

yana साम्यश्रुतेः for the scriptural text refers equally to all the four Āśramas.

19. Bâdarâyaṇa (thinks that Sannyâsa or monastic life) also must be gone through, for the scriptural text (cited refers equally to all the four Āśramas (stages of life).

In the text cited, sacrifice etc. refer to the householder's life, penance to Vânaprastha, studentship to Brahmacharya and 'one who is firmly established in Brahman' to Sannyâsa. So the text equally refers to all the four stages of life. The text relating to the first three stages refers to what is enjoined elsewhere. So also does the text relating to Sannyâsa. Hence Sannyâsa also is enjoined and must be gone through by all.

विधिर्वा धारणवत् ॥ २० ॥

विधिः Injunction वा or rather धारणवत् as in the case of the carrying (of the sacrificial fuel).

20. Or rather (there is an) injunction (in this text), as in the case of the carrying (of the sacrificial fuel).

This Sûtra now tries to establish that there is an injunction about Sannyâsa in the Chândogya passage cited. There is a Śruti text referring to Agnihotra performed for the manes, which runs as follows: "Let him approach, carrying the sacrificial fuel below; for above he carries it for the gods." The last clause Jaimini

interprets as an injunction, though there is no word in it to that effect, because such an injunction is nowhere else to be found in the scriptures. On account of its newness (Apûrvatâ) it is an injunction. Following this argument this Sûtra says that in Ch. 2. 23. 1 there is an injunction with respect to Sannyâsa, and not a mere reference, as it is not enjoined anywhere else. Moreover, there are Śruti texts which directly enjoin Sannyâsa: "Or else he may wander forth from the students' life or from the house, or from the forest" (Jâb. 4).

Again Jaimini himself says that even glorification, to be relevant, must be in a complementary relation to an injunction. In the text cited steadfast devotion to Brahman is being praised, and so it has an injunctive value. Now is it possible for one engaged in sacrificial rites etc. to be wholly devoted to Brahman? Devotion to Brahman means constant meditation on It without any disturbing thought. Such a thing is impossible for a householder engaged in ritualistic work. It is possible only for a Sannyâsin who has renounced all work, and not for others.

Neither is it true that Sannyâsa is prescribed only for those who are lame, blind, etc., and therefore unfit for ritualistic work. The text cited above (Jâb. 4) makes no such difference. Moreover, Sannyâsa is meant as a means to the realization of Brahman, and it is to be acquired in a regular prescribed way. "The wandering mendicant with coloured dress, shaven-headed, accepting no gifts, qualifies himself for the realization of Brahman." Therefore Sannyâsa is prescribed by the scriptures and Knowledge, because it is enjoined on Sannyâsins, is independent of work.

Topic 3: Scriptural statements as in Ch. 1. 1. 3 which refer to Vidyās are not merely glorificatory but enjoin the meditations.

स्तुतिमात्रमुपादानादिति चेत्, न, अपूर्वत्वात् ॥ २१ ॥

स्तुतिमात्रम् Mere praise उपादानात् because of their reference (to parts of sacrificial acts) इति चेत् if it be said न not so अपूर्वत्वात् on account of its newness.

21. If it be said (that reference as in Ch 1. 1. 3) are mere praise because of their reference (to parts of sacrificial act), (we say) not so, because here it is mentioned for the first time.

“That Udgîtha (Om) is the best essence of the essences, the supreme, deserving the highest place, the eighth” (Ch. 1. 1. 3), “This earth is Rk, and fire Sâman” (Ibid. 1. 6. 1). The opponent holds that these are mere praise, and no injunction to meditate on ‘Om’ and so on. These passages are akin to. “The ladle is the earth”, “The tortoise is the sun”, which simply glorify the ladle and so on. This view of the opponent is refuted in the latter half of the Sûtra. The analogy is not correct. Glorification to have a purpose must be in complementary relation to an injunction. The passages quoted for analogy stand in proximity to injunctive passages, and so they can be taken as praise. But the passage of the Chândogya where Udgîtha ‘Om’ is described as the essence of essences, is mentioned in the Upaniṣad, and so cannot be taken along with the injunctions about Udgîtha in the Karmakāṇḍa. As such,

on account of the newness it is an injunction and not mere glorification.

भावशब्दाच्च ॥ २२ ॥

भाव-शब्दात् There being words expressive of injunction च and.

22. And there being words expressive of injunction.

“Let one meditate on ‘Om’ (of) the Udgîtha” (Ch. 1. 1. 1). In this passage we have a clear injunction to meditate on ‘Om’. On the face of this we cannot interpret the text cited in the last Sûtra as merely glorificatory of ‘Om’.

Topic 4: The stories recorded in the Upaniṣads do not serve the purpose of Pâriplavas and so do not form part of the ritualistic acts. They are meant to glorify the Vidyâ taught in them.

पारिप्लवार्था इति चेत्, न, विशेषितत्वात् ॥ २३ ॥

पारिप्लवार्थाः For the purpose of Pâriplavas इति चेत् if it be said न not so विशेषितत्वात् on account of (certain stories alone) being specified.

23. If it be said (that the stories that occur in the Upaniṣads are) for the purpose of Pâriplavas, (we say) not so, because (certain stories alone) are specified (by the Śruti for this purpose).

In the Aśvamedha sacrifice, which lasts for one year, the sacrificer and his family are expected to hear at intervals the recital of certain stories. These are known as Pâriplavas, and form part of the ritualistic acts. The question is whether Upaniṣadic stories also serve this purpose, in which case they become part of the rites, and this means that the whole of Jñānakāṇḍa becomes subservient to Karmakāṇḍa. The stories referred to are those relating to Yājñavalkya and Maitreyi, Prātardana and so on, which we find in the Bṛhadâraṇyaka, Kauṣītakī and other Upaniṣads.

This Sûtra denies that they serve the purpose of Pâriplavas, for the scripture specifies the stories that are meant for this purpose. Any and every story cannot serve this purpose. Upaniṣadic stories are not mentioned in this category.

तथा चैकवावयतोपबन्धात् ॥ २४ ॥

तथा So च and एकवावयता-उपबन्धात् being connected as one whole.

24. And so (they are meant to illustrate the nearest Vidyâs), being connected as one whole.

The stories while not serving the purpose of Pâriplavas are intended to introduce the Vidyâs. The story form is meant to catch the imagination of the student, who will thereby be more attentive to the Vidyâ described.

Topic 5: Sannyâsins need not observe ritualistic acts, as Knowledge serves their purpose.

अतएव चाग्नीन्धनाद्यनपेक्षा ॥ २५ ॥

अतएव Therefore च and अग्नि-इन्धनादि-अनपेक्षा no necessity of lighting fires etc.

25. And, therefore, there is no necessity of lighting fires, and so on.

In Sûtra 3. 4. 1 it was said that the knowledge of the Self results in the attainment of the highest Puruṣârtha or goal of life. Therefore the lighting of fires for sacrifices and other similar acts enjoined on the householders etc. need not be observed by Sannyâsins, as Knowledge alone fulfils their object.

Topic 6: Nevertheless works prescribed by the scriptures are useful as they are an indirect means to Knowledge.

सर्वापेक्षा च यज्ञादिश्रुतेः अश्ववत् ॥ २६ ॥

सर्वापेक्षा There is the necessity of all works च and यज्ञादि-श्रुतेः for the scriptures prescribe sacrifices etc. (as means to Knowledge) अश्ववत् even as the horse.

26. And there is the necessity of all works, for the scriptures prescribe sacrifices etc. (as means to the attainment of Knowledge, though they are unnecessary for the attainment of its results, viz. Liberation), even as the horse (is used to draw a chariot and not for ploughing).

From the previous Sûtra we may conclude that works are altogether useless. This Sûtra says that all these works are useful, and that even the scriptures prescribe them, since they serve as a means to Knowledge. But they have no part in producing the result of this Knowledge, viz Liberation. It comes only from Knowledge and not from work. Work purifies the mind, and the knowledge of the Self is manifested in such a pure mind. So works have a place as a means to Knowledge, though an indirect one.

शमदमाद्युपेतः स्यात्तथाऽपि तु, तद्विधेस्तदङ्गतया
तेषामवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वात् ॥ २७ ॥

शम-दमादि-उपेतः स्यात् One must possess calmness, self-control, and the like तथा अपि even if it be so तु but तद्विधेः since they are enjoined तदङ्गतया as helps to knowledge तेषाम्-अवश्य-अनुष्ठेयत्वात् and therefore they have necessarily to be observed.

27. But even if it be so (i.e. even though there is no injunction to do work to attain Knowledge in the text [Br. 4. 4. 22]) one must possess calmness, self-control, and the like, since these are enjoined as helps to Knowledge, and therefore have necessarily to be observed.

“The Brâhmanas seek to know It through the study of the Vedas, sacrifices, charity” etc. (Br. 4. 4. 22). In this text there is no word to show that sacrifice is enjoined on one who wants to know Brahman. So the

opponent says that there is no need at all of work for an aspirant of Knowledge. This Sûtra says that even if it be so, yet control of the senses etc. are enjoined by the Śruti: “Therefore he who knows it as such becomes self-controlled, calm... sees Self in his self” etc. (Br. 4. 4. 23). This passage is injunctive in character, for ‘therefore’ expresses praise of the subject-matter and hence is connected with an injunction, because in the absence of an injunction the praise would be purposeless. Since these qualities are enjoined, they have necessarily to be practised. Self-control etc. directly help the attainment of Knowledge, while work helps it indirectly.

Topic 7: Restrictions as regards food may be waived only when life is at stake.

सर्वान्नानुमतिश्च प्राणात्यये, तद्दर्शनात् ॥ २८ ॥

सर्व-अन्न-अनुमतिः Permission to take all sorts of food प्राणात्यये when life is jeopardized तद्दर्शनात् because the Śruti declares that.

28. (Only) when life is jeopardized (there is) permission to take food indiscriminately, because the Śruti declares that.

“For one who knows this, there is nothing that is not food” (Ch. 5. 2. 1). The opponent holds that on account of the newness of the statement it is enjoined on one who meditates on Prâṇa. Such a statement being found nowhere else, it has an injunctive value.

This Sûtra refutes it and says that it is not an injunction, but only a statement of fact, and where the idea of an injunction does not arise, we are not justified in assuming one. Prohibited food may be eaten only when life is in danger, as was done by the sage Cākṛāyaṇa when he was dying for want of food. This fact we get from the Śruti.

अबाधाच्च ॥ २९ ॥

अबाधात् Because of a non-contradiction (thus) च and.

29. And because (thus) (the scriptural statements with respect to food) are not contradicted.

“When the food is pure the mind becomes pure” (Ch. 7. 26. 2). This statement will not be contradicted only if the explanation given is taken, and not otherwise.

अपि च स्मर्यते ॥ ३० ॥

अपि च Moreover स्मर्यते the Smṛtis say so.

30. Moreover the Smṛtis (also) say so.

The Smṛtis also say that both those who have Knowledge and those who have not can take any food when life is in danger; then it is not sinful. But they prohibit various kinds of food as objectionable.

शब्दश्चातोऽकामकारे ॥ ३१ ॥

शब्दः The scriptural text च and अतः hence अकामकारे prohibiting licence.

31. And hence the scriptural text prohibiting licence.

There are scriptural passages prohibiting one from doing everything just as one pleases. Licence, freedom from all discipline, cannot help us to attain Knowledge. “Therefore a Brāhmaṇa must not drink liquor” (Kāthaka Sam.). Such Śruti texts are meant for this discipline.

Therefore it is established that the Śruti does not enjoin on one who meditates on Prāṇa to take all kinds of food indiscriminately.

Topic 8: The duties of the Āśrama are to be performed by even one who is not desirous of Knowledge

विहितत्वाच्चाश्रमकर्माणि ॥ ३२ ॥

विहितत्वात् Because they are enjoined च and आश्रम कर्म duties of the Āśrama (order of life) अपि also.

32. And the duties of the Āśrama (are to be performed) also (by him who does not desire Liberation), because they are enjoined (on him by the scriptures).

In Sûtra 25 it was said that works are a means to Knowledge. The question is raised, since it is so why should one who does not desire Knowledge do these works? This Sûtra says that since these duties are en-

joined on all who are in these Āśramas or stages of life, viz student life, householder's life, and hermit life, one should observe them.

सहकारित्वेन च ॥ ३३ ॥

सहकारित्वेन As a means to Knowledge च and.

33. And (the duties are to be performed also) as a means to Knowledge.

Here we have to understand that the duties are helpful in producing Knowledge, but not its fruit, viz Liberation, which is not attainable except through Knowledge.

सर्वथापि त एव, उभयलिङ्गात् ॥ ३४ ॥

सर्वथा अपि In all cases ते एव the same duties (have to be performed) उभय-लिङ्गात् because of the two-fold indicative mark.

34. In all cases the same duties (have to be performed), because of the two-fold indicative mark).

The question is raised whether the work done as enjoined on the Āśramas and those done as aids to Knowledge are of two different kinds. This Sūtra says that in either case, whether as duties of the Āśramas or as aids to Knowledge, the same duties are to be done, as is seen from the Śruti and the Smṛti texts.

"The Brāhmaṇas seek to know It through the study of the Vedas, sacrifices" etc. (Br. 4, 4, 22). This text shows that sacrifices etc. enjoined in Karmakāṇḍa for different purposes are to be performed as means to Knowledge also. The Smṛti also says the same thing. "He who performs obligatory work without desire for fruits" etc. (Gītā 6. 1). Those very obligatory duties subserve Knowledge also.

अनभिभवं च दर्शयति ॥ ३५ ॥

अनभिभवं Not being overpowered च and दर्शयति the scripture shows.

35. And the scripture shows (that one endowed with Brahmacharya) is not overpowered (by anger etc.).

"For that self does not perish which one attains by Brahmacharya" (Ch. 8. 5. 3). This text also shows that like work, Brahmacharya etc. are also means to Knowledge. One endowed with it is not overcome by anger, jealousy, etc., and his mind not being disturbed he is able to practise Knowledge.

Therefore works are obligatory on the Āśramas and are also means to Knowledge.

Topic 9: Those who stand midway between two Āśramas are also entitled to Knowledge.

अन्तरा चापि तु, तद्दृष्टेः ॥ ३६ ॥

अन्तरा (Persons standing) in between (two Āśramas) च and अपि तु also तद्दृष्टेः such cases being seen.

36. And (persons standing) in between (two Āśramas) are also (entitled to Knowledge), because such cases are seen.

The question is raised whether persons of dubious position—who have not the means etc. to do the duties of an Āśrama, or who stand midway between two Āśramas, as for example a widower—are entitled to Knowledge or not. The opponent holds that they are not, since they cannot do the works of any Āśrama which are means to Knowledge. This Sūtra says that they are entitled, for such cases are seen from the scriptures, as for example Raikva and Gārgī, who had the knowledge of Brahman. *Vide* Ch. 4. 1. and Br. 3. 6 and 8.

अपि च स्मर्यते ॥ ३७ ॥

अपि च Further स्मर्यते the Smṛti records such cases.

37. The Smṛti also records such cases.

Samvarta and other Rṣis, without doing the works enjoined on the Āśramas, became great Yogīs.

विशेषानुग्रहश्च ॥ ३८ ॥

विशेष-अनुग्रहः Favour due to special works च and.

38. And special works favour (Knowledge).

A widower, who cannot be said to be a householder in the proper sense of the word or a poor man who has

not the means to perform the duties of the Āśrama, can attain Knowledge through special works like prayer fasting, Japa etc., which are not opposed to the condition of those who do not belong to any Āśrama.

अतरित्वतरज्ज्यायो लिङ्गाच्च ॥ ३९ ॥

अतः Than this तु but इतरत् the other ज्यायः better लिङ्गात् because of the indicatory marks च and.

39. But better than this is the other (state of being in some Āśrama or other), (being maintained by the Śruti and the Smṛti) and because of the indicatory marks (in the Śruti and the (Smṛti).

Though it is possible for one who stands between two Āśramas to attain Knowledge, yet both the Śruti and Smṛti say directly and indirectly that it is a better means to Knowledge to belong to some Āśrama. "The Brāhmaṇas seek to know It through...sacrifices" etc. (Br. 4. 4. 22)—this is a direct statement of the Śruti; "Any other knower of Brahman who has done good deeds" etc. (Br. 4. 4. 9), and "Let not a Brāhmaṇa stay even for a day outside the Āśrama"—these are indirect statements of the Śruti and Smṛti respectively.

Topic 10: One who has taken the vow of lifelong celibacy (Sannyāsa) cannot revert back to his former stages of life.

तद्भूतस्य तु नातद्भावः, जैमिनेरपि, नियमातद्रूपा-
भावेभ्यः ॥ ४० ॥

तद्भूतस्य For one who has attained that (the highest Āśrama) तु but न no अतद्भावः ceasing from that जैमिनेः of Jaimini (is this opinion) अपि also नियम-अतद्रूप-अभावेभ्यः on account of restrictions prohibiting such reversion.

40. But for one who has risen to the highest Āśrama (i.e. Sannyâsa) there is no reverting (to the preceding ones), on account of restrictions prohibiting such reversion. Jaimini also (is of this opinion).

The question whether one who has embraced Sannyâsa can go back to the previous Āśrama is taken up for discussion. This Sûtra says that he cannot, because the Śruti expressly forbids it. "He is to go to the forest, he is not to return from there." But there are no rules allowing a reversion, like those which sanction the ascent to higher Āśramas. It is also against approved custom. So one cannot revert from Sannyâsa.

Topic 11: Expiation for one who transgresses the vow of lifelong celibacy.

न च आधिकारिकमपि, पतनानुमानात्
तदयोगात् ॥ ४१ ॥

न Not च and अधिकारिकम् (expiation) mentioned in the chapter dealing with the qualification अपि even पतन-अनुमानात् because a fall (in his case) is inferred from the Smṛti तदयोगात् and because of its inefficacy (in his case).

41. And (the expiation), although mentioned in the chapter dealing with qualifications (in Pûrva Mîmâṃsâ), is not (with reference to one who has taken the vow of lifelong celibacy), because a fall (in his case) is inferred from the Smṛti, and because of its (of the expiatory ceremony) inefficacy (in his case).

The case of those who have taken the vow of lifelong celibacy and yet have transgressed this vow through a mistake in judgement, it is taken up for discussion. The opponent's whose view is given in this Sûtra, holds that for such transgressions there is no expiation. For no such ceremony is mentioned with respect to them, the one mentioned in Pûrva Mîmâṃsâ 6. 8. 22 referring to ordinary Brahmacârins, who are students, and not to Naiṣṭhika Brahmacârins. It can also be inferred that the Smṛti declares such lapses as not expiable. A beheaded man cannot be cured. "For him who lapses after having embraced the vow of a Naiṣṭhika Brahmacârin I see no expiatory ceremony by which such a suicide can be purified." The Smṛti here does not refer to the ordinary Brahmacârin, and so the expiatory ceremony applies only to them and not to the Naiṣṭhika. Moreover, the ceremony referred to in Pûrva Mîmâṃsâ is not efficacious in his case, for, to perform the ceremony he will have to light the sacrificial fire and therefore have to marry, which means that he will cease to be a Naiṣṭhika thereafter.

उपपूर्वमपि तु एके भावम्, अशनवत् तदुक्तम् ॥ ४२ ॥

उपपूर्वम् Prefixed with 'Upa', i.e. an Upapâtaka or

a minor sin अपि तु but एके some भावम् the existence अशनवत् as in the case of eating तत् this उक्तम् is explained in Pûrva Mîmâmsâ.

32. But some (consider this transgression on the part of the Naiṣṭhika) a minor sin (and therefore claim) the existence (of expiation for it), as in the case of eating (prohibited food by ordinary Brahmacârins). This is explained in Pûrva Mîmâmsâ.

Some, however, think that such lapses on the part of a Naiṣṭhika, other than disloyalty to teacher's wife etc., are minor sins and not major ones, and so can be expiated by proper ceremonies, even as ordinary Brahmacârins who take prohibited food are again purified by expiatory ceremonies. The reference to the text denying any such ceremony in his case is meant only to bring home to the Naiṣṭhika Brahmacârin the grave responsibility on his part so that he may struggle with all his soul. Similarly in the case of the recluse and the Sannyâsin. As a matter of fact, the Smṛti does prescribe the purificatory ceremony for both the recluse and the Sannyâsin. "The recluse when he has broken his vows undergoes the Kṛcchra penance for twelve nights and then develops a place which is full of trees and grass." The Sannyâsin also undergoes the purificatory ceremony, with certain modifications.

Topic 12: The lifelong celibate who lapses in his vows to be shunned by society.

बहिस्तूभययापि स्मृतेचाराच्च ॥ ४३ ॥

बहिः Outside तु but उभयया-अपि in either case स्मृतेः from the Smṛti आचारात् from custom च and.

43. But in either case (they are to be kept) outside the society, on account of the Smṛti and custom.

Whether the lapses be regarded as major sins or minor sins, in either case good people are to avoid such transgressors; because the Smṛti and approved custom both condemn them.

Topic 13: The meditations connected with the subordinate members of sacrificial acts are to be gone through by the priest and not by the sacrificer.

स्वामिनः, फल श्रुतेरित्यात्रेयः ॥ ४४ ॥

स्वामिनः To the sacrificer फल-श्रुतेः from the declaration of results in the Śruti इति this आत्रेयः Ātreya.

44. To the sacrificer (belongs the agentship in meditations), because the Śruti declares a fruit (for it); thus Ātreya (thinks).

The question is raised as to who is to observe the meditations connected with subordinate members of sacrificial acts, whether it is the sacrificer or the priest. The opponent, represented by the sage Ātreya, holds that it is to be observed by the sacrificer, as the Śruti declares a special fruit for these meditations.

आर्त्विज्यमित्यौडुलोमिः, तस्मै हि परिक्रीयते ॥ ४५ ॥

आर्त्विज्यम् The duty of the Rtvik (priest) इति thus
औडुलोमिः Audulomi तस्मै for that हि because परिक्रीयते he
is paid.

45. (They are) the duty of the Rtvik (priest),
thus thinks Audulomi, because he is paid for
that (i.e. the performance of the whole sacrifice).

Since the priest is paid for all his acts, and thereby
the fruit of all his acts is, as it were, purchased by the
sacrificer, the meditations also come under this category
and have to be observed by the priest and not the sacri-
ficer. This is the view of the sage Audulomi.

श्रुतेश्च ॥ ४६ ॥

श्रुतेः From the Śruti च and.

46. And because the Śruti so declares.

“Whatever blessing the priests pray for at the sacri-
fice, they pray for the good of the sacrificer” (Śat. Br.
1. 3. 1. 26). Such texts declare that the fruit of medita-
tions in which the priest is the agent, goes to the sacri-
ficer. Therefore Audulomi’s view is correct, being sup-
ported by the Śruti texts.

*Topic 14: In Br. 3. 5. 1. meditateness is enjoined
besides scholarship and the childlike state*

सहकार्यन्तरविधिः पक्षेण तृतीयं तद्वतः विध्या-
दिवत् ॥ ४७ ॥

सहकार्यन्तरविधिः Injunction of another auxiliary (to
Knowledge) पक्षेण as an alternative तद्वतः for one who
possesses it (i.e. Knowledge) तृतीयम् a third one विध्या-
दिवत् as in the case of injunctions and the like.

47. (The meditative state is) the injunction of
another auxiliary (to Knowledge), which is a
third one (besides the two expressly enjoined),
as an alternative (where the knowledge of diver-
sity is persistent) for one who possesses Know-
ledge; as in the case of injunctions and the like.

“Therefore a knower of Brahman, having done with
scholarship should remain like a child (free from
anger, passions, etc.); and after having finished with
this state and with learning he becomes meditative
(Muni)” (Br. 3. 5. 1). The question is whether the
meditative state is enjoined or not. The opponent
holds that it is not enjoined, as there is no word
indicating an injunction. The text merely says that
he becomes a Muni or meditative, whereas with respect
to scholarship and the state of a child free from all
passions, it expressly enjoins, ‘one should remain’ etc.
Moreover, scholarship refers to Knowledge and there-
fore includes Munihood which also more or less refers
to Knowledge. Therefore there is no newness with
respect to Munihood in the text, it being included in
scholarship already, and not being an Apūrva it has no
injunctive value.

This Sûtra refutes this view and says that Munihood or meditateness is enjoined in the text as a third requisite besides scholarship and the state of a child. For Munihood is not merely Knowledge but meditateness, continuous devotion to Knowledge and as such it is different from scholarship. Hence, not having been referred to before, it is a new thing (Apûrva), and therefore the text has injunctive value. Such meditateness has a value for a Sannyâsin who is not yet established in the knowledge of unity, and persistently experiences diversity owing to past impressions.

कृत्स्नभावात्तु गृहिणोपसंहारः ॥ ४८ ॥

कृत्स्नभावात् On account of the householder's life including all तु verily उपसंहारः (the chapter) ends गृहिणा with the householder.

48. Verily, on account of the householder's life including (duties from) all (the other stages of life), the chapter ends with the (enumeration of the duties of the) householder.

In the Chândogya Upaniṣad we find that after enumerating the duties of the Brahmachârî it enumerates those of the householder, and there it ends without any mention of Sannyâsa. If this also is one of the Āśramas, why is nothing said about it in that place? The Sûtra says that in order to lay stress on the householder's life, to show its importance, the Śruti ends there without referring to Sannyâsa, and not because it is not one of the prescribed Āśramas.

The householder's life is important because for him are prescribed, besides his own duties, those of other Āśramas like study, control of the senses, etc. It includes more or less duties of all Āśramas.

मीनवदितरेषामप्युपदेशात् ॥ ४९ ॥

मीनवत् Even as the state of a Muni (Sannyâsa) इतरेषाम् of the others अपि even उपदेशात् on account of scriptural instruction.

49. Because the scripture enjoins the other (stages of life, viz Brahmacharya and Vânaprastha) even as it enjoins the state of a Muni (Sannyâsa).

Just as the Śruti enjoins Sannyâsa and householder's life, so also it enjoins the life of a recluse and that of a student. Hence the scriptures enjoin all the four Āśramas or stages of life to be gone through, in sequence or alternatively. The plural number 'others' instead of the dual is to denote the different classes of these two stages of life.

Topic 15: Childlike state means the state of innocence, being free from anger, passion, etc.

अनाविष्कुर्वन्, अन्वयात् ॥ ५० ॥

अनाविष्कुर्वन् Without manifesting himself अन्वयात् on account of the context.

50 (The childlike state means) without manifesting himself, on account of the context.

In the passage of the Brhadâranyaka quoted in Sûtra 47, the childlike state is enjoined on an aspirant after Knowledge. The question is what is exactly meant by this? Does it mean to be like a child without any idea of purity and impurity and doing whatever one likes, or does it mean to be guileless and without the sense of egoism as a child? The Sûtra says it is the latter and not the former, because that is detrimental to Knowledge. It means one has not to manifest or give vent to any of the passions and has to be guileless and without the sense of egoism. It refers to the innate innocence of a child. Such a meaning alone is appropriate to the context, purity and innocence being helpful to Knowledge.

Topic 16: The time of the origination of Knowledge when the Vidyâ is practised.

ऐहिकमप्यप्रस्तुतप्रतिबन्धे, तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ५१ ॥

ऐहिकम् In this life अपि even अप्रस्तुत-प्रतिबन्धे if there is no obstruction to it (the means adopted) तद्-दर्शनात् because it is so seen from the scriptures.

51. (The fruition of Knowledge may take place) even in this life if there be no obstruction to it (the means adopted), because it is so seen from the scriptures.

From Sûtra 26 the various means to Knowledge have

been discussed. The question now is whether Knowledge resulting from these means comes in this life or in the life to come. This Sûtra says that it may come in this life only if there is no obstruction to its manifestation from extraneous causes. For it often happens that when the fruition of Knowledge is about to take place it is retarded by the fruit of some other stronger work, which is also about to fructify. In such cases Knowledge comes in the next life. That is why the scriptures declare that it is difficult to realize the Self. "Even to hear of It is not available to many; many even having heard of It cannot comprehend" etc. (Ka. 1.2.7). The Gîtâ also says: "There he is united with the intelligence acquired in his former body" etc. (Gîtâ. 6. 43); "The Yogî, striving assiduously, purified of taint, gradually gaining perfection through many births, then reaches the highest goal" (Ibid. 6. 45). Moreover, that Knowledge sometimes fructifies in the next life is known from the life of Vâmadeva who possessed Knowledge even while he was in the womb. This shows that it must have been the result of his past actions, for he could not have practised any Vidyâs in the womb. Knowledge did not manifest in his previous life owing to obstruction, and this being removed when he was in the womb, Knowledge fructified as a result of his past Sâdhanâ

Topic 17: There is no difference in Liberation i.e. in the cognition of Brahman—it is of one kind in all cases.

एवं मुक्तिफलानियमः, तदवस्थावधृतेस्तदवस्थाव-
धृतेः ॥ ५२ ॥

एवं Like this मुक्तिफल-अनियमः there is no rule with

respect to Liberation, the fruit (of Knowledge) तत् अवस्था-अवधृतेः because the Śruti asserts that state (to be immutable).

52. With respect to Liberation, the fruit (of Knowledge) there is no rule like this, because the Śruti asserts that state (to be immutable).

In the last Sūtra it was seen that Knowledge may result in this life or the next according to the absence or presence of obstructions and the intensity of the means adopted. Similarly a doubt may arise that there may be some such rule with respect to Liberation also, which is the fruit of Knowledge. In other words, the question is whether Liberation can be delayed after Knowledge, and whether there are degrees of Knowledge according to the qualifications of the aspirant. This Sūtra says that no such rule exists with respect to Liberation. Because the Śruti texts assert that the nature of final release is uniform, without any variations of degree in it. The state of final release is nothing but Brahman. "The knower of Brahman becomes Brahman," and there can be no variety in it, as Brahman is without qualities. Difference is possible only where there are qualities, as in the case of the Saguna Brahman about which according to difference in Vidyās there may be difference in the cognitions. But with respect to the cognition of Brahman, it can be only one and not many. Neither can there be any delay in the attainment of Liberation after Knowledge has dawned, for knowledge of Brahman itself is Liberation.

The repetition of the clause 'Because the Śruti asserts that state' is to show that the chapter ends here.

CHAPTER IV

SECTION I

in the third chapter the means to Knowledge were discussed. In this chapter the result of Knowledge and some other topics are taken up for discussion. In the beginning, however a special discussion connected with means to Knowledge is dealt with.

Topic 1: The meditation on the Ātman enjoined by the scriptures is to be repeated till Knowledge is attained.

आवृत्तिः, असकृदुपदेशात् ॥ १ ॥

आवृत्तिः Repetition (is necessary) असकृत् repeatedly उपदेशात् on account of instruction by the scriptures.

1. The repetition (of hearing, reflection, and meditation on the teaching of the Self is necessary), on account of the repeated instruction by the scriptures.

"The Self, my dear Maitreyî, should be realized—should be heard of, reflected on, and meditated upon" (Br. 2. 4. 5). "The intelligent aspirant after Brahman, knowing about this alone, should attain intuitive knowledge (*Ibid.* 4. 4. 21). The question arises whether what is enjoined in this is to be done once only or repeatedly. The opponent holds that it is to be observed