likewise, Omniscience is also to be disproved.

१३ नेश्वर-प्रणीतता②

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

अपि चास्ति नरः कश्चित्

तादृशातिशयाश्रयः ।

सिषाधयिषित-ग्रन्थ-

प्रामाण्यस्य किम् आगतम् (ईश्वर-ग्रन्थ-सम्बन्धः कुतः?) ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

सर्व-ज्ञ-वादि-नैकान्तता③

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

ननु च तादृश-पुरुषेण विरचितम् इदम्
इति पञ्चरात्र-गोत्रानुसारिणः स्मरन्ति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

पाशुपता वा किन् न स्मरन्ति,
तेऽपि स्व-दर्शनादर्शकम् अखिल-जगद्-अध्यक्षम् आचक्षते, तथाऽन्येऽपि ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

न च सर्वेऽमी सर्वज्ञा - विरुद्धार्थोपदेशानुपपत्तेः ।

▼ Buitenen

Now they cannot all of them be omniscient,
because then it would be impossible for them to set forth mutually
contradictory teachings.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

य एव च वादिनाम् एकस्य वादिनः सर्व-ज्ञ-सिद्धौ हेतुर् भवति
स सर्वेषां साधारणः।
तद् इह बहुषु परस्पर-विरुद्धम् अर्थम् अहम्-अहमिक्योपदिशत्सु
कतमं सर्व-ज्ञम् अध्यवसामः।

▼ Buitenen

The same ground which allows one among several discussants to
prove an omniscient promulgator
must hold equally for all of them.
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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथाऽह -

सर्वज्ञेषु च भूयस्सु
विरुद्धार्थोपदेशिषु ।
तुल्य-हेतुषु सर्वेषु
को नामैको निरूप्यताम् ॥

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

[[36]]

As the (unidentified) text says,

"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 ?"

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

स्वतन्त्राधिगमाधीनं
(नाना) सर्व-ज्ञ-परिकल्पनम् ।
परस्-पर-प्रतीघातात्
सर्वप्रामाण्यम् आवहेत् ॥

▼ Buitenen

When each omniscient being is assumed on the basis of one's own Tantra doctrine since the various tantric doctrines are mutually in conflict, the result will be that none of them is authoritative, !

▼ नरसिंहः

'स्वतन्त्र' इत्य् अस्य 'स्वकीय-तन्त्र' इत्य् अर्थो विवक्षितः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु,
श्रुति-स्मृति-प्रसिद्धेन
वासुदेवेन भाषितम् ।
कथं तन्त्रान्तरैर् एतत्
तुल्य-कक्ष्यां निवेश्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

44. OBJECTION.

How can the teaching of Vasudeva himself,

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

▼ नरसिंहः

The Mīmāṃsaka anticipates the following argument from the Siddhāntin.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा हि पौरुषे सूक्ते
श्रूयते तस्य वैभवम् ।
पद्भ्यां भूमिर् दिशशः श्रोत्राद्
इत्य-आदीदन् तथा परम् ॥
सूर्या-चन्द्रमसौ धाता
यथा-पूर्वम् अकल्पयत्

इति, तथा

स ब्रह्मा स शिव इति,
तद् विष्णोः परमम् पदम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.)

▼ नरसिंहः

पद्भ्यां ... Ṛgveda X. 90.41.

सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ ... Mahānārāyaṇa Up. V. 7.

स ब्रह्मा ... Ibid. XI. 13.

तद्विष्णोः ... Kaṭhopaniṣad III. 9; also Maitrīyopaniṣad VI. 26.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

"न तस्य कश्चित् पतिर् अस्ति लोके
न चेशिता तस्य च नैव लिङ्गम्" ।
इतीरयन्ति श्रुतयोऽस्य भूतिं
जगज्-जनि-स्थेम-पिधान-चिह्नाम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Śvetāśvatara Up. VI. 9.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

विष्णोस् सकाशाद् उद्भूतं
जगत् तत्रैव च स्थितम् ।
स्थिति-संयम-कर्ताऽसाव्
इत्य् आह स्म पराशरः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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;

▼ नरसिंहः

Viṣṇupurāṇa I. i. 35. This verse declares that Viṣṇu is both the material and the instrumental cause of the universe.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

इत्थं तम् एव सर्वेशं मनुर् अप्य् आह, तद् यथा ।

नारायणः परोऽव्यक्ताद्
अण्डम् अ-व्यक्त-साभवम् ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Manu, too, declared that He is the lord:

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ नरसिंहः

This verse does not occur in editions of Manusmṛti with the commentaries of Medhātithi and Kullūkabhaṭṭa.

Manvarthamuktāvalī of the Kāśī Sanskrit Series, however, has this verse inserted between the 10th and the 11th stanzas of the Ist Chapter.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

इत्थं नाना-श्रुति-मुनि-वचस्-सन्तत-स्तूयमान-
ज्ञानैश्वर्यः परम-पुरुषः पञ्च-रात्रं व्यधत्त ।

तच् चेद् एतच् छ्रुति-पथ-परिभ्रष्ट-तन्त्रैः समानं
पातृत्वेन प्रसज्जति तदा सोम-पस् ते सुरा-पैः ॥ (5)

▼ *Buitenen*

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!

▼ नरसेहः:

केवलं तन्त्रत्व-साम्यम् आदाय यदि पञ्चरात्रम् अपि अवैदिकम् इति वक्तुम्
उत्सहसे, तर्हि, ते तव प्रीति-पात्रं सोमपो ऽपि, पातृत्व-साम्यम् आदाय, सुरा-पैः
समानः प्रसज्जति

इत्य्-अन्वयः। "समान"-पदं पूर्व-पादाद् अध्याहार्यम्। मीमांसकस्य पूर्व-पक्षित्वाद् अत्र सोम-
प-दृष्टान्तः सरस इति च ध्येयम्।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नैतज् (तन्त्र) ज्यायः किम् अङ्ग? श्रुतिषु भगवतो न प्रसिद्धा विशुद्ध-
ज्ञानैश्वर्यादि-धर्मास् त्रिपुर-विजयिनस् - तेन यत् किञ्चिदेतत् ।
यद् वा देवस् स एव त्रि-भुवन-भवन-त्राण-विध्वंस-हेतुर्
वेदान्तैक-प्रमाणः कथयति स, कथं वेद-गोष्ठी-बहिः-षम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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 Vedānta furnishes evidence to the exclusion of anyone else, how could He promulgate a doctrine that is outside the pale of the Veda?

▼ नरसिंहः

The above argument of the Siddhāntin is refuted by the Mīmāṃsaka.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा हि भगवतः पशुपतेर् अपि
सार्वज्ञ-सर्वैश्वर्यविदिकाः श्रुतयो
बहुलम् उपलभ्यन्ते -

| यस् सर्वज्ञस् स सर्ववित् ।

| तम् ईश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरम्

इत्य्-आद्याः ।

▼ Buitenen

45. OBJECTION.

Nevertheless, a fair number of śrutiś 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.)

▼ नरसिंहः

यस्सर्वज्ञः ... Muṇḍakopaniṣad: I. i. 9.

तमीश्वराणां... Śvetāśvatara*: VI. 7.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सर्व-ज्ञेश्वर-शब्दौ च
न ते देवात् पिनाकिनः (→तस्मिन् अपि) ।
(पदार्थ-ज्ञान+.)उत्पत्ति-शक्त्या वर्तते
सत्यं अप्य अन्यत्र तद्वति ॥
(इति प्रत्याक्षेपः।)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

("यस् सर्व-ज्ञः सर्व-वित्" →)
किञ्च सर्व-ज्ञ-शब्देन
सर्व-ज्ञे प्रतिपादिते ।
पौनर-उक्त्यं प्रसञ्जेत
सर्व-विद्-ग्रहणस्य वः ॥(5)
अतः सर्वज्ञ-शब्दोऽयं
महादेवैक-गोचरः ।

▼ Buitenen

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

Consequently, the word sarvajia refers only to Mahadeva;

▼ नरसिंहः

The above argument, says the Mīmāṃsaka, is favourable to the Pāśupatas since the text "yassarvajñah sarvavit" (Muṇḍaka: I. i. 9) cannot be properly explained in favour of the Pāñcarātrins. "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 Pāñcarātrin in the defect of redundancy. Therefore, the Pāśupata method of explanation is in sooth, proper : the term 'sarvajña' refers to Śiva conventionally, while the term 'sarvavit' does so, through etymology.

▼ नरसिंहः

The above argument, says the Mīmāṃsaka, is favourable to the Pāśupatas since the text "yassarvajñah sarvavit" (Mundaka- I. 1. 9) cannot be properly 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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा च स्कन्द-लिङ्गादि-
पुराणानि पिनाकिनः ॥
उपक्षीणानि सार्वज्य-
सर्वेश्वर्योपपादने ।

▼ Buitenen

and so the Skanda-Purana, Linga-Purāṇa and other Purāṇas
exhaust themselves
in describing this all knowing and sovereign character of Siva.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ततश्च तत्-प्रणीतत्वात्
प्रामाण्यम् अनया दिशा ॥
प्राप्तं पाशुपतं तन्त्रं
तत्रान्योन्य-विरोधतः ।
सर्व-तन्त्र-प्रमाणत्व-
विषयसिः प्रसज्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[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.

श्रुति-विरोधः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च भवतु भगवान् वासुदेव एवौपनिषदः पुरुषः,
अथ च स कथम् इव श्रुति-परिपन्थि-तन्त्रम् एतत् प्रणयेतेत्य उत्वेक्ष्येत
य एवम् आह

श्रुति-स्मृती ममैवाज्ञे

इति ?

▼ Buitenen

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)

▼ नरसिंहः

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

śrutismṛtī mamaivājñā yas tām ullaṅghya vartate
ājñācchedī mama drohī madbhakto'pi na vaiṣṇavah.

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

śrutismṛtīr mamaivājñā tām ullaṅghya yajan śubhe
sarvasvenāpi mām devi nāpnotyājñāvilaṅghanāt.

▼ नरसिंहः

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

śrutismṛti mamaivājñā
yastāmullaighya vartate ājñācchedi mama drohi
madbhaktopi na vaiṣṇavah.

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

śrutissmṛtīr mamaivājñā
tāmullanghya yajan subhe
sarvasvenāpi mām devi
napnotyājñāvilaṅghanāt.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ततश्च -

वासुदेवाभिधानेन
केनचिद् विप्रलिप्सुना ।
प्रणीतं प्रस्तुतं तन्त्रम्
इति निश्चिनुमो वयम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

मोहनोद्देशः?③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अस्तु वा समस्तजगदध्यक्षो वासुदेव एवास्य तन्त्रस्य प्रणेता, तथाऽपि -

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

माया-मोहन-विग्रहेण हरिणा देव-द्वाहां संहतिम्
हन्तुं मोहयता इहितान्य् अभिहितान्य् आहुर् हि तच्छद्धना ।
एवं किन् नु नयन् नयन् निज-महा-माया-गुहा-गव्हरम् ।
व्याजह्वे किम् इदं न वेति विशये जाते, कथं निर्णयः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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?
This is the question that now arises.
How are we to resolve it?

▼ नरसिंहः

Viṣṇupurāṇa: (Jīvānanda's edn.) Arṁśa : III. chs. 17-18 give the story of Māyāmohana, 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 Liṅgapurāṇa and the Kāśīkhaṇḍa.

▼ नरसिंहः

Visnupurāṇa- (Jivānanda'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 Kāsikhanda.

वैदिकैर् अनज्ञीकारः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रत्युत भ्रमयन् एव
व्याजहरेति गम्यते ।
वैदिकैर् अगृहीतत्वात्
तथा इर्हत्मतं यथा ॥(4)

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वैदिकापरिग्रहश् च प्राग् एव प्रपञ्चित इति,
तस्मान् न (वेदापेक्षया→) स्व-तन्त्रानुभव-मूलतया प्रमाणम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

supra § 12.

न मन्वादि-स्मृतिवत्^③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि मन्वादि-स्मरणवद् इत्य् - अनुपपन्नं पञ्चरात्रस्मरणम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

supra §11.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यदि मन्वादिवद् देवः
शुश्रूषा-परितोषितात् ।

आचार्याल् लब्ध-वेदार्थस्
तन्म् एतद् अचीक्लपत् ॥
स्वातन्त्र्य-कल्पना इमुष्य
व्यर्था मिथ्या तथा सति ।

▼ Buitenen

[[39]]

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अनधीतोऽपि वेदोऽस्य
प्रतिभातीत्य् अलौकिकम् (ततोऽसम्भाव्यम्) ॥
तत्र वार्तिककारेण
ये दोषास् समुदीरिताः ।
ते च सर्वे इनुसंधेयाः
पुरुषातिशयादयः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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,

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide Ślokavārttika* I. i. 2, śl. 111b, ff.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किञ्च -

शैवं पाशुपतज् चैव
बौद्धम् अप्य आहृतं तथा ।
कापालं पञ्चरात्रज् चेत्य्
एवं पाषण्डता स्मृतेः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वैदिकं तान्त्रिकं चेति
विभाग-करणाद् अपि ।
गम्यते पञ्चरात्रस्य
वेद-बाह्यत्व-निश्चयः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

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

athāto devasyārcanam dvividham śruṇu । [sic]
vaikhānasam pañcarātram vaidikam tantrikam kramāt ॥
tayor vaikhānasam śreṣṭhamaihikāmuṣmikapradam ।

The (Mahā) Sanatkumārasamhitā draws a distinction among the Vaiṣṇava-mantras in terms of Vaidika Tāntrika and Vaidika-tāntrika.

Cf. Ṣaṭrūgaṇa IX. 35:

vaidikāṁ tāntrikāṁ caiva tathā vaidikatāntrikam I
mantratrayāṁ krameṇoktam..... II

Cf. Vasiṣṭhaśaṁhitā XIII. 16b-17a:

Vaidikāṁ tāntrikāṁ caiva tathā vaidikatāntrikam I
miśritāṁ vaidikāṁ mantraiḥ tasmāt vaidikatāntrikam II

Hārita in his Dharmaśāstra, says: srutiśca dvividhā, vaidikī tantrikī ca (Quoted in the Liṅgadhāraṇacandrikā, p. 240).

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

शैवं पाशुपतं सौम्यं
लागुडज्ज चतुर्विधम् ।
तन्त्र-भेदः समुद्दिष्टः
सङ्करं न समाचरेत् ॥

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसेह:

The Vaikhānōsāgamas call the Vaikhānasa and the Pāñcarātra systems "saumya" and "āgneya" respectively. Cf. Kāsyapajñānakāṇḍa, P.171:

vaikhānasam saumyam; āgneyam pāñcarātram.

See also Vimānārcanākalpa, paṭala 77, P.467:

vaiśṇavāṁ dvidvidhaṁ, vaikhānasāṁ pāñcarātram iti;
vaikhānasāṁ vaidikāṁ, vaidikairarcitam
aihikāmuṣmikaphalapradam; pāñcarātramāgneyāṁ avaidikam
āmuṣmikaphalapradam; saumyāṁ sarvatra saṁpūjyam.

Cf. also Bhāgavata XI. 27. 7, 49:

vaidikastāntriko miśra iti me trividho makhaḥ ।
trayāṇāmipsitenāiva vidhinā māṁ samarcayet ॥
evam kriyāyogapathaiḥ pumān vaidikatāntrikaiḥ ।
arcayannubhayataḥ siddhim matto vindatyabhipsitam ॥

It may be noted that such a division is found even among the Śaivāgamas. Thus, the Vāyu Saṁhitā of the Śivapurāṇa (uttarabhāga XXIV. 177-178) says:

śivāgamo'pi dvidvidhaḥ śrauto'śrautaśca saṁsmṛtaḥ ।
śrutiśāramayaḥ śrautaḥ svatantra itarassmṛtaḥ ॥ (Quoted in Liṅgādhāraṇacandrikā, P.290).

Also see Śaivasiddhānta P.43:

Āgamas are of two kinds: Śrauta and Aśrauta. The Śrautāgamas are dependent upon the Vedas and are full of their essence; not so the Aśrauta. The former Āgamas are accepted but not the latter. The aśrauta-āgamas have been declared by the Lord in order to delude some people. These Āgamas are Vāma, Pāśupata, Lākula, Bhairava, etc.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा -

भाक्तं भागवतज्ज्यैव
सात्त्वतं च त्रिधा मतम् ।

इत्य् एवं तन्त्रभेदोक्तिः
पञ्चरात्रेऽपि दृश्यते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

१५ जीव-जन्मोक्तिः②

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

किञ्च -

श्रुति-स्मृति-प्रतिक्षिप्त-
जीव-जन्मादि-गोचरम् ।
न्याय-हीनं वचस् तथ्यम्
इति हास्यम् इदम् महत् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

तथा च श्रुतिः -

अविनाशी वा अरेऽयमात्मा अनुच्छितिधर्मा
मात्रासंसर्गस् तस्य भवति

इति तथा

जीवापेतं वाव किलेदम् म्रियते,
न जीवो म्रियते

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.)

▼ नरसिंहः

अविनाशी ... Bṛhadāraṇyaka IV. v. 14.

Cf. Bhagavadgītā II. 14:

mātrāsparśāstu kaunteya śītoṣṇasukhaduḥkhadāḥ!
āgamāpāyino'nityastān titikṣasva bhārata॥

जीवापेतं ...Chāndogy* VI. 11. 3.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

स्याद् एतत् उच्छेदाभाव-मात्र-प्रतिपादकम् एतद् वचनं
न जन्माभावम् अवगमयति

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न,

अनुच्छेदाभिधानेन
जन्माभावो इवसीयते ।
न ह्य अस्ति संभवो भावो
जातो नैव क्षरेद् इति ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'जातो भावो नैव क्षरेद्' इत्य् एतद् वचनं न शक्य-सम्भवम् इति भावः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु च,
सद् एव सौम्येदम् इति
सद्-एकत्वावधारणात् ।
प्राक्-सृष्टि-कालाज् जीवानाम्
अ-भावो इद्यवसीयते ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Chāndogya: VI. ii. 1: 'सद् एव सोम्येदम् अग्र आसीत् एकम् एवाद्वितीयं ब्रह्म' ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यदि जीवाः पृथग्भूताः
प्राक् सृष्टे: स्युः परात्मवत् ।
कथम् एतत् "सद् एवे"ति
तद्-एकत्वावधारणम् । (5)

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Chāndogya VI. ii. 1.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अत्रोच्यते "सद् एवे"ति
यद् एकत्वावधारणम् ।
तत् सिसृक्षित-वाच्य-अम्बु-
वियत्-प्रभृति-गोचरम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[40]]

REFUTATION.

The reply to this is that
here the emphasis on sat's uniqueness
is with regard to the elements of wind, water and ether
that were about to be created by sat.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पर्युदासिष्यताऽनेन
वचसा चेतनो यदि ।

गगनादेर् इवास्यापि
जननं निरदेश्यत ॥(5)

▼ *Buitenen*

Were the soul excluded by this statement of sat's solitariness, then the soul's origin would have been described in the sequel, just as the creation of ether is described.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च निर्दिश्यते तेन
न जीवो जनिम् ऋच्छति ।
तत्-तेजोऽसूजतेत्यादौ
जीवसर्गो हि न श्रुतः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

This is not done; therefore the soul does not know birth, since in the sequel "That sat created fire, etc. (Ch Up. 6.2.3.) we do not hear of the creation of the individual soul.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid: VI. ii. 3.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु च "यतो वा इमानि भूतानि" इत्य्-अत्र
जीवानाम् एव जनन-जीवन-प्रायणाभिसंवेशनानि प्रतीयन्ते?

▼ *Buitenen*

OBJECTION. However, in the text *yato va imani bhūtāni* etc. we hear that the souls too know origin, continuance and reabsorption.

▼ नरसिंहः

Taittirīya : III. i. 1: "यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते, येन जातानि जीवन्ति" etc.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि भूतशब्दोऽयं
जीवानाम् अभिधायकः ।
भ्रामयन् सर्व-भूतानीत्य्-
एवम्-आदिषु दर्शनात् ॥

▼ Buitenen

Here the word bhuta denotes the jiva, the individual soul; for thus we find the word used in the passage bhrāmayan sarvabhūtāni,

▼ नरासिंहः

Bhagavadgītā: XVIII, 61b.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

जीवन्तीति हि शब्दोऽयं
जीवेष्व् एवावकल्पते ।
तेन जायन्त इत्य्-एतज्-
जायते जीव-गोचरम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

The verb jianti "they live" in the text can only apply to the souls, the expression tena jayante "by whom they are born" evidently refers to these same souls.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् इदम् अनुपपन्नं भूत-शब्दो विहायः-
पवन--हुत-भुग्-अस्मो-मेदिनीषु प्रसिद्धः ।

पदम् इदम् इतरस्मिन् लक्षणा-वृत्ति तेषां
बहु-विध-परिणामो गीयते जीवनञ्च ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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

The word bhuta commonly deonly 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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

प्रथमम् अधिगता ये खादयो भूत-शब्दात्
तद्-अनुगुणतयाऽर्थं वक्ति जीवन्ति-शब्दः ।
यदि च भवति जीवे भूत-शब्दस् तदानीम्
अपि वदति तदीयञ्च जन्म देहानुबन्धि ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

अतो जीव-परत्वेऽपि
भूत-शब्दस्य युज्यते ।
जायन्त इति शब्दोऽयं
गौरं जाते गच्छतीति वत् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा "अजो ह्य एक" इत्य्-आद्याः
श्रुतयोऽन्याश् च सन्ति नः ।
जीवानुत्पत्ति-वादिन्यस्
तथा भगवतो वचः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

There are śruti-s to this effect, like "For the soul, unborn, alone" (Svet Up. 4.5.) and we also have other Śruti-s which declare that the soul is unborn.

Similarly, the word of the Lord:

▼ नरसिंहः

Śvetāśvatara IV. 5: "अजो ह्य एको जुषमाणो ऽनुशेते ।"

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रकृतिं पुरुषञ्चैव
विद्ध्य अनादी उभाव् अपि । (Bh G. 18.61.)

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Bhagavadgītā XIII. 19a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अजो नित्यश् शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणः ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid: II. 20c.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न जायते प्रियते वा कदाचित् ।
इत्यादि ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid: II. 20a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न्यायश् च -

विवादाध्यासितो जीवो
न जातु जनिम् ऋच्छति ।
द्रव्यत्वे सत्य-मूर्तत्वाच्
चिद्-रूपत्वात् परात्मवत् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

१६ नापौरुषेयता②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पश्यन्तः पौरुषेयत्वे
दूषणान्य् उक्तया दिशा ।
अन्-अन्य-गतयः केचित्
तन्त्रं नित्यम् अतिषिधिन् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् एतत् स्व-हृदय-निहित-विशदतर-
कर्तु-स्मरण-प्रतिहतम् अभिधीयत
इत्य् उपेक्षणीयम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

१७ पाशुपतादि-समता②

पौरुषेयत्वम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किञ्च -

इत्थं पाशुपतादीनां (तच्-छास्त्र-पौरुषेयत्वे)

न्यायः किं-दण्ड-वारितः ।

तथाऽस्त्व इति यदि ब्रूयाद्

व्याघातस् स्यात् परस्परम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

सर्व-लोक-प्रसिद्धा च

वासुदेव-प्रणीतता ।

न हातुं शक्यते

यद्दृढ् वेदस्यापौरुषेयता ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

अनुदय-विपर्यास-विशयाः③

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

अथो कश्चिद् ब्रूयाद् -

अनुदय-विपर्यास-विशयैस् त्रि-रूपे प्रामाण्ये
कतरद् इह जोघुष्यत

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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 knowledge.), reversion and dubiety,

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. *Slokavārtika* (I. 1. 2) śl.54a:

अप्रामाण्यं त्रिधा भिन्नं मिथ्यात्वाज्ञान-संशयैः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

स वक्तव्यः

(यत्) किन् नु (स्व-मते) त्वद्-अभिलषितं
लागुड-मते तद् एव

इति ज्ञात्वा
नियमित-मदशं शाम्यतु भवान् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

लागुड-मतं पाशुपतम् इति यावत् ।

१८ उपसंहारः②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् एवम् उदीरित-न्याय-श्रुति-स्मृतीतिहास-पुराण-न्याय-विरुद्धाभिधानेन,
समस्त-शिष्ट-जन-परिग्रह-विरहेण च,
स्वर्गापवर्गावसानोपदेश-व्याजेन केनापि
जगद् वज्चयितुं विरचितानि पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्राणीति मन्यामहे ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

ईदृशापस्मृति-विषयम् एव तद्वचः -

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

या वेद-बाह्याः स्मृतयो
याश्च काश्च कुदृष्यः ।
सर्वास् ता निष्फलाः प्रेत्य तमो-निष्ठा हि ताः स्मृताः ॥

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

"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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Manusmṛti XII. 95.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ईदृश-दुर्-मार्गानुगामिन एव तेऽपि,
एषां वाङ्-मात्रेणापि +अर्चनं निषिध्यते,

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

उक्तज्य -

एत एव च ते येषां
वाङ्मात्रेणापि नार्चनम् ।
पाषण्डिनो विकर्म-स्थान्
बैडाल-व्रतिकांज् छठान् ॥
हैतुकान् बक-वृत्तिश् च
वाङ्मात्रेणापि नार्चयेत् ।

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

"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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. IV. 30.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

इत्य् उपन्यस्तया नीत्या
पञ्च-रात्रम् अशेषतः ।
अप्रमाणम् इति प्राप्तम्
एवं प्रत्ये ऽभिधीयते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

[[43]]

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

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

I read rityā.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

From here starts the 'Siddhānta'.

०२ उत्तर-पक्षः①

०१ निर्दोष-ज्ञान-जन्यतया प्रामाण्यानुमानम्②

प्रतिज्ञा③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

विवादाध्यासितं तन्नं
 प्रमाणम् इति गृह्यताम्।
 निर्दोष-ज्ञान-जन्मत्वाज्
 ज्योतिष्टोमादि-वाक्यवत्॥

▼ Buitenen

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 jyotiṣtoma etc.

▼ नरसिंहः

‘ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्ग-कामो यजेत्’ इति वाक्यवत् पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्रम् अपि निर्दोष-ज्ञान-
 कारणत्वाद् धेतोः प्रमाणम् एवेति स्वीक्रियताम् इत्य् आशयः ।

अनुमानय् अवयवाः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न तावद् अनुमानेऽस्मिन्
 न्याय-शास्त्र-परीक्षिताः ।
 दोषा मृगयितुं शक्यास्
 तत्र पक्षः परीक्ष्यताम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पक्षो नाम प्रतिज्ञाऽर्थः
स च सिद्धेन केनचित् ।
स्वयं सिद्धो विशिष्टस् सन्
यः साधयितुम् ईस्ति ॥(5)

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

पक्ष-शब्दं निर्वक्ति । पक्षो नाम (पर्वतादिः) प्रतिज्ञा-विषयी-भूतः कक्ष्यन् स्वयं सिद्धः पदार्थः । [प्रतिज्ञा 'पर्वते वह्निमान्' इत्य् एवं रूपा ।] स च सिद्धेन केनचिद् अन्येन पदार्थेण हेतु-भूतेन [धूमादिना] सिसाधयिषितः । सिसाधयिषितो ऽपि सः किञ्चिद् विशिष्टाकारेण [वह्निमत्-स्वरूपेण] सिसाधयिषितः; न तु सामान्याकारेण, इति दिक् ।

०२ पक्ष-सौष्ठवम्②

प्रसिद्धिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्र न तावद् अ-प्रसिद्ध-विशेषणः पक्षः -
प्रामाण्य-नामः पदार्थस्य उभय-वादि-सिद्धत्वात् प्रत्यक्षादौ,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नाप्य् अ-प्रसिद्ध-विशेष्यः (सविशेषणः पक्षः) पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रस्य सर्व-लोक-प्रसिद्धत्वात्

▼ Buitenen

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

न सिद्ध-साधनम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि सिद्ध-साधनः (सविशेषणः पक्षः);
प्रस्तुत-शास्त्र-प्रामाण्यस्य प्रतिवादिनोऽसिद्धत्वात्(4)

▼ Buitenen

Nor is the Object to be proved already proved,
for this Object, "The Pañcaratra is valid," is not proved for the
opponent.

न प्रत्यक्ष-विरोधः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च प्रत्यक्ष-विरुद्धः (सविशेषणः पक्षः) अ-प्रामाण्यस्यातीन्द्रियत्वात्,

▼ Buitenen

Nor is this Object incompatible with Perception,
since its opposite, ie. nonvalidity, is beyond perceptual verifiability.

नानुमानतो विरोधो बाह्यत्वादिभिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नाप्य अनुमानविरुद्धः (सविशेषणः पक्षः), अनुपलभ्नात् ।

▼ Buitenen

Nor is this Object incompatible with Inference,
because no inference proving non-validity is found.

न बाह्यत्वाद् अप्रामाण्यम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननूपलभ्यत एवानुमानम् -
पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रमप्रमाणम् वेद-बाह्यत्वात् बौद्धागमवत् ।

▼ Buitenen

55. OBJECTION. But such an inference is actually found: Pañcarātra Sastra is non-authoritative,
because it is non-Vedic, like Buddhism,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अत्र ब्रूमः कतरद् इहाप्रामाण्यं सिषाधयिषितम्

▼ Buitenen

REFUTATION. We reply, What is this nonauthoritativeness which this reasoning seeks to prove?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यदि (अप्रामाण्यम्) ज्ञानानुत्पत्ति-लक्षणं, ततः प्रत्यक्षविरोधः।

प्रत्यक्षं हि

विदित-पद--तद्-अर्थ--सङ्गतेः श्रोतुः

पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्र-वाक्य-श्रवण-समनन्तरम् उपजायमानं तद्-अर्थ-विषयं ज्ञानम् ।

▼ Buitenen

[[44]]

If it is defined by the fact that the Tantra does not produce knowledge,

then this definition militates against Perception;
for the knowledge which arises in a student, who is able to comprehend the relation between word and meaning, concerning the meaning of the sentences of Pañcaratra Sastra he hears is perceptually evident.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि (अप्रामाण्यम्) संशय-लक्षणं - तत् (\rightarrow प्रत्यक्षतः) एव विरोधात्।

न खलु

पद्ममध्ये चतुर्बाहुं
पूजयेत् पुरुषोत्तमम्

इतीदं वचनं "पूजयेन् न वे" ति संशयितं प्रत्ययमुत्पादयति,

▼ Buitenen

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?"

▼ नरसिंहः

'तत एव' प्रत्यक्षाद् एवेत्य् अर्थः ।

पद्ममध्ये ... To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नापि विपर्यय-लक्षणं योग्यानुपलभ्माभावात्,
अनागत-विपर्ययोत्प्रेक्षायाः प्रत्यक्ष-विरोधात्, अशेष-व्यवहारोच्छेद-हेतुत्वाच् च।
प्रपञ्चयिष्यते चैतद् उपरिष्टात् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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 yoganupalambha, if the objector's contention that Pañcarātra is invalid-through-reversion be correct.

▼ नरसिंहः

विपर्ययो मिथ्या-ज्ञानम् । 'पञ्च-रात्रं मिथ्या इत्य् एतज्-ज्ञानम् इदानीं नास्ति, कालान्तरे भविष्यति' इति, तद् आदाय अप्रामाण्य-वचनं प्रत्यक्षेण विरुद्ध्यते । तथा सति सकल-लोक-व्यवहार-बाधश् चेति भावः ।

▼ नरसिंहः

विपर्ययो मिथ्याज्ञानम् ।

'पञ्चरात्रं मिथ्या इत्येतज् ज्ञानं इदानीं नास्ति,
कालान्तरे भविष्यति'

इति, तद् आदाय अप्रामाण्य-वचनं प्रत्यक्षेण विरुद्ध्यते ।
तथा सति सकल-लोक-व्यवहार-बाधश् चेति भावः ।

वेद-भिन्नत्वान् नाप्रामाण्यम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

([वेद-बाह्यत्वाद् अप्रामाण्यम् इति] पञ्चरात्र-)आगम-विरुद्धज् च -

पञ्च-रात्रागमे स्वार्थस्
तथैवेत्य् अवबोधनात् ।

अथ " (पञ्चरात्र→) तस्याप्रमाणत्वे
(पञ्चरात्र→) तद्-विरोधो न दूषणम्" ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ En - विश्वासः:

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

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

▼ नरसिंहः

'पञ्च-रात्रम् अ-प्रमाणं वेद-बाह्यत्वात्' इति विरोधानुमानं पूर्व-पक्षिणा प्रदर्शितम् । तत्रोच्यते सिद्धान्तिना 'आगम-विरुद्धं च' इति । आगम-पदेन पाञ्चरात्रागमः अभिप्रेतः । पाञ्चरात्रागमे प्रतिपाद्यमानोऽर्थः प्रमाणम् इति तेनैवागमेन बोध्यते इत्य् अर्थः । तत्र आक्षिपति मीमांसकः 'अथेऽति । 'तस्य' पाञ्चरात्रागमस्यैव अप्रामाण्ये निश्चिते सति, मद्-उक्तेनानुमान-वाक्येन विरोधः स्फुट एव । तत्र को दोषः ? इति तस्य प्रश्नः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

हन्त एवं सति

तद्(=पाञ्चरात्र)-अप्रामाण्ये (त्वत्-प्रयुक्त-)^१नुमान-प्रामाण्यम् (इष्यते),
(अस्मत्-प्रयुक्त-)^२नुमान(तः)-प्रामाण्ये (प्रदर्शिते) तद्(=पाञ्चरात्र)-अप्रामण्यम् (इष्यते)
इत्य् अन्योन्याश्रयणम् । (5)

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *En - विश्वासः*

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).

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

I have difficulty in understanding the argument unless I assume an illogicality. 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 argumentation 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 tathātvāvabodhanāt), 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.

But I don't see how the objector can reasonably infer the validity of Pañcarātra, since its meaning or content is admittedly suprasensible. Yamuna himself has not argued that Inference proves the validity, but that Inference cannot disprove the correctness of the thesis. [[134]]

▼ नरसिंहः

यदा पञ्च-रात्रम् अप्रमाणम् इति निश्चितं तदैव त्वद्-उक्तानुमानं प्रमाणम्; तथा त्वदीयानुमाने प्रमाणतया सिद्धे पञ्च-रात्रप्रामाण्य-निश्चयश्च चेति अन्योन्याश्रय-दोष-प्रतिपादनं क्रियते ऽत्र सिद्धान्तिना ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि च किम् इदं वेद-बाह्यत्वम्?

▼ Buitenen

57. Besides, what does this mean, "being nonVedic, or outside the Veda?"

▼ नरसिंहः

परोक्तानुमान-वाक्ये हेतु-भूतस्य 'वेद-बाह्यत्व' पदस्य तत्त्वं विचार्यते ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि वेदान्यत्वं ततः (वेद-भिन्नत्वात्) प्रत्यक्षादिभिर् अनैकान्तः ।

▼ Buitenen

[[45]]

If it means that Pañcaratra is different from the Veda, we have an occasional application to Perception etc., which are also different from the Veda.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अथ (प्रत्यक्ष-ग्रहणं वारयितुं) "शब्दत्वे सती" ति हेतुर् विशेष्यते ततो निग्रहस्थानम्, यथाऽहुः

| निर्विशेष-हेतु-प्रयोगे पुनर् विशेषणोपादानं निग्रहः;

इति,

▼ Buitenen

If, in order to avoid this defect, the ground is thus specified, 'because, while being language, it is different from the Veda,' we have a hetvantaram deadlock, which, as they say, occurs when into a syllogism with an unqualified ground and additional qualification is accepted 120

▼ Buitenen - Notes

a hetvantaram constitutes on the part of the debator a confession of importance since the ground which he gave does not hold and he has to produce a different ground. By the rules of debate this means a defeat.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Nyāyadarśana V. ii. 6: "अविशेषोक्ते हेतौ प्रतिषिद्धे विशेषम् इच्छतो हेत्व-अन्तरम् ।"

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अनैकान्तिकश्च मन्वादिवाक्यैः ।

▼ Buitenen

Also, we then have an occasional application to the statements of Manu, which also are language and different from the Veda,

अ-वेद-मूलत्वान् न④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अथैतद्-दोष-हानाय
वेद-बाह्यत्व-शब्दतः ।
अवेद-मूलतां मन्द
मन्यसे किन् नु तार्किक? ॥

▼ Buitenen

If then, my slow-witted opponent, in order to remove this defect from your ground
you claim that being outside the Veda means
"not deriving from the Veda,"
then what do you, logician, think of it?

▼ नरसिंहः

The term 'Tārkika' need not necessarily refer to the logician here. Yāmuna makes fun of the dialectical helplessness of the Mīmāṃsaka.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तेनायम् अर्थः -
"शब्दत्वे सत्यं अ-वेद-मूलत्वाद्" इति,
ततो वेदैर् अनैकान्त्यम्,

▼ Buitenen

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!

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथवा अ-वेदत्वे सति शब्दत्वे सति अ-वेद-मूलत्वाद् इति हेतुः;

▼ Buitenen

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,"

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथापि ।

सन्ति नद्यास् तटे
वृक्षा इत्य-आद्याप्तोपदेशनैः ।
अ-वेद-मूलैर् दुर्वारम्
अनैकान्त्यं प्रसज्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ

| अवेदत्वे सति, शब्दत्वे सति, कार्य-विषयत्वे सति, अ-वेद-मूलत्वं हेतुः,
अत्रापि "अजीर्ण मन्दम् अश्नीयाद्" इत्यादौ व्यभिचारिता ।

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

This line runs like a verse.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ

| उक्त-विशेषण-विशिष्टत्वे धर्माधर्म-विषयत्वेऽपि सत्य अ-वेदमूलत्वाद् इति हेतुः,
ततो भागासिद्धो हेतुः; न हि पञ्चरात्रशास्त्रं कृत्स्नं धर्माधर्म-विषयम् -
ब्रह्मविषयाणामेव वचसां बाहुल्यात् ।

(अतः पक्षोऽसिद्धो भवति)

▼ Buitenen

[[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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ "प्रमाणान्तरायोग्यार्थत्वे सती" ति विशेषः

("अवेदत्वे सति, शब्दत्वे सति, अ-वेद-मूलत्वं हेतुः," इत्यत्र)

तत्रापि सैवासिद्धिः,

भगवत्-प्रत्यक्षस्य धर्माधर्मादि-समस्त-वस्तु-गोचरस्य श्रुति-शत-प्रसिद्धत्वात्।

तच्च-चैतद् अनन्तरम् एव वक्ष्यामः।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः:

असिद्धिरेवेत्य् अर्थः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् अलम् अनेनाशिक्षिताक्षपाद-मतानाम् अ-प्रतिष्ठित-प्रतिभा-विजृणितेन ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

Akṣapada - The founder of the school of logic.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

संभाव्यमानान्य् अप्य् अनुमानान्तराणि
परस्ताद् उपन्यस्य निरस्यन्ते
अतो नानुमान-विरुद्धः पक्षः ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

नागम-विरोधः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नाप्य् आगम-विरुद्धः -
पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्र-प्रामाण्य-प्रतिपादकस्य "इदम् महोपनिषदम्" इत्य्-आद्य्-आगम-शतस्य
प्रदर्शयिष्यमाणत्वात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसेहः

Mahābhārata (Critical edn., Poona) XII. 326. 100a:

| इदं महोपनिषदं चतुर्-वेद-समन्वितम्।

न स्व-व्याघातादि③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स्व-वचन (\rightarrow विरोधः) - स्वाभ्युपगम (\rightarrow विरोधः) - सर्व-लोक-प्रसिद्धि-विरोधाश्
शब्द-विरोध-प्रकारास् त्वा अनाशङ्कनीया एव,

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा हि न तावत् स्ववचनविरोधः,
स हि त्रेधा - उक्तिमात्रविरोधः, धर्मोक्तिविरोधः, धर्म्युक्तिविरोधश् चेति,

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्र न तावद् उक्तिमात्र-विरुद्धोऽयं पक्षः,
न हि "पञ्चरात्र-शास्त्रं प्रमाणम्" इति प्रतिज्ञा-वचनं
स्वार्थं व्याहन्ति -
यथा "यावज्-जीवम् अहं मौनी" इति,(5)

▼ *Buitenen*

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Ślokavārtika (I. i. 5) śls. 61b-62b:

त्रिधाशब्द-विरोधस् स्यात् प्रसिद्ध्य-आदि-विभागतः ।
प्रतिज्ञा-पूर्व-संजल्प-सर्व-लोक-प्रसिद्धितः ॥
यावज्-जीवम् अहं मौनीत्य् उक्ति-मात्रेण बाध्यते ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नापि धर्मोक्ति-विरोधः,
न हि प्रामाण्यं
पञ्च-रात्रोद्देशेन विधीयमानं पक्षं प्रतिक्षिपति
सर्व-वाक्यानाम् इव मिथ्यात्व-वचनम् (5)

▼ Buitenen

Secondly, there is no contradiction through utterance of property, as for example the statement: "All statements are untrue;" for the authoritativeness predicated of Pañcarātra does not cancel the proposition.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नापि धर्म्य-उक्ति-विरोधः,
सत्य् अपि धर्मिणि,
धर्मान्वयस्याऽविरुद्धत्वात्।
न हि जननीत्यम् इव वन्ध्यात्वेन
पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रतं प्रामाण्येन विरुद्धम् (प. ३३) (5)

▼ Buitenen

Thirdly, there is no contradiction through utterance of substance, since in the given substance a connection with the given property is not contradictory; Pancarātra is not contradicted by its property authoritativeness, as motherhood is contradicted by the property sterility.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. ibid*: śl. 63:

सर्व-वाक्य-मृषात्वे तु धर्मोक्त्यैवात्म-बाधनम् ।
धर्म्य-उक्त्याहं यतो जातः, सा वन्ध्या जननी मम ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि विवादाध्यासितस्य प्रामाण्य-प्रतिज्ञाने
तत्र श्रुत्य्-उक्त-धर्मि-विशेष-विरोधः -
(वेद-)विहित-हिंसानाम् इवाधर्मत्व-प्रतिज्ञाने (तत्-तत्-परिहारण) विवादाध्यासस्योपलक्षत्वात्,

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

The Vedic injunction *na hinñsyāt sarvabhūtāni* "one should not injure any being" raises the question of the validity of injunctions which do require injury to beings. But this is a secondary question which does not affect the validity of the Veda as a whole. Similarly, the thesis "Pañcaratra is valid" is not disproved by the possible mention in the valid Veda of something that conflicts with something in Pañcaratra. So far the argument is not for validity but against invalidity.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतो वा नागमविरोधः,
तद् एवं प्रतिपन्नः पक्षः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

There is, therefore, no contradiction by language statement;
so that we conclude that the proposition is presentable.

०३ हेतु-सौष्ठवम्②

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

नापि हेतोर् अनैकान्तिकत्वादयो दोषाः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

59. Nor is the ground affected by logical defects, like occasional application etc.

▼ **नरसिंहः:**

Vide Tarkasaṅgraha (Vavilla edn.) Anumāna-section, P.52:

| सव्यभिचार-विरुद्ध-सत्-प्रति-पक्षासिद्ध-बाधिताः पञ्च-हेत्व-आभासाः ।

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

तथा हि न तावद् अनैकान्तिकः,

▼ *Buitenen*

The ground is not occasionally applicable to other terms.

नानैकान्तिकः③

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

स हि द्वेषा साधारणासाधारणभेदात् -
यथा "पृथिवी-नित्यत्व-साधने प्रमेयत्वं" (इत्य् अनित्येष्व अपि वर्तमानो हेतुः) साधारणः,

असाधारणस्य "तत्रैव गन्धवत्त्वम्" (इत्य् अन्यत्रादृश्यमानो हेतुः),

▼ *Buitenen*

[[48]]

This fallacy of occasionalness is of two kinds, general occasionalness and special occasionalness.

An instance of the first kind provides the ground in the argument: "The earth is eternal, because it is knowable."

Of the second kind: "The earth is eternal, because it, possesses smell."

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

Since pots are knowable, the ground would also apply to prove the eternity of pots and all things that are knowable.

Since only earth (as an element) possesses smell, this ground has no general applicability.

▼ नरसिंहः

A third variety of 'anaikāntika' is 'anupasamāhārin' which the author does not enumerate here. Cf. Tarkasaṅgraha: P.53:

'स्व्यभिचारो ऽनैकान्तिकः । स त्रि-विधः — साधारणासाधारणानुसंहारि-भेदात्।' Quoting the passage 'न तावद् अनैकान्तिकः' & c. in his Nyāyapariśuddhi [Deśika Granthamālā], P.130, Deśika says: "बाधितस्य तु न पक्ष-धर्मत्वं, नापि व्याप्तिर् इति दूषण-द्वय-समुच्चयः।"

▼ *Buitenen*

Our ground, namely,

'Pañcaratra is authoritative, because it produces faultless knowledge',

does not apply equally whether it is authoritative or not, which would render the ground generally-occasional.¹²⁶

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

Like the ground "because it is knowable" which applies to things regardless of whether they are eternal or not.

न साधारणत्वात्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्र न तावन् निर्दोष-ज्ञान-कारणत्वं प्रमाणाप्रमाण-साधारणं,
येन साधारणानैकान्तिकं स्यात्,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि निर्दोष-ज्ञानकारणत्वम् अ-प्रमाण-भूत--विप्रलभ्षक-वचनादिषु विपक्षेषु दृष्टचरम् ।

▼ Buitenen

For this ground, namely its being a cause of faultless knowledge, has not been found before in the alternative propositions that Pañcaratra is deceptive and hence nonauthoritative.

नासाधारणत्वात्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नाष्य असाधारणः -

(पाञ्चरात्रं प्रामाणिकं निर्दोष-ज्ञान-जननात् - ज्योतिष-टीमादि-वाक्यवत् इत्यत्र)
ज्योतिष-टीमादि-वाक्य-दृष्टान्ताभिधानेनैव स-पक्षान्वयस्य प्रदर्शितत्वात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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

न विरुद्धः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि विरुद्धः,
विपरीत-व्याप्त्य-अभावात्
न हि निर्दोष-ज्ञान-कारणत्वम् अप्रामाण्येन व्याप्तम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः:

विपरीतेन साध्याभावेन व्याप्तिः विपरीत-व्याप्तिर् इति तृतीया-तत्पुरुषः । सा च व्याप्तिः
पञ्च-रात्र-प्रामाण्य-प्रतिपादके वाक्ये 'निर्दोष-ज्ञान-जन्मत्व'-रूपस्य हेतोर् नास्तीत्य् अर्थः ।
'शब्दो नित्यः कृतकत्वात्' इत्य् अत्र कृतकत्व-रूपो हेतुः साध्याभावेन नित्यत्वाभावेन
अनित्यत्वेन हि व्याप्तः, यत्र कृतकत्वं तत्रानित्यत्वम् इति नियमात् । तस्मात् स हेतुर् विरुद्धः ।
एवम् अत्रापीति बोध्यम् ।

न कालात्ययः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च कालात्ययापदिष्टः -
प्रत्यक्ष-विरोधाभावात्
आगमानुगुण्याच् च ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः:

नासिद्धः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न चासिद्धत्वम्,
अ-सिद्धिर् हि आश्रयतः स्वरूपतो वा तावद् आश्रयासिद्धिः,
पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रस्याश्रयत्वात्

▼ Buitenen

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 Pañcarātra Sastra, which is
proved to exist.

▼ नरसिंहः

हेतोर् असिद्धता ऽपि नास्तीत्य् अर्थः । व्याप्यत्वासिद्धिर् इत्य् अन्योऽपि असिद्धि-प्रकारः
शास्त्र-ग्रन्थेषु परिगण्यते । स तु नोदाहृतो ग्रन्थ-कृतः ।

अत्र हेत्वाभासेषु पञ्चसु 'अनैकान्तिक-विरुद्ध-कालात्ययापदिष्टासिद्धा' इति चत्वार एव
प्रकाराः परिगणिताः । अन्यः प्रभेदः सत्-प्रति-पक्षाख्यः न प्रतिपादितोऽत्र ।
'साध्याभावसाधकं हेत्व-अन्तरं यस्य स सत्-प्रति-पक्ष' इति हि तल्-लक्षणम् । तादृशं च हेत्व-
अन्तरं नैव सम्भावना-भूमिर् इति महता प्रबन्धेन ग्रन्थ-कारेण समनन्तरम् एव निरूपितम् इति,
न पृथग्-उक्तिर् इति च घ्येयम् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नापि स्व-रूपासिद्धः,
सोऽपि त्रेधा - अज्ञान-सन्देह-विपर्ययभेदात्

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न तावद् अ-ज्ञानासिद्धिः,
तत्-प्रतिपादक-शब्दोच्चारणात्,

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि संदिग्धासिद्धिः,
निर्दोषत्वस्य वादिनः स्वयं सिद्धत्वात्,
प्रतिवादिनो ऽपि दोषानुपलभ्माद् एवानायास-सिद्धत्वात्,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

विपर्ययासिद्धिस्तु दूरोत्सारितैव ।

▼ Buitenen

[[49]]

That the ground would be unestablished through reversal is

utterly out of the question.

पौरुषेयस्यापि ग्राह्यता③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| ननु कथं पौरुषेयत्व-सामान्याद् आपतन्ती दोष-संभावना अपनीयते

▼ Buitenen

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

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पञ्चरात्रमन्त्राणां कथं वाक्यत्व-सामान्याद् आपतन्ती वेदेषु सा (दोषसंभावना) वार्यते,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपौरुषेयत्वाद् इति चेत्
तद् इहापि सर्व-ज्ञावाप्त-काम--परम-पुरुष-प्रणीततयेत्य् अवगम्य शास्यतु भवान् ।

▼ Buitenen

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!

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एतदुक्तं भवति -

नैव शब्दे स्वतो दोषाः
प्रामाण्य-परिपन्थिनः ।
सन्ति किन्तु स्वतस् तस्य
प्रमाणत्वम् इति स्थितिः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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,

▼ Buitenen - Notes

Be it repeated that the validity, authoritativeness, etc. of Verbal Statements (ie, shabdapramāna) 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,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वक्तुर् आशय-दोषेण
केषुचित् तद् अपोद्यते ।
अङ्गुल्य-अग्रे उस्ति मातङ्ग-
यूथम् इत्य-एवम्-आदिषु ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā: II. 4, P.13:

विनाप्य् अर्थं हि शब्देन प्रतीतिर् उपजायते ।
अङ्गुल्य-अग्रे उस्ति करिणा यूथम् इत्य-एवम् आदिना ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

प्रस्तुत-ग्रन्थ-सन्दर्भे
वक्तुर् आशय-गामिनीम् ।
दोष-शड्कां त्रयी-मूर्ध-
ध्वनिर् एवापमार्दि नः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

The statements in the upanisad 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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

वदान्ति खलु वेदान्ताः
सर्वज्ञं जगतः पतिम् ।
महाकारुणिकं तस्मिन्
(वज्चन=)विप्रलभ्मादयः कथम् ॥

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.?

Deśika, in his Stotraratnabhāṣya (Deśika Granthamālā), P.37, says that the mercy of the Lord is referred to in the following Upaniṣads:

Śvetāśvatara : III. 17 : 'सर्वस्य प्रभुम् ईशानं सर्वस्य शरणं सुहृत्'; Kaṭhavalli : IV. 12a : 'अङ्गुष्ठ-मात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति' and Mahopaniṣat : 1 : 'स एकाकी न रमेत'

Also cf. Paramasamhitā : III. 40b-41a; P.24:

ध्यातव्यो भगवान् एव नान्यो विश्वस्य कारणात् ।
स्वामित्वेन गुरुत्वेन सुहृत्वेन च सर्वदा ॥

०४ सिद्ध-वस्तुनि शब्द-प्रामाण्यम्②

प्रतिज्ञा③

ननु च

सिद्धे वस्तुनि शब्दानां
प्रामाण्यं नेत्यवादिषम् ।
तत्-परेषु प्रयोगेषु
व्युत्पत्त्य-अग्रहणाद् इति ॥

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]]

▼ नरसिंहः

This is the view of the Prābhākara.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् असत् सिद्धम् अप्य् अर्थम्
आचक्षाणा: प्रयोगतः ।
लौकिका: प्रतिपद्यन्ते:
शक्तिं, कार्य-पराद् इव ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

This is the reply given by the Siddhāntin.

पुत्र-जन्मोदाहरणम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् यथा "पुत्रस् ते जात"
इति वचन-श्रवणानन्तर-जनित-विशिष्ट-वदन-विकासावसान-समनन्तरं
'हष्टोऽयम्' इति प्रतिपद्य

"हर्षोऽयं प्रियार्थविगम-निबन्धन" इति स्वात्मन् आकलयन्
मध्यम-वृद्धस्यापि तन्-निबन्धनम् एव हर्षम् अनुमिमानस्
तद्-भाव-भावितया शब्दस्यैव प्रियार्थोऽवबोधकताम् अव्यवस्थति ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्राप्य्

अतीतानागतादि-भेद-भिन्नेषु हर्ष-हेतुषूपप्लवमानेषु
कस्य वक्ताऽयम्

इति विचिकित्सोदये सति -

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

(तद्-अनन्तर-संज्ञात--जात-कर्मावबोधतः ।)

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

(तद्-अन्तर-सञ्ज्ञातं
ज्ञापकम् अन्विष्यतः ।
तद्-अनुभूतः कोऽपीति
भिन्न-वस्त्राभरणम् पुरा ॥)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

"तद्-धेतु-भूतः कोऽपी" ति
निश्चिन्वन् आत्मनः पुरा ॥
"कर्तव्यं जात-कर्म" ति
प्रतीतेः किन् नु कारणम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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 ?"

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रतीतं प्रियम् इत्य् एवं
विमृशन् अवगच्छति ॥
पुत्र-जन्मैव नैवान्यद्
इति व्युत्पित्सुर् अर्भकः ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्र च -

(नाना-वाक्येषु) आवापोद्धार-भेदेन

पदानां शक्ति-निश्चयः ।

उपपद्यत इत्य् एवं

सिद्धासिद्धार्थ-वाचिता ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

विधि-पक्षेऽप्य आवापोद्वापक्रमः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु न तद्-भाव-भाविता-मात्रेण कार्य-कारण-भावः,
अति प्रसङ्गात्।

▼ Buitenen

[[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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च जात-कर्म-कर्तव्यताऽवगतिर् नियमेन प्रियार्थावगम-पुरस्सरी,

▼ Buitenen

Nor does the realization that a birth ceremony is to be held follow invariably upon the knowledge of an agreeable meaning;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

दृश्यते हि कुतुम्ब-भरणायास-विदूयमान-मनसोऽग्रीति-पूर्विकापि तत्-
कर्तव्यतावगतिः,

▼ Buitenen

for we find also that the same realization follows upon a feeling of distress, namely when the informed father is vexed by the trouble of maintaining his family.132

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

कार्याविगतिः किं शब्द-कारणिका दृष्टा
येन "गाम् आनये"त्य् आदौ
गव्-आनयनादि-कर्तव्यताऽवगतिः शब्द-कारणिका इभ्युपेयते।

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

अथ

आकस्मिकत्वानुपपत्तेः
सन्निहित-शब्द एव तद्-अवगम-हेतुर्

इति चेत्
समानोऽयं विधिर् इतरत्रापि।

▼ *Buitenen*

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."

▼ **नरसंहेष्ठी:**

आकस्मिक ... कारणं विना कार्यं न जायत इति हेतोः ।

"विधिः" न्याय इत्य् अर्थः ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

यापि प्रवृत्ति-हेत्व-अर्थ-
प्रतिपादकता क्वचित् ।
लिङ्-आदि-प्रत्ययावाप-
हैतुकी साऽवसीयते (प्रतिपक्षिणा)॥

▼ Buitenen

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 liṅādi suffix.133

[133]: supra §36.

▼ नरसिंहः

प्रवृत्ति-हेतुः कार्यम्; तद्-रूपे अर्थः; तत्-प्रतिपादकता लिङादीनाम् इत्य् अन्वयः ।

आवापः प्रयोग इति यावत् ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

यश्च कार्य-परताम् एवाखिल-पदानाम् आतिष्ठते,

▼ Buitenen

He who maintains that all words only bear meaningfully on kārya,

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

तेनाप्य-आवापोद्भार-विनिधारितासंसृष्ट-शरीराणाम् एव गवाश्वादीनां तत्-तत्-पदार्थता समर्थनीया,

▼ Buitenen

maintains in effect that padārtha^s exist only in kārya statements and that e.g. in the case of cows, horses and the like, which are related to bodies, their being a padārtha is ascertained by the inclusion or exclusion of the words denoting them in a statement concerning kārya.

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

▼ नरसिंहः

विनिधारिता ... आवापोद्भारैः विनिधारितं कार्यम् । तद्-असंसृष्ट-शरीराणाम् इत्य् अन्वयः ।

गवाश्वादीनां ... शुद्ध-गवाश्वादि-पदानाम् ।

तत्-तत्-पदार्थता, कार्यान्वितो ऽप्य् अर्थः ।

न कार्यान्विताभिधान-मात्रम्③

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

| समर्थमाना ऽपि कार्यान्वयिन्य् एव समर्थत

इति चेत्

अलं व्यसनेन -

अन्यान्विताभिधानेनापि व्यवहारोपपत्तेः ।

▼ Buitenen

If he says, indeed, whenever their being a padārtha is significantly construed, it is construed just as connected with kārya, we reply, Stop being obstinate; for verbal exchange is also possible through denotation of words that are connected with other things than kāryas.

▼ नरसिंहः

भाष्ट-मते पदेनार्थः; तेन जाति-मात्रस्य बोध इत्य् अभ्युपगमः । अन्विताभिधानं नोररीक्रियते ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

अवश्याश्रयणीयेयम्
अचितार्थाभिधायिता।
कार्यान्विताभिधायित्वम्
अन्यथा दुर्वचं यतः॥

▼ *Buitenen*

63. It is necessary to accept the position that words are denotative of connected meanings, for otherwise it would be impossible to explain that they are denotative of meanings connected with kāryas.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

अवश्याश्रयणीयेयम्... Yāmuna emphasises here that no speciality should be attached to a statement that speaks of something to be done (kārya). Words, he says, generally depend upon some factors and those factors need not necessarily be 'kārya'. Pointing out the untenability of the theory of 'kārya', he says that it goes astray in the instance of 'liṅ' the optative itself. Even the 'liṅ'—suffix is found to depend upon a host of factors like the qualified aspirant (adhikārin), the means (sādhana) and the thing to be attained (sādhyā). Cf. the following verse:

tasmādākāṅkṣitāsannayogyārthāntarasaṅgate I
svārthe padānāṁ vyutpattirāstheyā sarvavādibhiḥ॥

Words convey their sense only in connection with such other idea or factor that is required to complete its sense (ākāṅkṣita), that is compatible with it (yoga) 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.

दुर्वदं ... [[??]]

▼ *विज्ञास-प्रस्तुति:*

अव्याप्तज् चैतत्

| कार्यान्वितम् एव सर्वत्र पदाभिधेयम्

इति - लिङ्-आदिषु व्यभिचारात्

▼ *Buitenen*

The definition 'the thing meant by a word is always connected with a *kāryā*' fails to cover the defined topic completely; for it does not apply in the case of injunctive suffixes,

▼ नरसिंहः

लिङा साक्षात् कार्यम् उच्यते इति चेत्, लिङि कार्य-परत्वं नास्तीति व्यभिचारः । लिङ् कार्यम् एव साक्षात्, न तु कार्य-परम् इति ध्येयम् ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

("स्वर्गकामो ज्योतिष्टमेन यजेते" ति यथा)
लिङ्-आदयो हि (स्वर्गकामना याजकेः) परिनिषिताधिकाराद्य-अनुबन्ध-संबन्धिनम् एव स्वार्थम् अभिदधति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

since these suffixes denote their own meanings as connected, not with *kāryā*, but with consequences of already established facts, such as proper qualification on the part of the person enjoined etc.¹³⁵

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[135]: Yamuna's argument is that the injunctive, etc. terminations of the verb denote the injunction as their thing meant (*padārtha*); but what makes this injunction 'meaningful' is not that it is an injunction, but that it is connected with someone who is qualified to accept the injunction, e.g., in the injunction *svargakāmo yajeta*. The injunctive *yajeta* has no meaning or purpose unless there is a "desire for heaven;" the meaning of the injunction thus is

connected with the consequence of this desire is prepared to do something about it.

▼ नरसिंहः

सम्बन्धिनमेव ... अधिकारः फल-स्वाम्यम् — स्वर्ग-कामादि-पदोक्तम् ।

स्वार्थम् ... स्वार्थं कार्यम् ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

अथ

तेष्व अन्विताभिधानम्
इतरत्र कार्यान्विताभिधानम्

इति चेत्
तद् अर्द्धजरतीयम्, ततो वरं सर्वत्रान्विताभिधानम् एवाश्रीयताम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Or if it is said that in their case there is denotation of connected meanings and in the other case denotation of meanings connected with kārya, we reply that this is a neither old nor young, argument;¹³⁶

it is more appropriate simply to accept the view that there is denotation of connected meanings in general.

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[136]: ardhajaratī is a half-old woman; the ardhajaratīyanyāya is used to indicate that the opponent wants to have it both ways and that consequently his argument, like a half-old and half-young woman, is useless either way.

▼ नरसिंहः

तेषु लिङ्गादिषु ।

जरतीयम्... For an explanation of the ardhajaratī-nyāya see

Nyāyasūdhā under I. iii. 3. P.135:

केनचित् पाशुपतेन सर्व-जरत्या योषितोऽनुपभोग्यत्वात्, सर्व-तरुण्याश् च वृद्धे
अप्य् अरुचि-प्रसङ्गात् अर्ध-जरत्यानयने दूतः प्रेषित इति लोक-प्रवादोऽर्ध-जरती-
शब्दे ।

Also cf. Bhuvaneśalaukikanyāyasāhasrī, P.104:

यत्र सर्व-त्यागे ग्रहणे वा प्रसक्ते, किञ्चिद् निर्युक्तिकम् एकांशोपादानम्
अंशान्तर-त्यागश् च क्रियते तत्रायं न्यायोऽवतरति — यथा जरती वृद्धा स्त्री,
तस्याः पतिः तद्-अर्धं गुण-मात्रं गृह्णाति ह्य अवयवान्तरं त्यजतीति युक्ति-शून्यम् ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

तस्माद् आकाङ्क्षितासन्न-
योग्यार्थान्तर-सङ्गतेः ।
स्वार्थं पदानां व्युत्पत्तिर्
आस्थेया सर्व-वादिभिः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

योग्यार्थान्तर-सङ्गते स्वार्थं एव पद-व्युत्पत्तिः । एतेन पदानां यत् किञ्चिद् अर्थान्वयः निरस्तो
वेदितव्यः । अर्थानां विशिष्ट-बोधकत्वं स्वाभाव्यम् इति भाष्टः । शब्दस्यैव सम्बन्ध-बोधकत्वं,
नार्थस्येति प्राभाकराः । तत्राह - 'तस्माद्' इत्य-आदिना ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

(“तुष्यतु दुर्जन” इति) यद्यु अपि (“गाम् आनये”ति →) प्रवृत्त्य-अनुपपत्ति-समधिगमनीयैव
शब्द-शक्तिस् तथाऽपि -

▼ En - विश्वासः

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

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[137]: Misra's text here has yady api vṛttyanupapattisamadhidigamanīyaiva 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 vyutpati, in pravṛtti perhaps a corruption of kāryārthe or kāryārtha-. I read conjecturally kāryārtha vyutpattisamadhi gamanīyaiva, which gives the required sense.

▼ नरसिंहः

'तुष्यतु दुर्जन'-न्यायेनाऽहं 'यद्य अपी'ति । प्रवृत्तिर् गवानयनादिषु । तस्या अन्यथा ऽनुपपत्त्या प्रथमं शब्द-शक्तिर् अभ्युपेया ।

व्युत्पन्न-प्रयोगे कार्यानिपेक्षा③

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

तटस्थोपायता-मात्रं
शब्द-शक्ति-विनिश्चये ।
कार्यस्याश्रयितुं युक्तं
प्रयोक्त्र-आकाश-देशवत् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

प्रेरक-पुरुषस्य, आकाशस्य, देशस्य वा क्वचिद् अपि विषय-कोटि-प्रविष्ट्वं नाऽभ्युपेयते,
तटस्थत्वम् एव ।
एवं कार्यस्यापीति ध्येयम् ।

▼ विज्ञास-प्रस्तुतिः

अनन्य-लभ्यश् शब्दार्थ
इति न्याय-विदस् स्थिताः ।
तस्मान् नोपाय-भूतस्य
कार्यस्यास्ति समन्वयः ॥
व्युत्पन्न-व्यवहारेषु (\rightarrow धरणे रत्नेषु)
पयः-प्रतरणादिवत् ।

▼ Buitenen

The logicians hold the view that the meaning of a language statement cannot be known except by language statement.¹³⁸ Consequently, there exists no inherent relationship with kārya as cause of denotation in uses of words that have their proper signification,
just as is the case with floating precious stones on water.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

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

▼ नरसिंहः

अनन्यलभ्यः ... 'शब्दार्थः' शब्द-शक्ति-गोचर इत्य् अर्थः । स एव शब्दस्यार्थः; यः
प्रकारान्तरेण न लभ्यते । "गङ्गायां घोष" इत्य् अत्र गङ्गा-पदस्य प्रवाह-रूपार्थ-मात्रे शक्ति-

स्वीकारे, तत्-सम्बन्धात् तीरम् अपि लभ्यते । एवं लक्षणया प्रकारान्तरेणापि तीर-लाभान् न तत्र शक्ति-स्वीकारः । अत एव जाति-मात्रे शक्तिः; व्यक्तेर् आक्षेपाद् एव सिद्धेः ।

Cf. Bhuvaneśalaukikanyāyasāhasrī, P.243.

पयःप्रतरणादिवत् ... Vide Ratnaśāstra of Buddhabhaṭa, Śl. 39:

यत् तु सर्वेर् गुणैर् युक्तं वज्रं तरति वारिणि ।
रत्नानां समस्ते ऽपि तस्य धारणम् इष्यते ॥

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 'kārya' though useful to arrive at the significance of words, is not useful at the time of using those words.

▼ विद्यास-प्रस्तुतिः

यथैव हि ब्रह्म-जातीयादि-वज्र-विशेषावधारणोपयोगिनोऽपि पयः-प्रतरणादेर् अवधृत-रत्न-सत्त्वस्य

न व्यवहार-दशायाम् उपयोगः,

एवं व्युत्पत्ति-ग्रहण-समय-समुपयुक्तस्यापि कार्यस्य

न व्युत्पन्न-दशायाम् उपयोगः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

यथैव ... For a classification of gems as 'male' and 'female', see Ratnadīpikā of Caṇḍeśvara, Śls. 11-13, and for a classification into

the four castes 'brāhmaṇa', 'kṣatriya', 'vaiśya' and 'śūdra' see Ratnaśāstra : śls. 21 and 23.

'व्यवहार-दशा'-पदेन, धारण-समयो विवक्षितः ।

नदी-तीर-फलम्③

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

यदि च कार्यान्वितम् एवार्थं शब्दाः प्रतिपादयन्ति कथं तेभ्यः परिनिष्ठित-नदी-तीर-फलादिसंसर्गावगमः,

▼ Buitenen

[[53]]

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?"

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

| नायं मुख्यो लाक्षणिक

इति चेत् क्व वा शब्दानां मुख्य-प्रयोगः ।

▼ Buitenen

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?

मानान्तरानपेक्षा③

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

(शब्दानां मुख्य-प्रयोगः) मानान्तरापूर्वे (←तेन न साध्यम् इत्य् "अपूर्वम्") कार्य

इति चेन् न -
तत्राव्युत्पन्नत्वेन प्रयोगानुपपत्तेः ।

▼ Buitenen

If you answer

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

we reply: no, for then no use of words would be possible, since their meaning would not yet have been identified.

▼ Buitenen - Note

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

मानान्तरापूर्वे ... Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā II. P.187:

क्रियादि-भिन्नं यत् कार्यं वेदां मानान्तरैर् न तत् ।
अतो मानान्तरापूर्वम् अपूर्वम् इति गीयते ॥

अव्युत्पन्नत्वेन ... शब्दस्येति शेषः ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

न हि मानान्तरापूर्वे (←तेन न साध्यम् इत्य् अपूर्वम्)
व्युत्पत्तिर् उपपद्यते ।
न चाव्युत्पन्न-शब्देभ्यः
प्रत्ययोऽतिप्रसङ्गतः ॥

▼ Buitenen

Naturally there can be no knowledge of the meaning of a word when that word denotes a meaning not previously known through other means of knowledge, and no cognition can arise from words with unknown meanings, for that would entail over-extension.

अपूर्व शक्तिः③

▼ विद्यास-प्रस्तुति:

योऽपि मन्यते

लोके क्रिया(-रूप) कार्यं व्युत्पन्न-शब्दः (← "यजेत्")

▼ Buitenen

[[54]]

66. OBJECTION. My position is this.

In ordinary language a statement is understood to have its proper signification when it bears on a kārya that is to be accomplished with a certain action.

▼ नरसिंहः

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

▼ विद्यास-प्रस्तुति:

(शब्दः) फल-पद-समभिव्याहार--बल-प्रतिलब्ध-- तत्-साधन-भाव-भङ्ग-यागादि-
धात्-अर्थोत्तीर्ण- +अपूर्व(-रूप)-कार्याभिधान-शक्तिर वेदे मोदते,

▼ Buitenen

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;

▼ नरसिंहः

'फल-पदं' फल-वाचकं स्वर्ग-कामादि-पदम् । तत्-साधन-भावः स्वर्ग-साधनत्वं अपूर्वस्येत् अर्थः । धात्व-अर्थोतीर्ण, धात्व-अर्थातिरिक्तम् ।

वेदे ... 'फल-पद...शक्तिः' इत्य् अयं बहु-ब्रीहिः । 'शब्द' इत्य् अस्य विशेषणम् ।

मोदते ... वेदे निर्वृत इति भावः ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

लोके तु सं-मुग्धेनापि[1] व्यवहारोपपचेर्
न शब्दार्थ-तत्त्वावधारणम् आद्रियते

इति -

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'क्रिया-कार्ये शक्तिर् लोके ऽप्य् अस्ती'ति भ्रान्तः पुरुष इति भावः ।

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā V. P.95:

कथं तर्हि लौकिक-वाक्येभ्यो व्यवहार-प्रवृत्तिः ? उच्यते — अर्थ-संशयेनापि
लोको व्यवहरति । सन्दिग्धायाम् अपि वृष्टौ वृष्ट्य-आयत्त-फले कर्मणि प्रवर्तेन्ते ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

तस्यापीदं मनोरथ-मात्रम्

▼ *Buitenen*

REFUTATION. This position is just wishful thinking;

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न हि क्रिया(-रूप)-कार्ये व्युत्पन्नः ("यजेत्"-शब्दः)
स्थापि(-अपूर्व-रूप)-कार्यं प्रतिपादयति - अति-प्रसङ्गात् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

for a language statement,
even if understood in your way as bearing meaningfully only on a
kārya to be accomplished with an action,¹³⁹
does not by that token set forth a permanent kārya,¹⁴⁰
since that would mean over-extension.

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[139]: read na hi kriyakārye vyut pannaḥ sthāyi kāryam.

[140]: 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.

▼ नरसेहः:

व्युत्पन्नः ... शब्द इति शेषः ।

अतिप्रसङ्गात् ... घट-ज्ञानात् पट-ज्ञानम् अपि भवेद् इत्य् आपत्तिः ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

यदि वृद्ध-व्यवहारे समधिगत-पद-सामर्थ्ये उनुरुद्धमाने
अन्वयावगतिर् ('स्वर्गकाम'पदस्य) नोपपद्यते, मोपपादि।

▼ *Buitenen*

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!

▼ नरसेहः

अन्वयावगतिः 'स्वर्ग-काम' पदस्येति शेषः ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

न तु तद्-अनुपपत्त्या
कूप्त-शक्ति-परित्यागेन शब्द-शक्त्य-अन्तरं भजते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

कामं लक्षणाऽश्रीयताम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

In such cases we surely must assume lakṣaṇā.141

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[141]: 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 *lakṣaṇa* "figurative usage," which remains related to the *mukhyā vṛttiḥ* "principal usage." But he will deny the entire construction (67).

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न हि ('सिंहो माणवकः', 'अग्निमाणवकः' इत्यादिप्रयोगेषु) विरुद्धार्थ-पद-समभिव्याहारे पदानाम् अभिधानन्म् एवान्यथा नीयते, सर्व-शब्दार्थष्व् अनाश्वास-प्रसङ्गात् ।(4)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः:

'सिंहो माणवकः', 'अग्निर् माणवकः' इत्य-आदि-प्रयोगेषु ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

किं च मानान्तरापूर्वं (←तेन न साध्यम् इत्य् अपूर्वम्)-
(-रूप-कार्य-बोधन-शक्तता ।
न कर्म-फल-सम्बन्ध-
सिद्ध्यै तावद् उपेयते ॥

▼ Buitenen

67. Besides, we do not admit that the fact that a word has the power to communicate a *kārya* that is not previously known through other means of knowledge proves that there actually exists a relationship between itself and the fruit of the action it enjoins.

▼ नरसिंहः:

मानान्तरापूर्वं = प्रमाणान्तरेणाज्ञातं अपूर्वम्; तद्-रूपं कार्यम् इत्य् अन्वयः ।

न कर्मफल ... कर्मणो यागादेः, फलेन स्वर्गादिना सम्बन्धः । तत्-सिध्य-अर्थ मानान्तराज्ञातस्य कार्यस्य बोधकता पदानां नाभ्युपेया । अपूर्वस्य लिङ्गर्थत्वं वर्तत इति प्राभाकरः; नास्तीति भाष्टे ग्रन्थकारश् चेति बोध्यम् ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

नैयोगिकस् (=विधि-सूचकः) स (कर्म-फल-सम्बन्धो
न पुनर् वैनियोगिकः (=साधन-सूचकः) ।
धात्व-अर्थोत्तीर्ण (-अपूर्व-) कार्यात्मा
न कर्म-फल-सङ्गमात् ॥
ऋते सिध्यति सम्बन्धस्
स (कर्म-फल-सङ्गमः) च तस्माद् (कर्म-फल-सम्बन्धात्) ऋते न हि ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'धात्व-अर्थ'-पदेन यागादिर् उच्यते । धात्व-अर्थोत्तीर्ण-कार्यात्मा सम्बन्धः ।

तस्मादृते ... 'स च' कर्म-फल-सङ्गमः ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

ततश्च दुरुत्तरम् इतरेतराश्रयणम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

स्वर्ग-काम-रूप-नियोज्यस्य क्रिया-सम्बन्ध-ज्ञानम्; तेन स्वर्ग-यागयोः सम्बन्ध-ज्ञानम्; तद्-अन्यथानुपपत्त्या ऽपूर्व-कल्पनम्; ततस् तस्य लिङ्-वाच्यत्व-कल्पनम्; वाच्ये ऽपूर्वे यागस्य स्वर्ग-कामस्य चान्वय-कल्पनम्; एवं, स्वर्ग-कामीयं याग-सम्बन्धं अपूर्वम्' इति ज्ञाते तद्-अनन्तरम् एव स्वर्ग-याग-सम्बन्ध-कल्पनम्।
इति अन्योन्याश्रयण-प्रकारः समनुसन्धेयः ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

साध्य-स्वर्ग-विशेषस्य
पुरुषस्य प्रवर्तकः ।
न स्याद् इति तद्-इष्टार्थ-
साधनं न भवेद् विधिः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

भङ्गरो न च धात्वर्थः
करणत्वेन कल्पते ।

इति तद्-भिन्न-(-अपूर्व-)-कार्यार्थ-
बोधकत्वं यद् उच्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

The root-sense of the words being transitory, the statement itself cannot function as this means.¹⁴²

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

▼ Buitenen - Note

[142]: 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.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

तद् असन् - न हि साध्येन
स्वर्गोणायं (पुरुषो) विशेष्यते ।
स्वर्ग कामयमानो हि
पुरुषो ऽत्र नियुज्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

A person is not specified by heaven as the object to be achieved,¹⁴³ but it is the person who desires heaven who is enjoined upon to accomplish the act.

[143]: Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā p. 182.

▼ नरसिंहः

'ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्ग-कामो यजेते'त्य् अत्र ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न हि स्वर्गोऽधिकारिविशेषणं साध्यत्वात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

सिद्धम् एव हि सर्वस्य
नियोज्यस्य विशेषणम् ।
('यावज्-जीवम् अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति'→) जीवनादि तथैवेह
कामनैव विशेषणम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'नियोज्यः' पुरुषः 'स्वर्ग-काम'-पदाभिहितः ।

जीवनादि ... 'यावज् जीवम् अग्नि-होत्रं जुहोति', 'यावज् जीवं दर्श-पूर्णमासाभ्यां यजेत्'
(see Śābarabhāṣya under II iv I) इत्य-आदिषु नित्य-विधिषु जीवनादिकं सिद्धम्
एव हि पुरुषस्य विशेषणं दृश्यते, न तु साध्यम् । एवं प्रकृते उपीति विभाव्यम् ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि च नियोज्य-विशेषणताम् (त्वन्-मते) अनुभवतः स्वर्गादिः
कीटृशं साध्यत्वम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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?

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि साधन-संबन्ध-
योग्यत्वं - नैव तावता ॥
स्वर्गेण सिद्ध्यता भाव्यं
यावद् योगम् अजन्मतः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[56]]

If its being a sādhyā means that it is fit for a relation with a sādhana,
it is impossible for heaven to be siddha, as long as its relatability obtains,
since it cannot become siddha in the meantime.144

▼ Buitenen - Note

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

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

सिद्धि-पर्यन्तता तस्य (स्वर्गस्य "नियोज्य-विशेषणस्य")
(अपूर्व=)नियोगैक-प्रमाणिका ॥ नियोगस् तत्-प्रमाणश् चेत्य
अन्योऽन्याश्रयणं ध्रुवम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'Niyoga' is another name coined by Prabhakara to denote Apūrva. See Karmamīmāṃsā, 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, Prabhākara dissents, elaborating instead, a theory which is obviously a refinement on the simple view which Kumārlila accepts from the older writers of the school and which best suits the Mīmāṃsā 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 Apūrva. 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 (kārya) to which also the name of Niyoga is given by Prabhākara, 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 Śālikanātha styles 'fate', nor is it apparent that either in his terminology, or in his view of the process, Prabhākara'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 Apūrva 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 Apūrva; 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.

साध्य-द्रुयापत्तिः④

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

यदि स्वर्गस्य साध्यत्वं,
न नियोगस्य (=अपूर्वस्य) साध्यता (इति वाच्यम्)॥
साध्य-द्रुयं च नैकस्मिन्
वाक्ये सम्बन्धम् अहंति ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

नियोग-स्वान्तर्न्यम्^⑤

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

स्वतन्त्रं हि साध्य-द्वयम् एकवाक्यतां निरुणद्धि -
नानुगुणम्,

▼ Buitenen

69. OBJECTION. Indeed, the unity of a sentence is broken up¹⁴⁵ when it contains two sādhyas that are independent, but not when the two are interdependent.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

[145]: This is the principle of ekavākyata: a statement can contain only one injunction, otherwise there is vākyabheda: what should be one sentence is split up into two.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

अनुगुणं चैतत्-साध्य-द्वयं -
नियोग-सिद्धिनान्तरीयकत्वात् स्वर्ग-सिद्धेः;

▼ Buitenen

And here the two sādhyas are interdependent since the realization of heaven is contained in the realization of the injunction.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

यद् आह

"नियोग-सिद्धौ सर्वं तद्-अनुगुणम्" इति
"केन नेष्टते नियोग-सिद्ध्य-अर्था फल-सिद्धिः" इति च,
तस्माद् अविरोध

इति चेत् —

▼ *Buitenen*

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?"¹⁴⁶ Therefore there is no conflict here.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

[146]: Quotations not identified; but for the argument, see Prakaraṇapañcikā, p 183 ff

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

तन् न -

स्वर्ग-सिद्धिं विना किं नु
नियोगस्य न सिध्यति ।
नाधिकारो न विषयो
न चान्यद्-विध्य-अपेक्षितम् ॥

▼ *En - विश्वासः*

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.

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न हि नित्याधिकारेषु
(अपूर्वः=)नियोगस् ताम् (स्वर्गसिद्धिं) अपेक्षते ।
न चान्यद् इच्छतोऽन्यत्र
नियुक्तिर् नोपपद्यते ॥
नियोगस्यैव माहात्म्यं
नित्येष्व इव नियुज्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

70. OBJECTION: In the case of the qualifications for periodical rites the injunction (apUrva) does not require the 'realization of any fruit.'¹⁴⁷

[147]: 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-eminence¹⁴⁸ 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.

[148]: māhātmya, which corresponds to prādhānya, pradhānatā

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

नियोगो हि प्रधानतया ऽधिगम्यमान-स्वर्गम् अभिलेषन्तम् अप्य्
आत्मन्य आकर्षति
यथा अनिच्छन्तम् अपि नित्ये कर्मणि निष्फले प्रवर्तयति ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

निमेषादि-साधनता०५

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

किं च ।

स्वर्गं कामयमानो हि निमिषत्य् उन्मिषत्य् अपि ।
न च ते स्वर्ग-सिद्ध्यर्था यागः किं नैवम् (निमेषोन्मेषवत्) इष्यते ॥ (4)

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

"तत्-साधनतया नैते
गृह्यन्त" इति चेन् मतम् ।
यागादयः किं तद् (साधनता) बुद्धि-
ग्राह्या विधि-बहिष्कृताः? ॥

▼ Buitenen

| 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?

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

तत्र च -

साध्य-साधन-संबन्ध-
प्रतिपादन-तत्-पराः ।
यावन् न विधयस् तावन्
नैष्फल्यं सर्व-कर्मणाम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

निगमनम्④

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

तस्माल् लिङ्गादिभ्यः प्रथमम् इष्ट-साधनता-अवगमः,
ततो रागतः प्रवृत्तिर् इत्य् एव युक्तम्,

▼ *Buitenen*

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 undertake the act of realization.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

"तद् अपूर्व-कार्याभिधान एव मुख्या शक्तिः, इतरत्र लाक्षणिकी"त्य् अनुपपन्नम्

▼ *Buitenen*

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 secondary.

अनुमान-मूलता न लौकिक-शब्देषु③

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

अत एव यथा-यथं लौकिक-शब्देभ्यस् तत्-सिद्धार्थ-गोचरा बुद्धयो जायन्ते ।

▼ Buitenen

We conclude that ordinary, non-Vedic statements give rise to cognitions concerning meanings that are just so established by these statements.

[[58]]

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

ननु न ताः शब्द-महिम-भुवः, आनुमानिकयो हि ताः;

▼ Buitenen

72. OBJECTION. But these cognitions do not arise from the denoting power of language, but result from Inference.

▼ नरसिंहः

This view of Prabhākara regarding the validity pertaining to the statements made by human beings, has already been stated and refuted briefly by Yāmuna. He now exposes in detail, the untenability and absurdity of this view and proves that even

sentences uttered by people in the world possess verbal authority, but not inferential authority. See the verse "tasmādasti madillie" [[??]], etc., following.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि व्युत्पत्ति-समय-संविदितार्थ-प्रतिपादन-सामर्थ्यान्य् अपि पदानि
कवचिद्_(शब्देतु) व्यभिचार-दर्शन-जनित-संशय-प्रतिबद्धानि
न श्रुत-मात्राण्य् अर्थं निश्चाययन्ति,

▼ Buitenen

For these statements, though their denotations in conveying certain meanings are consciously known once their proper meanings have been learnt, do not furnish complete certainty about their meanings merely upon being heard by a listener, when they are accompanied by doubt which is created by the listener's observation that in one case or other statements have deviated from their proper meanings.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā II. 24, P.14:

śāṅkyamānānyathārthatvaracanam tena pumvacaḥ I
śrutamātrakamevārthe na tāvanniścayāvaham II

Also vide ibid: śl. 36, P.15:

arthenaiva višeṣo hi nirākāratayā dhiyām I
na cāpratītenārthena višeṣaścāvakalpate II

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न चानिश्चितोऽर्थो ज्ञातो भवति
अनिश्चयात्मनो ज्ञानस्याभावात् ।

▼ Buitenen

And, unless there be complete certainty, the meaning will remain unknown; for no knowledge can arise in one's mind from uncertainty.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

तत्राज्ञातेऽपि वाक्यार्थं
श्रोतैवं विचिकित्सते ।

ब्रवीत्य् अन्योऽन्य-संबन्ध-
योग्यार्थानि पदान्य् अयम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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;

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. ibid. II. 38-40, P.16:

किं त्व अज्ञाते ऽपि शब्दार्थं पद-जाते श्रुते सति ।
विमर्शो जायते श्रोतुर् ईदृशो मति-शालिनः ॥
अन्योन्यान्वय-योग्यार्थं पद-जातं ब्रवीत्य् अयम् ।
आप्तस् तेनामुना नूनं ज्ञातस् तेषां समन्वयः ॥
न कदाचिद् असम्बद्धान् अर्थान् एष विवक्षति ।
न वा ऽप्रतीत-सम्बन्धान् इति दोषो न कक्षन् ॥

Also cf. ibid: V, P.95:

यो हि पुरुषः एवम् अवधारितो नायम् अशक्तो, न प्रमादी, सम्भवद् एतद् अर्थ-विषय-प्रमाणः सकलाशय-दोष-रहितश्च; नायम् अविज्ञायार्थम् अन्वितार्थानि प्रयुडक्त इति तद्-वाक्य-प्रयोगस्यान्वय-ज्ञान-पूर्वकत्वाद् अन्वय-ज्ञानं तावद् अनुमीयते । अन्वय-ज्ञानाच् चान्वयोऽप्य् अनुमीयते । ज्ञानं हि ज्ञेयाविनाभावि, ज्ञेयानुमाने भवत्य् एव लिङ्गम् । तद् एवं लौकिकाद् वचसो लिङ्ग-भूताद् वक्तृ-ज्ञानम् अनुमीयते । ततोऽर्थं निश्चित्य व्यवहारः प्रवर्तते । एवं च निश्चिते ऽन्ये निवृत्तान्वयाशङ्काद् वाक्याद् अप्य् अर्थ-निश्चयो जायते । किन्तु तस्यां दशायाम् अनुवादकतैव । अत एव लौकिक-वचने न शब्दं प्रमाणम् ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न चाविज्ञात-संबन्धान्
शब्दान् आप्ताः प्रयुज्जते ।

तेनेदृशान्वय-ज्ञानम्
अस्यास्तीत्य अवगच्छति ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

4 Cf. ibid. II. 38-40, p. 16-

' किन्त्वज्ञातेऽपि शब्दार्थं
पदजाते श्रुते सति ।
विमर्शो जायते श्रोतुर्
ईदृशो मतिशालिनः ॥
अन्योन्यान्वययोग्यार्थ-
पदजातं ब्रवीत्ययम् ।
आप्तस् तेनामुना नूनं
ज्ञातस्तेषां समन्वयः ॥
न कदाचिद् असम्बद्धान्
अथर्वेष विवक्षति ।
न वाऽप्रतीत-सम्बन्धान्
इति दोषो न कश्चन ॥ "

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

एवम् अन्वय-ज्ञाने ऽनुमिते
तद्-उपदर्शितो ऽर्थो न शब्दम् आकाङ्क्षति,

▼ Buitenen

If the knowledge of connection is thus inferred, the meaning discovered by the listener does not require the authority of verbal testimony.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. ibid. II. §ls. 26-28; P.15:

तस्य ज्ञानं च वाक्येन लिङ्ग-भूतेन गम्यते ।
ज्ञात्वैवार्थं ब्रवीतीति य एवम् अवधारितः ॥
तस्य ज्ञानेन नियतं वाक्यं ज्ञानानुमापकम् ।
ज्ञानं चार्थविनाभावि तेनार्थं ऽपि विनिश्चयः ॥
ततोऽर्थं निश्चिते पश्चात् सोऽर्थो वाक्येन गम्यते ।
तस्यां दशायां वाक्यस्य तस्य स्याद् अनुवादता ॥

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

अतो लौकिकस्य वचसो वक्त्र-अनुभव--पर-तन्त्रतया
तत्रैव पर्यवसानम्

इति ।(4)

▼ Buitenen

Consequently, since ordinary language statements are dependent on the speaker's cognition; they terminate in that cognition through Inference alone.

शब्द-शक्तिर् अप्रतिहतैकत्र दोषेऽपि④

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् असत्,
न हि
स्वभावतोऽर्थम् अवगमयन् शब्दः

"वक्वचिद् वक्त्र-आशय-दोष-वशीकाराद् वितथ"

इत्य् अन्यत्रापि तत्-संभावनया स्वारसिकीम् अर्थावबोधकताम् उज्जितुम् अहंति,

▼ *Buitenen*

73. REFUTATION. This view is not correct; for a word conveys its right meaning as its natural function, and the observation that in one case the statement happened to be untrue under the influence of defects in the speaker's character should not give rise to a general suspicion which would cause all statement to give up its natural capacity of conveying its meaning.¹⁴⁹

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न हि "मन्त्र-प्रतिहत-दशायां हतवहो न दहती"त्य्
अन्यत्रापि तादृश-दशा-शड्क्या न दहति, (5)

▼ *Buitenen*

The suspicion that a fire may not burn in other cases because in one case, when obstructed by mantras, it fails to burn, does not make fire fail to burn!

▼ राम-मिश्रः:

अत्र मन्त्र-प्रतिहति-दशायाम् इति युक्तः पाठो
अथवा हत-शब्दे भावे क्त-प्रत्यय इत्य् अनुसंधेयम् ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

नापि

शुक्ति-रजत-धियम् अर्थ-व्याभिचारिणीम् इन्द्रियं दोष-वशाद् उपलब्धम्
इति घटादिकम् अपि नावगमयति,

▼ *Buitenen*

And the fact that the sense of vision may give rise to a cognition which does not correspond to reality-e.g. that nacre is silver-as the

result of some optical error does not signify that the visual sense cannot produce true cognition of the visible presence of a pitcher etc.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

अतो विदित-पद-पदार्थ-सङ्गते:
श्रोतुस् सहसैव शब्दो इर्थम् अवबोधयति
मूल-ज्ञानं न प्रतीक्षते ।

▼ Buitenen

Therefore, a statement does indeed instantly convey a certain meaning to the listener if he knows the relation between the words and their meanings.

मूल-ज्ञानापर्याप्तता④

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

मूल-ज्ञान-परिज्ञानाद्
अर्वाग् अर्थे इपि चोदिते ।
"कथम् एवम् अयं वेद"
इत्य् अनुमानं प्रवर्तते ॥

▼ Buitenen

It does not require knowledge of the basis. Before there is complete knowledge on the part of the listener about the basic knowledge of the speaker, and, further, when the meaning has been expressed, the question rises: "How does he know this?" and Inference proceeds to resolve that question.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

"किम् अज्ञासीद् अयम् वक्ता
किञ्चिद्" इत्य् अनुमित्तसे ।

विशिष्टार्थन्वय-ज्ञानम्
अनुमातुम् अथेच्छसि ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

You want to infer: "Did the speaker know something?" or wish to infer his knowledge of the connection of the different meanings.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न तावद् अयम् अज्ञासीद्
वक्ता किञ्चिद् इतीयता ।
व्याहार-व्यवहारौ वा
स्यातां वाक्यार्थ-गोचरौ (वक्ष्यमाण-रीत्या)॥

▼ *Buitenen*

But the mere knowledge that the speaker knew something is not enough for utterance and action concerning a statement-meaning to proceed.

▼ नरसिंहः

व्यवहारः कायिकः व्याहारः वाचिकः ।

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

विशिष्टार्थन्वय-गोचर-चेतो ऽनुमानन् तु
प्रथमतर-प्रवृत्त--तद्-विषय-शेमुषीम् अन्तरेणानुपपन्नम्
इति प्रागेव शब्दार्थोऽवगन्तव्यः,

▼ *Buitenen*

Inference of a cognition concerning the connection of different meanings is impossible without a prior cognition of such a connection.

This being so, the meaning of the statement must be known first.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

न ह्य अनासादित-विषय-विशेष-संसर्गः संविदः
परस्-परतो व्यतिभिन्नते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

For cognitions whose particular objects are not connected, are not connected separated themselves.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

न च तथा उनुमिताभिर् अर्थ-विशेषः सिध्यति,

▼ *Buitenen*

Nor is a particular meaning established by cognitions that are inferred to be such.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

यादृशान्वय-प्रतिपादन-योग्या पद-रचना
सा तद्-अन्वय-ज्ञानम् आपादयति

इति चेत्,
अवगतस् तर्हि प्राग् एवार्थानाम् अन्वयः;

▼ *Buitenen*

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;

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

न हि बुद्धाव् अनारोपित एवान्वयः प्रयोगं व्यवच्छिन्नति,

▼ *Buitenen*

unless a connection has already reached the level of cognition it cannot give rise to being expressed in a statement.

उपसंहारः④

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

तस्माद् अस्ति नदी-तीरे
फलम् इत्य-एवम्-आदिषु ।
या सिद्धू-विषया बुद्धिः
सा शब्दी नानुमानिकी ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

ततश्च "अपूर्व-कार्य-गोचर एव शब्दः प्रमाणम्" इति -

▼ Buitenen

Therefore the position that statements produce valid knowledge only if they deal with a previously unknown kārya

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

स्व-सिन्धान्त-चिराभ्यास-
व्यामुग्ध-बल-बिद्धिभिः ॥ उक्तम् उक्तेन मार्गेण
युक्ता इन्यत्रापि शक्तता ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

व्यामुग्धाबलबुद्धिभिरिति पाठस्तु न युक्त इति मन्यामहे ।

वेदान्तोक्त-पुरुषः③

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

ततश्च यान्य् एतानि विलक्षण-पुरुष-प्रतिपादकानि वेदान्त-वचांसि

▼ *Buitenen*

Consequently, all the statements of the Upaniṣads which set forth the existence of a categorically different Person

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

- | "स एष सर्वाधिपतिः",
- | "सर्वस्येशानः",
- | "सर्वम् इदं प्रशास्ति",
- | "तस्याध्यक्षम् इदं सर्वम्"

इत्यादीनि,

▼ *Buitenen*

e.g.

- | "He is the overlord of the Universe,
sovereign of all.
He commands all the world,"149

"All this is manifest to Him¹⁵⁰ etc."

[149]: BA Up. 5.6.1. [150]: Not to be found in the major Upanisads.

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

148: BĀ Up. 5.6.1.

149: Not to be found in the major Upaniṣads.
[[59]]

150: supra §35.

▼ नरसिंहः

स एष ... Brhadāraṇyaka V. vi. 1.

तस्याध्यक्षम् ... To be identified.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

तान्य् अपि तत्र प्रमाणं
तद्-विषयासंदिग्धाविपर्यय-ज्ञान-हेतुत्वात् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

are authoritative as to what they state, since they produce
indubitable and unreversed knowledge of their contents.

[[60]]

सम्भावितानुवाद-विपर्ययौ③

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुतिः

न च (इश्वर-निभे) सिद्धे वस्तुनि
(तद्-वस्तु-साधक-बाधकयोर् अन्यतरोपनिपात-सम्भव-प्रसक्तेऽ
(तद्-वस्तु-भावितानुवाद-विपर्यय-पर्यालोचनया

तद्(वस्तु)गोचर-वचसः प्रामाण्य-प्रच्युतिः
(समिद-आहरणादि)कार्य-निष्पापि तत्(←प्रच्युति)-प्रसङ्गात्

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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.

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.

Another proving factor, c.g., the means of knowledge Perception, may turn up conceivably 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.

Scriptural validity, i.e., Scripture's being a means of knowledge, is to the Prabhakara Mimimsaka, its being the sole means of knowing a particular thing.

To the Prabhakara this validity is ideal in the case of injunctions

concerning actions which, suprasensibly, lead to a certain desired end.

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

(लौकिकं[←]) कार्यम् अपि हि मानान्तर-वेद्यम् एव ("ओदनेन होतव्यम्" इत्यत्र) लौकिकं समिद्-आहरणादि,
तच् च मानान्तरेणापि वेद्यम् ओदन-पाकवद् इत्य् अभ्युपगमात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

(The injunction concerning the odana oblation includes an injunction concerning the preparation of the odana and the fetching of firewood for the cooking. Since experience shows that for a cooking fire one needs firewood, this karya is not strictly known on scriptural authority.)

▼ नरसिंहः

\$ Vide Prakaraṇapañcikā II, p. 180-

" कृतिसाध्यं प्रधानं यत्,
तत् कार्यम् अवसीयते । तच मानान्तरेणापि
वेद्यम् ओदन-पाकवत् ॥ "

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

अथ विलक्षणान्नि-होत्रादि-विषय-कार्यस्यासम्भावित-मानान्तरतया
तत्-प्रतिपादयद् वचः प्रमाणम्,

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

हन्त तर्हि निरतिशयावबोधैश्वर्य-महाऽनन्द-सन्दोह-वपुषि भगवति
न मानान्तर-गन्ध-सम्बन्ध
इति सर्वं समानम् अन्यत्राभिनिवेशात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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
beatitude;
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!)

▼ विश्वास-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च -

प्रमाणान्तर-दृष्टार्थ-
विषयिण्य् अपि शेमुषी ।
प्रमाणम् एव, तत्-पूर्व
न चेत् स्वार्थं विगाहते ॥

▼ Buitenen

Moreover,
if a cognition concerning a content
that is also known through another means of knowledge

does not recognize its own content as authoritative,
since it has already been taken care of by another authority,

▼ विद्यास-प्रस्तुति:

तस्य संभावना-मात्राद्
अप्रामाण्यम् अलौकिकम् ।

▼ Buitenen

this non-authoritativeness of its content is beyond experience
for it is a mere matter of assumption.

उपसंहारः③

▼ विद्यास-प्रस्तुति:

तस्मात् परिनिष्ठितानुषेयादि-भेद-शून्यम्
असन्दिधाविपर्यस्तविज्ञानं प्रमाणम् एष्व्यम्,

▼ Buitenen

Therefore it must be maintained that all indubitable and
unreversed knowledge is authoritative, regardless of whether its
content is established, or yet to be performed, or anything else.

▼ नरसिंहः

परिनिष्ठिर् अयं [[??]] सिद्धार्थ-बोधकत्वम्; अनुषेयत्वं पराभीषं कार्य-बोधकत्वम् । उभयोर्
एतयोर् न कुत्राप्य् आग्रहः कार्य इति [[??]] ज्ञान-प्रामाण्यस्य तादृश-भेदाप्रयोजकत्वात्
विपर्यादि-शून्यत्वस्यैव तत्वाच् च ।

०५ सार्वज्ञ्यम्②

शब्द-प्रमाणम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अत इदम् अपास्तम् -

प्रसिद्धैः करणैरेव
सार्वज्ञं नान्यथेति यत् ।

▼ Buitenen

Hence we reject our opponent's position. [[61]]

76. The objections¹⁵² that omniscience is acquired by means of the regular senses is incorrect,¹⁵³

[152]: supra §42. [153]: read ity asat for iti yat.

▼ नरसिंहः

This line runs like a verse.

Cf. Ślokavārtika under I. 1.2; śl. 111b:

यदि षडभिः प्रमाणैस् स्यात् सर्व-ज्ञः, केन वार्यते ?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यतः श्रुतिरेव तत्र परिपन्थिनी -

▼ Buitenen

because śruti contradicts it:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

पश्यत्य् अ-चक्षुस्
स शृणोत्य् अ-कर्णः
यश् चक्षुषा न पश्यति
यश् चक्षूंषि पश्यति ।
न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

"He sees without eyes,
hears without ears;

he who does not see with the eye,
who sees the eyes,
has neither effect nor instrument;"154

[154]: Svet Up. 3.19.

▼ नरसिंहः

पश्यत्य् ... Śvetāśvatara : III. 19.

यः ... Kenopaniṣat : I. 6a; but the reading found is:

| यच् चक्षुषा न पश्यति, येन चक्षूषि पश्यति ।

न तस्य ... Śvetāśvatara*: VI. 8.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| स्वाभाविकी ज्ञान-बल-क्रिया च

इत्य्-आदिका ।

▼ Buitenen

| "knowledge, strength and action are natural to Him,"155

etc.

[155]: Svet Up. 6.8.

नार्थवादः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न चासां गुण-वादत्वं प्रमाणाभावात् ।

▼ Buitenen

These śruti-s do not speak metaphorically,
for there is no authority for this assumption.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अलब्ध-मुख्य-वृत्तीनां
गुण-वाद-समाश्रयः ॥
लभ्यते चेह मुख्योऽर्थ
इति तत्-कल्पना मृषा ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

न प्रत्यक्षतः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| नन्व इहापि मुख्य-अर्थ-भङ्ग-कारणम् अस्ति - प्रमाणान्तर-विरोधः ।

▼ Buitenen

[[62]]

77. OBJECTION. But in this case we have in fact reason to cancel the primary meaning, because the primary sense militates against other means of knowledge.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कुतः प्रमाणान्तरात्, न तावत् प्रत्यक्षात्,

▼ Buitenen

REFUTATION. What other means of knowledge? Not, to start, Perception,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि प्रत्यक्षम् उदीरित-पुरुषाभावावभासकम् उदीयमानं दृष्टम्,

▼ *Buitenen*

for we see no Perception occur which shows that the said Person is non-existent.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| योग्य-अनुपलभ्माद् अभाव-निश्चय

इति चेन् न -

प्रमाण-गोष्ठी-ज्येष्ठेन शास्त्रेणौपलभ्मनात्,

▼ *Buitenen*

If you retort that non-existence is decided by the nonapprehension of what should be there,
we reply that this does not hold in our case since the object,
that is the said Person, is actually apprehended through Scripture
itself, which is the highest-ranking among the assembly of the
means of knowledge.

▼ नरसिंहः

This line too is metrical.

नानुमानतः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नाप्य् अनुमानात्,

▼ *Buitenen*

Nor does it militate against Inference;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् धि शीघ्र-जन्मागमिक-प्रत्यय-प्रक्षिप्त-प्रतिबन्धं
कथम् इव मन्थर-प्रवृत्ति प्रादुर्भवति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

for how could an Inference which disproves that Person arise at all,
slow-moving as it is, when its object is instantly refuted by the
rapidly arising scriptural cognition?

▼ नरसिंहः

शब्द-प्रमाणापेक्षया अनुमानस्य दौर्बल्यम् एव । शब्दं ज्ञानं शीघ्रतरम् । व्याप्ति-ज्ञानानन्तर-
लब्ध-प्रतिष्ठस्यानुमानस्य मन्थर-प्रवृत्तिर् एवेति भावः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

कि चैवं सति यागादे:
स्वर्गापूर्वादि-सङ्गतिः ।
क्रियात्वेन विरुद्धेत
शास्त्रं चेत् तन् न बाधते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

Moreover, if this were so, the relation of sacrificing etc. to heaven,
apūrva¹⁵⁶ etc. would logically be contradicted by the fact that
sacrificing etc. are actions, when Scripture did not cancel such
reasoning.

[156]: cf supra note.

न यूपादित्यवत्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यूपादित्यादि-तादात्म्यं
प्रत्यक्षेणैव बाधितम् ।
विस्पष्ट-दृष्ट-भेदत्वात्
काष्ठ-सावित्रि-बिम्बयोः ॥ (4)

▼ Buitenen

True, the identity of sacrificial pole and sun, which is asserted by Scripture, is cancelled by another means of knowledge, namely Perception alone, because the difference between a piece of wood and the disc of the sun is indeed obvious.

▼ नरसिंहः

See P.47 above for the Mīmāṃsaka's argument. The illustration of the arthavāda : “ādityo yūpaḥ” [Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa : II-i-5-2] was put forth there. This view is now being refuted.

The figurative statement “ādityo yūpaḥ” is made on the ground of similarity of brightness (tejasvitva) between the Sun and the sacrificial post. The relevant sūtra is “sārūpyāt” [Pūrvamīmāṃsā : I. iv. 25].

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च
तत्र सन्निहित-यूपाज्जन-विध्-एकवाक्यतया
अर्थ-वादत्वाद् युक्तं गुण-वादत्वाश्रयणम्, (4)

▼ Buitenen

Besides, in this case it is legitimate to assume metaphorical usage, for the statement of this identity is an arthavāda,¹⁵⁶ since it forms one single statement with the proximate injunction about the unction of the sacrificial pole.¹⁵⁷

[157]: supra note 86.

▼ नरसिंहः

The ḫk to be repeated while anointing the yūpa with ghee is:
“añjanti tvāmadhvare devayantah” (Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa - VI-ii. p.

142). For the derivation of the term yūpa, see ibid- VI-i, the opening part.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चेह तथा विध्य-अन्तरम् अस्ति यच्-छेषतया अर्थ-वादः स्यात् ।

▼ Buitenen

There is no other injunction to which it could be accessory as an arthavāda.¹⁵⁷

157: supra § 36.

न कल्पित-विधे:④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ विध्य-अन्वयाभावे
पुरुषार्थत्वाहानतः ।
अध्याहत्य विधिं तत्र
शेषत्वं परिकल्प्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

Alternatively, inasmuch as the human importance of a statement would be lost if there were no injunction to connect it with, an injunction may be supplemented and then the arthavāda is regarded as accessory to that supplemented injunction.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् आहुः -

यावत् खलु प्रमातृणां
प्रवर्तन-निवर्तने ।

शब्दा न कुर्वते तावन्
न निराकाङ्क्ष-बोधनम् ॥

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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,

[158]: supra § 36.

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तन् न ।

▼ *Buitenen*

does not hold good.

विध्य-अनपेक्षा⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ऋते ऽपि विधि-संबन्धाद्
दृष्टैव हि पुम्-अर्थता ।
"पुत्रस् ते जात" इत्य्-आदौ
तथेहापि भविष्यति ॥ (5)

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च तत्र विध्य-अध्याहारः,
अन्तरेणापि विधिं पुत्र-जनन-अवगमाद् एव हर्षोत्पत्तेः ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा "का क्रिया", "पाकः" इत्यादि-प्रश्नोत्तर-व्यवहारेषु
प्रष्ट-जन-जिज्ञासित--क्रिया-विशेष-- प्रतिपादन-मात्र--निराकाङ्क्षः शब्दो
न विध्य-अध्याहारम् अपेक्षते ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इह तु ब्रह्म-विज्ञानं
महानन्द-फलं श्रुतम् ॥
"ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्म भवति",
"प्राप्नोति ब्रह्म-वित् परम्" ।

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[159]: This must refer to the śruti sa yo ha vai tat param̄ veda brahma veda brahma bhavati (quoted Rāmanuja, Vedārthaśmṛgраha, 91), which I have been unable to locate.

[160]: Taitt Up. 2.1.1. brahmavid āpnoti param.

▼ नरसिंहः

इह तु ... Note the way in which Yāmuna connects the previous discussion with the main theme, viz, the validity of the Pāñcarātra-texts, based upon the authorship of Nārāyaṇa, the Supreme and Omniscient Being.

ब्रह्मवित् ... Cf. Muṇḍaka: III-ii-9: “ब्रह्मैव वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति” ।

प्राप्नोति ... Cf. Taittirīya: II-i-1: “ब्रह्मविद् आप्नोति परम्” ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

"अश्रुते ब्रह्मणा सार्थ
सर्वान् कामान् स सामगः" ॥
इदम्-आदि-त्रयी-वाक्यैर्
व्यक्ता तस्य पुम्-अर्थता ।

▼ *Buitenen*

"the sāman 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.

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[161]: This must refer to Taitt Up. 2.1.1 so'śnute sarvān kāmān saha brahmaṇā vipaścitā, but sa sāmagah is obscure, unless one

may regard it as a corruption of *vipaścitā*.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. ibid: “सोऽश्रुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता” ।

निगमनम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् एवम् उदीरित-श्रुति-शत-समधिगतावितथ- सहज-सर्व-साक्षात्-काराकारुण्यादि-कल्याण-गुणैक-राशौ भगवति सिध्यति,
सिध्यत्य् एव तद्-अनुभव-मूलतया तन्त्र-प्रामाण्यम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Aniruddhasamāhitā* : II. 7-8:

तथा सर्वेषु शास्त्रेषु पञ्च-रात्रं वरिष्ठकम् ।
श्रुति-मूलम् इदं तन्त्रं प्रमाणं कल्प-सूत्रवत् ॥
पञ्च-रात्रे विशेषेण विष्णुना भाषितं यथा ।
अतः प्रमाणं लोके ऽस्मिन् धर्म-शास्त्रेषु सर्वशः ॥

Also cf. Viṣṇusamāhitā : ch. II:

वेद-मूलतया तन्त्रम् आप्त-मूलतया ऽथवा ॥ [11b]
पुराणवत् प्रमाणं स्यात् तथा मन्व-आदि-वाक्यवत् ॥ [12a]

आप्त-प्रोक्ततया तन्म प्रमाणम् इति ये विदुः ।
वेद-प्रामाण्यम् अप्य आहुर् आप्त-मूलतयैव ते ॥ [19]

विष्णोर् धर्म-प्रवक्तुत्वात् तत्-प्रोक्तं मनु-वाक्यवत् ।
ब्रह्म-विष्णु हि धर्माणां प्रवक्तारौ बुधैस् स्मृतौ ॥ [21]

०६ विष्णुः परमः②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु विरचित-नीत्या कश्चिद् आम्नाय-मूर्ख--
प्रमित-सहज-सर्व-ज्ञानवान् अस्तु नाम ।
स च हरिर् इति यावन् नावगम्येत सम्यक्
न खलु भवति तावत्पञ्चरात्रं प्रमाणम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[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, Pañcaratra will not be authoritative.

▼ नरसिंहः

The doubt expressed here by the opponent is as to who, among the trinity—Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, is the Supreme Deity.

श्रुतिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अत्यल्पम् एतत् -
न ह्य् अत्र त्रयी-विदो विवदन्ते यद्

वासुदेवः परमात्मा अखिल-जगत्-कारणम्

▼ *Buitenen*

REFUTATION. This is a worthless remark; no experts in the Veda dispute that the Supreme Soul, cause of the entire universe, is Vāsudeva.

▼ नरसिंहः

The following is a brief exposition of the Supremacy of Nārāyaṇa. The Puruṣanirṇaya of Yāmuna, solely devoted to this question is yet to be traced out and as such, the importance of this part of the text need not be overemphasised. It indicates the way at least, in which the author had dealt with this question in the work.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

श्रूयते हि स वेदान्तेष्व्

आत्मा नारायणः परः ।
सत्यं ज्ञानम् अनन्तज् च
तद् विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥
परा प्रकृतिर् अध्यक्षो
वासुदेवस् तथा ऽपरः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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".162

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[162]: Partial quotations from Taitt Up. 2.1.1, Muṇḍ Up. and an unidentified source.

[162a]: Nṛsiṁhapūrvatāpani Up. 2.4 (which reads purastād for parastād) and śvet Up. 3.9.

▼ नरसिंहः

वेदान्तेष्वात्मा ... Mahānārāyaṇa : XI. 4

सत्यं ... Taittirīya : II-i-1.

तद्विष्णोः ... Yajurveda : VI-5; also Kaṭhopaniṣat : III-9.

परा ... To be traced out.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एकः परस्ताद् य इदं बभूव
यस्मात् परं नापरम् अस्ति किञ्चित् ।

इत्य् उक्त-वाच्यानुगुणं "यतो वा
इमानि भूतानि", "सदेव सौम्य" ॥
इत्य्-आदि-वाक्यज् च ततस् स विष्णुस्
त्रयी-शिरः सिद्ध-विशद्ध-बोधः ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Note

162: Nṛsimhapūrvatāpanī Up. 2.4 (which reads purastāt for
parastāt) and Śvet Up. 3.9.

▼ नरसिंहः

एकः ... This appears in the Āyuṣyasūkta, beginning with “यो ब्रह्मा ब्रह्मण उज्जहार”. The reading found is “एकः पुरस्ताद् य इदं बभूव”. It appears on folio 15 b of palm-leaf ms. in Grantha, under R. No. 657, deposited in the Govt. Or. MSS. Library, Madras, and also on folio 42 a of another p.l. ms. in Grantha, R. No. 67 from the same library.

यस्मात्परं ... Śvetāśvatara : III-9;

यतो ... Taittirīya : III-i-1;

सदेव ... Chāndogya : VI-ii-1.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चान्यस्माज् जगाज्-जन्म-
स्थिति-ध्वंसाश् श्रुतौ श्रुताः ।
यतश् चैते स सर्वज्ञः
परमात्मेति सम्मतम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Brahmasūtra I-i-2 : “जन्माद्यस्य यतः” ।

इतिहास-पुराणादि③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अमुम् एव परमात्मानं
द्वैपायन-पराशर--नारद-प्रभृति--महर्षि-वचनेभ्यः प्रतिपद्यामहे।
तथा हि -

▼ Buitenen

That He is the Supreme Soul we learn also from the statements of Dvaiपायना, Parāśara, Nārada and other great seers.

Thus -

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विष्णौ जगत्-स्थितं सर्वम्
इति विद्धि परन्तप ।
सृजत्य् एष महा-विष्णुर्
भूत-ग्रामं चराचरम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

"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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Mahābhārata (Cr. edn.) XII. 271. 7-8. Variant : महा-बाहो for महा-विष्णुः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एष चाक्षिपते काले
काले विसृजते पुनः ।
आस्मिन् गच्छन्ति विलयम्
अस्माच्य प्रभवन्त्युत ॥

▼ Buitenen

In him they go to their reabsorption, from Him they originate,"

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अनादिनिधनः श्रीमान्
मुनिर् नारायणः प्रभुः ।
स वै सृजति भूतानि
स्थावराणि चराणि च ।

▼ Buitenen

"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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. XII. 271. 19. Variant : हरिः for मुनिः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

स ब्रह्म परमं चेति
तथाऽन्यत्रापि पठ्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

That He is the Supreme Brahman is also learnt elsewhere.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. XII. 280. 26 b. Variant परमो for परं ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

केशवो भरतश्रेष्ठ!
भगवान् ईश्वरः परः ।
पुरुषः सर्वम् इत्य् एतच्
छूयते बहुधा श्रुतौ ॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

"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."163

[163]: not identified.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. XII. 200.5. Variants : प्रभुः for परः; इत्य् एव for इत्य् एतत्; विभुः for श्रूतौ ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्त्वं जिज्ञासमानानां
हेतुभिः सर्वतो मुखैः ।
तत्त्वम् एको महा-योगी
हरिर् नारायणः प्रभुः ॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

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.164

[164]: not identified.

▼ Buitenen - Note

165: Could this refer to Varāha Purāṇa Cf. infra.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. XII. 335. 83b-84a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा दानधर्मे -

परमात्मा परः शान्तः
पद्म-नाभः परायणः ।
इति वेद-रहस्यन्तु
किन् न वेत्सि पुरुन्दर ॥

▼ Buitenen

Likewise in the Dānadhharma,

"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?

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्-प्रसादाद् वयं सर्वे
लोकानां स्थिति-हेतवः ।
आप्ताश् चामर-मुख्याश् च
देवाश् च स्थानिनो मताः ॥
यदि विष्णुरुदासीनो
नास्माकं विद्यते शुभम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

इति रुद्रस्य वचनं,
तथा भारतमात्स्ययोः ॥

▼ Buitenen

Thus Rudra's word.¹⁶⁵ Similarly, in the Mahābhārata and Matsya Purāṇa,

[165]: Could this refer to Varaha Purana? Cf. infra.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्र यः परमात्मा हि
स नित्यो निर्गुणश् शुभः ।
स वै नारायणो ज्ञेयः
सर्वात्मा पुरुषो हि सः ॥

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

"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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Mahābhārata XII. 339. 14. Variants: नित्यं for नित्यो; हि for वै ।

Cf. also ibid. XIII. App. 13, lines 20-21:

आलोङ्घ्य सर्व-शास्त्राणि विचार्य च पुनः पुनः ।
इदम् एकं सुनिष्पन्नं ध्येयो नारायणः सदा ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा वराहे -

यस्य देवस्य चरितं
व्रतं समभवद् भुवि ।
कोऽन्यस् तस्माद् अभ्यधिको
मुक्त्वा नारायणं प्रभुम् ॥

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

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?"

▼ नरसिंहः

To be traced out.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नारायणात्परो देवो
न भूतो न भविष्यति ।
एतद् रहस्यं वेदानां
पुराणानां च सत्तमाः ॥

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

"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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Ch. 73. śl. 52.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा लैङ्गे: -

स एकः पुरुषः श्रेष्ठः
परमात्मा जनार्दनः ।
यस्माद् ब्रह्मा ततो रुद्रः
ततश्चैवाखिलं जगत् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Liṅgapurāṇa: uttarabhāga: Ch. I. śl. 7b-8a. There the reading is:

य एकः पुरुष-श्रेष्ठः परमात्मा जनार्दनः ।
यस्माद् ब्रह्मा ततस् सर्वं समाश्रित्यैव मुच्यते ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा ।

विष्णोस् सकाशाद् उद्भूतं
जगत् तत्रैव च स्थितम् ।
स्थिति-संयम-कर्ता इसाव्

इति पाराशरं वचः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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."166

[166]: viṣṇu Pur., 1.1.31.

▼ नरसिंहः

Viṣṇupurāṇa: I. 1. 35. The remainder of the śloka is: 'जगतोऽस्य जगच्
च सः'

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा मानवे -

नारायणः परोऽव्यक्ताद्
अण्डम् अव्यक्त-संभवम् ।
अण्डस्यान्तस् त्वं इमे लोकाः
सप्त-द्वीपा च मेदिनी ॥

▼ Buitenen

Likewise in the Mānavadharmaśāstra,167

"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.

▼ नरसिंहः

This verse is not found in the Manusmṛti commented by Bhṛṭṭa Medhātithi. It is however, found inserted between the 10th and 11th verses of the first chapter in the Manvarthamuktāvalī with Kullūka's commentary [Kāśī Skt. Series, 1935]. Kullūka too did not comment upon it.

निगमनम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तस्माद् ईदृश-श्रुति-स्मृतीतिहास-पुराण-पर्यालोचनया

अखिल-जगत्-कारणं परमात्मा वासुदेव

इति निश्चीयते ।

▼ Buitenen

Therefore, the study of these and similar śrutis, smṛtis, epical texts and Purāṇas proves that Vāsudeva is the universal cause, the Supreme Soul.

न शिवादिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न चैवं परमात्मत्वं
रुद्रादेः श्रुतिष्वदितम् ।

प्रत्युतोत्पत्तिम् एवाहुस्
तस्यैकायन-शाखिनः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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 168 say that he has an origin,

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

[168]: A little known Vedic branch (if it was a Vedic tradition), from which certain vaisnava sects derive their authority; cf. infra §138.

▼ नरसिंहः

The Pāñcarātrins are the followers of the Ekāyanaśākhā, one of the redactions of the Śukla Yajurveda.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

"तमो वा इदम्" इत्य्-आदौ
तथा वेदे ऽपि दृश्यते ।
"यतो हि रुद्रस् सञ्जज्ञे
तत् श्रेष्ठं भुवनेष्व" इति ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Maitrīyopaniṣat V. 2.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

"तत् इद् आस भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठम्" इति ।

▼ Buitenen

"that indeed is the oldest in the worlds."

▼ नरसिंहः

R̥gveda X. 120. i.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा रौद्रं पदं स्पष्टं
कर्म-जन्यं प्रतीयते ॥
"महिमानं निजं लेभे
विष्णोर् अभ्यर्थनाद्" इति ।

▼ Buitenen

Similarly, Rudra's position is clearly known to be a result of his karman: "He obtained his greatness by propitiating Viṣṇu."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

"अस्य देवस्ये"ति,

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. VII. 40. 5.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

"ललाटाद् अभवद्-बिन्दुस्
तस्माद् रुद्रो व्यजायत ।"
इत्य्-आदिकाश् च श्रुतयो
रुद्रोत्पत्तिं वदन्ति वै ।

▼ Buitenen

"From the forehead sprang a drop; from that Rudra was born,"¹⁶⁹

These and other śrutis declare that Rudra was born.

[169]: These quotations could not be identified.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Subālopaniṣat II. 1: "ललाटात् क्रोध-जो रुद्रो जायते ।"

पुराण-वाद-निर्वाहः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एवञ्च सति रुद्रादि-
महिमावेदिका इव ।
या वाचस् तास् स्तुति-परा:
"श्रोत्रं ब्रह्म" इति गीर् इव ॥

▼ Buitenen

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."¹⁷⁰

[[67]]

[170]: BA Up 4.1.5.

▼ नरसिंहः

Bṛhadāraṇyaka IV. i. 5: "श्रोत्रं वै ब्रह्म" ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एतेन रुद्रादीनां परमात्मत्व-प्रतिपादक-पुराण-वादाः
प्रत्यक्ष-श्रुति-विरोधान् न मुख्य-अर्थाः । (4)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यद् वा त्याज्यतया तन्त्र-
सिद्धान्त-प्रतिपादकाः (पुराण-वादाः)।
अ-वैदिकेषु तन्त्रेषु
तन् (← रुद्रादि) माहात्म्यं हि कथ्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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,

वेदानुकूल-पुराणानि ③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

वेद-सिद्धान्त-मार्गेषु विष्णुर् एव परः सृतः ।

▼ Buitenen

we say that Viṣṇu is stated to be the Supreme One in the texts of the Way of the Vedic doctrine.

▼ नरसिंहः

This line occurs below. It is from the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, to be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् यथा वैष्णवे -

परमात्मा च सर्वेषाम्
आधारः परमेश्वरः ।

विष्णु-नामा स वेदेषु
वेदान्तेषु च गीयते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Viṣṇupurāṇa VI. iv. 39.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

वाराहे ।

विष्णुर् एव परं ब्रह्म
त्रि-भेदम् इह पठ्यते ।
वेद-सिद्धान्त-मार्गेषु
तन् न जानन्ति मोहिताः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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 padyate in b.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Varāhapurāṇa [Sri Venkatesvara Press, Bombay], Ch. 72. śl. 4.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

नारायणात् परो देवो
न भूतो न भविष्यति ।

एतद् रहस्यं वेदानां
पुराणानां च सत्तमाः ॥

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

"There has been no god greater than Nārāyaṇa, nor shall there be;¹⁷³ this is the secret doctrine of Vedas and Purāṇas, O excellent ones."

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ch. 73, śl. 52.

Also cf. ibid. Ch. 70, śl. 26a:

न तस्मात् परतो देवो भविता न भविष्यति।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा मात्स्ये ।

सात्त्विकेषु तु कल्पेषु
विष्णोर् माहात्म्यम् उच्यते ।
अनेश शिवस्य माहात्म्यं
तामसेषु प्रकीर्त्यते ॥

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Matsya Purāṇa Ch. 53, śl. 67b-68a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा लैङ्गे ।

न हि विष्णुम् ऋते काचिद्
गतिर् अन्या विधीयते ।
इत्य् एवं सततं वेदा
गायन्ते नात्र संशयः ॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Liṅga Purāṇa [Pūrva] Ch. 24, śl. 143.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा वायवीये ।

सहस-बाहुः परमः प्रजापतिः ।
त्रयी-पथेयः पुरुषो निरुच्यते ॥

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Passages to be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा भविष्यति ।

वेद-सिद्धान्त-मार्गेषु
विष्णुर् एव परः स्मृतः ।
विष्णुर् एव नर-श्रेष्ठो
महिष्ठः पुरुषोत्तमः ॥

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

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."¹⁷⁵

[175]: The Linga, Vayu and Bhavisyat quotations could not be verified.

▼ *Buitenen*

All this has already been explained in great detail in the Puruṣanirṇaya¹⁷⁶ and is therefore not further enlarged upon here.

[176]: Title of one of Yāmuna's treatises.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सर्वं चैतत् पुरुष-निर्णये निपुणतरम् उपपादितम् इति नेह प्रपञ्चते ।

▼ नरसिंहः

Puruṣanirṇaya is another work of Yāmuna, which is yet to be recovered.

▼ राम-सिंश्रीः

पुरुष-निर्णय-नामा भगवन्-महिम-प्रतिपादन-पुरःसरो-देवतान्तर-व्यावर्तन-मुखेन विष्णु-पर-तत्त्व-प्रतिपादन-परो ग्रन्थः परमाचार्य-प्रणीतः ।

०७ पाञ्चरात्र-दानम्②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ततश्च ।

श्रुति-मूर्धि प्रसिद्धेन
वासुदेवेन भाषितम् ।
तन्नं मिथ्येति वक्तुं नः
कथं जिह्वा प्रवर्तते ॥

▼ Buitenen

Therefore, how can our tongue endeavour to say that the Tantra which is revealed by Viṣṇu who is known from the Upaniṣads is false?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

| स हि सहज-संवेदन-साक्षात्-कृत--दीक्षाऽराधनादि-धर्मः

▼ Buitenen

| 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 sahajasamvedanasākṣātkṛta
dīkṣārādhanādīdharmah

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स्वर्ग-पुत्रादि-वैषयिक-सुखम् अनेक-दुःख-संभिन्नम्,
न चातिचिरम् अनुवर्तत

इति

▼ Buitenen

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,
continue for long,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् अपि दुःख-पक्ष एव निक्षिप्य
मोक्षाय गृहेभ्यः प्रव्रजद्भ्यः शाण्डिल्य-नारदादि-परम-ऋषिभ्यस्
तद्-अभिलिषित-निरतिशय-निश्रेयसैक-साधन--
स्वावगमाराधनावबोधिनीं पञ्चरात्र-संहितां निरमिमीतेति निश्चीयते ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

०८ तन्त्रान्तराद् भेदः②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च तन्त्रान्तरेष्य् एष
न्यायः प्रसरम् अहंति ।
यतस् तत्-तन्-निबन्दधृणां
विभ्रमाद्य् अपि संभवि ॥

▼ Buitenen

83. This argument cannot be extended to other Tantras, for in the various authors of those Tantras error etc. is possible.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

प्रत्यक्षादि-प्रमाणानां
न हि (तन्त्रान्तर-)मूलत्व-सम्भवः ।
तन्त्रान्तरेषु (प्रामाणिक-)शास्त्रन् तु
मूलं तैर् एव नेष्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अन्यच् च वेद-सिद्धान्त-
विरुद्धाथर्भिधानतः ।
प्रत्यक्ष-श्रुति-मूलत्व-
कल्पना तेषु बाध्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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
sublated.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथा माहेश्वरे तन्ने
विरुद्धं बहु जल्पितम् ।
चतुर्-विधा हि तत्-सिद्ध-
चर्या-मार्गानुसारिणः ॥

▼ Buitenen

For there are four kinds of followers of the way of life set forth in
those Tantras,

▼ नरसिंहः

The followers of the Māheśvara Doctrine are fourfold : Śaivas,
Pāśupatas, Kāpālikas and Kāruṇikasiddhāntins, according to
Vācaspati and Ānandagiri. Yāmuna calls the fourth group,
Kālāmukhas. Rāmānuja follows Yāmuna in calling them so. The
term Māheśvara is a name common for the followers of all these
sects.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथा कापालिकाः काला-
मुखाः पाशुपतास् तथा ।
शैवास् तत्र च कापालं
मतम् एवं प्रचक्षते ॥

▼ Buitenen

the Kāpālikas, Kālāmukhas, Pasupatas and Saivas.
The Kapalika doctrine is described as follows:

▼ नरसिंहः

See M. R. Sakhare, Liṅgādhāraṇacandrikā, pp.331-332:

In the Vāyupurāṇa (ch. 23) and the Liṅgapurāṇa (ch. 24) it is said that Maheśvara told Brahmā that when Vāsudeva is born, he would incarnate himself as a Brahmacārin by the name of Lakulin and that Lakulin would have four pupils of names Kushika, Garga, Mitra and Kaurushya, these would be Pāśupatas. The refutation of the Pāśupata system is found in the Brahmasūtra:
“patyurasāmañjasyāt” (II. ii. 37).

From all this it appears that the Pāśupata school was founded by Lakulīśa (the holder of lakula or lakuṭa — a club or staff). This Lakulīśa (also called Nakulīśa) is the last of the 28 incarnations of Śiva as mentioned by the Purāṇas. This has been confirmed by inscriptions too.

The Kālāmukhas and Kāpālikas were two different sects of the Māheśvaras. Dr. Bhandarkar (in his Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism, etc., P.183), identifies the Kālāmukhas with Mahāvratadharas on the authority of Śivapurāṇa but M. R. Sakhare, on the evidence of a Jain author, states that the Kāpālikas but not the Kālāmukhas were the same as Mahāvratadharas (pp.344 f.).

The Kālāmukhas, according to T. A. Gopinatha Rao (Elements of Hindu Iconography, Vol. II, P.26), were so called as they marked their forehead with black streak and were said to be the offspring of “nara” and “rākṣasa” parents.

The Kāpālika system is very ancient since it is mentioned in the Maitrī Upaniṣad ('atha ye cānye ha vṛthā kaśāyakundalinaḥ kāpālinah')

[Liṅgādhāraṇacandrikā, P.344].

The allegorical drama, Prabodhacandrodaya of Kṛṣṇamiśra (III. 12, 13) introduces a Kāpālika, who

describes himself and his practices as follows:

नरास्थि-माला-कृत-चारु-भूषणः
शमशान-वासी नृ-कपाल-भोजनः ।
पश्यामि योगाज्जन-शुद्ध-जक्षुषा
जगन् मिथो भिन्नम् अभिन्नम् ईश्वरात् ॥
मस्तिष्कान्त्र-वसभि-पूरित-महा-मांसाहुतीः जुह्वतां
वह्नौ ब्रह्म-कपाल-कल्पित-सुरा-पानेन नः पारणा ।
सद्यः-कृत्त-कठोर-कण्ठ-विगलत्-कीलाल-धारोज्ज्वलैः
अर्च्यो नः पुरुषोपहार-बलिभिर् देवो महा-भैरवः ॥

[Ibid. P.345]

Also vide Indian Philosophy by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Vol. I, P.488:

The Rudra of the R̄gveda (I. 114.8), the personification of the destructive powers of nature, becomes in the Śatarudrīya, the Lord of Cattle, 'paśūnāṁ patih'. In the Brāhmaṇas, Śiva becomes the distinctive term for Rudra. The Pāśupata system continues the tradition of Rudra-Śiva. In the Mahābhārata, we find a theology named Pāśupata centring round Śiva [Śāntiparvan, ch. 149, v. 64]. We have an account of this system in Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha and Advaitānanda's Brahnavidyābharaṇa. Śaṅkara criticises this theology in his commentary (II. ii. 37-39).

For a history and philosophy of these different schools of Śaivism from inscriptional data, see V. S. Pathak, History of Śaiva Cults in Northern India from Inscriptions, pp.4-28.

कापालिका:③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

मुद्रिका-षट्क-विज्ञानात्
पुनस् तस्यैव धारणात् ।

अपवर्ग-फल-प्राप्तिर्
न ब्रह्मावगमाद् इति ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

the reward of release is attained by knowing
what the six mudrikas are and by wearing them,
not by knowing Brahman.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

External signs worn by Saiva sectarians.

▼ नरसंहः:

Passages to be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथाऽऽहुः ।

मुद्रिका-षट्क-तत्त्व-ज्ञः
पर-मुद्रा-विशारदः ।
भगासन-स्थाम् आत्मानं
ध्यात्वा निर्वाणम् ऋच्छति ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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
nirvana."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा -

कर्णिकां रुचकज्_(=हार) चैव
कुण्डलज् च शिखा-मणिम् ।
भस्म यज्ञो-पवीतज्
च मुद्रा-षट्कं प्रचक्षते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

The six mudrikas of the Kāpālikas are stated to be the earring, necklace, pendent, head ornament, ashes and the sacrificial thread:

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

कपालम् अथ खट्वाङ्गम्
उपमुद्रे प्रकीर्तिंते ।
आभिर् मुद्रित-देहस् तु
न भूय इह जायते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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."

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

न चेदृश-मुद्रिका-षट्क-परिज्ञान--तद्-धारण--
निन्दित-भगासन-स्थ-देह-ध्यानस्यापवर्ग-साधनत्वं श्रुतयो मृष्यन्ति,

▼ *Buitenen*

Now, the śrutis do not bear out their view that the knowledge of such paraphernalia, the wearing of them and the concentration on the body in the immoral vulva posture are means to attain release,

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

ता हृ ऐहिकामुष्मिक-सकल-विषयाभिलाष-विमुखस्य
अ-खिल--जगत्-कारण-वासुदेवात्म-भावैक-लभ्यं मोक्षम्
आचक्षते -

▼ *Buitenen*

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 Universe:

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

| तम् एव विदित्वा अतिमृत्युमेति
| नान्यः पन्था अयनाय विद्यते
इत्य्-आद्याः,

▼ *Buitenen*

"knowing Him one goes beyond death;
there is no other path to tread etc." (Svet Up. 3.8.)

▼ **नरसिंहः**

Taittirīya Āraṇyaka III. xiii. 1; also Śvetāśvatara VI. 15.

कालामुखाः③

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

एवं कालामुखा अपि
समस्त-शास्त्र-प्रतिषिद्ध-कपाल-भोजन-शव-भस्म-स्नान-
तत्-प्राशन--लगुड-धारण-सुरा-कुम्भ-स्थापन--तत्-स्थ-देवतार्चनादेर् एव
दृष्टादृष्टाभीष्ट-सिद्धिम् अभिदधानाः श्रुति-बहिष्कृता एव ।

▼ **विश्वास-टिप्पनी**

इह कापालिक-कालामुखयोर् भ्रमो भाति।
तद् एव श्रीभाष्ये इनुवर्तितं रामानुजेनेति च श्रीभाष्ये (ii.2.35-37)।

सम्बद्धम् - TW1।

Many antinomian Kapalika rituals were first developed by Lakula-s/Kalamukha-s, the former just took it further. In his thesis Schwartz compares Ramanuja's description of the Kalamukha to the Pingalamata I believe; it matches up very well, but the latter is not Atimargic per se. - Andra

▼ *Buitenen*

The same is. true of the Kalamukhas who teach that certain practices,
which are condemned by all the [[70]] sāstras,
like eating from a skull,
bathing in and tasting of ashes of cremated corpses,
carrying a laguḍa staff,
putting up wine-cups and worshipping the deity in them,
will secure all material and immaterial desires:
these teachings are outside the Veda.

पाशुपता:③

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

यद् अपि पाशुपत-शैवाभ्यां विरुद्धाविरुद्ध-सम- (मिश्रण-) मुग्धं किञ्चिद् अभिहितं
तद् अपि श्रुति-बहिष्कृतम् एव ।

▼ *Buitenen*

84. Also some of the teachings of the Pasupatas and the Saivas in which compatible and incompatible elements are indiscriminately mixed are likewise outside the Veda,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्रैषा पाशुपतप्रक्रिया ।

▼ Buitenen

The Pasupata system is as follows:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

जीवाः पशव उच्चन्ते
तेषाम् अधिष्ठितश्च शिवः ।
स तेषाम् उपकाराय
पञ्चाध्यायीम् अचीकृपत् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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 Pañcādhyāyi. ("The
Doctrine of the Five Chapters.")

▼ नरसंहेतुः

जीवाः ... Vide Pāśupatasūtra with Kauṇḍinya's commentary, I. 1, P.5:

| पश्यनात् पाशनाच् च पशवः । तत्र पाशा नाम कार्य-कारणाख्याः कलाः ।

Also see ibid:

| साङ्गत्य-योगेन ये मुक्ताः; साङ्गत्य-योगेश्वराश्च ये ।
ब्रह्मादयस् तिर्यग्-अन्ताः सर्वे ते पशवः स्मृताः ॥

पञ्चाध्यायीम् ... This Pañcādhyāyi* is, in all probability, same as the Pāśupatasūtra, referred to above. This work is in five chapters, dealing with the five characteristics of this cult, viz., Kāraṇa, Kārya, Vidhi, Yoga and Duḥkhānta, which also go by the name Pañcapadārthas or Pañcārthas.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्र पञ्च पदार्थस् तु
व्याख्याताः कारणादयः ।
कारणं कार्यं विधिर् योगो
दुःखान्तः ...॥

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

There the five Categories are explained, namely,
Cause, Effect, Injunction, Yoga and the Cessation of Misery.

▼ नरसेहः

Cf. Kaundinya's commentary on the Pāśupatasūtra : I-i, P.6:

एवं सदुःखान्तं कार्यं कारणं योगो विधिर् इति पञ्चैव पदार्थाः समासत उद्दिष्टाः ।

Vide Indian Philosophy, Vol. I, P.489:

The five categories are:

1. Kāraṇa or Cause: The Cause is the Lord, the Pati, the Eternal ruler, who creates, maintains and destroys the whole existence.
2. Kārya or Effect: It is what is dependent on the cause. It includes knowledge or *vidyā*, organs or *kalā* and individual souls or *paśu*. All knowledge and existence, the five elements and the five qualities, the five senses and the five organs of actions and the three internal organs of intelligence, egoism and mind are dependent on the Lord.
3. Yoga or Discipline: It is the mental process by which the individual soul gains God.

4. Vidhi or Rules: It relates to the practices that make for righteousness.
5. Duḥkhānta or the end of misery: It is final deliverance or destruction of misery and obtaining an elevation of spirit, with full powers of Knowledge and Action.

For a more detailed explanation of these categories, see Liṅgādhāraṇacandrikā, pp.351-57.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

उपादानं निमित्तज् च
व्याख्यातं कारणं द्विधा ।
निमित्त-कारणं रुद्रस्
तत्-कला कारणान्तरम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

The Cause is of two kinds, material and instrumental.
Rudra is the instrumental cause
and a sixteenth part of him is the material cause.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

महू-अन्तं महद्-आदि कार्यम् उदितं, तद्वद् विधिर् गीयते
गृद्धाचार-मुख-स्मशान-भसित-स्नानावसानः, परः ।
योगो धारणम् उच्यते हृदि धियाम् ओङ्कार-पूर्वन् तथा
दुःखान्तो हि मतो ऽपवर्ग - इति ते पञ्चापि संकीर्तिः (पूर्वश्लोकस्थ-कारणेन सह) ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

Mahat - The highest material evolute.

▼ नरसिंहः

गूढाचार ... Cf. Pāśupatasūtra : IV. 2 : 'गूढवतः'; IV. 3 : 'गूढ-पवित्र-पाणिः'; IV. 4: 'सर्वाणि द्वाराणि पिधाय'; IV. 5 : 'बुद्ध्या'।

स्मशान ... Ibid. V. 30 : 'स्मशान-वासी'

भसित ... Ibid. I : 2, 3, 4 : 'भस्मना त्रि-षवणं स्नायीत', 'भस्मनि शयीत', 'अनुस्मानम्'।

हृदि ... Ibid. V. 23, 24 & 25 : 'अतो योगः प्रवर्तेत', 'ओङ्कारम् अभिध्यायीत', 'हृदि कुर्वीत धारणम्'।

दुःखान्तो ... Ibid. V. 40 :

| अप्रमादी गच्छेत् दुःखानाम् अन्तम् ईश-प्रसादात्।

मुक्ति-कल्पना③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

आत्यान्तिकी दुःख-निवृत्तिर् दुखान्त-शब्देनोक्ता
ताम् एव निशेष-वैशेषिकात्म-गुणोच्छेद-लक्षणां मुक्तिं मन्यते।

▼ *Buitenen*

The system holds that this cessation or release is defined by the annihilation of all the qualities of the differential soul.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इयमेव चेश्वरकल्पना शैवानामन्येषां च ।

▼ *Buitenen*

This conception of God is held by the Saivas as well as the others.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

सेयं सर्वा श्रुति-विरुद्धा कल्पना यतः -

▼ *Buitenen*

[[71]]

And this view of God is entirely, incompatible with Scripture, for

▼ नरसिंहः

This line is wanting in two syllables. Or, this may be taken as a prose passage.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

जगन्-निमित्तोपादानं
परं ब्रह्म श्रुतौ श्रुतम् ।
महानन्दात्मको मोक्षस्
तत्र तत्रासकृच् छृतः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

परस्परविरोधेन
व्याहतैषां प्रमाणता ।
त्रयी-दण्ड-प्रतिक्षेपं
किञ्चिन् नैव प्रतीक्षते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

किञ्च शैवादयो वेद-
सिद्धवर्णश्रमाद् बहिः ।
कल्पयन्त्य् आश्रमादीनि
ततोऽपि श्रुति-बाह्यता ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

यदाहुः -

दीक्षा-प्रवेश-मात्रेण
ब्राह्मणे भवति क्षणात् ।
कापालं व्रतम् आस्थाय
यतिर् भवति मानवः ॥

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

As they say," merely by entering Consecration one becomes
instantly a Brahmin.
A man becomes an ascetic by accepting the Kāpālika vow."

▼ **नरसंहः**

To be identified.

Every school of thought stresses the importance of its own dīkṣā-ceremony. See Śaivasiddhānta, P.47.

तन्त्रान्तर-मूलम् ③

शिवाप्रणीतता ④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च वाच्यम् "अ-प्रमाण-भूतम् इयन्तं ग्रन्थराशि कथं प्रत्ययिततरो रुद्रः प्रणयती" ति ।

▼ Buitenen

86. Let it not be said, How could Rudra, who is very trustworthy, promulgate such a vast collection of texts which are not authoritative?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च समान-नाम-निर्मातृ-स्मरण-निबन्धनम् इति युक्तम्
अति-प्रसङ्गादिति, यतः-

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

(शिवाख्योऽपरः कर्त्तते) नामैकत्व-कृत-भ्रान्ति-
कल्पना उप्य उपपद्यते ।
वेद-बाधान् न चान्यत्र (पाज्चरात्रादौ)
तावता अतिप्रसज्यते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

See the verse “vāsudevābhidhānena” etc. on P.52 above for the pūrvapakṣa-view.

Cf. Tantraśuddha, P.17:

यतः केनचिद् अर्वाक्तनेन क्षेत्र-ज्ञेन महेश्वर-समान-नामा त्रयी-मार्ग-बहिष्कृतेयं
प्रक्रिया विरचिता । तन् नाम नारायणं केचिद् व्याख्याय तन् नाम ...[[??]]
महेश्वर-नामकोपदिष्ट-मार्गम् अवलम्बितवन्तः ।

प्रमादः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

प्रमादोऽपि च नात्यन्तं रुद्रादिषु न सम्भवी ।(4)

▼ *Buitenen*

And error is not entirely impossible in the case of such persons as Rudra etc.

मोह-शास्त्रम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् वा रुद्रस्य मोह-शास्त्र-प्रणेतृतया इवगतत्वाद्
व्यामोहियितुम् एव हीदृश-शास्त्र-प्रणयनम् उपपद्यत इति नावश्यं प्रमाद एवाश्रयितव्यः,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा च वाराहे ।

त्वं हि रुद्र! महाबाहो!
मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ।
कुहकादीन्द्र-जालानि
विरुद्धाचरणानि च ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[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.

▼ नरसिंहः

त्वं ... Ch. 70, śl. 36b.

कुहकादीन्द्र ... To be traced out.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

दर्शयित्वाऽल्पमायासं
फलं शीघ्रं प्रदर्शय ।
दर्शयित्वा जनं सर्वं
मोहयाशु महेश्वर! ॥

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Having shown that the fruit can be won with little effort,
you must delude all these people quickly."84

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

[[139]]

corresponds to Varaha Purana. 70.36 tvam ca rudra mahābaho
mohaśāstrāṇī kāraya

▼ नरसिंहः

The ptd. text of the purāṇa has the following line in the place of
this verse:

अल्पायातं दर्शयित्वा मोहयाशु महेश्वर।

(ch. 70, śl. 37a)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा तत्रैव भगवान् रुद्रः
प्रस्तुत-शैवाद्य-आगमानां स्वयम् एव
वेद-बाह्यत्वं वेद-मार्गाप-भ्रष्ट-जनाधिकारित्वं तद्-व्यामोहैक-प्रयोजनतां च दर्शयति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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,

that only apostates from the Veda are qualified for these doctrines and that their only purpose is just to deceive them.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ये वेद-मार्ग-निर्मुक्तास्
तेषाम् **मोहार्थम्** एव च ।
नय-सिद्धान्त-मार्गेण
मया शास्त्रं **प्रदर्शितम्** ॥

▼ Buitenen

"I have propounded this sastra
as though it were correct doctrine
in order to deceive those who have deserted the Way of the
Veda.185

▼ Buitenen - Notes

cf. Varāha Pur., 70.41, which in cd reads nayasiddhanta sam jñabhir
maya shāstran tu darshitam.

▼ नरसिंहः

The ptd. edn. has the following reading:

नय-सिद्धान्त-संज्ञाभिः मया शास्त्रं तु दर्शितम्।

(ch. 70, śl. 41b-42a)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तस्माद् आरभ्य कालात् तु
मत्-प्रणीतेषु सत्तमाः ।
शास्त्रेष्व अभिरतो लोको
न वेदान् बहु मन्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

From that time onward, O excellent Ones,
the people who believe in the scriptures promulgated by myself
do not respect the Vedas.16

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

cf. Variha Pur., 70.38, which reads in cd shastreśv abhirato loko bahulyena bhaved atah.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ch. 70. śl. 38b-39a. Variant for the second line:

| शास्त्रेष्व अभिरतो लोके बाहुल्येन भवेद् अतः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| तथा पाशुपतादीनि
प्रवर्तन्ते कलौ युगे ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

Thus the Pasupata and like doctrines are active in the Kali Age.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

nearest is Varaha Pur., 70.42, tada pasupatam sastram jāyate vedasanjaitam.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid*. śl. 43a. Variant:

| तदा पाशुपतं शास्त्रं जायते वेद-संज्ञितम् ।

विरुद्धाचरणम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा च भगवत्-परिवारत्व-व्यतिरेकेण
स्व-प्रधान-पूजां पाशुपतादि-तन्त्र-सिद्धां वेद-बाह्यां दर्शयति । (4)

▼ *Buitenen*

Likewise he shows that the worship concerning himself as it is propounded in the Pasupata Tantras and other such Tantras is different and does not form part of the worship of the Bhagavan:

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

तद् वेदबाह्यं कर्मोक्तं
माप् उद्दिश्योपसेव्यते ।
तद् वै पाशुपतं नाम
कनिष्ठम् मोहनं नृणाम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

"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"

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

cf. Varaha Pur., 70.21, yad vedabāhyam karma ...

▼ **नरसिंहः**

To be identified.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

"मां विष्णु-व्यतिरेकेण
पूजयन्ति नराधमाः ।"
इत्य-आदि-वाक्य-जातानि
न लिख्यन्तेऽतिगौरवात् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

"Only the lowest people worship me with exclusion of Visṇu."
The large numbers of statements like the preceding ones will not
be written out here,
because they are too numerous.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

[189]: cf. Varaha Pur., 70.40, mam vimor oyatiriktam ye brahmasiat
ca doijottama bhajante pāpakarmāṇas te panti narakam narāḥ,

▼ नरसिंहः

Ch. 70. śl. 40b. Variant:

| मां विष्णोः व्यतिरिक्तं ये ब्रह्मणश् च द्वि-जोत्तम ।

The next line (41a) of the purāṇa may also be noted:

| भजन्ते पाप-कर्माणस् ते यान्ति नरकं नराः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

व्यक्तज्य वेदबाह्यत्वम् एतच्छास्त्रानुगामिनाम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

It is clear enough that those who follow these scriptures
are outside the Veda,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यथा तत्रैव -

शशाप ताज् जटा-भस्म-
कपाल-व्रत-धारिणः ।
भविष्यथ त्रयी-बाह्या
वेद-कर्म-बहिष्कृताः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ch. 71. śl. 40b-41a. Variant for the first line:

...जटा-भस्म-मिथ्या-व्रत-धरास् तदा ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

कलौ तद्-रूपिणस् सर्वे
जटा-लगुड-धारिणः ।
स्व-च्छन्द-व्रत-वेषाश् च
मिथ्या-लिङ्ग-धरास् तथा ।
ब्रह्म-शापाग्नि-निर्दधा
रुद्र-भक्ता जटा-धराः ॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

[[73]] In the Kali Age all those who assume that appearance,
wearing hairtuft and carrying a laguḍa stick, exhibiting arbitrary
observances and carrying false lingas about,
all these hair-tuft wearing devotees of Rudra are consumed by the
fire of Brahma's curse."
(not identified.)

▼ नरसिंहः

कलौ ... Ch. 71. śl. 51*. Variant:

कलौ त्वद्-रूपिणस् सर्वे जटा-मुकुट-धारिणः ।
स्वेच्छया प्रेत-वेषाश् च मिथ्या-लिङ्ग-धराः प्रभो ॥

ब्रह्म ... Passages to be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

प्रसिद्धज् चैतच् छैवागमेषु ।

▼ *Buitenen*

These practices are well-known in the Saiva scriptures:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

रुद्राक्षं कङ्कणं हस्ते
जटा चैका च मस्तके ।
कपालं भस्मना स्नानम्

इत्यादि ।

▼ *Buitenen*

"Rosary, and bracelet in the hand, a hair-tuft on the head, a skull,
bathing in ashes etc,"

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा चैतेषामादित्य-पुराणोऽपि
भगवत्-त्यागेन समं वेद-त्यागं कथयति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Similarly, he declares in the Aditya Purana that
along with relinquishing the Bhagavan they relinquish the Veda:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अन्ये भस्मजटोपेता
यथोक्ता गौतमात् पुरा ।
शापात् सन्त्याजिता वेदं
देवं नारायणं तथा ॥

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

"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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Passages to be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

किञ्चैते वासुदेवस्य
मन्दा निन्दां वितन्वते ।
ते च पाषण्डिनो ज्ञेया
यथा लैङ्गे समीरितम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

Moreover, those fools who pass censure on Vasudeva are to be regarded as heretics, for thus it is declared in the Linga Purīṇa,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ये तु सामान्यभावेन
मन्यन्ते पुरुषोत्तमम् ।
ते वै पाषण्डिनो ज्ञेया
वेद-मार्ग-बहिष्कृताः ॥(5)

इति,

▼ Buitenen

"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.)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ततश्च -

एत एव च ते एषां
"वाङ्मात्रेणापि नार्चनम् ।
पाषण्डिनो विकर्मस्थान्"
इत्य्-आदि-स्मृतिषूदितम् ॥
"या वेद-बाह्या" इत्य्-एतद्
अपि चेदृशगोचरम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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;

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

read yesAm for eṣām.

supra §52.

▼ *नरसंहः*

पाषण्डिनो ... Cf. Manusmṛti IV-30:

पाषण्डिनो विकर्मस्थान् बैडाल-व्रतिकान् शठान् ।
हैतुकान् बक-वृतींश् च वाङ्-मात्रेणापि नार्चयेत् ॥

या वेदबाह्या ... Ibid*. XII-95:

या वेद-बाह्यास् स्मृतयो याश् च काश् च कु-दृष्टयः ।
सर्वास् ता निष्फलाः प्रेत्य तमो-निष्ठा हि तास् स्मृताः ॥

न वेदाः, न प्रत्यक्षम्④

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

तस्मान् न वेद-मूलत्वं
नापि प्रत्यक्ष-मूलता ॥

तन्त्रान्तराणां युक्तेति
कल्प्यते कारणान्तरम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

परतो प्रामाण्यम् ③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु मूलान्तरापेक्षा
यदि स्याद् अस्तु (अवेद-मूलत्व-)दूषणम् ॥
स्वतःप्रमाणं विज्ञानं
भवतां ननु दर्शने ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

सत्यं तद् एव विज्ञान-
प्रामाण्यम् अपनीयते ॥
बाध-कारण-दोषाभ्यां
ताव् अपि द्वाव् इह स्फुटौ ।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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.

नामादि-साम्यम् ③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एवं श्रुतिविरुद्धस्य
स्फुट-मूलान्तरस्य यत् ॥
पञ्च-रात्रेण साधम्य
(हेतुना ←) तन्त्रत्वेनाभिधित्सितम् ... ।

▼ Buitenen

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,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

क्रियात्वेन तु साधम्य
ब्रह्म-हत्याऽश्वमेधयोः ॥(5)
श्रुति-प्रत्यक्षयोस् तत्र
यतो मूलत्व-निश्चयः ।

▼ Buitenen

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.~~

०९ श्रुत्य-अनुवादोचित्यम्②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु च श्रुति-मूलत्वे
 वेदाद् एवार्थ-सिद्धितः ॥
 तत्-प्रणेतृ--स्व-तन्त्रत्व-
 कल्पना नेत्र्य अचूचुदम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नैवं न कल्प्यते पुंसि
 स्वातन्त्र्यं, श्रूयते हि तत् ॥
 "तस्याध्यक्षम् इदं सर्व"
 "भीषाऽस्माद् इदम्" आदिषु ।

▼ Buitenen

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.)

▼ नरासेहः:

तस्याध्यक्ष ... To be traced out.

भीषास्मादि ... Taittirīya Āraṇyaka : VIII. 8. 1a; also Taittirīyopaniṣat: II. 8. 1a.

१० न वेद-बाह्यम्②

वेद-मूलता③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु वेदमूला एव चेदेताः पञ्चरात्र-स्मृतयः -
किं तर्हि तद्-अर्थ-स्मरणवत् तन्-मूल-भूत-वेद-वाक्य-स्मरणं नानुवर्तते पाञ्च-
रात्रिकाणाम् ?

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न "चार्थस्मरणस्य प्रयोजनवत्त्वात्
तस्य विफलत्वात् तद्-अनादरणीयम्"
इति युक्तम्,
न हि यतः प्रामाण्यं तदेव विस्मर्तु युक्तम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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 derives.

▼ नरसिंहः

'तस्य' मूल-भूत-वेद-वाक्य-स्मरणस्येत् अर्थः ।

न हि ... Cf. Tantravārtika under I. iii. 1, P.73:

| न हि यत् कृतं प्रामाण्यं, तद् एव विस्मर्तुं युज्यते ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| अथ विस्मरणोपपत्तये प्रलीन-नित्यानुमेय-शाखा-मूलता आश्रीयते।

▼ Buitenen

[[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,

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. ibid : I-iii-1, P.73:

| यदि तु प्रलीन-शाखा-मूलता कल्प्येत, ततस् सर्वासां बुद्धादि-स्मृतीनाम् अपि,
तद्-द्वारं प्रामाण्यं प्रसञ्जेत । यस्यैव च यद् अभिप्रेतं स एव तत् प्रलीन-शाखा-
मस्तके निक्षिप्य प्रमाणी-कुर्यात् । अथ विद्यमान-शाखा-गता एवैते ऽर्थः; तथापि
मन्वादय इति सर्वे पुरुषास् एवोपलप्स्यन्ते । युक्ततरा च स्वाध्यायाध्ययन-विधेः
साक्षाद् वेदाद् एव प्रतीतिर् इति स्मृति-प्रणयन-वैयर्थ्यं स्यात् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| तदा यद् एव येन प्रमाणतया परिगृहीतं
स तत्-प्रलीन-शाखा-मस्तके निक्षिप्य प्रमाणी-कुर्यात् ।
नित्यानुमेय-प्रलीन-शाखयोस्तु स्व-रूप-सिद्धिर् एव दुर्लभा ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अथ विद्यमान-शाखा-मूला एव ताः स्मृतयः।
तदा तत्-प्रणेतृवद्
अन्येऽपि तत एवोपलभेरन्
इति ग्रन्थ-प्रणयन-प्रयास-वैयर्थ्यम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

अत्रोच्यते -
स खलु भगवान् अमोघ-सहज-संवेदन-साक्षाद्-भवद्--अखिल-वेद-राशिर्
विप्रकीर्ण-विविध-विध्य---अर्थ-वाद--मन्त्रात्मकान्
एक-शाखाध्ययन-धारणादिष्व् अ-धीर-धियो भक्तान् **अवलोक्य**
तद्-अनुकम्पया लघुनोपायेन
तद्-अर्थ **संक्षिप्योपदिदेशेति**
न किञ्चिद् अनुपन्नम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथाऽऽहुः -

वेदान्तेषु यथासारं
सङ्घृत्य भगवान् हरिः ।
भक्तानुकम्पया विद्वान्
सञ्चिक्षेप यथा-सुखम् ॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

As they say

"The blessed Hari took the essence of the Upanisads and condensed it,
the Sage, out of compassion with his devotees for their convenience."

▼ नरसिंहः

Mahābhārata, śāntiparvan, ch. 348. śl. 64.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एते च मन्त्र-आदि-समस्त-स्मरण-साधारणाः पर्यनुयोगास्
तन्त्र-टीका-कृत-परिश्रमाणाम् अनायास-परिहार्या
इति नेह प्रपञ्च्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

The other objections made,
which are equally applicable to all Traditions of Manu and the others,
are easily answered by all those who have made a diligent study of
the commentaries on the Tantras and are not further enlarged upon here.

▼ नरसिंहः

This is another name for Tantravārtika of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa.

न वेद-निन्दा③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ननु चेदं वेद-मूलत्वं पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्राणाम् अनुपपत्तं वेद-निन्दा-दर्शनात्,

▼ Buitenen

90. OBJECTION.

The thesis that the Pañcarātra Tantras are based on the Veda is disproved by the fact that we find in these very Tantras a condemnation of the Veda.

▼ नरसिंहः

See p. 17 above, for the pūrvapakṣa-view.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

उक्तं हि

चतुषु वेदेषु पुरुषार्थम् अलभमानः
शाण्डिल्य (प्. ५२) इदं शास्त्रमधीतवान्

इति,

▼ Buitenen

For it is said that

Sandilya, failing to find a meaning of human importance in the four Vedas, learnt this shastra.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Aniruddha Samhitā Ch. I:

शृणु वेदविदां श्रेष्ठम् आत्म-ध्यान-परायणम् ॥ (9 b)
पार्श्व-रथा मुनयस् सर्वे प्रणिपत्य जगद्-गुरुम् ।
ऊचुस् तं मुनयः सर्वे एतद् वाक्यम् अतन्द्रिताः ॥ (12)
वेदास् सर्वे समासेन साङ्गेषाङ्गास् सविस्तराः ।
स्वतः कमल-पत्राक्ष श्रुताः पूर्व दयापर ॥ (13)
श्रेयो-मार्गं न पश्यामः, तद् वदस्व महा-मुने । (14 a)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अनवगत-वचन-व्यक्तेर् अयं पर्यनुयोगः,
न हि निन्दा निन्द्यां निन्दितुं प्रवर्तते
अपि तु - निन्दिताद् इतरत् प्रशंसितुं -

▼ Buitenen

REFUTATION.

This is the objection of someone
who does not know the distinct meaning of the statement.
For this censure does not mean to censure something deserving of
censure,
but rather to praise something else than that which is censured.

▼ नरसिंहः:

अनवगत ... Cf. Śrībhāṣya under II-ii-42, P.831:

यश् चैष केषाज्जिद् उद्घोषः

साङ्गेषु वेदेषु निष्ठाम् अलभमानः शाण्डिल्यः पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रम्
अधीतवान्, साङ्गेषु वेदेषु पुरुषार्थ-निष्ठा न लब्धेति वचनात् वेद-
विरुद्धं तन्त्रम् इति',

सो ऽप्य अनाग्रात्-वेद-वचसाम् अनाकलित-तद्-उपबूङ्हण-न्याय-कलापानां श्रद्धा-
मात्र-विजृम्भितः । यथा

प्रातः प्रातर् अनृतं ते वदन्ति पुरोदयात् जुह्वति ये ऽग्नि-होत्रम्

इति, अनुदित-होम-निन्दा उदित-होम-प्रशंसार्थेत् उक्तम्, यथा च भूम-विद्या-प्रक्रमे नारदेन

ऋग्-वेदं भगवो ऽध्येमि यजुर्-वेदं साम-वेदम् आथर्वणं चतुर्थम्
इतिहास-पुराणं पञ्चमम्

इत्य् आरश्य, सर्वं विद्या-स्थानम् अभिधाय,
सोऽहं भगवो मन्त्रविद् एवास्मि नात्मवित्

इति भूमि-विद्या-व्यतिरिक्तासु सर्वासु विद्या-स्वात्म-वेदना-लाभ-वचनं वक्ष्यमाण-भूमि-विद्या-प्रशंसार्थं कृतम्, अथवा ऽस्य नारदस्य साङ्गेषु वेदेषु यत् परतत्त्वं प्रतिपाद्यते, तद्-अलाभ-निमित्तोऽयं वादः; एवम् एव शाण्डिल्यस्येति पश्चाद् वेदान्त-वेद्य-वासुदेवाख्य-पर-ब्रह्म-तत्त्वाभिधानाद् अवगम्यते । तथा वेदार्थस्य दुर्जनातया सुखावबोधार्थ-शास्त्रारम्भः परम-संहितायाम् उच्यते ।

अधीता भगवन् ! वेदाः साङ्गोपाङ्गाः सविस्तराः ।
श्रुतानि च मयाङ्गानि वाकोवाक्य-युतानि च ॥
न चैतेषु समस्तेषु संशयेन विना क्वचित् ।
श्रेयो-मार्गं प्रपश्यामि येन सिद्धिर् भविष्यति ॥

इति । [I, 3, 4]

न हि ... Vide Śābarabhaśya under II-iv-20, P.139, lines 27 & 28.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथैतरेयक-ब्राह्मणे -

प्रातः प्रातर् अनृतं ते वदन्ति

इत्य्-अनुदित-होम-निन्दा उदित-होम-प्रशंसार्थेति गम्यते । (5)

▼ Buitenen

For instance, in the Aitareya Brahmana
the censure passed on the pre-dawn oblation
"Morning upon morning they speak untruth,"
is understood to praise the post-dawn oblation.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. also Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa II. 1. 2. 7:

यद् अनुदिते सूर्ये प्रातर् जुहुयात् उभयम् एवाग्नेयस्याद् उदिते सूर्ये प्रातर् जुहोति ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

मानवे

ऋग्वेदो देव-दैवत्यो
यजुर्-वेदस्तु मानुषः ।
साम-वेदस् तु पित्र्यः स्यात्
तस्मात् तस्याशुचिर् ध्वनिः ॥

इति साम-वेद-निन्दा इतर-वेद-प्रशंसाथा,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः:

Manusmṛti IV. 124.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथा वा भारते -

चत्वार एकतो वेदा
भारतं चैकम् एकतः ।
समागतैस् तु ऋषिभिस्
तुलया ऽरोपितं पुरा ॥

महत्त्वे च गुरुत्वाच् च च
श्रियमाणं यतोऽधिकम् ।
महत्त्वाच् च गुरुत्वाच् च
महा-भारतम् उच्यते ॥

इति महा-भारत-प्रशंसार्थेति गृह्यते
न वेद-निन्देति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ādiparvan I. 208-209.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एवं पञ्चरात्रप्रशंसेति गम्यते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

In this same way the above statement must be taken as praise of
the Pancarātra.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अथानुदित-होमादेव
अन्यत्र स्तुति-दर्शनात् ।
अ-तत्-परत्वं निन्दायास्
तथा ऽत्रापि भविष्यति ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वेदप्रशंसा बहुशः पञ्चरात्रेऽपि दृश्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

[[77]]

In Pañcaratra, too, we frequently find praise of the Veda;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि तेभ्यः परं किञ्चिद्
वाङ्मयं कमलासन ।
वेदान्तैर् इदम् एवोक्तं
तत्त्व-ज्ञानोपपादकैः ॥

इत्यादौ ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च "चतुर्षु वेदेषु" इति नायम् अर्थः -
वेदेषु पुरुषार्थो नास्तीति

किन्तु

यस् तेषु पुरुषार्थस्
तम् अलभमान

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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..."

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

ननु "पुरुषार्थम्" "अलभमान" इत्यन्वयो न "वेदेषु पुरुषार्थम्" इति,
(येन "वेदेषु पुरुषार्थो वर्ततय्" इत्य् अर्थं गृहीयात्)

▼ *Buitenen*

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."

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

मैवं - व्यावर्त्यभावात्

▼ *Buitenen*

REFUTATION. Don't argue like that, for there is no negation in the sentence.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

न हि वेदेष्व् एवायं पुरुषार्थो न लभ्यते।
अतो वेदेषु यः पुरुषार्थस्

तम् अलभमानः
तद्-आभिलाषी पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रम् अधीतवान्

इति पञ्च-रात्र-श्रुत्योर् ऐकार्थ्यम् एव प्रतीयते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

For it is not so that this purpose of human importance is absent from the Vedas;
hence the sentence "failing to find that purpose of human importance which is in the Vedas,
and desirous of finding it,
he learnt the Pañcarātra Sastra,"
conveys that both Revelation and Pañcaratra have the same meaning.

दीक्षादौ३

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

यत् पुनर् उक्तम्

उपनयनादि-संस्कृतानां भगवद्-आराधनार्थतया दीक्षा-लक्षण-संस्कार-विधानाद्
अवैदिकत्वम्

इति, तद् अयुक्तं,
न ह्य उपनयनादि-संस्कृतानां ज्योतिष-टोमादि-कर्माङ्गतया
दीक्षादि-संस्कार-विधायकम् "आग्ना-वैष्णवम्" इत्य्-आदि-वाक्यम् अवैदिकं भवति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

92. The further objection (Supra § 17) that Pañcaratra is non-Vedic because of the injunction that those who are qualified for Vedic sacraments etc. must undergo such sacraments described as Consecration because they are propitiations of the Lord, does not hold good.

For such statements as agnavaisṇavam.. 201
which enjoin the sacrament of consecration upon those qualified
for Initiation etc. as accessory to the ritual of the jyotiṣṭoma etc.
do not therefore become non-Vedic.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

āgnavaisNava, name of a sacrificial cake offered at the
dikṣaniyeṣṭi.

▼ नरसिंहः

यत्पुनरुक्तम्... See 18 above, for the opponent's argument.

आग्नावैष्णवम्... Cf.

आग्नावैष्णवम् एकादश-कपालं पुरोडाशं निर्वपेद् दीक्षिष्यमाणः,
quoted by Śabara under XII. 1-25, P.319.

Also cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. I. 1:

आग्नावैष्णवं पुरोडाशं निर्वपन्ति दीक्षणीयम् एकादश-कपालम्।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अथ वैदिक-संस्कारात् संस्कारान्तर-विधानं हेतुः,
तद् अनुपपन्नं -
सिद्धे हि पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रस्य अ-वैदिकत्वे
तस्य संस्कारान्तरत्व-सिद्धिः,
तत्-सिद्धौ च तस्यावैदिकत्व-सिद्धिर् इत्य् अन्योन्याश्रयणात्।(4)

▼ *Buitenen*

[[78]]

Or if the ground for its non-Vedic character is the injunction of
sacraments other than the Vedic ones,
the ground is inappropriate,
because of the circular argument it involves:

only if the non-Vedic character of Pancarātra Sastra is proved, it is proved that these sacraments are really different; and if the latter is proved, it is proved that Pañcaratra Sastra is non Vedic.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किञ्च समस्त-वैदिक-संस्कारेभ्यः संस्कारान्तरत्वं वा हेतुः,
उत कतिपयेभ्यः संस्कारेभ्यः?

▼ Buitenen

Moreover, the ground is either that the Pancarātra sacraments are different from all Vedic sacraments, or that they are different from some Vedic sacraments.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न तावद् अनन्तरः कल्पः
उपनयनादि-संस्कारस्यापि चौलादि-संस्कारात् संस्कारान्तरत्वेनावैदिकत्व-प्रसङ्गात्

▼ Buitenen

Not the latter alternative, for this would mean that the sacrament of Initiation etc. is non-Vedic because it is different from the sacrament of Tonsure;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चान्त्यः कल्पः - उक्त-दोषानतिवृत्तेः,
न ह्य उपनयनं समस्त-वैदिक-संस्कारेभ्यः संस्कारान्तरम्।
असिद्धश्च समस्त-वैदिक-संस्कार-व्यतिरेकः -
पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रस्यापि वैदिकत्वाद् इत्युक्तम् एव ।

▼ Buitenen

nor the first alternative, because it does not escape the said defect?

for the sacrament of Initiation is not different from all Vedic sacraments; and we have said that the difference (of Pañcarātra sacraments) from Vedic sacraments is disproved on the ground that Pañcarātra Sastra is Vedic.

विद्या-स्थान-परिगणना③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् अपि

धर्म-प्रमाणत्वाभिमत-चतुर्-दश-विद्या-स्थानेष्व् अ-परिगणितत्वात्
पाशुपतादितन्त्रवत् त्रयी-बाह्यत्वम्

इति तद् अपि द्वैपायन-वाल्मीकि-प्रणीत-भारत-रामायणादि-ग्रन्थैर् अनैकान्तिकम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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 Rāmāyaṇa composed by Dvaipayana and Valmiki.

▼ नरसिंहः

See P.19 above, for pūrvapakṣa.

व्यासेनाङ्गीकारः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यत्तु "भगवता बादायणेन निरस्तत्वाद्" इति तद् असत्, कथं हि भगवान् द्वैपायनः सकल-लोकादर्श-भूत-परम-भागवतो भागवतं शास्त्रं निरस्यतीत्य् उत्प्रेक्ष्येत ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

[[140]] The author of the Brahmasutras is identified with Vyasa Dvaipayana, composer of the Mahabharata

▼ नरसिंहः

See ibid.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

य एवमाह -

इदं शतसहस्राद्धि
भारताख्यानविस्तरात् ।
आविध्य मतिमन्थानं
दध्नो घृतम् इवोद्भृतम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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,

▼ नरसिंहः

Māhābhārata, śānti, 331. 2-3.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नवनीतं यथा दघ्नो
द्विपदां ब्राह्मणो यथा ।
आरण्यकं च वेदेभ्य
ओषधीभ्यो यथाऽमृतम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

and curds from milk,
the Brahmin from the bipeds,
the Aranyaka from the Vedas,
and the amṛta from the herbs

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

इदं महोपनिषदं
चतुर्-वेद-समन्वितम् ।
साङ्ख्य-योग-कृतान्तेन
पञ्च-रात्रानु-शब्दितम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

this Mahopanisada which is consistent with the four Vedas and the demonstrations of Sankhya and Yoga is called the Pañcaratra.

▼ **नरसिंहः:**

Ibid. 326. 100.

इदं पञ्च-रात्रं महोपनिषदं — महतीनाम् उपनिषदाम् अर्थ-प्रतिपादकम्, वेदार्थ-प्रतिपादकम्, साङ्ख्य-योग-सिद्धान्त[[??]] चेत्य् अर्थः ।

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

इदं श्रेय इदं ब्रह्म
इदं हितम् अनुत्तमम् ।
ऋग्-यजुस्-सामभिर् जुष्टम्
अथर्वाङ्गिरसैस् तथा ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

This is bliss, this is brahman,
this is the summum bonum.

Being consistent with Rk, Yajuh and Saman and the
Atharvāṅgirasas,

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. (Gorakhpur edn.) 322. 33a, 41b.

ऋभिः सामभिः अथर्वेण अङ्गिरसा च दृष्टा ये मन्त्राः तैर् अपि जुषं सहितम् इति भावः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

भविष्यति प्रमाणं वै एतदेवानुशासनम् ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

this discipline will of a certainty be authoritative.204

[204]: Mahābhārata, 12 340 (129.76) ff.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. (Critical edn.) 322.41a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

भीष्म-पर्वण्य अपि -

ब्राह्मणैः क्षत्रियैर् वैश्यैः
शूद्रैश्च कृत-लक्षणैः ।
अर्चनीयश्च सेव्यश्च
पूजनीयश्च माधवः ॥

▼ Buitenen

And in the Bhismaparvan too:

"Brahmins, Ksatriyas, Vaisyas and Sūdras as described are all to worship, serve and honour Madhava

▼ नरसिंहः

ब्राह्मणैः ... Ibid. 62. 38-39.

One of the chief characteristics of the Pañcarātra-religion is its liberal catholicity. It offers hope of salvation to all, without the distinctions of caste and sex.

कृतलक्षणैः ... 'कृत-लक्षणैः', कृत-दीक्षैर् इत्य् अर्थः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

सात्त्वतं विधिम् आस्थाय
गीतस् संकर्षणेन यः ।
द्वापरस्य युगस्यान्ते
आदौ कलियुगस्य च ॥

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

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."205

[205]: Mahābhārata, 6.66 (3012).

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Īśvarasamhitā I. 10 for a similar statement.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा शान्तिपर्वण्यपि -

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अवश्यं वैष्णवो दीक्षां
प्रविशेत् सर्वयत्नतः ।
दीक्षिताय विशेषेण
प्रसीदेन् नान्यथा हरिः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

To be identified.

As all schools of Śaivism, Vaiṣṇavism too insists upon the performance of Dīkṣā-ceremony.

See Sāttvata Saṁhitā II. 11b-12a:

karmavāñmanasaissamyag bhaktānāṁ parameśvara ॥
caturñāmadhikāro vai prāpte dīksākrame sati ।

This Dīkṣā is three-fold, yielding different results to the followers.

Cf. ibid. XIX. 4:

kaivalyaphaladāpyekā bhogaikaphaladā parā ।
bhogadaiva tṛtīyā ca prabuddhānāṁ sadaiva hi ॥

Ch. XIX of this āgama deals with Dīkṣā in detail.

Also see Parama Saṁhitā XXXI. 53:

tisro dīksāḥ kṛtā yena vaiṣṇavena tapasvinā ।
sa eva vaiṣṇavam jñānamakhilam śrotumarhati ॥

Ibid. XXVII. 41b:

| evam dīkṣāṁ tridhā bhinnāṁ uttarottarabhūyasīm ||

Also cf. ibid. VIII. 3:

| sā tu bhaktivaśāt nṛṇāṁ triṣu karmasu niṣṭhitā |
prathamāṁ samaye paścāt tantrajñāne tato 'rcane ||

The Dīkṣā-ceremony is dealt with in ch. VII of this Saṁhitā, in detail. The purpose of Initiation is given in VIII. 1-2:

| ata ūrdhvam pravakṣyāmi dīkṣāyā lakṣaṇam param |
yāmaवाप्या viśuddhātmā vaiṣṇavaḥ siddhimṛcchatī ||
apratīṣṭhasya manasah śreyomārgamavindataḥ |
upāyam bandhanasyāhur dīkṣāṁ dīkṣāviśāradāḥ ||

Also cf. ibid. śl. 6b-7a:

| yastu tīvrḥ prayuñjīta dīkṣāṁ bhaktisamanvitah ||
tasya devaprasādena sakalam siddhyatīpsitam |

The three types of Dīkṣā called Samaya, Tantra and Arcana, are defined and explained in ch. VIII. śls. 7b-11a.

Also, cf. ibid. III. 29b-30a:

| brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyā vaiśyāśśūdrā yoṣita eva ca ||
bhaktiyuktāḥ svabhāvena kuryād devasya pūjanam |

It is said that one who undertakes Dīkṣā is better qualified than one without it. Cf. ibid. III. 39:

| dvidvidhaḥ puruṣo brahman dīkṣito 'dīkṣitastathā |
dīkṣitassakalam kuryāt ekadeśamadīkṣitah ||

Cf. also Aniruddha Saṁhitā ch. IV and Viṣṇu Saṁhitā ch. X for different treatments of Dīkṣā.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वसन्ते दीक्षयेद्विप्रं
ग्रीष्मे राजन्यमेव च ।
शरदः समये वैश्यं
हेमन्ते शूद्रमेव च ॥
स्त्रियं च वर्षाकाले
तु पञ्चरात्रविधानतः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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."206

[206]: Mahābhārata not identified.

▼ नरसिंहः

To be traced out.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा -

वैदैश् चतुर्भिस् समितं मेरौ महागिरौ ।

▼ Buitenen

And likewise: "It has been made commensurate with the four Vedas on the great Mountain Meru."207

[207]: Mahābhārata not identified.

▼ नरसिंहः

Mahābhārata, Śānti*, 322. 28b:

▼ राम-सिंश्रः

(सम -शब्दात्ताद्वितेन इतच्छ्रत्ययेन व्युत्पन्नः समितशब्दो भवति तुल्यार्थः ।)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवम्-आदि-वचो-भङ्गी-
शतैस् सादरम् ईरितैः ॥
वेदान्तसार-सर्वस्वम्
आत्मीयं परमं मतम् ।
पञ्च-रात्रं निराकुर्यात्
कथं द्वैपायनः स्वयम् ।

▼ Buitenen

Now, how could Dvaiपāyana reject the Pañcaratra, which is his own supreme doctrine, comprising the sense of the Upaniṣads, as follows from these and a hundred direct and circumlocutory declarations made with full respect?

[[80]]

▼ नरसिंहः

Yāmuna holds Vyāsa, the author of the Mahābhārata to be one with Bādarāyaṇa, the author of the Brahmasūtra.

११ ब्रह्म-सूत्रे उनिराकारः②

जीवाद्य-उत्पत्ताव् आपत्तिः पूर्व-पक्ष-मात्रम्③

उत्पत्त्यसंभवात्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कथं तर्हीदं सूत्रम् "उत्पत्त्यसंभवात्" इति?

▼ Buitenen

95. OBJECTION. But then how to explain the sūtra
utpattyasaṁbhavāt!? 208

▼ नरसिंहः

Brahmasūtra II. ii. -39.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

कि वाऽस्य सूत्रस्य हृदयम् ?

▼ Buitenen

REPLY. What is the intention of the sūtra?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

इदम् अस्य सूत्रस्य [भावः]

भागवत-शास्त्रे जीवोत्पत्तेः प्रतिपाद्यमानत्वात्
तस्याश् च श्रुति-न्याय-विरोधेनासम्भवाद्
असमीचीनं शास्त्रम्

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

इदमस्य ... The 'pūrvapakṣa' arguments advanced here are those made by Śaṅkara. See his commentary on the four sūtras comprising the 'Utpattyasambhava' or the 'Pāñcarātra' section : Brahmasūtra II. ii. 42-45.

सूत्रस्य ... 'हृदयम्' इति शेषः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यद्यु एष सूत्रार्थस्
तर्हि पञ्चरात्र-शास्त्र-निराकरण-परं सूत्रम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

न हि पञ्चरात्र-शास्त्रेषु जीवोत्पत्तिर् अङ्गीकृता येनैवम् उच्यते ।

(अतो न सिद्धान्त-सूत्रम् इदम् ।)

▼ *Buitenen*

For the Pāñcarātra Śāstras do not accept that the individual soul
has an origin, which assumption would have justified the sūtra's
rejection.

व्यूह-प्रयोजनम्⑤

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

नन्व अस्तीदं वचनं -

वासुदेवः परा प्रकृतिः परमात्मा,
ततस् सङ्कर्षणो नाम जीवो जायते ।
सङ्कर्षणात् प्रद्युम्न-संज्ञं मनो जायते ।
ततोऽनिरुद्ध-नामा अहङ्कारो जायते इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Ahirbudhnya Samhitā V. 28a:

भगवान् वासुदेवस् स परमा प्रकृतिश्च सा ।

Cf. Śaṅkara under Brahmasūtra II. ii. 42:

यत् पुनर् इदम् उच्यते — वासुदेवात् सङ्कर्षण उत्पद्यते, सङ्कर्षणाच्च प्रद्युम्नः, प्रद्युम्नाच्च चानिरुद्ध इति ।

etc.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि तु व्यूह-रूपेण
व्यक्तिर् देवस्य कीर्त्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

REPLY. NO. The personal manifestation of God is described as being constituted by vyūhas,²⁰⁹

▼ Buitenen - Notes

[209]: 'Divisions' of the Supreme God as Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Ahirbudhnya Samhitā, ch. V-

व्यूहा एते विशालाक्षाश्
चात्वारः पुरुषोत्तमाः।
निर्दोषा निरनिष्टाश्च
निरवद्याः सनातनाः ॥ 5.41 ॥
अनन्तमक्षरं [^32]चैतच्
चातुरात्म्यं महामुने।

...

तत्र स्थूल-दशायां ते
व्यक्ति-भावम् उपागताः ॥ 5.43 ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्र संव्यवहारार्थ
जीव-शब्दः प्रयुज्यते ॥
वर्णनाम् आनुलोम्येन
पूज्य-भेद-प्रसिद्धये ।

▼ Buitenen

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 varṇas.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Ahirbudhnya Samhitā- V. 44-

जगताम् उपकाराय
सच्च-चिद्-आनन्द-लक्षणाः।
मन-आलम्बनायैषा[[^]34]
चातुरात्म्य-व्यवस्थितिः ॥ 5.44 ॥

This Samhitā thus clarifies that the four-fold manifestation of the Supreme Lord Vāsudeva, as Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha is for the welfare of the creation, by facilitating mental concentration in different degrees for aspirants of different capacities.

This four-fold manifestation has got a purpose, says the Sāttvata Samhitā, namely, facilitating the worship by the four castes, Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Sūdra, respectively.

It is only the Brāhmaṇa that is entitled to worship all these four manifestations of God, viz., Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and

Aniruddha. For the remaining castes, however, only particular forms of God are ordained for worship. For further details, see the Sāttvata Saṃhitā ch. VII.

Cf. the following passages from the Sāttvata Samhitā

अब्जान्तम् अर्चनं विष्णोर्
 निष्कामेणाग्र-जन्मना ॥ २९ ॥
 एवं सङ्कर्षणाद्यं तु वासुदेवान्तम् अर्चनम् ।
 विहितं क्षत्र-जातेर् वै कर्तव्यत्वेन सर्वदा ॥ ३० ॥
 प्रद्युम्नाद्यं तु वैश्यस्य
 मुसलान्तम् उदाहृतम् ।
 सच् छूद्रस्यानिरुद्धाद्यं
 प्रद्युम्नान्तं सदैव हि ॥ ३१ ॥
 सर्वत्राधिकृतो विप्रो
 वासुदेवादि-पूजने ।
 यथा तथा न क्षत्राद्यास्
 तस्माच् छास्त्रोक्तम् आचरेत् ॥ ५५ ॥
 चतुर्णा ब्राह्मणादीनां
 स्वयम् एवानुकम्पया ।
 चातुरात्म्येन रूपेण
 चतुर्था व्यक्तिमेति च ॥ 12.17 ॥
 एवम् अस्त्व अनुग्रहार्थं तु
 शक्त्यात्मा भावितात्मनाम् ।
 विभर्ति बहु-भेदोत्थं रूपं सद्-वाहन-स्थितम् ॥ [176]

the following from the Parama Saṃhitā 11. 99b-101-

स तु देवश् चतुर्व्युहो
 भुवनेष्व अधितिष्ठते ॥
 धुमार्दिषु परां सिद्धिम्
 अवाप्य हित-काम्यया ।
 वसुदेवस् स्मृतो धर्मो
 ज्ञानम् सन्कर्षणस् स्मृतः ॥
 तथा विमुक्तः प्रद्युम्नः
 अनिरुद्धस् सकलेश्वरः तत्र व्यक्तास् समस्ताश् च
 चत्वारस् तु गुणा इमे ॥

The above passages from the Parama saṃhitā point out that the four forms of the Lord, viz., Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha are intended by the Lord to initiate the qualities of Dharma, Jñāna, Vimukti and Aiśvarya respectively, in the beings created.

The fact that the four manifestations of the Lord are designed by the Ford Himself to facilitate the worship by the four different castes is briefly set both by the Pauṣkara Saṃhitā (ch. 38. śl. 4a, 5a), which Rāmānuja quotes in his śrībhāṣyā under II. ii. 41, p. 829-

कर्तव्यत्वेन वै यत्र
चातरात्यम् उपासते
क्रमागतैः स्व-संज्ञाभिः
ब्राह्मणैर् आगमम् तु तत् ।

C. also Viṣvaksena Saṃhitā XI. 146-147-

वसुदेवः परा मूर्तिस्
स्थापनीया द्विजोत्तमैः ।
द्वितिया स्थाप्यते मूर्तिः
क्षत्रियैर् मोक्ष-काङ्क्षिभिः ॥
प्रद्युम्नाख्या तु विप्रेन्द्र
वैश्यैस् स्थाप्या मुमुक्षुभिः
शूद्रैस् संस्थाप्यते मूर्तिर्
अनिरुद्धो जगद्-गुरुः ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथा इहः —

"वर्णेश् चतुर्भिश् चत्वारः
पूजनीया यथा-क्रमम् ।"

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

It is as they say: "The four vyūhas are to be worshipped successively by the four varṇas successively."

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि च

जीव-मनोऽहङ्कार-शब्दा

न तन्-मात्र-वचनाः

अपि तु तत्-तद्-अधिष्ठानाधिकृत-विलक्षण-विग्रहवत्-पुरुषाभिधाना

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

Besides, the words 'individual soul,' 'mind' and 'ego' do not denote these tanmātras²¹⁰ 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.

[210]: tanmātras here in the sense of the "higher evolutes."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विचित्र-देह-संपत्तिर्

जन्मेति व्यपदिश्यते ।

"तोयेन जीवान्" इत्य् एतद्

यजुर्-मूर्ध्णि यथा वचः ॥

▼ Buitenen

Birth is described as the acquisition of various bodies, as is said in the statement toyena jīvān in the Yajurmūrdhan.²¹¹

[211]: toyena jīvān visasarja bhūmyām, MahānārUp., 1.4.

▼ नरसिंहः

निर्वाह-सूत्रान्तरम्⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च

जीवोत्पत्ति-प्रलयादि-गोचरा: श्रुति-स्मृति-लोक-वादाः

"चराचर-व्यपाश्रयस् तु स्यात् -
तद् (=ब्रह्म) व्यपदेशो भावत्स् - तद्-भाव-भावित्वात्"

इत्य्-अत्रैव सूत्र-कारेण कृत-निर्वाहाः ॥

(अतो न सिद्धान्त-सूत्रम् इदम्।)

▼ Buitenen

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.212

▼ Buitenen - Notes

[212]: BrS. 2.3.16 (17). Translation: "A word descriptive of moving or unmoving beings, has not a secondary meaning [in referring to Brahman], because such a being's existence depends on Brahman's existence."

▼ नरसंहेः:

अपि च ... Here Yāmuna points out the discrepancy in Śaṅkara's division of the Brahmasūtra into Adhikaraṇas. According to Śaṅkara, the aphorism "carācaravyapāśrayastu" etc., forms another topic (adhikarāṇa). He argues that the origination of the

jīva is not of primary significance. But according to Yāmuna, this point has already been clarified by the sūtra : *nātmā śruteḥ”, etc., so much so that the sūtra “carācara” etc., becomes redundant and thus becomes “anadhikaraṇīya”, that is to say that it does not deserve treatment as a separate topic.

चराचर ... Brahmasūtra II. iii. 17.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किं च

"नामात्मा श्रुतेर्,
(तस्य) नित्यत्वाच् च ताभ्यः"

इत्य्-अत्रैव ब्रह्मणो जीवोत्पत्तिः श्रुति-स्मृति-न्याय-विरोधेन निरस्ता सती
न पुनर् उपन्यासं प्रयोजयतीति
अनधिकरणीयम् अधिकरणम् आपद्येत् ।

▼ Buitenen

And since, moreover, the origination of the individual soul out of Brahman has been rejected in the sūtras

"nātmā śruter nityatvāc ca tābhyaḥ",213

it does not occasion a renewed exposition:
an issue which does not need being made a topic would then be
made a topic.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

[213]: 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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. II. iii. 18.

न च कर्तुः करणम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एतेन "न च कर्तुः करणम्" इति सूत्रं व्याख्यातम् ।

▼ Buitenen

[[81]]

96. This also explains the sūtra na ca kartuh karaṇam;214

[214]: BrS, 2.2.43.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. II. ii 40.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न ह्य अत्र कर्तुः सङ्करणात् करणस्य मनस उत्पत्तिर उच्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

for it is not said here

that the instrument, sc. the mind, originates from the agent, sc.
Saṅkarṣaṇa.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

उक्तं हि विलक्षण-पुरुष-वचनाः एते शब्दा इति ।

▼ Buitenen

For we have already stated that these names solely refer to the
persons who uperintend these orders but are themselves different
from them

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

किम् इति वा "कर्तुः करणं नोत्पद्यते" (इति सूत्रम्)?

▼ Buitenen

OBJECTION. Then why this sūtra at all?

▼ नरसिंहः

† Cf. Śaṅkara on II-ii-43-

न च कर्तुः करणम् । इतश् चासङ्गतैषा कल्पना — यस्मान् न हि लोके कर्तुर् देवदत्तादेः करणं परश्च-आद्य उत्पद्यमानं दृश्यते । वर्णयन्ति च भागवताः

कर्तुर् जीवात् सङ्कर्षण-संज्ञकात् करणं मनः प्रद्युम्न-संज्ञकम् उत्पद्यते, कर्तृजाच् च तस्माद् अनिरुद्ध-संज्ञकोऽहंकार उत्पद्यते

इति । न चैतद्-दृष्टान्तम् अन्तरेणाध्यवसातुं शक्नुमः । न चैवंभूतां श्रुतिम् उपलभामहे ॥ ४३ ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

देवदत्तादेः कर्तुः परशु-प्रभृति-करणोत्पत्त्य-अदर्शनाद्

इति चेत्

▼ Buitenen

For we do not find that instruments, like a hatchet, originate from an agent, like Devadatta, so that an instrument out of an agent makes no sense.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

हन्त हतस् तर्हि अपगत-सकल-करण-कलाप--स्व-महिम-प्रतिष्ठ-ब्रह्मणः प्राण-मनः-प्रभृति-निखिल-करणोत्पत्त्यभ्युपगमः

"एतस्माज् जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि"

इति (श्रुत्या)।

▼ Buitenen

REFUTATION. Well, then you reject the general view that all instruments, vital airs, mind etc. have their origin in Brahman which itself is without the entire collection of all instruments and rests solely on its own power; this view is stated in the text: "From it springs the vital air, the mind and all the senses."215

[215]: Mund Up., 2.1.3.

▼ नरसिंहः

Muṇḍakopaniṣat II-i-3.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ "श्रुति-प्रसिद्धत्वात्
तत् तथैवाभ्युपेयते" ।
पञ्चरात्र-प्रसिद्धत्वाद्
इदं किं नाभ्युपैषि भोः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Yāmuna here pleads for the validity of the Pāñcarātrāgamas on the ground that they, like the Vedas, are based upon knowledge that is free from all defects. Cf. the inferential statement made by Yāmuna above:

vivādādhyaśitam tantram pramāṇam iti grhyatām ।
nirdoṣajñānajanmatvāt jyotiṣṭomādivākyavat ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि सृति-प्रसिद्धार्थ-
परित्यागो इतिशोभनः ।

निर्दोष-ज्ञान-जन्मत्वात्
प्रामाण्यं हि समं द्वयोः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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]]

व्यूह-रूप-भगवत्त्वय् उत्पत्ति-करण-सम्भवौ③

विज्ञानादि-भावे वा तद्-अप्रतिषेधः④

चतुर्धा-भाव उपपन्नः⑤

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

यत् तु "चत्वार एते किं
समानैश्वर्य-भागिनः ।
स्वतन्त्राः किम् उतैकस्य
स्वेच्छा-मूर्ति-चतुष्टयी ॥"

इति विकल्प्य

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Cf. Śaṅkara on II. ii. 44.

अत्रोच्यते — एवम् अपि,

तद्-अप्रतिषेधः उत्पन्न्य-असाम्भवस्याप्रतिषेधः; यदि तावद् अयम् अभिप्रायः — परस्पर-भिन्ना एवैते वासुदेवादयश् चत्वार ईश्वरास् तुल्य-धर्माणः; नैषाम् एकात्मकत्वम् अस्तीति; ततो ऽनेकेश्वर-कल्पनाऽनर्थक्यम्, एकेनैवेश्वरेणेश्वर-कार्य-सिद्धेः।

सिद्धान्त-हानिश्च, भगवान् एवैको वासुदेवः परमार्थ-तत्त्वम् इत्य् अभ्युपगमात् ।

अथा ऽयम् अभिप्रायः —

एकस्यैव भगवत् एते चत्वारो व्यूहास् तुल्य-धर्माण

इति, तथापि तद्-अवस्थ एवोत्पन्न्य-असाम्भवः। न हि वासुदेवात् सङ्कर्षणस्योत्पत्तिः सम्भवति, सङ्कर्षणाच् च प्रद्युम्नस्य, प्रद्युम्नाच् चानिरुद्धस्य, अतिशयाभावात्। भवितव्यं हि कार्यकारणयोर् अतिशयेन, यथा मृद-घटयोः। न ह्य् असत्य् अतिशये, कार्यं कारणम् इत्य् अवकल्पते। न च पञ्च-रात्र-सिद्धान्तिभिः वासुदेवादिष्व् एकस्मिन् सर्वेषु वा ज्ञानैश्वर्यादि-तारतम्य-कृतः कश्चिद् भेदोऽभ्युपगम्यते। वासुदेवा एव हि सर्वे व्यूहा निर्विशेषा इष्यन्ते। न चैते भगवद्-व्यूहाश् चतुः-सङ्ख्यायाम् एवावतिष्ठेन्, ब्रह्मादि-स्तम्ब-पर्यन्तस्य समस्तस्यैव जगतो भगवद्-व्यूहत्वावगमात् ॥ ४४ ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

"समानैश्वर्य-भागिते
तुल्यत्वान् नैव कार्यता ।
एकस्य मूर्ति-भेदश् चेत्
किं भेदेन प्रयोजनम् ॥"

इति दूषयति

इति व्याख्यातं

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

"विज्ञानादि-भावे वा तद्-अप्रतिषेधः" इति ,

▼ *Buitenen*

97. OBJECTION. The sūtra vā tadapratiṣedhaḥ 216 is explained as follows: above.

[216]: BrS., 2.2.44.

▼ नरसिंहः

Brahmasūtra-II-ii-41.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् अयुक्तम् - अ-सम्भावनीयत्वाद् विकल्पस्य ।

▼ *Buitenen*

REFUTATION. That is not correct, because an alternative is impossible.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न हि केनचिद् ईश्वर-वादिना
अनेकेश्वरं जगद् अभ्युपगतं
विशेषतश्च च पाञ्चरात्रिकैः -
वासुदेव एवैकः परा प्रकृतिर् इति वदद्धिः;

▼ *Buitenen*

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".

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Aahirbudhnya Samhitā V-28a:

भगवान् वासुदेवः स परमा प्रकृतिश्च सा ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किन्तु स एव भगवान् लीला-विरचित-चतुर्भेदः सकलम् अपि जगत् संरक्षतीति ।

▼ Buitenen

But this one Bhagavān, who has divided Himself into four for reasons of sport, protects the entire world.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. ibid. śls. 21b-24-

तत्र ज्ञानमयत्वेन
देवस् संकर्षणो बली ॥
व्यनक्त्य् ऐकान्तिकं मार्गं
भगवत्-प्राप्ति-साधनम् ।
वीर्येश्वर्यमयो देवः
प्रद्युम्नः पुरुषोत्तमः ॥
स्थितः शास्त्रार्थ-भावेन
भगवत्-प्राप्ति-वर्त्मना ।
शास्त्रार्थस्य फलं यत् तद्
भगवत्-प्राप्ति-लक्षणम् ॥
प्रापयत्य् अनिरुद्धस् सन्
साधकान् पुरुषोत्तमः ।
शास्त्र-शास्त्रार्थ-तत्-साध्य-
फल-निर्वाहिका इमे ॥

Cf. Philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita, p. 156-

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 vīrya, and as Aniruddha with Śakti and Tejas without any diminution of Divinity.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चेदम् अनुपपत्तं -

बल-भरतावरजाग्रजादि-प्रादुर्भाववद् उपपत्तेः,

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

यथैव हि भगवतः स्व-लीला-विरचित-गगन-पवन-हर-विरिज्य- आदि-प्रपञ्चस्य

अचिन्त्य-महिम-लीलैक-प्रयोजनस्य

राम-लक्ष्मण-भरत-शत्रुघ्नादि--स्व-च्छन्दा विग्रहा

न विरोत्स्यन्ते

एवं सङ्कर्षण-प्रद्युम्नादि-भेदा इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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, Śatruघna etc., without there being the possibility of logical conflict in the same manner the divisions of Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, too, are unconflicting.

[[83]]

▼ **नरसिंहः**

CJ. Sāttvata Samhitā IV. 33-34-

यथाम्बर-स्थस् सविता
त्वेक एव महा-मते ।
जलाश्रयाणि चाश्रित्य
बहुत्वं सम्प्रदशयेत् ।
एवम् एको ऽपि भगवान्
नाना-मन्त्राश्रयेषु च ।

तुर्यादि-पद-संस्थेषु
बहुत्वम् उपयाति च ॥ (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. Ahibudhnya Saṁhitā ch. 36 Śls. 64, 65.

प्रतित्रेतायुगं देवः
साधु-त्राण-कृते इरिः ।
राम-लक्ष्मण-शत्रुघ्न-
भरताद्य् आत्मना स्वयम् ॥
चतुर्धा उवस्थितस् तद्वत्
चक्रात्मा हरिर् एव हि ।
गुण-प्रधान-भावस् तु
रामादेर् इव युज्यते ॥

शब्द-विप्रतिषेधो न③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यत् परं "विप्रतिषेधाद्" इति
"चतुर्षु वेदेष्व्" इति (अध्याहत्य) श्रुति-विप्रतिषेधात्,
तन्नाणां परस्-पर-विप्रतिषेधाद् वा ।

▼ Buitenen

98. Furthermore, *vipratiṣedhāt* 217 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".

[217]: BrS., 2.2.45.

▼ नरसिंहः:

Brahmasūtra- II-ii-42. The reading found in the Śrībhāṣya and Śāṅkarabhāṣya is- 'विप्रतिषेधाच् च'. But Yāmuna, throughout has it as 'विप्रतिषेधात्'.

Cf. Śāṅkara on II-ii-45 - 'विप्रतिषेधाच् च'

विप्रतिषेधश्च +अस्मिन् शास्त्रे बहु-विध उपलभ्यते —
गुण-गुणित्व-कल्पनादि-लक्षणः।

ज्ञानैश्वर्य-बल-वीर्य-तेजांसि गुणाः, आत्मान एवैते, भगवन्तो वासुदेवा

इत्य-आदि-दर्शनात्।

वेद-विप्रतिषेधश्च भवति —

चतुर्षु वेदेषु परं श्रेयोऽलब्ध्वा शाण्डिल्य इदं शास्त्रम् अधिगतवान्
इत्य-आदि-वेद-निन्दा-दर्शनात्।

तस्मात् असङ्गतैषा कल्पनेति सिद्धम् ॥ ४५ ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अप्रमाणम् इति तत्र श्रुति-विप्रतिषेधस्तु प्रागेव प्रत्युक्तः,

▼ Buitenen

The former alternative, incompatibility with Revelation has already been refuted as being without valid basis.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

परस्-पर-विप्रतिषेधस् तु

प्रधान-गुण--सामान्य-विशेषादि-न्याय- संपादित-वचन-व्यक्तीनां तन्त्राणां नास्त्य् एव

▼ Buitenen

Mutual conflict between the Pañcarāṭra 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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'प्रधान-गुण-न्यायः' = अङ्गाङ्गि-भावः; 'सामान्य-विशेष-न्यायः' = छाग-पशु-न्यायः।

वचन-व्यक्तीनां = वचनान्वय-क्रमाणाम्।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न्यायानुग्रह-रहितानां तु वचसां
न क्वचिद् अपि परिनिश्चायकत्वम्,
यथा ऽहं

(पदजातं श्रुतं सर्वं
स्मारितानन्वितार्थकम् ।)
न्याय-संपादित-व्यक्ति
पश्चाद्-वाक्यार्थ-बोधकम्॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

The source is yet to be identified. This verse, however, is quoted in full by Sudarśani, in his commentary on the Śrībhāṣya, I-i-1; pp. 168-169-

पद-जातं श्रुतं सर्वं स्मारितानन्वितार्थकम् । न्याय-सम्पादित-व्यक्ति पश्चाद्
वाक्यार्थ-बोधकम् ॥

Vedāntadeśika too quotes this in his Nyāyapariśuddhi, p.151.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तस्मात् सूत्रकारेण
 "इदं महोपनिषदम्" इत्य-आदि-वचनैर्
 वेदेभ्योऽविशेषणाभिमततर-प्रामाण्येषु पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्रेष्व्
 अ-विद्यमान-जीवोत्पत्ति-प्रतिपादनाध्यारोपेण
 तन्-निराकरण-परतया सूत्रं व्याख्यायमानं
 व्याख्यातृणाम् एवाख्यातिं ख्यापयतीत्यलं प्रबन्धेन । (4)

▼ *Buitenen*

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 "idam mahopaniṣadam," etc.)
 the non-existent doctrine of the soul's origination,
 explain that the sūtra means to reject the Pañcaratra Tantras.

Enough.

▼ नरसेहः

इदं ... Mahābhārata, Sānti, ch. 326.100.

'अविशेषण' समानतया इत्य् अर्थः ।

१२ ब्रह्म-सूत्रे उज्जीकारः②

सन्दर्भः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्रैष सूत्रार्थः -
 पूर्वं स्वाभिप्रेत-समय-परिपन्थि--कपिल- काश्यप-सुगत-जिन-पशुपति-मतानां
 श्रुति-न्याय विरोधाद् असामज्जस्य प्रतिपाद्य

▼ *Buitenen*

99. The meaning of the Sūtras is this. First the Author has set forth that the doctrines of Kapila, Kaśyapa, Buddha, Jina and Paśupati,²¹⁸

who oppose the Author's own accepted doctrine, are unnatural²¹⁹ because they conflict with Revelation and logic.

[218]: In BrS., 2.2. [219]: asāmañjasya, taken from BrS., 2.2.37.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अधुना स्वाभिप्रेत--पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्राणाम् अपि इतर-समय-समान-परिगणनाद्
बुद्धौ सन्निहितानाम् इतर-समयवद् अ-सामज्जस्यम् आशङ्क्य
प्रामाण्यं व्युत्पाद्यते (स्थूणा-निखनन-न्यायेन)।

▼ Buitenen

Now, in order to remove the suspicion that the Pancarātra Tantras (which are his own accepted doctrine) are equally unnatural with the other doctrines 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.

▼ नरसिंहः

सन्निहितानाम् ... तन्त्रत्व-सामान्येन सन्निहितानाम् इति भावः।

व्युत्पाद्यते = स्थाप्यते।

▼ राम-सिंशः

स्थूणा-निखनन-न्यायेन +इत्यर्थः -
यथा हि स्थूणां द्रढयितुम् इच्छवस्
ताम् स्वयम् एव हस्तेन परिचाल्य परीक्षन्ते ।

▼ नरसिंहः

- व्युत्पाद्यते = स्थाप्यते ।

जीव-करणोत्पत्त्य-अर्थेन③

पूर्वपक्षः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्रादेन सूत्रद्वयेन पूर्वपक्ष उपक्षिप्यते,

▼ Buitenen

In the first two Sūtras the *prima-facie* case is laid down:

▼ नरसिंहः

According to Śaṅkara, all the four aphorisms of the *utpattyasambhava* section [11-ii-42-45] put forth the refutation of the Pañcarātra.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा हि -

पञ्चरात्रशास्त्रम् अप्रमाणम् उत्पत्त्यसंभवात् -
प्रतिपाद्यमानायाः संकर्षणाद्युत्पत्तेः असंभवात्।

▼ Buitenen

the Pancarātra likewise has no validity, *utpattyasambhavāt*, i.e., on account of the impossibility of Saṅkarṣaṇa's origination which is taught there.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

कथम् असंभवः? उभयथा इष्यनुपपत्तेः।

▼ Buitenen

Why should it be impossible? Because it cannot be established in either of two possible cases;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा हि ।

किन्तु चत्वार एवैते
समानैश्वर्यभागिनः । एको वा स्यात् चतुर्-भेदे
द्वेष्ठा व्युत्पत्त्यसंभवः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

either the four vyūhas are equally sovereign, or else one God exists in four persons; and in either case there is impossibility of origination.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

समानैश्वर्यभागित्वे तुल्यत्वान् नैव सृज्यते । एकात्मत्वे ऽभ्युपेते ऽपि तथोत्पत्तेः
असंभवात् । सदृसृज्यविभागो हि नैकस्मिन् अवकल्पते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

If they are equally sovereign, they cannot be created because they are equal; if only one being is admitted no origination is possible either, since a distribution within one being of creating and created parts is inconceivable.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा

न च कर्तुः करणम्
इतश्च च +अप्रमाणं कर्तुः सङ्कर्षण-संज्ञाज् जीवात् करणस्य प्रद्युम्नसंज्ञस्य मनस
उत्पत्त्य-अ-संभवात्,
न हि देवदत्तात् परशुरुत्पद्यत

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

[[84]]

100. Similarly na ca kartuh karaṇam: Pañcarātra has no validity for the further reason that it is impossible that the instrument, sc. the mind called Pradyumna, originates from the agent, sc. the individual soul called Saṅkarṣaṇa, for the hatchet does not originate from Devadatta.

▼ नरसिंहः

Brahmasūtra II. ii. 40.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एवं वा -

"न च कर्तुः करणम्"।
इतश्च कर्तुः संकर्षणात् न करणम् उत्पद्यते -
ब्रह्मण् एव समस्त-करणोत्पत्ति-श्रुतेः,

एतस्माज् जायते प्राणो,
मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च

इति।

▼ Buitenen

Or there is this alternative explanation of na ca kartuh karaṇam:
and for the further reason that the instrument does not originate from the agent Saṅkarṣaṇa,
since according to the text:

"From it spring the vital air, the mind and all the senses,"

it is revealed that all instruments really originate from Brahman.

▼ नरसिंहः

न च ... Cf. Śrībhāṣya under II. ii. 40, where almost the same words are used.

एतस्माज्जायते ... Mundakopanisad II. 1. 3.

उत्तर-पक्षः - व्यूह-ब्रह्मत्व-मात्रेण④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| विज्ञानादि-भावे वा तद्-अ-प्रतिषेध

इति,
वा-शब्दात् पक्षो विपरिवर्तते ।

▼ Buitenen

101. Then follows: *vijñānādibhāve vā tadapratīṣedhaḥ*.

By the particle *va* this *prima-facie* case is now reversed.

▼ नरसंहेः

Cf. Śrībhāṣya under II.ii. 41- "vijñānādibhāve vā tadapratīṣedhaḥ," where again the same words are used.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यद् उक्तम्

| उभयथाऽपि संकर्षणाद्य-उत्पत्तेर् असंभवाद् अप्रामाण्यम्

इति नैतद् अस्ति ।

▼ Buitenen

What has been said, viz., that there is no validity since in neither case origination of Saṅkarṣaṇa etc. is possible, is untrue:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तस्यास् सङ्कर्षणाद्य-उत्पत्तेर् अप्रतिषेधः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

it is not contradictory that Saṅkarṣaṇa etc. have originated.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि हि विज्ञानादय एते (सङ्कर्षणादयः) न भवेयुः - स्याद् उत्पत्ति-प्रतिषेधः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Indeed, it would be contradictory if they were not vijñānādi.

▼ नरसिंहः

'एते' सङ्कर्षणादयः ।

विज्ञानादिः⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विज्ञानञ् चादि_(श) चेति विज्ञानादि ब्रह्म,
तद्-भावे ब्रह्म-भावे उत्पत्तेर् अप्रतिषेधः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Vijñānādi is a dvandva compound: "knowledge and beginning," that means: Brahman;

thus vijñānādibhāve means brahmabhāve.

Inasmuch as they are Brahman (brahmabhāve), the origination is not contradictory.

▼ राम-मिश्रः

आदीयते -उपादीयते उपयुज्यते सर्वकार्यार्थम् इत्य् आदि सर्वजगन्निदानं ब्रह्म।⁽⁵⁾

अत्र यद्यपि

"उपसर्गं घोः किर्" इति पाणिनीयेन

किप्रत्ययान्तादि-शब्दस्य नित्यपुंस्त्वं प्राप्नोति
 तथापीहूं औणादिक-प्रत्ययेन साधि-भावोऽवगन्तव्यः
 "शिष्टप्रयोगे संज्ञासु धातुरूपाणी"त्यदिना तथैवानुशिष्टत्वेन
 शिष्ट-शिष्टेर् एव च प्रयोगमूलतया अनौणादिकस्यैव पुंस्त्व-कल्पनात् ॥

अथवा विज्ञानं चादिश्वेत्येव पाठः ।
 ततश्च विज्ञानं चादिश्व विज्ञानादि इति समाहारद्वन्द्वः, विज्ञानादीति-कृत-समाहार-द्वन्द्वके
 विज्ञानादि-पदे
 निर्विसर्गक-पाठावलोकन-भ्रान्तित एव
 प्राचीनकोशेष्वपि विज्ञानं चादिश्वेति विवक्षणीये
 विज्ञानं चादि चेति लिलिखुरिति केचिन् मन्यन्ते । (4)

इत एवास्वरसेन कल्पान्तरम् अवललम्बिरे ग्रन्थाचार्याः ।
 एवम् एव च विज्ञानादि-सूत्रे श्रीभाष्येऽपि -
 शङ्कासमाध्य-अभ्यूहनम् इति कृतं
 "कुसृष्ट्या वाचाम्" इति चापरे ।

वस्तुतस्तु श्रीभाष्यकोशेषु आगम-प्रामाण्य-कोशेषु च
 प्रायशो देश-विशेष-नैरपेक्ष्येण विज्ञानादि-सूत्रे
 (विज्ञानं चादि च विज्ञानादि -ब्रह्म तद्वावे)
 इत्येव प्रामाणिकः पाठ
 इत्य् अवश्यं तात्पर्य-विशेषेण स प्रयोगो वक्तव्यो,
 न तु यथा-शुतार्थकादि-पदेनाचरमार्थेन अ-ब्रह्म-साधारणेन ।

अत्रैवम् आचाचक्षमहे आ-समन्ताद् अत्तुं शीलम् अस्येत्य् आदिन् परमं ब्रह्म सुप्पजातौ
 णिनिस्ताच्छील्ये ।

इति पाणिनीयेन ताच्छील्येऽर्थेणिनः,
 आङ्ग चासाधारण्यं विवक्ष्यते तच्च अत्ता चराचरग्रहणाद् इत्य्-अधिकरणोक्तरीत्या
 ब्रह्मासाधारणं कर्मेति
 तादृशार्थकादिपदेन
 निखिल-जगद्-अदन-कर्त्-परं ब्रह्माभिहितं भवति
 तच्च साङ्गत्याद्युक्तदिशा प्रधानधर्मो माभूदिति विज्ञानपदेन विशेष्यते ।

एवं च जन्माद्यस्य यत इति सूत्रे
 आदिपदेन जगत्स्थितिप्रणाशहेतुताया लक्षणत्वेनाभिमततया
 लक्षणेनेतरभेदसाधने जन्मादि-त्रितयस्य संहत्य्-अहेतुतायां व्याप्तत्वासिद्ध्या
 प्रत्येकम् एव हेतुताया वाच्यत्वेन स्वासाधारणरूपेणादिन् पदेन ब्रह्मोपस्थापितं भवतीति ।

सति चैवं (विज्ञानं चादि च विज्ञानादि ब्रह्म) इति श्रीभाष्याचार्याणां
परमाचार्याणां श्री-यामुनमुनीनां चाभिधानम्
अज्जसा समञ्जसम्
इति यथाश्रुतार्थग्राहिणां केषांचिद् अमीषाम् आचार्य-तात्पर्यनबोध-निबन्धनम् एवानुपपत्त्य-
आभिधानम् ।

परे तु संपद्-आदित्वात् क्विपं कृत्वा
तस्मात् स्वार्थं विधाय
आद इति प्रसाध्य
ततो मत्वर्थीयेनिना आदिनपदं सिषाधयिषन्ति ।
तदिदम् अपि प्रक्रिया-गौरव-पराहतम्
इति नातितृप्तये विदुषाम् ।

किं च अच्-छब्दस्य संपदादि-क्विब्-अन्तस्य नित्य-स्त्रीत्वे
ततोऽणि जाते अणन्तत्वेन डीपिऽवश्यं भावेन
आदी इति स्यादिति ततोऽपि नेष्टसिद्धिसंभावना ।

यदपि अदनम् आद इति "भावे" इति सूत्रेण
भावे घजं कृत्वा भावघञ्जन्ताच् च मत्व्-अर्थीयेनिना
आदिन्पद-प्रसाधनं -
तद् इदं घजपोश् चेति पाणिनीयानुशासन-विस्मरण-निबन्धनं
घजे घस्लादेश-विधानात् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एतद् उक्तं भवति -

एकस्यैव परमात्मनो वासुदेवस्यापरिच्छिन्न-शक्तेः
स्वमायावेश-वशात् कार्य-कारण-भावोपपत्तिर्

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

That is to say by virtue of the fact that the unique Supreme Soul Vāsudeva, whose omnipotence is unbounded, enters into them through His māyā, a cause-effect relation is justified.

▼ नरसंहेः

एतदुक्तं ... चत्वार ईश्वरा इति पक्षः परित्यक्तः । तद्-एकत्व-पक्षः समादृतः । एक एव भगवान् सर्वेश्वरः स्वलीलया जगद्-अवनाय चतुर्धा उवतरतीति सिद्धान्तः ।

एकस्यैव ... Vide Ahirbudhnya Samhitā Ch. V-

पुरुषाः पुण्डरीकाक्षा
व्यूहाः शक्तिमया हरेः । [25a]

सर्व-शक्तिमयो देवो
वासुदेवः सिसृक्षया ॥
विभजत्य् आत्मना ऽत्मानं
यस् स सङ्कर्षणस् स्मृतः । [29b-30a]

अनन्त एव भगवान्
वासुदेवस् सनातनः ।
तत्र ज्ञान-बलोन्मेषात्
स्व-सङ्कल्प-प्रचोदितात् ॥
अनन्त एव भगवान्
देवस् सङ्कर्षणो ऽच्युतः । [34-35a]

अनन्त एव भगवान्
प्रद्युम्नः पुरुषोत्तमः । [36a]

अनन्त एव भगवान्
अनिरुद्धो भवत्य् उत ॥ [38b]

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 Śaṅkara regarding the plurality of God is unwarranted.

स्वमायावेश ... This Māyā is the Śakti or the Power of the Lord, termed also Jñāna, Vidyā, Saṅkalpa and so on.

करणोत्पत्तिः - विप्रतिषेधात् ⑦

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यत् तु

न सङ्कर्षणान् मन उत्पद्यते
ब्रह्मण एव उत्पत्ति-श्रुतेर्

इति -

तद् अपि तस्य विज्ञानादित्वेन परिहृतम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

[[85]]

उत्तर-पक्षः - युक्त्या करणोत्पत्ति-सिद्ध्या④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च "न च कर्तुः करणम्" इति किमुक्तं भवति?

▼ Buitenen

102. Furthermore, what is being said in the argument na ca kartuh
karaṇam?

▼ नरसिंहः

अपि च ... These different interpretations are not included by Rāmānuja in his Śrībhāṣya.

न च ... Vide Brahmasūtra: II.ii.40.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किं यस्याः क्रियाया यत् करणं
तत् क्रिया-कर्तुर् नोत्पद्यते,

उत् यद् यत्र क्वापि (*क्रियायाः*) करणं
तत् कुतश्चिद् अपि कर्तुर् नोत्पद्यत इति वा ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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?

▼ *नरसिंहः*

'यत्र क्वापि क्रियायाम्' इति शेषः ।

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

तत्राद्ये कल्पे (\leftarrow "क्रियायाः करणं कर्तुर् नोत्पद्यते")
सिद्ध-साधनतया अनुमानस्य विप्रतिषेधः -

न ह्य अत्र
सङ्कर्षणात् कर्तुर् उत्पद्यमानं मनः
स्वोत्पादने करणं - कर्मत्वात्

नापि स्वोत्पत्तौ (*सिद्धायाम्*) - (तदा तस्य) कर्तृत्वात् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपरेऽपि कल्पे प्रत्यक्ष-विप्रतिषेधः -

उदकाहरणादौ करण-भूतानाम् अपि घटादीनं
कर्तुः कुलालादेर् उत्पत्ति-दर्शनात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् इदम् आह - विप्रतिषेधाद् इति ।

▼ Buitenen

This the Author says in the sūtra vipratiṣedhāt: 'because there is conflict.'

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Brahmasūtra: II.ii.42.

उत्तर-पक्षः - ब्रह्म-कर्तृत्व-निश्चयेन④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् वा सूत्र-द्वयस्यास्य
व्याख्यानान्तरम् उच्यते ।

▼ En - विश्लेषः

Or, we state an alternative explation for the two sutras.

▼ Buitenen

103. ~~As to the other explanation that has been given of these two Sūtras,220

[220]: supra §§96, 97.

▼ नरसिंहः

सिद्धान्त-सूत्र-द्वयस्य - 'विज्ञानादि-भावे वा तद्-अप्रतिषेधः, विप्रतिषेधात्' इति सूत्र-द्वयस्येति भावः ।

विज्ञानम्⑥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विज्ञानादेः (ब्रह्मणः) प्रमाणत्व-
हेतोर् (सद्) भावे, न युज्यते ॥
पञ्च-रात्र-प्रमाणत्व-
निषेधो अतिप्रसङ्गतः ।

▼ Buitenen

since it is *vijñānādi*, i.e. "a ground for validity",221 the denial of the validity of Pāñcarātra is not justified, because it entails overextension.

▼ Buitenen - Note

[221]: ie., as a tatpuruṣa compound "the beginning (source) of (valid) knowledge:" *vijñānādibhāve* "since He (God) is a source of valid knowledge."

▼ नरसिंहः

'विज्ञानादेः' ब्रह्मण् इत्य् अर्थः ।

भावे - सद्-भावे ।

अतिप्रसङ्गः ... अन्यथा मन्वादि-समृद्धेर् अपि अप्रामाण्य-प्रसक्तेर् इत्य् आशयः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्रानुवाद-सन्देह-
ज्ञानानुत्पत्ति-लक्षणम् ॥
निरस्तम् अ-प्रमाणत्वं
विज्ञान-ग्रहणाद् इह (→ "विज्ञानादेर् वा") ।

▼ Buitenen

The invalidity, which is defined by the non-origination of knowledge through repetition or dubiety in the Tantras, is rejected, because vijnAna is taken up here knowledge is actually had from them.

आदि⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वक्त्र-आशय-वश-प्राप्त-
मिथ्या-शंकाऽपनुत्तये ॥
आदि-शब्देन तन्त्राणाम्
आप्तोक्तत्वं विवक्षितम् । (5)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

The term ādi is from Brahmasūtra II. ii. 41- 'विज्ञानादि-भावे वा तद्-
अप्रतिषेधः ।' आदि-शब्देन दोष-राहित्यम्, विज्ञान-शब्देन गुण-साहित्यं चाभिप्रेतम् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि -

यस् साक्षात् कुरुते सदा सहजया बुद्ध्या समस्तं जगद्
यः पुंसाम् अभिवाञ्छितानि दिशति ध्यानैक-संतर्पितः ॥
नित्यावाप्त-समस्त-काम इति यं प्राहुस् त्रयी-पारगाः ।
तस्मिन् विभ्रम-विप्रलभ्न-मुखा दोषा भवेयुः कथम् ॥ (4)

▼ Buitenen

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.?

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. The following verse, which, according to tradition, forms the opening verse of Nāthamuni's Nyāyatattva-

यो वेत्ति युगपत् सर्वं
प्रत्यक्षेण सदा स्वतः ।
तं प्रणम्य हरि शास्त्रं
न्याय-तत्त्वं प्रचक्षमहे ॥

विप्रतिषेधात्⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

उत्पत्त्य-असम्भवो यश् च
पूर्व-सूत्र-द्वयोदितः ।
संकर्षणादि-मूर्त्तिनां
तत्र प्रतिविधीयते (वक्ष्यमाण शास्त्रेण)॥

▼ Buitenen

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 vipratiṣedhāt.

▼ नरसिंहः

पूर्वं जीव-मन-आदीनाम् उत्पत्तिर् न सम्भवतीत्य् अस्य पूर्व-पक्षस्य समाधानम् उक्तम् । इदानीं 'उत्पत्त्य्-असम्भव' इत्य्-आदिना 'मूर्ति-भेदोऽपि कथम्?' इति शङ्कायाः समाधानम् उच्यते ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

"विप्रतिषेधात्" इति पञ्च-रात्र-स्मरणानुमित-भगवत्-प्रत्यक्ष-विप्रतिषेधात् तद्-अनुमित-श्रुति-विप्रतिषेधाद् वेति ।

▼ Buitenen

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]]

▼ नरसिंहः

Brahmasūtra II.ii. 42.

विरुद्ध-प्रमित्य्-उत्पत्त्य्-अर्थन③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यद् वा सूत्राणां न्याय-प्रदर्शन-परत्वात्
पञ्च-रात्र-श्रुत्योर् अ-सन्तम् अपि विरोधं कृत्वा
अत्र चित्यन्ते । (4)

▼ Buitenen

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:

पूर्व-पक्षः④

उत्पत्त्य-असम्भवात् पाञ्चरात्राप्रामाण्यम्⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा -

सति वेदाविरुद्धत्वे
किन् नु मन्व-आदि-वाक्यवत् ।
अ-प्रमाणम् इदं शास्त्रं
प्रमाणं वेति संशये ... ॥

▼ Buitenen

suppose that Pañcaratra is in conflict with the veda, is this śāstra then, like the statements of Manu etc., valid or invalid?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अप्रमाणं (वेद-)विरुद्धार्थ-
प्रमित्य-उत्पत्त्य-अ-सम्भवात् ।
(पूर्वोक्त-अ-सम्भवश्च (सूत्य-अन्तर्वत्) सापेक्ष-
(वेदवत्→)निरपेक्षत्व-हेतुकः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यावद् धि

सापेक्षं पञ्च-रात्र-स्मरणं

न मूल-प्रमाणोपस्थापन-मुखेन स्वार्थं प्रमातुम् उपक्रमते

तावन् निरपेक्षापौरुषेयागम-भुवा प्रत्ययेन

तद्-अर्थस्यान्यथा परिच्छेदात्

तद्-विरुद्धायाः प्रमितेर् "उत्पत्त्य-असम्भवात्" ।

▼ Buitenens

Thus the sūtra utpattyasambhavāt 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,

the cognition which originates from the independent preterpersonal scripture determines the Tradition's sense as being different, and consequently conflicting with itself.

▼ नरसिंहः

For a discussion on the validity of smṛtis when they are in opposition to more powerful means of knowledge, see Tantravārtika under I. iii. 3, pp. 82-103.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तावद्वि पञ्चरात्रस्य

मूल-श्रुत्य-अवबोधनम् ।

प्रत्यक्ष-शास्त्र-शस्त्रेण
यावन् मूलं न लूयते ॥ (4)

▼ *Buitenen*

For Pāñcarātra conveys that scripture is its basis only as long as the sword of direct scripture does not cut its root.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Cf. ibid. p. 87-

tāvadeva sphurantyarthāḥ purastādānumānikāḥ।
yāvat pratyakṣaśāstreṇa mūlameśāṁ na kṛtyate॥

न च कर्तुः करणं वेदः ⑤

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

ननु कथं वेदा वा निरपेक्षा?
यावता तेषाम् अपि भगवद्-अनुभव-सापेक्षम् एव प्रमाणत्वं -
(भगवतः) तत् (=वेद)-कारणत्वात्।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

221: cf. supra § 18.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

This is the contention of the Naiyāyika. He does not accept the “apauruṣeyatva” of the Vedas. They, according to him, are dependent upon the Supreme Being, like the Pāñcarāträgamas, for their validity, so much so they too are “pauruṣeya”, i.e., composed

by the Divine Person. This is the point on which Yāmuna differs from the Naiyāyika. The aphorism “na ca kartuh karaṇam” (Brahmasūtra II. ii. 40) is ingeniously interpreted by Yāmuna to refute the above concept of the Logician, and to establish the “apauruṣeyatva” or the revealed character of the Vedas.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथैव हि पञ्च-रात्र-स्मृतयः तद्-अनुभव-सापेक्षाः,
एवं वेदा अपि

इति

▼ Buitenen

Just as the Pāñcarātra Traditions are dependent on His cognition, so are the Vedas too dependent on His cognition.²²²

[222]: cf. supra § 18.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्रोच्यते -

न च कर्तुः करणं -

न कर्तुर् ईश्वरस्य करणं वेदाः।
क्रियन्त इति करणम्,
कर्मणि ल्पुट्,
अपौरुषेया वेदा इति यावत्।

▼ Buitenen

REFUTATION. To refute this view, the statement is made:

na ca kartuh karaṇam:

The Vedas are not the product of a maker, i.e. the Bhagavān.

Karaṇa here in the sense of "things that are made or produced", by the rule "suffix lyuṭ" in the sense of the object of the action.²²³ This then means that the Vedas are preterhuman.

[223]: karmaṇi lyuṭ Pāṇini.

[[88]]

▼ नरसिंहः

न च ... Brahmasūtra, II. ii. 40.

करणं ... 'करणं' = 'क्रियमाणं' = 'कार्यम्' इत्य् अर्थः।

उत्तरपक्षः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विज्ञानादिभावे वा तदप्रतिषेधः।

▼ Buitenen

107. Vijñānādibhāve vā tadapratīṣedhaḥ.

▼ नरसिंहः

Brahmasūtra, II. ii. 41.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न चैतद् अस्ति पञ्चरात्रशास्त्रम् अप्रमाणमिति।

▼ Buitenen

If, on the other hand, it is not true that the Pāñcarātra Śāstra is invalid,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

किम् तर्हि? तद्-अप्रतिषेधः।

▼ *Buitenen*

then what? tadapratiṣedhah,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

प्रमित्युत्पत्तेर् अप्रतिषेधः।
विरुद्धार्थम् अपि विकल्पेन प्रमाणम् इत्यर्थः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

i.e. non-rejection of the origination of valid knowledge (namely, even when partly conflicting, the conflicting statement may be valid optionally),

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

असम्भवद्-भ्रम-विप्रलभ्म-- भगवद्-अनुभवमूलत्वात् "विज्ञानादि-भावे" ।

▼ *Buitenen*

because it is based upon the direct cognition of the Bhagavān in whom error and deceit are impossible as He is a source of vijñāna (vijñānādibhāve):

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विज्ञानं विशिष्टं ज्ञानम् - असम्भवत्स्खलनम् इति यावत्,

▼ *Buitenen*

Vijñāna means "knowledge par excellence in which no mistake is possible.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अन्येषां हि सर्वधर्मशास्त्र-निबन्धनां
सांसारिकत्वेनासार्वज्ञात्

अनवाप्तन्-अकामत्वाच् च
सम्भाव्यमान-विविध-विष्लवं ज्ञानम्

▼ *Buitenen*

For since all other authors of Dharmāśtras are not omniscient,
as they are involved in samsāra, and since therefore they are also
not entirely self-sufficient,
various lapses are conceivable in their knowledge.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

भगवतस् तु स्वाभाविक-निरङ्गकृशैश्वर्यस्य
श्रुति-शत-समधिगतावितथ- सहज-समस्त-धर्माधर्मादि-साक्षात्-कारम् ज्ञानम्
इति विज्ञानम् इत्युक्तम्

▼ *Buitenen*

Whereas in the case of the Bhagavān, whose supremacy is natural
and unlimited, His knowledge is the immediate insight in all
dharma and adharma, which is natural to Him and true, as is
known from hundreds of śruti; it is this knowledge which in the
sūtra is described as vijñāna,

▼ *नरसेहः:*

Cf. Pādma Samhitā, Jñānapāda, II. 5b:

विज्ञानं भगवज्-ज्ञानं तज्-ज्ञानान् मुक्तिर् उच्यते ।

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

तादृशस्य तस्य
आदिभावे मूलत्वे सति
तद्-अप्रतिषेधः प्रमाणम् एव इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

When such knowledge is the 'beginning,' i.e. the basis, there is
non-rejection, sc. the śāstra is valid.

▼ नरसिंहः

'तद्-अप्रतिषेधः' प्रामाण्यस्याप्रतिषेधः; प्रामाण्यम् इति यावत्।

▼ राम-मिश्रः

अस्मिन् अर्थे विज्ञानस्य आदिभावो विज्ञानादिभाव इति षष्ठीतत्पुरुषः ज्ञेयः

१३ वेद-तुल्य-प्रामाण्यम्②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| ननु कथं श्रुति-विरुद्धस्य तन्त्रस्य प्रामाण्याभ्युपगमः?

▼ Buitenen

108. OBJECTION. But how can it be assumed that the Tantra, which conflicts with scripture, has validity?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्प्रामाण्ये हि श्रुत्या सह विकल्पः प्राप्नोति,

▼ Buitenen

For if it is valid,
it becomes optional beside 89 scripture;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

| (पञ्चरात्रेण) विकल्पश्च अष्ट-दोष-दुष्टः;

▼ Buitenen

and optionality is deficient in the case of the Tantras by eight defects.

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide *Tantravārtika*, pp. 89-90. Cf. *Tantraśuddha*, pp. 11-12:

"व्रीहिभिर् यजेत्", "यवैर् यजेत्" इत्युभयम् अपि वाक्यं प्रमाणम् । तत्र व्रीहि-वाक्याश्रयणे यव-वाक्यम् अनाश्रयणीयं भवति । अश्यक्यत्वात् युगपत् उभयानुष्ठानस्य । तत्र प्राप्तं यव-वाक्य-गतं प्रामाण्यं विना कारणेनापहुतव्यम्; अप्रामाण्यस्य प्रमाणत्वं षष्ठि-गोचर-कल्पम् अभाव-प्रमाणावसेयम् अङ्गीकर्तव्यम्; एवम् अपि केनापि हेतुना प्रयोग-साधनत्वेन यवाभ्युपगमे पूर्वम् अपाश्रय्य[??]] प्रामाण्यस्य पुनर् आश्रयणीयत्वम्; तन्-निरासेनाङ्गीकृतस्य अप्रामाण्यस्य पुनः परित्याग इति चत्वारो दोषा एकस्मिन् वाक्ये प्रसज्जन्ते । द्वितीये ऽपि प्राप्त-परित्यागोऽप्राप्ताश्रयणं परित्यक्तोपादानं यत् आनीतस्य परित्याग इति चत्वारो दोषाः । तथा ऽपि तुल्य-बलत्वात् गत्य-अन्तराभावाच् च व्रीहि-यवयोर् विकल्प आश्रितः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स च वचिद् अन्यतर-परित्याग-कारणाभावाद् अगत्या उभ्यनुज्ञायते,
यथा "व्रीहिभिर् यजेत यवैर् यजेत" इति,

▼ Buitenen

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;

for instance: "He must sacrifice with rice,"
beside "he must sacrifice with barley."

▼ नरसेहः

'वचित्' = वेद-वाक्ये

व्रीहिभिर्यजेत ... Āpastamba Śrautasūtra, VI. 3.1.13.

यवैर्यजेत ... To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि तत्रान्यतरद् अपहर्तु शक्यम् -
उभयोर् अप्य् अन्-अपेक्षत्वाविशिष्टत्वात् ।

▼ Buitenen

In the latter case it is impossible to eliminate one or the other because both **neither** of these statements is characterized by independence.

▼ नरसिंहः

अनपेक्षत्वाविशिष्टत्वात् = अपौरुषेयत्वात् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न चैवम् अपि पञ्च-रात्र-श्रुत्योर् विकल्पेन भवितव्यम् अतुल्यत्वात्,

▼ Buitenen

In the former case, however, there can be no such option between scripture and Pañcarātra,
because the two are not equal;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

निरपेक्षं हि वैदिकं वचनं - अपौरुषेयत्वात्,
सापेक्षं च पञ्च-रात्र-वचनम् इति।
कथम् अनयोर् विकल्पः?

▼ Buitenen

for the Vedic statement is independent, because it is preterhuman,
whereas the Pañcaratra statement is dependent.

So how can they be alternatives and optional?

इतर-निरपेक्षता ③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

श्रूयतां - पञ्च-रात्र-शास्त्रस्यापि निरपेक्षत्वाद् एव (विकल्पत्वम्)।

▼ Buitenen

109. REFUTATION. Listen: because Pañcarātra too is independent.

▼ नरसिंहः

'निरपेक्षत्वात्', वचनान्तर-मूलान्तर-निरपेक्षत्वात् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

कथनु पौरुषेयस्य
वचसो निरपेक्षता ।

▼ Buitenen

OBJECTION. How can a statement deriving from a person be independent?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

इति चेद् इदम् आचषां
पृष्ठस् सन् एष तार्किकः ॥
किम् अस्य बोधकत्वाय
परापेक्षा उभ्युपेयते ।
किं वा निश्चायकत्वाय
यथाऽर्थ-ज्ञापनाय वा ॥
पुम्-अर्थत्वाय वा तत्र
चतुर्णाम् अप्य् असम्भवः ।

▼ Buitenen

REFUTATION.

Let us ask the logician to explain this—
must dependence on something else
be assumed for a statement to be informative,
to give positive certainty,
or to state the truth about its content,
or to serve a purpose of human importance?
All four are impossible.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न खलु "चक्रवर्त्य-उपचारेण भगवन्तं समर्चयेद्"

इतीदं वचनं श्रूयमाणं

बोधकत्वाय किञ्चिद् अपेक्षते,

अन्यत्र व्युत्पत्ति-ग्रहणात्।

▼ *Buitenen*

When the statement is heard,

"One must worship the Bhagavan with the attendance due an emperor," (not identified)

nothing else is required for this statement to be informative, because the meaning of the words has already become known from other contexts.

▼ नरसिंहः

चक्रवर्त्युपचारेण ... To be identified.

व्युत्पत्ति-ग्रहणं विना अन्यत् किम् अपि नापेक्षत इति भावः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च तावता सापेक्षत्वेन दौर्बल्यं -

श्रुताव् अपि दौर्बल्य-प्रसङ्गात्। (4)

▼ *Buitenen*

Nor does this small measure of dependence prove the weakness of the statement's [[90]] validity, for the same weakness would follow for śruthi too.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि निश्चय-जननाय,
न हि "अर्चयेद्" इत्य् एतत् "अर्चयेन् न वे"ति संशयितं प्रत्ययम् उत्पादयति -
व्युत्पत्ति-प्रतिपत्ति-व्याकोप-प्रसङ्गात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि यथार्थत्वाय,
न हा उत्पन्नं ज्ञानं
स्व-कारण-व्यतिरेकेण यथार्थत्वाय अपरम् अपेक्षते -
(वेद-वाक्य-गुणतः) प्रामाण्यस्यायुक्तत्वात्, (गुणत्व-)अनभ्युपगमाच् च ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

If the cause (here: God) is above suspicion, the statement will be accurate.

gunataḥ prāmāṇyasyājuktateūd anabhjupagamāe; my understanding is that a statement has its validity by itself, and no secondary validity in the sense that its content must first be validated by some other means.

The validity itself must be proved (namely by the character of the personal author or by its preterpersonal origin), but once proved, the statement itself is valid.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च पुरुषार्थत्वाय परापेक्षा -
शास्त्र-शरीर-पर्यालोचनाद् एव तत्-सिद्धेः,

▼ Buitenen

Nor is it necessary for the statement to be dependent on something else
in order to serve a purpose of human importance,
for the proof of this purpose follows from a consideration of the entire body of doctrine.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इह ही यथोक्त-संस्कारवतां शास्त्र-श्रवणात् तद्-अर्थ-ज्ञानं,
ततस् तद्-अर्थं पाञ्चकालिकानुष्ठानम्,
ततो निरतिशय-संपत्-प्राप्तिर्
इति शास्त्राद् एवावगम्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

In this case, those who have undergone the afore-mentioned sacraments have knowledge of the content of the statement when they have heard the doctrine,
and hence they perform the "five-times-a-day" rites ([228]: Vaisnava rite observed five times a day: pañcakálika.), which form this content,
and hence they attain to supreme perfection;
this is learnt solely from the Sastra itself.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. AHIRBUDHNYA SAMĀHITĀ ch. XV:

पाज्चकालिकम् अच्छिद्रं कुर्वाणः शत-वार्षिकम्॥ [15b]
क्षेत्र-ज्ञं सर्व-भूतानां वासुदेवं विशन्ति ते॥ [17b]
पञ्च-काल-रतो नित्यं दया-क्षान्ति-धृति-स्थितिः॥ [49b]
प्राप्त-वेदान्त-विज्ञानो वैष्णवं श्रयते पदम्॥ [53b]

आप्ति-निश्चयो नापेक्षितः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथोच्येत

सत्य अपि पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्राणां स्वतः-प्रामाण्ये
यावत् तद्-वक्तुर् आप्ति-निश्चय-पुरस्सरं दोषाभावो नावधायते
न तावत् प्रामाण्यं निष्पाद्यते

इति

▼ Buitenen

110. Or if the objection is raised that,
granted the self-validity of Pañcaratra,
this validity is not complete
as long as it has not been made certain
that there are no defects,
after it has been made certain that the speaker is reliable,-

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् असत्,
न हि दोषाभाव-ज्ञानं प्रामाण्यं निष्पादयति
निर्दोष-ज्ञान-कारणाद् एव तद्-उत्पत्तेः । (4)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च निर्दोषत्वायाप्तत्वादि-गुण-निश्चयः -
सत्ता-मात्रेण तत्-सिद्धेः,

▼ Buitenen

[[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 defectless.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथाह वार्तिककारः -

तदा न व्याप्रियन्ते तु
(अदुष्टताया) ज्ञायमानतया (वक्तु-गुणाः) ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

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]: ślokavārttika, 2.6 7 ab.

▼ नरसिंहः:

Ślokavārttika under I.i.2, śl. 67a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

दोषाभाव-ज्ञानेऽपि
गुणानां सत्तयोपयोगो दर्शितः,

दोषाभावे तु विज्ञेये
सत्तामात्रोपकारिणः ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Ibid. 67b.

हानोपादानादि⑦

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चोत्पन्नम् अपि प्रमाणं
हानोपादानादि-व्यवहारायापरमम् अपेक्षते -
स्मरणाभिलाषाभ्याम् एव तत्सिद्धेः,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथाहुः

स्मरणाद् अभिलाषाच् च
व्यवहारः प्रवर्तते

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

As they say,

"Action proceeds on the basis of recollection and desire."

[231]: not identified.

(अ)कर्तृवत्ता④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च

स्वतः-प्राप्त-प्रामाण्यानां वेदानाम् अपि
यावत् कर्तृ-भाव--निश्चय--पुरस्-सरं दोषाभावो नावधार्यते
न तावत् प्रामाण्यं प्रतिष्ठिति

इति समानं सापेक्षत्वम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

ईश्वरकृततया दोषाभावः⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ

योग्यानुपलभाद् एवानायास-सिद्धे वक्त्र-अभावे
(नद्-अभावात्) निराश्रय (\leftarrow वक्तृ) दोषाणाम् अ-सम्भवाद्
अ-प्रामाण्य-शङ्कैव वेदे नास्ति

इति चेत्

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथाहुः ।

(वक्त्र-अभावे) तत्रापवाद-निर्मुक्तिर् (प्रामाण्ये)
वक्तृ-भावाल् लघीयसी ।
वेदे तेनाप्रामाणतं
न शङ्काम् अधिगच्छति ॥

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

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."**"

▼ नरसिंहः

Ślokavārtika under I.i.2, śl. 68.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

हन्त तर्हि पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्रेऽपि
 सर्व-ज्ञ--सर्वेश्वर-वक्तृ-भावाद् एव
 अ-यत्न-सिद्धे दोषाभावे
 अप्रामाण्य-शङ्का नावतरतीति समानश् चर्चः ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

The similarity of status between the Vedas and the Āgamas, according to Yāmuna, lies in the fact that both of them are understood to be free from the defects that generally stand in their way. The way in which this ‘faultlessness’ is understood, however, differs between the Vedas and the Āgamas. As regards the Vedic texts, there being no author (apauruṣeya), there is no question of any defect ever appearing at all. As regards the Pañcarātrāgamas too, there could be no question of any defect ever arising, on the ground that they are the direct utterances of Vāsudeva, the Omniscient Supreme Lord of the Universe. This is what Yāmuna explains in the succeeding para: “etaduktam bhavati” etc.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एतद् उक्तं भवति -

उभयोर् अपि स्वतःप्रामाण्ययोर् एकत्र दोषाभावनिश्चयः
तद्-आश्रय-पुरुषाभाव-निश्चयात्,
अन्यत्र तद्-विरुद्ध-गुण-वक्तृकृत्वं निश्चयाद्

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यथा

औष्ण्याभाव-निश्चयो नभसि
तद्-आधाराभाव-निश्चयाज्,
जले तु तद्-विरुद्ध-शैत्योपलभाद्

इति । (4)

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

सापेक्षता न बाधिका④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

किञ्च -

सापेक्ष-निरपेक्षत्वे
न हि बाधस्य कारणम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

113. Moreover, neither dependence nor independence is by itself a cause of invalidation.²⁹

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[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, sapeksanirapeksavat is a dual and requires the correction of karanam into kārane, If my understanding of the text is correct.⁽⁴⁾

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

शुक्तौ रजत-बोधस्य
निरपेक्षस्य बाधकम् ... ॥
"नेदं-रजत"-विज्ञानं
तत्-सापेक्षम् अपीष्यते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.)

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

"सेयं (समाना) ज्वाले" ति संवित्तेस्
तैल-वर्ति-विनाश-जा ॥

अनुमा बाधिका दृष्टा
सापेक्षाऽप्य् - अक्ष-जन्मनः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतो निरवकाशेन
सावकाशं निषिध्यते (न तु निरपेक्षेण) ॥
न चेह सावकाशत्वं
भगवच्-छास्त्र-वेदयोः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ श्रुतिविरुद्धस्य
तन्त्रभागस्य दुश्शकम् ॥
वासुदेव-प्रणीतत्वं
निश्चेतुम् इति मन्यसे ।

▼ Buitenen

[[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,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पञ्चरात्र-विरुद्धस्य
वेदभागस्य वा कथम् ॥
अपौरुषेयता-ज्ञानम्
आविर्भवति बाधितम् ।

▼ Buitenen

I ask you :

Why then does the knowledge arise that Scripture is
preterpersonal,
while it is invalidated because it conflicts with Pañcaratra?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तस्यापि वेद-भागत्वात्
तथाभावोऽभ्युपेयते ॥
अस्यापि पञ्चरात्रत्वात्
तत्-प्रणीतत्वम् इष्यताम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कर्तुर् अस्मरणात् तत्र
यदि चापौरुषेयता ॥
तत्-कर्तृकत्व-स्मृत्याऽत्र
किन् न स्यात् तत्-प्रणीतता ।

▼ Buitenen

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 promulgated by Vasudeva just because there is recollection of his authorship?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अस्ति ह्य आ-स्त्री-कुमारं सा
दृढा स्मृति-परम्परा ॥
पञ्चरात्रस्य निर्माता
केशवो भगवान् इति ।

▼ Buitenen

For there exists a strong transmission of the recollection, extending to women and children, that Kesava is the author of the Pancarātra.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्रणीतत्वविश्वासाद्
गजानश्वान् धनं बहु ॥
दक्षिणां विविधां दत्त्वा
प्रतिष्ठादीनि कुर्वते ।

▼ Buitenen

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,

▼ नरसिंहः

For *pratiṣṭhā*-rite, see *Sāttvatasamhitā* Ch. XXV and *Jayākhyasamhitā*, paṭala 16.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

साङ्ख्यस्य कपिलो वक्ता
पञ्चरात्रस्य केशवः ॥
इति स्कन्दपुराणेऽपि
पठ्यते भारते तथा ।

▼ *Buitenen*

In the Skanda Purana it is said that "Kapila is the promulgator of Samkhya, Kesava of Pañcaratra."

▼ नरसिंहः

साङ्ख्यस्य ... To be identified. See *Tantraśuddha*, p.22, for the second half of this verse:

वक्ता पञ्च-पदार्थनां साक्षात् देवो महेश्वरः ॥

Cf. *Mahābhārata*, XII. 337.60a:

साङ्ख्यस्य वक्ता कपिलः परमर्षिस् स उच्यते ।

भारते ...

The *Nārāyaṇīya* section of the *Mahābhārata* (XII. chs. 334-348) is valuable as it is the only fairly full account of the Pañcarātra doctrines that we possess in original Sanskrit....All the bhakti-writers from Rāmānuja down to the present day, assume the reader's familiarity with the principles inculcated therein.

[See G. A. Grierson, "The *Nārāyaṇīya* and the *Bhāgavatas*", *The Indian Antiquary*, vol. 37, pp. 261-62.]

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पञ्चरात्रस्य कृत्स्नस्य
वक्ता नारायणः स्वयम् ॥
इदं महोपनिषदं
चतुर-वेद-समन्वितम् ।

▼ Buitenen

Likewise in the Mahabharata:

"Narayana Himself is the promulgator of the entire
Pañcaratra.
This great Upanisada, consistent with the four Vedas,

▼ नरसिंहः

पञ्चरात्रस्य ... Mahābhārata, XII. 337. 63a. Variant: वक्ता तु भगवान् स्वयम्।
Also cf. ibid. śl. 63b-64a:

सर्वेषु च नृप-श्रेष्ठ ज्ञानेष्व एतेषु दृश्यते ॥
यथागमं यथा ज्ञानं निषा नारायणः प्रभुः ।

Quoting the line 'पञ्च-रात्रस्य कृत्स्नस्य' etc. in his Śrībhāṣya II. ii. 42 (p. 834), Rāmānuja says:

पञ्च-रात्रस्य कृत्स्नस्य वक्ता नारायणः स्वयम् इत्य उक्तवान् । एवं वदतश्चायम् आशयः । पौरुषेयाणां हि तन्त्राणां परस्पर-विरुद्ध-वस्तु-वादितया, अपौरुषेयत्वेन निरस्त-प्रमादादि-निखिल-दोष-गन्ध-वेद्य-वस्तु-विरुद्धाभिधायित्वाच्च, यथावस्थित-वस्तुनि प्रामाण्यं दुर्लभम् । वेद-वेद्यश्च पर-ब्रह्म-भूतो नारायणः । अतः तत्-तन्त्राभिहित-प्रधान-पुरुष-पशु-पति-प्रभृति-तत्त्वस्य वेदान्त-वेद्य-पर-ब्रह्म-भूत-नारायणात्मकतयैव वस्तुत्वम् अभ्युपगमनीयम् इति । ... अतो वेदान्त-वेद्यः पर-ब्रह्म-भूतो नारायणः स्वयम् एव पञ्च-रात्रस्य कृत्स्नस्य वक्तेति, तत्-स्व-रूप--तद्-उपासनाभिधायि तत्-तन्त्रम् इति च तस्मिन्न-इतर-तन्त्र-सामान्यं न केनचिद् उद्घावयितुं शक्यम् ।

इदं ... Mahābhārata, XII. 326, 100-101.

Discussing the position of the Pañcarātra with reference to the Upaniṣads, Dr. D. L. De in his article “Pāñcarātra and the Upaniṣads” [Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. IX], p.648, says:

The Upaniṣads, with no set theory of philosophy or dogmatic scheme of theology to propound, form the root of all the later religio-philosophic systems of the country.

It cannot be said definitely whether the Pāñcarātras confined themselves wholly to the contemporary Upaniṣads in the matter of borrowing. They borrowed probably from the contemporary Upaniṣads as well as from the pre-existing Upaniṣads. The Upaniṣads are the sources from which they drew most of their doctrines.

For a detailed account of these borrowings, see ibid., pp.648-660.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

साङ्ख्य-योग-कृतान्तेन
पञ्च-रात्रानुशब्दितम् ॥
नारायण-मुखोद्धीतं
नारदोऽश्रावयन् मुनीन् ।
ब्रह्मणस्सदने तात!
यथादृष्टं यथाश्रुतम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

साङ्ख्ययोग ... See G.A. Grierson, Indian Antiquary, vol. 37, p. 261:

Nearly the whole Mokṣadharma-parvan consists lectures on Sāṅkhya-Yoga, together with attempts to reconcile it with Brahmaism. One system which results from the attempted reconciliation of these two opposite philosophies is attributed to Pañcaśikha and is explained at some length ... The Nārāyaṇīya, while claiming to describe Sāṅkhya-Yoga really describes the Bhāgavata monotheism as united with this system, but also with more of a Brahmaist colouring than we find in the Gītā.

पञ्चरात्रानुशब्दितम् ... See ibid., p.258:

The Nārāyaṇīya sometimes alludes to the religion which it preaches as the doctrine of the Bhāgavatas, and sometimes as that of the Pāñcarātras. The two terms are not exactly synonymous, for the Pāñcarātras formed only one sect of the great Bhāgavata religion. Prof. R.G. Bhandarkar tells us that Dhruvasena I, one of the earliest princes of the Valabhi dynasty (C. 530 A.D.) is called a Bhāgavata, and Bāṇa (C. 600 A.D.) in the 8th chapter of the Harśacarita mentions both the Bhāgavatas and the Pāñcarātras.

नारायणमुखोद्धीतं ... According to the Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata (Gorakhpur edn.), the Sāttvata-teaching is said to have been announced by the sun:

सात्त्वतं विधिम् आस्थाय प्राक् सूर्य-मुख-निःसृतम् ।
पूजयामास देवेशं तच्-छेषेण पितामहान् ॥

See G.A. Grierson, Indian Antiquary, vol. 37, p.253:

We have no literary evidence as to the train of reasoning by which this doctrine (Bhāgavata) was reached, but to me it appears more than probable that it was a development of the Sun-worship that was the common

heritage of both branches of the Aryan people—the Eranian and the Indian. All the legends dealing with the origins of the Bhāgavata religion are connected in some way or other, with the sun.

See also in this connection, L.D. Barnett, "The Hindu Gods and Heroes," pp. 82-83.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवमादिपुराणोक्तैः
सहस्रे न्याय-बृहितैः ।
वासुदेव-प्रणीतत्वं
पञ्चरात्रस्य निर्व्यथम् ॥
किन्तु वेदस्य नित्यत्वे
विवदन्ते विपश्चितः ।

▼ Buitenen

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]]

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तेन निर्दोष-विज्ञान-
कारणत्वाद् द्वयोर् अपि ॥
निर्विशङ्कं प्रमाणतं
भगवच्छास्त्रवेदयोः । (5)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ विश्वास-टिप्पनी

अन्ततोऽस्मद्-आप्तानां चिरन्तनानुभवे निर्दोषत्वे साक्षात्कृते, नानवस्था, न चान्योऽन्याश्रयः।
कश्चन नूतनो ग्रन्थश् चेत् समस्या स्यात्। नानयोः।
आप्ति-निश्चयः - रक्त-विद्यादि-सम्बन्ध-परम्परया सफलया।
साफल्य-निश्चयः -

- धारणाद् धर्मम् इत्याहुः। केन प्रजा वरं धृता इति साक्षात्कार्यम्

निगमनम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ततश्च च तुल्यशीष्टत्वाद्
विकल्पेन प्रमाणता ॥
इति मत्वैतद् आचष्टे
सूत्रकारो महामनाः।
विज्ञानादिभावे वा
तद्-अ-प्रतिषेध इति ॥

▼ Buitenen

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: vijñanādibhave vaa tadapratiṣedhah.

▼ नरसिंहः:

Brahmasūtra II. ii. 41.

१४ अमोहकता②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु च भगवत्स् सर्व-ज्ञत्वेनासंभाव्यमानायाम् अपि भ्रान्तौ
सर्व-शक्तित्वेन विप्रलब्धमपि भवतीति

किम् इदम् अपि शास्त्रं व्यामोहयितुम् अभिहितम्?
उत वस्तुतोऽवहितबुद्ध्या निबद्धम् इति?

▼ Buitenen

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,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अन्यतर-पक्षावलम्बन-विकलव-मनसां
क इव निर्णयोपायः?
प्रत्युत वेद-विरोधाद् एव विप्लवन-फलम् इत्य् अध्यवस्थाम

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

what way is there to resolve their dilemma? We should prefer to decide that since it militates against Scripture it results in disaster.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्रोच्यते "विप्रतिषेधात्" इति -
समस्त-श्रुतीतिहास-पुराण-लोक-विप्रतिषेधात्।

▼ Buitenen

REFUTATION. To this objection the Author replies *vipratisedhat*, i.e., on account of the contradiction of all śruti, epic, purana and worldly experience.

▼ नरसिंहः

Brahmasūtra II. ii. 42

नाकारणम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि विना कारणेन भगवतः सर्व-शक्तित्व-मात्राद् विप्लावन-शङ्का -

▼ Buitenen

If, without any reason, merely because the Bhagavan is omnipotent, the question is raised if He might have intended to ruin His devotees,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

हन्तैवं सर्वशक्तित्वान्
नरके धार्मिकान् अपि ।
पातयेन् नेति सन्देहान्
निश्चेष्टं जगद् आपतेत् ॥ (4)

▼ Buitenen

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!

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि चायं सर्वशक्तित्वेन विप्रलिप्समानः
किम् अतीन्द्रियासत्यार्थान् वेदान् आदौ निर्माय
स्व-स्व-निर्माण-स्मरण-शक्तिम् अपि हिरण्य-गभीरं अपहृत्य

तत्-प्रभृति स्वाध्याय-परम्पराम् इमां प्रवर्तितवान् न वेति संशयानाः
कथं विश्वसिमः ।(5)

▼ *Buitenen*

[[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?

▼ *Buitenen - Note*

[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..

स्वरूप-विस्तुद्धम्③

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

अथास्य सत्यं अपि सर्व-शक्तित्वे
यावच्-छक्ति-करणे प्रमाणाभावाद् अनवस्थानाद्

▼ *Buitenen*

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,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

भगवतश्च स्व-भावाप्त-कामतया विप्रलभ्य-प्रयोजन-विरहाद्

▼ Buitenen

since there is no purpose for Him to deceive people because He is satisfied in all His desires,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वैषम्य-नैर्घृण्यादि-दोषैर् मात्रया ऽपि चासंस्पृष्टत्वात्

▼ Buitenen

and since He is not in the least affected by defects of partiality and cruelty etc.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. ibid. II. i. 34:

| वैषम्य-नैर्घृण्ये न, सापेक्षत्वात्, तथा हि दर्शयति।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सर्वप्राणिजातस्य स्वभावसौहृदेन व्यवस्थानात्।

▼ Buitenen

because He abides with natural affection for all living beings;

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Śvetāśvatara III. 17:

| सर्वस्य प्रभुम् ईशानं सर्वस्य शरणं सुहृत्॥

दोषास्मरणम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

विप्रलब्धं प्रणीतत्वे च
विदुषाम् अद्य यावत् स्वाध्यायाध्ययन--तद्-अर्थानुषानवतां
तत्-कर्तृ-दोष-विस्मरणानुपत्तेस्
तादृशाशङ्का नास्ति

इति चेत्
तद् एतत् सर्वम् अन्यत्रापि समानम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

तथा हि -

▼ *Buitenen*

Therefore,

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

किम् अस्यावाप्त-कामस्य
सर्वज्ञस्य दया-निधेः ।
अल्प-सत्त्वैर् अ-लब्धार्थैर्
विप्रलब्धैः प्रयोजनम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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)?

▼ नरसिंहः

दयानिधे: ... See G.A. Grierson, Indian Antiquary, vol. 37, p. 260:

India again owes the preservation of the idea of a God of Grace, of the Fatherhood of God, to the Bhāgavatas.

विप्रलब्धैः ... 'प्राणिभिः' *इति विशेष्यम् अध्याहार्यम्।

महाजन-गृहीतता③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विप्रलब्धुं कृतं तन्त्रं
कथं वा परम-र्षयः ।
इतस् ततः प्रशंसन्ति
तुल्य-वच् छ्रुति-मूर्धभिः ॥ (4)

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा हि वैदैस् सह निर्विशेषं
वाराह-रामायण-भारतादौ ।
अमुष्य तन्त्रस्य रहस्यभावं
वदन्ति सन्तस् तम् इमं वदामः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

'निर्विशेषं' समानम् इत्य् अर्थः।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

वेदेन पञ्चरात्रेण
भक्त्या यज्ञेन च द्विज ।
प्राप्योऽहं नान्यथा प्राप्ये
वर्षलक्षशतैरपि ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[96]]

"Through Veda, Pañcaratra, through devotion and sacrifice, O Brahmin, I can be attained, and not in any other way, even in hundreds of lacs of years.

▼ नरसिंहः

Varāhapurāṇa Ch. 66. śls. 19, 14, 15a, 18a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

पञ्चरात्रं सहस्राणां
यदि कश्चिद् ग्रहीष्यति ।
कर्म-क्षये च मद्-भक्तो
यदि कश्चिद् भविष्यति ॥
तस्य वेदाः पञ्चरात्रं नित्यं हृदि वसिष्यति (=वत्स्यति) ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् इदं पञ्च-रात्रम् मे
शास्त्रं परम-दुर्लभम् ॥
तद् भवान् वेत्स्यते सर्वं
मत्-प्रसादाद् अ-संशयम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

This supreme Pañcarātra doctrine of mine, which is not difficult to grasp, that you shall reach to all the world by my grace, doubtless.25

[238]: not identified.

▼ नरसिंहः

Varāhapurāṇa Ch. 66. śl. 18b.

Also Cf. ibid. śl. 11b:

अलाभे वेद-मन्त्राणां पञ्च-रात्रोदितेन वा॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पुराणैश्वैव वेदैश्च
पञ्चरात्रैस् तथैव च ॥
ध्यायन्ति योगिनो नित्यं
क्रतुभिश्च यजन्ति तम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

The Yogins mediate upon the Eternal One with Puranas, Vedas and Pañcaratras, and worship Him with the proper rites.

▼ नरसिंहः

Rāmāyaṇa [uttara] Ch. X (Prakṣipta) [M.L.J. Press], p.1012. The reading found is:

यजन्ति पञ्चभिर् यज्ञैः सततं मधुसूदनम्॥ [61b]

यः पुराणे च वेदे च पञ्च-रात्रे च पठ्यते॥ [62b]

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवम् एकं साङ्ख्य-योगं
वेदारण्यकम् एव च ।
परस्-पराङ्मान्य् एतानि
पञ्च-रात्रज् च सत्तम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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

▼ नरसिंहः

वेदारण्यक ... See Amarnath Ray, "Śrīkrṣṇa and the source of the Bhagavadgītā," Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. IX, pp. 193-194:

Kṛṣṇa was the great religious teacher who brought about a Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Vedānta synthesis....The first book which is fragmentary might have been a remnant of the Āraṇyaka of the Sāttvatas, spoken of in the Nārāyaṇīya account of the Mahābhārata [XII. 348. 31]. When the doctrines of bhakti and avatāra and desireless action were adopted by Kṛṣṇa's followers, they were called Bhāgavatas.

For a detailed account of the alliance between Pañcarātra and Sāṃkhya-Yoga and their influences and counter-influences, see G.A. Grierson, 'The Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas', The Indian Antiquary, Vol. 37, pp. 255-258.

Cf. ibid., Ch. 337. śl. 1:

| sāṅkhyam̄ yogam̄ pāñcarātram̄ vedāraṇyakameva ca |
| jñānānyetāni brahmaṛe lokeṣu pracaranti ha ||

Also cf. ibid. śl. 59:

| sāṅkhyam̄ yogah̄ pāñcarātram̄ vedāḥ pāśupatam̄ tathā |
| jñānānyetāni rājarṣe viddhi nānāmatāni vai ||

Commenting upon the verse “evamekam” in his Śrībhāṣya under II. ii. 39 (p. 834), Rāmānuja says:

साङ्ख्यं च योगश् च साङ्ख्य-योगम् । वेदाश् चारण्यकानि च वेदारण्यकम् । परस्पराङ्गान्य् एतानि, एक-तत्त्व-प्रतिपादन-परतयैकी-भूतानि; एकं पञ्च-रात्रम् इति कथ्यते । एतद् उक्तं भवति — साङ्ख्योक्तानि पञ्च-विंशति-तत्त्वानि, योगोक्तं च यम-नियमाण्य-आत्मकं योगम्, वेदोदित-कर्म--स्व-रूपाण्य् अङ्गीकृत्य तत्त्वानां ब्रह्मात्मकत्वं, योगस्य च ब्रह्मोपासन-प्रकारत्वं कर्मणां च तद्-आराधन-रूपताम् अभिदधति । कर्म--स्व-रूपं प्रतिपादयन्त्य् आरण्यकानि । एतद् एव परेण ब्रह्मणा नारायणेन स्वयम् एव पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्रे विशदीकृतम् इति । शारीरके च साङ्ख्योक्त-तत्त्वानाम् अब्रह्मात्मकता-मात्रं निराकृतम्, न स्व-रूपम् । योग-पाशुपतयोश् चेष्वरस्य केवल-निमित्त-कारणता, परावर-तत्त्व-विपरीत-कल्पना, वेद-बहिष्कृताचारो निराकृतः; न योग--स्व-रूपं, पशुपति--स्व-रूपं च । अतः

| साङ्ख्यं योगः पञ्च-रात्रं वेदाः पाशुपतं तथा ।
| आत्म-प्रमाणाण्य् एतानि न हन्तव्यानि हेतुभिः

इति तत्-तद्-अभिहित-तत्-तत्-स्व-रूप-मात्रम् अङ्गीकार्यम् । जिन-सुगताभिहित-तत्त्ववत् सर्वं न बहिष्कार्यम् इत्युच्यते । ‘यथागमं यथा-न्यायं निष्ठा नारायणः प्रभुर् इत्य् अनेनैकार्थ्यत् ।

Also see Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933), Vol. I, pp. 248-294 for an article ‘The Rāmānujīya and the Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātra systems’.

वेदेन पञ्चरात्रेण
यः पश्यति स पश्यति ।
इदम् महोपनिषदं
चतुर-वेद-समन्वितम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

O excellent one! He who sees through Veda and
Pañcaratra sees truly; this great Upanisada, consistent
with the four Vedas...."

▼ नरसिंहः

वेदेन ... To be identified.

इदं ... Mahābhārata XII. 326. 100a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

वचसाम् एवम्-आदीनाम्
आनन्द्याद् उपरम्यते ।
इत्थं-भूतस्य तन्त्रस्य
विष्लावं यदि शङ्कसे ॥
सर्वत्र स्यादनाश्वास
इत्य् एतद् उपदिश्यते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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:

▼ नरसिंहः

पञ्च-रात्रस्य परम-प्रमाण-भूतस्यापि विष्लावन-शङ्कायां सर्वत्रापि अप्रामाण्य-बुद्ध्या
अनाश्वास एव भवेत् । विप्रतिषेधश् च स्याद् वैदिक-लौकिक-व्यवहाराणाम् इति सूत्रार्थं
समुच्चिनोति 'सर्वत्र स्याद् अनाश्वास' इत्य् अनेन । 'विप्रतिषेधात् इति' इत्य् एतत् पर्यन्तम् एकं
वाक्यम् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

"विप्रतिषेधात्"
इति।

▼ Buitenen

vipratisedAt.

▼ नरसिंहः

Brahmasūtra II. ii. 42.

१५ विरोधाभासे तारतम्यम्②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एवज्च -

विरोधेऽपि विकल्पः स्याद्
भगवच्छास्त्रवेदयोः ।
विरोध एव नास्तीति
प्राग् एव प्रत्यपादयम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नन्व अत्र-भवतां (शाबर-)भाष्यकाराणां विरुद्धंशाप्रामाण्याभिधानं कथम् इव?

▼ विश्वास-टिप्पनी

नात्र शङ्करो भाष्यकार उक्तः - तस्यान्यत्रेह खण्डितत्वात्।
न च द्रमिडभाष्यकारः - उत्पत्यसम्भवाधिकरणे सूत्रेषु तद्-विप्रतिपत्तौ प्रमाणस्याभावात्।

न च श्रुतप्रकाशिकोक्त-पाञ्चरात्रपाशुपतादि-तुल्यत्व-कथकः कक्षन् - यामुनस्य
तत्रानङ्गीकारात्।
श्रुतिपारम्यवादिनं शबरनिभं गौरवास्पदं गृहीतुम् अलम्।

▼ *Buitenen*

116. OBJECTION. However, how can the venerable Author of the Bhāṣya 239 state that those parts which are in conflict are invalid:

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

Sabarabhāṣya and KMS.

▼ नरसिंहः:

This reference by Yāmuna to ‘bhāṣyakāra’ has been taken by some Vaiṣṇava scholars as speaking of Dramiḍabhāṣyakāra, who is traditionally said to have commented upon the Brahmasūtra. But this may be taken as a reference to Śaṅkara himself.

Rāmānuja's Śrībhāṣya also seems to support this position. Cf. Śrībhāṣya under II. ii. 42, p. 832:

यत् तु परैः सूत्र-चतुष्टयं कस्यचिद् विरुद्धांशस्य प्रामाण्य-निषेध-परं व्याख्यातम्,

with the above passage : “नन्व अत्र भवतां” etc. Also cf. Śaṅkara on the above sūtra, p. 259:

यद्यप्य् एवं-जातीयको ऊंशः
समानत्वान् न विसंवाद-गोचरो भवति ।
अस्ति तु अंशान्तरं विसंवाद-स्थानम्
इत्य् अतः तत्-प्रत्याख्यानायारम्भः

etc.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद्यु अपि विरोधः - कृत्वा चिन्तया परिहृतस्
तद् अपि गम्भीर-न्याय-सागरम् अवगाढुम् अ-परिवृढानां कोमल-मनसां
वेदानादरो मा भूद् इत्य्-एवम्-परम्,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ विश्वास-टिप्पनी

अत्रैव वेदस्य सुबोधतरत्वम् उक्तम्।
तच्च वेदाङ्गैस् तद्-उपबृहणेन सिध्यतीति सुवचम्।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथैव हि भगवतो जैमिने: "कर्म-फलोपन्यासः कर्म-श्रद्धा-संवर्धनाये"ति ।⁽⁵⁾

▼ Buitenen

This is comparable to the venerable Jaimini's exposition that the fruits of acts serve to increase people's faith in the acts.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Vedārthasaṅgraha, p. 157:

अश्रुत-वेदान्तानां कर्मणि अश्रद्धा मा भूद् इति देवताधिकरणे अतिवादाः कृताः;
कर्म-मात्रे यथा श्रद्धा स्याद् इति ।

१६ शिष्ट-बाह्य-ग्रहण②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वेद-बाह्य-गृहीतत्वाद्
अ-प्रामाण्यम् अवादि यत् ।
एतद्_(→पञ्चरात्र)-बाह्य-गृहीतत्वाद्
वेदानां वा कुतो न तत् ॥⁽⁴⁾

▼ Buitenen

117. The contention has been voiced that Pañcarātra is invalid because it is accepted by those who are outside the Veda." 240 But why could one not equally well contend that the Vedas are invalid because they are accepted by those who are outside Pancarātra?

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

[240]: supra § 17: vedabāhyagrīhatvāt. I have rendered grīta by "accepted' to cover approximately the variety of meanings that Yāmuna detects in the word.

▼ नरसिंहः

See the verse 'विवादाध्यासित' etc., p. 17 above.

बाह्यत्वे गृहीतत्वे च विकल्पाः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि च ।

किं चेदं वेद-बाह्यत्वं,
का वा स्यात् तद्-गृहीतता ।
किम् अङ्ग वेदाद् अन्यत्वं,
वेद-बाह्यत्वम् उच्यते ॥
(उत) तन्-निषिद्धार्थ-कारित्वम्,
आहो (स्वित) तद्-द्वेष-शीलता ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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?"

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा -

गृहीतत्वम् (नाम) अधीतत्वं
ज्ञातत्वं वा विचार्यताम् ।
क्रियमाणार्थता वा स्पाद्
+धेतुः सर्वत्र दुष्पत्ति ॥

▼ Buitenen

Likewise we must inquire whether "accepted" means learnt" or "known" or "observed."

In all cases the ground proves to be defective, 35

वेद-भिन्नैर् अधीतता ज्ञातता③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्र तावद् -

यदि वेदाद् विभिन्नत्वं
बाह्यत्वं, साऽप्य् अधीतता ।
"वेदाद् अन्यैस् त्रिभिर् वर्णेर्
अधीतं वैदिकं वचः ।
प्रमाणम् (पाञ्चरात्रं त्वं अप्रमाणम् उक्तम्)" इत्य् अनैकान्त्यं
हेतोस् तत्र प्रसज्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ज्ञातत्वे ऽपि गृहीतत्वे
दोषाद् असमान् न मुच्यसे ।

▼ Buitenen

If you take "accepted" to mean "known," you do not get rid of the same defect.

वेद-भिन्नैः क्रियमाणार्थता③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पूर्वोक्तं वेद-बाह्यत्वं,
क्रियमाणार्थता यदि ॥
गृहीतताऽपि, वेदैः (तद-गृहीतैः) स्यात्
तथैव व्यभिचारिता ।

▼ Buitenen

If the term "outside the Veda" means "different from the Veda," and "accepted" means "observed," then there would likewise be an occasional application of the ground to the Vedas themselves.

प्रतिषिद्धार्थ-कर्तृत्वे③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रतिषिद्धार्थ-कर्तृत्वे
वेद-बाह्यत्व-लक्षणे ॥
व्यभिचारस् त्रयी-वाक्यैः
प्रायश्चित्त-विधायकैः । (4)

▼ Buitenen

If "outside the Veda" is taken to mean "performing forbidden acts," the ground has an occasional application to those statements of the Veda which enjoin expiatory ceremonies. ([241]: Manusmrti, 8.107.)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रायश्चित्त-विधायकानि वाक्यानि
"कूष्माण्डैर् जुहुयात्" इत्यादीनि
प्रतिषिद्ध-कारिभिर् अधीत-गृहीतानुषीयमानार्थन्य् एव प्रमाणानीति
तादृश-वेद-बाह्य-गृहीतत्वम् अनैकान्तिकम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Bodhāyanadharmaśūtra, III. vii. 1:

| कूष्माण्डैर् जुहुयात् योऽपूत इव मन्येत ।

वेद-द्वेषि-ग्रहणम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि वेद-द्वेषि-जन-परिगृहीतत्वाद् अ-प्रामाण्यं पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्राणाम्,
हेतोर् असिद्धत्वात्

▼ *Buitenen*

Nor are the Pañcaratra Tantras invalid
because they are "accepted" by people hostile to the Veda,
for the ground is unproved.

▼ नरसिंहः

The argument here is that the handling of Vedic texts by the unorthodox people like the Buddhists and the Jains, cannot bring down the authoritative character of those texts. Otherwise, the Vedas would long ago, have become invalid since the unorthodox schools of thought tried to explain the Vedic passages as they pleased contradicting their original significance. The authority of the Vedas is for all time to come and the wrong handling of those texts by others cannot undermine it.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि च न वेद-द्वेषि-जन-परिग्रहः प्रामाण्यं प्रतिहन्ति,

▼ *Buitenen*

Besides, acceptance by people hostile to the Veda does not by itself refute the validity of what is accepted. (5)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि हि प्रतिहन्यात् - निर्गालस् तर्हि नास्तिकानां पन्था: (तत्-परिग्रहेण),
ते हि वेद-प्रामाण्य-प्रोत्सादनाय प्रयस्यन्तः (←यस्) ।

▼ *Buitenen*

If it did, the Path of the Heretics would be unbarred;
for they endeavour to uproot the validity of the Veda.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कथञ्चिद् वेद-वाक्यानि
गृहीत्वा विप्रलभ्नात्_(=रज्जनात्) ।
अनायासेन मिथ्यार्थान्
वेदान् कुर्युर् दिग्म्बराः ॥

▼ Buitenen

Thus the naked Jainas could effortlessly render the Vedas untrue
simply by accepting" the Vedas in some manner by way of
deception.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Tantravārtika I. iii. 3, p. 85:

लोकायतिक-मूर्खाणां नैवान्यत् कर्म विद्यते ।
यावत् किञ्चिद् अदृष्टार्थं तत् दृश्यार्थं हि कुर्वते ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ

तत्रानधिकारिणाम् अध्येतुणाम् एव

न चाभिव्याहरेद् ब्रह्म
स्वधा-निनयाद् ऋते ।

इत्य्-आदिवचन-पर्यालोचनया
दोषो न निर्दोष-वेद-वाक्यानाम्

इति चेत्

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Manusmṛti II. 172a. The reading found is: 'नाभिव्याहारयेत्' etc. A similar statement is found in the Gautama Dharmasūtra II. 9: 'न ब्रह्माभिव्याहारयेत्' & c.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्-प्रस्तुत-तन्त्रेष्व अप्य अनधिकारि-श्रोतृ-जनानाम् एष दोषः;
न निर्दोष-तन्त्राणाम्
इति सर्वं समानम् अन्यत्राभिनिवेशात् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

अनधिकारि-ग्रहणम्③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ मतं

वैदबाह्यत्वं नाम वैदिक-कर्मान्धिकारित्वं
तद्-अनधिकारिभिर् वेद-बाह्यैर् गृहीतत्वात्
चैत्य-वन्दन-वाक्यवद् अ-प्रमाणम्

इति

▼ *Buitenen*

244 Or if it be held that "outside the Veda" means "unqualified to perform Vedic acts," and that Pañcaratra is invalid, like the caityavandana statements,"

because it is accepted by those who, being unqualified, are outside the Veda,

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

supra § 17: this Buddhist injunction is outside the Veda

▼ नरसिंहः

Bhaṭṭa Medhātithi, commenting upon Manusmṛti XII. 95, quotes from some unidentified source:

| नोदनाः चैत्य-वन्दनतः स्वर्गो भवति ।

अनधिकारः क्व? ④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तत्रापि किम् अखिल-वैदिक-कर्मानधिकारि-जन-परिगृहीतत्वं हेतुः,
उत कतिपय-वैदिक-कर्मानधिकारि-गृहीतत्वम्
इति विविच्य व्याचषाम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

the following distinction must be 99 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.

अनधिकारो उखिले ④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न तावद् अग्रिमः कल्पः
कल्पते हेत्व-असिद्धितः ।

न हि सो ऽस्ति मनुष्येषु
यः श्रौते क्वापि कर्मणि ॥
नाधिकुर्याद् अहिंसादौ
नृमात्रस्याधिकारः । (5)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अन्यथा हि ब्राह्मण-हनन--तद्-धनापहरण--वर्णाङ्गना-संगम--वेदाध्ययनादि कुर्वाणाश्
चण्डालादयो न दुष्येयुः - तद्-अनधिकारित्वात् ।

▼ Buitenen

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 shrauta
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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यस्य हि यन् न कर्तव्य
तस्य हि तत्-करणं प्रत्यवायाय,

▼ Buitenen

If a man does something he should not do,
he commits an offence.

▼ नरसंहेः

Vide Karmamīmāṃsā*, p. 93:

While an injunction directs a positive act, a prohibition
(niṣedha or pratiṣedha) serves to turn a man away from

performing the action expressed in the verb and its object. The prohibition does not lead to any desirable result such as heaven; it serves none the less a useful purpose; the man, who obeys the direction not to eat the mysterious kalañja, by observing this taboo escapes the hell which else had been his fate. In disgusted technical phraseology of Mīmāṁsā, the negative applies not to the sense of the verb, but to the optative affix; as an optative urges us to action, so a negated optative turns away from it.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतः सर्वेषाम् ईदृश-वैदिक-कर्मणि अधिकारो विद्यत एवेत्य्
असिद्धो हेतुः,
साधन-विकलश् च (चेत्य-वन्दन-)दृष्टान्तः ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ Buitenen

in one sense.

For the observance of a prohibition is as much a ritual action as the observance of an injunction.

अनधिकार एकदेशे④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

नापि कतिपय-वैदिक-कर्मानधिकारिभिर् गृहीतत्वाद् अ-प्रामाण्यं समस्त-वेद-वाक्यानाम्
अप्रामाण्य-प्रसङ्गात्,

▼ *Buitenen*

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,
because that would entail the conclusion that all Vedic statements
are invalid.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अस्ति हि सर्वेषां कतिपय-वैदिक-कर्मानधिकारः,
ब्राह्मणस्येव राज-सूये,
राजन्यस्येव सोम-पाने, (5)

▼ *Buitenen*

For every man has some Vedic rites for which he is not qualified:
the brahmin is not qualified for the Royal Consecration,
the ksatriya not for the ritual drinking of soma.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतो व्यवस्थित-वर्णाधिकारि-गृहीत-वेद-वचनैर् अनैकान्तिको हेतुः, अ-प्रयोजकश्च च ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Consequently, this ground has an occasional application to the
Vedic statements,
which are accepted by qualified persons belonging to the three
estates,
and is therefore inconclusive.

▼ नरसिंहः

अप्रयोजकत्वम् एव प्रतिपादयति 'चैत्य-वन्दनतः इत्य्-आदिना ।

कारणदोषः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

चैत्यवन्दनतः स्वर्गो
भवतीतीदशी मतिः ।
न तत्-परिग्रहान् मिथ्या
किन्तु कारण-दोषतः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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]]

शिष्ट-परिग्रहः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

उक्तश्च वैदिक-समस्तास्तिक-प्रवर-भृगु-भरद्वाज-द्वैपायन-प्रभृति-मह-र्षि-जन-परिग्रहः;

▼ Buitenen

119. We have already said that Pancarâtra has been accepted by the Vedic, and among all orthodox pre-eminent, sages Bhrgu, Bharadvâja, Dvaiapâyâna etc.

▼ नरसिंहः

See G.A. Grierson, "The Nârâyañîya and the Bhâgavatas", Indian Antiquary Vol. 37, p. 254:

The usual tradition is that it (the Bhâgavata doctrine) was transmitted: Deity—Nârada—saints including the Sun—R̥sis in his train—gods—Asita—to the world in different channels. Modern Bhâgavatas recognise two great teachers of their religion. One is Nârada, to whom is attributed Nâradîya Bhaktisûtra. Equally esteemed is the collection of Śâṅḍilyabhakti-sûtras. The author to whom it

is attributed, composed the Śāṇḍilyavidyā quoted in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad III. xiv. 3.

See also p. 9 above, fn

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अद्यत्वेऽपि हि पञ्च-रात्र-तन्त्र-विहित-मार्गेण
प्रासाद-करण--प्रतिष्ठापन--प्रणाम-प्रदक्षिणोत्सवादीनि प्रत्यक्ष-श्रुति-
विहिताम्निहोत्रादिवत् श्रेयस्-करतर-बुद्ध्या ऽनुतिष्ठतः शिष्टान् पश्यामः।

▼ Buitenen

And in the present day we can also observe how exemplary persons of great learning, believing that these rites are most effective in attaining bliss, perform the rites of temple-building, erection of idols, prostration, circumambulation and particular festival ceremonies, just as they perform the agnihotra and other rituals enjoined directly by Scripture.

▼ नरसिंहः

For a detailed account of temple-construction according to Pañcarātra-texts, see Agastyasamhitā 1-106; Ahrbudhnya Samhitā XXXVI. 31-49; Īśvarasamhitā XVI. 1, 219-247; 266-287; Kapiñjalasamhitā X. 61-66; 69-72; Jayākhyasamhitā XX. 73ff; Pādma 'kriyā' IV. 24-28, 35-45; V. 84-90; VIII; Pārameśvara X. 2-106; Pauṣkara XL. 92-109a, XLII. 71-118; Viṣṇutilaka VI. 1-342a, 449-498; Sanatkumāra 'Brahma' VIII; Sāttvata XXIV. 280-432a, XXV. 1-375; Hayaśīrṣa 'Ādi'. XIII. 1-41; XXXVIII. 61; XLIV. 12-19.

For the installation of images, see Aniruddha XV, XXXIII, XXXIV; Īśvara XVI. 228-352, XVIII. 1-560; Jayākhyā XX. 131b ff; Parama XVIII. 28-75; Pauṣkara XXXVIII. 1ff, 15-46; Sanatkumāra "Brahma" VI. 110 passim, IX. passim; Sāttvata XXV. 307ff; 320ff, XXVI. 375.

For a description of Utsavas, which are as many as fifty in number, see Agastya V. 1-2; Aniruddha XVII. 9-16a, XX. 1-16, XXIV, XXV. 1-4, XXVII; Īśvara X. 4a-10, XII. 1-233a, XIII. 1-265a, XIX. 469-473; Kapiñjala XXII. 3-5, 8-9; XXIII. 1-84a, XXIV. 1-69a; Pādma "caryā" X. 6-23, XI. 1-292, XIV. 1-85; Pārameśvara XVI. 1-55, XVII. 1-550, Śāṇḍilya I, XV. 1-126; Śrīprāśna XXX. 79-87; Sanatkumāra "Śiva" IX.

For the annual festival called Mahotsava, see Aniruddha XXI. 1-112; Īśvara X; Pādma "car" XI; Śrīprāśna XXXI. 8, XXXVIII.

श्रेयस्-साधनता④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चैतदाचरणं निर्मूलम् इति युक्तं
सन्ध्या-वन्दनाष्टका-चरणादेर् अपि निर्मूलत्व-प्रसङ्गात्

▼ Buitenen

And it is improper to maintain that their conduct has no foundation,
for that would entail that such smārta rites as crepuscular worship,
astaka etc., are similarly without foundation.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

उक्तं च शिष्टाचारस्य प्रामाण्यम् -
अपि वा कारणाग्रहणे -
प्रयुक्तानि प्रतीयेरन् इति ।

▼ Buitenen

It has been said that the conduct of exemplary people is authoritative,²⁴⁶
and also that even when they do not know the cause of their

custom,
they do know what is proper custom.

[246]: supra §14.

▼ नरसिंहः

Pūrvamīmāṃsā I. iii. 7.

भागवत-परिग्रहे उदोषः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ भागवत-जन-परिगृहीतत्वाद् इति (अप्रामाण्ये) हेतुः;
हन्त तर्हि तत्-परिगृहीतत्वाद् वाजसनेयकैकायन-शाखा-वचसां प्रत्यक्षादीनां चाप्रामाण्यप्रसङ्गः
।(5)

▼ Buitenen

120. If the ground for the invalidity of Pañcaratra is that it is accepted by Bhagavatas,247 well, then the scriptural statements of the Ekayana Sakha and the Vājasaneyaka sakhas and the means of knowledge Perception, Inference etc., would also be invalid since the Bhagavatas accept those too!

[247]: supra § 16.

▼ नरसिंहः

अथ ... See p. 17 above, “एवं जात्या” & c.

वासनेय ... The Ekāyanaśākhā belongs to the Śukla Yajurveda.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ "तैर् एव परिगृहीतत्वाद्" इति (अप्रामाण्ये) हेतुः
तद्-असाधारणानैकान्तिकम्, असिद्धञ्ज्य ।

▼ Buitenen

This same ground, moreover, namely that Pañcarātra is invalid because it is accepted by the Bhagavatas, suffers from two defects; it is both specially-occasional and unproved.²⁴⁸

[248]: supra § 59.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किमिति वा तत्परिग्रहादप्रामाण्यम्?

▼ Buitenen

Why is Pañcarātra rendered invalid by their acceptance?

नात्रैवर्णिकत्वात्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

"अत्रैवर्णिकत्वाद्" इति चेत्
किं भोः त्रैवर्णिकेतर-स्वर्ण-रथकार-निषादादि-परिगृहीतानुषीयमानार्थनाम् आर्थर्वणवचसां
"रथकार आदधीत" "एतया निषाद-स्थपतिं याजयेत्" इत्य-आदि-वचसां प्रामाण्यं नास्ति ?

▼ Buitenen

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,"²⁴⁹ etc.)
would also be invalid.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

[249]: Quotations not identified; the groups enumerated are
śūdras, and yet by Vedic injunction have to observe, i.e., to accept,

the few Vedic injunctions addressed to them. Do they by their acceptance invalidate these injunctions?

▼ नरसिंहः

रथकार ... Cf. Āpastambaśrautasūtra V. 3.19.

एतया ... Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā [ed. Dr. Leopold V. Schroeder] II. 2.4.

The reading found is : “तया निषाद-स्थ-पति याजयेत् सा हि तस्येष्टि: ।” For the Niṣādasthapati-nyāya see Śabara on Pūrvamīmāṃsā VI. i. 51, 52.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अस्तुवाऽत्रैवर्णिक-परिग्रहो प्रामाण्य-हेतुः,
एतेषां तु भगवच्च-छास्त्रानुगमिनां भागवतानाम्
उत्कृष्ट-ब्राह्मण्यं सर्व-प्रमाण-समवगतम् इति
तत्-परिग्रहः प्रामाण्यम् एव द्रष्टयति ।

▼ Buitenen

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 Pañcaratra rather confirms its validity.

▼ नरसिंहः

For a detailed notice of the origination, transformation and philosophy of the Bhāgavata religion and its contribution to the Indian thought, see G. A. Grierson, “The Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas”, Indian Antiquary, Vol. 37, pp. 251-262.

१७ भागवत-ब्राह्मण्य-प्रमाणम् ②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

आह केन पुनः प्रमाणेनैषां ब्राह्मण्यमवगतम्, केन वाऽन्येषाम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

शिखादिभिः③

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

ननु चक्षुर्-विस्फारण-समनन्तरं शिखा-यज्ञोपवीत--पालाश-दण्ड--मौज्जी-युजो
द्विज-कुमारकान् **पश्यन्तो**
"ब्राह्मणा" इत्य् **अवगच्छन्ति** ।

▼ *Buitenen*

121. OBJECTION. But when one sees the small sons of the twice-born who wear the customary hairtuft, sacred thread, palasa wood stick and munjagrass girdle, one knows, the moment the eyes fall on them, that they are brahmins.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

इह वा किम् अहर् अहर् अधीयमान-वाजसनेयकैकायन-शाखान् विलसद्-उपवीतोत्तरीय-
शिखा-शालिनो उद्धापयतो याजयत प्रतिगृह्णतो विदुषः **पश्यन्तो ब्राह्मणा** इति नावयन्ति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

REFUTATION. And in our case, when one sees learned people who day after day study the Vajasaneyaka and Ekāyana śākhās, wear prominently their sacred threads, upper garments and hairtufts, impart teaching, sacrifice, receive priestly stipends---does one not instantly know that they are brahmins?

यजनादिभिः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ

याजन-प्रवचन-पालाश-दण्डादीनां दुष्ट-शूद्रादिषु व्यभिचार-संभवाद्
ब्राह्मण्य-सिद्धवत्-कारेण प्रवृत्तेश्च
न तेभ्यो ब्राह्मण्य निर्णयः,
तद्-भागवतेतर-विप्राणम् अपि समानम् ।

▼ Buitenen

If it be held that outcastes, low-caste people etc., may also illegitimately sacrifice, teach, carry palata sticks etc. and that they behave as though they were legitimate brahmins, and that therefore neither costume nor conduct provides positive certainty that a man is a brahmin, then the same applies to other priests than Bhagavatas.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ सत्य् अपि तेषां क्वचिद् व्यभिचारे,
तत्-सामान्याद् अन्यत्र (सद्-भागवतेषु) व्यभिचार-शड्कायां

शुक्तौ रजत-धियो व्यभिचारात्,
रजते रजत-धियां व्यभिचार-शड्कावत् प्रत्यक्ष-विरोधात्, अनवस्थानाच्च
अनुपलभ्यमान-व्यभिचारोदाहरणेषु तथात्व-निश्चयस्,

तद्([←]रजत)-अन्यत्रापि समानम् ।(5)

▼ Buitenen

Or be it granted that there are cases where people illegitimately display the marks of brahminhood;
still, [[102]] though there may be doubt about the legitimacy of these marks in others because of their resemblance to pretenders (just as when there is a doubt that one may be mistaken about real silver too because one has mistaken nacre for silver),
then there can be certainty of their being genuine brahmins

in all cases when no misapprehension occurs,
because otherwise doubt would conflict with Perception
and lead to infinite regress.

गोत्रतः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ मतम्

| अन्येषां ब्राह्मण्यं तद्-असाधारण-गोत्र-स्मरणाद्

इति,

तद् भागवतानाम् अपि समानम्

▼ Buitenen

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;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

स्मरन्ति हि भागवताः -

वयं भारद्वाजाः वयं काश्यपाः वयं गौतमाः वयमौपगवा इति ।

▼ Buitenen

for the Bhagavatas have the tradition: "We are descendants of Bharadvaja, of Kasyapa, of Gotama, of Upagava."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चेदं गोत्रस्मरणं निर्मूलं सामयिकं (आधुनिकम्) वा
सर्वगोत्रस्मरणानां तथाभावप्रसङ्गात् । (4)

▼ Buitenen

Nor is this recollection or tradition of gotras unfounded or merely contemporary, for the same can be argued for all tradition of gotras.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

संभाव्यमान-दोषत्वाद्
वंशानां यदि संशयः ।
तद्-ब्राह्मण्ये ततो लोकं
सर्वं व्याकुलयेद् अयम् ॥ (4)

▼ Buitenen

If there were doubt about descent since error could conceivably occur,
this would confuse the whole world about the authenticity of their brahminhood.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा हि ।

जननी-जार-सन्देह-
जातश् चण्डाल-संशयः ।
निर्विशङ्कः कथं वेदम्
अधीषे साधु सत्तम् (प्रतिवादिन्)? ॥ (5)

▼ Buitenen

After all, anyone may fear that he really is a candal
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?

▼ नरसंहेतुः

अयं बहु-ब्रीहिः 'त्वं' इत्य् अस्य अध्याहतस्य विशेषणम् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तेन भागवतानाम् अ-विच्छिन्न-परम्-परा-प्राप्त--विचित्र-गोत्र-स्मरण--पर्यवस्थापितं
ब्राह्मण्यम् अनपौदितम् आस्ते
इति न भागवतानाम् अन्येषाज्व ब्राह्मण्ये कश्चिद् विशेषः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

देवता-विवेकतः③

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

यदि परं

ते परम-पुरुषम् एवाश्रिता एकान्तिनः,
अन्ये क्षुद्र-दैवतिकास् साधारणा

इति,

कि पुनर् एतेषां ब्राह्मण्ये प्रमाणम् अभिहितं
यद् एवान्येषाम्?

▼ *Buitenen*

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,

▼ *नरसिंहः*

अन्येषां ब्राह्मणत्वेन प्रसिद्धानां ब्राह्मण्य-ग्रहणे यत् प्रमाणं, तद् एव एतेषां भागवतानां
ब्राह्मण्य-ग्रहणे प्रमाणं भवतीति ग्रन्थ-कृद्-वचः ।

▼ राममिश्रशास्त्री

तांस्तु भगवानेव -

तेऽपि मामेव कौन्तेय
यजन्त्य् अविधिपूर्वकम्

इति विनिनिद ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

केन वा तेषां ब्राह्मण्यम् अवगतम्
किन् न एतेन,

▼ Buitenen

or how else is their brahminhood known
if not by that same authority?

▼ नरसिंहः

अस्माकम् एतेन विवादेन को लाभः? तथापि श्रूयताम् इत्य् आह ।

▼ राममिश्रशास्त्री

न केवलं ममैव ब्राह्मण्य-निरूपण-भार
आवयोर् उभयोर् एव
तस्य निरूपणीयत्वेन समत्वाद् इति भावः ।

निर्णय-प्रकारः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि च कौतूहलम् -

श्रूयताम् उभयत्रापि
ब्राह्मण्यस्यावधारकम् ।

प्रत्यक्षं वाऽनुमानं वा
यद् वाऽर्थापत्तिर् एव वा ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

If this is the question, then listen:
there remains a criterion to determine brahminhood in either
case,
either Perception, or Inference, or Circumstantial-Implication.

प्रत्यक्षे शङ्का④

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

| ननु कथं प्रत्यक्षं ब्राह्मण्यमवगमयति,

▼ *Buitenen*

| 124. OBJECTION. But how can Perception convey that they
are brahmins?

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

| न हि प्रथमाक्ष-सन्निपात-समनन्तरम्
अ-दृष्ट-पूर्व-विप्र-क्षत्र-समान-वयो-वेष- पिण्ड-द्वय-सन्निधाव्
अज-गज-महिषादि-विशेषवद्
"अयं ब्राह्मणः", "अयं क्षत्रिय"
इति विभागेन प्रतिपद्यामहे ।

▼ *Buitenen*

| For when we are close to two individuals whom we have
not seen before, one a brahmin, the other a ksatriya, of
the same age and the same appearance, we do not
immediately observe the distinction that one is a brahmin
and the other a ksatriya in the same way as we instantly

observe the differentness of a goat, an elephant, a buffalo etc.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च

तत्-पित्रादि-ब्राह्मण्य-स्मरण-सापेक्षम् अक्षम् एव
सन्निहित-व्यक्ति-वर्ति ब्राह्मण्यम् अवगमयति

इति साम्प्रतम्,
तत्-स्मरणस्यैव
(तत्-पितृ-पूर्वानुभव-विरहेण वन्ध्या-सुत-स्मरणवद् अनुपपत्तेः ।
(पूर्वानुभव-साहित्ये इष्य अनवस्था-दोषेणानुपपत्तेः ।)

▼ Buitenen

Nor is it proper to maintain that

the visual sense conveys the brahminhood of a nearby individual
in dependence on our recollection of his father's brahminhood etc.;
for that recollection itself is impossible without a previous immediate cognition,
just as the recollection of the son of a sterile mother is impossible.

अनुमाने शङ्का④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चानुमानात् -
तत्-प्रतिबद्ध-लिङ्गादर्शनात् ।

▼ Buitenen

Nor can we know from Inference that a man is a brahmin, for we do not find a concomitant mark.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च शम-दम-तपश्-शौचादयो ब्राह्मण्ये लिङ्गम्,
तेषां ब्राह्मणेन सता संपाद्यत्वाद् व्यभिचाराच् च ।

▼ Buitenen

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.

अर्थापत्तौ शङ्का④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चार्थाप्रत्या ब्राह्मण्य-निर्णयः, अनुपपत्त्य-अभावात्,

▼ Buitenen

Nor can Circumstantial-Implication furnish proof of brahminhood,
because it is not lacking in reason

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च वसन्ते ब्राह्मणोऽग्नीन् आदधीत
इत्य-आदि-वाक्यार्थानुपपत्त्या ब्राह्मण्यनिर्णयः, ब्राह्मण्यादिपदार्थावगमपूर्वकत्वात्
तद्वाक्यार्थावगमस्य,

▼ Buitenen

[[104]]

and the fact that the sentence-meaning of the statement,

"In spring the brahmin must add fuel to the fire," 250

is otherwise unestablished
does not therefore by Circumstantial-Implication
furnish proof that a man is a brahmin;
for knowledge of that sentence-meaning presupposes
knowledge of the word-meaning of brahminhood etc.

[250]: not identified.

▼ नरसिंहः

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa I.1.2.

प्रत्यक्षम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नायं दोषः,

▼ Buitenen

125. REFUTATION. All this does not make for a defect in my argument.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न हि

प्रथमाक्ष-संप्रयोगसमय एव भासमानं प्रत्यक्षं
नान्यद्

इत्य् अस्ति नियमः,

▼ Buitenen

There is no invariable rule that
Perception becomes manifest only at the first contact between
sense and object and not otherwise.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् एवेन्द्रिय-व्यापारानुवृत्तौ सत्याम्
अ-परोक्षम् अवभासते
तत् प्रत्यक्षं

▼ Buitenen

Perception is that which illuminates the unmanifest
while there is continuity of the operation of the senses.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा च ब्राह्मण्यम् इति - तद् अपि प्रत्यक्षम् । (5)

▼ Buitenen

Thus there can be Perception of brahminhood;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रतीमो हि वयम् उन्मीलित-लोचनाः
तत्-सन्तति-विशेषानुसंधान-समनन्तरं
वसिष्ठ-काश्यपीय-शठ-मर्षण--प्रभृति- विचित्र-गोत्र-कुल-शालिषु समाचार-शुचिषु
विलसद्-उपवीतोत्तरीय-शिखा-मौज्जी-बन्धेषु
स्फुटतर-सन्दधद्-ब्राह्मण्यम् । (4)

▼ Buitenen

for when we keep our eyes open we note,
immediately upon observing the particular differentiae of the
genus brahminhood,
that the brahminhood is quite clearly noticeable in those who
belong to the families of the different gotras-Vasistha, Kasyapiya
Sathamarṣaṇa etc.--,

who are pure in their conduct,
and who display the sacred thread, upper cloth, hairtuft and munja
grass girdle.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चैतद् अ-लौकिकं
यत् "सन्तति-विशेषानुसंधान-सापेक्षम् अक्षं
ब्राह्मणं ग्राहयती" ति,

▼ Buitenen

Nor does it run counter to ordinary experience that the eyes can
convey brahminhood in dependence on the observation of the
peculiarities of genus.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सर्वत्र देश-काल-संस्थानादीतिकर्तव्यताऽनुगृहीतम् एवेन्द्रियं
स्व-गोचर-परिच्छेदोत्पादे कारणम् भवति। (5)

▼ Buitenen

In every case the sense becomes the cause of the rise of
determination of sense-object when favoured by the
accompanying circumstances of place, time, configuration etc.251

[251]: read deśakālasaṁsthānāditi.[[??]]

▼ नरसिंहः

सर्वत्र ... Cf. Ślokavārtika under I.1.5, śl. 26 (vanavāda) :

तस्योपलक्षणं चापि क्वचित् केनचिद् इष्यते ।
रूपादीनां विशेषेण देश-कालाद्य-अपेक्षया ॥

परिच्छेदः = ज्ञानं, निर्णयो वा ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

करण-मात्रस्यायं स्वभावो यद् इतिकर्तव्यतापेक्षणम् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

It is the natural function of the sense-organ as such to relate itself to these accompanying circumstances.

▼ नरसेहः

करण-मात्रम् = करण-सामान्यम् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथा ८८ह -

न हि तत् (ज्ञान-)कारणं लोके
वेदे वा किञ्चिद् ईदृशम् ।
इति-कर्तव्यता-साध्ये
यस्य नानुग्रहेऽर्थिता ॥

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

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.²⁵²

[252]: not identified.

▼ नरसेहः

Ślokavārtika (Sambandhākṣepavāda) under I.i.5.śl. 37.

'इति-कर्तव्यता-साध्ये' अङ्गाधीने; 'अनुग्रहे' उपकारे; 'अर्थिता' सापेक्षता इति भावः ।

Cf. Nyāyaratnākara (Chowkhamba edn.) on the above verse p.507:

सर्वत्र चक्षुरादौ प्रदीपाद्य-अर्थित्व-दर्शनाद् एकान्तिकं सहायापेक्षणं नाशक्तिम्
आपादयति । प्रस्तुत इति-कर्तव्य-तयैव करणत्वं, तद्-अभाव एव तस्य सिद्ध्यति ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ततश्च सन्तति-स्मृत्या
ऽनुगृहीतेन चक्षुषा ।
विज्ञायमानं ब्राह्मण्यं
प्रत्यक्षत्वं न मुच्यति ॥

▼ Buitenen

[[105]]

Consequently the visual sense, when favoured by the recollection
of genus,
gives knowledge of brahminhood
without the object giving up its perceptuality.

▼ नरसिंहः

Veṅkaṭanātha quotes this and the following verse in his
Nyāyasiddhāñjana V. p. 267.

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā III. p. 17:

जातिर् आश्रयतो भिन्ना प्रत्यक्ष-ज्ञान-गोचरा ।
पूर्वाकारावमर्शन प्रभाकर-गुरोर् मता ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा च दृश्यते नाना
सहकारि-व्यपेक्षया ।
चक्षुषो जाति-विज्ञान-
करणत्वं यथोदितम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

So it is evident that the visual sense can be the instrument of knowledge of genus in dependence on a variety of accompanying factors.

▼ नरसिंहः

श्लोक-वार्तिक इति भावः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

सुवर्णं व्यज्यते रूपात्
ताम्रत्वादेऽरु असंशयम् ।
तैलाद् धृतं विलीनञ्जच
गन्धेन तु रसेन वा ॥

▼ Buitenen

Gold becomes manifest through its colour from copper etc., ghee is differentiated from oil, through its smell and taste;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

भस्म-प्रच्छादितो वह्निः
स्पर्शनेनोपलभ्यते ।
अश्वत्वादौ च दूरस्थे
निश्चयो जायते ध्वनेः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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;

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Ślokavārtika (Vākyādhikaraṇa) śl. 358, p. 947:

पश्यतः श्वेतिमारुपं हेषा-शब्दं च शृणवतः ।
खुर-निक्षेप-शब्दं च श्वेतोऽश्वो धावतीति धीः ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

संस्थानेन घटत्वादि
ब्राह्मणत्वादि योनितः ।
क्वचिद् आचारतश्च चापि
सम्यग् राज्यानुपालितात् ॥ (4)

इति ॥

▼ Buitenen

a pitcher etc. are known through their configuration; brahminhood through descent, and also through conduct in certain particulars, which is completely protected by the king.

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide ibid (Vanavāda) I. i.5, śls. 27 & 29.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यत् समान-वयो-वेष-
पिण्ड-द्वय--विलोकने ।
तत्-क्षणाद् अक्षतो भेदो
नावभातीति भाषितम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

It has been contended that when we see two individuals of the same age and appearance, the difference between the two does not immediately appear to eye;
but the perceptuality of their differentness is not refuted by just this.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नैतावता विभागस्य
प्रत्यक्षत्वं निवर्तते ।
सादृश्य-दोषात् तत्र स्याद्
विभागस्यानवग्रहः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

In this case the non-perception of their differentness is caused by the defect of similarity.

▼ **नरसिंहः**

विभागो भेदः, विशेषो वा ।

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

समान-रूप-संस्थान-
शुक्तिका--कल-धौतयोः ।
विवेकः सहसा नाभाद्
इति कालान्तरेऽपि किम् ॥
प्रत्यक्षो न भवेद् एव
विप्र-क्षत्र-विशां भिदा । (5)

▼ *Buitenen*

The difference between nacre and silver, which are similar in appearance and configuration, may not be immediately visible, yet that does not mean that their difference is not visible at another time; and the same holds for the difference between brahmin, kṣatriya and vaisya.

सन्तति-कार्यत्वम्③

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

यद्वा संतति-विशेष-प्रभवत्वम् एव ब्राह्मण्यम्

▼ *Buitenen*

Or else, brahminhood is that which arises from the differentiae of genus,

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā, III, p. 31:

तेन सन्तति-विशेष-प्रभवत्वम् एव ब्राह्मण-शब्द-प्रवृत्ताव् उपाधिः । तत्-प्रभवानाम् एव कर्मस्य अधिकार इति न किञ्चिद् अवहीनम् । के पुनस् ते सन्तति-विशेषाः? न ते परिगणय्य निर्देष्यं शक्यन्ते; किन्तु लोकत एव प्रसिद्धाः प्रत्येतव्याः । तथा च तज्-जन्यत्वे इवगते ब्राह्मण-शब्दं प्रयुज्जते लोकाः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तच् चान्वय-व्यतिरेकाभ्यां
यथाऽलोकं कार्यान्तरवद् अवगन्तव्यम् एव,

▼ Buitenen

and such a product can empirically be known just like any other product
by a process of positive and negative consideration,

▼ नरसिंहः

कपाल-द्वय-योग एव घटोत्पत्तिः; नो चेत् । एवं, एतादृश-पितृ-मातृ-कारणत्व एव ब्राह्मणत्वं, न त्व अन्यथा इति भावः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

(यथा)

के पुनः सन्ति विशेषा,
येषु ब्राह्मण-शब्दं प्रयुज्जते वृद्धाः?
केषु वा प्रयुज्जते?

▼ Buitenen

e.g. "what are the specific characteristics to which the elders apply the term brahminhood, or to which characteristics is the term

applied?"

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

उक्तं गोत्रार्षेयादि-
स्मृतिमत्स्व इत्य् अनेकशः ।
आस्ताम् अ-प्रस्तुता चिन्ता
प्राची प्रस्तुयते कथा ॥
सिद्धं गोत्रादि-युक्तत्वाद्
विप्रा भागवता इति ।

▼ Buitenen

[[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.

वैश्य-व्रात्य-मूलं न③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

वैश्यव्रात्यान्वये जन्म
यद् एषाम् उपवर्णितम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

126. The objection that was made that the Bhāgavatas are born from a vaiśya vratya:

▼ नरसिंहः

See p. 13 above, for the pūrvapakṣa view.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

पञ्चमस् सात्वतो नाम
विष्णोर् आयतनानि सः ।
पूजयेद् आज्ञया राज्ञः
स तु भागवतः स्मृतः ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

([253]: supra § 15. [[143]])

"The fifth one, the Sarvata, must worship the sanctuaries of Visnu by royal decree;"

▼ *नरसिंहः*

To be identified.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

वैश्यात् तु जायते व्रात्याद्

इति वाक्यद्वयेक्षणात् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

and

"he is also called a Bhagavata; he is born from a vaisya vratya."

- On the authority of the two statements.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Cf. Manusmṛti X. 23:

वैश्यात् तु जायते व्रात्यात् सुधन्वा ८८चार्य एव च ।
भारुषश्च च निजङ्गधश्च मैत्रस् सात्वत एव च ॥

प्रयोगान्तराणि④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अत्र ब्रूमः किम् एताभ्यां
वचनाभ्यां प्रतीयते ॥
अभिधानान्वयो वा स्यान्
नियमो वाऽभिधीयताम् ।

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न तावत्

"सात्त्वत-भागवत-शब्दौ वैश्य-व्रात्याभिधायकाव् एव"

इति नियन्तुं शक्यौ - अप्रतीतेः, अतिप्रसङ्गाच्च,

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि "पञ्चमः सात्त्वत" इत्यत्र
सात्त्वत-भागवत-शब्दयोर् अर्थान्तराभिधान-प्रतिषेधः प्रतीयते -
श्रुत-हान्य्-अश्रुत-कल्पना-प्रसङ्गात्।

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इह हि व्रात्य-वैश्यान्वय-जन्मा यः पञ्चमः
सात्त्वत इति तस्य सात्त्वत-संज्ञान्वयो ऽवगम्यते
पञ्चम-शब्दस्य प्रथम-निर्दिष्टत्वेनोद्देशकत्वात्।

▼ Buitenen

In our statement the fifth one,
who is born from an vaisya vratyā,
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.

▼ रामस्मिन्नशास्त्री

उद्देश्यसमर्थकृत्वादित्यर्थः

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न च पञ्चमस्य सात्त्वतत्वे
सात्त्वतेनापि वैश्य-व्रात्य-पञ्चमेन भवितव्यम्,

▼ Buitenen

And if the fifth is the Satvata,
the Satvata is not necessarily also be the fifth, namely the vaisya
vratyā.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि उद्दिश्यमानस्याग्निमत्त्वे
उपादीयमानस्याग्नेर् धूमवत्त्वेन भवितव्यम्
(अयोगलोडपि स्यात् तत्र)

▼ Buitenen

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.

The example is 'parvato 'gnimin dhumavattvāt if we interchange S and P, we get parvato dhumavin agnimattvāt, but this is not true, for though there is no fireless smoke, there is smokeless fire.

Similarly here: the fifth may be a sitvata or a vaidya vratya, but being the fifth does not make the sitvata a vaidya vratya,

▼ नरसिंहः

'उद्दिश्यमानस्य' धूमवत इत्य् अर्थः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अतो नेदृश-स्मृति-पर्यालोचनया सात्त्वत-भागवत-शाब्दितानां व्रात्यत्व-निश्चयः ।

▼ Buitenen

Consequently the consideration if a smrti statement of this kind cannot give certainty that the words Satvata, Bhagavata etc mean vratya.

आचार्य-शब्दादौ व्यभिचारः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यदि पुनर्

| अनयोर् जात्य्-अन्तरे ऽपि प्रयोगो दृष्टः

इति + एतावता तच्-छब्दाभिधेयतया भगवच्-छास्त्रानुगामिनाम् अपि विप्राणां तज्-जातीयत्व-निश्चयः,

ततस् तत्रैव सह-पठिताचार्य-शब्दस्यापि निकृष्ट-व्रात्यापत्ये प्रयोग-दर्शनात्
साङ्ग-स-रहस्य-वेद--दातुर् द्विज-परस्यापि व्रात्यत्वं स्यात् । (4)

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 acaryas²⁵⁶ 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 vratya!

[256]: In the Manu quotation supra § 15.

▼ नरसंह:

यदि ... This paragraph is in elucidation of the word “atiprasāṅgācca” used in the para “na tāvat” etc. above.

सहपठिताचार्य ... The term ‘ācārya’ is from the Manusmṛti X. 23a:

| वैश्यात् तु जायते व्रात्यात् सुधन्वा ऽचार्य एव च ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ

तस्य व्रात्य-वाचकाचार्य-शब्दाभिधेयत्वेऽपि
प्रमाणान्तरेणाप्लुत-ब्राह्मण्य-निश्चयात्
आचार्य-शब्दस्य

आचिनोत्य् अस्य बुद्धिम्

इत्य-आदि-गुण-योगेनापि वृत्ति-संभवान्
न व्रात्यत्व-शङ्का।

If, on the other hand, even though a true brahmin is denoted by the word ācārya which dea vratya, there still can be no suspicion that he actually is a vratya, because there is positive certainty of his brahminhood which is clearly proved by other means of knowledge, and because it is possible that the word acarya is used figuratively (ācārya as one who "accumulates"—acinoti the pupil's knowledge) for a Brahmin teacher,

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Nirukta (Ānandāśrama Series 88) I. ii. 4, p. 36:

| आचारं ग्राहयत्य् आचिनोत्य् अर्थात् आचिनोति बुद्धिम् इति वा ।

Also Cf. Vihagendrasamhitā (ms.):

| आचिनोति परान् सर्वान् आचारयति सर्वतः ।

| आचरेत्य् अपि तान् लोकान् स तु आचार्य उच्यते ॥ [XXII. 14]

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् अत्रापि

जात्य्-अन्तर-वाचक--सात्त्वत-भागवत --शब्दाभिधेयत्वेऽपि
भगवच्-छास्त्रानुगामिनाम् अमीषाम् अतिस्पष्ट-विशिष्ट-गोत्रार्षेयादि-स्मरण- दृढावगतत्वाद्
ब्राह्मण्यस्य सात्त्वत-भागवत-शब्दयोश् च
सत्त्ववति भगवति भविति-योगेनैव वृत्ति-सम्भवान्
न व्रात्यत्व-शड्काऽवतारः।

▼ Buitenen

then in our case, too, the same argument can be made, namely thus: even though they are denoted by the terms Satvata and Bhagavata, which denote another caste, yet there can rise no suspicion that they actually are vratyas, because the brahminhood of these followers of the Bhagavan's doctrine is firmly known from the recollection of completely obvious clans, Vedic ancestry etc., and because it is possible that the terms Sātvata and Bhāgavata have a figurative denotation of sattva-vat and bhaga-vat.

(257, explained below, § 130.)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एतद् उक्तं भवति ।

न चैक-शब्द-वाच्यत्वाद्
एक-जातीयता भवेत् ।
मा भूद् आचार्य-शब्दत्वाद्
ब्राह्मणस्य निकृष्टता । (4)

▼ Buitenen

In other words,

the fact that the same word denotes both classes of people does not mean that therefore both belong to one and the same caste,

lest the true brahmin be not made into a low-caste man because he is also denoted by the word AchArya.

▼ नरसेहः:

“śabdyatvāt” would have been a better reading. But no text preserves this reading. As it stands now, the term “ācāryaśabdatvāt” has to be explained as a Bahuvrīhi compound, qualifying the term “Brāhmaṇa”.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा च 'हरि'-शब्दस्य
दृष्टा मण्डूकवाचिता ।
इति तच्-छब्द-वाच्यत्वात्
सिंहो मण्डूक एव किम् ॥
तथा गो-शब्द-वाच्यत्वाच्
छब्दश्च चापि विषाणवान् । (4)

▼ Buitenen

We find that the word hari also means 'frog.' Does it follow that a lion is a frog because both are denoted by the same word? Then word itself would be horned, since 'word' is denoted by gau !"

([259]: gauḥ can mean 'cow' and 'word.')

▼ नरसिंहः

This and the two succeeding lines are quoted by Sudarśanasūri in his commentary on Śrībhāṣya, I.i.1, Vol. I, p. 153.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ततश्च -

सुधन्वाचार्य इत्याद्या
यथाऽर्थान्तरवाचकाः ।
व्रात्यान्वये प्रयुज्यन्ते
तथैवैतौ (सात्त्वत-भागवतौ) भविष्यतः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

सुधन्वाऽचार्य ... Manusmṛti X. 23a: "वैश्यात् तु जायते व्रात्यात्" etc.

यथा ... सुधन्वादि-शब्दा यथा अर्थान्तर-वाचका, एवं सात्त्वत-भागवत-शब्दाव् अपीति योजना । 'यथार्थान्तर-वाचका' इति न समस्तं पदम् ।

अवयव-रूढिः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यद् उक्तं

योग-रूढि-शक्ति-द्वयोपनिपाते
सात्त्वत-भागवत-शब्दयो रूढि-शक्तिर् एवाश्रयितुम् उचिता

इति ,

▼ *Buitenen*

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,

[260]: supra §15.

▼ नरसिंहः

See “रूढ्या” etc., p. 12 above.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् अ-युक्तं -
कूप्तावयव-शक्त्यैवाभिधानोपपत्तौ सत्याम्
अ-कूप्ताखण्ड-शक्ति-कल्पनाऽनुपपत्तेः (वक्ष्यमाण-रीत्या)।

▼ *Buitenen*

is not correct;
for when a denotation is appropriate
which is the composite of the denotations of the component
elements of the words,
then it is not right to assume a non-composite denotation.

▼ नरसिंहः

अवयव-शक्तिः = योग-शक्तिः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

योऽपि हि
सात्त्वत-भागवत-शब्दयोर् वैश्य-व्रात्यान्वय-जन्मनि रूढि-शक्तिम् अभ्युपगच्छति

अभ्युपगच्छत्य् एव +असाव् अन्यत्र
सत्त्ववद्-भगवच्-छब्दयोः प्रकृति-भूतयोस्
तद्-उत्पन्नस्य च तद्धित-प्रत्ययस्यार्थान्तराभिधान-सामर्थ्यम्

सात्त्वतं विधिम् आस्थाय,
जन्मान्तर-कृतैः पुण्यैर्
नरो भागवतो भवेद्

इत्य्-आदौ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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 meaning 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.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

सत्त्ववद्... Parāśarabhaṭṭa in his 'Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya' gives the following explanations for the term 'sāttvata' identifying the latter with 'mahābhāgavata' [See Introduction to Jayākhya Saṃhitā]

- (i) सत् ब्रह्म, सत्त्वं वा, तद्वन्तः सात्त्वन्तः; ब्रह्म-विधा: सात्त्विका वा; तेषाम् इदं कर्म शास्त्रं वा सात्त्वतम्, तद्-कुर्वाणः, तद्-आचक्षणाश् च वा ।
- (ii) सात्यति सुखयत्य् आश्रितान् इति सात् परमात्मा; स एतेषाम् अस्तीति वा सात्त्वताः । सात्त्वतो वा महा-भागवतः ।

The Mahābhārata, Āśvamedhikaparvan [Vavilla edn., Vol. XVIII] ch. 124, śls. 33-37 speaks in favour of the brahmanical status of the Bhāgavatas:

अपार्थकं प्रभाषन्ते शूद्रा भागवता इति ।
न शूद्रा भगवद्-भक्ता विप्रा भागवता: स्मृताः ॥
सर्व-वर्णेषु ते शूद्रा ये ह्य अभक्ताः जनार्दने ।
द्वादशाक्षर-तत्त्व-ज्ञः चतुर-वेद-विभागवित् ॥
अच्छिद्र-पञ्च-काल-ज्ञः स वै भागवतः स्मृतः ।
ऋग्-वेदेनैव होता च यजुषा ऋधर्युर् एव च ॥
साम-वेदेन चोद्धाता पुण्येनाभिष्टुवन्ति माम् ।
अर्थव-शिरसा चैव नित्यम् आर्थर्वणा द्वि-जाः ॥
स्तुवन्ति सततं ये मां ते वै भागवताः स्मृताः ॥

तद्वित ... अमुम् एव प्रत्ययं 'अण्' इति स्वयम् एव निर्दिशति ।

सात्त्वतं ... Mahābhārata, Bhīṣma, ch. 62. śl. 39b.

जन्मान्तर ... Paramasamīhitā, III. 38b.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् इहापि (पूर्वकत-तद्वितान्त-^{तद्}-योगेनैव
त्रात्यान्वय-जन्मनि (प्रयोग-वृत्ति-सम्भवेन
शक्त्य-अन्तर-कल्पनायां प्रमाणं क्रमते।

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

संभवति चैतेषाम् अपि साक्षाद्-भगवद्-आराधनाभावे ऽपि
वासुदेवस्यायतनशोधन-बलिनिर्हरण-- प्रतिमा-संरक्षणादि-क्रिया-योगेनैव

सात्त्वत-भागवत-शब्दाभिधेयत्वम्,
तस्येदम् इति संबन्ध-मात्रेऽपि चाण्-प्रत्यय-स्मरणात्।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.)

▼ नरसिंहः

See Siddhāntakaumudī, IV. iii. 120.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

उक्तश्च वैश्य-व्रात्यान्वय-जन्मनोऽपि भगवद्-आयतनादि-शोधनादि-क्रिया-योगः,

▼ *Buitenen*

And it is declared that the issue of a vaiśya vratya has the work discipline of cleaning the Bhagavan's temple etc.,

▼ नरसिंहः

See p. 14 above where the word नैवेद्य-शोधनं was used.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

सात्त्वतानाज् च देवायतन-शोधनं नैवेद्य-भोजनं प्रतिमा-संरक्षणम्

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

"and (the task) of the satvatas is the cleaning of the deity's temple, the eating of the offerings, the guarding of the idol;"

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा "विष्णोर् आयतनानि संपूजये"ति ।

▼ Buitenen

and "he must worship Visnu's sanctuaries."²⁶⁴

([264]: quoted supra.)

वृत्तिसाम्यान् न व्रात्यत्वम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एतेन इदम् अय् अपास्तं
यद् एषाम् अपि वृत्ति-साम्याद् व्रात्यत्वम् इति।

▼ Buitenen

129. Herewith is also rejected the contention that the Bhāgavatas are vratyas because they would have the same profession.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अन्यद् एव हि देवायतन-शोधन--बलि-निर्हरण--प्रतिमासंरक्षणादिकम्

▼ Buitenen

For it is one thing to clean the temple, clear away the bali offerings, guard the idol,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अन्ये चाभिगमनोपादानेज्या -स्वाध्याययोगा
भागवतैर् अहर्-अहर् अनुष्ठीयमानाः क्रिया-कलापा

▼ *Buitenen*

and quite another thing to perform the variety of actions that are daily observed by the Bhagavatas: ~~the cleaning of the way to the~~ approaching, the preparation for worship, offering, daily study, and meditation.

It is as it is in the case of the jyotistoma etc.

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, (1911), p. 948:

The Pañcakāla or Five-Time-observances enjoined on a Bhāgavata are: (i) abhigamana: morning prayer, abluting etc., (ii) upādāna: fetching articles of worship, (iii) ijyā: divine worship, (iv) svādhyāya: study of the sacred lore and (v) yāga or yoga: divine meditation.

The day, from 4 a.m. to 10 p.m. is to be divided into five divisions for each of these acts. Cf. Pādmasaṁhitā: Caryāpāda: XIII: 3-4a:

ādyam karmābhigamanam upādānamataḥ param ।
ijyā ca paścāt svādhyāyastato yogastataḥ param ॥
pañcaite vidhayasteṣām kālāḥ pañcaiva te kramāt ।

For a definition and explanation of these five terms, see ibid: śl. 4b, ff.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथैव ज्योतिषोमे -

ग्रह--चमस-जुह्वादि-पात्र-करण-तक्षणादिषु तक्षणो व्यापारः,
ऋत्विजस् तु विशेष-मन्त्रोच्चारण-देवताभिध्यानाऽभिष्ठव-प्रभृतिषु ।

▼ *Buitenen*

In the jyotistoma, too, a carpenter has a task in making the various receptacles, soma-cups, soma-decanters, ladles etc., while the

officiating priests have their tasks in reciting various different mantra recitations, representing the deity, pressing of the soma etc. (5)

▼ नरसिंहः

"Graha", "Camasa", etc., are the names of cups into which soma-juice is poured during a sacrifice. Cf. Śabara on Pūrvamīmāṁśā: III.i.16, p. 158: "grahādi somapātrām".

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च तावता तेषां तक्षणाज् चैक-जातित्व-संशयः,

▼ Buitenen

And this occupational similarity, limited as it is, does not raise the question whether the priests have the same caste as the carpenters!

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

एवम् इहापि भगवच्छास्त्र-सिद्ध-पाञ्च-कालिकानुषातृणाम्
अन्येषाम् आयतन-शोधनादि कुर्वतां
प्रासाद-पालकापर-नाम्नाम् अन्त्यानां चेति ।

▼ Buitenen

So here, too, there is a difference between those who perform the pañcakālikā²⁶⁵ ritual, which is established by the Bhagavan's doctrine, and the low-caste people who do the cleaning-up of the temple and are also called temple-guards.

[265]: supra note.

रथ-कारे न व्यभिचारः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यत् पुनर् उक्तं -

सात्त्वत-भागवत-शब्दयोर् यौगिकत्वे

रथ-कार आदधीत

इत्य-अत्रापि

रथ-कार-शब्दस्य रथ-करण-योगेन त्रैवर्णिक-वृत्ति-प्रसङ्ग

इति, तद् अनुपपन्नम्

▼ *Buitenen*

[[110]]

130. Further, the contention²⁶⁶ that, if the words bhāgavata and satvata have their etymological meaning, this entails that the word rathakara in the injunction the "rathakara must build a fire"²⁶⁷ desomeone belonging to the three varias on account of its etymology of chariot-making,²⁶⁸ is not correct.

[266]: supra § 15.

[267]: not identified.

[268]: For the word means etymologically "maker of chariots, carts." "[269]: not identified.

▼ नरसिंहः

यत्पुनरुक्तं ... See p. 12 above for the pūrvapakṣa.

रथकार ... Cf. Āpastambaśrautasūtra, V. 3.19.

रथकरण ... रथ-करण-रूप-योग-शक्त्या ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

युक्तं हि तत्राधानोत्पत्ति-वाक्यावगत-- (त्रैवर्णिकोचित्) वसन्तादि-काल-बाध-प्रसङ्गात्,

इति मन्त्र-वर्णाविगत--जात्य-अन्तर--वृत्ति-- बाध-प्रसङ्गाच् च ।

▼ *Buitenen*

For in the case of rathakāra
it is correct that the term refers to someone belonging to the three
varṇas,
because otherwise the springtime etc.,
which are given in the statement on the origin of this fire-building,
would be invalidated,
and because usages of a word in the sense of different castes,
which is given in the mantra

"saudhanvanā ṛbhavaḥ sūracakṣasah"

would be invalidated.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

युक्तं हि ... "अध्यवसानम्" इति शेषः ।

तत्राधानोत्पत्तिः ... The “ādhāna-utpattivākyas” referred to here are:
“vasante brāhmaṇo ‘gnimādadhitā”, “grīṣme rājanyah” and
“śaradi vaiśyah” (Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I.i.2.1.)

Vide Karmamīmāṁsā, pp. 86-87:

The direction to perform an offering is laid down in an originating injunction (utpattividhi) or an injunction of application (viniyogavidhi), according as the matter concerned is a principal or a subordinate offering. The originating injunctions are few in number relating as they do, to the principal Vedic offerings only, such as the Agnihotra, the New and Full-moon sacrifices, the Soma sacrifice and so forth...The originating injunctions, however, do no more than excite in the mind of the

hearer the desire to perform the action which they enjoin, generally in the form of a sacrifice; it remains for other injunctions, those of application (*vinyogavidhi*), to denote the exact manner of procedure (*itikartavyatā*) by specifying the numerous subsidiary actions required, and the materials and other necessaries for the performance.

सौधन्वना ... Ṛgveda: I.110.4.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

माहिष्येण करिण्यां तु रथकारः प्रजायते

इति स्मृत्य-अवगत-जात्यन्तरत्वे ऽपि

▼ Buitenen

Despite the fact that *rathakāra* is also a name for another caste-as learnt from the *smṛti*

"the *rathakāra* is born out of a *kāriṇī* by a *māhiṣya*" 271

[271]: cf. *Amarakoṣa*, 10.4.

▼ नरसिंहः

Yājñavalkyasmṛti : Ācārādhyaḥya: I.iv.95a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

क्षत्रिय-वैश्यानुलोमोत्पन्नो रथ-कारस्
तस्येज्या-ऽधानोपनयन-क्रियाश् चाप्रतिषिद्धा

इति शङ्ख-वचनाद्

▼ Buitenen

nevertheless, since, on Śāṅkha's evidence²⁷² 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

265: supra § 15.

266: not identified.

[272]: not verified.

▼ नरसिंहः

No printed text of the Śāṅkhasmṛti contains this passage. It is however, traced in the "Reconstruction of the Dharmasūtra of Śāṅkha and Likhita", attempted by Dr. P. V. Kane, in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, Vol. VII, p. 115. The passage was numbered 76 there. The reading found is:

kṣatriyavaiśyānulomāntarotpannajo rathakārah,
tasyejyādhānopanayanasāṁskārakriyā aśvapratīṣṭhā
rathasūtravāstuvidyādhayayanavṛttitā ca.

This passage appears in the Mitākṣarā on Yājñavalkyasmṛti: I-95 and in Aparārka. The Mitākṣarā [Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No. 62] has a variant: "kṣatriyavaiśyānulomāntarotpanno yo rathakārah".

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विद्या-साधे ऽपि कर्मण्य अधिकाराविरोधात्

▼ Buitenen

there is no conflict of qualification for rites that can only be realized through knowledge of the Veda,273

[273]: which is the prerogative only of the three varṇas.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

त्रै-वर्णिकानां च शिल्पोपजीवित्वस्य प्रतिषिद्धत्वेन
तेषु रथकार-शब्दस्यानुचितत्वाच् च
जात्यन्तर-वाचित्वाध्यवसानम्।

▼ *Buitenen*

and since the word rathakāra (in its etymological meaning) is inappropriate for members of the three varṇas because they are forbidden to follow an artisan's profession, therefore we can only conclude that in both cases different castes are denoted by the term,

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

न चेह तथा विरोधो इस्ति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

and so there is no conflict (here).

अवयव-शक्ति-प्राधान्यम्④

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

अपि च ।

कूप्तावयव-शक्त्यैव
लब्धे स्वार्थावबोधने ।
नष्टावयव-मानत्वं
प्रत्याचष्ट च सूत्रकृत् ॥
प्रोक्षणीष्व अर्थ-संयोगाद्
इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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 prokṣaṇīśv arthaśaṁyogāt. 274

[[111]]

▼ नरसिंहः

नष्टावयवत्वं योग-शक्ति-राहित्यम् । 'नाम' पदेन प्रतिपादिकम् उच्यते । नष्टावयव-नामत्वं = रूढिम् इत्य् अतः ।

प्रोक्षणीष्वर्थ ... Pūrvamīmāṁsā : I.iv.11. This aphorism means that in words like "prokṣaṇī", the etymological significance itself is applicable; i.e., the word is to be taken in its etymological sense alone and not the conventional one, for the former is quite compatible with the latter. The advantage of this sūtra over the preceding sūtras is that all liquids are meant by the term "prokṣaṇī", and not water alone.

निगमनम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ततश्च सत्त्वाद् भगवान्
भज्यते यैः परः पुमान् ।
ते सात्त्वता भागवता
इत्य् उच्यन्ते द्विजोत्तमाः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

For a definition of the term Bhāgavata, see Pādmasāṁhitā, Caryāpāda, II.91b-95a and XXI. 14-15. For an interesting account of the origin and significance of the term Sāttvata see J. Przyluski, 'Sātvant, Sātvata and Nāsatya', IIIQ, Vol. IX pp 83-91.

For a glorification of Pāñcarātrins along with Vaikhānasas, see Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana [Vavilla edn. Vol. XVI], ch. 78:

यतयो मोक्ष-धर्म-ज्ञा योगिनश् चरित-व्रताः ।

पञ्च-रात्र-विदो मुख्यास् तथा भागवताः परे ॥ [24]

वैखानसाः कुल-श्रेष्ठाः वैदिकाचार-वारिणः । [25a]

यावद् एते प्रपश्यन्ति पङ्कतीस् तावत् पुनन्ति च ॥ [28b]

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

स्मृत्य-अन्तराणि च भागवतानाम् उत्कृष्ट-ब्राह्मण्य-प्रतिपादकानीति
परस्तात् प्रदर्शयिष्यन्ते ।

▼ Buitenen

Later on we shall show that other smṛtis set forth the eminent brahminhood of the bhāgavatas.

▼ नरसिंहः

No such smṛtis are however, quoted by the author in the remaining portion of the text.

पृथङ्-निर्देशः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यत् पुनर् उक्तं -

समाने ब्राह्मण्ये

किम् इति सात्त्वत-भागवतैकान्तिक-शब्दैर् एवैतेषां नियमेन व्यपदेश

इति,
तत् परिव्राजक-निगदादिवद् इत्य् अदोषः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

131. The further objection,²⁷⁵ 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.

[275]: supra § 15.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

See p. 12 above, for the pūrvapakṣa-view.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

यथैव हि समाने ब्राह्मण्ये यजुष्ट्वे च
केचिद् एव ब्राह्मणाः
कानिचिद् एव यजूषि
परिव्राजक-निगद-शब्दाभ्याम् अधीयन्ते,

- | तिष्ठन्तु ब्राह्मणाः:
- | परिव्राजका आनीयन्ताम्,
- | यजूषि वर्तन्ते न निगदाः;
- | निगदा वर्तन्ते न यजूषि

इति च,

▼ *नरसिंहः*

यथैव हि ... See Pūrvamīmāṃsā, II. i. 35-37: "तेषां ऋक् यत्रार्थ-वशेन पाद-व्यवस्था", "गीतिषु समाख्या", "शेषे यजुश् शब्दः", for the definitions of ṛk, sāman and yajus respectively. By the last of the above sūtras, the

group of mantras called “nigada” also comes to be known as “yajus”.

तिष्ठन्तु ... Cf. Śābara under II. i. 43, p. 89.

यजूषि ... Cf. ibid. under II. i. 39, p. 89.

▼ *Buitenen*

Certain brahmins are called bhāgavatas, just as certain brahmins are called parivrājakas, and certain yajuh formulae nigadas, though both are equally brahmins and equally yajuh formulae; namely in the statements:

The brahmins should remain,
the parivrājakas must be fetched; 276
“the yajuh formulae take place, not the nigadas;
the nigadas take place, not the yajuh formulae;”²⁷⁷

[276]: not identified. [277]: not identified.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुति:*

तथेहापि भविष्यति,

निगदाश् चतुर्थं मन्त्र-जातं
यजूषि वा तद्-रूपत्वाद्

इति न्यायाभिधानात्।

▼ *Buitenen*

and this is so because of the interpretation:

“the nigadas are the fourth mantra collection, or the yajuh formulae, because they are identical.”

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Vide Pūrvamīmāṃsā II. i. 40.

वृत्त्या③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

वृत्त्य-अर्थं देवता-पूजा-
नैवेद्य-प्राशनादिभिः ।
दौब्राह्मण्यं यद् अप्युक्तं
तत्र प्रतिविधीयते ॥

▼ Buitenen

132. The contention²⁷⁸ 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:

[278]: supra § 16.

▼ नरसंहः

See p. 15 above.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न हि भागवतैस् सर्वेर्
वृत्तये ऋभ्यार्चितो हरिः ।
दृष्टा हि बहवस् स्वार्थं
पूजयन्त्वा ऽपि सात्त्वताः ॥

▼ Buitenen

Surely not all bhāgavatas worship Hari for their profession, for many Sātvatas are found who perform pūjā for themselves.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

केचिद् यदि परं सन्तः
सात्त्वता वृत्ति-कार्शिताः ।

**याजयन्ति महा-भागैर्
वैष्णवैर् वृत्ति-कारणात् ॥**

▼ *Buitenen*

If there are certain people who, while being Sātvatas, follow a reprehensible profession and perform sacrifices for respectable bhāgavatas professionally,

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

न तावतैषां ब्राह्मण्यं
शक्यं नास्तीति भाषितुम् ।
न खल्व् आध्वर्यवं कुर्वन्
ज्योतिष्टोमे पतिष्यति ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

यदि न प्रतिगृहीयुः
पूजैवाविफला भवेत् ।
पूजा-सादुण्य-सिद्ध्य-अर्थम्
अतस् ते प्रतिगृह्णते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

अर्चनान्ते हिरण्यं च
तस्मै देयं स्व-शक्तिः ।
अन्यथा पूजकस्यैव

तत्र पूजा-फलं भवेत् ॥५॥
हन्त्य॑ अल्प-दक्षिणो यज्ञ
इत्य॑-आदि-स्मृति-दर्शनात् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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)."279

[279]: cf. Manu, 11.40.

▼ नरसिंहः

अर्चनान्ते ... Paramasamīhitā, XVII. 46b-47a.

हन्त्यल्पदक्षिणो ... Manusmṛti, XI. 40b.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ऋत्विजा द्रव्य-लुब्धेन
स्वयं याज्ञा-पुरस्सरम् ॥
यद् आर्तिर्जयं कृतं कर्म
तद् एव हि निषिध्यते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

It is however prohibited that a covetous Vedic priest officiate as a priest after he himself has put up his demands for a fee,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् यथा

यद् आशंसमानम् आर्तिर्जयं कारयन्त्य्

उत वा मे दद्याद्
उत वा मा वृणीत

इति

तद् ध तत् पराग् एव यथा जग्धं,
न हैवं तद् यज्यमानं भुनक्ति ।

इति,(4)

▼ *Buitenen*

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 benefit the sacrificer."280

[280]: AitBr., 3.46.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa XV. ii. p. 418 [Ānandāśrama Skt. Ser. 32,
with Sāyaṇa's commentary]. The passage reads thus :

taddhaitadeva jagdhāṁ yadāśaṁsamānamārtvijyāṁ²⁸¹
kārayata uta vā me dadyāt uta vā mā vṛṇīteti taddha
tatparāṇeva yathā jagdhāṁ na haiva tad yajamānam
bhunakti.

This passage points out that a careful yajamāna should avoid
greedy priests who perform three types of objectionable offerings
in sacrifices. Cf. ibid. p. 417: "trīṇi ha vai yajñe kriyante, jagdham,
gīrṇam, vāntam".

Vide Sāyaṇa's commentary on it:

tānyetāni trīṇi durbuddhibhir yajñe kriyante
jagdhādisthānīyāni trīṇi, varjanīyānītyarthah.

For more information on this, see Sāyaṇa's commentary, p. 411.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

श्रद्धा-पूत्-दक्षिणा-दानं
तूभयोर् अपि श्रेयस्करम् एव ।

▼ Buitenen

The donation of the sacerdotal fee which is purified by faith is felicitous for both,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

योऽविर्तं प्रतिगृह्णाति
दद्याद् अर्चितम् एव च ॥ तावू उभौ गच्छतः स्वर्गम्
इत्यादि-स्मृति-दर्शनात् ।

▼ Buitenen

as according to the smṛti, "He who receives the offering and he who {{deit|gives it}} both go to heaven."²⁸¹

[281]: not identified.

[[112]]

▼ नरसिंहः

Vide Manusmṛti. IV-238. The remainder of the verse is "narakaṁ tu viparyaye". The term "arcitaṁ" should be understood in the sense of "arcanāpurassaram". It is an adverb and not a noun.

This verse is also found in the Mahābhārata, Āśvamedhika [Vavilla edn. Vol. XVIII.] ch. 112, śl. 30.

देवालकता③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद् अपि

| वृत्त्यर्थं देव-पूजनाद् देवकोशोपजीवित्वाच् च देवलकत्व-प्राप्तिर्

इति,

▼ Buitenen

133. The statements²⁸² that professional worship of the deity and living off the god's treasure makes a man a devalaka²⁷⁵

[282]: supra § 16.

▼ नरसिंहः

See pp. 15-16 above.

देवतान्तर-वृत्तौ④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् अपि देवतान्तर-वृत्य्-अर्थाराधन- तत्-कोशोपजीवन-विषयम् इति द्रष्टव्यम् ।

▼ Buitenen

must be taken to refer to the professional worship of, and the living off the treasure of, other deities than Vāsudeva.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा च भगवान् व्यासः -

| भवेद् देवलको यो वै
रुद्रकाद्य-उपजीवकः

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

Thus the blessed Vyāsa: "A devalaka is he who lives on Rudra etc."

283

[283]: This and the following quotations could not be identified.

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

दीक्षा-हीनाः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अपि भवति शाण्डिल्य-वचनम् -

वृत्त्यर्थं याजिनस् सर्वे
दीक्षा-हीनाश् च केवलम् ।
कर्म-देवलका एते
स्मृता ह्यत्र पुरा मुने ॥
तांश् च संवत्सराद् ऊर्ध्वं
न स्पृशेन् न च संविशेत् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

And there is also Śāṅḍilya's word:

"All those who perform sacrifices professionally
and are also not consecrated
are the only ones who are traditionally known as
karmadevalakas in this world, O sage.
One should not touch them or consort with them for a
year."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

कल्प-देवलकाः केचित्
कर्म-देवलका अपि ।
अथ त्रिवर्षाद् ऊर्ध्वम्
अयोग्या देव-कर्मणि ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

Likewise:

"Certain people who are karmadevalakas and kalpadevalakas are unqualified for ritual before the deity for a period of three years.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

ये कल्पोक्तं प्रकुर्वन्ति
दीक्षा-हीना द्वि-जातयः ।
वृत्त्य-र्थं वा यशोऽर्थं वा
कल्प-देवलकास् तु ते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

Those brahmins who, without being consecrated, perform rites set forth in the Kalpa, either professionally or for the fame of it, are kalpadevalakas.

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुति:**

(कस्यचिद् विप्रस्य) वृत्तिं कृत्वा, तु विप्रेण
दीक्षितेन विधानतः ।
अन्येन याजयेद् देवम्
अशक्तः स्वयम् अर्चने ॥
यजनं मुख्यम् एवैतद्
गौणम् एवान्यथा भवेत् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Paramasamhitā, XVII. 46a.

Cf also ibid., 8b:

अन्येन वैष्णवेनैव देवं शूरः प्रपूजयेत् ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अन्यथा (\leftarrow गौणाराधनम्) +इत्य् अदीक्षितेन +इत्य् अर्थः,

▼ Buitenen

"In another manner,' that is to say, when it is done by a non-consecrated priest.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तद् एव स्पष्टयति -

अदीक्षितेन विप्रेण
येन केन विधानतः ।
वृत्त्य्-अर्थं यत् कृतं कर्म
तज् जघन्यम् उदाहृतम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

This the author elucidates:

"The rite performed professionally by 'some priest who has not been properly consecrated is called of the lowest degree."

निगमनम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इत्यादि-स्मृति-शत-पर्यालोचनात्

| पञ्चरात्र-सिद्ध-दीक्षा-संस्कार-विरहितानां ब्राह्मणानां
देवकोशोपजीवन-वृत्त्यर्थ-पूजनादिकम् उपब्राह्मणत्व-देवलक्त्वावहम्

इति निश्चीयते।

▼ Buitenen

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]]

निर्माल्योपयोगाद् अशिष्टता③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यत् पुनश्

| शिष्ट-विगर्हित-निर्माल्य-निवेद्योपयोगाद् भागवतानाम् अशिष्टत्वम्

इति -

तत्र ब्रूमः

किम् इदं निर्माल्यं, निवेद्यं चाभिप्रेतं श्रोत्रियस्य ?

▼ Buitenen

134. As to the statement²⁸⁴ that the bhāgavatas cannot pass for exemplary persons because they make use of flower and food

offerings, which practice is abhorred by exemplary persons, to this we say: what does the śrotriya 285 mean by left-over flowers and leftover food?

[284]: supra § 16.

[285]: a Brahman erudite in the Veda and following its observances.

▼ नरसिंहः

See p. 15 above for the opponent's view.

For a detailed discussion on this subject, see Vedānta Deśika's Saccaritrarakṣā, Adhikāra III.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

(विग्रहायार्पणस्यानन्दीकारात्)
(मिवेदनाद्य-अविशिष्ट) पुष्टौदनादि-मात्रं चेत्
सर्व-लोक-विरुद्धता ।
पुष्टौदन-परित्यागं
न हि लोकोऽनुमन्यते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

When he takes it only as the flowers and the cakes,286 he is contradicted by all the world, for nobody approves of wasting flowers and cakes.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

[286]: If he does not believe that God is present in the effigie, the offerings are obviously not used and cannot be characterized as left-overs. The priest's avoidance of them would simply amount to sinful waste.(4)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

(देव-निवेदन-)विशिष्ट-प्रतिषेधोऽपि
न युक्तस् तद्-असिद्धितः (आक्षेपक-मते) ।

▼ Buitenen

Also, a particularized prohibition 287 is not in order, because it is not established.

▼ Buitenen - Notes

[287]: He must make his prohibition specific, in order not to prohibit the priest from using food that is otherwise wasted. But he cannot determine the specification on his own terms.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न ह्य अनिरूपित-विशेषणा विशिष्ट-बुद्धिर् आविर् अस्ति,

▼ Buitenen

No notion of a particularized thing occurs when the particularization is not determined;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न चेह विशेषणं निरूपयितुं शक्यते ।

▼ Buitenen

and here it is impossible to determine the particularization.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किम् इति न शक्यते -
यावता देवोदेशेन परित्यागो विशेषणम्।

▼ Buitenen

OBJECTION. Why should it be impossible, since the particularization is that it is forbidden to use food what has been offered up to the deity?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

किम् इदार्नीं पञ्चरात्र-शास्त्रम् अपि प्रमाणम् अङ्गीकृतं भवता
येन पञ्चरात्र-तन्त्र-विहित-मन्त्र-प्रतिष्ठापित-प्रतिमासु देवताम् अभ्युपेत्य
तद्-उद्देशेन त्यागे विशेषणम् अभिलष्यते?

▼ Buitenen

REPLY. Are you now accepting the validity of Pañcaratra? For only when one admits that there is a deity present in the idols that are erected with the sacred formulae enjoined by Pañcaratra Tantra can one postulate that the particularization of the prohibition lies in the offering-up to the deity.

▼ नरसिंहः

The discussion here is, whether or not the usage of nirmālya, nivedya, etc., contradicts the genuine character of the Bhāgavatas. The Mīmāṃsaka cannot attribute non-brahmanical character to the Bhāgavatas, says the author, on the ground that they use nirmālya and nivedya prohibited in some smṛti-texts. First of all, the prohibition pertains to the nirmālya and nivedya offered to deities other than Viṣṇu. Secondly, the Mīmāṃsaka has to qualify the terms "nirmālya" and "nivedya", even to refute their usage, because flowers and food in general cannot be termed so. He might say that "nirmālya" and "nivedya" are things offered by the Pāñcarātrins to some deity; but this statement lands him in trouble, since he does not admit of any deity with a personality and also because such a statement would imply his acceptance of the validity of the Pāñcarātra-texts. Without admitting their validity as the starting point, he cannot speak of a deity, and flowers etc., being offered to that deity.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

कथं हि तत्-प्रामाण्यानभ्युपगमे
तत्-प्रतिपाद्यमानाया देवतात्वम्,
कथन्तरां च तद्-उद्देशेन त्यक्तस्य निर्माल्य-निवेद्य-भावः?

▼ Buitenen

For unless the validity of the Tantra is admitted, how can an idol which is set forth in the Tantra be a deity, and, a fortiori, how can the substance that is offered up for this deity's sake be nirmālya and nivedya,²⁸⁸

[288]: used flowers and used food offerings.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

न हि काचिज् जात्या देवता नामास्ति,
यैव हि हविः-प्रतियोगितया (न तद्-अन्तरा) प्रमाण-भूताच् शब्दाद् अवगम्यते
सा तत्र देवता

इति हि वः सिद्धान्तः । (5)

▼ Buitenen

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 oblation;

that is your own doctrine.

▼ नरासीहः

Cf. Tantravārtika under I. iii. 10, p. 172:

विधिनैव हि देवत्वं प्रतिकर्मवधार्यते । न जात्या देवतात्वं हि क्वचिद् अस्ति
व्यवस्थितम् ॥

Cf. also Prakaraṇapañcikā, V. p. 105:

देवतोदेशेन द्रव्य-त्यागो यागः ।.....स्तोत्रं शृणोमि यद् गुण-वचने । यद् उद्देशेन च हविषां त्यागश् चोद्यते, सा देवता । तत्रैव याज्ञिक-वृद्धानां देवता-शब्द-प्रयोगात् । यत्र हि आग्नेयादि-देशनार्थनुष्ठाने प्रवृत्तो अग्निम् उद्दिश्य हविस् त्यजति, तत्रैवम् आहुर् अग्निर् अत्र देवतेति ।

पाञ्चरात्रिक-पक्षे⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथ

पञ्चरात्रिकैर् देवतोदेशेन परित्यक्तत्वाभ्युपगमान्
निर्माल्य-निवेद्य-भावः,

▼ Buitenen

Or if it be held that

something is nirmālya and nivedya because it is admitted by the Pāñcarātrikas that it is offered up to the deity,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

हन्त तर्हि,
तैर् एव परम-पावनतयाऽपि निर्माल्य-निवेद्योपयोगस्याङ्गीकृतत्वात्
तद्वद् एव पावनत्वम् अङ्गी क्रियताम् ।

▼ Buitenen

well, in that case you must also admit its purity because the Pāñcarātrikas accept also that the utilization of nirmālya and nivedya is perfectly pure.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अथापावनम् एव तैः (पाञ्चरात्र-मोहितैः) पावन-बुद्ध्या परिगृहीतम् इति न तत् प्राशस्त्यम्
अङ्गीक्रियते,

▼ Buitenen

Or if you do not accept this peculiar excellence, since in your opinion the Pāñcarātrikas have accepted as pure something that is really impure,

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

हन्त तर्ह्यु अ-देवतैव देवता-बुद्ध्यारोपेण तैः परिगृहीतेति
न तद्-उद्देशेन त्यक्तस्य निर्मल्य-निवेद्य-भावो उज्जीक्रियताम् । (4)

▼ Buitenen

—well, in that case you must accept it that the substance which is offered up is not really nirmalya and nivedya, since then you opine that the Pañcarātrikas have adopted someone who is not really a deity by mistaking him for a deity!

निगमनम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एतद् उक्तं भवति

- पुष्पौदनादि-स्वरूप-मात्र-त्यागस्यानिष्टत्वात्,
- स्व-दर्शनानुसारेण च विशेषणासंभवात्
- पर-दर्शनानुसारेण विशेषण-निरूपणे
तस्यैव परम-पावनत्वापातात्

तत्र प्रामाण्यम् अभ्युपगच्छद्विरु अन्यैश् च
निर्मल्य-निवेद्योपयोगो उवश्याङ्गीकरणीय
इति । (4)

▼ Buitenen

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.

[289]: without divine utilisation.

पाञ्चरात्रे ऽनिषेधः④

निषेधाभासाः⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

आह

कथं पुनस् तत्र प्रामाण्यम् अङ्गीकुर्वता निर्मल्यं निवेद्यं च न परिहरणीयम् ।

▼ Buitenen

[[114]]

135. OBJECTION. But how is it possible then that even one
who admits the validity of Pāñcarātra
should reject nevertheless the nirmālya and nivedya?

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

निषिध्यते हि तन्त्रेषु
निर्मल्य-प्राशनादिकम् ।
यथा सनत्-कुमारीय-
संहितायाम् उदीरितम् ।

▼ Buitenen

For in the Tantras the tasting etc. of the nirmālya is prohibited. For instance, it is said in the Sanatkumārīya Saṃhitā:

▼ नरसिंहः

Published by the Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1969.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

निवेदितं तु यद् धव्यं
पुष्पं फलम् अथापि वा ।
तन् निर्माल्यम् इति प्रोक्तं
तत् प्रयत्नेन वर्जयेत् ॥

▼ Buitenen

"The offering that is proffered (to the deity), flower or fruit, is called nirmālya; that must be avoided meticulously."

▼ नरसिंहः

Śivarātra, V. 48b-49a. Also Cf. Paramasaṃhitā XII. 36b-37a:

पूजायां विनियुक्तं तु यद् द्रव्यम् इह पूजकैः ।
निर्माल्यम् इति विज्ञेयं न कार्येषु वर्जितम् ॥

Cf also Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā (ms) VII. 52b-5 a:

निवेदितं च यद् द्रव्यं पुष्पं फलम् अथापि वा ।
निर्माल्यम् इति तं [तत् ?] चैव प्रयत्नेन विवर्जयेत् ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा प्रदेशान्तरे -

निर्माल्यं भक्षयित्वैवम्
उच्छिष्टम् अगुरोर् अपि ।
मासं पयो-व्रतो भूत्वा
जपन् अष्टाक्षरं सदा ॥

ब्रह्म-कूर्च ततः पीत्वा
पूतो भवति मानवः ।

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

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."²⁹⁰

[290]: The pañcagavya is a substance in which the 5 products of the cow are mingled.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

निर्मल्यं ... Rśirātra, VIII. 77b-78. Variants: "भक्षयित्वा चापि" in the first line, "जप्त्वा चाषाक्षर" in the second line and "पूतो भवति साधकः" in the third line.

ब्रह्मकूर्च ... A mixture of five products of the cow (pañcagavya) with darbha-water.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

तथा इन्द्र-रात्रे ।

न चोपजीवेद् देवेशं
न निर्मल्यानि भक्षयेत् ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Likewise in the Indrarātra: "One should not live off the Supreme God, nor eat the nirmālya offerings."

▼ *नरसिंहः*

IX. 2a.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा -

न चोपभोगयोग्यानि
निर्मल्यानि कदाचन ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Also:

"And the nirmālya offerings are never fit for consumption."

▼ नरसिंहः

This is not found in the extant text of the Indrarātra-section, perhaps lost in the rest of ch. IX, which ends in a blank.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा संहितान्तरे -

निर्मल्यानि न चाश्रीयान्
न जिघ्रेन् न च लङ्घयेत् ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Similarly in another Saṃhitā:

"One should not eat the nirmālya offerings, nor smell them, nor step over them."

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

Cf Paramasamhitā III. 44:

निर्मल्यं लङ्घयेन् नैव न भुज्जीत न संस्पृशेत् ।
न दद्याच् च न जिघ्रेच् च रक्षेत्.....च ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् एवम् अनेक-संहिता-समधिगत-निषेधस्य निर्मल्योपभोगस्य
कथम् इव पावनत्वाङ्गीकारः ।

▼ Buitenen

How then can one accept the purity of the utilization of
the nirmālya when we thus know from several Saṃhitā
that it is prohibited?

विलम्ब्य प्रयोगः ⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अत्राह देवम् उद्दिश्य
त्यक्तस्यापि च वस्तुनः ।
नाडिका-दशकाद् अर्वाण्
उपयोगो न निन्द्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.²⁹¹

[291]: one nāḍikā is a half muhūrta.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा इन्द्र-रात्रे एव -

दश-नाड्य-अधिकं पूरं
स्थापयेत् तु विचक्षणः ।

काल-योगस् समुद्दिष्टो
रात्रावृ अहनि चैव हि ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

▼ नरसंहेः

I. 10b-11a. Variants: स्थापयित्वा for स्थापयेत् तु and स उद्दिष्टः for समुद्दिष्टः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अ-काल-योगातिरिक्तं तु
निर्माल्यं परिचक्षते ।
ततस् तद् अप्सु चैवाग्नौ
क्षिपेद् भूमौ खनेत् तु वा ॥

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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."

▼ नरसंहेः

I. 11b, 10a. Variant: वा चाग्नौ for चैवाग्नौ ।

अनधिकारिभ्यो निषेधः⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

उच्यते - नात्र निर्मल्य-
प्राशनादि प्रशस्यते ।
किं तु पूरण-पूजायां
विनियुक्तस्य वस्तुनः ॥ नाडिका-दशके पूर्णे
पश्चात् त्यागो विधीयते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

OBJECTION. But what is said here is not to praise the tasting etc. of the nirmālya, but to prescribe that the substance of the cake pūjā is thrown away after a period of ten nāḍikās.

▼ *नरसिंहः*

For an account of pūraṇapūjā, see Indrarātra, ch. I. See also Kapiñjalasamhitā, ch. 29.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*

सामान्येन निवेदितस्य पुष्पौदनादेः
कृत-कार्यताया निर्माल्यत्वेन +अपनये प्राप्ते
नाडिका-दश-पूरणं पूजाङ्गतया स्थापनं विधीयते

दश-नाड्य-अधिकं पूरं स्थापयेत्
इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

In the statement:

"He must let the offering cake stand for over ten nāḍikās,"

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

Indrarātra, I. 10b.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ततश्च तन्त्र-सिद्धान्त-
पर्यालोचनयापि वः ।
हरिद्रा-चूर्ण-नैवेद्य-
पादाम्बु-स्पर्शनादिकम् ॥ न सिद्ध्येत् तन्त्र-सिद्धान्तः
कव, नु यूयं कव चाल्पकाः ।

▼ Buitenen

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!

▼ नरसिंहः

This is Yāmuna's reply to the above arguments regarding nirmālya and naivedya.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अहो विद्या-लवोल्लासि-
जिह्वा-ग्रस्त-विचेतसः ॥ सितासितं वचो भाति
स-कलडकेन्दु-बिम्बवत् । (5)
ये हि युष्मद्-विधा मूर्खस्
तेषाम् एव निषेध-गीः ॥

▼ Buitenen

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,

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Sāttvata Saṁhitā, XXI. 45b-46:

yo na vettacyutam̄ tattvam̄ pañcarātrārthameva ca |
tathā sadvaiṣṇavīm̄ dīkṣām̄ nānāśāstroktalakṣaṇām̄ ||
na tena saha saṁbandhaḥ kāryaḥ..... ||

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

सेव्यमानं हि तत् सर्व
वैष्णवैर् अधिकारिभिः ।
अद्यौघ-क्वचनायालं
सोम-पानम् इवाध्वरे ॥

▼ Buitenen

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;

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अन्येषां हि तद् अस्पृश्यं
पुरो-डाशः शुनाम् इव । (5)

▼ Buitenen

for it is not to be touched by others, just as the puroḍāśa cake²⁹² is not to be touched by dogs!

[292]: cake used at Vedic offerings.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Pādmasaṁhitā, Caryāpāda, XII.83b:

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तद् यथेश्वर संहितायाम् -

दुर्लभो भगवद्-भक्तो
लोकेऽस्मिन् पुरुषः सुत ।
तत्रापि दुर्लभतरो
भावो वै यस्य तत्त्वतः ॥
पादोदकं प्रति शुभस्
सिद्धान्तैश् च निवेदिते ।
सग्-आदिके चोपभुक्ते
हू उपभोगार्थम् एव च ॥

▼ Buitenen

Thus in the Īśvara Saṃhitā,

"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,

▼ नरसिंहः

These and a few other verses following, quoted by Yāmuna as from Īśvarasamhitā, are not found in the available āgamas of that name. The Īśvarasamhitā from which Yāmuna quotes appears to have been a different work. See Introduction to Jayākhyasamhitā (Gaekwad Oriental Series), p. 49.

▼ राममिश्रशास्त्री

(श्रीमद्बागवते यथाऽह भगवन्तं श्रीकृष्णम् उद्घवः -

तवोच्छिष्ट-भुजो दासास्
तव मायां जयेमहि

इति ।)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अतश् च भाव-हीनानाम्
अभक्तानां च षण्-मुख ।
निषिद्धं भगवन्-मन्त्र-
दृक्-पूतम् अखिलं हि यत् ॥

इति,

▼ विषयः

प्रसादः, निर्माल्यम्, भक्तिः

▼ Buitenen

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."

पावित्रम्⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा प्रदेशान्तरे -

कुड्कुमं चन्दनं चैतत्
कर्पूरम् अनुलेपनम् ।
विष्णु-देह-परामृष्टं
तद् वै पावन-पावनम् ॥

इति,

▼ Buitenen

And in another passage: "The saffron, sandal, camphor and oils that have been taken off Viṣṇu's body are supremely purifying."

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा पद्मोद्धरे -

विष्णु-देह-परामृष्टं
यश् चूर्णं शिरसा वहेत् ।
सोऽश्वमेध-फलं प्राप्य
विष्णु-लोके महीयते ॥

▼ Buitenen

Likewise in the Padmodbhava: "He who wears the powder that is taken of Viṣṇu's body on his head obtains the fruit of a Horse Sacrifice and glories in Viṣṇu's heaven."

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथेश्वर-संहितायाम् ।

उपभुक्तस्य सर्वस्य
गन्ध-पुष्पादिकस्य च ।
स्नानादाव उपयुक्तस्य
दधि-क्षीरादिकस्य च ॥
दूषणं न प्रयोक्तव्यं
शब्दैर् अ-प्रतिपत्ति-जैः ।

▼ Buitenen

Similarly in the Īśvara Samhitā,

"No blame should be put by statements arising from ignorance on all that is used, the perfume, flowers etc., (the water) of the idol's bath etc., and the curds, milk etc.

▼ नरसिंहः

This is the second instance where Yāmuna quotes from Īśvarasamhitā, which is yet to be recovered.

▼ राममिश्रशास्त्री

(अप्रतिपत्तिजैः = निन्दाऽसूयाद्-आविष्कार-कारकैर् इत्यर्थः ।)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

निर्मल्य-बुद्ध्या देवीयं
पावनं दूषयन्ति ये ॥ ते यान्ति नरकं मूढास्
तत्-प्रभावापलापिनः ।

इति,

▼ Buitenen

Those who condemn this divine purifying agent because they consider it nirmālya, those witless detractors of its power will go to hell."

वैष्वकसेने निषेधः⑤

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यानि पुनर् दीक्षितम् एवाधिकृत्य
समयानुशासन-समये निर्मल्योपयोग-निषेध-पराणि वचनानि
तानि पारिषदेशोपयोगोत्तर-कालाभिप्रायेण द्रष्टव्यानि ।

▼ Buitenen

The above statements which to the consecrated prohibit the use of nirmālya at the time mentioned in the time instruction293 must be understood to mean a time subsequent to that when the (offerings to) the chief of the Bhagavān's retinue294 is being used.

▼ *Buitenen - Notes*

[293]: namely, in the above statement on the 10 nāḍikās.

[294]: Viśvaksena, to whom pūjā is performed after the main pūjā.

▼ नरसिंहः

इतः पूर्वम् अभक्तानां निर्माल्याद्य-उपयोग-निषेध-विषयो विचारितः । इदानीं दीक्षितस्यापि तद्-विषये विचारः प्रस्तूयते ।

▼ राममिश्रशास्त्री

(भगवत्-पारिषदानम् ईशो विष्वक्सेनस्
तद्-उपयोगानन्तर-काले निषेध-पराणि द्रष्टव्यानि ।)

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यतो भगवद्-अर्थेन
त्यक्तं सक्-चन्दनादिकम् ।
पश्चाद् अभोग्यतां याति
विष्वक्सेन-निवेदनात् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

Since the garlands, sandal etc, which are offered up to the Bhagavān, later on, after the Viśvaksena offering, become unfit to eat,

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Sāttvata Saṃhitā, X. 57-58.

दिजाते: दत्त-शिष्टस्य पुण्य-पत्रादिकस्य च ।
विहितश् चाभसि त्यागो विश्वक्सेनेनाचर्ने कृते ॥
धर्तव्यं न चिरं चाग्रे यत् पुरा विनिवेदितम् ।
नैवेद्यं मन्त्र-मूर्त्तिनां किञ्चित्-पुण्य-फलादृते ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

अत एव निवेद्य-आदि
ततोऽवाग् एव सात्त्वतः ।
सेव्यते तेन तत् तेषाम्
उत्कर्षस्यैव कारणम् ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

therefore the Sātvatas use the nivedya etc. before that time.
Consequently the use of the nirmālyā is a cause of excellence for
the Sātvatas.

देवतान्तर-निर्माल्ये④

▼ **मूल-प्रस्तुतिः**

अपि च ।

देवतान्तर-निर्माल्यं
शिष्टैर् इष्टं विगर्हितम् (सुरा-पानवत्) ।
इदं तु वैदिकत्वेन
सोम-पानवद् इष्यते ॥

▼ *Buitenen*

[[118]]

136. Moreover, it is our postulation that the exemplary people hold the nirmālyā 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).

▼ **नरसिंहः**

देवतान्तर-निर्माल्यं शिष्टैः विगर्हित-स्वरूपेण इष्टम् इत्य् अर्थः ।

इदं तु ... Cf. Viṣṇusamhitā, XXXIX. 12-13a:

निर्मल्यं न स्पृशेदद्यात् लङ्घयेद् वाशनं कुतः ।
सर्वेषाम् एव देवानां निर्मल्यम् अशुचि स्मृतम् ॥
विष्णु-भुक्तं तु पुष्पादि शुचीत्य् आददते परे ।

निगमनम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ये नाम भगवच्छास्त्र-
प्रामाण्यं नानुजानते ।
न निरूपयितुं शक्यं
तैर् निर्मल्यम् इतीरितम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

So I have said that those who do not accept the validity of the Bhagavān's doctrine are unable to determine what is nirmālya.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

निरूपणेऽपि भगवन्-
निर्मल्यम् अतिपावनम् ।
समस्त-वैदिकाचार्य-
वचनैर् अवसीयते ॥

▼ Buitenen

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.

शब्द-प्रमाणम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

शब्द-प्रमाणके ह्यु अर्थ
यथा-शब्दं व्यवस्थितः ।
न चात्र शब्दो नास्तीति
वक्तव्यं बधिरेतरैः ॥(5)

▼ विषयः

शब्दः, पाञ्चरात्रम्

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यथा ब्रह्म-पुराणे च पठ्यते -

विष्णोर् नैवेद्यं शुद्धं
मुनिभिर् भोज्यम् उच्यते ।
अन्यन् निवेद्य-निर्मल्यं
भुक्त्वा चान्द्रायणं चरेत् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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 cāndrāyāṇa in expiation.

▼ नरसिंहः

विष्णोर् ... Passages to be identified.

मुनिभिर्भोज्यमुच्यते ... Cf. Pādmasaṁhitā, caryā, XII. 81b:

विष्णोर् निवेदितेन शुद्धं पावनानां च पावनम् ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

विष्णु-देह-परामृष्टं
माल्यं पाप-हरं शुभम् ।
यो नरश् शिरसा धते
स याति परमां गतिम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

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."

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Pādmasamhitā, caryā, XII. 85:

धरितं विष्णु-निर्माल्यं चन्दनाद्य् अनुलेपनम् ।
अहर्-निशं धारयतां न पुनर्-जननं भवेत् ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

एतेन -

निर्माल्यं च निवेद्यं च भुक्त्वा चान्द्रायणं चरेत् ।

इति स्मरणम् अपि रुद्रकाल्पादिविषयम् इत्यावेदितव्यम्,

▼ Buitenen

It follows that the smṛti statement that a man who eats nirmālya and nivedya must perform the cāndrāyāṇa 295 should be taken to bear upon the nirmālya of Rudra, Kālī etc.

[295]: as quoted supra § 16.

▼ नरसिंहः

To be traced out. Cf. Pādmasamhitā, caryā, XII. 79a:

ब्रह्मोशानादि-देवानां नैव भोज्यं निवेदितम् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तथा महा-भारते -

हृदि ध्यायन् हरिं तस्मै
निवेद्यान्नं समाहितः ।
मध्यमानामिकाङ्गुष्ठैर्
गृहीत्वान्न-मितं पुनः ॥

▼ Buitenen

(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,

▼ नरसिंहः

To be identified.

Cf. Laghuvyāsasamhitā (Aṣṭāvimśatismṛtis) ch. II. 74-76:

स्वाहा-प्रणव-संयुक्तं प्राणायान्नाहुतिं ततः ।
अपानाय ततो हुत्वा ध्यानाय तद्-अनन्तरम् ॥
उदानाय ततो हुत्वा समानायेति पञ्चमम् ।
विज्ञाय चार्थम् एतेषां जुहुयाद् आत्मनि द्वि-जः ॥
शेषम् अन्नं यथा-कामं भुजीत व्यज्जनेर् युतम् ।
ध्यात्वा तन्-मनसा देवम् आत्मानं वै प्रजा-पतिम् ॥

This type of taking food is called 'anuyāga'. See Pāñcarātrarakṣā, p. 115: 'ईदृशं च भोजनम् एवानुयाग-समाख्यया इन्यत्र व्यपदिश्यते ।'

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्राणाय चेत्य् अपानाय
व्यानाय च ततः परम् ।

उदानाय समानाय
स्वाहेति जुहुयात् क्रमात् ॥

इति,

▼ *Buitenen*

and then sacrifice it bit by bit, saying: "Prāṇāya svāhā,
Apānāya svāhā, Vyānāya svāhā, Udānāya svāhā,
Samānāya svāhā."

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*:

तथा प्रदेशान्तरे -

निवेदितं तु यद् देवे
तद् दद्याद् ब्रह्म-चारिणे ।

इति ।

▼ *Buitenen*

Likewise in another passage, "what has been offered to the god must be given to a brahmacārin."296

[296]: Mahābhārata quotations not verifiable.

▼ *नरसिंहः*:

To be traced out.

▼ *मूल-प्रस्तुतिः*:

तथा महा-भारते -

पञ्चरात्र-विदो मुख्यास्
तस्य गेहे महात्मनः ।
प्राशनं भगवद्-भुक्तं
भुज्जते चाग्र-भोजनम् ॥

इति,

Thus in the Mahābhārata:

"The saintly knowers of the Pañcaratra ate in his house that which had been left over by the Bhagavān, as a means to attain to bliss, as supreme nourishment."297

[297]: The ritual taking of food is considered a performance of the prāṇāgnihotra.

▼ नरसिंहः

Śānti, ch. 322, śl. 23.

Cf. Sāttvatasamhitā, ch. 17, śls. 423-424:

दानानं च व्रतानां च तपसाम् यज्ञ-कर्मणाम् ।
निवेदितव्यं यद् द्रव्यं, दत्तं वा यत् पुरा ॥
कर्तव्यम् अनुयागार्थं प्राक् तद् एव हि केवलम् ।
तद् भावितम् अतोऽश्रीयात् पावनं प्राणान्वितम् ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

तथा च भगवान् शौनकः

नैवेद्यं स्वयम् अश्रीयाद्

इति ।

▼ Buitenen

And likewise the blessed Śaunaka:

"He himself eats the nivedya."

▼ नरसिंहः

Viṣṇudharma (of Bhaviṣyapurāṇa), Śaunakīya, ch. 92. śl. 32a:

नैवेद्यं स्वयम् अश्रीयात् मौनीत्य् एतद् उद्घ-मुखः ।

Cf. Pūjāsaṅgraha (ms.) folio 90b:

स्वयं वापि तद् अश्रीयात् सर्व-पाप-विशुद्धये ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इत्यादि-स्मृति-शत-सिद्ध-शुद्धि विष्णोर्
नैवेद्यं भव-भय-भेदि यो विनिन्देत् ।
नास्तिक्यात् स्मृति-वचनान्य् उपेक्षमाणस् तज्जिह्वा-विशसनम् एव युक्तम् अत्र ।

▼ Buitenen

He who condemns Viṣṇu's nivedya, whose purity is proved by hundreds of similar smṛtis and which dispels the fear of rebirth, really ignores the statements of the smṛti because of his heterodoxy and ought to have his tongue cut off.

[[119]]

प्राणाग्निहोत्रे नैवेद्यम्④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

ननु प्राणाग्निहोत्रस्य
नैवेद्य-साधनं कथम् ।
निर-इष्टकं न शिष्टानाम्
इष्टं होमादि-साधनम् ॥

▼ Buitenen

137. OBJECTION. But how can the nivedya be a means for the prāṇāgnihotra?283

The exemplary people do not approve of a means for homa etc. for which ~~no building bricks are used.~~?? (no sacrifice has been made.)

283: The ritual taking of food is considered a performance of the prāṇāgnihotra.

▼ नरसिंहः

Vedānta Deśika quotes from "ननु" upto "यथानुष्ठान-तन्त्रत्वं" etc., below, in his Saccaritrārakṣā, p. 93.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

न च (शरीरार्थ) द्रव्यान्तराक्षेपो
होमायेत्य् अ-कल्पते ।
रागतः प्राप्तम् एवान्नं
यतस् तेनोपजीव्यते ॥

▼ Buitenen

Nor can a substitution of another substance do duty as a homa,
because he lives off food that has been obtained
according to taste.

▼ नरसिंहः

आक्षेपः कल्पनम् इति यावत् ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नापि (सायम्-प्रातर्-अपेक्षया) भुक्त्य्-अन्तराक्षेपो
नैवेद्यायोपपाद्यते ।
सायं-प्रातर् द्वि-जातीनाम्
अशनं श्रुति-चोदितम् ॥
नान्तरा भोजनं कुर्याद्
इति तत्-प्रतिषेधनात् ।

▼ Buitenen

Nor can a substitution of another consumption be made
to replace 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."

▼ नरसिंहः

The remainder of the verse is 'अग्नि-होत्र-समो विधिः ।' Many Smṛtis attribute this to Manu. But Aparārka on Yājñavalkyasmṛti (p. 61) attributes this to Saṁvarta. Cf. also Saṁvartasmṛti (Collection of 27 smṛtis, Ānandāśrama Skt. Series), I.12.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

नैष दोषो यतः प्राण-
प्रभृतिर् देवता-गणः ॥
गुण-भूतः श्रुतो विष्णोर्
विष्णु-पारिषदेशवत् ।

▼ Buitenen

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 Viśvaksena, the chief of Viṣṇu's retinue.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यथैव हि भगवन्-निवेदितम् अपि पुष्पौदनादि
विष्वक्सेनाय दीयमानं नानौचित्यम् आवहति ।

▼ Buitenen

For just as the flowers, cake etc., though proffered to the Bhagavān
but actually given to Viśvaksena shows that.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यथा वा होतुर् उच्छिष्ट
एव सोम-रसोऽध्वरे ।
अध्वर्य-आदेर् विशुद्धौ स्याद्
एवम् अत्र भविष्यति ॥(4)

▼ Buitenen

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.298

[298]: The hotar is the principal reciting priest at the soma sacrifice, the adhvaryu the main executive

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

अपि च -

भोज्याभोज्य-व्यवस्थायाः
शास्त्रम् एव निबन्धनम् ।
तद्वचेद् भोज्यम् इदं ब्रूते
किं वयं विदधीमहि ॥

▼ Buitenen

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?

▼ नरसंह:

Cf. Bhagavadgītā, XVI. 24a:

तस्माच् छास्रं प्रमाणं ते कार्यकार्य-व्यवस्थितौ ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यथा इनुष्टान-तन्त्रत्वं
नित्य-काम्याग्निहोत्रयोः ।
एवं प्राणाग्निहोत्रेऽपि
नैवेद्याशन-तन्त्रता ॥(5)

▼ Buitenen

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.

▼ नरसिंहः

उभयोद्देशेन सकृद् अनुष्ठानं तन्त्रम् ।

वैदिक-कर्मातिरस्कारः③

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यद् अप्यु उक्तं

गर्भाधानादि-दाहान्त-संस्कारान्तर-सेवनाद्
भागवतानाम् अ-ब्रह्मण्यम्

इति तत्राप्यु अज्ञानम् एवापराध्यति,
न पुनर् आयुष्मतो दोषः;
यद् एते वंश-परम्परया वाजसनेय-शाखा-मधीयानाः
कात्यायनादि-गृह्णोक्त-मार्गेण गर्भाधानादि-संस्कारान् कुर्वते ।

▼ *Buitenen*

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.

[299]: supra § 17.

▼ नरसिंहः

यदप्युक्तं ... See p. 14 above for pūrvapakṣa. Vedānta Deśika quotes from here upto the end of the text, in his Nyāyapariśuddhi, p. 168

यदेते ... Deśika quotes from here upto the end, in his Pāñcarātrarakṣā, p. 95.

कात्यायनादि ... See Kātyāyanagrhyasūtra (ms.), p. 25ff for saṃskāras.

एकायन-शाखा④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

ये पुनः सावित्र्य-अनुवचन-प्रभृति--त्रयी-धर्म-त्यागेन एकायन-श्रुति-विहितान् एव चत्वारिंशत् संस्कारान् कुर्वते
तेऽपि स्व-शाखा-गृह्योक्तम् अर्थं यथावद् अनुतिष्ठमानाः
न शाखान्तरीय--कर्माननुष्ठानाद् ब्राह्मण्यात् प्रच्यवन्ते,
अन्येषाम् अपि पर-शाखा-विहित-कर्माननुष्ठान-निमित्तब्राह्मण्य-प्रसङ्गात्

▼ Buitenen

Those who perform the forty sacraments
which are enjoined by the Ekyana scripture
while giving up the dharmas of the Veda,
from the recitation of the gāyatri 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.

[300]: namely, at the upanayana ceremony.

▼ नरसिंहः

अननुष्ठानात् हेतोर् इति भावः ।

प्रच्यवन्ते ... Cf. the following quoted in the Pāñcarātrarakṣā, p. 110, as from the Pārameśvarasāṁhitā:

निषेकादींश् च संस्कारान् स्व-सूत्रोक्तान् समाचरेत् ।
पञ्च-रात्रेदितान् वापि ये स्व-वंश्यैर् अनुष्ठिताः ॥

Cf. also Auśanasa Dharmasāstra (Smṛtinām Samuccayaḥ, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 48), I, 48:

निषेकाद्याः श्मशानान्ताः क्रियाः पूजाङ्ग-सूत्र-धृक् ।
पञ्च-रात्रेण वा कश्चित् तन्त्रोक्तं धर्मम् आचरेत् ॥

▼ राममिश्रशास्त्री

यद्यपि अनूपसृष्टाच्छिष्टतेर्नात्मनेपदं प्राप्नोतीति अनुतिष्ठन्त इत्येव स्यात्
तथापि अनुष्ठानशीला अनुष्ठानपरायणा इत्यर्थस्य प्रतिपिपादयितत्वेन
ताच्छील्यवयोवचनशक्तिषु चानश् इति पाणिनीयेन चानश्प्रत्ययो
न तु शानच्चरत्यय इत्यवधारयन्तु निपुणाः ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

सर्वत्र हि जाति-चरण-गोत्राधिकारादि-व्यवस्थिता एव समाचारा उपलब्ध्यन्ते ।

▼ Buitenen

For everywhere among brahmins we find customs that differ according to birth, caraṇa, gotra, qualification etc.

▼ नरसिंहः

चरण-शब्देन शाखोच्यते ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

यद्य अपि सर्व-शाखा-प्रत्ययम् एकं कर्म
तथाऽपि न परस्-पर-विलक्षणाधिकारि-संबद्धा धर्माः
क्वचित् समुच्चीयन्ते,

▼ Buitenen

Even though one ritual is understood for all śākhās,
still all the various dharmas relating to mutually different qualified
performers
do not all together accumulate in any one place.

▼ नरसिंहः

Cf. Śābara on II. iv. 32, p. 142: “..सर्व-शाखा-प्रत्ययं सर्व-ब्राह्म-प्रत्ययं चैकं कर्म चोद्यत इति सिद्धं भवति ।”

See also Pūrvamīmāṃsā, II. iv. 18: “न चैकं प्रति शिष्यते ।” and Śābara on this (p. 139):

न च यत् काठके उग्नि-होत्रं तत् काठकम् एवैकं पुरुषं प्रति विधीयते ।
तैत्तिरीयस्यापि तत् विहितम् एव । पुरुष-विशेष-वचनाभावात् ।...तस्मात् सर्व-
शाखाभिर् एकं समाप्तं कर्मच्यत इति ।

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

विलक्षणाश् च त्रयी-विहित-स्वर्ग-पुत्रादि-विषयोपभोग-साधनैन्द्राग्नेयादि-कर्माधिकारिभ्यो
द्विजेभ्यस्

त्रय्य-अन्तैकायन-श्रुति-विहित-विज्ञानाभिगमनोपादानेज्या-प्रभृति-
भगवत्-प्राप्त्य-एकोपायक-कर्माधिकारिणो मुमुक्षवो ब्राह्मणा
इति नोभयोषाम् अप्य अन्योन्य-शाखा-विहित-कर्मानुष्ठानम् अ-ब्राह्मण्यम् आपादयति।

▼ *Buitenen*

And the Aspirants who are distinct from those brahmins who are qualified for rites of the aindrāgneya etc.,³⁰¹
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-[301]: aindrāgneya, name of a śrauta ritual.

▼ नरसिंहः

त्रय्यन्तैकायन ... See Pādmasaṁhitā, I. 5b-6a:

आद्यम् एकायनं वेदं सद्-ब्रह्म-प्रतिपादकम् ॥
तेनैव संस्कृता विप्रा मुख्य-कल्पाधिकारिणः ।

विज्ञानाभिगमन ... Ibid. Jñāna, II. 5b:

विज्ञानं भगवज्ञानं तज्ञानान् मुक्तिरुच्यते ॥

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुतिः

यथा चैकायन-शाखाया अपौरुषेयत्वं
तथा काश्मीरागम-प्रामाण्ये प्रपञ्चितम् इति
नेह प्रस्तूयते । (5)

▼ Buitenen

that the Ekāyana sākhā is preterpersonal scripture has been enlarged upon in the Treatise on the Validity of Kasmira Agama,302 and is therefore here not further discussed.

[302]: Name of a work of Yāmuna.

▼ विश्वास-टिप्पनी

अनेन यामुनो ऽपौरुषेयत्वम् अङ्गीचकारेति ज्ञायते । (5)

▼ राममिश्रशास्त्री

काश्मीरागमपदेन कि विवक्षितमिति न विशिष्य जानीमः
काश्मीरागमप्रामाण्यनिरूपणपरोग्न्थोऽपि चास्मदृष्टेरगोचर इति न किंचिदीश्महे वक्तुम् ।

यत्नेन तु तत् सर्वम् आसाध्य समये प्रकाशयिष्यते ।

इतरे भागवताः④

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

प्रकृतानां तु भागवतानां
सावित्र्य-अनुवचनादि-त्रयी-धर्म-बन्धस्य स्फुटतरम् उपलब्धेर्
न तत्-त्याग-निमित्त-व्रात्यत्वादि-संदेहं सहते ॥

▼ Buitenen

But since it is quite obvious that the Bhagavatas, which we are discussing here, are connected with the dharmas of the three Vedas, like the savitri recitation, there is no possible support for the suspicion that they are really vratyas because they would have abandoned these Vedic dharmas.

▼ रामसिंशशास्त्री

गायत्रीमन्त्रापेक्षा-विषयिणी टिप्पन्य् अत्र2 ।

१८ समाप्तिः②

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

तत्-तत्-कल्पित-युक्तिभिस् शकलशः कृत्वा तदीयं मतं
यच्-छिष्ठैर् उदर्मदि सात्त्वत-मत-स्पर्धाविताम् उद्घतिः ॥
यच् चैतत् सततं मुकुन्द-चरण-द्वन्द्वास्पदं वर्तते
जीयान् नाथ-मुनिस् स्व-योग-महिम-प्रत्यक्ष-तत्त्व-त्रयः ॥

▼ Buitenen

139. May Nāthamuni 303 be victorious, he to whom the Three Principles are immediately evident by virtue of his own miraculous

power, he by whose pupils the arrogance of the rivals of the Sāttvata Doctrine is terminated after their own view was rent to pieces by variously apposite arguments, he whose spirit is for ever the abode of the feet of Mukunda.

[303]: Predecessor of Yāmuna at Śrīraṅga.

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

आकल्पं विलसन्तु सात्त्वत-मत-प्रस्पर्धि--दुष-पद्धति--
व्यामुग्धोद्भृत-दुर्विदग्ध-परिषद्-वैदग्ध्य-विध्वंसिनः ।
श्रीमन्-नाथ-मुनीन्द्र-वर्णित-धियो निर्धूत-विश्वाशिवा:
सन्तस् सन्तत-गद्य-पद्य-पदवी-हृद्यानवद्योक्तयः ।

▼ *Buitenen*

May, for the length of this Aeon, play on the pious, enchanting and irreproachable sayings of the extensive collection of prose and verse compositions which eclipse the cleverness of the befuddled, conceited and witless assembly of the evil crowd of the rivals of the Sāttvata doctrine, whose spirit has been increased by the glorious Nāthamunīndra,³⁰⁴ and by which all the unholy powers are cleansed,

[304]: Nāthamuni compiled the sayings of the Vaiṣṇava saints, the Ālvārs.

[[122]]

▼ मूल-प्रस्तुति:

इति श्री-यामुन-मुनि-विरचितम् आगम-प्रामाण्यम् ॥

1. <https://manasataramgini.wordpress.com/2005/03/26/dvijas-and-non-dvijas-in-the-shaiva-cults/>

2. <https://vishvAsa.github.io/rAmAnujIyam/kriyA/venkaTa-nAtha-shAkhA/rAma-mishra-shAstri-sAvitri-japApexA/>

Appendix - +Dyugangā द्युगङ्गा①

Goals ध्येयानि②

Dyugangā (<https://rebrand.ly/dyuganga>) is a work group dedicated to the promotion of ever-victorious Hindu ideals and arts. It's current focus is in presenting important texts for easy study. Long term goal (<https://rebrand.ly/dg-archive>) is to save texts to last for millennia into the coming post-electronic/ industrial age.

The texts may be presented as

- audio files (eg: [MahAbhArata audio book project](#)),
- as web pages (eg. [Apastamba-gRhya-sUtra](#), [Apastamba-dharma-sUtra](#), [EkAgnikANDa commentary](#), [manu-smRti](#), [raghuvaMsha](#), more [kalpa-texts](#), [tattva-texts](#), [universal subhAShita DB](#)),
- as dictionaries (eg: [stardict](#))
- ebooks distributed on various platforms - (eg: [vishvasa.github.io/book-pub](#), amazon, google play - [SVK](#) [SVT का](#)). Formats include md, pdf (A4, A5), epub, azw3, html, etc.

We distribute these for free, and under a CC BY 4.0 license.
(Platforms may levy their fees.) You may subscribe to mail-streams for past and future announcements ([dg](#), [hv](#), [san](#)).

The choice of material heavily depends on the special interests of its current lead (vedas, kalpa, purANa-s).

संस्कृतानुवादः③

द्युगङ्गा नाम कार्यसंस्था - अजेयानां भारतीयपुरुषार्थपरिकल्पनानाज्य, हिन्दुकक्लानाज्य प्रसारणाय वर्तते।
तदीयस् स्थूलहेशोऽधुना प्रमुखग्रन्थानाम् अध्ययनसौकर्याय प्रस्तुतिः। ततो ग्रन्थ-सङ्कलन-

केन्द्रम् इति वक्तुम् अलम्। दूरोदेशस् तु (<https://rebrand.ly/dg-archive>) आधुनिक-शिला-तैल-युगात् परम् अपि सहस्राधिक-वर्षाणि यावद् ग्रन्थ-रक्षा।

ग्रन्थानाम् प्रस्तुतिर् ध्वनिसञ्जिकाभिस् स्यात् (यथा महाभारतपारायणप्रसारणे), जाल-क्षेत्र-पृष्ठैर् वा (यथा विश्वासस्य मन्त्राटिप्पनीषु, एकाग्निकाण्डटीका), शब्द-कोशैर् वाऽपि (stardict)। इमे उस्मत्-पक्षतो मुक्त-रीत्या प्रसार्यन्ते।

सद्याश्च ग्रन्थाः संस्थाग्रण्या रुचिविशेषम् अनुसृत्य चिताः - वेदाः, इतिहास-पुराणानि, कल्प-वेदाङ्ग-ग्रन्थाश् चेति।

Contribution दानम्③

Donations and sponsorship are welcome (use [contact page on our website](#)) - they help offset operating costs (eg. worker payments mainly ~1L/mo, book distribution) and plan further projects. Project-specific sponsorship opportunities are occasionally advertised on our social media accounts and on certain mailing lists.