

REVIEW
OF
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION
POONA

Vol. IV

1933

UNIV. OF CALIF. LIB.
AT LOS ANGELES
LIBRARY

THE UPANIṢADIC THEORY OF THE GAUDAPĀDA—KĀRIKĀS.

Y. SUBRAHMANYA SARMA:

Students of the History of Dvaita Vedānta have reason to be highly grateful to Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma for his two thought-provoking articles on the above subject, which appeared in the March numbers of the Second and Third Volumes of this Review. Although the subject-matter with which the writer deals is not altogether new, there is such a mass of valuable and suggestive material collected here for the first time, and the main idea is elaborated with such thoroughness, that there is certainly some justification for the arrestive title "New Light on the Gaudapāda-Kārikās."

It is well known that there are, at the present-day, at least three distinct and irreconcilable views regarding the authorship of the Kārikās. In the first place, there is the view commonly held that all the two hundred and fifteen Kārikās are from the pen of Gaudapāda, Śāṅkara's grand preceptor, who wrote his book as an exposition of the Advaitic doctrine which he believed to be taught in the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad. In the second place, there is the theory, first put forward by Paul Deussen, that both the so-called Upaniṣad and the Kārikās are the production of Gaudapāda himself. And in the third place, we have the Upaniṣadic Theory that the prose portion of the Māṇḍūkya together with the first twenty-nine Kārikās, is the Upaniṣad proper. It is this last view that Mr. Krishnamurti Sarma has taken upon himself to support in the articles referred to above.¹

Mr. Sarma claims that the Upaniṣadic theory is 'perfectly tenable' and that 'there is voluminous evidence' in its favour; that the first chapter of the Kārikās has been treated as part of the Upaniṣad not by Madhva alone, but by many prominent representatives of all the three Schools of Vedānta. He has incontestably shown that Post-Madhva writers, Advaitins as well as Viśiṣṭadvaitins included, have acquiesced in and even adopted the theory, though not without an occasional murmur. But

1. The Buddhistic traits supposed to be distinctive of Gaudapāda's writings have given rise to various other views; not to complicate matters, I defer their consideration for the present.

can we maintain that the belief is earlier than the first or the Kārikā view, or even that it has existed side by side with it from the earliest times? Mr. Sarma replies in the affirmative. It is his conviction, indeed, that "Gaudapāda was never credited with the authorship of the Kārikās of the first or the Āgama Prakaraṇa as it is called," that "at one time, later Advaitins themselves happened to forget and miss the real position of the first set of Kārikās and attribute it to Gaudapāda"; and that "this initial mistake of the later Advaitins" as he calls it, "dates from the 18th century or thereabout." In the following pages I propose to examine this part of his conclusion in particular; for in spite of the care with which Mr. Sarma has collected his evidence, he does not always seem to distinguish between, what is plausible and what is absolutely certain. He does not, moreover, seem to have taken a comprehensive view of all that has been or might be urged to modify or neutralize the value of some of the evidence now in his possession.

I

Mr. Sarma says that Śāṅkara, Sureśvara and Ānandagiri are all three of them fully and unreservedly in favour of including the disputed Kārikās in the Upaniṣad. Now there seem to be very serious obstacles to our acceptance of this induction. The truth seems to be just the other way about. We shall first take up Śāṅkara. Intrinsically his Bhāṣya on the Kārikās themselves must claim precedence over all other works ascribed to him.

The Ācārya opens his commentary with these significant words:—

वेदान्तार्थसारसंग्रहभूतमिदं प्रकरणचतुष्टयं ओमित्येतदक्षरमित्याद्यारभ्यते । अत एव न पृथक्संबन्धाभिधेयप्रयोजनानि वक्तव्यानि । यान्येव तु वेदान्ते संबन्धाभिधेयप्रयोजनानि तान्येवेह भवितुमर्हन्ति । तथापि प्रकरणव्याचिख्यासुना वक्तव्यानि ॥ (Mand. Up. p 5. Ānand. Edn.) Here Śāṅkara says in so many words, that he is going to undertake a commentary on a work consisting of four Prakaraṇas or monographs. The work being, so to say, only an explanatory discourse on the Upaniṣadic teachings, the author has deemed it superfluous to discuss the usual preliminaries (अनुबन्ध) to be settled in connection with a new literary work, such as its relation to other works in the field, its subject-matter or the main purpose it is meant to serve. Śāṅkara himself, however, as the commentator of these Prakaraṇas¹, now undertakes to specify

1. With this would agree Ānandagiri's explicit remark—प्रकरणकर्तुं रक्त-
भ्यामपि तद्भाष्यकृता तानि संक्षेपतो वक्तव्यानि ॥ (p. 6.)

them in brief. It is singular that this direct statement on the part of Śaṅkara at the very commencement of his Bhāṣya should have escaped the notice of Mr. Sarma. Here is positive evidence to show that Śaṅkara considers the whole work of four chapters only as a set of four Prakaraṇas (प्रकरणचतुष्टयं) and by no means as Śruti.

Again, after finishing with the *Anubandhas* (अनुबन्धः) to which reference is made in the above passage, Śaṅkara proceeds to describe the nature of each chapter of the प्रकरणचतुष्टयं he is going to comment upon. With regard to the first chapter, he says "तत्र तावदोक्तारनिर्णयः प्रथमं प्रकरणं आगमप्रधानं, आत्मतत्त्वप्रतिपत्त्युपायभूतम्" (p. 8). I am sure that Mr. Sarma would not have set such store by the phrase आगममात्रम् (which occurs in the opening lines of Śaṅkara's comment on the second and third chapters) had he noticed this important passage. For, Śaṅkara says, not that the first chapter is Śruti, but that it is आगमप्रधानं which means based principally on the आगम. Now even assuming that Śaṅkara does mean Śruti by the word आगम, the phrase आगमप्रधानं would imply that the first chapter contains not only *Āgama*, which is, of course, its special feature, but also something else besides. As a matter of fact, however, Śaṅkara means by the word no more than dogmatic teaching based upon tradition. Accordingly Ānandagiri remarks in his gloss:

'तदुपदेशप्रधानं माण्डूक्योपनिषद्व्याख्यानरूपम् । तेन तत्र प्रामाण्यादुक्तो निर्णयः संस्यति । न त्विदं युक्तिप्रधानम् । युक्तिलेशस्य सतोऽपि गुणत्वादप्रधानत्वात् ॥' (Ibid.)

Here clearly आगम is equated with उपदेश by Ānandagiri. That he is right in this interpretation is corroborated by Śaṅkara's own paraphrase of "आगममात्रं तत्" by "प्रतिज्ञामात्रेण" in the very passage quoted by Mr. Sarma:—

"ओक्तारनिर्णयः उक्तः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत आत्मेति प्रतिज्ञामात्रेण । ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यत इति च ।.....अद्वैतं किमागममात्रेण प्रतिपत्तव्यं, आहोस्वित्तर्कणापीत्यत आह ।....." (p.103). Śaṅkara obviously means to say that the first chapter being mostly in the form of authoritative statements based upon the Śruti, the second and third chapters are added on to demonstrate the unreality of duality and the reality of non-duality) as supported by reason also.

The word आगम having been thus disposed of by Śaṅkara himself, "ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते" (I-18) need not any longer be taken to have been cited as a Śruti by Śaṅkara. And Ānandagiri confirms

1. Whether एकमेवाद्वितीयमित्यादि श्रुतिः in the commentary on the second Chapter (II-1) is an interpolation as contended by Mr. Sarma, may be left an open question for the present.

this view in his gloss on III-1—"तत्रैवाद्ये प्रकरणे 'ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यत' इत्यत्र प्रतिज्ञामात्रेण द्वैताभाव उक्तः । स तु द्वितीयेन प्रकरणेन हेतुद्वयान्तात्मकेन तर्केण च प्रतिपादितः ॥" (p. 104) The expression 'तथा च वक्ष्यति' in the Bhāṣya under 'नान्तः प्रज्ञं' should, in the light of the above, be interpreted as anticipating only a Kārikā of the Prakaraṇa and not as conferring any scriptural character upon 'ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते.' Two more contexts, in which this same word 'वक्ष्यति' occurs not only justify this view, but throw an unexpected light upon the question at issue. 'वक्ष्यति च' in the Bhāṣya on the sixth Kārikā (p. 33) refers to III-28; while another in the Bhāṣya on the twelfth Mantra (p. 60) refers to III-16. Now in both of these cases reference is to an undisputed Kārikā of Gauḍapāda and leaves us no choice but to admit that Śaṅkara did attribute the *Āgama* Prakaraṇa to the same author that wrote the *Advaita* Prakaraṇa.

The above facts added to the circumstance that Śaṅkara is nowhere seen, in his accredited works, to quote the disputed Kārikās as Śruti, should force us to conclude that he in no way regarded the first chapter as part of the Upaniṣad. An additional piece of evidence that he did regard the chapter as part of Gauḍapāda's work, is furnished by his attributing two of the Kārikās (III-15, I-716) to Gauḍapāda, as 'one who is acquainted with the right tradition, (तथा च संप्रदायविदो वदन्ति Br. Sūt. I-4-4; अत्रोक्तं संप्रदायविद्विराचार्यैः Br. Sūt. II-1-9).

Mr. Sarma has drawn quotations from the *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*, the *Nṛsiṃha-Tāpanīya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya* and the *Viṣṇu-Sahasra-Nāma-Bhāṣya*, to show that Śaṅkara recognises the disputed portion of the Kārikās as Śruti. Scholars are not unanimous in ascribing these works to Śaṅkara and there are very good reasons to believe that most probably these are productions of different and later authors. As I intend to place before the public the internal and external evidences concerning the authorship and date of these writings, I shall not pursue the argument any further here. We may note, however, that they have never been attributed to Śaṅkara by any early Advaitin. Their evidential value is thereby greatly diminished more especially in the light of the positive incontrovertible proofs which we possess and can adduce.

II

We may now pass on to the evidence furnished by Suresvara, the immediate disciple of Śaṅkara. I have already given at length the passage from the Guru's Bhāṣya which decisively takes the

Āgama Prakaraṇa as one of the four monographs. But the opening lines of the *Bhāṣya* are so ambiguously worded as to lead one to suppose that the *Māṇḍūkya* itself is included in the प्रकरणचतुष्टय. It was this circumstance that led Deussen to remark that "the commentary on the *Māṇḍūkya* which is extant under the name of Śaṅkara treats this and Gaudapāda's *Kārikās* as one; and seems to regard the whole as in no sense an Upaniṣad (वेदान्तार्थसारसंग्रहभूतमिदं प्रकरणचतुष्टयं ओमित्येतदक्षरमित्याद्यारभ्यते ।). And with this would agree the fact that the *Māṇḍūkya* is not quoted either in the *Brahmasūtras* or in Śaṅkara's commentary on them." (p. 30. Deussen's 'Philosophy of the Upaniṣads'). I have not been able to find in Śaṅkara's genuine any Śruti quotations that may be distinctly traced to the *Māṇḍūkya* and Deussen does not explain why, on his hypothesis, Gaudapāda first sets his doctrine in prose in a very short paragraph and explains himself at great length in poetry—a topsy-turvy procedure evidently.¹ Be this as it may. In the absence of any other testimony from earlier writers, it would be of some interest to scholars to know that Sureśvara, a direct disciple of Śaṅkara calls the *Māṇḍūkya*, an Upaniṣad.

‘एषोऽन्तर्याम्येषयोनिः सर्वस्य प्रभवाप्ययौ ।

माण्डूकेयश्रुतिवच्च इति स्पष्टमधीयते ॥

(Bṛihad. Vārtika 3-8-26, p. 1294).

But to resume the present discussion. Mr. Sarma refers to three Vārtikās (I-4-615,712 and 744) wherein Gaudapāda has been quoted. Sureśvara is indeed not quite explicit here. But there is a passage in his *Naīṣkarmya-Siddhi* which leaves us in no doubt as to his exact attitude.

अस्यार्थस्य द्रष्टव्य उदाहरणम्—

कार्यकारणबद्धौ ताविष्येते विश्वतैजसौ ।

प्राज्ञःकारणबद्धस्तु द्वौ तौ तुर्यं न सिध्यतः ॥ (4-41)

अन्यथा गृह्यतः स्वप्नो निद्रा स्वप्नप्रमानतः ।

विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्रुते ॥ (4-42)

तथा भगवत्पादीयमुदाहरणम्—

सुषुप्ताख्यं तमोऽज्ञानं बीजं स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः ।

आत्मबोधप्रदग्धं स्याद्बीजं दग्धं यथाभवम् ॥ (4-43)

एवं गौडैर्वाविडैर्नः पूज्यैरयमर्थः प्रभाषितः ।

अज्ञानमात्रोपाधिः सन्नहमादिदृशीश्वरः ॥ (4-44)

1. Neither is Mr. Sarma's explanation of the repetition altogether free from objection; for, it is quite uncommon for the Upaniṣads to explain themselves at such length in śloka.

The first thing that strikes one is that Sureśvara expressly attributes to Gaudapāda two of the disputed *Kārikās* (including the very one whose scriptural nature Mr. Sarma has been at such pains to infer). This portion of *Naīṣkarmya-Siddhi* being meant for the satisfaction of those that demand an authority for Sureśvara's rationalistic position (न्याय्योऽपि वेदान्तार्थः), he naturally appeals to both viz. Gaudapāda and Śaṅkara as two unimpeachable authorities. (अभिमतप्रामाण्योदाहरणम्—p. 194, *Naī. Siddhi*, Bombay).

III

Ānandagiri's evidence is not so valuable for our purpose as either Śaṅkara's or Sureśvara's, especially because he is a very recent writer on Vedānta. (See Mr. T. M. Tripathi's Introduction to *Tarkasaṅgraha* of Ānandajñāna, Gaikwar Oriental Series). At any rate, it is certain that there have been at least two glossators of the name of Ānandagiri both of whom Mr. Sarma has been indiscriminately quoting in his support, thus conferring upon them an identity untrue to fact. Ānandagiri who deals with Sureśvara-Vārtika is entirely in favour of the Upaniṣadic theory. As pointed out by Mr. Sarma "he makes a clear distinction between the *Kārikās* occurring in the first chapter of Gaudapāda which he distinctly dubs Śruti-texts (श्रुति प्रमाणयति) and others occurring elsewhere in Gaudapāda which he quite faithfully attributes to Gaudapāda by name' (संप्रदायविदां वाक्यं प्रमाणयति). †

I shall now proceed to quote from the other Ānandagiri the glossator on the *Kārikā* itself, to show how diametrically opposite views are held by these two persons:—

गौडपादीयभाष्यं हि प्रसन्नमिव लक्ष्यते ।

तदर्थतोऽतिगंभीरं व्याकरिष्ये स्वशक्तिः ॥

In this opening verse Ānandagiri proposes, in unmistakable language, to analyse the *Bhāṣya* on Gaudapāda. I have already

1. I am not quite sure whether Gaudapāda is the actual name of the author of the *Kārikās*. Sureśvara may be referring to him only as one of the five Gauḍa Brahmins of the North in the same way as he is referring to Śaṅkara as a Dravida. In any case the author of the *Kārikās* must be quite different from his namesake the commentator on the *Sāṅkhya Kārikā*, as well as the commentator on the *Uttaragītā* for obvious reasons.

† This remark which Mr. Sarma makes in connection with Sureśvara also is inapplicable to him for reasons already given; but it remains perfectly true as applied to Ānandagiri, the glossator of *Aradhavārtika*.

referred to his explanation of 'आगमप्रधानं' as 'तदुपदेशप्रधानं, माण्डूक्योप-
निषद्ब्रह्मसूत्ररूपम्' whereby he distinguishes the first chapter of the
Kārikā from the Upaniṣad proper. Quite in accordance with this,
he says in his gloss on the Bhāṣya expounding the very first
sentence of Gauḍapāda—

‘आचार्यैर्माण्डूक्योपनिषदं पठित्वा तद्व्याख्यानं श्लोकावतरणमत्रेत्यादिना कृतम् । तदेत-
दनूय भाष्यकारो व्याकरोति ।’ (p. 25).

This is crystal-clear. Its import was very well under-
stood by Madhva writers like the author of the *Taraṅgiṇī* whom
Mr. Sarma himself quotes with approval. I do not understand
why, in these circumstances Mr. Sarma has exercised his
ingenuity in explaining away a plain statement of Anandagiri.
(श्रीगौडपादाचार्यस्य नारायणप्रसादतः प्रतिपन्नान् माण्डूक्योपनिषदर्थविकरणपरानपि श्लोका-
नाचार्यप्रणीतान् व्याचिरव्यासुः ।), as implying a distinction between two
different sets of Kārikās.

IV

Coming down from Śaṅkara and Sureśvara in whom one
can find no traces of the Upaniṣadic notion, one seeks in vain
for a confirmation or a denial of it either in Bhāskara or Rāmānuja,
two important Bhāṣyakāras both of whom are hostile critics of
Śaṅkara's system. Rāmānuja, indeed, quotes a Kārikā (I-16)
but only to dispose of it as having no reference to Śaṅkara's
Māyāvāda. He makes no allusion to its character either as
scriptural or other; neither does he quote from the Māṇḍūkya or
from the disputed Kārikās elsewhere in all his extensive writings.
Hence his attitude to the Kārikā is quite indeterminable. That
he is not always exact in his quotations, may be gathered from
his fusing two different quotations into one,¹ both in Śrī-Bhāṣya
and in the Vedānta-Dīpa on Sūtra I-1-31.

Ranga Rāmānuja and Kūranārāyaṇa, both followers of
Rāmānujācārya have commented upon the Māṇḍūkya. The
former has omitted the Kārikā portion altogether, while the
latter has commented upon it as a part of the Upaniṣad. Mr.
Sarma considers him to have been a contemporary disciple of
Rāmānuja. If so, he would perhaps be the first known authority
who made any reference to the tradition of the Upaniṣadic
theory. His commentary on the Māṇḍūkya, moreover, betrays
very close resemblance to that of Madhvācārya, except where
the exigency of the system requires a departure. Are we to

1. 'तद्वैतत्वं पश्यन् ऋषिर्ब्रह्मदेवः प्रतिपदे अहं मयुरभवं सूर्यभ्राह्मं कक्षीषातुर्विरिमि विप्रः ॥' This
is to be found partly in the Brhadvārtika and partly in the R̥gveda.

suppose that Madhvācārya was indebted to this Kūranārāyaṇa
for his thoughts on the Māṇḍūkya? This seems improbable.

However this may be, we may set aside the evidence of
Kūranārāyaṇa for the present, inasmuch as his date has not
been finally settled as yet. As Mr. Sarma himself admits, the
present followers of Rāmānuja are inclined to place this writer
later than Vedānta Deśika; and they are not wrong either, because
Kūranārāyaṇa's commentary on Īśāvāsya (ईशावास्य) is mostly
a paraphrase of Deśika's; Kūranārāyaṇa himself says,—

‘वेदान्तगुरुपादाब्जध्याननिर्मलचेतसा ।

वाजिवेदान्तसारार्थः श्रीवत्साङ्गेन दर्शितः ॥—(Mysore, Telugu Edn).

The net result is that we cannot confidently specify a single
Viśiṣṭādvaitic (विशिष्टाद्वैत) writer contemporaneous with Rāmānuja
who believed in the Upaniṣadic nature of the Kārikās.

V

Now to the upshot of the whole enquiry. There is little or
no evidence to suppose that before Madhva, the Upaniṣadic
theory was in existence or that it was consciously believed in or
referred to by any writer definitely known to have flourished
before that Ācārya. Mr. Sarma has not succeeded in carrying
us a step further than that Madhva and writers after him have
generally proceeded on this impression; while some of them have
argued in its defence. Of course he has made a learned attempt to
prove that the first twenty-nine Kārikās have been invariably
considered to be Śruti by writers earlier than Madhva. But un-
fortunately whenever there seems to be indubitable testimony
in his favour, its date or genuineness is found not to have passed
beyond the disputable stage; and whenever he appeals to sources
admittedly earlier than Madhva, the evidence is either vague and
insufficient, or else decidedly against him.

We shall leave the matter here. We need not trouble our-
selves with the conclusions that might be drawn from *a priori*
considerations such as the arrangement of the Kārikās or
the interpretative difficulties that are imagined by Mr. Sarma to
beset the Advaitin. For, where we have to deal with probabilities
there is always room for divergence of opinion. Nor need we
pause to consider the value of *Brahma Tarka* and *Garuḍa Purāṇa*
to which Madhva appeals as his main support. For, the former is a
literary work known only to himself, while the latter is a Purāṇa
whose contents are likely to be by no means constant. Of course
I do not doubt the *bonafides* of Madhva. Perhaps he had access
to *Brahma Tarka* when he wrote his Bhāṣya. But would it not

be explaining the unknown by the unknown, if we attempted to fix the nature of the Āgama Prakaraṇa during pre-Madhva days, on the strength of this solitary quotation from a work unknown to any writer either before or after Madhva?

As I have said at the commencement of this article, Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma has produced ample testimony of all the prominent exponents of the three schools of Vedānta to prove that the Upaniṣadic theory of the Gauḍapāda Kārikās has gained currency not only among the followers of Madhva but among all Post-Madhva Vedāntins. Much credit is due to him for having done this service to Oriental scholarship. Whether part of an Upaniṣad came to be mistakenly regarded by the Advaitins as Kārikās or whether a portion of the Kārikās has itself recently got converted into an Upaniṣad in the eyes of Madhvas and latter-day Vedāntins,¹ 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. Mr. Sarma suggests that after all Gauḍapāda might have had access to an original Upaniṣad with an explanatory tract thereon, on which again he based his more elaborate treatise. Thus, the twenty-nine Kārikās may have simply served as the nuclei of his later and more detailed treatise. But this bare possibility unsupported by evidence will rank no higher than an ingenious fancy.

P. S. The Editor has kindly sent to me in original another big article by Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma. As it only deals with additional evidence from writings dating after the twelfth century there is very little for me to modify what I wrote nearly a year ago.

1. This may perhaps explain how Vijñāna Bhikṣu happened to call one of the undisputed Kārikās a Śruti.

EMANUEL SWEDENBORG AND HIS PHILOSOPHY.

D. GOPAUL CHETTY.

Emanuel Swedenborg, the father of modern Philosophy was an illustrious and a far-seeing man of science, an epoch-making philosopher, an enlightened seer, a many-sided man, a heaven-directed theologian, a prophet of the New Christian Era and the world recognises him as one of the greatest geniuses of his age.

He was born at Stockholm in 1688 and died in London in 1772. His father, Jesper Swedberg was a Court Preacher, Professor in the University of Upsala and finally Bishop of Skara. The boy was thus familiar with the atmosphere of the Court and came into some sort of contact with the leading men of his country. His mind was thus early stored with vivid impressions of persons and views of events of general importance. In his youth, he was surrounded by an atmosphere of loving piety and theological study. Writing to a friend in old age, he says: "From my fourth to my tenth year, my thoughts were constantly engrossed in reflecting on God, on salvation, and on the spiritual affections of man. From my sixth to twelfth year, it was my greatest delight to converse with the clergy concerning faith; to whom I observed, that charity or love, is the life of faith." This shows that from the time of teething he was a reformer. As a child, he thought differently from children; and as a man, differently from men. His parents doted upon their Emanuel and in their parental ecstasy declared that the angels spoke through his mouth.

He entered the University of Upsala in 1699 and pursued his studies in the faculty of philosophy for ten years and afterwards graduated in that University. It was during this time, the Cartesian controversy was raging and he was therefore brought under the spell of revolutionary spirit and was imbued with the fresh intellectual impulses of the age.

His brother-in-law, Eric Benzeliu, the University Librarian and a learned scholar, encouraged the young student's zeal for mathematics and the physical sciences and aided him greatly to make a tour abroad. In 1710, he went abroad for a tour of five years, embracing England, Holland, France and Germany.

Part DCCLXXXI.

(VOL. LXII.)

October, 1933.

THE
INDIAN ANTIQUARY,
A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

IN
ARCHÆOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY, ETHNOLOGY, GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, FOLKLORE, LANGUAGES,
LITERATURE, NUMISMATICS, PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION, Etc., Etc.

EDITED BY

CHARLES E. A. W. OLDHAM, C.S.I.,

FORMERLY OF THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE,

Rao Bahadur Dr. S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR, M.A., (Hony.) Ph.D., F.A.S.B.

HONORARY CORRESPONDENT, ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA.

AND

Prof. DEVADATTA RAMKRISHNA BHANDARKAR, M.A., (Hony.) Ph.D., F.A.S.B.

CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE MANDŪKYOPANISAD AND GAUDAPĀDA, by A. VENKATASUBBIAH.	181
2. KASHMIRI PROVERBS, by PANDIT ANAND KOUL, SRINAGAR, KASHMIR.	194
MISCELLANEA—	
3. INDIA AND THE EAST IN CURRENT LITERATURE, by C. E. A. W. O.	199

BOOK-NOTICES—

	PAGE
4. MAHARANA KUMBHA: SOVEREIGN, SOLDIER, SCHOLAR, by HARBILAS SARDAR, M.A., by D. R. B.	200
5. GANGA-PURĀTATTVĀṆKA, by C. E. A. W. O.	200

SUPPLEMENT :—

ON THE MODERN INDO-ARYAN VERNACULARS, by SIR GEORGE A. GRERSON, O.M., K.C.I.E.	pages 151 to 166
--	------------------

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT THE BRITISH INDIA PRESS, MAZGAON, BOMBAY.

Agents for Europe and America :—

BERNARD QUARITCH, Ltd., 11, GRAFTON STREET, NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

[All Rights Reserved.]

Annual Subscription in advance Rs. 20.

THE MĀṆḌŪKYOPANIṢAD AND GAUḌAPĀDA.

By A. VENKATASUBBIAH.

THE Māṇḍūkya is one of the ten 'major' upaniṣads, the other nine being the Īśāvāsya, Kena, Katha, Praśna, Muṇḍaka, Taittirīya, Aitareya, Chāndogya and Brhadāraṇyaka. Though it is the shortest of the ten,¹ and in fact, of the hundred-and-eight upaniṣads, it is esteemed to be the best. Compare, for instance, Muktikopaniṣad I, 26-29 :

Māṇḍūkyam ekam evālaṃ mumukṣūṇāṃ vimuktaye || 26 ||
tathāpy asiddhaṃ cej jñānaṃ daśopaniṣadaṃ paṭha |
jñānaṃ labdhvā 'cirdā eva māmakaṃ dhāma yāsyasi || 27 ||
tathāpi dr̥ghatā no ced vijñānasyāñjanāśuta |
dvātriṃśākyopaniṣadaṃ samabhyasya nivartaya || 28 ||
videha-muktāṃ icchā ced aṣṭottara-śataṃ paṭha |

"The Māṇḍūkya alone is sufficient to lead aspirants to liberation. If even so (i.e., even after reading it), knowledge is not attained, read the ten upaniṣads ; you will then soon obtain knowledge and attain my abode. If even then, O son of Añjanā,² there is no firmly-established knowledge, read again and again the thirty-two upaniṣads and return (to my abode). If there is desire for *videha-mukti* (liberation after leaving the body), read the hundred-and-eight upaniṣads."

The Māṇḍūkya consists of but twelve sentences, and the first seven of them, in which the teaching of the upaniṣad may be said to be complete, are found with little or no variation in the *Nṛsiṃha-pūrva-tāpinī* (4, 2), *Nṛsiṃhottara-tāpinī*³ (1) and *Rāmottara-tāpinī* upaniṣads also, while the substance of their teaching is given, in the same words mostly, in the *Yogacūḍāmaṇi* (72 ff.) and *Nārada-parivṛājaka* (7, 3 ff.) upaniṣads.

The Māṇḍūkya has, as is well known, 215 kārīkās or compendious verses attached to it, which form an appendix or supplement to it. These verses are grouped into four prakaraṇas or sections known as Āgama-prakarāṇa, Vaitathya-pra°, Advaita-pra°, and Alātaśānti-pra°, which contain 29, 38, 48 and 100 verses respectively. The verses of the last three prakaraṇas are to be read one after the other regularly, but those of the first are not. They are interspersed among the sentences of the Māṇḍūkya in the following manner : vss. 1-9 are interposed between sentences 6 and 7, vss. 10-18 between sentences 7 and 8, and vss. 19-23 between sentences 11 and 12, while vss. 27-29 follow sentence 12.

According to the opinion current among scholars of the Advaita school, the sentences of the Māṇḍūkya alone are *śruti* (i.e., divine revelation), and all the 215 kārīkās are written by Gauḍapāda, the teacher of Govinda-bhagavatpāda, who was the teacher of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, the founder of the Advaita school. According to the scholars of the Dvaita school of Śrī Madhvācārya (or Ānandatīrtha), however, the kārīkās of the last three sections only are to be attributed to Gauḍapāda, while those of the first prakaraṇa (which, as we have seen, are interspersed among the sentences of the Māṇḍūkya) form an integral part of the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad, and have thus the character of *śruti*.

It is my object in this paper to show that both these opinions are wrong. For, not only the 215 kārīkās, but the twelve sentences that comprise the Māṇḍūkya also have been written by Gauḍapāda, as comes out clearly from Śaṅkara's commentary on the Māṇḍūkya and GK :⁴

¹ The citations made in this paper from the ten major upaniṣads are based on the Anandāśrama editions ; those from the other upaniṣads are based on the Nirṇayasāgara Press edition of the *Hundred and Eight Upaniṣads* published in 1913.

² i.e., Hanumān. The passage is addressed by Śrī-Rāma to him.

³ This upaniṣad contains, with many additions, the last five sentences also of the Māṇḍūkya.

⁴ i.e., Gauḍapāda-kārīkās.

(1) After two⁵ benedictory stanzas, Śaṅkara begins the commentary proper with the following sentences :—

*om ity etad akṣaram idam sarvaṃ tasyopavyākhyānam | vedāntārtha-sāra-saṃgraha-
bhūtam idam prakaraṇa-catuṣṭayam om-ity-etad-akṣaram-ity-ādy ārabhyate | ata eva na
pṛthak sambandhābhidheya-prayojanāni vaktavyāni | yāny eva tu vedānte sambandhābhi-
dheya-prayojanāni tāny eveha bhavitum arhanti |tatra tāvad om-kāra-nir-
nayāya prathamam prakaraṇam āgama-pradhānam ātmataṭṭva-pratipatty-upāya-bhūtam |
yasya dvaita-prapañcasyopasame 'dvaita-pratipattī rajjvām iva sarpādi-vikalpopasame
rajjutattva-pratipattiḥ | tasya dvaitasya hetuto vaitathya-pratipādanāya dvitīyam
prakaraṇam | tathā 'dvaitasyāpi vaitathya-prasaṅga-prāptau yuktitas tathātva-darśanāya
tṛtīyam prakaraṇam | advaitasya tathātva-pratipatti-pratipakṣa-bhūtāni yāni vādānta-
rāny avaidikāni teṣām anyonya-virodhitvād atathārthatvena tad-upapattibhir eva nirā-
karaṇāya caturtham prakaraṇam |*

He states clearly in the first two of these sentences (a) that the work that he is going to comment on begins with the words *om ity etad akṣaram idam*...., (b) that it consists of four sections, and (c) that the work with its four sections is an epitome of the teachings of the Vedānta. In the last five of the sentences cited, he states (1) that the first section explains the significance of the syllable *om* and the nature of the ātman, and consists mostly of propositions⁶; (2) that the second demonstrates with reasons the falseness of dualism; (3) that the third shows with reasons the rightness of Advaita; and (4) that the fourth shows how the very arguments, urged by opponents of Advaita belonging to non-Vedic schools, are mutually destructive and serve only to firmly establish Advaita.⁷

The words *om ity etad akṣaram*....cited by Śaṅkara form, as can be seen, the beginning of the Māṇḍūkya; and it hence becomes clear that, in Śaṅkara's opinion (1) the Āgama-prakarāṇa began with these words, and not with *atrate ślokā bhavanti || baḥiṣ-prajño vibhur viśvo*....as believed by present-day paṇḍits of the Advaita school, and (2) that all the four prakaraṇas have the same author. In other words, it is clear that the twelve sentences comprising the Māṇḍūkya are, in the opinion of Śaṅkara, of the same nature as the verses which, with these sentences, form the Āgama-prakarāṇa, and that they have been written by the same person as wrote the 215 kārīkās.

(2) That the Āgama-prakarāṇa began with the words *om ity etad akṣaram*...., and that they were written by the author of the kārīkās is, further, made plain by two observations of Ānandagiri. When explaining GK. IV. 1, Ānandagiri writes: *ādy-anta-madhya-maṅgalā granthāḥ pracāriṇo bhavantiḥ abhipretya ādāv om-kāroccāraṇavad ante para-devatā-praṇāmavan madhye'pi para-devatā-rūpam upadeśtāraṃ praṇamati*. The words *ādāv om-kāroccāraṇavat* used here refer to the *om* that stands at the beginning of Māṇḍūkya: *om ity etad akṣaram idam*....Similarly, when explaining the second stanza, *yo viśvātmā vidhija-viṣayān*....that occurs in the beginning of Śaṅkara's commentary, Ānandagiri observes: *anye tv ādya-ślokaṃ mūla-ślokāntarbhūtam abhyupagacchanto dvitīya-ślokaṃ bhāṣyakāra-praṇītam abhyupayanti | tad asat | uttara-ślokeṣv iva ādye'pi śloke bhāṣyakṛto vyākhyāna-praṇayana-prasaṅgāt | om ity etad akṣaram ity-ādi-bhāṣya-virodhāc ca*.

Ānandagiri's reference here to 'other' commentators (tīkākāra) who looked upon the first benedictory stanza, *prañānāṃśu-pratānaih sthira-cara-nikara-vyāpibhiḥ*....as 'belonging to the original,' and regarded the second stanza only as written by Śaṅkara, is of much interest in this connection. This first stanza is plainly benedictory in character, and strikes

⁵ This is according to the opinion of Ānandagiri. He has himself however reported in his tīkā on Śaṅkara's bhāṣya that there were some tīkākāras among his predecessors who thought that Śaṅkara wrote one benedictory stanza only.

⁶ i.e., mere statements unaccompanied by reasons proving them.

⁷ And he thus indicates that the work with its four sections is a unity conceived and executed according to a well-arranged plan.

a personal note with its 'I bow to Brahman'; and since none of the hundred-and-eight upaniṣads, with the exception of one,⁸ begins with any benedictory verse, it is clear that the 'other' commentators also, referred to by Ānandagiri, must have held the opinion that the work before them, beginning with *prajñānāṃśu-pratīnaih*, containing the sentence *om ity etad akṣaram idam....*, and ending with *namaskurmo yathā-balam* [GK. IV. 100d] was wholly written by Gauḍapāda. In other words, these commentators must have believed that the twelve sentences that are now regarded as comprising the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad formed part of the Āgama-prakarāṇa which was written by Gauḍapāda (and which began with the stanza *prajñānāṃśu-pratīnaih*).

Parenthetically, I may observe that Ānandagiri's objections against the first stanza forming part of the original work are not unanswerable. For, it is possible that it did really stand at the beginning of Gauḍapāda's work and that Śaṅkara began his commentary with the explanation of the words of the work proper (i.e., of the sentence *om ity etad akṣaram idam....*) not thinking it worth while to explain the benedictory verse. His statement that the words *om ity etad akṣaram....* mark the beginning of the work would not be incorrect, as the work proper really begins with these words. And then there would be no need to search for an explanation (that given by Ānandagiri, as also the two mentioned by him as given by other commentators is not very satisfactory) as to why Śaṅkara wrote two benedictory stanzas having the same meaning. Moreover the stanza *prajñānāṃśu-pratīnaih....* faithfully reflects the opinions of Gauḍapāda, is just the one that he would write if he wanted to, and is in all respects well suited to stand at the beginning of Gauḍapāda's work.⁹

(3) That all the four sections are written by the same author, and that the first section includes the twelve prose sentences (now known as the Māṇḍūkya Upan.) as an integral part, is made plain by the cross-references also that Śaṅkara makes in his commentary. Thus, in his commentary on GK. I, 6, he observes, "Similarly the author¹⁰ writes below *vandhyā-putro na jānāti*" and refers to GK. III. 28cd. In his commentary on sentence 12 in the Āgama-prakarāṇa, he observes, "Similarly, the author writes below, *āśramās trividhā hīnāḥ* [=GK. III. 16]." While explaining GK. II. 1, he writes, "It has been said above, *jñāte dvaitam na vidyate* (=I. 18)"; similarly, in his commentary on GK. III. 1, he writes, "The (result of the) full comprehension of the significance of the syllable *om* has been declared above in the statements *prapañcopaśamaḥ śivo 'dvaita..ātmā* (=sentence 12] and *jñāte dvaitam na vidyate*." The latter passage is referred to again by Śaṅkara in his commentary on GK. IV, 73, where he has observed, "It has already been stated above, *jñāte dvaitam na vidyate*."

It will be noticed that in the words cited above from Śaṅkara's commentary on GK. III, 1, he makes no distinction between sentence 12 and GK. I, 16. Similarly it can be seen from the words, "Thus the author has said below, *jñāte dvaitam na vidyate*," that occur in his commentary on sentence 7, that he makes no distinction between the verses and prose sentences of the first section, but holds them to be the writing of the same author. These cross-references thus show that Śaṅkara holds that the verses in GK. II-III, and also the verses and prose sentences in the Āgama-prakarāṇa, are written by the same author.

⁸ The Nirālambopaniṣad; but there is no personal note in its benedictory stanza which reads, *namaś Śivāya gurave sac-cid-ānanda-mūrtaye | niṣprapañcāya śāntāya nirālambāya tejase*.

⁹ For it indicates what the subject-matter, purpose, relation, etc., of the book are. Compare in this connection Ānandagiri's observation: *arthād apekṣitam abhidheyādy-anubandham api śūcayati*.

¹⁰ There is no word in the original that corresponds to 'author.' Śaṅkara merely uses the verb *daḥ*, leaving the subject to be understood. We can supply the word *śrutiḥ* as subject if we like (one has to do so frequently in similar circumstances in Śaṅkara's commentaries on the *Īśāvāsya* and other upaniṣads) or the word *ācāryaḥ* (teacher), *granthakartā* (author), or similar word. For the reasons shown, we cannot supply the word *śrutiḥ*, and I have therefore supplied the word 'author' as subject.

(4) Who this author was, is made plain by the following verse which is found at the end of Śaṅkara's commentary on GK. :

*prajñā-vaiśākha-vedha-kṣubhita-jalanidher veda-nāmno 'ntarasīhaṃ
bhūtāny ālokyā magnāny avirata-janana-grāha-ghore samudre |
kāruṇyād uddadhārām itam idam amarair durlabhaṃ bhūtahetor
yaś taṃ pūjyābhipūjyaṃ parama-gurum amuṃ pāda-pātair nato 'smi ||*

"I bow and prostrate myself many times at the feet of my grand-teacher,¹¹ that one who is adorable among the adorable, and who, seeing the world sinking in the ocean that is terrible with the crocodile of unceasing birth, out of compassion for it, extracted from the ocean named Veda, by churning it with the churning-stick of his discernment, this nectar (i.e., this work) which is unobtainable by gods."

We know from other sources¹² that this grand-teacher was Gauḍapāda; and since the Veda, like the ocean, is fourfold (consisting, as it does, of the Ṛk, Yajus, Sāman and Atharvan), it is indicated in this stanza that its essence, too, which Gauḍapāda extracted, is a four-sectioned work. In other words, this stanza too indicates that Gauḍapāda was the author, not only of prakaraṇas II-IV, but of the Āgama-prakaraṇa also.

(5) The fact that Śaṅkara regards the prose sentences and also the verses that comprise the Āgama-prakaraṇa as the work of Gauḍapāda, is sufficient by itself to show that he did not regard them as śruti. This is made plain by the word *prakaraṇa* also which he has used in the sentence *vedāntārtha-sāra-saṃgraha-bhūtam idam prakaraṇa-catustayam cm-ity-etaḍ-akṣaram-ity-ādy ārabhyate* which has been cited in (1) above. The significance of this word is well brought out in the following explanation¹³ given by Ānandagiri: "The commentator explains his object with the words *vedānta*... Is the work that he is going to comment upon a *śāstra* or a *prakaraṇa*? It is not the first; for it does not deal thoroughly with all the matters that appertain to the subject treated of. It deals with one matter only, and is therefore a *prakaraṇa*."

This discussion about *śāstra* and *prakaraṇa* and about the propriety of classifying the work in question under either of these two heads is very significant. It shows unmistakably that the work in question is written by a human author and is not a *śruti* text. *Śruti* texts are supreme and stand above all classification; and it would be regarded as sacrilege were one to examine a *śruti* text and declare in what particulars it satisfied, and in what other particulars it failed to satisfy, the definition of a *śāstra* or *prakaraṇa*; ¹⁴ compare the maxim,

¹¹ Or 'great teacher' *parama-guru* means 'grand-teacher' and also 'great teacher.'

¹² Works like Vidyāranya's *Śaṅkara-dig-vijaya*. According to these books, the line of succession is as follows:—Vyāsa, Śuka, Gauḍapāda, Govinda-bhagavat-pāda, Śaṅkara. Each was the immediate teacher of the one next mentioned, and the immediate disciple or pupil of the one previously mentioned. Gauḍapāda was thus the immediate pupil of Śuka, and the immediate teacher of Govinda-bhagavat-pāda. This succession-list seems to me to be dubious; the more so, since, according to the above-named work (5, 94 ff.), Govinda-bhagavatpāda is identical with Patañjali, author of the *Mahābhāṣya*; and hence I do not feel sure that Gauḍapāda was the grand-teacher of Śaṅkara. Prof. Winternitz, on the other hand, has observed (*Geschichte der ind. Litteratur* III, 430, n. 3) that 'the order of succession—Gauḍapāda, Govinda, Śaṅkara—is above suspicion.'

¹³ *kim idam śāstratvena vā prakaraṇatvena vā vyākhyāsitam | nādyah | śāstra-lakṣaṇābhāvād asya aśāstratvāt | eka-prayojanopanibaddham aśeṣārtha-pratipādakam hi śāstram | atra ca mokṣa-lakṣaṇaika-prayojanavaltve'pi nāśeṣārtha-pratipādakatvam | na dvitīyah | prakaraṇa-lakṣaṇābhāvād ity āśaṅkyāha vedānteti | śāstram vedānta-sādhārīhaḥ | tasyārtho 'dhikāri-nirṇaya-gurūpasādana-padārtha-dvaya-tadaikya-virodha-parihāra-sādhana-phalākhyaḥ | tatra sāro jīva-parāikyaṃ | tasya samyag-grahaḥ saṃgrahaḥ saṃśaya-viparyāsādi-pratibandha-vyuddhena tad-upāyopadeśo yasmīn prakaraṇe tat tatheti yāvat | tathā ca śāstraikadeśa-sāmbaddham śāstra-kāryāntare sthitam idam prakaraṇatvena vyākhyātam iṣtam nirguṇa-vastu-mātra-pratipādakatvāt | tat-pratipādana-saṃkṣepasya ca kāryāntara-tvāt prakaraṇatva-lakṣaṇasya cātra saṃpūrṇatvād ity arthah |*

¹⁴ Nor is it necessary that one should first explain one's reasons in setting forth to write a commentary on a *śruti* text. As explained by Śāyana at great length in the introduction to his commentary on the *R̥gveda-saṃhitā*, it is the duty of every *dvija* (twice-born one) to learn the Veda with its meaning; and hence one needs no apology for writing a commentary on the Veda.

nīyoga-paryanuyogānarhā bhagavatī śrutiḥ. Śaṅkara, assuredly, would not be guilty of such sacrilege ; and his carefully-chosen words therefore make it plain that the four-sectioned book that he is going to comment upon is not a *śruti* text, but the work of a human author.

Compare in this connection the sentences *tad idaṃ Gītāśāstram samastavedārtha-sūra-saṃgraha-bhūtam* and *vedānta-mīmāṃsā-śāstrasya vyācikhyāsitasyedam ādimaṃ sūtram* that occur in the introductions to Śaṅkara's commentaries on the *Bhagavad-gītā* and *Brahma-sūtras* respectively ; and note the use of the word *śāstra* in both sentences and that both these books are written by human authors (i.e., are not *śruti*). Contrast, on the other hand, the introductions to Śaṅkara's commentaries on the nine 'major' Upaniṣads, and note that in not one of them is the word *śāstra* or *prakaraṇa* used.

It must be observed, however, that Ānandagiri interprets the word *prakaraṇa-catustayam* in Śaṅkara's above-cited sentence as *prakaraṇa-catustaya-viśiṣṭam*. That is to say, he dissociates the epithet *om-ity-etad-akṣaram-ity-ādi* (after which, according to him, we have to supply the words *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad-ātmakam vākya-dvādaśakam*, or other similar words) from *prakaraṇa-catustayam* (to which it plainly belongs), and wants us to understand that the discussion about *śāstra* and *prakaraṇa* is concerned with the four sections of Gauḍapāda's *kārikās* and has nothing to do with the Upaniṣad which begins with the words *om ity etad akṣaram*.

But Śaṅkara's words are quite unequivocal, and the word *om-ity-etad-akṣaram-ity-ādi* is plainly an epithet of *prakaraṇa-catustayam*. If, as Ānandagiri implies, Śaṅkara had used it with reference to the 'Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad,' he would without doubt have said *om-ity-etad-akṣaram-ity-ādyā Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad*, as, for instance, has been said by Nārāyaṇāśramin (see below) ; and hence Ānandagiri's explanation is tantamount to saying that Śaṅkara is a clumsy writer and does not know how to write properly.

The fact is, Ānandagiri is one of those that believe (see below) that the Māṇḍūkya is an upaniṣad or *śruti* : and since the above-cited words of Śaṅkara indicate only too plainly that it is not a *śruti*, he tries, by means of the above explanation, to reconcile these words with his belief.

The explanation, however, is patently clumsy and can convince no one ; it only shows up in greater relief the sharp difference between Śaṅkara and Ānandagiri, and also bears testimony that the above-cited words of Śaṅkara indicate unmistakably in the opinion of Ānandagiri too that the work beginning with the words *om ity etad akṣaram* . . . is not *śruti*.

(6) That neither the prose sentences nor the verses that comprise the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* were regarded by Śaṅkara as *śruti* is made plain, further, by some other considerations also that are based on his works, that is, on his commentaries on the nine 'major' Upaniṣads, the *Bhagavad-gītā* and the *Brahma-sūtras* : for I follow the general consensus of opinion in believing that these are the only undoubtedly genuine works of Śaṅkara.

(a) In the course of his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras*, Śaṅkara has had occasion to make hundreds of citations from *śruti* texts including the *Ṛgveda-saṃhitā*, *Taittirīya-saṃhitā*, *Vājasaneyā-saṃhitā*, *Aitareya-brāhmaṇa*, *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa*, etc., and the upaniṣads. He has made numerous citations especially from the upaniṣads, not only from the 'nine major' ones (i.e., *Isāvāsya*, *Kena*, *Kaṭha*, *Praśna*, *Muṇḍaka*, *Taittirīya*, *Aitareya*, *Chândogya* and *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka*), but also from the *Śvetāśvatara* and *Kauṣītaki* upaniṣads. Even the *Jābālopaniṣad* is cited by him more than once ; but the Māṇḍūkya is not quoted even once, nor is the name Māṇḍūkya mentioned by him even once. See in this connection Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishads des Veda* (1905), p. 574 : "It is remarkable that Śaṅkara has not made any use of the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras*"; see also the index of quotations given at the end of vol. 38, *SBE* (Trans. of Śaṅkara's above-named commentary).

This observation holds good of Śaṅkara's commentaries on the nine 'major' upaniṣads and the Bhagavad-gītā also ; in these commentaries, too, Śaṅkara has quoted freely from the *śruti* texts, especially from the nine 'major' upaniṣads named above, and the Śvetāśvatara and Kauṣītaki upaniṣads. He has not cited even one single passage from the Māṇḍūkya.

The objection that the Māṇḍūkya is a very short upaniṣad dealing only with the letter *om* and its *mātrās*, and that hence there was no occasion in which Śaṅkara could, with propriety, quote passages from this upaniṣad, is not tenable. The Īśāvāsyā Upaniṣad too is almost as short as the Māṇḍūkya ; and yet Śaṅkara has cited passages from it on scores of occasions. Similarly, though the Māṇḍūkya deals only with the letter *om* and its *mātrās*, there are occasions when citations from it would be quite apposite. Thus, for instance, in the his commentary on the Vaiśvānarādhikaraṇa (1. 2. 24 f.), Śaṅkara has cited three passages—one from the Chândogya and two from the Ṛgveda-saṃhitā, to illustrate his statement that the word *vaiśvānara* is used in the Veda in different senses. Now this word is used in the Māṇḍūkya (3), and there can be no doubt that a citation of this passage would be quite apposite in this connection. Similarly, there are passages in the Chândogya, Brhad-āraṇyaka and other major upaniṣads which treat of the letter *om* and with the *jāgrat*, *svapna* and *susupti* conditions, and in explaining which, citations from the Māṇḍūkya would therefore be quite appropriate.

One should contrast with these Śaṅkara's commentary on the Māṇḍūkya and note how he has cited from the Chândogya, Brhad-āraṇyaka and other major upaniṣads many passages parallel to those he is explaining.

The fact then that Śaṅkara has not cited any passage from the Māṇḍūkya in his other works or even mentioned the name Māṇḍūkya, shows quite plainly that he did not look upon the Māṇḍūkya as a *śruti* text.

(b) This is shown, further, by a comparison of Śaṅkara's introduction to his commentary on the Māṇḍūkya and GK with the introductions to his commentaries on the nine major upaniṣads. In the case of these upaniṣads, Śaṅkara has, it will be seen, used the words *śrutiḥ*, *upaniṣad*, *mantra* or *brāhmaṇa*¹⁵ and thus indicated that he looked upon these texts as *śruti* ; but there is not one word found, either in the beginning or elsewhere, in his commentary on the Māṇḍūkya and GK that would even remotely indicate that he looked upon it as a *śruti* text.

(c) On the other hand, it is very significant that Śaṅkara has, in the latter, often cited *śruti* texts, not as mere parallel passages, but as authorities for the statements made. Thus, for instance, when explaining the word *ānanda-bhuk* in Māṇḍūkya 5, Śaṅkara writes, *ego'sya parama ānanda iti śruteḥ* ; in explaining *sarveśvaraḥ* in 6, he writes *prāṇa-bandhanam hi somya mana iti śruteḥ* ; in explaining *dakṣiṇākṣi-mukhe viśvo* in GK. 2, he writes, *indho ha vai nāmaiṣa yo'yam dakṣiṇe'kṣan puruṣa iti śruteḥ* ; in explaining *sarvam janayati prāṇaś celomśūn puruṣaḥ pṛthak* in GK 6, he writes, *yathorṇanābhiḥ yathā'gner viṣphuliṅgā ity-ādi-śruteḥ* ; in explaining *ekātma-pratyaya-sāram* in 7, he writes, *ātmetyevopāśīta iti śruteḥ* ; and in explaining *turyam tat sarva-dṛk sadā* in GK. 12, he writes, *na hi draṣṭur dīṣṭer viparilopo vidyata iti śruteḥ . . . nānyad ato'sti draṣṭṛ ity-ādi-śruteḥ*.¹⁶ In all these instances, it will be noted, Śaṅkara has cited the respective *śruti* passages as authorities on which are based the statements contained in the Māṇḍūkya and GK. I. If he had regarded these as *śruti*, then these statements

¹⁵ Of these words, *śruti* is a generic name and is synonymous with Veda ; *mantra* and *brāhmaṇa* denote the two subdivisions of the Veda (compare Āpastamba-śrauta-sūtra, 24. 1. 31 : *mantra-brāhmaṇayor veda-nāmadhcyam*), while the word *upaniṣad* is applied to some select portions of the Veda that deal, not with ritual but with the knowledge of Brahman. That Śaṅkara understood by this word a part of the Veda, is made plain by the discussion in his commentary on *Muṇḍaka* 1. 1. 5.

¹⁶ The *śruti* passages cited here by Śaṅkara are, respectively, Brh. 4. 3. 32 ; Chān. 6. 8. 2 ; Brh. 4. 2. 2 ; 1. 4. 10 ; 1. 4. 17 2. 1. 20 1. 4. 7 4. 3. 23 and 3. 8. 11.

themselves would have been authoritative, and there would have been no necessity to establish that they are based on *śruti* texts and are therefore to be accepted.

In the introductory portion of his commentary, when speaking of the *prayojana* (aim), Śaṅkara writes : *advaita-bhāvaḥ prayojanam | dvaita-prapañcasyāvidyā-kṛtatvād vidyayā tad-upaśamaḥ syād iti brahma-vidyā-prakāśanāyāsārambhaḥ kriyate |* "yatra hi dvaitam iva bhavati," "yatra vānyad iva syāt tatrānyo 'nyat paśyed anyo 'nyad vijānīyāt," "yatra tv asya sarvam ātmaivābhūt tat kena kaṃ paśyet kena kaṃ vijānīyād" *ity-ādi-śrutibhyo 'syārthasya siddhiḥ*. He says in this passage (1) that the end desired is *advaita* : (2) that *dvaita* (dualism) is the result of *avidyā* or wrong knowledge and disappears in the light of *vidyā* : (3) that the work in question treats of this *vidyā* ; and (4) that, hence, when wrong knowledge and its result *dvaita* disappear, *advaita* will be perceived as said in the *śruti* passages *yatra hi...* and other similar ones. The *śruti* passages cited here by Śaṅkara are Bṛh. Up. 2. 4. 14 (or 4. 5. 15) ; 4. 3. 31 and 4. 5. 15 ; and the word *advaita* occurs in the continuation of 4. 3. 31 (i.e., in 4. 3. 32).¹⁷

Now, the same thing is said in Māṇḍūkya 12 also ; and the fact that Śaṅkara has not referred to it in this connection shows that he did not look upon it as *śruti*. If he had regarded it as *śruti*, he would surely have mentioned it here and not had recourse to the Bṛh. Up. for an appropriate *śruti* passage.

Similarly, in the next paragraph but one, Śaṅkara asks himself the question, ' How does the understanding of the syllable *om* lead one to a knowledge of the *ātman* ? ' and answers : ' It is so said in *om ity etat | etad ālambanam, etad vai Satyakāma, om ity ātmānam yuñjīta, om iti Brahma, om-kāra evedam sarvam* and other similar *śruti* texts.'¹⁸ The same thing is said in Māṇḍūkya 1 : *om ity etad akṣaram idam sarvam...* also ; and the fact that Śaṅkara did not include it among those cited shows that he did not regard it as *śruti*.

(d) In the course of his commentary on the Brahma-sūtras, Śaṅkara has had occasion to cite a *kārikā* from the Āgama-prakaraṇa (Vs. 16 : *anādi-māyayā supto yadā jīvaḥ prabudhyate | ajam anidram asvapnam advaitam budhyate tadā*) when explaining 2. 1. 9. He does not say there that it is *śruti*, but introduces it with the words *atroktaṃ vedāntārtha-saṃpradāya-vidbhir ācāryaiḥ*, and thus distinctly says that the verse in question was written by a human author. Compare his commentary on 1. 4. 14, where he cites GK. III. 15 (*mṛl-loha-visphuliṅgādyaḥ...*), introducing it with the words *tathā ca saṃpradāya-vido vadanti*. A comparison of the two introductory sentences shows that Śaṅkara made no distinction between the *kārikās* in the first and third prakaraṇas, but looked on both as the work of a human author.¹⁹

II. The considerations set forth above thus make it plain beyond possibility of doubt that Śaṅkara regarded the Māṇḍūkya and the 215 *kārikās* as the work of the same human author. But, it may be objected here, Śaṅkara, after all, is but one of the many

¹⁷ 4.3.31-2 read as follows : *yatra vā 'nyad iva syāt tatrānyo 'nyat paśyed anyo 'nyaj jighred anyo 'nyad rassayed anyo 'nyad vaded anyo 'nyac chrñuyād anyo 'nyan manvītānyo 'nyat sprsed anyo 'nyad vijānīyād | salīla eko draṣṭā 'dvaito bhavaty eṣa brahma-lokaḥ samrāt...* And it is this word *advaita* that has been repeated by Śaṅkara in the sentence *advaita-bhāvaḥ prayojanam* cited above and later on in the sentence *advaitam iti śruti-kṛto viśeṣo na syāt* that occurs in his commentary on GK. I. 3.

¹⁸ The passages cited here are, respectively, Kaṭha 2.15-17 ; Praśna 5.2 ; Mahānārāyaṇa 24.1 ; Taitt. Up. 1.8.1 ; and Chān. 2.23.4.

¹⁹ The words *ātraite śloka bhavanti* occur four times in the Āgama-prakaraṇa when introducing the *kārikās* ; and Śaṅkara in his commentary too uses the same word (*śloka*) when referring to them. See pp. 25-1, 26-2, and 32-1 (the figures refer to the pages and lines of the commentary in the second Anandāśrama edition of 1900), and compare also his observation *prānādi-ślokanām pratyekeṇ padārtha-vyākhyāne...* on p. 88 in connection with some *kārikās* in GK. II. In the commentaries on the nine major upaniṣads, however, Śaṅkara usually paraphrases *śloka* by the word *mantra* ; and the fact that he has not done so even once in his commentary on the Āgama-prakaraṇa is, it seems to me, a further proof that he did not look upon either the Māṇḍūkya or the *kārikās* contained in that prakaraṇa as *śruti*.

commentators on the Māṇḍūkya whom we know of ; and though his testimony deserves credit, it is overwhelmed by that of the other commentators who have all said plainly that the Māṇḍūkya is a *śruti* text (while even Śaṅkara has nowhere said in so many words that the Māṇḍūkya is not a *śruti* text). Thus Madhvācārya writes in the course of his commentary *iti maṇḍūkya-rūpī san dadarśa Varuṇaḥ śrutim* ; and Kūranārāyaṇa begins his commentary with the words *mumukṣor adhikāriṇo nikhila-kleśa-nivṛtti-pūrvakam paramānandāvāptaye samasta-vyasta-praṇava-pratipādyā-bhagavad-upāsanām vaktum pravṛtteyam upaniṣad*. Nārāyaṇāśramin too begins his commentary with the following words : *om-ity-etad-akṣaram-idam-sarvam-ity-ādya Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad catuḥ-khaṇḍā | tāṃ khaṇḍaśaḥ paṭhitvā 'traite ślokā bhavanti catuḥ-paryāyair Gaudapādācāryā Nārāyaṇānugraheṇa śloka-racanayā vyācakṣire | tena śruti-tad-vyākhyā-ghaṭitam prathamam prakaraṇam śruti-prāyam eveti tatra chāndasānām upaniṣad-vyavahārah pravṛttaḥ | evam tad-vicārātmaka-prakaraṇa-traye 'pi | vedāntārtha-sāra-saṃ-graha-bhūtam idam prakaraṇa-catustayam | ata eva na pṛthak sambandhābhidheya-prayojanāni vaktavyāni* | ²⁰

Similarly, Śaṅkarānanda writes *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad-vyākhyām kariṣye pada-cāriṇīm* in the beginning of his commentary ; and Anandagiri himself, in his *ṭīkā* on Śaṅkara's commentary on the Māṇḍūkya, refers to it as *upaniṣad* or *śruti* on many occasions. Compare, for instance, p. 2, 3 : *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad-arthāviśkaraṇa-parān api ślokān* ; 4. 21 : *dvitīyena Māṇḍūkyā-śruti-vyākhyāna-rūpeṇa* ; 12, 1 : *artham upapādyā tasminn arthe śrutim avatārayati..... śrutim vyācaṣṭe* ; 12, 9 : *tasyetyādi śrutim avatārya* ; 12, 10 : *bhūtam ity-ādi-śrutim gṛhītvā* ; 22, 1 : *vyākhyāyamāna-śrutarau* ; 25, 1 : *ācāryair Māṇḍūkyopaniṣadam paṭhitvā*.²¹ Thus these commentators, though belonging to different schools of Vedānta, agree in saying that the Māṇḍūkya is a *śruti* text ; and the testimony of Śaṅkara, as against that of these other commentators, can be of but little account ; moreover, the archaic style in which the Māṇḍūkya is written resembles closely that of the Chāndogya, Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣads and shows that the Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad too, is, as indicated by its name, an *upaniṣad* or *śruti* text.

These objections are very plausible ; but, as regards the latter, it must be observed that not all books written in an archaic style are *śruti* texts. The Caraka-saṃhitā, for instance, that has come down to us and that was edited by Dṛḍhabala (see Winternitz, op. cit. III. 546 and n. 1) still retains abundant traces of the archaic style in which it was originally

²⁰ Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tanjore Sarasvatī Mahāl Library, p. 1054, no. 1556 ; in the third sentence I have corrected the reading *śrutis tad-vyākhyā-* into *śruti-tad-vyākhyā-*. The meaning of this passage is as follows : "The words *om ity etad akṣaram idam sarvam.....* mark the beginning of the Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad which consists of four sections. Reading it in sections, the teacher Gaudapāda, through the favour of Nārāyaṇa, explained it by means of verses which are in four series and are introduced (after each section of the *upaniṣad*) by the words *atraite ślokā bhavanti* 'In this connection are read, the following verses.' Thus, since the first section consisting of the *śruti* and its explanation is preponderatingly *śruti*, the practice grew up among Veda-knowers of calling it '*upaniṣad*.' Similarly in the case of the latter three *prakaraṇas* too that treat of the same matters. This collection of four *prakaraṇas* is an epitome of the essence of the Vedānta-sāstra. And therefore there is no need to state separately (in words) the object aimed, the subject treated of, and the relation (between the subject and the book)."

²¹ Anandagiri however is not quite consistent in his views. In the passages just cited, he refers to the Māṇḍūkya as *śruti*, while in his explanation of GK. IV, 1 (cited far above) he holds that the words *om ity etad akṣaram.....* (beginning of the Māṇḍūkya) have been written by the author of GK. IV, that is, that the Māṇḍūkya is the work of a human author.

This inconsistency seems to be due to the fact that Anandagiri lived in a time when the Māṇḍūkya was regarded as an *upaniṣad* by every one. This therefore was the view of Anandagiri also ; but since he undertook the work of writing a *ṭīkā* on Śaṅkara's commentary on that work, in which commentary Śaṅkara has plainly indicated (as we have seen above) that the Māṇḍūkya is not a *śruti* text, his explanations sometimes reflect his own belief, and sometimes that of the *bhāṣyakāra*.

written ; and this book, as we know, is not a *śruti* text at all.²² And, as regards the other commentators referred to above, even the earliest of them is posterior by at least three hundred or four hundred years to Śaṅkara, who is thus the earliest commentator that we know of on the work in question. As such, therefore, his testimony deserves far more credit than that of the other commentators ; and when there is a conflict between the two, we have necessarily to give credence to the former and reject the latter. Now, though it is true that Śaṅkara has nowhere said that the Māṇḍūkya is not *śruti*, he has said that it and the 215 kârikās have been written by the 'great teacher' (*parama-guru*). This statement effectively negatives the idea of the Māṇḍūkya being *śruti*, and it becomes plain that the Māṇḍūkya is not a *śruti* text,²³ but that it forms part of a work, which contains, besides, the 215 kârikās, and which was written by a human author.

In that case, it may be asked, what about the circumstantial account given by Madhva about Varuṇa, in the form of a frog, 'seeing' the Māṇḍūkya ? We answer, it is all pure concoction. The *Harivaṃśa* does not contain the passage cited by Madhva or anything similar to it. Nor is there any possibility of its containing it ; for, apart from other considerations, the Māṇḍūkya was, as set forth above, written by a human author and not "seen" at all by any seer.

The charge has often been brought against Madhvācārya that he is addicted to the fabrication of evidence, and that he very frequently cites passages from books which do not, and did not at any time, exist. Appayya Dikṣita, in his *Madhva-mata-vidhvaṃsana*, has compiled a small list of such books cited by Madhva which includes *Caturamaṭha*, *Māṭha-kaurṇarava*, *Kauṇḍinya*, *Māṇḍavya*, *Mārkaṇḍeya*, *Maudgalya*, *Paṇḍyāyana*, *Sautrāyana*, *Saukarāyana*, *Kāṭharāyana*, *Pārāśaryāyana*, *Mādhyamdināyana*, *Kāśārava*, *Kauśāra*, *Kauṣāyana*, *Bṛhad-uddālaka*, *Auddālakāyana*, *Kauśika*, *Sauvarṇya*, *Vatsa-gaupavana*, *Bhāllaveya*, *Āgñiveśya*, *Caturveda-śikhā*, *Caturveda-saṃhitā*, *Paramā Śrutiḥ*, *Adhyātma-nārāyaṇa-saṃhitā*, *Brahmavaikarta*, *Bhaviṣyat-parvan*, *Mahā-saṃhitā*, *Māyātānta*, *Brahmatānta*, *Nārāyaṇātānta* and *Puruṣottamātānta*. Similarly, the Virāṣaiva writer Nirvāṇa too, when criticising Madhva's views in his commentary on the *Kriyāsāra*, uses the words (p. 24) *svavacanaprakāṭita-vaiddika-mārgānanuguna-bhāgavatatvenābhīmata-sva-kapola-kalpita-vacane*, and thus says that Madhva's quotation from the *Bhāgavatātānta* is fabricated by Madhva. His words, *iti tad anadhīta-veda-gandha-Bhāllaveya-Kāṭharāyana-Māṭharāyana-śruti-Vyomasamhitādhīnam na bhavati | kiṃ tu prasiddha evopaniṣadi . . .* on p. 33 too seem likewise to indicate that he considered mythical the *Kāṭharāyana-śruti* and the other above-mentioned works cited by Madhva.

The justness of this charge is borne out by Madhva's commentary on the Māṇḍūkya. In this commentary (Kumbakonam edition), Madhva cites passages from *Pādma*, *Bṛhat-saṃhitā*, *Harivaṃśa* (in the plural), *Mahāyoga*, *Vārāha*, *Prakāśikā*, *Mārkaṇḍeya*, *Brahmatarka*, *Gāruḍa*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Māhātmya*, *Samkalpa*, *Pratyaya*, *Pratyānārā*, *Mahopaniṣad*, *Praakṭa-śruti* and *Ātma-saṃhitā*, and many other works. Of these, *Mahopaniṣad* is the name of an *upaniṣad* ; *Pādma*, *Gāruḍa*, *Vārāha*, *Mārkaṇḍeya*, *Brahmāṇḍa* and *Harivaṃśa* are the names of well-known Purāṇas, and *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* the name of Varāha-mihira's well-known work. No works are known bearing the names *Prakāśikā*, *Brahmatarka*, *Māhātmya*,

²² It is interesting to note that, like the Māṇḍūkya, the Caraka-saṃhitā too has, at the end of many of its sections (chapters), verses that are introduced by the words *atraithe* or *atraithe śloka bhavanti*. This is the case with Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* and Kauṭilya's *Arthasāstra* also, works which were, like the Māṇḍūkya, written in the early centuries of the Christian era.

²³ It is the accepted canon of the Mimāṃsakas that the sole criterion of whether a text is *śruti* or not, is its being known by the name of *śruti* among the Veda-knowers from time immemorial (*śrutiḥ tvena andī-kāla-śiṣṭa-vyavahārah*). Such usage is not seen in the case of the Māṇḍūkya ; for not only was it not known as *śruti* to Śaṅkara, who has commented upon it, but it is actually stated by him that it is the work of a human author.

Samkalpa, *Pratyaya*, *Pratyāhāra*, *Mahāyoga*, *Prakāṣa-śruti* and *Ātma-saṃhitā*. The passages cited by Madhva from the *Harivaṃśa*, *Mahopaniṣad* and *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* are not found in the books mentioned bearing those names, and are evidently fabrications of Madhva. So are, likewise, the citations from *Prakāṣa-śruti* and other mythical books²⁴; and to judge from these, it is also very probable that his citations from the *Pādma*, *Gāruḍa* and other *Purāṇas* are likewise fabrications.

It is of interest to note in this connection that, according to Madhva, the *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad* is in praise of the four-formed *Nārāyaṇa*, and the four forms praised of *Nārāyaṇa*, namely, *visva*, *taijasa*, *prājña* and *tūrīya* denote, respectively, *Gaṇeśa*, *Indra*, *Rudra* and *Nārāyaṇa* himself.

III. From the colophon at the end of Śaṅkara's commentary on prakaraṇas II (*iti...Śaṅkara-bhagavataḥ kṛtau Gauḍapādīyāgamaśāstra-bhāṣye*) and IV (*iti...Śaṅkara-bhagavataḥ kṛtau Gauḍapādīyāgamaśāstra-vivarāṇe*), we learn that the work comprising the *Māṇḍūkya* and the 215 *kārikās* bore the name of *Āgamaśāstra* and was written by *Gauḍapāda*.²⁵

The title *Āgamaśāstra* means 'the *śāstra* founded on the *āgama*,' i.e., *Veda*, and refers, without doubt, to the *upaniṣads*, on which, as a matter of fact, the book²⁶ is based. There is hence no doubt that *Gauḍapāda* chose this title for his work in order to show that it was based on the *Veda* and that it had for its object the establishment of *Advaita* as the only true doctrine and the refutation of the teachings propounded, on the one hand, by *Avaidikas* like *Buddhists*, and on the other hand, by *Naiyāyikas*, *Vaiśeṣikas*, *Sāṅkhyas* and others, who, though acknowledging the authority of the *Veda*, yet taught doctrines opposed to it.

The word *āgama* in the title *āgama-prakaraṇa*, on the other hand, seems to be used in a two-fold sense; and the *āgama-prakaraṇa* seems to be so called because (1) the teachings contained in it are based on *āgama*, i.e., the *upaniṣads*, and also (2) because the *prakaraṇa* consists mostly of *āgamas*, i.e., mere propositions or statements that are not accompanied with reasons.

IV. It is this title *Āgama-śāstra*, it seems to me, that has led to *Gauḍapāda*'s work being regarded as *śruti*. This happened as early as the middle of the eighth century A.D.; for, as pointed out by *Walleser* (*Der Aeltere Vedānta*, pp. 21 ff.; see also *Winternitz, op. cit.* III,

²⁴ The only other alternative is to believe that copies of these works existed in a library to which *Madhva* had access, that these copies were unique, and that no other writer except *Madhva* (whether anterior, posterior or contemporary to him) had access to that library. This is impossible, and hence one cannot but conclude that *Madhva* fabricated evidence on a large scale.

For the rest, it is also most improbable that works could have existed bearing such names as *Samkalpa*, *Pratyaya*, *Pratyāhāra*, *Māhātmya*, *Prakāṣa-śruti*, *Prakāśikā* and other similar names.

It is also most improbable that the *Pādma* contains the passage, *dhyāyan Nārāyaṇam devaṃ prañavena samāhitāḥ | māṇḍūka-rūpī Varuṇas tuṣṭāva Harim avyayam* which *Madhva* cites from it. The story of the *Māṇḍūkya* having been 'seen' by *Varuṇa* when he had assumed the form of a frog, is, as said above, an invention of *Madhva*; and the *Padma-purāṇa*, as originally written, cannot therefore know anything about it.

²⁵ This is shown by the words *Gauḍapādīya-bhāṣya āgamaśāstra-vivarāṇe* found in the colophon of the third *prakaraṇa* also. The colophon at the end of the first *prakaraṇa* reads (in the above-cited edition) *iti...Śaṅkara-bhagavataḥ kṛtāv āgamaśāstra-vivarāṇe Gauḍapādīya-kārikā-sahita-Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad-bhāṣye...*; but there is no doubt that the last of the above-cited words (*Gauḍapādīya*°) has been added later by some one, in the same way as the headings *atha Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣat* and *Gauḍapādīya-kārikāṇām sva-kṛtam avataraṇam* have been added by the editor on pp. 11 and 25.

²⁶ That is, the first *prakaraṇa* in it (the other three *prakaraṇas* are mostly argumentative); this is based on *Bṛh. Up.* 2. 1 and 4. 3; *Praśna IV* (see in this connection *Śaṅkara*'s commentaries on these passages), and similar passages in the *Chāndogya* and *Kauṣītaki upaniṣads*. Compare also the numerous references to the *upaniṣads* in *GK. II-IV* and the expressions *vedānta-niścayaḥ* and *vedāntesu vicakṣaṇaiḥ* in *GK. II. 12, 31*.

431, n. 1), the Buddhist writer Śāntirakṣita²⁷ refers to Gauḍapāda's work as 'upaniṣad-śāstra' and thus seems to have believed that Gauḍapāda's *Āgama-śāstra* as a whole (i.e., all the four sections of it) was an upaniṣad or *śruti* text. This opinion was current among some paṇḍits in the time of Nārāyaṇāśramin²⁸ also, whose words I have cited above; and I remember to have seen a printed edition of the 108 upaniṣads in which it was stated at the end of each prakaraṇa, *iti Māṇḍūkyopaniṣadi prathamam prakaraṇam, dvitīyam prakaraṇam*, etc. Similarly, the four prakaraṇas were treated as four upaniṣads in a manuscript examined by the late Prof. Albrecht Weber who writes,²⁹ "The *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad* is reckoned as consisting of four Upaniṣads, but only the prose portion of the first of these, which treats of the three and half *mātrās* of the word *om*, is to be looked upon as the real *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad*, all the rest is the work of Gauḍapāda." The verses cited far above from the *Muktikopaniṣad* too show that the author of that text also regarded the 215 kārīkās as forming part of the *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad*; for, his statement that 'the *Māṇḍūkyā* alone is enough to lead one to liberation' cannot, obviously, refer to the twelve sentences only of the *Māṇḍūkyā*, but also to the kārīkās³⁰, which prove that *dvaita* is false, and *advaita* alone, real. It is likewise interesting in this connection to note that the editors of the *Brahmasūtra-śāṅkara-bhāṣya* with three commentaries that was published by the Nirṇaya-sāgara Press in 1904 have, on p. 320, said that the kārīkā *mṛl-loha-visphuliṅgādyaiḥ*... is 'Māṇḍū. 3. 15.'

I do not know when the view began to be current that the prose sentences in Gauḍapāda's *Āgamaśāstra* formed an upaniṣad, and when the name *Māṇḍūkyā*³¹ was applied to them. As we have seen above, this is the view held by Ānandagiri, Nārāyaṇāśramin and other writers of the Advaita school, and also by Raṅgarāmānuja of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school.

The view that the *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad* comprises not only the twelve prose sentences found in the *Āgama-prakaraṇa*, but the 29 kārīkās also occurring in it, seems to be a still later development. This is the view of Kūranārāyaṇa,³² and perhaps of Doḍḍācārya or Mahācārya also, both of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school³³; and the words of Nārāyaṇāśramin cited above show that he too was aware that some 'Veda-knowers' regarded the whole of the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* as constituting the *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad*. According to him, this view had its origin in the fact that the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* with its 29 kārīkās is preponderatingly *śruti*, while the opinion that all the four prakaraṇas constituted the upaniṣad, had its origin in the fact that all the 215 kārīkās treat of the same matters as, and are associated with, the *Māṇḍūkyā-śruti*; see note²⁰ above.

²⁷ This writer was born in 705 A.D. and died in 765 A.D. according to the account given in S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa's *History of Indian Logic*, p. 323.

²⁸ The exact time in which this author lived is not known; but he mentions Śāṅkara and Ānandagiri, and is therefore later than both.

²⁹ *History of Indian Literature* (translation of John Mann and Theodor Zachariae), 1892, p. 161. In the manuscript in question, the four prakaraṇas of the *Māṇḍūkyā* form the upaniṣads numbered 25-28.

³⁰ Compare in this connection the following observation of Deussen on p. 533 *op. cit.*: "Dass die *Muktikā* von diesen 108 Upanishaden in erster Linie *Māṇḍūkyā* empfiehlt, ist, wenn wir die in der Sammlung einbegriffene kārīkā des Gauḍapāda darunter mitverstehen, von dogmatischem Standpunkte aus begreiflich; beide bieten eine vortreffliche Uebersicht der Vedāntalehre."

³¹ The nearest approach to this name that is met with in the *Carana-vyūha* is *Māṇḍūkeya*; and this is there the name of a *śākhā* of the Ṛgveda.

³² According to Madhva, the prose sentences only constitute the *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad*; but the 29 kārīkās in the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* too, though not forming part of the upaniṣad, are *śruti*; they were 'seen' by Brahmā originally, and Varuṇa, when he 'saw' the *Māṇḍūkyā*, added the kārīkās after the various *khaṇḍas* of the *Māṇḍūkyā*. Compare the stanzas, *pramāṇasya pramāṇam ced balavad vidyate mune | Brahma-dṛṣṭān ato mantrān pramāṇam salileśvaraḥ | atra śloka bhavanīti cakāraiva prthak prthak ||* 'cited' by Madhva from the *Gāruḍa* in his commentary on the *Māṇḍūkyā*.

³³ See Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma in *Review of Philosophy and Religion*, 2, 55-6.

It is hinted by Nārāyaṇāśramin in his above-cited words that the epithet *om-ity-etad-akṣaram-ity-ādi* in Śaṅkara's observation (*vedāntārtha-sāra-saṃgraha-bhūtam idaṃ prakaraṇa-catuṣṭayam om-ity-etad-akṣaram-ity-ādy ārabhyate*) at the beginning of his commentary refers really to the Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad and should not be construed with *prakaraṇa-catuṣṭayam*, which, as also the word *vedāntārtha-sāra-saṃgraha-bhūtam*, refers to the four sections of Gauḍapāda's kārīkās. This interpretation is, as already pointed out above, quite untenable. In addition, it may be observed that, in case Nārāyaṇāśramin's (and Ānandagiri's) view is correct, there would be no necessity at all for Śaṅkara to discuss about *śāstra* and *prakaraṇa* in the beginning of his commentary. It would have been enough if Śaṅkara had made the usual observations (compare the introduction to his commentary on the Kāthopaniṣad) about the meaning of the word *upaniṣad*; and since the four sections of the kārīkās form an appendix to the *upaniṣad*, there would be no necessity to discuss anywhere about *śāstra* and *prakaraṇa*. Moreover, one finds it difficult to believe, as Nārāyaṇāśramin and Ānandagiri ask one to do, that Gauḍapāda began his work baldly and strangely, with the words *ātraite śloka bhavanti*. No one has ever begun a book in this manner, and it is certain that Gauḍapāda too would not.

V. It is, as already observed above, very doubtful if Gauḍapāda, author of the *Āgama-śāstra*, was the grand-teacher of Śaṅkara. In his commentary on GK. I, 9, and I, 12, Śaṅkara gives alternative explanations of pādas *ed* and the word *sarva-dīk* respectively; this hardly seems consistent in one who was a grand-pupil of the author, and indicates, on the other hand, that there was a fairly long interval between the writing of the book and of the commentary. Similarly, Professors Belvalkar and Ranade too have observed on p. 96 of their *History of Philosophy* (vol. 2): "The Kārīkās have been actually quoted by several early Buddhist commentators of the Mādhyamika school, and dates make it impossible that they should have been produced by a teacher's teacher of a writer of the eighth century, as Śaṅkarācārya is usually taken to be." Dr. Walleser, too, similarly opines (*op. cit.*, p. 5 ff.) that the Kārīkās were written in about 550 A.D. which also makes it improbable that their author Gauḍapāda was the grand-teacher of Śaṅkara.

Dr. Walleser has also expressed (l.c.) the opinion that Gauḍapāda is not the name of a man, but is the designation of a school, and that the Kārīkās are the work of this school. This opinion seems to be endorsed by Professors Belvalkar and Ranade also who observe (l.c.); "Further, seeing that even the author of the *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, Suresvarācārya, refers to these Kārīkās as expressing the views of the Gauḍas as contrasted with the views of the *Drāviḍas* (*Naiṣ. IV*, 41 ff.), a doubt can be, and has been, legitimately expressed as to the authenticity of the tradition which makes an author by name Gauḍapāda (the pupil of Śuka and the teacher's teacher of the great Śaṅkarācārya) responsible for these so-called 'Māṇḍūkya Kārīkās.'"

This view is based on a misapprehension of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, IV, 41-44, which reads as follows:

kārya-kāraṇa-baddhau tāv iṣyete viśva-taijasau |
prājñāḥ kāraṇa-baddhas tu dvau tau turye na sidhyataḥ || 41 ||
anyathā gṛhṇataḥ svapno nidrā tattvam ajānataḥ |
viparyāse tayoh kṣīṇe turīyaṃ padam aśnute || 42 ||
tathā Bhagavatpādīyam udāharaṇam :
susuptākhyam tamojñānam bījaṃ svapna-prabodhayoh |
ātma-bodha-pradagdham syād bījaṃ dagdham yathābhavam || 43 ||
evam Gauḍair Drāviḍair naḥ pūjyair ayam arthaḥ prakāśitaḥ |

As explained by the commentator Jñānottama, the first two of the above-cited stanzas are from the Gauḍapāda-kārīkās (I. 11; 15) and the third from Bhagavatpāda's (i.e., Śaṅkara's) *Upadeśasahasrī* (17. 26 of the metrical version); and hence the words *Gauḍair* and

Drāviḍaiḥ do not mean 'by the Gauḍa people and Drāviḍa people' but 'by the Gauḍa teacher and Drāviḍa teacher,' i.e., 'by Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara.' The meaning of stanza 44ab, therefore is, "This has been thus explained by our revered teachers, Gauḍa[-pāda] and Śaṅkara"; and there is no mention in this stanza of the Gauḍa people and the Drāviḍa people.³⁴

For the rest, it also becomes plain from the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya-vārtika* of the same author, namely, Sureśvara, that he knew well that the Gauḍapāda-kārikās were written by the teacher named Gauḍapāda. See, for instance, l. 4. 389 (p. 510): *anīcitā yathā rajjur iti nyāyopabṛṃhitam | sphuṭārthaṃ Gauḍapādīyaṃ vaco 'rthe 'traiva gīyate ||*; 2. l. 386 (p. 951): *nihśeṣa-veda-siddhānta-vidvadbhir api bhāṣitam | Gauḍācāryair idam vastu yathā 'smābhiḥ prapañcitam ||*; and 4. 4. 886 (p. 1866): *ślokāṃś ca Gauḍapādāder yathoktārthasya sāksīṇaḥ | adhīyate 'tra yatnena sampradāya-vidaḥ svayam*. The second of the stanzas cited here shows that -pāda in *Gauḍapāda* is added only for the sake of respect (compare the words *bhagavat-pāda*, *ācārya-pāda*, *pūjya-pāda*, *pitṛ-pāda*, etc.), and that the real name is *Gauḍa* only. It is very probable that this was not originally a personal name but was an epithet applied to the teacher in order to distinguish him from other teachers, and that, in course of time, it wholly supplanted his personal name. *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, IV. 44, cited above affords another instance of this word *Gauḍa* being used as a personal name.

VI. There is thus not the least doubt that there existed a teacher known as Gauḍapāda, and that he produced the work known as *Āgamaśāstra*. As observed above, this work is a whole, conceived and executed on a well-arranged plan. It is the purpose of the work to establish the reality of Advaita; and this it effectively accomplishes, positively, by showing in the first prakaraṇa, that the *ātman* in the *tūrīya* condition, when the world has disappeared, is identical with Brahman, and, negatively, by showing, in the last three prakaraṇas, that Dvaita is unreal.

This work is thus the earliest systematical work on Vedānta that has come down to us. And it says much for the genius of Gauḍapāda that he should have picked out, from the heterogeneous mass of teachings contained in the upaniṣads, that about the *jāgrat*, *svapna*, and *susupti* conditions, as the one that would directly prove the truth of Advaita, given it clear-cut shape in the *Āgama-prakaraṇa*, and made it the corner-stone of his system of Vedānta.

The value of this achievement is by no means lessened even if Gauḍapāda borrowed some theories, arguments, stanzas and even passages from various other writers; for, after all, it is his genius that has bound all these diverse elements into a single whole.

It follows from this that the writers who have interpreted passages from Gauḍapāda's work in a non-Advaitic sense are merely deluding themselves and are in the wrong; for, it must be remembered that, in case the passages in question have been borrowed by Gauḍapāda, whatever their original meaning may have been, they are interpreted by Gauḍapāda in an Advaitic sense, and used by him to support his exposition of the Advaita philosophy.

The *Āgamaśāstra* contains, as already pointed out by Deussen (*op. cit.*, p. 574), all the essential teachings (*māyā-vāda*, *ajāti-vāda*, *raju-sarpa-dṛṣṭānta*, etc.) of the Advaita system. Śaṅkara³⁵ has but elaborated and systematised these teachings, in the same way as Plato did those of Parmenides; and Deussen's comparison of Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara with Parmenides and Plato is, now that we know that the Māṇḍūkya too is the work of Gauḍapāda, true to a greater extent than was thought of by him.³⁶

³⁴ *naḥ pūjyair Gauḍair Drāviḍaiḥ* is equivalent to *naḥ pūjyair Gauḍācāryair Drāviḍācāryaiḥ*; the plural here is honorific.

³⁵ And it is perhaps this fact that gave rise to the tradition that Śaṅkara was the grand-pupil of Gauḍapāda.

³⁶ Lately, there have been published by Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma two articles entitled 'New Light on the Gauḍapāda Kārikās' and 'Further Light on the Gauḍapāda Kārikās' in the *Review of Philosophy and Religion* (2, 35 ff.; and 3, 45 ff.) in which he has endeavoured to show that (not only the Māṇḍūkya but) the 29 kārikās also of the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* were regarded as *śruti* by not only Madhva and Kūranārāyaṇa, but by Śaṅkara himself, and also by Anandagiri, Sureśvara, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī and other advaitin writers. I shall therefore review on another occasion the arguments employed there by Mr. Sarma.

THE INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Edited by

NARENDRA NATH LAW

Vol. XI



CALCUTTA
1935

An Umā-Maheśvara Sculpture from Benares

(A REPLY)

In the last issue of this Journal (*IHQ.*, September, 1935, p. 584), Mr. D. B. Diskalkar criticised my article—"A new Gupta sculpture". published in *IHQ.*, vol. IX, p. 588. Mr. Diskalkar intends to prove that the sculpture is the production of the Mathura School of Art, and was brought to Benares from Mathura. In support of his theory he remarks, "I am not in a position to examine the sculpture in original, but from my study of the Mathura sculptures I think that it is no doubt a Mathura sculpture carved on a white-mottled red sand-stone generally used for Mathura sculptures."

It is strange that Mr. Diskalkar could find out the nature of the stone used for the sculpture only by consulting the photograph supplied by me. On close examination of the sculpture I find it in Chunar sand-stone.

Mr. Diskalkar remarks—"One important point which Dr. Ganguly has not noticed in this sculpture is that of the *Urdhvaliṅga* of Maheśvara which is also seen in the Mathura sculpture noted above and in some more sculptures of Umā-Maheśvara preserved in the Mathura Museum." *Urdhvaliṅga* in the Umā-Maheśvara sculpture is very common in Northern India. Mr. Diskalkar intends to use this phenomena in support of his theory that Maheśvara is in amorous mood. But if he examines it more carefully he may encounter some technical drawbacks in his way.

Lastly Mr. Diskalkar finds fault in my statement that Maheśvara is in his joyful mood. He may be right in his contention if he finds it lacking that expression of joy, which peculiarly develops during amorous display. But my angle of vision is quite different here. I observe in it that particular expression of joy, which emanates from the appreciation of divine beauty.

D. C. GANGULY

On Gauḍapāda's Āgamaśāstra

In the course of an article entitled "The Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad and Gauḍapāda," published in the *Indian Antiquary* (vol. 62, pp. 181 ff.), I had occasion to point out that the collection of verses now known as *Gauḍapāda-kārikā* and divided into four sections called *Āgama-prakaraṇa*, *Vaitathya-prakaraṇa*, *Advaita-prakaraṇa* and *Alātaśānti-prakaraṇa*, bore originally the name of *Āgamaśāstra*; and I have also, on p. 182 (see also n. 7 there) and elsewhere too in the course of that article, given expression to the belief that the *Āgamaśāstra* in question consisted of these four sections only. A re-examination, however, of the following passage (cited on p. 182 *loc. cit.*) in the beginning of Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad* seems to indicate that this belief is incorrect and that the above-mentioned four sections formed but a portion of the *Āgamaśāstra*:

ओमित्येतदक्षरमिदं सर्वं तस्योपव्याख्यानम् । वेदान्तार्थसारसंग्रहभूतमिदं प्रकरणचतुष्टय-
मोमित्येतदक्षरमित्याधारभूयते । अतएव न पृथक् सम्बन्धाभिधेयप्रयोजनानि वक्तव्यानि ।
यान्येव तु वेदान्ते सम्बन्धाभिधेयप्रयोजनानि तान्येवेह भवितुमर्हन्ति । तथापि प्रकरणव्या-
ख्यानसुना संक्षेपतो वक्तव्यानि । तत्र प्रयोजनवत्साधनाभिव्यञ्जकत्वेनाभिधेयसंबन्धं शास्त्रं
पारम्पर्येण विशिष्टसंबन्धाभिधेयप्रयोजनवद्भवति । किं पुनस्तत्प्रयोजनमित्युच्यते । रोगार्तस्येव
रोगनिवृत्तौ स्वस्थता । तथा दुःखात्मकस्यात्मनो द्वैतप्रपञ्चोपशमे स्वस्थता । अद्वैतभावः
प्रयोजनम् ।

In this passage, it will be observed, Śaṅkara says that he is going to comment on a quartet of prakaraṇas. This statement is incompatible with the belief that the *Āgamaśāstra* consisted of the four prakaraṇas in question; for, if such had been the case, Śaṅkara would have without doubt said that he was going to comment on the book *Āgamaśāstra*. Compare in this connection the following sentences in the introductions to his commentaries on the *Bhagavad-gītā*, *Chāndogyopaniṣad* and *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* that consist respectively of 700 ślokas, and eight and six adhyāyas:

(1) तं धर्मं भगवता यथोपदिष्टं वेदव्यासः सर्वज्ञो भवान् गीताख्यः सप्तभिः
श्लोकशतैरुपनिबबन्ध । तदिदं गीताशास्त्रं समस्तवेदार्थसारसंग्रहभूतं दुर्विज्ञेयार्थम् ।

तदर्थविष्करणायानेकैर्विब्रतपदपदार्थवाक्यार्थन्यायमप्यत्यन्तविरुद्धानेकार्थत्वेन लौकिकैर्गृह्यमाणमुपलभ्याहं विवेकतोऽर्थनिर्धारणार्थं संक्षेपतो विवरणं करिष्यामि ।

(2) ओमित्येदं चरमित्याद्यष्टाध्यायी छान्दोग्योपनिषत् । तस्याः संक्षेपतोऽर्थजिज्ञासुभ्य ऋजुविवरणमल्पग्रन्थमिदमारभ्यते ।

(3) 'उषा वा अश्वस्य' इत्येवमाद्या वाजसनेयिब्राह्मणोपनिषत् । तस्या इयमल्पग्रन्था वृत्तिरारभ्यते ।...सेयं षडध्याय्यरग्येऽनूच्यमानत्वादारण्यकम् ।

Śaṅkara has not said that he is going to comment on *sapta-śloka-sataka*, *adhyāyāṣṭaka* and *adhyāya-ṣaṭka*, but that he is going to comment on the *Gītā*-(śāstra), the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* consisting of eight chapters, and on the *Vājasaneyi-brāhmaṇopaniṣad* consisting of six chapters. There can be no doubt that, in case the Āgamaśāstra had consisted of these four prakaraṇas only, he would have similarly said that he was going to comment on the Āgamaśāstra consisting of four prakaraṇas. His statement, instead, that he is going to comment on a 'quartet of prakaraṇas' indicates that these four prakaraṇas did not constitute the whole of the Āgamaśāstra but formed only a portion of it.

But, it may be objected, Śaṅkara has abstained from using the word *Āgamaśāstra* here, not because this work contained more than the four prakaraṇas in question, but because it was his deliberate opinion that the work is not a *śāstra* (satisfying the definition *eka-prayojanopanibaddham aśeṣārtha-pratipādakam śāstram*), but a *prakaraṇa* (satisfying the definition *śāstraikadeśa-sambaddham śāstrakāryāntare sthitam prakaraṇam*). This objection, though plausible, seems to me to be untenable. For, the very fact that Śaṅkara undertook the work of writing a commentary on Gauḍapāda's *Āgamaśāstra* shows that he held in high esteem the author and also the views expressed by him in the work. The stanzas *prajñā-vaiśākha-vedha-kṣubhita-jalanidher*.....and *yat-prajñāloka-bhāṣā*.....at the end of the commentary too show how highly Śaṅkara reveres Gauḍapāda, while the commentary itself shows that Śaṅkara has accepted without reserve all the views expressed by Gauḍapāda in the four sections. It is therefore, in the circumstances, very improbable that Śaṅkara dissents from Gauḍapāda in one matter only, and regards as a *prakaraṇa* what Gauḍapāda regards as a *śāstra*.

Nor can it be urged here that the word *śāstra* is often used loosely in the sense of 'teaching', that Śaṅkara himself has so used it in the sentences *ācārya-pūjā hy abhipretārtha-siddhyartheshyate śāstrārambhe* and *śāstra-samāptau paramārtha-tattva-stutyartham namaskāra ucyate* that occur in his explanation of the first and last verses of the *Alāta-sānti-prakaraṇa*, that it is not improbable that it has been so used in the title *Āgamaśāstra*, and that Śaṅkara's abstention from using the word *Āgamaśāstra* in the beginning of his commentary is due, not to a difference of opinion between him and Gauḍapāda, but to a keen desire on his part that the readers should understand clearly the nature of the work on which he was commenting. For, in the circumstances indicated, Śaṅkara would have written *vedāntārtha-sāra-saṃgraha-bhūtam idaṃ prakaraṇam om-ity-etadaḥśaram-ity-ārabhyate*. Compare in this connection the sentence *prāripsitasya prakaraṇasyāvighnena parisamāpti-pracaya-gamanābhyaṃ śiṣṭācāra-paripālānāya ceṣṭa-devatām namasyann arthād viśayādikaṃ darśayati* that stands at the beginning of Jñānottama's commentary on Vimuktātman's *Iṣṭasiddhi*, which too is a *prakaraṇa* dealing with Advaitavedānta and consists of eight chapters; compare also the sentence *devatā-namaskāras tu samasta-vedāntārtha-sāra-saṃgrahasyāsya prakaraṇasyārtham parām devatām aupaniṣadaṃ puruṣam saṃkṣepato darśayitum granthādāv eva kṛtāḥ* that occurs in Vimuktātman's commentary (p. 37) on the work.

There is not the slightest necessity for using the word *catuṣṭaya* after *prakaraṇa*; and Śaṅkara's use of that word therefore in the above-cited sentence shows plainly that the text commented upon by him was not a whole book, but only part of a book. That is to say, it becomes plain that the four prakaraṇas in question do not constitute the whole of the *Āgamaśāstra*, but form only a portion of it.

The benedictory verse *durdarśam ati-gambhīram ajaṃ sāmyaṃ viśāradam| buddhvā padam anānātvaṃ namas-kurmo yathā-balaṃ|* that occurs at the end of the fourth prakaraṇa (*Alāta-sānti-prakaraṇa*) and Śaṅkara's observation *śāstra-samāptau paramārtha-tattva-stutyartham namaskāra ucyate* should not be regarded as indicating that the *Āgamaśāstra* ends with this section and verse. As already observed above, *śāstra* here signifies 'teaching' and should not be interpreted as the work *Āgamaśāstra*; for, if one were to do so here, one would have to do

so likewise in the case of Śaṅkara's observation *ācārya-pūjā hy abhipretārtha-siddhyarthesyate śāstrārambhe* on verse 1 and arrive thus at the conclusion that the *Āgama-śāstra* began with verse 1 of the *Alāta-śānti-prakaraṇa*! As a matter of fact, *maṅgalas* are enjoined not only at the beginning and end of works, but in their middle also; compare Patañjali's observation *maṅgalādīni maṅgala-madhyāni maṅgalāntāni hi śāstrāṇi prathante vira-puruṣāṇi ca bhavanti āyusmat-puruṣāṇi cādhyetāraś ca maṅgala-yuktā yathā syuḥ* in his commentary on 1.3.1.

It is not necessary therefore to look on the benedictory verse *durdarśam ati-gambhīram*.....as marking the end of the *Āgama-śāstra*; it can conceivably mark the end of a *prakaraṇa* that occurs in the middle of that work also. Compare in this connection the benedictory verses *jñānam jñeyam tathā jñātā yasmād anyan na vidyate | sarvajñāḥ sarva-śaktir yas tasmai jñānātmane namaḥ || vidyayā tāritāḥ smo yair janma-mṛtyu-mahodadhim | sarvajñebhyaḥ namas tebhyaḥ gurubhyaḥ jñāna-saṃkulam ||* which occur at the end of *prakaraṇa* 17, and the benedictory verse *vedānta-vākya-puṣpebhyaḥ jñānāmṛta-madhūttamam | ujjahārālivad yo naś tasmai sad-gurave namaḥ ||* that is found at the end of *prakaraṇa* 18,¹ of the *Upadeśasahasrī* (Padya-prabandha) which consists of 19 *prakaraṇas*.

It thus becomes plain from the foregoing that the four *prakaraṇas* in question formed a portion only of the *Āgama-śāstra*; and the following are some of the questions that arise in our mind in connection with this work that has not come down to us in full:

(1) Did the four *prakaraṇas* in question occur together, in the same order, in the *Āgama-śāstra*, or were they separated from one another by other *prakaraṇas*?

(2) Did the first of these *prakaraṇas* (the *Āgama-prakaraṇa*) stand at the beginning of the *Āgama-śāstra* too, or did it occur elsewhere in that work?

(3) Has Śaṅkara or any other author quoted in his works any

¹ It is of interest to note that, like the *Alāta-śānti-prakaraṇa*, these two *prakaraṇas* too have benedictory verses at the beginning.

passage(s) from the *prakaraṇas* of the *Āgama-śāstra* that have not come down to us?

The answers that we give to these questions can be only tentative.

(1) When pointing out the purpose of the four above-named *prakaraṇas*, Śaṅkara has written as follows in the introduction to his commentary on the *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad*:

तत्र तावदोक्तारनिर्णयाय प्रथमं प्रकरणमागमप्रधानमात्मतत्त्वप्रतिपत्त्युपायभूतम् ।
यस्य द्वैतप्रपञ्चस्योपशमेऽद्वैतप्रतिपत्ती रज्ज्वामिव सर्पादिविकल्पोपशमे रज्जुतत्त्वप्रतिपत्तिः
तस्य द्वैतस्य हेतुतो वैतथ्यप्रतिपादनाय द्वितीयं प्रकरणम् । तथाऽद्वैतस्यापि वैतथ्यप्रसङ्ग-
प्राप्तौ युक्तितत्त्वतात्वदर्शनाय तृतीयं प्रकरणम् । अद्वैतस्य तथात्वप्रतिपत्ति-प्रतिपक्षभूतानि
यानि वादान्तराण्यवैदिकानि तेषामन्योन्यविरोधित्वादतथार्थत्वेन तदुपपत्तिभिरेव निरा-
करणाय चतुर्थं प्रकरणम् ।

A consideration of these sentences seems to show that these four *prakaraṇas* occurred together, one after the other, in the *Āgama-śāstra*, in the order in which they are found.

(2) The words *dvitīyam* and *caturtham* that occur in the colophon *Śaṅkara bhagavataḥ kṛtaḥ Gauḍapādīyāgamaśāstra bhāṣye Vaitathyā-khyaṇ dvitīyaṇ prakaraṇam* and*Alāta-śāntyākhyāṇ caturtham prakaraṇam* at the end of Śaṅkara's commentary on the second and fourth sections do not help us in finding an answer to the second question as they can refer either to the order of the *prakaraṇas* chosen by Śaṅkara for commenting, or to that in which these *prakaraṇas* occurred in the original work. The following considerations show however that the *Āgama-prakaraṇa* occurred at the beginning of the *Āgama-śāstra*:

(a) It is customary on the part of Śaṅkara, when commenting on texts that comprise portions only of books not including the beginning, to make a few observations at the commencement about (1) the contents of the portion that has preceded, and (2) their relation with the contents of the portion that he is going to comment upon; compare in this connection the introduction to his commentaries on the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka*, *Taittiriya*, *Aitareya* and *Kena Upaniṣads* (which are all portions of different Brāhmaṇ texts). No such observation have been made by him in the introduction to his commentary on the *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad*, which indicates that there was nothing in the *Āgama-śāstra* that preceded the *Āgama-prakaraṇa*.

(b) On the other hand, Śaṅkara (as we have seen above), in the passage first cited above from his introduction, propounds the question, "What are the *sambandha*, *abhidheya*, and *prayojana* (subject, purpose and relation) of his quartet of *prakaraṇas* " and answers it by saying. "Since these are *prakaraṇas* of the Vedānta-śāstra, they have the same subject, purpose and relation as the Vedānta itself. There is thus no need (for the author) to mention them; but a brief mention of them must be made by one who wants to comment on the *prakaraṇas*." It is shown by this answer that the Āgama-*prakaraṇa* stood at the beginning of the Āgama-śāstra. For, it is only at the commencement of a work that the author is expected to mention the *sambandha*, *prayojana*, and *abhidheya*; and an apology for his not having done so is in place, only when the passage that is being discussed stands at the beginning of a book.

(3) Regarding the third question, the quotations in Śaṅkara's commentaries on the *Bhagavad-gītā* and the nine 'major' Upaniṣads² are exclusively from the texts known as *śruti* and *smṛti*.³ In his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, Śaṅkara, when criticising the doctrines of other schools of thought, quotes in addition from well-known text-books of those schools.

He also quotes frequently the *Brahma-sūtras* themselves, and also from Jaimini's *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā-sūtras*, *Nyāya-sūtras*, *Vaiśeṣika-sūtras*, *Pāṇini's Vyākaraṇa-sūtras* and a *Scapnādhyāya*. The following verses too are cited by him in his commentary on 2.1.9; 1.4.14; and 1.1.4⁴ with the introductions *atroktaṃ vedāntārtha-sampradāya-*

2 His commentary on the above-mentioned four sections of the Āgama-śāstra contains, besides quotations from *śruti* and *smṛti* texts, quotations from these sections themselves.

3 In this class Śaṅkara includes not only the works known as *Smṛti*, i.e., *Manu-smṛti*, *Dharma-sūtras*, *Gṛhya-sūtras* and *Srauta-sūtras*, but the *Mahā-bhārata*, *Bhagavad-gītā*, *Purāṇas* and other similar works also.

4 In the commentary on this sūtra, occurs the following quotation also, namely, *pravṛtti-nivṛtti-vidhi-tac-cheṣa-vyatirekeṇa kevalavastu-vādī veda-bhāgo nāsti* from some text-book of the Mīmāṃsaka school.

vidbhār ācāryaiḥ, tathā ca sampradāya-vido vadanti, and api cāhuḥ respectively:

1. अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते ।
अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥
2. मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदितान्यथा ।
उपायः सोवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ॥
3. गौणमिथ्यात्मनोऽसत्त्वे पुत्रदेहादिबाधनात् ।
सद्ब्रह्मात्माहित्येवं बोधे कार्यं कथं भवेत् ॥
अन्वेष्टव्यात्मविज्ञानात् प्राक् प्रमातृत्वमात्मनः ।
अन्विष्टः स्यात्प्रमातैव पाप्मदोषादिवर्जितः ॥
देहात्मप्रत्ययो यद्वत् प्रमाणात्वेन कल्पितः ।
लौकिकं तद्वदेवेदं प्रमाणं त्वात्मनिश्चयात् ॥

The first of these passages is verse 16 of the Āgama-*prakaraṇa*, and the second, verse 15 of the Advaita-*prakaraṇa*. To judge therefore from the similarity of the sentences that introduce them, it seems probable that the third passage too is a quotation from Gauḍapāda's work. That is to say, since we know of no other work of Gauḍapāda, it is probable that these verses are cited from the portion of Gauḍapāda's Āgama-śāstra that has not come down to us.

As a matter of fact, one of the commentators on the *Brahma-sūtra-Śaṅkara-bhāṣya*, namely, Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī, explains in his *Vārttika*, Śaṅkara's introductory words *api cāhuḥ* by adding the words *asmīnn arthe sampradāya-vido Gauḍapādācāryāḥ* after them (see p. 1245 of Mm. Anantakṛṣṇa Śāstrī's edition of *Brahma-sūtra-Śaṅkara-bhāṣya* with nine commentaries, vol. I, Part 2); and ordinarily, this would be sufficient evidence to show conclusively that the *kārikās* in question are derived from Gauḍapāda's book [i.e., his Āgama-śāstra]. The observations, however, made by the Mahāmahopādhyāya in his introduction, about the identity of this commentator would make out that he lived in the 15th or 16th century A.D., that is to say, at a time when it is very doubtful if complete copies of the Āgama-śāstra were extant. And secondly, the epithet *sampradāya-vidāḥ* used by Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī which is, without doubt, borrowed from Śaṅkara's above-cited

introduction to the verse *mṛl-loha-visphulīṅgādyaḥ*.....in his commentary on the Brahma-sūtra, 1.4.14 leaves room for the suspicion to arise that Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī's statement too is based on a process of inference analogous to the one adopted above by us. On the whole, then, though I think it probable that the above verses are cited by Śaṅkara from the portion of the *Āgama-śāstra* that has not come down to us, I do not think that, at this stage, we are entitled to consider it as certain.⁵

Similarly, it is not improbable that other early writers on Vedānta, and particularly on Advaita-vedānta, have sometimes cited passages from the portion of the *Āgama-śāstra* that has not come down to us; and a careful search of such texts will, I have no doubt, bring some of them to light.⁶

A. VENKATASUBBIAH

5 The attribution of the third of these kārīkās to Sundara-pāṇḍya's *Vārttika* in Mādhava's commentary on the *Sūta-saṃhitā* (3. 4. 11-12) does not militate against this view; for it is possible that Ācārya Sundara-pāṇḍya may have himself borrowed this kārīkā, mediately or directly, from the *Āgama-śāstra*, or, in case Gauḍapāda himself had borrowed it, from the original source. Compare in this connection the observation of Mr. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, X, 448, n. 45.

6 When however, as is possible, the passages are cited without the mention of Gauḍapāda's name and with introductions like *atrotkram*, *atrahuh*, etc., it is naturally impossible to refer them to Gauḍapāda's work.

Gauli

The word *gauli* occurs in the following passage (line 36-44) of story no. 32 of the metrical recension of the *Vikrama-carita* (p. 229 of Prof. Edgerton's edition, vol. 27 of the Harvard Oriental Series):

तयोः संलपतोरेवं यथेष्टं प्रश्नपेशलम् ।
तत्र गौली क्वचित् क्वचिदुच्चैरुदरवत्तदा ॥
ततो राजा तमप्राचीद्वौली किं वदतीति सः ।
नद्यामुत्तरवाहिन्यां नाभिद्वजलान्तरे ॥
शवः कश्चित्समायातीत्याह गौलीति सोऽब्रवीत् ।
ततः क्षणान्तरे कापि शिवा जुकोश कुतचित् ।
भूयापि पृष्ठः प्रोवाच पुरुषः स महीभुजा ॥
स्वर्णटङ्कायुतवती महती कापि नीविका ।
कटिप्रदेशे तस्यैव शवस्यायाति संयता ॥

“As they were thus conversing agreeably with pleasant questions, at that time somewhere a certain Gauli [=the more usual Gauri, a name of Siva's consort] cried out with a loud voice. Then the king asked him: “What does the Gauli say?” And he answered: “The Gauli says that in the north-flowing river a corpse is approaching, in water up to the navel.” A moment later, in another place, a certain Sivā [=Gauli] cried out; and being asked by the king the man said: “A great loin-cloth containing ten thousand gold coins is coming down (the river), tied about the hips of that same corpse.”

Edgerton's translation, H. O. Series, vol. 26, p. 248).

Gauli thus is another form of *Gauri*, according to Prof. Edgerton, and denotes the consort of Siva, even as does the word *sivā* used in the same passage.

Now, this word *gauli* (with cerebral *la* however instead of dental *la*) occurs also in story I.6 of the amplified version of the *Southern Pañcatantra* which has been described by Prof. Hertel in vols. 60 (pp. 769-801) and 61 (pp. 18-72) of the *ZDMG*. In 60,777, *loc. cit.* (line 26), Hertel has written ‘*gauḷi* Bezeichnung eines Vogels, I.6’, but has reported, a few lines later on, the opinion of Prof. Hultzsch that