BRAHMA SŪTRAS AND CHRISTIANITY

Author: Dr.J.D.Baskara Doss

PAPER FOR PRESENTATION AT THE

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON

THE HISTORY OF EARLY

CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA

Date : 13th to 16th August, 2005.

Venue : CONCORDIA COLLEGE
BRONXVILLE
NEW YORK

BRAHMA SŪTRAS 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 Bādarāyaṇa designated Brahma Sūtras or Vēdanta 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 systemetise the Upaniṣadic thought.

Almost all the commentators seem to identify the author of Brahma Sūtras with Veda Vyāsa. Apart from Bādarayaṇa, according to Brahma Sūtras, we come across the names of Kāsakṛṣṇa, Bādari, Kārṣṇajini, Āṣmarathya and Audulomi, who, according to scholars, had tried to systematize the philosophy of Upaniṣads. It is inferred that Bādarayaṇa's Brahma Sūtras is not the only systematic work in the Vedānta school, though probably the last and best.

Different names of Brahma Sūtras

Brahma Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa are a compilation of aphorisms (Sūtras) dealing with the subject of ancient Dravidian Philosophy which is, nowadays, called as Indian Philosophy. Though Upaniṣads are known by the name Vedānta, most of the learned scholars prefer to call Brahma Sūtras as Vedānta for the commentators on Brahma Sūtras agree that it is intended to be the summary of the teachings of the Upaniṣads.

Scholars identify this with different names. It is Brahma Mīmāmsa as it investigates into the qualities of Brahman. It is called as 'Uttara Mīmāmsa' because unlike Pūrva Mīmāmsa 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 mōksha etc., since it attempts to determine the exact nature of these entities it is also called 'Nirṇāyaka - sāstra'. Another important name assigned to this is 'Sāriraka Mīmāmsa'- Sāriraka 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 'mōksha', it is also known as 'Mōksha Sāstra'.

Prasthāna Trayi and Vedānta

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

1. Upaniṣads
2. Brahma Sūtras and
3. Bhagavad Gita.

In the introduction to Brahma Sūtras, 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 Brāhmaṇs, 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 Varṇāshrama.

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

> "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 Upaniṣads (Vedānta) are the end portion of the Vedas. In the true sense it is the opposite of it. 'Vedānta literally meant "the termination of the Vedic study".[4]

Vedās propound the obsolete practice of giving sacrifice (Karma Kāṇḍa) whereas Vedānta emphasizes acquiring the wisdom of the Brahman (Jñāna kānda). The "Karma Kānda' 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 Vedānta.

Brahma Sūtras and Bhagavad Gīta being the fundamental books of Vedānta, they teach an entirely a new philosophy diametrically opposite to the Vedic thought. Hence the 'Prasthāna Thrayi' cannot be construed as the end portion of the Vedās.

Brahma Sūtra and Christianity

If the Vedas, which pivot around sacrificial worship, are taken as Old Testament, then Vedānta may be taken as New Testament, for the doctrines of Vedānta are contructed upon the doctrine of 'fulfilment of sacrifice'. Paul Deussen has brought out the analogy between the two.

> "For the Veda falls (as Caṅkara 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 Kāṇḍa), which includes the Mantras and Brahmaṇas in general and a part of knowledge (Jñāna-Kāṇḍa) 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 Vedanta 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 kāṇda' 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 Sūtras were written in short aphorisms called sūtras 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 sūtra without a commentary. The omission of the subject or predicate in a given sūtra is common and sometimes the most important word without which the passage would be unintelligible is omitted, making its meaning hard to access.

Bādarayaṇa's work is classified in the following manner:

> "The Brahma Sūtras consist of four Adhyāyas (chapters) and each of the four chapters consists of four Pādas (parts). The first chapter is called the Samanvāyādhyāya and it determines that Brahman is the cause of creation, sustenance and destruction of the universe. The second chapter is called the Avirodhādhyāya 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 Sādhanādhyāya and it mentions the means for attaining Brahman. The last chapter is called Phalādhyāya and it treats of the results obtained by that means".[8]

Investigation of Brahman

The opening aphrosim of Brahma Sūtras runs as follows:

> "Athāto Brahma-jijñāsā"[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 Mīmāmsa introduces a subject pertaining to 'the desire to know Brahman' and hence the name Jijñāsādhikaraṇa'. Pūrva Mīmāmsa, 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 emphsises:

> "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 Sūtra. 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' >Paramaṉ > Bramaṉ - 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 'Paramaṉ', 'Paramporuḷ that denote God are still in vogue.

Taittirya Upaniṣad gives clear definitions for Brahman. The following will expound who Brahman is.

> "Yato vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante,
>
> Yena jātāni jīvanti,

Yat prayantyabhisaṃviśanti,
Tad vijiñāsava”[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 Jñānaṃ Ānantam 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 refered 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 'Srutis'. The Srutis try to describe the nature of and the innumerous and finite qualities of God."[16]

Swamy Vireswarananda writes:

> "According to Bādarāyaṇa, however, both are true; the former from the relative aspect and the later 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 affirms that Brahman is in possession of body.

'Rūpopanyāsācca'[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 Sāriraka Sūtras. 'Linguistically the the name 'Sāriraka' 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 Sūtras and Christianity would be an eye-opener for the scholars because the fundamental doctrines of Christianity are precisely expounded by Bādarāyaṇa and the attributes given to Jesus Christ are given to Brahman of Vedānta.

Cosmology/Creation

The Brahma Sūtras summerises the Upaniṣadic cosmology in Sūtra 1.1.2 which presents the starting-point for theological speculation.

> ‘Janmādyasya yataḥ’[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 Sūtras 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:

> “Kāraṇtvena cākāsadiṣu yathāvyapadiṣṭokteḥ”[22]
> (And on account of [the Brahman] as described being declared to be the cause of the ether etc.)

According to Chandogya Upaniṣad, ‘In the beginning, O dear boy, this was Being alone, one only without a second’.[23] “Jagad vācitvāt.’[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], ‘Nirmātāram’[26]-creator.

The Upaniṣads express the creation of the world through figures. Chandogya Upaniṣad 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]

BS[31]: 'Janmāti',[32] kāraṇatvena cākāsadiṣu"[33]

Taittiriya Upaniṣad: 'From the Brahman sprang ākāśa.[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 'māmsāti'[41] (flesh etc.) are the effects of earth according to scriptures. The creation of man is denoted by the term 'vijñānamanasi'.[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 ṃan 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 Siddānta doctrine of Pati, Pacu, Pācam are declared as eternal. Thus we may enumerate to show that the biblical doctrines, the Upaniṣadic tenets and Saiva Siddānta

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 Tirukkuṟal Pāyiram is that the saint poet Tiruvaḷḷuvar invokes the triune God of Christianity. God the Father in Kaṭavuḷ vāḻttu, God the Holy Spirit in Vān Cirappu and God the Son in Nīitār 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 'Brahmajijñāsa' of Brahma Sūtras is carefully contructed on the dogma of Triune God. While commenting on the second Sūtra of the first pāda 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 Mīmāmsa.

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 Gīta indicates God as the 'Seed of the universe'-'Pījam mām sarva bhūtānam[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] Bādarāyaṇa enumerates different names for God.

Nirmātāram[49] – He is the creator.

Sva[50] – He is without origin.

Param[51] – He is transcendent.

Pati[52] – He is the Lord.

Mahat[53] – He is Great.

Prakrit[54] – He is the material cause of the world.

Sarvabēta[55] – He is endowed with all powers.

Arūpavat[56] – He is formless.

Sat[57] – He is existent – no origin for God.

Sarvagatam[58] – He is all pervading.

Atta[59] – 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 ('arūpi') and name incarnated as a human being and therefore it is emphasized that he is endowed with form – 'rūpa-upanyāsat,[60] and hence the name 'Sāriraka Mīmāmsa' for Brahma Sūtras. Ramanuja also writes:

> "He is born in many ways; the wise know the place of His birth' (Puruṣa Sūkta, 21), where the text says that the supreme self without giving up His nature takes the shape, make, qualities …."[61]

Īsvara

The dogma of 'Son of God' is expressed in the aspect of Īsvara. 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 Īsvara is essentially saguṇa, 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 'Īcaṉ' to refer to Jesus. Īcaṉ vantu ciluvaiyil māṇṭāṉ'[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 'Isvara'. 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 Sūtras refer him as 'Prāṇa linga.'[68] Jesus proclaimed him to be the 'light of the world.'[69] One of the names of Brahman in Brahma Sūtras is 'jyoti.'[70]

Satya Brahman

The embodied Brahman is called by another name 'Satya' in Vedānta. In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 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 Upaniṣad, in 5.5.2, 5.3.1, 5.4.1 etc. Brahma Sūtras 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 'Prāṇa'[77]. In Kausītaki Upaniṣad, it is said,

> "Know me only; that is what I consider most beneficial to man … I am Prāṇa, the intelligent self (Prajñātman), meditate on me as life, as immortality … And that Prana is indeed intelligent self, blessed, undecayinging, immortal".[78]

Bṛhadāraṇyaka describes Brahman as, 'The Prāṇa of Prāṇa'.[79]

Om – mystic syllable?

'Om' is considered as the 'Pranava mantra'. In Chandogya only a part of the Udgīitha (hymn), the syllable 'Om' is meditated upon as Prāṇa. But in Bṛhadaraṇyaka the whole Udgīta is meditated upon as Prāṇa.

> "Let one meditate on the syllable 'Om' (of) the Udgīta".[80]

Accordingly, Prāṇa 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 'ām' in Tamil. Ām and Om are used interchangeably and both would mean 'let it be so'.

> Ām > Om > Āmen

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 Sūtras emphasise that this Udgīta (Om) is new,[82] the term Udgīta denotes Praṇava.[83] Om is symbolically attributed to Lord Muruga̲n and Piḷḷaiyār and these two are the mythological expression of the doctrine of son of God. So Brahma Sūtras expounds a new system of meditation in which Om has to be meditated

upon as Prāṇa 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 Nāda-Brahman and 'it (Nāda) is believed to be the creator of the universe.'[85] Nāda-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 him'[88] – created through him. This Nāda-Brahman is Sabda Brahman who is Īsvara and this Saguṇa Brahman 'that they placed Īsvara in the realm of māyē, 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 Apara 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 – 'Mritiyam jaya'. Tiruvaḷḷuvar has employed the phrase, Kūṯṟam kutittal'.[91]

God is spirit and he is omnipresent. He is 'Sarvabēda' 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 Vātisu"[92]

> "Antara Upapathe"[93]

The heart of an individual is described as the dwelling place of Brahman. Brahma Sūtras calls it as the 'dahara-ākāsa' – 'Dahara Uttarebhyaḥ'[94] – ('the subtle (ether) is Brahman, on account of the subsequent statement').

Chandogya Upaṇiṣad 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 God[97] 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 contructed by the hands of men, once regarded as the dewelling 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 indewelling person also is described as small. The 'sūkma' form of God is allegorically described as the one whose form is thumb in size.[99] Chandogya says: 'the indewelling 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 māya'.

'Ānandamāya anyasat'[101] (Brahman consisting of bliss). In Taithirya Upaniṣad God is defined as,

> "Satyam jñānam ānandam Brahma".[102]

Gīta employs two terminologies, 'kśētra' and 'kśētrajñā'-the Indewelling spirit. To quote the lines of Gīta,

> "This body, O son of Kunti, is called kśētra;
> him who knows it, they who know of them
> call kśētrajña'.[103]

Tiruvaḷḷuvar calls the Inner Ruler as, 'Malar micai Yeahiṉāṉ';[104] Maṇikkavācagar calls him, 'Manattiṭai maṉṉiya maṉṉē';[105] Tirumūlar describes the heart as 'Uḷḷam peruṅkōil;[106] the same way Tāyumāṉavar asserts, 'Neñcakame kōil'.[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 'Vaisvānara' in Brahma Sūtras and the Upaniṣads. According to Brahma Sūtras,

> "Vaisvānara sadharana sabda vishesad"[109]

The ordinary meaning of the term Vaisvānara is fire. But the above sūtras explains, "Vaisvānara (is Brahman), because of the qualifying adjuncts to the common words ('Vaisvānara' and 'self')."[110] Satapata Brāhmaṇa states,

> "He who knows this Vaisvānara abiding within man, this Agni Vaisvānara is a person."[111]

Therefore, Vaisvānara 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 Upaniṣads, more precisely in the Brahma Sūtras. The Vedānta tenets analysed above, pertaining to the doctrine of Triune God is tabulated as under.

TRINITY IN BRAHMA SŪTRAS[112]

Para	Apara	Parapara
Janmāti	Rupam	Antaryāmi
Janmātāram	Aparam	Takarākāsa
Pati	Jyōti	Vaisvānara
Yōni	Īśvara	Ānanta māya
Sat	Om (Akshara)	
Arūpi	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 Sūtras belongs to the school of fulfillment of sacrifice. Vedānta 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 Vedanta 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 Mīmāmsa states,

> "Ata evacāgnindhanā dyanapekṣā".[113]
> (For this very reason, there is no necessity of kindling the sacrificial fire).

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

> "Brāhmaṇās 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 Bṛhadāraṇyaka it is stated:

> "Aham Brahma, Aham yajñā, aham lōka 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] Aittareya 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 Brāhmaṇa, 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 'āṉmā' interchangeably. We are often struck with confusion when someone asks, what is 'uyir'? and what is āṉmā? The equivalent word for 'uyir' in Sanskrit is 'prāṇa', the one which has 'prāṇa' is 'prāṇi'.

Brahma Sūtras deal with the concept of 'prāṇa' in the Second Chapter, IV Section. The 'bhasyakārās' define 'prānās' as organs. In the previous pages we had noted down that Prāṇa refers to Brahman. But this section on 'prāṇa' 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 prāṇa'.[122] Because the Sanskrit word 'prāṇa' refers to 'uyir' and organs, Brahma Sūtras calls the vital force (uyir) with an epithet 'aṇavacaca'[123] – minute and 'srēsta'[124] – chief Prāṇa. Bṛhadāraṇyaka 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 'ātma' and in Tamil, 'āṉma'. It is etymologically explained that aṉma is derived from 'akam', means uḷḷam. Nirmal Selvamani explains it in the following manner:

> "Akam (Akaṉ) + Ma – Akaṉma ⟶ Āṉma. Akam is personified as 'mā' (animal) and hence the word āṉma. It was man who tamed the forest animal into a domestic one".[127]

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

> "Gauṇaścennātma śabdāt"[128]

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

The concept of ātman 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.

"Ātmani caivam, vicitrāsca hi"[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 'Cārntataṉ Vaṇṇamātal'. It acts as an 'agent' of the Supreme God. Moreover a crucial aspect of the soul is mentioned in the Brahma Sūtras. 'The rulership of the soul is covered by its connection with the body'.[139] The Vedānta texts invariably propound this aspect that nescience or 'ajñāna' 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]

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

'Makkaḷ tāmē ārari uyire' in 9.33. The sixth sense doesn't have a separate sensory organ. It is explained that this sixth sense is known as 'āṉma'. The other name with which āṉma is referred to is uḷḷam. The āṉma 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 Upapatteh' etc. occur and the bhāsyakāras 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 descern good from evil. Sivajñānabhōdam when it deals with the topic soul, it says:

> "Ūṉakkaṇ pācam uṇarāp patiyai
> Jñānak kaṇṇiṉil cintai vaittu
> Urāttuṉait tērtteṉap pācam oruvat
> Taṇṇiḷa lāmpati viti eṇṇum añceḻuttē".[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 Bṛhadāraṇyaka 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 the inner Ruler, He is the inner Light also. This Light alone can remove the darkness of ignorance which envelops the soul.

Bondage (of soul)

Almost all the systems of Indian Philosophy including Jainism and Buddhism admit that the soul is naturally in bondage. But none of the above elucidate the fact that how and when the soul was fettered with bondage. Brahma Sūtras indicates the bondage of the soul with the help of the terms 'tirōhitam' and 'bandam'.[143] This bondage clings on to the soul right from one's birth. Saiva Siddhānta calls it as 'Sahaja malam'. Saha+ja+malam = sahaja malam = Original sin. 'Piṟavip piṇi', of Tirukkuṟaḷ, 'Sahaja malam' of Saivism, 'Paḻa viṉai' of Vaiṣṇavism, 'Janma bhandam' of Bhagavad Gita, 'Pūrva bhandam' of Brahma Sūtra are the same. The other aspect of bhandam is 'karma bhandam' (Gita), Piravāḻi (Tirukkuṟal), kanma bhandam (Saiva Siddhānta), Uttara bhandam (Brahma Sūtras) etc.

The Brahma Sūtras declares that the two sins shall be destroyed when God is realized. Sankara comments on the Sutra as, 'when that (Brahman) is realized (there result) the non-clinging and destruction of the subsequent and previous sins respectively, because it is (so) declared (by the scriptures)'.[144] The other text of the Brahma Sūtras declares that one can attain the Brahman only after the destruction of the two sins. It says,

> "Mōgēna tu itarē śabaitva sampatyatē"[145]
>
> (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 'itarē', Ramanuja writes good and evil deeds – this explanation doesn't hold good because the fundamental doctrine of Brahma Sūtras 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 Vedānta.

Kausitaki Upaniṣad 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 Vedānta 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 Siddānta says:

> "Āṉma, cakaca malattuṇarātu"[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 'Prasthana Thrayi' 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 Vedāntins 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 Sūtras 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 Sūtras 'soul is not destroyed by the destruction of the gross body'.[156]

Uttara Mimāmsā 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 cānuposya'[157] - amṛtam = eternal life; Sanskrit has borrowed the Tamil noun 'amiḻtam' 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 Brahmāsmi. 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]

Mōksa is Brahmalōka. Ramanuja defines it thus: 'the compound, Brahma-loka must be interpreted as the Brahman itself is the loka (i.e. the world).'[162] 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."[163]

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. Chāndogya says:

> "The Ātman which is free from evil, free from old age, free from death, free from sorrow, free from hunger and thirst ..."[164]

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

> "Anāvṛttiḥ sabdāt anāvṛiltiḥ sabdāt"[166]
> (No returning; according to the scriptures. No returning according to the scriptures).

The commentators have very conveniently incorporated 'Varṇāśrama dharma' wherever possible in course of their deliberations for the Vedānta Sūtra texts. One example may suffice to prove the above statement. While commenting on the text 3.1.8 which begins as 'kṛtātyayenusayavān', Ramanuja writes:

> "Among these, those who have good residual karma quickly reach a good womb, that of a Brāhmaṇa, Kṣaltriya or Vaisya.

> But those who have bad residual karma reach an evil womb, that of a dog, or a hog, or a Caṇḍāla' (Chand. V.x.7)."[167]

A note on Pseudo-Sūdra

Indian philosophy sans Pūrva Mīmāmsā 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 Sūtras under the heading 'Apasūdrādhikaraṇa' (Pseudo-Sūdra) in the I chapter, III Pāda, Aporisms 33-38. This topic begins like this:

> "sugasya tadanādaraśravaṇāt tadādravaṇāt sūcyate hi."[168]

In the ensuing texts the right of the sūdras 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 Sūdras).
>
> 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 Sūdras is repeatedly declared in the scriptures. "Sūdras 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:

> "Sūdras are debarred from hearing and studying the Vedas. 'Therefore the Vedas must not be studied in the presence of the Sūdras'. 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 Sūtras 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 Varṇāṣrama. We are surprised to see him to fall in line with Sankara in this aspect. So Ramanuja's writings on Varṇāṣrama have to be re-examined.

Every man is entitled for Brahma Vidhya.

Brahma Sūtras very eloquently proclaims that man is entitled to study the scriptures and acquire Brahman knowledge (Brahma Vidhya). Brahma Sūtras 1.3.25 clearly states this: 'manusya adikāratvāt' (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 Bādarāyaṇa. The same Brahma Sūtras, in other place, declares that 'partiality and cruelty cannot be attributed to God'.[171] If Varṇāṣrama dharma is to be regarded as God-given or was instituted by God, then god becomes partial and cruel because in Varṇāṣrama these 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-Sūdra 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 'Apasūdradikaraṇam' and had interpolated it in the Vedānta Sūtras. P. George Victor in his

'Social Philosophy of Vedānta' also has endorsed the above view that the topic which debars the sūdra's access to Brahma Vidhya is an interpolation.[172]

Bādarāyaṇa in his scripture has declared that man has the access for Brahma Vidhya. If Apasūdrādikaraṇam is to be held as the work of Bādarāyaṇa 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 Sūtras. 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 Varṇa 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 Sūtras are the thoughts of the Dravidians. Dravidians only had proclaimed, 'Yātum ūrē, yāvarum kēḷir'.[175] 'oṉṟē kulam, oruvaṉē tēvaṉ'.[176] It was Tiruvaḷḷuvar who took the lead in proclaiming 'Piṟappokkum ellā uyirkkum'.[177]

Conclusion

The above presentation is only a brief outline on Brahma Sūtras 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 Sūtras 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 Bādarāyaṇa's Vedānta Sūtras.

The main purport of Brahma Sūtras is the Triune God who came down as an avatārin with a mission to redeem the human beings through his 'yajñā' (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. Bhasyakāras 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-alter 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, Upāsana, dhyāna, yōga 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 Brahmalōka 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 4^{th} c – 7^{th} 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. Vedās 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 Christainity.

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 Mallen 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 Oḷyil Brahma Sūtram, NILT, Chennai-600 080, 2004, pp.8-9.
8. Narasimha Ayyangar, M.B., Introduction to Vedānta - Sāra, Ed. Krishnamacharya, V., The Adayar Library and Research Centre, Madras – 20, 1979, pp.xiii-xiv.
9. Brahma Sūtras, 1.1.1.
10. Ramanuja, Vedāntasāra, op. cit., pp.3-4.
11. Ramanuja, Srī Bhāṣya, (Brahma Sūtras), 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 Sūtras, Sri Bhasya, Op.cit. p.-lxiii.

18. Brahma Sūtras, 1.2.24.

19. Brahma Sūtras, Sri Bhasya, Op.cit., p. 141.

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

21. Brahma Sūtras, 1.1.2.

22. Ibid., 1.4.14.

23. Chandogya Upanishad, VI.ii.1.

24. Brahma Sūtras 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 Sūtras.

32. Brahma Sūtras, 1.1.2.

33. Ibid., 1.4.16.

34. Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II.1.

35. Genesis, 1:3.

36. Brahma Sūtras, 2.3.10.

37. Genesis, 1:7.

38. Brahma Sūtras, 2.3.11.

39. Genesis, 1:9-10.

40. Brahma Sūtras, 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 Gīta, 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, Yēsu Kṛṣṭtu, Paḷaniappa Bros., Chennai-14, 1968.

64. Universal Dictionary, Reader's Digest Assṇ. Inc., London, 1988, p.826.

65. Raimundo Panikkar, Op. cit., p. 164.

66. Radhakrishnan, S., Vedānta – Advaitak Koḷkai, Kīḷai Mēlai, Nātukaḷin 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. Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, 5.4.1.

72. Brahma Sūtras, 3.3.38.

73. Chandogya Upaniṣd, 2.1.20.

74. Ibid., 8.3.4.

75. John, 14:6.

76. Ibid., 18:37.

77. Brahma Sūtras, 1.1.23.

78. Kausītaki Upaniṣad, III.1-8).

79. Brhadaranyakopanisad, 4.4.18.

80. Chandogya 1.1.1, Bṛhadaraṇyaka, 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 Sūtras, 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. I Corinthians, 3:16.

99. Brahma Sūtras, 2.3.24-25.

100. Chandogya, III.14.3.

101. Brahma Sūtras, 1.1.12.

102. Tailtiriya, II.1.

103. Bhagavad Gita, XIII.1.

104. Tirukkuraḷ, 3.

105. Tiruvācagam, Koil Tiruppatikam, 5.

106. Tirumantiram, 1823.

107. Parāparak Kaṇṇ̣l, 151.

108. Acts. 2:3.

109. Brahma Sūtras, 1.2.24.

110. Brahma Sūtras, 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 Sūtras, 3.4.25.

114. Bṛhadāranyaka, IV.iv.22.

115. Ṛg Veda, X.96.6.

116. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, I.v.17.

117. Bhagavad Gīta, VIII.4.

118. Ibid., XI:16.

119. Aittareya Upaniṣad, 3.2.6.

120. Brahma Sūtras, 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 Sūtras, 2.4.6.

124. Ibid., 2.4.7.

125. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, VI.1.13.

126. Sri Bhasya, Op.cit., p.307.

127. Nirmal Selvamani, Tamil Kāṭci Neriyiyal, 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.

Sivajñānabhodam, 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. Sivajñāna Bhōdam, 4.

148. Romans, 5:12.

149. Romans, 5:14.

150. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, p. 117.

151. Tailtiriya Upaniṣad, II.1.

152. Svetasvatara Upaniṣad, III.8.

153. Brahma Sūtras, 4.1.5.

154. Ibid., 4.2.9.

155. I Corinthians, 15:44.

156. Brahma Sūtras, 4.2.10.

157. Ibid., 4.2.7.

158. Baskara Doss, J.D., Aru Vakait Taricaṉaṅkaḷum Tamiḻar Samayamum (Viviliya Oḷiyil) Ōr Āivu, (Ph.D. Dissertation), Madras University, 1998, p. 224.

159. Brahma Sūtras, 4.4.17.

160. Brahma Sūtras, Sankara's Commentary, Op.cit., p. 468.

161. Ramanuja, Op. cit., p. 492.

162. Ibid., p. 474.

163. Revelation, 21:22-23.

164. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VIII.7.1.

165. Revelation, 21:3-4.

166. Brahma Sūtras, 4.4.22.

167. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, pp. 319-20.

168. Brahma Sūtras, 1.3.33.

169. Brahma Sūtras, Sankara's Commentary, Op.cit., p. 110.

170. Ramanuja, Sri Bhasya, p. 175.

171. Brahma Sūtras, 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. Puṟanānūṟu, 192:1.

176. Tirumantiram, 1204.

177. Tirukkuṟaḷ, 972.