CHAPTER I

VISNU AND VAISNAVISM

1

Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Caitanya, or as he is generally known, Śrī-Caitanya, was the founder of the last great Viṣṇava sect. Therefore, before dealing with his doctrine, it is necessary to discuss briefly the origin of Viṣṇavism.

Viṣṇava means a follower of Viṣṇu. Its etymological meaning, however, is ‘of’ or ‘relating to’ Viṣṇu, and the Purāṇas have used the word in both the senses. But, it has been pointed out, the word in the sense of a follower of Viṣṇu, is not to be found, either in the Vedic literature or in the principal Upaniṣads. Among the 108 Upaniṣads, the word is found once in a negative sense (avaiṣṇava) in the Mūḍgalopaniṣad, and rarely in the Mahābhārata. According to Dr. J. N. Banerjea the word vaiṣṇava occurs in the Mahābhārata (XVIII, VI, 97) in the following verse:

\[
asāḍāṣa-puraṇanāṁ śravānād yat phalam bhavet
\]
\[
tat phalam samavāpnoti vaiṣṇavo nātra saṁśayah.\]

Now this chapter (vi) is not a part of the Mahābhārata, which ends with Chapter V, and has not been included in the critical edition. The Citraśālā edition includes it, but at the end of Chapter V, it is definitely stated; iti Mahābhārataṁ samāptam, and makes it quite clear that the next chapter, namely, Mahābhārata-śravāṇa-mahimā, where the verse quoted above is found, is from the Harivaṁśa.

The word which was generally used to denote the followers of Viṣṇu, seems to have been bhāgavata, and Varāhamihira, who is usually taken to have written his Bhṛhatāṅkara in the middle of the 6th century A.D., says that the bhāgavatas should worship in Viṣṇu temples. We shall presently discuss earlier use of the term bhāga-
vata and its relation with Vaiṣṇavism; but before doing so, it would be preferable to trace briefly the origin of Viṣṇu.

Viṣṇu is mentioned in several hymns of the Rgveda, full details of which can be found elsewhere. How this Vedic god became identified with the deity of possibly the largest sect in India has
been a subject of inquiry by modern scholars for a long time; as a result a considerable volume of literature is available giving divergent opinion regarding the origin of Viṣṇu. One of the latest and most comprehensive work on the subject is by J. Gonda, who has discussed the theories relating to the possibilities of Viṣṇu being a god of fertility, a liberal and beneficent god, and his relation with Sun god and Indra. Gonda has also given brief summaries of views of practically all the modern scholars regarding the origin and importance of Vedic Viṣṇu. At the end he concludes: "We are, to begin with, fortified in our opinion that any effort to give a historical account of the role played by the god in the spiritual and religious life of ancient India can for reason peculiar both to the character of our sources and to the nature of the subject itself only end in an unsatisfactory substitute of what a historical study should be." We fully subscribe to Gonda’s view, and therefore shall not attempt to assess the position of Viṣṇu as a Vedic god on an analysis of the Rgveda.

However, a few points may be discussed in this connection.

There is a well-known hymn in the Rgveda (1.22.20) which is as follows: tad Viṣṇoḥ paramaṁ padaṁ sadā paśyanti suraṇaḥ diviva caṣṣur ātataṁ. This has been translated by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar as: ‘The wise see the highest place of Viṣṇu (Paramaṁ padaṁ), as it were an eye fixed in the heaven.’ R.T.H. Griffith translated it as:

‘The princes evermore behold that loftiest place where Viṣṇu is,
Laid as it were an eye in heaven.’

Swami Sarvananda has translated it as:

‘As the eyes spread out, as it were, in the sky (behold everything clearly), so do the wise ones see the supreme state of Viṣṇu.’

Griffith has rendered sūri as prince, and here Bhandarkar and Sarvananda’s rendering ‘wise (man)’ is certainly preferable. But they have not translated the word sadā, which Griffith has rendered as ‘evermore’, that is always, constantly, or continuously without interruption. This seems to us to be an important adverb, and is analogous to ‘ananya yoga’ of the Gītā (IX, 22; XII, 6), where a continuous rapport with the deity is indicated, or one might say demanded.

The importance of this hymn is, as pointed out by Swami Sarvananda, that orthodox Hindus always recite it before offering prayers, or indeed at the beginning of all rituals. As such its importance is only next to the Gāyatrī and would be inexplicable unless one assumes that Viṣṇu’s paramaṁ padaṁ, had a mystic
significance from very early times. We do not know as to when it became obligatory to utter this hymn before offering prayer; if one assumes that the practice was prevalent in Rgvedic times, then Viṣṇu has to be conceded a very high position among the Vedic gods, indeed if not the highest. For, it is also remarkable that the Taittiriya Samhitā (1.7.4) says, Yajña vai Viṣṇu (Viṣṇu is the sacrifice); and sarvaparama dhāma is spoken only with regard to Viṣṇu.7 In the Brāhmaṇa period, Viṣṇu becomes the highest god, and the story of his incarnation, the dwarf, appears quite early.8 It is evident, therefore, that Viṣṇu attained a very high, if not the highest position, during the Vedic times, and possibly even during the age of the Rgveda. As Bhandarkar has said: "The moment which seems to have been in operation during this process of elevation, was reverence for the third step or the mysterious highest abode of Viṣṇu beyond the ken of all."9

E. W. Hopkins10 was of the same view, but Gonda has criticized him and Bhandarkar, for, according to Gonda, they seem 'to have left out of consideration the comparatively unimportant role played by Viṣṇu's highest place as the "heaven" of the emancipated in the oldest texts in which the god himself usually, or often, figures as the Infinite Spirit and the Highest Being.'11 It is difficult to understand what Gonda means, particularly by 'oldest texts'; and as he has given no reference to support his statement, we have to ignore his criticism of Bhandarkar's and Hopkins's views.

The idea of Viṣṇu's paramam padam seems to have persisted and influenced the vaiṣṇavas. According to a story related in the Hariyaman, a demon used to abduct the children of a brāhmaṇa as soon as they were born. Having thus lost three children, the brāhmaṇa came to Kṛṣṇa and requested him to protect the fourth. As Kṛṣṇa was engaged in performing a yajña, he deputed Arjuna with all Viṣṇis and Andhaka warriors with the exception of Balarāma and Pradyumna. However, Arjuna and the Viṣṇis failed to protect the child, which as usual was taken away by the invisible demon. Then Kṛṣṇa having finished the yajña, took the brāhmaṇa with him on his chariot and asked Arjuna to drive it. After a very eventful journey they entered into a region of total darkness, and coming out of it they saw a puruṣa-vigraha, that is, a human shape, of radiating effulgence spread over all the lokas. While Arjuna and the brāhmaṇa waited in the chariot, Kṛṣṇa entered into that effulgent puruṣa, and returned with all the four lost children of the brāhmaṇa.12 Later in reply to Arjuna's queries Kṛṣṇa said that, the children were stolen because, that great soul knew that
Krṣṇa would only come if called upon to restore a brāhmaṇa's children. And then Krṣṇa added:

Brahma-tejomayaṁ divyaṁ mahad yad drṣṭavān asi
ahaṁ sa Bharata-sreṣṭha mat tejas-tat sanātanaṁ
prakṛtiḥ sā mama parā vyakt-āvyaktā sanātani
yāṁ praviśya bhavant-īha muktā yogavidūttamāḥ
sā sāṁkhyānāṁ gatiḥ Pārtha yo'gināṁ ca tapasvināṁ,
tat padam paramam Brahma sarvam vibhajate jagat.13

From this passage it appears that by the time the Harivaṁśa was written Brahman had become the object of inquiry, and accepted as the ultimate reality; so Brahman's paramam padam was substituted for Viṣṇu's, so that Viṣṇu, or Krṣṇa might be identified with Brahman.

In the Gitā, though the word pada is used, the word dhāman is emphasized to denote the location of the highest reality; and it is this word which is usually used by the vaiṣṇavas. The Śrī-sampradāya of Rāmānuja calls it Vaikunṭha, and the Gauḍiya vaiṣṇavas call it Gokula. We shall discuss Gokula later.

We have to discuss another topic in this connection; that is the identification of Devaki-putra Krṣṇa of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad with Krṣṇa of the Mahābhārata. This was first proposed by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, and though criticized by Dr. S. K. De and Swami Vidyaranya, has been accepted by Dr. J. N. Banerjea.14

Raychaudhuri's main contentions are that, (1) both the Krṣṇas are son of Devaki; (2) both of them have the epithet 'Acyuta'; (3) Chāndogya Upaniṣad's Krṣṇa's preceptor Ghora belonged to the Aṅgiras family; according to the Rgveda (III.53.7), the Aṅgirases were closely related to the Bhojas who in turn were related to the Vṛṣṇi's, that is the family of the Māhābhārata's Krṣṇa; (4) Chāndogya Upaniṣad's Krṣṇa and his preceptor were worshippers of Sun and from the Mahābhārata it is learnt that the Sātvata religion introduced by Krṣṇa was first propounded by Sun. (5) Some passages of the Gitā have a striking similarity with some passages of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. Raychaudhuri has dwelt on a few other minor points, but those need not be discussed here.

It is true that the mother of the Krṣṇa of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad and of the Mahābhārata is named Devaki. But this is too slender an evidence to suggest an identification particularly when it is recalled that for more than one thousand years the devotees of Krṣṇa have been reading both the texts, but never tried to identify the two Krṣṇas. Therefore, one has to analyze the other
reasons advanced by Raychaudhuri and it will be found that they will not bear scrutiny.

Raychaudhuri first states: 'The epic Kṛishna is often styled Acyuta. The epithet as Hill pointed out, figures in the Upanishad passage about the pupil of Ghora.' Unfortunately instead of quoting the passage here, he quotes the translation on pp. 79-80 and the text on p. 82. However, all that the Upaniṣad passage or Ghora wanted to convey to his pupil was that, at the time of death one should remember three (mantras), namely, 'you are imperishable, you are unchangeable (acyuta) you are the true essence of life.' It is clear that acyuta in this passage is not meant as an epithet.

Similarly, unwarranted is Raychaudhuri's statement: 'The teacher of the Upanishadic Kṛishna belonged to a family (Arṇgi-rasa) closely associated with the Bhojas, the kindreds of the Epic Kṛishṇa.' Now, in the Rigveda III, 53.7 on which Raychaudhuri relies for this conclusion bhōja seems to have been used in the sense of a rich patron, and in any case does not indicate a tribe.

We shall deal with the fourth point later in connection with Sātvata sect; here it is sufficient to say that Raychaudhuri has either misunderstood or misinterpreted the text.

Raychaudhuri's last point, as noted above, was the similarity between some verses of Gitā and the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. From these Raychaudhuri concludes: 'How are we to account for these coincidences (i.e. parts of two passages of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad and bits out of six verses of the Gitā)? In the Upanishad and in the Gitā we find the same doctrines associated with the name of one and the same person (Kṛishṇa the son of Devaki). There is no escape from the conclusion that these doctrines were actually learnt by Kṛishṇa from Ghora Arṇgirasa, and were transmitted by him to his disciples—the Bhagavatas—and formed the kernal of the poem known as the Bhagavadgitā.' In the next sentence Raychaudhuri postulates that the Gitā ‘is by no means a product of the age in which Kṛishṇa lived. Kṛishṇa himself is mentioned in one of the oldest Upanishads, while the Gitā presupposes the existence of all the classical Upaniṣads by its reference to the Brahma-sūtras.' This indeed is the strongest argument against Raychaudhuri's theory, for though the Brahma-utra may be explained away, Gitā shows influence of many late Upaniṣads, which Raychaudhuri failed to notice.

We have noted above the curious similarity of not only the personal name but that of the mother as well. But to assume on
this basis that the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* doctrine (assuming that the passages from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* and the *Gitā* cited by Raychaudhuri have anything in common, which does not seem to be apparent) could only be learnt from a seer mentioned in the *Upaniṣad* is very far fetched. Secondly, there are passages in the *Gitā* which resembles other *Upaniṣads*. The way out of this difficulty and the chronological difficulty is removed by suggesting that the *Gitā* was composed long after the death of Kṛṣṇa. Raychaudhuri’s reasons for this conclusion as noted above are: “Kṛṣṇa himself is mentioned in one of the oldest *Upanishads*, while the *Gitā* presupposes the existence of all the classical *Upanishads* by its reference to the *Brahmasūtras*. Now, the first part of this sentence is merely an hypothetical assumption, and as for the second part it is enough to quote from Raychaudhuri a little further on,” where he states: “The *Gitā* was certainly known to Kālidāsa and the author of the extant *Brahmasūtras*.” Either, therefore, Raychaudhuri is contradicting himself, or assumes the former existence of a non-extant *Brahmasūtra*. This is pure speculation, and the answer can well be that the *Gitā* refers to that *Brahmasūtra*, which was quite different from the present one. As no one has seen that mythical *Brahmasūtra*, and none is likely to see it, it will be impossible to contradict such a statement. There are also other reasons.

As for the *Brahmasūtra* mentioned in the *Gitā* (XIII, 4) it may be pointed out here that in the earliest extant commentary, namely, that of Śaṅkara, *Brahmasūtra* has been interpreted not as the work on which the commentator wrote his famous *Śarīraka-bhāṣya* but as: *Brahmaṇaḥ sūcakāni vākyāni Brahmasūtrāvī*. Among the later commentators, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Anandagiri, Vaiṣṇavaṇātha, Vallabha, Puruṣottama, and Śaṅkarānanda are of the opinion that it refers to the text known as the *Brahmasūtra*. But Hanumat (Paišācabhāṣya), Nīlakanṭha, Kesava Kāśmirī, Śrīdhara, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, Sadānanda (*Bhāvaprakāśa*) Dhanapatiśūri (*Bhāṣyotkārṣadāpiκā*) and Daivajña Pandita Sūrya (*Paramārtha Prāpa*) follow Śaṅkara.

It is therefore clear that even the medieval commentators were divided as to the interpretation of the *Brahmasūtra* mentioned in the *Gitā*, and it would be risky to frame any theory on the basis of this word.

We do not want to pursue the point further, nor shall we make any attempt to determine the age of the *Gitā*, which is not relevant to our purpose. We might state however, that the learned attempts
so far made to determine the age of the Gītā, have been merely
efforts to pass on hypothetical possibilities as certainties, where the
possibility of subjective predilections influencing scholarly judg-
ments cannot be ruled out.

2. I have found the term only once in the Mahābhārata: Yajñāma Vaiṣṇavam,
Mbh. cr. Ed. XII, 329.39. But this has little significance. Mudgalā Upaniṣad
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18. See, for example Śvetāśvatara, III, 16 Gītā, XIII, 13, which are identical.
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CHAPTER II

PAÑČARĀTRA SĀTVATA EKĀNTA AND BHĀGAVATA RELIGIONS

At the end of the Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata there are certain chapters (322-339; Citrasala ed. 335-351) devoted to the glorification of Nārāyaṇa, wherefore they are collectively known as the Nārāyaṇiya section. As references to Pañcarātras, Sātvatas and Ekāntas are scattered in some of these chapters, it is necessary to analyse their contents, with a view to find out, if possible, their origin.

The discussion begins with a question which Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīma (321.1; C.ed. 334.1) as to the deity which the grhaṣṭha, brahmacārin, vānaprastha and bhikṣuka should worship. There were also other questions of a metaphysical nature and in reply Bhīma narrates what he had heard from his father (321.8; C.ed. 334.8), namely that Nārāyaṇa is viśvātman. In Chapter 322 (C.ed. 355) is related Nārada’s travel to Svetadvīpa and the description of its inhabitants. Having heard this, Yudhiṣṭhira asks for more information, and in reply Bhīma tells him the story which Nārada had once related to Śāntanu and which he (Bhīma) had also heard, namely that, there was a king called Uparicara Vasu who was a friend of Akhaṇḍa (Indra) and a devotee of Nārāyaṇa-Hari, who had obtained his kingdom thanks to a boon granted by Nārāyaṇa. He used to worship the Deveśa (i.e. Nārāyaṇa) according to the Sātvata rites, which he had formerly learnt from Śūrya. With the remnants of the offerings, Vasu worshipped first the pītṛs and then the brāhmaṇas, but was really devoted to Janārdana. Indeed so glad was Indra to see his devotion for Nārāyaṇa that he (Indra) used to sit with Vasu on the same seat which had been donated by Indra to Vasu. Vasu had dedicated everything he had to Bhagavat, that is, Nārāyaṇa. He carefully performed all the kāmya and naimittika sacrifices according to Sātvata rites. In his house the most celebrated Pañcarātra scholars were always to be found, and they used to enjoy the first share of the offerings to Bhagavat. (322.2-16-24; C.ed. 335. 17-27).
Then after another verse eulogizing king Vasu, Bhīṣma suddenly begins to speak of the seven sages, collectively known as the Citraśikhandins (lit. those whose top-knots on the head are bright or wonderful). They were, Marici, Atri, Aṅgirasa, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vasiṣṭha, who composed a śāstra which was (as authoritative as) the four Vedas; and this śāstra was promulgated by the seven sages, who are called prakṛtis, and Svāyambhuva, that is Brahmā. (Nilakanṭha explains that prakṛti here indicates mahat, ahaṅkāra etc., while Svāyambhuva means the mūla-prakṛti). Then the sages worshipped Nārāyaṇa for one thousand divine years; as a result Nārāyaṇa sent Sarasvatī to them and the Goddess blessed (lit. entered into) all the seven sages. Then those sages used for the first time words imbued with artha and hetu, and this śāstra began with Om, and was first recited to Bhagavat, that is, Nārāyaṇa. Thus pleased, Puruṣottama told the sages that it was a very good śāstra, and would benefit all men. Then after more praises, Nārāyaṇa said, that Svāyambhuva Manu would preach this religion, and so would Sukra and Brhaspati, that is when they were born. 'After this śāstra has been promulgated by Svāyambhuva Manu, Sukra, and Brhaspati, king Vasu would learn it from Brhaspati, who would be my great devotee, and would perform all the kriyās according to this śāstra. By preaching this śāstra you will have many descendants and the great Vasu will become linked with rāja-śri. After the death of that king (Vasu) this śāstra will disappear.' (322.48; C. ed. 335. 51) Saying this the unseen Puruṣottama left the sages, who then preached the śāstra. (322.26-52; C. ed. 335. 29-55).

Vasu's story is continued in the next two chapters (323 and 324) from which it appears that in due course Vasu became Brhaspati's disciple and performed a horse sacrifice without killing animals, at which the Citraśikhandins, and Ekata, Dvita and Trīta, who were ekānta bhaktas (323.24) were present. They also worshipped Nārāyaṇa. Chapter 324 relates a quarrel between gods and ṛṣis on the interpretation of aja (whether it meant 'goat' or 'corn') and Vasu was appointed mediator. As he decided unfairly in favour of the gods, the ṛṣis cursed him, and his power to travel in air was gone (for which he used to be called Uparicara). Vasu then worshipped Viśvaksena and Nārāyaṇa, performed five sacrifices five times (324.28) whereupon Viṣṇu restored his power of travelling through air. Chapter 325 describes Nārada's visit to Śvetadvīpa and ṛṣis worship of Nārāyaṇa in 171 names among which are Pañca-yajñadhara (57), Pañcakāla-kartṛgata (58), Pañcarātrika (59), Sūrya (87), Phenaḥcārya (100), Vālakhilya (101), Vaikhānasas (102),
Citraśikhandin (156) and ultimately Nārada ends by saying Ekañta
darśanāga namo namaḥ'. (325.171) In the next chapter (326; C. ed.
339) Nārada sees the Viśvarūpa and it is said that only Ekañtins
can see this form. (326. 12; cf. Gitā, XI. 54). The Lord then
mentions the four vyūhas, as follows: (A) Vāsudeva is the only and
eternal principle; he is immanent in the five principles (earth, water
etc.); the five principles in combination form the body; the jīva
without which the active principle (prāṇa-vāyu) is useless is Saṁ-
karaṇa or Śeṣa; from Saṁkarṣaṇa is evolved Pradyumna, who
by his deeds attain Sanatkumārātva (jīva-mukti) in whom all life
reverts after dissolution, and he is the universal mind; from him is
produced Aniruddha, the Lord of kārya and kārava and the begetter
of the phenomenal word. (B) Vāsudeva is kṣetrajña, nirguiñātma
and knowable; (as) jīva (he) is Saṁkarṣaṇa; from Saṁkarṣaṇa is
evolved Pradyumna who is the mind, and from Pradyumna is
evolved Aniruddha who is the ahaṅkāra. (326, 24-39; C. ed.
339, 32-42). (C) Thereafter the Lord (Bhagavat) is identified with
the Puruṣa of Saṁkhya (v. 41) creator of Māyā (v. 43) etc. Saṁ-
karaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha are again mentioned: ‘I have
four mūrtis, (from Vāsudeva) is produced Saṁkarṣaṇa also called
Śeṣa, from him is born Pradyumna, and from Pradyumna is born
Aniruddha. I am Pradyumna and Aniruddha, and this recurring
creation is mine, from Aniruddha’s lotus- navel Brahmā was evolv-
ed, and from Brahmā came the entire phenomenal world, both the
animate and the inanimate; knowest thou, that thus do I create
(the world) at the beginning of each kalpa.’ (326. 68-70; C. ed.
339. 73-75).

Thus it will be seen that the vyūha-vāda has been presented
in three different manners in the same chapter, and in the third
account, the vyūhas are called mūrtis and Brahmā is introduced as
the active creative agent. This account may be an attempt to
syncrétize vyūhavāda with avatāravāda; its identification of Saṁ-
karaṇa as Śeṣa is also interesting for the Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇavas also
made the same identification and further identified Śeṣa or Saṁ-
karaṇa with Kṛṣṇa’s brother Balarāma and then with Caitanya’s
companion Nityānanda, as will be explained later.

The Lord then gave a list of his avatāras, namely, Varāha,
Narasimha, Vāmana, Paraśurāma, Dāśarathī Rāma, and Kṛṣṇa.
About Kṛṣṇa the Lord predicts that he would establish the city of
Dvārapā at Kuśasthalī, kill Narakaśura, Mura, Piṭha, and the king
of Prāgjyotisapura, defeat Saṁkara and Mahāsena the beloyed of
Bāṇa, kill thousand armed Bāṇa, Kālayavana, be instrumental in
killing Jarāsandha and kill Śiṣupāla; it is further predicted that
the Lord would be a friend of Arjuna, and they would be described as the sages Nara and Nārāyaṇa intent on destroying the kṣatriyas for the good of humanity; having fulfilled the desire he would destroy all the Sātvata chiefs, his own kindreds; having performed innumerable deeds, he would return to his own loka, in his caturmūrti, worshipped by Brahmā. (326.71-93; C. ed. 77-102). Then the Lord added that, not even Brahmā had ever seen him and that Nārada could see him because of his ekāntagata-buddhi (v. 96). ‘O brāhmaṇa’ the Lord declared, ‘You are devoted to me, hence I have related to you my past and future avatāras with their secrets (sarahasya).’ (v. 97).

Having said this, the Lord in his viśvamūrti disappeared, and Nārada, his desires fulfilled, returned to Badarāśrama, to see the sages Nara and Nārāyaṇa. Then Bhīṣma says (the whole episode, it may be remembered is related by Bhīṣma to Yudhiṣṭhira): ‘This great Upaniṣad (that is, what Nārada had heard from the Lord) is completely possessed of the four Vedas (and) based on Śāṅkhya and Yoga is called Pañcarātra. It was sung by Nārāyaṇa, heard by Nārada and related by him in Brahmā’s house just as he had seen and heard.’ (vv. 99-100).

Yudhiṣṭhira then asked another question in reply to which Bhīṣma informed him that, Nārada recited this Purāṇa imbued with Veda (purāṇam Veda-sammitam, v. 106) for the benefit of the Siddhas assembled in Brahmā’s house; from them (teṣāṁ sakāsāt) Śūrya heard it, and related it to his followers 60,000 in number; they related it to the gods on the Meru mountain; from them (teṣāṁ sakāsāt) Asita heard it, who related it to Bhīṣma’s father, who related it to Bhīṣma. (vv. 104-111). Bhīṣma further on states that, he who will read it or listen to it everyday, will enjoy ekānta-bhāva and will be established in ekānta; he will reach the Śvetadvīpa, and gain moon-like brilliance, and will undoubtedly enter the god with thousand rays. (vv. 116-17; C. ed. 128-29).

Chapter 327 (C. ed. 340) is not of interest for our purpose but in verses 24-26 (C. ed. 30-31) it is stated that for the creation of the world the Paramātman of Śāṅkhya and Yoga by his own karma becomes (is called) Mahāpuruṣa; from him is evolved the unmanifest which is called by the learned as Pradhāna; from Īśvara (evolution of Īśvara is not given) and the unmanifest (avyakta) is evolved the manifest (vyakta), who is called Aniruddha and Mahānātman. ‘This manifest Aniruddha has created Brahmā, who is extremely brilliant and is called āhaṅkāra. (vv. 24-26; C. ed. 29-31).
In Chapter 328 (C. ed. 341), Kṛṣṇa relates to Arjuna his glory and the derivation of his various names and incidentally he says that of his four kinds of devotees, the Ekāntins are the best, because they do not worship any other god; and ‘I am their gati, they who work without any expectation.’ As the other three kinds of devotees expect result they fall down, but the pratibuddhas (i.e. jñanins) are the best. (vv. 30-31; C. ed. 34-35).

Actually in this chapter Vaiśampāyana relates to Janamejaya Kṛṣṇa’s answers to Arjuna’s query, and this dialogue is continued in prose in the next chapter (329; C. ed. 342, vv. 1-65) in which Kṛṣṇa describes to Arjuna, the beginning of creation, glory of the Brāhmaṇas and various stories including that of Dadhici, Nahuṣa, Aditi, and Dakṣa. The next chapter continues the dialogue in verse (330; C. ed. 342 vv. 65 ff) in course of which Kṛṣṇa says:

\[
\text{sattvāṁ—na cyuto-pūrvo' haṁ sattvāṁ vai viddhi mat kṛtam janmāniḥ—ābhavat sattvam pauvikaṁ me Dhanaṁjaya nirāśiḥ-karma-saṁyuktāṁ sātvataṁ māṁ prakalpaya sātvata-jñāna-dṛṣṭo 'ham Sātvataḥ Sātvatāṁ patiḥ (330.12-13; C. ed. 342. 76-78).}
\]

(I have never fallen from (my) Essence; (or truth) (sattva); know indeed that truth (sattva) has been made by me; (and) I retain in my present birth my former (awareness of) truth. Imagine me as a sātvata, one attached to work without expectation (of result), I am seen by sātvata knowledge, I am Sātvata the lord of the Sātvatas). Thereafter Kṛṣṇa describes the etymology of other names and in reply to Arjuna’s further question describes his victory over Rudra.

The following four chapters (331-334; C. ed. 343-346) conclude the description of Nārāyaṇa’s glory related by Nārada and Nara- Nārāyaṇa. The next chapter (335; C. ed. 347) describes the Haya- grīva avatāra, recovery of the Vedas etc.

The next chapter (336; C. ed. 348) has some bearing on the religion of the Ekāntins. The chapter begins with a question by Janamejaya who first praises the Ekāntins (who, according to him, go to the paramāṁ padam, v. 3), and then asks Vaiśampāyana the name of the promulgator, rites (caryā) and origin (vv. 6-7) of the Ekāntins. In reply Vaiśampāyana says that when Arjuna became unmindful of his duties during the Kuru-Pāṇḍava war, the Lord himself sang this religion, that is the Gītā. (v. 8). Then Vaiśampāyana adds that he has already related this difficult religion which is equal to Sāma-veda, and is upheld by Nārāyaṇa. (It is interesting to note that Nīlakanṭha explains (vv. 9-10) that Sāma-veda here connotes tat tvam asi and śūra-vairāgya of Patañjali.). Then Vaiśam-
pāyana gives the information, that Pārtha put the same question to Nārada in an assembly of sages, where Kṛṣṇa and Bhīma also heard it; it was also said by Vaiśampāyana's preceptor (i.e. Vyāsa). But Vaiśampāyana told Janamejaya 'Listen to what Nārada said there.' (vv. 9-12). Then Vaiśampāyana relates the evolution of this religion in each yuga, which are as follows:

(1) In the first kalpa (Mānasam janma), Nārāyaṇa performed the daiva and pītya rites according to this religion, which was accepted by the Phenapās sages. From them the Vaikhānasās sages and from the Vaikhānasās sages Soma obtained it. Then it disappeared (that is, passed into oblivion.) (vv. 13-14).

(2) In the second kalpa (Cākṣuṣam janma), Brahmā received it from Soma and gave it to Rudra, who taught it to all the Vālakhiliya sages. Then it disappeared. (vv. 15-16).

(3) In Brahmā's third birth (Vācikam janma), Nārāyaṇa again founded this religion. Suparṇa received it from Puruṣottama. As he performed it thrice, it is known as tri-sauparṇa. (Nilakanṭha comments that it implies three mantras from the Rg-veda). This vrata (rite) is in consonance with the Rg-veda. From Suparṇa, Vāyu, and from the latter the Vighasāsi sages, and from them Mahadāhi received it. Then it disappeared and resumed into Nārāyaṇa. (vv. 17-22).

(4) During Brahmā's Śravaṇa birth when Brahmā was born from Nārāyaṇa's ears, Nārāyaṇa asked him to create the phenomenal world, and gave the Sātvata religion to establish the Kṛta-yuga with it (Sātvata religion). Brahmā bowed to the Lord of Gods, Hari, and received from him this religion with rahasya, saṁgraha, and āranyaka. This yuga-dharma was nirāśiḥ-karma-saṁjñitam and known as Sātvata. Brahmā taught it to Svārociṣa Manu who transmitted it to his son Śaṁkhapāda, who in his turn taught it to his son Sudharmāna (Suvarnābha, C. ed.). At the beginning of the Tretā-yuga it disappeared, (vv. 23-35).

(5) In Brahmā's Nāṣikya (Nāṣatya C. ed.) birth, the Lord Hari-Nārāyaṇa related this religion to Brahmā. From Brahmā Sanatkumāra, from him Vīraṇa, from Vīraṇa Raucya Manu (Rai-bhya Muni, C. ed.), and from Raucya his son Kukṣi, received it. Then this religion disappeared. (vv. 36-39).

(6) In Brahmā's Anḍaja birth, this religion again emanated from Nārāyaṇa, and Brahmā taught it to the Bahirṣada sages, from whom a Śāmavedēnta brāhmaṇa called Jyeṣṭha received it, and from him King Avikampana received it. Then this religion disappeared. (vv. 40-43).
(7) In the present Lotus or seventh birth of Brahmā, Nārāyaṇa related this religion to Brahmā, who gave it to Dakṣa. Dakṣa gave this religion to his eldest grandson (daughter’s son) Aditya, elder (brother) of Savitṛ from whom Vivasvān got it. At the beginning of the Tretā-yuga, Vivasvān gave it to Manu, who gave it to his son Ikṣvāku. Ikṣvāku (has) spread this religion which will pass away to Nārāyaṇa at the end of the age. (vv. 44-48; cf. Gitā, IV, 1-2).

Then Vaiśampāyana again adds that, this religion is the religion of vratis and has already been related in the Hari-gitā; Nārada also got it from Jagannātha Nārāyaṇa along with rahaṇya and saṁgraha; ‘This, O King!’ says Vaiśampāyana, ‘is the great original Sanātana-dharma, (which is) difficult to learn, difficult to perform, and is always upheld by sātvata (sātvatār dhāryate sadā) (vv. 49-51) (Here Sātvata seems to mean either the Vṛṣṇi race, or “truth”.) Lord Hari is pleased (if one performs this religion) with right knowledge, right application of rites and ahimsā. Sometimes one, sometimes two, sometimes three and sometimes four vyūhas are seen. . . . This is ekānta dharma. . . .’ (vv. 52-57). Curiously enough, at the end of this description Vaiśampāyana says that this account of this religion was related by his preceptor Vyāsa to Dharmarāja, that is Yudhisṭhira, in an assembly of sages, heard by Kṛṣṇa and Bhīṣma, and is the same as what had been related by Nārada before. (vv. 59-60).

Janamejaya then asked as to why everyone did not follow this religion of pratibuddhas (that is, jñānīnas), to which Vaiśampāyana replied that there are three types of men, namely sāttvika, rājas and tāmasa. The sāttvikas are ekānta-bhāktaś of Nārāyaṇa, and desire mokṣa, and Lord Hari himself carries the burden of their yoga and kṣema. (cf. Gitā IX. 22). “Those mortals who are (blessed by the benevolent) glance of Madhusūdana, are known as sāttvika and are certain to achieve mokṣa. The religion practised by the Ekānta is equal (in merit) to Śāmkhya and Yoga, therefore they attain the ultimate heaven of Nārāyaṇa’s mokṣa. By virtue of Nārāyaṇa’s blessing of glance one becomes a pratibuddha and not by one’s will.” (vv. 66-70) Vaiśampāyana then describes the different fates of the rājasika and tāmasika persons, after which Janamejaya, asks him the fate of the vaikārika (v. 74), that is sāttvikas tainted with ego. In reply Vaiśampāyana says that, ‘a puruṣa of the twenty-fifth (tattva, that is jīvātman) can attain the very subtle (one) associated with sattvaguna and three letters (praṇava) by completely giving up ego. Thus Śāmkhya-Yoga and Ved-āranyakas are same (i.e. identical), they are complimentary to each other and are also known as Pañca-
rātra, this is the religion of the Ekāntins who are devoted to Nārāyaṇa.

evaṁ ekaṁ sāṁkhya-yogam ved-āraṇyakam eva ca
paraspar-āṅganyāḥ etāni pañcaraṭraṁ ca kathyate
esa ekāntināṁ dharmo Nārāyaṇa-parātmakāḥ

Nilakaṇṭha in explaining this verse (C. ed. 348. 81-82) says:
sāṁkhyaṁ ātm-āṅgatma-vivekah; yogaś citta vr̥ttiṇirōdhaḥ;
ved-āraṇyakam Jiva-Brahm-ābhedaparāṁ tattvamasyādī-
vākyajam jñānam; pañcarātraṁ bhaktimārgaḥ paramaguraṁ krtāṁ vaidikānāṁ karmanāṁ arpaṇam; etat sarvam
eka-kārya-kāritvāt samuccitam eva na tu vikalpitam iti

In the next chapter (337; C. ed. 349), Janamejaya asks whether
Sāṁkhya, Yoga, Pañcarātra Veda and Āraṇyaka, which are widely
known, are the same or different. In reply Vaiśampāyana relates a
long story about Vyāsa's former birth (vv. 3-57) and then adds that
Sāṁkhya, Yoga, Pañcarātra, Vedas, and Pāṇḍapata are different (nānā-
matāni, v. 59) Kapila promulgated Sāṁkhya; sage Apantaramāḥ (a
name of Vyāsa in former birth) also known as Prācinagarba was the
ācārya of the Vedas; Brahmā's son, husband of Umā, lord of the
bhūtas, Śrīkaṇṭha Śiva promulgated the Pāṇḍapata jīna; the entire
Pañcarātra is known only to Lord (Bhagavān svayam), it seems to
be the best of all the jñānas, and is not known to the tāmasikas.
(vv. 59-64). Nilakaṇṭha does not comment on these verses.

For our present purpose, the Nārāyaṇiya section need not be
discussed further, for the next two chapters, also included in this
section, are devoted to the praise of Nārāyaṇa by Brahmā and his
son Rudra (lalāṭa-prabhavaḥ putraḥ Śiva 338.11) which, however,
does not yield any further information about the Śātvatas, Ekāntins
or Pañcarātras.

We may now attempt to correlate the information yielded by
the Nārāyaṇiya section.

In Chapter 326, as we have already noted, vyūha-vāda has
been presented along with avatāra-vāda. But about the vyūha-
vāda described in Chapter 326, it should be noted that there is
difference between the interpretation of the vyūhas in vv. 31-37,
and vv. 38-39 and Brahmā is introduced along with the four
vyūhas in vv. 68-70. It is indeed difficult to account for successive
verses giving different accounts, but what is noteworthy is that
Śāṅkara in his commentary on the Brahma-sūtra (II.2.42) has
criticized the vyūha-vāda of vv. 38-39, which it is said is not
found in any Pañcarātra text. In view of the fact that the earliest
available MSS. of the Mahābhārata were written in the 8th or the
9th century, it is possible that, these verses were added after the Śārīraka-bhāṣya was written.

Next, as we have seen, Bhīṣma says that, Pañcarātra is based on the Vedas, Śāmkhya and Yoga. This is supported by Vaiśampāyana’s statement in Chapter 336, v. 76 quoted above; from which we also learn that, this was the religion of the Ekāntins. We have quoted Nilakaṇṭha’s commentary on this verse, which seems to be a rational explanation. But in the next chapter (337-59) Vaiśampāyana changes his former position and says that Pañcarātra, Śāmkhya, Yoga, Vedas and Pāśupata are different opinions. This, it may be noted, is the only verse in which the Pāśupata sect is mentioned.

Secondly, in Chapter 327 the theory of the creation of the world has probably some similarity with Gitā, VIII. 20, but is foreign to Pañcarātra; but here (327.31), Aniruddha has been equated with ahaṁkāra, which is quite foreign to the Gitā. It seems that, the emphasis on nirāśīt-karma (328.30; 330.13) indicates an attempt to introduce a famous idea of the Gitā in the religion preached in the Nārāyaṇiya section, particularly the Pañcarātra, and in Chapter 337, Krṣṇa, among others, is called Pañcarātrika.

Next we come to the Sātvata religion. The derivation of this word is given in Chapter 330.12-13, quoted above, from which it becomes difficult to assign to it any special sectarian significance, and there is hardly any doubt that throughout the Nārāyaṇiya section ēkānta and sātvata have been used primarily in their etymological sense. However, it has been stated above that, king Uparicara Vasu used to worship Nārāyaṇa according to Sātvata rites. Here we have to note the previous history of Uparicara Vasu as found in the Adiparvan (57.1-27; C. ed. 63.1-29). There it is related that, Vasu according to Indra’s instructions, conquered the Cedi country. Thereafter he began a tapas to gain Indrahood, but was restrained by gods and Indra. As he gave up his attempt, Indra gave him a stick for protecting the people and a garland called Vaijayantī, which made him practically invincible. Out of gratitude to Indra, he dug the stick in the ground and thus started the Indra-pūjā.

It is well-known that, Krṣṇa in his young age had stopped Indra-pūjā. This incident is related in the Purāṇas, but Kaṁśa obviously refers to this incident in the Mahābhārata. Is it possible that a man could be the originator of Indra-pūjā and also be a follower of Krṣṇa? Chronological difficulties are also too great even
for an epic. For Vasu was the father of Satyavati, mother of Vyāsa, Citrāṅgada and Vicitravīrya, grandsires of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas. Therefore Vasu, could either have been the follower of a form of Viṣṇu worship much anterior to the Kuru-Pāṇḍava period, or, what is more probable, the verses relating to Vasu in the Śāntiparvan are interpolations or corrupt.

Even if we accept Vasu’s story in the Nārāyaṇiya section as a part of Mahābhārata, it should be noted that the prophecy was that after Vasu’s death the religion which he followed would disappear. Therefore it is not possible to identify Vasu’s religion with Pañcarātra or any other known sect.

Raychaudhuri, as noted above, has partly based his theory of the identification of Upaniṣadic and epic Kṛṣṇa on a verse from the chapter dealing with Vasu and stated that ‘the Sātvata-vidhi expounded by the epic Kṛishṇa has been declared in days of yore by the Sun himself prāk-sūrya-mukha-niḥṣṛta’.4

Now, it has been shown above that in spite of this categorical statement in Chapter 322, 19, in verse 44 of the same chapter it is stated that Vasu will learn it from Bṛhaspati and this is reiterated in 323, 2-3, and Sūrya is nowhere mentioned, and the next chapter relates how Bṛhaspati performed the sacrifice as Vasu’s priest. Therefore it is impossible to reconcile the statements of 322.19 and 322.43. Complications are also created by 322.23 and 322.24 which state that the king Vasu used to perform rites according to Sātvata system; and that the chief among the Pañcarātra scholars used to get presents and were the first to be offered food. From these two verses, Dr. Kane has concluded that Sātvata and Pañcarātra were the same sect.4a This, however, need not be the implication of the two verses, and such identification would militate against the statement, noted above, that the Sātvata religion would disappear with Vasu.

Another important point to be noted in Chapter 322 is the abrupt manner in which the Citraśikhandins are introduced in v. 26. This has not only no relation to what has been stated by Bhīṣma (vv. 17-25), but, as we have noted above, contradicts the latter. This and the fact that they do not give a list of teachers leads us to suggest that vv.17-25 are very late interpolations, and was not even a part of the ‘original interpolation’ if we may be permitted to use this odd term. Therefore they should be disregarded.

Another point to be noted about Vasu is that he performed five sacrifices five times (324.28). This may be the reason for which in the next chapter (325.57) Nārada calls Nārāyaṇa, Pañcayajñadhara',
but it also reminds one of Pañcarātra described in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 6.1) where Puruṣa Nārāyaṇa desiring to overpass all beings ‘beheld the five days’ sacrificial performance and took the performed offering’.

The religion practised by Vasu cannot be identified with Sātvata for another reason. We have given above a summary of Chapter 336 where it is stated (vv. 23-35) that Brahmā received the Sātvata religion from Nārāyaṇa and it was transmitted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahmā</th>
<th>Śaṁkhapada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Svārociṣa</td>
<td>Sudharmāṇa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Sudharmāṇa the religion disappeared. Here Vasu is not mentioned, and if 336.23-35 really describe a sect, then Vasu cannot be said to have belonged to it.

Regarding the Ekānta religion we have seen that the description of the Ekāntins in 328.30-33 are similar to Gīta VII.16-19. This is confirmed by Vaiṣampāyana in 336.8 as noted above. Therefore we may identify the Ekānta as the religion of the Gīta. Nilakaṇṭha also emphasizes the difference between Ekāntins and the Pañcarātras while commenting on 336.3 (C. ed. 348.3) which is as follows:

_Caturthyāṁ caiva te gatyāṁ gacchanti Puruṣottamam_  
_Ekāntinas—tu puruṣā gacchanti paramāṁ padam._

(They, the Ekāntins, reach the ultimate goal (which is) Puruṣottama, the fourth gati (state)).

Commenting on this verse Nilakaṇṭha explains caturthyā as Aniruddha-Pradyumna-Saṁkarṣaṇ-ānapekṣya caturthyāṁ Vāsudev-vākhyāyōṁ Hari-bhaktānāṁ viśeṣam āha. From this it is apparent that the Ekāntins only worshipped Vāsudeva-Hari, and not the vyūhas of the avatāras and thus they expected to attain the highest goal.

It is also difficult to identify the Sātvata with either Pañcarātra or Ekānta, and indeed it is questionable whether any sect of that name ever existed, except in the myth contained in Chapter 336. 23-35; the religion of the Citraśikhandins it may be noted, is not given any name. It is remarkable, however, that nowhere in the Nārāyaṇiya section do we find the word ‘Bhāgavata’; this leads us to believe that Ekāntins were later called Bhāgavatas, for Ekānta as a sect is not known except in the Nārāyaṇiya section. However, Bhāgavata is mentioned in the Besnagar inscription of the second century B.C. as will be related later; it is possible therefore that the core of the Nārāyaṇiya section was written before 2nd century
A.D. and later additions were made by Pañcarātras, who were not Bhāgavatas.
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As we have stated above (p. 1), the term Vaiṣṇava, was not used in ancient times, and it is usually taken that the general word in use seems to be Bhāgavatas, that is worshippers of Bhagavat or as Bhandarkar says, 'highest Brahmā'.

He also includes the Pañcarātra in the Bhāgavata system, but distinguishes it from the 'Ekāntika Dharma, which was promulgated in the Gītā'. But as we have shown above, this identification of Bhāgavata and Pañcarātra is not tenable, that is, before the advent of Rāmānuja.

The word Bhagavat is used to denote a person or a book, whose object is to describe the teachings or the life of a bhagavat or bhagavatī; a person who is a devotee of bhagavat or bhagavatī is also termed a bhāgavat, and it is in this sense that the word is most commonly used. Etymologically, the word means one who is possessed of 'bhaga'. This word, which in the Rgveda (VII. 41) has been used as the name of a god, was also used in various senses, and for our present purpose would seem to mean 'majesty, lustre or wealth'; therefore a male possessed of these qualities was a bhagavat, and the female bhagavatī.

The Bhāgavata-purāṇa calls itself Sātvatī-sruti (I. iv. 7), Sātvata-samhitā (I. vii, 6) and Bhagavatī-samhitā, (I, vii, 8) but it also refers to Kṛṣṇa as the 'Lord of the Sātvatas (Sātvatām bhartā, X, vi, 3 and Sātvatām prabhū X, xxxvii, 11), wherefore it appears that all that is meant is that the Bh.P. is a Samhitā or Sruti relating to Kṛṣṇa. Again in the same Purāṇa (VII, x, 45-46) Nārada says that the religion by which bhagavān can be attained is bhāgavata, and that bhagavān is Viṣṇu. From this, it is evident that Viṣṇu is the object of worship of the bhāgavatas and that he is also known as Bhāgavata; and from the statement Ekāntinām Bhagavatas=tad=ākīnacakānānāṁ (Ekāntins are the indigent (votaries) of Bhagavat; Bh. P., VII, vi, 27) it appears that the Ekāntins were the worshippers of Bhagavat.

The Bh.P., however, seems to contain several different traditions regarding the list of the teachers of this religion. Śuka says (Bh. P, II. iv, 25; II, ix, 5-7; III, iv, 13) that the secret doctrine preached in the work (Bh.P.) was given by Viṣṇu to Brahmā; from Brahmā, Nārada received it, who related an abridged version to Vyāsā, who incorporated these teachings in the Bh.P., and taught his sōn Śuka who read it out to King Parikṣit. Elsewhere, Śuka (Bh.P., X, lxxvii, 8; 47-48) says that this Brahmavāda was first
related by the sage Nārāyaṇa to Nārada, who in turn related it to Vyāsa and Vyāsa to Śuka. Elsewhere, (Bh. P. VII, vi, 27-28) Prahlāda states that the Bh. P. was related by Nārāyaṇa to Nārada, who related it to Prahlāda. However, the sage Maitreya says (Bh. P. III, viii, 2-9) that, Bhagavān Saṃkarṣaṇa first related the Bhāgavata-purāṇa to the sage Sanatkumāra who was desirous of learning the true principles of Vāsudeva; the latter related it to Saṁkhyāyana, who told it to sages Parāśara and Brhaspati; Maitreya learnt it from the latter and related it to Vidura.

Thus from the Bh. P. we get four lists of teachers, namely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
<td>Nārāyaṇa</td>
<td>Nārāyaṇa</td>
<td>Saṃkarṣaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brāhmā</td>
<td>Nārada</td>
<td>Nārada</td>
<td>Sanatkumāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vyāsa</td>
<td>Prahlāda</td>
<td>Saṁkhyāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nārada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyāsa</td>
<td>Śuka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parāśara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śuka.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these four traditions, the first three can be reconciled; Nārāyaṇa is held to be an incarnation of Viṣṇu, and in each the teaching is handed through Nārada. The fourth list is, however, entirely different.

The name of Sanatkumāra and the description of the sage Saṁkhyāyana as chief of the Paramahamsa-religion, indicates its affinity with the Haṁsa sect of the vaiṣṇavas to which Nimbārka belonged and Sanatkumāra is mentioned in two other lists in the Bh. P. First the Bh. P. (VI. iii. 20) states that twelve persons only knew the Bhāgavata dharma, namely Svayambhū, Nārada, Sambhu, Kumāra (i.e. Sanatkumāra), Kapila, Manu, Prahlāda, Janaka, Bhīṣma, Bali, Śuka, and Yama. Of these twelve names, only four, namely, Svayambhū (Brahmā), Nārada, Kumāra (Sanatkumāra); and Prahlāda are to be found in the lists given above. But this list (Bh. P. VI. iii. 20) is important, for Jiva Gosvāmin refers to it in the Bhakti-sandarbha (110) which implies that he recognized twelve sects, for he does not discuss this matter any further. However, again in the Bh. P. (IX. iv. 57-8), Rudra tells Dūrvāsas: ‘Myself, Sanatkumāra, Nārada, Brahmā, Kapila, Devala, Dharma, Asuri, Marici; and the Siddhas, (that is) all who have the knowledge (of reality pāra-śīnāḥ), do not know māyā being enveloped by her.’ From the
context, 'knowledge' here means, the knowledge of Viṣṇu, and this list seems to indicate a line of teachers.

It is, however, quite evident that the Bh. P. is not following the Nārāyaṇiya section, and both seem to ignore Gītā IV. 1. As it is not possible to maintain that the Nārāyaṇiya section and the Bh. P. were earlier than the Gītā, the only possible conclusion seems to be that they attempted to record current traditions. It is possible, however, that the Nārāyaṇiya section and the Bh. P. were written at about the same time, and it is also possible that while the former records the northern tradition, the latter records the southern one. A comparatively late date has been suggested for the Bh. P. which has been discussed in the next chapter. About the Nārāyaṇiya Section it has been pointed out below (p. 24 f. n. 2) that Khāravela claimed descent from Uparicara Vasu. It is difficult to believe that a devout Jain king like Khāravela would have associated himself with an ardent worshipper of Viṣṇu like Vasu, hence it is quite probable that the Nārāyaṇiya section, or at least the part of it which deals with Vasu, was added after Khāravela, who probably reigned during the 1st century B.C. It is remarkable that the Nārāyaṇiya Section does not use the term Bhāgavata as a religion, though it is frequently used in the Bh. P. and by Heliodorus in the second century B.C. It is possible, therefore, that the Bh. P. was written before Heliodorus, and the Nārāyaṇiya section was later added by the Pāṇcarātras as an aid to the propagation of their faith.  

It may therefore be tentatively concluded that there were two sects of Nārāyaṇa worshippers, one of which followed the Paṇcarātra tradition whose origin is not known. The other followed the Gītā tradition and were known in later times as the Bhāgavatas. Thus Bāṇa in the Harṣacarita mentions Paṇcarātra and Bhāgavata as two different sects. One of the principal preachers of the Bhāgavata sect was believed to be Nārada. It is clear however that, there were other exponents and tradition preserved their names as we find in the Nārāyaṇiya section and also in the Bh. P. The medieval Vaiṣṇava sects also were divided into four sects, and each claimed to have a distinct line of teachers, the earliest of whom heard the doctrine from Nārāyaṇa himself. Though there were doctrinal differences between these sects, the line of teachers was so important, that Caitanya's sect could not claim to represent any traditional sect, and later had to affiliate themselves to the Brāhma or Mādhva sect, though there were serious doctrinal differences between them.
Quintas Curtius, a Greek historian of the 1st century B.C., observes on the authority of Alexander's contemporary historians, that the soldiers of Porus, carried the effigy of Herakles while fighting the Greeks. Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador to the court of Candragupta Maurya, also refers to the worship of Herakles by the Soursenoi in whose lands were situated the cities of Methora and Kleisobora and through it flowed the navigable river Jobares. He further observes that the two gods, Herakles and Dionysios were worshipped by the Indians living in the plains and on the hills respectively. Herakles has been identified with Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, and Soursenoi with the Surasenas, a tribe which lived in the Mathura region which is identical with Greek Methora, while Jobares has been identified with the Yamuna.\footnote{7}

Later, however, another Greek ambassador came to take greater interest in Vāsudeva. One of the earliest archaeological evidence regarding the worship of Vāsudeva is the well-known Besnagar pillar inscription of Heliodorus, the ambassador of the Indo-Greek king Antialkidas to the court of Kāśīputra Bhāgabhadra of Vidiśā (near Gwalior Madhya Pradesh). An inscription engraved on the shaft of the pillar which gives these details records that Bhāgavata Heliodorus erected it in honour of Devadeva Vāsudeva, and the column is described as Garuḍadhvaja. Scholars have taken this as an evidence of Viṣṇu's identification with Sun-God for, in the Vedas, Sun has been twice called Garutmat, a bird, and we know from post-Vedic mythology that Garuḍa is Viṣṇu's vehicle. However, the Garuḍa-dhvaja, or the capital in the shape of Garuḍa is missing.\footnote{8}

Other inscriptions relating to Viṣṇu worship have been found at Nagari, Ghousundi (both in Rajasthan) and Mora in Mathura region. The former two inscriptions record the worship of Bhagavān by one Pārāśarī-putra Gājāyana, who had performed an Aśvamedha sacrifice, but had erected a Nārāyaṇa-vāṭikā for the worship of Saṁkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva, “the unconquered and lords of all.” Bhandarkar had taken this to refer to the vyūha worship of the Pāñcarātras but Banerjea has shown that it alludes to the five manuṣṭa-prakṛiti-devas mentioned in the Vāyu-pūrṇa, and are also alluded to in the Mora well inscription found near Mathura.\footnote{9} This must have been a sectarian form of worship which disappeared without leaving any trace behind it, but the provenances of the inscriptions show that it covered a fairly wide region.
CAITANYA: HIS LIFE AND DOCTRINE

Bhandarkar discussed the inscriptions mentioned above and the references to Vāsudeva and Arjuna in order to establish the date of the Gitā.\textsuperscript{10} In this connection he observed that, at the time the Gitā was composed Vāsudeva's identification with Viṣṇu had not been acknowledged, because in the eleventh chapter of the work, though Arjuna twice addresses Kṛṣṇa as Viṣṇu, the latter identifies Viṣṇu as the chief Aditya.\textsuperscript{11} This may be explained by the fact that vaiśnavas made a distinction between Viṣṇu the supreme principal and Viṣṇu a lesser deity. However, it appears that Bhandarkar is wrong when he states that Kṛṣṇa was not acknowledged as an incarnation of Viṣṇu in the Gitā, for in the eleventh chapter (v. 46) Arjuna ends his prayer by praying:

\begin{verbatim}
tenaiyā rupena caturbhuṣjena
sahasra-vāho bhava viśvamūrte
\end{verbatim}

While translating this verse Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Isherwood remark that, 'the only explanation of this passage seems to be that Arjuna is asking Sri Krishna to assume the shape of his chosen deity Vishnu—since it cannot mean that Krishna had four arms while in his human shape.'\textsuperscript{12} This conclusion seems to be quite reasonable, so it may be further concluded that the Gitā identifies Kṛṣṇa with Viṣṇu who at that time was worshipped in his well-known four-armed form.

As for the date of the Gitā, it has not yet been satisfactorily established, nor is it necessary for our present purpose to go into the problem, which in any case cannot be solved. A very good discussion of the problem will be found in Prof. S. N. Das Gupta's History of Indian Philosophy, who concludes that the Gitā is a pre-Buddhist work.\textsuperscript{13}

1. All references within brackets unless otherwise mentioned are to the Śantiparvan of the Mahābhārata, critical edition published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. C. ed. indicates the Citrasala edition, Poona, 1932. Many additional verses are to be found in the Citrasala edition of which no notice has been taken here. Nīlakanṭha's commentary is given in the Citrasala edition.
2. We need not go into the details here but Vasu's (natural?) daughter was Satyavati, Vyāsa's mother. It is interesting to note that King Kṛṣṇa's of the Hāthugumpha inscription claimed descent from this Upaniṣad Vasu. This seems to indicate that the Nārāyāṇiya section was added after Kṛṣṇa, who was a Jaina, c. 1st century B.C.
3. valmika-mātrāḥ sapīṣṭāṁ yady = anena dhṛtō'acalaḥ
tādā Govardhano Bhīṣma na tac = citram matam mama
(O Bhīṣma! What is there remarkable in this one's (Kṛṣṇa's) having supported for a week the Govardhana mountain which is like an ant hill). Nīlakanṭha does not comment on this verse, presumably because the implication is obvious. Mbh. II, 38.9; C. ed. 41.9.
4b. Here by sect is meant a regular 'samskṛta' with its distinct rituals and philosophy. It may be noted that Sātvatas are mentioned in very late litera-
ture like the Caitanya-candrodaya of Kavi-karnapūra. (Act. VIII, 1854 ed. p. 168) where it is stated by one Mallabhaṭṭa (from Karpāṭaka): Yathottaram eva daksīṇayam dīśi kiyantaḥ karma-niṣṭhāḥ katicid eva jñāna-niṣṭhā virātā eva sāvatāḥ pracuratarāḥ pāṇḍatāḥ pracurasamāḥ pāṇḍāṇāhāḥ. It is firstly difficult to accept this statement at its face value, for pāṇḍin, that is Buddhist dominance in the south at this time (16th century) must be a gross exaggeration. Secondly, it appears from the context that Sātvata here does not stand for the followers of Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa. Our impression is that Kavi-karnapūra had heard the name of the Sātvatas but was not quite sure about them. He could not have meant the Sātvatas of the Bh. P.


6. ibid, p. 17; p. 54.

6a. For the low position of the Pāncarātras see next chapter. According to Dr. Kane ‘the extant Mahābhārata is later than the extant Manuṣmṛti’, which according to him was finally recast between 2nd Century B.C. to 2nd Century A.D. P. V. Kane: History of Dharmaśāstra-I (2nd ed.), pp. 344-45.


11. ibid, p. 18.


CHAPTER III

PAṆCARĀTRA AND BHĀGAVATISM

1

Though Paṅcarātra is mentioned in the Nārāyaṇīya section, scholars have assumed that the extant Paṅcarātra texts are much later. The oldest work to quote a Paṅcarātra text is Utpala’s Spandapradipikā of the tenth century; about a generation later it was quoted for the first time in the south by Yāmuna, Rāmānuja’s spiritual predecessor. Thus the date of the earliest Paṅcarātra texts would be about 8th century A.D., which Schrader regards as the terminus ad quem of the original Paṅcarātra Samhitās.1 It may be noted here that Medhātithi (on Manu, II, 6) has called the Paṅcarātra and Pāśupata as heterodox sects, because they did not admit that the Vedas were the source of dharma. Similarly, in the Kūrma purāṇa, chapter fifteen, it is said that the great sinners, the Paṅcarātrins, were produced as a result of killing cows in some other birth, that they are absolutely non-Vedic, and that the literatures of the Śāktas, Śaivas and the Paṅcarātras are for the delusion of mankind. That Paṅcarātrins were a cursed people is also noticed in the Parāśara purāṇa. They are also strongly denounced in the Vaiśīṣṭha-samhitā, the Śamba-purāṇa and the Sūta-samhitā as great sinners and as absolutely non-Vedic. Another cause of denouncement was that the Paṅcarātrins initiated and admitted within their sect even women and Śūdras. According to the Aśvalāyana-smṛti, no one but an outcast would therefore accept the marks recommended by the Paṅcarātras. In the fourth chapter of the Bṛhan-nārada-purāṇa it is said that even for conversing with the Paṅcarātrins one would have to go to the Raurava hell. The same prohibition of conversing with the Paṅcarātrins is found in the Kūrma-purāṇa, and it is there held that they should not be invited on occasions of funeral ceremonies. Hemādhri, quoting from the Vāyu-purāṇa, says that, if a Brahman is converted into the Paṅcarātra religion, he thereby loses all his Vedic rites. The Līṅga-purāṇa also regards them as being excommunicated from all religion (saṅga-dharma-bahiskṛta). The Āditya and the Agni-purāṇas are also extremely strong against those who associate themselves in any way with the Paṅcarātrins. The Viṣṇu, Śatātapa, Hārīta, Bodhāyana, and the Yama samhitās also are equally strong against the Paṅcarātrins and those who associate with them in any way. The
Pañcarātrins, however, seem to be more conciliatory to the members of the orthodox Vedic sects. They therefore appear to be a minority sect, which had always to be on the defensive and did not dare revile the orthodox Vedic people. There are some Purāṇas, however, like the Mahābhārata, Bhāgavata and the Viṣṇu-purāṇa, which are strongly in favour of the Pañcarātrins. It is curious, however, to notice that, while some sections of the Purāṇas approve of them, others are fanatically against them.\(^2\)

According to Kane, Medhātithi most probably flourished between A.D. 825 to 900, while Hemādri flourished in the 13th century and the latter quotes the Kūrma-purāṇa which forbids inviting at śrāddhas Buddhists, Pāṣupatas, Pañcarātras and other similar heretical people.\(^3\) The Viramitrodaya however quotes Yogi-Yājñavalkya to the effect that Śaṅkhya, Yoga, Pañcarātra, and Pāṣupata were all Vedic and are highly authoritative, but this line is not found in the printed text.\(^4\) The date of Yogi-Yājñavalkya is not known, but the Viramitrodaya was written in the 17th century, when the vaisṇavas had rehabilitated Pañcarātra. But, the Viramitrodaya also distinguishes between a Vedic and non-Vedic Pañcarātra.

Unfortunately we do not know the dates of the texts mentioned above, which makes it difficult to trace chronologically the position of the Pañcarātras. We may, however, observe tentatively that, by the 9th century Pañcarātra was considered to be a heterodox sect, and the stigma continued for a long time. Whether Śaṅkara’s denunciation of Pañcarātra system was the cause or result of this attitude cannot be ascertained, but it is well-known that his description of the Pañcarātra system, (Brahma-sūtra II, ii, 42) differs from the known texts. If Śaṅkara’s interpretation is correct, then, of course, this system, which he calls ‘Bhāgavata’ was looked down upon when the Brahma-sūtra was composed. But the vaisṇava commentators, interpret it differently; Bhāskara alone agrees with Śaṅkara that this section deals with Pañcarātra doctrine, but he defends the doctrine and argues against Śaṅkara’s views.

We are here more concerned with Śaṅkara’s identification of Bhāgavata with vyūha-vāda, that is Pañcarātra, for he does not use the word Pañcarātra, but calls it the Bhāgavata system. It should also be noted that, though Śaṅkara argued against the vyūha-vāda, he wrote a commentary on the Gītā, which shows that he was not against the teachings of the Kṛṣṇa cult. As it is generally agreed that Śaṅkara lived between 788-820,\(^5\) it may be concluded that, by the end of the eighth century Pañcarātra was sometimes called bhāgavata, or that the vyuha doctrine had been accepted by the bhā-
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gavatas. This is curious, to say the least, for, from the time of Candra-gupta II (c.A.D. 376-415) many kings and emperors have called themselves Parama-bhāgavatas. Moreover, Bāṇa in his Harṣa-carita, written in the middle of the seventh century, separately mentions the Bhāgavatas and the Pañcarātrikas, explained by the commentator Śāmkarakavi as Viṣṇu-bhaktas (devotees of Viṣṇu) and Vaiṣṇava-bhedā (a sect of Viṣṇu-worshippers).⁵

It is interesting to note in this connection that in the Baset Stele inscription of Jayavarman of Kambuja (A.D. 657-681) it is stated that the deity Śrī-Trailokyasāra was worshipped by five sacrifices (pañcabhir-yajñaiḥ) by (people who) followed (the way) (anu-gāmiṇa) of five kalās, were proficient in the worship of the Pañcarātra deities (Pancarātr-ārcā-cuñcunā) and had knowledge of the five elements (pañca-bhūta).

The Prasat Komnap inscription of Yaśovarman (A.D. 889-c.900) of Kambuja (v. 62), which is a royal ordinance for regulating the services of a Viṣṇu temple, it is stated that the ācārya should be versed in Pañcarātra and śabda-śāstra, which may mean grammar, but in the present context seems to mean the Vedas. From verses 72, 73 and 86 of this inscription, however, it is apparent that the terms bhāgavata vaiṣṇava and sāttvata have been used in identical sense.

A late Khmer inscription of Kambuja, namely the Kuk Trapan Sroke Stele inscription dated Śaka 995 (A.D.1073) mentions one Kaviśvara Paṇḍita, who, observing the rules of the Pañcarātra sect, subsisted on ghī. He was the chief of the hermitages in four localities, and not only installed an image of Bhagavatī but a liṅga also. Later in life, he became the royal preceptor.⁶

The significance of the last inscription need not be discussed here, but the Baset Stele inscription of Jayavarman is interesting. The five sacrifices are also mentioned in connection with Vasu as mentioned above (p. 10, p. 19). The use of the word ārcā shows that as early as the seventh century A.D. the Pañcarātra doctrine was connected with ārcā worship in Kambuja, hence in India it must have been in vogue much earlier.

It is remarkable, however, that Rāmānuja (1017-1137) nowhere quotes from the Bh. P. or the Harivaṁśa, and confines himself only to the VP as his predecessor Yāmuna had done. The Bh.P. and the Harivaṁśa may be late texts, but they are certainly much older than Rāmānuja; therefore the explanation of his silence may
either be that he was ignorant of the Bh. P and the Harivamśa, or that in his days, his sect did not accept them as authoritative. If the second alternative, which seems more probable, is accepted, then it may be concluded that the difference between the vaikuṇṭhas of the Pañcarātra sect (to which Rāmānuja belonged) and other vaikuṇṭhas was that the former did not accept the Bh. P as authoritative which the others did.

The date of the Bh. P. is not free from dispute, and some scholars have ascribed it to the grammarian Bopadeva (13th century). But there is a MSS. of the Bh P. in Sarasvatī-bhavana of the Banaras Sanskrit College written in a 12th century script, that is at least a century earlier than Bopadeva. We have already mentioned that Rāmānuja does not mention it; this has induced scholars to ascribe it to a late date, the general opinion being about 9th century. One of the main reasons for this opinion is that the Bh. P. mentions the Āḻvārs or the Tamil saints who flourished, according to modern scholars, between A.D. 500 to 850 though the traditional period ascribed to them is 4203 B.C.-2706 B.C. Now, Rāmānuja himself was what might be called, a follower of the Āḻvārs, and it is indeed remarkable that he should have ignored a text which mentions the Āḻvārs; assuming on the basis of the Banaras MSS. that the Bh. P. was written before Rāmānuja’s time.

Our problem, however, is not so much to determine the date of the Bh. P. as to attempt to find the difference if any between the followers of the Bhāgavata and Pañcarātra systems. Dr. P. C. Bagchi was of the opinion, that ‘the Bhāgavatism, whatever connection it might have had with the Pañcarātra at the beginning, was completely different from it in the Gupta period. The vyūha-vāda which was the central idea in the Pañcarātra is absent from the Bhāgavatism of the Guptas which appears as a syncretism of various Vaiṣṇavite beliefs which had come to stay in the country. Viṣṇu of Vedic Brahmanism, Nārāyaṇa of the Pañcarātras, Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva of the Sātvatas, Gopāla of a pastoral people etc. all had been put in the melting pot from which originated the Bhāgavatism of the Gupta period. It is this Vaishnavism which had found its way to Bengal in the Gupta period and had been firmly established in the Pāla period.

This view has been challenged by Dr. D. C. Sircar who points out that the complete difference between vyūha-vāda and avatāra-vāda cannot be postulated in our present state of knowledge, while the Ahirbudhnya and the Viśvakṣena-samhitās show the influence of avatāra-vāda on the Pañcarātra.
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Sircar's objections to Bagchi's theory seems to overlook the point, that while the Pañcarātra texts have accepted avatāra-vāda, the Bh. P., does not accept the Vyūha-vada of Pañcarātra, and while a number of avatāras are mentioned in the Mahābhārata and in some of the Purāṇas the first attempt at systematization is met with in the Bh. P.

The vyūha-vada of the Bh. P. has been discussed by Prof. S. N. Das Gupta who has remarked that 'the Bhāgavata cult here described believed in three vyūhas of Vāmadeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa and Aniruddha, and therefore there is no mention here of the production of the Pradyumna-vyūha. Pradyumna in this view stands for desire; desires are but functions of the category of manas and not a separate category'.11 This is supported by Śrīdhara who, in his commentary on Bh. P., III, xxvi, 27, states: na tu Pradyumna-vyūhoptatiḥ tasya saṅkālpādi-kāryatvābhāvati. Das Gupta's views have been challenged by Dr. Siddhesvar Bhattacharya, who accuses Das Gupta for having failed 'to take account of the fact that the Bhagavata (11.5.29) does recognize four vyūhas though it does not give details of the Pradyumna-vyūha.'12 Now, the purport of the Bh. P. XI, v, 29 is not very clear, and it has to be read in the context in which it has been given:

tam tadā puruṣāṁ martyā mahārāj-opalakṣaṇaṁ
yajanti veda-tantrābhyaṁ paraṁ jīnasaśvo nṛpa
namaste Vāsudevāya namaḥ Saṅkarṣaṇāya ca
Pradyumnaḥ=Aniruddhāya tuḥhyāṁ bhagavate namaḥ.
Nārāyaṇāya ṛṣaye puruṣāya mahātmane
Viśveśvarāya Viśvāya sarva-bhūtātmane namaḥ
iti dvāpara urviśā stuvanti jagadīśvāram
nānā-tantra-vidhanena kalāvapi yathā śṛṇu
(Bh. P. XI, v, 28-31 See also Bh. P. VI, xvi, 18-20).

Here salutation has been offered not only to Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Aniruddha and Pradyumna, but also to Nārāyaṇa Ṛṣi, Puruṣa, Viśveśvara, Viśva and to the soul of the creatures. This is entirely different from the vyūha-doctrine of Pañcarātra, though it may be an attempt at syncretization. Secondly, the statement that, worship is held according to Veda and tantra. Does tantra here stand for rātra that is Pañcarātra, as Schrader suggested,11 or does it stand for something else, that is, in its ordinary meaning?

It should also be noted that from the description of the vyūhas by Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, the author of the Caitanya-caritāmṛta it is apparent that though the terminology used is taken from the Pañcarātra, it had no significant influence on that doctrine.14
A way out of our difficulty would be provided by a comparison of Pañcarātra philosophy with the philosophy of the Bh. P. Unfortunately this has not yet been done, and it is beyond the scope of the present work. A short account of the philosophy of the Bh. P. was given by Das Gupta in fifty pages, and Bhattacharyya has criticized Das Gupta's findings in forty-two pages. It is not easy to understand Bhattacharya's standpoint but he seems to criticize Das Gupta for his reliance on Śrīdāra and Jīva for the interpretation of the Bh. P. Now, as someone has said, the works on the Bh. P. may fill up a small library, so some selection of commentators has to be made, and so far as we are concerned, Das Gupta's selection of Śrīdāra and Jīva serves our purpose quite well; for, though Jīva Gosvāmin's commentary is recognized now as the standard by the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas, it was written long after Caitanya's death, and he considered Śrīdāra's commentary as the most authoritative.

Das Gupta's short summary of the philosophy of the Bh. P. may not be correct in every detail; but his statement that, 'it may generally appear rather surprising to find such an extreme idealistic monism in the Bhāgavata, but there are numerous passages which show that an extreme form of idealism recurs now and then as one of the principal lines of thought in the Bhāgavata,' seems to be entirely correct. As Das Gupta does not discuss this point at length, we may cite the following verses from the Bh. P.

It is stated that nine great Bhāgavatas, explained the Bhāgavata doctrine to King Nimi. One of them named Pippalāyana explained: 'O, king, know Him to be the Great Tattva, who is the instrument of the creation, preservation and destruction of this universe. But himself is divorced from all causes, who is present as the really existent in the various states of dream, wakefulness and sleepiness and in eternal rites and concentration, animated by whom, this body, senses, vital breaths, and mind are performing their respective actions. As scintillations of fire cannot display it or consume it, so mind, speech, eyes, intellect, vital breaths and senses are not capable of understanding him. Words can only minutely explain His meaning, but cannot manifest Him at all; Him, save whom there is no end of Nishedhas (proscriptions).

'Action and cause, are manifest as Brahman, for Brahman of diverse energies is the cause of both of these viz. action and cause. Before the creation the only Brahman was called Pradhāna. He is identical with three-fold qualities; for his energy of action, He
is the thread, and for His energy or Jñāna (understanding), He is called Mahat (Great). He is Ahaṅkāra (the consciousness of ego) which passes under the appellation of a creature. He is in the end manifest as the deities, senses, objects happiness and others. That Brahman of great energy is the action, cause, and the cause of both these. The Great soul is the Prime—without birth or death, without increase or decrease for He is the witness of the various particular states of all objects subject to birth and destruction. And He exists always and everywhere as the mere indestructible consciousness. As vital breath is determined by the power of senses, so the knowledge of Brahman is by that of scriptures. As vital breath in various forms pursues all creatures born of egg, womb, sweat and earth, so in the state of sleepiness when the action of senses and the consciousness of ego disappear, the soul for the want of gross body as its support consequent upon this change, remains in its subtle state devoid of metamorphoses; and when it rises from the state of sleepiness, recollection comes; when by great devotion consequent upon the desire of obtaining the feet of the lotus-navelled Deity, a man shall destroy the darts of his mind engendered by qualities and action, his mind being purified like into the appearance of the sun to the clear eyes shall acquire the very knowledge of Atman.‘

Again the Bh. P. states that Lord Ṣeṣa told King Citraketu:19
‘I constitute all created beings, and I am their soul and protector. Sabda-Brahman and Para-Brahman are my two eternal bodies. Behold thee! The Supreme soul pervades this universe, as well as the individual soul. I pervade both of them, and they both are made of me. Even as one, in a state of profound slumber, sees the different regions of the universe in his own self, and thinks of himself, whilst the same state continues, as awake and situated in a particular spot, so know the waking state, etc. of animated beings to be the hallucinations of the mind. Therefore, do thou worship the Great Being who is the spectator of them all. Do thou know me to be Supreme soul—Brahman—who is devoid of all the properties of matter, and through whose agency even a person who was fast asleep remembers his own slumber and happiness experienced during it.

‘That knowledge is the Supreme Brahman which is found by a person remembering his experience both during sleep and the awaking state, to be the connecting link as well as the separating medium between the two states of existence. But when a person forgets this my true nature, and thinks himself independent of me.’
then is he merged into worldliness, and becomes subject to assume form after form and suffer death repeatedly.\footnote{20}

From these, and from Prahlāda's instructions to the children,\footnote{21} Swami Vidyaranya has concluded that the main teaching of the Bh. P. is monism.\footnote{22}

This conclusion may not be totally invalid, but one has to take into consideration other statements in the Bh. P. For example,

\begin{quote}
na sādhayati mām yogo na sāmkhyam dharma Uddhava
na svādhyāyas-tapas-tyāgo yathā bhaktiṁ-maṁ=orijā
\end{quote}

Or again:

\begin{quote}
lakṣaṇāṁ bhakti-yogasya nirguṇasya hy=udāḥṛtam
ahaituky-avyavahitā yā bhaktiṁ Puruṣottame
sālokya-sārṣṭi-sāmīpya-sārupya-aikatvam apy=uta
diyamānāṁ na grīḥṇanti vinā maṁ sevanaṁ janāḥ.\footnote{23}
\end{quote}

These statements may be said to be the bases of Caitanya's doctrine; undoubtedly these conflict with statements mentioned above and are difficult to reconcile. This reminds one of the Gītā, where after teaching Arjuna all the yogas, Kṛṣṇa advises him to completely surrender himself. Indeed the resemblance between the Gītā and the Bh. P. are so striking that one is inclined to suggest that the Bh. P. was written on the basis of the Gītā. There are also some similarity in the thoughts expressed in the Bh. P. and in the VP and Ahirbudhnya-samhitā, which is taken as a Pañcarātra work. Possibly for this reason Das Gupta had concluded that the Bh. P. 'is a collection of accretions from different hands at different times and not a systematic whole', though it contradicts his earlier statement that 'it was composed by a Southerner'.\footnote{24}

It is difficult to accept the suggestion that the Bh. P. was composed by several persons; what is more probable is that it records all the traditions developed by the bhāgavata sects and is in the nature of a compendium, in the same way that many of the Upaniṣads record the utterances of different persons; therefore it is to the bhāgavatas or vaishnavas what the Upaniṣads are to the vedāntins. Rāmānuja indeed does not refer to it; the explanation may be that the Bh. P. was not a Pañcarātra text to which it may be pointed out that neither is the VP on which Rāmānuja relied heavily. The reason may be that Rāmānuja's main task was to rehabilitate the Pañcarātra doctrine which had acquired a bad reputation, and to secure it firmly to the Vedānta school. Here he found support from the VP which Dr. R. C. Hazra describes as 'a work which was written by a pro-Vedic Pañcarātra scholar of a comparatively late age with the deliberate intention of writing a
religious book for the propagation of his sectarian views under the
garb of a Purāṇa'.

We may therefore hold, at the present state of our knowledge,
that an attempt was made by the Akhrbudhnyapaṁhitā and the
VP to reconcile the stigmatized Pañcarātra doctrines with Vedic
thought by drawing upon certain traditions which may be called
the bhāgavata tradition. On the other hand the Bh.P. rests on
pure bhāgavata tradition of the Gītā, though it was not unaware
of the Pañcarātra tradition; due to some common characteristics,
particularly the worship of the same deity, the bhāgavata tradition
of the Gītā was to some extent modified to admit the peculiarly
Pañcarātra doctrine, namely the vyūha-vāda in a modified form.
Still the Pañcarātra tradition and the Bh.P. tradition should be
held to be different. This would explain as to why Medhātithi
and some Purāṇas mentioned above excommunicate the Pañcarātras.
There is no doubt that Medhātithi has twisted the meaning of
Manu II.6 in doing so; but Manu (III.152) himself has prescribed
that the devalaka brāhmaṇa (one who maintained himself by at-
tending on images either for salary or by appropriating what was
placed before the image) along with healers, meat sellers and those
living by (improper) trade, should be avoided at rites performed
in honour of Gods and Pitṛs (that is, Vedic sacrifices and śrāddhas).
From the following verse recorded by Locan Dās in the Caitanyamaṁgala (p. 100) it appears that this attitude towards the devalaka
or devala brāhmaṇas persisted:

mina snānaparaḥ phañi pavana-bhūc meṣo'pi parṇāsanaḥ
saśvad bhrāmyati cakri-goḥ paricaran devān sadā devalaḥ
garte tiṣṭhati mūsiko'pi gahane śīho bako dhyānāvān
kim teṣāṁ phalam asti hanta tapasā sadbhāva-siddhim kuru

(A fish bathes, a snake lives on air, and a goat lives on grass; a cow
yoked to an oil-press is constantly moving (travelling), a devala
is always serving gods, a mouse lives in a cave and a lion in a
forest, while a crane meditates; what result alas can they obtain?
Attain good qualities through austerities i.e. change thy inner-
self.)

Now, the main subjects of Pañcarātra literature are directions
regarding the construction of temples and images, and descriptions
of the various rituals associated with image worship. Indeed R. V.
Joshi states: 'Il faut remarquer que dans toute l'Inde, dans tous
les temples, parmi toutes les sectes, que ce soit pour adorer Śrī-
krṣṇa ou Viṣṇu, le rituel, se recommande des Pañcarātra Saṁhitā.
Bien plus, même dans les temples tamouls le culte est rendu selon
les Pañcarātrasaṁhitā, exception faite des temples de Veṅkatesvara de Tirupati et de Kancipuram ou ce sont les Vaikhānasasaṁhitā qui sont utilisées. Now, if we hold this position to be true for the ancient period also, namely, that the Pañcarātras specialized in temple worship, then it is possible to assign them a position analogous to the devalakas. This would also explain as to why the Pañcarātra writers were eager to graft bhāgavata concepts to their doctrine, for the bhāgavatas were never treated as outcastes; for example, even in the second century B.C., a Greek ambassador called himself a bhāgavata. The effort of Pañcarātra writers were successful to the extent that Śaṅkara referred to their doctrine as bhāgavata.

This does not mean that the Bhāgavata doctrine did not countenance idol worship and the involved rituals, or that Śaṅkara was against these practices. This is evident from the allusion to the four-armed image of Viṣṇu in the Gītā (XI.46) and to a simple ritual (IX, 26) which is non-Vedic and is akin to pūjā. Thus it seems that, there was always a common ground between the followers of the Pañcarātra and the Bhāgavata traditions due to the common deity Vāsudeva, leading to confusion and to their ultimate fusion, or the extinction of the followers of the strict Pañcarātra tradition. It may be noted here that though Madhva was the first great religious leader to write a commentary on the Bh.P., ultimately all the sects wrote their own commentary on it, including the monists and the Śrī-vaiśṇavas.

The most distinguishing feature of the Bh.P. is the tenth canto which deals with the life of Kṛṣṇa, and includes the rāsa-liṅga, which is unique in our religious literature. The importance of this liṅga in Caitanya’s doctrine will be discussed later. But a general feature of all the principal Indian sects which collectively forms the heterogenous conception known as Hinduism, may be pointed out.

There are four principal features in each sect:

(1) Rituals
(2) Mythology
(3) Mysticism
(4) Philosophy

All the vaiṣṇava sects seems to have relied on Pañcarātra for ritual; how far they modified them to suit the individual requirements of each sect is not known, and has never been studied. The difficulty is that rituals vary not only as between sects, but also
from temple to temple; even in the same temple rituals have been altered.

The mythologies are preserved in the sectarian Purāṇas, and the rituals are organically linked with the mythologies.

Mysticism or rather the mystic process by which reality can be realized differs from one sect to another and is their most distinguishing feature. Unfortunately, these are only known to the initiated and have not yet been divulged. Considering the time, areas, and the number of men involved, the mystic process or the mārga-upāsanā-paddhati of the Indian sects must be considered to be the most closely guarded secret in the world.

Indian philosophy is the rationalization of the mystic experience, wherefore there is hardly any system which does not admit of a supralogical category or does not present a clink in its armour of logic to its opponents. The Brāhmaṇical theologians were taken unawares by the Buddhists and the Jains, and their lost glory was not revived till Kumārila established an epistemological basis for the Vedic doctrines, and Śaṅkara laid not only the foundation, but the super-structure of Vedānta philosophy. Then came Rāmānuja, who integrated the Vedānta philosophy with Pañcarātra doctrine and initiated the massive vaiṣṇava movement of devotion, faith and philosophy.

3. P. V. Kane: *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. IV, p. 375. ibid, Vol. I, 275; it is difficult to determine the age of the Kūrma-purāṇa, according to Dr. R. C. Hazra, quoted by Kane (ibid, Vol. V, 886) the Kūrma was originally a Pañcarātra work and was later altered to make it a Pāṣupata one. But the verse quoted by Hemādri shows that in the 13th century it was neither.
4. Quoted by S. N. Das Gupta; *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. IV, p. 8 f.n.
5. One of the works of Vācaspaitiśrī, the author of the Bhāmati commentary on the Śrīvakabhaṣya is dated A.D. 841. Hence Śaṅkara must have flourished before that date. An inscription from Cambodia records the activities of one Śivasoma, guru of King Indravarman, and states that the former had studied the śastras at the feet of Bhagavān Śaṅkara; Prasat Kandol Dom (N) Inscription of Indravarman, v. 39. R. C. Majumdar: *Inscriptions of Kambuja*, Calcutta, 1953, p. 60. The portion in which the date was inscribed is slightly mutilated, but the extant portion shows that the date would be between A.D. 878-887. Bhagavān Śaṅkara can only mean the Ācārya.
8. The Banaras MSS. is written in 12th century script and Rāmānuja died in 1137. It may be argued that it was written after his death and the present copy was taken soon after it was composed, and there is nothing to prove that it is not the original Bh.P. MSS. We are here taking a common-sense view, and most scholars are of the opinion that it was composed in the 9th century.

For a bibliography on the date of the Bh.P. see A. D. Pusalker: Studies in Epics and Puranas, Bombay, 1953, pp. 214-16. See also Kane op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 898-99. Dr. Kane's conclusion is: 'No reliable and cogent evidence has been adduced to prove that the current Bhāgavata can be placed earlier than the 9th century.' See above p. 22.


11. S. N. Das Gupta: History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. IV, p. 27. Vāmadeva seems to be a printing mistake for Vāsudeva.


14. CC Adi, V.


16. Making a play on 'Śvām' (husband) of Śrīdhara Śvāmin, Caitanya stigmatized as 'prostitutes' all those who differed from Śrīdhara.

Prabhu hāsi kahe svāmī nā māne yei jan
veṣyār bhitarē tāre kariye gana

CC Anta, VII.


19. ibid., VI, xvi, 51-64.

20 ibid., VII, vi, 1-25.


22. Bh.P. VI, xiv. 20. O Uddhava, I am not attainable (as easily) by Sāṁkhya.

Yoga recitation of the Vedas, meditation or renunciation as by exalted devotion.


The devotion to Paramēśvara (ultimate reality) without any reason (i.e. spontaneous and not based on knowledge) is the sign of devotion. (The real devotee) does not accept (any kind of deliverance, be it) sālokya, sārṣṭi, sāmipa, sāruṣṭa or śāyujya. Sālokya means living in the same place with the Lord (here Vaiṅkhana or Goloka etc.); Sārṣṭi means possessing the powers of the Lord, sāmipa means living near the Lord. Sāruṣṭa means assuming the Lord's shape, śāyujya means to be fused with the Lord.

The Gaudiya-vaśmāvas reconcile the monistic doctrine to their view by equating śāyujya-mukti with mokṣa of the monists. and then point out this verse which entitles them to hold that mokṣa is inferior to Bhagavat-sevā; Gaudiya vaśmāvas also hold that there is fifth puruṣārtha, namely prema.


27. The word puṣṭa, in Tamil puṣṭai, is sometimes derived either from the Tamil words pu = flower and sev = do, i.e. an act done with the aid of flowers, or from puṣṭa = smear, implying that the smearings of the object worshipped with the blood of the animal sacrificed in the act was its central feature. But Prof. K. A. N Sastri observes that the word puṣṭai does not occur in early Tamil literature of the Sangam period. and that the Tamil Lexicon does not notice either of these derivations for the word puṣṭa. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Development of Religion in South India, Orient Longmans, 1963, p. 67.
CHAPTER IV
PRE-CAITANYA VAISHNAVISM

1

There are four traditional vaishnava sects, namely, Sri, Haansa, Brahma and Rudra; these were established respectively by Ramanauja (1017-1137), Nimbarka, Madhva (1238-1317), and Vallabha (1479-1532 or 1481-1533). None of them, however, claim to be the founder of the sect. We are giving below the list of teachers of these four sects:

(1) Sri-Vaishnavas
    Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa
    |   Śrī or Lakṣmī
    Viṣvaksena
    |   Śaṭhakopa
    |   Nāṭhamuni
    |   Puṇḍarīkākṣa
    |   Rāmāmīśra
    |   Yāmuna
    |   Mahāpurṇa
    |   Rāmānuja.

Of these the last three were historical persons and can be easily identified. Of the rest Śaṭhakopa and Nāṭhamuni were the Alvar saints, and it is easy to identify the former with the compiler of the Nālāyira Prabandham, a collection of vaishnava hymns. Yāmuna and Mahāpurṇa were historical persons, and the former has left many important works. The first three teachers are evidently mythological.
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(2) Ṣaṁśa-sampradāya

Viṣṇu as Ṣaṁśa

| Brahmana
| Kumāras
| Nārada
| Nimbārka

This list is found in the Saṁśila-Saṁhitā,1 but Nimbārka himself in his commentary on Br.-S. 1.iii.8. refers to Nārada as his preceptor, and states that he (Nārada) had been instructed by the Kumāras, his (Nimbārka's) paramācaryas (Paramācāryaiḥ Śrī-Kumāraie asmad gurave Śrīman-Naradāy=opadiṣṭo). The 'Kumāras' in this passage, has been interpreted by Śwāmī Santadāsa Vrajavidehi as Sanatkumāra etc.

As we have already noted, Sanatkumāra is mentioned both in the Nārāyanīya section (336.36-39) and the Bh.P. (III. viii, 2-9); while the Nārāyanīya section states that Sanatkumāra learnt from Brahма, according to the Bh.P., he learnt from Saṁkarṣaṇa, but Sanatkumāra's disciple Saṁkhyāna is called the chief of the Paramahamsa-religion (Saṁkhyāyanaḥ pāramahamsya-mukhya, Bh.P. III, viii, 8). Discrepancies in the three versions are to be expected, what is surprising is that Nimbārka's claim to high antiquity should find a modicum of support from scriptures.

These are undoubtedly very unsatisfactory and can hardly be called evidence in historical sense, but the strange fact remains that of all the vaiṣṇava teachers Nimbārka alone eludes historical research.2 Secondly even his personal details are controversial. S. N. Das Gupta on the basis of Harivyāsadeva's commentary on Nimbārka's Daśa-sloki states that his father's name was Jagannātha and his mother's name was Sarasvatī. According to Gopinath Kavi-raj, however, Nimbārka's father was Arūpi Ṣuni and his mother was called Jayanti. Radhakrishnan states that Nimbārka was a Telugu brāhmaṇa who was born in Nimba or Nimbapura in the Bellary district but lived in Vṛindāvana, and in a foot-note adds that there is also a view that he was born in Vṛindāvana on the Yamunā river.3 It is, therefore, evident that no reliable information about Nimbārka is available.
CAITANYA: HIS LIFE AND DOCTRINE

(3) Brahma-Sampradāya

Viṣṇu
| Brahmā
| Vaśiṣṭha
| Śakti
| Parāsara
| Vyāsa

Madhu or Prabhañjana

Madhva is known to be an incarnation of Vāyu or Prabhañjana, and it is claimed that he learnt his doctrine from Vyāsa. However, unlike Nimbarka's Madhva's identity can be satisfactorily established. He was the son of Madhyageha Bhaṭṭa a resident of village Rajatapīṭha (modern Kalyāṇapura) near Udipi, about forty miles west of Śrīṇgerī. It is admitted on good grounds that he died at the age of seventy-eight or seventy-nine, but while some scholars place his date of birth in 1199, others place the same event in 1238, not a very significant difference.

(4) Rudra-Sampradāya

The compilation of the teacher's list of this sect presents some difficulties. For, though it is generally agreed that Viṣṇu related the creed of this sect to Rudra, it appears that later it was revealed to one Viṣṇusvāmin, who flourished long before Vallabha. This Viṣṇusvāmin is a historical person, but it has been suggested that there were three Viṣṇusvāmins. The issue becomes more complicated by the fact pointed out by Das Gupta, that though Viṣṇusvāmin is known from other sources, 'Vallabha himself, however, never refers to Viṣṇusvāmin as the originator of his system'. Vallabha's life is, however, fairly well known; his great-grandfather was Gaṅgādhara Bhaṭṭa, his grandfather Gaṇapati Bhaṭṭa, and his father Laksmana Bhaṭṭa, while his mother's name was Illamāguru. He was born either in 1479 or 1481 and died in 1532 or 1533.

It is evident that all the four sects were (and are) claiming divine origin. The reason may be that like the kings of medieval India, it had become fashionable to claim mythical origin; but the possibility cannot be precluded of their really being ancient sects of which the names of the original founders were lost, and of which
garbled versions are preserved in the Nārāyaṇīya Section and the Bh.P. The real difference between these sects are due to their interpretation of the Br.S., and it is well-known, that though Śaṅkara’s interpretation is the earliest extant commentary, there were several pre-Śaṅkara commentators. For example Rāmānuja mentions Tārka, Darmiḍa, Guhadeva and Bhāruci as his pūrvacāryas in his Vedārtha-Saṅgraha (p. 154). It would not be surprising, therefore, for the dogma of these sects to have been really very ancient, and handed down from generation to generation till a permanent intellectual framework was provided by the four great teachers, namely. Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Madhva and Vallabha.

Since we are discussing the list of teachers, we might as well give the list of teachers of the Lion of Vedānta, which is traditionally as follows:

Vyāsa
| Śuka
| Gauḍapāda
| Govindapāda
| Śaṅkara

This list, even if we ignore Vyāsa and Śuka, raises some chronological problem, which can be solved if one accepts the list of Śaṅkara’s teachers found among the Tripūrā-Sampradāya which is as follows:

Gauḍapāda
| Pāvaka
| Parācārya
| Satyanidhi
| Rāmacandra
| Govinda
| Śaṅkara

The list of teachers is extremely important from the religious point. For, very ancient tradition and scriptural injunctions make
it obligatory on any individual who reads the Vedas to learn the name of the deva, ṛṣi, chandas and viniyoga of each mantra. Ṛṣi or brāhmaṇa means the ācārya-paramparā, while devatā-tattva means the metaphysical conclusions. Therefore, to establish a new sect it is obligatory to claim an entirely new line of teachers, and to produce a definite treatise on metaphysics, which in the case of the vaiśṇavas meant an independent commentary on the Br. S. Caitanya did neither; hence his sect had to be affiliated with the Madhva sect to which his preceptor probably belonged, though there was serious doctrinal difference between Caitanya and Madhva. In the 18th century Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa wrote a new commentary on behalf of Caitanya’s sect, still the Madhva affiliation could not but be affirmed, possibly because Caitanya did not claim to belong to any recognized line of teachers other than Īśvara Puri whose preceptor Mādhavendra Puri is said to have belonged to the Mādhva sect. There is therefore still some doubt as to whether Caitanya started a new sect, or represented a new line of thought in the Mādhva sect; and actually some of his followers call themselves Mādhva-Gauḍiya. But in spite of the fact that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa in his Govindabhāṣya has reiterated his sect’s affiliation and indebtedness to Madhva, it seems to us preferable to treat Caitanya’s sect as a new one. This point has been discussed in Chapter XXII.

It is now necessary to give a brief account of the position of Vedānta philosophy before Caitanya. It may also be stated here that all the vaiśnava sects including Caitanya’s were really, what may be called vedānta-sects each claiming that its interpretation was the correct one. However, there was one meeting ground, that was their opposition to Śaṅkara’s monism.

The Upaniṣads contain contradictory statements, yet the attempt of all the commentators has been to interpret them consistently. In order to do so Śaṅkara selected four statements from four principal Upaniṣads, one from each Veda, and called them mahāvākyas. They are: (1) Prajñānam Brahma (Aitareya, III. 3; Rg-veda); Tat tvam asi (Chāndogya, VI, viii, 7 Śāma-veda); Aham Brahmāmi (Brhadāraṇyaka, I. iv. 10; Yajur-veda); Ayam ātmā Brahma (Māṇḍūkya, 2. Atharva veda). It is on the basis of these four statements that Śaṅkara based his philosophy, and interpreted not only the principal Upaniṣads, but also the Br. S. and the Gītā. He was not unaware of the conflicting statements in the Upaniṣads, for interpreting Br. S. I.i.11, (Śrutatvāccha) he states unequivocally: dvi-rūpaṁ hi Brahmāṁ vāgamaye nāma-rūpa-vikāra-bhed-opādhi-viśiṣṭam tad viparītam ca sarv-opādhi-vivarjitaṁ. Then after giving examples from the Upaniṣads he states; iti c-aivan śahasraśo vidy-
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āvidyā-vaśayabhedena Brahmano dvirūpatāṁ darāyanti vākyāṇi; 
tatr-āvidyā-avasthāyāṁ Brahmanā upāsy-opāsakādi-lakṣāṇaḥ sarvo 
vyavahāraḥ.  

This simple statement seems to clarify the position of the Upa-
nisads, and it may be noted that this was the position adopted by 
Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahāṁsa. The vaiśṇavas, however, took great ex-
ception to it, because of the last part of the statement where Śaṅ-
kara practically calls all the dualists as abiding in ‘avidyā’. This 
the vaiśṇavas point out is merely Śaṅkara’s opinion and as it is not 
found in the Upaniṣads or any scripture—which is a fact,—must be 
disregarded with the contempt such obiter dictum deserves.

The fact is that the position taken by Śaṅkara and that taken 
by the vaiśṇavas are practically irreconcilable. For example Śaṅ-
kara in his commentary on Br.S. I.iii.19 declares: yāvad eva hi 
sthānāv=iva puruṣa-buddhiṁ dvaita-lakṣāṇāṁ=āvidyāṁ nivartayan 
kūṭastha-nitya-ākāś-svarūpam-ātmānaṁ aham Brahms=āśm=iti na 
pratipadyate tāvaj=ājāvya jīvatvam.⁹

As against this we may quote a verse ascribed to Hanumat, 
the great bhakta, by Rūpa Gosvāmin in his Bhakti-rasāṁrtanisindhu. 
(I. Purva. v. 54):

bhava-bandha-cchide tasmāi sprhayāmi na muktaye 
bhavāṁ prabur aham dāsa iti yatra vilupyyate.⁰

This epitomizes the attitude of the vaiśṇavas, for all of them want 
to enjoy some sort of association with the Lord, and Madhva parti-
cularly denies the existence of a state where the individual soul 
can be united with Brahman. As we shall see later, Caitanya does 
not deny such a possibility, but calls it a low form of salvation.

To the vaiśṇavas, the sense of ‘I’, the ego is not a mere quality 
extraneously imposed in the self, but the very nature of the self. 
The notion of ‘I’ is false when it is identified with the body and 
other sense-objects, and when it arouses pride and boastfulness. 
Then the ‘I’ becomes ahamkāra, which is a false notion or sentiment 
and has been denounced in the scriptures. But not the ‘I’, when it 
refers to the self,—for example, ‘I am the slave of Lord’—is the 
most accurate notion that one can have. In the madhura-bhāva 
of the Gaṅgīya-vaiśṇavas, the ‘I’ sense and ‘my’ sense can have further 
modification. Even Candrāvalī, who is nearest to Rādhā among the 
gopīs, is imbued with the idea, ‘I am Kṛṣṇa’s,’ but Rādhā says ‘Kṛṣṇa 
is mine’. Hence Rādhā is superior.

Another important point on which the vaiśṇavas differ with 
Śaṅkara, is the conception of Sakti, or energy. Śaṅkara does not
deny the existence of Brahman's śakti; in his commentary on Br.S. I.i.1 he states: nitya-śuddha buddha—muktā-svabhāvaṁ sarvajñāṁ sarva-śakti-samanvitam (Brahma.).

In his commentary on Br.S. II. 1.14, he has admitted the existence of māyā-śakti as follows:

śarvajñāsya=ēśvarasy=ātmabhuta iv=āvidyā-kalpīte
nāma-rūpe tatō—ānyatvābhvām anirvacaniyē
saṁśāra-prapaṇca-bīja-bhūte sarvajñāsya=ēśvarasya
māyā-śaktīḥ prakṛtir=iti ca śruti-smṛtyor=
abhilāpyete.11

Similarly in commenting on Br. S. II. i.37 (Sarva-dharm-opapateś=ca) he ends the section by stating: sarvajñāṁ sarva-śaktī mahā-māyaṁ ca Brahma iti.

Almost similarly he writes in his introduction to the Gītā: sa ca bhagavan aiśvarya-śaktī-bala-virya-tejobhiḥ sadā sampannas trigunātmikām vaṣṇavīṁ svām māyām mūlā-prakṛti vaśikṛtya ajo' vyayo bhūtānāṁ iśvaro nitya-śuddha-buddha-muktā-svabhāvo'pi san sva-māyāyā dehaṁ iva jāta iva ca lokān anugraham kurvan iva lakṣyate.12

Before we proceed further we must state that Śaṅkara's followers have explained all the apparent contradictions in the statements noted above, and we are merely presenting the vaiṣṇava criticism of his standpoint by isolating his statements. The vaiṣṇavas, for example, take very great exception to Śaṅkara's statement 'deha-vāṁ iva jāta iva (as if he were born, as if he took a body) in relation to Śrī-Kṛṣṇa, who they point out was a real person, an avatāra. But to Śaṅkara, even a person is a māyā, for everything except the ultimate reality, Brahman, is unreal.

Now, we come to Śaṅkara's doctrine of māyā, for which he has been soundly berated by all the vaiṣṇavas, who indeed call his doctrine derisively as māyāvāda and declare:

māyāvādam asac-chātraṁ pracchannam bauddhāṁ ucitate
may=āiva vihatam devi kalau brāhmaṇa-mūrtinā13

We have already pointed out that, it is impossible to harmonize the Vedānta texts without the interposition of a supra-rational category, and in Śaṅkara's system this was māyā. Though in the passages quoted above he has mentioned māyā-śakti, yet in his scheme of Undifferentiated Brahman, there cannot be any śakti, though once he postulated the possibility of the relationship of śakti and śaktimat.14 However, as for māyā, Śaṅkara never defined it, though it is usually explained as sad-asad-anirvacaniya, a
term which is not found either in his commentary on the Br. S. or on the Gitā, However, by anirvacanīya, that is ‘indefinable’ the Śaṅkarites mean something that appears in perception but is ultimately contradicted; which in other words mean that in relation to ultimate reality śakti is a negligible factor, ontologically indefinable, therefore contradicted or false but real in relation to the phenomenal world. But this distinction, which is vital for understanding Śaṅkara’s system of philosophy is ignored by the vaisṇavas, for this is not a logically sound position.

As Das Gupta has remarked, ‘Śaṅkara had to explain these (Br. S.) passages, and he did not always use strictly absolutist phrases; for, as he admitted three kinds of existence, he could talk in all kinds of phraseology, but one needed to be warned of the phraseology that Śaṅkara had in view at the time, and this was not always done. The result has been that there are at least some passages which appear by themselves to be realistically theistic, others which are ambiguous and may be interpreted both ways, and others again which are professedly absolutist.’ Actually it seems that, partly from inherent difficulty and partly under pressure of criticism from the vaisṇavas, Śaṅkara’s followers had to elaborate on his original thesis, resulting in the development of various schools of monism. Still the distinction between them and the vaisṇavas remained as wide as ever; a monist, also known as a jñāna-mārgī, concentrates on himself and seeks to identify himself with Brahman rejecting everything else as unreal; but to a vaisṇava, or a bhakti-mārgī, as he is called, nothing in unreal (anātman) to him; not only his self, but the entire world is a manifestation of Brahman; his devotion, therefore, is all-embracing; he does not become ānanda (bliss) but ānandī the enjoyer of bliss. Therefore for a bhakti-mārgī subject, object and knowledge never becomes one, a trace of ego persists in the subject so that he may consciously enjoy bliss.

As to the mokṣa of Śaṅkara, it is necessary to point out that he is in some difficulty in explaining Br. S. IV. iv. 4 where he has to explain Chāndogya VIII, vii, 3., but we need not go into that. But Br. S. IV. iv. 17. (jagad-vyāpāra-varjanā prakaraṇād = asamnihitvāc = ca) taken literally would seem to favour vaisṇava interpretation.

We have stated the general criticism levelled against Śaṅkara by the vaisṇava scholars, and it should be clearly understood that we did not attempt to present the advaita point of view. The duty of a historian is to present things as they happened and not as they should have happened. We have therefore stated his opponents
view. But lest there should be any reader not conversant with the Ācārya’s works, we should again reiterate the historical fact that, he was the father of modern vedānta movement. It was he, who selected the vedānta texts, the prasthāna-trayi, (10 or 11 principal Upaniṣads, Br. S. and the Gītā), it was he who set the standard of monastic life in medieval India, and it was he who rejuvenated the country with an intellectual movement which is unsurpassed not only in the history of India, but possibly in the world’s history. And above all, he did all this in a language which for its diction, style, grandeur, precision and brevity probably remains unsurpassed in the history of Sanskrit language.

Here at the risk of a little digression, we would like to point out that, though the Gupta age is generally regarded as the ‘golden age’ of Indian history, when an Indian today talks in terms of his spiritual heritage, he is primarily referring to the age that began with Śaṅkara, fully blossomed after Rāmānuja and continued uninterrupted till about the 17th century. Without them we would have had no understanding of the Upaniṣads, not to speak of the Br. S. or the Gītā. Within this period the Muslims conquered practically the whole of north India and penetrated into the South. But the grand intellectual and spiritual movement went on untruffled, seemingly oblivious to and independent of the political condition obtaining in the country. It may not have been the ‘golden age’, but it was a remarkable period in our history.16

Having stated some general though negative aspect of vaiṣṇava philosophy, we shall now give very brief accounts of the philosophy of each sect. Of these sects, the one founded by Vallabha cannot be called pre-Caitanya, for they were contemporaries, still we include Vallabha’s philosophy here, for the sake of convenience.

I. Śrī-sampradāya of Rāmānuja.

Rāmānuja’s philosophy is known as Viśiṣṭādvaita or qualified monism. According to this theory, there are three eternal principles, namely cit (conscious), acit (unconscious) and Īśvara. Of them Īśvara is viśeṣya (substance) or ānīga (body, that is, principal) and cit and acit are his viśeṣa (adjectives) or ānīga (limbs, that is subordinate). Īśvara is always characterized (viśiṣṭa) by cit (self conscious souls) and acit (inert matter). During creation cit and acit are gross, that is, they have attributes; during dissolution, they exist in a fine form, without such attributes. Cit is ātman (self); distinct from the physical body; it is also self-evident, nitya (eternal), atomic, (as distinguished from Śaṅkara’s viśhu ‘all-pervad-
ing') beyond sense perception, formless, and changeless. Atman is knowledge, but is also knower. Or, as Rāmānuja puts it (Br. S. I. i. 1) 'Though the self is itself of the nature of consciousness, yet, just as one entity of light exists both as the light and as the rays emanating from it, so can it be regarded both as consciousness and as possessor of consciousness.' It is always controlled by Īśvara. Action and its result are different forms of or extension of knowledge, hence ātman can not only be the knower, but the doer and the enjoyer as well. Ātman's subjectiveness (kārtṛtvā) is due to its contact with the reals (guṇas), and under all circumstances is controlled by Īśvara. But all imperfections and sufferings belong not to Īśvara (Brahman), but only to the sentient and non-sentient beings (cit and acit) which are its modes. It has some independence (svatantra-sakti) but even that is a gift of Īśvara, and ultimately depends on Him. The case is analogous to that of property of which two men are joint owners. If one of them wishes to transfer that property to a third person, he cannot do so without the permission of his partner; but that permission is given is after all his own doing, and hence the fruit of the action (reward or anything) properly belongs to him only. Therefore real freedom of the soul or the main goal of the individual is kārīkārya, that is, absolute servitude to Īśvara which is real deliverance, brought about by surrender to Him—that is prapatti.

Atman can be bound (baddha), free (mukta), or eternal (nitya). There are infinite number of each of them. By contact with prakṛti or acit, nescience, desire, and action are produced in the ātman, and these are destroyed when the contact is released.

Acit or jaḍa-tattva is liable to transformation. There are three types of jaḍa-pādārtha, śuddha-sattva (pure-sattva), miśra-sattva (mixed sattva) and kāla (time). Śuddha-sattva is unblemished sattva, untouched by rajas or tamo-guṇa, hence it is eternal, pure, and produces knowledge and bliss. Under the Lord's will, this tattva transforms itself into substances out of which are built the eternal dhāmans (Hindu counterpart of heaven, a transformation of Viṣṇu's para-m-padaṁ). According to some, śuddha-sattva is not jaḍa.

Miśra-sattva is compound of rajas and tamas, and forms the veil which covers the knowledge and bliss of the earth-bound souls (baddha-jīva). It is also nitya (eternal) and subserves Īśvara in His creation of the phenomenal world. It is also the cause of anti-knowledge and in course of time and space produces all worthy and unworthy transformations. Ultimately it develops into the twenty-four tattvas.
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That part of acit which is bereft of sattva and untramelled by the guṇas is kāla (time). It is the effective agent which brings about the consequential changes in prakṛti and its substances. All dissolution depends on kāla. In His līlā (supra-mundane) aspect, Īśvara’s action is determined by kāla, but in His nitya (eternal) aspect kāla has no influence on Him, even though it still subsists.

Īśvara is the fundamental essence, that is prime tattva. He is the ultimate rest or support of cit and acit and they are all held in Him (āśraya). He is the soul of both cit and acit, which form his body, and cannot exist independently of Īśvara. Īśvara is the embodiment of infinite knowledge, and bliss, possessor of infinite propitious qualities, creator, controller and destroyer of the world, protector of the devotee, bestower of rewards for action, and untouched by fault and is not liable to any transformation. All the changes and transformations take place in the body of Īśvara and not in His essence. Lakṣmi, Bhū and Līlā are his saktis. His beauty is changeless, possessed of unlimited lustre, and is indicative of his essential nature which attracts everyone, and a vision of which induces a cessation of worldly desires, and heals all miseries. Those who are eternally free from earthly bondage are in constant rapport with Him. An Avatāra, who comes down to earth to establish religion, is produced from His body.

Rāmānuja, as has been already noted, accepts the Pañcarātra doctrine of the vyūhas and according to him, Vāsudeva is the highest Brahman and the highest cause; from Him originates the individual soul called Saṅkarṣaṇa; from Saṅkarṣaṇa emerges the internal organ called Pradyumna, and from Pradyumna comes out the principle of egoity called Aniruddha. This evolution is due to the fact that Vāsudeva, the highest Brahman, from kindness to those devoted to Him, voluntarily abides in a four-fold form, so as to render Himself accessible to the devotees. Vāsudeva has for His body the complete aggregation of the six qualities, and divides Himself in so far as it is either the subtle (sūkṣma), or division (vyūha) or manifestation (vibhava) and is attained in His fulness by the devotees who, according to their qualifications, do worship to it by means of work guided by knowledge. From the worship of the vibhava-aspect one attains to the vyūha, and from the worship of the vyūha one attains Vāsudeva. Vibhava means the aggregate of beings, that is avatāras, such as Rāma, Kṛṣṇa etc. Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha are mere bodily forms which Vāsudeva voluntarily assumes.
Lord is also antaryāmin, that is, inner controller. In this state he is the companion and guide of every individual soul, and abides in the individual’s lotus-like heart.

These four categories, namely, Parā or Vāsudeva, the four vyāhas, the vibhavas and antaryāmin together with arca or the idol, that is the deity, are the five forms of the Lord.

Swāmī Vidyāraṇya has pointed out that, though Rāmānuja had accepted parts of Pañcaratra doctrine, his theory of evolution is based on Vedānta, which is entirely different from that of Pañcaratra. Secondly, though Rāmānuja has accepted the authority of the Pauśkara-saṁhitā and the Parama-saṁhitā, he has rejected their view that there is no difference between Brahman and a liberated soul.17

According to Veṅkaṭanātha, Rāmānuja's greatest exponent, bhakti, or devotion is ‘meditation with affection’.18 Rāmānuja himself says (Br. S. I. i. 1) that, steady remembrance (dhrūva-smṛti) is bhakti and has the same meaning as upāsanā (prayer or meditation). This steady remembrance or meditation is obtained through abstention (viveka), freedom of mind (vimoka) through repetition (abhyāsa), works (kriyā), virtuous conduct (kalyāṇa), freedom from dejection (anavasāda), absence of exultation (anuddharṣa), according to feasibility and scriptural statement. Viveka means keeping the body clean from all food impure either owing to species (jāti, such as kalaṇja, that is a bird or animal killed by a poisonous arrow) or abode (āśraya, food belonging to a caṇḍala or the like, that is, sinners), or accidental cause (nimitta, such as food in which a hair or the like has fallen).19

Vimoka or freedom of mind means absence of attachment to desires. Abhyāsa or repetition means continued practice (Gītā, VIII, 6). Kriyā or works means the performance, according to one’s own ability, of the five great sacrifices. By kalyāṇa or virtuous conducts are meant truthfulness, honesty, kindness, liberality, gentleness and absence of covetousness. Anavasāda or freedom from dejection means a state of mind contrary to the lowness of spirit or want of cheerfulness which results from unfavourable conditions of place or time and the remembrance of causes of sorrow (Muṇḍaka III, ii, 4). ‘Exultation’ is that satisfaction of mind which springs from circumstances opposite to those just mentioned; the contrary is anuddharṣa or ‘absence of exultation’.20

From this it appears that, according to Rāmānuja, mind becomes purified by the performance of actions according to one’s caste and stage in life, which help to produce bhakti or jñāna. But
merits and demerits are hindrances for the birth of ĵñâna, being
generators of rajas and tamas guñas, and should be always forsaken.20

Râmaunuja’s philosophy, was firmly based on Vedânta in
which the Pañcarâtra was admitted but his doctrine derived its
sustenance from the songs of the vaiṣṇava saints called Ālvârs who
lived in south India between 6th to 8th centuries of the Christian
era. Their songs are largely based on the lives of Râma and
Krşna and their basic emotions are traditionally associated with
Vaiṣṇavism, namely, servant’s devotion for the master (dâsya)
friendly love (sakhyā), mother’s affection for her child (vâtsalya)
and also of a female lover for her beloved (mâdhurya). For
example Peyâlvâr conceives himself as Yaśodâ and describes Krşna
as lying in the dust and calling for the moon. The Ālvâr poetess,
Anâdâl, conceives herself as a Gopî, requesting her friends to go
with her to wake the sleeping Krşna. In Anâdâl’s songs we come
across one particular lover or wife of Krşna called Nappinnâi, who
was most probably an early prototype of Râdhâ.21

It is not possible to establish on historical evidence any link
between the Ālvârs and Caitanya. He had started his movement
of intense devotion—with particular emphasis on the mâdhurya as-
pect—even before he went to South India. It is, however, quite
possible that his parama-guru (preceptor’s preceptor) Mâdhavendra
Puri was influenced by the Ālvârs. Not only he had visited South
India (for all we know he might have been a southerner), but unlike
a Mâdhva ascetic, which he is said to have been, he was a devotee
of great emotional capacity. Thus it is possible that the seed of
emotional devotion was transplanted by Mâdhavendra from the
South to Bengal, and the sapling was nourished to maturity during
Caitanya’s long tour of South India.

II. Haṁsa-sampradâya of Nimbârka.

Nimbârka’s school of philosophy is known as Bhedâbheda or
Dvaitâdvaita, that is, difference-in-identity. The main tenets of his
school was expounded by him in his commentary on the Brâh.
known as the Vedânta-pârijâta-saurabha, (the scent of the celestial
flower of the Vedânta), and for our present purpose it will be suf-
cient to quote from a few statements from his commentary to under-
stand his position.

According to Nimbârka, in Brâh. II, iii, 42, namely anâśo nânâ-
vypadesâd—anyathâ c—âpi dâsako-kitav-aditvam adhiyata eke,22 the
Sûtrasakâra is showing the anâśâbhã bhâva or the bhed-âbheda-bhâva
between the individual soul and Paramâtman. Jiva is a part (anâśâ)
of Paramātman; for the Svetāsvatara Upaniṣad (I. 9) states jñā-
ja- du-ajav-isanāvā (both jña and ajña—Īśvara and Jīva are
eternal and indestructible). On the other hand the Upaniṣads also
have stated their identity or non-difference in such statements as
tat-tvam asi (That thou art; Chāndogya). The Atharvan goes to
the extent of declaring that the fishermen, slaves and dishonest
people are also Brahman.

It may be noted that Śaṅkara here agrees that this aphorism
establishes the bhed-ābheda doctrine, for he ends his comment by
stating: ato bhed-ābheda-āvagamābhyaṁ aṁśatu-āvagamaḥ; kutaś=
ca aṁśatu-āvagamaḥ.23

In commenting Br. S. III, ii, 22, namely, prakṛitoitavattvaṁ hi
pratīṣedhāti tato bravīti ca bhūyāḥ,24 Nimbārka quotes from the
Bṛhadāraṇyaka which states that 'Brahman has indeed two forms,
the formed (amūrtta), the mortal and the immortal, the stationary
and the moving, the actual (sat) (perceptible) and the yon (tya,
imperceptible). He also quotes 'neti neti' from the Bṛhadāraṇyaka
(II. iii. 6), which states: athātaḥ adesaḥ neti neti, na hy-etasmād itī
nety-anyat-param asti.25 Svāmi Santadās Vrajavidehi, head of the
Nambārka monastic order, has construed it syntactically as: 'hi
(wherefore) Brahmanāḥ etasmāt (than this, i.e. what has been
said before) anyat param (other and beyond, that is better form)
na asti (does not exist) tī na (is not, that is, is not to be understood);
anyat param (better than this, that is, better from than this) asty=
eva (indeed exists). ' Here Nimbārka radically differs from Śaṅ-
kara, who established on the basis of this statement of the Bṛhadā-
raṇyaka that Brahman is undifferentiated.

Nimbārka then establishes his thesis on the basis of Br. S. III,
ii. 24, namely, api ca saṁrādhanke pratyakṣānumānābhyaṁ.26 Here
saṁrādhanaṁ has been taken by both Nimbārka and Śaṅkara as
bhakti-yoga, from which it follows that Brahman can be apprehended
through bhakti.

Nimbārka's position is further strengthened by Br. S. III, ii. 27:
ubhaya-vyāpdesaṁ tv=aṁ-kundalavat.27 According to him, this
aphorism strengthens the dual nature of Brahman in its form and
formless aspects. Just as the form of a coiled snake is hidden from
view and is only exposed when it stretches itself, similarly the
phenomenal world is hidden from view during dissolution and takes
its shape only on creation, but in both the states abides in Brahman.
Śaṅkara's comment on this aphorism is: '... As thus difference
and non-difference are equally vouched for by scriptures, the accep-
tation of absolute non-difference would render futile all those texts

51
which speak of difference. We therefore look on the relation of the highest-self and the soul as analogous to that of snake and its coils. Viewed as a whole, the snake is one, non-different, while an element of difference appears if we view it with regard to its coils, hood, erect posture and so on.\textsuperscript{28}

According to Nimbärka, there are three categories, \textit{cit}, \textit{acit}, and Brahman. \textit{Cit} is individual soul, different from insentient objects like the body et cetera; it is of the nature of consciousness (\textit{jñāna svarūpa}), and also its resting-place (\textit{āśraya})\textsuperscript{29}; hence the \textit{jīva} is always the knower. It is atomic, subject to ego and possessed of the power of acting or as a spontaneous agency (\textit{kārtytva}). The individual soul differs in each body and is capable of being bound or free. The Lord is the inner controller of every \textit{jīva}, who is His concomitant, is supported by Him, and is dependent on Him. There are three kinds of \textit{jīvas}, namely, those that are eternally free, others who have gained freedom from bondage, and the rest who are bound to the cycle of life and death. In the free state, the individual soul feels or enjoys the Brahman though remaining in a state of non-difference.

The \textit{acit} has no existence independent of Brahman. It has three categories, namely, (1) \textit{prākṛta}, (2) \textit{aprākṛta} and (3) \textit{kāla},\textsuperscript{30} that is (1) derived from primal matter which is the container of three \textit{guna}s; (2) not so derived; (3) time. Nimbärka's \textit{prākṛta} is like Sāṅkhya's \textit{Prakṛti}, the difference being that it is subject to the Lord's control. \textit{Aprākṛta} is the purest \textit{sattva}; it is also non-sentient but entirely different from \textit{prākṛta} and \textit{kāla} and is the stuff of which the celestial world like \textit{Viṣṇu-pada}, \textit{para-vyoman Brahmaloka} et cetera are made. \textit{Kāla} is eternal and all pervasive (\textit{vibhu}) and is the basic principle of the cosmic destiny. All empirical knowledge is subordinate to \textit{kāla}, and though it regulates and controls everything, it is under the complete control of the Lord.

Śrī-Kṛṣṇa or Vāsudeva is Brahman. He is faultless, combination and repository of all the virtues, the essence of truth and intelligence, and \textit{sac-cit-ānanda} (existence, knowledge and bliss); His power (\textit{śakti}) is unthinkable and infinite; he is Gopī-kānta (Beloved of the Gopis) as well as Ramā-nātha (Lord of Ramā). Gopī is the presiding deity of \textit{preman} (love) while Ramā or Lakṣmī is the presiding deity of majesty. So the Lord is the abode of both \textit{aśvarya} (majesty) and \textit{mādhurya} (belovedness). Satyabhāmā of the \textit{Purāṇas} is Ramā or Bhūṣākti. The Lord is attainable by the freed souls; He is the object of meditation by the \textit{yogins}; He is kind, affectionate and compassionate towards His devotees; He is worshipped by

52
PRE-CAITANYA VAIŚṆAVISM

Brahmā and other gods; He is the bestower of the results of action; He is the enjoyer of the religious sacrifices; He is the only subject of inquiry for those who desire salvation (mumukṣu). Like His essence, His body also is the repository of infinite blessed qualities. His bodily characteristics are extreme beauty, delicacy, charm, sweet scent, et cetera; His bodies are eternal like the ātman. In the state of bondage, the eternal body of a jīva remains veiled, but when due to the Lord’s grace, he is freed from bondage by perceiving Him, he is detached from his contact with prakṛti, and regains eternal (nitya-siddha) body. Just as during a festival, the servants get pre-determined liveries et cetera from the king, so on coming out of the shackles of prakṛti, a jīva receives from the Lord his pre-determined (pūrva-siddha), eternal, changeless body, suited to the service of the Lord. But even in this emancipated state, there is a difference between the emancipated beings and the Lord, though in this state the former are filled with utmost bliss.31

The view of Rāmānuja and his followers is that the souls and the inanimate world are associated with the Lord as His qualities. But since there is nothing to differentiate, the concept of the souls and matter as quality also fails. In Nimbārka’s view, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the Lord, the ultimate Brahman, and He is the support of the universe consisting of the souls and matter which are derived from Him and are absolutely under His control and dependent on Him for their existence. Thus while Rāmānuja considers that the soul and the matter qualify the Brahman and are in that sense one with it, Nimbārka repudiates the concept of a permanent modification of the nature of Brahman by the souls, (cit) and matter (acit).

Nimbārka developed the līlā aspect of the Lord, which even Śaṅkara had to concede due to the aphorism in the Br.-S. (II. i. 33) lokavat tu līlā-kaivalyam.32 The deity worshipped by Nimbārka’s sect is Kṛṣṇa as a cowherd accompanied by Rādhā. Here also he differs from Rāmānuja who worshipped Śrī and Nārāyaṇa.

As we shall see later, Caitanya’s doctrine had more in common with Nimbārka’s than with that of any other vaiṣṇava sect. One Keśavācārya, who is said to have been Caitanya’s contemporary also wrote a commentary on Nimbārka’s Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha. But though Caitanya’s biographers have related his meetings with the followers of Rāmānuja and Madhva, there is no record of his ever having met any follower of Nimbārka. This is remarkable, for Caitanya toured extensively, and visited even Śaṅkara’s famous monastery at Śrīneri.
III. The Brahma-sampradāya of Madhvācārya

Madhva came as a natural reaction to Śaṅkara’s uncompromising non-dualism, and it is said that, his followers avoided contact even with the shadow of an advaita-vādīn. However, he was compelled to lay special emphasis on epistemological considerations, and it has been held that to Madhva and his followers, ontological ideas are only the implications of their epistemological positions. As in the present work, we are avoiding epistemological problems, the strength of Madhva’s position will not be apparent from the following description of his doctrine.

According to Madhva, bheda or difference is of five kinds, namely, difference (1) between individual soul (jīva) and Īśvara; (2) sentient objects (jaḍa) and Īśvara; (3) jīva and jada; (4) one jīva and another jīva and (5) between one jaḍa and another jaḍa. Madhva designates this five-fold division as pra-paṇca: prakṛṣṭaḥ paṇcavidhā bhedaḥ, prapaṇcaḥ. Bondage is due to the false knowledge of identity or non-dualism, and deliverance can be attained only on the realization of the five kinds of difference.

Madhva has introduced the conception of ten categories (padārtha), namely, (1) dravya (substance); (2) guṇa (quality); (3) karma (action); (4) sāmānya (class-character); (5) viśeṣa (particularity); (6) viśeṣa (qualified); (7) aṁśa (whole); (8) sakti (power); (9) sādṛṣṭya (similarity) and (10) abhāva (negation). These categories are Madhva’s greatest contribution to Vedānta philosophy.

1. Among these categories, dravya has been subdivided into twenty forms: (i) Paramātman; (ii) Lakṣmī; (iii) jīva; (iv) avyākyatākāśa (unmanifested vacuity); (v) prakṛti; (vi) the three guṇas; (vii) mahat; (viii) ahamkāra (ego); (ix) buddhi (intelligence); (x) manas (mind); (xi) indriyas (the senses); (xii) bhūtas (the elements); (xiii) tan-mātras (the element-potentials); (xiv) Brahmāṇḍa (xv) avidyā (ignorance); (xvi) varṇa (speech-sounds); (xvii) andhakāra (darkness); (xviii) vāsanā (tendencies) (xix) kāla (time); (xx) pratibimba (reflections).

(i) Paramātman is the fulness of infinite qualities. It is impossible to state or even to think of His essential nature. He is the lord of creation, maintenance, destruction, control, knowledge, bondage, salvation, and obscuration. His qualities, such as knowledge and cetera are infinite times more than that of Lakṣmī and others. He has a body, but it is not material, and is composed of cit and ānanda. He is independent, everyone else is dependent, that is, dependent on another in point of existence, knowledge and activity, like Lakṣmī’s dependence on Brahmā. The individual souls are
sentient, but are always dependent, because they are limited both by space and in attributes.

(ii) Lakṣmī is different from Paramātman, and is only under His control. Brahmā and others are Lakṣmī’s children and during dissolution are absorbed in her, whence it follows that Brahmā and others are under the control of Lakṣmī as of Paramātman. Lakṣmī, being strengthened by the glance of the Lord, performs the eight-fold work of creation et cetera, mentioned above. In respects of dearness to, devotion to, and knowledge of the Lord, Lakṣmī is million times superior to the free-souls. Like the Lord, Lakṣmī is eternally free and replete with virtues; but even so and in spite of her having all her desires fulfilled, she always worships the Lord, and is therefore the ideal of the devotees. Being possessed of all the virtues and qualities, Lakṣmī also may be indicated by the word sārva, but primarily this word is applicable only to the Lord. Lakṣmī has various forms like Śrī, Bhū, Durgā, Hrī, Dakṣīṇā, Sītā, Jayanti, Bhṛṇī, Satyā, Rukminī et cetera; indeed she has infinite forms. Like the Lord’s, Lakṣmī’s body is also made of non-material cit and is eternal. She is not limited by time or space, but unlike the Lord, she is limited by guṇa.

(iii) The jīva (individual soul) is limited by ignorance, misery, fear and delusion. Even Brahmā is not entirely free from their contamination. But these are not permanent in Brahmā, as they are in Rudra. Brahmā’s delusion is not due to false knowledge but to the absence of immediate knowledge.

The Jīvas are infinite in number. They are divided into three gānas (groups), namely, mukti-yogya, nitya-saṁsārī and tamo-yogya. Mukti-yogya-jīvas are of five kinds: (1) gods like Brahmā, Vāyu and others; (2) ṛṣis like Nārada and others; (3) pītas like Viśvāmitra and others; (4) cakravartins like Raghu, Ambariṣa and others; and (5) uttama-manuṣya, or excellent men, that is those who are devoted to the Lord. Nitya-saṁsārī or madhyama-manuṣya are constantly revolving round the cycle of birth and death, that is earth, heaven and hell. They are infinite in number. The adhama-manuṣya and demons and goblins are tamo-yogya-jīvas. Each jīva is different from every other jīva, and even in emancipation they differ from each other in their respective merits, qualifications, desires et cetera.

Among the mukti-yogya-jīvas, the non-sentients are at the lowest level. Then come the beast and birds, followed by men. Among men, brāhmaṇas are the highest, but the cakravartins (great kings) are placed above the brāhmaṇas; indeed the cakravartins are
sometimes called the adhama-deva (worst god) or uttama-manuṣya (best of men). The cakravartins are free and enjoy a particle of Brahmā’s bliss, and provide the standard or unit for measuring the Brahmā’s bliss in others. Hence the cakravartins are called eka-nanda-svarūpa (he whose essential nature is of a single bliss). After the cakravartins come in an ascending order the manuṣya-gandharvas, deva-gandharvas, cira-pitṛs, ājānaja-devas, karmaja-devas et cetera. The deva-gandharvas are verbally ordered by the devas. Siddhas, cāraṇas, kinnaras, kiṁpuruṣas, vidyādharas, yakṣas, nāgas, vetālas et cetera have the same status as the deva-gandharvas. The cira-pitṛs like Viśvāmitra rank as high as Brahmā’s son Vaśiṣṭha. Ājānaja-devas are the servants of the devas. Kārtavirya, Pṛthu, Bharata the son of Duṣyanta, Śaśabindu, Māndhāta, Kakutstha et cetera belong to the group of karmaja-devatā. They are always in a state of extreme devotional fervour. There are also others, namely, nine crores of gods, various Manus, eight gandharvas, and ninety-two apsarasas, who are included in this group. These divisions are intended to illustrate the proposition that, jīvas are naturally different, and this difference persists even after salvation.

(iv) Avyākṛt-ākāśa (unmanifested vacuity) is almost of the nature of Vaiśeṣika dik (space). It is not subject to destruction at the time of dissolution nor to creation at the time of creation; hence it is eternal. It is intuited by the sākṣi, and is called pradeśa24 (space). The presiding deity of avyākṛt-ākāśa is Lakṣmī. It should be noted that avyākṛt-ākāśa is different from bhūt-ākāśa (physical space) which originates from tāmas aspect of ahaṁkāra.

(v) Prakṛti is the direct or indirect material cause of the world. It is the direct material cause of time and the three reals (sattva etc.) and indirectly that of elements like mahat et cetera. It is beyond the three reals non-sentient, subject to modification, and producive of various evolutes. As it is the matter out of which the world is created after dissolution, it is eternal; similarly it is vyāpaka (all-pervading) being the matter out of which time is created. Its presiding deity is Rāma. It is the totality of the līṅga-body possessed by each jīva, but at the same time is bigger than the sum total. At the time of dissolution prakṛti rests alone. Then the Lord desirous of creation divides it into three reals: sattva, rajas and tāmas, each being double in quantity than the other respectively; the extent of tāmas is ten times that of mahat (to be explained presently) and surrounds the latter.

(vi) At the beginning, pure sattva evolves out of prakṛti; later, sattva is contaminated with rajas and tāmas producing sattva-rajas and sattva-tāmas in the following proportion: in rajo-guna,
there is 1 part of rajas in 100 parts of sattva and 1/100 of tamas; in
tamo-guna, there is 1 part of tamas in 10 parts of sattva and 1/10 of
rajas. This differential state of the three evolutes is known as
'creation' and their equilibrium is 'dissolution.' The free souls,
under the influence of līlā, sometimes adopt a body of pure sattva,
and having enjoyed it to the full, discards it. As such bodies are
uncontaminated with rajas and tamas, they do not suffer bondage
as a result of their enjoyment.

(vii) Mahat-tattva is directly evolved from the three reals
mentioned above. Brahmā, Vasu and his wife are the presiding
deities of mahat. At the time of dissolution, mahat is divided into
12 parts, of which 10 enter sattva and one each in rajas and tamas,
and the same proportion is maintained during creation.

(viii) Ahaṁkāra is produced from the tamas part of mahat.
It is composed of 10 parts of sattva, 1 of rajas and 1/10 of tamas.
Ahaṁkāra is of three kinds, vaikārika, taijasa and tāmasa. The
following gods are the presiding deities of ahaṁkāra: Garuḍa, Indra,
Śeṣa, Kāma, Rudra, and their wives, Aniruddha, Brahmā, Saras-
vatī, Vasu, and Candra.

(ix) Buddhi also is evolved out of mahat and is augmented
by taijasāhaṁkāra. There is, however, another kind of buddhi,
which is attributive and is called jñāna, and is not counted as a
tattva.

(x) Manas is evolved from vaikārikāhaṁkāra. Its presiding
deities are, Rudra, Garuḍa, Śeṣa, Kāma, Indra, Aniruddha, Brahmā,
Sarasvatī, Vasu and Candra. The manas (mind) known as an
indriya is not a tattva. The non-substantive manas is of two
kinds, eternal and non-eternal. The eternal non-substantive manas
is in the nature of essence of Paramātman, Lakṣmi and all the ājīvas
including Brahmā and others, and is known as sākṣi. It is of the
nature of self or intelligence. The manas of an earth-bound soul
partakes the nature of both intelligence and non-intelligence, while
that of the free-souls is only of the nature of intelligence. The
Lord residing in the human body enjoys through the indriyas. The
non-eternal manas is external to the self, and is present in all the
ājīvas including Brahmā. Resolution and hesitation are the workings
of the manas.

(xi) Indriya is also of two kinds, namely, substantive, non-eternal
and non-substantive and eternal also known as sākṣi. Both types of
indriyas are further sub-divided into two on the basis of knowledge
(cognitive) and action. The non-eternal indriya is produced from
the taijasāhaṁkāra. The eternal indriya is of the nature of Para-
mātman, Lakṣmī and of every jīva, though there is some difference. However, according to Madhva, every jīva has its eternal and non- eternal indriyas, the latter being produced from ahaṅkāra, hence it is admitted that even Brahmā and other gods have gross indriyas. As noted above, the non-substantive indriya is of the real nature of jīva and is called sākṣi, which is the agency of cognition of all objects in the free state, though it has its uses in the state of bondage also. Ātman, manas, mano-dharma, pleasure and pain, avidyā, kāla and avyākta-ākāśa can be perceived by the sākṣi. Though rūpa (form) and rasa (taste) are subjects of direct cognition by the external indriyas, even these can be indirectly cognized by the sākṣi. All supra-sensory objects can be cognized only through the sākṣi.

(xii & xiii.) Indriya is that which has the power to flow towards its objects which are known as tan-mātrās and are five in number. namely, śabda (sound), sparṣa (touch), rūpa (form), rasa (taste) and gandha (smell). These should be distinguished from the attributive aspects of five bhūtas namely, ākāśa (space), vāyu (air), tejas (fire), ap (water), and kṣiti (earth) known by the same terms. The five bhūtas (ākāśa etc.) are evolved out of the respective tan-mātras through the agency of the tāmasāhaṅkāra, and gradually decreases in size by 1/10; for example vāyu is one tenth of ākāśa and, similarly tejas is one tenth of vāyu and so on. The eternal tan-mātras are of the nature of the Lord.

(xiv) The size of brahmāṇḍa is half that of the world. This phenomenal world and others, including the unmanifest, exist like a girdle around the brahmāṇḍa. It is made of all the tattvas and is the locus to which all the substances stand related.

(xv) Avidyā (nescience) is created from the tamo part of five bhūtas (elements). According to the Mādhvas, though avidyā has been created from the five elements outside the brahmāṇḍa, but the Lord hurled it at Brahmā wherefore at the time of creation it emerges out of Brahmā, hence sometimes it is known as the creation of Brahmā (Brāhma-sṛṣṭi). Avidyā is of four kinds, namely, jīva-chāḍikā (covering the individual soul), paramāchāḍikā (covering the reality), saivalā (floating like the leaves of a water plant) and māyā (ajñāna, that which is responsible for the jīva’s delusion). Avidyā rests in an individual and is different for each individual. Madhvā does not admit the validity of a single ajñāna shared by all the souls. Just as Śrī is the presiding deity of vidyā (knowledge), so is Durgā the presiding deity of avidyā.
(xvi) Varṇas (alphabetic symbols) are fifty-one in number, and are of the nature of all the words, Vedic and non-Vedic. They are all-pervasive and eternal.

(xvii) Andhakāra (darkness) is also a substance, and it is not proper to say that it is the state of the absence of light. This is supported by scriptural evidence, namely, destruction of darkness by the discus of Kṛṣṇa.

(xviii) Vāsanā or saṃskāra is produced from past experience and is located in the mind. It is impossible to trace its beginnings. All the dream objects are built of vāsanā.

(xiv) Kāla is the regulator of duration, it is not undifferentiated but made of many components including knowledge; hence it is not eternal. But it is all pervasive and is the locus of everything. The character of the flow of time is of eternal nature, and all action depend for their origination on time.

(xx) Pratibimba (reflection) is also a separate substance. It is similar to and inseparable (avinābhūta) from the bimba (object reflected) and not a false entity. It is of two kinds, namely, eternal and non-eternal. With the exception of Paramātman, all sentient objects are His reflection and are eternal. Lakṣmī and Brahmā have also their reflections, which are also eternal. The gods of the lowest class are the reflections of gods of the highest class.

2. The qualities or guṇas are of the same nature as of the Vaiṣešikas, but Madhva also admits certain physical and mental qualities, described below.

Guṇa (quality) can only subsist in a substance, being incapable of independent existence. It does not include the doṣas (bad qualities) for, as has been noted above, the Lord has infinite guṇas without being associated with any bad quality. There are innumerable qualities, and their number cannot be determined.

The most important quality is rūpa (colour) which is seven in number, namely, white, blue, yellow, red, green, tawny, and composite (citra) and each of these has two forms namely, eternal and non-eternal, and two states, namely, manifest and unmanifest. All the colours inhere in Paramātman and Lakṣmī; the jīvas have their individual distinctive colour.

Rasa (taste) is of six kinds, namely, madhura (sweet), amla (sour), lavana (saltish) kaṭu (pungent), kaśāya (astringent), and titkta (bitter). They are also eternal and non-eternal.
Gandha (smell) is of two kinds, namely, sweet and bad. The Lord, Lakṣmi and the free souls are always associated with sweet smell, while in prakṛti and vāsanā both sweet scent and bad odour are perceived.

Other guṇas include sparśa (touch), saṃkhyā (number), parimāna (dimension), saṁyoga (conjunction), viyoga (dissociation), draṇatva (fluidity), gurutva (heaviness), mṛdutva (softness) kāthinyā (hardness), sneha (viscidity), śabda (sound), buddhi (intelligence), sukha (happiness) duḥkha (misery), icchā (desire), dveṣa (hatred), prayatna (carefulness), dharma (right behaviour), adharma (wrong behaviour), saṁskāra (impression of past experience), āloka (light), sama (inner control), dama (control of outer senses), kṛpā (kindness), titikṣā (patience), bala (strength), bhaya (fear), lajjā (shame), gāmbhīrya (sobriety), saundarya (beauty).

3. Karma or action are those activities which directly or indirectly begets puṇya (merit) or pāpa (demerit) and are of three kinds, namely, vihita (enjoined by the scriptures), nisiddha (prohibited by the scriptures) and udāśina (indifferent), that is, not contemplated by the scriptures. The Śruti says 'na kuryāt nisphalam karma' (Do not perform an act which does not produce any result), from which it is inferred that fruit-less action begets demerit. Prescribed action is of two kinds kāmya and akāmya;17 whatever action is performed with a desire to obtain results is kāmya, and those actions which are performed to please the Lord is akāmya. Gods and goddesses such as Brahmā, Vāyu, Sarasvatī, Bhāratī also have desire, which is to have cognition of and devotion to the Lord. That the gods have kāmya-karma is proved by the ascendency of Brahmā in the Satya-loka, of Vāyu in the Vāyu-loka and so on, which are the results of past action. But Brahmā and other gods do not perform an action for self-gratification, but for the pleasure of the Lord. Only the Lord has no kāmya-karma. The karma performed by Rudra and others falls under the prohibited category, (which shows Madhva’s hostile attitude to Śaivism. It may be added here that in this respect Caitanya differed entirely from Madhva, and in his doctrine respect is to be shown to Śiva.)

Udāśina-karma is of the nature of throbbing, that is potential, and of various kinds. Both the sentient beings and non-sentient objects can partake of it.

Karma has also been divided on the basis of eternal and non-eternal. The eternal action is of the essence of the Lord and consists of creation, destruction et cetera; similarly the action of move-
ment et cetera are of the essence of an individual, but remain unmanifest during bondage. (These actions must be distinguished from the non-eternal actions of an individual which can be perceived by the senses). The antagonists point out that if the Lord’s action of creation and destruction be eternal there would be a constant process of creation and destruction. In reply it is pointed out that the contradictory action of creation and destruction abide in the Lord, but when one is in a dynamic form the other rests in Him in a potential form, which is called śakti. When the Lord is not actually engaged in creation, his power of creation (kriyā-sakti) abides in Him. The movement of the free souls is also eternal; these actions are described in the Chāndogya (VIII, xiii.3) as sa tatra paryetā jākṣat kriyāt ramamāṇah stribhir vā yānāir vā jñātibhir vā nopañjanaṁ smarann idam śārīram. These actions are also eternal, because these have no material basis being unrelated to prakṛti. The mental activities of an individual in bondage is non-eternal, and does not exist in a free soul (mukta).

4. Sāmānya, or class-character, is of two kinds namely, jāti (universals) and upādhi (apparent qualifications). Madhva however, rejects the presence of universals in each individual and believes in the distinctiveness or uniqueness of each individual and object. Class-characteristics such as brāhmaṇa-thood et cetera may be eternal or non-eternal; the apparent characteristic of brāhmaṇa-thood depends on a physical body and is non-eternal, while the immutable brāhmaṇa-thood persists even in a free soul.

5. Viśeṣa, or the doctrine of specific particulars, is admitted by Madhva to determine the relation of qualities to their substances, in order to escape from the contradictory conception of simultaneous relation of bheda (difference) and abheda (non-difference). For example, the relation between guṇa (quality) and guṇin (person qualified) may be bheda, abheda or bhedābheda. But if the quality were identical with the qualified person or object, then the destruction of the former (colour in a jug) would mean the destruction of the latter (jug) and the two words would be synonymous. As the non-contradictory cognition of colour et cetera in a jug are not fallacious, therefore even those who accept non-difference as a dogma have to admit viśeṣa as a working hypothesis. Similarly in the relation between guṇa and guṇin, admission of the category of viśeṣa, is indispensible. Similarly, the attribute of viśeṣa has to be ascribed to Paramātman. The Śrutiś have declared ānanda (bliss) to be of the essential nature of Brahman and it is also said that ānanda is of the nature of Brahman’s dharma. The conception of difference or difference-in-non-difference in Brahman
has been denounced, hence it has to be admitted that according to the Śrutiś, the relation of Brahman with its dharmas is of absolute non-difference. Under the circumstances, it has to be admitted that for ontological purpose, it is imperative to admit the category of višeṣa, which is representative of bheda and not bheda itself. It is not necessary that one subject must have only one višeṣa; it may possess as many as necessary. There are infinite višeṣas in the Lord. Višeṣa is its own determinant, hence one višeṣa need not be qualified by another in order to relate itself to its locus. Višeṣa is of two kinds; the višeṣa of eternal substances is eternal, while that of non-eternal substances is non-eternal.

6. Višeṣaṇa means the qualifying attributes and višeṣya is the substance qualified, wherefore viṣiṣṭa or 'composite whole' stands in Mādhva philosophy for the form which a substance acquires after being related to its attributes. Viṣiṣṭa is also of two kinds, namely, eternal and non-eternal. God and his attributes of omniscience are therefore to be distinguished from a daṇḍin (a man carrying a stick) from the daṇḍa (stick) which are non-eternal by nature.

7. The two terms aṁśa and aṁśin roughly correspond to the idea of 'fraction' and 'unit' and are also sometimes used to denote 'part' and the 'whole'. These two categories are also applicable to sentient beings also. For theological purposes distinction is made between svārūpāṁśa (fraction of essence) and bhīmnāṁśa (fraction apart), the avatāras (incarnations) of the Lord being in the former category, while the latter category includes the individual souls (jīvas). The devas have also their aṁśas.

8. Śakti (power) is of four kinds, namely (1) acintya-śakti (inconceivable power); (2) ādheya-śakti (adventitious power), e.g. the power brought about in an idol through the ritualistic operations of the installation ceremony; (3) sahaja-śakti (inherent power, by virtue of which changes and other things are produced by a thing; and (4) pada-śakti (power of words). Only the Lord possesses the full acintya-śakti, others possess it in relative quantities. It is due to the acintya-śakti that the Lord and other divine beings are capable of resolving contradictions, as of being seated in a place and yet going far away, as lying here and yet moving far away which are mentioned in the Śrutiś (Kāṭha, I. ii. 21; Gītā, XIII, 13-14.) This acintya-śakti is also known as aiśvarya.

Any power which is conducive to the performance of an action is sahaja-śakti; possessed by eternal objects they are eternal and by non-eternal objects are non-eternal.
The ādheya-śakti or adventitious power has been explained above. Pada-śakti is that power which relates a word to its meaning.

9. Sādṛṣya (resemblance) is a category which in the Mādhva system is designed to replace the universals. It is also of two kinds, namely, eternal and non-eternal. The resemblance of the free souls (mukta-jīvas) when they enjoy sārūpya-mukti (deliverance in the state of the same form as that of the Lord) are eternal whereas the resemblance between a cow and a gayal (gavaya), both non-eternal entities, are non-eternal.

10. Abhāva or (negation) is of four kinds, namely, (1) prāg-abhāva, that is, negation preceding a production; (2) dhvaṁs-abhāva, that is, negation following a destruction; (3) anyany-abhāva, that is mutual negation, like the negation or non-existence of a jug in a pot and of a pot in a jug; and (4) atyant-ābhāva, absolute negation or non-existence, belonging to impossible entities like the hare’s horn, which is the Sanskrit equivalent of mare’s nest.

According to Mādhva eschatology, one can gain immediate knowledge or a glimpse of the Lord through His grace, which bestows on the observer the knowledge of His infinite qualities and evokes an unceasing flow of love towards him. It is not possible to describe the magnitude of this love which erases from memory all past associations. This is known as parama-bhakti; such devotion brings extreme grace of the Lord to the devotee, which leads to salvation. The attainment of various heavens is due to His medium and small grace, but release from the sheaths imposed by prakṛti and avidyā without the Lord’s extreme grace is impossible. The Lord’s vision destroys prakṛti, guṇas, karma and the fine body attached to self, but like fire in smouldering embers they repeatedly appear and disappear in consecutive births and deaths, till the ripe (prārabdha) karmas are destroyed.

Salvation is of four kinds, namely, karma-kṣaya (destruction of karma), utkṛanti-laya (destruction of birth), arcirādi-mārga, and bhoga (enjoyment). Immediate knowledge destroys all accumulated demerits as well as those merits which are ultimately harmful (because fruit bearing); this is destruction of karma. Destruction here should not be taken literally, for though it implies the obliteration of certain actions and their results, it also implies the transference of certain merits to friends and demerits to enemies. Immediate knowledge cannot destroy ripe action (prārabdha-karma) which can only be exhausted through enjoyment. Even gods like Brahmā, Indra, Candra, and others have to enjoy (which also includes sufferings) the results of ripe action, but their ripe action is of a different nature and for Brahmā wholly meritorious; but for
other gods it is both meritorious and demeritorious. After the ripe action has been exhausted, the jiva ascends along the brahma or susumnä-nädi, which extends from the mülâdhâra to the head, like a white spoke, and is divided into five segments.

Some devotees do not use any image for their worship. Some of those who gain immediate knowledge without the use of any image leave the body along the susumnä channel. At that time the jiva remains senseless; Vişṇu's effulgence reveals brilliantly the fore-part of the centre of consciousness, which is known as brahma-dvâra. Along this way the indwelling God exits from the body taking the jiva with him. The prâṇa follows him; other gods, knowledge, karma and ability follow prâṇa. On his way the free-soul is entertained in various manners by the inhabitants of the celestial path who discern from the sight of the free-soul that God must be with him. Thus the free-soul reaches Vaikuṇṭha, where he can see the turīya-rūpa (ultimate form) of the Lord.

Those who gain immediate knowledge by worshipping images are bound to remember God at the time of death. But the ignorant persons and even the jñānins, whose ripe action has not been exhaust-ed, fail to remember him at the time of death. Their destiny and path of deliverance are different.

There are jivas who are eternally earth-bound (nitya-saṁsāri); their subtle bodies may be destroyed, without impairing their competency for mundane existence; thus they continue to enjoy, even after the destruction of the subtle body, pleasure mixed with pain; therefore, they are called eternally earth-bound. They have no fixed abode like the free souls, who reside in Vaikuṇṭha heaven. The tâmas-souls (the worst creatures) rest in a dark place; but some of the eternally earth-bound souls continually move from heaven to earth and to hell, while some rest in heaven. The only difference between such souls and a human being, is that while the latter enjoy pleasure and pain alternatively, the former undergoes the experience of simultaneous enjoyment, and suffering.

The lokas (bhû, bhûvaḥ, and svāh) are traversed in a cyclic order; hence fall from heaven is inevitable once merit is exhausted. Therefore one should not wish for attaining svarga. Beyond svarga is mahar-loka, wherefrom there are some slight chances of down-fall but it is comparatively safer. The longevity of the inhabitants of mahar-loka is one kalpa (432 million years) while those in heaven enjoy a longevity of one manvantara (4,320,000 years). By virtue of mere karma (rituals) and without acquiring jñâna (knowledge), it is not possible to go beyond svarga. With the dawn of knowledge
the *lokas* can be penetrated and all danger of downfall removed. With the perfection of knowledge one can reach the eternal abode, the less perfect going to *vāyu-loka*, otherwise the soul has to wait for time. The danger of downfall is completely gone when the *jana-loka* (above *mahar-loka*) is reached, where the longevity is one *kalpa* of Brahmā. But due to the *acintya-śakti* (unconceivable power) of the Lord, it is possible to return to the earth even after reaching the Vaikuṇṭha. The *devas* (gods) attain salvation in a different manner.

The subtle body is destroyed by bathing in the Virajā river. This river is situated between *pradhāna* and the *avyākṛt-ākāśa*.

At the time of dissolution all the souls enter into the body of the Lord. At that time it is possible to enjoy subjectively but not objectively, the latter beginning with the new creation. But the dissolution does not cause any modification in the knowledge or bliss of the free souls; the enjoyment of bliss, however, differs according to the capacity of each, even among the free-souls.

*Bhoga* (enjoyment) is of four kinds, namely, *sālokya*, *sāmīpya*, *sārūpya* and *sāyujya*. Enjoyment of *aśvarya* (magnificence) similar to that of the Lord is called *sārṣṭi*, which is a mere modification of *sāyujya*, which means enjoyment through entering into Lord’s body; this is the privilege of the gods. *Sārūpya* means the enjoyment through the adoption of a body similar to the Lord’s in form. *Sāmīpya* means resting near the Lord. *Sālokya* means the ability to reside in any part of the Lord’s abode.

The Lord resides in Vaikuṇṭha heaven, being constantly worshipped by millions of souls, including Brahmā. His companion is Lakṣmi or Mahālakṣmi.

**IV. Rudra-Sampradāya of Vallabhācarya.**

According to Vallabha’s philosophy—known as the *Suddha-advaita* (pure *advaita*)—Krṣṇa is the supreme or *Parā-Brahman Saccidānanda*. From Him is derived *Aksara* (immutable) Brahma, which is Brahman in its causal state. From *Saccidānanda-Brahman*, atomic particles burst out like sparks from a raging fire. These atomic parts are of the Brahman’s own *cit* nature. Due to His will, each particle retains the *sat* aspect but loses the *bliss* aspect. These unqualified atomic particles with *sat* and *cit* (but without *ānanda*) are *jivas*. However, when a *jiva* is immersed in a state of god-realization, qualities like bliss and all-pervasiveness may manifest in him. But just as a piece of red-hot iron may partake of the nature of fire, but still ‘burning’ cannot be called a nature
of iron, similarly all-pervasiveness as a concomitance of bliss is only a manifestation in a jīva and is not his natural state.

Jīva is eternal and can be divided into three types, namely, śuddha (pure), saṁsārī (earth-bound) and mukta (free). When the atomic particle comes out of Brahman, and loses its bliss aspect, it is known as śuddha-cit (pure-intelligence). This śuddha-cit or jīva is then attached to avidyā (nescience) and becomes saṁsārī, and loses its magnificence. Some of the saṁsārīs are of divine nature while others are of demonic nature. Those possessed of subtle good desire of sporting with the Lord are rewarded with divine nature which can lead to salvation. The jīvas with low desires are given demonic nature, which impedes release. In their gross body, they perform many heinous deeds, and gradually descend in the scale of animal life. Their salvation only comes when the Lord destroys avidyā.

Free-souls are of two types, namely, jivan-mukta and parama-mukta. The destruction of avidyā ushers in the state of jivan-mukti. Thereafter, due to the special grace of the Lord, some are enabled to enter the paravyoman (supreme heaven); they are parama-mukta.

Aksara-Brahman appears differently to the bhaktas (devotees) and jñānins (possessor of knowledge). The bhaktas see Him in all His splendour and qualities. To the jñānin, He appears as beyond time, space, quality and self-revealing, with only the power of obscurcation.

Mukti (salvation) is of two types, namely, saṅga and nirguṇa. The principal result of worshipping a god is union (sāyujya) with him. As all the gods have qualities, union with them will be of the nature of saṅga-mukti. But Kṛṣṇa is unqualified, hence union with him is nirguṇa-mukti, the highest form of salvation. This is not attainable by the path of knowledge.

Vallabha’s system (mārga, lit. way) is known as puṣṭi-mārga, or the ‘way of grace’. The Lord can deliver even a great sinner. For example, Indra had killed Dadhici, a great sage, and Vṛtra, a great devotee, but due to His grace Indra was absolved from the effects of sinful acts.

Bhakti (devotion) of any kind depends on His grace. The devotion which results from ordinary or common grace is known as maryāḍa-bhakti, and that due to special grace is known as puṣṭi-bhakti. In the latter type of devotion, the Lord becomes the only object of desire, and even mokṣa or final release is contemptible in comparison to it.
There are four kinds of puṣṭi-bhakti: (1) Pravāha-puṣṭi-bhakti: here the sense of ‘I’ and ‘mine’ is retained, which inclines one to perform deeds which are dear to the Lord.

(2) Maryādā-puṣṭi-bhakti: in this state, all desires disappear, and the devotee is attached to renunciation; all his other attachments disappear and he develops a desire to listen to scriptures.

(3) Puṣṭi-puṣṭi-bhakti: in this state the devotee receives the special grace of His knowledge and becomes omniscient. He come to possess full knowledge about the Lord, His servitors, His ḫlā (play) and the phenomenal world.

(4) Suddha-puṣṭi-bhakti: this is extremely rare. The devotee in this state is replete with love. Harirāja, fourth in descent from Vallabha has written 29 kārikās on suddha-puṣṭi-bhakti, but we need not go into that.⁴⁶

According to Rāmānuja, God holds the jīvas within himself and by His will dominates all their functions, by expanding or contracting all their knowledge. According to Nimbārka, jīva is naturally identical with God, and it is only through the limiting conditions that he appears as different from Him. According to Madhva, jīva is totally different from God. But Vallabha holds that the jīvas being parts of God are one with Him; they appear as jīvas through His actions by which certain qualities and powers that exist in God are obscured in the jīva and only limited powers are manifested.

According to Vallabha, the world is real, being a manifestation of God, who creates through His power called māyā, which is identical with Him. That aspect of māyā which causes confusion is called avidyā, and it is due to avidyā that a jīva suffers the birth cycle. Destruction of avidyā releases a jīva, but the prapañca (phenomenal world) remains.

Vidyā (knowledge) uproots avidyā (nescience), but that is not total destruction and cannot bring about real salvation. It is necessary to destroy the samavāya relation existing between the jīva and the avidyā; vidyā⁴⁷ cannot destroy the self-generating māyā, and so long as māyā exists avidyā must remain in a subtle form. Therefore, though vidyā can subdue avidyā, it cannot destroy it. But vidyā can destroy the illusory appearance of body, senses, and prāṇa, which are due to avidyā, thus bringing a cessation of life and death. But even in the absence of illusory appearance, the body etc. being a part of prapañca retains their essential nature. This is also a kind of mokṣa, but it is also called ‘release from bondage’. Real deliverance is the cessation of universal māyā,
which cannot be attained by knowledge. In the mokṣa, due to the agency of avidyā, avidyā rests in a causal state in māyā, which according to Vallabha, is the secondary material cause.

So long as the jīva retains his essential nature (jīvatva) his chance of rebirth remains, even if the combination of his component elements are destroyed; for, the cause remains, though its effect in the form of the body is destroyed. But on the termination of the essential nature of jīva, that is, when he is merged in Brahmā, or in Akṣara, the combined elements return to their primal cause, and chances of further rebirth is ruled out.

Brahman is vibhu (all-pervasive); but when at the end of dissolution, the time for creation dawns near, his all-pervasiveness practically evanesces. His first action then is to manifest His will-power (icchā-śakti), and its inherent subtle māyā-śakti with its three guṇas. Apparently, He then assumes finite determinations (paricchinnata) due to māyā, and as has been said above, His all-pervasiveness practically evanesces. Then space is manifested, and by the action of māyā the parts are finitely determined, whereupon He rests pervaded by the finite parts. Māyā is an inseparable power (śakti) of Brahmā, and this is the fundamental difference between Vallabha and Śaṅkara. Indeed, this is the reason for which Vallabha’s system is called Suddh-advaita or ‘pure Advaita’ in distinction to Śaṅkara’s Advaita, where māyā is categorized as neither sat nor asat and indefinable, which according to Vallabha is an extremely illogical attitude.

According to Vallabha, though Brahmā is undifferentiated, He has infinite forms which are not different from each other. Apparent differences are due to His will to create infinite forms. This is the essence of Brahmā—the material cause of the world. The desire of Brahmā to become many is for the purpose of creation.

It is due to His will that, from His essential nature is evolved infinite number of cit particles, as mentioned above. From the sat particles the sentient objects are produced, while from his ānanda aspect are produced the infinite number of antaryāmins or the inner controllers, one for each jīva. Thus from Sacc-cid-ānanda-Brahman’s sat aspect, the sentient objects, from cit aspect the sentient beings, and from the ānanda aspect the antaryāmins are produced respectively.

But as has already been stated, there is an element of sat in the jīvas, hence with the appearance of ānanda in him, he becomes of the nature of Sacc-cid-ānanda-Brahman. This is known as Brahma-sāmya or Brahma-bhāva. Just as a ball of iron placed in fire shares...
the burning power of fire, similarly a Brahma-bhūta-jīva is imbued with the qualities of Brahman.

Though the Lord is essentially one, His methods of creation are many. Sometimes He creates Himself, sometimes through the agency of others, like Puruṣa and Brahmā; the Vedas also record the gradual evolution of the created world; sometimes He himself assumes the form of the phenomenal world, while sometimes He creates the world like a magician through māyā. In all types of creation, except the last, the Lord indwells in the world.

The Lord’s power is infinite and inconceivable. The Vedas praise the greatness and glory of the Lord when they describe the variegated creation, the main object of which is to establish devotion.

Devotion cannot sprout without the knowledge of Lord’s greatness. Bhakti (devotion) is the firm and deep affection (sneha) for the Lord. Through bhakti the Lord is pleased and appears before the devotee; without His grace there is no other way to perceive Him. Therefore, bhakti is the cause of mukti (salvation). But the grace of God flows freely and unconditionally.

Vidyā has five aspect or stages, namely, vairāgya (renunciation), sāṁkhya (scriptural knowledge) yoga (control of mind), tapas (worship), and bhagavad-bhakti (devotion for the Lord). At first, there develops a distaste for sensual objects, this is vairāgya; then arises the knowledge of discrimination between eternal and mundane objects; this is followed by the practise of eight fold yoga and critical discussion. At the end, due to uninterrupted flow of thought, parama-prema dawns, by virtue of which a jīva is enabled to enter the Lord. Vidyā, avidyā and bhakti are powers of the Lord, but as has been said above, Lord’s grace is at the root of all bhakti. Therefore, one must give up everything and surrender himself to Him.

Brahman is the only object of knowledge, but to facilitate understanding, He has been described in three ways, namely svarūpa (essential point of view) kārana (causal point of view) and third kārya (active point of view). From the essential point of view, He may be viewed in three aspects, as knowledge, action, and knowledge and action. Ritualistic sacrifice is prescribed in the pūrva-kāṇḍa of the Vedas; though these are also of the nature of Brahman, but the prescribed process, from the stage of performance to the realization of result, must be reckoned as an action in the shape of worship. The Upanisads represent the jñāna-kāṇḍa of the Vedas, and though they undoubtedly represent His essential gnostic nature,
during the course of studies—that is, till ultimate realization—their teachings appear as mere knowledge. The essential nature of Brahman is the subject of the Gitā and Bh.P. also, but in such texts the object is bhakti, hence the Gitā and Bh.P. are imbued with both gnosis and action. In these texts Kṛṣṇa is described as having a form, and infinite qualities, hence he is described as Purṣottama. It is this form which is revealed through ultimate devotion. The categories of akṣara, karma, kāla and svabhāva are all included within Brahman. The antaryāmin is of His real nature, but as the former is inherent in every soul in the field of action, it is capable of finite division. But it also inheres in the causal Brahman, whom it helps.49

There are twenty-eight categories, which includes the twenty-five of Sāṁkhya, and the three guṇas.

In answer to the question as to whether Brahman has a form or is formless, Vallabha says that, form (rūpa) may be the function of the ten senses as well as their object, and in neither of these two senses can it be admitted that Brahman is possessed of a form. From everyday experience it is found that, rūpa (form) and rūpavān (one possessed of a form) are different. Brahman can never have the egotism consequent on having a form; indeed the ‘form’ itself is of the essential nature of Brahman, and there is no difference between them. Hence the scriptures admit the nature of knowledge and bliss (cid-ānanda) of Bhagavat as well as His body, by stating, ānanda-mātra-kara-pada-mukh-odor-ādi (bliss only [is His] hands, legs, mouth, belly et cetera).

This cid-ānanda is rasa which is necessary to sustain the life of the jīva and brings to his heart a taste of bliss. The account of rasa found in texts (rasa-śāstra) are the activated parts of Bhagavat whose essence is rasa. The mode of expression of rasa being various, it appears in many forms though essentially one. In reality, the supreme Brahman is signified as rasa by appearing in the heart according to a particular mode, which is impossible without unswerving devotion. It is admitted, however, that Bhagavat’s appearance outside the heart is also of the essence of rasa.50

However, though Bhagavat is rasa he is also its enjoyment, that is He is both rasa and rasika. Among the rasas, the chief is ēṛṅgāra (lit. erotic passion) of which the root-emotion (sthāyi-bhāva) is rati (sport). Therefore though Bhagavat is in essence rati, He is also Rati-mat, that is, possessed of rati. The substantial excitants (ālambana-vibhāga) of rati, for example, of the milkmaids of Vraja being ēṛṅgāra, to them the essence of Bhagavat is ēṛṅgāra-rasa. To Yaśodā, His essence will be of vātsalya-rasa (parent-sentiment).
Thus His essence will change according to the substantial excitants. Bhāva (inward sentiment) is also of the nature of Bhagavat.\textsuperscript{51}

There are those who think that, it is not possible that Bhagavat, who is knowledge itself and the essence of bliss, can suffer the pangs of viraha (separation from the beloved one), so that līlā is a mere imitation. But it should be remembered that the viraha aspect of the līlā does not obstruct His abundance or fullness. It is also not correct to say that, līlā is mere imitation. If it is true that Bhagavat is also of the essence of śṛṅgāra-rasa, then it is unreasonable to dismiss as impossible His meetings and separation from His beloved. This does not detract from His Brahman-hood; for, Brahman contains all contradictions of nature. This is declared by the Vedas, and realized by the sages.

Like Bhagavat, His attributes are also eternal and of the essence of sat, cit and ānanda. The devotees, on whom He bestows his attributes of aśṭavarga (majestic splendour), enjoy it so long as He pleases. Therefore līlā, which is action performed without any effort, is said to be eternal and of abundance of cit (cinmaya). Līlā is of two kinds, one is with regard to contradictory counterpart, the other regardless of such counterparts. The phenomenal world belongs to the former class, while Bhagavat’s līlā flows on without any regard for the counterpart.\textsuperscript{52}

Bhagavat’s nāma (name) is also eternal. Each name is imbued with a particular action or form, and that form in association with that action is eternal. However, ‘for the enjoyment of a particular sentiment by devotees, sometimes a part of the Bhagavat is manifested and at times a part is obscured. Therefore, Bhagavat holding the Govardhana mountain is eternal. Hence the actions involved in holding the Govardhana mountain, and the form in which He held it are eternally present. Therefore some devotees can feel Him thus even now.\textsuperscript{53} One can also worship and meditate upon Him in the shape of an image. Had these forms been mundane, and not of the essence of Bhagavat, then it would have been a sin to think of such forms as Bhagavat. But it is a fact that by worshipping such images it is indeed possible to obtain His grace. A form must have a name; hence name also, like quality, action and form, is eternal. Indeed His name, form, quality and action are all eternal.

Further, or one might say the furthest possible, development of the rasa theory will be found in the doctrine preached by Valla-bha’s contemporary, Caitanya.

2. For a discussion of Nimbārka's date see S. N. Das Gupta: A History of Indian Philosophy, vol. III, pp. 399-400.

3. S. N. Das Gupta, op. cit., vol. III, p. 399; Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj; Bhāratiya Sādhanār Dhārā (Bengali), p. 26; S. Radhakrishnan: The Brahma-Sūtra, p. 78. It may be noted that according to Śrī Svāmī Santādās Vrajavīdevī, Nimbārka's original name was Niyamāditya: once some saints came to his hermitage in the evening, and as they were not likely to eat after dusk, Niyamāditya got up on a Nimb tree and covered the sun with Viṣṇu's discus. This enabled the saints to enjoy a meal and since then Niyamādita came to be called Nimbāditya or Nimbārka, a name by which his sect came to be known. This story shows that Nimbārka's peculiar name may have other—though perhaps less rational—explanation than his connection with a village in Bellary of which there is no proof. It may be noted that in Śrīnīvāsa's Lāghuṣatavārāyja and in Sundarābhaṭṭa's Siddhāntasutu (quoted by G. Kaviraj, op. cit.) Nimbārka is referred to as Niyamānanda.


7. 'Brahman is apprehended under two forms; in the first place as qualified by limiting conditions owing to the mutiformity of the evolutions of name and form (i.e. the mutiformity of the created worlds); in the second place as being the opposite of this, i.e. free from limiting conditions whatever.' Translation by G. Thibaut, vol. I, p. 61.

8. 'All these passages, with many others, declare Brahman to possess a double nature, according as it is the object either of Knowledge or of Nescience. As long as it is the object of Nescience, there are applied to it the categories of devotee, object of devotion, and the like. The different modes of devotion lead to different results, some to exaltation, some to gradual emancipation, some to success in works; those modes are distinct on account of the distinction of the different qualities and limiting conditions.' Translation by G. Thibaut, vol. I, p. 62.

9. 'For as long as the individual soul does not free itself from Nescience in the form of duality—which Nescience may be compared to the mistake of him who in the twilight mistakes a post for a man—and does not rise to the knowledge of the Self, whose nature is unchangeable, eternal Cognition—which expresses itself in the form 'I am Brahman'—so long it remains the individual soul.' Translation by G. Thibaut, vol. I, p. 185.

10. 'O thou, the destroyer of the shackles of birth (cycle) I pray not thee to deliver me (into a state), where my relation with thee, my Lord! as a slave unto his Master is obliterated.'

11. 'Belonging to the self, as it were, of the omniscient Lord, there are name and form, the figments of Nescience, not to be defined either as being (i.e. Brahman) nor as different from it, the germs of the entire expanse of the phenomenal world, called in Śruti and Smriti the illusion (māyā), power (śakti), or nature (prakṛti) of the omniscient Lord.' Tr. by G. Thibaut. For the concept of māyā as aitattvā śakti, see Pañcadaśī, II, 38-41.

12. 'Thus the Lord, (who is) always possessed of majesty, power, strength, vital strength, and lustre, having subdued the primal prakṛti, (which is composed of) three guṇas by his own vaisnavi (that is, appertaining to Viṣṇu) māyā, though being unborn (that is, existing from eternity), not liable to modification, lord of all the elements, (and being of the) nature of eternally pure intelligence and free, (yet) it appears as if he assumed a body with (the help of) his own māyā, (and) as if he were born, as if to favour men.' Saṅkara has practically repeated himself in commenting on Gītā, IV. 6, which cannot be explained otherwise.

13. 'O Devi! Māyāvāda (that is, aadvaita) which is said by (the learned) as concealed Buddhism, was promulgated by me in the shape of a brāhmaṇa (that is śaṅkara) (in order to delude mankind).' Supposed to be said by Mahādeva to Devi, that is Pārvatī, and was probably first quoted by Viśnunabhikṣu or Madhva.

16. It may be noted in passing that almost all the great temples, the visible symbols of Indian culture, are post-Sāmkara.
17. According to the Pāṇāskara-samhitā a man, due to his accumulated merits, enjoys heaven and due to Divine will may reach yet higher spheres where he may spend hundreds of kalpas. Having gained knowledge such a man then descends on earth and is suddenly merged (lit. dissolved) into the amitâtmā Bhagavan; layāna ca sakâṣa yān bhagavati amitâtmā. The same text also states: ante bhātasya dēham tyaktvā = te Vāsudevaṃ (at the end they rid themselves of their body like Vāsudeva). Pāṇāskara-Samhitā, xxxi. 230-3 and XIX, 15.59 quoted by Svāmī Vidyāranya, Bhāgavat Dharma prācin Itkās (Bengali), vol. II, p. 81; for a detailed discussion of the difference between Rāmānuja and the Pāṇāsātras see ibid., pp. 242-251.
19. Rāmānuja here quotes Chāndogya, VII, xxvi, 2; āhāra-śuddhāḥ sattra-śuddhīḥ; sattra-śuddhāḥ dhruvā-smitih. (In pure nourishment there is a pure nature. Pure nature (leads to) steadfast remembrance).
20. For this reason and for several others in this section I have relied on MM. Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj: Bhāratiya Sadhānār Dārā (Bengali), pp. 8; 12.
21. Nappinnāi is also mentioned in the old Tamil classic Siḻappadiāram (c. 2nd century A.D.). For details see A. K. Majumdar: A Note on the Development of the Rādjā Cūt, ABORI, XXXVI (1955), pp. 231-57. In one of her songs Aṉāl writes: 'O Lady Nappinnāi, with tender breasts like unto little cups, with lips of red and slender waist, Liṅkāmi, awake from sleep.' J. S. M. Hooper: Hymns of the Alvarās, p. 55. From this it is apparent that Nappinnāi by this time was identified with Liṅkāmi.
22. (The ātmāna is) a part of (of Brahman) on account of the declaration of difference and otherwise also; for in some (scriptures) (Brahman) is spoken of as being (of the) nature of slaves, dishonest people etc.' In Sāmkara's commentary the number of this aphorism is II. iii, 43.
23. 'From these two views of difference and non-difference there results the comprehensive view of the soul being a part of the Lord. The following stātra supplies a further reason.'
24. 'Hitherto the (śruti) has forbidden (denied) the mārtta and amūrta forms of Brahman, hence it states again.'
25. 'Now (after the truth has been ascertained) is the precept (about Brahman): 'Not thus: not so. For there is nothing beyond him other than this, that is thus.'
26. 'And (Brahman is apprehended) through meditation, perception and inference,'
27. 'But (on account of) the dual precepts (the relation of Brahman to jīva is to be viewed) as that between a serpent and its coil.
28. However in commenting on next but one aphorism (Br. S. III. 2. 29), Sāmkara says: 'Nor, finally, can it be said that Śruti equally teaches difference and non-difference. For non-difference is what it aims at establishing; while, when engaged in setting forth something else, it merely refers to difference as something known from other sources of knowledge (viz. perception etc.)—Hence the conclusion stands that the soul is not different from the highest self.'
29. It may also mean that the individual soul is the subject (ārāya) to which knowledge is related as the predicate.
30. Nimbārka does not give any description of aprākṛta or kāla which are supplied by Puruṣottama in his Vedānta-ratna-maṇjusā. It should be noted that aprākṛta is a peculiar conception of the Vaishnavas, and means something like anti-matter. This conception is extremely necessary for their teleological system. For puruṣ-prakṛti, see Gitā, VII. 5, but there the meaning is slightly different.
31. For details see Nimbārka's commentary on the Br. S. 1 i.5-20.
32. 'But as in ordinary life (creative activity) is mere sport to Brahman.' Nimbārka's commentary on this aphorism is extremely brief as its meaning is too obvious. Sāmkara's longer comment is, however, an eloquent testimony to the devotional aspect of his heart.
33. Usually it is held that bheda or difference is of three kinds; (1) svagāta, difference in one class, e.g. one cow from another. (2) viśātiya, difference from those of another class, e.g. difference between a cow and a horse; (3) saṃgata,
internal or organic difference, e.g. difference between a tree and its branches, leaves and flowers. Madhva did not admit svagata-bheda in its absolute sense.

34. gaganaṁ sākṣi-gocaram pradeśa iti vijñeyam, Anuyālkhyaṁ, II. 3. Madhva’s theory of knowledge distinguishes between ordinary knowledge through sensory channels, termed vṛtti-jñāna and intuitive perception by the self called sākṣi-jñāna. The doctrine of sākṣi plays a very important part in Madhva’s epistemological system.

35. There is a distinct difference between Sāmkhya’s prakṛti and Madhva’s prakṛti.

36. The qualities admitted by the Vaiśeṣikas are: rūpa (colour),
   rasa (taste) gandha (odour), sparsa (touch) and śabda (sound); each is an attribute of the corresponding bhūtas, or their combinations.

37. Vaiśeṣikas have five kinds of karmas, but Madhva holds that even utkṣepaṇa-karma (upward action or movement) of the Vaiśeṣikas produce results.

38. There such a one goes around laughing, sporting, having enjoyments with women or chariots or friends, not remembering the appendages of his body.’

Chāndogya. Up. VIII. xii. 2.

39. Arcī means flame. For details see Madhva’s commentary on Gītā, VIII. 24, where he quotes Brhadāraṇyaka (VI. 11. 15) te’rcir-abhisambhāvanti, (they reach arcī, i.e. the deity identified with flame).

40. Karma or action is of three kinds, and has been compared with arrows:
   (1) sāmīcita-karma, arrows in quiver, (2) aprarabdha-karma, arrows in hand:
   (3) prārabdha-karma discharged arrow. The first two can be destroyed, but the last cannot be recalled, it must complete its trajectory.

41. A physically unidentifiable part of human anatomy near the anus.

42. Līmga-deha means the subtle body, consisting of the ten senses, five prānas
   and manas. Bhāgavata-tatparīyāya, I 13. quoted by Das Gupta, IV, pp. 317-
   18. But there are other descriptions of the līmga-deha, in other systems.

43. Bhū means the phenomenal world; bhūvaḥ means an intermediate heaven,
   which is not free from summer heat, winter’s cold or rain. Beyond this is
   svar-loka or svarga, that is heaven. Yogi-Yājñavalkya.

44. One kalpa is one day for Brahmā, so one Brahma-kalpa is 432 million multi-
   plied by 432 million years. For details see Bh.P. III. xi.

45. As we shall see later Caitanya practically decreed this idea of bhoga.

46. A short summary of Harirāja’s view is given by Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj, op. cit.,
   p. 61.

47. According to Vallabha, samavaya is not a relation of inherence which exists
   between cause and effect such as is admitted by Naiyāyikas; with him it means
   tādātmya (identity). Samavaya-karana, according to Vallabha is universal
   and unconditional pervasion.

48. (1) Yama (ahināśa, satyam, asteya, brahma-carṇa, aparigraha), (2) niyama,
   (saucā santosa, tatas, iṣvara-pranidhāna), (3) āsana; (4) ānandyaṃ;
   (5) prayāhāṛa; (6) dhīyaṇa; (7) dhāraṇa; (8) samādhi.

49. Anantārāṇīmaṁ svam-rūpa-bhūtate’pi jīvena saha kārīye praveśātm tad-bhedānāṁ
   ānantye’pi kārāni-bhūta-vakṣayamāna-tattva-sārīre praviśāya tat-sahaḥ-kaṇāṇāṁ
   kārāṇa-koṭaṁ eva niśeśo na tu svam-rūpa-koṭa. ’Quoted by Das Gupta: op cit.,
   Vol. IV, p. 332.

50. bahir-āvirbhutasya = āpi bhagavato rasatvam abādham eva, Purusottama,
   quoted by Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj, op. cit., p. 67.

51. tasya tasya rasasya tādṛk tādṛg = rūpa-nād yatra yo raso yādṛgā yo
   saṃvad vidhaḥ śāstra-sadās ātma tādṛgā tādād śāstra-siddhiḥ sa raso bhagavān eva;
   rasa-vānā =
   = c = aina eka; tathā ca tatatyā sarva śaṃcāṛi tad raso-rūp = aina;
   Viḍūma-
   mandalam, pp. 192. Quoted by Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj, op. cit., p. 67. f.n.

52. Counterpart means pratīyogīn, for example, a pot is the counterpart of the
   ‘absence of a pot’.

53. Vitthalānātha quoted by Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj, op. cit., p. 68.