CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT OF PRE - ŚAṆKARA VEDĀNTA

INTRODUCTION:

From the dawn of intellect, human mind has made earnest efforts to inquire into the purpose of this life and the life beyond. The quest of the eternal truth and the ways of practice through which the truth can be obtained have remained the two main preoccupations.

Truth was passionately and sincerely pursued in ancient India. The sages and seers have left for us a rich treasure of sound knowledge, some fragments and portions of which have been utilized gratefully by the world. Realizing the wonder of the world with their divine - vision, they praised the elements of nature and composed texts embodying their wisdom and vision for the happiness and good of the people.
In this connection, Vedic literature replete with free discussion on spiritual topics, carried on by individual sages or their assemblies give ample testimony to the quest for truth. The discussions gradually led to the development of rational and mystic tendencies which culminated into the evolution of six Darsanas. Like other Darsanas, Vedanta Darsana too is concerned with the true nature of reality.

The fundamental discussion of Vedantic philosophy is based upon the three उपनिषद्यां, namely, the Upaniṣads, the Bhagavadgītā, and the Brahmasūtras. Of course, the Vedas have their own place in this field. We do find the words such as Brahman1, Jīva2, Ākāśa3, Ātman4.

1. Rgveda: 1.10.4, 1.37.4, 1.47.2, 1.62.13, 1.75.2, 1.90.9, 1.88.4, 1.905.15, 1.117.10, 25, 1.29.4, 1.152.5, 5.7, 1.157.2, 1.165.11, 2.12.14, 2.18.7, 2.20.5, 2.34.7, 2.37.6, 2.39.8, 2.41.18, 3.9.2, 3.29.15, 4.6.11, 4.16.20, 5.29.15, 6.16.36, 7.22.3, 8.1.3, 9.67.29, 10.4.7, 10.13.1 etc.
Māyā etc. in the Rgveda, but they are not used in strictly philosophical sense.

The significance of the term 'Vedānta':

Here, we are concerned with the advaita system.

The term 'Vedānta' itself explains either the culmination of the knowledge' or 'the end of the knowledge'.

The term 'Veda' signifies the 'knowledge' and 'anta'- 'the end' i.e., the final aim or purpose. Thus, the term

2. Rgveda : 7.46.7, 1.104.6, 7.32.26, 10.18.3, 10.36.9
4. Rgveda : 10.168.4, 10.107.7, 10.97.11.8.3.24, 9.2.10
   162.20.
5. Rgveda : 1.11.7, 2.11.10, 1.32.8, 10.124.5, 2.11.5,
   9.1.1807, 2.17.5, 3.27.7, 4.30.12, 5.63.3,
   6.22.6.7, 104.24 8.41.3
Vedānta denotes the climax of the knowledge or say the highest knowledge, of which human being is capable, the highest knowledge being that of the Eternal truth or Reality itself.

An orthodox view holds that 'Veda' does not only mean the samhitās, but also the Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas and Upanisads. Generally speaking, the end or the concluding portions of each veda signifies the term 'Vedānta': It literally signifies 'conclusion of the Veda' and points to the Upaniṣads, which are, for the most part, terminating sections of the Vedas to which they belong. For example, Īsopanisat forms the fortieth Adhyāya of the Śuklayajurveda Samhitā, the Brhadāraṇyakopanisat forms the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa of the same veda.

The system of philosophy, which mainly depends upon these 'Vedāntas' comprises the Vedānta system.

The meaning of the word 'Upaniṣad':

The word 'Upaniṣad' is derived from the root 'sad', which means (i) to sit down (ii) to destroy (iii) to loosen. The prefix 'Upa' means 'nearby' and 'ni' means
devotedly. Therefore, the word 'Upaniṣad' denotes the act of sitting down of the disciple near his teacher in a devoted manner to receive instruction about the Highest Reality which loosens all doubts and destroys all ignorance of the disciple. In the words of Prof. Maxmuller, Upaniṣad means "originally sessions, particularly a session consisting of pupils assembled at a respectful distance round their teacher". The knowledge should be imparted only to those pupils, who by their supreme moral conduct and superior self-restraint, earnestly desire to know the Eternal Truth. Sāṅkara derives the word 'Upaniṣad' from the root 'Sad'-to destroy'. He opines that it is so called, because it destroys ignorance and leads to salvation by revealing the right path of knowledge.

The Period of 'Upaniṣad':

The exact number and time of the Upaniṣads is a matter of great difference among the circle of scholars.

But here we are not concerned with the regarding their date of composition dispute; our present concern is about the philosophy contained therein. It seems that the earliest Upanisads were written in prose form; they are Aitareya, Taittiriya, Brahadāranyaka and Chandogya. The Upanisads which are partly in prose and partly in verse form, such as the Kena, are said to come next while those which are purely in verse, have been viewed as the later ones.

So there is a difference of style between the Upanisads, but the general theme is one and is spread over all the Upanisads. It does not mean that they all contain one single topic or that they all agree in all their details. But as far as the general spirit is concerned, there seems to be a good affinity among them.

**The Upanisadic Philosophy**

The Upanisadic seers were fundamentally concerned with the final truth, and the real nature of the phenomenon of the universe, without any attempt at building up a system. Of course, the upholders of various systems and
schools of thought have interpreted the texts in such manner as they would appear favourable to their own doctrines.

Brahman: the ultimate reality:

The problem which the Upanishads ponder over and try to solve is what is the Reality — from which all things originate, by which all live and into which all dissolve?

When destroyed? This point has been frequently raised and solved. The name given to the Reality is Brahman or Sat. The Brhadaranyaka Upanishad says: "All this was in the beginning the self alone... it did not see anything else other than itself." "Verily all this is Brahman." "All this is self." In the beginning there was nothing other than Sat. The Brahman is one from which all things

1. ब्राह्मणं भवति सत्यं कुलं भवति: सौर्यतिष्ठ । नान्यदात्तस्येव शक्तिः। उप. १.६.९.
2. सत्यं भविष्यं कृष्ण । ह्यं, उप. III ६६.९.
3. रूपदार्थपिंडस सत्यं । ह्यं, उप. IV ८.७.
4. वदेव सोमेष्टिम जातिक्षिप्पेन वक्तुत। ह्यं, उप. VI २.१.
are born, by which all are made to live when born, and
to which all return when destroyed. All the creation
have the Sat for their origin ground and subsistence.
When all things are known as this one self only, all
infatuation and grief of a person comes to an eternal
end. Just as from a well-lit fire come out thousands
of sparks of similar nature, Similarly, O Saumya, come
out the manifold varied things from the Indestructible.
One in which they also get dissolved. Brahman is the
bridge to immortality.

The Upanisadic seers were not satisfied by saying
that Brahman is the only reality and universal self of all.

1. क्यों वा इमानि भूलानि जायिते | धन्य जातानि शीलि | यत्प्रकृतियः स्वरूपि | तद्विषति | - तै. उप. क. २. १.
2. समूलमानिन्वक्ष समूला: | - शां. उप. प. ५. ४
3. यहि मूल स्वयंधि कृत्य-यात्रामृत्युमिश्रितः | तत्र को मौद्र: क: शौक एकत्यम्प्रशस्तः | ईशोपनिषद् १. ६
4. क्षा सुदीप्ति पावकाहिक्षुलिष्ठा: सहस्र: प्रमक्ते सरः | तथाजाराज्यविषयः सौरम्य माया: प्रजायक्ते | - श्रुं. उप. २. १. १
5. यथा व: पन्या: सुकृत्य लोके | - श्रुं. उप. १. २. १
Their immediate realization of their identity with the absolute Reality i.e., Brahman, fills their minds and hearts with such joy that they say: "I am Brahman", "this self is Brahman", "I myself am all this", "that which is this self is the immortal, the Brahman, the all", that thou art in the Chandogya Upanisad, we find the same truth in different words: "He who is this in an individual person and that which is in the sun is one and the same".

The knower of the Brahman becomes Brahman itself. Just as pure water poured into pure water becomes exactly the same, similarly, a person who has realized Brahman becomes Brahman.
There are three types of assertions about Brahman in the Upaniṣad. It is sometimes described as a Qualified (Saguṇa) Brahman; sometimes as indescribable (nirguṇa) Brahman, and sometimes as both transcendent and immanent.

(a) Brahman as indescribable:

The Brahman is described as 'unseen, incapable of being dealt with or grasped without any mark, inconceivable, unnamable, devoid of all phenomena, perfectly quite, without a second, neither internally cognizant not externally cognizant, nor both internally and externally cognizant, nor a mass of cognizance, neither cognizing nor non-cognizing, but the essence of the knowledge of one’s self only.¹ Sometimes Brahman is held to be 'invisible, ungraspable, classless, colourless, without the sense organs of vision and audition without hands and legs, eternal, too subtle

¹ नाना:प्रज्ञ न बहि:प्रज्ञ नाईन्वत:प्रज्ञ न प्रेमानस्य न प्रज्ञ नाप्रज्ञ। अनुष्ठानमाहायतायैहुःदुर्लभत्वः गतिविधिमयादिश्वरस्यकाल्यन्तपुरुषाः। प्रज्ञोपर्यं शान्ति शिवमहेश्वरं चुत्तियते स बात्मा स विशेष। — मापूर्कः उप. ७
and imperishable. This Brahman is further spoken as Sat (real), as partless and stainless, and as the light of all luminaries, where neither the sun nor the moon nor any star nor lightning sheds its light. In the Brahadaranyaka Upanisad, we find the Brahman described as: 'not-gross, not-subtle, not small, not large, not red, not viscid, without shadow, and devoid of darkness,'
without air, without ether, unrelated; without taste, without smell, without eyes and ears, without speech, without mind, without vital fire, without vital breath, without mouth, without measure, devoid of internality, devoid of externality, one that eats nothing, and one which is eater by nobody whatsoever. This Brahman is 'neither this nor that, but 'the real of the real.'

It is beyond speech and touch. It is beyond good and evil, beyond cause and effect, and different from past and future. Brahman is described as neither 'Sat' nor 'asat'; it is Siva only; It is often called as Bhūmā

1. सत्यः जन्म गायिरा ब्राह्मणः विभवन्तः स्वल्पमकोऽपि परावर्णम्
   विशेषतः सत्यः जन्म गायिरा ब्राह्मणः विभवन्तः स्वल्पमकोऽपि परावर्णम्
   श्रीरामावर्णम् तै ज्ञानम्यमात्रम् श्रीरामावर्णम् तै ज्ञानम्यमात्रम्
   न तद्दशयिति
   किंन न तद्दशयिति कष्ट ॥ - बृ. उप. III. 2. 8

4. स राण नैति नैत्यात्मागुणयो । - बृ. उप. III. 6. 26
   स राण नैति नैत्यात्मागुणयो । - बृ. उप. I. 2. 3

5. सत्यः सत्यमिति । - बृ. उप. II. 3. 6

6. बम्बमशस्त्रमरमचच्च । - कठ. उप. I. 3. 94

5. कन्यः वर्णिन्यायां वर्णिन्यायाज्ञानात् तात्त्वलोकूऽ
   कन्यः मुद्रा च मनोऽझया च यज्ञपक्षी तहुद्द्
   कन्यः मुद्रा च मनोऽझया च यज्ञपक्षी तहुद्द
   कन्यः मुद्रा च मनोऽझया च यज्ञपक्षी तहुद्द
   कन्यः मुद्रा च मनोऽझया च यज्ञपक्षी तहुद्द

6. न सुन्तासस्य निर्लम्बं तथैव कैवलः । - एश्वेन. उप. IV. 8
(absolute) where a second is neither seen, nor heard nor known: It is absolutely one without a second. In fact it is one from which all speech along with mind returns, having not attained it. In short, the higher, pure or nirguna Brahman is devoid of all Qualities.

(b) Brahman as Qualified: (Saguna):

Now coming to Qualified (Saguna) Brahman or Isvara, all the scriptural texts which speak of Brahman as creator, and cause, as immanent, in all that exists, existed or will exist, as omniscient, and omnipotent Lord of all etc. pertain to Him. It is this Qualified Brahman whose

1. यथा नात्मकायास्ति नात्मकेयोति नात्मकिविजाति स दूषणाः।

2. एकप्रकाशिकायेः

3. यों वाचो निवृत्ते अवाम्य मक्षा बहुता

4. सत्तवेव सोमयेदणुष्ट्व बास्तवशेष्टनामकायेः।
   - तद्वैः कहतम
   प्राध्येति तद्भवोऽभ्यूजत...

5. तत्त्वेर्म नामगीयान रथ सोत्रांकारस्त जायम
   - दु. उप. II. 1.20.

6. एकस्या सबीमूच्यानांतत्त्वा हर्ष हृप प्रतिको पुजस्त
   - कठ. उप. 4.9.

5. — हैवावालेश्वरस्य सवीमुः।
   - है. उप. 1
Brahman in whom the world tree has been said to be rooted. The ether and the earth also have been viewed as constituting His body. This Qualified Brahman is mentioned as the inner controller of all, in the Upanishads.

1. अख्त्यामुलोवाक्षाश रण्विन्यत्य: सनातन: ।
   तदेव हृदन्तस्वास तैववृक्षमुच्यते ।। - कठ, उप. II. 6.1.

2. यो वायुः विष्नुवायोरत्तराये वायुः केवल वायुः
   शरीरं........... ।। - उप. II. 7.3.
   यस्तैजस्व तिष्ठ स्तेष्णृित्तरं ये तेषाऽ न केवल वायुः तेषाः शरीरं
   यस्तैजृित्तरं भृमयत्येन त वैत्तमान्यवृत्तम ।।

3. वतस्य वा कवारस्य प्रास्य संते गाण्य सुर्याँचतन्मथूः विष्णुवायो निष्पत्ति नििस्य गृहलो कवारारमण-विवेकमासा मात्रं केसी: स्वकंगरा इति विष्णुवायोत्स्वस्ख्य वा
   कवारस्य प्रास्य संते गाण्य प्राणयूःष्य नव: स्वन्दन्ते स्वेतैयम् निपितिम्
   परेयम्: फ़्लोििन्याः संि विद्धम् स्वयम कवारस्य वा
   कवारस्य प्रास्य संते गाण्य देवतो मूहुष्य: प्रज्ञातित यज्ञानं देवा
   वर्षी तिराोिििथः: ।।
   उप. III. 8.9.

   - ऐसा वृत्तायतम सर्व यत्संगेन घातया जगत् ।। - ऐसा, उप. ।.
   - एष स्वन्दन्ते एतं सहील राण्योरत्तरायेन यत्नी: स्वेतैयम्
   प्रवायस्याः हि पृष्ठनाम् ।। - माणुश्व पर. ६
Badarayana, the author of Brahmāsūtra, and Śāṅkara, a
commentator of the Upaniṣads, maintain that all the
Upaniṣads have decidedly propounded an intelligent being
as the cause of all that is created. And this intelli-
gent 'being' is their Saguṇa or Qualified Brahman. There
is really no room for Śāṅkya dualism in the Upaniṣads
and Prof. Radhakrishnan is right when he says: "The
Śāṅkya dualism is repugnant to the Upaniṣads."  

1. जन्माणक्य यत्थ॥ - B. S. 1.1.2.

2. खण्डसन्यासः । - B. S. 1.1.4.

3. The Philosophy of Upaniṣads

Radhakrishnan p. 58.
Brahman - as immanent and transcendent:

The Upanisadic passages describe Brahman as immanent and transcendent, and ascribe quite opposite characters to it. The Upanisads definitely propound only one ultimate Reality, which is Brahman. It is a genuine problem to explain the contradiction involved in the Upanisadic descriptions of nirguna and Saguna Brahma. The only alternative which comes to our mind is either to maintain that the Upanisads are full of contradictions, or to say that this contradictory statements were made from two different points of view. Of the alternatives mentioned above, the first one however is not appropriate, for it does not resolve the contradiction, but simply retains them. So the other alternative should be considered. The 'nirguna' concept of Brahman can be explained by the 'pārārthika (Ultimate) standpoint, while the 'Saguna' concept

1. तावानस्य यहिमा ततै ज्ञात्याः भूपुर्णः पादैश्वय्र स्वामुलानि जिष्पादव्याप्ती चिकित्तिः। - Chan. Up. III. 12.6.

2. इन्हे वायु भृगुर्वी रच्ये श्रुत श्रवणेच च चतुर्य च च तयां च च चित्त च च यां च च च च च च च। - उप. II. 3.1.
can be explained by 'Vyāvahārika (empirical) standpoint.
So, there can be no contradiction between the 'Saguna Brahman' and 'nirguna Brahman'.

Jīvatma:

The Upaniṣads shift the centre of interest from the Vedic gods to the Self of man. The individual Soul is different from the body, the sense organs, manas and buddhi. The body is the chariot, which is guided by the Self, which is the Charioteer. The intellect is the driver. The mind is the bridle. The sense organs are the horses.1 The individual Soul is a knower, enjoyer and active agent.2 It is imperishable and immortal. It does not perish when its body dies. It has no birth and death.

1. जीवत्मानं रथस्य विद्विषः शरीरं स्थितेऽवेदः ॥

2. मोक्षां भोग्यं प्रेतिकरः समुद्वा सर्वं प्राप्तं तिबिः ् कृत्यते ॥ भवे, १, १२

3. न जात्वे मिट्टे का विपश्चिन्तनां कुतुहलेन बमुख करितु ॥

अधो नित्यः: शाश्वतोऽयुगे न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥

कठ. १.२.१८
The individual Soul has four conditions (i) In the waking condition, He is called the Visva, who knows and enjoys gross external objects through the external sense organs. (ii) In the condition of dream, He is called a Taijasa, who knows and enjoys subtle internal objects or cognitions through manas (iii) In the condition of dreamless sleep. He is called the Prajña, who is one homogeneous consciousness and bliss. In this state he does not apprehend external objects and internal cognitions. (iv) In the fourth ecstatic condition, he is called the ātman, who knows neither external objects nor internal cognitions, and is neither consciousness nor unconsciousness.

The relation between the individual Soul & Universal Soul:

The jivatma has been clearly identified with the self of the supreme being in the Chandogya Upanisad and

1. सै द्वेक्ष्रक्षयमात्मा क्षो सौंक्षयमात्मा चुष्णात । जागरित्यथानां
   बलिप्रश्न सप्ता ...... माणिक्य उप. 2 to 10
2. कैन शीक्षात्मा तुप्रविष्य नामस्ये व्यक्तवाणीति ।
   ह्रां, उप. वि. 3. 2.
held as eternally identical with the Brahman, the ground of all Jivatman, though being limited in body, is by nature free from bondage. The experiences of pleasure and pain, are the fruits of the action. The Jivatman’s attainment of Brahman is the realization of its own nature and nothing more. The notion of diversity is based upon misapprehension. As soon as the adjuncts disappear the individual Soul realizes its own true nature. The Upanisadic seers have shown a clear distinction between the individual Soul and the Universal Soul.

The individual Soul experiences the fruits of actions and feels happiness or misery while the atman, i.e. the supreme reality, looks on as an indifferent spectator. When jīva recognizes the true nature of the Brahman, it

1. बाकाशी ये नान नामरुपयौनिन्दिता है
   यदंतारा त्वाः तद्वृत्ति स जात्मा प्रज्ञापते ।
   - हा, उप. VIII. 14.1.

2. ब्रह्म सत् ब्रह्मायंति ॥
   - कृष्ण, उप. IV. 4.6.

3. हवा सुरुग्नाः सुकृमा शलायत समानं कृत्यं परिष्कारते ।
   तयोरस्य: पिपङल स्वाद्वस्त्तमज्ञनयों भिन्नाभिन्नाति ॥
   - मू. III. 1.1.
becomes free from worldly bondage and attachment.

Ignorance is the cause of bondage and transmigration.

True knowledge is the cause of liberation from bondage realizing the non-difference, jiva becomes one with him.

The individual soul, when realizes Brahman, gets divested of its names and forms and attains him, as rivers merges into the sea, leaving their different names and forms. So long as the knowledge of duality persists, the individual self sees another thing, smells another thing, hears another thing, speaks another thing, knows another thing, as it were. But when it realizes the atman in all things, the distinction between it and the

1. ब्रह्मविद ब्रह्म भवति । - उप. ३१. २. ६

2. यथा नयं स्यन्दर्शना: समुदायस्तं गच्छन्ति नामरूपे विशय ।
   तथा विद्वानामरूपादिविश्वकर्मणां परात्परं पुरुषशुपेति दिव्यम्।
   - ३२. उप. ३१. २. ६
'atman vanishes, and the one atman shines as the knower.  

In the Brhadāraṇyaka Upanisad, it has been stated that,  
when clay is known, everything made out of clay becomes  
known, for it is only name and form, the reality being  
only clay. Similarly, when Brahman, the cause, is known  
everything being a mere effect of Brahman, becomes  
known, for the effects are only names and forms, the  
reality is Brahman alone. The notion of diversity is  
based upon misconceptions and hence is only apparent.  

The creation of the world:  
The earliest efforts of man, giving a philosophical  
explanation of the world, receive an appropriate

1. यत्र हि दृश्यतिम नवति तदिति इतरं पश्यति तदिति इतरं विज्ञाति  
तदिति इतरं प्रकाशति तदिति हतामिवति तदिति इतरं मूठे  
तदिति इतरं विज्ञाति यया वा वस्त्र सबमात्मावासूक्तिम्  

2. वाजाराम्यं विकारां नामपूर्वं कल्ले तु मृक्षिका इद्यय सत्त्व  

- Brihaspati, XIV. 4. 1
treatment in the hands of Upanisadic seers. From the vedic period, the universe is described as a part of Purusa or Virāt Purusa in a Purusa sūkta of Rgveda.1

In the Nāsadīyasūkta, we have an account of the creation of the world. The vedic seers express feeling of wonder: from which source, the world may have been formed? The same point has been dealt with at length in the upanisadic period.

The universe is maintained to be the manifestation of the supreme being, and is completely identified with Brahman. At some places atman is sung of as the

---

1. "From him was born virāt and from virāt Purusa.

He, as soon as born, became manifested, and afterwards (created the earth (and) then corporeal farms"—Rgveda X 7 6.5. Rgvedasamhita, Tr. by H.M. Wilson, Poona Ashtekar Co. ed.1928, p.166.

2. Rgveda : Nāsadīyasūkta, X 11-1 to 4 p. 236.

3. पुरुष एवं विश्व कथे तथो विश्व परामर्श । - मृ. उप. I1.१.१०

क्रृष्ण कथे विश्वार्थं वरिष्ठं । - मृ. उप. I1. २. ६९

4. सर्वे हृदयः ब्राह्मणायमाणं ब्रह्म । - मा. उप. २.
āyatana or the mūla, or the pratisthā of the entire Samsāra. It is through the Brahman, that the universe, in all its aspects, appears to be existant.

In the Māndukya Upanisad, the ātman is said to be the cause of the universe. In the Taitiriya Upanisad, we hear of the emergence of 'Sat' out of 'asat'. We are told that before the creation of the universe, there was nothing whatsoever present. Elsewhere we are assured that ātman was existing before creation.

1. सन्युक्तमात्राच्छ सन्युक्तः सोप्रभेदः सवर्णः प्रजाः सदायत्नः
2. यत्यार्थं भ्राः धारम वत्र विश्वं निधित्व माति शुभः । - अ. I. II. 2, 6
3. एष वैश्वर्यं एष सवैश्वर्याः एण्डुराय एण्डुराय योolute: सवैश्वर्य प्रभावायामहैं हि सूक्तानां II - याणुकय उपनिष. 6
4. अयोध्यर्वस्त्र वासीर्व । ततो वे धर्मायत । कविकार्यं
   विषयशुरुह । - ब. उप. भ. 7
5. नैवेद्विजनाग्रावासीर्व । II - श्रु. उप. II. 2. 9
6. बाल्वेदवस्त्र वासीर्व । - श्रु. उप. II. 8. 7 ; I. 8. 19
The creation of the universe in all its aspects, is attributed to Brahman by means of a spectacular drsya. 1

Sometimes of the creation is attributed to the volition of the omnipotent atman there the atman is stated to have become many through penance. 2 At another place, atman is said to have differentiated the undistinguished original matter into different names and forms and thus created the cosmos. 3 The Svetasvatara, a later upanisad, advocates theism, and refers to the

1. स योगीनामाधिमसनातनाः परवान्गे: चुदाः विस्पुलिको

2. संज्ञायत्वा श्रवणेदेत् स स प्रवर्त्तन तस्माद

3. विभेदेव्याकृतमासीस्तं क्षणरूपम् व्याकरणवाच्योऽस्मायनं

.... - ब्रह्म. उप. II, 6, 7
creation of the world by God out of māyā. ¹ In Chandogya Upanisad, we find the theory of triplication, and quintuplication. ²

Here, we find in the upanisads, the roots of the theories of Brahma - parināmavāda (the doctrine which maintains that Brahma evolves into the world), and Brahma-vivartavāda (the doctrine which maintains that Brahma does not change into but merely appears as the world).

Māyā:

The word māyā is used in the Rgveda, where it has the meanings 'supernatural powers' 'cunning' 'mysterious will power' etc. Sāyana, usually explains it as prajñā, mental power', 'guile' ³ Nighantū, an earlier known

---

¹ Chand. Up. VI. 3.3
² Chand. Up. VI. 3.3
³ Sāyana : Rg. 1.11.7
dictionary of vedic words, gives माया as one of the synonyms of 'prasna', 'intelligence'.

In the upanisadic literature, the word माया is first found in the स्वेताःवताः upanisad with the meaning - 'cosmic illusion'.

Secondly, in the same upanisad the word माया is used to describe God, a powerful Being who creates this world by his powers, while the other, namely the individual soul is described as bound down by माया.

Thirdly in the same upanisad, the word माया is used to state that only by meditation upon God, by union with him, and by entering into this Being, that at the end, there is the cessation of the विश्वमयाः.

---

1. कैल: कैल: चिंता कूल: अः धी: दी भावा कूलस
बहिः त्वत व्रजाः: I - निर्वतः 3, 8

2. माया: तु प्रकृति निपान्यायिन्युः मदनः - क्वी, उप. IV, 10

3. विश्वमया: तु विश्वमयाः तस्मान्याः माया
अनिःगुरुः: I - क्वी, उप. IV, 6

4. तस्मान्याः यो ज्ञाति तत्त्वमात्रेऽपि विश्वमयाः
निःस्विद: I - क्वी, उप. 1, 10.
Again in the Praśnopanishad, we are told that we cannot reach the world of Brahman unless we have shaken off the crookedness in us, the falsehood in us, the ignorance (maya) in us. Of course the distinction between the maya that envelops Isvara, and the avidyā that envelops jīva is not clearly explained by the upanisadic seers. Only the later vedāntins have clearly distinguished between them with logical arguments.

After having discussed the meaning of the term maya, occurring in various upanisads, it will be interesting if we explain here the term avidyā.

Avidyā:

The concept of avidyā seems however to be present in the upanisads. The term ‘avidyā’ denotes ignorance or misconception of reality. The Isopaniṣad tells us that truth is veiled in this universe by a vessel of

---

1. तैरां खसो विरजो बललोको न देशु जिकेकृति न माया
   नै वैलि । - प्रल. उप. ।. १६
   The word maya is directly used in almost in the sense of an illusion.
gold and it invokes the grace of God to lift up the
golden vessel and allow the truth to be seen. Here
we have the conception of avaraṇa, on which later
vedāntis build their arguments. Avidyā is a means by
which one crosses death and attains immortality by
vidyā, death, while vidyā leads to immortality. The
kathopanisad declares that people living in ignorance,
thinking themselves wise are like the blind, led by
the blind, in search of reality, which they would easily
gain if they would have lodged themselves in knowledge
instead of ignorance. Mundakopanisad compares
ignorance with a knot, which a man has to untie before

1. विद्यमेव पार्श्रण तत्ववाचितिः मुखः ।
   तत्वः पूजनापानः सत्यमाय दृष्टास् । - हैस. उप. १५
2. वाक्यमा मूल्ये तीत्त्बी विषयः मृतमः । - हैस. उप. २
   क्षणंति: प्रत्यविशति येद्विषयाप्पस्तेः । - कृष्ण. उप. IV. ६, १०
3. दृष्टे मेब विपरीते विषयकी विषयः यथा च विशेषिति ज्ञाता ||८॥
   वाक्याः आन्तिरो ज्ञानात्: स्वर्णीयवंज पद्मायां मन्यमाणाः ।
   कर्मणामाणाः: परिशेष्टः मृत्यु हन्मविव मीयताम् यथा ||९॥
   - कृष्ण. I. २. ४, ५.
he gets possession of the self in the recesses of his own heart. In the Chandogya Upanishad, we are told that knowledge is power and ignorance impotence. The cover of untruth hides the ultimate truth from us, just as the surface of the earth hides from us the golden treasure that is hidden inside it. In Mundakopanishad, we are told about two kinds of vidya.

Thus, the most significant terms, 'maya' and 'avidya' later on came to acquire various meanings and it is hardly justified if a single sense is

1. एवं वैद निलितं गुहायाम |।
कैे विषयार्धिन्यं विकिर्कितं सर्वम् || - मुंडक उप. II. 1.10

2. नानां वेद विश्वं वेदिकां च यदैव विधयते करीति श्रुत्योपनिषदः तदेव शीर्षविद भक्तिः || श्रीम. उप. I. 1.10.

3. इमां स्तुत्यन्त अनुतं निपां; तेन अत्यन्तो नर्तमपिन्नातुः वेद दिश्यन्ति निलितं बलेवतः उपेशपरिष्कर्यं चंद्रेतुः || - चाह. उप. VII. 3. 1 to 3.

4. द्वै विद्येन्द्र वेदित्वे इति द रम्य यद्वशेषादिव वदित परात्र चेतावपरां च || - मुंडक. I. 1.4.
attributed to it. In the growth of the vedāntic thought the upanisads supply the raw material out of which the human intellect built different vedāntic Schools of thought. They do not contain thorough and systematic treatment of the philosophical problems elucidating the philosophical conceptions with logical arguments. Inspite of the curious intermixture of heterogeneous matter there seems to be in them an unmistakable inclination towards the major tenets of the advaita schools of thought. Śaṅkara the propounder of advaita monism, elaborated the ideas of the Upanisads while building up his system of kevalādvaita.

*Bhagavadgītā*

Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā is not only famous in the east, but also in the west, for its excellences regarding the poetical and highly philosophical values. Though heterogeneous in content, it reveals the highest truth in a lucid and simple style. It does not only reflect the fundamental truth revealed in the Upanisads, but also clothes it in a new garb. There is nothing new
about the ideal of the ultimate goal and the way of its realisation, yet it revitalize\$ them in a beautiful manner.

\textbf{Atman:}

The fundamental metaphysical teaching of the Gita is based on a firm declaration\footnote{Gita II.16.} of the unreal there is no being, and of the real there is no non-being.\footnote{Gita II.21.} The \textit{atman} is described as indestructible, eternal and avyaya.\footnote{Gita II.20.} It is unborn and old. It is neither born nor does it die.\footnote{Gita II.20.} The \textit{atman} is immortal and everlasting. Just as a person casts off worn-out garments and puts on new ones, so does the soul casts off worn-out bodies and enters into others that are

\begin{enumerate}
\item नासली विष्णु मातृ नामावो विष्णु पति
\item कैवाक्षासिं नित्यं य समस्मवयस्मु।
\item न जाते पिताः कैवाक्षासिं भूत्वा पुत्राः का न सूयमः। अर्थो नित्यः शाश्वानवं पुराणी न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे॥
\end{enumerate}
new. The weapons do not hurt the soul, the fire
cannot burn it, the water cannot wet it and the wind
cannot dry it. It is immovable and ancient. It is
unmanifest, unthinkable, and immutable. The whole
world is pervaded by him through his subtle form.
It is described as both material and efficient cause
of the world and embodied souls. It is the seed of
all creatures. Though it is eternally pure and
autonomous it erroneously identifies itself with ego,
and regards itself as an active agent.

Thus in the Gītā the problem of ultimate reality is handled from a subjective as well as objective angle. It differentiates the permanent source of the world from its impermanent manifestations, and designates the former as aksara and the latter as Ksara. The aksara aspect of the world is called Prakṛti. Aksara is dependent on a higher truth. But the ultimate reality is neither the ksara nor the aksara Prakṛti, but Brahman, known as Puruṣottama in its personified form. The ultimate

1. पुरुषोत्तम ज्ञानानि गुणं: कर्मचिकितस्व सवैः।
बहुः कार्यविभात्तमा कर्मविहितं मन्यते ॥ - गीता III. 27

2. ज्ञ्यातकाद्यकथाय: सवाः प्रभक्ष्यकण्याम् ॥
राज्ञ्यां गच्चही प्रवृत्तीन्ते तत्रावृत्तिवस्तिः ॥ - गीता VIII. 18

3. द्वाविधैः पुरुषाः लोके पुरुषवाचार एव वा ॥
चास्त्र सम्बन्धे दुःस्ताति हृदयश्चयोहार उच्चते।। - गीता XV. 16

4. उच्छः पुरुषास्त्वः पर्वतमेल्युक्तः।
यो लोकांन्याविभिन्न विभिन्नाय ईश्वरः।। - गीता XV. 17

5. यस्मात्तत्स्तत्तेव त्रिस्वर्गराच्छि चौतमः।
कृष्णमृग्व लोके वै च प्रसिद्ध: पुरवषोक्तः।। - गीता XV. 18
reality i.e. Purusottama is beginningless and changeless by character, it dwells in all beings and animates this play of finite existence.  

The individual self:

The individual soul is said to be the ātma of the Lord. It has also been known as kṣetrajña; for, he knows the kṣetra i.e. the objective world, which is identified with the Supreme Reality. The body, with all its accessories, physical and psychical, is but a cloak, which he takes on and off. He is the knower of the object hence is called as kṣetrajña. The combination of the body or the psychical apparatus is formed for the sake of, because if there does not exist ātman, the forma-

---

1. श्रेष्ठं यज्ञदामयमि यज्ञात्यादृष्टांपं सुलभः ।
   कामादित्त्वं ब्रह्म न सवर्णायत्वं च। गीता ।

2. सङ्करैः सृष्टिलोकैः सृष्टिक्षुण्यं तिष्ठति। गीता
   मैत्राष्ठी जीवलोके जीवूर्व: सतान:। गीता ।

3. इत्यादिरूपेऽक्षेत्रं ज्ञातसमत्वाय भयं ।
   एवं विचित्रं तु प्राहु: जो ज्ञस्त हितं तत्वं। गीता ।

4. Ibid.
tion of body and cannot be attributed to the body, for they are non-sentient. The psychical apparatus would have no purpose whatsoever. Whole drama of rise, growth and decay belongs\(^1\) to the prakrti, which furnishes the atman with the physical and psychical instruments. The atman is ever free from the blemishes, inhabits the body and is akarta\(^2\). Having been misguided by the wrong impression of self's identity with the Prkrti, the individual soul considers himself as doer and experience.\(^3\) This failure of recognition of the self in its pure nature is the cause of \(\textit{Samsāra}\).\(^4\)

---

1. \(\text{प्रृवत्येव च कर्मौणि विज्ञानानि सैंकेश: ॥- शीवा।} \quad \text{XIII.29}\)

2. \(\text{कांक्षिक्ष्य नौनूणत्वत्वावस्तः स्मध्य: ॥} \quad \text{शशीवास्योपि कौन्तेय न करोति न लिप्यते ॥-शीव।} \quad \text{XIII.32.}\)

3. \(\text{सकैवास्यथतो दैव कथात्मा नौपलिप्यते ॥- शीवा।} \quad \text{XIII.33.}\)

4. \(\text{प्रृवत्येव विज्ञानास्य सुन्दरिणि सैंकेश: ॥} \quad \text{बहुश्चार विज्ञानानि कल्यंमिति कन्यैः ॥ - शीव।} \quad \text{III.27.}\)

4. \(\text{कामेत्यावलिते हैतु: प्रृवतिरुच्यते ।} \quad \text{पुरुष: सुझास्वानं मोक्तवते हेतुरूच्यते ॥-शीव।} \quad \text{XIII.21.}\)
But, he who sees the ultimate reality seated equally in all beings and unperishing with the perishing, sees truly.¹

**Purusottama:**

Gita transforms the impersonal Absolute of the Upanishads into a supreme godhead known as Purusottama. This conception of ultimate reality in the form of a supreme divinity is the most remarkable contribution of Śaṅkaṇa Śaṅkara vedānta. This universe is nothing more than the prakṛti of Purusottama.² Prakṛti is but a sakti of him,³ and evolves, subject to will and supervision,⁴ into the universe.⁵ The individual

---

1. समीपत्यमातमां सम्मशानि चात्मनि ।
   हैदारै योगवायत्तम स्मृत संप्रदेशः ।। - गीता. VI.29.

2. भूमिकायांकश्च्यो माया: से भो बुद्धिवर्त च ।
   बर्जार हल्यते भिक्षु प्रयुतिरस्वयम ॥ - गीता. VII. 4
   - अप्रेयमनित्वकान्यां प्रयुति विद्विच मे परावः ।

3. जीवकुशा महावाभी स्त्रद चतुह्रते । जग्गु ॥ - गीता. VII. 5.

4. देवी ह्यावा गुणायणी मम माया दुर्लभयाः ॥ - गीता.

5. मया,भूमिकाय प्रयुति: हृद्ये सत्तर्चयः ॥ - गीता. IX. 10.
so-pat is but an āmsa of the same eternal principle. He dwells in the hearts of all. Though every thing is born out of Him, He is affected by nothing. He is the pratiṣṭhā not only of the universe, but also of the eternal Brahman.

The concept of Puruṣottama is absent in the upaniṣad, which we see in the Gītā. The concept of Puruṣottama is more important for devotional and religious purposes than that of the Brahman. In fact, both the aspects of i.e. of Brahman and Puruṣottama are of one and the same reality.

1. पमेवांशौ चीकलौकेः कीचुकः सनाजः || गीता xv. 7.
2. बहमात्मा गुडाकेश बहमात्मस्वस्तिः || गीता x. 20.
3. प्रमुखविव कथाविन ज्ञानानानि सवाभिः || गीता xii. 30.
4. ब्रह्मण हि प्रतिष्ठामुलस्त्रायत्यस्य च || गीता xiv. 27.

These are the primary verses that discuss the concept of Puruṣottama in relation to Brahman.
According to Gita the world is not illusory. It is an outcome of Purusottama's amśa. But what is exactly meant by the term 'amśa' is not so clear.

**Emancipation:**

Gita presents three ways leading to the salvation. They are the jñāna-yoga, or the way of knowledge, Bhaktiyoga or the way of devotion and karmayoga or the way of action. These three paths emphasize the different aspects of spiritual disciples in accordance with the temperaments of the aspirants. An enlightened intellect, full of philosophic wisdom, a pure heart replete with love and a holy will strenuous in action go together. Jñāna, karma and Bhakti, understood in their proper senses bring peace and consolation to the heart of man. Hence bhakti too like niskēma karma can be performed only by a true jñānān.

Liberation, the highest status beyond good and evil is the supreme goal of human being. In Gita, the highest god is depicted as 'the end of perfection'.

---

1. परस्मानौति यूक्तम्: | गीता - | III. 19.
the eternal state¹, 'the path from which there is no return,'² 'perfection,'³ 'the highest rest'⁴, 'the entering into God'⁵, 'contact with God,'⁶ 'rest is Brahman,'⁷ 'translation in Godhood.'⁸

In the state of release, duality disappear and the released soul becomes one with the Eternal self. It is a condition beyond all modes and qualities, impassive, free and at peace. As long as the body

---

1. शाक्ति पदमविसु । गीता कीत । XVIII.56.
2. गच्चत्युताणाराष्ट्राणि शानवुष्किंलयमः ॥ गीता - v. 17.
3. पदासरिप्र कपालिणि कुवीतसिद्धवस्थिः ॥ गीता - XII.10.
4. परां शान्तिः - गीता IV. 39
5. त्यस्तव देहं प्रास्तेन वैति माति माति ॥ गीता IV.9.
6. जे शानस्त्रेष्यमः अस्वरुपनाचित: । मद्यामवतः । गीता IV.24.10.
8. ज्ञनस्पति: । - गीता VI.28.
9. रणा श्राद्विभिषितः ।...ज्ञनवृणूणमृत्विलिग्नातिः गीता-II.72.
10. ज्ञनवृणूणमृत्विलिग्नातिः । - गीता - v.17.24.
clings to the soul, it acts. When body falls for ever,
like a discarded shell, the individual soul becomes one
with the universal soul.

The individual soul, having realised the identity
with the eternal soul, possesses the body without
getting attached to it. This condition is called
Jīvanamukti.

Mayā and avidyā:

The doctrine of māya assumed a clearer aspect
in the Gītā. It is described as being of the nature of
gunas.¹ At another place ‘māya’ is used in a sense of
‘influence of rajas and tamas’,² because, it has
been said that the demoniac tendencies are generated
under the preponderating influence of rajas and tamas,
lastly it is said that God resides in the heart of all
living beings and moves them by māya.³ Māya is described

1.  देवी पृथ्वी कुण्यमयी का माया दुर्लभ्या ।
   गामेव ये प्रपन्ते मायाकैहां तरन्ति ते ॥ गीताः । VII.14

2.  Ibid

3.  ईश्वरः सकृतान्तः प्रदेशेनैव तिष्ठति ।
   प्राप्यस्य भूत्वा य-वर्त्तति माया ॥ गीताः । XVIII.61.
as divine, consisting of the three gunas and of the character of śakti visesa of Purusottama. It deludes the ignorant and veils from them the eternal reality lying beneath the samsāra.  

Māyā is the śakti (power), hinted in the upanisads is the doctrine that though which the infinite turns itself into infinite and yet remains unchanged; this doctrine comes to be associated with the Gītā conception of the ultimate reality. Being the power of supreme divinity, the māyā veils the supreme truth moreover it is powerful instrument through which the infinite turns into the infinite and fulfils its inscrutable motives, This is somewhat similar to the sāmkhya doctrine of Prakṛti. Like the Prakṛti of sāmkhya is dependent while the māyā of Gītā is also dependent upon the supreme divinity.

1. न मा दुष्किलो मूढः प्रकृति नराश्मा।

पाययाध्युतत्त्वं बाहुः प्रकृतिः शिल।। गीता- VII-15.
The conception of avidyā is used in much more wider sense than that of the Upanisads and Sāṃkhya doctrine. The word avidyā is used in the sense of 'ignorance' or 'misconception' in Gītā.¹ It is produced by tamas,² and it produces tamas in turn.³

Conclusion:

The Upanisadic doctrine referred to here and there in the Gītā does not remain monistic but advances its position towards realism and dualism. The passages of Upanisads describe the single Absolute, under the triple aspects viz. Brahman, Ātman and the world, without perhaps any idea of mutual distinction among

---

1. ज्ञानेन तु तत्सान्य येषां नात्मिकोऽत्मनात्मनापि भास्करः || गीता - पृ 5-15.
2. ज्ञानेन तु तद्वस्त्यो येषां नात्मिकोऽत्मनात्मनापि भास्करः || गीता - पृ 11-16.
3. तीर्थाद्यात्मानं तत्सान्य येषां मायात्मनात्मनापि भास्करः || X-11.
4. अन्यात्मानं तत्सान्य येषां मायात्मनात्मनापि भास्करः || गीता - पृ 11-16.
5. गतज्ञानेन मिति प्राप्तमानं यद्वस्त्योऽत्मनात्मतः || XVI-11.

---

20. तमसः फलः ||
30. तमसः तु ज्ञानां भविष्यति ||

---
The Gita exhibits them as separate entities, the atman and the physical world are dependent upon Brahman, the highest principle. The physical universe is not traced to Brahman as it seems to be in the Upanisads, but to the other source, namely Prakrti, in the Gita.

The different currents of thoughts refined and reconciled in Gita are the vedic cult of sacrifice, the Upanisadic teachings on the transcendent Brahman, the Bhagavata theism the sankhya dualism and the yoga meditation. In short, the Gita tries to synthesise thoughts which had come down to it through the ages.

---

1. पद्मावलिकौ कृति: \textit{स्मृते संग्रासम्} ।
\textit{हृदयालेख कौन्ते जगदिशपिरङ्की} ॥

- \textit{गीता - IX - 10}.
The Brahmasūtras

The Brahma-sūtra of Bādarāyana holds a unique position in the literature pertaining to the exposition of the philosophy of the Upanisads. It is also called the vedānta-sūtra, or Śāriraka-sūtra. The content of this work has been divided into four adhyāyas, each adhyāya again is divided into four pādas, and each of the pādas into several adhikaranaḥ. Each adhikaranaḥ consists of sūtras according to the nature of the point it deals with.

1. The philosophy of Vedānta takes its stand on the Upanisads the Brahma-sūtra and we may also say the Bhagavadgītā. The Upanisads are śrutī - a part of the Vedas. The Brahma-sūtra clarifies the meaning of the Upanisadic statements. The Bhagavadgītā is a part of the Mahābhārata. As a Smṛti, it supports śrutī and also clarifies its meaning.

2. The body is śārira, what resides in it is the Śāriraka, the self. Ratnaprabha - a commentary on the next page...
The sūtra is in the form of an appropriate statement. Because of the pithiness of the sūtras they have given rise to a bewildering diversity of interpretations in the later ages, and all the schools of Vedānta, though differing from one another in important matters claim to represent what, they thought, Bādarāyaṇa himself said.

Contd....

Brahma-sūtra Sāṅkarabhāṣya holds that the Brahma-sūtra is called sārīraka as it deals with the Brahman-hood of the individual soul. According to him, Brahman is embodied sārīra, since the sentient individual soul and the insentient world constitute the body (sārīra) of the Lord.
from those of the cause. The world was actually not produced afresh or in other words it is not something new that was created out of an absolutely non-existent state, but it can be said that in some sense it already existed and was imminent in the cause, it is not an entity independent of Brahman, yet it does not contaminate the nature of the cause at the time of dissolution. According to Bādarāyana, the order of creation is as in the chāndogya text. Brahman at each stage enters the successive products and enables them to be the causes of the next successive products.

1. न विक्रियार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थ तथात्म च शब्दार्थ || B.S.II.1.4.
2. अशुभेशाशुशास्त्रेण सैन्य ध्यातार्थेन सैन्यशास्त्रार्थ || B.S.II.1.16.
3. अशुभेशाशुशास्त्रेण सैन्य ध्यातार्थेन सैन्यशास्त्रार्थ || B.S.II.1.7.
4. अशुभेशाशुशास्त्रेण सैन्य ध्यातार्थेन सैन्यशास्त्रार्थ || B.S.II.1.8.
5. तदनिष्ठामैदैव तु तत्त्वार्थार्थ || B.S.II.3.13.
It seems from the Brahma-sūtra that Bādarāyana accepts trīyavrtiṣṭi. ¹

The concept of the individual soul can be determined clearly and definitely from the Brahma-sūtra. The individual soul is distinct from intellect, mind, sense-organs and life breath. It is also distinct from both the gross physical body and the subtle transmigrating body. The individual soul is minute in size. It resides in the abode of the heart, and dwells along with the Lord the creator, from whom it

¹. संसारतिथिज्ञिः सत्त्वान्तिकृत् उपदेशात् ॥ B.S.II.4.20
². विज्ञानात्मकविश्वास्य प्रामाण्यसंस्कृत शास्त्रकोष ॥ B.S.III.3.32
³. तत् संसारतिथिज्ञानिकृत् उपदेशात् ॥ B.S.II.4.17
⁴. विज्ञानविश्वासी धाराविनिमित्तविनिरस्तः प्रामाण्यसंस्कृत ॥ B.S.III.2.10.
⁵. नायनपद्धातीम् संसारतिथिज्ञानिकृत ॥ B.S.III.3.21.
⁶. विज्ञानविश्वासी धाराविनिमित्तविनिरस्तः प्रामाण्यसंस्कृतिः ॥ B.S.III.3.24.
is a distinct entity. 1 Badarāyana does not himself mention that the individual soul is related to the Higher Brahman like a drop to the ocean, or sparks to the fire. An individual soul is a doer of action. 2 It is immortal and liable to transmigration from life to life, 3 unless and until it is able to win its salvation through proper knowledge and discipline. An individual soul becomes one with the Brahman when he enters the nādis during the deep-sleep, and returns back at the awakening.

1. -उद्वन्द्ववादिविका मनोक्षी: || B.S.I.2.21 -
2. -रक्षसवानन्दा सुम्बाण्य: || B.S.II.3.22
3. -नात्पातित्तिकेष्ठवाच ताम्य: || B.S. II-3.17 -प्रेमायणशास्त्र: || B.S. II-3.18
4. -ब्रह्मपालिख हस्ति क्वाश्चम्यवाच || B.S. I-3.12
5. -वन्याशृष्टि परामश: || B.S. I-3.20
6. -परमिविणामादु विरूध्दल ततो वास्तव कृष्णप्रक्ष्याम? || B.S. III-2.5
7. कल्क शास्त्राध्याक्षाः || B.S.II-3.33.
8. -उद्वन्द्ववादिविका मनोक्षी: || B.S. II-3.19.
9. -संपरिष्कारत्व: प्रक्षानिनिजनामाव्याह || B.S. III-1.1.
10. संपरिष्कारत्व: प्रक्षानिनिजनामाव्याह || B.S. III-1.13.
11. -तदनन्तर्गतानां || B.S.III-2.7.
Bedārayāna, in one of his sūtras regards the jīva as an 'ābhāsa' of ātman. Here he may be said to foreshadow the theory of pratibimba-vāda. But at another place, he consider the jīvatman to be an 'aṁśa' of the ātman. Here also some feel that there is a glimpse of the Avachcheda-vāda of later times. But Bedārayāna may be intending to say that the jīva is a miniature but real copy of Brahma and is a part of him in as much as he cannot be separate from him.

The sūtrakārā do not give any clear idea of the conception of māyā which came to occupy an important place later on and held a unique position in the field of kevalādvaita vedānta. The terms 'māyā' and 'aṁidyā' faintly hinted at in the Upaniṣads, receive little attention at the hands of Bedārayāna. The terms 'avidyā' or 'ajñāna' are conspicuously absent in the five

1. बामाक एव च || B.S.II. 3.50.
2. बशी नानाबायपदेशावत्नाया चापि दाशकिवादित्वम् चिन म् ||
   B.S.II-3.43.
hundred sūtras. The term 'māyā' occurs only in one of the sūtras. It is very striking that this particular concept hinted at by the Upanisadic seers, does not crystallise into a theory in the hands of Bādarāyana. The whole topic of 'संस्कारिणम्' (III.2 to 6) treats of the soul in the dream state. And the word 'māyā' is used there in the sense of an 'unsubstantial appearance.'

According to Bādarāyana, the śrutī is the only source of knowledge of Brahman, and there is no scope for inference. He considers that gods like man have a right to study pure Brahmavidyā. Like Jaimini, he does not acknowledge the right of śūdra for seeking Salvation through knowledge of Brahman.

1. पायामात्रतु काल्याणामिविग्नायामप्रवतवान् ॥ B.S.III.2.3
2. हूतेत्तु शब्दमृद्धवात् ॥ B.S.II-1.27
3. युक्तेः शब्दान्तराश्च ॥ B.S.II-1.18
4. परं तु बाजरायणीशिष्य हि ॥ B.S.I-3.33
5. बुधस्य तदनाशुस्कन्तकालविक्षुण्णो मृथे हि ॥ B.S.I-3.34.
Bādarāyana frequently refers to the Vedas by using words like śāmanāya, śamanāna, Upaniṣad, Dārsana, Śāstra etc. Sometimes he uses the words Śāsti, eke, uktam, etareṣaḥ and refers to different Vedic Śākhas by ubhaye, ekesam etc. He has used direct Vedic words in the some of his Śūtras. This shows his deep and thorough knowledge of the Veda. In other words, Bādarāyana's Brahma-Sūtra is intimately connected with the Vedas in general and the Upaniṣads in particular inasmuch as the Brahma-Sūtras are meant to give an unambiguous interpretation of certain Upaniṣadic passages, the meaning of which is not immediately clear.

We also have in the Brahma-Sūtra, the criticisms of the current schools of philosophy of that age. The

1. शामन्ति कैसिस || B. S. I. 1032
   दस्त्राच | B.S. III. 1.20, 21; III.3.48; III.3.66; IV.3.13
   छुलीपतिन्याग्नित्यभिवानाच्च || B. S. I. 2.16.

2. गतरेषां चानुपलब्धे || B. S. II. 1.2,
   उपूपैमपिताके मावभनवक्षुकः || B. S. III. 4.42.

3. शास्त्रात्मको सृष्टि तुपैशी वामेत्तच् || B.S. I. 1.30.
   चौतंत्रिकशास्त्राः || B. S. I. 4.8. शास्त्रात्मकतपयं
   चौतंत्रिकशास्त्राः || B. S. III. 3.1.
cārya. According to Śaṅkara, the Brahma-sūtrakāra strung together all the philosophical passages of the Upaniṣads.

The Opinions noted by Bādarāyana:

Just as Pāṇini has mentioned 'वाक्यमणि' and 'विपिलि's' views in his 'Aṣṭādhyāyī', Bādarāyana also has mentioned the names as well as the opinions of several teachers in his work. They are Jaimini, Āśmārathya, Bādri, Audulomi, Kāśakṛtsna, Kārṣṇājini, and Ātreya. The name of Audulomi occurs in the 'Mahābhāṣya' of Pāṭhījali on Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī. But, that Audulomi and the person mentioned'

---

1. वैकालवाक्यसमग्रायत्वात्नासृजनायाम् ॥ - B.S.I.1.2.
2. महत्त्वपूर्व्यः - मेल्लेयाः ॥ अधिकारः ६३४ ॥
3. विचित्वकालिकम् ॥ ५.२.३८ ॥

---

in the Brahmasūtra is the same person or the other is an unresolved question. We also do not know that the above Vedāntic teachers mentioned by Bādarāyaṇa, are his predecessors or contemporaries. The difference of views among these teachers were essentially in respect to the points like the nature of mokṣa ¹ and the need of Saṅnyāsa for the Spiritual aspirant ² and the relation of the jīva to Brahman. The author Bādarāyaṇa has mentioned two views other than his own.

Let us note the views regarding the Soul. Jaimini maintains that the Soul attains complete identity with the Supreme Being and hence partakes of all the divine attributes when freed from Sin etc. Audulomi on the other hand holds that the Soul, whose essential nature is Being, Thought & Bliss (i.e. Pure Brahman) becomes totally absorbed in pure Intelligence devoid of all dualistic conception. Up to the moment of emancipation

(being reached) the Soul and the highest Self are different. But the emancipated Soul is no longer different from the highest Self. Here Audulomi seems to be an advocate of the doctrine - Saîyabhêdavâda.

They also differ on the topic of yâva, îśmarathya regards the jîvas as partly different and partly non-different from Brahman, just as the sparks are partly different and partly non-different from the fire. Sparks are not absolutely non-different from the fire, for in that case, they could be distinguished neither from the fire, nor from one another. Similarly, the Jîvas are (also neither absolutely different from Brahman, because they both are of the nature of consciousness), not absolutely non-different from Brahman, because in that case, they could be distinguished neither from Brahman nor from one-another. The doctrine advocated by him is Bhedabhêda.

Audulomi regards the jîvas as different from Brahman, when they become impure due to their contact with the adjuncts, viz. body, sense organs manas and buddhi. But
he regards them non-different from Brahman, when they are divested of the limiting adjuncts as a result of right knowledge and meditation. The liberated jīva is non-different from Brahman. The bound jīva is different from Brahman. It loses its individuality and realizes its identity with Brahman in the State of liberation.

Kāśākṛṣṭsna holds that the non-modified Supreme Lord himself is the individual Soul. The jīva is not a product of the Supreme, it is non-different therefrom. At death, the Soul is not destroyed, because of its eternity and consciousness, which generate the nescience and cause the illusory difference between the Soul and the Supreme Self. Real knowledge destroys the knot of illusion and ignorance.

Śaṅkara has clearly endorsed the view of Kāśākṛṣṭsna, that the Soul of one who is in possession of the lower knowledge of Brahma goes after death to the lower Brahman and not to the highest Brahman itself. These instances clearly show that Śaṅkara was positively influenced by teachers like Kāśākṛṣṭsna and Bādari, the details of
whose views have been unfortunately lost to us.

While examining the views of his predecessors, and contemporaries, Bādarāyana has supported some and rejected the others. This indirectly gives a glimpse of his own philosophy. It is significant to note over here that Bādarāyana has supported the views of Kāśiṣṭhāna against the views of Āśmarthya and Auḍulomi. Āśmarthya means that an individual Soul is not entirely different from the highest Soul i. e. Brahman. But a certain relation of cause and effect is between them. He understands the identity of an individual and Brahman in terms of causality. And Auḍulomi holds that the difference and the non-difference of our individual Soul and the highest Soul depend respectively on the state of bondage and emancipation of the individual Soul. While Kāśiṣṭhāna

1. बायय्यो मयुरतिय कायंकृत-3
2. बायय्यो मयुरतिय कायंकृत-3
3. बायय्यो मयुरतिय कायंकृत-3

- B.S.B.I.4.22.
- Ibid.

- B.S.B.I.4.22.
maintains the absolute identity between the individual Soul and the highest Soul.

Bādarāyana has mentioned the view of Kāśākrtsna in the last Sūtra of the 'Vākyānveyādhikaraṇa' of the fourth pada of the first adhyāya. All the commentators of the 'Brahma-Sūtra' are of the opinion that as Bādarāyana has mentioned the view of Kāśākrtsna in the last Sūtra of the adhikaraṇa, so Bādarāyana supports the view of Kāśākrtsna; however the view of Kāśākrtsna is interpreted differently. For example, according to Śaṅkara, Kāśākrtsna believes in an absolute identity of the jīva and Brahman. While Rāmānuja holds that Kāśākrtsna is of the opinion that the word jīva denotes, Brahman itself which stays as Ātman in the jīvatman forming its

---

1. तत्र काश्चर्त्तनियम यतं श्रुत्रुपार्थयति गम्ये, प्रति पिपादितिष्ठ- 
ाधिलिङाच तत्कालिष्ठं शिल्पर्थिव्य:।

- Brahma-Sūtra Śāṅkarabhāṣya : I. 4.22.

body. Vallabha explains that Kāśakṛtsna is of the opinion that the jīva is only an avasthā of bhagawān and the words denoting the jīva are applied to Brahman.

Some other Vedāntins

Ānandagiri, a commentator on Śaṅkara’s Upanisadīc Bhāṣya, concentrates his thoughts on a quotation in Śaṅkara’s commentary on Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad Kārikā (2.32). He says that it has been taken from the writings of a person named Dravidācārya or Drāmidācārya. He, in his

1. स्वस्तीरूपैः जीवात्मन्यात्मकत्वाविषयो जीवात्मन्यात्मक अप्रकृतिप्रकरण-रूपिति काश्चित्त ज्ञातायो मन्यायेत वचम्। —


2. ब्रजक्षेत्राः अवलम्बतां सिद्दान्तत्वदलिताः। इविनवेदतवये वल्लकृत्वत्वमित्रप्रक्षिपितवरो त्वरस्य प्रत्येकति काश्चित्तायो मन्येत्वा।

- श्रीमद्भागवतपरायण १. ४.२२. निर्णयसागराशिक ६००४, पृ. ४१२-४१४.

3. श्लोकः — सिद्धः तु निपुष्ट्वकारू हवि वाँछमित्वां वृंदाय जनं देविरूपं तन्निविद्वाणसम्मतिः ब्रह्म॥

gloss on the Chāndogyopanisad-Bhāṣya speaks of a commentary on the Chāndogya by Dravidācārya. In the same gloss, it has been noted that Śāṅkara relied on Dravidācārya's statement for resolving the conflict between the Śruti and the Purāṇas as regards the time of Sunrise and sunset in the different regions of the world of the Gods.

Sarvāṇātman, in his 'Samkṣepaśārīraka' refers to two advaita teachers, the Vākyākāra, a person born in the

1. अपि पापृष्ठ वाणिज्यार्थि द्विवेद भाष्यं प्रणितं विष अनैति जायिवेत्स्वयं विद्यमयं नृति II भान्दास्र्रम

2. व्यापि बुद्धिविरोध स्मृतिपूर्णाय तथा व्याख्यानित्य परिसरां द्रिक्कलाव्रोहकं उपपादयति II - Ibid. p.146.

3. पूर्वीकासुपास्तेष्व सोंकोषनुराण्टिः किरुञ्च निकटं परिः प्रभवत् संस्कृतविष्णुविष्णुदेहाय उपस्तररस्तति वाक्याराः II

- सं जीवाशारिक - 3.220.

बच्चणम् मण्डली प्रत्येक प्रत्येक प्रत्येक श्रवण प्रायश्चित् मायापि मायापि; II

ब्राह्म सम यथे दिति निर्णयं कतुवदि सहोच्छले न सुभि: सुगुणदेवादि III

संहीपाशारिक - 3.226.
family of the Atris, and the Bhāsyakāra. The Viśistādvi-
vaita tradition identifies the former with Brahmanandin, known as Tanka, and the later as Dravidācārya. It is believed, that Dravidācārya wrote an extensive commentary on the Chandogyapānisad vārtika, consisting probably of the aphoristic vākyas of Brahmanandin.¹ (The Viśistādvai-
tins, however claim Dravidācārya for themselves, several references of Dravidācārya and of Vākyakāra are found in them 'Vedārthasaṅgraha' and the 'Śrī Bhāṣya' of Rāmānuja. Yāmunācārya, a viśistādvaiti refers in his 'Siddhānta' to a Bhāṣya-krt, who, it is believed, is the same as Dravidācārya Vedāntadesākī, another Viśistādvaiti, also refers to him in the 'Tattvātīkā'.) Ānanda-giri and Sarva-
jñātman considers them as advaita vedāntī, the upholders of the nisprapaṇca or nirgunavastuvāda; while, Rāmānuja considers them as a Viśistādvaiti we are but helpless on this ground, for we do not have any work of Dravidācārya to fix his date or his exact views.

¹ Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastrī - Bodhayana and Dravidācārya, two Vedāntin pre-supposed by Rāmānuja - An Article - Third Oriental Conference, Madras, p. 473.
Bhartrprapañca

Bhartrprapañca, another vedantin is supposed to have flourished before Śaṅkara. Ānandajñāna, in his gloss on Śaṅkara’s Bhāṣya on the 'Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad' says, that a commentary was written by Bhartrprapañca on the same Upaniṣad. He commented upon the Madhyamadīna recension of the 'Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad' and not on the Kaṇva, as Śaṅkara did. Another Statement of Ānandajñāna points out the fact that Bhartrprapañca also wrote a commentary on 'Īsopaniṣad- Yāmunacārya. The 'Siddhītraya' of Yāmunacārya includes the name of Bhartrprapañca in the list of those who expounds the Vedānta Sūtras, as author of 'Siddhītraya' adds the name of 'Bhartrprapañca, in the list of those who expounded the Vedānta-Sūtra. Gopāl Yatindra says in the gloss of his commentary on the Kathopaniṣad, that, Bhartrprapañca wrote a commentary on that particular Upaniṣad also. Śaṅkara in his commentary on Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad and Śreśvara, in his Vārtika have quoted the views of Bhartrprapañca and his philosophy can be glimpsed through that only.

Note : Foot-Note see next page : No. 126.
Note. : Foot-Note see page No. 125.

1. Bhartṛprapānta. An Old Vedāntin 'An Article by

2. उण्ण नैति | लोप चिकित्सिताया कुचेर-भृगुप्रथाम भाष्यासागराधैतव्यम्
अत्तथा | तत्त्व द्वयो हैत्यापि | भाष्यासागराधैतव्यम् बाह्य कुल्य प्रसोः।
यथा पूर्वोऽवस्थ स्वस्तबाह्याधिकारि काण्युदाति वाक्यां नियति

...........
भृगुप्रथाम भाष्याधि क्षेत्राणातस्तु वाह वस्त्र नियति नन्द्यारिति

- Anandasrama Sanskrit Series Page. 2.

3. Tīkā on Vārtika P. 771. St. 1717.

4. वचन्यां मण्डलं वादमयाविद्ययन्वयवेव सुवर्णं प्रणितानि
विशाल्यानि च तानि परिभाषितामण्डलं सर्वमाण्डल्यानि
\[\text{स्वरूपसत्तानां} \]

5. Anandasrama Sanskrit Series Second ed. p. 3.
It seems that Bhartrprapañca was a bhedabhedavadin. He distinguishes para or higher, and apara or lower Brahman, and regards both of them as real in the same sense. (Śaṅkara considers the lower Brahman as an appearance of the higher Brahman and therefore not of the same order of reality). The higher and the lower Brahman are not altogether disparate, so that the relation is not one of the entire distinctin (bheda) as between a 'pot' and a 'piece of cloth'. It is rather Bhedabheda, and the ultimate Reality may therefore be described as an identity in difference. It is not easy to say what B. Specifically had in his mind when he formulated the relation of bhedabheda between the para and the apara-brahmans. But one thing is that, Brtrprapañca do not regard the lower Brahman as an appearance (Vivarta)-like Śaṅkara.

1. Śaṅkara on Brihadāraṇyakaopnîṣad I-IV. 10 tāt
   2. Tika on Vartika page 1955 St. 36 and page. 1957, St. 48.
   3. See Vartika p. 876, St. 86. ff.
Avidyā, does not affect the whole of it, but only a part which thereby comes to be cut off, as it were, from Brahman, and forgets its identity with it. Avidyā has accordingly its abode in the jīva and not in the jīva and not in the Brahman. The jīva is thus the result of two conditions - (i) avidyā, which delimits it (pari-ahetu) and, (ii) vāsanā which modifies it (vikṛti). The second condition is sometimes stated as gāsariga or 'attachment', since the vāsanās are eventually traceable to it.

According to him, both, the empirical and revealed knowledge are equally valid and exactly in the same sense. Perception does not construct diversity, but also

1. वालिक, p. 1156 - 7, st. 54-55 compare tika on वालिक, p. 1001, st. 53 - अविष्कारितपूवसपययपरीक्षकत: ||

2. वालिक, P. 1156, st. 51 & P. 1163 st. 89 साधुकर च traces 'attachment' itself to avidyā.
validates it, because a thing 'which is properly as-
certained by a pramāṇa, is true. The scriptures, on
the other hand, confirm the truth of diversity described
in the portion about creation. The ultimate reality,
i.e. the Brahma, holds both the features - a unity in
diversity. (१४७४६६१०९६१८४९४९०१८४९०) Anandajñāna at one place calls
This view as pramāṇa - samuccāya.

Bhartrprapañca holds that, both, karma and jñāna are the means by which the individual is able to attain
emancipation. (Technically, the pramāṇa samuccayavāda
is seen here also). Bhartrprapañca says that bhoga or
enjoyment of worldly objects, which leads to the
realisation of their true nature, is a necessary prelude

1. वार्तिकोलका on St. 36. (Page 1955) स्वातुमात्रादेखि-
स्यात्मकस्य भूति क्षाते । प्रामाण्यः ।
2. वार्तिक P. 1954 St. 32
3. वार्तिक M. I St. 30 - 36.
4. वार्तिकोलका P. 248 St. 913.
5. वार्तिकोलका P. 768-9 St. 17001-1 Vārtika.
to śāmīnaya. Unless and until you have tasted or experienced all the worldly things, your desire never subsides, when one has thoroughly experienced all the tastes, the desire for achieving anything more does not remain. But it is not possible for a human being to experience all the worldly things for a short period. The Upaniṣad opens the way for it. By attaining the śūtra-hood, the individual participates the universal life, the genuine virakti is not possible unless one attains this state.

There are two types of Samuccaya. The first kind of samuccaya is that, a person that is desirous of liberation identifies himself with the śūtra or Hiranyakarba, by Upāsna as taught by the Upaniṣads. This first type of Sammuccaya leads the individual to apavarga - escape from saṁsāra when the soul has given
up the narrow attachment, he becomes free from the cycle of birth and death. This condition is called "antarā-lavasthā (a condition intermediate between saṁsāra & mokṣa).

Bhartrprapañca is of the opinion that verbal statement never lead to immediate knowledge. He considers that scriptural knowledge has to be supplemented by meditation.

Bhartrprapañca admits both, the scriptures and meditation as a means to attain emancipation. According to him, the kāmakānda reveals injunctions about sacrificial acts and jñāna-kānda reveals injunctions about meditative acts and he gives equal status to them.

(Saṅkara and sureśvara, both are of the opinion that Bhartrprapañca was a propounder of vivartavāda instead of parināmavāda.) Whatever he might have taught, it is clear from the above discussion, that his views have a great influence over the later vedāntist. They have quoted his views in support of theirs.

In the Journal of the Alunamalai University. Vol. VI No.1 p.66.
Bhartrhari

Bhartrhari, the author of Vākyapadiya, is characterized as an advaitin, by Somananda and Utpala, (the writers on Kashmir śāivism) while discussing the splotavāda. He has been called a 'brahmavit prakānda' by Pratyagruḍa, in his commentary on Citsukha's Tattvapradīpikā. The content of the 'Vākyapadiya' reveals Bhartrhari as a śabdādvaitavādin. According to him, Ultimate Reality is non-dual, and the universe is a transfiguration (पूर्वक) of it. Tarka is an auxiliary to āgama, and not an independent pramāṇa. The Brahman of Bhartrhari is 'Śabda-brahman. He is an advocate of splotavāda. Being a grammarian, he is of the opinion that grammar leads to mokṣa which consists in the realization of the śabda - brahman which alone is real). The splotavāda


2. V. A. Ramaswami Sastris article 'Bhartrhari Baudha?' in the Journal of the Annamalai University Vol. VI No. 1 p. 66.
sponsored by Bhartrhari is not accepted by Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara recognizes Īśvara as the saṃguna aspect of Brahmāṇ, while in Bhartrhari's philosophy there is no Īśvara apart from śabda. For Śaṅkara, however, knowledge of the sense of the mahāvākyas is the sole means to release. In spite of these differences, Bhartrhari's place in Pre-Śaṅkara advaitism cannot be denied.

Yāmunācārya, an author of 'Siddhitraya', holds that Brahmadatta, as Vedāntin interpreted the Vedānta-sūtra. Of course, at present, we have neither his work, nor his exact date to confirm the above view. But, he could not have been later than Śaṅkara, for, his views are found in the works of Suresvara. Vedāntadesika gives a few details about Brahmadatta. According to him, Brahmadatta is the upholder of the view that the individual soul (jīva) is non-eternal, and perishable. However, not

a single vedântin has uttered such a view. Knowledge, (derived from mahâvîkyas, such as 'Thou art that') and meditation both are of equal importance. He maintains that the upnîsadic texts such as 'âôma vâ are drstavyah', prescribe Upâsanî. But the mere knowledge does not dispell ajñâna. The knowledge, thus gained, by description, has to be dwelt upon almost constantly until it is transformed into knowledge by acquaintance. Physical death is the means through which the individual Soul merges into Brahman. He is an advocate of the 'dhyâna-niyoga-vâda'. According to it, the Upnîsadic texts, which prescribe meditation should not be understood as bhâvanâ but as niyoga. And therefore, for him, moksa is an adrsaphala and not a drskaphala. That is why he puts mere emphasis on meditation till the end of life. Thus, Brahmadatta seems to have taught jhâna-Karma-Samuccaya. (Nevertheless, he was a mâyavâdin who believed in the essential identity of the Atman and Brahman, and regarded the distinction between them as the result of mâyâ.)
Sundara Pāṇḍya

Śaṅkara, in his commentary on the Vedāntasūtra (I.1.4) Quotes three verses, whose author has been identified as Sundara Pāṇḍya, Kumārila, a mīmāṃsaka also Quotes him, which shows his mastery in both, the Advaita Vedānta and Pūrva mīmāṃsā. It seems that he must have flourished between the time of Kumārila and Śaṅkara. It appears that Sundara Pāṇḍya wrote a vārtika on the Sūtras of Jaimini and Bhādarāyana. Probably he may have lived in the Pāṇḍya country. The verses, quoted by Śaṅkara, represents his view that, when one realizes the Supreme Brahman for whom the Scriptural injunctions and pramāṇas cease to exist and function.

Gaudapāda

Māṇḍukyakārikā or the Gaudapādiyakārikā is the first available systematic treatise on Advaita Vedānta. Tradition says that Gaudapāda, the writer of these

---

Kārikās on the Māndukya Upanisad was the teacher of Govindapāda, who was a teacher of Śaṅkarācārya. Śaṅkara most respectfully salutes Gauḍapāda as his grand-teacher who is the respected (teacher) of (his) respected (teacher) and, refers to him as the 'teacher who knows the tradition, and also quotes his two Kārikās on Vedānta.

Following the Upanisads, Gauḍapāda propounds the nature of Brahman to be both affirmative and negative. Being related to the world, he is called Īśvara, or in other words, lower (apara) Brahman. Īśvara is seated in the hearts of all. He is the beginning, middle and end of all things. He remains the same in the

1. यस्य पूज्यामिश्रूण्यं प्रस्मृत्युपस्तु पादक्षिणेन श्रीमश्चि प्रथम
   on the last verse of माणूककारिका

2. अन्नेकं कैदान्तसंप्रदायविभिन्तं वाचायं सम्प्रदायविशिष्टं वदन्ति

3. स्वेत्यं प्राणवो श्रादिख्रेयमन्तस्तथेव च
   सर्वं हि प्राणवं शाल्वं व्यस्तां तदन्तम्
   - G.K.I.27

4. प्राणवं दीर्घवरं विशल्लेक्ष्मुखं बुद्धि संस्थितम्
   - G.K.I.28

5. स्वेत्यं प्राणवो श्रादिख्रेयमन्तस्तथेव च
   - G.K.I.27
three states of experience, viz. waking, dream and sleep.

The higher or para Brahman is not related to the world because there is no world in reality. Being transcendent, He is not expressible in words. He is indicated only by a series of negations as is done by the Sāhardāraṇyakopanisad—"not this, not that." There is nothing either prior or posterior to him. He has neither an inside nor an outside. He is unborn, without sleep, without name and form.

He is calm, indescribable, and omniscient. He is unoriginated and unmoving, and without any dual. He is

1. त्रिपु वासु यूँ तृतीय सामान्य वैचि निरिन्दः \( \text{III} \) - G.K.I.22
2. ......व्रज तत्र न विलेस \( \text{II} \) - G.K.IV.75
3. वत्र ब्रह्म न कान्ते विविभक्तत्र नोच्यो \( \text{II} \) - G.K.IV.60
4. सह नेिनि नेतीनि व्यास्यां निष्टुते अनु: \( \text{II} \) - G.K.III.26
6. कपालवनििन्धवमनमानक्षमक्षत \( \text{I} \)
लक्ष्मिनारदः सबैः नैपराः कवीः \( \text{II} \) - G.K.III.36
7. यस्य शान्तं सन्निवारांक्षमां कुलुक्षम\( \text{I} \)
कपालवनििन्धव \( \text{I} \) - G.K.III.47
8. कपालवनििन्धवं विद्यां शान्तमान्धम \( \text{I} \) - G.K.IV.45.
The non-duality of the supreme spirit is the central point of the Advaita Vedanta. Gaudapāda has expounded this doctrine by discussing scriptural passages, and through logic. With a view to showing the non-duality of the Brahman of the Upaniṣads, the doctrine of Ajāti, set forth in the fourth chapter shows that the non-duality is the supreme truth.

The non-dual Brahman is the sole reality, and the world of plurality therefore, is an appearance, an

1. ........ तत्वकेतकः सदा  || - G.K.I.12.
2. ब्रजमनिषुमः कृतः प्रांतः मवति सक्षम् ।
   ब्रजमनिषुमः कृतः प्रांतः मवति सक्षमातः ॥ - G.K.IV.81.
3. वाविष्णवः शुरुपनः प्रूक्तः वृन्दिः ।
   हृदे वर्षः समाधिनः क्रम वायु विशालः ॥ - G.K.IV.93.
   ........ कृत्स्योपतः शिवः ॥ - G.K.I.29.
illusion, duality is māyāmatra; while non-duality is the Supreme truth. The one self seems to be many through its own māya. The world with its things in an illusory projection of ātma-māya. It is not a transformation either of an independent Primal Nature (प्राकृति) nor of Brahman. It is a appearance or apparitions (विकृति) of the Absolute.

Gaudapāda teaches Vivartvādā. The world of waking is illusory. Similar to the world of dreams. Just as the objects of dream consciousness are found to be unreal so are the things of the waking world. He explains the illusoriness of the world with the example of a rope.

A rope, in darkness appears as a snake. Similarly, the Brahman appears as the world, due to māya. Gaudapāda has compared the world with the Gandharvānagha.

The highest truth according to our author is that there is nothing that comes into being. This non-

1. मायामात्रिनः खङ्खन्तः परस्यात् - G.K.I.17.
2. कल्याणग्राहाद्वानात्मानात्मा देव: स्वायता - G.K.II.12.
4. न कश्चिद्याथे जीवः सङ्कारस्य न विचित्रे। एततु तदै उच्चं सत्यं यत्र क्रिक्रियायते। - G.K.III.48.
origination' is the main subject which the author takes up and discusses throughout his work. In all the systems of philosophy, the things around us have their origination; in other words, they are produced, they have their cause. This is the common view. But the Mādhya-mika Buddhist hold quite a different view denying the origination of anything in the world. This non-origi-
nation is asserted again and again by them. 1 (Gaudapāda highly influenced by Mādhya-mika Buddhist ideas, pro-
pounds the same theory in his Gaudapāda Kārikā, that "nothing is produced either from itself or from other." 2 For him, causality is impossible. 3 One can't prove that Samsāra is without a beginning, but has an end, nor can it be proved that Moksa has a beginning, but has

1. न स्वतः जाती भावः परलौ नैव जायते ।
   न स्थलः परत्सचेव जाती जायते कृतः ॥ — M.K.XXI.13.
2. रूपं वा परलौ वापि न किंचिद् करोऽसु जायते ॥ — G.K.IV.22.
3. वशक्तिरपरिहारः कुष्ठापीर्यायं वा वः । — G.K. IV.19.
no end. In short, that which exists neither in the beginning nor in the end, cannot exist in the middle also; that which is unreal in the past and in the future must be unreal in the present too. Similarly, the Brahman appears as the world, due to maya Gaudapada has compared the world with the Gandharvanagar.

(The doctrine of māyā, in Gaṇḍapādiya kārikā, represents the nisparapañca aspect of the Absolute.) The māyā however is not the power of some supreme divinity. It is dependent on the Ātman. It is the māyā of the Ātman that gives rise to the appearance of all Saṃghātās, that deludes even the Ātman himself. The exact nature of the

1. कार्येकर्तव्यं च शंकास्य न दैवस्यति ।
   कक्स्तसा चाक्षुस्व न प्रविष्ट्यति । - G.K.IV.30.

2. बाप्वत्रिवने च यथान्ति कर्मानेपि तदनि ।
   किब्रत्य: स्मृतशः कन्तुतः बितया स्वव लक्ष्यातः । - G.K.II.6.

3. श्रवणात् स्वप्नवचयैः ज्ञात्मायाविशिष्टा: ।
   मायेना तद्य दैव्य यस्मातं श्रवणितः स्वयम् । - G.K. 3.10-

4. मायेना तद्य दैव्य यस्मातं श्रवणितः स्वयम् ।
   आयामं तदा याति ग्राह्यानि तदार्थः । - G.K. 2.19.

5. बम्बनात् तदा याति ग्राह्यानि तदार्थः । - G.K. 3.32.
dependence of māyā is not made clear. If the appearance of finite existence, which is attributed to māyā, is dependent upon the ātman, then this attribution also is made from a vyāvahārika standpoint, it has got no real validity. Just as a serpent, Superimposed on the rope, is unreal, and it being unreal, the cause of it also becomes unreal, the Sāṃsāra being Vitatha, the cause of it, the māyā is nothing better than mithyā. (In this way, the Sāṃsāra as well as māyā do not exist. It is natural, because, Gaudāpāda is dealing with the problem of diversity from the empirical point of view. The individual Soul is like dram made creature. They are born and also dies likewise the māyā made Creature.

1. जन्म मायापूर्व तैसराः वा च माया न किले । - G.K.4.58.
2. यथार्थवाचायो जीवो जायले प्रियिते ।
तथा जीवा कर्म स्वेत म्हन्त्य न म्हन्त्ये । - G.K.IV.68.
3. यथार्थ मायाया जीवो जायले प्रियिते ।
तथा जीवा कर्म स्वेत म्हन्त्य न म्हन्त्ये । - G.K.IV.69.
According Gaudapāda, no creature is whatsoever born; no origination of it exists. There is neither destruction nor origination, neither the bound souls nor those who seek the means for release, neither mumukṣutva nor muktātva.

(Gaudapāda was first Vedāntin who make the fullest use of the doctrine of the three states i.e. waking, dream and deep sleep.)

Sometimes the word 'Buddha' is used to signify the everscient nature of the ātman; and sometimes it denotes the meaning 'wise'. However, it seems to many scholars that this particular word denotes the sense of the founder of the religious faith, known as the Buddha, and refers to Buddhist Philosophy. Gaudapāda has extensively used the terms normally used in the Buddhist Philosophy. The

1. न कर्क्षण्यायों जीवः कैमष्टीयं न हि विथे II
एव ज्ञानं सत्वं यत् कौन्तिन्य जायते II - G.K.IV.71.

2. बादो मुद्या 4.98. बादि मुद्या, II - G.K.4.92.
बादुः प्रकृतिक्रय 4.98 स हि बुद्धानां II - G.K. 4.88.
word 'Śūnyam' is frequently used by him, as a synonymous with māyā. (It is needless to note that some of the views are borrowed from the Mādhyamika doctrine, Nāgārjuna's Kārikās and Vijñānavāda doctrines, reflecting the influence of the Buddhist Philosophy. Influenced by the advaitic as well as the Buddhist philosophy of the current time, the Kārikās of Gaudapāda constitute a vital link between the two, and preaches the Advaita Vedānta through the medium of Buddhist idealism. Gaudapāda lived and taught in an age when Mahāyānaism was having a great hold on the minds of people, and therefore, he has to adopt the logical method of expounding the Vedānta and the Bauddha modes of expression and argumentation; and it was left for his disciple Śaṅkara to examine and explain his terms and concepts.

1. योऽस्वित कर्तिकंश्रेत्राय परमाधीन नास्त्यः ॥ - G.K. 4.73.

2. कर्तिकंश्रेत्राय परमाधीन नास्त्यः ॥ - G.K. 4.74.

3. चंद्रयानं सर्वं शास्त्रं नान्तिः बैन ॥ - G.K. 4.57.
Conclusion

The influence of the philosophy of the former philosophers noted above, over Śaṅkara is undeniable. However, not all the thoughts of Advaita Vedānta, but the fundamentals or essentials of Advaita are expounded by Śaṅkara in his works. The views of Bhartṛprapañca, the propounder of bheda-bheda-vāda, invites a great deal of criticism from Śaṅkara. Sureśvara, holds that Bhartṛ-prapañca was a vivarfa-vādin, and not like Śaṅkara parināmavādid. The parināma view which he taught was just provisional and not final. And, Sureśvara's view is beyond Suspicion. Dravidācārya was probably an Advaitin. But whether he was an Advaitin or Viśistādvaitin is a matter of doubt. Bhartrhari holds the theory of Sphota, and Brahmadatta emphasises meditation. Brahmadatta is doctrinally closer to Maṇḍana Misra, the author of the Brahmasiddhi than to Śaṅkara. Sundara Pāṇḍya, and Kāśakrtsna, were, in all probability, the teachers of that school of Advaita which Śaṅkara has made famous.
Unfortunately, their contribution to the development of early Advaita cannot be assessed, as their works are not extant. The influence of Gaudapāda too was on Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara was considered to be a spiritual successor of Gaudapāda. Śaṅkara framed and expounded the thoughts of Gaudapāda by his excellent intellect and relentless logical reasoning. The teaching of Gaudapāda provides a firm foundation on which Śaṅkara-cārya and his successors in the field of advaita built their edifice of detailed, analytical exposition of the Advaita theory.