Chapter 1.

Bird's eye-view of Pre-Saṅkara Advaita Vedānta

The very title Vedānta shows that the philosophy has its beginnings in Veda and reaches its full height at the end of the Vedic exegesis. It has been rightly styled the logical as well as the chronological end of Veda. From the very beginning man was impressed by the variety of the natural phenomena, by its unthinkable arrangement, by the regularity of the seasons, by the unending vault of the sky, by the rise and setting of the sun and the moon and what not! His mind began to probe into the "how" and "whence" of the things in this universe. The first impression of this unimaginable universal creation (cfr. अन्तर्दर्शनस्तथा वाचनमित्रम्) was an awe and he bowed down in salutation but still he was sanguine of some principle behind it - some creator over and above the world. Many men, many minds. But still it was unanimously supposed that there was one Highest Being behind all this. These are the roots of Vedānta, discernible in Rṣveda where the restive tumultuous human reason endeavours to peep into the very base of this universal edifice. The Nāsadiyasūkta (Rv. X 129) -

15. 2. 1.
the best exemplar of such attempt - depicts the method of the ancient truth-seeker. Whether this was so even from the first or had it any precedent?

Negation was the first and last method of research in Truth. Thus the sage in the above hymn starts (10-189.1). "There was neither naught nor aught, neither earth nor the ether." Then whence can there be any veil or was there only unfathomable spread of water? (किंतु कस्तुष्ठ समस्तस्मां तथास्मृष्णिः)।.

There was neither mortality nor immortality, no night or day. Then was it only mere void? No. (X-189.2).

The Highest One was throbbing there in the spontaneity (or shrouded in its illusion according to Sāyovā.). There was nothing over and above it. How then this universe came off if there was only one? The nescience which is indescribable and unfathomable.

 Desire was the first fruit of that tree of knowledge constituting that One (कस्मवर्ज्येन समस्तस्मात्) which helped to create all this edifice. After investigating into the principle in this way the sage concludes : को शरीरम् जीवान्तो जीवान्तो अनन्तान् अनन्तिष्ठितां विसंयत्तति। अनन्तिष्ठितां अनन्तिष्ठिताः स्त्रियाः स्त्रिया । (189.6)

।
Nobody can know how all this came off nor can one describe it. Even the deities are helpless in the matter. Thus the Rgvedic philosopher comes very near to the Upanishadic pronouncement ज्ञानं त्यानं भर्तिवस्य त्रप्तम् सर्वसा ज्ञानं और तदर्थन को एकत्रित कर विज्ञानीयाय । (Bṛh. U. 15.13)

Even the indescribability which later on served as the essence of Mayā was hinted at in जहा जन्म नीरव ।

Examples of Vedic attempts as above can be multiplied, e.g., त्वा सर्वेऽ ज्ञातः (Garh. 1.4.1.5)

The conception of Henotheism was bound to lead to monotheism. As has been said: "thus already in the hymns, the great idea of Universal Unity is foreshadowed, the idea that everything which we see in Nature ... in reality, is only the emanation of the one and Only one " (Winternitz p.100 Vol. I) nay, as Lok. Tilak puts it, the Rgvedic Rśi with his acute intuition jumped at the quintessence of the Vedānta philosophy even at his first attempt (Gītā-Rahasya p.282).

The search after truth was continuously carried on by the Vedic seers as exemplified by Av. and Yv. The former abounds in attempts to point out the Highest.
One Kāla, Rohitā, Rudra, Vṛatya and Skambh are some of the entities which were given the honour of being the omnipresent Īśān in all by AV. Prajāpati. If Īśān has been offered the highest pedestal in Yv.

The result of this search was Brahman of the Vedāntas or Upaniṣads. Prajāpati, Rudra and Prāṇa are some of the stations en route to Brahman. The Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas and the Upaniṣads in particular depict the development of the search undertaken by adamantine restless votaries. Large assemblies of learned Sāvants were summoned to discuss philosophy of the day. Great personalities like Janaka, Yājñavalkya, Uddālaka Āruṇi, Naṅkiketas and many others figure in the march towards the Highest One! Hot debates were carried on in the Royal courts. Scholars undertook long journey for the sake of Vidyā leading to highest Bliss. Women were not lagging behind. Even Gārgī, the Brahma-vādini dared to call Yājñavalkya's rulings in question. The devotees of truth did not take rest until they found out the answer. Even Brahmans approached the kings who possessed lore. Knowing full well that, Realisation - the One elixir which bestows eternal Bliss - cannot be had by sacrifices or by possessing riches
or gifts they threw away all their possessions and went to forests in the lap of Nature to achieve it (cf. १ कृष्णेन ऋषि भगवान श्रीमन्त साहित्यम् ।) । श्रीमन्त साहित्यम् was the advice. Tapas or Dhyāna or concentration was the only means, their only possession the Magic Lamp, which guided them on to their goal. Celibacy was their only friend ( । ) Even the gods were tempted to run after the Highest Reality. Indra, the Lord of the gods was prepared to abide by continence for more than hundred years to understand the highest truth. Thus by Herculean efforts they once for all realised Brahman - the true principle underlying unity in plurality - that which gives everything its essence, by knowing which everything else can be known ( ॥ बिंदुतेन सर्वं निर्विरलं स्वतं ।) and by realising which the realiser merges into It ( ॥ असर्वं वेदं सत्तं स्वतं ।) and this is the Salvation.

The Upaniṣads constitute an encyclopaedia of philosophical thoughts current in the time. Different views are strung together very loosely so that the taste of interpreting all the Upaniṣads and presenting them to conform to one fundamental view has become a

1 Kaivalyopanishad 1-3
2 Chandogya VIII.
hard nut to crack. All the Ācāryas of Vedānta tried their hands at it and came to different conclusions. But their task was not of interpreting the Upaniṣads but of finding out how far they support their own opinions and hence many a time these sacred ancient texts are seen tortured and dragged; they are taken away from their context and made to support some opinion. The task of stringing them into a systematic whole has been efficiently attempted by Saṅkarācārya with his acute intuition and lofty genius. He came to the conclusion that the Upaniṣads describe two types of Brahman; one is Saguna, as given in sentences like 'अले ना इमाने बहुलाने आपने येन जानाय जीनाती मातानाम िसे िसे' (Iṣ. 3.1). It is the स्रावण or the material as well as instrumental cause of this universe. It is associated with Māyā with the help of which it desired to create something, to have some pastime which proved to be the game of creation. The passages relating to the the त्रिशिश्रिष्ट, the manner of creation refer to this Brahman. The creation took place by what is styled the वेदनिष्ठ method. This Saguna Brahman is the Īśvara, the Lord, the Highest controller of the world. The other is Nirguna, the
the only Reality, One without second, above the Māyā, devoid of all transformations or modifications, infinite, constituted of knowledge. It is described in sentences like ॥ एको वेद्य मेविश्व ॥ अभिवेद्य मेविश्व अववेद्य मेविश्व ॥ अववेद्य मेविश्व ॥. S. always states that it is सैन्धमुक्तविश्व विश्वसन्तान तत्तत्वात्मा eternally pure and free. The machinations of Māyā have altogether no effect upon it. The Māyā which cannot be decided whether to be सत्य real or unreal, is Its power but not independent. How the play first began or how the Nirguṇa One was transformed into the Saguna cannot be thought of as it lies beyond the ken of our human mind which itself is an effect of the Māyā (cf. बृहस्पतिः बृहस्पतिः विनयमिति अस्त्रां गतिः महाय तिस्य वो वास्तुण्य कृते लिङ्गे ज्ञान स्वरूपात्रं ॥). The power of human reasoning is very meagre and hence cannot soar high into the field of Brahmam which is above Māyā, the veil by which it is shrouded—कैरान्तर्गतं जयस्य कार्यभ्रमणे जयस्य जयस्य गुणाणां देश ॥.

The Jīva or the individual soul is nothing but the highest Brahmam wrongly viewed through the coloured spectacles of Māyā. Uddālaka opens the secret of existence to his dear son Śvetaketu as नक नके "Thou art That." This is the highest उपरेत्र of the Upaniṣads.

1 Chāndogya 6.2.1
2 Subāla 3.2.
3 Kaṭhāpaniṣad
When he realises the true nature of Brahman, when he
gives up the pride of this insignificant body and rises
over the material temptations, all the pangs vanish, the
knot of Ahaṅkāra or egoism goes away, all the doubts
melt away and he attains his real nature or 

(Om - Śrīmān


\[ \text{Mundākya 2.2} \] ). He is for ever freed from the cycle of
transmigration (न आ जून्नालव न हैते). Brahman is
omnipotent and omniscient, all-pervading. After becoming
one with It the jīva also realises its all-pervasive
ness.

The salvation is of two kinds — जीवन्मुक्ति and लिङ्गमुक्ति

When one realises the highest unity one merges into Brahman
but still one's body persists on. This is जीवन्मुक्ति.

The complete merging takes place at the death which is
the second. Passages like सम्ब तलवें चिर यान विमोक्षेष शंपतर्मे

state this. The जीवन्मुक्ति serves the greatest attraction
towards the अविवेकित्व , the path to salvation, to Bliss.

Freedom in this very birth can be had अविवेकित्व कान माने न
विवाहितं कपुरतः। The bondage consists of the ties of
affection to the associations of this world. The supreme

1 Čāndogya 14-2

2 \[ \text{Viṣṇu 2.1} \]
position or the identity of the body and the soul or the idea of possession entangles one in an ocean of migrations. One अत्मां leads to another and thus there is a chain of super-impositions accumulating heaps of association and bonds. The soul gets at times tired and wants some remonstration as त जनः नमः खस्तस्मादः गुप्तां गताः and then like the आस्थासमुद्र the prince bred in the company of hunters he begins to realise his true nature. For the sake of ordinary men whose minds are tossed about here and there Upaniṣads have prescribed many alternatives which can lead him to the highest goal. Various उपासनाः are given. He is to meditate on many objects as Brahman and learn to concentrate his mind - to take away step by step his mind from the mundane things, to practise disinterestedness and dissociation. There was in the time of Upaniṣads an all-over zest for the real knowledge which would bestow the highest happiness. The story of Indra and Virochana speaks of the popularity of अत्माना. Virochana, the leader of even Rākṣasas wanted to know what is Ātman. That he was satisfied by shallow answer is another matter.

1 Čāndogya XIII.
Thus Upaniṣads record the greatest development in Indian Philosophy. They employed the negative method to arrive at the truth. Distracting Brahman from all associations, they found out नेति नेति ... as the ultimate Reality. It defies all description (cf. जो ते ते स्मले नि-ते नि-ते- ...). The Brahman, reached by the Upaniṣadic seers has served the Highest Principle for all times to come.

The sages who flourished in the period after Upaniṣads tried to systematise the rulings of Upaniṣads scattered all over the various texts. The period was marked by classification of all grooves of life ritual, polity, philosophy, morality, etc. Different Śākhās of Veda prepared Sūtras in these subjects. Though for ritual there are many Sūtras extant at present, there is only one अंशयूपूर्व going in the name of Bādarāyaṇa.

**Bhagavadgītā**

The problem whether B.C. comes before the Brahma-sūtras is not yet settled. B.G.XIII-4 refers to what work by the term Brahma-sūtras¹ is not yet decided for certain. Bādarāyaṇa— Sūtras where the word Smṛti or स्रवणे etc. occur are unanimously taken by all the

¹ अन्तराविशेषिते एवेन. केवलाति परिष्ठितिः चिन्ते.।
Bhāṣyaṃkāras to refer to B.G. Entering into the discussion of this question falls beyond the scope of this work. The teachings of B.G. are already well-known; some of these are recorded here in as much as it helped to spread the philosophical thoughts.

The laymen are somewhat dull to grasp the impersonal highest Brahman void of all qualities and form. Man imagines God in his own image and so some personal image is required for the sake of devotion. B.G. supplies this oasis in the dry sands of Advaita. With the doctrine of Vibhūti, it teaches that the highest one, the Puruṣottama manifests Himself in sublime forms. The incarnations serve as the personal gods, the stepping stones to the highest Realisation. It teaches how to bring Advaita into practice by its निमित्तमयाभ्यास. The Highest One is immanent in all beings but still it is transcendental of all. It is the अभिश्चान, the root, the foundation of this world, in as much as it projects all this due its power, viz., Māyā (cf. दृष्टिकोणम् शुचिनिः मात्रारूपात्)² People are led astray through this Māyā (मायाविषयः करणाः ...)³ and hence are unable to grasp the real truth which can be realized only through His favour by His ardent devotees like Arjuna who got the

1 इसार: मप्यसमां हेदिहेदीतीन निशिता। मोक्षमस्ती महामूर्तिः मन्मोक्षकाल्नि सर्वत्र। ११५.१२। ६१
2 २.७. ६७
3 २.१५. ६७
precious opportunity to have a dip into the विद्याधरणा. As He is behind all the activities etc., all our actions should be offered to Him, never forgetting Him, so much so that what is done without His devotion should be looked upon as sin. The only way to lead the safest life is “मण्डाश्च प्रति महान्यानि स नन्दनाय न्यायत:। 
मानसेविन्यासः युज्यते प्रतिमात्र त्रियोक्तिः मै।”

The Yogins are above ordinary feelings; hence their actions which are performed in a selfless manner do not bind them at all. For them, there is another way - rigorous penance and Yoga etc. But they should not lead astray the common man - "वुज्यते यज्ञाय मन्त्रेत्तन्त्र अनुपनुषस्तान। कलाहुः केशुः।"

*For the sake of भोजस्वागतः, the leader, though he is omniscient, should behave according to the behest of the scriptures and lead the ignorant by the royal path. The Lord Himself has given an assurance: पहिसताप यात्रायां विनाशय सत्य सुकुमारः। अर्थसंस्कारान्यायः समाधिः युज्यते। Thus the Lord Himself has made the Vedānta reach to the lowest strata of population.

Brahmasūtras

Attempts have been made to prove that originally there were प्रतिशताप अभिलोचनः like various Dharmaśūtras,

1 श्री. श्लोकम् १२५ ।
2 भाग. III. 26
3 भाग. IV. 8
4 भाग. भाग. VIII. ६५।
for all the Śākhās of Veda equipped themselves with all the three ॠतिः, ग्रंथं and सङ्केतकः. After some time the various philosophical treatises were collated into one Brahmasūtra which has come down to us. This collation was in most probability done by the Chāndogya School as the majority of the passages taken for discussion in the Brahmasūtra are from the Chāndogya Upaniṣads. Bādarāyaṇa Vyāsa, the author of B.S., is supposed to be different from Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyaṇa Vyāsa, the author of the Mahābhārata, on the ground that Saṅkarāchārya himself regards them as two different persons.

The Brahmasūtras have been commented upon by various Ācāryas belonging to different schools of opinion and propounding opposite views regarding the Reality as being one or more than one. Upaniṣads, Bhagavadgītā and Brahmasūtras are traditionally taken to be the triple foundation of philosophy or प्राचीन धर्म शास्त्र and are called प्राचीन धर्म शास्त्र. Every school tries to show that these three support their own opinion. According to Saṅkarāchārya¹ they are the cream of the Upaniṣads which he has successfully interpreted to have given Advaita which

¹ Vide S.B. II. i.

² Dr. Thibault in his introduction to the translation of S.B. has proved that the B.S. come closer to Visisṭhādavāda rather than to Sīḍhādavāda. This view is refuted in the introduction to Vedāntāsūtra of Śaṅkara in Vani Vilasa Series.
stands for Unity, Brahman alone comprising the Reality, 
and everything else being posited upon it. Thus B.S. 
I.1.2 defines Brahman as जिनमेव जगद्धर्मं (From which birth 
etc. of this world); this is the तत्सत्त्वविरुध्य | or the 
extraneous mark pointing towards Brahman. Sūtras like 
महात्मानम् मे कर्मशः (III.1.3) or अतः एवं केवलम् स्त्रियानान्तरण (III.3.11) 
or अतः एवं यथा (II.1.60) go to show that the Sūtrakāra 
intends that everything else than Brahman is only an 
appearance ficticiously superseen on It. B.S. II.3.43-53 
prove that Jīva is not atomic but all-pervading like 
Brahman being identical with It. The agency (अर्जुन) 
is not real but takes place through adjuncts or ज्ञान/अत्. 
The real nature of Brahman consists of Ānanda and 
knowledge pure and simple. The cause of the world can-
not be Pradhāna as imagined by the Sāmkhyas nor can it 
be atoms as propounded by the Naiyāyikas or rather 
Vaisēṣikas. It cannot be Śūnya either as shown by 
the Buddhists. This is clear from B.S.-II.1 and II-2. 
Brahman is both the material as well as the instrumental 
cause of this universe — ज्ञानेषु ज्ञातिः | अवशेषाय 
जिनाः is the only means to Salvation. Jivanmukti can

1 cf. B.S. III.33-39
2 vide B.S. I.1-5 + II.1.12-17
3 B.S. I.19-21
4 B.S. III.11.1-17
be had. After he is finally freed there is no return to this flimsy world full of transmigrations. For the ordinary devotees who are incapable of soaring high into the sky of detachment, various उपासना are laid down which lead him gradually to the goal अमृति or salvation step by step helps one to pass through higher and higher Births and ultimately one can shed all the accumulation of carnal ties made up of मया.

The Brahmasūtras allude to many Ācāryas who held different opinions on Vedānta. These are Jaimini, Ās'marathya, Bādari, Audulomi, Kāś'akṛtsna and Kāṛṣṇājini. He also refers to himself by name. It testifies that debates were carried on, on many problems. Perhaps this might go to support the view of अनुभविक्यम शमनसुर . Nothing can be said in the absence of any reliable data to the effect.

Rāmānuja and some of the Advaitins like Toṇāka, Vimuktatman, Sarvajñatman etc. refer to some authorities on Vedānta by the titled Vṛttikāra, Vākyakāra and Bhāṣyakāra. Baudhayana is said to have written a gloss or Vṛtti on B.S. Tāṅka is known as Vākyakāra.

! उपासना: अंग्रेजी उपासना: स्थानां । B.S., IV-14, 22.
These works are not extant to-day. The Vākyā might stand for some commentary perhaps on B.S. The term अरविवर्त refers to one Draṇidācārya who has written a voluminous commentary on Chāndogya Upaniṣad. S' also alludes to him in his आयुष्म on the said Upaniṣad. Sarvajñātman gives the views of one Ātreyā who is identified with Brahmanandin commentator of Draṇidācārya by the commentators. One Bhāruci also is given as authority on Vedānta. As no works of these are available to-day, these stand only as big names for us.

Gauḍapāda

After this came Gauḍapāda, the grand-preceptor of Śaṅkarācārya, who refers to him as संस्करतविद्वदवभृत. He has written Kārikās on Māṇḍukyopaniṣad while it is not certain whether the authorship of the Bhāṣya on Uttara-Rgītā and that on Īśvarakṛṣṇa's Sāmkhyakārikā should be fathered upon him. The gist of the Māṇḍūkya-kārikās is as follows: According to Māṇḍukyopaniṣad passages he first defines the three terms Viśva, the controller of the आरोग्य stage; Taṣājasa, that of अवस or dream and Prājñā that of Suṣupti. These are the three stages comprising the आनंदलिन्य जगत or this phenomenal universe (The fourth is the Highest

He is taken to have flourished about 5th cen. A.D.)
Stage styled स्त्रूतः. Various theories have been put forth as regards the origination of this universe. Some take it as created by the Prāṇa (Kārikā 1.6) while others think it to be only manifestation (विस्वषेषे) in many forms (1.7), some regard it as a figment in dream fictitious like magic show (कविते कल्याणेः प्राणे मृत्युमये स्त्रूते कविते विस्वषेषे) 1.7). Some opine that it came through the will of the Lord (cf. सूक्ष्मकामक्षितः प्रभु ैसोकामक्षितः एकोद्वीपे तः स्त्रूते प्रग्रन्धे) while others take time to be the source. According to some this universe has been created for either enjoyment or for pastime. But in Reality there is no origination at all. देवन्देवेऽ तत्तदानन्दे आत्मानस्तस्य कोषुद्र् (1.9). The Highest one is without any desire; so how can he wish for this pastime of origination? From Him run away all the miseries; He is the eternal, impartite Lord styled as दुर्ग्नम् the fourth one, the omnipresent one. The Viśva and Tajasa are engrossed or bound by कार्य व कारणाद्वित्य the adjuncts in the कार्य stage from which this स्त्रूतः has been produced and those of the कारण stage where everything is in the merging stage (कारणाद्वित्य); the Prājña is limited by the कारणाद्वित्य or the world in dissolution but as regards the Highest one there is no adjunct at all. The first two are possessed of
dream which is misapprehension and sleep which is nothing but ignorance; when both these are removed the fourth stage is reached. (Here vishva might stand for the अविभक्त power of अविभा while अश्र for the विकृत power.) Thus when the individual soul which is shrouded in beginningless Māyā awakens from his slumber he realises the unborn sleepless, dreamless Highest One (अग्निद्वारा अमुकः यश जीवः प्रकृतीति अद्वैतानामसत्त्वात् अद्वैतं अद्वैतं जना नमः)1

There is nothing else existing except the One, without second. If at all any world comes into existence it must come to an end. Thus all the duality is mere phantasy reflected on the One (तत्त्वज्ञानी तत्तत्त्वमेव तत्त्वमात्रतेऽपि)2 It is true that the Upaniṣads speak of creation etc. of this world but this description is only for the sake of instruction. A pupil who is lying in the deep bed of flowers of Māyā is gradually made to come out of it but the way lies through that bed. The Highest One is beyond all speech and thought; no discussion is possible in the highest stage, it can be had only in the state of duality until one crosses the border of this phenomena and leaps into the next stage (उपर्युपकर्मो वा एते सत्त्व न ज्ञनते)3. This analysis of the three stages is correspondingly equated to the three syllables of उपेक्षा: or

---

1 Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 6
2 17
3 18
on which the devotee is to fix his mind for,
the प्रगटिः itself is Brahman (1.95). The second chapter,
viz.,

and स्वार्तः on the strength of analogy and comes
to the conclusion that the objects in the जागरितः stage
are on par with those in the dream and hence false or
unreal. In the dream there are no objects as proved
by the Upaniṣadic passages like तत्तज्ञ, तस्य रसिमोऽपि...

So the existence of the dream-objects is falsified.
Likewise in जागरितः stage also the envelopment by फलसिद्धः
is the same (अथ तत्तज्ञ तस्य स्वार्तः रसिमोऽपि न प्रिलि। 2.4)
That which does not exist in the beginning or either in
the end is the same in the middle; i.e., a thing which
has got a beginning and an end can't exist in reality
at all (आदिकन्ते व अनन्तकन्ते तद्भवने विपाकः 1 K-2.6).

Though they are unreal still they appear as real. Thus
the objects in both the स्वार्तः and जागरितः states are
false. Then who imagines these and who is the
realiser that they are false? The answer of Vedānta is
that the Highest One, effulgent Lord himself imagines
the various forms through his own Māyā (कुटिय्य मायायत
अष्टक्षेत: कन्याया। म एव शुभं भैरवनिति वेदान्तविश्वसः 2.11)
In his mind, while in dream he reflects so many vague
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things while outwardly, in the Apara state he imagines various tangible regular things. Objects in dream change after a moment because they are not fixed while objects in Apara state are विषयती (विषयती क्षति तथा निराकारता स्वभावितान्। निराकारता विषयती एवं कल्पनान्ते प्रभुः). He first superimposes the Jiva or the individual soul and then other things external as well as internal (2.16). The care resembles to a piece of string mistaken for a serpent, a stream etc. when it lies in darkish place and hence incognisable but when it is decided that the thing is a string all the superimpositions flee away; so also when the Advaita is realised all duality melts away (निराकारता स्वभावितान्। निराकारता विषयती एवं कल्पनात्मकता स्वभावितान्।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.. All this is the play of his Mayā by which he himself is infatuated (2.19). The highest state is non-duality (तत्त्वाति अड्डयते तद् सत्त्वाति अड्डयते). This edifice of the universe, according to the Vedāntins is on a par with the dream-show or the castles in the air (तत्त्वाति अड्डयते तद् सत्त्वाति अड्डयते). There is only one thing in reality. So the talk about the destruction or origination is futile. Nobody is bound nor any devotee is free... n निरोधात् न दोषतात् वाचो न न साधना्।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.. Thus according to Dr. Vidyashankar Bhattacarya and Om Prakash, according to the commentator. The whole prakṛti intends to show that there is equality in the two states.
Realising this Highest Reality One should meditate upon it and reaching the unity with the Highest One, one should abide in this world as a fool who does not know his own existence! (2.36). The third chapter establishes the अत्माणां with proper syllogism. All the talk of धर्म, devotion, etc. applies after Brahman is born, i.e., engrossed in various adjuncts; before the creation everything was अज beginningless. Thus nothing comes into existence anew, nothing is created etc.

Creation exists only in words ( अत्माणां बिन्नकार्य नाममेव न्यूत्तिष्ठं अजम 18.6.6). The appellation Jīva in case of Ātman is like the term 'अध्यक्ष' either in the jar; the ether is the same impartite outer sky canoping the whole earth but still due to limitations like a room or a jar it is apparently differentiated. So also the Reality is only One without second but it is looked upon as variety through ignorance. The अत्माणां is neither a part nor an effect of the greater अत्माणां so also the Jīva is not either the विन्नकार or the अत्माणां of the Ātman.

Thus the Upaniṣads rightly stress the unity (or rather identity) of the Jīva and the Highest Ātman (as in passages like अत्माणां etc.) and criticise the plurality
(e.g., in नेत्र नातानि कर्मकाणा लोक । यद ते कृत्तिक्षिन भवति...)
(3.13). So the reference to creation by the terms clay, iron, sparks, etc., is only for the sake of discussion and understanding. It does not really show any difference. (मूलसूत्रविस्मृतिकथायेः मूलसूत्रोऽसोदितज्ञाति। उपाध: संदेशास्वाभाविको भेदः कथमम्।) The way to realisation is different according to the grasping power of the devotees, some of whom are ordinary, others are somewhat more attentive while a few are very retentive who can reach the realisation instantly. (3.16). The one beginningless is taken to be many due to मयाच; had the भेद अत real the immortal might have become mortal (3.18). In reality that what is mortal can never become immortal and vice versa - there is no change at all in Reality (प्रकृतसत्त्वालोऽतं कालाविद्या भवेऽवतिः। 3.21). A non-existing thing cannot come into existence; a अमूल्यम् is never born either really or by magic. When the mind stops its activity, viz. सुधाकम् and विकल्प reflections or projections one becomes अमूल्यम् i.e., goes beyond it; when there is no object for perception the act also does not take place (3.32). This knowledge which is benefit of any imagination is not distinct from the highest knowable viz. Brahman.

1 By the 2.4.14.
2 कृष्ण 3.15.
Realisation of the Atman is what is styled स्वयंभूतम् or विद्वधयम् and which is very difficult to secure (3.39). Thus the Highest Truth is न किंचि द्रास्ते जीवः समस्तोद्धर्म न विद्वधयते।

SUPPORTS THE अजहातिवेदी। All the disputants who quarrel themselves putting forth so many theories regarding creation really establish the अज्ञाति दृश्य न ज्ञाते किंविद्वधृतः न ज्ञाते। विधेयकोऽत्तुपद्वारं अमेभमान्यते द्वाबंपाति ने॥ ४.४

They want to prove origination of an entity which is अजनात or non-born - But how can that which has no birth or death be subjected to mortality? That is called प्रकृति or Reality which is natural, self-evident and non-artificial and that which never undergoes any change (प्रकृति: मैति प्रकृत्योऽनुभवन्ति न जानते तत॥ ४.७). If one argues that the कार्य or effect also is beginning-less as it is identical be the cause which is अजन, then your कारण or Brahman also would become unsteady due to the change in the कार्य (4.12). The ब्रजाकु र instance would not suit here as it is not proved; so it does not lead us any further. Nothing can originate either from itself or from something else (3.22).
we regard the world as अनन्त then it can have no end also and the मोक्ष also which has अनन्त or beginning will have an end too and so the effort to go in for some eternal thing would be useless. Thus all this necessarily boils down to saying that both मंडल and मोक्ष do not exist at all, and therefore the highest truth is न निरोधो न नोभालिः न अहं न च भाभुः। न मुक्तिः च मोक्ष िर्मेवा परभासिता।

Things which are seen existing in the dream are falsified in the state of waking and vice versa (4.38). Let us analyse the problem of creation. Either अस्तित्व can arise from सत्य or सत्य can come out of अस्तित्व; or possibly सत्य can spring out of अस्तित्व (4.41). But all these alternatives can not stand. For how can anything come out of nothing? Nor can "nothing" be said to be born from something. So also if anything is created from something, the reality will undergo some change and so will desist from being eternal.

The phenomena resembles the appearance of firebrand. The circles appear when it is moved but there is nothing when it is stopped; so also the highest omniscient one is unborn and without any appearance or transformations - Thus एवं दुःखम् न न च अयम् निशिष्ठम् जातयते। (4.7).
Thus the main tenets of Gaudapada's exposition of Advaita are viz., the Turīya, the highest One is only Real, beyond the three stages, viz., gaudaśvita, svaritya, sākṣī. The mundo world is melted away in the jñānaśīla stage, while the gaudaśvita things also are on the same par and hence both are superimposed through Māyā: the jīva also is only a name like dhāraṇī etc. Really speaking there is no mārga and hence - no kṛty or kṣetra. The Highest Reality is that which never undergoes any change. The misapprehension or the illusion of the jīva flees away at the realisation of the Reality. Everything in the world is an appearance. The world resembles the castle in the air. So the Highest Truth is ānātaśīla.

These salient features have been taken as the basis for his philosophy by Śaṅkarācārya. The world starts through ātma and sevaśū Çakāla, which is nothing but the play of ātmaśīla referred to by Gaudapāda. Gaudapāda has referred to many views as regards the causality of this world. S. takes them up, in the light of B.S. 2.1 and 2.2 for discussion and refutes these in detail showing how they cannot
stand. Though Gaudapāda remarks that there is no अनापदे संसार at all, still it is his opinion that संसार is only an illusion (as given in आचार्यदेश्येऽऽथ तथो गतिनिःस्यां इति). अतः विनिर्मित तथो ने शास्त्रं विनिर्मितं इति...

S. explains at the outset of his S'arīkābāhāsya how this happens, how असंवच्छिधास takes place etc. Many illustrations from Gaudapāda as शीघ्र प्रकृति, मध्यामकी, महत्वसुम , etc. are taken by S. and amplified and enriched. The main doctrine that Release can be had only through knowledge backed up by renunciation (cf. terms like श्रवण , श्रवण , स्वर्ग etc. in the करिकाद ) is upheld by him and proved in detail as in 1.1-4. That Jīvanmukti can be had is also reflected from Gaudapāda's statement as अर्थेण समन्तात अवस्थेण भवन्ते |. S'āṅkarācārya stresses this in season and out of season baring his arguments on upaniṣadic passages like अश्रुव्याहर अश्रुव्याहर भवति, अर्थे हृदयस्वरूप स्वरूप लक्ष्य तत्त्वेऽविराम विनिर्मिता संपन्ते |

The ultimate salvation, viz. Videhamukti takes place when the last bond, viz., the body slips away. (Twofold aspects of Avidya - कार्य + कारण or बिशेष + अब्बिशेष are also hinted)

Thus S'āṅkarācārya has based his philosophy on the views of Gaudapāda, his grand-preceptor. He has amplified and annotated him in an exquisite manner.
As has been put by Mm. Vasudevasastri Abhyankar*:

कारिन्यसिद्धान्तवाद यज्ञपादात्यायाणानुसारद्वितीयं तथ्यं अन्योमयांक्षोऽप्रृणितम्।
यज्ञादिक्तायाःप्राप्तेऽतसंकल्पनाः: प्रस्तुतातीतम्। यज्ञागर्भायाः: प्रतिपदितं
वचनं अनुस्याः: साधिनतम्। यज्ञादिक्तायाः: अधिकतं वचनं अनुस्याः: सिद्धान्तत्त्वा
प्रतिशापणिनम्। तथ्येन यज्ञादिक्तायाः: तुष्पुतितं धार्मिकं तथ्यं वचनं अनुस्याः: प्राणिकि
यज्ञादिक्तायाः: प्राणोधकाश्रयति। तथ्यं अनुस्याः: प्राणोधकाश्रयति। तथ्यं अनुस्याः:
मान्यताम्यसिद्धिणम्। यज्ञादिक्तायाः: साधितं मशिष्योत्तरं नामण्डलम्। यज्ञादिक्तायाः: साधितं
मशिष्योत्तरं नामण्डलम्। परिचितं च तथ्यं अनुस्याः: साधितं मशिष्योत्तरं नामण्डलम्।

c—— संस्कृतम इति प्रतिज्ञानिनि भवन्ति —
मौलिकात्यायाः: परस्परतं शिखरभुता: पूजनायाः: शुद्धिण गुरुसमृद्धिकादिनायाः: प्राणिकि
मायायाः न केवले ज्ञातिद्वारामात्र: तिनल उपसान्तिभोजन मुक्तियोऽनुष्ठान अनुष्ठान ज्ञातिद्वारायाः: अनुष्ठानिष्ठतन्त्रसंस्कार च्यात्माप्यायाः: पुरस्तात्यायाः: साधितात्याः: प्रत्येकपद्धाराः:।

* Vide P.5 Introduction to Siddhaentabindu R.S.S.No.1
II Saṅkarācārya Bhagavatpūjyapāda

Acārya Bādarāyaṇa in his Sūtras congregated in a body, so to say, the various limbs of the Vedānta-Puruṣa scattered here and there in all the Upaniṣads. The Bhagavatpāda with the Saṅjīvanī of his intuition enlivened that skeleton. Hence Madhusūdana Sarasvatī gave vent to: ैं मेरों मे मातमोण्डली मातम न मुरेरण्ये मे अवभाष ।

दिनापि ते: संग्रहीतारिम्यथे ते संबूतेन मेरो मुरेरण्ये ते ॥

That is why the name of Saṅkarācārya stands in the vanguard whenever one utters the word ‘Vedānta’. Though he has taken the Brahma-Sūtras and Gauḍapādārikēs as his basis, he has far left them behind in the exposition of the main tenets of ‘Advaita’ in his प्रसंगामीर style. Even the Vedāntas themselves fade in lustre before him!

Hundreds of works go in his name though the quintessence of these all is traditionally stated in half of a sūtra: श्रोते सत्वः सत्यमिथ्या तिथो श्रोते अवभाषः।

The main out of these are his commentaries on many Upaniṣads, on the Brahmasūtras and on Gītā so also various अन्तेः or hymns composed in highly devotional pitch of mind. The scrutiny of all the works

---

1 Wise ending verses in Siṣṭhāntabindu.
assigned to him has been made by some but the problem is not yet closed. Still a vast number of compositions are to be assigned to his pen with certainty.

As to the personal traits of this quite mythic person, many biographies are in vogue. Śiṅganaṅgāra’s Śaṅkarāvijaya, Vidyāraṇya’s Śaṅkaradigvijaya, Śaṅgadeva’s are some of the attempts recorded in this line. The salient features of his life are quite renowned and need not be enumerated here. This much is to be said in this respect that in a very small span like 32 years of his life he produced a veritable mountain of literature illustrating the promise of Gītā, viz., निदिष्टान्तम साथ्यं विनामात्य तत्तु कलंकम्। तधमात्मार्थविभवं संभवानि सुगो युगो। ॥ ६३ ॥

The main aphorism of Śaṅkara Vedānta is summarised, as given above, in three phrases, viz., Brahman the Reality, world the unreal and Jīva the one with Brahman. According to Śaṅkarācārya Brahman as S'rūtis unanimously proclaim, is the one ultimate Reality. The Universe falsely appears on It and the individual self is identical with that One. If Brahman is the only Reality how does the world come into light then? The answer is that this universe originates, continues and merges

again into the One Brahman. As S't remarks: पृथ्विभागेऽस्वर्ग: इश्वः
गणन: नाते नाते नाते नाते नाते नाते नाते नाते नाते नाते
हाथाकिनाः प्राणात सहाचारीनाः उपाशम सहाचारीनाः
माताकिनाः माताकिनाः प्राणात सहाचारीनाः उपाशम सहाचारीनाः
Thus Brahman is the cause of this universe. It is both
the material as well as an instrumental cause. प्राणात सहाचारीनाः
पारण सहाचारीनाः पारण सहाचारीनाः निनित्तकारणाः
(5.3.1.10-11)
For an effect
requires two causes, viz., some material from which it
takes its स्वस्तत्व or essence and an instrument which
gives the effect its form, i.e. which fashions the
material into the effect. Brahman, being the only
Reality can not be both the causes.** But still this
being the supra-natural case, the cause remains as it is,
even after the creation. No type of change takes place
in Brahman which is निविन्तित्वातः निविन्तित्वातः. How does this
happen? The everyday parlance shows that the cause is
changed after effecting its effect. Thus the clay
takes an altogether different form etc., when a jar is
produced out of it. So also milk is transformed into
curds which can not again attain the causal state, viz.,
milk. How then Brahman can remain unaltered after
producing the universe out of itself? The answer

---

* Introduction to B.S. Adhyāya II.
** निनित्तकारणाः पृथ्विभागेऽस्वर्गः इश्वः । ५:१३.
is given in the Adhyāśabhaśya by Śaṅkaraśārya. The
causality or the act of creation is an आफ्मस or super-
imposition and so अम मरधाम: तबूनै दोषेण गुणम नार्यग्नवेनेनावि
मा संविधयते। (ibid) All this is the play of the machinating
Māyā (अभिरंगललालपतीमिः) Maya or Avidyā. In fact Avidyā and
Adhyāsa are one. What is this Adhyāsa then? Śaṅkara-
śārya gives it in short as अर्थपर्यं तानलामिःतांलुक्स! (ibid)
Superimposition is the appearance of one thing on
another. A man happens to perceive silver on a shell.
As a matter of fact the shell has not changed a little
but due to some mistake, might be sunheat or bad eye-
sight, it appears as silver and the perceiver bends to
grasp it. Likewise Brahman due to contamination of
Māyā becomes Jīva and supersedes the universe on It.
Thus It is only metaphorically the cause of this
universe. What is called Māyā is wholly responsible
for this misappearance. But is this Māyā something
different from Brahman? If it is, then the Oneness
would come into question as this Māyā is regarded as
beginningless* like Brahman. If it is not different

* अनाति: सटतात्रते मिथुनीकृता -- १५.३.१००
from Brahman as difference whatsoever cannot be visualised according to Advaita it must be identical with Brahman and thus to call it Mâyâ would be tautology. The answer to this is that this Mâyâ is not something over and above Brahman nor is it identical with Brahman. In fact, it cannot be explained and hence is to be regarded as indescribable for these things remain beyond the ken of human intelligence which owes its existence to that very Mâyâ. It can simply be said that it rests somehow in Brahman as its own power and hence cannot be over and above it for

Thus S'âṅkara-cârtya states: कार्यसंवर्तकाद्वारप्रवेशं एव आधीनमान्यसि।

इति नामान्यतया विभावनेन-वचनीये संसारावलम्बीनित्वे समीतस्य-जरासंहारायं मात्र अभिष्टं वृक्षितिः तथा भूलितम् उपोर्भूतेऽवदे।

According to S'âṅkara-cârtya Mâyâ is nothing but the name and form which go to spread out this variety of the world. These are imagined due to Avidyā and cannot be ascertained whether real or unreal. They manage to absorb the Brahman so much so that they appear as if its essence. But really speaking these do not constitute the essence.

**S.B.2-1-14. It is interesting here to note the distinction made in Avidyā and Mâyâ. The former is given as the cause of the latter. The later Advaitins equate Avidyā and Mâyâ as and give Ajñāna as its cause. S. equates Avidyā and Advyāsa also नासनेन अन्तर्वर्तमानव्ययम् पुष्टिः अविद्यास्य सन्नाते (5.8.10)**
For तत् or continuity is the only essence and the name and form given to it are only conventional. The names are not natural to the things for they would have been the same in all the climes and times. But it is the man - the epitome of अविद्या - starts naming and the Brahman through its अविद्या - makes (brand) spectacles appears in the form of universe. And so it is we who call Brahman as the cause of this universe. In reality there is nothing like causation or transformation; it is only spoken of as such for नाम एकान्तमेव तत्त्वातः विनाय: -- त न नस्तुः ताच्छाते नाम कर्म्यविदिति।

All the phenomena is compared to the dream. In the dream the Jīva sees so many things but he himself realises these to be false after he wakes up. Likewise this universe is a dream lasting for a Jīva upto his realisation of the Reality - जीवजगताः कथापरं ज्ञातसब ज्ञातो विनाय: -- प्रमेयं यथे ज्ञातन अमाधूरः।

Brahman is the substrate or अविद्याः as no ज्ञान or illusion can take place without something to rely upon. Take the case of mirage. The water is seen on the sandy desert. Had there been no desert/sand the water
would not have appeared at all. Likewise, had there been no Brahman no-body would have seen this universe. Thus Brahman is the substrate of this Great Illusion of the universe which does not exist over and above Brahman. This is clear from Śrī's statements like:

Thus Śvāra who is Brahman associated with adjuncts of name and form and who is hence omniscient and omnipotent spreads out this universe. He should not be mistaken as something different from the pure Brahman. For do we differentiate between Devadatta with hands spread out and Devadatta with hands, etc., contracted? If at all there is any distinction it is only of degree and not kind; it lies in the posture of sitting. That does not mean that the two are entirely different personalities.*

Now what is Jīva? He is nothing but Brahman appearing only in some particular form. Śaṅkara-cārya says: 

The Lord who is omnipotent and omniscient controls the Jīvas who constitute of Knowledge and who

---

*** Śrī. B. 2.1.14

* Vide na a to bhūṣadatābhāseṣe abhinannāvah bāhuvaṁ hi rājasthaṁ saṁkalpitāṁ

** Śrī. B. 1.2.3.3 prabhārito jñānādhiṣṭo vijñāpeṣe iti bhūṣaṁatādhi bhāstantare gacchati!
are surrounded by the bodies made up of Avidyā. But their innate essence is the same as that of the Lord for is not the ether contained in a jar same as the ether outside? The material body so to say covers some portion of the impartite Brahman and gives it the name Jīva. Thus this entangled Jīva becomes distinguished from the Lord through Avidyā and hence is stated as different and less powerful than Brahman in the scriptures. Therefore it cannot be asked why this Jīva who in essence is Brahman cannot create this universe. In this case S'āṅkarācārya remarks: अबिन्दार्थ स्मरिति ब्रह्म निम्न ज्ञातु हस्ते स्थापितस्य सन्तोषं परिपूर्वकनेव, तद्दृढः ज्ञात: सृष्टि हुस्म:।
आत्मा नाचे द्रष्टव्य: — — इतिविकल्पितामः क्षत्रियो विद्वियांविशेषः अस्तित्वादिनी ब्रह्म हृदाविषयः।

(S'ā. a.)

S'ruti enjoins the Jīvas to concentrate upon the Highest Ātman; this shows that the Ātman is something over and above the Jīvas. But the same S'ruti sometimes proclaims निम्नावृत्ति that there is no distinction between them. So how to reconcile? Sāṅkarācārya's ruling is that when there is distinction implied in the passage, the S'ruti has the 'Avidyaka edifice' in
view and when it declares the identity it does not take the cognizance of the जीवन and the अनुभूति or causality of Brahman and the body of Jīva. So from the point of the true essence there is no difference whatsoever.*

This Jīva is not subject to either birth or death as the S'rutī goes - जीवन जीवन अनुभूति अनुभूति न जीवन जीवन। The words birth and death are applied to the Jīva only metaphorically in the daily parlance. They really refer to the body which is भौतिक, material and hence subject to production and destruction. No जीवन is possible in the case of Jīva who is one with the Ātman. He is only the superintendent of the body and the senses and enjoys the fruit of the actions.**

S'rutī tells that it is जीवन or eternal "मा ना एवं महान आकाश नमेरे शाने शुभेच्छ शोभे जीवन।" Its distinction from Brahman is only phenomenal due to the adjuncts. The adjuncts of Jīva are intellect, body, the senses, etc. Further he comprises eternal ज्ञान (ज्ञानज्ञानज्ञान) because he is the same as the Brahman who is सत्त्वज्ञानज्ञान***.

What is the measure of this Jīva? Sahkarācārya answers: प्रेमेन भृगुस्वरूप इत्युत्तम, परमेश्वर चौकुलस्वरूप: तस्मात्मात्मानं तस्मां प्रेमेन.

*अनुच्छेद 5 यज्ञप्राय: प्रतिकृतित: प्रेमेति, प्रेमप्रायोगिता तदन्तिय भूमिका संस्कृतिय आद्यः।
**अनुमल्य अनुमल्यम: एकोयोगस्वरूपसाधृत्व: कन्याभ्रमणचक्रवर्त:।
***प्रेमेन आद्यभूतेन नित्यप्रसिद्धिकर्मिनस्ते दिव्यांनां तिष्ठते।
Jiva being one with Brahman must necessarily have the same measure as Brahman. Brahman according to S'ruti is omnipresent, hence Jiva also is omnipresent or infinite. It might be argued that S'ruti states that Jiva is atomic as in passages like नातवस्तुत्तत्त्वज्ञातं सत्त्वं नालवक्तिस्नानं त:।... But this reference is only figurative - in case of Jiva. It refers to the Intellect as atomic for what is Jiva? नातवस्तुत्तत्त्वज्ञातं सत्त्वं नालवक्तिस्नानं त:।... It is the intellect which defines the Jiva and hence the qualities of the intellect are due to ignorance superimposed upon the Jiva (अः विशेषतः विक्रमपुरिः सत्त्वमवतं तोः।). He is further the doer (कर्ता) and enjoyer (प्रेक्षक). Due to his adjuncts he happens to perform the actions and enjoys the fruit thereof as reflected in S'ruti like यशोऽस्य; विद्यते सत्त्वत्वमवतं गृह्यं; च चलातिथिः।. But this कर्त्ता and प्रेक्षक is only phenomenal due to the adjuncts.

Granted that somehow or other for some unknown cause Brahman plays the part of Jiva. But how and when does It throw these adjuncts away? Saṅkarācārya

** S.1.
in this connection states that the Ātman can get rid off these encumbrances of Nescience with the help of Knowledge and knowledge alone. In fact salvation is the same as Brahman (समस्तं भूतं समस्तं भूतं) for Brahman is the real nature of Ātman and realisation of this innate nature destroys all the Ajñāna when the Ātman becomes Brahman (हूँ भूतं समस्तं भूतं अभ्यासी) . This salvation is in essence eternal (परमेश्वरिक) as opposed to things like earth and sky which are regarded as eternal for the time being (परिवर्णितपरमेश्वरिक).

Śaṅkarācārya describes it as : इति तु रामानुजाचार्य श्रूक्ष्य-निवर्त्योऽपेक्षा, सत्त्ववाची स्थापनायामहति निःस्वरूपति निरंश्वरायं भवन्त्य-सत्त्ववाची स्थापनायामहति निःस्वरूपति निरंश्वरायं भवन्त्य।

The Salvation thus means non-body-hood meaning thereby the absence of the Āvidyāaka adjuncts of the subtle and gross body. As there is no smell of Nescience (Āvidyā), It is absolute, Eternal, omnipresent void of all modifications, self-satisfied, impartite and self-effulgent wherein no semblance of either अस्ति or अस्ति is found. Thus if अस्ति is अस्ति a doubt arises whether it can be spoken of as attainable by

*S.B. 1.1.4*
an alive man. For अत्यावश्यक can be attained only when the body is shed and this happens only after death.

So there would be no talk of Jīvanmukti. Saṅkarācārya replies that अत्यावश्यक can be attained by a living person for what is the cause of this body? Only विश्वासितम or super-imposition due to ignorance. When it is removed by the knowledge of Self, the effect being one with the cause is as good as removed. So the जीवनमुक्ति destroys this ignorance and consequently his ego about the body. This is the Jīvan-Mukti.** Both S'ruti and Smṛti back it (Vide रमणीय सम्प्रदायत । रमणीय सम्प्रदायत)

सन्भवना नःपुरिण ।।

Svetasvāmī's Sūtra का आयाम: (B.G.II.). He who has realized his सत्ता निभाया with the Brahman does not act as before. If one acts as before and professes that he has realized Brahman take him to be a liar for has not S'ruti ordained "भक्तमार्ग ताम मूर्ति प्रसंगत तथा यथा केवल माया!"

Thus Brahman through superimposition of the Nescience appears in different forms like the Lord, the world and the Jīva, etc. But really It does not undergo any change and in essence is eternal Bliss, Knowledge and Infinity.

Uptil now we have seen how the Advaita Vedānta developed through ages and what form it took in the

** Cf. श्रीरंग जीतं श्रीविक्रम सहस्रवर्षीयं सन्त विभुवं श्रीमद्भापो श्रीमद्भापो-विशेषतः। तत्त्वानं श्रीविक्रम सहस्रवर्षीयं श्रीमद्भापो श्रीमद्भापो, अस्तित्वं निभाया। श्रीभवो आदित्य ।।
hands of Śaṅkarācārya. The Scriptures themselves showed many ways to the Highest Goal of Bliss, viz., 

The seers who came after the Upaniṣads followed the path trodden by the Great Seers and thus constructed a Royal Road by summarising the Upaniṣadic Conclusions in aphorisms like Brahmasūtras. Vyāsa and S'ri Kṛṣṇa made the truth known to greater numbers by simplifying and exposing and thus erecting as if the shady bowers on the Road! Gradually came the Vṛttis of Baudhāyana, Upavarga and others followed by what are styled vākyas of Tāṅka as has been cited by Rāmānuja. Meanwhile damages were caused to the Road by opponents like Cārvākas, Jains and Buddhists. The repairs were carried on by Gauḍapāda and the task of proper restoration and clearing out was left to Śaṅkarācārya whose followers decorated it at the same time guarding it with fences!

Appreciation of all this work is impossible as one cannot walk the whole path to find out its charms and drawbacks. In this work an attempt has been made only to peep into it through the fence! The Post-
S'āṅkara Advaita Vedānta is the theme of this endeavour.
The author has ventured into this task being fascinated by the charms of Śaṅkara System which she wants to grasp. With the thought that the rivers can easily carry one to the vast ocean, she has taken the guide of the Post-Śaṅkara Advaitins to reach Śaṅkarācārya’s heart-rationing yet baffling exposition!

Prof. Radhakrishnan remarks*:"Suresvāra, Vācaspati, Padmapāda, S’ri Harṣa, Vidyāraṇya, Citsukha, Sarva- jñātmamuni, Madhusūdana Sarasvati, Appayya though they all belong to the same general type of thinking have something fresh to say and reflect some facet of the meaning of absolute idealism not seen before with the same intensity. While they employ the same method and expound the same view, they yet manage to maintain their own individualities." In the light of this remark an attempt has been made in the following pages to record some such individualities in some significant respects in the Advaita movement carried on by Post-Śaṅkara Advaitins.

---

* P.452, Vol.II, "Indian Philosophy".