





CSL

154

THE
SYSTEM OF THE VEDÂNTA.



CSL

THE SYSTEM OF THE VEDĀNTA

ACCORDING TO BĀDARĀYANA'S BRAHMA-SŪTRAS
AND ÇAÑKARA'S COMMENTARY THEREON SET FORTH AS A
COMPENDIUM OF THE DOGMATICS OF BRAHMANISM FROM
THE STANDPOINT OF ÇAÑKARA

BY

DR. PAUL DEUSSEN

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, KIEL UNIVERSITY

AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION

BY

CHARLES JOHNSTON

BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE, RETIRED

188



~~188~~

CHICAGO U. S. A.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

1912



CSL

181.48 / cc
BAD-NIXS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

The thanks of the Author and Translator are tendered to Dr. PAUL CARUS, for his help in the Publication of this work; to Mr. E. T. STURDEY for valuable aid in revising the manuscript; and to Dr. J. BRUNE and Mr. LEOPOLD CORVINUS for help during the printing of the English version.

3927



Translator's Preface.

My dear Professor Deussen,

WHEN, writing to me of your pilgrimage to India and your many friends in that old, sacred land, you suggested that I should translate *Das System des Vedânta* for them, and I most willingly consented, we had no thought that so long a time must pass, ere the completed book should see the light of day. Now that the period of waiting is ended, we rejoice together over the finished work.

I was then, as you remember, in the Austrian Alps, seeking, amid the warm scented breath of the pine woods and the many-coloured beauty of the flowers, to drive from my veins the lingering fever of the Ganges delta, and steeping myself in the lore of the Eastern wisdom: the great *Upanishads*, the *Bhagavad Gîtâ*, the poems of Çaṅkara, Master of Southern India.

Your book brought me a new task, a new opportunity. For in it I found, most lucidly set forth, the systematic teaching of the Vedânta, according to its greatest Master, with many rich treasures of the *Upanishads* added.

Shall we say that the great *Upanishads* are the deep, still mountain tarns, fed from the pure water of the everlasting snows, lit by clear sunshine, or, by night, mirroring the high serenity of the stars?

The *Bhagavad Gîtâ* is, perhaps, the lake among the foothills, wherein are gathered the same waters of wisdom, after flowing through the forest of Indian history, with the fierce conflict of the Children of Bharata.



Then, in the *Brahma Sûtras*, we have the reservoir, four-square, where the sacred waters are assembled in ordered quiet and graded depth, to be distributed by careful measure for the sustenance of the sons of men.

What shall we say, then, of the Master Çaṅkara? Is he not the Guardian of the sacred waters, who, by his Commentaries, has hemmed about, against all impurities or Time's jealousy, first the mountain tarns of the *Upanishads*, then the serene forest lake of the *Bhagavad Gîtâ*, and last the deep reservoir of the *Sûtras*; adding, from the generous riches of his wisdom, lovely fountains and lakelets of his own, the *Crest Jewel*, the *Awakening*, the *Discernment*?

And now, in this our day, when the ancient waters are somewhat clogged by time, and their old courses hidden and choked, you come as the Restorer, tracing the old, holy streams, clearing the reservoir, making the primal waters of life potable for our own people and our own day; making them easier of access also, and this is near to both our hearts, for the children's children of those who first heard Çaṅkara, in the sacred land where he lived his luminous days.

So the task is done. May the Sages look on it with favor. May the sunlit waters once more flow in life-restoring streams, bringing to the world the benediction of spiritual light.

Believe me, as ever,

Cordially yours

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

Contents.

INTRODUCTION.

	page
I. Literary Notes	3—46
1. The Name Vedânta, p. 3.—2. Some Remarks on the Veda, p. 5.—3. The Philosophical Systems, p. 19.—4. Form of the Brahma-sûtras; Çaṅkara's Commentary, p. 25.—5. The Quotations in Çaṅkara's Commentary, p. 29.—6. Some Remarks on Çaṅkara, p. 35.—7. Analysis of the Contents of the Brahmasûtras with Çaṅkara's Commentary according to <i>adhyâya</i> , <i>pâda</i> and <i>adhikaranam</i> , p. 39.	
II. Aim of the Vedânta: The Destruction of an innate error	47—59
1. The fundamental Thought of the Vedânta and its previous History; a Glance at allied Theories in the West, p. 47.—2. Analysis of Çaṅkara's Introduction p. 53.	
III. Who is called to the Study of the Vedânta?	60—76
1. The indispensable Condition, p. 60.—2. Exclusion of the Çûdras, p. 60.—3. Admission of the Gods; their Rôle in the Vedânta System, p. 65.—4. Episode: on the Vedântic Philosophy of Language, p. 72.	
IV. Qualifications of those called to the Study of the Vedânta	77—87
1. The Study of the Veda, p. 77.—2. The four Requirements, p. 79.—3. Relation of the System to that of Justification by Works, p. 82.—4. Liberation through "the Grace" of Knowledge, p. 85.	
V. Source of the Vedânta	88—96
1. General Remarks on the Indian Pramânas or Canons of Knowledge, p. 88.—2. Insufficiency of the secular Canons of Knowledge, p. 89.—3. The Revelation of the Veda, p. 94.	



	page
VI. Exoteric and Esoteric Vedānta Doctrine . . .	97—115
1. Justification of Exoteric Metaphysics, p. 97.—2. Exoteric and Esoteric Form of the Vedānta, p. 98.—3. Appendix: Ṣaṅkara's Esoteric Philosophy, translated from 4, 8, 14, (a) Do the liberated go to Brahman? (b) Esoteric Cosmology. (c) Esoteric Psychology. (d) Esoteric Morality. (e) Esoteric Eschatology. (f) Esoteric Theology, p. 109.	
FIRST PART:	
THEOLOGY OR THE DOCTRINE OF BRAHMAN.	
VII. Prefatory Remarks and Arrangement . . .	119—122
1. On the Names of God, p. 119.—2. Arrangement of the Theology, p. 120.	
VIII. Proofs of the Existence of God	123—128
1. Prefatory Remark, p. 123.—2. Definition of the Brahman, p. 123.—3. Cosmological Proof, p. 124.—4. Physico-theological Proof, p. 125.—5. Psychological Proof, p. 126.—6. <i>Cogito, ergo sum</i> , p. 127.	
IX. The Brahman in itself	129—144
1. Brahman as the non-Existent, p. 129.—2. Brahman as the primordial Light, p. 130.—3. Brahman as the last, unknowable Origin of the Existent, p. 131.—4. Brahman as pure Intelligence, p. 134.—5. Brahman as Bliss, p. 137.—6. Brahman as Free from all Evil, p. 140.—7. Brahman as Free from Causality and Affliction, p. 141.	
X. The Brahman as Cosmic Principle	145—151
1. Brahman as Creator of the World, p. 145.—2. Brahman as Ruler of the World, p. 148.—3. Brahman as Destroyer of the World, p. 150.	
XI. The Brahman as Cosmic and at the same time Psychic Principle	152—171
1. Brahman as the very Small and very Great, p. 152.—2. Brahman as Joy (<i>kam</i>) and as Amplitude (<i>kham</i>), p. 164.—3. Brahman as the Light beyond Heaven and in the Heart, p. 167.—4. Brahman and the Soul dwelling together in the Heart, p. 170.	



	page
XII. The Brahman as Soul	172—197
1. Brahman as the Self (<i>âtman</i>), p. 172.—2. Brahman as <i>Prâna</i> (Breath, Life), p. 177.—3. Brahman as the Soul in deep Sleep, p. 183.—4. Brahman as the Soul in the State of Liberation, p. 188.	
XIII. The Brahman as the highest Goal	198—204
1. Brahman as Object of Meditation, p. 198.—2. Brahman as the Place of the Liberated, p. 200.—3. Brahman as Attainment of absolute Unity, p. 201.	
XIV. Esoteric Theology	205—215
1. Preliminary Remark, p. 205.—2. The differentiated and undifferentiated Brahman, p. 206.—3. Characteristics of the esoteric Brahman, p. 210.—4. On the Possibility of Knowing the esoteric Brahman, p. 213.—5. On certain figurative Expressions used of Brahman, p. 214.	

SECOND PART:

COSMOLOGY OR THE DOCTRINE OF
THE WORLD.

XV. Preliminary Remarks and Arrangement	219—221
XVI. Brahman as Creator of the World	222—229
1. The Motive of Creation, p. 222.—2. Brahman is the efficient and at the same time material Cause of the World, p. 223.—3. Brahman creates without Instruments, p. 225.—4. Brahman and the Powers of Nature, p. 227.	
XVII. The exoteric Picture of Creation	230—249
1. General, p. 230.—2. The Origin of Space (<i>Âkāśa</i>), p. 232.—3. The Origin of Air, Fire, Water, Earth, p. 235.—4. Incidental Remark on the Destruction of the World, p. 237.—5. Organic Nature, p. 238.—6. Physiological Remarks, p. 240.—7. The Controversy with the Buddhists concerning the Reality of the outer World, p. 241.	
XVIII. Cosmological Problems	250—254
1. The Problem of Causality, p. 250.—2. The Problem of the One and the Many, p. 252.—3. The Moral Problem, p. 252.	



	page
XIX. The Idea of Causality	255—260
1. The Cause persists in the Effect, p. 256.—2. The Effect exists before its Manifestation, namely, as Cause, p. 256.—3. What is the Difference between the Effect before and after Manifestation? p. 257.—4. The Effect is prefigured in the Cause, p. 257.—5. The Activity of becoming manifest must have a Subject, p. 258.—6. The Activity of the Agent is not superfluous, p. 258.—7. Generality of the Identity of Cause and Effect, p. 258.—8. The Activity of the Agent must have an Object, p. 259.—9. Result, p. 259.—10. Illustrative Examples, p. 259.	
XX. The Doctrine of Identity	261—272
1. Introductory, p. 261.—2. " <i>Tat tvam asi</i> "—That art thou, p. 262.—3. The Doctrine of Identity in the Vedānta System: a) The Extinction of Plurality in Brahman, p. 267.—b) The Relation of Unity to Plurality, p. 268.—c) How is the Knowledge of Unity possible, from the Standpoint of Plurality? p. 270.—d) The Value of the Doctrine of Unity, p. 271.—e) Criticism of Anthropomorphism, p. 271.	
XXI. Solution of the Cosmological Problems . . .	273—281
1. The Problem of Causality, p. 274.—2. The Problem of the One and the Many, p. 277.—3. The Moral Problem, p. 278.	

THIRD PART:

PSYCHOLOGY OR THE DOCTRINE OF
THE SOUL.

XXII. Proofs of the Immortality of the Soul . .	285—292
1. Preliminary Remarks on Psychology, p. 285.—2. Arguments of the Materialists against the Immortality of the Soul, p. 287.—3. Proofs of the Immortality of the Soul, p. 288.—4. On the Doctrine of Immortality in general, p. 290.	
XXIII. Origin and Nature of the Soul	293—296
1. Origin of the Soul, p. 293.—2. Nature of the Soul, p. 295.	



XXIV. Relation of the Soul to God page
297—305

1. Non-Identity and Identity, p. 297.—2. Illusion of all Pain, p. 299.—3. Subjection to and Freedom from Law, p. 300.—4. How are the individual souls separated from each other? p. 301.—5. Brahman and the Upâdhis, p. 302.

XXV. Relation of the Soul to the Body 306—314

1. The Opinion of the *Jainas* that the Soul is as large as the Body, p. 306.—2. The Opinion that the Soul is of minute (*anu*) size, p. 308.—3. The Soul is infinitely great (*vibhu*), p. 310.—4. Connection of the Soul with the Intellect (*buddhi*), p. 312.

XXVI. Relation of the Soul to its Actions 315—323

1. Preliminary, p. 315.—2. Reasons for Supposing the Soul to be essentially an Agent (*i. e.* exercising Volition), p. 316.—3. The Soul is naturally not an Agent (exercising Volition), p. 317.—4. Freedom of the Will and Determinism, p. 321.

XXVII. The Organs of the Soul 324—341

1. Preliminary Survey, p. 324.—2. Origin and Nature of the Organs of Life (*prâṇa*), p. 327.—3. The System of the conscious Life: Organs of Relation, p. 329.—4. The System of the unconscious Life: Organs of Nutrition, p. 333.—5. Mutual Relation of the Systems of the conscious and unconscious Life, p. 336.—6. The Cooperation of the Gods, p. 337.—7. Retrospect, p. 338.

XXVIII. Special States of the Soul 342—354

1. Dream-Sleep, p. 343.—2. Deep Sleep, p. 346.—3. Swooning, p. 352.—4. Metaphysical Significance of Death, p. 353.

FOURTH PART:

SAMSÂRA OR THE DOCTRINE OF THE
TRANSMIGRATION OF THE SOUL.

XXIX. The Eschatology of the Vedânta 357—360

1. The main Phases of Indian Eschatology, p. 357.—2. Exoteric and Esoteric Eschatology, p. 358.—3. No Transmigration from the Esoteric Standpoint, p. 359.



	page
XXX. The Vedic Doctrine of the Five Fires . . .	361—366
1. Introduction, p. 361.—2. The Five Sacrificial Offerings, p. 361.—3. The Path of the God (<i>devayāna</i>), p. 362.—4. The Path of the Fathers (<i>pitrīyāna</i>), p. 363.—5. The third Place, p. 364.—6. Epilogue (only in <i>Chândogya-Up.</i>), p. 364.—7. On the two Recensions of the Doctrine of the Five Fires, p. 365.	
XXXI. The Passing of the Soul from the Body .	367—380
1. The Vedic Basis, p. 367.—2. The Involution of the Organs, p. 367.—3. The subtle Body, p. 370.—4. Moral Determination of the transmigrating Soul: a) Prefatory Remark, p. 374.—b) The <i>Karma-âṣṭaya</i> , p. 375.—c) <i>Vidyâ-karma-pûrvaprajñâ</i> , p. 376.—d) The <i>Apûrvam</i> , p. 377.—e) The <i>Graddhâ</i> , p. 378.—5. The Path into the Beyond, p. 379.	
XXXII. The Destinies of the Soul in the Body .	381—386
1. Contradictions of the Vedic Texts, p. 381.—2. The Punishments of Hell, p. 382.—3. The Third Place, p. 383.—4. Felicity on the Moon, p. 385.	
XXXIII. The Cause of the Return to Earthly Existence	387—393
1. Prefatory Remark, p. 387.—2. In Retribution a Residue remains (<i>anuṣaya</i>), p. 387.—3. How is this Residue to be conceived? p. 389.—4. Ritual and Moral Work, p. 390.	
XXXIV. The Descent of the Soul for a new Embodiment	394—398
1. The Stages on the Way, p. 394.—2. Duration of the Descent, p. 394.—3. The Soul sojourns in the various Stages only as a Guest, p. 395.—4. Retrospect, p. 396.	

FIFTH PART:

MOKSHA OR THE TEACHING OF
LIBERATION.

XXXV. The Path of Liberation	401—417
1. Definition of Liberation, p. 401.—2. Liberation impossible through Works, p. 402.—3. Liberation impossible through moral Improvement, p. 403.—4. Knowledge without Works liberates, p. 405.—5. How is this	



saving Knowledge brought about? p. 403.—6. Works as Means to Knowledge, p. 411.—7. Devout Meditation (*upāsana*) as Means to Knowledge, p. 413.

XXXVI. Condition of the Sage in this Life . . . 418—426

1. Characteristics of the Sage, p. 418.—2. The Destruction of Sin, p. 421.—3. Destruction of Good Works also, p. 423.—4. Why the Body, in spite of Liberation, still continues to exist, p. 424.

XXXVII. The dying Sage 427—431

1. His Soul does not depart, p. 427.—2. The Dissolution of the Psychic Apparatus, p. 428.—3. Can the Liberated assume a new Body? p. 430.

XXXVIII. Condition of the Sage after Death . . 432—435

1. Entrance into the highest Light, p. 432.—2. Characteristics of him who has obtained absoluteness, p. 433.—3. The *Unio mystica*, p. 434.

XXXIX. The Passing of the Pious to Brahman . 436—443

1. The Characteristics of the Pious, p. 436.—2. The Departure of the Soul of the Pious, p. 439.—3. The Stages on the Path of the Gods, p. 440.—4. Brahman as Goal of the Path, p. 442.

XL. Heavenly Lordship and Final Liberation of the Pious 444—448

1. Lordship (*aicvāryam*), p. 444.—2. The Existence of those who have obtained Lordship, p. 445.—3. Limits of Lordship, p. 446.—4. Final Liberation of the Pious, p. 447.

Concordance 449

APPENDIX.

I. Short Survey of the Vedānta System 453—478

1. Introductory, p. 453.—2. Theology, p. 455.—3. Cosmology, p. 459.—4. Psychology, p. 467.—5. Transmigration, p. 471.—6. Liberation, p. 474.

II. Index of all Quotations in Ṣaṅkara's Commentary on the Brahmasūtras 479—500

III. Index of the proper names in Ṣaṅkara's Commentary 501—504

IV. Terms of the Vedānta 505—513

Upanishad Passages Quoted.

The numbers on the right are those of the present work.

Bṛih. 1, 1 = 8	Chând. 8, 7—12 = 51. 183 ff. 432
" 1, 3, 28 = 82	" 8, 14 = 146
" 1, 5, 3 = 331	Kâth. 2, 23 = 409
" 2, 4 = 172 ff.	" 2, 24—25 = 150
" 2, 4, 5 = 52	" 3, 1 = 170 ff.
" 3, 2, 13 = 375	" 4, 10—11 = 52 ff.
" 3, 4—5 = 141 ff.	" 4, 12—13 = 155
" 3, 7 = 149	" 5, 1—3 = 50
" 3, 8 = 132	" 5, 7 = 373
" 4, 3—4 = 188 ff.	" 6, 1 = 148
" 4, 4, 23 = 80	" 6, 17 = 155
" 4, 5 = 172 ff.	Mund. 1, 1, 5 = 131
" 6, 2 = 361 ff.	" 2, 1, 1 = 131. 291
Chând. 1, 6 = 140	" 2, 2, 5 = 200
" 1, 8, 9 = 145	" 2, 2, 8 = 200 ff.
" 1, 11, 5 = 147	" 2, 2, 10 = 130
" 3, 12—13 = 167	" 3, 1, 1 = 171
" 3, 14 = 50. 152	" 3, 2, 8 = 201
" 4, 1—2 = 61 ff.	Praçna 5 = 198
" 4, 4 = 63 ff.	" 6, 5 = 429
" 4, 5—9 = 64	Taitt. 2, 1—7 = 51 ff. 129. 137
" 4, 10—15 = 64. 164 ff.	" 2, 1 = 230
" 5, 3—10 = 361 ff.	Ait. 1, 1 = 230
" 5, 11—24 = 156	Kaush. 3 = 177 ff.
" 6, 1, 4 = 52	" 4 = 181 ff.
" 6, 1—7 = 262 ff. 230	Kena 11 = 408
" 6, 8—16 = 263 ff.	Îçâ 1, 6 = 52
" 7 = 201 ff.	Çvet. 1, 11 = 87
" 8, 1—6 = 159 ff.	" 3, 8 = 313
" 8, 6, 6 = 379 ff.	" 4, 3 = 298



INTRODUCTION.

I. Literary Notes.

1. The Name Vedânta.

Vedânta means literally "the end of the Veda" and signifies originally the theologico-philosophical treatises which appear as the closing chapters of the single Brâhmaṇa's of the Veda, and which are afterwards generally called *Upanishad*, that is, "(secret) séance," "secret doctrine."¹—Further on, the

¹ *Vedânta* may originally mean either 1. "End of the Veda," or 2. "Dogmas of the Veda" (cf. *siddhânta*, *râddhânta*), or 3. "Final Aim of the Veda." Max Müller declares himself in favor of the latter view (*Upanishads* I, p. LXXXVI N.); but this presupposes an appreciation of the dogmatic at the expense of the ritual part, which it is difficult to accept for the time at which the word arose (we find it already rigidly fixed in TÂ. p. 817, 2 = Mund. 3, 2, 6 = Kaiv. 3 and Qvet. 6, 22). Hence the view given above (for which we must of course not rely on TÂ. p. 820, 1) recommends itself as the simplest and most natural. The remarkable circumstance that the etymological meaning of both *vedânta* and *upanishad* cannot be proved by quotations may be explained, if we assume that both were originally popular terms in the language of the pupils, and first received a definite sense when they were transferred to the language of the higher style. After the Brahmachârin had learnt the formulas of prayer (*mantra*) necessary for his future calling, and the manner of their application in the cult (*bandhu*, *brâhmaṇam*), at the conclusion of the course (Ind. Stud. X, 128 cf. Chând. 4, 10—15;—a chapter like Brih. 6, 4 was of course possible only at the end of a period of study) the Guru might communicate to him certain things easy to misinterpret, and therefore secret, concerning the metaphysical power of the prayer (*brahman*) which supported and maintained the gods, and the resulting superiority of the own Self of the knower (*âtman*) over all the powers of nature, whence in course of time arose the Brahmavidyâ, Âtmavidyâ, which the pupils might joyfully hail and greet as the *Vedânta*, that is, as "the end of the studies," and of the (not seldom severe [Mahâbhârata I, 745]) period of pupilage. These communications to the Antevâsin took place in a confidential séance, that is (in contrast with



name Vedânta in the sense of "Final Aim of the Veda" is applied to the theologico-philosophical system founded on the Upanishad's, which may fitly be termed the Dogmatics of Brahmanism, and the exposition of which is to occupy us here. In order not to mix things historically distinct, we base this exposition exclusively on the standard work of the Vedânta School, the *Çârîraka-mîmânsâ-sûtra*'s of Bâdarâyana together with Çaṅkara's Commentary thereon. As for the present a separate treatment of these two authors does not yet seem practicable, we consider the work as an indivisible whole for the purpose of our systematic exposition, and shall quote it in the sequel either with three numbers according to *adhyâya*, *pâda* and *sûtram* or with two numbers according to page and line in the edition of Roer and Râma Nârâyana Vidyâratna in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1863.²

To characterise the position of this work and its two authors in Sanskrit Literature, it may be well to recall briefly certain facts.³

parishad, *samsad*), in an *upanishad*, an expression which then adopted the meanings of "secret meaning, secret name, secret teachings" just as the word "Collegium" adopted in German has been transferred from the idea of "assembly" to that of an "object of study" which can be "read" or "heard."

² Unfortunately no translation of this work exists as yet, (1883) since neither the aphorisms of the Vedânta by Ballantyne (Mirzapore, 1851) nor the translation by Banerjea (Calcutta, 1870), nor that in the *Shad-darçana-cintanikâ* (Bombay, since 1877) have up to the present got beyond the beginning. A Dutch rendering by A. Bruining in the "Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van N.-Indie" only goes as far as the end of the first Adhyâya.

[The whole work has now been translated: into German by the author of the present work (Leipzig 1887), and into English by G. Thibaut (Oxford 1890—93)].

³ Cf. with the following: Colebrooke, On the Vedas or sacred writings of the Hindus, As. Res., VIII, 369—476; On the philosophy of the Hindus, Transact. of the R. As. Soc., I, 19—43. 92—118. 439—461, II, 1—39, I, 549—579 (in the Misc. Ess.³, II, 8ff., 239ff.); A. Weber, Indische Litteraturgeschichte², 1876, S. 8ff., 249ff., where the literature up to the most recent times (1878) is to be found brought together in the notes and supplements; Max Müller, A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature², 1860.



2. Some Remarks on the Veda.

a) General view.

The great and not yet fully accessible complex of writings which bears the name of *Veda*, that is, "(theological) knowledge," and whose extent exceeds that of the Bible more than six times over, falls in the first place into four divisions, the *Rigveda*, *Sāmaveda*, *Yajurveda* and *Atharvaveda*; in each of these four Vedas we have to distinguish between three different classes of writings, according to content, form and age: 1) The *Samhitā*, 2) The *Brāhmaṇam*, 3) The *Sūtram*; moreover the greater part of these twelve divisions exists in different, more or less divergent recensions, as used by the different schools for whose study they served, and these are commonly spoken of as the *Śākhā*'s, that is, "the branches," of the Veda-tree. For an understanding of this complicated organism it will be useful to distinguish between the form in which the Veda exists at present, and the historical development through which it has grown to this form.

b) The literary materials of the Veda.

In the first place the four Vedas, in the form in which they come to us, are nothing else than the Manuals of the Brahmanical Priests (*ritvij*), providing them with the materials of hymns and sentences necessary for the sacrificial cult, as well as teaching them their right use. To each complete sacrificial ceremony belong, in fact, four chief-priests distinguished according to their courses of studies, and their functions: 1) the Hotar, who recites the verses (*ric*) of the hymns, in order to invite the gods to the enjoyment of the Soma or other offerings, 2) the Udgâtar, who accompanies the preparation and presentation of the Soma with his chants (*sāman*), 3) the Adhvaryu, who performs the sacred rite, while he mutters the corresponding verses and sacrificial sentences (*yajus*), 4) the Brahman, to whom is confided the superintending and guiding of the whole. The canonical book for the Hotar is the *Rigveda* (though the *Rigveda-samhitā* has from the outset a wider import, not merely ritual but also literary), that for the Udgâtar is the *Sāmaveda*, that



for the Adhvaryu the Yajurveda, while on the contrary the Atharvaveda has nothing to do with the Brahman,⁴ who must know all the three Vedas, and to whom the Atharvaveda is only referred for the sake of appearance, in order to help to raise it to the dignity of a fourth Veda, which was for a long time refused to it.⁵ It finds its practical application on the one hand in the domestic cult (birth, marriage, burial, sicknesses, blessing the harvest, incantations over cattle and so forth), on the other hand in certain official acts (inauguration of the king, blessing before a battle, cursing of the enemy and so on); in the latter aspect it is the Veda of the Kshatriya caste, as the three others are of the Brahman caste,⁶ and might stand in the same relation to the *Purohita* (prince's family priest) as that which the others hold to the *Ṛitviḥ*'s (cf. Yājñavalkya 1, 312).

Each of the priests named required in his duties, first, a collection of prayer-formulas (*mantra*) and, second, directions for the right liturgical and ritual application of these (*brāhmaṇam*). With the exception of the black Yajurveda, we find these two more or less completely separated and relegated to two different divisions.

I. The SAMHITĀ of each Veda, as the name indicates, is a "collection" of the Mantra's belonging to it, which are either verses (*ric*) or chants (*sāman*) or sacrificial sentences (*yajus*).

⁴ Āpastamba-śrauta-sūtram 24, 16—19: *ṛigvedena hotā karoti, sāmavedena udgātā, yajurvedena adhvaryuḥ, sarvair brahmā*.—Madhusūdana (Ind. Stud. I, 16, 8): *tatra hautra-prayogaḥ ṛigvedena, ādhvaryava-prayogo yajurvedena, audgātā-prayogaḥ sāmavedena, brāhma-yājāmāna-prayogau tu atra eva antarbhūtau; atharvavedas tu, yajña-anupayuktāḥ, cānti-paushtika-abhicāra-ādi-karma-pratipādakatvena atyantā-vilakṣhanā eva*.

⁵ Gopatha-brāhmaṇam I, 2, 24: *ṛigvidam eva hotāraṁ vrinīṣhva, yajurvedam adhvaryuṁ, sāmavidam udgātāraṁ, atharvāṅgirovidam brahmānam*.—Atharva-pariśiṣṭam I (Ind. Stud. I, 296, 28): *rakṣāṁsi rakṣati brahmā, brahmā tasmād atharvavit*.—Of. Viṣṇupurāṇam III, 4 (p. 276, Wilson).—An indirect acknowledgement of the fourth Veda by Çaṅkara is found on p. 239, 2.

⁶ It is perhaps to be understood in this sense, when Brh. 5, 13 (Çatap. Br. 14, 8, 14) *kshatram* appears as fourth along with *uktham*, *yajus* and *sāman*.



Thus the *Rigveda-samhitâ* consists of 1017 hymns in 10580 verses, from which the Hotar has to select the required invocation for the purpose in view; the *Sâmaveda-samhitâ* contains a selection of 1549 verses (or with repetitions 1810), either from the *Rigveda-samhitâ*, or from the materials on which it is based; all these excepting only 75, are also found in the *Rigveda*. They are modulated in numerous ways, for the purposes of the chant (*sâman*); the *Samhitâ* of the white *Yajurveda* contains both prose sacrificial sentences (*yajus*) and verses, the latter of which are in great measure taken from the materials of the *Rigveda*; on the other hand, the *Atharvaveda-samhitâ* consists merely of 760 Hymns, only about one sixth of which are common to it and the *Rigveda*, while the remainder occupy an independent and in many respects quite peculiar position in the total of the Vedic Mantra literature, of which later. Each of these four *Samhitâs*, according to the *Çâkhâ's* or Schools, in which it is studied, is extant in different recensions, which, however, do not, as a rule, differ materially from one another. It is otherwise, as will presently be shown, with the second division of Vedic literature.

II. The *BRÂHMAṆAM*, whose most direct purpose generally is, to teach the practical use of the materials presented in the *Samhitâ*, in its widest scope often goes far beyond this immediate purpose, and draws within its sphere what (with *Madhusûdana*) we may include in the three categories of *vidhi*, *arthavâda* and *vedânta*. 1) As *vidhi* (*i.e.*, precept) the *Brâhmaṇam* enjoins the ceremonies, explains the occasions of their use, as well as the means for carrying them out, and finally describes the process of the sacred rite itself. 2) With this, under the name of *arthavâda* (*i.e.*, explanation) are linked the most various discussions, whose purpose is, to support the content of the precept by exegesis, polemic, mythology, dogma and so forth. 3) The consideration of the subject here and there rises to thoughts of a philosophical character, which, as they are found for the most part towards the end of the *Brâhmaṇa's*, are called *vedânta* (*i.e.*, Veda-end). They are the chief content of the appendixes to the *Brâhmaṇa's* which are

called *Āraṇyaka*'s, and whose original purpose (though not strictly maintained) was to serve for the life in the forest (*aranyam*), which was enjoined upon the Brahmans in old age, to serve as a substitute for the ritual which, if not completely left behind, was yet very much limited. However this may be, it is the fact that in them we meet abundantly a wonderful spiritualising of the sacrificial cult: in place of the practical carrying out of the ceremonies, comes meditation upon them, and with it a symbolical change of meaning, which then leads on farther to the loftiest thoughts.⁷

⁷ Let the opening passage of the *Bṛihad-āraṇyakam* (which is intended for the *Adhvaryu*), in which the Horse Sacrifice is treated, serve as an example:

"Om!—Dawn verily is the head of the sacrificial horse, the sun is his eye, the wind his breath, his mouth is the all-pervading fire, the year is the body of the sacrificial horse; heaven is his back, space is his belly, the earth is his foot-stool (*Ṣaṅk*). The poles are his loins, the intermediate quarters are his ribs, the seasons are his limbs, months and half-months are his joints, day and night are his feet, the stars are his bones, the clouds are his flesh. The deserts are the food which he consumes, rivers are his entrails, the mountains his liver and lungs, plants and trees his hair; the rising sun is his forequarters, the setting sun is his hindquarters; when he yawns, that is the lightning, when he neighs, that is the thunder, when he waters, that is rain; his voice is speech. Day verily arose after the horse as the sacrificial vessel, which stands before him: its cradle is in the eastern ocean; night verily arose as the sacrificial vessel, which stands behind him: its cradle is in the western ocean; these two sacrificial vessels arose to surround the horse. As a racer he carried the gods, as a war-horse the *gandharvas*, as a steed the demons, as a horse mankind. The ocean is his companion, the ocean his cradle."

Here the universe takes the place of the horse to be offered, perhaps with the thought in the background, that the ascetic is to renounce the world (cf. *Bṛih.* 3, 5, 1. 4, 4, 22), as the father of the family renounces the real sacrificial gift. In just the same way, the *Chândogya-Upanishad* (1, 1) which is intended for the *Udgâtar*, teaches as the true *udgîtha*: to be recognised and honoured the syllable "om," which is a symbol of Brahman (*paramâtma-pratîkam*); and the *uktham* (hymn) which belongs to the *Hotar* is subjected to a like transformation of meaning in *Aitareya-âraṇyakam* (2, 1, 2).—Compare *Brahmasûtra* 3, 3, 55—56, where the thought is developed that symbolical representations (*pratyaya*) of this kind have validity not only within the *Çâkhâ*, in which they are found, but also in general.



The most important parts of these *Āraṇyaka*'s were later detached from them under the name *Upanishad*, and were brought together from the different *Veda*'s into a single whole; but originally, as we must admit, each Vedic school had its special ritual textbook, and together with this a more or less rich dogmatic textbook, and if there were in reality, as the *Muktikā-Upanishad* (Ind. St. III, 324) affirms, $21 + 1000 + 109 + 50 = 1180$ *Qākhā*'s, it follows that there must have been 1180 *Upanishad*'s. In reality, however, the matter is much simpler, since the number of the *Qākhā*'s, which we really know, is limited for each *Veda* to a very small number, whose textbooks present the common ritual and dogmatic material in differing order, treatment and elaboration. Thus we are acquainted with only two *Qākhā*'s of the *Rigveda*, that of the *Aitareyin*'s and that of the *Kaushītakin*'s, each of which possesses one *Brāhmaṇam* and one *Āraṇyakam*, the latter containing the *Upanishad* of the school.—For the *Sāmaveda* we know up to the present for the *Brāhmaṇa* section only one *Qākhā* accurately and completely, that of the *Tāṇḍin*'s, to which belong the following writings: a) the *Pañcaviṅśa-brāhmaṇam*; b) the *Shadvīṅśa-brāhmaṇam*, whose name already characterizes it as an addition to the former; c) we must also attribute to the school of the *Tāṇḍin*'s the hitherto incompletely known *Chândogya-brāhmaṇam*, since *Çaṅkara* under this name quotes a passage, p. 892, 9, which according to *Râjendra-lâla Mitra* (*The Chândogya-Up.*, Introduction, p. 17 N.) forms the beginning of the *Chândogya-brāhmaṇam*; d) finally *Çaṅkara* repeatedly quotes the *Chândogya-upanishad* as belonging to the *Tāṇḍin*'s; thus *Chând.* 3, 16 (quoted p. 889, 10. 890, 8) 8, 13, 1 (p. 899, 3. 907, 7. 908, 5) 6, 8, 7 (p. 923, 8).—A second independent book of ritual for the *Sāmaveda* is possibly the *Talavakâra-brāhmaṇam* of the *Jaiminîya-qākhā* (cf. *Çaṅkara*'s statement on *Kena-Up.*, p. 28, and those of *Burnell* in *Müller's Upanishad's* I, p. XC), according to *Burnell* in five *Adhyâya*'s, the last but one of which contains the well-known short *Kena-Upanishad* (quoted p. 70, 1. 4. 10. 163, 3. 808, 10), while the last consists of the *Ārsheya-brāhmaṇam* (quoted p. 301, 8). The four remaining *Brāhmaṇa*'s of the



Sāmaveda (*Sāmavidhāna*, *Van̄ṣa*, *Devatādhyāya*, *Samhitopaniśad*) can make no claim to the name of independent textbooks of the school.—For the Yajurveda we have to distinguish two forms, the black (that is, unarranged) and the white (arranged) Yajurveda. The former contains Brāhmaṇa-like materials mingled with the Mantra's in the Samhitā; in this form the schools of the *Taittirīyaka*'s (whose Brāhmaṇam and Āraṇyakam are merely continuations of the Samhitā), the *Kāṭha*'s and the *Maitrāyaṇīya*'s have handed the Yajurveda down to us. The Taittirīya-āraṇyakam contains at its close two Upanishad's, the *Taittirīya-Upanishad* (Book VII. VIII. IX) and the *Nārāyaṇīya-Upanishad* (Book X). To the school of the *Kāṭha*'s belongs the *Kāṭhaka-Upanishad*, which we now possess only in an Atharvan recension, whereas in Ṣaṅkara's time it seems to have formed a whole with the other texts of the *Kāṭha*'s, of which more will be said later; under the name *Maitri-Upanishad* we have received a late product of very apocryphal character;⁸ the name of a fourth Ṣākhā of the black Yajurveda, the *Ṣvetāṣvatara*'s, is that of a metrical Upanishad of secondary origin, which, however, is largely quoted by Ṣaṅkara as "*Ṣvetāṣvatarāṇām mantropaniśad*" (p. 110, 5, cf. 416, 1. 920, 4) and seemingly also already by Bādarāyaṇa (1, 1, 11. 1, 4, 8. 2, 3, 2).

In contrast to the Ṣākhā's of the black Yajurveda, the *Vājasaneyin*'s, the chief school of the white Yajurveda, separated the Mantra's and Brāhmaṇa's after the manner of the remaining Veda's; the former are collected in the *Vājasaneyi-samhitā*, the latter form the content of the *Ṣatapatha-brāhmaṇam*, the concluding part (B. XIV) of which contains the greatest and most beautiful of all the Upanishad's, the *Bṛihad-āraṇyakam*. A piece closely related to it (probably only on account of its metrical form) has been added to the *Vājasaneyi-samhitā* as Book XL, and is called, from its first word, the *Īcā-upaniśad*; in the version of Anquetil Duperron four ad-

⁸ Ṣaṅkara nowhere quotes it (*Maitreyī-brāhmaṇam* p. 385, 8. 1006, 5 means the section Bṛih. 2, 4 = 4, 5); moreover the term *Sushumnā* (Maitr. 6, 21) is not yet to be found in the Commentary to the Brahmasūtra's.



ditional sections of the same Samhitâ, *Çatarudriyam* (B. XVI), *Purushasûktam* (XXXI), *Tadeva* (XXXII), and *Çivasamkalpa* (XXXIV, the beginning) are classed as Upanishad's.—Besides the Vâjasaneyin's Çañkara thirteen times quotes an other school of the White Yajurveda, the *Jâbâla*'s; nine of these quotations (p. 222, 8. 223, 1. 417, 11. 988, 8 = 991, 4. 999, 6. 1000, 1, 3. 1025, 8) are found, with important variants, in the *Jâbâla-Upanishad*, which is to-day included among the Atharva-Upanishad's, four others (924, 7 = 1059, 1. 931, 4 = 933, 4) are not, so that, as it seems, Çañkara had a more complete work of this school before him. Whether Bâdarâyana quotes the same work (1, 2, 32. 4, 1, 3) remains uncertain.⁹—To the Atharvaveda belongs the *Gopatha-brâhmanam*, a work which has preponderatingly the character of a compilation and is without close relation to the Atharva-samhitâ. We find no quotations from it in Çañkara; the circumstance that at 3, 3, 24, p. 889 ff., he does not also consider Gopatha-br. II, 5, 4, increases the probability that he did not know or did not recognize this work. Finally, to the Atharvaveda, which could most probably not be guarded against new invasions by supervision of the guild as were the other Veda's, has been attached a long series of Upanishad's for the most part short, many of which have a wholly apocryphal character and are nothing more than the textbooks of later Indian sects. Two Upanishad's of the Atharvan are of special significance for the Vedânta, the *Mundaka*- and the *Praçna-Upanishad*, both of which are frequently quoted by Bâdarâyana and Çañkara, while we strangely find no certain quotation from the *Mândûkya-Upanishad* which is so abundantly used in the Vedântasâra.

III. A third and last stage of the Vedic literature is formed by the SÛTRA's, likewise divided according to Veda's and Çâkhâ's (whose relations however seem to be somewhat un-

⁹ Çañkara understands 1, 2, 32 as the *Jâbâlopanishad* 2, p. 439 and 4, 1, 3 as a text of this school unknown to us; on the other hand according to the *Vedânta-çaiva-bhâshyam* (Pandit, June 1872, p. 19) 1, 2, 32 and according to the *Vedânta-kaustubha-prabhâ* (Pandit, August 1874, p. 55) 4, 1, 3 are not to be referred to the *Jâbâla*'s.



fixed); they bring together the contents of the Brâhmana's, on which they are based, condensing, systematizing and completing them, for the purpose of practical life, in very compendious form, and in the lapidary style which is often quite incomprehensible without a commentary, a style to which also the grammatical, and, as we shall shortly see, the philosophical literature of India has adapted itself. There are three classes of Vedic Sûtra's: 1) the *Çrauta-sûtra's*, which regulate public worship, 2) the *Grihya-sûtra's*, which regulate domestic ceremonies (at birth, marriage, and the funeral), and 3) the *Dharma-sûtra's*, in which the duties of the Castes and Âçrama's are set forth in detail, and from which the later lawbooks of Manu and so on are derived. As the *Çrauta-sûtra's* are based on the *Çruti* (that is, Divine Revelation), the two other classes in like manner rest on the *Smṛiti* (that is, Tradition) and *Âcâra* (that is, Custom); more will be said further on of the meaning of these expressions in the terminology of the Vedânta.

c) Of the Genesis of the Veda.

The most ancient monument in this extensive circle of literature (and perhaps also the most ancient literary monument of the human race) is formed by the Hymns of the Rigveda, since, as regards the great bulk of them, they go back to a time when their possessors were not yet in the valley of the Ganges, but lived among the tributaries of the Indus, had as yet no Castes, no privileged worship, no Brahmanical system of government and life, but belonged to small tribes (*viç*) under kings most of whom were hereditary, tilling their fields, pasturing their herds, fighting among themselves, and enjoying a primitive life. The Hymns of the Rigveda unfold a graphic picture¹⁰ of all these relations, but especially we can follow in them the genesis of the primitive nature

¹⁰ Cf. on this point the mutually supplementary works: Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, Berlin 1879; Ludwig, *Die Mantra-Litteratur und das alte Indien* (in the third volume of Ludwig's *Rigveda*), Prague 1878; Kaegi, *Der Rigveda*, Leipzig 1881; Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, Berlin 1894; Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, Breslau 1891—1902.



religion of India through its different phases, in part even from the moment when the gods are crystallizing under the hand of the poet out of the phenomena of nature, to the point at which belief in them for the thinking part of the nation begins to grow dim,¹¹ and is being replaced by the first stirrings of philosophical speculation, the latter especially in the later hymns chiefly found in the last Maṇḍala, many of which, as for example the Hymn of Puruṣa, R̥g. 10, 90 (VS. 31. AV. 19, 6. TÂ. 3, 12), already show an immigration into the Ganges valley with the consequent development of the Caste system.

For after the Indians through many battles and struggles, whose poetical reflections are contained for us in the Mahābhārata, had won a permanent dwelling place for themselves in the paradise-like plain between the Himālaya and the Vindhya, their manner of life took on a form essentially different from the earlier one, owing to its altered external relations: an insurmountable barrier was in the first place erected between the Çûdra's, the repressed population of the aborigines, and the immigrant Aryans; then further, above the Vâiçya's, that is, the collective mass of Aryan tribes, were raised on the one side, as possessors of material might, the Kshatriya's, the warrior-nobility with the kings at their head, and on the other side the real or pretended descendants of the old Vedic poet-families, who called themselves Brāhmaṇa's (offerers of prayer, priests), and succeeded in making their family privilege not only the Vedic hymns and the worship bound up with them, but by and by also the whole national education. It is true that, as before, all members of the three upper castes, so far as they

¹¹ There are hymns in the R̥gveda which treat religion with open scorn. Thus among others (e. g. R̥g. 7, 103) the hymn R̥g. 9, 112, which not without humour develops the thought that even the god Indra, like mankind, selfishly follows his own profit; and which very effectively uses a constantly recurring refrain, borrowed apparently from a religious hymn, "*indrāya indo parisrava.*" It is true that Grassman has omitted this refrain, in which the whole point lies.—The "Liturgy of the Dogs" (*çauva udgîtha*) Chând. 1, 12 seems to own its origin to similar motives.

were *Dvija*'s ("twice-born," reborn through the sacrament of the *Upanayanam*, the admission into the Brahmanical church) had to offer, and in part also to perform, sacrifices, but only the Brahmins could eat the sacrificial food, drink the Soma, and receive the sacrificial gift without which the sacrifice was not efficacious; they only could be *Ritvij*'s (sacrificial priests for another for hire) and *Purohita*'s (permanent family priests of the princes). Of these caste privileges the Brahmins were able in time to make a more and more extended use. In proportion as, through the consolidation of their settlements, the prosperity of the princes and the people grew, the external pageantry of worship increased; the number of the participating priests augmented, the names Brahman, Hotar, Adhvaryu, Udgâtar, which we see emerging in the *Rigveda* at first sporadically and without strict distinction, were bound up into a system, and by the side of each of these *Ritvij*'s at a great sacrifice stood a series of accolytes.

Now the more complex the system of worship became, the more imperatively it demanded a special training, and this practical need was the decisive factor in the arrangement of the Vedic literature,—if indeed this word can be employed for a condition of things in which no written record is to be thought of.¹² Little by little, a firm tradition grew up about the verses and sentences with which the Adhvaryu had to accompany his manipulations (*Yajurveda*), as about the songs which the Udgâtar chanted at the sacred operations (*Sâma-veda*), and lastly it was no longer enough for the Hotar to know the songs hereditary in his own family; the separate

¹² Even the Upanishads seem originally to have been handed down only orally. On the one hand we find passages in them which only become intelligible by an accompanying gesture (e.g., Brih. 1, 4, 6: *atha iti abhyamanthat*; 2, 2, 4: *imau eva* [the ears] *Gautama-Bharadvâjau, ayam eva Gautamo, 'yam Bharadvâjah*, and so on); on the other hand, e.g., Chând. 8, 3, 5 *satyam* is treated as a trisyllable, Brih. 5, 14, 1, *bhûmir antariksham dyauh* and 5, 14, 3 *prôno 'pâno vyânah* are treated as eight syllables.—For the rest, the question of a written record in India has not the importance which we, judging by our own position, are inclined to give it.



collections of hymns were gathered into circles (*maṇḍalam*), the circles into a single whole (*Rigveda*), which then for a certain further period still remained open for additional new productions.—Not all the old hymns were admitted into this canon; many had to be excluded, because their contents were thought to be offensive or otherwise unsuited; others because, sprung from the people, they were not supported by the authority of some famous bardic family. To these were continually added new blossoms which the old stem of Vedic lyrics bore in the Brâhmaṇa Period, and which bear clear testimony to the altered consciousness of the time. From these materials, which had to be handed down for a long time outside the schools in the mouths of the people (to which fact their frequent and especially metrical negligence bears testimony), there came into being in course of time a fourth collection (*Atharvaveda*), which had to struggle long before gaining a recognition which always remained conditional.

Meanwhile the other older collections had become the basis of a certain course of study, which in course of time took a more and more regular form. Originally it was the father who initiated his son into the sacred lore handed down by the family, as best he could (Bṛih. 6, 2, 4. Chând. 5, 3, 5), soon, through the growing difficulty of understanding the old texts, the more and more complicated form of the ritual, the perpetually extending circle of studies, this became too difficult for him; it became necessary to look for the most approved authorities for each of the theories (*vidyâ*) that had to be learned, travelling scholars (*caraka*) went further afield (Bṛih. 3, 3, 1), celebrated wandering teachers moved from place to place (Kaush. 4, 1), and to many teachers pupils streamed, "like the waters to the deep" (Taitt. 1, 4, 3). Later custom demanded that every Ârya should spend a series of years (according to Âpast. dharma-sûtra 1, 1, 2, 16 at least twelve) in the house of a teacher, the Brâhmaṇa's, to prepare themselves for their future calling, the Kshatriya's and Vaiçya's, to receive the influences which were to mould their later thought and life. We must assume (even if we have no quotation at hand to prove it) that the imparting of this instruction became in

course of time the exclusive privilege of the Brahmans: only thus can be explained the unparalleled influence over the life of the Indian peoples which the Brahmans succeeded in winning and maintaining. As the outward apparel of the scholars of the different castes differed, so also probably did their instruction. As payment for it, the scholars performed the household and field labour of the teacher; they tended the sacred fire (Chând. 4, 10, 1), herded the teacher's cattle (Chând. 4, 4, 5), collected the customary gifts for him in the village and brought him presents at the conclusion of the course. In the time left free by these manifold obligations (*guroh karma-atigeshena*, Chând. 8, 15) the Veda was studied. On the whole, it was less a time of study than a time of discipline, as the name *Âçrama* implies, intended for the practice of obedience to the teacher (of which extravagant examples are handed down) and strenuous self-abnegating activity. It was the tendency of Brahmanism to mould the whole life to such an *Âçrama*. Not all, after the termination of the time of study, set themselves to found a family: many remained in the teacher's house to the end of their lives (*naish-thika*); others betook themselves to the forest to devote themselves to privations and penance; others again disdained even this form of regular existence, and cast away every thing (*sannyâsin*), to roam about (*parivrâjaka*) as beggars (*bhikshu*). The different kinds of "*Âçrama*," or "religious exercise," were further bound together in a whole, in which what appears as an abrupt command in St. Matthew's Gospel XIX, 21, seems to have been expanded into a vast system embracing the whole of life. Accordingly the life of every Brâhmana, and even the life of every Dvija,¹³ was to be divided into four stages, or *Âçrama*'s; he was (1), as *Brahmacârin*, to dwell in the house of a teacher, then (2), as *Grihastha*, to fulfil the duty of founding a family, then (3) to leave it in old age, as a *Vânaprastha* (forest hermit), to give himself up more and more to increasing

¹³ A limitation to the Brâhmana caste does not seem to follow with certainty from Manu VI, cf. v. 38. 70. 97 *brâhmana*, v. 29. 32. 93 *vipra*; on the other hand v. 2 *grihasthas tu*, and so on; v. 40. 85. 91. 94 *dvija*.



penances, and lastly (4), towards the end of his life, as a *Samnyâsin* (*Bhikshu*, *Parivrâjaka*) to wander free from all earthly ties and live on alms.—We do not know how far the reality corresponded to these ideal claims.

While Brahmanical teaching and conduct of life were surrounding the existence of the Indian peoples in ever denser toils, we see ripening on the branch of Brahmanism itself a world concept which, though outwardly bound up with it, was inwardly opposed to it in its very basis.—Already in the Rig-veda strong movements of a certain philosophical tendency make themselves manifest. We perceive a special seeking and asking after the Unity which finally lies at the basis of all diversity; we see many attempts being made to solve the riddle of creation; to grasp through the motley changes of the world of appearances, through the more and more richly developed variety of the Vedic pantheon, the one formless principle of all that has form,—until at last the soul finds and lays hold of unity where alone unity is to be found—in the soul itself. Here, in the mysterious depths of his own heart, the seeker, raised above his own individuality by the fervour of aspiration (*brâhman*) discovered a power which he felt to transcend all the other powers of creation, a god-like might which, as he felt, dwells within all earthly and celestial beings as inner ruling principle (*antaryâmin*) on which all worlds and all gods rest, through fear of which fire burns, the sun shines, the storm, wind and death perform their work (*Kâth.* 6, 3), and without which not a straw can be burned by Agni, or carried away by Vâyu (*Kena* 3, 19. 23). A poetic formative power had clothed Agni, Indra and Vâyu with personality; this power it was by which that power of fervour, “that which in the narrow sphere expanding to all sides grows mightily, as a delight of the great gods, that which extends “as a god to the gods from afar and embraces this universe” (*Rigv.* II, 24, 11) was raised above all gods first in a very transparent personification as *Brihaspati*, *Brahmanaspati*, but afterwards more truly, boldly, philosophically as *Brâhman* (prayer), as *Âtman* (Self), and from this power the gods and the whole world besides were derived in endlessly varied play

of phantasy.—We may hope that thanks to the wealth of texts preserved in the *Rigveda*, *Atharvaveda*, and *Brāhmaṇa*'s, we may be able to trace step by step how the sparks of philosophic light appearing in the *Rigveda* shine out brighter and brighter until, at last, in the *Upanishad*'s, they burst out in that bright flame which is able to light and warm us to-day.

Numerous indications intimate that the real guardians of these thoughts were originally not the priestly caste, absorbed in their ceremonial, but rather the caste of the *Kshatriya*'s. Again and again, in the *Upanishad*'s, we meet the situation that the *Brahman* begs the *Kshatriya* for instruction which the latter, after several representations of the unseemliness of such a proceeding, imparts to him (cf. *Bṛih.* 2, 1. *Kaush.* 4, 1. *Bṛih.* 6, 2. *Chând.* 5, 3. *Chând.* 5, 11. *Kaush.* 1, 1).—However this may be, the *Brahmans* appropriated this new teaching of *Brāhmaṇa* and its identity with the Self, and attached it, as best they could, to their own system of justification by works, in a way of which we shall say more in the sequel. Both systems, the ritual and the philosophic, were propagated in the Vedic schools, became inside and outside the school (at public festivals, at the courts of kings and so forth) the subject of keen debate and a not seldom vehement polemic; both suffered manifold transformations and exchanges in these contests and mutual accommodations; at last, as the precipitate of this rich spiritual life, the *Brāhmaṇa*'s and the *Upanishad*'s, in which they issue, were formed and brought into their present shape and finally (probably after their practical meaning had already long been transferred to the *Sūtra*'s) recorded in writing. It is to be hoped that in time it will be possible to reconstruct from them, even if not in every detail, the course of development which found its conclusion in them.

We have already seen how to the older *Upanishad*'s, which are the philosophic text-books of the different *Çākhā*'s, were added a long series of younger products of the same name; in these we can follow the further extension of religious concepts, and, hand in hand with it, the development of a special tendency to accomplish even in this life the union with the All-spirit, through a certain practical process (called *Yoga*),



down to the time of the Indian sects. These texts, as it seems, have a purely external connection with the Atharvaveda.

3. The Philosophical Systems.

Parallel with this development of the Vedic theories there early arose side by side in India, from the germs contained in the Brâhmaṇa's and older Upanishad's, a whole series of philosophic systems, which stand in very varied, sometimes convergent, sometimes hostile, relations to the Vedas and to each other, and in which we can trace every shade of philosophical concept of the world, from the crass and cynical materialism of the Cârṇvâka's up to the orthodox faith in the letter of the Vedas. Six among them were able to obtain the reputation of orthodoxy, that is, of a harmony between their teachings and the Vedic faith, or at least an appearance of it; the others, and among them Buddhism, were held to be heterodox and heretical. The six orthodox systems (a name to which, in its full sense, only the two Mīmāṃsâ's can lay claim) are as follows:—

1) The Sâṅkhyam of Kapila, which served, as some believe, as the basis of Buddhism, a highly spiritual theory of the unfolding of the world to the end of self-knowledge and thence resulting liberation, which, however, falls into an irreconcilable dualism between the unfolding primitive matter (*prakṛiti*, *pradhânam*) and an original plurality of individual spirits (*puruṣa*).

2) The Yoga of Patañjali, which, interpreting the Sâṅkhya-system theistically, undertakes to point out the way of attaining a union with God, treating it in four parts, 1. of contemplation (*samādhi*), 2. of the means of attaining it (*sâdhana*), 3. of the mastery over nature thereby gained (*vibhûti*), 4. of the condition of absoluteness (*kaivalyam*).¹⁴

¹⁴ The relation of this teaching to the Yoga-Upanishad's has yet to be investigated; in the *Samkshepa-Çaṅkara-jaya* 1, 21—27 (Gilde-meister, *Anthologia*³, p. 88) are distinguished three parts of the Veda, the *karma-kāṇḍa*, *jñāna-kāṇḍa*, and *yoga-kāṇḍa*, to which the three systems of *Jaimini*, *Bâdarâyana* and *Patañjali* refer; the latter appears as an incarnation of *Çesha* (this throws light on Cowell's remark on Colebrooke *M. E.*³, p. 247, n. 2).

3) The Nyâya of Gotama, a system of logic, which, however, draws within its sphere all the subjects of Indian thought and treats of them under its sixteen categories (*pramânam* proof, *prameyam* what is to be proved, *saṃcāya* doubt, and so on).

4) The Vaiṣeṣhikam of Kaṇâda, frequently (e.g., in the *Bhâṣhâpariccheda*, in the *Tarkabhâṣhâ*) woven together with the Nyâya into a single whole, which teaches the growth of the world from atoms (*paramânu*) and undertakes a classification of existence, according to natural science, under the six categories of substance, quality, action, identity, difference, and inherence (*dravyam*, *guṇa*, *karman*, *sāmānyam*, *viśeṣa*, *samavâya*).

The gradual growth and consolidation of this and other systems may have instigated the stricter adherents of the Veda also, on their side, to a scientific, systematic investigation (*mîmâṃsâ*) into the contents of the Veda, whence arose

5) The *Karma-mîmâṃsâ*, *Pûrva-mîmâṃsâ*, or, as it is usually simply called, the *Mîmâṃsâ* of Jaimini, as a system of worship through works, which investigates the duties (*dharma*) enjoined by the Veda, together with the rewards (*phalam*) attached thereto, and

6) The *Çârîraka-mîmâṃsâ*, *Uttara-mîmâṃsâ*, or, as it is mostly called from its source, *Vedânta* of Bâdarâyana, which unites the contents of the Upanishad's in a theologico-philosophical system.

The two *Mîmâṃsâ*'s may have arisen together, since Jaimini and Bâdarâyana quote each other, often agreeing, often opposing; the two systems complete each other in that together they exhibit the totality of Vedic theology (since in particular the *Vedânta* holds fast throughout to the system of rewards of the *Karma-mîmâṃsâ* cf. 2, 3, 42. 3, 1, 25. 3, 2, 9 and p. 1076, 13), and their principles are in a thorough-going antithesis, which has its foundation in the Veda itself. For the Veda falls (as Çaṅkara on *Brih.* p. 4ff. shows), according to the concept of the *Vedânta*, into two parts, which show a far-reaching analogy with the Old and New Testaments, a Part of Works (*karma-kāṇḍa*), which includes the Mantra's and



Brāhmaṇa's in general, and a Part of Knowledge (*jñāna-kāṇḍa*), which includes the Upanishad's and what belongs to them (e.g., the Agnirahasyam, Ātap. Br. X, for which compare 3, 3, 44—52, p. 943—952). The former enjoins works, such as sacrifices and other ceremonies, promising like the Old Testament, rewards and threatening punishments, with this difference however that, for the most part, by relegating these to the other world, it evades the conflict with experience; the investigation of these circumstances, of the religious works and the merit obtained by them, which enters as a "new moment" (*apūrvam*) into the complex of deeds necessitating a requital in the other world, forms the essential content of Jaimini's Karma-mīmāṃsā, which precedes the Vedānta not so much in time as in order, and is largely quoted by Caṅkara in his Commentary on the Vedānta-sūtras as "the first part," "the first book" (e.g., p. 848, 6. 897, 1. 919, 9. 944, 4. 951, 3. 1011, 12). However, as we shall see (Chap. IV, 3), a knowledge of it is not necessary for the study of the Vedānta, which bases itself entirely on the "part of knowledge" of the Veda's, that is, on the Upanishad's. The work of Bādarāyaṇa stands to the Upanishad's in the same relation as the Christian Dogmatics to the New Testament: it investigates their teaching about God, the world, the soul, in its conditions of wandering and of deliverance, removes apparent contradictions of the doctrines, binds them systematically together, and is especially concerned to defend them against the attacks of opponents. As such appear not only the heterodox philosophers, the Buddhists (whose teachings 2, 2, 18—32 in their various forms are examined, and entirely rejected as an outcome of hatred toward the human race p. 581, 2), the Jaina's (2, 2, 33—36), the Pāṇḍupata's (2, 2, 37—41) and the Pāṇcarātra's (2, 2, 42—45), but also the adherents of the other orthodox systems; inasmuch as Bādarāyaṇa, 2, 1, 11, declares himself fundamentally against any possibility of discovering the truth by means of reflection (*tarka*). This will be further treated in Chap. V, 2.—For the purpose of fixing Bādarāyaṇa's time, it is important to note how he treats the four non-Vedic systems. The Nyāya is not mentioned by Bādarāyaṇa at all, and only

twice casually quoted by Ćaṅkara (p. 67, 6. 594, 1), but with approbation, perhaps because it lent no support to his polemics (but compare on Brih. p. 801, 8); the Yoga appears, as far as we see (1, 1, 19 the word has another meaning), with the exception of 4, 2, 21 (where, however "*Yoginah*," refers in the first place to Bhag. G. 8, 23) only at 2, 1, 3, where it is briefly dismissed with the remark, that what has been said against the Sāṅkhyam applies to it also; the Vaiṣeṣhika-teaching is confuted at 2, 2, 11—17 with the remark that no attention need be paid to it, since no one adopts it (2, 2, 17: *aparigrahâc ca atyantam anapekshâ*), a proof, that in Bâdarâyana's time or country Kaṇâda's teaching was in disrepute. On the other hand, we must conclude from the way in which he treats the Sāṅkhyam that this system (recommended by authorities like Manu and the Mahâbhâratam) was held in high regard in his time. At every opportunity he recurs to it, in part in long discussions (as 1, 1, 5—11. 1, 4, 1—13. 2, 1, 1—12. 2, 2, 1—10), in part in single references (1, 1, 18. 1, 2, 19. 1, 2, 22. 1, 3, 3. 1, 3, 11. 1, 4, 28. 2, 1, 29. 2, 3, 51. 4, 2, 21), to which others are sometimes attached (2, 1, 3 and 4, 2, 21, the Yoga; 2, 1, 29, and 2, 3, 51, the Vaiṣeṣhikam; 2, 1, 4—11, the systems of reflection in general), and repeatedly (1, 4, 28; 2, 1, 12) the remark is made, that with the Sāṅkhya system the others are also dealt with.¹⁵ It is worthy of remark, that Bâdarâyana does not mention by name any of the other systems (except the Yoga, 2, 1, 3 and the Yogin's 4, 2, 21, which in fact stand nearer to the Veda)

¹⁵ Cf. Ćaṅkara on 1, 4, 28, p. 403: "From *îkshater na açabdam* (1, 1, 5) onwards the teaching of the Pradhânam [primitive matter of the Sāṅkhya's] as the cause of the world has been again and again examined and refuted in the Sûtra's [not only in the Commentary]; for this assertion finds a support in certain passages of the Vedânta [Upanishad's], which apparently speak for it, and this might at first sight deceive the inexpert. Also the said teaching approaches the teaching of the Vedânta, in that it recognises the identity of cause and effect, and is therefore recognised by Devala, and other composers of *Dharmasûtra*'s; therefore so much more effort has been expended on refuting it, than on refuting the atomism [of Kaṇâda] and other teachings."—Cf. p. 440, 6: "The atomic teaching and others [contrary to the Sāṅkhyam], have not even been accepted in part by sages like Manu and Vyâsa."

or any of their founders, and even avoids repeating the usual terms for their chief ideas; so, instead of *pradhānam* (the primitive material of the Sāṅkhya's), he says rather *smārtam* (1, 2, 19), *anumānam* (1, 1, 18. 1, 3, 3) *anumānikam* (1, 4, 1) "the traditional," "the hypothetical," while on the other hand *pradhānam* with him 3, 3, 11 means the Brahman. But the more careful he is to allow the names of his opponents to fall into oblivion, the more frequently, for the most part when investigating small differences between them, does he name the teachers of the two Mīmāṃsā schools. As such appear in his work: *Bādarāyaṇa* (1, 3, 26. 1, 3, 33. 3, 2, 41. 3, 4, 1. 3, 4, 8. 3, 4, 19. 4, 3, 15. 4, 4, 7. 4, 4, 12). *Jaimini* (1, 2, 28. 1, 2, 31. 1, 3, 31. 1, 4, 18. 3, 2, 40. 3, 4, 2. 3, 4, 18. 3, 4, 40. 4, 3, 12. 4, 4, 5. 4, 4, 11). *Bādari* (1, 2, 30. 3, 1, 11. 4, 3, 7. 4, 4, 10). *Audulomi* (1, 4, 21. 3, 4, 45. 4, 4, 6). *Ācmarathya* (1, 2, 29. 1, 4, 20). *Kāçakritsna* (1, 4, 22). *Kārshṇājini* (3, 1, 9), and *Ātreya* (3, 4, 44).—These are in fact with two exceptions (1, 1, 30. 1, 3, 35), the only proper names that appear in Bādarāyaṇa's Sūtra's.

As sources of knowledge our author makes use of the *Ṛuti*, and in the second rank for confirmation and without binding force, the *Smṛiti*; and in doing so he in a very curious way uses the names which serve in the other systems to indicate the natural sources of knowledge, with an altered meaning in his own, so that with him *pratyakṣam* (perception) repeatedly stands for *Ṛuti*, and *anumānam* (inference) for *Smṛiti* (1, 3, 28. 3, 2, 24. 4, 4, 20), and this as Čaṅkara, p. 287, 11 explains, because the latter requires a basis of knowledge (*prāmāṇyam*), and the former not. Under *Ṛuti* (revelation, holy scripture) Bādarāyaṇa understands, not only the older Upanishad's, Brihadāraṇyaka, Chāndogya, Kāthaka, Kāushītaki (2, 3, 41), Aitareya (1, 1, 5), Taittirīya (1, 1, 15) and the rest, but also certain Upanishad's of the Atharvaveda, as especially the frequently quoted Muṇḍaka and Praçna, even products of such late origin as the Çvetāçvatara (1, 1, 11. 1, 4, 8. 2, 3, 22), and perhaps even the Jābāla Upanishad (1, 2, 32. 4, 1, 3); 3, 3, 25 refers to an unknown Upanishad of the Atharvaveda. It is also worthy of note, that the Sūtra 2, 3, 43 alludes to a verse of the Atharvaveda which is not found in the printed

editions. Under *Smṛiti* (tradition) our author, according to Ṣaṅkara, on whose explanations we are completely dependent for all quotations, understands the Sāṅkhya and Yoga systems (4, 2, 21), the Mahābhāratam, especially its episode called the Bhagavadgītā, the law-book of Manu, and perhaps other books (cf. 4, 3, 11). Beside it appears, 3, 4, 43, custom (*âcāra*; cf. 3, 4, 3; 3, 3, 3). As perfectly known, are mentioned the recensions of the same Ṣṛuti work, differing according to the Vedic schools (*çākha*'s): thus Bādarāyaṇa considers in particular the agreement and divergence in the Kāṇva and Mādhyandina recensions¹⁶ of the Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (1, 2, 20 *ubhaye*; 1, 4, 13 *asati anne*), as also the frequently appearing "some" (*eke*) refers for the most part to the differences of the Vedic schools (1, 4, 9. 3, 2, 2. 3, 2, 13. 4, 1, 17, and likewise *anye* 3, 3, 27), but at times also means different passages (4, 2, 13. 2, 3, 43) and teachers of the Mīmāṃsā (3, 4, 15. 3, 4, 43) and once even (3, 3, 53) something quite different, namely, the materialists.—His own work our author quotes with the words "*tad uktam*" (about this it has been said), by which at 1, 3, 21 he points back to 1, 2, 7, further at 2, 1, 31 to 2, 1, 27, and at 3, 3, 8 to 3, 3, 7, just as through the equivalent "*tad vyākhyātam*" at 1, 4, 17 to 1, 1, 31.—But the same formula "*tad uktam*" is further frequently used to indicate the Karmasūtra's of Jaimini, thus 3, 3, 33 (Jaim. 3, 3, 9), 3, 4, 42 (Jaim. 1, 3, 8–9), 3, 3, 26 (p. 903, 9: *dvādaçalakṣhaṇyām*) 3, 3, 43 (p. 942, 5: *saṅkarshe*), 3, 3, 44 *tadapi* (Jaim. 3, 3, 14), 3, 3, 50 (p. 951, 3: *prathame kāṇde*), from which it may perhaps be concluded that the works of Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa, each of whom quotes both himself and the other by name, may have been combined by a later editor into one work, and provided with the additions already mentioned and others.¹⁷ To such an

¹⁶ The two are distinguished by Ṣaṅkara p. 1098, 14 as different Çākha's, while on the other hand p. 882, 6 Bṛih. 5, 6, 1 in the Kāṇva recension and Çatap. Br. 10, 6, 3, 2 in the Mādhyandina recension (perhaps identical with the Kāṇva recension?) are quoted as belonging to the same Çākha of the Vājasaneyin's.

¹⁷ In this unified form the work of Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa seems to have been commented on by Upavarsha, on whose work the com-



editor the name *Vyâsa* (the arranger), occurring (according to Colebrooke M. E.³, p. 352) in connection with Bâdarâyana, would be admirably suited, and he might very well be Vyâsa, the father of Çuka, the teacher of Gâudapâda, the teacher of Govinda, the teacher of Çañkara, and thus be 200—300 years older than his commentator, Çañkara (Windischmann, Sanc. p. 85), though Çañkara understands by Vyâsa in all the passages where this name occurs (p. 313, 9. 440, 6. 690, 11. 764, 10 and *Vedavyâsa*, p. 298, 5, cf. Mahâbh. XII, 7660), only the editor of the Mahâbhârata while he calls the author of the Sûtra's, p. 1153, 8, *bhagavân Bâdarâyana-âcârya*.

4. Form of the Brahma-sûtra's; Çañkara's Commentary.

After these indications, which can only be of use after a determination, only possible later on, of the date when our work was composed, let us turn to a consideration of its form, which is a very singular one. It is composed, as are also the fundamental works of the other Indian philosophic systems, in a series of *sûtra*'s, which word means "thread" (from *sîv* = Lat. *suere*), and is here best understood as the warp of

mentaries of Çabarasvâmin and Çañkara may rest, cf. p. 953, 2: "We proceed now to an investigation of the immortality of the soul, for the purpose of the teaching of its bondage and deliverance. For did the soul not endure beyond the body, the commandments which promise a reward in another world would not be permissible, and still less could it be proved that the soul is identical with Brahman. But was not the existence of the soul beyond the body, and its enjoyment of the fruit promised in the teaching of the scripture already settled at the beginning of the book in the first pâda [that is, on Jaim. 1, 1, 5]?—Certainly, but only by the commentator (*bhâshyakrit*), and there is no *sûtram* there on the continued existence of the soul. Here, on the contrary, its continued existence is, after previous mention of objections, confirmed by the composer of the *sûtra*'s (*sûtrakrit*) himself. It was from here that the teacher Çabarasvâmin took it and explained it in the *Pramâṇa-lakṣaṇam* [the first book of Jaimini, at viz. 1, 1, 5 p. 18-24]. The venerable Upavarsha also, in the first book, where he declares the continued existence of the soul, points to this also, since he says: 'In the Çârî-rakam [that is, in the Brahmasûtra's] we shall explain it.' And so here, after consideration of the honours resting on prescription, the continued existence of the soul is taken into consideration, in order to show that this teaching is in conformity with the whole of our canon."

threads stretched out in weaving to form the basis of the web, but which will become the web only when the woof is added,¹⁸ just as the Sûtra's become a connected whole only through the explanations interwoven among them by oral or written exposition. For without this the 555 Sûtra's, consisting for the most part of two or three words each, in which our author lays down the whole Vedânta system, are utterly unintelligible, especially as they contain, not so much the leading words of the system, as the catch words, for the memory to grasp, and these seldom exhibit the main matter, but frequently something quite subordinate, have often a quite general, indeterminate form, which fits the most different circumstances and leaves everything to the interpreter. Thus the same Sûtra often recurs: thus for instance *smṛiteṣ ca* 1, 2, 6. 4, 3, 11; *gruteṣ ca* 3, 4, 4. 3, 4, 46; *darṣayati ca* 3, 3, 4. 3, 3, 22; *sva-paksha-doshâc ca* 2, 1, 10. 2, 1, 29; *ubhayathâ ca doshât* 2, 2, 16. 2, 2, 23; *darṣanâc ca* 3, 1, 20. 3, 2, 21. 3, 3, 48. 3, 3, 66. 4, 3, 13, that is, five times, and, in fact, if we are to believe the Commentator (as indeed we must), in different meanings, since *darṣanâc ca* generally (3, 2, 21. 4, 3, 13 cf. 1, 3, 30) means "because the scripture teaches it," while in 3, 1, 20. 2, 2, 15 and 4, 2, 1 it means: "because experience shows it," and 3, 3, 48: "because it is perceived (from the indications)." In the same way we twice have the sûtra *gaunyasambhavât* (2, 3, 3. 2, 4, 2), and this, as Caṅkara himself says (p. 706, 9), in quite contrary meanings. Thus *anumânam* generally means "the Smṛiti" (e.g. 1, 3, 28. 3, 2, 24. 4, 4, 20), then it is also for a change the synonym of *pradhânam* (primordial matter of the Sâṅkhya's) in 1, 3, 3; thus, again, *itara*, 1, 1, 16. 2, 1, 21, means the individual, but, 2, 3, 21, the highest soul, and again, 4, 1, 14, "the good work"; and *prakaraṇât*, 1, 2, 10 and 1, 3, 6, "because it is spoken of," but, 4, 4, 17, "because he is charged with it." This is accompanied by a special leaning to rare words and phrases in which another word is frequently chosen, than that used in the passage of the Upanishad taken for consideration, which is sometimes indicated

¹⁸ Cf. p. 622, 2: *tathâ sūtrair ūrnâ-ādibhiḥ ca vicitrân kambalân vitanvate*.—Compare also our "text," from *texere*, to weave, and the Chinese *king*, "warp of a web" (Schott, *Chin. Litt.*, p. 3).

only by this word; thus 1, 1, 24 *carana* for *pāda* (Chând. 3, 12, 6); 1, 3, 1 *sva* for *âtman*, *bhû* for *prithivî* (Mund. 2, 2, 5); 1, 3, 2 *upa-sarp* for *upa-i* (Mund. 3, 2, 8); 1, 3, 10 *ambara* for *âkâça* (Brih. 3, 8, 7); 1, 3, 39 *kampana* for *ejati* (Kâth. 6, 2); 1, 4, 24 *abhidhyâ* for *akâmayata* (Taitt. 2, 6), *aikshata* (Chând. 6, 2, 3); 4, 2, 4 *upa-gama* for *abhisamâyanti* (Brih. 4, 3, 38); 4, 3, 2 *abda* for *samvatsara* (Chând. 5, 10, 2); 4, 3, 3 *taḍit* for *vidyut* (Chând. 5, 10, 2) and so on.¹⁹

This condition of the Brahmasûtra's cannot be sufficiently explained either by striving after brevity or a predilection for characteristic ways of expression. Rather must we admit that the composer, or composers, intentionally sought after obscurity, in order to make their work treating of the secret doctrine of the Veda inaccessible to all those to whom it was not opened up by the explanations of a teacher. From such explanations, which conformably to this intention were originally only oral, may in the course of time have arisen the written Commentaries on the work which Colebrooke (Misc. Ess.¹ p. 332, 334) enumerates, and of which only that of Çaṅkara is now accessible to us. We must therefore at present renounce the attempt to keep Bâdarâyana's teaching and Çaṅkara's interpretation of it separate from each other, so that our exposition, strictly taken, is one of the Vedânta system from the standpoint of Çaṅkara only. However, he is nowhere in contradiction to the Sûtra's (if we omit 1, 1, 19, about which we shall treat, Chapter IX, 5, and perhaps also p. 870, 5,

¹⁹ As rare, words and phrases in part found nowhere else we note the following: 1, 1, 5 and 1, 3, 13, *ikshati* as substantive; 1, 1, 25 *nigada*; 1, 1, 31 *upâsâ* for *upâsanâ*; 1, 2, 4 *karma-kartri* for *prâpya-prâpaka*; 1, 2, 7 *arbhaka*, *okas*; 1, 2, 26 *drishṭi*; 1, 1, 30 *çâstra-drishṭi*; 1, 3, 4 *prânabhrit*, "individual soul;" 1, 3, 34 *çuc*; 2, 1, 16 *avaram* for *kâryam* (effect); 2, 1, 26 *kopa* shaking (of the authority of scripture); 2, 3, 1 *vīyat* for *âkâça*; 2, 3, 8 *mâtariçvan* for *vâyu*; 2, 3, 10 *tejas* for *agni*; 2, 4, 9 *kriyâ*, organ, for *karanam*; 2, 4, 20 *sañjñâ-mûrti-kṛipti* for the usual *nâma-rûpa-kalpanam*; 3, 1, 1 *rañhati*; 3, 1, 8 *anuçaya* "remainder of work" (*bhuktaphalât karmaṇo 'tiriktam karma* Çaṅk. p. 760, 5); 3, 1, 21 *saṃçokaja* for *svedaja*; 3, 1, 22 *sâbhâvya*; 3, 2, 10 *mugdha* for *mûrchita* (faint); 3, 3, 3 *sara*; 3, 3, 25 *vedha*; 3, 3, 57 *bhûman* = *samasta*; 4, 2, 4 *adhyaksha* "individual soul;" 4, 2, 7 *ṣṛiti* way; 4, 2, 17 *çesha* consequence; 4, 3, 1 *prathiti* proclamation; 4, 3, 7 *kâryam* for *aparam brahma*.

where *âdhyânâya* is explained by *samyagdarçana-artham*, and p. 908, 12, where the interpreter for *ubhayathâ* substitutes *ubhayathâ-vibhâgena*), although 3, 1, 13, p. 764, 3 we have the strange case that, in considering Kâth., 2, 6, Çaṅkara refers the words *punaḥ punar vaçam âpadyate me*, with Bâdarâyana, wrongly to the penalties of hell, while, in his Commentary on Kâth., 2, 6, p. 96, 14, he rightly understands the same words as referring to repeated birth and death. Here and there his explanation of a Sûtram is given with reserve (e.g. 2, 4, 12. 3, 2, 33); in the following places he (or the different hands that have redacted them) give a double explanation: 1, 1, 12-19. 1, 1, 31. 1, 3, 27. 1, 4, 3. 2, 2, 39-40. 2, 4, 5-6. 3, 1, 7. 3, 2, 22. 3, 2, 33. 3, 3, 16-17. 3, 3, 26. 3, 3, 35. 3, 3, 64; at 1, 1, 23 he combats (p. 141, 7ff.) the reference of the Sûtram to Brih. 4, 4, 18, Chând. 6, 8, 2 instead of to Chând. 1, 10, 9; at 1, 4, 26 he remarks that many treat it as two Sûtra's; at 1, 2, 26 and 2, 1, 15 he discusses a variant reading of the Sûtram; at 2, 4, 2. 3, 3, 38 and 3, 3, 57 another interpretation of it; 3, 2, 11-21 he treats as connected, and rejects, after a very detailed discussion, the opinion of those who make two sections (*adhi-karana*), namely 11-14 and 15-21, of it; yet more remarkable and indicative of profound differences of principle among the interpreters is it, that Çaṅkara, p. 1124, 9, mentions and further amply refutes, the opinion of others who find the Siddhânta (the final opinion) expressed, not in the concept of Bâdarâyana 4, 3, 7-11, but in the subsequent one of Jaimini, which seems to presuppose that, for them, Bâdarâyana was not the final author of the work, and would be in harmony with the above-mentioned indications of the Karma-mîmâṃsâ as a part of the same work, and of the author as *Vyâsa*.

Çaṅkara's Commentary has, there is reason to believe, suffered many interpolations, particularly in the first part, where they are generally introduced with the words *apara' âha*. The pursuit of this subject would lead us too far, so that we only name briefly the passages in which we believe ourselves to detect additions from a foreign hand: 1) p. 122, 9-129, 5, which we shall treat of in Chap. IX, 5; 2) p. 141, 7-142, 3, seems to be a polemic addition of another, cf. p. 138, 12; 3) p. 150,



10—151, 5, without doubt an interpolation; 4) p. 153, 5—154, 2 an “*apara*,” who took offence at the saying that Brahman is in Heaven instead of beyond Heaven, repeats Caṅkara’s words, while correcting them; 5) p. 163, 11 there follows, with the words “*athavâ—asya ayam anyo ’rthah*,” a quite different explanation of the Sûtram, possibly from a different hand; 6) p. 184, 1—185, 17: an “*apara*” contests the previously made application of the verse Mund. 3, 1, 1 and explains it in another sense, with an appeal to the Paiṅgi-rahasya-brâhmanam; here he quotes Brih. 4, 5, 15 according to the Mâdhyandinas, while Caṅkara is usually wont to quote this passage according to the Kânvas (or instead 2, 4, 14 Mâdhy.), p. 111, 4. 199, 12. 393, 3. The motive of this excursus seems to be taken from p. 232, 12; it is ignored at 3, 3, 34, just as much as the addition p. 122, 9—129, 5 at 3, 3, 11—13; 7) p. 228, 2—6 an evident addition of an interpolator, according to whom the bridge “*setu*” in Mund 2, 2, 5 is the knowledge of Brahman, and not Brahman itself, to which, however, the expression is referred before, p. 227, 10, and again later, p. 834, 11; 8) p. 247, 3 (perhaps only to 247, 7) an “*apara*” asserts that the *jîvaghana* is not the *jîva*, as already explained, but *brahmaloka*. On a fusion of both views seems to rest the apprehension of *jîvaghana* as Hiranyagarbha in the Commentary on Praçna 5, 5.

5. The Quotations in Caṅkara’s Commentary.

It is of special interest to trace back to their sources the numerous quotations, introduced for the most part by a “*grûyate*” or “*smaryate*” and so on, without further statement of their origin, though in general verbally correct, in which Caṅkara’s Commentary in all its parts is so rich, partly because a full understanding of the text becomes thereby possible for the first time,²⁰ partly because an accurate determination of the writings which Caṅkara did and did not use may support many

²⁰ Thus, to give only one example, Banerjea (Transl. p. 34) has completely misunderstood the words p. 87, 11 “*sthita-prajñasya kâ bhâshâ*,” because he did not recognise them as a quotation from the Bhag. G. 2, 54, and Bruining (Transl. p. 29) does not make matters better by leaving the passage in question out altogether (cf. further p. 395, 5. 1081, 9).



valuable conclusions as to the genuineness of the other works which are attributed to Caṅkara, as to certain interpolations in the Commentary, as to the incorporation of older preparatory works in it, and so forth.

Not without labour, we have prepared an Index of all the quotations occurring in Caṅkara's Commentary, together with a statement of their source, which is added at the end of this work, and will serve as a welcome aid to the study of the Brahmasûtra's. However, it is to be used with a certain care; for on the one hand the quotations sometimes show more or less important deviations from their sources, and it cannot in every case be satisfactorily decided whether these deviations are due merely to inaccuracy, or to difference of reading, or, finally, to the fact that Caṅkara had before him, not the passage quoted by us, but a parallel passage from another Çâkhâ; on the other hand we must leave a (relatively small) number of quotations undetermined, whether it is that they are taken from lost writings, or that we have not yet come across them, or have overlooked them in the writings which we have. We shall indicate them the more exactly, because the conclusions which can be drawn from the other facts have validity only so far as they are not traversed by the quotations not yet recognised.

According to an estimate, which within certain bounds (according as things connected are joined or separated) is subjective, we count in the whole Commentary, all repetitions and simple references included, 2,523 quotations, of which 2,060 are derived from the Upanishad's, 150 from other Vedic scriptures, and 313 from non-Vedic literature.

a) Upanishad Quotations.

The Upanishads, arranged according to the frequency with which they are used, provide quotations in the following numbers: Chândogya (quoted in 8, not in 10 *prapâthakas*, p. 106, 1) 810; Brihadâraṇyaka (the fourth Adhyâya of which is quoted, p. 330, 4, as *shashṭha prapâthaka*, and as its beginning p. 893, 3, Çatap. Br. XIV, 1, 1, 1, therefore, according to the Mādhyandina's) 567, eight of which (p. 198, 8. 366, 9. 385, 3.



677, 7. 682, 12. 685, 10. 893, 3. 1098, 13) are only found in the Mādhyandina recension (Çatap. Br. XIV), while the others are mostly quoted according to the Kāṇva's, but also sometimes according to the Mādhyandina's, without showing any fixed principle²¹; Taittirīya (Taitt. âr. VII, VIII, IX), 142; Muṇḍaka 129; Kāthaka 103; Kaushitaki 88 (which agree now with the first, now with the second recension of Cowell, but often diverge from both, as for example Kaush. 3. 3 is quoted p. 140, 15 and again exactly the same p. 299, 7 contrary to both recensions which makes it very probable that Çaṅkara had before him a third recension of this work, which he quotes comparatively seldom; Çvetâçvatara (quoted p. 110, 5 as "*Çvetâçvatarânâm mantropanishad*," cf. p. 416, 1. 920, 4) 53 Agnirahasya (Çatap. Br. X) 40 (mostly found on pp. 214—222. 943—952); Praçna 39; Aitareya (Ait. âr. II, 4—6) 22; Jâbâla 13, nine of which (p. 222, 8. 223, 1. 417, 11. 988, 8 = 991, 4. 999, 6. 1000, 1. 3. 1025, 8) are found in the Jâbâlopanishad, but the four others (924, 7 = 1059, 1. 931, 4 = 933, 4) not; Nârâyaṇīyâ (Taitt. âr. X) 9 (890, 2, 13. 891, 1. 5. 6. 10. 892, 1. 998, 2. 998 4); Îçâ (Vâj. samh. XL)

²¹ Very remarkable is the disproportion with which the two great Upanishad's, Brihadâranyaka and Chândogya, are used. According to the external extent and internal importance of these two works, as well as the treatment which Çaṅkara bestows on them in his Commentaries (where the Brih. numbers 1096, the Chând. 628 pages, including the text), one would rather expect a contrary relation of the numbers of quotations. This one-sided preference for the Chând. Up. is in harmony with the leading rôle which it plays in the whole design of the Brahmasûtra's; thus of the 28 Upanishad passages in connection with which the theology in the first Adhyâya is discussed, Chând. provides 12, Brih. 4, Kâth. 4, Muṇḍ. and Praçna together 4, Taitt. and Kaush. together 4, (on this cf. Chap. VII, 2). In the case of parallel texts, as for example in the Pañcâg-nividya Brih. 6, 2, Chând. 5, 3—10), as a rule, the (mostly secondary) readings of the Chând. are preferred; finally, it is remarkable that where a passage is quoted with the bare addition: "*iti brâhmanam*," "*tathâ brâhmanam*," with two exceptions (p. 1115, 8. 1116, 11) as far as we know, the Chândogya is always to be understood (p. 143, 6. 240, 11. 262, 12. 367, 7. 390, 4. 906, 3. 1014, 11) as though it were the Brâhmanam, *κατ' ἐξοχήν* and even on p. 106, 1 Chând. VI is quoted with the words "*shashṭha-prapâthake*" without further addition, as if it were self-evident that it only could be meant.

8 (66, 4. 74, 1. 395, 5. 414, 1. 979, 9. 985, 12. 986, 2. 1126, 10); *Paiṅgi* 6 (184, 2, 7. 185, 4. 889, 10. quoted as *Paiṅgi-rahasya-brāhmaṇam*, 232, 12 [= 184, 2] as *Paiṅgy-upanishad*, undetermined 903, 3); *Kena* 5 (70, 1. 4. 10. 163, 3. 808, 10). Besides, p. 892, 7 (perhaps only because the *Sūtram* required it) an *Atharva-Upanishad* unknown to me (or the unknown beginning of a known one) is quoted with the words *ātharvanikānām-upanishad-ārambhe*). We leave undetermined the seven times quoted passage: "*ākāṣavat sarvagataḥ ca nityaḥ*" (130, 12 = 172, 5 = 610, 3 = 624, 8 = 652, 7 = 838, 9 = 1124, 12), which, according to the Commentator of *Chând. Up.* p. 409, 8 is ascribed to the *Kāthakam* (by which he understands the *Upanishad* [p. 409, 6] as well as the *Samhitâ* [p. 139, 4]), hardly with justice; as also the following *Upanishad*-like passages: 87, 9. 112, 8 (= 1047, 12 = 1135, 6). 113, 3. 182, 7. 610, 6. 7. 613, 4. 679, 8. 717, 10 (= 719, 8 = 939, 7). 741, 10. 832, 8, and, as especially worthy of notice, 808, 11 and 982, 11. If we overlook these not yet discovered quotations, we can state as result that no *Upanishad* except those above enumerated occurs; that is, neither *Māṇḍūkya* (69, 2. 77, 5 occur also in *Brih.*), nor *Maitri* nor any of the *Ātharvana-Upanishad*'s, since 810, 1 is indeed to be found in *Brahma-vindûp.* 12, but probably also in *Mahâbh.* XII, and was taken probably from that work.

b) Other Vedic Quotations.

Rigveda-samhitâ: Book I) 138, 1. 211, 13. 403, 2. II) 960, 8. IX) 341, 7. X) 151, 13. 208, 13. 211, 11. 215, 6. 298, 3. 304, 4. 426, 12. 495, 7. 716, 7. 764, 7.—*Aitareya-brāhmaṇam*: I) 901, 9. III) 74, 8. 313, 2. V) 43, 2. VII) 990, 10.—*Aitareya-âranyukam*: II) 103, 10. 872, 10. 924, 6. 958, 4. 1000, 9. 1002, 9. III) 150, 6. 450, 7. 450, 8. 783, 9. 852, 3.—*Kaushîtaki-brāhmaṇam* perhaps 893, 4. (Under the same name *Kâush. Up.* is quoted 378, 2. 865, 3: perhaps *Çaṅkara* regarded both as a single work).—Perhaps the supplements of the *Râṇyâniya*'s (*khila*), quoted 887, 9, may be counted to the *Sâma-veda-samhitâ*.—*Pañcaviṅça-brāhmaṇam* X) 319, 9. 319, 10. XXI) 919, 5. 960, 7.—*Shadviṅça-brāhmaṇam*: I) 892, 9 (cf. *Rājendralâla*



Mitra, Chând. Up., introd., p. 17 n.)—*Ârsheya-brâhmanam*, p. 3 (Burnell): 301, 8.—According to the Glossator 288, 1 also comes from a Brâhmanam of the Chandogas (cf. Rîgv. IX, 62, 1); presumably also the passage quoted with "*iti brâhmanam*"; 1115, 6.—*Vâjasaneyi-saṃhitâ*: I) 960, 1? XXI) 960, 5? XXII) 1123, 7.—*Çatapatha-brâhmanam* (besides books X and XIV): I) 1033, 10. VI) 310, 5. 422, 9. 701, 7. 901, 8. VIII) 1098, 3. XI) 320, 7. 749, 1. XII) 980, 1. XIII) 609, 10. 1005, 3.—*Taittirîya-saṃhitâ*: I) 51, 5. 52, 2. 146, 12. 362, 11. 747, 4. 990, 8. II) 311, 12. 412, 8. 704, 3. 858, 5. 858, 6. 941, 9. 942, 1. 975, 4. 992, 5. 1006, 8. 1011, 10. III) 312, 1. 935, 4. 971, 4. 975, 2. V) 709, 5. 6. 12. 711, 15. 712, 3. 951, 12. 1077, 2. VI) 975, 3. VII) 315, 11. 960, 9.—*Taittirîya-brâhmanam*: I) 902, 1. II) 289, 6. III) 146, 9. 304, 7. 418, 1.—*Taittirîya-âranyakam* (with exception of books VII, VIII, IX, X): III) 111, 8. 390, 6. 454, 14. 686, 9.—*Kâthakam*: 311, 5 and 1016, 11. ("*Kâthânâm saṃhitâyâm*") 859, 12; ("*agnihotra-darçâ-pûrṇa-mâsa-âdînâm kâthaka-eka-grantha-paripathitânâm*"), 893, 1 ("*Kâthânâm*"); the latter passage belongs to those which according to 893, 10 stand "*upanishad-granthânâm samipe*;" let it be remembered that the Kâth. Up. is repeatedly (835, 6. 852, 5. 869, 2) quoted as "*Kâthakam*," and it follows almost certainly that for Çaṅkara it still formed a whole with the Kâthakam.—*Maitrâyaṇî-saṃhitâ*: 959, 14; 960, 3 (according to the Glossator).—*Atharvaveda-saṃhitâ*: no certain quotation; 171, 4. 686, 7 are far more probably to be referred to Çvet.; the verse 686, 2. ("*âtharvanikâ brahmasûkte*") is not found in our recension; for 851, 11 cf. A. V. 10, 9. Kauç. 64ff.—That the *Gopatha-brâhmanam* is ignored, we have already seen above, p. 11.—The following brâhmaṇa-like quotations remain undetermined; 43, 1 (= 370, 1 = 483, 1 = 849, 13). 75, 1. 81, 8. 83, 4. 112, 1. 141, 15. (cf. schol. Kâty. 7, 1, 4, p. 625, 23). 640, 8. 747, 8. 846, 2. 960, 4. 994, 6. 1001, 4. 1017, 10. Probably many of them may yet be found in the Taittirîya texts.²²

²² Çaṅkara quotes, p. 412, 8 not "*Manur vai yat kiṇca avadat, tad bhîshajam âsīt*" (Kâthaka 11, 5. Ind. Stud. III, 463), but "*yad vai kiṇca Manur avadat, tad bhesajam*" (Taitt. S. 2, 2, 10, 2);—p. 747, 4 not "*âpo vai çradhâ*" (Maitrây. S. p. 59, 3 Schröder), but "*çradhâ vâ ôpah*"

Mention is further made of other Vedic schools, in part with quotations: *Kaushumaka* 846, 1; *Ātyāyana* 846, 1. 893, 1. 899, 7 = 907, 8 = 1082, 15. 902, 10; *Bhāllavin* 902, 9. 903, 6; *Ārcābhīn* 903, 4.

From the Sūtra-Literature occur: *Āvalāyana* 894, 10. 897, 5; *Kātyāyana* 931, 11. 932, 8. 1020, 1; *Āpastamba* 410, 6. 754, 3. 1026, 7? 1036, 4. 1130, 9.—To the same source may belong: 322, 5. 6. 9. 11. 692, 4. 4. 5. 761, 5. 1016, 6. 1030, 1.

c) Non-Vedic Quotations.

Bhagavadgītā in 56 passages; *Mahābhāratam* (with many variants): I) 310, 4. III) 276, 7. 412, 6. VI) 1107, 14. XII) 133, 5. 213, 12. 283, 9. 288, 6. 288, 10. 298 5. 302, 7. 304, 12. 305, 1. 322, 14. 409, 6. 409, 9. 413, 1. 413, 2. 413, 4. 413, 7. 638, 1. 660, 1. 677, 9. 690, 13. 692, 5. 758, 1. 809, 6. 828, 3. 915, 8. 1025, 5. 1048, 1. 1101, 6. XIII) 338, 12. 1022, 5.—Undetermined, *Mahābhārata*-like: 214, 3. 309, 10. 362, 7. 726, 11. 809, 14. 828, 5. 916, 3. 917, 1. (= 1122, 1) 1009, 6. 1041, 8. 12. 1057, 6. 1075, 11. 1101, 9. 15.—*Rāmāyaṇam*: 1036, 5.—*Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇam* XLV) 208, 15. 872, 8.—*Purāṇa*'s: 410, 1. 427, 3 = 482, 6. 495, 10. 633, 12, perhaps 713, 14.—*Manu*: I) 196, 13. 289, 1. 1093, 14. II) 730, 5. 1023, 3. IV) 322, 10. 907, 12. X) 321, 2. 321, 3. 1016, 4. XII) 412, 10. 437, 3.—*Dharmaśāstra*-like: 1024, 4. 1027, 3 = 1030, 6. 1031, 1.

Yāska (p. 31, 15 Roth) 39, 2.—*Pāṇini*: 234, 3. 366, 1.

(Taitt. S. 1, 6, 8, 1);—p. 1077, 2 not "*taratī sarvam pāpmānam*" and so on, (Ātap. Br. 13, 3, 1, 1) but "*sarvam pāpmānam taratī*" and so on (Taitt. S. 5, 3, 12, 1);—p. 709, 5, not "*sapta vai gīrshan prāṇāḥ*" (Āit. Br. 3, 3, 1) or "*sapta gīrasī prāṇāḥ*" (Pāñc. Br. 22, 4, 3) or "*sapta vai gīrshanyāḥ prāṇāḥ*" (Āt. Br. 13, 1, 7, 2), but "*sapta vai gīrshanyāḥ prāṇā, dvāv avāṇcau*" (Taitt. S. 5, 3, 2, 5).—A glance at the above comparisons shows further, that (excepting the Upanishad's and what pertains to them). Čāṅkara quotes from the other Čākhā's only occasionally, but from that of the Taittirīya's constantly. Perhaps in the future, from this fact, and conversely from the above mentioned preference for the Čhānd. Up. (note 21), which runs through the original web of the work, certain conclusions may be drawn as to its compilation from elements of different character.



399, 10; mentioned as a „*smṛitir anapavadanîyâ*” 416, 6.—*Paribhâṣhâ* to Pāṇini (8, 3, 82) 1122, 9.

Sāṅkhya-kārikā: 355, 12. 361, 4. 718, 2.—No certain quotation from the *Sāṅkhya-sūtra*'s; cf. however 417, 9. 447, 11. 485, 7.—Other *Sāṅkhya* quotations are perhaps 345, 10. 346, 1. 420, 13.—*Yogasūtra*'s: 314, 6. 723, 12; not in our text 416, 4; cf. also 1072, 3.—*Nyāyasūtra*'s: 67, 6. 594, 1.—*Vaiṣeṣikasūtra*'s: I) 539, 13. IV) 525, 1. 534, 5. 534, 7. 535, 2. VII) 524, 1. 524, 2 and again 524, 2.—*Mīmāṃsāsūtra*'s: I) 50, 5. 58, 4. 52, 1, again 58, 4. 80, 1. 61, 7. 89, 2. 285, 3. 411, 2. 1002, 3. 1028, 10. II) 100, 5. 848, 6. III) 897, 1. 944, 4. 919, 10. 995, 1. 1011, 12. VI) 278, 3. 1027, 1; presumably from book XI—XII) 903, 9. 906, 3. 942, 5. 951, 3.—Similar: 58, 2. 79, 9. 953, 5. 953, 9. 77, 14.—*Gauḍapāda*: 375, 3. 433, 1.—Unknown 89, 10. 1003, 1.—*Buddhistic*: 555, 6. 558, 7. 563, 4.—*Bhāgavata*'s: 601, 3. 602, 6. 14. 604, 6. 8.—*Śvapnādhyāyavidāh*: 783, 11.—*Indian proverbs*: 823, 10 = 825, 5; unknown 978, 3.

To these are added 99 quotations and references to the *Sūtra*'s of Bādarāyaṇa himself, and eight passages about which it is doubtful if they contain a quotation (61, 8. 157, 10. 238, 4. 301, 6. 367, 9. 369, 9. 1025, 4. 1094, 13), which raises the sum total to 2523 quotations.

6. Some Remarks on Ṣaṅkara.

The date of Bādarāyaṇa and the circumstances of his life are entirely unknown to us. Of Ṣaṅkara it seems to be certain that he lived about 700 or 800 A. D., founded a famous school in *Ṣrīṅgagiri*, where perhaps also he was born, as an ascetic pilgrim (*paramahansa*, *parivrājaka*), undertook journeys as far as Kashmir, to work for his doctrine, and died in *Kāñcī*.²³

²³ Colebrooke, M. E. I p. 332; Wilson, Sanskrit Dict. I p. XVI ff; Windischmann, Sanc. p. 39—48.—According to the *Āryavidyāsudhākara* p. 226 and the quotations there given, Ṣaṅkara was born in the village of *Kālapī* in the territory of *Kerala* as son of *Ṣivaguruṣarman* in the year 3889 of the Kaliyuga (which began 18th February 3102 B. C.) in the year 845 of the Vikramāditya era (beginning 56 B. C.), which brings us to 787—789 A. D. as the year of his birth. The passage runs: “*Sā iyaṃ adhyātma-vidyā, Kali-kāla-vaçāt kṛiçatvam āpannā api, çṛimac-Chaṅkara-ācāryair brahmasūtra-upaniṣad-bhagavadgītā-pramukheshu brah-*

From teaching, by which a new impetus was given to the Vedānta doctrine in India, arose a great number of writings

mavidyā-pratipādaka-grantheshu bhāṣhya-ādīn prasanna-gambhīrān mahā-nibandhān virācyā samupabrinhitā. Tad anu Viṣṇurūpācārya-Vācaspati-miśra-prabhritibhir ācārya-śiṣhya-praśiṣhya-ādibhir vārttika-vivaraṇa-bhā-matī-pramukhān udāra-nibandha-nīcayān ābadhya supratishṭhāpitā, iti jñeyam. Ṣaṅkara-ācārya-prādurbhāvas tu Vikramārka-samayād atīte (845) pañca-catvāriṅśad-adhika-ashtaṭaṭimīte samvatsare Kerala-deśe Kālapī-grāme Īvaguruṣarmanō bhāryāyām samabhavat. Tathā ca sampradāya-vida' āhur:

Nidhi-nāga-ibha-vahny-abde, vibhave, māsi mādhave,

Ḥukle tithau, daṣamyām tu Ṣaṅkara-ārya-udayah-smṛitā, iti.

«*Nidhināgebhavahnyabde*»: (3889) *nava-aṣṭi-uttara-ashtaṭaṭi-adhika-trisahasrīmite varshe, iti arthah, Kaliyugasya, iti ṣeṣah.*—Tathā Ṣaṅkara-mandāra-saurabhe Nīlakanṭha-bhaṭṭā' api evam eva āhur: «*Prāsūta tishya-ṣaradām atiyātavatyām ekādaṣa-adhika-ṣata-ūna-catvṛhsahasryām* » *iti-ādi.*—«*Tishya-ṣaradām* », *Kali-yuga-varshānām, iti arthah.*»

„After this science of the highest spirit had suffered diminution “through the sway of the Kali age, it was supplied with new force by “the illustrious Ṣaṅkara-ācārya, in that he composed luminous and pro- “found commentaries and the like of great compass to the Brahmasūtra's, “the Upanishad's, the Bhagavadgītā and other scriptures which handed “down the teaching of Brahman. These were then further fortified by “Viṣṇurūpācārya, Vācaspatimiśra, and other pupils and pupils' pupils of “the master, through the composition of a mass of excellent works, such “as scholia, interpretations, explanations and the like; that is the fact. “The birth of Ṣaṅkara from the wife of Īvaguruṣarman happened in the “territory of Kerala in the village of Kālapī after the 845th year of the “era of Vikramārka [Vikramāditya] had gone by. And thus the knowers “of the tradition say:

“In the year sea-elephant-mountain-beast-fire,

“In the increasing year, in the month Mādhave,

“On the tenth day of the bright fortnight,

“There came to the world the noble Ṣaṅkara.

“In the year sea-elephant-mountain-beast-fire, that is in the year 3889, “meaning, as must be supplied, of the Kali era.—So too says the Master “Nīlakanṭha in the work called ‘the fragrance of the tree of heaven “Ṣaṅkara’ ‘He was born in the myrobalan harvest while the four “thousandth year less a hundred and eleven years was rolling by.’ The “myrobalan harvests mean the year of the Kali era.”

Further it is circumstantially explained that Māṇikyā (who according to Merutuṅga, lived about 1150 of Vikramāditya's era) in his commentary to the Kāvya-prakāśa, quotes Kumārila-bhaṭṭa as a commonly recognised authority; the latter must therefore have lived long before 1150 (= 1094



which bear his name, whose genuineness still remains to be investigated. His master-piece is the Commentary on the Brahmasûtra's, numbering 1155 pages together with the gloss of Govindânanda (for 3, 4 of Ânandagiri) in the Bibl. Ind., which gives a substantially complete and sufficient picture of his system, and from which alone we draw our exposition of it, in order in this way to form a safe standard by which the genuineness of the other works attributed to Çaṅkara, the minor writings, as well as the Commentaries to the Upanishad's, may subsequently be tested. From the examination of the latter, weighty conclusions can then again be drawn as to the time when the different Upanishad's came into existence, and as to their authority. We believe we have made a contribution toward this in the demonstration, of course still conditional, that has already been given, that Çaṅkara, in the Commentary to the Brahmasûtra's, used no other Upanishad's except *Aitareya*, *Kaushîtaki*; *Chândogya*, *Kena*; *Taittirîya*, *Kâthaka*, *Çvetâçvatara*, *Îçâ*, *Brihadâraṇyaka*; *Mundaka*, *Praçna* (and incidentally *Paiṅgi*, *Agnirahasya*, *Jâbâla*, *Nârâyaṇîya* and, once, an *Atharva Up.*)²⁴ The Commentaries published in the Bibl. Ind. (Vol. II, III, VII, VIII) to *Brihadâraṇyaka*, *Chândogya*, *Taittirîya*, *Aitareya*, *Çvetâçvatara*, *Îçâ*, *Kena*, *Katha*, *Praçna*, *Mundaka*, *Mândûkya*, are handed down under Çaṅkara's name; it is remarkable that *Kaushîtaki* is not among them.²⁵ Besides these, he is said to have commented on *Atharvaçikhâ* (Weber, Ind. Stud., II, 53, L. G. 2, p. 182), *Nrisinhâtâpanîya* (Colebr., p. 96) and *Atharvaçiras* (Ind. St.

A. D.), and therefore also Çaṅkara, who had a meeting [very problematical, however] with Kumârila-bhaṭṭa in Prayâga.

²⁴ The *Vâshkala-Upanishad*, still existing in 1656 A. D., he cannot well have known, as otherwise he would quote the Myth of Indra as a ram, p. 310, 2, according to it, and not according to Shaḍv. 1, 1. For the remarkable passage 808, 11, there is no place in the *Vâshkala Up.*, as we know it according to Anquetil Duperron.

²⁵ According to Weber (L. G. 2, p. 56) he also commented on *Kaushîtaki*; yet this statement must be erroneous, so far as it rests (Ind. St., I, 392) only on the Berlin Manuscripts, No. 83-84 (Chambers, 292a, 294b, not 262); the Commentary contained in them bears the name of Çaṅkara-ânanda, pupil of the Ânandâtman, and is identical with that published by Cowell.

I, 383, L. G.², p. 188). Other works going under his name are: *Āptavajrasūci* (ed. Weber, Berlin 1860) and *Tripurī*, which are both counted as Upanishad's (Weber, L. G.², p. 179), *Upadeśasahasrī* (Colebr.¹, p. 335, Hall, Bibliogr. Index, p. 99), *Ātmabodha* (ed. Calc. 1858), *Mohamudgara* (Hall, p. 103), *Bālabodhanī* (ed. Windischmann in Sanc., Bonn 1833), *Bālabodhinī* (Berl. Ms. No. 618, 2) and a series of other writings, which will be found enumerated by Windischmann and Hall (cf. Regnaud, Matériaux, p. 34. Weber Verz. der Berliner H. S., p. 180, L. G.², p. 205, n. Lassen, *Bhagavadgītā*, p. XII).

Characteristic²⁶ for Ćaṅkara's period as well as for his theological conception is a passage of his Commentary on the Brahmasūtra's, p. 313, 8ff., which we translate here:

"For also, what is for us imperceptible was perceptible for "the ancients; thus it is recorded, that Vyāsa [the author of "the Mahābhāratam] and others used to meet the Gods and "[Rishis] face to face. But if some would assert that, as for those "now living so for the ancients also it was impossible to meet "with gods and the like, they would deny the variety of the "world; they might also maintain that, as at present, so also "in other times, there was no world-swaying prince (*sārvabha-* " *maḥ kshatriyaḥ*) and thus they would not acknowledge the "injunctions referring to the consecration of kings; they might "further assume that, as at present, so also in other times, the "duties of castes and Āçrama's had no stable rules, and "thus treat as vain the canon of law which provides rules for them. "We must therefore believe that the ancients, in consequence

²⁶ As stylistic curiosities from Ćaṅkara's Commentary may be quoted: *prathama-tara*, p. 137, 4, 148, 12 (also on Brih. 273, 5); *upapadyate-tarām* 144, 6; *na-tarām* 931, 8; *akalpate* 815, 2 and *avyācakshīta* 819, 8 (a privative with a verb) and, to read it so, also *avirudhyeta* 265, 3; *janimataḥ* 833, 14; *janyate* 844, 7; *akiñcitkaratvāt* 141, 5; *arddhajaratīya* 122, 13, 176, 11 (read so); *mukhya' eva prāṇasya dharmah* (for *mukhyaprāṇasya eva dharmah*) 161, 3; *çrutarahasyasya vijñānasya* (for *çruta-rahasya-vijñānasya*) 191, 7. Frequent enough is the use of the 3rd pers. sing. pres. as substantive: *caratiḥ* 762, 4; *srijatiḥ* 707, 10; *dhyāyatiḥ* 1071, 11; *īkshati-ādi-çraṇam* 109, 7; *karoti-artha* 381, 4; *dhyāyati-artha* 1071, 10; also in the genitive: *sambhavater* 630, 3; *āpnoter* 1132, 9; *tarateḥ prāpnoti-arthaḥ* 834, 14 and even *prapañca-yishyater* 99, 5, which is, however, retracted in the Çuddhipatram.



"of pre-eminent merits, held visible converse with Gods and
 "[Rishis]. The Smṛiti also says [*Yogasūtra* 2, 44]: "through
 "study [is gained] union with the beloved godhead." And
 "when it further teaches, that Yoga bestows as reward the
 "mastery of nature, consisting [in the freedom from embodied
 "being and its laws, and thereby] in the ability to become as
 "small as an atom and the like [2, to become light, 3, to
 "become large, 4, to reach everything, 5, to realise every wish,
 "6, to rule all being with one's will, 7, to possess creative power,
 "8, to penetrate all, *Gauḍap*, on *Sāṅkhyak*. 23, *Vedavyāsa* on
 "*Yogas*. 3, 44] this is not to be rejected out of hand by a
 "mere dictatorial sentence."

7. Analysis of the contents of the Brahmasūtra's with Caṅkara's Commentary according to adhyāya, pāda and adhikaraṇam.

We conclude with an analysis of the contents of the
 Brahmasūtra's, which will be useful not only for our exposition
 of the system, but also in the study of the original work.
 The work (in which the number four everywhere plays an
 important rôle, cf. Chap. VII, 2) falls, as we have it, into
 four Adhyāya's (Lectures) of four Pāda's (Feet or Quarters)
 each, a division which calls to mind the four fourfold feet of
 Brahman (Chând. 4, 5-8) and the sixteenfold Spirit (Prajña 6,
 cf. Chând. 6, 7, Çvet. 1, 4, Brih. 1, 5, 15). The numbers at
 the beginning of the lines indicate the 555 Sūtra's of the work,
 their unions the Adhikaraṇas or chapters, of which, following
 the appended Adhikaraṇamâlâ, we count 192 (not with Cole-
 brooke 191).

I, 1.

Introduction: concerning Avidyâ and Vidyâ.

1. Preliminaries to the Vedânta.
2. That, from which the world has sprung, is Brahman.
3. Relation of Brahman to the Veda.
4. Relation of the Vedânta to the Mîmâṃsâ.
- 5-11. The Principle of the world is conscious, not, as the *Sāṅkhyâ's*
 teach, unconscious.
- 12-19. The *ânandamaya* Taitt. 2, 5 is Brahman.
- 20-21. The *antar âditye* Chând. 1, 6, 6 is Brahman.

22. The *ākāṣa* Chând. 1, 9, 1 is Brahman.
 23. The *prāṇa* Chând. 1, 11, 5 is Brahman.
 24—27. The *paro divo jyotis* Chând. 3, 13, 7 is Brahman.
 28—31. The *prāṇa* Kaush. 3, 2 is Brahman.

I, 2.

- 1—8. The *manomaya prāṇaśarīra* Chând. 3, 14, 2 is Brahman.
 9—10. The *attar* Kāth. 2, 25 is Brahman.
 11—12. The *guhām pravishṭau* Kāth. 3, 1 are Brahman and Jīva.
 13—17. The *antara* Chând. 4, 15, 1 is Brahman.
 18—20. The *antaryāmin* Brih. 3, 7, 3 is Brahman.
 21—23. The *adṛśyam* Muṇḍ. 1, 1, 6 is Brahman.
 24—32. The *âtman vaiçvânara* Chând. 5, 11, 6 is Brahman.

I, 3.

- 1—7. The *âyatanam* Muṇḍ. 2, 2, 5 is Brahman.
 8—9. The *bhūman* Chând. 7, 23 is Brahman.
 10—12. The *aksharam* Brih. 3, 8, 8 is Brahman.
 13. The object of *om* Praçna 5, 5 is Brahman.
 14—18. The *dahara* Chând. 8, 1, 1 is Brahman.
 19—21. The *samprasāda* Chând. 8, 12, 3 refers to Brahman.
 22—23. The *na tatra sūryo bhāti* Muṇḍ. 2, 2, 10 refers to Brahman.
 24—25. The *aṅguhṭha-mâtra* Kāth. 4, 12 is Brahman.
 26—33. Claim of the gods to the Vidyâ. Eternity of the Veda.
 34—38. Exclusion of Çûdra's from the Vidyâ.
 39. The *prāṇa* Kāth. 6, 2 is Brahman.
 40. The *jyotis* Chând. 8, 12, 3 is Brahman.
 41. The *ākāṣa* Chând. 8, 14 is Brahman.
 42—43. The *viññānamaya* Brih. 4, 3, 7 is Brahman.

I, 4.

- 1—7. The *avyaktam* Kāth. 3, 11 is not the Matter of the Sâṅkhya's (*pradhānam*) but "the subtle Body" (*sūkshmaṃ śarīram*).
 8—10. The *ajā* Çvet. 4, 5 is not the Sâṅkhya Matter but Nature.
 11—13. The *pañca pañca-janāḥ* Brih. 4, 4, 17 are not the 25 Principles of the Sâṅkhyas, but Breath, Eye, Ear, Food and Manas.
 14—15. Consistency of the Vedânta. The Nonbeing, from which in Taitt. 2, 7 the world arose, is only relative.
 16—18. The *kartar* Kaush. 4, 19 is Brahman.
 19—22. The *âtman* Brih. 2, 4, 5 is Brahman.

-
- 23—27. Brahman is the *causa efficiens* and *causa materialis* of the world,
 28. The refutation of the Sâṅkhya Matter holds good also for the atomists.



II, 1.

- 1—2. Why the Sāṅkhya's do not mention Brahman.
3. This applied also to the Yoga.
- 4—11. Brahman is also the *causa materialis* of Nature. Objections of reflection rebutted.
12. This rebuttal extended also to the atomists and others.
13. Subject (*bhoktar*) and Object (*bhogyam*) one in Brahman.
- 14—20. Identity of Cause and Effect, Brahman and World.
- 21—23. The Origin of Evil. The soul, although not the author of creation, bears all the guilt for it. Illusory character of the *Samsāra*.
- 24—25. Brahman works without tools, although he is pure Spirit.
- 26—29. Brahman is transformed into the world, and yet remains whole and undivided, as a dreamer, a magician makes forms and yet remains one.
- 30—31. Brahman as Creator has many powers and yet remains without difference.
- 32—33. Motive of creation: Brahman, self-sufficing, creates only for sport.
- 34—36. Brahman neither unjust nor cruel; inequality of creatures due to themselves by their earlier forms of being. Beginninglessness of the *Samsāra*.
37. Recapitulation concerning Brahman as Creator.

II, 2.

- 1—10. Refutation of the Sāṅkhya's. Physico-theological proof.
11. An objection of the Vaiśeṣika's answered.
- 12—17. Refutation of the Vaiśeṣika's. Impossibility of the atom.
- 18—27. Refutation of the Buddhists of *realistic tendency*; persistence of subject and substance.
- 28—32. Refutation of the Buddhists of *idealistic tendency*; the reality of the outer world demonstrated.
- 33—36. Refutation of the Jaina's; how great is the soul?
- 37—41. Refutation of the Pācūpata's.
- 42—45. Refutation of the Pāṅcarātra's.

II, 3.

- 1—7. The *ākāśa* was evolved. Not so Brahman. *Cogito, ergo sum*.
8. From the *ākāśa*, the *vāyu* was evolved;—
9. Brahman was not evolved; cosmological proof;—
10. From the *vāyu*, the *agni* was evolved,
11. From the *agni*, the *āpas*,
12. From the *āpas*, the *annam*, that is, the earth.
13. Not the elements, but Brahman in them is the creating agent.
14. Reabsorption of the world in reverse order.
15. Evolution of the soul-organs: *indriya*'s, *manas*, *buddhi*.
16. The individual soul was not evolved. Moral grounds.

17. Counter-reasons weighed. Identity of the soul with the Brahman. Only its *upādhi*'s are evolved and disappear.
18. The soul is conscious essentially (as the Sāṅkhya's) not accidentally (as the Vaiśeṣika's teach).
- 19—32. Relation of soul to body; it is not *anu* but *vibhu*.
- 33—39. Of the *kartritvam* (actorship) of the soul.
40. Its *kartritvam* is not *svābhāvika*m, but *upādhi-nimittam*.
- 41—42. The soul is not free and is guided in acting by God (*īśvara*) according to its former works.
- 43—53. The soul identical and not identical with Brahman. Illusory character of all individual existence and its pains.

II, 4.

- 1—4. The *prāṇas* (organs of relation) also evolved from Brahman.
- 5—6. Eleven of them: 5 *buddhi-indriya*'s, 5 *karma-indriya*'s, 1 *manas*.
7. On their extension in space.
8. The *mukhya prāṇa* (organ of nutrition) also created.
- 9—12. Of its nature and five functions.
13. Of its extension in space.
- 14—16. Connection of the *prāṇa*'s with the soul. Collaboration of the gods.
- 17—19. Relation of the *mukhya prāṇa* to the other *prāṇas*.
- 20—22. Relation of the body and its organs to the elements.

III, 1.

- 1—7. Departure of the soul with its organs after death.
- 8—11. Why must it re-enter a new body?
- 12—21. Punishment of evildoers; different destinies of the soul after death. The four classes of (organic) beings.
22. Return through the *ākāśa* and other stations. Relation to them that of a guest.
23. Of the duration of the halts at these stations.
- 24—27. Animation of plants. Return of the soul through plants, food, seed, womb to embodiment.

III, 2.

- 1—6. Of the nature of dream; difference from waking.
- 7—8. Nature of deep sleep; it is an entering into Brahman.
9. Why is he who wakes identical with him who went to sleep?
10. The swoon; difference from deep sleep and death. Metaphysical meaning of death.
- 11—21. Brahman is free from all differences, determinations and attributes.
- 22—30. Brahman is never object, because eternally subject (*sākshin*).
- 31—37. Of certain figurative expressions used of Brahman.
- 38—41. The fruit of works comes from God, who takes account of former works. On the *apūrvam*.