

Jadavpur University Sanskrit Series No. 1

Government of India Reprinting Series

General Editor :

DR RAMARANJAN MUKHERJI

M.A. D. PHIL , D. LITT

Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit,
Jadavpur University.

ṢAṬSANDARBHA

BY

ŚRĪJĪVA GOSVĀMIN

Vol. I.—PART II

TATTVASANDARBHA

Editor : DR SITANATH GOSWAMI, M.A., D. PHIL.,
Vedānta-Vyākaraṇatīrtha

SEPTEMBER, 1967



JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY

CALCUTTA—32.

Jadavpur University Sanskrit Series

Board of Editors :

DR SADANANDA BHADURI, M.A., PH.D.
Chairman

DR RAMARANJAN MUKHERJI,
M.A., D. PHIL., D. LITT.,
Secretary & General Editor

DR SITANATH GOSWAMI, M.A., D. PHIL.,
Vedānta-Vyākaraṇatīrtha

DR GOPIKAMOHAN BHATTACHARYA,
M.A., D. PHIL., DR. PHIL.
Kāvya-Nyāyatīrtha

SRI HEMANTAKUMAR GANGULI, M.A.



श्रीजीवगोस्वामिपादकृतः

तत्त्वसन्दर्भः

श्रीबलदेवविद्याभूषणकृतटीकासहितः

यादवपुर-विश्वविद्यालयाध्यापक-डः सीतानाथगोस्वामिकृत-
टिप्पण्यादिसमेतः

TATTVASANDARBHA

BY

ŚRĪJĪVA GOSVĀMIN

Edited by :

DR SITANATH GOSWAMI, M.A., D. PHIL.,
Vedānta-Vyākaraṇatīrtha
Reader, Jadavpur University



JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY

CALCUTTA—32

SEPTEMBER, 1967

is seeing the light of the day first as constituting Part II of Volume I of the Series has been edited by Dr Sitanath Goswami, Reader in Sanskrit at this University. In the exhaustive notes Dr Goswami has discussed fully the various problems connected with the text and has examined how far the stand of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism can be defended in its controversy with the opposing schools of thought.

The Board of Editors has reasons to believe that this and other volumes to be published subsequently will remove a long-felt want and bring out the manifold aspects of an important but less discussed branch of philosophical literature. It takes this opportunity of expressing its profound sense of gratitude to the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India but for whose financial assistance, the scheme would not have been translated into action. Warmest thanks are due to Dr Triguna Sen, Education Minister, India and former Vice-Chancellor, Jadavpur University, Prof. Hemchandra Guha, the present Vice-Chancellor and Sri Prabirchandra Vasu Mallik, the Registrar of the University, whose sincere sympathy and active co-operation enabled the treatise to see the light of the day.

RAMARANJAN MUKHERJI

General Editor

PREFACE

Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal marks the significant development of the cult and philosophy of divine love. In the flare up of Caitanya movement, it assumed a distinctive form of its own which is one of intensely spiritual emotionalism. It is characterised by fruitful literary energy as evinced by the vast and varied literature in the theology, metaphysics and ritualism as shaped and formulated by the celebrated six Gosvāmins of Bengal.

The ecstatic-aesthetic devotionalism of the Gauḍiṣa Vaiṣṇavite school derived all its requisite force and logical bearings from the scriptural authority of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, and its inspiration from the life and teachings of the great savant Śrīmanmahāprabhu himself. It is told that Śrīrūpa received his intellectual illumination from Śrīcaitanya at Prayāga on the fundamental principles of *Bhakti* as *sine qua non* of *rasa* and he gave the world his valuable classics, *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* and *Ujjvalanīlamanī*. Śrīsanātana was taught lessons in the Vaiṣṇava tenets and theology and we have from him two great works *Brhadbhāgavatāmṛta* and *Haribhaktivilāsa*. It is Śrījīva Gosvāmin, the son of Anupama and nephew of Śrīrūpa, who is the most prolific in the list of Gosvāmins to have dealt with the different aspects of Gauḍiṣa Vaiṣṇavism and its philosophy in particular. His deep-delved scholarship, versatile genius and intense spiritual fervour endowed him with unique competence to elucidate the philosophical doctrines of the school to a full-fledged system in his immortal work *Bhāgavatasandarbhā*.

The *Bhāgavatasandarbhā* consists of six constituent parts dealing with *Tattva*, *Bhagavat*, *Paramātman*, *Kṛṣṇa*, *Bhakti* and *Pṛīti*. The *Tattvasandarbhā* is dedicated to the task of determining the nature of *tattva* (reality) which is the goal of all philosophical pursuits. *Kṛṣṇa-Bhagavat* is the ultimate reality. It is set forth as a demonstrated conclusion in the co-ordinated treatment of the first four *Sandarbhās*. The fifth *Sandarbhā* on *bhakti* deals with *bhakti* as a mode of spiritual experience for the realisation of the character of individual soul as an infinitesimal part

of the *Kṛṣṇa-Bhagavat*. Love for God is an end in itself and there is no extraneous aim. This is the postulate of the philosophy of love as summed up in *Prītisandarbhā*, the last but not of the least importance. I need not dilate upon the nature and scope of the philosophical teachings as substantiated in Śrījīva's *Bhāgatasandarbhā*, about which, I have made some observation in my introduction to the *Bhaktisandarbhā* as published with text and translation by the University of Calcutta. It is to be noted, however, that Śrījīva was the first to have built the buttressed edifice of the philosophy of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism mainly on the plinth and foundation of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* and his contributions will shine ever with pinnacle of their glory.

Śrījīva's *Sandarbhās* have not so far been critically edited. While editing and translating the texts of two other *Sandarbhās*, *Bhakti* and *Paramātmān*, I came across some readings which seemed to me dubious or misleading. I felt the need of critical edition of the works of Śrījīva, and even contemplated to take up the work myself. But my preoccupations and pressure of other academic assignments did not permit me to proceed with the task. I do, however, feel comforted that an able scholar Dr Sitanath Goswami, my ex-pupil and Reader, Jadavpur University, has come forward towards removing the long-felt want by bringing to light for the first time the critical edition of the *Tattvasandarbhā*. His scrupulous care and attention in the matter of collation of texts with variants and references to the sources with lucid notes will be of immense help to the study and sympathetic understanding of the text in its critical perspective.

As a student of Advaita philosophy under the tutelage of the most eminent scholar Mahāmahopādhyāya Pandit Jogendranath Tarkavedāntatīrtha and then as a researcher under the able guidance of the most distinguished Anglo-Sanskrit scholar Dr Satkari Mookerjee, Dr Goswami has already made his mark as a competent scholar in Advaita philosophy. His editions of *Īśā* and *Kena Upaniṣads* have won him unstinted encomium. Coming of the holy family of Śrīviṣṇupriyā, as he does, Dr Goswami now seeks to enter the portals of the Vaiṣṇava-Vedānta to place the wreath of his offering, the critical edition of the *Tattvasandarbhā*, at its altar. I have reasons to believe that his edition

will be a valuable addition to the literature on the subject of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava philosophy.

Dr Goswami has made a serious study of the work in the task of which he has exploited the commentaries of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa and Rādhāmohana Gosvāmi-Bhaṭṭācārya. The arguments advanced for and against the theories of limitation (*paricchedavāda*) and reflection (*pratīmbavāda*) and the exposition bearing on the term *advaya* as set forth by Dr Goswami demand special mention in order to appreciate the extent of critical reasoning he has employed. It gives me pleasure to write this Preface to the critical edition of the *Tattvasandarbhā* by one of my worthy and distinguished pupils, Dr Sitanath Goswami, and I bless him for his admirable work.

The 1st July, 1967
Calcutta University

DR KRISHNAGOPAL GOSWAMI
Asutosh Professor and Head of the
Department of Sanskrit
Calcutta University

INTRODUCTION

Śrīmanmahāprabhu was fully aware of the necessity of a full-fledged philosophical system for the propagation of the doctrines and truths he realised. Hence he found out some disciples where the philosophical speculations and theological niceties could be infused for further transmission into the posterity. Thus Śrīpāda Nityānanda was entrusted by Śrīcaitanya with the duty of propagating the Vaiṣṇava ideals to common man and accordingly Nityānanda delivered innumerable sinners including Mādhāi who inflicted injury to Nityānanda's person. The unique organizer Śrīcaitanya had the flair to know the scholarly tendency of Śrīrūpa and Śrīsanātana and met them secretly in the camp of Hussain Shah. During the second meet at Prayāga Śrīcaitanya taught Śrīrūpa intensely for consecutive ten days and infused in Śrīrūpa the power of writing the difficult texts on *Rasa*.¹ Śrīcaitanya was kind enough to instruct Rūpa in all the abstruse discussion with Rāy Rāmānanda and also the basic principles of *Bhakti*,² which later on formed the nucleus of the most reputed treatises as *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* and *Ujjvalanīlamāṇi*. Śrīsanātana was given training in the most difficult *Vaiṣṇava* tenets for two months at Banaras and for one year at Nilācala. Rūpa and Sanātana, the two stalwarts of Vaiṣṇava philosophy of the Sixteenth Century, established the Vaiṣṇava sect of Bengal on a sound footing.

- 1 एइमत दशदिन प्रयागे रहिया ।
श्रीरूपे शिक्षा दिल शक्ति सञ्चारिया । (CC. 2.19)
- 2 शुद्ध भक्ति हैते हय प्रेमेर उत्पन्न ।
अतएव शुद्धभक्तिर कहिये लक्षण ॥
अन्य वाञ्छा अन्य पूजा छाड़ि ज्ञानकर्म ।
आनुकृत्ये सर्वेन्द्रिय कृष्णानुशीलन ॥ (ibid)

The Bhāgavata already became an essential book for the propagation of the philosophical doctrines. But the exposition and discussion of the Bhāgavata came to a full-fledged polemical standard only when Śrījīva, the son of Anupama and nephew of Śrīrūpa, wrote his immortal work *Bhāgavata-Sandarbha* divided into six volumes—*Tattva*, *Bhagavat*, *Paramātmān*, *Kṛṣṇa*, *Bhakti* and *Prīti*. That the work *Bhāgavatasandarbha* was written in accordance with the teachings of Rūpa and Sanātana has been mentioned by Śrījīva himself in the colophon of *Tattvasandarbha* as—श्रीरूपसनातनानुशासनभारतीगर्भे श्रीभागवतसन्दर्भे etc. Moreover, this work was undertaken by Śrījīva at the instance of Śrīrūpa and Śrisanātana.¹

As regards the authorship of these six *sandarbhas* a question is often posed by many scholars whether Jīva Gosvāmī can really claim the authorship or he was merely an editor of an earlier reputed compendium written by Gopālabhaṭṭa. JG himself has left some clues for such doubt since he begins his work with this apology that he practically did nothing new excepting the rearrangement of the contents, supplying the missing links and occasional elucidation of recondite passages.² This confession of JG should not, we think, be accepted literally inasmuch as a devout Vaiṣṇava like him shows his extreme humility by even declining his authorship. At best the thing which we can admit is that JG based his treatise on a previous cryptic work and made an elaboration of its contents.

Of the six *sandarbhas* this *Tattvasandarbha* is the smallest in size although the amount of importance which is attached

1. जयतां मथुराभूमौ श्रीलरूपसनातनौ ।
यौ विलेखयतस्तत्त्वं ज्ञापकौ पुस्तिकामिमाम् ॥ (TS, śl. 3)

2. कोऽपि तद्बान्धवो भट्टो दक्षिणद्विजवंशजः ।
विविच्य व्यलिखद् ग्रन्थं लिखिताद् वृद्धवैष्णवैः ॥
तस्याद्यं ग्रन्थनालेखं क्रान्तवृत्तक्रान्तखण्डितम् ।
पर्यालोच्याथ पर्यायं कृत्वा लिखति जीवकः ॥ (TS, śl. 4, 5)

to this work is perhaps the greatest. This prime status of TS is also demonstrated by its primary position in the list of *sandarbhas*. Again, this first *sandarbha* determines the reality (तत्त्व) which is the ultimate aim of all philosophical pursuits. Further, it is this *sandarbha* which serves as an introduction to all the other *sandarbhas*.

Tattvasandarbha may be divided into two main parts, the first being *pramāṇakhaṇḍa* consisting of Para. 1 to 28 and the second being *prameyakhāṇḍa* comprising Para. 29 to 63.

Pramāṇakhaṇḍa starts with a reference to the four *anubandhas* (śl. 8) which is followed by a discussion of the instruments of valid cognition (*pramāṇa*). Indian philosophers widely differ as to the number of *pramāṇas*, the number varying from one of cārvāka to eight of Paurāṇikas. JG's tenet remains here non-committal of the number of *pramāṇas*.¹ He only observes that the *pramāṇas* as perception etc. are not adequate enough to determine the supernormal unthinkable Reality.² Baladeva says categorically in his commentary of TS that the number of *pramāṇas* is eight and he defines or elucidates these eight *pramāṇas*.³ But according to BD seven of these eight *pramāṇas* cannot lead us to the ascertainment of Supreme Reality. Only *śabda* or the Veda may be relied upon due to its remaining free from any sort of blemish as error, inattention, deception or unskilfulness.⁴

In spite of the fact that only the Veda is the dependable and valid instrument of cognition, it is a problem to understand the import of the Vedas since many of the recensions of the Vedas

- 1 It should be noted that JG has accepted ten *pramāṇas* in *Sarvasaṁvādinī*, the annotation of TS. (see p. 9, f. n. 3). So it is difficult to assign any reason for Baladeva's acceptance of eight *pramāṇas*. (प्रत्यक्षादीन्यष्टौ भवन्ति प्रमाणानि—P. 9)

- 2 Vide para. 9-11.

- 3 Vide Pp 9-10.

- 4 "ततो भ्रमादिदोषयोगात् तानि प्रत्यक्षादीनि परमार्थप्रमाणानि न भवन्ति ।"—P. 10

are irretrievably lost and there are mutual contradictions in the Vedas resulting in the conflicting conclusions of the various sages.¹ *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa* constitute the fifth Veda and whereas the four Vedas present the reality only in an obscure and abstruse manner, the fifth Veda viz. *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa* makes a plain statement of the reality to be known and attained.² Of these *Purāṇas* again the *Bhāgavata* excels all³ and that is why in these six *sandarbhās* an attempt has been made to determine the import of the BH.⁴

In order to determine the import of the BH Śrījīva ascertains first the supernormal (अलौकिक) doctrine which has specially occupied the mind of the author of the BH.⁵ Any supernormal doctrine may be revealed to anybody when he reaches the supernormal state of mind. Hence JG rivets his attention to the *samādhi* of *Vyāsa*, the author, for having a precise knowledge of the import of the BH.⁶ *Vyāsa* realises the three *ślokas* which constitute the quintessence of the entire BH. JG has faithfully followed these three *ślokas* and has carefully analysed the contents thereof. He derives practically the cream of the Vaiṣṇava doctrines from this scanty source and has been able to strengthen his view with the help of sound reasons which have been presented in the subsequent paragraphs.

1 Para. 12, P. 14

2 वेदार्थादधिकं मन्ये पुराणार्थं वरानने ।

वेदाः तिष्ठिताः सर्वे पुराणे नात्र संशयः ॥ (Para. 16, P.26)

3 “श्रीभागवतमतं तु सर्वमतानामधीश्वरमिति ।” (Para. 24, P. 51)
“तस्मादेवमपि श्रीभागवतस्यैव सर्वाधिक्यम् ।” (Para. 26, P. 54)

4 “तदेवं परमनिःश्रेयसनिश्चयाय श्रीभागवतमेव पौर्वापर्याविरोधेन विचार्यते ।” (Para. 27, P. 57)

5 “श्रीमद्भागवतस्य तात्पर्यं तद्वक्तुर्हृदयनिष्ठापर्यालोचनया संक्षेप-
तस्तावन्निर्धारयति ।” (Para. 29, P.63)

6 “तादृशमेव तात्पर्यं करिष्यमाणतद्ग्रन्थप्रतिपाद्यतत्त्वनिर्णयकृते
तत्प्रवक्तृश्रीबादरायणकृते समाधावपि संक्षेपत एव निर्धारयति ।”
(Para. 30, P. 65)

By an analysis of these three *ślokas* JG establishes the extraordinary influence of *bhaktiyoga* for the annulment of *māyā*,¹ the difference between *jīva* and *Īśvara*² and that *jīva* is both consciousness and conscious.³ JG refutes the Advaita stand that salvation (*mokṣa*) may be achieved by the annihilation of the determinant.⁴ He teaches the dual function of *māyā* viz. concealment and distortion⁵, the special favour of *Bhagavān* towards *māyā*⁶, the five cardinal realities of the Vaiṣṇavas,⁷ *Īśvara* and *jīva* being the first two of these five realities differ from each other and the tenet of the Advaitins establishing complete identity of the two requires to be refuted by the Vaiṣṇavas; otherwise the number of realities comes down to four. Thus relevantly enough JG shifts his discussion to the animadversion of the Advaita theories of limitation (परिच्छेदवाद) and reflection (प्रतिबिम्बवाद)⁸ This topic of TS has been marked by its specialities and perhaps it would not be an exaggeration if it is held to be the best part of this first volume of *Bhāgavatasandarbhā*. Then follows the proposition of the unthinkable power (अचिन्त्यशक्ति) of *Bhagavān*.⁹ Next occurs the proposal of the result (प्रयोजन) of reading the work¹⁰ and then come the discussions on *sādhana-bhakti* and dependence of knowledge on *bhakti*.¹¹ JG takes special care for the explanation of the word अद्वय since he considers the so-called Advaitin, rather *Māyin*, to be his worst enemy in the realm of philosophical speculation and at the same time cannot disown the famous line of BH—वदन्ति तत्तत्त्वविदस्तत्त्वं यज् ज्ञानमद्वयम् (BH 1.2.11)—where अद्वय is maintained as the Reality.¹² The two succeeding discussions must draw our attention, the first of them being the refutation of the transience of knowledge¹³ and the substantiation

1 Para. 31, P. 72

2 Para. 32, P. 74 ; Para. 35, P. 85

3 Para. 32, P. 75

4 Para. 32, P. 76

5 Para. 32, P. 77

6 Para. 33, P. 79

7 Para. 34, P. 83

8 Para. 36-42, P. 86-99

9 Para. 43, P. 100

10 Para. 45, P. 104

11 Para. 46, P. 107

12 Para. 51, P. 115

13 Para. 52, P. 119

of the difference between the body and the self.¹ The last, though not the least, topics are the explanation of the terms सर्ग, विसर्ग etc.² and the establishment of Śrīkṛṣṇa as the ultimate abode of all entities.³

In a resume' of this work it may be maintained that TS is one of the most useful books of Vaiṣṇava literature of Bengal and one cannot even have a fair knowledge of the Vaiṣṇava stand-point without going through this short but significant treatise. One of the main purposes of this work was to pulverize the Advaita doctrine which attained considerable celebrity—a type of celebrity that the author does not demur to acknowledge. Most of the philosophers first explain the position of their adversaries and then refute their views. But JG does not consider it necessary to elucidate the Advaita view since it was amply known to all discerning men.⁴ JG's opposition to the Advaita views is not so vociferous as it is found in Baladeva, who has often made an impatient outburst of his feelings.⁵

JG has to face considerable difficulty in controverting the Advaita view since Śaṅkarācārya, its chief exponent, rose to an extraordinary eminence. It is queer that Śaṅkara's abstention from any commentary of BH has had to be justified by JG, an opponent!⁶ This justification too is far from convincing. It is quite amusing that even JG acknowledges Śaṅkara to be an *avatāra* (incarnation) of Śiva and he has to find out the works of Śaṅ-

1 Para. 53-55, Pp 123-132

2 Para. 56-57, Pp 132-136

3 Para. 58-63, Pp 136-144

4 “अद्वैतव्याख्यानन्तु प्रसिद्धत्वान्नातिवितायते” (Para. 27, P.59)

5 (i) “मायावादं यस्तमस्तोममुच्चैर्नाशं निन्ये वेदवाग्शुजालैः etc.” (P. 2, line 1)

(ii) मायावादमहान्धकार..... (P. 2, line 5)

(iii) मायिनामीशविमुखानां मतम्.... (Para. 42, P. 99)

6 अथ यदेव कैवल्यमप्यतिक्रम्य भक्तिमुखव्याहारादिलिङ्गेन निजमतस्याप्युपरि विराजमानार्थं मत्वा यदधौरुषेयं वेदान्तव्याख्यानं भयादचालयतैव” (Para. 23, Pp 46-7). Also see f. n. 1, P.47

kara where some of the contents of BH are available.¹ As it has been said earlier, the BH is the most trusted treatise of the Vaiṣṇavas. But the difficulty of the Vaiṣṇavas cannot be overlooked since the traditional commentary of the BH, which is respected by all, is written by Śrīdharasvāmīn, who is also an accredited Advaitin. Śrīdhara has often propounded the *māyāvāda* which is totally unacceptable to the Vaiṣṇavas. So they have tried to explain away this feature of SR's commentary by holding that by having recourse to *māyāvāda* SR entraps in his fold the devout Advaitins who would not listen to anything else than Advaitavāda and later on converts them to the *Vaiṣṇava* faith. Thus the recourse to *māyāvāda* serves merely as an alluring bait for the die-hard Advaitins.²

JG does not hesitate to utilise the Advaita methods of arguments wherever those suit to his needs. In *Sarvasaṃvādinī*, the commentary of TS by JG, we find several lines quoted verbatim from *Bhāmatī* of Vācaspati Miśra.³

We are not aware of many commentaries of TS ; only two commentaries by Baladeva Gosvāmī and Radhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhaṭṭācārya are available. Baladeva is a prolific writer who has commented upon the *Brahmasūtra*, the *Gītā*, the *Upaniṣads* etc. and has composed some original works as *Prameyarat-*

1 “शङ्करावतारतया प्रसिद्धेन वक्ष्यमाणस्वगोपनादिहेतुकभगवदाज्ञा....” (Para 23, Pp 47-8). Also see f. n. 2, P. 47 and f.n.1, P.48

2 “अयमर्थः—श्रीधरस्वामिनो वैष्णवा एव....तथापि क्वचित् क्वचित् मायावादोल्लेखस्तद्वादिनो भगवद् भक्तौ प्रवेशयितुं वडिशामिषार्पणन्यायेनैवेति विदितमिति ।” (BD under Para. 27, P. 59)

3 “अत्र वाचस्पतिश्चैवमाह—‘न च ज्येष्ठप्रमाणप्रत्यक्षविरोधात्.... पौर्वापर्यबलीयस्त्वं तत्र नाम प्रतीयते । अन्योन्यनिरपेक्षाणां यत्र जन्म धियां भवेत्’ इति ।”—SS p. 9-10. Barring a few negligible changes this long extract tallies with the current editions of *Bhāmatī*. JG has perhaps effected wilful changes in the *karikā* पौर्वापर्य etc. for making it true to the original (तन्त्रवार्तिक, ३।३।२ सूत्र).

nāvalī, *Vedāntasyamantaka* etc. Baladeva's contribution to the Bengal Vaiṣṇava sect i.e. to the sect of Mahāprabhu cannot be over-emphasized since it is Baladeva who has raised this sect to a full-fledged school of Vedānta. Prior to him the followers of Mahāprabhu showed respect to the *bhāṣya* of Madhva and considered the BH to be the *bhāṣya* of *Brahmasūtra*. But the opponents poohpooled this sect for not having any *bhāṣya* of its own. Once this sneer of the adversaries pained Baladeva and he, being empowered by Govinda, finished the *bhāṣya* of *Brahmasūtra* only within a month. Accordingly the *bhāṣya* won the appellation *Govindabhāṣya*.

Baladeva's commentary on TS has won sufficient popularity and TS is being traditionally read by posterity along with the commentary of Baladeva. Bengal is generally found averse to the Pāṇinian system of Grammar. But BD has often requisitioned the *sūtras* of Pāṇini in his commentary of TS.¹ The few inaccuracies which are found in BD's commentary of TS have, perhaps, originated from unworthy scribes.²

Although only TS, of the six *sandarbhās*, is found commented upon by BD, we can definitely hold that BD had in his mind the desire to comment upon at least the two other *sandarbhās*.³ From the scanty information it is hazardous to jump to any conclusion that BD had actually made a commentary of any of these two *sandarbhās*.

The other commentator Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhaṭṭācārya is a first-rate scholar having to his credit a commentary of *Nyāya-darśana*. His scholarship in *Smṛti* is also worth reckoning. That he comes of the family of Śrīmadadvaitācārya of Śāntipur, Nadia is recorded in the colophon of the commentary of TS.⁴ This commentary bears a stamp of scholarship in every line.

1 P. 4, 5, 6 etc.

2 See P. 4, f. n. 1 ; P. 5, f. n. 2 etc.

3 P. 78, line 8 ; Para 49, P. 113

4 'इति कलियुगपावनावतारश्रीमदद्वैतकुलोद्भवश्रीराधामोहनगोस्वामि-भट्टाचार्यकृता....'

RG dwells elaborately upon the views of the opponents and makes a threadbare discussion of each of the topics. For this reason his commentary has been extensive and bears all the details.

For the first time a critical edition of TS is being brought out with necessary comments and notes in English. The following five editions have been compared for the collation of the text and the commentary of BD :—

A—Tattvasandarbhā—Edited and translated by Nityasvārūpa Brahmācārī and Kṛṣṇācandra Gosvāmī. Published from Calcutta by Sacīndramohana Ghoṣa. Caitanyābda 433 (c. 1919)

B—Tattvasandarbhā—Edited, translated and published by Satyānanda Gosvāmī from Calcutta, B.S. 1318 (c. 1912)

C—Śrībhāgavatasandarbhā—Edited by Śyāmalāla Gosvāmī, Calcutta. Śaka 1822 (C. 1900)

D—Ṣaṭsandarbha—Edited and translated by Rāmanārāyaṇa Vidyāratna. Printed from Berhampur, Bengal. Kārtika 23, B.S. 1289 (1882)

E—Ṣaṭsandarbha—Edited and translated by Rāmanārāyaṇa Vidyāratna. Published by Śyāmasundara Miśra. Berhampur, Bengal. B.S. 1362 (C. 1956)

From the affinity in readings these five editions may be classified into two groups—the first consisting of A, D and E and the second comprising B and C. The manuscripts available in Sanskrit College, Calcutta belongs to any of these two groups and most of these manuscripts are written by unworthy scribes who have multiplied the mistakes in a disgraceful manner. The same mistakes have been repeated in subsequent manuscripts without any attempt for correcting the readings. One corrupt tradition has been followed in the manuscripts and printed editions. There are many expressions in the current editions of TS which are definitely corrupt and on many occa-

sions some emendations in text have been suggested by the present editor and the scholars will judge the justifiability or otherwise of these suggestions.¹ Of the extant editions the one edited by Nityasvarūpa Brahmācārī is doubtless the best. The translation and exposition of the text has been very helpful. This edition has an added attraction of incorporating the hitherto unpublished commentary by Radhāmohana Gosvāmi Bhaṭṭācārya.

The original scheme of this edition as envisaged was to insert the commentary by RG as also a new commentary written by the present editor. Later on the scheme underwent some change by way of the omission of these two commentaries. Accordingly there appeared in Notes the chief contentions of RG and long extracts from RG's commentary.

Quotations found in TS are perhaps reproduced from the memory of JG and that is why it has not been possible to find out the sources of a good number of these quotations.² Sometimes quotations vary from the original to the extent of beyond recognition.³ JG has confessed also that he could not personally verify the original treatises but he dares to refer to these quotations only on the authority of his predecessors viz. Madhvācārya etc.⁴

1 स्मृतिता for मध्यपातिता (P. 22) ; जाल्या for ज्ञाता (Para. 52) ; आगमापायितद्वाधभेदेन for आगमापायितदवधिभेदेन (Para. 53 & 55) ; तद्वाधत्वात् for तदवधित्वात् (Para. 55, BD) ; साक्ष्यात् for साक्षात् (Para. 55, BD) etc.

2 See Pp 22-26

3 See P. 27, f. n. 3. Also cf. P. 105, f. n. 1&2.

4 “क्वचित् स्वयमदृष्टाकराणि च तत्त्ववादगुरुणामनाधुनिकानां.... श्रीमध्वाचार्यचरणानां भागवततात्पर्यभारततात्पर्यब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्यादिभ्यः संगृहीतानि । (P. 60)

Each and every variant reading has not been recorded because some readings are obviously untenable and generated by the ignorance of the scribes and faithfully maintained by subsequent negligent editors.

JG has twice referred to *Paramātmāsandarbhā* and once to *Prītīsandarbhā* for the detailed discussions of the topics dealt with briefly in TS.¹

So that the work may be best utilised, a few important appendices have been appended—(i) Index of the hemistichs of the verses quoted in TS and BD's commentary (ii) Index of works and authors referred to and (iii) Index of important words.

Before I complete this Introduction, I must pay respectful homage to Dr Satkari Mookerjee, M.A., Ph.D., formerly Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Calcutta University for his assistance and guidance in my higher studies and research but for whom my education would have come to an end after the Intermediate stage. It is at his feet that I learnt the modern method of research as a result of which I could venture to prepare a critical edition of this book. I cannot but remember my *guru*, Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr Yogendranath Tarkasāmkhya-Vedāntatīrtha D.Litt. who infused in me the Vedantic thoughts and ideals, although of Advaita Vedānta.

1 (i) Reference to परमात्मसन्दर्भ in TS (Para. 22, P. 43)—The allied discussion in परमात्मसन्दर्भ is to be found in Pp 286-299 of edition C.

(ii) Reference to परमात्मसन्दर्भ in TS (Para. 52)—A detailed discussion in परमात्मसन्दर्भ is available in Pp 233-36 of edition C.

(iii) प्रीतिसन्दर्भ is referred to in TS (Para. 52)—In प्रीतिसन्दर्भ the topic has rather been briefly discussed in Pp 676-77 of edition C.

At his feet I knew that by reading the Advaita-Vedānta one can understand the Dvaita texts better. Today before embarking on a new field of Dvaita-Vedānta I seek endless blessings from my *guru*. I am really indebted to Prof. Dr. Krishnagopal Goswami, my teacher, for the valuable preface of this work. I often consulted Pt. Rajendra Chandra Tarkatirtha of Nabadwip Sanskrit College and have always been welcome by this learned *pandit* endowed with typical Vaiṣṇava demeanour. Imploring the kind blessings of Śrīvīṣṇu-priyā I started but I do not know how far I could prove myself worthy of the task entrusted upon me. I must be failing in my duty if I do not acknowledge the services of two of my students. Sri Prajñāranjan Datta, M.A., helped me for preparing the press copy and Sri Himansunarayan Chakravarti, M.A., lecturer, Gobardanga Hindu College and Part-time lecturer of Jadavpur University, gave me valuable suggestions and corrected the press. I affectionately remember the assistance of Sm. Uma Chakravarti for the preparation of the Index.

Sanskrit Department,
Jadavpur University.

Birthday of Mahāprabhu
(Phālgunī Pūrṇimā)
1373 B.S. (1967)

SITANATH GOSWAMI

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|---------|
| Foreword | ix—x |
| Preface | xi—xiii |
| Introduction | xv—xxvi |
| Contents | xxvii |
| Abbreviations | xxviii |
| Text with Commentary and Notes | 1—145 |
| Appendix A Index of the Hemistichs of the Verses | 147—152 |
| Appendix B Index of the Works and Authors | 153—155 |
| Appendix C Index of Important Words | 156—162 |
| Appendix D Addenda et Corrigenda | 162—164 |