

BRAHMA SÍTRAS AND CHRISTIANITY

DR. J.D. BASKARA DOSS

Introduction

Vedānta is considered as the culmination of Indian thought. This was developed by the native Indians by assimilating the Indian culture and background and Vedānta is described as a movement of spirituality which opposed the Vedic ideologies. The origin of Vedāntic thoughts cannot be traced before the era of Christ. Scholars have evidenced a great amount of interest to learn more about the dogmatics that are common to both Vedānta and Christianity. It has been pointed out by the historians that Christian thought had been sown in the Indian soil in the very first century A.D. Therefore, a comparative study of the Brahma Sūtras and Christianity would bring out their relationship into lime light.

The text attributed to Bṛhadārya, a designated Brahma Sūtras or Vāṇḍanta Sūtra occupies the foremost position of authority in the system of Vedānta. The Upaniṣads do not contain any consistent system of thought. A bird's eye view of the Upaniṣads at first sight will show that they appear to be full of contradictions. Therefore, at a point of time, arose the necessity to systematise the Upaniṣadic thought.

Almost all the commentators seem to identify the author of Brahma S  tras with Veda Vy  sa. Apart from B  dar  ya, according to Brahma S  tras, we come across the names of K  sak      , B  dari, K  r      ,     marathya and Audulomi, who, according to scholars, had tried to systematize the philosophy of Upani  ads. It is inferred that B  dar  ya's Brahma S  tras is not the only systematic work in the Ved  nta school, though probably the last and best.

Different names of Brahma S  tras

Brahma S  tras of B  dar  ya are a compilation of aphorisms (S  tras) dealing with the subject of ancient Dravidian Philosophy which is, nowadays, called as Indian Philosophy. Though Upani  ads are known by the name Ved  nta, most of the learned scholars prefer to call Brahma S  tras as Ved  nta for the commentators on Brahma S  tras agree that it is intended to be the summary of the teachings of the Upani  ads.

Scholars identify this with different names. It is Brahma M         as it investigates into the qualities of Brahman. It is called as 'Uttara M        ' because unlike P  rva M         which is concerned with the

correct interpretation of the Vedic sacrificial rituals, it deals chiefly with the nature of Brahman, the status of the world, the individual soul, bondage, release or *m°ksha* etc., since it attempts to determine the exact nature of these entities it is also called ‘*Nir,ijyaka - sijstra*’. Another important name assigned to this is ‘*Sjriraka M°mijmsa*’- *Sjriraka* means the ‘Embodied One’ which refers to the incarnated God. Since it expounds the ways and means to get released from the miseries of this mundane world and shows the path to ‘*m°ksha*’, it is also known as ‘*M°ksha Sijstra*’.

Prasthijna Trayi and Vedijnta

The Vedijnta School accepts three fundamental books as its source material. They are:

1. UpaniÅads
2. Brahma S£tras and
3. Bhagavad Gita.

In the introduction to Brahma S£tras, it is noted:

“there is no denying the fact that Indo-Aryans in their earlier days in India were given more to rituals and sacrifices. Those were elaborated to such an extend by the Brjhmas, the priestly class that persons of

rationalistic bent of mind revolted and questioned the very efficacy of the sacrificial religion. They engaged themselves in metaphysical problems and arrived at different solutions of the world. The Vedāntic thought was now developed more and more, and we have the Upaniṣads. This spirit of revolt against ritualism was carried on mainly by the Kṣatriyas”.¹

Here the word ‘Kṣatriyas’ should refer to the warrior class of the Dravidians and not the Kṣatriyas of the Varṇashrama.

Many scholars have shown that Vedānta differs from Vedas in many respects. Najime Nakakumara writes:

“And the fact that these, as secret teachings, had to be hidden from the people in general, shows that the teachings of the Upaniṣads differed very much from the general thought of the Vedas, the religious scriptures of the Aryan race of that time”.²

Many writers of Aryan or pro-Aryan race would have us believe that early Aryans were pious. ‘They did not live their lives meditating upon the ultimate Brahman. Neither they were concerned with life after death. They were essentially worried about keeping alive in a hostile environment. Nature appeared to be hostile to

them because they did not understand the laws of nature'.³ In the same manner the above mentioned writers keep on mentioning that UpaniÅads (Vedjnta) are the end portion of the Vedas. In the true sense it is the opposite of it. 'Vedjnta literally meant "the termination of the Vedic study"'.⁴

Vedjs propound the obsolete practice of giving sacrifice (Karma Kj;a) whereas Vedjnta emphasizes acquiring the wisdom of the Brahman (Jm;na kjnda). The 'Karma Kjnda' of the Vedic thought is terminated as meaningless after adopting a new standpoint of theology. Hence putting an end to the Vedas became the true essence of Vedjnta.

Brahma S£tras and Bhagavad G£ta being the fundamental books of Vedjnta, they teach an entirely a new philosophy diametrically opposite to the Vedic thought. Hence the 'Prasth;na Thrayi' cannot be construed as the end portion of the Vedjs.

Brahma S£tra and Christianity

If the Vedas, which pivot around sacrificial worship, are taken as Old Testament, then Vedjnta may be taken as New Testament, for the doctrines of Vedjnta are constructed upon the doctrine of 'fulfilment of sacrifice'.

Paul Deussen has brought out the analogy between the two.

“For the Veda falls (as Ca’kara on Brih.p4 ff. shows), according to the concept of Vedānta, into two parts, which show a far reaching analogy with Old and New Testaments, a part of works (Karma Kṛti), which includes the Mantras and Brahmanas in general and a part of knowledge (Jñāna-Kṛti) which includes the Upaniṣads and what belongs to them”.⁵

He adds:

“The work of Badarayana stands to the Upaniṣads in the same relation as Christian Dogmatics to the New Testament; it investigates the teaching about God, the world, the soul, its conditions of wandering and of deliverance, removes apparent contradictions, binds them systematically together, and is especially concerned to defend them against the attacks of the opponents”.⁶

A new system of thought enveloped Indian thought as a whole — both theology and philosophy, iconography, mythology etc. in the days beginning with the era of Jesus Christ. Since Jesus was crucified, offered himself as a sacrifice, he fulfilled the Old Testament ideology of giving sacrifice to God, thus he nailed the Old Testament practice to the cross and he initiated the doctrine of ‘fulfilment of sacrifice’.

It is observed:

“Vedānta accepts and enfolds the doctrine of fulfillment of sacrifice.

God had incarnated and offered himself as a supreme sacrifice. This

new thought in Vedānta could be seen throughout. The Vedānta Sūtra

also propounds that salvation was made available to the human beings

through His sacrifice and whoever believes in Him shall have eternal

life”.⁷

The Brahma Sūtras asserts that God (Brahman) is cognizable only through the scriptures. He cannot be known by other means than the scriptures and therefore Brahman is the main purport of all Vedānta texts.

Unlike the other texts, Brahma Sūtras delves directly into the investigation of Brahman, (the first aphorism indicates) not only negates the ‘karma kīda’ but institutes a new theme in the construction of Indian

theology and in this process Vyāsa has pre-eminently employed the epithets, in Sanskrit for God, are as same

as the epithets used to denote Jesus Christ in the New Testament. The basic doctrines such as the creative

principle in Sonship, Trinitarian doctrine, the tenets of incarnation, the bondage of sin, the sacrifice being

fulfilled by God himself, salvation by faith, the aspects of eternal fire and eternal life etc. are the main

subjects that are being dealt with in the Brahma Sūtras. Hence this subject of study becomes more

imperative to bring out the analogous features to the lime light.

Architectonics of Brahma Sutra

The systematic treatises of Brahma S tras were written in short aphorisms called s tras and were intended as memory-aids to long discussions on any topic which the student had gone through with his teacher or Guru. Scholars have pointed out that these aphorisms are unintelligible and it is difficult to understand even a single s tra without a commentary. The omission of the subject or predicate in a given s tra is common and sometimes the most important word without which the passage would be unintelligible is omitted, making its meaning hard to access.

B daraya a's work is classified in the following manner:

“The Brahma S tras consist of four Adhy yas (chapters) and each of the four chapters consists of four P das (parts). The first chapter is called the Samanv y dhy ya and it determines that Brahman is the cause of creation, sustenance and destruction of the universe. The second chapter is called the Avirodh dhy ya and it removes any inconsistency that may arise for such determination. It establishes firmly what the first chapter has done. The third chapter is called S dhan dhy ya and it

mentions the means for attaining Brahman. The last chapter is called
Phalīdhyāya and it treats of the results obtained by that means”.⁸

Investigation of Brahman

The opening aphorism of *Brahma Sūtras* runs as follows:

“*Athito Brahma-jijṃṣi*”⁹

(Then therefore the inquiry into the Brahman).

This aphorism opens up with an extraordinary note, in the sense, unlike the other systems of philosophy, the *Uttarara Mīmāṃsā* introduces a subject pertaining to ‘the desire to know Brahman’ and hence the name *Jijṃṣīdhikarāḥ*. *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*, being a Brahmanic recension, gives prominence to the knowledge of ritualistic works which give only small and transitory results that are ephemeral and limited but the Brahman-realization only can produce infinite and eternal results. Therefore, Ramanuja emphasises:

“Then, in the person, who wants to attain *Mokṣa* (i.e. final release), and
 who has determined that works can denote even the objects that have
 been already in existence, the desire to know the Brahman springs up.

Therefore, it is stated in the SĒtra. Then therefore the enquiry into the

Brahman. (Br.S. 1.1.1)”.¹⁰

So far as Ramanuja is concerned, ‘the word Brahman is derived from root ‘bṛh’ which denotes greatness
 more aptly to that object which by nature and qualities possesses this greatness to an infinite degree;
 hence the word ‘Brahman’ primarily denotes that Supreme Person’.¹¹ Sankara also holds the same view.¹²

‘Bṛh’, the Sanskrit root probably have derived from the Tamil word, ‘peruku’ >Parama^o > Brama^o - in
 which, with the help of Sanskrit ‘sabda’, could have given rise to the word Brahman. The meaning of ‘bṛh’
 and ‘peruku’ is the same and the Tamil words ‘Parama^o’, ‘Paramporu^{1/2}’ that denote God are still in vogue.

Taittiriya UpaniĀd gives clear definitions for Brahman. The following will expound who Brahman is.

“Yato vj imjñi bhḒtjñijjyante,

Yena jñtñi jevanti,

Yat prayantyabhisāḒviḒanti,

Tad vijñisava”¹³

(That from which truly all beings are born,

by which when born they live

and into which they all return

that seek to understand).

The same Upaniṣad gives another definition:

“Satyam Jñānaṁ Ānandam Brahma”¹⁴

(Brahman is Truth, Knowledge, Bliss).

The Upaniṣadic definitions given for Brahman are very apt and precise that could fit into the doctrinal tenets of theology. As far as Indian philosophy is concerned there is not much of a difference between philosophy and religion. Therefore, it is to be understood that the Brahman which is spoken of in the Upaniṣads refers only to God Himself.

According to Madhva,

“God is an effulgence of infinite attributes. He is eulogized in the Brahmanas and Upaniṣads under the name Brahman. He is known as Paramatman All substances owe their existence to God or Brahman. Madhva considers God (Brahman) as the only independent reality. He is the cause of all existence.”¹⁵

It was contested by the commentators and the scholars of Vedānta as to which Brahman (Nirguṇa Brahman or Saguṇa Brahman) actually Vyāsa has referred to in his Brahma Sūtras. The Supreme God, the one without a second, as having attributes is attested by various schools. Madhva holds that,

“to think of God as having no qualities is not only self-contradictory but also it goes against the verdict of the ‘Śrutis’. The Śrutis try to describe the nature of and the innumerable and finite qualities of God.”¹⁶

Swamy Vireswarananda writes:

“According to Bīḍarjya, however, both are true; the former from the relative aspect and the latter from the transcendental aspect, even as Brahman is so viewed from these two stand points as Saguṇa and Nirguṇa.”¹⁷

The above view holds good because the Brahma Sūtras affirm that Brahman is in possession of body.

‘Rūpānyasīcca’¹⁸-meaning: ‘and because (its) form is mentioned (the passage under discussion refers to Brahman).’¹⁹ God is explained as having no attributes and having attributes. The above sūtra clearly exemplifies about the corporeality of God, i.e., avatāra. Based on this, Brahma Sūtras is also known by the

name S'riraka S'etras. 'Linguistically the the name 'S'riraka' means that which has body or self within the body'.²⁰ In this, the definition 'that which had body' may be held as appropriate for it refers to God incarnate himself because he is the purport of the above work. Therefore, a comparative study of Brahma S'etras and Christianity would be an eye-opener for the scholars because the fundamental doctrines of Christianity are precisely expounded by B'ḍarjya,a and the attributes given to Jesus Christ are given to Brahman of Vedānta.

Cosmology/Creation

The Brahma S'etras summerises the Upaniṣadic cosmology in S'etra 1.1.2 which presents the starting-point for theological speculation.

'Janmīdyasya yataĀ'²¹

([Brahman is He] from whom (proceed) the creation, etc. of this universe.)

This text gives a definition of that Brahman, the peculiar characteristics by which Brahman is distinguished from other things. The Bible and the Brahma S'etras begin their exegesies from the creative power of God. So there is no contradiction in the scriptures as regards the fact that God is the first cause.

Another text tells:

“Kṛa,tvena cḥkṣadiĀu yathṁvyapadiĀḡokteĀ”²²

(And on account of [the Brahman] as described being declared to be the
cause of the ether etc.)

According to Chandogya UpaniĀad, ‘In the beginning, O dear boy, this was Being alone, one only without a second’.²³ ‘Jagad vḥcitvḥt.’²⁴ (He of whom all this is the work is Brahman) because (the work) denotes the world.). God is regarded as the origin of all beings-‘Yoni’.²⁵, ‘Nirmḥtḥram’²⁶-creator.

The UpaniĀads express the creation of the world through figures. Chandogya UpaniĀad tells:

“It thought, ‘May I become many and be born. It created fire. The fire
willed, “May I become many, may I grow forth”. It created water.”²⁷

In the ensuing texts Chandogya speaks how the other elements were created by God. ‘Water thought ... it projected earth’²⁸; After creating fire and water etc. It thought, “Let me now enter into these three as this living self and evolve names and forms.”²⁹ These are the reflections of the Bible as evidenced from the book of Genesis.

Bible: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth”.³⁰

BS³¹: ‘Janmṛti’,³² kṛā,atvena cṛkṛsadiĀu”³³

Taittiriya UpaniĀad: ‘From the Brahman sprang ṛkṛā.³⁴

Bible: God said, “Let there be light”; and there was light.³⁵

BS: Fire is produced from this (i.e. air).³⁶

Bible: God said, “Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters”³⁷

BS: Water (is produced from fire).³⁸

Bible: And God said, “Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear”. And it was so. God called the dry land earth.”³⁹

B.S. Earth (is produced from water).⁴⁰

The creation of the animal kingdom is indicated in Brahma Sūtras as ‘mṛmsṛti’⁴¹ (flesh etc.) are the effects of earth according to scriptures. The creation of man is denoted by the term ‘vijṛṇamanasi’.⁴² It declares that

soul (man) is a part of the Lord—‘amsa.’⁴³ The biblical accounts of creation and the Vedāntic accounts are, so to say, are the same. In this regard the statement of Ramanuja about creation including Ān is worth the mention here:

“Individual souls are not created but existed even before creation in a very subtle condition almost non-distinguishable from Brahman, and hence the scriptural texts which declare the non-existence of everything before creation”.⁴⁴

The Saiva Siddhānta doctrine of Pati, Pacu, Pīcam are declared as eternal. Thus we may enumerate to show that the biblical doctrines, the Upaniṣadic tenets and Saiva Siddhānta doctrines do fall in the same line of thought. Now we shall go on to evaluate the doctrine of Trinity as expounded in Brahma Sūtras.

Doctrine of Trinity

The dogma of Trinity plays a significant role in Indian religions and Indian philosophy. As has been analysed the unique characteristic of Tirukkuṛāḷ Pjyiram is that the saint poet Tiruvaḷḷuvar invokes the triune God of Christianity. God the Father in Kaṭṭavuḷ vjḷttu, God the Holy Spirit in Vjṇ Cirappu and God the Son in Nēṭṭr Perumai. Many scholars have pointed out that Tirukkuraḷ’s contribution towards the

development of bakti movement and also towards the development of philosophic dialectics is immensely great.

The edifice of the ‘Brahmajijṃsa’ of Brahma Sūtras is carefully constructed on the dogma of Triune God.

While commenting on the second Sūtra of the first pīḍa of the first Chapter, Raimundo Panikkar emphasizes that,

“it will provide an introduction to one aspect of the Christian thematic of the Trinity touch a common problem about which fruitful dialogue can take place”⁴⁵.

The various aspects of the triplicity of God is scattered throughout Uttara Mīmāṃsā.

1. God the Father

As the creator of the universe the supreme God is conceived as Father and according to Jesus addressing God as Father, He is conceived as ‘Father’ in the Christian theology. Bhagavad Gītā indicates God as the ‘Seed of the universe’-‘Pṛaṇaṁ māṇaṁ sarva bhūtaṇāṁ’⁴⁶-a masculine feature and Brahma Sūtras calls God as the ‘womb’-‘yoni’⁴⁷ — a feminine feature because from him only had emerged the universe. This is affirmed by

Raimundo Panikkar: ‘There is also a feminine feature in this conception of Brahman as ‘matrix’ and womb of all that is’.⁴⁸ Bṛhadarjyaṇa enumerates different names for God.

Nirmāṇam⁴⁹ — He is the creator.

Sva⁵⁰ — He is without origin.

Param⁵¹ — He is transcendent.

Pati⁵² — He is the Lord.

Mahat⁵³ — He is Great.

Prakrit⁵⁴ — He is the material cause of the world.

Sarvabhūta⁵⁵ — He is endowed with all powers.

Arūpavat⁵⁶ — He is formless.

Sat⁵⁷ — He is existent — no origin for God.

Sarvagatam⁵⁸ — He is all pervading.

Atta⁵⁹ — He is the eater — the universe dissolves in Him.

2. Incarnated God (God the Son)

The Creator of the universe, omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient God, though endowed with no form ('arEpi') and name incarnated as a human being and therefore it is emphasized that he is endowed with form — 'rEpa-upanyisat,'⁶⁰ and hence the name 'Sririraka Memimsa' for Brahma SEtras. Ramanuja also writes:

'He is born in many ways; the wise know the place of His birth'

(PuruÅa SEkta, 21), where the text says that the supreme self without

giving up His nature takes the shape, make, qualities''⁶¹

Ìsvara

The dogma of 'Son of God' is expressed in the aspect of Ìsvara. Sankara makes use of the term 'Apara Brahman', which does not mean lower Brahman but it is the opposite of 'Para' — (transcending nature) and thus would mean the embodied Brahman. In the words of Raimundo, 'This Ìsvara is essentially sagu,a,

yet somehow claims also to be nirguṇa. The divergence between Brahman and Īsvara is overstressed in order to save the absolute purity of the former'.⁶²

Bharatiyār uses the name 'Īcaṇ' to refer to Jesus. Īcaṇ vantu ciluvaivil m;ṭṭiṇ'.⁶³ The dictionaries mention how the name Iesous (Greek) was pronounced as 'Jesus' in Latin and the name Joshua became Yeshua in Hebrew.

'Late Latin Jesus, from Greek Iesous,

from Hebrew Yeshua from Yəhoshua,

JOSHUA.'⁶⁴

In the same way the name Jesus should, in all its probabilities, had made its entry in Indian thought as 'Īcan' or 'Īsvara'. Again the words of Panikkar may be quoted here:

"in the realm of philosophy: the role of Īsvara in Vedānta — which is postulated in order to explain the connection between God and the world without compromising the absoluteness of the former or the relatively of the latter corresponds functionally to the role of Christ in Christian theology for Īsvara."⁶⁵

As S. Radhakrishnan writes, 'Saguṇa Brahman or Īsvara refers to the God who lives in this world.'⁶⁶

Just as Peter calls Jesus as ‘the living stone’⁶⁷ Brahma S  tras refer him as ‘Pr  a linga.’⁶⁸ Jesus proclaimed him to be the ‘light of the world.’⁶⁹ One of the names of Brahman in Brahma S  tras is ‘jyoti.’⁷⁰

Satya Brahman

The embodied Brahman is called by another name ‘Satya’ in Ved  nta. In the B  had  ra,yaka Upani  ad, we have,

“He who knows this great, adorable, first born (being) as the Satya
Brahman, conquers these worlds”.⁷¹

Again Satya Brahman is mentioned in the same Upani  ad, in 5.5.2, 5.3.1, 5.4.1 etc. Brahma S  tras gives the attribute ‘Satya’⁷² to God incarnate. Chandogya says:

“Satyasya Satyamiti”⁷³

In another text, ‘It is Brahman, the name of the Brahman is Satya’.⁷⁴

The New Testament assigns a name to Jesus as ‘Truth’.

‘I am the Way, the Truth and the Life’⁷⁵

‘For this I was born, and for this I have come into the world, to bear
witness to the truth’⁷⁶

Life in Sanskrit is ‘Prj,a’⁷⁷. In Kaus̥taki Upaniṣad, it is said,

‘Know me only; that is what I consider most beneficial to man ... I am
Prj,a, the intelligent self (Praj̣ātman), meditate on me as life, as
immortality ... And that Prana is indeed intelligent self, blessed,
undecaying, immortal’⁷⁸

Bṛhadjaraṇya describes Brahman as, ‘The Prj,a of Prj,a’⁷⁹

Om – mystic syllable?

‘Om’ is considered as the ‘Pranava mantra’. In Chandogya only a part of the Udg̥etha (hymn), the syllable

‘Om’ is meditated upon as Prj,a. But in Bṛhadaraṇya the whole Udg̥eta is meditated upon as Prj,a.

‘Let one meditate on the syllable ‘Om’ (of) the Udg̥eta’⁸⁰

Accordingly, *Prj,a* and ‘Om’ are treated as the same. The outdated worship of offering sacrifice was transformed into *bhakti* and meditation and the object with which one has to meditate upon is none other than the Brahman who had offered himself as the supreme sacrifice, i.e., Christ Jesus. The so called mystic syllable is, in fact, the word ‘*im*’ in Tamil. *Ēm* and *Om* are used interchangeably and both would mean ‘let it be so’.

Ēm > *Om* > *Ēmen*

Jesus Christ is referred to by the name Amen in the New Testament, ‘the words of the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of God’s creation’⁸¹ and hence the attribution to him of the title ‘the Amen’. Brahma *Sētras* emphasise that this *Udgēta* (*Om*) is new,⁸² the term *Udgēta* denotes *Pra,ava*.⁸³ *Om* is symbolically attributed to Lord *Muruga*⁸⁴ and *Pi½½aiyir* and these two are the mythological expression of the doctrine of son of God. So Brahma *Sētras* expounds a new system of meditation in which *Om* has to be meditated upon as *Prj,a* and this meditation negates the symbol, i.e., ‘a symbol should not be meditated on’.⁸⁴

The other name with which *Om* is referred to is *Njda-Brahman* and ‘it (*Njda*) is believed to be the creator of the universe.’⁸⁵ *Njda-Brahman* is Jesus himself, the ‘Word’,⁸⁶ *Logos*.⁸⁷ According to the New Testament the ‘word’ was with God, and all things were made through him⁸⁸ — created through him. This *Njda-Brahman*

is Sabda Brahman who is Īsvara and this Saguḥa Brahman ‘that they placed Īsvara in the realm of mṛtyu[®], since it is he who is concerned with creation of the world and hence gets involved in the cosmic play’.⁸⁹ The next tenet that has to be analysed is the ‘third person’ in Trinity.

3. Holy Spirit - Antaryāmi

The immanent form of God is the third dimension in Vedānta. The Para Brahman became Aparā Brahman and manifested himself as a human being and he offered himself as a sacrifice. He died but did not perish.

Tenth Mandala of the Ṛg Veda confirms,

“That Yama had released His body”⁹⁰

It is a metaphorical expression of His victory over death. Yama is the god of death and he released His body signifies His resurrection — ‘Mṛitīyam jaya’. Tiruvāḷḷuvar has employed the phrase, Kḷēḷḷam kutittal’.⁹¹

God is spirit and he is omnipresent. He is ‘Sarvabḥuḍa’ and nothing is hidden from His rule. He is described not only as the universal ruler but He is the inner ruler — the ‘Indewelling spirit’.

Brahma Sūtras elucidates this in the following sūtras:

“Antaryami Yahitai V;titu”⁹²

“Antara Upapathe”⁹³

The heart of an individual is described as the dwelling place of Brahman. Brahma Sūtras calls it as the ‘dahara-jk;sa’ – ‘Dahara UttarebhyaĀ’⁹⁴ – (‘the subtle (ether) is Brahman, on account of the subsequent statement’).

Chandogya Upa,iĀad describes this in the following way:

“Now, what is in this city of Brahman, is an abode, a small lotus-flower.

Within that is a small space. What is within that, should be searched

for. Certainly that is what one should desire to know”⁹⁵.

It was believed during the Old Testament days that God was living in the temple; temple was supposed to be the abode of God, Jacob called it Beth-el.⁹⁶ The shrines made by men are no more considered to be the abode of God⁹⁷ and the real abode of God would be the hearts of the individuals. St. Paul writes:

“Do you not know that you are God’s temple and that God’s Spirit

dewells in you”⁹⁸.

The super structure constructed by the hands of men, once regarded as the dwelling place of God, is thoroughly transformed into the hearts in the New Testament. Evidently it is clear that the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit is expressed in the Vedānta texts as 'Antaryāmi'.

Since the heart is very small the indwelling person also is described as small. The 'śākma' form of God is allegorically described as the one whose form is thumb in size.⁹⁹ Chandogya says: 'the indwelling soul in my heart is smaller than the grain of paddy, smaller than a mustard seed'.¹⁰⁰

Brahman in Brahma Sūtras is adorned with another name — 'Ānanda mīya'.

'Ānandamīya anyasat'¹⁰¹ (Brahman consisting of bliss). In Taitthirya Upaniṣad God is defined as,

"Satyam jñānam ānandam Brahma".¹⁰²

Gēta employs two terminologies, 'kṛ̐tra' and 'kṛ̐trajñā' -the Indwelling spirit. To quote the lines of Gēta,

"This body, O son of Kuntī, is called kṛ̐tra;

him who knows it, they who know of them

call kṛ̐trajñā'.¹⁰³

Tiruvāḷḷuvar calls the Inner Ruler as, ‘Malar micai Yeahiḷḷ’;¹⁰⁴ Maḷikkavḷcagar calls him, ‘Manattiḷḷai maḷḷiya maḷḷ’;¹⁰⁵ Tirumḷlar describes the heart as ‘Uḷḷam peruḷḷil’;¹⁰⁶ the same way Tḷḷumḷavar asserts, ‘Neḷcakame kḷil’.¹⁰⁷

The anointing of the Holy Spirit is described in the form of fire. On the day of the Pentecost, when the disciples were gathered in a house in Jerusalem, they were visited with signs from heaven. The Holy Spirit descended upon them, and ‘there appeared to them tongues as of fire’.¹⁰⁸ The charismatic movement equates the anointing of the Holy Spirit with that of the anointing of fire. This is referred to as ‘Vaiṣṇava’ in Brahma Sūtras and the Upaniṣads. According to Brahma Sūtras,

“Vaiṣṇava sadharana sabda viśeṣaḥ”¹⁰⁹

The ordinary meaning of the term Vaiṣṇava is fire. But the above sūtra explains, “Vaiṣṇava (is Brahman), because of the qualifying adjuncts to the common words (‘Vaiṣṇava’ and ‘self’).”¹¹⁰ Satapata Brāhmaṇa states,

“He who knows this Vaiṣṇava abiding within man, this Agni

Vaiṣṇava is a person.”¹¹¹

Therefore, Vaiṣṇava is conceived as a person who abides in the heart.

The above evaluation is suffice to show that the dogma of Trinity of Christianity is echoed in the UpaniĀads, more precisely in the Brahma SĒtras. The Vedānta tenets analysed above, pertaining to the doctrine of Triune God is tabulated as under.

TRINITY IN BRAHMA SĪTRAS¹¹²

Para	Apara	Parapara
Janmṛti	Rupam	Antaryṁi
Janmṛtṛam	Aparam	Takarṁkṛsa
Pati	Jyoti	Vaisṛnara
Yni	Īvara	Ēnanta mṛya
Sat	Om (Akshara)	
ArĒpi	Satya	
Param	Prana	
Akasalingam		

Table 1.

The attributes under each category in the above table are the thematic expressions of the Christian Trinity.

This may further be reduced to show that both are the same. The following table elucidates this.

God the Father	God the Son	God the Holy Spirit
Para Brahman	Apara Brahman	Takara Brahman

Fulfilment of Sacrifice

It had already been noted that Brahma S  tras belongs to the school of fulfillment of sacrifice. Ved  nta signifies that it is not the end portion of the Vedas but it is the one which puts an end to the Vedic sacrifice.

The religion of the Old Testament and the Vedic worship emphasise that the worship has to be accompanied by the sacrificial rituals whereas the New Testament and the Ved  nta accept the significance of sacrifice but they do not propound the offering of animal sacrifice anymore. Therefore, they are regarded as the religion of the fulfillment of sacrifice.

Therefore the Uttara M  m  msa states,

“  ta eva  gnindhan   dyanapek  ”¹³

(For this very reason, there is no necessity of kindling the sacrificial fire).

Bṛhadaranyaka brings out the fact how the br̥hmaṇs wish to know God with the help of performing sacrifices.

“Br̥hmaṇs desire to know him by the study of the Veda, by sacrifice, by gifts”.¹¹⁴

But Vedānta prescribes ‘bakti’ and upāsana as the means of salvation.

The tenth mandala of the Ṛg Veda asserts that ‘Prajapati was given as the sacrifice at the time of creation.

Visvakarma only offered himself as sacrifice’.¹¹⁵

In Bṛhadīra.yaka it is stated:

“Aham Brahma, Aham yajµṇi, aham loka iti”¹¹⁶

(I am Brahman, I am sacrifice and I am the world).

When God says that He himself is the sacrifice, the cessation of sacrifice begins. Gita says, ‘Adhidaivata is the Puruṣa; I am the Adhiyajña, here in the body.’¹¹⁷ “I am the sacrifice”.¹¹⁸ Aitareya Upaniṣad poses a very pertinent question, ‘Why should I learn the Vedas and why should I offer sacrifices when God (Brahman) himself is the sacrifice?’¹¹⁹

In his commentaries, Sankara indicates that 'the names 'Ahar' and 'Aham' are assigned to Satya Brahman', "two secret names of the Satya Brahman are also taught in connection with these abodes; the former is 'Ahar' and the latter 'Aham'".¹²⁰ Monier Monier Williams had explained that 'the name Ahar is connected with sacrifice'.¹²¹ We may infer that Ahar, is the Great sacrifice, that Satya Brahman, the word of God (Son of God) had offered himself as sacrifice. 'And therefore, for this very reason, there is no necessity of kindling the sacrificial fire', says the *Brahma Sūtras*.

There is no need to build altars with the help of bricks; no need to drink soma juice, no need to take up the soma vessels, no need to sing hymns and recite mantras according to the Vedic practice. The physical sacrifices have been transferred to mental sacrifice. Instead of building fire in the fire altars inflame the mind- 'those fire-altars are built of knowledge only' according to *Satapatha Br̥hmaṇa*, X.iv.1-2. These are a few evidences to show that a new doctrine, doctrine of fulfillment of sacrifice, has set in, in Indian soil based on the sacrifice of Jesus.

In the Old Testament, sacrifices of various kinds were part of the worship which was considered as an act of thanks giving and an expiation. The theological doctrine of the New Testament testifies that the act of offering bloody sacrifices has become meaningless as God has given himself as the Supreme Sacrifice for the remission of sins of the whole world and the only thing which is required is to have faith in him. This aspect had given rise to a new doctrine called 'salvation by faith'.

The concept of Soul

Generally speaking the religionists use the Tamil words ‘uyir’ and ‘i^om_i’ interchangeably. We are often struck with confusion when someone asks, what is ‘uyir’? and what is i^om_i? The equivalent word for ‘uyir’ in Sanskrit is ‘pr_i,a’, the one which has ‘pr_i,a’ is ‘pr_i,i’.

Brahma S£tras deal with the concept of ‘pr_i,a’ in the Second Chapter, IV Section. The ‘bhasyak_ir_s’ define ‘pr_in_s’ as organs. In the previous pages we had noted down that Pr_i,a refers to Brahman. But this section on ‘pr_i,a’ is dealt with, in a different perspective. Here we will be concerned not with the whole section. We can easily differentiate the living things from the non living things. Living things give birth to another living being and get multiplied; when it dies it begins to decay. The force that keeps the body alive is ‘uyir’.

Chandogya says that ‘the fundamental vital force which keeps the body alive and preserves it from getting decayed is pr_i,a’.¹²² Because the Sanskrit word ‘pr_i,a’ refers to ‘uyir’ and organs, Brahma S£tras calls the vital force (uyir) with an epithet ‘a,avacaca’¹²³ – minute and ‘sr[®]sta’¹²⁴ – chief Pr_i,a. B£had£ra,yaka says, “We shall not be able to live without you”.¹²⁵ Ramanuja is of the view that, ‘the vital force is produced from Brahman’.¹²⁶

Soul, in Sanskrit, is termed as ‘jīma’ and in Tamil, ‘jīma’. It is etymologically explained that a^oma is derived from ‘akam’, means u¹/₂am. Nirmal Selvamani explains it in the following manner:

“Akam (Aka^o) + Ma – Aka^oma → Ē^oma. Akam is personified as ‘m_j’
(animal) and hence the word jīma. It was man who tamed the forest
animal into a domestic one”¹²⁷.

Brahma Sūtras makes use of the term jīma in its texts in the following way:

“Gau, a_jcennjīma jād_jt”¹²⁸

(There is the word Ētman (mentioned in the context)

The concept of jīman is dealt with in the following texts in Brahma Sūtras: 1.1.6, 1.1.29, 2.2.34, 2.1.28, 2.3.17-18, 2.3.20-22, 2.3.25-27, 2.3.29-30, 3.3.33-43, 2.3.50, 3.2.1, 3.2.4-8, 3.3.15-16, 3.3.53, 4.1.3, 4.4.3, 4.4.6.

A few important characteristics are taken up for discussion here.

“Ētmani caivam, vicit_rsca hī”¹²⁹

(There are diversified powers in the individual soul).

‘The individual soul is eternal and permanent.’¹³⁰

‘The nature of the individual soul is intelligent.’¹³¹

‘The individual soul is atomic.’¹³²

‘It is within the heart.’¹³³

‘As long as the soul exists there is no defect.’¹³⁴

‘The individual soul is a doer.’¹³⁵

‘The soul does the deeds, being so directed by the Lord.’¹³⁶

‘The soul is the ‘amsa’ (part) of the Lord.’¹³⁷

‘Existence of a soul within a body.’¹³⁸ (Body and soul are different)

The above mentioned natures of soul are the Christian aspects of soul. The soul was not created but was within God and was passed on to Adam at the time of his creation. The in-born nature of the soul is pure but got defiled only when the first man disobeyed God's command. The individual soul acts according to the will of God when it submits itself to the voice of God and will act according to the voice of Satan when it listens to him. In Saivism it is stated as 'Cjmtata^o Va,,am;tal'. It acts as an 'agent' of the Supreme God. Moreover a crucial aspect of the soul is mentioned in the *Brahma S tras*. 'The rulership of the soul is covered by its connection with the body'.¹³⁹ The Ved nta texts invariably propound this aspect that nescience or 'aj na' has covered the soul and this ignorance could be removed only with the help of God. This point necessitates the grace of God to fall on the soul so as to be redeemed. Ramanuja writes:

"It is according to the wish of the Supreme Person that the true nature of the soul is hidden. Due to sinful 'karma' of the soul, its essential nature is hidden by the Lord. That is why the scriptures say that the bondage and release of soul come from the Lord."¹⁴⁰

Tolk ppiar classifies 'uyir' into six different categories viz.  ruyir – having one sense alone,  ruyir – having two senses etc. Human beings are classified as having six senses. Every sense is associated with a particular sensory organ. According to Tolk ppiar human beings are the ones who have six senses. He proclaims:

‘Makka½ t̃m® j̃rari uyire’ in 9.33. The sixth sense doesn’t have a separate sensory organ. It is explained that this sixth sense is known as ‘j̃ma’. The other name with which j̃ma is referred to is u½½am. The j̃ma alone has the power to discern the lasting goodness and the perennial evil. This discernment is possible only with the help of God, the Inner Light.

In the Brahma Sūtra texts 1.2.13 & 14, ‘Antara Upapattēh’ etc. occur and the bh̃syak̃ras like Ramanuja elucidate its meaning as ‘(The person) within (the eye) is the Highest Self’ etc. ‘The eye’ referred to here should mean not the external eye with which we see the objects in this world but should mean the ‘inner eye’ through which the Lord enlightens us to see things and to discern good from evil. Sivaj̃nabh°dam when it deals with the topic soul, it says:

‘Ĵakka, p̃cam u,ar̃p̃ patiyai

J̃nak̃ ka,,i°il cintai vaittu

Ur̃ttu°ait t°rtte°ap̃ p̃cam oruvat

Ta,,i«a l̃mpati viti e,,um aµce«utt®”.¹⁴¹

The Holy Spirit works from within us, as an Antaryāmi and he controls the ‘inner eye’ and shows the path of righteousness. By quoting Bṛhad̃j̃rayaka Upaniṣad III.vii.18, Ramanuja writes, ‘He who inhabits the eye, ... and who controls the eye from within, He is your Self, the inner Ruler, the immortal’.¹⁴² God is not only

(But having destroyed by experience of the other two (i.e. good and evil deeds that have begun to yield fruits), then he attains (Brahman)).¹⁴⁶

For the term ‘itar®’, Ramanuja writes good and evil deeds – this explanation doesn’t hold good because the fundamental doctrine of Brahma S  tras is to make an individual to yield good fruits and so it has to be interpreted as the original and individual sins, only then it will coincide with the basic doctrine of Ved  nta.

Kausitaki Upani  ad says:

“He makes these whom He will raise do good deeds”.

Obviously it is clear that the bad deeds are evil and the good deeds are divine. Naturally the good deeds can never bind a person.

This is how the Ved  nta tenets of bondage expounds the doctrine of evil of Christianity.

When the soul is covered by sin, it can neither know about itself nor about God. Saiva Sidd  nta says:

“  ma, cakaca malattu,arjtu”¹⁴⁷

According to the Bible, it is because of the first man who had disobeyed God, sin came into being and it was passed on from one generation to the other.

The Bible says:

“Therefore, just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned.”¹⁴⁸

“Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned according to the likeness of the transgression of Adam

...¹⁴⁹

If bondage is dealt with as a separate entity, we cannot understand how the soul was captured by sin. But when the Vedānta texts are studied as a comparison with the Bible, we are enlightened with the clarity of thought.

Mukti

The commentators of the ‘Prasthanā Thrāyī’ like Ramanuja reiterate that ‘bondage is real and is the result of ignorance which is the nature of Karma without a beginning. This bondage can be destroyed only through

knowledge, i.e., through the knowledge that Brahman is the inner Ruler different from souls and matter.¹⁵⁰

The Vedjintins admit that the results of work are ephemeral and can never give permanent results, and so it cannot help us to attain immortality. On the other hand, the scriptures declare that immortality can be attained only through the knowledge of Brahman. Taittiriya declares: ‘The knower of Brahman attains the Highest’.¹⁵¹ Svetasvatara also declares: ‘Knowing Him alone one transcends death’.¹⁵²

The last three sections in the last chapter of Brahma S  tras deal, at length, with the nature of liberation. The composition of the mortal body gets disintegrated and gets merged with different elements of nature.¹⁵³ But the departed soul puts on a new, future body.¹⁵⁴ The fifteenth chapter of Corinthians deals with this topic elaborately. The 44th verse tells about the spiritual body.

‘It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and a spiritual body’.¹⁵⁵

This doctrine is explained with the help of a seed – when the grain of wheat is sown in the land, the grain dies but out of the seed sprouts a new plant and it grows. Unless the grain dies the new plant cannot emerge. In the same way, when this body is sown, there emerges a new spiritual body. This is the resurrected body. Therefore, according to Brahma S  tras ‘soul is not destroyed by the destruction of the gross body’.¹⁵⁶

Uttara Mimāṃsā emphasizes that the soul, after resurrection is subject to the eternal life or eternal fire. It is brought out in the terminology of Brahma Sūtras as, ‘amṛtatvam c’nuposya’¹⁵⁷ - amṛtam = eternal life; Sanskrit has borrowed the Tamil noun ‘amṛtam’ which connotes immortality or eternal life; and the other Sanskrit word ‘anuposya’ means ‘without having burnt.’ ‘It would be appropriate to hold that this aphorism text would refer to the attainment of eternal life without having burnt in the eternal fire’.¹⁵⁸

According to Brahma Sūtras, ‘the released soul attains all lordly powers except the power of creation’.¹⁵⁹ Therefore, the powers of the liberated souls are not absolute but limited, and are dependent on the will of Īsvara’.¹⁶⁰ This explanation of Sankara may be taken as the refutation of his own concept of Aham Brahṃsmi. According to Sankara’s concept of Advaita, the individual soul becomes Brahman himself. This is an example how Sankara contradicts himself by way of twisting commentaries. The released self has no part in cosmic activities. In this connection Ramanuja writes:

“If this cosmic control is common to released selves and to Brahman, then Brahman’s extraordinary character of being the cosmic Lord cannot hold good. Wherever the Supreme Brahman is mentioned in the scriptures as the cosmic cause, sustentation and destruction, the released selves are not at all mentioned, and hence, cosmic activity does not belong to the released selves.”¹⁶¹

M^oksa is Brahma^oka. Ramanuja defines it thus: ‘the compound, Brahma-loka must be interpreted as the Brahman itself is the loka (i.e. the world).’⁶² In the book of Revelation, heaven is described in the following way:

“And I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb.”

“And the city has no need of sun or moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb.”⁶³

As long as a devotee is alive in this world, the Lord of the universe longs to live in the heart of the devotee as an Antaryami or Holy Spirit. But when he dies, his soul longs to live with God as its abode. In this state the abode of God becomes the abode of the soul. The happiness with which the soul enjoys in the presence of God, the Brahma-loka is unfathomable, it is free from miseries, sins etc. Ch_hndogya says:

“The Ētman which is free from evil, free from old age, free from death, free from sorrow, free from hunger and thirst ...”⁶⁴

This text is to be compared with the passage of the Book of Revelation.

“... and God himself will be with them. He will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more, for the former things have passed away.”¹⁶⁵

From the above texts it is clear that the Vedānta texts reflect the ideology of the New Testament. But the commentators have incorporated the concept of cycle of birth or rebirth while commenting on the last Pada of Brahma Sūtras. The theory of cycle of birth or rebirth cannot hold good because it is the concept of atheistic religions or agnosticism, whereas Vedānta is theistic proposition.

Cycle of birth negated

The Jains and the Buddhist formulated a theory of cycle of birth. These two systems are atheistic and they knew nothing about the soul. They tried to analyse the previous birth and the future birth. In fact it is an investigation about ‘uyir’ (spirit) and not the soul. It was formulated that the birth of a person is decided by his ‘karma’ (deed), good deeds yield higher births and vice-versa. It was formulated by Buddhism and Jainism with a very good intension of shaping up good conduct and character of an individual. The concept of rebirth and cycle of birth are the contributions of the Dravidians but in course of time, Brahminism took control of the Dravidian religion and philosophy and Brahmins could successfully made use of this concept to uphold Brahmin supremacy and stratification of caste.

Brahma S tras emphasizes the fact that there is no rebirth – the released soul does not return to this mundane world. The last aphorism of the Brahma S tras reiterates this truth thus:

“Aniv rtti  sabd t aniv rtti  sabd t”⁶⁶

(No returning; according to the scriptures. No returning according to the scriptures).

The commentators have very conveniently incorporated ‘Var  rama dharma’ wherever possible in course of their deliberations for the Ved nta S tra texts. One example may suffice to prove the above statement. While commenting on the text 3.1.8 which begins as ‘k t tyayenusayav n’, Ramanuja writes:

“Among these, those who have good residual karma quickly reach a good womb, that of a Br hma a, K  altriya or Vaisya. But those who have bad residual karma reach an evil womb, that of a dog, or a hog, or a Ca  la’ (Chand. V.x.7).”⁶⁷

A note on Pseudo-S dra

Indian philosophy sans P&Ervā M&E;m;ms; is Dravidian Philosophy. Except Jaimini, all the other exponents are Dravidians. The philosophical tenets of these Dravidian sages are earmarked with a clear-cut ideology of attaining spiritual liberation by all without any kind of reservation as such in the name of race, caste, language, creed etc. It is surprising and shocking that we come across a portion in the Brahma S&E;tras under the heading ‘Apas&E;dr;dhikara,a’ (Pseudo-S&E;dra) in the 1 chapter, III P;da, Aporisms 33-38. This topic begins like this:

“sugasya tadan;dara&A;rava;it tad;drava;it s&E;cyate hi.”¹⁶⁸

In the ensuing texts the right of the s&E;dras to the study of the Veda is discussed. Sankara’s commentary for the 36th aphorism runs as follows:

“Purifactory ceremonies are mentioned (in the case of the twice-born) and their absence are declared (in the case of the S&E;dras).

Purifactory ceremonies like Upanayana etc. are declared by the scriptures to be a necessary condition of the study of all kinds of knowledge or Vidya; but these are meant only for the higher castes.

Their absence in the case of the S&E;dras is repeatedly declared in the scriptures. “S&E;dras do not incur sin (by eating prohibited food), nor

have they any purifactory rights” etc. (Manu. 10.12.6). Consequently they are not entitled to the study of the Vedas.”¹⁶⁹

In Sri Bhasya, for the 38th aphorism, Ramanuja writes:

“S£dras are debarred from hearing and studying the Vedas. ‘Therefore the Vedas must not be studied in the presence of the S£dras’. When they are not entitled even to hear the Vedas the question of their studying them and performing rites prescribed by them does not arise at all”¹⁷⁰.

It should be noted in this context that the commentators for Brahma S£tras are the Vedic Brahmins, and they claim themselves to be superior to other castes.

Ramanuja, though he belongs to the Brahmin caste, is highly regarded by great men, that he is above caste stratification and he really worked for the annihilation of casteism and he really put in his heart and soul for the eradication of Var,£Àrama. We are surprised to see him to fall in line with Sankara in this aspect. So Ramanuja’s writings on Var,£Àrama have to be re-examined.

Every man is entitled for Brahma Vidhya.

Brahma S tras very eloquently proclaims that man is entitled to study the scriptures and acquire Brahman knowledge (Brahma Vidhya). Brahma S tras 1.3.25 clearly states this: ‘manusya adik;ratv;t’ (man being entitled). The next text says: ‘(Beings) above them (men) also are entitled’ – for this text (1.3.26) the commentators agree that gods who are above men are also eligible to study the scriptures, according to B;darjya,a. The same Brahma S tras, in other place, declares that ‘partiality and cruelty cannot be attributed to God’.¹⁷¹ If Var;j rama dharma is to be regarded as God-given or was instituted by God, then god becomes partial and cruel because in Var;j rama there is no social equality etc. and every man is not regarded as the creation of God. According to scriptures, man was created by God and naturally every human being is equally a child of God. Therefore, the Pseudo-S dra portion should be considered as the handiwork of a cruel child of devil. At this juncture, we cannot set aside the fact that Sankara could have utilized his scholastic acumen to compose ‘Apas dradikara,am’ and had interpolated it in the Ved;jnta S tras. P. George Victor in his ‘Social Philosophy of Ved;jnta’ also has endorsed the above view that the topic which debars the s dra’s access to Brahma Vidhya is an interpolation.¹⁷²

B;darjya,a in his scripture has declared that man has the access for Brahma Vidhya. If Apas dr;dikara,am is to be held as the work of B;darjya,a himself, then it becomes self-contradictory which is inadmissible in the scriptures. The Brahmin commentators have failed to take note of the fact that every man is a child of God according to Brahma S tras. Therefore, it goes without saying that the Brahmins, however great they are, are not prepared to accept the Darvidians as human beings. In the whole set up of Var;a hardly 10% of the population of India alone belong to Aryan race which is alien in origin. Now, considering the above, we are

given to review one thing – is it logical to accept the supremacy of the 10% minority Aryans to impose restriction on the 90% people who are the sons of the soil?

Christianity doesn't profess caste discrimination. It propagates universal, humane love and equality.

St. Paul writes:

“There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there
neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”¹⁷³

Pauline's writings are clear that the one who believes in God is a child of God and he is free from bondage.

“And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his son into our
hearts, crying, ‘Abba! Father!’”

So through God you are no longer a slave but a son, and if a son then an
heir.”¹⁷⁴

The dogmatics and the ideologies imbibed in the Brahma Śāstras are the thoughts of the Dravidians.

Dravidians only had proclaimed, ‘Yitum Ēr®, yivarum k®½ir’.¹⁷⁵ ‘o®¼® kulam, oruva® t®va®’.¹⁷⁶ It was

Tiruva½½uvar who took the lead in proclaiming ‘Pi¼appokkum ellj uyirkkum’.¹⁷⁷

Conclusion

The above presentation is only a brief outline on Brahma S  tras and Christianity. A careful and thorough analysis in this line will yield much more doctrinal aspects that will show that both are from the same roots. Just as the Bible which begins with the creation of the world, Brahma S  tras also narrates and it emphasizes that Brahman is Jesus Christ because it enumerates the vital and fundamental attributes of Jesus as was recorded in the gospels. The fall of man or bondage, the means with which he may be released and how he may attain eternal bliss are the basic doctrines of B  dar  ya's Ved  nta S  tras.

The main purport of Brahma S  tras is the Triune God who came down as an avat  rin with a mission to redeem the human beings through his 'yaj  ' (self-sacrifice). His sacrifice had once for all stopped the age old practice of offering bloody sacrifices and the sacrifice of action (karma) is transformed as sacrifice of meditation. Bhasyak  ras like Ramanuja have classified a separate topic on 'Alternative to physical fires previously mentioned' in 3.3.40-50. These texts emphasize that the fruits of the sacrifice of action performed through brick-altar is transferred to that of meditation, bhakti etc. This is because of the sacrifice of Brahman, the physical sacrifice was transferred into mental sacrifice, i.e., the fulfillment of sacrifice.

Bhakti, Up  sana, dhy  na, y  ga etc. are the ingredients of faith through which salvation is to be achieved. This is the indegenised form of the Christian doctrine of salvation by faith.

The final goal is to get united with God (not united as God) in Brahmaloka as has been elucidated in the Apocalypse.

The Brahma Sūtras was composed by Vyāsa in classical Sanskrit. The period of the Brahma Sūtras may be between 4th c – 7th c.A.D. The analysis by the contemporary scholars reveal that Sanskrit was not a mother tongue of any ethnic group, nor was it spoken by a group of people and it was developed as a scholastic language and as a code language to propagate the doctrines of Vedānta. The proof of evidence for its antiquity does not go beyond 2c. A.D. Vedīs have not contributed to Vedānta. Jainism and Buddhism are atheistic and the fact remains that Christianity is the only probable religion which had contributed to the development of Vedānta.

It would be proper to conclude that Brahma Sūtras is a compendium of Christology and the quintessence of New Testament dogmatics. Vedānta sans interpolations, corruptions, twisted commentaries is Christianity.

References

1. Introduction, Brahma Sūtras, Commentary of Sankara, (Tr.) Vireswarananda, Swamy, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta-14, 1993, pp.i-ii.

2. Najime Nakakumara, Tr. Into English by Trevor Legget, Sengakul Mayeda and Others, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi-7, 1983, p.102.
3. Fredrick L. Kumar, The Philosophies of India, Studies in Asian Thought and Religion Vol.14, The Edwin Mellen Press, Lampeter, UK. 1991, pp.4-5.
4. Najime Nakakumara, Op.cit. p. 96.
5. Paul Deussen, The System of Vedanta, Tr. by Charles Johnson, the Open Court Pub. Company, Chicago, 1912, pp.20-21.
6. Ibid., p. 21.
7. Baskara Doss. J.D. Viviliya Oṣṣyil Brahma SṢtram, NILT, Chennai-600 080, 2004, pp.8-9.
8. Narasimha Ayyangar, M.B., Introduction to Vedānta - Sṣra, Ed. Krishnamacharya, V., The Adayar Library and Research Centre, Madras — 20, 1979, pp.xiii-xiv.
9. Brahma SṢtras, 1.1.1.
10. Ramanuja, Vedāntasṣra, op. cit., pp.3-4.
11. Ramanuja, Sṣṣ Bhṣṣāya, (Brahma SṢtras), Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1995, p.1.
12. Encyclopaedia of Vedanta, Ed. Ram Murti Sharma, Eastern Books Linkers, Delhi, 1993, p. 200.
13. Taithriya Upanishad, III.1.
14. Ibid., II.1.
15. Fredrick L. Kumar, Op.cit., p. 508.
16. Ibid., p. 509.
17. Vireswarananda, Swamy, Introduction to Brahma SṢtras, Sri Bhasya, Op.cit. p.-lxiii.
18. Brahma SṢtras, 1.2.24.
19. Brahma SṢtras, Sri Bhasya, Op.cit., p. 141.

20. Fredrick L. Kumar, *Op.cit.*, p. 426.

21. *Brahma S  tras*, 1.1.2.

22. *Ibid.*, 1.4.14.

23. *Chandogya Upanishad*, VI.ii.1.

24. *Brahma S  tras* 1.4.16.

25. *Ibid.*, 1.4.27.

26. *Ibid.*, 3.2.2.

27. *Chandogya Upanishad*, VI.ii, 1,3.

28. *Ibid.*, VI.ii.4.

29. *Ibid.*, VI.iii.2.

30. *Genesis*, 1:1.

31. *Brahma S  tras*.

32. *Brahma S  tras*, 1.1.2.

33. *Ibid.*, 1.4.16.

34. *Taittiriya Upani  ad*, II.1.

35. *Genesis*, 1:3.

36. *Brahma S  tras*, 2.3.10.

37. *Genesis*, 1:7.

38. *Brahma S  tras*, 2.3.11.

39. *Genesis*, 1:9-10.

40. *Brahma S  tras*, 2.3.12.

41. *Ibid.*, 2.4.20.

42. *Ibid.*, 2.3.15.

43. *Ibid.*, 2.3.43.

44. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, Op. cit., pp. 238-39.

45. Raimundo Panikkar, *The Unknown Christ of Hinduism*, Asian Trading Corporation, Bangalore — 560 025, 1982, p.110.

46. Bhagavad Geta, 7:10.

47. Brahma Sūtras, 1.4.27.

48. Raimundo Panikkar, Op.cit., p.139.

49. Brahma Sūtras, 3.2.2.

50. *Ibid.*, 1.3.1.

51. *Ibid.*, 1.2.21.

52. *Ibid.*, 1.3.43.

53. *Ibid.*, 1.4.7.

54. *Ibid.*, 1.4.23.

55. *Ibid.*, 2.1.30.

56. *Ibid.*, 3.2.14.

57. *Ibid.*, 2.3.9.

58. *Ibid.*, 3.2.3.

59. *Ibid.*, 1.2.9.

60. *Ibid.*, 1.2.23.

61. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, Op. cit., p.149.

62. Raimundo Panikkar, Op. cit., p.159.

63. Subramaniya Bharati, Bharathiyar Kavithaikal, 76:1, Y[®]su Kṛ[®]Attu, Pa[®]aniappa Bros., Chennai-14, 1968.
64. Universal Dictionary, Reader's Digest Ass., Inc., London, 1988, p.826.
65. Raimundo Panikkar, Op. cit., p. 164.
66. Radhakrishnan, S., Vedjnta — Advaitak Ko¹/₂kai, Kṛ[®]ai M[®]lai, Nj¹/₂tuka¹/₂in Meipporul Iyal Varataru, Part I, Annamalai University, 1970, p.485.
67. Peter, 2:4.
68. Brahma Sūtras, 1.1.30.
69. John, 12:46.
70. Brahma Sūtras, 1.1.24, 1.3.40.
71. Bṛhadj¹/₂ra,yakopaniṢad, 5.4.1.
72. Brahma Sūtras, 3.3.38.
73. Chandogya UpaniṢad, 2.1.20.
74. Ibid., 8.3.4.
75. John, 14:6.
76. Ibid., 18:37.
77. Brahma Sūtras, 1.1.23.
78. Kausṭaki UpaniṢad, III.1-8).
79. Brhadaranyakopanisad, 4.4.18.
80. Chandogya 1.1.1, Bṛhadara,yaka, 1.3.2.
81. Revelation, 3:14.
82. Brahma Sūtras, 3.4.21.
83. Ibid., 3.3.9.

84. *Ibid.*, 4.1.4.
85. *Encyclopaedia of Vednta*.
86. *Revelation*, 19:13.
87. *John*, 1:1.
88. *Ibid.*, 1:2-3.
89. Raimundo Panikkar, *Op.cit.*, p.151.
90. *Rig Veda*, X. 13.4.5.
91. *Tirukkural*, 269.
92. *Brahma S  tras*, 1.2.18.
93. *Ibid.*, 1.2.13.
94. *Ibid.*, 1.3.14.
95. *Chandogya*, VIII.1.1.
96. *Genesis*, 28:19.
97. *Acts*, 17:24.
98. *1 Corinthians*, 3:16.
99. *Brahma S  tras*, 2.3.24-25.
100. *Chandogya*, III.14.3.
101. *Brahma S  tras*, 1.1.12.
102. *Taittiriya*, II.1.
103. *Bhagavad Gita*, XIII.1.
104. *Tirukkura*^{1/2}, 3.
105. *Tiruv  cagam*, *Koil Tiruppatikam*, 5.

106. Tirumantiram, 1823.
107. Parjparak Ka., I, 151.
108. Acts. 2:3.
109. Brahma S  tras, 1.2.24.
110. Brahma S  tras, Sankara Op. cit. p. 76.
111. Satapata Brahmana, 10.6.1.11.
112. Baskara Doss, J.D., Trinity in Indian Thought, NILT, Chennai – 600 080, 2004, p. 51.
113. Brahma S  tras, 3.4.25.
114. B  had  ranyaka, IV.iv.22.
115.   g Veda, X.96.6.
116. B  had  ra.yaka, I.v.17.
117. Bhagavad G  ta, VIII.4.
118. Ibid., XI:16.
119. Aittareya Upani  ad, 3.2.6.
120. Brahma S  tras, Sankara, Op.cit., pp.332-3.
121. Monier Monier Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Oxford Clarendon Press, Great Britain.
122. Chandogya, V.1.7.
123. Brahma S  tras, 2.4.6.
124. Ibid., 2.4.7.
125. B  had  ra.yaka, VI.1.13.
126. Sri Bhasya, Op.cit., p.307.
127. Nirmal Selvamani, Tamil K   ci Neriyaal, International Institute of Tamil Studies, Chennai.

128. *Brahma Sūtras*, 1.1.6.

129. *Ibid.*, 2.1.28.

130. *Ibid.*, 2.3.17.

131. *Ibid.*, 2.3.18.

132. *Ibid.*, 2.3.22.

133. *Ibid.*, 2.3.24.

134. *Ibid.*, 2.3.30.

135. *Ibid.*, 2.3.33.

136. *Ibid.*, 2.3.41.

137. *Ibid.*, 2.3.43.

138. *Ibid.*, 2.3.53.

139. *Ibid.*, 3.2.5.

140. Ramanuja, *Sri Bhasya*, p. 332.

141. Cdf;fz; ghrk; czuhg; gjpia
 Qhdf; fz;zpdpy; rpe;ij itj;J
 cwhj;Jidj; Njh;j;njdg; ghrk; xUtj;
 jz;zpo yhk;gjptpjp vz;Zk; mQ;nrOj;Nj.

Sivajµ;nabhodam, 9.

142. Ramanuja, *Sri Bhasya*, p. 133.

143. *Brahma Sūtras*, 3.2.5.

144. *Brahma Sūtras*, Sankara's Commentary, *Op.cit.*, pp. 418-19.

145. *Brahma Sūtras*, 4.1.19.

146. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, p. 448.
147. Sivajµjna Bh°dam, 4.
148. Romans, 5:12.
149. Romans, 5:14.
150. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, p. 117.
151. Taittiriya UpaniÅad, II.1.
152. Svetasvatara UpaniÅad, III.8.
153. Brahma S£tras, 4.1.5.
154. *Ibid.*, 4.2.9.
155. I Corinthians, 15:44.
156. Brahma S£tras, 4.2.10.
157. *Ibid.*, 4.2.7.
158. Baskara Doss, J.D., *Aru Vakait Tarica°a'ka/£um Tami«ar Samayamum (Viviliya O'£iyil) Őr Ėivu*, (Ph.D. Dissertation), Madras University, 1998, p. 224.
159. Brahma S£tras, 4.4.17.
160. Brahma S£tras, Sankara's Commentary, *Op.cit.*, p. 468.
161. Ramanuja, *Op. cit.*, p. 492.
162. *Ibid.*, p. 474.
163. Revelation, 21:22-23.
164. Chjndogya UpaniÅad, VIII.7.1.
165. Revelation, 21:3-4.
166. Brahma S£tras, 4.4.22.

167. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, pp. 319-20.
168. Brahma S tras, 1.3.33.
169. Brahma S tras, Sankara's Commentary, Op.cit., p. 110.
170. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, p. 175.
171. Brahma S tras, 2.1.34.
172. George Victor, P., Social Philosophy of Vedanta, K.P. Bagchi & Co., Calcutta, 1991, p. 198.
173. Galatians, 3:28.
174. Ibid., 4:6-7.
175. Pu an n u, 192:1.
176. Tirumantiram, 1204.
177. Tirukku a  , 972.