

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ADVAITA-VEDĀNTA

The VOICE of ŚĀṆKARĀ

śaṅkara-bhāratī

Editor

T. M. P. MAHADEVAN

Volume FIVE

Number THREE

ADI ŚĀṆKARA ADVAITA RESEARCH CENTRE
8-A, Distant Way, (1st Floor, 1-4th Fl.)
Mylapore, ★ Madras-600 004.

NOVEMBER

1980

CONTENTS

- 207 *Homage to Śaṅkara*
- JAGADGURU ŚRĪ
CANDRASEKHARENDRA
SĀRASVATĪ* 209 *Non Difference of
Śiva and Viṣṇu*
- JAGADGURU ŚRĪ
JAYENDRA SARASVATĪ* 235 *Some Cultural Habits
of Ours*
- ŚAṅKARA
BHAGAVAT-PĀDA* 249 *Ganeśa Bhujāṅgam*
- 258 *Octad dedicated to
Śrī Kāla-Bhairava of Kāśī*
- T. M. P. MAHADEVAN* 267 *The Heritage of India*
- Dr. N. VEEZHINATHAN* 293 *Liberation—Its Nature
and Its Means in Advaita*

Homage To Sankara

[63]

श्रीरामं प्रतिपुष्कराभिध-महायक्षेण वेदत्रय-
व्याख्यानावसरे विशिष्य कथितं श्रीविष्णुधर्मोत्तरे ।
एतं यधेनुमुपह्वयामि सुदुघामित्यग्गतं शङ्करा-
चार्यं शिष्यचतुष्टयेन सहितं वन्दे गुरूणां गुरुम् ॥

śrīrāmaṁ prati-puṣkarābhīdhamahāyākṣeṇa
veda traya
vyākhyānāvasare viśiṣya kathitam śrī
viṣṇu dharmottare
etaṁ yadhenumupahvayāmi sudughām ityag-
gatam śaṅkarā-
cāryam śiṣyucatuṣṭayena sahitam vande
gurūṇām gurum

The great *yakṣa* by name Puṣkara taught Śrī Rāma the Ṛks-verses which are found in the three vedas. Thus is stated in the Viṣṇudharmottara.

It is also stated there that when on earth the *Advaita-tattva* will be forgotten, Paramaśiva will come as *avatāra* in order to bless through giving instructions in Advaita even as a cow protects its calf by giving it milk. He will come along with four disciples. I offer my obeisance to that preceptor of preceptors.

[Bhāskarācārya's Commentary of Lalitāsahasranāmam]

[64]

करिष्यत्यवताराणि शङ्करो नीललोहितः ।
श्रौतस्मार्तप्रतिष्ठार्थं भूतानां हितकाम्यया ॥

kariṣyatyavatārāṇi śaṅkaro nīlaloḥitaḥ
śrauta-smārta pratiṣṭhārtham bhūtānām
hitakāmyaya

The blue-throated Śaṅkara will take *avatāras* in order to re-establish the teachings of scripture and traditional codes, out of his wish to do good to all beings.

(Sivarahasya)



Non Difference of Siva and Visnu

Jagadguru Śrī Candrasekharendra Sarasvatī

Parameśvara and Śrīman Nārāyaṇa are one and the same Reality; They are not two. This is the conclusive view of all the *Śāstras*. Names differ, forms are different, occupations vary but the Reality which is within them is one and the same. The conclusive teaching of our Ācārya is also this. But those who hold three types of views are of the opinion that Paramaśiva is different and Śrīman Nārāyaṇa is different.

In Śaiva - Siddhānta which is also known as *Meykaṇḍa-Śāstra* it is stated that Paramaśiva and Śrīman Nārāyaṇa are different; Śrī Madhvācārya is also of the same view; so also Śrī Rāmānuja. Śrīkaṇṭhācārya has written a commentary on the

Two discourses given in Madras on the 4th and 28th December 1932. Translated by Dr T. M. P. Mahadevan

Brahma-Sūtra. His view agrees with that of the *Meykaṇḍa-Śāstra*. He says that Paramaśiva remains as the Inner Ruler in the heart of Śrīman Nārāyaṇa. Śrī Madhvācārya is of the view that Śrīman Nārāyaṇa resides as the Inner Ruler in the heart of Paramaśiva. Śrī Rāmānuja declares that even as Śrīman Nārāyaṇa is the Inner Ruler in all other things He is the Inner Ruler in Paramaśiva who is a *jīva*. Since they say that either resides in the other the obeisance offered to either of them is, in effect, offered to the other also. According to the school of Madhvācārya one may go to Śiva-temples but one must offer obeisance thinking that that Deity (Śiva) is Rudra. According to the school of Rāmānuja it is enough if one goes to Viṣṇu-temples. But if one sees the image of Śiva on the way one must worship Him. Because Paramaśiva is the supreme Devotee (*Bhāgavata*), if one does not worship Him when one sees Him it would be tantamount to abusing Him. The *Meykaṇḍa - Siddhānta* came into existence about five - hundred years ago, the Rāmānuja Siddhānta about seven-hundred years ago and the Madhva Siddhānta about six-hundred years ago. Those who belong to Ādhīnams like Tiruvāvaḍuturai go through the *dīkṣa* - ceremonies and follow the Śaiva - Siddhānta. The Śaiva - Siddhānta is based on fourteen texts. They together are called *Panḍāra - Śāstra*. All the three siddhāntas accept *dīkṣa*. According to the Rāmānuja - Siddhānta one must undergo *samāśrayaṇa*

once in one's life. According to the Madhva - Siddhānta one must wear the five *mudras* whenever one sees one's Preceptors. Although in the Śaiva - Siddhānta there is no practice of wearing the *mudras*, there is *dīkṣa*. The temple - *arcakas* who are called Ādi - Śaivas and those who belong to the community of *Velālas* go through *dīkṣa*. The Madhva tradition is spread in areas where Telugu Kannada and Mahārāṣṭra are spoken. The Rāmānuja tradition is to be found mostly in the Tamil country and somewhat in the Telugu area. Those who follow these two *siddhāntas* maintain that Paramaśiva is different and that Śrīman Nārāyaṇa is different. But they say that one of them (i. e. Śrīman Nārāyaṇa) is the Inner Ruler within the Other. (i. e. Śiva).

Before these three *siddhāntas* came into being, i. e. more than eight - hundred years ago, what did people think? Even for the thoughts of those days the basic *pramāṇas* were the *Vedas*, *Śāstras*, eighteen *Purāṇas* etc. Even before the time of Śrī Rāmānuja the Viśiṣṭādvaita Siddhānta was followed by some people. Tirumalai Nambi, Ālavandar, Nāthamuni and others were Viśiṣṭādvaitins. Because Śrī Rāmānuja received the teaching from Nāthamuni, Viśiṣṭādvaita is also known as Nāthopāyāna. Nāthamuni's father was Īśvarabhakta. Śrī Rāmānuja's father was Keśava somayājīn. He was one who had performed the *somayāga*. His uncle

was Tirumalai Nambi. When Śrī Rāmānuja's father got married, the bride's parents said that they would give their daughter in marriage only if he received *samāśrayaṇa*. Therefore it can be known that they were greatly attached to the Viśiṣṭādvaita practices. And thus it can be inferred that Śrī Rāmānuja strengthened the *Siddhānta* which was esteemed by those who belong to his uncle's family. He took *Tiruvāymoli* as the basic text for the Viśiṣṭādvaita doctrines. The Saivas take as foundational texts for Śaiva-siddhānta *Tevāram* and *Tiruvācakam*. Madhvācārya considered the *Veda* itself as the foundation for his doctrine. He did not regard as basic other texts in Kannada. They (the Saivas and Vaiṣṇavas respectively) considered the *Tevāram* and *Tiruvāymoli* as equal to the *Veda*. Although Madhvācārya did not take as authority the texts in Kannada language, he brought esteem to that language. He brought honour to that language by laying down the rule that the *Purāṇas* should be expounded only in Kannada and that at the time of *śrāddha*-ceremony one should speak only in Kannada. Thus although the Preceptors of other traditions made certain rules, our Ācārya did not lay down any such conditions; for us there is no *dīkṣa*. For brahmins *upanayana* is the only *dīkṣa*. In the *Purāṇas* there are stories related about the lives of Śrī Rāmā, Śrī Kṛṣṇa and others but nowhere it is

stated that they applied on their bodies, *mudras* etc. We who are Advaitins go to all temples. The Vīraśaivas would not visit Viṣṇu - shrines. Those who have faith in Rāmānuja-siddhānta would not go to Śiva - temples. Since we alone go to all temples, let us see what the view of our elders was in this regard. At that time there was no other religion than the Vedic.

Our Ācārya has expressed his view clearly in his work *Praśnottara-ratna-mālikā*.

He says therein *Śaṅkara nārāyaṇātmā ekaḥ* (Śaṅkara and Nārāyaṇa are one). There is a temple called *Śaṅkaranārāyāṇa temple*. The Lord there is Śiva on one side and Nārāyaṇa on the other. There is a sacred place called *Harihara* on the way to Bombay. Śrī Bhagavatpādācārya declares that Śiva and Viṣṇu are one. But what does the *Veda* say? Of the *Upaniṣads*, only ten are the major ones. In those *Upaniṣads* the word Śiva occurs only once and the word Viṣṇu also only once. In other places it is the expression *Brahman* that is used. The word Viṣṇu is found in the *Kāthopaniṣad*. The passage is *Viṣṇoḥ paramam padam*. In the *Māṇḍūkya-upaniṣad* a passage declares: *Śivam advaitam*.

The text *Viṣṇoḥ paramam padam* has been interpreted in three ways. Adding the word *paśyanti* which means 'they see' the passage is

taken to mean : the *Nityasūris* are seeing the supreme place of Viṣṇu which is Vaikuṅṭha. It is thus that others interpret the passage.

Our Ācārya gives the meaning thus: 'They are seeing the supreme place (goal) which is Viṣṇu'. Viṣṇu is formless. In order to bless us He takes on a form with hands, feet etc. That Viṣṇu is the supreme goal is the interpretation given by Ācārya. When it is stated that the *Nityasūris* keep on looking at Vaikuṅṭha which is the place of Viṣṇu it would mean that they are seeing that world and not that they are looking at Viṣṇu's form. Looking at a world cannot be *mokṣa*.

It is looking at Him that is *mokṣa*. In the Saiva-siddhānta the word Viṣṇu is taken in the fifth case adding the relevant case-ending and the meaning that is given to the passage is 'They are seeing Pramaśiva who is superior to Viṣṇu. Our Ācārya does not consider Viṣṇu and Śiva to be different, and so he interprets the passage to mean 'the supreme goal which is Viṣṇu.' If that is so, one may ask why do the *Śiva-purāṇas* praise Śiva as the supreme Reality? The answer that is ordinarily given to this question is 'The Deity which is considered to be the supreme in a particular text is declared to be so in that text. 'The principle behind this answer is called '*na hi nindā nyāya*'. 'The intention is not to denounce a particular deity

but to declare the other as the highest. It is not this much alone. That Śiva worships Viṣṇu and Viṣṇu Śiva is true. At Setu Śrī Rāma consecrated Śiva - linga. At Gudimalla Paraśurāma offered worship to Śiva. At Kāñcī Viṣṇu consecrated *Kaccapēśvara*. From these one may think that since Śrī Mahā-Viṣṇu Himself offered worship to Śiva, all of us should perform Śiva-*pūjā*. But so also Śiva worshipped Viṣṇu. Therefore the thought will come to us that all of us should offer worship to Viṣṇu. Instead of Śiva worshipping Himself remaining as Śiva, if He were to worship taking the form of Viṣṇu, there will accrue blessing to the world. Similarly if Viṣṇu does *pūja* assuming the form of Śiva there will result the good of the world. Therefore it is true that they mutually worshipped each other.

Now we shall see what the opinion of great scholars is. The best among poets was Kālidāsa. In the *Raghuvamśa* he says that the gods went to Vaikuṅṭha and prayed to Śrīmannārāyaṇa. In the *Kumārasambhava* he mentions that the gods went to Brahmā and prayed to him. He also says (elsewhere) that the gods went to Paramaśiva and prayed. At all these places he describes the concerned Deity as the Supreme. If each one of the Three is supreme then who among Them is the highest? To those who ask this question the poet gives the following answer:

*ekaiva murti bibhīde tridhā sā sāmānyam eṣām
prāthamā varatvam*

One Form separated itself into three. 'Superior' and 'inferior' are common to all the Three. This is the meaning. We shall give an example. For the crow, they say, there is only one eye but in both the sockets there are eye-balls, but what we refer to as the pupil is only one. When it sees through one eye-ball the pupil goes back to that eye. Similarly, if the Deity is looked upon as Siva, Viṣṇu comes there. If it is seen as Viṣṇu, Siva comes there. The poet Bāṇa also says similarly thus. In the *mangala - śloka* he says God has the three qualities *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. At different times he takes on one or the other of these *guṇas*.

*rajojuṣe janmani sattvavṛttaye sthitau prajānām
pralaye tamaḥspīṣe ajāya sargasthitināśahetave
trayīmayāya triguṇātmane namaḥ*

In the *Tēvārm* Apparsvāmī says thus, while referring to the ancient age of the Tiruvārūr-*kṣetra*: "Was it the day when as One Being He uplifted the world, was it the day when as One preceptor He assumed Three Forms—That was the day when he chose to remain in the Tiruvārūr-temple". Thus Appar also says that One Form became three-fold.

In the *Tiruvāymoli* Nammālvār sings of Viṣṇu thus: "O Thou who art Muni, the four-faced

Brahmā, the Sire with three eyes.” The saint who sings the praise of Viṣṇu, himself calls Him “O Thou who art the Sire with three eyes”. The meaning which he wants to convey is clear. Pēyālvār went to Tirumalai for *darśan*. The verse which he sang there is well known:

*tāḷśadaiyum nīḷ mudiyum onmaḷuvum cakkaramum
śūḷavarum ponnāṇum tonṇumāl-śūḷum
tiraṇḍaruvi pāyum tirumalaimēl endaikku
iraṇḍuruva monṇa iśaindu*

Poygai Ālvar has sung thus :

*aran nāraṇan nāmom ānviḍaipuḷḷūrdi
urainūl maṇaiyuyaiyum kovilvaranēr
karumam aḷippuaḷippuk kaiyaduvel nīmi
uruvameri kārmēni yonṇu*

There are two names for Thee, Aran and Ari. There are two mounts. Vṛṣabha and Puḷ (Garuḍa). There are two places of residence: the mountain and the ocean”. This is the meaning of the verse. Kambanāṭṭār has said “There is not the supreme place for those who declare ‘Hara is superior’, ‘Hari is superior’.”

One of the Ālvārs who is variously called Vipranārāyaṇa, Bhaktaṅghrenu, Tonḍaraḍippoḍi was keen on singing the praise of Śrī Raṅganātha alone. When the forms of Viṣṇu that are in the other temples asked him to sing about them, it

seems, he refused saying 'I shall not'. He knew that all the forms of Viṣṇu are the same but it was only in the form of Śrī Raṅganātha that his mind was concentrated. There is a similar story related about Hanumān. He knew that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Śrī Rāma were incarnations of Viṣṇu but it seems that he said frankly that he would pay obeisance to Kṛṣṇa only if he took the form of Rāma.

In the Vaiṣṇava tradition the temple of Śrī Raṅganātha is known as 'The Temple.'

In the Śaiva tradition Cidambaram alone is called 'The Temple' (*Koyil*). Ko—king, il—house. Therefore *koyil* means king's house.

Which king? In one place it is Nāgarāja (King of serpents); in one place it is Naṭarāja (King of dance). One remains in bliss, sleeping. One is awake and dances in bliss. Waking, dream and deep-sleep are the three states of experience. In the states of waking and dream there is anxiety and fear. It is only in deep-sleep state that there is bliss. When will one dance in the state of waking? He will dance when he is in bliss without any anxiety.

Although the author of *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmyta* belonged to the Śaiva tradition, had initiation into the *pañcākṣara*, (the five-lettered *mantra*) and was repeating that *mantra*, his mind, he says, has been captivated by Yaśoda's Child (i.e. Kṛṣṇa).

*śaivā vayam na khalu tatra vicāranīyam
pañcākṣarījapaparā nitarām tathā'pi
ceto madīyam aṭasikusumāvabhāsam
smerānanam smarati gopavadhū-kiśoram*

Appayya Dīkṣita says that although Maheśvara and Janārdana are one and the same, his mind has been drawn to Śiva who wears the young crescent on His matted locks. One should not say that the two are equal. If we say they are equal it would mean that they are two. The truth is that the Two are not different. There is no difference between them.

*Maheśvare vā jagatām-adhīšvare
janārdane vā jagadantarātmani
na vastubheda pratipattir asti me
tathāpi bhaktis-taruṇendu śekhare*

This place is Māmbalam;* it is 'big *ambalam*' (temple). Once this place might have been a well known *kṣetra*.

Since going to temples has decreased, the temples are becoming dilapidated. Cosmopolitan clubs are becoming favourite resorts. It is because we do not go to the temples that they are not maintained properly. If thousands of people go to temples habitually, then *arcakas* (priests) will perform their duties properly; the trustees will con-

* The place in Madras where the discourse was given.

duct themselves with fear. In olden days people used to go to temples alone. At that time there were no reading-rooms and clubs. Therefore countless temples were built. But now as people do not go to temples, it appears as though temples were built unnecessarily. All should go to temples every day, if that is not possible they should go at least on special days. If this is done it will not appear that temples were built unnecessarily.

Among those who have faith in our *Vedas* and *Śāstras* and perform the prescribed rituals, there are two kinds of worshippers. They are the Śaivas and the Vaiṣṇavas. There are also temples for Siva and temples for Viṣṇu. Beside, these there are the temples for Subrahmaṇya, for Saptamātā and others. But the majority of temples are shared by Siva and Viṣṇu. In the Southern part of our country there are shrines for *Piḍārī*. Some people wrongly believe that these shrines are for a malevolent deity. In the *Sahasra-nāma* of Ambāl (Mother-Goddess) there occurs the name '*Bhaṭṭārikā*.' This name became corrupted into '*Bhaṭārikā*' and then into '*Piḍārī*.' Some copper-plate inscriptions there are both in Sanskrit and Tamil. In the Sanskrit inscriptions the expression '*bhaṭārikā-mānyam*' occurs and in the Tamil inscriptions '*bhaṭāri-mānyam*. Therefore it is certain, that the word *bhaṭṭārikā* was changed into *Piḍārī*. Although there are many temples in this manner, Siva-temples and Viṣṇu-

temples are the important ones. If a foreigner comes and looks around he will note that there are only followers of two traditions. Among Saivas and Vaiṣṇavas there are some who are Pūrṇa-Saivas, and some who are Pūrṇa-Vaiṣṇavas. Vīra-Saivas who are known also as Līngāyats are Pūrṇa-Sāivas; among those who follow the tradition of Rāmānuja there are some common Vaiṣṇavas who go to both kinds of temples. Still their Preceptors would say that they need not go to Śiva-temples and listen to Śiva-purāṇas. The Vīra-Saivas would say that there is no need to go to Viṣṇu-temples and listen to Viṣṇu-purāṇas. We who are in the middle — i. e. smārta brahmins and those who are other than brahmins - all perform both types of devotion.

Wearing the sacred ash (*vibhūti*) on the forehead they go to Viṣṇu-temples. To all those who are other than Vīra-Saivas and Vīra-Vaiṣṇavas, both the forms of the Deity are the same. Wearing *vibhūti*, they celebrate Śrī Rāma navami, Gokulāṣṭami, Radha-Kalyāṇam, etc. Even though they wear *vibhūti* and *rudrākṣa*, they have more of devotion to Viṣṇu. *Vibhūti* and *rudrākṣa* are the signs of their tradition. Their own devotion is to Viṣṇu. Some people wear *ūrdva-puṇḍra* but they show devotion to Śiva. Apart from these, performance of ritual acts are the same. If we ask the Vīra-Vaiṣṇavas why they do not go to Śiva-temples, the reply that they give is this: Is not the Lord

One alone? There are not two Lords, the Paramātman is one; all other Gods, including Brahmā and Rudra are *jīvas* like Sūrya and Candra. In order that we may be saved we want the Paramātman alone. That is only Viṣṇu; therefore we have to go to Viṣṇu-temples alone. This is their view. The Lingāyats also declare in a similar way. Śiva is the Paramātman, Viṣṇu is a *jīva*. Those who belong to both these traditions jibe at us saying that we have no determinate view. When we ask some people, "Although Paramaśiva is a *jīva*, He is certainly greater than us; should we not go to His temples?", they reply the relation between *jīva* and Īśvara is like that between a wife and her husband. Therefore they say, we should not go to Śiva-temples. In other words women should concentrate their entire mind on their husbands. Similarly we should be devoted to Viṣṇu alone. If a loyal wife goes to another house, there will be hindrance to her loyalty. Just as a lady should not look at another man, one should shut the door against seeing other deities and go away. Thus they say. The Vīra-Saivas too, in a similar way, advocate the view of the wife-husband relation.

The Paramātman is not two. This is certain. Even if it is assumed that there are two, they say that like a loyal wife one should not see a different

deity. But we go to both the temples. Many among us show greater devotion to Viṣṇu than the Vaiṣṇavas themselves. I am not referring to brahmins alone. In all sections of our people there are Viṣṇu-devotees but what they wear is *vibhūti*. Expounding the different views mentioned above, at different times *Ācāryas* came and turned many people to follow their own respective ways. Is the mode of worship that has come from beginningless time the right mode, or is what they say right? If we ponder over this question we will conclude that that is right for them and this is right for us. One may ask how is that so? (We answer) If the Paramātman is taken to be two then one of them should be turned into jīva. This difficulty arises because of the assumption that they are different entities. The *śāstra* says that only the guise is different. In Temples like Śaṅkara-nayinār-koyil we see both the deities in one form. I shall give an example : Let us say that a person has the name Kṛpāśaṅkara. He is called, for short Kṛpā. It is meaningless to say that Kṛpā fought with Kṛpāśaṅkara. If the Paramātman were two entities, what they (the other *Ācāryas*) say alone will be right. But if the two are one and their guises alone are different, what we say is right. Because the Reality is one and not two, no defect will accrue to loyalty. A husband may put on one guise at one time and another guise at another time. To

the woman who has devotion to him in both the guises, will there accrue any defect? If one were to say that there will accrue defect, those who have devotion to Rāma should not go to temples of Kṛṣṇa. The reason is that there would accrue defect to loyalty. After going to the temple of Pārthasārathi' one should not go to the temple of Keśavaperumāl. In the temples the names are different, the forms are different. Without thinking so, we believe that the Lord is the same and go to all temples. If the entities were two, there would certainly be loss of loyalty. The greatest loss in this regard is to change from our *dharma*. Devotion to the *Guru* is the greatest loyalty. If we follow the way of one *Ācārya* today listening to what he says, then after two generations, one may resort to another *Guru*. But true loyalty is to follow the beginningless path. Therefore it is wrong to say that defect will accrue to one's loyalty (to Viṣṇu) if one goes to a Śiva-temple.

The *Sāstras* say that one and the same Paramātmān takes on three forms for the purpose of creation, maintenance and destruction of the world. Creating the world is one function, afterwards maintaining it is another function. Thereafter destroying it is still another function. It is possible to say that destroying is an improper function. What we experience is misery, it appears, we are led to think 'why did God create the world?'

When misery becomes too much a man destroys himself. He thinks that destruction is better than existence.

If all of us remain without dying, what will happen in two-hundred years? Population will enormously increase and there would be no place even to sit and no food would be available. Therefore destruction becomes a necessary function. Old people, those who have disease and others long for death. To them destruction appears to be a desirable event. Therefore destruction is necessary. One and the same Paramātman takes on three forms in order to perform the three cosmic functions. The names of those forms are Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra.

God acquires the *guṇas* that are pertinent to the respective functions. If a guest visits our house we serve him. We tell him "Please come, please come." Even if we are prone to anger, at that time we acquire *sattva-guṇa*. When we want to make our children come we do not say "please come, please sit." etc., we order them to sit at a particular place. For this *rajo-guṇa* is necessary. In our place there are many people. From the forest nearby a tiger has come out. In that situation we have recourse to *tamo-guṇa* and should execute a cruel deed. Thus there is needed the relevant *guṇa* for the kind of deed that is to be performed.

Creation is *rajo-guṇa*; maintenance is *sattva-guṇa*; destruction is *tamo-guṇa*. The three together constitute *māyā*. These *guṇas* do not form the nature of the Paramātman. It takes them on for the purpose of cosmic functions. Īśvara is attributeless. Attributes (*guṇas*) are *māyā*. The word *mā* means 'not;' '*yā*' means 'that which is'. In the hymn to Sarasvatī beginning with the words *yā kundendu*, the word *yā*, you know, means 'She who'; therefore *māyā* means 'She who is not'. The supreme self exposes what is not as something which is.

Brahmā is the Paramātman which has assumed *rajo - guṇa*; Viṣṇu is the Paramātman which has assumed *sattva - guṇa*. Rudra is the Paramātman which has assumed *tamo - guṇa*. But seventy-five percent of the temples are Śiva - temples. Viṣṇu temples constitute only twenty-five percent. Among the people also seventy-five percent are devotees of Śiva; of the remaining twenty-five percent there are many different sects. The number of temples depends upon the number of devotees. Even before the school of Rāmānuja came into being there were Viṣṇu - temples. At that time it was the *Smārtas* who were wearing *vibhūti*, that performed worship in those temples. Even now in Śrī-raṅgam there is a group of brahmins called *Kāṇīyālar*. In the Viṣṇu - temple they have the right to *Kāṇīyāṭchi*. Even now there are the

members of a family known as *Tiruvangatu-amudanār*. After Rāmānuja's school came into existence they started wearing *tripundra* (*nāmam*). But they are *Smārtas*. Once a year they are taken to the temple, are shown all honours and brought back to their house. The mark on the forehead which is ancient for those who are devoted to Viṣṇu is wearing *ūrdva-pundram* with *gopi-candanam*. In our country the major traditions are that of Advaita and the Saiva. In the villages the *Smārtas* were managing the Viṣṇu temples.

The Lord makes use of the *guṇas*, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* when He performs the respective cosmic functions. Apart from these three functions there are two others. It is usually stated about the Mother Goddess that She is intent on five functions. (*pañcakṛtya parāyaṇī*).

Creation, sustenance, destruction, veiling and grace are the five functions. In the *Lalitā-Sahasranāmam* the Mother is described as *Pañcapretāsanī*.

The five functions mentioned above are performed respectively by Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Sadāśiva and Maheśvara.

After every *pralaya* (cosmic dissolution) they become united with the Mother. Some new agents assume those positions. The bodies of those who

have gained unity with the Mother become Her seeds. Therefore it is that She has the name *Pañcapretāsanī*. Of creation, sustenance and destruction, sustenance is the function of *sattva-guṇa*. Mahāviṣṇu sustains the world with *sattva-guṇa*. For giving food *sattva-guṇa* is necessary.

Our getting food or not getting it is not the result of our effort. While in the mother's womb did we grow because of our skill? In the womb who gave us food? Does even the mother know? She knows only the pain. He who sustains us by giving food is only Mahāviṣṇu. That is his function. The function of Rudra is destruction. In order to perform this He takes on *tamo-guṇa*. Of these three *guṇas* endowed with what do we worship the Parā-mātman? We go to a great person in order to accomplish something with his help. If we go at a time when he is happy he would say "Please come", and our object would be fulfilled. If we go to him when he is angry our purpose would be defeated. Even though the person is the same can we resort to him when he is seized with *tamo guṇa*? In the *Bhāgavata* it is stated thus: "Of the three *guṇas* it is only when there is *sattva*, that good will accrue to us." If that is so, is *tamo-guṇa* worship correct? To this question I shall at first give a small answer. Afterwards I shall reply extensively in accordance with the *śāstras*. Worship is done out of love. If we show love with a view to gain something, then

it will become a trade. That will not be true love. We should not love with a view to gain some fruit. We should show devotion without desiring any fruit. If good accrues to us, let it. If it does not even then there is no heart-burning. When devotion is offered with this attitude that alone is correct.

God-head is one alone. It takes on three *guṇas*. When it is not associated with the *guṇas* it remains attributeless (*nirguṇa*). The crystal *līṅga* has no colour. It takes on the colour of the thing that is placed in its proximity. That which remains without *guṇas* is said to be *Turīya*. *Turīya* means the Fourth. That which is not three is the Fourth. That is the *Brahmanātman*. The *Upaniṣad* says *Sāntam śivam advaitam, caturtham*. Śiva is the Reality which does not have the three *guṇas*. If it takes on form it will become Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra. Śiva which is the *Turīya* is the *Mahā-līṅga*. Before it splits into three it is Śiva. In the Śiva-temple Śiva is in the form of *Mahā-līṅga*. The other images such as Somā-skanda are forms of Rudra. What is the relation between Śiva that is *Turīya* and Rudra who is endowed with *tamogūṇa*? Along with the *Mahā-līṅga* which is of the form of Śiva why are not the images of Viṣṇu and others meant for procession kept? In order to understand the reason for this let us start with our own selves. We are awake we sleep, we see dreams. These three states are

known as *jāgrat*, *suṣupti* and *svapna*. In these three states, apart from experiencing one of them we do not experience the Fourth state which is other than these three. But we should attain this Fourth state. In the three states there is no happiness. In the state of waking there are hunger, thirst, anxiety etc. In the state of dream there is no happiness. Whenever we dream we do not always dream that we come by a treasure. Bad dreams are in plenty. I dreamt a dream one day, there was a tall building. In order to go up to the terrace there was a ladder placed. I climbed up by it but there was only a small space about nine inches long. I was afraid. At that time a man took away the ladder. There was the fear whether I would fall down. At that time I woke up. There was no limit to the happiness that I felt then. This life is a dream just like that. If we wake up from this there would be limitless happiness. We must so wake up. But we go on revolving in the states of waking, dream and sleep. Just as a man submits himself to these three states, the Paramātman of its own accord takes on the three *guṇas*.

The entire world is its body. All our *jīvas* — all the inert things in the world constitute its body. The three states come to us without our knowing. But the Paramātman of its own accord takes the three *guṇas* on. In order to perform certain functions He puts on Himself those states.

Dream is *rajo-guṇa*. Sleep is *tamo-guṇa*. This world is what is seen in the Paramātman's dream. Maintenance (of the world) is Its *sattva*. Destruction is Its *tamas*. In our sleep the organs of action and of knowledge get resolved in the Self. In the Paramātman's sleep the universe which is Its body gets resolved in It. Its dream is Brahmā. Its waking is Viṣṇu, Its sleep is Rudra. Of thees three states in which is there great happiness? In the state of waking even other creatures are afraid that there might be danger for their lives. In dream, as we have already said, in the state of dream there is much that is bad. It is in the state of sleep that there is no pain. We say we slept happily, we do not say we dream happily. Therefore the state which is free from difficulty is sleep alone. Because there is happiness in sleep, if we want to sleep always it is not possible. A man is condemned to be hanged. Even he forgets his misery when he sleeps. Therefore there is no happy state equal to that of sleep. But it is not possible to sleep always. The three states come to us one after the other. If we can go beyond these three we will have the state of *Turīya* which is other than these three. This state is called *mukti* or *mokṣa*. Death is misery. In sleep the power of the sense-organs gets resolved. In death leaving the body one gathers the power of cognitive sense-organs and takes another birth. When another

body comes the connotive sense-organs also come into that body. None of these are there in *Turīya* the Fourth state. In the three states together there is momentary happiness but long time misery.

From the time we sat here we have been happy without any anxiety. That is why it is stated that *Purānas* should be heard. At least during the period we listen to the *Purānas* we are free from anxieties. When we take bath in a holy river at least during that moment we remain without worry. When we offer gifts and perform other righteous deeds also there arises happiness. The mind feels happiness during the respective periods. It is stated that if one serves the *Guru* and listens to his expositions of *Vedānta* one acquires the fruit of performing eighty *kṛchras*. Bathing in Akhaṇḍa-kāverī is equal to the fruit of eight *kṛchras*. In order to transcend the three *avasthas* we should train ourselves in this manner. The states of waking and dream are mixed states. The Fourth state is pure and unmixed. What is proximate to it is sleep. It is in sleep that there is no misery at all. In staying in the Self also there is no misery. What is the difference between the two? From sleep we come back again to the state of waking. In *Turīya* that is not the case. The state of *Turīya* is called 'sleeping without sleep.' The *guṇa* of sleep is *tamas*. Rudra is of the form of *tamas*;

therefore it is Rudra that is proximate to the Paramātman which is *Turīya*. *Tamas* is darkness, in darkness nothing can be seen. In sleep there is the seed which is the cause of sleep. Rudra hides that. Our daily sleep is called *nitya-pralaya*. Having compassion for us Rudra brings on sleep for Himself which is called *mahā-pralaya*. By His *tamo-guṇa* He veils our misery from us. That is His great compassion. In *mahā-pralaya*, having mercy for the *jīvas*, He draws them unto Himself. The period of *pralaya* will be equal to the period of world existence. As it is stated by our Ācārya '*punarapi jananam, punarapi maraṇam.*' The *jīvas* suffer taking repeated births and undergoing repeated deaths. 'Let them take rest.' With this end in view, having compassion for us, He resolves us unto Himself. We surrender ourselves to Him alone praying that He should shower grace on us without sleep. The *Mahā-līṅga* is the symbol of the Paramātman which is *Turīya*. Rudra remains close to the Paramātman which is *Turīya*. That is why in the Śiva-temples along with the *Mahā-līṅga* there are the forms of Rudra such as Soma-skanda. What we worship is Paramaśiva, the Fourth. The *Mahā-līṅga* is Its form. He who remains proximate to it is Rudra. He too has the name Śiva. His cosmic function which is destruction is for our benefit. *Samhāram* means joining. He joins us with Himself. It is He that is Viṣṇu. And it is He

that is Brahmā. It is stated that sometimes Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra prayed to the Mother. How is that so, it may be asked. Parāśakti is *Turīya*. Parāśakti became three-fold splitting Herself into Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī and Pārvatī. Because Pārvatī is of the form of sleep She is proximate to Parāśakti. Similarly Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra are the three forms resulting from the separation of the Paramātman. Each takes on one *guṇa*. Since the Mother who is of the form of sleep remains next to *Turīya* the other forms of Godhead who belong to the other states pray to Her. They bow to Her; in saying thus there is nothing wrong.

I am repeating in short from the beginning. The Paramātman became three-fold. In order to perform the three cosmic functions It acquired the three *guṇas*. Although there are three forms the Real is one. Of the three states waking, dream and sleep, it is in sleep that there is happiness. That is *tamoguṇa*. Rudra is He who has *tamoguṇa*. It is He that is proximate to the Paramātman that is the Fourth. His state leads us to *Turīya*. *Mahā-līṅga* is what we worship. It is the symbol of the Paramātman. Let us offer worship to Śiva and reach the ultimate good.



Some Cultural Habits of ours

Jagadguru Śrī Jayendra Sarasvatī

We normally think that a person is in bondage only when he is in jail. But actually we are in chains or in bondage even when we are living in the world outside. We used to visit many jails for the purpose of bringing about transformation in the minds of the prisoners so as to bring them over to the right path. Religious teachers belonging to other religions were doing such a thing, and therefore, we thought that we should also do it. We would visit the jails and then come back and have purification by doing *anuṣṭhāna* and so on. I used to tell the prisoners that they were in fact having a better life and they could be happier than the people outside because they were very well looked after in the jails and they had nothing to worry about. I have seen many prisons in Madhya Pra-

desh, and have gone there and given the prisoners my blessings. I went there to preach *dharma*, just to awaken their interest in our *dharma* and in our *Śāstras*. Some of them who were behaving well could wear white dress and could have freedom to move about within the compound freely. When some mental transformation takes place in a person, he is able to get a job also within the prison and he can earn and get some promotion and also secure his release a little earlier. I used to tell the prisoners that the people outside did not have even that much of freedom, and they were much happier than the people outside and that the people outside were in chains and in bondage all the time.

The question arises how we shall be free from bondage and how we shall be happy all the time. We have three types of bodies, namely, the gross body, the subtle body and the casual body. The activities of the subtle body affect the gross body and similarly the treatment given to the gross body also affects the subtle body.

Without the subtle body, the gross body cannot function at all. Even if we want to make a physical movement, we have to invoke the aid of the subtle body. So, whatever we do to the subtle body affects the gross body and vice-versa.

Often we find that a person is doing *śrāddha* of *pitṛkāryas* and *devakāryas* etc. regularly and with faith, and he is also doing worship of the *devatas* etc., but still we find that he is not happy. What is the reason for this? I often say that the reason is the change which has been made by them in their traditional cultural habits. There may be many reasons for his unhappiness, but in my opinion, this change in cultural habits is also one of the most important reasons. When the cultural habits change, it affects our happiness and peace of mind. So, we have to pay proper attention to the auspicious ornaments or auspicious things that we and our womenfold have to wear.

In *Saundaryalaharī*, *Adi Śaṅkara* has sung a beautiful śloka which says:

सुधामप्यास्वाद्य प्रति-भय-जरामृत्यु-हरिणीं
 विपद्यन्ते विश्वे विधिशतमखाद्या दिविषदः ।
 करालं यत् क्ष्वेलं कवलितवतः कालकलना
 न शम्भोस्तन्मूलं तव जननि ताटङ्क-महिमा ॥

sudhāmapyāsvādya prati-bhaya jarā mṛtyu harīṇīm
vipadyante viśve vidhi śatamakhādya diviṣadaḥ
karālam yat kṣvelam kabalitavataḥ kālakalanā
na śambhos tanmūlam tava janani tāṭaṅka mahimā

When the *devas* churned the ocean, they got many things out of it and the *devas* took away all

of them, but when poison came out of it, everybody started running away. The Devas had taken nectar and they had no fear of death, and yet at the mere sight of the poison, all of them including Brahmā ran away in fright. It was only Parameśvara who could swallow that poison and contain it in his neck, and he did not die. What is the reason for this? Adi Śaṅkara says that it was due to the greatness of the *tātaṅka* (तातङ्क) or ear-ornament that Pārvaṭī was wearing. This śloka reminds us of a great principle, namely that the ear-ornament worn by a lady is of great protective value for her husband and in fact for her whole family as well.

This *tātaṅka* is a great symbol of Indian culture, and we have to preserve this habit because of its protective value. Therefore, if our women start wearing something else, naturally, some other results will flow therefrom. Now-a-days, we see our children and even elderly ladies wearing plastic ear-rings or hollow ear-ornaments in the form of rings, made of plastic or gold or silver. This is totally against our Indian cultural tradition. The reason for my saying this should be obvious. Suppose in a school examination, one of our children gets a cipher or zero out of a hundred marks in one particular subject, we start worrying about it, even if it be cipher only in just one subject. But when our ladies start wearing a cipher as an ornament on their body, we do not

seem to worry about it at all. If we keep a cipher in our body as an ornament then how can we insure against suffering? We will not fail to suffer for this fault. The *tāṭaṅka* is an ancient mark of Indian culture and the wearing of this should never be given up. So, the hollow ear-rings made of plastic or gold etc., should never be worn. Instead, our children could wear the *dolak* or the pendant which they used to wear and which has come down to us down the ages.

In this way, there are ever so many aspects of our cultural traditions and *dharma* which have to be taken care of. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* when Sītā was in the Aśoka forest, she was thinking all the time of Rāma. She had removed many of her ornaments and thrown them away, while she was being carried away by Rāvaṇa and the monkeys could pick them up later and tell Rāma about the path of *Rāvaṇa's* flight. But she did not remove the *maṅgala ābharāṇam* or auspicious ornaments, as for instance, the ring on her toes, the ring on the fingers given to her by her husband, the ear-ornaments, the neck-ornaments and the hand-ornaments. After all, these ornaments are not worn for the sake of beautifying the body but they are worn because they are auspicious ornaments. These auspicious ornaments should not, therefore, be removed from the body at any cost. For instance, the bangles should not be removed

from the forearm at any cost. Nowadays, it has become a fashion for some of our ladies to wear the bangles only on one forearm and not on the other. They wear a watch on one forearm with no bangles and transfer all the bangles from that hand to the other hand. Therefore, it is no wonder that on one side they observe our *dharma* and on the other side they do not. So, they are happy sometimes and they are also having unhappiness and difficulties at other times. This is because the auspicious ornaments are there only on one side of the body. If happiness is to be had all the time, the bangles should be always worn on both the forearms.

Further, at the time of marriage, a *maṅgala sūtra*, that is, a yellow thread bedecked with turmeric and *kuṅkum* is given to the bride by the bridegroom as a sign of auspiciousness. But nowadays, we find that is being replaced by a golden chain which weighs also a substantial amount. This was not at all intended in Vaidika marriages. Yet we find that this yellow thread is being replaced by this gold chain. Much of the suffering of the parents is often due to this requirement of the gold chain to be given to the bride. What is prescribed or ordained in our *dharmaśāstra* is only the *maṅgala sūtra* and not the golden chain. The golden chain may add to the beauty of the bride

but the *maṅgala sūtra* is a 'must' for every married lady.

Actually, these *maṅgaladravyas* and *maṅgalābharanaḥ* are auspicious ornaments and things meant for giving us happiness only.

Similarly, the wearing of *tilak* on the forehead is also a sign of auspiciousness. It is not meant as a beauty aid only. Ladies must wear only *kumkum* on their foreheads, that is, *kumkum* prepared in the prescribed manner from turmeric by the addition of lime juice, ghee etc. But nowadays, we find people wearing all types of colours on their foreheads. If there is this type of change in cultural habits, then, naturally, it is bound to affect the happiness of the person. The wearing of marks on the foreheads is one of the special features of the Hindu religion. Its followers must wear some mark such as *Vibhūti* (ash), or *tirumaṇ* (Holy sand or holy mud), *Gobicandan* or *candan* or carbon black streaks or *kumkum* etc.

The wearing of these marks like *vibhūti* or *bhasma* reminds us of so many aspects of our *dharma*. The wearing of *kumkum* also reminds us of many great truths. The wearing of *gobicandan* reminds of Lord *Viṣṇu*. In the case of *Mādhvas* also, the black lines remind them of *Viṣṇu*. Thus the wearing of these marks has got its special significance.

The wearing of *vibhūti* reminds us of Parameśvara. It is said :

विभृतिभृतिरेश्वर्यम्

vibhūtir bhūtiraiśvaryam.

The term '*vibhūti*' means wealth. How do we say that *vibhūti* signifies wealth?

For this, we have to analyse the manner in which *vibhūti* is prepared. It is prepared from something in which *Lakṣmī* resides. It is prepared from cow-dung which comes from the hind part of the cow where *Lakṣmī* resides. The *vibhūti* which is sold in the bazaars may not be pure-*vibhūti* obtained in this manner. Pure *vibhūti* has to be prepared by burning dried cow-dung cakes. *Lakṣmī* resides in the hind part of the cow, and other *devatas* also reside in various parts of the cow. So, cow-dung has a special significance, and the *vibhūti* prepared by burning cow-dung is also considered to be a sign of wealth. As long as we have *vibhūti* there will be no poverty and there would be no question of taking loans.

Lakṣmī resides in five places, mainly, the hind part of the cow, the head of the elephant, the line of parting of hair on a married woman's head, in the lotus and in the *bilva* leaves. In North India, married women wear *sindūr* at the line of parting of the hair on their heads.

This is our *dharma* and this is of very great significance.

While other flowers and leaves have to be plucked and used on the same day for the *pūjā*, the *bīlva* leaves and lotus flowers could be kept and used for about ten days, because *Lakṣmī* resides in them, and therefore there is no *nirmālya dōṣa*.

I often used to say that our country is in debts because our people have left off the habit of wearing *vibhūti* or other marks on their foreheads. If we revive the practice of wearing *tilak* or marks on our foreheads, we shall be able to wipe off all our debts. There are actual instances in history where after people started wearing *vibhūti* the country had become prosperous. In Madurai, St. Tiru-jñānasambandar had exhorted all the people to wear *vibhūti* and soon the country became prosperous and all poverty vanished. When wealth or *vibhūti* is there, how could there be poverty? Some wear *vibhūti* while performing *anuṣṭhāna* only, and wipe off while going to office. They would not get full satisfaction in anything they do. Therefore it should be worn always: It is a symbol of wealth, prosperity and happiness. *Īśvara* Himself wears *vibhūti*, three horizontal bands, on His forehead. Therefore wearing of *vibhūti* reminds us of *Īśvara* ultimately.

Vibhūti has no form and no colour; its colour is just pure white. It denotes the last state of everything in the world. The last product of com-

plete burning is only ashes. That last state of things is the state of Paramēśvara. It implies purity also. *Vibhūti* thus reminds us ultimately of the fact that only ashes remain when a thing is burnt completely or only Para Brahman remains in its pure and white form. Thus, the wearing of *vibhūti* reminds us of so many great philosophical truths also.

It we trace the cause of all things, we find that only one eternal substance is the sole and universal cause of the variety and multiplicity that we see in this world. It is as a symbol of that ultimate source of things that we wear *vibhūti*. *Vibhūti* reminds us that everything is Sivamayam only, which is the ultimate goal of life. When a thing is burnt, first it becomes black and when it is burnt again it becomes white ash and even if we burn it again, this white ash alone remains. Therefore, the consummation of all bodies is ashes only. So *vibhūti* in the material plane corresponds to Śiva in the spiritual plane. When we burn everything in the fire of knowledge, what remains is Śiva only or *Parabrahman* only.

Similarly *kumkum* or vermilion which is saffron or red in colour reminds us of *Lakṣmī*, *Lakṣmī-svarūpa* or *Pārvatī-svarūpa* and thus it is also a sign of wealth.

The wearing of *gobicandan* reminds us of the *gobi*-mud which was sanctified by the holy feet of

Lord Kṛṣṇa and it reminds us of the *gopīs* and then also of the Lord. We wear *gobicandan* to remind ourselves of Lord Viṣṇu.

The Mādhvas wear carbon black marks on their body and on their forehead. The carbon black denotes the idea that ultimately everything will perish in the world and become charred into carbon on being burnt. Therefore nobody should have any attachment to any worldly thing, but develop *vairāgya* or detachment. The Mādhvas wear this along with *gobicandan* and remind themselves of Lord Viṣṇu also while developing the spirit of renunciation and detachment.

The wearing of *tilak* in any one of these forms is a special characteristic of the Hindu religion. It is also an indication of the fact that those who wear it are believers in the theory of past and future births. Even Buddhists and Jains accept this theory and therefore they also wear such marks on their foreheads.

Those who wear the *vibhūti* or *tilak* think of God and gets His grace and so their obstacles, miseries, sorrows and sufferings become less and they can suffer any adversity with greater mental strength and get the necessary power to do so.

Similarly in regard to the dress also we find that there are a lot of changes which have come about. Dress is worn not for the sake of beauty

but only for the sake of purity and the health of the body. It is not intended that one should not enjoy the things of the world. All that is needed is that everyone should do his or her *dharma* and then enjoy everything through that *dharma*. Everything should be done without prejudice to our cultural traditions.

Again' let us take the case of the plaited hair worn by the ladies. Sītā was having just one plait. She was *ekaveṇīdharā* (एकवेणीधरा). Sitting by her side were *rakṣasīs* belonging to Rāvaṇa's palace. But they were having more than one plait. For instance Trijaṭa was having three plaits as her name itself symbolises. Only one plait is recommended according to our tradition, and more than one is tantamount to changing our cultural habits.

I am referring to all this, because whatever external things are worn on the gross body, also affect our subtle body indirectly and thereby affect our happiness. I can illustrate this by an example.

When a policeman is wearing his uniform, all of us get a certain feeling about him, have some respect for him. The very dress inspires respect and creates fear in us. Similarly if a person wears a black coat and a black tie we know that he is a lawyer or an advocate. A person in military uniform is recognised as a soldier. The dress of a

person makes others aware of his profession and nature. It is said that military dress induces some quality of bravery in the soldier. Thus whatever dress we wear on the body has an influence on our mind and creates impressions on other people's minds as well. If we change our external dress and take into newer forms of dress naturally our minds also will undergo corresponding transformation.

The food we eat has a great influence on our mind. It is said :

आहारशुद्धौ सत्वशुद्धिः

āhāraśuddhau satvaśuddhiḥ.

If we get pure food then our thoughts will be pure. Whatever food we may take, first we offer it to God, the Creator of all beings. Purity of food depends on the manner of production of food-grains. In the early days we used to have only cow-dung as manure for our fields and the cow being a *sātvik* animal the foodgrains produced with its dung as manure were also pure and gave us only pure thoughts. Chemical manure and fertilizers are nowadays in use in our farms in a large measure aiming at greater production but the food produced thereby when eaten influences our whole body metabolism and affects our mental processes and thoughts also. The preparation of the food should be done with purity and *ācāra* or sacred-

ness. All these will contribute to *āhāraśuddhi*, and thereby to *sātvik* thoughts.

Thus, whatever we do outside has an influence inside on the subtle body also. By performance of *pūjā* a person experiences good dreams and feels a sense of happiness. When we live our physical life properly, automatically our inner life will be taken care of. Thus in order to take care of the subtle body, we have to take care of the physical body and also take care of our daily activities.

Let us learn our culture, our *dharma* and our civilisation and try to preserve them by contemplating our habits and traditions just for ten to fifteen minutes daily and bestow in them *śraddhā* or faith. In spite of the changing environments, we should try to preserve our habits of dress, ornaments, food, *ācāra* etc.

Ganesa Bhujangam*

Śaṅkara Bhagavadpāda

रणत्क्षुद्रघण्टानिनादाभिरामं
चलत्ताण्डवोद्घण्टपत्पन्नतालम्।
लसत्तुन्दिलाङ्गोपरिव्यालहारं
गणाधीशमीशानसूनुं तमीडे ॥ १ ॥

*raṇat-kṣudra-ghaṇṭā-ninā dābhirāmam
calattāṇḍavoddaṇḍapat -padmatālam
lasattundilāṅgopari vyālahāram
gaṇādhiśam Īśānasūnum tam īde.*

I offer my words of praise to the Lord of Gaṇas, the son of Īśa, who has a pleasing bearing caused by the sound produced by the resonant

*Translation and Notes by Prof. P. Thirugnanasambandhan

little bells as he was moving about in the course of his ecstatic dance marking time with his lotuslike feet. He has for his ornament the serpent tied over his beautiful belly.

The concept of 'the Lord of gaṇas' occurs in the ṛg Veda and Taittiriya āraṇyaka though the same cannot be identified with the Gaṇapati that we worship today. In the Mahābhārata Gaṇanāyaka is spoken of as Vighneśa, the lord who removes the obstacles. Among the different icons of Gaṇapati we have Nṛtta Gaṇapati the jubilant dancing lord. Being the son of Īśa, naturally he shares the features and functions of the Father of the Universe and so wears serpent as ornament and dances in joy to the accompaniment of tāla and vādyā.

ध्वनिध्वंसवीणालयोल्लासिवक्त्रं

स्फुरच्छुण्डदण्डोल्लसद्बीजपूरम् ।

गलदर्पसौगन्ध्यलोलालिमालं

गणाधीशमीशानसूनुं तमीडे ॥ २ ॥

Dhvani-dhvamsa-vīṇā layollāsivaktram

Sphuracchuṇḍa-daṇḍollasad-bījapūram

Galaddarpa-saugandhya-lolālimālam

Gaṇādhīśam Īśānasūnum tam īḍe.

I adore Gaṇeśa, son of Lord Parameśvara, who has a pleasing countenance as he was absorbed in enjoying the aesthetic effect at the end of the play on the lute, whose long beautiful trunk shines with the pomegranate fruit and who has a row of

bees hovering round the fragrant ichor flowing down.

The poet conjures a vision of Gaṇeśa in a mood of delight. He is delighted by the sweet note of the lute that satisfies his ears (śrotrendriya); He is delighted by the sweet pomegranate that satisfies his palate (rasanendriya); He is delighted by the sweet fragrance of flowing rut that satisfies his olfactory sense (ghrāṇendriya); He is delighted by the sight of a bevy of bees hovering around him that satisfies his eyes (cakṣurindriya). Gaṇeśa in such a mood will surely concede the prayer of a devotee.

प्रकाशञ्जपारक्तरत्नप्रसून-

प्रवालप्रभातारुणज्योतिरेकम् ।

प्रलम्बोदरं वक्रतुण्डैकदन्तं

गणाधीशमीशानसूनुं तमीडे ॥ ३ ॥

*prakāśaṅ-japārakta-ratna prasūna-
pravāla-prabhātāruṇa-jyotirekam
pralambodaram vakratuṇḍaika-dantam
gaṇādhīśam īśānasūnum tam īde.*

I adore Gaṇeśa, the son of Parameśvara, that peerless effulgence resembling in redness the *japā* flower, the red ruby, the tendril, the coral and the rising Sun. I adore him who has the big belly, the curved trunk and a single tusk.

It is a convention to describe Vināyaka, the son possessing the features of his father, to indicate that they are but different forms in which the One Supreme God manifests himself to enable the devotees to approach him in the manner chosen by

each one of them. The redness of Śiva is therefore transferred to Gaṇeśa. The huge belly indicates that the whole universe is in him. The trunk of the elephant is a part of the Omkāra mūrti that Vināyaka is. It stands for the bestow of grace (arul śakti), one of the five cosmic acts of the Supreme Being. His singular tusk reminds us of his heroic exploit of destroying Gajamukhāsura with the other tusk as his weapon that is no longer there. The tusk used as a weapon represents his *nigraha śakti*; the single tusk that now adorns his body represents *anugraha śakti*.

विचित्रस्फुरद्रत्नमालाकिरीटं
किरीटोल्लसच्चन्द्रेस्वाविभूषम् ।
विभूषैकभूषं भवध्वंसहेतुं
गणाधीशमीशानमनु तमीडे ॥ ४ ॥

vicitra-sphurad-ratna-mālā-kirīṭam
kirīṭollasac-candra-rekhā-vibhūṣam
vibhūṣaikabhūṣam bhavadhvamsa-hetum
gaṇādhiśam-īśānasūnum tum īde.

I venerate Gaṇapati, the son of Maheśvara who wears a bracelet and crown studded with multi-coloured bright gems; on the crown shines the bright disc of the moon. He is the matchless Being that adds charm to the ornaments themselves. It is he who causes the destruction of this cycle of births and deaths.

We find the final word of the first and second line forming the initial word of the second and third line respectively. This is a type of poetic device called 'antādi' which is usually adopted to link the preceding and the following verse. This

device may also be taken to suggest here the metaphysical concept of the Supreme Being being the source as well as the culmination of the Universe. Saint Jñānasambandha refers in his prayer to Gaṇapati this aspect of his destroying the obstacles to the final goal of liberation 'Tanadu aḍi vaḷipaluṃ avar idar kaṭi Gaṇapati'.

उदञ्जद्भुजावल्लरीदृश्यमूलो-

चलद्भ्रूलताविभ्रमभ्राजदक्षम् ।

मरुत्सुन्दरीचामैः सेव्यमानं

गणाधीशमीशानसूनुं तमीडे ॥ ५ ॥

udañjad-bhujāvallārī-dṛśyamūlo-

ccalad-bhrūlatā-vibhramabhrāja-dakṣam

marutsundarī-cāmaraiḥ sevyamānam

gaṇādhīśam Īśānasūnum tam īde.

I revere Gaṇapati, the son of Lord Siva who has his uplifted hands beautiful like creepers and eyes that look beautiful with the knittings of eyebrows that extend to the corners of the eyes. He is propitiated by divine damsels who wave chowries.

To a man in the street who looks at the figure of Gajānana with his physical eyes there may not appear in that form anything that satisfies his aesthetic sense. But to a true devotee like Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda the inner beauty reveals itself as he perceives through a different lens at a different level. The uplifted hands with the aṅkuśa (goad) and pāśa (noose) remind the devotee of the benign grace behind the weapons which are used by him in controlling our wild senses which run amuck.

in great frenzy and direct them on the righteous path. To a discerning mind, his multidimensional form viz. the head of an animal, the hands of Gods and the feet of men, will reveal his all pervasive nature and rulership of the Universe. It is no wonder that the divine damsels serve the Supreme Lord, the Vināyaka [one apart from whom (vinayaka) there is no leader (nāyaka)].

स्फुरन्निष्ठुरालोल पिङ्गाक्षितारं
 कृपाकोमलोदारलोलावतारम् ।
 कलाविन्दुगं गीयते योगिवर्यैः
 गणार्धेशमीशानसूनुं तमीडे ॥ ६ ॥

Sphuran-niṣṭhurālola-piṅgākṣitāram
Kṛpākomalodāra-līlāvatāram
Kalābindugam gīyate yogivaryaiḥ
Gaṇādhīśam Īśānasūnum tam īde.

I extol Gaṇeśa, the son of Īśāna whose eyes are glittering, commanding, tremulous and crimson. He has taken a form that exudes compassion, is tender, lofty and sportful. It is sung by great mystic poet-sages that he pervades the bindu and kalā.

One finds in the Gaṇeśamūrti, the fierce and benign forms, harsh and tender features, to deal with the wicked and the good. Looked at in another way He is beyond the pair of opposites love and anger, good and evil, light and shade. He pervades everything such as cause and effect, to wit the *bindu*, the root matter, the pure. Counterpart of *māyā*, the material substratum of the cosmos, the deluding medium, as well as

kalā, the principle or tattva that generates finite experience, one of the six strata of cosmos of Saiva philosophy. Whatever path one pursues, be it bhakti, yoga or Jñāna, Gaṇeśa favours them all. Kapiladeva, the author of Tiruvirattai maṇimālai in the 11th Tirumurai shows the bhakti mārga; Avvaiyar in her Vināyakar Akaval indicates the yoga mārga; Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda in this verse points to the jñāna mārga

यमेकाक्षरं निर्मलं निर्विकल्पं
 गुणातीतमानन्दमाकारशून्यम् ।
 परं पारमोंकारमाप्नायगर्भं
 वदन्ति प्रगल्भं पुराणं तमीडे ॥ ७ ॥

Yam ekākṣaram nirmalam nirvikalpam
Guṇātītam ānandam ākāraśūnyam
Param pāram oṃkāram āpnāyagarbham
Vadanti pragalbham purāṇam tam īde.

I pay my honour to gaṇapati who is the One eternal, pure, immutable, beyond all qualities and attributes and blissful. He has no specific form; he is the most supreme praṇava that is the secret of the scriptures. They (wise men) say that he is ancient and his nature inscrutable.

Gaṇapathi is adored equally by the Śaivas, Vaiṣṇavas Śāktas, Jainas and Bauddhas. So he is unique among the manifestations of the Supreme Eternal Being. Hence he is 'eka' and 'akṣara'. In fact we have the worship of the Heramba-Gaṇapati in Tibet in both the Buddhist vihāras and Śiva temples. In Khotan, one finds Vināyaka with four hands

carrying *modaka*, *añkuṣa* etc. Similarly one can, see Vināyaka in the form conceived by the inhabitants of Srīlaṅka, Burma, Siam, Kamboja, Campā, Jāvā, Japan and Mexico. The epithets *nirmalam*, *nirvikalpam* etc. show his identity with Parabrahman. He occupies the pride of place in the pañcāyatana pūjā, the worship of Gaṇapati, Śiva, Śūrya, Śakti and Viṣṇu. The *Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa* recounts that Devī Lalitā conferred on Vināyaka the honour of being the recipient of 'agrapūjā', the one to be worshipped first among the Gods. The *Gaṇeśa Purāṇa* enjoins that the Saivas, Vaiṣṇavas, Śaktas and Sauras should worship Gaṇapati in all rituals auspicious or otherwise. *Garuḍa purāṇa* refers to the Omkāra rūpa of Vināyaka thus 'Omkārarūpī bhagavān uktas tu Gaṇanāyakaḥ' The shape of the head and the trunk of Gajānana reminds one of the shape of Omkāra which comprises of the nāda and the bindu, the akāra-ukāra-makāra Combine, that is extolled in the Upaniṣads in Omkāropāsanā section.

चिदानन्दसान्द्राय शान्ताय तुभ्यं
 नमो विश्वकर्त्रे च हर्त्रे च तुभ्यम् ।
 नमोऽनन्तलीलाय कैवल्यभासे
 नमो विश्वबीज प्रसीदेशसूनो ॥ ८ ॥

*cidānandasāndrāya śāntāya tubhyam
 namo viśvakartre ca hartre ca tubhyam
 namo 'nanta - līlāya kaivalyabhāse
 namo viśvabīja prasīdeśasūno.*

O son of Īśa. be pleased. I offer my obeisance to Thee who is the plenitude of consciousness and bliss and who at once is tranquil. Obeisance to Thee, the creator of the Universe and its destroyer.

Obeisance to Him of countless divine sports, one who shines in his pure state and is the source of the Universe.

He is indeed an abode of apparent contrasts of surging waves of bliss and of absolute tranquility; being the author of both creation and destruction; being engaged in numerous sports and yet being in a state of purity and poise. He is at once 'lokarakṣaka' and 'muktisādhaka' as Saṅkara Bhagavat-pāda puts it in Sri Gaṇeśapancarātnam.

इमं सुस्त्वं प्रातरुत्थाय भक्त्या
 पठेद्यस्तु मर्त्यो लभेत्सर्वकामान् ।
 गणेशप्रसादेन सिध्यन्ति वाचो
 गणेशे विभौ दुर्लभं किं प्रसन्ने ॥ ९ ॥

*Imam sustavam prātar utthāya bhaktyā
 Pathed yastu martyo labhet sarvakāmān
 Gaṇeśaprasādena sidhyanti vāco
 Gaṇeśe vibhau durlabham kim prasanne.*

Whosoever recites this wholesome prayer with devotion as soon as he gets up early in the morning shall achieve all that he desires. All utterances indeed are fructified by the grace of Gaṇeśa, for if Lord Gaṇeśa is pleased what is there that is not attainable?

Devotion on the part of a sādḥaka evokes the compassion of the God and without that earned grace of Gaṇeśa, nothing can be achieved. There is nothing that is not wrought by prayer and let us all pray to Gaṇeśa for the well being of all.

Octad dedicated to Sri Kala - Bhairava of Kasi*

Śaṅkara Bhagavad Pada

This OCTAD (group of eight verses) is dedicated to Lord Kālabhairava, one of the main manifestations of Śiva in Kāśī. He is considered to be the Dispenser of justice to those who die at Kāśī, after taking stock of their merits and sins and absolving them of their sins through His grace. Dark and terrific in appearance (Kāla - bhairava), He lords over Death. He rules over the destinies of those living in Kāśī and hence His mercy is sought by all residing in that city.

KĀŚĪ means the shining city. It shines by its being the cradle of pristine culture and Learning,

*Translation and notes by Dr. C. S. Venkateswaran.

by its association with the perennial sacred Ganges flowing past and by its being presided over by deities like Viśvanātha, Bhairava, Mādhava, Annapūrṇā and others.

The last line of each verse ends with the refrain meaning "I worship Lord Kālabhairava, the presiding deity of the city of KĀŚĪ (Kāśīkā-pura)." Here the reading followed is after the text of the VĀNĪ VILAS edition which has readings slightly varying in a few places from other editions of the text though the meaning is practically retained. (Vide Ashtekar & Co. Poona, 1924 Edn.)

[1]

देवराजसेव्यमानपावनाङ्घ्रिपङ्कजं

व्यालयज्ञसूत्रमिन्दुशेखरं कृपाकरम् ।

नारदादियोगिबृन्दवन्दितं दिगम्बरं

काशिकापुराधिनाथकालभरवं भजे ॥ १ ॥

Devarājosevyamāna-pāānāṅghripaṅkajam

Vyālayajñasūtram induśekharam kṛpākaram

Nāradādiyogibṛnda-vanditam digambaram

Kāśīkāpurādhinātha-Kālabhairavaṁbhaje

I worship Lord Kāla - bhairava, the presiding deity of the city of KĀŚĪ whose holy lotus - feet are worshipped by Deva - rāja (Indra) the king of the gods, who, the mine of mercy, has the serpent for His sacred thread, and the Moon as His crest ornament, and who the Dig - ambara Lord, is

worshipped by groups of sages (yogins) headed by Nārada.

The Lord has Dik (space) as Ambara (dress). He is space-glad—a refined way of expressing that He is without any dress. A yogin, like Nārada possesses super-natural powers or siddhis.

[2]

भानुकोटिभास्वरं भवाब्धितारकं परं
नीलकण्ठपीप्सितार्थदायकं त्रिलोचनम् ।
कालकालमम्बुजाक्षमक्षशूलमक्षरं
काशिक्रापुराधिनाथकालभैरवं भजे ॥ २ ॥

*Bhānukotībhāsvaram bhavābdhitārakam
param
Nīlakaṇṭhamīpsitārthadāyakam trilocanam-
kāla kālam ambujākṣam akṣaśūlam akṣaram
Kāśikāpurādhinātha-kālabhairavam bhaje.*

I worship the Lord, Kālabhairava.....

Who is brilliant like a crore of rising Suns, the supreme Saviour from the ocean of transmigratory existence, who, the blue-necked and three-eyed god, is the giver of all desired objects and who is KĀLAKĀLA, the lotus-eyed Lord, Imperishable, holding the rosary (akṣa) and the trident (śūla).

Akṣa is the rosary of beads. Akṣa also sometimes means a serpent which the Lord, being terrific in his appearance, holds as a rosary along with the trident held in His hand. The Lord rules over Kāla (Time) as well as the god of Death. The swallowing serpent with its tortuous body and the Trident with

three points would symbolize Time with its three states (past, present and future) kept by Kālakāla under His control. Purānic tradition has it that Śiva killed Kāla with His trident to save His devotee Mārkaṇḍeya from the hands of Yama, god of Death.

[3]

शूलटङ्कपाशदण्डपाणिमादिकारणं

श्यामकायमादिदेवमक्षरं निरामयम् ।

भीमविक्रमं प्रभुं विचित्रताण्डवप्रियं

काशिकापुराधिनाथकालभैरवं भजे ॥ ३ ॥

śūlaṭaṅkapāśadaṇḍapāṇim ādikāraṇam.

śyāmakāyam ādidevam akṣaram nirāmayam

bhīmavikramam prabhum vicitratāṇḍava-
priyam

kaśikāpurādhinātha- Kālabhairavam bhaje

I worship Lord Kālabhairava...

Who holds (in His hands) the trident, the axe, the noose and the rod and who, is the Primal Cause of the Universe, who the Primeval god has a blue body, and who is imperishable and pure, And the Lord of terrific prowess, fond of the wonderful dance (Tāṇḍava).

Here Kālabhairava is identified with Brahman the Primal Cause of the Universe (Janmādyasya yataḥ. Br. sūtra 1-1-2) His dance (Tāṇḍava) is varied and wonderful (Vicitra.)

[4]

भुक्तिमुक्तिदायकं प्रशस्तचारुविग्रहं
 भक्तवत्सलं स्थिरं समस्तलोकविग्रहम् ।
 निकणन्मनोज्ञहेमकिङ्किणीलसत्कटिं
 काशिकापुराधिनाथकालभैरवं भजे ॥ ४ ॥

bhukti-mukti-dāyakam praśasta - cāru-vīgra-
ham
bhaktavatsalam sthīram samasta loka vīgra-
ham
nīkvaṇanmanoñña-hemakiṅkiṇī-lasat-kaṭim
kāśikāpurādhinātha-kālabhairavam bhaje

I worship Lord Kālabhairava.....

Who is the bestower of enjoyment and Liberation, the Lord with a body excellent and charming, who is fond of His devotees the Immutable One who holds the whole world in His body, And whose waist shines with the charming golden bells which tinkle at the time of His dance (Tāṇḍava).

The readings "VINIKVAṆAT" and "Ninikvaṇat" are identical in sense.

[5]

धर्मसेतुपालकं त्वधर्ममार्गनाशकं
 कर्मपाशमोचकं सुशर्मदायकं विभुम् ।
 स्वर्णवर्णं केशपाशशोभिताङ्गनिर्मलं
 काशिकापुराधिनाथकालभैरवं भजे ॥ ५ ॥

*dharmasetupālakam tvadharmamārganāśakam
karmapāśamocakam suśarmadāyakam vibhum
svarnavarṇa keśapāśa-śobhitāṅka-nirmalam
kāśīkāpurādhinātha-kālabhairavam bhaje.*

I worship the Lord Kālabhairava...

The Supreme Lord who is the Protector of the dam of *Dharma* and the Destroyer of the path of *Adharma*, who removes the bonds of *karma* and bestows supreme bliss, And who, the Pure One, has His body adorned with the golden profuse locks of hair.

Dharma, righteousness, prevents destruction caused by unrighteousness like a dam which prevents devastating flood. Kālabhairava is Dharmarāja who supports *Dharma* and destroys *Adharma*. He purifies the actions of all beings and gives them happiness.

The reading “*śvarṇa-varṇa-śeṣa-pāśa-śobhitāṅga-maṇḍalam*” accords with the epithet of the ‘Lord “*vyāla-yajñasūtra*”. It means “whose body shines with the golden-hued serpent (*Śeṣa*) serving as a cord (sacred thread).”

[6]

रत्नपादुकाप्रभाभिरामपादयुग्मकं

नित्यमद्वितीयमिष्टदैवतं निरञ्जनम् ।

मृत्युदर्पनाशनं करालदंष्ट्रभूषणं

काशिकापुराधिनाथकालभैरवं भजे ॥ ६ ॥

*ratnapādukā prabhābhirāma pādayugmakam
Nityam advitīyam iṣṭadaivatam nirañjanam
mṛtyudarpanāśanam karāladamṣtra - bhū
ṣaṇam
kāśikāpurādhinātha - kālabhairavam bhaje.*

I worship Lord Kālabhairava...

Whose pair of feet is charming with the lustre of the jewelled sandals, who is eternal, without a second (an equal), the favourite god of purity, who destroyed the pride of Mṛtyu and who shines with His dreadful teeth.

The reading *Karālā-damṣtra-bhīṣaṇam would also suit the context. Mṛtyu is Yama, god of Death.

[7]

अट्टहासभिन्नपद्मजाण्डकोशसन्तति
दृष्टिपातनष्टपापजालमुग्रशासनम् ।
अष्टसिद्धिदायकं कपालमालिकाधरं
काशिकापुराधिनाथकालभैरवं भजे ॥ ७ ॥

*Aṭṭahāsabhinnā - padmajāṇḍa kośa - san-
tatim
dṛṣṭi - pāda - naṣṭapāpajālam ugraśāsanam
Aṣṭasiddhi - dāyakam kapālamālikādharam
kāśikāpurādhinātha - kālabhairavam bhaje.*

I worship Lord Kālabhairava...

Who by His deafening peals of laughter has rent the vaults of many a Brahmāṇḍa (world) who, by

His glance destroys hosts of sins, the wielder of severe ordinances, And who bestows the eight *siddhis* and wears the garland of skulls.

Padmajah is the god born out of the lotus which appeared from Viṣṇu's navel. Padmajāṇḍa is Brahmāṇḍa the Universe. The eight Siddhis are: aṇimā, mahimā, garimā, laghimā, prāpti, prakāmya, īṣitva and vaśitva. The faculty of becoming 1. very small in size like an atom (aṇu), 2. extremely big in size, 3. extremely heavy, 4. extremely light, 5. obtaining anything, 6. freedom of will, 7. mastery over others and 8. control over everything.

The reading "kapāla-māli-kandharam" means Whose neck has the garland of skulls.

[8]

भूतसङ्घनायकं विशालकीर्तिदायकं
 काशिसिलोकपुण्यपापशोधकं विभुम् ।
 नीतिमार्गकोविदं पुरातनं जगत्पतिं
 काशिकापुराधिनाथकालभैरवं भजे ॥ ८ ॥

*bhūtasanghanāyakam viśāla kīrtidāyakam
 kāśivāsiloka - puṇyapāpaśodhakam vibhum
 nītimārḡa kovīdam purātanam jagatpatim
 kāśikāpurādhinātha-kālabhairavam bhaje.*

I worship Lord Kālabhairava...

Who lords over the host of *bhūtas* (spirits) and bestows wide fame, The Lord who analyses the merits and sins of the dwellers of Kāśī and purifies them, And who is an expert guide in the path of

right conduct, and the Primeval Lord of the Universe.

[9]

कालभैरवाष्टकं पठन्ति ये मनोहरं
 ज्ञानमुक्तिसाधकं विचित्रपुण्यवर्धनम् ।
 शोकमोहदैन्यलोभकोपतापनाशनं
 ते प्रयान्ति कालभैरवाङ्घ्रिसन्निधिं ध्रुवम् ॥ ९ ॥

*kālabhairavāṣṭakam paṭhanti ye manoharam
 jñānamuktī sādhakam vicitra - puṇyavardha-
 nam
 śoka - moha - lobha - dainya - kopa - tāpa-
 nāśanam
 te prayānti kālabhairavāṅghrisannidhim
 dhruvam.*

The octad dedicated to Kālabhairava is charming. It is the means leading to spiritual wisdom and liberation. It promotes merits of various kinds. It destroys grief, delusion, avarice, misery, anger and all tormenting pain. Those who chant this hymn verily go near (and attain the grace of) Lord Kālabhairava.

The last verse is the *phala - śruti* - declaration of the fruit (*phalam*) that accrues to the devotee who chants "Kālabhairavāṣṭakam."

THE HERITAGE OF INDIA

T.M.P. Mahadevan

[A lecture delivered on the Hill of the Pnyx, Athens, on June 1, 1966, in connection with the Athens Meeting organized by the Royal National Foundation, Greece.]

India, like Greece, is not a mere piece of land. She is "a tradition, a spirit, a light" in the world of President Radhakrishnan, "Her physical and spiritual frontiers do not coincide."¹ The cultural heritage of India was never confined to the sub-continent which extends from the Himalayas to Cape Comoria. There is a tradition which traces the original home of the people of India to the Arctic region. There is a theory about the migra-

1. S. Radhakrishnan, *Religion and Society* (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1959), p 102.

tion of the Mediterranean people into India. Whatever be the truth regarding these, there are clear elements of universality in the composition of India's culture. That was why when it was carried to other lands scattered far and wide, it found ready acceptance. The evidence of Indian influence is observable in plenty even today in the regions of South-East Asia. In the distant past when goods, laden vessels sailed to these regions, the spiritual gifts of India also were freely offered to their inhabitants. Northwards commerce and culture spread to Central Asia and China. While it is fairly well recognized that there is the unmistakable stamp of India on the rest of the Asian continent—it is not so well known that in ancient days there was close cultural kinship between India and Greece. It has now been established that there was contact between India and Greece even long before Alexander's campaign. This contact was first through the Achaemenid Empire, then through that of the Seleucids, and finally, under the Romans, through the traders of the Indian Ocean. The Greeks of Asia Minor-Ionia-had interchange of ideas with India through the medium of Persia. Panini, the grammarian, who is generally assigned to the seventh century B. C., refers to the Greek script as *yavanāni lipi*, the term *yavana* being the Sanskritised form of 'Ionian' *Yavanikā* is the name of the curtain used on the stage of the Indian

theatre. It is obvious that exponents and exemplars of literature, science, philosophy and religion travelled not infrequently between the two countries. The cultural climate was quite favourable for the sharing of ideas between India and Hellas. It was an age which did not know the East-West or Asia-Europe division. There was one-world, although, geographically it was not a big world.

Alexander's campaign to India had very little political significance but was of considerable cultural value. The Greek settlement in Asia that followed, and the early Hindu kingdoms were cosmopolitan in character. It is known that Alexander himself, while he was resting for sometime at Taxila after crossing the Indus in 326 B.C., took the opportunity of visiting Indian ascetics and philosophers who were residing in a forest at some distance from the city. It was not only soldiers that accompanied him on his Indian expedition but also a number of learned men belonging to a great variety of disciplines. We have also accounts of the visits of Indian sages to Athens and of their meetings with Greek philosophers. Eusebius (A.D. 315) speaks of a tradition which he attributes to Aristoxenus, the well-known writer on harmonics and a pupil of Aristotle, that certain learned Indians actually visited Athens and conversed with Socrates. When asked by them to explain the scope of his philosophy, Socrates is stated to have replied,

‘An inquiry into human affairs.’ Thereupon, Aristoxenus tells us, one of the visiting Indians burst out laughing. ‘How’, he asked, ‘could a man grasp human things without first mastering the Divine? Reference to the visit of the Indians to Athens is also to be found in the fragment of Aristotle preserved in Diogenes Laertius. It is a matter for particular pleasure and pride to me to be reminded on this historic occasion that in the cosmopolitan city of Athens my forebears sojourned in order to participate in and contribute their share to the world’s progress in wisdom.

The similarity between Greek philosophy and early Indian thought is as close as closeness could be under such circumstances. For the speculations of the Ionian Greeks who were the founding fathers of what has now come to be called Western philosophy, parallels could be cited from the Vedas and the Upaniṣads. The quest of the leaders of the Eleatic school, Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Zeno, for the One Reality underlying material phenomena is very much the same as the metaphysical quest of the Upaniṣadic seers for ‘That’ by knowing which everything else becomes known. The Socratic Irony may be matched by a passage in the *Kena Upaniṣad* which declares with reference to the Truth : ‘It is not understood by those who understand; it is understood by those who do not understand’ (ii, 3). While it is possible to hold that the

beginnings of Greek philosophy were not directly influenced by Indian thought, the Indian influence on some of the subsequent developments in Greek philosophy cannot be doubted. The Orphic cults, Pythagoreanism, Platonism and Neoplatonism, the mystical strands of which mark at least a partial break with the Greek tradition of rationalism and humanism, bear ample evidence of inspiration from Indian sources. Particular mention may be made here of certain characteristically Indian doctrines : the divinity and immortality of the soul, its transmigration which constitutes its bondage to the time-process, the possibility of its release from metempsychosis through discipline and training, the oneness of all life, and the non-duality of the so-called individual soul and God, were taught in the Orphic cults; the doctrine of rebirth figures prominently in the teachings of Pythagoras; almost all the theories, religious, philosophical, and mathematical, taught by Pythagoreans, observes Rawlinson, were known in India in the sixth century B. C. :¹ in Plato there are echoes of several Indian doctrines—the soul is regarded as simple, by nature, indestructible and immortal; it migrates from birth to birth in accordance with a 'cycle of necessity' the counterpart of the principle of *karma*; the simile of the Cave in the seventh book of the

1. See *The Legacy of India*, ed. by G. T. Garratt (Oxford University Press, London, 1938), p. 5.

Republic teaches, in principle, the Vedāntic doctrine of *māyā*; Plato believes that the world is the body of God in the same way as the Upaniṣads believe; the division of the ideal polity into classes bears close resemblance to the classification of *varṇas*; in Neoplatonism the imprint of Indian thought is even deeper—in fact, it may justifiably be claimed that the philosophy of Plotinus is the earliest known version of Vedānta in the West; the ultimate reality, according to Plotinus, is the One Being which can be indicated only *via negativa* as 'not this, not that'; the world is not a creation but an emanation of the One Being; the soul can regain its oneness with the primal Being through ethical and spiritual exercise. What may be described as the mystical vein in Hellenic culture—what has been called the Platonic tradition in Western philosophy—owes at least some of its characteristic doctrines to India.¹ It was a happy augury for the future of human well-being that, at such an early formative period in human history, Hellenic humanism and Indian spirituality came together and exerted a healthy influence on each other. The world needs a synthesis of the two today as much as it did in the past.

1. See the present writer's article 'Western and Eastern Thought' in *Goethe and the modern age* (Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, 1950), pp 284-303.

The concept of the spiritual is central to the cultural legacy of India. This does not, however, mean that the Indians are a race of naked fakirs or starving ascetics, or that they are asked to become such. A wrong image of India has been projected to the outside world by writers either because of scanty acquaintance with her complex culture, or because of prejudiced outlook. It is difficult, one should admit, to enter into the heart of a very ancient, yet living, culture. Aberrations and distortions are to be found in every part of the world. No generalisation should be made in regard to the genius of a people on the basis of these. Even with the best of intentions one may arrive at wrong conclusions. One such conclusion is that India's attitude towards life and the world is one of negation. A well-known Western historian of India, who has great sympathy and respect for her culture, rightly combats the charge that "ancient India was land of 'life-negating' ascetics, imposing their gloomy and sterile ideas upon the trusting millions who were their followers." But, he seems to miss the point when he says: "Dandin's description of the joys of a simple meal served in a comparatively poor home is probably more typical of ancient Indian everyday life than are the Upaniṣads".¹

1. A.L. Basham; *The Wonder that was India* (Sidgwick and Jackson, London, 1954) p. 9.

Surely, no one believes that the ideal Upaniṣadic life is the average man's everyday life, that every Indian is an Upaniṣadic sage. The crucial question is this: Does the acceptance of the Upaniṣadic ideal imply the adoption of negative and ostentatious asceticism such as starving the body and lying on a bed of spikes? The answer is clearly 'no'. Let me cite a couple of passages from the Upaniṣads and their interpretation of Śaṅkarācārya,—who, in passing, it may be mentioned, is regarded as the leading exemplar of negative asceticism—in order to show that the object of these philosophical texts is not to reduce human beings into killjoys and walking skeletons. A text of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* mentions fasting (*anāśaka*), among the disciplines that lead to the knowledge of the ultimate Reality (*Brahman*).¹ Explaining the meaning of the term *fasting (anāśaka)*, Śaṅkara remarks that the Upaniṣad recommends here not physical fasting but refraining from pampering to the desires. The term means, according to Śaṅkara, abstention from sense-indulgence, and not starvation. For, he adds with a sense of humour, if one starves one would die, and not realize the Self." In the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, there is the following prayer for wealth: "Thereafter, do bring me prosperity in wool, along with cattle! Hail!" (i. 4.)

1. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, IV, iv, 22.

2. *Bhojananivṛttau mriyāta eva, na ātmavedanam.*

*tato me śriyam āvaha, lomaśām
paśubhiḥ saha-svāhā*

Commenting on the first word 'Thereafter' (*tataḥ*), Śaṅkara observes : 'After the acquisition of wisdom bring me wealth; for prosperity placed in the hands of a fool makes, verily, for evil, (*amedhaso hi śrīr anarthāyaiveti*). It is quite clear that, according to the Upaniṣads and the allied sacred texts, the life of the spirit is essentially a life of moderation. Witness the unambiguous teaching of the *Bhagavad-gītā* in regard to *yoga* : 'Yoga is not for him who overeats, nor for him who fasts completely; it is not for him who is given to too much sleeping, nor for him who keeps total vigil. *Yoga*, which destroys sorrow, is gained only by him who is moderate in diet and recreation, moderate in activity, sleep and wakefulness' (vi, 16-17).

The spiritual, in Indian thought, is not to be confused with spirit-phenomena or para-psychical manifestations. No system of Indian philosophy is concerned with any of these. The true Spirit is the whole, the Full, the plenary Reality (*pūrṇa*). There is nothing higher than the Spirit (*Puruṣa*), declares the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, it is the final limit, the supreme goal.' Because it fills all, the Spirit is

1. *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, I, iii, 11

called *Puruṣa* (*sarva-pūraṇāt puruṣaḥ*). All the schools of Indian philosophy, except the Cārvāka Materialism which never attained to the status of a definitive system, consider the spirit to be of the nature of consciousness. Consciousness is not the same as the mind; what is called the mind is constituted by subtle matter. The spirit it is — variously referred to as *Ātman*, *Brahman*, *Kūṣastha*, *Prajñāna*, *Puruṣa*, etc.,—that is the non-composite, indestructible, eternal reality. The Self or Spirit is not only the root-reality; it is also the highest value. The goal of Indian philosophy is the realization of the Self—not the limited individual soul, but the supreme Spirit. The theistic systems call it God; the non-dualist philosophy regards it as the Absolute; some unorthodox schools describe it even as a process or as a status. But, according to all the traditions, the ground-reality which is also the goal is spiritual, in the sense I have already defined.

There are, to be sure, pluralisms and realisms among the philosophical schools of India. They believe in a plurality of souls and in the reality of the external world. But, as has been pointed out by the teachers of Advaita-Vedānta whose greatest consolidator was Śaṅkara, all the arguments advanced by the realistic-pluralistic philosophies succeed in establishing only the plurality of empirical souls and the empirical reality of the world.

Distinctions in birth, physical conditions, mental attitudes, individuality, character, etc., belong to the soul as conditioned by the mind-body complex, and not to it in its purity. Similarly, the external world is real and independent only as distinct from the individual conditioned soul. This, however, does not militate against the plenary reality of the non-dual Spirit. The more includes the less, the whole its parts, the ground its appearances.

The primacy of the spirit, thus, is a pervasive doctrine in Indian philosophy. Let me show how this is so by referring to two philosophical systems which are pluralistic, one belonging to the heterodox group and the other to the orthodox. In Jainism, two fundamental categories are distinguished each from the other—soul (*jīva*) and non-soul (*ajīva*). The nomenclature itself is significant, since it is indicative of the primary place assigned to the soul in the system. A distinctive doctrine of Jainism is that there is no particle of matter which is not ensouled. I do not think that it is very correct to describe this view as hylozoism; for what pervades all is not mere life but soul. The soul's intrinsic nature is one of perfection; infinite intelligence, infinite peace, infinite faith and infinite power are what characterize the soul. But, these features get obscured because of the soul's union with matter which constitutes its bondage. The main concern of Jainism is to understand the

nature of this bondage, and to prescribe a course of discipline that will restore to the soul its true nature. It is the association with *karma*, which is conceived in Jainism as consisting of subtle matter, that binds the soul to the empirical cycle of birth and death. The association takes place in two stages: ignorance of the ultimate truth and the accompanying psychic conditions impel the karmic matter to move towards the soul. This is known as *āsrava*. Then the actual influx of *karma* takes place. This is called *bandha*. The freeing of the soul from the fetter of *karma* also is effected in two steps. The influx of *karma* is arrested, first, through right knowledge and self-restraint. This is *saṁvara*. Next, the *karma* that is already attached to the soul is removed. This is *nirjara*. When the soul is thus rid of all trace of *karma*, it regains its natural purity and perfection.

I chose Jainism as an illustrative system for showing that even in a heterodox, pluralistic and non-theistic school, the primary philosophical concern is the perfection of the soul. From among the orthodox schools, I shall select the Sāṅkhya, which also is pluralistic and non-theistic, to illustrate the same point. The two categories recognised in the Sāṅkhya system are spirit (*puruṣa*) and nature (*prakṛti*). The two are diametrically opposed to each other. The spirit is pure, changeless intelligence, and is manifold; nature is primarily

one, is ever mutable, and it alternately evolves the material world out of itself and re-absorbs it. Nature has no purpose of its own, its evolution and involution are for the sake of the spirit. The Sāṅkhya seeks to prove the existence of spirit and nature through arguments. Among the proofs given for the existence of spirit is the one which says that nature which is a composite of three *guṇas*, (constituents), *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*, serves the purpose of some being other than itself, as for instance, a bed or a seat; that being is spirit. The term *guṇa* itself means what is subordinate. *Prakṛti* or nature which the *guṇas* go to form is subordinate to *puruṣa* or spirit. Spirit which is mere sentience is eternal and omnipresent. It forgets the truth about itself and identifies itself with the products of nature. Hence the misery it undergoes in metempsychosis. Through discrimination and self-discipline, when the spirit ceases from wrong identification with the body, mind etc., the goal of life, *kaivalya*, the state of purity and perfection, is attained. Thus, in the Sāṅkhya system also, the primacy of the spirit is stressed. This is true in general of all Indian philosophy. Philosophy in India is thus spirit - oriented.

Another prominent feature of Indian philosophy is the search for metaphysical unity. This is a feature which characterises even pluralistic systems. In the tradition of Vedānta, for instance, there are

pluralistic as well as monistic standpoints. Of the Vedāntic schools, Dvaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita, and Advaita are the most prominent ones. Dvaita, which literally means 'dualism', stands ostensibly for a radical pluralism. As expounded by Madhvācārya (thirteenth century A.D.), it teaches that there is a plurality of reals. "Diverse are all the things of the world, and they possess diverse attributes." The system formulates a fivefold difference : difference between (i) God and soul, (ii) soul and soul, (iii) God and matter, (iv) soul and matter, and (v) one material thing and another. God, souls, and the external world are all equally eternal. But, it is to be noted, God alone is the supreme reality (*sarvottama*), endowed with the plenitude of all excellences (*guṇa-pūrṇa*). There is nothing equal to him; nor is there any reality superior to him. Although the pluralistic standpoint of Dvaita-Vedānta may be described as that of the One-and-the Many, the Many are not on a par with the One. The principle of unity, here, takes the form of the affirmation of the One God on whom the souls and the world are absolutely dependent.

Viśiṣṭādvaita, which is the philosophy expounded by Rāmānuja (eleventh century A. D.), sponsors an organismic view of Reality. Reality, according to it, is the One-in-the-Many, or the One which accommodates the Many, within itself as parts.

The non-dual Spirit, Brahman, is not a distinctionless, homogeneous unity; but it is a unity which involves an internal plurality. A peculiar relation subsists between the one and the Many: it is the internal relation of inseparability (*apṛthaksiddhi*). The world of souls and matter is related to God, as mode to substance, as qualification to the qualified, as the body to the souls. Viśiṣṭādvaita affirms that Reality is non-dual (*advaita*), but as qualified (*viśiṣṭa*) by the world of souls and matter.

The quest for unity reaches its culmination in Advaita-Vedānta whose great consolidator was Ācārya Śaṅkara. Brahman, according to Advaita, is the One-without-a-second (*ekam eva advitīyam*). The world is an appearance of it, even as the snake is of the rope, or silver is of nacre. The so-called individual souls are individuals only so long as there is identification with body-mind complexes which are 'not-self'; when the wrong identification is removed through the removal of nescience, the soul is realized to be non-different from Brahman. Brahman or Ātman is of the nature of plenary being, pure consciousness, and the plenitude of bliss (*sat-cit-ānanda*). These expressions, however, should not be understood as standing for the characteristics of Brahman; for the category of substance-attribute does not apply to Brahman. By these expressions what is meant is that the non-dual Self is not non-being, not non-conscious,

and is not of the nature of misery. When the elements of disvalue are rejected, the supreme value stands self-revealed. Better than the term 'one' is the expression 'not-two' or 'non-dual'; for the self cannot be numbered the categories of quantity and number are inapplicable to it. Thus, the metaphysical quest for Reality finds its fulfilment in Advaita.

Although Advaita can be, and has been, expounded systematically, as a philosophy, it is not, strictly speaking, a system. *Non-dual-ism* is not an 'ism'. The negative prefix *non* applies not only to duality but also to *ism*. While Advaita comprehends all systems of philosophy, it is not exhausted by them. The pluralistic *Weltanschauungen* may imagine that they are opposed to Advaita; but Advaita is not opposed to any Reality-view. What Advaita aims at is to show that the rival views which are called philosophical systems have their limitations, and are helpful only in so far as they lead to something beyond. The goal of metaphysics is the total experience (*pūrṇā-nubhava*). The supreme objective of Advaita is to urge man not to rest till he has gained that experience.

One of the distinctive traits of Indian culture is the maintenance of a close alliance between philosophy and religion. It will not be true to say

that, in India, philosophy and religion are utterly indistinguishable from each other. Certainly, a distinction can be made between philosophical literature and religious lore. But, what is true is that the distinction between philosophy and religion never resulted in a divorce. This is because Indian philosophy is not satisfied with mere speculation but has a practical aim, and religion does not outlaw rational inquiry. '*Darśana*' which is the Sanskrit equivalent of 'philosophy' means 'direct perception' or 'intuitive insight'. Even from this expression we can learn that the goal of philosophy is not cogitation or theorizing but the direct experience of Reality. '*Mata*' is the term generally used for 'religion'. It means 'what is believed in after mature thought'. And so, religion in India does not abjure reasoning. If philosophy is not to waste itself in the desert sands of dry speculation, and if religion is not to end up as a matrix of dogmas, a healthy alliance between the two is essential. This is what the philosophers and religious leaders of India aimed at, and succeeded in a great measure in achieving.

The characteristic feature of the religions of India may all be traced to their comparative freedom from dogma. Absolute catholicity in matters of faith, absence of regimentation in regard to modes of belief and methods of worship, and non-insistence even on the concept of a personal deity

as a necessity are the special excellences of the Indian tradition in religion. These excellences are to be observed even as early as in the Vedic age. In the hymns of the *Rg-veda*, we come across religious statements which are of high philosophical import. Questions are asked not only about the ground of the universe but also about the source of the gods : To which god shall we offer our oblation (*kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema*)? Who has seen the first-born (*ko dadarśa prathamam jāyamānam*)? Although the names of many Gods are to be found in the Vedic hymns, it is not correct to say that the Vedic religion is polytheistic; for there is an unmistakable recognition, on the part of the Vedic seers, of the same Divinity underlying the various gods. A verse of the *Rg-veda* declares : 'The One Being the wise called by many names' (*ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadanti*) (I, 164, 46). A text of the *Atharva-veda* proclaims the same truth thus :

"He is the One, the One alone,
In Him all Deities become One alone."¹

There is a tendency in the Veda to praise, as the highest, one of the several gods at a time. Max Muller has called this tendency 'henotheism,' describing it as belief in *one* God as distinguished from monotheism which is belief in *one only* God.

1. sa eṣa eka ekavṛd eka eva sarve asmin devā ekavrato bhavanti xiii, 4.

The honotheistic tendency has also been referred to as 'opportunist monotheism'. But such descriptions do not do justice to the insight of the Vedic thinkers into the ground-divinity which unites the gods. What we have here is not the dogmatic theism of the exclusive religions, but 'philosophic theism'—a view of the one Godhead in the many gods. That is why it becomes a matter of indifference whether the godhead is addressed in the masculine, feminine, or neuter genders. A prayer addressed to the supreme Being in the *Atharva-veda* reads thus :

"Thou art woman, Thou art man;
Thou art boy, Thou maiden
Thou as the old man totterest with the staff;
Thou dost exist in all forms".¹

The following verse of the *R̥g-veda* employs the expression 'One' in all the three genders:

"One (*ekaḥ*, mas) is Agni kindled in many a place; 'One' (*ekaḥ*, mas) is Sūrya shining over all.

One (*ekā*, fem) is Uṣas illuminating all this.

That which is One (*ekam*, neut) has become This all (*sarvam*, neut)".²

1. tvam stri tvam pumān asi tvam kumāra uta vā kumāri
tvam jirṇo daṇḍena vañcasi tvam jāto bhavasi viśva-
tomukhaḥ. (X. 8. 27)

2. eka evāgnir bahudhā samiddha ekaḥ sūryo viśvam anu
prabhūtaḥ ekaivoṣāḥ sarvam idam vibhāty-ekam vā
idam vi babhūva sarvam. (viii, 58, 2).

The non-insistence on regimented uniformity in regard to religious beliefs and practices has been a characteristic feature of India's spiritual history. Following the Vedic teaching, the *Bhagavadgītā* proclaims in a couple of memorable verses the charter of universalism in faith. The Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who is the teacher of the Gītā, declares : "Whoever wishes to worship the Lord, with faith, in whichever form, will find his faith strengthened by Me. Howsoever men approach Me, even so do I accept them; for, on all sides, whatever path they may choose to follow is Mine".¹ The Emperor Asoka had this inscribed on his rock pillars : "The King, beloved of the Gods, honours every form of religious faith, whereof this is the root; to reverence one's own faith and never to revile that of others. Whoever acts differently injures his own religion while he wrongs another's".² Successive waves of the persecuted of other religions sought asylum on the shores of India—the Jews, the early Christians, the Zoroastrians, and the Non-conformists of various sorts; and all of them received protection and patronage at the hands of the princes and the people alike. The saints of the Mediaeval period who flooded the country in its different regions, with a devotional upsurge, pleaded unequivocally for catholicity and understanding

1. *Bhagavad-gītā*.

2. *Rock Edict. xii.*

in matters relating to faith. The author of a very popular hymn to Śiva (*Śivamahima-stotra*) sings thus, addressing the Lord : ‘There are different paths to Godhead, as enjoined in the texts belonging to the different schools—the Veda, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Pāśupata, and Vaiṣṇava. The devotees, following the different paths—straight or crooked-, deeming this path or that to be the best or the most appropriate one, on account of differences in taste, reach Thee alone, just as rivers enter the ocean’.

*trayī sāṅkhyam yogah
 paśupati matam vaiṣṇavam iti
 prabhinne prasthāne param
 idam adaḥ pathyam iti ca,
 rucīnām vaicitryād
 ṛju-kuṭīla-nānāpatha-juṣām
 nṛṇām eko gamyas-tvam
 aśi payasām arṇava iva.*

All the leaders of the present Indian renaissance have re-emphasised the same spirit of universalism in faith. Śrī Rāmakrishna of the last century taught, through precept and practice, that all religious paths led to the same goal even as the various bathing *ghats* led to the same Ganges. Mahātma Gāndhi expressed the following typical Hindu sentiment when he consecrated a temple in New Delhi : ‘It must be the daily prayer of every

adherent of the Hindu faith that every known religion of the world should grow from day to day and should serve the whole of humanity". This has been the tradition of the religious thought of India—not to speak ill of any religion and to honour Truth, wherever it may come from and whatever vesture it may wear.

I now turn to consider briefly the place assigned to ethics in the teachings of Indian culture. That without moral purity, not only the goal of religion, but also metaphysical insight cannot be gained is a principle universally accepted. We have here, in principle, the doctrine with which the students of Socratic thought are familiar—viz. that knowledge is virtue. An Upaniṣadic text declares; "Not he who has not ceased from evil conduct; not he who is not tranquil; not he who cannot concentrate his mind; not even he whose mind is not composed can reach the Self through knowledge".¹ And, there is the well-known saying, "The Vedas do not cleanse those who are unrighteous". That is why every system of thought or school of religion lays emphasis on ethical discipline. For example, Śāᅅkara includes among the qualifications for the prospective student of Vedānta such accomplishments as freedom from the passions, sublimation of the mind, and the

1. Kāᅅha Upaniṣad, ii, 24.

cultivation of the cardinal virtues. It is not creeds that are important, but character and conduct. If the way we live is pure, the vision of truth will follow. The term *dharma*, which is one of those untranslatable expressions, stands for the mode of life which is designed to lead man to the perception of truth and the gaining of perfection. *Dharma* is the doorway to *mokṣa*.

Life cannot be partitioned into what is holy and what is non-holy, what is sacred and what is secular. The man who is good only at sometimes, or towards some people, or in certain respects alone, is not really good. Virtue ought to govern the entire being of man. There could be no compromise between the good and the expedient. The expedient may appear to succeed temporarily; but it is the good that will ultimately win. It is this consideration that made Mahātmā Gāndhi in our time to introduce into politics and public affairs the essential principle of goodness. It was given to him to demonstrate in an unprecedented manner that even political objective ought to be, and can be, achieved through spiritual means. As long ago as in 1927, he wrote: "I do believe that if India has patience enough to go through the fire of suffering and to resist any unlawful encroachment upon its own civilisation which, imperfect though it undoubtedly is, has hitherto stood the ravages of time, she can make a lasting contribution to the

peace and solid progress of the world.” And again, two years later in 1929, he declared : “If we are to be saved and are to make a substantial contribution to the world’s progress, ours must emphatically and predominantiy be the way of peace”.

There is nothing in what I have said in regard to the fundamentals of Indian culture that is not universal in its appeal and application. The good and the wise do not make any distinction between man and man, people and people. They are truly the citizens of the world, and their example is for all the world to follow. It is in the fitness of things that His late Majesty King Paul should have chosen a cosmopolitan statement of Isocrates as expressing the spirit of the Athens Meeting. After legitimately singing the praise of the city of Athens in the *Panegyricus*, Isocrates observes, “She has brought it about that the name ‘Hellenes’ suggests no longer a race but an intelligence, and that the title ‘Hellenes’ is applied rather to those who share our culture than to those who share a common blood”. It may be of interest to this audience to know that Swami Vivekananda quotes a Sanskrit passage which means : “The Greeks may be foreigners; but such of them in whom wisdom is firmly established are worthy of veneration’ (*mlecchā vai yavanāh tesu eṣā vidya pratiṣṭhitā, ṛṣivat te pī pūjyante*). So far as wisdom and the

Godhead are concerned, there is not the distinction between nationals and aliens. The characteristic of *sagehood*; so goes a saying, is the same in *āryas and mlecchas* (*ṛṣi āryamlecchānām samānam lakṣaṇam*). Speaking of the Godhead as Varuṇa (the same as Ouranos), a Vedic text says 'Varuṇa is of our own land, and also of foreign land' (*yaj samdeśyo varuṇa yo videśyah*).¹ At random, one may pick identical statements made by sages of all lands and times to show that they belong to one community. The Upaniṣadic seer teaches: "Realize the Self" (*ātmānam viddhi*). Socrates: 'Know thyself'. A contemporary sage of India, Ramana Maharshi's central teaching is: "Inquire into the nature of the Self. Ask yourself persistently the question "Who am I?", until you discover your true Self".

There is a widespread doubt in the minds of intellectuals both in my country and abroad in regard to the future of the heritage of India in the face of the present encounter with science and technology. A visiting scholar from Poland expressed this doubt, a few months ago, to a living sage in South India, Śaṅkarācārya of Kāmakoti Pīṭham. The sage, who leads the ideal ascetic life as it obtained in ancient India, replied without any hesitation: "No damage will be done to the Soul of

1. Atharva-veda, iv, 16, 8.

India. If anything, modern science and technical knowledge may serve to dispel the lingering superstitions and blind beliefs. The culture of India has withstood many challenges, and has come out victorious each time.' There could be no better authentic evidence to the immortal nature of India's heritage than the words of the Sage Śaṅkarācārya. The heritage of India is not India's alone, but of all mankind.

The concept of spiritual unity that is to be realized through serene contemplation and spotless conduct is the finest flower on the tree of Indian culture which is ancient, and yet ever new. This blossom I have brought as India's offering to Goddess Athena, and as a tribute of Greek wisdom of which she is the inspirer. Let me conclude with a Vedic prayer to Athena's counterpart, Sarasvati. 'These offerings have been made by you with adoration' - Do say thus, Sarasvati, and be pleased with each one of our prayers! And, coming under thy protection, thou most beloved, may we approach thee as a tree for shelter!

Liberation—its Nature and Its Means in Advaita

Dr. N. Veezhinathan

The philosophy of Advaita on its practical side holds that *karma* when performed without any desire for its fruit paves the way for liberation through self-realization. The role of *karma* on the practical side of Advaita, therefore, centres around the nature of liberation according to Advaita.

According to Advaita, one and the same Brahman appears as *Īśvara*, *jīva* and the world. *Īśvara* always realizes His identity with Brahman and so He is ever released. The world is an illusory appearance of Brahman. So it is only *jīva* who falsely identifying itself with body-minds complex

undergoes transmigration and strives after liberation. *Jīva* is Brahman itself appearing through the limiting adjunct—mind, which is a product of *avidyā*. Brahman reflected in or delimited by *avidyā* and its product—mind appears as *jīva* and thus there results the mutual identification of *jīva* associated with mind like finitude, agency, etc. Further there is the mutual identification of *jīva* associated with mind and its qualities with sense-organs, body, etc. Śrī Saṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* says; ‘as long as the *jīva* is associated with the adjunct-mind, so long only is the *jīva*, a *jīva*. In reality, however, there is nothing like *jīva*-hood apart from what is fancied to be such by reason of this adjunct.’¹ He proceeds to point out: ‘this relation of Brahman with mind has but *avidyā* as its source, and this *avidyā* cannot be removed by anything other than the knowledge of the self. Hence this relation with such a limiting adjunct as the mind does not cease so long as the identity of *jīva* with Brahman is not realized.’² *Avidyā*, therefore, is the source of all evils and its removal of the relation of mind and its qualities like finitude, agency, etc. *Jīva*, then, ceases to be a *jīva*, as it is manifest as Brahman in its true nature of absolute bliss and consciousness. And the self which is thus free from *avidyā* and which is unconditioned bliss is liberation. Liberation, therefore, is identical with Brahman-Ātman or the self

and so it is ever existent and eternal. Yet, since in order that there may be the manifestation of the self in its true nature which is liberation the removal of *avidyā* is necessary, and since the latter is effected by the knowledge of self, liberation also is spoken of by courtesy as being attained. And attainment is thus only figurative.

The concept of liberation thus has a vital bearing upon the removal of *avidyā*. *Avidyā* could be removed only by the direct knowledge of its content (*viśaya*). The self is the content (*viśaya*) of *avidyā* and hence its direct knowledge would necessarily remove *avidyā*.

The mental state which arises from the Upaniṣadic texts in the form of the self and which is inspired by the reflection of the self in it is termed the direct knowledge of the self. The self as such cannot dispel *avidyā*; it is its witness. But when reflected in the mental state arising from the Upaniṣads, it removes *avidyā*, just as the rays of the sun normally illumining the grass burn the very grass when reflected through a lens."

The view that *avidyā* is removed by the direct knowledge of the self is based upon *śruti* and *śrutārthāpatti*. These two are valid proofs, and hence there is no reason that would disprove the above view.

i. *Śruti*: The Upaniṣadic passages affirm that the direct knowledge of the self removes *avidyā*. We may cite two passages in this connection. The passage 'only by realizing the self, one overcomes *mṛtyu* (*avidyā*)'⁴ and the passage 'one who has the direct knowledge of the self (*Ātman*) overcomes *śoka* (*avidyā*)'⁵, state that the direct knowledge of the self is what annihilates *avidyā*.

ii. *Śrutārthāpatti*: This is postulating something to account for what apparently clashes with the import of a sentence. The Upaniṣadic text 'one who realizes the self (Brahman) remains as the self (Brahman)'⁶ states that the direct knowledge of the self leads to the manifestation of the self in its true nature which is liberation. The manifestation of the self in its true nature would be impossible unless there is the removal of *avidyā* which veils it. The *Śruti* text 'the self is veiled by *avidyā*'⁷ and the *Gītā* text 'The true nature of the individual souls, that is the self, is veiled by *avidyā* and hence the individual souls experience phenomenal existence'⁸ convey that *avidyā* veils the nature of the self. Hence the above Upaniṣadic text, 'one who realizes the self remains as the self' which states that the direct knowledge or realization of the self leads to the manifestation of the self implies the removal of *avidyā* by the direct knowledge of the self.

The direct knowledge of the self is opposed to *avidyā*, and hence it dispels *avidyā* by its mere rise. But there remains *avidyā - leśa* or *avidyā - saṃskāra* which accounts for the continuance of the physical body in the case of one who has attained the direct knowledge of the self. This state is known as *jīvanmukti*. And after the removal of *avidyāleśa*, the so-called *jīva* remains as the self which is pure consciousness and absolute bliss and which is liberation.

To sum up this part of the discussion; the self which is non-dual bliss, and consciousness is liberation when it is free from *avidyā*; and, it becomes free from *avidyā* when the latter is removed by the direct knowledge of the self. Knowledge of the self is, therefore, the sole means of liberation.

II

Karma not the Direct Means to Liberation

We must now consider whether *karma* is efficacious in bringing about liberation. This, however, requires the discussion regarding the fundamental distinction between *karma* and *jñāna*-the distinction which is essential for the doctrine of Advaita. *Karma* and *jñāna* differ in two ways both as regards their nature and their fruits. In the first place, *karma* is of the nature of action, and it can be either performed or not performed, or performed otherwise. It depends upon Vedic

injunctions or on the choice of a man. *Jñāna*, on the other hand, is the result of means of knowledge. Means of knowledge relate to things that are existent. So *jñāna* cannot be made, or not made, or made otherwise according to the choice of a man, but depends upon the nature of the thing in itself, and is thus always one and the same. In the second place, the fruit of *karma* is of the nature of happiness or misery to be achieved, and it admits of various degrees or stages; these stages are the worlds of the upper, the intermediate and the nether worlds and the forms of life therein. But the fruit of *jñāna* is the inner self identical with the supreme self—the only partless ultimate which is real, consciousness, and bliss. It must be noted here that it is only by courtesy it is said that the fruit of *jñāna* is the inner self. Really the fruit of *jñāna* is only the removal of *avidyā*; and when *avidyā* is removed the inner self manifests in its true nature. The nature of the self is summed up by Śrī Śaṅkara thus :

“It is the absolute reality, immutable, eternal, omnipresent as etheric space, free from all modifications, absolutely self-sufficient, not composed of parts, and self-luminous in its nature.”

The self of this nature when freed from *avidyā* is liberation; and it cannot be on any account the fruit of *karma*. For, as we have said, the fruit of

karma admits of various degrees, while the self is the same always. Further, the fruits of *karma* are classified¹⁰ by Śrī Saṅkara into four divisions; (i) effected (*utpādya*), (ii) obtained (*āpya*), (iii) ceremonially purified (*saṁskārya*), and (iv) modified (*vikārya*). If it is admitted that liberation identical with the self is the fruit of *karma*, then the self must be admitted to be either effected, or obtained, or ceremonially purified or modified. None of these holds good in the case of the self which is identical with liberation.

It cannot be regarded as effected or modified. For, if these positions be admitted, then the non-permanence of *mokṣa* would certainly follow. In ordinary experience, we find sour milk and the like which are modifications, and jars and the like which are effects to be non-eternal.¹¹

Nor can liberation identical with the self be regarded as a thing to be obtained; for, being one's self, it is not something to be attained by one. Even if it is held to be different from one's self, still it would not be something to be obtained; for, as it is all-pervasive like etheric space it must be understood to be ever present to everyone in its essential nature.¹²

Nor can liberation identical with the self be regarded as ceremonially purified and therefore as

depending on activity; for, ceremonial purification to an object is the result of addition of some excellence to or removal of some blemish from that object. It cannot happen in the case of liberation through addition of excellence; for, liberation identical with the self is absolute perfection and needs nothing to be added to it to make it more perfect; nor can it happen through removal of some blemish, for, liberation is identical with the eternally pure self.¹³

It follows from this that liberation which is identical with the self cannot be brought about directly by *karma*, and so we have to exclude *karma* as a direct means of liberation.

The Pūrva-mīmāṃsā school, however, asserts that it is only *karma* and not the knowledge of the self that is the sole means to liberation. This school holds that the association of *jīva* with the body-mind complex constitutes bondage and to remain in its pure nature by being dissociated from the body-mind complex constitutes liberation. So what is to be achieved is only dissociation from body-mind complex; and it is possible by performance of *karma* alone.¹⁴

How *karma* alone is efficacious in bringing about liberation is explained thus by the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā school: the causes of embodiment, that

is, birth are merit and demerit. Of these, the former arises by performance of meritorious deeds, and the latter by committing interdicted actions and by non-performance of obligatory and occasional rites. If one succeeds in avoiding both merit and demerit, thereafter one will not be born. In order to avoid merit and demerit one must refrain from resorting to optional and prohibited rites. One should perform obligatory and occasional duties in order to avoid the sin of omission that would occur by their non-performance. The present body is caused by all the merits and demerits accumulated in the earlier births, and these will be exhausted by experiencing their fruits in the present life itself. Thus when the present body falls there is no fresh merit, because one has not performed optional deeds; no fresh demerit, because one has neither committed any interdicted action nor has refrained from the performance of obligatory and occasional duties. And all the merits and demerits are exhausted in the present life itself. Since there will be no cause for seizing another body for the *jīva* when the present body falls off the *jīva* remains in its pure nature by being dissociated from body-mind complex; and this constitutes liberation. When liberation could be attained through *karma* this way, the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā school does not find the need for the knowledge of the self.¹⁴

Śrī Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Taittirīyo'paniṣad* and Sureśvara in his *Naiṣkarmya-siddhi* refute the above contention of the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā school. The present body is caused not by all the merits and demerits that are accumulated in the past but by certain merits and demerits only; for, it is not reasonable to hold that merits and demerits which bring forth different fruits like birth in heaven, or in hell, or as a human being give forth only one birth. So only a portion of the accumulated merits and demerits gives rise to the present body. The remaining accumulated merits and demerits would definitely give forth different bodies in future. It might be said that the remaining accumulated merits and demerits would be annihilated by the performance of obligatory and occasional rites. But it is wrong because such a performance may annihilate only the accumulated demerits and not the accumulated merits. The accumulated merits could be exhausted either by experiencing their fruits or by the knowledge of the self. Experience of the fruits of accumulated merits would be possible only in several births and not in one birth. All accumulated demerits also cannot be removed by performance of obligatory and occasional duties. They could be removed either by experiencing their fruits which would require several births or by the knowledge of the self. In the meantime, one would be accumulating

fresh merits and demerits. So the annihilation of all merits and demerits by performance of obligatory and occasional duties alone is not possible. As a consequence of this there cannot be any dissociation between the *jīva* on the one hand and the body-mind complex on the other. The important result of this argument is that liberation—the state of the self being freed from the association of body-mind complex is not possible through *karma* alone.¹⁶

Srī Saṅkara and Sureśvara further refer¹⁷ to the view-point of the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā school according to which knowledge of the self may be admitted to be the means of liberation not independently, but as associated with the performance of karmas. This view is held on the ground that the *Īśāvāsya*¹⁸ text “One who knows that *karma* (*avidyā*) and *jñāna* (*vidyā*) are to be performed by one and the same person, overcomes death by *karma* and attains immortality by *jñāna*,” speaks of the combination of *karma* and *jñāna*.¹⁹ They further hold that this combination of *karma* and *jñāna* admits of three interpretations which are as follows: (i) *karma* is primary and *jñāna* is its auxiliary; (ii) both *karma* and *jñāna* are primary and have equal status; and (iii) *jñāna* is primary and *karma* is its auxiliary. Of these, the first interpretation is based upon the *Gītā* text²⁰ “Janaka and others (who possessed the knowledge of the

self) attained liberation (*samsiddhi*) by performing *karma* only.” The second one is based upon the text ‘*Jñāna* and *karma* are the means of self-realisation.’”²¹ The third one is based upon the text “One who knows the self attains the supreme human end”.²²

Śrī Śaṅkara critically examines these three views and proves them to be unsound; and, we shall set forth Śrī Śaṅkara’s arguments against the three views successively:

I. *Karma is primary and Jñāna is auxiliary :*

It is admitted by the followers of the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā school, that the knowledge of the self is subsidiary to *karma* on the basis of the text which states that ‘One’s own branch of Veda should be studied’. Here the study of Veda has for its purpose the knowledge of the sense of the Veda. One who knows the sense of the Veda is entitled to perform *karma*. Here the expression ‘the sense of the Veda’ signifies the sense of the Upaniṣads, namely, the self. Thus the knowledge of the self is subsidiary to the performance of *karma*.

Moreover, the texts such as “One who knows the knowledge of the sense of the Veda performs sacrifices and assists others in performing them” state that the knowledge of the self which comes under the knowledge of the sense of the Veda is

subsidiary to the performance of sacrifice. The *smṛti* text "Performance of sacrifice presupposes the knowledge of the sense of the Veda" also substantiates the above view.²³ When it is thus established that the knowledge of the self, that is, the knowledge of the sense of the Upaniṣads also is subsidiary to the performance of *karma*, then it comes to this that the entire Veda has for its purport the performance of *karma* only. And it is with this in view that Jaimini has said²⁴ that the entire Veda has performance of *karma* as its import. And, the texts which do not prescribe any *karma* like the text which conveys the nature of the self are to be treated as eulogistic in character. That is, they become valid by becoming one with the injunctive text through praising the agent of *karma*, that is, the self. From this it follows that knowledge of the self alone cannot be the means of liberation but only as associated with *karma*.

Śrī Saṅkara points out that the view set forth in the foregoing paragraph is wrong. He states that the text "One must study one's own branch of Veda", only means that one must learn by rote the Veda including the Upaniṣads. Later, since one cannot perform *karma* without the knowledge of the sense of the injunctive texts which prescribe the sacrifices along with the *modus operandi*, those injunctive texts themselves presumptively imply the

enquiry into the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā-sūtras* or *Jaiminī-sūtras*. Thus since the text 'One's own branch of Veda must be studied' does not relate to the knowledge of the sense of the Upaniṣads, that is, the self, the knowledge of the self is not the subsidiary to *karma*.

It has been said : in the text "One who has the knowledge of the sense of the Veda performs sacrifices and assists others in performing them", the expression "the sense of the Veda" conveys the sense of the Upaniṣads, namely, the self also. So knowledge of the self is subsidiary to the performance of *karma*. This contention also is wrong; it is because the expression 'one who knows the sense of the Veda' stands for 'one who has the knowledge of the several factors relating to the ritual' and not for the knowledge of the self; for, the knowledge of the self and the performance of *karma* are diametrically opposed to each other, and, this we shall explain later. On this ground we have to conclude that the *Jaiminī-sūtra* referred to above relates only to the ritualistic section of the Veda. This means that when Jaimini states that the entire Veda has *karma* as its import, we have to understand by the expression "entire Veda" only the ritualistic section of the Veda and not the Upaniṣads. So the knowledge of the sense of the Upaniṣads, namely, the self is not subsidiary to the performance of *karma*.

Even admitting that the knowledge of the self is subsidiary to the performance of *karma*, yet the view that *karma* is primary and being aided by *jñāna* it is the means to liberation is wrong; for, liberation being eternal cannot be the result of *karma*. Whichever is the result of *karma*, is found to be non-eternal. It might be argued that liberation although effected by *karma* may yet be eternal on the strength of the latter's association with *jñāna*. This position is explained on the analogy of poison which by itself leads one to death but cures some disease when ceremonially purified by sacred formulas. In the same way, an effect produced by *karma* aided by *jñāna* can be eternal.

This view does not hold good. It is admitted that there may arise an effect altogether new from a cause when it is associated with auxiliary causes. But this cannot be extended to the case of *karma* as giving rise to an altogether new effect, namely, liberation as eternal by being associated with the auxiliary cause, namely, the knowledge of the self. To say that liberation is effected by *karma* and yet it is eternal is a contradiction in terms.

It may be said that on the strength of the Upaniṣadic text, "He does not return to the cyclic existence"²⁵ it would be maintained that liberation although an effect is yet eternal. This view is wrong because the Upaniṣadic texts only make

known an existent thing and are not productive factors. Even hundreds of Upaniṣadic texts cannot produce an eternal thing or cannot make a produced thing eternal. So the view that *karma* aided by the knowledge of the self is the means of liberation is wrong.³⁶

The Gītā text cited in favour of this view means that Janaka and others attained purity of heart (*samsiddhi*) by performance of *karma*.

II. *Both Karma and Jñāna are primary :*

This view, namely, that both *karma* and *jñāna* are primary and they give rise to liberation is wrong on the ground that what is produced by *karma* cannot be eternal.

Moreover, *karma* and *jñāna* are diametrically opposed to each other. Performance of *karma* would be possible only when there is the knowledge of difference among the deity to whom offerings are made, the agent who makes the offerings, and the instruments for making the offering. But the knowledge of the self, by its mere rise annihilates all knowledge of duality. Moreover it has for its content - the self which is not an agent and experient. *Karma*, on the other hand, requires an agent who is the experient of the result of *karma*. In view of this conflicting nature between *karma* and *jñāna*, both cannot stand together. Therefore

there arises no question of their being the means of liberation."²

The text "*karma* and *jñāna* are the means of self-realisation" means only *krama-samuccaya*.

III. *Jñāna* is primary and *Karma* is secondary :

The argument set forth against the second view exactly applies with reference to this view also. So we have to conclude that this view also is wrong.

The Upaniṣadic text "One who knows the self attains the supreme human end" states that the knowledge of the self by itself is the means of liberation.

So far we have said that neither *karma* nor *karma* and *jñāna* could be the means of liberation. The *pūrvapakṣin* has said that the *Īśāvāsya* text² speaks of the combination of *karma* and *jñāna*. It is not so. That text simply means the combination of *karma* and *upāsanā* on the conditioned Brahman, and not of *karma* and *jñāna*. From what has been said, it would have become clear that neither *karma* nor *karma* associated with *jñāna* is the means of liberation. It is only *jñāna*-the direct knowledge of the self, the mental state arising from the Upaniṣads that annihilates *avidyā* by its mere rise. The supreme self shines then in its true nature of absolute bliss, and this is liberation.

Not all the Vedāntins admit that *jñāna* alone is the means of liberation. They admit that it is indispensable; yet, it should be combined with *karma* to attain *mokṣa*. It is the combination of *jñāna* and *karma* for this purpose that is known as *samuccaya*. Two were the Vedāntins who held this view. One was Brahmadaṭṭa and another Maṇḍana.

Sureśvara in his *Naiṣkarmya-Siddhi* refers to the views of these two authors and briefly refutes them. Brahmadaṭṭa holds that the Upaniṣads like the ritualistic section of the Veda, are injunctive in character. The injunction, however, is not about meditation which is referred to as *prasaṅkhyāna*, *bhāvanā* or *upāsanā*. The central teaching of the Upaniṣads is to be had from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* texts like *ātmetyeva upāsīta* "6 which enjoins the meditation upon the self. The major texts of the Upaniṣads are subsidiary to the injunctive texts mentioned above. They are subsidiary in the sense that they signify the self which is the content of meditation. Thus it is not the knowledge of the self that arises from the major texts that leads to liberation but only the meditation upon the self. Now according to the *yathā-kratu-nyāya* the aspirant who has the mediate knowledge of a particular deity can transform that knowledge into an immediate one by persistent meditation upon that deity. Moreover the aspirant would become united

with the deity after the fall of his body provided he continues the meditation till the end of his life. Brahmadata argues that in the case of *mokṣa* Brahman is the goal to be reached and continued meditation upon its true nature known mediately from the major texts of the Upaniṣads will help the aspirant to have the direct knowledge of Brahman and finally, that is, after the fall of the physical body to become merged in it.

The above is the theory of *mokṣa* according to Brahmadata. Knowledge of the self arising from the Upaniṣads and liberation are not simultaneous as in the school of Advaita. There is an interval between the rise of the knowledge of the self and the attainment of liberation. And in this period, the aspirant continues to be in the realm of *avidyā* and so he is not free from obligation to perform his allotted karmas. The non-performance of the latter would lead to sin, which, in its turn, would lead to fresh bondage. So the aspirant has to perform his karmas even after attaining the knowledge of the self, in order to attain liberation.³¹

Maṇḍana's view is similar to that of Brahmadata. But it differs in one important respect. While Brahmadata holds that it is *prasaṅkhyāna* that leads to liberation, Maṇḍana holds that it is the direct knowledge of the self that leads to liberation. He argues that the Upaniṣadic texts also

being in the form of words could give rise to the knowledge of only what is related and mediate. But, since Brahman is supra-relational and immediate, the knowledge arising from the Upaniṣads must be transformed into immediate one referring to the supra-relational entity, that is, the self. And, it is *prasaṅkhyāna* or *bhāvanā* or *upāsanā* that would bring about such a transformation. It follows from this that the knowledge of the self is followed up by *prasaṅkhyāna* and only after this actual liberation results. Thus as in the view of Brahmadaṭṭa, according to this view also, there is an interval between the rise of the knowledge of the self and attainment of liberation.

In this interval, the aspirant is in empirical existence and so the obligation to perform *karma* remains.³² Thus according to both Brahmadaṭṭa and Maṇḍana, there is no stage in a man's life where *karma* could be dispensed with.

Sureśvara refutes these views in his *Naiṣkarmya-siddhi*. He says that *prasaṅkhyāna* (which can be referred to as *nididhyāsana*) is only helpful to remove certain impediments that stand in the way of the rise of the direct knowledge of the self. Thus the function assigned to *prasaṅkhyāna* by both Brahmadaṭṭa and Maṇḍana is wrong. Moreover, Maṇḍana's view that the Upaniṣadic texts could give rise only to a mediate knowledge of the self is

not accepted by all Advaitins. According to them, the question whether a sentence gives rise to mediate knowledge or immediate one and whether it refers to the related entity or a supra-relational one depends upon the object signified. In the present case the self is immediate and non-relational and so the Upaniṣadic texts would definitely give rise to the immediate knowledge of the self provided there are no impediments. This knowledge would immediately annihilate *avidyā* and the one would be freed from *saṃsāra* immediately. Since the state of *saṃsāra* does not continue after the rise of the knowledge of the self, the obligation to perform *karma* also does not exist. So the contention that the knowledge of the self in combination with *karma* leads to liberation should be discarded.

It may be added here that Vācaspatimiśra holds that the Upaniṣadic texts give rise only to the mediate knowledge of the self and it is only by pursuing *nididhyāsana* there arises the immediate knowledge of self from mind. This leads to liberation through the removal of *avidyā*. It may be argued that according to Vācaspatimiśra's view also there is an interval between the acquisition of the knowledge of the self and liberation; and in this interval the obligation to perform *karma* remains. Thus there is the combination of *jñāna* and *karma*.

The above contention is wrong; for Vācaspati-miśra holds that performance of *karma* leads to what is known as 'cleansing of heart' which gives rise to intense desire for liberation. On the basis of Upaniṣadic texts, he advocates the view of *karma-sannyāsa* after one gets purity of heart by performance of *karma*. Moreover, by the mediate knowledge of the self also, one becomes convinced that one is not an agent and enjoyer and so one cannot perform *karma* at this stage which involves the notion that one is an agent and enjoyer. So there arises no question of the obligation to perform *karma* after the rise of the mediate knowledge of the self from the Upaniṣadic texts.

Adhering for the moment to the stand-points of Brahmādatta and Maṇḍana, we may say that persistent meditation upon the nature of the self would be possible only when one is free from the obligation to perform *karma*. If not, the meditation would not be continuous. It must be noted here that neither Maṇḍana nor Brahmādatta holds the view that the immediate knowledge of the self leads to liberation in association with *karma*. Maṇḍana holds this much only that before the rise of the immediate knowledge of the self from *prasaṅkhyāna*, there is the combination of mediate knowledge of the self and *karma*. As we have said above Vācaspatimiśra does not subscribe to this view. Brahma-

datta, on the other hand, holds that before actual liberation results from *prasaṅkhyāna* there is the combination of the mediate knowledge of the self and the performance of *karma*. These two views are proved to be unsound. So, *jñāna* alone is the means of liberation.

ABBREVIATIONS

- Bh.G.* — *Bhagavad-gītā*
- Ns* — *Naiṣkarmya-siddhi*, (Bombay Sanskrit & Prākṛt Series, No XXVIII, 1925)
- BS* — *Brahma-siddhi*, (Madras Government Oriental Series, No. 4, 1937)
- BSB* — *Brahma - sūtra - bhāṣya* of Śrī Saṅkara
- Chānd.* — *Chāndogyo'paniṣad*
- Muṇḍ.* — *Muṇḍako'paniṣad*
- ŚB* — *Sāṅkara-bhāṣya*
- Śvet* — *Śvetāśvataro'paniṣad*
- SLS* — *Siddhānta-leśa-saṅgraha* (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benaras, 1916)
- Taitt.* — *Taittirīyo'paniṣad*
- VM* — *Vanamālā* of Acyutakṛṣṇānanda Tīrtha (Śrī Vāṇi Vilās Śāstra Series, No. 13; Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1913)

REFERENCES

1. *BSB*, II, iii, 30.
2. *ibid.*
3. *SLS*, p. 492.
4. *Śvet.*, III, 8.
5. *Chānd.*, VIII, i, 3.
6. *Mund.*, III, ii, 9.
7. *Chānd.*, VIII, iii, 2.
8. *Bh. G.*, V, 15.
9. *BSB*, I, i, 4.
10. *ibid.*
11. *ibid.*
12. *ibid.*
13. *ibid.*
14. *VM*, p. 4.
15. *VM*, pp. 4, 12.
16. *ibid* and *NS* pp. 46-48.
17. *SB on Taitt.*, I, ii; *NS*, p. 15.
18. *Īśāvāsyō' pañṣad*, 18.
19. *VM*, p. 72.
20. *Bh. G.*, III, 20.
21. *SLS*, p. 401.
22. *Taitt*, I, ii; *VM*, p. 72.
23. *ŚB on Taitt.*, I, II.
24. *Jaimini Sūtra*, I, ii, I.
25. *Nirālambō' pañṣad*, 33.

26. *ŚB* on *Taitt*, I, 11.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Īśāvāsyō' pañṣad*, 18.
30. *Brh*, I, iv, 7.
31. *NS*, p. 38.
32. *NS*, p. 38.

vide also : Mm. Kuppuswami Śāstri's Introduction to *BS*,
x xxiii-xxxiv.

ABOUT THE PUBLISHERS

The Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre was established in 1975 under the guidance and with the blessings of His Holiness Jagadguru Śrī Śaṅkara-cārya of Kāñcī Kāmakōṭi Pīṭha. The main objectives of the Centre, among other things are:—

- (1) to undertake the carrying on of scientific research for the extension of knowledge in the fields of Natural and Applied Sciences generally, and in particular in the fields of Physics and Metaphysics.
- (2) to undertake and carry on scientific study and analysis of the Advaita system of thoughts as expounded by Ādi Śaṅkara and to conduct research as regards the relevance of his teachings in solving present day ills of mankind.
- (3) to undertake, promote and encourage the study of ancient philosophical systems of India.
- (4) to undertake research for the purposes of establishing norms necessary for realising the divinity in man through moral, spiritual and cultural infra-structure.

THE VOICE OF ŚAṅKARA (ŚAṅKARA BHĀRATI) is the quarterly journal published by the Centre in pursuance of its many objectives.

The following are its office-bearers: —

Patron :

Justice Sri V. Sethuraman

President :

Sri V. D. Swami

Vice-Presidents:

Sri V. Gauri Shankar

Sri S. V. S. Raghavan

Sri P. R. Ramasubrah-
maniya Rajah

Sri S. V. Narasimhan

Sri Pattam Sivaramakrishna Iyer

Secretary :

Sri N. C. Krishnan

Jt. Secretary-cum-Treasurer :

Sri S. Chandran

Editor : Dr. T. M. P. Mahadevan. Published by: S. Chandran on behalf of Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre, 1 E, Rosewood Offices, Nungambakkam High Road, Madras-600 034. Printed by: M. S. Maniyavan Elango Achukoodam, 165, R. H. Road, Madras-600 004.

संसाराध्वनि तापभानुकिरणप्रोद्भूतदाहव्यथा-

खिन्नानां जलकांक्षया मरुभुवि भ्रान्त्या परिभ्राम्यताम् ।

अत्यासन्ननुधाम्बुधिं सुखकरं ब्रह्माद्वयं दर्शय-

त्वेषा शङ्करभारती विजयते निर्वाणसंदायिनी ॥

samsārādhvani tāpabhānukiraṇaprodhbhūta-

dāhavyathā

khinnānām jalakāṅksayā marubhuvi bhrāntyā

paribhrāmyatām,

atyāsannasudhāmbudhim sukhakaram brahmād

vayam darśayaty-

eṣā śaṅkarabhārati vijayate nirvāṇasamdāyini.

To those who are afflicted, in the way of the world, by the burning pain given rise to by the scorching sun-shafts of misery, and who through delusion wander about in the desert (of worldliness) seeking water — showing the felicitous ocean of nectar, which is very near, the non-dual *Brahman*, this the Voice of Śaṅkara — is victorious, leading, as it does, to liberation.