

Compiled from the book 'Sridakshinamurthistotram Vol.1 authored by Ved Sri D.S.Subbaramaiya, published by the Sringeri Sharada Peetham. This compilation has 14 pages.

6.12.6 Other Schools pointers to Brahmavidya

Explicit statements to this effect by the protagonists of some of the apparently rival philosophical schools are also in evidence. Dealing with the case of the rival schools, the *ṭīkā* on the *Sūtasamhitā* quoted points out how this perspective can be brought to bear in respect of the so-called non-Upanisadic schools as well. This may be illustrated by a few examples.

(a) Sankhya and Yoga

Taking the case of the *Sāṅkhya* and the *Pātañjala*, it may be noted that liberation according to them is secured by the discriminative knowledge of the *puruṣa* (the knower, who is of the nature of Consciousness) from the *prakṛti* in its two states, evolved and causal—*व्यक्ताव्यक्तज्ञविज्ञानात्* (*Sāṅ. Kā* 2). In this state of *Kaivalya*, where *Ātman* alone shines, there is neither the experience of any other individual nor of the *prakṛti* in either of its states. Also, they cannot be affirmed to exist, since the existence is to be established by a *pramāna* — *मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिः* — and there is no *pramāna* in that state. That is, they are *jñāna-
mvartya*—sublated on the dawn of knowledge leading to *Kaivalya*. Again, what the *Yogasūtra* (2-22)—*कृतार्थे प्रति
नष्टमप्यनष्टं तदन्यसाधारणत्वात्*— says viz , that though they cease to exist from the standpoint of the liberated, they are

experienced by others, is reminiscent of the rope-snake. Because of these two reasons, the plurality of *purusas*, and *prakṛti* are illusory, *mithyā*, though not explicitly mentioned so by these two schools; thus Ātman which is of the nature of Existence and Consciousness, is one without a second. Again, in the *Jaiḡśavyopākhyāna* in the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* (3-18) it is stated that, though the happiness resulting from the *siddhis* is greater than that in ordinary parlance, it is nothing but misery as compared to *Kāvalya*. This shows that *Kāvalya* is what is to be sought after in preference to everything else, as being most beneficial. This implies that Ātman is of the nature of Bliss as well, though not explicitly spoken of as such. Further, in the spirit of the Śruti असङ्गो ह्ययं पुरुषः (*Bṛ U.* 4-3-16) [This *purusa* is indeed non-attached] the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* (62) says—

तस्मान्न बध्यतेऽद्वा न मुच्यते नापि संसरति कश्चित् ।

संसरति बध्यते मुच्यते च नानाश्रया प्रकृतिः ॥

which declares that, in reality, there is neither bondage nor transmigration nor liberation for anyone; all such parlance is to be traced to *prakṛti* (which has been shown to be illusory). This is reminiscent of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*—

न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो नैव साधकः ।

न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥

Sarvatantīrasvatāntra Śrī Śrī Vācaspatimiśra who is at home in all *Śāstras*, says in his *Bhāmatī* on the *Bhāṣya* on the *Sūtra* (2-1-2-3) एतेन योगः प्रत्युक्तः । thus—

न चैतानि योगशास्त्राणि प्रधानादिसद्भावप्रतिपादनपराणि, किं तु योगस्वरूपतत्साधनतदवान्तरफलविभूतितत्परमफलकैवल्यव्युत्पादनपराणि, तच्च यत्किञ्चिन्निमित्तीकृत्य व्युत्पाद्यमिति प्रधानं सविकारं निमित्तीकृत . . .

न तु तद्विवक्षितम् । . . . अत एव योगशास्त्रं व्युत्पादयिताऽऽह स्म भगवान्
वार्षगण्यः —

गुणानां परमं रूपं न दृष्टिपथमृच्छति ।

. यत्तु दृष्टिपथप्राप्तं तन्मायैव सुतुच्छकम् ॥

[The intention of the *Yogaśāstra* is not in establishing the existence of the *pradhāna* etc., but in delineating the nature of *yoga*, the means for it and the *siddhis* as its subsidiary benefits, and *Kaivalya* as its supreme purport. Since some framework is to be adopted for this purpose, the *pradhāna* with its products as conceived of in *Sāṅkhya* is adopted as offering incidence for this. The intention is not thus in delineating the *pradhāna*. That is why Bhagavān Vārsaganya says in his exposition of *Yogaśāstra* that the substratum of the *gunas*, the *Ātman*, is not an 'object' of experience. That which is an 'object' of experience, is indeed illusory; in fact, it does not exist at all.]

This points out the slender difference between the *pradhāna* as believed to be conceived of by the *Sāṅkhyas* and the *avyakta* or *avyākṛta* of the Vedānta. The *Bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtra* (1-4-1-3) तदधीनत्वादर्थवत् । says—

यदि वयं स्वतन्त्रां काञ्चित्प्रागवस्थां जगतः कारणत्वेनाभ्युपगच्छेम,
प्रसङ्गयेम तदा प्रधानकारणवादम् । परमेश्वराधीनां त्रियमस्माभिः प्रागवस्था
जगतोऽभ्युपगम्यते । न स्वतन्त्रा ।

[Should we admit some independent primal state as the cause of the world, we shall be implicitly admitting the theory of *pradhāna* as the cause. What we admit, however, is only a primal state dependent on the Supreme Lord and not an independent one; only then would it be purposeful.]

Again as to how the concepts of *mahat* and *ahankāra* of the *Sāṅkhyas* can be taken over into the Vedāntic scheme as equivalent to the concepts of *īkṣana* and *saṅkalpa* has already been referred to.

(b) Nyaya and Vaisesika

Since, just as in the case of the *Sāṅkhyas* etc., even according to the schools of *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika* etc., liberation results from knowledge, and from the standpoint of the liberated, the world characterised as non-Self does not exist apart from the individual, they too must necessarily admit, like the *Sāṅkhyas* etc., the non-duality of Self and the illusory nature of the world. Liberation being coveted as more beneficial than the positions of Brahmā, Indra etc., greatest happiness is in liberation though not explicitly stated as such. They speak of the non-existence of knowledge as well in liberation, in this sense that there is no knowledge whatsoever of anything that is different from Ātman like the mind, senses, body, objects etc., of the world. Consciousness that is Ātman is absolutely *nirvikalpa* i.e., It has no objective characteristics and hence there is no knowledge categorised as a quality in their system. That liberation ensues from right knowledge which dispels the illusory knowledge is expressed by their own *sūtras*—

तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगमः । दुःखजन्मप्रवृत्तिदोषमित्याज्ञानानामुत्त-
रोत्तरापाये तदनन्तरापायादपवर्गः । (1-1-2)

[Liberation results from the removal of the illusory knowledge, which in turn, results in the successive removal of defects (like attachment, repulsion etc.), activity, birth and misery.]

Śrī Udayanācārya, the great logician, when dealing with the Buddhist logicians points out the discrepancy in their *śūnyavāda* by such statements as—

न ग्राह्यमेदमवधूय धियोऽस्ति वृत्तिः ।
तद्वाधके बलिनि वेदनये जयश्रीः ॥

[Without an external object, there can be no knowledge relating to it Thumping victory crowns only the impregnable Vedāntic set-up which alone shows that the external world is sublated only on the dawn of the knowledge of the Substratum.] and प्रविश वाऽनिर्वचनीयव्यातिकुक्षिम्, तिष्ठ वा मतिकर्दममपहाय ।

[Enter the fold of the *anirvacanīyakhyaṭi* of the Vedāntins or remain quiet by cleansing your mind of your untenable speculations.]

That his anxiety is particularly in saving people from atheism and in providing the ground for taking eventually to the Vedāntic discipline, is made clear by the above statements as also by the statement—किमार्द्रकवणिजो वहिन्नचिन्तया ? [What has a ginger-trader to do with a sea-going vessel ?] when comparing his own system with Vedānta. Even the great logicians Gaṅgeśopādhyāya and Raghunāthabhaṭṭācārya have made clear in the invocations respectively in their compositions that their sole purport is in Brahman of the Vedānta, which, though by Itself transcends the three *gunas*, appears to be associated with them because of *upādhi* and which is secondless, impartite Bliss and Consciousness—

गुणातीतोऽपीशस्त्रिगुणसच्चिवः । and अखण्डानन्दबोधाय पूर्णाय परमात्मने ॥

Likewise, that the purport of Annambhaṭṭa, the author of the *Tarkasaṅgrahadīpikā* is also in Vedānta, is indicated by his choice of the *Mahāvākya* 'That thou art' to exemplify the *jahadaḥhallakṣaṇā* and his concluding statement in the *Dīpikā* that the purpose of the *Tarkasaṅgraha* is in aiding *manana* i.e., contemplation on what is learnt from Śruti i.e., *śravaṇa*, as per the Śruti—

आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः ।

(*Br. U.* 2-4-5)

(c) *Purvamimamsa*

Śrī Kumārilabhattapāda, expounder of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāśāstra* observes in his *Ślokavārtika* (1-10)—

प्रायेणैव हि मीमासा लोके लोकायतीकृता ।
तामास्तिकपथे कर्तुमयं यत्नः कृतो मया ॥

[For the most part, in the world the *Mīmāṃsā* has been rendered materialistic as it were. My effort is to expose its character that is anti-atheistic.]

Again, in the *Ślokavārtika* (*Ātmavāda*-148) he observes—

इत्याह नास्तिक्यनिराकरिण्युरात्मास्तिता भाष्यकृदत्र युक्त्या ।
दृढत्वमेतद्विषयश्च बोधः प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन ॥

[*Bhāṣyakāra* Śrī Śabaravāmpāda has, through reasoning, established the existence of Self, with the intention of refuting the atheistic school. Firm conviction of this knowledge of Self ensues from the study of the Vedānta.]

The real intention behind the refutation of the existence of Īśvara in the *Ślokavārtika*, must be deemed to be the refutation of the view that Īśvara can be established through inference, and not in the non-acceptance of Īśvara, as is seen from the invocatory verse of the *Ślokavārtika* wherein he pays obeisance to Him as adorned by the crescent Moon, with the three Vedas as the divine eyes, the embodiment of Pure Consciousness, the bestower of Bliss—

विशुद्धज्ञानदेहाय त्रिवेदीदिव्यचक्षुषे ।
श्रेयःप्राप्तिनिमित्ताय नमः सोमार्धधारिणे ॥

Also, Śrī Prabhākaramiśrapāda in his commentary *Brhatī* on *Śābarabhāṣya* says—

यस्तु ब्रह्मविदामेष निश्चयो यदुपलभ्यते न तत्तथ्यमिति, यन्नोपलभ्यते, तत्तथ्यमिति, नमस्तेभ्यः, विदुषा नोत्तरं वाच्यम् । and

यदुक्तं अहङ्कारममकारौ अनात्मन्यात्माभिमानादिति, मृदितकषायाणा-
मेवैतत्कथनीयम्, न कर्मसङ्गिनामित्युपरम्यते । आह च भगवान् द्वैपायनः
'न बुद्धिमेदं जनयेदज्ञाना कर्मसङ्गिनाम्' इति रहस्याधिकारे । तस्मान्न
विद्वृतमत्र भाष्यकारेण भगवतो वचनानुरोधात्, नाज्ञानात् ।

[As regards the conclusion arrived at by the knowers of Brahman—that which is an 'object' of knowledge is not the Reality and that which can never be an 'object' is the Reality—we prostrate before them May nothing be said after the wise have expressed themselves.

As regards the statement that the feeling of 'I' and of 'mine' in the non-Self is due to superimposition, it applies only to those whose minds are cleansed of passions, but not to those who are attached to action. So says Bhagavān Dvaipāyana in the *Rahasyādhikāra*—'The wise should not confuse the minds of the ignorant who are devoted to the path of action' Thus it is that Śrī Śābarasvāmīpāda in his *Bhāṣya* has not gone into the details of this aspect, in accordance with the instruction of the Lord, and not because he was not aware of it.]

Again in the *Vyākaraṇa* section of the *Tantravārtika*, for example, is to be found statements pertaining to liberation, Self, Knowledge and action which are all in accordance with the Vedāntic set-up. In this connection it is seen that often the *Mīmāṃsakas* maintain the view—

यन्न दुःखेन संमिन्न न च प्रस्तमनन्तरम् ।

अमिलाषोपनीत च तत्सुखं स्वःपदास्पदम् ॥

[That Bliss which is not mixed with sorrow or eclipsed by any other mental state, which has no cessation and which is available for the mere wish, is heaven.]

which is the viewpoint of Śruti.

Śrī Madhusūdanasarasvatīpāda in his *Advaitasātra-
rakṣanam*, in the section showing that the ultimate purport

of the Śrutis like 'The aspirant after heaven must perform sacrifice' is in *Advaita* alone, impresses on the *Mīmāṃsakas* thus—

तथा च त्वदुपन्यस्तं प्रमाणं रुदन्तमपि त्वा द्वैतरागिणमद्वैतमेव बोधयतीति परिभाषय ।

[Likewise, know well that the *Śrutipramāna* quoted by you yourself teaches you *Advaita* alone in spite of your protests and your attachments to *dvaita*.]

Thus all the great *Mīmāṃsakas* have made it abundantly clear, without any speck of doubt, that their purport is in *Advaita* and that the *Mīmāṃsāsāstra* operates keeping in view only the less qualified people who have not overcome attachment.

(d) Dharmasastra

Referring to the *Dharmaśāstra*, it is seen by way of example, that the *Tājñavalkyasmṛiti* (1-8) says—

इज्याचारदमार्हिसादानस्त्राध्यायकर्मणाम् ।

अयं तु परमो धर्मो यद्योगेनात्मदर्शनम् ॥

[Of all the *karmas* such as sacrifices, conduct, control of senses, non-violence, gift, learning of one's own branch of Śruti etc., this is the supreme *Dharma* which is seeing Ātman by means of *yoga*.]

Says the *Manusmṛiti*—

सर्वेषामपि चैतेषामात्मज्ञानं परं स्मृतम् ।

तद्व्यग्र्यं सर्वविद्यानां प्राप्यते ह्यमृतं ततः ॥ (12-85)

सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि ।

समं पश्यन्नात्मयाजी स्वाराज्यमधिगच्छति ॥ (12-91)

एतद्धि जन्मसाफल्यं ब्राह्मणस्य विशेषतः ।

प्राप्यैतत्कृतकृत्यो हि द्विजो भवति नान्यथा ॥ (12-93)

आत्मैव देवताः सर्वाः सर्वमात्मन्यवस्थितम् । (12-119)

[The knowledge of Ātman is considered superior to all these. This is the foremost of all disciplines, immortality is secured from it. Seeing himself in all, and all in himself, and seeing Brahman everywhere, the seeker of Self secures the kingdom of Self. This is the fruitfulness of one's life—specially of a *Brāhmaṇa*. He is verily the twice-born who secures this fruit and thus fulfils all his duties in life, and none other. All gods are verily Ātman Itself, everything is established in Ātman.]

These illustrations serve to show that the exponents of *Dharmaśāstra* have themselves made explicit statements to the effect that the ultimate aim of the practice of *dharma* is in the realisation of Brahman-Ātman.

(e) Agamas

That the purport of all *Āgamas* delineating various deities and devotional practices is also in *Brahmāvidyā* is seen from their own statements. *Sarvajñānottara*, an authority in respect of *Śaivāgamas* says—

योऽसौ सर्वेषु वेदेषु पठ्यते ह्यज ईश्वरः ।
 अकायो निर्गुणो ह्यात्मा सोऽहमस्मि न संशयः ॥
 अहमात्मा शिवो ह्यन्यः परमात्मेति यः स्मृतः ।
 एवं यो भावयेन्मोहान्न शिवत्वमवाप्नुयात् ॥

[I am indeed He who is spoken of in all the Vedas as the unborn Lord, Ātman Himself, devoid of body and qualities. There is no doubt about this.

He who, out of delusion, thinks that he is Self and that Śiva the Supreme Lord is indeed different from him, will not attain Śivahood.]

The *Suprabhedāgama* says—

यथा जल जले क्षिप्त क्षीरे क्षीरं घृते घृतम् ।
 अविशेष भवेत्तद्वदात्माऽपि परमात्मनि ॥

[As water poured in water, milk in milk or ghee in ghee, so also jīva merging in Śiva becomes non-different.]

In the *Pāñcarātrāgama* are found statements such as—

अयं प्रपञ्चो मिथ्यैव सत्यं ब्रह्माहमद्वयम् ।

तत्र प्रमाणं वेदान्ता गुरुः खानुभवस्तथा ॥ (*Nāradaṣṣāncarātra*)

द्वैतं नास्तीति बोधेन मनसो द्वैतनाशनम् ।

एतदन्तो हि संसारो ब्रह्मन्नेव विचारय ॥

सगुणोपासनं तावत्साधनं निर्गुणस्य तु ।

ब्रह्मविद्भवति ब्रह्म इत्येषा च परा श्रुतिः ॥ (*Brahmasamhitā*)

[This world is only illusory, the truth is that I am the secondless Brahman. The Vedāntas, the Guru as also one's own experience are the *pramānas* in this respect.]

On the dawn of the realisation that there is no duality, the duality of the mind is destroyed. This is the end of *samsāra*. O Brāhmana! enquire on these lines

Meditation on the qualified leads to the one that is devoid of qualities. The knower of Brahman is Brahman. The great Śruti also declares this.]

(f) Saktatantra

Those who follow the *Śākta* school also hold *Advaita* as the ultimate truth. All the seed-letters end in *bindu*, the material cause of all principles. The *Śāktatantra* texts also say—

मिथ्याजगदधिष्ठाना, ब्रह्मात्मैक्यस्वरूपिणी, निर्भेदा, भेदनाशिनी, अहमित्येव विभावयेन्महेशीम् etc.

[She who is the Substratum of the illusory world, whose *svarūpa* is Brahman-Ātman, the One without distinction, the one who destroys differences, the Supreme Goddess should be meditated upon thus alone. 'I am She'.]

(g) Vyakarana

Again, the subject of grammar which has been known to occupy itself with the correct usage of words, has also a philosophical development as is seen from the works of the great grammarians, Pāṇini, Vararuci, Patañjali, Bhartṛhari etc. A few examples may be considered. Says Bhartṛhari—

अनादिनिधन ब्रह्म शब्दतत्त्व यदक्षरम् ।

त्रिवर्ततेऽर्थभावेन प्रक्रिया जगतो यतः ॥

[The immutable Brahman without beginning or end is the sum and substance of all sound. The world of objects denoted by words is an apparent transfiguration of this Brahman.]

सम्बन्धिभेदात् सत्तैव भिद्यमाना गवादिषु ।

जातिरित्युच्यते तस्या सर्वे शब्दा व्यवस्थिताः ॥

ता प्रातिपदिकार्थं च धात्वर्थं च प्रचक्षते ।

सा नित्या सा महानात्मा तामाहुस्त्वतलादयः ॥

[Existence which differs from animal to animal as in cows by virtue of the difference in its association is called genus (*jāti*), all words are based upon it. This alone is referred to as the meaning of the stem and verbal root. That is the eternal and Supreme Self. The suffixes 'tva', 'tal' etc., pertain to It.]

The above statement of Bhartṛhari is from the viewpoint of Śrī Śrī Vyājayānācārya who accepts genus (*jāti*) as what is denoted by a word.

Bhartṛhari again gives expression to the viewpoint of Śrī Vyādi who accepts the individual as what is denoted by a word—

सत्य वस्तु तदाकारैरसत्यैरवधार्यते ।

असत्योपाधिभिः शब्दैः सत्यमेवाभिधीयते ॥

6.12

622

अध्रुवेण निमित्तेन देवदत्तगृह यथा ।

गृहीतं गृहशब्देन शुद्धमेवाभिधीयते ॥

[The real object is made known through unreal ones which have the appearance of the Real. By words which act as the unreal adjuncts, the Real alone is expressed. Just as the house of Devadatta is made known by an incidental entity—*upalaksana*—serving as a pointer (e.g., a crow), the word 'house' e.g., indicates the Pure Brahman Itself.]

Śrī Vidyāraṇyācarana says in the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (13-234)—

भाष्यकारेणापि 'सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धे' इत्येतद्वार्तिकव्याख्यानावसरे 'द्रव्यं हि नित्यम्' इत्यनेन ग्रन्थेनासत्योपाध्यवच्छिन्नं ब्रह्मतत्त्वं द्रव्यशब्द-वाच्यं सर्वशब्दार्थं इति निरूपितम् ।

[Commenting on the *Vārtika* 'word, its meaning, and the relation between them being eternal' Bhagavān Patañjali states—'The meaning of a word is the individual itself which is eternal' by which he implies (as Śrī Kaṣyapa clarifies) that it is Brahman Itself as delimited by an unreal adjunct that is the connotation of every word]

6.12.7 Different Expositions due to Adhikaribheda; Each has an in-built secret exit leading to Brahma-vidya

In respect of this variety of exposition, says the *Sūtasamhitā* (*Yajñavalkyaśāstra* 22-22 to 26)—

अतोऽधिकारिभेदेन मार्गा मानं न संशयः ॥

ईश्वरस्य स्वरूपे च बन्धहेतौ तथैव च ।

जगतः कारणे मुक्तौ ज्ञानादौ च तथैव च ॥

मार्गाणां ये विरुद्धाशा वेदान्तेन विचक्षणाः ।

तेऽपि मन्दमतीना हि महामोहावृतात्मनाम् ।

वाञ्छामात्रानुगुण्येन प्रवृत्ता न यथार्थतः ॥

दर्शयित्वा तृण मत्स्रो धावन्तीं गा यथाऽग्रहीत् ॥

दर्शयित्वा तथा क्षुद्रमिष्टं पूर्वं महेश्वरः ।

पश्चात्पाकानुगुण्येन ददाति ज्ञानमुत्तमम् ॥

[Therefore all paths are valid because of the difference in the competency of the seekers, there is no doubt about this. As regards the aspects of these systems that are contradictory to Vedānta such as the real nature of Īśvara, cause of bondage, cause of the world, liberation, knowledge etc., they are meant for those of less intellectual and mental calibre, steeped in great illusion. But these contradictions are not real. Like a man who can control a running cow by showing grass, the Supreme Lord shows some trivial object of desire (to those ignorant men) and confers upon them the highest knowledge later, according to their maturity.]

From all this it is clear that the principal purport of all the systems mentioned is in Brahman-Ātman of the Vedānta. The differences in expositions are because of the differences in the equipment of the seekers. Their intention is not revealing their main purport as such is in conformity with the dictum given expression to by Bhagavān Vasīṣṭha—

अज्ञस्यार्धप्रबुद्धस्य सर्वं ब्रह्मेति यो वदेत् ।

महानिरयजालेषु स तेन विनियोजितः ॥

[He who preaches to the ignorant and the half-learned that everything is Brahman, verily entangles him in a mesh of horrible hells.]

The concepts and the method of instruction have been designed carefully in each case, to provide for a path leading eventually to *Brahmavidyā* in the manner of the secret exit provided by Vīdura enabling the Pāṇḍavas to escape from the house of wax wherein if they had remained, they would have been burnt up. By way of

example may be cited the *Nyāyavaiśeṣika* concepts of *samavāya* as being one only, *atyantābhāva* (absolute non-existence), differences in one and the same entity due to *upādhis* like the organs of hearing in different living beings as associated with one and the same *ākāśa*, *dyāṇuk* as arising from the untenable imaginary contact of two partless *paramāṇus*—

कणादः पारिमाण्डल्यसंयोगाद्द्वयचणुकक्रमात् ।

जगदुत्प्रेक्षयन् मायावादसादरमानसः ॥

The *Sāṅkhya* concept of *prakṛti*, the *pradhāna* the unmanifest state of the manifest world, is virtually the same as the concept of *Māyā* except for this difference that *prakṛti* is not spoken of by them as the power of *Īśvara* and it is not said to be sublated by knowledge. This shows the close proximity of *Sāṅkhya* to *Vedānta*. So also the notion of *Purusa* of the nature of Consciousness. Again it may be recalled that all the systems speak of *jñāna* as the means for liberation which is hardly distinguishable from that according to *Vedānta*. Again *Śrī Appayya* *dīksitapāda* says in the *Nyāyarakṣāmani* in connection with the *Brahmasūtra* (1-3-3-12)—

स्फोटचेतनमपि केचिदभ्युपगच्छन्ति शब्दब्रह्माद्वैतवादिनः, तन्मतानुसारेण प्रशासनमपि स्फोटस्योपपद्यत इत्याशङ्क्याह—अन्यभावव्यावृत्तेश्च एव चेत् ब्रह्म स्फोट इति नाममात्रे भेदः स्यात्, न वस्तुनि, मुक्त्यन्वयिसकलजीवाभेदजडप्रपञ्चराहित्यचानभ्युपगम्य स्फोटाद्वैतोपपादनायोगात्

[Some of those who teach the non-dual *Śabda-Brahman*, accept a *sphota* that is sentient. According to them, it is reasonable to attribute even the mighty rule to the *sphota*. If that be so, the difference between *Brahman* and *sphota* is only in respect of nomenclature, not in substance, as those who establish by reason

the non-duality of *sphota* have perforce to accept non-difference of *jīvas* and the negation of the insentient world in final emancipation.]