ROLE OF KARMA IN LIBERATION AS REFLECTED IN NAIṢKARMYA SIDDHI

Subramanian Chidambaran

Ādi Śankara is probably the greatest philosopher that strode this phase of the earth and revived the Sanātana Dharma that was fast declining due to the impact of non-orthodox systems of philosophy (Nāstika darśana)[1] such as Buddhism and Jainism. He propounded Kevalādvaita i.e. the philosophy of absolute monism which could be simply expressed in three statements as"Brahman alone is truth, World is an illusion, theindividual is no different from Brahman"[2]

Though Śankara stands tall and proud in the field of Advaita, the very fact that we speak of it even today is testimony to the fact that there have been personalities and lineages that have developed and sustained this philosophy even after him. The focus of this
paper is to discuss the work of one such pe sonality, Sureśvara (the foremost disciple of Śankara) through his magnum opus 'Naiṣkaṛmya siddhi'. The term Naiṣkaṛmya siddhi literally translates as 'attaining the action-less state'. It is etymologically explained as

Niṣkriyātmarūpeṇāvasthānam naiśkaṛmyasiddhih. Hence this refers to the state of liberation itself. This topic is specifically interesting because Sureśvara in his pūrvāśrama was Maṇḍanamiśra disciple of the great Kumārila Bhatta and a great proponent of Bhatta school of Pūrva Mīmāmsa. It is well known to the students of Vedānta that 'Pūrva Mīmāmsa' that is based on the 'Karma kāṇḍa'

or the 'Ritualistic section' of the Vedas is ideologically opposed to Vedānta regarded as 'Jñāna kāṇḍa' or the 'Knowledge section' of the Vedas.

The story (as per MādhavīyaŚankaraVijaya) goes that this was the first text composed by Sureśvara as a testimony of his profound understanding of Kevalādvaita before going on to compose the Vārthika on Śankara's Brahmasūtrabhāṣya. This is also explained by

Sureśvara in the introductory verses that he is composing this text to test his own understanding of the supreme philosophy of Kevalādvaita[3]. Thus it is interesting to observe how a core Mīmāmsaka in his pūrvāśrama writes a supreme Vedānta text and argues against the futility of Karma kāṇḍa himself! This text is composed in the form of a Kārikā i.e. verse form to explain a scientific subject (here the science of 'action-less state' along with Vṛttis (explanations) for some of the verses. Thus it is in a gadyapadyamiśra form. It also starts with an Avatārikā which again is in gadya form giving an introduction to the topic. It is organized into four chapters following the structure of Brahmasūtrabhāṣya. This paper has been organized into five sections which help find answers to five questions that could possibly be in the mind of the readers:

· Can't karma (actions) lead to liberation?
· If not, then what is the relation between karma & liberation?
· How do we destroy karma?
· How do we attain liberation?
· Finally, does a liberated soul at all perform karma?

1. Can't Karma lead to liberation?

Now, as stated earlier, the key message of this text is Naiṣkaṛmya siddhi i.e. attaining the 'action-less' state. The obvious question arises, 'Why should we speak of an actionless state? Can't action (Karma) lead to liberation?' This is in fact the primal focus topic of

the text wherein a lot many arguments are put in from the Pūrvāpakśa (of the karmavādins) and Sureśvara refutes these in a logical way

Let's begin by observing at the Pūrvāpakṣa. They say "If this birth is a result of the good and bad deeds of our previous birth, then it is quite obvious that for liberation, people should refrain from doing Kāmya karma and Niṣiddha karma which cause these good and bad deeds. Instead they should keep doing only the Nitya-Naimittika karma[4] (non-doing of which results in Pāpa and doing of which does not give Puṇya). Thus they can exhaust their stock of good and bad deeds and ultimately get liberated. Thus when action alone can lead to liberation, what is the role of knowledge or jñāna[5]?" They also quote from the Mīmāmsā sūtra of Jaimini[6] saying that "Entire Vedas speak of karma alone. Portions that speak of other things are quite meaningless[7]" as also from other portions of the Vedas[8] to strengthen their argument. Then they say that even knowledge is said to be attained through initiation into the 'Mahāvākyas'. Now in every sentence, the verb is the most important without which the sentence has no meaning and verb indicates action. How can one not focusing on the verb just focus on the knowledge element indicated by the sentence? Thus knowledge and action together lead to liberation and have a part-whole relationship (aṅgāṅgībhāva). Finally they conclude by saying that liberation may be possible to a person who performs his deeds religiously while knowledge cannot grant him liberation at all![9]

Firstly, Sureśvara says that we cannot go with the principle that since there are more Vedic statements on action (i.e. karmakāṇḍa is much bigger than the jñānakāṇḍa sections), karma is the objective of the Vedas[10]. Every statement correlates to a karma. Since there are more karmas, there are more statements related to them. Since there is

only one Ātman, there are few statements related to it[11]! Then, Sureśvara refutes the argument that just because an active verb is suggested in all Vedic statements, it doesn't necessarily imply Karma. Karma can be considered to be indicated only by those statements wherein the person is the decision maker to perform the karma such as 'Agnihotram juhuyāt svargakāmah' wherein the person can decide if he wants to perform Agnihotra and attain heaven or not. Statements indicating the nature of Brahman/Ātman are not of this kind and hence cannot be included in this group.

He then goes on to say that even the statements indicating Karma are in many cases a contradiction. He illustrates this through the same example of Agnihotram juhuyāt svargakāmah. Herein he says that the fruit of action is going to heaven but there is no doer there since the body ceases to exist after death and the Ātman is non-doer by nature. How then did Jaimini assign doer ship to this Ātman?[12] Also when the Ātman does not have any relation with the body and definitely not with any Viṣaya, then how will it experience any pleasure in heaven?[13]

Then Sureśvara asks the pūrvapakśa, "If liberation is the result of action, then is it the result of one action or multiple actions? If it is one action, then other actions are useless. If its multiple actions, then they contradict with the fruits mentioned for those actions in the Vedas themselves. Thus in any case, liberation cannot be the result or fruit of action"[14]. He then goes on to say that Karma itself arises due to ignorance of the Ātman and hence is incapable to destroy it[15]. How can something that is the effect be capable to destroy its own cause? It is hence that in multiple places in the text, he states that action cannot destroy ignorance as it is not opposed to it[16] while knowledge alone can destroy ignorance as it is opposed to it[17].

But then the question arises that even knowledge of the self is dependent on things such as Vedanta texts, a realized guru and an

earnest disciple which are but creations of Avidyā[18]. For this, Sureśvara says that though for the knowledge of the self to dawn, these things are important, they are not required to destroy ignorance[19]. Ignorance automatically gets destroyed once knowledge dawns. However this is diametrically opposite to Karma/action which depends on Avidyā for both its creation as well as delivering its fruit or result. Hence it is completely dependent on Avidyā and has no existence of its own.

To further strengthen his argument, Sureśvara quotes[20] the famous verse from the Muṇḍakopaniṣad[21] which states that "An earnest seeker, after careful examination of the laws governing actions and results (mutual relations and limitations) and realizing that karma or action will not give Liberation or permanent happiness, should approach a teacher to seek that knowledge, a teacher who is knowledgeable in śāstras and who himself is well established in Brahman, with samit (fire wood) in his hands indicting an attitude of service or humility." Thus, very conclusively Sureśvara establishes that **karma cannot lead to liberation.**

2. Relation between karma and liberation

Having established that karma cannot lead to liberation, is there any correlation between karma and liberation or are they two independent entities?

Sureśvara goes on to explain the exact relation Karma and liberation as follows:

- He begins by saying that 'Añgāñgībhāva' of Karma and Jñāna is not possible since (as earlier established) Karma is only one of the instruments for destruction of ignorance through purification of mind and cannot exist at the same time as the final goal Jñāna which comes after the destruction of ignorance[22]. To illustrate this, he gives examples of the sun and darkness, fire and coldness, water and heat etc.[23] The only places where these are seen to have Añgāñgībhāva

are when a person performs action out of wrong knowledge. For e.g. a person performs action under the assumption that he is the body-mind complex.

- Also, 'Samucchayabhāva' i.e. coexistence is also not possible since Knowledge comes only after destruction of ignorance and ignorance is the cause of Karma. Hence knowledge cannot even touch Karma[24].
- The only relation between the two is 'Bādhyabādhakabhāva'[25] i.e. mutually exclusive (in modern management) because Karma is the result of ignorance and knowledge is directly opposed to ignorance.

Further in a logical way, he explains in his Avatārikā, "All living beings by nature are primarily striving to get rid of all sorrows and become happy which results in their different activities"[26]. Liberation or Mokśa is nothing but eternal happiness, isn't it? What then is the reason for these sorrows? He says "To assume a bodily form is the reason for all sufferings and the body comes into existence because of the accumulated Karma of previous births. Hence without exhausting/uprooting them, without uprooting the righteous and the unrighteous deeds, the body cannot cease to exist. And until you keep doing the prescribed and prohibited actions, the righteous and unrighteous deeds can never stop."[27] *Thus it is clear, that to achieve eternal happiness, we need to destroy karma since that causes the body to take birth.*

3. How to destroy karma?

Now how do we do away with Karma? Mīmāmsakas believe that karma itself can help do away with karma. Herein, explaining a bit of the karma theory, Sureśvara says, "All actions that have been done in the past can be exhausted in only two ways – experience the fruits of actions (for prārabdha karma) or else perform the prāyaśchitta (for sañchita karma)[28].Only the actions that are yet to be done can be renounced exercising the freedom of the doer[29]. Karma is infinite[30]. Karma cannot be

the solution to exhausting a previous karma. There is not testimony in the Vedas to these statements. Also, it is impossible for humans to not do any desirous or prohibited actions in their lives because mistakes happen by even the noblest of people[31]. Nityakarma cannot also be viewed as a means to exhaust the fruits of past karma because as per the pūrvapakśa itself, nityakarma does not yield any fruit. Thus no action can cause the exhaustion of karma. Further on, he says "Karma is made of up of attachment and aversion. Attachment and aversion are created by super-imposing beauty and non-beauty on things i.e. Adhyāsa. Adhyāsa arises out of non-thinking, gives rise to the world of duality. And this Adhyāsa is primarily due to ignorance of the Ātman i.e. Avidyā."[32] Thus removing Avidyā automatically removes karma as also leading to realization of the Ātman. Thus, liberation implies removal of Avidyā which in turn implies action-less state! Hence the term Naiśkaṛmya siddhi.

Now one objection that arises here is that if destruction of karma was the objective, then why did the Lord in the Gita says "None can attain freedom from action (Naiśkaṛmyam) without performing the prescribed Vedic duties. Also he cannot attain perfection (siddhi) by renouncing the actions[33]" It is interesting how both the terms Naiśkaṛmya and siddhi come into this verse of the Gita.

Explaining this, Sureśvara says that as a first step, people should give up the Niṣiddha and Kāmya karma but should continue doing their Nitya-naimittika karma not from the opinion of the Mīmāmsakas that this itself will lead to liberation. But from the perspective that this will lead to purification of the intellect as explained in the following sequence of points:

"Performing of Nitya-naimittika karma → Righteousness → destruction of sins → purification of the mind (Chitta Śuddhi) → Real knowledge of the world → apathy (vairāgya) → Desire for liberation (Mumukśutva) → Enquiry into means of liberation → Renouncing of

actions → performance of yoga → Turning the mind inwards → Realization of Ātman → destruction of Avidyā → remaining in the self. Thus karma can progressively help in destruction of Avidyā but since it is not opposed to Avidyā, it cannot be the direct cause! [34]"

Though we see that Karma can be an instrument for destruction of ignorance, this in no way establishes that Karma can lead to liberation. Because by nature, liberation cannot be the fruit of any action aimed at creation, attainment, refinement or change/modification. Hence karma cannot be an instrument for liberation[35]. This nature of liberation is also explicitly defined by Śankara in his Brahmasūtrabhāşya where he says that the knowledge of Brahman is not a form of wealth (to be acquired)[36], not a result of a special action[37] or any refinement process[38] nor is it subject to change[39].

4. How to attain liberation?

Now as we understand till now, Karma cannot lead to liberation though it can to some extent aid in destruction of ignorance. Then what will lead to the complete destruction of ignorance and knowledge of Brahman?

To explain this, Sureśvara first begins by explaining how ignorance is created. He portrays a beautiful sequence of events that begin with detachment/indifference to the world → desire to free from the world → desire for liberation → approach the teacher → Listen to the Vedāntavākyas → Understand the words and their meaning → Understand the 'true knowledge' behind the words → Destruction of ignorance → Liberation[40]. Hence the starting point is detachment. Now, the reason for attachment, he says, is the wrong notion that 'I am the body' i.e. the ego. He says that you can eradicate this notion only by coming out of the body[41]. Once you are out of the body, dogs will take possession of this body that you are so proud of now and establish their supremacy over it by keeping their legs over it! [42] Knowing these, through

discrimination, one should clearly distinguish between Self and the non-Self (what Śankara calls Nityānityavastuviveka as a part of the Sādhanāchatuṣṭaya.) This can be clearly established knowing that just as fire cannot burn its own heat (because it's a part of its form), similarly if the ego and others were the nature of the Self then they would not be evident as a different experience / feeling within one self. This in itself proves that they are not the real nature of the Self [43]. Just like the body undergoes changes, so does the status of ego which says 'I am happy', then later says 'I am sad'. Hence it too like the body depends on the Sāmānya-Viśeṣa principle[44]. The Self is one that does not depend on this principle.

Now he goes on to explain how the Vedāntavākyas help the aspirant understand the true knowledge. Speaking of the statement Aham Brahmāsmi, the pūrvapakśa says that this is similar to any other statement that says 'I am so and so'. Also Tat Tvam asi, just speaks of 'That' which again points to some object and establishes a resemblance with oneself. To these, Sureśvara says that when one says 'This is snake. This is rope', it is impossible to reconcile the two at the same time because if it is snake, then it cannot be rope and vice versa. Thus if one exists, the other automatically ceases to exist. Similarly in due course of contemplation on Aham Brahmāsmi i.e. 'I am Brahman', 'I' and 'Brahman' will not exist together – 'I' will cease to exist leaving 'Brahman' alone[45]. Similar is the purpose of the statement Tat Tvam asi. Also it's a known fact that since no word can indicate the Self. Then how can the Vedāntavākyas grant knowledge of the Self? Sureśvara agrees that no words can be the direct description of the Self which is without attributes. However just like a sleeping person can be awakened by calling his name (though the name has nothing to do with him *per se*), similarly these Vedāntavākyas have the power to awaken the person from his sleep of ignorance[46]. Even these words indicate the Self only in the

implied or suggested meaning and not necessarily in the actual meaning[47].

5. Does a liberated soul perform karma?

Sureśvara also describes in brief the nature of the liberated soul.

- He says that since the Brahmajñāni is one with the entire universe, he is united with all castes and communities. Hence there is no reason for him to identify with any one community and perform their actions48. Also since he does not have any desires or identification with the body, there is no reason to believe why he will perform specific actions. And if we believe that he has these desires, then his Brahmajñāna is a waste[49].
- But then can't the Jñāni perform action with the notion that he is different from others and then later remain in the realized state united with all? This Sureśvara says is impossible because then sooner or later the sorrowful nature of the Universe would be superimposed on Brahman and Brahman would become 'sorrowful' itself50. How then can a sorrowful Brahman become a puruṣārtha to be attained?

Concluding thoughts

The striking feature of this text is the great conviction and clarity with which Sureśvara extols the principles of Advaita Vedānta. He resembles Śankara's style at many places in the text especially in nature of examples. In many cases, he gives a logical build up of the cause-result chain thus making it easier for the reader to grasp the point. He also repeats a lot many arguments multiple times probably just to reinforce the point. Also being an ardent Mīmāmsaka in his previous life, he very strongly and clearly refutes the arguments of the Pūrvapakṣa.

Unique feature of this text is however the explanation of karma and its role in liberation. This is tackled from multiple perspectives by Sureśvara giving the reader a clear directive on the purpose of karma and what can be achieved by it.

Abbreviations

BG: Bhagavad Gita
Mi Su: Mīmāmsā sūtra
MU: Muṇḍakopaniṣad
NS: Naiṣkarmya siddhi

Bibliography

Bakre, M. S. (1934). Brahmasūtra Śānkarabhāṣyam. Bombay.
Maheswaran, K. S. Naiṣkarmya Siddhi of Sureshwaracarya. Youtube videos. Dept. of Advaita Vedanta, Madras Sanskrit College.
Paramarthananda, S. (n.d.). Lectures on Naishkarmya siddhi .
Tripathi, P. (2007). श्रीमत्सुरेश्वराचार्यविरचिता नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धिः Kashi.

Notes and References :

1. Indian systems of philosophy that did not accept the authority of the Vedas
2. ब्रह्मसत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः ।।
3. न ख्यातिलाभपूजार्थं ग्रन्थोऽस्माभिरुदीर्यते ।
   स्वबोधपरिशुद्ध्यर्थं ब्रह्मविन्निकषाश्मसु ।। NS 1.6
4. अकुर्वतः क्रियाः काम्या निषिद्धास्त्यजतस्तथा ।
   नित्यं नैमित्तिकं कर्म विधिवच्चानुतिष्ठतः ।। Ibid 1.10
5. मुक्तेः क्रियाभिः सिद्धत्वाज्ज्ञानं तत्र करोति किम् । Ibid 1.9
6. आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्ववादानर्थक्यमतदर्थानां तस्मादनित्यमुच्यते । Mi.Su 1.2.1
7. आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वादानर्थक्यमितोन्यथा ।
   इति साटोपमाहोच्चैर्वेदविज्जैमिनिः स्वयम् ।। NS 1.17
8. कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः ।
   इति मन्त्रोऽपि निःशेषं कर्माण्यायुरवासृजत् ।। Ibid 1.18
9. अतःसर्वाश्रमाणां हि वाङ्मनःकायकर्मभिः ।
   स्वनुष्ठितैर्यथाशक्ति मुक्तिः स्यान्नान्यसाधनात् ।। Ibid 1.21
10. न च बाहुल्यं प्रामाण्ये कारणभावं प्रतिपद्यते । Ibid 1.86
11. प्रामाण्याय न बाहुल्यं न ह्येकत्र प्रमाण्यताम् ।
    वस्तुन्यटन्ति मानानि त्वेकत्रैकस्यय मानता ।। Ibid 1.86
12. स्वर्गं यियासुर्जुहुयादग्निहोत्रं यथाविधि ।
    देहाद्व्युत्थापितस्यैवं कर्तृत्वं जैमिनेः कथम् ।। Ibid 1.92

13. न तावद्योग एवास्ति शरीरेणात्मनः सदा।
विषयैर्दूरतो नास्ति स्वर्गादौ स्यात्कथं सुखम्।। Ibid 1.95
14. एकेन वा भवेन्मुक्तिर्यदि वा सर्वकर्मभिः।
प्रत्येकं चेद् वृथान्यानि सर्वेभ्योऽप्येककर्मता।। Ibid 1.25
15. कर्माज्ञानसमुत्थत्वान्नालं मोहापनुत्तये । Ibid 1.35
16. दन्दहीत्यात्मनो मोहं न कर्माप्रतिकूलतः । Ibid 1.8
17. सम्यग्ज्ञानं विरोधस्य तमिस्रस्याम्शुमानिव । Ibid 1.35
18. नन्वात्मज्ञानमप्यविद्योपादानं न हि शास्त्रशिष्याचार्याद्यनुपादायात्मज्ञानमात्मानं लभत इति । Ibid 1.35-36
19. स्वात्मोत्पत्तावेव शास्त्राद्यपेक्षते नोत्पन्नमविद्यानिवृत्तौ । Ibid 1.35-36
20. परीक्ष्य लोकान् इत्याद्या आत्मज्ञानविधायिनीः ।
नैष्कर्म्यप्रवणाः साध्वीः श्रुतीः किं न शृणोषि ताः।। Ibid 1.87
21. परीक्ष्य लोकान् कर्मचितान् ब्राह्मणो निर्वेदमायान्नास्त्यकृतः कृतेन ।
तद् विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत् समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम्।। M.U I.ii.12
22. सन्निपत्य न च ज्ञानं कर्माज्ञानं निरस्यति।
साध्यसाधनभावत्वादेककालानवस्थितेः ।। NS 1.54
23. तमोऽङ्गत्वं यथा भानोरग्नेः शीताङ्गता यथा।
वारिणश्चोष्णता यद्वज्ज्ञानस्यैवं क्रियाङ्गता।। Ibid 1.79
24. अज्ञानमनिराकुर्वज्ज्ञानमेव न सिद्ध्यति।
विपन्नकारकग्रामं ज्ञानं कर्म न ढौकते।। Ibid 1.65
25. बाध्यबाधकभावाच्च पञ्चास्योरणयोरिव।
एकदेशानवस्थानान्न समुच्चयता तयोः।। Ibid 1.55
26. आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तैः सर्वप्राणिभिः सर्वप्रकारस्यापि दुःखस्य स्वरसत एव जिहासितत्वात् तन्निवृत्त्यर्था प्रवृत्तिरस्ति स्वरसत एव। Ibid अवतारिका
27. दुखस्य च देहोपादनैकहेतुत्वात् देहस्य च पूर्वोपचितधर्माधर्ममूलत्वादनुच्छित्तिः।
तयोश्च विहितप्रतिषिद्धकर्मत्वादनिवृत्तिः। Ibid अवतारिका
28. कर्मणो हि निवृत्तात्मनो द्वाभ्यां प्रकाराभ्यां निवृत्तिः सम्भवति। आरब्धफलस्योपभोगेन अनारब्धफलस्याशुभस्य प्रायश्चित्तैरिति।। Ibid 1.81
29. अनिवृत्तं हि चिकीर्षितं कर्म शक्यते त्यक्तुं प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्ती प्रति कर्तुः स्वातन्त्र्यात्। Ibid 1.81

30. आनन्त्याच्च। Ibid 1.81
31. न शक्यते प्रतिज्ञातुं यावज्जीवं काम्यानि प्रतिषिद्धानि च कर्माणि न करिष्यामीति सुनिपुणानामप्यपराधदर्शनात् प्रमाणाभावाच्च।। Ibid 1.81
32. कर्मणश्च रागद्वेषास्पदत्वाद्रागद्वेषयोश्च शोभनाशोभनाध्यासनिबन्धनत्वादध्यासस्य चाविचारितसिद्धद्वैतवस्तुनिमित्तत्वात् द्वैतस्य च शुक्तिकारजतादिवत्सर्वस्यापि स्वतः सिद्धाद्वितीयात्मा नवबोधमात्रोपादनत्वादव्यावृत्तिरतः।
सर्वानर्थहेतुरात्मानवबोध एव।। Ibid. अवतारिका
33. न कर्मणामनारम्भात् नैष्कर्म्यं पुरुषोऽश्नुते।
न च संन्यसनादेव सिद्धिं समधिगच्छति।। BG III. 4
34. नित्यनैमित्तिककर्मानुष्ठानाद्धर्मोत्पत्तिः धर्मोत्पत्तेः पापहानिः ततश्चित्तशुद्धिः ततः संसारयाथात्म्यावबोधः ततो वैराग्यं ततो मुमुक्षुत्वं ततस्तदुपायपर्येषणं ततः सर्वकर्मतत्साधनसंन्यासः ततो योगाभ्यासः ततश्चित्तस्य प्रत्यक्प्रवणता
ततस्तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यार्थपरिज्ञानं ततोऽविद्योच्छेदः ततश्च स्वात्मन्येवावस्थानम्।।
पारम्पर्येण कर्मैवं स्यादविद्यानिवृत्तये।
ज्ञानवन्नाविरोधित्वात्कर्माविद्यां निरस्यति।। NS 1.52
35. उत्पाद्यमाप्यं संस्कार्यं विकार्यं च क्रियाफलम्।
नैवं मुक्तिर्यतस्तस्मात्कर्म तस्या न साधनम्।। Ibid 1.53
36. न चेदं ब्रह्मात्मैकत्वविज्ञानं सम्पद्रूपम्। Brahmasūtra Śānkarabhāṣyam I. i. 4
37. नापि विशिष्टक्रियायोगनिमित्तम् । Ibid.
38. नापि संस्कार्यो मोक्षः येन व्यापारमपेक्षेत। Ibid.
39. अविकार्योऽयमुच्यते। Ibid.
40. नाविरक्तस्य सम्सारन्निविवृत्सा ततो भवेत्। न चानिवृत्ततृष्णस्य पुरुषस्य मुमुक्षुता।।
न चामुमुक्षोरस्तीह गुरुपादोपसर्पणम्।। न विना गुरुसंबन्धं वाक्यस्य श्रवणं भवेत्।।
तथा पदपदार्थौ च न सतो वाक्यमृते क्वचित्। अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ च तावृते किमाश्रयौ।।
अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां विना वाक्यार्थबोधनम्। न स्यात्तेन विना ध्वंसो नाज्ञानस्योपपद्यते।।
NS 2.6-9
41. मन्यसे तावदस्मीति यावदस्मान्न नीयसे। Ibid 2.13
42. शिर आक्रम्य पादेन भर्त्सयत्यपरान् शुनः। Ibid 2.14
43. नोष्णिमानं दहत्यग्निः स्वरूपत्वाद्यथा ज्वलन्। तथैवात्मात्मनो विद्यादहं नैवाविशेषतः।।
Ibid 2.23

44. विशेषं किञ्चिदाश्रित्य यत्स्वरूपं प्रतीयते। प्रत्ययभिज्ञाप्रमाणेन परिणामी स देहवत्।।
सामान्याच्च विशेषाच्च स्वमहिम्नैव यो भवेत्
व्युत्थायाप्यविकारी स्यात्कुम्भाकाशादिवत्तु नः।। Ibid 3.17

45. लक्षणं सर्पवद्रज्जवाः प्रतीचः स्यादहं तथा।। तद्वाधेनैव वाक्यार्थं वेत्ति सोऽपि तदाश्रयात्।। Ibid 3.27

46. शयानाः प्रायशो लोके बोध्यमानाः स्वनामभिः। सहसैव प्रबुद्ध्यन्ते यथैवं प्रत्यगात्मनि।। Ibid 3.105

47. त्वमित्येतद् विहायान्यत्र वर्त्मोत्मावबोधने। समस्तीह त्वमर्थोऽपि गुणलेशेन वर्तते।। Ibid 3.98

48. सर्वजात्यादिमत्त्वेऽस्य नितरां हेत्वसंभवः। विशेषं ह्यनुपादाय कर्म नैव प्रवर्तते।।
Ibid 1.74

49. न चाध्यात्ममाभिमानोऽपि विदुषोऽस्त्यासुरत्वतः। विदुषोऽप्यासुरश्चेत्स्यान्निष्फलं ब्रह्मदर्शनम्।। Ibid .1.75

50. न हि भिन्नोऽयमित्यभेदबुद्धिमनिराकृत्य भेदबुद्धिः पदार्थमालिङ्गते। एवं ह्यनभ्युपगमे भिन्नाभिन्नपदार्थयोरलौकिकत्वं प्रसज्येत।
अथ निष्प्रमाणकमप्याश्रीयते तदप्युभयपक्षाभ्युपगमादभेदपक्षे दुःखि ब्रह्म स्यात्।। Ibid 1.78

* * *