CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing pages in three divisions an attempt has been made to give a critical study of the whole of Anubhāṣya with an eye on conformity with the letter and spirit of the original text. The various topics of philosophical importance have also been given in the light of the new conclusions deduced from the totally fresh critical study of A.B. In the present division we will bring them together and make a general estimate of the philosophical value of V.'s contribution to the Vedāntic thought in particular and Vedānta for the citizens of the world in general.

V. rightly deserves to be put on equal rank with the four great ācāryas, viz. Ś., R., N. and M. It has been pointed out (Introduction) that the then historical, political, social, religious and philosophical backgrounds heralded the advent of the great ācārya like V. He could foresee the future of Hindu religion, philosophy and society to be disappointing and gloomy. He could gauge that it was practically impossible to overcome the imminent danger of social disruption and religious schism by adopting any political measures. His three tours all over the country fully convinced him of this dismal situation. He devoted very serious thought to this problem and found that religious reorientation and philosophical reinterpretation were the only solutions for the consolidation of the religious and social life of the Hindus at large. So he made his newly founded Pustimarga or path of divine grace to be the religion of the masses rather than that of classes only. The fact that it was open to all, irrespective of the distinctions of caste, colour, sex or nationality, is enough to show the liberal-minded and broad outlook of the ācārya. He could make out that if the classes had to co-exist and flourish, they should be based, not on the birth in a particular caste, but on the presence or otherwise of highly moral conduct. So he classified the jīvas as the pusti-jīvas, the maryādā-jīvas and the pravahā-jīvas (Part II - Jīva). Here even the women, the outcastes, and others could be qualified for the highest path of pusti if the Lord made them the objects of His divine grace. The insistence on the
...the daily performance of seva of the Lord developed later on into an elaborate seva-paddhati (procedure of worship). The practical side of this new religion was made strong by the innovation of Brahmasambandha which is absolutely necessary for getting admission to this path and for the performance of seva. The claims of vital Puṣṭi-mārga or Śuddhādvaita to be a universal religion (Visvadharma) can be established by liberally re-interpreting its teachings in the light of modern methods of criticism without in any way sacrificing its fundamentals. The above-mentioned new feature, viz. puṣṭi, proves the truth that in its critical periods of conflicts with alien religions the Hindu religion received a very great support from Puṣṭi-mārga which insisted on essentials and rejected the out-dated formalities. The ethical and monotheistic fervour found in Śuddhādvaita is the result of this outlook. It takes into account the need for self-realisation and direct union with the Supreme Person (Purusottama). So it can become the religion of the future. Its innate vitality and power to satisfy the religious and philosophical needs of its followers can preserve its popularity. Being a hereditary religion it has some inevitable excrescences which should be removed in order to reorient it in terms of modern thought without impairing its integrity.

V. has set a very glaring example of the harmonious combination of exemplary simplicity and modesty with the highest type of philosophical genius and religious life. He actually put into practice what he believed. His incessant insistence on leading the life of a house-holder by ordinary persons and then gradually infusing it with intense devotion to the Lord is really a very great contribution of V. at the time when all people blindly followed the dictates of those who insisted on adopting the life of a recluse. The said blind following of the life of a recluse proved pernicious to the growth of a healthy social life. Thus V.'s contribution for social solidarity is of no mean order when it is evaluated in the light of the then disturbed state of political and social life.

V.'s travels proved of great advantage to him by broadening his outlook and enriching his experience and to the people by consoling them. His regular recital of the Bhāgavata and reading it to the people within a week went a long way in remoulding the religious life of the masses who seemed to suffer from spiritual starvation as it were. The performance of
of elaborate, complicated and outdated sacrificial formalities was too heavy and practically impossible for them. The pursuit of the path of knowledge only was almost beyond their reach. The combination of karma and jñāna by way of giving prominence to either of them was realised as equally difficult for them. This does not prove at all that all these paths were totally extinct and obsolete. What it means is that the aspect of feeling somehow did not receive proper encouragement and was ignored at times. V. realised this through his penetrating insight and made a praise-worthy attempt at synthesizing the three aspects, viz. thinking, willing and feeling, for the development of balanced and integrated personality of the people at large. It can be said that V.'s diagnosis as well as the medicine actually injected in the very blood of the people by way of propounding, preaching and propagating the path of Pusti-mārga was correct. The study of the psychology of the masses convinced him that the hearts of the people could not be won over by karma, jñāna or yoga only. For the mind and the sense-organs of the worldly-minded people were sure to run after their gratification by worldly objects. In order to bring them under control, neither self-mortification nor the out-right renunciation was so useful as the moderate living. So the life of a house-holder was regarded as a must for the people at large who aspired for the supreme bliss. V. therefore simply changed the channels by transferring the flow of feelings from the worldly objects to those of the Lord by way of seva. All were induced to offer all their possessions and their self to the Lord and then deal with them as His trustees. They had to do everything for and in the name of God when motivated by His will. Thus the responsibility was to be transferred to the Lord through total self-surrender. The people could perform all activities without being mentally perturbed. All this is possible through Brahmasaṁbandha. Though it appears to be small and less important, it really reaches the high water-mark of bringing the moral standard to a very high level. Thus, the practical side of Pusti-mārga as a religion is the lasting contribution of V. to the development of humanitarian and cosmopolitan ideals at large. There have been misrepresentations and misinterpretations of the high ideals of this great Acarya by some vested-interests in his name. But these are the limitations of human-beings which should be got rid of for the better understanding of the Acarya.
The above statement refers to the graphic and colourful word-pictures of the actual love-sports of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Ṛadha (or Gopīs). It has been shown (under Līlārasa) that they may be regarded as the juvenile pranks and free-lancing of the son of the chief of the shepherds of Gokula. The ācārya did entertain this fear. Attempts have been made to convince the people of the supernatural character of Līlās as already shown. But some doubt and dissatisfaction still linger in the mind. If the concept of Līlā were reviewed in the light of the then political, social and religious conditions and the high ideals towards which V. was trying to lead the masses, it becomes clear that such descriptions alone were to attract them towards the religious life where non-attachment, power to discriminate between the moral and the immoral and self-control formed the very corner-stones. All his writings make it clear that V. was the last man to teach the life of reckless self-indulgence. It is therefore said that the Līlās were described in the same terms as were understood by the masses. So it is a proof of V.'s close study of their psychology. The previous ācāryas like R., N. and M. and his contemporaries like Caitanya also referred to such disports in their own way. Such concepts are found in the non-Hindu religions also. V. gave the finishing touch to this concept in his unique and novel way which has therefore been regarded as his another contribution to the Hindu religion. The followers of Freud's dream-psychology will ascribe them to the unsatisfied desires (libidos) which are projected in that form. The social and political condition of the people lends fairly good support to such an assumption. The people were deprived of all the advantages of free social and political life. So they became sceptical and otherworldly in attitude. When the base passions were passed through the purgatory of religious and moral ideologies they became purged of their ugliness and were sublimated. Still, they appeared worldly to those who did not pass through the said purgatory. Any way it has its limitations which are to be accepted. It is one of the interesting topics of socio- and psycho-religious interest contributed by V.

The detailed textual, critical and comparative study of A.B. leads us to some of the conclusions which are important as they show the original contribution of V. to Indian Philosophy in general and the interpretational method of the B.S. in particular. The historical study of the
the philosophical schools of Ācāryas prior to V. *M* shows that all who
came after S. were at pains to refute his doctrine of Maya and Kevala-
dvaita. V. too regarded S. as the pradhanamalla or chief combatant. Of
course, he has readily accepted those views of S. that did not create
any conflict with his own. The influence of his predecessors is naturally
visible in V. But this does not in the least deprive him of his origina-
licity. It only indicates that he kept before himself the views of the
different Ācāryas prior to him and deduced his own conclusions by their
happy and harmonious blending and synthesis. So he avoided all the ex-
tremes in the previous views. It has been pointed out in due places that
V. has given his special and original contribution to the concepts of the
various Vedantic topics like Brahman, Purusottama, Aksara, Jīva, Jagat,
Saṁsāra, Avikṛtāparināmavāda, Puṣṭi-bhakti, Bhaktirasa, Lilārasa, Moksa,
and so on (Part II). Their remarkable points will be given below.

From the critical study of A.B. in the light of the studies of
Thibaut, Ghate and Telivala, it can be safely inferred that the conclu-
sions of Dr.G.Thibaut(S.B.E. Vol.XXXIV,Intro.pp.xxiii-iv) would have been
changed considerably if he would have been in a position to get at the
correct exposition of A.B. The way in which he has given superiority to
the interpretations of R. are purely based on the comparison of the
bhāṣyas of S. and R. only. So it is found that many times he is at pains
to decide as to which of them is reasonably acceptable(ibid.pp.xcv-vi).
This becomes clear when he declares that the systematic expounder of the
views of the śūtrakāra is probably the Bhedābhedāvādin, 'the other com-
mentator', of whom he was not aware. The adherents of Bhedābheda will find
this as very favourable to their views. But it would be proper to say
that Thibaut was indirectly driving at some school of Vedanta which
could have been safely identified with Suddhādvaita whose concept of both
bheda and abheda, viz. Bhedasahisnu Abheda, is more faithful to the letter
and spirit of the B.S. than the said Bhedābheda. It is true that Dr.
Thibaut has not said anything which has direct bearing upon the Suddh-
ādvaita school. Still, it was selected as worth considering because the
air created by some of its remarks had adversely affected the true under-
standing of A.B. which therefore did not receive the same attention as it
deserved.

Now the work of Dr.V.S.Ghate has been deemed fit to be referred
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...referred to in this connection because in his comparative study of the five great ācāryas, viz. S., R., N., M. and V., he has given the palm of superiority to the bhāṣya of N. In doing this he has passed several remarks as regards A.B. particularly deserved to be refuted in the light of this new critical study of A.B. Again, there were some other remarks which were passed by him due to some misunderstanding of the purport of the B.S. These also were regarded as fit to be controverted and refuted. This has been done in the proper places in the 'Notes'. The following are some of those examples: (Cf. The Vedānta) II.i.13(p.72), II.i.14(p.74), II.iv.14-16(p.104), III.ii.11-21(p.117,p.123), III.iv.51(p.132), IV.i.(p.133), IV.i.7-10(p.135), IV.ii.7-15(pp.143-4), IV.ii.6(p.138), IV.iv.4(p.154), IV.iv.15,17(pp.154-5), I.ii.7(p.57). The refutation and necessary remarks have been made under 'Notes' in Part I. Dr. Ghate has made wrong remarks in 'Conclusion' (pp.164-5,&c) also. Of course, there are certain cases where he has praised V., e.g. II.iii.19-28(pp.87-89), II.iv.1-4(p.112), IV.iii.7-14(p.148).

As a matter of fact Dr. Ghate had (p.50) 'the question before us is one purely of literary criticism and not one of philosophy proper. Here is a literary product before us and here we have so many interpretations of it; and our object is to see which of these, if any, has faithfully represented the natural and straightforward meaning of the original, apart from the inherent philosophical value of the doctrines propounded by them'—as his chief object while passing all the remarks that are refuted here for the first time. It becomes clear therefore that Dr. Ghate did not study the five bhāṣyas from the point of view of their inherent philosophical values. His aim was purely literary criticism which led him to do grave injustice to V. in particular and others in general. The present thesis has been prepared with an open eye to avoiding the extremes like 'purely literary' and 'purely philosophical'; for such extremes are not going to help much in the thorough study of the works like the B.S. which are primarily philosophical and only secondarily deserve to be evaluated as a piece of literature. Here it is philosophy that counts more than anything else. Again, the five bhāṣyas that are studied comparatively by Dr. Ghate have certainly been written for philosophical purposes and not as purely literary products as Dr. Ghate would have us believe. So his study itself loses its value when it is reviewed.....
...reviewed in this light. The true and faithful evaluation and appreciation of A.B. was therefore missing all the while. The present thesis fulfills this long-felt need by opening new vistas in the hitherto virgin soil.

Lastly, we come to the essay of Mr. M.T. Telivala. It mainly dealt with the consideration of the faithfulness or otherwise of S. to the original śūtras while he interprets them. In doing this he has confined his attention to the main Vedāntic topics, viz. Brahman, Jīva, Jagat and Moksa. So he has taken into account only those śūtras that have direct bearing upon this object. He has, of course, made a fairly detailed study of those śūtras. Still, in view of the detailed textual and critical study of the whole of A.B. it can be called a mere cursory study. It lacked in the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of the study that is given here for the first time. It deserved to be referred to here because its due importance and limitations could be realized in that way only.

Thus the three works were selected just to show the different views that were prevalent as regards the A.B.

As shown in the 'Introduction' the present thesis gives a critical study of A.B. This has led to the conclusion that the A.B. is surely a really great advancement towards arriving at the true interpretation of the B.S. V. kept before himself all the previous bhāyas. Many a time some lines are word to word cited from the B.S. The Suddhādvaita or pure monism propounded in it is: the fully blossomed flower of the far-reaching insight and broad philosophical and religious outlook of V., who, though not quite satisfactory in some places, has done it in a synthetic and systematic as also critical and comprehensive manner. It is true that the exact conceptions of the śūtrakāra about the cardinal doctrines of Vedānta may appear to evade the terminology employed by the bhāsyakāras. Still, the concept of 'Suddhādvaita' as against those of Kevalādvaita, Visistādvaita, Dvaitādvaita and Dvaita, is not far off the mark. The problem is to be solved in the light of the B.S. and its bhāyas. This demarcates the field before us. According to V. the advaita or nondualism that evolves from the B.S. is suddha or pure in the sense that the concept of Maya is not brought in to explain the creation of the jagat and the jīvas in the same way as S. does to establish his kevala or
...or absolute non-dualism. Again, it is suddha because the visista or qualified non-dualism of R. is not accepted. The equal importance given to both dualism and non-dualism cuts both ways like a double-edged sword. Similarly, pure dualism may have its independent importance. But it did not represent the purport of the B.S. Beginning from the absolute non-dualism the Vedantic thought has passed through the stages of increasing prominence given to dualism till we come to M. Thus the circle that started with the one extreme of absolute non-dualism came to its direct opposition in extreme dualism. It once again came to advaita which was now suddha or pure, i.e. purged of the previous extreme of kevala advaita which necessitated the acceptance of Māyā. The suddhadvaita can be said to have perfected this concept by avoiding the two extremes. It reconciled dvaita and advaita without rejecting or sacrificing either of them. Both of them should get their due place. To put it more clearly, it is the question of reconciliation of advaita, Brahman, on one hand and dvaita, the ķīvas and the jagat, on the other. The non-dualism in the true sense can be possible only when all of them are real and not real and unreal as Ś. holds. The ķīvas and the jagat are real in so far as they are non-different from the Brahman. This sounds paradoxical to pure reasoning. It tries to get yet higher advaita. But that will land us in the contingency of infinite regress. The śūtrakāra has declared in clear terms that tarka or pure reasoning is apratisthita or unstable and indefinite in this case of Brahman who is beyond all tarka. (A.B.II.i.11). Its nature can be known from the śrutis only. (A.B.II.i.27). There It is declared to possess all qualities (A.B.II.i.30,37) and to be ubhayalīrga or possessed of twofold characteristics (A.B.III.i.11,27,30). So even the contradictory qualities are sure to reside in It. But they are contradictory from the worldly point of view. Once this important point is understood in its true light the concept of suddhadvaita will be found to be more capable of reconciling apparently contradictory qualities and to be fundamentally in greater harmony with the essential teachings of the Up's, than the other schools of philosophy. This is one of the greatest contributions of V. to the exposition and understanding of the B.S. in particular and the Vedanta in general.

V.'s other original contributions have been fully brought about in Part II. The whole concept of Brahman has been put in new light by V.
All the Vaisnava acaryas prior to V., viz. R., N. and M., tried to fully express their concept of the highest Reality as Visnu, Narayana or Krsna. So to speak of the Supreme Reality in such terms was not totally new. The question of real importance was how to show the superiority of personal God. V. gave Sri Krsna who was regarded by him as the Durma Purusottama or the perfect and the best person (Supreme Person). V.'s originality lies in showing this Supreme Person as Rasātmaka or of the nature of sentiment and hence constituting perfect and supreme bliss. It is true that pure reasoning will lead us to the conclusion that the Supreme Reality cannot be personal in nature. It should better be pure and absolute intelligence only. V. realised that in doing so the majority of the Upanisadic passages that declared the Supreme Reality to be personal in character would be violated and rendered meaningless. The speculative reasoning by itself was indefinite and indecisive. So total reliance on it was sure to make the scriptures insignificant. The Supreme Reality can only be the highest authority declares it. It is saccidānanda or existence, intelligence and bliss. Here all these cannot become appositional in the same sense as S. holds. It is equally sat, cit and ananda. So mere sat or cit cannot bring out its concept fully. These are the three āsas or parts of the same Reality and should therefore be integrally accepted in it. Then alone its concept will be perfect. To make it clear, V. said that ānanda was the only word which could fully bring out the whole concept of Supreme Reality. The Up. (Tait. II. 7, Rasva vay sah...) showed that the ānanda or rasa included in it both sat and cit āsas by way of making all jivas and jagat exist and become cognisable (object of knowledge). Aesthetically and psychologically 'rasa' is the highest concept which helps people enjoy unalloyed and supreme bliss. So it is called Brahmānanda-sahodara or the brother of (i.e. of the same nature of) the bliss of direct realisation of Brahman. This explains why V. has regarded the Bhaktirasa and Lilārasa as the best of all rasas. Nay, as a matter of fact all other rasas were included in them. This shows that these other concepts are the direct corollaries of the concept of Supreme Reality, Sri Krsna.

The concept of Aksara Brahman is another original contribution of V. It is far inferior to the Supreme Person because it serves as His dhāma (abode), carana (foot), puucha (tail) and Lilāsthāna. It is called the
...the Vyāpi-Vaikuntha where the Līlās of the Lord go on eternally. It is distinctly perceived by the jñānins and the bhaktas. The former totally merge in it, while the latter cognize it as the abode of the Lord. But it should be borne in mind that the difference between the Lord who is the Para Brahman and the Aksara Brahman, accepted by V., cannot be put on equal par with the difference between the Para or higher Brahman and the Apara or lower Brahman that is accepted by S. For according to V. both are equally real and eternal. The aksara Brahman is not unreal from the highest standpoint as S. holds about the apara Brahman. Here everything depends upon the desire of the Lord who is the Supreme Person as already shown.

The difference between the Jagat or Prapāñca and Saṁsāra is also the quite original contribution of V. Here the Jagat is regarded as equally real with the Brahman because it is an aṁsa or part of It. So it cannot be jñānanāya (destructible by knowledge) or mithyā (unreal). To explain this, he brings in the concept of āvirbhāva and tirobhāva which is brought to light in its true sense by V. for the first time. The theory of avikṛtaparinnāma or causation without transformation is its direct corollary. Thus both these theories establish that the Jagat is real as the real aṁsa of Brahman. The social and philosophical background seem to have gone a long way in the evolution of this concept. The inordinate emphasis that was being laid on the pursuit of the path of knowledge and adoption of the life of a recluse created an unusual stir in the then intelligentzia. The above atmosphere made the people regard the world as an illusion. They became indifferent to the regular performance of their duties and hence sceptical and otherworldly in attitude. Even the unqualified persons increased as recluses. This resulted in untold moral degeneration and hypocrisy which brought calumny to the true and pious recluses also. The people at large needed the proper perspective which convinced them of the reality of Jagat. To guard against materialism, V. has struck the golden mean of regarding the Saṁsāra as mithyā, i.e., false and unreal. This is the rise of the feelings of I-ness and mineness that arise due to avidyā or ignorance. So it can be destroyed by right knowledge (vidyā) without in any way depriving the Jagat of its reality. Its importance can be properly understood in the light of the above circumstances.

.....578
The concept of Jīva and the varieties of the jīvas display the new outlook of the acārya. In a way the philosophical pursuit starts with the individual soul and ends in the realisation of his true nature as an aḥāśa of the Lord. During the state of being a jīva the bliss-part remains non-manifest and the jīva undergoes all sorts of miseries as he is subject to avidyā. It is only the grace of God that can save him from it and lead to the enjoyment of supreme bliss. The fact that the jīva always remains atomic in size and even after the manifestation of the bliss-part he does not become of the same nature as the Lord is worth noting. He becomes all-pervading through or by virtue of his cit-part which is all-pervasive in nature. If he became vibhu in the same sense as Ś. would have it, then the various krīdās of the Lord would become impossible. So even in the highest stage of mukti the jīva remains anu. Again he is an aḥāśa of Brahman and emanates from It like sparks from fire. This rules out the contentions that the jīva is an abhāśa or appearance or pratibimba or reflection of Brahman and hence is absolutely non-different from It. Moreover, mokṣa can be attained and enjoyed by the jīva when he is real and related to the Lord as His aḥāśa. The classification of the jīvas into the pusti, the maryāda and the pravaha is to replace the old caste-system by another system which came into being by the desire of the Lord to perform various līlās.

The sole importance given to the path of bhakti in general and that of pusti in particular is peculiar to Ś. His system is called Pūstimārga because of this. It has its value when viewed in the light of the then social, religious and philosophical conditions. The masses were eagerly awaiting for some saviour who heard their heart-felt prayers and came to fulfil all their needs even without being requested for it. In the highest type of pusti-bhakti the jīvas are required to do total self-surrender to the Lord by accepting as their motto, 'Kṛṣṇa eva gatirṇama' (Kṛṣṇa alone is my refuge). The initiation ceremony, called Brahmasaṁ-sarga, is the indispensable pre-requisite for being qualified for this path of divine grace. But all this depends solely on the desire of the Lord whose workings are absolutely inconceivable and mysterious. All can enter this path without any distinction if the Lord selects them. It has been shown that all the jīvas are women while the Supreme Person alone is man. So the jīvas have to foster femininity or Gopī-bhava in the same
...same emotional and devotional way as the Gopīs of Vraja did with ardent love for Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It is for this reason that they are hailed as the ācāryas or teachers of the path of suddha-pusti-bhakti which is the best of all and very rare. This shows how V. has slowly but steadily taken all from the cumbersome karma-marga and abstract jñāna-marga to the enlivening bhakti-marga which culminated in suddha-pustī. The concept of Bhaktirasa will be found to be novel in this path. The whole psychological approach behind this becomes clear when the theory of aesthetic enjoyment is brought in by him.

The concept of mokṣa is also original. The highest stage of muktī is the attainment and enjoyment of the eternal Līlās in Śrī Gokula in the company of Śrī Kṛṣṇa whose very form, constituting pure and supreme bliss, is directly enjoyed by such bhaktas. The devotees attain bodies which constitute the same stuff as the Lord. The concept of Līlārasa is the very essence of this type of mokṣa. It is said that it is the phala or fruit of mokṣa or liberation that is ordinarily understood. The graphic descriptions of Līlās are devoid of even the slightest tinge of sensuality even though they appear to depict highly sensual pleasures. They are really supernatural and sublime. It is for making the common people understand the thrill of supreme joy of God that such descriptions are given.

V. has laid utmost emphasis on the authority of the sabda-praman and has shown the speciality of his standpoint. There too the samādhi-bhasha of Vyāsa in the Bhagavata is explanatory of all other authoritative works. He has insisted on taking the literal meaning of the Vedas, etc. by avoiding their laksana or secondary sense. All other pramanas based on pure reasoning should necessarily follow the Vedas. If in case they create any contradiction with them it is specifically mentioned that they must be rejected. This shows how V. has remained faithful to the very letter of the Vedas.

Keeping this in view, we can say that the interpretation of the various Upanisadic passages that is found in a scattered form in A.B. is of much importance; for it sheds light on the interpretational method of V. in the absence of his regular bhāsyas on the individual Upanisads. According to V. this would give us the same results as the sage Badarayana has
...has arrived at in the B.S. Of course, the later part of A.B. (by Vith.) and the Subodhinī by V. contain some interpretations which are either far-fetched and twisted or full of sectarian tinge. Still, they have their due importance as a contribution to the field of Vedic and Upanisadic interpretations.

The textual study of A.B. makes it clear that V. has fairly succeeded in bringing out the import of the B.S. It has been shown above (Part I) in due places how V.'s interpretation can be regarded as superior to or equally convincing and admissible as the bhasyas of other acāryas. It stands as the outcome of the critical, comparative and above all synthetic outlook of the great acārya. Apart from the sectarian touch and certain preconceptions, from which of course none of the five great acāryas including V. is free, the A.B. can be rightly regarded as an epoch-making work which has given a harmonious blending of the religious and philosophical ideologies prevalent before him. In doing this V. has preserved his own originality and surpassed and proved more powerful in many respects. It is true that I. was the main target of his attacks as it was with other acāryas who came after S. But this destructive method is limited to a certain extent only. For V. has shown the liberal-mindedness and truth-seeking readiness of a real acārya by accepting the views of S. even whenever they were in consonance with the ideal set before him. Thus his creative and constructive side outweighs the destructive one. The text itself is written in a very cryptic and laconic style which makes it at times not easy to understand. Though it is simple and less pedantic its meaning can be extracted after some pains. Still, it does not lack in balance and proportion. It is found that the language is rarely embellished and flowery. The outward ornamentation by literary devices and rhetorics is generally discarded. But on the whole it befits a bhasya.

All this shows that V.'s contributions to the interpretation of the B.S. and the systematic presentation of the Vedānta have gone a long way in remoulding the philosophical and religious thinking in particular and the Hindu society in general.

The study will remain imperfect and prove prejudiced unless the weaknesses and limitations of some of the original contributions of V.
It is true that philosophically the concept of Supreme Reality in the form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa or Pūrṇa Purusottama gave the personal God back to the people at large. But the mythological aspects of Kṛṣṇa were so much mixed with this concept that the common man found it difficult to draw the line of distinction between these two entities. This made the pusti-mārga a mythological cult full of romances and juvenile pranks of Kṛṣṇa. This induced some of the descendants of V. to take undue advantage of the faith put in them by the masses that embraced the path of pusti by undergoing the ceremony of Brahmasaṁbandha. The pious acārya had made it clear through his writings that the self-surrender and dedication of all possessions was to be made to Kṛṣṇa and not the acārya who initiated. But this was intentionally connived at by some unworthy initiators. It resulted in their moral degradation and disgrace which dealt a deadly blow to the growth of this path of divine grace.

The same warning is to be made about the concept of Līlās and the enjoyment of their bliss. As said above, they are full of graphic descriptions of the love-sports of Kṛṣṇa and Gopīs in a sensuous and sensual manner. It was put in terms of carnal pleasures only for the sake of bringing home to the people the supreme bliss that could be enjoyed by following the path of pusti. It has been said time and again that all these descriptions are devoid of all sensuality. Still, it is found that however hard attempts may be made to purge of the baseness of such disports and convince people of their allegorical meaning, that remains as a distant cry which is stifled in the midst of the onrush of base passions that play a very important and major part in the lives of the masses as also the classes. It is needless to speak of the untold gross immorality that would skip into the lives of less qualified ordinary people who would follow this path without the capacity to discriminate the allegorical descriptions from the surrealistic ones.

The sole emphasis laid on the grace of God is quite good in its own way. But the moment it comes to the masses, lacking in discriminative power, the result is found to be similar to that of jñāna only. In stead of truly understanding it as doing everything for and in the name of God by His will, the people totally shut up the doors of intellect, reasoning...
reasoning and calm and cool thinking. They became over-sensitive and hence perturbed and hysterical in the times of difficulties. They sat with folded hands without knowing whether they were qualified for the path of pusti or not. There might have been rare cases of real pustibhaktas who were saved by the grace of God. But it cannot become a general rule for all. The efficacy of the grace of God is always there and will ever remain. But it has exercised adverse effects on the people at large when not understood properly. Just as the path of knowledge of the highest order is meant for those only who are fully qualified for it, similarly the path of pusti, though declared to be open to all, is meant for those only who are selected by the Lord for it and who possess the same kind of supreme devotion to the Lord as it was found in the case of the Gopis of Vraja.

The hereditary priesthood (acarya-ship) has made this cult lack in the vigour and fervour as it would have been in case the really qualified person would have succeeded to the pontifical throne. Its other aspects fall out of the scope of this thesis, so they are not touched here.

The stylistical, interpretational and doctrinal have been shown already. Now it remains to be seen whether the views of the different acaryas are compatible or reconcilable with one another. In a way such a quest may be regarded as unsuccessful when the different views are seen to be mutually contradictory in several respects. But viewed in the light of the fundamentals of Suddhadvaita, the presence of contradictory qualities can coexist in this path only. It fulfils the quest after perfection in so far as the philosophical thinking is concerned. While dealing with the various Vedantic topics (Part II), I have shown how the corresponding concepts of other acaryas have been developed and advanced by V. with the touch of his original thinking. This proves by itself that the circle that began with the Kevaladvaita of S. has passed through the intermediate stages of the Visistadvaita, the Dvaitadvaita and the Dvaita of N. and M. resp'ly and has become complete when it again reached the Suddhadvaita of V. Thus the system of the sutrakara seems to be Suddha Advaita which by itself is the reconciled form of the previous systems (schools) of Vedanta. Hence it is said that V.'s system is the culmination of S. Vaisnava monism which is a synthetic philosophy par excellence. It is the
...the rapprochement of realism and idealism and the reconciliation of religion and philosophy which promotes emotional integrity and inter-religious understanding through its catholicity and insight into universal love. It brings out the harmony of the whole life by synthesising its physical, mental and spiritual aspects.

Lastly, it will be in the fitness of things to say a few words about the importance of Suddhadvaita alias Pusti-marga in modern times when the entire human race seems to be passing through a serious crisis. When the high ideals of universal brotherhood and religious tolerance are being emphasised much, the critical study of A.B. in a comparative and comprehensive way will be useful in eliminating the apparent contradictions which are found among the different Vedantic schools. V. has given us an ideal pattern of society through his Pusti-marga. In due consideration of human weaknesses and social evils V. has set an example of bringing about social solidarity by broad synthetic outlook. The time-honoured privileges of the classes, based on the distinctions of colour, birth in a particular caste and nationality, have to go for the healthy development of an ideal society. The evils of untouchability and casteism were wiped out by him to revive and survive the fast-decaying ancient Indian culture. He tried to establish emotional integration by the divine doctrine of Pusti where all could get admission by undergoing the initiation ceremony of Brahmassabandha. He insisted on hating sins and not the sinner. The position of women was pitiable and it was V. who gave them the highest honour of Suddha-pustibhaktas by declaring that the Gopis of Vraja were the acaryas of Pustimarga. Again the insistence on the cultivation of Gopibhava, i.e. femininity is also for establishing the importance of women. The high ideals of world-religion and world-citizenship, the dignity of labour, leading of the pious life of a house-holder, and so on are given by V. in one way or the other. The frustration that is experienced by the modern man who runs after purely materialistic gains will be practically removed by truly understanding the meaning of the path of Pusti.

Thus the exposition of the Suddhadvaita Vedanta of Sri Vallabhacarya, one of the five great acaryas, by way of the literal and critical study of Anubhaya, the monumental work of this school of Vedanta, shows that its study is of absorbing interest to all Vedantists. Such a study...
...study will enhance the proper understanding and true appreciation of the intrinsic and eternal value of Suddhādvaita or pure monism as a darsana or philosophy that gives some original contribution to the advancement and encouragement of the 'Philosophia Perennis'. Viewed in the present situation, it will help in removing the imbalance in the philosophical thought of present India. It will be worthwhile to reiterate that the Anubhāṣya has its own high place as one of the most valuable commentaries on the Brahma-sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa Vyāsa which have always remained as a mysterious treasure-house of Vedāntic thought to the Vedāntists from time immemorial. From the unknown days of the ācāryas prior to Ś. down to the times of V. and even after him till today the original sūtras have been interpreted. The present critical study of Anubhāṣya which interprets the said sūtras will go its own way to the advancement of Vedāntic thought in general by helping the seekers after truth to understand this one of the principal schools of Vedānta which has laid ever-lasting and indelible influence on the Vedāntic thought at large.

Sri-Kranārpanamastu.
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