

A

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF
PĀNCARĀTRA RELIGION,

---oOo---

Thesis submitted for Ph.D. Degree (Patna)

JANUARY, 1931

DHIRENDRA LAL DE

ProQuest Number: 11010398

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 11010398

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

P R E C I S

The subject has been divided into five chapters. In the Introduction we have indicated three different phases in the evolution of Pāñcarātra Philosophy, corresponding to an identical number of stages in the historic career of Pāñcarātra. In the second chapter Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva has been shown to be a real historical figure, and not a vegetation deity nor a solar one. Then, the fortunes of Bhāgavatism, in the light of literary and epigraphic records, have been traced. Incidentally, a birds-eye view of the philosophy of the four principal Saṁpradāyas, into which Bhāgavatism at a later stage split up, viz: Śrī-Saṁpradāya, Saṅkādī-Saṁpradāya, Brahma-Saṁpradāya, and Rudra-Saṁpradāya, has been taken to explain the continuity of theistic currents in India. Next we have analysed the various ingredients of Viṣṇu, the Vedic God, leading to his subsequent elevation to the rank of a supreme spirit. The cult of Nārāyaṇa has been attended to by a similar analytical study, justifying his claim to the position of a cosmic deity. The third chapter contains the philosophy of the semi-Brahmaised Bhāgavatas from the Nārāyaṇīya episode. As we have no systematic religious literature for the first period, we have entirely to rely for it upon certain stray materials pieced together by Dr. Bhandarkar, Professor Garbe, and Dr. Grierson. In the fourth chapter, an attempt has been made to portray the philosophy of the Pāñcarātras from their traditional text-books, e.g., the Saṁhitās. In our treatment of

philosophy during the successive stages, we have not allowed ourselves to be disturbed by the question of indebtedness of Pāñcarātra to pantheism of the Midland. The subject, on account of its immense importance, has received special attention in the concluding chapter on the philosophy of the Upaniṣads.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Ahir.	.	.	.	Ahimbudhnya Samhitā.
A.Br.	.	.	.	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
A.S.R.	.	.	.	Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report.
Bhg.G.	.	.	.	Bhagavad-Gītā.
Bhg.Pu.	.	.	.	Bhagavata Purāṇa.
Bo.Br. R.A.S.	.	.	.	Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Br.Up.	.	.	.	Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad.
Chā.	.	.	.	Chāndogya Upaniṣad.
Corp. Ins. Ind.	.	.	.	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.
E.H.D.	.	.	.	Early History of the Dekkan.
E.H.I.	.	.	.	Early History of India.
E.R.E.	.	.	.	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.
I.P.A.S.	.	.	.	Introduction to Pāñcarātra and Ahimbudhnya Samhitā.
J.A.S.B.	.	.	.	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
J.R.A.S.	.	.	.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
K.Br.	.	.	.	Kausītaki Brāhmaṇa.
Mbh.	.	.	.	Mahābhārata.
P.Prakāśa	.	.	.	Paramatattvanirnayaprakāśa Samhitā.
R.I.	.	.	.	Religions of India.
S.B.	.	.	.	Srī-Bhāṣya.
S.Br.	.	.	.	Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.
S.B.E.	.	.	.	Sacred Books of the East.
Sve.	.	.	.	Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad.
Tait.	.	.	.	Taittirīya Upaniṣad.
T.Br.	.	.	.	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.

Lakṣmī Lakṣmī Tantra.
 Padma Padma Tantra.
 Sātvata Sātvata Samhitā.

C H A P T E R I

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

This is an attempt to give the history and philosophy of Pāñcarātra from its germination to its final development. Broadly speaking, three different stages may be traced in the development of its philosophy, coincident with three different stages in its historic career. Of the first stage, in its twofold aspect - historic and philosophic - we have very little information. During this phase, monotheistic religion called Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātra^I was founded by Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, belonging to the Sātvata sept of the Outland Yādava tribe (Grierson's Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas, p.3; Bhandarkar's Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts, pp.72-74; Grierson's Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India, p.6.). Vāsudeva called the object of his worship Bhagavat.. He taught that the Supreme Being was eternal, infinite, and full of grace, and that salvation consisted in a life of perpetual bliss near the Lord. Before the fourth century B.C., the founder of this religion, as in the case of Buddhism and Jainism, was deified, and under his

-
1. In a wider or generic sense Pāñcarātra and Bhāgavata are treated as equivalent terms, but strictly speaking, they are different (for separate identities, see Bana's Harṣa-Carita, translated into English by E.B. Cowell and F.W. Thomas, chapter VIII, p.236).

patronymic of Vāsudeva became identified with Bhagavat (see Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II, pp.540-41; Garbe's Philosophy of Ancient India, pp.18, 83-85). During this phase in its career, Pāñcarātra entered into an alliance with ancient Sāṃkhya-Yoga, quite in keeping with the manifest tendency of India to combine religion with philosophy (Garbe's Bhagavad-Gītā, p.28). This period was also marked by the absorption of the cult of Nārāyaṇa into the church of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva (E.R.E., Vol.II, p.541). During the second stage, about the third century B.C., Pāñcarātra came into contact with Brahmanism of the Midland (Indian Antiquary, 1908, p.257). The life and death struggle between the Brahmans and the Buddhists was the immediate cause of this fusion (Garbe's Bhagavad-Gītā, p.35). In their warfare against the Buddhists, the Brahmans won over the Bhāgavatas as their allies. Once thus brought in touch with Brahmanism, Bhāgavatism became a cult of Brahmanised anti-Brahmanists (Grierson's Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas, p.7.). The Bhagavad-Gītā bears witness to the compromise thus arrived at between Brahmanism and Bhāgavatism. The syncretic character of the Bhagavad-Gītā, to a great extent, justifies the remark of Hopkins that it is a Kṛṣṇaite version of a Viṣṇuite poem (see ^{Hopkins} ~~Hopkins~~ Religions of India, p.389). In it Vāsudeva, the founder of Bhāgavatism, was identified with Viṣṇu (XI, 24, XI, 30), and Kṛṣṇa, the personal name of Vāsudeva, was given admission into the circle of Brahmanical gods as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. Thus the outcome of the rapprochement was the identification of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva with Viṣṇu, and the confession by Brahmanism of

the religious orthodoxy of Bhāgavatism (Grierson's Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India, p.8). One of the effects of the identification was that the object of worship became farther removed from devotees. So a craving was necessarily felt by the latter for a personal object of adoration. The Bhāgavata doctors had, therefore, to supply some connecting link between the worshipper and the worshipped. At this stage, two things were resorted to; one was the theory of Vyūhas or conditioned spirit (Mbh., XII, 340.36-40); and the other was the doctrine of incarnations (Mbh., XII, 340.73-87, 99-100). The Nārāyaṇīya section of the Sānti-Parva of the Mahābhārata (XII. 335-352) is the oldest religious literature of these semi-Brahmaised Bhāgavatas. During the third phase, Pāñcarātra transformed itself into Viṣṇuism (Radha Krishnan, Indian Philosophy, Part I, p.489). This period synchronises with the rise of some of the earliest Saṃhitās, which, in the matter of practice, constitute the Kalpasūtras, as it were, of the Vaiṣṇavas. This period was characterised by the rise of the cult of Śrī or Lakṣmī, who typifies the activity of Viṣṇu or Vāsudeva in finite existence. At this stage, Viṣṇu is the usual

I. It is difficult to say whether the doctrine of Vyūhas was native to the Pāñcarātras. Patañjali's Sūtra on Pāṇini (VI.3.6) probably refers to the said doctrine. Dr. Bhandarkar doubts it (Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism, p.13). The principle of Avatāra, however, underlies primitive Aryan thoughts (J. Hertel's Die sonne und Mitra, pp.69 and 79); but it cannot be determined with certitude whether the Pāñcarātra at its inception fell back upon that doctrine.

designation of the Supreme, although Viṣṇu and Vāsudeva were treated as identical (see Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, pp. 56 fl., 269 fl., etc.). Epigraphic records of the imperial Guptas, show the growing popularity of Avatāras, in preference to Vyūhas (see Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, pp. 56 fl., 158 fl., etc.). This is also one of the characteristic signs of the transformation of Bhāgavatism into Viṣṇuism. During this time, there was further augmentation of schemas or devices. God, at this stage, has assumed five forms, viz.: Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Antaryāmin, and Arcā, for the purpose of meditation, more than for anything else (see Viśvakṣena Saṁhitā, pp. 122 fl., Ahirbudhnyā Saṁhitā, XI, 62 fl., etc.).

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.

India has always been a land of religions. From the dawn of her culture and civilisation, her religion, philosophy, and mythology have been intermixed. Almost every dominant activity is wrapped up in a myth. And, as India is pre-eminently a country of creeds, so is her literature conspicuously priestly and religious. From the Veda to the last Purāṇa, religion forms the basis of the most important works, or, as in the case of the Epics, the basis of didactic excursions and sectarian interpolations, imparting to worldly themes a theological character. Grammar, systems of philosophy,

fables, commentaries, lyrics, and dramas, are all pressed into the service of religion. Nowhere is the texture of life so much impregnated by religious practices and convictions. From the beginning of India's history, religious institutions control the character and development of the people to an extent unknown elsewhere. Havell thus rightly observes: "In India, religion is hardly a dogma, but a working hypothesis of human conduct, adapted to different stages of spiritual development and different conditions of life" (See, ^{History of Arya Rule in India,} ~~the article on the~~ Heart of Hinduism, Hibbert Journal, October 1922). Hindu life is surrounded by institutions and practices, and clouded by superstitions which are discarded only by those who have worked their way to the highest philosophical aspects of religion. Hindu life from birth to death, or even after death, is sacramental or religious throughout. Life is an essentially solitary religious pilgrimage, the goal being personal salvation. The religious history of India does not really begin at the time when the Veda, the earliest literature, was composed: it begins much earlier. It shares a fairly clear common life with the ancient religion of Iran in a prehistoric time.

The Vedas, Brāhmanas, and Upaniṣads, works respectively of poets, priests, and philosophers, could not satisfy the religious spirit of the people. "The hymns of the Veda are to a considerable degree cloudy, turgid and mystic" (Bloomfield, Religion of the Vedic Veda, p.22). "The keynote and engrossing theme of Rg-Vedic thought is worship of personified powers of nature" (ibid., p.30). The Yajur-Veda represents the exceeding growth of ritualism, or sacerdotalism;

as time went by, gradually the main object, namely, devotion to the gods, is lost sight of; solemn, pompous performance, garnished with lip service occupies the centre of the stage. The progress of ceremonialism reached its zenith in the Brāhmanas, which are partly analogous to the Hebrew Talmud, as regards contents and literary quality. Thus, the religion which is contained in the main body of the hymns of the Rg-Veda, the Yajur-Veda, the Sāma-Veda, and the Brāhmanas, is a hieratic or priestly religion (Bloomfield, Religion of the Veda, p.60). Such a religion cannot engender genuine devotion in the heart of devotees. The religion is purely mechanical in character. It is not instinct with passionate religious ardour which a full-orbed theism can inspire. Moreover, this religion, as regards its immediate purpose, or its economic aspect, is thoroughly utilitarian and practical. "Reciprocity, frank unconditional reciprocity, thus becomes an accepted motive: 'Give thou to me, I give to thee,' is the formula" (Bloomfield, Religion of the Veda, p.184).

Various reactions set in against the sacrifice-ridden religion of the Brāhmanic period. It was a period of fermentation, both intellectual and religious. The Upanisads, which followed the Brāhmanas, are the expressions of reaction from the hieratic religion. It is generally believed that the Upanisads teach a system of Pantheism; but a closer examination will show that they teach not one, but various systems of doctrines regarding the nature of God,

man and the world, and the relations between them. It will not be far from truth to say that all the later religio-philosophic systems of the country are based upon the Upaniṣads. It has been aptly remarked by Bloomfield that "there is no important form of Hindu thought, heterodox Buddhism included, which is not rooted in the Upaniṣads" (Religion of the Veda, p.51). At any rate, some of the Upaniṣads, notably the Śvetāśvatara, contain doctrines which can be galvanised into the resemblance of a decent theism, which may to a certain extent lull the religious clamour of the people. However, the fact remains that the lofty idealism and thin abstractions of the Upaniṣads failed to capture ~~sentiment~~ the imagination, and kindle the religious sentiment of the people. Now before we begin the history of monotheism, something should be said about the geographical position of the various movements that resulted in the ultimate triumph and immense popularity of ~~monotheism~~ monotheism. The migration of the Aryans into India was a long process, extending over many generations (See Grierson's Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India, pp.5 fl1.). The long and continued struggle between various groups of invaders resulted in the overlordship of the Midland people. It was here that the Brāhmaṇa caste monopolised all priestly functions. As distinguished from the Midland, there was a tract called Outland, also inhabited by the Aryans, encircling the Midland on south, east and west. In the Outland, it was the Kṣatriyas who held the key of literature. It was in the Outland that the Sāṃkhya system of philosophy took

its birth. Here, later on, Śākya Simha and Mahāvīra, both Kṣatriyas, founded respectively the Buddhist and the Jain religions. It was here, while the Brāhmaṇas of the Midland were developing their pantheism, that the leading spirits of the Kṣatriyas thought out their monotheism (see E.R.E., Vol. II, pp. 540 fl.).

In our historical sketch of Pāñcarātra religion, we shall use the term Pāñcarātra as a synonym for Bhāgavatism. Strictly speaking, the former is not identical with the latter, although both have descended from the cognate church of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva. Many early writers overlooked the distinction between the two sects. But evidence, both historical and theological, militates against such an identification or confusion. Bāṇa's Harṣa-Carita (circa A.D. 630) clearly distinguished between them (see Harṣa-Carita, translated into English by E.B. Cowell and F.W. Thomas, chapter VIII, p. 236). Traditional Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās are the text-books of the Pāñcarātras, and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is the scripture of the Bhāgavatas. The cult of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, of which Pāñcarātra is one of the descendants, is involved in extreme obscurity. What Whitney says in regard to dates, "in Indian literary history", that they are so many "pins set up to be bowled down again", is so applicable to all hypotheses in this field, that a new opinion would do well to allow itself some considerable time to ripen. The origin of the Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva cult has been discussed again and again, and eminent scholars, with a single body

of evidence before them, have come to such utterly divergent conclusions, that it must now be admitted that no absolutely certain solution of the problem will be reached unless new and convincing evidence is discovered. We shall, however, offer our suggestions in the light of existing materials.

Before we begin to survey the cult of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, the most important monotheistic church^I of India, we shall try to ascertain whether such monotheism, as implied in the cult of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, is an indigenous fact, or of foreign origin, namely, a plagiarism from Christianity. Several scholars have tried to trace the germs of monotheism to various hymns of the R̥g-Veda, such as, I.164.46, X.72, X.81, X.90, X.114, X.129, etc., also to some hymns to Varuna (e.g. I.24.8, I.25.14, etc.) Vāk (see Barth's Religions of India, p.17; Bloomfield's Religion of the Veda, pp.24-44; Hopkins, Religions of India, p.63). It would probably be a fruitless task to seek for a full-orbed theism in the Vedic hymns, since the expressions of monotheism in the various hymns are really dim and faint. Moreover,

-
1. Hopkins regards the cult as sectarian pantheism, or, more properly, personal pantheism (Religions of India, p.388).
 2. Weber finds in the hymn to Vāk (X.125) the prototype of the logos doctrine (see Hopkins, Religions of India, p.143).

they have not the religious warmth, nor the glow of passionate ardour which a clear-cut, trenchant monotheism can inspire. We quite agree with Bloomfield when he considers the Vedic religion to be mechanical (Religion of the Veda, p.199). The same eminent scholar further characterises the religion of the Veda as "polytheism grown cold in service, and un-nice in its distinctions, leading to an opportunist monotheism in which every god takes hold of the sceptre and none keeps it" (ibid, p.199). On the other hand, several scholars opine that this monotheistic religion is of foreign origin, and was preached in India for the first time by Rāmānuja. Dr. Keith observes that the first great theistic movement in India is that of Rāmānuja, and that Christian influences are possible and even probable (J.R.A.S., 1915, pp.836-837). This misimpression, in our opinion, probably arises from not giving due weight to the indebtedness of Rāmānuja to those Ācāryas and Ālvārs, who had gone before him (see Krishna Swami Aiyangar's Śrī Rāmānuja, pp.2-4). It is also reasonable to conclude with T. Rajagopala Chariar that the earlier Ālvārs were the offshoots of the northern Bhāgavatas, otherwise their genealogy cannot be established (Vaiṣṇavite Reformers of India, p.140).

The Pāñcarātra, Bhāgavata, Sātvata, or Ekāntika religion is referred to in the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śānti-Parva of the Mahābhārata (Mbh, XII.336.19, 25; XII.337.44; XII.349.3; XII.350). In the Mahābhārata we find two different statements about the tradition of Pāñcarātra. According to XII.340.112-118, this religion was obtained by Nārada from Nārāyaṇa himself. Again, according to

XII.13441, it was told by the Lord Himself to Arjuna in the Bhagavad-Gītā. The date of Bhagavad-Gītā or of the Nārāyaṇīya section is uncertain; but we have direct archaeological evidence to prove the priority of the apotheosis of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva in India to the rise of Christianity. The Ghasundi stone inscription ^I speaks of a pūjā stone wall for the worship of Bhagavat Saṁkarsana and Vāsudeva (Lüders, List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 6, see Epigraphia Indica, Vol. X, Appendix, p.2, also J.A.S.B, Vol.LVI, ^{at,} pp.77-78). The Besnagar inscription ² mentions the erection of a flag-staff with an image of Garuḍa at the top in honour of Vāsudeva, the god of gods, by Heliodoros (Lüders, List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 669, see Epigraphia Indica, Vol.X, Appendix, p.63). In this inscription, Heliodoros, who styles himself a Bhāgavata, is an ambassador of Amtalikita, who, in all likelihood, is the same as Antialkidas of

1. Bühler assigns this record to the period between B.C.350 and 250 (see Indian Palaeography, English translation, p.32). Ramaprasad Chanda places it in the second century B.C. (Memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India, No. 5, p.163).

2. Ramaprasad Chanda points out that the archaic type of Brāhmī characters used in the inscription indicates that it was probably engraved in the first half of the second century B.C. In the opinion of this scholar, the Besnagar inscription antedates the Ghasundi inscription (Memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India, No. 5, pp.151 and 163).

the Bactro-Greek coins. Antialkidas is supposed to be one of the earlier members of the line of Eucratides, who came to the throne of Bactria about 171 B.C. after ousting Demetrius (Rapson, *Ancient India*, Cambridge, 1914, pp.124 and 134). The Nānāghāt cave inscription contains an adoration of Saṃkarsana and Vāsudeva (Lüderö, *List of Brāhmī inscriptions*, No. 1112, see *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. X, Appendix, p.121).

All three epigraphic records, particularly the Besnagar inscription, clearly show that Vāsudeva was worshipped as the god of gods, and his worshippers were called Bhāgavatas. This fact enables us to trace back the existence of the sect to the age of Pāṇini; for we should recognise in the Vāsudevakas of that grammarian (Sūtra IV. 3.98)² the precursors of the Bhāgavatas of the second century B.C. But the exact date of Pāṇini is uncertain. Macdonell (*History of*

1. Bühler places the Nānāghāt inscription in 150 B.C. (Bühler, Table II, Columns XVII and XXIII-XXIV).

2. The meaning of the term tatrabhavat has been the subject of a good deal of controversy. Kielhorn writes "In either case the word tatrabhavataḥ, by which saṃjñaiṣā is followed, does not in the least suggest that the passage denoted by the proper name is a divine being; the word indeed conveys an honorific sense, but would be equally applicable to a human being (J.R.A.S., 1908, p.503). From the context both Vāsudeva and Arjuna of the Sūtra IV.3.98, are to be understood as Kṣatriyas (Weber, *Indian Literature*, p.185, n.). Hopkins goes so far as to state that in Pāṇini's Sūtra they were only objects of such worship as is accorded to most Hindu heroes after death (*Great Epic of India*, p.395, n.). Two other eminent authorities, Dr. Keith (J.R.A.S., 1908, pp.847-848) and Dr. Bhandarkar (J.R.A.S., 1910, pp.168-170), are of opinion that tatrabhavat in this case, as in Patañjali's commentary on Pāṇini IV, 2.25, refers to a divine being. Later Indian commentators, like the authors of the Kāśikā, understand Pāṇini to denote a divine being by Vāsudeva in IV, 3.98 (also see Grierson in J.R.A.S., 1909, p.1122).

Sanskrit Literature, p.17) and Weber (Indian Literature, p.217) place him in the fourth century B.C. In the opinion of Hopkins, it cannot be conclusively proved that he flourished before the third century B.C. (Great Epic of India, p.391). Dr. Bhandarkar thinks that he must have flourished in the beginning of the seventh century B.C., if not earlier still (Early History of Dekkan, Second edition, p.9).

It is unanimously admitted that Pāṇini flourished before Patañjali (second century B.C.) who wrote the Mahabhāṣya on his Sūtras (see V.A. Smith's E.H.I., Third Edition, p.214). It is also certain that he must have lived even before Kātyāyana, a predecessor of Patañjali, who wrote the Vārttikas on Pāṇini's grammar. If Kātyāyana's date, the fourth century B.C., ^{be relied upon, Pāṇini must have} ~~(see Bhandarkar's~~ lived before the fourth century B.C. ^{(see Bhandarkar's} E.H.D. p.7; Smith's E.H.I. Third Edition p.451, n; also Goldstücker's Pāṇini, 1914, pp.63, 68 and 93). In all probability, he lived in the fifth century B.C. The interval of a century between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana is not too short, in view of the fact that "the oldest author on record who wrote on Pāṇini was Kātyāyana" (Goldstücker's Pāṇini, p.90). This hypothesis may be strengthened by the fact that, unlike later grammarians, he never alludes to the Yavanas or Sakas as fighting races, and that he knows the Persians as a warlike people (V.3.117). The Bhāgavata sect must have arisen before the fifth century B.C., since Pāṇini flourished in that century.

1. The actual word occurring there, is parśu, pārśava being the derivative of parśu.

There is no literary evidence as to the train of reasoning by which the doctrine of monotheism was reached. But it appears reasonable to endorse the view of Dr. Grierson that it was a development of sun-worship, the common heritage of the Indo-Iranian (Indian Antiquary 1908, p.253; also Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India, p.6.).

All the legends dealing with the origin of Bhāgavata religion are connected in some way or other with the sun. According to Mahābhārata (XII.340.112-18), this religion was first obtained by Nārada from Nārāyaṇa, who communicated it to the sun, who in turn, taught it to mankind. Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva learnt the reverence for the sun from Ghora Āṅgīrasa, and transmitted the same to his followers (see Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III.17). In the later stages of Bhāgavata religion Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva is identified with Viṣṇu, who was worshipped as a sun-god. According to Bhāgavata eschatology (Mbh., XII.345.13-18) the saved soul ^apasses through the sun on its way to Bhagavat after death. Rāmacandra, one of the incarnations, was, by human origin, a descendant of the sun. Some of the legends of Bhāgvatism are connected with the sun. ^{Sugrīva}~~Sugrīva~~ had the sun for his father. Satrājīta, Kṛṣṇa's father-in-law, was a sun-worshipper, and received from the sun a jewel that became the subject of many stories. The Bhakta-Māla mentions the miracle performed by Kṛṣṇa with the aid of the cooking-pot given to Draupadī by the sun. Viṣṇu's Garuda and Kaustubha are connected with solar legends (see Macdonell's Vedic Mythology, p.39; ~~Macdonell's~~ ^{Macdonell's} Indian Mythology according to the

Mahābhārata in outline, London, 1903, pp. 82, 105 and 130). The Garuḍadhvaja of the Besnagar inscription was a symbol of the Bird of the sun (See ~~Th~~ Thausboll's Indian Mythology, p. 80; also Mbh, 1.33. 16-17).

Whether monotheism was a development of the sun-worship or not, the following facts may be taken as accepted:

I Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, a ksatriya, was the founder of this religion. He sprang from the ancient Śatvata or Vṛṣṇi branch of the Outland Yādava tribe. Their home, perhaps, was in the

1. Non-Vedic or non-Brahmanic origin of this religion has been strongly emphasized by Dr. Bhandarkar (Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS., pp. 72 and 74) and Professor Garbe (E.R.E., Vol. II, pp. 535 fl.; also Philosophy of Ancient India, pp. 83). Mr. Chanda points out that the un-Vedic or un-Brahmanic Pāncaratra evidently grew out of the primitive worship of Sankarsana, Vāsudeva and other Vṛṣṇi chiefs, such as Vāsudeva's son Pradyumna, and his grandson Aniruddha, as hero-gods, by the barbarian Ābhīras and Saurāṣṭras. The religion of the Bhagavad-Gītā, on the other hand, represents the orthodox phase of Vāsudevism, in its fully developed form. He believes that the worship of Vāsudeva as the founder of the Bhagavad-Gītā and the Anu-Gītā, originated among the Vṛṣṇis, Andhakas and Kurus, and was handed down by them to the Sūrasenas (Memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India, No. 5, p. 166).

I

neighbourhood of Mathurā. Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva's father's name was Vasudeva, and his mother's Devakī; he had an elder brother named Balarama or Balarasana (Mbh., II. 79. 23). In the older parts of the Mahābhārata he appears in the twofold character of a mighty warrior, and of a religious reformer. Religion was at first adopted by the people of his own tribe, and gradually spread over the greater part of the Outland. Before the fourth century B.C., as in the case of Buddha and Mahāvīra, he was deified, and under his patronymic of Vāsudeva, became identified with Bhagavat (see E.R.E., Vol. II, pp. 540 fl.).

Having thus stated our view, we shall now proceed to lay down the various theories that have been adduced by other scholars regarding the genesis of this cult. According to Hopkins, "The Viṣṇu-worship^{which} grew about Kṛṣṇa was probably at first an attempt to foist

-
- I. Dr. Bhandakar holds that Vāsudeva was not originally a patronymic, but the name of a member of the Śātvata or Vṛṣṇi race, who had a religion of their own, in which Vāsudeva was worshipped as the Supreme Being. Regarding the early mentions of Kṛṣṇa, he observes: "There was a tradition about Kṛṣṇa as a sage from the time of the Rg-Vedic hymns to the time of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. This tradition gave rise to the identification of the sage Kṛṣṇa with Vāsudeva, when he was raised to the rank of the Supreme Deity". He suggests that this identification may have been due to the fact that Vāsudeva belonged to the Kṛṣṇāyaya gotra (see Bhandarkar's Vaisṇavism, pp. 9-11; for the rejection of the theory of the separation of Kṛṣṇa and Vāsudeva as two entities, see J.R.A.S., 1915, p. 840).

upon Vedic believers a sectarian god, by identifying the latter with a Vedic divinity" (R.I., p.388). "The simple original view of Kṛṣṇa is that he is a god, the son of Devakī" (ibid, p.467). Barth thinks that Kṛṣṇa is "beyond all doubt, a popular divinity", and that there is a "connection between the attainment of supremacy by Viṣṇu and his identification with Kṛṣṇa" (R.I., p.166). "The supremacy of the Brahmanic god was the result of his fusion with the popular god" (ibid, p.166). Dr. Keith finds in Kṛṣṇa a development from one of the vegetation deities. He remarks: "It is clear that from this original divine character of Kṛṣṇa as the spirit of reviving vegetation we can derive his whole character, both as a child and as a hero, for the vegetation spirit has both sides in the Greek Dionysos, who is in this aspect parallel to Kṛṣṇa, and the legend of ^{Kamba}~~Kamsa~~ is a mythological invention based upon the ritual of (a) the child-god and (b) the slaying of a rival - the old spirit of vegetation or some similar conception by the new spirit" (J.R.A.S., 1915, p.841).

It may be observed that there is no direct and positive evidence to support such theories. Dr. Keith's interpretation of the Mahābhāṣya passage is extremely doubtful, and is not accepted by all. The meaning of the passage is thus given by Dr. Bhandarkar: "The narrators give expression to what they may know about them (Kamsa and Kṛṣṇa) from their birth to their death, and thus externally manifest what at the time exists internally, and that the things do exist internally or in the mind, is shown in this way. They (the

narrators) are of various kinds, some are adherents or devotees of Kamsa, and some of Vāsudeva. Their countenances assume different colours; the faces of some (whose favourite hero is defeated) become dark, the faces of others red" (Indian Antiquary, 1874, p.15). Thus there is no reference to the slaying of the black man by the red man, or to the slaying of winter by the spirit of spring and summer.

Although it may be inferred with certitude that the Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva cult was closely associated with the sun, it is not obvious for that reason that Kṛṣṇa himself was a solar deity. The pre-epic I literature of the Hindus testifies to the human character of Kṛṣṇa. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad, one of the oldest Upaniṣads, and belonging to the pre-Buddhistic period (S.B.E., Vol. I, Introduction, p. LXVII), mentions Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra as a human being, a disciple of Ghorā Āṅgīrasa (III. 17.6). The Buddhist Ghata-Jātaka as well as the Jaina ^{lit} Nīlavarādhyaṇa Sūtra (Lecture XXII) certify the human character of Kṛṣṇa. Max Müller denies the identity of the Kṛṣṇa of the Upaniṣad with the Kṛṣṇa of the epic (S.B.E., Vol. I, p. 52, n.). Macdonell doubts the identity (Vedic Index of Names and Subjects, Vol. I, p. 184). Dr. Keith has elaborately dealt with the subject in J.R.A.S., 1915 (pp. 548-550). He remarks, "In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (III. 17.6) we hear of a pupil, Kṛṣṇa-Devakīputra,

1. The human character of Krsna has been acknowledged by Garbe (Philosophy of Ancient India, pp.83-85), Bühler (Indian Antiquary, 1894, p.248), Grierson (Indian Antiquary, 1908, p.253), Bhandarkar (Indian Antiquary, 1889, p.189), and Dr. Seal (Comparative Studies in Vaisnavism and Christianity, p.10).

of Ghora Āṅgīrasa, who is credited with certain doctrines. We are asked to believe that this is an historical reference to the Kṛṣṇa of the epic. It is a much more credible hypothesis on the theory of identity of the Kṛṣṇas, that we have in this Kṛṣṇa a euhemerism, a reduction to human rank of a tribal god, and it is the only hypothesis which does not raise serious difficulties as to the date of the divinity of Kṛṣṇa and his appearance in the epic. That text never treats Kṛṣṇa as a mere ordinary mortal teacher; when he teaches, he reveals himself as the Supreme Being, and we cannot ignore the fact that his divine nature is clearly known throughout the epic, which, in a part claimed as old by Garbe^(II. 291), calls him Gopījana Vallabha, revealing him already as the beloved of the Gopīs, a feature which sits oddly on a presumed warrior-teacher, but which accords well with a god of Kṛṣṇa's type, closely connected with pastoral life. Moreover, it is impossible to ignore the fact that in the epic Kṛṣṇa appears in his actions, and his practical advice, in a very different aspect from the Kṛṣṇa of the Upaniṣad, who appears in a passage where, among other virtues, the telling of truth is inculcated" (Chā, III. 17.4).

With reference to Dr. Keith's remarks regarding the difference between the characters of the epic and Upaniṣadic Kṛṣṇas, it may be observed that one and the same man may appear in different phases or aspects. But this difference in aspects should not be made the sole and absolute basis of separate identities (cf. Aśoka of the Chronicles with that of the fifth and thirteenth Rock Edicts). Dr. Keith also overlooks the fact that truth-telling has been inculcated by Kṛṣṇa in

the Gītā (XVI.2) and also in Book VII.179-29 of the epic. Furthermore, the epic has preserved distinct traces of the original character of Kṛṣṇa as a human being. Barth accepts the identity of ^{the} Kṛṣṇas, but regards the mention of Kṛṣṇa in the Upaniṣad as a euhemerism (R.I., p.168). The theory of Barth appears to be an unsound one, when we consider the parallel or analogous case of Buddha. In the Saddharmapundarīka (VII.31) Buddha is not merely deva; he is devātideva. Again, in the Dhammacakkappavattanasutta, he is mentioned as a human teacher. Merely on the strength of this statement, it cannot be contended that the mention of Buddha in Dhammacakkappavattanasutta is a piece of euhemerism.

Having thus set forth the views of other scholars, we shall now proceed to advance our arguments to prove the identity of the Kṛṣṇas. They may be briefly summarised thus:-The Kṛṣṇa of the Upaniṣad (Chāndogya, III.17.6) is the son of Devakī, the Kṛṣṇa of the epic (I.190.33, III. 29.46, etc.) is also called the son of Devakī (cf. the Bhitari Pillar inscription of Skandagupta, where Kṛṣṇa is mentioned as the son of Devakī). Kṛṣṇa learnt from Ghora Āṅgīrasa, a priest of the sun, the following doctrines:- The life of a man in its various states, may be compared to various ceremonies observed in ritual sacrifices; the mystic meaning of sacrifice is the life of man himself. Austerity, almsgiving, uprightness, harmlessness, truthfulness (tapo dānam ārjavam ahimsā satyavacanam), - these are one's gifts for the priests. At the hour of death, one should meditate upon

these three: "Thou art the Imperishable, the Never-falling, and the very ~~Essence~~ of Life". Hearing this, Kṛṣṇa is said to have lost all thirst for other knowledge. The sage then quotes two verses, bearing on the subject (Chāndogya, III.17.7):-

"Proceeding from primeval seed,
 (The early morning light they see,
 That gleameth higher than the heaven).
 From out of darkness all around,
 We, gazing on the higher light -
 Yea, gazing on the higher light -
 To Śūrya, god among the gods,
 We have attained - the highest light!
 - Yea, the highest light!"

(Dr. Hume's translation, see Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads, p.213).

The doctrines which Kṛṣṇa learnt from his Guru, reappear in the Gītā. In the Upaniṣad, Kṛṣṇa learnt that all the acts of man's life constitute a sort of sacrifice offered to God. We may compare this doctrine with the teaching of Gītā, IX.27:- "Whatever ^{work} thou doest, whatever thou dost eat, whatever thou dost sacrifice or give, whatever be thine austere practices, do all, O son of Kuntī, as an offering to Me" (See Hill's Translation of the Bhagavad-Gītā, p.187). The virtues mentioned in the Upaniṣad occur in the Gītā (XVI.1-3). The importance of the last thoughts, is taught in the Gītā (VIII, 5, 6, 13). The remembrance of Kṛṣṇa leads to the Home that is called "Imperishable (Gītā, VIII.11-13). Three times in the Gītā, Kṛṣṇa is called Acyuta, e.g. Never-falling (1.21, XI.42, XVIII.73).

Having thus established the identity of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, let us now try to trace the fortunes of Bhāgavatism, of which he was the founder, in the light of literary and epigraphic records. In the fourth century B.C., the strongest adherents of Vāsudeva were to be found only in the Mathurā region; for we learn from Megasthenes that the people who held Herakles in special honour were the Sourasenoi, who possessed two large cities, Methara and Kleisabora, and through whose country flowed a navigable river called the Jobares (McCrindle, Megasthenes and Arrian, p.201). The Indian Herakles has been identified by some scholars with Kṛṣṇa, and by others with Śiva. The reasons for the latter view are thus stated by Kennedy:- "The identification of the Indian Herakles is fairly easy. The Greek Herakles figures on the Indo-Scythic coins of Kadphises I, and is replaced by the Indian Śiva on coins of Kadphises II, under the name of Oeshe, and with various attributes, including the club, Śiva figures on coins of Kaniska, Huviska and Vāsudeva. Mr. D.R. Bhandarkar has shown that the incarnation of Śiva as Lakulīśa, "the Lord who bears the club", goes back to this period. It is held that the name of the people called Sibi in Sanskrit - the Sibai of the Greek writers, who mention them as descendants of the followers of Herakles - marks them as special worshippers of Śiva, the letters *Ḥ* and V being constantly interchanged. Lastly, Herakles' daughter, Pandaia, recalls the Kingdom of Pandion or Pāṇḍya, a famous Kingdom of Southern India, while we infer from the 'P^{er}icplus' that Kumārī was especially worshipped at Cape Comorin. Now, the Dravidians of this

region are still noted for their devotion to Śiva, and Kumārī is at once his Śakti, his daughter, and his wife" (J.R.A.S., 1907, pp. 967-68).

The view of Kennedy has been strongly criticised by Ramaprasad Chanda in Memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India, No. 5, pp. 155 fl. The latter scholar points out that "the absence of the trident, a necessary attribute of Śiva, renders this identification very doubtful" (ibid., p. 155). In the Mahābhārata, and in all other texts, gadā or club is mentioned as an attribute, not of Śiva, but of Viṣṇu. Śiva is śūlin, the holder of the trident, and pinākin, the holder of the bow pināka, while ^{Viṣṇu} is Saṅkhacakra-gadādhara, the holder of conchshell, discus (sudarsana) and club (Fausboll's Indian Mythology, ^{pp. 157 and} p. 105). Therefore, it is more reasonable to identify the Indian Herakles with Viṣṇu than with Śiva. Regarding the identity of the Indian Herakles, Hopkins observes: "According to him (Megasthenes) there were Dionysiac festivals in honour of the latter god (Śiva), who belongs where flourishes ^{the} wine, in the Asvaka district, north of the Kabul river. From this place, Śiva's worship extended into the East, Magadha (Behar), around Gokarna in the west, and even to the ^{Kalinga} Kātunga country in the extreme south-east. But it was especially native to the mountainous north-west, about the Gate of Ganges (north of Delhi, near Saharampur), and still further north in Kāśmīr. In the Epic, Śiva has his throne on ^{Kailāsa} Kaitasa, the northern mountain, in the Himālayas, and Ganges descend from the sky, upon his head. On the other hand, Herakles of the Ganges land, where grows no wine, is plainly Kṛṣṇa, who carries club, discus and conch.

The Greek cities, Methora and Kleisobora, are Mathurā and Kṛṣṇa - pur 'Kṛṣṇa-town', the latter on the Jumna, the former near it on the same river, capital of the clan which venerated Kṛṣṇa as its chief hero and god, the Yādavas. Megasthenes says, also, that Herakles' daughter is Pandaia, and this agrees with the Pāṇḍya, a southern development of the epic Gangetic Pāṇḍavas, who specially worship Kṛṣṇa, in conjunction with the Yādavas. Their South-Indian town, Mathurā, still attests their origin " (Religions of India, pp.458 and 459; for the like identification, see McCrindle, Megasthenes and Arrian, p.140, n; Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p.64,n; Indian Antiquary, 1876, p.334; also Keith in J.R.S.A. 1915, pp.547-50). It is a noticeable fact that the Bhāgavatas are almost ignored in the ancient literary and epigraphic records of the Buddhists in Magadha, but are constantly mentioned, from the time of Pāṇini onwards, in the records of the western part of Northern India. There is a solitary reference to the worshippers of Vāsudeva and Baladeva in a passage of the Niddesa (see Dr. Bhandarkar's Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism, p.3.). In this book, the worshippers of Vāsudeva are mentioned along with those of birds and beasts. We hear little about the Bhāgavatas in the third century B.C. But there is a good deal of information regarding the sect in the second century B.C. It is probably due to the preferential treatment accorded to Buddhism by Aśoka, and also due to the proselytising zeal displayed by the same monarch for the propagation of his creed, that the Bhāgavatas were hurled

down

down from their position of pre-eminence, in some parts of North India, to one of obscurity. Whatever might have been the state of the Bhāgavatas in the third century B.C., we learn from the Ghasundi and Besnagar inscriptions that the Bhāgavata religion in the second century B.C. spread to the Indian borderland, and counted among its adherents even some of the Greeks.

The Ghasundi stone inscription records the erection of a pūjā stone-wall (śiṭāprākāra) at the Nārāyaṇavāṭa by Gaṇḍāyana, the son of a Pārāsarī, for Bhagavat Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva (J.A.S.B., Vol. LVI, Pt. I, pp. 77-78; Lüders, List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 6, see Epigraphia Indica, Vol. X, Appendix, p. 2.). We next come to the Besnagar column inscription (Lüders, List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 669, see Epigraphia Indica, Vol. X, Appendix, p. 63).

The first part of the inscription records the erection of a Garuḍadhvaṇḍa of Vāsudeva, the God of gods, by the Bhāgavata Heliadora, the son of Diya (Dion), the Takhkhasilāka (native of Taxila), a Yona₂ ambassador, who came from Mahārāja Antalikita (Antialkidas) to rājan Kāśīputa Bhāgabhaṇdra the saviour (trātāra),

-
1. The worship of Saṃkarṣaṇa is alluded to in Kaṭṭiya's Arthaśāstra (Shamsastry's English translation, p. 485).
 2. Antialkidas is supposed to have reigned in the second century B.C. (See Smith's History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, pp. 65-66).

who was prospering in the fourteenth year of his reign. The second part of the inscription reads as follows: "Three immortal precepts when practised lead to heaven - self-restraint, charity and conscientiousness". This inscription furnishes the first clear indication of the apotheosis of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva. Mr. Chawda points out that the archaic type of Brāhmī characters used in the inscription of Heliodoros, indicates that it was probably engraved sometime in the first half of the second century B.C. (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 5, p.152). The Garuḍadhvaḥja points to the close connection between Vāsudeva and solar worship, since Garuḍa or Suparna is connected with Viṣṇu and other sun-gods (see Mbh. I.33. 16-17; Fausboll's Indian Mythology, p.80). Garutman is associated with Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu (Bodhāyana's Dharma-Sūtra II.5.24). Again, the three immortal precepts, dama, tyāga, and apramāda, appear to be an echo of the Gītā, XVI.1-2, where dama, tyāga and apramāda are inculcated. There are also the remains of another Vaiṣṇavite archaeological document at Besnagar. These are the capital of a column, and a makara, which originally surmounted the capital now lying by it, a few yards off the column of Heliodoros. These sculptures cannot be chronologically far removed from Khārm Bābū, i.e., the column of Heliodoros (see A.S.R., 1913-14, Part II, pp.189-190). It has been well contended by Mr. Chawda that we have to recognise in the makara and the capital the remnants of a Makara-dhvaḥja or a "column with crocodile symbol", since there has been a striking consensus of opinion among such scholars as Cunningham,

Marshall and Bhandarkar regarding the Makara being the pinnacle of the capital (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 5, p.162). In Sanskrit literature, Kṛṣṇa's son Pradyumna is called Makaradhvaja or Makaraketana, 'one with the crocodile as his symbol'. In some of the Greco-Buddhist sculptures of Gandhāra, one of Māra's daughter is seen holding a staff with a makara on it (ibid, p.162). In Mahāvastu and Lalitavistara, Māra is called Kṛṣṇa-bandhu, 'Kṛṣṇa's kinsman'. From all this evidence, both literary and sculptural, Mr. Chanda concludes that the Makaradhvaja presupposes the existence of a temple of Pradyumna or an image of Pradyumna in the temple of Vāsudeva, just as Garudadhvaja presupposes a temple of Vāsudeva (ibid, p.163).

The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali throws out a significant hint on the condition of the Bhāgavatas in the second century B.C. (see Indian Antiquary, Vol. III, pp.14-16). Patañjali regarded Vāspudeva not as a mere Kṣatriya, but as a divine being. Under Pāṇini IV, 3.98, he says that the word Vāsudeva is the name of Bhagavat, and not of a Kṣatriya; for the name of Vāsudeva comes under Sūtra IV.3.99, in the capacity of a divine being. The story of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva in the time of Patañjali, was the subject of dramatic representations in some such legends as Bali-Bhanda and Kamsa-Vadha (see Barth's R.I., p.163). Weber points out that the first subject has been taken from the legend of Viṣṇu. He then draws the inference that Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu already stood in close relationship (J.R.A.S., 1908, p.172). Patañjali notices under Pāṇini II.2.34, a verse in which it is stated that musical instruments were sounded in the temples of Rāma and Keśava.

In this verse, Kesava refers to Kṛṣṇa. Kesava was an epithet of Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu, according to Bodhāyana's Dharmasūtra (II.5.24). Kesava thus indicates that he was identified with Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu. The exact period when Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva was first identified with Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu cannot be ascertained. It cannot be conclusively proved whether Viṣṇu had any connection with the church of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva from its inception or not. But as it has been shown by Dr. Bhandarkar (Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS., pp.72-74) and Professor Garbe (E.R.E., Vol. II pp.535 fl.; Philosophy of Ancient India, p.83-85) that originally the church had an altogether independent existence, untrammelled by the Brahmanic pantheon, the identification might probably have taken place during the second stage. A clear indication of the identification of Vāsudeva with Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu is found in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (X.I.6)^I. But the date of the work is uncertain. If we agree with Dr. Keith that the Āraṇyaka dates from the third century B.C. (J.R.A.S., 1915, p.840), it would not be unreasonable to conclude with Garbe that it was the life and death struggle of the Brāhmaṇas against the active propaganda of the Buddhists that led the Vedic priests to identify Vāsudeva with Viṣṇu, for the purpose of winning over the Bhāgavatas as their allies (see Garbe's Bhagavad-Gītā, p.35). The Mahābhārata contains indications that it was with great difficulty that the ^{orthodox} ~~orthodox~~ Brāhmaṇas could

be induced to acknowledge the divinity of Kṛṣṇa. In the reviling scene of the Sabhā-Parva (Mbh., II.42.6) Śiśupāla contests Kṛṣṇa's claim to the rank as god. In the Ādi-Parva (Mbh., I.197.33) he is represented to be a hair of Nārāyaṇa. Again, in the same Parva (I.228.10) he is identified with Nārāyaṇa, but this Nārāyaṇa is a ṛṣi, not the deity. In the Bhagavad-Gītā (XI.24, XI.30) he is identified with Viṣṇu, and in chapters 65 and 66 of the Bhīṣma-Parva Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, Viṣṇu and Nārāyaṇa are treated as equivalent terms. The burden of the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Sānti-Parva seems to be the identification of Vāsudeva with Nārāyaṇa. The Mahābhārata thus contains several layers of thought, one superimposed upon another in the course of ages, representing Kṛṣṇa in various grades from a historical character to the avatāra of Viṣṇu. The identification was universally accepted when the epic was complete. Towards the concluding stage of this chapter, we shall make an analytical study of Viṣṇu and Nārāyaṇa, to find out the *raison d'être* of the identification of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva with the above-mentioned deities.

Let us then resume our thread of connection, for a time lost in digression. Besides the inscriptions discovered at Ghasundi and Besnagar, we have another valuable record, which testifies to the growing importance of Bhāgavatism in the period immediately preceding the Christian era. The Nānāghāt inscription shows that the Bhāgavata religion was no longer confined to Northern India, but had

migrated to the south, and converted people of Mahārāṣṭra to this faith (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. X, Appendix, p.121). The famous inscription records, after an invocation of Dhamma (Dharma), Ida (Indra), Saṃkarsana and Vāsudeva, the descendants of the moon (camda= candra), the guardians (lokapālas) of the four cardinal points, Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera and Vāsava, the fees given at various sacrifices by the daughter of the Mahārāṣṭri Kālāyā, the scion of the Amgiya family, the wife of Siri, the mother of Prince Vedisiri, the son of a king who is called Lord of Dakṣiṇāpatha, and mother of Sati Sirimata. The importance of the Nānāghāt inscription in the history of Bhāgavatism can hardly be overrated. The appearance of Saṃkarsana and Vāsudeva among Brahmanic gods shows that the rapprochement between the Brāhmanas and the Bhāgavatas had already begun. Next we come to the obscure and damaged Mora stone-slab inscription of the time of the Mahākṣatrapa Rājuvula. This valuable record furnishes evidence of the prevalence of Bhāgavatism before the beginning of the Christian era. Mr. Chanda points out that the stone-slab is probably one of the pavement slabs of a big temple, in which the images of Kṛṣṇa and the five Pāṇḍava brothers were enshrined (see Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 5, p.167).

The history of Bhāgavatism, from the first to the third century A.D., is very obscure. The Buddhist works of the period, such as Buddhacarita, and the Awakening of Faith of Aśvaghosa, do not throw much light upon the subject. We can only

mention three famous inscriptions of the period, which yield certain materials for the history of Bhāgavatism. These are (1) the Mathurā inscription of the time of the Mahākṣatrapa Śodāsa (Annual Progress Report of the Superintendent, Hindu and Buddhist Monuments, Northern Circle, for the year ending 31st March 1917, p.10), ⁽²⁾ the Nāsik Buddhist cave inscription of the time of rājan Vāsithiputa Sirī-Pulumāyī (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, p.60 fl.) and (3) the Cinna Stone inscription of the time of rājan Gotamiputa Sirī-Yaṇasātakanī (Lüden's List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 1340). Referring to the Mathurā inscription, Mr. Chanda observes: "The find place of the stone (Mathurā) renders the restoration of the name of the Bhagavat of the inscription as Vāsudeva unavoidable. If it may be assumed that the monument to which this inscribed red sandstone pillar originally belonged stood at Mathurā, - and the occurrence of the name of the Mahākṣatrapa Śodāsa ^I strengthens this assumption, - the Bhagavat whose 'mahāsthāna' is at ^a Mathurā can be no other than Vāsudeva" (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 5, p.170). In the opinion of Mr. Chanda, the mahāsthāna may be understood to denote a spot sacred to the memory of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva - a spot believed to have been either the birth-place of Kṛṣṇa, or the scene of some other notable event in his early career (ibid, p.172). In the Nāsik inscription, the name Kṛṣṇa (Kṛṣṇa) occurs in the following passage: "the unique

-
1. Sir John Marshall allots the reign of Śodāsa to a period between A.D. 10 and 20 (A Guide to Taxila, p.21).

archer, the unique hero, the unique Brāhmaṇa, in ^{process} ~~process~~ equal to Rāma, Keśava, Arjuna, and Bhīmasena" (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, p.61). The Cinna inscription of the time of rājan Gotamiputa Siṅg-Yāna-sātakaṇi contains an invocation of Bhagavat Vāsudeva (Lüders, List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 1340, also Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, pp. 95 fl.).

Mathurā, the birth-place of Bhāgavatism, where Megasthenes had found the religion in a flourishing condition, ceased to be the stronghold of the faith during the Śaka-Kuṣāṇ period. Only one inscription, namely, the Mathurā inscription of the time of the Mahākṣatrapa Śodāsa, can be referred to Northern India. The paucity of Bhāgavata inscriptions at Mathurā probably indicates that Bhāgavatism did not find much favour at the royal court. During the period which elapsed from the time of Śodāsa to the age of the Guptas - a period which may be characterised as a dark spectrum of Ancient Indian history - no inscription is at present available to throw any light on the state of Bhāgavatism in Northern India.. But during the Gupta period, we find the religion

-
- I. "The period between the extinction of the Kuṣāṇ and Āndhra, about A.D. 220 or 230, and the rise of the imperial Gupta Dynasty, nearly a century later, is one of the darkest in the whole range of Indian history" (Smith's Early History of India, Fourth Edition, p.292).

flourishing in the Punjab, Rajputana, Central and Western India, and Magadha.

The Tusām Rock inscription, which does not refer itself, to the reign of any king, and is not dated, but which, on palaeographical grounds, may be allotted to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, mentions two reservoirs for the use of the god Viṣṇu, under the name of Bhagavat or the Divine One, which are the work of Ārya Śatvata-Yogācārya-Bhagavad-Bhakta Yaśastrāta (Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. V, p.138 fll., Plate XL, No. 5; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.269 fll. No. 67, Plate XL.A). The undated Meharauli^l iron pillar inscription is a posthumous eulogy of the conquests of a powerful king named Candra. The object of this inscription is to record the erection of the pillar, which is called a dhvaja, or 'standard' of the God Viṣṇu, on a hill called Viṣṇupada, i.e., hill that is marked with foot-prints of Viṣṇu (Bo. Br. R.A.S., Vol. X, p.63 fll.; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, No. 32, Plate XXI A, p.139 fll.). Mr. Haraprasad Shastri identifies the Candra Varman of the Śūśunīā inscription with the Candra of the Meharauli^l iron pillar inscriptions (Indian Antiquary, 1913, p.217 fll.). Prinsep assigned this inscription to the third or fourth century A.D. (Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.140, n). Fergusson is convinced that the inscription is one of Candraguptas of the Early Gupta dynasty (Indian Architecture, p.508). The Gaṅgadhār stone inscription, of the time of a prince named Viśavarmā, records the erection of a temple of Viṣṇu by a certain Mayūrakṣaka, a minister of Viśvavarmā. This inscription is dated, in words, when four hundred and eighty years had expired. The era is not specified, but

probably the date has to be referred to the Malava era, commencing B.C. 57; and the result for the present inscription is A.D. 424-25 current (Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, No. 17, Plate X, p.72 fll.).

The coins of the Traikūṭaka King Dahrasena, the son of Indradatta, describe him as Paramavaishnava. Dahrasena flourished about A.D. 456 (J.R.A.S., 1905, pp.801-804). The Gupta sovereigns were mighty

champions of Bhāgavatism, and styled themselves ^{Pa}rama-Bhāgavatas" (see Gadhwā stone inscription of Candragupta II in Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.36 fll., where the title Parama-Bhāgavata occurs).

The general prevalence of the religion throughout the Gupta empire is attested by numerous inscriptions and ^{ulb}scriptures. The Udayagiri cave inscription of the year 83 (Gupta era) records the gift or dedication of two images, one of Viṣṇu, the other of a twelve-armed goddess who must be some form of Lakṣmī, by a Mahārāja of the Sanakānika ^{tribe or} family, who was a feudatory of Candragupta II

(Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. I, p.50; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.21 fll., No. 3, Plate II B). The undated Bhitārī stone pillar inscription of Skandagupta records the installation of an image of god Viṣṇu under the name of Śārṅgin or "the wielder of the ^{bo}ne of horn named Śārṅga", and the allotment to the idol of a village by the emperor in memory of his father Kumāragupta (Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. I, p.98, Plate XXX; Corp. Ins. Ind.,

Vol. III, p.52 fll.). The Junāgaḍh rock inscription of Skandagupta contains an invocation of Viṣṇu, "the perpetual abode of ^{Lakṣmī,} dākṣiṇ, whose

dwelling is the water-lily, the conqueror of distress, the completely victorious one, who, for the sake of the happiness of the lord of gods, seized back from Bali the goddess of wealth and splendour, who is admitted to be worthy of enjoyment and who had been kept away *from him* for a long time". The second part of the inscription records the erection of a temple of Cak^arbhrt (the bearer of the discus) by Cakrapalita who was the son of Parnadatta, the governor of Skandagupta (J.A.S.B., Vol. VII, p.347 fll.; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol.III p.56 fll.). The Godhwā stone inscription of the year 148 (A.D.467-68) records the installation of an image of the god Viṣṇu under the name of Anantasvāmin, and a grant of some land at a village belonging to the same god under the name of Citrakūṭasvāmin (Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. X, p.11; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.267 fll.). The Eran stone a pillar inscription of the year 165 (A.D. 484-85) records the erection of the column, which is called ^aadhva^aja-stambha or "flag-staff" of the god Viṣṇu, under the name of Janārdana, by a Mahārāja named Mātrviṣṇu and his younger brother Dhanyaviṣṇu (Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. X, p.82; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p. 88 fll.; No. 19, Plate XII A). The Eran stone inscription of Toramāna records the building of the temple, in which the Boar stands, by Dhanyaviṣṇu, the younger brother of Mātrviṣṇu (J.A.S.B., Vol. XXX, p.20 fll.; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.158 fll., No. 36, Plate XXIII A.).

After the fall of the Guptas Bhāgavatism flourished in the dominions of many of their former feudatories. The Khoh copper-plate inscription of the year 177 (A.D. 496-97) records the

gift of the village of Dhavaṣaṇḍikā, by the Mahārāja Jayanātha, for the purposes of a temple of the god Viṣṇu (Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. IX, p.13; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p. 121 fl1., No. 27, Plate XVII). The Khoh copper plate inscription of the year 209 (A.D. 528-29) contains an invocation of Vāsudeva, and records the grant of the village of Opāni to a temple of the goddess Piṣṭapurī, apparently some local form of Lakṣmī, the wife of Viṣṇu, by the Mahārāja Saṃkṣobha (Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p. 112 fl1., No. 25, Plate XV B; Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. IX, p.15). The Khoh copper-plate inscription of the year 193 (A.D. 512-13) records the grant of the village of Āśramaka by the Mahārāja Sarvanātha, for the purpose of a shrine of Viṣṇu under the title of Bhagavat (Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.125 fl1., No. 28, Plate XVIII). The Khoh copper-plate inscription of the Mahārāja Sarvanātha records the grant of half of the village of Dhavaṣaṇḍikā, for the purposes of a temple of the goddess Piṣṭapurīkādevī (Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. IX, pp.14 and 16; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.135 fl1., No. 31, Plate XX). We learn from the Māliyā copper-plate inscription of the Mahārāja Dharasena II (year 252 = A.D. 571-72) that Dhruvasena I, King of Valabhī, was a Bhāgavata or Vaisnava (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIII, p.166 fl1.; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.164; No. 38, Plate XXIV). The Aphad stone inscription of Ādityasena, of the family of the Guptas of Magadha, records the building of a temple of the god Viṣṇu (Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. XV, p.11; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p. 200 fl1., No. 42, Plate XXVIII). The Barābar Hill cave inscription of

Anantavarman, a Mauryan chieftain, records the installation of an image of the god Viṣṇu in his incarnation as Kṛṣṇa (Asiatic Researches, Vol. II, p.167 fll; Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, p.221 fll, No. 48, Plate XXX B). The Sarnāth stone inscription of Prakāśaditya records the building of a temple of the god Viṣṇu under the name of Muradvīś, and some provision for the repairs of the temple (Corp. Ins. Ind, Vol. III, p.234 fll., No. 79, Plate XLIII C.).

One noteworthy fact of the Bhāgavatism of the Gupta Age is that it had now lost itself in Viṣṇuism. This is quite evident from the fact that, though Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu were regarded as identical, the latter is the more usual designation of the supreme god of the Bhāgavatas (see Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, pp. 56 and 269 fll.). Another salient feature of the Bhāgavatism of the Gupta Period is the worship of incarnations. The Eran inscription of the time of Toramāṇa expressly refers to the Bear incarnation (ibid., pp.158 fll.). The Dwarf incarnation is implied in the Junāgadh inscription of Skandagupta (ibid., p. 56 fll.). The Rāma avatāra is not mentioned in the Gupta inscriptions. But in the Raghuvamśa (XIII.I) we come across the said avatāra. The inscriptions belonging to the Age of the Guptas are characterised by the total absence of any reference to the Vyūhas. The Mahābhāṣya (VI. 3.6) of Patañjali, the Ghasundi and Nānāghāt inscriptions show that the cult of Vyūhas in some shape must have prevailed in the second and first centuries B.C. The

worship of Lakṣmī is another noticeable feature of the Bhāgavatism of the Gupta period (see Corp. Ins. Ind., Vol. III, pp. 112 fl., 135 fl.). The Sāṃkhya doctrine of Puruṣa and Prakṛti might have influenced the Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa cult. The numismatic evidence seems to point to the fact that the worship of Pallas and other Greek goddesses had something to do with the wide diffusion of the cult of Śrī. On Rājvula's coin Lakṣmī sometimes takes the place of Pallas on the reverse (Cunningham's Coins of Ancient India, p. 86).

With the disintegration of the empire of the Guptas, Bhāgavatism lost its pre-eminence in Northern India. But we can by no means conclude that it was extinct in Northern India. About the middle of the seventh century Bāṇa in his Harṣacarita represents a sage of the name of Divākaramitra, who, originally a Brāhmaṇa, became a Buddhist, as being surrounded in the Vindhya mountains, where he had his abode, by followers of a number of sects, two of which were the Bhāgavatas and Pāñcarātras (see Harṣacarita, translated into English by E.B. Cowell and F.W. Thomas, chapter VIII, p. 236). At Sirpur in the Raipur district, C.P., over the front of a shrine-door there is a sculpture of Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa reclining on the folds of the serpent Śeṣa, and from his navel springs a lotus on which is seated Brahmā. The temple belongs probably to the eighth century A.D. (Annual Progress Report of Archaeological Survey, Western Circle, for 1903-04, p. 21). Even in the early part of the ninth century A.D. the Bhāgavatas are mentioned by Śaṅkara, who condemns the system for its incomplete and heterodox character

(Brahma-Sūtras II.2.42-45).

Although the lamp of Bhāgavatism was dimly burning in Northern India, it was in full blaze at this time in the Tamil country. There the faith flourished under the strong impulse given to it by the Ālvārs, who by their Prabandhas inculcated bhakti and temple-worship. Bhāgavatism migrated to the Dekkan as early as the first century B.C. (see the Nānāghāt inscription, Lüders, List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 1112). The Cinna stone inscription of rājan Gotamiputasi^{Sri}-Yaṇa Sātakanī shows that the faith flourished in the second century A.D. (see Lüders, List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 1340). In Śaka 500, Maṅgatiśa^{Maṅgatiśa}, a prince belonging to the early Gālukya dynasty of the Dekkan, got a cave scooped out, in which a temple to Viṣṇu was constructed, and an image of Viṣṇu was installed in it. In this cave-temple there are the figures of Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa lying on the body of a serpent, with Lakṣmī rubbing his feet, and of the Boar and Narasimha incarnations (Indian Antiquary, Vol. III, p.305, Vol. VI, p.363; Fergusson and Burgess, Cave Temples, p.407). We have also direct evidence of the existence of Kṛṣṇa-Baladeva worship in the Tamil country in the early centuries of the Christian era. Some ancient Tamil poems, such as Śilappadigāram, refer to temples dedicated to Kṛṣṇa and his brother at Madurā and other cities (see Kanakasabhai's Tamil 1800 Years Ago, pp.13, 26, 68-69; Krishnaswami Aiyangar's Ancient India, p.92).

The Vaiṣṇava tradition of Southern India mentions

twelve Ālvārs; and they are divided into three classes by Krishna-swami Aiyanger (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXXV, p.238, Early History of Vaisnavism in South India, p.13, Ancient India, p.403 fl1.)

Their names are as follows:-

ANCIENT

Sanskrit name	Tamil name
Saroyogin	Poygai Ālvār
Bhūtayogin	Bhūtattār
Mahadyogin or	
Bhrāntayogin	Pey Ālvār
Bhaktisāra	Tirumālisai Ālvār

MIDDLE

Sāthakopa	Namm Ālvār
Madhurakavi	
Kulasekhara	
Viṣṇucitta	Periy Ālvār
Godā	Āṇḍal

LAST

Bhaktāṅghrirenu	Tondaradippodi
Yogivāhana	Tirūppāṇ Ālvār
Parakāla	Tirumāgai Ālvār.

The Ālvārs represent the emotional side of Tamil Vaisnavism. They composed, mostly in Tamil, what are called Prabandhas in praise of the deity full of piety and devotion. They are spoken of as the Vaisnava Veda. The dates assigned to the Ālvārs by the hagiologists, viz: B.C. 4203 to the first, 3706 to the last, and the others ranging between these two, do not bear any scrutiny (Krishnaswami Aiyanger's Ancient India, pp.403 fl1.). The first three Ālvārs teach the worship of the deity Nārāyaṇa by recitations of his names, services at temples, and contemplation of his personal forms. They allude to the early avatāras of Viṣṇu and are eloquent in their admiration

of the Kṛṣṇa avatara (T. Rajagopala Chariar, Vaiṣṇavite Reformers of India, p.2.). Although they speak glorifying Viṣṇu-bhakti, yet they do regard Śiva-bhakti with considerable sympathy, and make a visible effort to keep the Śaivas in countenance (Krishnaswami Aiyangar's Early History of Vaiṣṇavism in South India, p.77). Krishnaswami allots Poygai Ālvār to the second century A.D. (ibid, p.75). Sathakopa stands first among the Ālvārs in order of importance. Krishnaswami thinks that he should be placed in the fifth century A.D. (ibid, p.84, Ancient India, p.401). The same eminent scholar believes that Kulasekhara^I must have lived early in the seventh or late in the sixth century A.D. (Vaiṣṇavism in South India, p.86). Āṇḍāl, the daughter of Viṣṇucitta, may rightly be called the "Mīrā Bāi" of the South. Tirumāṅgai, the last of the Ālvārs, composed four thousand verses of the Vaiṣṇava Prabandham. Gopinatha Rao infers that Tirumāṅgai Ālvār must have lived in the latter half of the eleventh century A.D. (Madras Review, February and May 1905-History of the Śrī Vaiṣṇava Movement). Mr. Aiyangar controverts the theory of such a late date in favour of a much earlier one, namely, the earlier half of the eighth century A.D. (Ancient India, p.414). The Ālvārs were followed by the Ācāryas who represented

-
1. According to Dr. Bhandarkar Kulasekhara lived in the first half of the twelfth century A.D. (Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, p.50).

the intellectual side of Southern Vaiṣṇavism. The first Ācārya was Nāthamuni. He was a passionate lover of the songs of the Ālvārs, especially those of Śaṭhakopa. He collected the hymns of Nammālvār and of the other Ālvārs, arranged them in four groups of about a thousand stanzas each, and set them to Dravidian music. The whole collection is called Nāṭāyira Prabandham (see Farquhar's Outline of the Religious Literature of India, p.241). The two works, Nyāyatattva and Yoga Rahasya, are attributed to Nāthamuni (T. Rajagopala Chariar's Vaiṣṇavite Reformers of India, p.3). In the opinion of Mr. Chariar Nyāyatattva is an elaborate treatise covering the whole field of philosophy from the point of the view of the Rāmānuja school (ibid, p.4). Nātha seems to have accepted and brought into practice the doctrine called prapatti or surrender to God in absolute renunciation and faith (ibid, p.6). He probably died in 922 A.D. (Krishnaswami Aiyangar's Ancient India, p.409). He was succeeded by Pundarikākṣa, who in turn was succeeded by Rāmamiśra, the spiritual instructor of Yāmunācārya. The most important work of Yāmunācārya is Siddhitraya. It contains three sections called Ātma-Siddhi, Īśvara-Siddhi, and Samvit-Siddhi. Its main object is to confute the doctrine of Māyā and establish the real existence of individual and supreme souls. Another important work is Āgama-Prāmānya, which maintains the orthodoxy

of the Pāñcarātra school against the attack of Śaṅkara (see Charier's Vaisṇavite Reformers of India, pp.34 fl1.). He is also the author of the Gītārtha-Saṁgraha, a summary of the teachings of the Gītā. Yāmunācārya is a star of the first magnitude in the galaxy of Vaisṇava sages of the South, and laid the foundation of all doctrines which go under Rāmānuja's name. Of ^{Rāmānuja} him Dr. Macnicol remarks that "he accomplished for Indian Theism a work similar to that which the Greek fathers did for Christianity in its Hellenic environment" (Indian Theism, p.112). Relatively the sect of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas founded by Nāṭhva and strengthened by Yāmunācārya and Rāmānuja was a symbol of revolt against the orthodox faith in a twofold sense. In one sense, it was the expression of a natural reaction from the sacrifice-ridden Pūrva Mīmāṃsā School of Prabhākara, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, and others. The Vaisṇavas, while abstaining from an open denunciation of the Karma-Kāṇḍa, disapproved of those actions which are done for mundane purposes, and considered utter indifference to the fruits of actions as the desideratum. In another sense, it was a vigorous protest against Śaṅkara, who made religion an affair of the head, and thus laid an axe at the root of Bhakti. The Vaisṇava reformers laid the greatest stress on Bhakti, and taught that Bhakti is competent to secure the grace of God, which cuts the "Gordian knot", namely, the weary round of births and rebirths. The protest against Śaṅkara's system was carried further by Madhva, a Vaisṇavite apostle of the thirteenth century A.D. (see Bhandarkar's Vaisṇavism, Śaivism, pp.51 fl1.).

Since the revival of Bhāgavatism in the twelfth and following centuries, the school has been divided into four churches, viz: Śrī-Saṃpradāya founded by Rāmāṇya, Brahma-Saṃpradāya churches, viz: Śrī-Saṃpradāya founded by Rāmāṇya, Brahma-Saṃpradāya Sanakādi-Saṃpradāya founded by Nimbārka or Nimbāditya (see E.R.E., Vol. II, pp.544 fl.). The Bhāgavata writers state that the differences between the churches are only apparent, that they really form one church. It is only due to ruci or preferences on which particular teachers have laid stress that the churches have received separate names and recognition (ibid., p.544). It may, however, be observed in this connection that the Śrī-Saṃpradāya church of Southern India has more or less shown a tendency towards the retention of old Pāñcarātra forms of belief and practice. Other schools have neglected, or altogether ignored, some of the essential tenets of the Pāñcarātra, such as the Vyāsas. This may probably account for the apocryphal character of some of the Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās.

All the Bhāgavatas agree in rejecting the entire doctrine of cosmic illusion or Māyā. The supreme deity is personal by nature. The soul is individual by nature, and, once emitted, lives for ever. It is never merged in the supreme soul (see V.S. Ghatge's Vedānta, pp.29-40).

The Śrī-Saṃpradāya is the most important Bhāgavata church which, while rejecting Śaṅkara's Advaita, remains faithful to the alliance with the old Brahmaism. The teaching of this

sect is said to have been communicated by Bhagavat to Lakṣmī, also called Śrī. Hence the name Śrī-Sampradāya. She is said to have taught a demi-god named Viṣṇaksena, who taught Śaṭhakopa; and eighth in descent from Śaṭhakopa, in succession of master and pupil, came Rāmānuja (see E.R.E., Vol. II, p.544). Rāmānuja's theory, as distinguished from Sāṅkara's Advaita, is called Viśiṣṭādvaita or "qualified monism".

The Viśiṣṭādvaita is so called because it inculcates the advaita or oneness of God, with viśeṣa or attributes. God alone exists; all else that is seen is the manifestation of His power as something real (S.B. 1.1.1, see S.B.E., Vol. XLVIII, p. 89). Non-intelligent matter and intelligent beings are the modes of God (ibid, 1.1.1, 1.1.13, etc). The Advaitin regards the manifestations as illusory and as a result of Avidyā. Rāmānuja and his school regard the modes as real, but subject to the control of one Brahman in all their modifications and evolutions (ibid, 1.1.1, 1.4.23, 27, II.3.18, etc.). The oneness of God is compatible with the existence of attributes, as the latter are incapable of existing alone, and so do not constitute independent things (ibid, II. 1.9). They are called the prakāras, śeṣas or accessories, niyānya or the controlled of one Brahman (ibid, 1.1. 1). "The word Brahman is thus used either to denote the central unity, when it becomes possible to speak of the souls and matter, as its attributes, or to denote the combined trinity when the whole universe may properly be designated as consisting of

Brahman and Brahman alone" (Rajagopala Chariar, Vaisnavite Reformers of India, p.79). The ~~Vishva~~ Advaita school bases its theory of composite personality upon two important passages of the Upanisads (Br. Up., 3.VII.3; Sve. Up., 1.12). This school accepts perception, inference and scripture as valid sources of knowledge. With regard to things supersensuous, the Śāstras are the only source of knowledge (S.B., 1.1.3). No generalisation from experience can prove or disprove the reality of Brahman (ibid., 1.2.23). Reason is not a sufficiently determining factor in the establishment of Brahman. The want of finality in mere reason is referred to in the Brahma-Sūtra (II.1.11). Reasoning is to be applied only to the support of scripture (II.1.12).

Brahman is the material as well as the operative cause of the world (S.B., I.IV.23). He comprises within himself all auspicious qualities, and finds his pastime in originating, preserving, reabsorbing, pervading and ruling the universe (ibid., 1.1.1, see S.B.E., Vol. XLVIII, pp. 88 fl.). Brahman has internal difference (svagatabheda) and is a synthetic whole, with souls and matter as his moments (1.1.2). Brahman's knowledge is immediate and is not dependent upon the organs of sense (1.2.19). Unconditioned existence, eternal, limitless and uniform knowledge, and absence of all limitations of time, space and causality, distinguish him from the individual souls and the inanimate world (S.B., 1.1.13, 1.2.12, II.3.9, II.1.15, etc.). God alone is the supreme moral personality, free from all bondage to matter and karma (1.1.4).

The supreme spirit has a divine form peculiar to itself, not of the stuff of prakṛti and not due to karma (see S.B.E., Vol. XLVIII, p.256). Souls and matter are comprehended within the unity of Lord's essence and are related to the supreme as attributes to a substance, as parts to a whole, or as body to the soul which animates it (S.B., 1.2.12, 1.1.1, II.1.4-11, 11.3.45^{etc.}). They are called the prakāras or modes, śeṣas or accessories, niyāmya or the controlled, while God is the supporter, controller and the principal or śeṣi (II.1.14). The objection that on this view Brahman being embodied suffers, is met by the reply that it is not generally true that embodiedness proves dependence on karma, and it is karma, and not embodiedness, that brings suffering as its consequence (S.B., 1.1.21). Further, Brahman is free from all dependence upon karma, his nature being fundamentally antagonistic to all evil (S.B.E. Vol. XLVIII, pp.239 and 240). God, ^{from} within the cosmic order, sustains it as its ultimate ground and support, and receives it back on its dissolution (S.B., 1.1.1, and 1.1.2). Creation and dissolution are not to be taken as events in time, but are to be interpreted as signifying logical dependence on the Supreme. Brahman alone is uncaused, while all the rest is caused (ibid., II.3.9). The creation of the universe from Brahman is not a production of something new; it is only a change of attribute or condition (ibid., 1.4.23). Effect, therefore, is not a substance different from its cause, but the cause itself which has passed into a different state. The creation of the universe is thus a mere modification of that which is subtle into that which is gross.

Thus Brahman, having for its body *Cait* and *Acit* in their subtle condition, is the cause, while the same Brahman, having for its body *Cait* and *Acit* in a gross form, is the effect. Similarly, the destruction of the universe is nothing but becoming subtle of that which is gross (S.B. 1.4.27, II.3.18).

There are two ways of defining the individual soul. Negatively, we can say that ^{it} is different from body, the senses, vital breath and even buddhi (I.1.1, S.B.E., Vol. XLVIII, p.72). Positively, we can say that it is a mode of the Supreme, real, unique, eternal, endowed with intelligence and self-consciousness, without parts, unchanging, imperceptible and atomic (S.B., II. 3.18-32). The plurality of souls is evident from the distribution of pleasures and pains (ibid., II.1.15). The essential nature of the soul is something eternally accomplished, but in the *samsāra* state it is obscured by nescience in the form of karma (ibid., p. IV.4.3). The soul remains unchanged in its essential nature through all the processes of birth and death. Changes as that of clay into a pot are denied in the case of it (ibid., II 3.18). Association with or dissociation from bodies, resulting in the contraction or expansion of intelligence, is what is meant by birth or death, and, until release, the souls are attached of necessity to bodies, though in *pralaya* they are connected with subtle stuff which does not admit of differentiation by name and form (III.2.5., II.3.18). The characteristic essence of the *jīva* is the consciousness of self (S.B. 1.1.1, II.3.18). No soul can be without consciousness. Rāmāṇja holds that soul is not

mere consciousness, but it is a conscious knower (1.1.1, 3.3.19).
 Even in dreamless sleep the soul is not without its essential
 nature of knowership, though in that state there is no conscious-
 ness of objects, still its subjectivity (ahamārtha) continues
 (1.1.1). In the states of bondage and release, the soul retains
 its character of a knowing subject (1.1.1). Rāmāṇjya further
 states that bliss also forms the essential nature of the soul - in
 its original natural state it is always blissful. The soul is
 not only a knowing subject but possesses the power to act (II.3.
 33-35). In its embodied state its power stands limited by contact
 with matter (4.4.15). But when its connection with matter is
 severed, it can realise its wishes by mere will (IV.4.8). As
 long as the soul is implicated in matter, its consciousness cannot
 spread itself beyond its body (IV.4.15). But when it is free
 from matter, its consciousness can extend to a number of bodies
 which it may like to assume for the time being (IV.4.13-15). In
 its original purity the soul possesses many auspicious qualities
 in common with Brahman. But even in its essential nature the
 soul differs from Brahman on two points: (1) it does not possess
 omnipotence, such as powers of creation, preservation and
 destruction of the universe, which exclusively belongs to Brahman
 (IV.4.17), and (2) it is of atomic size, while Brahman is all-
 pervading (II.3.19-32). The soul is represented by Rāmāṇjya to
 be a part of Brahman. But by part we are not to understand a

part cut off from the whole, because Brahman is indivisible (II.3.42). Secondly, Brahman being different in nature from the individual soul, the latter cannot be a part of the former in this sense. The individual soul is a part of Brahman in the sense in which brightness of a luminous body is a part of that luminous body, or in the sense in which generic characteristics of a cow or horse are parts of a cow or horse, or whiteness or blackness is a part of an embodied being (II.3.42-45). "For by a part is meant that which constitutes one place of something, and hence a distinguishing attribute is a part of the thing distinguished by that attribute. Now although the distinguishing attribute and the thing distinguished thereby stand to each other in the relation of part and whole, yet we observe them to differ in essential character" (S.B.E. Vol. XLVIII, p.563). The indwelling of the supreme spirit does not deprive the jīva of its autonomy of will, though the mere effort of the individual soul is not enough for action. The cooperation of the supreme spirit is also necessary (II.3.41). The inner ruler has regard in all cases to the volitional effort which prompts a man's action (II.3.41). When a devotee is fully earnest in his resolve to please God, God, of his own accord, engenders in his mind love for virtuous actions which serve as means of attaining him. On the other hand, when a person insists upon displeasing the Lord by his act, he, for the sake of punishment, engenders in him love for actions which degrade

him and oppose his attainment of him (II.2.3, II.3.41). When an individual attains to the perfect realisation of Brahman, it gives him the highest pleasure; he, out of grace, destroys the effect of karma and frees him completely from the wheel of existences (IV.4.2 and 3). Rāmāṇya thus expresses the relation of soul to God: the soul is created by Brahman, is controlled by him, is his body, is subservient to him, is supported by him, is reduced to subtle condition by him in the dissolution state, is his worshipper, and depends upon his grace for his welfare (II.3.42, S.B.E. Vol. XLVIII, p.561).

The inanimate world or Prakṛti is as real as Brahman and individual souls, and is essentially distinct from both the categories. At the same time, it forms an attribute of Brahman and so cannot exist independently of him (II.4.14, II.1.9). The evolution of Prakṛti takes place under the guidance of the indwelling supreme spirit (II.2.2). The successive stages of Mahat, Ahaṁkāra, etc., are like those of the Sāṁkhya system, which has been adopted by the Purāṇas also in the account of creation. The creation after the production of the mundane egg is also made by Īśvara as the internal controller of Brahmadeva, Dakṣa, etc. (II.4.17).

Thus for Rāmāṇya, Brahman, Cit and Acit are three entities, individually distinct from each other, at the same time all forming a unity in the sense in which self and body form a unity.

So much for the philosophical part. The practical part may be summed up thus: The devotion to Vāsudeva is the only means of securing mokṣa. As to the means of attaining mokṣa, two methods have been prescribed by Rāmānuja. The first leads through karma-yoga and jñāna-yoga to bhakti. This method is confined to the upper three classes, excluding the Śūdras, while the second is open to those who despair of accomplishing the elaborate process and fling themselves upon the will of God (prapṛtti). This can be practised by all, including the Śūdras (see E.R.E., Vol. X, p.573); also Rāmānuja's Gītā-Bhāṣya, English translation by G. Svāmin, pp.573 fl., also Introduction XVIII). Karma-yoga is the teaching of the Gītā. It is the performance of all actions without regard for the fruits resulting from them. These are the worship of the deity, practice of austerity, pilgrimage to holy places, giving in charity and sacrifices (see Gītā-Bhāṣya, English translation by G. Svāmin, Introduction). This disciplines and purifies the soul and leads to jñāna-yoga which consists in seeing oneself as distinct from Prakṛti and as an attribute of God. This jñāna-yoga leads to bhakti which is a continuous meditation accompanied by the practice of yoga processes, such as yama, niyama, etc. (S.B. I.I.I). Rāmānuja insists upon an elaborate preparation for the promotion of bhakti. These are vīkeda viveka, (discrimination of good), vimoka (freedom from all else and longing for God), abhyāsa (continuous thinking of God), kriyā, kalyāṇa,

anavasāda (freedom from dejection), and annuddharsa (absence of elatedness; see S.B.E., Vol. XLVIII, p.17). Bhakti, as promoted by these seven means, culminates in an intuitive realisation of God (S.B. I.I.I). Bhakti, according to Rāmānuja, is not a surging emotion which chokes the speech, thrills the frame and leads to trance, but is an unceasing meditation continued till death (ibid, IV.I.12). Rāmānuja does not believe in jīvan-mukti (S.B. 1.1.4, see S.B.E. Vol. XLVIII, p.186). The state in which a soul finds itself after being released from Karman is full manifestation of its true nature (S.B. IV.4. 3 and 4). It does not develop any new character (ibid, IV. 4.17). The released soul attains the nature of Brahman, though not identity with him (ibid., 1.1.1).

There are two main divisions of the sect, Teṅgalais and Vadagalais, who differ chiefly in externals (see Aṣṭādaśhedas by A. Govindācārya in J.R.A.S., 1910, pp.1103 fl1., also Viśiṣṭādvaitin, Vol. I, No. 8, pp. 200 fl1). The main difference between them affects the doctrine of grace. The former teach that God's grace is "irresistible", and the latter that it is "co-operative". They also differ in the view held regarding the goddess Śrī. The Vadagalais look upon her as a form or phase of the Supreme, assumed mainly for the purpose of spreading the truth, and, equally with Him, infinite and uncreate. The Teṅgalais, on the other hand, give her an independent personality. She is looked upon as the mediator between God and man. The Teṅgalais, otherwise called the adherents of the Mārjāra-nyāya or "Cat doctrine", maintain that God saves the soul as the cat takes up her kitten, without any free-will on the part of the

latter. The Vadagalais, otherwise called the adherents of the Markata-nyāya or "Monkey doctrine", maintain that the soul must reach out and embrace God as the young of the monkey embrace their mother.

I

The Śanakādi-Sampradāya founded by Nimbārka, a Tailāṅga Brāhmaṇa of the twelfth century A.D., is one of the oldest Bhāgavata churches. Nimbārka is said to have been an incarnation of the sun. The doctrine of this church is dualistic non-duality or dvaitādvaita-mata. God, individual soul and the inanimate world are identical as well as distinct from one another. They are identical in the sense that the inanimate world and individual soul are dependent upon God for their existence, and have no independent existence of their own. God is incomprehensible but is manifest in the book of nature, in which natural objects form the letters constituting the words.

Individual soul is of the nature of knowledge. Just as the sun is both light and the source of light, so the individual soul is both knowledge and the possessor of knowledge. The jīva is also Ego which persists not only in the state of deep sleep but also

-
- I. The following account of the various Sampradāyas, including the Śanakādi, is abridged from Bhandarkar's *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism*, pp. 57-82, *M.V.S. Ghatge's Vedānta*, pp. 29-40, and from Grierson's article on *Bhakti-Mārga* in *E.R.E.*, Vol. II, pp. 44-46.

relation between these three principles is not one of absolute identity, nor one of absolute difference, but one of non-difference and difference. Difference (bheda) means the possibility of

in the state of liberation. It is essentially active. This quality belongs to it in all its conditions. It is also an enjoyer in all its conditions. For its activity and knowledge it depends on God. The quality of dependence constitutes the very nature of jīva; and ^{it} is thus distinguished from God whose essential nature consists in nityantr̥tva.

The jīva is atomic in size, at the same time its attribute, knowledge, is omnipresent. The jīvas are infinite in number and are different in different bodies. The jīva, on account of its contact with karman resulting from ignorance, which is beginningless, has its true form obscured and contracted. Its nature is fully manifested, when Karman is destroyed through the grace of God.

Acit is of three kinds: (1) aprākṛta, i.e. the primordial matter; (2) prākṛta or derived from prakṛti, consisting of the three qualities of sattva, rajas and tamas; and (3) kāla. The three categories in their subtle form are as eternal as the **Et.**

~~Et.~~ The third principle is Brahman or Kṛṣṇa who is naturally free from all taints, is the abode of all glorious attributes, and the object of worship. He has four forms and becomes incarnate as Matsya, Kūrma, etc. He is the efficient and the material cause of the universe. The creation of the universe is nothing but a manifestation in gross form of what was in a subtle state. The relation between these three principles is not one of absolute identity, nor one of absolute difference, but one of non-difference and difference. Difference (bheda) means the possibility of

existence, which is separate, at the same time dependent, while non-difference (abheda) means the impossibility of independent existence.

To obtain redemption, the jīva has to begin with complete submission to God. God extends his grace to those who are prapanna (those who possess the six constituents of prapatti). Knowledge of the following five things is essential for a devotee: (I) the nature of the supreme soul, (II) the nature of the individual soul, (III) the fruit of God's grace or Mokṣa, (IV) the feeling of enjoyment consequent on bhakti, and (V) the nature of the obstacles in the way of the attainment of God.

The system of Nimbārka is a sideways development of that of Rāmānuja. Both regard difference and non-difference as real, but for Nimbārka they are on the same level and are of equal importance, while for Rāmānuja non-difference is the principal and difference is subordinate to it. Nimbārka refuses to admit Rāmānuja's theory of Cit and Acit as forming the attributes of Brahman. The doctrines of Nimbārka approach nearest to the Teṅgalai, but the great difference between the two is that, while the latter confine themselves to Nārāyaṇa and his consorts Lakṣmī, Bhū, and Līlā, the former gives the greatest prominence to the Cowherd God Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa and his mistress Rādhā, attended by thousands of her female companions. His followers are scattered over the whole of Northern India and exist in large numbers near Mathurā.

Brahma-Sampradāya was founded by Madhva or Ānanda-Tīrtha. He was born in 1200 A.D. in the Dekkan. His system is mainly a vigorous protest against that of Saṅkara. His dualism is unqualified. He sets forth five eternal distinctions, viz., the distinction between (1) God and the individual spirit, (2) God and the inanimate world, (3) the individual spirit and the inanimate world, (4) one individual spirit and another, and (5) one inanimate object and another.

God, according to Madhva, possesses an infinite number of qualities. His form is made up of knowledge and joy. He is independent of everything and remains the same in the midst of different forms. His principal functions are eight: Creation, protection, dissolution, controlling all things, giving knowledge, manifestation of Himself, tying beings down to the world, and deliverance.

The individual souls are infinite in number, undergoing cycles of existence and are characterised by ignorance or other defects. They are all distinct from God and distinct from each other individually.

The world is created from Prakṛti, which is ever distinct from the Supreme Soul. Madhva energetically protests against Brahman's being the material cause of the world. According to him, he is only the efficient cause of it.

The enjoying Self (bhoktr), the bhogya (the objects of enjoyment), and the controlling supreme spirit (niyāmaka) are

three eternally distinct entities and all are equally real.

Duality alone can be the truth, for we everywhere see nothing but pairs - knowledge and ignorance, merit and demerit, man and woman,

So also Brahman and Jīva or Brahman and Prakṛti must be two entities and never identical with each other.

Mokṣa is attained by the direct knowledge of God.

Some of the means are: Vairāgya - aversion to the enjoyments of this and the next world, Śama - self-control and other virtues.

Saranāgati (self-surrender), love of God, dedicating every act to God, knowledge of the five distinctions mentioned above. Responding to the faith of the worshippers, there is the grace of God. Knowledge, wisdom and mokṣa alike are the gift of the Lord. (Madhvācārya's Gītā-Bhāṣya, English translation by Subba Rau, Intro. XXX).

Unlike other Vaiṣṇavite theologians who theoretically admit the possibility of any soul ultimately winning salvation, Madhva classes all souls into (1) those destined to enjoy paradise for ever, (2) those doomed to eternal hell, and (3) those destined to everlasting rebirth.

Madhva was something of a Calvinistic reformer. He set himself in opposition to the sacrifice of animals, appointing again the ancient substitute of "barley ewe". The standard of morality of those who profess his doctrine is high. In his creed there is no place for the Vuhas, and the name by which the supreme spirit is spoken of is mostly Viṣṇu. It thus appears that the Pāñcarātra system has been thrown into the background. The old traditional cult gradually

The inanimate world is essentially Brahman, with the disappeared and made room for general Vaiṣṇavism. < The Rudra-Saṃpradāya is the most modern of the Bhāgavata churches. The doctrines of this sect are said to have been originally communicated by God to Rudra who passed them on to mankind, Viṣṇuvāmin being fifteenth in descent in succession of teacher and pupil. One of his disciples, Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa, migrated to Northern India, where his son Vallabha (born circa A.D. 1478) became the founder of a sect, and his followers are known as the Vallabhācāris. He laid the greatest stress on the myths of Kṛṣṇa's childhood and amours. The school of Vallabha, in addition to the three prasthānas, viz., the Upaniṣads, the Brahma-Sūtra, and the Bhagavad-Gītā, has a fourth one, i.e., the Bhāgavata. The doctrine of this church is Suddhādvaita, i.e., the unity of Brahman which is pure or free from Māyā. The Jīva and the inanimate world are essentially the same as Brahman, without involving any idea of Māyā.

The Jīva is atomic in size, non-different from Brahman; it is a manifestation (āvirbhāva) of Brahman, with the attribute of bliss suppressed. It is a product of Brahman in the sense in which sparks are produced from fire. Thus it is eternal and real. The Jīva, though atomic, can pervade the whole body by virtue of its quality of intelligence. The Jīva is either (I) Suddha, when its qualities are not contracted by contact with Avidyā, or (II) Sameśarin, when it experiences birth and death due to its contact with Avidyā, or (III) Mukta, when it is delivered from the bondage of Avidyā by means of Vidyā.

The inanimate world is essentially Brahman, with the qualities of bliss and intelligence suppressed, thus possessing the quality of ~~Sattva~~ (existence) alone. It is created from Brahman in the sense that Brahman himself is manifested in the form of the gross world. Thus the creation and destruction of objects in this world mean only the appearance and disappearance of God in these forms, creation and destruction being the powers (Śaktis) of Brahman. They are not different from Brahman, nor are they illusory. The world, therefore, is eternal and real as Brahman himself. Everything being Brahman, the forms of all things are to be found in everything. Absolute unity thus characterises the relation between cause and effect.

But the infatuating Avidyā affects the jīva and endows the world with unreal forms. Thus while the whole world is real, its illusoriness consists in pratīti or experience by the individual concerned. Hence the inanimate world appears to be in three different forms to three kinds of persons: (1) it appears as pure Brahman to those who have become Brahman, (2) it appears as endowed with both subjectivity and objectivity to those who have discriminative knowledge of them, and (3) it appears as endowed with subjectivity and objectivity but without any discrimination to those who are ignorant.

Brahman is essentially of the nature of Sat, Cit and Ānanda, and is never contaminated by contact with Māyā. He possesses marvellous power which makes everything possible. He manifests himself, at his own will, as jīva or jada, simply for the purpose of

sport without his essence being affected in any manner. He is thus both the material and efficient cause of the universe. He has three forms: (1) the highest divine form as Kṛṣṇa, possessing endless attributes, attainable by a devotee, (2) the aksara form, in which all the attributes have become non-manifest, and which is attainable by a jñānin, and (3) the antaryāmin form as seen in different incarnations of Viṣṇu.

The relation between Brahman, jīva and jada, is one of pure identity, one that subsists between a part and the whole. Non-difference alone is real, while difference is simply for the sake of sport.

Mokṣa can be attained by two means, Bhakti and jñāna. The former is preferable, since it leads to the realisation of the divine form of Kṛṣṇa, in which ānandāśā is at its best, while the latter leads to the realisation of non-determinate form of Brahman where ānandāśā is of a lower order. Bhakti is of two degrees, madyādā-bhakti and puṣṭi-bhakti. In the former, the devotee attains mokṣa by the practice of means prescribed by the Śāstras, such as worship and prayer of Bhagavat. In the latter, the devotee entirely depends upon the simple love of him, his highest pleasure is to become one of his associates and to sport with him in the celestial Vṛndāvana. The latter is the privilege of those only whom God is pleased to favour; it begins with preman, and passing through āsakti, culminates in vyasana or entire devotion to God.

But the evil consequences which declared themselves among the followers of Vallabha are to be attributed to the place given in his sect to the worship of Kṛṣṇa in association with the Gopīs and Rādhā. He preached in the land about Mathurā, but the centre of his influence is in Gujrat. The unbridled emotion displayed by the followers of this sect has led to the wildest debauchery. The Vallabhācārīs have their equal and parallel in the Vāmācārīs or the "left-hand" worshippers of the female power.

The four Viṣṇu schools are equally emphatic in their wholesale condemnation of the doctrine of Māyā expounded by Śaṅkara. These schools alike maintain (1) that Brahman is Īśvara, possessed of an endless number of glorious and auspicious attributes, (2) that the individual soul and the inanimate world are as real as Brahman himself, (3) that their individual distinctions can never be completely lost, (4) that the individual souls are atomic, infinite in number, all possessed of the attributes of knowing and acting, and (5) that bhakti is the means of obtaining deliverance.

But the school of Madhva differs from the rest in the following respects: (1) it maintains absolute duality, while all the rest try to reconcile duality and unity in one way or another, (2) it holds that Brahman is only the efficient and not the material cause of the world, while all the rest agree in holding that he is both. As for the metaphysical or philosophical part of their system, namely, the mutual relation of Brahman, Cit and Acit, each of these schools has its own doctrine which has given

each its distinctive character and name. Before concluding our survey of Bhāgavatism let us say a word or two regarding its later development. Although Rāmānuja taught the theoretical equality of all classes, the teachers and leaders were invariably Brahmins; persons of lower caste were not even admitted as disciples. He laid down strict rules of conduct. Even drinking and eating were bound by the minutest regulations. Fifth in spiritual descent from Rāmānuja there arose in the fourteenth century a teacher named Rāmānanda. He was a disciple of Rāghavānanda. He quarrelled with his superior on a question of discipline and migrated to Northern India. He founded a sect of his own called Rāmānandī. He insisted upon the pure and chaste worship of Rāma and Sītā. He used the vernacular for the propagation of the new creed and thus brought his teachings within the reach of all classes of people. He interpreted the Bhāgavata doctrine of brotherhood in its most liberal sense, made no distinction between Brāhmanas and members of the degraded castes, and admitted all, not only as members of the sect but also as teachers. All could dine together, provided they were the devotees of Viṣṇu. The catholicity of his teachings may be gathered from the fact that he numbered among his disciples not only Hindus of all classes but also non-Hindus. Thirteen of them became noted and their names are: (1) Anantānanda, (2) Surasarānanda, (3) Sukhānanda, (4) Haraharīyānanda, (5) Yogānanda, (6) Pīpā, (7) Kabīr, (8) Bhāvananda, (9) Senā, (10) Dhannā, (11) Galavānanda, (12) Rāidās, and (13) Padmāvatī (Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, p.67). Two

important sub-sects branched out from this Rāmānandī church - the Sikhs and the Dādūpanthīs. The former has left its mark upon the political history of India. The Rāmānandī has become a local mother-church in Northern India. The great bulk of the Hindu population of Northern India adheres to the original doctrines of Rāmānanda. One of the most important later teachers of the Rāmānandī sect was Tulāī Dās. He was born in 1532, and died in 1623, bequeathing to his countrymen as his chief work a Hindu version of the Rāmāyana which has been described as the one Bible of one hundred millions of people (see Grierson's articles in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXII).

In this Rāmacaritamānasa he has gathered around the name of Rāma, and made familiar to every peasant, the doctrines of bhakti and of the love and grace of God. "Except, O Raghu-rāi", he says, "by the water of faith and love, the inferior stain can never be effaced. He is all-wise, he the philosopher, the scholar, the thoroughly accomplished, the irrefutable doctor, the truly judicious, and the possessor of every auspicious attribute, who is devoted to your lotus feet" (see the Rāmāyana of Tulāī Dās, Bk.VII, Dohā 49, Growse's translation, p.652). Again in Dohā¹⁰⁷ he says that devotion to Rāma is like the elements of water and his soul is, as it were, a fish, and that it cannot exist without it (see the Rāmāyana, English translation by Growse, p.694). He thus did more than any of his predecessors to popularise the worship of Rāmacandra. Another member of the Rāmāvat church deserves special mention. This is Nābhājī, a contemporary of Tulāī Dās. The importance of his work, Bhakta-Māla,

cannot be overrated. It is a storehouse of legends, regarding the Bhāgavata saints. This book, with its commentary by Priyā-dāsa, has justly been called the Acta-Sanctorum of the four churches. The Bhakta-Māla and the Rāmāyana are the two text-books of the Bhāgavatas of Northern India.

Sanakādi-Sampradāya:— This church is now of small importance. Its few votaries are found in Rajputana and Northern India. The Brahma-Sampradāya is strongest in Southern India, where it has numerous monasteries; it has few votaries in the north. The Vaisnavas of Bengal, who look upon Caitanya as their founder, are said to be an offshoot of this church. But the doctrines of Bengal Vaisnavism approximate most nearly to those of the Rudra-Sampradāya.

Rudra-Sampradāya:— This cult is very popular in Northern India and the Bombay Presidency. Many sub-sects have branched out from this church. Mīrā Bāi, the Āndāl of Rajputana, founded a sub-sect in the sixteenth century.

We may close the main part of our historical sketch by the remark that the worshippers of the Cowherd God Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa in association with the Gopīs and Rādhā have shown an unhappy tendency to lapse into immoral practices. The worship of Rāma is ennobling and wholly immune from eroticism of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa cult. Our historical background will, however, remain incomplete unless we trace the development of the cults of Viṣṇu and Nārāyaṇa, which were appropriated and absorbed into the church of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva.

It is, therefore, desirable that we should discuss the genesis of the above-mentioned cults for a fuller comprehension of the subject. We shall also try to bring out, in the course of our discussion, the rationale of the identification of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva with Viṣṇu and Nārāyaṇa. Incidentally we shall take a hurried glance at another stream of thought, namely, the one flowing from the cult of the Cowherd god Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa, as conveyed in the Purāṇas (Harivamśa, Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata), which has acquired an exclusive predominance in some of the schools of Bhāgavatism, such as the Rudra-Sampradāya in all its ramifications. Be it noted, however, that the latter cultus has no bearing upon the traditional Pāñcarātra faith.

Viṣṇu is a Vedic deity. From the statistical standard he would appear to be an unimportant god in the Rg-Veda, but ^{qualitatively} ~~quantitatively~~ he occupies an important position. In the Rg-Veda he figures as a beneficent young giant (Rv. I.155.6, I.156.5) endowed with two characteristic attributes; the first of these is his three strides, the second is his close association with Indra. The long strides which he takes and the three steps by which he

-
- I. Bergaigne, Macdonell and some other scholars think that the three steps symbolise the passage of the sun through the three divisions of the world, the earth, sky and upper heaven (Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p.38). The three steps, in the opinion of Wilson, denote the sun at rising, culmination and setting (Wilson's Introduction to Rg-Veda Samhitā, p.XXXIV). According to Colebrooke the three steps taken by Viṣṇu might have formed the groundwork of the Paurāṇik legend of the dwarf incarnation, but Wilson entirely repudiates this theory (see Wilson's Introduction to RV. Samhitā, p.XXXIV). Oldenberg is of opinion "that every definite trace of solar character is lacking in Viṣṇu, that he was from the beginning conceived only

traverses the terrestrial spaces are enthusiastically described. Two of these steps are visible to men, but the third is beyond the flight of birds or the ken of men (I.155.5, 7.99.2). Viṣṇu's highest step is in the bright realm of heaven (I.155.3). This highest step shines down brightly and is the dwelling of Indra and Viṣṇu (I.154.6). This place is regarded as identical with the highest place of Agni, for Viṣṇu guards the third place of Agni (10.I.3). The loftiest place of Viṣṇu is his favourite abode, where pious men and gods rejoice (8.29.7). The liberal look upon the highest place as an eye fixed in heaven (I.22.20). There is a well of honey in the highest realm (I.154.5). All beings dwell within the three steps (I.154.2), which are full of honey (I.154.4.). Viṣṇu is once spoken of as having three abodes (I.156.5). In some of the hymns we find reasons why Viṣṇu took his three steps. He thrice traversed the earthly spaces for man in distress (6.49.13, I.154.1). He traversed the earth to bestow it on man for a dwelling (7.100.4). He measured out the spaces for wide-stepping existence (I.55.4). With Indra he took vast strides and stretched out the worlds for our existence (6.69.5, 6). To this feature in the R̥g-Veda may ultimately be traced the myth of Viṣṇu's dwarf incarnation which appears in the Purāṇas.

as a traverser of wide space, and that no concrete natural conception corresponded to the three steps. The number of the steps he attributes simply to the fondness for triads in mythology" (Macdonell's Vedic Mythology, p.39). The identification of Viṣṇu with the sun in the Vedic literature appears to us doubtful; such an identification is an afterthought (see Barnett's Hindu Gods and Heroes, p.38).

(8.66.10). The second marked trait in the character of Viṣṇu is his friendship with Indra. He is allied with him frequently in action of creating the wide air and spreading out the spaces and the fight with Vṛtra. This is indicated by the fact that the one whole hymn (6.69) is dedicated to them conjointly. Indra's name is coupled with that of Viṣṇu in the duel as often as with that of Soma. The closeness of their alliance can be made out from the fact that Viṣṇu is the only other deity associated, either explicitly or implicitly, in hymns extolling Indra alone (7.99.5-6, 1.155.2, 7.99.4, 1.154.6, 1.155.1). Indra about to slay Vṛtra cries out, "friend Viṣṇu, strive out vastly" (4.18.11). In company with Viṣṇu, Indra slew Vṛtra (6.20.2). Viṣṇu strode his three steps by the energy (ojasā) of Indra (8.12.37). Viṣṇu and Indra together triumphed over the Dāsa, destroyed Śambara's 99 castles and conquered the hosts of Varcin (7.99.4-5). Viṣṇu is Indra's intimate friend (1.32.19). He accompanied by his friend opens the cows' stall (1.156.4). In S.Br (5.5.5.1) Indra is described as shooting the thunderbolt at Vṛtra, while Viṣṇu follows him. In various single verses Viṣṇu is addressed along with Indra (Rv.4.2.4, 4.55.4, 8.10.2, 10.66.4). When coupled with Indra as a dual divinity, he shares Indra's power of drinking soma (6.69) as well as his victories (7.99.4 and 6). On account of this friendship Indra drinks soma beside Viṣṇu (8.3.8, 8.12.16) and thereby increases his strength (8.3.8, 10.113.2). Indra drank the soma ^{pressed} passed by Viṣṇu in three cups (2.22.1). Viṣṇu also cooks for Indra 100 buffaloes (6.17.11) and boils milk for him

(8.66.10). He celebrates Indra with songs along with Varuna and Mitra (8.15.9). To them is conjointly attributed the action of creating the wide air and spreading out the spaces and of producing Sūrya, Uṣas and Agni (6.69.5, 7.99.4). Indra's constant attendants in the Vṛtra fight are also drawn into association with Viṣṇu (1.156.4, 1.85.7, 2.34.11, 8.20.3, 6.17.11).

In the Brāhmanas Viṣṇu is conceived as taking his three steps in earth, air and heaven (Ś.Br.1.9.3.9, T.Br., 3.1.2.7). These three strides are imitated by the sacrificer, who takes three Viṣṇu strides beginning with earth and ending with heaven, for that is the goal, the safe refuge, which is the sun (Ś.Br., 1.9.3.10, 1.9.3.15). A special feature of the Brāhmanas is the constant identification of Viṣṇu with the sacrifice. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (1.1.) Viṣṇu is mentioned as the highest of the gods and Agni as the lowest. In the same Brāhmaṇa (6.15) it is related that, in a conflict with the Asuras, Viṣṇu and Indra agreed to occupy as much as Viṣṇu could stride over in three steps. He traversed these worlds, the Vedas and speech. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (1.2.5) relates that, when the gods and Asuras were contending for a place for sacrifice, the latter agreed to give up as much as Viṣṇu could lie on. Viṣṇu was accordingly made to lie. He by encompassing the whole earth got it for the gods. The same Brāhmaṇa (1.9.3.9) relates with great fulness of detail the legend regarding the three strides. It further represents him as the personification of sacrifice. "Viṣṇu truly is the sacrifice,

by striding (vi-kram) he obtained for the gods that all-pervading power (vikrānti) which now belongs to them. By his first step he gained this same (earth), by the second this aerial expanse, and by his last (step) the sky. And this same pervading power Viṣṇu, as the sacrifice, obtains by his strides for him (the sacrificer). For this reason he strides the Viṣṇu-strides" (Eggeling's translation, see S.B.E., Vol. XII, Part I, p.268). Again in the same Brāhmaṇa (XIV.1.1) and also in Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (5.1.1.7) we have the story of a sacrificial session held by the gods for the attainment of splendour, glory and food, and Viṣṇu, by first comprehending the issue of the sacrifice, became the highest of the gods; and therefore they say that Viṣṇu is the most eminent of the gods. In the Katha Upaniṣad (III.9) the progress of a human soul is compared to a journey, the end of the path is the highest place of Viṣṇu (paramampadam) — the final goal and the abode of eternal bliss. In the Maitrī Upaniṣad (VI.13) food is called the form of Bhagavad-Viṣṇu, which sustains the universe. In the epic Viṣṇu grew to be in every respect supreme spirit. In the Bhagavad-Gītā (XI.24, XI.30) Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva is identified with Viṣṇu. In chapters 65 and 66 of the Bhīṣma-Parva, Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, Viṣṇu and Nārāyaṇa are treated as equivalent terms. The identification was universally accepted when the epic was complete.

But now the question remains: why was Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva identified with Viṣṇu and not with any other Vedic divinity?

The close friendship of Viṣṇu with Indra may furnish us with a clue to the solution of the riddle in which the early character of Viṣṇu is shrouded. In the Brāhmanas he is frequently referred to as the sacrifice (Ś.Br., 1.1.1.2, 13; T.Br., I.2.5.I; A.Br., I.X5; K.Br., 4.2, 18.8, 14). In the hieratic literature or tradition sacrifice means stimulation or inspiration (Rv., I.63.2, 3.32.12). Sacrifice is imagined to have a magic power of its own, by which the gods worshipped were strengthened to perform their divine functions.

This inspiring power, we are told in the Brāhmanas, is supposed to pervade the three realms of the universe, earth, sky and upper heaven. It is, therefore, quite natural for a priest to conceive the spirit of sacrificial rites as a personal deity. The Brāhmanas assure us again and again that Viṣṇu is this deity. If we keep our eyes wide open to this trait of Viṣṇu in the Brāhmanas, the germ of it may be traced back to his close alliance with Indra in the Rg-Veda. All the characteristic deeds of the two deities are indissolubly blended, and hence can be explained on the basis of their friendship (see Rv., VIII.12.27, VI.69.5, VII.99.6, etc.).

Indra is evidently a god of phenomenal activity, but he needs to be stimulated for his action, and we are frequently told that Viṣṇu labours to aid Indra in his heroic exploits for the welfare of men and gods (see Rv., 2.22.1, 8.3.8, 8.12.16, 10.113.2, etc.). Thus it is quite probable that Viṣṇu was originally nothing more or less

I. For an alternative view, see Macdonell's Vedic Reader, p.31: "viś means to be active", and Viṣṇu was originally a personification of the activity of the sun.

than the embodied spirit of sacrificial rites (see Barnett's Hindu Gods and Heroes, p.39). Then the question how he was elevated to the position of a supreme spirit calls for some explanation. To the plain man the figure of Indra is a vivid reality, and he is always told that Indra is aided in his exploits by Vishnu. So it is quite natural that he would look upon Vishnu as a present helper in troubles. Thus the friend of Indra became the friend of mankind. It is thus clear that the concrete reality of Indra is responsible for the transfusion of some of his live blood into the veins of Vishnu, the priestly abstraction, and thus invests the latter with the character of a real and living god. The functions of Vishnu, outside the rituals, were somewhat vaguely defined and were capable of considerable expansion. During the epic period, the theologians who were looking for a god of grace and were not satisfied to find him in Siva seized upon the figure of Vishnu, I clothed him with all the hoary myths, and raised him to the rank of a supreme spirit (see Barnett's Hindu Gods and Heroes, p.75).

-
- I. It is also a significant fact that Vishnu was connected, from the earliest Vedic times, with a work of deliverance for mankind in distress (Rv., VI.49.13). If it is characteristic of Theism that it binds together the temporal and the eternal and that it binds them in an ethical relationship, then we might not be wrong in detecting in this ancient and enduring legend additional reason for the association of this god with theistic aspiration.

section (Mbh., XII.335-338) seems to be the identity between
Vishnu and Narayana. Besides this Narayana, the creator of all,

The idea of Nārāyaṇa, the cosmic god, as distinguished from a historical or mythological individual, is developed in the period of the Brāhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XII.3.4) Puruṣa Nārāyaṇa is represented to have sent forth from the place of sacrifice the Vasus, Rudras and Ādityas by means of morning, midday and evening libations respectively, he alone remaining in the place. In this passage we get an indication of Nārāyaṇa's being regarded as the receptacle of all beings. He pervades all beings, all things are in him, and he sent them forth in the beginning. In the same Brāhmaṇa (XIII.6.1) Nārāyaṇa is represented as having conceived the idea of a Pañcarātra Sattrā as the means of obtaining superiority over all beings and becoming all beings. He obtained that dignity by the performance of the sacrifice. In the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (X.1.6) we find prayers addressed to Nārāyaṇa, Viṣṇu and Vāsudeva as three phases of the same god. In the same Āraṇyaka (X.11.1) Nārāyaṇa appears as the Eternal Deity and Supreme Lord and receives the name of Hari. In the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas he figures as the Supreme God, especially in connection with creation. Mythologically, he is represented as lying on the serpent in the ocean of milk. In the Vana-Parva (Mbh., III.188, 189) we have the description of a boy lying on a couch on a branch of a Nyagrodha tree, at the time of dissolution of the universe. The burden of the Nārāyaṇīya section (Mbh., XII.335-352) seems to be the identity between Vāsudeva and Nārāyaṇa. Besides this Nārāyaṇa, the creator of all,
 were very much alarmed in consequence of a war with the Asuras.

there is a tradition about Rṣi Nārāyaṇa, composer of the Puruṣa-Sūkta (Rv.I.90), who is commonly associated with Nara.

The following stories may be narrated:-

- 1) In the Mahābhārata (III.46.47) Janādana is represented to have said to Arjuna, "Oh invincible one, thou art Nara and I am Hari Nārāyaṇa and we, the sages Nara-Nārāyaṇa, have come to this world at the proper time; thou art not different from me, *Oh Partha,* and I am not different from thee; it is not possible to know any difference between us".
- 2) In the same Parva (Chapter 30, verse I) of the epic the god of gods (Śiva) says to Arjuna: "In a former birth thou wast Nara and with Nārāyaṇa for thy companion performedst austerities for many thousands of years in Badarī".
- 3) Once Brhaspati, the Vasus, the Maruts with Indra, the Ādityas, the Sādhyas, the seven Rṣis and the Apsarasas went to Brahman, and having saluted him they sat around him. Just then the two ancient Rṣis, Nara and Nārāyaṇa, left the place. Brhaspati said to Brahman: "Who are these two that leave the place without worshipping thee?" Brahman said that they were Nara and Nārāyaṇa who had come from the world of men to the world of Brahman; worshipped by the gods and Gandharvas they exist only for the destruction of the Asuras. Indra went to the spot where those two were practising austerities, accompanied by all the gods headed by Brhaspati. At that time the gods had been very much alarmed in consequence of a war with the Asuras.

given in the Vāmana-Purāṇa (chapter VI).

Indra obtained the boon that Nara and Nārāyaṇa should assist him in the battle. Both of them, by their acts, enjoy numerous eternal and celestial regions, and are repeatedly born in times of war (Mbh., V.49.2-22).

4) Nārāyaṇa is older than the oldest ones. For some purpose that creator of the universe took his birth as the son of Dharma. On Himavat he underwent austerities for sixty-six thousand years, and then for twice that period, and thus he became a Brāhmaṇa, and beheld the supreme deity Śiva. Nārāyaṇa recited a hymn to Śiva. The deity (Śiva) granted him boons, that neither gods, nor the Asuras, the Rākṣasas, the Gandharvas, the birds, the Nāgas, nor any creatures should ever be able to withstand his prowess, 'thou shalt be superior to myself if thou ever goest to battle with me! That god walked over the earth (as Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva), beguiling the universe by his ^{illusive} ~~Museve~~ power. From the austerities of Nārāyaṇa was born a great muni Nara, who was equal to Nārāyaṇa himself. Arjuna was none else than that Nara. The two ṛṣis, who are said to be older than the oldest gods, take their births in every yuga for the benefit of the world (Mbh., VII.200.57-58).

5) In the Kṛta Age, during the epoch of the self-born Manu, the eternal Nārāyaṇa, the soul of the universe, took birth as the son of Dharma in a quadruple form, namely, as Nara, Nārāyaṇa, Hari and self-create Kṛṣṇa. Amongst them all Nara and Nārāyaṇa underwent the severest austerities by repairing to the Himālayan retreat known by the name of Badarī (Mbh., XII.335.8-10). The same story is

given in the Vāmana-Purāṇa (chapter VI).

^I
Nārāyaṇa denotes a man of the Nara family, just as Kāraṇāyaṇa means a member of the Kṛṇa family and Rānāyaṇa a man belonging to the family of Rana. Nārāyaṇa was originally a divine or deified saint or ṛṣi and somehow became identified with Viṣṇu and the Universal Spirit (see Barnett's Hindu Gods and Heroes, p.77). Divine saints are sometimes mentioned in the Rg-Veda (X.129.5) and the Brāhmaṇa (S.Br., VI.I.I.I-5) as being the creators of the universe, and they appear again and again in the legend as equals of the gods. In several passages of the epic (Mbh., I.333.18, III.13.45, 47.10, V.48.15)) we are plainly told that Nara is a previous incarnation of Arjuna and Nārāyaṇa is the supreme deity who, in the time of Arjuna, was born on earth as Kṛṇa-Vāsudeva, and that in earlier birth both were ascetic saints. This tradition is very important as it represents Nārāyaṇa as an ancient saint connected with Nara, just as Kṛṇa was connected with Arjuna. Thus the two great ṛṣis were brought into connection with the two interlocutors of the Bhagavad-Gītā. The worship of Viṣṇu has, therefore, owed much to the influence of live yogis idealised as divine saints.

The legend of the infant Gopāla of Gokula is a specimen of Hindu eclecticism. The child Kṛṇa has nothing in common

-
- I. According to Dr. Bhandarkar Nārāyaṇa means the resting place or the goal of Nāra or a collection of Naras (Vāṇavism, Saivism p.30; cf. Manu, I.10; Mbh., III.189.3, XII.341.35).

to answer this question, there is full scope for the play of

with the older Kṛṣṇa of Dvārakā, except the name. The multifarious elements of his legend, and the clumsiness with which they have been fitted together, show that he is no natural development, but a forcible adaptation of something foreign. The childhood tales of Kṛṣṇa are of Pūāṇik origin (see Harivaṃśa, Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata), and most of the cow-boy exploits are post-epic (see Hopkins, R.I., p.457). The Jain traditions represent the oldest form of the Kṛṣṇa-legend, and they know nothing of a pastoral Kṛṣṇa (see Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXX (1901), p.280). Certain elements of the legend are obviously Hindu and borrowed from the story of the older Kṛṣṇa. Vasudeva, Devakī, Balarāma, Kāṃsa, and the story of his death at the hands of Kṛṣṇa, referred to by Patañjali, could not be omitted, and were an integral part of the well-known legend. Weber has shown that the names of Yaśodā and Nanda are borrowed from Buddhist sources (see J.R.A.S., 1907, pp. 977-78). But the framework of the story has an undeniably Christian look. The honours paid to Devakī, the birth in a stable, the flight of Vasudeva with the infant, the massacre of the male children by Kāṃsa, as well as various miracles, betray a marvellous similitude to the story of Christ's nativity and infancy (see Kennedy, J.R.A.S., 1907, p.978). Thus there can be no doubt about the fact that the whole story is a medley of various elements, indigenous and foreign. Who, then, introduced this new cultus and when? Here, in seeking to answer this question, there is full scope for the play of

conjecture. Regarding its post-Christian origin nothing can be gainsaid. But it is very difficult to determine the exact period of its introduction with scant or no materials at our disposal. The hypothesis of Kennedy and Bhandarkar that it was introduced by pastoral nomads appears to be sound, in view of an almost inseparable connection of the boy-god with them (see Kennedy, J.R.A.S., 1907, p.980, Bhandarkar, Vaisṇavism, Saivism, p.37). But now the question, whether it was the Ābhīras, as suggested by Bhandarkar, or the Gujars, as suggested by Kennedy, or some such other nomads that were responsible for the introduction of the cult, remains to be definitely established.

- I. Kennedy traces its genesis to the sixth century A.D., (J.R.A.S., 1907, p.951). Bhandarkar assigns it to the first or second century A.D. (Vaisṇavism, Saivism, p.37).
2. Dr. Barnett believes that, though much of its later decoration may be of foreign origin, the legend of Kṛṣṇa's pastoral childhood may well be original, and possibly was told of other heroes long before Kṛṣṇa was born. The older epic and Jains had no use for it, so they ignored it; the Ābhīras or some such people seized upon it and developed it to suit their peculiar taste; then it was cast into literary form, and spread like wild-fire over India (see Hindu Gods and Heroes, p.97).

of the Pāṇḍavas, see also Yāgyalkṛya's Āgama-Prāśāda, pp.51-70.

3. "Vedaṁ śāstrāṇaṁ nāma Vedaṁśu (śāstrāṇaṁ) tad arthakam Pāṇḍurāṣṭraṁ mokṣadantat-kṛtīyātām, yasmānśau mokṣa-sāgṛha Vedaḥ prokṣat saṁhitāṁśu mad-Śrīmadhara-rūpāṇa saṁhita śāstrāṇaṁ bhavet" (Śrī-Prāśāda, II.22, 23).

Sākhya of the Veda, designated the Ekāyana. Any such Sākhya

has not, up till now. CHAPTER III

is not altogether impossible in view of a good many references

to the Ekāyana school in the religious works of India. The Śāṅkhya Upaniṣad mentions the Ekāyana science.

After having outlined the history of Pāñcarātra religion, let us now proceed to deal with the evolution of philosophy of the said religion. We know little about the primitive Pāñcarātra - we mean the system as it was originally promulgated by Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva. It is noticed in the Mahābhārata (XII.350.63), with the Sāṁkhya, the Yoga and the Pāśupata.

Śaṅkara, in his commentary on the Vedānta-Sūtras (II.2.42-45), intimates that its promulgator was Śāṇḍilya and condemns the system for its heterodox and incomplete character. Some of

its partisans, however, try to trace its genesis to one of the

I. Rāmānuja, in his Bhāṣya on the Brahma-Sūtras (II.2.40-43), says that the view of the objector is based on a misconception of the doctrines of the Bhāgavata system, and gives the correct doctrine under II.2.42 and the next. These doctrines are, he asserts, in harmony with the Śruti, and thus, according to him, the Pāñcarātra system is not refuted by Bādarāyaṇa, the author of the Sūtras. In connection with his arguments he quotes from the Paṇḍara, Sūtvata and Parama Saṁhitās. For defence of the Pāñcarātra, see also Yāmūnācārya's Āgama-Prāmānya, pp.51-70.

2. "Vedam ekāyanam nāma Vedānām śirasisthitam | tad arthakam Pāñcarātram mokṣadantat-kriyāvatām, yasmin|eko mokṣa-mārgo Vede proktas saṁtānah mad-ārādhana-rūpeṇa tasmād ekāyanam bhavet" (Śrī-Praśna Saṁhitā II.38, 39).

Śākhās of the Veda, denominated the Ekāyana. Any such Śākhā has not, up till now, been known to exist. But its existence is not altogether impossible in view of a good many references to the Ekāyana science in some of the ancient religious works of India. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad^I mentions the Ekāyana science. Yāmunaċārya refers to Kāśmīr-Āgama-Prāmānya at the end of his work called Āgama-Prāmānya, the object of which is to establish the orthodoxy of Pāñcarātra. Kāśmīr-Āgama-Prāmānya is now lost and nothing is known about it except that it sought to establish the genuineness of the Ekāyana Śākhā, the fundamental text of the Pāñcarātra school, as a branch of the Veda. As already hinted in the Introduction, during the earliest stage in the career of Pāñcarātra, it had an existence independent of Brahmanism (see Bhandarkar's Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts, pp. 72-74; Garbe's Philosophy of Ancient India, pp. 83-85, also his Introduction to the Bhagavad-Gītā). At this stage it entered into an alliance with ancient Sāṃkhya²-yoga (see Garbe's Bhagavad-

-
1. "Rg-Vedaṃ bhagavo 'dhyemi yajur-Vedaṃ Sāma-Vedaṃ Atharvanam Caturtham Itihāsa-Purāṇam pañcamam Vedānam Vedaṃ pitryam rāsim daivam nidhim vāko-vākyam ekāyanam". (Chāndogya, VII, 1. 2, VII. 1. 4, VII. 2. 1, etc.).
 2. Weber holds that Sāṃkhya is the oldest of the existing systems (History of Indian Literature, p. 235). The Mahābhārata mentions the Sāṃkhya and yoga as very ancient systems (XII. 13711). We hear of a Sastitantra Śāstra as being one of the oldest Sāṃkhya works. This is described in the Ahirbudhnya Samhitā (XII. 19-211.) as containing two books of 32 (prakṛti) and 28 (vikṛti) chapters. It appears that the Sāṃkhya of the Sastitantra referred to in the Ahirbudhnya was of atheistic character, resembling the doctrine of the Pāñcarātra Vaiṣṇavas, and the Ahirbudhnya

Gītā, p.38). This alliance furnished the Pāñcarātra with a number of technical terms, one of these being the word Puruṣa. The word generally denotes the Supreme Spirit of the Pāñcarātra system. Another borrowing may be traced to the word Yoga. But the Pāñcarātra altered the meaning of the word from "concentration of thought" to "devotion to God" (see Garbe's Bhagavad-Gītā, p.43). Then during the next phase Pāñcarātra came into contact with Brahmaism of the Midland (see Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas, p.7). The life and death struggle between

says that Kapila's theory of Sāṃkhya was a Vaiṣṇava one. The Sāṃkhya views, as we find them in the Upaniṣads (Śve, I.4; IV.5; Kāṭha, III.10-11; Praśna, IV.8; Maitri, III.3; also Chāndogya, VI.3), the Mahābhārata including the Bhagavad-Gītā, and Manu, lean to theism. "A study of the Epic and other early materials", observes Franklin Edgerton, "has convinced me that there is not a single passage in which disbelief in Brahman or God is attributed to the Sāṃkhya" (American Journal of Philology, XLV.I.p.8). Though Manu does not mention the Sāṃkhya by name, the account of creation given in the first chapter, the acceptance of the three sources of knowledge (XII.105), and a detailed description of the three Guṇas (XII.24-52) show the strong influence of the Sāṃkhya. Puruṣa and Prakṛti were not independent realities but only the modes of God. In Aśvagosa's Buddhacarita we have an account of a meeting between Buddha and his former teacher Arāda, who holds the Sāṃkhya views, though in a theistic setting. It seems to be very probable that the earliest form of Sāṃkhya was a sort of realistic theism, approaching the Viśiṣṭādvaita view of the Upaniṣads. While this type of Sāṃkhya may be regarded as a legitimate development of the teachings of the Upaniṣads, the dualistic Sāṃkhya, I mean the classical Sāṃkhya which insists on the independence of Prakṛti and the multiplicity of Puruṣas, can hardly be said to be in line with the teachings of the Upaniṣads. The nearest approach to the classical Sāṃkhya is found in the Amu-Gītā (Nṛg., XIV.40-42). The question now arises: how did the Sāṃkhya drop all account of the Absolute? The answer may thus be hazarded. The Sāṃkhya became, in all probability, a well co-ordinated system after the rise of

the Brahmans and the Buddhists was the immediate cause of this fusion (Garbe's Bhāṣya on Gītā, p.35). Once thus brought into connection with Brahmanism of the Midland, Pāñcarātra became a cult of Brahmanised anti-Brahmanists (Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas, p.7).

The earliest literature which we can make use of regarding the semi-Brahmanised Pāñcarātra, is the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śānti-Parva of the Mahābhārata. Here we have two accounts, the second of which is interwoven with the first. These two accounts seem to represent two stages in the progress of reform. In the earlier one the worship of Vāṇudeva and his three other forms is not known. The Supreme God is named Hari, and his worship has not thoroughly emancipated itself from the religion of sacrifices. The reform had no reference to specific historical

Buddhism. When Buddhism offered a challenge to realism, the Sāṃkhya accepted the challenge and argued on strictly rational grounds for the reality of selves and objects. When it developed on a purely rationalistic soil, it was induced to maintain that there was no proof for the existence of God. Yoga:- The word Yoga is used in a variety of senses. It is often used in the sense of yoking or harnessing (Rv., I.34.9, VII.67.8, III.27.11, X.30.11, X.114.9, IV.24.21, I.5.3, I.30.7; S.Br., XIV.7.1.11). It may simply mean a method, as in the Bhāgavad-Gītā (III.3). In the Upaniṣads and the Bhāgavad-Gītā the soul in its outwardly and sinful condition is said to be estranged from the supreme soul. The attainment of spiritual unification, namely, the consciousness of the two in one, called Yoga, is the desideratum. Passages are not wanting where Yoga means the supreme power possessed by God (Bhāg.G., IX.5). Yoga, according to Patañjali, is a methodical effort to attain perfection through the control of different elements of human nature, physical and psychical (Yoga-Sūtra, 1.1). Crude conceptions of the value of ecstasy and hypnotic trance are to be met with in the Rg-Veda

gradual growth in the later ones. Dr. S.N. Das Gupta (History of

personages and was promulgated by certain sages who are called Citrasākhandins (Mbh., XII.336.30). The latter account connects the reform with Vāmadeva and his brother, son and grandson (Mbh., XII.340.36-40), and the new religion is represented to have been identical with that taught in the Bhagavad-Gītā (XII.13441). This reformed system is said to have been promulgated by Nārāyaṇa himself (Mbh., XII.350.63). The current tradition is that it was taught by Nārāyaṇa to Nārada, who taught it to the saints (siddha), and Sūrya (sun), having heard it, repeated it to the r̥sis, who communicated it to the deities, who in their turn transmitted the same to Asita, and from Asita it was handed down to the fathers (pitṛs), by whom it was imparted to mankind (Mbh., XII.340.112-18). But we came across a different statement of its tradition in Mahābhārata (XII.13441), which says that it was taught by the Lord

(X.136, VII.59.6, X.114.2, X.167.1, X.109.4). In the Atharva-Veda the idea is common that supernatural powers can be attained through the practice of austerities. The Upaniṣads assume Yoga in the sense of a striving after a true knowledge of reality. Since a direct knowledge of the self as subject is not possible, the Upaniṣads insist upon meditation and concentration (Kāṭha, III.12; Praśna, V.5; Br. III.5, IV.14, etc.). The Upaniṣads regard tapas and brahmacharya as virtues productive of great power (Br., 1.2.6, III.8.10; Chāndogya, III.17.4; Taittirīya, 1.9.1, III.2.1, III.3.1; also see Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, II.2.3; Rv., X.129; S.Br., XI.5.8). Yoga, as a technical term, occurs in the Kāṭha (III.6) and the Maitri (VI.10), but it cannot be said that the Yoga mentioned in them is identical with the Yoga of Patañjali. The Kāṭha, Svetaśvatara, and the Maitri speak of the practical side of religious realisation, as distinct from the theoretical investigation of the Sāṃkhya. The Kāṭha (III.13; also see Chāndogya, VI.8.6) refers to the highest condition of Yoga as a state in which the senses, with mind and intellect, are brought to a standstill. The Maitri Upaniṣad (VI.18) speaks of sixfold Yoga. Apparently the Yoga of Patañjali was not perfected at the time of the early Upaniṣads, although we see its gradual growth in the later ones. Dr. S.N. Das Gupta (History of

(Kṛṣṇa) to Arjuna. In the Māhābhārata (XII.349.13-52) Nārada thus narrates the history of Pāñcarātra during the traditional seven births of Brahmā:-

1. When Brahmā was mentally born from Nārāyaṇa's mouth, the latter imparted it to the Vaikhāṇasas, and they to Soma, and then it disappeared.
2. At the second birth of Brahmā from Nārāyaṇa's eye, Brahmā received it from Soma and gave it to Rudra, who, in turn the Kṛta age, gave it to the Vālakhilyaṛsis. Then it again disappeared.
3. At the third birth of Brahmā from Nārāyaṇa's voice, Nārāyaṇa himself gave it to the ṛṣi Suparna, who recited it threetimes a day. Hence it is called trisauparna. Suparna

Indian Philosophy, p.226), referring to Sūtra (V.1.94) of Pāṇini whom he regards as pre-Buddhist, holds that the word Yoga attained its technical meaning in Pāṇini's time.

Buddha practised Yoga in both its senses. He underwent ascetic austerities and practised highest contemplation. According to Lalitavistara numberless forms of ascetic practices were in vogue in Buddha's time. The Buddhist Suttas (e.g. the Satipatthāna Sutta) are familiar with the Yoga methods of concentration. The later Buddhist works assume a developed Yoga technique (see Hopkins: Yoga Technique in the Great Epic, Journal of the American Oriental Society, XXII).

In the Māhābhārata, the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga represent two complementary aspects of one whole signifying theory and practice, religion and philosophy. It is said that Yoga admits a twenty-sixth principle of God. Besides, salvation which was originally looked upon as identification with the Absolute becomes isolation of spirit from Prakṛti, when the Absolute ceased to be the all-comprehensive being from which individual souls sprang and became the Īvara or helper (see Mbh., XII.318). Many of the ascetics of the epic resort to Yoga as a

gave it to Vāyu, who gave it to the rains. They gave it to the ocean (mahodadhi), and then it disappeared again and became merged in Nārāyaṇa.

4. At the next birth of Brahmā from Nārāyaṇa's ear, Nārāyaṇa ordered Brahmā to receive the religion under the name of Sāttvata, and by its means to create and arrange the Kṛta age. Brahmā received the religion with its mysteries, its abstracts (saṃgraha) and its Āraṇyaka, as it issued from the mouth of Nārāyaṇa. He then created the worlds. The first age was the Kṛta age, which was auspicious, in as much as the Sāttvata religion was established and pervaded the worlds. Brahmā taught it to Manu Svārocisa who taught his son Śaṅkha, who taught his son Suvarṇabha. When the Tretā age came, it again disappeared.

5. In the fifth birth of Brahmā from Nārāyaṇa's nose, Hari Nārāyaṇa recited it himself to Brahmā, who taught it to Sanat Kumāra, who taught it to Virāṇa, the Prajāpati, in the Kṛta age, who taught it to Raibhya, who taught it to his son Kuksi. It then disappeared.

means to the attainment of magical powers (Mbh., XII.326.8). The Upaniṣads, the Mahābhārata including the Bhagavad-Gītā, Jainism and Buddhism accept yoga practices. Patañjali's yoga (e.g. the classical yoga) is the crystallisation of ideas on asceticism and contemplation extant at the time in a more or less undefined manner. He codified the nebulous tradition evolved under the pressure of life and experience. When insistence on activity is attached to the Sāṃkhya philosophy, we get the classical type of yoga.

Sāṃkhya-yoga, really describes the Bhāgavata monothism as united with this system, but also with more of a Brahminist colouring than

6. In the next birth of Brahmā from an egg born of Hari, Brahmā received it from Nārāyaṇa's mouth and communicated it to the Barhiṣad Munis, they to a Brāhmaṇa (dviṇa), who gave it to King Āvikalpana. It then disappeared.

7. At the seventh birth of Brahmā, that from the lotus, Nārāyaṇa taught it to Brahmā, who taught it to Dakṣa, who taught it to the eldest son of his daughter, Āditya, who was older than Savitr, and from whom Vivasvat received it. In the beginning of the Tretā age Vivasvat gave it to Manu, who gave it to his son Ikṣvāku, by whom it was spread abroad over the earth. At the dissolution of the universe, it will again go to Nārāyaṇa.

The Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śānti-Parva alludes to the religion which it teaches as the doctrine of the Bhāgavatas, Sattvatas, Pañcarātras and Ekāntikas (Mbh., XII.344.63, XII.336.19, 25, 337.44, 350.1, 349.3). Dr. Grierson (Indian Antiquary, 1908, pp. 251 and 257) rightly observes that even the Nārāyaṇīya does not represent the tenets of the religion in their original purity. It embodies the cult of Brahmaised anti-Brahmaists. It is all shell without the kernel.

The Nārāyaṇīya sought the reconciliation of pantheistic Brahmaism of the Midland and popular worship of a personal god of the Outland. Dr. Grierson truly remarks that the Nārāyaṇīya, on the other hand, while claiming to describe Śaṅkhyā-yoga, really describes the Bhāgavata monotheism as united with this system, but also with more of a Brahmaist colouring than

we find in the Bhagavad-Gītā" (Indian Antiquary, 1908, p.262). The tenets of Pāñcarātra religion, as portrayed in the Nārāyaṇīya episode (Mbh., XII.335-352), may be thus summarised:-

The object of this devoted faith is the one God, variously called Paramātman (XII.12890), Puruṣa (XII.335.29), Nirguṇa, Kṣetrajña, Puruṣoṭtama, Anantapuruṣa, Mahāpuruṣa, Triguna Pradhāna, Pañca-kāṣṭha-kartṛ-pati, Pañca-rātrika, Haṁsa, Para-haṁsa, Mahā-haṁsa, Sāṁkhya-Yoga, Sāṁkhya-mūrti, Abhagna-yoga, Vāmadeva, Bhakta-vatsala, Hari, Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu (XII.339.4), existing from eternity to eternity (XII.340.23, 343.125). He is defined as the endless (ananta), the imperishable (acyuta), and indestructible (avināśin; see XII.339.4). He is the self and source (yonī) of everything movable and immovable (XII.336.30, 340.32, 41), immortal, without organs of sense, the merciful, without hate, death or decay, and all-pervading (XII.343.6). He is inconceivable and above the three ^{gunas} ~~guṇas~~ (guṇādhika; see XII.351.37). He is the abode of glorious and auspicious attributes raised to infinity, incomprehensible, indestructible, inner-ruler and controller (XII.349.59), unborn and witness of the worlds (XII.339.4). He is kind to all worshippers, the refuge of all and the giver of boons (XII.348.13, ³⁴⁷19). Unmoved by happiness or misery, his attitude towards all is equal (XII.346.38). He is the actor, the cause, the effect and omnipotent (XII.344.54). Though divested of a body, He dwells in every body (śarīra) - not touched by the acts accomplished by these bodies. He is the

all-seeing witness dwelling within all embodied creatures and engaged in marking their acts (XII.352.3-4). Just as fire is one, but glares everywhere; just as the sun is one, but is the universal source of heat; just as air is one, but blows everywhere; just as the ocean is one, but is the source of all the waters; so the Puruṣa is one, void of constituents, having for His form the universe. As the lotus-leaf is not affected by a drop of water, so He is not affected by the fruits of actions (see Mbh., XII.352.10 fl.). The universe is real, for it is pervaded by Him (XII.339.4). The universe consists of two real categories - matter called Prakṛti possessed of three constituents (XII.335.30 fl.), and infinitely many jīvas (XII.351.26). Prakṛti is not an independent entity, nor is it entirely negated or denied. The Bhāgavatas argue that the Supreme Being carries within His own nature an element from which the material universe originates, an element which is not an independent entity, nor is it entirely false, but quite as real as any other part of the Deity's own nature (see Thibaut's translation of the Vedānta-Sūtras: S.B.E., Vol. XXXIV, Introduction, p.CXVII). Primarily the two categories are identical (non-different from) with the Supreme Soul; for though they are beginningless, it is from Him that they periodically manifest themselves (XII.340.68-70, 341.94). If we carefully consider the relationship of individual soul to God, it is most probable

that from the earliest times the soul was considered to be an eternal part (amśa) of the Supreme, emitted by Him and given a separate existence (see Garbe's Bhagavad-Gītā, pp.41 and 48). Once so emitted, the soul exists for ever as a separate entity. The Lord has created Brahmā, Śiva, and countless subordinate deities to carry out his orders in creating and ruling the universe and to promulgate true religion (XII.340.49-52). He generally leaves the burden of ruling the earth upon their shoulders; but as occasion demands, from time to time, in His infinite grace He becomes incarnate to relieve the world from sin or His followers from trouble (XII.350.32-34; cf. Bhagavad-Gītā, IV.6-8). In the Mahābhārata (XII.340-73-87) six incarnations are mentioned, viz.: the Boar, the Man-lion, the Dwarf, Rāma of the Bhṛga-race, Rāma Dāśarathī, and that assumed for the destruction of Kāṁsa (Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva). This passage is followed after a short interval by another in which the incarnations are given as ten, the additions being Hamsa (Swan), Kūrma (Tortoise), Matsya (Fish), and Kalkin (XII.340.99-100). The Lord has willed the world and wills it ever and His grace is to be found everywhere by those who seek deliverance through absolute devotion (XII.349.1). The force or power by which he determines Himself into conditioned being is not an unreal principle, nor an independent entity like the

I. "He is awakened (prātibuddha) by Hari looking upon him. No one can be awakened by his own will".

is usually called when looked upon as creator) Vāsudeva, in the Pradhāna of the Sāṃkhyas, but His own knowledge (XII.352.22), act of creation, ^{lila} induces from Himself, not only Prakṛti (XII.340.70). The doctrine of ^{lila} tīta (sport) also occurs in the Nārāyaṇīya (XII.349.60, 352.22). The Nārāyaṇīya contains germs of the doctrine of irresistible grace now professed by the Teṅgalai school (XII.349.75).

There is the usual theory of aeons (kalpa), each divided into four yugas. At the end of a kalpa the universe is absorbed into primal matter and thence into Bhagavat, awaiting emission again in the creation at the beginning of the next kalpa. (XII.340.29-30, 340.70-73, 341.94). We may also say with great probability that from the earliest stages of their religion the Pāñcarātras have showed the belief in the transmigration of souls and in the inevitable sequence of cause and effect. As a man sows so shall he reap and the harvest is the weary round of births and rebirths. Whatever a man does is an effect of previous karman and the cause of things to come (XII.342.2, 73).

The principles according to which creation is developed resemble closely those of the Sāṃkhyā-yoga, but the terminology is not always the same.

From Vāsudeva is evolved the universe in a parallel procession of physical and spiritual orders. Bhagavat or (as He

I. "He is awakened (pratibuddha) by Hari looking upon him.

No one can be awakened by his own will".

three and Vāsudeva).

is usually called when looked upon as creator) Vāsudeva, in the act of creation, produces from Himself, not only Prakṛti, the indiscreet primal matter of the Sāṃkhyas, but also a Vyūha, or a phase of conditioned spirit, called Saṃkarsana. From the association of Saṃkarsana and Prakṛti spring Manas, corresponding probably to the buddhi of the Sāṃkhyas, and also a secondary phase of conditioned spirit called Pradyumna. From the combination of Pradyumna with Manas spring the Ahaṃkāra and also a tertiary phase of conditioned spirit called Aniruddha. From the union of Aniruddha with Ahaṃkāra arise the ^{Mahābhūtas} ~~mahābhūtas~~, with their qualities, and also the Brahmā who fashions out of the grosser elements the universe and all that it contains, and proclaims the true religion to the world. When the universe dissolves at the end of a kalpa, the process is reversed. Brahmā and the elements are absorbed into Aniruddha and Ahaṃkāra, and so on, backwards, till all is absorbed into the Supreme, who remains quiescent till the next creation (XII.340.36-40, 70-73; also Dr. Barnett's Bhagavad-Gītā, p.53, Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I, p.415).

Although the Nārāyaṇīya generally teaches the existence of four Vyūhas (e.g. Mbh., XII.13893 fl.), the number is not insisted upon. The above episode (XII.1360²) distinctly states that some say there is only one (Aniruddha), others that there are two (Aniruddha and Pradyumna), others say that there are three (Aniruddha, Pradyumna and Saṃkarsana), and others that there are four (the foregoing three and Vāsudeva).

Theoretical and abstract knowledge of the Sāṃkhyas and practical discipline of the yoga will seldom be sufficient in securing release from the wheel of existences. Bhakti alone is sufficient for emancipation (XII.349.3, 335.43, 337.53, 340.42). The religion of devotion is declared to be superior to that of knowledge (XII.349.4). The final beatific condition consists in a life of perpetual bliss near the Lord. The released souls become like Him but they do not become His Self. It is not the identity with the Supreme, as taught by the Vedānta, nor is there loss of all consciousness, as declared by the Sāṃkhyas. The doctrine that the released soul has an everlasting conscious existence near the Lord has been the persistent mark of Bhāgavata religion, even up to the present day (see Grierson's Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas, p.11).

The Pāñcarātra eschatology of the saved is peculiar and interesting. The released begin their final course towards union with Vāsudeva by entering the sun as the door. There their bodies are consumed; they then pass to Nārāyaṇa after being made invisible by the fire of the sun. Then as paramāṇubhūtas (supremely subtle entities) they enter into Aniruddha, and thence they pass into Pradyumna after having become pure mind (manobhūtas) and thence go on to Saṃkarsaṇa. Lastly casting off all the elements of materiality (traiguṇya-hīna), viz: the three strands, they enter for ever the supreme Vāsudeva, the abode of all things. Here they dwell in everlasting bliss. They abide with Him in an eternal union

of love and knowledge (for the eschatology, see Mbh., XII.345. 13-18). We also come across an amended or qualified version of the same eschatology in XII. 349.3, where it is asserted that ordinary good men, free from merit and demerit, reach the Purusa through the three stages: but those who are monotheists (ekāntin) reach Him at once.

Dr. Schrader believes that "the sect took its name from its central dogma which was the Pāñcarātra Sūtra of Nārāyaṇa

(mentioned in CHAPTER I) interpreted philosophically

as the fivefold self-manifestation of God by means of His

Para PĀÑCARĀTRA SAMHITĀS.

p.35). According to the spurious Nārada Pāñcarātra, ^{Matram} signifies

The next important landmark in the development of the philosophy of Pāñcarātra religion is furnished by the Samhitās which, in the matter of practice, constitute the Kalpa-Sūtras, as it were, of the Vaiṣṇavas. The Samhitā-period represents the third or the final phase in the career of Pāñcarātra, and is characterised by its gradual transformation into Viṣṇuism. It has been rightly observed by Dr. Schrader that "the Samhitās have some right to speak of the ocean of the Pāñcarātra" (I.P.A.S., p.14)†. For our treatment of the philosophy of the Samhitās we are greatly indebted to Dr. Schrader who, by the publication of his excellent monograph, ^{nandy,} ~~eng.~~ Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Samhitā, has stimulated further research on the subject. The title Pāñcarātra has given rise to a bewildering

variety of opinions, regarding its connotation. Some scholars

are of opinion that Nārāyaṇa's legendary performance of a sacrifice lasting over five days (referred to in S.Br., XIII.VI.1) has earned for his doctrine the title of Pāñcarātra (see Dr. Barnett's Hindu Gods and Heroes, pp. 76, 86 and 104). Dr. Schrader believes that "the sect took its name from its central dogma which was the Pāñcarātra Śattra of Nārāyaṇa (mentioned in S.Br., XIII.6.1) interpreted philosophically as the fivefold self-manifestation of God by means of His Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Antaryāmin, and Arcā forms" (I.P.A.S., p.25). According to the spurious Nārada Pāñcarātra, ^{It} signifies knowledge; because there are five kinds of knowledge the wise call the science Pāñcarātra (Nārada Pāñcarātra, 1.1.44). The five kinds of knowledge are Īśvara, mukti-prada, bhakti-prada, yaugika, and vaiśeṣika (ibid, 1.1.45-46). Similarly, a division into five rātras of mixed contents is found in the Mahāsanat Kumāra Saṁhitā (see I.P.A.S., p.23). According to Viṣṇu Saṁhitā (1.31-34), since the whole science has an extent of five lakhs of śloka, each lakh being attributed to a separate God, it is called Pāñcarātra. Pādma Tantra reads a different meaning into it. It says that the science ² is so denominated because the five great five great

I rātram ca jñāna-vacanam jñānam pañca-vidham smṛtam | ten-edam
pāñcarātram ca pravādanti manīṣiṇaḥ

2 pañc-etarṇā śāstrāṇi rātrīyante mahānty api | tat-sannidham
samākhyāsaṁ loka pravartate.

Śāstras are like darkness in the presence of it (Pādma Tantra 1.1.71). The other five Śāstras are Yoga, Sāṃkhya, Bauddha, Ārṇata, and Kāpāla (ibid., 1.1.47-50). Śrī-Praśna Samhitā^I (II.40) has forced quite a different meaning into it. It categorically asserts that Pāñcarātra is the science which dispels ignorance. By following the 'Historical Method' which is quite a safe and reliable guide in the treatment of Indian philosophy and religion, we deem it proper to support those scholars who opine that Nārāyaṇa's several acts of sacrifice lasting over five days have gained for the science the title of Pāñcarātra. In order to make ourselves quite clear and intelligible, we shall say that Hindu minds have never been able to divest themselves wholly of certain preconceived or fancied notions derived from past mythologies or real historical traditions. "In India", observes Srinivasa Iyengar, "thinkers, however independent they may be, whatever new vistas of thought they may open to us, are compelled by inexorable orthodoxy to father their opinions on the ancients". (Outlines of Indian Philosophy, Preface II). Thus, abiding by the 'Historical Method' one would naturally expect that later developments should take note of earlier legends or historical facts, and should fit in with instead of jarring with them. Successive philosophers and promulgators of various religious systems have always padded out hoary myths with something new called for by exigencies of the time, with a view to further their selfish

I rātrir ajñānam ity uktam
pañc-ety ajñānāsakam.

or sectarian interests. Be it noted, however, that this eclecticism has seldom been satisfactory. Generally, myths drawn or borrowed from various quarters have been clumsily fitted up.

Before we deal with the philosophy of the Samhitās it is desirable that we should make some observations regarding them. The rise of the Samhitās is noteworthy in a twofold sense. Firstly, they mark the emergence of Śākta principles in the Vaiṣṇava sect (see Gopalaĉharlu's Introduction to the Mantra Śāstra, pp.38-41). Secondly, the Samhitās may be regarded as the manuals of beliefs and practices of the Vaiṣṇavas. It is difficult to state with certainty when and where they were written. The utmost that we can hazard is that their striking similarity to the Śaiva Āgamas and to the early Tāntrik literature, both Hindu and Buddhist, suggests that the earliest of them arose about the same time as the latter works, namely, probably between 600 and 800 A.D. In the North of India the Spandaprādīpikā of Utpala Vaiṣṇava seems to be the earliest work quoting the Pāñcarātra Samhitās. Utpala mentions the following Samhitās in his work: Hameṣapārameśvara (p.33), Śrīkālaparā (p.33), Jayā (pp.9, 11, 34 and 43), Śrī Vaiḥāyasa (p.33), Śrī Sāttvataḥ (p.20) and Nārada Saṁgraha (pp.7.21, 54; consult Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series Vol.XIV). Of the various extant works quoting the Pāñcarātra Samhitās in the South of India, the oldest one seems to be the Āgamaprāmānya of Yāmūnācārya. The Samhitās mentioned by name in this work are: Īśvara, Sanat Kumāra, Indrarātra, Parama, Sāṁdilya and Padmodbhava (see Āgamaprāmānya, pp.7.69, 70, 71, etc). Rāmānuja, in his

Bhūṣya on the Brahma-Sūtras (II.2.42-43), quotes from the Parama, Paṇḍikara and Sāttvata Saṁhitās. Dr. Schrader fixes the eighth century A.D. as the terminus ad quem of the original Pāñcarātra Saṁhitās (I.A.P.A.S., p.19). In discussing the date of the Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā the same scholar points out that the said Saṁhitā might well have been composed about the third century A.D. (ibid., p.99). It remains to be seen how far his theory about such an early origin of the Saṁhitās can bear scrutiny. Dr. Schrader holds that most of the literature was produced in the North, but believes that several of the works belong to the Tamil South, notably Īśvara, and Brhad-Brahma (ibid., pp.16 and 17). He further points out that all the Saṁhitās betraying a Dravidian origin belong to a later stock of literature (ibid., p.16). It is probably premature to make such a general statement unless all the Saṁhitās have been thoroughly examined, classified, and their chronology fairly determined. We may provisionally divide the Saṁhitās into three classes: (1) the original Saṁhitās belonging to the North; (2) the original Saṁhitās belonging to the South; and (3) a few spurious or apocryphal Saṁhitās written both in the North and the South. The Saṁhitās of the last category are devoted to the exclusive worship of Rāma, Rādhā, etc., and which have given up some essential doctrine of the Pāñcarātra, such as that of the Vyūhas. As an instance of this class of Saṁhitās we may mention the Nārada Pāñcarātra, the apocryphal character of which has been thoroughly exposed by Dr. Bhandarkar (see Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research, III.6, pp.40-41). Some of the Saṁhitās reflect

later developments. It is quite probable that they have suffered from interpolation precisely in the same way as the Purāṇas. In support of our conjecture we may refer to one or two striking passages of the Saṁhitās. The Īśvara-Saṁhitā^I (XX, 378-8) states thus: "O Son of Yadu-race (Balarāma)! thou hast pure devotion for me. Thou, first as Śeṣa, didst great service for me. Then next didst thou worship me as Lakṣmaṇa. Thou art now serving me as Balabhadra. Thou shalt again in the Kali Age be born as a great Brāhmaṇa (= Rāmānuja), and shalt worship me with many things of joy".² Brhad-Brahma Saṁhitā (II.7.66 fl.) makes the following statement: "My Saṁkarsaṇa part (O Śrī), says Nārāyaṇa, "is the form of a Brāhmaṇa, of the name of Rāmānuja, which it is going to take, after the Dvāpara Age and in the Kali Age, to expound the Vianu-dharma (= Bhāgavata religion), when the world will be full of heretics or renegades (pāṣaṇḍa). Know that Rāmānuja will be the specially favoured of Śrī-Raṅga, and he will show the way to the realm known as

-
- I. Asti te vimatā bhaktiḥ mayi Yadava-nandana!

 nānā-vidhair bhoga-jālair arcanam me kariṣyasi
2. dvija-rūpeṇa bhavitā yā tu Saṁkarsaṇābhidhā ||

 Rāmānujena muninā kalay saṁsthām upeṣyati ||

Vaikunṭha. According to the requirements of the age, I take many forms, and act by means of my devotees, such as Viśvakṣena, Śaṭhakopa, etc, and Rāmānuja in the Kali Age". It is needless to cite any more passages in favour of our case. The above passages clearly illustrate how far the proselytising zeal of a sect is responsible for the intrusion of certain personal or traditional elements into the Saṃhitās. It is probably true that each Saṃhitā, even in its earliest form, represented some sectarian division or some variety of worship or doctrine. Thus one of the Agastya Saṃhitās is a Ramaite work. The Saṃhitās will be more intelligible to us when the sectarian divisions are fully realised.

The Saṃhitās are supposed to number 108, but about double that number of names are known. Dr. Schrader enumerates 215 Saṃhitās (I.P.A.S., pp.6-11). Four lists occurring in the Saṃhitās and the fifth found in the Agni Purāṇa (39th chapter) coquet with the sacred number. The results, therefore, are hazy. No definite conclusion can be arrived at. There is also no unanimity of opinion among scholars as to which are the earliest documents. Dr. Schrader takes Pauskara, Vārāha, and Brāhma as the earliest of all (I.P.A.S., p.20), while Srinivasa Iyengar

I Padma Tantra mentions 112 Saṃhitās (I.1.96-111); Hayasīra gives us a list of 34 Saṃhitās (2nd Paṭala); Kapiñjala (first column) enumerates 106 and Viṣṇu Tattva 141 (see I.P.A.S., p.5).

regards Lakṣmī and Pādma as decidedly very old (Outlines of Indian Philosophy, p.175). Īśvara Samhitā (1.64) refers to Sātvata, Pauṣkara, and Jaya as the most authoritative part of the Pāncarātra scripture. In that connection it further states that Īśvara, Pāramesvara and Pādma are the expansions of these works. According to Pādma Tantra (IV.33.197v.) the six gems, out of this ocean of Bhāgavata literature, are said to be: (1) Pādma, (2) Sanatkumāra, (3) Parama, (4) Padmodbhava, (5) Māhendra, and (6) Kāṇva.

The Pāncarātra Samhitās, like the Śaiva Āgamas, are said to consist of four sections (pāda). These are: (1) Jñāna (knowledge); (2) Yoga (concentration); (3) Kriyā (making); and (4) Caryā (doing). This division into Pādas is observed by only two of the extant Samhitās, viz.: Pādma-Tantra and Viṣṇutattva. All the other Samhitās have dealt with one or two sections, the rest being treated as a rule by way of introduction or digression. The practical part, namely, Kriyā and Caryā, is the favourite subject of the Samhitās. Bhāradvāja Samhitā deals with conduct only and especially prapatti. The Samhitās abound with the technique of Mantra-Śāstra, Yantra-Śāstra, Māyā-Yoga (see Ahir., chapters 16-19; Hayasīra, Paṭala 2-14, etc.). Briefly Jñāna-pāda treats of the nature and attributes of God, the nature and purpose of creation, and so forth (see Pādma Tantra, 1.2.6). Yoga-Pāda deals

as to assume a creator of matter (Philosophy of Ancient India, p.25).

3. It is hard to concede that Kṛṣṇa himself felt the need of a divine being. He traces the primal activities of the atoms

with the constitution of man, and how by austerities and meditation, self and God may be realised (ibid., II.1.3). Kriyā embraces all acts from ploughing the ground for laying the foundation of a temple to establishing the idol (ibid., III.1.6). Caryā is the method of worship (ibid., IV.1.1). Thus we can say that the first two Pādas deal with the theoretical or abstract side of Pāñcarātra religion, while the last two take up the practical or outer aspect of the system.

The theology of the chief Samhitās is essentially a development of the teaching of the Nārāyaṇīya episode with the incorporation of a considerable ¹Śaṅka element. The basis of the philosophy is an effective theistic Yoga as distinguished from the pseudo-theistic one. The supreme deity of this system is not a deus ex machina of the later Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika ²₃ systems, nor the

-
- I. "The insertion of the personal God, which subsequently decisively determined the character of the yoga system, was, to judge from the yoga sūtra, the textbook of Patañjali, at first accomplished in a very loose and superficial manner, so that the contents and purpose of the system were not at all affected by it. We can even say that the Yoga Sūtra, 1.23-27; II.1.45, which treat of the person of God, are unconnected with the other parts of the textbook - nay, even contradict the foundations of the system" (Garbe, Philosophy of Ancient India, p.15).
2. Regarding the original Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika systems Professor Garbe observes: "The fundamental textbooks of the two schools, the Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya Sūtras, originally did not accept the existence of God; it was not till a subsequent period that the two systems changed to theism, although neither ever went so far as to assume a creator of matter" (Philosophy of Ancient India, p.23).
3. It is hard to concede that Kanāda himself felt the need of a divine being. He traces the primal activities of the atoms

'Artificer' of Plato, nor the quiescent and inactive god of the classical Yoga, manufactured or imported merely to satisfy the current superstition, but he is a real and ^{dynamic} God - God that is and that becomes. The system combines the static idea of the deity clearly embodied in some passages of the Upaniṣads (e.g. Katha, 3.15; Br., 3.3.8, 3.5.19, etc.), with the dynamic or immanent conception of him in popular religion. The transcendent aspect of Viṣṇu (see Pādma Tantra, 1.VI. 41-43, 1.II.7-13) is not very different from the Absolute of the Upaniṣads in the passages alluded to above - motionless, undifferentiated and non-active, and the dynamic aspect of Viṣṇu, more properly called Śakti (see Lakṣmī-Tantra, II.10 fl.), is not very different from the God per se of emotional religion, God that creates, preserves, destroys,

and souls to the principle of adṛṣṭa. The famous passage, Tadvacanād āmnāyasya prāmāṇyam (1.1.3, X.2.9), has no reference to God; but it has been made to support theism by later commentators. Prāsaṣṭapāda does not make God central to his system, though he regards Īśvara as the cause of the world in the opening verse of his Padārthadharma Saṅgraha (see the opening and the concluding portions of Prāsaṣṭapāda's Padārthadharma Saṅgraha with Śrīdhara's Nyāyakandaṭī; also Keith's Indian Logic and Atomism, pp. 265-6).

in everything. He is all-pervading, and at the same time He is all-transcending. That is to say, His nature has primarily a twofold aspect - an immanent aspect in which He pervades the universe, and a

I Cf. Dr. Haldar's interpretation of the Absolute of Hegel (see Hegelianism and Human Personality, p.6).

binds and saves (see Ahir, XIV, 14 fl1; Lakṣmī XIII.22 fl1.)

The two aspects technically known as Viṣṇu and Śrī, though logically distinguishable, are really inseparable. The relation between the two is declared to be one of identity (tadātmya; see Lakṣmī, 2.16 fl1.), unbroken association (avinābhāva, ibid., 2.17), and immediate connection (samanvaya, ibid., 2.18) like that of sun and sunshine, moon and moonshine, substance and attribute, I and I-ness, and that which exists and existence (see Ahir, 3.25 fl1.). Viṣṇu is the Life and Soul of everything. He is the Self^I of Selves, if we may be allowed to use the expression. "He is the Ātmā of all beings, the Ego, called Hari" (Lakṣmī, 2.12). Viṣṇu is the reality which underlies, as its innermost and true self, not only beings, but everything else in the universe, collectively as well as separately (ibid., 2.19). As the inmost essence of all things in the universe, Viṣṇu is one and the same in them all, undivided and unlimited by any of them, however much they may be separated in time or in space. To put it differently, Viṣṇu is beyond the limits of time, space and form, and as such is eternal and infinite (ibid., II.7). Again, as the underlying reality in everything, He is all-pervading, and at the same time He is all-transcending. That is to say, His nature has primarily a twofold aspect - an immanent aspect in which He pervades the universe, and a

I Cf. Dr. Halder's interpretation of the Absolute of Hegel (see Hegelianism and Human Personality, p.6).

transcendent aspect in which He is beyond all universal manifestations (see Pādma Tantra, 1.3.7-13). The universe of soul and not-soul, mind and matter, ego and non-ego, is nothing but a manifestation of the immanent aspect of Viṣṇu (Viṣṇutilaka, 1.33). This phase of His is called Śakti, which is not in any way different from or independent of Viṣṇu, but is one and the same with Him (Lakṣmī Tantra, II.10, also II.16 fl1.). If anything, it is His creative power and is spoken of as His feminine aspect. Thus, in reality, the universe is an *unmāsa* (opening out, see Lakṣmī, 3.20) of the power of Viṣṇu - or to put it more correctly - of Viṣṇu in His aspect as Śakti, by which aspect He both becomes and pervades the universe thus produced, while yet he remains the ever transcendent Viṣṇu without in any way whatsoever being affected by the manifestation of a universe. When Śakti opens herself out (*unmāsa*), the universe comes to be, and when she closes herself up (*nimāsa*; see Lakṣmī Tantra, 3.21), the universe disappears as a manifestation. She alternates herself eternally between a phase of manifestation or explication and a phase of potentiality, bringing a universe into existence when she assumes the manifesting phase, and reducing it to what may be called a seminal state or form when she passes into the potential phase (see Viṣṇutilaka, 1.23 fl1.). Such a phase of manifestation ^{or} of actuality is called *br̥ti*, while a potential phase is termed a *pralaya*, and a complete cycle

consisting of *śṛṣṭi* and *pralaya* is technically named a *kalpa* (see *Lakṣmī Tantra*, 2.20 fl.). Now, even though of an infinite variety, things and beings, of which the universe thus produced by the *udaya* or appearance of *śakti* consists, are built up of a few fundamental *Tattvas*. The ^{various} *Tattvas* are not *vivarta* (illusory), but are ^{as real} really *Viṣṇu* Himself (*Ahīrbudhnyā*, 2.45; *Lakṣmī*, 2.5). They are really eternally existent. For they do not disappear at the time of universal dissolution, but remain in the bosom of *Viṣṇu* as the seed of the universe to come (*Lakṣmī*, 2.20 fl.). What in their essence and in the most highly synthesised form constitutes part and parcel of the Lord, cannot itself be unreal. Before we begin with the theory of creation we should note a very important characteristic of this process of *Unmeṣa* or *udaya*. It is a process of apparent division (see *Padma Tantra*, 1.3.21 fl.), so that the source, when divided, remains unaffected and exists exactly as it ever was as the inexhaustible fountainhead of an infinite series of products. This idea appears to be an echo of what we find in the *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (5.1):

"Om!

The yow is fulness, fulness, this.
From fulness, fulness doth proceed.
Withdrawing fulness's fulness off,
Then fulness then itself remains"

(Hume's translation, see *Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads*, p.149).

1. *Mutatis mutandis* this answers to the *Suddhādhvan* of the *Trika* system of *Kāṇḍīr*.

2. This corresponds to the *śuddhādhvan* of the *Trika*.

CREATION.

forms are dissolved, but not the ~~substances~~ (elements, organs) of which they consist, nor ~~the~~ each. This takes place at the end of each day of Brahmā. This is followed by the night

The Pāñcarātra Samhitās make a distinction between ¹ *suddhasṛṣṭi* (pure creation) and ² *asuddhasṛṣṭi* (non-pure creation; see Ahir, chapter XXXVIII, also chapters V and VII). The former is not so much a creation as the everlasting expression of the inwardness of God's being, wherein the six qualities of God manifest themselves (Ahir, 5.17). This is the eternal or spiritual universe of ineffable glory (Vienutilaka, II.11). According to Pāma Tantra (1.2.16 fl.), however, it is not an eternal but a periodical manifestation. We can make out the distinction still more clearly by using the terminologies of the Rāmānuja school. In Non-pure Creation God reveals Himself as a cosmic ^{force} through his *nityavibhūti* with the aid of Prakṛti (see Yatīndramata-Dīpikā, English translation by Govindācārya, p.66), and in Pure Creation reveals Himself in His transcendent existence through His *nityavibhūti* with the aid of *Suddhatattva* (ibid., p.90). The Pāñcarātra Samhitās admit an intermediate creation also (see Ahir, chapter VI). The Samhitās make a distinction between *avāntara-pralaya* (temporary dissolution) and *mahā-pralaya* (universal dissolution, see P.Prakāśa Samhitā, 1.3.43-57, also III.3 fl.). In the former case, the

1. Mutatis ⁱⁿ Mutandis this answers to the *Suddhādhvan* of the Trika system of Kāśmīr.

2 This corresponds to the *Asuddhādhvan* of the Trika.

forms are dissolved but not the *Jattvas* (elements, organs) of which they consist, nor the Cosmic Egg as such. This takes place at the end of each day of *Brahmā*. This is followed by the night of equal length when the Egg hibernates, as it were. This process is repeated $360 \times 100 = 36000$ times, after which the life of *Brahmā* comes to an end by the Great Dissolution when the Cosmic Egg (Cosmic Eggs?) and the force working in it or them are completely dissolved or unified (see *P. Prakāśa Samhitā* 1.1.43-58). We should also observe another distinction which the *Samhitās* make before we begin the conspectus of the cosmic process, namely, the distinction between *samaṣṭi* (collective or general) and *vyāṣṭi* *śreṣṭi* (separate or special), and the same between immediate (*advārikā*) and mediate (*sadvārikā*, see *Viśvaksena Samhitā*, pp.126-129). The scholiasts regard *samaṣṭi* and *advārikā* and also *vyāṣṭi* and *sadvārikā* (see *Yāgyandramata Dīpikā*, p.80). But from the definition given, a minor distinction is discernible. God's creation prior to that of the Egg or Eggs is called *samaṣṭi śreṣṭi*, thenceforward *vyāṣṭi*. God's creation up to the four-faced *Brahmā* is immediate, thenceforward mediate (*ibid.*, p.80). Although, to all intents and purposes, they may be regarded as identical, scientific precision and accuracy will reveal a little difference, the discussion of which need not detain us here.

It is independent of space and time: *deśakālādīkā vyāptis tasya* (*Ahikā*, III.57).

Bhūti which is divided in many ways (nābhodhātā, see Ahir, XIV.3).

The latter is a **PURE CREATION** than the former.

Kriyā is identified with the Sudarśana portion of Lakṣmī (Lakṣmī

In the last part of the Cosmic Night (Layāntima, or pauruṣī rātri, see P.Prakāśa, 1.1.51) the great Śakti of Viṣṇu, awakened as it were by His command, flashes up, with an infinitely small part of herself, in her dual aspect of Kriyā^I and Bhūti², that is Force and Matter (see Lakṣmī, IV.4; P.Prakāśa, 1.1.51-53; Ahir, III.27-28, VIII.36, XIV.7-8). According to Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā (III.5½ fl1.) Śrī is the very first flutter of Viṣṇu - the first vibratory movement towards a universal manifestation (prasphuratā jagannmayī). In this sense she is the Life (prāṇa) in the universal seed (Lakṣmī Tantra, XIV,4.5). Following the analogy of the ^{seed} soul, we can say that Kriyā and Bhūti abide as the potentiality of infinite variety of Forms in which that Life becomes manifest (ibid., 3.19). In other words, Śrī, as Bhūti, appears as the universe, and, as Kriyā, vitalises and governs it. Kriyā is related to Bhūti, as the thread to the pearls, the pin to the leaves (Ahir, III.44-45, V.7-8, LIX. 55-57). Kriyā³ is niskala (undivided, see Ahir LIX.61), as contradistinguished from

I and 2 Cf. Kriyā and Bhūti with Form and Matter of Aristotle. Also note Aristotle's distinction between potential and actual matter. According to Aristotle, Form is that which stimulates Matter and Matter is that which responds to Form.

3 It is independent of space and time: desākā-lādikā vyāptis tasya (Ahir, LIX.57).

Bhūti which is divided in many ways (nānābhedaavatī, see Ahir, XIV.9). The latter is a less powerful manifestation than the former. Kriyā is identified with the Sudarsana portion of Lakṣmī (Lakṣmīyāh Sandarsanī Kāṭā: Ahir 3.45), which symbolises Viṣṇu's "Will-to-be" (ibid., 3.7 fl1.). It has, therefore, been defined in a variety of ways, such as, prāṇa-rūpo Viṣṇoḥ saṁkalpaḥ (Ahir, 3.29½), bhūti-parivartaka (ibid., 3.29), and bhūtān sambhāvayati (ibid., 3.31½). We can thus say that Viṣṇu is the efficient cause, Kriyā the instrumental cause, and Bhūti the material cause of the world. The first phase of the manifestation of Lakṣmī or Śrī is called guṇomesadāsā (Ahir., 5.18), i.e., the stage in which the six particular ^I Guṇas make their appearance. Unlike the Sāṁkhya Guṇas, the six Guṇas are aprākṛta (not belonging to Nature, see Ahir, 2.24 and 55). Without these Guṇas there can be no Pure Creation (ibid., 5.16), and, for the matter of that, no creation at all. For, in this system each succeeding creation depends upon the preceding one. All the various phases of creation form a concatenation. As already hinted, the Pāñcarātra teaches a chain, as it were, of emanations, each emanation, except the first, proceeding from an anterior emanation (Pādma Tantra, 1.2.21 fl1.; Ahir 2.26). This

I Of. This conception of the six Guṇas with that of the two by Spinoza - Thought and Extension. Although the attributes are infinite, the intellect perceives but two. It is a curious coincidence that in Zoroastrianism also God has six attributes.

2 For an able account of the process of Abhaya, see J.E. Chatterji's Kashmir Shaivism

This is illustrated in the Pādma Tantra (1.2.21) by the image of one flame issuing from another flame. The Guṇas, in their totality and by pairs, constitute the material, as it were, of Pure Creation (Aḥir.5.16). The Guṇas, in their totality, make up the body of Vāsudeva and also that of Śrī inhabiting the Highest Heaven (Lakṣmī Tantra, 2.35; also Aḥir VI.25). The pairing arrangement of the Guṇas sets in that process which we may conveniently call ^Iābhāsa (shining out). The partition of the Guṇas must not be taken in an exclusive and absolute sense. The combination of the two Guṇas does not mean total exclusion or absence of four other Guṇas. It only means that in a particular case the two Guṇas have become predominant, while the other four are held in a comparatively subdued condition (see Aḥir, 5.19 and 20); as in ordinary parlance when we call a man Sāttvic we only mean that in him Sattva Guṇa preponderates over Rajas and Tamas (see Sāṃkhya-kārikā, Sūtra, XII, Colebrooke's translation, p.49). The beings thus brought into existence by pairs are called Vyūhas, literally meaning the "shoving asunder" of the Six Guṇas into three pairs (see I.P.A.S., p.35). Each Vyūha is thus Viṣṇu with Six Guṇas, of which the two, in each case, become manifest (Aḥir., 5.19 fl1.). The Guṇas may be characterised in the following way:-

- 1) The first Guṇa is jñāna. It is the essence and attribute of Vāsudeva and thus of Lakṣmī (Lakṣmī Tantra, II.25), for which

I For an able account of the process of ābhāsa, see J.C. Chatterji's Kashmir Shaivism, pp. 55 fl1.

reason the remaining five Guṇas are sometimes called channels of jñāna (jñānasyaartayah, see Lakṣmī, 2.35), or attributes of jñāna (Ahir, 2.61). Jñāna is self-conscious, all-penetrating and eternal (ibid., 2.55½ and 56).

2) The second Guṇa is aiśvarya or lordship (Ahir, 2.57½). It implies independence, in creating the universe, of any other cause (Lakṣmī, IV.9). According to Lakṣmī-Tantra (II.38), it is identical with iśvara in other Tattvaśāstras.

3) The third Guṇa is śakti. It contains the potency to become the material cause of the world (jagat-prakṛti-bhāva: Ahir, 2.57).

4) The fourth Guṇa is bala which is defined as śramahāni (without exhaustion, see Ahir, 2.58½), and dhāraṇa-sāmarthya (power to sustain things, Ahir, 2.59).

5) The fifth Guṇa is vīrya, defined as vikāra-viraha (without being affected) in spite of being the material cause (ibid, 2.59½-60). This is a condition not found in the world (Lakṣmī, 2.31).

6) The sixth Guṇa is tejas which means sahakāri-anapekṣā (self-sufficiency, Ahir., 2.60½). It is defined in the Lakṣmī Tantra (2.34) as parābhibhavana-sāmarthya (power to defeat others).

The first three Guṇas are characterised in the Lakṣmī Tantra (IV.34, II.46-47) as viśrama-bhūmayah (stages of rest), and the last three as śrama-bhūmayah (stages of effort, ibid, III.4).

The Vyūha called Śaṅkarsana is associated with jñāna and bala (Ahir. 5.16½); the Vyūha known as Pradyumna is connected with aiśvarya and vīrya (ibid, 5.17); and the Vyūha

designated as Aniruddha is associated with Śakti and Tejas (ibid, 5.17½). The Vyūhas are four in number, including Vāsudeva (ibid, 5.25½). The Śaktis of the Vyūhas are mentioned in some of the Saṃhitās, such as Lakṣmī (IV. 8 fl1.) which enumerates four Śaktis after the four Vyūhas, viz.:, Śānti, Śrī, Sarasvatī and Rati. From Vyūha descend three Sub-Vyūhas (Vyūhāntaṭa, see Ahir, 5.45 fl1.), namely, (1) from Vāsudeva: Keśava, Nārāyaṇa, and Mādhava; (2) from Saṃkarṣaṇa: Govinda, Viṣṇu, and Madhūśūdana; (3) from Pradyumna: Trivikrama, Vāmana, and Śrīdhara; and (4) from Aniruddha: Hrīkeśa, Padmanābha, and Dāmodara (see Ahir, 5.46-49). They are represented as the presiding deities of twelve months (see Mahāsanatkumāra, III. 6.33). They play an important part in yantras (Ahir, V.49, VIII. 49, XXVI.33 fl1.). Another twelve, usually called Vidyēśvaras (Mahāsanatkumāra, III.6.34), are enumerated after twelve Sub-Vyūhas in Pādma Tantra (1.2.26 fl1.) also Vihagendra Saṃhitā, II.18). These twenty-four are called in the Pādma-Tantra caturvīṃśati-mūrtayaḥ (see 1.2.27). Each Vyūha has a twofold function, viz.:, cosmic and ethical (see Lakṣmī, 4.8.20). Each of these activities of a Vyūha is said to be mediated by one of his two Guṇas (Viśvaksena, pp.125-127). The creative or cosmic activities of the Vyūhas mark three successive stages in the evolution of Non-pure universe (Lakṣmī, VI.5). Saṃkarṣaṇa carries the universe in a germinal condition (maṣṇo vikāraḥ: Lakṣmī, VI.7). As a rule, he performs this cosmic function with the aid of bala, but sometimes it is said to be jñāna (Ahir, 5.31 fl1.). With Pradyumna the duality of

Purusa and Prakṛti makes its first appearance (Lakṣmī, VI.10: *śrotr-śhogya-samastis tu nīlinā tatra tiṣṭhati*). He is said to perform this function with the aid of his Guṇa called aiśvarya (Ahir, V.35). Aniruddha takes over the creation of Pradyumna, and, by means of Guṇa known as Śakti, evolves vyakta (manifest Matter) and mīśra-sṛṣṭi (Mixed Creation; see Viśvaksena, p.129). In some of the Saṃhitās we come across some contradictory statements of their creative activities. Lakṣmī Tantra (4.11, 19, 20) assigns creation, preservation and destruction to Aniruddha, Pradyumna and Saṃkarsaṇa respectively, while Viśvaksena (p.125 fl1.) attributes the self-same functions to Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Saṃkarsaṇa respectively. In Ahir (LIII.53, LV.42) Aniruddha is occasionally called "protector", but elsewhere (LV.31) it ascribes to him all the three activities.

Regarding the moral activities of the Vyūhas we can say that Saṃkarsaṇa teaches the theory of monotheism (ekāntika-mārga); Pradyumna inculcates the practice of it; and Aniruddha teaches the gain resulting from such a practice, namely, liberation (see Lakṣmī Tantra, IV.15-20; Ahir, V.21-24; Viśvaksena, pp.125-27). The original functions with which the Vyūhas were associated in the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śānti-Parva of the Mahābhārata (XII. 12904 fl1.), viz.: the superintendence of Saṃkarsaṇa over the individual soul, the superintendence of Pradyumna over Manas, and the control of Aniruddha over Ahaṃkāra, have been adhered to only

in two of the extant Samhitās, e.g., Lakṣmī Tantra (6.9-14) and Viṣākṣeṇa Samhitā (p.125). In the Viṣvaksena Samhitā no similar statement is made about Aniruddha, but he is declared to be the creator of the mīśra-varga. Thus it is quite likely that he was looked at, by the author of the Samhitā, as the adhiṣṭhātṛ of the Ahankāra.

Next we shall deal with the Vibhavas, which is the second form of God, the first and the second being Para and Vyūha respectively. We shall treat of the Para form towards the concluding stage of this chapter, although, from the point of view of scientific treatment, it should have occupied our attention first. Before we examine the account of the Vibhavas from the Samhitās we should make some general observations regarding them.

I

J. Hertel (Die Sonne und Mithra, pp.69 and 79) has shown that the principle of Avatāra belongs to primitive Aryan thought, and thus underlies the Veda and Avesta. The completely formulated doctrine of Avatāras or Vibhavas appears in the Bhagavad-Gītā (IV.5-8). Once thus declared, the doctrine gathers strength; as Kṛṣṇa becomes more definitely identified with Viṣṇu,

I Schroeder (Literatur und Cultur, p.330) would derive the notion of Avatāra from the birth-stories of Buddha. Hopkins (R.I., p.430) believes that the Avatāra theory is older than Buddhism, and is often only an assimilation of the outlying totem-gods to the Brahman's god, or as in the case of flood story the necessary belief that the "Fish" must have been the god of the race.

full-fledged doctrine of Avatāra was a necessary corollary to the

the theory of Avatāra is referred back to the theriomorphic descents of early legends, viz.: the legends of Fish, Tortoise, Boar, etc. (see S.Br., 1.8.1.1, 7.5.1.5, 14.1.3.11; T.Br., 1.1.3.5, Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, 1.13; Taittiriya Saṃhitā VI.2.42, 7.1.51). In the Brāhmaṇa period Prajāpati the creator was believed to assume, on occasions of distress, various forms, as that of a Boar or Tortoise, in order to rescue the creation (see the references above). Now, at this stage, we shall recall the fact that the cult of Nārāyaṇa, as a cosmic god, was developed during the Brāhmaṇa (S.Br., XII.3.4, XIII.6.1) and the Āraṇyaka (Taittiriya, X.1.6, X.11.1) period. When Nārāyaṇa thus became a great god and creator of the world, he stepped into the position of Prajāpati, and, consequently, all the deeds of the latter were transferred to him. Now we should also remember that this cult of Nārāyaṇa was appropriated and absorbed into the church of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva (see our Introduction). Nārāyaṇa represented the Supreme in His quality of universal immanence; and while the identification of Kṛṣṇa with Viṣṇu satisfied the desire of the worshipper for a personal supreme, the cosmic Nārāyaṇa met the need of the philosopher who preferred to meditate on Vāsudeva as the immanent principle of life. When and how this process was completed, we are not able to say anything definitely. We find, however, a clear indication of the identification of Vāsudeva with Viṣṇu and Nārāyaṇa in the Taittiriya Āraṇyaka (X.1.6), which, according to Dr. Keith, dates from the third century B.C. (J.R.A.S., 1915, p.840). Thus we can surmise that the full-fledged doctrine of Avatāra was a necessary corollary to the

identification of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva with Viṣṇu. In the Bhagavad-Gītā we find Kṛṣṇa in the capacity of a charioteer of Arjuna; if he was at the same time the highest god, the paradox could only be explained by the theory of descent. Certainly Kṛṣṇa was not the first Avatāra acknowledged by his church, nor the last, but the influence of his personality strongly stimulated the belief in incarnation. Originally the number of these descents or appearances of the Lord seems to have been regarded as indefinite; but theological speculation tended not only to fix the number of incarnations but also to define more clearly their relation to the Supreme God. They were usually designated as prādurbhāva (see Harivamśa, 1. chapter 43; Mbh., XII.12966 fl.). but later on the name Avatāra became current. The doctrine of Avatāra is thus a great principle pervading and upholding a popular religion. The belief in the incarnations of Viṣṇu has a popular as well as a speculative side. The latter is determined by ideas about the evolution of the world from the Supreme. The popular side of the belief in the incarnations of Viṣṇu is, to some extent, founded on that God's popular character as destroyer of demons (daityāri). Viṣṇu vanquishes the fiends to relieve the world, gods and men, from their oppression (see S.Br.1.3.5; A.Br., 6.15; Rv., 6.49.3, 7.100.4, etc.). The same functions, ascribed to some minor deity, becomes the bond that connects him with Viṣṇu in popular opinion. This theory of Avatāras has become very popular in India, and is

being applied in many cases even now. When a local saint has a proper shrine where he is worshipped, and his fame continues to increase, a legend is sure to be fabricated which declares him an Avatāra of some god or ṛṣi.

After having made these general observations, let us now proceed to examine the account of the Samhitās. The Samhitās do not give us a traditional and normal picture of the Vibhavae. They do not bear out the signification^I attached to them in the Bhagavad-Gītā (IV.5-8). The Samhitās do not deal with their origin, but only with form and activity as objects of meditation (see Sāttvata, chapters IX and XII; Ahir chapter LVI; Pādma 1.2. 31 fl., etc.). It is, indeed, for meditation more than for anything else that Viṣṇu is believed to have manifested Himself under different forms. The Vibhavae are held to be eternal aspects² of Viṣṇu (Viśvaksena, p.130). Two Samhitās, viz., Ahirbuddhyna³ (VIII.51) and Viśvaksena (pp.130-33), make a distinction between

-
- I E.G., to guard the good, to punish the wicked, and to re-establish true religion.
- 2 Cf. the account of the Bhakta-Māla - each incarnation is co-existent, co-eternal, but not co-equal (J.R.A.S., 1909, p.623).
- 3 Cf. Yatīndramata-Dīpikā, pp.153 and 154.

mukhya (primary) and gauna (secondary) Avatāras. According to the latter Saṁhitā, the primary Avatāras are like a flame springing from a flame, i.e., Viṣṇu Himself with a transcendent body, while a secondary Avatāra is a naturally embodied being who is pervaded, for some special mission, by the power of Viṣṇu. The said Saṁhitā does not confine the Avatāras to human and animal forms but extends them to the vegetable kingdom also. The mango tree, in the Dandaka forest, is cited as an instance of the last kind (Viśvakeśa, p. 132). The same Saṁhitā (p.132) also instructs us to worship the primary Avatāras for liberation, and to resort to secondary Avatāras for some earthly gain. In Pādma Tantra (1.2.31 fl1.) we find that some of the Avatāras (e.g., Fish, Tortoise and Bear) have sprung from Vāsudeva; some (e.g., Dwarf, Man-lion, Rāma and Parāśurāma) from Saṁkarṣaṇa; some (e.g. Balarāma) from Pradyūma; and the rest (e.g. Kṛṣṇa, Kalki) from Aniruddha. According to Lakṣmī Tantra (2.55) all the Vibhavas descend from Aniruddha, while Viśvakeśa (p.132) declares that all of them spring from Aniruddha, some directly and others indirectly. We do not like to enter into

-
- I. Cf. this with the Buddhistic account: "The Mahāvastu, Sūvarṇa, etc., held that Buddha is born as an apparitional being, his body is, therefore, defined as spiritual (manomaya) which means produced by the spirit without the aid of the elements of generation" (see E.R.E., Vol.VII, p.188).

details connected with the various Vibhavas, but simply mention them mainly on the basis of Sāttvata (chapters IX.XII and XXIII) and Ahirbudhnya (5.50-59, 56.2-45) Samhitās.

1. Padmanābha: Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa from whose navel lotus springs in which Brahmā was born (Ahir. 56.2).
2. Dhruva: the rsi and polar star, celebrated, in Sāttvata (IX.105), as the bearer of the Ādhāra Śakti.
3. Ananta: Balarāma, inserted, after Parasurāma, as the eighth of the ten Avatāras (Pādma, 1.3.53).
4. Saktyātman: Viṣṇu as iocā-rūpa-dhara (Sātt., XII.9).
5. Madhusūdhana: Viṣṇu's victory over the demon Madhu or rather the demons Madhu and Kaitābha (see Ahir, chapter XLI).
6. Vidyādhīdeva: the four-faced Brahmā (Ahir, 5.51).
7. Kapila: the Sāṃkhya philosopher (Ahir, 56.31). He is referred to as the teacher of the Naga Kings (Pādma, 1.1.23 fl1; Viṣṇutilaka, II.170 fl1.).
8. Viśvarūpa: Bhagavat Kṛṣṇa or Viṣṇu appearing to Arjuna (Bhg.G., XI).
9. Vihaṅgama: Kāma (Ahir, 56.26).
10. Krodātman: Viṣṇu as Yajña-varāha or Yajña-sūkara (Sātt., XII.45 fl1.).
11. Bodabāvaktra: Aurva (Ahir. 56.17½).
12. Dhama: Viṣṇu as dharma personified (Ahir, 5.51).
13. Vāgīśvara: Hayagrīva (Bhg (Bhg, R., II.7.11).
14. Ekārṇavaśāyin: Nārāyaṇa as sleeping with Lakṣmī, on the primeval waters (Sātt., XII.66; Lakṣmī, V.21).

15. Vidyādhīdeva: Viṣṇu as sarva-vyāpī (Ahir. 5.55).

15. Kamathesvara: Kūrma (see Mbh., XII.340.73-87, 99-100)
16. Varāha: Boar.
17. Nārasimha: Man-lion (Ahir., LVI.39).
18. Piyūsāharana: Viṣṇu as the restorer of immortality to the gods.
19. Śrīpati: Viṣṇu as the husband of Lakṣmī who threw herself into His arms when she emerged from the ocean (Ahir., LVI.11½).
20. Kāntātman: Pradyumna (Sātt., XII.85 fl1.).
21. Rāhujit: Viṣṇu, conqueror of Rāhu.
22. Kālanemighna: Viṣṇu, conqueror of Kālanemi (Ahir., LVI.10).
23. Pārijāta-hara: Kṛṣṇa wresting from Indra the celestial tree (Ahir., LVI.32).
24. Lokanātha: Manu Vaiṣvata who was saved from the deluge by Brahmā as a fish, and made the secondary creator of living beings (Ahir., LVI.35-36).
He may also refer to Puruṣa of Bhāgavata (1.3).
25. Sāntātman: Mind-born son of Brahmā (Sātt., XII.110).
26. Dattātreya: the well-known sage, son of Atri and Anasūyā (Bhg. Pu., 1.3, II.7).
27. Nyagrodhasāyin: the boy floating on the Nyagrodha branch, in whose mouth Mārkaṇḍeya discovered the dissolved universe (Mbh., III.188 fl1.).
28. Ekasṛṅgatam: Matsya (Ahir., LVI.35).
29. Vāmanadeha: Viṣṇu as the very small one, viz., the Dwarf incarnation (Ahir., LVI.20).
30. Trivikrama: Viṣṇu as sarva-vyāpin (Ahir. 5.55).

- | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 31. | Nara | } | They are Viṣṇu appearing as the four sons of Dharma and Ahimsā (Mbh., XII.335.8-10). |
| 32. | Nārāyaṇa | | |
| 33. | Harī | } | They are the four ascetics of Sāttvata (XII.139-148), clad in deer skin, etc. |
| 34. | Kṛṣṇa | | |
| 35. | Paraśurāma: the exterminator of the ksatriya race. | | |
| 36. | Rāmadhanurdhara: Rāma, son of Daśaratha. | | |
| 37. | Vedavid: Veda-Vyāsa (Sāttvata, XII.154 flī.). | | |
| 38. | Kalkin: Kalkin (Mbh., XII.340.99-100). | | |
| 39. | Pātālasāyana: Viṣṇu as the Lord of the cataclysmic fire, waited upon by Lakṣmī, Cintā Nidrā and Puṣṭi (Sāttvata XII.165 flī.). | | |

(For a succinct explanation and account of the Avatāras or Vibhavas, see (1) Dr. Grierson's Gleanings from the Bhakta-Māla, J.R.A.S., 1909, pp.622-44; and (2) Bhāgavata Purāṇa (I.3, II.7, XI.4).).

The next form of God which we have to deal with is the Arcā Avatāra. A mūrti, or image, is merely a representation of something or other, made of metal or stone, and nothing more. But as soon as it is consecrated (pratiṣṭhita) according to the Pāñcarātra rites, and, at the proper season, with proper mantras, songs, and other ceremonies, it ceases to be a mūrti, and becomes a descent of the Supreme for worship, or an Arcā Avatāra.

(Viśvakṣena, pp.123 and 143). We get the rationale of image worship from the Pādma Tantra (III.26.3-7)^I. It may be thus stated:

"Though Hari is the soul of all existing things, He condescends to dwell in symbols by the power of invocations (mantra) and the power of the invoker. Creatures entreat the Lord in this form for what they wish to possess. Hence this installation (pratisthā) of the Lord is full of meaning. As the Burner Fire permeates objects but burns not, but burns and becomes practically useful for other purposes when evoked by attrition of two pieces of wood, so does Viṣṇu, the All-pervader, invisible to worldly men, become visible in the counterpart, to the evoker, by the strength of invocation. Hence by all means install Viṣṇu, by means of statues, sculptor-made, according to rules laid down by Śāstra".

The fifth form which God takes on is the Antaryāmi Avatāra. This form is nothing but Aniruddha as the "Inner Ruler" of all souls

I Sarva-bhūtasya jātasya Harir ātmā sthīto 'pi saṁ /
 mantra-vīryācca mātmyāt sthāpakasya guroḥ tathā ||

 tasmāt sarvātmanā Viṣṇum pratisthāpy-ābhipūjayet
 śilpibhir nirmite bimbe śāstra-dṛṣṭena vartmanā ||

(niyantā sarva-dehinām: Viśvaksena, p.123). The Antaryāmin is the Supreme considered as an All-Pervading Soul, but, as an Avatāra, he is God, dwelling and guiding the soul of every animate creature. The Antaryāmin plays an important part in Yoga practice and appears as an instinct (ibid., p.122).

Let us now deal with the first mode or prakāra of God. This form is known as the Para^I. God assumes this form as the root of innumerable Avatāras, and especially for the enjoyment of the Nityas and the Muktas (Viśvagendra II.15, Yatāndranata-Dīpikā, p.150; Tattvatraya, p.71). God, in His Para form, is said to reside in Vaikunṭha² in the company of His consort Lakṣmī (Lakṣmī Tantra, VII.9-10; Ahir., VI, 25, IX.31, XXXVI.55). This Vaikunṭha, or Highest Heaven, should not be confounded with the temporal heavens forming the upper spheres of the Cosmic Egg (see Tattvatraya, p.50). It is called Tripād-

I The Para form of God, according to Pādma(1.2.7-15) and Viśvaksena (p.136), is four-armed and of a dark-blue complexion. It has sprung from a still higher, the very first, form of God, which is two-handed, of the colour of pure crystal. This form, again, has originated from that which has all forms and no form (Pādma 1.2.7-15).

2 According to Pādma (1.2.46) and Pārameśvara (1.7), God is in the company of Śrī and Bhūmī, while Yatāndranata-Dīpikā favours the view of the company of many wives (p.150).

the senses, a garland (vanamālā) - the elements (yatāndra-
Dīpikā, p.96; Viśvavilāsa, 2.25-51; also Viṣṇu-Purāṇa 1, chapter
XXII). Para Vasudeva is sometimes identified with, and sometimes

Vivhūti in contradistinction to the one-fourth with which Aniruddha creates the Cosmic Egg or Eggs (see Yatīndramata-Dīpikā p.96). The following are the synonyms of Vaikunṭha given in the Yatīndramata-Dīpikā (p.96): (1) Tripād-Vibhūti, (2) Parama-Vyoma, (3) Parama-Pada, (4) Parama-Ākāśa, (5) Amṛta, (6) Ānanda-Loka, (7) Aprākṛta-Loka, etc. Some of these synonyms occur in Ahir (VI.21 fl1.) and Lakṣmī (VI.43). The Highest Heaven comes into existence together with the Vyūhas (Pr. Ahir., VI.21). Vihagendra Samhitā (II.20) connects each Vyūha with a particular heaven in the following way: Āmṛta = the realm of Saṁkarsana, Pramoda = the realm of Pradyumna, Sammoda = the abode of Aniruddha, and Vaikunṭha = the realm of Para Vāsudeva. At the time of Great Dissolution Vaikunṭha is withdrawn (P.Prakāśa, I.14: Vaikunṭhā-divihāram hitvā). This is also the standpoint of Pādma Tantra (1.2.16 fl1.). But according to Tattvatraya (p.50) the Highest Heaven is not affected by the Dissolution (see also Viṣṇutilaka II. 11-16). God in His Para form is said to be adorned with nine chief ornaments and weapons, which symbolically represent the cosmic principles, viz.: Kaustubha = the souls, Śrīvatsa = Prakṛti, Gadā = Mahat, Saṁkha = Sāttvic Ahaṁkāra, Śārṅga = Tāmasic Ahaṁkāra, Asi = knowledge, its sheath = ignorance, Cakra = mind, the arrows = the senses, a garland (vana-mālā) = the elements (yatīndramata Dīpikā, p.95; Viṣṇutilaka, 2.29-31; also Viṣṇu-Purāṇa 1, chapter XXII). Para Vāsudeva is sometimes identified with, and sometimes

distinguished from, the Vyūha Vāsudeva. When distinguished, the Vyūha Vāsudeva is said to have sprung from the Para Vāsudeva, who, again, is sometimes distinguished from, and sometimes identified with, Puruṣa or Nārāyaṇa. The two are clearly distinguished in Pādma Tantra (1.2.15-15) and in P.Prakāśa Saṁhitā 1.2.3 (Puruṣād Vāsudeva 'bhūt, catvāro hy abhavams tataḥ). Viṣṇutilaka (II.11-16), however, modifying this account, identifies the Para with Nārāyaṇa.

Of the two classes of *gīvas* existing in Vaikunṭha (Aḥir., IX.29-30, Pādma, 1.2.36-40), the more exalted ones are the Nityas. They have never entered into the round of transmigration (Tattvatraya, p.32), but are saved from the moment of their creation and for ever. They hold perpetually certain offices (yatīndra, p. 149 fl1.). They store up service to Nārāyaṇa, like wealth in the treasuries of their hearts. They can incarnate at will in the world, just as Viṣṇu Himself (ibid., p.136). Another class of residents of the Highest Heaven are the Muktas. They differ from the Nityas in the above three respects. They were turning the wheel of existences, and were saved by the grace of the Lord from the weary round of births and rebirths. They are not privileged to interfere in the affairs of the world (yatīndramata Dīpikā, pp. 135 fl1.). Lastly, unlike the Nityas, they are not the coadjutors of the Lord (ibid., pp.135 fl1.). They are described as intensely radiating spiritual atoms of the size of a trasareṇu (Aḥir, VI.27;

Viśvaksena, p.13). This means that they have no *prākṛtik* body (karma-made), but they can assume, if they like, a non-natural body, or even simultaneously several such bodies, and freely roam about in the world (Tattvatraya, p.24; Yatīndramata Dīpikā, p.136). There exists no social difference of any kind among the Muktas, they being as equal, essentially, as for instance grains of rice, or a heap of gold coins (Tattvatraya, p.25). But their mode of life differs by the difference of devotional inclinations preserved from their last earthly existence (Ahir., VI.29-30).

Let us, then, consider another important category known as *Suddha Sattva* (spiritual or pure matter). It exists nowhere, except in Pure Creation. It is not to be regarded as a mixture of the three *Gunas*, nor as *Sattva* alone without the admixture of the other two. Tattvatraya (II.1-6) understands it in the latter sense (see Srinivasa Iyengar's *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*, p.187). It is *atyānāprabhā* of Pure Creation (Ahir VI.21-22), and is of the nature of knowledge and bliss (*ibid*, VI.23, 24). It is a necessary hypothesis for the explanation of non-natural bodies of God, *Nityas* and *Muktas* and also to explain the existence of various objects in *Vaikuntha*, such as sandals, flowers, parks, etc. (see Ahir, 6.23 and 24).

of Nityas, until he is fully materialized and thus prepared for further multiplication (Ahir, VI.45). He is probably the same as the *Kūṭastha Puruṣa* of the *Bhagavad-Gītā* (XVI.16). He is

I N T E R M E D I A T E C R E A T I O N

(SECOND STAGE OF EVOLUTION)

The creation with which we are now concerned may conveniently be called the Intermediate Creation, i.e., the creation which is different from the pure one, although based upon (Ahir., VI.27: *tanmūlaiva*) the latter. This is performed with an infinitely small portion of divine energy (Ahir., III.21, Lakṣmi, IV.35). Before entering into the subject it may be observed here that in this stage Bhūti is manifested in pure-impure form; while in the subsequent stage it is manifested in gross condition. Under this heading we shall have to examine the two Tattvas, with their respective developments, that is to say the Kūṭastha Puruṣa (Ahir., VI.53 fl1.) and the Māyā or Mūlaprakṛti (ibid., 4.4). These two principles take their rise from Pradyumna (Viśvaksena, p.126). Kūṭastha Puruṣa, variously called Manus, Eight Manus, etc., is the Puruṣa of four pairs, male and female ancestors of four castes (Ahir, VI.34, VII.3; Lakṣmī-Tantra, VII.11-13; Viśvaksena, p.126). These four pairs are supposed to spring from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet of Pradyumna (Ahir., VI.9 fl1.). Kūṭastha is imagined as retaining this form while travelling through the various evolutes of Māyā, until he is fully materialised and thus prepared for further multiplication (Ahir, VI.45). He is probably the same as the Kūṭastha Puruṣa of the Bhagavad-Gītā (XVI.16). He is

regarded as the source of all disembodied but karma-bound souls before the creation and after the dissolution of the non-pure universe (Lakṣmī Tantra, VII.11-12). It may be noted^{here} that the liberated souls do not return to Kūṭastha. He is śuddhy-asuddhimaya (Ahir, VI. 34 fl1), pure in himself but impure on account of carrying the vāsanā of non-liberated souls. He is thus the soul of souls massed together like a bee-hive (ibid, IX.35²⁷).

Māyā is the primordial or primitive form of Prakṛti into which the Manus are destined to gradually descend (Ahir, VI.45). It consists of kālamaya vapuṣ (Ahir, VI.15), viz:, time and its subtle cause, e.g., Niyati, and guṇamaya vapuṣ (Ahir, VI.16), viz:, Śattva, Rajas and Tamas. It is variously designated as Māyā Śakti, Vidyā, Śakti, etc. (Lakṣmī Tantra, IV.52). Māyā is to the material universe what the Kūṭastha is to the world of souls (cf. Māyā and Kūṭastha taken together with what is technically known as the World-Soul of Plato).

After the production of these two Tattvas, Pradyumna transfers them (Śakti with the Puruṣa in it) to Aniruddha for further development (Ahir, 6. 13 $\frac{1}{2}$). After being developed by the Yoga of Aniruddha, the material principles emerge in the following order, first, directly from Aniruddha, Śakti; from Śakti, Niyati; from Niyati, Kāla; from the latter, Śattva, from the latter, Rajas, and, from the latter, Tamas (Ahir, VI.43 fl1.). Simultaneously and in the same order the Manus descend this line of Tattvas, thus

appropriating successively the individual faculty which each Tattva is capable of bestowing (ibid, VI.45).

^I
A word or two regarding *Māyā*, *Niyati*, and *Kāla*, may not be amiss here. These categories play a very important part so far as the Non-pure Creation is concerned. They are the conditions sine qua non of the material universe (*Lakṣmī Tantra*, VII.13, IV.67, VI.18-19). They play more or less an analogous rôle in the cosmology of the *Pāñcarātra* to that which the Forms of perception and conception play in the epistemology of Kant.

Just as Kant holds that no experience or knowledge is possible without being conformable to the Forms of perception and conception, so, too, the material universe cannot be explained without the operation of the Principles of obscuration in the *Pāñcarātra* system. Hence the justness of the remark in *Lakṣmī-Tantra* that they are the three mothers and creators of the world (IV.67, VI.18-19, VII.13).

Niyati is the subtle regulator of everything (*Ahira*, VI.46), viz: nature, form, and work (both intellectual and practical) of every being (ibid, VI, 48). Dr. Schrader (*I.P.A.S.*, pp.64 fl.) believes that it includes the functions of *Vidyā*, *Rāga* and *Kāla* of the *Trika*, in addition to that of *Niyati* of the latter system. Thus, it is far richer in contents than the *Vaiśeṣika* *Dīś*, which is

I Cf. *Māyā*, *Niyati* and *Kāla* with the six *Kāñcukas* of the *Trika* system (see J.C. Chatterji's *Kashmir Shaivism*, pp.75 fl.)

only the upholder of positional relations and order on the part of discrete things (see J.C. Chatterji, *Hindu Realism*, pp.58 fl1.).

Kāla is the mysterious power (Ahir, IV.48) which pursues everything to be ripened (ibid., VI.51). It is the maturing form of time (Ahir, VI.49: *Kālasya pācanam rūpam*). Three kinds of time are distinguishable, to wit: (1) eternal; (2) relatively eternal, and (3) gross time (Ahir.LIII.10-11; also see P. Prakāśa, chapter III). The first kind of time exists in the transcendental sphere as an instrument to be used by Īśvara (see Ahir, LVIII.10-12). The second kind of time, though relatively eternal, is created by Aniruddha. Time of the third denomination is the product of Mahat in its Tamas aspect (Ahir VII.9-11). It consists of *truti*s, *lavas*, etc. It is the second kind of Kāla with which we are concerned here. It is the subtle force conditioning time (Ahir, VI.49).

The Guna body consisting of the three Guṇas (Ahir, VI.51-52), namely, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, comes under the protectorship of Aniruddha in the form of the Trimūrti (three gods) regarded as the forces underlying the formation of *prasūti-kōśa*, or more properly called *Avyakta* (Lakṣmī Tantra, VI.20-21). Lakṣmī Tantra (IV.32 fl1.) says that the Guṇas have been evolved from an infinitesimal part of the first, second and third Guṇas of the Lord, the other three being employed for the creation of Kūla (ibid, V.24-25). The qualities ascribed to the Guṇas are similar to those of the Sāṃkhya Guṇas, to wit: brightness, passion,

and stupefaction respectively to Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas (Ahir, VI.52 fl1.: see also Sāṃkhya-kārikā, Colebrooke's translation, pp.54 fl1.). When the Guṇas have been evolved separately, they become, for the purpose of creation, a uniform mass variously called Avyakta, Mūlaprakṛti, Guṇa-Sāmya, Avidyā, Aksara, Yoni, Ayoni, Svabhāva, etc. (Ahir, VI.63).

THIRD STAGE OF EVOLUTION

I

After the formation of Avyakta there follows an evolution similar to that of the classical Sāṃkhya (Ahir, VI.61). But certain differences are noticeable. The Sāṃkhya evolution results from the combined activity of the two principles, viz., Puruṣa and Prakṛti (see Sāṃkhya-kārikā XII, Colebrooke's translation, pp.76 fl1.). But the Pāñcarātra evolution proceeds from the co-operation of the three entities, namely, Prakṛti, Puruṣa and Kāla (Ahir, VII.5 fl1.). Again, Puruṣa in the classical Sāṃkhya

1 It should always be borne in mind that the Manus travel simultaneously through each Tattva after its formation.

2 In the classical Sāṃkhya time is a mere quality of matter (Sāṃkhya-kārikā X, Colebrooke's translation, pp.39 fl1.)

skandha) of the Bauddha (I.P.A.S., p.75). The same eminent scholar (ibid., p.75) further points out that Mahat is almost identical with the Prāṇa of the Cāndogya (IV.3), Prāṇa (II.4) and Hraṇīta (IV.30). It is the sub-or super-conscious principle

are many (Sāṃkhya-kārikā XVIII), but here at this stage only ~~the~~ the one Kūṭastha or collective Puruṣa. Lastly, we should always bear in mind the theistic character of the Pāñcarātra system, which is conspicuous by its absence in the classical Sāṃkhya.

The first product of the joint activity of the three principal agents is what is variously described as Mahat, Vidyā, Avāṇī, Vadhū, Brāhmī, Vṛddhi, etc. (Ahir, VII.8-9). Mahat is threefold; its Tamas element appearing as Kāla, its Sattva element as Buddhi, and its Rajas element as Prāṇa (ibid, VII.9-11; cf. Lakṣmī XVI.2-4). Mahat is not a mere synonym for Buddhi as in the classical Sāṃkhya, but Buddhi is one of its forms, viz., its Sāttvic aspect (Ahir., VII.13-14). According to Sāṃkhya-kārikā XXIX (Colebrooke's translation, p.102) the five Prāṇas are a common function of Buddhi, Ahaṃkāra, and Manas, which three together form antah-karana (inner organ); whereas, according to Ahirbudhnya (VII.42-43), they come from Mahat only. Mahat is thus the psycho-physical energy at the building up and the preserving of organisms. It is probably the Mahad-Brahma of the Bhagavad-Gītā (XIV.5; see Dr. Barnett in J.R.A.S., 1927, pp. 127 fl.). Dr. Schrader is quite positive about the correspondence of Mahat with the re-connection consciousness (vijñāna-skandha) of the Bauddhas (I.P.A.S., p.74). The same eminent scholar (ibid, p.73) further points out that Mahat is almost identical with the Prāṇa of the Chāndogya (IV.3), Praṇa (II.4) and Kauṣītaki (IV.20). It is the sub-or super-conscious principle

consisting of intelligence, vitality and time (Ahir.VII.9-11; cf. Brhadāraṇyaka, IV.3.36; IV.3.4, IV.4.4).

From Mahat originates Ahaṁkāra, having a Sāttvic, Rājasic and Tāmasic form called respectively Vaikārika, Taijasa, and Bhūtādi (Ahir, VII.17 fl.). Manas, the concreting and synthesising factor, is a direct product of Vaikārika (VII.20, also 42-43). Ahaṁkāra (or power of self-arrogation) is evidently a product of the Bhūtādi. From Ahaṁkāra the Manus receive not only the above-mentioned faculties (viz.: Manas and Ahaṁkāra), but also ten more Indriyas (senses), but by an indirect process.

AHAMKĀRA

AHAMKĀRA			
Bhūtādi	←	Taijasa	→ Vaikārika
Tat. Tanmātras:	Bhūtas:	Buddhīndriyas:	Kar ^{me} āndriyas :
śabda →	ākāśa	śrotra	vāc
sparsa →	vāyu	tvac	pāṇi
rūpa →	tejas	cakṣus	pāda
rasa →	āpas	rasanā	upaśtha
gandha →	prthivī	ghrāṇa	pāyu

I

From the Bhūtādi, assisted by the Taijasa, is

I Rajas Ahaṁkāra is the concomitant cause along with the other two kinds of Ahaṁkāra in producing their respective objects (see Tattvatraya, p.44). Lakṣmī Tantra (IV.34), speaking on Non-pure Creation generally, says that mostly Rajas is engaged in it which is, however, flanked by Sattva and Tamas.

produced, śabda-tanmātra, which is the cause of ākāśa. The Vaikārika, with the co-operation of śabda-tanmātra and Taijasa, produces śrotra. The Vaikārika, with the aid of śrotra, produces vāc. Śabda-tanmātra is the cause of sparsa-tanmātra which is the cause of vāyu. The Vaikārika, with the assistance of Taijasa and Sparsa, produces tvac and, with the help of the latter, produces pāṇi, and so forth (see Ahir, VI.21 to 45; Viṣṇutilaka II.66 fl1.).

The Manus, then, by entering successively the five Elements, are furnished, at each of these steps, with one sensory and one motor faculty. They are thus fully equipped (see Ahir, VII.45 fl1.). Not immediately, however, after the Tattvas have originated, can ^{the} Manus commence their activity on earth, it being necessary that the Cosmic Egg (Egge?) and in it the god Brahmā should come into being; while for the creation of the Egg the Tattvas, from Mahat down to the Gross Elements, should be massed together under the influence of the foremost Puruṣa (P.Prakāśa Samhitā, i.2 end). The Manus (after the formation of the Cosmic Egg), by the command of Aniruddha, begin to multiply (Ahir, VII.43); each of the four pairs generates a hundred descendants (male and female) called Mānavas, and these become the ancestors of aparimitaḥ (numberless) Mānava-mānavas (Ahir, VII.43; cf. Mahāsanatkumāra, sixth adhyāya). This is called the Pure Group (śuddha-varga), as distinct from the Mixed

Group (misra-varga) consisting of four castes born of Rajas and Tamas (Visvaksena, pp.126-129). In the former group Sattva Guna prevails. Tattvatraya (p.75) and Visvaksena (126-129) derive the Pure Group from Pradyumna and the Mixed Group from Aniruddha. ^{But according to} Aniruddha (VI.13, VII.47-48) both the types are traceable to Aniruddha, the Pure One being introduced into the Cosmic Egg directly and the Mixed One indirectly (i.e. after being transferred to Brahmā). The creation up to the four-faced Brahmā, as already hinted at, is called the immediate creation, and the creation following it is called mediate (see Yatīndramata Dīpikā, p.80; Visvaksena, pp.126-129). Pādma Tantra (1.5.19-21, also 1, adhyāya 3) thus gives an account of the Gross Creation:

The principles thus created could not create beings without coalescing into a mass. Out of the massing together of the Tattvas an Egg was produced from the navel of Padmanābha and in the Egg the four-faced Brahmā (created by Aniruddha) became the womb of the world. He (Brahmā) makes three attempts at creating the world, the third of which is fully successful, by generating (1) the four youths (Sanaka, etc.) who refuse to have offspring; (2) Śiva who by self-partition creates the eleven principal and many minor Rudras; and (3) the six Prajāpatis from whom all the remaining creatures descend. The plurality of the Cosmic Eggs is emphasized in several Samhitās, such as Visvaksena (p.66) and Pādma Tantra (1, adhyāya, 10-13).

They are the play-balls of Īśvara and arise simultaneously like bubbles of water (Tattvatraya, p.47). The Pādma Tantra (1, adhyāyas 10 to 12) describes these Brahmāṇḍas as consisting of fourteen spheres (loka) surrounded by seven enclosures (āvarana).

P. Prakāśa Samhitā, differing from the Pādma Tantra, says that Brahmā has sprung from the lotus-bud, which (bud) itself has sprung from the navel of Viṣṇu sleeping in the Egg's interior, namely, in the midst of the water (III.37-38; cf. Lakṣmī Tantra V.15 fl1.) Śrī-Praśna Samhitā (II.21 fl1.) states that Brahmā, desirous to know his origin, makes a futile attempt at getting, through the navel, at the cause of the lotus, then meditates for a thousand years, and finally receives from the Puruṣa the instrument of creation, e.g., the Vedas.

Before we close this chapter let us make a general survey of the three important philosophical principles dealt with by the Samhitās, viz.: Soul, Matter, and God. These three categories, tentatively enunciated in the Nārāyaṇīya episode, receive further development from the Samhitās. The three entities are clearly set forth in Viṣṇutilaka in the words (2.34-35): "There is a triad here: Brahman is a rāśi (mass) of light, Jagat a mass of elements (bhūta), and Jīva a mass of knowledge" (cf. Ahir, 45.3-4, 33.13 etc). The relation between them may be summed up thus: Souls and Matter have their being in

Brahman, their support from Him, are pervaded by Him, and are reabsorbed in Him (Viṣṇutilaka, 1.33; Ahir, 2.22-53; Pādma, 1.6. 27 fl1, 1.6.23 fl1.etc.); and the individual soul is entirely dependent upon His Anugraha Śakti for salvation (Ahir, XIV. 30-35). Individual soul differs from Matter in that the latter is unconscious and subject to modification (Ahir, 5.9 fl1.), while the former is conscious and in its intrinsic self-hood suffers from no change or modification (aparināmin; Ahir, VII.6).

The size of the Jīva is atomic (Ahir, VI.27; Viśvaksena, p.13). Its characteristic is the union of knowledge and bliss (Viśvaksena, p.13). In the Lakṣmī Tantra (VI.36) it has been characterised as a contracted form of Lakṣmī (pramāṭa cetanaḥ prokto, mat-saṁkocaḥ sa ucyate). It is pure, free, undifferentiated consciousness (Lakṣmī Tantra XII.23 fl1.). In the saṁsāra the naturally unlimited knowledge of the Jīva is obscured and contracted by the Nigraha Śakti of the Lord (Ahir, XIV, 16-19), but at the time of liberation it becomes omniscient (Viśvaksena, p.13). Since God, at the beginning, obstructs the souls by obacuring their ākāra, aiśvarya, and vijnāna (Ahir XIV, 16-19), it might give us the impression that souls, when liberated, become omnipresent and omnipotent, besides being omniscient. Such an impression cannot, however, be consistently maintained unless, of course, omnipresence and omnipotence are construed in a restricted and relative sense. The Jīvas cannot be omnipotent

in as much as they, besides being denied the powers of creation, preservation and destruction, cannot even incarnate at will in the world - a privilege accorded to the Nityas (see Yatīndramata Dīpikā, pp.135 and 136). They cannot be omnipresent as well. They have been described as atomic in Viśvaksena (p.13) and Ahirbudhnya (VI.27). Yatīndramata-Dīpikā (pp.69 and 75) has tried to explain away the difficulty by holding that the liberated soul, though atomic like the bound one, is omnipresent in consciousness. Dr. Schrader gives us a different solution of the problem. He thinks that omnipresence means that which is beyond space. In the saṃsāra the Jīva is spatially restricted, as such it is not described as omnipresent; but in liberation it becomes free from the limitations of space, hence it is said to be omnipresent (I.P.A.S., pp.90 and 91). The conception of a soul as ubiquitous suggests the influence of the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika systems (for the conception of ubiquity of the soul, see Garbe's Philosophy of Ancient India, p.23; also Radhakrishnan's Indian Philosophy, p.143). Further investigation into the subject will show how far the suggestion can be borne out. The intrusion into the Pāñcarātra of this particular tenet, viz., the omnipresence of the soul, might be attributed to the Śaivas. For, the Śaivas do teach that the souls are naturally omnipresent, that is, not hampered by space, though limited, while in bondage, by Niyati (see Pratyabhiññādaya, Śrīnagar

edition, p.23; also Sarvadarśana Saṅgraha, Poona edition, p.69).

Besides the Nityas, the souls are divided into four classes: (1) Mukta (liberated); (2) Mukti-Yogya (those fit for liberation); (3) Nitya-Baddha (ever-bound); and (4) Tama-Yogya (those fit for darkness; see P.Prakāśa Samhitā 1.1.11 fl1.).

The summum bonum (hitam atyantam) of men is the absolute discontinuance of the succession of sorrows, and the eternal happiness implied in it, which is tantamount to the attainment of one's real nature, that is the nature of God (bhagavannayatā, see Ahir, XIII.9-11). The reason and object of this saṁsāra is shrouded in mystery. It is the play of God (P. Prakāśa, 1.1.4; Ahir, 33.10, 30.3-4), though God as the perfect one can have no desire for playing. But how the play begins and how it ends, that, indeed, may be said. At the beginning God obstructs the soul by obscuring its form (akāra), power (aiśvarya), and knowledge (vijñāna), the result being the three taints (mala) of the soul, to wit atomicity (^{anantva}ajintva), (2) impotence (kiñcit-karatā), and (3) ignorance (ajñatva); see Ahir, XIV.16-20). It is owing to the taints and also to the passions arising from the contact with Matter, that the soul finally treads the path of action and so produces vāsanās leading to new births; and it is the Karman so produced which (like the seed producing a tree,

and the tree producing seeds) ultimately necessitates a new creation and so establishes the Creative, Preservative, and Destructive Saktis of the Lord (Ahir, XXXVIII.10-16). This is called the transmission of obscuration (Tirodhāna-paramparā) of the Nigraha Śakti (Ahir, XIV.25). This Tirodhāna-paramparā comes about with the assistance of the two parts of the Bhūti called Time and Māyā (ibid, XIV.26). It has no beginning, but it may have an end, so far as the individual is concerned, by the breaking in of the power of divine grace (anugrahaśakti-pāta), resembling a shower of compassion coming down upon him who has been beheld by God (Ahir, XIV.30-35). It is impossible to determine when and how the sublime mercy of Viṣṇu breaks in. But no sooner has it happened than both the Karmans (good and bad) become silent. The breaking in of grace causes the soul to discern its ^{goal} (liberation) and to strive after it by means of the recognised systems (Ahir, XIV.30-37).

A word or two regarding ^{some} sense of the exoteric doctrines of Pāñcarātra religion ^{may} need not be amiss here, although it is the aim of the thesis not to deal with the outward or objective side of the Pāñcarātra, but only to expose the philosophy of the said system.

The ~~dīkṣā~~ dīkṣā, or what may be called the Masonic initiation, plays a very important part among the Pāñcarātrins. Every twice-born Vaiṣṇava is expected to select a guru and receive

initiation from him (Ahir, XX.8). ^IĪśvara Saṁhitā (VIII.179) extends the rite of dīkṣā to all castes. The above Saṁhitā² (XXI, 40-41) has elaborately dealt with the subject. "There is no distinction of gotra; all the four (i.e. Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, Sūdra) are equal. There is no high and low (distinctions) of caste (jāti). They are meditators of the twelve-syllabled Bhagavad-Vāsudeva formula, unconcerned in other fruits than that of sure emancipation (mokṣa); and to them no sacramental impurities consequent on births and deaths attach".

Initiation consists of (1) tāpa, (2) pundra (paint-marks on the forehead), (3) nāma, (4) mantra, and (5) yāga (divine worship). He who receives these is called the great Bhāgavata (Viṣṇutilaka IV.189-90; also read Bhāradvāja Saṁhitā, Parisiṣṭa, ch.II.).

Five-time observances (pañca-kāla) are enjoined on the pious Bhāgavatas. Pādma Tantra devotes a whole chapter (IV) to this. Briefly they are: (1) abhigamana (2) upādāna (3) iḥyā (divine worship), (4) svādhyāya (study of sacred works),

I ~~Sya-sva varṇāśram-ācāra-saṁskṛti-cestitān~~ 1
~~ānāhitān cakṛa-Saṁkhābhyam bhuḥjayor dāksināditaḥ~~ |)

2 sarve samānās catvāro gotra-pravara-varjitah

(Also read Bhāradvāja Saṁhitā, 1.14-16; Viṣṇutilaka IV. 189-90).

is the mere expression of the Lord's wishes" (I.P.A.S., p. 22).
 God is the Self or Soul of all beings (I.P.A.S., II.12). All

and (5) yāga or yoga (see Pādma IV.13). The day, commencing at about 4 a.m. and closing at about 10 p.m., is to be appropriated, in five different divisions, for each of the five holy acts enumerated above (see Pādma IV.13,4).

After noticing one or two salient features of the practical side of the Pāñcarātra system, let us resume our thread of connection disturbed by a somewhat necessary digression.

The last and the most important concept that remains to be analysed is that of God. The Supreme Deity has two natures, viz.: transcendent and immanent (Pādma I.VI.41-43). However, the transcendent aspect of Viṣṇu remains so completely in the background in the Pāñcarātra that we are practically only concerned with the one force (Lakṣmī) which, as Bhūti, appears as the universe, and, as Kriyā, vitalises and governs it. The mutual relation of the two (Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī), as already explained, is one of inseparable connection or inherence like that of substance and attribute, moon and moonshine, sun and sunshine, aham and ahamtā (see Lakṣmī 3.16 fl1; Ahir, III.21 fl1.). But despite this frequent assurance as to the real identity of Lakṣmī and Viṣṇu, the two are actually regarded as distinct (see Ahir, IV.75). "Still, the dualism", as has been well observed by Dr. Schrader, "is a makeshift for preserving the transcendent character of Viṣṇu: Lakṣmī alone acts, but everything she does is the mere expression of the Lord's wishes" (I.P.A.S., p.30). God is the Self or ātmā of all beings (Lakṣmī, II.12). All

things are in Him, are evolved out of Him, and are reabsorbed in Him. He pervades everything (Viṣṇutilaka, 1.23; Ahir, II.22 fl1.; Pādma 1.6.23; etc.). Brahman is characterised by bliss; He is without beginning, changeless, always undifferentiated, self-knowing, faultless, superlatively subtle, self-determined, the ruler, self-luminous, spotless, infinite, indestructible, tranquil, invisible, capable of evolving the world, omnipresent, supreme, devoid of past and future, the Lord called Vāsudeva, the source of all beings, Īśvara, the supreme Puruṣa, eternal, without waves, without disturbance, boundless, beyond the Guṇas (Sattva, Rajas and Tamas), with Guṇas (non-natural Guṇas), the grantor of all desires (Pādma Tantra, 1.V.29-34; also see Lakṣmī XIV.1-10; Ahir, II.22-53). With reference to the material universe God, in addition to the three well-known powers of creation, preservation, and destruction, is armed with two more, namely, Amagraha and Nigraha (Ahir, XIV.14 fl1.; Pādma 1.2.9 fl1.). Cycles of existence come about through the instrumentality of Nigraha Śakti (ibid., XIV. 15 fl1.); and liberation is conceivable only through the breaking in of divine grace (ibid., XIV.30-35).

The relation between the Jīva and God is, in some Saṃhitās, described in Advaitic language. The influence from that quarter is quite possible. But it is quite fair to concur with Dr.

Schrader when he asserts that the general trend of the Pāñcarātra is non-Advaitic, and that the main characteristic of Advaitism, viz.: illusionism (māyā-vāda), is altogether absent in the Saṃhitās (I.P.A.S., pp.91-93). Some of the Saṃhitās, here and there, breed pure Advaitism, namely, the identity of an individual soul with the Supreme. With a few exceptions, the said borrowing may be treated as formal. Moreover, the Saṃhitās which appear to teach Advaitism do not cling to it right up to the end. Over and over again, they break out into theism, thus betraying their theistic predilection. We may refer to a few passages of the Saṃhitās which seemingly preach Advaitism, with a view to support our contention.

In Pādma Tantra (1.4.14 fl1.) Brahmā puts the question: "What is the difference, O Lord, between thee and the liberated soul?" The Lord replies: "They become I; there is no difference whatever". This seems to be plain Advaita, but the answer goes on: "As I live (viharāmi), just so live the liberated souls", which immediately brings back the idea of plurality. Visṇutilaka apparently teaches Advaitism in many passages, such as 1.33, 1.114, II.30, etc. But as we proceed we find that theism overtakes Advaitism and maintains its ground firmly. We shall quote a passage from the said Saṃhitā just to illustrate how theism has been unmasked in its pristine simplicity, despite the strenuous effort made to enclose it in a Brahmaist

shell. "Just as, by means of the gates of various kinds, people go forth from a town, even so the souls go forth from Brahman - this is called Creation; and, as through these gates, the inhabitants of that town enter it again, just so the souls go back to that Brahman - this is called Withdrawal" (Visṇutilaka, II.95 fl.). This is theism pure and simple, without any tinge of Advaitism. Thus we can say that theism, though for a time lost in the cobweb of Advaitism, is finally restored to its purity.

The following seemingly Advaitic passages may profitably be consulted; Pādma Tantra 1.6.24, 43-44, 51-52, Visṇutilaka, II.100, II.54, II.30, 1.114, etc.

The neighbouring religions, especially and necessarily would it therefore exercise a far greater influence upon a religion that had chance to come under its sway. Once this brought to touch with Brahmanism of the Hindus, Pāṇḍita became a cult of Brahmanism and Brahmanism (Kāṇḍīya and the Bhāgavata, p. 1). Thus, on the one side, Brahmanism asserted its usual supremacy over Pāṇḍita, and, on the other, the Pāṇḍita found a

I It is difficult to say whether the Pāṇḍita system was in close relations with a branch of Brahmanic thought from the beginning.

CHAPTER V

PĀÑCARĀTRA AND THE UPANISADS

In the Introduction we have observed that the Pāñcarātra, during the second stage of its career, came into contact with Brahmaism of the Midland (Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas, p.7). We have also noticed that the life and death struggle between the Brahmans and the Buddhists was the immediate cause of this fusion (Garbe's Bhagavad-Gītā, p.35). In their warfare against the Buddhists the Brāhmanas won over the Bhāgavatas as their allies. This alliance was mutually beneficial. One dominant characteristic of Brahmaism is that it has always exercised a sort of magnetic influence upon all the neighbouring religions; naturally and necessarily would it therefore exercise a far greater influence upon a religion that had chance to come under its sway. Once this brought in touch with Brahmaism of the Midland, Pāñcarātra became a cult of Brahmaised anti-Brahmaists (Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas, p.7). Thus, on the one side, Brahmaism asserted its usual supremacy over Pāñcarātra, and, on the other, the Pāñcarātras^I found a

I It is difficult to say whether the Pāñcarātra system was in close relations with a branch of Upaniṣadic thought from the beginning.

life's opportunity, as it were, to recover their lost ground, since the alliance enabled them to borrow some doctrines from the Upaniṣads, thus placing them in a position to claim orthodoxy^I for their religion, so long put under the ban of heterodoxy (see Radhakrishnan's Indian Philosophy, p.489). Despite this plagiarism, it must be said to the credit of the Pāñcarātras that they maintained the essentially theistic character of their religion. In the Introduction we have also noticed that the religion, during the final phase of its evolution, was more and more suffused with pantheistic tenets, and transformed itself into Viṣṇuism. We shall now consider the sources from which the Pāñcarātras are likely to have derived their doctrines, during those two stages in their career. We shall remember that the Midland at this period (i.e. the period when the alliance was effected between the Brāhmanas and the Bhāgavatas) was passing through a great fermentation, both intellectual and religious. Sacerdotalism of the Brāhmanas gave place to the meditation of the seers of the Upaniṣads. The Upaniṣads mark an advance upon

I The assertion is subject to modification as we do not know anything definitely about the incipient stage of Pāñcarātra. This view may be accepted if we place absolute reliance upon Śaṅkara's comment (see Brahma-Sūtra II.2.42-45). Be it noted, however, that Śaṅkara's criticism of the Pāñcarātra cannot be regarded as final (for defence of the Pāñcarātra, see Yamunācārya's Āgamaprāmānya, pp.50-71).

the Saṃhitā mythology, Brāhmaṇa hair-splitting and even Āraṇyaka theology, though all these stages are to be met with here. Broadly speaking, we can say that this period (circa 300 B.C.; see Indian Antiquary, 1908, p.257) synchronises with the rise of some of the post-Buddhistic Upaniṣads, which easily lend themselves to theistic interpretation. We cannot say with any definiteness whether the Pāñcarātras confined themselves wholly to the contemporary Upaniṣads, in the matter of borrowing. Rather it appears more probable that they borrowed not only from the contemporary, but also from the pre-existing, Upaniṣads according to their suitability. Thus, practically speaking, the Upaniṣads are the sources from which they drew most of their doctrines. Before we consider this part of our thesis let us make some observations regarding the Upaniṣads.

The Upaniṣads are not the systematic treatises of a single hand, but are rather collations or compilations of floating monologues, dialogues or anecdotes. Unlike the sophistication of Ancient Greece, they are essentially the outpourings or poetic deliverances of philosophically tempered minds in the face of the facts of life. It is clear that the Upaniṣads had no set theory of philosophy or dogmatic scheme of theology to propound. They teach a variety of doctrines and are to be regarded as guesses at truth. It will not be far from truth to say that all the later religio-philosophic systems

of the country are rooted in the Upaniṣads (see Bloomfield's Religion of the Veda, p.51). Thanks to the obscurity as well as the richness, the mystic haze as well as the suggestive quality of the Upaniṣads, the interpreters have been able to use them in the interests of their religion and philosophy. All the later philosophers and theologians display an almost pathetic anxiety to accommodate their doctrines to the views of the Upaniṣads, even if they cannot father them all on them. For a proper understanding of the Upaniṣads we must go back to the last Book of the R̥g-Veda which contains certain hymns, such as X.90, X.129, etc., that try to solve the problem of existence in a more or less philosophic way. The advance of the Upaniṣads on the Vedas consists in an increased emphasis upon the monistic suggestions of the Vedic hymns, a shifting of the centre from the outer to the inner world, a protest against the externalism of Vedic practices and an indifference to the sacredness of the Veda. In effecting their objects the thinkers did not break away with the past by a process of revolution, as it were. "Conserve and reform" was the motto of the seers of the Upaniṣads. They moralise, reinterpret and allegorise the Brahmanic sacrifices. In some passages of the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.1.3) we are asked to meditate on the horse-sacrifice.

By giving detailed descriptions of the kind of plank, the nature of the wood, etc., the thinkers of the Upaniṣads show that they are not indifferent to sacrificial religion. While adhering to the forms, they try to refine them. They say that all sacrifices are for the sake of realising the self of man. Life itself is a sacrifice. The true sacrifice is man (see Chāndogya, III.16). Sometimes we are told that sacrifices are necessary as preparations for the higher path. They are for the unenlightened, though they alone will not do. Ceremonialism is contrasted with spiritual worship (Chāndogya, I.1.10, 1.13. 4-5, etc.). Thus the rigid ritual of the Brāhmaṇas was held in check in the Upaniṣads.

The number of the Upaniṣads, as given in the Muktikā, is 108. The total number of Upaniṣads, says Barth, amounts to 350 (R.I., p.66). Weber reckons their number at 235 (History of Indian Literature, p.155). ^{note} ~~History of~~ *History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 226-227.* ~~Sanskrit Literature, pp. 236).~~ Professor Macdonell divides the Upaniṣads chronologically, on internal evidence, into four classes. The oldest group consists, in chronological order, of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, Chāndogya, Taittirīya, Aitareya, and Kauṣītaki. They are written in prose of an archaic style. The Kena Upaniṣad forms a transition between the first and the second class, being written partly in prose and partly in verse. The second group comprises Katha, Iśā, Śvetāśvatara, Muṇḍaka and Mahānārāyaṇa,

The composition of these treatises is almost entirely metrical. The third class consists of the *Prasna*, *Maitrāyaṇīya*, and *Māṇḍūkya*. These Upaniṣads revert to the use of prose, but the prose is of a type distinct from that of the earlier Upaniṣads and approximates to the style of the classical Sanskrit. The fourth group consists of some of the later Atharvan Upaniṣads, such as *Garbha*, *Piṇḍa*, etc. They are composed mostly in prose with an intermixture of verse (see Deussen's *Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*, authorised English translation by A.S. Geden, pp. 25-26; also E.R.E., Vol. XII, pp. 542 fl.). The earliest Upaniṣads are non-sectarian in character and are remarkable for their speculation. In the later Upaniṣads there is more of religious worship and devotion (see E.R.E., Vol. XII, p. 542). Professor Max Müller believes that the *Maitrāyaṇī* belongs to the earliest group (S.B.E., Vol. XV, Introduction, p. L). It is held by the same scholar that the ancient Upaniṣads (i.e., those which occupy a place in the *Samhitās*, *Brāhmaṇas* and *Āraṇyakas*) must be older than 600 B.C., i.e. anterior to the rise of Buddhism (S.B.E. Vol. I, Introduction, P. LXVII). The principal Upaniṣads to which Śaṅkara appeals in his great commentary on the *Vedānta Sūtra* are the following: (1) *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, (2) *Chāndogya*, (3) *Aitareya*, (4) *Kauṣītaki*, (5) *Īśā*, (6) *Kaṭha*, (7) *Mundaka*, (8) *Taittirīya*, (9) *Svetāśvatara*, (10) *Prasna*, and (11) *Kena*. The above eleven are regarded by Max Müller as the

classical Upaniṣads (S.B.E., Vol. XV, Introduction, p.IX).

We shall reiterate what we have already stated, namely, we should look upon the Upaniṣads not as a systematic treatise but as a repository of diverse currents of thought - the melting pot in which all later philosophical ideas were still in a state of fusion. Under the circumstances the proper and feasible course open to us is not to rely upon the absolute claims of the exponents of the Upaniṣads, such as Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, etc., but to determine their meaning independently.

The central idea running through the early Upaniṣads is the equation of ^IĀtman, the inmost essence in man, with Brahman, the ultimate essence of the universe (Br., IV, 4.5, 23, 25, I.4.6; Āit., V.3; Muṇḍaka, II.2.5; Sve., 1.16; Tait., 1.5, etc.). The Upaniṣads are emphatic in their declaration

-
- I In the pre-Upaniṣadic Vedic literature the word ātman was used to denote, on the one hand, the ultimate essence of the universe, and, on the other, the vital breath in man. Later on in the Upaniṣads Brahman is generally used in the former sense, while the word ātman is reserved to denote the inmost essence in man (see Garbe's Philosophy of Ancient India, p.9; Bloomfield's Religion of the Veda, pp.371-74; American Journal of Philology, XVI, p.421; also Macdonell's History of Sanskrit Literature, pp.213 fl.).

that the two are one and the same. There is Ātman not in man alone but in all objects of the universe, the sun, the moon, the world; and Brahman is this Ātman (Br., V.5.2; Muṇḍaka II. 1.10; Chāndogya, III.13.7; Tait, II.8, III.10, etc.). But what is the nature of the reality, be it Brahman or Ātman? It is indefinable. Mere negative statements are all that can be asserted of the central reality, which ex hypothesi is incapable of qualification, determination and diversity implied in descriptive attribution. Although no logical demonstration of the ultimate reality is possible, yet intellectual necessity requires us to give some descriptions of it, however fragmentary or partial they may be. This is what is attempted in the Upaniṣads. Several visible objects of nature and psychological principles were tried, but none could render satisfaction to the ideal thus raised. Yājñavalkya said: "He, the Ātman, is not this, nor this (neti neti), is inconceivable, for he cannot be conceived, unchangeable, for he is not changed, untouched, for nothing touches him; unfettered, he is not pained nor suffers harm" (Br., IV.5.15; for negative definitions, see Br. III.7.3, III.9.26; Katha III.15; Br., IV.3.4, IV.4.22). The attempt to define the ultimate reality is doomed to disappointment on account of the inherent incapacity of intellect to grasp the whole. Intellect, with its symbols and shibboleths, creeds and conventions, is not by itself adequate to the grasp of the real (see Tait., II.4;

Kṛa, II.3; Muṇḍaka II.1; Kaṭha, 1.3.10, etc.). The Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad (3-7) gives us an analysis of consciousness, which also leads to the same negative definition. Intellect works with the categories of time, space and cause; but the real is beyond these, although it is basis or ground of finite actualities (Muṇḍaka, 1.1; Chāndogya, III.13.7). Our intellectual categories can give us description of the empirical universe under the forms of time, space and cause. But the self-existent Brahman is independent of time, space and cause. Though including space, he is not spatial, though including time, he is not temporal, though containing a causally-bound system of nature, he cannot be reduced to causal relations (Kaṭha II.14; Br. IV.4.15, IV.4.16, 17, III.8.7, IV.2.4; Chāndogya III.14.3, etc.). Therefore intellect must confess itself to be bankrupt when ultimate questions arise. An ultimate reality can never be made into an objective representation (Br., II.4.13, III.4.3, III.7.23, III.8.11, etc.), - a fact which has been clearly illustrated by Kant. "What I must presuppose in order to know an object", says Kant, "I cannot know as an object". It is the explanation of all else, though it itself remains unexplained. If we carefully go through the conversation between Indra and Prajāpati in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (VIII.7-12), we find that Prajāpati was trying to emphasize the identity of the self which is unaffected by changes of experience.

He was anxious to point out that, while the self was not exclusive of conscious states, it was not the conscious states - a fact which has been well shown by Dr. McTaggart. "What does it (self) include? Everything of which it is conscious. What does it exclude? Equally-everything of which it is conscious". (Studies in Hegelian Cosmology, Second edition, p.23). We are obliged to accept the reality of a universal consciousness which ever accompanies the contents of consciousness and persists even when there are no contents (see Br. IV.3.6, IV.4.3, etc.). Although it cannot be subjected to empirical investigation, yet its reality cannot be denied. Taittiriya (II.1) says Brahman is existence, consciousness and infinity. He is self-caused (Īśā VIII: avayambhū). Brhadāranyaka (V.1) characterises Brahman as a positive reality: "Full is that, full is this". Thus it is quite clear that Brahman is not a negative indeterminate principle, although logically indemonstrable.

According to the Upanisads there is a higher power which enables us to grasp this central spiritual reality. By knowledge one becomes Brahman (Br., IV.4.25; Muṇḍaka, III.2.9; Kauṣītaki, 1.4; Prasna, IV.10; Śve, 1.7). But this knowledge is not to be understood in the sense of intellectual acumen or dialectical subtlety; it is the intuition of the mystics (Br., IV, 3.32). It is inarticulate (cf. Inge: Plotinus, Vol.II., p.140).

We cannot give any formal exposition of this intuition (see Br., III.9.26, IV.4.22, IV.5.15; Kāṭha, III.15; Prasna, IV.10; Chāndogya, VII.24.1, etc.). It is only when thought becomes perfected in intuition that we catch the vision of the real (see Br., III.5.1, IV.4.21). We have to pass beyond thought, beyond the clash of oppositions, beyond antinomies that confront us when we work with categories of abstract thinking, if we are to reach the real where man's existence and divine being coincide. By intuitive realisation the unheard becomes heard (Br., II.4.5; Chāndogya, VI.13). The problems raised by intellect solve themselves the moment we transcend reasoning and start to live the religious life (Mundaka, III.1.8). Thus intuition is a magic talisman or soul-sense which transfigures the existence of men into a new reality (Br., IV.3.22; Kauṣītaki, III.1, etc.).

Some passages of the Upaniṣads (e.g., Kāṭha II. 23; Mundaka, III.2.3; Svetāśvatara, I.6) also foreshadow the doctrine of grace (prasāda) which enables us to catch the vision of the real.

After having discussed the philosophy of the Upaniṣads in a nutshell, let us proceed to find out the doctrines of the Pāñcarātra in the passages of the Upaniṣads. If we have been able to discover in them what we seek, we may congratulate ourselves on our achievement, and, like every school of dogmatics, shall assert the orthodoxy of our tenets.

Let us sum up the essential dogmas of the Pāñcarātra and see how far we can trace them to the sayings of the Upanisads:

1. Transcendent and immanent character of the Deity (Pādma, I.VI.41-43; Ahir, II.26 fl1.; Lakṣmī, XIII.13 fl1., etc.).
2. God - endowed with non-natural Guṇas (i.e., jñāna, aiśvarya, śakti, etc.), but free from prakṛtik Guṇas (Pādma, I.V.33-34; Lakṣmī, II.8-9; Mbh., XII.347.12, 348.13, etc.).
3. Various powers ascribed to Him, such as Creation, Preservation, Destruction, Anugraha and Nigraha (Ahir., XIV.14 fl1; Pādma, I.2.9 fl1.; Lakṣmī XIII.21 fl1.).
4. God - the efficient and the material cause of the universe (Mbh., XII.13537; Ahir., XXX.3-4; Viṣṇutilaka, I.23 fl1.).
5. God - All-pervading (Pādma, 1.6.23, 24-29; Viṣṇutilaka, I, 23 fl1., II.5-7; Mbh., XII.13746-47).
6. Brahman - the Ruler and Overlord of all things (Lakṣmī II.2-10, II.13 fl1; Pādma, 1.5.30-34; Ahir, II.45-53).
7. He - the Inner Controller and witness of all (Mbh., XII.352.2-4; Ahir II.45-53, LIX.34-36; Lakṣmī, II.13 fl1.).

8. Various Forms attributed to Him, such as Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Antaryāmin and Arcā (Ahir., XI. 62 fl1.; Viṣvaksena, p.123; Mbh., XII.13528, XII. 340.36-40, 73-87, 99-100).
9. Emanation of all things from Him (Pādma, 1.2. 8 fl1., 1.V.33; Lakṣmī, II.13).
10. The Ultimate Source (e.g. Brahman) - inexhaustible (Pādma, I.2.7-12, I.V.29-34, 1.2.21).
11. Recognition of the existence of the Three Categories, viz.: Soul, Matter, and God (Viṣṇutilaka II.34; cf. Ahir, XLV.3-4, ~~XXXVIII~~ VII.13).
12. Individual soul - a part of the Deity (Lakṣmī VI.36)
13. It is atomic (Viṣvaksena, p.13; Viṣṇutilaka, II. 28, Ahir, VI.27).
14. It is eternal, imperishable (Viṣṇutilaka, II.33, 29-31, 1.107).
15. Release consists in union with the Lord (Pādma 1. 4.15 fl1., 1.6.24, 1.6.51-52; Ahir XIII.11, etc.).
16. Release - possible only through the grace or Anugraha Sakti of God (Mbh., XII.13631, 12768; Ahir, XIV.25-35).
17. Embodied or mundane state of the Jīva - due to the Nigraha Sakti of God (Ahir., XIV.25-35).

18. Theory of creation (Mbh., XII.12934; Lakṣmī II.19 fl1.; Ahir, XXXVIII.10 fl1.).
19. Creation - the sport (^{līlā} ~~tīta~~) of God (P.Prakasa Samhita, 1.1.4; Ahir, XXX.12-13; Mbh., XII. 13602, 13762).
20. Distinction between Pure and Non-pure creation (Ahir., XXXVIII.10 fl1., LiX.34-36).
21. Derivation of the Gross Creation from a Cosmic Egg (Ahir., XXX.5-11; Pādma, I.5.19-21; of Lakṣmī V.74; Viṣvaksena p.64).
22. Distinction between empirical and non-empirical time (Ahir., LIII.10-11).

After having indicated the cardinal doctrines of the Pāñcarātra, let us now quote parallel passages from the Upaniṣads to explain how far the latter can be viewed as supplying a basis for the philosophy of the Pāñcarātra system:

1. "The Paramātmā has two natures, Prakṛti and Vikṛti. Prakṛti is the synthesis of Sattva and other Guṇas; Vikṛti is Puruṣa, called Paramātmā" (Pādma, 1.6.41-43; also see the Mbh., XII.339.3-4).

"Brahman resides in all the Tattvas and is the Soul of them; He is also above all the Tattvas" (Ahir., II.26 fl1.).

Katha V.9.

"As the one fire has entered the world
And becomes corresponding in form to every
form,
So the one Inner Soul (Ātman) of all things
Is corresponding in form to every form, and
yet is outside".

Katha V.10.

"As the one wind has entered the world
And becomes corresponding in form to every
form,
So the one Inner Soul of all things
Is corresponding in form to every form, and
yet outside".

Īśā 5.

"It moves. It moves not
It is far, and It is near.
It is within all this,
And it is outside of all this". (cf. Bhg.G.
13.15a.b.d.).

3. "Brahman is devoid of past and future
..... the source of all beings
boundless, beyond the Guṇas, with Guṇas, the
giver of all desires" (Pādma, 1.V.33-34).
"He is called Mahāvibhūti, the
Supreme abode of six qualities similar to the
ocean of immortality (amṛta), waveless, shining"
(Lakṣmī II.8-9).

In the citation of passages from the Thirteen Principal
Upaniṣads we have used Dr. Hume's translation of the same.

"The one God, hidden in all things

.....

.....

Śvetāśvatara } The witness, the sole thinker, devoid of
VI. 11 and 17 } qualities (nirguṇa),
.....

He who is the maker of all, the all-knower,
self-sourced,

Intelligent, the author of time, possessor of
qualities, omniscient,

Is the ruler of Primary Matter (pradhāna) and
of the spirit (kṣetra-jña), the Lord of
qualities (guṇa),

The cause of transmigration (saṃsāra) and of
liberation (mokṣa), of continuance and of
bondage".

3. "The Will of God, though of innumerable forms,
manifests in five principal ways, to wit, the
Śaktis called Creation, Preservation and
Destruction of the universe, and Nigraha
(obstruction or obscuration) and Anugraha
(furtherance or favouring) of the soul" (Ahir,
XIV.14 fl1.; also see Pādma, 1.2.9 fl1; Lakṣmī
XIII.21 fl1.).

"....., he (Bṛgu) understood that Brahma is bliss (ānanda). For truly, indeed, beings here are born from bliss, when born they live by bliss, on deceasing they enter into bliss".
(Taittirīya, III.6).

"This one, truly, indeed, causes him whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds, to perform good action. This one, also, indeed, causes him whom he wishes to lead downward, to perform bad action".
(Kauṣītaki III.8).

4. "Before creation the Lord, having nothing to play with (līlopakarana), could find no satisfaction (na ratim lebhhe). He, consequently, made Himself manifold (ātmānam bahu akalpayat; see Ahir, XXX. 3-4).

"On the contrary, my dear, in the beginning this world was just Being, one only, without a second. It bethought itself: 'Would that I were many! Let me procreate myself!'....."
(Chāndogya VI.2.2-3; cf. Maitri II.6).

"As a spider emits and draws in (its thread),
As herbs arise on the earth,
As the hairs of the head and body, from a living person,
So from the Imperishable arises everything here".
(Mundaka, 1.1.7, see also Viṣṇu Purāṇa 1.1.35).

5. "The wise say: Bhagavat is the Highest Soul (paramātmān) and pervades the Jagat (jagatmaya), as butter in cream, as oil in sesame seeds, and as sweetness in guda" (Pādma I.6.27; also see 1.VI.24-29).

"Just as fire is one, but glares everything; just as the sun is one, but is the universal source of heat; just as air is one, but blows everywhere; just as the ocean is one, but is the source of all waters; so the Puruṣa is one, void of constituents, having for His form the universe" (Mbh., XII.13746-47).

"As oil in sesame seeds, as butter in cream,
As water in river-beds, and as fire in the
friction-sticks,

.....
.....

The Soul (Ātman), which pervades all things
As butter is contained in the cream,

.....
.....

This is Brahma, the highest mystic teaching"
(Svetāśvatara 1.15,16).

"He entered in here, even to the fingernail-tips,
as a razor would be hidden in a razor-case, or
fire in fire-holder" (Br., 1.4.7; Kauṣītaki
IV.20).

"It is as a lump of salt cast in water
would dissolve right into the water;"

..... (Br.II.4.12).

6. "Brahman is the Ruler.....
the source of all beings, the Supreme Puruṣa,
..... the giver of all desires."
(Pādma I.5.29-34).

"The Self of all, the Refuge, the Ruler of all,
the Lord of the Souls" (Mahānārāyaṇa XI.).

"Verily, this Soul is the overlord of all things,
the King of all things. As all the spokes are
held together in the hub and felly of a wheel,
just so in this Soul all things, all gods, all
worlds, all breathing things, all selves are
held together" (Br., II.5.15; also see Śve VI.16)

7. "Though divested of body, He dwells in everybody - not touched by the acts accomplished by these bodies. He is the Inner Soul. He is the all-seeing witness dwelling within all embodied creatures and engaged in marking their acts".
(Mbh., XII.350-2-4).

"He who, dwelling in the earth, yet is other than the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who controls the earth from within - He is your Soul, the Inner Controller, the Immortal.

.....
He is your Soul, the Inner Controller, the Immortal"
(Br. III.7.3-23).

"He who moving within the earth, and so on - whose body is death, whom death does not know, He is the Self of all beings, free from sin, divine, the one God, Nārāyaṇa" (Subāl Up., VII.1).

The Creator of all, of manifold forms,

The One embracer of the universe -

By knowing Him as truly (Siva) one attains

peace forever? (Śrīmadbhagavadgītā, IV.14).

8. "Whatever forms the Deity assumes, He does so by His own power" (Mbh., XII.13528; also see Mbh., XII, 340.36-40; 73-87, 99-100).

"The Lord Himself extracted, as the purest essence of the sole divine Sāstra, the system (tantra) called Pāñcarātra describing Him as Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Antaryāmin, etc., and being recognisable by having liberation as its sole result (Ahir., XI. 62 fl., also see Viṣvakeśa, p.123: mama prakārāḥ pañceti prāhur Vedānta-pāragāḥ).

"The Inner Soul (antarātman) of all things, the One Controller,

Who makes His one form manifold —

The wise who perceive Him as standing in oneself, They, and no others, have eternal happiness!" (Katha V.13).

"More minute than the minute, in the midst of confusion

The Creator of all, of manifold forms,

The One embracer of the universe —

By knowing Him as kindly (Śiva) one attains peace forever". (Śvetāśvatara, IV.14).

"Him who is without beginning and without end,
 in the midst of confusion,
 The Creator of all, of manifold form,
 The One embracer of the universe —
 By knowing God (deva) one is released from
 all fetters!" (Śvetāśvatara, V, 13).

9. "From Vāsudeva came all created things"
 (Pādma 1.2.8 fl.).

"Vāsudeva is the source of all beings"
 (Pādma, 1.V.33).

"Its root is above, its branches below —

This eternal fig-tree!

That (root) indeed is the Pure. That is Brahma.

That indeed is called the Immortal.

On it all the worlds do rest,

And no one eever goes beyond it". (Kāṭha VI.1;
 cf. Bhg.G.XV.1-3).

By knowing what is the root, Brahma-knowers
 become merged in Brahma, intent thereon, liberated
 from the world. (Śvetāśvatara 1.7, also see 1.12).

(Pādma, I.V.39-34).

15. The Five's size is atomic; its characteristic is

E'en fulness then itself remains".

(Br., V.I, see also Atharva Veda X.8.23).

and Jagat" (Viṣṇutilaka II.34). (Śvetāśvatara, I.9.

"This has been sung as the supreme Brahma.

Imperishable. — No rust, free from disease. It is

By knowing what is therein, Brahma-knowers

Become merged in Brahma, intent thereon, liberated

from the womb.³² (Śvetāśvataṛa I.7, also see I.13).

(Vistotilakha 41.33: na 'tpathir na vutistaya

SVENSKA SAMFUNDET SYD: HÄRNÄSANDSKOLEN
LÄSAREN - FÖRSTÄNDE: RÅD - KÖP - VÄRDESEN

12. Individual soul is a part of the Deity or a contraction of Lakṣmī, as the Goddess herself calls it in Lakṣmī Tantra VI.36: pramātā cetanaḥ prokto, mat-samkocah sa iacyate.

"This whole world is pervaded

With beings that are parts of Him". (Śvetāśvatara IV. 10).

13. "The Jīva's size is atomic; its characteristic is the union of knowledge and bliss; it is of the dimension of trasareṇu (mote) and shining with millions of rays" (Viṣvaksena, p.13; see also Ahir, VI.27; Viṣṇutilaka II.28).

"This living (self) is to be known as a part
Of the hundredth part of the point of a hair
Subdivided a hundredfold;

And yet it partakes of infinity". (Śvetāśvatara, V.9, also V.8; Bhg.Pu., VI.16.18, X.87.2-6).

14. "The jewel called Kaustubha is Jīva; it is a mass of consciousness, free from disease. It is without beginning or end. It always lives in Brahman". (Viṣṇutilaka II.29-31).

"No birth, no death for Jīva, O Caturānana".

(Viṣṇutilaka II.33: no 'tpathir na mṛtistasya

14 (cont.) jīvasya, Caturānana).

"Just as Brahman is eternal, even so is the individual soul" (Viṣṇutilaka, I.107).

"The wise one (i.e. the soul, the ātman, the self) is not born, nor dies.

This one has not come from anywhere, has not become anyone.

Unborn, constant, eternal, primeval, this one is not slain when the body is slain.

If the slayer think to slay,

If the slain think himself slain,

Both these understand not.

This one slays not, nor is slain" (Kathā II.

18.19; see also Bhg.G.II.19,20 and

Bhg.Pu.,VII.7.19-20).

15.

"The summum bonum (hitam atyantam) of men is the absolute discontinuance of the succession of sorrows, and the eternal happiness implied in it, which is tantamount to the attainment of one's real nature, that is, the nature of God" (bhagavanmayatā; Ahir,XIII.9-11).

"As I live (viharāmi), just so live the liberated souls" (Pādma, 1.4.15 fl1.).

15 (cont.) "When a seer sees the brilliant
 Maker, Lord, Person, the Brahma-source,
 Then, being a Knower, shaking off good and evil,
 Stainless, he attains supreme identity (paramam
~~8~~ ⁸āmyam upaiti) with Him".
 (Mundaka III.1.3).

16. "That man only can see Him, on whom He
 has shown His grace or prasāda" (Mbh., XII.12768).

"The transmission of obscuration (tirodhana-
 paramparā) has no beginning, but it may have
 an end, so far as the individual is concerned,
 by the breaking in of the power of divine grace
 (anugraha śakti-pāta) resembling a shower of
 compassion coming down upon him who has been
 beheld by God" (Ahir., XIV.25 fl1.).

"This Soul (ātman) is not to be obtained by
 instruction,

Nor by intellect, nor by much learning.

He is to be obtained only by the one whom He
 chooses;

To such a one that soul (ātman) reveals His own
 person". (Katha II.23; see also Mundaka
 II.2.3; Śv. I.6).

17. "At the beginning God obstructs the souls by obscuring or contracting their form (ākāra), power (aiśvarya), and knowledge (vijñāna), the result being the three taints (mala) of the soul, to wit (1) atomicity, (2) impotence, and (3) ignorance" (Ahir., XIV.16-20).

"This one, indeed, causes him whom He wishes to lead downward, to perform bad action".
(Kauṣītaki, III.8).

18. "What is called His ^{wa}making (unmeṣa), like moonrise on the ocean, that is I, Nārāyaṇī Śakti, of the nature of desire to create. What is called the winking (ni~~me~~ṣa) of the Paramātmā, during annihilation, that am I, Nārāyaṇī Śakti known as susuptā, desirous of sleeping".
(Lakṣmī II.19 fl1.).

"This Brahma, verily, shines when fire blazes; likewise this dies when it blazes not. Its brilliance (tejas) goes to the sun; its vital breath (prāṇa), into the wind (vāy~~u~~).
... ..

18 (cont.) "All these divinities, verily, having entered into wind, perish not when they die in the wind; therefrom indeed they come forth again". (Kauṣītaki II.12; also see II.13).

19. "So the Highest Lord, though all of His wishes are ever fulfilled, could experience, by means of the beings created by Himself, the flavour of playing" (līlā-rasa; Ahir, XXX. 12-13).

"Puruṣa in His fourfold manifestation sports as He wishes" (Mbh., XII.13762).

"With the one unborn female, red, white, and black, fourth, the immortal in the sky. Who produces many creatures like herself, There lies the one unborn male taking his delight.

Another unborn male leaves her with whom he has had his delight". (Śve., IV.5; also see Viṣṇu Pu., VI.7.69-71).

20. (cont.) "The Lord, in order to play, created the world once more: first (pūrvam) the names and forms, then (punah) Prakṛti consisting of the three Guṇas, called Māyā, with whom He began to enjoy". (Ahir., XXXVII.10 fl1.; also see Ahir., LiX.34-36, where one quarter of God which alone has become this world is naturally identified with Aniruddha, the Inner Ruler (antaryāmin) of all beings, who pervades that which has food and that which has no food, namely, animate and inanimate nature).

"His greatness is of such extent,

Yet Puruṣa is greater still.

All beings are one fourth of him;

Three fourths, the immortal in the sky".

(Chāndogya III.12.6; also see Ṛg-veda X.90.3).

21. "He (Lord), consequently, made Himself manifold by creating Pradhāna and Puruṣa and then from the former, with the help of His Śakti in the form of time, the Mahat, the Ahaṁkāra, etc., down to the gross elements. Out of these He then formed the Cosmic Egg" (Ahir., XXX.5-11).

21 (cont.) "In the beginning this world was merely non-being. It was existent. It developed. It turned into an egg. It lay for the period of a year. It was split asunder. One of the two eggshell-parts became silver, one gold". (Chāndogya III.19.1, see also 2).

22. "Gross is called the time possessing the lava (one-sixth of a second), etc.; subtle the one determining the Tattvas; while that which pervades the activity of the Vyūhas is styled Highest Time". (Ahir., LIII.10-11).

"Now, it has elsewhere been said: 'Food, verily, is the source of this whole world; and time, of food. The sun is the source of time'. The form thereof is the year, which is composed of the moments and other durations of time, and which consists of twelve months. ... Among these (asterisms) each month of Ātman (viewed as the year) includes nine quarters according to the corresponding course (of the sun through the asterisms). On account of the subtilty (of time) this (course of the sun)

22 (cont.) is the proof, for only in this way is time proved. However, the thing to be proved (e.g. time) may come to be proved from the fact of its containing parts (e.g. moments, etc.), to the cognisance of the thing itself.

... For thus has it been said:-

From Time flow forth created things.

From Time, too, they advance to growth

In Time, too, they do disappear.

Time is form and formless too".

(Maitri VI.14).

A close study of the above parallelisms will show how far we are justified in regarding the Upanisads as the sources of Pāñcarātra philosophy, during the second and third stages of its existence, ~~although the same conclusion cannot be~~ ^{definitely} ~~extended to the primitive Pāñcarātra philosophy on the strength of the materials at our disposal.~~ The resemblances between the Pāñcarātra and Upaniṣadic doctrines, during the ^{two} above-mentioned phases in the evolution of Pāñcarātra philosophy, are so striking and fundamental that they cannot but lead to the conclusion we have already arrived at.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

HISTORY:—

- Aiyenger, Krishnaswami. Early History of Vaishnavism in South India. Madras, 1920.
- _____ Ancient India. Madras, 1911.
- Aiyenger, Krishnaswami. The Beginnings of South Indian History. Madras, 1918.
- Aiyenger, _____
- Bhandarkar, R.G. Early History of the Dekkan. Second Edition, Bombay, 1895.
- Cowell, E.B., and Thomas, F.W. Bāna's Harsacarita (E. Tr.). Oriental Translation Fund, 1897.
- Cunningham, A. Coins of Ancient India, London, 1891.
- McCrindle, J.W. Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian. Calcutta, 1887.
- _____ Ancient India as described in Classical Literature. London, 1901.
- Pillai, Kankasabhai. The Tamils 1800 years ago. Madras and Bangalore, 1904.
- Rapson, E.J. Ancient India. Cambridge, 1914.
- Reychaudhuri, H.C. Early History of Vaisnava Sect. Calcutta University, 1922.
- Shamasastri, R. Kautilya's Arthashastra (E.Tr.). Bangalore, 1915.
- Smith, V.A. A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon. Oxford, 1911.
- _____ The Early History of India. Editions 3rd and 4th. Oxford.
- _____
- _____

THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY, MYTHOLOGY, GRAMMAR, ETC.:-

- Acharya, Krishna Tatha. Life and Writings of Vedānta Deśika. Madras, 1911.
- Acharya, M. Raṅga. Śrī-Bhāṣya of Rāmānuja (E.Tr.). Madras, 1899.
- Acharya, Utpala. Spandapradīpikā, Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, Vol.XIV.
- Aiyangar, Krishnaswami. Śrī Rāmānujam, Madras, 1908.
- Aiyangar, Partha Sarathy. Tattva-Traya (E.Tr.). Madras, 1900.
- Aiyar, K.Narayana Svamin. Thirty Minor Upaniṣads, Madras, 1914.
- Barnett, L.D. Brahma-Knowledge. London, 1904.
- _____ Hinduism. London, 1905.
- _____ The Heart of India. London, 1904.
- _____ Bhagavad-Gītā. London, 1905.
- _____ Hindu Gods and Heroes. London, 1922.
- Barna, B. A History of the Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy. Calcutta University, 1921.
- Barth, Auguste. The Religions of India (authorised E. Tr. by J. Wood). Trübner's Oriental Series, 1878.
- Bloomfield, Maurice. The Religion of the Veda. New York and London, 1908.
- Bhandarkar, R.G. Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems. Strassburg, 1913.
- Chariar, Rajagopala. The Vaiṣṇavite Reformers of India. Madras, 1909.
- Chariar, Venkata. Pāñcarātrarakṣā. Bangalore, 1918.
- Charlu, Gopala. Introduction to Mantra Śāstra. Bombay, 1894.

Chatterjĳ, J.C.

Hindu Realism. Allahabad, 1912.

Kashmir Saivism. Śrīnagar, 1914.

Colebrooke, H.T.

Miscellaneous Essays. 2 Vols.
London, 1837.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa-Sāṃkhya Kārikā (E.Tr.).
1897.

Cowell, E.B.

The Aphorisms of Śāṇḍilya (E.Tr.).
Bibliotheca Indica, Vol. LXXXIV, 1848, etc.

" and Gough, A.E. The Sarvadarśana Saṃgraha. Trübner's
Oriental Series, 1878.

Das Gupta, S.N.

A History of Indian Philosophy.
Cambridge, 1922.

Deussen, Paul.

Outlines of Indian Philosophy.
Berlin, 1907.

The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads
(authorised English Translation).
by A.S. Geden). T & T. Clark, 1906.

Dowson, John.

A Classical Dictionary of Hindu
Mythology, Religion, Geography, History,
and Literature. Trübner & Co., 1879.

Dutta, M.N.

Viṣṇu-Purāṇa (E.Tr.).
The Wealth of India, Vol. I.
Calcutta, 1892, etc.

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (E.Tr.). The Wealth
of India, Vols. II and III, Calcutta,
1892, etc.

Farquhar, J.N.

Outline of the Religious Literature
of India. London, 1920.

Modern Religious Movements in India,
New York, 1915.

Fausböll, V.

Indian Mythology according to the
Mahābhārata in outline. London, 1903.

- Garbe, Richard. The Philosophy of Ancient India, Chicago, 1897.
-
- Die Bhagavad-Gītā. Leipzig, 1905.
- Ghate, V.S. The Vedānta. Poona, 1926.
- Goldstücker, Theodor. Pāṇinī, His place in Sanskrit Literature. Allahabad, 1914.
- Gough, A.E. The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads. Trübner's Oriental Series, 1878.
- Grierson, G.A. Ancient The Monotheistic Religion of India and its descendant. York Town and Surrey, 1908.
-
- The Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas. Bombay, 1909.
- The Bhakta-Mala (E.Tr.). J.R.A.S., 1909.
- Growse, F. Salmon. The Rāmāyaṇa of Tulsī Dās (E.Tr.). Allahabad, 1914.
- Guha, Abhaya K. Jīvātman in the Brahma Sūtra. Alipore (Calcutta), 1920.
- Hertel, J. Die Sonne und Mithra. Leipzig, 1927.
- Hill, W.D. Bhagavad-Gītā. Oxford, 1928.
- Hopkins, E.W. The Religions of India. Boston, 1895.
-
- The Great Epic of India. Yale, 1901.
- Hume, R.E. The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads. Oxford, 1921.
- Iyengar, Srinivasa. Outlines of Indian Philosophy. Benares and London, 1909.
- Jacob, G.A. A Concordance of the Principal Upaniṣads and the Bhagavad-Gītā. Bombay, 1891.
-
- The Vedāntasāra. Trübner's Oriental Series, 1878.

- Krishnan, Radha. Indian Philosophy. 2 Vols. x
George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale. Indian Logic and Atomism. Oxford,
1921.
- _____
The Sāṃkhya system. London and
Calcutta, 1918.
- _____
The Religion and Philosophy of the
Veda and Upaniṣads. 2 Vols. x
Oxford, 1925.
- Macdonell, A.A. A History of Sanskrit Literature.
London, 1899.
- _____
India's Past. Oxford, 1927.
- _____
Vedic Mythology. _____
- _____
Grundriss der indo-arischen
Philologie, 1897.
- _____
Vedic Reader, Oxford, 1917.
- Macdonell and Keith. Vedic Index of Names and Subjects.
London, 1912.
- Macnicol, Nicol. Indian Theism. Humphrey Milford,
1915.
- Mallik, Girindra Narayan. The Philosophy of the Vaiṣṇava
Religion. Punjab, 1927.
- Max Müller, F. The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy.
London, 1899.
- _____
Lectures on the Origin and Growth of
Religions as illustrated by the
Religions of India. London 1882.
- _____
India, what can it teach us?
London, 1892.
- Muir, John. Original Sanskrit Texts. London, 1858.
- Paul, M. Tattva-Trava (E.Tr.). Allahabad,
Pāṇini office.

- Ranade, Rama Chandra. A Constructive Survey of the Upanisadic Philosophy. Poona, 1926.
- Roy, Protap Chandra. The Mahābhārata (E.Tr.). Calcutta, 1896. 1883-1896.
- Rau, Subba. Madhava's Gītā-Bhāṣya (E.Tr.). Madras, 1906.
- Schrader, F. Otto. Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and Ahirbudhnya Samhitā. Madras, 1916.
- Schroeder, Leopold von. Indiens Literatur und Cultur. Leipzig, 1887.
- Seal, B.N. Comparative Studies in Vaisnavism and Christianity. Calcutta, 1899.
- _____ The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus. London, 1915.
- Sturdy, E.T. The Bhakti-Sūtras of Nārada (E.Tr.). London, 1926.
- Sörensen, S. An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata. London, Hertford, 1904, etc.
- Svāmin, Govindācārya. Yātindra-Mata-Dīpikā (E.Tr.). Madras, 1912.
- _____ Rāmānuja's Bhagavad-Gītā (E.Tr.). Madras, 1906.
- _____ Arthapañcaka. J.R.A.S., 1910.
- Telang, Kashinath Trimbak. Bhagavad-Gītā and Anu-Gītā (E.Tr.). S.B.E., Vol.VIII.
- Thibaut, G. Introduction and E.Tr. of Saṅkara's Commentary on the Brahma-Sūtra. S.B.E., Vols. XXXIV and XXXVIII.
- _____ English translation of the Śrī-Bhāṣya. S.B.E., Vol.XLVIII.
- Thomas, E.J. Vedic Hymns. London, 1923.

- Weber. The History of Indian Literature (E.Tr. by J. Mann). Trübner's Oriental Series, 1878.
- Whitney, W.D. Atharva Veda Samhitā. Harvard University, 1905.
- Williams, Monier. Indian Wisdom. London, 1893.
- _____ Brahmenism and Hinduism. London, 1887.
- _____ Hinduism. London, 1897.
- _____ Religious Thought and Life in India. London, 1885.

S A M H I T Ā S.

- Ahirbuddhnyasamhitā. 2 vols. Madras, 1916. ~~Sanskrit Series~~
No. ~~LXVIII~~.
- Bṛhad Brahma Samhitā, Poona, Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series, No LXVII.
- Bhāradvāja Samhitā. Madras, 1912.
- Heya-sīrsa Pañcarātra. Calcutta, 1915.
- Īśvara Samhitā. Conjeeveram, 1921.
- Kapīñjala Samhitā. Kalyāṇakumāraviṭasa Press, Tirukkovalūr.
- Lakṣmī Tantra. Sadvidyā Press, Mysore, 1888.
- Pādma Tantra. Mysore, 1891.
- Paramatattvanirṇayaprakāśa Samhitā. Madras Government
Oriental MSS. Library (No. 5300).
- Parāśara Samhitā. Bangalore, 1898.
- Sāttvata Samhitā. Conjeeveram, 1902.
- Śrī Nārada Pañcarātra. Allahabad, 1921.
- Śrīpraśna Samhitā. Kumbakonam, 1904.
- Viṣṇutilaka. Bangalore, 1896.

SOME BOOKS ON WESTERN PHILOSOPHY.

- Abbott, T.K. Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and other works on the Theory of Ethics (E.Tr.). London, 1879.
- Broad, C.D. Five Types of Ethical Theory. London, 1930.
- Burnet, J. Early Greek Philosophy. London, 1920.
- Dotterer, Ray H. Philosophy by Way of the Sciences. New York, 1929.
- Dresser, H.W. A History of Modern Philosophy. London, 1928.
- Durant, Will. The Story of Philosophy. London, 1928.
- Erdmann, J.E. A History of Philosophy. 3 Vols. London, 1893.
- Gomperz, Theodor. Greek Thinkers. IV Vols. London, 1901, 1905 and 1912.
- Sidgwick, H. Outlines of the History of Ethics. London, 1892.
- Mc Taggart, John
Taggart, M. Studies in Hegelian Cosmology. Second Edition. Cambridge, 1918.

JOURNALS, PERIODICALS AND OTHER IMPORTANT PUBLICATIONS.

- American Journal of Philology.
- Asiatic Researches.
- Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Archaeological Survey of India.
- Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report.

Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological
Survey of India.

Hibbert Journal.

Indian Antiquary.

International Journal of Ethics.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Journal of the American Oriental Society.

Mind.

Monist.

Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India.

Monographs on the Ancient Monuments of India, Office of
the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India
(H.H. Cole, Calcutta, 1884, etc.)

Notes on the North Western Provinces of India.

Philosophical Review.

Proceedings of the Indian Philosophical Congress.

Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society.

Sacred Books of the East.

Sacred Books of the Hindus.

Vaisnavite, Madras, 1898.

Viśiṣṭādvaitin, Srīraṅgam.

Wealth of India (Calcutta).