CHAPTER - II

Salient Features of Advaita and Dvaita Vedānta

(A) Introduction :

The entire literature of the Vedas comprising of rich material regarding the performance of ritual, also contains the esoteric teachings of philosophy. The Upaniṣads mark the culmination of the Vedic speculation, as such the Upaniṣadic philosophy literally is what the term Vedānta means. Hence, Vedānta is obviously that philosophy which takes its lead from the Upaniṣads. Precisely, the term Vedānta means “end of the Veda” (veda+anta). By considering the upaniṣads as having been the last section of Brāhmaṇa or Āranyaka, it is evident that the position they occupy in the Vedic literature is significant; and these upaniṣads have their place in the portion which is in fact, the end of the Vedic canon handed down by each branch. In this sense, the upaniṣads have been termed as Vedānta. Besides, the word Vedānta is used also in the sense of the “Ultimate purport of the Vedas” or “secret principle of the Vedas”. These meanings do bear homogeneity with the meaning of “final portion of the sacred canon of the Vedas.”

“Vedānta is regarded as the perfect system of the Hindus. Hinduism is the popular name for the religion of the Vedānta. It stands out as the most significantly, ‘Clear native philosophy of India.’ It is the most impressive attempt at system building made in India. It answers at once to the strict demands of metaphysics and the deep requirements of a sound religion that does not surrender the claims of reason or the needs of humanity. Vedānta in one form or another has become a contemporary spiritual force working for the good of humanity.”

Besides the *Upaniṣads*, the *Vedānta* philosophy has an addition to itself the *Brahmasūtras* and *Bhagavadgita*. Thus, the *Upaniṣads*, the *Brahmasūtras* and the *Bhagavadgita* comprise what is considered to be the triple texts of perfect authority for the *Vedānta* philosophy. The *Upaniṣads* are the Śruti texts while the *Brahmasūtras* and the *Bhagavadgita* are the Smṛti texts embodying the meaning of the former. Wide portions of these texts are concerned with niceties of language and it is mainly in later times that philosophers make bold to compose independent treatises in which the elements of the *Vedānta* philosophy are set forth according to the logic of the views themselves, rather in an order determined by that scriptural authority.

These triple texts of the *Vedānta* have been interpreted by the commentators with different emphasis in the way of defending their own schools of *Vedānta*. Of the Vedāntic schools, Śaṅkara’s Advaita system, Rāmānuja’s Viśiṣṭādvaita system and Madhva’s Dvaita system have been more prominent as they have large quantity of philosophical literature of sufficient weight and quality.

**B) Principles of Śaṅkara’s Advaita Philosophy :**

An inquiry into the nature of valid proofs in fact, is the beginning point in any system of Indian philosophy. As such, each system of philosophy has given much priority to formulate the theory of *pramāṇas* and ascertain how its philosophical concepts are firmly based on the *pramāṇas*.

Like Bhaṭṭa Mīmāṁsakas, the advaitins too accept the six *pramāṇas* :

1) Perception (*Pratyakṣa*)
2) Inference (*Anumāṇa*)
3) Comparison (*Upamāna*)
1. Perception \([\text{Pratyakṣa}]\)

In the \textit{Vedāntaparibhāṣa}, the perception is defined as being the instrument of valid perceptual knowledge. And, according to the Advaita \textit{Vedānta}, the perceptual knowledge is nothing but \textit{cit} or \textit{pure-consciousness}.\textsuperscript{2} Despite the fact that the Pure-consciousness is beginningless pervading everywhere and devoid of sense-organs, it is revealed through the mental state – \textit{Antāḥkarana-vṛtti}. In case of perception of a pot, when eye is fixed on a pot, the mental state comes out through the eye, illuminates the pot by its own light and assumes its shape. Further, the \textit{cit} within the pot manifests in the mental state, then the pot is seen.\textsuperscript{3}

\textbf{Manas is not Indriya}:

Whether \textit{Manas} is a sense-organ or not is a disputed question. Vacaspati Mishra holds that \textit{Manas} is a sense organ. Śaṅkara in his commentary on the Brahma-sūtras, says that the scriptural texts hold the mind not to be a sense-organ, where as \textit{Smṛti} texts characterise it as a sense-organ. Dharmarāja Adhvarindra regards \textit{Manas} as not a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} For details, see Swamy Madhavananda, \textit{Vedanta Paribhāṣa} of Dharmarāja Adhvarindra, Advaita Ashram, Calcutta, 1989, pp. 4-149
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Dharmarāja Adhvarindra, \textit{Vedanta Paribhāṣa}, p. 8
  \item \textsuperscript{3} Ibid. p. 14-15
\end{itemize}
sense-organ. *Manas* is an auxiliary to *Pramāṇa*. It is the locus but not the instrument of valid cognition. The *Kathopaniṣad* expressly declares that *Manas* is not a sense-organ “greater than the senses are the objects; greater than the objects is the mind.” [III.10]⁴

**Kinds of Perception:**

The perception is two-fold; one is *Savikalpaka* i.e. *Determinate* and the other being *Nirvikalpaka* i.e. *Indeterminate*. In the determinate perception, there is distinction between the thing determined, the jar and the determining attribute i.e. jarness. In an example ‘I know the jar’, the object of knowledge i.e. jar and its qualifying attribute i.e. jarness are apprehended. Thus it is a cognition apprehending relatedness. In the Indeterminate perception, there is no apprehension of relatedness. All determinate perception is the knowledge arising from the sentences like “This is that Devadatta.” “Thou art That” etc.⁵

Perception is again said to be two-fold. That is, *Jiva-Sākṣi* or the witness within the individual self and *Īśvara-Sākṣi* or the witness within God. As has been stated in the *Vedāntaparibhāṣa*, Jiva is nothing but ultimate consciousness limited by the *Antahkaraṇa* or the mind; and *Sākṣi* however is the consciousness that has the *Antahkaraṇa* as its limiting adjunct [*Upādhi*].

When the cosmic illusion or *Māyā* is a qualifying attribute of consciousness, that consciousness is called God; and when the cosmic

---


illusion is limiting adjunct or Upādhi of the consciousness, it is called the witness in God.6

2. Inference [Anumāna]

Inference is the instrument of inferential knowledge (Anumiti). This inferential knowledge is produced by the knowledge of invariable concomitance (Vyāpti). This invariable concomitance is the co-existence of the probandum (Sādhya) with the probans [Līṅga or Hetu] in all the substratums where in the probans may be found. The instrument which generates the inferential knowledge is Vyāptijñāna. The residual impression of Vyāpti and the perception of the probans (Līṅgadarsana) are the causes of inference.7

Advaitins admit only one type of inference i.e. Anvayit or the method of agreement in presence. It admits other two types of Inference such as Svārthānumāna and Parārthānumāna. The former is meant for oneself and the latter for convincing others, which requires the help of syllogisms.8

The Advaita Vedānta advocates only three premises in the Parāthānumāna, namely,

1] Pratijñā - hill is fiery.
2] Hetu - because it has smoke;
3] Udāharana - as in the kitchen.

---

6. तत्त्र प्रत्यपं पुनर्धिविधम् - जीवसाधिकः ईवत्साधिकः चेति | तत् जीवोऽन्य अन्तःकरणवचिन्य चैतन्यम्, तस्यात् तु अन्तःकरणोपालित चैतन्यम् | अन्तःकरणयो विशेषाबलोपपाठाभावभाबम्; | द्वादश्यां तस्यात् तु मायापीतं चैतन्यम् | तत्त्वेत्, तत्त्वाभिभूतत्माया एकत्वम् | Ibid. p. 37-39

7. अनुमितिकः करणसाधनम् | अनुमितिश्व स्वाधिनवेदे स्वाधिनवेदे तत्त्वन्य त्वाभावकः प्रतिभिम् | Ibid., p. 68

8. तत्तत्व्यासायत्वसंकेतकेऽपि | न तु केवलावशि, सर्वस्यावि धर्मसंसारस्य श्रापन्नात्तत्तवराधितियोऽविद्यरीतिवेदेन अर्ज्जवात्तत्तवात्तत्तवाविद्यायत्वसंकेतकेऽपि | Ibid., p. 73
OR the other three namely, Udāharaṇa, Upanaya and Nigamana.9

The Vedānta does establish only subjective and formal validity for inference but not any material validity.

3. Comparison [Upamāṇa]

Both the Mīmāṁsakas and the Advaitins admit Upamāṇa as being an independent means of valid knowledge. It is otherwise called analogical reasoning. The instrument of the valid knowledge of similarity is comparison. It is exemplified thus: A person who has seen a cow in the town, goes to the forest, finds the gavaya and notices its similarity to the cow. He then compares the cow with gavaya and entertains the conviction that the cow resembles the gavaya. The conviction itself is Upamiti which is nothing but the knowledge of similarity. And noticing cow's similarity in gavaya seen in the forest, is the instrument.10

4. Verbal Testimony [Āgama]

Verbal testimony or Āgama is the fourth means of valid knowledge as accepted by the Advaitins. Like the Mīmāṁsakas, the Advaitins too regard the Truth as revealed by the scriptures. Therefore, this means of knowledge has been vitally important. That Āgama is means of valid knowledge in which the relation among the meanings of the words intended by the sentence is not contradicted by any means of valid knowledge like perception. The knowledge arises from such sentence due to four causes:

9. तत्तथात् द्विविधम् | तत स्वार्थानुसारे प्रमाणम्, पार्श्वतु ज्ञात्व मात्रायम् | अवस्थनः व्रतं एव - प्रतिज्ञानां दहारणरूपः, उदाहरणपञ्चविवरणरूपः। | Ibid., p. 75
10. सदृश्यप्रतिक्रियामत्युपयोगम्। तथा हि - गवयेप्रकृतियुक्त्रम् पुरुष्या वर्गे तत्तवाय प्रकृतिसंस्करणे सति भवति भवति। “अथ विन्दो” गोस्त्रोहि। | Ibid., p. 83
i) Expectancy [Akāṅksā]
ii) Consistency [Yogyatā]
iii) Proximity [Āsatti]
iv) Knowledge of purport [Tātparya-Jñāna]

5. Presumption [Arthāpatti]

This means of knowledge consists in the postulation of an explanatory fact [Upapādaka] through the knowledge of a thing to be explained [Upapādaya]. For instance, "Devadatta who is alive, is not at home." Here it is known that Devadatta is alive but not found at home. In order to reconcile the two facts of his being alive and absent from house, we assume that he must be somewhere outside his house. Thus, the knowledge of a thing to be explained i.e. the absence from home of the person who is alive, is instrumental to the knowledge of what explains i.e. Devadatta exists somewhere outside the house, and this itself is the result.

6. Non-Apprehension [Anupalabdhi]

This means of valid knowledge which consists in non-apprehension, is the distinctive cause of that experience of non-existence [Abhāva] which is not generated by an instrumental [Karaṇa] of knowledge. As there is no contact of sense-organ with non-existence, the cognition of non-existence does not arise from sense-organ. The cognition of non-existence arises from sense-organ. The cognition of non-existence arises from sense-organ. The cognition of non-existence arises from sense-organ.
when a perceptible object is not seen. For example, when there is a jar on brightly lit ground, there is an apprehension of the jar. If the jar is not perceived on such ground, non-existence of the jar is ascertained. And this non-existence of the jar is to be known through non-apprehension.

The author of the *Vedāntaparibhāṣa* mentions four kinds of non-existence:

1. Prior non-existence (*Pragabhāva*).
2. Annihilative non-existence (*Pradhvamsabhāva*).
3. Absolute non-existence (*Atyantabhāva*).
4. Mutual non-existence (*Anyonyabhāva*).

The cognition of the above four types of non-existence is through non-apprehension which is possessed of capacity. Hence non-apprehension is a separate means of valid knowledge. 13

**CONCEPT OF THE WORLD**

The validity of means of knowledge which has been explained so far, is of two types. Of the two, the first type of validity belongs to all means of knowledge (except the verbal testimony) that set forth the empirical reality. Because prior to the realisation of one's identity with Brahman, there is no sublation of the objects of those means of knowledge during the empirical state of existence. The second type of validity however, belongs to the scriptural and the Vedāntic texts that have the identity of

the individual soul with the Absolute Brahman for their purport. Accordingly, the consideration of nature and scope of the objects that have phenomenal state of existence is taken up here.

The Three-Fold Existence

The Advaita Vedânta regards the three orders of reality or existence.

i) Pâramârthika or Absolute

This existence represents the Absolute Brahman which remains uncontradicted at all times.

ii) Vyâvahârîka or Phenomenal

This existence belongs to the ether etc. This existence abides till the realisation of the absolute reality i.e. one's identity with Brahman.

iii) Prâtibhâsika or Illusory

This existence refers to silver in the conch-shell, which disappears as soon as the obstacles to a proper vision, such as distance etc. are removed.

Thus, the last two kinds of existence are false impressions due to defect. The distinction between phenomenal and illusory existence is that the defect of the phenomenal perception gets removed after salvation, whereas the defect of illusory perception is vanished as soon as the obstacle is removed. Hence illusory experience lasts for a much shorter period than the phenomenal experience.

The Nature of the world-appearance

The Advaita theory of the world is founded on the basis of the doctrine of Âjñâna or Avidya. The world of multiplicity is false. But it does not mean that the world is absolutely non-existent like horn of hare
or the son of a barren woman. The world is only relatively *Mithya*. As long as the knowledge of Absolute Brahman is not obtained, the world of experience is considered to be real.

The individual souls on account of their inherent *Ajñāna* consider themselves to be different from Brahman and mistake It for this world of plurality. It is just like mistaking a rope for a snake.\(^\text{14}\) Thus, it is *Ajñāna* that binds individual soul in the circle of birth and death. As *Ajñāna* plays an important role in the sphere of the world-experience, its nature needs to be known at this juncture.

### Nature of *Ajñāna*

*Ajñāna* being the cause of all illusions is beginningless and positive (*bhāvarūpa*) and removable by the knowledge of the Absolute Reality. It is said to be beginningless as it is associated with the pure-consciousness which is beginningless. Based on the fact of positivity of *Ajñāna*, it cannot be urged that it is real. Because, it ceases to exist at the dawn of knowledge of the non-dual self which means liberation. If it is unreal it should never appear like the son of a barren woman or sky-flower. If it is inexplicable,\(^\text{15}\) it then becomes impossible to know the nature thereof. Hence, it obviously comes to the stage of non-existence.

In order to subvert these ideas, the Advaitins hold that *Ajñāna* is heterogeneous in character and is composed of the three qualities *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. Due to its association with pure-consciousness it comes to be known as positive. But the positivity of *Ajñāna* does not mean here the opposite of negation (*Abhāva*). It is called positive because it is not a mere negation. Thus, it is not the absence of apprehension but it...

---

is mis-apprehension. This is the basis of experience such as ‘I am an ignorant.’

Ajñāna is only one in true sense. Yet it is felt to be many owing to its association with many individual souls. This idea is further made clear by accepting two categories of Ajñāna, one being the collective (Samaṣṭi) and the other Distributive (Vyaṣṭi).16

**Power of Ajñāna**

Ajñāna has two-fold power. One is the power of concealment (Āvarana-ṭakti) and the other power of projection (vikṣepa-ṭakti). It is the power of concealment which conceals the Sat-cit-ananda-svarupa of Brahman. It is the **Power of Projection** which lets the entire universe proceed from Brahman. These two are different sides of the same Ajñāna, and they never separate from each other. The Absolute Brahman though is declared to be undiscerned (Aparicchinnā), Self-luminous (Svaprakāsa), All-full being partless (Akhanda-paripūrṇa), gets its svarūpa concealed by Ajñāna. But how? In this connection, an example of a small cloud covering the disc of the Sun may be given. Here, it is not the Sun which gets covered by a small cloud. The cloud obscures the path of the vision of the beholder. The Sun remains always bright, uncovered by any veil. So too, Ajñāna though in fact, does not have the capacity of concealing Brahman, obscures the intellect of the Self. As such it does not come within Soul’s experience. Ātman is neither bound nor released. It is the working of Ajñāna obscuring one’s intellect. As a result of concealing power of Ajñāna, soul experiences all mundane conditions as an agent, an enjoyer etc.17

---

Furthermore, when the Absolute Brahman is conditioned by the power of projection of Ajñāna, It comes to be called the cause of the universe. This power by itself projects ether and the world of multiplicity, on the Ātman, just as Ajñāna regarding a rope, by its own power raises up the form of a snake, on the rope which is covered by it. Thus, Ajñāna with its two-fold power finds Ātman as its locus (Adhiṣṭhāna) and the object (Viṣaya) as well; and further, it conceals the lustrous nature of Ātman and projects Jiva, Iśvara and Jagat.18

Order of the World-creation

At the beginning of creation, Iśvara associated with Ajñāna attended by its projective power, first conceives in its mind the entire universe consisting of names and forms and resolves “I should do this”. For, the Chāndogya text states “It reflected; let Me multiply, let Me be effectively born” (VI.ii.3). From this Iśvara, non-quintuplicated (Apāṇicikṛta) five elements signified by their Tanmātras, are produced. Of these, the property of the ether is sound (śabda); of the Air, Sound and Touch (sparśa); of the fire, sound, touch and colour (rūpa); of the water, sound, touch, colour taste and smell (gandha).19 Sound is not the property of the ether alone, as it is found in other elements also. These five elements being the effects of cosmic Māyā which is made up of the three ingredients, are composed of those three ingredients sattva, taken singly, are produced in order, the five sense-organs. That is, from sattva essence of the ether, the ear is produced; from sattva essence of the fire,

---

18. अन्य एव आवरणाकल्या अविद्यास्मात: कृत्तिवधोकृत्तुषु चुक्तुत्तमोहालक्ष; तुच्छसंसारभवनापि सम्भवते यथा स्वच्छन्नेन आकृतायं रूपं सर्पेन्द्रायना | विभेदप्रभावितुं यथा रुपरूप श्वास्त्रायं श्वस्त्रायं सर्पविदिक्षुद्रायवतिः | एवमज्ञानापि स्ववस्त्रायनार्थस्य प्रभावितया आकृतिनिलग्नरूपं भवायति, तद्वृत्त साम्यवर्धिताः | Ibid., p. 11

19. तत: वाचात्विशेषपशुप्रतिमाणद्वाराप्रभावितात्वद्वादशस्त, आकृतिनिलग्नरूपं वाचोपनिः, अन्नेपद, अद्रेयम् पृष्ठिकथि च उपायते, “पृष्ठिकथि मे मेय्यातमयात्मान सांस्कृत:” (५० उपाय २.१.१) इत्यादिकृते | तेषु जात्याभिबत्तद्वितीय तथाविद्यते तत्कारणम् | तदनां सत्त्वज्ञानस्य कारणविविध प्रकृति तेषांकारादिभिः उपर्युपरः | एतानेव सत्त्वज्ञानस्य सत्त्वज्ञानाम् अपनीप्रकृतिनि बोधिते | Ibid., p. 12
the eye; from the sattva essence of the water, the tongue; from the sattva essence of the earth, the nose. And, from these five elements that characterised by sattva quality taken in combination, are produced the mind (Manas), the intellect (Buddhi), the ego (Ahaṅkāra) and the citta.²⁰

Similarly, from these same five elements taken singly, as particularly possessed of the ingredient of Rajas are produced in order, the five organs of action. And from the same five elements taken in combination, possessed of Rajas quality, the five vital airs are produced. Of these, Prāṇa Vāyu moves forward and has its seat in the region of nose etc. Apāṇa Vāyu is that which moves downwards and has its seat in the region of the anus (pāyu) etc. Vyāna Vāyu is what moves in all directions and pervades the whole body. Udāna Vāyu is that which moves upwards and helps the soul’s departure from the body, and has its seat in the region of the throat. Samāna Vāyu is what metabolises the food etc. which we eat and drink and has its seat in the region of the navel.²¹

Further, out of the five elements mentioned above, is made the (liṅga śarira) consisting of the five sense-organs, the five organs of action, the Manas, the Buddhi, and the five vital airs as said above. This subtle body helps the soul’s passage to other world and lasts till liberation.

There are two types of the subtle body, superior and inferior. The superior type of subtle body is the subtle body of Hiranyagarbha. The subtle body of Hiranyagarbha is called Mahat-tattva. He is the first

---

²⁰. ज्ञातिप्रयाणि श्रेय-त्वक्क-वधु-निजः-प्रणायायनि | एतानि आकाशादीनां सालिकांश्यम्: व्यस्तेष्यः: पृथक पृथक्
क्रयोगोत्पन्नः | भृत्वद्वितीम निर्घायांक्तःकरण्वृष्टि: | मनो नाम सहस्त्रत विक्लेन्द्रिक्तान्तकरण्वृष्टि: | अनयोऽङ्गतिवः
विकृताः | अनुसाराशिवात्काल सकट्वृष्टि: विलयः | अभिमन्नतिवर्त्तिकाल सकट्वृष्टि: अहस्सुः | एते पुरुषः
आकाशादिगोत्तिवाक्तां किरीतिश्रो विदिति उत्पन्नः | एते प्रकाशात्वयुक्तः सालिकांश्यमस्कृतस्मि | Ibid. p. 12

²¹. वायुः प्रणायानाथसहस्त्रविकः | प्राणो नाम प्रायमन्वत्वं नासास्थानवत्वं | अपानो नाम अवमन्वत्वं चार्थकिस्थानवत्वं |
व्यानो नाम विचारमन्वत्वं अविक्षिप्तस्थानवत्वं | उदानो नाम कान्तस्थानो अवमन्वत्वं उक्रमणवत्वं | समानो नाम
सालिकांश्यमहत्तिकांश्यमानवत्वं | Ibid., p. 12
individual to be born and is different from Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. The
inferior one is the subtle body of an individual soul and his body is called
the ego. (Ahāṅkāra).

And out of these non-quintuplicated five elements as particularly
possessed of the ingredients of Tamas, gross elements are produced by
the working of quintuplication (Pañcikaraṇa) of the subtle elements.
According to the will power of Īśvara, all five elements combine with one
another in a fixed ratio to make themselves perceived in the phenomenal
world.²²

World appearance as Illusory

The theory of world-appearance as illusory has been technically
called Adhyāropa or Adhyāsa i.e. superimposition. The superimposition
or an erroneous cognition is one whose content is contradicted by a
subsequent cognition. A person sees a rope as snake due to illusion. His
cognition of snake is invalid as it is falsified by subsequent experience
when he sees it as a rope. Thus, it is superimposing upon the real what
is not real.

As the world of space, time etc. is not present at all times, it cannot
be real. The objects of the world never are, but always become. In the
words of Śaṅkara “That which is eternal cannot have beginning and
whatever has a beginning is not eternal.”³³ This suggests that whatever
is non-eternal is unreal and the eternal one is real. Since the world is the

---

²². cTgK^tgKf (H.^.2.4.22)
²³. fHcqcqi-HlSPRT | qfffqrq f°bRKk^cl I aqftcqftfa | Sankara’s Taittiriya Upaniṣad-
projection of Isvara, it becomes endowed with a quality of beginning. As world has a beginning, it is not eternal hence is not real.

But, this world of experience cannot be said all at once to be unreal. Because our perception grasps the world-appearance in its manifold aspects. It does not disprove its reality. Therefore, it may be asked as to how we can deny its reality. The Vedānta gives the solution that the notion of reality or unreality cannot be adjudged by sense-organs. We perceive the Sun to be very small. This perception goes false when he is proved to be very big by means of inference. Consequently, our perception being contradicted by inference, becomes erroneous. The cause of erroneous knowledge is nescience of it.

When the locus of Avidyā i.e., the Supreme Reality is concealed by Avidyā, the association with Antaḥkaraṇauṛttaśc becomes necessary for removing the veil of Avidyā. As soon as complete realization of the blissful self-luminous Brahman is acquired, all illusions vanish themselves. This vanishing of phenomena of the world-appearance means nothing but the realization of the Absolute Reality.24

Moreover, one’s illusory experience of the world is different from that of the other. Because, in accordance with one’s good or bad deeds done in the past life and in accordance with one’s impressions (Samskāras) of the past life, one gets a particular kind of world-experience, and one’s impressions do not affect the formation of the illusory experience of another. The phenomena of world-appearance exists in a certain unknowable state even before one’s cognition. Therefore, the experience of the world-appearance is not completely a subjective creation for every person.

24. समस्तस्म अपवज्ञः मयाममात्स्वस्म। प्रेक्षु ब्रह्मचारिणानां विकटार्देवताः व्यवसिततरुको भवति। Sāṅkara Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya - III.ii.4. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi - 1985, p. 347
Besides, the world-appearance is not as illusory as the perception of silver in the nacre. Because, the latter type of illusion is called prātibhāsīka as it is contradicted by other later experience. But the illusion of the world appearance does not get contradicted in the empirical level. Therefore the illusoriness of the world-appearance is called Vyāvahārika. This world-appearance is Asat as it does not continue to exist at all times, and it disappears at the dawn of knowledge of Brahman. Moreover, the world of manifold nature is sat, since it exists, for a time. But one and the same object cannot be both sat and asat. Hence the falsehood of the world-appearance is neither sat nor asat in an absolute sense, therefore it is sadasadvilākṣaṇa which means inexplicable. It is in this sense the world-appearance has been regarded as illusory.

In addition to this, the Advaita theory of the world-appearance as illusory has rational foundation. Not only the revealed scriptures, but also perception and reasoning as well prove the illusory nature of the world. The basic point of consideration is that the effect is non-different from the cause. The perception tells us that there is anything other than clay in pot made of clay. A pot cannot be separated from the clay. The effect does not exist without cause. Hence it is not legitimate to suppose that effect is a new thing as it is produced now. It persists in substance always in the material cause. It is even unwise to think of non-existent entity coming into existence. If it could be ever possible, then pressing oil out of sand would have become possible. But it is not so. The effect therefore has to be admitted to be non-different from the cause.\(^{25}\)

Another important point is that the change of form does not imply the change in reality. The form is but a state of the material or substance

\(^{25}\) 1) Vide. Śaṅkara bhāṣya on Bra. Su. II.i.15; p. 202
and it cannot be separated from the latter even in thought. Therefore, it is not reasonable to think that perception of a change in form as a change of reality. Devadatta and his sitting or standing is recognised as identical. Thus a form or quality is not distinct from substance.  

So any distinction between quality and its substance would be indefensible.

Pure Being, the common cause of the entire world is itself formless though appearing in various forms. It is infinite though it appears in all finite forms. In fact, consciousness is present in every appearance of existence. When we perceive clay modifying into a pot, our clay-consciousness is changed into pot consciousness.

Thus all these arguments constitute a strong rational foundation of the Advaita theory of world-appearance as illusory.
CONCEPT OF BRAHMAN

Śaṅkara believes and posits the reality of only one category and that is nothing besides Brahman. All that is Brahman. It is non-dual. This doctrine of Brahman has been established on the authority of the scriptural texts.

Śaṅkara's Absolute Brahman is not substance but is the pure spirit. As there is nothing but Brahman, It cannot be defined in terms of categories. Brahman is beyond the sphere of the relational ways of knowledge. It is impersonal transcendent being. It is unthinkable in terms of predicates. It is the seer of the objects. The sights are many but the seer is one. It has no Jāti no Guṇa. It does not undergo any change. It is existence itself. It is identical with the self of all beings. It is neither a subject nor an object, nor even the unity of the subject and object. It is an unchanging indeterminate and subject-objectless consciousness. The statement say that Brahman cannot be described, does not mean that It does not exist. It can be known indirectly, and realised directly through spiritual experience.

Aspects of Brahman

Śaṅkara formulates two types of definitions with regard to two aspects of Brahman. One is svarūpa-lakṣaṇa and the other being Tatāstha-lakṣaṇa. The first definition speaks of the essential nature of Brahman, which is of the nature of Existence (sat) Knowledge (cit) and Bliss (ānanda). In fact, these are not so much the attributes of Brahman. The description of these phrases has to be negatively interpreted. That is, Brahman is not unreality, nor ignorance nor sorrow. Thus, in the light of appositional construction, if those phrases are understood the true essence of the svarūpa-lakṣaṇa of Brahman can be obtained. Moreover, there is no distinction between the quality and substance in Brahman. The Absolute Brahman which is spoken of as Sat, Cit and Ānanda is same
as Nirguṇa Brahman. That is, the Absolute Brahman is attributeless (Nirguṇa), without any activity or movement (Niṣkriya), without any part (Niravayava), unconditioned (Nirupādhi), having no distinguishing element in It (Nirviśeṣa) and having in Itself no difference either sajātiya, vijātiya or svagata.

*Tatāstha-lakṣaṇa* demarcates an object from the rest by indicating some accidental qualifications. For instance, when showing a particular house to a strange man. We point it out to the crow which is sitting on the roof. A sitting crow is not an essential character of the house. It only serves to distinguish the object while not being originally related to the defined object.

Śaṅkara gives an ordinary example of actor to illustrate both the essential nature and accidental nature of Brahman. That is, a shepherd appears on the stage in the role of a king, wages war, conquers a country and rules it. The description of the actor as shepherd gives what he is from the real point of view. It is an essential description. But the description of him as a king, ruler and conqueror, is applied to him only from the point of view of the stage and his role there; it is merely a description of what is accidental to the person and does not touch his essence.28

So too, the description of this aspect of Brahman as creator, sustainer and destroyer of the world or by any other characteristic connected with the world is a mere accidental description. Brahman described by accidental attributes, is nothing but Saguṇa Brahman. According to the Advaita, Saguṇa Brahman or God is conceived as an object of worship or meditation and through a deeper meditation upon Saguṇa Brahman it is realized that the relation of the unreal to the real

---

28. तथा मूलकारणगुजारताकारार्थेन तेन कार्यार्थण नटवस्मिःव्हान्हासम्पदें ग्रहिताः | एवं पुक्षः कार्यस्य ग्रामुः | सत्यमञ्जरिब्रह्मजन्यम् च कारणादेवभ्रायते | Ś. Brahmastūtra-bhāṣya, II.1.18 p. 207.
cannot be itself real. Thus arises the realisation of the Supreme Reality which is beyond all multiplicity and devoid of all ascribable attributes.

The reality of the self like that of a worldly object is based on Ajñāna on the failure to realize that God is the only Reality. God is worshipped because He is thought of as the creator, the controller etc., of the world. Hence worship and the God worshipped are bound up with the phenomenal standpoint. The world therefore appears as real and God as endowed with the attributes.

But from the transcendental point of view, the God is indeterminate and cannot be described by any positive attributes. To quote: “The metaphysical idea, put in terms of theology, is nothing but the conception of God as the creator of the world and possessed of a magical creative power, Māyā”.29

**God – the Creator of the world**

Brahman conditioned by Ajñāna with its two-fold power, is both the efficient cause and the material cause, when respectively caitanya and Ajñāna are chiefly considered. Just as a piece of iron moves here and there due to its contact with magnet, so also Ajñāna, though itself insentient gets awakened into action when it is associated with Ātman. The non-eternity of the world results from the superimposition. Ātman does not modify Itself into the world. The world-perception takes place due to the working of Ajñāna. Hence Ātman need not lose its Caitanya- svarūpa by being the material cause. In this connection, an example of a spider and a web may be given for more clarification.

A spider produces a web out of itself. Mere an insentient body cannot produce a web out of itself. Also, mere consciousness without body cannot accomplish the work of producing a web. The fact is, the web is produced

---

29. Chaterjee & Datta, *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 1950, p. 400
when both body and consciousness get together. Since, a spider gets the material out of its body to produce a web, it is regarded as material cause. Since the spider itself is the producer of the web, it comes to be called the efficient cause too. Thus it is seen that when the body of spider is chiefly considered in the process of producing the web, it is called the material cause; and when the spider itself is chiefly considered, it becomes the efficient cause.

Similarly, Brahman associated with two powers of Ajñāna is regarded as efficient cause when caitanya is chiefly considered. And when its associate i.e. Ajñāna is chiefly considered the same Brahman is regarded as the material cause. Thus Brahman is both the efficient cause and the material cause of the world. This is known as the doctrine of Abhinna-nimittopādāna.

God’s creation of the world proceeds without implements. He needs no external co-operation as He possesses all necessary powers perfect within Himself. As God is essentially free, He cannot be under any compulsion to create the world. As He is Nityatrpta and Āptakāma. He has no motive.

God’s act of creating the world is but the spontaneous overflow of His nature (Svabhāva), just as the nature of man to breath in and out. At the close of each kalpa, the world gets merged through God, in non-distinct prakṛti, while the individual souls lie in deep slumber as it were. But the embodied souls which have not yet worked out the fruits of their deeds, have again to enter the embodiment, as soon as God sends forth a new material world.

Brahman – Names and Forms

Names and forms are superimposed on Brahman. There may be a number of day-dreams fitting across the material arena, but no embodied

30. ‘वा तो वन्यनामात्मक वा व्यतिरिक्तं किंचिदधर्मनिर्भरितं केवलं तीलात्म्यः प्रकृत्यः, क्रीडाविहारं भवति, यथा चोख्मात्मात्मविशेषं निर्भरितं केवलं तीलात्म्यं संप्रविश्व, एव विषयवेदनार्थं किंचिदविचित्रादित्यं स्वभवतिः केवलं तीलात्म्यं प्रकृतिप्रभिष्यति’ | Śaṅkara’s bhasya on the Brahmasūtras II.i.33, p. 216
one pays any heed to them. They are evanescent, ever fleeting; so too are the names and forms and their phenomenal usage. But, when the nature of the names and forms are recognised to be unreal, the intellect is set free to indulge in the meditation upon Brahman. Just as the rocks that lie buried in the river-bed remain unaffected by the flow of the stream. So also the immutable Brahman remains unchanged inspite of the fleeting things of the world. When Absolute Brahman which is of the nature of Existence, Knowledge and Bliss is realized, the cognition of names and forms vanishes of its own accord.\textsuperscript{31}

In fine, Brahman is foundational though It is in no sense substance. To say that Brahman is Absolute Reality is to say that it is different from the phenomenal, the spatial and temporal. There is nothing similar to It, nothing different from It and no internal differentiation, because all these are phenomenal distinctions. Due to its nature opposed to all empirical existence, It is understood as the negative of everything which is positively known. Though the words used are negative, what is meant, is intensely positive. Here negation means only an affirmation of absence. It is eternal because Its completeness and perfection are not at all related to time. It is the Highest Truth, perfect Being and fullest freedom.

\textsuperscript{31} Vidyaranya, \textit{Pañcadasī}, Ramakrishna Ashram, Mysore, 1996, XIII. 93-102, pp. 471-74
CONCEPT OF INDIVIDUAL SOUL

Nature of the Soul

The Advaita Vedānta has its aim to lead an individual soul to the reality of the one Absolute Self. The individual soul is nothing but Brahman Itself. The distinction between the individual soul and Brahman is experienced due to the illusory adjuncts. The soul in its intrinsic state, is not a finite miserable being. It does not separate itself from the rest of the existence and does not limit itself by a feeling of the ‘I’ ‘This’ or ‘That’. It is also free from all worries that arise from hankerings after worldly objects. The self really then is unlimited consciousness and bliss. The soul is said to be Vibhu or all-pervading but not of atomic size. If the soul were to be minute, it could not feel throughout the whole body.\(^{32}\)

There is difference of opinion regarding atomic size of the jīva. “Those who hold that the soul is atomic, argue that an infinite soul cannot move, where as it is seen to leave one body and return to another. This passage, according to Śaṅkara, does not touch the soul as such, but only its limitations. The objection that if the soul be atomic, it can only be in one place in the body, and so cannot perceive throughout the body, is set aside, by the example that even as a piece of sandal-wood refreshes the body all over, even though it touches the body only at one spot. So the atomic soul can feel throughout the body by means of the sense of touch which pervades the whole body. Śaṅkara refutes the suggestion by urging that the thorn on which one treads is also connected with the whole sense of feeling, though the pain is felt only on the sole of foot and not on the whole body. The advocates of the atomic view suggest that the atomic soul pervades the whole body by means of the quality of spirit or

\(^{32}\) S.B.S.Bh., II.iii.29, p. 285
caitanya, even as the light of a lamp placed in one spot extends from there to the whole room. Śaṅkara declares that quality cannot extend beyond substance. The flame of a lamp and its light are not related as substance and quality. Both are fiery substances; only in the flame the parts are drawn closer together. While in the light they are more widely separated. If the quality of caitanya or spirit pervades the whole body, then the soul cannot be atomic. The passages of the Upaniṣads which refer to the soul as Anu have in view not the Ātman but the nucleous of the qualities of understanding and mind. They are intended to show the subtlety of the Ātman which escapes perception. It is admitted that the empirical self, bound down by Manas. etc., is not infinite while the Supreme Reality is infinite, if associated with buddhi. All the statements about the soul's abiding in the heart are due to the theory of the location of the buddhi in it.

Again, what is everywhere can certainly be in one place, though what is confined to a place cannot be everywhere. In this way, Śaṅkara explains all the passages of the Upaniṣads, which assert a spatial limitation of the soul.33

"The individual self when seen sub specie acternitatis, is Brahman itself. When this fact is realized in one's own experience, what is denied is not the jīva as a spiritual entity, but only certain aspects of it, such as its finitude and its separateness from other selves. Its conception may thereby become profoundly transformed, but the important point is that it is not negated (badhita) in the same way in which the physical world is. It is, on the other hand, reaffirmed, though only as Brahman.34

Transmigration of the Soul

In the light of the Upanisadic declaration, the Advaita Vedānta holds the view that there are three paths or stages as to the condition of the individual soul after death. The enlightened souls after death, will be carried through the Devayāna or the 'path of the Gods' onwards into Brahman, whence there is no return. Secondly the doers of rituals daily and occasional, go upwards through the Pitryāna or the 'Path of Fathers' into the luminous realm of the moon, enjoy there the fruit of their good deeds and again descend once more to the earth with new incarnation with much distinction of the moral character. And those who possess neither knowledge nor the merit of good deeds are reborn as animals, birds, plants etc.

Both the Devayāna and the Pitryāna are said to be valid only in the exoteric sense. That is, only for him, to whom this world of multiplicity still appears as real, the two paths can be real. The Advaita Vedānta regards the liberation attained through the Devayāna as being not yet complete. It becomes so only when those who go through the lower knowledge have entered into the Saguṇa Brahman, there obtain the perfect knowledge, the samyagdarsana. For only the latter that is the knowledge of the identity of one's own soul with Brahman, brings about absolute liberation.

Is the Soul One or Many?

From the standpoint of the Absolute, a question about the number of the jivas does not arise at all, as there is no world and no jiva in that transcendental level. But from the empirical point of view multiplicity of the jivas has to be acknowledged. It is a known fact that the experience of one individual soul is however not same as that of another. Hence, a doubt here arises as to whether there is one individual soul or many.
The Advaitins hold that there is but one jīva and all this world as well as all jivas in it are seen due to wrong apprehension. The world-appearance and multiplicity of the individual souls are just because of the limiting adjuncts being different. This is general understanding of the view of the Ekajīva-vāda.

To be specific, the view is that there is only one jīva animating only one body. The other bodies that we see, are non-animated like the ones seen in the dream. This world of the living and the non-living is a fiction created by a single jīva animating a single body. This view therefore is known as Eka-śārīraka-jīva-vāda.35

Another group of the Eka-jīva-vādins contends that Hiranyagarbha, the reflection of Brahman is the one principal jīva. And the other jīvas are mere the reflections of this principal jīva. This view of single jīva with many distinct bodies is known as Saviśeṣa-anekāsārtra-ekajīva-vāda. Besides, there are other explanations regarding the theory of the Ekajīva-vāda. Yet all different views of Eka-jīva-vāda agree that there is no distinction between the bound and the released as only a single jīva is there; and the non-recollection of one's happiness or pain by another is on account of the difference of bodies.

Such of the Advaitins who do not agree with the views set forth above, uphold the view of the plurality of jīvas. It is that there are many individuals and the world-appearance has no permanent illusion for all souls. Each individual creates for itself its own illusion. As for instance, ten persons see a rope in darkness, and having the illusion of a serpent run away. They all agree in their individual perceptions that they have all seen one and the same serpent. But, there is no serpent at all. This

doctrine is mainly based on the point that jivas are many or different owing to the association with the Vyāsti-Ajñāna. According to this view, the distinction between the bound and released exists on account of the plurality of jīvas.\textsuperscript{36}

CONCEPT OF THE PATHWAY TO REALISATION

\textit{Karma} and \textit{Jñāna}

It has been pointed out that \textit{Jñāna} alone is the direct means to liberation. But, enlightenment of knowledge arises in him who is completely detached from the pleasure-giving mundane ends. The sense of absolute detachment from worldly objects of enjoyment results from the purification of the mind which is usually swayed by the selfish passions and desires. But how this purification of the mind be gained? It is but through the performance of the obligatory works (\textit{Nityakarmas}), Śaṅkara states in this connection that “When a man performs higher kinds of works (\textit{Nityakarma}), his mind unsoiled by desire for fruits becomes regenerated and pure; when thus purified, the mind becomes fit for contemplation of the self. Thus the man whose mind has been purified by the performance of obligatory works and who is prepared to acquire the self-realization, may gradually attain \textit{Jñāna}.\textsuperscript{37}

All deeds good and bad demand their retribution in the following existence. Hence, no performance of deeds of whatever kind it may be, ever leads to liberation, but only back again to \textit{Samsāra}. It is not certain that there may not be works demanding for their atonement for several

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., p. 28

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Vidyavachaspati V. Panoli, \textquoteright\textquoteright{Gita in Saṅkara\textquoteright s own words\textquoteright} Part-II, The Mathrubhumi Printing & Publishing Co.Ltd., Calicut 1990, pp. 310-11.}
lives and even if one were successful in getting rid of the evil deeds by ceremonies yet the good works would still be left. These ceremonies bring with not only annihilation but in addition, positive fruits to be enjoyed in a future life. Further it is practically impossible to avoid all works throughout entire life, so long as the natural disposition of the soul to action and enjoyment persists. Therefore, so long as this natural disposition is not removed through perfect knowledge, there is no hope of liberation. The liberation if were dependent upon the merits of deeds, it would necessarily be transitory due to consumption of the works, and be graduate owing to their different value; these two factors contradict the conception of liberation as an eternal and paramount state. The view that “liberation is not possible through works” amounts to the saying that it is not attainable by moral purification too. Liberation does not come about like a quality of the mirror which absorbs the reflection into it through the action of cleaning. But the goal of man, liberation is to be achieved only through the knowledge of Ātman. And this knowledge is independent of performance of works and of moral improment but in itself alone suffices for liberation. Thus the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad declares “He who knows Brahman, becomes Brahman.” (III.2.9). The fruit of knowledge is not like the fruit of work, consists of something future but is based on inner perception.

The discussion leaves a clear understanding of the essentiality of Karma and Jñāna as Śaṅkara holds. It is therefore not correct to say that the works have no room in the Advaita Vedānta. On the contrary higher works must always be performed so long as the dawn of spiritual knowledge, where all works, all duties find their completion and the highest fulfilment.

38. Ibid., III.iv. 1-17
39. कृतां कृत्यं कर्त्यं ये न कृतां कृत्यं विशिष्टतन्माद्यस्मृतं भाषिण व अन्यायं कर्त्यं ये सर्वं भयावहं नित्याकृतं। | न स अन्यायं कर्त्यं परिसमाप्तं कर्त्यविचित्रिता इति अभिप्राय। | Ibid., Part II. pp. 255
Theory of Bhakti

Besides *Karma*, *Bhakti* has also been accepted as an indirect means of self-realisation. *Bhakti* is contemplation on one's self (*Nijasvarūpānuṣandhāna*).

Means of Realisation

It is an admitted fact that the self-realization is possible through only the spiritual knowledge; and the spiritual knowledge takes its birth in him whose mind is purified by the performance of the obligatory duties. This does not mean here that the purification of the mind does consequently beget the knowledge. Yet, the person whose mind is purified, has to undergo some necessary accomplishments through which the knowledge dawns. Those accomplishments are mainly four:

1) Hearing (*Śravaṇa*)
2) Reflection (*Manana*)
3) Meditation (*Nididhyāsana*)
4) Absorption (*Samādhi*)

Through the repeated practice of these accomplishments, the forces of deep-rooted beliefs of the past gradually disappear. When wrong beliefs thus become removed and firm faith in the truth of the Vedānta remain permanent, the aspirant is instructed by the preceptor - Thou Art Brahman. He then starts contemplating on this truth steadfastly till at last he has an immediate realization of the truth in the form of I am Brahman. Thus, the illusory distinction between the individual soul and Brahman at last disappears and liberation is attained.

CONCEPT OF LIBERATION

Nature of Liberation

Liberation is nothing else than our true self existent from all eternity. In the words of Dharmarājādhhvarin the attainment of Brahman
which is Bliss as also the cessation of grief, is liberation. But, entering the higher world or experiencing the joy produced there, is however not liberation; for that being non-eternal as something generated and there is the contingence of a fresh return to Saṁsāra for the released one.

**Liberation is not a new production**

Although, the liberation is said to be our true self, it is hidden from us due to ignorance, whence also the knowledge of Ātman has not to produce anything new whatever as its fruit, but only to remove the obstacles in the way of liberation.

**Theory of Jivanmukti**

*Jivanmukti* is a kind of liberation even when the soul is associated with an embodiment. In precise, even on the attainment of liberation the embodiment of the individual soul may continue to exist, if there is the product of karma which had already borne its effect (*prārabha-karma*). The knowledge of the Highest Reality destroys no doubt, the karmas that still lie accumulated (*Saṅcita*) and prevents the karmas which being gathered here in this life (*Saṅciyamāna*), thus makes transmigration impossible. But the *prārabdha-karmas* cannot be prevented; they have to be experienced by *Jivanmukta*. After the exhaustion of the *Prārabdha-karmas*, his gross and subtle bodies perish; the vital force of *Jivanmukta* merges in the Absolute Brahman; and thus he attains the disembodied state of liberation i.e. *Videhamukti*.

In fine, there is no bondage or liberation. It is all false. Jiva has neither destruction nor origin. He is neither aspirant nor aspiring for liberation. He is always free and not other than Absolute Brahman.

---

In a nutshell, the philosophy of Advaita as advocated by Śaṅkara, may be summarised under a single declaration: ब्रह्म सत्यं जगन्नित्या जीवं ब्रह्मेव नापरः ॥

A. Principles of Madhva’s Dvaita Philosophy:

Madhva’s philosophy represents one of the main points of departure in the Vedānta system on the issue of Theism versus Monism.

He is the most prolific writer among the great Bhāṣyakāras of the Vedānta system. He has left thirty-seven works in all, of which only six are minor ones, comprising poems, stotras and miscellaneous works.

The following are the thirty-seven works of Madhva, from which his doctrines have been culled out:

A] Commentaries on the RgVeda & the Upaniṣads -
   1) कृतबायाम्  2) ईश  3) केन  4) कठ
   5) पदप्रमण  6) मुण्डक  7) माण्डूक्य  8) एतरेय
   9) तैत्तिरीय  10) बृहदारण्यक  11) छान्दोध्य

B] Commentaries on Brahmasūtras -
   12) ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्यम्  13) अनुवाचायानम्  14) ब्रह्मसूत्राण्वभाष्यम्  15) न्यायविवरणम्

C] Commentaries on the Gītā -
   16) गीताभाष्यम्  17) गीतातत्त्वयम्

D] On the Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavata -
   18) महाभारततत्त्वयनिर्णयः  19) भागवततत्त्वयम्

E] Monographs (प्रकरणग्रन्थां) -
   20) प्रमाणलक्षणम्  21) कथालक्षणम्  22) उपाधिक्षणम्  23) मायावदात्मद्विजनम्  24) प्रपन्नमित्यात्वानुमानमित्यवेदनम्
Some hold कन्दुक्तुलिति to be the 38th work of Madhva. Vidwan Bannanje Govindacharya says that, he has procured palm-leaf manuscripts of two more works of Madhva and they are: 1) Nyāsapaddhati; and 2) Tithinīrṇaya. He has mentioned it in his kannada booklet ‘Granthānjali - Ācārya Madhvara Mūlagraṅthagalu’.

Madhva’s Dvaita philosophy is based on the statement:

स्वतन्त्रम्बतत्त्व ो प्रभम द्विविध मन्त्र् । (Tattvaviveka.1)
“There are two orders of reality - the independent and the dependent.”

However, the cardinal doctrines of Madhva’s Dvaita Vedānta have been summed up as nine in a verse attributed to Vyāsatirtha (1478-1539 A.D.), one of his illustrious followers. The verse runs as follows:

श्रीमान्याध्यमे हरि परतर् सत्यं जगतांबो
भेदो जीवणा हरेरनुत्तरा नीचोच्छाबां गताः ।
मुक्तिन्द्रसुयुतानुभूतिर्मला भक्तिश्च तत्संधानं
हस्याधिश्रंगं प्रभाणमविकलामायकवेषां हरेि ॥

The nine doctrines enlisted in this verse are:

1) हरि परतर् – In all respects Lord Viṣṇu alone is Supreme and the Highest; 2) सत्यं जगत् – This entire universe is truly and ultimately real;
3) तत्वो भद्रः – The five-fold difference is fundamental; 4) जीवनमधृ हररजुवरः – The manifold embodied souls are all dependent on Lord Viṣṇu; 5) (जीवनमधृ) नीचोभावां गताः – The embodied souls are inherently graded as higher and lower (mainly three-fold); 6) मुक्तिः नैसज्ञानानुभूतिः – Liberation is enjoying the bliss befitting to one’s original form; 7) अमला भक्तिः तत्साधनम् – The means to secure liberation is pure devotion to Lord Viṣṇu; 8) अशादनिरिथया प्रमाणम् – The means of valid knowledge are only three; viz, perception, inference and verbal testimony; 9) अखिलान्यायवेदेऽ हरिः – Lord Viṣṇu alone is known by the entire mass of scriptures.

1) हरिः परतः –

“God is the Independent Being possessed of all adequate and unrestricted powers in regard to the cit and Acit and who is all-knowing. He is the one who controls the cit and Acit (sentient and insentient reals) which are of a different nature from Him.”

Over-all supremacy of Lord Hari - is declared in the scriptural texts.

(1) The entire universe is indwelt by the Lord.41
(2) God is dwelling invisible in all beings and hence is not manifest.42
(3) That of whom these beings are born, by whom when born they live, into whom they go and dissolve, desire to know That, That is Brahman.43
(4) He is the overlord; He is omniscient; He is the Indweller; He is the source of all; He is the origin and dissolution of all beings.44

41. ईशवस्यमिञ्जरन् सत्वं [Iṣā.Up., mantra-1]
42. एव सर्वेण भूतेऽ गूढतः न प्रकटते [Kath.Up., III.12]
43. यत्र व इपान्त भूतानि नामस्ते | येन जातानि जोतानि यदाद्यत्तं द्वितीयानुभविश्वासितं | तद्विन्यासः तदर्थं ||[Tait.Up., III.1]
44. एव सर्विन्त्रं एव सर्वसं एष्ठोत्तरान्योग्याः योनिः सर्वेण्यमप्राप्तेः हि भूतानाः [Mund.Up., 1.6]
(5) He is the Father of this world, the Nourisher and the Grandsire.\textsuperscript{45}

(6) O Sage, in reality there is nothing higher than Lord Vāsudeva – neither Matter, nor Action [non Destiny], nor Time, nor Innate nature, nor embodied soul.\textsuperscript{46}

(7) Lord Viśṇu is deviod of all defects. He is the embodiment of all virtues. He is independent and all are under His control. He is considered to be the highest.\textsuperscript{47}

(8) Viśṇu is \textit{parama} i.e., the highest. In the communion of gods, Viśṇu was the highest.\textsuperscript{48}

(9) Supreme is the abode of Viśṇu; always it is witnessed by the liberated.\textsuperscript{49}

These scriptural statements reveal the Supremacy of Lord Viśṇu.

The attributes and actions of Brahman are the same as itself. They are not different. There is no mutual difference either, among them. There is an intrinsic peculiarity in things (called Viṣeṣa) by which, even in the absence of actual difference, a relation of ‘\textit{Substance and attributes}’ is rendered possible for purpose of reference.

“Brahman is formless because it transcends Prakṛti and others and controls them all.”\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Gita, IX.17}  \\
\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Bhag., II.5.14}  \\
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Paramopanisad quoted in the VTN, III.1}  \\
\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Quoted by Dr. B.N.K. Sharma, op.cit. p.8, fn.2}  \\
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Rgveda, 1.22.20}  \\
\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Madhva Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya (B.S.Bh.), iii.2.14}
\end{flushleft}
All forms, so far as our minds can conceive, are either prakrtic or bhautika (constituted of the five elements). This is, however, impossible in Brahman, which is admittedly above the sway and influence of Prakṛti and bhūtas (elements). Hence it follows that it is formless.

There is no independent potency anywhere in the universe (in Prakṛti, Puruṣas etc.) It is Īśvara Himself that directs properly, the various potencies of nature and of the souls for production, growth, development etc., which are always dependent on Him.51

The Supreme Being, possessed of infinite powers, enters into various stages of evolution of matter and brings about each and every such manifestation of things, Himself.52

This idea gives point to the conception of God as the infinite one whose presence is felt everywhere and in everything that exists. This is how the Supreme chooses to reveal His pūrṇatva in a very real and active sense: 'तेनेन्द्र पूर्ण पुरुषेण सर्वथा।'

2) सत्त्व जगत् -

The ultimate reality or otherwise of this material world is one of the much discussed topics in Vedānta metaphysics. And Madhva, on the basis of the pramanās or valid means of knowledge, holds the reality of this world consisting of the sentient souls and insentient matter with all its effects. He declares सत्त्वं चायथ अनुभृतिः.53 The firm foundation on which the ultimate reality of this world depends, according to Śrī Madhvācārya, is anubhūti or consolidated human experience.

51. अन्यं क्षणम् शक्तिनां शक्तत्स्वातंज्ञेयेश एव हि ||
   ज्ञानस्ते; प्रेमक्षेत्रं; तद्धीनाएव सर्ववदा || Anuvyākhyaṇa, p. 13b
52. तत् तत् स्थानों मयुष्मत्चक्रवत्तारः ||
   एकं एव महाशयं। कुरुतं सर्वभूतात् || Madhva Brahmastūtra-bhasya, ii.3.11
53. Madhva, Anuvyākhyaṇa, Ed. K.T. Pandurangi, Bangalore, p. 775
This reality as a whole is expressed in a system of five-fold distinction, which gives its philosophical designation of “Prapañca”:

प्रकृति पञ्चविंशो भेदः प्रपञ्चः।

“This valuable five-fold difference is “Prapañca”.

The word “Prapañca” is derived from the substantive “Pañcan” with the suffix “da” signifying “kind”, the prefix ‘pra’ denotes ‘excellence’ or value. It is excellent in the sense that knowledge of this five-fold difference constitutes right knowledge that leads to Mokṣa.

“This five-fold difference is the difference that exists between Jīvas, Jaḍas (material principles) and Brahman on the one hand and mutually Jīvas and Jaḍas themselves on the other.”

“This scheme of Pañcabheda is not illusory as it is cognized by God, maintained and controlled by Him; for there can be no illusion for God.”

According to Madhva, those who hold this world to be a product of illusory experience forget the fundamental and essential phenomenon governing all cases of illusion. To understand this phenomenon, one has to analyse any case of illusion. Let us take the familiar example of silver seen in the shell. Here an analysis will show that when one beholds the shell, one mistakes it to be a piece of silver on the basis of Sādṛṣya or resemblance between the two. So, it means that the person had previously seen a piece of silver elsewhere and when he sees the shell he remembers the silver previously seen and due to the resemblance between the two and the inadequate perception due to distance and proximity.

54. जीवविविधता चैव जडेविविधता तथा ||
    जीववेदो मिथ्यावेद जडविविधता तथा ||
    मिथ्याय जडवेदोंय प्रसंयो भेदपंचः || M. Viṣṇutattvaniṁna, p. 27

55. पपमेख्येऽन्तः सत्तपत्तिपुरुषो न हृतसं प्रातिकलितत् || न हेतुवर्तस्य प्रातिः || Ibid., p. 27
brilliant light, he mistakes it for a piece of silver. That is, the piece of silver seen elsewhere previously is real; the shell seen for the time being is also real. Without two similar and real things, there cannot happen the phenomenon of illusion or superimposition. Thus, one can see that illusions depend upon a number of real factors, like the sense-organ being influenced by the impressions left by a similar object seen in a different context; and the object in front itself distorted by insufficient light (rope-snake) or placed at an inappropriate distance or in an environment which is favourable to erroneous knowledge (shell-silver). The main condition is that the illusions are possible only in the event of resemblance between two similar and real entities.

Madhva concludes the reality of this material world on the basis of intuitive experience of one and all, and also on the evidence of logical reasoning. This conclusion of Madhva has the support of the authoritative scriptures, which are quoted by him in his works:

1) विश्व सत्यम् || (ऋणवेद, II.24.6) (The Universe is real)

2) बन्धुकेत सत्यमित्र || तत्र मोक्षम् || (Ibid. X.55-6) (God’s creation is all real! not false)

3) कवित्वर्मी परिभृष्ट स्वयंभूत्योत्तरत्नतो-वर्ण || व्यदाच्चाय्नत्तक्षम || समान्तम् || (ईशोपनिषत्, 8b) (God is omniscient, the controller of all minds, omnipresent and independent. He created real things in their proper forms eternally. And the world is God’s creation.)

"World-experience is sometimes likened in our śāstras to dreams etc., not on account of its factual unreality; but in virtue of the impermanent and changing character of the world and its dependent nature."56

56. अनिस्थत्व-विकारित्व-पारतत्वविद्विसयत् ||
   स्मारदीताय় জনলো, ন তু জোঁধিতাবর্তিতা || Ibid, p. 25
It is therefore to be given an indesputable reality in the sense of being 'anāropitarti' (non-superimposed) and pramitiviṣayāḥ (being an object of valid experience, albeit impermanent and subject to change and modifications. Its reality is naturally based on the concept of 'difference' which, in its five-fold aspect, constitutes the "pra-paṇca", as already explained.

3) तत्त्वो भेदः -

Difference is one of the pivotal concepts of Madhva’s ontology.

Difference is not merely a component part of reality, but constitutes its very essence.

The concept of ‘difference’ (bheda) has, however, been severely criticized by many eminent dialecticians of the Advaita school - such as Maṇḍana, Vimuktātman and Śriharṣa. Madhva has taken due note of all their criticism, in formulating his own conception of ‘difference’, with the help of a new category of “viśeṣa”, which he uses to overcome the difficulties which are supposed to stand in the way of an intelligible conception of ‘difference’ in relation to objects:

Difference is of the nature of thing (dharmi). It cannot be argued that difference cannot be viewed as the nature of things, as it is apprehended only relatively to the perception of a given object and that from which it differs. Just as identity of Jīva and Brahman, tho’ the same as the nature of the Ātman, is yet apprehended only in relation to the terms : Jīva and Brahman, similarly, in the case of difference.”

Such, in brief, is Madhva’s theory of difference. It is plainly different from the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Mīmāṁsā view and this is another striking proof that the logico-philosophical bases of Madhva’s system are in no

57. पदार्थव्यवस्था भेदम् | न व धर्माञिनिग्रहायेऽभेदम् जीवन्म विषयर्व भेदम् मन्यते यथाविशेषः | Ibid., p. 21
way borrowed from or inspired by these pre-Madhva realisms and that they are the result of independent cogitation on the problems of philosophy.

We have seen that God, matter and souls constitute the three major realities of Madhva's system.

These manifold differences are generally classified under these heads: 1) Sajātiya or difference of one thing from other of its own kind. 2) Vijātiya or difference from those of another kind and 3) Svagata or internal distinctions within an organic whole. The last one is not admitted by Madhva in its absolute sense. In the sphere of the other two differences he has adumbrated a scheme of "five-fold difference" (Pañcabhedā).

"This difference, though, partaking of the nature of things, is yet colourfully identical with it and through such colourful identity it is mentally and linguistically deferentiated from the object, wherever exigencies require it. "Višeṣas" are the basis of such colourful identity." Madhva offers his theory of "Savīšeṣābheda" between the object and its difference, as a way out of the riddle.

Difference is thus the nature of the thing (dharmisvarūpa) itself. It is perceived simultaneously with the perception of an object. In one and the same act of perception, an object and its individuality, (which is the same as its difference from all else) are both perceived in a flash as it were.

Madhva rightly concludes:

The monist should specify his position regarding the acceptability of the perception and the inference as pramāṇas. He cannot eat the cake.

---

58. एकत्रिकों वस्तुनि विशेषतेतेष्यागीकृत् एव। 'नेति नेतो'-त्यय सर्ववेद्यवपद्रोक्तकाल् || Ibid., p. 21.
and have it too. He should not place his legs on two boats. Does he accept the knowledge derived through these two pramāṇas as valid or not? If yes, then he should not disrespect that verdict and consequently he cannot dismiss the Vedānta as unauthoritative. If no, then the Vedānta are not contaminated by the ‘defect of Anuvādakāla’ and hence are not unauthoritative. On any count, he cannot prove the Vedānta to be unauthoritative. 59

4) जीवगण: हरेनुरचराः

Madhva holds the self to be established by Sākṣyānubhava. His definition of the self is:

“अहंमन्द्वेयं यो बेदं स जीवं इति कीर्तितं।
स दुःखी स मुच्छी चैव स पात्रं कल्याणायोः॥” (Viṣṇutattvaniranyā p. 26)

“He who enjoys the happiness and suffers the ills of life, who is eligible for bondage and release, is the jīva. He is indeed in a position to know himself, in all his states, as ‘I am’.”

This implies that the jīva is permanent entity which endures its changing states of consciousness and experiences, which constitute the sum total of its life, here and in the hereafter. The pragmatic necessity of assuming a permanent self can well be understood in the light of the primary instinct to be and so survive. That is why our Upaniṣads emphasize the indestructibility of self and its attributes as well (Brh. Up. अनुवादकालम्). These attributes of the self are the potential powers of conscious life here and in the ‘beyond’. Without such a continuity and survival of individual consciousness, the goal of mukti would be void of meaning and purpose.

59. अनु: प्रमाणसिद्धते तदपल्पूर्वकः, अप्रमाणसिद्धते च भेदप्रमाणगम्य अनुवादिभाषाच: न भेदवाक्यानां दौर्बल्यम् |Ibid., p. 9
At this stage, one must note how Madhva declares and substantiates the distinction lying inherently between Brahman and the individual soul. Jiva-paramātma-abheda cannot be the purport of Veda as it is opposed to all pramāṇas.

It is opposed to one's own experience. No one experiences that he knows all, he is the master of all, he is free from the sorrow and he is free from the drawbacks. On the contrary every one experiences in the opposite way. (viz., he knows very little, he is not the master, he experiences sorrow etc.). These experiences cannot be considered as untrue as these are not opposed by any pramāṇa.

The individual soul, as a sentient being, is admitted by Madhva to be self-luminous (sva-prakāra). It is not merely of the form of knowledge (jñānabhaṅg), but it is a knower (jñātā). The conception of the self as a conscious personality is the same as it is in respect of God.

Except for the fact that even the self-luminosity of the jīva is dependent on the Supreme, which makes bondage possible.

The bonds and impurities of the souls are not, however, their essential nature (sva-rūpa), at any rate, of those of the highest order. They are foreign to the core of their being, like the rust on copper and are taken to be associated with them from the beginning, at the pleasure of the Lord. This event is beginningless in time; but is, all the same, subject to the Lord's pleasure. He is thus ultimately responsible

---

60. Itib., p. 14
62. Ibid., p. 126
63. (Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya - II.3.31) (Tattva prakāśikā).
(metaphysically) for their bondage, not in the sense that He threw them into it at a certain point of time in history, but that its continuous association with them is, in every way, subject to Him and its riddance will depend on His grace and cooperation. Its onset is rendered possible by the power of concealment or obscuration of the true nature of souls, which is vested in the Lord, and which corresponds to the “Tirodhāna-Śakti”.

Madhva calls his view of the origin of bondage as “Svabhāvājñānavāda” or the theory of the souls’ ignorance of their true nature and of their dependence on the Supreme: स्वभाव भावो धर्मम परततः जीवज्ञान कल्पना द्वारा जीवभावानवत्ता” (Nyāya Sudhā – p-64). The term “Svabhāva”, here, has been explained by Jayatīrtha in six different ways. The first explanation is as given above. The second takes “Svabhāva” to mean what is in fact and what is not imagined by ignorance. On this view, Ajñāna which is the cause of the soul’s bondage exists in reality and is not merely something which is imagined to exist. Thirdly, “Svabhāva” signifies, “Independent Being” or God; fourthly, the Jiva’s own nature of metaphysical dependence. Thus, “Ajñāna” of the true nature of God and of one’s own dependence is “Svabhāvājñāna”. It is also explained as “Ajñāna” that is induced in the jiva by the independent Being i.e. God.

Madhva finds the basis of the doctrine of plurality of selves in the intrinsic diversity of their essences, which he shows to be the inevitable presupposition of the (Hindu) theory of Karma. It is accepted that the

64. परम्प्राप्यतना न निनिश्यन्ति सर्व धार्म विद्वानांपरि | (Brahma-sūtra-iii-2-5)
65. भूतं स्वविविशिष्टमानवेऽपि | (Gītā, XV.15) (Śvet. Up., vi.16)
66. i) तथा स्वप्रभाव भवति स्वभावो नाग्नकल्पित रत्त चावत् | ii) स्वभावार्ती भवते स्वभावो जीव: तद्वस्तरं तद्वस्त्रियं च्यानानमिति वाद: स्वभावानवाद: | iii) स्व: स्वप्रभाव: परभाव: | स्वभावो धर्मम परतत्रावर्तिर्म स्वभाव: | तद्वस्तरं नाग्नकल्पित रत्त चावत: स्वभावानवाद: | iv) तथा स्वप्रभावानवाद अज्ञानं न मिष्या रत्त चावत: | v) तथा स्वभावानवाद अज्ञानं परस्परस्तिर्म अज्ञानं नाग्नकल्पित रत्त चावत: || (Nyāya Sudhā p. 64.b)
inequalities of an individual equipment and endowment are regulated by one’s past life and its karma. But, by its very nature, the Karma theory would be powerless to explain the why of such inequalities, in the remotest past, without recourse to the hypothesis of an intrinsic peculiarity (anādiviśesa) that is uncaused. It is this anādiviśesa, says Madhva, that distinguishes one soul from another.

“unseen merit, which accounts for similar merit in the present, should pre suppose a like merit. This series should regress ad infinitum. If it breaks down in any particular instance, the principle of unseen merit might as well as dispensed with, even at the outset. If it holds good in all cases without exception, as far back as human thought could reach, it is a clear admission of the fact that such unseen merit is ingrained in the nature of individuals.”

Madhva adduces the disparity of sādhanas practised by different orders of beings, as an additional ground for the persistence of plurality in the released state:

“Variations in results, in accordance with diversity of means, is inevitable in release.”

Hence Madhva concludes:

“To all beings are dependent upon Him. They rejoice through His grace who is a friend of Indra praising Him - This is the truth.”

67. *n ?
|
^ ? (Anu-vyakhyana-iii.p. 49)
68. ^ ^ wranRpR | Ibid., p. 45
Madhva’s doctrine of the soul insists not only upon the distinctiveness of each soul, but also upon an intrinsic gradation among them based on varying degrees of knowledge, power and bliss. This is known as Tāratamya or Svarūpatāratamya, which comes out all the more clearly in the released state, where the souls realize their true status. This position is peculiar to Madhva and is not found in any other school of Indian Philosophy. Together with the allied doctrine of Jīva-traividhya or tripartite classification of souls into - (1) Muktiyoga (salvable) (2) Nitya-Samsārin (ever-transmigrating), and (3) Tamayogya (damnable), it has come in for a good deal of adverse criticism at the hands of modern scholars.

It has been emphatically stated in the Mahābhārata-tātparya-nirṇaya that the Lord Viṣṇu is always the absolute controller of everything else, both sentient and insentient in this universe. Anybody aspiring for liberation or eternal bliss should necessarily realise the truth of the over-all supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu and also the inherent gradation among souls.69

The sentient too is two-fold: duḥkhasprṣṭa or sorrow-touched and duḥkhasprṣṭa or sorrow-untouched. The sorrow-touched involve two varieties: duḥkha-samstha or continuing in sorrow. The latter are again two-fold. Mukti-yoga or eligible for liberation and mukti-ayogya or ineligible for it. The mukti-yogas are five-fold: gods, sages, manes, monarchs and the best among human beings. Those ineligible for liberation are two-fold: tamoga or the condemned souls fit for dark hells

---

69. स्वास्थ्य च हर्षिचिकं नित्यव तद्भवं परं ||
तदन्तं ततस्य सत्त्वपरं हीरत्तत्थ ||
एवद्वि न कस्यर्युष विमुक्ति: स्वायत्कष्ण्य || (I. 80-81)
and Śṛtisamsthita or those who remain for ever in the worldly bondage. The tamoyogyas are four-fold each having two varieties:

देवतरक्षा पिशाचकारः। मल्याधमाःश्चतुर्द्वैः।
ते ज प्रासा्मध्यमसः। मृतिसंस्या इति द्विः। (तत्त्वसंस्थानम्)

It means that those souls who are only fit for eternal sorrow and misery are four kinds:

1) demons; 2) devils; 3) goblins and 4) the worst among men. The two-fold sub-variety of each of the four consists of those who have reached the darkest hells or nether regions 70 and those who are still languishing in this mortal world having not yet reached those regions.

We can take any aspect and we will come across inequality between any two beings. One has to discover the root cause of this inequality and gradation. Certainly the element of karma or previous action cannot be the root cause because an action is an effect of the thinking of the being. A particular thought propels a particular action. Even the thought cannot be the root cause because it depends upon the particular tendency or the bent of mind of the person. Now even the tendency cannot be the root cause because it depends upon the peculiar nature of the person. This nature is unique to the soul. And this is the exact conclusion to which Madhva arrives at when he delves deep to find out the root cause of the gradation among the souls experienced by one and all in this universe. Hence he declares the souls are by their very nature graded as superior, mediocre and inferior.71

The term ‘Sraddhā’ stands for the individual nature of the embodied soul. And this ‘Sraddhā’ differs from one soul to another. Hence due to

70. Read: “Those who appear to be incurable from the enormity of their sins are hurled down to Tartarus whence they never come forth again”. – Plato, Prof. B. Venkatesachar in his English translation of Tattvasaṅkhyaṇa, Bangalore, 1964, p. 24
71. स्त्रभावतस्मिविधा जीवा उदयाद्धमध्यममाः। Madhva, Gitā-tātparya, III.30, p. 45.
this distinction the souls should be understood to be graded as the best or superior, the mediocre or middling and the worst or inferior or condemned.\textsuperscript{72}

Secondly, Madhva brings to light another outstanding ingredient of this inherent nature of the souls. And that is, as a popular saying goes, खळ्डळों दुर्लभात्मक् or ‘the nature is unchangeable.’ He states:

“The souls get the form of gods, demons, men and so on due to their own unique nature. This unique nature possessed by them cannot be changed by anybody, at any time.”\textsuperscript{73}

The gradation among souls is beginningless and endless. It cannot be changed by anybody, at any time.\textsuperscript{74}

This is an important factor worth serious perusal. The unique nature of a soul, just as it is limited to himself and cannot be shared by anybody else, so too it can never be changed for good or bad by anybody at any time, however anybody try at it.

To point out this gradation from human beings upto the Lord, he quotes many authoritative passages in his works depending upon relevant context. This is what he states in the \textit{Mahābhārata}\textsuperscript{-}tātparyānirṇāya:


\begin{quote}
क्षितिगम मनुष्यनामानि देवाश्च पिताशिवरा
आज्ञानां कर्मजाक्ष देवाः इति पुरुर्वः
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{72.} श्रद्धा खळ्डळं जीवस्य तस्माद्भृद्विवेदतः।
उत्तमाभ्यात्मकू जीवा भ्रेता। पृथक् पृथक् || \textit{Ibid.}, XVII.3, p. 146.
\textsuperscript{73.} देवामुसस्वत्वाञ्ज जीवानां तु निर्मानः।
निर्माणो नायस्थेतुष्म केनविच्छिन्देव वा || \textit{Ibid.}, XVI.24, p. 145
\textsuperscript{74.} तत्मात्यानि हि तत्तत्यं चिदानन्दम्।
तव नैवायत्वं कर्तुं शक्यं केनापि कुञ्जिन्त् || (महाभाषान तात्त्विनिर्णय, \textit{1.92})
\end{flushright}
It means: In the scheme of gradation if one starts from human beings, first of course, there come the best among them. Then in order —
(2) Monarchs; (3) Manuṣya-gandharvas (the messengers of gods who receive orders indirectly), (4) Devagandharvas (who receive orders directly from gods); (5) Manes; (6) Cīras or Superior manes; (7) Ājānajas (born as gods) (8) Karmajas (those who earn godhood); (9) Gods (gods by nature itself); (10) Divine preceptor Brhaspati; (11) Indra (12) Rudra (13) Sarasvatī and (14) Vāyu.

Among these the latter excel hundred-fold over the former. Vāyu and Brahmā are equal in status because the present Vāyu is the future Brahmā. So too Rudra, Garuḍa and Śeṣa are equal in status. But these are never equal to Vāyu. Then, on the upper limit is Goddess Lakṣmī who is thousand-fold superior to Vāyu. The highest is Lord Viṣṇu who is infinite-fold superior to Lakṣmī. These and other scriptural passages declare the over-all supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu, the Bestower of liberation and bliss.

In conformity with the inherent and eternal Ṣaiva-rāja Madhva points out the अधिकारितरंतम् or gradation in eligibility to study the Vedānta or God-knowledge, in his introduction to the Brahmasūtra-bhaṣya.75

75. अधिकारितरंतम् भावावने – “मद्यमान्यतमतम् तिरिक्षितवर्गाः। तद्वर्तिः शीत्यवर्गाः विरिक्षितवर्गाः।” इति जातिकृते भेदात्वादिः। || सर्वशिक्षितवर्गाः विरिक्षितवर्गाः। अथवा राज्यरंतम् तद्वर्तिः।" तथा || सर्वशिक्षितवर्गाः विरिक्षितवर्गाः। अथवा राज्यरंतम् तद्वर्तिः। || सर्वशिक्षितवर्गाः विरिक्षितवर्गाः। अथवा राज्यरंतम् तद्वर्तिः। || मद्यमान्यतमतम् तिरिक्षितवर्गाः। धिति (~I.1.1)
6) पुनः प्राणमुक्ति नै ज्ञानमुक्तिपूर्णतः

In each system of thought, the doctrine of salvation is determined by the conception of the nature of souls and God.

The final state, according to Madhva, is marked by a complete absence of all traces of pain, evil and suffering, coupled with a positive enjoyment of inherent spiritual ānanda. This bliss has nothing material about it and is not conditioned by the possession or enjoyment of material objects. There is no fear of its being ever diminished or tainted by evil or otherwise becoming tiresome:

विरजो ब्रह्मलोकों न वेषु जिद्धं अनृतं न माया चेति। (Prāsna.Up.I.16)

Madhva, lays great stress on the survival of every individual personality, as such, in release. This is the corollary of his belief in the distinctiveness of the Svarūpa of each Jīva. As release is the realization of the intrinsic bliss of selfhood by each one of us, it must be a positive experience, to be felt and be realized by each and at the same time, incommunicable to others.

The first and foremost fact about Mokṣa emphasized by Madhva is its positive aspect. He opposes the purely negative view of Mokṣa, held by the Sāmkhyas and the Naiyāyikas. To be a “Puruṣārtha” and the highest one at that, it must be a state of Supreme bliss. This bliss must be fully manifested, i.e., capable of being actually felt and enjoyed with a full consciousness that it is being enjoyed.

Madhva, therefore, regards Mukti as a complete self-expression, self-manifestation and self-realization, in short, a complete unfolding of the self in all its promise and potency:

परंतुप्रतिपाद्यं स्वप्न रूपेणाभिनिष्पत्ते। (Chān.Up.)
मुक्तिहिंदिवस्य कर्मयम् वायस्मिति। (Bhāg.ii.10,6)
The realization of the truth does not mean the abolition of the plurality of the world; but only a removal of the false sense of separateness and independence.\(^{76}\) It is a new insight that changes the face of the world and makes all things new. The \textit{Mukta} sees everything thro' the eyes of God,\(^{77}\) as dependent on God, in their proper perspective, which he has failed to do in \textit{Samsāra}.

There is no prescribed round of activities or code of conduct in \textit{Mokṣa}, which means there is unlimited scope for spontaneous, creative work of every kind, - \textit{Karma},\(^{78}\) \textit{Jñāna}, and \textit{Bhakti}.\(^{79}\) There is no call for activity in that, there is no one to call upon you to do this or that. The urge is from within, entirely:

\begin{quote}
\textit{कदाचित्तं कुर्वल्लं कदाचित्रेत् कुर्वल्लं।}
\textit{नित्यजातस्वप्नपल्लविभिः प्रायल्लितं केशवम्।} (\textit{B.S.B. iii.3.30})
\end{quote}

The worship and activity in \textit{Mokṣa}, such as they are, are an end in themselves. They are not means to an end:

\begin{quote}
\textit{साध्यान्तरस्वप्नैव भक्तिमेवात् साधनम्।} (\textit{G.T. p-663})
\textit{हरेप्रभुसा चात्र सदैव सुखरूपिणी।}
\textit{न तु साधनमूलता सा सिद्धिरक्षत्वा सा यतं।} (\textit{B.S.B. iv.4.21})
\end{quote}

The \textit{Mokṣa} in which he liberated souls experience the befitting enjoyment is four-fold; (1) \textit{Sālokya}, (2) \textit{Sāmipya}, (3) \textit{Sārūpya}, (4) \textit{Sāyujya}.

(1) \textit{Sālokya} - Some enjoy to their full contentment residing anywhere in Lord's Realm.

\(^{76}\) येहि नायात्मकातिक ज्ञातन्मनोद्भव स्वातंत्र्यम् साध्यवादां पर्यति, तेषां विधायतिनिः जगत्परकेरिति। (\textit{Saṅkara B.S.B. 1.4.19})

\(^{77}\) सं ब्रह्मण पर्यति, ब्रह्मण श्रृणिति ब्रह्मणेऽवेद सर्वमुभवति। (\textit{Madhva B.S.B. iv.4.5})

\(^{78}\) कृणो मुक्तिस्वल्लकां जीतमहें। (\textit{Mbh. xiii.18.16})

\(^{79}\) आत्मारामः तु मुनो निर्मुक्तं अपमुक्तं।
\textit{कुर्वल्लं} मुक्तिमिहैत्ये \textit{भक्तिमेवमेवमुक्तिम} हि। (\textit{Bhāg. i.7.10})
(2) **Sāmipyā** - Some enjoy to their full contentment being in Lord’s vicinity.

(3) **Sārūpyā** - Some bear four arms and conch, disc and other weapons and enjoy to their full contentment.

(4) **Sāyujya** - Some enjoy to their full contentment having entered Lord’s body.

Even in the case of liberated Brahmā and others, they do not have the function of world’s creation and the like. But, they necessarily have the control over their inferiors. The liberated do not return to this worldly life.

Madhva lays more stress on the survival of every individual personality, as such, in **Mokṣa**.

“The released though” capable of realizing all their wishes have their sovereignty limited. They have no power to carry on the cosmic functions of the Supreme Being, such as the creation, preservation etc., of the world.”

“There is natural gradation among the released souls as also disparity in their Sādhanas. The difference in the nature and quality of Sādhanas must necessarily have a relation to the result. The existence of such a gradation in **Mokṣa** is established by reason and revelation. How can any one oppose it?"

---

80. Dr. D.N. Shanbhag - "A Primer of Dvaita Vedānta", p. 36
81. Ibid., p. 37
82. B.S.B. iv.4, 17-18
83. AV. p. 486
Thus does Madhva conclude his exposition of the subject of *Mokṣa* with an interesting and spirited defence of the concept of Ānandatāratamya. The significance of this unique doctrine lies as much in its logical trenchancy as in its mystic in-wardness. Anyway, here is a conception which applies the principle of peaceful co-existence and fellowship to the whole community of the released souls.

7) अमला भक्ति: तत्साधनम्

The means to secure liberation is pure devotion to Lord. Madhva gives a new and refreshing lead in tackling the problem of relative position of *Bhakti* and *Jñāna* as means of release and determining their mutual relation. *Bhakti* in fact is a deep love of God inspired by and based upon an adequate knowledge of His majesty. It is a blend of both. He does not look upon them as unrelated much less mutually exclusive. They invariably go together in true *Bhakti*. This will be clear from his definition of *Bhakti*:

“That firm and unshakable love of God, which rises above all other ties of love and affection based upon an adequate knowledge and conviction of His great majesty, is called “Bhakti”. That alone is the means of *Mokṣa*.”

**Stages of Bhakti:**

Spiritual knowledge or realization according to Madhva, is not a mere cold intellectual apprehension of Reality. It is a vivid preception of the Supreme Reality as the pivot of one’s own reality, consciousness and bliss (*sarva-sattapratiti-pravṛtti-nimittam*), with the utmost warmth of love and attraction for one’s own *Bimba* that the soul is capable of, which

---

84. महालङ्कारपुर्वस्तु सुदृढ़त्वेऽपि:।
    स्तनेऽव भक्तिविनिर्विवधाय सुभिक्षितवाच्यः॥ (Mbh.T.N.i.86)
is known as *Bhakti*. Such *Bhakti*, according to Madhva, both precedes and follows the attainment of knowledge:

"From *Bhakti* one reaches (mediate) knowledge, thence again ripe *Bhakti*, thence vision and thence again very ripe devotion to the Lord. Then comes *Mukti* (release) and thereby *Bhakti* again, which is of the essence of bliss and an end in itself."\(^85\)

**Highest *Bhakti* an end in itself:**

A very striking and almost unique feature of Madhva's philosophy of *Bhakti* is that it is viewed, not as a means to an end, but as an end in itself.

Says Madhva of this state: "The worship of the Lord, there is an unalloyed bliss in itself. It is not a means to any further end. It is an end in itself and a fulfilment of our selfhood."\(^86\)

It is not open to us, in Samsāra, to peep into the released state and try to describe in detail the behaviour of the blessed ones in their release towards the Lord or towards one another. That state of blessedness is something beyond our comprehension in its richness and glory.\(^87\)

He emphasizes two aspects of devotion: the positive and the negative. It is worthy of note that the theory and practice of *Bhakti*, as taught by Madhva and his followers, are free from all traces of erotic manifestations, which dominate or at least colour the conception of

---


\(^87\) (B.S.B. iv.4.21)

---
Bhakti in certain forms of North Indian Vaishnavism, like those of Jayadeva, Caitanya and Vallabha.

In his view, Kāma-Bhakti or erotic devotion is the special privilege of Apsarasas and ought not to be practised by others. He indicates a variety of stand points of devotion with reference to different orders of Jivas and harmonizes the various accounts on the basis of adhikāras.

Madhva's concept of Bhakti avoids these emotional excesses and identifications and remains at its exalted intellectual and spiritual level of firm philosophic devotion to the Supreme Lord of the universe who is to be worshipped with loving attachment as the Bimba of all pratibimbas (Jivas). But it is not, on that account lacking in intensity of fervor and feeling. For, Madhva has recognized in the clearest terms, that Bhakti is in essence an ineffable blending of the emotion and the intellect.

It is what the Bhāgavata Purāṇa refers to as the intrinsic devotion of God-intoxicated souls like Sanaka, who feel a natural bond of attraction to the Lord and go on practising Bhakti even after siddhi (Mokṣa):

आत्मारामाशं मुनयो निर्बन्धा अभयस्रवः
कुज्ञेन्द्रहृद्यं भक्तिं इत्यंभूतगुणो हरिः || (1.7.10)

8) अक्षादित्रितम् प्रमाणम्

The means of valid knowledge are only three; viz., perception, inference and verbal testimony.

"Pramāṇa" in the first sense of valid knowledge refers to the capacity of true knowledge to reveal the nature of an object as it really is: यथावस्थितज्ञविश्वेषीकारिः

Madhva has done a distinct service to epistemology in distinguishing these two senses and usages of the term and coining two separate terms
“Kevala” and “Anu” Pramāṇa, to denote them, without ambiguity. He defines Pramāṇa in both the above senses as विधार्थम्. 88

Kevala-Pramāṇa is divided into four types, in the descending order of merit as Īśvara-jñāna, Lakṣmi-jñāna, Yogi-jñāna, and Ayogi-jñāna, on the basis of intrinsic difference in quality, luminosity and range. The first two are in the nature of Svarūpa-jñāna alone while the other two include vṛtti-jñāna (sensory knowledge) also. 89

Kevala-pramāṇa has two aspects: knowledge consisting of the essence of selfhood and that arising from mental processes. These are graded in regard to validity as regards both, into uttama, madhyama, and adhama.

The Anupramāṇa constitutes Pratyakṣa - perception, inference and Āgama - verbal. Thus, the means of valid knowledge in the Dvaita system of Vedānta, are only three.

Madhva defines pratyakṣa as knowledge produced by the right type of contact between flawless sense-organs and their appropriate objects. 90 Such contact would be in the nature of an Anu-pramāṇa.

In the case of pratyakṣa, the right kind of reapproachment between the sense-organs and the objects as well as other conditions of suitable distance, angle of observation, adequate light and so on are meant to be conveyed by the term ‘nirdoṣa’. These conditions are applicable to the object the sense-organs and their contact as well. Perception becomes faulty through excessive remoteness, nearness or smallness of objects or intervening obstructions or being mixed up with things similar to them.

88. यथार्थ प्रमाणम् | तद्विधिस्य | केवलमुप्रमाणम् च | Madhva, Pramāṇalakṣaṇa, Daśaprakaraṇa Vol.I. A.B.M.M. Bangalore - 1969 p. 9
89. केवलम् चतुर्विधिम् | इशालक्षमीयोपनिषेदन | Ibid., p. 16
90. निर्दोषप्रायविधिस्तिस्तिक्षम्; प्रत्यक्षम् | Ibid., p. 33.
or through similarity to others knowledge, arising when all these conditions of flawlessness are fulfilled, is bound to be true and valid; Yathārtham.

The Sākṣi intuits its own self (ātman) and its characteristics of bliss etc., as well as the mind and its processes, Avidyā, knowledge arising from external senses, the feelings of pleasure and pain etc., Time, Space and God. The mind comprehends external reality through the sense organs and acts as the independent instrument of memory (aided by Saṁskāras).

The other sense have their own well-defined sphere of objects.

According to Madhva, inference consists in the knowledge of the mark of inference as pervaded by the sādhyā and invariable concomitant with it, leading to the ascertainment of the Sādhyā.91 Pratyakṣa (perception), the means of valid knowledge is eight-fold : Sākṣin, six sense-organs (including mind) and valid knowledge.92

Anumāna (Inference) is three-fold : Kevalānvayin (affirmative alone), Kevalavyatirekin (negative alone) and Anvaya-Vyatirekin (affirmative and negative).

The Kevalānvayin possesses that vyāpti which is understood as associated with only an affirmative illustration. It is independently the cause of inferential knowledge.

The Kevalavyatirekin possesses the vyāpti which is understood as associated with only negative illustration. It is not a direct (independent)

---

91. निर्देशोपस्थितिस्यन्यम् | Ibid., p. 34
92. प्रत्यक्षाण्वयान्वयतिरोक्षिक | Madhva Siddhānta Sāra of Padmanabhasuri, Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation, Bangalore, 1994, p. 21.
cause of inferential knowledge; but becomes the cause through the knowledge of the Vyāpti associated with only affirmative instance. Because negative concomitance is dissociated from the subject under discussion.

The Anvaya-Vyatirekin possesses the Vyāpti which is understood as associated with both (affirmative and negative instances). Here also, only the knowledge of the Anvaya-vyāpti is the cause of the inferential knowledge. [Even though Anvaya-vyāpti is thus the cause of the inferential knowledge], the three-fold division of inference is because of the distinction in the cause of the knowledge of Vyāpti.93

Again inference is two-fold; Svārtha (for oneself) and parārtha (for others). The Svārtha is the cause of one obtaining interential knowledge for oneself and the parārtha is the cause of imparting inferential knowledge of others.94

Āgama [verbal testimony] is two-fold: Pauruṣeya [human composition] and Apauruṣeya [not human composition]. The human composition of only the trustworthy persons are valid and authoritative. The trustworthiness of the speaker consists of (1) perfect and true knowledge of the subject intended to impart. (2) absolute absence of wrong understanding, carelessness, deceitful desire, defective sense-organs and others; and (3) following the Vedas; for example, the Mahābhārata. The entire Veda which is not human composition is valid and authoritative. The fact that the Veda is not human composition is proved by the Veda itself.

93. अनुमानं विविधम् केवलान्वित केवलव्याप्तिन्यसर्वव्याप्तिकं भेदत। अन्यभवचारणाग्रहयात्ियां केवलान्वित। स्वत्ववाच्यां योजनामिनि। आध्यात्मिकश्च वाच्यामयान्यसर्वव्याप्तिकं व्याप्तिक्रिया केवलव्याप्तिकं। आध्यात्मिकश्च वाच्यामयान्यसर्वव्याप्तिकं। अन्नवाच्यामयान्यसर्वव्याप्तिकं। आध्यात्मिकश्च वाच्यामयान्यसर्वव्याप्तिकं। आध्यात्मिकश्च वाच्यामयान्यसर्वव्याप्तिकं।

94. स्वार्थं परार्थं च मुद्रिताविविधवाच्यम्। स्वार्थं स्वामिनि। परार्थं परार्थिनि। ना परार्थी: स्वार्थी। याब्रो ब्रह्म नाम ब्रह्मसहिताविविधवाच्य। प्रयोगवत्। ना परार्थी: स्वार्थी। | Ibid., p. 21.
That Veda alone, the meaning of which has been determined by six-fold interpretational canons viz. *Upakrama* (commencement) and others causes true knowledge. Otherwise it causes wrong knowledge.\textsuperscript{95}

The sense of the Veda is three-fold: The Lord, gods like Brahmā and others, and the Lord's forms residing in them. The Lord is expounded through the super-primary word power. All else is expounded through primary power (denotation), implication, indication, metaphor, conventional metaphor, and conventional implication.

The primary or expressive power (denotation) is also three-fold: etymological, conventional and etymologico-conventional. *Rūḍhi* or convention is ample usage; e.g. the words 'gauh', 'ghaṭah' etc., denoting the cow, the pot, etc. *Yoga* or etymology is expressive power of the parts of a word; e.g. the words 'pācaka' etc. denoting (cooks like) Devadatta and others. Combination of both is *Yogarūḍhi*, e.g. the words 'paṅkaja' etc. denoting the lotus and the like.\textsuperscript{96}

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., p. 21

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., p. 21-22
Lord Hari is known by the entire sacred Vedic literature. Such or entire mass of Vedic literature constitutes all Vedas and other texts following the line thereof. In precise, it is thus -

\textit{RgVeda, YajurVeda, SāmaVeda} and \textit{AtharvaVeda, Mahābhārata}, the entire \textit{Pañcarātra}, original \textit{Rāmāyaṇa}, the Purāṇas that are not contrary to these all such works that follow these are the sacred scripture. The other texts that are opposed to these and indifferent to the tenets in these, are perverted texts. These do not help to know Nārāyaṇa.\footnote{Professor K.T. Pandurangi - “Visnutattvanirnaya” - p. 4.}

The theory of knowability of Lord Hari through Vedas alone, is well supported by the authorities. He who does not know the Veda etc., sacred scripture will not be able to comprehend the Supreme God who possesses infinite attributes and who is omniscient. The Veda teaches the Supreme God to enable the seeker to obtain the liberation—thus states the \textit{Taittiriya Śruti}.

Not the senses, nor the inferences help one to comprehend the God. Vedas alone enable to comprehend him - thus states \textit{Pippalāda Śruti}.

The entire Veda consisting of \textit{Vidhi, Arthavada, Saṅkalpa, Prārthānā} etc., is eternal and always of the same form. It is present in the mind of the Supreme God always in the same form. At the commencement of each creation the Vedas are uttered by the Supreme God in the same order, with the same letters, and with the same accent without any change. The Vedas are only heard by all and therefore are designated as \textit{Śruti}. These are partly revealed to the seers who had heard

\footnote{\textit{मुनरामायणं चैव पुराणं चैवतदवककषं ||
ि च पतविदनीलोकं सवेन ते च सदाधम: ||
षुभमसलग्ने व तैनं इते वर्तन्ते: ||
Prof. K.T. Pandurangi - “Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya” - p. 4.}
them in the previous births, by the grace of the Supreme God. These are seen by the Supreme God and heard by others. Therefore, these are designated as Śruti and described as seen by the ancients.

The Vedas and the other sacred literature convey the Supreme God Nārāyaṇa who is omniscient, creator of all, free from the defects and inadequacies, and Supreme. Veda, Itihāsa, Purāṇa and other scriptures chiefly convey him. The other things i.e., Dharma etc., are conveyed only to enable us to understand his glory.  

The Mahopaniṣat states that the entire scripture chiefly conveys the Supreme God who possesses unlimited number of attributes, who is absolutely free from the drawbacks who is unique and distinct from all others. The scriptures does not convey anything else.  

---

98. ādante va nālante -  
   sarvaṁ sarvākāṁ nātvamamnāyam |  
   sarvātman mahātmanam hi |  
   sarvāvamapi vedaññamśiḥastupūrṇoḥ |  
   pramāṇāṇāṁ ca sarveśvāṁ tadbhañjyante || Prof. K.T. Pandurangi “Viṣṇutattvavinirṇaya”, p. 38

99. sarvātman sarvāvamanno ucyati; abhiiśe; pūrṇamastu samasat.  
   vātānāhānāhānāhānāḥ prakṛtiḥ; sarvaḥ kete; mukhāḥ teṣāṃ chaṣyate || iti mahopaniṣad || Ibid., p. 212