

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ADVAITA-VEDĀNTA

The Voice of ŚĀṆKARA

śāṅkara-bhāratī

Chairman, Advisory Board:

V. R. Kalyanasundara Sastri

Editor:

N. C. Krishnan



Volume TEN
Number TWO

AUGUST

1985

esā śaṅkara-bhāratī vijagate
nirvāṇa-sandāyini

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

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

Chairman, Advisory Board

V. R. Kalyanasundara Sastri

Editor

N. C. Krishnan

Volume TEN

Number TWO

சுந்தரம் அ. கிருஷ்ணன்

AUGUST

1985

ADVISORY BOARD

Chairman

Sri V. R. Kalyanasundara Sastri

Members

Sri V. S. V. Gurusvami Sastri

Dr. R. Balasubramanian

Dr. P. K. Sundaram

Dr. N. Gangadharan

Dr. V. K. S. N. Raghavan

Sri J. R. S. Vasani Ramanan

Editor

Sri N. C. Krishnan

CONTENTS

<p style="text-align: center;">JAGADGURU ŚRĪ CANDRAŚEKHARENDRA SARASVATĪ</p>	<p>83 <i>Homage to Śaṅkara</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">JAGADGURU ŚRĪ JAYENDRA SARASVATĪ</p>	<p>85 <i>Śrī Kṛṣṇa - The Perfect Avatāra</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">JAGADGURU ŚRĪ JAYENDRA SARASVATĪ</p>	<p>88 <i>Suadharmā</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">ŚAṅKARA BHAGAVATPĀDA</p>	<p>93 <i>Gaṅgāṣṭakam</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">S. S. SŪRYANĀRĀYAṆA ŚĀSTRĪ</p>	<p>99 <i>Devīcatusṣaṣṭyupacāra- pūjāstotram</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">S. S. SŪRYANĀRĀYAṆA ŚĀSTRĪ</p>	<p>107 <i>Viṣṇupādūdikēśānta- varṇanastotram</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">ĀTMAVIDYĀBHŪṢAṆAM V. S. V. GURUSVĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ</p>	<p>115 <i>Vivekacūdāmaṇi</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">ĀTMAVIDYĀBHŪṢAṆAM V. S. V. GURUSVĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ</p>	<p>123 <i>The Philosophy of Śaṅkara</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">BHĀṢYABHĀVAJṆA V. R. KALYĀṆASUNDARA ŚĀSTRĪ</p>	<p>141 <i>Śūrirakavyākhyā- prasthānabhedaḥ (in Sanskrit)</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">BHĀṢYABHĀVAJṆA V. R. KALYĀṆASUNDARA ŚĀSTRĪ</p>	<p>150 <i>Śūrirakavyākhyā- prasthānabhedaḥ</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">BHĀṢYABHĀVAJṆA V. R. KALYĀṆASUNDARA ŚĀSTRĪ</p>	<p>158 <i>Abhedaḥ Paramam Sūmyam (in Sanskrit)</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">BHĀṢYABHĀVAJṆA V. R. KALYĀṆASUNDARA ŚĀSTRĪ</p>	<p>165 <i>Non-difference is Supreme Identity.</i></p>

HOMAGE TO ŚAṄKARA

[106]

ओङ्कारार्थविवोधनचतुरं
करुणार्द्रनयनकञ्जातम् ।
माण्डूक्यकारिकाम्बुज-
बालरविं नौमि शङ्कराचार्यम् ॥

*oṅkārārtha-vibodhana-caturam
karuṇārdra-nayana-kañjātam
māṇḍūkyakārikāmbuja-
bālaravim naumi śaṅkarācāryam.*

I bow to Śrī Śaṅkarācārya who is adept in explaining the meaning of *praṇava-akṣara* (*Oṅkāra*, i.e. Brahman), who has lotuslike, compassionate eyes, and who being the rising sun blossoms the lotus of the *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*.

[107]

नयनजितपङ्कजातं
नतनयनाम्भोधिपूर्णचन्द्रमसम् ।

नवनीततुल्यहृदयं
नौमि सदा शङ्कराचार्यम् ॥

nayana-jita-pāñkajātam
natanayanāmbhodhi-pūrṇacandramasam
navanīta-tulya-hṛdayain
naumi sadā śaṅkarācāryam.

I always bow to Śrī Śaṅkarācārya whose beautiful pair of eyes defeat the lotuses, who is like the full moon in gladdening the ocean of the devotee's eyes, and whose heart is similar to the butter.

[108]

मथितमदमानमार-
प्रभृतिबलिष्ठारिमर्बगर्वमहम् ।
मनसा स्मरामि सततं
विरतिप्रदमाशु शङ्कराचार्यम् ॥

mathita-mada-māna-māra-
prabhṛti-baliṣṭhāri sarva-garvam-aham
manasā smarāmi satatam
viratipradam-āśu śaṅkarācāryam.

I reflect in my mind Śrī Śaṅkarācārya incessantly, who has completely thwarted all the strong enemies of haughtiness, arrogance, passion, etc., and who quickly makes his devotees attain dispassion (*vairāgya*).

Jagadguru Śrī Saccidānandaśivābhīnava Nṛsiṃhabhārati
in *Śrīśaṅkarācāryasuvārṇamālāstavarāja*

ŚRĪ KRṢṢNA — THE PERFECT AVATĀRA*

Jagadguru Śrī Candrasekharendra Sarasvatī

I

Light is most welcome in utter darkness; Kṛṣṇa is that great light born in darkness, both physical and spiritual.

What is a year to us is a day for the gods (*devas*). The six months of our *dakṣiṇāyana* is a single night for them. What is a month to us is a day for our departed forefathers in the *pitrloka*. So the dark half of our lunar month (*kṛṣṇapakṣa*) is their night; and in it our *aṣṭamī* (the eighth day) is their midnight. So, Kṛṣṇa, born in the midnight of *dakṣiṇāyana-kṛṣṇapakṣa-aṣṭamī* is one born in the deepest darkness according to the calendar of human beings, manes (*pitrs*), and gods (*devas*).

Not only the time, but the place where He (Lord Kṛṣṇa) was born was also plunged in darkness. It was

*Courtesy : *Śaṅkara and Śaṅmata* — Souvenir published in connection with the conference on "Śaṅkara and Śaṅmata" held in Madras from 1-6-1969 to 9-6-1969.

the prison-cell. In addition to this He was Himself dark-complexioned (*kr̥ṣṇa* in colour).

Like the rain and the lightning born of dark water-laden clouds, Kṛ̥ṣṇa gave out the rain of Grace and the lightning of Enlightenment. The light of the *Bhagavad-gītā* given by Lord Kṛ̥ṣṇa will be shedding its radiance as a lamp *within*, for all those who seek the way out of this dark, worldly life of ours.

II

The *Bhāgavata* which describes the sports of Lord Kṛ̥ṣṇa is extolled as the Scripture of scriptures. It opens out the inner eye of the devotee. The endearing Tamil name of Lord Kṛ̥ṣṇa, *Kaṇṇan*, signifies that He is that *eye* which sees all, and yet stands apart.

Kṛ̥ṣṇa's beautiful form is a feast for the eye. His *Bhagavadgītā* is a feast for the ear. Through the eye and the ear, He seeps into the soul and drenches it with joy.

The great dynamism of this perfect *Avatāra*, His numerous exploits, His great renunciation are all enveloped in His utter playfulness. He bears all the brunt with the cheer of a play-boy (விளையாட்டுப் பிள்ளை) ever playing dulcet notes on His flute (புல்லாங்குழல்). We should also cultivate that equipoise, detachment, and light-mindedness, even though ever engaged in activities for the welfare of the world.

He fascinates the entire cross-section of humanity — as the mischievous urchin of Gokula; as the cowherd

of Brindavan; as the divine artist playing on the flute; as the beloved of the cowherdesses; as the wrestler who did short work of Cāṇūra; as the wise adviser of king Ugrasena; as the emissary of the Pāṇḍavas showing consummate statesmanship; as the strategist devising plans in the war — He who was all this soothes us most by saving Draupadī from dishonour, by conferring riches on the indigent Kucela, and by conferring the highest wisdom on Arjuna, and the very fruit of that wisdom — liberation (*mukti*) on Bhīṣma.

All His life, He was utterly impersonal. Even when He had to shed the mortal coil, as the arrow of an inadvertent hunter shot Him, He did not lose His self-composure and had nothing but love for the hunter.

He who stole butter and milk in His boyhood continues to steal the hearts of people by His grace. Both Man of ceaseless Action and Man of supreme Knowledge, Kṛṣṇa is rightly worshipped as the Perfect incarnation of Viṣṇu.

SVADHARMA
(One's own duty)*

Jagadguru Śrī Jayendra Sarasvatī

Our religion is a religion based on experience. It has not been born as a result of study. Whatever *dharmas* we have acquired today have all come down to it as a result of experience and not as a result of bookish knowledge. In the *Gītā*, Lord Kṛṣṇa emphasizes the same thing when He says:

स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः ॥

Man attains fulfilment only by doing his *svadharma* or his own duty. The first thing required to attain God's grace and *mokṣa* is to do one's own duty (*svadharma*). One can do *bhakti* afterwards, but one should do one's duty first. A father should do his duty as a father, a mother should do her duty as a mother, a disciple should do his duty as a disciple, and a *guru* (teacher) should do his duty as a *guru*, and so on. If a

*Courtesy: *Our Heritage* — ed. Dr T. M. P. Mahadevan; pub. Sri V. T. Rajan (Madras: M/s Rajan & Co. Printers, 1976) pp. 47-50.

person does service to his parents, if a wife does service to her husband, then there is no need to worship any other deity at all. It is only those who forget this think of going to temples to worship this deity or that deity. If a person just goes on doing service to his parents, or if a wife goes on doing service to her husband, it is as good as their worshipping God. There is no need for them to go to temples to seek God's grace as they get it in their very house.

There is a story in the *Mahābhārata* to illustrate this idea. There was a boy who did not do any service to his parents. He forgot his duty relating to his parents, but he went to the forest. In the forest, a *maharṣi* (great sage) initiated him into some *mantra* and the boy continued to recite it for ten days. After performing *tapas* (penance) for ten days he thought he had attained some *siddhi* (fulfilment). While he was doing *tapas* under a tree, suddenly a crane, which was sitting on the tree, allowed its excretion to fall on the boy's head. The boy then looked up in an angry mood, and the crane fell down dead and was burnt to ashes. (The boy became angry and said, "I have been doing *tapas* (penance) here for ten days, and I have obtained *mantra-siddhi*. You are just a bird and you are allowing your excretion to fall on me." He stared at the bird, and the bird was burnt to ashes; and it fell down.)

The boy then thought that by his *tapas* he had attained *mantra-siddhi*, and so he thought he could shake the whole world with his *mantra-śakti*. Therefore, he thought there was no need to do penance any longer. As he was going along, he was hungry and he began

to search for food. When one is hungry, one forgets everything else. He went to many houses, but all of them had bolted doors. Only in one house, the door was open. The boy went to that house and asked the lady to give him *bhikṣā* (भिक्षा). The lady heard him but did not reply to him. She went on doing her work in the house. The boy then stared at her. Immediately, the lady also stared at him and said, "Do you think that I am the crane which you burnt down under the tree?"

“*Kokkenṟu ninaittāyō koṅganavā?*”

“கொக்கென்று நினைத்தாயோ கொங்கணவா?”

The boy was really surprised as to how the lady had come to know that he had killed the crane because of his *tapas*. He felt that the lady knew more than he did. He asked her, "How do you know that I have burnt a crane?" She replied, "I have no time to tell you; I have to attend to other things. Please go and ask that butcher in that street corner and he will tell you."

So the boy went to the butcher. The butcher asked him, "Has that lady sent you here?" The boy was still more surprised at this. He wanted the butcher to tell him how he knew about it. The butcher told him, "I have no time to tell you now; please wait." The boy waited patiently, suppressing even his hunger. After finishing his business, the butcher went to his house, bathed his old parents, gave them meals and attended to their comforts.

After serving them, the butcher came to the boy. The latter repeated his question, and then the butcher

“That lady was serving her husband at the time you went. So she had got *devānugraha* by her service to her husband. Therefore she has got the power to know about the past, present and future. There is no need for her to do any *tapas* at all; nor is it necessary for her to go to the temple to get the divine grace. It is enough if you do your duty. The gods are there not only in the temple but in your own house. The husband is god for his wife and the parents are gods for their son.” (We have the story in Tamil about the St. Kāraikkāl Ammaiyaṛ. She was able to get a fruit just by meditation, because she had acquired that power by service to her husband.)

Then, the butcher told the boy, “But, what have you done? Have you done any service to anyone, even to your wife for that matter? So far as I am concerned, I have my old parents in my house. And, I have been serving them daily. It has been said in our religion:

“*mātr̥-devo bhava; pitr̥-devo bhava*”

मातृदेवो भव । पितृदेवो भव ।

Therefore, I have been serving them as God, and I think of them only all the time. I do not think that I am a butcher at all, but I am just doing my duty. Service to my parents is my greatest *dharma*. But you have forgotten this basic thing, and that is why you do not know about these things.” The boy told him, “I have done *sādhana* by doing *tapas* for ten days.” The butcher told him that his *mantra* was just worth a quarter *anna* piece. There are *mantras* for snake-bite,

scorpion-bite, etc., and your *mantras* were also just like them.

The *Maharṣis* had learnt all these *mantras* in order to protect themselves from hunger, heat, cold, etc., during the rainy season as they could not go out for seeking food for many days at a stretch. So in order to carry on their *tapas* without any disturbance they had learnt these *mantras* and attained *siddhi* in them. But once those *siddhis* were there, the deities (*devatās*) used to give them whatever they wanted. Our *Purāṇas* and *Śāstras* contain many such examples.

The *Purāṇas* give details about our *dharma* and tell us what we could do and what we could get as a result of the action. So, doing one's duty has been given the highest importance, such as duties of the wife to the husband, the son to his parents, and so on. That is the best way to obtain *śreyas* or prosperity, and happiness.

GAṄGĀṢṬAKAM*

Saṅkara Bhagavatpāda

[1]

भगवति भवलीलामौलिमाले तवाम्भः-
कणमणपरिमाणं प्राणिनो ये स्पृशन्ति ।
अमरनगरनारीचामरग्राहिणीनां
विगतकलिकलङ्कातङ्कमङ्के लुठन्ति ॥

O Holy Ganges, a garland on the sportive head of Lord Śiva (Bhava)! those beings who merely touch even a drop of your water, become free from anxieties associated with the dark *kali* age and roll on the lap of chowrie-bearing celestial nymphs.

'Bhava' is one of the names of Lord Śiva listed in the Śatarudriyam in Yajurveda. It means the One who is the source of all that constitutes the Universe.

[2]

ब्रह्माण्डं खण्डयन्ती हरशिरसि जटावह्निमुल्लासयन्ती
स्वर्लोकादापतन्ती कनकगिरिगुहागण्डशैलात्स्खलन्ती ।

* Translated with notes by Professor P. Thirugnanasambandhan.

क्षोणीपृष्ठे लुठन्ती दुरितचयचमूर्निभरं भर्त्सयन्ती
पाथोधिं पूरयन्ती सुरनगरसरिपावनी नः पुनातु ॥

The Ganges cleaves the Universe; She adds to the beauty of the creeperlike matted hair on the head of Lord Śiva (Hara); She flows down from heaven; She glides from the rocks beside the cave of mountain Meru; She roams on earth carrying out a fierce onslaught on the army of accumulated sins. May that celestial river which ultimately fills the ocean purify us.

Lord Śiva is referred to as one who destroys the Universe as Saṁhāarakartā (Hara). He is the same Lord who is the creator (Bhava) referred to in the first verse. This is also the purport of the Brahmasutra 'Janmādyasya yataḥ' (I.i.2).

[3]

मज्जन्मातङ्गकुम्भच्युतमदमदिरामोदमत्तालिजालं
स्नानैः सिद्धाङ्गनानां कुचयुगत्रिगलत्कुङ्कुमासङ्गपिङ्गम् ।
सायम्प्रातर्मुनीनां कुशकुसुमचयैश्छद्मतीरस्थनीरं
पायाक्षो गाङ्गमम्भः करिकरमकराक्रान्तरंहस्तरङ्गम् ॥

The waters of the Ganges are overlaid with a swarm of bees that are attracted by the sweet fragrance of the ichor that flows from the temples of intoxicated elephants that plunge in them; they are pink with the saffron powder that falls from the bosom of the semi-divine damsels who bathe in them; the waters on the banks of the river are concealed by the clusters of flowers and *kuśa* grass (offered by) the sages in the mornings and evenings; the swiftness of the current is

impeded by the sharks and the trunks of elephants (in the stream). May such waters of the Ganges protect us.

The river Ganges is a resort to all strata of beings, insects, aquatic and terrestrial animals, sages and semi-divine beings. She yields place to all without distinction in the true spirit of *advaitabhāvanā*.

[4]

आदावादिपितामहस्य नियमव्यापारपात्रे जलं

पश्चात्पद्मगशायिनो भगवतः पादोदकम्पावनम् ।

भूयः शम्भुजटाविभूषणमणिर्जहोर्महर्षेरियं

कन्या कल्मषनाशिनी भगवती भागीरथी पातु माम् ॥

At the time of the creation the water of the Ganges had its abode in the vessel used by the first Creator (Pitāmaha) while performing certain rites; later it became the sanctified water as it flowed from the feet of the Lord who reclines on Ādiseṣa; again the daughter of the sage Jahnu (Jāhnavī) became the jewel that adorns the matted hair of Lord Śiva. May that holy river Bhāgīrathī that destroys all sins protect me.

The holy river is thus associated with the Hindu Trinity, Brahmā Viṣṇu and Śiva as well as the venerable sage Jahnu and a royal scion of the solar race Bhagiratha. Lord Śiva is spoken of in this verse as Śambhu, the source of everything auspicious and good.

Sagara was a king of the solar race. He performed a horse sacrifice and Indra fearing that he might lose his overlordship of heaven stole the sacrificial horse and placed it in *Pātāla* near sage Kapila who was practising penance there. The 60,000 sons of Sagara, in search of the horse, reached Pātāla and seeing the horse

near Kapila called him a thief. Kapila thus infuriated cursed them to be burnt to ashes. What Sagara, his son Amśumān and grandson Dilīpa could not do was achieved by Sagara's great-grandson Bhagīratha who by his continued austerities brought the heavenly river Gaṅgā to the nether world and brought back to life his ancestors with the Gaṅgā water. So Gaṅgā is called *Bhāgīrathī*. When Bhagīratha brought down Gaṅgā, the river destroyed in its course the sacrificial grounds of sage Jahnu who got enraged and drank up its water. On being implored by Bhagīratha he let it off through his ears. Hence she is called the daughter of Jahnu or *Jāhnavī*.

[5]

शैलेन्द्रादवतारिणी निजजले मञ्जञ्जनोत्तारिणी
 पारावारविहारिणी भवभयश्रेणीसमुत्सारिणी ।
 शेषाहेरनुकारिणी हरशिरोवल्लीदलाकारिणी
 काशीप्रान्तविहारिणी विजयते गङ्गा मनोहारिणी ॥

Hail to the Ganges that skirts on the outskirts of Kāsī ravishing the mind of the beholder! She who descends from the lord of mountains (Himālayas) redeems the people who plunge in her streams. She sportively glides on either side of the banks. She drives away the chain of fears that grip the people in this mundane life. She resembles the serpent Ādiśeṣa (by her zigzag path). She looks like a petal on the creeper-like (matted) hair on the head of Hara.

Gaṅgāmāhātmya section of the Skandapurāṇa says, 'khalah ko nāma muktīm na bhajate tatra majjanāt' — 'What man so wicked is there who does not get the bliss of liberation by bathing in the Ganges?' When Bhagīratha brought down the Ganges from the Heaven. She came down with such tremendous force that Brahmā asked Bhagīratha to request Śiva to bear Gaṅgā on his

head. Bhagīratha did so and Gaṅgā settled on Śiva's head and He came to be known as Gaṅgādhara.

[6]

कुतोऽवीची वीचिस्तव यदि गता लोचनपथं
 त्वमापीता पीताम्बरपुरनिवासं वितरसि ।
 त्वदुत्सङ्गे गङ्गे पतति यदि कायस्तनुभृतां
 तदा मातः शातक्रतवपदलाभोऽप्यतिलघुः ॥

O Mother! if only the waves on your stream are seen; if one drinks the Ganges water, you bestow on him a place in Vaikuṅṭha. If embodied persons cast off their body on your lap, O Mother! it is very easy to obtain Indra's status.

[7]

भगवति तव तीरे नीरमात्राशनोऽहं
 विगतविषयतृष्णः कृष्णमाराधयामि ।
 सकलकलुषभङ्गे स्वर्गसोपानसङ्गे
 तरलतररङ्गे देवि गङ्गे प्रसीद ॥

O Bhagavati! I am worshipping Krishna free from all worldly desires, on your bank, your water being my only food. Be pleased, O Goddess Gaṅgā of undulating waves that serve as a flight of stairs to heaven and are capable of destroying all sins!

The rise and fall of the waves of the Ganges represent the rise heavenwards and the fall of sin. The Ācārya gives a precept by his own practice in securing the grace of the Goddess Gaṅgā.

[8]

मातर्जाह्नवि शम्भुसङ्गमिलिते मौलौ निधायञ्जलिं
 त्वत्तीरे वपुषोऽवसानसमये नारायणाङ्घ्रिद्वयम् ।
 सानन्दं स्मरतो भविष्यति मम प्राणप्रयाणोत्सवे
 भूयाद्भक्तिरविच्युता हरिहरद्वैतात्मिका शाश्वती ॥

O Mother Gaṅgā, daughter of sage Jahnu! on the event of the fall of my body on the bank of Thine, I shall place my folded palms on my head which is united with Śambhu; and as my life is about to leave on its auspicious journey, I shall also remember with joy the pair of feet of Lord Nārāyaṇa. May I be enabled to cultivate unabated devotion of a nondual nature directed to Hari and Hara alike.

Ācārya's total devotion in thought, word and deed is revealed in this verse. He stresses the importance of the devotion that knows no distinction of denominational difference based on the mere names of Godhead.

[9]

गङ्गाष्टकमिदं पुण्यं यः पठेत्प्रयतो नरः ।
 सर्वपापविनिर्मुक्तो विष्णुलोकं स गच्छति ॥

The man with self-control who reads this holy octad in praise of the holy Gaṅgā is freed from all sins and reaches the world of Lord Viṣṇu.

Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda's

DEVICĀTUṢṢAṢṬYUPACĀRAPŪJĀ-
STOTRAM

(Contd. from Vol. X, No. 1)

Translation with notes

by

Dr. S. S. Janaki

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY
LABORATORY OF CHEMICAL PHYSICS
5301 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL: 773-936-3700
FAX: 773-936-3701
WWW: WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

I always offer to you, O Goddess, the varied scented flowers — Mandāra, jasmine of different types, oleander, Campaka, Ketakī, china rose, clove and Bakula.

[26]

मालतीवकुलहेमपुष्पिका-
काञ्चनारकरवीरकेतकैः ।
कर्णिकारगिरिकर्णिकादिभिः
पूजयामि जगदम्ब ते वपुः ॥

mālatī-bakula-hemapuṣṭikā
kāñcanāra-karavīra-ketakaiḥ
karnikāra-girikarnikādibhiḥ
pūjayāmi jagadamba te vapuḥ.

O Mother of the world! I am offering the flowers — jasmine, *bakuṣa*, yellow jasmine, *karavīra*, *kāñcanāra*, *girikarnikā*, *ketaka*, *karnikāra*, etc.

[27]

पारिजातशतपत्रपाटलै-
र्मल्लिकावकुलचम्पकादिभिः ।
अम्बुजैस्सकुसुमैश्च सादर-
म्पूजयामि जगदम्ब ते वपुः ॥

pārijāta-śatapatra-pāṭalair-
mallikā-bakula-campakādibhiḥ
ambujais-sakusumaiśca sādaram-
pūjayāmi jagadamba te vapuḥ.

Oh Mother of the universe! I am also offering the fragrant flowers — *pārijāta*, trumpet-flower, *bakuḷa*, *campaka* and lotus-types, *mallikā*, *pātala*, etc.

Verses 25 to 27 refer to the worship of the Goddess with many types of scented flowers, an important constituent in the Pūjā of any deity. According to the *Siddhāntasūtrāvalī* of Trilocanaśiva (Kriyā, v. 51), the various Upacāras in the course of worship are related to the five gross constituent elements of the microcosm and macrocosm. Amongst them, the offering of unguents like sandal paste, flowers and fragrant roots is related to the element of earth — Pārthivaṃ gandhapuṣpādyam. The various Āgamas, Tantras and Stotras give the details of the favourite flowers for the different deities, the devotee offering them as held in the *mṛgi mudrā* (by bringing together the tips of the thumb, middle and ring fingers) of the right hand, along with the recitation of the string of names usually 108 or 1008 for the deity. The *Śivārcana-candrikā* of Appayya Dīkṣita (pp. 70-74, Devakottai edn.) especially gives a long list of flowers and leaves to be offered to Śiva, with their classification into best, middling and least desirable; the various categories, yielding distinct fruits like *bhoga* (enjoyment), *mokṣa* (emancipation), progeny, etc.

The Supreme Goddess who is the beauty incarnate, is traditionally said to reside in the charming Kadamba grove. The *Lalitāsahasranāma*, *Lalitātrīsatī*, *Mūkapāñcatī*, and such other grand hymns on her refer to her association with many flowers. See for example, the names in the *Lalitāsahasranāma* — *campakāśoka-punnāga-saugandhika-lasat-kacā* (no.13) (Her hair is adorned with Campaka, Aśoka, Punnāga and Saugandhika); *navacampaka-puṣpābha-nāsadaṇḍa-virājitā* (no.19) (Her nose is beautiful like the newly blown Campaka); *kadambamañjarī-kṛptakarṇapūra-manoharā* (no.21) = Decked with clusters of the Kadamba flowers worn above Her ears; *mahāpadmāṭavi-saṁsthā* (no.59) = Residing in the great forest of lotuses; and, *dāḍimī-kusuma-prabhā* (no. 560) = She is of the colour of pomegranate flower.

Although many flowers are associated with the Śakti, the red-coloured ones are said to be specially suited for Her.

[28]

लाक्षासम्मिलितैः सिताभ्रसहितैः श्रीवाससम्मिश्रितैः
 कर्पूराकलितैस्सितामधुयुतैर्गोसर्पिषालोडितैः ।
 श्रीखण्डागरुगुग्गुलुप्रभृतिभिर्नानाविधैर्वस्तुभि-
 र्धूपं ते परिकल्पयामि जननि स्नेहात्त्वमङ्गीकुरु ॥

*lākṣā-sammilitaiḥ sitābhrasahitaiḥ śrīvāsa-sammīśritaiḥ
 karpūrākalitaiḥ sitāmadhuyutair-gosarpiṣāloḍitaiḥ
 śrīkhaṇḍāgarugugguluprabhṛtibhir-nānāvidhair-vastubhir-
 dhūpaṁ te parikalpayāmi janani snehāt-tvamaṅgīkuru.*

Mother! I am preparing the fragrant *dhūpa*-offering with sandal-pieces, aloe and bdellium mixed with scented camphor-crystals, lac, and freshly prepared white sweet ghee; kindly accept the same out of your affection for me.

According to the texts of the *Āgamas* showing incense, and waving with fans, chowries, etc. are *Upacāras* related to the element of *Vāyu* among the *Pañca-bhutas* — *vāyavyaṁ cāmaraṁ dhupaṁ vyajanaṁ vātakāraṇam*. Some texts like the *Amsumad-āgama* specifically mention that incense smoke removes all sins — *Dhūṇo harati pāpāni*.

As is his wont, Appayya Dikṣita in his *Śivārcanacandrikā* (Devakottai ed. pp. 74-5), gives complete details about the vessel in which *dhūpa* is to be offered, its shape, design, metals, of which it is to be made; the ordinary and māntric purification of the *dhūpa*-vessel; the manner of making this offering to the accompaniment of the sweet sound of the bell; the various *dhūpa-dravyas*, how they are to be mixed, the special names of such mixtures like

Yakṣa-Kardama, Prājāpatya, Vijaya, Śitāmśu, and Kalyāṇa; and the fruit that one is likely to get by such varied offerings.

[29]

रत्नालङ्कृतहेमपात्रनिहितैर्गोसर्पिषा दीपितै-
 दीपैर्दीर्घतरान्धकारभिदुरैर्बालार्ककोटिप्रभैः ।
 आताम्रज्वलदुज्ज्वलज्वलनवद् रत्नप्रदीपैस्सदा
 मातस्त्वामहमादरादनुदिनं नीराजयाम्युच्चकैः ॥

*ratnālaṅkrta-hemapātranihitair-gosarpiṣā dipitair-
 dipair-dīrghatarāndhakāra-bhidurair-bālārkakoṭi-
 prabhaiḥ
 ātāmrajalad-ujjvalajvalanavad-ratnapradīpais-sadā
 mātas-tvām-aham-ādarād-anudinain nīrājayā-
 my-uccakaiḥ.*

Mother! I present to you daily with respect the waving of lights in a glorious manner; the lighting is with wicks dipped in ghee prepared from fresh cow's milk and kept in a gem-studded golden container, sparkling forth like the early morning sun and removing the pitch darkness (*tamoguṇa*).

The symbolism of waving a series of lights culminating in the camphor-burning has been explained in many Āgamic treatises. Light with its illuminating capacity and giving life to all living beings is well known; the Supreme Being as well as the knowledge that leads to its experience are naturally considered in terms of light.

The divinity in a temple that represents the Supreme Being is thought of in the Āgamas as Light, which is responsible for the life in the world by its mere *saṅkalpa*; ultimately all this worldly

activity goes and merges into the very same luminary. Hence the term 'liṅga' (consisting of the two verbs 'li' to be absorbed, and 'gam' to go) is significant. This would also explain the direct worship of Sun by itself, or the worship of Śiva Himself as present in mid-Sun by Śaivites, the concept of Jyotir-liṅgas, etc. Ālvārs, Nāyaṁmārs and great devotees like Rāmaliṅga Svāmigaḷ have sung the glory of the Supreme as of the form of Jyotis. St. Tāyumaṅavar (*Enṇāṅkaṇṇi*, 14, 8) for example, says —

தீதணையாக் கர்ப்புர தீபமென நான்கண்ட
சோதியுடன் ஒன்றித் தூரிக அறுவது என்னோ ?

The offering of camphor-light is one of the last few *upacāras* by which time the devotee would have already realised the presence of the Supreme within. At this last stage the camphor represents the *sattva*-predominance of the individual, and its being burnt immediately in contact with fire, symbolising the release of the *paśu* in contact with the fire of supreme knowledge and simultaneously getting rid of all connate impurities.

[30]

मातस्त्वां दधिदुग्धपायसमहाशाल्यन्नसन्तानिकाः
सूपापूपसिताघृतैः सवटकैः सक्षुद्ररम्भाफलैः ।
एलाजीरकहिङ्गनागरनिशाकस्तूरिकासंस्कृतैः
शाकैः साकमहं सुधाधिकरसैः सन्तर्पयाम्यम्बिके ॥

mātastvāṁ dadhi-dugdha-pāyasa-mahāśālyanna-santānikāḥ
sūpāpūpasitāghṛtaiḥ savatakais-sakṣudra-
rambhāphalaiḥ
elājīraka-hiṅgu-nāgara-niśākastūrikāsaṁskṛtaiḥ
śākais-sākam-aham sudhādhikarasais-santarpayamy-
ambike.

Mother! I offer to you varied eatables as *naivedya* curds, milk with rice, vegetable-soup, sweet and salt

cakes, plantains, all made tasty with condiments and spices like cardamom, cumin seed, asafoetida, ginger, and turmeric, along with vegetables.

[31]

सापूपसूपदधिदुग्धसिताघृतानि
 सुखादुभक्ष्यपरमान्नपुरस्सराणि ।
 शाकोल्लसन्मरिचजीरकबाहिलकानि
 भक्ष्यानि भुङ्क्व जगदम्ब मयार्पितानि ॥

sāpūpa-sūpa-dadhi-dugdha-sitāghṛtāni
susvādubhaksya-paramānna-purassarāṇi
śākollasan-marica-jīraka-bāhlikāni
bhaksyāni bhukṣva jagadamba
mayārpitāni.

Oh Mother of the universe! kindly relish the different eatables, rice with cakes, soup, milk, curds, ghee, vegetables, and spices like pepper, cumin and turmeric.

[32]

क्षीरमेतदिदमुत्तमोत्तमं
 प्राज्यमाज्यमिदमुत्तमं मधु ।
 मातरेतदमृतोपमं त्वया
 सम्भ्रमेण परिपीयतां मुहुः ॥

kṣīram-etad-idam-uttamottamam-
prājyam-ājyam-idam-uttamam madhu

*mātar-etad-amṛtoṣamam tvayā
sambhrameṇa pariṇīyatām muhuḥ.*

Oh Mother! please enjoy eagerly the sweet stimulating nectarine drinks — milk, ghee and honey offered by me.

[33]

उष्णोदकैः पाणियुगं मुखञ्च
प्रक्षाल्य मातः कलधौतपात्रे ।
कर्पूरमिश्रेण सकुङ्कुमेन
हस्तौ समुद्वर्तय चन्दनेन ॥

*uṣṇodakaiḥ pāṇiyugam mukhañca
prakṣālyā mūtaḥ kaladhautapātre
karpūramiśreṇa sakuṅkumena
hastau samudvartaya candanena.*

Oh Mother! please wash your hands and mouth with the hot water kept in the silver container; and cleanse them with the unguent mixture of sandal paste, scented camphor and saffron.

[34]

अतिशीतमुशीरवासितं तपनीयावपने निवेदितम् ।
पटपूतमिदं जितामृतं शुचि गङ्गामृतमम्ब पीयताम् ॥

*atiśītam-uśīravāsitam tapanīyāvapane niveditam
paṭapūtam-idam jitamṛtam śuci gaṅgāmṛtam-amba
pīyatām.*

Oh Mother! here is the distilled holy Gaṅgā water rendered cool with scented roots, exceedingly sweet and kept in a golden container; please take it.

[35]

जम्बवाम्ररम्भाफलसंयुतानि
द्राक्षाफलाक्रोडसमन्वितानि ।
सनालिकेराणि सदाडिमानि
फलानि ते देवि समर्पयामि ॥

jambvāmra-rambhā-phala-saṁyutāni
drākṣā-phalākroḍa-samanvitāni
sanālikerāṇi sadāḍimāni
phalāni te devi samarpayāmi.

Oh Goddess! I place before you rose apple, mango, plantain, bunches of grapes, coconut and pomegranate; (please take them).

[36]

कलिङ्गकोषातकिसंयुतानि
जम्बीरनारङ्गसमन्वितानि ।
सबीजपूराणि सबादराणि
फलानि ते चाम्ब समर्पयामि ॥

kaliṅga-koṣātaki-saṁyutāni
jambīra-nāraṅga-samanvitāni
sabījapūrāṇi sabādarāṇi
phalāni te cāmba samarpayāmi.

Oh Mother! I also present you with other fruits like *kaliṅga*, *koṣātakī*, sweet and sour orange, citron and jujube.

(to be continued)

Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda's

VISNU - PĀDĀDI - KEŚĀNTA - VARNANA-
STOTRAM

(Contd. from Vol. X, No. 1)

Translation with notes

by

Dr N. Gangadharan



This verse refers to some concepts described in the *Puruṣasūkta* hymn of the *Vedas*. The *Vedas* describe the primary being as possessing thousand heads, thousand eyes, thousand feet, etc. Those pursuing knowledge had their origin from His mouth. The warriors were born from the arms, the tradesmen from the thighs and others from the feet.

[15]

विष्णोः पादद्वय्याग्रे विमलनखमणिभ्राजिता राजते या
 राजीवस्येव रस्या हिमजलकणिकालङ्कृताग्रा दलाली ।
 अस्माकं विस्मयार्हाण्यखिलमुनिजनप्रार्थनीयानि सेयं
 दद्यादाद्यानत्रद्या ततिरतिरुचिरा मङ्गलान्यङ्गुलीनाम् ॥

May the extremely shining rows of fingers (on the two feet of the Lord) confer on us good that would make us feel wonder-struck and that deserve to be coveted by all the ascetics. They shine at the forepart of the two feet of (Lord) Viṣṇu. They are made beautiful by the spotless shining gems, namely, the nails. They are beautiful like the row of blue lotus petals whose edges are adorned by the drops of dew.

[16]

यस्यां दृष्ट्वामलायां प्रतिकृतिममराः स्वां भवन्त्यानमन्तः
 सेन्द्राः सान्द्रीकृतेष्वर्स्त्वपरसुरकुलाशङ्कयातङ्कवन्तः ।
 सा सद्यः सातिरेकां सकलसुखकरीं संपदं साधयेन्नः
 चञ्चच्चार्वंशुचक्रा चरणनलिनयोश्चक्रपाणेर्नखाली ॥

May the row of nails that emits beautiful halo of rays on the lotus feet of Lord Cakrapāṇi, at once

confer on us abundant riches which give all happiness. The celestials along with Indra who bow down become extremely jealous on seeing their own reflection in the spotless row of nails and feel sad suspecting a second family of celestials.

'Cakrapāṇi' denotes Lord Viṣṇu as having the disc, *cakra* in his hand.

[17]

पादाम्भोजन्मसेवासमवनतसुरव्रातभास्वत्किरीट-
 प्रत्युत्सोच्चावचाश्मप्रवरकरगणैश्चित्रितं यद्विभाति ।
 नम्राङ्गानां हरेर्नो हरिदुपलमहाकूर्मसौन्दर्यहारि-
 च्छायं श्रेयः प्रदायि प्रपद्युगमिदं प्रापयेत्पापमन्तम् ॥

May the pair of the foreparts of the feet of Lord Hari that confers good fortune on us put an end to the sins of us who are bowing down to Him. It shines with the variegated multitude of rays of various excellent gems that are studded in the crowns shining on (the heads of) hosts of celestials bending down to worship the lotus-feet. It has a lustre that robs the beauty of huge tortoise made of emerald.

[18]

श्रीमत्यौ चारुवृत्ते करपरिमलनानन्दहृष्टे रमायाः
 सौन्दर्याढ्येन्द्रनीलोपलरचितमहादण्डयोः कान्तिचौरे ।
 सूरीन्द्रैः स्तूयमाने सुरकुलसुखदे सूदितारातिसङ्घे
 जङ्घे नारायणीये मुहुरपि जयतामस्मदेहो हरन्त्यौ ॥

May the two shanks of Lord Nārāyaṇa be ever victorious, taking away our sins. They are charming and well-shaped. They get delighted with the shampooing by the hands of Goddess Ramā. They rob the radiance of huge pillars of sapphire that are rich in beauty. They are extolled by learned men. They confer happiness on the celestials and destroy the hosts of their enemies.

'Ramā' denotes Lakṣmī, the consort of Lord Viṣṇu.

[19]

सम्यक् साह्यं विधातुं सममिव सततं जङ्घयोः खिन्नयोर्धे
 भारीभूतोरुदण्डद्वयभरणकृतोत्तम्भभावं भजेते ।
 चित्तादर्शं निधातुं महितमिव सतां ते समुद्रायमाने
 वृत्ताकारे विधत्तां हृदि मुदमजितस्यानिशं जानुनी नः ॥

May the two knees of the invincible Lord Viṣṇu rejoice our hearts always. They come up as a support to bear the weight of the two thighs as if to help the shattered shanks. They have been set as if to be a mirror for the minds of the good people. They are being extolled by all. They are round in shape.

[20]

देवो भीतिं विधातुः सपदि विदधतौ कैटभाख्यं मधुं चा-
 प्यारोप्यारूढगर्वावधिजलधि ययोरादिदैत्यौ जघान ।
 वृत्तावन्योन्यतुल्यौ चतुरमुपचयं विभ्रतावभ्रनीलौ
 ऊरू चारू हरेस्तौ मुदमतिशयिनीं मानसे नो विधत्ताम् ॥

May the two charming thighs of Lord Hari confer abundant bliss on us (*lit.* our mind). The Lord killed the two foremost demons, Kaiṭabha and Madhu (who made Brahmā to feel afraid and who became haughty) after placing them (on his thighs) on the ocean. The two thighs of Lord Hari are round in shape, equal to one another, well-formed and bear the blue colour of the clouds.

Madhu and Kaiṭabha, the two very powerful demons, were said to have sprung from the ears of Lord Viṣṇu while He was asleep. When they threatened to devour Brahmā, they were slain by Lord Viṣṇu by placing them on His thighs and crushing them.

[21]

पीतेन द्योतते यच्चतुरपरिहितेनाम्बरेणात्युदारं
जातालङ्कारयोगं जलमिव जलधेर्बाडवाग्निप्रभाभिः ।
एतत्पातित्यदान्नो जघनमतिघनदेनसो माननीयं
सातत्येनैव चेतो विषयमवतरत्पातु पीताम्बरस्य ॥

May the adorable hip of Lord Viṣṇu (one who wears the yellow garment) always become the object of our thought and protect us from the multitude of sins which pull us down. The hip shines beautifully as it is skilfully adorned by the yellow silk-garment. As a result of this decoration it resembles the water of the ocean made beautiful by the lustre of the submarine fire.

[22]

यस्या दाम्ना त्रिधाम्नो जघनकलितया भ्राजतेऽङ्गं यथाब्धेः
मध्यस्थो मन्दराद्रिर्भुजगपतिमहाभोगसंनद्धमध्यः ।

काञ्ची सा काञ्चनाभा मणिवरकिरणैरुल्लसद्भिः प्रदीप्ता
कल्यां कल्याणदात्री मम मतिमनिशं कम्परूपा करोतु ॥

May the attractive girdle (of Lord Viṣṇu) that confers good make my thought always auspicious. It has the golden lustre and shines with the splendid rays of excellent gems. The body of Lord Viṣṇu shines with the strings of the girdle set on the hip resembling the Mandara mountain in the middle of the ocean with the lord of the serpents (Vāsuki) around it.

[23]

उन्नम्रं कम्परुचैरुपचितमभूद्यत्र पत्रैर्विचित्रैः
पूर्वं गीर्वाणपूज्यं कमलजमधपस्यास्पदं तत्पयोजम् ।
तस्मिन्नीलाश्मनीलैस्तरलरुचिजलैः पूरिते केलिवुद्ध्या
नालीकाक्षस्य नाभीसरसि वसतु नश्चित्तहंसश्चिराय ॥

May the swan, namely, our mind, sportively dwell always in the navel-pond of the lotus-eyed Lord Viṣṇu filled with the waters of vibrant rays which are blue resembling the sapphire. The lofty and beautiful lotus which rose up with variegated coloured leaves, which is adored by the gods and which is the abode of the bee, namely, Brahmā, was produced from that (navel-pond).

[24]

पातालं यस्य नालं वलयमपि दिशां पत्रपङ्क्तिं नगेन्द्रान्
विद्वांसः केसरालीर्विदुरिह विपुलां कर्णिकां स्वर्णशैलम् ।

भूयाद्वायत्स्वयंभूमधुकरभवनं भूमयं कामदं नो
नालीकं नाभिपद्माकरभवमुखं तन्नागशय्यस्य शौरैः ॥

May the lotus, which had its origin from that navel (lotus-pond) of Lord Śaurī (Viṣṇu) who reclines on the serpent, be the conferrer of our earthly desires. It is wide and is the abode of the singing honey-bee, namely, Brahmā. The learned know that the nether world is its stalk, the different quarters are its rows of petals, the mountains are its rows of filaments and its wide pericarp is the golden mountain (Meru).

[25]

आदौ कल्पस्य यस्मात्प्रभवति विततं विश्वमेतद्विकल्पैः
कल्पान्ते यस्य चान्तः प्रविशति सकलं स्थावरं जङ्गमं च ।
अत्यन्ताचिन्त्यमूर्तेश्चिरतरमजितस्यान्तरिक्षस्वरूपे
तस्मिन्नस्माकमन्तःकरणमतिमुदा क्रीडतात्कोडभागे ॥

May our minds sport blissfully with the abdomen of the invincible Lord Viṣṇu of an inconceivable form. The abdomen is of the form of the sky. This vast universe with all its diversity had its origin from that abdomen at the beginning of the *kalpa*. All the mobile and immobile objects enter the same at the end of the *kalpa* (a long period — of many millennia of years).

A *kalpa* is a day of Brahmā made up of one thousand cycles of four *yugas*, being equivalent to 12000 human years.

[26]

कान्त्यम्भः पूरपूर्णे लसदसितवलीभङ्गभास्वत्तारङ्गे
गम्भीराकारनाभीचतुरतरमहावर्तशोभिन्द्युदारे ।

क्रीडत्वानद्धहेमोदरनलिनमहाबाडवाम्निप्रभाढये

कामं दामोदरीयोदरसलिलनिधौ चित्तमत्स्यश्चिरं नः ॥

May our mind of the form of fish, sport to its heart's content in the lofty ocean in the form of the belly of Lord Dāmodara. It is full with shining waters. It shines with the bright waves in the form of the dark folds. It has the deep navel that is quite beautiful with the huge whirl-pools (in the form of the line of hair). It abounds with the lustre of the huge submarine fire in the form of the lotus set in the golden belly.

The word 'Dāmodara' denotes Viṣṇu (Kṛṣṇa) as having a string around the waist (belly).

[27]

नाभीनालीकमूलादधिकपरिमलोन्मोदितानामलीनां

माला नीलेव यान्ती स्फुरति रुचिमती वक्त्रपद्मोन्मुखी या ।

रम्या सा रोमराजिर्महितरुचिमती मध्यभागस्य विष्णोः

चित्तस्था मा विरंसीच्चिरतरमुचितां साधयन्ती श्रियं नः ॥

May the beautiful and radiant line of hair on the middle part of the abdomen of Lord Viṣṇu ceaselessly rejoice our hearts conferring on us forever the prosperity that we deserve. The bees dart upwards from the root of the navel-lotus towards the lotus face like a bright blue garland being delighted with the superior fragrance.

[28]

संस्तीर्णं कौस्तुभांशुप्रसरकिसलयैर्मुग्धमुक्ताफलाढ्यं
 श्रीवत्सोल्लासि फुल्लप्रतिनववनमालाङ्कि राजद्भुजान्तम् ।
 वक्षः श्रीवृक्षकान्तं मधुकरनिकरश्यामलं शार्ङ्गपाणेः
 संसाराध्वश्रमार्तेरुपवनमिव यत्सेवितं तत्प्रपद्ये ॥

I resort to the *vakṣasthala* (breast) of Lord Śārṅga-pāṇi that is resorted to as a garden by those who are afflicted by fatigue on the course of mundane existence. It shines with the tree in the form of Śrī (Lakṣmī). It is dark like a host of bees. It is permeated by the tender shoots spread by the rays of the bright gem, Kaustubha. It is full of fruits in the form of charming pearls. It shines with the *śrīvatsa* mark as well as the garland, *vanamālā* or *vaijayantī* of blossomed wild flowers that are fresh. It shines between the arms.

'Śārṅga' is the name of the bow of Lord Viṣṇu and Śārṅga-pāṇi denotes Lord Viṣṇu as the holder of the *śārṅga*-bow.

Śrīvatsa' is the 'curl of hair' on the breast of Lord Viṣṇu.

'Kaustubha' is one of the gems obtained from the milky ocean (*Kṣīrābdhi*) when it was churned.

[29]

कान्तं वक्षो नितान्तं विदधदिव गलं कालिमा कालशत्रोः
 इन्दोर्विम्बं यथाङ्गो मधुप इव तरोर्मञ्जरीं राजते यः ।
 श्रीमान्नित्यं विधेयादविरलमिलितः कौस्तुभश्रीप्रतानैः
 श्रीवत्सः श्रीपतेः स श्रिय इव दयितो वत्स उच्चैः श्रियं नः ॥

(to be continued)

Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda's

VIVEKACŪḌĀMANI

(Contd. from Vol. X, No. 1)

Translation

by

Dr R. Balasubramanian

1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

*jāgratsvapnasusuptiṣu sphuṭataram yo'sau samujjṛm-
bhatē
pratyagrūpatayā sadāhamaham-ityantaḥ sphurann-
ekadhā
nānākāravikārabhājina imān paśyannaham-dhīmukhān
nityānandacidātmanā sphurati tam viddhi svam-
etaṁ hrđi.*

Know that which is in your heart as the Self, which very clearly manifests itself in the states of waking, dream, and deep sleep; which, being inward, always shines inside in the same form as "I", "I"; which perceives these manifold modifications assumed by the intellect; and which shines as the eternal bliss and consciousness.

[220]

घटोदके बिम्बितमर्कबिम्ब-
मालोक्य मूढो रविमेव मन्यते ।
तथा चिदाभासमुपाधिसंस्थं
भ्रान्त्याहमित्येव जडोऽभिमन्यते ॥

*ghaṭodake bimbitamarkabimbam-
ālokya mūḍho ravimeva manyate
tathā cidābhāsam-upādhisaṁstham
bhrāntyāhamityeva jaḍo'bhimanyate.*

An ignorant person, seeing the reflection of the sun in the water of a pot, thinks of it as the sun itself. In the same way, one who is ignorant, due to illusion, thinks of the semblance of consciousness in the adjunct (*i.e.*, the intellect) as his own Self.

[221]

घटं जलं तद्गतमकबिम्बं
 विहाय सर्वं दिवि वीक्ष्यतेऽर्कः ।
 तटस्थितस्तत्त्रितयावभासकः
 स्वयंप्रकाशो विदुषा यथा तथा ॥

*ghaṭam jalam tadgatamarkabimbam
 vihāya sarvam divi vīksyate'rkah
 taṭasthitas-tat-tritayāvabhāsakah
 svayamprakāśo viduṣo yathā tathā.*

Just as a wise man, ignoring the pot, the water, and the reflection of the sun therein, sees the self-luminous sun in the sky, which reveals all these three and which is indifferent to them, even so a wise man sees the Self ignoring the limiting adjuncts.

[222-223]

देहं धियं चित्रप्रतिबिम्बमेतं
 विसृज्य बुद्धौ निहितं गुहायाम् ।
 द्रष्टारमात्मानमखण्डबोधं
 सर्वप्रकाशं सदसद्विलक्षणम् ॥
 नित्यं विभुं सर्वगतं सुसूक्ष्म-
 मन्तर्बहिः शून्यमनन्यमात्मनः ।
 विज्ञाय सम्यङ्निजरूपमेत-
 त्पुमान्विपाप्मा विरजा विमृत्युः ॥

*deham dhiyam citpratibimbametaim
visrjya buddhau nihitam guhāyām
draṣṭāramātmānamakhaṇḍabodham
sarvaprakāśam sadasadvilakṣaṇam.*

*nityam vibhum sarvagatam susūkṣmam
antarbahiṣṣūnyamananyamātmanah
vijñāya samyam-ni jarūpametat-
pumān-vipāpmā virajā vimṛtyuh.*

Discarding the body, the intellect, and the reflection of consciousness in it (*i.e.*, the intellect), and knowing well the real nature of the Self which is located in the cave of the intellect, which is the seer, which is unlimited consciousness, which reveals everything, which is different from *sat* and *asat* (*i.e.*, gross and subtle objects), which is eternal, infinite, omnipresent, and very subtle, which has neither outside nor inside, which is not different from one's own Self, a person becomes free from sin, agency, and death.

[224]

विशोक आनन्दघनो विपश्चि-
त्स्वयं कुतश्चिन्न बिभेति कश्चित् ।
नान्योऽस्ति पन्था भवबन्धमुक्ते-
र्विना स्वतत्त्वावगमं मुमुक्षोः ॥

*viśoka ānandaghano vipaścit
svayam kutaścinna bibheti kaścit
nānyo'sti panthā bhavabandhamukter-
vinā svatattvāvagamam mumukṣoh.*

The wise man, who is free from grief and who is full of bliss, is not afraid of anything anywhere. To a seeker after liberation, there is no other path for getting liberation from the bondage of *samsāra* than the realization of his true nature.

[225]

ब्रह्माभिन्नत्वविज्ञानं भवमोक्षस्य कारणम् ।
येनाद्वितीयमानन्दं ब्रह्म सम्पद्यते बुधः ॥

*brahmābhinnatvavijñānam-bhavamokṣasya kāraṇam
yenādvitīyamānandaṁ brahma sampadyate budhaḥ.*

The knowledge of one's non-difference from Brahman is the cause of liberation from *samsāra*. By that (knowledge), the wise man attains Brahman which is bliss and non-dual.

[226]

ब्रह्मभूतस्तु संसृत्यै विद्वान्नावर्तते पुनः ।
विज्ञातव्यमतः सम्यग्ब्रह्माभिन्नत्वमात्मनः ॥

*brahmabhūtastu saṁsṛtyai vidvānnāvartate punaḥ
vijñātavyamataḥ samyag-brahmābhinnatvam-ātmanah.*

Indeed, the wise man who has become Brahman does not return to the course of *samsāra*. Hence, the non-difference of the Self from Brahman should be properly known.

[227]

सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म विशुद्धं परं स्वतः सिद्धम् ।
नित्यानन्दैकरसं प्रत्यगभिन्नं निरन्तरं जयति ॥

*satyam jñānamanantam brahma viśuddham-param
svatassiddham
nityānandaikarasam-pratyagabhinnam nirantaram
jayati.*

Brahman is real, knowledge, infinite, pure, supreme and self-established. It is eternal and homogeneous bliss. It is non-different from the inward Self. There is nothing inward to it. Thus it remains incomparable.

[228]

सदिदं परमाद्वैतं स्वस्मादन्यस्य वस्तुनोऽभावात् ।
न ह्यन्यदस्ति किञ्चित्सम्यक्परतत्त्वबोधसुदशायाम् ॥

*sadidam paramādvaitam
svasmādanyasya vastuno'bhāvāt
na hyanyadasti kiñcit-
samyak-paratattvabodhasudaśāyām.*

This Being (Brahman) is absolutely non-dual, since there is no other object different from it. Indeed, there is nothing else in the state of the perfect realization of the supreme Reality.

[229]

यदिदं सकलं विश्वं नानारूपं प्रतीतमज्ञानात् ।
तत्सर्वं ब्रह्मैव प्रत्यस्ताशेषभावनादोषम् ॥

*yadidaṁ sakalam viśvam nānūrūṣam-pratītam-
ajñānāt
tatsarvam brahmaiva pratyastāśeṣabhāvanādoṣam.*

This entire universe which is seen as manifold due to ignorance is Brahman alone, which is free from all defects caused by thinking.

[230]

मृत्कार्यभूतोऽपि मृदो न भिन्नः
कुम्भोऽस्ति सर्वत्र तु मृत्स्वरूपात् ।
न कुम्भरूपं पृथगस्ति कुम्भः
कुतो मृषाकल्पितनाममात्रः ॥

*mṛtkāryabhūto'pi mṛdo na bhinnah
kumbho'sti sarvatra tu mṛtsvarūpāt
na kumbharūṣam-prthagasti kumbhah
kuto mṛṣā-kalpitanāmamātrah.*

A pot, though an effect of clay, is not different from clay, because it is throughout of the nature of clay. There is no pot-form separate (from clay). Where, then, is a pot, which is illusory, a conjured up name alone?

[231]

केनापि मृद्धिन्नतया स्वरूपं
घटस्य सन्दर्शयितुं न शक्यते ।
अतो घटः कल्पित एव मोहा-
न्मृदेव सत्यं परमार्थभूतम् ॥

*kenāpi mṛdbhinnatayā svarūpam
ghaṭasya sandarśayitum na śakyate
ato ghaṭaḥ kalpita eva mohāt
mṛdeva satyam-paramārthabhūtam.*

It is not possible for anyone to show that the nature of a pot (made of clay) is different from clay. So a pot is illusory alone due to delusion. Clay alone is real, being the essence of it.

[232]

सदब्रह्मकार्यं सकलं सदैव
सन्मात्रमेतन्न ततोऽन्यदस्ति ।
अस्तीति यो वक्ति न तस्य मोहो
विनिर्गतो निद्रितवत्प्रजल्पः ॥

*sadbrahmakāryam sakalam sadaiva
sanmātrametanna tato'nyadasti
astīti yo vakti na tasya moho
vinirgato nidritavat-prajalpaḥ.*

Everything which is the effect of Brahman which is *sat* is *sat* always. This (universe) is *sat* alone; and there is nothing different from it (*i.e.*, *sat*). A person who says that there is something (different from it) is not free from delusion; he prattles like one in sleep.

[233]

ब्रह्मैवेदं विश्वमित्येव वाणी
श्रौती ब्रूतेऽथर्वनिष्ठा वरिष्ठा ।

तस्मात्सर्वं ब्रह्ममात्रं हि विश्वं
नाधिष्ठानाद्भिन्नतारोपितस्य ॥

*brahmaivedam viśvamityeva vānī
śrautī brūte'tharvaniṣṭhā varīṣṭhā
tasmāt-sarvam-brahmamātraṁ hi viśvaṁ
nādhīṣṭhānād-bhinnatāropitasya.*

“This universe is Brahman alone” — this is the declaration of the supreme *Atharva-śruti*. So, this universe is, indeed, Brahman alone, for what is superimposed is not different from its substratum.

[234]

सत्यं यदि स्याज्जगदेतदात्मनो-
ऽनन्तत्वहानिर्निगमाप्रमाणता ।
असत्यवादित्वमपीशितुः स्यात्
नैतत्त्रयं साधु हितं महात्मनाम् ॥

*satyaṁ yadi syāj jagadetadātmano-
'nantatva-hānirnigamāpramāṇatā
asatyavāditvamapiśituḥ syāt
naitattrayaṁ sādhu hitaṁ mahātmanām.*

If this world were real, the infinitude of the Self will be in jeopardy; *śruti* will become invalid; and *Īśvara* will become a speaker of untruth. These three are neither good nor desirable to the great.

(to be continued)

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ŚAṄKARA

by

Professor S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri

(Extracted from *Śaṅkarācārya*, G. A. Natesan & Co.

(Continued from Vol. X, No. 1)



that link would require another link and so *ad infinitum*. And the problem repeats itself when we look at the bearing of the relation not merely on the subject, but on the attribute as well. One concludes therefore that relations, which are so self-contradictory, are not real. Though characteristic of finite experience, they do not apply to Infinite Experience, *i.e.* Brahman. This applies to all relations whatsoever, whether merely conjunctives, like that between a thing and its locality, or organic, like that between a substance and attribute or cause and effect. We shall have occasion to revert to this latter relation lower down.

The Nature of Delusion

Relations then are delusive. "How does it help," we may be asked, "to be told that they are delusive? The delusion itself calls for explanation." To this the Advaitin attempts an answer by explaining the nature of delusion. It is a case of something appearing as other than what it is; the shell appears as if silver, the one moon appears as if two; the real appears as if relational. Philosophers both in the East and in the West have offered divergent analyses of error; but they all agree in this, that it is a case of something appearing as if of a different nature. Some say it is a case of what is internal, a state of awareness, appearing as if it were an external object; others say that it is a case of a present object (say, mother-of-pearl) being cognised as possessing the characteristics of an object present not here, but elsewhere (silver in the shop); yet others say that in such cases we have two awarenesses: a perception (of the 'this') and a memory (of 'silver'), each of which is correct as such, though because of a failure to distinguish between the two, we make the

practical mistake of putting forth our hand towards the perceived "this" (a piece of shell) as though it were itself the remembered ("silver"). Analysis will show that these and all other such theories are inadequate. In the last resort, the erroneous is inexplicable, for all that it is a fact. For, if it did not exist here and now, it would not be perceived; but if it really existed here and now, it would not be erroneous. The silver in the shop cannot be perceived here; and a merely remembered silver cannot prompt me now to put forth my hand; the silver *is* out there now; else I could not see it or reach for it; but it is not real; else I would successfully grasp it and utilise it, without any subsequent contradiction or sublation. The content of error, what is known delusively, is thus *anirvacanīya*, not determinable as solely real or as solely unreal.

What about error itself, as distinct from its content? Why should there be error at all? We can give no answer, except ascribe it to *māyā*; and that is to explain one inexplicable in terms of another. There is, however, this advantage, that for our errors which are *innumerable* we have provided an underlying *unitary* principle in the shape of *māyā*. The fundamental inability to explain is bound to continue. For, to explain is to relate, either to what goes before or to what is to come after; in the former case, we have an explanation 'how', and in the latter an explanation 'why', but in either case, we have only a relation, and relations, we have seen, are not real. Whatever explanation we may attempt of error, none can ultimately satisfy. Of error we can only say that it exists; but in the very awareness of its existence, we pass beyond it to the real that is above relations. If we had not this knowledge, we could not be aware of error as error; but if we had that

knowledge solely and fully, we would make no error at all. We have a dim and imperfect apprehension of Brahman; to clarify and consolidate it is the task of any *mokṣa-śāstra*, any revelation or subsidiary discipline, whose object is release.

Eligibility for Brahman-Inquiry

Such knowledge is to be sought through that inquiry into Brahman, which is called Vedānta-study. One would naturally expect as a preliminary the learning (*adhyayana*) of the *Vedas*, inclusive of the *Vedānta* texts. Though this was barred by tradition to some classes of people, these were nevertheless held eligible for the inquiry into the ultimate real. The pursuit of the philosophic quest depends on the attractiveness of the subject matter; given the existence of attraction, the closing of one channel will only lead to taking up other channels of pursuit, not the abandonment of the pursuit altogether. Besides the *Āgamas* which are declared open to all castes and both sexes, there are also the *Itihāsas* and *Purānas* whose object is to expand, expound and popularise the teachings of the sacred scriptures. Everyone is at liberty to read these; and if the student has a critical mind, he will understand Brahman to be what is taught even in such works. And such Brahman-knowledge will result in release. What philosophy requires, above all, is a discrimination of true values from false and an unremitting pursuit of the true; these will not normally be possible for those who are preoccupied with acquisition and conservation, getting and saving, *yoga* and *kṣema*; this, however, is a passing phase of all beings, whether men or women; for, does not the *Upaniṣad* itself say of Kātyāyanī, the elder wife of Yājñavalkya, that "at that time (*tarhi*)" she had only a woman's wit ?

Further, this formal study (*adhyayana*) is preliminary to the inquiry into *dharma* too, the investigation of the nature and details of ritualistic acts, the inquiry known as *karma-mīmāṃsā* or *dharma-jijñāsā*; hence, it cannot be the distinctive preliminary to Brahman-inquiry. The suggestion is made and sustained by many that the inquiry into ritual should precede the inquiry into the self. One of their grounds is a textual tradition that the whole of the *mīmāṃsā* in twenty chapters is a single *śāstra*, of which the first sixteen are concerned with ritual and the rest with Brahman. Besides conflicting with the traditional ascription of the two sets of *sūtras* to different authors (the aphorisms about *dharma* to Jaimini and the others to Bādarāyaṇa), there is also the difficulty pointed out and insisted on by Śaṅkara, that between *karma* and Brahman there is not such organic unity as to call for the recognition of a single science pertaining to both. Ritualistic knowledge relates to what is to come into being, an act to be done, with a result still further in the future; and the knowledge does not obligate the act which may be done, not done or done differently. Brahman-knowledge is of what is eternally; it is objective and necessary, not subject to option at the will of the knower or any other. Whence then the propriety of linking the two together in a single body of teaching?

Has Brahman-inquiry then no preliminaries? It certainly presupposes a desire, one not on a par with worldly desires; for these latter are content with the fleeting and the perishable, the temporary results of transient activities, while the former is a desire to realise lasting happiness. The discrimination of the eternal from the non-eternal is thus the first requisite. This does not of course mean a knowledge of the eternal or

Brahman, since no further inquiry would be needed thereafter; but there should be present the discrimination of eternality as somehow real but not realised in the finite world. Then commences a search for this reality, if the inquirer should be distracted by desire for the enjoyment of fruit whether in this world or in a next, there would be a strong tendency to stop short of the ultimate goal of the inquiry, and rest content with the idols of magic or science or uninformed religion; the powers that we can command or understand or implore for beneficent results, would appear absolutely supreme, instead of revealing their nature as appearances. But none of these can be real as such, since none is self-luminous, all being objects of awareness, liable to be surpassed in proportion to the expansion of our apprehension. Desire for enjoyment blinds us to their finitude and leads to their acceptance at face value until there is an awakening, more or less rude. Non-attachment to fruit, *vairāgya*, is therefore another essential preliminary. But desire is difficult to remove so long as there is lack of discipline. If the external senses ever reach out, or if the mind wanders, if the body is easily affected by variations of heat and cold, pleasure and pain, and such other correlative pairs of opposites (*dvandvas*), if there is neither quiescence nor contentment, nor forbearance, desire for fruit is bound to be present, whether for our own gain or loss to an adversary; we may long for air-conditioning, the bliss of a hill station, the charms of radio and television, the powers of the yogin and the magician, the ability to vanquish opposition by physical means or by spells, the capacity for infinite enjoyment of the pleasures of life at least in a heavenly life and so on. Proper discipline resulting in the control of the body and the senses

is therefore the pre-requisite for non-attachment. Added to these three, discrimination, non-attachment and discipline, there should be the desire for lasting happiness or release; that is called *mumukṣutva*. Many a man longs for release from the body, vaguely hoping that death will solve all his problems; he is a *mumūrṣu*, not a *mumukṣu*. The latter knows what he wants, not the former; to the *mumukṣu* death is neither a terror nor a mystery; to the other it is both. The longing for release is due to the conviction that all produced enjoyments are finite, even those of a future life; the longing for death is due merely to the experiences of the finitude of present enjoyments, without any realisation of the principle of finitude, *viz.*, their being produced, instead of being natural and eternal. This principle of finitude is given expression to even in the scriptures which one is expected to have studied before entering on the performance of religious duty. Scripture itself says that just as the enjoyment produced by acts in this world perish, even so perish the enjoyments procured in another world through religious merit. Thus are to be understood the words "Then, therefore" of the first aphorism of the *Vedānta-sūtras*, as laying down the preliminaries for Vedānta study.

Need for Renunciation

It will be seen from the discipline insisted on that renunciation (*sannyāsa*) is indispensable for the serious student of the Vedānta. The inquiry should be prosecuted with singleness of purpose and without paying heed to numerous distractions on the way. How can that be possible for one caught up in the whirl of numerous duties and obligations to the family, to the fathers, to the gods? The non-neglect of these is certainly enjoined but as certainly it is not for him who seeks

beatitude instead of worldly welfare; and the postponement of enjoyment to another world does not of itself avail to *exalt* that enjoyment or its instrument. Further, the seeker of release seeks the eternal and the infinite; the round of duties, however, presupposes an agent, an actor working here and now, identifying himself with and thereby actuating bodies and other finite instruments. How could such pursuit serve the realisation of the infinite? Will it not tend rather to keep him immured in the round of finite cause and consequences, act and fruit, however wearisome it may be felt to be? Renunciation, therefore, is a supreme need, even for the seeker of knowledge. That he who has attained knowledge will be a *sannyāsin* goes without saying; for with knowledge ceases the delusion of being finite, an agent in relation to deed and fruit; how then can he be a fulfiller to obligations? Is such knowledge possible in this life? If so, will the knower not be an actor at all? To these questions we shall refer later in considering the nature of release.

Value of Prescriptions and Prohibitions

The *śāstra*-made prescriptions and prohibitions, have they then no value for self-knowledge? They do have value. As we are, we feel ourselves finite; though we are knowledge, we have yet to know through instruments, the mind and the senses. And the purer the instruments, the purer will be the resultant knowledge. The injunctions, positive and negative, laid down by the *Śāstras* have the object of making the mind pure and clear. The exercise in a continual round of duties has the effect of freeing the mind from attachment and aversion, so that it becomes fit for the ultimate intuitive knowledge of oneness of Brahman and the inner self of the inquirer.

And similar to the injunctions to perform or refrain, there are also injunctions in the Vedānta, to study the self, to reflect on the teaching and to meditate on it profoundly. These, of course, apply if at all only to the inquirer, not to him who is content with the goods of this world or the next. But even in relation to the inquirer, they are not injunctions proper; for it is the nature of a sāstraic injunction to make known what was not or could not be otherwise known; the inquirer has already started to learn about the self; hence the injunction to study the self does not establish what was not already established; it is also well known from ordinary experience that reflection and contemplation result in clarifying and consolidating a piece of knowledge; hence there is not an injunction, properly speaking, even in respect of reflection and contemplation. The scriptures do, however, use language suggestive of prescriptions. These apparent prescriptions have one effect; where a man is primarily an extrovert, seeking and finding pleasure in the external, such injunctions dam the natural flow of his activity and turn it inward, causing him to seek the inner self; the extrovert is changed into the introvert.

Purport of the Vedānta

The Vedānta, which is to be studied for the sake of self-knowledge teaches that the inner self of the inquirer is not other than Brahman, the sole reality, consciousness, bliss. We are repeatedly told that this reality was in the beginning undifferentiated by name and form, that all the diverse phenomena of this world are one with this reality, as pot, jug, basin, etc., are one with clay, name and form alone being different, that this reality is the Brahman-self and that the Brahman-self is but the self of the inquirer. Just as when

iron or gold is known, all that is made of iron or gold is also known, whether nail-scissors or garden shears, bangles or anklets, even so is the entire world known when Brahman is known. Such knowledge is not as of an object; for Brahman is the subject too; "That thou art" says scripture; and the knowledge also is Brahman. It is the knowledge whose attainment is the supreme human goal; it is the knowledge whence words and the mind turn back unable to encompass; it is the knowledge which rises above all the petty intellectual disciplines of our lives, the sciences, arts and even philosophy; it is the knowledge on the attainment of which one seeks nothing else, hears nothing else, is aware of nothing else; it is that plenum of bliss beside which there is nothing to compare, infinitely trivial as is all else; it is that eternal beatitude, on the realisation of which, one no longer worries "Have I done aught that is sinful? Or, neglected aught that is good?" In that experience of oneness there is no delusion, no more grief.

God in Advaita

Is this the God of religion? The scriptures speak of a God who created this world, who maintains it and will destroy it periodically to re-create it periodically. This same God is also the author of the sacred scriptures, the store of such knowledge as veritably lays claim to omniscience. A being that created the scriptures and the world with its extreme diversity and organisation cannot but be omniscient and omnipotent. And this conclusion of reason is reinforced by scripture which speaks of a supremely intelligent and powerful creator. Even though, according to Advaita, *māyā* is the cause of the world, it is only the material cause, as clay

is of pot; an efficient, controlling, cause is needed for the world, as a potter is needed for the pot. What is merely non-consciousness like *māyā* or the *pradhāna* of the Sāṅkhya philosophers cannot of itself give rise to orderly evolution; it requires a guiding spirit; and this is *Īśvara*. Of course, mere reasoning may suggest a plurality of creators working in co-operation, whether simultaneously or in succession; houses are built by many agents; and factories work in shifts. But such arguments do not bother us since we take our stand on scripture which teaches a single creator, sustainer and destroyer.

In his world-operations, *Īśvara* does not act from any motive, selfish or altruistic. His activities are merely sportive, the overflow of His nature, caused with little or no effort, like normal respiration. He is the wielder of *māyā*. But *māyā* is nothing different from Him, being but His own potency or energy. That is why there is a three-fold definition of *Īśvara* as creator, sustainer and destroyer; anyone of these functions individually may be exercised by the material cause alone or the efficient cause alone; the exercise of all the three is, however, possible only for what is both efficient and material cause. And the declarations elsewhere that *māyā* is the material cause do not conflict with this position; for *māyā* is energy while *Īśvara* is the energiser; and between energy and energiser there is non-difference. Those who have squarely faced the puzzle whether there is any substance other than its qualities, whether being the possessor of qualities is not itself a quality, and so on, will be ready to admit the non-difference of a potency (*śakti*) from the potent (*śaktimat*); others may require a little reflection along the lines just indicated. And the history of the notion of "substance" in

Locke, Berkeley and Hume may throw some light in this connection.

But what is the place of *Īśvara* in the Advaitin's scheme of the universe? Reality is one, according to him and non-different from his own inner self. *Īśvara*, however, is neither man (*jīva*) nor Brahman. While *Īśvara* is claimed to create the whole world, man creates, if at all, only very small parts of it; and while *Īśvara* functions as agent of creation, destruction, etc., Brahman cannot be agent, at all; for how can the infinite be an agent, to what purpose, with what instruments? Some say that while man is reflection of Brahman in bits of *māyā* or in products of *māyā*, or in impure *māyā*, *Īśvara* is a reflection in *māyā* as a whole or in pure *māyā*. Others say that while Brahman is neither reflection nor the prototype thereof, this relation of prototype and reflection somehow comes to be established therein, *Īśvara* being one end, the prototype of this relation, and man the other end, the reflection; the reflecting medium is *avidyā* or *māyā*, of which there are many, one for each (apparently) finite individual. Yet others hold that while Brahman is an infinite expanse, like space, man is an apparently finite part of it; we speak of space as contained, for instance, in a pot; but when the pot is moved, from room to room, the pot alone is moved, not space, this being infinite and incapable of being moved. While man, however, is apparently under the dominance of *avidyā* which limits him, *Īśvara* dominates the *avidyā* that seeks to limit Him. Whichever may be the view we adopt, *Īśvara* comes in as a third entity between ourselves and the Brahman from which, we were told, we are non-different. Do the scriptures really demand such *Īśvara*? If so, what

becomes of the claim that the non-dual Brahman is their purport?

There is no doubt that scriptural texts speak of both the non-dual Brahman and *Īśvara*, the creator. Since both references cannot be taken at their face value without convicting scripture of contradiction, it is said that the real purport is in respect of the non-dual Brahman, while *Īśvara* is the intermediate purport; the teaching about the latter is intended to subserve that about the former. This position is arrived at along many lines of argument. Plurality is a fact of experience; and the explanation of it in terms of cause and effect is familiar to us even without recourse to scripture. Revelation can claim authority neither in respect of the already experienced nor in respect of what contradicts experience; perception tells us that fire is hot and in respect of that a scriptural text can be only repetitive, not authoritative; and if any text says that fire is cold or that stones float, that is false; the statement has to be justified on some ground other than truth-value, *e.g.*, that it is hyperbolic praise of the stones used to press the *soma* juice; the purport in such a case is the excellence of the stones, not their floating capacity. Since then the causal explanation is what we are already familiar with, we need not resort to revelation for an *Īśvara*. It has been said that perception and inference cannot give us a single, omnipotent, omniscient cause of this entire variegated universe. Not even on this ground can scripture have *Īśvara* for its purport; for the notion of cause is itself in the last resort unintelligible and the unintelligible cannot be the purport of sound revelation.

Analysis of the Causal Concept

We have already seen that the notion of "relation" does not make sense, since it is either identified with one or both of the terms to be related, or it falls outside of them, calling for a fresh relation; in either case, it fails of its obvious and only purpose of relating. The causal relation, being but a variety of relation, is subject to the same defect. It has also some special defects of its own. When an effect is produced from a cause, say, oil from coconut, is the effect already present or not? Either way there are difficulties. We naturally say that it did not exist before the production, which brought it into existence. Now let us look at the process a little closely. Coconut was, it ceased to exist; oil was not, and it has come to exist; the immediate antecedent of oil is the non-existence of oil or non-existence of coconut. Now, while entities may be differentiated by their properties, non-entities cannot obviously be so differentiated; there is no difference between the non-existence of coconut and the non-existence of sand, since both are non-entities; why then does not oil result when sand has ceased to be, instead of when coconut has ceased to be? Again, coconut has ceased to be, not through being passed into an oil-expressor, but through being buried in the ground or in some other way, why is not oil produced? If, in other words, non-existence intervenes between cause and effect, why do we seek particular causes for particular effects? All this suggests that the effect is already present in the cause, but as latent; it is not yet manifest; for if it were manifest too, no causal activity could be required. Though this position is on the face of it more satisfactory, it does not take us far, since the question raised as to the effect has now to be

raised as to "manifestation". "Being made manifest or patent," this too is a product; otherwise it would be eternal and every effect would be always manifest. Now, does manifestation exist before it is itself made manifest? That is absurd, asking us to swallow the combination of manifestation and non-manifestation at the same time. If, on the contrary, it does not exist, we have at least one instance of an effect, not pre-existent in the cause. Why then should not other effects have the same character? The effect thus can neither pre-exist in the cause, nor be non-existent therein. This paradox should make us realise that the causal notion is inadequate for the apprehension of reality.*

Nevertheless it is a convenient and a common notion, intended to explain change by exhibiting an underlying identity. The search for identity is ingrained in us; we look for it in one form or another. Even in respect of the universe as a whole, those who do not admit God, seek an explanation in the fortuitous concurrence of primal atoms or in the spontaneous evolution of nature and so on. Such explanations err even more than the postulation of a God, since they are remote from the recognition of Spirit or consciousness or *Caitanya*. The notion of Spirit as a cause is a poor thing; it is not finally acceptable, but it is certainly more intelligible than the rejection or ignoring of Spirit, since that is to ignore Intelligence itself. From Spirit as cause, we may pass to Spirit that is neither cause nor effect, the reality, of which cause and effect are partial appearances. Reality is not less but more than God; not by

*For a fuller analysis of the causal concept from the standpoint of Advaita as well as that of modern science, see the author's "Advaita, Causality and Human Freedom" — *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XVI, 113-151.

eschewing God, but by realising and transcending Him, can we realise the Self; for, the world is God-dependent; and to ignore God may well lead to the world asserting itself as if independent and weighing us down, as in *samsāra*; release requires therefore the realisation first of the dependence of the world on God, and then of God being an appearance of Brahman. Not all can comprehend the absolute that is above relations and uncharacterisable as this or that (*nirguṇa* or *nirviśeṣa*); at least for their sake there has to be a preliminary teaching of Īśvara, a Being characterisable as the creator, etc. of the universe. Further, we cannot make a sensible denial except of that which has been or may be affirmed; we do not say that 'virtue is not a square' since there is no possibility of a confusion between virtue and a square. Now, the doctrine that Brahman is the sole real involves the denial of reality not (existence) to the world; and this presupposes the affirmation, actual or possible, of the world's reality. Where can the world be real, if at all, except in Brahman, since according to the Advaitin, Brahman is all that is? Therefore, even to deny the reality of the world, we have to postulate a relative reality for it, that is to say, a relation to Brahman. While Brahman, that transcends the universe, is called *nirguṇa* or *niṣprapañca*, that which is related to the world as its cause is called *saguṇa* or *saprapanca* or Īśvara. The introduction of the teaching of creations is thus not an irrelevance; it is a step in the advance to Advaita realisation.

From this point of view, one is loth to reject many of the works ascribed to Śaṅkara, though one is equally unwilling to accept as his all the works fathered on him. Those who are interested in *Tantras* and Mother-worship, which hold ultimately to Advaita, will find to

little significance in works like the *Prapañcasāra*, the *Saundaryalaharī*, the commentary on the *Lalitātrīsatī*, and so on. And the followers of Śaṅkara, the philosopher, have also owned religious allegiance not merely to Īsvara but even to special forms like Śiva or Viṣṇu and tried to make out that Śaṅkara himself had a partiality for one form or another. One of the most successful attempts in this direction, is perhaps that of Appayya Dīkṣita in the *Śivādvaitanirṇaya*, for in making out Śaṅkara's Śaiva leanings, the author relies there not on minor apocryphal hymns, but on the *Sūtrabhāṣya* itself.

An ancient maxim has it that what one intensely contemplates, that one becomes. The teaching about Īsvara will lead to the contemplation of Īsvara, a God wielding power for the sake of the world. Will this not fall short of the Advaitin's ideal of Brahman-realisation? Perhaps, yes; but we do not avoid the conclusion, since, in technical language, it is a contingency of the acceptable. From our unrealised point of view, we have three entities, God, the material world and ourselves. In the realisation of unity it will be something achieved if at least three is reduced to two, by our becoming Īsvara. Further what limits Īsvara is *māyā*, or *avidyā* (nescience), as it is variously called; nescience, we have already said, is a bond to us, not to God who wields it; we view Him as limited by it; He does not feel it as a limitation; indeed if there were not men like us, apparently finite selves or *jīvas* in bondage to nescience, God would not be aware of nescience at all; for only as binding us does nescience exist. Now supposing that all of us become Īsvara, there will be none in bondage and nescience in entirety would have ceased to be or bind or limit even Īsvara; then there

would be no difference between Brahman and Īsvara. But so long as there is even one *jīva* in bondage, Īsvara will be aware of that nescience and so far limited by it; and as the supremely merciful ruler of the world, He will direct Himself to help the *jīva* get rid of his fetters. Is this not a reasonable view to hold, that so long as there is even one unreleased *jīva*, the released shall not disport in a private heaven, but, in the realisation of themselves as Īsvara, exert themselves for the redemption of the yet unreleased? Hence it is that later Advaitins, like Appayya Dīkṣita, explicitly maintain that until the final release of all *jīvas*, release for anyone consists only in becoming Īsvara; and as that author shows with not a little success, the germs of the view are to be found in Śaṅkara's own teaching. Even for those who contemplate *saguṇa* Brahman, there is no return to this world of bondage and travail. And *saguṇa* Brahman or Īsvara is neither an irrelevance nor a concession to the mob; the worst that may be said of it is that it is a concession to ignorance or *avidyā*; as we are, we are in *avidyā*, bound by it; we can be free not by ignoring *avidyā* (as that will be only a variety of self-delusion), but by rising above it and controlling it so that it is no longer a fetter, mastering it instead of being mastered by it, realising it to be one's own potency or *śakti*, not something external; when this realisation comes, one becomes Īsvara and the stage is set for final release as the realisation of pure consciousness, *nirguṇa* Brahman. The highest knowledge that is the Vedānta can therefore be interpreted harmoniously as teaching both the *saguṇa* and the *nirguṇa* the realisation of the former being both an inevitable step in the realisation of the latter and also in itself release from bondage (*samsāra*) though not from nescience (*avidyā*).

It is true that Śaṅkara has interpreted some *sūtras* of the *Vedānta Sūtras* as teaching the *nirguṇa* and others teaching the *saguna*; but, as Appayya says, his view would appear to have been that the whole body of Vedānta doctrine was susceptible of this dual interpretation. And of this, Śaṅkara has given an indication, on the principle of a single rice being tested to find if the pot of rice is cooked, in his twofold commentary on the third aphorism (*sūtra*).

God as Revealing the Vedas

The said aphorism can be understood in two ways. One teaches *Īśvara's* omniscience, on the ground of his being the author of the sacred scriptures (*śāstras*). The *śāstras* are the ocean of all knowledge; and judging from our experience, the author of a science should know more than what is contained in that science; hence *Īśvara* must know more than what is contained in the *śāstras*, *i.e.* he should be omniscient. There are some who say that the *Vedas* are uncreated. But our authority in such matters is scripture itself, and that declares in no uncertain terms the breathing forth, as it were of the *Vedas* by the supreme Being. All that we are concerned to preserve is the impersonality of the *Vedas*, not their non-origination. And we know that even statements made by ordinary human beings can be impersonal, when they speak dispassionately and with a strict regard for fact. *Īśvara* has no passions to affect Him, all His desires being ever fulfilled; and there is no limitation to his knowledge; what then can be the limitation to the dispassionateness or objectivity of His utterance? And the *Vedas* are objective in the sense that in revealing them, *Īśvara* pays heed to their

(to be continued)

शारीरकव्याख्याप्रस्थानभेदः

आत्मविद्याभूषणम् व. श. वै. गुरुस्वामी शास्त्री

I. मङ्गलाचरणम्

[1]

शान्तमद्वैतमानन्दं ब्रह्म सत्यं सनातनम् ।
ध्यायामि मङ्गलं तत्त्वं ध्यातव्यं सर्वदेहिभिः ॥

[2]

प्रत्यक्तत्त्वावबोधोल्लसितमुनिगणस्वान्तदर्यन्तरेषु
स्वेच्छासञ्चारशीलः प्रशमितदुरितो यः शिवः
स्वेन नाम्ना ।
तत्त्वं वेदान्तवेद्यं वटतरुनिकटे योऽदिशत्पुण्यभाजा-
माचार्यः शङ्कराख्यः स भवतु भगवान् सद्गुरुः
श्रेयसे नः ॥

[3]

एकाम्रेश्वरजीवनाः श्रितजने मन्देतरश्रीपुषः
कम्पातीरविहारिणः शुभकरी काञ्चीपुरीपावनाः ।

कामाक्षीत्यमलाह्वयाः कुमुदिनीकान्तावतंसाः शिवाः
धेयासुर्हिमशैलपुण्यविभवाः श्रेयांसि भूयांसि नः ॥

[4]

धर्माश्रिका-वैद्यनाथ-वैद्यनाथ-बुधोत्तमान् ।
जननी-जनकाचार्यान्नौमि भक्त्या दिवं गतान् ॥

[5]

भागीरथीव या सूक्तिर्भगवत्पादसम्भवा ।
अनेकपथगा सा मे सत्सेव्या तनुयाच्छिवम् ॥

II. आचार्यपरम्पराप्रणामः

[6]

यत्कृपापालितं तत्त्वदर्शनं प्राणिमुक्तये ।
जागर्त्यद्याप्यविच्छिन्नं तान्वन्दे देशिकोत्तमान् ॥

[7]

बादरायणमाचार्यं शुकं गौडपदं गुरुम् ।
गोविन्दभगवत्पादं भगवत्पादशङ्करम् ॥

[8]

पद्मपादं मण्डनं श्रीसुरेश्वरयतीश्वरम् ।
विमुक्तात्मयतीन्द्रं तं प्रकटार्थकृतं तथा ॥

[9]

तत्त्वशुद्धिप्रणेतारं श्रीज्ञानघनदेशिकम् ।
नृसिंहभट्टोपाध्यायं प्रकाशानन्दयोगिनम् ॥

[10]

बहुग्रन्थप्रणेतारं श्रीमदप्पय्यदीक्षितम् ।
सम्प्रदायविदग्रचं तम्प्रणमामि मुहुर्मुहुः ॥

[11]

परम्परेयमाचार्यवर्याणां कथिताधुना ।
विमर्शस्योपयोगाय विध्नविध्वंसनाय च ॥

III. विमर्शविषयवस्तुनिर्देशः

[12]

प्रतिजानीमहे पूर्वं विमर्शविषयादिकम् ।
विमृश्यांशविमर्शञ्च तदनु प्रारभामहे ॥

[13]

काकदन्तसमं वस्तु विफलं न विमृश्यते ।
तदत्र सफलं वस्तु विषयीक्रियते मया ॥

[14]

शाङ्करं किल पन्थानमनुरुध्य मनीषिभिः ।
पद्मपादप्रभृतिभिर्दीक्षितान्तैर्विनिर्मिताः ॥

[15]

बह्व्यो हि सन्ति कृतयस्तासु चाद्वैतमुच्यते ।
तथापि भिन्नगतयः सन्त्यनेकेषु वस्तुषु ॥

[16]

जीवेश्वरव्यवस्थायां मानमेयव्यवस्थितौ ।
श्रवणादेः साधनत्वे मिथ्यात्वस्योपवर्णने ॥

[17]

शाङ्करानन्तराः सर्वे शाङ्करालम्बनाश्च ते ।
किं शाङ्करोक्तमालम्ब्य भजन्ते विविधां गतिम् ॥

[18]

इत्येवंप्राक्तनाचार्यग्रन्थजातं विमृश्यते ।
सिद्धान्तविन्दु-सिद्धान्तलेशसङ्ग्रह-कर्तृभिः ॥

[19]

केचिन्दये परे त्वेवं दर्शितानि मतान्यपि ।
फलं ममान्तःकरणशुद्धिरन्यच्च सिद्ध्यति ॥

[20]

समूलत्वे तु सिद्धान्ताः सङ्ग्राह्याः शिवकाङ्क्षिभिः ।
परस्परविरोधेऽपि मतानाञ्चेत्समूलता ॥

[21]

मतानि नैव दुष्यन्ति तात्पर्यांशाविरोधतः ।
भाष्येऽपि दृश्यते ह्येवं विरुद्धा प्रक्रिया क्वचित् ॥

[22]

‘शान्त’ इत्यादि वाक्यं यच्छान्दोग्योपनिषद्गतम् ।
छान्दोग्योपनिषद्भाष्ये ब्रह्मोपास्तिविधायकम् ॥

[23]

इति व्याख्याय तां व्याख्याम्प्रतिषिध्य तु तत्पुनः ।
शारीरके शमगुणविधायकतया स्फुटम् ॥

[24]

व्याख्यायि भगवत्पादैरिदमत्र निदर्शनम् ।
बृहदारण्यके ‘यस्मिन्पञ्च पञ्चजना’ इति ॥

[25]

वाक्ये पञ्चजनेत्येतच्छब्दार्थप्रतिपादने ।
प्राणश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रमन्नं मनः पञ्चजना मताः ॥

[26]

अन्नाभावे प्राणचक्षुः श्रोत्रज्योतिर्मनांसि वा ।
असुरा राक्षसा देवा गन्धर्वाः पितरस्तथा ॥

[27]

ब्राह्मणः क्षत्रियो वैश्यो निषादः शूद्र एव वा ।
इति नैकविधां व्याख्यां दर्शयामासतुर्गुरु ।
सूत्रभाष्यप्रणेतारौ व्यासशङ्करदेशिकौ ॥

[28]

विद्याविद्यामन्त्रगयोः विद्याविद्येति शब्दयोः ।
ईशावास्ये चैतरेये बृहदारण्यके तथा ॥

[29]

माण्डक्येऽपि च भाष्येषु भाष्यकारा बभाषिरे ।
अर्थं नैकविधं स्पष्टं सप्रमाणं सयुक्तिकम् ॥
तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येऽपि लक्षणा कथ्यते द्विधा ॥

[30]

तत्सिद्धं परतात्पर्यविषये यद्विरुध्यते ।
मतं तदेव हेयं स्यादुपादेयं ततोऽपरम् ॥

IV. श्रीपद्मपादाचार्यः

[31]

पद्मपादप्रणीता या प्रसिद्धा पञ्चपादिका ।
भगवत्पादभाष्यस्य व्याख्या तामाहुरादिमाम् ॥

[32]

चतुः सूत्र्यन्तभागस्य केवलं सोपलभ्यते ।
एतद्विमर्शपूर्वञ्च पद्मपादाशयम्बुवे ॥

(i) मङ्गलाचरणे शिष्टाग्रणीभाष्यकारः

[33]

उपोद्घाततयाध्यासभाष्यं शारीरके यथा ।
अपेक्षितार्थकथनान्निर्वहत्यखिलां धुरम् ॥

[34]

व्युत्पादितं पञ्चपाद्यां तथा पद्मपदैः स्फुटम् ।
मङ्गलाचरणं भाष्यप्रणेतुर्नेति संशयः ॥

[35]

उपप्लवैर्विरहितं विज्ञानघनविग्रहम् ।
प्रत्यञ्चम्परमात्मानं युष्मदस्मत्पदान्वितात् ॥

[36]

वाक्यात्स्मरन्भाष्यकारो सुष्ट्वाचरति मङ्गलम् ।
इत्यन्यपरवाक्यात्तादर्थ्यमस्तीत्यपोद्यते ॥

(ii) विचाररूपे श्रवणे विधिः प्रामाणिकः

[37]

अन्तर्णीतविचारार्था जिज्ञासाभ्युपगम्यते ।
उपेयते विचारेऽपि विधिः श्रुत्यनुसारतः ॥

[38]

अन्तर्णीतविचारस्य विधेयत्वोररीकृतेः ।
वेदान्तशास्त्रं श्रोतव्यं ब्रह्मविज्ञानकाङ्क्षिणा ॥

[39]

इत्यवर्णयदाचार्यस्तृतीये वणके स्फुटम् ।
अध्याहृतम्भाष्यकृता जिज्ञासेति पदोत्तरम् ॥

[40]

कर्तव्येति पदं यत्तु तदिदं मूलमिष्यते ।
जिज्ञासितव्यं ब्रह्मेति भाष्यं सूत्रार्थबोधकम् ॥

[41]

जन्मादिसूत्रप्रारम्भे योऽनुवादोऽस्य दृश्यते ।
सहकार्यन्तरविधिरावृत्तिरिति सूत्रयोः ॥

[42]

विधिसाधकभाष्यं यद्बृहदारण्यके तथा ।
तदेतत्सर्वमेवात्र मूलमूहामहे वयम् ॥

[43]

यत्तु श्रोतव्यवचनं विधिच्छायमितीरितम् ।
समन्वये भाष्यकृद्भिस्तत्तु बोध्यमतत्परम् ॥

[44]

ज्ञानात्मतायां श्रवणे विधिनैव भवेदिति ।
वृत्तिकृत्पक्षविक्षेपबद्धदीक्षैरुदीरितम् ॥

[45]

साधकम्बाधकञ्चैव भाष्यं यदि विधेर्भवेत् ।
ध्रुवं विप्रतिषेधः स्यात्तथा सत्यसमञ्जसम् ॥

[46]

ज्ञानात्मके तु श्रवणे निषेधति विधिं ततः ।
विचाररूपं श्रवणं विदधात्येव भाष्यकृत् ॥

[47]

इत्थमत्राविरोधः स्याद्भगवत्पादवाक्ययोः ।
न केवलानुमानोपन्यासः सूत्रप्रयोजनम् ॥

[48]

किन्तु वेदान्तकुसुमग्रथनं तत्प्रयोजनम् ।
इति श्रुतीनां सूत्राणां समानार्थत्वसूचकात् ॥

[49]

जिज्ञासितव्यमित्यादि श्रुतिच्छायोपपादकात् ।
भाष्यादाद्याधिकरणविषयस्तैत्तिरीयकम् ।
विजिज्ञासस्व तद्ब्रह्मेत्येतद्वाक्यमुदाहृतम् ॥

(iii) शारीरकमीमांसाशास्त्रं पृथक्शास्त्रम्

[50]

शारीरकं पृथक्शास्त्रमिति पद्मपदाशयः ।
उल्लिखामो वयं मूलमाकरादस्य साधकम् ।
शारीरकेऽधिकरणे प्रथमे किल भाष्यकृत् ॥

(अनुवर्तते)

ŚĀRĪRAKAVYĀKHYĀ-PRASTHĀNA-BHEDAḤ*

Ātmavidyābhūṣaṇam V. S. V. Gurusvāmī Śāstrī

Prefatory note: The *Śārīrakavyākhyāprasthānabhedaḥ* is a thesis on the sources of different principles of Advaita philosophy established by the authors belonging to the post-Śaṅkara period, the source for these authors being the commentaries of Śrī Śaṅkara. This research work is the result of my labour as a Government Research Scholarship-holder in the Madras Sanskrit College, Mylapore, Madras - 4, during the years 1938 - 1940.

I. *Invocation*

[1]

I contemplate upon the auspicious Absolute Principle that is known as 'the Brahman' which is the Peace, the Non-dual, the Bliss, the Truth, and the Ancient, and which is to be contemplated upon by all human beings.

[2]

Lord Śiva, who travels at will in the hearts of the sages, that have blossomed due to the attainment of the supreme knowledge, who mitigates the miseries of the masses and who, with the name of Śaṅkarācārya,

*Free rendering in English by J. R. S. Vasani Ramanan.

taught the supreme knowledge to the meritorious people — may that great preceptor, Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda bring us prosperity.

[3]

May Goddess Kāmākṣī, whose life and breath is Ekāmresvara (Lord Śiva), who reveals the knowledge of reality to the devotees, who sports on the banks of the river Kampā, who sanctifies by her presence the city of Kāñcī and who is the daughter of the snow-clad mountain (Himavān), bring all-round prosperity to all of us.

[4]

My reverential salutations are due to Śrīmatī Dharmāmbikā, Śrī Vaidyanātha, and Śāstraratnākaram Veppattūr Śrī Vaidyanātha Śāstrī, who were my mother, father and teacher respectively, but who are no more with us now.

[5]

Just as the Bhāgīrathī (the river Ganges) has many courses, the words of Śrī Śaṅkara or his commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* could be interpreted in different ways. May those words of Śrī Śaṅkara bring us auspiciousness.

II. *Homage to the Lineage of Preceptors*

[6]

I worship all those great preceptors, with whose compassion the knowledge of Brahman could be attained even to-day for the liberation of all the human beings who wallow in the world of *samsāra*.

[7 - 10]

I worship repeatedly the preceptors Śrī Bādarāyaṇa, Śrī Śuka, Śrī Gauḍapāda, Śrī Govinda Bhagavatpāda, Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda, Śrī Padmapāda, Śrī Maṇḍanamisra, Śrī Sures'varācārya, Śrī Vimuktātmayati, Śrī Anubhūtiśvarūpa, Śrī Jñānaghanapāda (the author of the *Tattvasuddhi*), Śrī Nṛsiṃhabhaṭṭopādhyāya, Śrī Prakāśānandayati, and Śrīmad Appayya Dīkṣita (the author of several works).

[11]

The lineage of the great preceptors of Advaita has been mentioned above in order to ward off the obstacles and to help the progress of this research work.

III. *The Title of This Research Work*

[12 - 13]

Let us first know the topic of this research work. The content in detail would be dealt with later. Matters that are useless like a crow's teeth are not going to be dealt with in this work. I will explain those points only that are important and useful.

[14 - 15]

Starting from Śrī Padmapāda down to Śrī Appayya Dīkṣita, all the scholars have written a number of works following the principles of Advaita philosophy expounded by Śrī Śaṅkara. Even though these scholars derive the source of their works from the commentaries of Śrī Śaṅkara, their views differ on some points.

[16 - 18]

The preceptors of Advaita belonging to the post-Śaṅkara period hold divergent views pertaining to the nature of *jīva* and *Īśvara*, the means to liberation, the illusory nature of the world and so on. But Śrī Śaṅkara's works form the basis for these views. This point has been dealt with in detail in the *Siddhānta-bindu* of Śrī Madhusūdana Sarasvatī and the *Siddhānta-leśasaṅgraha* of Śrī Appayya Dīkṣita.

[19 - 20]

Even though there are differences of opinion on some Advaitic principles among various authors belonging to post-Śaṅkara period, I strongly feel that they have a common origin, *viz.* the works of Śrī Śaṅkara. Divergent views in any system of philosophy should be welcomed by the well-wishers as long as such views are not contradictory to the fundamental principles of that particular system.

[21]

There are a few apparent contradictions on some points in Śrī Śaṅkara's commentaries themselves. But the basic principles of Advaita expounded by Śrī Śaṅkarācārya do not suffer from any contradiction.

[22 - 23]

Śrī Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Chāndogyo-paniṣad* says that the sentence beginning with '*śānta*' etc. in this *Upaniṣad* refers to the adoration of Brahman. Śrī Śaṅkara contradicts this in his commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* and says that '*śānta*' refers to '*śama*' (tranquillity).

[24 - 25]

To cite another example: Śrī Śaṅkara has contradicted himself in his works. While explaining the meaning of the sentence, 'yasmīn pañca pañcajanāḥ' of the *Bṛhadāraṇyakoṇiṣad*, he says that *prāṇāḥ* (vital airs), *caḡṣuḥ* (eye), *śrotram* (ear), *annam* (food), *manāḥ* (mind) are referred to by the word 'pañcajanāḥ'.

[26 - 27]

In the absence of *annam* (food), 'pañcajanāḥ' could refer to *prāṇāḥ*, *caḡṣuḥ*, *śrotram*, *jyotiḥ* (flame) and *manāḥ* (mind), or 'pañcajanāḥ' could mean *brāhmaṇāḥ*, *kṣatriyāḥ*, *vaiśyāḥ*, *niṣādaḥ*, and *śūdraḥ*. Thus Śrī Vyāsa, the author of the *Brahmasūtras* and Śrī Śaṅkara, the commentator on the *Brahmasūtras* have interpreted the word 'pañcajanāḥ' in many ways.

[28 - 29]

The words 'vidyā' and 'avidyā' found in the *Īśā-*, *Aitareya-*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-*, and *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣads* have been interpreted in many ways by Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda. Even the Upaniṣadic statement, 'Thou art that' is interpreted in two ways.

[30]

So it is clear that only that school of thought in a system of philosophy should be discarded which conflicts with the fundamental principles of that system of philosophy. Other schools of thought should be accepted.

IV. Śrī Padmapādācārya

[31]

The famous work called the *Pañcapādikā* written by Śrī Padmapādācārya is considered to be the first commentary on the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* of Śrī Śaṅkara.

[32]

This work, the *Pañcapādikā* is available to us and contains the commentary only upto the section ending with the fourth aphorism of the *Brahmasūtras*. I shall now explain the viewpoints expressed by Śrī Padmapādācārya.

V. Śrī Śaṅkara Stands the Foremost (among those who commence their works with an auspicious beginning)

[33]

The introduction to the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* of Śrī Śaṅkara which is called "*adhyāsabhāṣya*" fulfils the responsibility of what is expected of it.

[34]

The doubt whether the commentary of Śrī Śaṅkara on the *Brahmasūtras* contains an auspicious beginning has been explained well by Śrī Padmapāda in his commentary, the *Pañcapādikā*.

[35 - 36]

If it is studied carefully, it would become clear that Śrī Śaṅkara in his *bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtras*

has made an auspicious beginning with the sentence commencing with the words 'yuṣmat' and 'asmāt' which in fact refer to the blemishless, intelligent Self which is the absolute principle.

VI. *Hearing (Śrotavyā) the Vedānta texts is a Vedic Injunction in Respect of Inquiry (Vicāra).*

[37 - 38]

The word 'jijñāsā' of the first aphorism of the *Brahmasūtras* means 'inquiry into the real nature of Brahman'. Moreover, it should be construed as an injunction like the Vedic mandates. So, one who aspires to acquire Brahman-knowledge should study the Vedic texts.

[39 - 40]

Thus Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda has explained the word 'jijñāsā', in the third *varṇaka* (chapter) of his *bhāṣya* (commentary) on the *Brahmasūtras*. Śrī Śaṅkar points out that the word 'jijñāsā' should be construed as 'jijñāsā kartavyā' or 'jijñāsītavyam brahma'.

[41 - 42]

It seems that the above contention is based on the commentary of Śrī Śaṅkara on the *Brahmasūtras*, 'janmādyasya yataḥ' (I-i-2), 'sahakāryantaravidhiḥ' (III-iv-47) 'āvṛttiḥ asakṛdupadeśāt' (IV-i-1) and his commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*.

[43 - 44]

The word 'śrotavyā' which has been spoken of as a Vedic injunction by Śrī Śaṅkara in his commentary

on the fourth aphorism of the *Brahmasūtras* should be understood in a different manner. It has been pointed out that the imperative suffixes such as 'tavya' and others do not enjoin any injunction because they become powerless in respect of knowledge.

[45]

Śrī Śaṅkara would be suffering from self-contradiction if he says that the imperative suffixes enjoin injunction at one place and if he says that they do not enjoin any injunction at another place.

[46]

But he explains that the suffix, 'tavya' does not enjoin any injunction in respect of knowledge or self but it enjoins injunction in respect of inquiry (*vicāra*).

[47 - 48]

Thus there will not be any contradiction in the sentences of Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda. The purpose of the *Brahmasūtras* is not just to infer anything but to compile the Vedic injunctions. This is to show that the Vedic injunctions and the *Brahmasūtras* mean the same.

[49]

Thus it has been proved that Śrī Śaṅkara has used the word 'jijñāsītavyam' in his commentary on the first aphorism of the *Brahmasūtras*, 'athāto brahmajijñāsā' for which the *Taittirīya* text, 'vijijñāsasva tad brahma' forms the basis.

(to be continued)

अभेदः परमं साम्यम्

भाष्यभावज्ञ वरहृक् कल्याण सुन्दर शास्त्री

“योऽसावसौ पुरुषः सोऽहमस्मि ।”

“स यश्चायं पुरुषे । यश्चासावादित्ये स एकः ।”

“य इमं मध्वदं वेद आत्मानं जीवमन्तिकात् ।
ईशानं भूतभव्यस्य ।”

“अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति ।
ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य ।”

“ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति ।”

“ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति ।”

इत्याद्याः शतशः श्रुतयः जीवपरमात्मनोरभेदं साक्षात् प्रति-
पादयन्ति । तत्त्वमस्याद्या महावाक्यात्मभूताः श्रुतयश्च तात्पर्यविषय-
तयामुमेवार्थं प्रतिपादयन्ति । अत्र च पराक्रान्तमादिशङ्करभगव-
त्पादानुयायिभिः सुरेश्वराद्यैर्विद्यारण्यरामरायान्तैर्महात्मभिः ॥

अत्र चैवं आक्षिप्यते —

“यदा पश्यः पश्यते ह्यमवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्म-
योनिम् । तदा विद्वान् पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं
साम्यमुपैति ॥”

“यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति ।
एवं मुनेर्विजानत आत्मा भवति गौतम ॥”

“यथा नद्यः स्यन्दमानास्समुद्रेऽस्तं गच्छन्ति नामरूपे
विहाय । तथा विद्वान् नामरूपाद्धिमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषं उपैति
दिव्यम् ॥”

इत्यादिश्रुतिवचनैः

“इदं ज्ञानमुपाश्रित्य मम साधर्म्यं आगताः ।”

इति गीतावचनाच्च मुक्तस्य जीवस्य परमात्मसाम्यमेवाधिगम्यते,
नाभेदः । अतो जीवस्य परमात्मसाम्यापत्तिरेव मुक्तिः, न ऐक्यप्रतिपत्तिः
इति ॥

तत्र ब्रूमः — उक्तवाक्यस्थितैः ‘परमं साम्यम्’ ‘तादृगेव’
‘साधर्म्यम्’ इत्यादिपदैर्न जीवस्य मुक्तस्य परमात्मसमतापत्तिरुच्यते,
किंत्वभेद एव । “यथा नद्यः” इति दृष्टान्तानुरोधात् । न हि समुद्रं
गता नद्यस्समुद्रसाम्यं प्रपद्यन्ते, किन्तु तदभेदमेव । न च मधुरजला
नद्यस्समुद्रम्प्राप्य क्षारजला भवन्ति समुद्रवदिति वाच्यम्, यदि समुद्र-
म्प्रविष्टासु सतीषु नदीषु ‘इदं नदीजलम्’, ‘इदं तु समुद्रजलम्’, इति
पृथक्प्रतीतिस्तर्हि नदीजलस्य समुद्रजलसाम्यं वक्तुं शक्यते, न तु
सास्तीति । न ह्यपृथक्प्रतीतयोस्साम्यम् क्वचिद्दृष्टमुपपन्नं वा ।
एतेन यदुक्तं लयशब्दो न स्वरूपैक्यपर इति तत्प्रत्युक्तम् । अस्तं

गच्छन्तीत्यस्य लयपरत्वात् समुद्रे नदीनामस्तंगमनरूपस्य लयस्य समुद्रस्वरूपैक्यपरत्वस्योक्तत्वात् । न च नित्यनैमित्तिकमहाप्रलयेषु लयशब्दप्रयोगो दृश्यते, स च लयो न स्वरूपैक्यम्, अन्यथा तेषु ज्ञानं विनैव सर्वमुक्तिप्रसङ्गादिति वाच्यम् ; ऐक्यमेव लयशब्दस्य मुख्यार्थः । अत एव मोक्षस्यात्यन्तिकलयत्वेन व्यवहारः ।

“आत्यन्तिकोऽपि मुक्तिर्या लयो ब्रह्मणि शाश्वतः ;”

इति विष्णुपुराणवचनात् । लयो हि चतुर्विधः । नित्यादिषु तेषु लयशब्दप्रयोगो औपचारिकः । श्रूयते हि सुषुप्तस्मृति प्रलीन इव भवतीति । घटादिकार्यञ्च स्वकारणमृद्द्रव्यभूतचूर्णपुञ्जनैक्यम्प्रपञ्चं सदेव नष्टमित्युच्यते । नाशो हि लयः — न हि नष्टो घटो मृदैक्यमप्राप्य मृत्समस्तन् दृश्यते — मृदिति घट इति च सति पदार्थद्वये तयोस्साम्यं वक्तुं शक्यते । न हि घटनाशानन्तरं घटपदार्थोऽस्ति, विरोधात् । तथा च आत्यन्तिकप्रलये स्थूलसूक्ष्मात्मकं सर्वं जगत् स्वकारणेनाज्ञानेन सह विनष्टमेवेति कृत्वा तस्य परमकारणे ब्रह्मणि मुख्यो लय उपपद्यते । नित्यादिषु तु न सूक्ष्मप्रपञ्चनाश इति न तस्य ब्रह्मणि लयः । न च आत्यन्तिकप्रलये जीवस्यैव लय इत्युक्तमिति वाच्यम्, जीवस्य नित्यस्य लयायोगात् ; जीवोपाध्योस्सूक्ष्मकारणयोर्लयेन जीवलयव्यपदेशात् ; जीवो हि मुक्तौ सूक्ष्माद्युपाधिद्वयम्परित्यज्य केवलब्रह्मात्मनावतिष्ठते । तस्माज्जीवोपाधेर्जीवस्य वा मुक्तौ न साम्येन स्थितिर्ब्रह्मणि, किन्त्वभेदेनैव, जीवोपाधेः प्रध्वंसभावाज्जीवस्य च ब्रह्मभेदकोपाध्यभावेन ब्रह्मणः पृथक्स्थित्यभावाच्च । तदेव ह्युक्तम् —

“विभेदजनकेऽज्ञाने नाशमात्यन्तिकं गते ।”

इति । यथा आरम्भवादे परिणामवादे च कार्यस्य कारणे लयो नाम कारणस्वरूपैक्यम्, तथा विवर्तवादेऽपीति कृत्वा रज्जुसर्पवत् रज्जुना प्रपञ्चोऽप्यज्ञानेऽपगते सति ब्रह्मणा स्वरूपैक्यमेव प्रतिपद्यते । न तु तत्साम्यम् — न हि रज्जुं दृष्ट्वा सर्प इति भ्रान्तः पुरुषः आप्तोप-

देशादिना रज्जुरियमिति ज्ञात्वापि रज्जुसमस्सन् सर्पोऽत्र वर्तते इति मन्यते, किन्तु सर्पो रज्जुरेव भवतीति । न च कालत्रयेऽपि सर्प एवात्र नास्तीति प्रत्येतीति वाच्यम्, इष्टापत्तेः । कारणस्वरूपातिरिक्तं नास्ति हि कार्यस्य किञ्चित् स्वरूपं यस्मिन् कस्मिन्नपि वादे । एवं कार्यस्य मिथ्यात्वादेव ब्रह्मण्यान्तिकलय उपपद्यते । न हि सत्यस्य लयस्सम्भवति, सत्यत्वादेव, नाप्यसत्यस्यासत्यत्वादेव, किन्तु मिथ्याभूतस्यैव । न चैवं ब्रह्मणि जीवस्य लयश्रवणाजीवो मिथ्यैवेति वाच्यं, इष्टापत्तेः.— ‘जीव ईशो जगच्च’ इति सर्वं हि मिथ्या ब्रह्मभिन्नत्वात् । जीवस्वरूपस्य सत्यत्वेऽपि जीवोपाधेर्मिथ्यात्वान्न काप्यनुपपत्तिः । तस्माल्लयो नाम कार्यस्य कारणेनैक्यप्राप्तिरेव । जीवस्य च सोपाधिकस्य ब्रह्मकार्यत्वाद् ब्रह्मणैक्यप्राप्तिरेव लयः । तच्च जीवस्य ब्रह्मैक्यमुपाधिपरित्यागमात्रमेव, न त्वपूर्वमिति सिद्धम् ॥

ननु कार्यस्य कारणैक्यं न लयशब्दार्थः, किन्तु विसदृशावस्था-प्रहाणेन कारणत्वधर्मिणा द्रव्येण विभागस्थापादानभूतेन संश्लेषो लय इति । मैवम् । कार्यस्य निमित्तकारणेन सह संयोगविभागसत्त्वेऽपि उपादानकारणेन सह तदभावात् । न हि मृदा वियुक्तस्सन् घटो दृश्यते, येन मृदा संश्लिष्टो घटो नष्ट इत्युच्येत । न च पत्रस्य वृक्ष इव घटस्य मृदपादानं दृश्यते, न हि वृक्षात् पत्रमिव मृदस्सकाशात् घटः पतति । यद्यपि ‘इदं पत्रम्, अयं वृक्षः’ इतिवत्, ‘इयं मृत्, अयं घट’ इति घटाकारपरिणतमृदतिरिक्तमृदः पृथक्त्वेन घटो विविच्य ग्रहीतुं शक्यते, तथापि घटाकारपरिणतमृदस्सकाशात् शक्यत इति कृत्वा कथं मृद्-घटयोस्संयोगवियोगभावः । किञ्च यदि घटः विसदृशां कम्बुग्रीवाद्य-वस्थां प्रजह्यात्तर्हि मृत्स्वरूप एव स्यादिति कृत्वा घटस्यैवाभावात् कस्य कारणेन सह संश्लेषः? सतोर्हि वस्तुनोर्द्वयोस्संश्लेषः कपिवृक्षयोरिव सम्भवति, न त्वन्यतरासत्त्वे । अपि च सत्कार्यवादिना त्वया सतो द्रव्यस्य पूर्वावस्थाप्रहाणेनोत्तरावस्थास्वीकारः कार्योदयः, तत्परित्यागेन पुनरवस्थान्तरस्वीकारः कार्यनाश इत्युक्तम्प्राक्, तदिदानीं विरुद्ध्यते कार्यकारणपदार्थद्वयाभ्युपगमात् । न हि तस्यैव द्रव्यस्य तदेवापादान-

म्भवति, तदेव तेन च संश्लिष्टम्भवति । ननु महत्या मृदस्सकाशात् कियतीं मृदं विच्छिद्य आदाय कुलालो घटमकरोदिति कृत्वा कारणभूतादपादानान्महतो मृद्द्रव्यात्सकाशाद्विभक्त एव विसदृशावस्थो मृन्मयो घटः, स च मुद्गरेण विध्वस्तस्सन् मृद्विसदृशावस्थाम्परित्यज्य अपादानभूतेन मृद्द्रव्येण महता संश्लिष्टस्सन् नष्ट इत्युच्यते इति कृत्वा कार्यस्य कारणेन संश्लेष एव लयो न त्वैक्यमिति । मैवम् — यां कियतीं मृदं विच्छिद्यादाय कुलालो घटमकरोत् सैव मृद् घटस्योपादानतया कारणम्भवति, न तु तदतिरिक्ता महती मृत् । अतिरिक्ताया घटस्यारम्भकत्वाभावात्परिणामित्वाभावाच्च । तथा च घटस्य नामरूपप्रहाणे सति स्वोपादानमृदंशेनैक्यमेव । यद्यपि घटोपादानमृदंशस्य तदितरमृदा संश्लेषस्सम्भवति, तथापि न तयोः कार्यकारणभाव इति । यदुक्तम् — आकाशस्यापि प्रदेशभेदाभ्युपगमाद् घटाकाशादि दृष्टान्तोपन्यासश्चौपाधिकवैषम्याभावनिवन्धन इति, तदप्यसत्, निरवयवं गगनमिति लोकप्रसिद्धिमाश्रित्य तद्दृष्टान्तोपन्यासात् । यथा समुद्रवदपारमिति न हि समुद्रस्य पाराभावोऽस्ति, परन्तु लोकस्तमुद्रमपारं मन्यते तद्वदिति । तस्माद् घटे नष्टे सति घटाकाशो महाकाशेनेव, समुद्रप्रवेशे सति नदी समुद्रेणेव, अज्ञाने नष्टे सति जीवो ब्रह्मणा सायुज्यापरपर्याय-मैक्यमेव प्रपद्यते । तदेव

“परमं साम्यम्”

इत्युच्यते । सायुज्यप्रतिपादकश्रुत्यैकार्थ्यात् परमत्वविशेषणाच्च साम्यस्येति ॥

ननु सायुज्यं नाम नाभेदः, किन्तु समानगुणयोग एव — समानगुणयुक् — सयुक्; तस्य भावस्सायुज्यमिति व्युत्पत्तेः । स च समानगुणयोगस्सत्येव भेदे सम्भवतीति नाभेदसिद्धिरिति । मैवम् — समानगुणयोगस्य सार्ष्टितारूपत्वेन सायुज्यस्यैक्यपरत्वात् । ‘सालोक्यं सामीप्यं, सारूप्यं, सार्ष्टित्वं, सायुज्यम्’ इति पञ्चविधा हि मुक्तयः । तत्र समानलोकवासित्वं सालोक्यम्, यस्मिन् लोके सेव्योऽस्ति तस्मिन्

लोके सेवकस्यापि सत्त्वं सालोक्यमित्यर्थः । समानलोकत्वं ह्यभिन्न-
लोकत्वं, न तु तुल्यलोकत्वम् — न हि विष्णुमुपासीना वैष्णवा विष्णु-
लोकाद्वैकुण्ठादन्यं तत्तुल्यलोकं गच्छन्ति, किन्तु तमेवेति । एतेन
'समानशब्दो नैक्यपर' इति प्रत्युक्तम् । यद्यपि समानशब्दस्य तुल्यत्वं
मुख्यार्थस्तथाप्यैक्यमपि क्वचित् सहोदरः, सग्रामः, सतीर्थ्यः इत्यादौ
स्वीकर्तव्यमेवेति बोध्यम् । समानरूपत्वं सारूप्यम्, सेव्यतुल्यरूपत्व-
मित्यर्थः । सेव्यसमीपवर्तित्वं सामीप्यम् । सेव्यसमानैश्वर्यत्वं सार्ष्टित्वम् ।
एताश्चतस्रोऽपि मुक्तयः सगुणपरा एव । सायुज्यमुक्तिस्तु निर्गुणपरा,
तच्च सायुज्यमभेद एव, दर्शितप्रकारचतुष्टयातिरिक्तत्वात् समानस्थिति-
युक् सयुक्, तस्य भावस्सायुज्यमभेदेनावस्थानमित्यर्थः । समानभाव-
युक् सयुगिति वा ब्रह्मणा सहाभेदेन युक्तस्तिष्ठतीति वा सयुक्, घातूना-
मनेकार्थत्वात् । इयञ्च सायुज्यमुक्तिः स्फुटम्प्रतिपादिता सूतसंहितायाम्—

“अन्या सायुज्यरूपोक्ता सत्यविज्ञानरूपिणी ।

केवलं ब्रह्मरूपोक्ता सर्वदा सुखलक्षणा ॥

सर्वेषाम्प्राणिनां साक्षादात्मभूता स्वयम्प्रभा ॥”

इति । न च तत्र सार्ष्टित्वस्थानुक्तत्वात्सार्ष्टित्वमेव सायुज्यमिति वाच्यम्,
सार्ष्टित्वस्य दर्शितसायुज्यलक्षणाभावात् । तत्र सामीप्यसार्ष्टित्वयोरेक-
त्वेन गृहीतत्वाच्चेति । एतेन सगुणविष्णुसायुज्यम्प्रत्याख्यातम् ।
निर्गुणब्रह्मप्राप्तेरेव सायुज्यत्वात् । अत एव

“काश्चिच्छङ्करसारूप्यरूपाः प्रोक्ता विमुक्तयः ।”

इत्यादिना सारूप्यसालोक्यसामीप्यमुक्तय एव विष्णवादीनाम्प्रतिपादिता,
न तु सायुज्यरूपाः । ननु

“एतासामेव देवतानां सायुज्यं सार्ष्टितां समानलोक-
तामाप्नोति ।”

इति सगुणमुक्तिरपि श्रूयते । मैवम् — तत्र सायुज्यमित्यस्य सामीप्याद्य-
र्थान्तरपरत्वात् । तस्माद्यदा पश्य इति श्रुतौ परमं साम्यं नामाभेद एव ॥

यदुक्तम् —

“ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति ।”

इत्यत्रापि —

“नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषं उपैति दिव्यम् ।”

“निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति ।”

“परं ज्योतिरुपसम्पद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते ।”

इत्यादिभिरैकाग्र्यात्प्रकृतनामरूपाभ्यां विनिर्मुक्तस्य निरस्ततत्कृतभेदस्य
ज्ञानैकाकारतया ब्रह्मप्रकारतोच्यते । प्रकारैक्ये च तत्त्वव्यवहारो
मुख्य एव, यथा सेयं गौरिति — तत्तुच्छम् । पुरुषमुपैतीत्यनेन सायुज्य-
स्यैवोक्तत्वात् । न च सामीप्यादिकमुक्तमिति वाच्यम्, पुरुषसामीप्य-
मुपैतीत्यादेरनुक्तत्वात् । पुरुषशब्दस्य पुरुषसामीप्याद्यर्थवर्णनस्य
लाक्षणिकत्वेनायुक्तत्वात् । न च पुरुषप्राप्तिर्नाम पुरुषसंयोग इति
वाच्यम्, निरवयवेन निष्क्रियेण च परप्रात्मना सह तथाविधस्यैवात्मन-
ससंयोगायोगात् । एवं निरञ्जनश्रुतिरपि सायुज्यपरैव । तथा
परञ्ज्योतिरिति श्रुतिः, पुरुषः परञ्ज्योतिः परं ब्रह्म, उपसंपद्य संप्राप्य,
स्वेन रूपेण सच्चिदानन्दात्मना, अभिनिष्पद्यते अवतिष्ठत इति तदर्थत् ।
तथा च दर्शितश्रुतिसमन्वयाद्ब्रह्म वेदेति श्रुतिरपि यथाश्रुतार्थैव,
न तु लाक्षणिकार्थपरा । ब्रह्मैव भवतीत्यस्य ब्रह्मतुल्यो भवतीति
ब्रह्मप्रकारत्ववर्णनं खलु लाक्षणिकम् । किञ्च सेयं गौरिति प्रत्यभि-
ज्ञायामपि तदिदन्तयोर्विरुद्धयोः प्रहाणाद् गौरित्यखण्डार्थं एव प्रतीयते —

“ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति”

इति तु न प्रत्यभिज्ञेति न तदिह दृष्टान्तीकरणीयम् । आकारसाम्य-
प्रयुक्तस्तु तत्त्वव्यवहारो भ्रान्तिप्रयुक्त एव । देवदत्तयज्ञदत्तयोः खलु
(अनुवर्तते)

NON-DIFFERENCE IS SUPREME IDENTITY*

Bhāṣyabhāvajña V. R. Kalyāṇasundara Śāstri

Hundreds of *śruti* texts like the following establish directly the non-difference between the individual self and the supreme Self: “I am, indeed, he who is the *Puruṣa*” (*Īśhvāsyopaniṣad*, 16); “He that is here in the human person and he that is there in the sun are one” (*Taittirīyopaniṣad*, II, viii, 5); “Anyone who knows proximately this Self — the enjoyer of the fruits of works, the supporter of life, etc. — as the Lord of the past and the future ...” (*Kaṭhōpaniṣad*, II, i, 5); “The *Puruṣa*, of the size of a thumb, resides in the body. Knowing Him as the ruler of the past and the future...” (*Ibid.*, II, i, 12); “The knower of Brahman becomes Brahman itself” (*Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, III, ii, 9); and “Being Brahman itself, he attains Brahman” (*Bṛhadāraṇyako-paniṣad*, IV, iv, 6). *Śruti* texts such as “That thou art” (*Chāndogyopaniṣad*, VI, viii, 7) which are known as *Mahāvākyas*, convey this idea as their purport. The same idea is sought to be conveyed by the respected followers of Śaṅkara, beginning with Suresvara and ending with Vidyāraṇya and Rāmarāyakavi.

* Translated by Dr. R. Balasubramanian

The following objection is raised in this connection. The *śruti* texts, "Oh Gautama! as pure water poured on pure water becomes verily the same, so also does become the Self of the man of knowledge who is given to deliberation (on the Self)" (*Kaṭhōpaniṣad*, II, i, 14), "As rivers flowing down become indistinguishable on reaching the sea by giving up the names and forms, so also the illumined soul, having become freed from name and form, reaches the self-effulgent *Puruṣa*, that is higher than the higher (*māyā*)" (*Muṇḍakōpaniṣad*, III, ii, 8), "When the seer sees *Puruṣa* — the golden-hued, creator, lord, and the source of the inferior Brahman — then the illumined one completely shakes off both virtue and vice, becomes taintless, and attains absolute equality" (*Ibid.*, III, i, 3), and the *Bhagavadgītā* (XIV, 2): "They who, having resorted to this knowledge, have attained unity with Me..." convey the idea that the liberated *jīva* attains only equality with Brahman and not non-difference; and so *mukti* consists in equality of *jīva* with the supreme Self and not identity.

We reply as follows: Words such as "*tādṛg-eva*" (verily the same) "*paramam sāmyam*" (absolute equality), "*sādharmaṃyam*" (unity) which occur in the above texts do not speak about the attainment of equality with the supreme Self by the liberated *jīva*, but its non-difference alone in accordance with the example of rivers. Rivers which reach the sea do not, indeed, attain equality with the sea, but non-difference alone with it. It is no argument to say that the river-waters which are sweet become saltish like the sea-water on reaching the sea. If there were separate cognitions such as "This is river-water," "This is sea-water," when the river-waters join the sea-water, then it is possible to speak of equality between river-water and sea-water;

but we do not have such (separate cognitions). Indeed, nowhere is equality seen or tenable between two things which are not seen separately. By this the view that the word "*laya*" (dissolution) does not convey the purport of identity stands refuted. The expression "*astam gacchanti*" (disappear) is in the sense of "*laya*"; and so, the dissolution of the rivers in the sea when they attain it is in the sense of becoming one with the nature of the sea. The argument, "The word '*laya*' is used with reference to the three *pralayas*—*nitya*-, *naimittika*-, and *mahā-pralays*; and *laya* here does not convey identity in nature. If it be otherwise, there will be the possibility of universal salvation even without knowledge" is untenable, for identity alone is the primary meaning of the word '*laya*'. That is why *mokṣa* is spoken of as final dissolution. There is a text of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* which says: "The dissolution in the eternal Brahman — that is final liberation." *Laya* is of four kinds. The use of the word '*laya*' with regard to *nityapralaya*, etc. is figurative. A person who is asleep is spoken of as one who is in the state of dissolution. When products such as a pot attain oneness with their cause, *viz.*, clay which is made of the aggregate of particles, they are said to be destroyed; and destruction is dissolution. Indeed, a pot which is destroyed does not become equal to clay without becoming one with it. If there are two objects such as clay and pot, then we can speak of their equality. However, subsequent to the destruction of a pot, pot does not exist, as it will be a contradiction in terms. In the same way, the entire world consisting of objects which are gross and subtle gets destroyed along with its cause, *viz.*, *ajñāna* at the time of final dissolution; and so its dissolution in Brahman which is the ultimate cause is '*laya*' in the primary sense. Since there

is no destruction of the unmanifest universe in *nitya-pralaya*, etc., there is no dissolution in Brahman. It cannot be said that there is destruction of *jīva* itself at the time of final dissolution, for there is no destruction of *jīva* which is eternal. The *jīva* is said to be destroyed on account of the destruction of the subtle and causal bodies of the *jīva* which are its limiting adjuncts. Indeed, the *jīva*, having given up the limiting adjuncts such as the subtle and causal bodies, remains in the form of pure Brahman in the state of *mukti*. Therefore, neither the *jīva* nor its limiting adjuncts remain as equal to Brahman in *mukti*; but there is non-difference alone (between *jīva* and Brahman). Since there is destruction for the limiting adjunct of the *jīva*, the *jīva* cannot remain as a separate entity in the absence of the limiting adjunct which differentiates it from Brahman. That is why it has been said, "When *ajñāna* which causes distinction is completely destroyed....." (*Viṣṇupurāṇa*).

Just as in *ārambha-vāda* as well as *pariṇāma-vāda* the dissolution of the effect in the cause is becoming one with the nature of the cause, even so is it in the case of *vivartavāda*; consequently just as the rope-snake becomes one with the rope, even so the world, when *ajñāna* is removed, becomes one with Brahman. It does not become equal to Brahman. A person mistakes a rope for a snake; and when he knows that the object in front is rope through the statement of a trustworthy person, he does not think that there exists a serpent which is equal to the rope; on the contrary he thinks that the serpent is the rope itself. If it be said that he thinks that there is no snake at all in the rope in all the three periods of time, it is

acceptable. Whatever be the theory (of cause-effect relation), the effect has no nature of its own different from the nature of its cause. Thus, since the effect is *mithyā* alone, it is appropriate to speak of its final dissolution in Brahman. Indeed, what is being has no destruction, because it is eternal; nor is there destruction for non-being, because it does not exist at all. On the contrary, only for an object which is *mithyā* there is destruction. If it be said that the *jīva* is *mithyā* alone, since it is said to be dissolved in Brahman, it is acceptable. Everything — *jīva*, *Īśvara* and the world — is *mithyā* as it is different from Brahman. There is no absurdity here, because, even though the essential nature of the *jīva* is real, the limiting adjunct of the *jīva* is *mithyā*. So '*laya*' consists in the effect becoming one with the cause alone. Since the *jīva* which has the limiting adjunct is the effect of Brahman, '*laya*' means becoming one with Brahman alone. And this (*laya*) which consists in the *jīva* becoming one with Brahman is nothing but the abandonment of the limiting adjunct; it is not the attainment of something new.

It may be argued: "The word '*laya*' does not mean that the effect becomes one with the cause; on the contrary, it means the union of the effect with the object which is its cause on account of the removal of separation between them following the absence of dissimilarity (between them)." This argument cannot be accepted. Though an effect has union with as well as separation from its efficient cause, it has neither of these with its material cause. A pot is nowhere seen being separated from clay; if it were the case, one could speak of the destruction of a pot which was united with clay. Unlike a leaf which remains separated

from the tree, a pot is not seen being separated from clay; unlike the leaf which falls from the tree, a pot does not fall (in separation) from clay. Just as we say, "This is a leaf," and "This is a tree," even so we could say, "This is clay," and "This is a pot," differentiating the clay from the pot-shape-transformed-clay; nevertheless, since it is not possible to differentiate pot from the clay which has been transformed into the form of the pot, how is it possible to speak of union and separation between clay and pot? Further, if a pot gives up its round-neck-bulging-bottom shape which makes it dissimilar (to clay), then it assumes the form of clay; and in the absence of pot, whose union with the cause is spoken of? There can be union only if there are two objects like a monkey and a tree, and not when one of them is absent. Moreover, according to one who advocates *satkāryavāda*, when an existing object gives up its earlier form and assumes another form, there is the origination of effect; when it abandons the latter and assumes again some other form, there is destruction of the effect. This view is now contradicted, since two objects as cause and effect are admitted by you. Indeed, one and the same object cannot be separated from itself; nor can it be united with itself.

It may be argued: "By separating a small amount of clay from a huge lump of clay, a potter makes a pot; the clay-pot which is in a dissimilar state is, indeed, distinct from the huge lump of clay which is its cause; and when it is destroyed by a hammer, it gives up its dissimilar state and becomes united with the huge lump of clay from which it came into existence; then it is said to be destroyed. Consequently, the word '*laya*' means union of the effect with cause and not oneness." The above argument cannot be accepted. The small amount

of clay by which the potter makes a pot — that alone being the material stuff of the clay-pot is its cause, and not the separate huge lump of clay. The latter which does not undergo transformation is not the cause of pot. Thus, when a pot gives up its name and form, it becomes one with that part of clay which is its material cause. Even though that part of clay which is the material cause of pot may be united with the other (huge lump of) clay, there is no cause-effect relation between them.

It is argued: "Accepting difference in space in respect of *ākāśa*, the elucidation of the examples of pot, ether, etc. is based on the difference in the limiting adjuncts." This argument is not tenable. The elucidation of these examples is based on the generally accepted view that *ākāśa* is partless, in the same way as something is said to be endless like the ocean. Indeed, there is no absence of shore for the ocean; but the people think of the ocean as shoreless; so is it the case (with regard to *ākāśa*). So, when a pot is destroyed, the pot-ether becomes one with infinite ether; getting into the ocean, the river becomes one with the ocean; even so, when *ajñāna* is destroyed, the *jīva* becomes one with Brahman — the oneness being the synonym of *sāyujya*. This oneness is also called supreme identity, since the *śruti* text which speaks of *sāyujya* has its purport in oneness and since the word '*sāmya*' is qualified by '*parama*'.

It may be argued: "The word *sāyujya* does not mean non-difference; on the contrary, it conveys the sense of possessing equal qualities; to be united with equal qualities is '*sayuk*' and the state of (union) with equal qualities is '*sāyujya*'. Such is the derivation of

sāyujya. Union with equal qualities takes place only when there is difference; and so non-difference cannot be established (on the basis of *sāyujya*).” This argument cannot be accepted. Since possession of equal qualities constitutes *sārṣṭitā*, *sāyujya* conveys the sense of oneness alone.

There are five kinds of *mukti* — *sālokya*, *sārūpya*, *sāmīpya*, *sārṣṭitva* and *sāyujya*. Of these, *sālokya* means dwelling in the same world; it means that the worshipper also remains in the same world where the worshipped dwells. The state of *samāna-loka* does not mean the state of (dwelling in) the equal world, but remaining in the same world. Indeed, the Vaiṣṇavas who worship Viṣṇu do not reach a world which is similar to, though different from Vaikuṅṭha, the abode of Viṣṇu; but they reach the same abode alone; thus the contention that the word ‘*samāna*’ does not convey the sense of oneness stands refuted. Even though the primary sense of the word ‘*samāna*’ is equality, it has to be explained in some places in the sense of oneness, e.g., *sahodarā* (brother from the same uterine), *sagrāma* (resident of the same village), *satīrthya* (student under the same teacher), etc. *Sārṣṭitva* means the state of possessing powers equal to those of the worshipped. The above four kinds of *mukti* have to be explained with reference to *saguna*-Brahman; but *sāyujya-mukti* is related to *nirguna*-Brahman alone. Here *sāyujya* is in the sense of non-difference alone, since it is different from the four kinds of *mukti* mentioned above. The derivative meaning of ‘*sāyujya*’ is: to be united with the same state is ‘*sayuk*’, and the state of ‘*sayuk*’ is *sāyujya*, i.e., remaining in the state of non-difference. Since the verbal roots have different meanings, the word *sayuk* can also be explain-

ed as being united with the same form, *i.e.* one remains as nondifferent from Brahman with which one is united.

This *sāyujya-mukti* has been clearly expounded in the *Sūtasamhitā* as follows: "What is called *sāyujya-mukti* is different (from others). It is always real, knowledge and bliss by its very nature; it is said to be of the form of pure Brahman; it is, undoubtedly, the self-luminous Self of all beings." It cannot be said that *sārṣṭitva* itself is *sāyujya* on the ground that it is not mentioned therein, for the definition of *sāyujya* stated above does not hold good in the case of *sārṣṭitva*. Also, there is the reason that *sāmīpya* and *sārṣṭitva* are understood to be one. By this the view that *mukti* is becoming one with Viṣṇu stands refuted, for *sāyujya* is the attainment of *nirguṇa*-Brahman alone. Hence the texts such as, "Some states of *mukti* are spoken of as 'similarity to the form of Śiva'," which speak of *mukti* in association with Viṣṇu and others refer to *sārūpya*, *sālokya* and *sāmīpya*, but not *sāyujya*. If it be said that the *śruti* text, "A worshipper, indeed, attains *sāyujya*, *sārṣṭitā* and *sālokya* with the gods," (*Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad*, XV, 1) speaks of *mukti* with *saguna*-Brahman, it is not so, since the word *sāyujya* conveys a sense different from that of *sāmīpya*. Hence in the *śruti* text, "When the seer...", the expression '*paramam sāmīyam*' means non-difference alone.

It is argued: "Even the text, 'The knower of Brahman becomes Brahman itself' (*Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, III, ii, 9) conveys the same idea as set forth in the texts, 'Having become freed from name and form, (one) reaches the self-effulgent *Puruṣa* that is higher than the higher' (*Ibid.* III, ii, 8), '(The liberated soul) becomes taintless and attains supreme *sāmīya*' (*Ibid.* III, i, 3)

(to be continued)

ADORATION TO LORD VIṢṆU

अनृतजडविरोधि रूपमन्तत्रय-
 मलबन्धनदुःखताविरुद्धम् ।
 अतिनिकटमत्रिक्रियं मुरारेः
 परमपदम्प्रणयादभिष्टवीमि ॥

I devoutly praise the supreme status of Viṣṇu — the enemy of the demon named Mura — whose nature is opposed to what is unreal and insentient, which is free from the three limitations (of time, space and objects), and is likewise free from impurity, bondage and misery, and which is immediate and immutable.

भुजङ्गमाङ्गशायिने विहङ्गमाङ्गगामिने ।
 तुरङ्गमाङ्गभेदिने नमो रथाङ्गधारिणे ॥

Salutations to Lord Viṣṇu who is reposing on the body of the serpent Ādiśeṣa, who rides on Garuḍa, who broke the body of the demon (Kesiḱa, who came) in the guise of a horse, and who holds the disc in his hand.

(The *Saṅkṣepaśrīraka* of Sarvajñātman, I, 1 and IV, 63)

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 Śaṅkarācārya of Kāñcī Kāmakōṭi Pīṭha. The main objectives of the Centre, among other things, are:

- (1) to undertake the carrying on of scientific research for the extension of knowledge in the fields of Natural and Applied Sciences generally, and in particular in the fields of Physics and Metaphysics.
- (2) to undertake and carry on scientific study and analysis of the Advaita system of thoughts as expounded by Ādi Śaṅkara and to conduct research as regards the relevance of his teaching 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 BHĀRATĪ) is the quarterly journal published by the Centre in pursuance of its many objectives.

The following are its office-bearers:—

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

Secretary:

Sri N. C. Krishnan

Jt. Secretary-cum-Treasurer:

Sri S. Chandran

Editor: N. C. Krishnan. Published by: S. Chandran on behalf of Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre, 1-E, Rosewood Offices, Nungambakkam High Road, Madras-600 034. Printed by: V. Seshachalam, Avvai Achukkoodam, Madras-600 013.

संसाराध्वनि तापभानुकिरणप्रोद्भूतदाहव्यथा-

खिन्नानां जलकाङ्क्षया मरुभुवि भ्रान्त्या परिभ्राम्यताम् ।

अत्यासन्नसुधाम्बुधिं सुखकरं ब्रह्माद्वयं दर्शय-

त्येषा शङ्करभारती विजयते निर्वाणसन्दायिनी ॥

saṁsārādhvani tāpabhānukiraṇaprodhbhūtadāhavyathā-
khinnānāṁ jalakāṅkṣayā marubhuvi bhrāntyā

paribhrāmyatām

atyāsannasudhāmbudhiṁ sukhakaraṁ brahmādvayaṁ

darśayaty-

eṣā śaṅkarabhārati 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.