(A) The concept of God in various systems:

Introduction:

Inquisitiveness, rooted in the sense of wonder towards the objects of the world, set the sages of India thinking. And as a result of their efforts the belief in God came into existence in diverse forms. Every human being somehow or the other gets consolation in life in one form or the other, by having faith in a principle higher than himself.

This proves that the belief in an independent God is very ancient and hence deeply rooted among the masses. The deeply rooted belief in the hearts of the masses impels the philosophers and thinkers too to undertake a consideration of the same. God was conceived differently by the various schools of philosophical thought.
The Māheśvara view regarding God:

This sect regards Māheśvara as almighty God. The followers of this sect undoubtedly recognise a plurality of non-sentient principles and souls. There are two main currents of thought among the Māheśvaras. Even though they regard God as the cause of the world, there are some who assume that God is not guided by the karman of the Souls and hence is a fully independent cause; while others do not imagine God to be so completely independent but as a Creator who pays due heed to the karman of the Soul. 1

1. - नन्तु महेश्वरदिविज्ञाय यन्त्रियेकः परप्रेवरः कारणमिति तथातैः कृतेकु लुष्य स्वेतायां गुणसमाकल्पकादर्शेति दौषभ्य ग्राहुः च्यात्सः भैरवेव मन्त्रेयः।

- Sarvadarśanasangraha, - Nakulīsapāupata-

- तत्परप्रेवरः कारणामिति पत्ते वेष मधुकर्ष्णे-
दौष्ट्रिन्तवेप्रस्तुतिप्रमततः कैक्य महेश्वरः। श्रवणमहेश्वरलक्ष्यावदीवर्गानि: कारणेतिपत्ते परप्रेवरः कारणामिति पत्ते कतार्कुवर्गानि: पत्तान्तप्रस्तुतिप्रमततिः।।

- Sarvadarśanasangraha, Saivaśāstra ed. by V. S. Abhāyankara Govt. Oriental Series No. 1.1924 (p. 174. line 1-4).
Sāṃkhya-Yoga view of God:

The original Sāṃkhya was monistic and theistic. But the classical Sāṃkhya, perhaps under the influence of the views of Materialism, Jainism and Buddhism became atheistic. The Sāṃkhya tradition is a believer in human endeavour, but there is no place whatsoever in it for the endeavour of the puruṣa, or Soul. They consider Prakṛti to be the material cause (Upādāna Kāraṇa) of creation and also its creator and controller. Prakṛti is believed to have full potency and power for activity - creation and destruction. This, on the one hand, leaves little scope for deership or enjoyership in the Puruṣa principle though it is recognised as eternally unchanging and sentient, and on the other a still less scope for even the bare belief in God-principle, leave alone its doership.

Of course there have been some thinkers who believed that the Sāṃkhya tradition did not negate God. It only...
asserted that God is not necessary for the attainment of vivekakhyati (discriminative knowledge) which leads to spiritual Emancipation. But in fact, there can be no justification for the place of the God-principle in the Sāṁkhya tradition recognizing twenty-five principles.

The Yoga system accepts the existence of God. Patañjali's interest in God seems to be practical. What can be directly derived from the extant sūtras of Patañjali is only that God has a place in the Yoga system as a witness or an object of worship. Patañjali defines God

Foot Note contd....

- The Sāṁkhya Pravacana Bhāṣya by Vijnānabhaṭṭa, ed. by R. Garbe. The Harvard University Press, 1943

  (page : 3 line : 24 to 29)

  1. ईश्वरप्रणिनानां ।

  - Yoga-Sūtra 1. 23.
as a special kind of Purusa who is always free from pains, actions, effects and impressions. But the commentator Vyāsa looks upon God as the Saviour. He there says that the function of God is to confer His grace on beings. By imparting knowledge and instruction in dharma, God resolves to save all creatures. He makes a Samkalpa by virtue of the predominance of the Sattva-gūṇa. While commenting upon the Yoga-Sūtras Vyāsa has not explicitly pointed out that the Puruṣa-Viśeṣa (God) is also the creator and destroyer, yet he has stated clearly that God is the saviour of creatures. Vācaspāti Miśra and Vijnānabhikṣu forcefully established God as the creator of the world by their respective methods.

Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view of God:

The Sūtras of Kanāda do not specifically refer to God. His aphorism, "The authority of the Veda is due to its
being His word." has been interpreted by the commentators in the sense that the Veda is the word of God. The expression 'Tadvacana' may also mean that the Veda is the word of the seers. But the commentators of the Vaiśeṣika and the Nyāya systems, including Praśastapāda and Udayana are theistic and they put forth arguments to prove the existence of God. Praśastapāda in his Bhāṣya refers to Maheśvara as the creator and destroyer of the world. It is also suggested that Maheśvara creates or destroys the world keeping in view the good or bad actions of Creatures. The Nyāya system is allied to the Vaiśeṣika system, as a Samāna-tantra (cognate system). Aksapāda, the author of the Nyāyasūtra, has also discussed briefly the concept of God, but his commentator Vātsyāyana has made it more

1. तद्वक्तयाद बामाक्षेय प्रामाण्यम् । कैरविर्दृष्टी 1/1/3
2. सबीलविस्ताराम पुष्पसिन्धुं सति पवित्रचतुर्भुजामुद्योग-जःसः श्रीरामनारायणायुपिनिन्धूयोगिनिवृजः तैशानान्यपर-भाषाौ नित्याः ।
कवीशिवकृष्णद्वीप प्रशुष्टदार्शणम् - चोलव्यायं स्वरूप गुप्तायला, कारस । 4/1/19.
3. ईश्वरः कारणः पुरुषशकुमकुलदेशीताः । नायायूत्र 4/1/20.
न पुरुषशकुमकुले फलानिष्ठः ।
तत्कारित्वादेशैतः । 4/1/21.
explicit. Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakāra have not only estab-
lished God as the creator and controller of the creation,
but they have, on the basis of the original sūtras, also
made it clear that God is the creator of the world in
conformity with the karman of the soul and not independen-
tly of it.

Some thinkers of these systems—regarded God as
the creator but established this principle mostly by
Reasoning or Inference; while others relied mostly on
the authority of the Scriptures (āgama) acceptable to
them and Stated that it cannot be established with
certainty by Inference, for the inference establishing
God can no longer remain forceful when those who do not
recognise God advance a counter-inference which is equally
powerful. Thus in establishing God as a creator some had
resort to Inference and others relied mostly on the
Scripture.

Later Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas are theists and
they discuss the concept of God logically. Annap Bhatta,
a later Naiyāyika has stated that the supreme soul is God.

1

1. तत्त्वज्ञान: परमात्मक एव ॥ - श्रीविक्रम
Udayanācārya wrote his Nyāya-Kusumāṇḍali only to establish God. He has given nine arguments to prove the existence of God. There is a certain cause, which determines our happiness and misery. Each and every effect has a cause, so there must be a cause for our happiness and misery.

Udayana says that the different degrees of enjoyment which different souls experience are determined by the differences in their adṛṣṭa. God is said to supervise the work of adṛṣṭa. In short, the unintelligent principle of adṛṣṭa is directed by God. Udayana strongly established God in his Nyāya-Kusumāṇḍali and finally established Mahēśvara as the creator of the world and controller of all.

1. काव्य-प्रत्यापि: पदाः प्रत्यापि: युः:।
वाक्यायम् तं न्यायविलेण यत्सोऽविलेण जयः।।-न्यायानुमालोऽवलम्।।

2. सापेक्षाद्वादना तद्विलेण तद्विलेण हृदस्त:।।
प्रत्यायम्-नियायानुमालोऽवलम् हृदस्त:।।

- Ibid. I. 4.

3. पुंजिनवो हि हृदस्त: कीये भेतेन कैणकृतिः।।
व्याकृतिपि नित्यस्य घटिणिः र-न्यथा न भि।।

- न्यायानुमालोऽवलम्।। I. 19.
activities.

There has always been an intimate relationship between the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school and the traditions of the Māheśvaras, the Pāṣupatas. Guṇaratna, while commenting upon Haribhadra's Saddārasanasamuccaya, says that the Naiyāyikas are Śaivas, while the Vaiśeṣikas are said to be Pāṣupatas. Bhāsarvajña speaks of the direct vision of Maheśvara as the result of meditation.

1. कार्यकारणिकार्यानुसत्तमा मायाबद्धा सङ्करत्र
हार्य हारकः-उपालक्ष्यं वं कुक्ता वस्तुः कोडः
ते देवं निर्वीर्ष्णु-पुरुषद्यानुभावम् परमात्मा
विज्ञानासिकः शिवं प्रतिनमात्र मूर्त्त प्रतिकारण्यायिनम्।

- Ibid. II. 4.

2. परं शास्त्रेण्यायर्था: वदा शिवांत्वत्त्वेव श्वेते
स्वश्रिष्टावत्, प्रेसिणिकास्तु
पालुक्ता हति। तेष नैयायिकस्तत्र श्रेष्ठावत्त्वें, प्रेतेषिणिकासैत
व पालुक्तमिति।

- Saddārasanasamuccaya-

of Haribhadra - comm. of Gunaratna:
ed. by Luigi Sialli, 1905. page: 51.

3. शास्त्रेण्यायर्था: योगास्त्तमा मुक्तमिति:.......
परं शास्त्रेण्यायर्था: व परा
प्रेतेषिणिकास्तत्रं नैयायिकां श्रेष्ठावत्त्वात्मिकाम्।
- यास्तिकार्यान्वेषिणः पृ.47.
Jaina and Buddhist views regarding God:

These two systems of Indian philosophy believe in the other world—heaven etc., and in mokṣa, and regard the latter as the chief puruṣārtha; Still they do not recognise an independent God.

Both these systems do not believe in the doctrine of an absolutely unchanging eternal sentient principle. They believe in the development of the innate good qualities of soul or principle of citta. The insentient Rūpa, Smṛjña etc. can be helpful to the jīva or Citta for the development of its good qualities, but the seed of development however is present only in the jīva or citta. A spiritual aspirant brings the fullest development of this seed and achieves his end, and then attains the Status of God. According to both these systems, the siddha (perfect) or the buddha (enlightened) soul which has attained perfection by its own efforts itself serves as such a support; and those who supporting themselves in this way become perfect can, in their turn, serve as supports for other sādhakas.

Thus in the Jaina and Buddhist systems, the perfect emancipated or enlightened souls or Cittas are themselves
God or the Highest self. They do recognise change in the universe, but do not believe that the world was ever first created, and so the question of the place of God as a creator does not arise.

The Pūrva - Mīmāṃsā View of God:

This system has firm belief in the fruits of rituals. It does not care to consider the problem of emancipation. The followers of this system consider only this world and the other world like heaven. And sacrifice is a means to achieve the ends that are to be attained in either of the two worlds. The mantras of Vedas, performance of appropriate rites, Hōtr, etc. alone have a place of importance in such a Karmakanda. The performer of actions like sacrifice, etc. got the desired fruit, according to the injunctions. It shows that the doership of men desirous of fruits has a place in this system, and the souls have this capacity (for being doers). So the question of the Grace of God does not arise at all. And as such the concept of God as a creator becomes irrelevant! Thus, in this system, mantra, deity, action performed according to injunction and power produced by the assemblage of conditions
(Sāmagri) - are the substitutes for God's creatorship.

Conclusion:

We have seen that the Māheśvara, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Yoga systems are theist. But the Mīmāṃsaka, the Sāṁkhya, the Jaina and the Buddhist traditions recognise change in the universe, but do not believe in God as a creator of these changes. The Mīmāṃsakas believe in Karm in their characteristic way, so do the Sāṁkhya, the Jainas, and the Buddhist. In each system the individual has the power to perform action and to enjoy its fruits. So the question of the place of God in the performance of action or in the enjoyment of its fruits does not arise. The doership of the jīva or the Citta in the Jaina and the Buddhist traditions has taken the place of the Self-sufficient doership of Prakṛti in the Sāṁkhya.

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, Pāśupata Māheśvara, and Yoga systems regard God as doer (kartr). They believe God only as the efficient (Mimitta) or controlling (adhiṣṭhāyaka) cause, and not the material cause of the universe.

1. श्रीमःजैमिनिंद्रणः पीयायायायः
    शब्दस्यः २.९.४
    पृष्ठः ४२५-४२६
In the Vedantic system of thought (except Madhva's school) all the sub-schools accept Brahman as one prime principle. This principle is deeply rooted in the Veda. A Vedantist thinker said "One alone, wise call in diverse form." This inquiry about the absolute passed through a number of stages and culminated in the 'Sat, cit, ananda' of the Upanishads. As this thought grew in strength it also assumed many forms and ultimately led to the composition of the Brahma-Sutra. The commentators of the Brahma-Sutra unanimously believe that Brahman—the ultimate principle is the primary and independent cause of the world, and have explained the prime cause in terms of Godhood also. All of them differ when they explain Godhood in the Brahman Principle. Let us see the differences among them.

Śaṅkara is a Kevalādvaitin (believer in absolute non-dualism). For him, Brahman is the Ultimate principle. This Brahman is Kūṭastha and one without a second. The question is as to how can this one Brahman, who is unchanging, emerge into transformation? Śaṅkara accepted...
the doctrine of Avidya or māya as explaining the appearance of the Non-dual Brahman as many and diverse. He calls māya as Sadasanirvacanīya, and does not regard it as different from Brahman nor also as absolutely identical with it. Thus by accepting the existence of Māya, Śaṅkara justified the doctrine of Absolute Non-dualism and established that the phenomenal world of sense-perception is illusory. While commenting upon the Brahma-Sūtra, he has accepted Brahman conditioned by Avidya or Māya as the God-principle and established it as the material and efficient cause of the phenomenal world. Thus, Brahman came to be regarded as the perfect Greater and God in Śaṅkara’s Absolute Monism.

Bhāskara, another Advaitin regards Brahman as undergoing transformation and recognises diverse powers in it. He explains the creation of the objects of enjoyment by one power—and the creation of the enjoyer.

1. विभाजितमात्राम श्रवण्यात्मकाः ज्ञानपेशात्वात्सृष्टिकृत्वा तत्साधुत्ते एकत्रमात्रात्मक मात्राः संतुल्यं नित्याविद्वारेराज्ञानानिमित्तिप्रविष्टाः।

- ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ II/1/14.
by another. And giving Brahman itself the status of God as the creator, protector and destroyer, he regards it as both the material and the efficient cause of the world. According to him the universe is both different and non-different from the material cause, Brahman. He is of the opinion that every entity is one from one point of view, and many from another. Unity and diversity, both are real in one and the same thing. He explains this by means of the simile of the sea. The Sea is one, but appears as manifold in the form of waves etc. Similarly God in the form of Brahman is one, but in the form of transformations as world and souls is manifold. The waves are there for a short period but this does not mean that they are unreal. Like Śaṅkara, Bhāskara does not have to resort to māyā in order to establish Godhood in Brahman, but he has directly recognised a number of coexistent innate real powers in Brahman.

Eventhough the Advaitic thought was progressively growing and strengthening, the Dualists also at the same time kept on establishing the dualistic thought. The Dvaitādvaitavāda (Doctrine of Dualism-Non-dualism or of
Unity in Diversity) was emerging in different forms. Though ācāryas like Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Vallabha and Caitanya established Brahmādvaita (Non-duality of Brahman) in their characteristic ways, they in truth supported only the doctrine of bhedābheda (difference-non-difference) and dvaitādvaita (Dualism-Non-dualism). Each one of them in his commentary on the Brahma-Sūtra establishes Brahman as non-dual and eternally unchanging and gives it different names such as Īśvara, Parmeśvara, Nārāyaṇa, Viṣṇu and so on. Even then, they give a rational explanation of the insentient-Sentient or inanimate-animate creation, which is real, as originating from God.

According to Rāmānuja the Highest Brahman which is the inner controller and is omnipresent is Nārāyaṇa. He is essentially unchanging but by his own powers, His own body which consists of ācīt and cit is made manifest as effect. In establishing the Highest Brahman as Īśvara, Rāmānuja has mostly depended on the scriptures (Āgama) and stated that Inference (Anumāna) is not at all a sound means of Valid proof. He states that by the power of Nārāyaṇa the Souls which were all the while
with Him as His body, are motivated. While establishing the Highest Brahman as of the nature of Vāsudeva or Narāyana, Rāmānuja has freely used the Upaniṣadic passages. The Śruti passages which Śaṅkara had used for his Kevalādvaita, Rāmānuja also used and demonstrated that the Highest Brahman is Narāyana.

Rāmānuja considered the Highest Brahman i.e. Narāyana as the material and the efficient cause of the sentient, insentient world.¹

Nimbārka also established the Brahman-principle as God and called Him Viṣṇu. He is a believer in real bhedābheda or Dvaitādvaita. According to Him the Highest Brahman, Viṣṇu is both the material and efficient cause of the real 'caracara' world. Like other advaitins, Nimbārka too relies on Scriptural Testimony and believes that creation is in accordance with the karman of creatures.²

---

1. नूतनविद्विठक्तुशरीररूपेव ब्रह्मणः स्वालक्षितेनकुसूक्तिरूपमेव कार्येत्वाः। त्रीमाण्यः 1.1.1.

2. कल्पातु सवृषः सवृषिकत्वायन-सवृषिकतिविष्क्रम-विष्क्रमाधि हैतुवेदकुप्रमादश्र्ग्यः सवृषिकतिविषस्वत: सवृषातः सवृषिकतिविषस्वत: सवृषिकति सवृषिकतिस्वत: सवृषिकतिस्वत:।

- क्वानंसामाण्यः - 1.1.4.
Vijnanabhiksu has also established Brahman as God. He states that Brahman, by means of the pure prakrti of the nature of sattva, creates and brings about the evolution of the prakrti and the puruśa-principles that are eternally present in Him. Prakṛti and Puruṣas are real; and also distinct from Brahman, yet they do not exist in any substratum (adhisthāna) other than Brahman. Therefore, though distinct they are undivided (avibhakta) from Brahman. According to him it is thus that Brahman is both the material and efficient cause of the world. He also adds another cause viz. the substrate-cause (adhisthānaskāraṇa) and states that this adhisthānaskāraṇa is a fourth kind of cause quite distinct from the samavāyi (material), the asamavāyi (non-material), and the nimitta (efficient) kāraṇas, in which the effect stays undivided and supported by whom it can be operative. Brahman is an adhisthānaskāraṇa, and prakṛti- puruṣa remain undivided in it.

Vallabhaçārya advocates suddhadvaita doctrine, and regards Brahman as the cause of the universe and the universe as of the nature of Brahman and establishes
the reality of the universe. According to him Brahman or God is not the upādānakārāṇa of the universe, but it is Samavāyikārāṇa, as it is not modified but remains pure in the process of Creation.

Vallabha has raised and solved a point that God is of the nature of Sat, cit and ānanda, these three aspects, must be experienced in the world which as the effect of God. If the universe is an effect of God, all the qualities of the Samavāyi-kārāṇa must be present equally in the effect. Purushottamji, the commentator of the Bhaṣya of Vallabhacārya has briefly discussed the above question. He says that Existence and other qualities of Brahman who is the Samavāyi-kārāṇa are seen to manifest themselves in the effect-world by gradation. This is so because of the gradation of the removal of the obscuration. Sentiency is not manifest in the insentient world, it is obscured there, but this obscuration is feeble in the sentient world, so sentiency is experienced in it. There is gradation of sentiency even in the sentient world. This too can be accounted for by the gradation of the removal of the obscuration. The aspect of pure Bliss is manifest in God alone.
Vallabhācārya installed Brahman in the place of the prime cause Prakṛti and gave it the name of Paramesvara.

According to Śrīkantha, Brahman is sat-cit-ānanda, but is of the form of Śiva and is God. God is not only the nimitta kāraṇa but is the material and the efficient cause also. Śrīkantha uses the term 'Samavāyi-kāraṇa' for it. He establishes Śiva as Brahman, and states that Brahman endowed with the power of subtle acit and Cit, is the Kāraṇa-Brahman and the universe possessing gross or objective acit and ētit is the Kārya-Brahman.

Madhvācārya describes God as the creator and destroyer of the world and also states that He creates the world in accordance with the merit and demerit of the creatures. He recognises God, Souls and the insentient world as different from one another, but the latter

1. "कृपेश समवायिकारण, कुतुष्क प्रमाण, समान-वृत्तवाह, बन्धुवालिकाकलैश सत्यदान-दर्शनांनहु, नामस्थापे, कादेमकलैश, प्रकृतिरूपस्वतं तदृशत्वात्, क्षनात तारिक्षा-प्रियात्वे, ज्ञानेन बाधितैशु, नामात्य त्वरित्त्वधैर्य...।।

- अणुभाष्य : १.१.३
two as being Completely under the control of God.

we have seen the views of different ācāryas regarding the concept of God. Now we will see the concept of God according to Madhusūdana Sarasvatī as found in the 'Siddhāntabindu'.

Some Advaitins have no place for Ṣiva, for they say that somehow the Brahman itself must be the creator of the world without itself being effected by the process of creation. But some try to make the process more conceivable and show how the pure Brahman can be the creator. They say that the Brahman in connection with māyā becomes Ṣiva and he is the creator of the world. Ṣiva is the Lord of the universe.

All the Kevalādvaitins accept Brahman as pure consciousness, and due to māyā the Non-dual Brahman becomes Ṣiva. But there are differences of opinions regarding the relation between Ṣiva and the jīva. There are three main views: the ṛbhāsavāda or the appearance view; the pratibimśavāda or the theory of reflection, and the avachchedavāda or the theory of limitation.
According to Abhasavāda, the self, when reflected in ajñāna identifies itself with ajñāna. But it is worthy of note that not the pure self but the reflection of the self (पुरुषविनाश्य) limited by avidyā identifies itself with its limitation, and this limited self is not considered as pure self. Sūrēśvara maintains that Brahman screened by avidyā appears as Sāksin and screened by buddhi or intellect appears as the jīva. Madhusūdana has noted the view of Sūrävarācārya in his Siddhāntabindu. He there mentions that the author of the Vārttika says that Ātman having ignorance as an adjunct, and thinking himself as identical with ignorance, does not find any distinction between himself and his likeness, so he is called 'the Inner Ruler', 'the witness' and 'the cause of the world, while Ātman having buddhi as an adjunct does not distinguish between himself and his likeness is called jīva, an agent, an experiencer, a perceiver. 1

1. क्षत्रियपन्हि शात्मा क्षत्रियतत्वात्मानस्वविदाः परिवैगैक्यात्
न्वयनी शात्मी जगत्कारणमहासर्वत्र सति च कुृत्तते ।
कुंशलविज्ञ तत्वात्मानस्वविदाः परिवैगैक्यीवः
कति भौतिक प्रमात्मेति च कुृत्तत हस्ति वार्तिकारः ॥

- S. B. p. 42-47
Suresvara has not drawn any kind of difference between the āśraya and vișaya of avidyā. He is of the opinion that Brahman himself is both the āśraya and viṣya. The limited self is not the pure self but is regarded as the inner controller (antaryāmin) and witnessing self (Sākṣin). The pure ātman when reflected in buddhi becomes limited by buddhi. This limited self, identifies himself with buddhi. And due to the difference between the pure self and the limited self - he is regarded as jīva, agent, enjoyer and knower. The mind being different in each body, and body being innumerable, the semblance of the self in the minds will also be innumerable. The self not being differentiated from the semblance, appears to be many. But Avidyā is one only, and due to this the reflection of the Self in it (cidābhāsa) is not different.

1. प्रतिदेहें च ज्ञ्ञिनि, भिन्नत्वात्भस्मतिविदारमासेनविद्याः।
विविधतः चेतन्यपि भिन्निभव प्रतिक्योऽ॥

- S. B. p. 43.
from ajñāna and so appears as one.

In this theory, the individual Souls are not really many, but appear as many because the intellects or inner-organs are different and the Self is not distinguished from them.

Madhusūdana interprets this in another manner. He observes that the pure Self reflected on avidyā is misunderstood as the reflection Self — Īśvara. In the same manner, the pure self, when reflected upon buddhi and being falsely identified with the reflection self is jīva. The pure self is real, but its upādhis (limitation) — avidyā as well as the reflection self on avidyā (in case of Īśvara) and buddhi as well as the reflection-self on it (in case of jīva) are unreal. Here, the identity between jīva and Brahman can be established without the negation of the existence of jīva.

Comparing the two interpretations, in the former view the pure self as the prototype — (bimba) of the reflection-selves viz. Īśvara and jīva is the Sāksin.

1. अज्ञानस्य तु सवैःभिन्नत्वात् इत्सवाः प्राकृत्तिः विचिन्तन्यस्य न कदाचिद्यमेव गुयानिः।

— S. B. p. 43
while the Self which has no reference to Isvāra or jīva is the pure (Suddha) Consciousness. While in the latter interpretation, Sākṣin cannot be separated from Isvāra i.e. both the conceptions of Sākṣin as well as Isvāra have been merged into one conception of Isvāra.

The Pratibimbavāda favoured by the Vivaraṇakāra and endorsed by Sarvajñātman declares that jīva is the reflection of Brahman. The consciousness with Ignorance as an adjunct, is called Isvāra; while the consciousness reflected in Ignorance, limited by the inner organ and its impressions is jīva. Sarvajñātman holds that the reflection in Avidyā is Isvāra, and the reflection in the antahkaraṇa or buddhi is jīva. The consciousness reflected in avidyā is in itself pure consciousness.

---

1. व्ह्हानापूर्वते विम्बोऽत्वंपीयस्वरः || नृत्तःकृरि तत्स्वारायतिहः
   व्ह्हानपूर्वति तिर्यक्तः कैत्यं जीवः || - S. B. p. 46.

2. व्ह्हानापूर्वति तिर्यक्तः कैत्यंपीयस्वरः || तुदितिपूर्वति तिर्यक्तः कैत्यं जीवः ||
   - S. B. p. 46.

3. व्ह्हानात्पूर्वते तु विम्बोऽत्वंपीयस्वरः ||
   - S. B. p. 46.
Madhusūdana Sarasvatī comments here that in both these views, the diversity of buddhi causes innumerable jīvas. At the time of liberation, false identity with buddhis disappears. The Buddhi exists as long as the ignorance exists. No sooner the existence of ignorance is destroyed, than the pure consciousness is free from bondage.

The difference of views of the authors of the Vivaraṇa and the Samkṣepaśārīraka is that, the former regards Īśvara to be the bimba-self (limited by ajñāna); while the latter regards Īśvara, like jīva, as a reflection of Brahman. The pure consciousness is the very same in both jīva and Īśa.

There is a difference between abhāsavāda and Prati-bimbavāda. The former holds that reflection is absolutely false. While the latter accepts the reflection as true. Because, according to the latter bimba as well as its pratibimba are one and the same.  

Pratibimba Caitanya

1. कवयोक्ते पत्रयोक्तेनिदिख्येत्रश्रीवाः ज्ञातवर्म ॥
   - S. B. p. 47.

2. तलयं च प्रतिविम्बस्य सत्यलुभ्यते प्रतिविम्बवादिति ॥
   निदिख्यते न भासितवादिनः ॥ स्वरूपे तु न विवाद हत्तयति। ॥
   - S. B. p. 25.
is not at all different from the bimba Caitanya. Reflection as well as its prototype are considered to be real.

Some followers of the Vivarana do not accept that both Isvara and jiva are reflections, but that jiva only is reflection and Isvara is the prototype of that reflection. The difference between a prototype and an original is that the original Brahman, being pure, cannot be reflected, yet jiva as reflection means to have a prototype and Isvara serves as that prototype. Isvara is conceived with reference to the jiva and the Brahman is pure Consciousness.

The difficulty in justifying how the formless Brahman could be reflected in maya leads Vacaspati to advocate the limitation view. He holds that the pure consciousness, as an object of ignorance is Isvara, and the same (Consciousness) which is the support of Ignorance - is jiva. Isvara is the object (विषय) of avidya; while jiva is the support (अत्यंत) of avidya. According to this

---

1. ब्रजनिष्ठोऽस्वे ताक्ष्यनिश्वकः || - S. B. p. 47
2. ब्रजनाष्टयोऽस्वेच्छे जीव हृति वाचस्पतिमित् || - S. B. p. 47.
view, avidyās are innumerable, and so jīvas also many.  
Jīva, avacchina by avidyā is the material cause of the 
universe. As jīvas are many in number, every jīva is a 
creator of a separate universe. The adjunct of the jīva 
being his own ignorance, makes him the essential cause of 
the world. The object world is recognised as one and the 
same by all jīvas by virtue of the fact that the worlds of 
all the jīvas are similar. Ṣvēvara is the cause of the 
world, because Ṣvēvara may be secondarily called the cause 
of the world as the being the substratum of ignorances of 
the jīva together with the phenomenal world.

These three theories agrees on one point, viz. the 
Supreme Reality Brahman. According to them Brahman is the

1. अद्वितीय पदि ब्रजनानात्मानं द्वितीयकानात्मकः ।
   - S. B. p. 47
2. जीवस्यवाज्ञानापञ्चिनत्वं जगुपादानत्वतः ।
   - S. B. p. 47
3. प्रत्येकमेन च बालिकाद्वृत्तयथा ।
   - S. B. p. 47
4. औष्णार्धे व स्रष्यान्तिवाभिक्षणेन विभुक्तेन
   कारणात्बोधारादिति ।
   - S. B. p. 47.
Highest Reality and of the nature of Being Consciousness and Bliss. The difference is regarding ķīva and Īśa, and their adjuncts. Śaṅkara took recourse to the analogy of the Sun's reflection in water, contained in different receptacles, and the analogy of the limitation of ubiquitous space within jar etc. His followers followed him one sub-school putting forth the theory of reflection and another the theory of limitation.

Ekājīvavāda and Drātisrātivāda:

While discussing the three theories regarding the nature of ķīva, Madhusūdana has noted the Ekājīvavāda and Drātisrātivāda. He says that the pure consciousness without any adjunct (of ignorance) is Īśvara and the same

1. प्रतिज्ञावाक्तविमति। जलात्र हि द्विप्रतिज्ञाय जलकुद्वा
   कविते, जलाशयं ज्ञाति जलथलं चलति जलश्च भिक्षत इत्येव जलमावं
   नुयायित्वं भवति, न तु परमार्थतः बुद्धव्रत्वत्वभस्ति ।
   - ब्रो सौो शाहो ८.२.२०

2. परिचित्वात्मा देहानिधिः चक्राणां तत्काद्यपापिभः परिचित्वात्मानो बालः।
   शीरः इत्युपयोगः। कथा इत्यक्राणामिवाविशीतपरिचित्वात्मिः।
   नमः परिचित्वात्मानो तद्वृत् ।
   - ब्रो सौो शाहो ९.२.६
having ignorance for its adjunct, is jīva. Or the consciousness which has for its adjunct ignorance, is Īśvara; the consciousness which is the reflection in ignorance is the jīva. As its very name suggests, this Ekajīvavāda holds that jīva is both, the material and the efficient cause of the world. In our worldly experience we find many bodies, and due to that experience of ours we are led to conclude that as there are many bodies, there are many jīvas. But actually jīva is only one. It is an erroneous notion that jīvas are many due to the many bodies.

Madhusūdana has thus noted these two vādas. The first view states that self limited by (उपलब्ध) ajñāna is Īśvara, while the reflection of pure consciousness is jīva. As its very name suggests, this Ekajīvavāda holds that jīva is both, the material and the efficient cause of the world. In our worldly experience we find many bodies, and due to that experience of ours we are led to conclude that as there are many bodies, there are many jīvas. But actually jīva is only one. It is an erroneous notion that jīvas are many due to the many bodies.

---

1. अज्ञानमधिः ब्रिन्दनकत्तमीर्षर: | ज्ञानप्रतिबिम्तिते कैतन्या जीव इति वा अज्ञानातुपालिः हुः कैतन्यमीर्षर: ज्ञानोस्पष्टिः च जीव इति वा मुक्तः वेदान्तभिन्नन्त एकस्वात्माथः | हमेव च \\

2. जीव एव इक्षुकवश्याज्ञुपादात निमिन्त च | \\

3. वैतेजिदाच्छ - जीवेदेश्वरस्तिः |
in ignorance is jīva. The second view states that Īśvara is not only the pure caitanya; but at the same time, also not limited by ignorance; while jīva is limited by ignorance. Prakāśānanda has accepted and expounded this second view in his 'Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvalī'. Appayya Dīkṣita has also given an account of both these views in his 'Siddhāntaśeṣasamgraha'. According to him, the Drṣṭidrṣṭivāda is of two kinds. In the first view. The world is supposed to be created at every operation of the senses. While in the second view - the world is regarded as nothing else but perception only - there is no proof to show that the object of perception is different from the perception.

This view does not explain the common experience of each and every individual, and so, the other view - drṣṭidrṣṭivāda has been preferred by some ācāryas. According to it, the senses operate on things which are already

1. अनेकानु हृद्योपशास्त्रयाविश्वास्तिरि हृद्योपशास्तिवादः।
   सिद्धान्तलेखसंह : पृ ३५५

2. कन्यसतु हृद्योपशास्त्रविश्वास्तिविधि।
   दृढ्यत्व हृद्योपशास्त्रेण प्रमाणपार्त्तु।
   सिद्धान्तलेखसंह : पृ ३५५
in existence. The world is created by God. And this view has been supported by Veda the perception of the objects are due to the function of the organs of knowledge. 

This Srstidrstivāda is useful in explaining the Śruti passages - which describe the creation of the universe by the one non-dual Brahman.

As Madhusūdana has not given his own comments regarding the Ekajīvvāda and the Drstisrstivāda in his 'Siddhantabindu', it is difficult to say which of these two is favoured by him. It seems that he accepts the view that Īśvara, the pure consciousness, seems to be limited by avidyā and therefore it is called prototype, while jīva is the reflection of Īśvara in ignorance in his 'Advaitasiddhi'.

Madhusūdana Sarasvatī does not clearly favour any of the Vādas while discussing the difference between Jīva

---

1. द्विविदेश द्विप्रश्नस्वादे: म; प्रत्ययमलमानाः; कैविदाचायीःśrūṣṭिप्रश्नावर्ते रौक्यन्ते। श्रुतिविद्वितीय ब्रम्ण परमेश्वर-श्रुतिमश्वकावयकस्मि विश्वतविवाकयुग्मान्तवरणो तत्व तत्व श्रुतिप्रश्नाधिरिति। - सिद्धान्तालेखांग्रहः पृ४ ३५६

and Isvara. But it seems that he is of the opinion that Pratibimbavāda and Ābhāsavāda are acceptable. Brahman i.e. Atman is the only final goal and it can be realized only through sacred texts. The division of jīva and Isvara are nothing but the result of the intellect of man. The Pure-consciousness is transcendentally real and one. But on account of different adjuncts, She is phenomenally three-fold viz. the Isvara, jīva, and witnessing conscious i.e. Sākṣin. Madhusūdana says that Isvara has for its adjunct the ignorance which is the cause of the world. While jīva has the ignorance conditioned by the inner organ and its impressions of past lives. Madhusūdana

1. तत्स्य च प्रतिविभिः सत्यत्वाभावति प्रतिविभिम्बवादिनः।निथ्यात्म- कीत्याभासवादिनः।रक्षये तु न विभाज्यते। - S. B. p. 25.
2. इत्यैव उपनिषदोऽपि अधिक्षितावेदार्थसूत्रम्। - S. B. p. 51-52.
3. तत्र दुरुपदेशी ज्ञात्मा वार्षिकयोगाधिकार एक एव सर्वाकार्यपौष्पाधिक प्रेक्षेत त्रिक्षण: सुंदरो जीवं सादिक चैति। - S. P. p. 90 दू।
4. तत्र कारणीमुतानांपर्याधीशवः। - S. B. p. 89.
mentions the views of Sarvajñātman, Vivaraṇakāra and Vārttikakāra. Sarvajñātman holds that Isvara is a reflection of the Self in the original ignorance. Vivaraṇakāra maintains that Isvara is the self itself limited by the ignorance. According to Vārttikakāra, Brahman itself appears as Isvara due to māyā.  

Isvara manifests Himself in three different aspects viz. Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Rūdra, in due to the difference the three modes of the ignorance. As conditioned by the Sattva guṇa of ignorance in its causal condition. He is called Viṣṇu, the protector. As conditioned by the Rajas guṇa of that same ignorance he is called Brahmā - the Creator. Hirṇyagarbha is not the cause of the subtle

---

1. बाणाप्रवर्त्तिकेश्वरपत्रो बिम्बचेतन्य साध्वि। बिम्बेश्वरपत्रो व बिम्बप्रवर्त्तिकेश्वरपत्रो वलनात्वमेव किवेश्वरपत्रो वलनात्वमेव चैतन्य साध्विकेष्ट्रैय:। कार्तिकार्पत्रो त्वाश्चव एव साध्विकेष्ट्रैय:।

S. B. p. 89-90.

2. तवेश्वरस्तिविष्येऽऽस।

S. B. p. 90.

3. कार्णिपमुख्यसाध्विकेष्ट्राणि विष्णु: पालिता।

S. B. p. 90
elements and is therefore not Brahmā, but is however called Brahmā because he is the creator of the gross elements. And as conditioned by the tamoguna Īśvara is called Rudra, the destroyer. The male forms such as Caturbhuja, Caturmukha, Pāṇcamukha etc. as well as the female forms such as Śrī, Bhārati, Bhavānī etc. belong to Īśvara. Madhusūdana holds that the incarnations like the fish, the tortoise are nothing but līlā of the (divine) Brahman for the sake of granting grace to the devotees. Actually Brahman is pure consciousness, Secondless, Impartite and Formless but is believed to have forms for the fulfilment of the purposes of His devotees.

1. विरणमैत्यु महामध्यकरणात्याभावान मर्यादा ।
   - S. B. p. 91
2. कारणमूलार्धितस्तः संहस्त ।
   - S. B. p. 91
3. एवं कैसे च चुम्बमहकुमारा योः पुणाकवः
   श्रीभारतिभवायाधारश्रेष्ठकारः ।
   - S. B. p. 91
4. जनयेच्च फलस्वयम्भवायान्तवतारा तील्क साध्विकिष्टमः
   प्रकाशुपुञ्जायमित्यकोऽयम् ।
   - S. B. p. 91.
Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha comments that Chaturmukha Brahmā, four handed Viṣṇu, five-faced Rudra and the female forms Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Bhavāṇī are said to be the manifestations of the One because in the Purāṇas, the forms of Viṣṇu is stated to have performed acts appropriate to Rudra, and Rudra is stated to have performed acts appropriate to the former. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha quotes Brhannārādiya 1 et al. Brahmananda has explained the same but seems very prolix on this point. Abhyankara states that these forms are 2 : Purūgottama does not pass any remark here.

CONCLUSION :

Madhusūdana's view of three forms of Īśvara and His incarnations seems to be strange to Vedāntins. Perhaps this shows his devotionalism. He firmly believes that the secondless, formless Brahman assumes forms for the fulfillment of the purpose of His devotees.

Madhusūdana being a Kevalādvaitin could not go beyond the typical views of the monist school, yet could not keep himself away from the influence of Vaiṣṇavism of his time.

Note: See foot Note No. 1. and 2 next page
1. चतुबशरीरियोऽः पालकदृष्टान्तयोऽः विष्णुलक्ष्मेिनि वन्दनमश्च।

2. चतुर्वंशार्यारिष्णस्य परिवर्तनेऽष्टुः। तस्य दैवताणिवलक्ष्येऽष्टुः। तथा च वाक्यादिरावृत्तिः। यथा क्रियतेन रुद्रहायबिष्णुः।

- Comm. of Narayana Tirth on S.B.-p.352-353