



## DEFINITION OF THE PLURALITY OF PURUSA IN SAMKHYA DARSHANA.

Arpita Biswas.  
Research Scholar,  
Department of Sanskrit .  
Seacom Skills University,  
Santiniketan, Kendradangal, Birbhum,  
West Bengal, Bolpur-731236

**Abstract:** The Sankhya philosophy talks about the clear distinction between the Prakriti and the Purusha .Purusha and Prakriti as the two main heads. Purusha is the source of energy and infuses Prakruthi, which is otherwise lifeless on its own. Prakriti in its default state is well-balanced by the three gunas . In Samkhya Darshana Puruṣa is the plural immobile cosmic principle, pure consciousness, unattached and unrelated to anything. Purusa uniting with Prakriti gives rise to life. The Purusha Tattva, the twenty-five Tattvas accepted in the philosophy of Sāṅkhya, the last of the twenty-four Tattvas, are related to Prakrti and other things. By that difference between consciousness and unconsciousness, the two main elements shine. Just as the consciousness of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is composed of twenty-five elements, so the elements, such as Prakrti, are composed of three modes of material Prakrti. Just as Puruṣa is eternal, so is Prakrti eternal. Just as the conscious Puruṣa is eternal because there is no breakdown of his threefold Prakrti, so Prakrti is always consequential because it is eternal.

**Keywords:- Purusa, Prakriti, Sattva, Rajas, Tamas.**

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Purusha in Sāṅkhya, the eternally pure Buddha, the liberated Prakrti, the almighty The Purusha Tattva <sup>1</sup> is also proclaimed in the Asura commentary uninterrupted <sup>2</sup>.

Is that Puruṣa a single Nana? Is the field-knowing in all fields one or independent of every body? Here, according to the Sāṅkhya, that Puruṣa is not one, but various. Here the Sāṅkhya logic proclaims the plurality and it is held in the Sāṅkhyakārika<sup>3</sup>.

In Sankhya, birth, death and the senses are separately regulated, and again by the cause of the contradiction of the three modes of Prakrti as the cause of simultaneous instinct

The plurality of the Puruṣa is proved. Thus, in asserting the plurality of Puruṣa, three arguments are invoked:

- From the counter-regulation of birth and death;
  - the absence of simultaneous involvement of living beings;
  - Antibiotic because of the triple inequality. so far .
- From the counter-regulation of birth and death

By the eight distinct bodies: there the name of birth is associated with the unprecedented pains of the body, senses, mind, ego and intelligence of the soul, not the result of the soul, since it is inconsequential. The abandonment of these bodies and other objects is death, not the destruction of the soul, since it is eternal in the Kutastha. The actions, again, are thirteen, such as intelligence. The counter-regulation of these births and deaths is a system that does not exist in one Puruṣa in all bodies. Then, indeed, there would be a disorder that when one person is born all would be born, and when one dies all would die, and in the beginning of blindness all would be blind and others, and in the beginning of confusion all would be confused. The arrangement for each field is based on the difference between the male and female.

This is the point. If there were only one soul, then at the birth of one all would be born, at the death of one all would die, and at the separation of one's senses all would be deaf, blind, dumb, and lame. And it doesn't happen like that. Therefore, from the counter-regulation of the causes of birth and death, it is proved that there are many Puruṣa.

b) In the absence of the simultaneous involvement of living beings: by the simultaneous involvement of living beings

Instinct is impossible. Gourpāda Ācārya also consulted on this subject in his commentary Therefore, all beings do not tolerate instinct in Dharma and others simultaneously. Others are engaged in renunciation, others are engaged in iniquity, and some are engaged in knowledge. Therefore, in the absence of the simultaneous instinct, the Puruṣa is not one, but various. Instinct is a characteristic of effort, although it is carried out by the consciousness. Similarly, when one strives in that one body, one should strive everywhere that He is one in all bodies. Then one should move all the bodies simultaneously. Again, no fault has been committed in the diversity.

c) From the triple inequality of the antibody: The state of the triple inequality of the antibody <sup>4</sup> .

It is observed. Gauḍapāda Ācārya elaborated on this context.

It should be noted here that the difference in the nature of the three modes of nature has proved the plurality of Puruṣa. All are born the same; But there are some who are happy, who are dominated by the mode of goodness, others who are dominated by the mode of passion, and others who are dominated by the mode of darkness, who are foolish. This Puruṣa, theorized in terms of the differences of this Trinity, is not one but various. The elemental compound instinct is detailed here <sup>5</sup> .

In the first chapter of the Sankhya Sutra, the plurality of persons is somehow differently represented; but the idea raised there in many ways by the formula <sup>6</sup> .

What is the name of the system from the system expression in the formula? Who is the arrangement for? These are the questions that constantly arise. The monk of science gives the answer in his commentary on the Sāṅkhya Pravacana, This is what should be said here. Without accepting the differences from the system of hearing and memory, it is impossible to consider the plurality of Puruṣa. Without accepting the plurality of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, separate behavior such as someone going to heaven, someone going to hell, someone being bound and someone being liberated will never attain perfection. Therefore, the Puruṣa is various, not the same.

Vācaspati, even in his philosophy of philosophy, thought in this way <sup>7</sup> .

Again, by compiling the logic presented in Sankhya, it was also written by the great teachers, Mr. Radhakrishnan, in the Purushabahutva Sankalpa <sup>8</sup> .

This issue was re-raised by Maharshi Kapila in the sixth chapter of the Sankhya Darshan <sup>9</sup> . In his commentary on this, the monk of science has poisoned himself <sup>10</sup> .

It must be said, how can the system of bondage and liberation, as stated in the scriptures, that only those who know the Tattva attain immortality and that others who are different from it enjoy suffering, be

attained in the absence of various systems of man? If it is said that the system of bondage and liberation can be achieved only by the difference of titles, then the formulator's <sup>11</sup> discourse again This is the meaning of the formula. If the title is accepted, then the fulfillment of the title again breaks the duality.

If it is repeated that the title is made by ignorance, since there is no duality in the acceptance of the title, another formulated is the perfection of Advaita <sup>12</sup>.

If ignorance is accepted as the mother of the title there, it is by its own nature a loss of Advaita.

The Sāṅkhya again speak for the sake of their own opinion. It is true that somewhere in the Sruti and Smriti the Purusha is taught as one <sup>13</sup>.

It has been researched that there is only one Being Self present in all beings, just as there is a moon in the sky and a moon in the water. The moon in the sky, though once in the sky, appears to be many because of the reflection in various <sup>14</sup> waters, and so it should be considered in the male position <sup>15</sup>.

The Self is eternal, omnipresent, hidden and flawless. By Prakṛti, that Puruṣa alone is perceived in a different form due to the influence of the illusory energy. Even when this duality is reigned, the author of the Sāṅkhya Sutras <sup>15</sup> himself speaks in reply, understanding the contradiction of the perfection of Advaita with his head <sup>16</sup>. A commentary on this subject has also been written by a monk of science <sup>17</sup>.

From the statement " caste-oriented" in the formula, the word caste should be understood as generality or uniformity. Such a meaning is taken as the implication of the Advaita scripture It is not acceptable as a three-form, because it is assumed that all men are one-form Otherwise, it would be impossible for the non-religious to assert the characteristics of the Self by Brahman himself By representing uniformity by separation.

Again, the Sankhyas proclaim that the Advaita Sruti <sup>18</sup> is for the slow-witted.

It is beyond mere translation rather than the attainment of enthusiasm, as we declare.

The Sutrakar's assertion that " My soul is Bhadrāsena" is also meditative, where it is elaborated by the monk of science.

Again, the Sāṅkhya mantras argue that if the soul is one even without many, then there is a case of liberation for Vamadeva and others in the scriptures. When they are liberated, even living beings like me will be liberated. The formulator's opinion is that the plurality of men is inferred from such an occasion. Here it is elaborated by the monk of science.

In accepting the Advaita Tattva, the preaching of the subject of liberation and the practice of it would become completely meaningless and fruitless. Indeed, even Vamadeva and others have not attained supreme liberation, as formulated by the Maharshi Again, it is elaborated by the commentary on the discourse The experiment here on the subject is formulated by the Sankhya Sutra Again, the commentary on the discourse recommended by the monk of science thus.

The doctrine, equipped with Sāṅkhya and logic, is declared to be favorable for establishing the plurality of Puruṣa. Similarly, if the system of birth and death is proved by the difference of titles, the author of the Sāṅkhya Sutra dispels the doubt that the acceptance of many Purusha is meaningless. elaborated by the monk there.

When the soul is the almighty, the union of various objects with that soul constantly occurs. For example, although the sky is one, it simultaneously combines with the pots and other objects because of its omnipotence or omnipresence. Therefore, how is it possible to distinguish between various births and deaths by the difference of titles? Here the separating title is different, but if the separated man is accepted as one and the same, except for many, the arrangement of birth and other things can never be perfected.

Again it is seen that the soul of one title is freed from the existence of other titles and union with them occurs; In such a case, how can the bound state of that Puruṣa be extinguished? Therefore, the system of bondage and liberation cannot be achieved by the difference of titles.

Because of the multiplicity of the title, the object conveyed by that title is not to be regarded by the Advaitas as the Self. They worship the diversity of men, who are distinctly distinct and freely accessible in many ways. Thus the loss of Advaita would be attached. In the acceptance of the distinctiveness of the bound persons, in the state of liberation, in the absence of such distinction, in the destruction of the distinct Puruṣa, doubt arises as to when and in what form liberation may be attained. This statement, accepted by Sāṅkhya, cannot be produced in such a way that in your view, when every Puruṣa is the master, all men have always seen a multiplicity of combinations in the combination of all the titles. How can this question be fulfilled in the system of birth and death and in the system of bondage and liberation? The sage Vamadeva was determined by the mouth of an illustration The intellect of identity with the mind or the body of the being.

Such sense of identity disappeared in the fame of discrimination born of truth, Vamadeva was liberated, but his union with the transcendental mind remained intact as his soul remained omnipotent or omnipresent. So how can the bound state disappear? Indeed, when one is in seclusion with one mind, one becomes secluded with the whole mind. Therefore, the answer applies to the Advaitaists as follows <sup>19</sup>.

When one is liberated from one object, he is liberated from all objects, or he attains liberation or bliss. We have seen that in Sāṅkhya the mind of Rāma produces the perception of Rāma when it is applied to a Puruṣa called Rāma This makes Rama consider himself happy, unhappy, lustful and angry. But when a man named Rama is omnipresent, his union with the mind of a Puruṣa named Shyama is certain. So how can the mind in Shyama not be treated in Rama, the mind in Rama in Shyama? How is it that in a Puruṣa called Shyama, there are all men in the world who are freely existing in their own mind-instincts, and every moment there is a transition of the mind-instincts of other men to another man? Thus, when Sāṅkhya states that there are many Puruṣa and that they are so powerful, the possibility of the transcendence of the mind and its functions, separate from the system of birth and death, is not evil. In other words, it is not impure to transcend the irony of accepting the power and abundance of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The great teacher, Mr. Moksharmul, spoke 209 explaining the essence of the Puruṣa accepted by Sankhya.

Here, when the plurality is accepted as the sovereignty of the soul, it is not to be accepted. It is argued here that the contradiction of plurality with sovereignty is Prakṛti. Repeatedly.

It should be understood that when the plurality of Puruṣa is accepted, the acceptance of the particularity of the person occurs in the Nisvapavaca.

Mr. Teacher Radhakrishnan also argues the irrationality of the plurality<sup>20</sup> of men in this way. Here you have noticed the words of Gaudapada <sup>21</sup>

Gaudapadacharya 44 in the commentary on the Karika 212 mentions the state of liberation <sup>22</sup>. The Supreme Soul is God, and no one else. But He is one, and there cannot be many. Aniruddha Bhatta, who wrote the Vṛtti, also advised the same in the case of men <sup>23</sup>.

Who is the other Purusha and who is the other purusu? That's a kill creature. Even a monk of science should accept that in the case of a person, he is the omnipotent person <sup>24</sup>.

This omniscient, omnipotent Supreme Personality of Godhead, the Supreme Soul, is called Abhinna. The special person is God, as reported in the Yoga scriptures <sup>25</sup>.

It is therefore thus observed that the distinction between the masculine and the feminine is proved by the distinctive face of the title. In such a case, there is no contradiction in any way as to whether the man is one or many <sup>26</sup>.

How does the Sankhya Sutra fit together? Just as the white rays of the sun assume a variety of colors such as yellow, red, green, etc. through a glass of various colours, so the teaching of the Upadhyaya is clearly supported in the Upanishads <sup>27</sup>.

Just as the sun, the form of light, may be illuminated in many forms in different reservoirs even though it is one, so the luminous eternal soul is perceived in many forms in different fields.

Here it can be thought thus, except for the rejection of the title by the Sankhyas.

The acceptance of the title accepted by Vedanta is more appropriate by which the arrangement of birth and other things.

It is consistently proved, which again is tediously assumed in statistics.

If the man is one, how can the action of one being not be the action of another being?

Getting mixed up? formulated by Badarayana on this subject.

Shankaracharya also spoke here

Nevertheless, the scriptural consensus on the unity of man, if carried out as a matter of race, is consistent with the meaning of nature in plurality. The statement supported by the feet of the monks accepts the plurality of men as caste-oriented, as enjoined in the Swetasvetara Upanishad Moreover, the aforementioned contamination regarding the unity of the Purusha and others has been refuted by the Sankhya Sutra <sup>28</sup>. Here, in the commentary, even the monk of science has typed his own opinion Sham.

End note

ग्रन्थनिर्बन्धः

१ "पुरुषः शुद्धो निर्गुणः व्यापी चेतनः " - गौ. भा. ।

२." पुरुषः अनादिः सूक्ष्मः सर्वगतश्चेतनः अगुणो नित्यो द्रष्टा भोक्ता अकर्ता क्षेत्रविद् अमलः अप्रसवधर्मीति ।" - आसुरिभाष्य

३." जननमरणकरणानां प्रतिनियमादयुगपद्भवत्तेश्च। पुरुषबहुत्वं सिद्धं त्रैगुण्यविपर्ययाच्चैव ॥" - सा. का. १८ ।

, ४. “ युगपत् एककालं, न युगपत् अयुगपत् प्रवर्तनम्। यस्माद् अयुगपद् धर्मादिषु प्रवृत्तिः दृश्यते, एके धर्मे प्रवृत्ता अन्येऽधर्मे वैराग्येऽन्ये ज्ञानेऽन्ये प्रवृत्ताः तस्मात् अयुगपत् प्रवृत्तेश्च बहव इति सिद्धम्।” - गौ.भा.सा.का. १८ ।

५. “ त्रिगुणभाव- विपर्ययात् च पुरुषबहुत्वं सिद्धम् । यथा सामान्ये जन्मनि एकः सात्त्विकः सुखी, अन्ये राजसो दुःखी, अन्यस्तामसो मोहवान्। एवं त्रैगुण्यविपर्ययाद् बहुत्वं सिद्धमिति । ” - गौ. भा.सा.का. १८।

६. “ सुख-दुःख-मोह-सङ्कर-विशुद्ध-करणापाटव-जन्ममरणकरणानां नानात्वात् पुरुष-बहुत्वं सिद्धं लोकाश्रयवर्णभेदात् च । यद्येकः पुरुषः स्याद् एकस्मिन् सुखिनि सर्व एव सुखिनः स्युः । एकस्मिन् दुःखिनि सर्व एव दुःखिनः स्युः । एकस्मिन् मूढे सर्वे मूढाः स्युः । एकस्मिन् संकीर्णे सर्वे संकीर्णाः स्युः । एकस्मिन् विशुद्धे सर्वे विशुद्धाः स्युः । एकस्य करणापाटवे सर्वेषां करणापाटवं स्यात् । एकस्मिन् जाते सर्वे जायेरन् । एकस्मिन् मृते सर्वे म्रियेरन् इति पुरुषबहुत्वम् इतश्च बहवः पुरुषाः ।” - त.स.दी.४।

७. “ जन्मादिव्यवस्थातः पुरुषबहुत्वम् ”- सा.सू. १/१४९।

८. “ पुण्यवान् स्वर्गे जायते पापी नरकेऽज्ञो बध्यते ज्ञानी मुच्यते इत्यादेः श्रुतिस्मृतिव्यवस्थाया विभागस्यान्यथानुपपत्त्या पुरुषो बहव इत्यर्थः ।” - प्र.भा.सा.सू.

९. “ न च प्रधानवत् एक एव पुरुषः, तन्नानात्वस्य जन्म-

मरण-सुख- दुःखोपभोगमुक्तिसंसार-व्यवस्थया सिद्धेः ।”-

त. वै.यो.सू. २/२२

१०. “ There are many selves\_ since experience shews that men are differently endowed physically, morally and intellectually.

Each conscious being regards the world in his own way and with an independent experience of its subjective and objective processes- which shews that there are different witnessing consciousnesses. The Sankhya lays stress on the numerical distinctness of the streams of consciousness as well as the individual unity of the separate streams." -

Indian Philosophy Vol.II, Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan

११. “ पुरुषबहुत्वं व्यवस्थातः " - सा.सू. ६/४५

१२. ये तद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्त्यथेतरे दुःखमेवापियन्ति इत्यादिश्रुत्युक्तबन्धमोक्षव्यवस्थात एव पुरुषबहुत्वं सिध्यतीत्यर्थः ॥ - प्र.भा.सा.सू. ६/४५ ।

१३. “ उपाधिश्चेत् तत्सिद्धौ पुनर्द्वैतम् ।” - सा.सू. ६/४६ ।

१४. “ द्वाभ्यामपि प्रमाणविरोधः " - सा.सू. ६/४७

१५. “ एक एव हि भूतात्मा भूते भूते व्यवस्थितः । एकधा बहुधा चैव दृश्यते जलचन्द्रवत् ॥ नित्यः सर्वगतो ह्यात्मा कूटस्थो दोषवर्जितः। एकः स भिद्यते शक्त्या यायया न स्वभावतः ॥ " - प्र.भा.सा.सू. १/१५४।

१६. “ नाद्वैतश्रुतिविरोधो जातिपरत्वात् ।” सा.सू. १/१५४ इति।

१७. जातिः सामान्य एकरूपत्वं तत्रैव अद्वैतश्रुतीनां तात्पर्यात्। न त्वखण्डत्वे प्रयोजनाभावादित्यर्थः । \*\*\* जातिपरत्वात् विजातीयद्वैतनिषेधपरत्वादित्यर्थः तत्राद्यव्याख्यायाम् अयं भावः । आत्मैक्य - श्रुति-स्मृतिषु एकादिशब्दाः चिदेकरूपतामात्रपरा भेदादिशब्दाश्च वैधर्म्यलक्षणभेदपराः 1\*\*\* तथैकरूपताप्रतिपादनेनैव निखिलोपाधिविवेकेन सर्वात्मनां स्वरूपबोधनसम्भवात् च । न ह्यन्यथा निर्धर्मकम् आत्मस्वरूपं विशिष्य ब्रह्मणापि शब्देन साक्षात् प्रतिपादयितुं शक्यते । \*\*\* एकस्यैव वाक्यस्य अखण्डत्वावैधर्योभयपरत्वे च वाक्यभेदोऽखण्डतापरकल्पनायां फलाभावश्च। अवैधर्म्यज्ञानादेव अतोऽद्वैतवाक्यानि नाखण्डतापराणि ॥” इति सर्वाभिमाननिवृत्तेः। - प्र. भा. सा.सू. १/१५४।

१८. “ अन्यपरत्वमविवेकानां तत्र " - सा.सू. ५/६४

१९. अविवेकानाम् अविवेकिपुरुषान् प्रति तत्राद्वैतेऽन्यपरत्वमुपासनार्थकानुवाद इत्यर्थः लोके हि शरीरशरीरिणोर्भाग्यभोक्तोश्चाविवेकेनाभेदो व्यवह्रियतेऽहं गौरो ममात्मा भद्रसेन इत्यादिः । अतस्तमेव व्यवहारमनूय तानेव प्रति तथोपासनात् श्रुतिविदधाति सत्त्वशुद्ध्याद्यर्थमिति । अतएव परमार्थदशायामुपास्यानामात्मत्वं प्रतिषेधति श्रुतिः । " यन्मनसा न मनुते येनाहुर्मनो मतम् । तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते । " - प्र.भा.सा.सू. ५/६४ ।

२०. “वामादेवादिर्मुक्तो नाद्वैतम्" - सा.सू. १/१५७

२१. वामादेवादिर्मुक्तोऽस्ति तथापीदानीं बन्धः स्वस्मिन्ननुभवसिद्धः । अतो नाखण्डात्माद्वैतमित्यर्थः । " स चापि जातिस्मरणात्तबोधस्तत्रैव जन्मन्यपवर्गमाप इत्यादिवाक्यशतविरोधश्चेति शेषः 33 न चैवं बद्धमोक्षावुपाधेरेवेत्यवगन्तव्यम्, श्रुतिस्मृतिसिद्धान्तविरोधात्

दुःखं मा भुञ्जीयेति कामनादर्शनेन पुरुषमोक्षस्यैव मोक्षाख्यपरमपुरुषार्थत्वाच्च । उपाधेर्दुःखहानस्य च तादयेन परम्परयैव पुरुषार्थत्वात् पुत्रादिवदिति यदप्याधुनिकैर्मायावादिभिरुच्यते,। अद्वैतश्रुतिविरोधाद्वन्धमोक्षसृष्टिसंहारादिश्रुतयो बाध्यन्त इति, तदप्यसत्, मोक्षाख्यफलस्यापि श्रवणकाल एवाभावनिश्चये श्रवणोत्तरं मननादिविधेरननुष्ठानलक्षणाप्रामाण्यप्रसङ्गात् । प्रपञ्चान्तर्गतस्य वेदान्तस्याप्यद्वैतश्रुत्या बाधे वेदान्तावगतेऽप्यद्वैते पुनः संशयापत्तेश्च। स्वाप्रवाक्यस्य जाग्रति बाधे तद्वाक्यार्थे पुनः संशयवत् किञ्च मिथ्याबुद्धिर्नास्तिकता 35 इत्यनुशासनाद्धर्मादिषु स्वापवन्मिथ्यादृष्टयो बौद्धप्रभेदा एव, सांवृत्तिकशब्देन प्रपञ्चस्याविद्यकतायाश्च तैरभ्युपगमादिति दिक्।” इति ।

प्र.भा.सा.सू.१५७

२२. “ अनादावद्य यावदभावाद्भूविष्यदप्येवम् "इति ।

सा.सू. १/१५८

२३. “ अनादौ कालेऽद्य यावच्चैन्मोक्षो न जातः कस्यापि तर्हि भविष्यत्कालोऽप्येवं मोक्षशून्य एव स्यात् सम्यक्साधनानुष्ठानस्याविशेषादित्यर्थः” - प्र.भा.सा.सू.१५८

२४." इदानीमिव सर्वत्र नात्यन्तोच्छेदः " - सा.सू.१५९

२५. “ सर्वत्र काले बन्धस्यात्यन्तोच्छेदः कस्यापि पुंसो नास्ति वर्तमानकालवदित्यनुमानं सम्भवेदित्यर्थः ।” - प्र.भा.१५९॥

२६. “ उपाधिभेदेऽप्येकस्य नानायोग आकाशस्येव घटादिभिः” सा. सू. १/१५०

२७. उपाधिभेदेऽप्येकस्यैव पुरुषस्य नानोपाधियोगोऽस्त्येव, यथैकस्यैव आकाशस्य घटकुड्यादिनानायोगः । अतोऽवच्छेदकभेदेनैकस्य आत्मन एव विविधजन्ममरणाद्यापत्तिः कायव्यूहादौ इवेति न सम्भवति किञ्चैकोपाधितो मुक्तास्यापि आत्मप्रदेशस्य उपाध्यन्तरैः व्यवस्था । \*\* पुनर्बन्धापत्त्या बन्धमोक्षाव्यवस्था तदवस्थैव । " प्र.भा.सा.सू.१/१५०

२८. " If the Purusha was meant as absolute as 3 eternal, immortal and unconditioned, it ought to have been clear to Kapila that the plurality of such a Purusha would involve its being limited determined or

#### ग्रन्थसूचिः

\*) "A History of Indian Philosophy" (vol 1), Surendra Nath Dasgupta, Cambridge at the University Press, 1922.

\*) "A History of Sanskrit Literature", Arthur A. Macdonell, 1913 ed.

\*) "Classical Samkhya: A Critical Study", Dr. Anima Sengupta, Patna University, Patna Ed. Monchen First Ed. June, 1969.

\*) "Die Samkhya Philosophies Early Samkhya", Richard Garbe E. H. Johnston, The Royal Asiatic Society, London, - 1937.

\*) अमरकोषः - श्रीमद्गुरुनाथविद्यानिधिभट्टाचार्यसम्पादितः, देवाशिम्- भट्टाचार्यप्रकाशितः, संस्कृतपुस्तकभाण्डारः, १४१७ वङ्गाब्दः।

\*) उपनिषद् (बँगला) - गीता प्रेसप्रकाशितः, गोरक्षपुरः - २७३००५, स.मु. २०१०।

\*) ऋग्वेदभाष्योपक्रमणिका सायणाचार्यकृता, सत्यरञ्जनबन्योपाध्यायसम्पादिता, देवाशिम्-भट्टाचार्यप्रकाशिता, संस्कृतपुस्तकभाण्डारः, द्वि.स., २००३ आङ्गलाब्दः।

\*) कौटिलीय अर्थशास्त्र आचार्यकौटिल्यप्रणीतः, ड. अनिलचन्द्रवसुसम्पादितः, अभयवर्मनप्रकाशितः, संस्कृतवुकडिपो, कोलकाता ७००००६, मु. २००५।

\*) तर्कसंग्रहः अन्नंभट्टकृतः, श्रीनारायणचन्द्रगोस्वामिसम्पादितः, देवाशिम्- भट्टाचार्यप्रकाशितः, संस्कृतपुस्तकभाण्डारः, तृ.स., १४१० वङ्गाब्दः।

\*) तर्कसंग्रहः- अन्नंभट्टकृतः, श्रीयुधिष्ठिरगोपसम्पादितः, अभयवर्मनप्रकाशितः, संस्कृतवुकडिपो, न. स. २०१३।

\*) धातुरूपदीपिका (धातुरूपकल्पद्रुमः) -डः श्रीरवीन्द्रनाथशाखिसम्पादिता, देवाशिम्-भट्टाचार्यप्रकाशिता, संस्कृतपुस्तकभाण्डारः, कलिकाता-६, प्र. प्र. १४१३ वङ्गाब्दः।

\*) न्यायदर्शन (तृतीयखण्डः) महर्षिगौतमप्रणीतः,

फणिभूषणतर्कवागीशसम्पादितः, पश्चिमवङ्गराज्यपुस्तकपर्षद्यकाशितः, द्वि.मु.,

\* ) पातञ्जलदर्शन आचार्यपतञ्जलिकृतः, कालीवरवेदान्तवागीशकृतवङ्गानुवादसम्बलितः, अशोककुमारवन्योपाध्यायसम्पादितः, मदेशप्रकाशितः, १०१ सि. विवेकानन्दरोड्, कलकाता ७००००६, स. २००४।

\* ) पाणिनीयम् - पाणिनिप्रणीतम्,

ड. प्रबोधचन्द्रलाहिडीहृषीकेशशाखिसम्पादितम्, सुशीलकुमारदत्तप्रकाशितम्, दि डाका स्टुडेन्टस् लाइब्रेरी, मु. २००५।

\* ) बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद् - अध्यापककरुणासिन्धुदास-अध्यापकवेचारामपोष- अध्यापकसुबुद्धिचरणगोस्वामिसम्पादिता, अभयवर्मनप्रकाशिता, संस्कृतबुकडिपो, कलकाता ७००००६, मु. २०१०।

\* ) ब्रह्मसूत्र (शाङ्करभाष्य) - बादरायणकृतम्, श्रीकरुणासिन्धुदाससम्पादितम्, अभयवर्मनप्रकाशितः, संस्कृतबुकडिपो, कलकाता ७००००६।

\* ) भारतीयदर्शनेर रूपरेखा - अध्यापकः अमितभट्टाचार्यकृता, अभयवर्मनप्रकाशिता, संस्कृतबुकडिपो, तृ.स.न.मु. २०१३।

\* ) मानमेयोदयः (प्रथमखण्डः)- नारायणभट्टकृतः, श्रीदीननाथत्रिपाठीनवतीर्थसम्पादितः, विनयेन्द्रनाथचतुर्धरिप्रकाशितः, संस्कृतकलेज, कलिकाता ७३।

\* ) युक्तिदीपिका - यदुपतित्रिपाठीसम्पादिता, देवाशिस्-भट्टाचार्यप्रकाशिता, संस्कृतपुस्तकभाण्डारः, कलिकाता-६, प्र.प्र.१४११ वङ्गाब्दः।

\* ) वेदान्तपरिभाषा - धर्मराजाध्वरीन्द्ररचिता, श्रीकरुणासिन्धुदाससम्पादिता, देवाशिस्-भट्टाचार्यप्रकाशिता, संस्कृतपुस्तकभाण्डारः, कलिकाता ६, २००४.

\* ) वेदान्तसारः- श्रीसदानन्दयोगीन्द्रप्रणीतः, स्वाम्यमृतत्वानन्दसम्पादितः, स्वामिमुमुक्षानन्दप्रकाशितः, उद्बोधनकार्यालयः, वाग्वाजारः, कलिकाता- ७००००३, १९९८।

