

TATVAVĀDA

(PRIVATE CIRCULATION ONLY)

Volume : 2

Issue : 3

May-June 2002

ADDICTION TO SENSUAL ENJOYMENT

It was a hungry bird; it was fed up searching for food. At last, it got the one; it was a dead body; it was floating on an ocean. Bird had a feast; it ate and ate digging the dead body. But it didn't get satisfied by eating.

Still, it grew avaricious (greedy) of eating. But, at last its greed got quenched; lost the taste and appetite. It felt, 'enough of everything'. It prepared to run away from where it was. But, alas, the dead body has now reached the middle of the ocean and the bird too. Bird was over the dead body and found itself in the middle of that ocean. Bird had no strength left with it to fly from the center of ocean and cross over to the coast. Neither it could remain in the ocean nor it can reach the land. Bird's situation was like that of Trishanku- to hang in the middle.

There is no difference between the plight of the bird and the plight of a person engulfed in the over-enjoyment of sensual objects. He, when all the strength is diminished, only becomes aware of Paraloka, the world beyond the death. But then he has neither Iha (here) nor Paratra (there).

H.H. SRI VISHVESHA TIRTHA SWAMIJI

Editorial Board

Chief Editor : Prof. K.T. Pandurangi

Editors

Prof. A. Haridasa Bhat,
Dr.C.H. Srinivasa Murthy

Executive Editors

Sri U.B. Gururajacharya,
Pt. Tirumala Kulkarni,
Pt. Srinivasa Varakhedi

Advisory Board

Dr. V.R. Panchamukhi
Prof. D. Prahlada Char

Prof. D.N. Shanubhag

Sri K.V. Murthy Yerkadithaya
Sri K. Gopinath

Publisher

Sri Vasanata Kumar Parigi
Secretary,
A.B.M.M.Mandala, Bangalore-28

From the Editors' desk

Dear Readers,

The present senior Swamiji of Mantralaya Sri Raghavendra Matha, Sri Sushameendra Tirtha recently initiated to Samnyasa a great scholar Sri Guruvenkatacharya and crowned him to succeed him as the Mathadhipati. It is immensely heartening to note that this time the choice of the person for the place of high sanctity did not go by the considerations of kith or kin or the blood relationship. It is not to say that no choice should fall on such relatives who may qualify from the right considerations of पाण्डित्य, ब्रह्मचर्य, औदार्य, विनय. The choice based on only relationship consideration overlooking the inadequacies in the above noble qualities which are a must to possess should be desisted.

And the yellow journalism which has no business to poke its nose even in matters like this, should be condemned outright along with those who go to them to air their grief over their loss of grip over the incidence in one voice by the society concerned or just should be ignored.

Sri Guruvenkatacharya with a remarkable possession of high learning being a product of Sri Poornaprajna Vidyapeetha, Bangalore, a unique contribution of Yagyayogi Sri Vishvesha Tirtha Swamiji of Pejavara Matha deserves this coronation. He has the command over the Madhva Shastras, other Vedanta schools, Puranas and Vedangas. His oratory is commendable.

The Tattvavada English along with its readers offers its obeisance with Ananta Pranamas to Sri Sushameendra Tirtha and to Sri Suvidyendra Tirtha and pray Sri Hari Vayu for success in all their endeavors, Jnanaprasara and social reforms. -Editors

CONTENTS

Sri Vidyamanya Sandesha	5
Yativaani	8
Report	10
Research Article	13
Special Article	17
Presidential Address	24
Upanishad Section	31
Geeta Section	36
Sarvamula Section	37
Youth Section	41
Pavana Yatra	45
History Section	47
Book Review	48

Type setting :

Poornaprajna Samshodhana
Mandiram, Bangalore-28.

Cover design by :

Sri K. M. Sheshagiri

SUBSCRIPTION

Issue : Rs. 10-00

Yearly : Rs. 50-00

Patron : Rs. 1000-00

ABROAD

Issue : \$ 5/-

Yearly : \$ 30/-

(Outstation cheques must include the
Bank charges.)

Cheque/D.D./M.O. for subscription may
be sent in favour of :

Tattvavada (English),
The Secretary, A.B.M.M.Mandala,
P.P. Vidyapeetha, Bangalore-28

Tel : 080-6690068, 6694026

E-mail : ppsmb@bgl.vsnl.net.in

Web address : <http://www.tattvavada.org>

Sri Vidyamanya Sandesha :

NINE GEMS OF TATVAVADA

The last and lasting message of Sri Sri Vidyamanya Tirtha swamiji

English translation : Sri N.A.P.S. Rao

(Contd. from the previous issue)

“Harih paratharah” – Vayu jivotthamathva

The Jivotthamathva of Vayu is also an important tenet, as the sarvotthamathva of Hari. There is an opinion that this has not been stated in this shloka. But Sri Vyasraya has stated this subject also here and thus has included all the important tenets. How is the statement of Harih paratharah interpreted to mean Vayu jivotthamah is like this: Harih means Vayu just as it means Narayana. In Amara kosha, Hari is shown as a name for Vayu. Thus the words Harih paratharah mean that Vayu jivotthamah also. But, Vayu can not be Para as he is not always free from sorrow (only 2 persons are Paraa as explained earlier). But Vayu, though not free always from sorrow is not having the effect (peeda) of sorrow. To give an example, small children cry when hungry, but as adults, we say that hunger is a good thing as we enjoy our food when hungry. But how can Vayu be denoted by the word Para as he is not free from sorrow always? How can he be called Parathara? Para also means Utthama (superior). Vayu is also devoted to the Supreme Being, and meditates upon him, without a break, even for an instant. As stated – Shuddhe bhagavathe dharme niratho yadvrikodarah” – he is always devoted to God. Such a person who is in Shuddha bhagavatha dharma is Para. Here it does not mean "eternally free from sorrow". Bharathi, the consort of Vayu, Saraswathi (consort of Brahma) are all such persons. Rudra and other gods some times have hatred for God, and thus are not in such

classification. Only 5 persons – Lakshmi, Brahma, Vayu, Saraswathi and Bharathi are in shuddha bhagavatha dharma. These can be called by the word Para. Saraswathi and Bharathi can thus be called Para and their consorts Brahma and Vayu can be described as Parathara. Lakshmi would be Parathama. Thus Vayu is correctly described as Parathara as he is the greatest soul. But another question can be raised, why has the word Hari been used instead of Vayu? This is justified on the basis of Mathyaikya – or identical opinion or conclusion. Vayu never thinks in a manner different from the will of the Lord. We should understand that Sri Vyasraya has used the same word Hari to describe both God and Vayu to indicate this. To establish the Jivotthamathva of Vayu (superiority over Rudra and all other jivas) we will give the support of the pramana from the Vedas. There is a story narrated in the Veda. In the past both the gods and daithyas joined together to churn the milky ocean. At first, a great poison called Kaalakoota came up as a result of the churning, which had the potential of destroying the entire world. There was a boon given by Brahma that no one could even touch it. Vayu who is not affected by the boon given by Brahma (being of equal stature) collected the poison in a golden vessel and then took it in his hands. He rubbed and kneaded the poison repeatedly to remove its destructive potential. A small portion of the poison so rendered weaker was given by Vayu to Rudra to drink. Rudra found it very difficult to tolerate the pain due to the poison. His neck became blue and he became known as Neelakantha. When a small quantity of the poison went down he lost consciousness. He regained consciousness after he was touched by Narayana by His hand. Vayu then drank the entire Kaalakoota poison and he did not have any difficulty what so ever. There is a Rigveda manthra

in this regard : “VayurasmA upAmanthathpinashmismA kunannamA keshee vishasya pAthrena yadrudrenApEbathsaha” . This manthra means - Keshee – Kaschaasau ishascha keshah – keshah asyaastheethi keshee – Keshee is a name for Vayu as he has Narayana who is of the essence of eternal bliss as his Lord always. He meditates always in his heart, the form of Narayana without a break. Kunannama is another name for Vayu as he destroys evil persons – kuthsithan adhah paathayathi. The three words Vayu, Keshee and kunannama have been used to describe Vayu in this text. Asmaa – asmai – for the sake of Rudra and upaamanthatha – means rubbing and kneading in his hand. PinashmismA means to convert into fine powder – here it means that its essence was removed. Rudrena saha apibath – drank along with Rudra. This shows that Vayu was the main drinker of the poison and Rudra was secondary. When a statement is made that the Guru came along with his disciples, - Shishyena saha Guruh aagathah – the Guru is primary and the shishyas are secondary. Thus Vayu drank the Kalakoota poison without any fear or ill effects. Rudra found it very difficult and suffered the effects of the poison. The word Rudra has been used – “Sorodeeth yadarodeeth thadrudrasya rudrathvam” – This vedic passage says that the name Rudra was given because he cried. Vayu on the other hand is given this name – based on Vaya – he was fully capable in movement. The word Keshee also suggests that as he was meditating the blissful form of Narayana, he did not suffer any sorrow. On the other hand, Rudra is known - Abhisheka-priya shivah –as the deity who enjoys constant pouring of water on his head – which is prevalent in all temples of Rudra from that time. Thus it is clearly established that Vayu is superior to Rudra. *(To be continued)*

Yativaani :

Message of Sri Vidyeshā Tirtha

(Sri Vidyeshā Tirtha Swamiji is the Ashrama Shishya and Vidya Shisya of Paramapoojya Sri Vidyamanya Tirtha. He was adopted to succeed him in the Peetha of Bhandarakeri Satyatirtha Samsthana. Sri Vidyeshā Tirtha is highly learned, a good orator and a lucid writer on Madhva Siddhanta. The following is an excerpt from his book in Sanskrit on the importance and meaning of Gayatri titled "Gayatri Bhava Tilakam".)

The word भर्गः appears in Gayatri Mantra. Some say by this word ‘रुद्र’ (Shiva) is propounded. For this, they cite ‘भर्गो देवस्य वै रुद्रः’, a Upanishat sentence as the proof. But, this is not correct. Why because,

1. 'Rudra' can influence only मनस्, मनो वै रुद्रः. He is not the motivator for the बुद्धि and other इन्द्रियात्. Whereas, in Gayatri Mantra invoking simulation of बुद्धि is prayed for. Hence the word भर्गः does not indicate रुद्र.

2. On the other hand as भगवत् explains, in the sentence ‘श्रियः पतिः यज्ञपतिः प्रजापतिः धियां पतिः’, that only Vishnu is धियां पतिः and hence He is indicated by the word ‘भर्गः’.

3. Another Smruti (वृद्धस्मृति) running as ‘भर्गाख्यं विष्णुसंज्ञं तु’ denotes Vishnu as indicated by the word ‘भर्गः’.

4. In Paadma Puraana, in ‘तद्वै सवितुर्वरेण्यं भर्ग उक्तमम् । सदा धीमहि....

(a prayer to Krishna by Indra), Krishna (Vishnu) is indicated by the word 'भर्ग'.

5. In the श्रुति, भर्गो वै रुद्रः, the word Rudra can be attributed to Vishnu also. For, in 'रुद्रो बहुशिराः बभ्रुः....' which is from Vishnu Sahasranama the word 'Rudra' is used to indicate Vishnu.

6. By an incidence, the fact that रुद्र cannot motivate बुद्धि is proved as below.

A demon called वृक (भस्मासुर) got a Vara from Rudra. To test its authenticity वृक wanted to keep his palm over the head of Rudra and checkup whether he gets burnt by the power of Vara. That Rudra has to seek the help of Vishnu in order to motivate the बुद्धि of वृक to desist from his foolish advances towards Rudra proves that he himself cannot control the mind.

7. The character of अश्वत्थामा in Mahabharata is Rudra's incarnation. He, after the 18 days of Mahabharata war, with the intention of killing all the sons of Paandavas, was entering the entrance door of the शिविर. There he was stalled by Rudra, his own Moolarupa. There was a fight in between them and Rudra snatched all the weapons of अश्वत्थामा. This incidence proves that both Rudra's Moolarupa and अवताररूप have no power to control their own minds. How then Rudra could control other's mind?

(Rendered into English by Sri U.B. Gururajacharya)

Report :

Coronation of Junior Swamiji to Mantralaya Sri Raghavendra Matha

-A. Haridasa Bhat

Sri Sri Sushameendra Tirtha Swamiji's Diamond Jubilee was being celebrated at Udupi on 3.4.02 when at 6-30 p.m. in the evening that day he announced to the large audience assembled in the Rajangana of Sri Krishna Matha his decision to instal Vidwan Guruvenkatacharya, Prof. Sri Poornaprajna Vidyapeetha, Bangalore as the successor by giving him Sannyasa Deeksha and the Junior Peethadhipatya the next day early morning.

In the morning hours (about 2-30 a.m.) of 4.4.02 starting from Punyahavachana and followed by Aatmashraaddha, Shiromundana, Ashtaakshara Homa, Jayadi Home etc., were performed in the stewardship of Purohit Vijayeendra Acharya of Chennai. Next, taking a holy dip in Sri Madhva Sarovara Sri Guruvenkatacharya declared "सन्न्यस्तोऽहम्" and rooted out four hairs remaining on his head as a token of delinking himself from his Samsaara (family bondage). He removed his sacred thread (यज्ञोपवीत) he was wearing and still being in waters of Sarovara wore the Safron clothes (Shaati) offered from the Gruhasthas and came out of the water.

Further rituals were held at Madhva Mantapa in the premises of Sri Krishna Matha in the holy presence of Moola Vighraha of Sri Raghavendra Matha. Danda and Kamandalu were presented to him by his Ashrama Guru Sri Sushameendra Tirtha. Dandodaka was offered. His Guru named him as Sri Suvidyendra Tirtha relieving him of his previous Ashrama name.

Sri Sushameendra Tirtha gave Upadesham of प्रणव, अष्टाक्षर, राम and राघवेन्द्र मन्त्रs and putting his hand on the head of new

यति gave the दीक्षा, “विष्णोः सर्वोत्तमत्वं च सर्वदा प्रतिपादय” (Establish and propogate that Vishnu is the ultimate Supreme to all). Then he was coronated (पद्मभिषेक) as the successor to Mantralaya Sri Raghavendra Matha. Kshira Abhisheka was performed placing 'Vyasa Mushti' in a vessel over his head by pouring milk through Shankha by Sri Sushameendra Tirtha. Then followed presentation to the Yati of the necessary paraphernalia to possess as the junior head of the Matha.

Thus Sri Suvidyendra Tirtha became the 39th Yati in the Guruparampara occupying the 22nd place from Sri Raghavendra Swamiji.

The following is the brief greetings offered to the new Yati by the various Yatis present on the occasion.

Sri Vishvesha Tirtha Said, "We did not have the slightest inkling when Sri Vidyamanya Tirtha joined the young boy Guruvenkatacharya to our Vidyapeetha that he would become the Adhipati of Sri Raghavendra Matha. Probably Sri Raghavendra himself presented the boy to me at that time. It's now the matter of great pride for Vidyapeetha. He is the most befitting choice to succeed the sacred parampara. We pray that the senior and junior Yatis together would propogate the Tatvajnana for long."

How the new Yati was greeted by other Yatis?

From the Sarvajna Peetha, the Paryaya Swamiji Sri Vidyadheesha Tirtha spoke, 'Sri Krishna advised us to offer Him whatever we do'. 'This means we should have the humble belief that नाहं कर्ता हरिः कर्ता at the time of doing anything'. 'Sri Sushameendra Tirtha is holding this concept and offering everything desirelessly. Sri Krishna, having been pleased by this has blessed him with a befitting Shishya to succeed him'.

Well-known scholar Sri Bannanje Govindacharya said that it is rare that the deserved ones get their due place of respect. But, Sri Guruvenkatacharya, one of the great scholars of

contemporary period, is rewarded with a place he deserved by Sri Raghavendra Swamy through Sri Sushameendra Tirtha.

Sri Suvidyendra Tirtha in his maiden message as the new head of Mantralaya Peetha said,

‘अगम्यमहिमालोके राघवेन्द्रो महायशाः

I never expected that I would be elevated to this high place. First, I went to Sri Vidyamanya Tirtha who then took me to Sri Vishvesha Tirtha who educated me. Now I consider it as God's wish that I should be initiated to Sannyasa in the holy presence of Vidyaguru Sri Vishvesha Tirtha during the Paryaya period of Sri Vidyadheesha Tirtha, the Ashrama and Vidya Shishya of Sri Vidyamanya Tirtha. My Guru Sri Sushameendra Tirtha himself thought of this proposal and when this was placed before Sri Vishvesha Tirtha, he naturally whole heartedly and happily welcomed it.

But, I had left everything to the Sankalpa (wish) of 'Rayaru' and was prepared for any eventuality. Finally as God wished it, it happened. Yet I feel little apprehensive when I picture within my mind about the heavy responsibility I am shouldered with. Had this not happened I should have been sitting in a row of scholars on this occasion of this Diamond Jubilee Celebration of our Guruji. It is quite natural for me to feel out of place when I sit in a row among the Yatis as one among them by the sudden turn of events.

I am aware of the greatness of this Peetha and that this was adored by the great Sage Sri Raghavendra and responsibilities associated with it. I have decided in my mind to give utmost priority and stress for the propogation of Tatvajnaana which is the primary duty of all Peethas. To teach the great works such as Nyaya Sudha, Chandrika etc. and to perform Mangalotsava of such teachings in presence of my Guru and to publish Vedanta books are my other main intentions.'

(Rendered into English by Sri U.B. Gururajacharya)

Research Article :

'On the nature of the soul'

-Late Prof. B. Venkateshachar

(From previous issue)

KUMAARILA'S VIEW OF THE SOUL:

According to Kumaarila the soul is pure Chit (intelligence) and is revealed in the experience of one's self as 'I'. It is eternal, omnipresent and is different in different bodies. The number of souls is infinite. It is the object of *Maanasapratyaksha*, i.e., the mind should operate as an instrument in order that one may have the perception of one's self. Here Kumaarila differs from Prabhaakara. As the mind is absent in the state of release, the soul then exists as pure Chit without self-consciousness or personality and knows neither itself nor anything else.

THE SOUL IN THE SAANKHYA PHILOSOPHY:

In the Saankhya Philosophy the soul is known as *Purusha*. The number of Purushas is infinite. Each body is linked with a particular soul which is different from other souls. It is not atomic but omnipresent and eternal. All changes take place in *Prakrti*; egoity, happiness, misery, agency, enjoyership and the like are all modifications of *Prakrti*. *Purusha* is the witness of these changes and not discriminating himself from primeval matter he fancies that he is self-conscious as 'I' and that he experiences happiness, misery, agency in action and so on. When it is said that *Purusha* is the witness of the changes in *Prakrti* all that is meant is that his presence is necessary for the modifications in *Prakrti* to take place. He, by himself, is inactive and according to some is not even an enjoyer. When the realisation arises for a *Purusha* that he and *Prakrti* are

separate entities having no real connection between them, that particular *Purusha* is released from *Samsara*; for then *Prakrti* ceases to delute him by her modifications. In fact the modifications of *Prakrti* so far as this particular *Purusha* is concerned cease to operate. In the state of *Mukti* there is no consciousness and no personality. The condition of the soul according to the *Saankhya* system is tellingly described in the following words by Odenberg: The *Purusha* who has attained *Mukti* exists 'eternally released from the delusion and suffering of the world, as a seer who no longer sees anything, a glass in which nothing is any longer reflected, as pure untroubled light by which nothing is illuminated.

THE CONCEPT OF JIVA IN NYAYA SCHOOL:

In Nyaya the soul (*Aatman*) is eternal, omnipresent and is defined as the substratum of knowledge. The mind serves as an instrument in the perception of the Self. The number of souls is infinite, each living body having its own soul. We must notice here that consciousness does not belong to the soul as such but is a state of the embodied *Aatman* due to the presence of the mind and the sense-organs; in the perception of this state the mind functions as an instrument. The existence of the soul can also be established by inference. It is clear from this description that in the state of release since mind (*Manas*) is absent the condition of *Aatman* is not different from that of an insentient thing, say, a stone.

THE VAISHESHIKA VIEW OF THE SOUL:

The only difference between the *Naiyayikas* and the *Vaisheshikas* is that the latter do not admit that the soul is *Maanasapratyaksha*, i.e., mind perceived. Its existence has to be established by inference.

THE CHAARVAKA CONCEPT OF THE SOUL:

The Materialists of India are known as Chaarvakas. They hold the view that there is no soul other than the body. In fact the soul and body are identical. Consciousness is an effect of a particular association of the *Bhutas*, namely, fire, air, earth and water; just as the intoxicating quality in grape juice is produced as the result of fermentation, so consciousness is produced by a particular association of the four elements. Their philosophy is a crude form of hedonism. The supreme end of man must be to get as much pleasure out of life as possible unhindered by any idea of ethical conduct. That course should be followed by a man which results in the enjoyment of the greatest pleasure. All ethical rules are the concoctions of clever men to deceive fools and serve their own selfish ends.

One class of materialists however admit the existence of a conscious entity other than the body. But this soul exists only so long as the body exists and disappears when we say that a man dies; the soul dies with the body. Both these schools of materialists hold the view that there is no permanent soul for whose permanent good an ethical life should be lead.

MATERIALISM OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND THE CONCEPT OF THE SOUL:

In the nineteenth century the development of Newtonian mechanics, the progress in chemical research, the advancement of physiological studies and above all Darwin's theory of evolution resulted in a purely materialistic view of the universe. All phenomena, according to this philosophy, result from changes in matter. Only matter and motion are real. In the

final analysis every event taking place in the Universe can be traced to some change in a portion of matter. Every form of consciousness is an incidental product of some modification of the brain. Consciousness is always an effect and never a cause and accompanies some particular activity of the brain. For instance when the consciousness of a red rose arises and one has the experience in the form 'I see a red rose' what happens may be thus described. Light rays of diffused light from the rose fall on the eye and the crystalline lens of the eye produces an image of the flower on the retina and nervous impulses are transmitted along the optic nerve to a particular portion of the brain where a certain change takes place in the matter of the brain. Incidental to these material changes there arises the consciousness of a red flower. This consciousness has no effect on the brain and its modifications. The greatest thoughts of the poet, the course of subtle reasoning in the mind of a great mathematician and the spiritual insight of the saint are all incidental occurrences due to physical changes in the brain.

This concept of consciousness has some resemblance to the view of the second class of Chaarvakas who, as has already been pointed out, admit the existence of a soul other than the body which takes birth when one is born and ceases to exist when one dies. There is however one important difference. In the nineteenth century materialism which we have been considering, the self as a single continuous experiencing entity is illusory. As the result of revolutionary advances in physical science very few people, except probably a class of behaviourist psychologists, subscribe to this form of materialism.

(*Courtesy : Dharmaparakasha Journal, Chennai*) ■

Special Article :

Radhakrishnan's Exposition of Dvaita Vedanta

-Prof. K.T. Pandurangi
Upa-Kulapati, Poornaprajna Vidyapeetha,
Bangalore

(From prev. issue)

1. As regards the first observation mentioned above, Radhakrishnan's own remark made earlier, in the section 'God and world' answers the point. He has remarked that 'the supremacy of God introduces order and unity into the universe in spite of ultimate differences.' The souls and the world of nature being dependent on God in respect of Svarupa, Satta and Pravrtti (their nature, being and functioning) will introduce the necessary order and unity and can be sufficient ground for an organic conception of the world if at all such a conception is a must.

2. The point raised in the second observation, viz., if the creation is the result of the desire of divine-self, then, He has a want and consequently is imperfect. He cannot be regarded as supreme perfection.

This criticism is a summary of the Purvapaksha of one of the Adhikaranas in the Brahmasutras and is adequately answered by all the three Bhashyakaras. The pertinent question here is whether the desire to serve one's own purpose is necessary for all activities or serving the purpose of others can also initiate activity. Within the limited field of human, animal and birds activities also, we observe the self-less activities. God's creation is intended to provide an opportunity for the souls to pursue a course of career that ultimately enables them to realise their spiritual nature. This purpose does not necessitate any want on the part of God in the usual sense of the term

and does not result in His imperfection. Further, activities that emanate at the very nature of something and those that are undertaken with a purpose have to be distinguished. God's creation being of the former type, no want and consequent imperfection have any room.

Moreover, this problem, is a common problem to all theists, and the nature and degree of answer depends upon the nature and degree of perfection each one has thought of. In any case, it is not an absolutely insoluble problem. Radhakrishnan's earlier remark under the section 'God' puts Dvaita solution in a nut-shell. He remarks: God's activity is the result of his over-flowing perfection'.

3. The third criticism is about the difficulty felt in respect of the nature of dependence. There is no difficulty at all here. Even in the ordinary usage, when we say 'A' is dependent on 'B', we mean that its nature, being or functioning is supported by the other. Sri Madhva has made it clear that souls and the world of nature depend on God in respect of Svarupa, Satta and Pravrtti (nature, being and functioning). This is exactly the dependence of souls and world on God.

4. The fourth criticism relates to the relation between the world and Brahman if both are co-eternal. It is argued that if both are co-eternal and if their relation is also co-eternal, some reason has to be adduced as present in the Supreme for warranting such a co-relation.

Such a problem is not peculiar to Dvaita. In Saankhya, for instance, Prakrti and Purusha are co-eternal and somehow co-related also. Similarly, in Advaita, Brahman and Avidya are co-eternal and somehow co-related also. On these analogies it is not difficult to understand God, souls and the world of nature being co-eternal and also co-related. The nature of relation, naturally differs in each case depending upon the ontological

status assigned to the partners. In the case of Dvaita, it is Bimba-pratibimba relation. Soul is Pratibimba of God. Even matter is Pratibimba of God in respect of its Satta (being).

5. The next criticism is the question whether souls and world of nature can be considered as 'substance' in Dvaita. As per the definition of the substance quoted by Radhakrishnan, only God can be substance in Dvaita and therefore, God alone is Purna. But the usual practice is to render the Sanskrit term 'Dravya' as substance, and in that sense souls and the world of nature are Dravya or substance. The connection of the terms in Sanskrit and in Western Philosophy do not exactly agree in many cases. Therefore, their implications have to be defined and used. Even in Indian Philosophy, the term Guna, for instance, is used in different senses in Nyaya-Vaisheshika and Saankhya. Further, dependency on a transcendental entity may not mitigate the self-sufficiency required for the purpose of being described as a substance in the world of nature.

6. The theory of 'hierarchy of souls as Saattvika, Raajasa and Taamasa, and the eligibility of only Saattvika for liberation, accepted in Dvaita has caused annoyance to many thinkers and writers, and has created an impression that it is highly unethical and a great discouragement to the efforts for spiritual uplift. Naturally, Radhakrishnan also has felt this way and has given his candid opinion. It is not necessary to go into the very question whether such a gradation is worked out merely on the basis of scriptural authority or has reasons also to support it. It is also not necessary to examine the purport of the scriptural authority quoted by Sri Madhva in this connection or the status of the same as authority. Assuming that such a gradation is accepted on whatever authority, the question whether it is unethical or discouraging the efforts for spiritual uplift, can be examined. With this in view, two remarks of Radhakrishnan are examined here. The first one

is that the moral character of God is much compromised and the qualities of divine justice and divine love are emptied of all meaning and value. The second one is that individual effort loses its point, since whether one believes oneself to be elect or the non-elect, one is bound to lapse into indifferentism and apathy.

Let us consider the second remark first. Continuing this remark, Radhakrishnan observes, 'If we do not know what we are destined for, we may work on to purify ourselves. In the absence of knowledge we may at least have a hope'. These remarks give us a clue to the solution. A Saattvika, Raajasa or Taamasa Jiva is not aware of his true nature when he is in transmigration. Therefore, he does not know what he is destined for. In the absence of the knowledge of his true nature as non-eligible, he can certainly have a hope. If he does not entertain any such hope, there must be something intrinsically wrong with him. There is a no question of God playing any practical joke on him by implanting a desire in him for heaven. Only, he will not be permitted to play a practical joke on God or himself as a spiritual seeker. Therefore, so far as the efforts for spiritual uplift are concerned, it is guided by what one is, but not what one thinks 'he is'. On the contrary, the belief that everyone bears the divine in human form is more likely to lead to indifferentism, if not apathy, since he is quite certain that one day the divine in him will assert. Such an assertion of the world or something tragic develops here. Therefore, a seeker seeks without being diffident about his being elect, and a non-seeker does not even if he is told to be an elect.

As regards the moral character of being compromised consequent on electing some and rejecting the others, it is a problem that has to be faced by all theists irrespective of the fact whether they accept the gradation of souls or not.

Even without gradation the fact remains that some are happy and some are not, in worldly life. The variation in divine justice and divine love in this respect is explained with reference to karma in Hindu philosophies. The next question as to why this very Karma, the performance of which is also guided by God, is differentially initiated in different souls by God and a practical gradation, if not an ultimate gradation, is introduced, is parried by different philosophers in different ways. Sri Madhva is bold enough to say that it is rooted in the very nature of the souls. To the next question whether God cannot change this nature and make all souls good souls, Sri Madhva's reply is that he can, but he does not. Whether one gently parries the question, or bluntly answers, the result is the same.

Divine justice and divine love are not found justly bestowed in this world and there is no point in creating a make-belief that it will be done so after death or liberation. Therefore, one has to change one's very approach to understand the way of divine justice and divine love; and Sri Madhva's is one way of understanding it. This will not make any difference to a genuine seeker who believes in the infinite love of God, irrespective of dialectician's dilemma.

The above clarification of the position of Dvaita in respect of the points raised by Radhakrishnan are intended to enable the readers to appreciate his critical reflection with a little more background of Dvaita position.

A few more points that are not in the critical reflections but are mentioned in other sections also deserve to be noted.

He remarks that Sri Madhva makes a clever use of Saankhya and Nyaya-Vaisheshika theories. This remark is also made by a few other writers. In this connection, it may be clarified that Dvaita differs from Nyaya-Vaisheshika in respect of the theory of error, nature of soul and God, nature of liberation,

Vedaapaurusheyatva, and even in working out the details of Vyapti, Hetvaabhaasa etc. Dvaita does not accept Jaati. Its Visheshha is altogether different from that of Nyaya. Nyaya holds the theory of external verification for the validity of knowledge, while Dvaita accepts intrinsic validity. Nyaya holds Asat-kaarya-vaada, while Dvaita holds Sadasat-kaarya-vaada. Nyaya refers to the silver present elsewhere while explaining error, while Dvaita holds that the silver presented in error is totally absent and only mentally presented. Dvaita takes Prakrti as the source of matter, while Nyaya goes by Paramaanus. The differences in respect of the nature of soul, God, liberation, etc., are well-known. As against these major differences, there is no major point of similarity much less a clever use of the Nyaya theories.

The same is the case with Saankhya. There is a vast difference between the Saankhya concept of Purusha and Dvaita concept of Jiva. Svatantra-God, the central doctrine of Dvaita, is totally absent in Saankhya. The two differ in respect of the theory of causation as well as the theory of knowledge. So far as the evolution of matter from Prakrti is concerned, all schools of Vedanta have adopted it in one way or the other. But the important difference found in Dvaita is that Prakrti is the material cause guided by God. Dvaita has overcome certain deficiencies found in the Saankhya in respect of the theory of causation, functions of Purusha and the concept of liberation.

Another point that requires our attention in Radhakrishnan's exposition of Dvaita is his comments on the concept of Visheshha. To understand the concept of Visheshha in Dvaita, one has to first understand the difference between the concept of Visheshha in Nyaya and that in Dvaita. In Nyaya, Visheshha is intended to account for the difference that exists between two things, while in Dvaita it is intended to account for

making a difference where difference does not exist. For instance, there is no difference between Guna and Guni according to Dvaita and, therefore, we have to account for making a difference between the two in linguistic usage. This is managed by Vishesha. The relation between Guna and Guni is 'Savisheshabheda' according to Dvaita. Vishesha is intended to cover those cases where there is no difference, but a distinction is made in linguistic usage. It is a speciality that characterises a thing. While Vishesha is required to distinguish between Guna and Guni, that have no difference, no further Vishesha is necessary to distinguish Vishesha from Guni, since it is the very special characteristic of that Guni. If this special nature of Vishesha is kept in mind, the inapplicability of the criticism made by Radhakrishnan, viz., 'If Vishesha is different from the Supreme, it breaks the integrity of the Supreme; if it is non-different from it, we cannot call it Vishesha', can be clearly seen.

The very purpose of Vishesha is to distinguish the non-different for the purpose of linguistic usage, and it does so in its own case also. Therefore, the question whether Vishesha is different from the Supreme or not does not arise. Radhakrishnan's criticism may apply to some extent to Vishesha in Nyaya-Vaisheshika which has also found out a way out.

It may be concluded that Radhakrishnan has given a compact and lucid exposition of Dvaita with very useful critical reflections in a wider context. The summary of his exposition and the clarifications of the Dvaita position in respect of his reflections are given here as a tribute to his great services to Indian philosophy.

(By courtesy Indian Philosophical Annual Special Number on Radhakrishnan- Madras University.)

Presidential address* :

Madhva's Philosophy of life and social welfare

-Dr. V. R. Panchamukhi
Chancellor,

Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati

(From previous issue)

Principles of Equanimity and Just Social Order :

Madhva provides one of the most profound principles of socialism viz. equanimity for optimum global welfare. Many thinkers confuse between equality and equanimity. Many so-called socialists argue that all entities in life should be treated equally. They misunderstood the concept of equality in evolving a socialistic state in the country. Madhva's thesis that Paramatman 'stays' in every entity as its नियामक and that every entity is not itself Brahman, enables him to propound the principles of equanimity in an elegant manner. See the explanation of the following phrases in Bhagavadgita:

पण्डिताः समदर्शिनः (गी. ५.१८), समबुद्धिर्विशिष्यते (गी. ६.९), सर्वत्र समदर्शिनः (गी. ६.२९), समोऽहं सर्वभूतेषु (गी. ६.२९), समं पश्यति (गी. ६.३२), सर्वत्र समबुद्धयः (गी. १२.४), समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु (गी. १३.२) etc.

Sri Raghavendra Tirtha's succinct presentation on these phrases, clearly brings out Madhva's conception of equanimity and just social order.

सहदादिषु विषये शास्त्रेषु यथा यथा वृत्तिर्विहिता तथा तथा वर्तनं वर्तनज्ञानं वा सुहदादिजीवेषु समबुद्धिर्ध्येया । (गीताविवृतिः ६.९)

विष्णुवर्तिषु स्वात्मनीव स्नेहं कुर्वन् श्रेष्ठो मतः । (गीताविवृतिः ६.३२)

Thus, Madhva's just social order, provides for equitable

opportunities to one and all according to each one's own inherent aptitudes and abilities and it also envisages an environment of inter-personal harmony because each is required to recognise the presence of Paramatman in everyone else and show respect and love for one and all. This framework of just social order, avoids the situations of conflicts and jealousy because it does not permit unwarranted penetration of one entity into the other entity's domain of functions and responsibilities. Further, Madhva underscores the need for mutual love and respect for the other person's comforts and happiness.

Emphasis on Social Service and Swami-Sevabhava :

Madhva's Emphasis on स्वामि-सेवाभाव and नानाजनशुश्रूषा is often not highlighted as much as it deserves. Today's Madhva community has become highly selfish, very narrow and highly secretive in the pursuit of self-interests. Kindly forgive me for making these harsh comments on our behavioural pattern, in general. This kind of self-centred attitude is contrary to the basic tenets of the philosophy of life propounded by Madhvacharya. Consider the following most impressive Shloka of Bhagavata Tatparya of Sri Madhvacharya.

विष्णोर्गृहत्वात् भूतेषु दया कार्या विजानता ।
नाना जनस्य शुश्रूषा कर्तव्या करवन्मतेः ॥

This prescribes the imperatives of compassion and service to mankind like the payment to taxes to the government. Madhva's rationale for social service stems from his thesis that each entity of the universe is the abode for Paramatman and we have to worship the same.

The record of Madhva Community in doing social service

for the upliftment of the members of their own community and also for the welfare of the mankind at large, is not at all satisfactory. We are constrained by many mental hang-ups in vigorously pursuing social service activities. It is gratifying to note that in the recent years, some prominent personalities and spiritual leaders of Madhva community are increasingly getting involved in social service. Much more needs to be done in this direction. But it should be noted that the message of social service given in Madhva philosophy of life is universal and it should become the guide post for people in all walks of life, particularly for our political leaders, as the main instrument of realising social welfare. Incidentally, I may mention that true social service on the principles laid down in Madhva philosophy of life would also enable the politicians to win the love of the people and thereby capture 'votes'.

Ashta Bhava Pushpas :

Madhva lived an ideal life, which provided a rolemodel for others to follow. He had fully understood the essential message of Lord Krishna contained in the following Shloka.

यद्यदाचरति श्रेष्ठस्तत्तदेवेतरो जनः ।
स यत्प्रमाणं कुरुते लोकस्तदनुवर्तते ॥

He knew that in order to become a role-model for the others, he himself should become श्रेष्ठ. Note the use of the word श्रेष्ठ here. Krishna did not use the word नेता or अहं here. The present-day Netas can not become role models even in our dreams. Because, our Netas have not cared to become श्रेष्ठ-s. All the functions and deeds of Madhva, taken in an integrated manner, provide the characteristics of a श्रेष्ठ. often, Madhva's personality is misunderstood and misrepresented when only some events of his life are taken in an isolated manner. For

example, we can not depict him only as a person who ate 200 big plantains, drank several pots of milk, wrestled with stout wrestlers, recited Vedas even when his throat was suppressed by two sturdy ment etc. etc. Madhva ate fruits etc. only to show that the Paramatman in the form of Jatharaagni, situated in the stomach, has the unlimited capacity even to burn the entire universe, and that he has the yogic power to invoke that tremendous energy located within everyone of us.

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रं जठरे प्रतिष्ठितं जाज्वल्यमानं मम जातवेदसम् ।
नित्यं हितं विश्वदहं च वित्त तं विश्वेशचेता इति सोऽब्रवीत्तदा ॥ (म.वि.)

The same Madhva observed strict Upavasa and silence for several days while proceeding to Badarikashrama.

The most comprehensive characteristics of Madhva, which make him श्रेष्ठ, are described in Sumadhva Vijaya (Canto 14) when his daily routine is described. In particular, the description that Madhva was always performing the Pooja of Paramatman, through the eight Bhava Pushpas, brings out the most profound principles of Madhva philosophy of life.

तमरुणमणिवर्णं दिव्यदेहाख्यगेहे स्रपितमतिपृथुश्रद्धानदीचित्तवार्भिः ।
ननु स यजति नित्यं हृत्सरोजासनस्थं ननु सकृदिति पुष्यैरष्टभिर्भावपुष्यैः ॥
(म.वि. १४-३७)

It should be noted that in Mahabharata, Bhimasena is also described to be performing his eternal Pooja of the Lord residing within himself with these eight Bhava Pushpas.

Bhava Pushpas mean flowers of emotions, moods and attitudes. We should not think that we should perform Pooja for an hour or so, when we sit in our Pooja rooms. Bhagavat-

pooja should be a continuous process, every moment of our life, by adopting suitable moods, emotions and attitudes.

These eight Bhava Pushpas are the following :

अहिंसा प्रथमं पुष्पं पुष्पमिन्द्रियनिग्रहः ।
सर्वभूतदया पुष्पं क्षमापुष्पं विशिष्यते ॥
ज्ञानपुष्पं तपः पुष्पं ध्यानपुष्पं तु सप्तमम् ।
सत्यं चैवाष्टमं पुष्पम् एभिस्तुष्यति केशवः ॥

These eight flowers of emotion are :

- i. Attitude of non-violence, not (परपीडाकरव्यापारोपरमः) hurting others.
- ii. Control over sense organs.
- iii. Compassion on all beings.
- iv. Attitude of forgiveness.
- v. Pursuit of knowledge.
- vi. Approach of penance.
- vii. Approach of Meditation.
- viii. Truthfulness.

Each of these attributes is profound and it can be elaborated further. But their importance is well understood as essential inputs for making our life peaceful and blissful both at the individual level and at the Societal level. What a universal philosophy of life!

ज्ञान, भक्ति and वैराग्य

Knowledge, Commitment and Self-sacrifice are the three sturdy legs of the Madhva philosophy of life. Each of these attributes feed into the other in a sequential manner. Madhva has candidly brought out that all the different types of Yogas,

propounded in Bhagavadgita viz., constitute an integrated whole and that Aparoksha Jnaana constitutes the culmination of all the Yogas. For the conduct of all the Yogas, ज्ञान, भक्ति and वैराग्य are essential attributes. It should be noted that the term Yoga is interpreted to mean instrumentally of knowledge,

युज्यते फलम् अनेन इति करणव्युत्पत्त्या, योगः ज्ञानोपायपरः ।

(गीताविवृति २)

I would like to present before this scholarly audience, a novel interpretation of the following Shloka of Madhva Vijaya to bring out the message of ज्ञान, भक्ति and वैराग्य propounded by Madhvacharya.

नेदृशं स्थलमलं शमलग्नं नास्य तीर्थसलिलस्य समं वाः ।

नास्ति विष्णुसदृशं ननु दैवं नास्मदुक्तिसदृशं हितरूपम् ॥ (म.वि. ६)

This Shloka was supposedly written by Madhva, on sand, while proceeding to Veda Vyasa Ashrama from Narayana Badari, one day early morning. The apparent meaning of the Shloka is known to all. But I had some inspiration to give a philosophical interpretation to this Shloka. Since Madhva had doubts about his return to the Badarikashrama, to reunite with his disciples, after he had reached the Ashrama of Veda Vyasa, his final Shloka of farewell could not have been without a philosophical purport.

Incidentally, I would also like to raise the question as to why this Shloka or any other equivalent, if this is not the exact Shloka written by Madhva - is not counted as one of the works of Madhva.

The philosophical meaning is as follows : स्थल्यते अत्र भगवता इति स्थलशब्दः क्षेत्रशब्दवत् मानवशरीरपरः । This birth and this body

as a human being, are the most opportune situations for performing Sadhana for waiting off all sinful acts. The second part of the first line provides the philosophical essentials.

अकारो विष्णुरुद्दिष्टः । षष्ठी सम्बन्धार्थे । अत्र विषयत्वं सम्बन्धः । तीर्थं शास्त्र-मित्यर्थः । सलिलपदं तन्त्रम् । ॐ अम्बुवदग्रहणात् न तथात्वम् ॐ इति सूत्रे इव सलिलपदेन तद्गतस्नेहगुणः लक्ष्यते । सल् - गतौ, गत्यर्थधातूनां ज्ञानार्थ-कत्वम् । सलिलं- ज्ञानम्, सलिलं सलिलं- स्नेहगुणः नाम भक्तिः ज्ञानं च । वरयतीति वाः- संसारवर्तात् वारणम् । विष्णुविषयकशास्त्रेषु प्रतिपादितात् भक्ति-ज्ञानमार्गात् - लक्षणया वैराग्यसहितात् भक्तिज्ञानवैराग्यमार्गात् सदृशम् उत्तमं वा संसारबन्धननिवारणपूर्वकं मोक्षसाधनोपायः न कश्चिदपि अन्यः वर्तते ।

(वा.रा. पञ्चमुखिव्याख्यानम्)

Thus it means that there is no other better instrumentality for realising Moksha or eternal bliss and freedom from all bondages, than the path of ज्ञान, भक्ति and वैराग्य, which is propounded in the Shastras recognising Vishnu as the Supreme Lord. Vishnu is the Supreme Lord and Madhva's Gita Bhashya, gives more details about the Sadhana Marga.

Interpreted in this way, Madhva preached the most profound philosophy of life which is universally and which is a true instrument for the realisation of bliss and peace in the Society.

In this long section of my address, I have endeavoured to present some of the select salient features of Madhva's philosophy of life for optimum individual and social welfare. Viewed in this way, Madhva is indeed a great social philosopher and spiritual master caring for the welfare of the mankind as a whole. His messages are extremely apt for the present-day strife ridden society where, as stated earlier, Aasuri Sampat is taking an upper hand.

Upanishad Section :

Talavakara

- Sri Bannanje Govindacharya
Ishavasyam, Ambalpady, Udupi 576 101

(This article originally written in Kannada by the author, is rendered into English by Sri U.B. Gururajacharya.)

(From previous issue)

'It's none of these' (नेति नेत्यात्मा)

Vaidic literature grew from the ॐकार. Upon the growth of this Vaidic literature, it's quintessence, the Upanishat came to existence. What caution does this ॐकार imply basically to us?

We have inherited a tradition; we have to utter the ॐकार at the beginning of Vedaadhyayana (Study of Veda) and when we start chanting of any मन्त्र (hymn). Of course, even at the end (we should do so). Thus, by bracketing (सम्पुटीकरण) with the ॐकार, the power hidden in the मन्त्र gets consolidated and preserved without its getting drained off.

Study of Veda starts with the utterance 'हरिः ॐ' why because, all the following portions of Veda which we chant thereonwards are the expansion of this ॐकार. Vedas say in detail whatever the ॐकार says in a nutshell.

Who is described by this ॐकार? Sri Hari, and which is why, this हरिःॐ. All the Vaidic literature is the expanse of the attributes (गुण) of Sri Hari who is indicated by the ॐकार.

As a proof for this explanation, a statement is found in one of the Purana Shlokas,

वेदाक्षराणि यावन्ति पठितानि द्विजातिभिः ।

तावन्ति हरिनामानि पठितानि न संशयः ॥

We would have uttered so many names of Sri Hari as many letters of Vedas are pronounced by us.

And hence, we start with the utterance of हरिःॐ. We have, here in such utterance of हरिःॐ, an awareness of the fact (अनुसन्धान) that we would be chanting हरिनाम through each and every letter of Veda that we are going to pronounce further.

To know about the tree, we are required to know about the seed. That is, to know the Veda we should know the ॐकार. When we understand the meaning of ॐकार then we are entitled to enter into the Veda domain.

What then this ॐकार speaks about?

ॐकार speaks of the बीजसूत्र, the first lesson and technique in nutshell, for the meditation of God. अ-उ-म.

अकार means 'No'. नेति नेत्यात्मा.

Bhagavan is 'not'! What is He 'not'? He is 'not' whatever we know. He is 'not' whatever our mind can comprehend. Because, He is quite beyond our imagination.

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह ।

Words including (alongwith) our mind retreat failing to reach Him. This is how, in the primitive stage, the Bhagavan is introduced.

Why is it like this? Why ॐकार, instead of telling us what Bhagavan is, should tell us what He is not. Why because, it is the only and usual method of introducing a thing through the words. Through the words it is not possible to introduce or identify a thing which is not known to us.

First, we must have the knowledge of a thing; must also have known the word which identifies the particular object. Then, when the particular word is heard one would recollect the particular object.

Thus, it amounts to say that a word only helps to recollect the particular object; but it does not give the idea of an unknown object. As such, how is it ever possible to introduce or make known the Bhagavan about whom nothing is known.

That is why ॐकार expounds; "Bhagavan" is अ.

अः इति ब्रह्म ।

This ब्रह्म concept is not either this earth or the water or the fire that we perceive; nor it is the space or the air that we cannot perceive. ब्रह्म is neither this nor that.

Neither this means, it is neither this क्षर world; nor that means it is nor that अक्षरप्रकृति. It is beyond क्षर and अक्षर i.e., समतीतक्षराक्षर.

Our mind is limited whereas, IT is limitless.

Our mind is mundane and materialistic. Whereas, It is supramundane, nonmaterialistic.

Our mind is silly and incomplete, but It is endless, complete, and optimum.

And on account of the above, our mind cannot grasp or comprehend It.

This awareness is the initial step of meditation (ध्यान); First know that Bhagavan cannot be known fully, completely and entirely. This is the first status of भगवत्प्रज्ञा.

Why the Bhagavan is 'अ' as stated? To answer this question the second letter in ॐ has come up.

-"Because He is 'उ' He is अ"

-उ is an abbreviation in Sanskrit. 'उ' is the shortform of उत्तम or उत्कृष्ट i.e. supreme and superb. So, ब्रह्मतत्त्व is the greatest of the things or supersedes all the objects that we could comprehend. It is too great to comprehend in our mind.

Well then, if so why should we bother about It?

Instead of trying to know about the incomprehensible object in vain we could as well leave it alone. Why this job of simply boxing with the wind?

To absolve this argument, the third letter in ॐ would come to the rescue; it is 'म'.

म means 'मान', the knowledge; मानं ज्ञानम्.

This implies, 'Yes, It is not within the reach of our comprehension; It is far above the measure of our knowledge. Yet, we can know about It.'

'What!' It sounds like a contraversial statement!

'It is incomprehensible, still can be understood?'

It is like this. Is it not a form of knowledge to know that it is not understandable? To know that among the objects to know, it is super positioned at in unreachable height is also, in a way, an understanding only. In essence, the ॐकार says, 'Know that ब्रह्मतत्त्व as 'अ', know It as 'उ'. Fine, you have known atleast that much'.

Now, we have found out 'IT is above all; IT is above our knowledge'. So, yes, IT can be known and yes IT can't be known. In the depth of the above statements both of them mean one and the same.

This is the gist :

Entire ocean's water can't be filled into our container. At

the same time nobody prevents us from filling as much water as we can into our own containers.

Take a small vessel, it can also be filled; take a bucket, even that can be filled; If need be, you can also fill a big drum. But, even after filling our containers, still the ocean remains full.

Ocean is not emptied, but our container is full. That's what we can do; our job is done.

Thus we have come to know, what an ocean is. It is clear now that to believe that ब्रह्मतत्त्व can be comprehended in its totality is as much a futile exercise as to try to empty the ocean's entire water into our container.

ॐकार settles down indicating that 'It is impossible to totally empty. Yet, you needn't keep without filling. Get your container filled as much as it can hold'.

The Talavakaropaniṣat is nothing but a search for realising as to how many of such droplets of bliss and knowledge out of unfathomable eternal infinite ocean of knowledge and bliss can be collected into our vessel i.e. our mind and soul.

(To be contd...)

From 47th page

available at Ranivaru palace (Dilapidated) adjacent to Sanskrit school at the beginning of footpath to hills, opposite to the huge Hanuman Statue. This structure, surrounded by thick shrubs may be explored to confirm the existence of a Brindavan.

Similarly a Matha called Odapalli Matha, to serve the Saints of Sripadaraja Matha at Odapallu near Erode, seems to have existed between 1800-1949. The last Saint of this Matha, Sri Gurubhaktinidhi Tirtha entered Brindavan at Dharapuram Bheema Rayara Agraharam in 1949 on Pushya Bahula Ekadashi day.

Geeta Section :

Geeta as seen by some others

-Dr. P. Nagaraja Rao
Chennai

A glance at the opinions expressed by the ancient sages and modern savants describe to us the glory of the gospel. It is delivered by Krishna to Arjuna, the close companion, representative man and 'the chosen instrument of the Lord' in the words of Aurobindo.

In the year 1785 Charles Wilkins translated the Gita into English, and Warren Hastings the first Governor-General writes in the preface to the Volume, "that works like Bhagavadgita will survive when the British dominion in India shall have long ceased to exist and when the sources which it once yielded of wealth and power are lost to remembrance." We have the Gita with us, and the Britishers have pulled themselves out of India, and we are not using the Gita as we should.

Emerson, the American Transcendentalist on reading the Gita writes, "it was the first boo, it was as if an empire spoke to us; nothing small or unworthy, large, consistent, in its voice of an old intelligence which another age and climate had pondered and thus disposed of the same questions that concern us."

The German critic William Von Humboldt writes "the Gita is the most beautiful, perhaps the only true philosophical song existing in any known tongue." After reading the book, he wrote to his statesman friend Fredic Von Gentz, "I read the Indian poem for the first time, when I was in my country estate in Silesia and while doing so I felt a sense of overwhelming gratitude to God having let me live to be acquainted with this work. It must be the most sublime thing to be found in the world."

(contd. on page 44)

Sarvamula Section :

Tatvasamkhyana and Tatvaviveka

-Prof. K.T. Pandurangi

In Tatvasamkhyana as the very name suggests the categories of the reality as conceived in Dvaita Vedanta are enumerated. This small text opens with the definition of a Tatva i.e., a real entity: 'That which is not superimposed is a real entity'. It is further explained as that which is the object of valid knowledge. For instance, when "A garland of flowers is comprehended as 'A garland of flowers' then its object viz., the garland of flowers is a real entity. But when some one mistakes it as a snake from a distance or in a dark place, his comprehension is not valid knowledge. Consequently its object viz., Snake which is superimposed on a flower garland is not a real entity. It is Aaropita i.e., superimposed, and hence it is not a Tatva i.e., a real entity. All those that satisfy this definition i.e., "Tatvam Anaaropitam" are Tatvas.

The Tatvas are first classified into two; Svatantra i.e., independent and Paratantra i.e., dependent. The Supreme God is Svatantra i.e., Independent category. All other categories are Paratantra. The Svatantra is defined as that which is independent in respect of its very essential nature, the functions, and the comprehension. The Supreme God is only independent in all these respects. All others are entirely dependent upon the Supreme God in all these respects. Therefore, all others are Paratantra i.e., Paramaatmantra.

The Paratantra is further classified as Bhaava and Abhaava i.e., the Positive and the Negative. 'That which presents itself as "Is" in its first cognition is Positive' and 'that which present itself as "Is not" in its first cognition is Negative'. The Bhaava i.e., the Positive is classified into Chetana and Achetana i.e., sentient and non-sentient. The sentient is further classified as

that which is never afflicted by the sorrow and those that are afflicted by the sorrow. Goddess Lakshmi only is never afflicted by the sorrow. She is Nityamukta i.e., ever free from the bondage. All other sentient beings are afflicted by the sorrow sometime or the other. Further classification of these is given in the Text.

The non-sentient are classified into Nitya i.e., eternal and Anitya i.e., perishable, Nityaanitya i.e., partly eternal and partly modified. Veda, Varna and Avyakrta Aakaasha are eternal. Puraana, Kaala and prakrti are partly eternal and partly changing.

The negative i.e., Abhaava is classified into three viz., Praagabhaava i.e., previous negation, Pradhvamsaabhaava i.e., later negation and Sadaabhaava i.e., total negation. In respect of Abhaava two important points have to be noted. 1. Anyonyaabhaava is not accepted as a category of Abhaava. This is because, Anyonyaabhaava i.e., Bheda, the distinction is considered as Dharmisvarupa i.e., an internal attribute of every entity. To be distinct from all other entities is the very nature of each entity. Therefore, this fact of being distinct from all other entities is part and parcel of the very nature of each entity. Therefore, it is not negative and hence is not to be considered as a category of Abhaava. 2. The Sadaabhaava concept of Dvaita is distinct from the Samsargaabhaava or Atyantaabhaava concept of Nyaya Vaisheshikas. The Samsargaabhaava of Nyaya-vaisheshika could be easily included under Praagabhaava, the absence before the Sansarga i.e., the contact, and under Pradhvamsaabhaava after the contact is withdrawn, that is to say before the Jar is brought on the ground, it is Sansarga praagabhaava and after the Jar is withdrawn from the ground it is Sansargpradhvamsaabhaava. Therefore, there is no need to accept a separate type of Abhaava called Sansargaabhaava. In respect of the concept of

Atyantaabhaava an important difference between the Nyaya concept and the Dvaita concept is, the Pratiyogin of this Abhaava is elsewhere present according to Nyaya view while according to the Dvaita it is only envisaged and denied. It is not a reference to that which is actually present elsewhere and its denial. Therefore, the Pratiyogin of this Abhaava is Apraamaanika i.e., not really existing elsewhere. This Abhaava is an Abhaava i.e., absence present at all three times i.e., past, present and future. That is why it is called Sadaabhaava.

Tatvaviveka also enumerates the categories more or less in the same way. This work contains the verses of a larger work of the same name composed by the God himself. Thirteen verses are quoted in this small work in support of the statements made in Tatvasamkhyaana. Therefore, it is not a repetition but an extract of a source work to support tatvasamkhyaana. Naturally the two texts verbatim agree barring a few passages. The few verses that are differently worded or additional contain some significant points. These are as follows :

1. The Achetana i.e., non-sentient is classified into two viz. Nitya and Anitya i.e., eternal and non-eternal. The third group i.e., Nityaanitya is not mentioned. This does not involve any conflict between the statement of Tatvasamkhyaana and Tatvaveka. The items listed under Nityaanitya have an eternal aspect and a modified aspect. From the first aspect point of view these are included under Nitya. The second aspect naturally goes under Anitya. In order to bring out these two aspects more clearly these are first listed under Nitya i.e., eternal, then it is stated that the modified forms of these are Anitya. Some more items in addition to the items listed under Nitya and Nityaanitya in Tatvasamkhyaana are mentioned. The nature of the modification in respect of these items differs from item to item. This is explained in the commentaries.

2. In Tatvasamkhyaana, Guna, Kriya, Jaati etc., attributes

are not mentioned. Here these are mentioned. These are classified into two groups viz., i) Yaavad-dravyabhaavi i.e., the attributes that last as long as the substance lasts. ii) Ayaavad-dravyabhaavi i.e., the attributes that perish even before. The relation between the substance and the attributes, in the former case is Abhedha while it is Bhedaabhedha in the case of the latter.

In Tatvasamkhyaana the attributes are not separately mentioned keeping in view the fact that the attributes are not totally different from the substance. Here, these are mentioned to bring out the nature and the relation of the two types of the attributes.

Strictly speaking these two texts form one unit. Therefore, these additional statements do not indicate any difference of views on the respective issues.

The classification of the categories in these two texts is quite different from the pattern followed in the texts of the other systems of Philosophy such as Nyaayavaisheshikas. The Nyaayavaisheshikas go by the pattern as Dravya, Guna etc. This is because, the objective of those systems is to provide the knowledge of the material world, while that of Dvaita Vedanta is to lead to the knowledge of the Supreme God. Therefore, the Supreme God is first stated as Svatantra bringing out his Supremacy and all other categories are brought under Paratantra indicating their dependence on the Supreme God. The other categories are to be known only to realise the Supremacy and the glory of the God. The concluding verses of these two texts make this position abundantly clear. The last verse of Tatvasamkhyaana enumerates the creation, sustainance, destruction etc., eight states of the world that are caused by the God and glorifies Him by giving his Srshtyaadi ashtakartrtva definition. The concluding verse of Tatvaviveka emphatically states that it is the knowledge that the entire world consisting of Chetana and Achetana entirely depends upon the God that enables one to attain the liberation. ■

Youth Section :

धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात्

-Sri U. B. Gururajacharya

(Broadly, this section is dedicated to the youth. This may carry articles on spiritual subjects which are relevant and palatable to them written either by a youth or by any other for the youth, not necessarily written by youth. Contributions by youths or even by others on above lines for this section are invited. -Ed.)

(Contd. from previous issue.)

Bhagavan is highly competent without anyone to equal or surpass Him. He keeps His greatness ever. Suppose He wishes to protect to lift anyone by preventing him from doing something extending a helping hand. Oh! sorry, He would not do it appearing in person in front of us holding a stick and scolding. Nor He would advice speaking using words, to say to us 'you guys, not this way, but this way'. Then, howelse? He would only give inspiration to mind. How much compassionate He is to us?

Some of us might even not heed for His words if and when He appears in person in ordinary form. This is why He adopts an indirect tactics.

'These people, though have sense, do not have proper sense. They are too duds to recognise Me if I stand before them. There is also some funny attitude with them. When I tell them to do something or to not to do another thing or to do this way and not that way they may just ignore doubting my words thinking whatever way they think is only the right and good to them. They may even consider Me as somebody not friendly and dependable giving some advice unacceptable (from their point of view) to them'.

Yet, He decides to rescue, save and lift up a staunch devotee

21

considering his deservedness and goodness. 'This poor fellow is after all a pathetic human being. He is an egg of ignorance, fickle and inconsistent. But, he is good and has consistent devotion'. Thus He chooses the person and enters the mind straight. If our mind and heart are सत्त्वं विशुद्धं वसुदेवशब्दितं, He would dwell and appear there as वासुदेव. When it happens so, surely we are saved. That was how Kashyapa Vasudeva (कश्यपवसुदेव) was chosen to be blessed.

It is also equally true that on the same lines of this process of inspiration to save a devotee (सज्जन) the process of inspiring a दुर्जन also takes its course. This fact should also be noted by us.

In Bharata Tatparya Nirnaya the following verses that we come across are in support of this concept-

१. नैतद् विचित्रममितोरुबलस्य विष्णोः

यत्प्रेरणात् सपवनस्य भवेत् प्रवृत्तिः

लोकस्य सप्रकृतिकस्य (6.11)

२. यः प्रेरकः सकलश्रेमुषितसन्ततेश्च (6.17)

३. यः प्रेरकः सकललोकबलस्य नित्यम् (6.21)

४. सृष्टिस्थित्यप्ययाज्ञानबन्धमोक्षप्रवृत्तयः

प्रकाशनियमौ चैव ब्रह्मेशादिक्षरस्य च

अक्षरप्रकृते सन्तः मत्त एव न चान्यतः (25.6)

न देवा दण्डमादाय रक्षन्ति पशुपालवत् ।

यं तु रक्षितुमिच्छन्ति बुद्ध्या संयोजयति तम् ॥

The above are only a few out of many sayings that occur in Shastras. All these consolidate the conception that primarily Bhagavan and secondarily the Abhimani Devatas under Him motivate the Buddhi and Indriyas.

The summary meanings of these excerpts are as under.

1. This act of Vishnu is not the only estonishing act. (Context: Sri Rama, an incarnation of Bhagavan using a single arrow, has beheaded the दैत्यसप्तक who was engaged in the penance in order to occupy चतुर्मुखब्रह्म's status in Kishkindha) After all, He alone is the motivator in the excecution of all their duties that Laksmi, Vayu and all others in the whole universe are entrusted with.

2. He is the only motivator for all the good and bad, right and wrong.

3. He is the stimulator for the powers that be in the universe.

4. None other than Me is the motivator to entire क्षरप्रपञ्च comprising of चतुर्मुख, रुद्र and others including अक्षरलक्ष्मी (प्रकृति) in matters of birth, existance, death, ignorance, bondage, release, knowledge etc.

5. The देवताs do not protect or lead us by using a stick in hand like a shepherd or cowboy does to his sheep or cowherd. But, when they desire to help any one, he would be motivated properly through his mind.

All right, even then, why I should beg like, 'kindly motivate all of us'. Why not only for me alone?

The answer is, 'Yes we should pray for collective motivation.'

We are living as a society and in families. We are not creations living in seclusion. We are very much a part and parcel of the collective society and family. In all the moments of life, in one way or the other, may be an individual or a society or a country or the whole world would have to act, or conduct business or mingle or react with one another. So, it is imperative that the behaviour and all acts of all of us would have a bearing on others, on our own selves, our works, our reactions and our thinkings in one way or the other. This

is unquestionable and can't be denied. Thus it becomes clear to us that we should not only pray for the motivation of our mind but also for the minds of others too. This is helpful for our Yoga Kshema also. So it is more essential to pray like 'धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात्'.

Having known the facts and the greatness of this Manu (Mantra), the Gayatri which was in the first instance visualised by Chaturmukha (ब्रह्मगायत्री- without व्याहृति) and then by the sage Vishvamisra in the form we chant (विश्वामित्रगायत्री with व्याहृति) we should not neglect it. At least, a single meaning of it that 'the unparalleled glories of that omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent entity, the God, which creates, sustains and annihilates this universe, I pray to, that our minds be motivated properly by It'. If such a prayer is offered by all the eligible, the vibration set out by the Mantra and Mantrārtha would surely cause the people at home, at houses neighbouring, of the society around, of the places around, of the nation and of the world around to get motivated for the good. The non-eligible -to chant would get protected by such prayers by the eligible. It is everybody's material experience that if everyone's mind behaves rightly then only can there be wealth, health, life, peace and everything and anything in tact and safe. ■

From 36th page

John Eglinton in his memories of George Rusell writes, Goethe, Wordsworth, Emerson and Thoreau among the moderns have something of this vitality and wisdom, but we can find all they have said and much more in the grand "Sacred Books of East," The Bhagavadgita and the Upanishads contain such God-like fullness of wisdom on all things that I feel the authors must have looked with calm remembrance back through a thousand passionate lives of feverish strife for and shadows, ere they could have written with such certainty of things which the soul feels to be sure. ■

Pavana Yatra :

Bheema's stone on the bank of river Bhadra

-Sagri Raghavendra Upadhyaya

Once, Acharya madhva was touring the villages along the River Bhadra. He came across the village Kalasa where, in the middle of the footpath, a big stone was seen lying obstructing the passage. On enquiry from the village people he learnt that the stone couldn't be carried to the place where it was required to be placed even by the gang comprising thousands of men because of its heavy weight. The Acharya, without any effort, could carry it by his single hand and kept it in the spot where it was required to be. Acharya Narayana Pandita had referred to this incidence in Sri Madhva Vijaya (16.7,8,9) saying, 'the big stone which was carried and kept by Acharya can be seen even now in the bank of Bhadra river'.

This stone on which an inscription in Kannada script conveying the incidence in Sanskrit language 'श्रीमध्वाचार्यैकहस्तेन आनीय स्थापिता शिला ।' is standing like a monumental witness even today in place called Ambutirtha in Kalasa village. A linesketch of Acharya is also drawn on the surface of the stone of the size 20'x16'x10' and of approximate weight of 500 Kg. It stands as silent witness to the exhibition of the fact that Sri Bheemasena of Dwapara has incarnated as Acharya and the incidence was just a small demonstration of his unimaginable and unconquerable physical strength.

To reach the place- go to the village Kalasa of Chikkamagalore district. Continue on the road leading to Horanadu from Kalasa until you come across a temple of Sri Venkataramana on the left side of the road. Little beyond that, on the same side of the road a mud road is running. Catch this mud road. After about a distance of 2 furlongs (quarter of a mile) the road splits into two. Take the road on the right (leaving the left road) and cover a distance of about 2 Kms. There you

would reach the Bhadra River's bank. From there at a distance of about hundred yards to the East direction in this River bank the stone which was consecrated by the touch of Acharya stands awaiting to sanctify us.

Madhva (Madda - A Place named as):

There is a place by name 'Madhva' at a distance of about 38-39 Kms. on the Charmadi road leading to Dharmasthala. This is about 18 Kms. after Bantwala. Here there is a Higher Primary School (Kavala Padur) to the left of which lies a mud road. At a 100 yards' distance on this road an elevated place (Katte) where Acharya Madhva used to sit for some time obliging request of the devotees while he was on walk to the Madhyavata Matha (मध्यवाटमठ) could be visited.

The significance of this Madhyavata Matha we would read in next issue.

(Rendered into English by Sri U.B. Gururajacharya) ■

From 50th page

Likewise, no opponent of Madhva's system has come forward with a work of similar scope and depth, nor even with a thorough critique of Shrii Jayatirtha's work. Even to the skeptical mind, these facts call for notice.

An exposition of such a work in English is awesome to attempt, much less to complete, so it is indeed a great credit to Dr. Sharma that he has completed the task. The first volume in the series deals with the first five adhikarana-s (topics of discussion) in the NS, and does this in relatively greater detail. The second volume takes over from where the first left off, and covers the discussion up to the end of the first chapter of the sutra-s. The third volume deals much more briefly with the remaining chapters of the Brahma Sutra-s.

(It is a complete text [Brief Version] of this review is available at <http://vidyapeetha.net> under link for E-Texts.)

History Section :

The Madhva Matha at Simhachalam

-B. Sarvothaman
Officer, Syndicate Bank,
9/5, iii Trust Link St.,
Santhronne CH-28

Sri Madhvacharya (1238-1317) initiated number of his disciples to monastic order, to carry on his mission. His mission may be broadly classified into two categories: 1. To carry on Philosophical devotion. 2. To disseminate devotional Philosophy.

For the first category, he founded the Krishna Matha at Udupi and the 8 Monks, in perfect coordination, carry on the Philosophy-based devotion.

For the second category, he wrote 37 works and taught them to his (4+1) principal disciples.

With this he laid the foundation for uninterrupted operation of his system in the country which has 8° and 37° as the Southern and Northern latitudes.

Of his four principal disciples, Sri Narahari Tirtha (1324-33) had founded a Matha at Simhachalam temple which existed for less than a Century. The Inscriptions in the temple give the names of Saints of this Matha- Varadagiri Sripadulu, Narasihma Bharati Sripadulu, Jagannatha Tirtha Sripadulu, Raga Bharati Sripadulu. The lineage seems to have abruptly ended around 1400 AD.

However, a Saint of the Madhava Tirtha's lineage, Sri Narayana Tirtha is reported to have entered Brindavan at Simhachalam in 1430 AD. A Brindavan - Like structure is

(contd. on page 35)

Book Review :

'Nyayasudha of Shrii Jayatiirtha' by B.N.K. Sharma, 3 vols.

Shrisha Rao
U.S.A.

Nyaayasudhaa of Jayatiirthamuni, Pa~ncaadhikarani, Rendered into English by Dr. B.N.K. Sharma, published by Shrii Raghavendra Ashrama, Bangalore-55, 1995. pp. xxx+303.

Nyaayasudhaa of Shrii Jayatiirtha, vol. II (FirstAdhyaaya complete), Dr. B.N.K. Sharma, published by Vishva Madhva Mahaaparishhat, Bangalore 560 004, 2000. pp. xvii+316.

Nyaayasudhaa of Shrii Jayatiirtha, vol. III (Second, Third & Fourth Adhyaayas, Dr. B.N.K. Sharma, published by Vishva Madhva Mahaaparishhat, Bangalore 560 004, 2001. pp. xx+136.

The suutra-s (aphorisms) of BaadaraayaNa which are considered by all to be authoritative in respect of Vedaanta {and are hence also called Vedaanta-suutra-s} do not anywhere support the notion of solipsism. Indeed, in several places they explicitly dismiss it. How then has it come to be widely accepted that such an un-sanctioned view is the final conclusion of Vedaanta? Quite simply, this has happened because of careless and ill-considered explanations of the suutra-s and other canonical Vedaantic texts. Add to the mix an ingredient of unwary worshipfulness fraudulently obtained in the first place and hallowed in the public eye by centuries of blind following, and another of unwillingness to critically examine contrasting claims (preferring to numb one's doubts and persist in the false belief that all ideas are equal) --- and you have a recipe for spiritual and material disaster. Is it any wonder that there is so much affliction in the world?

Ill-considered explanations not only do little justice to the actual purports of these canonical texts, but even show little hesitation in dismissing their explicit sanctions against solipsism in favor of an imagined higher end that is supplied ex cathedra}, without basis. For example, see Sha~nkara under suutra 1.2.19:

jiiivasya tu na parasmaadanyatvam pratipipaadayishhyati kintvanuvadati eva; avidyaakalpitam lokaprasiddham jiiivabhedam

(`[The suutra} does not propound the difference of the individual from the Supreme, but only re-states it; [for] the difference of the individual [from the Supreme] tht is famous in the world is imagined due to nescience.")

The point to note is that no authority exists to back up the claim, and that it is never made clear why Baadaraayana needs to moronically re-state well-known concepts alleged to be falsehoods, without ever correcting himself. Such a style of commentary not only casts suspicion upon its conclusions, but even tends to show the revered aphorist to be a fool, and all of Vedaanta to be a worthless body of chimerical knowledge. By nowhere caring for the actual words and intents of the suutra-s and by everywhere spouting extraneous preconceptions while claiming to explain them, it has come to pass that what are alleged to be commentaries upon the suutra-s are anything but, and only seek to rob the glory of Baadaraayana to further their own parochial agendas.

Thus, if we are to avoid these pitfalls and decide to consider for evaluation only such commentaries upon the Vedaanta-suutra-s as are completely honest to the actual words used, and which nowhere reject, impugn, or disregard them, then the choice becomes remarkably simple. Only the bhaashhya of Madhva remains for one's consideration, and all others fall by the wayside.

However, the bhaashhya of Madhva upon the suutra-s is extremely laconic, and is not given to wasting words. More to the point, it also does not explicitly deal with the many erroneous interpretations of the suutra-s that may yet plague one's consciousness in spite of one's analysis above. For this reason, Madhva's biographer informs us, he was requested by his favorite disciple Trivikrama Pandita to compose another work explicating the purport of the suutra-s: this metrical text in about 2000 grantha}-s is called the Anu-Vyaakhyaana, and stands as an unparalleled magnum opus in the entire literary history of Vedaanta.

As a Vedaantic commentary, and as a work clarifying the tenets of Madhva's theology, the Anu-Vyaakhyaana scarcely has a parallel much less a superior. Even so, and perhaps for that very reason, persons such as oneself are not capable of directly digesting its contents, owing to lack of skill, ability, and so on. It took a truly awesome sub-commentary from a tremendous scholar to bridge the gap and clarify matters in a way that lesser talents can more easily appreciate. This work is the Nyaaya-Sudhaa, the subject of the books by B.N.K. Sharma presently under discussion.

As Dr. Sharma himself notes (vol. 1, p. 3), ``Though there were some earlier commentaries on the AV, Shrii Jayatrtha's work surpasses them all in its all-round completeness of detail and range of survey, and is acknowledgedly the most learned, brilliant, and thoroughgoing exposition of the original. To this day, it stands as the one and only masterly exposition of the masterly work of a master-mind in Indian philosophy."

The Nyaaya-Sudhaa is a work of such magnitude that even the most talented and confident man could not but be humbled by it --- in all the time since its writing, there is no instance of anyone claiming to have mastered it completely.

(contd. on page 46)