

The answer is: "On account of what follows (i.e. the immediately following text ¹), the being of that kind of the word (is established), (there is) the mention (of grace in the passage), on the other hand, on account of preponderance (i.e. because the grace of the Lord is the most predominating factor in attaining salvation)". That is, the Muṇḍaka-text does imply that devotion is the cause of a direct vision of the Lord, and the latter a cause of emancipation, for the grace or choice by the Lord is not arbitrary, but is determined by the devotion of men.²

Adhikaraṇa 21: The section entitled "Existence in the body". (Sūtras 51-52)

PRIMA FACIE VIEW (Sūtra 51)

SŪTRA 51

"SOME (HOLD THAT THE INDIVIDUAL SOUL IS TO BE MEDITATED ON IN ITS STATE OF BONDAGE), ON ACCOUNT OF THE EXISTENCE (OF SUCH A SOUL) IN THE BODY."

Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha

At the time of meditation, the individual soul is to be meditated on in its state of bondage, on account of the existence of such a soul alone "in the body"—so "some" (think).

Vedānta-kaustubha

Immediately above, an investigation has been undertaken into the fires piled up by the mind and so on as forming subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting in meditation. Now, the question is being considered, viz. in what form is the individual soul too, entitled to its fruit, to be sought for at the time of meditation?

The doubt is as to whether at the time of meditation, the individual soul is to be conceived of simply in its state of bondage,—i.e. in the form of a knower, a doer, an enjoyer and the rest,—or in its state of

¹ "Nāyamātmā vala-hīnena labhyaḥ", etc.

² G.B. 3.3.54, pp. 214 ff., Chap. 3.

salvation, i.e. in its real nature, characterized by the manifested attributes of freedom from sins and the rest. With regard to it "some" think that it is to be conceived of in its state of bondage alone, i.e. in the form of a knower and the rest. Why? On account of the non-existence "in the body", at that time, "of the soul" in its state of salvation, i.e. in its real nature as characterized by freedom from sins and so on. Or else, (an alternative explanation:) on account of the existence of such a soul alone, i.e. of the soul in its state of bondage.¹

COMPARISON

Śaṅkara and Bhāskara

This is sūtra 53 in the commentary of Śaṅkara and 52 in that of Bhāskara. They take this *adhikaraṇa* to be concerned with a different problem, viz. the relation between the soul and the body. This sūtra sets forth the opponent's view, viz. the view of the Cārvākas, that the soul is nothing but the body, since consciousness is found only when the body is present, and not found when it is absent. Hence, the sūtra: "Some (maintain the non-difference) of the soul (from the body), on account of the existence (of consciousness) if there be the body".²

Baladeva

This is sūtra 55 in his commentary. He takes it as forming an *adhikaraṇa* by itself, concerned with an entirely different topic, viz. the worship of the Lord in the different parts of the body. Hence the sūtra: "Some (recommend the worship) of the soul (viz. the Lord) in the body, on account of the existence (of the Lord there)". That is, the Lord is to be worshipped in the different parts of the body, such as, the stomach, the heart, the top of the head and so on, since He exists in these places also and gives salvation to the devotee.³

¹ Note that while Nimbārka reads only "bhāvāt", Śrīnivāsa reads both "abhāvāt" and "bhāvāt".

² Ś.B. 3.3.53, pp. 838-840; Bh. B. 3.3.52 (written as 3.3.53), pp. 195-196.

³ G.B. 3.3.55, pp. 218-219, Chap. 3.

CORRECT CONCLUSION (Sūtra 52)

SŪTRA 52

“BUT (THE INDIVIDUAL SOUL IS TO BE MEDITATED ON IN ITS STATE OF RELEASE) DIFFERENT (FROM ITS STATE OF BONDAGE, AND) NOT (IN ITS STATE OF BONDAGE), BECAUSE OF BECOMING OF THAT NATURE, AS IN THE CASE OF REALIZATION.”

Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha

¹At the time of meditation, the individual soul is to be conceived of in its freed state, different from its state of bondage,—since during release, it is to become of that very form, just as one attains the Highest Self in accordance with meditation.

Vedānta-kaustubha

With regard to it, we reply:

The word “but” implies emphasis. The individual soul is not to be conceived of simply in its state of bondage, i.e. simply in its form of a knower, a doer and so on. On the contrary, it is the real nature of the soul, in its state of release, possessed of the manifested attributes of freedom from sins and so on, and possessed of the attributes of being a knower and so on, which is “different” from its nature in its state of bondage, that is to be conceived of at the time of meditation. Why? “Because of becoming of that nature,” i.e. because during the state of release, the soul becomes “of that nature”, i.e. of the nature of its real form, conceived, in accordance with Scripture, at the time of meditation,² “As in the case of realization”. That is, just as there is the realization of Brahman in accordance with meditation, so is the case here, as declared by the scriptural texts: “As the purpose of man is in this world, so will he be on departing” (Chānd. 3.14.1). “Howsoever he meditates on him, such alone he becomes” (Śat. Br. 10.5.2, 20³). Hence it is established that during

¹ The C.S.S. ed. adds “Tan na”—“that is not so”, p. 68.

² I.e. the form which is meditated on during bondage is the form which is attained later on during salvation.

³ P. 725, line 13. Cf. a very similar passage in Mudg. 3, p. 384, lines 8-9.

the state of realization, the individual soul is to be conceived of in its state of release.

Here ends the section entitled "Existence in the body" (21).

COMPARISON

Śaṅkara and Bhāskara

This is sūtra 54 in the commentary of Śaṅkara, sūtra 53 in that of Bhāskara. Here they answer the Cārvāka view that the soul is identical with the body. They interpret the sūtra in the same way, only Śaṅkara reads: "tad-bhāvābhāvitvāt", instead of "tad-bhāva-bhāvitvāt". Thus, according to him, the sūtra means: "(The soul is) different (from the body), not (identical) because the existence (of consciousness) does not depend on the existence of that (viz. the body), as in the case of perception". That is, consciousness is not a quality of the body, since even where the body is present, there may be no consciousness, e.g. in the case of a dead body. Hence just as perception is other than the object perceived, so consciousness is other than the conscious body.¹

According to Bhāskara, the sūtra means: "(The soul is) different (from the body) not (identical) because the existence of (the qualities of the body) depend on the existence of that (viz. the body), as in the case of perception". That is, consciousness cannot be an attribute of the body, since an attribute of the body exists when the body exists. But consciousness does not exist always when the body does, e.g. in a dead body.² Hence the two explanations are identical in spite of the difference of reading. Bhāskara's reading is preferable.

Rāmānuja

Interpretation same, only the phrase "upalabdhiḥ" interpreted differently, viz. just as the realization of Brahman, enjoined in Scripture, means the realization of His real form, so exactly, self-realization too means the realization of the real form of the self.³

¹ Ś. B. 3.3.54, p. 840.

² Bh. B. 3.3.53 (written as 3.3.54), p. 196.

³ Śrī. B. 3.3.52, p. 337, vol. 2.

Baladeva

This is sūtra 56 in his commentary. He begins a new adhikaraṇa here (three sūtras), concerned with an absolutely different topic, viz. different kinds of realizations in accordance with the different kinds of devotion. Hence the sūtra: “(During release, there is) no (perception of the Lord as possessed of the attributes) other (than those with which He was meditated upon in this life), on account of the existence (of the Lord) as having that nature (i.e. attributes) (during release), as in the case of knowledge”. That is, when a man, conceiving a thing in a particular form, meditates on it as such, he obtains that thing in that particular form. Similarly, the devotees who meditates on the Lord as the Sweet, realizes Him as such during release; and who meditates on Him as the Majestic, realizes Him as such.¹

Adhikaraṇa 22: The section entitled “Connected with the subsidiary parts”. (Sūtras 53-54)

SŪTRA 53

“BUT (THE MEDITATIONS) CONNECTED WITH THE SUBSIDIARY PARTS, (ARE) NOT (RESTRICTED) TO (PARTICULAR) BRANCHES, FOR (THEY BELONG) TO EACH VEDA.”

Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha

The meditations connected with the subsidiary parts of (sacrifices) like the udgītha, enjoined in the passage: “Let one meditate on this syllable ‘Om’ as the udgītha” (Chānd. 1.1.1 ²) and so on, do not rest upon (their own) branches ³, but are connected with “each Veda”, i.e. with all the branches ⁴, on account of the non-specification of the scriptural text about the udgītha.

¹ G.B. 3.3.56, p. 221, Chap. 3.

² Ś, R, Bh.

³ C.S.S. ed. reads “Sva-śakhāsu”, p. 68.

⁴ C.S.S. ed. reads “Kutaḥ”. *Op cit.*