

The Advaita Concept of Learning : A Pedagogic Approach

Raghunath Ghosh

Abstract: The present paper deals with Teaching-Learning Methodology as adopted in the Advaita Vedānta, which is applicable not only in the domain of Advaita Vedānta but other fields of teaching – learning also. First, the phenomena of hearing (*śravaṇa*), reflection (*manana*) and one-pointed concentration (*nididhyāsana*) are admitted as methods not only for self-realization but understanding any scientific knowledge also. No theory can be constructed without proper hearing (*śravaṇa*) the prima-facie thesis, without fixing the real subject matter through reflection (*manana*) and without proper meditation (*nididhyāsana*) on it. Secondly, a free egoless dialogue (*samvāda*) between a preceptor and a disciple opens the door of truth. For this reason the scriptures like Upaniṣads, Bhagavadgītā etc. have started their initial academic journey with an enquiry leading to dialogue and repeated questioning (*paripraśna*). That is why; both *saṁvāda* and *paripraśna* have been taken as tools of learning.

Thirdly, the negative approach is also taken as an important method of learning in Advaita Vedānta as described as '*netineti*' ('not-this, not-this') in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. The attainment of a positive entity through the denial of others (*anyāpoha*) has been undertaken and appreciated by the Buddhists also through the invention of the theory called *apohavāda*.

Fourthly, the verbal usage among the ordinary human beings and society (*lokavyavahāra*) has been admitted as evidence to justify a theory in Advaita Vedānta. Dharmarāja Adhvarīndra has referred to the public usage-'*kalpayāmi*' (assuming) but not '*anuminomi*' (inferring) in case of *arthāpatti* (presumption) and hence such usage can be cited as a proof to admit *arthāpattias* a *pramāna*. Moreover, Sankara has admitted that the unseen has to be determined from the seen (*Bhāṣya* on sūtra-2.2.2). He further argues that when the import of the scripture is not clear, it can well be interpreted in accordance with everyday experience (Ibid on sūtra no.4.1.5).

Fifthly, the problem of *adhikārin*, a competent student as pointed out by the Advaitins is quite significant for acquiring knowledge in any branch of learning. Vedānta or any branch of study is to be taught to one who is of tranquilized mind, who is subjugated his senses, free from faults, obedient to the teachers, having virtues like non-discrimination, renunciation and forbearance. Moreover, the six attributes like calmness (*śama*), self-control (*dama*), self-withdrawal (*uparati*), forbearance (*titikṣā*), concentration (*samādihāna*) etc.

Lastly, illusion (*adhyāsa*) has been taken as a foundation of reality and hence it is very much necessary and inevitable. Though duality is taken to be false by the Advaitins yet it is necessary to know the Supreme Reality. Hence superimposition (*adhyāsa*) is the pillar of getting truth or higher reality, just as failure is the pillar of success. Though all these methods are mentioned in the context of Advaita Vedānta yet they are very much relevant in other branch of study also.

Keywords: *śravaṇa*, *manana*, *nididhyāsana*, *saṁvāda*, *paripraśna* and *apoha*

The ethics of propagating a philosophic view, particularly in Advaita Vedānta lies in the fact that the right cognition or realization of Brahman can associate us with our well-being which has got some pragmatic value in our life. At the same time the import of the transcendental value like emancipation etc has not been ignored. In order to have the Brahman-realization or Self-realization it is necessary for the beginners to know the right cognition of 'pramāṇa', ('means of knowing') 'vāda' ('debate to arrive at truth without any desire to get victory over the opponent'), 'jalpa' (argumentation for achieving victory, but not truth), 'vitandā' (argument only to refute others views without substantiating one's own) etc. leads to the realm of emancipation.¹ In a debate between an opponent and a proponent the determination of truth which is called technically *vāda* is the main objective primarily of the Naiyāyikas which can be extended to the Vedāntins also leaving the question of victory aside. In the *vāda* type of debate there should be the adoption of one of the two opposing sides (*pakṣa-pratipakṣa-parigraha*), which is defended by *pramāṇa* and *tarka* (*pramāṇa-tarka-sāadhanopalambha*) and which is not opposed to the established tenets (*siddhāntabirudhha*). If the desire of victory prevails in debate, and determination of truth is by passed, it is called *jalpa*, which is not taken as an ideal pattern of forwarding argument in a philosophical debate. If someone refutes the opponent's view only without forwarding his own, it is called *vitandā*,² which is not honoured as a better philosophical method. Hence each and every theory based on philosophical doctrine is called *vāda*, e.g., *nirvikalpakavāda*, *apohavāda*, *Īśvaravāda*, *vivartavāda*, *māyāvāda* etc. as found in Advaita Vedānta also.

Truly speaking in philosophy, no standpoint is to be taken as final and hence all positions are *ad hoc*. The Indian term for Philosophy is *darśana* (literally seeing) which actually means 'critical subsequent seeing' (*anvikṣā*). It is the ethics of Philosophy that nothing can be taken in blind faith, but it should be judged through a critical eye. To follow something without proper reflection gives us a training to follow blindly what our tradition says and hence there is no fresh air to receive a new thing or idea. That is why; *ānvikṣikī* or critical thinking has occupied an important role in all branches of Philosophy including Advaita Vedānta. Such phenomenon is also described as *manana* by the Advaitins. It is nothing but a mental exercise, which when in respect of a particular meaning of a word there is doubt as to the conflict with other *pramāṇas* causing knowledge in the form of *tarka*, which ultimately removes doubt.³

In order to bring clarity about some concept the Indian thinkers have forwarded their argument in a very precise educative manner of *uddeśa* (mere introduction of the object), *lakṣaṇa* (definition of the object) and *parīkṣā* (critical examination of the same), which makes a particular system more philosophically alive. If a researcher wants to know something, he may be given a rough idea about the object through *uddeśa* (*nāmnāsamkīrtanamuddeśaḥ*).⁴ At the successive moments one should give a definite description of the object which is called

lakṣaṇa. To describe an uncommon characteristic of the intended object, which can eliminate it from other objects ('*atattva-vyavacchedakodharmaḥ*') is called 'definition' ('*lakṣaṇa*'). It is essential to judge what is said earlier as definition and to see whether it is free from defects or not. Hence *parīkṣā* is to be taken as an ascertainment of reality (*tattva-nirṇaya*). *Parīkṣā* or examination is a method which examines a theory to know whether it is such or not such (*lakṣitasya idam itihambhavati itinyāyataḥ parīkṣaṇa Aṁparīkṣā*)⁵. Such methodology is found to be followed by all the branches of philosophy including Advaita Vedānta. Moreover, the Advaitins, after following this, had given the characteristic features of Brahman like *tatstha-lakṣaṇa* (in the phenomenal level) and *svarūpa-lakṣaṇa* (in the transcendental level) along with arguments behind this acceptability.

While critically reviewing a certain standpoint, one may partly or wholly reject or re-interpret the earlier view of the opponents (*pūrvapakṣa*). It is the custom that the whole system achieves philosophical growth through opponent-proponent-debate. The opponent's standpoint is taken so seriously by the proponents that the explanation of opponents given by the proponents is more understandable to us than that of the opponents, which evidences the intellectual honesty of the philosophers. If the opponent's view is not tenable; it is expressed as *tanmandam* i.e. the thesis achieves less merit. If the position of the opponent is considered absurd, it is described as *tattuccham* i.e., the thesis is ignorable.

In short, the Advaita Vedānta deals with methodology adopted in Indian Philosophy of Education and its significance. First, 'hearing' ('*śravaṇa*'), 'reflecting' ('*manana*') and 'deeply concentrating' ('*nididhyāsana*') on a particular subject are essential for proper education on it. The Indian term for Philosophy is '*darśana*' which means '*seeing*' implying '*subsequent seeing*' ('*anvīkṣā*') of an object already seen and presented earlier. In fact, it is a kind of 'critical observation' ('*parīkṣā*'), which is otherwise called '*manana*' ('critical thinking') on primarily known object. In education three methods are taken into consideration- 'introduction of the subject' ('*uddeśa*'), 'definition of an object' ('*lakṣaṇa*') and 'critical examination' ('*parīkṣā*').⁶

Secondly, the repetitive enquiry (*jijñāsā* or *pariprasna*) is the seed of original thinking. An individual can produce some creative or original way of interpretation, if and only if he possesses repetitive enquiry or curiosity. Vācaspati argues that there are two conditions under which an enquiry is possible. An enquiry is permissible if the object in doubt (*sandigdhatva*) and if it is very much essential to know (*saprayojanatva*). If the object does not have the above-mentioned characteristics, no enquiry is permissible.⁷

Thirdly, in any system of Indian Philosophy no conclusion is taken to be final but *ad-hoc*. An individual can raise further issues on the apparently settled issues. That is why; philosophy is to be taken as flowing water as opposed to stagnant one. It flows in the endless future

depending on opponent-proponent debate. In this way, philosophy grows. In Advaita Vedānta also such *pūrvapakṣa-uttarapakṣa*-debate continues till today. Sankara's arguments are primarily taken by the subsequent readers as the foundation of Advaita Vedānta. Afterwards, Vivaraṇa school and Vācaspati school had raised certain questions which are followed by rejoinders given the later Advaitins like Sadānanda Yogīndra, Dharmarāja Adhvarīndra, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī etc. Such mutual questioning is an unending method. Even after such great scholars some new interpretations of Advaita Vedānta have been given by the thinkers like Swami Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, Rabindranath Tagore etc. For this reason a higher value has been attached to this dialogical method in the form of questioning and replying.

Fourthly, various relations (*sambandha*), *Reductio-ad-absurdum* (*tarka*) and doubt (*saṁśaya*) are taken as tools of concept-analysis, which have got some methodological value for providing proper quality education. Doubt is the basic platform which gives rise to various inquisitiveness in the mind of a serious thinker as endorsed by Udayana (10th century) in his *Nyāyakusumāñjali*- '*Śamkācedanumāstyeva*' etc. In Indian system of education revelation of truth through mutual discussion between a teacher and a student (but not ego or defeat of a particular) is given more importance, which is called '*vada*' type of debate as opposed to '*jalpa*' and '*vitandā*', that are not recommended due to their non-efficaciousness towards the revelation of truth.⁸

Fifthly, a free egoless dialogue (*saṁvāda*) between a preceptor and students opens the door of truth. For this reason the scriptures like Upaniṣads, Bhagavadgītā etc. have started their initial journey with an enquiry leading to dialogue and repeated questioning (*paripraśna*). That is why; both *saṁvāda* and *paripraśna* have been taken as tools of learning. In this connection a question may be raised whether the phenomenon of *atipraśna* can be taken as a logical tool also. Though this phenomenon of *atipraśna* can be included in *paripraśna* yet there are certain differences. The method of *paripraśna* deals with repeated questions regarding a particular issue raised by his teacher about the relevant matter. *Atipraśna* can be interpreted the phenomenon of over questioning which may include irrelevant issues or distantly related questions. If these questions are *totally* relevant then it will come under the domain of *paripraśna*. If otherwise, they are to be taken as *atipraśna*.

Sixthly, the negative approach is also taken as an important method of learning in Advaita Vedānta as described as '*netineti*' ('not-this, not-this') in the Bṛhadarāṇyakopaniṣad. The attainment of a positive entity through the denial of others (*anyāpoha*) has been undertaken and appreciated by the Buddhists also through the invention of the theory called *apohavāda*.⁹

Lastly, the verbal usage among the ordinary human beings and society (*lokavyavahāra*) has been admitted as evidence to justify a theory in Advaita Vedānta. Dharmarāja Adhvarīndra

has referred to the public usage- '*kalpayāmi*' (assuming) but not '*anuminomi*' (inferring) in case of *arthāpatti* (presumption) and hence such usage can be cited as a proof to admit *arthāpatti* as a *pramāṇa*.¹⁰ Moreover, Sankara has admitted that the unseen has to be determined from the seen (*Bhāṣya* on *sūtra*-2.2.2). He further argues that, when the import of the scripture is not clear, it can well be interpreted in accordance with everyday experience (Ibid on *sūtra* no.4.1.5). Moreover, the problem of *adhikārin*, a competent student as pointed out by the Advaitins is quite significant for acquiring knowledge in any branch of learning. Vedānta or any branch of study is to be taught to one who is of tranquilized mind, who is subjugated his senses, free from faults, obedient to the teachers, having virtues like discrimination, renunciation and forbearance. The six attributes like calmness (*śama*), self-control (*dama*), self-withdrawal (*uparati*), forbearance (*titikṣā*), concentration (*samādhāna*) etc. are tools of achieving Self-realization.¹¹

Illusion (*adhyāsa*) has been taken as a foundation of reality and hence it is very much necessary and inevitable. Though duality is taken to be false by the Advaitins yet it is necessary to know the Supreme Reality. Hence superimposition (*adhyāsa*) is the pillar of getting truth or higher reality, just as failure is the pillar of success. Though all these methods are mentioned in the context of Advaita Vedānta yet they are very much relevant in other branch of study also.

It is told that a human being can feel for integrity for the society and social beings. If he attains truth or abode of simplicity which is equivalent to the attainment of Brahman. For this he must go through certain rigorous training process which has got some individual and social value. These processes are to adopt *śama*, *dama*, *uparati*, *titikṣā*, *samādhāna* and *śraddhā*. In order to perform some moral duties one should undergo certain process to prepare himself for such work. First is to become self-restraint in respect of mind (*śama*). It is necessary to restrain mind from the objects which are not necessary for our purification of mind. The second (*dama*) is to restrain our external sense-organs from their objects. *Uparati* is the rejection of the actions not efficacious to our wellbeing. *Titikṣā* is to acquire the power of enduring both hot and cold, because the path towards Brahman is as difficult as razor's edge (*kṣurasyadhārā*). *Samādhāna* is concentration for engaging the restrained mind towards the content of *Āgama-vākya*.¹² It is also essential to have our regards towards the sentences uttered by preceptors or sentenced of the Vedas. If an individual is qualified with the above-mentioned qualities, he will be in a situation of engaging himself in *śravaṇa* (hearing the Vedāntic and *Āgamic* sentences), *manana* (reflecting in what is said in Vedānta and *Āgama*) and *nididhyāsana* (meditating on the Ultimate reality).¹³

Apart from the necessity of the realization of Brahman the means like *śama*, *dama* etc

have a great relevance in our present day society. If a man is self-controlled in respect of external and inner sense organ, having power of enduring heat and cold in the same manner and having regards to the superiors, there will be fewer problems in the society. All social problems arise out of greed, anger, intolerance, disrespect to others etc, and hence if all social beings are trained with these qualities, no moral crisis will be found in the society. For this reason I am inclined to tell that these qualities have got some mundane or moral values also, apart from their transcendental ones.

Such self-restrained moral persons can behave in a different way in a society creating fewer problems. They start thinking mother, father, teachers, and guests as the manifestation of Divine deity and hence they engage themselves in performing faultless actions. Even the gifts they give are presented with regards, dignity, and fear as per their own capacity in a decent manner. In this manner such persons can change the whole world leaving no room for immorality.

The term '*śānti*' is originated from the root '*śam*' meaning restriction of the internal sense organ. In order to understand peace we have to understand what pleasure (*sukha*) and pain (*duḥkha*) are. To the Naiyāyikas (a school of Indian Logicians) something experienced as favourable generates happiness in somebody (*anukūla-vedanīyamsukham*) while something experienced as non-favourable generates pain (*pratikūla-vedanīyamduḥkham*)¹⁴. The favourability (*anukūlatā*) and non-favourability (*pratikūlata*) of an experience is very much subjective, as it depends on a particular situation or environment. There is no fixed rule under what situation an experience would be favourable and non-favourable.¹⁴ In the Kāṭha-Upaniṣad there is a prescription through which we may judge whether our experience is favourable or not and thereby determines its pleasantness or peacefulness.¹⁵

As per the derivative meaning of the terms '*sukha*' and '*duḥkha*' a common term '*kha*' is found in two terms, which are prefixed by two particles- '*su*' (favourable) and '*duḥ*' (non-favourable). The term '*kha*' literally means the 'hearing sense-organ' (*śrotra*) by which all sense-organs may be taken into account as its meaning by secondary implication (*lakṣaṇa*). These sense-organs are always rushing towards the external objects to fulfil one's thirst, which is the cause of painfulness or an unpleasant situation. Hence in order to have peace in our mind we should try to resist the rushing of the external sense-organs towards the objects and to bring them back towards an opposite direction i.e., self. Just as the flow of the river can be brought to the opposite direction through some method, the nature of the sense-organs which rush to the external objects can be changed through turning them towards the opposite direction, i.e., the internal side. An individual who is wise tries to withdraw his sense-organs from the external world and concentrates these to his own self, which is called '*śama*' ('the restrain of the sense-

organs') from which the word '*sānti*' meaning 'peace' is originated as told earlier.¹⁶

Apart from the above-mentioned arguments we can supply some from common sense point of view. Any discovery, scientific or philosophical, presupposes doubt about something. Newton had discovered the law of gravitation as he had some doubt regarding the falling of an apple downwards. His doubt was why it cannot go up. Before this incident many times apple had fallen down, but no question was raised about it due to the absence of doubt. That is why; doubt is taken as the key of discovery or invention. Doubt prompts an individual to question regarding something. If there is questioning, it is to be presupposed that there prevails a kind of doubt. Our Upaniṣads start with a question from an innocent disciple. The Kenopaniṣad has started with a question which runs as follows: '*keneṣitāmpatatipreṣitammanah, kenaprānaḥprathamapraitīyuktah/ keneṣitāmvācamimāmvadanticakṣuṣrotram ka u devo yunakti//*'. That is, by whose desire does our mind direct towards an object? By whom our vital organ has received first prominence? Why and by whose desire our speaking organ functions? And by whom our eye and hearing organs are engaged in revealing the objects.¹⁷ Again, in Kathopaniṣad Naciketā asks the question of knowing self to great teacher Yama, which is very much appreciated as '*barānameṣobarastṛtīyam*' (i.e., among the three boons third was the most desired one as it involves doubt regarding self). Following the same line Maitreyi in Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad asks the question to Yājñavalkya- '*yenāhamnāmṛtamsyāntenāhamkinkuryāma*' (What can do with that which cannot provide me Immortality?). This point will be more systemic, if the Praśnopaniṣad is referred to. Here it would not be irrelevant if take the case of this Upaniṣad. In this one question had been raised by the student to his teacher. What is attained after this is the while separate Upaniṣad which is but the answer of the question what goes as follows- "*Athakavandhī Kātyāyanamupetyaprapachha- Bhagavan kuto ha bāimāḥprajāḥprajāyante?*" (That is, the student asked his teacher, Katyayana, from where the subjects have been originated).¹⁸

Even Narendranath who was known as Swami Vivekananda afterwards went to Ramakrishna with a question- 'Have you seen God?' All these questions are prompted by some doubt regarding a particular object. Keeping this in view Śrīmadbhagavad-gītā has taken *paripraśna* or repeatedly questioning as a method of learning (*pranipātenaparipraśnenasevayā*). In fact there are three methods of learning- repeatedly questioning (*paripraśna*), deep regards towards teachers (*pranipāta*) and service to the teachers (*sevā*). All these activities are backed by certain doubt to know the truth. In ancient time when a student used to feel tension being disturbed by some doubt regarding some incident, he tried to dispel his /her doubt through questioning about this again and again. Sometimes the teacher is given service to get some enlightenment from him, which is also prompted by doubt in mind on certain subject. It is already known to us that a student having profound regards to his preceptor can attain knowledge alone

(*śraddhāvānlabhatejñānam*). One who has regards can attain education from the preceptor and in this way doubt in the form of darkness is dispelled. If we seriously think about it, the proper education is meant for removing doubt from the mind.¹⁹

Those who are engaged in laboratory for scientific discovery try to dispel some sort of doubt. Had there been no doubt, no discovery is possible. That is why, we get discovery of so many scientific discoveries. There are two types of doubt- positive and negative. The positive doubts are called non-pathological doubts which are otherwise called epistemological or metaphysical doubts. These doubts are virtuous in nature as they lead us to phenomenon of philosophical analysis. At the same time there is another type of doubt called pathological doubts which have no importance in our philosophical enterprise. It has been said in the *Bhagavad-gītā*- '*samsayātmā vinaśyati*'.²⁰ Those who are possessing doubt are on the way of destruction. For smooth running of our empirical and spiritual life we must have a sense of reliance towards our Vedic and secular codes that are called *vidhi*-s. If we do not have reliability towards our laws formulated by the state machinery, our society would be turned into an anarchic state, which is not desirable. That is why; we must maintain the laws and orders in the society. If we nourish doubt always regarding the efficacy of such laws, we shall refrain from obeying it, which ultimately leads to the world of irregularity technically called *mātsyanyāya*. Just as big fishes can swallow the smaller ones due to having greater physical power, the powerful persons would have killed the weaker section (*śūlematsyānivāpaksyandurvalānbalavattarāḥ*). If we want to live in a society, we have to maintain civic laws without any doubt on them. We always depend on our near and dear relatives and hence some sort of reliability lies on them. Had there been doubt, our life would not have been smooth and steady. In habitual cases we cannot doubt about the efficacy of an object as told earlier. Depending on our past experience we take food when hungry, drink water when thirsty, when sick, take medicines, when tired take rest. These are habitual behaviors grown after repeated experience. If somebody expresses doubt even in these cases, this leads to contradiction. A question may be asked to a person entertaining doubt- if doubt pertains whether water will quench thirst or not then why does he ask for water? Even after this if he is on doubts about the efficacy of water, food, medicine etc., and this doubt is to be taken a pathological one having no importance in philosophical activities. This type of doubt is taken as *bhayāvaha* or frightening. For, the phenomenon of doubting may be treated as psychological disorder.

The *Sāṃkhyakārikā* begins with enquiry being hurt by the suffering of three types (*duḥkhatrayābhigātādbhavatijijñāsā*). When an individual suffers from sorrow, he will have doubt whether such suffering can be removed or not. This doubt gives rise to innovation of a way for it. In *Tattvakumudī* it has been explained that a sufferer has got doubt about its removal,

because such suffering cannot be dispelled through an ordinary means (*laukikaupāya*). The suffering related to body (*ādhyātmikaduḥkha*) and suffering caused by external factors like animal etc. (*ādhibhautika duḥkha*) can somehow be managed if an individual takes prior precaution. But doubt regarding its removal is more prominent when we see our helplessness in case of suffering arising out of Divine will (*ādhidāivikaduḥkha*). The calamities caused by earth-quake, draught, flood etc. are not under the control of human being and hence it under Divine will. So the prior precaution cannot help us to remove such suffering. Doubt becomes stronger in such cases regarding the impossibility of its removal. To the Sāṃkhya system the absolute cessation of suffering is not possible even through the super-normal means (*alaukikaupāya*). Doubt is clear when Īśvarakṛṣṇa has prescribed a path of its removal. Most of the systems of Indian Philosophy are found to be worried about suffering and its removal. Hence Indian systems are not free from doubt giving rise to philosophical exercise.²¹

Again, a question may be raised that sometimes over reliance on some authority; person or institution makes no room for doubt which sometimes leads to a chaotic life. Just like over confidence overreliance is harmful and hence the doubt on some principles of the authority or person or institution makes them self-critical and self-assessing. Others doubt or critical points help them to rectify themselves. This is true in case of philosophical or any type of writing. Had there been doubt giving rise to critical analysis, the writer would have been cautious in self-assessment leading to their self-rectification. All these cases are the results of positive or constructive or virtuous or non-pathological doubt and hence its methodological value can never be ignored. In this manner one conclusion depend on a method of knowing where there is doubt at the initial level and hence the methodological value of doubt has got tremendous value in teaching-learning method.

Notes and References

1. *Nyāyasūtra*, 1.1.1. and *Nyāyabhāṣya* on the same. Re-edited by Raghunath Ghosh, New Bharatiya Book Corporation, Delhi, 2003, pp.1-4.
2. *Nyāyasūtra*-1.2.1-3 and also *Nyāyabhāṣya* (same edition as above).
3. 'Mananamnāmaśabdāvadharite' rthemānāntaravirodhaśankāyāntannirākaraṇānukālaḥmānasī kriyā.' *Vedānta-Paribhāṣā* by Dharmarāja Adhvarīndra, Viśaya-parichheda, Bengali Trs. by Panchanan Bhattacharya, Kolkata, 1377 (BS).
4. 'Tatra nāmadheya-śabdenapadārtha-mātrasyābhidhānamuddeśaḥ' *Nyāyabhāṣya*, 1.1.2 (same edition).
5. *Nyāya-Darśana*, Vol.1, Edited by Phanibhusan Tarkavagisha, p.82, WBSBB, 1989.
6. *Vedānta-Paribhāṣā* by Dharmarāja Adhvarīndra, Viśaya-parichheda, Bengali Trs by Panchanan

- Bhattacharya, Kolkata, 1377 (BS).
7. *Bhāmatī* on Sankarabhāṣya, Adhyāśabhāṣya, Trs. Srimohan Bhattacharya, Kolkata.1390 (BS)
 8. *Nyāyakusumāñjali*-3/4.Chowkhamba, p.342.
 9. *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* by Mādhavācārya, Cārvāka Philosophy, Bengali Trs. Sayajyoti Chakraborty, Sāhityaśree, Kolkata, 1383 (B.S.)
 10. *Vedānta-Paribhāṣā*, Anupalabdhi Chapter, by Dharmarāja Adhvarīndra, Bengali trans by Panchanan Bhattacharya, Kolkata, 1377 (B.S.)
 11. “*Śama-damoparati-titikṣā-samādhāna-śraddhākhyāh. Śamastāvatsravaṇādi-vyatirikta- viṣayebhyomanasonigrahaḥ. Damahvāhyendriyānā Atadvyatirikta- viṣayebhyonivarttanam. Uparatiḥnivarttitānāmeteṣām tad-vyatirikta- viṣayebhyouparamaṇam. Athavāvihitānām karmaṇām vidhinā parityāgaḥ. Titikṣāśītoṣna- dvanda- sahiṣnutā. Samādhānamnighrītasya manasaḥ śravaṇāda tad aṅuṅa viṣaye ca samādhīsamādhānam. Śraddhā guru-vedānta-vākyeṣu viśvāśah*”. Yogīndra, Sadānanda : *Vedāntasāra*, Brahmācārī Medhācāitanya (Trs. & Ed.. Sri Ramakrishna Vedanta Math, Kolkata, 1993 pp.39-43).
 12. *Ibid*.
 13. *Vedānta-Paribhāṣā* by Dharmarāja Adhvarīndra, Viśaya-parichheda, Bengali Trs. by Panchanan Bhattacharya, Kolkata, 1377 (B.S.)
 14. *Nyāyasūtra- 1.1.21. And “Parāñciparagañcantigacchanīti, khānitadupalakṣitāniśrotrādīni- indriyāni, khāni-ityucyante. Tānīparañcaivaśabdādi- viṣaya- prakāśanayapravartante.”* Sankara- bhācyā on *Kaḥa-upaniṣad*, 2/1.
 15. *Ibid*.
 16. “*Parāñcīkhānīvyatṛṇatsvayāmbhāstasmātparanpasyatīnāntarātman/ kaściddhīraḥpratyagātmanamaikṣādāvrttacakuramṛtatvamīcchan//”* Kaṥhōpaniṣad, 2/1. *Kena- upaniṣad*, 2/1. And Sankara- bhāṣya on *Kena-Upaniṣad*, 2/1.
 17. *Introductory Mantra of Kenopaniṣad*. Upaniṣad-Samagra, edited by Atul Chandra Sen etc. Haraph, Kolkata, 2015. Henceforth, Upaniṣad-samagra.
 18. Bṛhadāraṇyaka- Upaniṣad, *Upaniṣad Samagra*, Kaṥhōpaniṣad, Mantra-1.1.20
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-2.4.113. (*Upaniṣad Samagra*)
Prašnopaniṣad-1.1.20. (*Upaniṣad Samgraha*)
 19. *Śrīmadbhagavadgītā*-4/49
 20. *Ibid*, 3/65.
 21. *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*, Introductory Verse with *Sāṅkhya-tattva-kōumudī*, Trans. and Elucidation by Narayan Chandra Goswami, Kolkata, 1990.