

He reads both "bhākta" and "abhākta" and gives two explanations accordingly. Thus: (1) But the designation which depends on (i.e. refers to) the movable and the immovable must be secondary, because of being permeated by the being of that (viz. Brahman). (Here he reads "bhākta".) That is, all the words denoting movable and immovable objects are only secondary with regard to those objects, but really denote Brahman, since all objects are modes of Brahman, (2) or, all the terms denoting movable and immovable objects are primary with regard to Brahman, because the denotative power of all terms depends on the being of Brahman. (Here he reads "abhākta".) ¹

Śrīkaṇṭha

This is sūtra 17 in his commentary as well. He reads "abhākta", takes this sūtra as an adhikaraṇa by itself, and interprets it exactly like Rāmānuja. ²

Baladeva

This is sūtra 15 in his commentary. He also reads "abhākta", takes it as an adhikaraṇa by itself, and interprets on the whole like Rāmānuja. Only the interpretation of the word "tad-bhāva-bhāvitvāt" is different; viz. "But the designation dependent on (i.e. referring to) the movable and the immovable must be primary (with regard to the Lord), because that fact (tad-bhāva) (viz. the fact that all words really denote the Lord) is something that follows in future (i.e. is not directly known at once, but is a matter which one comes to know after studying Scripture)". ³

SŪTRA 17

"THE SOUL (DOES) NOT (ORIGINATE), ON ACCOUNT OF NON-MENTION IN SCRIPTURE, AND ON ACCOUNT OF ETERNITY (KNOWN) THEREFROM (I.E. FROM SCRIPTURAL TEXTS)."

Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha

The individual "soul" does not originate. Why? Because there is no text about its having origin by nature; and because from

¹ Śrī. B. 2.3.17, pp. 132-33, Part 2.

² Śk. B. 2.3.17, pp. 138-39, Parts 7 and 8.

³ G.B. 2.3.15, pp. 181-82, Chap. 2.

the scriptural texts: 'A wise man is neither born nor dies' (Kaṭha. 2.18¹), 'Eternal among the eternal' (Kaṭha. 5.13²), 'An unborn one, verily, lies by, enjoying' (Śvet. 4.5³) and so on, the eternity of the individual soul is known.

Vedānta-kaustubha

If it be argued: In conformity with the texts: 'One desirous of heaven should perform sacrifices' (Tait. Saṃ. 2.5.5⁴), etc., which lay down the means to attaining lordship in the next world, let the designation: 'Devadatta is born and dead' refer to the birth and death of the body. But like the ether and the rest, birth and death must pertain to the individual soul as well at the time of creation and dissolution (respectively). Thus there is no conflict whatsoever with any text.—

We reply: "Not, the soul, on account of non-mention in Scripture". The singular number 'soul' implies the class,⁵ in accordance with the scriptural text teaching the plurality of souls, viz. 'Eternal among the eternal, conscious among the conscious' (Kaṭha. 5.13; Śvet. 6.13), and in accordance with the aphorism, to be mentioned hereafter, viz. "And on account of non-continuity, there is no confusion" (Br. Sū. 2.3.48). The soul is not born, nor dies. Why? 'On account of non-mention in Scripture', i.e. because there are no scriptural texts designating the birth and death (of the soul) at the time of creation and dissolution; and, because on the contrary, "the eternity" of the soul is known "therefrom", i.e. from the scriptural texts like: "'Imperishable, verily, O! is this soul, possessing the virtue of being indestructible'" (Bṛh. 4.5.14), 'A wise man is neither born, nor dies' (Kaṭha. 2.8), 'Eternal among the eternal, the conscious among the conscious, the one among the many, who bestows objects of desires' (Kaṭha. 5.13; Śvet. 6.13), 'The two unborn ones, the knower and the non-knower, the lord and the non-lord' (Śvet. 1.9), 'One unborn one, verily, lies by, enjoying. Another unborn one leaves her who has been enjoyed' (Śvet. 4.5) and so on; as well as from the following Smṛti passages, viz. "'Nor at any time, verily, was

¹ Ś, R, Śk, B.

² Not quoted by others.

³ And not that there is only one soul.

⁴ R, Śk, B.

⁵ P. 208, line 27, vol. 2.

I not, nor you, nor these lords of men; nor, verily, shall we ever not be hereafter”’ (Gītā 2.12), “Unborn, eternal, constant and ancient, he is not killed when the body is killed”’ (Gītā 2.20), “Who knows him to be imperishable, eternal, unborn and immutable, how can that man kill one, O Pārtha, or cause one to be killed?”’ (Gītā 2.21) and so on.

If it be objected: There are scriptural texts designating the origin of the world together with the sentient, such as, ‘All come forth from this soul’, ‘Born of whom, the progenitress of the universe let loose the souls with water on the earth’ (Mahānār. 1.4), ‘The lord of beings created beings’ (Tait. Br. 1.1.10, 1¹) “All these beings, my dear, have Being as their root, Being as their abode, Being as their support”’ (Chānd. 6.8.4), “From whom, verily, these beings arise, through whom they live when born, to whom they go and enter”’ (Tait. 3.1) and so on. Hence, the denial of birth and death of the individual soul is not reasonable. For this very reason, the initial proposition that through the knowledge of one there is the knowledge of all, is established,—

(We reply:) “No”, because the quoted texts teach that individual soul has an origin, which (is not *actual* origin, but simply) consists in the expansion of its knowledge, caused by its connection with the body, subsequent to its giving up its real nature at the time of dissolution. If this be so, then the individual soul too being an effect of Brahman, the above initial proposition is established. And hence, it is established that Brahman, who in His causal state possesses the non-divided names and forms as His powers and is without an equal or a superior,—in accordance with the text: “The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning, one only, without a second”’ (Chānd. 6.2.1),—comes Himself, as possessed of the manifest names and forms as His powers at the time of the production of effects, to abide as three-fold, viz. in the forms of the enjoyer (i.e. the cit), the object enjoyed (i.e. the acit) and the controller (i.e. Brahman). There is no contradiction here by any text whatever.

Here ends the section entitled “The soul” (7).

¹ P. 23, line 16, vol. I.