

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL

The Voice ŚĀṆKARĀ

śāṅkara-bhāratī

Editor

T. M. P. MAHADEVAN

Volume

Number

XXXX

XXIX

FEBRUARY

1981

śaṅkara-bhāratī vijayate
nirvāṇa-saṁdāyini

victorious is the voice of śaṅkara,
leading, as it does, to liberation.

The Voice of Śaṅkara

is published under the guidance of

His Holiness Jagadguru Śrī Jayendra Sarasvatī

Śrī Śaṅkarācārya of Kāñcī Kāmakoti Pīṭha

by Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre.

Registered Office:

26, College Road,
Nungambakkam,
Madras-600 006.

Subscriptions are to be sent to:

The Administrative Officer,

Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre,

49, Fourth Street, Abhiramapuram,

Madras-600 018.

Subscription Rates:

	Indian	Foreign
Annual	Rs. 30/-	US Dollars 10
For Two Years	Rs. 50/-	US Dollars 18
Life	Rs. 250/-	US Dollars 100
Single copy	Rs. 10/-	US Dollars 3

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ADVAITA-VEDĀNTA

The VOICE of
ŚĀṆKARĀ

śaṅkara-bhāratī

Editor

T. M. P. MAHADEVAN

Volume

FIVE

Number

FOUR

FEBRUARY

1981

CONTENTS

319 *Homage to Śaṅkara*

JAGADGURU

ŚRĪ CANDRAŚEKHA-

RENDRA SARASVATI

321 *Veda and Dharma*

JAGADGURU ŚRĪ

JAYENDRA SARASVATI

341 *Brahman and the
world*

SADĀŚIVA

BRAHMENDRA

348 *Ātmānusandhāna*

ŚAṆKARA

BHAGAVAT PĀDA

365 *Śrī Mātṛkā-Puṣpa-
mālā-Stuti*

Dr. SENGAKU MAYEDA

376 *The Teachings of
Śaṅkara*

Dr. N. VEEZHINATHAN

379 *Anubhūti-svarūpā-
cārya*



HOMAGE TO SANKARA

[65]

विचार्य सर्ववेदान्तैः संचार्य हृदयाम्बुजे ।
प्रचार्य सर्वलोकेषु आचार्य शङ्करं भजे ॥

*vicāryam sarvavedāntaiḥ
samcāryam hṛdayāmbuje
pracāryam sarvalokeṣu
ācāryam śaṅkaram bhaje*

I worship Ācārya Śaṅkara, who is sought after by all the vedāntas, who is to be meditated upon in our lotus-like-heart, and who is to be made known in all the worlds.

— *Nārāyaṇīyopaniṣad bhāṣyam.*

[66]

यस्योपदेशदीधित्या
 चिदात्मा नः प्रकाशते ।
 नमः सद्गुरवे तस्मै
 स्वाविद्याध्वान्तभानवे ॥

*yasyopadeśadīdhityā
 cidātmā naḥ prakāśate
 namaḥ sadgurave tasmai
 svāvidyādhvānta bhānave*

Salutation to that great Preceptor, who is as the Sun to our darkness of *avidyā* (ignorance) and by whose rays of teachings, the Consciousness—Self is made manifest.

— *Hastūmalaka.*

VEDA AND DHARMA

Jagadguru Śrī Candrasekharendra Sarasvatī

In the Veda there are several matters such as *mantras* that are used in performing *agnihotra*, *soma-yāga*, many *iṣṭis*, various types of rituals, *homas* etc.

Satra is the name given to a big *yāga*. A *yāga* generally is performed by a person. Many brahmins who are knowers of the Veda would come and help in the performance of the *yāga*. There would be at the *yāga* those who know the *Ṛg-Veda*, those who know the *Yajur-veda* and those who know the *Sāma-veda*. The *Sāma-vedins* would sing; the *Ṛg-vedins* would perform the *homa* and the *Yajur-vedins* would repeat the *mantras*. The *yaja-māna*

Discourse given on November 16, 1967.

{master of sacrifice) i.e. the one who performs the *yāga* conducts the sacrifice with their help. He performs the *yāga* either with his own money, or with the money gathered through subscription. The merit that results from that *yāga*, the fruit thereof, entirely goes to him. The rest of the brahmins who had come to the sacrifice are called *ṛt-viks*. The master of the sacrifice gives to them gifts (*dakṣiṇā*).

To the *ṛt-viks* that help in the performance of *soma-yāgas*, the *yajā-mānas* offer gifts that are specified in the *śāstras*—gifts such as cows, gold and other valuables. In the Veda there are mentioned many *soma-yāgas*. *Satra* is the name of another type of *yāga*. When we say *satra* many people may not understand what it means. Many among us think that *satra* is the place where feeding is done. This also may be forgotten by the next generation. The reason is that now-a-days many *satras* are being closed down. In the Veda just as there are many kinds of *soma-yāgas*, there are several varieties of *satra*. *Satra* is what is performed collectively. The performance thereof lasts for a long time. In the performance of *satra* the fruit thereof goes to all those who recite the Veda as *ṛt-viks* and make *homa* offerings etc. There is merit accruing to all the *ṛt-viks* who perform that *yāga*. They gain what is good as also purification of mind. It is stated that they attain the higher worlds.

satre sarve yajamānāḥ

In the *satra-yāga* all those who are connected with it are *yaja-mānas*. All have a share in the fruit. That is why the place when all gather and eat claiming the right to do so as *yaja-mānas* is called *satra*. All those who go to a *satra* and eat are *yaja-mānas*.

Besides *yāga*, *yajña* etc., many modes of meditation or worship are mentioned in the Veda. Meditations severally are explained. There are seen in the Veda such topics as: 'how does the soul enter into this body; at the end what is going to become of the body? 'Again' In what manner is the soul going to enter into a human body?'

Moreover many other topics are explained in the Veda for example the treatment for keeping the body healthy, the rituals for quietening the injury that may come from enemies etc. When we consider all these, a doubt arises in our mind.

What is the aim of the Veda? What for is the Veda intended? It is known that all the Vedas collectively teach one Reality as is stated in some *Upaniṣads*. What is that one Reality? 'All the Vedas declare one supreme Reality which is the meaning of *omkāra*.' This is an *Upaniṣadic* passage.

The doubt that assails us is 'does not the Veda declare many things? Does it not tell us about several deities?'

In this city (i.e. Madras) there was a judge by name Sadasiva Aiyar. In Mysore state there was one Paramasiva Aiyar who was his brother. He has written thus: 'The Vedas are the sciences about material objects. They give information about geology.

Many others speak differently about the Veda. 'In those days the people who lived in India looked with wonder at the sun and the moon. That was a time when science had not progressed. Therefore different people saw phenomena of nature in different ways and have expressed several things about them. Everyone did not have the ability to express these in poetry only some had this ability. The songs which they sang are the *mantras*. The Veda is a collection of these *mantras*.' this is the view of the Western scholars.

When we consider all these, although the *Upaniṣads* say 'all the Vedas speak of only one Reality,' it seems as though there are many topics mentioned — not only one Reality.

There is a verse in regard to the Rāmāyaṇa :

*vedavedye pare pumsī jāte daśarathātmaṃ
vedaḥ prācetasādāsīt sākṣād-rāmāyaṇātmonā*

Veda vedye : the one who is to be known through the Veda. Who is he? *pare puṁsi* : He is the supreme *Puruṣa*; he is verily *Śrīman Nārāyaṇa*. The supreme *Puruṣa* who is to be known through the Veda and who is verily *Nārāyaṇa* incarnated Himself as *Rāma*. When he came as the Son of of *Daśaratha*, the Veda became the child of *Vālmiki* because it thought Let me incarnate myself as the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The Veda thought 'That which is my purport has become the Son of *Daśaratha*. Let me also become the child of *Valmiki*' thus the Veda transformed itself into the *Rāmāyaṇa*. This is the meaning of the verse.

Prācetas is a name of *Varuṇa*. *Valmiki* was *Varuṇa*'s son. In that *Valmiki* the Veda manifested itself as the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

In the Veda many matters have been taught. Yet all the Vedas together speak only of one purport. This I have already stated.

This verse also says the same thing. In order to teach one purport why should the Veda speak of many matters? This question may arise in our minds. It is through many matters that it is possible to understand that one purport which is Reality; *yoga*, meditation austerly, sacrifice, performance of *karma*, when these are accomplished what they

indicate is that one Reality; it is that Reality which is the true purport of the Veda. Other than that true purport the other things are of changing nature. They become woven into a story and then even that story disappears.

If we want to understand the one true Reality which is indicated by the Veda, we must submit our mind to certain disciplines so that we may have the thought about that one Reality. Performance of sacrifices, austerities, doing charitable acts, building temple-towers, digging tanks etc.,—all of them are for the sake of controlling the modes of the mind by purifying it. The aim of the various kinds of *karma* is only to aid in gaining the Supreme Self.

In the world we weep even if we meet with a little sorrow; we suffer greatly. In order that we may have a mind which will not slacken and be grieved even if great sorrow or dishonour comes, there are needed many disciplines. In order to strengthen the body we excersize it by practising *daṇḍāl* and *baski*. It is only when such excersizes are regularly practised that the body becomes strong. Similarly in order to make the soul grow some disciplines are necessary. The Veda details them. What is the fruit of performing the *karmas* as taught in the Veda? No sorrow will come near us. This is called '*yoga*' in the *Gītā*.

*tam vidyādduhkha-samyoga-
viyogam yoga-samjñitam
sa niścayena yuktavyo
yogo'nirviṇṇa cetasā*

Samyogam means joining; and *viyogam* means separation. If one says 'he has attained *viyogam*' it means that that person has separated himself from his body. Is this not the meaning of the statement?

The Lord has stated in the *Gītā*: *tam vidyādduhkha-samyoga-viyogam*. 'Yoga is separation from association with sorrow. Thus you should know.' This is the Lord's teaching. Many sorrows come and join with us. *Yoga* separates the sorrows which join us in that manner. Whatever sorrow might come is separated from us by *yoga*. It is not possible to avoid sorrow altogether. Plenty of sorrows will keep on coming. If there is *yoga*, that will separate whatever be the sorrow from attaching itself to us. Just as *vibhūti* (sacred ash) will fall off from the seed of the kalar-kāy when it is taken out after being immersed in it (because the seed is smooth and shining) and just as if water falls on a lotus-leaf it will drip away drop by drop, the sorrow that may come to us will go away without sticking to us. Even before it comes to us *yoga* will separate it from us. This is called *yoga*. Thus has the Lord stated.

What are the characteristic marks thereof?

*yam labdhvā cāparam lābham
manyate nādhikam tataḥ*

That one after attaining which there will be no other gain, that than which one will not deem greater, it is that one Reality that is fit to be gained. In order to gain that one Reality, the purification of mind is necessary as also one-pointedness thereof. The nature of mind is to wonder always. Without stopping even for a minute it will be whirling far and wide. Because it whirls thus it will gather a great deal of dirt and impurity. Even if we say 'we do not want, we do not want,' it will stick to us. Even if we think 'we should not have desire, we should not get angry', because the mind wanders, mental impurity is occasioned.

Desire, anger, delusion — all these are impurities of the mind. The *Tiruvācakam* says: *citta mala muṣuvittuc civamākki*. If the impurities of the mind are removed we can become Śiva. Untill then there will be *jīva*, if mental impurity goes he becomes Śiva. Saint Mānikkavācakar sings *attanenaḥ karuḷiyavā ṛarpeṇavar accove*.

In this manner the impurity of the mind should be removed; the mind should stay without moving. This means that it must perform many actions properly. It is for this that big temple-towers are built; many sacrifices are performed, several *yajñas* some lasting one year others two years etc.

are undertaken and performed according to rule. Those who perform such sacrifices would wear round their neck an iron ring. This would make it impossible for them to lie down even without their knowing. The name for that ring is *arikaṅṭham*.

Now-a-days people who take some vow to be fulfilled at Tirupati tie round their leg a small wire.

Many acts relating to God, like building temples, digging tanks were performed. While executing them there would be many difficulties. There would come also several kinds of dishonour. Not minding any of these they would complete their tasks with mental one-pointedness, removing impurities from their mind and not letting the mind wonder. By straitening the mind they acquire mind-control and at the end they realise the Reality that is to be known. Digging tanks building temple-towers and such other acts are called *Pūrttam*. The performance of sacrifices etc., is known as *iṣṭam*. Combining the two we have the word *iṣṭapūrttam*.

Born in a Vedic family and studying the Veda properly, many perform different *iṣṭas* and thus they should gain purity of mind. All could attain mental purity by performing *pūrttam*.

Performing many sacrifices, observing many *vratas*, building temple-towers — through such

iṣṭa-pūrttas, the body is subjected to austerity (*kṛcchra*). These are not the ends; they are only means for removing mental impurity; they serve to stop the wavering of mental modes. After removing impurity from the mind and after gaining concentration if one knows that single Reality which has to be known, there would be nothing else that one would want. If the thought that something else is required is there -- even if a little of such an idea rises—it means that such a one has not seen the Lord.

*yam labdhvā cāparam lābham manyate nādhi-
kam tataḥ*

From this statement of the Lord we get one sign i. e. we can ask for ourselves 'have we attained that Reality which has to be attained?' If we attain that which has to be attained, there will not rise the idea that we require something else. If that idea rises we may infer that we have not yet attained That. There is another sign.

yasmin sthito na duḥkhena guruṇāpi vicālyate

After the mind stays firm in that Reality then it will not stagger or shake even a little when great misery is encountered. This also is a sign that we have gained that One which has to be gained. If the mind staggers then it means that it has not yet reached that Reality,

We may get many types of sorrow. What seems to be sorrow to all the people of a place may not seem sorrowful to us. If we stay, always happy, without wanting to attain anything, untouched by sorrow like the lotus-leaf and the *kalarkoḍi*-seed, that is called *yoga*.

*tam vidyādduḥkha-samyoga-viyogam yoga—
samjñitam*

‘Know that to be indicated as *yoga* which is separation from being united with sorrow, the removal of association with sorrow.’

There is a saying ‘*keṭṭai mūṭṭai sevvāykkilamai*’ They have named this *sevvāykkilamai* (Tuesday) *maṅgala vāram* (auspicious day). Just like that *viyoga* (separation) is named *yoga*.

It is possible to help grow the power of one-pointed mental concentration only through right conduct and discipline, by removing all impurities that are in the mind and ridding it of its oscillations. The poet *Kālidāsa* has stated in a verse in the *Raghuvamśa* that every one should reach the state of *yoga* before the soul leaves the cage of the body, through proper education and discipline.

The purport of the Veda is *Rāghava*. It is only for the sake of knowing that one Reality that all these sacred texts, sacrifices, austerities and meditations are designed. With one-pointed mind

we should inquire about that one Reality. In order to do this mental impurities should go. The modes of the mind should be brought under control. How can this be done? It must be achieved step by step.

The one Reality should be known. If that is known, then there would not arise the desire to know anything else. Whatever misery may come there would not arise anger towards anyone; instead there would arise compassion let anything come to us. There would arise in us compassion in the form that we should not be the cause of misery for any living being. We should say that even the cosmic function of God's world-destruction is an act of extreme compassion. The supreme compassion enables us to be detached from whatever great misery may come to us. This state of not being attached to misery—the state of supreme compassion—must come to us little by little. It is for the sake of this that even while one is a child one is taught the recitation of the Veda and all branches of knowledge and all *śāstras*.

śaiśavē' bhyastavidyānām

During childhood there should be proper learning under the guidance of a good teacher and the necessary knowledge for entry into the path of the good. This is an important duty.

yauvane viṣayaiṣiṇām

When the state of youth comes, in order that the lineage may not become scizzored with one, one must marry a woman in accordance with the rules laid down for the purpose and help the continuation of good familial ties. One should marry in order that one may give one's body (in service) so as to help many a living being wash away their sins and thus gain the fulfilment of their life's purpose.

After some time the house-holders will perform *yāgas*, *homas* and *yajñas* in order to remove impurity from their minds and in order that they will remain unshaken, whatever be the sorrow that may fall to their lot; they will also undertake acts of social service like digging a tank etc. (*iṣṭāpūrta*) They will purify their minds preventing the entry thereinto of passions such as desire, anger and lust.

vārdhake munivṛttinām

At the time of old age one should resort to sages and those who practise austerities, recieve instructions from them, and practise spiritual disciplines. One should undertake to follow the means that are required for knowing that one Reality which is to be known from the Vedas.

yogenānte tanutyajām

At the end when one has to leave the body one should leave it with *yoga*. In the *Bhagavad-Gītā* the Lord has said '*yoga means viyoga*' i.e. remain-

ing always happy without association with even a little of misery. When one leaves the body weeping, one will again get a body which weeps. One should depart from the body only at a time when one is happy without the least sorrow. Even when numerous kinds of sorrow come, the mind should remain without disturbance and follow *dharma* alone in perfect happiness. If there was one answering to this description he was Rāma alone. The meaning of the word Rāma itself is 'he who remains in happiness.' Rāmam=remaining in happiness.

That is why, *vedavedye pare puṁsi* He is the supreme person knowable through the veda *jāte daśarathātmaje*. He manifested Himself as Daśarathi i. e. as the son of Daśaratha. He who is the soul of the veda incarnated Himself as Rāma the son of Daśaratha. Because of this, what did the Vedas do?

vedaḥ prācetasādāsīt sākṣād rāmāyaṇātmanā. The Vedas became Vālmīki's child, in the form directly of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. This is what has been stated.

In the *Rāmāyaṇa* of that stature what has been stated? The Veda teaches *dharma*. It says that Rāma is of the nature of that *dharma*. How is this known that Rāma is of the nature of *dharma*? This is clearly evident from what Rāma's mother Kausalyā Devī said when he was starting to go to the forest.

When a child departs leaving his mother, the mother would give him a packet of edibles. The mothers that live in a village prepare some sweets and give them to their children who are leaving for a town. Rāma is going to a forest. If Kausalyā Devī gives him edibles, for how many days would they last? He is going to live in the forests for fourteen years. If the edibles are not of use, one could give money. When we send our children to places like America we give them enough money, but in the forests there would be no shops etc. If Rāma is sent with money what would he do with it in the forest? If one thinks of sending bags of rice, for how many years could they be sent? Is he going to stay in one particular place in the forest? At the end what did Kausalyā give her son before he left for the forest? She sent him with her blessing saying "This is what I am going to give you:

*yam pālayasi dharmam tvam dhṛtyā ca niyamena ca
sa vai rāghavaśārdūla dharmastvāmabhirakṣatu"*

‘O Rāghava, the *dharmā* which you are following with courage and discipline—may that *dharmā* protect you.’ Thus she blessed him.

Dhṛti means courage. Without the least slackening of the mind thinking ‘So and so is ridiculing me’ remaining firm inspite of whatever ridicule

may come from others, is stated to be *dhyti*. Some people will maintain such courage whatever others might say for about four days. Thereafter they themselves will loose courage. There would be no discipline or regulation. Acting thus is also no good.

Rāghava followed *dharma* with regularity and discipline without neglecting it even for one day or for once. He did his duty without mental slackness. 'Whoever might ridicule, whoever might attempt to cause hindrance let them do so; because of them we should not leave our *dharma*.' It was in this spirit that Rāma who was of the nature of *dharma* protected *dharma*. When, in order to keep his father's word and thus protect *dharma*, her son was about to start for the forest she gave him this bundle of edibles : 'There in the forest you might meet with many dangers. Yet the *dharma* which you are following with courage and discipline—may it protect you.' She gave him the blessing which would remove all dangers.

If a dog is to protect us from thieves, we should take care of it well. That which we protect will protect us. Others may say to Rāghava 'you are protecting *dharma*, let that *dharma* protect you.' But his own mother, without weeping that her child is going to the forest, told him this.

His own brother Lakṣmaṇa said to him several times, 'O brother! you stick to that which you call *dharma* and wonder about. That is why so many difficulties and strains have come about. Do leave that *dharma*.' But Rāma's mother Kausalyā Devī gives him leave saying 'O Rāghava! whoever might mock at you, the *dharma* which you are following with courage and discipline, without the least neglect—may that *dharma* protect you.' There is a saying to the effect '*dharma* will save one's head.' The *dharma* which Rāghava followed with courage and discipline saved his head in the forest and protected him from numerous dangers that came to him in the forest. Rāvaṇa had ten heads. Because he was indulging in doing *adharma*, not even a single head of his was saved. All his ten heads were gone.

vedo'khilo dharmamūlam

The Veda, verily, is the source of *dharma*. 'It indicates only the supreme Reality as its purport.' Thus declare the *Upaniṣads* which are the ends of the Veda. 'The supreme Reality, the great Puruṣa, who is known through the Veda manifested Himself as Rāma, the son of Daśaratha.' Thus states a verse. That Rāma is of the very nature of *dharma* is discerned from the words of Kausalyā Devī which constitute a *śloka* occurring in the Rāmāyaṇa itself. At another place in the Epic we come across the following statement.

rāmo vigrahavān dharmah

Dharma is an attitude of the mind. If it takes on a shape, that will be Rāma. Without straying in the least into wrong ways, even at times of danger, following what is right with courage, discipline and firmness—that nature is called *dharmā*. It is that *dharmā* that is born as Rāma. The Reality which is to be understood through the Veda becomes what can be seen by all people with their own eyes. It was at that time that the Veda manifested itself as the Rāmāyaṇa.

It is not possible to speak adequately of the greatness of the Veda. Whatever is the highest, it is usual to refer to that as the Veda. The Āḷvars sang the *prabandha*. That work is regarded as Veda. They say of Śaṭhagopa thus : He is Māraṇ who wrote the Veda in Tamil. It is stated 'Do not consider this to be low.' It is the Veda that he sang in Tamil as the *prabandha*. It is known that the Veda is the highest. In order to indicate something which is the highest it is usual to refer to it as the Veda. There are many such cases. The *Bhārata*, they say, is the fifth Veda. It is stated that the Veda is endless. Whatever is endless—all that is for the sake of knowing the one supreme Reality.

One who has understood that supreme Reality will protect *dharmā* without the least disturbance in his mind, whatever sorrow may come to him.

Chatrapati Sivaji received the grace of Samartha Rāmadās. Therefore even at the time when he fought fiercely against his enemies, he did not cause any kind of dishonour or misery to those women who were rendered helpless. He saw to it that no harm was done to them and made them go to their rightful places. Eventhough his enemies in war abducted women and dishonoured them, having recourse to lawlessness, Sivaji did not do so. This has been stated by his enemies themselves. He had as his ideal Rāma. For those who repeat the *Rāma-mantra* there would not come mental impurities such as lust and delusion. At no time would they swerve from *dharma*.

It is said that wherever the songs about Rāma are sung Ānjaneya is present. Without these two, Ānjaneya and Rāma there is no Rāmāyaṇa. What is called the Rāmāyaṇa is the Veda. When the Veda remains as Veda its teachings relate to the path of *jñāna*. At the time when it manifests itself as the *Rāmāyaṇa* its teachings relate to the path of *dharma*.

*vedavedye pare puṁsi jāte daśarathātmaje, vedaḥ
prācetasādāsīt sākṣād rāmāyaṇātmanā*

The supreme Person who is to be known through the Veda became directly Rama the son of Daśaratha. Because he manifested himself as

Daśaratha's son, the Veda became manifest from Vālmīki. Thus says this verse.

The entire purport of the Veda is in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The essence of this which is the *Rama-nāma* will remove our mental impurity, bring the modes of the mind under control and without endangering in us the desire for attaining anything else, will enable us to remain in happiness always.

Brahman and the World*

Jagadguru Śrī Jayendra Saraswaī

The basic scriptures of our Hinduism are the *Vedas*. The important parts of the *Vedas* which contain their purport are the *Upaniṣads*. In the *Upaniṣads* there are two versions of how the world appeared. These two modes may be found in the following expressions. The first in “*Brahman* alone is real; the world is illusory” and the second in “*Brahman* alone is all this” and “*Atman* alone is all this”. The statement “*Brahman* alone is real; the world is illusory” says that it is only *Brahman* that is the destructionless and changeless reality and that all the world is subject to destruction and change. The other mode as expressed in

*Translated by Dr. T. M. P. Mahadevan from Tamil original.

the other statements "*Brahman* alone is all this", "*Ātman* alone is all this" say that whatever we see before us as constituting the world is only of the nature of the Self, *Brahman*. There seems to be a contradiction between the two modes. One that the entire world is amenable to change and destruction and that it is the Supreme Self of *Brahman* itself. If *Brahman-Ātman* is itself the world, how can this be accepted since the world is destructible and changeable. How can the world be the *Brahman*-self? This question arises. *Brahman* and Self are one and the same. Did the world come out of this *Brahman*? Or has *Brahman* itself become the world? Even if the world has come out of *Brahman* how can that which has come out of *Brahman* be non-eternal? Moreover *Brahman* is of the nature of consciousness, knowledge. The effect which is the world is inert and non-eternal. The characteristics of the cause which is *Brahman* are not found in the effect which is the world. Even if *Brahman* itself has changed into the world which is its effect, the above mentioned doubts will still be there. Therefore the question is how has this world come from *Brahman*? In what form has it arisen? In the *Bhagavad-gītā* too Śrī Kṛṣṇa says 'all this is pervaded by me', and again 'The world of Jīvas is a part of Me alone. That is, the supreme Self itself fills the entire world. The world is but a part thereof. This is what the *gītā*-statements mean. Thus both in the *Upaniṣads* and in the *Bhagavad-gītā* one and

the same teaching is found. There is a way of clearing these doubts which has been stated.

In this world there are altogether six factors. Of these only one is eternal and that is *Brahman*. The six factors are the following: *Brahman*, *Jīva*, *Īśvara*, the difference between *Jīva* and *Īśvara*, *Avidyā* (*māyā*), the connections between *Avidyā* and *māyā*. These are the six factors. Of these the Supreme Self (*Brahman*) is the pure quality-less Being. It is the supreme root-cause of everything. There is no place where that Supreme Self is not. It is like space or air. *Māyā* or *Avidyā* is dependent on the Supreme Self which is its support even as the shadow is dependent on our body. What is called *avidyā* is *māyā*. The shadow of a body is not something which is real like the dress of a man. What is not real appears as if existing. That is *māyā*. The body does not suffer in any way by its shadow. It does not bear it as a load nor have any responsibility for it. Even if the shadow is in an impure place the body does not become impure. If someone steps on the shadow the body does not suffer pain. In like manner *māyā* has the Supreme Self for its support. By this *māyā*, the Supreme Self does not suffer any bondage.

yā mā sā māyā. [या मा सा माया]

Māyā is that which is not.

Thus *māyā*, which is not, has the Supreme Self for its locus. It is because of this *māyā* that all sorts of differences appear, starting from the *jīva* upto the world. The *jīva* and the Supreme Self are one and the same. Although the Supreme Self is in all things and all-pervasive, it is called *jīva* when it is in each body. When it is called *jīva* the pleasure-pain etc., which come to the body are taken as coming to the *jīva* too. Although the Supreme Self is the ground of all things and is the root-cause of world creation, creation is not the work of the Supreme Self. It is *Īśvara* (God) that does it. When the Supreme Self takes on the power of creation it gets the name *Īśvara*. Therefore *Īśvara* creates the world through *māyā* which has as its support the beginning-less Supreme Self. The *jīva* and *Īśvara* are different. They will not become one. If they become one, then the *jīva* will acquire the power to create. But the *jīva* is never the creator. It is *Īśvara* alone that is the creator. The Supreme Self is the primal ground of all things. The creator is *Īśvara*. Therefore this world is created by *Īśvara* through *māyā* whose substitute is the Supreme Self, the primal ground. Because creation takes place through *māyā* and *māyā* is what is destructible, it is said that the world is non-eternal. Because Brahman is all-pervading and is the primal ground of everything, it is stated to be the world itself. Since electricity is the common cause for the functioning

of battery, fan etc., it is the general factor but for each one of its effects there is a separate suitable switch-board. And the function appropriate to each is performed. Similarly, although the Supreme Self is the root-cause of all, *Īsvara* takes on different forms such as *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu*, *Rudra* etc, for performing the cosmic functions of origination, sustentation, dissolution etc.

There is a verse (in the *pañcadaśī*) which is as follows:

- 1) *asti bhāti priyam nāma rūpam ceti amśa-pañca-*
kam
- 2) *ādyatrayam brahma rūpam jagadrūpam tato*
dvayam

According to this statement, in every object there are these five aspects: 1) Is-ness: every object exists thus we know. 2) manifestation: every object is manifest. We know that it is seen: 3) lovability: we desire every object, thinking that it is required for us; 4) name: There is a name for every object. 5) form: There is a form for every object. The name and form of every object belong to *māyā*. Existence, manifestation and lovability— these aspects belong to the Supreme Self. Therefore it is that in the world every objects exists and is also destroyed. Thus *Brahman* alone is real. The others are all destru-

ctible. Thus it has been stated. *Īśvara* creates the world through *māyā* but He does not produce the *jīva*. The *jīva* is beginning-less. It is, in essence (i.e. without the adjuncts) the Supreme Self itself. The *jīva* does not perish. It 'becomes' the Supreme Self (when ignorance is destroyed and the adjuncts are removed). Thus the *jīva* is not alone. The world set up by *māyā* will continue to exist. *Māyā* too is not created by anyone. What is created by *Īśvara* is the world. There is, however, release for the *jīva* from *māyā*. When the *jīva* realises its non-difference from the Supreme Self, there will be no relation for it to *māyā*. But the effect of *māyā* which is the world will continue to exist. There is, no defect or loss by such continuity. Even after the *jīva* has realised its non-difference from the Supreme Self, the world which was its location would be there. When the body continues to exist in the world the *jīva*, which has realised the Self in that body is called *jīvan-mukta* (the one who has been released while tenanting a body). Thus the Supreme Self is the primal ground. Through *māyā* which depends on it *Īśvara* creates the world. Through an experience of this, when arises the Supreme knowledge, that knowledge is called absolute (*pāramārthika jñāna*). Untill this knowledge does not arise, one's knowledge exists in the form of words spoken and written. This is known as empirical knowledge (*vyāvahārika jñāna*)

Thus the *jīva's* relation to the world is only empirical. The absolute knowledge is experience of its non-difference from the Supreme Self. Therefore there is no real connection for the *jīva* with *māyā* which causes the appearance of the world. Remaining in this body which is non-eternal and perishable the *jīva* 'gains' the eternal Supreme Self. Although the dream that one sees is false, if while dreaming one falls down from a pial one gets hurt which is (empirically) true. Similar is the release of the *jīva* from the non-eternal effect of *māyā* and the 'gaining' of the eternal Supreme Self.

Ātmanusandhana*

Sadāśiva Brahmendra

The Ātmānusandhāna in 36 verses in the anuṣṭubh metre is ascribed to Sadāśiva Brahmendra Sarasvatī. In verses 2 and 3 here he conveys his respects to his preceptor Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī. This is the only clue for us to infer that this work has been composed by him. He belonged to the 17th century and was the 57th pontiff of the Kāma-koṭipīṭha. He attained siddhi at Nerur on the banks of the river Kaveri. He has written several works on advaita and has composed songs both vedantic and devotional. The whole text has been printed in the 13th volume of the Descriptive

*Translated by Dr. N. Gangadharan.

Catologue of Sanskrit manuscripts in Tanjore Serfoji Maharaja Manuscripts library. Here is an English translation of the work along with the original text.

[1]

त्रय्यन्तततिसंसिद्धशुद्धविद्यैकगोचरः ।
अनाद्यन्तः परात्मासौ जयत्यानन्दमुन्दरः ॥

*trayyantatatisamsiddhasuddhavidyaikagocarah
anādyantaḥ parātmāsau jayatyānandasundarah*

That supreme soul without beginning and end and which can be realised by pure knowledge accomplished by the series of vedāntic texts and which is of the blissful form of beauty reigns supreme.

[2]

श्रीमत्परशिवेन्द्रश्रीदेशिकानां वयं मुदा ।
अद्वैतानन्दमाध्वीकमद्भिघ्नपद्मपुष्पास्महे ॥

*śrīmatparaśivendra śrī-
deśikānām vayam mudā
advaitānandamādhvīka-
maṅghripadmamupāsmāhe ॥*

We merrily worship the lotus-feet of the revered preceptor which is verily the honey of blissful non-dualism.

[3]

श्रीदेशिकवेदान्तनामसाहस्रमव्ययान् ।
कांश्चिन्नाममणीन्पद्यदामभिर्ग्रथयाम्यहम् ॥

śrīdeśīkavedāntanāmasāhasramavyayān ।
kāṁścinnāmamaṇīnṣpadyadāmabhir-
grathayāmyaham ॥

I set a few of the thousands of gems of unmu-
tilated philosophic terms I have got from the rever-
ed preceptor in the form of a garland of verses.

[4]

अच्युतोऽहमनन्तोऽहमतर्क्योऽहमजोऽस्म्यहम् ।
अव्रणोऽहमक्रामोऽहमसङ्गोऽस्म्यभयोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

acyuto'hamananto'ha-
matarkyo'hamajo'smyaham ।
avraṇo'hamakāmo'ha-
masaṅgo'smyabhayo'smyaham ॥

I have not fallen. I am endless. I am beyond
reason. I am unborn. I am unafflicted. I am
without desire. I am without any association. I
am without fear.

[5]

अशब्दोऽहमरूपोऽहमस्पर्शोऽस्म्यहमव्ययः ।
अरसोऽहमगन्धोऽहमनादिरस्मृतोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

aśabdo'hamarūpo'ha-
masparśosmyahamavyayaḥ ।
araso'hamagandho'ha-
manādirasmṛto' smyahan ॥

I am not the sound. I am without form. I am not the (the sense of) touch. I am decayless. I am not (the sense of) taste. I am not (the sense of) smell. I am without beginning. I am not one who is remembered.

[6]

अक्षरोऽहमलिङ्गोऽहमजरोऽस्म्यकलोऽस्म्यहम् ।
 अप्राणोऽहममूर्तोऽहमचिन्त्योऽस्म्यकृतोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

akṣaro'hamaliṅgo'ha
majaro'smyakalo'smyahan ।
aprāṇo'hamamūrto'ha-
macintyo' smyakṛto'smyahan ॥

I am without decay. I am not the symbol. I am not the old age. I am not the part. I am not the life-breath. I am not the visible form. I am beyond the reach of thought. I am not the deed.

[7]

अन्तर्याम्यहमग्राह्योऽनिर्देश्योऽहमलक्षणः ।
 अगोत्रोऽहममात्रोऽहमचक्षुस्कोऽस्म्यवागहम् ॥

antaryāmyahamagrāhyo'-
nirdeśyo'hamalakṣaṇaḥ ।

agotro'hamamātro'ha-
macakṣusko'smyavāgaham ॥

I am one who is present within. I cannot be seized. I cannot be demonstrated. I am without any characteristics. I do not have an origin. I cannot be measured. I am without the eyes. I am not the speech.

[8]

अदृश्योऽहमवर्णोऽहमखण्डोऽस्म्यहमद्भुतः ।
अश्रुतोऽहमदृष्टोऽहमन्वेष्टव्योऽमरोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

adṛśyo'hamavarṇo'ha-
makhanda'smyahamadbhutaḥ ।
aśruto'hamadṛṣṭo'ha-
manveṣṭavyo'maro'smyaham ॥

I cannot be seen. I am colourless. I am the undivided. I am the wonderful. I have not been heard. I have not been seen. I am one ought to be sought after. I am deathless.

[9]

अवायुरस्म्यनाकाशोऽतेजस्कोऽव्यभिचार्यहम् ।
अमतोऽहमजातोऽहमतिस्सूक्ष्मोऽविकार्यहम् ॥

avāyurasmyanākāśo'—
tejasko'vyabhicāryaham ।
amato'hamajāto'ha—
matīsūkṣmo'vikāryaham ॥

I am not the wind. I am not the ether. I am not the one with lustre. I am not fickle-minded. I am one who is not thought of. I am unborn. I am extremely subtle. I am without change.

[10]

अरजस्कोऽतमस्कोऽहमसत्त्वोऽस्म्यगुणोऽस्म्यहम् ।
अमायोऽनुभवात्माहमनन्योऽविषयोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

arajasko'tamasko' ha-
masattvo'smyaguṇo'smyaham ।
amāyo'nubhavātmāha-
mananyo'viṣayo'smyaham ॥

I am without the qualities of rajas, tamas and sattva. I am not any of the qualities. I am not the super-imposition. I am the soul of experience. I am without the second. I am not the material.

[11]

अद्वैतोऽहमपूर्वोऽहमबाह्योऽहमनन्तरः ।
अश्रोत्रोऽहमदीर्घोऽहमव्यक्तोऽहमनामयः ॥

advaito'hamapūrvo'hamabāhyo'hamanantaraha-
aśrotro'hamadīrgho'hamavyakto'hamanāmayaha-

I am non-dual. I am without precedence. I am not the external. I am without break. I am not the ears. I am not long. I am the unmanifest. I am without any blemish.

[12]

अद्वयानन्दविज्ञानघनोऽस्म्यहमविक्रियः ।
अनिच्छोऽहमलेपोऽहमकर्तास्म्यहमक्षयः ॥

*advayānandavijñānaghano'smyahamavikriyaḥ ।
aniccho'hamalepo'hamakartāsmyahamakṣayaḥ ॥*

I am saturated with the knowledge of the blissful non-duality. I am without change. I am without desire. I am untainted. I am not the doer. I am decayless.

[13]

अविद्याकार्यहीनोऽहमवाङ्मनसगोचरः ।
अनल्पोऽहमशोकोऽहमविकल्पोऽस्म्यतिज्वलन् ॥

*avidyākāryahīno'hamavāṅmanasagocaraḥ ।
analpo'hamaśoko'hamavikalpo'smyatijvalan ॥*

I am free from the acts of ignorance. I am beyond the reach of speech and mind. I am not the petty thing. I am without grief. I am without change. I am very effulgent.

[14]

आदिमध्यान्तहीनोऽहमाधारोऽस्म्यहमाततः ।
आत्मचैतन्यरूपोऽहमहमानन्दचिद्धनः ॥

*ādimadhyāntahīno'ha-
mādhāro'smyahamātataḥ ।*

*ātmacaitanyarūpo'ha-
mahamānandacidghanah ॥*

I am devoid of the beginning, middle and end. I am the extended support. I am of the form of the spirit of the soul. I am the intense luminosity of bliss.

[15]

आनन्दामृतरूपोऽहमात्मसंस्थोऽहमान्तरः ।
आप्तकामोऽहमाकाशात्पर आत्मेश्वरोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

*ānandāmṛtarūpo'ha-
mātmasaṁstho'hamāntarah ।
āptakāmo'hamākāśāt-
para ātmeśvaro'smyaham ॥*

I am the form of nectar of bliss. I am one established in the soul. I am the inner being. I am one whose desires have been fulfilled. I am exalted than the ether. I am the lord of my soul.

[16]

ईशानोऽस्म्यहमीदृयोऽहमहमुत्तमपुरुषः ।
उत्कृष्टोऽहमुपद्रष्टाहमुत्तरतरोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

*īśāno'smyahamīdṛyo'hamahamuttama pūruṣah
utkṛṣṭo'hamupadraṣṭāhamuttarataro'smyaham*

I am the master. I am the one to be praised. I am the supreme being. I am the most excellent.

I am the supervisor of the sacrifices. I am relatively superior.

[17]

केवलोऽहं कविः कर्माध्यक्षोऽहं करणाधिपः ।
गुहाशयोऽहं गुप्तोऽहं चक्षुषश्चक्षुरस्म्यहम् ॥

kevalo'ham kavih
karmādhyaakṣo'ham karaṇādhipaḥ ।
guhāśayo'ham gupto'ham
caakṣuṣaścakṣurasmayaham ॥

I am the only poet. I am the one who governs the acts. I am the lord of the means. I lie in the cavity. I remain concealed. I am the eye of the eye.

[18]

चिदानन्दोऽस्म्यहं चेता चिद्घनश्चिन्मयोऽस्म्यहम् ।
ज्योतिर्मयोऽस्म्यहं ज्यायाञ्ज्योतिषां ज्योतिरस्म्यहम् ॥

cidānando'smyaham cetā
cidghanaścinnmayo'smyaham ।
jyotirmayo'smyaham
jyāyāñjyotiṣām jyotirasmayaham ॥

I am the blissful knowledge. I am the knower. I am the deep consciousness. I am of the form of bliss itself. I am of the form of lustre itself. I am the foremost lustre of the luminous (bodies).

[19]

तमसः साक्ष्यहं तुर्यात्तुर्योऽहं तमसः परः ।
दिव्यो देवोऽस्मि दुर्दर्शो द्रष्टा ध्येयो ध्रुवोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

tamasah sākṣyaham

turyātturyo'ham tamasaḥ paraḥ ।

divyo devo'smi durdarśo draṣṭā

dhyeyo dhruvo'smyaham ॥

I am the witness of darkness. (I am above the fourth state of existence and above the darkness). I am the divine celestial being. I am difficult to be perceived. I am the seer, one who is to be contemplated and one who is firm.

[20]

नित्योऽहं निरवद्योऽहं निष्क्रियोऽस्मि निरञ्जनः ।
निर्मलो निर्विकल्पोऽहं निराख्यातोऽस्मि निश्चलः ॥

nityo'ham niravadyo'ham niṣkriyo'smi nirañjanah
nirmalo nirvikalpo'ham nirākhyāto'smi niścalaḥ

I am eternal. I am faultless. I am one who has no work to be done. I am unstained. I am free from impurity. I am without any change. I am one who has not been named. I am without any commotion.

[21]

निर्विकारो नित्यपूतो निर्गुणो निःस्पृहोऽस्म्यहम् ।
निरिन्द्रियो नियन्ताहं निरपेक्षोऽस्मि निष्कलः ॥

*nirvikāro nityapūto nirguṇo niḥspṛho'smyaham
nirindriyo niyantāham nirapekṣo'smi niṣkalaḥ*

I am without any change. I am always pure. I am without any quality. I am without desire. I am without the senses. I am the director. I am without any expectation. I am not the parts.

[22]

पुरुषः परमात्माहं पुराणः परमोऽस्म्यहम् ।

परावरोऽस्म्यहं प्रज्ञाप्रपञ्चोपशमोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

puruṣaḥ paramātmāham

purāṇaḥ paramo'smyaham ।

parāvaro'smyaham

prajñāprapañcopaśamo'smyaham ॥

I am the spirit. I am the supreme soul. I am the ancient (being). I am the supreme. I am remote as well as proximate. I am the cessation of the universe in the form of discernment.

[23]

परामृतोऽस्म्यहं पूर्णः प्रभुरस्मि पुरातनः ।

पूर्णानन्दैकबोधोऽहं प्रत्यगेकरसोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

*parāmyto'smyaham pūrṇaḥ prabhurasmi purātanāḥ
pūrṇānandaikabodho'ham pratyagekaraso'smyaham*

I am the rain. I am full. I am the primeval lord. I am one who had the knowledge of complete bliss. I am the one inward essence.

[24]

प्रज्ञात्माहं प्रशान्तोऽहं प्रकाशः परमेश्वरः ।
बहुधा चिन्त्यमानोऽहमहं ब्रह्मादिवन्दितः ॥

prajñātmāham prasānto'ham
prakāśaḥ parameśvaraḥ ।
bahudhā cintyamāno'hamaham
brahmādivanditaḥ ॥

I am the soul within the intellect. I am shining. I am the supreme lord. I am one who is contemplating in different ways. I am one who is adored by Brahmā and others.

[25]

बुद्धोऽहं भूतपालोऽहं भारूपो भगवानहम् ।
महादेवो महानस्मि महाज्ञेयो महेश्वरः ॥

buddho'ham bhūtapālo'ham bhārūpo bhagavānaham
mahādevo mahānasmī mahājñeyo mahēśvaraḥ

I am the awakened. I am the protector of the beings. I am of the form of lustre. I am the embodiment of fortune. I am the great god. I am great. I should be known as great. I am the great lord.

[26]

विमुक्तोऽहं विभुरहं वरेण्यो व्यापकोऽस्म्यहम् ।
वैश्वानरो वासुदेवो विश्वतश्चक्षुरस्म्यहम् ॥

*vimukto'ham vibhuraḥam vareṇyo vyāpako'smyaḥam
vaiśvānaro vāsudevo viśvataścakṣurasmyaḥam*

I am the released (soul). I am the master. I am the most excellent. I am one who pervades. I am the fire-god. I am (lord) Vāsudeva (form of Viṣṇu). I am the eye of the universe.

[27]

विश्वाधिकोऽहं विशदो विष्णुर्विश्वकृदस्म्यहम् ।
शुद्धोऽस्मि शुक्रः शान्तोऽहं शाश्वतोऽस्मि शिवोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

*viśvādhiko'ham viśado viṣṇurviśvakṛdasmyaḥam
śuddho'smi śukraḥ śānto'ham śāśvato'smi*

śivo'smyaḥam

I am beyond the universe. I am spotless. I am (lord) Viṣṇu. I am the maker of the universe. I am pure. I am white. I am calm. I am eternal and auspicious.

[28]

सर्वभूतान्वरात्माहमहमस्मि सनातनः ।
सर्वेश्वरोऽहं सर्वज्ञः सूक्ष्मः सर्वगतोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

sarvabhūtānvarātmāha-

mahamasmī sanātanaḥ ।

sarveśvaro'ham sarvajñaḥ

sūkṣmaḥ sarvagato'smyaḥam ॥

I am the excellent among all the beings. I am eternal. I am the master of all beings. I know everything. I am the subtle. I move everywhere.

[29]

अहं सकृद्विभातोऽहं स्वे महिम्नि प्रतिष्ठितः ।
सर्वान्तरः स्वयंज्योतिः सर्वाधिपतिरस्म्यहम् ॥

aham sakṛdvibhāto'ham
sve mahimni pratiṣṭhitah ।
sarvāntarah svayamjyotiḥ
sarvāधिपतिरस्म्यहम् ॥

I am at once the dawn. I am firmly established in my greatness. I am (present) in all the beings. I am self-luminant. I am the master of all beings.

[30]

सर्वभूताधिवासोऽहं सर्वव्यापी स्वराडहम् ।
समस्तसाक्षी सर्वात्मा सर्वभूतगुहाशयः ॥

sarvabhūtādhivāso'ham sarvavyāpī svarāḍaham
samastasākṣī sarvātmā sarvabhūtaguhāśayaḥ

I reside in all the beings. I am all-pervasive. I am the supreme being. I am the witness of all things. I am the soul of everything. I reside in the heart of all the beings.

[31]

सर्वेन्द्रियगुणाभासः सर्वेन्द्रियविवर्जितः ।
स्थानत्रयव्यतीतोऽहं सर्वानुग्राहकोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

sarvendriyaguṇābhāsaḥ
sarvendriyavivarjitaḥ ।
sthānatrayavyatīto'ham
sarvānugrāhako'smyaham ॥

I am the semblance of the qualities of all the senses. I am devoid of all the senses. I am beyond the three places. I am benevolent to all.

[32]

सच्चिदानन्दपूर्णात्मा सर्वप्रेमास्पदोऽस्म्यहम् ।
 सच्चिदानन्दमात्रोऽहं स्वप्रकाशोऽस्मि सद्ब्रह्म ॥

saccidānundapūrṇātmā
sarvapremāspado'smyaham
saccidānandamātro'ham
svaprakāśo'smi sadbrahmaḥ

I am the soul of fullness of existence, knowledge and bliss. I am the object of all affection. I am of the form of existence, knowledge and bliss alone. I am self-luminous. I am highly sentient.

[33]

सत्यस्वरूपः सन्मात्रः सिद्धः सर्वात्मकोऽस्म्यहम् ।
 सर्वाधिष्ठानसन्मात्रस्यात्मा बन्धहरोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

satyasvarūpaḥ sanmātraḥ
siddhaḥ sarvātmako'smyaham
sarvādhiṣṭhānasanmātra-
syātmā bandhaharo'smyaham

I am of the nature of truth. I am only the existence. I am accomplished. I am the soul of everything. I am the soul of existence, the controller of all. I am the remover of bondage.

[34]

सर्वग्रासोऽस्म्यहं सर्वद्रष्टा सर्वानुभूरहम् ।
स्वतन्त्रोऽस्मि सुविस्पष्टः सुविभातोऽस्म्यहं हरिः ॥

sarvagrāso' smyāham sarva-
draṣṭā sarvānubhūrahām
svatanthro'smi suvispaṣṭaḥ
su vibhāto'smyāham hariḥ

I am the swallower of all things. I am the seer of all. I am the person experiencing all things. I am independent. I am quite clear. I am clear dawn. I am (lord) Hari (Viṣṇu.)

[35]

अहं हरो हृदिस्थोऽहं हेतुदृष्टान्तवर्जितः ।
क्षेत्रज्ञः परमात्माहं श्रीमदेशिकसूक्तितः ॥

aḥam haro hṛdistho'ham
hetudṛṣṭāntavarjitaḥ
kṣetrajñāḥ paramātmāhām
śrīmaddeśikasūktitaḥ

I am (lord) Hara (Śiva). I am stationed in the heart. I am devoid of reason and illustration.

I am the knower of the field. I am the supreme soul according to the words of the holy preceptor.

[36]

इत्थमात्मानुसन्धानपरो यः पुरुषो भवेत् ।
सोऽविद्याक्लेशनिर्मुक्तो ब्रह्मैव भवति स्वयम् ॥

*itthamātmānusandhāna-
parō yaḥ puruṣo bhavet
so'vidyākleśanirmukto
brahmaiva bhavati svayam*

Whoever is bent on inquiry of the soul in this manner, that person will himself become verily the brahman after getting freed from the anguish of ignorance.

Sri Matrka - Pushpamala-Stutih *

(Flower-Garland of Letters)

Sankara Bhagavatpada

Stava or Stotra is of varied types. The characteristics of Stotra are mentioned in the following—

गुणिनिष्ठगुणाभिधानं स्तोत्रम् ।

And

नमस्कारस्तथाशीश्च सिद्धान्तोक्तिः पराक्रमः ।

विभूतिः प्रार्थना चेति षड्विधं स्तोत्रलक्षणम् ॥

Guṇiniṣṭha-guṇābhidhānam stotram ।

And

Namaskārastathāśīśca siddhāntoktiḥ parā-
kramah ।

vibhūtiḥ prārthanā ceti ṣaḍvidham stotra-
lakṣaṇam ॥

* Translation and notes by Dr. S.S. Janaki.

“The stotra describes the superior qualities of the Perfect Being;

and,

“Salutation, blessing, definitive conclusive statement, power, magnificence, and prayer are the six modes of expression in a Stotra”.

A particular type of Stotra is that which embodies the above features and also is constructed in such a fashion that the beginning letters of the verses are arranged in the same order of the Sanskrit alphabet (Mātrkā), the vowels and consonants, totalling fifty, or fifty-one including kṣa (ꣳ). In the *Lalitāsahasranāma* for example, Devī is called “One of the form of the letters in the alphabet” (Mātrkā-varṇarūpiṇī) and ‘One occupying the pīṭha comprising the fifty syllables (Pañcāśat-pīṭha-rūpiṇī). In the *Annapūrṇāṣṭaka* Devī is called ‘Ādi-kṣānta-samastavarṇanakarī’.

According to the Śaivite and Śākta tradition, the alphabet, all knowledge, lore and branches of learning are ultimately traced to Śiva and His complimentary Śakti. Śaiva Āgamas and Śākta Tantras have dealt at great detail with the symbolism, philosophy and significance of the letters constituting the alphabet, their origin from Śiva and Śakti, and their relation to the divinities at the three levels, gross (sthūla), subtle (sūk-

ṣma) and supreme (parā). "I am singing this word of praise, in your honour composed with your own words", says Śaṅkara in the concluding verse of *Saundaryalaharī* (*Tvadīyābhir vāgbhis tava janani vācām stutiriyam*)

Śaṅkarācārya who has sung the praise of different deities in varied types of stotras for the benefit of mankind, has composed two Mātrkā Stotras, 'Mātrkā' meaning both the goddess and the 'Sanskrit alphabet'. The present 'Mātrkāpushpamālā Stuti' (Praise of the Flower Garland of Letters) is on Goddess Akhilāṇḍeśvarī at Tiruvānaikkā (Gajāraṇya Kṣetra) at Tiruchinopoly, the consort of Śrī Jambukeśvarar, well known as representing the element of water (ap). All the verses in this stotra end with the refrain 'vande' khilāṇḍeśvarī', in the last foot.

The Sākta tradition recognises different forms of the Devī in the various kshetras, although ultimately She is the One Supreme Being (*Parabrahmasvarūpiṇī*) and is of the form of Supreme knowledge (*Brahmavidyā-rūpiṇī*).

Three distinct chief forms of Devī are said to be present in the three well-known Kshetras in the South-Kamakshi at Kanchi of the form of 'Mahārājñī' or 'Rājarājeśvarī', Meenakshi at Madura of the form of 'Mantriṇī' or 'Śyāmalā' and Akhilāṇḍeśvarī at Tiruvānaikkā representing the form

‘Daṇḍinī’ or ‘Daṇḍanāthā’. The ear-ornament (Tāṭaṅkā) of Akhilāṇḍeśvarī is of special significance as Adi Sankara is known to have performed the Tāṭaṅka-pratiṣṭhā with the Śrī Chakra on it. More recently in 1909 H. H. Sri Chandrasekharendra Sarasvati Swamigal of Kanchi Kamakoti Pitha performed the Tāṭaṅka-pratiṣṭhā again in connection with the Mahākumbhābhisheka of Tiruvānaikkā temple.

As is usual with Mātṛkā-stotras, each verse begins with the letter in the order of the alphabet, and the other descriptive epithets are also begun in the same letter as the initial word in the first epithet. There is therefore a ringing unmatched musical assonance that runs through all the 54 verses of this stotra. Each of these verses is in the long Śārdūlavikrīḍitā metre, containing 19 syllables in each foot of the verse. Besides the inherent musical quality and assonance (*prāsa*) the verses contain beautiful figurative expressions and significant allusions, bringing out the greatness of the goddess at the five levels-*sthūla* or gross (physical form), *sūkshma* or subtle (*mantra*-form), *sūkshmatara* or more subtle (*kāmakalā*-form), the *sūkshmatama* or the subtlest (*kuṇḍalinī*-form) and *Suddhabrahma* or absolute (*Nirguṇa* form)-and also the uniqueness of the holy Kṣetra.

[1]

अध्वातीतपदे अलङ्कृतशिवे अर्थान्तरर्थे परे
 अत्यर्थे अमलाशये अतिदये अर्धेन्दुभूषोज्ज्वले ।
 अध्यक्षे अमराङ्गनापरिवृते अध्यात्मविद्यामये
 अव्यक्ते अचलाधिराजतनये वन्देऽखिलाण्डेश्वरि ॥

*Adhvātītapade alamkṛtaśive arthāntararthe pare
 atyarthe amalāśaye atidaye ardhendubhūshojjvale
 adhyakshe amarāṅganā-parivyte adhyātmavidyā-
 maye
 avyakte acalādhirājatanaye vande'khilāṅḍeśvari*

I bow down to the goddess Akhilāṅḍeśvarī, who is in a state beyond the six modes of Mantra Upāsanā, a beautifier of Śiva, the Supreme Being that is the inner essence of all things and beyond everything, not superceded by any object, possessed of a spotless heart, very compassionate, resplendent with decorative crescent moon, the pre-eminent (among divinities), surrounded by celestial damsejs, the personification of Brahma Vidyā, beyond the ken (of even ascetics) and the daughter of Himavān.

In this first verse there are thirteen epithets which begin with the first letter in the alphabet 'a' amongst vowels and glorify Goddess Akhilāṅḍeśvarī. 'Adhvā' means 'a path' and Mantrādhvā is all knowledge relating to Mantra. The Śaiva and Śākta works deal with six (ṣaḍ) *adhvās*-three on the Śabda side- *Varṇa* (Letter), *Paḍa* (Syllable) and *Mantra* (combination

of syllables), each being dependent on one another. On the Artha side, the three *adhvas* are *Kalā* (5), *Tattva* (36) and *Bhuvana* (224) each similarly dependent. The goddess is beyond these six states (*adhvātītapadā*). Cf. *Ṣaḍadhvātītarūpiṇī* in *Lalitāsahasranāma*. The Sakti's indispensable co-ordination with Śiva is mentioned in 'alamkṛtaśive' and 'ardhendubhūṣojjvale'. 'Amarāṅganās' are the associate Saktis who are worshipped as 'āvaraṇa-devatās'. The other epithets refer to the goddess in her supreme and transcendental state as *Brahmavidyāsvarūpiṇī*. The specific reference of the goddess as 'acalādhiraḥjatanayā' is reminiscent of the *Adhyātma Vidyā* realised by Indra as *Umā-Haimavatī* in *Kenopaniṣad* III. 12

[2]

आद्ये आगमसम्प्रदायनिपुणे आचार्यवर्यार्चिते
 आधारादि-सरोजपीठनिलये आलोलनीलालके ।
 आताम्राधर-चारु-मन्दहसिते आपीनवक्षोरुहे
 आब्रह्माच्युत-शङ्करार्चितपदे वन्देऽखिलाण्डेश्वरि ॥

Ādye āgamasampradāya-nipuṇe ācāryavaryārcite
ādhārādi-sarojapīṭhanilaye ālolanīlālake
ātāmrādhara-cāru-mandahasite āpīnavakṣoruhe
ābrahmācyuta-śaṅkarārcitapade vande 'khilāṇḍe-
śvari

I salute the goddess *Akhilāṇḍeśvari*, the primordial power, well versed in āgamic traditions, adored by the best Jagadgurus, with her seat in the lotuses at the *Mūlādhāra* and other cakras, possessed of moving tresses of dark hair, a charming smile

on her lower lip and stout breasts, and Her holy feet being worshipped by all beings, including Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva.

Attributes 5, 6, 7, describe the physical charms of the goddess. 3 and 8 refer to Her uniqueness in as much as She is adored by great ācāryas and even the Trinity, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. Cf. *Atas tvām ārādhyām harihara-viriñcā-dibhirapi* (*Saundaryalaharī* 1; also verses 24, 25, and 91 there); *Ābrahmācyuta - Śaṅkara - prabhṛtibhir devaissadā pūjitā* (*Sarasvatī-Stotra*) etc. The Śakti is Ādyā for as the Universal Mother She is the moving power. The formless Infinite (Śiva) becomes finite in diversified creation due to Sakti, the Kinetic Power. She is the personification of all knowledge (Cf. *Jñāna - viśrahā* and *Sūstramayī* in *Lalitā-sahasranāma*; *Sūtra-yonitvāt-Brahma Sūtra* I. I. 3.)

Cf. also *Kumārasambhava* I. 30 that all lores sought Pārvatī at the time of instruction. (*Sthiropadeśām upadeśakūle prapedire prāktana-janmavidyāḥ*). What wonder is there in Her being adept in Āgama - sampradāya? That the goddess has Her abode in the lotuses at the six cakras or centres, *mūlādhāra*, *svādhiṣṭhāna*, *maṇipūra*, *anāhata*, *viśuddha* and *ājñā* and at the thousand - petalled lotus - like region (*sahasrāra*) is mentioned at detail in Devī stotras like *Lalitā-sahasranāma* and *Saundaryalaharī*, as well as in Śākta texts.

[3]

इच्छाज्ञानसमस्तशक्तिसहिते इन्दीवरश्यामले

इन्द्रोपेन्द्रवरप्रदे इभवनाधीशे इनाराधिते ।

इज्ये इन्दुनिभानने इभनुते इष्टार्थसिद्धिप्रदे

इन्द्राणी-नमिते इभाननसुते वन्देऽखिलाण्डेश्वरि ॥

*Icchā-jñāna-samasta-śakti-sahite indīvaraśyamāle
indropendra-varaprade ibhavanādhīse inārādhite
ijye indunibhānane i'hanute iṣṭārthasiddhiprade
indrāṇī-namite ibhānana-sute vande 'khilāṇḍeśvari*

I salute you, goddess Akhilāṇḍeśvari, endowed with the three Śaktis Icchā (Wish), Jñāna (Knowledge) and Kriyā (Action), dark like the blue lotus, conferer of boons to Indra and Upendra (Vāmana), the presiding deity of Gajāraṇya Kṣetra (Tiruvānaikkā), worshipped by the sun, of the form of Sacrifice, with a face captivating like the moon, worshipped by the Elephant, conferer of desired boons, worshipped by the wife of Indra and having the elephant-faced Gaṇeśa as Her Son.

Epithets 2, 7 describe the physical charm of the Goddess. She holds in her hands noose (*pāśa*), goad (*aṅkuśa*) and a bow (*kodaṇḍa*) with five arrows (*sāyaka*)-the five arrows standing for the five *Tanmātras*, *śabda*, *śparśa*, *rūpa*, *rasa*, and *gandha*. Of these *pāśa* represents Icchā, *Aṅkuśa* Jñāna and Bow and Arrows Kriyā Śakti. Attributes 3,4,5,8 and 10 refer to anecdotes about the Tiruvānaikkā (Gajāraṇya) Kṣetra as mentioned in the Sthalapurāṇa. According to the Sthalapurāṇa the elephant, Indra, Indrāṇī, Upendra and Sun worshipped the Goddess and secured Her grace. *Ibha* means 'elephant'; and *Ibhavana*, *Gajāraṇya* etc. are the Sanskrit equivalents of Tiruvānaikkā. '*Ijyā*' is 'Sacrifice'; the *Dēvi* is *Yāgasvarūpiṇī*. cf. *Lalitā-sahasranāma*, 'Yajña-rūpā'.

[4]

ईशे ईशविरिञ्चिशौरिवरदे ईड्यालि ईशात्मिके
 ईर्ष्यादूषितचित्तदूरचरणे ईशप्रिये ईश्वरि ।
 ईड्ये ईश्वरवामभागनिलये ईकारकल्पोदये
 ईशित्वादि महाविभूतिनिलये वन्देऽखिलाण्डेश्वरि ॥

Īśe īśa-viriñci-śaurivarade īḍyāli īśātmike
īrṣyādūṣita-citta-dūracaraṇe īśapriye īśvari
īḍye īśvaravāmabhāganilaye īmkārakṣptodaye
īśitvādi-mahāvibhūti-nilaye vande'khilāṇḍeśvari

I bow down to Goddess Akhilāṇḍeśvarī, the controller of everything, the giver of boon to Śiva, Brahmā and Viṣṇu, having worshippingable attending divinities, of the true form of the Absolute, Whose holy feet are unapproachable to the vicious filled with jealousy, Who is dear to Śiva, is the ruler of the universe, glorifiable, the occupant of the left half of Śiva, appears before those meditating upon 'īm' and is the abode of great powers like absolute command.

The Goddess is 'Īśī' as She possesses the power of creating, preserving and withdrawing. Epithets 4 and 7 show that She is the moving spirit of Īśvara and has the absolute control over all things. In Īḍyāli, the 'ālis' or friends are the divinities, the 'āvaraṇa-devatās' (see above verse), epithet 10) worshipped at different levels or the Yoginis Sākinī, Rākinī etc, attending upon the Goddess. In the Mantra-śāstra each syllable is significant. In 'Kṛīm' for example, K is Kālī, Ṛ is Brahmā, Ī is

Mahāmāyā, Nāda is the Matrix of the universe and Bindu is the dispeller of sorrow. Imkarakṣiptodaye, means that the Goddess is sure to arise in the mind of the devotee or sādḥaka who meditates upon Her with the Bija mantras like 'Kṛim' and 'Hṛim', ending in 'Īm'. The super-human powers or *mahāvibhūti*s are eight—becoming small (*aṇimā*), big (*mahimā*), weighty (*garimā*) and light (*laghimā*) and also the power of obtaining everything (*prāpti*), irresistible will (*prākāmya*), supremacy (*īśitva*) and subduing all to his will (*vaśitva*). These *vibhūti*s or *siddhi*s are inherent in Īśvara and his associate Sakti.

[5]

उद्यद्भानुसहस्रकोटिकिरणे उर्वीधरेन्द्रात्मजे

उत्फुल्लाम्बुजलोचने उभयकावेर्यन्तरालाश्रये ।

उद्यच्चन्द्रनिभानने उरुतरे उच्चासने उज्ज्वले

उद्दामद्युति-पुञ्ज-मञ्जुलतरे वन्देऽखिलाण्डेश्वरि ॥

*udyadbhānusahasrakotīkīraṇe urvīdharendrātmaḥ
utphullāmbujalocane ubhayakāveryantarālāśraye
udyaccandranibhānane urutare uccāsane ujjvale
uddāmad्युति-puñja-mañjulatāre vande 'khiḷāṇḍeś-
vari*

I bow down to goddess Akhilāṇḍeśvarī, dazzling like the rising multi-rayed Sun, daughter of the mountain Himavān, with lovely eyes, resembling the blossomed lotus, having her abode in between the two Kāverīs (the lower and upper streams), with a charming face like the rising moon, the Supreme, occupying a lofty seat, the resplendent one, and captivating with Her extraordinary brilliance.

The first epithet is the same as the beginning in the *Mīnākṣī - Pañcaratna*. For the reference 'Daughter of the Mountain' see above verse 1. The other epithets in the verse bring out in a general manner the trans-cosmic splendour of the abode and throne of the Goddess as described in a splendid manner in the *Lalitāsahasranāma* and the *Saundaryalaharī*. Worshippers of Devi know that the abode is called Śrī Nagara and it is surrounded by 25 ramparts. In the middle there shines the Cintāmaṇi Palace. The Devī sits in the Bindu Pīṭha in the Śrī Cakra in that palace. This macrocosmic brilliance only symbolises a parallel abode of Devi with identical glory in the microcosm of the human body and Her presence therein.

THE TEACHINGS OF SANKARA

Dr. Sengaku Mayeda

(Extracts from the book "A Thousand Teachings" the *Upadeśa Sāhasrī* of Śaṅkara, translated with introduction and Notes)*

It was the knowledge of *Brahman*, the absolute, that Śaṅkara taught to his followers over and over again. The teaching that *Ātman*, one's inner Self (*pratyagātman*), is wholly identical with *Brahman* is not only the starting-point of his philosophy but also its goal. Śaṅkara's central doctrine is *Ātman's* identity with *Brahman*; this truth arrived at by the Upaniṣadic thinkers was the culmination of the serious quest for universal truth which Ṛg-vedic

*Courtesy : University of Tokyo Press 1979

poet-thinkers had first begun. In Śaṅkara's view the knowledge of this truth is the means (*sādhana*) to final release.

When the knowledge (*vidyā*) (of *Brahman*) is firmly grasped, it is conducive to one's own beatitude and to the continuity (of the knowledge of *Brahman*.) And the continuity (of the knowledge of *Brahman*) is helpful to people as a boat is helpful to one wishing to get across a river. (*dṛḍhagr̥hīta hi vidyātmanaḥ śreyase santatyai ca bhavati*

vidyāsantatiśca prāṇyanugrahāya bhavati naur-iva nadīm titīrṣoḥ
Upad. II, 1, 3).

Philosophy is not his aim but is rather a vital weapon with which to fulfill his aim, which is to rescue people out of transmigratory existence. Logic and theory are subordinate to this end.

The Advaitic tradition started long before Śaṅkara; it has its origin in the Upaniṣads. The *Gauḍapādīyakārikā* is the earliest extant that advocated illusionistic *Advaita*. It was, however, Śaṅkara who established the illusionistic *Advaita* tradition based on the concept of nescience and the Sāṃkhyan dualism, and made it the main current of the Vedānta.

Śaṅkara holds, that *Brahman* is *Ātman* and *Ātman* is *Brahman*, but this truth may be approached along different lines. When Śaṅkara undertakes

his search for the truth--or, rather, when he explains to his pupils or renders the truth he has already attained—he does it from two different starting-points. Accordingly, in the *Upadeśa-sāhasrī*, two different approaches are recognizable. When in his search for the truth he sets out from *Brahman* as the ultimate cause of the universe, he comes, through a theological or cosmological approach, to the knowledge that *Brahman* is *Ātman*. When his investigation sets out from the inner *Ātman*, he arrives, through a psychological or epistemological approach, at the knowledge that *Ātman* is *Brahman*. The second line of approach is adopted and much more frequently than the first in Śaṅkara's works, including the *Upadeśasāhasrī*. However, neither of them can be complete by itself, and there is a third aspect which is that the knowledge of *Brahman* and *Ātman* is attainable only through the *Śrutis*, and so the conclusion arrived at by the two approaches is to be confirmed and authenticated by the *Śrutis*. Through an exegesis of the *Śrutis*, Śaṅkara determines that the *Śrutis* state the truth of the identity of *Brahman* and *Ātman*.

Anubhūtiśvarūpacārya

His contribution to Advaita Vedānta

Dr N. Veezhinathan

I

Anubhūtiśvarūpacārya- His Works, Identity, and Date

Anubhūtiśvarūpacārya who is known in the Advaitic tradition as the *Prakaṣārtha-kāra* or the author of the work *Prakaṣārthavivaraṇa*—an independent commentary on the *bhāṣya* of Śrī Śaṅkara on the *Brahma-sūtra* is one of the most important among the Advaitic writers of the *post-Śaṅkara* period. He has been well-known in the history of grammar as the author of the *Sārasvata* grammar. His works in Advaita are of the nature of commentaries. Of these, some were mentioned

in Mr Tripāṭhi's introduction to the *Tarkasaṃgraha* of Ānandagiri.¹ He wrote mainly commentaries.² All the three prakaraṇas of Ānandabodha received his attention and we have manuscripts of his glosses on the *Nyāyamakaranda* (*Saṃgraha*), the *Nyāyadīpāvalī* (*Candrikā*), and the *Pramāṇamālā* (*Nibandha*). Among the other standard authors on whose works Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya commented upon are Gauḍapāda, Śaṅkara, Vimuktātman, and Śrīharṣa. On Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* of Gauḍapāda, a brief *tippaṇa* was written by Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya and this has been published by the Sanskrit Education Society, Madras. On Śaṅkara's *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya*, Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya wrote the commentary called *Prakatārthavivarāṇa* which has been published anonymously in the Madras University Sanskrit Series. On the *Iṣṭa-siddhi* of Vimuktātman published in the Gaekwad Oriental Series, Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya wrote an extensive commentary known as *Iṣṭasiddhivivarāṇa*. This work has been available in manuscript³ without its identity being

1. *Tarkasaṃgraha*, Gaekwad Oriental Series, p. ix.

2. *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, Vol. I, pp. 208-209 (University of Madras, 1968).

3. Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, Ms. No. 4384.

Sri. R. Krishnamurthi Sastri, M.A., Prof. of Vedānta, Sanskrit College, Madras, is preparing a Critical Edition of this commentary for the Ph. Degree of the Madras University under the supervision of the author of this paper.

found out. A careful study of this commentary shows that this is a work of Anubhūtisvarūpācārya. It also shows that the commentary of Jñānottama made known to the scholars in the Gaekwad Oriental Series Edition on the text is really derived from Anubhūtisvarūpācārya's commentary on the *Iṣṭa-siddhi*. The other standard writer on whose work Anubhūtisvarūpācārya commented is Śrīharṣa. The commentary of his called *Śiṣya-hitaiṣiṇī* on Śrīharṣa's *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khāḍya* is also unprinted and it is available in a single manuscript in the Big Bhaṇḍār at Jessalmere.

In the *Gītā-prasthāna*, Anubhūtisvarūpācārya made his contribution in the form of a brief gloss on Śaṅkara's *Gītābhāṣya*, which is still in manuscript. Naturally, we would expect that our author did not omit to do something in the *Upaniṣad-prasthāna*. There are evidences of Anubhūtisvarūpācārya having commented upon Śrī Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on the *Upaniṣads*. There are manuscripts of *Upaniṣad-bhāṣya-tippṇa-s* mentioning *Prakatārtha-kāra*, that is, Anubhūtisvarūpācārya as the author. But the same texts are also current as the productions of one Narendrapuri in some cases and Ānandagiri in some other cases. Narendrapuri was closely associated with Anubhūtisvarūpācārya both in grammar and in Vedānta and Ānandagiri is well-known as the pupil of Anubhūtisvarūpā-

cārya.⁴ These make the textual problem of the *Upaniṣad-bhāṣya-tippaṇā*-s referred to above somewhat complicated and this problem requires careful and immediate investigation.

We have thus eight works of Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya, namely, the *Prakaṣārthavivarāṇa*, the *Gītā - bhāṣya - tippaṇa*, the *Gauḍapādīya-bhāṣya-tippaṇa*, the *Iṣṭasiddhivivarāṇa*, the *Śiṣyahitaiṣiṇī*, and the commentaries on the three prakaraṇas of Ānandabodha.

As to the identity of Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya, it is clear that the Advaitic writer is the same as the author of the Sārasvata grammar; for, between the grammar on one side and the Advaitic commentaries on the other, and also among the Advaitic commentaries themselves, there are agreements which are of a conclusive nature about the identity of the authorship in all these cases. Similar agreements of a very conspicuous nature are to be seen between the *Tattvāloka*⁵ of Janārdana and the *Prakaṣārtha-vivarāṇa* and the other works of this cycle. Janārdana has been held by scholars to have been the civil name of the prolific Advaitic commentator Ānandagiri or Ānandajñāna. Prajñanā-

4. See *Tarkasaṃgraha*, pp. x-xi.

5. Printed in the Bhāratīya Vidyā Series. No. 27, Bombay-7.

nanda who has commented on the *Tattvāloka* refers to Anubhūtisvarūpācārya as his *parama-guru*.⁶

Ānandajñāna, a pupil of Anubhūtisvarūpācārya has been assigned by Mr. Tripāṭhi to the middle of the 13th century, a date which Das Gupta also accepts. Amalānanda the commentator on Vācaspatimiśra's *Bhāmatī* replies without mentioning the name to Anubhūtisvarūpācārya's criticisms of Vācaspatimiśra. Amalānanda flourished in the first half of the 13th century; and, this is evident from his statement at the end of his *Kalpataru* that he wrote his work under the Yādava king of Devagiri, Kṛṣṇa (1248-1259 A. D.) and his brother Mahādeva. Anubhūtisvarūpācārya must, therefore, be taken as having flourished in the first half of the 13th century A. D.

II

His Times and The Historical Background

We have so far reconstructed the personality of Anubhūtisvarūpācārya and shown the extent of his contribution on the basis of the evidences supplied by manuscripts. Anubhūtisvarūpācārya no doubt became a forgotten author in the history of Advaita. His commentaries on the *Iṣṭa-siddhi*, *Khaṇḍana - khaṇḍa - khāḍya*, *Nyāya - makaranda*,

6. See Adyar Descriptive Catalogue, Vol. IX, p. 319a.

Nyāyadīpāvalī, *Pramāṇamāla*, Śrī Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on the *Gauḍapāda-kārikā* and the *Bhagavad-gītā* fell into oblivion. But his commentary on the *bhāṣya* of Śrī Śaṅkara on the *Brahma-sūtra*, namely, the *Prakaṣārthavivaraṇa* which may be rightly described as his *magnum opus* was remembered in the Advaitic tradition. Even in respect of this his real identity was lost as he was remembered only as *Prakaṣārtha-kāra* (the author of the commentary *Prakaṣārthavivaraṇa*). We have clear reference to him in the writings of Ānandagiri. This is, as it should be; for Ānandagiri, as has already been mentioned, was a pupil of Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya, and his *Tattvāloka*, as he himself says, was directly based on the *Prakaṣārtha-vivaraṇa*.⁷ Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya vehemently criticises Vācaspati-miśra's distinct views on Advaita that are embodied in his commentary *Bhāmatī* on Śrī Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on the *Brahma-sūtra*. Amalānanda-Vyāśāśrama in his *Kalpataru* on the *Bhāmatī* answers Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya's objections. He, however, does not refer to Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya by name. The details of these criticisms can be had in Prof. Hiriyanna's article entitled *Gleanings from the Prakaṣārtha*.⁸ But for the present it is necessary to point out that the references in Amalānanda could easily be identified as one to Anubhūtiśva-

7. *Ibid.*

8. See *Journal of Oriental Research*, Vol. 15, pp. 1-8.

rūpācārya. Govindānanda in his commentary *Ratnaprabhā* on the *bhāṣya* of Śrī Śaṅkara on the *Brahma-sūtra* identifies a reply in Amalānanda as directed against the *Prakaṣārtha-kāra*.⁹ Puruṣotama—the disciple of Rāmatīrtha Yati¹⁰ who flourished in the middle of the 16th century in his commentary *Subodhinī* on the *Samkṣepaśārīraka*¹¹ of Sarvajñātmamuni and Appayya-Dīkṣita in his *Siddhāntaleśasaṁgraha*¹² make references to *Prakaṣārtha-kāra*. Govindānanda, already referred to, has had access to the *Prakaṣārtha vivaraṇa*; for there are several contexts in which he shows the influence of that work.¹³ Dhanapatisūri in his commentary *Bhāṣyotkarṣadīpikā* on Śrī Śaṅkara's

9. *prakaṣārthakāraistu pāṭakaprasiddha-antodatta-svarūḥ pāribhāṣikāḥ iti vyākhyātam, tat kalpatarukārair dūṣitam, Ratnaprabhā, p. 311.*

10. See the Article — *The Date of Rāmatīrtha Yati*, by P. K. Gode, *Adyar Library Bulletin*, Vol. VI, Pt. II, pages 107-110.

11. *Samkṣepaśārīraka*, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, Vol. II, p. 628.

12. *Siddhāntaleśasaṁgraha*, Vol. II, pp. 2, 12, 23. (Publications of the Department of Indian Philosophy, Madras University No. 4).

13. (i) *parākrāntam cātra darpaṇaḥkūyām ācāryaiḥ ityuparamyate, Ratnaprabhā* (Nirnaya-Sagar Press, 1909), p. 561. See *Prakaṣārthavivarāṇa*, p. 660. This work will hereafter be referred to as 'PV'.

bhāṣya on the *Bhagavadgītā* makes¹⁴ reference to a particular view on *avidyā* and this view could easily be identified as that of Anubhūti-svarūpācārya. All the above references do clearly point out that some of the criticisms and specific views of Anubhūti-svarūpācārya were remembered in the writings of the later Advaitins.

To appreciate the place occupied by Anubhūti-svarūpācārya in the history of Advaita in the *post*-Śaṅkara period, it is necessary to refer to some of the authors who preceded him in the immediate past—authors who belonged not only to the Advaitic school, but also others who were active in opposing the philosophy of Advaita. The latter opponents of Advaita were mainly of two groups—the Naiyāyikas and the *Bhedā-bheda-vādins* or the *Brahma-pariṇāma-vādins*. The two formed the main targets of the criticisms of the Advaitins in the centuries immediately following Śrī Śaṅkara.

Of the exponents of the *bhedā-bheda-vāda*, Bhaskāra who appeared on the scene immediately

(ii) *etatsūtrabhāṣyabhāvānabhijñāḥ sannyāsāśrama-dharmaśravaṇādau vidhīrṇāstīti vadanti, Ratna-prabhā, p. 818. See PV., p. 989.*

14. *anādiranīrvācyū bhūta-prakṛtiḥ cinmātra-sambandhinī māyā, tasyām citpratibimbūḥ īśvaraḥ, tasyā eva āvaraṇavikṣepa saktimādayābhīdhāneṣu paricchinna-anantapradeṣeṣu cit pratibimbo jīva iti kecit, Bhāṣyotkarṣadīpikā, p. 357. Cf. PV., page 3,*

after Śrī Saṅkara led the opposition against the exposition of Śrī Saṅkara. In the introductory verse to his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, Bhāskara says that his commentary is to refute the interpretation of the *Brahma-sūtra*, by those who read their own ideas into it thereby distorting its sense¹⁵. A study of the *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya* of Bhāskara shows that he has Śrī Saṅkara in his mind. In his wake appeared Keśava and the author referred to as Brahma-prakāśikā-kāra, one Mādhava and a writer named Amṛtānanda.¹⁶ The Advaitic dialectics against this group of critics of Śrī Saṅkara had two of its leading protagonists in our author Anubhūtisvarūpācārya and another named Ānandānubhava who also lived almost in the same age. He wrote two works *Padārtha-tattva-nirṇaya* and *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī*. We could also add to this the earlier writer Ānandabodha on whom our author Anubhūtisvarūpācārya wrote commentaries. Bhāskara upheld not only the old *pre-Saṅkara* philosophical positions of *bhedā-bheda* and *pariṇāma* but also upheld the ancient view on the *sādhana* plane of combining *jñāna* and *karma* and the monastic mode called *tridaṇḍī-sannyāsa*. Both Anubhūti-

15. *sūtrābhiprāyasamvṛtṭyā svābhiprāyaprākāśanāt
vyākhyātam yairidam śāstram vyākhyā iyam tannivṛtṭayē* — Introductory Verse.

16. *PV.*, pp. 1, 10, 24, 29, 55, 84, 118, 128, 370, 378, 417, 429.

svārūpācārya and Ānandānubhava criticized effectively Bhāskara who symbolised this type of opposition to Śrī Śāṅkara. In the field of Nyāya also there was revival of activity which was directed mainly against the philosophy of *jagan-mithyātva*. In the times before the 10th century—if we may draw a rough demarcation like that—the orthodox darśanas and particularly the Nyāya were concerned with opposing the Buddhist schools. After this period when the influence of Buddhism waned, the attention of the orthodox schools turned in a more pronounced manner against each other. Different schools of Vedānta developed and the controversies in the field of philosophy were concerned with these differing stand-points within the fold of Vedānta. The renewed activity in the field of Nyāya may be said to have received a fresh impetus from the new technique developed by one Kulārka Paṇḍita in his *mahāvīdyānumāna*. After a time the Nyāya school was rendered more or less ineffective and the Bhedā-bheda school was superseded by the new developments of the theistic schools of Ramānuja and Madhva. Later Advaitic dialectics concerned itself in the main with the last mentioned schools.

When we view the history of Advaita in relation to the other schools on the lines indicated above, we can see what important role certain able exponents of Advaita played in the field when *post-*

Saṅkara Advaita had to contend against the Bhedābheda and Nyāya schools. At least three powerful advocates of Advaita could be mentioned as the most active controversialists of this phase—Anubhūtisvarūpācārya, Citsukha, and Ānandānubhava. Just as Bhāskara was roughly handled by both Anubhūtisvarūpācārya and Ānandānubhava, in Nyāya the author of the work called *Mānamanohara* (Vādivāgīśvara)¹⁶ was the common target of attack for Ānandānubhava and Citsukha.

Not only did the two authors Anubhūtisvarūpācārya and Ānandānubhava live in about the same age and do the same kind of work, but there seems to have been some kind of connection between them; for we find Ānandagiri who was—as Janārdana—a pupil of the former writing commentaries on the works of the latter. Like the *Tattvāloka* and the *Tarkasaṃgraha* of Janārdana—Ānandajñāna—Ānandagiri, the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* of Ānandānubhava is a critique of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika categories.

Anubhūtisvarūpācārya's contribution to Advaita lies in his critical examination and the final rejection of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Bhedābheda schools. Further he has distinct views as regards

16. Published by Swāmi Yogīndrānanda in the *Ṣaḍdarśana-Granthamālā* series, No. 2., Varanasi, 1973.

some of the most important concepts of Advaita and they have considerable importance in the historical development of Advaita.

III

Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika

The Vedānta-Sūtras themselves have reference to the views of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika particularly of the Vaiśeṣika school. The Vaiśeṣika it is well-known hold a theory of the creation of the universe from atoms as the material cause to which the Vedāntic position of Brahman as being the sole material and efficient cause of the universe is directly opposed. In the wake of their basic theory, the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika realists hold also several other categories all of which are not acceptable to the Vedāntins. Under all the contexts where the Sūtras have direct or indirect reference to the positions of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, and under the *bhāṣya* on these where Śrī Śaṅkara briefly refutes the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika views, Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya takes the occasion to enter into further details and launch upon a systematic examination and refutation of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theories. We may in passing take note of the contexts in which the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika criticisms occur in the *Prakāṣārthavivaraṇa*.

At the outset under the *adhyāsa bhāṣya*, Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya speaks of the *anyathā*—

khyāti of the Naiyāyikas more than once.¹⁷ While commenting on the *Brahma-sūtra*, *janmādyasya yataḥ* (I, i, 2) Śrī Śaṅkara refutes the Naiyāyika stand-point that God is to be inferred on the basis of a syllogism as the creator of the universe. Here Anubhūtisvarūpācārya devotes some attention to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theory of God and creation and criticises the same.¹⁸ Śrī Śaṅkara's reference to *tamas* in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, *jyotiścaraṇābhīdhānāt* (I, i, 24) is availed of by Anubhūtisvarūpācārya to criticise the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view that *tamas* is not a positive entity.¹⁹ The section known as the *Devatādhikaraṇa*²⁰ provides an occasion for Anubhūtisvarūpācārya to examine the logicians' theory about the non-eternality of *śabda*.²¹

In the same context, Anubhūtisvarūpācārya examines the category of *śakti* which the Naiyāyikas do not accept and criticises the latter mentioning Udayana by name.²¹ The *Brahma-sūtras*²² revert to the Vaiśeṣika tenet of the atomic origin of the world. Anubhūtisvarūpācārya makes his

17. *PV.*, P. 6-7.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 40-43.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 139.

20. *Brahma-sūtra*, I, iii, 28-30. *PV.*, pp. 284-30.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 286.

22. II, ii, 11-17.

elaborate criticism of the Vaiśeṣika theory of atoms together with the critical examination of the six padārthas accepted by the Vaiśeṣikas along with their sub-divisions. In the sequel also both in Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* and the *Prakāṣārthavivaraṇa* there are criticisms of the Vaiśeṣika view particularly. In the section known as *Paṭyadhikaraṇa*,²³ the Naiyāyika theory of God as the efficient cause is taken up again for criticism in both the *bhāṣya* and the *Paṭyadhikaraṇa*. This section is very important as herein Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya gives a systematic critique of the sixteen padārthas of the Nyāya school; and his criticism runs to over thirteen pages.²⁴ The discussion about *ākāśa* in the *Brahma-sūtra-yāvadvikāraṇi tu vibhāgo lokavat*,²⁵ provides an occasion for Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya to examine in detail the Nyāya conception of *dik* and *kalā*.²⁶

IV

Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya—His Views on Advaita and His relation to the Bhāskara School

The philosophy of Advaita centres around the doctrine of *avidyā* or *māyā*. The distinguishing feature of this school is the doctrine that the mate-

23. *Brahma-sūtra-s*, II, ii, 37-41.

24. *PV.*, pp., 562-574.

25. *II.* iii. 7.,

26. *PV.*, p. 592.

rial world is an illusion. It is, therefore, referred to as *māyā-vāda*. The ultimate reality is Brahman which is attributeless (*nirguṇa*) and formless (*nirākāra*) and which is of the nature of absolute consciousness. Owing to *avidyā* or *māyā*, it appears as *jīva*, *Īśvara*, and the world. The universe as such is indeterminable either as real or unreal. *Jīva* is to realize its identity with Brahman. To remain as Brahman is the ultimate goal, that is, liberation. And, this is possible only by overcoming *avidyā*. *Avidyā* could be removed only by the direct experience of Brahman. This, in short, is the philosophy of Advaita.

Bhāskara who appeared on the scene immediately after Śrī Śaṅkara criticized the concept of *nirguṇa* Brahman, the theory of *avidyā*, the doctrine that the universe is illusory, the contention that direct experience of Brahman is the means of liberation and the concept of *jīvanmuktī*. As against Śaṅkara, Bhāskara upheld that the ultimate reality is possessed of attributes (*saguṇa* Brahman), the universe is real by being the transformation of Brahman, and liberation results from both *jñāna* and *karma* only after death and not here and now.

Brahman

The Upaniṣadic texts speak of two forms of Brahman. Some texts convey Brahman as attributeless (*nirguṇa*) and formless (*nirākāra*). Other

texts speak of Brahman as having attributes (*saguṇa*) and forms (*sākāra*). The Upaniṣadic texts such as 'Brahman is not gross, not fine, not short, not long, without sound, without touch, without form, immutable, etc.,'²⁷ convey Brahman to be free from quality and form. And the Upaniṣadic texts such as 'He cherishes all (righteous) desires, contains all (pleasant) odours, and is endowed with all tastes', etc.,²⁸ convey Brahman as having qualities. In the same way the Upaniṣadic text 'Verily there are two forms of Brahman, gross and subtle, mortal and immortal, limited and unlimited, definite and indefinite,'²⁹ declares Brahman to have forms. Śrī Śaṅkara notices this distinction between two forms of Brahman, one which is without attributes (*nirguṇa*) and the other which is conceived-with attributes.³⁰ He adds that although Brahman as it is in itself can be but one, it may yet be viewed in such a way that it appears to possess attributes which do not genuinely belong to it, just as a piece of crystal, although really transparent appears red when a red hibiscus flower is placed near it. Hence there is no reason why certain texts should not teach, with a view to meditative worship, that Brahman has such and such attributes and forms.³¹

27. *Bṛhadāraṇyako'paniṣad*, III, viii, 8.

28. *Chāndogyo'paniṣad*, III, xiv, 2.

29. *Bṛhadāraṇyako'paniṣad*, II, iii, 1.

30. Śrī Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, I, i, 12.

31. *Ibid.*, on the *Brahma-sūtra*, III, ii, 15.

The author of the *Brahma-sūtra* points out³² that Brahman by itself cannot have these two contradictory characteristics, as it is opposed to experience. It may be said that Brahman by itself is free from all attributes, but by its association with a limiting adjunct it acquires qualities and forms which are real. This contention is not correct; for, the true nature of a thing cannot change because of its association with some limiting adjuncts. Redness in a crystal which is colourless is caused by the redness of a flower placed by its side and it is not real. Similarly the qualities and forms in Brahman which is pure consciousness are caused by *avidyā* and hence they are not real. Of the two aspects of Brahman set forth in the Upaniṣads we have to accept that which is free from any adjunct as its true nature. The other aspect of Brahman is only superimposed on it by *avidyā*, and hence it is not real. This aspect, however, is mentioned for the sake of worship.³³

As regards the forms mentioned in the Upaniṣads with reference to Brahman every such form is denied of Brahman in the Upaniṣadic texts that are negative in character.³⁴ The Upaniṣadic texts

32. *Brahma-sūtra*, II, ii, 11.

33. Śrī Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*,
III, ii, 11.

34. *Ibid.*, on the *Brahma-sūtra*, III, ii, 17.

“He goes from death to death who perceives anything like variety”³⁵ teaches that manifoldness in Brahman is not true by condemning those who see difference in it. From these it is clear that forms and qualities in Brahman are not true and Brahman is formless and attributeless.

Avidyā (Ajñāna)

Now the question arises as to how Brahman of this nature could be the cause of the world. The Upaniṣadic text “That from which these beings arise, That from which they derive existence and manifestation, That into which they lapse back at the time of dissolution—seek to know that; That is Brahman”³⁶ states that Brahman is the cause of the universe. It is in order to account for the rise of the universe from Brahman that the Upaniṣadic text “The sages absorbed in meditation discovered the creative power (*māyā*) which is present in Brahman and which consists of the three qualities of *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*”³⁷ introduces the principle of *māyā*. The expression ‘creative power’ in the passage cited above stands for *māyā* which is identical with *avidyā* or *ajñāna*. Śrī Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtrā*, *tadadhīnatvādarthavat*³⁸ states about *avidyā* (*māyā*) thus :

35. *Kaṭho’paniṣad*, IV, 11.

36. *Taittirīyo’paniṣad*, III, i, 1.

37. *Śvetāśvataro’paniṣad*, I, 3.

38. *Brahma-sūtra* I, iv, 3

“*Avidyā* is the root-cause of the world; it is designated by the word *avyakta*; it is indeterminable; it is identical with *māyā*; it is deep sleep; it is *paramēśvarāśraya*, that is, it depends on Brahman. And in it the individual souls not aware of their identity with Brahman rest”.³⁹ This passage affirms the identity of *māyā* and *avidyā* or *ajñāna*. We shall now set forth Anubūtiśvarūpācārya’s view on *māyā-avidyā*.

The Upaniṣadic text – “Know *māyā* to be the primal cause of the universe and *maheśvara* as possessing *māyā*,”⁴⁰ states that *māyā* is the source of the universe and it is present in Brahman—the pure consciousness. According to Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya the word *maheśvara* in the Upaniṣadic text cited above signifies pure consciousness, that is, Brahman. He points out that *māyā* is present *only* in the pure consciousness (*cin-mātra-sambandhinī*)⁴¹ word *only* clearly shows that *māyā* is not present in anything else, namely, *Īśvara* or *jīva* or the insentient objects. *Māyā* is indeterminable. It is not real; for, in that case it cannot be removed. It is not unreal, like a flower sprung from the sky; for then it cannot serve as the transformative material cause of the world. It cannot be real and unreal at once;

39. *avidyātmikā hī bījaśaktiḥ avyaktaśabdanirdeśyā paramēśvarāśrayā māyāmayī mahāsuptiḥ yasyān svarūpapratibodharahitāḥ śerate saṁsāriṇo jīvāḥ.*

40. *Śvetāvataśva’paniṣad*, IV, 10.

41. *PV.*, p. 3.

for, that would violate the law of contradiction. *Māyā* does not have parts; for, if it has parts then it must be admitted to have a beginning. Hence it must be admitted that *māyā* does not have parts. The conclusion presents another difficulty. If *māyā* does not have parts, then it cannot be viewed as the transformative material cause of the universe. It is a matter of ordinary experience that only those objects having parts do serve as the cause of the effects. Hence *māyā* cannot be said to be partless. It cannot be partless and possessed of parts at once, for, that would violate the law of contradiction. These difficulties do suggest that *māyā* is indeterminable (*anirvacanīya*).

When it is said that *māyā* does not have parts, it must be understood that *māyā* does not have parts that are real in nature. It does have parts that are indeterminable. The parts possess the powers of veiling (*āvaraṇa*) and projection (*vikṣepa*). They are termed *ajñāna* or *avidyā*. The reflection of pure consciousness in *avidyā* is *jīva*. Since there is plurality of *avidyā*, the *jīvas* are many. Since the limiting adjunct of *jīva*, namely, *avidyā* is limited, *jīva* as such is also limited although in its true nature it is all-pervasive. Śrī Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* states: Brahman—the pure consciousness does exist in the physical body; but it does not exist only there. It is all-pervasive and this is known from the Upaniṣadic

text “It is eternal and all-pervasive like etheric space.” *Jīva* as such, on the other hand, exists only in the body, as it cannot exist anywhere apart from the body which is the field of its experience.⁴² In another place he states that *jīva*, being limited, cannot be the cause of the universe.⁴³

It might be said that the indeterminable part of *māyā* cannot be held to be the limiting adjunct of *jīva*; for, Śrī Saṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra-tadadhīnatvād arthavat* states *avidyā* to be the limiting adjunct of *jīva*. Anubūtisvarūpācārya points out that the indeterminable parts of *māyā* alone serve as the limiting adjunct of *jīva*-s. But since they are removable by knowledge (*vidyā*) of Brahman they are termed *avidyā* by Śrī Śaṅkara.⁴⁴ The sense of the term *avidyā*, therefore, is the indeterminable parts of *māyā*—the whole. And, since the whole and parts are identical, *māyā*—the whole is said to be of the nature of *avidyā*—its parts.⁴⁵ The distinction of whole and parts as

42. *nanu īśvaro'pi śarīre bhavati, satyam śarīre bhavati, na tu śarīre eva bhavati, ākāśavat sarvagataśca nityaḥ iti vyāpīvaśravanāt, jīvastu śarīre eva bhavati tasya bhogādhiṣṭhānāt śarīrādanyatra vṛttyabhāvāt, Śrī Śaṅkara's Commentary on the Brahma-sūtra, I, ii, 1.*

43. *na ca upādhiparicchinnasya avibhoḥ prāṇabhṛtaḥ dyubh-vādyāyatanatvampi samyak sambhavati, Ibid., I, iii, 1.*

44. See Foot-Note, No. 39.

45. *PV.*, p. 325.

regards *māyā* is only illusory and not real. It comes to this. The reflection of pure consciousness in *māyā* is *Īsvara*. And, the reflection of pure consciousness in *avidyā*—the indeterminable part of *māyā* is *jīva*. There is the plurality of *avidyā* and hence there are many *jīvas*.⁴⁶ The consciousness which serves as the original is pure and to remain as it is liberation.

This way of viewing *māyā-avidyā* solves the problem of accounting for the distinction of the bound and the released souls. In the case of the individual soul who realises his identity with the consciousness that serves as the original, *avidyā* or *ajñāna* which is his limiting adjunct is annihilated. Thereby mind—the effect of *avidyā* is removed and its removal leads to the removal of the characteristics of finitude, agency, etc., pertaining to the individual soul. Such an individual soul then ceases to be an individual soul and remains as pure consciousness which serves as the original for both the reflections of *Īsvara* and *jīvas*. He is the released soul. The others are the bound souls. The universe which is the transformation of *māyā* does exist, but it is not experienced by the released soul. This *māyā* will be annihilated only when all its parts which serve as the limiting adjuncts of *jīvas* are annihilated. The parts, however, will be

46. *PV.*, p. 3.

annihilated only when all the individual souls realize their identity with pure consciousness that serves as the original. To sum up this part of our discussion: The pure consciousness reflected in *avidyā*—the indeterminable part of *māyā* is *jīva*. It acquires the characteristics of finitude, agency, etc. This is bondage. And to be free from all these characteristics and to remain as the pure consciousness that serves as the original is liberation.⁴⁷

Jīva and Īśvara

Advaitins seek to explain the nature of *jīva* and *Īśvara* in three different ways: and they are *pratibimba-vāda*, *ābhāsa-vāda*, and *avaccheda-vāda*. These three may be explained successively as follows:

Pratibimba-vāda: This view is advocated by Padmapāda in his *Pañcapādikā* and by his commentator Prakāśātman in his *Vivāraṇa*. According to this view, *avidyā* which is super-imposed on Brahman—the pure consciousness receives its reflection, like a mirror, the reflection of a face. The pure consciousness which serves as the prototype (*bimba*) is *Īśvara*. And the reflection of pure consciousness in *avidyā* and its product—mind is *jīva*.

This theory known as *pratibimba-vāda* is explained in a slightly different way by Sarvajñāt-

47. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

mamuni in his *Samkṣepaśārīraka*. He holds both Īśvara and *jīva* to be the reflections of pure consciousness in *avidyā* and mind respectively. The unique feature of *pratibimba-vāda* is that the reflected image is identical with the prototype and hence it is real. But wrong localisation and transposition of the prototype in the limiting adjunct and the defects of the limiting adjunct presented in the reflection—these are not real, that is, indeterminate either as real or unreal.

Ābhāsa-vāda: This view is advocated by Sureśvara. It is almost the same as the previous one. It is different only in the conception and interpretation of the nature of reflection. According to the previous view, in a reflection the reflected image is identical with the prototype and hence it is real. But it is only wrong localisation, transposition, etc., of the original in the limiting adjunct—these that are unreal. According to the *ābhāsa-vāda*, the reflected image is not identical with prototype; it is different from it and it is indeterminate either as real or unreal. The pure consciousness that is reflected in *avidyā* is Īśvara; and, the pure consciousness that is reflected in mind is *jīva*.

Avaccheda-vāda: This view is advocated by Vācaspatimiśra in his *Bhāmātī*. Vācaspatimiśra does not favour the theory of reflection of Brahman-

While commenting on the *adhyāsa-bhāṣya*, Vācaspatiśra observes that there could not be any reflection of Brahman which is free from any form. An object having a form could receive the reflection of that thing which has form. Brahman being free from any form cannot have any reflection in mind. How could there be any reflection of sound, smell, taste, etc.? On this ground he advocates the theory known as *avaccheda-vāda*. According to this theory, Brahman delimited by *avidyā* is *jīva* which is its locus (*āśraya*) and Brahman which is not conditioned by it, but which is the content (*viṣaya*) of *avidyā* is *Īsvara*.⁴⁸

Anubhūtisvarūpācārya advocates the *prati-bimba-vāda*. He holds that *māyā* is located in Brahman—the pure consciousness. Its parts – indeterminate are they—are termed *ajñāna* or *avidyā*. And the reflection of pure consciousness in *māyā* is *Īsvara* and the reflection of pure consciousness in *avidyā* is *jīva*. Since the indeterminate parts of *māyā*, namely *avidyā* are many, there is plurality of the individual souls (*jīvas*). Anubhūtisvarūpācārya makes his position clear in his commentary on Śrī Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on the *Brahma-sūtra*, *ābhāsa eva ca*.⁴⁹ He points out that the author of the *sūtras* in

48. See *Bhāmatī* on the *Brahma-sūtra*, II, iii, 13 and III, ii, 3.

49. II, iii, 50.

the previous aphorisms⁵⁰ holds the *jīva* to be the part *as it were* of Brahman. This however, is from the stand-point of the *avaccheda-vāda*. But in the *sūtra-abhāsa eva ca*, the author of the sūtras uses the word *eva* with reference to *ābhāsa* or reflection and this shows that the theory of reflection or the *pratibimba-vāda* is his cherished view.⁵¹ In this connection Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya examines Bhāskara's interpretation of the *sūtra, ābhāsa eva ca*. Bhāskara reads the *sūtra* as *ābhāsā eva ca* and interprets it to mean that all Advaitic theories are false (*ābhāsāḥ*). And he also criticises the *pratibimbavāda*. Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya points out that Bhāskara's criticism of the *pratibimbavāda* is unsound. To explain the theory of error (*bhrama*), Bhāskara upholds the theory known as *anyathā-khyāti-vāda*. So, according to him, reflection of face inside a mirror, means the association of face which exists in a different place with mirror. Here the appearance of the association of face with mirror is erroneous; the appearance of face, however, is real. According to Advaitin's view also there is no negating cognition in the form, 'This is not face' with reference to the reflection of face in

50. II, iii, 43-49.

51. *yat ādye sūtre jīvasyāmśitvam āsūtritam tadavacchedābhiprāyena ityuktvā adhunā ābhāsa eva ca ityevakāram prayuñjānaḥ pratibimbapakṣam svarahasyam sūtrayāmāsa bhagavān sūtrakāraḥ, PV., p. 659.*

mirror. But there is the negating cognition in the form, 'Here is not a different face but only mine' which suggests only the negation of wrong localisation of the original face and affirms the identity of the image and the original one. Anubhūtisvarūpācārya thus points out that Bhāskara's criticism of the *pratibimba-vāda* would definitely contradict his cherished theory of error, that is, *anyathākhyātivāda*. He concludes by referring the reader to the section known as *darpaṇa-ṭīkā* in the *Pañcapādikā* of Padmapāda.⁵²

There is a criticism that there cannot be any reflection of formless Brahman in *avidyā* on the ground that only objects which have form could be reflected. Advaitins point out that redness of a flower is reflected in a crystal; and, redness does not have any form. Sound which does not have any form has reflection in the form of an echo. Hence it is not correct to say that only objects which have form could have reflection. It might be said that only those objects which can be perceived by the sense-organs could have reflection. Redness and sound, although they do not have any form, are reflected because they are respectively perceived by the sense of sight and the sense of hearing. Brahman, on the other hand, does not come within the range of any sense organ. On this

52. *PV.*, pp. 659-660.

ground it cannot have any reflection. This rule, namely, that it is only those objects which can be comprehended by the sense organs could have reflection lacks correspondence. Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya points out that etheric space which does not come within the range of any sense organ and which is manifested by the witness self does have reflection in water. In the same way, Brahman which is formless and which transcends all sense organs has reflection in *avidyā*⁵³. It comes to this : The reflection of Brahman which is pure consciousness in *avidyā*—the indeterminable part of *māyā* is *jīvā*. And the reflection of Brahman which is pure consciousness in *māyā* is *Īśvara*.

The personified forms of *Īśvara* as *Viṣṇu*, *Brahmā*, and *Śiva* are not mentioned in any of the principal Upaniṣads. The *Chāndogyo'paniṣadic* text—'He the Puruṣa that is seen in the sun is golden in colour; His beard is golden, hair is golden, everything upto the tip of the nails is golden,'⁵⁴ speaks of Brahman as having a form, but does not speak of the three-fold distinction as *Viṣṇu*, *Brahmā*, and *Śiva*. It is only in the *Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad* we find reference to the three-fold conception of *Īśvara* as mentioned above. Therein it is stated that Brahman associated with *avidyā*, although one, is designated by such terms as *Viṣṇu*

53. *PV.*, p. 4.

54. I, vi, 6.

Brahmā, and Śiva, according to the preponderance of the three strands of *avidyā*—*sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*.⁵⁵ Śrī Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*⁵⁶ which discusses the *Chāndogyo'paniṣad* passage cited above states that Īśvara, out of His own will, takes an illusory form in order to bestow grace upon His worshippers.⁵⁷ This view is based upon the statement of Brahmanandin—an Advaitin of the *pre*-Śaṅkara period in his aphoristic commentary on the *Chāndogyo'paniṣad* which is not available now.⁵⁸ His commentator Drāviḍācārya in his *bhāṣya* states that the forms spoken of with reference to *saguṇa* Brahman do exist as the scripture would teach only what actually exists (*yathābhūta*).⁵⁹ The word *yathābhūta* means only empirical reality (*vyāvahārika-satyatva*) and not absolute reality (*pāramārthika-satyatva*). The forms of Brahman could exist only till the rise of the direct experience of Brahman. It is with this in view that Śrī Śaṅkara has used the word *māyāmaya*. Bhāskara while interpreting the *Brahmasūtra* refer.

55. IV, 5.

56. I, i, 20.

57. *syādiśvarasyāpi iccāvaśāt māyāmayaṃ rūpaṃ sādha-*
kānugrahārtham.

58. *syādrūpaṃ kṛtakam anugrahārtham tacchetasām*
aiśvaryaṃ, rūpaṃ cātindriyam antakarṇaṃ pratyakṣam
tannirdeśāt, See Draviḍātreyadarśanam, Śrī Kāmakoti
Kosasthanam, Francis Joseph Street, Madaas-1.

59. *na hi arūpāyāḥ devatāyāḥ rūpaṃ upadiśyate, yathābhū-*
tavādi hi śāstram, Ibid.

red to above points out that the forms of Brahman spoken of in the *Chāndogya* text are absolutely real; for, scripture would teach only what is real (*yathā bhūta*). Śrī Rāmānuja also in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* referred to above follows Bhāskara's interpretation. Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya makes reference to Bhāskara's view and points out that if the forms of Brahman spoken of in the *Chāndogya* text are considered to be real in the strict sense of the term on the ground that scripture would teach only what is real then one should treat the creation of dream objects as real, for there are scriptural passages which deal with them. Dream objects, however, are not real and this has been explained by Gauḍapāda, and the author of the *Brahma-sūtra*. Hence the forms spoken of with reference to Brahman in the *Chāndogya* text are real only empirically and not absolutely.

The Phenomenal World

Bhāskara considers the phenomenal world to be the transformation of Brahman which according to him, is characterized by attributes. The one serious criticism that one would make on this view is this : It is not possible to maintain that Brahman transforms itself into the universe. Only those objects which have parts could transform themselves into other objects. Brahman, being partless, cannot have any transformation. If it is pressed that

Brahman somehow undergoes transformation, then it amounts to admitting that it has parts. This admission would definitely lead to the unwelcome position of treating Brahman as non-eternal; for, whichever has parts is non-eternal. Hence it must be held that Brahman appears as the universe through *māyā*. The universe, therefore, is neither real like Brahman; nor unreal, like a flower sprung from the sky; nor real and unreal at once. It is *mīthyā* or *anirvacanīya*, that is, indeterminable either as real or unreal. Brahman alone is real.

Several objections are raised against the conclusion that the phenomenal world is indeterminable and Brahman alone is real. It is said: if absolute Brahman alone is the truth, then ordinary means of right knowledge—perception, etc., become invalid, since the absence of their manifoldness deprives them of their objects. Again, the Vedic texts embodying injunctions and prohibitions, and the Upaniṣadic texts referring to *mokṣa* lose their meaning if the world does not exist. Further, if Brahman alone is real, there is no room for the distinction of a God who rules and the world and the souls ruled by him. Devotion to personal God would therefore be an impossibility. Moreover, the passages of the Vedānta also are not real, as they belong to the phenomenal world which is not real. Hence they cannot convey the truth of the identity of the individual soul with Brahman.

Śrī Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*⁶⁰ answers these objections. He points out that the entire phenomenal world does not exist for him who has realized his identity with Brahman; and, for him there is no distinction of God, the ruler, and the individual souls and the world, the ruled. The author of the *Brahma-sūtra*⁶¹ advocates the *vivarta-vāda*, that is, the theory that the world is an appearance of Brahman and therefore not real, from the stand-point of the liberated souls. But so long as the knowledge of Brahman has not arisen, the entire complex of phenomenal existence is taken to be real, even as the phantoms of a dream are taken as real until the sleeper awakes.

The Upaniṣadic texts although ultimately not real, yet could convey the identity of the individual soul with Brahman, which is real. Death which is real occurs sometimes as a result of the mere suspicion that a venomous snake has bitten.⁶² The *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* text⁶³ declares that the perception of aperture in the sun which is not real indicates death which is real. The author of the *Brahma-sūtra*⁶⁴ declares that dream is an illusion

60. II, i, 14.

61. *Ibid.*

62. Śrī Śaṅkara's Commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, II, i, 14.

63. III, ii, 4, 7.

64. III, ii, 4.

and yet it is indicative of future good or evil, that is real. From this it is clear that an event in dream though not real indicates an actual future event. In the same way the Upaniṣadic texts, though not real, can convey the identity of the individual soul with Brahman.

It has been said by the Bhāskarites that the direct experience of Brahman also must be considered to be not real, as it is only knowledge like the knowledge of the phenomenal world. Anubhūti-svarūpācārya points out that the direct experience of Brahman *as such* is no doubt indeterminable either as real or unreal. But Brahman which is pure consciousness and which is the content of the direct experience is absolutely real⁶⁵

Liberation

Avidyā is the source of all evil and its removal would necessarily bring about the 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 this is liberation. The matter that is of profound importance here is that Brahman associated with mind is *jīva*—the transmigratory soul. And when the association is

65. *PV.*, pp. 428-9.

removed there is liberation. Liberation is thus the removal of *avidyā*.

Avidyā could be removed only by the direct knowledge of the substratum (*āśraya*). And substratum is defined as the content (*viśaya*) of *avidyā* which is the source of all superimpositions. Brahman is the content of *avidyā* and hence it is its substratum. Its knowledge, therefore, necessarily removes *avidyā*.

The mental state which arises from the Upaniṣadic texts in the form of Brahman and which is inspired by the reflection of Brahman in it is termed direct experience of Brahman. Brahman as such cannot dispel *avidyā*; for being associated with *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 illuminating the grass when reflected through a lens."

The direct experience of Brahman annihilates *avidyā* unaided by any auxiliary cause. The Bhāskārites hold that *jñāna* associated with *karma* or rituals leads to liberation. It is very doubtful whether by the word *jñāna* they mean the direct experience of Brahman. But as far as the Advaitic position is concerned the direct experience of Brah-

man in the form 'I am Brahman' cannot have any relation with rituals which require for their performance the sense of agency. The experience in the form 'I am Brahman' is free from any sense of agency. On this ground there cannot be any combination of *jñāna* and *karma*.

The direct experience of Brahman is thus directly opposed to *avidyā* and hence it dispels *avidyā* by its mere rise. The individual soul is then freed from the bonds of *saṁsāra*. The Upaniṣadic text is explicit that the direct experience of Brahman enables one to attain freedom from the bonds of *saṁsāra* here and now.⁶⁷ Such an individual soul remains here for sometimes as a *jīvanmukta*; and the concept of *jīvanmukti* is cardinal to the Advaita Vedānta.

We shall now deal with this in some detail.

In the case of one who has attained the direct experience of Brahman, the merits (*puṇya*) and demerits (*pāpa*) accumulated in the innumerable previous births and also in this life before the rise of the direct experience of Brahman are annihilated. The Upaniṣadic text 'Just as the upper part of a reed thrown into fire is completely burnt, so also all his sins are burnt away'⁶⁸ and the Upaniṣadic

67. *Kaṭho'paniṣad*, II, iii, 14.

68. *Chāndogyo'paniṣad*, V, xxiv, 3.

text 'He transcends both merits and demerits'⁶⁹ states that merits and demerits accumulated in the past life and also prior to the rise of the knowledge of Brahman are annihilated by the knowledge of Brahman. Further there is no possibility of the rise of any merit or demerit in future to the knower of Brahman; for, merit and demerit would arise by performing prescribed and interdicted actions respectively with attachment in the form 'I am the agent of this action'. But the one who has the direct experience of Brahman has no idea of any agency whatsoever with regard to any action that may occur in future. Hence there is no possibility of rise of any merit or demerit in future in his case. It is with this in view that the *Chāndogyo'paniṣad* passage 'As water does not stick to a lotus leaf, even so sin does not cling to one who has realised Brahman'⁷⁰ states that a future sin that might be expected to arise by performance of activities does not arise in the case of one who has realized Brahman. The word 'sin' in the Upaniṣadic text must be taken to convey the sense of merit also; for the result of merit like that of sin, is inferior to the fruit of the direct experience of Brahman.⁷¹

69. *Bṛhadāraṇyako'paniṣad*, IV, iv, 2.

70. IV, xiv, 3.

71. *yatrāpi kevala eva pāpma śabdo dṛśyate tatrāpi tenaiva puṇyamapi ākalitamiti draṣṭavyam jñānaphalāpekṣayā nikṛṣṭaphalatvāt*, Śrī Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, IV, i, 14.

It follows from the above that the knowledge of Brahman destroys past merits and demerits, and since it removes the sense of agency no future merit or demerit clings to the one who has realized Brahman.⁷²

There is one important point to be noted in this connection. When it is said that the past merits and demerits of a person are destroyed, we have to make a distinction between two kinds of past merits and demerits, namely, *sañcita*—the merits and demerits which have not fructified, and *prārabdha*—the merits and demerits which have begun to yield their results and have produced the body through which a person has attained knowledge. The *Brahma-sūtra*⁷³ states that the merits and demerits which have not fructified are annihilated by the direct experience of Brahman. But the merits and demerits which have started giving their results and which have produced the body through which a person has attained the direct experience of Brahman are not annihilated by the latter. Knowledge could arise to an individual soul only when it is embodied. And body is produced by merits and demerits which have evidently started yielding their results. When it is thus clear that the rise of knowledge is based upon the body produced by

72. *Brahma-sūtra*, IV, i, 13-14.

73. IV, i, 15.

merits and demerits that have started yielding their results, it is but natural that knowledge cannot annihilate the latter.⁷⁴ Such an individual who is free from the accumulated merits and demerits that have not fructified and who is living out only his fructified merits and demerits is called a *jīvan-mukta*—one who is liberated while embodied. His body continues to exist by the merits and demerits that are fructified.

Now it is necessary to deal with the factor that sustains the fructified deeds. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in his *Advaita-siddhi* sets forth two views. The first view is that it is *saṁskāra* or a residuum of *avidyā* after the latter has been removed by the direct experience of Brahman that sustains the fructified deeds. This he explains by means of a simile. Just as the fragrance of flowers persists in the vessel even after the flowers have been taken away, so also a residuum of *avidyā* (*saṁskāra*) persists even after it has been removed. This *saṁskāra* is present in the pure consciousness, that is, the released soul.⁷⁵ The other view is: Of the two powers of *avidyā*, namely, *āvaraṇa-śakti* and *vikṣepa-śakti*, it is only the *āvaraṇa-śakti* that is removed by the direct experience of Brahman. The

74. *brahmajñānam na pravṛttaphalakarmabījadāhakaṁ pravṛttaphalakarmakāryatvāt; bhōgavat, PV., p. 1031.*

75. *Advaita-siddhi*, (Nirnaya Sagar Press), p. 890.

vikṣepa-sakti, however, persists even after the rise of the direct experience of Brahman and this residual portion of *avidyā* is termed *avidyāleśa*. This sustains the fructified deeds that account for the continuance of the body in the case of a *jīvan-mukta*. This explanation Madhusūdana Sarasvatī gives in his commentary *Sārasaṅgraha* on the *Samkṣepaśārīraka*.⁷⁶ This *vikṣepa-śakti* has three aspects. Of these, one gives rise to the notion that the universe is absolutely real. The second one gives rise to the notion that the universe, though not absolutely real, is empirically real. That is, the objects of the universe, can be adapted to practical needs of life. These two powers are removed by the direct experience of Brahman. The third one gives rise to the apparent presentation of the universe; and it is not annihilated by the direct experience of Brahman. It is *avidyā* associated with this power and divested of the other two powers that is termed *avidyāleśa*.⁷⁷ Another definition of *avidyāleśa* is: The subtle form of *avidyā* after the latter is annihilated by the direct experience of Brahman is *avidyāleśa*.⁷⁸

It is not clear from the *Praktārthavivarāṇa* as to the view which Anubhūtisvarūpācārya accepts in order to account for the persistence of the fructi-

76. *Samkṣepaśārīraka*, IV, 40.

77. *Advaita-siddhi*, p. 891.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 892.

fied deeds. But this much is certain that any one of the above views must be admitted in order to explain the concept of *jīvanmukti*. The *jīvanmukta*'s life has two phases: It is either *samādhi* when he turns inwards and loses himself in Brahman; or the condition known as *vyutthāna* or revision to empirical life when he wakes back to variety. The world does appear to him then; but it does not delude him, since he has once for all realized its falsity. Śrī Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* says: 'One who has realised his identity with Brahman does not have the worldly experience *just as before*, whereas one who considers the world to be real and is deluded by it has not realized his identity with Brahman.'⁷⁹ Such a one known as *jīvanmukta*, in order to be Brahman waits for nothing else but the extinction of the merits and demerits that have already begun to fructify and have produced the body through which he has attained the knowledge of Brahman. The *Chāndogyo*' *paniṣad* text 'He waits so long only as he is not freed from the body; then he becomes free,'⁸⁰ affirms this view. The *Brahma-sūtra*⁸¹ states that the merits and demerits which have begun to

79. *na avagatabrahmātmabhāvasya yathāpūrvam samsāritvam, yasya tu yathāpūrvam samsāritvam nāsau avagatabrahmātmabhāvaḥ*, Śrī Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, I, i, 4.

80. VI, xiv, 2.

81. See IV, i, 19, and also IV, i, 14.

bear fruit are exhausted only by experiencing their fruits. And then *avidyāleśa* or *avidyā-saṁskāra*—the sustaining factor of the fructified merits and demerits is annihilated by the continuing knowledge of Brahman. The body of the *jīvanmukta* falls off and he becomes Brahman itself. This is *videhamukti*. And Brahman which is pure consciousness and absolute bliss is free from *avidyā* and bodily organisms then. This is liberation.

Bhāskara, however, criticises the concept of *jīvanmukti*. He says that the expression—one who is liberated and yet living is a contradiction in terms. He thinks that liberation means absence of embodiment, and this could be attained only in a hereafter and not here and now. Anubhūtisvarūpācārya points out that an individual soul is said to be released because in his case there is the annihilation of merits and demerits that would give rise to a future birth. He is considered to be living; for, his physical body experiences the results of the fructified merits and demerits. He is said to have become Brahman because in his case there is the removal of erroneous notion that he is not Brahman. Bhāskara's criticism of the concepts of *jīvanmukti*, therefore, is based upon his ignorance of the Advaitic view-points.⁸²

82. *PV.*, p. 1031.

V

Conclusion

Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya flourished in an age when Advaita had to contend against the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and the Bhedā-bheda schools. By criticising the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school and by refuting the objections of the Bhedā-bheda school against Advaita and by setting forth his distinct views on the concept of *māyā-avidyā* Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya rendered a solid service to the cause of Advaita. But it is a misfortune that for all that he wrote he became a forgotten author in the history of Advaita.

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 Kāmakōṭī 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. Ramasubrahmaniya Rajah

Sri S. V. Narasimhan

Sri Pattam Sivaramakrishna Iyer

Secretary:

Jt. Secretary-cum-Treasurer :

Sri N. C. Krishnan

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, 166, R. H. Road, Madras-600 004.

संसारध्वनि तापभानुकिरणप्रोद्भूतदाहव्यथा-

खिन्नानां जलकांक्षया मरुभुवि भ्रान्त्या परिभ्राम्यताम् ।
अत्यापन्नमुधाम्बुधिं सुखकरं ब्रह्माद्वयं दर्शय-
त्येषा शङ्करभारती विजयते निर्वाणसंदायिनी ॥

samsārādhvani tāpabhānukiraṇaprodhbhūta-
dāhavyathā
khinnānām jalakāṅkṣayā marubhuvī bhrāntyā
paribhrāmyatām,
atyāsannasudhāmbudhim sukhakaram brahmād
vayam darśayaty-
eṣā śaṅkarabhāratī vijayate nirvāṇasandāyini.

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.