

श्री

Samyaminipura High Court.

VEDANTA - ENQUIRY

CIVIL SUIT

FIFTH ISSUE.

JUDGMENT

WRITTEN BY

HIS HOLINESS

SRI SRI SATYADHYANA THEERTHA SWAMIN,

*(the master maintaining the Vedic Vatshnava
Siddhanta, graced with the excellent qualities
of Paramahamsas, adorning the Pontifical
seat of the famous Uttaradimutt.)*

RENDERED INTO ENGLISH

BY

S. SUBBA RAU, M. A.,

&

PUBLISHED BY

SRI MADHVA SIDDHANTA ABHIVRIDDHIKARINI SABHA
TIRUCHANUR,

1934.

श्रीः
Samyaminipura High Court.

VEDANTA - ENQUIRY

CIVIL SUIT

Fifth ISSUE.

JUDGMENT

WRITTEN BY

HIS HOLINESS

SRI SRI SATYADHYANA THEERTHA SWAMIN,

*(the master maintaining the Vedic Vaishnava
Siddhanta, graced with the excellent qualities
of Paramahansas, adorning the Pontifical
seat of the famous Uttaradimutt.)*

RENDERED INTO ENGLISH

BY

S. SUBBA RAU, M. A.

&

PUBLISHED BY

SHRI MADHYA SIDDHANTA ABHYASADHIKARINI SAMITHI
TIRUCHANUR.

1934

PRINTED AT THE
SRI VYASA PRESS,
TIRUPATI.

Prefatory Note.

Process of time and changed circumstances have a natural power to dim the light of understanding and to weaken the intensity of conviction and faith. Seeing that the disciples of Sri Madhwa are also affected by these causes, His Holiness now adorning the pontifical seat of the famous Uttaradimutt has evolved certain Lectures as a result of his very wide and careful study and examination of all the available ancient works in the field of Vedanta Philosophy. The matter is cast into the form of a judicial enquiry and the conclusions are summed up in the form of Judgments on the several Issues.

The desired conviction gains strength only in the clear light of contrast. Accordingly the positions diametrically opposed to Sri Madhwa's tenets and doctrines are brought out by references to the authoritative works of other systems, which are clear admissions.

The nature of human understanding often demands proofs or tests and also proved instruments of knowledge which is invariably correlated to two points, the knower and the known. Nothing is acceptable as an existence unless there is a knowledge of the thing as real. Thus that knowledge and its trustworthy instruments must form the basis of all Enquiry; and the conclusion of any enquiry on their strength is acceptable only so long as no contradiction occurs; and the great wish is that such conclusions must be a matter of everlasting conscious experience, without which Moksha is pure darkness. Such instruments including the knowledge got through them are the *Pramanas i. e.*, the means of knowing anything as a real existence. What is not within the range of *Pramanas* cannot be consistently said

to exist even. Whatever is supposed to be destitute of all attributes or properties cannot be conceived to be a thing or existence and cannot be the matter of *Pramanas* and knowledge.

The critical examination exhibited in these lectures discloses that in the *Adwaita* system, as it is in the *Buddhistic* systems of *Sunyavadin* and *Vignanavadin*, the real existence of only One thing (*Brabman*) is granted, though it is neither known by *Pramanas* nor even self-conscious. When *Brahman* the one real existence is itself thus *Apramanika i. e.*, outside the sphere of *Pramanas*, *Aikya* or the oneness of the *Jiva* with *Brahman* being the very essence of the unknowable *Brahman* is also unknowable *i. e.*, *Apramanika*. Therefore the system is not at all acceptable to those that can cherish faith only in what is established by *Pramanas*.

Five issues are framed. The first is about taking up this enquiry once again; and this is easily settled by the Court. The second is about the reality of the Universe presented to the intelligent being called *Jiva* in the state of their waking or dreaming. The third question is whether *Parabrahman* is one with the little spiritual being called *Jiva* or quite distinct from him. The fourth issue is whether *ParaBrahman* is Omniscient, the Maker of all the Universe and is possessed of all the excellent qualities infinite in number and in absolute perfection. The fifth issue is whether *Adwaitism* is distinct from *Buddhism* or not and whether it is a Vedic or non-Vedic system. In this part the Fifth issue is investigated into and the judgment drawn up.

Those that are still eager to prosecute this enquiry and prove as *Pramanika* the several positions set aside as *Apramonika*, may reopen the question and discuss it to their entire satisfaction.

Samyaminipura High Court.

BEFORE HIS LORDSHIP

Chief Justice Dharmaraj H. B.

VEDANTA - ENQUIRY

CIVIL SUIT

FIFTH ISSUE.

O. S. No. 564 of 1927.

JUDGMENT.

PLAINTIFF

Vishnu Dasacharya,
Plaintiff's Vakil
Madhavadas P. B. D.

DEFENDANT

Gangadhara Sastri,
Defendant's Vakil
Hari Hara Sarma P. B. S.

The Plaintiff's contention is:-

1. That the suit is filed by the Plaintiff on behalf of all people who are Vaidic, with the permission of the Court.
2. That with the permission of the Court Gangadhara Sastri the all-round champion of Adwaita is sued against as the defendant on behalf of Adwaitins.
3. That the plaintiff belongs to the religion of the Vedas.

4. That the tenets of the Vaidic religion are:-

- (a) The whole Universe including four castes, the four stages, sacrifices, the gods, Vedas, the sacred waters as the Ganges, Swarga and other Higher worlds, this world etc., is real — transcendently real.
- (b) Vishnu is the Highest God, Omniscient, the Maker (the First cause of all) and perfect in all auspicious qualities (in every excellence.)
- (c) God is different from the individual finite souls. (jivas or dependent spiritual beings)
- (d) That the knowledge that Vishnu is infinitely far higher than all other beings, is the Maker of all things and is distinct from all the jivas, and He grants salvation.

5. That the above tenets are propounded in the Vedas, the Vedanta Sutras (which decide the meaning of the Vedas) and the Bhagavad Gita and consequently all those who follow the authority of the Vedas must accept the above tenets.

6. That the religion of the Vedas has come down from eternity.

7. That as truth stands thus, Gaudapadacharya and his disciple's disciple Sankaracharya have deliberately misinterpreted the Vedas, Sutras and the Gita, and by giving a new, yet Vedic garb to the Theories of Vignnavadi and Sunyavadi

Buddhists presented them as Vaidic and taught doctrines contradicting the tenets of the Vaidic Religion, with the object of deceiving people. They therefore become punishable in accordance with Sec. (chapter) XVI of the Bhagavadgita (Eternal Vaidic Law).

8. The preaching of the defendant is as follows.

(a) Vishnu is not the Highest Omniscient author of everything, nor is He perfect in infinite, auspicious qualities. He is devoid of all qualities.

(b) That the Universe including the four castes, etc stated in para 4 supra is unreal.

(c) That God is not different from the finite soul or jiva.

(d) The knowledge that God is distinct from the finite soul and that He is Highest, is not the means of salvation. The knowledge 'I am Brahman' is the only means of salvation?

9. By misunderstanding and misinterpreting the doctrines of the Vedas, Sutras and Gita, The Adwaitins pave the way not only for their own downfall but also for the perishing of the world (vide Gita XVI.)

Therefore the plaintiff prays that in the interests of humanity a decree to the following effect may be given.

(a) God is different from the finite soul and is the Supreme Being. The whole Universe including

the four castes and stages, Vedas, sacrifices, the gods, Sacred waters like the Ganges is real and not false. This is what is taught by the Vedas, Sutras and the Bhagavad-gita.

- (b) The Court must decree that the preaching of Adwaitins that Brahman is qualitiess, that the Universe is unreal, etc., is opposed to the teachings of the Vedas, Sutras and the Gita.
- (c) The plaintiff prays that the Court must in the interests of Truth and humanity publish what it considers as the real principles of Vedanta; otherwise many people may be deceived by false doctrines and go to perdition. This was filed by the plaintiff's Vakil on 25-3-27 on behalf of the plaintiff by his Vakil Mr. Madhavadas along with all the necessary authorities and evidence. The defendant, served with notice on 30-3-27, put in the following statement.

Defendant's Statement

1. All that has been stated in the petition of the plaintiff is false.
2. The principles mentioned in para 4 of the Plaintiff's statement are not the real teachings of the Vedas, Sutras and Gita, though they are referred to in them. Therefore they are not Vaidic and are not true.
3. The philosophy of the plaintiff is not Eternal.
4. The tenets mentioned by the plaintiff in para 4 of his statement are all utterly false.

- (a) Only the Adwaita is the philosophy of the Vedas.
- (c) It is not proper to say that Adwaita is Buddhism.

5. The doctrines of Adwaita are:-

- (a) The Universe (including the four castes, stages, etc.,) which is different from Brahman is false as a dream.
 - (b) Brahman is qualitless.
 - (c) The finite soul and Brahman are one.
 - (d) The realisation that 'I am Brahman' is the only means of salvation.
6. As the question has already been decided upon, it is barred by *Res-Judicata*. This Court has no power to enquire into the matter.
7. All that has been stated by the Plaintiff in para 9 of his statement is false.

We have nothing to complain against our adherence to Adwaita; nor does anybody else who has embraced it complain of any harm on account of following the Adwaita Philosophy.

For all these reasons, I pray that the Court should not give any heed to the petition of the plaintiff but summarily dismiss it.

This statement has been filed by Mr. Hari Hara Sarma along with the necessary affidavits. Thereupon in the presence of the plaintiff and the defendant, the following issues were framed:—

Issue-points of dispute

1. Is this a case of Res-judicate or not, *i. e.*, Since this question was already decided upon, is this court empowered or not to enquire into it again?
2. (a) Is the Universe including the four castes, stages, etc., real or unreal?
(b) Is dream real or unreal?
3. Is the finite soul the one with, or different from, Brahman?
4. Does Brahman possess innumerable auspicious qualities of Omniscience, omnipotence to be the creator of the Universe etc or not?
5. (a) Is Adwaita different from Buddhism or not?
(b) Is Adwaita Vaidic or not?

The first issue of *Res-Judicata* has been argued out by the Advocates of the two parties on 3-7-27 and the Judge has come to the conclusion that this Suit is not *Res-Judicata*.

The second issue regarding whether real or unreal are (a) the Universe including four castes, etc., and (b) the objects of dream, has been argued out on both sides by the learned Vakils and the court has decided on 28-8-1928 that the castes, stages, sacrifices, the gods, etc., are all real the Universe is not false, and likewise the objects of dreams are all real and not false.

The third issue—"Is Brahman one with, or different from, the finite soul?" — was argued out and the Court decided on 20-10-1928 that the Brahman is different from the finite soul and the two are not identical.

The fourth issue—whether Brahman has the qualities of Omniscience, Omnipotence, being the creator of the Universe, or has not — was argued out and the Judgment was given on 21-12-1928 that Brahman possesses all the auspicious qualities of Omniscience etc, and is not at all devoid of qualities.

The fifth issue whether Adwaita is the same as or different from Buddhism, whether Adwaita is Vaidic, *i. e.*, consistent with the Vedas or avaidic *ie.* contradictory to the Vedas — has been argued out by the parties and Vakils, and the Court after careful consideration comes to the conclusion that Adwaita and Buddhism are identical, Adwaita is the same as the Sunya Vada (Buddhism) for the following reasons,

THE PRINCIPLES OF ADWAITA.

(1) Brahman is qualitative existent. knowledge, bliss unknowable and indescribable.

(2) The Vedas, the gods, sacrifices holy waters like

THE PRINCIPLES OF SUNYA VADA BUDDHISM

(1) Sunya is qualityless, existent, knowledge, bliss unknowable and indescribable.

(2) The Vedas, the gods, sacrifices, holy waters like

the Ganges, the four castes and stages, the higher worlds and other things of the whole Universe are all unreal like the horns of the hare or the mirage or a dream. Only Brahman is transcendently real.

(3) The finite soul by meditating 'I am Brahman, I am Brahman' realises Brahman and becomes Brahman

(3) The finite soul by meditating as 'I am Sunya, I am Sunya' realises Sunya and becomes Sunya.

In consideration of the identity of the two systems on these essential principles, the Court comes to the conclusion that the two systems are one and the same.

Once when evil-minded people became attached to Vedas and Vedic dharmas and when by the strength so attained they began to tease the devas, the Almighty God at the request of the devas, appeared as Buddha and wrote the deluding Buddhistic Sastras with the object of diverting the evil-minded from the Vedic dharma and thereby weakening them. When again after some time the wicked people took to the Vedic path and began to do the Vedic dharma, Rudra instructed by Bhagavan Narayana took the form of a Brahmin, misinterpreted the Vedic passages and began to propagate the tenets of Buddhism under the new garb of Mayavada (Adwaita).

In their Adwaita Sastra are taught the following doctrines—that Brahman and the finite soul are identical, that Brahman is qualitless and that the Universe is unreal. On this question the Court has been guided by the unimpeachable evidence of (1) Vishnupurana, (2) Padma-Purana

(1) प्रसीद नाथदैत्येभ्यः त्राहिनः शरणाधिनिः । त्रैलोक्य यज्ञभागाश्च
दैत्यैर्हृदिपुरोगमैः ॥ हता नो ब्रह्मणो व्याज्ञमुल्लंघ्य परमेश्वर । स्ववर्ण धर्माभिरता
वेदमार्गानुसारिणः ॥ नशक्यास्तेरयो हंतुमस्माभिस्तपसा वृताः । तमुपायमशे
षात्मन् अस्माकं दातुमर्हसि ॥ येन तानसुरान्हंतुं भवेमभगवन् क्षमाः ॥ इत्युक्तो
भगवांस्तेभ्यो मायामोहं शरीरतः । समुत्पाद्य ददौ विष्णुः प्राहचेदं सुरोत्तमान् ॥
मायामोहोऽयमखिलान् दैत्यांस्तान् मोहयिष्यति । ततो ब्रह्मा भविष्यति वेदमार्गं
बहिष्कृताः ॥ इत्युक्ताः प्रणिपत्यैनं ययुर्देवा यथागतम् ॥

(2) पार्वत्युवाच - तामसानि च शास्त्राणि समाचक्ष्व ममानघ । संप्रो
क्तानिचैर्विप्रैर्भगवद्भक्तिवर्जितैः । तेषां नामानि क्रमशः समाचक्ष्व सुरेश्वर ।

रुद्रमुवाच - शृणु देवि प्रवक्ष्यामि तामसानि यथाक्रमं । येषां स्मरणमात्रेण
पातित्यं ज्ञानिनामपि । प्रथमं हि मया प्रोक्तं शैवं पाशुपतादिकं । मच्छक्यावोशि
तैर्विप्रैः प्रोक्तानि च ततः शृणु । कणादेन तु संप्रोक्तं शास्त्रं वैशेषिकं महत् ।
गौतमेन तथान्यायं सांख्यं तु कपिलेन वै । धिषणेन तथा प्रोक्तं चार्वाकमपि
गर्हितं । दैत्यानां नाशनार्थाय विष्णुना बुद्धरूपिणा ॥ बौद्धशास्त्रमसत्प्रोक्तं
नग्ननीलपट्टादिकं । मायावादमसच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं बौद्धमुच्यते । मयैव कथितं देवि
कलौ ब्राह्मणरूपिणा । अपार्थं श्रुतिवाक्यानां दर्शयन् लोकगर्हितं ।
परेशजीवयोरैक्यं मया तु प्रतिपाद्यते । ब्रह्मणोऽस्य स्वयं रूपं निर्गुणं वक्ष्यते मया ।
सर्वस्य जगतोऽप्यत्र मोहनार्थं कलौ युगे । वेदार्थवन्महाशास्त्रं मायावादमवैदिकं ॥
(पद्मपुराणम्.)

and (3) Brihad-Brahma Sambhita. It is clear therefore that Advaita is Buddhism.

Again that this identification of Advaita with Buddhism is as old as the age of Gaudapada the teacher of Sankara, becomes evident from (a) the work of (4) Gaudapadacharya, (b) the commentary thereon of (5) Sankaracharya, (c) the work of (6) Anandagiri which is a commentary on (b); (d) from (7) Mitakshara and (e) (8) Gaudapadiya viveka both of which are the commentaries on Gaudapada karika, (f) the opinions of (9) Bhaskara

(3) राजन् कार्यस्य मिथ्यात्वं नैर्गुण्यम् परमात्मनः । आभासवादो जीवस्य पाण्डैरूपकाल्पितः । नैतद्विश्वसनीयं ते मयोक्तमपि मायया । आज्ञया वासु देवस्य मोहनाय सुरद्विषां । प्रवर्तितमसच्छास्त्रमयथार्थस्य शासनात्.....माया वादमिदंशास्त्रं मायामोहं प्रवर्तितम् ।

(4) ज्ञानमात्रं पारमार्थिकं । तत्रैव ज्ञातृज्ञेयादि कल्पितमिति सौगत मतमेव भवतापि संगृहीतमित्याशङ्क्याह ज्ञानमिति (आनन्द.)

(5) ज्ञानं नैतद्बुद्धेन भाषितम् (गौडपादीयम्.)

(6) ज्ञानज्ञेयज्ञातृभेदरहितं परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वयमेतन्न बुद्धेन भाषितम्.

(7) The texts quoted in F. N. 1, 2, 3.

यद्यपि बाह्यार्थनिराकरणम् ज्ञानमात्रकल्पनाच्चाद्वय-वस्तुसामीप्यमुक्तं इदं तु परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वैतं वेदांतेष्वेव विज्ञेयमित्यर्थः । (शां. भा.)

(8) ननु ज्ञानमात्रमेव तत्त्वं ज्ञातृज्ञेयादिसर्वं तत्रकल्पितं बौद्धमताचारः स्यात् इत्यत आह । नैतदिति । यद्यपि बाह्यार्थनिराकरणम् ज्ञानमात्रस्यास्तित्वं च स्वीकृतं तथापि नैतदद्वैतदर्शनं बुद्धेन सुगतेन भाषितम् भेदाङ्गीकारादित्यर्थः । परमार्थाद्वैतदर्शनं वेदांतैक गम्यमिति नास्यसाधारणमित्यर्थः.

(Madras Oriental Government Library R. N. 3882).

(9) येषु बौद्धमतावलम्बिनो मायावादिनस्तेष्वनेन न्यायेन सूत्रकारेणैव निरस्ता वेदितव्याः । 'महायानिकबौद्धगाथितं मायावादं व्यावर्णयंतो लोकान् व्यामोहयन्ति' ।

(g) (10) Vignana Bhikshu (h) (11) Parthasarathy Misra, the scholarly contemporary of Sankaracharya.

The Court agrees with these learned Pandits and declares that Adwaita and Buddhism are identical-

We have considered very carefully the remark of the defendant that the Plaintiff is bringing this Suit and insulting them on account of mere hatred. It is contended that Bhaskaracharya and others are inspired by mere hatred when they identify Adwaita with Buddhism. They also add that if these hostile criticisms inspired by hatred be accepted as true, every religion and Philosophy would be in danger, for every system has its own foes who never fail to damn the opponent's system. This argument has been considered well and has been rejected by the Court as it deserves to be, for it is absurd to maintain that Badarayana Vedavyasa who is considered by Adwaitins themselves (12) to be an avatara of Narayana Himself speaks falsehood, being inspired by the spirit of hatred.

(10) येतुरज्जुसर्पादिवत् प्रपञ्चस्यात्यन्ततुच्छत्वमिच्छन्ति तेतु बौद्धप्रमे
दाएव । मायावादमच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं बौद्धमेवच इत्यादि पञ्चपुराणवक्यात् ।
असत्यमप्रतिष्ठितं जगदादुरनीश्वरं इत्यादि गीतावाक्याच्च ।

(11) 'तद्वरं अस्मान्मायावादात् महायानिकवादः'

(12) द्वापरे द्वापरे विष्णुः व्यासरूपी महामुने । वेदमेकं सुबहुधा
कुरुते जगतोहितं । (पराशरः)

The rule has been recognised by all that as long as a statement — be the witness rich or poor—remains uncontradicted, it must be accepted as true. To come to the point the statement of learned men like Bhaskaracharya that Adwaita is Buddhism has not been falsified. The consideration of the tenets of both the systems brings us to the same conclusion. The Court does not agree with the defendant that Bhaskara and others were inspired by hatred.

The Adwaitic scholar who is the author of *Brahma-Vidya-Bharana* in commenting on 2-2-39 (*Brahmasutras*) makes the unambiguous remark (13) that if only the *Sunya-Vadins* should postulate that their *Sunya* is existent, *Sunya* becomes identical with *Brahman*, and that *Sunya vada* becomes the same as *Adwaita*.

Even if *Sunya* is described to be of the nature of the non-existence of the world, in as much as *Brahman* is also described to be of the nature of the absence of the world, in standard

(13) शून्यवादिपक्षस्तु, सर्वप्रमाण विप्रतिषिद्ध इति तन्निराकरणाय नादरः क्रियते (ब्र. सू. शां. भा. २-२-३९) शून्यपदेन सर्वप्रपञ्चातीतं भावरूपं किञ्चित्त्वं विवक्षितम् उत अभावरूपं? नाद्यः, तथासति वाचोयुक्त्यं तरेण ब्रह्मवादएव आश्रितः, यदि द्वितीयः पक्षः तदा सर्वप्रमाण विरोधः॥ सर्वप्रमाणैः प्रपञ्चे उपलभ्यमाने तदभाव एव तत्वमिति निरूपयितुमशक्यमिति दूषणस्य स्फुटतया न तन्निराकरणाय सूत्रकृता सूत्राण्यारचितानि इति (ब्रह्मविद्याभरणे २-२-३९)

works of Adwaita, such as (14) Adwaita Siddhi and (15) Khandana khandakhadya, it follows that Adwaita and Buddhism are identical.

The contention of the defendant that it is not proper to label as Buddhism the philosophy of Sankaracharya who put down Buddhism, does not hold good because in (16) Sarva Siddhanta Sangraha Sankaracharya himself admits that the credit of putting down Buddhism and other Nastika religions goes to Kumarila Bhattacharya. The following story from Sankara Vijaya * written by Anandagiri corroborates the above fact. The story is as follows—An excellent Brahmin won over in Sastraic controversy numberless Buddhists, many Jains embracing the wicked religion got their heads under loyal Proclamation cut and

(14) प्रपंचनिषेधाधिकरणीभूत ब्रह्मभिन्नत्वान्निषेधस्य तात्त्विकत्वेपि नाद्वैतहानिकरत्वं.

(15) भावेऽभावानतिरेक स्वीकारादेवाद्वैताव्याघातः' अस्माभिरपि ब्रह्मातिरिक्ताभावानङ्गीकारान्नाद्वैत-व्याघातः'

(16) बौद्धादि नास्तिकध्वस्त वेदमार्गपुराकिल। भट्टाचार्यः कुमारान्शः स्थापयामासभूतले। वेदबाह्यान्निराकृत्य भट्टाचार्यैर्गतेपथि (शां. सर्व. सि.)

* भट्टाचार्याख्यो द्विजवरः कश्चिदुदग्देशादागत्य दुष्टमतावलंबिनो बौद्धान् जैना नसंख्यान् राजमुखादनेक विद्याप्रसंग भेदैर्निर्जित्य एषां शीर्षाणि परशुभिः श्लिष्ट्वा बहुषु उल्लखलेषु निक्षिप्य कटभ्रमणैश्चूर्णीकृत्यचैवंदुष्ट मतध्वंसमाचरन् निर्भयोवर्तते. श्रुत्वैतदद्भुतं कर्म गुरुः (शंकरः) शिष्यसमान्वितः प्राप्तो रुद्धाक्यनगरम् जयशब्द विजृम्भितं (तदनु) जानुमात्र दग्धोपि भट्टाचार्यः तं (शंकराचार्यप्रति) जाग्रत्कालानागतोनूतनो बौद्धतरः इति प्राहेत्यादि (आनन्द-गिरि शंकरविजये)

powdered in mortar and was living a life of peace and tranquility. Sankara who heard of this wonderful event went with all his disciples to the town of Ruddha which was reverberating with the singing of Victory. At that time Kumarila accosted Sankaracharya thus, "You, prince of the Neo-Buddhists, you did not come when I was in my vigour. Now I am burnt up to my knees. The same story is told by (17) Vidyaranya in his Sankara Vijaya. In the light of these stories handed down by Adwaitins themselves the Court deems it false to say that Sankara put down Buddhism.

The defendant contends that the Sunya of Buddhists is not qualitless, not existent, not knowledgs, not bliss, not unknowable and indescribable and therefore such Sunya cannot be identified with the Adwaitin's, Brahman which is qualitless, existent, knowledge, bliss, etc. The Court does not accept the Validity of this contention for the following reasons.

From the (18)note of Sankara in his Sahasra-nama Bhashya that Brahma is Sunya on account of its being qualitless as well as the (19)text

(17) उपन्यसत्सु साक्षेपं खंडयत्सुपरस्परं । तेषूदतिष्ठन्निर्घोषोभि
दन्निवरसातलम् । अधः पेतुर्बुधेद्रेण क्षताः पक्षेषु तत्क्षणं । व्यूढकर्कशतर्केण
तथागत धराधराः॥ निरस्ताखिल संदेहो विन्यस्तेतरदर्शनात् । व्यधादाज्ञांत
तोराजा वधायश्रुति विद्विषां । आसेतोरातुषाराद्रे बौद्धानावृद्धबालकम् । नहंति
यस्सहंतव्यो भृत्यानित्यन्वशानृपः । कुमारिल मृगेन्द्रण हतेषुजिनहास्तिषु ।
निष्प्रत्युहमवार्धतश्रुतिशाखास्समंततः (विद्या, शं. विजय)

(18) 'निर्विशेषत्वात् शून्यवच्छून्यः' (19) 'निर्विशेषं स्वयंभातं'

of the Buddhists it follows that Sunya is qualitative like the Brahman of Advaitins.

From (1) passages like the (2) following, from Buddhistic works which state that there are two kinds of reality, viz, phenomenal and transcendental, as well as from Advaitic works like (3) Bhamati which concedes reality to the Sunya of Sunyavadins, it follows that Sunya like Brahman is existent.

From the passages of (4) Advaita Siddhi (5) Gunda Brahmanandiya as well as (6) of some of (7) Buddhistic works, it is clear that the Sunya of Buddhists is like the Brahman of Advaitins, knowledge and Bliss.

The contention of the defendant that Sunya cannot be existent just because in Advaita Siddhi Sunya is described as being knowledge and bliss and devoid of existence is not correct because from the remarks of Buddhists (8) that Sunya is is transcendentally real, as well as of Advaitic works (9) that the Sunya of the Sunya Vadins is

(1) 'द्वै सत्ये समुपाश्रित्य बुद्धानां धर्मदेशना । लोके सांवृतसत्यं च सत्यं च परमार्थतः ॥' (2) 'शून्यवादिनां शून्यताया अपि सत्यत्वात्'

(3) 'शून्यवादिभिरपि सत्त्वरहित ज्ञानानंदत्मकवत्प्र ब्रह्मणोन्यतांगीकारात्'

(4) 'शून्यवादस्य विज्ञानवाद विशेषरूपत्वात् तथा चानंदोऽपि ज्ञानाकारत्वात् ज्ञानाभिन्नइति ज्ञानात्मकानंदवत्त्वं तन्मते (शून्यवादिमते) ब्रह्मभिन्नेऽपीति'

(5) 'केवलां संविदं स्वस्थां मन्यन्ते मध्यमाः पुनः' (6) 'अद्वयज्ञानैकरूपां शून्यतां विमान्य ॐ शून्यज्ञानवज्रस्वभावात्मकोहं' (7) 'केवलां अद्वयविज्ञति लक्षणां'

(8) 'सत्यं च परमार्थतः' (9) 'शून्यवादिनामपि शून्यतायाः सत्यत्वात्'

existent, it follows that the Sunya is existent. On this question the opinion of the author of Adwaita Siddhi is no authority and cannot be accepted.

From the statement of the Buddhists (10) that Sunya is qualitless, Self-evident, flawless, not subject to old age and death, unknowable, beyond the grasp of mind and speech, it follows that the Sunya of Buddhists and the Brahman of Adwaitins are only two names. The two are identical.

Adwaitins (11) contend that their Brahman is devoid of any quality or nature. They emphatically assert that there is no kind of distinction of name or action. Therefore it is impossible in the very nature of the case to distinguish Brahman from Sunya.

In view of all these convincing arguments and evidence the Court decides that the Brahman of Adwaitins is identical with the Sunya of Buddhists.

Judgement on the topic of the Universe including Vedas etc.

The Adwaitins accept the Vedas as authoritative, observe all the dharmas enjoined in them,

(10) निर्विशेषं स्वयं भातं निर्लेपमजरामरं शून्यं तत्त्वमविज्ञेयं मनोवाचागोचरं'

(11) 'नाम वा कर्म वा भेदो वा न ब्रह्मण्यस्ति'

such as the four castes, stages, the holy bath, sacrifices study of Vedas,—get their mind purified thereby, through hearing, reflection, meditation and Vedantic study, realise Brahman and become Brahman. So they are Astikas, whereas to Buddhists the Vedas are no authority. They do not recognise the castes and stages and their respective dharmas and sacrifices as enjoined in the Vedas. Therefore they (Buddhists) are Nastikas. It is absurd to identify the system of Buddhists who are Nastikas with that of Advaitins who are the best of the Astikas. Such is the argument of the defendant. This argument is puerile and invalid for the following reasons. The astikas believe in the higher worlds, the means of reaching them, and God the giver of fruits; and they accordingly do some acts for meriting the higher world. The Nastikas are those who say that there is no higher world and do not perform any meritorious deed to reach it.

Relevant to this question are the following remarks of Advaitic Scholars.

(a) Sankara in his commentary on 2-1-14 (Brahma Sutras) (12) asks how the real Brahman could be established by the unreal Vedantic passages. (13) The attainment of Heaven etc by performing Jyotishtoma Sacrifice is as false as the attainment of Heaven in a dream by performing

(12) कथं त्वसत्येनवाक्येन सत्यस्य ब्रह्मत्वस्यासिद्धिः.

(13) ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामोयजेत'

in dreams the Jyotishtoma Sacrifice. The creation of Ether, etc., is false like the horn of the hare (Vide Siddhanta-lesa-Sangraha) (14)

(b) (15) If the objects of wakeful life are all illusory, what is the difference between the Universe and the objects in a dream. Both are superimposed and false (Vide Sankshepa Sariraka). (16)

(c) Even as the objects in a dream, objects in jugglery, the castle in the air, are all false, so also the Universe is false, It has no origin, no end. There is no body in bondage, no one to exert himself for Salvation, no one who desires it, no body who has attained it. The whole Universe is unreal, (17) (Vide Gaudapada karika) and its commentary by Sankara. (18) From these

(14) ज्योतिष्टोमादि श्रुतिबोधितानुष्ठानात् फलसिद्धिः स्वप्नश्रुति बोधितानुष्ठान प्रयुक्तफलसंवादतुल्या.

(15) स्वप्नेकश्चित् कदाचित् ज्योतिष्टोमादिश्रुतिं कल्पयित्वा ततः साधनविशेषं सुपलभ्य तदनुष्ठानात् फलं लभते तत्तुल्यं जागरणेऽपि स्वर्गादि फलं लभनं विधिदादि सृष्टितत्कमादेः शशशृंगायमाणत्वं.

(16) ननु कल्पितं यदि हि जागरितं वद कीदृशी खलु विलक्षणता । स्वपनादमुष्य भ्रमतो भिमता परिकल्पितत्वं मुमयोस्तु समं ॥

(17) स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे गंधर्वनगरं यथा । तथा विश्वमिदं दृष्टं वेदांतेषु विचक्षणैः ॥ न निरोधो न चोत्तिः न बद्धो न च साधकः । न मुमुक्षुः न वैमुक्तः (गौडपादकारिका)

(18) गंधर्वनगरं दृश्यमानमेव सत् अकस्मादभावतां गतं दृष्टं यथा च स्वप्नमाये दृष्टे असद्रूपे तथा विश्वमिदं द्वैतं समस्तमसत् द्वैतस्यासत्त्वात्. (गौ शां. भा.)

authorities of Adwaita, it is clear that the Adwaitins have admitted that the Universe is false like a dream, or a castle in the air.

It is evident from the passage (1) of the Buddhistic system that to them also the Universe is unreal like a dream or a castle in the air.

Adwaitins say that the higher worlds, and the means of reaching them are all unreal like a dream or a mirage. They deny any world to be reached by them, any act to be done, anything to be heard, or anything to be contemplated. In the famous story of a man being pursued (2) a mad elephant, Adwaitins denied the reality of both the elephant and the act of being pursued. Likewise they deny the reality of the holy baths, prayers, sacrifices, Vedic study, but pretend to observe all these even as Buddhists who assert the unreality of heaven and the means of reaching it, pretend to do something to merit Heaven, merely for deceiving good people. The truth is that on the topic of the Universe also the two systems hold the identical view. Under such circumstances it is absurd to label one of them (Adwaitins) as Astikas and the other (Buddhists) as Nastikas. So the Court decrees that both the systems are Nastikas. Both the Buddhists and Adwaitins are Nastikas.

(1) यथा माया यथा स्वप्नं गंधर्वनगरं यथा । तथोत्पादस्तथास्थानं तथा भोग उदाहृतः ॥

(2) 'न हि स्वप्नसुखाद्यर्थं धर्मे कश्चित् प्रवर्तते । नास्तिक्य परिहारार्थं 'स्वर्गकामधैत्यं वंदेत्'

“Adwaitins regard the Vedas as authoritative and deem the higher world, etc., as phenomenally real. Buddhists do not recognise the authority of the Vedas nor do they recognise the phenomenal reality of the Universe etc., referred to in the Vedas. Therefore the Adwaitins are astikas and the Buddhists are nastikas.” —this contention is not sound and valid for the following reasons.

Even as Adwaitins consider the Universe to be phenomenally real, so also Buddhists consider (1) the Universe as phenomenally real. (2) Vide the statements of (a) Buddhists (b) Vartikakara and (c) Bhamati. Therefore Adwaita cannot be distinguished from Buddhism on this question of phenomenal reality of the Universe.

If there is a wall there is the possibility of drawing on it. How is it possible to draw or paint without a canvas or wall? When the Vedas are deemed false a mirage like, where is the relevancy or possibility of the authenticity of the Vedas. It is impossible. So to say that Adwaitins regard the Vedas as authoritative whereas Buddhists do not, and therefore the two are different, is not Valid.

It is clear from Sankacharyas Bhashya and Bhamati that the instruments of knowledge

‘द्वे सत्त्वे समुपाश्रित्य’ ‘नास्तिक्य परिहारार्थं संवृतिः कल्पनेति च’
‘यद्युच्येत’ ‘सतिकुड्ये चित्रं कर्म’

give us only transcendently real knowledge and never phenomenally real knowledge. To say that the higher worlds, sacrifices the Gods etc, which are referred to in the Vedas are only phenomenally real is inconsistent with their own position.

The sanskrit word *Pramana* literally means that which generates knowledge of transcendently real things. (Pra = pertaining to transcendently real objects, ma = knowledge, ana = generater). In other words the objects known through a *Pramana* or instrument of knowledge is transcendently real. No less than the Adwaitic scholar Appaya Dikshita has interpreted phenomenal reality as that which is contradicted like the Silverness of shell, that which is not true in all the three times. Therefore to say that the higher worlds etc., are phenomenally real is to say that they do not exist in all the three times and that the Vedas etc., which refer to such phenomenally real worlds are not authoritative. They do not refer to transcendently real things. In the light of this evidence, it is wrong to distinguish Adwaita from Buddhism, that the former recognises the authority of the Vedas while the latter does not.

Nor is it possible to distinguish the two systems as Adwaitins do, that according to Adwaita, the finite Soul, after gaining direct Vision of Brahman, becomes Brahman who is Bliss; but that according to Buddhism the finite Soul gets direct Vision of Sunya and becomes Sunya.

Just as Advaitins maintain that Brahman is bliss and knowledge, so also Buddhists say that their Sunya is bliss and Knowledge. Even as the adwaitins say that the released soul doer not enjoy bliss but becomes Brahman which is Bliss, so the Buddhists say that the released soul becomes Sunya. So even in the state of Salvation or Moksha, there is no distinction between the two systems.

Thus the Court decrees that Adwaita is identical with the avidic Buddhistic system which maintains that Sunya alone is real.

Adwaita proved identical with Vignanavadi Bauddha theory.

The principles of Buddhism are taught to three types of students.

देशना लोकनाथानां 'विनेयभदाद्वा' 'हीन मध्यमोत्कृष्टत्रयः' २-२-१८

(a) When the Universe is known through perception etc., if it is contended at the very outset that in reality everything is only Sunya, the foolish disciples cannot grasp the truth. So these disciples of low intelligence are taught that the Universe is real, momentary, but they are gradually led up to the recognition that ultimately Sunya is real.

(b) The intermediate fellows are taught that only knowledge (Vignana) is real and that on it is superimposed the whole Universe. But these two are led up to the recognition that ultimately Sunya is real.

(c) The advanced students are taught straightway that only Sunya is ultimately real and that on it the whole Universe is superimposed (Vide Buddhism, Sankara Bhashya and Bhamati).

From these authorities it is clear that the real spirit of Buddhism is the ultimate reality of Sunya. Having proved that Adwaita is the same as Sunyavada, it follows clearly that Adwaita is the same as Vignanavada.

PRINCIPLES OF ADWAITA

PRINCIPLES OF VIGNANA VADA.

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1) Vignana Brahman only is real. | (1) Vignana only is real. |
| (2) The whole Universe is superimposed on Vignana | (2) The whole Universe is superimposed on Vignana |

(1) The fact of this identity is clear from Sankara Bhashya on Gaudapadiyaviveka Anandagiriya, Mitakashara, Gaudapadiyakarika. Sankshepa Sariraka, Sankara Vijaya.

(1) ननु सर्वस्यापि वियदादेप्रपंचस्य स्वप्नतुल्यत्वे तद्विज्ञानात्मकमेव सर्वं वक्तव्यं ततश्च विज्ञानवादि समयप्रवेशापात्तिरिति शङ्कते.

ननु शाक्यबिष्णुसमयेन समः प्रतिभात्ययं च भगवत्समयः यदि बाह्यवस्तु वितथं नु कथं समयाविमौ न सदृशौ भवतः (2-25)

नन्विति शाक्यौ जिनबौद्धौ विज्ञानवादी तत्सिद्धांतेनेत्यर्थं भगवतो व्यास भगवत्पादादेः (शंकराचार्यस्य) समय इत्यर्थः ननु विज्ञानवादिना वेद प्रामाण्याद्यनभ्युपगमात् कथं तदभ्युपगंतुं भगवत्समयस्य तत्समयतुल्यमेति चेत्सत्यंतथापि विज्ञानातिरेक विज्ञेयानभ्युपगमे कथं न तत्तुल्यम् तेनापि

So the Court deliver that Adwaita and Vignana Vada are identical

The contention of Adwaitins "That though the two systems agree in maintaining that only Vignana is real and on it is superimposed the whole Universe, the two are really different because the Vignana (Brahman) of Adwaita is knowable through the Upanishads, one and unchanging while the Vignana of the Buddhists is not knowable through the upnishads, manifold and changing"—is not vailed for the following reasons.

When Adwaitins like Buddhists maintain that only knowledge is real and on it is superimposed the whole Universe including the four castes and Stages, Sacrifice, Gods, worship higher worlds etc, what does it matter whether the knowledge is one or many, changing or unchanging

The performance of Sacrifices, holy baths worship etc by Adwaitins as if they were astika is inconsistent with their fundamental and foundational principles. Therefore Adwaitins are nastikas as Buddhists nothing can be gained by contending that the knowledge of the Adwaitins is one and unchanging.

On a real consideration of the matter in as

तथैवांगीकारादित्याह यदीति बाह्यं विज्ञानातिरिक्तं वस्तु वितथमलौकिकं कथं न्वि
ति संबंधः व्यतिरेकमुखेन उक्तमतद्वयसाध्यमन्वयेनाप्याह 'यदिबोधएव पर
मार्थवपुर्न तुबोध्यमित्यभिमतं भवति । ननुचाश्रितं भवति बुद्धमुनेर्मतमेव
कृत्स्नमिह मस्करिभिः' 26

much as the knowledge of Adwaitins is qualitiless and devoid of all kinds of distinction, it is impossible to predicate oneness, unchangingness, knowablity from Vedas and distinction from Buddhism.

As the Vignana of the Buddhists is also qualitiless, momentariness and manyness cannot be predicated of it. Further the quality of eternality is connected with several things and is part-ful, while the Brahman of Adwaitins is without parts.

Hence it is impossible to predicate the part-ful eternality of the partless Braman.

In a sloka (1) of Dasasloki Sankara maintains that oneness is due to ignorance and is not present in Braman, nor could Brahman be said to possess existence or knowledge. Similarly as the Vignana of the Buddhists is qualitiless, it cannot have manyness or momentariness. As momentariness implies parts, it cannot be predicated of the partless knowledge (Vignana) of Buddhists. Madhusudana Sarasvati in his commentary on Saukshepa Sariraka 2-6-9 remarks(2) that in case the Alaya Vignana (knowledge) should be unchanging it is Brahman (of the Adwaitins.) Combining this evidence with the remark of the Author of Bhabmati in his commentary on Brama Sutras 2-2-3 that Buddhists maintain

(1) किंच आलयविज्ञानं स्थायिचेत् नामांतरेण अस्मदात्मैव स्यात्

(2) आलयविज्ञानं समस्तवासनाधारमभ्युपगच्छन् अक्षरं (अविनाशिनम्) आत्ममभ्युपैति' (२-२-३३)

that their alaya Vignana (knowledge) is unchanging it follows that the Vignana of the Buddhists is identical with the Brahman of Adwaitins. So it is absurd to distinguish the two by saying that the (Brahman) Vignana of Adwaitins is one and unchanging, while the Vignana of Buddhists is many and unchanging.

If any word is to denote an object, there must be in that object, substance, or attribute or activity or species, or distinction or relation. The Brahman of Adwaitins, does not possess any of these qualities. Therefore it cannot be known through any word. Hence to say that the knowledge of Adwaitins is possible only through the Upanishads is impossible. Consequently it is wrong to distinguish the two systems by saying that the Vignana of Buddhists cannot be known through the Upanishads, while that of Adwaitins can be. The Universe is admitted by both to be illusory and superimposed. Hence the Vignana of Buddhists is the same as the Brahman of Adwaitins.

Decree

1. The defendant should not preach Advaita which is really avaidic as Vaidic. They should not say that their Philosophy is grounded in the Vedas.
2. Good people must not be misguided by the teaching of Adwaitins. In their own interest

they must not meditate as (1) "I am Brahman as interpreted by Adwaitins.

- 3, If Adwaitins should violate the order made in Para (1) or the Good people violate the order passed in (2), they become punishable according to Section XVI chap (2) of the Bhagawad Gita—without ever attaining to God they reach the worst state.

This decree has been given in the interests of all people, so that they may know God as described in the (3) Vedas, Sutras and the Gita—that He is the Supreme Being, the first creator of the Universe and the father of Brahma, Siva, etc. Good men will by virtue of their correct meditation attain direct Vision of God, get rid of all bondage, reach God and enjoy everlasting bliss in all desirable and desired ways in Vaikunta and other regions of Heaven as described in the Upanishads.

Dharma Raja H. B.

Samyaminipura }
10-3-1929 }

Chief Judge,
High Court.

(1) व्यदापश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिं । तदा विद्वान् पुण्यपापेविधूय निरंजनः परमं साम्यमुपैति । (2) 'यो मामेवमसंमूढो जानातिपुरुषोत्तमं इति बुद्ध्वा बुद्धिमान्स्यात् कृतकृत्यश्च भारत ।' अनावृत्तिश्च दनावृत्तिश्च ।

(3) "स एष संप्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात् परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते सतत्रपर्येति जक्षन् क्रीडन् रममाणः कामाजीकामरूप्यनुसंचरन्"

The quotations relating to the first Eighteen pages printed in the Sri Vyasa Press, as well as the body of the book from page 17 and the Judgment portion.

Page 5. Line 3

बौद्धादि नास्तिकध्वस्त वेदमार्गपुराकिल। भट्टाचार्यः कुमारांशः
स्थापयामासभूतले। वेदबाह्याभिराकृत्य भट्टाचार्यैर्गतेपथि (शां. सर्व. सि.)

Page 5. Line 18.

भट्टाचार्यख्यो द्विजवरः कश्चिदुदग्देशादागत्य दुष्टमतावलंबिनो बौद्धान्
जैना नसंख्यानं राजमुखादनेक विद्याप्रसंग भेदैर्निर्जित्य एषां शीर्षाणि परशुभि
रिच्छत्वा बहुषु उल्लखलेषु निक्षिप्य कटभ्रमणैश्चूर्णीकृत्यचैवंदुष्ट मतध्वंसमाचरन्
निर्भयोवर्तते. श्रुत्वैतदद्भुतं कर्म गुरुः (शंकरः) शिष्यसमन्वितः प्राप्तो
रुद्राक्यनगरम् जयशब्द विजृम्भितं (तदनु) जानुमात्र दग्धोपि भट्टाचार्यः तं
(शंकराचार्यप्रति) जाग्रत्कालानागतो नूतनो बौद्धतरः इति प्राहेत्यादि (आनन्द-
गिरि शंकरविजये)

Page 6. Line 13.

उपन्यस्तसु साक्षेपं खंडयत्सुपरस्परं । तेषूदतिष्ठन्निर्वोषोभि
दन्निवरसातलम् । अधः पेतुर्बुधेन्द्रेण क्षताः पक्षेषु तत्क्षणं । व्यूढकर्कशतर्केण
तथागत धराधराः । निरस्ताखिल संदेहो विन्यस्तेतरदर्शनात् । व्यधादाज्ञांत
तोराजा वधायश्रुति विद्विषां । आसेतोरातुपाराद्रे बौद्धानावृद्धबालकम् । नहंति
यस्सहंतव्यो भृत्यानिल्यन्वशानृपः । कुमारिल मृगेन्द्रण हतेषुजिनहस्तिषु ।
निष्प्रत्यहमवार्धतश्रुतिशाखास्समंततः (विद्या, शं. विजये)

Page 8. Line 6.

पार्वत्युवाच - तामसानि च शास्त्राणि समाचक्ष्व ममानघा संप्रोक्तानिचयैर्विप्रैर्भगवद्भक्तिर्जितैः । तेषां नामानि क्रमशः समाचक्ष्व सुरेश्वर ।

रुद्रमुवाच - शृणु देवि प्रवक्ष्यामि तामसानि यथाक्रमं । येषां स्मरणमात्रेण पातित्यं ज्ञानिनामपि । प्रथमं हि मयाप्रोक्तं शैवं पाशुपतादिकं । मच्छक्त्यावेशितैर्विप्रैः प्रोक्तानिच ततः शृणु । कणादेनतु संप्रोक्तं शास्त्रं वैशेषिकं महत् । गौतमेन तथान्यायं सांख्यंतु कपिलेनवै । धिषणेन तथाप्रोक्तं चार्वाकमतिगर्हितं । दैत्यानां नाशनार्थाय विष्णुना बुद्धरूपिणा ॥

Page 8. Line 21.

बौद्धशास्त्रमसत्प्रोक्तं नग्ननीलपटादिकं।मायावादमसच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं बौद्धमुच्यते । मयैवकथितंदेवि कलौब्राह्मणरूपिणा । अपार्थं श्रुतिवाक्यानां दर्शयन् लोकगर्हितं ।.....परंशजीवयोरेक्यं मयातु प्रतिपद्यते । ब्रह्मणोऽस्य स्वयरूपंनिर्गुणं वक्ष्यतमयो । सर्वस्यजगताप्यत्रे मोहनार्थकञ्चैयुगे । वेदार्थवन्महाशास्त्रं मायावादमवैदिकं॥ (पद्मपुराणम्.)

Page 8, Line 31.

राजन् कार्यस्य मिथ्यात्वं नैर्गुण्यम् परमात्मनः । आभासवादो जीवस्य पाषंडैरुपकल्पितः।नैतद्विश्वसनीयं ते मयोक्तमपि मायया । भाज्ञया वासुदेवस्य मोहनाय सुरद्विषां । प्रवर्तितमसच्छास्त्रमयथार्थस्य शासनात्.....मायावादमिदंशास्त्रं मायामोह प्रवर्तितम् ।

Page 8. Line 32

‘यच्छून्यवादिनांशून्यम् ब्रह्म ब्रह्म विदांचयत्’

Page 9. Line 8.

यद्यापि बाह्यार्थनिराकरणम् ज्ञानमात्रकल्पनाच्चाद्वय वस्तुसामीप्यमुक्तं
ज्ञानज्ञेयज्ञातृभेदरहितं परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वयमेतन्न बुद्धेन भाषितम् इदंतु
परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वैतं वेदांतेष्वेव विज्ञेयमित्यर्थः । (शां. भा.)

Page 9. Line 11.

ज्ञानं नैतद्बुद्धेन भाषितम् (गौडपादीयम्.)
ज्ञानमात्रं पारमार्थिकं । तत्रैव ज्ञातृज्ञेयादि कल्पितमिति सौगत मतमेव
भवतापि संगृहीतमित्याशंक्याह ज्ञानमिति (आनन्द.)

Page 9. Line 12 to 17.

‘वैधर्म्याच्च नस्वप्नादिवत्’ येतुबौद्ध मतावलंबिनो मायावादिनस्ते
‘अप्यनेन न्यायेन सूत्रकारेणैव निरस्ता वेदितव्याः’ महायानिकबौद्धगाथितं
‘मायावादं व्यावर्णयंतो लोकान् व्यामोहयंति’

Page 9. Line 27.

येतुरज्जुसर्पादिशब्दं प्रपंचस्यात्यंततुच्छत्वमिच्छंति तेतु बौद्धप्रभेदाएव।
मायावादमच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं बौद्धमेवच इत्यादि पद्मपुराणवक्यात् ।
असत्यमप्रतिष्ठंते जगदाद्गुरनीश्वरं इत्यादि गीतावाक्याच्च ।

Page 13. Line 22

अस्तिपरलोक इति बुद्धिर्यस्य स आस्तिकः. नास्ति परलोक इति
बुद्धिर्यस्य स नास्तिकः. मिथ्यादृष्टिर्नास्तिकता ।

Page 14. Line 14.

ब्रह्मसत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः.

Page 8. Line 6.

पार्वत्युवाच - तामसानि च शास्त्राणि समाचक्ष्व ममानवा संप्रो
क्तानिचयैर्विप्रैर्भगवद्भक्तिवर्जितैः । तेषां नामानि क्रमशः समाचक्ष्व सुरेश्वर ।

रुद्रबुवाच - शृणु देवि प्रवक्ष्यामि तामसानि यथाक्रमं । येषां स्मरणमात्रेण
पातित्यं ज्ञानिनामपि । प्रथमं हि मयाप्रोक्तं शैवं पाशुपतादिकं । मच्छक्त्यावोशि
तैर्विप्रैः प्रोक्तानिच ततः शृणु । कणादेनतु संप्रोक्तं शास्त्रं वैशेषिकं महत् ।
गौतमेन तथान्यायं सांख्यंतु कपिलेनवै । धिषणेन तथाप्रोक्तं चार्वाकमति
गर्हितं । दैत्यानां नाशनार्थाय विष्णुना बुद्धरूपिणा ॥

Page 8. Line 21.

बौद्धशास्त्रमसत्प्रोक्तं नग्ननीलपटादिकं।मायावादमसच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं
बौद्धमुच्यते । मयैवकथितंदेवि कलौब्राह्मणरूपिणा । अपार्थं श्रुतिवाक्यानां
दर्शयन् लोकगर्हितं । परंशजीवयोरैक्यं मयातु प्रतिपद्यते । ब्रह्मणोऽस्य
स्वरूपंनिर्गुणं वक्ष्यतमयो । सर्वस्यजगताप्यत्रे मोहनार्थकञ्चैयुगे । वेदार्थ
वन्महाशास्त्रं मायावादमवैदिकं । (पद्मपुराणम्.)

Page 8, Line 31.

राजन् कार्यस्य मिथ्यात्वं नैर्गुण्यम् परमात्मनः । आभासवादो
जीवस्य पाषंडैरुपकल्पितः।नैतद्विश्वसनीयं ते मयोक्तमपि मायया । आज्ञया वासु
देवस्य मोहनाय सुरद्विषां । प्रवर्तितमसच्छास्त्रमयथार्थस्य शासनात्.....माया
वादमिदंशास्त्रं मायामोह प्रवर्तितम् ।

Page 8. Line 32

‘यच्छून्यवादिनांशून्यम् ब्रह्म ब्रह्म विदांचयत्’

Page 9. Line 8.

• यद्यापि बाह्यार्थनिराकरणम् ज्ञानमात्रकल्पनाच्चाद्वय वस्तुसाम्यमुक्तं
ज्ञानज्ञेयज्ञातृभेदरहितं परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वयमेतन्न बुद्धेन भाषितम् इदंतु
परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वैतं वेदांतेष्वेव विज्ञेयमित्यर्थः । (शां. भा.)

Page 9. Line 11.

• ज्ञानं नैतद्बुद्धेन भाषितम् (गौडपादीयम्.)
ज्ञानमात्रं पारमार्थिकं । तत्रैव ज्ञातृज्ञेयादि कल्पितमिति सौगत मतमेव
भवतापि संगृहीतमित्याशंक्याह ज्ञानमिति (आनन्द.)

Page 9. Line 12 to 17.

‘वैधर्माच्च नस्वप्नादिवत्’ येतुबौद्ध मतावलंबिनो मायावादिनस्ते
‘न्यायेन न्यायेन सूत्रकारेणैव निरस्ता वेदितव्याः’ महायानिकबौद्धगार्थितं
‘मायावादं व्यावर्णयंतो लोकान् व्यामोहयन्ति’

Page 9. Line 27.

येतुरज्जुसर्गादिशत् प्रपंचस्थालंततुच्छत्वमिच्छन्ति तेतु बौद्धप्रभेदाएव।
मायावादमच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं बौद्धमेवच इत्यादि पद्मपुराणवक्यात् ।
असत्यमप्रतिष्ठंते जगदादुरनीश्वरं इत्यादि गीतावाक्याच्च ।

Page 13. Line 22

अस्तिपरलोक इति बुद्धिर्यस्य स आस्तिकः. नास्ति परलोक इति
बुद्धिर्यस्य स नास्तिकः. मिथ्यादृष्टिर्नास्तिकता ।

Page 14. Line 14.

ब्रह्मसत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः.

Page 16. Line 8

द्वे सत्वे समुपाश्रित्य बुद्धानां धर्मदेशना । लोके सांवृतसत्यत्वं स
च परमार्थतः ॥

Page 16. Line 13.

सत्यं चेत्संवृतिः केयमृषा चेत्सत्यता कथं । सत्यत्वं नच सामान्यं
मृषार्थपरमार्थयोः । तुल्यार्थत्वेपि तेनैषां मिथ्यासंवृतिशब्दयोः । वंचनार्थमुपन्या-
सः लालावक्त्रासवादिवत् । नास्तिक्यपरिहारार्थं संवृतिः कल्पनेति च.....
तस्माद्यच्चास्ति नास्त्येव यदस्ति परमार्थतः । तत्सत्यं मन्यन्मिथ्येति नसत्यद्वय-
कल्पना । न हि स्वप्नसुखाद्यर्थं धर्मे कश्चित्प्रवर्तते ।

Page 16. Line 34.

शून्यवादिपक्षस्तु सर्वप्रमाण - विप्रतिषिद्ध इति तन्निराकरणाय
नादरः क्रियते.

Page 17. Line 12

न ह्ययं सर्वप्रमाण प्रसिद्धो लोकव्यवहारेन्यत्तत्वं मनधिगम्य
शक्यतेऽपह्नोतु मपवादाभावे उत्सर्ग प्रसिद्धेः

प्रमाणानि हि स्वगोचरे प्रवर्तमानानि तत्त्व मिदमित्येव प्रवर्तते.
अतात्त्विकत्वं तु तद्गोचरस्यान्यतो बाधकादवगंतव्यं. न पुनः सांव्यवहारिकं
नः प्रामाण्यं नतु तात्त्विकमित्येव प्रवर्तते.

Page 18. Line 12

वंचनार्थमुपन्यासो लालावक्त्रासवादिवत् । नास्तिक्यपरिहारार्थं
संवृतिः कल्पनेतिच. (कुमारिलभट्टः)

Page 18. Line 13

व्यावहारिक विषयस्य शुक्तिरूप्यादिवत् कदाचिद्वाध्यत्वात् बाध्य
विषये च व्यावहारिक प्रामाण्यमिति व्यवहारस्य अद्वैति परिभाषा मात्रसिद्धत्वात्

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE,
SAMYAMINIPURA,
BEFORE THE CHIEF JUSTICE HIS LORDSHIP
DHARMA RAJ. H. B.**

(Civil suit regarding the truth of *The Vedanta*)

O. S. NO. 564 OF 1934.

5th ISSUE.

(a) Is the philosophy of Adwaita different from that of the Buddhists or is it the same?

(b) Is the philosophy of Adwaita Vaidic (is it derived from the Vedas and in consonance with them) or is it avaidic (ie that which is not derived from the Vedas and which is hostile to them)?

Plaintiff.	}	Defendant.
Vishnudasacharya	}	Gangadhara Sastri

COURT EXAMINATION OF THE PLAINTIFF.

Court.:—What is your name?

Plaintiff.:—My name is *Vishnudasacharya*.

C. Swear as follows “In the name of God, I swear that all that I say before this Court is truth and nothing but truth”

P. In the name of God, I solemnly swear that all that I say before this honourable court is truth and nothing but truth.

C. What is your case?

- P. The philosophy of Adwaita and that of Buddhism are identical and therefore Adwaita is avaidic even as Buddhism undoubtedly is. That is, Adwaita is hostile to the Vedas and is not at all derived from them. Consequently it is a perennial source and cause for a number of ills and evils. Naturally therefore it is not fit to be adopted by persons who believe in the Vedas and the truths taught in them, and who desire for salvation and other fruits of their action. It is my contention, My Lord, that those who seek salvation must be made to abandon the philosophy of the Adwaitins, which is inimical to the Vedas and adopt the philosophy of Dwaita which alone is taught by the Vedas.

Court Examination of the Defendant.

- C. What is your name?

Defendant.:—*Gangadhara Sastri.*

- C. Swear as follows. "In the name of God, I swear that all that I say before this Court is truth and nothing but truth".

- D. My Lord! According to our philosophy, there is nothing other than Brahman which is really or transcendently true. Every thing other than Brahman is only phenomenally true (ie) true from a lower stand point. Therefore My Lord! I cannot swear in the very nature of the case that what I say before this learned Court is true from the higher stand point. But I can certainly say that in the name of God whatever I say before the Court is true only from the phenomenal or lower standpoint.

- C. What is your contention?

D. My Lord! I submit that our Adwaita is not Buddhism. Adwaita is one thing and Buddhism is altogether different. Adwaita is Vaidic. It is derived from the Vedas. Buddhism is Avaidic and inimical to the Vedas. Only those who believe and act in accordance with our Adwaita philosophy can attain the highest reward that is desired by men.

C. Is there any reward for those who live in accordance with the Dwaita philosophy?

D. Yes, My Lord! There is some reward for those who live in accordance with the Dwaita. Why? Even *We*, act as the Dwaitins do, by following the different Varnas (Castes) of the brahmin etc; and the different stages or Asramas of the Brahmacharya etc. We also perform the various acts enjoined in the Vedas such as the bath, the prayer at the different parts of the day, sacrifices, pilgrimage to holy baths in sacred rivers like the Ganges, study of the Vedas, meditating on their import etc. But My Lord! such a belief and living in accordance with Dwaita, can give only a knowledge of Brahman with qualities (Saguna Brahma) and can only entitle the worshippers to attain the world of Vaikhunta. They cannot attain the highest kind of salvation of the attributeless Brahman. *That* is the reward of only those who get the direct vision of Brahman through the utterance and reflection of the Vedic sentence (Aham Brahmasmi) I am Brahman. Living in accordance with Dwaita is only a lower stage while living in accordance with Adwaita and becoming the attributeless Brahman is a higher stage. Therefore the result that is realised through Dwaita is not supreme whereas that which is attained through Adwaita is supreme. Hence it is that Adwaita philosophy is the highest.

D. Vakil:— My Lord! My client! The Defendant desires to examine the Plaintiff directly. I pray that your Lordship will be pleased to grant him permission for the same.

C. Mr. Doss, what is your opinion on the request made by the Defendant's Vakil?

P. Vakil:— If my client, the Plaintiff enjoys the same privilege of examining the Defendant straight and if both the parties are prepared to express before the learned Court their views with all the necessary authorities justifying them, I and my client have absolutely no objection.

C. Allright, the Plaintiff as well as the Defendant may place before the Court the arguments in support of their views and in condemnation of their opponent's views. Meantime, both of you, the advocates may clarify the situation by your examination. Whenever necessary the Court also will examine the parties. That will be the procedure of enquiry.

The two Advocates:— Yes, yes, My Lord.

D. Mr. Acharya, when our Sankaracharya has condemned the Philosophy and religion of the Buddhists which is incongruous with the Vedas and has established the Vaidic religion, how dare you say that Adwaita is identical with Buddhism?

P. Mr. Sastriar, have you seen this book? (gives the book)

D. Most certainly.

P. What is it please?

- D. It is the work of our Sankaracharya - by name Sarva Siddhanta Sangraha.
- P. Please explain the meaning of this verse (1.)
- D. In by - gone days, Bhattacharya, who was the (Amsa) incarnation of Kumara, firmly established in the world, the Vedic path which was destroyed by atheists like the Buddhists. Thereafter people began to walk on the path which was trodden by Bhattacharya who condemned all who were outside the Vedic fold.
- P. Whom does Sankaracharya express in the Sloka as having condemned the Buddhists and established the Vedic religion?
- D. Kumarila Bhatta himself condemned the Buddhists and established the Vedic Religion according to Sankaracharya's Sloka.
- P. Pray, what is this book?
- D. This is Sankara Vijaya written by Anandagiri.
- P. Please explain the meaning of these passages (2.)
- D. A good Brahmin by name Bhattacharya hailed from the North and won over in Sastraic controversy of various kinds, several Buddhists who were following a wrong religion. With royal support he got the heads of those Buddhists cut down by axe and pounded in the mortar and having destroyed the wicked faiths in such ways, he was leading a life of tranquility. Having heard of this wonderful event, Sankaracharya along with his disciples reached the town of Riddha which was reverberating with the sound of victory. On that occasion Kumarila Bhattacharya accosted him thus.

"Oh the best of the new Buddhists (i.e. one who has founded afresh the religion of the Buddhists) you have not come when I was all right. I am now burnt, up to my knees. What can I argue with you just now?" This is the meaning of the above passage.

- P. Who according to this work of Sankara - Vijaya is the person that condemned the Buddhistic religion?
- D. It is clear that Kumarila Bhatta himself condemned it.
- P. Have you seen this book please? Who is its author?
- D. Yes, It was written by Vidyaranya.
- P. What is the import of the following Slokas in the Sankara Vijaya? (3.)
- D. "After Kumarila Bhatta controverted with the Buddhistic pandits and won victory over them, he got an edict from King Sudhanva to the effect that all Buddhists from Cape Camorin to the Himalayas, be they young or old, must be destroyed. Any servant who fails to do this must be put an end to. Thus while the lion viz, Kumarila Bhatta, was killing the elephants viz, Buddhists, the different branches of the Vedas, began to grow and spread in all places i.e. all people began to live in accordance with the vedic injunctions" - such is the meaning of the above Slokas.
- P. Well then, from the Sankara Vijaya of Vidyaranya whom do you deem as the person who condemned the Buddhistic religion?
- D. It is clear that Kumarila Bhatta did it.

- P. Does it not follow then that your Sankaracharya was not the person who condemned Buddhism?
- D. Even after Kumarila Bhatta put down Buddhism, it once again began to grow and spread. We may say that Sankaracharya condemned it then. How can you then say that Sankara did not condemn Buddhism?
- P. It has been stated in the authorities cited above and you have also admitted, that Kumarila Bhatta after condemning and destroying all the Buddhists, young, middle aged and old, established, on a firm basis, the Vedic religion throughout the country. It was at the time when Kumarila was enjoying a well-earned rest, it has been recorded that Sankaracharya with a large following of his disciples went to Kumarila to see him and pay his respects to such a great man. To justify this record, certainly Sankara must have attained the age of judgment. Putting this along with the fact that Sankara lived for only 32 years it is not correct to say that in that short recess of time Buddhism once again reared its head and spread through the country. Hence it is not at all historically possible for Sankara to have condemned Buddhism.
- D. Mr. Achariar, let it be even as you say that in the lifetime of Sankaracharya, Kumarila Bhatta condemned Buddhism and destroyed all the Buddhists and that as there were no Buddhists at all then, there was no propoganda of Buddhism and consequently there was no opportunity for Sankaracharya criticising Buddhism. Let all this be conceded. But how on earth can you say that Sankara gave the name of Adwaita to Buddhism itself and spread the doctrines of Buddhism in the new garb of Adwaita? Have you any authority to

make such an astounding statement?

P. Well asked, pray, please listen attentively to the following recognised authorities. "Parvati asked her Lord to expound to her the genesis and authorship of the Tamasa (evil) Shastras, to which question, the reply was given by Rudra, thus. (4.)

"Gautama and others who were endowed with my power wrote works like the Nyaya Sastra. The great Vishnu took the form of Buddha and composed the Buddhistic Sastra. Regarding that wicked philosophy of Adwaita or Mayavada which is famous in the world as crypto-Buddhism (Buddhism in hiding), please note that it was composed by myself in the guise of a Brahmin. It is said in the Padma Purana that the Sastra of the Mayavadi (the champion of the Illusion theory) teaches doctrines which are despised in the world, such as that the individual soul and God are identical and that Brahman is devoid of all qualities and virtues. Consequent upon this, it follows that Adwaita and Buddhism are identical."

Further it is stated in Brihad Brahma Samhita (chapter VIII) that the philosophy which states that the world is unreal, that God is devoid of qualities and that Jiva (individual soul) is only an illusory appearance of Brahman, is taught by Pashandis i.e. those who are outside the pale of the Vedas. Though this philosophy has been taught by me by order of Vasudeva for the purpose of deceiving the Daityas i.e. people with wicked nature, good people must not believe in it. This doctrine of Maya has been propounded by Maya Moha (Buddha); so, it has been declared that Mayavada is identical with Buddhism.

Again consider this passage of Sankara in Sarva Siddhanta Sangraha.....which means that the jnani

(the Seer) attains that which is called sunya by the Sunyavadins (Buddhists) and that which is called Brahman by Brahnavadins. From this we get the equation Sunya of the Buddhists = Brahman of the Advaitins and also Advaitism = Buddhism.

That this identification of Advaitism and Buddhism is as old as the philosophy of Advaita becomes evident from the consideration of the passages* of 1. Sankara 2. Gaudapada (Sankara's teacher's teacher) and 3. Anandagiri.

Again Bhaskaracharya who was a contemporary of Sankara in his commentary of Brahma Sutras on 2-2-29* writes as follows. *"Let it be known that even the Mayavadins (Advaitins) who are only the upholders of Buddhism have been overthrown by this principle by the sutrakara himself. The same author in commenting on 1-4-25 of the Brahma sutras writes that the expounders of the doctrine of maya which is only Mahayana Buddhism* are deceiving the world. Here also he has expressed his opinion that Advaita and Buddhism are identical and that both of them have been condemned by the sutrakara.

Vignana Bhikshu also in his commentary on the sutras, says that those who predicate unreality of the world like the unreality of the serpentness in the rope are only a class of the Buddhists. He cites by way of corroborating his opinion, the puranic passage that the doctrine of Maya is a false sastra and is crypto-Buddhism, as well as the passage from the Gita. *"Those who say that the world is unreal, unsupported and without God are the enemies of the world"

The same author in his preface to Sankhya prava-chana Bhasya has equally clearly remarked that Mayavada is the same as Buddhism,

Parthasarathy Misra in his work *Sastra Deepika* says that Buddhism is better than the Mayavada. In the *Sankara vijaya* of Anandagiri, Kumarila Bhatta addresses Sankara as the new expounder of Buddhism. Ramanuja and other commentators on the *Brahma sutras* have remarked that Advaita and Buddhism are the same. Likewise Sir. S. Radhakrishnan and other modern scholars, who have written in English have established the same conclusion after careful consideration. It is for these and other reasons that from a very long time Advaita has been without the slightest doubt identified with Buddhism.

D. V.:—Achariar, I cannot help laughing at your words. I won't be surprised if His Lordship has been controlling his laughter with great restraint. Every religion has its own critics. It is no wonder that Advaita from its very inception has had its enemies. They might have condemned Advaita as being identical with the heterodox Buddhism. Even today such a criticism may be levelled against it by its foes. How can you believe as true, such criticisms inspired by hatred? Has your religion or philosophy no critics? The remarks of these people who are moved by the spirit of hatred will not be deemed as trustworthy even by ignorant children. I am extremely surprised that learned men of your stamp should believe the words of prejudiced men and conclude that Advaita and Buddhism are identical.

P. Is it the procedure in any Court of Law that to prove the integrity of one witness, another must be brought in and to establish his honesty in turn yet another, yet another, ad infinitum should be required? My Lord, On this point of procedure, we crave your Lordship's ruling.

D. V. My Lord, let me explain what I meant. The evidence of a witness must be acceptable when there is nothing

- to contradict his statement. Whether the witness is rich or poor, only if and when his evidence is inconsistent with facts or contradicted by reliable authorities it must be deemed false. That is why the defendant's Vakil while cross-examining the witness puts questions like these: Are you related to the Plaintiff? Are you on friendly or inimical terms with the defendant? Did you not quarrel some time before with the defendant? Was there not a case filed against you in the Magistrate's Court? Where do you take your meals? Is it not in the Plaintiff's house? The object of such examination is to elicit if the witness is prejudicial in favour of the Plaintiff on account of his relationship, friendship or dependent position, or prejudiced against the defendant on account of a previous quarrel and enmity. Naturally the evidence of persons vitiated in the above two ways is not trusted. Also when the evidence of a person is contradicted by the evidence of one who has won a name for honesty and good conduct his statement is deemed as untrue. But when it is uncontradicted whether the witness is young or old, whether he is rich or poor, his evidence is certainly authoritative.

P. V. Mr. Sarma, I entirely agree with what you have just now said. When the evidence of one witness is not contradicted by another, his evidence is relied upon. Likewise when any scriptural authority or perception or inference or the statement of a witness is uncontradicted it must be accepted as true. But when it is falsified by being contradicted it cannot be accepted. Here is a point on which the Dwaitins as well as Advaitins are agreed. To come to the topic on hand Bhaskaracharya, Vignana Bhikshu, Ramanujacharya, Bhatta Kumar, Parthasarathy Misra and a host of other learned men have unambiguously expressed that

Advaita and Buddhism are the same. As their opinion is not contradicted by any facts it must be accepted as true. Further in Padma Purana Vedavyasa who is the incarnation of God Narayana Himself has expressed the same identity between Advaita and Buddhism. Gaudapadacharya, Sankaracharya and other Advaitic scholars have admitted that there is great similarity between Advaita and Buddhism. In attempting to criticise this charge, what is the utility of saying that the Buddhists are in China and the Advaitins are in India, they wear black dress while we put on white robes, they do not wear, on their forehead ashes while we do, their language is different from ours. etc.? These superficial differences are of no avail. So long as you do not establish (and you can never establish it) that there is no identity between Advaita and Buddhism on fundamentals like the nature of reality, the universe, means of release from bondage, vedas, instruments of correct knowledge, you cannot escape from the identity of Advaita and Buddhism and our own honest view on the matter is that the two are identical.

- D. Achariar, in Advaita which is the crown of orthodoxy it has been stated that through all that has been enjoined in the vedas such as the observance of the four varnas beginning with the Brahmin and the four stages of life beginning with Brahmacharya (celibacy) and the performance of Sandhyavandana, worship of God, ceremonies and gifts, the mind becomes pure and through hearing and meditation he attains a direct vision of God and becomes entitled to salvation of becoming Brahman whereas according to Buddhism the Vedas are illusory (false), they are not authoritative; they do not observe the four-fold scheme of Varnas (castes)

- and Ashramas (stages) nor do they worship God or do sacrifice. They do not perform Sandhya. To them there is no salvation of becoming Brahman. With all this world of difference between Advaita and Buddhism, if you still maintain that the two are identical I am afraid it is due to your fast on account of
- Ekadasi. Evidently the fast has upset your mind. Please don't get angry. Consider well before you say that the two are identical.

Court. Achariar, As Sastriar says it seems that Advaita is very orthodox where as the Buddhists are heterodox and do not accept the authority of the Vedas. They do not recognise sacrifices and such other acts which are enjoined by the Vedas. In the face of such a distinction how can you say that Advaita is identical with Buddhism? Please answer satisfactorily the questions put by the defendant.

D. As your Lordship directs. I pray your Lordship's attention.

P. Mr. Sastriar, who are called the Astikas (orthodox) and who the Nastikas (heterodox)?

D. One who believes in the existence of a higher world, the means of reaching it and God who is the giver of it is called an Astika. One who believes that there is no higher world, that there is no means of attaining it and that there is no God is a Nastika.

P. For the sake of clearness let me ask again:—those who say that there is no higher world and that there are no ways of reaching such worlds and that there is no God to grant them - are such people Nastikas or Astikas?

D. Where is the doubt on this matter? Those who deny

the higher worlds, the means of attaining them, and God their giver, are certainly Nastikas.

- P. Those who maintain that the higher worlds, and this world which is perceived, do not exist, are these Astikas or Nastikas?
- D. Such people are not mere Nastikas. They are Nastikas of Nastikas. I mean they are the worst of the Nastikas.
- P. Are not the Buddhists who maintain that this world, the higher world, the means of reaching them are all illusory, the Nastikas of Nastikas?
- D. What doubt is there? The Buddhists are indeed the Nastikas of Nastikas.
- P. Mr. Sastriar, who is the author of this sloka.
- D. Our revered Sankaracharya is its author.
- P. What is its meaning?
- D. Only Brahman is real. On it are superimposed the four Varnas and Ashramas, Sandhya, Sacrifices, Vedas, Holy Baths. Higher worlds like the Swarga, etc; The individual soul is Brahman. This is the meaning.
- P. What is the meaning of saying that all this (jagat) is superimposed.
- D. Achariar, this is a very well - known topic yet I will explain. Please listen. Even as through ignorance, the unreal silver appears on the shell, the unreal serpent appears on the rope, and unreal objects appear in dreams, likewise the world of varnas etc. appears on

- account of ignorance. But in reality the world does not at all exist in all the three times.

P. Mr. Sastriar, Today being Sivaratri your mind seems to be affected by the fast. There is no consistency in what you say. You have yourself waxed eloquent that the Buddhists who deny this world and the higher worlds, the means of attaining them and God, must be characterised as Nastikas of Nastikas. Like them you Adwaitins are also saying that this and other worlds, the ways of attaining them and God the giver of them, do not exist and yet you maintain that you Adwaitins are the ornaments of Astikas—the best of them. How is this possible? The Adwaitins really deserve to be called Nastikas of Nastikas (the worst of Nastikas.)

D. Achariar, I now see that you have not understood aright our Advaita. Though we say that the world is illusory, we maintain that it is phenomenally real (ie real from the standpoint of Vyavahara). we say that this world, the other worlds, the means of reaching them, the God who gives them, the four varnas and Ashramas are all phenomenally real. We never say like the Bhuddhists that they are entirely unreal. How can we be then like the Buddhists the Nastikas of Nastikas? Though you characterise us as the worst of Nastikas we are not angry because our knowledge is devoid of all differences. Still you will do well to remember that this is a Court and that you must talk carefully.

P. Sastriar, Let this kind of talk not block our main discussion. To say that Advaitins maintain that this world is phenonienally real and therefore they are not Nastikas is not sound, Though you maintain that this

world is phenomenally real you cannot escape being called Nastikas. For the Buddhists like the Advaitins admit that the world is phenomenally real. It is not correct to say that the Buddhists do not predicate phenomenal reality of this world.

- D. What is your authority to say that the Buddhists admit that the Jagat is phenomenally real.
- P. Look at this passage. From this it is clear that in Buddhism there are two kinds of reality one, transcendental reality, the other phenomenal reality. This recognition of phenomenal reality on the part of Buddhists becomes established from the following criticism of Kumarilabhattacharya on Buddhism. "How can anything which is real be called phenomenally real (ie., falsely real). If anything be false how can it be called real? The quality of reality cannot be present both in the real and the false. Though there are different words having the same meaning, people use the different words for the sake of deceiving people; Likewise though the words Mithya, Samvriti, Vyavaharika Satya, all have the same meaning, still with the object of deceiving the Astikas, the Buddhists instead of using the word Mithya to connote that which is false call it samvrita satya - phenomenally real. But the truth is what is non-existent never exists and what exists is supremely real. Kumarila Bhatta concludes by saying that the Buddhists with the object of deceiving people call that which is false phenomenally real". From this criticism of Kumarila, it follows that Buddhists believe in phenomenal reality. Why so much trouble on this point. That even Sankaracharya, Vachaspathi Misra (the author of Bhamati) are of the same opinion will become evident from the following criticism of theirs on Buddhism

All the instruments of knowledge establish the reality of jagat. To say that the world is not real is contradicting the evidence of the instruments of knowledge. In answer to this the Buddhists contend that the Pramāṇas establish only phenomenal reality and what is denied of jagat is transcendental reality. Since these two are entirely different Predications there is nothing inconsistent (there is no offending the Pramāṇas). In condemning this reply the Advaitic commentator asserts that the instruments of knowledge establish that the objects perceived by them are real, transcendently real and never that they are Phenomenally real. Thus you see that no less than Sankarāchārya and his famous commentator Vāchaspathi have conceded that Buddhists predicate vyavahāric (Phenomenal) reality of jagat. Now then when Buddhists as well as Advaitins admit alike that jagat is phenomenally real why should Buddhists alone be called the Nāstikas of Nāstikas? why are not the Advaitins who like the Buddhists contend that jagat with its four castes etc., is only phenomenally real, the Nāstikas? There is absolutely no justification for this differential treatment. The Advaitins like the Buddhists are Nāstikas of Nāstikas.

Court. You contend that only those who deny the existence of the higher worlds are Nāstikas. The Advaitins say that the higher worlds etc are phenomenally real. How then could the Advaitins be Nāstikas of Nāstikas?

P. My Lord, even as Kumārila Bhaṭṭa remarked that for the sake of deceiving others the Buddhists used

words of the same meaning differently, the Advaitins to avoid the charge of Nāstikas are maintaining that the worlds like Swarga, merit and demerit etc, are all phenomenally real, though all the time they are sure in their minds that they are unreal. In truth on deep consideration Vyavaharika reality is equal to unreality like the Silver of the Shell, the mirage and the Serpentine-ness of the rope. From the statement of the Advaitins themselves it becomes clear that the expression Vyavaharika reality is only a technical expression for unreality (that which is not real in all the three times). To say that a thing is not real in all times is the same as to say that it is phenomenally real. Hence even as those who deny reality of jagat at any time are Nāstikas, so those who predicate phenomenal reality of it are also Nāstikas.

P. V. It is my prayer that your Lordship must kindly note the identity of Advaita and Buddhism on these Points 1. Jagat is illusory (Superimposed) 2. Jagat is phenomenally real 3. Reality is of two kinds—transcendental and phenomenal.

Court. Mr Doss, why all that now. Let the investigation be completely over. Advaitins assert that Brahman alone is real. Some Buddhists say that Sunya is real. Other Buddhists maintain that Vignana (knowledge) alone is real. I suppose that there is a difference between the two on the fundamental issue. Is it not so? Let there be elucidation on that Point now.

Enquiry regarding the indentity of Advaita and Sunyavadi Buddhist.

P.V. Well then! as the Honble Court directs. Mr. Sastriar. What is the nature of Brahman as admitted by the advaitins?

D. According to Advaita Brahman is destitute of all attributes, of all properties. It is Satya (real existence) Gnana (knowledge) and Ananda (bliss). It is unknowable and indiscribable.

D.V. Acharya! What is the nature of Sunya as admitted by Buddhists?

P. Why should I describe the Sunya of the Buddhists? It is well explained in the Advaitic as well as Buddhistic works. What is there which is not known to you, Mr. Sastriar?

D.V. A question in the Court of law must be answered. What if the answer is or is not known to the question. A knows or B does not know it. That does not matter.

P.V. All right then. The Sunya of the Buddhists is qualitless. It is existence (Satya), knowledge (Gnana) and bliss (Ananda). It is unknowable and indescribable.

P.V. Mr. Sastriar. As the Brahman of the Advaitins and the Sunya of the Buddhists are of the same nature, does it not follow that they are identical?

D. Mr. Madhava Doss! What is the use of merely

stating that the Sunya of the Buddhists is like the Brahman of the Advaitins qualitless, and has for its nature existence, knowledge and bliss. And that therefore the Sunya of the Buddhists is = Brahman of the Advaitins. What is your authority in saying so? Supposing I say that I am a lawyer even as you are, can I who am without the degree of law be called a lawyer?

P.V. Mr. Acharya. What is your authority in saying that Sunya is devoid of qualities (Nirvisesha).

P. Mr. Sasāriar, have you seen this work?

D. Yes, this is the commentary of Sankara on Vishnu Sahasra Nama.

P. Please explain this passage? (1)

D. As Brahman is attributeless, like Sunya it is called Sunya.

P. Does it not follow then that Sunya like Brahman is attributeless?

D. Granting that Sunya is devoid of attributes, what is your authority in saying that Sunya is Satya (existent),

P. From the passage (2) it follows that there are two kinds of reality while the Jagat is phenomenally real, Sunya is transcendently real. Again from the

(1) निर्विशेषत्वाच्छून्यवच्छून्यः'

(2) 'द्वैसत्वे समुपाश्रित्य बुद्धानां धर्मदेशना । लोके सांवृतसत्यं च सत्यं च परमार्थितः'.

statement of Bhamati (1) it becomes quite clear that the Sunya of the Sunyavadins is existent.

D. Granting that Sunya is qualitless and existent, can you cite authorities to establish that it is knowledge and bliss.

P. Your own Advaitic works are the authorities for this.(2) Look at this passage from Advaita Siddhi. In explaining the three epithets of Satya, Gnana and Ananda (Existence, knowledge and bliss) used with reference to Brahman, the author asserts that the Sunya- Vadins maintain that Sunya is characterised by knowledge and Bliss, but not Satya (Existence). Again the following passage (3) from Gauda Brahmanandiya makes it clear. 'Therein the author contends that in as much as knowledge and bliss are common to both Sunya and Brahman, that cannot constitute the differentia of Brahman. So in the definition of Brahman we must state something which is not present in Sunya viz. Satyatwa (existence). From this also it is evident that Sunya is knowledge and bliss.

D. Now then, from these two authorities you have cited viz, Advaita Siddhi and Brahman nandiya, it becomes clear that Sunya is not Satya (existent); how then do you contend that Sunya is existent?

(1) 'शून्यवादिनां शून्यताया अपि सत्यत्वात्'.

(2) 'सत्यं ज्ञानमानंदं ब्रह्म'. 'शून्यवादिभिरपि सत्त्वरहितं ज्ञानानं दात्मकत्वस्य ब्रह्मणोन्यत्रांगीकारात् मिळितं विना न निर्विचिकित्सा ब्रह्मसिद्धिरिति मिळितं लक्षणं' (3) 'तथाज्ञानात्मकानंदवत्त्वं तन्मते (शून्यवादिमते) ब्रह्मभिन्नेपीति तद्वारणाय सत्यमिति'.

P. Bhamathi and other Advaitic works state that Sunya is existent. The same is established in Buddhistic works. So on that point the remark of Advaita Siddhi is not authoritative. The following(1) passages from Buddhistic works establish that Sunya is essentially knowledge and bliss.

D. On what authority do you conclude that Sunya like our Brahman is unknowable and indescribable?

P. From(1) passages like the following of Buddhists, it becomes clear that Sunya is unknowable and indescribable. So it follows that Brahman of Advaitins is not different from the Sunya of Buddhists. If the pot is to be different from the cloth, there must be some quality in the pot which is not present in the cloth and vice versa. Then alone the mutual difference between the cloth and the pot may logically follow. No quality that is absent in Sunya is present in the Brahman of the Advaitins and vice versa. Then how could there be difference between the Brahman of the Advaitins and Sunya. This(1) passage makes it clear that the Advaitins do not recognise any differentiating attribute in Brahman and as such it cannot be different from the Sunya of Buddhists.

P.V. Mr. Sastriar, Do you know what these works are?

D. Yes, This one is the Bhashya of Sankara on Brahma

(1) 'आकारसहिता बुद्धिर्योगाचारस्य सम्मता । केवलां संविदं स्वस्थां मन्यन्ते मध्यमाः पुनः' (विवेकविलासे) 'अद्वयं ज्ञानैकरूपां शून्यतां विभाव्य ॐ शून्यताज्ञानं वज्रस्वभावात्मकोहमित्यधितिष्ठेत्' (शान्तिपादे) 'केवलामद्वयं विज्ञप्तिं लक्षणं.... अनन्तां पश्येत्' (रत्नाकरशान्तिपादे)

Sutras. The second one is a commentary on it by name Brahma-vidyabharana.

P. V. I Suppose these 2 works are respected by you.

D. They are very much respected by us.

P. V. Please explain the meaning of this passage. *

D. Even as the Sutrakara has criticised the Buddhism of Yogachara which maintains that only knowledge is real and that on it the external world such as the knower & the known is superimposed, why has he not criticised the Buddhism of the Madhyamikas, which maintains that only Sunya is real and on it the whole of Jagat (universe) is superimposed? To clear this doubt is the purpose of the passage from the Bhasya (F. N.) The doctrine of the Sunyavadin is contradicted by all the instruments of knowledge and cannot at all be established. So the Sutrakara did not care to make an aphorism in condemnation of it. In explanation of this, Advaita-nanda, the author of Brahma-vidyabharana makes the following remarks. If the Sunya of the Buddhist is existent, then that Sunya of the Buddhist becomes identical with the Brahman of the Advaitins, and also Sunyavada becomes the same as Brahmapada. We have difference only in the two words Sunya and Brahma. If it is maintained as the opinion of Sankaracharya that the doctrine of Sunya which makes Sunya an existent (Bhava), (pramanas) is inconsistent with all the instruments of knowledge, then it follows that our Advaita is equally inconsistent with all the instru-

* निर्विशेषं स्वयं भातं निर्लेपमजरामरं । शून्यतत्त्वमविज्ञेयं मनोवाचा मगोचरं ॥

ments of knowledge. So it is wrong to say that such is the interpretation of Sankara.

If the Sunya of the Buddhist is deemed to be an existent, it becomes equivalent to our Brahman so that the Sunyavada which interprets Sunya as existent is unworthy of our recognition. When the world is known through the instruments of knowledge, the absurdity of maintaining that it does not exist is so transparent that the Sutrakara did not make an aphorism to condemn it. Thus the philosophy of the Sunyavada which maintains that Sunya means the non-existence of the world is against the testimony of the instruments of knowledge. This is the meaning of the passage from the commentary of Sankaracharya.

P.V. Mr. Sastriar, if the Sunya of Buddhists is existent, then is it not the opinion of your Adwaiti scholar that your Brahman and their Sunya are identical and that their religion and your religion are the same?

D. In case Sunya is an existent (Bhava), then the Brahmavada of the Adwaitins and the Sunyavada of Buddhists are one and the same. Such is the opinion of Adwaitananda, the author of Vidyabharana.

P.V. What is this work?

D. This is Adwaita Siddhi written by our Madhusudana Sarasvati.

P.V. Please explain the meaning of this passage (1)

(1) व्यभिक्तं कश्चिद्विशेषोऽस्ति नाम वा रूपं वा भेदो वा जातिर्वा गुणो वा तद्वारेण हि शब्दप्रवृत्तिर्भवति, न चैषां कश्चिद्विशेषो ब्रह्मण्यस्ति.'

D. Dividing the topic of the non-existence of the world-into two alternatives as the non-existence of the world true or illusory, the question is tackled thus. If the non-existence of the world is real, then there would be two realities, viz, Brahman and non existence of the world and consequently adwaita (non-duality) is lost. If on the other hand the non-existence of the world is illusory (false) then the world must be real. In the face of such criticism, we accept the position that the non-existence of the world is real. Even if the non-existence of the world is real, there is no objection to non-duality (Adwaita). We maintain that the non-existence of the world is the very nature of Brahman — This is the interpretation of the passage.

P.V. Mr. Sastriar, What is this book?

D. It is Khandana - Khanda Khadya.

P. V. Please explain the passage (F. note 1 and its commentary (F. note 2)

* शून्यवादि पक्षस्तु सर्वप्रमाण विप्रतिषिद्ध इति तन्निराकरणाय नादरः क्रियते (ब्र. सू. शां. भा. २-२-३२) शून्यपदेन सर्वप्रपञ्चातीतं भावरूपं किञ्चित्त्वं विवक्षितं उत अभावरूपं? नाद्यः, तथासति वाचोयुक्त्यन्तरेण ब्रह्मवाद एव आश्रितः. यदि द्वितीयः पक्षः तदा सर्वप्रमाणविरोधः. सर्व प्रमाणैः प्रपञ्चे उपलभ्यमाने तदभाव एव तत्त्वमिति निरूपयितुं मशक्यमिति दूषणस्य स्फुटतया न तन्निराकरणाय सूत्रकृता सूत्राण्याराचितानि इति ब्रह्म विद्याभरणे २-२-३९)

१ प्रपञ्चनिषेधाधिकरणीभूत ब्रह्मभिन्नत्वानिषेधस्य तात्त्विकत्वेऽपि नाद्वैत हानिकरत्वं.

२ 'भावेऽभावानतिरेके स्वीकारादेवाद्वैताव्याघातः' 'अस्माभिरपि ब्रह्मातिरिक्ताभावानङ्गीकारान्नाद्वैत व्याघातः'

D. Non-existence is a description of Brahman since we do not recognise any non-existence over and above Brahman; two realities viz, the reality of Abhava and the reality of Brahman do not separately come into being and therefore the Advaita position is not shaken thereby. This is the idea.

P.V. Is it not the view of the author of Khandana Khanda Khadya and Advaita Siddhi that Brahman is of the nature of the non-existence of the world?

D. Most certainly.

P. V. How do those Buddhists who do not contend that Sunya is existent, describe Sunya?

D. They say that Sunya is of the nature of the non-existence of the world. What is the doubt on this. In the passage * the whole criticism is based on the recognition that Sunya is of the nature of the non-existence of the world.

P.V. The Advaitins recognising similarity between Sunya and Brahman in other points proclaim that in case Sunya is of the nature of existence, then Sunya and Brahman are identical. Even if it is held that Sunya is of the nature of the non-existence of the world in as much as the Advaitins have accepted that Brahman is of the nature of the non-existence of the world, there is no distinction in any detail between the Sunya which is of the nature of the non-existence of the world and Brahman which is of the nature of the non-existence of the world. Hence

* 'सर्वप्रमाणैः प्रपञ्चे उपलभ्यमाने तदभाव एव तत्त्वमिति'

the Brahman of Advaitins is identical with Sunya—is it not. so Mr. Sastriar?

D. (No reply is given by the Defendant)

P.V. My Lord, in Advaita, only Brahman is real. On Brahman is superimposed all the Jagat (vide verse) consisting of the four Varnas etc. In Buddhism only Sunya is real. On Sunya is superimposed the whole of the Jagat. Sunya is quality-less, of the nature of existence, knowledge and Bliss, is unknowable and indescribable. In case Sunya is of the nature of existence, the Advaitins themselves have admitted that Sunya is Brahman. Even if Sunya is of the nature of the non-existence of the world, in as much as Brahman of the Advaitins is also held to be of the nature of the non-existence of the world, there is no difference at all between the Sunya of Buddhists and the Brahman of Advaitins. Both the Buddhists and Advaitins admit that the world (Jagat) is illusory and both recognise that Jagat is phenomenally real. In the light of all this I pray that your Lordship may be pleased to ask Mr. Sarma to state in what respects Advaita differs from Buddhism.

Court. Mr Sarma, please instruct your client to enumerate the points of difference between Advaita and Buddhism.

D.V. As your Lordship directs. (to the client) Mr. Sastriar, please explain the points of difference between Advaita and Buddhism.

D. There are several points of difference.

D.V. Please present them one by one.

D. We Advaitins accept the Vedas as authoritative. We perform the Sacrifices etc enjoined by the Vedas for the purpose of attaining ends like heaven, Swarga. Buddhists do not recognise the Vedas as authoritative. They do not perform sacrifices and other acts enjoined in the Vedas for attaining heaven. On this point there is difference between Advaitins and Buddhists

P.V. What is this work?

D. This is our Sankaracharya's Bhashya on Brihadarany Upanishad with the notes of Anandagiri.

P.V. Please explain these passages. *

D. Though Buddhists consider that the world of Duality including Swarga etc is all illusory, they recognise the authority of their Shastras which refer to the higher worlds. Similarly arises the authority of the Shastras for Agnihotra. This is the purport of the passages.

P.V. Does it not follow from these passages that the Buddhists like Advaitins recognise higher worlds like Swarga and that they adopt certain means for attaining them.

* किंच नद्वैत वैतथ्यं शास्त्रप्रामाण्यं विघातकं यतोबौद्धादिभिश्चैयसे प्रस्थापिताः स्सुशिष्याः द्वैतमिथ्यात्वावगमेपि 'स्वर्गकामश्चैत्यं वंदेते' त्यादि शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं गृह्णांति तथाग्निहोत्रदि शास्त्रस्यापि प्रामाण्यं भविष्यति साधनत्वं - शक्यनपहारादित्याह नापीति (अनंदगिरीयम्) नापि पाषंडिभिरपि प्रस्थापिताः शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं न गृह्णीयुः (बृ. शां. भा. 5. 1.)

D. Most certainly. It is clear from these passages that Buddhists recognise higher worlds and to attain them they do certain meritorious acts.

P.V. How can you then say that the difference between Advaitins and Buddhists is that the Buddhists do not perform any meritorious acts to attain heaven?

D. (No reply)

P.V. What do you mean by saying that the Veda is a Pramana?

D. Mr. Acharya, you have put me a very big question.

P.V. Never mind whether it is big or small. Please answer.

D. The word Pramana consists of three parts — प्र (Pra), मा (Ma), ल्युट् (Lyut) प्र (Pra) = regarding a real object; मा (ma) knowledge; ल्युट् (Lyut) = the means. Therefore Veda is a Pramana. Veda gives knowledge regarding real things; i.e. the objects of knowledge derived from the Veda are real.

P. Whose works are these?

D. This one is Siddhanta-lesa-Sangraha of our Appaya Dikshita and the other is its commentary called Krishnalankara.

P.V. Do you Advaitins recognise these works as authoritative?

D. Appayya Dikshita is a great man. We certainly recognise his works as authoritative. But he never expressed his own views. He has merely.

epitomised the works of the previous teacher. Hence the name Siddhantalessa Sangraha.

P.V. Please explain the meaning of these passages (1)

- D. Suppose a person in his dream thinks of the Vedic injunction (2) regarding the performance of Jydtistoma for attaining Heaven and performs it in his dream what is the worth of the attainment of worlds like Heaven, in dream? Similar is the attainment of worlds like heaven in the state of wakefulness by performing Jydtistoma on the authority of the Vedic injunction. In truth on careful enquiry that it becomes clear that objects like the Sky which are spoken of in the Vedas are all unreal, like the horns of the hare, in as much as there is no one to give such fruits as the Swarga.

P.V. Mr. Shastriar, What are these works?

- D. This is the work of our Gaudapadacharya by name Mandukopanishad Karikas and this other is its commentary of Sankaracharya.

P.V. Are these works respected by you?

- D. They are very much respected by us.

(1) 'ज्योतिष्टोमादि श्रुतिबोधितानुष्ठानात् फलसिद्धिः स्वाप्न श्रुतिबोधि तानुष्ठानप्रयुक्त फलसंवादतुल्या' ॥ (2) स्वप्ने हि कश्चित् कदाचिज्ज्योतिष्टोमादि श्रुतिं कल्पयित्वा ततः साधनाविशेषमुपलभ्य तदनुष्ठानात्फलं लभते, तत्तुल्यं जागरणेपि स्वर्गादि फललभनमित्यर्थः । वस्तु तस्तु श्रुतिमात्रप्रतीतिवियदादि सर्गतत्क्रमादेरिव श्रुतिमात्रप्रतीति स्वर्गादिफलस्याप्यसत्त्वमेवाभिप्रेतं कल्पकाभावस्य तुल्यत्वादिति बोध्यं.

P. V. Please explain the meaning of these slokas and Sankaracharya's commentary thereon (1)

D. Just as the objects of dream-experience are unreal just as the city of illusion with all the houses and Shops created by the magician is all unreal, so also this world is unreal. As this world is unreal it has no origin and no destruction. There is no jīva (individual soul), there is no one to seek salvation. In short the whole of this world is unreal even as are the horns of the hare.

P.V. Where is this sloka to be found?

D. It is in a Buddhistic work by name, Madhyamika Vritti

P.V. What is its meaning?

D. Even as the objects of Jugglery are unreal, even as dreams are unreal and even as the city of illusion is unreal; so also creation, existence and destruction are unreal.

(1) स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे गंधर्वनगरं यथा । तथा विश्वमिदं दृष्ट्वेदांतेषु विचक्षणैः ॥३१॥ न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः न मुमुक्षुर्न वैमुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थतः ३२ (कारिका) स्वप्नश्च माया च स्वप्नमाये असद्वस्त्वात्मिके, सद्वस्त्वात्मिके इव लक्ष्येते अविवेकिभिः । यथा च प्रसारितं पण्यापणं ग्रहप्रासादं स्त्रीपुंजनसद्व्यवहारार्काणामिव गंधर्वनगरं दृश्यमानमेव सत् अकस्मात् अभावतां गतं दृष्टं यथा च स्वप्नमाये दृष्टे असद्रूपे तथा विश्वमिदं द्वैतं समस्तं असत् दृष्टं न निरोधः प्रलयः उत्पत्तिः जननं बद्धः संसारी जीवः साधकः साधनवान् मोक्षस्य मुमुक्षुः मोचनार्थी मुक्तः विमुक्तबंधः उत्पत्तिं प्रलययो रभावात् बद्धादयो न संतत्येषा परमार्थता द्वैतस्यासत्वात् (शांकरबाण्यं)

P.V. Have not Gaudapadacharya and Sankaracharya said like the Buddhists that creation, sustenance etc are unreal (1)

D. Yes, they have said so.

P.V. Mr. Sastriar, by whom are those statements made?

D. By our Sankaracharya.

P.V. Please state their import.

D. (2) There is no virtue, no sin, no mantras, no distinction of caste, no mother, no father, no devas, no higher worlds. This world does not exist, no Vedas, no sacrifices, no place of pilgrimage, no distinction into castes and stages, no Shastras; no body to order, no spiritual teacher, no disciple, no training, you do not exist, I do not exist. Sankhya, Pasupata, Pancharatra, Saiva, Saura, Ganapata, Saktamata and other religions do not. In short the whole Jugat (Universe)—never existed before, does not exist now and will not exist in the future. It seems to exist merely on account of ignorance. There

(1) 'स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे'

(2) न पुण्यं न पापं न सौख्यं न दुःखं न मंत्रो न तीर्थं न वेदा न यज्ञाः (निर्वाणषट्कं ४)....न मे जातिभेदः....(नि. ष. ५)न माता पितावा न देवा न लोका न वेदा न यज्ञा न तीर्थं ब्रुवंति (दशश्लोकि ३) न वर्णा न वर्णाश्रमाचारधर्मा (२) न शास्ता न शास्त्रं न शिष्यो न शिक्षा न चत्वं न चाहं न चायं प्रपंचः (७) न सौख्यं न शैवं न तप्ताचरात्रं न जैनं न मीमांसकादेर्मतंवा (४)

तस्मादविद्या कार्यत्वात्सर्वकर्मणां तत्साधनानां च यज्ञोपवीतादीनां परमार्थदर्शनं निष्ठेन त्यागः कर्तव्यः । उपदेशसहस्री (४४).

fore we must give up all acts and objects like the holy thread - this is the purport of the passages-

P.V. Mr. Shastriar, according to your Advaita all the things mentioned in the Vedas such as merit, sin, Heaven, the four castes are all unreal like the silver in the shell or mirage or the horns of the hare; how can the Veda be considered by you as capable of giving correct knowledge of real things? Does it not follow that to Advaitins even as to Buddhists the Vedas are really incapable of yielding knowledge of real things?

D. Mr. Achariar, you take a passage away from the context deliberated to deceive people. In the work of Siddhantalessa Sangraha, the author has answered this charge that you are levelling now, viz, that to the Advaitins the Vedas are incapable of yielding correct knowledge.

P.V. Will you kindly cite the passage that are relevant and establish that to the Advaitins the Vedas are really capable of yielding correct knowledge?

D. Note the following passage(1)

It means that though the sacrifices, the castes, the forms of worship etc are all unreal, still the mind of the person who performs all these acts enjoined, by the Vedas becomes purified. To one who is thus

(1) ज्योतिष्टोमादि श्रुतीनां च सत्वशुद्धिद्वारा ब्रह्मणि तात्पर्यान्ना प्रामाण्यं (सि. ले. सं.) कर्मवाक्यै रूपासनावाक्यैश्च विहितानि कर्मापासनानि अनुतिष्ठतः शुद्धिर्भवति, शुद्धसत्वस्य चाधिकारिणो वेदांतशास्त्रं ब्रह्मप्रामितिं जनयति.... इति नाप्रामाण्यप्रसंग इति (कृष्णालंकार व्याख्यानं)

qualified having a pure mind, the Vedanta Shastra yields a correct knowledge of Brahman. Therefore we maintain that the Vedas are capable of yielding correct knowledge. There is absolutely no room for entertaining a doubt that to us Advaitins as to Buddhists the Vedas are unauthoritative.

P. V. Mr. Shastriar, to you Advaitins, Sacrifices are unreal, worship is unreal, the mind and its purification are unreal, the Sastras and the Vedas are unreal, the qualitiess Brahman is unreal. And yet you maintain that the Vedas are authoritative. Your contention is as absurd as the statement that (1) that the son of a barren woman, took his bath in the waters of the mirage, decorated himself with the flower of the Sky and is marching armed with the bow made of the horns of the hare. Your statement when clearly and frankly expressed comes to this. An unreal person by falsely performing an unreal sacrifice and unreal worship gets an unreal purification of an unreal mind and thereafter the unreal. Vedanta Sastra produces in him the unreal knowledge of the unreal Nirguna Brahman. In short according to you, the false Vedas are falsely authoritative. What does all this mean in plain unvarnished language?—the Vedas are incapable of yielding correct knowledge.

D. Mr. Achariar, I am afraid you have not at all understood the technology of our Advaita Philosophy. Sacrifices etc are phenomenally real and the Vedas

(1) मृगतृष्णाभिसिन्नातः खपुष्पकृतशेखरः । एष वन्द्यामुतो याति शशशृंग धनुर्वरः ॥

which prescribe such phenomenally real sacrifices are also phenomenally real. How then can you say that to the Advaitins the Vedas are not authoritative. Your criticism is unfair and unreal.

P.V. My Lord, the defendant Mr. Sastriar is frequently repeating that *Reality* is, of two kinds, Phenomenal and Transcendental and that the Vedas give us knowledge of the Sacrifices etc which are of Phenomenal Reality. His contention, my Lord, is not correct, for the instruments of knowledge give us only correct knowledge of their respective objects. And that such knowledge is always transcendently real has been accepted by great Advaitic Scholar like the author of *Bhamati*. The expression "Phenomenally real" indeed means "unreal" or false and consequently phenomenally authoritative means not-authoritative. This point has been argued out before your Lordship. Sankaracharya himself has made the same remark in his work—*Swatma Nirupana* * I pray that in the interests of truth and clarity the defendant must not be allowed to use the expression Vyavaharic or phenomenal reality.

Court. Mr. Sarma, this point of Vyavaharic or phenomenal reality has already been argued out. It is *Res-judicata*, Please tell your client that he must not repeat it again.

D. V. Mr. Sastriar, let there be no further discussion on the topic of Vyavaharic reality.

D. Mr. Achariar, why do you say that to us Advaitins

* 'व्यवहारस्य दर्शयं विद्या विद्येति भेद परिभाषा नास्त्येव'

the qualitless Brahman is unreal.

P. Mr. Sastriar, what is this book?

D. This is our Advaita Siddhi.

P. I suppose this is recognised as authoritative by you.

D. Most certainly.

P. Please explain the meaning of this passage (1).

D.V. The pure qualitless Brahman cannot be an object of knowledge derived from the Vedas. Only the Brahman with attributes which is phenomenally real can be the object of knowledge. How can Brahman be pure when there is knowledge regarding it. And yet there is no scope for the doubt, viz, how can the existence of Brahman be established if Brahman is not the object of knowledge derived from the Vedas. Brahman is Swatah-Prakasa (Self-evident) and therefore its existence is established.

P. Is the pure Brahman known or not known through the Pramanas of the Vedas etc.

D. The pure Brahman is not known through Vedas etc.

P.V. The horns of the hare, the son of the barren woman—are these real or unreal?

D. They are unreal

P Why unreal?

(1) शुद्धं हि न दृश्यं..... किंतूपहितमेव । तच्च मिथ्यैव न हि वृत्तिदशया मनुपहितं भवति..... न चैवं सति शुद्धसिद्धिर्नस्यादिति वाच्यं स्वतएव तस्य प्रकाशत्वेन सिद्धत्वादिति.

D. *Knowledge depends upon an instrument of knowledge. Perception or Inference or the Vedas do not establish the horns of the hare and the son of the barren woman. Hence they are unreal.

P. When the Brahman of Advaitins cannot be established by Perception or Inference or the Vedas, does it not follow that it is unreal?

D. Though our Brahman is not established by any Pramanas, still it is real because it is Swa-Prakasa (Self-evident). The horn of the hare is not self-evident nor is it known through any of the Pramanas. Therefore it is unreal.

P. Is there any authority to maintain that Brahman is Swa - Prakasa (Self - evident)? In other words can it be known by any Pramana that Brahman is self-evident (Swa-Prakasa).

D. If Brahman can be known to be self-evident through any Pramana, it naturally and inevitably becomes impure. Therefore on the Self-evident character of Brahman there is no Pramana.

P. If Brahman is self-evident (Swa-prakasa) without any Pramana, why not we say that even the horn of the hare for which there is no testimony is Self-evident.

D. **No reply.**

P. Granting that Brahman is Swaprakasa what is the meaning of that expression?

- D. Swaprakasa means that which cannot be known through any Pramana (instrument of knowledge).
- P. Can the horn of the hare be known through any Pramana or not?
- D. It cannot be known through any Pramana; what then?
- P. Like your Brahman, the horn of the hare also is incapable of being known through any instrument of knowledge. Therefore the horn of the hare also is Swaprakasa (Self-evident).
- D. No reply.
- P. There is no authority to establish your adwaitic Brahman. Likewise there is no authority in regard to the horn of the hare. Brahman is self-evident. So also is the horn of the hare. Under such circumstances how can you say that Brahman is real while the horn of the hare is unreal.
- D. No answer.
- P. My Lord, Pramana means that which gives us knowledge of real things. According to the Adwaitins the Universe which is taught by the Vedas is false. The Brahman of the Adwaitins is unreal like the horn of the hare. Even if for their satisfaction we grant that their Brahman is real it cannot be known by the Vedas. So in as much as the Vedas are incapable of yielding us knowledge of any real thing, the Vedas are unauthoritative to adwaitins as to Buddhists. I pray that your Lordship be pleased to note that that alleged diffe-

rence between Adwaitins and Buddhists regarding the authoritative nature of the Vedas does not exist and it is wrong to maintain it.

**Enquiry on the topic of the
Identity between Adwaitins and
Vignanavadi Buddhists.**

Court. Mr. Achariar. Why do you say that the Philosophy of Adwaita is the same as the Buddhism of Vignana Vadins.

P. My Lord, Sunyavada is the Philosophy which is recognised as the best by the Buddhists. Yet for that some unintelligent disciples may not all on a sudden believe that the qualitless Sunya alone is real and that the whole Universe is superimposed on it, it is maintained that Vignana alone is real and that the external Universe is superimposed on it. In reality Vignana is identical with Sunya, though a very slight difference between the two is attempted. Hence in as much as it has been previously established that Adwaita is identical with Sunyavada, it follows equally well that Adwaita is Vignanavada.

Vignana Vada = Sunyavada

Adwaita = Sunyavada

Adwaita = Vignana Vada

Even if you consider the doctrines of the two systems, you get the same conclusion.

Court. How can you say that to the Vignana Vadins also Sunya is the only reality. Is there any authority for saying so?

P. Yes, my lord, Here is my authority (1) which with your permission I shall explain,

(2) The disciples are of three classes-viz the worst, the intermediate and the best. For the worst disciples it has been maintained that the external world is real and momentary. For the intermediate disciples it has been said that only Vignana is real and the external world is unreal. To both of these gradually the knowledge is imparted that Sunya is the only reality. But to the best disciples, from the very beginning the knowledge is imparted that Sunya is real and that the Universe is unreal. This is what is expressed in the work Bodha chitti-vivarana. The same is the opinion of Sankara and the author of Bhamati. From all this it becomes evident that even the Buddhists who teach that only Vignana is real, entertain the view that Sunya alone is real-

Court. Mr. Sastriar, please combat the statement of Mr. Achariar that on examination of the principles of the two systems of Adwaita and Vignanavada, their identity will become clear

(1) देशना लोकनधानां सत्वाशय वशानुगाः । भिद्यंते बहुधा लोके
त्पुण्यैर्बहुभिः पुनः । गंभीरोत्तान भेदेन क्वचिच्चोभय लक्षणा । भिन्ना हि
देशना भिन्ना शून्यताद्वयलक्षणा (बोधिचित्त विवरणम्.)

स च बहुप्रकारः विनेय भेदाद्वा (ब्रं. शां. भा. २-२-१८).

‘हीनमध्यमोत्कृष्टधियो हि शिष्या भवन्ति । ये हीन मतयस्ते सर्वास्ति
त्ववादेन तदाशयानुरोधाच्छून्यतायामवतार्यते । ये तु मध्यमास्ते ज्ञानमात्रास्तित्वेन
शून्यतायामवतार्यते । ये तु प्रकृष्टमतयस्तेभ्यस्साक्षादेव शून्यतत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते’
(भामती)

- D. Mr. Achariar, what is your authority for saying that our Adwaita and Vignana Vada Buddhism are identical?
- P. My authorities are the works of Adwaitic Soholars like Gaudapadacharya and Sankaracharya as wellas Buddhistic works
- D. Please show the authorities from the Adwaitic works.
- P. What is this book please?
- D. This is a book containing Mandukopanishad karikas. of Gaudapada (2) the commentary of Sankara on it and (3) the note on it by Anandagiri-
- P. Explain the meaning of these passages. (1)
- D. The following is the meaning of the passage. The Contemporary Pandits of Gaudapadacharya. attacked him thus, "you have accepted merely the philosophy of the Buddhists that only knowledge is real and that on it the whole universe of the knower and the known, etc is superimposed." In reply to this criticism Gaudapada made this remark.* On

(1) ज्ञानमात्रं पारमार्थिकं । तत्रैव ज्ञातृज्ञेयादि कल्पितमिति सौगतमतमेव भवताऽपि संगृहीत मित्याशङ्क्याह ज्ञानमिति (आनंद.)

*ज्ञानं नैतद्बुद्धेन भाषितं (गौडपादीयम्)

ज्ञानज्ञेयज्ञातृभेदरहितम् परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वयमेतन्न बुद्धेन भाषितं यद्यपि बाह्यार्थनिराकरणं ज्ञानमात्रकल्पनाचाद्वयवस्तुसमीप्यमुक्तं इदं तु परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वैतं वेदांतेष्वेव विज्ञेयमित्यर्थः । (शां. भा.)

ज्ञानेति सकलभेद विकलं परिपूर्णमनादिनिधनं ज्ञप्तिमात्रमुपनिषदेकसमधिगम्यं तत्त्वमिह प्रतिपाद्यते । मतांतरे तु नैवमिति कुतोमतसांकर्यं शंकावकाशमासादयेदित्यर्थः । (आनंद)

this remark Sankaracharya has commented as follows. "We recognise that like Buddhists that only knowledge is real and on knowledge is superimposed the whole external universe Yet the secondless transcendental Reality, devoid of the difference of Knowledge, Knower and the Known has not been recognised by Buddha. This secondless transcendental reality can be known only through the Vedanta. Therefore where is the scope for suspecting that Buddhism and Adwaita are identical?

P. What is this book?

D. This is known as MitaKshari. It is a commentary by Swayamprakasananda on Gaudapadakarikas.

P. *Please explain the commentary on the passage of Gaudapadakarika.

Q. The same doubt as mentioned in the above mentioned works is entertained and answered.

P. What is this book?

D. This is Gaudapadiya Viveka.

P. Please explain this commentary on the same passage of Gaudapada.

D. How often are you questioning on the same point? This too assumes the same doubt of the identity of Buddhism and Adwaita and answers it.

P. What is this book?

D, This is Sankaravijaya written by our Vidyyaranya (alias Madhavacharya)

P, Please explain the meaning of these slokas.

D. (1) Once when Sankaracharya was about to enter a temple he was accosted by those who were there: "If you want to enter the temple explain what difference there is between your religion and that of Buddhists" And Sankaracharya answered. "Vigyanavadins predicate momentariness and plurality of Knowledge whereas we say that knowledge is unchanging and one. "This is the difference."

P. Mr. Sastriar, what is this book?

D. This is known as Sankshepa Sariraka. It was written by Sarvagna Muni. This commentary on it was written by Madhusudana Saraswati.

P. Please explain these slokas and the commentary thereon. (2)

D. Advaitins like Buddhists maintain that knowledge alone is real and on it is superimposed the

(1) विविक्षुर्यदिदेवतालयं । विज्ञानवादस्य च किं विभेदकं भवन्मता
द्ब्रूहि ततः परं ब्रज । विज्ञानवादी क्षणिकत्वमेषामंगीचकारापि बहुत्वमेषः । वेदांत
वादी स्थिरसंविदेके त्यंगीचकारेति महान्विशेषः ।

(2) ननु सर्वस्यापि वियदादि प्रपंचस्य स्वप्रतुल्यत्वे तद्विज्ञानात्मकमेव
सर्वं वक्तव्यं ततश्च विज्ञानवादि समय प्रवेशापत्तिरिति शंकेते,

ननु शाक्यभिक्षुसमयेन समः । प्रतिभात्ययं च भगवत्समयः ।

यदि बाह्यवस्तुवितथं नु कथं समयाविमौ न सदृशौ भवतः (२-२५)

नन्विति शाक्योजिनबौद्धौ विज्ञानादी तत्सिद्धांतेनेत्यर्थः भगवतो व्यास
भगवत्पादादेः (शंकराचार्यस्य) समय इत्यर्थः ननु विज्ञानवादिना वेदप्रमाण्या

world like the sky etc. The world is unreal like the objects of dreams. So Adwaita is the same as Buddhism—In reply to this criticism it is contended that the Vignana Vadins do not consider that the Vedas are authoritative, while the Advaitins consider them so; and therefore adwaita cannot be regarded as the same as Buddhism. Considering this answer it is alleged that in as much as Advaitins do not recognise as real, anything other than knowledge, though it is taught by the Vedas. It follows that Advaitins do not consider the Vedas as authoritative That is, Adwaita is the same as Buddhism—Such is the purport.

P. What is this book?

D. This is a Buddhistic work by name Tattva-Sangraha.

P. (1) What is the meaning of these slokas?

D. "The whole Universe including the earth etc is superimposed on the unchanging reality of knowledge. And this knowledge is Atman". Such is the contention of Advaitins. Therefore our religion (Buddhism) and Adwaita are identical. Adwaita is a correct Philosophy; still in as much as they say that knowledge is unchanging, it is slightly erroneous.

यन्म्युपगमात् कथं तदभ्युपगंतुं भगवत्समयस्य तत्समयतुल्यतेति चेत्सत्यं तथापि विज्ञानातिरिक्तं विज्ञेयान्म्युपगमे कथं न तत्तौल्यं तेनापि तथैवांगी कारादित्याह-यदीति । बाह्यं विज्ञानातिरिक्तं वस्तु वितथमलीकं कथं न्विति संबंधः व्यतिरेकमुखेन उक्तमतद्वयसाम्यमन्वयेनाप्याह

यदिबोधएवपरमार्थवपुर्नतु बोध्यमित्यभिमतं भवति । ननु चाश्रितं । भवति बुद्धमुने र्मतमेव कृत्स्नमिहमस्कारिभिः २६.

(1) नित्यज्ञानविवर्तोऽयं क्षितितेजो जलादिकः । आत्मा तदात्मकश्चेति संगिरन्तेऽपरेपुरः ॥३२८॥तेषामल्पापराधंतु दर्शनं नित्यतोक्तिः ।

Court. Mr. Achariar, how many books are you going to examin the defedant in. Please do not waste the time of the court. Proceed further.

P. My lord, we do not want to waste the time of the court. As these evidences are important, we had to exhibit them. There are many more works which we want to exhibit as evidence before the court. But if your Lordship should consider that they are not necessary, I pray that I may have the permission to exhibit them if and when circumstances demand them.

Court. Certainly.

P. From the works of Adwaitins and Buddhists does it not follow that the two systems are identical?

D. Mr. Achariar, I am afraid that you have not understood the adwaitic or Buddhistic works. Though there is mention of some points of identity, between the two systems, the very same books refer to the points of divergence between them too, Without recognising them, you have been saying that Adwaita is identical with Buddhism.

P. Many, many points of similarity between Adwaitism and Bnddhism have been established previously. How many points of difference are there between the two?

D. That knowledge alone is transcendently real and on it the whole Universe is superimposed has been admitted by both Bnddhists and Adwaitins. But Buddhists maintain that this knowledge is momentary and fleeting and manifold, whereas the Adwai-

tins say that knowledge (Brahman) is unchanging and capable of being known through the Vedanta. As this difference is clearly and explicitly stated, how can you say that the two are identical. Every system may have points of similarity with another and in case you maintain that Adwaitism and Buddhism are identical because of some points of similarity, you have to accept that every system is identical with every other system.

P. Mr. Sastriar, If, as you say, there is difference between the knowledge (Brahman) of the Adwaitins and that of Buddhists, they may be different. As knowledge (Brahman) of Adwaitins cannot become an object of any Pramana like the knowledge or Sunya of Buddhists, it cannot be known through the Vedanta.

Court. Mr. Sarma, Please discuss this question.

D.V. Even so, my Lord.

D.V. Mr. Achariar why is not Brahman known through Perception?

P. The objects which can be known through Perception (the eye, ear, etc) must have qualities like form, colour etc. As such qualities are not in Brahman, it cannot be known through perception.

D.V. Why is it not known through Inference?

P. On the authority of the Vedic passages it becomes clear that Brahman cannot be established through any logical inference. Further inference can reveal only an object with qualities. In as much as the

Adwaitins do not predicate any qualities of Brahman, it cannot be known through inference.

D.V. Why cannot Brahman be known through Vedas and other Scriptural authorities (Sabda)?

P. Ideas that are caused by Sabda are of two kinds (a) Ideas connoted by a single word and (b) ideas connoted by sentences. Meanings connoted by a single word are of two kinds (1) conventional and (2) literal *ie* derived by combining the meanings of the different parts of the word. The Brahman of the Adwaitins cannot be known through the conventional, literal meaning of the word, or the sentence of the Vedas.

D.V. Why cannot the Brahman be known through the conventional meaning of words?

P. Can orthodox people of my stamp understand the meaning of the English words you are using?

D. If any knowledge is to arise through words there must previously be the knowledge of the distinctive meaning of each word. Since the distinctive meaning of English words is not had by us, we are not able to understand the meaning of the English words.

P. If the knowledge that a particular word denotes a particular object is to be had, is it not necessary that we should have a previous knowledge of that object.

D. Certainly. Only when the pot is previously perceived by a person, he can understand the meaning of the word pot, when he is asked by some body to bring a pot. Thus if knowledge is to be obtained

through the conventional meaning of any word, there must be a previous knowledge of that object.

P. If the knowledge of Brahman is to arise through the conventional meaning of words, is it not necessary to have a previous knowledge of Brahman?

D. Most assuredly.

P. By what can the previous knowledge of Brahman be had?

D. As it is impossible to have it either through Perception or Inference, it must be had only through Sabda.

P. If the knowledge of Brahman is to be had through Sabda, previously there must have been a knowledge of Brahman only through Sabda. And the same must have been preceded by a knowledge of Brahman through Sabda and thus *ad infinitum*. Therefore how can the knowledge of Brahman be possible through the conventional meaning of words?

Similarly if the knowledge of Brahman is to be had either through Lakshana (figuratively) or guna (secondarily) there must be a previous knowledge and so on *ad infinitum*, causing the fallacy of Infinitum ad Regressus. Therefore the knowledge of Brahman cannot be had, through the conventional figurative or secondary meaning (Rudha Lakshana or gauna).

D. Even if the knowledge of Brahman cannot be had through its conventional or figurative or secondary meaning, can it be not had through derivation (literal meaning—yoga)?

P. Through literal meaning we can know only qualified and related objects and never a partless object. The Brahman of Adwaitins is not qualified and is not composed of parts. And therefore knowledge of Brahman cannot be had even in this way.

D. Can the knowledge of Brahman be had through the sentence?

P. The sentence like the literal meaning of words is capable of giving knowledge only of relations. In as much as the Brahman of Adwaitins is devoid of particular relations it cannot be known even through sentences. Further, words function by indicating substance, quality, activity, generality, particularity, etc. In as much as Brahman of Adwaitins is devoid of all these specifications, Sabda cannot primarily denote Brahman — such is the opinion of Sankarācharya expressed in Brihadaranyaka-Upanishad:Bhashya. Thus the Brahman of Adwaitins cannot be known through the Vedānta and so also the Vignana (knowledge) and Sunya of Buddhists are incapable of being established through the Vedānta. Consequently how is it possible to say that these are different?

D. No reply.

D.V. The knowledge (Vignana) of Buddhists is manifold, momentary, whereas the knowledge of Adwaitins is one and unchanging. I suppose you admit this difference between the two.

P. No—I do not admit ever this difference.

- D. If Buddhists like Advaitins maintain that that knowledge is unchanging and one, the two might be identical. Or if Advaitins like Buddhists say that knowledge (Brahman) is momentary and plural, the two might be identical. But such statements are not made either by Buddhists or Advaitins and therefore how can they be identical?
- P. There are two schools of Buddhism, one which maintains that knowledge is unchanging and the other maintains that it is changing. Advaita is identical with that School of Buddhism which says that knowledge is unchanging.
- D. What is your authority for saying that some Buddhists maintain that knowledge is unchanging?
- P. The works of Advaitins and Buddhists are my authorities.
- D. Please cite the Advaitic authorities.
- P. What is this book?
- D. This is Sankaracharya's Bhashya and Vachaspati's commentary on it by name Bhamati
- P. Please explain the following passages (1)
- D. The Sutrakara in Brahmasutra I, 2, 32 (2) has condemned in many ways the Vignanavadi Buddhists.

(1) यथायथायं वैनाशिक समय उपपत्तिमत्वाय परीक्ष्यते, तथातथा सिकताकूपवद्विदीर्यत एव। नकांचिदप्यत्रोपपत्तिं पश्यामः (शां. भा.)

अर्थतश्च नैरात्म्यमभ्युपेत्याह्वय विज्ञानं समस्तवासनाधार मभ्युपगच्छन्न क्षरमात्मान मभ्युपैति (मामनी.)

(2) 'सर्वथानुपपत्तेश्च' (ब्र. सू. २--२--३२)

Sankara in his Bhasya on this Sutra brings out many inconsistencies both in the verbal expression and reasoning and concludes by saying that Buddhism is lost like a sandy well. Vachaspati in his commentary on the above statement in the course of explaining the inconsistencies, remarks that the Buddhists while denying the existence of a soul (Atman) say that the Alaya Vignana (Atman) is the substratum of all Vasanas (tendencies) and thus recognise an unchanging Alaya Vignana (Atma). Therefore they are guilty of contradiction.

P. Does it not follow from this that Buddhists recognise Vignana (knowledge) as unchanging?

D. No answer.

P. What is this work?

Court. How many books are you going to exhibit in the course of the enquiry? Enough please.

P. My Lord, I want to indicate that there are several authorities to prove and establish that the Vignana (Knowledge) of the Buddhists is unchanging. If your Lordship does not need any further evidence being cited I will not exhibit any more authorities for the present. But I must have the permission of the court to refer to them if necessary. May I discuss another point?

Court. Yes, go on please.

P. Is the Brahman of Adwaitins with attributes or without attributes?

D. It is without attributes.

- P. How do you know it is attributeless?
- D. From the following authorities, viz, Sankaracharya's commentary on (1) Vishnu sahasranama (2) Brihadaranyaka, (3) Brahmasutras, it is evident that Brahman is attributeless i. e. devoid of name, form, activity, difference, generality, qualities, etc.
- P. Is the Vignana (knowledge) of Buddhists with or without qualities?
- D. It is qualitless.
- P. Mr. Shastriar the knowledge that is accepted as real by both of you, Buddhists and Adwaitins, is devoid of all qualities. Is there the quality of momentariness in the knowledge (gnana) of Buddhists and the quality of unchangingness in the knowledge (Brahman) of Adwaitins.
- D. There is no quality of unchangingness in the (Brahman) knowledge of Adwaitins; nor is there the quality of momentariness in the knowledge (gnana) of Buddhists.
- P. If so how can you maintain that the knowledge of Buddhists which is momentary is different from the knowledge of Adwaitins which is unchanging Is it not absurd to say that?

1 निर्विशेषत्वाच्छून्यवच्छून्यः-

2 यस्मिन्नकाश्चिद्विशेषोस्ति नाम वा रूपं वा कर्म वा भेदो वा जातिर्वा गुणो वा (बृ. शा. भा. २-३-६)

3 समस्तविशेषरहितं निर्विकल्पकमेव ब्रह्म प्रतिपत्तव्यं नतद्विपरीतं.
(ब्र. शां. भाष्यं ३-२-११)

- D. Mr. Achariar, though there is no quality of unchangingness in our Brahman or Vignana, (1) unchangingness is the very nature of gnana (Brahman); likewise though there is no quality of momentariness in the gnana of Buddhists, it is the very nature of their gnana; consequently there is undoubtedly a difference between our Vignana and Buddhaistic Vignana.
- P. Mr. Sastriar, suppose somebody says that a chameleon entered the thigh of our teacher,* will not an intelligent pupil consider the absurdity of such a possibility? Where is the hole in the thigh for the chameleon to enter. It is only a fool who would begin to weep at such a narration. Every intelligent man like you, must bear in mind the moral of this old story; we must not believe without consideration whatever is said.
- D. What is the mistake in the statement of Sankshepa Sareeraka?
- P. (2) How can "eternality" which includes relation to several objects, be predicated of the part-less Brahman which is not related to even one object? Likewise how can momentariness which lives only for a moment and is related to many objects be predicated of the part-less knowledge which is not related to any object. Without considering the absurdity of

(1) स्थैर्यं स्वरूपात्मकं चैतन्यस्य च भंगुरत्वमिदमे सर्वस्य ते दर्शने
(संक्षेप शा. 2.31)

* 'भट्टस्य कट्यां सरटः प्रविष्टः'

* 'छिद्राभावात्कथं प्रवेशः'

(2) 'सकलकालवर्तित्वं'

such predication how is it proper to say that Buddhism and Adwaita are different because the knowledge of the former has for its nature momentariness while the knowledge (Brahman) of the latter has for its nature unchangingness.

D. No reply.

D.V. Never mind the difference between the two on the principle of momentariness and unchangingness. The Brahman of Adwaitins is one, while the Vignana of Buddhists is many. On this principle, there is difference between the two. I suppose.

P. Mr. Sastriar, Adwaitins do not predicate oneness of their Brahman. Further, in as much as the gnana of Adwaitins and Buddhists is qualitiless, it is impossible to predicate oneness of the Adwaitins' Brahman or manyness of the knowledge of Buddhists. Hence it is not possible to distinguish the Adwaitins' Brahman from the Vignana of Buddhists on the principle that the former is one and the latter many. In as much as they are devoid of all qualities and relations, there is no difference between them at all.

D. What is your authority in saying that Adwaitins have not predicated oneness of their Brahman.

P. Mr. Sastriar, from the statement that Brahman is devoid of all qualities, it logically follows that it cannot have the quality of oneness. Further San-karacharya's works and Madhusudanasaraswati's Commentary thereon by name Siddhanta Bindu etc, are my authorities for making the statement.

- D. Please show the work of Sankara.
- P. Well asked. Explain this passage and the commentary thereon.
- D. In considering the vedic passage "there is only one secondless Brahman" anticipating the doubt that in as much as oneness is predicated of Brahman it is not proper to maintain that the quality of oneness cannot be predicated of Brahman, Sankara remarks that because oneness is illusion-caused and false, it is not in Brahman. Such is the opinion of Sankaracharya.
- P. Now then, Mr. Sastriar, does it not follow from this remark of Sankaracharya that oneness does not exist in Brahman according to the Adwaitins.
- D. Yes.
- P. How can the Buddhists predicate "manyness" of their knowledge (gnana) which is devoid of all qualities.
- D. The 'manyness' that is predicated of their gnana is not real. It is false.
- P. Now Sir, if in truth the unchangingness and oneness predicated of gnana by the Adwaitins and the momentariness and manyness predicated of gnana by the Buddhists are non-existent, how is it possible to say that the Vignana of the Adwaitins is different from that of the Buddhists?

नवाकेवलत्वं (दशश्लोकी १०)

ननु एकमेवाद्वितीयमिति श्रुत्या एकत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते नेत्याह नवा केवलत्वमिति केवलत्वं एकत्वं तच्चाविद्यकत्वात्.

D. (1) Questioning and answering are possible only through the language of duality. To us both dwaita and adwaita are unreal and therefore it is not desirable for us to engage ourselves in a controversy. Only the ignorant are involved in such discussions. It is the message of our Sankaracharya that pandits of our stamp must sit quiet like a rock. So we do not propose to discuss with you any further. We will sit quiet like stone without giving a reply to any of your questions.



(1) 'किंवापेक्ष्य मिहापिमथ्यतितिरां मिथ्याविचारादिकं द्वैताद्वैतविवर्जिते समरसे मौनं परं संमतं' । (शां. प्रौढानुभूति ११) 'मिथ्यावादविचारचित्तन महोकुर्वत्य दृष्टात्मका भ्रान्ताएव न पारगा दृढाघियस्तूष्णींशिलावत् स्थिताः' १३.)

'चोद्यंवा परिहारोवा क्रियता द्वैतभाषया'

Argument of the Plaintiff's Vakil on the identity between Adwaita and Sunyavada (Buddhism)

P. V. My Lord, If two religions are to be different, there must be difference between the doctrines of the two. In as much as there is no difference in the tenets of Buddhism and Adwaita, the two are identical. *Vide* the following scheme.

DOCTRINES OF ADWAITA.

1. Only Brahman is real.
2. The whole universe is superimposed on Brahman on account of ignorance and is unreal as a dream, or the silver in the shell or the horn of the hare is.
3. By meditating "I am Brahman, I am Brahman" the salvation of becoming Brahman must be attained.

DOCTRINES OF BUDDHISM.

1. Only Sunya is real.
2. The whole Universe is superimposed on Sunya on account of ignorance and is as unreal as a dream or the silver in the shell or the horn of the hare is.
3. By meditating, "I am Sunya, I am Sunya", the salvation of becoming Sunya must be attained.

Thus, my Lord, these two systems are identical. There is no difference between them at all. Therefore this system of Adwaita is avaidic (not consistent with the religion and philosophy of the Vedas) and is consequently responsible for many ills and evils of this world. I pray that the Adwaitins must not be allowed to preach their philosophy as Vaidic (drawn from the Vedas). Those who consider the sanctity and authority of the Vedas must not adopt

the Adwaita, but instead follow the Vaidic religion of Dwaita which alone is capable of yielding the desired fruit of Moksha (Salvation) and the like. I pray that in the interests of justice, truth and humanity your Lordship be pleased to give such decree.

Argument of the Defendant's Vakil.

My Lord, though there is similarity between Adwaita and Buddhism on the topic of unreality of the Universe, in as much as there is difference on other topics, the two cannot be identical (*Vide* the following scheme)

DOCTRINES OF ADWAITA.

1. Brahman is real. It is the substratum for the illusion of the universe.

2. The universe is phenomenally real.

3. Veda is authoritative.

4. The existence of Heaven and other worlds is accepted and the means of reaching them such as doing meritorious acts is adopted.

5. These are Astikas.

6. Sankaracharya has condemned Buddhism.

DOCTRINES OF BUDDHISM.

1. Sunya is real. It is the substratum for the illusion of the universe.

2. The universe is not phenomenally real.

3. Veda is not authoritative.

4. The existence of Heaven and other worlds is not accepted. These do not perform any meritorious acts to reach Heaven, etc.

5. These are Nastikas.

6. Buddha has established Buddhism.

Thus my Lord on these and other points there is difference between Adwaita and Buddhism and

therefore the two are different. If it is held that in as much as there are some points of similarity between Adwaita and Buddhism, they are identical, it must be maintained with equal force and validity that any two religions or philosophies must be identical, for, they certainly have some points of similarity between them. But such a step is palpably absurd. Therefore Adwaita is one thing and Buddhism is another. According to standard works on Adwaita like Siddhantalessa Sangraha one should perform sacrifices, meditate as "I am Brahman, I am Brahman," get the mind purified thereby, obtain the immediate knowledge of "I am Brahman" through the study of the Vedanta, destroy ignorance by that knowledge and obtain the salvation of becoming the Attributeless (Nirguna) Brahman. That is, the ignorance that one is not the attributeless Brahman must be destroyed.

This is the highest reward.

That Brahman is the Overlord, Independent, Omniscient, Superior to every thing else, capable of achieving every thing that He wills or desires, the finite soul is different from God, that salvation can be obtained only through the knowledge of the difference between the finite soul and God and that even after salvation there is difference between the finite soul and God etc., which are all recognised by the Dwaitins—though all these tenets are referred to by the Upanishad, Gita, and Sutras, in as much as they are not their real import they constitute but a lower stage.

Our Adwaita and the practices in accordance with it constitute the higher stage. Consequently

them consequently, my Lord, I pray that those who seek highest reward must follow Adwaita and act in accordance with that philosophy I pray that your Lordship be pleased to decree accordingly.

Reargument of the Plaintiff's Vakil.

P. V. My Lord; the defendant maintains (1) that Brahman is real, the universe is unreal, the finite soul is none other than Brahman. He condemns just like the Buddhists that every thing other than Brahman is as unreal as the horns of the hare, mirage or castle in the air. Consequently to the Adwaitins the Vedas and the worlds and means of obtaining them taught in the Vedas must all be unreal. Here there is no difference on these topics between Adwaita and Buddhism. That Buddhists like Adwaitins recognise phenomenal reality of sacrifices, the universe, sacrifices, other worlds etc, is evident from the works of Adwaitins and Buddhists. On that point also there is no difference between the two.

That the *Pramanas* or the instruments of knowledge never report that the Universe is phenomenally real, but only that it is transcendently real, is clear from the works of Sankara and Bhamati. Hence it is not correct to say that the *Pramanas* report phenomenal reality of the Universe. Appayya Dikshita and other Adwaitic scholars have admitted the identity between phenomenal reality and unreality. So it is against the *Pramanas* to say that the Universe is phenomenally real, even as it is to say that the Universe is false.

(1) ब्रह्मसत्यम् जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैवनापरः'

From the work of Sankaracharya and Sankara Vijaya it is evident that it is not Sankara but Kumarila that condemned Buddhism. So it is wrong to argue that in as much as Sankara condemned Buddhism, it is wrong to say that Adwaita is identical with Buddhism.

Vedavyasa Himself who is the incarnation of Sri Narayana has proclaimed that Adwaita is none other than Buddhism. It is clearly evident from the works of Gaudapada-charya, Sankaracharya and other Adwaitic scholars, that the Pandits of the very time when Adwaita Philosophy came into being (even earlier than Sankara's age) maintained that Adwaita was Buddhism. Sankaracharya and other Adwaitic scholars have recognised the identity between Adwaita and Buddhism and have tried to show some difference between the two, merely because of their zeal for their own system but in truth, my Lord, the two are identical. Bhaskaracharya, Vignana Bhikshu and other scholars have said that Adwaita is Buddhism and therefore it is wrong to maintain that Dwaitins are saying this now out of mere hatred. The doctrines of both the systems are identical and therefore there is no ground for the charge that out of sheer hatred the identity between the two systems is upheld.

Any evidence given by a witness on any point in a court of Law is taken as true as long as there is nothing to conflict it. That is exactly how it should be likewise, in days prior to Sankara, in Sankara's time as well as after Sankara, people have been maintaining that Adwaita is none other than

Buddhism, In as much as there is nothing to contradict it, it must be admitted as true. Sankara and other Advaitic scholars recognise identity on several points between the two systems and pretend to show difference on some points. On consideration of the doctrines of the two systems the same conclusion is reached. We have proved previously, my Lord, that in truth the two are identical. Therefore Advaita is Buddhism.

Just as Advaitins maintain that their Brahman is existence, knowledge, bliss, unknowable, indescribable and devoid of all attributes, so also Buddhists say that Sunya is existence, knowledge, bliss, unknowable indescribable and devoid of all attributes. This becomes evident from the works of Buddhists as well as those of Advaitins. Therefore only a difference in name as Sunya or as Brahman is clearly seen to exist. There is no difference at all in the thing meant. Since Advaitins do not admit in their Brahman difference from any thing else, they do not admit in it the difference from Sunya too. So long as differentiating attributes do not exist, no difference could exist. If the Sunya of Buddhists be a positive Being, the Sunyavada is nothing but Brahnavada, as the author of BrahmaVidyabhavana observes; the Sunya if a positive being he admits it to be veritably Brahman itself. Even when Sunya is the negation of the phenomenal Universe, Advaita siddhi and other works admittedly speak of Brahman as the negation of the phenomenal Universe. Therefore the Brahman of Advaitins

is one with the Sunya of Buddhists.

Adwaitins themselves have admitted that their Brahman cannot be established by the Vedas. Therefore it is, like the Sunya of the Buddhists, incapable of being established by the Pramanas. It naturally follows that the Brahman of Adwaitins does not deserve to be accepted. Nor is it right to contend that Brahman is established because it is self-evident. (Swaprakasa), for in as much as Brahman is incapable of being known through any Pramana, there is no authority for its being Swaprakasa (Self-evident). If it is contended that the self-evidence of Brahman may be accepted notwithstanding the absence of a Pramana, we are logically forced to accept the horns of the hare as self-evident. Even granting that Brahman is Swaprakasa (Self-evident), in as much as Adwaitins assert that Swaprakasa means not knowable through any Pramana, it is contradiction to say that Brahman is known because it is Swaprakasa, which means that Brahman is known because it cannot be known. If we accept this, we are logically obliged to say that the hare's horn which is not known, becomes known. Therefore we cannot accept the Brahman of Adwaitins.

The Vedas do not teach the Brahman of Adwaitins. If the Universe taught by the Vedas is false, it is not correct to say that the Vedas are authoritative. The Vedas according

to the Adwaitins cannot teach about really existing things.

Even the Buddhists rely upon the passage in their Sastra and (1) do meritorious acts to merit Heaven. Again they say that they meditate as "I am Sunya, I am Sunya", get a direct vision of Sunya and attain the salvation of becoming Sunya, just as the Adwaitins say that they attain the salvation of becoming Brahman. Therefore it is wrong to maintain that the Adwaitins reach Heaven etc by performing the acts enjoined in the Vedas and with purified minds etc. they get the direct vision of Brahman and obtain the salvation of becoming Brahman, whereas Buddhists do not reach Heaven etc by doing meritorious acts and that they do not attain salvation.

To Adwaitins, sacrifice is false, worship, worshipping and worshipper are all false, mind and its purification are false, Sastras are false, Vedas are false Brahman, is false, bondage is false and salvation is false, the person desiring salvation is false, the four castes and stages are false. The adwaitic position in plain and unvarnished language comes to this—We adopt the false caste system and false Asrama, falsely taught by the false Vedas, falsely obtain the false purity of the false mind, falsely hear, falsely earn the false knowledge of the false attributeless Brahman and falsely obtain the false salvation. This is just like say-

ing that the barren woman's son, after bathing in the waters of the mirage, decorating himself with the flowers of the sky, armed with the bow made of the horns of the hare is fighting a war. The absurdity of this is transparent even to children.

*Though Adwaitins know and say that no one exerts himself for getting the happiness in dreams and that the fruit attained by performing sacrifices etc., is equal to that got by the acts done in dreams, still merely for the sake of misguiding and deceiving the Astikas, they pretend to be doing the Vedic acts. In truth, in accordance with their philosophy, there is no need or scope to do any act. There is no fruit for such deeds. Thus Adwaita like Buddhism is avaidic (outside the pale of the Vedas, and the two are the same. I pray that your Lordship consider all the evidences cited and deliver your judgment in the interests of Truth and Justice.

Argument of the Plaintiff's Vakil on the Identity between Vignanavada Buddhism and Adwaita.

P.V. My Lord, the Adwaitins speak of three grades of pupils for whose benefit the doctrine is

‘नहि स्वप्नमुखाद्यर्थं धर्मे कश्चित् प्रवर्तते’

‘ज्योतिष्टोमादिश्रुतिबोधितानुष्ठानात् फलशुद्धिः स्वप्नश्रुतिबोधितानुष्ठान
प्रयुक्तफलसंवादतुल्या’ ‘वंचनार्थमुपन्यासः’

taught differently thus, viz (1)—the worst pupils are taught the doctrine of evolution (Parinama) (2) the intermediate are taught the doctrine of Superimposition and (3) the best are taught the the annihilation of all dual point of view, the non-existence of the Universe and the identity between the finite soul and Brahman. In a similar manner the Buddhistic truth is taught differently to suit the three grades of pupils, for fear that the teaching of the doctrine of Sunya at the very beginning to the dull follower may not be understood and appreciated. Accordingly, to the worst pupils the visible world is taught to be real and momentary, but the real goal of the teaching is to lead gradually the pupils to recognise that in truth every thing is Sunya. This first step is known as the systems of the Sautrantikas and Vaibhashikas. (2) For the benefit of the intermediate class of pupils, the teaching is started by saying that only Vignana (knowledge) is real and the external world is unreal, but the pupils are led gradually to believe that only Sunya is real. (3) The best pupils are straightway taught that only Sunya is real and on it is superimposed the whole Universe which is false like a dream. From this, my Lord, it follows clearly that

Vignana Vada = Sunya Vada

(1) अरोपदृष्टिरुदिता परिणामदृष्टिर्द्वैतोपशांति रपवादक दृष्टिरंत्या । मध्ये विवर्तविषयाद्वय मिश्रदृष्टिः व्यामिश्रदृष्टि रधरोत्तर भूमिभावात्. (२-८२). कृपणधीः परिणाममुदीक्षते क्षपित कल्मषधीस्तु विवर्ततां । स्थिरमतिः पुरुषः पुनरीक्षतेव्यपगतद्वितयं परमंपदं (संक्षेपशारीरकम् २८९.)

Sunyavada = Adwaita

Adwaita = Vignana Vada

Further in as much as the pioneer of Adwaita, viz, Gaudapadacharya Sankaracharya, and the author of the Panchapadika Vivarana and Tattvadipana have all admitted only the doctrines of the Vignanavada Buddhism, that only Vignana (knowledge) is real and that the whole of the external Universe is superimposed on it, it follows that Adwaita is Vignanavada Buddhism and is outside the pale of the Vedas (avaidic) as the other undoubtedly is.

If the Astikas who are Vaidic (who believe that the Vedas teach about real things) should in a fit of ignorance and carelessness mistake this avaidic Adwaita as Vaidic and follow it, they might go to eternal perdition without ever reaching the Lord in accordance with the injunction of Lord Krishna in chapter XV1, 20 of the Gita*

So, my Lord, in the interests of the welfare of people, I pray that your Lordship be pleased to decree that (1) the Adwaita is the same as the avaidic Buddhism and (2) no one should teach Adwaita as the philosophy derived from and in accordance with the Vedas.

Argument of the Defendant's Vakil.

D.V. My Lord, inspite of the facts (1) that Adwaitins like Buddhists have taught diffe-

* 'मामप्राप्यैव कौंतेय ततो यात्यधमां गतिं.'

rently the three grades of the worst, the intermediate and the best pupils (2) that even as the crowning phase of the Buddhistic teaching was gradually to lead up to the belief that ultimately Sunya alone is real the Adwaitins gradually lead up to the ultimate goal of the annihilation of all duality—passing through the standpoints of evolution (Parinama) and superimposition (Vivarta) and (3) that like the Vignana Vadins, Adwaitins have taught that only Vignana is real and that the external world is superimposed on it and is unreal as a dream—notwithstanding all these points of similarity, in as much as there is divergence in several points between the two, Adwaita is not Buddhism. If Adwaita is regarded as identical with Buddhism on the basis of a few points of similarity, it would logically follow that any system is identical with any other system because there are certainly some points of resemblance between any two systems. So, my Lord, it is wrong to argue that Adwaita is Buddhism because they resemble one another in some points.

The Vignana of Buddhism is momentary and many and cannot be known through the Vedanta. The Vignana (Brahman) of Adwaita is unchanging and one and can be known through the Vedanta. The Buddhists do not recognise Heaven and meritorious acts, while we Adwaitins recognise them. Therefore, my Lord, Adwaita and Buddhism are different.

The plaintiff is inspired by hatred, speaking

about the identity between our Advaita and the Avidic Buddhism. I pray that your Lordship be pleased to dismiss the petition of the Plaintiff.

Re-argument of the Plaintiff's Vakil

•P. V. My Lord, the contention that the Vignana (knowledge) of the Buddhists is momentary and many is false.

To say that the Brahman (Vignana) of the Advaitins is knowable through the Vedanta and that it is unchanging and one, is false. For the present it is futile to speak about any distinction by these differentiating attributes.

The Brahman (jnana) of the Advaitins is devoid of all attributes and consequently it cannot be one, unchanging and capable of being known through the Vedas.

Advaitins do not predicate of their Brahman, name, form, attributes, activity, difference, relation, etc. which are necessary for words to function by way of giving either the primary or secondary connotation. Further they admit that their Brahman is not knowable through any Pramana, since it is Swaprakasa (Self-evident). Therefore like the Vignana of the Buddhists the Brahman of Advaitins is unfit to be known through the Vedanta.

Sankaracharya has stated (1) that since the idea of oneness is caused by illusion, it cannot be

(1) 'नवाकेवलत्वं' इत्यादिना.

predicated of Brahman (Vignana).

Likewise since the Vignana of Buddhists is devoid of all qualities, it cannot have momentariness or manyness. Therefore there is no possibility of the Vignana of Buddhists being different from that of Adwaitins.

The contention that though Brahman is devoid of the qualities of oneness and unchangingness, Brahman has for its very Swarupa (nature) oneness and unchangingness, is absurd and impossible, because oneness is admitted by Adwaitins to be caused by ignorance and the oneness caused by ignorance can only be unreal and never be the nature of Brahman.

Eternality means that which is related to all times and is related to many things and implies parts and therefore it cannot be predicated of Brahman which is part-less.

In a similar manner it is absurd to predicate the quality of momentariness with its implication of partness of the partless *gnana*. Thus in as much as it is impossible to predicate the qualities of oneness and unchangingness of Brahman or the qualities of manyness and momentariness of the Vignana of Buddhists, it is not possible to distinguish the Vignana of the Buddhists, and the Vignana (Brahman) of Adwaitins.

Again since it is clear from the works of Buddhists and Advaitins that even among Buddhists there are some who maintain that Vignana

is unchanging, it follows that Adwaita and Buddhism are one.

Even granting that the Vignana of Buddhists is momentary, while that of Adwaitins is unchanging, in as much as Adwaitins uphold like Nastikas that the castes, Sasacrifice, bath, Sandhya-vandana, virtue, sin etc., are all unreal and in as much as they warn * that nobody would exert himself to do any good act for the sake of dream-happiness, it is not sound or correct to say that Adwaitins like Astikas perform sacrifices, Sandhya, etc. Consequently the alleged small difference between Buddhism and Adwaita cannot entitle the Adwaita to be a Vaidic system. Nor could its followers be called Astikas or Vaidikas. They, however, pretend to do sacrifices, baths, worship, etc., like Astikas, merely for cheating people and making them believe their religion to be Vaidic and follow it. Though Buddhists maintain that Heaven, etc., are all illusory and unreal, still on the authority of their spiritual text (1) like Adwaitins they do some meritorious deeds to merit Heaven. On this point also of belief in Heaven and performing good acts to merit it, there is no difference between Adwaita and Buddhism.

So, my Lord, I pray that your Lordship be pleased to decree (1) that the Avaidic Adwaita should not be followed by those who have faith in Vedas and who dread spiritual dead-fall, that Adwaita is only Buddhism, that Adwaitins must not preach that their system is derived

* 'नहि स्वप्नसुखाद्यर्थं धर्मे कश्चित्प्रवर्तते'

from the Vedas, (2) that God is the creator of the entire Universe including the castes, stages, sacrifices, Heaven, which are all transcendently real, that God who is the protector of the whole real Universe is full of innumerable auspicious qualities and is distinct from the sentient souls and insentient objects, that God is the giver of salvation and other fruits desired by His devotees, that all good people should do sacrifices, etc., to propitiate God, get their things purified, meditate on the attributes of God such as His knowledge or bliss, attain a direct vision of God, and through His Grace enjoy in this world all that they desire and after getting freedom from bondage enjoy happiness in Vaikuntha as indicated in the Vedic passage* and that it is only Dwaita Philosophy that is Vaidic and that must be followed by all those who do not want to be caught by the perpetual tossing of births and deaths and who want to constantly sing the glories of God and enjoy the joy that knows no end or limit.



* 'स एकाग्रो भवति स चिद्धो भवति' 'जक्षन् क्रीडन् रममाणः' 'स यदि पितृलोककामो भवति संकल्पादेवास्य पितरः समुत्तिष्ठन्ति' 'अनावृत्तिशब्दात् अनावृत्तिशब्दात्' 'सर्वान् कामान् आप्त्वा अमृतः समभवत्' 'इममानवमा वर्त नावर्तते' 'कामनीकामरूप्यनु संचरन् एतत्साम गायत्रास्ते'

Books can be had of:—

V. N. Desikacharya

Librarian, S. M. S. A., Sabha,

Uttaradimutt Buildings,

Bassayangudi,

BANGALORE

உத்தரத்திமுத்த கட்டிடங்கள்
அருகே உள்ள
OR

AT THE UTTARADIMUTT, TIRUCHANUR
Near Tirupati.

Printed at Sri Vyasa Press, Tirupati.