

# POONA ORIENTAL SERIES

PUBLISHERS

## THE ORIENTAL BOOK AGENCY

15 Shukrawar, Poona 2

| No.   | Title  | Rs.          | No. | Title   | Rs.          |
|-------|--|--------------|-----|---|--------------|
| 1     | Bhagavadgītā with Śāṅkara-Bhāṣya, best critical edition 2-0                              |              | 25  | Mudrārākṣasa by Dhruva                                  | 4-0          |
| 2     | Bhagavadgītā—A Fresh Study by Prof. Vadekar, M.A. 1-0                                    |              | 26  | Veṇisamhāra by Dravid                                   | 3-0          |
| 3 & 4 | Kena & Katha Upaniṣads with Comms. by M. M. Pathak Sastri                                | 3-8          | 27  | Svapnavāsavadattā by Prof. Deodhar, M.A., (3rd edition) | 2-0          |
| 5     | Mundakopaniṣat by M. M. Pathak Sastri  | 1-0          | 28  | Pratimā by Prof. Paranjpe                               | 3-0          |
| 6     | Isāvāsyopaniṣat „  | 1-0          | 29  | Plays ascribed to Bhāsa by Prof. Deodhar, M.A.          | 1-0          |
| 7     | Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy by Prof. Ranade R. D., M.A. Glazed edition. | 10-0<br>15-0 | 30  | Uttara-Rāma-carita Text by Dr. Belvalkar                | 1-8          |
| 8     | Minor Works of Śāṅkarā-cārya (70 works in all)   | 4-0          | 31  | Meghadūta by Dr. Pathak                                 | 1-4          |
| 9     | Sāṅkhyakārikā by Dr. Sharma. Intro. Trans. &c.   | 2-0          | 32  | Pancatantra by Edgerton                                 | 1-8          |
| 10    | Tattva-Kaumudī (Sāṅkhya) by Drs. Jha & Sharma  | 3-0          | 33  | Kāvyaḍars'a by Belvalkar                                | 3-0          |
| 11    | Sāṅkhya System—Critical Study by Sovani, M.A.  | 1-0          | 34  | Kāvyaśāṅkaraśāstravṛtti Text by Kulkarni, B.A.L.L.B.    | 1-8          |
| 12    | R̥gveda, Lectures on by Dr. Ghate, M.A.  | 3-0          | 35  | „ trans. by Dr. Jha                                     | 1-8          |
| 13    | Brahmasūtra II, 1 & 2 by Dr. Belvalkar, M.A., Ph.D.                                      | 6-0          | 36  | Rāṣṭrakūṭas & Their Times by Dr. Altekar A. S., M.A.    | 7-8          |
| 14    | Vedāntasāra by Hiriyanṇa   | 1-8          | 37  | 22 Srutis of Indian Music                               | 0-8          |
| 15    | Tarkasaṅgraha with Dipikā by Prof. Gokhale, B.A.   | 0-6          | 38  | Manual of Hindu Ethics by Chandavarkar, B.A.            | 1-4          |
| 16    | Tarkabhāṣā trans. by Jha   | 1-4          | 39  | Bhandarkar Comm. Vol. Ordinary edition.                 | 16-0<br>12-0 |
| 17    | „ Text by Kulkarni, B.A., LL.B.  | 0-8          | 40  | Kṛṣṇa Problem by Tadpatrikar, M.A.                      | 1-0          |
| 18    | Arthasaṅgraha by Gokhale   | 2-0          | 41  | Democratic Hinduism by Krishna Sastri                   | 2-8          |
| 19    | Nyāyasāra by Deodhar and M. M. Abhyankar Śāstri  | 2-8          | 42  | Vaijayantī—(Under revision)                             |              |
| 20    | Saptapadārthi by Ghate   | 1-8          | 43  | Nāmaliṅgānus'āsana do.                                  |              |
| 21    | Dhammapada by Vaidya P.L.  | 2-0          | 44  | Śāś'vata Kos'a by Kulkarni                              | 2-0          |
| 22    | Prakrit Prakāś'a by Vaidya   | 3-0          | 45  | Śābdarūpāvali & Samāsa                                  | 0-3          |
| 23    | Manual of Pali by Joshi, M.A.  | 2-0          | 46  | Systems of Sk. Gr. by Dr. Belvalkar                     | 3-0          |
| 24    | Comparative Philology by Prof. Jahagirdar, M.A.  | 3-0          | 47  | Sk. Inscriptions Selections by Diskalkar 2 Pts.         | 4-0          |
|       |  |              | 48  | Kādambarī of Bāṇa, Text                                 | 3-0          |
|       |  |              | 49  | Kāvyaṣṭrakāś'a X by Sharma                              | 3-0          |
|       |  |              | 50  | Bhāminivilāsa by Sharma                                 | 2-0          |
|       |  |              | 51  | Kāvyaṣṭrakāś'a III by Dr. Sharma                        | 0-8          |
|       |  |              | 52  | Jātakasaṅgaha by Tungar                                 | 0-12         |

### 53. ANCIENT KARNĀṬAKA Rs. 10

Vol. I. History of Tuluva by Dr. Saleore

# THE POONA ORIENTALIST

A quarterly journal devoted to Oriental studies  
published in April, July, October, and January

Edited by

Vidyāsudhākara Dr Har Dutt Sharma, M.A., Ph.D.

VOL. I

APRIL 1936

NO. 1

## CONTENTS

Pages

|   |     |      |
|---|-----|------|
| 1. SOMETHING ABOUT OURSELVES<br><i>The Editor</i>                                 | ... | 1    |
| 2. THE LION-CAPITAL OF THE PILLAR OF AŚOKA ...<br><i>Prof. B. N. Sharma, M.A.</i> | ... | 2    |
| 3. ARE THE GAUḌA-PĀDA-KĀRIKĀS ŚRUTI ?<br><i>Dr A. Venkatasubbiah, M.A., Ph.D.</i> | ... | 7    |
| 4. INCIDENTS IN ARTHAŚĀSTRA :<br><i>Dr B. A. Saleore, M.A., Ph. D.</i>            | ... | 18   |
| 5. KṢĪRASVĀMIN'S COMMENTARY :<br><i>Dr N. G. Sardesai, L. M. &amp; S.</i>         | ... | 24   |
| 6. THE MEANING OF THE WORD वृत्ति<br><i>Dr Har Dutt Sharma, M.A., Ph. D.</i>      | ... | 26   |
| 7. NOTES ON INDIAN CHRONOLOGY ...<br><i>Mr. P. K. Gode, M.A.</i>                  | ... | 33   |
| 8. BIBLIOGRAPHY ...<br><i>Dr R. N. Sardesai, L.C.P.S.</i>                         | ... | 42   |
| 9. REVIEWS OF BOOKS ...   | ... | 53   |
| 10. NYĀYASŪTRAS OF GAUTAMA WITH BHĀṢYA<br>(Text)                                  | ... | 1-16 |
| Edited by MM. Dr Ganganath Jha  |     |      |
| 11. NYĀYASŪTRAS OF GAUTAMA WITH BHĀṢYA<br>(English Translation)                   | ... | 1-16 |
| by MM. Dr Ganganath Jha   |     |      |

POONA

THE ORIENTAL BOOK AGENCY

tells us that on the summit of the capital there, we have four Buddhist divinities. "They are some of the inhabitants of the heavenly spheres which rise from the summit of the world-lotus at Mt. Kailāsa." May we take it that he would suggest some such interpretation here also, though he is not quite sure?<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Havell's views have made clear at least this that for understanding the inner meaning of Indian art, we shall have to part company with our archaeological friends. We shall have to look to other quarters for that esoteric light. We may not agree with Mr. Havell *in toto*, but we shall have to confess that in order to find out the principles of metaphysics which guided the hands of our ancient artists, we shall have to dive deeper. In every stage of our religious life, we have had certain sets of mystical ideas holding the minds of our people. We may take, for example, the symbol of the lotus. It is very very old. It is no wonder. The Āgamic schools are as old as our Vedic Institutions. One thing more in this connection. The numerical figures have always played an important part almost everywhere whenever mysticism was of any account. We have heard of the Pythagorean Brotherhood. This aspect has been totally neglected by our scholars. Here in this lion-capital at Saranath, we find 16 petals in the 'bell-shaped' lotus, 24 spokes in the wheels and the complete shaft itself was about 48 feet. Is it not significant that each of them should be a multiple of 8? No new theory is put forward here. It is only to suggest most respectfully to our scholars that they should, if they consider it worthwhile, have this aspect also in mind while they are studying such models of ancient art.

1. Mr. Havell's works on Indian art are most valuable contributions to the study of Indian Antiquity. From aesthetic point of view also, they are of unique interest. The views of Mr. Havell, as expressed above have been elaborately and systematically put forward in his 'The Himalayas in Indian Art', and in his 'Hand-book of Indian Art'.

## ARE THE GAUḌAPĀDA-KĀRIKĀS S'RUTI?

(A. Venkatasubbiah)

This question, as regards the first twenty-nine *kārikās* (i. e. those contained in the first section known as *Āgama-prakaraṇa*), is answered in the affirmative by Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma, who has lately published in the *Review of Philosophy and Religion* (Vol. 2, 35 ff.; Vol. 3, 45 ff.) two articles entitled 'New Light on the *Gauḍapāda-kārikās*' and 'Further Light on the *Gauḍapāda-kārikās*,' in this connection. It is his purpose to show in these articles (1) that Madhva's opinion that the first twenty-nine *kārikās* are *S'ruti*, is well-founded and is, in fact, shared by Śaṅkara, Sureśvara, Ānandagiri, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī and other well-known *advaitin* writers and also by *Viśiṣṭadvaitin* writers like Rāmānujācārya and Kūranārāyaṇa; and (2) that hence the ill-natured gibes, veiled insinuations, etc., made by latter-day *advaitins* that Madhva could not distinguish a patently *advaitic* work of a prominent *advaitin* teacher from *S'ruti*, are quite baseless and deserve to be repudiated. In the execution of this purpose, Mr. Sarma has in these articles put forward many arguments that are based on (1) internal evidence of the *Gk.*<sup>1</sup> and (2) the writings of (a) Śaṅkara, Ānandagiri, Sureśvara, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī and his commentator Gauḍa-Brahmānanda; (b) Madhvācārya, Vyāsātīrtha and his commentator Vyāsārāmācārya; and (c) Śrī Rāmānujācārya, Kūranārāyaṇa, and Doḍḍācārya or Mahācārya.

Mr. Sarma takes it as undisputed (and undisputable) that the *Māṇḍūkya* is a *S'ruti* text, and hence confines himself to showing that the *Kārikās* in the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* are not written by Gauḍapāda, but are *S'ruti*. Since this conclusion too is opposed to that reached by me in my article entitled "The *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad* and Gauḍapāda" and published in the *Indian Antiquary* for October 1933 (Vol. LXII, pp. 181 ff.), I shall examine his arguments here in detail, and show that they are unsound. I begin with those that he has based on the writings of *Advaitin* authors. 1. "Śaṅkara himself", writes<sup>2</sup> Mr. Sarma (l. c. 2,49 f. and 3,52), "cites in v. 406

1. This abbreviation stands for *Gauḍapāda-kārikā*.

2. The words in quotations are not the *ipsissima verba* of Mr. Sarma, but represent the gist of what he has said. The words used by Mr. Sarma are lacking in restraint and balance, and cannot bear to be reported.

of his *Viveka-cūdāmaṇi* (मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः । इति ब्रूतं श्रुतिः साक्षात्सुखावनुभूयते ॥) the hemistich मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतं (= Gk. I. 47) as *S'ruti*.<sup>1</sup> (2) In his commentary on a passage of the *Nṛsiṃha-tāpanī Upaniṣad* (Vāṇī Vilāsa Press ed. x. 106), which is almost identical with *Māṇḍūkya*, Śaṅkara writes किं चोभयत्रापि बहुतरपाठ-साम्येऽपि कचित्पाठभेदोऽपि दृश्यते and also अत ऊर्ध्वं माण्डूक्य उक्त एवार्थे श्लोकान्पठित्वा तुरीयः पादः । एतस्मिन्स्तापनीये तु तान् विहायैव तुरीयः पादः । and thus says explicitly<sup>3</sup> that the śloka or kārīkās interspersed between the sentences of the *Māṇḍūkya* are *s'ruti*. (3) Similarly, in the

1. Mr. Sarma acknowledges on 2,51 l. c., that this stanza and its significance were pointed out to him by His Holiness Śrī Satyadhyānātīrtha Svāmī of the Uttarādi Mutt. Now it is very natural on the part of the said pontiff and other orthodox *paṇḍitas* to regard as the works of Śaṅkara all those that purport to be written by him. But Mr. Sarma is not an orthodox *paṇḍita*; he has passed the Honours B. A. examination, and it is expected of him and others like him that they should not blindly follow the opinions of orthodox *paṇḍitas*. Considering specially the views already expressed on this subject by Prof. Winternitz and other modern scholars (see below), Mr. Sarma would have done well if he had used his own critical judgment and satisfied himself first that the *Viveka-cūdāmaṇi*, and for that matter the commentary on the *Nṛsiṃha-tāpanī*, were really the works of Śaṅkara before citing passages from them.

Mr. Sarma seems to follow the lead of orthodox *paṇḍitas* in another matter also, to wit, in his manner of referring to books. In l. c. 2,50, n. 4, he writes that Śaṅkara cites Gk. I., 16 'in his *Sūtra-bhāṣya*'; on p. 43, he refers to the views of Pt. Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭācārya without saying where they have been published; and in l. c. 3,50, n. 1, he refers to the views of Walliser without, again, indicating where these have been published. The suffering reader cannot help wishing that Mr. Sarma would abandon the lead of orthodox *paṇḍitas* and follow modern writers, at least, in the matter of giving precise references in all such cases.

2. Note the use by this author of the incorrect expression अत ऊर्ध्व instead of अतः परं. Similarly, the expression तान् विहायैव, though not incorrect, is decidedly inferior to तान् विनैव.

3. It does not appear to me to be explicit at all. The author's use of the term *śloka* seems to me to indicate that he too thought that the *kārīkās* or *ślokas* were the work of a human author. If he had thought that the *ślokas* were *śruti*, he would then, it seems to me, assuredly have used the word *mantra*; for, we have to remember that it is only in *śruti* passages that the word *śloka* is used to denote *mantra*. I have not so far come across any passage in the writings of human authors in which the word *śloka* is used to denote metrical *śruti* passages.

opening of his commentary on Gk. 11, he writes, ज्ञातं द्वैतं न विषय इत्युक्तम् । आगममात्रं तन् । तत्रोपपत्त्यापि वैतथ्यं शक्यतेऽवधारयितुमिति द्वितीयं प्रकरणमारभ्यते । and thus ascribes to the pāda ज्ञातं द्वैतं न विषयते [= Gk. 1. 18d.] the character of *s'ruti*. He does so again in the beginning of his commentary on Gk. III where he writes, ओंकारनिर्णय उक्तः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत आत्मेति प्रतिज्ञामात्रेण । ज्ञातं द्वैतं न विषय इति च । अद्वैतं किमागममात्रेण प्रतिपत्तव्यमाहोस्वित्तर्केणापीत्यत आह । शक्यते तर्केणापि ज्ञातुम् । and also in his commentary on *Māṇḍūkya* 7 where he writes, अन्तः प्रकादिनिवृत्तिसमकालमेव प्रमातृत्वादिनिवृत्तेः । तथा च वक्ष्यति- 'ज्ञातं द्वैतं न विषय' इति ।

(4) In the course of his commentary on the *Viṣṇu-sahasra-nāma* (s. v. *viśva*), Śaṅkara writes, ओमित्येतदध्वरमित्युपक्रम्य..... स मुनि-नेतरो जनः । ..... इत्यादिभ्यः श्रुतिभ्यः and thus explicitly says that the whole of the *Āgama-prakaraṇa*, consisting of the *Māṇḍūkya* and the 29 *kārīkās* is *s'ruti*, while he quotes, later on, the following three *kārīkās* :

मनोविर्जुषितं चेतश्चिच्छित्सचराचरम् । मनसो ह्यमनीभावे द्वैतीभावात्तदाप्रयातः ॥  
यथैतं प्रपञ्चस्य तन्निवर्त्य (for निवर्त्यम्?) हि चेतसा । मनोवृत्तिमयं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः ॥ यथा स्वप्ने द्रयाभासं चित्तं चलति मायया । तथा जाग्रद्द्रयाभासं चित्तं चलति मायया ॥ from the undisputed portion of the Gk. and says expressly that they are from *Gaudapādiya* (इत्यादि गौडपादीये). That is to say, here too he makes it plain that the *kārīkās* in Gk. I and *Māṇḍūkya* are *s'ruti* while Gk. II-IV are not.

(5) In his commentary on the sūtra लोकस्वात् तु लीलाकैवल्यम् (*Brahma-sūtra* 2. 1. 33), Śaṅkara has written as follows : नदीभरस्य प्रयोजनान्तरं निरूप्यमाणं न्यायतः श्रुतितो वा संभवति । न च स्वभावः पर्यनुयोज्यं शक्यते । यद्यप्यस्माकमियं जगद्बिम्बरचना गुह्यतरसंरंभेवाभाति तथापि परमेभरस्य लोकेव केवलेयम् । अपारेमितशक्तित्वात् । यदि नाम लोके लीलास्वपि किञ्चित् सूक्ष्मं प्रयोजनमुत्प्रेक्ष्येत, तथापि नैवात्र किञ्चित् प्रयोजनमुत्प्रेक्षितुं शक्यते । आप्तकामश्रुतेः । नाप्यप्रवृत्तिरुत्तमप्रवृत्तिर्वा । मुदिश्रुतेः सर्वश्रुतेश्च । Śaṅkara here presumably means by आप्तकामश्रुति the *kārīkā* देवस्यैव स्वभावोऽयमाप्तकामस्य का स्पृहा । (Gk. 1. 9), which shows that he regarded as *s'ruti* the *kārīkās* in Gk. 1."

Before examining these arguments, it is necessary that I should make a few observations about the works of Śaṅkara. Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum* (I. 626 ff.) mentions the names of a large number of works attributed to Śaṅkara, including (a) commentaries on the *Brahma-sūtras*, the ten 'major' *Upaniṣads*, the *S'vetāśvatara Upaniṣad* and *Nṛsiṃhatāpanī Upaniṣad* :

(b) commentaries on the *Bhagavad-gītā*, *Viṣṇu-sahasra-nāma* and *Sanatsujātiya*; (c) poems like *Saundarya-lahari*, *Dakṣiṇāmūrti stotra*, *Harim-īde-stotra* and many other similar *stotras*; and (d) works on Vedānta like *Viveka-cūdāmaṇi*, *Upadeśa-sāhasrī*, *Sarva-vedānta-siddhānta-sāra-saṁgraha*, *Vākya-vṛtti*, *Yoga-tārūvali*, *Svātmā-nirūpaṇa*, and *Ātmabodha*. So does 6, 61 f. of the *S'āṅkara-dig-vijaya* also that is reputed to be the work of Vidyāranya. The text of many of these works is printed in the memorial edition of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya's works published by the Vāṇī Vilāsa Press of Śrīraṅgam and in the volumes of the Kāvya-mālā.

These works are not all of the same quality; some show such profundity of thought and give expression to such sublime ideas that only a master-mind could have conceived and written them: others are so commonplace that almost anybody could write them. And it hence becomes plain to the most casual reader that many of the works attributed to Śaṅkara are not written by him, but are in fact written by others. Compare in this connection the following observations made by Prof. Winternitz on III, 433 of his *Geschichte der ind. Litteratur*: "His (Śaṅkara's) chief works are the commentaries on the *Upaniṣads*, on the *Bhagavadgītā*, and on the *Brahma-sūtras*. Numerous independent works are also attributed to him. But it is certain that not all the commentaries and independent works that are ascribed by tradition to Śaṅkara, really have the great master of Vedānta for author." Compare also the following observations of A. Mahādeva Shastri in the preface to Vol. I of his edition of *S'ri S'āṅkarācārya's Miscellaneous Works* (Bibliotheca Sanskrita, No. 19; Mysore, 1898): "Śrī Śaṅkarācārya's commentaries on what is called the *Prasthānatraya*, the three-fold basis of the Vedāntic doctrine comprising the *Upaniṣads*, the *Bhagavadgītā*, and the *S'ārīraka-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra*, are undoubtedly the most genuine of his productions. Besides these, there are many other works—commentaries as well independent treatises on Vedāntic philosophy, and devotional hymns, ascribed to him..... Though under these circumstances, there is no guarantee that all the works that go by his name are his genuine productions...."

Similarly, when writing of the numerous *stotras* that are attributed to Śaṅkara, Winternitz has observed (op. cit. III, 122),

"The great majority of them must, in all the probability, be wrongly ascribed to him."<sup>1</sup>

I, therefore, agree with the above-named two scholars in holding that the only works that can without question be accepted as Śaṅkara's are his commentaries on the *Prasthānatraya* (i.e., on the *Bhagavadgītā*, the 'ten Major' *Upaniṣads*, and the *Brahma-sūtras*)<sup>2</sup>, and that of the other works attributed to him, none should be accepted as his unless ample proof is forthcoming to that effect.<sup>3</sup>

Regarding some of these works, however, there is definite evidence to show that they are not written by Śaṅkara. Thus the pundits who have edited in the Ānandāśrama series the *S'vetā-s'vataropaniṣad* with 'Śaṅkara's' commentary have pointed out that the style employed in this commentary is quite different from that of the commentaries on the major *Upaniṣads*, and for this and other reasons, definitely and justifiably concluded that it was not written by Śaṅkara. Similarly, Pandit Sitārāma Sastri has observed on p. 140 of his *Sahasra-nāmāvali* (2nd ed., 1930, Mysore) that the commentary on the *Lalitā-nāma-tris'atī* that is ascribed by tradition to Śaṅkara, is not really written by him. Similarly, there can be no doubt that the commentary on the *Nṛsimha-tāpani Upaniṣad* that is ascribed<sup>4</sup> to Śaṅkara was not written by him. This is shown by the commentary on the passage ओमित्येतदध्वरिमिदं सर्वं (corresponding to *Māṇḍūkya I.*) where the author has reproduced the words of Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Māṇḍūkya*, including the sentence (see p. 104 in Vol. X of the Śrīraṅgam edition of Śaṅkarācārya's Works), तथा च वक्ष्यति पादा मात्रा मात्राश्च पादा इति । quite

1. See also op. cit. III, 435, lines 12-14 and n. 4; M. Walleser's *Die Buddhistische Philosophie*, p. 36, note and Winternitz's comment on it in op. cit. III, 433, n. 1.

2. It can be seen from the style used in these commentaries that they were all written by the same author. At the same time, I must also observe that the arguments used by me here will lose none of their force even if one thinks that the commentaries on the *Brahma-sūtras*, the *Bhagavadgītā*, and the *Isāvāsya*, *Kena*, *Kaṭha*, *Praśna*, *Muṇḍaka*, *Taittirīya*, *Aitareya*, *Chāndogya*, and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣads* and on the *Māṇḍūkya*, were, each, written by a different author.

3. Winternitz, however, accepts as genuine (op. cit. III, 435) *Upadeśa-sāhasrī*, *Ātmabodha*, and *Svātmānirūpaṇa*.

4. In 6-62 of Vidyāranya's *Śaṅkara-digvijaya* mentioned above.

oblivious of the fact that the *Māṇḍūkya* passage containing these words does not occur at all in the *Nṛsiṃha-tāpanī*. It is not conceivable that the great commentator Śaṅkara would have been so forgetful as to refer to a passage that does not occur at all in the text. This author's explanation of यजत्राः as यजनशीलाः (l. c. p. 4) and (मृगं) न भीमं as अभयङ्करं (pp. 66, 76), too, shows this plainly; for, the Vedic commentators (Sāyaṇa, Skandasvāmin, Bhāskara, Venkaṭamādhava, Uvāṭa, Mahidhara and others) uniformly and correctly explain यजत्र as यष्टव्य or पूजनीय and मृगं न भीमं as मृगमिव भीमं; and it is not conceivable that the great commentator Śaṅkara was ignorant of the correct meanings of these expressions. Similarly, there is no doubt that the *Viveka-cūḍāmaṇi* too is not written by Śaṅkara. Stanza 48 of this work, 'अद्वाभक्ति-ध्यानयोगान्मुमुक्षुर्देहेतुं वा किं साध्यात् श्रुतेर्गीः', refers unmistakably (see Jacob's Concordance to the Upaniṣads) to Kaivalyopaniṣad 2 तस्मिन् स होवाच पितामहश्च अद्वाभक्तिध्यानयोगादवेहि; now this *Upaniṣad* is a late one, and the *Viveka* that refers to it must be still later. Similarly, stanza 250 of the *Viveka* refers to *jahallakṣaṇā* and *ajahal-lakṣaṇā*; the recognition of these two *lakṣaṇās*, too, is comparatively late,<sup>2</sup> and hence their mention in *Viveka*, shows that it was written in later times.

Turn we now to the above-cited arguments of Mr. Sarma. Regarding (1) and (2), I have already shown above that neither

1. The citations are made according to the Mysore Oriental Library edition, in Bibliotheca Sanskrita, No. 22.

It must also be mentioned here that the *Viveka* contains a number of verses that are found in the *Adhyātmopaniṣad*. Verses 1-17, 19-29, 42cd-48, 51-54, 56-63, and 65-69 of the *Upaniṣad* are identical with verses 270-2, 279, 28-93, 301, 319, 318, 323, 326, 331, 355, 388, 390, 399, 401-5, 409, 419, 421-28, 428-9, 440-2, 444, 451-4, 462-472, 485-7, and 491-2 of *Viveka*. It is difficult to determine if the *Upaniṣad* has borrowed the verses from *Viveka* or the latter from the former. It seems to me that it is the *Viveka* that has borrowed and if this view is correct it would be additional evidence to show that the *Viveka* was not written by Śaṅkara; for the *Adhyātmopaniṣad* is patently a late *Upaniṣad*. It is also very probable that the *Viveka* contains stanzas found in other late *Upaniṣads* also. If the *Viveka* had been really written by Śaṅkara, it would without doubt have been cited by later writers. The fact that it is not so cited (I have not found it cited in any work) also shows that it was not written by Śaṅkara but is of late date.

2. See Bhīmācārya Jhalkikar's *Nyāyakośa* under these words: he mentions comparatively later writers only in this connection.

the *Viveka-cūḍāmaṇi* nor the commentary on the *Nṛsiṃhatāpani Upaniṣad* is the work of Śaṅkara. They are both late works, and it is not of interest to us to know what these pseudo-Śaṅkaras thought about the *Māṇḍūkya* and the *Kārikās* in Gk. I.

3. The word *āgama* in the passage cited above, does not mean 'S'ruti' as Mr. Sarma believes. It is synonymous with the word *pratijñā* that is used in the passage cited immediately after, and denotes 'authoritative statement or declaration; proposition; आप्तवाक्य'.<sup>1</sup> This is shown by the words एकमेवाद्वितीयं ब्रह्मत्यादिश्रुतिव्यः that occur in Śaṅkara's commentary immediately after the sentence आगममात्रं तत् and which Mr. Sarma holds (l. c. 2, 48-9) to be interpolations. This is because Mr. Sarma has not comprehended the import of these sentences. Śaṅkara says in them, "It has been said above, 'When the real truth is known, dualism disappears', on the authority of s'ruti passages like एकमेवाद्वितीयं 'The Brahman is one only, without a second'. That is however a mere statement without proof. Therefore the second section now follows here in order to show that the unreality of dualism can be understood by means of reasoning also". To be sure, Śaṅkara has not said in his commentary on Gk. I. 18d. ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते that the statement is based on एकमेवाद्वितीयं ब्रह्म and other similar s'ruti passages; but that is the case, and he refers to it here.<sup>2</sup> Śaṅkara's commentary at the beginning of Gk. II and III thus really indicates that Gk. I. 18 and *Māṇḍūkya* 7 are not s'ruti and Mr. Sarma's argument is based on misapprehension.

4. As regards the commentary on the *Viṣṇu-sahasra-nāma*, the style employed in it shows that it is not, the work of Śaṅkara<sup>3</sup>

1. That the word *āgama* has these meanings also is shown by the St. Petersburg Lexicon, Apte, Monier-Williams, etc.

2. Mr. Sarma observes in a footnote on 2, 49 l. c. "It is a mystery why Śaṅkara should have gone all the way to the *Chāndogya* to cite a s'ruti regarding the unreality of the Universe when he could more easily and naturally have cited one from the *Māṇḍūkya* itself besides the *Kārikā*!" It is precisely because neither the *Māṇḍūkya* nor the *kārikās* were regarded as s'ruti by Śaṅkara that he had to cite here a s'ruti passage as authority for the statement that 'there is no dualism'.

3. This is shown, further, by the explanations he has given of the names also; compare especially his explanation of the names *uttara*, *kṣama*, *nyagrodha*, etc., and likewise his explanation of the word *kasmāi* in the pāda कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम on p. 11 of the above-cited edition.

It is very dissimilar to that used in Śaṅkara's commentaries on the nine major upaniṣads, etc., while, curiously enough, it resembles closely that used in the commentary on the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad. Perhaps it was written by the same pseudo-Śaṅkara as wrote the latter commentary.

The author of the *Viṣṇu-sahasra-nāma-bhāṣya* seems to have had somewhat elastic views as to what is meant by *s'ruti*; for the editors of that book in the Mysore Oriental Library edition have pointed out (pp. 63, 70) that this author has cited as *s'ruti* two passages found in Āpastamba's Śrauta-sūtra and Dharma-sūtra respectively. It is not surprising therefore that he should cite the whole of the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* also as *s'ruti*.

It will be noticed that Mr. Sarma has not identified the stanzas मनोविजृम्भितं, etc., with those in Gk. but has merely said that they occur 'in the undisputed portion of Gauḍapāda's work'. This is disingenuous; for no such passage<sup>1</sup> is to be found in Gk. The third of the stanzas cited is identical with Gk. IV. 61; but the first and second are identical with no kārīkā of Gauḍapāda, and are merely similar to Gk. III. 31 and I. 17. Their quotation in the *Viṣṇu*<sup>2</sup> therefore shows that (1) either the author was acquainted with a work of Gauḍapāda which was different from the Gk; or (2) he was a very slovenly writer and did not take sufficient care to transcribe his quotations correctly. The former contingency is very improbable; and we are hence led to believe that he was a very slovenly writer. Such being the case, the views of such a writer about the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* being *s'ruti* are not worth serious consideration.

5. Mr. Sarma is again disingenuous when he writes (l. c., 2, 50, n. 1) that he does not know of any other *s'ruti* passage containing the word *āpta-kāma* which treats of creation, and that hence the reference in the passage cited is to Gk. I. 9. What Śaṅkara says in the latter half of the passage cited is this: "It is perhaps possible in this world to think of some small purpose

1. The way in which these stanzas are cited in the *Viṣṇu-sahasra-nāma-bhāṣya* shows that these form one passage, that is, that the *śloka*s occur together, one after the other, in the original, and that they are not extracted from different parts of it.

even in connection with play (*līlā*); but, in connection with the Brahman's act of creation, it is not possible to do even that; for it has been declared in the *s'ruti* that it is *āptakāma* (i. e., has all desires realised) and has thus nothing left to wish for. Nor should it be said that there is no act of creation or that it is the act of a madman. For, the *s'ruti* declares that the Brahman [has created, and that It is omniscient." What Śaṅkara is insisting upon is, that the Brahman cannot be said to have any purpose in creating; for purpose implies the attainment of something now unrealised, and it is said in the *śruti* that Brahman has] attained all desires. The word आप्तकाम occurs in Brh. Up. 4, 4, 6: योऽकामो निष्काम आप्तकाम आत्मकामो न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति in connection with the *ātman*, and it becomes plain from Śaṅkara's commentary that these epithets are here applied to Brahman also. Compare his observation सर्वात्मनो हि ब्रह्मणो दृष्टान्तत्वेन प्रदर्शितमेतदुप तद्वा अस्य तदाप्तकाममात्मकाममकामं रूपमिति. And hence there is no doubt that it is this passage that Śaṅkara had in his mind when he wrote his commentary on *Brahma Sūtra* 2. 1. 33.

There is not the slightest reason why Mr. Sarma should search for a *s'ruti* passage dealing with creation and containing the word आप्तकाम. He could, with equal propriety, search for a *s'ruti* passage dealing with creation and containing the word सर्वज्ञ, and because such a passage cannot be found, declare that Śaṅkara is a careless writer who refers to non-existent *s'ruti*-passages.

II. "Sureśvara, the immediate disciple of Śaṅkara", writes Mr. Sarma (2, 53), "is heart and soul in favour of treating the disputed kārīkā[s] [i. e., those in the *Āgama-prakaraṇa*] as *s'ruti* texts. Three of his stanzas in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya-vārtika*, namely, 1. 4. 615; 1. 4. 712<sup>1</sup> and 1. 4. 744, expressly refer to three disputed kārīkā[s] as *śruti* (Ānandagiri too when commenting on these stanzas faithfully identifies them with

1. '713' in Mr. Sarma's article is a misprint. There is nothing said here, either by Sureśvara or by Ānandagiri, about this kārīkā being a *śruti* or even that it is a quotation from GK. As it happens however this stanza is cited by Sureśvara in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* (IV. 41), and there he has said distinctly (in IV 44 ab) that it was written by Gauḍapāda. We may therefore leave it out of consideration.

the *kārikās* of GK. I), while he quotes four other *kārikās* from the undisputed portion [i. e., Gk. II-IV] and plainly mentions Gaudapāda's authorship of them".

This statement of Mr. Sarma's is not quite correct : one of the three stanzas referred to, namely, 1. 4. 712 reads as कार्यकारणबद्धी and is identical with GK. 1, 11. Ānandagiri's comment on this is as follows : अज्ञानेन स्वापे जागरादौ अज्ञानतज्जाभ्यां प्रतिबद्धं तत्त्वमित्यत्र मानमाह - कार्येति ।

Stanza 744 reads : विश्वो हि स्थूलभुङ्गित्यं तैजसः प्रविविक्तभुक् । आनन्द-भुक् तथा प्राज्ञ इति चागमशासनम् ॥ Ānandagiri comments on it: अत्रापि श्रुति पठति-विश्वो हीति, but has not cited in full the *s'ruti* passage he has in mind. Now, stanza 72 of *Yoga-cūḍāmaṇi*, *Upaniṣad* reads as विश्वो हि स्थूलभुङ्गित्यं तैजसः प्रविविक्तभुक् । आनन्दभुक् तथा प्राज्ञः, सर्वसाक्षीत्यतः परः ॥ while the statement विश्वः स्थूलभुङ्गित्यं is found in the *Nārada-parivrajaka* and *Nṛsiṃhottaratāpini Upaniṣads*, the statement तैजसः प्रविविक्तभुक् in the latter *upaniṣad* and in the *Rāmottaratāpini Upaniṣad*, and the statement आनन्दभुक् प्राज्ञः in all the three *Upaniṣads* named. All these are, in the eyes of orthodox pandits *s'ruti* texts; and the term आगमशासनं used by Sureśvara refers without doubt to one of these texts in case it means *s'ruti-vacas*.

I feel however very doubtful if Sureśvara has used the word in that sense. शासनं is a synonym of the cognate word शास्त्रं and Sureśvara uses it in that sense in, for instance, op. cit. 4. 4. 38 (p. 1730) : न च वेदान्तसिद्धान्ते परमात्मातिरेकतः । इष्टं विकारकृद्भुक्तु यथा कपि-लशासने ॥ आगमशासनं means therefore आगमशास्त्रम्<sup>1</sup> that is, वेदान्तशास्त्रं which is the same as वेदान्तसिद्धान्त used in the above-cited verse. The meaning, therefore, of Sureśvara's verse 1. 4. 744 is, "Viśva is the enjoyer of the gross, Taijasa of the subtle, and Prājña of bliss : this is the teaching of Vedāntaśāstra"; and the reference is, not to any particular *śruti* text, but the teaching of the Vedānta-śāstra, which means, to Sureśvara, of the Advaita school of Vedānta. Compare in this connection the words वेदानुशासन and

1. Āgama-śāstra is, as I have shown in my above mentioned article (p. 190), the name of Gauḍapāda's work; and though it is very probable that Sureśvara had I. 3 of this work in his mind when he wrote the above stanza, it is not likely that the word āgama-śāsana used by him refers to the name of this work.

श्रुतिशासन that occur in the following passages : *S'ātyāyanīyopaniṣad* 10 :

त्रिदण्डं वैष्णवं लिङ्गं विप्राणां मुक्तिसाधनम् ।  
निर्वाणं सर्वधर्माणामिति वेदानुशासनम् ॥ ibid. 29.  
परिव्राज्यं गृहीत्वा तु यः स्वधर्मे न तिष्ठति ।  
तमारुढच्युतं विद्यादिति वेदानुशासनम् ॥ ibid. 32.  
संन्यस्तमिति यो ब्रूयात्कण्ठस्थप्राणवानपि ।  
तारिताः पितरस्तेन इति वेदानुशासनम् ॥ ibid. 37.  
यस्य देवे परा भक्तिर्यथा देवे तथा गुरौ ।  
स ब्रह्मविस्परं प्रेयादिति वेदानुशासनम् ॥

and Nārada-parivrajakopaniṣad (p. 550) :

यं यं वापि स्मरन् भावं त्यजत्यन्ते कलेवरम् ।  
तं तमेव समाप्नोति नान्यथा श्रुतिशासनम् ॥<sup>1</sup>

Compare also the word श्रुतिशासनं used by Sureśvara in op. cit. 5. 1. 81 (p. 1961) : एकधैवानुविज्ञेयमिति च श्रुतिशासनम्. The reference here is to Brh. Up. 4. 4. 20 : एकधैवानुदृष्टव्यम् and this stanza makes it plain that in such statements Sureśvara is not quoting the exact words of the *śruti*, but is referring to their purport.

This is the case in 1. 4. 615 also (स्वप्ननिद्रायुतावायौ प्राज्ञस्त्वस्वप्ननिद्रया इत्यादिस्थानभेदोऽपि वेदान्तोक्तौ विनिश्चितः ॥) which has been referred to by Mr. Sarma. The expression वेदान्तोक्तौ विनिश्चितः means, 'is taught definitely in the Vedānta-śāstra', and refers to the teaching conveyed by the words स्वप्ननिद्रा...निद्रया; it does not mean "The difference in locality too is taught definitely in the *s'ruti*, स्वप्न...निद्रया.' The reference of course is to the teaching contained in GK. I. 11, and Brh. Up. 4. 3; see Śaṅkara's commentary on the latter.

Regarding the expression वेदान्तोक्तौ विनिश्चितः, compare the following passages; GK. II. 12.

कलयत्यात्मनात्मानमात्मा देवः स्वमायया । स एव बुध्यते भेदानिति वेदान्तनिश्चयः ॥ *Kṣurikopaniṣad* 10. ततो रक्तोत्पलाभासं पुरुषायतनं महत् । दहरं पुण्डरीकं तद्वेदान्तेषु निगद्यते । *Jābāladars'anopaniṣad*, 10. सर्वं सत्यं परं

1. This is a particularly interesting instance; if, like Mr. Sarma, one were to interpret the word *śruti-śāsanam* as 'these are the words of the *śruti*', one would then have to conclude that this stanza and the Bhagavad-gītā as a whole in which it occurs, are *śruti*.



न चान्यदिति या मतिः । तच्च सत्यं वरं प्रोक्त वेदान्तज्ञानपारगः । The terms वेदान्तनिश्चयः, वेदान्तेषु निगद्यते, वेदान्तज्ञानपारगैः प्रोक्तम् and वेदान्तोक्तौ विनिश्चितः all signify the same thing, namely, 'It is taught in the Vedānta Śāstra.'

Ānandagiri, on the other hand comments on this stanza as follows : स्थानभेदे श्रुतिं प्रमाणयति स्वमति... दक्षितश्रुतरथं संगृह्णाति-इत्यादीति । I do not believe that his explanation is correct and that the hemistich स्वप्न निद्रया has been cited as śruti by Sureśvara ; see the passages cited above. In any case, even Ānandagiri has not said that the passage cited is from the Āgama-prakaraṇa.

(To be continued)

## SOME HISTORICAL AND QUASI-HISTORICAL INCIDENTS IN KAUṬALYA'S ARTHAŚĀSTRA

(B. A. Saleore)

### I

In his chapter on "The Shaking off of the Aggregate of the Six Enemies" in Book I concerning Discipline, Kauṭalya alludes to certain historical events which have till now remained unexplained. He affirms the following :—"Whosoever is of reverse character, whoever has not his organs of sense under his control, will soon perish, though possessed of the whole earth bounded by the four quarters." "For example," he continues, "Bhoja, known also by the name Dāṇḍakya, making a lascivious attempt on a Brahman maiden, perished along with his kingdom and relations...Vātāpi, in his attempt under the influence of overjoy to attack Agastya."

The object of this paper is to give the above historical incidents alluded to by Kauṭalya, reserving for a later treatment others mentioned by him. Mahāmahopādhyāya Arthśāstraviśārada Dr. R. Shama Sastry commented on the first example of Bhoja thus :—"No Purāṇa mentions the particular historical incident in connection with some of the kings."<sup>2</sup> But the source of the

1. Kauṭalya, *Arthśāstra*, Bk. I. Ch. VI, pp. 10-11 (Sastry's ed. 1929).
2. *Ibid*, p. 11, n. 1.

first allusion is the *Rāmāyaṇa* where in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* the whole story of the fate that befell Dāṇḍakya is given.

On Rāma enquiring of Kumbhayoni (Agastya) why the dense forest in which the king Śveta had formerly performed severe penances, was divested of birds and animals, Agastya relates the following story—That in the golden age there lived king Manu, who, after installing the irrepressible Ikṣvāku on the throne, and after advising him on the method of meting out punishment (*daḍḍa*) only to the deserving, repaired to the region of Brahmā. Ikṣvāku had a hundred sons of whom the youngest became stupid, ignorant and disrespectful to his elders. Thereupon Ikṣvāku, as a sort of punishment, named him Daṇḍa and allotted to him the region between the Vindhya and Śaivala. This beautiful region Daṇḍa governed well with the aid of his preceptor Uśanas, called also the Kavi Śukra, and renowned for his intelligence and wealth. Śukra was a most famous member of the Bhārgava family. The capital of Daṇḍa was named Madhumanta.

For many years Daṇḍa ruled wisely ; but one day he chanced to come to the hermitage of his preceptor Śukra, just when the beautiful daughter of the latter was walking in the forest near by. Filled with lust Daṇḍa asked her whose daughter she was ; and she replied that she was the daughter of his preceptor and that her name was Arajā. She warned him not to lay his hands on her, not only because she was a maid under the guardianship of her father but also because her father was Daṇḍa's own preceptor. She advised Daṇḍa that, in case he desired to win her he might ask the permission of her father which would easily be given. If, however, Daṇḍa forcibly seized her, he would be reduced to ashes by her irascible father. But maddened as Daṇḍa was by desire, he forcibly ravished her and speedily returned to his capital. Arajā cried out loudly in the forest at no distance from the hermitage, and waited for her father who was away on a visit to the celestials.

When Śukra returned to his hermitage, one of his disciples related to him all that had transpired during his absence. Uśanas burned with rage on beholding his daughter in that wretched plight. Turning to his disciples he said that that day they



## RULES

I. All contributors are requested to be so good as to observe the following directions:—

- (i) To keep the first half of the first page of their Ms. blank.
- (ii) To type their Ms. on one side of the page only.
- (iii) To number the pages consecutively after having fully revised their Ms. and to see that their article is entirely complete before sending it to the Journal.

(iv) To use the diacritical marks given below.

II. All contributions will be duly acknowledged.

III. The Editor reserves the right of accepting or refusing any contribution without assigning any reason thereof.

IV. All contributions, books for review and remittances may kindly be sent to The Manager, *The Poona Orientalist*, 15, Shukrawar, Poona 2.

V. The Annual Subscription is Rs. 6 in India or 10 Shillings and 6 pence., or 3 Dollars outside India.

### System of Transliteration

|   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |   |    |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|---|----|
| अ | आ | इ | ई | उ | ऊ | ऋ  | ॠ | ए | ऐ  | ओ | औ  |
| a | ā | i | ī | u | ū | r  | l | e | ai | o | au |
| क | ख | ग | घ | ङ | च | छ  | ज | झ | ञ  | ट | ठ  |
| ṅ | ṇ | ṅ | n | m | c | ch | m | h | ś  | ṣ | s  |

N. B.—For the convenience of scholars a limited number of offprints of important articles will be kept on sale and can be had of the Manager. All correspondence relating to advertisement, business, etc., should be addressed to the Manager.

THE POONA ORIENTALIST,

15, Shukrawar, Poona 2.

Printer:—S. R. Sardesai, B.A., LL.B., Navin Samarth Vidyalaya's

'Samarth Bharat Press,' 947 Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2.

Publisher:—Dr. N. G. Sardesai, L.M. & S. for the Oriental Book Agency, 15 Shukrawar, Poona 2.

## THE POONA ORIENTALIST

A quarterly journal devoted to Oriental studies

Vol. I ]

JULY 1936

[ No. 2

### Editorial

We have great pleasure in publishing below Sir Jadunath Sarkar's letter to Dr. N. G. Sardesai in which the learned *Savant* has very kindly helped us in identifying तेजपुर. We regret to state that on account of some unavoidable circumstances, no enquiry could be made about the author's *gotra*, but we are trying our utmost to come into touch with certain people at Tejpura and shall publish the results in our next issue:—

Darjiling, 20 May 1936.

Dear Dr. Sardesai,

Received your *Poona Orientalist*, first number. Page 26 of it, Tejpura is a small State in Katosan subdivision of the Mahikantha District, 23°. 28 N. 72°. 16 E. (Please consult Campbell's *Bombay Gazetteer*, Mahikantha volume for details.)\* From the fact that the MS was written in the Nemi-nāth temple and the minute information given about the author's *gotra* &c., you can easily find out by a local inquiry whether the family is there still.

I was at first tempted to identify *Tejpur* with *Suryapur* or *Suryanagar*, i.e., Surat, because तेज: also means the Sun and the Moon (see *Shākuntala तेजोद्वयस्य युगपद्वयसमोदय* &c.), but in 1561 Surat was not in Akbar's possession. With best regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd. Jadunath Sarkar.

\* "Tejpura, in Katosan, has three villages, with a population of 1241 souls, and a yearly revenue of about £500 (Rs. 5000). Neither following primogeniture nor holding a patent of adoption, the present chiefs, Jethaji and Himtaji, Makvana Kolis by caste, ranking in the seventh class, pay the Gaikwar a yearly tribute, *ghasdāna*, of £31 (Rs. 310)." *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. V., p. 428.—Editor.

## ARE THE GAUḌAPĀDA-KĀRIKĀS ŚRUTI ?

(A. Venkatasubbiah)

We thus find that Sureśvara has not said (or suggested) anywhere that any *kārikā* in the *Āgamaprakaraṇa* is *śruti*; what he has said is, that it is definitely taught in the Vedānta that 'Viśva is the enjoyer of the subtle' etc.; and that 'both Viśva and Taijasa have *svapna* and *nidrā*', etc. This statement certainly does not mean that the words *विश्वो हि स्थूलम्* etc., are found in *śruti* texts.

For the rest, it is true that, as Mr. Sarma writes (3, 52), there is a pronounced difference between the *Āgamaprakaraṇa* and the following three. The former contains (as already observed on p. 182 of my above-mentioned article), propositions without any reasoning: the latter three contain the reasoned arguments which are used to demonstrate the falseness of *dvaita* and the reality of *advaita*. The propositions of the former have not been given out for the first time by Gauḍapāda: they are part of the teachings of the Upaniṣads (see in this connection Brh. Up. 2. 1 and 4. 3; and Praśna IV and Śaṅkara's commentary thereon), and can therefore only be described as 'the teachings of Vedānta-śāstra'; the arguments found in the latter, on the other hand, are, so far as we know, first employed by Gauḍapāda, and can only be described as 'the arguments of Gauḍapāda'. This explains why Sureśvara has made explicit mention of Gauḍapāda when he refers to the statements contained in GK. II-IV, and why, on the other hand, he mentions as 'the teachings of the Vedāntaśāstra' the teachings contained in the *Āgamaprakaraṇa*. He could of course have said, even in connection with the latter, that they were 'the teachings of Gauḍapāda'; but he has not done so, presumably, because a 'teaching of the Vedāntaśāstra' is, as such, more authoritative than a 'teaching of Gauḍapāda'.

III. "Besides the passages referred to above in his commentary on Sureśvara's work", writes Mr. Sarma (3, 54; 2, 44), "Ānandagiri refers to the hemistich *अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते* [= GK. I. 16 ab] as *śruti* in his commentary on Sure-

śvara's *Sambandhavārtika* (st. 182; p. 58) where he writes 'अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते', 'प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव विद्वन्नादी उभावपि', 'नासदासीनो सदासीत्', 'आसीदिदं तमोभूतम्', 'मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यात्', 'माया शेषा मया सृष्टा', 'भूयश्चान्ते विश्वमायानिवृत्तिः', 'मायामेतां तरन्ति ते', इति श्रुतिस्मृतिभिरेव सिद्धेः. It is clear that the first passage cited (namely, *anādi-māyayā...*) from its very place at the head of the quotation, must be a *śruti* text since otherwise it would be little short of an unpardonable sacrilege to relegate *śrutis* to a secondary place and give the first place of honour to a *Kārikā* of Gauḍapāda. Ānandagiri, surely would not be guilty of such sacrilege. (b) In his sub-commentary on the *Māṇḍūkya*, too, he has written श्रीगौडपादाचार्यस्य नारायणप्रसादतः प्रतिपन्नान् माण्डूक्योपनिषदर्थोपकरणपरानपि श्लोकानाचार्यप्रणीतान् व्याचिख्यासुः and thus made a distinction between the *kārikās* in the first *prakaraṇa* and those in the other three. The former he attributes to the grace of Nārāyaṇa, Madhva attributes them to Brahmā; and anyhow all are agreed that these *kārikās* were not written by Gauḍapāda."

In the passage cited above from Ānandagiri's commentary on the *Sambandhavārtika*, it will be seen that he has cited *Bhagavad-gītā* 13, 19 immediately after GK. I. 16 and *Manu* I. 5 before *S'vetāś.* 4. 10. That is to say, he has no thoughts of the superiority of *śruti* over *smṛti* but has cited passages from both just as they came into his mind. If however one prefers to follow Mr. Sarma in his reasoning, one will have to declare the *Bhagavad-gītā* too to be *śruti*; for the observations of Mr. Sarma apply with equal force to the *Bhagavad-gītā* also.

As for the above-cited passage from Ānandagiri's sub-commentary on the *Māṇḍūkya*, it must be admitted that it is somewhat obscure, and not very intelligible. But, if, instead of making conjectures, Mr. Sarma had read that work right to the end, he would have found out that Ānandagiri has plainly indicated more than once that the *kārikās* in the *Āgamaprakaraṇa* are not *śruti*. Thus, for instance, before explaining st. 1, he writes, आचार्यमाण्डूक्योपनिषदं पठित्वा तद्व्याख्यानश्लोकवतारणमत्रेत्यादिनाकृतम्; and in explaining st. 10 and 19, he writes नान्तःप्रशमित्यादिश्रुत्युक्तेऽर्थे तद्विवरणरूपान् श्लोकानवतारयति and पादानां मात्राणां च यदेकत्वं समितिं श्रुत्योपन्यस्तं तत्र श्रुत्यर्थविवरणरूपान् पूर्ववदेव श्लोकानवतारयति and thus draws a distinction between the *śruti* and *ślokas* that explain it. In explaining st. 24,

he writes यथा पूर्वमाचार्येण श्रुत्यर्थप्रकाशकाः श्लोकाः प्रणीताः and thus says explicitly that the *śloka*s explanatory of the *śruti*, i. e., the *kārikās* of the *Āgamaprakaraṇa*, have been written by the *ācārya*. Similarly, he writes in his explanation of the stanza प्रज्ञावैशाखवेध etc., at the end, परमगुरुनागमशास्त्रस्य व्याख्यातस्य प्रणेनृत्वेन व्यवस्थितान् and says that the *Āgama-śāstra* (i. e. the work commented on by Śāṅkara and consisting of what is known as *Māṇḍūkya* and *Gauḍapāda-kārikās*) was written by the *ācārya*. Thus these passages make it plain beyond doubt that Ānandagiri held that the *kārikās* in the *Āgamaprakaraṇa* too were written by the *ācārya*.

For the rest, it is shown by the sentences आचार्यो हि पुरा बदरिकाश्रमे नरनारायणाधिष्ठिते नारायणं भगवन्तमभिप्रेत्य तपो महदतप्यत । ततो भगवानतिप्रसन्नस्तस्मै विद्यां प्रादात् found in Ānandagiri's commentary on GK. IV. I that what the आचार्य (i. e., Gauḍapāda) received from Nārāyaṇa was not the *kārikās*, but the *vidyā*, that is, Brahman-vidyā. After thus receiving the *vidyā* and becoming proficient in it, he composed the work *Āgamaśāstra* which contains the essence of the teaching of the Upaniṣads in order to help suffering mankind. Compare the stanza प्रज्ञावैशाखवेध...referred to above.

IV. "Many of the *kārikās* contained in the *Āgamaprakaraṇa*", writes Mr. Sarma (l. c. 2, 37 ff.), "inculcate doctrines opposed to those of the *Advaitins*, and cannot therefore have been written by Gauḍapāda, who is, above all, a pucca *advaitin*. *Kārikās* 17, 18, for instance, are extremely fatal to *Advaitic* dogmas; for they really serve to establish, as pointed out by Vādirāja Svāmin ( *Yuktimallika*, p. 435 ) and the author of the *Nārōpantiya*, the reality of the world. Similarly, the *advaitic* view that the creation is an illusion and a myth, स्वप्नमायासरूपा मृष्टिः, is one of those that are criticised and declared to be unsatisfactory in *kārikās* 7-9. The *advaitin* teacher Gauḍapāda cannot, obviously, be the author of these *kārikās* which thus refute his own views. (b) The word *vinīcitāḥ* too used in *kārikā* 8 ( इच्छामात्रं प्रभोः मृष्टिरिति मृष्टौ विनिश्चिताः ) shows that it is the considered opinion of the author of the *kārikās* that *sr̥ṣṭi* is real and has its origin in the *icchā* (will) of the Lord. According to the *advaitic* interpretation, however, it is pointless. Why should Gauḍapāda use such a term of eulogy in connection with a *pūrvapakṣa*? The employment of this term too therefore shows that these *kārikās* (1-29) are not written by

Gauḍapāda. (c) This is likewise shown, further, by the fact that the first twenty-nine *kārikās* are thrust between the sentences of the Upaniṣad. Gauḍapāda was, after all, a commentator, and no commentator, however eminent, would allow his commentary to thrust itself in between the passages of the original and thus jeopardize its sanctity as a piece of revelation. (d) The words अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति also that introduce the *kārikās* in the *Āgamaprakaraṇa* show that they have not been written by Gauḍapāda. The most natural interpretation of these words is to regard them as forming part of the Upaniṣad itself; compare the similar expressions—तदेष श्लोकः, तदेष श्लोको भवति, तदेष श्लोको भवतः तदेषतदुच्चार्युक्तं, तदुक्तं ऋषिणा, etc., that introduce *śloka*s (i. e. *mantras*) in the *Praśna* (1, 10; 3, 11; 4, 10; 5, 5; 6, 5), *Brhad.* (4. 2. 3; 6. 3. 11; 6. 4. 8), *Muṇḍaka* (3. 2. 9), and *Aitareya* (2. 4. 4) Upaniṣads. Even if we regard them as the words of Gauḍapāda, it would follow that he is citing *śloka*s that were already current in his time and that must therefore have been written by some one else earlier; and thus, in any case, Madhva's attitude towards the *kārikās* is found to be justified."

Regarding (a), it must be observed that Mr. Sarma is a follower of Madhva and naturally gives preference to the interpretations of Madhva and his school. To an unbiassed reader, however, it is the interpretation of Madhva (of the *Kārikās* in GK. I) that appears to be forced and unnatural, and that of Śāṅkara that seems to be natural; compare in this connection the commentary of Kūranārāyaṇa and note how closely his explanation of *kārikās* 17, 18 and 7-9 (and in fact, of the *Āgamaprakaraṇa* as a whole) resembles that of Śāṅkara. As a matter of fact, even Madhva's explanation<sup>1</sup> of *kārikā* 18 is essentially the same as that of Śāṅkara; and it can be seen that there is nothing in it that is 'fatal to *advaitic* dogmas'.

Mr. Sarma is mistaken in thinking that the proposition मृष्टिः मायासरूपा represents the view of *Advaitins*. It does not; the

1. विकल्पो देहबन्धादिः केनचित्कारणेन तु ।  
कल्पितो विनिवर्तत गुस्वाक्यादसंशयः ॥  
एष एव सतां वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥  
निवर्तत तथाऽज्ञानं तत आनन्दमेत्यसौ ॥

teaching of *advaita* is *सृष्टिः माया* (or *मायामात्रम्*). The proposition *सृष्टिः मायासरूपा* would make out that *sr̥ṣṭi* is real, and is therefore rightly included among unsatisfactory teachings in GK. I. 7-9.

Regarding (b), Mr. Sarma and Jayatirtha<sup>1</sup> are mistaken in thinking that the word *vinīṣcitāḥ* cannot be used in connection with a *pūrvapakṣa* and that its use in *kārikā* 8 shows that: इच्छामात्रं प्रभोः सृष्टिः is the considered view (or *siddhānta*) of the author of the *Kārikās*. Compare in this connection stanzas 4. 4. 561 ff. in Suresvara's *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya-vārtika* (p. 1812 f.)

मोक्षमार्गे यथोक्तेऽस्मिन्नविद्योपप्लुताशयाः ।  
दर्शनानि विचित्राणि कल्पयन्ति यथारुचि ॥ ५६१ ॥  
शुक्लं ब्रह्मातिसंशुद्धमिति केचिद्विनिश्चिताः ।  
शरदि व्योमवल्लीलमित्याहुरपरे जनाः ॥ ५६२ ॥  
पिङ्गलं तत् परं ग्रहं वह्निज्वालेव शाश्वतम् ।  
वैदूर्यवच्च हरितं केचिदाहुर्विपश्चितः ॥ ५६३ ॥  
अपरे लोहितं प्रादुर्जपाकुसुमसंनिभम् ।  
यथा रूपे तथा ज्ञेया शब्दादिष्वपि कल्पना ॥ ५६४ ॥  
अविद्यापटसंवीतचेतसामागमादृते ।  
कामापहतबुद्धीनामेवमाद्या विकल्पनाः ॥ ५६५ ॥  
एकमेवैकरूपं सदस्त्वज्ञातं निरञ्जनम् ।  
जात्यन्धगजदृष्टेव कोटिशः कल्पयते मृषा ॥ ५६६ ॥  
अस्थूलाशब्दनेतीति सर्वमात्रादिनिहुतेः ।  
कुतोऽकारणकार्येऽस्मिन्नुक्तादेः सम्भवः परे ॥ ५६७ ॥

and note the use of the word *vinīṣcitāḥ* in st. 562 in connection with a *pūrvapakṣa*.

With regard to (c), Mr. Sarma's description that 'the *kārikās* thrust themselves in between the sentences of the original' is not quite correct. The *Māṇḍūkya* consists, as observed by Mr. Sarma himself (l. c. 3, 47; n. 2), of four *khaṇḍas* or sections; and the *kārikās*, introduced by the words अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति are added at the end only of each of these sections and nowhere else. As pointed out by me in my afore-mentioned article in the *Ind. Antiquary*, (p. 189. n. 22), one can see a similar addition of *ślokas* at the end of

1. In connection with this author, see *Review of Philosophy and Religion*, 2, 40; n. 4.

the chapters in Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* and the *Carakasamhitā*. The *Māṇḍūkya* is, as I have shown in loc. cit., written by Gauḍapāda; and he has, like the authors of the above-named works, added *ślokas* at the end of each section of this work.

(d) I agree with Mr. Sarma that the words अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति must be regarded as forming part of the *Māṇḍūkya* and that they are not newly added by a later commentator. As observed by Mr. Sarma (l. c. 2, 43), "it is ludicrous to believe that Gauḍapāda began his treatise in the most abrupt manner possible without any benedictory verse and plunged into the subject with a mere-'so it is' ".<sup>1</sup>

V. In l. c. 2, 43, Mr. Sarma lays stress on the fact that Śaṅkara has not mentioned the name of Gauḍapāda anywhere in his commentary on the *Āgamaśāstra*, and regards it as additional evidence pointing to the conclusion that the first twenty-nine *kārikās* were not written by Gauḍapāda. This is a very strange argument; why should we deprive Gauḍapāda of the honour of having written the GK because Śaṅkara has not chosen to mention it? Again, this argument applies with equal force to the *kārikās* in the later three *prakaraṇas* also, and according to Mr. Sarma, these too should be judged to be not the work of Gauḍapāda.

As a matter of fact, Śaṅkara has indicated that the *Āgamaśāstra* was written by Gauḍapāda; see p. 184 in *Ind. Ant. Vol. LXII*. Only, according to the *saṃpradāya* prevalent in India he does not mention him by name but refers to him as *ācārya*. It may here

1. But Mr. Sarma's reasoning contained in his observation (2, 44; n. 1), "it appears to me that Gauḍapāda's beginning his treatise without the usual benediction is highly unaccountable and tends to argue forcibly against his authorship of the first twenty-nine *Kārikās*", seems to me to be most strange. Because there is no benedictory verse, why should the *kārikās* in the first *prakaraṇa* alone be believed to be not the work of Gauḍapāda, and not those in the two following *prakaraṇas* also? It is only the fourth *prakaraṇa* that has a benedictory verse in the beginning and that can, according to Mr. Sarma's reasoning, be pronounced to be the work of Gauḍapāda.

As a matter of fact however Mr. Sarma is mistaken in believing that there is no *maṅgala* in the beginning of Gauḍapāda's work; see pp. 182-183 in my afore-mentioned article in the *Ind. Ant.*

be noted that, similarly, Ānandagiri too has nowhere in his sub-commentaries on Śaṅkara's commentaries mentioned Śaṅkara by name.

VI. Mr. Sarma observes on l. c. 2, 42, that though Vyāsātīrtha in his *Nyāyāmṛta* has referred to some *kārikās* in GK. I by the name of *śruti*, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in his criticism of that work (i. e. in his *Advaitasiddhi*) has passed by this matter and said nothing to show that he did not subscribe to this opinion; and Mr. Sarma has therefore arrived at the conclusion that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī acquiesced in this opinion of Vyāsātīrtha.

This conclusion is illegitimate. The works written by *dvaitin* writers are, in the eyes of *advaitins*, as full of errors and mistakes as a sieve is of holes.<sup>1</sup> Hence an *advaitin* who wants to refute the opinion expressed in a *dvaitin* work must be content to pick out some opinions only for refutation and overlook the rest; for he cannot, even if he be most industrious, hope to refute in detail all the errors and mistakes that he sees in it.

As regards the particular opinion in question, it would have been a waste of words over a mere matter of nomenclature if Madhusūdana had said anything about it. For, GK. being a work of acknowledged authority among *advaitins*, the teachings contained in the *kārikās* command the respect of Madhusūdana even without being *śruti*. And that is why he has not troubled to refute Vyāsātīrtha's opinion that the *kārikās* are *śruti*.

This explains why the other *advaitin* writers mentioned by Mr. Sarma in l. c. 3, 45, namely Appayya Dikṣita, Gauḍa-Brahmānanda and others, have not troubled to refute the opinion of Madhva and his followers that the *kārikās* in GK I are *śruti*. And hence, it is illegitimate in their case too to conclude that they acquiesced in this opinion.

VII. "Vijñāna Bhikṣu in his *Sāṅkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya*" writes Mr. Sarma further in l. c. 2, 44 ff., "cites two verses that are found in GK. II-IV. One of these verses is

यथैकस्मिन् घटाकाशे रजोधूमादिभिर्वृत्ते ।  
न च सर्वे प्रयुज्यन्ते एवं जीवाः सुखादिभिः ॥

1. This observation holds good of all writers, of whatever school, that want to refute the opinions expressed in books written by proponents of other schools.

the source of which is mentioned by Bhikṣu as the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*; the other is

न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः ।  
न सुसुखं न सुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥

The first of these verses is found in a slightly different form (यथैकस्मिन् घटाकाशे रजोधूमादिभिर्वृत्ते । न सर्वे संप्रयुज्यन्ते तद्वज्जीवाः सुखादिभिः ॥) in GK. (III. 5); and since the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* is admittedly anterior to Gauḍapāda, it becomes apparent that Gauḍa° has plagiarised a bit here, not without an effort to conceal the same. As regards the second verse, Bhikṣu is quite positive that it is a *śruti*; and here too it becomes apparent that Gauḍa° has simply passed off this *śruti* as his own *kārikā*. Since thus two of the *kārikās* in sections II-IV which are everywhere regarded as the work of Gauḍa°, turn out to be plagiarisms, a serious and genuine suspicion may rightly be entertained regarding the *kārikās* in GK. I also. Madhva's ascription of them to the original *Upaniṣad* is thus a legitimate conjecture. Gauḍa° must have purposely drawn his materials bodily, from various authentic sources while composing his *kārikās*. And he might not have scrupled to use the twenty-nine *kārikās* preserved by current tradition as nucleus to his treatise and might have proceeded, in his zeal, to incorporate them into the body of his work to such an extent that modern *advaitic* tradition has entirely missed the real character of these verses and imagined them to be the original productions of Gauḍapāda."

The views expressed here by Mr. Sarma are, it will be noticed, inconsistent with those which have been reproduced above. Mr. Sarma has said there (1) that it is difficult to believe that Gauḍa° began his work without a benedictory verse and in an abrupt manner with the words अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति or that he could be the author of stanzas whose teachings are opposed to his own; and (2) that Madhva knew of an ancient tradition which identified *kārikās* 1-29 as part of the original *Upaniṣad*. Here, on the other hand, he says (1) that Gauḍa° himself has cleverly incorporated borrowed passages in his work so as to produce the impression that *kārikās* 1-29 were his own, and (2) that Madhva's ascription of them to the *Upaniṣad* is but a conjecture.

The grounds too on which Mr. Sarma convicts Gauḍa° of having plagiarised are of the flimsiest, consisting as they do of unverified statements of Vijñāna Bhikṣu who lived about one thousand years later than Gauḍapāda. Mr. Sarma is not apparently acquainted with the collection known as *One-hundred-and-eight Upaniṣads*. If he had been, he would have known that the stanza न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिः... occurs in no less than four of them, namely, in *Amṛtabindūpaniṣad* (v. 10), *Tripurātāpinī Upaniṣad* (v. 10), *Avadhūtopaniṣad* (v. 8), and *Ātmopaniṣad* (v. 81). These are all, to be sure late *Upaniṣads*; but they are nevertheless *śruti* in the eyes of Indian writers and are referred to as such by them. It is these four *Upaniṣads* (or, one or more of them) that Bhikṣu had in mind, and not GK. II, 31 when he cited the stanza न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिः as *śruti*; and far from Gauḍapāda having plagiarised from an ancient (and now lost) *śruti* text, it is the above-named *Upaniṣads* that have really borrowed from Gauḍapāda. Compare in this connection p. 51 in Vol. 29 (April 1932) of *Theosophy in India* where Dr. Atreya has pointed out numerous instances of later *Upaniṣads* borrowing from the *Vāsiṣṭha-rāmāyaṇa*; see also *Avadhūtopaniṣad* 7 आपूर्यमाणमचलप्रतिष्ठं समुद्रे, ..... which is undoubtedly borrowed from the *Bhagavad-gītā*.

As for the stanza यथैकस्मिन् घटाकाशे<sup>1</sup> Mr. Sarma merely quotes Vijñāna Bhikṣu's observation that it is from the Viṣṇu-purāṇa, but has not attempted to verify this statement.

Again, it is not certain that the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* is anterior to Gauḍapāda; and even if it is, there is no doubt that many of the stanzas now found in it are not original but have been added later. The stanza यथैकस्मिन् घटाकाशे, if it really does occur in it, must, without doubt, be one of these later additions.

It does not at all follow therefore from what Mr. Sarma has said, that Gauḍapāda is a plagiarist; and even if one grants that he is one, it does not follow that the *kārikās* in GK. I are not written by Gauḍapāda but borrowed by him. Further, even granting that these *kārikās* too are borrowed, one should not lose sight of the fact that it is Gauḍapāda who has compiled the work

1. According to the *Viṣṇusahasranāma-bhāṣya* (p. 16) referred to above of pseudo-Śaṅkara, this stanza (with a different reading in *pādas* cd) is from the *Viṣṇudharma*.

known as the *Āgama-śāstra*, and that it is this work of Gauḍapāda which has been commented on by Madhva, Śaṅkara and others. The question therefore whether these stanzas were borrowed by Gauḍapāda or written by him is not relevant at all in this connection. For, these commentators having set forth with the purpose of explaining the work of Gauḍapāda, all the contents of the work are, in the absence of express mention to the contrary, to be attributed by them to Gauḍapāda and to none else.

VIII. The foregoing examination of the arguments urged by Mr. Sarma thus shows that Śaṅkara, Sureśvara, Ānandagiri and the other *advaitin* writers named by him do not, as averred by him, share the view that the *Kārikās* in GK. I are *śruti*. But it is indisputable that this is the opinion of Madhva and his followers, and of Kūranārāyaṇa also.

The *Māṇḍūkya* itself is, as shown by me in the aforementioned article in the *Indian Antiquary*, not *śruti*, but part of the *Āgamaśāstra* which was written by Gauḍapāda, and which consists of what we now know as the *Māṇḍūkya* and the GK. The origin of this work however was forgotten by many, and as early as 750 A.D. the work came to be regarded as an *Upaniṣad* as attested by the Buddhist writer Śāntirakṣita who refers to the *Āgama-śāstra* as उपनिषच्छात्र. The opinion of Ānandagiri and other *advaitin* writers that the *Māṇḍūkya* is an *Upaniṣad*, is but an echo of this belief; and so is the belief of Madhva and the 'Veda-knowers' referred to by Nārāyaṇāśramin (see *Ind. Ant.* LXII, 188) that the *Āgama-prakaraṇa*, consisting of the *Māṇḍūkya* and twenty-nine *kārikās*, is *śruti*. Unlike the *advaitin* writers, however, Madhva has endeavoured to buttress his opinion with the help of passages which he has really fabricated, but which he has ascribed to the *Pādma*, *Gāruḍa*, *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* and other known works, and to *Samkalpa*, *Pratyāhāra*, *Pratyaya*, *Brahmatarka*, and other similar mythical works; see *Ind. Ant.* LXII, 189 f.

For the rest, it becomes plain that Mr. Sarma has failed in his attempt to show that the *kārikās* in the *Āgamaprakaraṇa*, on which Madhva has commented, were not written by Gauḍapāda; as a matter of fact, not only these *kārikās*, but the *Māṇḍūkya* also (on which too Madhva has commented) is the work of Gauḍapāda;

and we have before us the interesting spectacle of the founder of the *dvaita* school commenting<sup>1</sup> on a fundamental *advaitic* work written by a prominent *advaitin*, and trying to force *dvaita* meanings into it.

\* \* \* \*

Since the above lines were written, I have read the third article written by Mr. Sarma, entitled "Still Further Light on the Gaudapāda-kārikās" that appeared in the last issue (September 1933) of the *Review of Philosophy and Religion*. The passages cited by him there from the works of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, Appayya Dikṣita, Vidyāranya, Advaitānanda, and Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvatī make it clear that these prominent *advaitin* writers held the view that the *kārikās* in the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* were *śruti*. Whether these writers have, elsewhere in their works, given expression to a contrary view, or acknowledged as *śruti* the *kārikās* in the other three *prakaraṇas* also is a matter which Mr. Sarma has not touched upon. The passages cited by him however show that these writers too belong to the same class as Madhva.

For the rest, these writers are all later than Madhva, and their opinions do not therefore in the least affect the conclusion arrived at by me in the afore-mentioned article in the *Indian Antiquary*.

1. This commentary, it may be noted, serves as an index to point out to what extent Madhva represents or misrepresents the ideas which the authors of the works commented on by him had in mind.

## ROYAL PATRONAGE AND SANSKRIT POETICS

( Baladeva Upādhyāya )

The aim of this paper is to describe and to estimate the influence exerted by royal patrons upon the composition of certain well-known works on Sanskrit poetics. From an early date Sanskrit Ālmkārīkas, especially those who hailed from Kashmir, were patronised by kings most of whom were renowned far and wide for their genuine love of Sanskrit learning and some of whom were themselves devout votaries in the temple of divine Śārādā. But the influence of these royal patrons was only indirectly felt upon the Ālmkāra works composed by these writers. But at the commencement of the fourteenth century there came to be composed works under the direct and benevolent guidance of certain kings, which mark a new departure from the old established traditions of our Sāhitya Śāstra. In works on Ālmkāra written after this century, writers, though few, were ready to utilise this new type of composition in their works and have given us some fine specimens of such writings. The striking feature of such works is the glorification of royal patrons. All the illustrative verses contained therein are sparkling panegyrics where the writers have elaborately described some valorous deeds, noble charities and superlative merits of their royal masters. Some critics may be inclined to lay the charge of abject sycophancy at the door of such well-meaning writers but a sympathetic study of their writings is enough to show that such charges, if any, are only apparent, not real. The influence of such meritorious masters was on the whole healthy and consequently in these works we have got some very good manuals where the subject matter has been ably treated, thoroughly analysed and lucidly explained.

### Vidyādhara

The foremost work of this new type is the एकावली of विद्याधर about whom little is known either from internal or external sources. He appears to be a great devotee of Śiva as is well attested by the benedictory verse and by his holding the title of महामाहेश्वर mentioned in the colophon of each chapter of his work. Besides this, we know nothing about his personal life. But his date can be



distinguishes between the commentator (of works of Kālidāsa) Vallabhadeva and the author of the anthology. One Vallabhadeva is also quoted in the S'ārṅgadhara-Paddhati, and in the Subhāṣitāvali itself many verses are ascribed to one Vallabhadeva. *Haraprasāda S'āstrī*, describing a MS. of Subhāṣitāvali,<sup>1</sup> says: "It seems to have been an older collection on which Subhāṣitāvali as published by Peterson in Bombay is based."

All these questions need further investigation. A new critical edition of the S'ārṅgadhara-Paddhati, based on all available MSS., and increased by a second volume containing the critical apparatus, and the "Introductory Sketch of the Literature embraced in it," once promised by P. Peterson, is a great desideratum. This "Introductory Sketch" would have to grapple with all the problems connected with the two anthologies which are amongst the most important for the history of Sanskrit Literature.

1. Catalogue of Sanskr. MSS. in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, VII, No. 5437.

## THE UPANIṢADIC THEORY OF THE GAUḌAPĀDA KĀRIKĀS - A REJOINDER

(B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma)

This subject has been dealt with by me in the course of three articles contributed to the *Review of Philosophy and Religion* Poona.<sup>1</sup> I showed in them that (1) writers of the Advaita and the Viśiṣṭādvaita schools of Vedānta, both before and after Madhva—have, in their works, quoted certain kārīkās occurring within the first or *Āgama Prakaraṇa* of Gauḍapāda as *S'ruti* and treated them as part of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*; (2) and that therefore, the charge against Madhva of having mistaken these kārīkās of Gauḍapāda for *S'ruti*, misread them as part of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* and so brought into existence 'the Upaniṣadic Theory of the Kārīkās', has to be summarily rejected.

I expected an outburst of protest against my defence of Madhva from Advaitic quarters and was not surprised when Mr. Y. Subrahmanya Śarma of Bangalore published a criticism of my views in Vol. IV No. 2 of the *Review of Philosophy and Religion* which has since been followed by that of Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah in the inaugural number of this journal. Both the critics claim to speak from an historical point of view and vie with each other in trying to separate the genuine from the spurious works of Śaṅkara. In view of much that is common between the two, I have thought it fit to reply to them one after the other, in this same journal. I shall first of all, deal with Mr. Subrahmanya Sarma's rejoinder.

### I.

I am greatly relieved to find that Mr. Sarma has considerably lessened my labors by his frank and fearless admission that I have "incontestably shown that Post-Madhva writers, Advaitins as well as Viśiṣṭādvaitins included, have acquiesced in and even adopted the Upaniṣadic theory." (p. 196). Even for this I sincerely thank Mr. Sarma; for, not many among his fraternity would, I know, be disposed to avow as much. I am sure the followers of Madhva will be grateful to him, for his plain speaking.

1. Vol. II no. 1; Vol. III no. 1; and Vol. IV no. 2.

Mr. Subrahmanya Sarma's only difficulty then, lies with the Pre-Madhva Period. He feels that "there is no evidence that the Upaniṣadic theory was in existence *before* Madhva or that it was consciously believed in and taught by any writer definitely known to have preceded that Ācārya;" and that "whenever there seems to be indubitable testimony" in my favour, "its date or genuineness is not found to have passed the controversial stage" and that whenever "I appeal to sources admittedly earlier than Madhva, the evidence is either vague and insufficient or else, decidedly against" me. (p. 205)

I shall therefore re-examine the Pre-Madhva evidences urged by me, in the light of Mr. Sarma's comments.

Remarking that "intrinsically Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on the Kārikās themselves must claim precedence over all other works ascribed to him," Mr. Sarma quotes the opening lines from that *bhāṣya*:— वेदान्तार्थसारसंग्रहभूतमिदं प्रकरणचतुष्टयं ओमित्येतदक्षरमित्याचार्य्यते ॥ and observes "here is positive evidence to show that Śaṅkara considers the whole work of four chapters only, as a set of Prakaraṇas and in no way as *S'ruti* (P. 198). Unless it be Mr. Sarma's meaning that the प्रकरणत्व of Gauḍapāda's work would be lost or imperilled by the intrusion of any foreign matter— i. e. of the 29 kārīkās if admitted as *S'rutis*, I am unable to see how the above sentence of Śaṅkara can upset the Upaniṣadic theory. Mr. Sarma must be arguing in his mind that each Prakaraṇa (chapter) of Gauḍapāda's work is a homogeneous whole emanating solely from the pen of Gauḍapāda, nay that each chapter contains or ought to contain the kārīkās, the kārīkās alone and nothing but the kārīkās of Gauḍapāda. If so, he cannot face the logic of his own statements. For strictly speaking, Śaṅkara himself in the lines so approvingly quoted by Mr. Sarma *unequivocally includes* the first twelve prose passages of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* proper within the प्रकरणघंथ of Gauḍapāda. He clearly says that the words ओमित्येतदक्षरम्— (*Māṇḍūkya I. 1*) mark the beginning of the प्रकरण he is to comment upon:—प्रकरणचतुष्टयं "ओमित्येतदक्षरम्" इत्याचार्य्यते । There is no room for quibbling here. Mr. Sarma himself is painfully alive to this difficulty, which he tries in vain to get over by a sapient comment that "the opening lines are so *ambiguously worded* as to lead one to suppose that the *Māṇḍūkya* itself is included in the

प्रकरणचतुष्टयं." [Italics mine.] The ambiguity rests, if at all, in Mr. Sarma's own anxious brain. Śaṅkara is as plain and unambiguous as he can be. Nor was Dr. Deussen wrong in his inference that the prose passages too, were meant to be treated as part of the प्रकरण. Only, Drs. Deussen and Venkatasubbiah<sup>1</sup> are wrong in rushing to the conclusion from this circumstance, that there was no such thing as a *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* in the days of Śaṅkara. Mr. Subrahmanya Sarma himself has incontestably shown that the *Māṇḍūkya* as a *S'ruti* was known to Sureśvara<sup>2</sup>—the immediate disciple of Śaṅkara. What was known to Sureśvara cannot surely have been unknown to his Master! It being thus impossible to deny that Śaṅkara in the passage cited by Mr. Sarma, looks upon the twelve prose passages of the *Māṇḍūkya* also to form part—at least for the time being, of Gauḍapāda's work, it is but fair to assume<sup>3</sup> that in Śaṅkara's opinion the प्रकरणत्व and homogeneity of his Master's work would not in the least be jeopardised by the intrusion of any foreign matter (at the beginning). Could it then really *matter* if this initial intrusion were to be increased by twenty-nine kārīkās regarded as *S'ruti*? Assuredly not. It could make no difference to the wounded self-respect of Gauḍapāda or his champions if only a part or even the whole of his first chapter should turn out to be *not his*!

Thus, we find that "Śaṅkara's significant remark" at the opening of his *Māṇḍūkya Bhāṣya* (which, Mr. Sarma deplures, has escaped my notice), contains nothing detrimental to the Upaniṣadic theory. As I have already explained more than once, the advocates of the Upaniṣadic theory are willing to concede that Gauḍapāda might, with the best of intentions, have used the whole of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* together with the explanatory Śruti-Śloka going with it, as nucleus to his more elaborate treatise

1. See his paper 'The Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad and Gauḍapāda' *I.A.* Oct. 33 and p. 7 Vol. 1 No. 1. of this Journal.

2. एषोऽन्तर्याम्येष योनिः सर्वस्य प्रभवाप्ययं ।

माण्डूकेयश्रुतिवच इति स्पष्टमधीयते ॥

(*Bṛhad-vārtika* 3, 8, 26. p. 1294)

drawn attention to on p. 200 of Mr. Sarma's article.

3. All the more so when both Dr. Venkatasubbiah and Mr. Sarma are unanimous in ascribing the commentary on the Kārīkās to the Ādi-Śaṅkara himself.

without the remotest idea of ever claiming them as his own—which fact was scrupulously understood by all the early and later Advaitins acquainted with their true *Sampradāya*. If modern Advaitins like the late Ramasubba Śāstri, Tryambaka Śāstri, Mr. Sarma, etc. would, however, prefer to be more Advaitic than even some of the great leaders of Advaita such as Advaitānanda, Sāyaṇa, Vidyāranya and Appayya Dikṣita, we can only give them a long rope.

Mr. Sarma then argues at some length that even the phrase “आगमप्रधानम्” used by Śaṅkara in describing the nature of the first Prakaraṇa, would only support Gauḍapāda’s authorship of that Prakaraṇa as a whole. I am at one with Mr. Sarma in thinking that the term “आगम” is here used in the sense of a ‘dogmatic utterance’ as contrasted with an argumentative one. But can we not distinguish between certain dogmatic texts and others which are closely argumentative, even within a given body of wholly Scriptural texts? I suppose we can. Witness for instance the following lines from Sureśvara’s *Bṛhad-vārtika* :—

याज्ञवल्कीयकाण्डस्य ह्युपपत्तिप्रधानतः ।

आगमोक्तिप्रधानत्वं मधुकाण्डस्य वर्णितम् ॥ (III. 1. 4-5.)

and Ānandagiri’s comment:—आगमप्रधानं मधुकाण्डं व्याख्याय, युक्तिप्रधानं मुनिकाण्डमवतितारयिषुः.....(P. 1137). Suppose the 29 kārīkās alone as *S’ruti* constitute the first *Prakarāṇa* of Gauḍapāda (without the 12 Upaniṣadic sentences, as desired by Mr. Sarma). Even then, it must be possible to distinguish between certain purely dogmatic utterances of the *S’ruti* (G. K. i, 1-8) and others which are essentially argumentative (G. K. i. 9; 17-18). Thus, even the presence of the term आगमप्रधानम् cannot militate against the Upaniṣadic theory. Its advocates have no objection to let the Advaitins regard the whole of the *Āgama Prakaraṇa* (including, if need be, even the 12 prose sentences of the *Māṇḍūkya*—as is done by Śaṅkara in his commentary on the kārīkās) as provisionally forming part of the work of Gauḍapāda, provided its ultimate scriptural character and identity outside the work of Gauḍapāda are clearly recognised. If this distinction is understood, it would put an end to so much misplaced अर्थापत्ति argument for the sole authorship of Gauḍapāda on grounds of

प्रकरणत्वान्यथापत्तिः। It is from this standpoint that such references as Śaṅkara’s to G. K. i, 16 under B. S. B. 2. 1. 9; 3, 28 and 3. 16 under the *Āgama Prakaraṇa* (as pointed out by Mr. Sarma on p. 199) and Sureśvara’s to G. K. i, 11 and 15 under *Naiṣkarmya Siddhi* (IV, 41, 42) would receive their explanation. I have no objection if the only natural and edifying explanation of the conduct of such Post-Madhva Advaitins as Sāyaṇa, Vidyāranya Appayya Dikṣita etc. in quoting the disputed kārīkās as *S’rutis*, that Mr. Sarma could, in his turn, think of, is to be that they were either all of them misled by Madhva, or trying to achieve “traditional sanctity” (for their kārīkās) at the expense of “historical accuracy” (p. 204), in spite of their clear knowledge of the alleged citation of some of these as mere compositions of Gauḍapāda by their own Ācāryas like Śaṅkara (B. S. B. 2, 1, 9) and Sureśvara (*Naiṣkarmya Siddhi* 4, 41-42) !

## II

I leave it to the Advaitins to settle with Mr. Sarma whether or not the *Viṣṇusahasranāmābhāṣya*, the *Vivekacūdāmaṇi* and the *bhāṣya* on the *Nṛsimhatāpani* are the genuine works of Śaṅkara. I shall then pass on to Sureśvara. Mr. Sarma tries to belittle the value of the evidence adduced by me from Sureśvara’s *Bṛhad-vārtika* with the cheap comment that “Sureśvara is not explicit here.” (p. 200.) I have shown that Sureśvara quotes *only* the kārīkās from the *Āgama Prakaraṇa*, under such titles as वेदान्तोक्तिः,<sup>1</sup> आगमशासनम् and scrupulously avoids such epithets with reference to others quoted by him from the other portions of Gauḍapāda’s work, in his *Bṛhad-vārtika*. What is Mr. Sarma’s explanation of this deliberate and uniform distinction observed by Sureśvara? None. I maintain therefore that there is more than meets the eye in this.

1. Note that the term वेदान्त is usually synonymous with the Upaniṣads with Śaṅkara and his immediate disciples—B. S. B. 3. 3. 1. That Sureśvara has only Scriptural passages in view whenever he uses the terms श्रुतिशासनम् or आगमशासनम् is also clear from other references in the *Bṛhad-vārtika*—See IV. 2. 28; V. 1, 118; V. 1. 80 and V. 1. 81. 1. 4. 1761.

## III

Akhaṇḍānanda in verse 4 of his *Tattvadīpana* refers to Ānandagiri (alias Ānandaśaila) as his Guru. This shows that he cannot be a "very recent writer on the Vedānta" as Mr. Sarma puts it. Whatever the date of Ānandagiri,<sup>1</sup> the evidence of his gloss on the *Brhadvārtika* is admitted to be entirely in favour of the Upaniṣadic theory. Mr. Sarma would have us believe that this Ānandgiri is different from the other glossator on the *Māṇḍūkya-Kārikā-bhāṣya*. But he gives no external proof in support of his opinion. That there have been many Ānandgiris is no reason why any two of them should always be necessarily differentiated. (1) Mr. Tripaṭhi to whose introduction to Ānandajñāna's *Taraksamgraha* (G. O. S.) Mr. Sarma so approvingly refers us, is himself of opinion that the glosses on the *Brhadvārtika* and the *Māṇḍūkyakārika bhāṣya* are by one and the same Ānandagiri !<sup>2</sup> (2) The colophons to both speak of him as the disciple of Śuddhānana Pūjyapāda. (3) Even the phrase : व्याख्यान-श्लोकावतरणम् is not opposed to the Upaniṣadic theory since it does not preclude the possibility of these व्याख्यानश्लोकs being themselves śrutis introduced in the words of the text itself—

माण्डूक्योपनिषद्व्याख्यानरूपाः श्लोकाः, अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्तीति तद्व्याख्येनैवावतार्यन्ते ।  
Mr. Sarma may be surprised at my attempt to see a reference to two sets of kārikās, one revealed to Gauḍapāda by the grace of Nārāyaṇa and the other (consisting of chapters 2-4) composed by himself, in Ānandgiri's remark : श्रीगौडपादाचार्यस्य नारायणप्रसादतः प्रतिपन्नान् माण्डूक्योपनिषदर्थविष्करणपरानपि श्लोकानाचार्यप्रणीतान् व्याचिख्यासुः भाष्यकारः... Roundabout as it is, it is the only interpretation which could save Ānandgiri from redundant and faulty expression. If the entire sentence were taken to refer to only one set of kārikās composed by Gauḍapāda (albeit through the grace of God) one or the other of the two phrases श्रीगौडपादाचार्यस्य or आचार्यप्रणीतान् would become clumsy, redundant and meaningless. Their presence

1. "It is safe to conclude that Ānandgiri flourished at the latest in the latter half of the thirteenth century." (Tripaṭhi, Introd. to *Taraksamgraha* G. O. S. 3, p. xx.)

2. Op. cit. p. xii. Mr. Tripaṭhi goes to the extent of saying that the gloss on the *Brhadvārtika* is the *masterpiece* of this Ānandgiri !

would be inexplicable except on my hypothesis. (5) It might, therefore, be seen that what the *Taraṅgiṇi* observes at the pūrva-pakṣa stage need not necessarily be indicative of its own ultimate interpretation of Ānandgiri's words, in harmony with the Upaniṣadic theory.

## IV

I fail to see why Rāmānuja and Bhāskara should either have confirmed or denied the Upaniṣadic theory. Not having written any commentary on the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, they were presumably not interested in the question. As to why they did not write commentaries on the Up., the question may profitably be addressed to themselves. I have shown that Rāmānuja has quoted one half of a disputed kārikā (I. 16) in his *S'ribhāṣya* where the context and manner of citation leave no doubt as to its scriptural character. There he is seen arguing strongly against the ब्रह्मज्ञानवाद or the doctrine which regards the Brahman itself as undergoing transmigration in the form of the individual, due to the spell of Māyā.<sup>1</sup> In the course of his criticism, Rāmānuja observes:—

जीवस्यैव हि मायया निरोधः श्रूयते—तस्मिंश्चान्यो मायया सन्निरुद्धः (Śvet. Up.) इति 'अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुद्धयते' (G. K. 1. 19) इति च ॥

[Even in Scripture only the individual soul—but nowhere the supreme Being—is taught to be bound by Māyā. For we read "That other is bound by Māyā and also when the Jīva wakes up from his prolonged slumber in Māyā..." and so on. The doctrine of ब्रह्मज्ञानवाद is thus alien to Scripture.] No one conversant with the ways of commentorial and first class polemical writing would care to deny that "श्रूयते" in such argumentative contexts is used to denote the pronouncements of Scripture. Look again at the juxtaposition of the two texts "तस्मिंश्चान्यो and अनादिमायया—" How could Rāmānuja give weight to a kārikā of Gauḍapāda side by side with a text of the *S'vetāśvatara Upaniṣad*? Without considering any of these difficulties, Mr. Sarma merely seeks to escape with a facetious comment that "Rāmānuja is not

1. अनाद्यविद्यावच्छेदलक्षजीवभावः पर एवात्मा... Vācaspati on B. S. 1. 2. 5.

always *exact* in his quotations.<sup>1</sup> This is irrelevant. The author of the *S'ribhāṣya* may or may not always be "exact" in his quotations. But what concerns us here, is not the soundness or the reverse of his attitude to the disputed *kārikās* as manifested by his quotation of one of them, *but the fact of that attitude itself*. Mr. Sarma may answer the question if Rāmānuja is right or wrong in describing G. K. I. 16 as a *S'ruti*, in any way he chooses. But any answer he may give would absolve Madhva from the charge of having invented the Upaniṣadic theory. If R. is *right* in describing अनादिमायया... as a *S'ruti*, therein we have irrefragable evidence that "the Upaniṣadic theory was in existence *long before Madhva*" and that it was "consciously believed in and taught by a writer definitely known to have preceded" him. If on the other hand, he is *wrong* in having done so, even then, Madhva would stand exonerated from the charge. The blame and responsibility of starting the Upaniṣadic theory would in any case have to be laid at the door of Rāmānuja. Madhva has to be acquitted and Rāmānuja accused instead. Let us hope the modern Advaitins will soon do it.

Admit Gauḍapāda's authorship of the disputed *kārikās* and you have necessarily to abide by their Advaitic interpretation. There is no अर्थजरतीय! Now, in the face of Śaṅkara's explicit comment on G. K. I. 16 under B. S. B. 2, 1, 9:—

मायामात्रं ज्ञेयत् परमात्मनः अवस्थात्रयात्मनावस्थानं—रज्वा इव सर्पादि-  
भावेनेति । अत्रोक्तं वेदान्तार्थसम्प्रदायविद्विज्जिज्ञासाचार्यैः

अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुद्धयते ।

॥ इति ॥

I do not see how it could be possible for Rāmānuja to "dispose of it as having no reference to Śaṅkara's Māyāvāda!" unless he also repudiated in the same breath, its connection with

1. As for R's quotation तद्वैतत्वस्यन्-etc. being inexact, it may be observed that there is nothing to show that the whole was meant to be a single quotation from a single source. That he intended to quote from both the Brh. up and R. V. is clear from his use of the term आदि in मनुसूर्यादीन् व्यपदिशति. Śaṅkara too, is reported to be "inexact" under B. S. 3, 20—तस्योपनिषद्द्वयवैतव्यम् तस्योपनिषद्द्वयमित्यध्यात्मम् (Brh. 5, 5, 3-4) Vide f. n. 14 p. 889 of Ānanda Press Edn. of *Gītā* with C of Śaṅkara, R. and Madhva. (Madras 1911) Notorious is Sureśvara's inexactitude in the *Naiṣkarmya Siddhi*—यत्तु जैमिनीयं वचनमुद्धाटयति..... p. 52, Bombay.

Gauḍapāda. Does Mr. Sarma seriously want us to believe that Rāmānuja expects his readers to swallow his remark that the very lines written by the Māyāvādins have no reference to Māyāvāda? That must indeed be a new and original line of argument.

## V

One is almost tempted to agree with Mr. Sarma's finding that "whether part of an Upaniṣad came to be mistakenly regarded by the Advaitins as *kārikās* or whether a portion of the *kārikās* recently<sup>1</sup> got converted into an Upaniṣad in the eyes of Mādhyas and later-day Vedāntins, it cannot be denied that this curious phenomenon exemplifies the process of transformation that religious and philosophical works must have undergone *at a time when traditional sanctity was more valued than historical accuracy*" (p. 204) [Italics mine.] This splendid analysis of the situation is again eno<sup>2</sup> to exculpate Madhva from the charge of being the original sinner in turning the (disputed) *kārikās* into *S'rutis*. For, consistent with his own scintillating logic, Mr. Sarma must admit that such a transmutation would, in the first instance, be effected by the party which stands to gain most by the transaction. Assuming Mr. Sarma's analysis to be true, who would benefit by raising the *kārikās* of Gauḍapāda to the rank of *S'rutis*? The Advaitins or Madhva? Not certainly the latter! Consider for a moment what an advantage it would be to the Advaitins if texts like मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः (G. K.) were to be raised to the rank of *śruti*! All dualistic opponents could thus be discomfited and made to look absurd in the eyes of the world in trying to offer forced interpretation of them to suit their own views. Advaita itself could thus be held up as the natural outcome of the *Śruti*. Such a transformation then, ought, if at all, to have been effected *long before Madhva, by the Advaitins themselves*. So much so that a budding philosopher and exponent of new and rival system, like Madhva, was obliged to take these *kārikās* at their prevailing estimate as *Śrutis* and do his best to repudiate their Advaitic interpretation. He could not afford to deny their *श्रुति* and refuse to comment on them as such; for then, his entire reputation would be at stake. It would give a ready handle to the Advaitins who would not fail to heap

1. How about Madhva who is by no means 'recent'?

fun and ridicule upon him alleging that he was afraid of their Advaita-Śrūtis, was incapable of satisfactorily explaining them on his view and was therefore seeking to escape them altogether by denying their श्रुतित्व. This makes it clear that the disputed kārikās had already established themselves as Śrūtis in the days of Madhva<sup>1</sup> who was [therefore forced to adopt the only course open to him of accepting them as such and offering his own interpretation. In any case, it would be absurd to say that Madhva himself originated the theory. (1) In the first place, he had nothing to gain but everything to lose, by such an act. (2) He would not have risked his reputation by suddenly proclaiming, one fine morning, the kārikās of a rival school to be Śrūtis! Why should he, when he could more easily have escaped them by turning his back upon all of them instead of raising them to inconvenient heights and straining every nerve to find a dualistic interpretation for them?

Moreover, Madhva, in his own days, ought to have been quite familiar with Gauḍapāda's work and presumably also with Śaṅkara's commentary thereon.<sup>2</sup> And if contemporary Advaitic opinion had not looked upon the disputed kārikās as Śrūtis, he would not have bothered himself about them. That such was actually the case is proved by a reference to two such kārikās in the *Iṣṭasiddhi* of Vimuktātman who flourished not less than three centuries before Madhva,<sup>3</sup> in a context and manner which leave no doubt as to their scriptural character,<sup>4</sup> and by certain statements made by

1. And, as we have seen, even in the days of Rāmānuja.

2. If it be acknowledged as a genuine work of Śaṅkara.

3. The *Iṣṭasiddhi* itself we are told was one of the earliest monistic works studied by Madhva under his Guru. (see *Madhva-vijaya*, 4, 44)

4. The *Iṣṭasiddhi* runs :—(p. 331, G. O. S.)

स्वप्रविद्येव ते विद्या नाविद्यां हन्ति सा यतः (vi, 18) स्वप्ने विद्या स्वप्रविद्या । सेव सैव वा तव विद्या, अविद्यानिवर्तकत्वात् । अविद्यावस्था स्वप्नः—‘अनादिमायया सुतः (G. K. 1. 16) स्वप्ननिद्रायुतां (G. K. 1. 14) त्रयः स्वप्नाः त्रय आवसथाः Ait. Up. 3. 12) इत्यादिप्रयोगदर्शनात् ॥

Such appeal to प्रयोगs to be effective, must be with reference to works of universal authority—and not merely to the manuals of one's own school. Cf. ‘मुनीनामप्यहं व्यास’ इति च प्रयोगदर्शनात् Śaṅkara B. S. B. 3. 4. 47. and ‘प्रसवाप्ययौ’ (Mān. 6) इत्युत्पत्तिप्रलययोः प्रयोगदर्शनात् 1. 1. 9.

Note also that Vimuktātman gives the kārikās precedence over even the text from the *Aitareya Upaniṣad*. (3. 12).

some of the earliest commentators on the *Anu-vyākṛhāna* of Madhva. One of them, Padmanābha Tirtha who was a direct disciple of Madhva, writes introducing a disputed kārikā cited by Madhva:—अधुना प्रपञ्चस्य मिथ्यात्वपरत्वेन उद्भावितां श्रुतिमुदाहृत्य, सत्यत्वपरतया व्याचष्टे ॥ Another commentator, Jayatirtha, writes:—प्राक् प्रपञ्च-मिथ्यात्वसिद्धये परोदाहृतानां श्रुतीनां बाह्योपपत्तिविरोधः प्रतिपादितः । इदानीं-मान्तरानुपपत्तिप्रदर्शनपूर्वकं तासामविरुद्धार्थव्याख्यानार्थमुत्तरो ग्रन्थः । तत्र तावत् ‘प्रपञ्चो यदि विद्येत’ इत्यादि वाक्यद्वयं पठित्वा पराभिमतार्थेऽनुपपत्तिमाह ॥

It is obvious from the foregoing that the disputed kārikās had come to be regarded as Śrūtis long before Madhva. If what Mr. Sarma says about the true nature of the kārikās were true, then, he should see in Madhva *not the inventor* of the Upaniṣadic Theory, *but the victim of a prevailing Advaitic tradition*! The acceptance of Mr. Sarma's theory would also lead to certain absurd and ridiculous conclusions. (I) In the first place, it would be curious indeed that a host of Advaitins like (1) the Śaṅkaras of the *Viṣṇu-sahasranāmbhāṣya*, *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* etc., (2) Ānandagiri of the *Brahadvārtika*-gloss, (3) Sāyaṇa, (4) Vidyāraṇya, (5) Advaitānanda, (6) Appayya Dīkṣita (7) Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvatī all swallowed Madhva's pill! (II) We would be forced to admit that all these celebrated Advaitins connived at Madhva's offence for the mere satisfaction of procuring traditional sanctity for the first Prakaraṇa at the expense of historical truth—even forgetting their own scores with him, even nodding at the real attitude of the Ādi-Śaṅkara, Sureśvara and Ānandagiri of the kārikās! (III) Are they then to be put down as traitors to their Guru and abettors with Madhva? (IV) If the Advaitins were so badly enamoured of traditional sanctity, did they wait helplessly for a Madhva<sup>3</sup> to break the ice in this respect and content themselves with merely being his camp followers? Colossal as is such a tribute to the influence of Madhva, the Advaitic world will find it hard to stomach!

## VI

Mr. Sarma is pleased to characterise my thesis that ‘Gauḍapāda was never at all credited with the actual authorship of the

1. *Sannyāyaraṇāvali*, (Dharvar) i, 4, p. 35.

2. *Nyāyasudhā*, i, 4, p. 221 (Bombay).

3. How about G. K. 2, 31, which is styled a Śruti by some Advaitins quite independently of Madhva?

disputed *kārikās* and that he might have had access to an original Upaniṣad with an explanatory tract, on which again he based his more elaborate treatise" as "an ingenious fancy unsupported by evidence". Taking a comprehensive view of all that has been said for and against the Upaniṣadic theory, I find that the balance of evidence does incline to my side. If Mr. Sarma wants more evidence, I shall let him have it. But proof and evidence in such cases can never be of the laboratory variety. From the newly published commentaries of Upaniṣad-Brahma-Yogin on the *Daśopaniṣads*,<sup>1</sup> I find that my "ingenious fancy" is shared by that commentator. So fully does he support the Upaniṣadic theory<sup>2</sup> that I can hardly resist the temptation to quote him *in extenso*—

हिमवत्पृष्ठासनो गौडपादाचार्यः श्रीशुकमुखान्माण्डूक्योपनिषद्दाशयं  
विज्ञाय,—××× अथ सर्वभूतानुकम्पया तामेवोपवनिषदं व्याचिख्यासोः गौड-  
पादाचार्यस्य माण्डूक्यगूढशयानुवादिन्यः श्रुतयः खिलश्रुतयो मन्वाश्च प्रादुर्बभूवुः  
सहस्रशः ।

तत्र कांश्चिन्मन्त्रान् प्रधानतः चतुष्पादगोचरचातुर्मात्रालङ्कृतमाण्डूक्योप-  
निषदः प्रत्यंशं विभागशो योजयामास । तस्य आगमप्रधानत्वेन ओंकारयाथात्म्य-  
निर्णायकत्वात्तदिदमागमप्रकरणमुच्यते ॥

शिष्टं श्रुतिमन्त्रजातमर्थतः सङ्गृह्य कारिकारूपेण प्रकरणत्रयं रचयामास—  
वैतथ्याद्वैतालातशान्तिभेदात् ॥

P. 213. *Māṇḍūkya—bhāṣya* of Upaniṣadbrahma Yogin.

### VII

It is hoped that ordinary commonsense and logic at least, if not any amount of textual evidence, would enable critics of Madhva, ancient and modern, to see the absurdity of their charge against him and acquit him of it.

Whether the disputed *kārikās* were really *kārikās* (of Gauḍa-pāda) or not, I would appeal to Mr. Sarma and the Advaitic world, to declare that *Madhva is not the originator of the Upaniṣadic theory of the Gauḍapāda kārikās*, and leave it at that.

1. Adyar, 1935.

2. Commenting on अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति he says : उक्तेऽर्थे एते श्लोका मन्त्रा भवन्ति and repeats नेतरो जनः after the last *Kārikā*. That the commentator is an ardent Advaitin is clear from his commentaries and from the Preface to the Edn. by Dr. C. Kunhan Rāja.

## SOME UNPUBLISHED INSCRIPTIONS OF THE CHAULUKYAS OF GUJARĀT

(D. B. Diskalkar)

### INTRODUCTION

In course of studying the inscriptions of the Chaulukya rulers of Gujarāt, who had their capital at Aṇahilapāṭaṇa, with a view to prepare an uptodate list, I found that out of a total of 85 inscriptions of this dynasty so far discovered, as many as 30 have not yet been published, some of them not having been noticed before. They come mostly from Gujarāt proper, while others are from Kāthiāwār, Cutch, Rājputānā, and Mālavā, which during the palmy days of the Chaulukyas, formed part of their empire. I may, however, state here that the following inscriptions, which have been noticed before but have not been fully published, cannot be traced as yet :

1. A copperplate grant of V. S. 1030 (Bhādrapada Śu 5 Monday) of Mūlarāja (I), noticed by H. H. Dhruva in the Vienna Oriental Journal. Vol. V. p. 300.
2. A fragmentary inscription of V. S. 1236 (Phālguna Sudi 2 Saturday) of Bhīma II, noticed by the same scholar in the same journal. Vol. VII. p. 87.
3. An inscription on Girnar of V. S. 1234, noticed by Tod in his Travels of Western India, p. 510.
4. Two inscriptions at Siddhapur in Gujarāt noticed by the same scholar on p. 142 of the same book : one mentioning that the construction of Rudramāla was begun in V. S. 998 and the other recording that it was completed in 1202 Māgha Vadi 4.
5. An inscription of V. S. 1206 of Kumārapāla referred to by the same scholar on p. 256 of his Antiquities of Rajasthan.

The following inscriptions, as will be seen, add very much to our knowledge of the Chaulukya history and of the political history of the different provinces that were under the control of the Chaulukyas at one time.



## ARE THE GAUḌAPĀDA KĀRIKĀS ŚRUTI? A REJOINDER\*

(B. N. Krishnamurti Śarmā)

In Vol. I nos. 1 and 2 of this Journal, Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah criticised my views respecting the status of the Kārikās said to form part of the *Āgama Prakaraṇa* of Gauḍapāda. The following is my reply to him.

At the outset Dr. Iah refers patronisingly to a conclusion reached by him in the *I.A.* for Oct. 33, that there was no such thing as a *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* at the time of Śaṅkara. This stands exploded by the fact of Sureśvara citing the *Mān.* as an Upaniṣad. in his *Vārtika* on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*.<sup>1</sup>

### I.

My quotations from the *Vc.*, *Nr. Up.* commentary and *Vsnb.*, were addressed to such as recognise them as the genuine works of Ś. Modern scholars, even if they won't recognise these as the genuine works of Ś., must allow them a certain amount of value in determining the issue before us. For, it is really too much to dismiss them all as the effusions of "pseudo-Śaṅkaras," as does Dr V. We have also the spectacle of a great many makers of Advaitavedānta like Advaitānanda, Sāyaṇa, Mādhava, and Appayya Dīkṣita, following Madhva and sharing his belief in the *śruti* of the kārīkās of the first Prakaraṇa. And among the predecessors and contemporaries of M. holding similar views, attention has been drawn to Sv., R. and Ā. The critic has not faced these witnesses squarely.

### II.

He has advanced some arguments to disprove the genuineness of the *Vsnb.* etc. as works of Śaṅkara. They are good so far as they go; but I would leave it an open question. The different levels of thought and expression betrayed in the works (attributed to) of Ś., are no doubt interesting; but no valid

\* The following abbreviations have been used:—Ā. Ānandagiri; Ā. P. Āgama Prakaraṇa; G. Gauḍapāda; Ś. Śaṅkara; R. Rāmānuja; M. Madhva; Dr. V. Venkatasubbiah; Vc. *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*; Vsnb. *Viṣṇusahasranāma-bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara; Nr. Up. *Nṛsiṃhatāpani Up.*; Mān. *Māṇḍūkya*; Yg. *Yogacūḍāmaṇi*; NP. *Nārada Parivrajaka (Up.)*; Sv. Sureśvara.

1. See Vol. I No. 2 of this Journal p. 29.

conclusions can be drawn from them until ampler proofs are forthcoming. Even a "master-mind" is not made in a day; nor does it function always at 'top-level' or exhibit the same profundity of thought and grace of expression throughout. A comparison *passim* of the *Gitābhāṣya* and the c. on the *Sūtras* by Ś. would be eno' to convince one of the truth of this observation.<sup>2</sup> The former is undoubtedly "commonplace" and does often recall Bhoja's caustic comment on glossators:—

स्पष्टार्थेऽपि विस्तृतिं विदधति व्यर्थः समासादिकैः ।

अस्थानेऽनुपयोगिभिश्च बहुभिर्जलैर्भ्रमं तन्वते

श्रोतृणामिति वस्तुविप्लवकृतः सर्वेऽपि टीकाकृतः । (Vṛtti on Yoga Sūtras.)

Yet it is admitted to be a genuine work of Ś. both by Dr. V. and Prof. Winternitz. What can this mean if not that style is after all a very misleading and vagarious criterion of authorship? Even Homer nods. If the critic has been able to discover flaws in the *Vsnb* etc., another may say that the Ādi-Ś. himself was not any the less "elastic" in his views of what is to be meant by a 'mantra'; For, in his c. on *Gitā* ii, 19, he calls the passage य एनं वेत्ति हन्तारम् also, a *rk*<sup>2</sup> side by side with न जायते म्रियते वा (*Kaṭha* 1, 2, 18)<sup>3</sup>. But only the second half is identical in the *Kaṭha* (1, 2, 18) and *Gitā* (ii, 19cd), the first half being entirely different in both. Another instance of 'elasticity' in Ś. has been pointed out by me on an earlier occasion.<sup>4</sup> As for inferiority of expression, mention may be made of the use of the feminine form 'छागी' by both Ś. and Vācaspati under B. S. i, 4, 8, "which tho' not incorrect", is (yet) "decidedly inferior to" छागी<sup>5</sup> Sv. confounds Jaimini and

1. See my paper on Śaṅkara's Authorship of the *Gitābhāṣya* *Annals B.O.R.I.* Vol. xiv, 1-2, (1933).

2. इत्येतस्यार्थस्य साक्षिभूते ऋचावानिनाय भगवान्-(ii, 19) कथमविक्रिय आत्मेति-द्वितीयो मन्त्रः—'न जायते...' (2, 20).

3. There is discrepancy here too. *Gitā* ii, 20 ab is found only in a slightly different form in *Kaṭha*. None of the two verses of the *Gitā* are thus actual quotations from the *Kaṭha*. R. is more careful than either Ś or M. He says nothing about ii, 19-20 being quotations from the *śruti*.

4. *Poona Orientalist*, Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 34 f. n. 1.

5. अजा छागी शुभछागबस्तछागलका अजे (*Amarakośa* ii, 9, 76) Ś. has of course been defended by later commentators. See *Brahmavidyābharāṇa* p. 388 (Kumbakonam).

Bādarāyaṇa and ascribes to the former the first two sūtras of the latter, in his *Naīṣkarmyasiddhi*.<sup>1</sup> He is also guilty of using Un-Pāṇinian forms.<sup>2</sup> Are we to set up a plurality of Ś-s and Sv-s, in these cases? The great Advaitic commentator Śrīdhara Svāmī<sup>3</sup> is 'oblivious' of the correct (?) meaning of नुक् प्रवोचम् (R. V, i, 154, 1) which he renders as कः प्रावोचत् instead of as "अतिशीघ्रं प्रवोचं प्रब्रवीमि as rightly (?) interpreted by Sāyaṇa and the modern scholars. All this must show that arguments from language, style and thought have their obvious limitations.

Dr. V. argues that the use of the word श्लोक instead of the rightful "मन्त्र" by the *Nr. Up.* commentator, only goes against my theory and proves that "he too thought that the ślokas were the work of a human author." (P.8, f. n. 3). But he forgets that in that case, these ślokas could have no place in the text of the *Mān.* as required by that commentator. The fact is that Dr. V. has not understood the drift of the commentary.

As for the use of the term श्लोक "instead of the rightful" मन्त्र, we may explain it as an instance of speaking in the words of the original. If Dr. V. has "not so far come across any passage in the writing of human authors in which the word śloka is used to denote metrical śruti passages" (P. 8, f. n. 3) it only proves that there are limits even to his studies. Ś. under B. S. 1, 4, 15, uses the word श्लोक to denote a metrical śruti passage<sup>5</sup> and

1. यत्तु जैमिनीयं वचनमुद्धाटयसि, तदपि तद्विवक्षापरिज्ञानादेवोच्यते । किं कारणम् ? यतो न जैमिनेरयमभिप्रायः—'आम्नायः सर्व एव क्रियार्थ' इति । यदि ह्यमभिप्रायोऽभविष्यत्—“अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा, ॥ जन्माद्यस्य यतः” इत्येवमादि ब्रह्मवस्तु-स्वरूपमात्रयाथात्म्यप्रकाशनपरं गम्भीरन्यायसंहन्धं सर्ववेदान्तार्थमीमांसनं श्रीमच्छारीरकं नासूत्रविष्यत् ; असूत्रयच्च ॥

(By Skt. and Prākṛt Series, 38, P. 52) Many explanations have been offered for this curious mistake ; but none has been convincing.

2. एष संसारपन्था व्याख्यातः (P. 29); 3, 35, i, 14; ईक्षण p. 663 Var. 115, *Bṛhadvārtika*; मत्पन्थानम् P. 136 v. 453.

3. Under *Bhāgavata* ii, 7, 40.

4. I don't grant this.

5. तदप्येष श्लोको भवति (Taitt. Up. ) इति तस्मिन्नेव प्रकृतेऽर्थे श्लोक-मिसुदाहरन्ति—'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्' इति ॥

Sv. on two occasions in his *Bṛhadvārtika* :—

इत्येतस्मान्नयाद्राजा श्लोकशुश्रूषयेरितः ।

प्रादात्सहस्रमेवास्मै शुश्रूषालिङ्गवित्तये ॥ iv, 4, 537.

अक्षयेव यतः पूर्वं व्याख्यातो देवतागणः ।

श्रोत्रादिकरणार्थोऽयं श्लोकस्तस्मादुदाहृतः ॥ ii, 2, 25.

### III.

Why should आगममात्रम् used by Ś. be interpreted only as a scriptural statement? Why should it not be applied to the utterances of a reliable person like G.—asks the critic. The answer is that the views of a mortal however eminent, are not by themselves sufficient to establish a metaphysical truth.<sup>1</sup> The Doctor himself unconsciously admits as much when he says that "Ś. had to cite here a śruti passage as authority for the statement that there is no dualism." [Italics mine]. (P. 13). What is taught by scripture is admitted with implicit belief. Reason also may afterwards be made to augment or clarify the thesis so established. Such is the tradition of Vedāntic Dialectics.<sup>2</sup> The presence moreover of Upaniṣadic texts like एकमेवाद्वितीयम् ; प्रपञ्चोपशमः, in both the sets of passages re-cited by the Doctor, must also show him that the term आगम ought, in fairness, to apply to them also, in which case, the contention falls to the ground that आगम here means nothing more than an authoritative proposition of G. The paraphrasing of प्रतिज्ञामात्रेण by आगममात्रेण is also another indication that what has throughout been meant was an आगमरूपप्रतिज्ञा, a proposition laid down in the words of the śruti. The reference to तर्क immediately afterwards, also shows that the partnership is between Reason and Revelation: तर्क and आगम (*Manu*, xii, 105-6) and not between Reason and the words of a man in the street.

1. नागमगम्येऽर्थे केवलेन तर्केण प्रत्यवस्थातव्यम् । यस्मान्निरागमाः पुरुषो-त्प्रेक्षामात्रनिबन्धनास्तर्काः अप्रातिष्ठिता भवन्ति ; उत्प्रेक्षायाः निरङ्कुशत्वात् । तथाहि कैश्चिदभियुक्तैः यत्नेनोत्प्रेक्षितास्तर्काः अभियुक्ततरैरन्यैराभास्यमाना दृश्यन्ते—*Śaṅkara*, B. S. B. 2, 1. II.

2. सत्सु तु वेदान्तवाक्येषु तदर्थग्रहणदार्ढ्याय अनुमानमाप वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवच्च निवार्यते—op. cit 1. 1. 2.

## IV.

As for the *Vsnb.*, I cannot follow the reasoning that because a writer has made a few mistakes of fact and textual interpretation, *whatever* he says must, forever, remain suspect. Under such circumstances none can pass the ordeal. The critic, moreover, is needlessly confusing the question of the statement of one's belief by a writer, with its truth. The author of the *Vsnb.* has said that certain of the disputed *kārikās* are *śruti*. He may be right or wrong in having done so. That is a different matter altogether. To dismiss inconvenient *Ś-s* as "bogus" ones is easy. But even a mistake needs explanation.

## V.

As for the antiquity of the three kinds of लक्षणा जहलक्षणा etc., it may interest Dr. V. and the Compiler of the *Nyāyakośa* to hear that they are as old as the *Samkṣepaśārīraka* (1. 157) of Sarvajñātma—10 th century—and that allusion to them in the *Vc* is perfectly understandable even as a work of Ś.

## VI.

Where the entire *adhikaraṇa* in B. S. ii, 1, 33, turns upon the question of Creation and its purpose, I fail to see anything "disingenuous" in connecting the आसकामश्रुति mentioned by Ś. with Creation. Even granting that it need not necessarily be coupled with the act of creation, Dr. Iah would be no nearer his escape from identifying it with a G. K. For, even according to his own showing, the आसकामश्रुति must be one which describes the God of Creation as an Āpta-kāma. But in Advaitic metaphysics, the Supreme Brahman (Nirguṇa) is neither really आसकाम nor ever does create. It is the Lower Brahman, Īśvara or Parameśvara, as Ś. advisedly calls Him, that is actually responsible for creation. It is certainly *not* this Lower Brahman that is called an Āpta-kāma in Bṛh. Up. iv, 4, 6 summoned to his aid by Dr. Iah. On the contrary, *that* text applies the term Āptakāma to the Individual soul on the eve of release. It is only by a metaphysical *tour de force* that Ś. secures its application to the Supreme Brahman also. But that is neither here nor there. While Ś. himself has not specified the full text he has in view, we have the indirect approval of Advaitānanda and Appayya Dīkṣita to equate it with G. K. where Creator-God is given by the context.

## VII.

It is only a special pleading, not any convincing explanation that we have from Dr. V. as to why Śv. has been so particularly careful *not* to make use of such terms of eulogy as वेदान्तोक्ति, आगमशासनम् in referring to the *kārikās* from the undisputed portion of G.'s work. He tells us that "stanza 744 ac of Sv. is paralleled by Yg. Up. 72 ac. and by certain statements in the *NP* etc., and that therefore, it cannot be surely asserted that the reference in Sv. is necessarily to a G. K., answering to the passage cited by Sv. But our knowledge of the fact that Sv. was acquainted with the *Mān. Up.* and the *Kārikās* of G., coupled with the absence of proof that he was similarly acquainted with such patently "late" *Ups*, as the Yg., *NP.* etc., should, I think, be enough to render the latter identification more acceptable.

No doubt, Sv. is not quoting the exact words of the *śruti* but is only referring to its purport in *Bṛhadvārtika* 5, 1, 81. But this neither warrants the generalisation that *he must always be so doing*, nor proves yet that he has never once made a verbatim quotation from the *śruti* with the words आगमशासनं or the like.

Until a law is made that Sv. *must do as is done by the S'āthyāyani* and other (late) Upaniṣads, Dr. Iah's laborious extracts from them can only be dismissed as irrelevant to the issue before us. Had he really wanted to find out what Sv. meant to indicate by such epithets as वेदानुशासनम्, वेदान्तोक्ति, आगमशासनम्, and so on, Dr. V. must have gone to the *Bṛhadvārtika* itself and not to the *S'āthyāyani N. P. etc.*, collected all those passages which appear to be quotations from the *Śruti*, examined them and *then* have declared that *in all such cases*, "Sv. is *not* quoting the exact words of the *śruti*", but is merely referring to their purport, or that the references in such cases are "*not to any particular text of the śruti*, but to the teachings of the Advaita-vedānta" (P. 16). Instead of this, he has taken the path of pseudo-research, quoting from irrelevant sources and making use of spurious arguments. I wish, before closing, to draw attention to the fact that Sv. *has made* a number of quotations from the *Śruti* under such titles as श्रुतिशासनम्, आगमशासनम्, आगमोक्ति, आगमिकं वचः. A majority of these are *actual* *Śruti* texts, while one or two are arthānuvādas. But in no case is there any

room for doubt that *only* śrutis, express or implied, are meant by these epithets, and not merely the teachings of individual teachers of the Advaitavedānta:—

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| १. मुक्तेर्बिभ्यस्त इत्यादि तथाच श्रुतिशासनम्   | 1. 4. 14   |
| २. यतो वाचो निवर्तन्त इति च श्रुतिशासनम्  | 1. 4. 518  |
| ३. नह्यन्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टेति—  | 1. 4. 117  |
| ४. विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयादिति श्रुतेः  | 1. 4. 1393 |
| ५. यत्र वान्यदित्यादि तथा च श्रुतिशासनम्  | 1. 4. 1560 |
| ६. ब्रह्मवेदं विश्वमिति साक्षादाभ्यायशासनम्<br>[ विद्या विनयसंपन्न इति च स्मृतिशासनम् ]       | 1. 4. 1691 |
| ७. नाविरतो दुश्चरितादिति चागमिकं वचः  | 1. 4. 1791 |
| ८. बह्वर्थबद्धधिषणः प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यवित्तये<br>नालं विरोधात्पुरुषः “ पराञ्जी ” त्यागमोक्षितः | 1. 6. 5    |
| ९. यः पृथिव्यामिति तथा नेति नेती ति चागमः   | 2. 1. 445  |
| १०. शम्भुद्वै रेतस इति तथाच श्रुतिशासनम्  | 2. 3. 71   |
| ११. एतदालंबनं श्रेष्ठमिति च श्रुतिशासनम्  | 4. 4. 997  |
| १२. स्वतस्तस्य च संप्रातेर्विनाप्यागमशासनात् ।<br>एकधैवानुविज्ञेयमिति च श्रुतिशासनम् ॥        | 5. 1. 81   |

And *Bṛhadvārtika*, i, 29, 30; ii, 4, 7; i, 4, 802; and p. 89 verse 288; p. 165, V. 562; p. 85, V. 275; and ii, 3, 137. There is thus enough justification to hold that the passages from the first chapter of G. quoted in the *Bṛhadvārtika* under such titles as आगमशासनं etc. were certainly meant to be from the śruti.

### VIII.

Touching Ā. the glossator on the *Bṛhadvārtika*, Dr. V. says that “not even he has said that the passage cited is from the Ā. P.” (P. 18). How could he when Ā. has already made it clear that he looks upon it as a Śruti?

I take my stand on Ā.’s plain statement that the ślokas explanatory of the *Mān. Up.* : माण्डूक्योपनिषदथाविष्करणपराः श्लोकाः were “received” by G. from Nārāyaṇa, which simply means that in the opinion of Ā, they were *not* the compositions of G. This is no guess but what follows from the actual words of Ā. There is nothing “obscure or unintelligible” about him. Elsewhere, the critic does *not* believe that Ā. is right” when he says that विश्वोहि स्थूलभुक्त्विज्यं (G. K. I, 3) quoted by Sv. is a śruti. (i. P. 18).

We really have nothing to do with the beliefs and disbeliefs of the Dr. interesting as they might be. The question is one of textual facts. In the light of Ā.’s introductory statement, his subsequent one आचार्यैर्माण्डूक्योपनिषदं पठित्वा तद्व्याख्यानलोकावतरणम् ... can only mean that it is these very ślokas received from Nārāyaṇa that were incorporated by G. into his work with the words : अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति. Of course, it would follow that in Ā.’s opinion, the words : अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति were G.’s. There can be no doubt however, that he did regard the विवरण-ślokas themselves as ‘quotations’ made by G. from Nārāyaṇa. The two other passages cited from his gloss on st. 10 and 19, also admit of the same explanation. There is nothing subversive of the Upaniṣadic theory in the phrase : तद्विवरणरूपान् श्लोकान् used by Ā. That they were looked upon as “quotations” is plain from Ā.’s comment on G. K. 1, 4:—उदाहृतश्लोकयोर्व्याख्यानापेक्षां वारयति, उक्तेति ॥ which has naturally escaped the Dr.’s eyes!

It would be impossible to deny that Ā. has cited G. K. I. 16 *ab*, as a śruti, in his gloss on the *Sambandha-vārtika*. Dr. V. chuckles at the thought of Ā.’s “citation of *Gītā* xiii, 19, immediately after G. K. 1, 16 and of *Manu* 1, 5, before Śvet. Up.” (ii. p. 3).—circumstances which to him indicate that Ā. had no idea of the order in which the quotations from the Śrutis and Smṛtis had to be given, nor any “thoughts of the priority of Śruti over Smṛti but has merely cited passages from both as they came to his mind” (11. P. 3.). A little thought would have shown him that far from having no idea of the order of texts, Ā. had for a very good reason quoted texts from the Śrutis and Smṛtis alternately, in *four* groups, so as to illustrate four points that he seeks to stress in order:—

|                     | S’ruti                                 | Smṛti                               |
|---------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| १. अविद्यानादित्वम् | (a) अनादिमायया सुप्तः<br>(G. K. i. 16) | (b) प्रकृति पुरुषं चैव<br>(Gītā)    |
| २. तदनिर्वचनीयत्वम् | (a) नासदासीन्नो सदासीत्<br>(R. V.)     | (b) आसीदिदं तमोभूतम्<br>(Manu i, 5) |

1. Cf. अविद्यानादित्वानिर्वचनीयत्वबन्धकत्वज्ञानापोद्यत्वादीनां ‘अनादिमायया सुप्तः’ । ..... इत्यादि श्रुतिस्मृतिभिरेव सिद्धे; न तान्यविद्यायाः कल्प्यत्वेऽपि कल्प्यानीति भावः ॥ (A. on *Bṛhadvārtika*)

३. तस्याः बंधकत्वम् (a) मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यात् (b) माया ह्येषा मया सृष्टा  
(S'vet Up.) (Mbh.)  
४. तस्याः विद्यापोद्यत्वम् (a) भूयश्चान्ते विश्वमाया- (b) मायामेतां तरन्ति ते  
निवृत्तिः (S'vet.) (Gītā)

There is thus no fear of our having to "declare the *Gītā* to be Śruti, were one follow" my reasoning. On the contrary, we may have to recognise the *Gauḍapāda-Kārikās*, as a *Smṛti*, if we allow ourselves to be guided by Dr. V.'s line of reasoning!

## IX.

When one is referring to the opposition of G. K. i, 18-19, as Kārikās, to the dogmas of Advaitism, it is irrelevant to say that M's explanation of the Kārikās in Chap. I, is also forced and unnatural. In the latter case the difficulty is unavoidable as the text is not a composition of M. but Śruti, in the interpretation of which every philosopher has his own difficulties. But in the case of the Advaitin, it is certainly avoidable (i. e. assuming the authorship of G.) in that it has been entirely self-created. That makes the difference between M. and G.

## X.

I need not go on repeating the fact that the *Mān.* as an Up. was known to Sv. and ergo to Ś. Dr. V. agrees that "the words अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति are not newly added by a later commentator but must be regarded as forming part of the *Mān.* itself." (P. 7). It must follow from this that G. was not the author of the first Prakaraṇa at all. It is quite possible that Dr. Iah considers both Ś. and Śv. to have perpetuated the error first committed by Śānta rakṣita (750 A. D.). What I fail to see in that case, is the special propriety of flamboyantly levelling a charge against Madhva alone. I still repeat my view that the circumstances are really suspicious when Ś. does not even once mention the name of G anywhere in his c. not even where the context requires it or where there is every chance and necessity for him to do so as under the headlines : अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति ! occurring four times ! The reference to the परमगुरु at the end is not enough as it may merely be an acknowledgment of G. as the 'compiler' of the *Āgama-śāstra* as it stands. (See Dr. V. ii, P. 10-11) without committing

1. Cf. पूर्ववदत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति (Cf. G.K. C. 1. 24.)

us to the necessity of attributing the words : अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति and the Kārikās following them to him. The words employed by Ś. do not differ from those used by him to introduce Scriptural quotations in his comm. on other Ups. :—

तत्तस्मिन्नेवाथ प्राणमयात्मविषये एव, श्लोको भवति; तदप्येष श्लोको भवति पूर्ववत्; तदेतस्मिन्नप्यर्थे एव श्लोको भवति—'असन्नेव स भवति' ॥ (Taittiriya Up. Bhāṣya)

As for tradition, it does not seem to have prevented Vācaspati Miśra from mentioning Śaṅkara by name, in his *Bhāmati* (introd. verse).

Parallelisms from Caraka and Vātsyāyana are not relevant to our purpose. To be sure, there are parallels also in the well-known Ups. of ślokas being introduced in the words of the original. Why should the later ones be preferred to the earlier parallels?

## XI.

I still think that some of the Kārikās qua Kārikās, are out of tune with the dogmas of the Advaita Vedānta. The critic has said nothing to meet the difficulties raised by Dvaitins. One's allegiance apart, it is clear from Ś's comment on G. K. 1, 17, तस्मान्न कश्चित् प्रपञ्चः प्रवृत्तो निवृत्तो वा अस्तीत्यभिप्रायः that he is prepared to face the situation boldly and accept the result of the विपर्यय-पथवसान made by the Dvaitins : न निवर्तते तस्मान्नास्ति प्रपञ्चः । There is no question of World-disappearance, for the very simple reason that it has never been there :—

वन्ध्यापुत्रो न तत्त्वेन मायया वापि जायते (G. K. iii, 28).

सतो ह्युत्पत्तिः प्रलयो वा स्यात्, नासतः शशविषाणादेः (C. on III, 32).

It would be more difficult to interpret the propositions : स्वप्नसरूपा सृष्टिः and मायासरूपा सृष्टिः realistically than to differentiate them effectively from the Advaitic view of Creation. No Realist would feel flattered by the description of Creation as "resembling" a Dream or a Magical show. The view on the other hand, bears a strong family resemblance to those of the Mādhyamika Buddhists:—

यथा माया यथा स्वप्नः गन्धर्वनगरं यथा ।

तथोत्पादः तथा स्थानं तथा भङ्ग उदाहृतः ॥

and of Advaitins:—

स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे गन्धर्वनगरं यथा ।

तथा विश्वमिदं दृष्टं वेदान्तेषु विचक्षणैः ॥ (G. K. II, 31).

वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः (G. K. II, 6).

अतो मन्यामहे—तेषां (i. e. जामदग्न्यानां) अप्यसत्त्वं स्वप्नदृश्यवत्.  
(Śaṅkara *ibid*) ननु, जामदग्नस्तुनो न स्वप्नदृश्यवत्स्वम् । सत्यमेवमविवेकिनां  
स्यात्—<sup>1</sup> (C. on IV. 38).

असज्जागरिते दृष्टा स्वप्ने पश्यति तन्मयः (G. K. IV. 39).

So too, in the case of मायासरूपा सृष्टिः :—

जन्म मायोपमं तेषां, साच माया न विद्यते (G. K. iv, 58).

There is thus no point in the objection that creation on the Advaitic view is माया but not मायासरूप. The addition of the term सरूप would not make the world real any more than the presence of such suffixes as वत्, सदृश, सरूप, यथा, उपम etc. in the passages cited above. G. K. i. 9 cd, is however anxious to put down creation as almost the second nature of God: देवस्यैष स्वभावोऽयम् and say that there can be no motive behind such spontaneous activity which can hardly be lowered to the rank of a random illusion :— नहि रज्वादीनामविद्यास्वभावव्यतिरेकेण सर्पाद्याभासत्वे कारणं शक्यं वस्तुम्! (Śaṅkara on G. K. i, 9 cd.) The rift in the analogy is that whilst सर्पाद्याभास may be due to अविद्यास्वभाव the creative activity of God is due to देवस्वभाव not देवाविद्यास्वभाव !

I am glad Dr. Iah has seen his way to admit frankly that Advaitin writers like Madhusūdana Sarasvati, Appayya Dīkṣita, Vidyāranya, Sāyaṇa, Advaitānanda etc. "belong to the same class as Madhva" (ii. P. 12). Had he examined the evidences cited by me a little more dispassionately he would have admitted that Sureśvara, Ānandagiri, Vimuktātman and Rāmānuja also "belong to the same class as Madhva." There is thus no rhyme or reason in the charge against Madhva.

In conclusion, I should like particularly to repeat my remarks in the last two paragraphs of my Rejoinder to Mr. V. Subrahmanya Sarma, in Vol. i. no. 2. P. 38, of this Journal. I think that light must dawn upon Dr. V. if only he would keep clear of irrelevant issues, such as the true and original status of the disputed Kārikās during Pre-Śāṅkarite times.

1. Cf. ज्योतिष्टोमादिश्रुतिबोधितानुष्ठाननिष्कर्षसिद्धिः स्वप्नश्रुतिबोधितानुष्ठानप्रयुक्त-  
फलसंवादतुल्या—Appayya Dīkṣita *Siddhāntaleṣa Saṅgraha*.

IDENTIFICATION OF RANGA JYOTIRVID,  
THE AUTHOR OF VICĀRASUDHĀKARA,  
A MEDICAL TREATISE COMPOSED  
IN A.D. 1765,  
BY ORDER OF RAGHUNĀTHRAO PESHWA

(By P. K. Gode)

In my note<sup>1</sup> on the "Date of Vicārasudhākara of Rāṅga Jyotirvid" I pointed out that this treatise on Piles was composed in A. D. 1765 by order of Raghunathrao Peshwa. The author was a resident of Junnar in the Poona district. He mentions the following physicians of the Peshwa period in his treatise:—

1. Bagāji Vaidya, resident of Junnarapura
2. Balavantrāya Vaidya
3. Bābā Bhiṣagvarya
4. Jaya Śaṅkara

He also refers to the surgical operation of piles, a method current among the Yavana or English physicians residing on the sea-coast.

When I wrote my note on this work I was not able to identify the author of the treatise viz. Rāṅga Jyotirvid. Rao Bahadur G. S. Sardesai, the Editor of the Peshwa Daftar, who was consulted by me in the matter of this identification suggested that I should write to some member of the Joshi family of Junnar. I acted on this suggestion but without any direct acquaintance with the person concerned I could get neither information nor any response.

Recently in the *Chandrachud Daftar*<sup>2</sup> published by the Bharata Itihasa Sam. Mandal, Poona, I came across the following references to a person called RANGA JOSI Junnarkar:—

Pp. 3–10—Here a partition-deed of the members of the Chandrachud family is reproduced. It is dated *Saka 1701* Vikāri nāma Samvatsara, Pauṣa Śudda 10, which corresponds to Monday, 17th January, A. D. 1780.

1. Vide *Annals*, Vol. XII, pp. 287–289.  
2. Bha. Iti. Sam. Mandal Series No. 22. Edited by D. V. Apte, *Saka* 1842 (A. D. 1920) Poona.