ON THE PROCESS OF THE FORMULATION OF THE ADVAITIC VYŪHA THEORY*
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1. Introduction

Modern Hinduism is roughly divided into the Śaiva (Śaivism) and the Vaiṣṇava (Vaiṣṇavism) traditions, which worship Śiva and Viṣṇu, respectively. Among the Vaiṣṇava schools is found Pañcarātra, the origins of which date back to ancient times. The Pāñcarātrikas have a distinctive doctrine known as the Vyūha theory. This theory claims that in the creation of the world Viṣṇu successively took the forms of Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha.¹

The Advaita school, which is known as the oldest hermeneutic school devoted to the Upaniṣad, had criticized this Vyūha theory since its inception by Śaṅkara (ca. 756–772 CE),² the founder of this school. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī (16th cent. CE) followed Śaṅkara in this regard and criticized the Pāñcarātrikas’ Vyūha theory. It should be noted, however, that Madhusūdana, being a worshiper of Viṣṇu, also adapted the Pāñcarātrikas’ Vyūha theory but, at the same time, set forth an Advaitic Vyūha theory in line with the tenets of the Advaita tradition. In my previous work, I have shown that Madhusūdana formulated this Advaitic Vyūha theory by interpreting the Pāñcarātrikas’ Vyūha theory along the lines with the “theory of the four states of the ātman,”

* This paper is based on my presentation for “Exploring the Two Wings of Buddhism in the World (2)” held at Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale” on the 27 November 2017. The Japanese version of this paper has already been published as Manabe [2018b].
1 See Gupta [2013: XXVIII–XXXI].
2 This date is based on Harimoto [2006].
namely, *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* which is one of the Advaita doctrines.\(^4\)

In the history of Advaita, there were variations of the *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theory. In this paper, I attempt to elaborate how Madhusūdana combined different versions of the *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theory in the formulation of the Advaitic *Vyuha* theory.

2. **Three versions of the *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theory**

2.1. The first version

First, I examine the *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theory on which Madhusūdana based his Advaitic *Vyuha* theory. As already mentioned, there are several versions of the *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theory in the history of Advaita, and three of them bear significance to my present purpose.\(^5\) I outline these three versions below.

The *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theory is an Advaita doctrine developed on the basis of the *Māṇḍūkyopanisad* (MāṇḍU, 1st to 2nd cent. CE).\(^6\) In the MāṇḍU, ātman as the only sentient reality is said to have four states (*pāt*, feet).\(^7\) Table 1 shows a summary of the *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theory seen in the MāṇḍU.\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourth state</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Ātman itself</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Fourth state (<em>caturtha</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

\(^3\) This term was not established in the Advaita school, but for convenience’s sake I use the term. On its usage, see Manabe [2017a: fn. 7].

\(^4\) See Manabe [2014]. In addition, see Manabe [2015], [2016].

\(^5\) There are also *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theories other than the versions mentioned in this paper. Those versions are found in *Nṛsiṁhottaratāpaniḥopanisad* 3 and Madhusūdana’s *Śivamahimnastotraḥ* (on *Śivamahimnastotra*, ŚMS 27), the commentary on the ŚMS, and so forth. The Vedas are also tied into the *ātmāvasthācatusṭaya* theory there.

\(^6\) See Nakamura [1990: 608–613].

\(^7\) MāṇḍU 2–7. See Nakamura [1955: 289–299].

\(^8\) I have already presented Table 1 in Manabe [2017a: 3].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third state</td>
<td>The intellectual (Prājīna) = The supreme god (Īśvara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Bliss (ānanda)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Sound sleep state (sūuptasthāna)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second state</td>
<td>The bright (Taijasa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Subtle elements (sūkṣma, Object of the cognition in the dream state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Dream state (svapnasthāna)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First state</td>
<td>The universal (Vaiśvānara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Gross elements (sthūla, Object of the cognition in the waking state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Waking state (jāgaritasthāna)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Māṇḍūkyopaniṣadbhāṣya (MāṇḍUBh), that is, Śaṅkara’s commentary on the MāṇḍU, the ātman described in the MāṇḍU was divided into, as it were, the cosmic ātman as the deity presiding over the phenomenal world (adhidaiyam) and the ātman as the individual self (adhyaatmam) of living beings. Each ātman was thought of as being endowed with the first three states. The first of the three versions of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭayā theory is based on this interpretation of Śaṅkara. The first version is directly derived from Śaṅkara’s understanding, and therefore, can be called a traditional theory even within the Advaita school. Here, I present Table 2, which shows the result of an analysis of the first version mainly based on the ātmāvasthā-

---

9 Regarding the third state, it seems strange that its appellation is Prājīna although it is in the sound sleep state and its object is bliss. According to Advaita, however, when the inherently physical activity of the mind (manas) ceases, the multiformity of phenomena appearing on the basis of that activity temporarily disappears and the true knowledge of non-duality arises in the sound sleep state. Moreover, the bliss that is the essence of ātman is temporarily perceived in this state. On this, see MāṇḍUBh on MāṇḍU 5. See also Manabe [2017a: fn. 10].

10 However, since the fourth state is common to two ātmans, they are one and the same ātman in this state. See Manabe [2017a: 3–4].
**Table 2: The ātmāvathucaṭuṣṭaya theory in mainly the PD (the first version)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourth state</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Brahman (Ātman)</th>
<th>adhyātmam (as the individual)</th>
<th>adhidaivam (as the collective connected with the godhead)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third state</td>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>Prājña</td>
<td>Īsvara</td>
<td>Iśvara</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>Ignorance (avidya)</td>
<td>Illusional power (māyā)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>[Sound sleep state]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second state</td>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>Taijasa</td>
<td>Hiranyagarbha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>Subtle body</td>
<td>Subtle body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>[Dream state]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First state</td>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>Viśva</td>
<td>Vaiśvānara (Virāj)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>Gross body</td>
<td>Gross body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>[Waking state]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 There is a view that the author of PD is not Vidyāraṇya but Bhāratītīrtha (ca. 14th cent. CE). See Mahadevan [1938: 1–7].
12 This date is based on Maeda [1980: 47].
13 This date is based on Maeda [1980: 49].
14 Ibid.
15 Table 2 has already been published in Manabe [2017a: 22]. For a detailed discussion of Table 2, see Manabe [2017a: 7–11 "3. The traditional 'ātman’s four states theory'"].
I would like to add some explanatory remarks concerning Table 2 here. In the Advaita school, only brahman (ātman), the singular spiritual principle, is thought to exist, and the other states are thought to be like illusions that ultimately do not exist. According to the PD, brahman is first conditioned by ignorance (avidyā) or illusional power (māyā), and then Prājñā as an individual self (vyaśṭī) and Īśvara as a collective being (samaśṭi) composed of individual selves appear. Prājñā, that is an individual at this stage, is said to be in the state of sound sleep. Second, avidyā and māyā develop into the subtle elements, which constitute the subtle world. Then Prājñā and Īśvara, conditioned by these subtle elements, change into Taijasa and Hiranyagarbha, respectively. Taijasa at this stage is said to be in the dream state. Moreover, the subtle elements develop into the gross elements, which constitute the phenomenal world. Taijasa and Hiranyagarbha, conditioned by these gross elements, change into Viśva and Vaiśvānara (Virāj), respectively. This stage is our daily world and Viśva at this stage is said to be in the waking state.

In this way, the development from the fourth state to the first state serves to explain the creation (srṣṭi) of the daily phenomenal world from brahman, and the flow from the first state to the fourth state conversely illustrates the destruction (pralaya) of the world. In addition, by meditating (upāsana) on the process of creation and destruction, sentient beings can obtain the knowledge to distinguish between brahma and non-brahma and realize that they are brahman by nature. Thus, the ātmāvasthācatusṭaya theory provides both an explanation of the creation and destruction of the world and a practical theory of meditation.

2.2. The second version

Next, I consider the second version of the ātmāvasthācatusṭaya theory. This second version is found in the Pañcikaraṇa (PK) attributed to Śaṅkara and in the third chapter of the Pañcaprakriyā (PPr) of Sarva-

---

16 In the PD and the SLS, avidyā and māyā are clearly distinguished as corresponding to vyaśṭi and samaśṭi. However, there is no such defined distinction in the VeS.

jnātman (ca. 9–11th cent. CE). The analytic description of the PK are shown in Table 3.

18 There are various views concerning the dating of Sarvajñātman. In Japan, Sarvajñātman is considered to have been active in the 8–9th cent. CE, based on Nakamura’s view. See Nakamura [1950: 63–121]. In India, Sarvajñātman is considered to have been active either from the 9th cent. CE to the first half of the 10th cent. CE, or from the latter half of the 10th cent. CE to the 11th cent. CE. The former opinion considers Sarvajñātman to be a disciple of Sureśvara (ca. 8–9th cent. CE), and Nakamura also considers this tradition to be correct. The second opinion, on the other hand, does not consider Sarvajñātman to be a disciple of Sureśvara, and considers Sarvajñātman to be later than both Vimuktatman (ca. 9–10th cent. CE?) and Vācaspati Miśra (ca. 9–10th cent. CE). See Kocmarek [1985: 7–11]. Based on the description in Sarvajñātman’s Pramāṇaṇākaṇa, I suppose that he was at least later than Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (ca. the latter half of the 9th cent. CE).

19 PK pp. 1,11–2,14: pañcikṛtapañcamaḥābhūtāni tatkāryam ca sarvaṃ virād ity ucyate. etat sthālaśartram ātmanah. indriyair arthopalabdhir jāgaritam. Tadubhayābhīmāṇā atma vīśvaḥ. etat trayam akāraḥ. apañcikṛtapañcamaḥābhūtāni (em.; bhūta-Ṣ) pañcatattmatrāṇī tatkāryam ca pañca prāṇaḥ, daśendriyāṇī mano buddhiḥ ceti sapadaśaṇkāṃ lingam bhautikaṃ hiranyagarbha ity ucyate. etat sūkṣmaśartram ātmanah. karaṇeśūpasamhīreṣu jāgaritasamksārajaḥ pratayayaḥ savīṣayaḥ svapnaḥ ity ucyate. tadubhayābhīmāṇā atma tājīsaḥ. etat trayam ukāraḥ. śaṅcāvayakāraṇaṃ ātmatājanam sābhāsam avyākṛtaṃ ity ucyate. etat karaṇaśartram ātmanah. tac ca na san nāsan nāpi sadasan na bhinnam nābhinnam nāpi bhinnabhinnam kutaścit, na nirayayavam, na savayavam, nobhayam, kim tu kevalabrahmātmākaṭvajñānāpanodyam. sarvaprakāra-jñānopasaṃhare buddheḥ kāraṇatmanāvaśāsanam susuṣṭih. tadubhayābhīmāṇā atma prājñāḥ. etat trayam makāraḥ ... ahaṃ atma sākṣe kevalaś cinmātrasvarūpaḥ, nājītaṇaṃ nāpi tatkāryam. “All of the quintupled (pañcikṛta) five elements (pañcamaḥābhūtā) and their results are called Viraj. This is the gross body of ātman. The waking [state] (jāgarita) is the grasping of objects by the intellectual organs. Ātman who arrogates them (the gross body and the waking state) to the self (abhimānīn) is Viśva. These three (the gross body, the waking state and Viśva) are the letter “A.” The five tannātras undivided into quintuples (apañcikṛta) and their results, that is, the subtle body (liṅga) made of elements, that is, consisting of the seventeen elements, the five breaths, the ten organs, the mind and the intellect, are called Hiranyakarbhā. This is the subtle body of ātman. The dream [state] is said to be the notion accompanied by the objects arising from the impression of the waking state when the organs are absorbed. Ātman who arrogates them (the subtle elements and the dream state) to the self is Taijasa. These three (the subtle body, the dream state and Taijasa) are the letter “U.” Avyākṛta is said to be the cause of two types of body, the ignorance of ātman and connected with appearance. This is the cause body of ātman. Furthermore, it is not existence, and not non-existence, neither existence nor non-existence. [It] is not distinguished from anything, and not undistinguished, neither distinguished nor undistinguished. [It] is not lacking parts, not having parts and neither. Instead, [it] is to be removed by the knowledge that pure brahman and ātman are identical.”
Comparing Table 3 with Table 1, it can be pointed out that the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory in the PK follows that of the MaṇḍU as it is. However, the limiting condition or the third state in Table 3, which corresponds with the object of Prājñā in Table 1, is not bliss but the unmanifested (Avyākṛtā = ajñāna). Furthermore, in Table 1, the third state is equivalent to Īśvara, but there is no reference to Īśvara in Table 3. Table 3 and Table 1 differ in these respects.

Furthermore, comparing to the first version of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory as shown in Table 2, the second version differs as follows: In the first version, brahman = ātman is divided into adhyātma and adhidaivam, but in the second version no such distinction is made. Roughly speaking, only the aspect of adhyātma is taken up as

The sound sleep [state] is the state that arises when all kinds of knowledge are absorbed, and the intellect is in the state of ātman that is the cause. Ātman which arrogates them (the cause body and the sound sleep state) to the self is Prājñā. These three (the cause body, the sound sleep state and Prājñā) are the letter “M.” … I am ātman, the witness (sākṣīn), the sole being (kevala), the form of the single soul (cinmātrasvarāpa) and neither the ignorance nor its result.”

I omitted the letters “A”, “U”, “M” found in the PK when organizing Table 3 since they are not related to the subject of this paper.

Regarding the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory of the PPr, see Kocmarek [1985: 54–57].
a subject in the second version. In this regard, it also differs from Table 1. Conversely, Hiranyagarbha and Viraj, which are the appellations of the aspects of adhidaivam in the first version, are regarded as the subtle body and the gross body in the second version as the limiting conditions.

Regarding the treatment of Hiranyagarbha and Viraj, it could be thought of as follows: It is thought that the first version of the atmavastha-catushta theory was established earlier than the second version since the old type of the first version can already be seen in Sankara’s Manubh. As previously mentioned, it is a theory of the creation and destruction of the world as well as a practical theory of meditation. However, the PK is thought to explain samadhi, and accordingly, in the PK the atmavastha-catushta theory is treated as a practical theory of individual (adhyatamam) meditation. Hence, there is no description of the atman as a presiding deity (adhidaivam), the aspect which is closely related to the explanation of the creation and destruction of the world. Nevertheless, since there is a concept of correspondence between macrocosm and microcosm even in the practice of this meditation, it is thought that the PK preserves Hiranyagarbha and Viraj as the material elements, viz. the subtle body and the gross body in general, which correspond to the atman as a presiding deity in the first version.

---

20 PK p. 1.3: atha paramahamsanam samadhividhim vyakhyaasya mah. “Now, we will explain the methods (vidhi) of samadhi for Paramahamsas herefrom.” In addition, the Panctkaraanavarttika (PKV) attributed to Surevra, the metrical commentary on the PK, runs as follows: PKV 1: omkara sarvavedanam saras tatvaparakshakah / tena citasamadhanam mumukshanam prakasyate // “Om” is the essence of all Vedas and illuminates the truth. By it (“Om”) the steadiness of the mind of people who desire liberation is revealed.” Moreover, the PPr explained the atmavastha-catushta theory as an interpretation of the scripture’s dictum “thou art that” (tat tvam asi), which also is thought to provide the practical theory of contemplation (nidadhyasa). See above Kocmerek [1985].

21 However, considering that the atman as abstracting from each individual is mentioned, I may not be necessarily able to say that in the PK “the atman as the individual self” is only stated.

22 In the PKV, regarding the motile organs and intellectual organs called Viraj, there are three kinds: adhidaivam, adhyatamam and adhibhatam. See PKV 11–28. In the PPr, it is also mentioned as follows: PPr p. 131.7-9: tebhya utpannam adhidaivam brahmndam, adhyatmam adhibhatam ca karastra-caranadimallokapradham sthaala-satrijataam. etani panchakramahabhatani tatkaryam ca brahmndam prapinam sthala-satrijataam ca sarvan viraj iti ucyate. etat sthala-satriram atmanah. “From them (the five elements in
2.3. The third version

The third version of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory is closely related to the second version. This third version is found in Madhusūdana’s Siddhāntabindu (SB) as outlined in Table 4.23

At first glance, the third version of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory in Table 4 appears to be similar to the first version outlined in Table 2, but the following differences between the third and the first versions can be noted. First, the ātmā as the individual self and the ātmā as the presiding deity correspond to the difference between vyaṣṭi and samaṣṭi in the first version. In the third version, however, both vyaṣṭi and samaṣṭi are classified into the ātmā as the individual self. Furthermore, Hiranyagarbha and Virāj, which are the appellations of the ātmā as the presiding deity in the first version, are considered to be the subtle elements and the gross elements, that is, the limiting conditions in the third as well as in the second version. In addition, the three states under the third state of the ātmā as the presiding deity in the third version are all subcategories of Īśvara, and the limiting conditions of this Īśvara are also subcategories of avidyā. Therefore, in the third version there is no one-to-one correspondence between each state of the ātmā as the individual self and the ātmā as the presiding deity as found in the first version. The three states of the ātmā as the presiding deity practically correspond to the third state of the ātmā as the individual self and they are three classifications of that stage.24

Considering the relationship between the third version and the second version based on the differences between the first version and the third version as sketched above, it can be stated that the third version is formed by adding Īśvara to the stage corresponding to the third state of the ātmā as the individual self in the second version. Therefore, it...

quintuples), the egg of brahman occurs with respect to deity. [And from them,,] with respect to individuals and elements, living things arising from the gross bodies known in the world, with hands, heads, legs and so forth [are generated]. All of these quintuple [five] elements, and the egg of brahman and living things derived from the gross bodies that are the result of these [quintuple elements] are called Virāj. This (Virāj) is the gross body of ātmān.”

23 Table 4 has already been published in Manabe [2017a: 23]. In Manabe [2017a], however, I did not discuss how Table 4 is derived from the SB. I will discuss this point in the near future.
24 See Manabe [2017a: 12–16].
can be said that the third version inherits the structure of the Māṇḍū as represented in Table 1. Nevertheless, in the third version, since Īśvara is classified into three and each is allocated from the first state to the third state, the third version seems to be structured like the first version. I suppose that perhaps Madhusūdana had tried to keep the traditional framework found in the first version, and for that reason, he allocated the three classifications of Īśvara to the three states of the ātman as the presiding deity.\textsuperscript{25}

2.4. Summary

Based on the above considerations, the relationship among the first version, the second version, and the third version may be illustrated as follows.\textsuperscript{26}

| Table 4: The ātmāvasthācaatuṣṭaya theory in the SB (The third version) |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Fourth state                | Appellation      | Limiting condition | Characteristic |
| adhyātma                    | Consciousness as witness (Brahman) | None | Sound sleep state |
| adhidaivam                  |                  |                  | Destruction (pralaya) |
| Third state                 | Appellation      | Limiting condition | Characteristic |
| Prājña                       | Rudra            | Tamoguṇa          | Sound sleep state |
| (Īśvara’s subcategory)      | (avidyā’s subcategory) | Destruction (pralaya) |
| Avidyā, ajñāna               | Tamoguṇa          | Tamoguṇa          | Destruction (pralaya) |
| Second state                | Appellation      | Limiting condition | Characteristic |
| Taijasa                      | Hiraṇyagarbha     | Rajoguṇa          | Sound sleep state |
| (Īśvara’s subcategory)      | Subtle elements  | (avidyā’s subcategory) | Dream state |
| (vyāṣṭi and samaṣṭi)        | Rajoguṇa          | Creation (ṣrṣṭi) | |

\textsuperscript{25} See Manabe [2017a: 16].

\textsuperscript{26} The bold arrow shows the direct genealogy up to the third version, and the thin arrows show the influence between each version.
In summary, the first version was established in the MāṇḍUBh based on the MāṇḍU. The second version found in the PK was established from the MāṇḍU, but also was influenced by the first version. The third version can be seen as deriving from the same genealogy springing from the MāṇḍU as the second version, but it is also influenced by the framework of the first version.

3. The Relation between the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory and the Advaitic Vyūha theory

Next, I would like to consider the relationship between the Advaitic Vyūha theory as proposed by Madhusūdana and the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory. Madhusūdana explained the Advaitic Vyūha theory as follows in his Śrīmadbhāgavatādyaślokatrayasya tīkā (ŚBhĀŚṬ-T), a commentary on the scriptural passage from Bhāgavatapurāṇa

---

27 An English translation of the ŚBhĀŚṬT is being prepared by Dr. S. Bhuvaneshwari, an independent researcher and writer (Indian Philosophy and Aesthetics), Chennai. Previous scholarship on the ŚBhĀŚṬT includes the following: Modi [1929: 43–45], Raghavan [1978], Venkatkrishnan [2015: 195–204], Manabe [2014], [2017a], [2017b], [2018a], [2018b], [2018c]. The ŚBhĀŚṬT until now has been known as the Paramahamsapriya (PP). In Raghavan [1978] it is argued that the PP is not a work of Madhusūdana but of Vopadeva (ca. 12th cent. CE). However, according to Dr. Bhuvaneshwari [2018], the commentary on the BhP called the PP is a work of Vopadeva, which is not existent and different from Madhusūdana’s. Consequently, Dr. Bhuvaneshwari
(BhP) 1.1.1–3. I would like to begin my investigation with the following passage from the ŚBhĀŚṬṬ.

Passage 1:

ŚBhĀŚṬṬ p. 69,23–25: kevalaṁ paramātmadivarṇapahito vāsu-devaḥ, kāraṇopahitasaṃkarṣaṇaḥ, sūkṣmabhūtopahitaḥ pra-dyumnaḥ, sthūlabhūtopahito 'niruddha iti yathāvyākhyānam evādaraṇīyam.

[The following statements] should be venerated only if they are explained in accordance with the explanation [given above]: Vāsudeva is nothing but the mere supreme ātman (paramātman) that is unconditioned. Saṃkarṣaṇa is [the supreme ātman] conditioned by the cause (avidyā) [of the subtle elements and the gross elements]. Pradyumna is [the supreme ātman] conditioned by the subtle elements. Aniruddha is [the supreme ātman] conditioned by the gross elements.

The description given in Passage 1 corresponds to the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory as follows: First, Vāsudeva, being the unconditioned supreme ātman, corresponds to the fourth state of ātman. Saṃkarṣaṇa is the supreme ātman conditioned by the cause of the subtle elements and the gross elements, that is to say, avidyā. Considering it as ātman’s having avidyā as the limiting condition, Saṃkarṣaṇa can be said to correspond to the third state. Similarly, Pradyumna corresponds to the second state because of having the subtle elements as the limiting condition, while Aniruddha corresponds to the first state since he has the gross elements as the limiting condition.

Having confirmed that the Advaitic Vyūha theory is interpreted along the lines of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory, I would like to examine now the “explanation [given above]” mentioned in Passage 1.

---

argues that the appellation Paramahamsapriyā was wrongly given to Madhusūdana’s commentary on the BhP, and Madhusūdana’s commentary on the BhP should be referred to as Śrīmadbhāgavata-ādyaslokatrayasya-ṭīkā. In this paper, I follow Dr. Bhuveneshwari in referring to Madhusūdana’s commentary as the Śrīmadbhāgavatādyaslokatrayasya ṭīkā.
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ŚBhĀŚṬṬ p. 69,10–17: pañcikṛtapañcamahābhūtopahitaṁ suddhacaitanyāṁ tadabhimānivirāṇantaryāmirūpam otam iti aniruddha iti cākhyaṁate. evam apañcikṛtapañcamahābhūtopahitaṁ suddhacaitanyāṁ tadabhimānihiraṇyagārbarāntaryāmirūpam anujñāta iti pradyumna iti cākhyaṁate. evam sthūlasūkṣmakāraṇībhūtaṁ 28 yan māyātmakam avyākṛtaṁ tad-upahitaṁ suddhāṁ caitanyāṁ 29 taniṣṭhācidābhāsopalakṣitam anujñeti saṁkarṣaṇa iti cākhyaṁate. anupahitaṁ tu caitanyāṁ sarvānusyūtasamanmātraṁ sarvasākṣiparamāñandaghanam avikalpa iti vāsudeva iti cākhyaṁate.

The pure consciousness (suddhacaitanya) conditioned by the five [gross] quintupled (pañcikṛta) elements is in the form of the internal governor (antaryāmin) of Virāj who arrogates them (the five gross elements) to the self (abhimānin), and is called “the woven” (ota) or “Aniruddha.” Similarly, the pure consciousness conditioned by the five [subtle] elements not quintupled (apañcikṛta) is in the form of the internal governor of Hiranyagarbha who arrogates them (the five subtle elements) to the self, and is called “the permitted” (anujñāta) or “Pradyumna.” Likewise, Aavyākṛta is the cause of the gross [elements] and the subtle [elements] and is of the nature of māyā, the pure consciousness conditioned by it (Aavyākṛta) is non-essentially indicated (upalakṣita) by the appearance of consciousness itself (cidābhāsa) in it (Aavyākṛta), and is called “the permission” (anujñā) or “Saṁkarṣaṇa.” On the other hand, the unconditioned consciousness is the mere existent (saṁmātra) woven into [consistently] everything, the mass of the supreme bliss that is the witness (sākṣin) of everything, and is called “the indiscrimination” (avikalpa) or “Vāsudeva.”

In Passage 2, the explanation starts from Aniruddha which is the first state of ātman in the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory. Moreover, what was called the supreme ātman in Passage 1 is called the pure consciousness

28 sthūlasūkṣmakāraṇībhūtaṁ ŚBhĀŚṬṬD, ŚBhĀŚṬṬS: sthūlasūkṣmakābhūtakaraṇībhūtaṁ ŚBhĀŚṬTK.
29 suddhāṁ caitanyāṁ ŚBhĀŚṬṬD, ŚBhĀŚṬṬS: suddhacaitanyāṁ ŚBhĀŚṬTK.
in Passage 2. And, if the pure consciousness is conditioned by the quintupled five elements,\(^{30}\) that is, the gross elements, it is called “the woven” (*ota*) or “Aniruddha.” “The woven” is a term found in the *Nṛsiṃhottaratāpanīyopaniṣad* (NUTU) which provides the basis of the Advaitic *Vyuḥa* theory. These points are in common with Passage 1. Additionally, when the pure consciousness is conditioned by the subtle elements, it is called “Pradyumna,” and when it is conditioned by *Avyākṛta*,\(^{31}\) which is the cause of the subtle elements and the gross elements, it is called “Saṃkarṣaṇa.” These points are common to Passage 1 and Passage 2. However, the remaining descriptions of Aniruddha, Pradyumna and Saṃkarṣaṇa are problematic.

Aniruddha is said to be in the form of the internal governor of *Virāj* who arrogates the quintupled five elements, that is, the gross elements, to the self. Does this mean that Aniruddha is conditioned by the gross elements, or not? If it does, this would correspond to the first state of *ātman* in the second and third versions of the *ātmāvasthācatusṭtaya* theory. However, I don’t think that *Virāj* means merely the gross elements because of the expression “arrogat[ing] the gross elements to the self.”

A hint towards the solution of this problem is the expression “the pure consciousness is non-essentially indicated (*upalakṣita*) by the appearance of itself (*cidābhāsa*) in *Avyākṛta* which is of the nature of *māyā*” in the explanation of Saṃkarṣaṇa. This passage corresponds to the expression “the pure consciousness is the internal governor of *Virāj* who arrogates the gross elements to the self” in the case of Aniruddha. I would interpret the notion of “being non-essentially indicated (*upalakṣita*) by *X*” as “being conditioned by *X*.” In other words, it can be interpreted as the internal governor of *X*. If so, Saṃkarṣaṇa is the pure consciousness conditioned by the appearance of itself manifested in *Avyākṛta*, which is the material principle called *māyā*, and here the pure consciousness is conditioned by the sentient, the appearance of consciousness manifested in *Avyākṛta* as well as by the material,

\(^{30}\) “Quintupled” (*pañcikṛta*) is each of the subtle elements of the earth, water, fire, wind, and ether combined with the four other elements to form one gross element. Regarding this process, see Kanakura [1976: 209], Nakamura [1996: 252, fn. (1)], Manabe [2015: 36, fn. (10)].

\(^{31}\) *Avyākṛta* is said to be of the nature of *māyā*. In Madhusūdana’s doctrine, *māyā* and *avidyā* are mostly used synonymously. Thus, it may be said that *Avyākṛta* is of the nature of *māyā*. See Manabe [2017a].
Avyākṛta. Consequently, in the above explanation of Saṃkarśana, the expression “Virāj who arrogates the gross elements to the self” in the case of Aniruddha might mean that Virāj, who is the appearance of consciousness, manifests himself in the gross elements. Furthermore, the consciousness conditioned by the gross elements and Virāj, who is the appearance of consciousness, is Aniruddha. The above is true even in the case of Pradyumna. This conclusion is supported by the description offered later in the ŚBHĀŚṬṬ to the effect that the consciousness is the internal governor of Hiranyagarbha and Virāj.

However, Madhusūdāna considered Hiranyagarbha and Virāj as the elements in the third version of the ātmāvasthācatusṭāya theory in the SB. Moreover, Madhusūdāna also mentioned Hiranyagarbha and Virāj as both the elements and the individual self as samaṣṭi in the Bhagavadgītāgīdhārthadīpiḍā (BhGGAD), the commentary on the Bhagavadgītā (BhG).

What does this mean? The following

---

32 ŚBHĀŚṬṬ p. 70,10–12: brahmādāvacchinnadābhāso hi virād jīvaḥ. ayam tu tadbimbabhūtas tadantaryāmī svayam eva rājata iti svarāj. “Because an individual self called Virāj is a manifestation of the mind limited by the egg of brahman. On the other hand, what is the object (bimba) of that (Virāj) and the internal governor (antaryāmin) of that is self-illuminant because it illuminates only by himself”; ŚBHĀŚṬṬ p. 70,14f.: ādikavye śūkṣmabhūtvāvacchinnadābhāsāya hiranyagarbhasamjñākāya jīvāya brahma vedanā tadantaryāmīrāpeṇa bimbabhūto yas tanmanasaiva tene. “He, being the object (bimba) had extended brahman, that is, Vedas to the first saint poet, that is, the individual self called Hiranyagarbha who is a manifestation of the mind conditioned by the subtle elements in the form of his (Hiranyagarbha’s) internal governor only by his mind.”

33 See below regarding the passage referring to Virāj and Hiranyagarbha as the elements. BhGGAD p. 62,18–20 (on BhG 2.18): antavanto vināśina ime ‘parokṣā dehā upacitāpacitarāpatvāc charitrāni. bhuvacanat śhūlāsākṣmakāraṇāraṇā virāsūtrāvya-kṛtākyā纽约āvāya yāvātmaṇā mahāvāyāvāya yāvātmaṇāh svapakāśasphuranarūpasya sambandhina drṣṭatvena bhogyatvāna cokāḥ śrutībhir brahmavādibhi ca. “These directly visible (aparokṣa) bodies are finite, that is, perishable. The bodies are based on the form of growth and decline. It is stated in the scriptures (śruti) and by Vedāntists (brahmavādin) that being plural, [they are] all that are in the form of the gross, the subtle and the cause, and called Virāj, Śūtra (Hiranyagarbha) and Avyākṛta, and the nature of samaṣṭi and vyaṣṭi [, and they] are related to the sole ātman that is eternal, that is, nothing but not perishable, and embodied, that is, embodied by relation caused by false attribution, and the form of self-luminous brightness as to be seen and enjoyed.” See bellow regarding the passage referring to Virāj and Hiranyagarbha as the individual self. BhGGAD p. 186,36–38 (on BhG 4.6): yadi tasya śarīraṃ sthūlabhūtakāryam syāt tadā vyaṣṭirūpave jāgrādavasthāmadātītalyavam.
explanation might be offered: The individual self is the consciousness reflected in the internal organ and its impression, into which māyā developed. In addition, the internal organ and its impression are material, and the individual self cannot exist without the material internal organ or its impression. Therefore, it can be ventured that Hiranyagarbha and Virāj are the mixture of the individual self and the material. Furthermore, Virāj and Hiranyagarbha referred to as material, that is, as elements, relate to the aspect of the elements that is the limiting condition of the individual self. On the other hand, it is said that Virāj and Hiranyagarbha as the individual relate to the aspect of consciousness reflected in the elements as the internal organ. Considering the problem in this way, we can say that Virāj and Hiranyagarbha are both the elements and the individual self. In addition, since the individual self is consciousness reflected in the elements, if we consider the relationship between consciousness and its limiting condition, by simply stating that the material that is the limiting condition (māyā and elements) conditions consciousness, it can naturally be inferred that the individual self comes into existence. 34 It is possible that for this reason Passage 1 does not explicitly mention the individual. 35

Thus, although the explanations of the first, the second, and the third states are slightly more complicated than in the ātmāvasthā-

samaśṭirāpate ca virādjīvataḥ syād tasya taudāpādhitvā. atha stikṣmaḥbhūtakāryaṃ tadā vyaśṭirāpatve svapnāvasthānaddhatiḥ syāt. samaśṭirāpatve ca hiranyagarbhajñiḥvyāpato syāt taudāpādhitvā. “If his (Īśvara’s) body were the result of the gross elements, then, in the case that [Īśvara] is in the form of the individual, [Īśvara] is equal to ours in the waking state. On the other hand, [if his (Īśvara’s) body were the result of the gross elements,] in the case that [Īśvara] is in the form of the collective, he is the individual self called Virāj because of being conditioned by them (the gross elements). If [Īśvara’s body were] the result of the subtle elements, then, in the case that [Īśvara] is in the form of the individual, [Īśvara] is equal to us in the dream state. On the other hand, [if Īśvara’s body were the result of the subtle elements,] in the case that [Īśvara] is in the form of the collective, he is the individual self called Hiranyagarbha because of being conditioned by them (the subtle elements).”

34 Incidentally, although not clearly stated in the ŚBhĀŚṬṬ, it can be said that Avyākṛta is also the individual self as samaśṭi for the same reason as in the case of Hiranyagarbha and Virāj. In the IPP, Avyākṛta corresponds to the individual self.

35 Conversely from the above consideration, it is thought that in Table 4 Avyākṛta, Hiranyagarbha and Virāj, which are the material limiting conditions, also imply that they are the individual self as samaśṭi just because this view is not explicitly stated.
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catuṣṭaya theory, we can state that Aniruddha, Pradyumna and Saṃkarsṇa correspond to the consciousness in the first, second, and third states, respectively.

Finally, with regard to Vāsudeva, it is clear that Vāsudeva corresponds to the consciousness in the fourth state in the ātmavasthā-catuṣṭaya theory, because Vāsudeva is unconditioned consciousness.

Table 5 summarizes the Advaitic Vyuha theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Fourth state]</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Vāsudeva, avikalpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Third state]</td>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>Saṃkarsṇa, anujñā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>Avyākṛta [as the elements] (= avidyā, māyā) Avyākṛta [as the individual self as samaśti]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Second state]</td>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>Pradyumna, anujñāta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>Subtle elements (Hiranyagarbha as the elements) Hiranyagarbha [as the individual self as samaśti]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[First state]</td>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>Aniruddha, ota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>Gross elements (Virāj as the elements) Virāj [as the individual self as samaśti]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In considering the relation between this Advaitic Vyuha theory and the third version of the ātmavasthā-catuṣṭaya theory, I present the result of the analysis of the Advaitic Vyuha theory found in the Iśvarapratipattiprakāśa (IPP) attributed to Madhusūdana36 below as Table 6.

36 It is not yet certain whether the IPP is an authentic work of Madhusūdana or not. I consider it to be authentic, or at least the work of someone whose thought bears a strong resemblance to Madhusūdana. See Manabe [2015: 35, fn. 3] and Manabe [2016: 148, fn. 6].
Table 6: The Advaitic Vyūha theory in the ÍPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Fourth state]</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Vāsudeva, avikalpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Third state]</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Saṃkarṣaṇa, anujñā, Īśvara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>māyā (Avyākṛta as the elements) A vyākṛta [as the individual self as samaṣṭi]</td>
<td>Tamas of māyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Second state]</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Pradyumna, anujñātṛ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limiting condition</td>
<td>Subtle elements (Hiranyagarbha as the elements) Hiranyagarbha [as the individual self as samaṣṭi]</td>
<td>Rajas of māyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[First state]</th>
<th>Appellation</th>
<th>Aniruddha, ota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limiting</td>
<td>Gross elements (Virāj as</td>
<td>Sattva of māyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 is basically the same as Table 5. However, the great differences between them are that in Table 6, Saṃkarṣaṇa is identified with Īśvara, who is divided into Rudra, Brahmā and Viṣṇu as his subcategories, and Table 6 adopts this structure to the state of Saṃkarṣaṇa as seen in Table 5. Looking at this structure, the Advaitic Vyūha theory in Table 6 closely resembles the third version of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory

---

37 Table 6 shows my interpretation and arrangement of the ÍPP according to the above analysis of the SB and the ŚBhÄŚṬṬ. In the ÍPP, Madhusūdana did not assign Rudra, Brahmā, Viṣṇu to the third, the second and the first state, respectively. In regard to the analysis of the ÍPP, see Manabe [2015], [2016].
in Table 4. Additionally, except for the point of being the individual self, Table 6 is the same as the third version of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory in that Avyākṛta, Hiranyagarbha and Virāj are listed as limiting conditions. However, as can be seen from the points that the appellations Viśva, Taijasa and Prājña are not given and that only individual selves as samaṣṭi are listed, the structure represented by Table 6 was strongly influenced by the notion of the ātman as the presiding deity found in the first version of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory represented in Table 2. The Advaitic Vṛūha theory of Table 6 has most likely been formed on the basis of the third version of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory given in the SB, while excluding the aspect of the individual self, who is the ātman as the individual, in line with the Vṛūha theory of Viśṇu’s four states.

Furthermore, I argue that the Advaitic Vṛūha theory of the ŚBhĀŚṬṬ outlined in Table 5, which does not include the three subcategories of Saṃkarṣaṇa listed in Table 6, nonetheless is of a type with Table 6, and consequently formulated based on the third version of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory, excluding the aspect of individual self. In addition, the Advaitic Vṛūha theories of the ŚBhĀŚṬṬ outlined in Table 5 and of the IPP outlined in Table 6 were also a practical theory of meditation, which is the common point of all versions of the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory.

38 In addition, I would like to point out that before Madhusūdana formulated the Advaitic Vṛūha theory based on the ātmāvasthācatuṣṭaya theory, Śrīdhara Svāmin (ca. 1350–1450), who is said to belong to the genealogy of the Advaita School, advocated the samādhi centered on Īśvara only concerned with the first state in his Bhāvavṛttadīpikā (BhPBhAD), the commentary on the BhP, BhPBhAD p. 49,13f. (on BhP 2.1.39): tad evam cītasthairyārthaṁ virāḍdehajīvēśvarātm abhedenopāsanam uktam, tatra tu dehajīvāv Īśvare pravilāpya sa eva dhīyaya iī nirdhārayati—sa iti. “Thus, in order to strengthen the mind, veneration (upāsana) was explained in that the body of the Virāj, the individual self and the presiding deity are indiscriminate. On the other hand, in that case I will say “that” to state in detail that he (Īśvara) should be meditated on only after completely causing the body and the individual self to vanish in Īśvara.” Since Madhusūdana is thought to have known the BhPBhAD, I think that he probably got some hints in formulating his own Advaitic Vṛūha theory from Śrīdhara.

39 ŚBhĀŚṬṬ p. 70,1f.: dhīyānam atropāsanarūpam evādhīpretam. caturyāṭharačānāyāt upāsanaḥ śrīhāvāt. “Here, meditation (dhīyāna) is meant only to be of the form of veneration (upāsana) because the composition of the four Vṛūhas aims at veneration.” Regarding the IPP, see IPP p. 9.9–21.
4. Conclusion

As discussed above, it can be said that the Advaitic Vyūha theory in the ŚBhĀŚṬṬ can be positioned in the genealogy of the MāṇḍU as well as of the second and the third versions of the ātmāvasthācatusṭaya theory. The genealogy of the second to the third version was based principally on the ātman as the individual self, although it does include the aspect of the ātman as the presiding deity derived from the first version. However, it can be pointed out that, in the case of the Advaitic Vyūha theory, since the four states of Viṣṇu were the subject, it was based on the structure of the third version but excluded the aspect of the ātman as the individual self. Instead, it focused on the viewpoint of the ātman as the presiding deity.

I end this study by showing a schematic representation of the above considerations.
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