It has been pointed out that there are many speculations even in earlier Vedic literature which are certainly "too coherent and logical to be primitive", and we need not continue to think that early Vedic literature marked only primitive philosophy. In the Maitryupaniṣad and the Mahābhārata, the method of speculation with the help of pramāṇas or Utsarga and apavāda is also found. That these Upaniṣads and the Mahābhārata precede Buddha has been amply asserted by scholars, and I do not find any difficulty in sharing their view. Mrs. Rhys Davids however has taken for granted Maitryupaniṣad as a work later than Buddha, and she also seems to hold that the philosophy did not go beyond Sāṇkhya and Yoga. Lokamāṇya Tilak has however proved beyond doubt, that the Maitryupaniṣad and most of the Mahābhārat existed before Buddha. Mrs. Rhys Davids

2. कांडो.उप.प्रत्यक्ष ५.१.१ मेंट्रयु.अनुमान ६.१ कौशी.शब्द ३.६ महाभारत मोक्षर्म ३३८.६
4. गीतारहस्य पु. ५४६, ५५६.
has not sufficiently thought over the nature of the great epic. It is a repository of all Indian thought and development. One reads in it about times when promiscuity was in vogue, and also of the practice of burning on funeral pyre of a woman together with her deceased husband. About the high philosophy of this epic it has been amply said before. If then anything in the Śvetāsvatara and Maitreya upaniṣad appears similar to Buddhist thought, it should not be relegated to the influence of Buddhism. Let us refrain from concluding from such passages that a particular creed is indebted to another creed of thought. Buddha himself was a great man and we should not hesitate to accept that, like other saints of India, he too influenced Indian people in many ways. What he preached may be his own experience, and we need not doubt the authenticity of his sayings. But when certain authors assert that

1. *Śvetāsvatara Mahābhārata* श्वेतास्वातर महाभारत आदि. १७३.४-१५

2. *Māṇḍūkya Mahābhārata* माण्डूक्य महाभारत आदि. ११६.२५-३१
that the Vedānta too borrowed from Buddhistic thought, it must be pointed out that positive evidence goes against their verdict.

The problem needs particular attention because there is a great misunderstanding as regards the relation of Brāhmaṇism and Buddhism. Max Muller's estimate of the glory of Buddha is now mostly resounded even in popular circles. "Buddha's glory consists not in having discovered new truths of metaphysics, but in having emphasised the ethical aspect of the Upaniṣads at a time when exclusive attention to dry forms and cumbrous rituals had robbed the Hindu religion of its life." Subsequent history has however very little to prove these ideas. In order to cause upheavals, evils of rituals should have reached an unbearable degree. Many Suttas of Dīgha and other Nikāyas contain dialogues and accounts

1. Six systems of Indian Philosophy, p. 135; even popular writers of later age are misled by such views. Cf. निविप्सि यज्ञविषेकान्त्रुप्रतिज्ञातम । सदविषय दर्शितपुस्कातम । गीतगोविवदमाः।

2. दीघनिकायो १४२-१४६

by N.K. Bhagawat, Bombay 1942.
accounts of conversions. But in none of these is reflected any such discontent towards forms or class-tyranny. In the Agyaṅa Sutta which deals with the merits of Brahmaṇa and Kṣatriya and the stanzas of Dhammapada like 391, 401, 410, 411, 418, etc. there is not slightest trace of disgust for cast-tyranny. The remark about cumbrous forms etc. too do not contain much truth. Had Buddhism and Jainism any genuine disgust about these, they should never have returned to forms of worship. An instance from European history would illustrate this point. Protestantism militated against the image worship and several forms and rituals of catholicism, and shook them off once for all. They never thought of returning to them. Quite contrary is the case with Buddhism and Jainism. Works in early centuries of Christian era show not only cumbrous forms but even repulsive practices. This means that

1. Dhammapada by V. Fausboll, 1855.

2. Cf. Śrī Guhyasamājatantram Ed. by B. Bhattacharya. Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1931. The work was originated in the second or third century A.D. pp. 40, 84, 20,130, 143 are enough to reveal mystic words like hōm hum etc. and even obnoxious practices.
that people started worshipping and magic long before, perhaps a few centuries after the demise of Buddha. It does not appear to be convincing, that a religion which could not tolerate a beast being offered in sacrifice, easily accommodated repulsive and noxious forms of worship just a few centuries after the departure of their master. Dr. Ketkar's observation therefore should carry weight. The glory of Jaina and Baudhādatta religion need not be allocated to the opposition of sacrificial cult. The Mahāyāna Buddhism thus had to acquiesce in the existing cult of forms, ceremonials and practices. Scattered in Buddhist literature, there are many other ideas that are exclusively of Vedic origin. Almost all the biographers of Gautama refer to the seven jewels of a Cakravarti King. This belief has its trace in the Rgveda, the Brhaddevatā and the Purāṇa. To

1. Buddha's age is considered to be the sixth century B.C. Oxford History of India by Vincent Smith p. 52. Cf. "Indian Antiquary Vol. XII, p. 21, where the time of Mahāvīra is considered.

2. "जैन व बौद्ध सांप्रदायायाची किंमत त्यांच्या त्याः विरोधी-त्यामुळे नहीती." महाराष्ट्रीय तात्त्विक संग्रह ४ पृ. १३२

3. Rgveda 5.1.5, Brhaddevatā 5.123, Vāyu Purāṇa 57.68.
To abstain from meat and censure is admitted to be current among heretics even by Laṅkāvatāra. The four Brahmavihāras show direct relation with Brāhmanical practices as they occur in the Yoga-sūtra 1.33. This indicates that, not only after Buddha, but in his own life-time too Baudhā and Jaina cult were freely exploiting current ideas and practices. It is learnt that Buddha himself received schooling in Yogic practices under Ārada Kālam and he did not leave them. Words like Vijñāna, Skandha, Trṣṇā, Karma, sparsā, dharma, saṁjñā, vikāra, brahma, samādhi, śramaṇa etc. so profusely utilised in Buddha's literature are known very well to the Vedic literature that existed long before Buddha. It is true that their connotation changed according to the ideology, but it cannot be denied that to a great extent they retained original sense also. To the

1. The History of Buddhist Thought by Edward J. Thomas, p. 25.
2. Ibid, p. 50.
4. The Heart of Jainism by Mrs. Stevenson, pp. 174, 175.
the established Vedic religion and philosophy, the Buddhism is thus indebted in respect of religious and philosophical ideas, terminology and practices. In face of these, it is difficult to understand why the question of the borrowal of Advaita-Vedānta from Buddhism, should have been considered so serio-
sously, especially when devout followers of Buddhism and scholars do not hesitate to say that specification concerning the nature or mind is not a Buddhist characteristic."

The remark of scholars that "Buddha himself refused to decide the question whether Nirvāṇa is complete extinction or an unending state of unconscious bliss," can be corroborated by the utterances of Buddha given in texts. The Cūḷamāluṅkya Sutta of the Majjhimīya Nikāya and the Pūṭhāpāda Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya both give almost in the same

1. Buddhist Psychology by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 66.
same words, that enquiry into the existence or non-existence of Tathāgata after death, into the eternality or transitoriness of the world, into the identity or non-identity of body and soul, etc. is futile, it would not lead to real knowledge, dispassion, awakening or Nirvāṇa:

न विरागाय, न निरोधाय, न उपसमाय, न अभिभ-आय, न सम-वोधाय न निख्वाणाय संवत्तति - - -।

When such utterances give quite a death-blow to speculative inquiry, there are others that lead to the conclusion that Buddha believed in a permanent entity. Buddha calls himself as Brahma-bhūta:

वेसं वे दुःखमे लोके पातुचारे अभिभ-सत्ताय।
सों हं ब्राह्मण सम-वुध वे सत्ता अभिभ-सत्ताय।
ब्रह्मसूत्रो अतिवृलो मारसेनध्यथमुद्वन्ती।
सबबासिते कसीक्तवा मोवासि भक्तोभयो॥


Cf. Also The Ēthera and Therī-Ġāthā by Oldenberg and Pischel London, 1883, p. 79, stanzas 830 and 831.
Buddhist themselves however strongly contend even today, that belief in a permanent entity is not a genuine Buddhist doctrine. More about this will be said later, but such quotations surely create a doubt as to the real implication of Buddha. However, if we hold that Buddha did believe in a permanent substratum of the ephemeral world, such a doctrine is very old, and Buddha was one who emphasised the same. If however, Buddha did not believe in a permanent soul, then certainly his school is in sharp contrast with the Advaita. It is difficult to understand what Buddha had to attain by laying down, ethical injunctions, if he had not accepted any permanent entity. For, the ethical injunctions have significance only because of metaphysics on which it stands.

The stanzas 58, 60 of the Udyoga parva/ 39th chapter of the Mahābhārata, are almost identical with 109 and 223 of the Dhammapada, and many more parallels can be found in the Sāntiparvan. But in

1. While giving the implication of Ri and Ji Prof. D. T. Suzuki gives the same impression. Cf. The Essence of Buddhism, Kyoto Hozokan, 1948.
in the Mahābhārata, the injunctions would have a different purpose to serve, in view of the metaphysics of that epic. In case of Buddha we are not sure whether he had similar metaphysics in mind.

Leaving the problem of a permanent entity in eternal suspense, later Buddha writers have laid emphasis on the pratītyasamutpāda. In his pāñjikā, a commentary on the Bodhicaryāvatāra, the author prajñākaramati asserts with authority that one who knows pratītyasamutpāda is the real knower of religion.

यो हि भिष्म: प्रतीत्यसमुत्पादं पवित्तिति स धर्मं पवित्तिति।

The Mādhymika Kārika in chapter twenty four known as Āryasatyaparīkṣā emphasises the same, and the Abhidharmakośa too elaborates it. The Abhidharmakośa however clearly states that there is no entity as Ātman:

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

But pratītyasamutpāda ultimately means Śūnyatā.

In Śūnyatā there is no pratyaya as a Buddhist would say. A Vedantin however would say there is Ekātmapratyaya, which is to be finally attained.

By analysing the apparent, the substratum—the Real—is to be attained by a Vedāntin. Thus the division of the Absolute and apparent has a different significance in the scheme of Advaita. As we have seen, this difference between the Real and the apparent is marked by the Saṃhitās, the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads. While the Samvṛti satya of the Mādhyamikas is differentiated from the parṁartha satya which is

1. अनिधर्मकोष काली १९३२, ३.२०

2. माध्यमिककारिका पृ. १८४

Buddhist Text.
is Śūnyatā, and this Śūnyatā is a thing which cannot be said to be Being. Nāgarjuna's division of the apparent and paramārtha cannot be said to be the original from which Śaṅkara might have taken inspiration.

There is another author known as Aśvaghoṣa whose thought strikingly resembles the Vedāntic one. "The soul as birth and death comes forth from the Tathāgata womb (tathāgata-garbha), the ultimate Reality........ thus when the absolute soul assumes a relative aspect by its self-affirmation, it is called the all-conserving mind." Though this account reminds us of the Brahman, and Īsvara or Brahman and Virāt or Hiranyagarbha of the Vedānta, we can easily see that Hiranyagarbha is known to Vedāntins much earlier than Aśvaghoṣa. It may be marked in passing that Aśvaghoṣa and Nāgarjuna were

1. वे सत्ये समुपाश्रित्य जुदानां धर्मविद्वानः
   लोकसंबंधितत्सत्यं च सत्यं च परमार्थं: ||
   माध्यमिक कारिका आर्यसत्वपरीक्षा।

2. A History of Indian Philosophy by Das Gupta, p. 131.
were Brāhmīns and had received full training in Brāhmaṇistic schools of philosophy before they embraced Buddhistic faith. It is not altogether impossible that these stalwarts put the wine of Vedānta in Buddhistic bottles. At least Buddhism had nothing substantial and original to contribute to the Vedānta.

It may be noted that Buddhist text refer to the Advaitins as separated from the Buddhists:


ttukāmyaṁ bhagavatīrckācātmanvutvasthyāyagat-
garvavāde n mathi?

Here Ātmavāda and Tīrthakāvāda are mentioned as distinct from the Buddhist ideology.

Āśvaghoṣa in his Buddhacarita says:


eṣesatपरमः ब्रह्म निति भें यथवमयम्।

1/ The Lāṅkāvatārasūtra Nanjo Ed. p. 78.

2/ बुद्धचरित्र ६५
Samantabhadra, an old Jain author writes in his Āpātamāmsā:

अश्वेताकान्तपक्षे पि दुष्टो भेदों विच्छिद्यते।
कारकाण विषयाच्छ नैंक स्वस्मात्माप्रजायते॥

Sāntarakṣita writes the description of Vivarta in his Tattvasamgraha:

नित्यन्नाविविधतां संविभित्तेजोजलाविकम्म।
आत्मा तदात्मकेचैत संगिरते परे पुनः॥
श्राशक्षणसंयुक्तं न किंचिविह विचैते।
विश्वनपरिणामोऽयं तस्मात्सर्यं समीक्षते॥

Kamalaśīla refers to Advaitins as:

अश्वेतदर्शनावलिमिवन्न्योपपनिषिद्धा।

1/ Āpātamāmsā by Samantabhadra p. 18 stanza 24.
   Ed. by G. L. Jain.

The philosophy of Advaita thus existed in a crystallized condition not only in times of Buddha and the Baudhahas but even before them. The Buddhists had nothing to lend them. Inspite of similarities in the Vedānta and the Buddhist schools, let us remain content, saying that both were developing in their own way. Let the Advaita be not charged of borrowing from Buddha, for such a charge may bring a closer scrutiny of the problem, which may reveal something else. Some points of metaphysical importance in Baudhaha schools are discussed later, while discussing the philosophy of Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara.
It is little doubted that Tantra cult was very old in India, and it continued unbroken. The Tāntrikas from Bengal affiliate the Tantras to Atharvaveda. We know people practising Vāmadeva-vrata from the Upaniṣads, and of Śisnadeva in the Vedas. In the Rāmāyaṇa, the description of the worship and sacrifice performed by Indrajit is much in this light similar to that of Vāmācāra, and we may perhaps better understand the motive of Rāvana's eagerness to be after women. One thing however appears to be convincing, that many passages in the Guhyasamājatantra do not fit in Buddhism even by the most liberal interpretation. It is true that Mudrās, Mantras, Yoga and Samadhi are not absent in original Buddhism,

---

1. छांदो.उप. २.४३.१-२


but they are the features even of Yoga, and not exclusively of Tantra. Dr. S. B. Dasgupta asserts 1 that Tantras are neither exclusively Hindu nor exclusively Buddhist. But Prof. D. C. Bhattacharya's opinion, that the very spirit of Tāntrisim is not keeping with Buddhism, seems to be correct. It can therefore be agreed that Tantra was a genuine Hindu cult which took inspiration perhaps from Mīmāṃsā and Yoga. May be certain Tantra practices are repulsive, but there are many other practices which are introduced in the multifarious forms of worship in the Hindus, and they are not considered bad. Commentator Kullūkabhatta has given Tantra as the status of Ṣrūtis and that literature was elaborated a good deal, 3 Keeping in view the ultimate end of the Ṣrūtis. We certainly find high philosophy in many of the Tantra works. The


3. श्रुतिविवाद वैविध्य तांत्रिकी च। कुल्लूक टीका मउ. २२
The Akūtāgamatantra says that the study of the Vedānta is one of the principle duties of an adept of Tantra.

As for the Advaita we certainly find traces in different Tantras. In the Pāñcarātra texts we find traces of the Advaita as follows:

अनायत्तं परं ब्रह्म कल्याणमभवयम्।
अनामरूपसमेधमवाजुर्मन्दगोचरम्॥
वस्तुतः कालतो वैशाशत्वं त्वल्याहंतियति हि या।
एकं निर्यः सनोः सीमेच्छुः अमवलक्षणम्॥
अनायत्तं परं ब्रह्म नारायणमनामयम्॥
तत्त्वोपावानमावेरि विकारिवर्हो हि यः॥

1. कल्याण वेवांतांक पृ. २६८.

2. 6-9-22-60.
God is one without the second, Absolute, Bliss, Immutable. Himself manifesting as the world He remains changeless. Māyā or Sakti is thus described:

या न किच्छिदिवापति न सती नापि चासति ॥

Nārada is described as enlightened through knowledge as omnipotent as God.

The Nārada Pāñcaratra also gives Advaita in the form of Pratibimba theory. God is one without the second. Plurality is but his several reflections through Upādhis. In essence everything is God eternal.

1. Ahirodedhyasamhitā 51.35.
2. Sūtrāntasāhasranāmasūtra ६ - ८ - १०.
3. परम परमानंद मायायोध्नित्तानन्।
निरिक्षेत निर्देश करेन भौतिकायुक्तम्।

It may be remembered here that Pañcaśikha, who is an advocate of Sāṅkhya and about whom we have read in the chapter of Mahābhārata, is also an Acārya of Pāñcarātra school.
The Lakṣmītantra also gives the exposition of Advaita in the same manner. Lakṣmī says that there is nothing apart from her. The world is but a reflection, as we see reflection of a bird in waters, or of mountains etc. in a mirror.

Sakti is also another form of Goddess worshipped since old times and related to the famous Vāgam-bhrnī Sukta of the Ṛgveda. The Kulārnava, Mahā-nirvāṇa, etc. are the texts of this Saktta Tantra:

अहं देवी न चान्योक्तिः प्रहुमैवाहं न झोकमाकु।
सचिवालान-वृहोहं नित्यत्वकत्स्वभाववान् ॥ ३

This famous stanza which occurs in the Purāṇas is also seen here. The Mahānirvāṇa Tantra is also replete with Advaitic thoughts:

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

१. कह्याण वेवांतांक पृ. ३३९।

२. क्रणेव १०.१२५

३. पारसियवर्जन। पृ.५३१
The Ullāsa fourteen of this work contains many such stanzas, but even in other Ullāsas, Advaitic idea is not wanting. Śaṅkarācārya himself was an adept of Śrīvidyā. This point will be elaborated in its proper place. It is however clear that the worship of Goddess had the Advaitic metaphysics as its background. The Goddess Kālikā

   महानिर्वाणपूर्ण १४.११५-११६
2. महानिर्वाणपूर्ण ८.२६४-२६६
   ४. २६-२८
   २. ५९-६२
Herself is described in Advaitic manner:

श्रीमहागुप्ताणां श्रीमहागुप्ताणां

In the Saiva Tantras, we learn in the commentary of Tantrāloka by Rājānaka Jayaratha, that the thoughts of Advaya, Dvaya, and Dvayadvaya were preached respectively by Tryambaka Āmardaka and Srinātha. The Pratyabhijñā or Trika School, which is known also as the Traiyambaka School, is mostly Advaitic, as we have seen elsewhere:

अन्तर्विभावि सकलं जगवात्मननीह
यदद् विचिन्नरचना मुक्रान्तराले।

This utterance of Abhinavagupta is nothing but an echo of the Brahmāsūtra:


2. श्रीमच्छेरीकण्ठनाथाचार्यशास्त्राचार्यांे सवातङ्गां, श्रीमच्छेरीकण्ठनाथाचार्यशास्त्राचार्यांे सवातङ्गां
     ज्ञानएमर्दकां मिल्यथ्रीनाथांे सवातङ्गां
     श्रीमच्छेरीकण्ठनाथाचार्यशास्त्राचार्यांे सवातङ्गां
     क्रमेण सवातङ्गायां

प्राचीन आर्यकोश: १९१८
पृ. २६
The analogy is more elaborated after the manner of Abhasavāda. The stanzas 12 and 13 from the Paramārthasarasa by Abhinava delineate this view. But it must be remembered that the view existed long before Abhinavagupta. Somānanda, the guru of Utpala lived sometime in the ninth century, and he calls himself as the nineteenth successor of Tryambaka. It is thus likely that the Śaiva Advaita existed before Śaṅkara.

In this case there is one positive evidence available, to which Dr. Pandey also has given only partial attention, which perhaps has not done justice to the matter. He says, "The characteristic doctrines of Vīra Śaivism are found in later Āgamas of this set. This probably refers to the eighteen Āgamas, which according to Abhinavagupta, present

1. भारतीय वर्षन पु. ५५१.

present Bhedābheda. "Now this part of the scholarly introduction of Dr. Pandey deals with the Vīsaṣṭādvaita of Śrīpati. This doctrine is referred to by various names of which one is Śivādvaita. But this Śivādvaita as explained by Dr. Pandey, differs from the Advaita of Śaṅkara. Dr. Pandey enumerates Siddhānt Śikhāmani as a work giving an account of the sects and subsects of the Vīrasaivas. The Doctrines that this work elaborates are many, and it must specially be noted that many a time we find a clear exposition of the Advaita expounded by Śaṅkara, and criticised by Śrīpati. I am therefore constrained to say that Vīrāsaivism is represented not merely by the doctrine of Śrīpati, but by that of Renuka also.

The chronology of Renuka can be fixed tentatively. We find a stanza in the Saḍ-darśanasamuccaya of Haribhadrasūri:

1. Bhāskari Introduction, P. CLXXIX.
The name of Revāna, who is often mentioned as Revānasiddha in a gloss on the Siddhānta Śīkhistamiṇi, is here associated with Prabhākara and Ombeka. Ombeka or Umveka has written a commentary on the Śloka-vārtika of Kumārilā. If Revāna or Reṇuka is the contemporary of Ombeka and Prabhākara, he may be an earlier contemporary of Saṅkarācārya. From legendary tradition it is known that Reṇukācārya had given a linga to Saṅkara, and this is probable. There appears to be a great similarity between the pontifical worships of Saiva Maṭhas and Saṅkara Maṭhas. The philosophy of Reṇuka as gathered from the Siddhānta Śīkhistamiṇi is as follows:

1. श्रीबुध्वरैनमुच्चयः श्रोतुकाषारंश्चानमिदराध्यक्षेण
   प्रकाशितः सं. २००६ प्र.

1a. Umbeka is sometimes identified with Bhavabhūti


2a. श्रीबुध्वरैनमुच्चयः श्रोतुकाषारंश्चानमिदराध्यक्षेण
   प्रकाशितः सं. २००६ प्र.

3. श्रीबुध्वरैनमुच्चयः श्रोतुकाषारंश्चानमिदराध्यक्षेण
केवल कर्मपांश्रेण जन्मकोटिपतिरपि।
नात्मनां जायते मुक्तिस्तान्न मुक्तेहि कारणम् ॥

अष्टंत्वाः सत्वसंविशिष्टवर्गः ब्रह्म केवलम्।
मिथ्या तत् विद्यविद्येषां स्त्रीत्वां निन्दोपच्यते ॥

अनायथविधामूला हि प्रतीतिर्ज्ञगतां मिमांसा।
स्थात्तैवकोधातान्नां कृते चिन्त्वप्रकाशन्नम् ॥

अछतवे जगत्सर्वं सत्त्वं प्रतिभास्ते।
झाते शिवेश तदशां स्वरूपमुपते ॥

तित्तराचित्वमेव सर्वं जगदेतज्जवरायकरम्।
तत्त्वमित्तत्वा माति सर्पत्वमिव रज्जुः ॥
गंधर्वपुरुषः च ज्ञोभिन संचिवान्धवलखोऽ।
निरस्त्रेवस्वरूपां शिवेश चित्वं विराजते ॥

---

1. सिद्धान्तकित्तिवामणि परि १६ सानागमस्तथल ॥
2. सिद्धान्तकित्तिवामणि परि १९ सानागिन्यस्तित्वः ॥
3. सिद्धान्तकित्तिवामणि परि २० चराचरविनाश ॥
4. सिद्धान्तकित्तिवामणि परि २० चराचरविनाश ॥
5. सिद्धान्तकित्तिवामणि परि १० चित्रजगान्यय ॥
6.
As Dr. Pandey has shown Śrīpati has attacked the Advaitic concept of Māyā and its locus-āśraya. The following will show that Renuka does not agree with Śrīpati, who refutes Māyā as self-sufficient or self-supporting:

उपाधि: पुनराभ्यातसंवृद्धाशुवृद्धविमेवत: ॥ १ ॥
शुवृद्धोपाधिपत्र माया स्वाश्रय भोजकारिणी ॥

These citations are enough to show that the Vīraśaiva philosophy as represented by Renuka is Advaita philosophy. Renuka is said to be a follower of Śiva and so are Vasiṣṭha, Suka, Vyāsa, etc. who are also Advaitins. In the north the Advaita amongst Saivas was known as Pratyabhijñā. In the south Vīra Śaiva sect had developed Advaita along with other speculations. Renuka thus seems to be a pre-Śaṅkara Advaitin.

1. शिवाध्यात्मिकलामणि परिः ५ पिंडस्थल ५५.
2. शिवाध्यात्मिकलामणि परिः ६ ४५-५५.
3. It is reported that Renuka wrote a gloss on the Brahma-Sūtras. 

2 ३५०
Some other texts of Tantra too record Advaitic thought:

शब्दानाथिनी विषया विषया विषयाविषयिनी।
ब्रह्मविद्यासमं श्रानं नास्ति नास्ति कथान॥

शात्मा सादी विषयं पूर्णं सत्योऽहेतः परात्परः।
वेदस्योपयं न वेदस्यो शात्वेवं मुक्तिमागमवेत॥

नित्यं सर्वंतो शात्मा कृतस्यो दोषवर्जितः।
एकं संविचारं श्रान्त्यमायवा न स्वरूपं॥

1. कल्याण वैदांताक पु. ४६६-४८१
It has been marked while surveying the philosophy of the Purāṇas, that the Śruti tradition was preserved in those ages with certain alterations in the ceremonial forms. The Śrāvaka tenets were preached in the Smṛtis and Sūtras. It cannot be disputed that the Sutras and Smṛtis deal more with sacerdotal aspect of religion. But many of these works unmistakably mention their main object, showing that philosophical aspirations ever reigned supreme. It is declared in words as explicit as possible that no attainment can excell that of the Ātman, the Self.

श्यामसंगीताय‍ परं पियते ।

It is also stated explicitly that a Muni leaves truth and falsehood, pleasure and pain, the Vedas, the worlds here and hereafter, and goes in search of the Ātman:

\[ \text{Śaipatya-vicharanyasūtra 1.8.2} \]

Ed. by Dr. Georg Buhler Bombay 1868.
He has nothing to do with rituals that are necessary for a householder:

अनगिन्तरनिकेति: स्यादश्मांश्यो गुर्जीः।

All this gives the impression of Nityānityaviveka, Ihamuträrthavirāga etc. It is stated that there is no bond of Karma in an exalted stage:

्नास्यांस्मिल्लोके सवम्यो विधते तथा परस्वप्नः कर्मवैः।

The final Reality is spoken as the Self Supreme, the transcendent and also immanent.

चलनं चलनिलगतं चेषुतिष्ठति तेषुः。

सर्वमेवं को नित्यो विपरित्विद्यते श्रवः।

अत्रैकृतद्वेषतीर्थविश्वव्याप्तिभी महानः श्रवः।

1. आपस्तम्भवीचाकं-धर्मसूत्रम् २.९.२१.१२
2. वैवानिषधर्मसूत्रम् २.१०.२५, आपस्तम्भवीचाकं-धर्मसूत्रम् २.९.१०
3. आपस्तम्भवीचाकं-धर्मसूत्रम् २.९.२४.१९
4. आपस्तम्भवीचाकं-धर्मसूत्रम् १.८.२२.४-६
One should see this Self everywhere:

आत्मा-पश्चात् सर्वत्र भवति न मुख्यतिर्मम् काँचि। २

If Self is the only Reality to be experienced, it follows that not-self is transitory. The sage Bodhāyana too recommends this experience:

शोभिती ब्रह्म ब्रह्म वा एष्य ज्योति: व एष्य ज्योति: य एष्य तर्पण्यत्र वेदा य एष्य तर्पण्यत्र वेदेयेवेतथ एष्य तर्पण्यत्र एवमेवेष श्रात्मानं तर्पणयात्मान नमस्करोति श्रात्मा ब्रह्म श्रात्मा ज्योति:। ३

The final attainment recommended by ritualistic Sūtras thus seems more or less the same as that prescribed by Advaitic discipline.

---

१. आप. धर्मसूत्र १.४.२३.२

२. आप. धर्मसूत्र

३. वोधायनधर्मसूत्रम्
Atmajñāna is praised much even in Smṛtis.

The commentator Kullūkabhatta says:

The final result to be attained by Ātmajñāna or Ātmayajñā is Svārājya, one’s own real nature, which according to Kullūka is Brahman. Manu too describes Brahman as the final goal which is bereft of all duality;

1. मनुस्मृति १२.८५, १२.९२

2. मनुस्मृति ४.२४
This implies the identity of the Ātman with Brahman. The evolution of the world from Brahman is described by Manu mostly in the terminology of the Nāsadiyā Sūkta of the Ṛgveda. It may be supposed therefore that he had the Advaita ideology before him.

Yājñavalkya seems to be more explicitly putting the ideas of Advaita in his work. Ātman the Supreme Self is unborn transcendent as well as immanent:

अजः शरीरश्रवणातु स जात इति कथयते।
अनाविरात्मा कथितस्तत्त्वाविस्तु शरीरक्रमः। ३

with the commentary of Kullukabhatta, Nirṇayasaṅgara 1925.

1. मनुस्मृति ५.४९

2. मनुस्मृति १.५-६

3. वाशंकवल्क्यस्मृति ४.६९,११७.

Under the influence of Moha we are unable to see that all is nothing but this shining Ātman. We must leave Moha:

मोहजालमपास्येः पुरुषो दुःखते हि य:।
सहस्करपन्ने: सुर्यवचा: सहस्क: ॥ ३

The whole world has come out of Ātman:

आत्मनस्तु जगत्सर: जगत्वचात्मसः ॥ २

But how has the duality come into existence from the Ātman who is One? The answer given by Yājñavalkya is thus:

आकाशमेकं हि यथा घटादिको पृथगमवेतु।
तथात्मेको हनेकथ: जलवारेर्ववांतुमान ॥ ५

We perceive One Ātman as many as we see several reflections of the same Sun. Plurality is thus not absolutely real. The commentator Vijñānaśvara says:

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

१. यात्ववल्लभवस्मृति ४.११९।

२. यात्ववल्लभवस्मृति ४.११७

३ यात्ववल्लभवस्मृति ५.१५४।
We learn that Visvarūpa, a commentator of this Smṛti, has given the ideology of Advaita in his commentary. This commentator was probably a contemporary of Śankarācārya. The Yājñavalkya Smṛti is thus a work before Śaṅkara, and it is significant that it sketches the outline of Advaita very clearly.

Smṛtis mostly deal with injunctions and we can find little of philosophy in them. It is sometimes difficult to categorise the philosophical thought in them. But certain concepts that we find can certainly help the Advaita. Some of them may be given below. The Śaṅkha Smṛti describes God after the manner of the Upanisads and quotes Anorāṇīyān etc. The Brahman is Viṣṇu:

अं निरंजन शांतमभ्यक्तं श्रवमक्षरमृ.
अनाविनिन्यनं ग्रहम तद्विष्णोऽपरं पदमृ।

---

1. About Visvarūpa a little discussion will appear in the chapter of Śaṅkaraścārāyā.

2. श्लोकस्योगितः ७.३२ स्मृतीनां समुच्चयः आनवाश्रम १९०५.
He is also called Siva. God is manifested in the heart of one who meditates on him. There is nothing beyond God. The world is indeed essenceless:

जगदेति निराकृतं न व सारमनर्यङ्गम्।

God is not seen by ignorant people. A wise man, therefore, should live in solitude. All the sacrificial fires should be within himself. He should live with non-attachment, by which he will be led to the permanent abode Brahman.

The Laghuvisnusmrtsi asks a person to remain attached to the Self - Ātmanishta. By renouncing all desires and concentrating only on the Self, he becomes Haṁsa and attains Brahmanhood.
The Vṛddhaharīta Smṛti speaks (as) God as all pervading, as the pervader and also the pervaded, i.e. the only reality:

श्वाप्तत्वा देश्यायपक्तत्वा च विश्वुरित्यविश्वातः
सदेवरूपवात्सर्वात्मत्वादू विश्वतः || ३ ।

Harīta speaks of the best worship - param ārādhana of the Lord. He is to be meditated in the heart, as Absolute Consciousness and Bliss, Immutable, changeless, beyond body and senses. This may lead to Ātman Brahman identity. Lord Vāsudeva has no Upādhi and by going to his abode there is no return:

यदृकत्वा न निश्चिते तत्वाधाम परम हरे: || ४ ।

He himself is all Gods. ६

 completa

1. वृद्धधारीतस्मृति ६.२१५  4. वृद्धधारीतस्मृति ६.१६९
2. वृद्धधारीतस्मृति ६.१  5. वृद्धधारीतस्मृति १.१५
3. वृद्धधारीतस्मृति ६.२-३  6. वृद्धधारीतस्मृति १.१६-१४
In Daksasmiti we find Advaita clearly mentioned:

अश्वतं च तथा बैस्तं बैलाक्षतं तथैव च।

This seems to be a remark when sectarian struggles amongst Advaita, Dvaita etc. had gained momentum. This Smriti, or at least such lines in it, appear to be of later origin. The final attainment is Ātmānubhūti:

यस्त्वात्मविश्वातिरेण क्षितिज नैव पद्यति।
श्रद्धामृति: स विशेष्यो – – – – – – – – – –

The general discipline of spiritual life is also much extolled but that is not restricted to Advaita alone. Anyway we see that the Smṛti literature is not devoid of Advaitic thought.

1. दक्षस्मृति ७.४६
2. दक्षस्मृति ७.११
3. दक्षस्मृति ७.४९
A brief sojourn into classical Sanskrit literature is intended now. As distinguished from the philosophical literature whose understanding involves exhaustion of mental energies, this literature is meant for removing all tension of human mind. Philosophical references in such literary works should, therefore, be casual. But they are of great importance; because most of the illustrious classics in Sanskrit have derived inspiration from religious literature, which must abundantly deal with philosophy. Dr. De and Das Gupta have rightly observed that "the Indian people in general were as a rule religiously-minded..." and hence "there was an easy bridge between what may be called dharma and what may be called plain literature." Whenever ideal characters are portrayed by leading poets, the ideals of life are always high,

and can only be explained with the help of philosophical doctrines, which must undoubtedly have penetrated deep into the general society of the times. Casual expressions also are significant enough if looked in this light. A boon invoked from Lord Śiva is thus put by Kālidāsa:

\[
\text{ममा पि व ब्रह्मचू नीलोहितः}
\text{पुनर्भवं परिग्नत्तत्तिरात्मपूः}
\]

Now this clearly shows that release from the round of birth and death was recognised even popularly as the highest attainment - Puruṣārtha of human life. We are, however, concerned particularly with the Advaitic ideas, and it must be remembered that

1. Though we need not enter into the disputable problem of the date of Kālidāsa, it may be casually marked that Aśvaghoṣa's style seems to be of a later age, and hence he must be a later poet. In his Saundarananda he has consecutively used the forms of Aorist. This certainly is a later practice. Canto 2, stanzas 12-4, and 50 onwards - "The Saundarananda of Aśvaghoṣa" Ed. Johnston 1928

2. अनंतानन्दाकुंतलसू ७३५
that such ideas are to be found, in literature of this type, only in a reflected form. It can be marked however, that some clear crystals of the current philosophy can be traced in Kālidāsa's works. Let us then turn first to Kālidāsa, the prince of Indian poets.

The benedictory stanza of the Śākuntala describes the Lord with eight forms. Amongst these is included the Sarvabīja-prakṛti by which all creatures of the world are animated. This can easily be compared with the prakṛti, described in the seventh discourse of the Bhagavadgītā. But the Bhagavadgītā proceeds to call this Prakṛti as the delusive Māyā. Do we find any such expression of Kālidāsa? At least it is clearly stated, Prakṛti which brings forth creation, sustenance and destruction of the world is the Lord Himself:

त्वामामनंति प्रकृति पुष्पार्थप्रवर्तिनीम्।
तद्विश ebसवाधिने त्वामेव पुरुषं विदुः॥ २॥

1. या सूर्यः संदर्भम् etc.
2. कुमारसम्बन्ध २०१३
The duality of Prakṛti and Puruṣa must ultimately vanish into the substratum of both. God is thus both Prakṛti and Puruṣa. It is however observed that Prakṛti is subject to changes. Does God also change then? Kālidāsa says that such is not the thing:

रसान्तरणेकरसं वषा विद्यं पवोः सुते।
देशे देशे गुणेष्वेवमवस्यास्त्वमाविशिष्यः॥

The heavenly waters, which are always sweet, consume waters of different tastes from different places, without losing their sweetness, so God consumes different states of creatorship, etc., that come through qualities of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas; and yet Himself, he remains changeless. Though God Himself is Prakṛti, He does not change like the Prakṛti. Changeable and the unchangeable, both are thus God. It is all Paramātmā who creates Himself and dissolves the creation within Himself:

1. रघुवर्ष १००७।

2. Commentator Mallinath says: पवमाविशिष्यायो निर्विकारः।
एक्रूप इत्यर्थः। त्यः गुणेषु सत्वाविभवस्या सत्त्वाविष्कर्तुरुपं अष्टुं।॥
But why the multiplicity is at all perceived? This problem always remains unsolved. God is one un-born and yet He takes birth; He has no purpose to achieve, nothing to gain, and yet we see His activities and exploits. Kālidāsa says that nothing can be finally stated about this:

शतत्त्वे गुरुपत्र जन्म निरीहत्स्य हतश्रिष्टिः।
स्वपत्रे जागृतक्ष्य याथार्थवेव वेद कृत्वः ॥

रत्नवाप्तमवाप्तच्यः न ते किंचन चिन्तने।
महिमानं यदुक्तीत्व तव संहितये वचः ॥ २
श्रमेष तवशक्त्या वा - - - - - - - - - - - - ॥ ३
- - - - - - न धियां परि वत्से ॥ ४

1. कुमारसम्भव २.१०।
2. रघुवंश १०.२४, ३१।
3. रघुवंश १०.३२।
4. कुमारसम्भव ६.२२।
God is thus Omnipotent. He is also Omniscient:

A devotee need not describe his devotion to the Lord, for the Lord is the self of the devotee:

He is called the one Purusa who has pervaded heavens and earth:

1. रघुवंश १०.२०
2. कुमारसंभव ६.२९
3. रघुवंश १०.१९
4. विक्रमाध्यंशीय Opening Stanza.
He is then the immortal conscious principle that pervades everything. He is indeed the Supreme Self, the one without the second — the Kevalatman. What is His relation with mutable world then? Some stanzas give us Kālidāsa's probable view on the point:

नमस्त्रेवृत्ते तुम्हरे प्राक्षुण्टे। केवलात्मन् ।
गुणात्मकिष्णागाय पश्चाद मेवमुधुथुः॥

Duality or Bheda comes afterwards. It is not the essential nature of the Lord. He is the Self alone. The Bheda comes through limitation - Parimāṇa. The creation and destruction are as if waking and sleep of the Lord:

स्वकालपरिमाणं व्यस्तराथ्विनिवसे ते।
यथा तु स्वप्नववेको कर्तो भूतानां प्रलयोऽवयो॥

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

१. कुमारसम्भव २.४

२. कुमारसम्भव २.१०
Duality is thus due to limitation which arises later, when the pristine state of God is somehow changed. This limitation comes through imposition, as is guessed from the following stanza:

यदद्यक्षेपं जगतां वयथारोपितास्त्रवत्या।
मनोरथस्याबिषष्यं मनोविषयमात्मनः। ॥

The Lord has indeed no desire in his mind. Yet he has imposed in his mind the Rṣis as desired objects. Such is the relation between the manifold creation and its substratum. Now in what way is the individual soul related to God? The following throws light on Kālidāsa's probable idea about this:

प्रत्येकं विनियुक्तात्मा कधं न सात्यसि प्रमो। ॥

Lord Himself has entered every creature. We have seen already how He resides in the heart of everyone. Mallinātha says here:

\[\text{कुमारसंमव } ६.१६\]
\[\text{कुमारसंमव } ६.२१\]
This indicates the essential identity of the Jīva and the Lord. Their difference should then be only apparent. This concept is reflected in the following:

The Supreme Self appears as many individual souls, as we have reflections of moon in waters. Thus the difference, multiplicity, is related to God. The relation is not explained by the process of Pariṇāma or cause and effect. It is implied in the following that the cause effect relation must remain inadequate for ultimate explanation:

"यमामन्न्यात्मात्मानवोऽपि कारण कथं स हक्कयमवोभविष्यति। १अ"

---

१ रघुबरस ९०.६४
१ अ कुमारासमव ५.८९
Kalidāsa has employed the similes of imposition and reflection for this purpose as we have seen. We can therefore say, that all the essentials of the theory of Advaita are traced in Kalidāsa's works and we need not insist upon finding the Śaṅkara terminology which might have been developed later.

---

Bhāravi

Bhāravi must have flourished much earlier than the beginning of the seventh century, because he is mentioned in Aihole inscriptions. He can safely be taken to be a pre-Śaṅkara author, and that is enough for our purpose.

1. Cf. The use of the word Māyā, which here means the elusive power of an individual:

   तं विस्मितं चेतुरुवाच साध्वे मायां मयोद्वापत्यां परी खिलोऽसि।
   
   रघुवंश २.६२

In his famous work Kirātārjuniya we find the traces of Advaita. Brahman, the Supreme Reality, which in this poem is identified with Lord Siva is thus described:

अष्टीवसे विष्वविधारिणे नमो
नमोः न्तिक्ष्याय नमो दयीवसे।
अतीत्व वाचां मनसां च गोचरं
स्थिताय ते तत्फलये नमोऽनमः।

This is the description mostly after the Upaniṣadic ideology. God is beyond mind and speech. He is the Lord of these. He is the nearest of all because he resides in the heart of every individual as the commentator explains. Though God is transcendent, He is also immanent:

1. Kirātārjuniya १८.४९ १८.४०

2. Mallinātha says: भन्तिक्ष्याय, अन्त्यायांमित्या
सन्तुक्षेत्राय - - ।
It is indicated that God remains beyond the round of cause-effect. Cause-effect relation is inadequate to explain Him and hence the expression:

ত্বঃ কারণে কারণকারণানামঃ।

Even though the Supreme cause of creation and its pervader, God does not lose His transcendent nature:

नानिन्यातन्यनुनेत्रस्तथानुन विविक्तं ब्रह्मणं पद्म।

1. किराताजुनीर १८.४०
2. किराताजुनीर १८.३५
3. किराताजुनीर १८.३५
4. किराताजुनीर १७.१४
5. किराताजुनीर ११.६६
The term "anādiniṣṭhah" is explained by the commentator Mallinātha:

अविभास्ये आदिनिष्ठे उत्पत्तिः यत्त्वास्री अनादिनिष्ठ : । निष्ठानिष्ठपतिः आनान्द : ।

God is really formless and yet He takes to forms:

अविभ्रह्याप्युलेन हेतुना
समेत्य रिन्नमयमूर्ति निष्ठात : ।

He is said to take different forms, out of which eight are famous, which are described by Kālidāsa as we have seen. It is said that God takes these forms through Māyā, to shake off the fear of the world and save it from being plunged into evils:

---

1. किराताध्यजीव १८.४० Cf. ५.१८
2. किराताध्यजीव १८.३३
3. किराताध्यजीव १८.२७ Cf. Mallinātha's commentary.
Thus the Prakṛti of the Sāṅkhyas - from which Puruṣa is different - is the manifestation of God through Māyā and God is the Supreme Puruṣa:

कर्मणां भयकरः परः पुमानः

The Lord is spoken of as destroying the Karmas of an individual, for when the power of past Karma is spent and new Karma does not arise, one attains release because through it one has right knowledge:

1. किराताःबुद्धीनीय १८.३०
2. किराताःबुद्धीनीय १५.१५
3. किराताःबुद्धीनीय १८.३३
दृष्टव्य दृष्टान्त्वाच नीवानि विधाय प्रेमाकारी पायि पवं मुक्तमपावे।
सम्यक दृष्टिस्तम्भ्य परं परम्यति वस्त्रां यस्मोपास्ते साधु विशेषं स विश्वे॥

This indeed is Samyg-dṛṣṭi the right vision that is directed to the Lord. It is futile to go after worldly pleasures and riches:

न सुलं प्राथ्ये नार्थयुंवंचलवी विचिचिलम्॥

It is advised not to have a longing for sense-pleasures and riches, for they are formidable obstacles in the way of right-knowledge:

मुलानान दीपस्य हिंसादेवर्कामो स्म मा पुषं
तौ हि तत्त्वात्वोष्ट्र्य दुर्धर्धवाधुप्यल्वो॥

* १. किरातार्जुनीय १८.२८
  २. किरातार्जुनीय ११.६६
  ३. किरातार्जुनीय ११.२०*
Right-vision or right-knowledge is said to ward off ignorance even as darkness is dispelled by light:


dhāyaṁ viniścail ātmāṃjanānāṁ taṁ

tarvasya śamāntaḥvināśaṁ ॥

Mallinātha interprets apavidya as avidyā. It is said that for those who are desirous of attaining the state of Brahmaṇ, there are many schools of thought that are founded on the Śastras, which are capable of putting an end to Samsāra.

वीतजयम् जयसं परं जुरि
ब्रह्मणं पवयुनेत्रमिच्छतामु।
आगमाविव तमोपहारितः
संमवन्ति मलयेत्मविच्छिदः ॥

1. Kiratārjunīya 16.32

2. Kiratārjunīya 5.22
The words "brahmaṇaḥ padam" are thus interpreted by the commentator:

ब्रह्मण: परमात्मन: सम्बन्धः परमेश्वरः शुचि

निष्कलंकं परिव इति पदं स्थानं तादात्मयः। मुक्ति-

मित्यर्थः।

The final state of release is thus the unity of Brahman and Atman as suggested by the commentary; and this suggestion is quite probable because, as we have seen, God or Brahman is the innermost principle of every individual.

It is true that the illusory character of the world is not to be found in these citations. But the futility and destructibility of the world and worldly desires is expressed. We can therefore say that in Bharavi's poem we see concepts from which the theory of Advaita is deducible.
This is not the place to enter into a discussion on Bhavabhuti's date etc. One thing is certain; he was the contemporary of Vākpati, the writer of Gaudavaho, who flourished at the court of Yasovarman the King of Kanauj. It is suggested that Bhavabhūti, according to the colophons of some manuscripts of the Malatīmadhava, was a disciple of some Umbekācārya, and Umbekācārya is identified with, or sometimes called the disciple of Kumārila. In any case Bhavabhūti is supposed to be a Mīmaṁsaka. That his ancestors were Somapayins and performers of Vājapeya sacrifices, he himself has mentioned. But this does not prove that he was Mīmaṁsaka alone, and not a Vedāntin.

1. The identity of Bhavabhūti, Umbeka, Maṇḍana, kumārila is also a problem yet not solved.

2. सोमपीयिन उम्ब्रकर्तानानो ब्रह्मवाचिन: प्रतिकासिन्ति।
मालातीमाधव शंक १
वाजपीयवाचिनो महाक्वे: .... महावीरचरित शंक १.
For sacrifices and drinking of Soma are not forbidden to the followers of the Advaita. The witness of Bhavabhūti deposes that he belonged to the Advaita school. The following shows that he fully realised the importance of knowledge:

तत्र वालोकनिरस्‌तमोहतमसामध्यात्मविवाहानुषारः
यत्र ब्रह्मविद्या निर्मं भुः जागर्ति सौम्यं महः।

That by the attainment of knowledge the distinctions of time as past, present and future vanish, is reflected in the following:

नैरन्तर्वर्त्यां च परमशुभूमत्रवृक्षेः प्रापत्
शान्त्वोति: परिन्वन्दतुमन्नव्याप्तः प्रभावः।

1. महावीरचरित ७.२७
2. महावीरचरित ३.२५
The idea of Vivarta seems to be a favourite one of Bhavabhūti. He has mentioned it twice in his Uttararāmacarita:

अथ भगवान् प्राचेतस: प्रथमं मुख्येषु ब्रव्यश्रापणस्तादु-
कहूँ चिवर्तमितिहासं रामायणं प्रणिनाय। ॥

At the end of the third act also the word occurs:

एको रसः कहुँ एवं निमित्तेषवावृ 
मिन्न: पृथक् पृथिविवाश्रय: विवर्तानः। 
अब्बश्वदूवूतरंगमयान् विकारानृ 
एम्मो यथा सलिलमेव तु तत्समग्रम् ॥

However in a verse in the sixth act of this drama, we have the complete theory of Advaita in a

۱. उत्तररामचरित अंक ۲

۲. उत्तररामचरित ۲.۴۶
a nutshell, and as it occurs by way of simile, it
must already have been a popular theory. The
verse is as follows:

विद्वाक्ष्ये न मक्ताः मेघानं शृङ्गामणि।
श्रुत्वावधिये विक्तानं क्षपिः विष्णुः कृतः॥

It might be objected that the verse does not
necessarily mean Kevalādvaita. The simile in the
third act corroborates more the Śuddhādvaita idea
and as far as the simile is concerned, the idea is
in fact Śuddhādvaita. As water does various forms
of eddies, bubbles and waves, it ever remains the
same water, as an element there is not the slightest
change in it, so, the Śuddhādvaita says, this whole
cosmos and the individuals are just like so many
bubbles on the surface of the Absolute One. Even
as bubbles, they are perfectly one with the Absolute.
Their patent simile is that of gold and ornaments.

1. उत्तरामचरित ६.६

2. This is technically termed as Anadhyasta Vivarta.
There is not the slightest change in gold as ornaments. Thus there is complete Advaita in the ornaments and gold. This is of course anything other than Kevalādvaita, because it accepts the real existence of the ornaments. The natural question that presents itself to any thinker is, if in fact there is no difference between the ornaments and gold, where is the necessity of realising the elemental form of ornaments viz. gold? It also affirms that ornaments are as real as the gold. The Puṣṭimārga of the followers of Vallabha has already taken to this attitude. If at all an individual ever will want to transcend the ornament view, and realise the whole only as gold, that is possible according to them only through Divine grace. According to them, there is no such different thing as Amūrta Brahman. What is called in the Upaniṣads as Amūrta Brahman is simply a change in the angle of vision of the individual soul. Can we say conclusively that this was the view of Bhavabhūti, and interpret Vivarta mentioned by him in that light?

To decide the matter, we must turn to the verse
verse in the sixth act, and here we see that the verse gives quite different ideas. Let us try to understand the verse with the context. On account of the Meghāstra of Lava, the sky was so crowded with clouds, that the whole creation seemed trembling in deep darkness, only enlightened at times by sudden flashes of lightening, as though the terrible jaw of death had opened to swallow the whole Universe. But by the timely use of the Vāyavya-astra, Candraketu dispersed the clouds in no time, even though they were overwhelming. In order to make this description complete, Bhavabhūti has used the Vedāntic simile. Though the appearances are innumerable in the form of this cosmic illusion, they are dispelled in no time, and vanish again into the Absolute One, by the knowledge of Reality; so also the overwhelming clouds were made to vanish into the void of sky, by the wind created by the missile of Candraketu. Here the doctrine of Kevalād-vaita which explicitly holds, that returning to
to the Absolute One is possible only through right knowledge - Jñānādeva tu Kaivalyam - is clearly stated. Vidyā has here the sense of knowledge, and not the technical meaning in which the word occurs in some Upaniṣads. It is also expressed that only the Absolute Brahman is real, and everything else is illusion. The words Kvāpi vipralayah Kṛtah are meant to express, that, what remains after disillusionment is indescribable. This exactly is the position of the Kevalādvaita. Only the Absolute Brahman is real in its absoluteness and everything else is illusion. As illusion has never a real existence and is caused by the obscuring of knowledge of reality, the dispelling of illusion is possible only by the removal of the obscuring ignorance, by means of right knowledge. This in short is the purport of the Kevalādvaita. The use of the term Vivarta has, thus, this ideology at the

1. Manthavidyā, Paryaṅkavidya, etc.
the background in the scheme of Bhavabhūti. Thus the simile of Vāyavya-astra too is a perfect one, and unless the public were familiar with it, the poet would not have used it with such an ease.

The emphasis on right knowledge will be evident from the advice of Viśvāmitra given to Bhārgava, that he should be the disciple of Vasīstha for the removal of doubts and the attainment of right-knowledge. By right knowledge one attains Brahman - God whose nature is thus described:

शय स्वस्थ्याय देवाय नित्याय हतपापमने।
श्यत्यक्तक्रमविमागाय वैत्यज्योतिशे नमः॥

The Commentator Viṭarāgghava has nicely explained this stanza. By Svastha is meant one abiding by

1. Mahāvīracharitra 7.36

16. Mahāvīracharita 1.1
by Himself, in his own glory. Nitya means eternal, without beginning and end. God is also indivisible either in respect of time or space. That is the sense of Tyaktakramavibhāgāya. The commentator says:

क्रमः पौवार्ययम्। विभागोः वान्तरमेदः, तौ त्यक्तौ
येन स तथोक्तस्ततः। नित्यत्वीताः निरवयवत्वाच त्यस्तक्रमः
विभागतं विरविभिन्नम्।

The attribute Caitanyajyotiśe indicates that God is Absolute Consciousness, Self-illumined, self-evident Reality. Bhavabhūti thus seems to be a perfect Advaitin from the concepts that we see in his dramas.

We can certainly refer to works of other classical writers like Bāna, etc. but we must restrict our choice only to a few writers, for classical literature is not the only type to be dealt with in this chapter. Let us now turn to an author who is a grammarian and also an Advaitin.

1. In such expressions as गंधर्वनगरलेखेण पश्यत
एव नस्यति Bāna seems to employ Vedāntic simile. Cf.
कादम्बरी मुक्तमसौपदेशा.
There seems to be a great friendship between grammarians and philosophers and it was felt necessary for even late authors like Madhavacārya to enter into his work, grammar as a philosophical system. It is also very clear that philosophical thoughts wittingly or unwittingly portrayed in grammatical works, show similarity more to the Advaita than to any other system. The following is an oft quoted stanza in grammatical work:

उद्वितवति परस्मिन प्रत्यये शास्त्रयोनौ गतवति विलयं च प्राकृतेऽपि प्रपंशे।
सपविष पवयुद्वतं केवल: प्रत्ययो वन्तु तत्विवचिति भिमीति को हत्वा परिष्ठतोऽपि॥

The final phase is unqualified consciousness. Absolute knowledge, which can never be determined. At that time all worldly experience vanishes. This is the state of final release described in the Advaita Vedānta. Grammatical works mention this to be a
a stanza having two meanings, and composed with the Upaniṣadic and grammatical terminology in mind:

Even if it is doubted, though on definite grounds, that Patañjali the famous grammarian is not identical with the author of the Yogasūtraa, Bhartṛhari the grammarian has distinctly stated philosophical thoughts in his grammatical work Vākyapadīya. It will appear from what follows that he was an Advaitin. That he was a famous Vedāntin is assured even by a person as great as Yāmunācārya:

9 प्रदेहमोरमा Benares 1907 p. 469 and The Siddhānta kaumudi with the Taittirīśodhini. Bombay 1915, p. 298

13 सिद्धवर्ग PP. 5-6 काश्याम सन् १९०० इस्वी।
Itsing was the first to introduce the opinion that Bhartrhari was a Buddhist, and it is rather surprising to find, that this wrong notion continues to obsess scholars even now. Rejecting the identity of the author of the famous triad of centuries with the grammarian, Prof. Kosambi writes, "Finally, that Bhartrhari, on reading Itsingā closely, is seen to be an ardent Buddhist....., but there is nothing in our collection that could be traced to such an author." There are ample evidences in the Vākyapadīya, that clearly show abject surrender of the author to the Vedās:

(prāptyupāyop ukarvan tadānād chandakāndam mahārṣiyaḥ)

(ekotetragnesavatāṃ sahāyānāt: prayukta prayukta)

(āsannāṃ bhrāmunāsānān tapasāyusmān tap:)

(prathmām hanaśānām prāhūryākaraṇān kṛita:)

1. खटक्रयादि - सुमाचितसंग्रहः

Epigrams attributed to Bhartrhari by Prof. D.D. Kosambi Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1948, Intro. p. 79.

2. वाक्यपदीय १.५

Benares 1887 with a commentary by Puṇyārāja Ed. Gangadhara Sastri Manavatī.

3. वाक्यपदीय १.११
न चागमाड़ुते धर्मवस्त्रीय ठवयतिष्ठते। ३

अनाविनिधनां श्रुतिमहादृष्टिकामृ।
शिष्टेन्लिन्द्रवमाना तु न ठवयचिष्ठते स्मृति: ॥ २॥

This can never be the tendency of an ardent Buddhist. When we deal with the philosophy of this grammarian therefore, we deal with Vedic philosophy. २॥

This philosopher-grammarian begins with the verse:

अनाविनिधनं ब्रह्म शब्दवत्तवं यदववर्मय।
विवर्तिते शर्माचेन प्रक्रिया जगतो यतः ॥ ३॥

Brahman is without beginning and end, the root-principle of speech. From it whirls out the world-order. Puñyarāja explains Vivarta thus:

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

१. वाक्यपदीय १.१०
२. वाक्यपदीय १.१५६

२॥ See also “Bhartrhari not a Buddhist: Evidence from nearer Home” Poona Orientalist Vol. V No. 1 1940 by Madhava Krishna Sarma.

३. वाक्यपदीय १.३
४. शब्दस्य तत्त्वमृ।
The experience of duality is like dream-experience. Further on Bhartrihari says:

एकशेष यदाम्नानं मिनं शक्तिभव्याश्रयात।
अष्टक्तथे पि शक्तिभः पूष्टक्तथे वर्तते ॥

What is declared as one by scriptures is divided by virtue of Śakti. Though there is no difference in the One, the difference stands as it were through powers. Thus difference is illusory. Puṇyārāja dilates:

न हि शेषणाताकारावश्र्यो शान्त्येकावण विभक्त्यते ---
------- शक्तिभ:, पि ब्रह्मणोः पूष्टक्तथे पि अरोपित: पूष्टक्तथा-वमास इत्यतः ॥

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

१. वाक्यपदीय १.२
Difference is thus attributed to Šaktis. The main resort of these powers is termed as Kālasakti. It must be remembered that Bhartrhari was writing a treatise on grammar. It was the word with which he was concerned, and explanation of grammatic principles was his purpose. It is natural, therefore, that he took to the explanation of Time and space in which word would first manifest as a sound. The power through which plurality rises is termed by him as Kālasakti. Let us however not make haste to say that word is the Supreme Reality, and Kāla is the origin of plurality according to Bhartrhari. We must remember that like Kālasakti he has also mentioned Rūpašakti. Then he has also said that word itself is the power. Let us therefore see his clear concepts about the Absolute Reality etc.


2. वाक्यपदीय २.२७९

3. वाक्यपदीय २.४७९
The Absolute Reality according to Bhartrhari is beyond word. It is the principle to be understood by word—Saṅbadatattva. The principle is certainly beyond the word:

क्रणीणां दर्शनं वच्च तत्वे किंचिदवस्तितम्।
न तेन व्यवहारं स्ति न तच्छवनिवधनम्॥

Again:

चच्चेपावतं शानं वच्च शानसलौकिकम्।
न ताम्यं व्यवहारं स्ति शब्दं लोकनिवधना॥

Words are forged by people. Supreme Reality is not bound by words. It is the direct experience of Sages. It is the very principle known as Self that manifests as object in phenomenal knowledge:

---

1. वाक्यपदीय २.२४१

2. वाक्यपदीय २.२९९
The appearance of plurality is through some error according Bhartrhari:

The world full of plurality is thus evanescent like an image. We find this implication in the following:

1. वाक्यपदीय १.५०
2. वाक्यपदीय २.१४२ Cf. अप्रत्यक्षप्रस्तुतोऽपि ब्रह्मचर्यमानस्त्रियात्मकः प्रमुखः शांकरामाश्य व १.१.१
3. वाक्यपदीय २.२८६-२९१
Punyārāja clearly elaborates this:

प्रसिद्धार्थविपयवासनिमित्तामिति प्रसिद्ध: सत्येऽपेषः।
तत्स्व विपरीतो वो मिथ्यात्ववलक्षणस्तस्य निमित्तां कारणः।
मिथ्याविषयवस्तु दोष हिति, यथा तस्मात्वबौमेदो विशेषो
लक्ष्यो द्विवन्त्रादिः तथात्मूलं दर्शनविषयं प्रचलते।

The same subject is further carried:

स्पर्शप्रवश-थ्रो हस्तेन यथा चक्रस्य संतत:।
न तथाश्चलात्चक्रस्य विचित्रन्म स्पुशते हि तत्तु॥
वच्चं प्राध्यन्तश्रेयः स्पर्शनावरणे यथा।
नगरेणु तु तेन तद्भु ग-धर्मगरेष्वपि॥

These descriptions clearly show that difference must be attributed to wrong knowledge, and not merely to Kāla. It is for this reason, that

१. वाक्यपदीय २.२९३-२९४
that right knowledge is praised so much. The Sāstras are taught to Bālas or undeveloped people for dispelling avidyā. It is through the unreal that one has to go to real:

उपायः विष्णुपाणां वालानामङ्गना:।
असत्ये वर्त्तनी स्थित्वा ततः सत्यं समीहते॥

Punyarāja says:

असत्यंत्रेषु वास्त्राप्रक्रियानां नृत्यं न विधायुक्तं सत्यं विधायतः ब्रह्म समीहते प्राप्योत्तिति यावत

The Ultimate Reality to be attained is Sāsvata Brahma. Through different Sāstras we see only the exposition of avidyā, but we tread the region for destroying it, and then Vidyā dawns automatically:

शास्त्रेः प्रक्रियास्मैदार विधायुक्तं सत्यं नृत्यं विधायतः॥

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

1. वाक्यपदीय २.१४०
2. वाक्यपदीय २.२३९
3. वाक्यपदीय २.२३४-२३५
This is a clear exposition of the same Advaita as was later represented by Śaṅkarācārya. There is therefore a good ground to believe that Bhartṛhari is one of the systematic exponents of the Advaita Vedānta before Śaṅkarācārya, especially when we learn recently of his gloss on the Vedānta-Sūtras. This gloss is not available, but it will not be a far cry, to assume, that, in his treatise actually on the Vedānta, he might have refrained from the provisional terminology he has utilised in his Vākyapadīya. Dr. Mahādevan's remark therefore that "The Vākyapadīya bears him out to be as uncompromising an Advaitin as any other" is absolutely correct and need not be modified at all.

1. "इनके अतिरिक्त भर्तरहरि-विरचित तीन ग्रंथ और शात हुए हैं - ६ मीमांसा माण्ड्य, ८. वेदान्तसूत्रावलि,
   ९. शब्दव्याकरणसमीक्षा - संस्कृत व्याकरणशास्त्रका इतिहास
   By युधिष्ठिर मीमांसक. पृ. २६४.

2. Gauḍapāda, a study in the early Advaita, p. 229.
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It is evident even from the works of Śaṅkarācārya, that there were Vedāntins, before Śaṅkara, with whom Śaṅkara agreed. We come across certain opinions in different works, which may here be taken note of, as they seem to belong to Advaita. Names of certain Ācāryas are also alluded to, and some of them were probably Advaitins.

Fitz Edward Hall has collected extracts from the commentary on Rgveda by Rāvana. Rāvana quotes from some Vedāntic work a stanza as follows:

यथा स्वप्नमुहृत्ते स्वातु संक्त्सरसशनम्।
तथा मायाविलासोऽयं जायते जाग्रति श्रमः॥

This is the doctrine of Māyā, which must have been enunciated in a work before Rāvana, the

1. Rāvana's commentary on the Rgveda.

   Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1862, 129.
the commentator of the Rgveda. Rāvana must be an ancient commentator on the Vedas is evident from a commentary Paramārthaprapā on Bhagavadgīta 11.33. We know of a Rāvana, who had commented on the Vaiśeṣika-sūtras. Can he be the same person as the commentator of the Rgveda? We see that the Vedic commentator was interested in philosophy also. May be, he wrote on Vaiśeṣika-sūtras too. The antiquity of the Vaiśeṣika sūtras may go back to the times of Patañjali and even earlier. If Rāvana, a famous Vedic commentator is to be placed between Patañjali and Harisvāmi, we may say that he lived sometime before Christ or in the early centuries of Christian era, when Buddhist philosophy was undergoing elaboration. The work that he quotes

1. सायनमाध्यकारारातिष्ठितिकामिनांश्चावृत्तमवशा दर्शितामि। रावणमाध्यानु दबवात्मकरीत्वाण्वतंत्रसंग्रामनिष्ठामिः दर्शितामि। वोटमाध्यायं तुम्भयमि। परमार्थप्रपाभू। श्रीनवमुदवंनु गोतात्र अन्याष्टटिकोपेत।
   गुजराती प्रिंटिंग प्रेस मुंबई खं १८२४ घ.४२८

quotes must be existing before him. The Advaita thus existed long back and hence, as we have seen, the Laṅkāvatāra mentions it.

Upavarsa is spoken of as a Vedāntin by Śaṅkara in 3.3.53. Sabara in his gloss on Mīmāṃsā-sūtra 1.1.5 alludes to him. Fitz Edward Hall however gives a different account. In his Tantracūḍāmani, the author Kṛṣṇadeva says, that Upavāsa wrote a gloss on Sābarabhāṣya. May be, there were two Upavarsas. Who amongst them was a Vedāntin, it is difficult to say. Śaṅkara and Bhāskara alike respect him. It cannot be said with certainty that he was an Advaitin from the available information.

Bodhāyana and Bhārtṛprapañca are Vedāntins, who subscribed to a view which is different from the Advaita of Śaṅkara. Prof. Hiriyanna has elaborated Bhārtṛprapañca's doctrine. 2

1. Index to Sanskrit Philosophy by F.E.Hall.
2. Indian Antiquary vol. LIII
Kumārila and Yāmuna speak of Bhartrmitra in Sloka-वर्तिका 1.1.1.10; 1.1.6.130-131 and Siddhitraya respectively. Nothing can be said whether he was an Advaitin or not.

Brahmanandi's opinion is learnt from the Saṅkṣepa Ārīraka, that the Karūya or the creation is just a vyavahāra. It means that Reality is different from Vyavahāra, and that is the goal to be attained. Brahmanandi thus perhaps was an Advaitin.

It is doubted whether Saṅkara wrote a commentary on the Māndukya Karīka, and hence we cannot say that he has referred to Braviḍā or Dramiḍā by the word Āgamavit. It is however certain that Dramiḍā was a great Vedāntin. If he is the commentator of Brahmanandi, he may be an Advaitin.
Prof. Hiriyanna has written on Brahmadatta and his philosophy. The authenticity of his opinion is judged on the authority of later writers like Suresvara, Jñānottama, Ānandajña, etc. Like the physical world, Jīva, in the opinion of Brahmadatta, is said to have come into Being from Brahman. He is essentially one with Brahman but appears to be different. Now this seems to suggest that Brahmadatta was an advaitin, though we can't say that he agreed with the ideology of Śaṅkara in all its details.

About Sundarapāṇḍya, it can be said without any fear of contradiction that he was an advaitin who lived before Śaṅkara. If the chronology of Śaṅkara goes back, that of Sundarapāṇḍya too must go back. His identity also with Kūna Pāṇḍya etc. will have to be reconsidered. In any case this Ācārya

flourished before Śaṅkara and Kumārila. There is no harm if he is a Saiva, for we have seen elsewhere that some Saiva Vedāntins were Advaitins. Śaṅkara has quoted three stanzas from him in his famous Commentary on the Brahma-sūtra; while some more stanzas are referred to in different other works.

The available biographies of Śaṅkara tell us that Maṇḍana Misra was his great opponent and he was a Bhedavādin. It is also almost established, that Maṇḍana and Suresvara are two distinct persons. In his learned introduction to Brahma-siddhi, M.M. Prof. Kuppusvāmi Sāstri gives 615-695 A.D. as the lifetime of the author of Brahma-siddhi. It may be so.

However a few points need consideration. If, on the authority of tradition we are to hold that Maṇḍana is a contemporary of Śaṅkara, we cannot set aside the fact that tradition calls Maṇḍana a Bheda-vādin. The author of Brahma-siddhi, Vibhramaviveka etc. is however a thorough Advaitin. Philosophically
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his difference with Śaṅkara is negligible. But his discussion about the locus of Avidyā as Jīva, and the probable objections to such a hypothesis etc. points to a later stage of the Advaita theory, when the thought of Śaṅkara might have been attacked by the opponents giving rise to a closer analysis of the concept of Avidya. Himself Śaṅkara does not seem to be so anxious on the point.

I am therefore inclined to believe that Brahmāsiddhi, Vibhramaviveka, etc. were written after Śaṅkara's writings were known to the people.