



**Nagesh D. Sonde**

*Brahmasūtras are also known as Vedānta, Uttara Mīmāṃsā, Śārīraka Sūtras. Brahmasūtra is called Uttara-Mimāṃsā or the investigation of the later part of the Vedas, as distinguished from Poorva Mimāṃsā or the investigating the earlier part of the Vedas and Brahmanas which deal the ritual or karmakānda. Sutra means thread and Brahma sūtras stitch Upanishadic teachings, systematizing the Wisdom.*

*Brahma Sutras are attributed to Badarayana, who according to Sri Sankara is the knowledge-power of the Supreme Being, whereas according to Sri Madhva, he is Krishna Dvaipayana Vyāsa, who having lived in Badarī in the Himalayas. The number of Sūtras vary and are gathered in four chapters (adhyāya), each chapter being divided into four quarters (pāda). Each quarter consists of several groups of sūtras called Adhikaraṇas or topical sections. An Adhikaraṇausually consists of several sūtras.*

*Brahma Sūtras are capable of being interpreted in multiple ways and they are often difficult to understand, therefore one finds\_ ample evidence that there were differences of opinion among the various interpreters like Audulomi, Kārshnāgni, Kāśakṛtsna, Jaimini and Bādari, in addition to Vyasa or Badarayana. Many commentaries have been written on this text, the earliest being one by Sri Shankara. His commentary set forth the Advaita interpretation of the Vedānta, and was commented upon by Vachaspati and Padmapada. The commentary by Sri Rlamanuja called Sri Bhashya lays the foundations of the Vishistadvaita tradition which refutes Sri Shankara's Advaita philosophy. Sri Madhva's lays down the foundation of the Dvaita tradition refuting all earlier commentaries on Brahma Other commentators on the Brahma Sūtras, belonging to other schools of Vedānta include those by Bhāskara, Yādavaprakāśa, Keśava, Nīlakaṇṭha, Vallabha, Vijnyanabhikshu, Nimbaraka, Balamdeva, Vidhyabhushana and Haridas Shastri.*

o o o o o

## A Note Regarding Translation of Sanskrit in English.

Translation of any subject especially those relating to spiritual matters from one temporal language to another language is difficult since spiritual expressions because spiritual matters are not exact like mathematics. Spiritual matters deal with emotions which are supra-sensory experiences. Very much earlier in Rigveda we find it mentioned that Vak, Speech was pure and unadulterated, which Brihaspati made it known using signs and symbols, marks and medium to make the Spiritual mysteries known the rough empirical means. The society accepted the signs and symbols, marks and mediums, with conscious common acceptance, thereby giving rise to language to enable communication between people.

In spite of these instruments made available to the people, it was found impossible to communicate in the same intensity what in essentially personal experience, which led the Upanishadic intellectuals to remark that the mysticism of सत्य, the Prime Existence as became effulgent - Brahman was not possible since the Speech and Mind return without attaining it. Therefore, we find in Upanishads variety of views expressed by Seers about what they revealed as their supra-sensory experience. Therefore to accept the thoughts of the Darshankara or the Bhashyakaras as the final say on सत्य, the Prime Existence. Each one had their perception - दर्शन, of what each accessed through listening, reflection and meditation, which they expressed as may be able to be understood in language, using signs and symbols, legends and examples as the people of the place and of the period.

Therefore, it would be an error to say that one Seer was correct and the other was wrong, accepting each communication as perception may be intensely personal to them, the communication not necessarily be the only truth and nothing short of being Absolute Truth. When one refuses to accept such view in its broad and fundamental connotation, it gives rise to creed, sect, religious belief, which denies right to see things as one would like to see. Only when one frees himself from the fetters of traditional creeds, sects and religious beliefs then one becomes freed from bondage and see सत्य, in its true essence (नाम) and form (रूप).

There are two ways of looking at this problem. Firstly one may have to subordinate the signs and symbols to seek as far as possible the intent and purpose which the communicator intended to convey. It would be profitable to

derive the meaning of the words used going back to source from where the words have derived their basic meaning. In all my studies of religious texts I have therefore consciously subordinated the signs and symbols used by the Seers and the saints, howsoever intellectually superior or spiritually deep the latter commentators may be, in clarifying the intent or propounding their thesis or howsoever hoary the traditions of the people, in the place and the period may be when they were communicated. If the signs and symbols used by them when they communicated are not relevant or acceptable in the present larger context then I would have no hesitation to seek the meaning from the original source for enabling the people in different places and in newer environment to use new forms to explain how one has understood what the ancient seers or saints wanted to communicate.

For instance I believe that the legends and the events used being allegorical and not real, historical to a point but transcend the time to convey what is eternal and not restricted to few chosen people, given in particular place and restricted to particular period. Therefore that which is contained in Vedic scriptures is as relevant what is contained in Old or New Testament or in Koran, or to that matter whatever contained in the all the religious literature live or extinct. I believe that the Ultimate Reality is unitary energy, which manifests in various big or small forms, whether one calls by whatever names or use whatever the forms to reach सत्य, the Prime Existence, the way it became ब्रह्मन्, effulgent. Therefore I have tried to translate many words from the roots from which they are derived rather than by the signs and symbols traditionally used. For instance, I have generally translated सत्य, derived from its root अस् to be, to exist, therefore Existence. ब्रह्मन् from the root बृ to grow expand to become effulgent, श्रद्धा from the root श्रु to listen, to be receptive, ब्राह्मण, one wise in wisdom, क्षत्रिय, one who strong in arms, वैश्य, one who is industrious, शूद्र, one who labours, so on so forth. I believe that in doing so I am not disrespectful to the ancient seers and saints nor to the traditional beliefs but I am doing so because it clarified my Mind. In doing so I do not feel that I am either untrue, to the Seers, the Sages, the Darshanas or the Bhasyskaras. My experience intensely my own, I can neither replicate the experience which they had nor my limited experience can ever be compared to the experience of the Great Gurus.

ooooo