The Visnupurāṇa is quoted by Saṅkarācārya in his Brahma-sutra-bhāṣya. This is thought-provoking in view of the fact that it is held as belonging to the Pāncarātra sect, some tenets of which are strongly criticised by Saṅkarā as opposed to Vedic traditions. Dr. Hazra has tried to determine the date of this purāṇa between 100 A.D. and 350 A.D. To fix the earlier limits of this date, the Dr. gives the argument that the mention of Zodiacal signs or Rāṣīs is enough to prove that purāṇa was written not earlier than the first century A.D. The general view that Indians were not familiar with Rāṣīs till the second century A.D. is doubtful; for certain verses of the Ṛgveda too cannot yield plausible interpretations unless words used therein are interpreted as the names of the Rāṣīs. That the compilation of almost all purāṇas continued for centuries is a fact already noted by
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2. 'Puranic records on Hindu Rites and Customs' by Dr. R. C. Hazra, University of Dacca, 1936, p. 19.
3. १५८८ १५८८
4. १५८८ १५८८ १५८८ १५८८
by scholars, and can be accepted without any reserve. But the nucleus of sectarian purāṇas should far ante-date Āpastamba, who quotes Bhavīṣya-purāṇa, which certainly must precede him by a few centuries, to have attained an importance of being quoted by an author on religious code. Now Bhavīṣya-purāṇa is a name, which shows contradiction of terms and points out that the purāṇa literature had lost its primary significance. Other purāṇas therefore, which deal more with devotion to the personifications of God, should precede the Bhavīṣya-purāṇa. The composition of the Viṣṇu-purāṇa thus should certainly precede the Christian era.

In his learned introduction to his recent book the Purāṇa Index, Mr. Diksitar has placed the Viṣṇu-purāṇa in the 6th or 5th century B.C. and has also suggested, that it may go back even to the times of

1. Mr. Diksītār quoted by Hazra, p. 13.
2. आपस्तंब वर्णन्यात्र २.९.२४.६
   He mentions only Purāṇa also cf. 1.6.9.13, 2.9.23.3
of the composition of the Atharvaveda. In a Tamil work Mañimekhalai, the reference is made to Viṣṇu-purāṇa according to Mr. Dīksitār. This Tamil epic belongs roughly to the second century A.D. Considerable time must have passed after the composition of Viṣṇu-purāṇa before it was popularly expounded even in Tamil countries. The words Budhyate, Arhata, etc. had no significance to indicate the Buddhás or Jains, and the Māyāmoha of Viṣṇu which led some people astray to become arhats, was an event on the banks of the Narmadā, "away from the birth-place of these so-called heretical sects." In any case much of the bulk of this Purāṇa is pre-Buddhistic, and hence the picture of philosophical ideas furnished by it must give us a faithful record of the thought that was current before Buddha. If Buddha's exit from this world dates 2066 B.C. according to Prof. Mankad, composition of certain purāṇas will have to be placed

2. "The Purāṇa Index" Intro. pp. XVI and XVII.
placed still earlier. I am not in a position to judge Prof. Mankad's submission that he has given after a close examination of Purānic computations.

About the philosophy of the purāṇas, an opinion that has found favour with scholars is, that Saṅkar's absolutism is not the philosophy of the Purāṇas. I have already discussed Dr. Belvalkar's opinion in this connection. Dr. Das Gupta has advanced more or less the same view; "It is highly probable that at least one important school of ideas regarding the philosophy of the Upanisads and the Brahma-sūtra was preserved in the Purānic tradition. Saṅkar's interpretation of Upanisads and the Brahma-sūtras seems to have diverged very greatly from the semi-realistic interpretation of them as found in the Purāṇas. It was, probably, for this reason that Saṅkara seldom refers to the Purāṇas; but since Saṅkara's line of interpretation is practically absent in the earlier Purāṇas, and since the extreme monism of some passages of the Upaniṣads is modified and softened by other considerations, it may be believed that the views of the Vedānta, as

1. "Vedānta Philosophy" Poona 1929.
as found in the Purāṇas and the Bhagavād-gītā, present, at least in a general manner, the oldest outlook of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads and the Brahma-sūtra.¹ Dr. Das Gupta wants us to believe that Purāṇas have followed semi-realistic interpretations of the Upaniṣads and the sūtras, from which Śaṅkara has diverged; and Śaṅkara's line of interpretation is practically absent in the earlier purāṇas. If it is argued that the Upaniṣadic passages advocate extreme monism, such passages are softened and modified by other considerations. Hence the Purāṇas and the Bhagavād-gītā present the oldest outlook of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads and the Brahma-sūtra.

Dr. Das Gupta has not mentioned the names of what he thinks to be earlier Purāṇas, yet it may be fairly assumed that the Viṣṇu, Vāyu, Mārkandeya, Nārada and Kūrma are according to him some of the earlier purāṇas for he has selected these only for exposition. That Śaṅkara's thought can be found in many of these Purāṇas will be evident from the sequel.

1. "A History of Indian Philosophy" Vol. VIII, p.496.

2. According to Mr. Dīksitar Vāyu, Brahmānda, Viṣṇu, Matṛga and Bhāgavata are the most ancient Purāṇas amongst the eighteen.
The term semi-realistic is again confounding. The terms "real" and "unreal" used by Saṅkara will have to be understood from their context; and Saṅkara's differentiation of Sattās will have sufficiently to be taken into account. It is generally agreed that Saṅkara's interpretation of the Upaniṣads represents best the Upaniṣadic philosophy, and its echo is to be found in the Purāṇas. Difference from Advaitic thought need not be taken to be a criterion to prove the genuine outlook of the Upaniṣad or Śūtra philosophy.

It would be better to allow a place to every mode of thought in the Upaniṣads as well as in the Purāṇas, and we see that the Advaitic thought is not missing in them. If it is held on the evidence of the Mahābhārata and Pāṇini that sectarian worship and literature was sufficiently developed in their times, there should be no hesitation in accepting, that the Advaita philosophy was asserting its existence even in popular literature that existed before Buddha.

1. I use the word "sectarian" only to indicate preference to a particular deity.
Visṇu seems to be a favourite God of the devotees in the Purāṇic pantheon. Devotees surrounded by difficulties are always rescued by him by his mysterious ways. He is said to appear in different forms to save the earth from being obsessed by sinful people. In many Purāṇas we find elaborate accounts of different exploits of Visṇu. The very word Visṇu, in conformity with Vedic etymology, means all-pervading principle. This has a metaphysical significance. Visṇu was thus regarded as the Lord who pervades the whole creation. His transcendent aspect which knows no difference in any form is also spoken of. Let us begin with the Visṇu-purāṇa, the famous work on which the Vaiṣṇivas often draw.

The Brahman is transcendent according to the Visṇupurāṇa:

पंतवेदज्ञानविद्वान्तविद्वानचिन्त्यानामवर्णित: १
एक: समस्तं विविधातिः किरृत्चतु तदच्छुरो नास्ति परं ततोऽन्यन्तर: २
सोःस्त्रेष्ठ स च तत्वं स च सर्वमिदं शार्मस्वरूपं त्वं मेवमोहस्त ॥ ३
पर: पराणां परम: परमात्मात्मसंस्थित: । ३
रूपवचारादिनविदेषिकं विशेषणविवरित: ॥

\[
1. 5.1.39 \\
2. 6.16.23 \\
3. 1.2.10
\]
The transcendent Brahman is beyond Prakṛti.
It cannot be described as gross or small or by any qualification:

This principle which has no qualities is apprehended as having qualities through ignorance:

1. 2.14.29

2. 1.19.46

3. 1.9.52
Through the advent of Rajas, the creatorship of the world goes to Brahman:

Kesidhvaja speaks to Khāndikya about Avidyā and its activities:

---
1. 1.14.37
2. 1.2.61-62
2. Cf. also 1.9.39-40/2.16.31-32/5.18.52-53
3. 1.9.39-40
Here the Upanisadic order of evolution of the world is stated and it is negated as the origination of Avidyā. After the Upanisadic manner of negation of plurality, we find all difference negated in dialogue of Jādabharata and Rahūgana:

\[ \text{तत्त्वं राजा बिजिका बैयामि वाहा: दुरस्वरा: ।} \]
\[ \text{अवं च भक्तो लोको न सदेतुपोच्चते} \]

\[ \text{वस्तु राजेति नल्लोके यथव राजमन्दाविकम्} । \]
\[ \text{तथा न्यथव दृष्टेत्यं तनं सत्तं संक्षपनामयम्} \]

We should look at the objective world from a right perspective, and it will be known that the world is

---

1. 6.6.10-12
2. 2.13.62
3. 2.13.9
is essentially Brahman. Because Brahman is infinite it must run through every finite object, and there cannot be anything beyond that:

र्वणनात्स्य स एवाधेयस्वितः।
भत: सर्वमह सर्वे माय सर्वं सतातने॥

थत सर्वे थत: सर्वे य: सर्वं सर्वसंथयः॥

The individual is also essentially the Infinite Brahman:

निवासमय एवाधमात्मा शानमयोः मल:॥
दुःसानमया धमा: प्रकृतेष्वे दु नात्मन:॥

Ignorance, pain, grief, etc. belong to Prakṛti and not to the Ātman. This ignorance must be dispelled by right knowledge which is thus spoken of:

\[1. 1.19.89\]
\[2. 1.9.79\]
\[3. 1.9.84\]
\[4. 6.7.22\]
Right Knowledge brings direct experience of non-difference. When one attains that state, he becomes Lord Himself. This is the state of Jīvanmukti:

When one transcends all difference he attains liberation even in this life:

1. 6.6.53
2. 6.6.95
3. 6.6.96
4. 2.16.20
5. 2.16.24
In this Purāṇa, we thus find a grand exposition of the Advaitic principles. With the Vedāntins, Svāmkhya does not always mean "Svāmkhya system" and this Purāṇa has distinctly stepped beyond Svāmkhya after the manner of the Mahābhārata, though it has utilised it wherever necessary. Indian Philosophy had, therefore, reached a development from Svāmkhya to Advaita in very early times and, it continued to be reflected in these early Purāṇas.

A strong case has been made by Prof. Krsnamurti Sarma about the antiquity of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, and some modern researches too seem to support him. The belief in Bopadeva's authorship of this Purāṇa, held up by Dayānanda Svāmi and H. H. Wilson is now rightly rejected. Yet some eminent writers are inclined to think, on the strength of the silence of Śaṅkara and

1. Cf. 1.9

2. Diksitar. Purāṇa Index Introduction, p. XXIX.

3. तत्त्वार्थप्रकाश श्रमर १९३०. प. २१८-२१९.

Wilson's Introduction to Viṣṇupurāṇa, pp. 50-51.
and Rāmānuja on this Purāṇa, that the Purāṇa is a product of an age later than Rāmānuja, but much earlier than Madhva. Prof. Šarma has however shown that in a minor work Vedānta-Tattva-sāra, Rāmānuja has referred to this work, and no convincing proof has yet been advanced against the genuine authorship of Rāmānuja's work. Rāmānuja's spiritual ancestor Yāmunamunī refers to this work in his Agamapramāṇya. The work thus must precede Rāmānuja, for Yāmuna is undisputably known as a spiritual ancestor of Rāmānuja. Sri Durgāśāṅkar Ṣāstri places this work in the first half of the ninth century, obviously later than Śaṅkarācārya, for, according to him, the author of this Purāṇa was acquainted with "the literature bearing on Śaṅkara philosophy." The Sarvasiddhanta-samgraha is a work which is generally attributed to Śaṅkara, and


and being a minor work, it is always doubted to have come from the pen of Ādi Śaṅkara. Prof. Sarma, on the strength of verses on the introductory portion of this work, has proved that the work mentions Śaṅkara himself by the words Bhagavatpāda. As Prof. Sarma has shown the word Bhagavatpāda cannot be taken to mean Govinda-Bhagavatpāda. I am however inclined to believe, that though by the word Bhagavatpāda the reference is to Śaṅkara himself, we need not conclude that the whole work is composed by a post-Śaṅkarite Advatin. It is likely that the preliminary portion is added to the work later. Apart from that, Śaṅkara's or Rāmanuja's silence about this work in their commentaries on the Brahma-Sūtra might have quite a different reason. It is quite probable that these masters wanted to emphasise their doctrines by relying more on Śrutis. I shall deal again with this point later on.

Avoiding therefore such negative or other ubiquitous facts, Mr. Sarma has tried other sources and has succeeded remarkably. His conclusion is that the

---

the "Purāṇa was well known in the 10th century, was extant in the 7th century, was not unknown in the 6th century, and might very well, therefore, have been composed about the 5th century A.D. if not earlier still." In support of this conclusion he has given the following evidence:

(a) Abhinavagupta, a pioneer of the Kāśmīra Pratyabhijñā school, who flourished in the 10th century quotes this work. Scholars are inclined to believe that Bhāgavata was composed in the south India. Some centuries must have elapsed before this work reached the extreme north, as an authoritative treatise to be accepted by Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas alike.

(b) Gaudiapāda gives an echo of a stanza from the Bhāgavata 10.14.4 in his commentary on the Uttarakītā. Nothing so far is discovered to oust the traditional claim about Gaudapādas authorship of this commentary.

(c) Māthara Vṛtti of the Sāmkhya-Kārikā gives stanzas that resemble those of the Bhāgavata 1.8.52 and 1.6.35.

(d) Mr. Śastri has also shown that a Jain work Nandīṣūtra speaks of Bhāgavayam.
The last two evidences are rejected by Mr. Sastri, because Matthara gloss has suffered inflation and the Bhagavayam need not necessarily mean the Bhagavata. I feel that the evidence of Matthara gloss cannot be brushed away so unceremoniously. None would say that Bhagavata in its present form existed always. But the text of Purana should have existed in some form, before it was reproduced by others. There is nothing to support a hasty supposition, that this stanza in the gloss was interpolated later. Prof. Diksitar informs us that the cult of Sankarsana-Vasudeva prevailed from the sixth century B.C.; and as Bhagavata does not mention this cult, it should have been composed, when this cult disappeared and Vasudeva alone remained as the Supreme-God. He then assigns this work to 3rd century A.D. It may not be lost sight of, that Panini mentions Vasudevarjuna cult to which we have referred before in agreement with Dahlmann. The date of Panini cannot be later than 5th century B.C., though I am inclined to place him still earlier. The Bhagavata mostly follows the Visnupurana and its composition also must have followed Visnupurana by some centuries, a time that can reasonably be required
required for Viṣṇupurāṇa to win reputation in southern India, which is taken to be the place where the Bhāgavata originated.

That this work breathes the atmosphere of the Viṣṇupurāṇa has already been mentioned. It must therefore represent the oldest outlook of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads and the Brahma-sūtra as pointed out by Dr. Das Gupta. We have seen that the Viṣṇupurāṇa does not fail to present an absolutely Advaitic view. The notion of reality of the world is there described as Saṃvyavahārābhūta. From absolute stand-point, that reality is negated in emphatic terms. The "realistic note" found in Saṃkhya ideology is thus "very nearly destroyed" in the Viṣṇupurāṇa. Same is the case with the Bhāgavata as Dr. Das Gupta has observed. Not only in the eleventh chapter as shown by Dr. Das Gupta, but also in earlier chapters, the emphasis on the illusory character is strong enough. In the third chapter the Saṃkhya of Kapila is found in several ending discourses

1. विष्णुपुराण २.१२.४६

2. A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. IV, p. 32.
discourses e.g. 24 - 33 - wherein is included not only the later classical Śāmkhya order of the world, but also the doctrines of Bhakti and Yoga, and ultimately the final emancipation similar to that of the Advaita. In the sixth chapter the fifteenth discourse starts with the Satkāryavāda ideology, and the same discourse later on points out:

इश्वावस्थेव विषयामर्गः कार्यादिप्रवृत्तम्।
राज्यं तत्र वर्ण कोशीवः पुर्वत्माः शून्यज्ञानः॥
सर्वं तपं दूरस्येमेष शोकमोहमयादिवम्।
गंगार्जनग्रिश्या स्वप्नमध्यायमनोरस्यः॥

This can easily be compared with:

यथा मनोरवधियो विषयामुक्तो मृषा।
स्वप्नदृष्टांश् नास्ताः तथा संसार आत्मनः॥

------------------------------------------------

1. भागवत ६.१५.२

2. भागवत ६.१५.२२.२३

3. भागवत १२.२२.५५ Cf. ११.१०/१०.१८/१२.२५
The remark of Mr. Dhruva quoted and corroborated by Mr. Śāstri "..... the knowledge it imparts has a purely monistic garb. ..... the māyāvāda of the Bhāgavata agrees not so much with that of any other Vedāntic school as with that of the Śaṅkara." is very true.

The knowledge of one fundamental Reality is the real knowledge:

शानं च ब्रह्मवर्णनम् ॥
śānaṁ ca brahmavārṇanam ॥

शानं चैकात्म्यवर्णनम् ॥
śānaṁ ca kātma-vārṇanam ॥

That reality is beyond duality, the Prakṛti and the Purusa. It is the fundamental substrate from which both of these appear to have sprung.

एकत्वमेव भगवनिविद्यमात्मबुद्धक्ता ॥
ekatvameva bhagavānividyamātma-buddhakta ॥

मायाव्ययोहसुशच महावाच्यक्षेपम् ॥
maīyāvīyayo āhau śc maha-vāca-kṣepam ॥

2. मागवल  ३.२२.२३
3. मागवल  १०.१६.२७  ४. मागवल  ४.९.६
Commentator Sridhara lucidly explains this stanza of the Vedastuti thus:

2. Bhagvat 10.14.21
4. Bhagvat Shruti Gita 10.87.37
The gloss of Maheswara also explains in the same way:

किं च इदं विश्वं सृष्टेः पूर्व नासीत तथा स्वान्तरमपि न पश्चिमेण अतो मध्ये न, तथापि त्वाय सत्ये मध्याधूपे मेवेः भावि।

All this argument is based on the Nāsa-dīya hymn of the Rgveda, and the famous stanza of the Gītā:

Whatever is not cannot be.
Whatever is not cannot perish.

The creation and destruction of the world is thus evidently an illusion. The illusory character of the world that appears in Brahman is clearly shown here. It is interesting to see how a follower of Madhva inter-
interprets this stanza. Vijayadhvaja says in his commentary thus:

 Jennerāvartaye bādhakamah vaeiti. Ihamīśvaratvamprāy utpāte:
pūrvajīveṇu gṛmstheṣu nās nāstī ... ...

This however does not seem to be the subject matter of the stanza. All duality is specifically negated in the 25th stanza of the Vedastuti. The same is found repeated several times in this Purāṇa. Thus in the eleventh chapter we have:

तत्स्मान्नाशात्म्यनोः नास्मादन्यो भावो निरूपितम् ॥
निरूपितेऽर्थो निर्मला भाविकात्मिनिति ॥
इति गुणमयं विदृष्टि निर्मल भाविकानामायद्वः ॥
पतं विदृष्टा न्युर्द्वितं श्रावषेष्वात्मेन्यंधुरं ॥
न निर्विवात त्व च स्तीति ताक्रेण चरति द्रुवयतः ॥
प्रत्येकानुमानं निर्गुणेनात्मसंविदा ॥
बाध्यतवदस्यात्मानं निःसङ्गो विचरेश्चित ॥

The same is again told at the end of the 24th discourse of the eleventh chapter. After having des-

1. महाभारत १०.५५.२५
2. महाभारत १६.२४.६-१०
described fully the order of involution of elements that are named after Sāmkhya terminology, it is told that everything should be looked upon as self:

The individual soul is essentially the Supreme Self. We find this pronouncement also in many places. Having known that the Self is not contaminated by the world—the product of Māyā, a discriminate person should freely move:

1. भागवत ११.२४.२७-२८

2. भागवत ३.३३.४६-५८
This is the right attitude of a liberated soul, for he knows that the world he is moving within is a creation of Māyā and the limitation that he feels is unreal. He is indeed the Supreme Brahman:

1. For in reality there is no bondage and hence no liberation. "ततो न काम: प्रातिविन्दुः " मायाय । नाम १०.४८.२२

2. मायायत १०.२१.१३

3. मायायत १२.५.२

4. मायायत १२.५.११
In the Bhāgavata thus we have a full-fledged Advaita system, enumerating the Śāmkhya idea wherever necessary, and negating duality in the final phase. The Prakṛti thus is nothing but God's power, and the percipient is not really bound by limitations, as he is essentially identical with the Supreme Self:

ला वा अतत्स्व संक्षण्डा स्वक्तः शुद्धवात्मिका ।
माया नाम महामागच चेतव सत्त्वे विषयः॥

पुरुषेश्वरयोगेन न वैश्वर्णयमण्डप॥

This development upon the Śāmkhya, which is called as a complete deliberation consisting of Utsarga and Apavāda in the Mahābhārata as we have seen, is a continuation of the Vedic Advaita thought. If in a latter phase of Apavāda some analogies that would remind of Buddhist influence are used, they need not point to a borrowal of Buddhist ideology.

1. मागवंत ३५.२६

2. मागवंत १२.२२.४४

3. इत्तिष्ठित विप्रभूमिः मनलो विलासम्
वृष्टं विनष्ट्वतिलोकलालात्तथेष्म। मागवंत १२.२२.४४
Taking leave of the Bhāgavata, we now turn to other early Purāṇas. The Vāyu Purāṇa is much discussed by scholars as one of the earliest mythological records. Dr. Pātil has given 500 B.C. as the upper limit and 500 A.D. as the lower limit of the antiquity of this Purāṇa. The archaic survivals of this Purāṇa suggest, according to him, a date that would mark the end of the Vedic period. But this period should be taken back, as we have seen while thinking about the antiquity of the Mahābhārata. Leaving aside the testimony of Harivamśa, we can turn to Mahābhārata itself, which speaks of Vāyu Purāṇa. In such circumstances the nucleus of this Purāṇa should exist two or three centuries earlier. Prof. Diksitar has told us, that the chapter dealing with royal dynasties speak of Adhisimakṛṣṇa, in whose reign the scene


2. हरिवंश १७०१३
3. बारश्यक २०१४०१५

3 In the opening discourse the name is given as Asimakṛṣṇa. असिमकृष्णे विनाश्वते राजन्ये शुपतिविवि etc.

वायु पु. २८४
scene of the Purāṇa must have occurred. The date of Adhisimakriṣṇa is 1100 B.C. It is not improbable, that after two or three centuries, all those events were reduced to writing, for which scholars have waited for six centuries. Prof. Dīksitar tells us that the Brahmanda-purāṇa immediately followed Vāyu-purāṇa. The earliest composition of these purāṇas should therefore exist between 800 B.C. and 400 B.C. In any case the general trend of Indian culture reflected in it is before Buddha or Jaina advent. We should not therefore be far from correct, if we take philosophical reflections in it as pre-Buddhistic.

It is said that Avyakta - the unmanifest - which is the cause of the world, having its constituents from the Mahat to the Vīṣeṣas or the special characteristics - is created by Lord Maheśvara. This Avyakta is a combination of the real and the unreal, much the same as the Māyā spoken of in the Bhāgavata 3.5.25:

1. Dīksitar Intro. p. XX.

2. Dīksitar Intro. p. XXII.
The Purana then elaborates at length descriptions of different worlds, the Jambudvipa, the Plaksadvipa, the celestial regions the worlds of the fathers, Gods, demons, different genealogies, etc. In course of these narratives we get different shades of speculations like Sāmkhya in chapter 26, 27, 103 Yoga, Pāśupata in chapter 16 and 10 (St. 77-94). The Advaita Vedānta is also not absent in it. About God and his creation we again have the following:

महत: परमे धार्म विषयवाच्यत्मना पदम् ||
श्रैधीमाचेन चात्मानान्त प्रविष्टस्तु ध्ययस्यत:।
निष्कल: सूक्षममध्यवंत: सकलस्व महेन्व: ||
शस्य भावाविविधस्य अगम्यगमनस्य च।
पुरा लिंगं मधौवीजं प्रथमं त्वाविर्तनिकम्।

1. वाङ्गुराज (आनन्दाचार्य १९०५) १०४५-४६
2. वाङ्गुराज अध्याय २४ श्लो. ६०-६२
From God thus proceeds the worlds through his power which may be called Avyakta, Mahat or Maya.
But essentially everything is God though He Himself appears as the manifold:

एको मूल्या यथा मेघः प्रक्षेपनालं तिष्ठते।

God is everything, the beginning and at the end, the manifest and the unmanifest, the subtlest principle beyond all:

नित्यायानित्यायुपाय नित्यानित्याय वै नमः।
व्यक्ताय वैव्यक्ताय व्यक्ताव्यक्ताय वै नमः।
चिन्त्याय वैविचिन्त्याय चिन्त्याचिन्त्याय वै नमः।
त्यमेव चात्मा विरित्यन्ते त्यमेव स्पौर्णस्व शुरुष्मः पुरुषस्य शुरुष्मेव।
त्यमेव सुक्ष्मस्य परः परस्य - - - - - - - - - -।
नित्यं सत्वं सर्वं तु भौर्षं पश्यन्तिः प्रक्षेप्टत एव प्रकाशम्।
परमेष्ठिः परं त्रहमु अवरं परमं पवमु।

1. वायुपुराण अ. ६६, स्तो. १०२।
2. वायुपुराण ६६.३४-३५।
3. वायुपुराण ६६.६९-१००।
4. वायुपुराण ६६.६६।
5. वायुपुराण ६६.३२।
Such is the Supreme reality which is mostly identified with Śiva in this Purāṇa. For one desirous of attaining it, devotion, austerities, meditations, etc. are prescribed. An aspirant is asked to become Samāhita. In that state there is no differentiation of Jñāna and Jñeya. As long as such a difference remains there is no liberation:

But if a person has right knowledge, he attains a state from which there is no return:

1. Vāyu Purāṇa ६५.२२
2. Vāyu Purāṇa ६६.२१-२२
3. Vāyu Purāṇa १५.२२-२४
4. Vāyu Purāṇa १६.३
The trouble of Samsāra is due to ignorance. A person revolves just like a wheel, as he comes in contact with Anista:

कुलालचक्रवृद्ध: ब्राह्मस्तैव परिक्रियंति: ॥

This idea of Kulālacakra which is also found in later Advaita Vedānta is used here more or less in the same way.

Chapter 104 of this Purāṇa is replete with the Advaita Vedānta; but as the Ānandāśrama Edition says that out of five versions used, four omit this adhyāya, it may be doubted that this adhyāya is spurious. However, it is included in the edition of Rajendralāl

1. वायुपुराण १४.२६

2. वायुपुराण १४.२८

3. अथवत्तिरिक्तपुस्तकेन न विचये।

Mitra. But we can easily see, that in its essentials the Advaita is found even in uninterpolated chapters. Later addition is definite only in using terminology which make the same ideas more explicit:

शकरं परमं ब्रह्म परमात्मा परं पवन्।

तदू ब्रह्म परमं शुद्धवनाथत्मनायमय।

नित्यं सर्वं स्थायं कूटस्य कूटवर्तितम।

विकालाष्टः नित्यं चिन्मात्रणवय।

श्रद्धक्षणं सर्वविषयं विज्ञानमेतत्प्रकाशते।

विश्वविश्वें चान्वेति निर्विकारं च रज्जवल।

विद्विद्विदं यतः च केन वेदं यतवं स्मृतम।

यदवानामध्यवर्तं माति यव्वत ज्ञाते जगन्न हि।

घटावच्छिन्न प्रवायं महाकाशों विभिन्ने।

कालमेयं परिच्छिन्नं तद्दू यथ्येवसंशक्षम।
These verses are too explicit too need any commentary. Even if these are later additions, they need not be called post-Sańkarite, for in earlier portions too the general idea is the same, and when the immanent aspect of God is described as Gūḍhāvarta, Brahmāvarta, Kāmāvarta, etc. its familiarity with later Vivarta doctrine can be easily guessed.

We may now turn to the Brahmāṇdapurāṇa, which is a production - at least in part - of the 4th century B.C. according to Prof. Dīksitar. It reproduces almost the same matter as given in the Vāyupurāṇa, and sometimes stanzas are found repeated word by word. Yet Lalitā worship is a conspicuous speciality of this purāṇa.

At the very start the Purāṇa enunciates Advaitic principles:

नमो नमः ब्रह्म स्यात् स्थितो सर्वमयय वा।
नमो रजस्तम् सर्वातिरिक्ताय स्वर्ये शुद्धनी।

1. वायुपुराण 20.274-278
2. ब्रह्ममाण्डपुराण 1.1.1
The Being who does not suffer the creation, decay, or sustenance of the world is first saluted. From him proceed the world. He creates the world; how? By taking recourse to Yogic power:

लोककूलोकक्तरवशो योगमास्त्याय योगचित्ति।
अर्थज्ञस्वभूताति स्यावराणि चराणि च॥

Like the Vāyupurāṇa, the Brahmāṇḍa also sometimes identifies the Supreme Lord with Siva:

परमेष्ठि परं ब्रह्म त्वं बक्षि परमं पवम॥

The Māyā of this Lord deludes others:

माया मोहिता तेन नष्टसंशो ठवस्थिता॥

The reality can be perceived only by those who have the eye of knowledge:

पत्तदृश्चि परमं ज्ञातमभवतं निःसंशितम॥
पत्तत्प्रतिप्रभुमचित्तं च पस्यंति ज्ञानचुन्द्र॥

1. Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 1.1.6
2. Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 2.26.23
3. Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 2.26.29
God Himself has created and bound up the world with the tie of hope:

यथा बद्धुर्मिनं सर्वं जगत्स्थापरजंगमम्।
आश्मायनं बल्येन — — — — — — — — — — ||

Yet there are aspirants who wish to cut this tie and go beyond:

संवृद्धस्येवं कर्मज्ञि वासना: कर्मजात् च वै।
वमेष्यवावतिष्ठं दोषं दृष्टंता तु कर्मसं।
ख्यातिशयुक्तं च ते दृष्टंता कर्मका फलम्।
हुम्रस्तं प्रसृति च निःलक्षणा निर्माणममाभवन्॥
आज्ञान्यं कां संभवायाते निर्मुक्तं वृषदर्शिनः।
अर्थं धर्मं च कां छ द्वित्वा ते वै व्यवस्थिता:॥
परं ज्ञानमात्माय तत्संबिधं तु संस्थितं:।

The order of emancipation is elaborately described. After a certain stage some individuals are said to go to Brahmaloka where they become as powerful

1. ब्रह्मांडपुराण ३४.१६-१८
2. ब्रह्मांडपुराण ३४.५-८
powerful and illustrious as God Brahmā, and ultimately they attain final liberation with him. Final emancipation thus means going beyond the stage of Kāryabrahman - to use the terminology of the Sūtra:

गत्वा ते ब्रह्मलोकं वै अपरार्थर्तिनं गतिम्।
भवति ब्रह्मणा तुत्त्वा दूरपेण विपयेण च।
आनंदं ब्रह्मण: प्राप्त्य शुचं ते ब्रह्मणा सह।

The transcendent aspect of God is indeed the absolute reality which aspirants are always desirous of:

अविकारम्यं नित्यं सूक्ष्मदृष्टमनौपमम्।
आदिविमच्छयानं नित्यायावाढ्यक्तमस्य।

But the same unmanifest reality becomes manifest and has three qualities. The same is also individual percipient:

-----------------------------------------------------------
۱. ब्रह्मांदुरारण २.६.२१-२२
۲. ब्रह्मांदुरारण ३.२५.२५
۳. ब्रह्मांदुरारण ३.२५.१६
The Absolute becomes of double nature which are termed as Sat and Asat. All modifications and duality are thus the product of Asat - aspect which also can be termed as Māyā:

Māyā kृतमाचछेत्य पायी देवो महेश्वरः।

This Māyā is the deluding principle that veils reality from an individual, who through ignorance attaches himself to sense objects:

1. भ्रूमांडयुगराज ३.२५.१८-२४

2. भ्रूमांडयुगराज उत्तरभाग ४.२.२२१
Knowledge dawns after the extirpation of ignorance, and that leads to renunciation:

शानाचू हि त्यज्यते सर्वं त्यागादुभिधिर्गतिरज्ञते।

All relations are thus broken and the self is freed:

निःस्बर्मयो श्रेयस्त्येत्त्य: स्वात्मन्वेशावतिष्ठते।

यदृ गत्वा न निष्कृत्ये ब्रवेष्टं हु निरंजनम्।

The Lalitopākhyāna too countenances the same type of philosophy. Here the Supreme reality is identified with the Goddess:

रहस्यानायाध्यात्मस्तरविविधमिनिथवः॥

परं ब्रह्मेति या स्वात्ता तस्मै वेद्ये नमो नम॥

---

1. ब्रह्मांडपुराण उत्तरमाण ४.२.४९
2. ब्रह्मांडपुराण उत्तरमाण ४.२.४५
3. ब्रह्मांडपुराण उत्तरमाण ४.२.५६
4. ब्रह्मांडपुराण उत्तरमाण ४.२.१०४
5. ब्रह्मांडपुराण उत्तरमाण ४.२.२८
She is the transcendent principle, knowledge, absolute Jñānasakti. She is also the world full of twenty-five principles, which constitute the veil of Maya:

पंचविश्वतितवानि मायाकृष्णकं सँ ||
य-मयं मुनयं प्राहुस्तस्य वेद्ये नमो नमः ॥

She alone manifests in all forms:

देवकलपदाधारत्मा चहृयदु वस्तु यथा तथा ॥
तत्त्वपेण या भाति तत्त्वे वेद्ये नमो नमः ॥

She is also the self of every individual:

सत्त्वमन्त्तरत्मा परमानंदूर्पिणी ॥

We may now restrict our attention to some extracts from some other important Purāṇas. Out of the five reckoned as earlier by Dr. Das Gupta, we have discussed two viz. the Viṣṇu and the Vāyu. We may now turn to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p.</th>
<th>ब्रह्माण्डपुराण उत्तरयाग ४.३९.३४</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Mārkaṇḍeya, Nārada, and Kūrma Purāṇas, and see that along with other speculations, these Purāṇas mention unmistakingly the Advaitic line of thinking also. If these Purāṇas represent an old view of the philosophy of the Upaniṣad and the Sūtra – as opined by Dr. Das Gupta, it follows that not only the Advaita was implicated in the Upaniṣads and the Sūtras, but that it was preserved and followed faithfully in texts, that were produced in the pre-Buddhistic as well as post-Buddhistic era. The Mārkaṇḍeya thus records the Advaita philosophy:

नाहयवीं न सरिं न ज्योतिरिनिलो न च ।

नाहं शरीरं न मनो यतोः प्रयक्षक्षरीरानुवस्तथास्त्रोषरम् ॥

सम्यकप्रयत्ता ब्रह्ममु मय बुः न किं चनं।

असम्यकपर्वतिनी मनसा: सक्तिवाचकाणि॥

सा मुक्तब्रह्ममणा चैवमयनेव ाऽकृतैं गुणः ॥

मुक्तिसन्तुचकं भूप पर निवारणमाल्यम:॥

तत्रो न जाते नैव बच्चे न विनविद्यति॥

1. मारकृटवं पुराण 3.33-39
2. " " 35.2
3. " " 36.1
4. " " 37.29
The position that Prakṛti as well as Puruṣa ultimately dissolve into the Supreme is clearly vindicated from this. The Nārādīya is still more clear in expressing the Advaitic ideas:
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2. 22

2. 24

4. 44

5. 81

6. 26
तत्त्रात्मेवंविषया लोके वृत्ति: सत्यावटे मथेतु।

आत्मा तु निर्मल: बुद्धः सच्चिदानन्दविभ्रमः।
सच्छीपार्थिविनिर्मलोऽयोगिनः मात्मवंचशः।
निर्मलोऽपि परस् परो घनानान्तु गुणवाक्षरः।
विशाल्यश्वाननाते हूँ वचापुवः व्यवस्थितम्॥
परं ज्योतिर्वेदात्मा ताहाः भावावान्तान्तान्तान्ताम्।
तन्नात्रे निर्मल ब्रह्म प्रकाशावति पंखित॥
एकमेवाद्वितीयं च परं ज्योतिर्निर्णयम्।
सच्चिदामेव भूतानामन्नत्वार्मिताः स्थितम्॥

ध्यानं ध्यायं ध्यातुमार्यं यथा नस्तवति निर्मलम्।
ततोऽभ्यं भवति सानामस्मृतुः निरीक्षणात्॥

ब्रह्मवादवं न संसारी नित्यमुक्तो न ज्ञातेमादृशः।
सच्चिदान्त-दूषोऽहमात्मानमिति मायेते॥

१. नारदीय पुराण ४३.८४
२. नारदीय पुराण ४३.८५-४६
३. नारदीय पुराण ४४.४१-४२
४. नारदीय पुराण ६६.९५-९६
The Kūrma purāṇa too is equally emphatic in maintaining the Advaitic position:

बहुनाश्च किंयक्तेन सर्वं ब्रह्ममयं जगत्।
सर्वप्रातात्मप्रभृताय भूतस्वाय नमः।
अनन्ताय प्रदेश्याय कार्याय कारणाय च।
युमोह माययाः सत्यो मायिनः। परमेश्विनः।

श्लोकां मायेकिंविन्दुपं स्वप्नात्मकचित्स्मृतस्मृतम्।
तं ब्रह्मपरं परमेश्वरं त्वां नमस्कारिष्ये न यतोऽन्ववस्ति॥

First eleven discourses of the latter part of this purāṇa constitute the popularly known Īśvaragītā, which indisputably gives an account of the Advaita. Vijnānabhikṣu has written a commentary on the Īśvara-

$1. \text{Kūrma Purāṇa} \text{ युक्तार्थ} \ 8.65$
$2. \ " \ " \ 8.14-16$
$3. \ " \ " \ 6.22$
$4. \ " \ " \ 22.40$
where the Sāmkhya-yoga and Vedānta appear to be wielded
together into one indivisible harmonious system." The
Purāṇas in general and even the Īśvaragītā have enough
of Sāmkhya-yoga together with the Vedānta, and there
can also be no dispute that they can be treated as one
harmonious system. Care must only be taken to remember
that the way of this harmonisation is not the only
one prescribed by Vijñānabhikṣu. Śaṅkara's inter-
pretation too can be effectively used for that purpose.
A superficial consideration of this point may induce
an argument, that negation of creation or multiplicity,
which is the conspicuous feature of the Śaṅkara School
of Advaita, is irreconcilable with Sāmkhya-yoga. This
is not the place to deal with the philosophy of Śaṅkara,
but in passing we may note that Śaṅkara has accepted
the validity of Sāmkhya-Yoga to a certain extent.
Again, negation of creation has a particular significance
in context of Śaṅkara's system of thought. Negation
of a thing is impossible unless it is first posited.

1. A History of Indian Philosophy Vol. III, p. 482.

2. Cf. उत्तरार्थ कूर्मपुराण अध्याय 2,१. 
Thus the account of creation etc. is an essential part of Śaṅkara's thought-pattern. Śaṅkara was not also the originator of such a manner of philosophical thinking. Even in the Mahābhārata, it is mentioned that sages had built up systems of philosophy, of which Utsarga and Apavāda were inseparable parts:

उत्सर्गायपवादेभैं कष्टिभि: कपिलाविभि: ।
शब्द्यात्मातिन्त्वामानित्व शास्त्राण्युक्तानि भारत ॥

It is thus very true that the "line of interpretation of Vedānta followed in the Purāṇas" and the Mahābhārata is the harmonisation of the Sāmkhya Yoga and Vedānta; but such attempts were in ways more than one, and the way that Śaṅkara followed was not unknown either to the Sūtras or to the epics and Purāṇas.

With this digression let us turn again to the Īśvaragītā. From the following the Advaita point of view will be evident:

तत्र च चात्मापरसारुच तनासमनुत्तमम् ॥
शान्त प्रदृष्टविषयं तेन पत्यसं तत्परम् ॥

1. Mahābhārata śańkhya. 3.38.6 B.O.R.I.Ed.

2. Kūrmapurāṇa uttarārth 1.3
हनुमन समाशिल्य व्रहमीयुत द्विजोपास्मः।
न संसारं प्रपन्नं पूर्वोऽपि व्रहमचारिः॥

आत्मादे भक्त: स्वच्छ: श्रुव्यः शुक्लः सनातनः॥
अस्ति सर्वान्तर: सापविच्छ-मात्रस्मः पर:॥

स मायेत मायवया वृद्ध: करोति विविधास्तु॥
न चाप्यवं संसरति न संसारमवे: प्रथु॥

न माया जैव च प्राणा न जैव परमार्थतं॥
ह्वानस्वरूपमेवाहुर्ष्ट्वं विचर्यः॥

त्वयेवेत्रे व्रहमचाक्यो मायावी त्वं जगतामेकनाथ॥

अहं कि भगवानीव: स्वर्णज्योति: सनातन:॥
परमात्मां परं व्रहम महो ज्ञन्यो न चिदयते॥

1. कूम्पुराण उत्तरार्ध २.२ 
2. कूम्पुराण उत्तरार्ध २.४ 
3. कूम्पुराण उत्तरार्ध २.६ 
4. कूम्पुराण उत्तरार्ध २.६ 
5. कूम्पुराण उत्तरार्ध २.१० 
6. कूम्पुराण उत्तरार्ध २.२६ 
7. कूम्पुराण उत्तरार्ध २.२६ 
8. कूम्पुराण उत्तरार्ध ६.५२
It is needless to add quotations from the Īśvaragītā which contains abundant passages in support of the Advaita. In the end it is said, that this knowledge was imparted by Śiva to Nārāyaṇa, and then it went on to Sanatkumāra, from him to Āngirā, then to Kapila and Pañčāśikha. Parāśara is also said to have obtained it from Sanaka. How significant this lineage is, can be evident by referring to the reflections about the authenticity of Pārāśaryā sūtra. A glance at other chapters of this Purāṇa - e.g. chapters 35, 39, 46 of the latter half - will be enough to convince that there is no want at all of Non-dualistic thought in this text.

In his recent article Dr. Hazra has tried to prove admirably that the upper limit of the date of the Devī Bhāgavata cannot be placed earlier than 950 A.D. On the basis of the story of Nara-Nārāyana's penance, Mr. Rāmačandran has tried to calculate the
the date as not later than the 6th century A.D.

This does not appear to an improbable earlier limit of the Purāṇa. About the words Mlečcha and Yavana, we have noted that Yavana is a very old word, and Mlečcha is also a word known before Pāṇini.²

In many parts this Purāṇa lays down the principles of Advaita:

श्रेयो न चान्यो स श्रेयो न श्रेयो न श्रेयो
तस्मात सन्धूपोः स्वात्मानभिः चिन्तयेत

This is the final state to be attained by an aspirant. This suggests the identity of the individual soul with the Supreme Self. Of the seventh part, the thirty second chapter opens with the account of the Manusmrīti and the Nāsadiya Śūkta.


2. तस्मात ब्रह्मणे न म्लेच्छतं नामप्याप्तिता, म्लेच्छे हि वा
एष वदपश्चवः॥ म्लेच्छा यस्मिनं मृत्य इत्यमेवं व्याकरणम्
व्याकरणमहाभाष्यम् परमेष्ठानासिनः

3. देशेराजनंदनि ११.१.४६
अहमेवास पूर्वें तु नाम्यतिक्षितु चिन्नगाधिप | 
तवाल्मूर्पं चित्संवित्तपनेनक्कनामकम् ||
अप्रत्ययमाविनेद्रस्मनौभन्नमनामकम् ||
तस्य कार्तिकसतः सिवेना संक्तमार्गीति विषुतम् ||
न सती सा नासती सा नोथवात्मा विरोगत: ||
प्रत्युविविधवत्ता का चिद वस्तुपुत्ताः स्मित सर्वव ||

तस्मावात्मा शानूपः सुकर्पण्वच सर्ववा ||
सत्यः पूर्णस्मेवत्तच शैतिजालविचारिति: ||

रज्जुवर्वमा सर्वसाधनवेदेनेका विभाति हि ||
तथेवेदेनविद्वृद्धेण मामवहे नाट्र संख्यः ||

एकमेवं ब्रह्मदितीयं के ब्रह्म नित्यं सनातनम् ||
शैतिजाल्यं पुनर्वाच्च काल उत्तपकस्मके ||

सर्वं लक्ष्वप्येवाहं नाम्यविद्यतं सनातनम् ||

---

१. देशीभाग्यत ७.१२.३
२. " ७.१२.२०
३. " ७.२२.१८
४. " १.६.४
५. " १.२५.५२
It is needless to multiply quotations. The fifth and eighteenth discourses of the first Skandha, the fifth of the third, the fourteenth of the fourth, nearly the whole of the seventh, many discourses of the eleventh, etc. contain several stanzas elaborating the Advaita Vedānta.

The historical value of the Purāṇas is acknowledged by many scholars now. They help us in reconstructing the history of Indian culture and civilization, which necessarily include religion and philosophy. Prof. Diksitar tells us that "In season and out of season they teach us how to cultivate detachment and aim at the identification with the Supreme Spirit to get riddance of Samsāra." This pregnant remark of the learned writer suggests that thinking people always kept in view the real aim of codes, ceremonies, injunctions, and deliberations that were called religious. The motive behind the reiteration of this final goal of religion is the

1. दीक्षितार Intro. p. XXX.

2. Intro. p. XXXI.
the same that is seen in the Upaniṣads. For the attainment of the final goal religious discipline is always indispensable. Observing strict discipline however is a very hard job, and during hard times it becomes the hardest. People abandon themselves to mundane allurements and natural propensities, spoiling the order of society and leading it to destruction. Such a destruction was presaged in times of the Mahābhārata:

उत्साहन्तो जगतिष्मा कुलधार्म्क्ष्य शाश्वतः

and the Mahābhārata itself which describes a state of society where no religious authority is supreme - is said to be a work that would serve as a sure guide out of such a chaos. The composition of the epic as well as that of Purāṇas is attributed to Vyāsa. Whether a single person brought forth all the Purāṇas, or whether there were many individuals bearing the
the same name are the problems yet to be solved. One thing however appears to be indisputable, that the epic and the purāṇas were composed with a particular motive. It was the whole society that was to be saved from being plunged into chaos.¹ The high Upaniṣadic ideals were to be made understandable and practicable; and circumstances necessitated a different application of those very Vedic principles. The Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas are evidently an attempt to teach the highest doctrines of the Vedānta, making them palatable by means of everything that entertains popular mind. These compositions are such that, from the ignorant to the scholars, they are engaging. One finds in them fables of beasts and birds, fairy tales, amusing stories and many useful subjects such as astronomy, grammar, music, politics, etc. side by side with the highest technique of the Upaniṣads. It is quite natural that such literature has a wider range of admirers and students, and that is why we find its multiplication carried on for centuries and centuries. The special feature of

¹. श्रुत्पादयो लोकजनान्सीवक्ष विधाविहीनानु पुनवदनुवेषिन्तानु।
   तेषाय मुक्तय प्रतिवोधनाय भ्यासः पुराणं प्रथितं चक्कार॥
   महावीषपुराणं ब्राह्मणपर्वं अध्याय १०।
   Cf. also अध्याय २५५-२६-२७।
of the Purāṇas is that they speak more of Śmaṛta ceremonies. The Śaṁhti ideology is suspected by some as divergent from Śraukta ideology, and Dr. Belvalkar has in this respect remarked thus, "The art of deviating from the past, while yet honestly professing to revere it was thus cultivated well-nigh to perfection." Well, there is no denial of the fact that external form of religion might have changed. But that is no sign of change even in the essentials of religion. New forms of worship or systems of thought, which stood for protecting Vedic religion, always paid homage to Vedic sanction, and Śmaṛta injunction had to give way in preference to Śrutin case of conflict between the two. Even if we find changes of forms of worship or philosophical expressions, it need not show a change of principles.

We may, therefore, safely hold that the Purānic lore faithfully preserved the ancient Vedic philosophy and religion in difficult times, and Purānic testimony on this point therefore has a great importance.
When it was observed that higher ideals were beyond the grasp of common men, preferential worship was introduced according to diverse tests of the people. But the principle behind these symbols was never forgotten. This can very well be compared with the analogy of Ayurveda. Owing to change of circumstances new disease overtake a man. But whatever the disease, its root cause is that the balance of the three Dhātus is disturbed, that one or two or all the three Dhātus are thrown out of order. A physician may therefore prepare a new drug according to the permutation and combination of the Dosas; yet the pathology, the cause of a disease remains unchanged. So was the case in Purānic times. New ceremonies and worships came into vogue, but every such worship led to the same goal. Thus in Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas, Viṣṇu would be the Supreme God, in Saiva Purāṇas Śiva would stand the highest, while in Devī Purāṇas, Devī would be the highest deity. Yet the description of these highest Gods is always found to be the same. It has

\[1. \text{धौषस्त्रू-मार्गमानिता} \]
has already been pointed out that Advaitic idea of God is not wanting in different Purāṇas. In their proper places, philosophic concepts about the world, the individual soul and their mutual relations, are also noted. In above passages certain selections would sound to be chronologically late, and there are actually references to heretic advents. However as the general tenor of thought is undisturbed, we can arrive at a conclusion that Vedic and Upaniṣadic Advaita continued in Purāṇic times.