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ABSTRACT

The Lokamanya B. G. Tilak wrote a commentary on the Bhagavadgītā, which is called Śrimadbhagavadgītarahasya athavā Karmayogaśāstra but is popularly known as the Gītārahasya. In the Gītārahasya, Tilak often quotes three of the prominent saints of Mahārāṣṭra, namely, Jñāneśvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās. A few scholars have indicated that there might be some influence of the theology of the prominent Marāṭhā saints on the Gītārahasya. But no one has studied this matter in detail and demonstrated the depth of their influence on the Gītārahasya. This thesis hopes to fill that gap in Tilak scholarship. In attempting to do that this thesis traces out how the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical ideas of Jñāneśvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās influenced Tilak's religious, social, philosophical, and ethical thought in the Gītārahasya.

Tilak was a controversial leader in Mahārāṣṭra. He opposed the 'Age of Consent Bill' introduced by Hindu social reformers and argued that social reform should be carried out within the frame of Hinduism. He opposed the Moderate party being allowed to hold its Social Conference in the Congress pandal and thus separated social reform from political reform. His opposition to the social reforms proposed by the social reformers was understood by many to mean that he was anti-reformist and pro-orthodox. How can a student of Tilak...
understand him? This thesis provides an answer to this problem, saying that Tilak took a middle position on questions of social reform and orthodoxy between the strict orthodox, who were completely opposed to social change, and the Hindu social reformers, who wanted to reform Hindu society on the basis of western values and culture. This thesis demonstrates that Tilak's middle position on those issues is best understood as an attempt to continue the position taken by the Marāṭhā saints on problems of social change and orthodoxy.

Tilak, being a nationalist, defended Hindu values and institutions. He defended the final authority of the Vedas. He defended the traditional Hindu social order, that is, the varṇa vyavasthā, in terms of the guṇa-karma theory (i.e. position of an individual in Hindu society is determined by his qualities and functions). He did not, however, justify social hierarchy in terms of birth. He was fully aware of the defects of the caste system and he wished to remove them. He expounded the message of the Bhagavadgītā along these lines. Tilak argued that the Gītā teaches advaita Vedānta. Because of this he preferred the commentary (bhāṣya) of Śaṁkaraçārya on the Gītā over the commentaries written by other ācāryas. This might lead one to believe that Tilak's advaitic philosophy and Śaṁkara's advaita Vedānta were identical. This thesis, however, argues that Tilak's advaitic philosophy differs from Śaṁkara's system in that Tilak follows the
advaitic theology of the Marathā saints rather than that of Śāṅkara's system. Tilāk's system is purṇa advaita (perfect or complete non-dualism) like that of the saints, rather than Śāṅkara's kevala advaita (pure or abstract non-dualism).

Tilāk rejected all the bhaṣyas on the Gītā because they proposed either jñānamārga or bhaktimārga as the way of liberation and exhorted a liberated person to renounce society and take saṁnyāsa (renunciation of society). Tilāk argued that the Karmayoga of the Gītā is a synthesis of knowledge (jñāna), devotion (bhakti), and action (karma) and its liberated person (jñāni or sthitaprajña) continues to act even after liberation. This is Tilāk's unique position. This thesis argues that Tilāk's distinctive position follows the activistic (pravṛtti-pāra) theology of the Marāṭhā saints whose bhaktimārga was a synthesis of knowledge, action, and devotion and who asked a liberated person to continue doing his socio-religious duties for the welfare of others in the spirit of dedication and selflessness. Tilāk followed the saints of Mahārāṣṭra very closely in this regard.

In short, this thesis is an attempt to explain Tilāk's religious, social, philosophical, and ethical ideas in the light of the saintly tradition of Mahārāṣṭra. It does not specifically deny that he was aware of western thought that he felt some loyalty to his Brahmanical heritage, or that he was responding creatively to the political and cultural
pressures of his day. While each of these factors affected his thought, this thesis argues that he was determined to keep to the tradition of the Marāṭhā saints and that in the Gītārāhasya he largely succeeded in that endeavour.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Hypothesis:

This dissertation is an investigation of the hypothesis that the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical dimensions of the thought of some prominent saints of Mahārāṣṭra namely, Jñānesvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās, influenced the Lokamānya Bal Gangādhar Ṭīlak's (A.D. 1856-1920) Śrimadbhaqavadgītārahasya Athavā Karmayogaśāstra\(^1\) also called the Śrimad Bhāgavadgītā-Rahasya Or Karma-Yoga-Śāstra\(^2\), commonly referred to as the Gītārahasya. The evidence for this hypothesis is the fact that Ṭīlak often cites these prominent Marāṭhā saints in the Gītārahasya, and that his religious, social, philosophical, and ethical thoughts tend to follow the theology of the saints on crucial issues. While this fact has been noted by a few scholars, the nature and the full extent of the influence of the saints tradition or the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra on the Gītārahasya has not been studied in detail. This study


will attempt to fill this gap.

A) The Historical Setting:

Before investigating the hypothesis, let us introduce
the historical setting of Mahārāṣṭra, its saint tradition,
and the Lokamānya B. G. Ṭīlak.

The present state of Mahārāṣṭra covers a total area
of 3,06,059 square kilometres which is more than 10% of the
area of the Indian Republic. Mahārāṣṭra is situated on the
coast of the Arabian Sea and surrounded by Gujarāt, Madhya
Pradeś, Aṅhāra Pradeś, Karnāṭak, and Goa. Its geographical
setting places Mahārāṣṭra in contact with both North India and
South India and gives it a culture which is a mixture of the
cultural patterns of the North and South in India.

(1) The Early History of Mahārāṣṭra-

King Asoka, the greatest emperor of the Maurya Empire
(321-185 B. C. ), referred to the rulers of Mahārāṣṭra as the
4 Rathikas (i.e.'going by carriages or chariots, or driver or
5 owner of a car or chariot' ). Mahārāṣṭra was a part of the
Mauryan Empire. After the decline of the Mauryan Empire, the

---

3 G. B. Sardar, The Saints-poets of Mahārāṣṭra: Their
Impact on Society, tr. K. Mehata, (Bombay: Orient Longmans,

4 C. V. Vaidya, Madhyayuquin Bhārat Athavā Hindu Rājyaṅcā
Udbhav, Utkarṣa, āni Ucched, (A.D. 600-1200), (Puṇe:
Bhāratetihās Samsodhak Manḍal, 1920), II, 463.

5 M. Monier-Williams, A Saṅskrit-English Dictionary,
Sātavāhanas came into power in the Deccan. Their capital was Pratiṣṭhān (the modern Paithan). They encouraged the development of the Maharāṣṭri Prākṛt language. Śatakarni was a great king of the Sātavāhanas who supported the Brāhmaṇa orthodoxy and performed a horse-sacrifice to celebrate his victory.

After the Sātavāhanas, the Cālukyas came into power in Maharāṣṭra; they ruled over Maharāṣṭra from A. D. 500 to A. D. 753. During the rule of the Cālukyas, Vedic religion, devotional sects, Jainism, and Buddhism co-existed. The Cālukya power was overthrown by Daṇṭidurga, one of the Cālukya feudatories.

Daṇṭidurga established a new dynasty, the Raṭrakūṭas. Daṇṭidurga performed brāhinical sacrifices (e. g. Hiranyagarbha sacrifice at Ujjayini). During the rule of the Raṭrakūṭas, Purāṇic Hinduism, especially the worship of Viṣṇu and Śiva, grew popular in the Deccan. Kṛṣṇa I built a rock-cut shrine for Śiva at Elora. Temples were built to house images of Śiva and Viṣṇu who were worshipped with an elaborate ritual. Amoghavarṣa I and Īndra IV patronized Jainism. The Raṭrakūṭas ruled over Maharāṣṭra from A. D. 753 to A. D. 973. The Raṭrakūṭas were defeated by the Cālukyas and Maharāṣṭra came


under the power of the Cālukyas again from A. D. 973 to A. D. 1189. After the Cālukyas, the Yādavas became rulers of Mahārāṣṭra.

(2) The Yādava Dynasty-

Dṛḍhāpāhāra, the founder of the Yādava dynasty, established a kingdom at Candrapuri (district Nasik) in A. D. 843. Bhillama IV moved the capital to Devgiri (the modern Daulatabad) in A. D. 1187. Singhaṇa (A. D. 1210-1247) was a supporter of Brāhmanic-Vedic religion; he gave grants to Hindu temples and the Brāhmaṇas. Both Kṛṣṇa (A. D. 1247-1260) and Mahādeva (A. D. 1260-1271) performed many Vedic sacrifices. While the Yādava kings patronized Brāhmanic-Vedic religion, the common people were embracing sectarian movements. The Yādava period is important from the point of the religious history of Mahārāṣṭra primarily because the major sectarian movements came into prominence during this period, namely, the Vārkari Saṃpradāya, the Liṅgāyata Saṃpradāya, the Nātha Saṃpradāya, and the Mahānubhāva Saṃpradāya.

The Vārkari devotional sectarian movement originated under Puṇḍalik in the eleventh century. On the basis of inscriptions (A. D. 1186, 1236, 1237, and 1273) we know that the cult of Viṭṭhal and the Vārkari Saṃpradāya were in

existence a few centuries before Jñāneśvar (A. D. 1275-1296).

Another sectarian movement, called the Liṅgāyata or Viraśaiva Saṁpradāya, was introduced into Mahārāṣṭra in A. D. 1190. This movement was grounded in the philosophy of Śaivism. It challenged the orthodox or Brahmanic Hinduism which was centered on the authority of the Vedas, the exclusive privileges and rights of the Brāhmaṇas, the exclusion of women and the Śūdras from Vedic knowledge, and Sanskrit as the only medium of religious instruction.

The third religious movement, called the Nātha Saṁpradāya, was introduced into Mahārāṣṭra by Gahininātha (A.D. 12th and 13th century), the chief disciple of Gorakṣanātha (A. D. 1050-1150). The Nātha Saṁpradāya was also oriented towards the philosophy of Śaivism. This movement used the regional languages, e. g. Marāṭhī, Hindi, and Bengali, for religious instruction and de-emphasized the importance of Sanskrit. Nāthism also accepted women and Śūdras within

---


its fold. It emphasized self-purification (ātmaśuddhi) as the way of self-realization (ātmāsakṣātkāra) and criticized excesses of ritualism.

The fourth religious movement which spread through Mahārāṣṭra during the Yādava dynasty was the Mahānubhāva Sampradāya. This devotional sect was founded by Cakradhara (A. D. 1194-1274) in A. D. 1263, at Paithan. The Mahānubhāvas emphasized the non-observance of the caste system, initiated Śūdras and women into their sect, criticized the excesses of karmakānda or ritualism, and used Marāṭhī as a medium of religious instruction. They were the first to produce a large body of literature in Marāṭhī.


14 P. R. Mokasi, op. cit., p. 32.

15 Ibid., pp. 65f.

16 Ibid., p. 66.


While the common people were following these "popular" religious movements some orthodox Hindus were trying to revive Vedic or Brāhmaṇic Hinduism under the royal patronage of Mahādeva (A. D. 1260-1271). Vijñānesvara, Bopadeva, and 19 Hemādri attempted to revive Vedic religion. Hemādri was a minister of Mahādeva and also a learned scholar. With the help of a number of orthodox scholars he produced a large compendium of religious rites and observances called "Caturvargaciṅtāmaṇi" which consists of four large books or parts: (a) the Vratakhandā or vows, (b) the Dānakhandā or charities, (c) the Tirthakhandā or pilgrimages, and (d) the Mokṣakhandā or liberation, with several supplements (Parisēgakhandā) emphasizing the worship of various deities, of the manes, and the daily and seasonal duties and penances (prāyaścitta). The emphasis of the Caturvargaciṅtāmaṇi was that the people should perform all the rites mentioned in the Grhyasutras, the Kalpasutras, the Smṛtis, the Purāṇas, the Epics, and usages (sarvaśākhagṛhyakalpasutraśmrtpurāṇapitihāsācāravagatadharmamatrayuktamena sarvaiḥ śrādham kartavyamiti sthitam). The purpose of the Caturvargaciṅtāmaṇi was to


20 Caturvargaciṅtāmaṇi II.i.16; III. i.25; quoted by P. V. Kane, History of Dharmashastra (Ancient and Medieval Religious and Civil Law). (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1975), I.ii.752.
arrest the decline of the Brāhmaṇic or karmakāndic Hinduism. Hemādri directly opposed Cakradhara and his Mahānubhāva Sampradāya. Because of Hemādri's influence at the royal court, the Mahānubhāvas and the Liṅgāyatās did not get the sympathy of the Yādava kings.

The last king of the Yādava dynasty was Rāmdeva (A. D. 1271-1306). During his period the revived Brāhmaṇism emphasized the performance of many rites and ceremonies, and observance of strict dietary rules and the caste distinctions (viz. touchables and untouchables). It was, in short, an attempt at a revival of laws and regulations based on the Dharmaśāstras. However, the three non-Vedic religious movements namely, Nāthism, the Liṅgāyatās, and the Mahānubhāvas continued to flourish. St Jñāneśvar (A. D. 1275-1296) and St. Nāmdev (A. D. 1270-1350) and many other Vārkari saints, e.g. Baṅkā Mahār (died in A. D. 1378), Cokhāmeḷā Mahār (died in A. D. 1339), Sāvatā Māli, Narahari Sonār, etc., were born under this situation of social and religious tension between orthodoxy and heterodoxy.


22 N. N. Relekar, H. V. Inamdar, and N. D. Mirajkar, eds. op. cit., p. 11.

23 Ibid., pp. 24f.
(3) The Muslim Rule-

The Yadava dynasty was brought to an end by Alā-ud-din Khalji, the nephew of Jalāl-ud-din, who attacked Devgiri in A. D. 1296, defeated Rāmdeva and extracted booty from him. By the end of A. D. 1312 the Yadavas and other kingdoms in the south of India acknowledged Alā-ud-din as their suzdar. There also soon emerged the Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar (A.D. 1336-1565) and the Muslim Bahāmani kingdom (A. D. 1347-1526). Both of these kingdoms were situated in the south of India.

(4) The Rise and Fall of the Marātha Power-

The Bahāmani kingdom was later divided into five independent Sultanates which controlled the territory of Mahārāṣṭra. Marāṭhā chieftains soon began to accept service under the Deccan Sultanate rulers. Marāṭhā statemen and warriors began to occupy important positions in the civil and military departments. The hill forts near the Ghāts and the surrounding territory came under the control of Marāṭhā Jāgirdārs (fief holders) who were nominally dependent upon these Muslim rulers. This situation eventually led to the process of independence from Muslim rule. Sivāji established

24 M. G. Ranade, Rise of the Marāthā Power and Other Essays... (Bombay: University of Bombay, 1961), p. 20

a Marāṭhā kingdom and was crowned in A. D. 1674 as a king of the Marāṭhās. He had to fight the Muslim powers in the Deccan and the Moghul power in the north in order to defend his newly established kingdom.

While the independent Marāṭhā power was in its nassant stage, two prominent Marāṭhā saints: namely, Tukārām (A. D. 1598-1650) and the Samartha Rāmdās (A. D. 1608-1681) were enlightening people in socio-religious matters. They were the contemporaries of Śivāji. Śivāji took keen interest in these religious leaders. According to a letter from Śivāji to Tukārām and Tukārām's reply it seems that they met in A. D. 1645.

Tukārām directed Śivāji to contact Rāmdās; Śivāji did so in A. D. 1645. It is clear from Rāmdās' writings that he acted as one of the spiritual advisors to Śivāji.

After Śivāji his sons Sambhāji (A. D. 1680-1689), Rājārām (A. D. 1689-1700), and his grandson Śāhu (A. D. 1707-1715) became kings. At the time of Śāhu, the Marāṭhās were

---


28 The Poems of Tukarama 1473, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe.

29 S. G. Tulpule, op. cit., pp. 397f., e.g. Dās.18.vi, Rāmavaradāyini, Ānāndavananabhavan.
engaged in fighting a civil war and soon the actual power came into the hands of Bāḷāji Viśvanāth, the first of the powerful Peśwas. After the death of Bāḷāji Viśvanāth in A. D. 1720, his son, Bājirāv I was appointed as the Peśwa. Bājirāv I continued his father's policy of conquest in the north and south of India. After the death of Bājirāv I in A. D. 1740, his son Bāḷāji or Nānā Sāheb became the Peśwa and remained in the office till his death in A. D. 1761. Under the Peśwaship of Nānā Sāheb, the Marāṭhā power became dominant in India. After the battle of Panipat in A. D. 1761 the Marāṭhā Confederacy was weakened. Nānā Sāheb's son Mādhavrāv I became the Peśwa in A.D. 1761. He died in A. D. 1772 and his younger brother Nārāyaṇrāv became the Peśwa. Nārāyaṇrāv was killed in a plot. His son Mādhavrāv II was made the Peśwa. As he was minor, Nānā Phāṇnis was the caretaker of the Peśwa. Mādhavarāv II died in A. D. 1795. After this, Bājirāv II, a son of Raghunātharāv was made the Peśwa in A. D. 1796 by Nānā Phāṇnis (died in A. D. 1800). Bājirāv II applied to the Bombay Government for protection in A. D. 1802. The Peśwa rule was continued under the over-all authority of the British. Peśwa rule was ended by the British in A. D. 1818. Maratha leaders, however, organized and led the revolt in A. D. 1857 against the British rule in India. This spirit of Marāṭhā defiance against outsiders is seen in Tilak's work, as scholars
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have noted. The heritage of the Marathas seem to have been uppermost in his mind.

B) The Prominent Maratha Saints:

(1) Saint Jñānēśvar-

Jñānēśvar, whose works became the theological foundation of the Vārkarī Sampradāya, was born in A. D. 1275. His father Vīththalpant was very religious. He once went on a pilgrimage during which his religious aspiration became so intense that he gave up his householdership and became a samnyāsi (i.e. a hermit). But at the word of his preceptor he later gave up samnyāsa and resumed householdership.

Vīththalpant had four children: Nīvītīnāth (A. D. 1273-1297), Jñānēśvar (A. D. 1275-1296), Sopāndeva (A. D. 1277-1296), and Muktābāī (A. D. 1279-1297). Vīththalpant, his wife, and the children were excommunicated by the Brāhmaṇas of Ālandi because they thought of Vīththalpant's withdrawal from samnyāsa as a serious offence. The Brāhmaṇas

---


forced the family to live on the outskirts of the village. Vişṭhālpaṇt asked the Brāhmaṇas for an atonement (prāyaścit), but the Brāhmaṇas suggested he commit suicide as an atonement. His children were denied the right to the initiation rite (upanayana), the right of every twice-born (dvīja) male of Hindu society.

As Viṣṭhālpaṇt's sons were denied the right to the initiation rite and to be in the fold of orthodox Hindus, the children were initiated into the non-Brāhmaṇic or non-Vedic Nātha Saṃpradāya. Gahinīnātha (A. D. 12-13 cent.), a chief disciple of Gorakṣanātha (A. D. 1050-1150) had spread Nāthism in Mahārāṣṭra. Gahinīnātha was willing to receive Nivṛttīnāth, the eldest son of Viṣṭhālpaṇt, into the Nātha order despite the excommunication ban of the Brāhmaṇas, and Nivṛttīnāth was initiated into the Nātha order when Jñānesvar was only eight. Viṣṭhālpaṇt then went again on pilgrimage and committed suicide as his atonement when he drowned himself in the Ganges. His wife followed him and ended her life a year later. Their orphaned children went to Āpegaṇv, their ancestral village to get their share of property, but

---


they were denied their right to the property and they had to
resort to begging. Because of this harsh treatment, the
children became keenly aware of the frustration of the
downtrodden and oppressed masses and they sought a spiritual
path which would alleviate such situations.

Jñānesvar was initiated into the Nātha Saṃpradāya by
his eldest brother Nivṛttināth. After the initiation,
Jñānesvar started his life-mission. He began to expound his
ideas on socio-religious matters. He selected the Bhagavadgītā,
the most famous text of sectarian Hinduism and the text which
had earlier been commented on by Saṁkaracārya (A. D. 788-820),
Rāmānujācārya (A. D. 1017-1137), Madhvācārya (A. D. 1197-1276),
e tc., in Saṁskṛt. He wrote his commentary in Marāthī, the
varnacular of Mahārāṣṭra. He wrote his commentary at Nevāse
(district of Ahmednagar) in A. D. 1290. His commentary is
called by various names: Gītartha, Gītātikā, Gītā Devi,
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Jñānesāvari, and Bhāvārthadīpika. The Jñānesāvari became one of the first important Marāṭhī books. His purpose in writing the Jñānesāvari was to promote social and religious harmony in society, a concern which arose from the suffering his family had undergone.

Jñānesāvar also wrote two other books. The first book is called 'Anubhāvāmṛta' which is popularly known as 'Amṛtānubhava' at Nevāse (district Ahmednagar) in A. D. 1292. He wrote this book in response to Nivṛttināth's desire for a more original work because he felt the scope for originality in the Jñānesāvari was limited by the framework of the Gītā. In the Anubhāvāmṛta, Jñānesāvar tells us of his own religious experience and expounds the sphurtivāda which is different from Saṃkara's māyāvāda and also refutes Sāṅkhyan dualism, ajñānavāda (i.e. doctrine of mystical Ignorance), etc.
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The second book of Jñānesvar is called 'Cāṅgadev Pāsasthi' which was written at Ālāndi (district of Pune) in A.D. 1294.

The Anubhavamrta and the Cāṅgadev Pāsasthi expound the philosophy of the Nātha Sampradāya.

After writing the Jñānesvari and the Anubhavamrta, Jñānesvar left Nevasa and went back to Ālāndi. He went to Paṇḍharapur in A.D. 1293 and met St. Nāmdev there. They became spiritual friends and thus Jñānesvar became a preacher of the Vārkari Sampradāya. Jñānesvar's parents and his grandfather had also gone to Paṇḍharapur to bow down before Viṭṭhal's image. St. Nāmdev tells us that Jñānesvar's grandfather, Siddhopant, had taken Jñānesvar's parents to Paṇḍharapur to bow down before Viṭṭhal's image after their marriage. Therefore, Jñānesvar, as a youth, had some knowledge about the Vārkari Sampradāya and was taught respect for the central deity of the Sampradāya. When Jñānesvar later joined the Vārkari Sampradāya, his theological works provided a sound foundation for the Vārkari Sampradāya. Because of this, he later came to be honoured as the founder of the Vārkari Sampradāya and the Jñānesvari came to be accepted as the
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principal text of the Sampradāya.

Jñānesvār also wrote Haripāth which has twenty-eight poems remembering the name of God as the means of liberation. He also wrote 900 lyrics emphasizing the supremacy of the path of devotion, the futility of asceticism and other subjects. In addition the following works are ascribed to Jñānesvār: Yogavāsiṣṭha, Bhaktirāj, Panśikarāṇ, Śūkṣṭak, Gāyatrīṭikā, Prākṛtagītā, Uttaragītā, Samās, etc.

Jñānesvār who suffered from the ill treatment accorded to him and his family by orthodox Brāhmaṇas initially embraced Nathism because of its liberal outlook on the socially downtrodden. Wanting to expound his ideas on social and religious matters, he wrote the Jñānesvari, the Anubhavāmṛta, the Cāṅgadev Pāsaṣṭhi, the Haripāth, and the Abhangs, etc.

In these works he expounded both the advaita philosophy of Nathism and the bhaktimārga (i.e. way of devotion) of the Bhāgavat Dharma or sectarian Hinduism. He later joined the Vārkarī Sampradāya in order to make his message available to
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a larger number of people. Having done this work, Jñāneśvar took samādhī (was buried alive) in A. D. 1296, at Ālandī.

(2) Saint Tukārām-

After Jñāneśvar, the Vārkarī movement was led by St. Nāmdev (A. D. 1270-1350) and St. Eknāth (A. D. 1548-1599), for a time before it found its final form around the works of St. Tukārām. Tukārām was born in A. D. 1598, a year before St. Eknāth died. He was born in a religious and well-to-do family. His ancestor Viśvāmbhar More used to go to Paṇḍharpur on pilgrimage. When he was unable to go there, he had a vision that Viṭṭhthal had come to see him at Dehu. He then built a temple for the deity right there and Dehu too became a holy place of pilgrimage. Tukārām was of the Marāṭhā caste, a caste which claims to have sprung from the old order of Kṣatriyas but is considered by others to be of the Śūdra order. Tukārām's ancestors were grocers or tradesmen by profession. Tukārām talks about his life in a poem, as follows:

By caste I was a Śūdra, I became a trader, this God from the first had been worshipped by my family... A famine used up my money, and took away my good name; one wife of mine died crying for food. I grew ashamed and was tormented by this grief; I saw that I was losing my business... So I learned by heart some speeches of the saints... When others sang first, I

---
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took up the refrain, purifying my mind by faith.

His autobiographical note states how Tukārām learned religious knowledge. As Tukārām's caste was traditionally considered a Śūdra caste, he had no access to the Veda and other Saṃskṛt books. The source of his knowledge was listening to the kirtans (i.e. preaching) of the saints, reading the books of the saints, and personal meditation. According to Mahipati, Tukārām studied the Jñāneśvari, Yogavaśīstha, and the Anubhavāmṛta of St. Jñāneśvar, the Bhāgavat and the Bhāvārtha Rāmāyana of St. Eknāth, the Abhaṅgs of St. Nāmdev, and the Vācanāmṛta of St. Kabir.

After studying the works of the saints, Tukārām began to compose abhaṅgs (i.e. poems) and to perform kirtans. His preceptorship was opposed by a few orthodox Brāhmaṇas. Māṃbājī, a professional teacher of Dehu, was angry with Tukārām because people began to attend Tukārām's kirtan instead of Māṃbājī's teaching. Another Brāhmaṇa of Dehu, Rāmeśvar Bhāṭṭa, became furious because of Tukārām's popularity. He issued an injunction prohibiting Tukārām from writing abhaṅgs and ordered him to throw his works in the Indrayāni river. He also induced

55 The Poems of Tukarama 101, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe.

herdsmen to drive Tukārām out of the village, Dehu. Tukārām's abhangs or gāthā (i.e. collection of the abhangs) were miraculously saved, says the tradition.

In his gāthā, Tukārām has emphasized bhaktimārga as the way of liberation. He criticized the samnyāsa cult and emphasized purity of heart. He emphasized that a saint should do his duties for the welfare of the people. He himself led a householder's life. In his works, he dealt with the advaita philosophy and some socio-religious issues. His work brought him honour as a great saint of the Sampradāya. Having served the Sampradāya, he died in A. D. 1650. How he died remains a mystery.

Jñānesvar, Nāmdev, Eknāth, and Tukārām were the prominent saints of the Vārkari Sampradāya. Their contribution to the development of the Sampradāya was traditionally recognized by Bahinābāī, one of the disciples of St. Tukārām
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when she said:

The grace of saints was showered on the Saṃpradāya and the building was completed. Jñānadev laid the foundation and started to erect the temple. Nāmdev was its evangelist (kīṅkar); he built a compound around it. Janārdan and Eknāth gave the pillars of the Bhāgavat. And Tukārām became its steeple.

The building of the Vārkari Saṃpradāya was erected in about five centuries by the contributions of many saints among whom Jñāneśvar, Nāmdev, Eknāth, and Tukārām were prominent. Jñāneśvar and Tukārām were considered more important than the others because Jñāneśvar provided a sound foundation for the theology of the Vārkari Saṃpradāya and the teaching of the Saṃpradāya culminated in the works of Tukārām. For these reasons, it seems that Tilāk concentrated on these two saints when he was writing the Gītārahasya.

Jñāneśvar and Tukārām emphasized bhaktimārga as the central way of liberation implying that the way of liberation was open to Śūdras, women, and all. This position ultimately stands against the orthodox position concerning Vedic authority, the privileges of the Brāhmaṇas, the exclusion of the Śūdras and women from the right to religious knowledge and the pre-requisite of scriptural knowledge for liberation. The saints were trying to address a problem which had arisen in the Hindu social order in that they were trying to re-unite Hindu society...
by criticizing those who took pride in being born in the upper castes and by emphasizing that devotion (bhāy) was the only requirement of liberation. They also criticized the samīnyāsa cult and praised the importance of householdership. Except for Jñāneśvar, the Vārkarī saints were householders and they taught that one should discharge one's social and domestic duties disinterestedly. They also tried to show how advaita philosophy could be interpreted in such a way as to provide a positive attitude towards society and the world.

(3) The Samartha Rāmdās Svāmi-

Another Marāṭhā saint who was a contemporary of St. Tukārām and Śivāji Mahārāj was the Samartha Rāmdās. He was born in A. D. 1608 at Jāmbaṅāv (district of Nasik) in a Brāhmaṇa family. His parents were devotees of Rāma. His marriage was arranged when he was about twelve. He fled from the marriage hall in A. D. 1620 in order to realize God (Iṣṭha i.e. Rāma). He then spent twelve years (A. D. 1620-1632) in meditation and realization of God. He then travelled far and wide through India, for about twelve years. His travel helped him to assess the social, religious, and political condition of India. He returned to Mahārāṣṭra in A. D. 1644.

Rāmdās established his own Sāmpradāya called 'Rāmdāsi

---

Sāmpradāya' which was different from the Vārkarī Sampradāya in some respect. The objectives of the Sampradāya were outlined in the works of Rāmdās as follows: The principal objective was to expound religious stories (harikathā nirupan); the second objective was to awaken the people for political concern (rājakāraṇ); and the third objective was to be aware of all things (sāvadhānpan sarvā viśayī or vartāyāce lakṣaṇ). In order to accomplish these objectives, Rāmdās established seven or eight hundred maths (i.e. monasteries) in different provinces of India. For Rāmdās, Harikathā nirupan meant to popularize the worship of Rāma, his family deity. He also popularized the worship of Hanumān, a devotee of Rāma and a symbol of physical power. He set up eleven images of Hanumān at Cāphal, Śāpur, etc. and introduced the festival of Rāma's birth-day (i.e. Rāmanavami) in A. D. 1645 at Masur and in A. D. 1647 at Cāphal. Rāmdās' second objective was to take part in rājakāraṇ. For Rāmdās, rājakāraṇ meant to undertake those activities which would strengthen Hindu dharma. When Śivāji (A. D. 1630-1680) started to organize the Marāṭhās against Muslim rule in Mahārāṣṭra, it is assumed that the Rāmdāsi Sampradāya supported Śivāji in his effort, for Rāmdās had asked
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his mahants (i.e. disciples) to participate in the process of political awakening. His third objective was to make the people alert about every thing (sāvadhapan sarvā viśayā).

For Rāmdās, sāvadhapan or vartāyaçe lakṣan meant to discharge individual and social duties skillfully; this was a code of ideal behaviour followed by the disciples of Rāmdās.

Rāmdās wrote books to-propagate his teaching: Ekavis Samāsi arthāt Junā Dāsbodh, Manāçe Ślok, Abhaṅgs, Dāsbodh, Panč Samās, Pančikarana, Rāmāyaṇa, Ātmārāma, Gurugītā, etc.

Rāmdās' outstanding book is the Dāsbodh. In his works, Rāmdās emphasized bhaktimārga as the way of liberation within a traditional Hinduism which recognized Vedic authority, the

---
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privileges of the Brāhmaṇas, the hierarchical caste system, and the necessity of karmakāṇḍa. His bhaktimārga was especially characterized by emphasis on action (karmamārga or prayatnavāda). He synthesized prāpañca (i.e. social and domestic duties) and paramārtha (i.e. religious duties and goal). In short, Rāmdās was instrumental in restoring the orthodox religious traditions (sanātan adhyātmavāda) in Mahaṅgastra.

Rāmdās and his disciples indirectly participated in the political awakening associated with Śivāji. He was honoured as the preceptor of Śivāji. After the death of Śivāji in A. D. 1680, Rāmdās continued his mission of giving advice to Sambhāji, Śivāji's successor. Rāmdās died in A. D. 1681.

C) The Lokamānya Tilak and His Milieu:

Having dealt with the life and works of the prominent Marātha saints, we now proceed to study the life and work of Tilak who at the beginning of the century organized the people of Mahaṅgastra and of India to fight against British rule in India.

Tilak was born on 23 July 1856, thirty-eight years after the fall of the Marātha Confederacy in A. D. 1818, and a year before the independence war or mutiny of A. D. 1857.

---
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He was born in the Citapāvan Brāhmaṇa caste, the caste of the Peśwas, in Ratnāgiri.

Mahārāṣṭrians reacted variously to British rule. Their reactions can broadly be classified in three types. The first type of reaction was represented by the Lokahitavadi and J. G. Phule. The first type of reaction was positive because Maharāṣṭrians experienced peace, order, safety, and happiness at the initial stage of British rule. They appreciated British rule in Maharāṣṭra. Elphinstone, the first Governor of Bombay Presidency, introduced English in a school in A. D. 1842 and the school grew up and was renamed the Deccan College in A. D. 1848. English literature and history, Western philosophy and science were taught in the College. English education affected the outlook of educated Maharāṣṭrians. Many of them became critical of Hindu social customs and practices and developed a broader perspective. They began to talk about social reform. The second type of reaction of Maharāṣṭrians was represented by M. G. Rānade who appreciated British rule as a blessing in disguise and who advocated reforms in all spheres of life and who gave priority to social reform over political reform. The third type of reaction was represented by Tilāk and his colleagues. They considered British rule
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to be a curse. They began to instil patriotism among Mahārāṣṭrians, preparing them to fight against foreign rule. They blamed western values and culture for the moral and social disintegration of Hindu society. They wanted to revive Hindu values and institutions. They reacted against the social reforms suggested by some Hindu social reformers. They gave priority to political reform over social reform. These three types of reactions will be discussed in detail in the following pages.

(1) The First Type of Reaction:

(a) Sardār Gopālrāv Hari Deshmukh (A.D. 1823-1892)-

Sardār Gopālrāv Hari Deshmukh (A.D. 1824-1892), popularly known as the Lokahitavādi (i.e. advocate of people's welfare) and Mahatmā Jotibā Goviḥd Phule (A.D. 1827-1890) were prominent figures representing the first type of reaction. Deshmukh was especially influenced by his study of European culture, western ideology, and science. His ideals of social equality, humanitarianism, and democracy were formed out of western values. He wrote 'Satpatre', edited a newspaper, and established societies like 'Paramhamśa Maṇḍal', 'Students' Literary and Scientific Society', 'Bombay Association' in order to propagate his ideals. Deshmukh was critical of the excessiveness of rituals, gifts, hypocrisy, and blind belief among Hindus; he emphasized the virtues of purity of heart, honesty, and benevolence. In this endeavour he turned to the
Marāṭhā saints like Jñānesvar, Tukārām, etc.. His primary concern was social reform. He advocated re-marriage, adult marriage, female education, and other social reforms.

Deśmukh believed that social progress would automatically lead to political independence. He emphasized that people should first be educated and qualified before trying to run a democracy in India. He considered British rule to be a blessing in disguise. He did not fail, however, to criticize the British policy of keeping India economically poor. He welcomed the industrialization of India and asked people to be self-reliant, and advocated swadesi (i.e. using indigenous products). In short, he was a pioneer of Marāṭhī journalism, the first advocate of social reforms in Mahārāstrā, N. Pandit, Mahārāstrātīl Rāstravādācā Vikās, (2nd ed., Puṇe: Modern Book Depot Prakāsan, 1972), p. 13.
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and an initiator of modern nationalism.  

(b) Mahātmā Jotibā Govind Phule (A. D. 1827-1890) -

If Deśmukh represented educated Brāhmaṇas, Phule represented educated non-Brāhmaṇas. He noticed that the non-Brāhmaṇa castes were groping in ignorance, living in poverty, and suffering social miseries because of the Brāhmaṇas' dominance in the social, religious, and economic spheres. In order to propagate his concerns, he founded a society known as the 'Satyaśodhak Samāj' in A. D. 1873. The object of the Society was not only to defy the Brāhmaṇa dominance, but also to ask for educational, social, and economic parity with the Brāhmaṇas, and to ask for human rights.

Phule advocated female education and opened a school for women in A. D. 1851. He also tried to popularize the re-marriage of widows in A. D. 1864. He suffered for these causes at the hands of orthodox Brāhmaṇas and other Hindus.

(2) The Second Type of Reaction:

Mr. Justice Mahādev Govind Rānade (A.D. 1842-1900) -

A social reformer, who represented a second type of

---
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reaction towards British rule, was M. G. Rānade. He believed, as Deśmukh did, that British rule was a blessing in disguise for India. The British conquest of India, according to him, was for the ultimate welfare of India and Britain. 84

Rānade, being influenced by western education, wanted reform in all spheres of life, when he wrote:

The change which we should seek is thus a change from constraint to freedom, from credulity to faith, from status to contract, from authority to reason, from unorganized to organized life, from bigotry to toleration, from blind fatalism to a sense of human dignity. This is what I understand by social evolution, both for individuals and societies in this country. 85

He gave priority to social reform over political reform, thinking that people should be socially fit to exercise political rights. 86 He urged Hindu society to bring all socio-religious codes into conformity with rationality, justice, and conscience. 87

Rānade advocated social reform by writing in magazines, by organizing public meetings and oratory competitions. He edited 'Induprakāś', the official organ of social reformers.
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He was against child marriage, and for widow re-marriage. He joined the Prārthana Sāmāj (i.e. prayer society) in A. D. 1967, which was a religious reform movement in Bombay. He was also associated with the Female High School Society, the Marāthā Literature Encouragement Society, the Sārvajanik Sabhā, etc. 88

Rānaḍe formed his philosophy of religious and social reform out of the teachings of Christian reformers—Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, St. Augustine—, the western philosophy of Kant and Spencer, and the religious tradition of the Marāthā saints—Jñānēśvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās. He interpreted the works of the Marāthā saints, as follows:

Ancient authority and tradition had been petrified here, ... but in the monopoly of the Brāhman caste, and it was against the exclusive spirit of this caste dominion that the saints and prophets struggled most manfully to protest. They asserted the dignity of the human soul as residing in it quite independently of the accidents of its birth and social rank. 89

He was attracted by the principle of spiritual equality and dignity taught by the saints. 90 He said that the work of the saints influenced all strata of society, male and female, high and low, literate and illiterate, Hindu and Muslim alike. 91

---
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He put forth the thesis that Marāṭhā spirituality was responsible for the emergence of Marāṭhā nationality, when he said:

By the influence of Rāmdās and Tukārām the national sentiment was kept up at a higher level of spirituality and devotion to public affairs than it would otherwise have attained. In token of the work of liberation being carried on, not for personal aggrandisement but for the higher purpose of service to God and man, the national standard received, at the suggestion of Rāmdās, its favourite orange colour, which was and is the colour of the clothes worn by anchorites and devotees. 92

He added that the religious work of the Marāṭhā saints created patriotism and sustained it in the time of crises. 93

(3) The Third Type of Reaction:

(a) Vāsudev Balavaṇṭ Phaḍke (A. D. 1845-1883)-

The third type of reaction to British rule in Mahārāṣṭra and India was represented by V. V. Phaḍke, Viṣṇuśāstrik. Cipluṇkar, Tiḷak, and his colleagues. Phaḍke looked at British rule as a curse and proclaimed that the duty of every patriot was to fight against the British regime and to liberate unfortunate poor people. 94 In order to arouse patriotic feeling among the people he reminded Marāṭhās of their past glory and of their Marāṭhā kingdom. He organized an armed
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revolution against British rule, but it was a failure.

(b) Viṣṇu Śāstri K. Cipluṅkar (A. D. 1850-1882)-

Phadke's anti-British attitude was followed by Cipluṅkar. He started writing a series of articles, called 'Nibañdhmañalā' from A. D. 1874 to the end of his life. He argued that the cause of the miserable condition of the people was 'only the loss of our independence' and from this loss all other losses followed. Thus, according to Cipluṅkar, the existence of British rule was the basic cause of people's misery.

Cipluṅkar, on the one hand, was attempting to disenchant people from their belief in British rule as a blessing. On the other hand, he was trying to make people proud of their ancient culture and history and was arousing them to recognize their self-importance. In this, his means were two-fold. He reminded Marāṭhās of the glorious achievements of their heroes and of the Peśwas in establishing the Marāṭhā empire


97 S. N. Banhatti, op. cit., p. 40.
and Mahārāṣṭra dharma. His objective in doing so was to instil patriotism among the people, and to encourage them to fight for political liberation, and to fill them with the spirit of self-respect and self-confidence.

Ciplunkar was proud of Hinduism. He believed that the structure of Hindu society was perfectly compatible with social progress and looked forward to an age which would see the revival of Hindu values and institutions. He, therefore, attacked Hindu social reformers: the Lokahitavādi or Deśmukh, M. G. Rānaḍe, and others who were finding fault with Hinduism and its institutions and who were influenced by western values and Christian theology. He reacted against the criticisms of social reformers saying that they were humiliating Hindus. He blamed western values and culture for the moral and social disintegration of Hindu society and criticized the social reformers for propagating those values. He opposed radical
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changes in the values and institutions of Hindu society.  

Ciplunkar opened the New English School on 1 January 1880, with the objective of reviving Hindu values, imbuing self-respect and pride in Hindu culture, and saving Hindu society from the disintegrating effects of foreign rule. 

Tilak joined Ciplunkar in planning the school. The Principal, Vaman S. Apte (A. D. 1858-1892) read a statement prepared by Gopal G. Agarkar (A. D. 1856-1895) and Tilak, before the Hunter Commission in September 1882, expressing their objective:

We have undertaken this work of popular education with the firmest conviction and belief that of all agents of human civilization, education is the only one that brings about material, moral and religious regeneration of fallen countries and raises them up to the level of the most advanced nations by slow and peaceful revolutions and in order that it should be so, it must ultimately be in the hands of the people themselves.

(c) The Lokamanya Tilak, His Life and Works—

Tilak (A. D. 1856-1920) joined the aforesaid School after completing his academic studies. He obtained the B. A. in A. D. 1876 from the Deccan College. He passed the LL. B. in A. D. 1879. He specialized in Hindu law. While he was
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studying Hindu law, he read almost all the important works on Hinduism, including the Saṃskṛt commentaries. ¹⁰⁷

Ṭīlak, like every other educated person, could have secured a Government job, but he preferred to serve the society independently. His decision can be explained in terms of his heritage. His great grandfather Keśāvāv, who served the Peśwas in the capacity of a high ranking civil servant, refused to serve the British Government because of his patriotism and loyalty to the Peśwas. ¹⁰⁸ His grandfather Rāmacandraṇaḍaṇaḍ (A.D. 1802-1872) told Ṭīlak horrible stories of what took place during the Independence War of A. D. 1857, and the condition of the Peśwas family in exile. ¹⁰⁹ Rāmacandraṇaḍaṇaḍ was a religious person who used to recite vedic hymns and do rituals (snānasāndhyā), and as a young man Ṭīlak used to imitate his grandfather. Thus Rāmacandraṇaḍaṇaḍ was responsible for instilling patriotism and Hindu piety in Ṭīlak. Rāmacandraṇaḍaṇaḍ went to Benares and took saṃnyāsa and finally entered into samādhi (i.e. to be buried alive) in A. D. 1872. ¹¹⁰ Ṭīlak's father Gangādharpaṇaḍ (A.D. 1820-1882) was an orthodox Hindu rigidly


¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 10; S. L. Karandikar, op. cit., p. 33.

observing religious rite and observances. He used to take Tilak to listen to akhyāns (i.e. religious narrations) in a temple. Gaṅgādharpaṁt was an educationist and taught his son Marāṭhī, Saṃskṛt, and mathematics at home and often asked his son to recite Marāṭhī poems and Saṃskṛt verses.

Gaṅgādharpaṁt's philosophy about education and social service influenced Tilak's philosophy of life. Gaṅgādharpaṁt said, "A human being... attains the dignity of man through his second birth, viz. education" and "A sense of duty to God and religion, to family and society ought to characterize an educated man". It seems that his father's philosophy made Tilak very conscious of his responsibility as an educated Indian towards his country and fellowmen.

The primary objective of Tilak and his colleagues was to impart national education in order to create national consciousness. They used different means to achieve the goal. They started two newspapers namely, the Mahrāṭṭā in English and the Kesari in Marāṭhī. The first issue of the Mahrāṭṭā
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came out on 3 January 1881. Tilak was its first editor.\textsuperscript{116} The \textit{Mahratta} stated its purpose clearly thus:

When we reflect upon the condition of our country... pause to think upon the social status of the nation of Shivaji... the why of such a state, we come to the inevitable conclusion that all evils, social and political, from which the Mahratta population is at present suffering, are to be traced to the unique system of education now followed by Government. The instinct of nationality being wide awake within us, we have already undertaken the arduous duty of educating the young portion of the Mahratta community; but our experience shows that our labours will not be appreciated nor will our teaching be of good avail, if we neglect the task of, at the same time, educating the more advanced portion of the community.\textsuperscript{117}

The first issue of the \textit{Kesari} came out on 1 January 1881. Agarkar was its first editor. Tilak became its editor from A. D. 1887.\textsuperscript{118} The \textit{Kesari} stated its purpose, as follows:

Just as street lights and the rounds of police constables bring to light anything wrong or unjust happening on the roads in the dark, the editorial pen brings to light the injustices and the wrongs of the administration.\textsuperscript{119}

During the first year, the \textit{Mahratta} and the \textit{Kesari} dealt with the affairs of the native States of Boroda and
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Kolhapur which were survivals of the Marāṭhā Confederacy. These newspapers exposed M. V. Barve, the Dewan of Kolhapur. Barve filed a suit against the editors who were sentenced to four months of simple imprisonment on 17 July 1882. 120 Tilāk and Āgarkar were accorded a magnificent welcome upon their release from the prison and were honoured as patriots. 121

In A. D. 1888 Tilāk focused on the 'Crawford Case'. He criticized Crawford, the Revenue Commissioner, for taking bribes and for corrupting Indian Mamlatdars. 122 He exposed the "topsy-turvydom" of the Government's justice and defended the Indian Mamlatdars. 123

By the end of A. D. 1889, Tilāk was involved in the 'Sārada Sadan' controversy with the Paṇḍitā Ramābāi and her supporters, the Lokahitavādi, M. G. Rānande, Justice Telāṅg, and R. G. Bhāṇḍārkar who were prominent social reformers. Ramābāi founded a school to take care of "destitute high-caste widows". It was made clear at the beginning that the school would not be used to gain converts to Christianity. Tilāk exposed that the school was carrying on the work of conversion
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under a pretext of educating widows. Tilak advised people to disavow all connection with the Sāradā Sadan. 124

Tilak and his colleagues had opened the New English School in order to instill patriotism among youth. The School was to run on the principle of self-sacrifice and selfless work. 125 When the School was prospering, Tilak's colleagues asked for more money for their service and they opposed the idea of complete dedication which Tilak was insisting. This controversy was ended by Tilak's resigning from the Deccan Society on 15th December 1890. 126

After resigning from the Deccan Education Society, Tilak had more time for the politics of Mahārāṣṭra. Tilak was involved in the controversy of 'The Age of Consent Bill' in A. D. 1891. The bill was introduced in the Imperial Legislative Council to raise marriageable age from ten to twelve years, by the reformers. Tilak opposed social reformers like M. G. Rānade, 127 Justice K. T. Telāṅg, and
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R. G. Bh ā nḍ ā rkar,\textsuperscript{128} because he thought that such a method of imposing social reform on Hindus would be dangerous to Hindu religion and culture.\textsuperscript{129} He advised the Government not to interfere with the social customs of Hindus.\textsuperscript{130} After this controversy, Tilak became known as an "orthodox" leader.

After the Age of Consent Bill controversy, Tilak became involved in the Hindu-Muslim riot issues in August 1893 and he popularized the Gaṇeś festival which became a national festival in A. D. 1896.\textsuperscript{131} Tilak also introduced the Śivāji festival in A. D. 1896 and asked the people not to observe caste distinctions in the festival because Śivāji was the symbol of their unity.\textsuperscript{132}

The year 1893 was important from the point of literary achievement because Tilak published his first book, \textit{The Orion or Research into the Antiquity of the Vedas}. In this book, he criticizes the literary or linguistic method for ascertaining
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the age of the Vedas as applied by Max Müller and Dr. Haug, describing it as 'most vague and uncertain'. 133 He suggested that scholars calculate the Vedic age on the basis of the astrological references in the Veda. By publishing the book, Tīlāk was able to enhance his prestige among his orthodox compatriots and to argue for the superiority of the Āryan civilization over Western civilization on the basis of its greater antiquity.

The Congress had two political parties. One party was led by social reformers who were moderate in their political demands. Another party was led by the "orthodox" who were extremist in political demands. The social reformers used to hold their Social Conference in the same pandal as the Congress. This practice gave the impression that the Congress as a whole was in favour of social reform. Tīlāk belonged to the second party which wanted to separate social reform from political reform. Tīlāk was gradually making his political party stronger than that led by the social reformers. In A. D. 1890 and again in A. D. 1895 Tīlāk and his group objected to holding the Social Conference of the reformers in the Congress pandal. In December 1895, the Congress session was held in Poona and Tīlāk and his party were finally successful in forcing the reformers to hold
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their Conference separately.\textsuperscript{134} Thus Tilak and his party were successful in separating social reform from political reform. They also by A. D. 1895 had ousted their opponents from their position of provincial leadership.

In A.D. 1896 Mahārāṣṭra was struck with famine. Tilak translated the Famine Code into Marāṭhī and made people conscious of their rights during the famine.\textsuperscript{135} At the end of the year, plague broke out in Bombay and Poona. Walter C. Rand was appointed the Plague Commissioner in A. D. 1897 and he used British soldiers to enforce the precautionary sanitary measures. Tilak warned the Government against the harrassment being caused the people by the plague administration. At the time of the Śivāji festival of A. D. 1897 Tilak published the discussion of Prof. Parānjape, Jinsivāle, and Bhānu concerning the question 'Did Śivāji commit a crime by killing Afzulkhan?' He also published Damodar H. Cāphekar's controversial poem in the Kesari on 15 June 1897. On 22 June 1897 Rand and another administrator, Ayerst, were shot dead by the Čāphekar Brothers and Tilak was arrested and sentenced to eighteen months rigorous imprisonment. While he was serving his time, he wrote some chapters of his second book, Arctic Home in the Vedas. He was given an early release from prison on 6 September

\textsuperscript{134}D. Keer, Lokamānya Tilak, Father of the Indian Freedom Struggle, pp. 95-99.

1898.

After the release, Tilaka was busy with the Tai Maharaj Case for several years. Tai Maharaj was the young widow of Baba Maharaj who wrote a will and appointed Tilaka, G. S. Khaparde, Mr. Kumbhojkar, and Nagpurkar to be trustee of his property, authorizing them to adopt a boy if his wife give birth to a girl or if her baby-son died. Tai Maharaj wished to adopt Bala Maharaj of Kolhapur and Mr. Nagpurkar supported her. The other trustees were not in favour of this proposal and they took Tai Maharaj to Aurangabad and with her consent adopted Jagannath. When she returned to Poona, she came under the influence of Tilaka's rivals and lodged a complaint against Tilaka for forcing her to adopt Jagannath. She applied for revocation of the probate granted to Tilaka and the other trustees. Mr. Aston the judge decided in the widow's favour and revoked the probate. Mr. Aston also charged Tilaka with perjury, forgery, and the illegal detention of Tai Maharaj in her wada. Tilaka was sentenced to eighteen months rigorous imprisonment with a fine of Rs. 1,000. It would appear that the Government had taken a special interest in the case in order to call into question Tilaka's personal integrity. Tilaka finally won the case in A. D. 1917: 136

While Tilaka was busy with the Tai Maharaj case, he

became involved in the Vedokta controversy. The Vedokta controversy reflected a dispute between the Brāhmaṇas and non-Brāhmaṇas. The dispute arose in A. D. 1901 when Sayājirāv of Baroda raised a question as to why the rites prescribed in the Vedas could not be performed on Marāṭhās, the non-Brāhmaṇas. This question was also raised in Kolhāpur. The Chatrapati Śāhu Mahārāj used his power and demanded that the Brāhmaṇas perform the Vedic rites in his palace, telling them that the temple of Aṃbābāī and its grants would be forfeited if they would not comply with the order. Tilāk wrote in the Kesari that Śāhu Mahārāj as a king should protect tradition and well-established practices and should not interfere in the caste system.

The partition of Bengal took place in A. D. 1905, and this infuriated the people of Bengal and all India was drawn in. Tilāk mobilized the Indians against British rule by advocating a fourfold programme: Boycott British products, Swadeśī (i.e. the use of indigenous products), National Education, and demand for independence (Swarāj). He started what was called the non-co-operation movement in A. D. 1906 throughout India and in some places people became violent and used bombs. Tilāk


wrote two controversial articles namely, "The Country's Misfortune" and "These Remedies Are Not Lasting" in the Kesari on 12 May and 19 June 1908 respectively. Because of these articles, Tilak was accused of being a chief instigator of Indian unrest, and of provoking sedition and the use of violent means. He was sentenced to six years penal transportation on 22 July 1908 and was sent to Mandalay jail (Burma). While he was serving his time, he wrote the third book, Śrimadbhagavadgītārahasya Athavā Karmayogasāstra: The Hindu Philosophy of Life, Ethics and Religion, his magnus opus which Tāhmankar describes as 'a socio-political thesis'. It is this work with which this thesis is mainly concerned.

Tilak was released on 16 June 1914. Germany and Britain declared war on 4 August 1914. Tilak used the opportunity to launch the Home Rule (Swarāj) movement during the war years and gained a measure of responsible government for India. He formed the Home Rule League on 28 April 1916. Afterwards, he unified the Extremist and the Moderate factions of the Congress and even brought in the Muslim League at the Lucknow Congress session held in December 1916. Then all the parties unitedly asked for Swarāj or Home Rule. After his return from England, on 27 November 1919, he began to talk
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about responsive co-operation with the government and founded the Congress Democratic Party on 18 April 1920. In his last months, he saw M. K. Gāndhī (A. D. 1869-1949) being recognized as the national leader. The mantle of Tilak gradually fell on Gāndhi who announced the non-co-operation programme, on 1 August 1920, the day on which Tilak breathed his last.140

In this section, we have reviewed Tilak's career and his works in the context of his milieu. We described the various controversies he became involved in during his fight against the social reformers and the British government in the course of defending Hindu tradition and values and seeking to obtain political independence for India. His struggle was the struggle of a nationalist. Tilak was recognized as a national hero in whom the Indian struggle against British rule was epitomized. His national leadership, however, was an extended form of his leadership in his province, Mahārāṣṭra. His national leadership was grounded on his solid rootage in his own Marāṭhā tradition. This fact has been emphasized by scholars such as, Aurobindo and Cashman. Aurobindo commented:

They felt him to be of one spirit and make with the great men who had made their past history, almost believed him to be a reincarnation

140 I. M. Reiser and N. M. Goldberg, eds., op. cit., p. 652.
of one of them returned to carry out his old work in a new form and under new conditions. They beheld in him the spirit of Mahārāṣṭra once again embodied in a great individual.

Similarly, Cashman noted:

Although Tilak was a national figure who epitomized the Indian struggle against the British in his day, he was primarily a Maharashtrian politician deeply imbued with the cultural traditions of the region. His influence at the national level was based on a sizeable local following achieved by the development of a style of politics in harmony with the region.

In other words, Tilak was a Marāṭhā politician and nationalist who was deeply indebted to the tradition of Mahārāṣṭra.

D) The Lokamānyā Tilak and the Marāṭhā Tradition:

In a general way Tilak might be said to have utilized the whole tradition of Mahārāṣṭra. In A. D. 1896 Tilak introduced the Śivāji festival in order to generate patriotism among Mahārāṣṭrians and Indians. He thought of Śivāji as an ideal hero who could serve as a source of inspiration for Mahārāṣṭrians involved in the freedom struggle. He wrote in the Kesari (2 July 1895) that Mahārāṣṭrians should enthusiastically help build a monument to Śivāji for they would be expressing their gratitude to Śivāji by laying the foundation of their

---
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national welfare. Tilak became involved in raising funds for a monument to Sivaji in August 1896 and celebrated the Sivaji festival annually. He wrote in the Kesari (26 May 1896) before the first celebration of the festival, "It is our first duty to celebrate the festival of Sivaji as other heroes in order to remind our country-men of the deeds and efforts of our heroes, for the sake of our gratitude to them and for the sake of national wellbeing". On the occasion of the Sivaji coronation festival held in Poona in A.D. 1906, he described the purpose of the festival in these terms:

To turn to the Shivaji festival, the knowledge we have, or the knowledge which we want to inculcate among the people in this connection, relates not to the actual measures which Shivaji for instance took but to a proper appreciation of the spirit in which he resorted to the measures suitable to his time. Festivals like these prove an incentive to the legitimate ambitions of a people with a great historic past. They serve to impart courage, such courage as an appreciation of heroes securing their salvation against odds, can give. They serve as antidote to vague despair.

For Tilak, Sivaji was an ideal hero under whose leadership social unity was formed for political purposes.

---
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He, therefore, wrote in the Kesari (28 April 1896) pleading with Maharashtrians to remain united, "The symbol which can be loved by different castes in Maharashtra is Śivāji's life; this should be borne in mind by the people who celebrate the Śivāji festival. It is not appropriate to maintain differences like Marāṭhās and Brāhmaṇas, Brāhmaṇas and Prabhus". He appealed not only to Maharashtrians but both the Hindus and Muslims of Bengal to accept Śivāji as their national hero, at the time of the first celebration of the Śivāji festival in A. D. 1906. In doing this he was asking Indians to unify themselves for political strength.

A second way in which Tilak grounded his political struggle in the Marāṭhā tradition was in claiming political freedom as his 'birth right'. A. S. Karandikar observed:

'Svarājya is our birth-right' said Tilak on 2 May 1908, the day of Śivāji festival at Akola. Such was his proclamation. The term 'svarājya' came into being at the time of Śivāji. The term became popular in the Rāṣṭriy Sabhā twelve years after celebration of the Śivāji festival. The idea of svarājya is given to us by the ancestors of Maharashtra. It is said that svarājya is the ultimate aim. I say, it is our natural right. Even though we have forgotten the idea of svarājya for some time, the idea is still alive in

146 The Kesari, 22 August 1899, Samagra Lokamānya Tilak: Sāmāj v Saṅskṛti, (Pune: Kesari Prakāśan, 1976), V, 539; also quoted by S. N. Banhatti, op. cit., p. 135.
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We have forgotten the idea of svarājya.
It is the duty of the leaders to try to see that we should not forget it. Man has nose and ears; similarly, he had the idea of svātāntara (i.e. self-rule). He is a beast who does not think of the svātāntara as anything but natural.
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T. L. Shay also noted the depth of this idea in Tilāk's thought, as follows:

He also made continuous reference to the great Shivājī and the history of his Marāthā people, the fiery tradition of their independence svātāntara, their war against the Mogul Empire to restore swarāj and to serve the Dharma. The Marāthā people had not forgotten that they had been free; the Swarāj had been their birth-right. From his childhood, he inherited a vision of new India arising, firmly based on the spirit and traditions of her civilization and her glorious past.
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The fact that Tilāk's inspiration for political freedom was derived from the struggle Śivājī had in carving Marāthā Rāj out of the Muslim rule, has also been noted by scholars such as I. M. Reisner and N. M. Goldberg, D. V. Athalye, and R. I. Cashman.


Another festival which Tilak popularized was the Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\) festival. That Tilak used the religious tradition connected with the god 'Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\)' for a political purpose, has been pointed out by I.M. Reisner and Goldenberg:

According to R\(\text{\text{"a}}\)m Gopal... Tilak's ultimate objective always being to stir up the masses against the British rule, he placed this political propaganda under the special patronage of the most popular deity in India i.e. Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\), the Elephant God, son of Shiva. The legendary conqueror of the demon Gajasuara, Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\) became a symbol of the emancipation of the country from its foreign rulers.

153

A. J. Karandikar has argued that Tilak popularized the Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\) festival in order to revive the memory of Pe\(\text{\text{"s}}\)wa rule (A. D. 1713-1818) because the Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\) festival had been a big annual celebration of the Pe\(\text{\text{"s}}\)was.154 According to Karandikar, Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\) was the deity of freedom because Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\) fought against demons.155 Tilak's use of the Ga\(\text{\emph{\text{n}}e\text{\text{"s}}}\) festival to deepen patriotism or nationalism has also been observed by scholars such as Cachman, Kher, Banhatti, Kelkar and others.156

Tilak's purpose in restoring the traditional festivals
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of Mahārāṣṭra clearly had the political intention of unifying the people and giving them courage. ТИлak also recognized the deeper spiritual purpose of the traditional festivals as D. P. Karmarkar read into Tilak's argument in the *Kesari* (1, 8 September 1896):

> Here in India, as religion occupied a vital place in the life of people, our festivals normally assumed in the past a religious character, but the object was essentially to keep the religious instinct of the people alive and in addition the occasions were utilized as a means of educating the people in the moral, social, and political spheres. In recent history, both before and after Shivaji, similar festivals and jatras /i.e. a large gathering of people in honour of deity/ were held when people in the thousands gathered in a devotional atmosphere. Saints like Eknāth also participated in such festivals. It was also Saint Rāmdās who started the Rāmnavami festival. These festivals helped largely in the galvanization of the Marāṭha people and it was this strength that enabled them to meet the fierce attacks of the armies of Aurangzeb. In fact the jatras of olden times were huge exhibitions of religious, industrial and social activities of the people... In brief, a national festival is one of the principal means of the all-round development of the Nation.
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As we have seen the scholars are very much aware that ТИлак utilized the political and religious tradition of Mahārāṣṭra in formulating his political philosophy and in generating patriotism or nationalistic enthusiasm and zeal in Mahārāṣṭra and in India in general. But much less

attention has been given to the fact that it was the Bhāgavat Dharma of the saints of Mahārāṣṭra which influenced the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical thought of Tilak, as he expounds it in the Gitārahasya.

E) The Bhagavadgitārahasya:

(1) The Gitārahasya as a Nationalistic Work-
The Gitārahasya is conceived by Tilak as a nationalistic work to sustain Hindu tradition. This characteristic of the work is highlighted by Tilak in the statement he made upon the completion of the Gitārahasya, in the letter dated 2 March 1911 from Mandalay:

About the Gitā, I have finished what I call Gitā Rahasya, an independent and original book investigating the purpose of the Gitā and showing how our religious philosophy is applied therein to the solution of the ethical problem. ...I have compared throughout the Gitā Philosophy with the Western, both religious and ethical, and have tried to show that our system is, to say the least, not inferior to any of the Western methods.

Tilak thus wants to reject the prevailing attitude of his day which said that Western values were superior and Indian values inferior. Scholars commenting on the Gitārahasya also emphasized this characteristic. N. Pandit observed that Tilak compared Indian philosophy (adhyātmavāda) with modern
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philosophical trend of Europe and tried to prove the superiority of Indian philosophy. His Gitārahasya, according to Paṇḍit, reflects traditional patriotism (paramāparāniṣṭha rāṣṭravāda). S. Radhakrishan said, "It is needless to say that it is Mr. Tilak's robust patriotism that predisposed his mind to his activistic view." S. A. Wolpert observed:

Like Tilak's earlier scholarly efforts, the Gitārahasya was in fact more important as a work of Nationalist literature than of philosophy, though it was certainly the latter as well. Essentially, however, in this last of his books the Lokamanya bequeathed to his country-men a stirring and rigorous call to selfless action.

D. V. Tahmankar called the Gitārahasya 'a socio-political thesis based on the most sacred books of the Hindus'. D. Mackenzie Brown considered the Gitārahasya 'the major philosophical work of the Indian Nationalist movement'.

159 N. Pandit, op. cit., p. 114.
162 D. V. Tahmankar, op. cit., p. 40.
B. D. Kher\textsuperscript{164} and G. P. Pradhan\textsuperscript{165} also shared the interpretation of the \textit{Gītārahasya} as a nationalistic work.

The \textit{Gītārahasya} is considered to be a nationalistic literature at two levels. The first is a general level derived from the fact that Tilak was known for his patriotism or nationalism which was reflected in his earlier works\textsuperscript{166} and in his active political career. This work carried on that spirit. But it is nationalistic at a deeper spiritual level in that Tilak utilized the national or Hindu tradition in formulating a scheme of Hindu ethics which would be competitive with Western ethics. In using the Hindu tradition in order to find a basis for a Hindu ethics, Tilak based himself primarily on the best known Sanskrit work, the \textit{Bhagavadgītā}. But the \textit{Gītā} had been subjected to many interpretations over the centuries, some of which did not lend themselves very well to an activistic interpretation. So it was the more activistic interpretation of the Marāṭhā tradition which became the more immediate support for his interpretation of the \textit{Gītā}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{164}B. D. Kher, \textit{op. cit.}, p. nine (of introduction).
\item \textsuperscript{166}S. A. Wolpert, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 64f, 125, considered Tilak's \textit{The Orion or Research into the Antiquity of the Vedas} as a nationalist literature. N. C. Kelkar, \textit{Life and Times of Tilak}, I, 468f., considered the \textit{Orion... and The Arctic Home in the Vedas} to be the nationalist literature.
\end{itemize}
(2) *Stages of Writing the Gītarahasya-

The Gītarahasya is regarded in Marāṭhī literature as an epoch making book. In the preface of the Gītarahasya, Tilak mentioned the various stages he went through in preparing to write the Gītarahasya. Tilak was first asked to read out a commentary on the Gītā to his father during his last illness in A. D. 1872. His liking for the Gītā was the reason of his regular reading of Saṃskṛt commentaries, and of criticisms and expositions by scholars in English and Marāṭhī. He became unclear about the import of the Gītā as the commentators tended to say that the Gītā teaches either jñānamārga or bhaktimārga as the way of liberation instead of karmayoga. He was dissatisfied with the solutions given by the commentators and he set them aside and independently read the Gītā several times. He was then convinced that the Gītā teaches karmayoga and not renunciatory philosophy (nivṛttimārga). His conviction was strengthened by the study of the Mahābhārata, the Vedānta Sutras, the Upaniṣads, and Saṃskṛt and English books on the vedānta. He had to study again the commentaries with a view to find out the reasons why he could not accept their opinions. He wrote the first draft of his commentary on the Gītā in the Mandalay jail in the winter of A. D. 1910-1911, the draft was revised several times, and the work was completed after his

release. The work was first published in June 1915.

(3) Indebtedness of the Gītārāhasya—

Tīlak, in the preface, has acknowledged his indebtedness to the ancient and modern commentators on the Gītā, to western scholars, to the Marāṭhā saints, and to others. This indebtedness implies their influence on Tīlak's Gītārāhasya. Tīlak specially acknowledged the influence of Spencer when he wrote in Spencer's memoir, in A. D. 1903, as follows:

We have never before attempted to write the philosophy of Vedānta or Sāṅkhya from the practical point of view (in accordance with the Ethics of Spencer). The Bhagavadgītā is the only... exception. But Vedantins have distorted this book which is uniquely practical. If we want to advance in a new direction, as in Spencer's book, we should think of the liberated philosophers not sitting idle. The duty of the philosophers to reflect upon these incomprehensible principles is as important as is their duty to demonstrate how these principles can be applied to everyday life and to advise as to how perfection of the human race can be achieved.

Similarly, Tīlak acknowledged the influence of T. H. Green, in his letter dated 2 March 1911, from the Mandalay jail:

For my view of Gītā is that it is a work on ethics— not utilitarian, nor intuitional— but transcendental,

168 GR. pp. 10f (M); pp. xvii-xix (E).

169 Ibid., pp. 16f (M); pp. xxvii-xxix (E).

somewhat on the lines followed in Green's *Prologomena to Ethics.*\(^{171}\)

Tilak also referred to the works of Kant, Butler, Mill, Hume, and Sidgwick.

Secondly, Tilak was influenced by various commentators on the *Gītā*, both ancient and modern commentators. He mentioned, for instance, Śāṅkarācārya, Brooks, and S. Rādhākrishan.\(^{172}\)

Thirdly, Tilak acknowledges the influence of the religious tradition of Mahārāṣṭra by putting a poem of Tukārām at the beginning of the preface. Our thesis is intended to investigate the influence of the prominent Marāṭha saints, namely, Jñāneśvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās on the *Gītārahasya*.

**F) The Hypothesis:**

(1) The Literary Evidence for the Hypothesis-

Our hypothesis is that the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical dimensions of the thoughts of some prominent saints of Mahārāṣṭra namely, Jñāneśvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās, influenced the *Gītārahasya*. The literary evidence for the hypothesis is that Tilak cites and refers to the works of the prominent saints in the *Gītārahasya*. He often quotes from the *Jñāneśvari*, the commentary of Jñāneśvar on the *Gītā*, the

---

\(^{171}\) *Samagra Lokamanya Tilak: Towards Independence, VII*, 769; cf. GR. p. 17 (M) preface; quoted by D. V. Tahmankar, op. cit., p. 204.

\(^{172}\) GR. pp. 16f (M); pp. xxviiff (E).
abhängs of Tukārām, and the Dāsbodh, and occasionally refers to the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra in general, in order to support his interpretation of the Gītā. Tīlak directly quotes from the Jñānesvari three times (pp. 225, 292 (M));\textsuperscript{173} he directly quotes the abhāṅgs of Tukārām more than twenty times (pp. 73, 77, 96, 208, 209, 223, 252, 300, 346, 387, 389, 390, 391, 294, 397, 398 (M));\textsuperscript{174} and he quotes from the Dāsbodh more than ten times (pp. 38, 130, 143, 165, 288, 340, 348, 352, 381, 394, 395 (M)).\textsuperscript{175} In the course of different arguments he refers to Jñānesvar three times (pp. 151, 356, 451 (M));\textsuperscript{176} Tukārām five times (pp. 16, 210, 223, 225, 391 (M));\textsuperscript{177} Rāmdās seven times (pp. 92, 252, 274, 340, 358, 359, 451 (M));\textsuperscript{177} and the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra in general six times (pp. 16, 206, 352, 397, 688, 785 (M)).\textsuperscript{178} This evidence

\textsuperscript{173} GR. pp. 345, 449 (E).

\textsuperscript{174} Ibid., pp. 110, 115, 144, 318, 320, 343, 388, 461, 534, 598, 600, 601, 602, 606, 615, 617 (E).

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., pp. 57, 197, 216, 251f., 443, 524, 536, 543, 588, 611, 612 (E).

\textsuperscript{176} Ibid., pp. 229, 549, 705f. (E).

\textsuperscript{177} Ibid., pp. 25, 321, 343, 346, 605 (E).

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid., pp. 25, 315, 543, 615, 1060, 1198 (E).
clearly indicates that in some degree the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra explicitly influenced Tilak or at least that Tilak thought of himself as agreeing with the teaching of the saints.

(2) Scholars Suggesting the Possibility of the Hypothesis-

Among the scholars who have indicated the influence of the Marāṭhā saints on the Gitārāhasya is J. F. Edwards who saw a parallel between the Gitārāhasya and the Jñānēsvāri and suggested the possibility of the influence of the Jñānēsvāri on the Gitārāhasya:

His Tilak' greatest claim on the affection of religiously minded India is his acknowledged success in expounding and applying to modern condition the message of the Bhagavadgitā, the message of Dnyaneshwar first put into Marathi in his Dnyaneshwari.

D. Mackenzie Brown elaborated J. F. Edwards' point and argued that there was a definite influence of the Jñānēsvāri on the Gitārāhasya and even referred to certain passages in the Gitārāhasya:

Tilak's interpretation of the Gitā is consistent with a lifetime of thought and action. As a student and admirer of the thirteenth-century Marāṭhā philosopher, Jñānadeva, he had a familiar precedent for attacking the quietism and renunciation of Śaṅkara. In a renowned commentary on the Gitā, and in his Amṛtānubhava, Jñānadeva rejects Śaṅkara's concept of the illusory and meaningless world and describes the material universe and man as 'natural expression of Reality'. Even the jīvanmukti, or liberated soul /sic/ of Śaṅkara and the Vedantists fail to achieve the bliss of Jñānadeva's devotee living in the material world.

Tilak, in the Rahasya, cites Jñānadeva's description of the devotee (I, 345-346).

180

S. A. Wolpert concurred with the opinion of J. F. Edwards and argued that he, too, thought the activistic interpretation of the Jñānesvari had influenced the Gītārahasya.181

Though D. Mackenzie Brown pointed out a similarity between the Jñānesvari and the Gītārahasya, he indicated a difference between them and emphasized the uniqueness of the Gītārahasya:

In rejecting the renunciatory elements of Śāmkara's teaching and in appealing to the Marāthā masses in their native tongue, both Dnyanadeva and Tilak had a common approach, although the latter's emphasis was on a social action for public welfare rather than devotive action for individual salvation.
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R. I. Cashman seemed to agree with the opinion of Brown as he added:

Although a political activist, Tilak admired the commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā produced by the thirteenth century saint Jñāneshwar. This work represented an attack on the renunciatory philosophy of Śāmkara, for Jñāneshwar believed the material world and man to be 'a natural expression of Reality'. But, true to the Vaishnava bhakti tradition, Jñāneshwar's emphasis was on individual salvation through devotional action, whereas Tilak preferred


182 D. Mackenzie Brown, op. cit., p. 204.
M. R. Lederle explicitly stated Tilak's dependence on the tradition of Maharashtra in general and on the Jñānesvari in particular, when he said:

When Tilak sought a basis for his ethics, he found a model in the tradition of Maharashtra. He gives us a clue that he knew of this tradition. He explained that the final ethical stage could be described by the words aham brahmāsmi, and concluded that to attain the true knowledge of Paramesvara means to realise the identity of the Brahman and the ātman and to understand that there is only one ātman in all created beings. To behave accordingly is the climax of spiritual knowledge.

He, then quoted Jñānesvara:

Who does not know mine or thine, like the all-pervading sentience, will not bear hatred towards any living being. The earth does not sustain only the good and reject the bad. Life, full of mercy, does not activate only the body of the king, and avoid the poor man. Water does not think of quenching the thirst of the cow, and turning itself into poison in order to kill the tiger. In the same way acts one who befriends the entire realm of living beings evenly. In his forgiveness he is like the earth. He does not know the words 'I' and 'thou', He does not claim anything as 'mine'. He does not feel joy or sorrow.

In short, scholars have suggested the possibility of the Jñānesvari influencing the Gitārāhasya, but they have not dealt with the issue in detail.

Scholars have also suggested the possibility of some

---


influence of Tukārām on the Gitārahasya. V. G. Bhat referred to two verses of Tukārām which he thought may have influenced Tilak and the Gitārahasya. One of these verses is, "He, who owns as his own the distressed and the harassed, should be known as a saint and the abode of God." Tilak quoted the verse in the Gitārahasya. D. Mackenzie Brown also pointed out the influence of Tukārām on the Gitārahasya:

He [Tilak] also refers to the Marathi poet Tukārām, who was deeply influenced by Jñānadeva. He describes Tukārām as one of those who (in contrast to the renunciatory philosophers) inherited and carried on the true science of spiritual knowledge in an unbroken line from the time of the Upaniṣads (I, 346).

Among the Marāṭhā saints, Tukārām is quoted most often by Tilak, but scholars have not paid much attention to this fact and have not tried to explore in any depth the influence of Tukārām on the Gitārahasya.

The last prominent saint of the Marāṭhā Bhāgavat Dharma is Rāmdās who has influenced the Gitārahasya to a remarkable extent. D. P. Karmar emphasized the influence of Rāmdās on Tilak's patriotism, when he quoted a part of Tilak's speech on the life of Rāmdās:

---

185 V. G. Bhat, op. cit., p. 90.
186 GR. pp. 300, 393 (M); pp. 461, 609 (E).
Therefore have faith, make your mind strong, have faith in religion and God. Religion and practical life are not different. To take to samnyāsa is not to abandon life. The real spirit is to make the country your family instead of working only for your own. To step beyond is to serve humanity and the next is to serve God.

188

S. L. Karandikar also referred to Tilak's speech on Rāmdās, but he did so in reference to Tilak's patriotic philosophy in general and not in reference to the influence of Rāmdās on the Gitārāhasya.

Other scholars, however, have indicated a possibility of the influence of Rāmdās on the Gitārāhasya. G. P. Pradhan mentioned that Tilak had gradually become convinced of the idea that the spiritual goal (paramārtha) could be achieved through doing this-worldly duties (aihika niṣṭha), a point emphasized by Tilak in the Gitārāhasya. According to Pradhan, Tilak had read the works of Rāmdās earlier, but it was, while he was reading Western philosophy, that he understood the activistic (prayrttipara) teaching of Rāmdās in a unique way. D. Keer stated the relationship more clearly than Pradhān did:

It seems that Tilak was much influenced by the 'Dāsbodh' of Rāmdās. It is the essence of the 'Gitārāhasya' that a jñāni i.e. a mystic or a

188 D. P. Karmarkar, op. cit., p. 165.

189 S. L. Karandikar, op. cit., p. 283.
knower of spirituality should keep followers or collect people (lakasaṭhre karāvā) for the wellbeing of people and man should do his duty disinterestedly.

M. R. Lederle, too, emphasized Tilak's debt to the Dāsbodh:

Tilak does not sufficiently distinguish between conclusions drawn from mythology, and those from natural sciences or philosophy. The eight million four hundred thousand species of living beings mentioned in the Dāsbodha of Rāmdāsa are brought into connection with the number of generations required for the evolution of life from the first living cell to the highly developed organisms...
(Dāsabodha 13.3.14. cf. GR, pp. 181-82 (M); pp. 252-53 (E)).

In short, scholars have suggested the possibility of the influence of Rāmdās on the Gītārahasya, but they have not studied in detail the nature and the extent of that influence.

From this review of what has been said by previous scholars about the influence of the prominent Marāṭhā saints of the Bhāgavat Dharma on the Gītārahasya, we can briefly conclude that none of the scholars have studied and demonstrated in detail the nature and the extent of the influence of the Bhāgavat Dharma or the teaching of the prominent saints of Mahārāṣṭra on the Gītārahasya. This is the gap in the scholarship on Tilak, which needs to be filled. Our thesis, therefore, will be a first detailed study of the influence of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra on the Gītārahasya. In other

---


words, this thesis, as stated in the beginning of the chapter, will be an investigation of the hypothesis that the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical dimensions of the thought of the prominent saints of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra have influenced and shaped the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical thought of the Gitārāhasya.

G) Scope and Limitations of the Thesis:

Our hypothesis has to be argued in terms of the major concerns which Tilak seems to have shared with the prominent Marāṭhā saints. They defined their position over against traditional orthodoxy and the traditional social order. They also expounded advaita (i.e. non-dualism) philosophy and emphasized that a liberated person (or saint) should not withdraw from society but should discharge his duties (dharma) disinterestedly. Tilak, being a nationalist, defended the traditions of Hinduism, its values, and principles of its social order. He argued that the Gitā teaches advaita philosophy.192 He added that the jñāni or the stitaprajña of the Gitā continues to do his duties (dharma) disinterestedly, even after release (mokṣa).193 Tilak has argued his religious, social, philosophical, and ethical ideas on the basis of and with reference to the Marāṭhā saints. Because of the dimensions

192 GR. p. 212 (M); pp. 324f. (E).
193 Ibid., pp. 275, 740 (M); pp. 423, 1133 (E).
of the thought of the saints and of Ṭīlāk, our thesis has to be divided into two sections, namely (i) religious and social dimensions, (ii) philosophical and ethical dimensions. These sections will be further divided into chapters. The first section will be divided into two chapters, one dealing with the problem of orthodoxy and another dealing with the problem of social order. Similarly, the second section will be divided into two chapters, one dealing with the problem of Advaita and another dealing with the problem of saintly action.

Our investigation will be limited to the major works of the prominent Marāṭhā saints. Ṭīlāk has directly quoted the Jñānesvari, Abhaṅgs (or Gāthā) of Tukārām, and the Dāsbodh. In addition to these works, we shall refer to Jñānesvar's Anubhavamṛta, Cāṅgadev Pāsaṣṭhi, Haripāṭh, and Abhaṅgs, and Rāmdās' Ekavis Samāsi arthāt Junā Dāsbodh, Manāce Ślok, and Abhaṅgs.
PART ONE

THE LOKAMĀNYA B. G. ТИŁАК'S THOUGHTS

ABOUT ORTHODOXY AND SOCIAL ORDER
CHAPTER II
THE PROBLEM OF ORTHODOXY

In the first part of the thesis, which consists of two chapters, we shall attempt to demonstrate the nature and the extent of the influence of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra on the religious and social aspects of the philosophy of the Gītārahasya. In the first chapter, we will concentrate on the problem concerning the influence of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra on Ṭiḷak's religious philosophy. The term "religious" in this context is to be understood as meaning his approach to "tradition" or to the authority of that which was generally considered to be "orthodox". In other words, we will deal with the problems (i) of defining Hindu orthodoxy, (ii) of how the Marāṭhā saints, Jñānesvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās, responded to the traditional Hinduism, and (iii) of the influence of the Marāṭhā saints on Ṭiḷak's working out of his position regarding orthodoxy.

A) Hindu Orthodoxy:

As Hindu orthodoxy is not officially defined by any institutional structure, its definition presents problems and different aspects can be emphasized. A.N. Deśpāṇḍe, a noted Marāṭhā scholar, has offered a workable definition of
orthodoxy by suggesting that there are five features or facets (sāpekṣatās) that taken together seem to point to the central features of orthodox Hinduism. Despāṇḍe delineates the five features of Hindu orthodoxy namely, Vedasāpekṣatā, Vaijñasāpekṣatā, Brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā, Āryasāpekṣatā, and Sanskrtaśāpekṣatā. We will take this scheme of Despāṇḍe as our starting point. Let us first briefly explain each of these five facets.

1) The Vedasāpekṣatā

The first and most fundamental facet of Hindu orthodoxy is vedasāpekṣatā. The Vedas are the oldest and most sacred scriptures of Hinduism. The term 'Veda' comes from the root 'vid' meaning 'to know', therefore Veda means the 'knowledge' or 'wisdom' which was accumulated by the ancient ṛṣis (i.e. seers, mystics, philosophers). The Vedas are also called 'Śruti'. The term 'Śruti' comes from the root 'śru' meaning 'to hear', therefore Śruti means 'that which is heard' by the ṛṣis, or that which was revealed to the ṛṣis. The Vedas or Śruti came to be regarded as the revealed scriptures of Hinduism. As the Vedas had been generally revered as the revealed scriptures of Hinduism they were recognized as the final authority of Hindu orthodox philosophy and practice. The ultimate authority of the Vedas was recognized by the Dharmaśāstras (i.e.

religious code books) which serve as the actual sources of authority on specific matters concerning orthodoxy:

Now, therefore, we will declare the acts productive of merit which form part of the customs of daily life, as they have been settled by the agreement (of those who know the law). The authority (for those duties) is the agreement of those who know the law, (and the authorities for the latter are) the Vedas alone. 2

Or, "The Veda is the source of the sacred law, and the tradition and practice of those who know the Veda." 3 Similarly, the Dharmasastras of Manu 4 and of Yajñavalkya 5 recognize the authority of the Vedas (vedo'khilo dharmamūlam, tr. the Vedas are the roots of all religious practices). P. V. Kane explains the position of the Dharmasastras regarding the Vedas as the final authority on religious matters and also answers the question as to why the Vedas be regarded as the final authority on dharma despite the fact that they do not contain formal rules on dharma, when he says:


5 Yajñavalkya Smriti with the Commentary of Vijñāneśvara called the Mitākṣarā..., tr. S.C. Vidyarnava (Allahabad: The Panini Office, 1918), I.7.
The foregoing brief discussion will make it clear that the later rules, contained in the dharmasūtra and other works on dharmaśāstra had their roots deep down in the most ancient Vedic tradition and that the authors of the dharmaśāstras were quite justified in looking up to the Vedas as a source of dharma. But, as said above, the Vedas do not profess to be formal treatises on the various aspects of dharma; we have to turn to the Smritis for a formal and connected treatment of the topics of the dharmaśāstras. 6

M.R. Gopalacharya, 7 V.G. Bijapurkar, 8 and others also come to the conclusion that the Vedas are the final authority determining the religious practices and beliefs of Hinduism.

(2) The Yajñāsāpeksatā

As the Vedas are traditionally considered to be the final authority on Hindu religious practices, i.e. rites, ceremonies, and the ways of worship, Hindu rituals or karmakanda are traced back to the Vedas. The Vedic religion seems to be characterized by the worship of many gods such as Agni, Varuṇa, Indra, Uṣas, Āditi, etc., and by doing sacrifices to these gods. The Saṃskṛt 'vaj' which originally meant 'to worship' includes both the concept of praying and

---

6 P.V. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Medieval Religious and Civil Law), I.7.


8 V.G. Bijapurkar, Riksangraha or a University Selection of Vedic Hymns with the Commentary of Sāyaṇchārya (Bombay: Tukaram Javaji, 1907), p. 1 (preface).
of offering or sacrificing.⁹ Among the gods whom the Aryans worshipped and sacrificed to, Agni, the fire god, seems to be the most prominent because Agni-hymns stand at the beginning of each of the family-books (II-VII) and every book of the ten books (mandalas) of the Rgveda, except two, begins with a hymn to Agni.¹⁰ Agni is honoured as the king of sacrificial rites¹¹ and is considered to be the mediator and messenger between gods and men,¹² or the divine priest.¹³

Sacrifices were offered to deities so that they might grant the wishes of their worshippers, such as a long life,¹⁴ a happy life,¹⁵ offspring,¹⁶ etc. Thus there was a frank

---


¹¹RV. VII.11.4; VIII.43.24; I.1.8; I.27.1, tr. R.T.H. Griffith (Banares: E.J. Lazarus & Co., 1926).

¹²Ibid., I.26.6; I.94.3; I.59.1; VII.11.1; X.80.4; IV.8.4; VII.5.1, etc.

¹³Ibid., I.94.6; I.1.1, etc.

¹⁴Ibid., VII.66.16; X.161.1.

¹⁵Ibid., I.89.9.

¹⁶Ibid., VII.57.6.
reciprocity between deities and worshippers.\textsuperscript{17} This practice of sacrificing was developed into a complex ritual system when later on the emphasis was laid on correct performance or the mechanics of the sacrifice. The later collections (\textit{sa\={m}hit\={a}s}) and the \textit{Br\={a}hma\={n}as} (books on sacrifices and rites) reflect this development.\textsuperscript{18}

It is debatable whether the modern ritual of Hinduism which is prescribed in the Dharma\={a}stras, Pur\={a}\={n}as and \={A}gmas, is derived and developed directly from the \textit{Rgveda}.\textsuperscript{19} It seems, rather, that the modern ritual or \textit{karmak\={a}\={n}da} is the result of the fusion of two streams -- \textit{Rgvedic} ritual and the Dravidian ritual. The \textit{Rgvedic} ritual did, however, play some part in the formation of the complex modern ritual,\textsuperscript{20} and the \textit{karmak\={a}\={n}da} of Hindu orthodoxy is certainly in some degree an extension of the Vedic \textit{yaj\={n}as\={a}pek\={s}at\={a}}.


\textsuperscript{18}P.S. Deshmukh, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 133.

\textsuperscript{19}J. Gonda, \textit{A History of Indian Literature: Vedic Literature (Samhit\={a}s and Brahmanas)} (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975), I, 88, 84.

\textsuperscript{20}H.D. Griswold, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 336f.
(3) The Brāhmaṇaśāpekṣatā

As the importance of the mechanics of the sacrifices was emphasized, the importance of the officiating priests who were Brāhmaṇas by varṇa was enhanced. The ritual or karmakāṇḍa was controlled by the Brāhmaṇas who were traditionally authorized to perform sacrifices:

The Brāhmaṇas (priests) are the guardians of this sacrifice; for guardians of the sacrifice, indeed, are those Brāhmaṇas who are versed in the sacred writ, because they spread it, they originate it; these he thereby propitiate; for this reason he says, the Brāhmaṇas are the guardians of the sacrifice. 21

The Dharmaśāstra writers defined orthodoxy primarily in terms of the rights of the Brāhmaṇas. Their attitude is characterized by Manu's famous phrase: "buddhimatsu narāh śreṣṭha nareṣu brāhmaṇāh smṛtāh" (tr. among the intelligent beings men are supreme and among human beings the Brāhmaṇas are supreme22).

The Brāhmaṇas were given exclusive authority to do the karmakāṇḍic rituals as well as to teach and interpret the scriptures. Teaching was their specific duty:

Let the three twice-born castes (varṇas) discharge their (prescribed) duties, study


22The Manusmṛti with The Commentary Manvarmukta Vali of Kulluka, ed. Narayan Ram Acharya, i.96; ii.135.
Teaching implies the authority to interpret the scriptures for in the Hindu scheme of things the remoteness and mystery associated with the Veda made interpretation very important to political, social, and religious rulings. The Brāhmaṇas were exclusively given these privileges. Recognizing and protecting the exclusive traditional rights of the Brāhmaṇas is construed as brāhmaṇasāpeksatā.

(4) The Aryanāpeksatā

The Brāhmaṇas played an important role in preserving the Vedas because they alone could do rituals, recite Vedic hymns, and teach the scriptures. In thus preserving the Vedic tradition, they have preserved the religion and culture of the Aryans against the inroads of non-Aryan culture and religion. The Vedas were accessible only to men of the three higher varṇas who were thought to be Aryans, and others were prohibited from hearing the Vedas. According to Āpastamba, the study of the Vedas was allowed only to men of the higher


varṇas (castes):  

(For all these), excepting Śūdras and those who have committed bad actions, (are ordained) the initiation, the study of the Veda, and the kindling of the sacred fire.  

The Dharmaśāstras prescribe that Vedic teaching be kept secret from Śūdras, the fourth varṇa, the masses of society, and from women. Even the recitation of the Vedas in their presence was prohibited. This policy of preserving the Āryan religion and culture from the inroads of the non-Āryan people is construed as āryasāpekṣatā.

(5) The Saṃskṛtasāpekṣatā

The Vedas which are the final authority of Hindu beliefs and religious practices were composed in Saṃskṛt, the language of the Āryans. The Āryan priests (Brāhmaṇas) used to chant the Vedic mantras (hymns) at the time of the Vedic sacrifices and rituals. Religious books were written


only in Sanskrit and religious discussions were conducted only in Sanskrit. Therefore, Sanskrit came to be regarded as the official medium of religious communication among Aryans. It was honoured as the language of the gods (devavāni). In order to retain Sanskrit as the exclusive medium of religious knowledge, the Brāhmaṇas were forbidden from learning any language spoken by non-Āryans or barbarians. Retaining Sanskrit as the only medium of religious rites and communication is construed as the saṁskṛtasāpekṣatā.

These five facets (sāpekṣatās): Veda, Yajña, Brāhmaṇa, Ārya, and Sanskrit, which can comprehensively define the traditional orthodoxy of Hinduism, seem to be inter-related. The Vedas are the final authority of Hindu dogma and practice. The Vedic religion was centred around the performance of sacrifices and rites which were developed into a complex system of rituals or karmakāṇḍa. The priests (Brāhmaṇas) were exclusively authorized to perform sacrifices and to teach the scriptures, thereby the power and authority of the Brāhmaṇas was increased. The Āryans preserved their religion and culture by making the Brāhmaṇas their officiating priests and religious teachers, on the one hand, and by denying accessibility to the Vedas to non-Āryans and women, on the other hand. The Āryans preserved not only Vedic or

28 Vāsīṣṭha, Dharmaśāstra, ed. F. Max Müller, vi.41.
Brāhmaṇic religion and culture but also preserved the Āryan language, Saṃskṛt, by making it the only medium of religious communication.

B) The Marāṭhā Saints and Hindu Orthodoxy

Having briefly explained the five facets of orthodox Hinduism and their inter-relatedness we should proceed to examine how the Marāṭhā saints viewed these five facets of Hindu orthodoxy. Let us begin with the prominent saints of the Vārkārī Sampradāya, Jñāneśvar and Tukārām.

(1) Jñāneśvar and Hindu Orthodoxy

Jñāneśvar whose theology became the basis of the Vārkārī Sampradāya generally accepted the authority of the Vedas but he took a critical look at the traditional practice of excluding Śūdras and women from studying and listening to the Vedas. He focused attention on the Gītā because the Gītā, he thought, opened the door of liberation (mokṣa) to all people including Śūdras and women, and in practice he seemed to ascribe more authority to the Gītā than to the Vedas. In his commentary on the Gītā, he says:

Sri Kṛṣṇa has thus revealed the philosophy of the Gītā (Gītāsāstra), which is the fundamental text (mūlasūtra) of the Vedas, and is holy because it is authoritative over all (sārvādhi-kāraikapavitra). If you ask [me] how I realized (bodhā āle) that the Gītā is the root (mūl) of the Vedas, I shall explain it to you in terms of a well established doctrine (upapatti). The Vedas were born out of the breath (niśvāsi) of [the Parabrahman]; [but] He, whose nature is truth (satyapratijña), told [the philosophy of
the Gītā] by His own lips (svamūkhe). Therefore, it is appropriate to say that the Gītā is the root (mūlabhūt) of the Vedas. Moreover, there is another doctrine [in support of that proposition].... The three divisions (kāndatrayātmaku) of scriptural knowledge (sadbārāśi) [or the Vedas] are in the Gītā without division (aṣekhu), even as trees are [potentially] in seeds. Therefore, I understand (game) and clearly recognize that the Gītā is the seed (bīj) of the Vedas. 29

Jñānesvar later on identified the Gītā with the Lord or the Parabrahma. 30 He thus heightened the importance of the Gītā.

The Gītā or the Bhagavadgītā is a part of the Mahābhārata which is included in the secondary tradition called Smrīti. The term Smrīti comes from the root 'smṛ' meaning 'to remember' or 'to reflect'. Smrīti therefore means the reflection on the revealed scriptures (Śrūti) or the Vedas which are traditionally regarded, as we stated before, as the primary source of Hindu beliefs and practices. The Mahābhārata, which includes the Gītā, is a Smrīti text and is also called a fifth Veda. 31 This kind of respect to the Mahābhārata seems to be an effort to give that text an equal status with the four Vedas. We have above noted that Jñānesvar gives the Bhagavadgītā a higher status than the Vedas.

29 Jñ. xviii.1426-1432.
30 Ibid., xviii.1684-1685.
Next to the *vedasāpekṣata* comes the *yajñasāpekṣata* or *karmakāṇḍa*. In the historical setting of the Marāṭhā saints, we have referred to Hemadri's encyclopaedic book called the *Caturvargacintāmani* whose emphasis was on worship of various deities, of the manes, the daily and seasonal duties and penances for failure, and performance of all rites mentioned in the *Gṛhyasūtras*, the *Kaplasūtras*, Smṛtis, the Purāṇas, the Epics, and traditional usage. Jñānesvar's reaction to this emphasis on ritual (*karmakāṇḍa*) was as follows:

Otherwise, O son of Pāṇḍu, if one's heart is not pure, his exterior actions are a caricature (*vitāmbu*) really. It is like a corpse adorned with ornaments, a donkey being washed in holy water, and a bitter pumpkin being smeared with jaggery. [It is like] tying a festoon (*toran*) on a deserted house, putting layers of food around the body of a hungry person, a widow putting red powder on [her forehead].... This is like a decorated fruit which has dung (*śeg*) within. So are external actions. A false thing (*kuḍā*) cannot be sold at a high price. A pitcher of liquor cannot be holy even though it is put in the holy Ganges. Therefore, there must be knowledge within; then external purity results from knowledge and actions. By what means can one attain that purity? Therefore, let the exterior part be purified (*cāṅg*) by action, and the filth (*vaṅg*) of the heart be removed by knowledge. Then the distinction between internal and external will disappear and purity will become unified (*ek*); then, finally purity becomes a whole. 32

---

32 Jn. xiii.468-475.
In these verses, Jñānesvar is sharply critical of the external karmakāṇḍa which is performed without internal purity or knowledge. He does not condemn ritual as such, but emphasizes inner purity and seeks to maintain a balance between inner purity and external or ritual purity.

Jñānesvar's emphasis on inner purity and knowledge (of god) in the context of the traditional karmakāṇḍa seems to have some effect on his view of the brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā. His position seems to have not only weakened karmakāṇḍa but also weakened or lessened the authority of the Brāhmaṇas which had been enhanced primarily because only the Brāhmaṇas were authorized to do sacrifices and rituals.

The brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā was further weakened by Jñānesvar's position about scriptural knowledge and about who is qualified to interpret the scriptures. Jñānesvar considers scriptural knowledge as a necessity in the process of liberation:

Wind blows away clouds; without [such an action we cannot see the sun covered behind the clouds]; but that action does not create the sun. Do hands not take moss (bābulī) away from water? [Without such an action we cannot see the water that was covered under the moss;] but that action does not create the water. Similarly, the dirt of avidyā (metaphysical Ignorance) is an obstacle in realizing the Self; it (viz. the dirt of avidyā) is wiped out (lit. destroyed) by the study of the scriptures. The One (Self) is pure and I become illumined to myself. Therefore, all the scriptures are means (pātre) of destroying avidyā; Self-knowers (ātmabodhī) do not become liberated without studying the scriptures. 33

33 Jñ. xviii.1231-1233.
But Jñāneśvar distinguishes redemptive knowledge from the knowledge of the scriptures and the related sciences:

He is [expert] in discussing Smrtis (traditions); he knows the secrets (dañśu) of Gāruḍī vidyā (i.e. evil devising and scheming); he is sharp (prajñecā) in the Nighaṇṭū (i.e. dictionary of the Vedas). He is excellent (cokaḍā) in grammar and very proficient in inference. But he is ignorant (phudā) about the knowledge of the Self; [therefore] he is blind by birth....It is like a peacock whose feathers have eyes all over but none of those eyes have vision.... Similarly, O Arjuna, know that the knowledge of the scriptures is completely unauthoritative (apramāṇ) without Self-knowledge. 34

In these verses, Jñāneśvar says that one should have redemptive knowledge or Self-knowledge in order to interpret the scriptures more authoritatively and that verbal knowledge of the scriptures is not sufficient. This position of Jñāneśvar seems to suggest that Jñāneśvar questioned the traditional authority of the Brāhmaṇas to interpret the scriptures on the basis of their verbal knowledge alone.

As the Brāhmaṇas were exclusively authorized to teach and to interpret the scriptures, they took pride in the privilege, because of their monopoly. Jñāneśvar was critical of the pride of the learned on the one hand and he emphasized that redemptive knowledge is obtained by bhaktimārga, on the other hand:

It is a suprising matter about egoism (ahaṅkār) that it does not pursue the ignorant closely but

34 Jñ., xiii.833-839.
it grasps the throat of the learned (viz. egoism makes the learned to speak egoistically) and puts them in many difficulties (sāṅkaṭī).

Again,

O knower of secrets, this condition is otherwise called brahmata (i.e. being or realizing Brahman). He who worships me attains this condition. My devotee in the world is commonly (puṅhatī) characterized by the sign (liṅgi) that he is with brahmata (i.e. liberated condition) as a devoted wife (pativratā) is with her husband.

While dealing with the vedasapekṣatā, we have noted that Jñāneśvar gives a higher status to the Gītā than to the Vedas because it opened the door of liberation to all including Śūdras and women. Jñāneśvar makes this point clear in his commentary on the Gītā:

The great book of the Bhagavadgītā is thus the ocean of the entire Sāṅkhya philosophy. Know it in reality that this book is a distinctive (āgalā) Veda by its generosity (audārye). The Veda is originally rich [by knowledge] but no one is as miserly as it is for it can be heard by the three varnas only. Women, Śūdras and other [human] beings have, [like the three varnas,] to suffer the miseries of earthly existence. [But denying right to women, the Śūdras, etc., the Vedas] has created a difficult situation (anavasaryu). Therefore, I think that in order to make good this defect and to be in service of anyone the Veda is embodied in the form of the Gītā.

---

35 Jñ. xiii.82.

36 Ibid., xiv.398-399.

37 Ibid., xviii.1456-1459.
In these verses, Jñāneśvar criticizes the Vedic or Brāhmaṇic stand concerning the āryasāpekṣatā viz. denying the Śūdras, women, and others the right to study and listen to the Vedas. He praised the Gītā for overcoming this defect and showing its generosity in serving all.

The last facet of Hindu orthodoxy was the saṃskṛta-sāpekṣatā. In discussing the historical setting of the Marāṭhā saints, we have referred to a few sectarian movements of Mahārāṣṭra: the Liṅgāyata Saṃpradāya, Nātha Saṃpradāya, Mahānubhāva Saṃpradāya, and the revived Brāhmaṇism or Hinduism. The Liṅgāyata Saṃpradāya challenged the saṃskṛta-sāpekṣatā by writing religious books in Kanarese. The Nātha Saṃpradāya encouraged the use of regional languages and produced religious literature in Marāṭhī, Hindi, Behgāli, Tāmil, and other languages. The Mahānubhāvas produced a large body of literature in Marāṭhī. While these sectarian movements were challenging saṃskṛtasaṃśeṣatā, Hemadri, Bopdev, and Vijñāneśvar were reviving Brāhmaṇism and were writing religious books, like the Caturvargaśiśmatā, in Saṃskṛt and thus were attempting to reinforce saṃskṛtasaṃśeṣatā. Jñāneśvar, who was initiated into the Nātha Saṃpradāya, followed the policy of his Saṃpradāya by writing his religious books in Marāṭhī, the language of the people. He argued that it was necessary that the religious knowledge

38 G.D. Ḍhavle alias Jñānadevopāsak, op. cit., p. 4.
which was stored in Saṃskṛt be shared with others if people were to be enlightened:

I shall spread the knowledge of Brahman (brahma-vidyā) limitlessly (sukāl) in towns where Marāṭhī is spoken. Let this world receive and give the blessing of happiness (sukhāci vartī). 39

In doing this Jñāneśvar was following the tradition of the Nātha Sampradāya and his teacher Nivṛttinath who rendered knowledge from Saṃskṛt into Marāṭhī. 40 Jñāneśvar himself admits that part of his reason for writing in Marāṭhī was aesthetic for he had confidence when expressing the ideas of the Saṃskṛt tradition in Marāṭhī:

My Marāṭhī tongue (bolu) is wonderful; it can certainly (pajā) excel [the taste] of nectar. I shall gather such savory (rasike) words (akṣare, lit. letters). 41

Elsewhere he justifies his writing a commentary on the Gītā (i.e. the Jñāneśvari) in Marāṭhī when he says:

Arun resides near the sun; therefore he sees it. Can an ant on the earth not see the sun? Therefore, [it was possible to produce] the Gītā with a commentary in Marāṭhī (dešikāre) for us who are ordinary people (prākṛtā). There is no reason to consider our position as improper (anucitā). 42

---

39 Jñ. xii.16.
40 Ibid., xi. 9f.
41 Ibid., vi. 14.
42 Ibid., xviii. 1719-1720.
For these ostensible reasons, Jñānesvar wrote the Jñānesvari and other religious books in Marāṭhī and broke the traditional Brāhmaṇic practice of saṁskṛtasāpekṣatā.43

(2) Tukārām and Hindu Orthodoxy

Tukārām, like Jñānesvar, generally accepts the authority of the Vedas and even took a stand against the critics of the Vedas when he said:

If a man destroys the source of milk, what will he gain by doing so? He who finds fault with the Vedas is low and sinful, a polluted wretch. If a man sets fire to his own house, where will he find a place to live in? Tukā declares the secret; the rest are led astray by error. 44

Again,

A reviler of the Vedas is not of a pure seed; know him for a low caste man. He who credits not the Vedas nor heeds the speech of the wise. Tukā says, his pleasant words are like sweet food with spirit, touch him not. 45

While Tukārām accepts the authority of the Vedas, he seems to hold that one should have access to an even higher authority for he warns an aspirant (mumukṣū) to use his discretion and not to accept everything in the Vedas as authoritative, when he says: "If you seek salvation, first


44The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe, 1063.

45Ibid., 1102.
sift the Vedas, discard those sayings in them which are fruitless." The authority which is higher than the Vedas is God Himself, according to Tukārām when he says:

He is the essence (sār) of the scriptures and the embodiment (mūrti) of the Vedas; He is our companion (sāṅgātī) and bosom friend (prāṇasakhā). 47

Again,

The Vedas sing His praise; we have His company. His name is on our lips (kaṇṭhī); He is completely stored in [our] hearts (lit., stomach). 48

Tukārām, like Jñānēśvar, is sharply critical of the external karmakāṇḍa and he emphasizes purity of heart and virtuous conduct when he says:

What have you done by visiting holy places? You have merely washed your skin. Is your heart purified by it? You have secured for yourself worldly distinction (bhūṣan). Even though a fruit of colocynth (vṛndāvan) is marinated with sugar, its internal essence (thārā) or bitterness does not change. Tukārām says, "While you have no peace, forgiveness, and compassion [within], you sob (phundā)." (In other words, external bathing in holy waters is in vain, if there are no good qualities in the heart). 49

Again,

Does a snake not give up food? Does a heron not contemplate? [But] their internal mind (buddhi)

46 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe, 507.

47 Śrī Tukārām Mahārājānce Abhang, Śrī Sakal Sant Gāthā, 3334.1.

48 Ibid., 1924.1-2.

49 Ibid., 1750.
is deceptive (khotī); their heart (pot, lit. stomach) is filled with evil. Does a rat not abide in a hole? Does a donkey not smear (his body) with ashes? Does a crocodile not stay in water? Does a crow not bathe? says Tukārām. 50

Tukārām is also critical of the traditional means of karmakāṇḍa and considers the bhaktimārga of the Varkarī Saṃpradāya superior to traditional karmakāṇḍa, as he says:

Let the birth (jyālepaṇ) of a man be accursed, who had visited a million holy places and has not visited Pañdharpur, and has not seen the even feet (samacaranaṇ) of [Viṭṭhobā]. He has done innumerable things such as practising yoga and doing sacrifices; but as he has not seen the feet of Viṭṭhobā, he has not obtained the merit of visiting innumerable holy places. 51

Tukārām's position about the karmakāṇḍa seems to have lessened the necessity of karmakāṇḍa and in turn weakened the authority of the Brāhmaṇa or the brāhmaṇa-sāpeksatā. The brāhmaṇasāpeksatā was further weakened by Tukārām's position about the scriptural knowledge as a necessity of liberation and about who is qualified to interpret the scriptures. Tukārām, unlike Jñāneśvar, does not see the necessity of scriptural knowledge in the process of liberation:

What avails me the dry knowledge of Brahma? It is a measure filled with nothing but illusion. Something wherein thou art not. That is not my


51 Ibid., 324.
soul's desire; give me a vision of thy feet, says Tukā. 52

Or,

Listen, O pious ones, whoever you may be, cast aside association with philosophers and worship Pāṇḍuraṅg, seek not the many opinions of men, they will drown you certainly. 53

Tukārām who advocates bhaktimārga considers the scriptural knowledge without faith (bhāv) to be a useless thing:

While the heart is not pure, rote knowledge (pāṭhāntar) acquired to the fullest extent (bharovarī), is in vain. Does a horse not carry a heavy burden? Similar is rote knowledge, if it is acquired without faith. 54

Tukārām, like Jñāneśvar, distinguishes direct redemptive knowledge from scriptural knowledge when he says:

The knowledge of Brahman (brahmajñāna) cannot be proved (or established or realized) by talking about it; it is not realized unless one has experienced it (in himself (citti). What will this vain, unfounded (laṭikāci) tall talk (pāḥhāl) do? This is just a labour of knowing [the scriptures] (jānice śram). Having given up the happiness of sense-objects, you tell the people that you are god. You talk about the taste of nectar to your audience but you are dying of starvation. 55

52 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe, 1626 cf. 453.


54 Sri Tukārām Mahārājānce Abhāṅg, Śri Sakal Sant Gāthā, 1124.2-3, cf. 1561.

55 Ibid., 1813.1-4.
Tukārām, like Jñāneśvar, holds that religious experience or Self-knowledge is necessary in the interpretation of scriptures when he says:

Only we know the meaning of the Vedas; others do not know the meaning of the Vedas (lit., others carry the burden of the Vedas on their heads as coolies do). The relish which one gets out of eating food cannot be regarded as equal with just seeing that food; [in other words, we have tasted the food but others have only seen the food], (lit., others carry the burden of food for wages).... Tukārām says, 'We have found the root, (therefore,) the fruit has come into our hands naturally. 56

Again,

[with our own efforts] we will milk the white cow of Vedic truth; we will wrestle with the Vedas ourselves.... 57

These two poems clearly imply that according to Tukārām, a direct spiritual experience is a better guide to interpret the scriptures than the traditional scholastic method. This position of Tukārām that the immediate experience of God is the highest authority directly undercuts the exclusive right of the Brāhmaṇas to interpret the scriptures.

Tukārām, like Jñāneśvar, is critical of the Brāhmaṇas' pride in knowledge when he says:

You may treat me, O God, as you will, but I will not call these men saints; for they have set their hearts on rule and wealth. Their desires have

---


57 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe, 1266.
made them victims of hypocrisy. Though they be Brāhmaṇas, I shall hold them none such. They bear knowledge blindly as a burden. Tukā says, I shall not fear mankind in the persons of such men, though I suffer for it. 58

Again,

Weighed down by pride of knowledge, you are drowning in the gulf of the world; why will you not rise out of it? Tukā says, you will reach God by faith, through [the] effort to know him, you will not understand him. 59

Tukārām, like Jñānesvar, not only distinguishes redemptive knowledge and scriptural knowledge but also holds that redemptive knowledge comes through bhaktimārga:

Truly, God dwells in all souls, yet none can be saved without seeing that other one. Truly, knowledge dwells in all men, yet without devotion it does not become Brahma. What would be the good of practising postures, though they had been explained to you and you had learned them, unless the light of emancipation was kindled within you? 60

Again,

If God shows me any favour, then the knowledge I receive will be Brahma itself. There will be no need to bring anything from anywhere, or to go anywhere to get salvation. 61

While dealing with the vedasāpekṣatā, we have noted that Tukārām gives less importance to the Vedas than to the

---

58 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe, 1192.
59 Ibid., 505 cf 555, 1013.
60 Ibid., 2080.
61 Ibid., 3219 cf. 2080.
God who is the source of the Vedas. He seems to view the vedasāpekṣātā together with the āryasāpekṣātā, as Jñānēśvar does, when he says: "The Vedas left us in anger (rusoniya gelā); but their author (lit. father) is in our hearts (kaṇṭhī)." Tukārām seems to have reacted against the āryasāpekṣātā as he, being a Śūdra, was prohibited from reading and listening to the Vedas. However, this prohibition did not hinder his own spiritual quest, as he said:

We have been barred access to the Vedas, but our inner spirit urges us to seek ceaselessly the core of Vedic philosophy.

Thus in his view, it was not absolutely necessary to have access to the Vedas in order to be liberated because God, the source of the Vedas, was with him and it is He who grants liberation to all including Śūdras, women and others.

The last facet of Hindu orthodoxy was the saṅskṛta-sāpekṣātā. We have noted that Jñānēśvar wrote religious books in Marāṭhī in order to impart the knowledge stored in Saṅskṛt books. It seems that he made Marāṭhī the medium of religious communication as far as the Vārkarī Saṁpradāya was concerned. The majority of the Vārkarī saints were

---

62 Quoted by S.G. Tulpule, op. cit., p. 361.
64 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe, 689.
from the masses and they wrote their books in Marāṭhī. Marāṭhī thus became an official medium of religious communication. Tukārām, concerning whom we said in the historical setting that his sources of religious knowledge were the Marāṭhī works of Jñāneśvar, Eknāth, and others, of course, wrote his poems in Marāṭhī. Even though he does not justify the use of Marāṭhī over against Saṃskṛt, he holds his mission to be like that of Jñāneśvar to enlighten the masses by explaining Hindu scriptures:

The ancient things (purāṇas) have lost their meaning; verbal knowledge (sabdajñāna) (or idle skill in words) has destroyed [their meaning]; men's minds are greedy of pleasure; the way of liberation is spoiled. We shall loudly proclaim the name of god and terrify the evil. Tukārām says, 'Raise a joyful shout of victory'. 65

In the above poem, Tukārām wants to explain traditional knowledge which had been beset with irrelevant things (ādarāne) and overshadowed by verbal knowledge (sabdajñāna).

3) Rāmdāś and Hindu Orthodoxy

Having thus reviewed how the Vārkarī saints responded to the five facets of Hindu orthodoxy, let us proceed to examine how Rāmdāś responded to Hindu orthodoxy. Rāmdāś not only accepts the authority of the Vedas as the Vārkarī saints do but also argues in favour of re-affirming it:

65Śri Tukārām Mahārājānce Abhaṅg, Śri Sakal Saṅt Gāthā, 236.3-4, cf. 119, 334.
The Vedas have power to save people. If the Vedas had no power [to save the people] who would have cared for the Vedas? He who has access to the Vedas (vedākgare) has been regarded as righteous (punyarāṣṭ). Are the Vedas, therefore, lacking power [to save all]?

Rāmdās thus re-affirms Vedic authority on the one hand and acknowledges the limitation of the Vedas as far as revelation of God through bhaktimārga is concerned:

The Vedas have illumined (prakāśile) all knowledge and there is no knowledge outside of the Vedas. [However,] the Vedas cannot show one substance (vastu) which one can know [only] by his own experience (svānubhava) in the company of saints (sāntasange). Who can tell His greatness (mahimā) in words (vacani)? Māyā is wonderful but it cannot introduce that Thing. The saints tell the means (soy) to know the Infinite (anānt) who is beyond Māyā.

In these verses, Rāmdās seems to ascribe more importance to the company of saints (or the bhaktimārga) than to the Vedas as far as the revelation of God (Vastu) is concerned.

Rāmdās, unlike the Vārkarī saints, encourages traditional rites and other religious practices when he says:

Because of our laziness (cukurpane), we should not give up ritualistic bathing and worship (snānasāndhyā), and break the family-practices (kulācār). Because of the pressure of domestic life (prapañcabale), we should not neglect listening to stories of Hari (god), and fail to

66 Dās. 7.vi.29-30.
attend the exhortations (nirūpan), or disrupt our spiritual life (paramārtha). 68

Rāmdās classifies the rite, performed without a selfish motive, as the sāttvik (i.e. good) duties⁶⁹ and regards a non-observer of karmakāṇḍa as an educated fool (paḍhata-mūrkha).⁷⁰ He has emphasized the necessity of performing the rituals. This is a major concern in Rāmdās' works. However, he also shares a few ideas with the Vārkarī saints.

Rāmdās, like the Vārkarī saints, occasionally criticizes the mechanical or habitual performance of the karmakāṇḍa.⁷¹ He also occasionally emphasizes the idea of purity of heart accompanied by rituals:

We should do ritualistic bathing, worship, meditation (jap), concentration (dhyān), going to holy places, and the worship of the Lord. (And thus) should maintain our holiness (pavitrapaṇ) and keep our heart pure. ⁷²

But he was not as critical of the karmakāṇḍa and as emphatic about purity of heart over against karmakāṇḍa, as the Vārkarī saints were. He did not advocate bhaktimārga as a substitute for karmakāṇḍa, as the Vārkarī saints did.

---

⁶⁸Dās. 2.1i.34-35.
⁶⁹Ibid., 2.vii.17,36.
⁷⁰Ibid., 2.x.24.
⁷¹Ibid., 18.x.26; GR. p. 588 (E).
⁷²Ibid., 2.ix.20.
Though Rāmdās agrees with the Vārkarī saints on some points about the karmakāṇḍa, he is trying to revive the traditional karmakāṇḍa and thereby to reinstate the authority of the Brāhmaṇas (brāhmanasāpekṣatā) who were traditionally authorized to do rituals. Now let us see Rāmdās' position about scriptural knowledge with a view to examining whether it is similar to that of the Vārkarī saints and whether it intends to restore the exclusive preceptorship of the Brāhmaṇas (brāhmanasāpekṣatā).

Rāmdās, like the Vārkarī saints, distinguishes between scriptural knowledge and redemptive knowledge when he says:

Herein actual first-hand experience (pracit) is the authority (pramāṇa) and inference based on the scriptures is not needed. Or what is given in the scriptures should actually be experienced. Talk without direct experience (pracitivip) is entirely detestable (kaţalvāne); it is like a dog barking with a wide open mouth. What is there to listen to and to find out, as the talk is drearily empty (śunyākār) as far as the actual first-hand experience is concerned. 73

Again,

Knowledge without first-hand experience is inference only; such knowledge cannot serve men as a means of attaining the other world (paratra). Therefore, experience is the major factor (mukhya); knowledge without experience is useless. Even though bookish knowledge (apāy) appears similar to knowledge based on experience, the wise distinguish them. 74

73 Dās. 9.v.14-16.
Moreover, Rāmdās recognizes the limitations of trying to understand the divine mystery or God by intellect and logical reasoning. In another work he says:

He is infinite (or incomprehensible) (vād) even though we search many scriptures; He is not expressed by any statement (niścay) (viz. He is indescribable). Minds quarrel over controversies arising from trying to understand the scriptures; intellection (prabodhe) and comprehension by knowledge (jñānabodhe) fall short (of knowing Him). The revealed scriptures, Nyāya, philosophy, logic, traditions (Śṛṭi), Vedas, aphorisms of Vedānta philosophy, and various schools (cannot apprehend Him). Śeṣ (i.e. a thousand-headed snake) himself became silent and therefore sees steadily. (Therefore,) O mind, give up all knowledge (jānīv). 75

Rāmdās, like the Vārkarī saints, recognizes the necessity of having spiritual experience (pracit) to interpret the scriptures when he says:

Taking medicine without actual experience, following a diet (pathya) without experience; and imparting knowledge without the direct experience are all called delusion (bhram). 76

Rāmdās, like the Vārkarī saints, is critical of pride in scriptural knowledge and considers it a barrier to the spiritual life:

How can a man digest food, who has swallowed the fly (of pride) of knowledge (jānīv)? The stomach of man cannot digest knowledge-food, if its mental egoism (mānsīcā ahaṁbhāv) has not passed away (jireṇā). 77

75 Manāče Ślok 157-158.
76 Dās. 10.vi.32.
77 Manāče Ślok 159 cf. Dās. 14.i.47.
Or,

A person who is highly learned and is conversant with the scriptures (vyutpanna) and talks of the knowledge of Brahman (brahmajñāna) explicitly is an educated fool (paḍhatmūrkha) if he has evil desires and pride in himself. 78

Though Rāmdās does not explicitly say that redemptive knowledge comes from bhaktimārga as the Vārkarī saints have said, his stand on bhaktimārga as the only way of liberation implies a similar position because there is no liberation without redemptive knowledge. He propagates bhaktimārga as the way of liberation:

Man certainly reaches (pavatī) God by devotion alone (bhakticenayoge); this is the contention (abhiprāv) of the book (i.e. Dāsbodh). 79

He also, like the Vārkarī saints, considers bhaktimārga sufficient for liberation and says that other means are not required of a devotee:

Rāmdās says, "If you have faith in the name of God, you are not required to do rites (karma), religious duties (dharma), yogic practices; (you are not required) to eat specific food (bhoga) or to renounce (something) (tyāga) or (to follow) the order (sāṅg) (of someone). You should meditate on the name of Rāma at dawn. 80

78 Dās. 2.x.3.

79 Ibid., 1.ii.4.

80 Manāce Ślok 76 cf. Dās. 4.iii.13-25.
Again,

Great faults go away by (the reciting of) His name;
people are liberated by (the reciting of) His name. 81

Rāmdās thus agrees with the Vārkarī saints on many points but he differs from them when he tries to restore the traditional practice of allowing only the Brāhmaṇas to teach and to interpret the scriptures and blames the Śūdras for trying to assume the role of teachers:

As inferior men (prāṇī) have assumed preceptorship, religious practices have sunk and nobody cares for the teachings of the Vedas (vedāśāstra) and the Brāhmaṇas. Only the Brāhmaṇas are authorized (adhikāru) to reflect on the knowledge of Brahman (brahmajñāna, lit. studying the scriptures). "Varnāṇāṁ brāhmaṇo gurūḥ" (tr. the Brāhmaṇa is preceptor of (all) varṇas) is the authoritative saying (vacan) [of the scriptures]. The Brāhmaṇas have madly turned away (cevāle) from intellectual pursuit (buddhi); they have given up their preceptorship and have become disciples of disciples... The degraded castes (nicayāti) have taken over the preceptorship and their greatness (mahaṁti) has been enhanced; the Śūdras are degrading the religious practices of the Brāhmaṇas. The Brāhmaṇas do not realize this fact; they have not changed their behaviour (vṛtti); and they do not give up false pride in their own foolishness. 82

Rāmdās tries to restore the traditional preceptorship of the Brāhmaṇas on the basis of scripture. He also advises the people not to select preceptors from the lower castes:

81 Manāce Ślok 76 cf. Dās. 4.iii.13-25.
Selecting a preceptor of an inferior caste is in itself a degrading idea (kāṅkondā vicāru). The preceptor hides himself as a thief in an assembly of the Brāhmaṇas (brāhmaṇabhā). In the presence of the assembly of the Brāhmaṇas, (a disciple) should not take holy water (tirtha) from the feet of such a preceptor or should not receive holy food (prasād) from him because the disciple will have to do atonement (prayāscita). If the disciple does not receive tirtha and prasād from his preceptor, he exposes the inferiority of his preceptor and his devotion to his preceptor (gurūbhakti) dies (satvali) immediately. If the disciple treats his preceptor with respect, the Brāhmaṇas certainly will become angry with him; and if the disciple respects the practice of the Brāhmaṇas (brāhmaṇya), his preceptor will become angry with him. As these are embarrassments (saṅkaṭ) on both sides, the disciple repents (for having selected a preceptor of inferior caste); for this reason, inferior castes are not given preceptorship. 83

Ramdas repeats the idea that one should not select a preceptor from the lower castes in another place in the Dāsbodh, 84 and he reproduces the whole argument, quoted above, in another work. 85

Rāmdās' brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā becomes very clear as he says:

Even though a Brāhmaṇa becomes void of duties (kriyāhīn) he remains the preceptor (guru) of all; (and) we should submit ourselves to him with special devotion. 86

83 Dās. 5.ii.58-62.
84 Ibid., 2.iii.39.
85 Ekavīśa Samāśi arthāt Juna Dāsbodh v. 58-62.
86 Dās. 5.i.6.
Ramdas stands for the traditional practice of venerating the Brähmaṇas not because they are Brähmaṇas by merit (guṇas) but only because they are born in the Brähmaṇa caste. He also asks the people to protect the brāhmaṇa-dharma (i.e. rights and privileges of the Brähmaṇas) with respect and to continue their preceptorship with determination (nīrdhāre). He also stands for their social superiority, a matter which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Ramdas tries not only to restore the preceptorship of the Brähmaṇas (brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā) but also tries to re-inforce the traditional limits of imparting religious knowledge in accordance with the Brähmaṇic or Vedic imperative when he says:

He (a devotee of the Lord) protects all and imparts knowledge in such a way that the command of the Vedas is not disobeyed. He thus leads all people (prāṇimātra) by the good and right way.

Ramdas' emphasis on the Vedic imperative implies the traditional exclusion of the Sudras, women, and all others who are not qualified to study the Vedas or who are not regarded

---

87 Dās. 4.ii.20.
88 Ibid., 2.iv.2; 5.i.6-18.
89 Ibid., 4.ii.25.
as righteous (puñyarāsi) to study the Vedas. Rāmdās stands for the āryasāpeksatā by re-inforcing the traditional policy of imparting religious knowledge only to the twice-born (dvijas) and of excluding the Śūdras and others from it.

The final sāpeksatā is the saṃskṛtasāpeksatā. Now, let us examine what Rāmdās thinks of the saṃskṛtasāpeksatā. Rāmdās maintains the superiority of Saṃskṛt books over Prākṛt (i.e. Marāṭhī) books when he says:

Books in Saṃskṛt are superior to books in Marāṭhī. Books on the Vedānta are the best (thor) among the books in Saṃskṛt. However, he does not really accept the saṃskṛtasāpeksatā because he recognizes the importance of Marāṭhī as a medium of religious communication when he says:

The book which talks about non-dualism (advaita) should not be regarded as inferior (prākṛt), because its vedānta philosophy is true as far as its import (artha) is concerned. The vedānta philosophy which is found in all scriptures is understood in Marāṭhī (Prākṛt) and one gets satisfaction and becomes mature (nivāle) in his heart. The book which is a resource (upāy) of knowledge should not be regarded as inferior (prākṛt). Can a fool understand this? It is like a monkey understanding a coconut. Now, enough is said; one should understand it according to one's calibre (adhikārparatve). One should not say that pearls are inferior (une) because they come from shells.

90 Dās., 7.vi.30.
91 Ibid., 5.vi.36.
92 Ibid., 7.x.46-49.
Again,

Import is not lost a little because of another language (bhāṣāpālte); (because) all success or accomplishment (kāryasiddhi) depends on the import only. However, Saṃskṛt books have attained significance (sārthakatā) because of books in Marāṭhī (Prākṛt). Otherwise, who would know that secret import (guptartha)? Now, this talk is enough. We should pick up the import and give up the language even as one takes the best and gives up peels and husks. 93

The aforestated argument is repeated by Rāmdās in another place, as follows:

The Marāṭhī language seems to you [Paṇḍits] to be inferior, but whether in Marāṭhī or Saṃskṛt the meaning is the same. If one reads the Purāṇas in Saṃskṛt, one has to explain the meaning in Marāṭhī, just as a king's glory is not manifested except through his subjects. "God created the Saṃskṛt language, and Marāṭhī originated from a thief", so the wise should not speak. 94

Even though Rāmdās initially recognized the superiority of Saṃskṛt over Marāṭhī, he justified the use of Marāṭhī in imparting religious knowledge, as the Vārkarī saints did.

At this stage, we can summarize how the Mārāṭha saints viewed the five facets (sāpeksatās) of Hindu orthodoxy. First, they all accept Vedic authority in general. Jñāneśvar, however, departed from a narrow view of the Vedas by arguing that the Gītā contains the essence of the

93 Dās. 7.i.41-43.

Vedas and overcomes their defect. Tukārām also departed from the narrow view of the Vedas saying God is a higher authority than the Vedas. Rāmdās re-affirmed Vedic authority. Secondly, Jñānesvar and Tukārām took a critical look at the traditional karmakāṇḍa and propagated bhaktimārga as a substitute for karmakāṇḍa; but Rāmdās tried to revive the traditional karmakāṇḍa. Thirdly, the Vārkārī saints tried to undercut the brahmāpasāpeksatā but Rāmdās tried to restore it. Fourthly, the Vārkārī saints were critical of the traditional stand on excluding the Śūdras, women, and others from the study of the Vedas; but Rāmdās tried to re-affirm it. Finally, all the Marāṭhā saints stood for the use of Marāṭhī for imparting religious knowledge.

C) The Lokamāna Tilak as an Orthodox Hindu

Our thesis is that Tilak's Gītārāhasya followed to a substantial degree the Marāṭhā religious tradition in which he was raised and that in particular his thought was indebted to the saints of Mahārāṣṭra. Let us examine his view of orthodoxy and see to what extent it is indebted to his Marāṭhā heritage.

D.P. Karmarkar thought of Tilak as an orthodox Hindu because of his life style:

Tilak's way of life in college was of the orthodox type. He used to sit for meals with a silk
dhoti as was common amongst the orthodox and his outlook in social matters also was more conservative than liberal. 95

The Marāṭhā social reformers, R.G. Bhāṇḍārkar (A.D. 1837-1925), M.G. Rāṇāde, Mr. Justice K.T. Taleṅ (A.D. 1850-1894), and G.G. Āgarkar (A.D. 1856-1915), labelled Tilāk orthodox on account of three major controversies they had with him. The reformers began to describe Tilāk as a 'champion of orthodoxy', a 'reactionary', and an 'enemy of progress' 96 when he criticized the 'Sāradā-Sadan' and its founder the Panditā Ramābāī (A.D. 1858-1922). Ramābāī founded the Sadan (i.e. home or an institute) in A.D. 1889 with the intention of taking care of 'destitute high-caste widows' and improving the social condition of 'fallen women'. Her work was admired by the reformers. But Tilāk was sceptical about the work of Ramābāī. He did not approve of the idea of a school run by a Christian lady for Hindu girls 97 for he suspected that the school might be used for gaining Christian converts. He drew attention to the report of the progress of the Sadan, published in the Christian Weekly (New York,

95 D.P. Karmarkar, op. cit., p. 5 cf. p. 11.

96 D.V. Athalye, op. cit., p. 56; D.V. Tahmankar, op. cit., p. 44.

97 Ibid., p. 56.
December 1889) declaring the Sadan to be a 'Christian institute'.

When he accused Ramabai of being a hypocrite the public raised a strong outcry against Ramabai's work. That protest eventually forced the reformers to sever their connection with the Sadan and identified Tilak with orthodox Hindus.

Tilak was again identified as a 'conservative' (sanatani), 'anti-reformist' and 'an orthodox Hindu who was against social change' when he opposed the 'Age of the Consent Bill' in A.D. 1890. The bill was supposedly introduced to reduce the abuses connected with Hindu child-marriage by raising the marriageable age for girls from ten to twelve. Tilak, however, sided with the orthodox Hindus and undermined the cause of the Hindu reformers. He argued against the reformers saying, "If a part of the body is decaying, it should be cut off; similarly we have to deal with this group", and called them "the wicked people adorned with knowledge".  

---

98 Quoted by D.V. Tahmankar, op. cit., p. 43f.


100 The Kesari, 7 April 1891; quoted by D. Keer, op. cit., p. 9.
Western scholars have condemned Tilak for this stand. J.F. Edwards wrote concerning Tilak's attitude in this context:

The life record of the author of the Gītā Rahasya is sadly marred by his fierce opposition to the noble moral effort represented by the Age of Consent Bill in 1890 which was introduced to mitigate the indescribable wrongs and sufferings of Hindu child-marriage. His influence as proprietor of the Kesari was seen in his use of its columns to denounce as renegades and traitors of Hinduism all those Hindus who supported this crying need of Indian social reform, though it was happily placed on India's statute-book as an Act in 1891. 101

V. Chirol, referring to Tilak's writing in the Kesari, made a similar observation:

Tilak raised against them [reformers] a storm of passion and prejudice. In the columns of the Kesari, ... he denounced every Hindu who supported the measure as a renegade and a traitor to the cause of Hinduism, and thus won the support of conservative orthodoxy, which was [had] hitherto viewed with alarm some of his literary excursions into the field of Vedāntic exegesis. 102

D. Keer, a Hindu scholar, made a similar observation on Tilak. 103

The third incident which led to Tilak being identified as orthodox was when the political party led by Tilak opposed another political party holding the Social Conference in the Indian National Congress pandal (maṇḍap) in Poona in 1895.104 The Congress was comprised of two political parties: the Moderate Party and the Extremist Party. The Moderate Party was made up of the social reformers who were moderate in political reform but revolutionary in social reform. On the other hand, the Extremist Party, led by Tilak, was moderate in social reform but revolutionary in political reform. In the early years of the Congress, the Moderate Party was in the majority and it became customary to hold the Social Conference, sponsored and conducted by members of the Moderate Party, in the same pandal as the Congress. This practice gave the impression that the whole Congress was in favour of social reform. Therefore, Tilak and his party decided to show the people that the Congress as a whole was not in favour of social reform. Tilak's orthodox party opposed this practice in A.D. 1890 but its protest was not successful.

The Congress session was to meet again in Poona in A.D. 1895. Tilak had appealed to all parties and classes in Mahārāṣṭra to support the work of the Congress and had

for the time being put aside his differences with others on the question of social reform. Ṭiḷāk's work popularized the Congress in Mahārāṣṭra. Nevertheless, the Moderate Party, led by the reformers, again stirred up the fury of the Extremist Party, by insisting that its Social Conference would be held as usual in the Congress pandal in A.D. 1895, in spite of the Extremist Party's opposition. This insistence of the Moderate Party gave rise to a vigorous demand from the Extremist Party not to hold the Social Conference in the Congress pandal in Poona, in A.D. 1895. ¹⁰⁵ Ṭiḷāk's party was successful this time in separating political reform from social reform and in forcing the Moderate Party to hold its Social Conference in a separate pandal.

D) Ṭiḷāk's Middle Stand on Social Reform

The aforesaid controversies made Ṭiḷāk appear to be an orthodox Hindu because he was on the side of the orthodox Hindus who were totally opposed to social reform. He sided with the orthodox Hindus at least partly for the practical reason that as he said, "If I adopt heterodox ways, I would not be in a position to influence them [orthodox] to the same extent as I could do by keeping to my orthodox ways". ¹⁰⁶


¹⁰⁶ S.V. Bapat, op. cit.; II, 7 (English section).
But while he chose to side with the orthodox masses, he took a positive stand on social reform even though he opposed the westernized reformers. His position seems to be a middle ground between the extreme positions of the westernized reformers who had set out to change Hindu society on the basis of western values and the strict orthodox Hindus who did not want to change at all.

In order to understand Tilak's middle stand, we should know the reasons he opposed the reformers and what kind of social reform he advocated. Tilak opposed the westernized reformers on the following grounds. First, the reformers, being influenced by western life and values, wished to re-build Hindu society on the basis of foreign values at the expense of Hindu values. Tilak thought this attitude would undermine the Hindu heritage in blindly copying western values. For this reason, he opposed the Pandita's mission because he thought converting Hindu women to Christianity would directly undermine Hindu society and its values. He set forth his own principle of social reform in these terms:

In brief, every person who strives for the welfare of a country, must first attempt to awaken pride in our institutions and in our country rather than to reconstruct the society. It is not enough to

107 D.V. Tahmankar, op. cit., p. 47.
say 'do not leave the old'. In order to fulfil the task, one must indeed be 'properly' proud of the old institutions. 108

This statement of Tilak was asking of the reformers that their social reform should not go against the religious and patriotic susceptibility of the people109 and also asking the orthodox people not merely to cleave to the old but to be 'properly' proud of the old institutions.

Secondly, Tilak opposed the reformers not only because their reforms were imitative, but also because they were asking a foreign government to legislate the social reforms. Tilak opposed this policy of the reformers because he thought the policy would grant officials of a foreign culture opportunities to interfere in the religious customs and beliefs of Hindu society and thereby they would lose their religious independence as they had lost their political independence.110 Ten years before the Consent Bill, he put his stand about foreign government intervention in these words:

We would not like that Government should have anything to do with regulating our social customs or ways of living...even supposing that the act of

---


110 D.V. Tahanmankar, op. cit., p. 46.
Government will [would] be a very beneficial and suitable measure. 111

Moreover, the Government had promises not to interfere in socio-religious matters,112 since A.D. 1857. On the basis of that principle, Ēkāk opposed the Consent Bill legislated by the foreign government. But he called for Hindu volunteers to discourage their sons marrying before sixteen, eighteen, or twenty and to keep their daughters from marrying before twelve and fourteen. He signed a circular supporting this kind of reform in August 1889.113 On 26 October 1890 he went further and proposed that girls and boys should not be married until they reached the age of sixteen and twenty respectively.114 This means that Ēkāk was in favour of social reform, but without government intervention.

Thirdly, Ēkāk opposed the reformers because they gave priority to social reform over political independence and even held the view that the foreign power should rule over India until Indians became qualified to rule

111 The Mahrāṭṭā, 22 May 1881, quoted by S.A. Wolpert, op. cit., p. 47.

112 S.A. Wolpert, op. cit., p. 47.

113 Ibid., pp. 51f.

114 Ibid., pp. 55f.
Tilak understood this policy of allowing foreign rule several centuries to mean that India would not get her political freedom even after five hundred or a thousand years. His policy was radically different in that he gave priority to political independence over social reform when he said:

"Self-respect, enthusiasm, loyalty to freedom in the real life of a nation; and as long as there is vitality social reform follows as a thread follows a needle; this is evidenced by history. Therefore, the nationalists party does not ascribe as much importance to it as it ascribes to political movement. It does not say there should be no social progress of the nation; but it should be done in harmony with political progress and self-respect."

On the basis of this policy, Tilak opposed the Moderate Party, holding the Social Conference in the Congress pandal in A.D. 1890. The Congress decided to separate social and political concerns in A.D. 1891 in response to Tilak's argument.

---

115 S.N. Banhatti, *op. cit.*, p. 115

116 S.V. Bapat, *op. cit.*, III, 4f (intro).


Finally, Tilak opposed the social reformers because they were trying to impose social reform on the people without their consent. Tilak thought such a policy would divide society and the reform would not be genuine and beneficial to the public. He said in a public meeting held on 1 November 1890, attended by M.G. Ranade and R.G. Bhandarkar, the social reformers:

There has been much talk but little action regarding social reform, with the result that even those reforms, the vital need of which has been generally admitted, have not been carried out into practice. We must not only see what reforms are required, but also whether and how they can be made popular; for in reforming society, care ought to be taken to avoid the creation of any gulf between the people on the one hand and the reformers on the other. We must carry public opinion with us; and this can be done, inter alia, by securing for our reforms the sanction of religion. I am in favour of Social Reform. 119

In this statement, Tilak admitted the need for social reform and suggested that the reforms should have the sanction of Hinduism. This idea is made clear by T.L. Shy when he says: "He [Tilak] was loyal both to his convictions about the need for reform and to the classical heritage which was his guide". 120 As R. Kumar puts it: "Although Tilak opposed the social programme of the liberal Brähmanas on grounds of

119 Quoted by D.V. Athalye, op. cit., p. 53.

120 T.L. Shy, op. cit., p. 68
expediency, he cheerfully accepted the need and the inevit­ability of change".\textsuperscript{121} This statement of Tilak makes it clear that if reforms had the sanction of Hinduism there would be popular support and the reforms would be implemented.

The foregoing discussion about Tilak's position regarding social reform should lead us to conclude that Tilak was in favour of social reforms provided they were made within the framework of Hinduism. This means that he took a middle stand between the two extreme positions taken by the reformers and the strictly orthodox people.

E) The Gītārahasya and the Marāṭhā Saints

Tilak's middle stand on social reform seems to have been influenced by the Marāṭhā saints who remained within the framework of Hindu tradition but advocated change. Let us now examine whether Tilak follows the saints in formulating his views on the five facets of orthodoxy we have already outlined.

Tilak, like the Marāṭhā saints, accepts the authority of the Vedas. He once defended the traditional view of the Vedas in an important public debate held in A.D. 1903. The debate was organized to examine the growing opposition to the traditional view that the Vedas were \textit{apauruṣeya} (i.e. of non-human origin) and \textit{anādi} (i.e. eternal). Though

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{121}R. Kumar, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 321.
\end{flushright}
S.G. Jinsiwale (A.D. 1852-1903), the other participant, was a staunch believer in Hinduism, he held that the Vedas were **pauruṣeya** (i.e. of human origin) and were not **īśvarapraṇīta** (i.e. divinely inspired). 122 Tīlak sided with the orthodox scholar, Kṛṣṇānanda Swāmi and opposed Jinsiwale, arguing:

> If the Vedas are eternal (nitya) as far as their meaning is concerned, and beginningless (anādi) as far as their antiquity is concerned, it can not be proved that they have a human origin (pauruṣeya). And as it is not proved that they have a human origin nobody should say that they have. 123


> According to the view held by Hindu theologians, the Vedas are eternal (nitya), without beginning -(anādi), and also not created by a human author (a-paurusheya); and we are told that these attributes have been predicted of our sacred books from the most ancient times known to our divines or philosophers. 124

Tīlak goes on to argue that his scientific research re-affirms the theological view of the Vedas:

> Such, in brief, are the views entertained by Hindu orthodox theologians, scholars and philosophers in regard to the origin, character and authority of the Vedas; and on comparing them

---

122 Samagra Lokamānya Tīlak: Sāmāj v Sanskriti, V, 935.

123 N.C. Kelkar, Lokamānya Tīlak yāñce Caritra (A.D. 1899-1914), II.ii.18.

with the results of our investigation, it will be found that Patanjali's and Vyāsa's view about the antiquity and the eternity of the Vedas derives material support from the theory of the Arctic home which we have endeavoured to prove in the foregoing pages on strict scientific and historical grounds. 125

Tilak makes it explicit that the purpose of his book is to re-affirm the traditional authority of the Vedas (veda-sāpekṣatā), the cardinal principle of orthodox Hinduism.126

In this general sense, Tilak accepts the authority of the Vedas as had all the Marāṭhā saints before him.

Tilak also seems to follow Jñāneśvar when he departs from the narrow view of the Vedas and raises the authority of the Gītā over the Vedas on the ground that the Gītā overcomes the defect of the Vedas and opens the door of liberation to all. In the Jain Conference held at Baroda on 22 November, 1904, Tilak said:

There were no equal rights to the four varṇas in Brāhmaṇism. The Brāhmaṇas believed that one could get liberation by doing sacrifices; but the way of sacrifice was not open to the Śūdras,...a problem arose at that time whether all have equal rights in the house of God. Jainism, without discriminating one person from another, propagated the way of liberation to all. A slok, 'sriyo vaisyastathā śudraste'pi param gatiṁ', (tr. women, Vaiṣya, and the Śūdras also attain liberation) is due to the influence of Jainism... It has fulfilled a deficiency in Hinduism. 127


126 S.L. Karandikar, op. cit., p. 126.

127 Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, VI. 798.
We should take note of the fact that Tilak's major work was on the Gita as had been that of Jñāneśvar.

The second facet of Hindu orthodoxy is the yajñasāpekṣatā and its extended form, the karmakanda. Tilak, in the preface to Saṃskār-Meemaṃsā by Shri Saraswati-Bhusan Vamanashastri Kinjawadekar, expresses a few of his thoughts on the rituals of Hinduism. He seems to justify the universal practice of rites in these words:

Every religious community required that its members should lead a particular kind of domestic life in order to obtain admission into that religious community and maintain their social and religious status therein. The rites and the acts prescribed in this behalf have thus a clear socio-religious purpose in view. To belong to a particular religion a man must live in a particular way, marry in a particular way, pray in a particular way and be initiated into that community in a specific manner; and there must also be a definite set of rules out of these rites so as to secure uniformity of practice in that community or sect. 128

Later on he makes two further points in this regard. The first point is:

But there is not the slightest doubt that the practices so codified and defined were handed down from generation to generation from times immemorial. Thus we find that the marriage ceremony is expressly referred to in the Rigveda, the Jātakarma, Nāmakarana, Upanayana and Garbhadhāna in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajurveda. Many of the Mantras used in the Grihya Śaṃskāras are also found in the Atharvaveda Samhitā. This proves that the domestic ceremonies defined and described in the different

128 Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, VII, 332-333.
Grihya Sūtra were no new inventions, but were the domestic customs of the Vedic communities from times immemorial and that in consequence they created obligations as much binding on the Vedic society as the Srauta rites prescribed in the Srauta Sūtras. 129

The second point is:

The Saṃskāras are obviously of Aryan origin. But when the Aryan and non-Aryan came in contact it was inevitable that these Saṃskāras should be extended to non-Aryan people also. Thus even in the Srauta rites and sacrifices we find a place assigned to Rathakara and Nishadasthapati (Jaimini VI.144-51) and the reasons for which the Srauta restrictions were so relaxed, applied with greater force in the case of Grihya rites as the Aryan community absorbed into its fold the non-Aryan communities in India. The growing and expanding custom in this behalf is found fully recognized in the Smṛtis and the Purāṇas which consequently are justly regarded as the authoritative and religious text for the Shudras. 130

In this way, Tilak traces the origin of all Hindu rites, ceremonies, and ways of worship, or the whole karmakānda, to the Vedas, and holds the view that the Vedic karmakānda was extended to non-Aryans. This means that he holds that the karmakānda is prescribed to all Hindus.

We have already seen how Jñānesvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās thought of the Hindu karmakānda. These saints were critical of the external karmakānda and they emphasized one's purity of heart against it. As the saints of the Marāṭha tradition were known to be critical of the

129 Ibid., p. 333.
130 Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, VII, 335.
karmakāṇḍa, Tiṅak explains why the traditional karmakāṇḍa had come to be looked down upon, in his comment on the Gītā ii.45:

>yāvādartha udapāne sarvataḥ samplutodake /
tāvānsarveṣu vedēṣu brāhmaṇasya vijānataḥ //
(tr. To the extent to which there is a use (that is, necessity) for a well there is a flood of water everywhere (clearly, there is no necessity whatsoever), to the same extent is any necessity for the Vedas (containing the ritualistic Karma-kāṇḍa) for the enlightened Brāhmaṇa (that is to say, for him, there is no more any necessity of the Vedic Karma-kāṇḍa which describes desire-fulfilling ritual). 131

In the above slok, a criticism or an indication of the inferiority of the desire-prompted Vedic actions is pointed out [but] the inferiority is not of the ritual itself, but of the desire-prompted motivation. If this desire-prompted motivation is not in the mind the mere yajñayāga would not obstruct, in any way. (GR. pp. 262-274) 132

It seems that Tiṅak interprets the Gītā as favouring karma-kāṇḍa done with a disinterested frame of mind. We have noted that Rāmdās classifies the rite performed without a selfish motive, as the sāttvik (i.e. good) duty and encourages karmakāṇḍa. Tiṅak seems to develop a similar idea in his comment on the Gītā ii.46:

But the Gītā does not agree that the inference drawn by some persons that as a jñāni one is not required to do yajñā, yāga, etc. karmas, he should not do actions (karme) and should absolutely give them up. Though the jñāni does not want the

131 GR. p. 573 (M); p. 891 (E), tr. B.S. Sukthankar.
132 GR. p. 573 (M); p. 890 (E).
reward of his actions, he cannot give up actions, for he does his ritual actions, not for the reward, but as the prescribed duty. The Lord has clearly expressed His opinion, in the eighteenth chapter, that the jñāni should also do ritual actions detachedly as he does other selfless actions. 

Tilak thus understands the jñāni of the Gītā as the disinterested karmayogi doing his karmakāṇḍa.

The Marāṭhā saints emphasized purity of heart and virtuous conduct and they were critical of the karmakāṇḍa without these qualities. Tilak's position on the karmakāṇḍa was similarly ambiguous as that of the saints, especially the modified version of the karmakāṇḍa as expounded by Rāmdās. Tilak, in his criticism of the show of ritualistic actions unaided by pure devotion (śuddha bhāv) thus consciously follows Rāmdās:

If your bhāv (i.e. faith, sincerity) is not pure, however good the symbol (pratik) may be, what is the use of it? It is impossible to attain God if you deceive people all the day along and after that go to worship an idol in a temple every morning and evening or on feast days. Samartha [Ramdas] has described some persons going to temple to listen to sermons (pūrāṇ) as follows:

Sensual persons go to listen to [the sermon]; but they look at the ladies only. Persons who are thieves go away after stealing shoes (Dās. 18.x.26)

---

133 Tbid., p. 575 (M); pp. 894f (E).

134 GR: p. 381 (M); p. 588 (E).
Tilak even concurred with Tukārām's saying that 'God craves bhāv (i.e. devotion or faith) and not the symbol (pratik)'.

Tilak, in his interpretation of the Gītā, over and over emphasizes bhāv (i.e. purity of heart, sincere devotion), a favourite theme of the Marāṭhā saints.

The third sāpekṣatā is the brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā. We have seen that the Vārkarī saints were weakening the authority of the Brāhmaṇas, and that Rāmdās, though agreeing on some points with the Vārkarī saints, was trying to restore the authority of the Brāhmaṇas and was advocating the protection of their rights. How Tilak responds to the brāhmaṇa-sāpekṣatā in his time is our concern now.

Tilak in the preface to Saṁsakār-Mimāṁsā states:

Only the first three of these are called Dvijas or twice-born and their Saṁskāras from cradle to the grave are performed with the Vedic Mantra...

The later Smriti and Prayoga writers have fully recognized the extension of Grihya rites, excepting Upanayana, to the Shudra class provided no Vedic Mantras are used.... Carried to its logical conclusion this means that a Shudra may have all the Saṁskāras if Vedic Mantras are not used or if the study of the Veda is not their object, as is the case with the Upanayana.

Tilak took this stand when he became involved in the Vedokta controversy in A.D. 1901. The Marāṭhās had the right only to the purāṇic rites and their saṁskāras were done without

135 GR. p. 382 (M); p. 590 (E).

136 Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, VII, 335-336.
reciting Vedic *mantras*. But the Brāhmaṇas had the exclusive right to the Vedic rights and their *saṁskāras* were done with Vedic *mantras*. This was the traditional practice. The Marāṭhās claimed that they were Kṣatriyas and demanded the right to the Vedic rites and to have their *saṁskāras* done with Vedic *mantras*. The demand of the Marāṭhās was supported by Sahu Mahārāj of Kolhāpur who used his power and demanded that the Brāhmaṇas perform the Vedic rites in his palace. He threatened them, saying that their inherited land and grants (*vatane*) would be confiscated if they failed to comply with the order. Tilāk wrote two articles in defence of the Brāhmaṇas. Because of these articles (the Kesari 22, 29 October 1901) Tilāk was accused of fighting for the cause of the Brāhmaṇas and against allowing non-Brāhmaṇas to read the Vedas. 137 Tilāk wrote in defence of the Brāhmaṇas who were not ready to obey the order of Sahu Mahārāj:

In accordance with the prescription of caste order (*jāti-dharma*), the prescribed rites (*grhya saṁskāras*) of the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas are to be done with Vedic *mantras*. Verses of Smṛtis support this position. But according to...all authorities on the Dharmasastras, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas do not exist at the present and one should use one's discretion (*tārtamya*) in bestowing rites on the castes that exist between the Brāhmaṇas and the Śūdras. Now, the problem is whether Marāṭhās are real Kṣatriyas or Śūdras or between these two castes. 138

---


138 The Kesari, 22 October 1901, Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, V, 149.
Tišak added in defence of the Brāhmaṇas:

If we take into account individual freedom, it would be not only improper but also oppressive for a Brāhmaṇa to be compelled to bestow Vedic sacraments on the Marāṭhas and if a Brāhmaṇa would not comply with this [order] his property be confiscated.... No one should interfere in the old religious tradition.... The British government continued the grants of land (vatane) previously given to Deśpāṇe and Joṣi even though the government had no need of doing so. The same rule applies to religious grants and grants of land. 139

Tišak defended the rights of the Brāhmaṇas to discharge their religious privileges but he did not say that non-Brāhmaṇas have no right to study the Vedas:

If sahibs are permitted to recite or to learn the Vedas, non-Brāhmaṇa castes of Hindus must be permitted to do so. The present time emphasizes individual freedom; it is logical to say that as we cannot prohibit Europeans from studying the Vedas why should we prohibit Marathas from studying the Vedas. 140

Tišak had earlier written in the Kesari in A.D. 1894 about the problem of why the Śūdras were prohibited from reading the Vedas:

As far as acquiring knowledge of Brahman is concerned the Vedānta philosophy does not mention caste-distinction or superior-inferior status. The store of religious knowledge (brahmajñāna) was accessible to the first three varṇas and the Śūdras were prohibited from having access to it; according to Max Müller, this prohibition was not due to inferiority of caste but due to their

---

139 The Kesari, 29 October 1901, Samagra Lokamānya Tišak, V, 154-155.

140 Ibid., p. 154.
intellectual capacity (*buddhivaikalpa*). And he has clearly said that imparting religious knowledge to the Śūdras in ancient times would have been similar to inviting wild Africans to listen to scholarly lectures on the Royal Institute. 141

Though Tilak defended the rights of the Brāhmaṇas he did not advocate a monopoly of religious knowledge in the hands of the Brāhmaṇas at present but he was rather liberal in his approach. Tilak's views on the traditional Brāhmaṇa privileges (*brāhmaṇasaṃpeksatā*) did not, however, constitute a one-sided defence of the Brāhmaṇas for he saw the distinction of duties and rights conferred on non-Brāhmaṇas as well.

In a political sense Tilak's position must have proved satisfactory, for his supposedly pro-Brāhmaṇa stance did not lose him the support of non-Brāhmaṇa parties. In A.D. 1917, a non-Brāhmaṇa party emerged in Madras which was opposed to Tilak's Home-Rule League and received the encouragement and co-operation of the British officials. But a few years later when the party left government tutelage it accorded a welcome address to Tilak, indicating that even the militant non-Brāhmaṇas had gained confidence in Tilak as a leader of all.142

---

141 The Kesari, 4 September 1894, *Samagra Lokamānya Tilak*, V, 527.

Tilak expressed his view on the growing Brāhmaṇa-non-Brāhmaṇa controversy in the Kesari in A.D. 1917:

Muslims comprise the largest group among the non-Brāhmaṇas in India. A person, who knows the unanimous compromises which took place at the Lucknow Congress session, with regard to Muslims...would not be doubtful about the policy of protecting the rights of Muslims by Hindus; and it should be clear that the policy, which all Hindus adopted towards Muslims, would essentially be the same policy of the Brāhmaṇas towards non-Brāhmaṇas. What is the reason to change it? ...Dividing up Indians between Brāhmaṇas and non-Brāhmaṇas and stirring up hatred of the Brāhmaṇas is a work of evil intention. 143

At the end of his life Tilak had to face the Brāhmaṇa and non-Brāhmaṇa controversy at the Belgaum District Conference held at Sahkeśvar on 6-7 March 1920. In that Conference, he challenged the allegations which had been made against him that he favoured the Brāhmaṇas. In a similar spirit, Tilak addressed the Gopal Club of non-Brāhmaṇas in Poona, on 16 March 1920. 144 He also wrote articles about the issue and published their summary in the Mahrāttā (21 March 1920). Thus Tilak's political actions clearly indicate that he did not fight for the exclusive rights of the Brāhmaṇas (brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā) but his struggle transcended such distinctions and he was liberal in his attitude.

143 The Kesari, 18 September 1917, Lokamānya Tilak Lekhasaṅgrah, ed. L. Jośi, p. 38.
144 S.L. Karandikar, op. cit., pp. 626f.
Tilak's liberal attitude toward non-Brahmanas while at the same time vindicating the brähmanaśāpekṣatā seems to illustrate how he tends to follow the ideas of the Varkari saints who had earlier weakened the brähmanaśāpekṣatā. Tilak, like the Marāṭhā saints, distinguishes between the scriptural knowledge or bookish knowledge and redemptive knowledge. This reminds us of Tukārām specially:

There are many who give dry discourses on Brahman and also many who hearing those discourses nod their heads in appreciation... or who are like courtiers in a drama saying 'once more' (Gl. ii.29; Ka. ii.7). But, as stated above, the man who is internally and externally purified viz. who has become equable (sāmyaśila), is a true Self-devoted (Ātmaniṣṭha) one and he alone gets liberation, and not a mere learned man who is extensively learned or intelligent. 145

Tilak supports this argument by quoting a poem of Tukārām:

(You) have become a pandit (i.e. scholar) (and) you tell (us) pūrṇams (i.e. exhortation); but you do not know who you are (Ga. 2599). 146

Tilak, like the Marāṭhā saints, considers redemptive knowledge to have come primarily from bhaktimārga:

It will be clearly seen that though there are two paths (jñānamārga and bhaktimārga) yet they have the attainment of only one God in common and finally the same equanimity is generated in mind; these are eternally established different staircases, leading to the same floor, used by (people)

145 GR. p. 455 (M); p. 713 (E).
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according to their respective qualifications; paths
are different but not the goal...though these two
means are different initially because of (people's)
qualifications, they are effectually of the same
significance (and) they both are called 'adhyātma'
in the Gītā (Gī. xi.1)... The ultimate resolution
of bhakti is Jñāna (and) bhakti is it means, and
not a goal. 147

Again,

There is a proposition (siddhānta) of the religion
of the Gītā that once a devotee of the bhaktimārga
has submitted himself to God, God gradually increases
the devotee's faith and finally grants the perfect
knowledge of His nature (Gī. vii.21; x.10), and by
that knowledge (not by dry and blind faith) the
devotee finally gets the perfect attainment. 148

Ṭīlak tends to follow the Marāṭhā saints in holding that
redemptive knowledge comes from bhaktimārga. On the basis
of this view he answers the objection that bhaktimārga does
not yield true knowledge, by referring to Tukārām:

But the actual experience of the saints is the
only incontrovertible answer (bintod uttar) to the
objection, and among all these experiences, I
consider the experience of Tukārām, the best among
the devotees of Bhagavān (bhagavadbhaktaśiromāṇi),
especially significant (viśeṣ mahatvācā). No one
need to be told that the saint Tukārām obtained
the adhyātmanajñāna without studying the Upaniṣads
and other books. Nevertheless, there are about
300 or 350 poems in his Gāthā devoted to the de-
scription of the state of non-duality (advaita);
and in those poems 'Vasudev is all' (tr.) (Gī.
vii.19)...has been expounded on the basis of

147 Gī. pp. 373f (M); p. 576 (E).
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personal experience. For example—

As sweetness of jaggery (is in every part), so God is in all. Now, in what manner should I worship? God is outside and inside. Apart from water the waves of water do not exist; as gold is called (differently) because of (different) ornaments, so we are, says Tukārām (Gā. 3627)....

When the saint Tukārām himself describes the supreme state of the devotee, on the basis of his personal experience, it is strange that anybody dare to make loquacious (bāskal) assertions, by inference, such as: 'It is impossible to have knowledge of advaita by the bhaktimārga' or 'only by blind faith in God is liberation achieved, one does not need knowledge'.

Tīlak here approvingly refers to Tukārām as the most authoritative source to answer the objection raised against the bhaktimārga by scholars. His special regard for Tukārām as bhagavadbhaktaśīromani (i.e. best of devotees of the Lord) is clear evidence of Tukārām's influence on Tīlak.

The fourth sāpekṣata is the āryasāpekṣata. According to it, knowledge of the Vedas is a pre-requisite of liberation and the Vedas are inaccessible to the Sudras, women, and others. Even though Tīlak upholds the vedasāpekṣata, he seems not in favour of the āryasāpekṣata because he challenges the traditional presupposition on the basis of the revealed scriptures viz. Upaniṣads and other scriptures:

Well; if one says that women and Sudras can never attain Release [mokṣa] because the Vedas are thus

149 GR. p. 387 (M); p. 598 (E).
inaccessible [abolā] to them, then, there are statements in the Upaniṣads that Gargi and other women obtained Perfection (siddhi) by acquiring Knowledge; and there are statements in the Pūrāṇas that Vidura and other Śūdras did likewise (Ve. Su. 3.4.36-39). Therefore, one cannot lay down the proposition that it is only the men folk belonging to the upper three classes (varṇa) who attain Release.... 150

In order to buttress his point of view, Tilak refers to the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra, as a living example:

Thus, when the door of release is opened for all people in the society, there emerges a distinguished awareness (vilaksan jāgrti) whose nature can be easily comprehended from the history of the Bhāgavat Dharma in Mahārāṣṭra. As far as God is concerned, women, Cāndāḷ, and the Brāhmaṇas are equal (sārkhec). 'God craves for bhāv (i.e. devotion, faith) and not for symbols (pratīks), nor white and black colour, nor differences between man and woman, and the Brāhmaṇa and Cāndāḷ.' 151

Tilak more precisely sustains his argument by quoting Tukārām:

Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, Śūdra, Cāndāḷ, children, man, woman, and prostitute, and all have right. Tukārām says, 'He is convinced by experience that others and devotees experience the happiness by good fortune' (Gā. 2382.5-6). 152

Tilak seems directly dependent on the Marātha Bhāgavat Dharma in his understanding of the all-inclusiveness of the religion

150 GR. p. 396 (M); p. 614 (E). tr. B.S. Sukanthar.
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of the Gītā. Tilāk goes on asserting the all-inclusiveness of the Gītādharma in these words:

The religion of the Gītā is undauntable and all-inclusive (vyāpak) and equitable (sam) which means that it does not maintain any distinction between varṇas, castes, countries or anything else, (but) grants release to everyone equally,... (it is) endowed with knowledge, devotion, and action, and is the highly sweet and immortal fruit of the tree of the Vedic-Dharma. 153

Tilāk considers the Gītādharma as the 'immortal fruit' of the Vedic-dharma because the Gītādharma is all-inclusive (vyāpak). We have already shown that Tilāk considers the Gītā to overcome the fault of the Vedas by opening the door of liberation to all. 154 As Tilāk thinks highly of the Gītā in these terms, he seems to follow Jñāneśvar who departed from the narrow view of the Vedas and praised the Gītā for overcoming the defect of the Vedas.

The final sāpeksatā of orthodox Hinduism is the saṅskṛtasāpeksatā which needs to be considered in the context of existing tendencies among scholars in the age in which Tilāk lived. English had occupied the status of Saṅskṛt, as the language of the elite. In the context of Tilāk's milieu the concept of saṅskṛtasāpeksatā be extended to include the use of English as opposed to Marāṭhī. Why

153 GR. p. 455 (M); p. 713 (E).
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did Tilak favour the vernaculars as the mass media?

Tilak had received his preliminary academic education from his father who was an educationist, a profound scholar in Marathi and Sanskrit and who made Tilak recite Marathi poems and Sanskrit verses.155 His father thought that a sound grounding in the mother tongue accompanied by a sound study of Sanskrit was more valuable than an early acquaintance with English;156 therefore, he was not in a hurry to send Tilak to the Government High School, Ratnagiri. This early training seems to have influenced Tilak in giving priority to Marathi and other vernaculars over English.

Tilak and his colleagues urged the acceptance of Marathi as the medium of instruction.157 They opened a school in Poona, with the determination:

Let us, said this school of Poona Patriots, cultivate our own vernaculars, let us awaken the people by teaching them the greatness of our History and our religion and excellence of our civilization. 158

155 vide, p. 37.
156 S.L. Karandikar, op. cit., p. 35.
157 D.V. Athalye, op. cit., p. 34.
158 'Hindu Missionary', quoted by V. Venkatesvarulu, op. cit., p. 98.
Tilak and his colleagues also started two newspapers: the Mahratta in English and the Kesari in Marathi. Tilak worked as an editor of these newspapers. However, he concentrated more on the Kesari than the Mahratta. He spelled out his policy of favouring vernaculars as the mass media, in his address at Madras:

I am one of those who hold that the development of India will be facilitated if [the] vernaculars are developed and if [the] provinces are distributed according to language.... We can appeal to our people better through [the] vernaculars than in English. English can never become the language of the masses. We must appeal to them through their own vernaculars, and this has been one of the chief objectives of my life, and [I therefore] tell you once [and] for all why I devoted more attention to the Kesari than to [the] English paper. 159

Tilak believed in the vernaculars as one of the chief means of national awakening. 160

Tilak seems to follow the examples laid by the Maratha saints in using Marathi as the medium of mass instruction when he says:

Europe was revived when the Bible was translated; similar work was done when Jñāneśvar translated the Gītā. Therefore a collection of Marāṭhī books would bring about the recollection of (our) past glory and of the service rendered by the saints. If (such a work) is done, there would be an awakening that would accomplish much. 161

159 B.G. Tilak, His Writings and Speeches, pp. 326f.
160 D.V. Athalye, op. cit., p. 325.
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Again,

When the Bible was translated into European languages, the people became illumined by knowledge and were revived. Similarly, the books of Rāmdās, Tukārām, and others effected a renaissance (bhāgyoday) in Mahārāṣṭra. It is unfortunate that these books are not read in that perspective. When the saints and poets opened the knowledge stored in Saṅskṛt (to the people) and when exhortations (kirtane) were given, the people became conscious of their pride in religion (dharma) and in country. Can the task, which these books undertook two hundred years ago, not be done today? 162

Ṭīlak interprets the saṅskṛtasaṃpiṭatā in the context of his time and asks the educated people to develop Marāṭhī:

The educated class of the country was talking Saṅskṛt in the past. The class, reared up in Saṅskṛt, persecuted the saints of Mahārāṣṭra. The learned humiliated the Marāṭhī speaking people. A difference between the learned of the past (śāstri) and the educated of today is that the ancient śāstri used to talk Saṅskṛt from which Marāṭhī is derived and the educated of today speak a foreign language... The educated should have the zeal to develop Marāṭhī. 163

Ṭīlak praises the work of the Marāṭhā saints and asks the people to develop Marāṭhī and make it a means of communication:

The saints of Mahārāṣṭra developed Marāṭhī. They had to render in Marāṭhī the knowledge stored in Saṅskṛt. Along with that work, the work of

162 Samagra Lokamānya Ṭīlak, VI, 125.
163 The Kesari, 11 September 1906, Samagra Lokamānya Ṭīlak, VI, 928.
developing Marathi was accomplished. Language is a means of communicating one's ideas to another. Those who talk Marathi should communicate more (in Marathi). One should have a desire to develop language and have the zeal for it. 164

Tilak criticizes the existing tendency among writers and scholars to write books in English on the ground that Marathi has an inadequate vocabulary for expressing their ideas. To such writers, Tilak once said in the context of the Jñanesvari:

The complaint that there are not many words in Marathi is in vain. There should be no shortage of words to those writers who sincerely want to explain any important concern to their countrymen and who want to exhort their ignorant countrymen to make them knowledgeable (sujña) and all-round progressive. When Jñanesvar Maharaj started to write the Jñanesvari, six centuries ago, he did not feel the shortage of [Marathi] words in simplifying the secret knowledge of Sanskrit to his brethren in Mahārāstra. 165

Tilak proved this fact by writing articles in Marathi and writing the Gitarahasya in Marathi. The Gitarahasya is considered to be the 'first prose writing of the front rank in weight and importance in the Marathi language',166 an 'epoch making book' (yugapraavartak grāntha).167 In order to

---

164 The Kesari, 11 September 1906, Samagra Lokamanya Tilak, VI, 928.
165 Quoted by J.R. Ajaganvakar, op. cit., I, 76.
166 Aurobindo, Bankim-Tilak-Dayanaḍa, pp. 17f.
impart religious knowledge and to reveal the secret of the Gītā to the common people of Mahārāṣṭra Ṭīlak wrote the Gītarahasya in Marāṭhī.168 Thus he followed the Marāṭhā saints in practice.

F) Conclusion

In this chapter, we explained how the Marāṭhā saints responded to the five facets of Hindu orthodoxy and how Ṭīlak was guided by these responses in working out his position in his day. His position was a middle position between two extreme positions taken by the strictly orthodox Hindus and the westernized liberal Hindu reformers. Ṭīlak defended and re-affirmed the traditional authority of the Vedas (Vedasāpeksatā), the cardinal principle of Hinduism. His position was similar to the position taken by all Marāṭhā saints concerning the final authority of the Vedas. Even though he upheld the final authority of the Vedas, he did not fight exclusively for the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas. But his struggle transcended caste distinction viz. Brāhmaṇas and non-Brāhmaṇas, therefore, he gained the confidence of the non-Brāhmaṇas. He expressed his concern for all castes. Ṭīlak's position on this was in conformity with the Vārkārī saints. Even though he accepted

168 G.P. Pradhan, op. cit., p. 31; N.C. Kelkar, Lokamānya Ṭīlak yāṇce Caritra, III.vii.22.
the final authority of the Vedas he did not vindicate the prohibition against imparting Vedic knowledge to the Śūdras and women. Nor did he hold Vedic knowledge to be an absolute pre-requisite for liberation. For this position, Ṭīlak turned to the Gītā and the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra. He praised the Gītā for not maintaining distinctions such as varṇa and caste as far as granting liberation is concerned. He praised the Gītā Dharma as the fruit of Vedic Dharma. Ṭīlak made a distinction between scriptural knowledge and salvific knowledge, the same distinction made by the Marāṭhā saints. He also held, like the Marāṭhā saints, that salvific knowledge is a fruit of bhaktimārga. Ṭīlak held that a jñāni should do rituals (yajñasaṃpekṣatā) with a disinterested frame of mind. This position is similar to that of Jñāneśvar and Rāmdās. Finally, Ṭīlak favoured the vernaculars as a means of mass education and national awakening. From this fact, we can conclude that Ṭīlak was indebted to the Marāṭhā saints and thereby was influenced by them in working out his position in his day.
CHAPTER III
THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL ORDER

In the last chapter, we attempted to demonstrate the influence of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra on Tilak's religious philosophy by showing that the moderate position he took on the issues of the authority of tradition was essentially the position taken by the prominent Marāṭhā saints. In this chapter, we shall try to demonstrate how Tilak's thoughts about the ideal social order (samāj vyavasthā) were also influenced by the Marāṭhā saints. In setting forth our argument we will: (i) outline the traditional social order and the caste system; (ii) set forth the interpretation of the social order by the Marāṭhā saints, and (iii) demonstrate the influence of the Marāṭhā saints on Tilak's thoughts about the proper social order for Hinduism.

A) Traditional Hindu Social Order

(1) Social Order in the Śruti

In the last chapter, we noted that Hinduism holds the Veda to be the final authority on Hindu dharma (i.e. socio-religious practices). It is generally held by most scholars that the 'Purūṣasukta' hymn of the Rgveda contains one of the earliest accounts of the traditional social order
of Hinduism. The Puruṣasukta hymn talks of the social order as follows:

Then they dismembered Puruṣa. How many portions did they make? What was his mouth called, what his arms, what his two thighs, and what his feet?

His mouth [mukham] became [āsid] the Brāhmaṇa; and His two arms [bāhu] the Kṣatriya; His thighs [uru] became [krita] the Vaiśya-class. And from His feet [padbhya] the Śūdra sprang [ajayata].

These two stanzas refer to the four fundamental social orders or divisions (varṇas) of Hindu society namely, the Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra. They tell us that these orders or classes (varṇas) originated from the various parts of the body of the all-pervading Puruṣa or God. This means that there is a religious basis for the social order.

According to these stanzas, the Brāhmaṇas, who are imagined to have originated from the mouth or head of the all-pervading Puruṣa, seem to be on top in the Hindu social order, and Śūdras, who are imagined to have originated from the feet, the lowest part of the body of the Puruṣa, seem to be on the lowest rung of the social order. This means that there is a kind of hierarchy in the social order of Hindus. A.B. Keith brings out a far-reaching implication

---

1RV. X.90.11-12, tr. H.D. Griswold, The Religion of The Rigveda, pp. 344-346; Griswold acknowledges his indebtedness to Macdonell, Hillerbrant, Griffith, Scherman, and Deussen in translating the hymn.

of the religious monopoly of the Brāhmaṇas, when he observes on these stanzas:

The mere precision by which the four castes are equated with the appropriate parts of the giant [Purūsa] is clear proof that the ideas found in the hymn have been completely worked over in the interest of the priests. 3

As these stanzas of the hymn of the Rgveda mention the four fundamental divisions of Hindu society, it seems probable that the Rgvedic poets already knew the system which distinguishes the Brāhmaṇa varṇa from other Āryan varṇas -- Kṣatriya and Vaiśya (non-priestly classes) -- and also distinguishes all Āryan varṇas from Śūdra or Dāsa (serf) group which was made up of the aborigines. 4 The Rgveda mentions the four basic social divisions of Hindu society, but it does not talk about criteria or norms of social division. Secondly, the Rgveda does not talk about the ordained and specific duties of every social division (varṇa-dharma). These were tasks which were to be taken up by later writers. 5

The Rgvedic version of the social order is adopted by the later samhitās (i.e. hymn books). The stanzas of the

---

4 Ibid., p. 23.
5 Ibid., p. 23.
Puruṣasukta hymn, stated above, appear in the White Yajurveda and in the Black Yajurveda. These two stanzas and other stanzas of the Puruṣasukta hymn appear in the Atharvaveda which is supposed by scholars to be the latest saṁhitā. The Atharvaveda also begins the theory of social order for it not only mentions the four varṇas but also mentions in a number of hymns the privileges of the Brāhmaṇas (priestly class) and calls them the 'gods' of this earth.

Another division of the Śruti is called 'Brāhmaṇas' which are priestly commentaries on the Vedic rituals. The period of the Brāhmaṇas is a very important one because in it the social order of the four varṇas "assumed definite shape, furnishing the framework within which the highly complex network of the castes of today has been developed."

---


The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa seems to follow the lead of the Atharvaveda in calling the priestly class the 'gods' of the earth:

Verily, there are two kinds of gods; for, indeed, the gods are the gods; and the Brahmans who have studied and teach sacred lore are the human gods. The sacrifice is divided into two kinds: oblations constitute the sacrifice to the gods; and gifts to the priests that to the human gods, the Brahmans who have studied and teach sacred lore. With oblations one gratifies the gods, and with gifts to the priests the human gods, the Brāhmaṇas who have studied and teach sacred lore. Both these kinds of gods, when gratified, place him in a state of bliss (sudhā). 11

The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa goes on heightening the socio-religious position of the Brāhmaṇas (priests) as beings in whom even the deities are incorporated12 and therefore the ones who should be given special respect and dignity.13

The final division of the śruti is called the 'Upaniṣads' which are usually described as philosophical treatises. They undertake the task of developing philosophical theories to account for the social order. The

11 The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, tr. J. Eggeling, ed. F. Max Muller, II.2.2.6, cf. IV.3.4.4.

12 Ibid., XII.4.4.6.

13 Ibid., XI.5.7.1; XIII.1.5.4; cf. XIII.3.5.3; cf. Taittiriya Saṁhitā, II.5.11.9, M. Winternitz, op. cit., p. 199.
Upaniṣads mention sometimes two,¹⁴ three,¹⁵ and four varnas.¹⁶ They hold that these different varnas were created by Brahmā, who was originally only one, as part of his own development.¹⁷ They explain the differences among the four varnas by the theory of karma (i.e. action) and punarjanma (i.e. rebirth as the result of previous actions):

Accordingly, those who are of pleasant conduct here - the prospect is, indeed, that they will enter a pleasant womb, either of the womb of a Brāhmaṇ or a womb of a Kshatriya, or the womb of a Vaiśya. But those who are of stinking conduct here - the prospect is, indeed, that they will enter a stinking womb, either the womb of a dog, or the womb of a swine, or the womb of an outcaste (cāndāla).¹⁸

According to this karma theory, Hindu society is primarily divided into two sections: one formed of those who are born in the pleasant wombs and another formed of those who are


¹⁵‘Chāndogya’ viii.14; ‘Kaushitaki’ ii.9; The Thirteen Principal Upanishads, tr. R.E. Hume.

¹⁶‘Chāndogya’ v.10.7; The Thirteen Principal Upanishads, tr. R.E. Hume.

¹⁷‘Brihad-aranyaka’ i.4.11-15; The Thirteen Principal Upanishads, tr. R.E. Hume.

¹⁸‘Chāndogya’ v.10.7; The Thirteen Principal Upanishads, tr. R.E. Hume.
born in unpleasant wombs. The people born in the pleasant wombs are the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas. The people of these varnas are considered to be of the Āryan race. But the people born in unpleasant wombs seem not to belong to the Āryan race because they are considered to be outcaste (cāṇḍāla). This theory explains these differences between Āryans and non-Āryans on the basis of the merits and demerits (karmaphala) of previous lives and thus justifies the superiority of the Āryan people over the non-Āryan people.

Some Upaniṣads explain the differences among all creatures including human beings by the theory, later identified as a Sāṅkhya theory of the guṇas of Prakṛti:

With the one unborn female, red, white, and black, who produces many creatures like himself, there lies the one unborn male taking his delight. Another unborn male leaves her with whom he has had his delight. 19

The unborn female has three colours: red, white, and black. These colours are identified with the three constituents (guṇas) of Sāṅkhya Prakṛti namely, sattva, rajas, and tamas. 20 According to this guṇa theory, the differences among human beings are due to the three guṇas and their

---


combinations. Thus in the Upaniṣads, we note that there are two theories: the theory of karma-punarjanma and the theory of gunās, which explain differences among Hindu people.

We have noted the four basic divisions (varṇas) of the Hindu social order, the guna and karma theories which explain those social divisions, and attempts to heighten the socio-religious importance of the Brāhmaṇas (i.e. priestly class). We have noted that the Brāhmaṇas have the top position and the Śūdras the lowest position in the social order, according to the Purūṣasukta hymn of the Rgveda.

The name Śūdra seems to be given later to the Dāsas or Dasyus, the original inhabitants, when they were thoroughly subjugated by the Āryans. 21 In a number of hymns, the Āryans invoked their gods to destroy the Dāsas:

Ye smote and slew his Dāsa and his Āryan enemies, and helped Sudās with favour, Īndra-Varuṇa. 22

Demolish thou the Dāsa's might. May we with Īndra's help divide the treasure he hath gathered up. 23


23 Ibid., VIII.40.6, cf. VIII.59.10, tr. R.T.H. Griffith.
In the mid-way of heaven the Sun unyoked his car; the Ārya found a match to meet his Dāsa foe. 24

Sublime from birth, mayst thou O Indra, Hero, with Surya overcome the Dāsa races. 25

These Ṛgvedic verses indicate that the Āryan had to fight with the aborigines of India before they were able to settle down in India. The Dāsas are described in the Ṛgveda as follows:

Indra, thou justifiest us, and tramplest down thy slanderers. Guard thyself, valiant Hero, in thy vital parts; strike down the Dāsa with thy blows. The man who brings no sacrifice, inhuman, godless, infidel, Him let his friend the mountain cast to rapid death, the mountain cast the Dasyu down. 26

Around us is the Dasyu, riteless, void of sense, inhuman, keeping alien laws. Baffle, thou Slayer of the foe, the weapon which this Dāsa wields. 27

These Ṛgvedic verses indicate that the Dāsa or Dasyu were followers of different religious practices and also were ethnically different from the Āryans. The ethnic difference of the Dāsa is noted in another Ṛgvedic hymn:

Day after day far from their seat he drove them, alike, from place to place, those darksome creatures.


26Ibid., VIII.59.10-11, tr. R.T.H. Griffith.

27Ibid., X.22.8.
The Hero slew the meanly-huckstering Dāsas..., where the waters gather. 28

Thus there were racial, religious, and colour differences between the Āryans and the Dāsas. The Āryans were a fair-skin people and the Dāsas a dark-skin people. This colour contrast seemed to have served as the original distinguishing mark of the varṇa vyavasthā (i.e. social order) for the term varṇa means 'colour'. 29 In the varṇa vyavasthā, the varṇa (i.e. class) of the Śūdras is the lowest. It was already argued that the aborigines, originally called Dāsas or Dasyus, were later on called Śūdras by the Āryans after the complete submission of the Dāsas and their acceptance into the Āryan community as serfs (dāsas). The defeated Dāsas were accepted as a servile class (Śūdra) in the Āryan community. 30 However, the Śūdras were on the social periphery.

The Śūdras who were different in race and colour were also different in religious practices. The Āryans who kept the Śūdras on the social periphery also wanted to keep the Śūdras away from the Āryan religion. The Āryans had

---

28RV. VI.47.21.


30 A.A. Macdonell, A History of Saṁskrit Literature, p. 162.
instituted the *upanayana saṃskāra* (i.e. initiation ceremony). After this ceremony, the Āryan males were considered to be qualified to study the Vedas and to do the Vedic rituals. This ceremony was categorically denied to the Śūdras and thereby the Śūdras had no access to the Āryan scriptures and rituals. On the basis of the *upanayana saṃskāra*, Hindu society was sharply divided into *dvijātayāḥ* (twice-born) and *ekajātāḥ* (once-born). These two major divisions of society seem to be similar to the earlier divisions - born in pleasant wombs and born in unpleasant wombs - outlined by the *Upaniṣads*. However, the task of defining *varṇas* strictly on the basis of birth and of setting forth the distinctive features of the later caste system had not yet been completed.

(2) Social Order in the *Smṛti*

It was explained in the last chapter that *Smṛti* means the reflection on the *Śruti* and the *Smṛti* texts include the two epics - the *Mahābhārata* (including the Bhagavadgītā) and the *Rāmāyana* - the *Purāṇas*, and the Dharmasastras (i.e. religious code books). The *Dharmaśāstras* took as their task the responsibility of developing the short statements of the *Śruti* into a complete theory of social order. The *Manusmṛti* is the best known of the *Dharmaśāstras* and is often thought

---

of as the single source of the Hindu social order. It adopts the idea of the varṇa vyavasthā as given in the stanzas of the Purūṣasukta hymn of the Rgveda and expands it as follows:

But [for] in order to protect [preserve, guptyartham] He, the resplendent one, assigned separate (duties and) occupation [prthakkarmāni] to those who sprang [jagām] from his mouth [mukhā], arms [bāhu], thighs [ūru], and feet [pad]. 32

In this stanza, Manu tells us the purpose of creating the four-fold social order and of assigning separate duties to each varṇa. Manu goes ahead and talks of the specific duties of each varṇa:

To Brāhmaṇas he assigned teaching and studying (the Veda) [adhyāpanadhyāyānaṁ], sacrificing for their own benefit and for others [yajanaṁ yajanaṁ], giving and accepting (of alms) [dānaṁ pratigrāhaṁ]. The Kshatriya he commanded to protect the people [prajānāṁ raksanāṁ], to bestow gifts, to offer sacrifices, to study (the Veda), and to abstain from attacking himself of sensual pleasures. To Vaiśya to tend cattle, to bestow gifts, to offer sacrifices, to study (the Veda), to trade [vanikpatam] and to cultivate land [krṣim]. One occupation [karma] only the Lord prescribed [samādiṣat] to the Sudra, to serve meekly [suvrūṣamanasavyā] even these (other) three castes [varṇānaṁ]. 33

This version of the social order, which is found in the Manusmṛti, is also found with only minor modification in

---

32 The Laws of Manu, tr. G. Buhler, ed. F. Max Muller, The Sacred Books of the East, i.87.

33 Ibid., i.88-91.
the other important Dharmaśāstras, e.g. Āpastamba,34 Viṣṇu,35 Vaśiṣṭha,36 and Yajñavalkya,37 etc.

In the version of Manu's social order, Manu assigns six religious duties to the Brāhmaṇas: studying the Vedas and teaching religious knowledge to other Āryan varṇas, doing sacrifices for themselves and doing them on behalf of others, and giving gifts to others and receiving them from others. But Manu withholds from the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas, the other Āryan classes (varṇas), the privileges of teaching religious knowledge to others, of doing sacrifices on behalf of others, and of receiving gifts from others. He especially assigns to the Kṣatriyas the duty of protecting the people and to the Vaiśyas, the duty of cultivating land and trading. He excludes the Śūdras from religious duties such as studying the Vedas, doing sacrifices, and giving gifts but he asks them to serve the three upper varṇas without contempt (anasuyayā).

34 Āpastamba's Aphorisms on the Sacred Law, tr. G. Buhler, ed. F. Max Muller, The Sacred Books of the East, ii.4-7.

35 The Institutes of Vishnu, tr. J. Jolly, ed. F. Max Muller, The Sacred Books of the East, ii.5-14.


37 Yajñavalkya Smṛti, tr. S.C. Vidyarnava, v.118.
It has already been shown how Hindu society was divided into two main blocks of people on the basis of the *upanayana* *sāṃskāra* (i.e. initiation rite); twice-born (*dvija*) and others (viz. Śūdra). Manu maintains this position by calling the three Aryan classes (*varṇas*), 'dvijatayaḥ' (i.e. twice-born) and by calling the Śūdras 'ekajātah' (i.e. once-born).\(^{38}\) As the Śūdras were considered to be the lowest class by the Āryan society, Manu, therefore, calls them 'aṁtajātah' (i.e. lowly born).\(^{39}\) These epithets - ekajātah and aṁtajātah - used with reference to the Śūdras seem to point up the religious and ethnic differences which existed between the Āryans and Dāsas or non-Āryans.

It was also noted that the *upanayana* *sāṃskāra* was traditionally conferred only on the male of the upper *varṇas*. This means that the Āryan women were traditionally excluded from doing Vedic rites and studying the Vedas. Manu reaffirms the Vedic position concerning women as he specifically excludes women from the right to perform religious rites and sacrifices.\(^{40}\)


\(^{39}\) Ibid., i.93.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., ix.36.
The Dharmaśāstras take the task of consolidating the social order as their responsibility. They seem to follow the trend of the Brāhmaṇas (i.e. priestly commentators on the Vedic rituals and religious practices) in seeking to strengthen the socio-religious status of the Brāhmaṇas (i.e. priestly class), when they talk of the lordship of the Brāhmaṇas. The Manusmrți talks of the lordship of the priestly class in the following terms:

As the Brāhmaṇa sprang from (Brahman's) mouth, as he was the first-born, and as he possesses the Veda [Brahman], he is by right [dharmataḥ] the lord of this whole creation. 41

In this stanza, Manu vindicates the lordship of the Brāhmaṇas over all creation, interpreting the Purūšasukta hymn of the Rgveda in the interest of the priestly class. He also justifies the lordship of the Brāhmaṇas over other varṇas (classes) in these words:

On account of his pre-eminence [vaiśeṣyāt], on account of the superiority of his origin [prakṛtiśreṣṭhyāt], on account of his observance of (particular) sanctification the Brāhmaṇa is the lord [prabhu] of all castes [varṇa]. 42

Thus the Manusmrți accords the lordship of creation and of

41 The Laws of Manu, tr. G. Buhler, ed. F. Max Muller, The Sacred Books of the East, i.93.

42 Ibid., x.3; cf. The Institutes of Vishnu, tr. J. Jolly, ed. F. Max Muller, The Sacred Books of the East, lxviii.31.
the social order to the Brāhmaṇas. It goes on vindicating the highest position of the Brāhmaṇas saying that 'the very birth of a Brāhmaṇa is an eternal incarnation of the sacred law [utnattireva viprasya mūrtirdharmasya sasvati], ⁴³ or 'a Brāhmaṇa by the very fact of his birth is an object of honour even to the deities', ⁴⁴ 'a Brāhmaṇa, be he ignorant or learned, is a great divinity', ⁴⁵ and 'though Brāhmaṇas employ themselves in all (sorts of) mean occupations, they must be honoured in every way; for (each of) them is a very great deity'. ⁴⁶ In these verses, Manu insists that there is a religious significance to the life of the Brāhmaṇas strictly on the basis of their birth. As Manu ascribes religious significance to the life of the Brāhmaṇas in terms of their physical birth, he seems to introduce the principle that varṇa is determined by one's birth.

Manu also enhances the social position of the Brāhmaṇas by saying that a Brāhmaṇa determines the duties of other varṇas (or castes), and by asking the Kṣatriyas to be guided by the Brāhmaṇas in all matters of administration, ⁴⁷

---

⁴³The Laws of Manu, tr. G. Buhler, ed. F. Max Muller, The Sacred Books of the East, i.98.
⁴⁴Ibid., x.84.
⁴⁵Ibid., ix.317.
⁴⁶Ibid., ix.319.
⁴⁷Ibid., x.2.
and by asking the upper castes - the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas - to force the lower castes - the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras - to do their social duties lest negligence of these duties bring about complete disorder. In brief, Manu set forth the lordship (prabhutva) of the Brāhmaṇas and thereby subjects secular power to religious authority. This position made the Brāhmaṇas religiously and socially superior to all.

It has already been shown that Manu calls the Śūdras 'aṇṭajātah' (i.e. lowly born) because they were considered the lowest class (varṇa) by the Āryans. This implies that the varṇa of the Śūdras was determined by their physical birth. Manu brings out the implications of the principle, varṇa by birth, in the case of the Śūdras, as follows:

But a Śūdra, whether bought or unbought, he may compel to do a servile work [dāsyamḥ]; for he was created [srṣṭah] by the Self-existent [śvayaṁbhuh] to be the slave of a Brāhmaṇa.

A Śūdra, though emancipated by his master, is not released from servitude; since that is innate [nisargajam] in him, who can set him free from it?

In these stanzas, Manu says that a Śūdra is created by god to be a slave of a Brāhmaṇa and servitude is intrinsically in him. In other words, a Śūdra is a slave by birth and


49 Ibid., viii.413-414.
remains a slave throughout his life and nothing changes his position. A Śūdra remains in the lowest position in the social order.

Having accorded the highest religio-social status to the Brāhmaṇas and the lowest status to the Śūdras, the Dharmāsāstras define the position or status of the other two varṇas in the religio-social hierarchy as follows:

(There are) four castes - Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiṣyas, and Śūdras. Among these, each preceding (caste) is superior by birth to the one following. 50

This stanza clearly states the principle that a varṇa of a Hindu is determined in terms of his biological birth and natural heredity, and also the status of a Hindu in the religio-social hierarchical social order is determined by that birth. Fixing a varṇa of a Hindu by birth and natural heredity seems to be a significant contribution of the Dharmāsāstras in the development and solidification of the caste system.

In the foregoing discussion, we have shown the role of the Dharmāsāstras in the development of the social order. They specifically prescribed duties for each varṇa in order to run Hindu society properly. They reinforced the principle of varṇa in terms of the natural birth of a Hindu. They contributed to the solidification of the religio-social

---

hierarchy by vindicating the religio-social status of the Brāhmaṇas in terms of their birth. As the Dharmaśāstras determined the social and religious status of a Hindu in terms of his birth in a social order which is religiously and socially hierarchical, the result of this doctrine would be (i) social separation or exclusion of one varṇa or caste from another, (ii) emphasis on one's rights and privileges rather than duties, and (iii) social immobility and rigidity.

(3) Social Order in the Bhagavadgītā

We first dealt with the contribution of the Dharmaśāstras to the development of social order because their line of thought was in accord with the Brāhmaṇas which are generally supposed to be composed before the Upaniṣads. Having dealt with the contribution of the Dharmaśāstras, we will proceed to examine the position of the Bhagavadgītā which seems to take a different position from that of the Dharmaśāstras and which seems to take a position more in line with the Upaniṣads which are generally supposed to be composed after the Brāhmaṇas.

The Gītā which is included in the Smṛti texts has occupied a special position among Hindu scriptures. It was shown in the last chapter that the Gītā is sometimes given an equal status with the four Vedas (Śruti). 51

51 vide, pp. 80f.
Therefore, the Gītā's ideas about social order must be considered to be important. Moreover, St. Jñāneśvar gives the Gītā a position higher than the Veda\(^{52}\) and Tīlāk follows Jñāneśvar in this. \(^{53}\) Therefore, the Gītā's ideas about social order are important for us.

The Gītā explains how the four-fold social order came into being in these words:

\[\text{I [the Blessed Lord] have created the four varṇas (cāturvarṇyām) according to the division of aptitude and action (or functions) (gunakarma-vibhāgāsāḥ)....}^{54}\]

According to the Gītā, the four-fold social order called cāturvarṇyām or varṇa vyavasthā is formed on the basis of divisions of karma (i.e. duties or functions) and gunas (i.e. qualities, aptitude, or strand). In the Gītā's theory of social order we find a combination of the karma and guna theories which were held by the Upaniṣads and which we have discussed earlier.

The Gītā elsewhere talks about the four varṇas and their duties and qualities:

Of Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, O Paramātapa, the duties are distributed according to the Strands [gunas] which prevail in the nature

\(^{52}\) Vide, pp. 80f.

\(^{53}\) Vide, pp. 119ff.

\(^{54}\) BG. iv.13.
of each [svabhāvaprabhava]. Quietude, self-restraint, austerity, cleanness, longsuffering, and uprightness, knowledge, experience, and belief, are the Brāhmaṇa's duties [karma], born of his nature [svabhāvajam]. Bravery, spirit, constancy, adroitness, and courage to face the foe, generosity and lordliness, are the Kṣatriya's duties [karma], born of his nature. Tilling the soil, herding cows, and commerce, are the Vaiśya's duties [karma], born of his nature; and of a Śūdra service is the proper duty, born of his nature [svabhāvajam].

In these verses, the Gītā repeats its theory that the four-fold social order is due to the divisions of karma and guṇas. As the Gītā tries to reaffirm the guṇa-karma theory about the social order, it follows the Upaniṣadic philosophical trend.

It seems that the Gītā does not subscribe to the view that varṇa is determined by birth, the view held by the Dharmaśāstras. Therefore, it differs from the Dharma-śāstras in a significant way on the issue of the proper social order. The Gītā is a part of the Mahābhārata and the Gītā seems to share the general view of the Mahābhārata on this issue. The Mahābhārata holds a theory that not birth, but virtuous life, makes one a Brāhmaṇa:


56 A Source Book in Indian Philosophy, ed. S. Radhakrishnan and C.A. Moore, p. 119.
I certainly consider you (butcher) even now as a Brahmin, because a Brahmin who is proud and does wrong and follows evil practices, is not better than a Sudra. The Sudra who has dharma, truth, and self-control, I take to be a Brahmin. A man becomes a Brahmin by his deeds; bad deeds drive him to a terrible doom.

In these verses, emphasis is on qualities rather than on birth. The Gītā's guna-karma theory seems to be in accord not only with the Upaniṣads but also with the Mahābhārata.

B) Actual Social Order of Hindu Society

According to the Hindu scriptures, Hindu society should have been divided into four fundamental orders (varnas) and the existing social groups should be classified under the four fundamental orders. But this is not carried out in practice because in fact Hindu society has hundreds of groups and it includes groups which are considered aprēya or untouchable which were nowhere part of the theory. As the untouchable castes claim to be Hindus, they form a fifth fundamental order of Hindu society. This means that Hindu society seems to be actually divided into five fundamental social categories. As Hinduism recognizes only four fundamental categories and does not recognize the fifth category in theory, they would remain outside the fold of Hinduism as Sudras remained outside the fold of

the Āryan twice-born (dvijas) society. 58

Hindu society is actually divided into many castes. The problem of how the hundreds of groups called jātis came into being has been discussed by many scholars without arriving at an agreed conclusion. Some scholars attempt to explain the phenomenon by a theory called the traditional theory of caste or Hindu theory of caste. 59 According to the traditional theory the caste system (jāti vyavasthā) emerged out of the traditional four-fold theory (cāturvarṇa vyavasthā). This theory seems to be helpful to the extent that it throws light on the problem of why the actual system has some features of the theoretical system. The caste system, like the varṇa system, is hierarchical. The Brāhmaṇas are on the top, 60 but the untouchables rather than the Śūdras are on the lowest rung. 61 The principle of


60 L. Dumont, op. cit., p. 73.

jāti-dharma (i.e. doing one's caste-duty) is similar to the 'svadharma' of the varṇa vyavasthā in the sense that these principles have religious connotations rather than purely economic ones. The caste system, like the varṇa vyavasthā, divides society into different groups and keeps them separate from each other by rules and yet at the same time it asks the groups to work together towards the common goal of the wellbeing of all.

While the caste system seems to have derived these features from the varṇa vyavasthā, the caste system also has its distinctive feature: a birth criterion. According to this arrangement the jāt or jāti (caste) of every individual is solely and permanently determined by his biological birth and heredity, irrespective of his good and bad qualities (guṇas). As the jāti vyavasthā is based solely on birth and heredity it is characterized by the rigidity with which it divides the society into birth-ascribed groups. It strictly separates one caste from another by restrictions such as endogamy, commensality, and traditional or inherited occupations. In addition, as the jāti vyavasthā is rigidly

62 (Eds.) A. de Reuck and J. Knight, op. cit., p. 34.
63 L. Dumont, op. cit., pp. 9, 92.
64 Ibid., p. 74.
hierarchical, it stands for social inequality, it extends the Dharmástras' regulations by insisting on the non-admittance of the lower castes into temples, and the total prohibition of the learning of scriptures by the lower castes.66

The játi vyavasthā, even if it has evolved out of the varṇa vyavasthā, has a distinctive emphasis on birth and heredity. Scholars point out a difference of emphasis between varṇa vyavathā and játi vyavathā. P.V. Kane observes that the játi vyavasthā lays all emphasis on birth and heredity; and it tends to create the attitude of clinging to rights and privileges without fulfilling duties corresponding to the privileges and rights.67 L. Dumont agrees with Kane68 and says, "heredity is more important than function, which is true of caste but not of the varṇa"69 and again says, "the feature [of the varṇa vyavasthā] which most constrasts with the caste-system is perhaps the stress laid on function rather than birth."70 Thus Kane and Dumont point out a

---

67 P.V. Kane, op. cit., I, part 1, pp. 54f.
69 Ibid., p. 74.
70 Ibid., p. 69.
difference of emphasis in the varṇa vyavasthā and the jāti vyavasthā.

C) The Maratha Saints and Social Order

We first studied the position of the Śruti - Vedic Samhitās, Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads, and of the Smṛti - Dharma-sāstras and the Gitā on the social order and their contribution to the development of the ideas of the social order. We then studied the jāti vyavasthā which seems to have evolved out of the theory of the varṇa vyavasthā and saw a difference of emphasis between the varṇa vyavasthā and the jāti vyavasthā. The Marāṭhā saints had these scriptural traditions (i.e. Śruti and Smṛti literature) in front of them and were confronted with the actual caste system and its social and religious effects on the life of Hindus. We must now proceed to examine how the Marāṭhā saints interpreted the Hindu scriptures on this matter and how they thought about the caste system and its practical implications. Let us begin with Jñāneśvar, the founder of the Vārkari Saṃpradāya. 71

(1) St. Jñāneśvar and Social Order

We have already shown that the Gitā explains the four-fold social order in terms of the guṇa-karma theory. Jñāneśvar's commentary on the same crucial verses of the

71 M.G. Panse, op. cit., p. 149.
Gītā (xviii. 41-44) will serve to give us his ideas of the social order. In his commentary on the Gītā xviii.41, he talks about the cāturvarṇa vyavasthā as follows:

Among the four varṇas, the Brāhmaṇas are head (mukhyya) and foremost (dhurece). The other two are the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas; they also should be respected (mānī) as the Brāhmaṇas are respected (brāhmaṇānci mānīye); they are worthy (yogya) because they (too) have the right to do Vedic rites (vaidikavidhāni). O Dhananjay, the fourth is the Sūdra varṇa; this varṇa has certainly (kīr) no access (lāg) to the Vedas. However, his vṛtti (i.e. conduct, profession) is (rather) dependent on the three other varṇas. The Sūdras became the fourth varṇa because they were close (javalika) to the three varṇas - Brāhmaṇas and others - due to their profession (vṛtticiyā). The Śruti accepts the Sūdras because they are with the twice-born (dvijasaṅge) just as a noble man accepts (turambīje, lit. smells) the threads (tāntu) because it is with the flowers. O Pārtha, this is the order (vyavasthā) of four varṇas....

In these verses, Jñānesvar seems to acknowledge the prominence of the Brāhmaṇas in society. The religio-social prominence of the Brāhmaṇas, as already shown, had been set forth by the Dharmaśāstras in particular. The Dharmaśāstras have made the Brāhmaṇas superior to the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas - varṇas which were also of Āryan origin - by emphasizing the distinctive privileges of the Brāhmaṇas over the other varṇas and also by ascribing religious significance to being born in the Brāhmaṇa caste. As Jñānesvar acknowledges the prominence of the Brāhmaṇas, a question

72 Jñ. xviii. 818-823.
arises whether he endorses the entire position of the Dharmāśastras on this matter. In his commentary, cited above, he does not say that the Brāhmaṇas are superior to the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas and does not ask for special treatment of the Brāhmaṇas. He rather says that the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas should be respected as the Brāhmaṇas are respected. This seems to mean that they have more or less equal respect (mān). He thus differs from the position taken by the Dharmāśastras in enhancing the religio-social position of the Brāhmaṇas over other varṇas.

In the quotation, cited above, Jñānesvar argues for equal respect to the three upper varṇas on the basis of their having a common right to do the Vedic rites. He seems to find here a common ground of social unity. He, therefore, differs from the Dharmāśastras which sought grounds for justifying the distinctive privileges of each varṇa and the consequent separation and exclusion of one varṇa from another. Jñānesvar's exploring the common ground of social unity implies his intention of unifying society rather than maintaining strict social divisions. His intention of unifying society becomes even more clear when he says that the Śūdras should be included in the varṇa vyavasthā. In his commentary, mentioned above, he says that according to the Śruti the Śūdras are accepted into society
because of their closeness (jāvalika) to the twice-born, even though they have no access to the Vedas. Jñāneśvar's emphasis is on the acceptance of the Śūdras rather than their being treated as a separate and isolated group. He seems to differ sharply from the Dharmaśāstras on the question of the treatment of the Śūdras.

Jñāneśvar reaffirms the Gītā's guṇa-karma theory of social order when he adds in his comments on the Gīta xviii.41:

Prakṛti, which resides in the Self, has three qualities (guṇas) - sattva and other guṇas. It has divided four duties (karme) among the four varṇas. The guṇas of Prakṛti have divided (velhavani) duties of the four varṇas. The sattva guṇa, in its various divisions (sāminaniminbhāgī, lit. equal and unequal divisions), has appointed (niyogi) both the Brahmāṇas and the Kṣatriyas. The Vāsāyas are due to the mixture of sattva and rajas and the Śūdras are due to the mixture rajas and tamas guṇas. O enlightened one, know that four-fold (caturvarṇadhā) order is made for human beings (prāṇivṛndā) by guṇas. 73

In these verses, Jñāneśvar explains how the four varṇas came into being out of the mixture of the three guṇas of Prakṛti and says that four duties were divided among four varṇas according to the guṇas of Prakṛti. His reference to the four duties of the four varṇas has to be understood as the three common duties - yajāṅ, adhyayana, and dāna - of the twice-born and serving the three varṇas as a duty of the Śūdras. 74

73 Jñ. xviii. 825-830.
74 Ibid., xiii. 883f.
Here he seems to emphasize again the common grounds of social unity rather than the specific duties of each varna which tend to divide society. Jñāneśvar's intention of emphasizing the common ground was pointed out before.

In the verses, cited above, Jñāneśvar affirms the Gītā's theory that the social order is based on the division of the three guṇas of Prakṛti and on the division of duties according to the guṇas. He reaffirms this theory of the social order when he comments on the Gītā iv.13, as follows:

Now, understand thus that I (Kṛṣṇa) created the four varṇas according to the division of the guṇas (aptitudes) and karma (duties or actions). The duties were assigned (vivānicile, lit. explained) on the basis of Prakṛti and the mixture (vyabhicāre) of the guṇas. 75

Jñāneśvar goes on emphasizing the qualities of each varna, as the Gītā does, in his commentary on verses xviii. 42-44. 76 In brief, he follows the Gītā's theory of social order, viz. the guṇa-karma theory, very closely.

As Jñāneśvar upholds the Gītā's theory of social order, he seems to differ from the theory of the Dharmaśāstras about social order, viz. varna by janma (birth), as we discussed before that the Gītā differs from the Dharmaśāstras on this problem.

---

75 Jñ. iv. 77-78.
76 Ibid., xviii. 833-884.
As Jñānesvar upholds the gupa-karma theory of social order, he does, of course, recognize the distinctions among the varṇas. Even though he recognizes such distinctions, however, he does not regard them as absolute for he considers bhaktimārga (i.e. way of devotion) to be a religious means to level all such distinctions. Commenting on the Gītā ix.32, he argues:

As long as brooks and water-streams do not reach the Ganges, (they are different); when they reach it they become identical with the Ganges (gangārūp). Are not Khair [a kind of tree] and sandal considered to be different (vivācanā) woods until they are put together in fire? Similarly, the Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, low-born (aṁṭaja), women, and others are considered to be different castes (jāti), until they have reached me. When they are united (mānale) with me by their faith (bhāv), their differences as castes and individuals are dissolved (bindule), even as the salt dissolves when it is put into an ocean. 77

In these verses, Jñānesvar seems to think of the bhaktimārga as a way of dissolving social distinctions including not only the four varṇas but also the distinction between out-caste and caste, and man and woman as well. This seems to mean that the bhaktimārga is intended to create a spirit in which social distinctions are forgotten and all feel part of a common society under a common deity. His actual intention of uniting the different castes under the umbrella

77 Jñ. ix. 458-461.
of bhaktimārga becomes clear when he asks people to give up the practices which cause social isolation and dissension:

Do not give up faith (bhāv) but give up doubts (sandeh) and always cry (ṭāho phoqi) in the name of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. (Discard ideas) of caste (jāt), wealth, family (got), ancestry (kul), character, and reputation, and worship (God), being filled with (pious) feelings (bhāvanāyuktā). Jñānesvar has Rāma and Kṛṣṇa in his mind therefore he abides in the world of God (vaikunṭha).

Jñānesvar repeats the idea of giving up pride in caste and pride in knowledge, and provides a religious rationale for his argument when he comments on the Gītā ix. 31-32:

Neither purity of family (kul) nor noble birth (abhijātya) is required. Why should we bear the burden of knowledge in vain? If they have no devotion (bhāv), (everything of theirs) becomes meaningless (pālhāl).... They might be born in sinful families (pāpayoni), they might be stupid (srutadhita), but if they are devoted to me entirely (sarvabhāve), they do not lack (tuṭi nāḥi) when they are compared with me.... Actually (Pralhāda) was born in the family of a daitya (barbarian) but Iñdra could not excel him. Therefore, devotion excels; and caste (jāti) is not a standard (apramāṇ) [in judging an individual].

In these verses, Jñānesvar argues that people should not be proud of the purity of their family line, of being born in the upper castes (viz. noble birth), of having knowledge,
and of having the worldly things which give them a sense of superiority over others. He tells them to give up these matters of pride because they are worthless if possessors of them have no devotion (bhāv). He tells them that God takes into account the devotion (bhāv) of His devotees only, and He does not think of the other factors which are responsible for giving superior status to people. He goes on to tell the people that in the sight of God a person who is born in a lower caste and has devotion (bhāv) can excel another person born in an upper caste. He then emphatically argues that devotion (bhakti) is the only standard of excellence, not caste (jāti):

Therefore, family (kul), caste (jāti), and social order (varna) and all these (avagheci) are not instrumental (akāraṇ). O Arjuna, attaining my being (māzepaṇ) is the only fulfillment (sārthak) (of life). 80

Commenting on these verses, a Marāṭhā writer says that this kind of thinking is non-conformist (bandakhor) in a manner of speaking for it opposes a traditional idea (paramārik vicār). 81 The traditional idea, as shown in our discussion about the Dharmaśāstras, was that the socio-religious worth of an individual was determined in terms of his birth in a

80 Jñ. ix. 456.

81 N. N. Relekar, H. V. Inamdar, N. D. Mirajkar, eds., op. cit., p. 751.
hierarchical caste system. In the verses cited above, Jñāneśvar says that devotion (bhāv) is the only criterion for judging the worth of an individual and all devotees, irrespective of their castes, can attain the same spiritual status.

From the foregoing discussion, we can conclude that Jñāneśvar differs from the teachings of the Dharmasāstras on the following issues. First, it was shown that the Dharmasāstras vindicate the highest social position of the Brāhmaṇas because of their birth, ritualistic purity, and their scriptural knowledge; the Dharmasāstras assign the lowest position to the Śūdras because of their birth, ritualistic impurity, and their lack of Vedic knowledge. They seem to consider the social hierarchy to be an outward form of the religious condition of individuals. In short, they uphold the theory according to which birth is the sole basis of social order. But Jñāneśvar differs from the Dharmasāstras because he upholds the guṇa-karma theory of social order rather than the janma theory. Because of the guṇa-karma theory, Jñāneśvar also differs from the Dharmasāstras on the other issues referred to above. He does not ascribe importance to being born in the upper castes or to having scriptural knowledge as far as liberation (mukti or sārthak) is concerned. He argues that a Śūdra can excel
an upper caste person in religious worth. In other words, for Jñānesvar, social inferiority is not an expression of inherent religious condition and social superiority is not necessarily expressive of religious superiority. He thus distinguishes between social position and religious condition. Secondly, Jñānesvar differs from the teachings of the Dharmaśāstras because he ascribes more importance to bhāv (devotion) than to birth. As he argues that bhāv is the only criterion in judging the religious worth of man, he seems to be inclined towards relativizing the rigid hierarchical caste system. Because of this inclination, he differs from the Dharmaśāstras on other social concerns. He emphasizes the common ground of social unity rather than special privileges and strict social divisions. He sees bhakti as a religious force which levels all social distinctions and creates a spirit in which social distinctions are forgotten and all feel part of a homogenous society under a common deity.

These differences, which Jñānesvar held with the teaching of the Dharmaśāstras, seem to have appealed to the people belonging to the lower castes and particularly to the untouchable castes. The Vārkarī Sampradāya gained devotees from all castes, creeds, and sexes. Its doors were open to anyone. Many of the devotees eventually became
saints of the Sampradāya. Some of the saints were from castes traditionally grouped under the Śūdra varṇa, e.g. Gorā Kumābhār (A.D. 1267-1317), Sāhvata Mālī (A.D. 1350-1395), and Narahari Sonār (died in A.D. 1313). Some of the saints were even from the castes traditionally grouped under the untouchables, e.g. Visobā Khecar (died in A.D. 1309), Cokhameḷā Mahār (died in A.D. 1333), Rohidās Cāṃbhār, etc. Some of the saints were women, e.g. Muktābāī (A.D. 1279-1297), Janābāī (died in A.D. 1350), Nirmālā, and Kānhopāṭrā, etc. Some of the saints were even Muslims, e.g. Sajan Kasāī, Dādu Piṅjārī, Sheikh Mahamud. Thus the Vārkarī Sampradāya in actual practice opened the door of liberation to people of whatever caste, creed, and sex. Secondly, the Vārkarī Sampradāya gave canonical status to the writings of the saints who belonged to the lower castes and even the untouchable castes. Recognizing the sainthood of devotees belonging to the lowest castes and giving canonical status to their writings was a very radical step.

---


to take at a time when Hindu society, dominated and led
by the Brāhmaṇas, denied all religious rights to the lowest
castes, including entering temples, reading Hindu scrip-
tures, and writing on religious matters. The stand of the
Vārkarī Saṃpradāya was taken in order to extend the right
of religious pursuit to those who were socially neglected
and degraded, to give them education and to uplift them
socially. In other words, the Vārkarī Saṃpradāya, through
the teaching of the Bhāgavat Dharma, brought about a
modification of the position set forth in the Dharmaśāstras.

We have summarized above how Jñāneśvar differed
from the Dharmaśāstras on the major issues about social
order and we have also shown how the Vārkarī Saṃpradāya
attempted to modify the position set down in the Dharma-
śāstras. Now we should proceed to examine Jñāneśvar's
teachings about ordained social duties (svadharma).

Jñāneśvar, in his commentary on the Gītā xviii.41,
takes a position similar to that of the Gītā, in holding
that the varṇa dharma (i.e. socio-religious duties of the
varṇas) is divided on the basis of the guṇas of Prakṛti:

Prakṛti has three guṇas namely, sattva and the
other guṇas. It has divided the duties among the
four varṇas. As a father assigns (duties) to his
sons, as the sun divided the road for the travellers,
and as a lord assigns different duties to his ser-
vants, so the guṇas of Prakṛti have divided the
duties among the four varṇas. 85

85 Jñ. xviii. 825-827.
In these verses, Jñāneśvar says that the duties are divided on the basis of the guṇas of Prakṛti. He differs from the Dharmasastras on this issue because he does not accept the view that duties are determined by birth (janma).

Jñāneśvar exhorts people to verify their duties and to discharge them, when he comments on the Gītā xviii. 45:

It is proper for rain to mingle with the water of a river and it is proper for the river to merge with an ocean. Similarly, the duties assigned to vārṇa and ṣārāma (vargāṣramavāse) should be (properly) discharged. (It is as natural) as white colour of white body. These naturally ordained duties (svabhāvavihita karma) should be verified by the scriptures which set criteria (pramā) for day-to-day conduct. 86

Jñāneśvar here exhorts the reader to discharge the natural duties spontaneously as the river merges with an ocean naturally. This implies that there is no necessity of external force to enforce duties. Jñāneśvar differs from the Dharmasastras which asked the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas to force the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras to do their duties.

Jñāneśvar's emphasis on discharging one's ordained duties (svadharma) is also found in his commentary on the Gītā iii.10:

I (Krṣṇa) have ordained your duties (svadharma) according to your specific vārṇa. If you follow

---

86 Jñ. xviii. 886-888.
(upāsā) them, your desire will automatically be fulfilled. [If you do not follow them] you need not do any self-imposed religious observances (vrat) or obligatory religious observances (niyam); you need not chastise your body or go to distant holy places. 87

These verses glorify discharging one's natural duties (svadharma) over other means, saying that if one does his ordained duties he need not follow other means of liberation. Jñānēśvar, like the Gītā ii.47, says that one should not abandon one's appointed duties but should do them disinterestedly (hetuvip). 88 Jñānēśvar develops the principles of doing duties, called saṅkalpasamnyāsa (i.e. renunciation of selfish desires) and brahmasamarpana (i.e. dedication of actions and the fruit thereof to the deity) in the light of the teaching of the Gītā. These principles are discussed in the final chapter. 89 It suffices to say that Jñānēśvar develops his philosophy of action in accordance with the Gītā rather than in accordance with the Dharmaśāstras.

(2) St. Tukārām and the Social Order

Tukārām talks about the origin and relativity of the varṇa vyavathā in the following poems:

---

87 Jñ. iii. 88-89.
88 Ibid. ii. 266.
89 Vide, pp. 317-319, 325.
I declare the secrets in the presence of saints. Listen to the actions (karme) ordained by the Vedas (vedaviihit). The four varṇas sprang from One's body (ekāciye āngi), divided according to merits and sins (pāpapunya bhāgi). At the initial stage, there was no distinction (bhed) such as top (ādi), middle (maddhya), and bottom (anta). Mango, jujube, banian, and sandal are different in quality (guptgupa) but they are one (viz. not different) (ek) for fire. Tukārām says, 'I shall observe duties prescribed by the Vedas (vidhi) as convenience (soy) until my mind escapes from the consciousness of personality and is swallowed up in the deity (man unman jo hoy)'.

Again,

God intervened and he completely removed (nivārilā) languor (śīq) of sacred and profane (śubha-aśubhā). Individual self and God (jivaśiva) played a children's game (bhātuke) and created this wonder (kautuk), the world here (yethe loke) which is an illusion (Abhāsa) and which is not eternal (anitya). The world is in fact filled with Viśnu (visnumay jag). In this world, relationship (lāg) is made obligatory, and divisions are made (vaṭile); duties of varṇas (varṇadharmā) are like a play (khej). All this is the texture (vin) of One only. Why then are there differences and non-difference (bhinnā-bhinna)? God Nārāyaṇa, who is the Purūṣa of the Vedas (vedapurūṣa), decided (nivāda kela) so. Tukārām tested His grace (prasād), he is at His feet closely and he is not different from Him (navhe nirāla).

In these poems, Tukārām seems to be alluding to the Purūṣasukta hymn of the Rgveda because he refers to the Purūṣa of the Veda out of whom the varṇa vyavasthā came into being. He says that the different varṇas came out

90 Sri Tukārām Mahārājānîce Abhaṅg, Śri Sakal Sant Gāthā, 970.

91 Ibid., 210.
of the One. This means that Tukārām, like Jñāneśvar, recognizes the religious basis of the varṇa vyavathā and the qualitative differences of the four varṇas which exist at present. He holds, however, that these differences are not absolute because they were not at the initial stage and they are not important to God as fire does not treat one kind of wood differently from another. Secondly, Tukārām says that the different varṇas are determined according to the balance of merit and sin (pāpapunya). The concept of pāpapunya is a popular expression of the karma theory. This means that Tukārām holds the view that the social order is explained in terms of the karma theory. Thirdly, Tukārām talks about the top, middle and bottom of the social order and thus seems to suggest that he accepts a view of social hierarchy. Finally, Tukārām says that he will do the prescribed duties only as convenience (soy) till his mind transcends and becomes one with the deity (man unman jo hoye). These are the main ideas about the social order in Tukārām's theology. Let us see how these ideas are elaborated.

Tukārām holds a hierarchical view of the social order. He talks about the hierarchical social order in the following poem:

The chief honour belongs to the one at the head; the rest are esteemed according to certain rules;
there is a scale, as when large and small vessels are arranged in a pyramid. Tukā says, Go on worshipping them; no one can be angry with you; they will diffuse light in their own proper place. 92

The word 'pyramid' implies an idea of hierarchical social order. Tukārām explains the hierarchical social order in terms of traditional philosophical theories, as follows:

Look, O God, what mankind are like, each differing according to his store of merit. No one resembles another; men show themselves pure or base. In each the five elements form a single heap; how the threads set them dancing! Tukā says, Each finds himself in a position according to his nature. 93

In this poem, Tukārām tells us that individual differences are due to one's merit or karma and each individual is made out of the five elements of (Prakṛti) which determine his nature. An individual's position in the social order is dependent on the kind of nature he has. In other words, Tukārām holds a view that the social order is to be explained in terms of the guṇa-karma theory. It seems that Tukārām agrees with Jñāneśvar about the basis of the social order.

Tukārām, like Jñāneśvar, also acknowledges the prominence of the Brāhmaṇas in society. It was already

92 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser and K.B. Marathe, 1170.

93 Ibid., 2960.
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shown, however, that Jñānesvar does not consider the 
Brāhmaṇas to be superior because of their birth. Tukārām 
seems to agree with Jñānesvar when he talks about who 
should be considered a Brāhmaṇa:

Listen to the Śruti; it says that he is not a 
Brāhmaṇa who does not like praise (kirtan) of the 
name of Hari and dancing of the devotees of Viṣṇu. 
In fact, [such a Brāhmaṇa] was conceived of his' 
mother's adultery with a lowest person (aṅtaja)...
Certainly consider him a Brāhmaṇa, even though he 
is born in the lowest caste (aṅtaja), who utters 
correctly the name of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa and remembers 
his brown form (sāvale rūp). He is characterized 
by inner peace, forgiveness, and mercy and shows 
courage at the time of praising god (abhaṅg 
prasaṅgi). A person who has given up six evil 
emotions-[passionate desire (kama), anger (krodha), 
pride (mada), temptation (moha), greed (lobha), 
and envy (matsara)] - is a real Brāhmaṇa. 95

In this poem, Tukārām argues that religious qualities make 
a person a true Brāhmaṇa, whatever be his caste by birth, 
and a person born in the Brāhmaṇa caste should be considered 
a low person if he has no religious qualities. This means 
that religious qualities (gunaś) rather than biological 
birth are the criteria of the ideal social order, according 
to Tukārām. Tukārām's emphasis on religious qualities and 
especially on devotion as a criterion of the social order 
becomes clear to us when he defines who is twice-born 
(dvija):

95Śri Tukārām Mahārājāhce Abhaṅg 848-849.
He who delights in reciting the name of God (Harināma) is very pure (suci). He who meditates on the name of God is the twice-born (dvija)...

On the same religious basis, Tukārām condemns a Brāhmaṇa because of lack of devotion and praises a low born person because of it:

Shame on a Brāhmaṇa who is void of devotion [abhakta]. Blessed is the Vaishnava who is a Chamar [cobbler]; his image [kul yāti, i.e. family and caste] is pure [śuddha] on both sides. So the Purāṇas have decreed [nivāga jālāse]; this is not a private opinion of my own. Tukā says, Cursed be their self-conceit [thorapā, i.e. greatness]; may I never behold a bad man [durjana] of that kind.

In short, Tukārām uses the guṇa-karma theory to explain the ideal social order; he does not consider birth a determining factor in an individual's position in the ideal social order. He is in general accord with Jñānesvār on these matters.

We have already shown that Jñānesvār does not justify the special privileges of the twice-born but rather emphasizes the common rights of all with a view to unifying society. Tukārām again follows Jñānesvār when he similarly emphasizes the common rights of all people:

He who talks of castes (yāti) of devotees of Viṣṇu falls into hell (kumbhāpakī). The Vedas

---

96 Śrī Tukārām Mahārājānāce Abhaṅ 1062. 1-2.
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and the Purāṇas declare that these faults (duṣandes) are not true in the case of the devotees of Hari. They are dear to Nārāyaṇa; one should not talk of them belonging to higher and lower varṇa. All four varṇas have a right (adhiikār). When they start worshipping God their defects (doṣ) go away. It is like the fact that a sāligram [i.e. consecrated black stone] is not called a stone because it becomes respectable to all.... Those who are devoted to the name of Rāma become themselves like gods (devarūp). 98

Again,

The essence of all scriptures, the bursting forth (gavhar) of the Veda, and the idea (vicār) of the Purāṇas is that the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Cāndālas, children, men and women, prostitutes and all have the right (adhiikār). Tukārām says, "I have experienced the fact that many devoted people experience bliss (sukh). 99

In these poems, Tukārām talks of a common right, acknowledged and emphasized by bhaktimārga, to worship God and to work out liberation. He also says in one of the poems that devotees of God do not belong to any varṇa because they transcend caste limitations when they worship God. Tukārām goes on describing how the bhaktimārga of the Vārkari Saṁpradāya makes devotees forget their differences:

They play on the sandy banks of the river (vālvaṇṭi); the devotees of Viṣṇu dance speedily; they have forgotten anger and pride; one prostrates to another.... They are merged in contemplation (samādhi); they seem to be foolish to other people. To devotees (siddhasādhaka), a

98 Sri Tukārām Mahārājānce Abhaṅg 3354.
99 Ibid., 308. 4-6.
learned person, a scholar, a yogi, and a great soul are identical (ekaci). They have forgotten pride in varna and in caste (yati); one prostrates to another.... Tukārām says that the way of liberation is made easy. 100

Tukārām repeats the idea in other poems, like this:

We have forgotten our castes and the four varṇas became one. They have become one by the bliss of Kṛṣṇa; they will certainly play childish games. 101

Tukārām elaborates this idea saying that God does not observe distinctions such as social status, profession, and caste:

With thee...there is no distinction; kings and clowns are equal at the feet of God. 102

Again,

Here prince and peasant are alike; there is no difference of person in your home. 103

Or,

The Lord (Bhagavaṅta) does not consider whether (His devotee) belongs to either high or low caste; He stands in front of him seeing the devotion of His devotee (bhāvabhakta). He ate broken kernels of rice given by Vidur; He protected Pralhad at

100 Sri Tukārām Mahārājānce Abhaṅg 3707.
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the house of the daitya; He tanned hides with Rohidas; He wove scarfs on the loom of Kabir; He sold beef with Sajan, a butcher; he mowed grass with Savata, a gardener; He blew fire with Narahari, a goldsmith; He dragged away dead animals with Cokhamela.... He fetched clay with Gora, a potter. 104

In these poems, Tukārām says that God treats everybody equally, irrespective of the devotees' caste and traditional profession. In the last poem, he refers to a string of devotees whose names are mentioned in the Purāṇas and who also were the earlier saints of the Vārkarī Saṃpradāya. Many of the saints of the Vārkarī Saṃpradāya, mentioned in the list, were from lower castes and even outcastes. This means that people of the lower castes and the outcastes were saved by God because of their devotion. Tukārām depicts God as having a special interest in saving the people of the low castes:

My faults (dog) could not be corrected by whatever I did. Finally I embraced your feet. Why can he not accept me? Is Pāṇḍuraṅg cruel? He has given bliss (pad vaikunṭhice) to the one who has not heard the Vedas because of his being born in the lower caste. Tukārām says, "Why did you oblige me? Why did you carry this burden on your head? 105

---

104 Śri Tukārām Mahārājāṇće Abhaṅg 1135. 1-5.
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Tukārām's emphasis on God's special concern for the people of the lower castes and the outcastes and his emphasis on the equal religious rights of all seem to constitute an idea similar to the argument of Jñāneśvar that the twice-born have common rights and that the āsruti accepts the Śūdras in the Āryan community so that they are not excluded from the right of religious pursuit.

We have already shown that Jñāneśvar exhorts people to give up pride of caste, profession, and of knowledge, and other matters which are responsible for social disension, social separation and isolation. Tukārām follows Jñāneśvar in this when he says:

Glory, princely power, and wealth let us renounce, ... Let us first secure our true welfare; this is what the rules of conduct enjoin on us. Pride of caste or lineage, worldly honour we should renounce. 106

Tukārām exhorts people to give up pride in caste and family because they are a delusion:

Pride in varṇa, caste, and family are like a mirage (mṛgaśal); it is a childish play (bhātuke) played by young girls (kumāri); is that game real? 107

106 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser and K. Marathe, 3496.

107 Sri Tukārām Mahārājānce Abhaṅg 1776.2.
Tukārām is critical of the Brāhmaṇas in this matter, as he says:

Paṇḍit, a scholar in Vedas, or a man of high learning (daśgranṭhi) cannot excel Tukārām. Even though they regularly read the Gītā, Purāṇas, and other scriptures, they cannot understand the real meaning (vārma). The Brāhmaṇas are badly affected (nāḍle) by pride in rituals (karma abhīmāne) and in varṇa (varṇa abhīmāne) . Tukārām is not like them in his job; he is devoted to Viṭṭhobā. 108

He condemns people full of pride (garvāṣiromāṇi), calling them Cāṇḍāls (i.e. lowest born people) in the three worlds. 109 Tukārām asks people to give up pride in caste and other matters and follow bhaktimārga, giving his own example:

Tukā says, Shunning the pride of caste and learning, I seek the protection of the saints. 110

Again,

Give up the dispute about differences and attain bliss (paramānanda) by one faith (bhāve). Life goes away gradually and ask soon what is (our) welfare (hit). Tukārām says, 'devotion is the name of liberation and he who is without devotion (dūṣan) is a hypocrite (daṃbh), leading a wild life (nāgavi) '. 111

109 Ibid., 3329.
110 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser and K. Marathe, 2443 cf. 1358.
111 Sri Tukārām Mahārājājī Abhāṅg 2474. 1-3.
It has already been shown that Jhānesvar lays a special emphasis on devotion and religious qualities and considers that caste is no criterion (jāti apramāṇ).

Tukārām seems to follow Jhānesvar when he says:

He is devilish by nature, merciless in heart, and cruel in mind. Caste (yāti) and family (kul) are not criteria (apramāṇ) herein; this is due to his natural qualities (gūnce...aṅgi). 112

Tukārām's emphasis on bhāv rather than on caste becomes very clear when he says:

If an onion springs up on a pediment for the tulsi it pleases thee not, O Govinda, whatever we do for it. So too, men void of devotion, though born in high ranks, we should look on as demons, as the scentless core of the ketaka flower. Tuka says, A maggot in a piece of sandal wood will never be placed on God's forehead. 113

Tukārām's emphasis on bhāv as the only means and criterion becomes clear when he says:

Why do you worship stone images, brass images, and eight-metal images? Without devotion (bhāvevin) they are nothing. Bhāv and only bhāv is the means of liberation; it is thus said. What would a rosary do, if you often think of pleasure? What would a learned speech do? It would be only a great pride of letters. What would skillful singing do if the mind is impure (maḷīp)? Tukārām says, 'If you serve God without devotion (bhāv), you would not be worthy [of being accepted] by God, even if you do these things'. 114

112 Śri Tukārām Maharājānec Abhaṅg 195. 1-2.
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In short, Tukārām seems to consider bhāv as the only criterion of an individual's worth in the sight of God. This means that Tukārām follows Jñānesāvar.

It was shown earlier that Tukārām teaches people that God does not observe social distinction and he considers bhaktimārga as a means of forgetting social distinctions. He exhorts the devotees not to observe such differences because such an observance is unholy (amaṅgal) and despising anyone is contrary to the conviction that God pervades all:

According to the religion of devotees of Viṣṇu, the world is filled with Viṣṇu (viṣṇumay jag) [therefore] observing difference is unholy (amaṅgal). O devotees of the Bhāgavat religion, listen and practise the truth (in daily life). This is the secret (varma) of the worship of the Lord that you should not despise (matsar) anyone. Tukārām says, "We are parts of one body; we experience the happiness and pain of others". 115

Tukārām gives another reason why a devotee should not observe differences:

He, who knows by experience that the world is in reality God, feels God nearby him and his sins are destroyed because of that vision (darsāne). Desires and anger do not attack him because he sees equality (samatā) in all beings. Tukārām says, "A dispute about differences is over for him". 116

115 'Sri Tukārām Mahārājānce Abhaṅg 21.
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From the foregoing discussion about Tukārām's ideas of social order, we can conclude that Tukārām closely follows Īśānāsvar in developing his ideas on social matters.

Finally, we should examine Tukārām's position on svadharma. Tukārām emphasizes discharging svadharma thus:

> Your proper course is to ask nothing of him; to do the work appointed you to do — provided it is not done through any sort of desire. Tuka says, Devotion will carry you to the goal, if you keep your soul intent on service alone. 117

However, svadharma in Tukārām's theology is not in itself important if it is not grounded in devotion to God:

> The performance of prescribed duties, apart from God, is like the pliant smoothness of a reptile's skin. Tuka says, If you are wanting in devotion, you are truly unfortunate. 118

As Tukārām emphasizes disinterested performance of svadharma as a devotee, he seems to follow Īśānāsvar in this case also.

We have attempted, in the foregoing discussion, to show how Tukārām's theology is similar to that of Īśānāsvar. It was already shown that Īśānāsvar differs from the Dharmaśāstras on many points. As Tukārām agrees with Īśānāsvar on most of those points, we can infer that Tukārām also differs from the Dharmaśāstras on those issues. As
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Jñāneśvar was attempting to modify the position of the Dharmaśāstras, so too, we must conclude, was Tukārām. Jñāneśvar and Tukārām, the two best known Vārkarī saints, were no doubt attempting to modify the caste system by the way in which they taught the Bhāgavat Dharma in Mahārāṣṭra.

(3) The Samartha Rāmdās and the Social Order

Having dealt with how the Vārkarī saints interpreted Hindu scriptures and how they attempted to modify the caste system, we will now proceed to consider how Rāmdās interpreted the scriptures and how he thought of the caste system. It should be born in mind that Rāmdās was confronted both by the scriptural tradition and by the teachings of the Vārkarī Sampradāya which were widespread by his time.

One does not find Rāmdās commenting on either the Purūṣasukta of the Rgveda or the Gītā when he explains his position on the social order. Therefore, one has to construct Rāmdās' position on the social order from a variety of sayings in his works.

Rāmdās follows both the Vedānta and the Sāṅkhya systems in the way he explains the creation of the universe. Like a Vedantin he says:

\[\text{[References and notes]}\]

The One has become many (udandes); though He has become many, He is still one. He bears His own hubub (galbalas). Though He is one, He is divided (phuti jal); though He is divided, He is one; the divided condition (vicitra kalas) is wide spread (paisavalis) in beings. 120

Rāmdās also explains the evolution of the universe in terms of the Sāṅkhya theory of the guṇas:

The original māyā (mūlamāyā) was born of quality-less māyā (nirguṇamāyā); māyā with qualities (guṇamāyā) was born of the original māyā. The sattva guṇa was born of the māyā with qualities. The rajaguṇa was born of the sattva guṇa. The tamoghāna was born of the rajaguṇa. Know that the sky (vyoma) was born of the tamoghāna. Air (vāyu) was born of the sky, and light (teja) of the air, water (āpa) of the light, and earth (bhumandala) from the water. Rāmdās says, "These are declarations (vacane) of the scriptures. 121

Rāmdās adds that the diversity of forms is due to the guṇas of māyā:

The Lord (Īśvara) had to create all these things (sakalas), therefore He made differences. When one looks above [to Brahman] he does not see the differences. The differences were necessary for creating the world (srsti); the differences naturally do not exist when the world is destroyed (saṁhare). The talk of difference and non-difference is due only to the guṇas of māyā. 122

Rāmdās explains this diversity of forms and beings on the background of a spiritual oneness or unity, when he says:

120 Dās. 15.v.8-9; cf. 15.viii. 12.
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One God resides in these beings – kings, poor people, Brahmā and other gods. He moves their sense-organs. He is called the Paramātma. People see different forms (lit. bodies) but the wise see what is in the bodies; the learned see them with the view of equanimity (samadarśan). 123

He continues explaining the phenomenon of One-and-many with reference to the Fire God (Vaiśvānara) and the Air God (Vāyu):

There are different varṇas and various other differences, but the fire is non-different (abheda) to all beings; it is non-different and highly purifying even to Brahmā and the other gods. The creation is sustained by fire; people cook (dhāle) because of fire; the great and the small are all living (jyāle) because of fire. If fire is brought from the houses of the lowest caste (aṇtaja), nobody finds fault with it because fire (Vaiśvānaru) from all houses is holy. 124

And,

There are various differences in human beings; and there are beasts (śvāpaḍe) of innumerable differences. The creatures of jungles and of water play happily. In all of them, air is moving; all birds fly because of air; fire blazes up because of air (Vayu). 125

Rāmdās thus argues that all human beings have come from one source and God resides in all different beings. He also argues that all beings will merge in one Brahman ultimately:

123 Dās. 11.i.21-24.
124 Ibid., 16.v.3-12.
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Greatness of consciousness (dehabuddhi) is not honoured (cale) in the transcendent state (parabrahmi); egoism is extinguished therein. There is no difference between high and low; kings and the poor are of one rank; all have only one status (ekacipad) whether they are men or women. There is no difference such as Brahman of the Brāhmaṇas is pure (sovale) and Brahman of the Śūdras is impure (vovale). There is no difference such as the high Brahman is given to kings and the lower Brahman to kings' servants (parivār). All have one Brahman and there are no various Brahman; the poor and the Brāhmaṇas and others all go to Him. He is the only one abode (sthal) of rest to all learned people of the three worlds - heaven, earth, and hell. 126

In short, Rāmdās argues, like an advaitin, that all human beings come from one spiritual source and all differences will ultimately disappear in Brahman who is equally present in all beings. Thus Rāmdās speaks of primordial and ultimate spiritual oneness or unity basing his argument on absolutism. He also holds, like an advaitin, that social differences are due to the guṇas of māyā or Prakṛti.

As Rāmdās talks of ultimate spiritual oneness, one is likely to conjecture that Rāmdās would advocate mitigating social differences and lessening caste exclusiveness. The task of mitigating social distinction and exclusiveness was undertaken by the Vārkarī saints. We have shown their efforts in this matter in our foregoing discussion. Rāmdās seems to differ from the position taken by the Vārkarī

126 Rādā. 7.ii. 23-28.
saints because he firmly advocates observing social differences (bheda) for he believes that these differences are also created by God Himself:

The Lord (Isvara) has created various differences; the whole creation is sustained by differences. 127

Again,

There are all kinds of beings in the world. How can all have grandeur (vaibhav)? Therefore God created positions of more or less grandeur (thayathav). 128

Rāmdās thus firmly believes that as these differences are made by God nobody could do away (lit. break) with them and these differences are built into the social order. 129

This means that the social differences (bheda) must be observed. This idea is evident in what he advocates as far as the daily life (vyavahār) is concerned, even though he believes in the primordial unity:

There are hāri (rows or ranks) from lords to the poor. How can we treat all of them equally? It is abundantly clear scriptural opinion (udand abhiprāv) that gods, demons, human beings, beings of low origin and inferior beings are (born) according to their sins (pāp) and good deeds (sukṛti) [committed in their previous births]. The world is maintained by one God (ekānte), but every being is endowed with different powers.

127 Das. 17.x.20.
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129 Ibid. 17.iv.27-29.
Association with one leads to liberation and association with another, to hell (ravray). Sugar and dust are from the earth; but we should not eat dust (mātī). Is poison not like water? But it is not true (khote). The inner spirit (aṇtarātmā) is in both a good man (punyātmā) and a sinner (pāpātmā); but we should not give up the line between a saint and a hypocrite. It is true that there is one inner Self (aṇtar ek); but we should not take a Mahār [i.e. an untouchable] for a company (sāṅgāte). How are learned persons and naughty children alike? 130

In these verses, Rāmdās argues that even though there is only one inner Self of all, there are differences among all beings because of their karmas (sins and merits) in their previous lives. He, therefore, advocates that one must not regard them as equal but should treat them differently. In these verses, he also says, as far as the caste system is concerned, that one should not keep contact or company with the untouchables. This means that he advocates the observance of untouchability and other social differences. He seems to be arguing against the Vārkarī saints who were advocating the non-observance of social distinction and also were recognizing bhāv and other religious qualities of people born in the lower castes and in the untouchable castes, when he says:

Rāmdās says: "It is shameful to say that superior and inferior people are equal (sārkheci). If we bow down before a donkey he kicks in our face. Why

130 Dās. 13.x. 8-13.
do the foolish people say (bhajan) that the superior and inferior people are equal? 131

Rāmdās goes on arguing that a person who treats everybody without considering differences and treats them equally is not necessarily a liberated person. Rāmdās does not regard the person who does not observe social distinctions and treats all equally, as an ideal person or saint, but compares such a person with a fly, a sub-human being. He, on the other hand, appreciates the Brāhmaṇas' maintenance of social differences:

A Brāhmaṇa sees differences and non-differences (bhedābheda) but a fly regards all as non-different. But the behaviour of the fly does not suggest that the fly has received self-realization (jñānabodha). 132

In short, Rāmdās advocates the observance of social differences and of untouchability.

As Rāmdās advocates the observance of social differences, he seems to justify the caste system, which is hierarchical and based on birth, rather than varṇa vyavasthā which is justified in terms of guṇa-karma theory. He talks about the superiority of the Brāhmaṇas being based on the fact that they are born in the Brāhmaṇa caste:

132 Dās. 9.x.6.
This human body is itself a reward for various good deeds. Besides that, if a man is fortunate enough he goes by a good path. The body of a Brāhmaṇa is special (viṣeṣa) among the bodies of human beings. Besides that, a Brāhmaṇa gives ritualistic baths (saṅdhyāśnān) to his body; he has good desires and devotion to the Lord; all these happen to a body of a Brāhmaṇa because of the merit acquired in previous births (pūrvapūnye).

Rāmdās talks about the religious significance of the Brāhmaṇa caste and the importance of their religious roles in justifying their socio-religious superiority:

A Brāhmaṇa is the preceptor (guru) of all people, even though he does not do his duties (kriyāhīn). However, we should submit to him with special devotion. Nārāyaṇa became an avatār [i.e. manifestation of god] and Viṣṇu bore srivatsa [i.e. the mark on the breast of Viṣṇu made by the foot of a Brāhmaṇa] for the sake of the Brāhmaṇas. There are many such examples. The words of the Brāhmaṇas are authoritative (pramaṇa); Śūdras [viz. uninitiated men of the Brāhmaṇa and other upper varṇas] become Brāhmaṇas by the words of Brāhmaṇas; metal and stone become deified at a chanting (māṇtra) of Brāhmaṇas. When they are without the initiation ceremony (munjibaṅdhan), they are undoubtedly Śūdras; they are only called twice-born because they are the offsprings (saṅtat) of twice-born people. That the Brāhmaṇas should be venerated by all people is the main imperative of the Vedas (vedājñā), which is authoritative (pramaṇa). Whatever is without the sanction of the Vedas is unauthoritative and unpleasant (apriy) to the Lord (Bhaqavānta). Yoga, sacrifices, religious observances, giving gifts, pilgrimages, and discharging religious duties (karmamārga) can not be done without the Brāhmaṇas. The Brāhmaṇas are the Vedas embodied (murtimaṇṭa) and they are the Lords themselves. All desires are fulfilled by the words of the Brāhmaṇas. By adoring the Brāhmaṇas, our attitude is purified and we are attached to the Lord. Men attain

133 Dās. 2.iv.1-2.
liberation (uttam gati) by drinking water which falls off the feet of the Brähmanas (brāhmaṇa-tirtha). The Brähmanas are respected at the time of great feasts (lakṣaḥbhōjani); and no one then cares (puse) about other castes (yāti). Even great gods honour the Brähmanas; man is just a poor creature (in respecting the Brähmanas). A Brähmaṇa is venerated by the world (jadagvāndya) even though he may be a fool (mūghamati). 134

In these verses, Rāmdās emphasizes the priestly role of the Brähmaṇas and the fact that they have the exclusive right to perform sacrifices and do other religious functions such as the right of performing the initiation which qualifies others to be twice-born. Because of these exclusive privileges, he argues, the Brähmaṇas remain to be preceptors of all even though the Brähmanas do not discharge their duties. They should be venerated by all even though they may be fools. This means that the preceptorship and veneration of the Brähmaṇas are determined by their birth and not necessarily by their qualities. Rāmdās differs in this from the Vārkari saints who consider the religio-social superiority of individuals in terms of their merits rather than birth.

Rāmdās enhances the prestige of the Brähmaṇas by grouping their traditional duties under sattva guṇa, as follows:

\[\text{134 Rāms. 5.i.6-15.}\]
Sacrificing for oneself (yajña), sacrificing on behalf of others (yājan), studying (the scriptures) and teaching others, and acquiring for them the merit of gifts (dānapunya) are the functions of sattva guṇa. 135

Rāmdās differs from the Vārkarī saints who do not talk about the religious duties of the Brāhmaṇas. Rāmdās selects one of the religious duties of the Brāhmaṇas, namely studying and teaching the scriptures, and emphasizes it as their exclusive prerogative by birth when he says:

The body of a human being (naradeh) [is best] among the bodies of beings; a body of a Brāhmaṇa [is best] among the bodies of human beings. A body of a Brāhmaṇa has the authority (adhikār) [of studying and teaching] the Vedas. 136

In this verse, Rāmdās emphasizes not only the religious significance of a physical body which is a result of birth but also the exclusive teaching privilege of the Brāhmaṇas. Rāmdās' emphasis on the religious rights (adhikār) enables us to say that Rāmdās seems to re-enforce the position of the Dharmaśāstras on these issues. Rāmdās differs from the Vārkarī saints who were trying to modify the position taken by the Dharmaśāstras on these issues. As the exclusive role of the Brāhmaṇas to impart religious knowledge to people had been usurped by non-Brāhmaṇas, the Vārkarī saints in particular, Rāmdās expressed his concern and opposition

\[135\text{ Dās. 2.vii.13.} \]

\[136\text{ Ibid., 10.ii.17.} \]
by re-affirming that the traditional preceptorship (gurutva) was meant for the Brāhmaṇas only. We have already shown in the last chapter how Rāmdās stood for the brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā in this case. 137

The second varṇa in the hierarchical social order of Hindus is the Kṣatriyas (i.e. rulers and fighters). Rāmdās asks the Kṣatriyas to do their traditional duties (kṣātradharma) fearlessly:

He, who is afraid of death, should not do the duties of the warrior class (kṣātradharma); he should sustain himself by some other means. If he turns away from death, he goes to hell; if he comes alive from a battle-field, he is ridiculed. Thus he loses this world and the other world (paralok). He should die while he kills (the enemy), for he will attain liberation (gati). If he comes back alive (after defeating the enemy) he will enjoy a great fortune... A fighter should not give up courage (takvā) for he will be victorious; he should know [the proper] occasion and time [in order to be successful]. 138

Again,

The kings should do their royal duties, the Kṣatriyas, the duties of warriors, and the Brāhmaṇas, their own duties (svadharma), all in a variety of ways. 139

Thus Rāmdās exhorts the Kṣatriyas to do their duties fearlessly. It is traditionally supposed that Śivāji went to see Rāmdās, after killing Afzulkhan. In their meeting,

---

137 Vide, pp. 101-103.


139 Ibid., p. 206.
Rāmdās advised Śivāji to protect the Brāhmaṇas, gods, and traditions and take care of the Brāhmaṇas. Rāmdās took care of the interests of the Brāhmaṇas through Śivāji, a Marāṭha king and warrior.

The Vaiśyas and the Śūdras are on the lower rungs, and the untouchables on the lowest rung of the social hierarchy. Rāmdās does not mention the duties of the Vaiśyas and Śūdras in his works. It seems that he is more concerned with the interests of the upper castes than the interests of the lower castes.

Having shown how Rāmdās reaffirms the position taken by the Dharmaśāstras on some issues about the social order and how he differs from the position of the Vārkarī saints, we should now proceed to examine the question of whether Rāmdās' doctrine of bhaktimārga serves to minimize the social differences and thus to unify the society, as it did in the hands of the Vārkarī saints.

Rāmdās propagates bhaktimārga as the way of liberation:

The Supreme Self (Paramātmā) pervades all; it is the One abiding in the many; its wisdom (vivek) is incomprehensible (atarkya). The Vedas thus speak about the condition of the Supreme Self. There is no doubt that the Supreme Self is obtained (pāvije) by devotion (bhakti).

\[142\] Dās. 8.viii. 4-5.

\[141\] G.B. Sardar, op. cit., p. 122; P.R. Mokasi, op. cit., p. 206.
Rāmdās qualifies his bhaktimārga as ninefold (navavidhā) bhaktimārga. One of the characteristics of his bhaktimārga is 'reciting the name of god'. Even though he stands for exclusive privileges of the Brāhmaṇas (brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā) and for withholding religious knowledge from the Śūdras and the untouchables, he recognizes the right of all to recite the name (nāmādhikār) of god, when he says:

The four varṇas are authorized to recite the name (nāmādhikār); the name of God does not take into account whether the devotees are great or small. The rocklike (jag) and foolish (mūd) [people] have crossed over (the world) by (reciting) the name.

He mentions the names of the Purānic persons who were liberated by repeating the name of God, e.g. Vālmiki, Pralhād, Ajamela, and concludes by saying that grave sinners (mahāpāpi) were liberated by the name of God.

Rāmdās occasionally says that God sees the bhāv (i.e. devotion) of a devotee and goes not care for other things. He also occasionally says that God goes away

---

143 Dās. 9.viii.6.
144 vide, pp. 101-102.
145 Dās. 4.iii.24.
146 Ibid., 4.iii.16-19; cf. 7.viii.34, 4.viii.26-28.
147 Ibid., 4.iii.24; Ekavis Samāśi arthāt Junā Dāsbodh; 6.10; 16.5-6.
from man because of his pride; therefore, he thinks of pride of body (deh), action (karma), caste (vāti), family and knowledge as illusion. Even though he is not as emphatic as the Vārkāri saints are in these matters, his position seems similar to that of the Vārkāri saints as far as his teaching about the bhāv and pride is concerned. Nevertheless, his intention in emphasizing these matters does not seem to modify his support of the social order set forth in the Dharmaśāstras.

Finally, Rāmdās, like the Vārkāri saints, emphasizes svadharma (i.e. doing one's socio-religious duties). It has already been shown that Rāmdās asks the people of the upper castes - the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas - to discharge their inherited duties. He also supports the contention of the Gītā and the Dharmaśāstras that:

Renunciation (udāvan) of one's own duties (svadharma) is called the dropping (budvān) of the ultimate goal (paramārtha), therefore, it is obligatory (agatya ādhār) to do one's duties (svadharma). If one does duties as prescribed (yathāvidha) and he fails intermittently he will not be unhappy but he will get gold and fragrant things. Our mind does not comprehend giving up duties on any ground (ādhāre); one should not give up his own duties (svadharma) at all.  

---


149 Ibid., 10. vi. 29; cf. 14.1.48; 7. vii. 43-52.

150 Ekavis Samāsi arthāt Junā Dāsbodh 20.18-20.
He emphatically says that one should not shirk one's duties and responsibilities, even if others do.\textsuperscript{151} He thus asks everyone to follow his own duties (svadharma or jāti dharma) as ordained by the scriptures.\textsuperscript{152}

(4) The Marāṭhā Saints and the Social Order: A Brief Comprehensive Statement

We have discussed the views of Jñānesvar and Tukārām - the two Vārkarī saints - and Rāmdās on the social order, and are now in a position to make a comprehensive statement about their positions. Even though the Vārkarī saints and Rāmdās teach bhaktimārga as the way of liberation, they have different socio-religious perspectives. First, Rāmdās, like the Vārkarī saints, holds that there is only one primordial, undifferentiated source of origin, implying that there is spiritual oneness. But he differs from the Vārkarī saints in that he wants to retain social or caste differences (bhed) as far as daily life (vyavahār) is concerned.\textsuperscript{153} Secondly, followers of the Rāmadāsi Sampradaya,

\textsuperscript{151} V.H. Date, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{152} B.V. Bhat, \textit{Mahārāstradharma: arthāt Marāthyaṁcyā Itihāsāce Ātmik Svarup} (Dhule: Mahārāstradharma Granthamālā, 1925), IV, 188.

founded by Rāmdās, were exclusively conservative (nakhaśikhaṇta) Brāhmaṇas; whereas followers and saints of the Vārkarī Sampradāya were from all castes. Thirdly, Rāmdās wanted to restore the preceptorship of the Brāhmaṇas but the Vārkarī Sampradāya extended the preceptorship to saints irrespective of their castes. 155

Fourthly, Rāmdās holds, like the Vārkarī saints, that God sees the bhāv (devotion) of devotees and nothing else, but he does not make the bhāv the universal criterion to judge the spiritual worth of an individual as the Vārkarī saints did. Fifthly, Rāmdās is not critical of the factors which divide society, as the Vārkarī saints are. This means that the Vārkarī saints are more concerned with the problem of social unity than Rāmdās is. Sixthly, Rāmdās does not use bhaktimārga as a means to mitigate social differences as the Vārkarī saints do. Seventhly, as Rāmdās considers the superiority of the Brāhmaṇas to be based on biological birth and inheritance, he seems to justify the caste system as the Dharmasastras have done. He, therefore, differs from the Vārkarī saints who wish to modify the position


155 P. R. Mokasi, op. cit., p. 179.
on the social order taken by the Dharmasāstras. Finally, even though these Sampradayas have different perspectives on the social order, it seems that they have agreed on the idea that every individual should do his prescribed duties (svadharma).

D) The Lokamāṇya Tilak and the Social Order

Having shown how the Marāṭhā saints interpreted the Hindu scriptures and what positions they took on the social order, we should now proceed to inquire into the question of whether the Marāṭhā saints influenced Tilak's ideas of an ideal social order. First let us examine Tilak's views about an ideal social order and then see whether Tilak's positions on the social order are in agreement with and in any way dependent on the Marāṭhā saints.

In the last chapter, we attempted to show how Tilak took a middle stand on social reform and why he opposed Hindu social reformers. Tilak seems to defend the traditional social order against the criticism levelled by social reformers, like M.G. Rānade, R.G. Bhāṇḍarkar, etc., who were saying, as Tilak understood them:

Our dharma is useless, our social structure is completely wrong, varna vyavasthā is disadvantageous to all and it creates feelings of division (dvaidhibhāv), and unless it is broken our country will not flourish. 156

156 Lokamāṇya Tilak Lekhasaṅgrah, ed. L. Josi, pp. 14f.
Tilak also refers to the critical stand taken by the social reformers against the caste system, in his article 'The Hindu Caste from an Industrial Point of View':

Of course there are gentlemen who hold that any amelioration of the industrial classes of this land is impossible without a religious revival, or at any rate without a complete annihilation of the caste system, which they have been taught to regard as the prime source of all evil in Hindu society. 157

Tilak seems to defend the caste system on the basis of its usefulness in the ancient time and its possibility of being re-organized to serve modern Hindu society, when he says:

The free competition of foreign countries has well nigh threatened the very existence of many industrial classes in the land, and the ignorance of the latter leaves them completely helpless in such crisis in spite of their inherited skill.... Under these circumstances, I think it will be readily conceded by every one that our industrial classes badly want an organization which will prevent them from sinking down into helpless agriculturalists or what is still worse from total ruin and extinction. The organization of caste already prevails among them, and its history shows that it has saved them from similar crises in ancient times. It is true that in some particulars it has become rather inconvenient, but as I have shown before the evils are not irremediable, and if we prudently attempt to build on these existing foundations there is every hope that the organization of caste may again become a living force and under the altered circumstances of the country protect the working classes in the same way as it did in ancient times. 158

---

157 'The Hindu Caste from an Industrial Point of View', the paper read by Tilak in the second Industrial Conference held in Poona from 5th to 8th Sept. 1892, Samagra Lokamanya Tilak: Towards Independence, VII, 468.

158 Ibid. pp. 474f.
Tišak opposed the social reformers who were advocating the reconstruction of Hindu society and its social order in the image of a European social order, when he said:

Briefly, take any social order (samajaracana), it can never be completely faultless, many people have understood the principle. "Caturvarṇyam maya srṣṭam gunakarmavibhāgaśah" is the foundation of Hindu society. If one is not bound by contract, he is at liberty to do what he wills; this is the principle of the society of the western nations. Now, Mr. Ranade and other gentlemen are saying that the building of society should be taken off from the old foundation and replaced on another (western) foundation; otherwise we cannot stand in the national struggle of the 19th century. I think it is not convincing (sayuktik). Even though the European societies are built up on the different principle, there are social evils. 'Every town has its slum' (gāṇv āhe tethe mahāravādā āhe). In accordance with that proverb, there is a lot of scope for social reform in European nations. 159

In this quotation, Tišak asserts the principle of the social order as given in the Gitā and he also sees the necessity of social reform in all societies - Indian and European. He argues for the inevitability of change in the social order due to the encounter with the European social order when he says:

When the eastern and western social orders which are spiritual and materialistic, and which are controlled by the varṇa vyavasthā and free enterprise (yadrccchācārapravartak), and which are old and new, have come into contact (saṁyog), there would be some changes in the principle of the old social order; anybody would agree with this, and there would be no dispute about it. The dispute remains which of the two aforesaid ways should be followed: either

to demolish one and to establish another or to make appropriate changes in the old and revitalize (punarujivan) it. 160

Ṭiḷak seems to be in favour of revitalization of the Hindu social order. 161 He advocates change in the social order in the spirit of the Gītā:

The time in which our social institutions (samāj-saṁsthā) were originated is now changed; according to the change of time, our social institutions need to be modified. If we do not modify them they will be changed by the impact of circumstances and against our wishes as the Bhagavadgītā says...

162

Ṭiḷak advocates social changes in the spirit of the Gītā and without hurting Hindus' pride in their religious tradition:

Many educated people are thinking that if we give up the foundation of Hinduism we will not have anything of ours. Everybody wants social changes to be in accord with the new circumstances. But everybody must be on guard that those changes do not destroy our pride in Hinduism. 163

Ṭiḷak advocates social changes when he considers them to be suitable to the altered circumstances of India. 164


161 R. Kumar, op. cit., p. 313.

162 The Kesari, 10 Jan 1907, Samagra Lokamānya Ṭiḷak, V, 174.

163 The Kesari, 5 Jan 1904, Samagra Lokamānya Ṭilak, V, 172.

164 The Hindu Caste from an Industrial Point of View', Samagra Lokamānya Ṭiḷak, VII, 470.
This indicates that he is well aware of the dark side of the caste system. He often explains how social defects, such as feelings of inferiority and pollution, which are associated with the caste system, came into being:

It is now well-known that in the oldest parts of the Rigveda there are no traces of caste. But though the sense of superiority or inferiority was thus absent amongst the members of the Aryan race inter se in those old days, yet we find verses in the Rigveda which shew that the Aryan always treated the Dāsa or aborigines with contempt.... In Rig. X.86.19, Indra says that he is careful to distinguish an Ārya and a Dāsa and whom to protect. Here in my opinion, we have a clue, as to how the idea of inferiority and pollution came to be afterwards attached to the members of [the] lower caste. It appears to me that originally the only distinction known to the Āryas was that of an Ārya and a Dāsa, the latter of whom was always treated with contempt by his conquerors. In the course of time as the Āryas become settled they came to be divided into Brahmanas, Ksatriyas, and Vaishyas according to their trades and professions, but for a long time all the three enjoyed the same rights and privileges, and the oldest customs recorded in the Smṛtis shew that inter-marriage and inter-dining were once freely allowed amongst these three castes - known by the common name of twice-born. The origin of castes must therefore be traced chiefly to the difference of occupation amongst all the castes except the lowest, and the idea of inferiority and contempt [came in] only so far as the aboriginal races were concerned. Gradually as the lower castes came to be admitted into the pale of Hinduism and as the society became more and more settled the idea of inferiority appears to be spread more or less to other castes.

In this quotation, Tīlak explains not only how the feelings of inferiority and pollution came into the Hindu social

---

165 'The Hindu Caste from an Industrial Point of View', Samagra Lokamānya Tīlak, VII, 470f.
order but he also argues that Hindu society was divided into two blocks, namely Āryas and Dāsas. All Āryas, on the basis of their right to initiation which made them "twice-born", had the same or equal rights and privileges. The divisions amongst the Āryas were in terms of their occupations [karma] and among them there was no restriction of inter-marriage and inter-dining. Ĥiλak seems to be talking about the varṇa vyavasthā in this quotation although he uses the term "caste" interchangeably with "varṇa". In the Gitārahasya, Ĥiλak discusses why varṇa vyavasthā was formed and how it turned into a caste system:

The ancient ṛṣis had laid down the institution of four varṇas (cāturvarṇyasamsthā) which was in a form (or nature) of division of labour (śramavibhāgarup) in order that all affairs of society should go on smoothly, and in order that the society be protected and maintained on all sides, without a particular person or group bearing a whole burden. Later on, people (purūṣa) of the (social system) became jātimātropajivi (i.e. determined by caste only) viz. they forgot their own respective duties (svadharma) and became nominal Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas or Śūdras because of their birth in that particular varṇa. 166

In this quotation, Ĥiλak says clearly that the caste system came out of the varṇa vyavasthā. As Ĥiλak holds this view of the caste system, his theory of social order could be called a traditional or Hindu theory of social order.

166 GR. pp. 59f (M); pp. 89f (E).
Tiłak seems to justify the traditional varṇa vyavasthā and at the same time he is critical of the defects of the caste system when he argues:

The Hindu polity which is included in the king's duty in the Manusmṛti text lays down a kind of social organization which is known as Chatur Varna. Many of you now believe that Chatur Varna consists merely of [the] different castes that divide us at present. No one thinks of the duties belonging to these castes. A Kṣatriya will not take food with the Brāhmin and a Vaiśya will not take food with a Shūdra. It was not so, let me point out, in the days of Manu and the Bhagavadgītā. The Bhagavadgītā expressly states that this division was made not by birth but by the quality [guna] and by the profession [karma] which were necessary to maintain the whole society in those days. 167

In the foregoing discussion, Tiłak has often said that the varṇa vyavasthā is based on a distribution of professions (karma) and on a distinction of qualities (gunas). He thus emphasizes the position taken by the Gītā on the social order. He repeats his position with an intention to remove and minimize the defects of the caste system, when he says:

Caste distinctions were originally planned on the principle of division of labour [karmavibhāgaśaḥ]. They were meant for a better organization... It is true that there are defects in the system, and we must try to remove them. But until they are removed, they must be minimized. 168

167 B.G. Tiłak His Writings and Speeches, pp. 218f.

In our foregoing discussion, we have shown that Tilak holds the traditional theory of social order, according to which the caste system originated from the varṇa vyavasthā. Tilak justifies the varṇa vyavasthā in terms of its being based on the division of professions and qualities rather than its being determined solely by birth. Tilak is aware of the defects of the caste system and he wishes to remove them so that the social order of the Hindus can be properly established on its ancient foundation and can begin to serve its original purpose, namely the wellbeing of all. In a lecture at Cawnpore on the 3rd January 1917, he said:

Today Brāhmīns are not Brāhmin, Kṣatriyas are not Kṣatriya, nor Vaishyas. Some honourable exceptions, ..., are of course to be found in every class. The true Śūdra is he who is unqualified for any higher task than that of intelligent labour. He has his place in the national family. But the true Vaishya has a higher place. And the true Brāhmin stands highest, while the Kṣatriya comes next to the Brāhmin in the ideal hierarchy. We have need today and there always is, if a nation is to prosper continuously, of ripe scholarship, undaunted bravery, sagacious enterprise, as well as tough and sturdy muscles. These are severally the distinguished marks of the true representatives of the four classes which constitute the ideal Chāturvarṇya. 169

In this quotation, Tilak seems to argue that people who claim to be Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas are not truly

---

169 The Mahrāṭṭā, 7 Jan 1917, Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, VII. 630.
so, because they do not possess the qualities which go with their varṇas. His definition of a Śūdra is a person who only does intelligent labour and is not qualified to do any higher task. This definition is intended as a criticism of those members of elite castes who were serving the foreign government. Tilāk calls them Śūdras even though they claimed to be Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas, the members of the upper varṇas. In this quotation, Tilāk seems to assume a hierarchy, but a hierarchy understood in terms of qualities (guna). Tilāk considers the four varṇa system an ideal system if it is based on qualities which help develop the nation.

Tilāk applies the principle of guna (qualities) in his criticism of the actual social order viz. the caste system which divides the Hindu community into Brāhmaṇas and non-Brāhmaṇas and implies that all Brāhmaṇas are good and non-Brāhmaṇas not good. Tilāk addresses such an attitude, as follows:

This dichotomous division [the Brāhmaṇas and non-Brāhmaṇas] is unnatural and artificial. Among Brāhmins as in other castes there are many men who follow what are comparatively degrading professions. Among them, as in other communities, there are good and bad men. They have bad and good qualities also. Wisdom consists not in accentuating [the] defects in all communities, but in recognizing them and removing them. It really consists in organizing all the communities in the nation on some broader basis than these caste distinctions. 170

170 The Mahrāṭṭā, 21 March 1920, quoted by S.L. Karandikar, op. cit., p. 627.
This quotation implies that Tilak does not consider the Brāhmaṇas socially superior because of their birth and he recognizes that there are bad persons in the Brāhmaṇa caste and good persons in non-Brāhmaṇa castes. This means that Tilak does not think of birth as the criterion to judge the worth of an individual, but considers the qualities (guṇas) of persons to be the criterion.

Tilak holds a different view about the feeling of superiority and inferiority built-in in the caste system. In one of the quotations cited above, Tilak explains how the feeling of superiority and inferiority originated in the caste system. That explanation was not intended as a justification because he does not see a religious ground for such feelings in true Hinduism as he argues, "There is no more tolerant religion (sahisṇu dharma) than Hinduism in the world. [Therefore,] there should be no superiority-inferiority feeling among Hindus". Tilak denies that there could be a religious basis to such feelings when he argues, "the institution of caste was not originally religious, and the feeling of inferiority which it implies in some cases is not its necessary consequence".

---

171 vide, p. 215.
172 Samagra Lokamāṇya Tilak, VI, 807.
173 The Hindu Caste from an Industrial Point of View', Samagra Lokamāṇya Tilak, VII, 473.
points out that Tilak rejects "the notion that distinctions of castes implied differences in status and ranks".\footnote{R. Kumar, op. cit., p. 310.} Thus Tilak does not see the feeling of superiority and inferiority arising out of ideal or true Hinduism.

Tilak also holds a special view of the exclusive rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas who are considered to be highest in the socio-religious hierarchy. Later in the quotation referred to above, Tilak argues that all the twice-born people enjoyed the same rights and privileges as the Brāhmaṇas. In the last chapter we noted that Tilak did not fight for the exclusive rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas but recognized the rights of all Indians and fought for them.\footnote{vide, pp.124ff.} When he discussed 'Caste and Social Equality' in the Gaṅgā festival of A.D. 1907, he said that it appeared absurd to him that certain castes alone should have Vedic rites as their privilege.\footnote{S.L. Karandikar, op. cit., p. 247.}

Tilak also takes a critical look at the practice of pollution and untouchability. He once argued against this evil practice in the Gaṅgā festival held in Poona in A.D. 1907:
The Vedas mention four varnas. The Brāhmaṇas are supposed to be originated from the mouth, the Kṣatriyas from the arms, the Vaiśyas from the thighs, and the Śudras from the feet [of the Virāt Purūṣa]. How then is the head polluted by the legs or arms? 177

In this quotation, Tilak refers to the Purūṣasukta hymn of the Šrīveda and seems to argue that the Vedas do not support the practice of pollution. He expressed his view about the problem again in the All India Depressed Classes Conference at Bombay, on 24 March 1918:

The Hindu Dharmaśāstras do not support the notion of treating any class of human beings as untouchable. When the Aryans entered India they defeated the non-Aryans, the aborigines; afterwards, the Aryans considered them (non-Aryans) inferior and excluded them. But this policy did not last for a long time. The Aryans began to include non-Aryans in their society and granted them the right of Vedic rites. The social unification stopped after some time. And some groups of non-Aryans remained isolated from the Aryans. Whatever may be the genesis of untouchability, the sinful nature of the notion (of untouchability) is beyond doubt. Untouchability must go. For the sake of the progress of the nation, and social reform, the notion (or stigma) of untouchability must go. Mistakes committed by the Brāhmaṇas (or the Brāhmaṇa bureaucracy) of old time must be rectified. 178

In the same Conference, Tilak emphatically said, "If a God were to tolerate untouchability, I would not recognize

---

177 Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, VI, 806.

178 The Mahrāṭṭā, 24 March 1918, quoted by S.L. Karandikar, op. cit., p. 492; B.D. Kher, op. cit., pp.287f.
him as God at all". Ģhāl again said in a meeting in Sāṅgli that he was concerned, as much as the reformers, with uplifting the untouchables and the depressed classes, but his way was different from that of the social reformers. In his private conversation with his disciples he said that he did not observe untouchability, but the people - both untouchables and touchables - first must be educated so that tradition (ruḍhi) might be broken gradually. As an indication that he was not observing untouchability, Ģhāl placed an image of the Gaṇeś of the Cāmjbār (untouchable) along with his own image of the Gaṇeś in the procession.

Finally, Ģhāl takes a new position about the feeling of inferiority and superiority of social duties as they are assigned to various castes in the religio-social hierarchy. He seems to dissociate such a feeling from social duties and considers all equally valuable in the work of national upliftment, when he exhorts:

---

179 S.V. Bapat, op. cit., II.204; S.L. Karandikar, op. cit., p. 492.
180 Ibid., II. 108f.
181 Ibid., II, 108; II, 279.
182 Ibid., II, 108.
We must learn to live the truth that all work is noble and do away with his 'touch-me-not' notions. He must be ready to put his hands even to 'Śūdra' work. And he must rouse up and foster Kshatriyatva in himself for, in the new world every one must be a soldier on pain of national ruin. To this Śūdra-Kshatriya training one may join either the Brāhmaṇ or the Vaishya education or a suitable admixture of either division. Thus equipped let every Indian place his equipment and himself at the service of the motherland. For thus alone will his mental, physical and worldly belongings be sanctified. And thus alone will he - the soul - find his way to Himself, or, in other words, to Bliss ineffable (Moksha). 183

Ṭīlak thus sees the necessity of all social duties being performed in the development of the country and asks all people to discharge their duties (svadharma) disinterestedly as the Gītā teaches:

For whatever reason, when one has once accepted some duty (karma) as his own he must do it disinterestedly, however difficult or detestable (apriy) it might be. Because the greatness and (or) smallness of man does not depend on his profession; and his worth (yogatā) from the spiritual point of view (adhvatmadratvā) depends on the frame of mind (buddhi) with which he does that particular profession (Gī. 2.49). A person, whose mind is peaceful, who has realized the unity (aikya) underlying all beings (sarvabhūtāḥtargat) may be, by profession or caste, a merchant or a butcher. If he does his profession disinterestedly, he is equally great and equally entitled to liberation (mokṣalā ādhikāri) as is a Brāhmaṇa, who does ablution and religious duties, or as is a brave Kṣatriya. 184

---

183 The Mahrāṭṭā, 7 Jan. 1917, Samagra Lokamānya Ṭīlak, VII, 930.

184 GR. pp. 746f (M); pp. 1198f (E).
In this quotation, Tilak emphasizes the performance of one's socio-religious duties (svadharma) disinterestedly as an evidence of realizing one's mystical unity with all beings, however difficult and detestable that svadharma may be, because the spiritual worth of an individual depends on the frame of mind rather than on the profession itself.

E) The Gītārahasya and the Marāṭhā Saints

Having stated the views on the social order taken by the Vārkarī saints, the Samarthā Rāmdās, and the Lokamānya Tīlak, we should now proceed to inquire into the question of whether Tīlak developed his position on the social order in agreement with and in dependence on the Marāṭhā saints.

First, we have shown that Jñānesvar re-affirmed the Gītā's theory of the social order that the division of the four varṇas is based on the guna-karma theory. Tukārām agreed with Jñānesvar on this issue. Rāmdās also applied the guna theory to the social order. Tīlak seems to be in agreement with the Marāṭhā saints as he re-affirms the Gītā's theory of the social order.

Secondly, the Vārkarī saints distinguished between the varṇa vyavasthā as based mainly on the gunas and the actual caste system as based mainly on birth. This distinction is not maintained in Rāmdās. Tīlak seems to
follow the Vārkari saints when he says that the caste system is based on birth and the varṇa vyavasthā on the guṇa-karma theory.

Thirdly, the Vārkari saints held that the highest position of the Brāhmaṇas in the varṇa vyavasthā was based on the qualities (guṇas) and not on birth. Tīlak seems to agree with the Vārkari saints when he says that the true Brāhmaṇas hold the highest position in the varṇa vyavasthā because of the qualities (guṇas) rather than birth.

Fourthly, the Vārkari saints did not uphold the exclusive rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas as Rāmdās did. Tīlak seems to follow the Vārkari saints for he does not emphasize the exclusive rights of the Brāhmaṇas nor does he fight for those rights and privileges.

Fifthly, the Vārkari saints recognized the equal right of all people, including the Śūdra castes and the untouchables, to pursue religious goal. Rāmdās also recognized the right of all people to recite the name of God (nāmādhikār), though he was not in favour of imparting religious knowledge to the Śūdras and untouchables. In practice the Vārkari saints made bhaktimārga accessible to all castes without social distinction. Tīlak seems to be influenced by the Vārkari saints in this when he argues:

Caste distinction (jātibhed) has become inseparable from the Hindu society. If dharma means only the
way of attaining the Paramesvar, it becomes evident that Hinduism has nothing at all to do with caste or eating and drinking or other manners. Because, according to our religion, as God was accessible to Vaśiṣṭha [Brāhmaṇa] He was equally accessible to Vaśvāmitra [non- Brāhmaṇa]; [as He was accessible] to Yajñavalkya [Brāhmaṇa], he was equally accessible to Janak [non-Brāhmaṇa]; and Tukārām [Sūdra], Gorā Kuśāmbī [Sūdra], and Cokhāmelā [untouchable] obtained liberation as Jñānesvar and Eknāth [Brāhmaṇa] did. In such a religion, eating-drinking and castes are not considered. They are independent practices.

In this quotation, Tilak not only argues for the religious right of all, but also argues that the caste system is independent of dharma. This means that he argues for a distinction between the caste system and the varṇa vyāvasthā and in this is dependent on the Vārkarī Sampradāya.

Sixthly, the Vārkarī saints used the bhaktimārga to mitigate or lessen the feeling of superiority and inferiority among the Hindus, arguing that all are equal in the sight of God. Tilak seems to argue in a similar way in dependence on the Vārkarī saints when he says:

There is no more tolerant religion than Hinduism in the world. There is [should be] no feeling of superiority-inferiority among Hindus.... There are many castes in our society. There might be low and high status [among us] but the Hindu scriptures say that all - Mahār, Māṅg [the untouchables], and the Brāhmaṇas - are Hindus. In addition to this, the Bhāgavat Dharma does not agree with the feeling of superiority and inferiority. Pāṇḍuraṅg of Paṇḍharpur loves all

---

185 The Kesari, 29 October 1901, quoted by B.D. Kher, op. cit., p. 299.
including Mahār, Māṅg, Cāmbhār [the untouchables], and Sonār [a Śūdra]. If any person goes to Paṇḍharpur he will notice that all are embracing the feet of Paṇḍuraṅg. 186

Seventhly, the Vārkārī saints argued that God grants equal liberation to all in order to mitigate the feeling of superiority and inferiority. Tīlak takes up this idea in dependence on the Marāṭhā saints when he says in the Gītārahasya:

The true greatness (mahti) of this royal way (rājamārga) of devotion to the Blessed Lord, which grants the identical liberated status (ekac sadgati) to all, without maintaining difference of castes, of varṇas, of man and woman, and of other kinds, or black and white skin people, will become intelligible to anyone from the history of the saints of Mahārāṣṭra. 187

Eighthly, the Vārkārī saints regarded bhāv (devotion) rather than birth as the criterion by which to judge the worth of an individual. Rāmdās also emphasizes bhāv. Tīlak seems to be influenced by the Marāṭhā saints on this when he says in the Gītārahasya:

Thus, when the door of release is opened for all people in the society, there emerges a distinguished awareness (vilakṣan jāgṛti) whose nature can be easily comprehended from the history of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra. As far as God is concerned, women, Cāndāl, and the Brāhmaṇas are equal (sārkhec). "God craves for bhāv (devotion)" and not for symbols

186 Samagra Lokamānya Tīlak, VI, 807.

187 GR. p. 688 (M); p. 1060 (E).
(pratiks), nor white and black colour, nor differences between man and woman, and the Brāhmaṇa and Cāṇḍāl. 188

Ṭīlak quotes Tukārām in this connection:

Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, Śūdra, Cāṇḍāl, children, man, woman, and prostitutes, all have right. Tukārām says, 'He is convinced by experience that others and devotees experience the happiness by good fortune' (Gā. 2382. 5,6). 189

Ṭīlak repeats the idea in the Gītārahasya saying:

That omnipresent Parameśvar, who gives rewards for all actions, looks only to the bhāv (devotion or faith) of devotees. Therefore, Tukārām had said that the Parameśvar takes into account only the bhāv and not the pratik (symbol) which is worshipped. 190

Ninthly, the Vārkarī saints were attempting to unify society which was divided by pride of ancestry, of knowledge, and of rights and privileges. In order to do this they emphasized common religious right (dharmaḍhikār) and exhorted people to give up pride of various kinds. Rāmdās also upheld the common religious right of all to recite the name of God and exhorted people to give up pride in caste and in knowledge. Thus the Marāṭhā saints were attempting to unify society on a common religious ground (dharma). Ṭīlak seems to follow them as he, in

188 vide, p. 132.

189 vide, p. 132.

190 GR. p. 382 (M); p. 590 (E).
his address at Benares in A.D. 1906, made an appeal for social unity on the basis of dharma:

The word Dharma means to tie and comes from the root dhri [dhṛ] to bear or hold. What is there to hold together? To connect the soul with God, and man with man. Dharma means our duties towards God and duty towards man. Hindu religion as such provides for a moral as well as social tie.... The study of the Gītā, Rāmāyaṇa, and Mahābhārata produce the same ideas throughout the country... If we lay stress on it forgetting the minor differences that exist between different sects, then by the grace of Providence we shall ere long be able to consolidate all the different sects into a mighty Hindu nation. This ought to be the ambition of every Hindu. 191

A similar definition of dharma appears in the Gītārāhasya. 192

This definition of dharma is made in the context of religious texts namely, the Mahābhārata, Gītā, and the Rāmāyaṇa, which are supposed to be texts of Bhāgavat Dharma. The concept of dharma seems to be a better basis for social unity to Tilak than the caste system. It was already shown that Tilak was seeking such a basis for social unity. 193

Tilak's definition of dharma and his appeal for unity seem to be influenced by the Marāṭhā Bhāgavat Dharma because his concept of dharma is identical with theirs and his efforts to unify society on the basis of dharma are

191 B.G. Tilak, His Writings and Speeches, pp. 36f; Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, VII, 633.
192 GR., p. 60 (M); p. 90 (E).
193 vide, p. 209.
similar to theirs. Tilak is in agreement with the Marāṭhā saints in using dharma as a basis to unify the society. He seems to be inspired by them to make a similar effort when he says:

> We must try to remove social defects and develop morality, courage, and unity (eki) in society. Sri Tukārām and others made such efforts. In the present situation which is more dangerous than that time, it is absolutely necessary to make such efforts. 194

Tilak also argues the same with reference to Rāmdās:

> In order to accomplish public welfare we have to mingle with people of all kinds and castes. We have to take up the task of preachers and guides as Ramdas did, giving up one's own interest and working without selfish motives. 195

Finally, the Vārkarī saints and Rāmdās had agreed on discharging one's prescribed duties (svadharma) with a disinterested frame of mind. Tilak seems to depend on the Marāṭhā saints in similarly emphasizing the concept of svadharma along with the idea of a disinterested frame of mind in which to do svadharma:

> The perfection which is to be obtained by abandoning action is equally obtained by those who do their professions (karme or svadharma) with a disinterested frame of mind. This is the innermost secret of the Bhāgavat Dharma; and this is

---

194 Samagra Lokamānya Tilak, VI, 809.

clear from the history of the mahulis (i.e. sects) of the saints of Mahārāṣṭra (GR. pp. 13, 396-397). 

In this argument, Tilak not only agrees with the saints but also depends on their ideas.

F) Conclusion:

In this chapter, we have shown how Tilak develops a position on the social order which is in agreement with the saints in most cases and is in direct dependence on them in some cases. He justifies the traditional social order viz. varṇa vyavasthā in terms of the guna-karma theory. He criticizes the shortcomings of the caste system and wishes to remove them. His efforts to unify Hindu society on the broad basis of dharma were inspired by the saints. He argues for the equal right of all to pursue the religious goal even as the saints before him did. He makes bhāv (devotion) rather than janma (birth) and inheritance the criterion by which to judge the spiritual worth of an individual, even as the saints had. He emphasizes discharging svadharma (one's prescribed duties) with a disinterested frame of mind as the saints did. In short, he is indebted to and influenced by the Marāṭhā saints to a remarkable extent in his social teachings.

---

196 GR. p. 784 (M); p. 1199 (E).
PART TWO

THE LOKAMĀNYA B. G. ŢIĻAK'S THOUGHTS
ABOUT NON-DUALISM AND SAINTLY ACTION
CHAPTER IV

THE PROBLEM OF NON-DUALISM

Having shown that the religious and social aspects of Tilak's philosophical system were influenced and informed by the theology of the Maratha saints to a remarkable extent, we ought now to proceed to ask whether the philosophical, viz., the vedantic and ethical, aspects of Tilak's system were influenced and informed by the theology of the Maratha saints. This task will be dealt with in two chapters: one of dealing with the problem of whether Tilak's special vedantic philosophy was influenced by the theology of the Maratha saints, and the other dealing with the ethical problem of whether Tilak's concept of the sthitaprajna, a liberated person who has realized and experienced advaita or non-dualism, was influenced by the theology of the prominent Maratha saints. We will deal with the first problem in this chapter.

A) The Gitarahasya's Advaita Philosophy:

Tilak, in the Gitarahasya, defines his philosophical position with reference to the bhashyas (i.e. commentaries) on the Gita written by the acaryas (i.e. preceptors who are founders of different schools of vedanta) which are considered to be the authoritative texts of the schools. Tilak has
referred to the bhāsyas of Śaṅkarācārya, the founder of
the advaita school, Rāmānujacārya, the founder of the
qualified advaita school, Madhva, the founder of dualism,
Vallabha, Nimbārka, and others. After studying the bhāsyas,
Tīlāk makes an over-all observation in these terms:

Briefly, different sectarian commentators and
annotators have thus interpreted the meaning of the
Gītā in their own way: They made the activistic
(pravṛttipara) discipline or philosophy of action
(karmamārga), taught in the Gītā, subordinate (gauna)
a mere means of knowledge (jñāna), and went on
saying that the Gītā asserts (pratipādyā āhet)
their sectarian philosophy and practices prescribed
from the point of view of liberation, e. g. monism
characterized by the doctrine of 'Appearance'
(māyāvādātmaka advaita) and renunciation of action
(karmasamnyāsa); qualified monism characterized by
the doctrine of 'Appearance' (māyāsatyatvapratipādaka
visiṣṭādvaita) and devotion to Vāsudeva; dualism
(dvaita) and devotion to Viṣṇu; pure dualism
(suddhadvaita) and devotion; monism of Śaṅkara and
devotion; only yoga; or only knowledge of Brahman
(brahmajñāna). These are the various
renunciatory (nivṛttipara) religious ways of liberation
(mokṣadharma). No one says that the Bhagavadgītā

---

1 GR. pp. 15f, 18-21, 427=429, 483, 510f, 703f (E).
2 Ibid., pp. 21-23, 25, 427, 475, 707, 780, 810 (E).
3 Ibid., pp. 23, 26, 428, 475, 766, 874, 875, 892 (E).
4 Ibid., pp. 24f (E).
5 Ibid., p. 25 (E).
regards the Karmayoga as major (pradhān) or dominant. 6

Having pointed out the various interpretations of the teaching of the Gītā Tīlak goes on to say:

The Gītā is not a jugglery (gauḍabāṅgāl)-that any one can extract whatever meaning one desires out of it. The Gītā was produced before all the sects, mentioned above, came into being; the Gītā was preached by Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Arjuna not to increase his confusion (bhrama) but to remove it; and it was, for Arjuna, an exhortation (upadeś) which had only one (ekac), specific (viṣīṣṭa) and definite meaning (or purport) (niścitārtha) (Gī. v. 1-2). The influence of the exhortation on Arjuna was as expected. 7

The verses referred to (viz. Gītā v. 1-2) in the above quotation are important in discerning the specific meaning (niścitārtha) or the purport of the Gītā, for Tīlak. These verses both raise the question and provide the answer concerning which of the two paths- renunciation of action (karmasaṁnyāsa) or performance of action (karmayoga)- is superior? Tīlak comments on these verses:

The question and answer mentioned above are both unambiguous and clear. The word 'śreya' in the first stanza grammatically means 'more praise worthy, better'; and 'karmayoga viṣīṣyate' i.e. karmayoga is better, is the reply to Arjuna's question about the comparative value of the two courses.... The Gītā does not say that the way of renunciation (saṁnyāsamārga) described in the Upaniṣads is not conducive of liberation (mokṣaprada). Even though the paths of Karmayoga and Saṁnyāsa are equally conducive of liberation and both

6 GR. p. 17 (M); pp. 27f (E).

7 Ibid., p. 18 (M); p. 28 (E).
yield the same result from the point of liberation, nevertheless from a pragmatic point of view (jagācyā vyavahārācā vicār karitā), one should continue to perform actions (karma) disinterestedly even after having acquired knowledge. This is the way which is more praise-worthy (ādhik praśasta) or superior (śreṣṭha); this is the firm stand or doctrine (thām mat) of the Gītā. This interpretation of mine is not acceptable to the majority of commentators. They have treated the Karmayoga as subordinate (gaunā). 

Ṭīlak claims to differ from the commentators because he treats the Karmayoga as major or dominant (pradhān) and not as subordinate (gaunā). According to him, the liberated person (jñāni or sthitaprajña) has to discharge his duties disinterestedly. In other words, according to Ṭīlak, the practice of action (karmayoga) is the prescribed religious way of life (ācāra) for the liberated person. This particular theological problem will be discussed in the next chapter, but it is alluded to here in order to introduce Ṭīlak's claim that he differs from other commentators.

Ṭīlak differs from the other commentators not only on what is the prescribed practice (ācāra) but also on what is the form of philosophy (tattvajñāna) or the form of Vedāṇta set forth in the Gītā. He has to do this because the commentators have interpreted the Gītā in terms of their different understandings of the Vedāṇta. He seeks to determine the specific form of the Vedāṇta in the Gītā as follows:

---

8 GR. p. 626 (M); p. 969 (E).
There is room to doubt whether all the Upaniṣads have the same import because there are many Upaniṣads of the different branches of the Vedas, but this is not true in the case of the Gītā. It is clear that the Gītā expounds only one kind of Vedānta (ekac prakārca Vedānta) because it is a single work. When one considers what kind of Vedānta it expounds, one is obliged to say that it expounds non-dualism (advaitapara siddhānta) because it teaches "That which remains eternally after all beings are destroyed" (Gītā viii. 20). "That alone is really true and It has pervaded all the material bodies (pindas) and the cosmos (brahmānda)" (Gītā xiii. 311). Nay, the ethical principle of ātmaupamyabuddhi i.e. the mind which considers one's self in comparison with others' selves in the Gītā cannot be fully established (upapatti) by any other form of Vedānta, except advaita (non-dualism).

Tīlak reaffirms his philosophical interpretation of the Gītā's advaita philosophy in his comment on the Gītā vii. 1-2:

From this, it is clear that having acquired knowledge (jñāna) and specific knowledge (vijñāna) of the Pārameśvara (the Supreme Lord), nothing remains to be known of the world because the fundamental element (mūlatattva) of the world is the same. It has pervaded names and forms (nāmarūpabheda), and there is nothing in the world beside it; this is the principle of advaita Vedānta which is intended (abhipret) herein.

As Tīlak is interpreting the philosophy of the Gītā in terms of advaita Vedānta, he has to issue a statement regarding whether the Gītā's philosophical system is similar to Śaṅkara's advaita system and whether Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya

---

9 GR. p. 212 (M); pp. 324f (E).
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is consistent with the purport of the Gītā. Tilak makes the following statement on that issue:

The Gītā was produced before the dualistic, monistic, and qualified monistic sects came into being. But this does not prevent me from saying that the Vedānta in the Gītā is similar to the advaita philosophy of Śaṅkara from the point of philosophy. Yet the Gītā gives more importance to Karmayoga than Karmasaṃyāsa. Therefore I say that the religion of the Gītā is different from the cult of Śaṅkara . . . but the Gītā and the cult of Śaṅkara have advaita in common. And that is the reason why the Śaṅkarabhaṣya on the Gītā is more valuable than the other sectarian commentaries.

The quotation cited above implies that Tilak finds similarity between the philosophy of the Gītā and that of Śaṅkarācārya. This claim forces us to review the advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara in so far as it is necessary for clarifying Tilak's philosophy.

B) Śaṅkarācārya's Advaita Vedānta:

Śaṅkara (A.D. 788-820) is the founder of advaitavāda, the doctrine of absolute non-dualism. According to him,

Brahman (the ultimate or ontological reality) is alone (eva) true (satyaṁ), all (sarva) else (itarat) that has issued from it (tadvikāram) is merely (or measured in terms of names) (nāmadheyamātram) untrue or false (anṛtam); this universe (viśvaṁ), this entire world (jagat) is Brahman itself.

11 GR. p. 212 (M); p. 325 (E).

This is, in brief, the advaitavāda of Śāṅkara, but it needs to be explained with reference to how Śāṅkara accounts for the existence of the world and the individual selves (jīvas).

Śāṅkara explains the existence of the individual selves (jīvas) by two theories. According to the theory of limitation (avaccheda), the jīva is Brahman limited by the adjuncts (upādhi) of the body, mind (manas), intellect (buddhi), and sense-organs (indriyāṇi).

According to another theory, the theory of reflection (pratibhīṣa), the jīva is a reflection of Brahman as the sun is reflected in water. These two theories make possible the doctrine of the identity between an individual self (jīvātman) and Brahman. Śāṅkara argues the doctrine as follows:

The individual soul (jīva) is called awake as long as being connected with the various external objects by means of the modifications of the mind - which thus constitute limiting adjuncts of the soul - it apprehends those external objects, and identifies itself with the gross body, which is one of those external objects. When, modified by the impressions which the external have left, it sees dreams, it is denoted by the term 'mind'. When, on the cessation of the two limiting adjuncts (i.e. the subtle and the gross bodies), and the consequent absence of the modification due to the adjuncts, it is, in the state

\[ \text{abhāsa eva caisa jīvah parasyātmano jalasurya-} \]
\[ \text{kādivatpratipattavyah / SBS. ii. 3.50; iii. 2.18; Cf.} \]
\[ \text{Śāṅkarabhāṣya Mund. Up. ii.2.4; iii.2.7, etc..} \]
of deep sleep, merged in the Self as it were, then it is said to be asleep (resolved into the Self). A similar etymology of the word 'hridaya' is given by Śruti, 'That Self abides in the heart. And this is the etymological explanation: he is in the heart (hridi ayam)' (Kh. Up. VIII.3.3).

The individual self (jīva) is limited by the adjuncts of body, the sense-organs, mind, and others which are a creation of avidyā (ātma-māyā-visarjita). When the avidyā is destroyed by mystical knowledge, the aspirant realizes himself to be the immortal Brahman. The underlying reality or Ātman is the infinite Brahman.

Śaṅkara explains the existence of the world (jagat) and its plurality of names and forms (nāmarūpaṇi), as follows: He distinguishes between two phases of reality. He calls the first phase of reality 'para Brahman' (i.e. the higher or


17 Mundaka Upanishad III.ii.9; The Upanishads ... with Notes and Explanation based on the Commentary of Śri Śaṅkarāchārya,... by Swamy Nikhilananda, (New York: Bonanza Books, 1949), I, 309.

18 Kena Upanishad I.5; The Upanishads ... with Notes and Explanation based on the Commentary of Śri Śaṅkarāchārya., by Swamy Nikhilananda, I, 233.
transcendent Brahman) which is without phenomenal attributes and determination (sarvadharmaṁviśeṣavarjitaṁ) and which transcends all phenomena (sarpapraṇāṇacātvarjitaṁ) and all empirical existence (sarvavyavahāragocaraṭītaṁ). It is non-temporal and non-causal, therefore it is not responsible for the origin of the world. But another phase of Brahman called 'apara Brahman' (the lower Brahman) is, on the contrary, qualified by attributes (saguna), determinate (saviśeṣa), empirical and phenomenal (saprāṇa). This phase of Brahman is called 'Īśvara' who is the creator, preserver, and destroyer (tajjalānti). Īśvara is Brahman conditioned by māyā; he creates the world out of his magic power (māyāsākṣī) which is the matrix of names and forms. Metaphysically, only Brahman is real. The world is not a modification (parināma)

19 Sāṅkarabhāṣyayuta Praśnopaniṣat v.2; Ten Principal Upanishads with Sāṅkarabhāṣya, (Pub. Motilal Banarasidass), p. 412.

20 Ibid., v.7; Ten Principal Upanishads with Sāṅkarabhāṣya, (Pub. Motilal Banarasidass), p. 415.


22 SBS. ii.1.14.

23 Ibid., i.2.1.
of Brahman but is its mere appearance (vivarta), it is mere maya, unreal like an illusory snake in a rope.

In short, according to the advaitavāda of Śaṅkara, Brahman is the only reality; the Īśvara and the individual selves are empirically real but are essentially one with Brahman; the world and its plurality of names and forms is due to the māyāsakti of Brahman. It appears to be real (vivarta); and it is real from an empirical stand-point (vyavahārika satya), but it is unreal from the metaphysical stand-point (paramārthika satya) for Brahman is the only reality.

The preceding discussion about Śaṅkara's advaita system was undertaken because Tilak has said that the Gītā and the cult (saṃpradāya) of Śaṅkara have the advaita system in common. This statement needs to be carefully examined pointing out the similarities between Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta and Tilak's advaita philosophy in his Gītārahasya.

C) Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta and the Advaita Philosophy of the Gītārahasya: (1) Similarities between These Systems-

Tilak argues that the Gītā teaches the advaitic doctrine of identity between the Absolute (Brahman, which is called the Śri Bhagavān in the Gītā) and the individual selves,

24 Śaṅkarabhāṣyayuta Maṇḍukyakārikāh i.18; Ten Principal Upanishads with Saṅkarabhāṣya, (Pub. Motilal Banarasidass), p. 437.

25 ayam prapanco māyā rajyusarpavat, ibid. i.18.
as he comments on the Gītā ii.12, rejecting Rāmānuja's (A.D. 1017-1137) interpretation and affirming the advaitic interpretation:

In commenting on this stanza, it is stated in the Rāmānujabhāṣya that, if both 'I', that is, the Supreme Being, and 'you and these kings'—that is, the other Ātmans, existed in the past and will be born in the future, then, according to this stanza, the Supreme Being, and the Ātman both become separate, independent, and permanent entities. But, this argument is not correct. It is a partisan argument in support of a particular doctrine; because, this stanza is intended to explain only that both are permanent; and their mutual inter-relation is not stated here, nor was there any occasion for doing so. When that occasion arose in the Gītā itself, the non-dualistic (advaita) doctrine that the Paramesvara, that is the Blessed Lord, is the embodied Ātman in the bodies of all created beings (Gī. 8.4; 13.31).

In this comment on the Gītā viii.4, Tīlak rejects the theory of a plurality of selves and affirms the advaitic doctrine of one Self abiding in many bodies. He thus rejects the non-advaitic principle and a major commentary supporting such a view.

Tīlak argues that the Gītā distinguishes between two phases of reality, in the manner of the advaita system:

It must be said that the cosmic form (viśvarūpa) mentioned in the Gītā, (and) shown to Arjuna, must be māvyik (illusory). In short, although the Blessed Lord (Bhagavatā) has praised the manifested form (vyakta svarūpa) in the Gītā, for the sake of worship,

---

26 GR. p. 559 (M); pp. 870 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.

27 Ibid., pp. 669f (M); pp. 1032 (E).
it is undoubtedly the doctrine of the Gītā... that the superior form of the Paramēśvara is unmanifested (avyakta) i.e. imperceptible to sense-organs, that the unmanifested becomes manifest is His māyā, man cannot attain liberation unless he crosses over the māyā and knows the pure and unmanifested form (of the Paramēśvara)... this māyāvāda is not an invention of Śaṅkarācārya; even before him, it was an accepted doctrine of the Bhagavadgītā, Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavat Dharma.

28

Ṭiḷaka, in the quotation cited above, not only upholds the distinction between the higher and lower phases of reality, but also alludes to the māyāvāda. He defines māyā in the Gītā iv.6, as an advaitin does:

This unimaginable power of the Paramēśvara to create the entire cosmos from His Imperceptible form is called 'māyā' in the Gītā....

29

Ṭiḷak argues that the Gītā teaches the māyāvāda of advaita Vedānta, in interpreting the Gītā xiii.12-17:

Therefore it is quite clear that the Gītā positively asserts the advaita doctrine (advaita siddhānta) - the māyā embodied in various names and forms (nāmārūpaśāmaka) is an illusion (bhrama) and Brahman which indivisibly abides in it (illusion) is alone true or real (satya).

30

Ṭiḷak accounts for the existence of the world as Śaṅkara had done. It was said before that Śaṅkara regarded the world (jagat) and its plurality of names and forms
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(nāmarūpāṇi) as empirically real but metaphysically unreal or illusory. Śaṅkara recognized the empirical reality (vyavahārikasatya) of the world and therefore he accommodated the Sānkhyān theory of parināmavāda (i.e. the Iśvara is the material and efficient cause of the world and the world is the real transformation of the mayic power of the Iśvara) with a modification, that is, the Sānkhyān prakṛti which is not dependent on the Puruṣa is treated as māyā which is dependent on Iśvara in the advaita Vedānta. Śaṅkara also accepted the Sānkhyān distinction between the subtle elements (suksmabhūta) and the gross elements (mahābhūta) and the order of cosmic evolution and dissolution. Śaṅkara has thus accommodated the Sānkhyān parināmavāda in his system, from the empirical stand-point. But as he emphasized Brahman as the only reality, he advocated the vivartavāda—'the doctrine of false transformation or of apparent change'—from the metaphysical stand-point, as the proper theory of the world.

31 cetanaṁ brahma jagataḥ kāraṇaṁ prakṛtiśca, SBS. ii.1.11.

32 Śaṅkarabhāṣayāyuta Praśnopaniṣat iv.8; Ten Principal Upanishads with Śaṅkarabhāṣya, (Pub. Motilal Banarasidass).

33 SBS. ii.3.15;ii.3.14.

34 M. Hiriyanna, The Essentials of Indian Philosophy, (8th impression, Bombay: George Allen & Unwin, 1973), p. 159; Tilak defines vivartavāda as the fundamental substance looking something different (atāttvika), GR. pp. 332(E).
J. Sinha observes that Śaṅkara advocated *vivartavāda* from the metaphysical stand-point, and *parināmavāda* from the empirical stand-point.

Ṭilak, like an advaitin, finds both these theories about the existence of the world in the *Gītā*:

When it has been proved by the *Vivarta-vāda*, that it is possible to see the Appearance of the three-constituted _sic_ qualityful *Prākṛti* in _the_ one qualityless *Parabrahman*. *Vedānta* philosophy has no objection to accepting _the idea_ that the further development of that *Prākṛti* has taken place according to the *Gunaparīṇāma-vāda*. The chief doctrine of the Non-Dualistic *Vedānta* is that the fundamental *Prākṛti* is an appearance, or as Illusion, and that it is not Real. But once this first Appearance of *Prākṛti* begins to be seen, Non-Dualistic Vedantists have no objection to accepting _the idea_ that the appearances... are not independent;... Therefore, although the Blessed Lord has said in the *Gītā* that *Prākṛti* is nothing but *My Māyā* (Gītā 3.28; 14.23). From this it will be clear, that when once the appearance of Māyā has taken place in the fundamentally qualityless *Brāhmaṇ* according to *Vivarta-vāda*, the principle of *gunotkāraṇa* (Development of Constituents) has been accepted even by the *Gītā* for explaining this Māyic appearance. That is this further development of *Prākṛti*.

As Tilak finds that on the various points of philosophy there is similarity between the metaphysics (adhyātma) of the *Gītā* and the *advaita* *Vedānta* of Śaṅkara, he considers the *Śaṅkarabhāṣya* more valuable than the other sectarian


36 GR. pp. 217f (M); pp. 333f (E), tr. B. Sukthankar.
Commentaries. Tilak has taken pains to show the points of similarity between the *adhyātmaśāstra* (spiritual philosophy) of the *Gītā* and the *advaita Vedānta* of Śaṅkara, and it seems that Tilak defines his own philosophical system vis-a-vis Śaṅkara as far as these points are concerned.

(2) **Differences between Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta and the Advaita Philosophy of the Gītārāhasya—**

But while Tilak's philosophical system has some points in common with Śaṅkara's *advaita Vedānta*, it also differs from Śaṅkara's *advaita Vedānta* at certain points. The *advaita Vedānta* of Śaṅkara distinguishes between two types of knowledge: *parā vidyā* (i.e. higher knowledge) and *aparā vidyā* (i.e. lower knowledge). According to the *aparā vidyā*, the world (*jāgat*) and its named and formed diversity has empirical reality (*vyavahārika sattā*) which is higher than illusory reality (*pratibhāsika sattā*). This lower knowledge is the first step leading to *parā vidyā* (higher knowledge), according to Śaṅkara. The *parā vidyā* means that Brahman is the only reality and its diversity is but an appearance or illusion (*mithyatva*); and the world has no actual place in the ultimate reality.

The *parā vidyā*, realized by a liberated self (*jīvanmukta*) denies the individual self its finitude and

---


separateness from other created beings and re-affirms its essential identity with Brahman. According to the para vidyā, the jīva is not false or illusory (mithyā), as the world is. It treats the world as an illusory manifestation, but the jīva as Brahman itself, appearing under the limitations which form part of that illusory world. This brings out clearly that the identity of the jīva with Brahman is the doctrine of fundamental importance to the advaita Vedānta of Śaṃkara. And the world is left out of the mystical unity of Brahman and the jīva.

Ṭīḷak differs from Śaṃkara as he talks of the unity of the Absolute (viz. Bhagavān), the individual self (jīva or ātman), and the creation. In his comment on the Gītā iv. 35, he says:

Sarvabhūtataikyajñāna is mentioned here. That means the knowledge of all beings in oneself and oneself in all beings. The same idea is discussed later on (Gī. vi. 29).* The Self (ātman) and the Blessed Lord (Bhagavān) are fundamentally identical, therefore, all beings are comprehended in the Self. That means that the threefold distinction (trividhabheda) among the Self (we) and other beings and the Blessed Lord disappears.

The quotation cited above implies a threefold identity. But in Śaṃkara's advaita Vedānta there is a twofold identity viz.

---


* sarvabhūtasthamātmanān sarvabhūtāni cātmanān / ikṣate yogayuktāma sarvatra samadarsanāḥ // Gī. vi.29.
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identity between an individual self (jīvātman) and Brahman, and the world is left out of the complete (pūrna) unity. This point will become clearer when we consider Śaṅkara's prescribed mode of behaviour (acāra) for a liberated self (jīvanmukta). The prescribed acāra for a jīvanmukta is saṁnyāsa i.e. a negative attitude towards the world realized through physical withdrawal from society and the world. For Śaṅkara the mystical knowledge (jñāna) of identity between an individual self and Brahman does not go with karma i.e. action and world-involvement. To argue this hypothesis is the main purpose of Śaṅkara, when he says:

Therefore, this is a settled fact in the Gītā - not jñāna combined with action, but by pure knowledge of the Self alone immortality is attained. In the following passages we shall show that such is the import (of the Gītā) as occasion arises.

Ṭīlak differs radically from Śaṅkara when he argues in favour of a combination of knowledge with action (karma-jñāna-samuccaya):

There is a fundamental unity underlying the Logos /Īśvara/ man and /the/ world. The world is in existence because the Logos has willed it so. It is his will that holds it together. Man strives to gain union with God; and when this union is achieved, the individual will merges in the Mighty Universal Will. When this is achieved, will the individual say -'I shall do no action, and I shall not help the world?'

---

It does not stand to reason. Śri Krishna says in the Gītā that there is nothing in all the three worlds that he need acquire, and still he acts. If man seeks unity with the Deity, he must necessarily seek unity with the interests of the world also, and work for it. If he does not, then the unity is not perfect (pūrṇa), because there is union between only two elements out of the three—Man, Deity, and the World.

Thus Tīlak's philosophical system which holds the principle of the threefold identity differs from Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta which holds the twofold identity.

Secondly, though Śaṅkara and Tīlak hold the advaita philosophy in common, they differ in its practical application. We have already alluded to the fact that Śaṅkara prescribed the saṁnyāsa (i.e. renunciation of society and of the world) as the acāra (i.e. moral code of behaviour) for a jīvanmukta. On the other hand, as the quotation cited above implies, Tīlak prescribes a different Acāradharma (ethics) for a liberated person. Śaṅkara prescribed karmasamnyāsa (i.e. renunciation of action), but Tīlak prescribes karmayoga (i.e. performance of action), though they hold advaita system in common. This distinction is very important and needs some elaboration.

It has been shown that Śaṅkara and Tīlak hold the principle of identity between the Self and Brahman

---

(brahmātmaikya) in common, but Tilaka differs from Śaṅkara in that he holds the threefold identity among the Deity, Man, and the world. The concept of identity between an individual self and the other created beings (sarvabhūtātmaikya) or the world (jagat) which Tilaka calls ātmaupamya (self-identification) or ātmaupamyadṛśti (self-identifying outlook or vision) seems to distinguish Tilaka from Śaṅkaraśārya.

Although one may find altruistic teaching in Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta, and although Śaṅkara exceptionally allowed liberated selves (jīvanmuktas or jñānins) to do social service as he himself did, one does not find an ethic of social action based on the principle of ātmaupamya in Śaṅkara because he ultimately prescribes karmasamnyāsa (i.e. renunciation of action or duties) for the liberated selves. In contrast to Śaṅkara, Tilaka develops an ethic of social action (Karmayoga) based on the principle of ātmaupamya along the following lines.

43 GR. p. 347 (M); pp. 534f (E).
44 Ibid., p. 349 (M); p. 538 (E).
45 Ibid., p. 435 (M); p. 681 (E).
46 SBG. xii.15; xiii.7,11; xvi.1-4.
47 Ibid., xiii.11; iv.19,20,24; SBS. v.7 cf. GR. p. 483(E).
It has already been indicated that Tilak considers the principle of ātmaupamya the same as sarvabhūtātmaikya. On the basis of this assumption, he argues:

If I am in beings and all beings in me, it naturally follows that I must treat other beings as I treat myself.

Tilak considers this principle of ethics more satisfactory than any other principle of worldly morality. He also considers this principle as the guide to evaluating pain and happiness; and argues that other measures are inadequate. Tilak considers the principle of identifying the interests of others with one's own and makes it the principle of social action (Karmayoga), when he argues:

When the conviction (bhāvanā) that all persons are in me and I in them has been once affirmed, the question of one's interest (svārtha) as being different from others' interest (parārtha) does not arise at all.

Tilak develops this idea with reference to the ethic of saintly
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persons, a matter which will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Thirdly, even though Tiłak sees an inclusion of *guṇaparipācamāvāda* in Śāṅkara's *advaita* Vedānta, he differs from Śāṅkara in interpreting the *māyāvāda*. This point becomes clear when he argues that there is *karma* (action) in the Absolute (or the *nirguṇa* Brahman) where the creation or extension of the world (*srṣṭiḥ samsār*) is concerned:

> The transcendent Brahman (parabrahman) which is fundamental, unmanifested, and qualityless (*nirguṇa*), at the beginning of the creation (*srṣṭi*), becomes manifest with qualities embodied in name and form; that is, it appears to be perceptible in the form of creation; this (change) is called *māyā* in the science of Vedānta (Gī. vii. 24-25) and action is included in it (Br. I.6.1). Nay, we may even say that 'māyā' and 'karma' are synonymous. Because, unless some action has been performed first, it is not possible for the unmanifest to become manifest and qualityless, qualityful.

Tiłak concludes:

> In brief, *karma* is the activity (*vyāpār*) which takes place in the fundamental qualityless Brahman at the time when the visible world (*srṣṭi*) began to be created. This activity is called *māyā* with names and forms.

---

53 *vide*, pp. 242f.

54 *Gr.* p. 236 (M); p. 362 (E).

Thus Tilak has equated māyā with karma and emphasized the necessity of action being performed in Brahma for the creation or evolution of the universe. The idea of the necessity of action is not emphasized in the māyāvāda or vivartavāda of Śaṅkara.

Having pointed out the similarities and differences between Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta and Tilak's philosophical system, we proceed next to examine the issue whether Tilak was influenced by the Marāṭhā saints in reaching this philosophical position. We also proceed to examine the issue did the saints utilize a philosophical position which had the same kind of similar and dissimilar points from the position maintained by Śaṅkara.

D) Tilak's General Observation on the Marāṭhā Bhāgavat Dharma:

We have already explained that Tilak prefers the Gitābhāṣya of Śaṅkara because it upholds the advaita Vedānta. This means that the Śaṅkarabhāṣya has contributed to Tilak's understanding of the Gitā. But proving the influence of the Śaṅkarabhāṣya on the Gitārāhasya is not the immediate concern of our thesis. The major concern of the thesis is to examine whether and in what ways Tilak's philosophy was influenced and informed by the thought of the Marāṭhā saints. We must

56 GR. pp. 362, 369 (E).
therefore ask what Tilak thinks of Marathā spirituality in
general and more specifically what he thinks of their
interpretation of the advaita philosophy. Having surveyed
the commentaries on the Gītā by Rāmānujācārya (A.D. 1050–1135),
Madhvacārya (A.D. 1197–1276), and Vallabhācārya (A. D. 1479–
1531) which emphasize devotionalism, Tilak makes an
observation on the devotionalism of the Marathā saints, by
way of comparison, as follows:

Unless the things, directly perceived by the eyes,
are believed to be true, individual's worship
(upāsanā), that is devotion (bhakti), would be
without foundation (nirādhār) or would fall short
of something. Because of this belief, various
devotional Sampradāyas (cults or traditions), such
as dualism (dvaita) and qualified non-dualism
(viśiṣṭādvaita), came into being which rejected the
māyāvāda of Śaṅkara's Saṃpradāya. This fact is
quite clear. But it cannot be said that one has
to give up advaita and māyāvāda in order to explain
the theory (upapatti) of devotion. Because the
saints of Mahāraṣṭra justified devotion without
discarding the principles of māyāvāda and advaita.
The devotional discipline (pañṭha) of the
saints of Mahāraṣṭra was in existence before
Śaṅkara. The tradition (pañṭha) of the
Marathā saints takes the principles of the
Saṃpradāya of Śaṅkara namely, non-dualism (advaita),
the illusory nature of things (māyāmithyatva), and
the necessity of abandonment of action
(karmatīgyāvaśyakatā), for granted.

In commenting on the devotionalism of the Marathā saints,
Tilak says about the Jñānesvari, "Jñānesvar himself has at
the end of his book Jñānesvari said that he has written
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his commentary after consulting the Bhāṣyakāras (Śāṅkaraśārya)".

This over-all observation of Tilak on the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahāraṣṭra leaves the superficial impression that the Maṇḍhā saints, who, like Śāṅkara, were understood by Tilak to be propagating the necessity of abandonment of action (karmayāgaśāyakata), have probably not, therefore, influenced Tilak's activistic (pravṛttipara) interpretation of the Gītā. One might conclude that Tilak thinks the saints have blindly followed Śāṅkara's teachings. This general remark of Tilak will, however, have to be evaluated again after we evaluate the philosophical position of the prominent saints. Let us first examine Tilak's specific comments on the Jñāneśvari.

Whether Jñāneśvar followed Śāṅkara's philosophy in writing the Jñāneśvari is a matter of controversy among scholars. S. D. Peṇḍase follows Tilak's contention and points out the many similarities between Śāṅkara's Gītābhāṣya and the Jñāneśvari and concludes that Jñāneśvar followed Śāṅkara's Gītābhāṣya. S. G. Tuḻpule supports the opinion

---

58 GR. p. 17 (M); p. 26 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.
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of Peṇḍase. G. S. Ghurye and S. R. Sharma also say that Jñānesvar followed Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta. S. G. Tulpule also supports Peṇḍase's opinion that Jñānesvar followed the Upaniṣads, the Gītā, Yogavaśīṭa, Gauḍapāḍakārikā, the philosophy of Śaṅkara, Kāśmīri Saivism, and the philosophy of the Nāthas. But D. G. Divākar alias Jñānadevopāsak argues that Jñānesvar contradicts Śaṅkara's māyāvāda and karmasamnyāsa (renunciation of action) and teaches the philosophy of the Nāthas. How can the issue be resolved?

61 S. G. Tulpule, Paṅc Saṅtakavi, pp. 40f.
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Jñāneśvar, at the end of the Jñāneśvari, says:

I have followed the foot-steps (māgovā) of Vyāsa (the author of the Mahābhārata) and have consulted all the interpreters (bhāṣyakārānte). How then can I be wrong in interpreting even though I am not worthy?

68

The verse literally means that Jñāneśvar followed many commentators (bhāṣyakārānte). In Marāṭhī, however, the honorific plural is often used for a single person. It is likely that Jñāneśvar used the honorific plural in order to speak of the one commentator he was consulting. Tilāk understood him this way and concluded that Jñāneśvar referred to Śaṅkara with honour. However, the interpretation that Jñāneśvar followed many commentators cannot be ruled out. If Jñāneśvar was closely following Śaṅkara as the traditional authority, he might be expected to have mentioned Śaṅkara's name in his work. He does not mention Śaṅkara in the Jñāneśvari, but he does mention his own lineage at the end of the Jñāneśvari. This evidence seems to suggest that Jñāneśvar, who was initiated into the Nātha Saṃpradāya, followed the theology of the Nāthas rather than Śaṅkara, in writing his commentary.

The argument, stated above, suggests the possibility

68 Jñ. xviii. 1722.
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that Jñānesvar consulted the works of the Nāthas and followed their theology rather than advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara, but this argument needs to be developed by pointing out the similarities and differences between Jñānesvar's theology and Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta.

E) Similarities among Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta, Jñānesvar's Theology, and the Gītārahasya:

(1) Similarities between Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta and Jñānesvar's Theology—

Śaṅkara and Jñānesvar are both advaitic as they believe in one absolute reality. For Śaṅkara, Brahman is the only reality. Jñānesvar similarly believes in one absolute principle when he says, "There is no other thing besides the One Substance". Or, "Thus there is only one (ekaci) Substance; its threefold manifestation (drśya (i.e. a thing that is seen), draṣṭa (i.e. seer), and dārśana (i.e. vision) is misunderstood (brānti) to be three; when this threefold manifestation goes away, only one Person (Vyakti) remains, (because) it is essentially one (ekapan)". Thus both Śaṅkara and Jñānesvar are advaitic.

Secondly, Śaṅkara believes that the One Principle is eternal and whatever has issued from it is untrue or
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perishable. Jñānesvar upholds a similar idea when he says:

Husks and seed remain together. When they are winnowed, the seeds remain (in the pan) because they are heavy and husks are fanned away. Similarly, when a knower reflects he realizes that the world (prapañca) is naturally perishable and that whatever is left is essentially the Principle (tattva).

Thirdly, Śaṅkara holds the principle of identity between the Absolute (Brahman) and an individual self (Jīvatman). Jñānesvar upholds a similar principle when he says:

There remains no obstruction (gābhāgobhā) for the reflection of a thing to become one with the thing when the water is drained away. There is nothing to prevent (ādayārā) wind becoming one with the ocean. You and I appear (different) because of the fact that we are embodied (dehadharmī). When our bodies are destroyed (virāmī) you and I will be one.

Again,

When a brook becomes dry, the reflection of stars in it disappears. Similarly, when the limiting condition disappears the conditioned self will disappear (i.e. self becomes unlimited).

Thus Śaṅkara and Jñānesvar hold the similar idea that when the mental and physical limitations of an individual self are destroyed, the individual self becomes one with the Absolute.

---
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Fourthly, as we have seen Śaṅkara’s advaita Vedānta has accommodated the Sāṅkhyan theory of parināmavāda which deals with the evolution (nirmiti) and dissolution (śamhāra) of the world (jagat). Jñāneśvar’s system also includes the Sāṅkhyan theory of evolution (utpatti) and involution (pralaya). He devotes many verses to explaining the Sāṅkhyan theory. A few of them run as follows:

Prakṛti is the source (tāṅkasāl; lit. mint) of sounds; it is a busy creeper of wonders. Nay, all is its play. Evolution (utpatti) and dissolution (pralāya) are its morning and evening (sāyamprat). Thus it is surprising and enchanting (mohan).

These are the points of similarity between Śaṅkara and Jñāneśvar. Among these ideas, the idea of the identity between an individual self and the Absolute is of the most fundamental importance to Śaṅkara. The issue of deciding whether Jñāneśvar depends on Śaṅkara might be resolved if one could prove that Jñāneśvar not only holds a similar view but also uses similar phrases. When, however, Jñāneśvar talks of the identity between an individual self and Brahman, he uses the language of Nāthism rather than of Śaṅkara:

That 'one body devours another body' is the secret (daṇṣu) of the teaching of the Nāthas. This has
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been revealed by Śrī Mahāviṣṇu.

The principle of identity between an individual self and Brahman is stated by Gorakṣanātha, a major Nātha of the Nātha Saṃpradāya, in these terms: brahmāṇḍavartī yatkiṁścit tatpaineḍ'pyasati sarvathā / iti niścaya evātra

pinḍasamvittirucyate // (tr. whatever is in the brahmāṇḍa (cosmos) is in a body completely...) Jñāneśvar's phrase "one body devouring another body" is very similar to Gorakṣanātha's phrase. From this evidence we are inclined to conclude that Jñāneśvar's advaitic interpretation of the Gītā is in agreement with Nāthism rather than with Śaṅkara's advaitavāda. This conclusion is further established by the other differences one finds between Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta and Jñāneśvar's philosophical system. But before demonstrating these differences, we should return to Tilak and show Tilak's dependence on Jñāneśvar's theology in arguing for an advaitic interpretation of the Gītā even where points of similarity between Śaṅkara and Jñāneśvar are concerned.

In the beginning of this chapter, we have argued that Tilak thinks of the philosophy of the Gītā as advaitic, and therefore, he thinks of the Śaṅkarabhāṣya as more valuable
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than any other bhāṣyas (viz. commentaries on the Gītā). We have shown the similarities between Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta and Tīlak's philosophy, as follows: (i) that there is only one reality, (ii) that reality alone exists after everything is destroyed i.e. it is imperishable reality, (iii) that the unmanifest reality becomes manifest because of māyā the power of Brahman to create the world and its plurality of names and forms, (iv) that advaitavāda includes both vivartavāda and parināmavāda, and (v) that there is identity between an individual self and Brahman. We have also shown the similarities between Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta and Jñānesvar's philosophical system, as follows: (i) that there is only one reality, (ii) that reality is imperishable, and (iii) that the advaita system includes parināmavāda. From these similarities we are inclined to say that Śaṅkara, Jñānesvar, and Tīlak hold that there is one reality, which is imperishable and eternal, which is manifested through māyā (i.e. divine power to create the world), and which is identical with the individual self.

As far as these points of similarity between Śaṅkara and Tīlak are concerned, we might say that Tīlak was influenced by the advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara and his advaitic interpretation of the Gītā directly, because he has said that the Gītā and
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the school of Śaṅkara have advaita philosophy in common and therefore, that Śaṅkara's Bhasya on the Gītā is more valuable than any other commentary. Before reaching that conclusion, however, we must ask in what way Tilak's philosophy was influenced by Jñāneśvar.

(2) Jñāneśvar's Theology and Tilak's Philosophical System

First, Tilak, like Jñāneśvar, believes in one reality. There is a similarity of ideas here but there is no specific evidence cited by Tilak from the Jñāneśvari to show that he borrowed the idea from that source.

Secondly, there is a similarity between Tilak's way of arguing for the imperishability of the Absolute and Jñāneśvar's. In the Jñāneśvari, Jñāneśvar argued for the imperishability of Brahman, as follow:

Similarly, one can discern, after reflecting that when the visible world (prapañcu) naturally vanishes, there remains One Principle (tattva), for the wise, essentially.

Tilak has argued the imperishability of the Absolute in the manner of Jñāneśvar, as follows:

'That which remains eternally after all beings are destroyed' (Gī. viii. 20), That alone is really true and It has pervaded all the material bodies (pindas) and the cosmos (brahmāṇda) (Gī. xiii. 31).
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Thirdly, Tilak seems to depend on Jñānesvar's theology in his argument for the unity between an individual self and Brahman (brahmātmaikya) when he explains:

'Tattvamāsi' (i.e. That thou art) is one of the main sacred utterances of the Upaniṣads (mahāvākya) of the advaita Vedānta and 'je pindi te brahmāndi' (tr. whatever is in body is in the cosmos) is its translation into Marāṭhī.

The Marāṭhī phrase 'je pindi te brahmāndi' (i.e. whatever is in the body is in the cosmos) is advaitic in one sense, but one would not normally equate it, as Tilak does, with the Saṅskṛt phrase 'tattvamāsi'. Tilak does not differentiate between the different backgrounds of these two advaitic phrases. The Marāṭhī phrasing of advaitic philosophy is very important for Tilak, and he repeats it as least four times. The Marāṭhī phrase was popularized by the Vārkari Sampradāya and is clearly based on the teaching of the Nāthas. We have earlier pointed out that the phrase originated with Gorakṣanātha and that it is given special attention in the Jñānesvāri where it is said, "'one body devours another body' this is the secret of the teaching of Nāthas". Jñānesvar provided a theological foundation
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for the Vārkarī Sampradāya by writing a commentary on the 
Gītā in agreement with Nātha thought. Therefore, the advaitic 
teaching of the Jñānesvari has to be understood in the context of 
Nāthism. However, Tilak wrongly supposed that Jñānesvar 
had consulted Śaṅkarāṇi in writing his commentary on the Gītā, and 
this assumption led him to equate the two ways of expressing 
advaitic thought. It was the Marāthī phrase, coming from the 
background of Nāthism, which was important in Tilak's advaitic 
thought. Therefore, one can trace the influence of Nāthism 
through Jñānesvar onto Tilak's philosophy even when he himself 
was not fully aware of that influence.

Fourthly, Tilak seems to be influenced by Jñānesvar 
when he explains the ideas 'Viśvācī Udbhārṇi v Samhārṇi' 
('Construction and Destruction of the Cosmos' ch. viii of 
the GR.). Tilak begins the chapter by referring to Jñānesvar 
and says:

But how the bazaar (bājār) or playful activities (kheḷ), 
which is called 'saṁśāticā pīṅgā' (i.e. the cyclic 
dance of the worldly life) by Marāthī poets and which 
is called 'prakṛtīcī tāṅkasāl' (i.e. a mint of matter) 
by Jñānesvar Maḥārāj, that is, how the evolution 
(saṁsār) of Prakṛti, ... and its dissolution (lay) 
take place remains to be explained; and I shall do 
that in this chapter.

Tilak seems to be impressed by Jñānesvar's catch-word 'tāṅkasāl'. 
Jñānesvar had used the word 'tāṅksāl' in discussing the 
functions of Prakṛti, i.e. the construction and destruction 
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of the universe. Tilak was impressed by the simile used by Jñāneśvar to describe the functions of Prakṛti. Jñāneśvar's advaitic theology includes the pariṇāmavāda of the Sāṅkhya system. This means that Jñāneśvar provided Tilak with a theology which gives prominence to the pariṇāmavāda within advaitic philosophy. This too implies a direct influence of Jñāneśvar on Tilak.

Thus far we have pointed out the influence of Jñāneśvar in helping Tilak express the points on which they were in agreement with Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta. We should now proceed to ask whether Jñāneśvar's theology also influenced Tilak to disagree at times with Śaṅkara. In order to see this point we must first discuss the difference between Śaṅkara and Jñāneśvar.

F) Differences among Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta, Jñāneśvar's Theology, and the Gitārahasya:

1) Differences between Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta and Jñāneśvar's Theology-

Though Jñāneśvar and Śaṅkara have some points in common, they differ on some important points. First, their theories of creation have different philosophical implications. Śaṅkara's theory is called māyāvāda (i.e. theory of Illusion) or vivartavāda (i.e. theory of Appearance), according to which the world is false (mīthyā), untrue (anṛt), or mere appearance (vivarta), from the metaphysical point of view. Brahman, the
Absolute, is not responsible for the world, but Ṣivara, the lower Brahman, is responsible for its creation, maintenance, and destruction. Jñānesvar differs from Śaṅkara because he does not make a distinction between the Parabrahman (i.e. the higher Brahman) and the Aparabrahman (i.e. the lower Brahman) or the Ṣivara. He regards the One Principle as responsible for the creation of the world and also regards the creation as its manifestation and essentially identical with it. As he says:

Is this whole world not an extension (vistāralepan) in terms of my names? This rhetorical question implies the positive answer 'yes'. When milk is curdled it naturally becomes curd. Seeds grow into trees; or gold turns into ornaments. Similarly, this world is an extension of Myself alone. That which was frozen in the form of the unmanifest has become melted in the form of the world. Know thus that the unmanifest (Prakṛti) becomes manifest in the form of the three worlds.

Again,

As an ocean is related to waves (kalol) so these beings are related to me; I am their supporter.

Or,
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Just as water plays itself assuming the form of waves so the Ultimate Substance or Atman plays happily with Himself.

90

Again,

Innumerable forms and sight arise but one Pure Intelligence underlies all.

91

That Jñānēśvar did not regard the world to be different from the Absolute but regarded it as Its real or actual manifestation is considered to be an original contribution of Jñānēśvar. This idea distinguishes Jñānēśvar's advaita theology from Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta because for Śaṅkara, the named and formed manifestation of Brahman is illusory while for Jñānēśvar it is real and actual. Jñānēśvar described an inter-dependent relationship (anyonya saṁbañḍha) between God and the world, when he said:

AA. both fire (vanhi) and flame are fire only, so all these are related to me.
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Again,

The beings which have left this world were my forms
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and the beings which exist are my forms.

As the world and its beings are actual manifestation and not false appearance (mithyā), Jñāneśvar argued against the idea of leaving the world on the ground that it is a false way to try to know God:

If the world were different (paraute) from me, then you should leave it for my sake, but this truth cannot be asserted (ukhete) because I am all.

Again,

First the worldliness of the world should go away and then you could know me; but this view is not true because I am all.

In short, Jñāneśvar regarded the world as the real or actual manifestation of God.

Secondly, as Jñāneśvar regarded the world to be a real manifestation of God, he rejected the idea of the falsehood of the world, when he said:

What is seen i.e. the world (dṛṣya) and who sees i.e. individual self (dṛṣṭatva) are originated from Ignorance (avidyānimitte); I do not understand (nene) this doctrine; whatever exists is an actual expression of (reality). It is like a sāri made out of threads; otherwise, a sāri is threads

---
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obviously. It is like as earthen vessel made out of earth; otherwise, an earthen vessel is earth.

Jñānesvar differed from Śāṅkara because he rejected the metaphysical falsehood (mithyatva) of the world and considered the ātman (i.e. an individual self) and the jagat (i.e. the world or cosmos) to be from the same source.

Thirdly, Jñānesvar differed from Śāṅkara in his concept of the power of God to create the world and the beings in it. Śāṅkara called this illusion-creating power 'māyā'. Māyā in Śāṅkara's philosophy is dependent (upādhi) on Brahman. It is instrumental in creating the appearance or illusion of the world but it is not the intrinsic power of Brahman. On the contrary, in the theology of Jñānesvar, the power of creating is intrinsic and identical with God. Jñānesvar calls the power 'śakti'. Jñānesvar's theory of the world seems to be a restatement of the theory of Nāthism, for he says:

It is through God that the other (the Power or Śakti) is Goddess and without her the Lord is nowhere. As a matter of fact their existence is due to each other.

Again,

The essence of all void became Purusha through her, while the Shakti got her peculiar existence through the Lord. Shiva himself formed His beloved without whom Shiva loses his own Personality. Her form is

---
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the cause of God and His glory manifested in the process of the world. But her form itself is created by Him out of Himself.

These differences— the world as a real or actual manifestation of God, denial of the illusory nature of the world, and the power of creating as the intrinsic power of God—which Jñānesevār had with Śāmkara, constitute a theory which is different from the māyāvāda of Śāmkara. In order to show the difference between them, Jñānesevār's theory of creation is technically called 'sphurtivāda' or 'cidvilāsavāda'. Scholars have attempted to define the theory. B. P. Bahirat defines cidvilāsavāda as the theory, "which maintains the universe as the expression of the Absolute Reality" and adds that according to cidvilāsavāda a knower (jñātā) and what is to be known (jñeya) are manifestations of the Self whose nature is knowledge. R. D. Rānaḍe defines it as the theory according to which 'the universe is an illumination of the Absolute' (Amritanubhava vii. 289). S. G. Tulpuḍe says that according to the cidvilāsavāda, the world is cidvilāsa

99 Amṛtānubhava i.27-29, tr. B.P. Bahirat.


102 R. D. Ranade, op. cit., p. 158.
or 'jag asiki vastuprabhā' (i.e. the world is a real manifestation) of the Paramātmā (the Supreme Self) who is beyond seer (drāstā), visible world (drśya), and vision (darśan) who assumes the form of the world. All these attempts to define the spurtivāda or cidvilāsavāda amount to saying that the cidvilāsavāda means that the world is the real manifestation or illumination of God through His intrinsic power (śakti).

Fourthly, Jñāneśvar differed from Śaṅkara because he held that the world is the real manifestation of God, and God and the world are identical in the sense that they are essentially one. This point was discussed previously. It suffices to say that Jñāneśvar held the metaphysical unity or identity between God and the world.

Fifthly, Jñāneśvar differed from Śaṅkara because he held that there is identity between an individual self and the world. Jñāneśvar emphasized the vision of identity of the ātman with the world in these verses:

O Pāṇḍava, see the universe (viśva) in you and be yourself the universe. Thus you will experience (upāsīje) identity (sāmya). There is no higher achievement in the world than this vision. Therefore, I have told you / to aspire toward achieving the vision of identity / on several occasions.
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According to the fourth point, Jñānesvar held the principle of the identity between God and the world, and according to the fifth point, the principle of the identity between and individual self and the world. Thus there is a perfect (*purṇa*) identity or unity among the constituents of Reality according to the advaitic theology of Jñānesvar.

Jñānesvar differed from Śaṅkara because he held the three-fold unity or the three-fold essential unity among the constituents of Reality, whereas Śaṅkara held the principle of identity between Brahman and the individual self (*ātman*) and left the world out of the complete or perfect (*purṇa*) unity.

We had earlier shown that even contexts where Jñānesvar was in agreement with Śaṅkara's *advaita Vedāṇta* one could see the influence of Nāthism which was Jñānesvar's spiritual heritage. These two reasons together distinguish Jñānesvar's *advaita* theology from Śaṅkara's *advaita Vedāṇta*. S. V. Dāndekar attempts to distinguish these two schools of thought by calling Śaṅkara's system *kevala advaita* (abstract or pure non-dualism) and Jñānesvar's school *Puruṇa Advaita* (complete or perfect non-dualism).

(2) **Similarities between Jñānesvar's Theology and Tukārām's Theology**

We have already shown that the *puruṇa advita* differs from the *kevala advaita* of Śaṅkara in that it holds the principle of the unity between God and the world and the
world and the beings in the world (nāmarūpātmak jagat). Does Tukārām follow Jñānesvar's theology in this respect?

Tukārām, like Jñānesvar, talks of the identity between God and the world and the beings in the world, in his poems:

The whole world is God; this is the treasure (they) of the teachings.
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Again,

I shall explain to you that the essence of the Vedānta is that the Lord (Viśvamīhāra) prevades the universe. The scriptures repeatedly tell us that the Lord of the world (jagadiś) is in the world. The Purāṇas loudly proclaim that the Lord (Nārāyaṇ) has pervaded all of this (viz. the world). The saints say that the Lord of the universe (Janaṛdan) is in the people.
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The second form of the identity in the purṇa advaita is the identity between an individual self and the world and the beings in the world. Tukārām, like Jñānesvar, talks of the identification of an individual self with the world and the beings in the world, when he says:

As I have set this diversion asfof, I have not neglected any aspect of it. I find the whole world peopled with relatives; I see nothing to cause contamination of man by man. At one stroke I am made acquainted with the whole world; I see nothing anywhere different from myself. Tukā says, I am not limited by time or environment or laws of mind; I regard nothing but God.
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Again, "Tukā says, I look on all and I meet (them) as my part".  

(3) Indebtedness of the Gītārahasya to the Theology of the Vārkāri Saints—

We have now shown that both Jñānesvār and Tukārām hold purṇa advaita. Having shown this, we should proceed to ask whether the purṇa advaita theology of the Vārkāri saints influenced Tilak's advaitic philosophy.

We have shown that Tilak was influenced by Jñānesvār's way of describing the perishability of the visible world. He followed Jñānesvār's Nātha theology when he described identity as 'whatever is in the body is in the universe'. He was impressed by Jñānesvār's catch-word for Prakṛti, the 'tānkāśāl' (i.e. mint) in which the evolution and dissolution of the world take place. Moreover, as Jñānesvār's advaitic theology included the Sāṅkhyan theory of parināmavāda, this has served as a model to Tilak for constructing an advaitic philosophy. Apart from these general influences of Jñānesvār on Tilak, there are some specific influences of ādvaitic theology of the Vārkāri saints on the advaitic philosophy of Tilak.

First, it has been shown that Tilak differs from Śaṅkara in that Tilak holds the idea of the three-fold unity or identity. Because of the three-fold identity, Jñānesvār's

---
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advaita school was called 'purṇa advaita'. As Tukārām also holds the principle of three-fold identity, his theological system can also be called 'purṇa advaita' theology. As Jñāneśvar differed from Śāmkara's kevala advaita system so we can say that Tukārām also differed from Śāmkara on the same grounds. We have also shown that Tīlak differs from Śāmkara on the very same grounds. This fact suggests that there was probably an influence of the theology of the Vārkarī saints on Tīlak's advaitic philosophy. Can we find evidence in the Gītārahasya that Tīlak was aware of this influence?

The purṇa advaita system emphasizes two principles, namely, (i) the identity between God, the world, and the beings in the world, (ii) the identification (ātmaupāmya) between an individual self, the world, and the beings in the world. Tīlak argues for the principle of identity between God, the world, and the plurality in the world by referring to Tukārām, whom Tīlak considers as authority on advaita doctrine:

But, the actual experience of saints is a more convincing answer to this objection than mere logic. And among these, I consider the practical experience of that king among Devotees, the saint Tukārām, as of the utmost importance. No one need to be told that the knowledge of the Absolute Self (adhyaatma) which has been acquired by saint Tukārām, had not been acquired by him by reading treatises like the Upaniṣads. Nevertheless, in his Gāthā, about 300 to 350 abhaṅga stanzas are devoted to the description of the State of Non-duality, and in those stanzas, the doctrine of 'vasudevah sarvam' (Gī. 7.19) (i.e. 'Vasudeva is everything') or as stated by Yajñavalkya in the Bhādarāṇyakopaniṣad 'sarvam ātmaivabhūte' (i.e. 'everything has become identified with the Self', trans.), has been propounded, as being based on
personal experience. For instance:—

As every part of jaggery is sweet / so has God come to be everywhere / Now whom shall I worship / God is inside as also outside //
The film on the water / is not separated from the water /
Just as gold gets a name by being made into an ornament / Tukā says, so are we //

(Gāthā 3627)

The two first lines have been quoted by me in the chapter on the Philosophy of the Absolute Self.

The last two lines of Tukārām's poem cited here suggest the identity of God and the world, including human beings. When Ṭīḷāk quoted the first two lines of Tukārām's poem, Ṭīḷāk praised Tukārām saying, "But that saint: Tukārām about whom it was said 'jayācī vade nitya vedānta vāṇi' (i.e. one whose voice uttered Vedānta, trans.)". Thus Ṭīḷāk treats Tukārām as the authority on Vedānta philosophy and used his poems in explaining the principle of the identity between Brahman and the world and the plurality of names and forms in the world.

In another place, Ṭīḷāk again argues for the doctrine of the identity between Brahman and the world and its plurality of names and forms and again uses Tukārām:

If all the things or qualities to be seen in the world are only forms /rupē/ or symbols /pratike/
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of the Paramesvara, how can one say that the Blessed Lord is in one of them and not in another, ... and Tukārāma Buvā, a devotee of the Blessed Lord, has with the same import said:—

Tukā says whatever name you give / such name is proper for this Viththal // (Tu. Gā. 3065.4).

Another principle of the purṇa advaita is identification of the individual self with the world and the beings in the world (ātmaupamya). It seems that Tilāk also develops this principle by referring to Tukārām, when he argues:

As it is a doctrine of the Philosophy of the Absolute Self, that there is only Ātman in the Body and in the Čosmos, / pindāni brahmāndi ekād ātmānāmarūpānē ācchādit zalā āhe / which has become clothed in a Name and Form, we say from the Metaphysical point of view that "sarvabhūtastham ātmānām sarvabhūtāni cātmanita" (Gī. 6. 29), i.e. "that Ātman which is in Me is also in all other created beings", or again, "idān sarvām ātmaiva" i.e. "all this is the Ātman"; and the saint Tukārāma has with the same idea said:

"Tukā says, Whatever I come across / I think that it is myself // " (Gā. 4444.4).

Secondly, it has already been shown that Tilāk made the advaita philosophy, which is the purṇa advaita, and especially its principle of ātmaupamya, a fundamental principle of social action. Tilāk has given it that meaning by again referring to Tukārām, as follows:

112 GR. p. 379 (M); p. 586 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.

113 Ibid., p. 388 (M); p. 600 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.
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As both one's self, and every one else, has been included in the Paramesvara, and as the Paramesvara is included in one's self and every one else, both one's interest and other's interest are merged in the highest goal in the shape of the dedication of Sri Krsna; and then, the following words of the saint Tukarama, namely,

"the incarnations of saints are for the benefit of the world / they labour their own bodies by philanthropy //"

applies everywhere.

The quotation cited above also implies that a saint is a benefactor of society, a social activist (karmayogi) and not a renouncer of social duties (karmasamnyasi). Tilak differs from Sankara, who prescribed 'karmasamnyasa' to a liberated person (jivanmukta). But this issue will be dealt with in detail in the next chapter.

Thirdly, it was pointed out that Jnanesvar explains the evolution or creation of the world by the cidvilasavada or sphurtivada and Tukaram is in agreement with Jnanesvar on this. According to the cidvilasavada, the world is a real manifestation of God's power (sakti). The real manifestation of God's power through the named and formed world requires action on the part of God. Jnanesvar has emphasized the necessity of divine action for the manifestation of the world, when he says:

115

GR. p. 391 (M); p. 604f (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.
Action (karma) is the natural order (svabhāva) from which the manifestation of the universe (viśvakāru) has come into being (saṁbhaye). You should thoroughly understand this.
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Ṭīṭak seems to be influenced by Jñāneśvar when he argues like Jñāneśvar:

In short, Karma is the activity which is to be seen in the fundamental qualityless Brahman, at the time when the visible world began to be created.

117

Again,

Unless some Karma or Action has been performed, it is not possible for the Imperceptible to become perceptible, or for the Qualityless to become Qualityful.
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These are the points where Ṭīṭak's advaitic philosophy is informed and influenced by the advaitic theology of the Vārkari saints. Having shown the influence of the Vārkari saints on Ṭīṭak's Gitārahasya, we must finally proceed to deal with the question of whether Rāmdās also influenced Ṭīṭak's advaitic philosophy.

G) Similarities among Śaṁkara's Advaita Vedānta, Rāmdās' Theology, and the Gitārahasya:

(1) Similarities between Śaṁkara's Advaita Vedānta and Rāmdās' Theology—
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Jñ. iv. 89.

117

GR. p. 238 (M); p. 365 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.
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According to Śāmkarācārya, Brahman is the only reality. The world is unreal or illusory, and Ātman and Brahman are identical. Rāmdās seems to develop his theology in conformity with Śāmkara and differs from Jñānesvar's theology, when he says:

Evolution (srṣṭi) is of the following kind. The architecture of a gateway of a temple (gopūr) might be beautiful, but the architect should not be confused with the architecture; similarly, he who created the world is different from the world. Some (people) foolishly say that the world is (identical with) the Lord of the world (jagadīś). The creation of the world is his marvellous deed (kalā). He is in all, but He is different from all. Therefore, the inner Self (ātmāramu) is different from matter (kardamu, lit. mud) from which all beings were born. This appears to be the case (satya) because of the illusion (bhrama) of māyā and Ignorance (avidyā). The manifestation of the world (jagadāṃbar), caused by māyā, is true. This is a strange idea and is not found anywhere. Therefore, the world is false (mithyā) and the Self is true (sāc); the Supreme Self transcends all; the inner Self pervades both internally and externally. He is called God (dev) and all else is false (vāv). This is the inner meaning of the Vedānta.

The aforesaid summary of Rāmdās' theological system seems to be in general accord with Śāmkara's advaita Vedānta. Rāmdās, like Śāmkara, explains the existence of the world by māyāvāda. According to Rāmdās, māyā is instrumental (upādhi) in creating the diversity of names and forms in the world. Rāmdās's theory of creation goes as follows:

The Self is qualityless and pure as the sky...
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Qualityless Brahman is imperishable; and whatever perishes is the qualityful mayā; in other words, mayā which is full of qualities is perishable and Brahman which is without qualities is imperishable. In such a qualityless Ātman, qualityful mayā was born even as waves of wind (zuluk) appear in the (still) sky. Light was born from wind, and water from light. And from water, earth (bhūmāndal) was formed. Innumerable beings were born of the earth. However, Brahman remains untouched at the beginning and at the end. Whatever was born has perished but Brahman remains as it was. Sky existed before the earthen pot; it appears in the earthen pot; and the sky is not destroyed when the earthen pot is destroyed. Similarly, the Parabrahman is unchangeable (aṇṭha); and the world of immovable and movable appears and disappears in between evolution and involution.

This quotation is an evidence that Rāmdās accommodates, like Śaṅkara, the Sāṅkhyan theory of evolution and involution in his advaita theology.

Rāmdās develops the mayāvāda along the lines of Śaṅkara's vivartavāda, according to which the world appears to be real because of the dual functions of mayā, namely, (i) hiding the real nature of Brahman (āvaraṇa) and (ii) projecting something which does not exist (vikṣepaṇa). The vivartavāda of

121 Das. 6.iii. 1-7.
Rāmdās is stated in these verses:

We have thus explained how Brahman is eternal and māyā is false appearance (mithyā bhān) even though it appears to be real (vivartarūpa).

Again,

When one is giddy (bhovandī) he sees that the earth is moving around. When he has jaundice, he sees everything yellowish. When he is affected by violent fever with delirium and syncope (sannipāt), he sees many scenes. Māyā does such things. When an object is affected (padārthavikār) by something, it appears illusory (bhāsamātra); it appears different from what it is. Māyā is like that.

Rāmdās repeats the vivartavāda in another work:

Do not get suddenly perplexed; look at the root. Nothing has happened at the root. How can we say that nothing has happened at the root when it seems obvious and when moving and immoving be true? Can beams of the sun sink into darkness? When we awaken our dreams become false (mithyā). When we sleep our dreams appear to be true. Truth appears to be false and falsehood, true; this is the effect (kṛtya) of Ignorance (avidyā).

From what has been said so far, we can conclude that Rāmdās closely followed Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta. Tilak's observation that the Marāṭhā saints support advaita and māyāvāda is true in the case of Rāmdās, but as we have seen it
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is misleading in the case of the Vārkarī saints, because the Vārkarī saints uphold the purṇa advaita which is different from the kevala advaita of Śaṅkarācārya.

(2) Indebtedness of the Gītārahasya to the Theology of Rāmdās—

While Tilak has learned the combination of the advaita and the Sāṅkhyan theory of evolution and involution from Śaṅkara, he specifically says that he expresses it in the language of Rāmdās, when he says:

This activity (vyāpār) of the Prakṛti is called the 'construction and destruction of the universe' (viśvāci ubhāraṇi v-saṁhāraṇi). Because, according to the Sāṅkhya system, this entire world (jag) or creation (srṣṭi) is created by the Prakṛti for the benefit of innumerable spirits. The Samartha (Rāmdās) has given, in two or three places in the Dāsbodh, a beautiful description of how the entire universe (brahmāṇḍa) is created from Prakṛti; and I have taken the phrase 'viśvāci ubhāraṇi v-saṁhāraṇi' i.e. the construction and destruction of the universe from that description alone (vaṁpaṭṭuṇac).

The letter 'c' of the word 'vaṁpaṭṭuṇac' (i.e. from the description alone) is a suffix which is used in Marāṭhī for expressing emphasis, distinctiveness, uniqueness, and exclusiveness. In the foregoing quotation, 'c' is used to express the exclusiveness of the source. From this emphasis of Tilak, we can conclude that Rāmdās provided a model, which combines the advaita system and the Sāṅkhyan theory of the
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construction and destruction of the cosmos, for Tīlak.

Secondly, Tīlak's proposition "That which remains eternally after all beings are destroyed" (Gī. viii. 20), "That alone is really true, It has pervaded all the material bodies (piṅḍa) and the cosmos (brahmāṇḍa) (Gī. xiii. 31)", seems to have been influenced by Rāmdās' advaitic theology for Rāmdās holds:

Whatever is seen with the eyes and thought (bhāse) by the mind is destroyed with the lapse of time. Therefore, the Supreme Brahman (Parabrahman) is beyond vision. The Supreme Brahman is eternal but māyā is perishable. This specific meaning (niścitārtha) is asserted in various scriptures.
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Thirdly, Tīlak affirms his advaitic position against the Sānkhyan dualism and the Nyāya paranānuvāda (viz. atoms are responsible for the creation of the world and there are many atoms) by referring to Rāmdās, when he argues:

To this the reply of the Sāmkhya philosophers is... that the root of all of them... must nevertheless be in existence in a subtle form (Sām. Kā. 8); and the Vedānta philosophers have accepted the same line of argument for proving the existence of the Brahman (see the Saṃkarabhāṣya on Kathā 6.12, 13). When you once in this way acknowledged prakṛti to be extremely subtle and imperceptible, the atomic theory of the Nyāya school naturally falls to the ground.... Therefore, the doctrine of the Sāmkhya philosophy is, that in prakṛti there are no different parts

127 vide, P. 262.

in the shape of atoms, that it is consistent and homogeneous or unbroken in any part, and it perpetually pervades everything in a form which is avyakta (...) and inorganic. In describing the Paratman Sri Samartha Râmâs Śvâmi says in the Dâsbodhâ (Dâ. 20.2.3):-

"In whichever direction you see, it is endless; there is no end or limit anywhere; there is one independent homogeneous substance; there is nothing else".

The same description applies to the prakṛti of the Sâmkhya philosophy.

The quotation is evidence that Tilak was dependent on Râmâs in resolving philosophical questions connected with the advaita philosophy and that he thought of his advaitic position as in conformity with that of Râmâs.

We have shown how Tilak explicitly admitted that he adopted the terms 'viśvācī ubhāraṇi v saṁhāraṇi' (i.e. the construction and destruction of the cosmos) from the accounts of the Dâsbodh. It was also been pointed out that Râmâs' advaitic theology which accommodates the parināmavāda provided a model of philosophy to Tilak. It was also pointed out that Tilak's idea of the imperishability of Brahma has a parallel in the theology of Râmâs. And finally, it was shown that Tilak defined his advaitic stand on the philosophical option in the context of Râmâs. These evidences lead us to conclude that Tilak was dependent on Râmâs to a considerable extent.

GR. p. 143 (M); pp. 215 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.
Having shown Tilak's dependence on Ramdas' theology we proceed next to examine the problem of whether Tilak is dependent on Ramdas as far as Tilak's distinctive theory of atmaupamya (i.e. identification of an individual self with the world and the beings in the world, particularly human beings) is concerned.

Ramdas, who closely followed Samkara's kevala advaita, did not accept the principle of the identity between Brahman and the world and the beings in the world, a doctrine which the Varkari saints propagated on the basis of purna advaita; but he did accommodate the ethics of atmaupamya in his advaitic theology when he said:

The great and small people are ready to do their duties; so this great person (mahapurush) does benevolent deeds (paropkar) from the bottom of his heart. His disposition (vasan) is as follows: he becomes unhappy with the unhappiness of others and happy with the happiness of others; he feels that all should be happy.
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Again,

Toil in doing benevolent deeds; be useful to many people; and nobody should want of anything. Know who are in difficulty and in distress (jaksale); help them according to your power. Say good words to everybody. Be unhappy with the unhappiness of others and be happy with the delight of others (parasanto); and make people yours by sweet words
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Tiṣṭak seems to be influenced by these ethical teachings of Rāmdās when he compares a saying of Christ with Hindu ethics and especially refers to Rāmdās:

'So whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them' (Mt. 7:12; Lk. 6.31).

this is the exhortation (upadeś) of Christ, which is only a part of the sutra (i.e. aphorism) of ātmaupamya (i.e. Self-identification). But this principle was enunciated in our country, long before Confucius, in the Upaniṣads (Īśa. 6; Kena. 13); and later on in the Bhārat (i.e. Mahābhārata) and the Gītā; and it is also expressed in the words of Marāṭhā saints as 'one should consider others as one considers oneself' (atmavat parave te / mānit jāve) (Dās. 12.x.22).

H) Conclusion:

In this chapter, we have discussed the similarities and differences between Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta and Tiṣṭak's advaitic philosophy. We have also discussed the similarities and differences between Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta and the advaitic theology of Jñāneśvar and Tukārām. The similarities which Tiṣṭak has with the advaita system of Śaṅkara are ones which also agree with the advaitic theology of the Vārkari
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saints. Tilak's advaitic system is different from Śaṅkara's advaita Vedānta in that Tilak holds purṇa advaita and the principle of ātmaupamya (i.e. identification). These crucial differences can only be accounted for in the context of the theology of the Vārkari saints and therefore they explicitly show Tilak's dependence on the saints. We also discussed the advaitic theology of Rāmdās who defined his advaitic position more within Śaṅkara's tradition. It was pointed out that though Rāmdās closely followed Śaṅkara, he accommodated the ethics of ātmaupamya in his advaitic theology. Tilak specifically acknowledged his indebtedness to Rāmdās' thought. Therefore, we can conclude that the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra influenced Tilak in clarifying his philosophical position and that in most respects he interpreted advaita (i.e. non-dualism) in accord with the patterns he had learned from the teachings of the Marāṭhā saints.
CHAPTER V

THE PROBLEM OF SAINTLY ACTION

In the last chapter, we dealt with the problem of Ṭiḻak arguing for one specific form of *Vedānta* (ekāc prakāraracā *Vedānta*) in the *Gītā*. According to Ṭiḻak, the *Gītā* utilizes *advaita* *Vedānta*, therefore, he considered the *Gītābhaśya* (i.e. commentary on the *Gītā*) of Śaṅkarācārya preferable to other *bhāsyas* (i.e. commentaries). Nevertheless as Ṭiḻak developed his advaitic philosophy of the *Gītā* we were able to demonstrate that the salient features of his advaitic philosophy were derived from the advaitic theology of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra and thus to indicate the influence of that movement on Ṭiḻak.

In the beginning of the last chapter, we alluded to the fact that Ṭiḻak believes that there is a definite meaning or purport (*niścitārtha*) and a definite doctrine (*ṭhāṃ mat*) in the *Gītā*. According to Ṭiḻak, the *Gītā* prescribes *Karmayoga* (i.e. activism) to a liberated person (*jīvanmukta* or *sthitaprajña*) and not *karmasāmnyāsa* (i.e. renunciation of action or duties). Ṭiḻak did not approve of the traditional *bhāsyas* (i.e. commentaries) because they interpreted the *Gītā* as favouring renunciation of actions or duties after a person gets liberation. This issue constitutes the heart of Ṭiḻak’s position about the *ācāra* (i.e. conduct or code of behaviour)
of a jīvanmukta or a saintly person. In this chapter, this ethical position of Tilak will be discussed with reference to the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra.

A) Sources of the Problem of Saintly Action:

(1) The Šāmkarabhāṣya-

Tilak, in the Gītarahasya, argues that the major problem or concern (mukhya praśna) of the Gītā is whether the jñāni (i.e. knower) who has realized in what the welfare (kalyān) of his self lies, should do his prescribed worldly actions or duties (svadharmaokta sāṁsārik karme), such as fighting and others, till death.

The sources of his problem were the commentaries written by the ācāryas, which were responsible for teaching samnyāsa (i.e. renouncing society and the world) and paramārtha (i.e. other-worldliness) alone. Tilak described the source of his problem in his speech delivered at Umaravati in 1917, as follows:

When I was a boy, I was often told by my elders that strictly religious and really philosophical life was incompatible with the hum-drum life of every day. If one was ambitious enough to try to attain Mokṣa, the highest goal a person could attain, then he must divest himself of all earthly desires and renounce this world. One could not serve two masters, the world and God. I understand this to mean that, if one could lead a life which was the life worth living, according to the religion in which I was born, then the sooner the world was given up the better. This set me thinking. The question that I formulated for
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myself to be solved was: Does my religion want me to give up this world and renounce it before I attempt to, or in order to be able to, attain the perfection of mankind.

This assertion of Tilak's elders was in keeping with the tradition followed by them and many devout Hindus of taking samnyāsa (i.e. physical renouncing of the world) and showing indifference to the social, domestic, and political aspects of life. The question cited above states the general trend of Hinduism, but does not mention the bhāsyas of the ācāryas and the Marāṭhā writers. In other places Tilak accounts for this trend towards renunciation (samnyāsa) in terms of the samnyāsa school (samnyāsanistā) of Śaṅkarācāryya and both the older and modern Marāṭhā commentators of the Gītā, e. g. Hanumān Paṇḍit and K. Telang, who followed Śaṅkara's bhāṣya (commentary) on the Gītā. Thus the source of his problem was the general trend of Hinduism as well as the commentaries interpreting the Gītā as favouring renunciation (nivṛtti).

In order to clarify his view, let us examine Tilak's evaluation of the major commentaries.

It seems that Tilak critically studied the commentary of Śaṅkara on the Gītā. Among the existing commentaries, the Śaṅkarabhāṣya is the oldest. It was written, on the one

---

2 Venkatesvarulu, All About Lok. Tilak, p. 666.

3 GR. pp. 13-14 (M); p. 21 (E).
hand, in order to establish the religious validity of the
advaita school, which stood for the principle that liberation
(moksha) can come about only by means of jnanamarga (i.e. the
way of mystical knowledge) accompanied with samnyasa (i.e.
renunciation of actions or rituals), and, on the other hand,
to refute the view of some commentators who held the doctrine
that self-knowledge should be conjoined with works, which is
technically called karmajnanasamuccaya. Tilak brings this
latter fact to the notice of his readers, when he argues:

Nevertheless, it is obvious from the reference to the
opinions of the ancient critics (pracintikakars) in
the Sankarabhasya (Gl. Sam. Bh. chs. 2 and 3 introduction)
that the critics, who were prior to Sankaracarya, had
interpreted the Gita to be activistic (pravrttipara),
as the writer of the Mahabharata did, in terms of
a synthesis between knowledge and action (karmajnanasamuccaya), that is to say, that a jnani
should discharge his prescribed action (or duty)
(svadharmokta karma) till death, accompanied by
knowledge.

Tilak adds to his argument by pointing out that the sole
intention of Sankaracarya was to refute the view-point of
jnanakarmasamuccaya and to establish his cultic view of

4 The Bhagavad-Gita with the Commentary of Sri
Sankaracharya, tr. A. Mahadeva Sastry, pp. 22f.
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nivṛttipara vaidik saṁnyāsadharma (i.e. renunciatory Vedic Dharma) or karmasāṁnyāsadharma (i.e. religion of renunciation of action). Tilak criticizes Śaṅkara for being the first to deprive the Gitā of its activistic form and to make it a renunciatory treatise. He also criticizes Śaṅkara for either belittling the statements in the Gitā supporting the Karmayoga (i.e. activism after liberation) or considering those statements to be merely laudatory (prasāmsāpara or arthavādapara). Tilak adds in his criticism that Śaṅkara favoured the saṁnyāsa path and looked upon all other paths as based on ignorance (ajñānamulaka).

Tilak points out the role for Karmayoga which was assigned by Śaṅkara in the Gitābhāṣya, when he observes:

Having raised the question whether liberation (mokṣa) is obtained by knowledge or by the synthesis (samuccaya) of knowledge and action (jñāna v karma), Śri Śaṅkarācārya, in his bhāṣya (i.e. commentary) first gave the purport of the Gitā (gitārtha) that by knowledge alone all actions are burnt and one gets
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liberation, and there is no necessity of action for attaining liberation. On the basis of this presupposition, he inferred that, since actions are not required for liberation they become meaningless (nirarthak) after purification of mind (cit), according to the Gītā. And as actions are naturally (svabhāvataḥ) binding viz. against knowledge; this is the doctrine (mat) which is agreeable to the Lord in the Gītā.
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Tīłak clearly states that Śaṅkara had given an inferior position (gaunatva) to karmamārga (i.e. way of action). Śaṅkara considered karmamārga or karmakāṇḍa (i.e. Vedic rituals and sacrifices) as the means of purifying the mind and preparing it (the mind) to attain self-realization, states Tīłak. Śaṅkara thus made karmamārga subordinate to jñānamārga (i.e. way of knowledge) and implied that karmamārga as a way of liberation does not exist independently. Śaṅkara also considered not only the karmamārga as preparatory but also as inferior when he said, "wherefore works are enjoined on the ignorant, not on the wise". Tīłak has pointed out this fact in his criticism of the Śaṅkarabhāṣya.
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Tilak again points out the relation between \( jñāna \) and \( \text{karma} \) in the \( \text{Śaṅkarabhāṣya} \), as follows:

There is another proposition of the Śaṅkara doctrine relating to the mode of life, that, although it is necessary to perform the Action pertaining to the state of a householder in order to acquire the capacity of realizing the identity of the Brahman and the Ātman by the purification of mind, yet it will be impossible to attain Release unless one discontinues those actions later on and ultimately gives them up and take up \( \text{saṁnyāsa} \) (ascetism); because in as much as Action (\( \text{karma} \)) and Knowledge (\( jñāna \)) are mutually antagonistic like light and darkness, the knowledge of the Brahman does not become perfect unless a man has entirely conquered all root tendencies (\( \text{vāsanā} \)) and given up all Actions.

Herein Tilak points out that the \( jñāni \) of the \( \text{Śaṅkarabhāṣya} \) is ultimately a \( \text{karmasaṁnyāsi} \) who must discontinue acting after he has obtained mystical knowledge because the \( jñānamārga \) is the only way of liberation. Tilak does not accept this interpretation of Śaṅkara and of the others who follow Śaṅkara. He suggests another interpretation:

It is true that the \( \text{saṁpradāya} \) of Śaṅkara gives the opinion that one must renounce actions (\( \text{karm} \)) having taken \( \text{saṁnyāsa} \) after acquiring knowledge. But because of that it does not follow that the same is the teaching (\( \text{tātparya} \)) of the \( \text{Gītā} \), or that one has to interpret the \( \text{Gītā} \) in a manner consistent with the the doctrine (\( \text{dharma} \)) of Śaṅkara or others as if it were the only doctrine (\( \text{dharma} \)). It is the established doctrine (\( \text{kāyam siddhānta} \)) of the \( \text{Gītā} \) that it is better (\( \text{uttam pakṣa} \)) to follow \( \text{karmayoga} \) rather than to follow
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GR. p. 279 (M); pp. 428f (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.
saṃnyāsamārga, even after the acquisition of the knowledge. 18

The quotation clearly states that Tilak differs from Śaṅkara in interpreting the teaching of the Gītā.

From the foregoing discussion and criticism of Tilak concerning the Śaṅkarabhāṣya, it should be understood that Tilak took the Śaṅkarabhāṣya seriously because it posed the problem of how to interpret saintly action for him. Tilak also studied the bhāṣyās of the ācāryas and the criticisms of some scholars in his attempt to understand the purport of the Gītā as he says in his autobiographical note in the Gītārahasya. 19

(2) The Rāmānujabhāṣya-

Tilak studied the Rāmānujabhāṣya critically. Rāmānuja was dissatisfied with the advaitic teachings of the Yādava Prakāśa and turned to the teachings of the Ālvārs or the Tamil Saints. 20 In him we can find a combination of a particular philosophical doctrine with a particular religious creed. 21 His school is

18 GR. p. 279 (M); pp. 428 f (E).

19 Ibid., p. 11 (M); p. xvii (E).


21 C. Sharma, op. cit., p. 366.
known as the Viśiṣṭadvaita school which is different, to some extent, from the advaita school of Śaṅkara. These differences are quite apparent in their commentaries on the Gītā.

As the Viśiṣṭadvaita school differs from the advaita school in its view about reality it consequently differs in its views about ways of liberation. The Rāmānujabhāṣya states that mystical knowledge is obtained by various means—karma, jñāna, and bhaktimārga (Gītā ii.10). It considers that karmayoga is more important than jñānayoga, on the following grounds: (i) a person has to be active in doing sacrifices and the like, for sustaining one's body; (ii) karmayoga does not make a person negligent of his duties. The Rāmānujabhāṣya gives us its idea about the final phase of the way of liberation when it says concisely:

Knowledge of the atman combined with karmayoga leads to jñānayoga, through jñānayoga one arrives at the true contemplation of the realizing atman. This contemplation again is propaedeutic to bhaktiyoga; through bhakti alone one is capable of attaining God.

This quotation states clearly that these three ways are not separate roads but successive stages of the same way, culminating in the attainment of God. This is the fundamental

---


23 Ibid., pp. 65f.
teaching of the Rāmānuja-bhāṣya. But according to the Śaṁkarabhāṣya, karmamārga and bhaktimārga only lead to jñānayoga, which alone is the means of liberation.

It was said that the jñāni of the Śaṁkarabhāṣya has to give up action ultimately. Has the bhakta of the Rāmānuja-bhāṣya to give up action after liberation? The Rāmānuja-bhāṣya says that the duties of varnāśrama (i.e. orders and life-stages) are means of contemplation and these means serve to make a person turn away from non-spiritual things; it holds that the released one contemplates the ātman and turns away from non-spiritual things of his own accord. He does not need these means viz. karmayoga and jñānayoga, therefore, he need not perform his duties after release. Moreover, the Rāmānuja-bhāṣya conceives of bhaktimārga alone as the means of liberation and considers devotion as an end in itself (niṣṭhā). It exempts its fully liberated devotee from all duties; its devotee need not perform his duties after liberation. Thus the bhakta of the Rāmānuja-bhāṣya is the same as the jñāni of the Śaṁkarbhāṣya as far as both are exempted from duties.

Tilak has criticized the Śaṁkarabhāṣya, for this reason; he similarly criticizes the Rāmānuja-bhāṣya:


But although Rāmānujaścārya had effected a change in
the cult of Śaṅkara by substituting the Qualified-
Monism for Non-Duality and Devotion for Renunciation,
yet if Devotion is looked upon as the highest duty of
man from the point of view of mode of life, then the
lifelong performance of the worldly duties pertaining
to one's particular status becomes an inferior mode
of life, and on that account the interpretation put
on the Gītā by Rāmānujaścārya must be looked upon as
in a way in favour of Renunciation of Action.

Tīlak also criticizes Rāmānuja's treatment of karmayoga, saying
that Rāmānuja assigned karmayoga to an inferior position and
treated the praise of karmayoga as mere arthavāda (abiter
dicta) (Śi. Ra. Bhā. 5.1).

Tīlak says about the jñāni of the Śaṅkarabhāṣya and
the bhakta of the Rāmānujabhāṣya that both are renunciatory
from the point of view of action (karma). These two bhāṣyas
together constituted the source of the problem of saintly
action for Tīlak.

(3) The Madhva-bhāṣya-

Tīlak also critically studied the bhāṣyas of Madhva,
Vallabha, Nīmbārka, and others. We need not go into much
detail on Tīlak's criticism of the later bhāṣyas because his
criticism of the bhāṣyas of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, and Madhva are

26 GR. p. 14 (M); p. 22 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar
27 Ibid., p. 449 (M); p. 703 (E).
28 Ibid., p. 278 (M); p. 427 (E).
applicable to other bhāṣyas for those schools stand between advaita (non-dualism) and dvaita (dualism) in that they too emphasize (bhaktimārga) as the way of liberation. Tilāk's criticism of the Madhvabhāṣya, however, is important because Madhva represents the dvaita philosophy which is different from both Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja. Secondly, it is important because we should know how Tilāk evaluated Madhva's nīskāmakarma (i.e. disinterested performance of action or duties) philosophy, an issue which is at the heart of Tilāk's own position.

The Madhva school, like the Rāmānuja school, regards bhaktimārga as the only means of liberation. It emphasizes the necessity and efficacy of bhakti on the basis that in the absence of bhakti neither upāsanā (i.e. devotion) nor knowledge of God would be possible.²⁹ It ascribes supremacy to bhakti saying that bondage (or avidyā i.e. mystical Ignorance) cannot be destroyed by knowledge automatically, but bondage is removed only through the Benediction (Īśvarapraśāda)³⁰ or the grace of God.³¹ It describes bhakti


in three stages, namely, (i) that which precedes parokṣajñāna (i.e. indirect knowledge), (ii) that which follows parokṣajñāna, and (iii) that which comes after the aparokṣajñāna (i.e. direct realization) and wins the atyartha prasāda (i.e. absolute grace) of God. According to the Madhvabhāsyā, in the third and the final stage of the bhakti, mukta jīvas (i.e. liberated selves) worship God without selfish motive and only for the sake of worship. This kind of worship is called 'disinterested worship'.

The disinterested worship of the Madhva school has some influence on Tilak's doctrine of nīṇḍakārmamārga (i.e. disinterested activism). Madhva recognizes the necessity of discharging duties before the achievement of liberation and the utility of discharging duties after liberation. He considers karma as the means to the direct realization which grants liberation (ato pararokṣa jñānadeva mokṣaḥ karma tu tatsādhameva), and holds that disinterested action purifies the heart and it is by that purification that one gets redemptive knowledge (akāmakarmabhirantahkaranāsuddhivāra jñānamokṣa

---
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In these verses, Madhva recognizes the necessity of action. A liberated devotee of the Madhva school continues discharging his duties disinterestedly because the school holds that bondage lies not in action itself but in the motive of action. It also defines true nivṛttimārga (i.e., way of renunciation) not as the abandonment of action but as the active performance of duties in the spirit of devotion and dispassion: niṣkāmaṁ jñānapūrvam tu nivṛttimihacocyte.

Madhva does not consider karmamārga as a stumbling block in the life of the liberated but he considers it blissful and productive as he says: jñānottaramanusthitena nivṛttakarmapā pradannah paramātmā muktau jñānābhivyaktamapi sukham vyaktikarotī.

Ṭiḷaka evaluates the karmayoga of the Madhva school in these words:

He says that although Desireless Action has been extolled in the Gītā, yet Desireless Action is only a means and Devotion is the true and ultimate cult, and that when one has become perfect by following the Path of Devotion, whether one thereafter performs or


does not perform Action is just the same.

Tilak also points out, as he has done in the case of the other schools, that Madhva belittles the importance of karmayoga in the Gita when he argued that no one cares for a well when he can get pure water from a river or a large lake. This means that Tilak thinks that karmayoga in the school of Madhva is treated as preparatory for bhaktimarga and that karmayoga is not thought of as mandatory in the case of the liberated. Tilak also rejects Madhva's dvaita (i.e. dualism) philosophy for he holds to the advaita (i.e. non-dualistic) philosophy firmly.

In brief, Tilak's main criticisms against the bhāṣyas of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, and Madhva and others are as follows: (i) They do not recognize karmayoga as an independent way of liberation; the Śaṅkarabhasya considers it preliminary to the jñānamarga, and the bhāṣyas of Rāmānuja and Madhva, preliminary to bhaktimarga. (ii) Their liberated person is ultimately renunciatory; a jñāni of the Śaṅkarabhasya and a devotee of the Rāmānujabhasya are clearly renunciatory, and a devotee of the Madhvaḥṣa is only optionally karmayogi.

37 GR. p. 15 (M); p. 23 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.

38 Ibid., p. 574 (M); p. 892 (E).
In other words, they do not continue to act for the sake of lokasāhgraha (i.e. universal or public welfare).

B) Differences of the Gitārahasya from Other Bhāsyas:

Having studied the bhāsyas of the ācāryas and the other criticisms on the Gitā, Tilāk said in his autobiographical note:

I was then faced by the doubt as to why the Gitā, which was expounded in order to induce to fight that Arjuna, who was dejected by the idea that it was sin to war with one's own relatives, should contain an exposition of the manner in which release could be obtained by knowledge (brahmajñāna) or by devotion (Bhakti), that is to say, only the mokṣamārga; and that doubt gradually gained ground because I could not find a satisfactory answer to the question in any commentary on the Gitā. ... When a person is engulfed in commentaries he cannot find a different solution, though he feel that the solution given in the commentary is not satisfactory. I, therefore, put aside all criticisms and commentaries, and independently and thoughtfully read the Gitā over several times. I then got out of the clutches of the commentaries, and was convinced that the original Gitā did not preach the Philosophy of Renunciation (nivṛtti) but of Energism (Karma-Yoga); and that possibly the single word 'yoga' used in the Gitā has been used to mean Karma-Yoga.

The autobiographical note suggests that Tilāk rejected the traditional commentaries (bhāsyas) of the ācāryas and other commentaries of modern interpreters because each of them prescribes either jñānamārga or bhaktimārga as the only way of liberation and set aside the major question. Tilāk
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re-states his argument in these words:

That the Gitā supports the Path of Devotion, or only the Path of Knowledge, or only the Path of Yoga are opinions, which are fathered on the Gitā by the supporters of those respective doctrines. The doctrine really established by the Gitā is something quite different. Whether, after a person has acquired the Knowledge of the Paramēśvara—whatever the means he may have employed for the purpose— he should or should not continue the various Actions of worldly life, for universal welfare, is the chief question in the Gitā; and the reply to that question... is that the Karma-Yoga is the most superior.

Thus Tilak differs from other commentators as he argues that the Gitā teaches 'Karma-Yoga' or 'Pravṛtti-Mārga' and not the nivṛttimārga of the schools which emphasizes jñānamārga or bhaktimārga as the only way of liberation.

Secondly, Tilak differs from the Acāryas and other commentators in their treatment of Karmayoga and other mārgas of liberation mentioned in the Gitā, when he argues:

Jñāna-Yoga there is, yes. Bhakti-Yoga there is, yes. Who says not? But they are both subservient to the Karma-Yoga prescribed in the Gitā. If the Gitā was preached to desponding Arjuna to make him ready for the fight— for the action— how can it be said that the ultimate lesson of the great book is bhakti or jñāna alone? In fact, there is a blending

40 GR. p. 740 (M); pp. 1132f (E), tr. B. Sukthankar.

41 Ibid., p. 53 (M); p. 80 (E).

42 Ibid., p. 54 (M); p. 81 (E).
of all three Yugas in the Gita; and as the air is not oxygen or hydrogen, or any other element alone, but a composition of all, there is a certain proportion, so in the Gita all these Yugas are blended into one.

The quotation implies that Tilak's Karmayoga includes knowledge (jñāna) and devotion (bhakti); and he sees no conflict between knowledge and action, as it is maintained in the school of Sāmkara, or between devotion and action, as it is maintained by some schools of devotionalism. Tilak's Karmayoga is a synthesis of devotion, knowledge, and action. This proposition becomes clearly established as he argues:

The main object (mukhya viṣay) expounded in the Gita is to harmonize spiritual knowledge (brahmavidyā) with devotion (bhakti) and through the combination justify (samarthan karane) karmayoga.

Again,

Only one way (niṣṭhā) is told in the Gita, that is Karmayoga grounded in knowledge (jñānamulak) and in which devotion is predominant (bhaktipradhan).

This means that there is harmony among jñāna, bhakti, and karma, an interpretation which is technically called karma-jñānabhakti-samuccaya.

43 quoted by N. C. Jog, op. cit., p. 198.
44 GR. p. 423 (M); p. 662 (E).
45 Ibid., p. 413 (M); p. 645 (E); cf. pp. 664, 1206 (E).
Thirdly, Tilak differs from other commentators in the way he handles the main problem of the Gita namely, whether a liberated person has to act after achieving liberation. Tilak asserts the distinctiveness of his interpretation of the Gita as compared with the interpretation of others, in these words:

I differ from almost all the commentators when I say that the Gita enjoins Action after the perfection in jhāna and bhakti is attained and the Deity is reached through these media. Now, there is a fundamental unity underlying the Logos (Ishvara), man, and the world. The world is in existence because the Logos has willed it so. It is His will that holds it together. Man strives to gain union with God; and when this union is achieved, the individual will merge in the mighty Universal Will. When this is achieved, will the individual say: I shall do no action, and I shall not keep the world- the world which is, because of the will with which he has sought union has it so, be so? It does not stand to reason. It is not I who say so; the Gita says so.

Thus Tilak argues that the liberated person of the Gita, called variously as sthitaprajña (i.e. steady-in-mind) (Gī. ii.55-75), bhaktimān (i.e. devotee) (Gī. xii. 13-20), jñānin (i.e. possessed of knowledge) and karmayogī continues to act disinterestedly and for the universal welfare (lokasaṅgraha).

46 quoted by N. C. Jog, op. cit., pp. 198f.
47 GR. p. 224 (M); p. 344 (E).
48 Ibid., p. 296 (M); pp. 454f (E).
49 Ibid., p. 599 (M); pp. 930f (E).
Tilak depicts the jñāni of the Gītā in contrast with the jñāni of the Śaṅkaraḥāṣya, as follows:

In brief, according to the Gītā, the idea 'it is not for me' (mālā nako) should not be a reason for giving up action (karma). As action (karma) is unavoidable (aparihārya), (we) can infer from this idea that one has to do his unavoidable action, which is prescribed by the scriptures, with a mind of self-denial. ... This is a big difference between karmasaṁyāsa and karmayoga: 'It is not for you, therefore you should do nothing' according to the people advocating saṁyāsa; and 'It is not for you, therefore, whatever you have to do do it with a disinterested frame of mind', the Gītā is arguing so.
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Tīlak argues that the doctrine of the Gītā has come into being only in order to explain why a wise man (jñāni) must act, and this explanation of the Gītā makes the Gītā most distinctive. He adds that the ultimate doctrine of the Gītā is that the union between action (karma) and spiritual knowledge (jñāna) is best and mere action or spiritual knowledge is onesided. Tīlak argues that the jñāni of the Gītā has to act for the sake of duty, as follows:

But, just as when one is asked to remove a colour (...) from a piece of cloth, it does not mean that he should destroy the piece of cloth. Similarly, when it is said that one should not entertain selfish desire (kāma), attachment (saṅga) or love (rāga) in action,

50 GR. p. 292 (M); pp. 448f (E).

51 Ibid., p. 272 (M); p. 417 (E).

52 Ibid., p. 323 (M); p. 499 (E).
it does not mean that actions themselves should be given up... one can act with detachment (vairāgya) and nobody can give up action. Therefore, actions, which ignorant people do expecting results, should be performed by a jñāni even after having obtained the knowledge (jñānottarāhi), considering advantages and disadvantages, happiness and unhappiness as equal (Gī. ii. 38), with courage and enthusiasm, with a pure mind, that is, being detached (virakta) or indifferent (udāsina) to the results (Gī. xviii. 26), with a peaceful mind, according to one's own privileges (adhikār), and only as a duty (Gī. vi. 3). This is the true principle of leading one's life in view of ethics (nītidadṛṣṭyā) and of liberation (mokṣadrṛṣṭyā).

Ṭīlak adds that there is no conflict between karma and jñāna in the Gītā and the jñāni must do all duties for the sake of the duties and also for universal wellbeing (lokasahgraha). Thus the jñāni of the Gītā is the karmayogi of the Gītarahasya.

Similarly, Ṭīlak depicts the devotee (bhaktimān) of the Gītā in contrast with the devotee of the ācārya-bhāṣyas. In his comment on the Gītā viii. 7-8, Ṭīlak asks those who maintain that the Gītā teaches the renunciation of the world and following the way of devotion, to pay attention to the proposition laid down in the seventh stanza, when he argues:

One gets liberation by his devotion to God, which is united with knowledge (jñānayukta bhakti)... It is not the proposition (abhiprāy) of the Gītā that one has to give up action in order to attain liberation.

53  GR. pp. 295f (M); pp. 454f (E).

54  Ibid., pp. 440f (M); p. 689 (E).
On the contrary, it is the proposition (siddhānta) of the Gītā-science that even the devotee of the Blessed Lord must do his duties prescribed by his dharma with the desireless frame of mind; and the same proposition is conveyed by the words 'always meditate on Me, and fight'.
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Ṭīlak argues the same point in his comment on the Gītā ix. 27-28, as follows:

From this it becomes quite clear, that even the Devotee of the Blessed Lord /the bhagavad-bhakta/ has to perform all Actions with the idea of dedicating them to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and that he cannot give up Action.
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Ṭīlak argues that the devotee of the Gītā is a karmayogi:

The bhaktimārga of the Gītā is predominantly activistic (karmapradhān); and the Paramēśvara is worshipped not only by flowers or speeches (vacane) but also by desireless actions (nīkāma karma) prescribed by one's dharma (svadharmokta); and everybody must do such worship; this is the main principle of devotion cum action (karmamaya bhakti) is not found anywhere except in the Gītā, this must be considered the specific characteristic (viśeṣ lakṣana) of the bhaktimārga of the Gītā.
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Ṭīlak repeats the idea in another place when he says that in the path of devotion, actions are not given up but their fruit

55 GR. p. 651 (M); p. 1035 (E).

56 Ibid., p. 686 (M); p. 1057 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar; cf. Ṭīlak's commentary on the Gītā xi. 55.

57 Ibid., p. 395 (M); p. 613 (E).
is dedicated to the Parameśvara (Gī. xii. 7-8). Thus the bhakta of the Gītā is understood as a karmayogi in the Gītārāhasya.

It was argued before that the jñāni of the Gītā is understood as a karmayogi in the Gītārāhasya, and now that the bhakta of the Gītā is understood as a karmayogi in the Gītārāhasya. Thus both the bhakta and the jñāni of the Gītā are karmayogis in the Gītārāhasya.

In brief, it was argued that Tilak rejected all the interpretations of the acāryas and other commentators because they prescribe either jñānamārga or bhaktimārga as the final way of liberation and they ultimately support samnyāsa (i.e. renunciation of social life and duties). Their bhakta or jñāni is ultimately a samnyāsi. Tilak differs from them when he says that the Gītā preaches the Karmayoga which includes bhakti and jñāna; his Karmayoga is a synthesis of karma, jñāna, and bhakti. Tilak also differs from other commentators when he says that the sthītaprajña, who is jñāni and bhakta, is the karmayogi who continues to act even after being liberated and acts disinterestedly and for the sake of universal wellbeing (lokasaṅgraha).

---
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C) Sources of the Solution to the Problem of Saintly Action:

It should be clear that the bhāsyas and other commentaries constituted a problem in arriving at a proper interpretation of saintly action for Tilāk. In other words, the solution to the problem that a liberated person should continue to act disinterestedly and for universal wellbeing did not come from them. What were Tilāk's sources in working out his own solution? We have already shown in the introduction of the thesis that Tilāk often cites the Marāṭhā saints in support of his arguments. Is it then possible to suppose that the Marāṭhā religious tradition provided the basis for Tilāk's solution? If the Marāṭhā tradition contributed to solving the problem, what was the form of its contribution? A need to examine this possibility leads us to ask several questions concerning the Marāṭhā religious tradition: Is there a teaching about action (karmayoga) in the Marāṭhā tradition? How does the tradition treat jñānamārga and karmamārga? Is its devotionalism mainly activistic (karmapradhān)? Does it ask its saint, the released person, to renounce the world or to remain in the world and to discharge his social duties disinterestedly for the sake of social wellbeing (lokasaṅgraha)? Is its bhakta or jñāni a karmayogi?
(1) Theology of the Varkari Saints

The questions stated above are to be addressed to the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra. Let us begin with the teaching of the Varkarī saints and particularly with the teaching of Jñānesvār, as we have done in the previous chapters. Before we start discussing Jñānesvār's theology, it should be said at the outset that although the Marāṭhā saints tend to stress bhaktimārga as the principal way of liberation, they have interwoven karmayoga or disinterested performance of duties into their bhaktimārga in such a way that Tīlak can legitimately find in them an ally for his activistic interpretation of the Gītā. This is the proposition we will try to prove as we go on discussing the theology of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra.

Jñānesvār heightens the importance of bhaktimārga over other means to liberation when he comments on the Gītā ix. 48, as follows:

The Vedas reached their limit (soy) and became silent; the sacrifices returned from heaven (i.e. they did not reach God). Those who sought (God) through yoga saw a great barrier (āyās) and left off the practice of yoga. The effort (saura) to study the scriptures proved not useful; the most righteous deeds led into self-deception and only reached satyalok with great difficulty. Those who practise austerity (tap) saw (my) glory only from a distance (apārāntare) and immediately abandoned their austerity. The cosmic form which you saw without difficulty is not seen by anyone (kavaṇā) in the world of men.
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In these verses, Jñāneṣvar talks of the limitations of knowing God by means of studying the Vedas and other sacred books and of practising austerity and doing righteous deeds, and concludes that the cosmic vision of God is seen by a devotee very easily.

Jñāneṣvar says that the fruit of yoga (austerity) is also obtained by bhaktimārga, as follows:

Your devotees (sevak, lit. servants) enjoy the bliss of yoga, by your love (snehāle) alone.

Jñāneṣvar also holds that the mystical knowledge of identity between Brahman and ātman is obtained by bhaktimārga:

You gratify the loving want (lāle pālisi) of knowledge "so'haṁsiddhi" (i.e. doctrine that you are that), of your devotees.

Again,

He who worships me with purity (cokhauli) in the discharge of his duties attains the way of knowledge (jñānanisthā) by my grace (prasāde). When the way of knowledge is in the hands of the karmayogi, he becomes delighted (ulhāse) with my devotion. He becomes identical (samaras) with me by devotion and therefore attains bliss.

---

60  Jñ. xii. 4.
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In this quotation, Jñāneśvar states that there is devotion after jñānamārga. This type of devotion is called devotion transcending jñāna (jñānottarabhakti). In other words, the bhaktimārga of Jñāneśvar is jñānamaya (i.e. permeated by mystical knowledge).

Tukārām, like Jñāneśvar, considers bhaktimārga as the best means of liberation because it is the easiest means and also yields the fruit of all the other means. He emphasizes reciting the name of God, a characteristic of bhaktimārga:

When we recite the name we obtain the merits of the morning and evening ritual (saṅdhya), of various rites (karma), of meditation (dhyān), of muttering vedic mantras (jap), of austerity (tap), and of religious observance (anuṣṭhān). We do not have to pay a price for the name and we are not required to make a big effort (sāyās). Then why do you want to be lazy in reciting the name? This is the essence. Why do you not take that which is given freely? Are you paying a price for it?

Tukārām says that the essence of all religious means is in reciting the name of God which is a part of bhaktimārga:

Your name is my austerity, my gift, and my religious observance. Your name is my pilgrimage, my rite, and my truth. Your name is my action (karma), my religious duty (dharma), and my discipline (nityanem). Your name is my family-practice (kulācār), my family-religion (kuladharma) and my discipline. Your name is my practice (ācār), my principle (vicār), and my


64 Śrī Tukārām Mahārājānēce Abhaṅg 1745. 1-2.
certainty (nirdhār).

Tukārām follows Jñāneśvar in saying that bhaktimārga yields the fruit of jñānamārga namely, the mystical experience of identity, when he says:

Know this, the devout have no store of merit; they have reached the state where all is God, immanent and transcendent... Tukā says, There is no such distinction as 'God and His worshipers'.

From the evidences cited above, we can conclude that the Vārkārī saints hold bhaktimārga as the best means of liberation, one which yields the fruits of all the religious means of liberation. The bhaktimārga of the Vārkārī saints holds that the mystical knowledge of identity between Brahman and ātmān is also obtained by bhaktimārga. It means that there is no conflict between jñāna and bhakti and bhaktimārga is grounded in knowledge (jñānamūlaka). The emphasis of the Vārkārī saints on reciting the name of God as a means of liberation implies that mystical knowledge is obtained easily in bhaktimārga.

The next very important and crucial problem is whether the bhaktimārga of the Vārkārī saints is kammaśamvāsāpara
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(i.e. oriented towards renunciation of action) or nivṛttipara (i.e. renunciatory), or karmapradhāna (i.e. predominantly activistic) or pravṛttipara (i.e. oriented towards action).

It seems that Jñāneśvar is not in favour of the renunciatory mode (of a saṁnyāsi) of life which prefers renouncing social life to remaining in society. He understands saṁnyāsa in terms of the renunciation of selfish desires rather than withdrawal from the society, when he says:

> When the mind has become detached (niḥsaṅga) in nature, we need not give up the domestic life and other things. It is like picking up the ashes with cotton balls, once the fire is extinguished. Similarly, he who has no desire (saṅkalpa) is free from the bondage of action even though his organs are functioning. Therefore, when desire (kalpanā) is given up, one becomes a saṁnyāsi. For this reason, saṁnyāsanārga and karmānārga are equal as far as their final reward is concerned.

Jñāneśvar criticizes the saṁnyāsi life, and emphasizes saṁnyāsa of desire (saṅkalpa), when he says:

> He has become a saṁnyāsi by saying so, but he still greedily runs after enjoyment. He does not know Brahmān (brahmarasu), and his efforts (kāśāvisu) are in vain... He defiles the body and holds a stick in his hand and wanders; he is dissatisfied and crazy (vivha) about sense-objects, so what is the use of the stick? Householders wonder about this saṁnyāsi. If you are a liberated soul (siddha), why do you defile your body? Know that you are not saṁnyāsi at

---
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Jñāneśvar defines *saṁnyāsa* in terms of mental discipline and asks people not to give up social duties, as follows:

He who remains in his āśrama (i.e. householdership) and renounces desire is a renouncer (vairāgi); he only is a saṁnyāsi who has (true) detachment (asaṅgatā) towards sense-objects (saṅga); the nature (of Brahman) is with him.

Again,

Why do you bid good-bye to householdership (grhāśrama)? why do you give up religious obligations (kriyākarma)? Why do you give up your family duties (dharma)? The secret lies elsewhere.

On the basis of what Jñāneśvar has said, we can conclude that Jñāneśvar was critical of the external mode of the saṁnyāsi life, and that he thought of saṁnyāsa in terms of the renunciation of desires or selfish motives (saṅkalpa). He did not ask the people to renounce the world and social life, but rather to renounce wrong motives and selfish attitudes towards life while continuing to discharge a householder's duties.

---
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Tukārām, like Jñānesvar, criticizes the saṁnyāsa cult, as follows:

Becoming saṁnyāsis, they wear safron dress but they have not given up the desire for enjoyment (viśay). They despise tasteless food (kadānna) and desire delicious food (devānna). Tukārām says, "How the Lord will meet such people of hypocritical devotion (dāmbhik bhajan)?" /viz. saṁnyāsis are expected to eat whatever is given to them, as a proof of controlling their tongue /

In a few poems, Tukārām criticizes the saṁnyāsi mode of the Kānphāṭi Saiva sect, Mahānubhāva, and of the Śvetāmbar sect of Jainism, all of which valued renunciation of society.

Tukārām, like Jñānesvar, defines saṁnyāsa in terms of the renunciation of desire (saṅkalpasamnyāsa):

Have you taken the saṁnyāsa which destroys selfish desire (saṅkalpa)? If you have, it does not matter whether you stay in society, or in a forest, or (sleep) on a cot or on the bare ground (bhoi). When you have broken the bud of consciousness (jāniv), you have a different attitude.

Again,

Even though a hermit (saṁyogi) lives in the forest (vānaprastha), he must still have detachment because saṁnyāsa means the renunciation of selfish desire

---
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From the foregoing discussion, we can conclude that the Varkari saints were critical of the samnyasa cult; they attacked the hypocritical tendency of the samnyasa cult and emphasized the renunciation of selfish motives (sañkalpa), and of doing duties irrespective of whether a person leaves society and stays in a forest or remains in society. In brief, the Varkari saints emphasized sañkalpasamnyasa (i.e. renunciation of social duties).

While discussing the theology of Jñãneśvar about samnyasa it was made clear that Jñãneśvar did not ask householders to give up their social duties and take samnyasa (i.e. physical withdrawal from society) for the sake of religious life or for attaining liberation (mokṣa), because he defined samnyasa in terms of the abandonment of selfish motives (sañkalpa) and asked the householders to continue to discharge their duties. He clearly asked the householders not to take samnyasa but to continue doing their duties.

The burden of householder's duties is already on his shoulders. Why should it be increased more by asking him to take a samnyasa? viz. burdening him with the duties of a samnyasi. Therefore, we should not
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give up doing sacrifices (agnisvā), and should not cross the threshold of duty, for we naturally have the bliss of yoga within ourselves.
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Jñānesvar has repeated the idea in another place in the Jñānesvari. In the quotation cited above, Jñānesvar has said that the bliss of liberation lies within one's self, implying that a householder can have it without taking saṁnyāsa.

Tukārām, like Jñānesvar, speaks highly of a householder and says that the householder attains the results of saṁnyāsa, which implies that he need not be a saṁnyāsi, as follows:

He serves others and heeds no censure, he looks on other men's wives as sisters. He is compassionate to all creatures, a protector of cows, he supplies them with water when they are thirsty in the wilderness. He is an image of peace, he treats no man harshly, he enlarges the glory of the householder's state; he attains the highest state and has all the strength that renunciation gives.
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From what has been said above, we can conclude that the Vārkari saints clearly emphasized the duties of householder­ship (grha­stā­rama) and did not encourage people to renounce house­holdership in the interest of the religious life or in the interest of attaining liberation. They held that the

---
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spiritual fruit which is obtained by being a samnyasi can better be obtained in householdership. This position implies that there is no conflict between bhakti and karma, or doing social duties and leading the ideal spiritual life. In other words, the Varkari saints were trying to harmonize prapaṇca (i.e. social and domestic life) and paramārtha (i.e. spiritual or religious life).

The idea of harmony between prapaṇca and paramārtha is emphasized by Tukārām, when he says:

Vain is the renunciation which consists in leaving one's country. Lust and fear grow up through desire; we must quit idle prattle of renunciation... A precious life is one spent in the service of others, we shall repent if we do not break through the snares of the world.

The Varkari saints were thus against the practice of the samnyāsa cult which called for abandoning social duties in the interest of spiritual pursuit. They taught that one should do prapaṇca (i.e. domestic and social duties) within the framework of paramārtha (i.e. ideal religious or spiritual life). This means that the bhaktimārga of the Varkari saints was karmapradhāna (i.e. dominated by activism) and not karma-samnyāsapradhāna (i.e. dominated by renunciation of actions). In other words, there is karmayoga in the bhaktimārga of the Varkari saints.
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Having shown that there is karmayoga in the bhakti-marga of the Vārkārī saints, we should next proceed to examine the prominent features of the karmayoga of the Vārkārī saints.

First, a devotee (bhakta) of the Vārkārī Sampradāya is a karmayogi, that is, he continues to do his social and domestic duties even after being liberated; he is an active jīvanmukta (i.e. a saintly person who is liberated in the embodied state). Jñānesvar calls the jīvanmukta 'mahātmā' (i.e. great soul) and describes the mahātmā as a person actively engaged in the wellbeing of others, as follows:

Thus by extolling (my) name, they remove the pains of the world. 

Because of their doing so the whole world is filled with the highest bliss (mahāsukhe). They enable others to see without the light of dawn; they enliven others with nectar; they show liberation (kaivalya) to others even though the others have not practised yoga... Someone rarely goes to heaven (Vaikuntha) but they have made the universe (viśva) heaven; they have purified the universe by the glory of praising my name.

Jñānesvar adds that saints are the embodiment of compassion; they show their compassion to anyone irrespective of his social status; they identify with the suffering and happiness of
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others; their work is "to bring relief to those who are worn out by travelling or afflicted by distress; or,

As the sun sets out to encircle the earth, it dispells the world's darkness and opens the temples of prosperity (śriyā). Similarly, they set free those who are in bondage; they rescue the drowning, and remove the afflictions of the distressed. In short, they work night and day for increasing the happiness of others (puḍhil) and in so doing they attain their goal.

Tukārām follows Jñānesvar in describing the work and attitude of a saintly person, as follows:

He makes friendship with those people who are oppressed. Know him to be a saint and God dwells in him... He takes to his heart those who are helpless (āpaṅgītā). He shows compassion to his son as well as to his servants. Tukārām says, "I have told you often that he is the very image (mūrti) of the Blessed Lord.

Again,

Manifestations (vibhūti) of saints are for the wellbeing of the world; they wear themselves out doing benevolent deeds for others. Showing compassion to beings is the stock (bhāndaval) of the saints; they do not love their own bodies. Tukārām says, "They become happy by the happiness of others and the nectar flows out of
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From what has been said above, we can conclude that the Varkari saints taught that a devotee (bhakta) or a person who has obtained spiritual knowledge (jñāni) or a saint or a jīvanmukta has to continue doing his duties for the sake of universal wellbeing (lokasaṅgraha) or the wellbeing of society.

Another feature of the karmayoga of the Varkari Sampradāya has to do with the spirit in which actions are performed. It was shown before that the Varkari saints have emphasized doing duties while renouncing selfish motives (saṅkalpasamnyāsa), that is, acting disinterestedly. In addition to the principle of saṅkalpasamnyāsa, there is the principle of the dedication of action and the fruit thereof to the deity, in the Varkari Sampradāya. Jñānesvār calls the principle 'brahmasamarpana' and defines it as follows:

They say that these actions and their fruit are identical with Brahman (brahmarupa), therefore, there is nothing left for our enjoyment. Thus having dedicated their action to Brahman, they shake off the responsibility saying 'it is not mine'. Now, actions are respectfully dedicated to the syllable Om which is the form of Brahman; and in this way, the actions become identical with Brahman (brahmatva).
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Again,

As seeds which are put in the fire are destroyed of germination, actions dedicated to me do not yield good or bad results.
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Tukārām follows Jñānesvar when he says:

Every action should be offered to God; this is the only worship that reaches him. Every action is perfected by this rule of conduct, that the worshippers are members of God. This is the one secret; this is the message of religion. Tukā say, 'It is true, it is true; three times I say it is true'.
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Now, we can summarize what we have learned about the bhaktimārga of the Vārkari saints. (i) The bhaktimārga is the easiest way of liberation because its emphasis on reciting the name of God. (ii) The bhaktimārga yields the fruit of jñānamārga and other means of liberation. As it yields mystical knowledge it is characterized as grounded in knowledge (jñānamulaka). (iii) The bhaktimārga of the Vārkari saints is critical of the samnyāsa cult and does not advocate karmasamnyāsa, that is renunciation of social life and its duties. It defines samnyāsa in terms of the renunciation of selfish motives (sāṅkalpa). It asks householders to do their duties and asks its devotees and saints to continue doing their social and domestic duties. (iv) The bhaktimārga of the Vārkari
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saints asks its saints to continue to discharge their duties after attaining enlightenment. This is done for the wellbeing of others (viz. poor and ignorant) and is carried out in the spirit of disinterestedness (niṣkāma) and is a dedication of both the deeds and fruit thereof to the deity. Thus it is karmapradhāna (i.e. predominantly activistic).

(2) Theology of Rāmdās-

Having dealt with the theology of the Varkarī saints, we should proceed to examine the theology of Rāmdās, bearing in mind the questions we put to the Varkarī saints.

Rāmdās also teaches that bhaktimārga is the way of liberation, when he says:

The name of the book is the Dāsbodh; herein is a dialogue (sāmvād) between a preceptor and his disciples; bhaktimārga is explained in it. Ninefold devotion, knowledge, the characteristics of renunciation (vairāgya), and explanation of spiritual knowledge (adhyātma) are explained in it. The import (abhiprāv) of this book is that man can surely attain God by devotion.

Ramdas' bhaktimarga emphasizes the easiness of the way or reciting the name of God, when he says:

One cannot express in words the greatness of the name of God; many people were uplifted by the name. Śaṅkara himself was saved from the halāhal poison (by reciting the name). Four varṇas have the right of reciting the name; the name does not discriminate between the great and the small. Both lazy (jaḍ) and foolish (mūḍha) people have made it across the
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shore (pailpār) by the means of the name.

Rāmdās establishes the self-sufficiency of reciting the name of God or the bhaktimārga over other means of liberation, as follows:

Rāmdās says,"If you have faith in the name of God, you are not required to do rites (karma), religious duties (dharma), yogic practices; (you are not required) to eat specific food (bhoga) or to renounce (something) (tyāga) or (to follow) the order or mandate (sāṅg) (of someone). You should meditate on the name of Rāma at dawn."

Mahipati, a biographer of the Marāṭhā saints, notes this emphasis in Rāmdās' theology on the name of God and quotes Rāmdās:

In the repeating of God's name there is the equivalent of all other forms of religious acts and austerities. One who repeats God's name is unharmed by hindrances...

Rāmdās also holds that the bhaktimārga yields the mystical knowledge of identity between the Paramātman and ātman (or a devotee), when he says:

When one tries to know God, he becomes identical (tadrupatā) with God (because) there is (then) no separation (vibhaktatā) between God and His devotee.
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at all. As he is not separate (vibhakta) (from God) he is called a devotee (bhakta). As he is not in bondage, he is free (mukta). An argument, supported by the scriptures, is appropriate (yukta) and not inappropriate. When one looks at the origin of God and the devotee, the differences between God and the devotee seem to be eradicated. There is only one Supreme Self (the Paramātma) beyond all that is visible. After dedicating oneself to God (ātmanivedan) one attains to the unified devotion (abheda bhakti) which is truly called sāyojyamukti (i.e., liberation in terms of being united with the Deity). He who submits himself to saints learns about non-dualism (advaita). After that, if one tries to make himself separate from God, he cannot be separated... (for) God and the devotee are one at the origin; he who realizes this wisdom (vivek) is the saint who is able to give one liberation (mokṣadāyak).

Rāmdās repeats in another work that bhaktimārga yields the mystical knowledge of identity. Rāmdās makes his bhaktimārga based on knowledge or wisdom (vivek) and criticizes naive devotion (bhola bhāv), when he says:

If one has naive devotion (bhola bhāv), he has a correspondingly ignorant nature. How can one attain the God of gods by ignorance?

Again,

Let the simple faith lead to liberation; this is a means (upāv) of liberation (udhār, lit. uplift).
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But we should know liberation by wisdom (vivek); this is the clear (rokaḍā) intent (abhīprāv).

In brief, the bhaktimārga of Rāmdās is jñānamūlaka (i.e. grounded in knowledge).

As the bhaktimārga yields mystical knowledge, Rāmdās maintains harmony between devotion and knowledge, as is seen in some of his sayings:

The way of knowledge and the way of devotion (upāsanā) are identical (ekaci); (but) people are liberated ultimately by devotion.

Or, 'There is no liberation by knowledge without devotion' and 'Knowledge without devotion is called ignorance'.

Thus Rāmdās' bhaktimārga harmonizes jñāna and bhakti.

Rāmdās not only harmonizes jñāna and bhakti but also harmonizes knowledge and action (karma), when he says:

Bookish knowledge (śabdajñāna) without action is like the detestable vomit of a dog. Good people never pay attention to it.
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Or, :

Pure knowledge without corresponding action, is like a mime. Or it is like the perfectly beautiful wife in the dramatic play, who bears no children.

From the evidences cited above, we can conclude that the bhaktimarga of Rāmdās is a synthesis of bhakti, jñāna, and karma (bhaktikarmajñānasamuccaya).

The next important question is whether the bhaktimarga of Rāmdās is nivṛttipara (i.e. advocating renunciation of social and domestic duties) or pravṛttipara (i.e. advocating performance of social and domestic duties).

It was discussed in the earlier chapter how Rāmdās asked the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas to discharge their duties. The remainder of the problem is whether Rāmdās recognizes the importance of grhasthāśrama (i.e. householdership) or asks people to renounce it in the interest of religious pursuit, that is, mokṣa. Rāmdās praises the grhasthāśrama in these verses:

There are different dresses and life-stages (āśramas); but the householdership (grhasthāśrama) is the root of all. Beings of the three worlds (trailokavāsī)- gods, seers, sages, yogis, tāpāsi, recluse, manes and others, and guests (abhyāqat)- are supported by it. They were born in householdership; they renounced their
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householdership but they again go to householders after achieving their goal (kirtirupe). Householdership is the best of all the life-stages, for this reason. However, discharging one's duties (svadharma) must be practised in householdership. Six duties are discharged, prescribed and performed, and pleasing words are spoken to all creatures, in this life-stage.

Ramdās does not ask people to renounce social and domestic life (prapanca) but rather asks the people to lead the social and domestic life and the spiritual or religious life (paramārtha) together, when he says:

First the domestic life (prapanca) must be led successfully and then one should think of the religious life (paramārtha). O thoughtful people, do not be lazy about it. If you relinquish domestic life in order to be successful in the religious life, you will be unhappy. You will be considered thoughtful if you do both domestic and religious duties. If you do religious duties and give up your domestic duties, you will not get food to eat. How, then, will such a hapless person (karahtā) attain the religious goal (paramārtha)? If you give up religious duties and do only your domestic duties, you will suffer pain in hell and you will be most distressed (kaśṭī) while experiencing pain in hell.

Ramdās adds that when both prapanca and the paramārtha are done with discretion (vivek), people in both worlds (i.e. here and hereafter) are pleased. Thus Ramdās harmonizes
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the social and spiritual aspects of life, which is the outstanding feature of Ramdas' bhaktimarga. From the foregoing discussion, we can conclude that the bhaktimarga of Rāmdās is prayrttipara (i.e. advocating performance of social and domestic duties).

The next very important problem is whether Rāmdās' ideal person or saint or devotee or sthitaprajña continues to act after attaining spiritual knowledge or enlightenment (jñānottarakarma). Rāmdās describes characteristics of the saint in these verses:

They do actions (karma) with fondness and they have no desire for rewards, Peace, forgiveness, and compassion are their friends. (Therefore), give up selfish desires and achieve what is eternal.

Or,

They have saved themselves (and) they have become useful to the people. Having heard their fame, the undevout (abhakta) become devoted (bhāvārthī).

Rāmdās adds that the saints enlighten people; they
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always engage themselves in conferring obligation (paropkār) on others; they become unhappy with the unhappiness of others, and happy with others' happiness; they desire all to be happy.

Thus the saints of the theology of Rāmdāś work for the wellbeing (lokasaṅgraha) of all people with disinterestedness.

Another feature of the karmamārga of Rāmdāś' theology has to do with the spirit in which actions are performed. It was pointed out that the saint of Rāmdāś' theology works disinterestedly or unselfishly or with sahkalpasamnyāsa. In addition there is another principle of doing actions, that is, the spirit of self-dedication to the deity (ātmanivedana or ātmasamarpana). The principle of ātmanivedana is not only dedication of deeds and the fruit thereof to the deity but it is also the dedication of one's self to the deity. It seems to be a spiritual experience of identity in the context of devotion. Rāmdāś defines ātmanivedana, as follows:

Listen to the characteristic of dedication (nivedan); you will know (the characteristic of dedication) when you dedicate yourself to God or when you try to explain reality (tattva). Therefore, we should meditate on and recognize who is God and we should search in our hearts who we are. When we examine (tattvazāda) in order to decide who we are, we shall come to know that we are nothing. When we exercise our wisdom (vivek), we would know that all are the forms of reality (tattvarupa); and when Prakṛti vanishes the

111 Dās. 19.iv. 10-11.
112 Ibid., 19.iv. 23.
Self remains and not us... We are false (mithyā) and God is true (sāc) and there is an identical relationship (ananyabhāv) between God and the devotee. The significance (abhiprāv) of this saying (vacan) is realized by those who experience (anubhavi) reality. This is called self-dedication (ātmanivedanā)...

Atmanivedana is a nineth kind of devotion; without attaining it, nobody can avoid birth and death. This is an authoritative saying, and not a false saying. Having performed the ninefold devotion, one gets sāyujyamukti (i.e. being united with the deity). There is no change (calan) in the condition of sāyujyamukti, at any time (kalpa).

This quotation brings out the significance of the Atmanivedana as a means to achieve liberation and also a means to serve God and society. In the principle of Atmanivedana an individual forgets his doership and ascribes it to God; this idea is upheld by Rāmdās, when he says:

If you say that you are a doer (kartā) you will be miserable (kaṣṭī) but if you say that Rāma is the doer, you will get success, fame, and valour.

Now, we can summarize what we have learned about the bhaktimārga of Rāmdās. (i) The bhaktimārga of Rāmdās seems to be the easiest way of liberation because of its emphasis on reciting the name of God. (ii) The bhaktimārga yields the fruit of other means of liberation and also yields the mystical knowledge therefore it is jñānamūlaka. (iii) It does not advocate karmasāṁnyāsa but rather advocates sankalpasāṁnyāsa;
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it recognizes the importance of householdership and does not ask its devotees to renounce householdership. It thus harmonizes prāpāṇca and paramārtha. (iv) The bhaktimārga of Rāmdās asks its bhaktas or saints to discharge their duties, after achieving liberation, for the wellbeing of others, in the spirit of disinterestedness and self-dedication to the deity. Thus the bhaktimārga of Rāmdās is karmapradhāna.

We have studied the theology of the Vārkarī saints and of Rāmdās with reference to their theology of action. Therefore, we can make some general observations about the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra. The Vārkarī saints and Rāmdās harmonize bhakti, jñāna, and karma. Therefore the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra is karmajñānbhaktisamuccayapara (i.e. harmonizing action, devotion, and knowledge). Both schools harmonize prāpāṇca and paramārtha and emphasize the importance of householdership. They do not encourage the samnyāsa cult and the abandonment of social and domestic duties, but they teach samnyāsa in terms of giving up selfish motives (saṅkalpa). Both schools ask their saints or bhaktas to continue discharging their duties for the sake of the wellbeing of others (lokasāṅgraha) in the spirit of disinterestedness (nīskāmavṛtti) and in the spirit of dedicating their deeds and fruit thereof, and also themselves, to the deity (ātmanivedana or brahmasamarpāna), after achieving liberation. Thus the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra is activistic (pravṛttipara).
(3) Acāra (Code of Behaviour) of the Marāṭhā Saints—

Having summarized the theology of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra, let us briefly examine the acāra (i.e. life-style) of the saints of Mahārāṣṭra. Although Jñānesvar was a yogi, he did not advocate the saṅhyāsa cult but remained in society and strengthened the Vārkari Sampradāya.115 It was his desire to enlighten the world with his teaching so that the world might enjoy a great feast of spiritual experience.116 That this was Jñānesvar's determination has been pointed out by scholars such as R. D. Ranade,117 S. G. Tulpule,118 Svāmi Sivatattvānanda,119 and others.

Tukārām was a householder.120 He carried forward the mission of the spiritual elevation of Mahārāṣṭra through his kirtans (i.e. preaching).121 Thus the Vārkari saints were

115 Jñānishvari: Bhāvārthadīpikā, tr. V. G. Pradhan, ed. H. M. Lambert, p. 20

116 Jñ. xiii. 1159-1163; Amt. x.24, 25, 31.

117 R. D. Ranade, op. cit., p. 140.

118 S. G. Tulpule, op. cit., p. 46.

119 Svāmi Sivatattvānanda, op. cit., p. 3.

120 The Poems of Tukarama, tr. N. Fraser & K. Marathe, I, 4.

activistic and continued to do their social and domestic duties.

Rāmdās, on the other hand, was not a householder. He fled from the marriage hall in A. D. 1620 in order to dedicate himself to a religious mission. He travelled far and wide through India for about twelve years (A. D. 1632-1644) and studied the socio-political situation of the country before returning to Mahārāṣṭra in A. D. 1644 and establishing his Sampradāya. Rāmdās, however, is supposed to have been the preceptor of Sivāji Mahārāj (A. D. 1630-1680), the founder of the Marāṭhā kingdom. S. G. Tulpule argues that there was a teacher-student relationship between Rāmdās and Sivāji as evidenced by references in the writings of Rāmdās, such as 'Rāmavaradāyini', 'Ānañdavanabhavan' as well as in the Dāsbodh, e.g. 'Uttamapurusalakṣana' (Dās. 18.vi). H. V. Date, S. S. Dev, and R. D. Rānade agree that there was a relationship between Rāmdās and Sivāji. It is generally held that Rāmdās inspired Sivāji to establish the Marāṭhā kingdom. Rāmdās' interest in political matters is evident in his advice to Sambhāji, Sivāji's son, "Unite all the Marāṭhās and spread

122 V. H. Date, op. cit., p. 2.

123 S. G. Tulpule, op. cit., pp. 389f.

124 Ibid., pp. 397f, 450.
everywhere Mahārāṣṭra-Dharma. If you do not exert yourself for accomplishing this, your ancestors will look upon you with derision. Rāmdās is given credit for introducing the phrase 'the Mahārāṣṭra-Dharma'. Rāmdās' Mahārāṣṭra-Dharma is understood as 'patriotism' by M. G. Ranade. J. F. Edwards observed:

Ramdas was Shivaji's guru. Himself a bachelor to the end of life, this Brahmin saint and poet was full of the spirit of nationalism, so much so that he was led to give a patriotic turn to the religious consciousness of his people, making it much more national than devotional.

In short, all the Marāṭhā saints were activistic (pravrttipara).

D) Indebtedness of the Gītārahasya to the Marāṭhā Saints:

Marāṭhā leaders, during the period of the British Raj, emphasized the contribution of the Marāṭhā saints towards social and political life. In this context, M. G. Ranade put forth the following thesis:

The Rise of the Marāṭhā power was due to the first

---


127 M. G. Ranade, Rise of the Marāṭhā Power and Other Essays, p. 23.

beginnings of what one may well call the process of
nation-making. It was not the outcome of the successful
enterprise of any individual adventure. It was the
upheaval of the whole population, strongly bound
together by the common affinities of language, race,
religion, and literature, and seeking further solidarity
by a common independent political existence.

And,

By the influence of Rāmdās and Tukārām the national
sentiment was kept up at a higher level of spirituality
and devotion of public affairs than it would otherwise
have attained. In token of the work of liberation
being carried on, not for personal aggrandisement
but for higher purposes of service of God and man...

But this thesis of M. G. Ranade was not acceptable to V. K.
Rājvāde, a Marāṭhā historian, who said:

When one takes into consideration that the name
"Samartha" /i.e. able person/ came into being
because of the rejection of emasculation (paṅgutva)
caused by the saints (saṅtāle) /of the Vārkārī
Sampradāya/, one would know that significance of
Tukārām's teaching had and how inferior his sect was.
Mr. Justice Ranade tells us that Mahārāṣṭra became
vigorous because of the teaching of the saints; but
this is not true; this miracle took place because of
the Rāmdāsi Paṁthā newly established by the Samartha.
Can a saint who was oriented towards renunciation
(nivṛtti) do such activistic work (pravṛttipara kṛtya)?

Rājvāde then stated his thesis about the Vārkārī saints,
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as follows:

A saint is an incarnation (mūrtimaṭa putalac) of emasculation (paṅgutva). He does not want to eat, to drink, to dress; he needs nothing. When he has obtained Viṭhobā, he has got all things. This world does not belong to saints. A saint is not concerned with 'who is king?' or 'who does collect taxes?' As such saints were directing people, Mahārāṣṭra became emasculated for three centuries...

TIŁAK once gave a lecture on the Bhāgavat Dharma during the Gaṇeś festival; he said that the view taken by historian Rājvāde that saints emasculated the people of Mahārāṣṭra was not correct. On another occasion when a learned person criticized the Bhāgavat Dharma and the practices of the Vārkarāl Saṃpradāya, TIŁAK said:

See, you are wrong (in criticizing thus). Rānade has pointed out how the propagation of the Bhāgavat Dharma was useful to the society. The saints had created an inclination of sacrificing one's interest in the interest of serving the society.

TILAK, in his lecture on the Bhāgavat Dharma, has referred to Tukārām saying that devotees of Viṣṇu are strong enough to break even steel and added that the saints aroused in people devotion to religion and duty because of their teaching

132 quoted by P. B. Kavade, op. cit., p. 141

133 D. Keer, Lokamāṇya TIŁAK, Father of the Indian Freedom Struggle, p. 211.
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of disinterestedness, selflessness, and compassion. Tilak has thus rejected Rājvāde's interpretation of the Vārkari Sampradāya and accepted Rānade's interpretation that the saints were activistic.

We have pointed out that the bhaktimārga of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra is a synthesis of karma (action), jñāna (knowledge), and bhakti (devotion) and its ideal person or saint continues to act after the release (jñānottara karma). We have similarly pointed out that the Karmayoga of the Gitārahasya is a synthesis of karma, jñāna, and bhakti and that its ideal person or the sthitaprajñā continues to act after liberation (jñānottara karma). These similarities suggest the possibility that Tilak's Gitārahasya was indebted to and thus influenced by the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra. However, it remains to be shown that this was the case and to what extent Tilak depends on the saints to support his position.

It has been argued that the Vārkari saints criticized the external mode of samnyāsi life and encouraged the discharge of social duties. Tilak adopts these ideas from Tukārām's poems, as follows:

He has nowhere stated that there is no more anything / rather nothing \ left for him to do, as it is said by those who follow the Path of Samnyāsa; in the same way, the opinion of the saint Tukārāma on this matter becomes quite clear from the following other abhaṅg stanza, namely,
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Taking up the beggar's bowl / fie on such disgraceful life! / such persons will by Nārāyaṇa / be always abandoned  // (Ga. 2595)

Or,
The Real-worshipper (satyavādi) perform all the activities of the worldly life / in the same way as the lotus remains in the water / untouched by the water / He who is philanthropical, he who is kindly towards all created beings / he is in the state of being merged in the Ātman // (Ga. 3780. 2,3).

Ṭīlāk also argues a similar idea on the basis of the Dāsbodh, an important work of Rāmdās, as follows:

Even Śri Samarth Rāmādāsa Svāmi says in the Dāsbodha after having referred to the Knowledge of the Brahman, that:

'If one tries to reach the highest goal (paramārtha), giving up the activities of life (prapāna) one will not get even food to eat / (Da. 12.1.3).

Secondly, with reference to samnyāsa, it was argued that the Marāthā saints defined the samnyāsa not in terms of giving up social duties and withdrawal from the society and the world but rather in terms of giving up selfish motives (saṅkalpa) or wrong attitude, which is called true samnyāsa. Ṭīlāk's idea of true samnyāsa is similar to that of the Marāthā saints, when he argues:

The true samnyāsa consists in giving up a Desireful Reason, or the Hope of Fruit. Samnyāsa consists in

136 GR. p. 394 (M); p. 611 (E), tr. B. S. Sukthankar.
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the frame of the Mind, and not in the external act of giving up the maintenance of the sacrificial fire, or ritual. Therefore, that man alone, who gives up the Hope of Fruit, or the saṃkalpa, and thus performs his duties, can be called the true Saṃnyāsin. 138

Thirdly, it was argued that the Marātha saints discouraged the inclination to take saṃnyāsa by emphasizing performance of domestic and social duties (prāpaṇa) and especially emphasizing the importance of householdership (grhastraṇa). Ṭilak similarly understands the import of the religion of the Gītā (Gītādharma), when he argues:

Considered those as BHAGAVATA, who believed that all the Actions appropriate to the state of a householder should be performed desirelessly till death, according to the advice of the Blessed Lord, simultaneously with the acquisition of Knowledge and with the possession of a passionate devotion to the Blessed Lord....

139

Ṭilak argues further that a householder can be a true saṃnyāsi, in these words:

Nay, that man who has started performing all Actions desirelessly and with the idea of dedicating them to the Parameśvara, must be said to be an 'eternal ascetic (nitya-saṃnyāsi)', though he may be a householder (Gī. 5.3). This is the principal doctrine of the Bhāgavata religion....
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This quotation suggests that Tilak is in favour of harmony between prapañca and paramārtha. It has already been shown that the Marāṭhā saints emphasized harmony between prapañca and paramārtha. It seems that Tilak depends on Rāmdās for arguing the idea of harmony between prapañca and paramārtha, when he argues:

'Samnyāsa' means 'giving up' and if a man has not successfully led his worldly life with the help of dharma what has he to give up? Or, in other words, how can that 'hapless fellow' (karaṅṭā) who cannot properly attend to his worldly life (prapañca), attend to the highest benefit (paramārtha) properly? (Dās. 12.i. 1-10 and 12.viii. 21-31).

Tilak argues a similar point in his lecture on the work of Rāmdās, 'Sri Samarthāṇci Kāmagiri' in Sholapur in A. D. 1908:

'Sri Samartha' / Rāmdās / was a great yogi. Mahāraṣṭra was lifted up by that yoga only. The previous saints only taught a yoga of dharma. Their yoga was not practical. When the time of combining dharma and practical life (vyavahār) came, Rāmdās did so and taught such a yoga. Rāmdās taught how to combine dharma and vyavahār (i.e. practical life).

From these evidences, it becomes clear that Tilak understood that the bhaktimārga of the Marāṭhā saints is pravrtttipara (i.e. activistic) and not nivruttipara or karma- samnyāsapara (i.e. renunciatory). He often refers to the karmamārga of the Marāṭhā saints and its actual results.
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arguing that Tukārām taught Śivāji Mahārāj the doctrine of karmayoga. This reference indicates that Tilak was dependent on the teaching of the karmayoga of Tukārām to some extent but he relied more clearly on Rāmdās than on Tukārām, as he argues:

But, although the saint Tukārām was a householder, his inclination was towards abandonment of action (karmatyāga) a little. Therefore, if someone wants a complete explanation of the doctrine (siddhānta) of the Gītā or activistic (pravṛttipara) characteristic of the Bhāgavat Dharma namely, intense devotion (utkāt bhakti) accompanied by desireless action, performed with the idea of dedicating them to the Paramesvara, till death, he must go to the Dāsbodh, written by Śri Samartha Rāmdās Svāmi, to whom Tukārām himself directed Śivāji Mahārāj surrender (himself) to the venerable preceptor.

Tilak forcefully reiterates the exceptional importance of the work of Rāmdās in the concluding chapter of the Gītārahasya, when he says:

However, as this modern revival (punaruṣṭrīval) of the Bhāgavat Dharma took place during the Muslim rule, it was mostly devotional, that is, one-sided (ekadeśīy); and the karmayoga of the original (mūl) Bhāgavat Dharma, which had once lost its independent importance (svatantra mahatva) did not restore it; and saints, learned people, and the ācāryas of the Bhāgavat Dharma at this time began to say that the karmayoga was a part of or a means of the Saṃnyāsamārga. I think that the work of Śri Samartha Rāmdās is the only exception to the then prevalent trend (parcalīt samajīt); and anyone who desires to see (or examine) the true (khare) importance (mahatva) of the karmayoga in a pure and dignified (prāśādik) Marāthī, he must study
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Thus, in brief, Tilak was indebted to the Bhagavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra in formulating his ideas of Karmayoga as far as these three ideas, as argued above, are concerned.

The next most important issue is whether the Bhagavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra contributed to and thereby influenced Tilak in formulating the concept of the jīvamukta or jñāni who continues to act after the release (jñānottara Karma) obtained either by jñānamārga or bhaktimārga. This is a most important issue because Tilak claims that his solution to the problem of saintly action is unique and different from the other bhāsyas. It was argued that the saint of the Bhagavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra continues to act disinterestedly and for the wellbeing of others (lokasaṅgraha). As the saint or devotee (bhakta) of the Bhagavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra and the sthitaprajña of the Gītārahasya continues to act after release (jñānottara Karma), there is a definite conceptual similarity between the teaching of the Marāthā saints and the philosophy of the Gītārahasya. This similarity suggests
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the possibility of Tilak's indebtedness to the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra in formulating this unique idea. But are there evidences to prove the hypothesis and to determine the extent of such an influence on Tilak? We shall address the problem in the following pages.

Tilak quotes the Jñānesvari in order to argue that the bhakta of the Jñānesvari is the same as the sthitaprajñā of the Gitā, as follows:

Oh, Partha, that man in whom there is no trace of differentiation who, both friend and foe looks as alike / Lighting his own house / and leaving the house of another in darkness is a thing which he does not do, O Parth / he is like a light / To the one who deals blows to cut / and to the one who planted it / It (the tree) gives both shelter / he is like the tree // (Jñā. 12. 197-99). ...

Supporting the best / rejecting the worst / Is a thing which he does not do / he is like the earth / Activating the body of a king / and refusing to activate the body of a poor man / Is a thing which the Prāna (Vital Force) does not do / so he is; he is kind / Slaking the thirst of a cow / and becoming a poison to kill a tiger / Is a thing which water does not do / he is like water / Towards all created beings he is friendly, looking upon all as one / He is kind to all / With a sense of equability // He does not know the word 'I' / he does not say of anything that is 'mine' / Experience of pain and happiness / for him there is none // (Jñā. 12. 145=149)

And Jñānesvara has thus, by giving numerous illustrations, and in very sweet attractive language, described in Marāṭhī the equability of the Brahmiified man; and we may safely say, that this description contains a summary of the description of the Brahmi state given in four different places in the Gitā. This is what is to be ultimately acquired by Spiritual Knowledge.

GR. p. 225 (M); pp. 345f (E), tr. B. Sukthankar.
Tilak's aforesaid conclusion implies that the idea of the devotee of the Jñānesvari is in reality the correct view about the Gītā's sthitaprajña, which means that Tilak looks at the Jñānesvari in order to formulate his idea of the sthitaprajña.

Tilak argues that the sthitaprajña of the Gītā continues to act after release (jannottara karma) for the sake of universal welfare. It seems that Tilak also develops this idea on the basis of the poems of Tukārām, when he argues:

It is not possible that there can be more jñāni, more disinterested (niṣkāma) or more yogin than the Lord. But the Lord himself takes incarnations from time to time, 'to protect saints, to destroy the wicked, and to establish Dharma', which are the functions of the wellbeing (lakasaṅgraha) (Gl. iv.8); it is totally improper for a jñānin to give up doing lokasaṅgraha and continue to say, 'the Paramēṣvara who created all the world (lok), will maintain and sustain (dharāṇapoṣana), as He pleases, and it is not my duty to look at it'. Because, after knowledge, there remains no difference between the Paramēṣvara, me, and the world; and if such a difference remains, the person is not jñāni, but he must be called a hypocrite. If a jñānin becomes uniform with the Paramēṣvara by knowledge, how a jñānin can escape the necessity of doing the work which the Paramēṣvara does and in the spirit of desirelessness as the Paramēṣvara does (Gl. iii. 22, iv. 14, 15)? Besides, whatever the Paramēṣvara has to do, He does it in the form of a jñānin or through the jñānin. Therefore, a person who has direct knowledge of the form of the Paramēṣvara, that is, 'one Self in all beings' will be filled with the noble sentiment, such as compassion on all beings, etc., and his natural inclination will be towards wellbeing of all (lakasaṅgraha). With this import (abhipray), Tukārām has described saints, viz. the great souls who have fully realized the Paramēṣvara by devotion, as follows:

Recognize him alone a saint who embraces the unhappy and the distressed as his own (relatives). God is in the saint (Gī. 960. 1-2).
Or,

He who spends his power in benevolent deeds has realized the condition (or state) of the Self (Gā. 4562).

Having described the characteristics of saints, Tukārām says:

The incarnations (vibhuti) of saints are for the wellbeing (kalyāṇa) of the world; they labour their bodied for benevolence (Ga. 929).

Tīlak’s dependence on Jñānesvar and Tukārām becomes very clear when he defends the idea of jñanottara karma in the Gitārahasya, on the basis of the Jñānesvari and with reference to Tukārām’s general theology. Tīlak, in his reply to a critic of the Gitārahasya, said:

Mr. Kolhāṭkar took quotations from the Amrtānubhav and tried to prove, on that basis, that a jhāni has no duty (karma) after acquiring knowledge (jñanottara). But Jñānesvar himself, in his commentary on the Gitā iii.20, has said, ‘When they have obtained the (final) goal they become disinterested. Even for them, there is the obligatory duty (kartavya) in this world’. Mr. Kolhāṭkar did not pay attention to this clear statement. Tukārām holds a similar opinion that of Jñānesvar.

Tīlak also depends on Rāmdās for developing the idea of the sthitaprajñā of the Gitā, acting after acquiring knowledge (jnanottara karma), when Tīlak argues:

‘Carati’ (behaves) of this section BG. ii.64-71 is interpreted by the exponents of the sannyāsamārga
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as 'he goes on begging food'. But this is not right. The meaning of 'caran' and 'carata' in the slok 64 and 67, must be taken herein also. The Gita nowhere tells that the sthitaprajña should ask alms. On the contrary, in the 64th slok, it is clearly said that he, having controlled senses, 'should remain in (the world) of senses'. Therefore, 'carati' must be interpreted as 'behaves' (and) 'does worldly things (vyāpār)'. Sri Samartha (Rāmdās) has, in the latter part of the Dāsbodh, well described how the 'disinterested' (nihsṛṣṭa) wise person (sthitaprajña) behaves in daily activities (vyavahār); and the same (too) is the subject-matter (viśay) of the fourteenth chapter of the Gītārahasya. 151

A reader of this quotation get the immediate impression that Tilak developed one chapter on the basis of Rāmdās' concept of the sthitaprajña. But we can find more far-reaching significance to the quotation when we take into consideration the subject-matter of the chapter. Tilak briefly summarizes the subject-matter of the chapter, as follows:

In short, whatever means of attaining liberation are prescribed by the Vedic religion are occasionally and somewhat extensively mentioned in the Bhāgavadgītā in order to explain the karmayoga elaborately. If all these descriptions (varnaṇe) are treated (or told) independently, there arises inconsistencies and (thereby) it appears that the doctrines (siddhānta) of the Gītā are mutually contradictory; and this false impression (bhāsa) is fortified by the sectarian commentaries. But if someone holds the proposition (siddhānta), as I mentioned before, that the main doctrine (pratipāda viśay) of the Gītā is to harmonize brahmajñāna with bhakti and to explain karmayoga on that basis, all these inconsistencies (will) disappear ...

The Gītā does not support the saṃśyāsāmārga, or any other nivṛttipara sect, but on the other hand, the Gītā is ready to answer logically the question why one should not do karmacāmyāsa even after the acquisition of knowledge (jñānottara) from the point of view of
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This summary statement is not only the summary statement of the fourteenth chapter of the Gitārahasya but it is the summary statement of the entire Gitārahasya because it is the thesis of the Gitārahasya. The summary statement explains why Tilak rejected all sectarian commentaries and how his interpretation is different from other commentators. It also suggests that other commentators failed to get hold of the principal doctrine of the Gitā because the Gitā has mentioned all the means of liberation and unless one knows the central idea of the Gitā, namely, the concept of the sthitaprajña, one cannot correctly understand the purport of the Gitā. Tilak grasped the central idea of the Gitā because he was helped by the work of Rāmdās.

Tilak argues that the sthitaprajña continues to do his duties, even though he is not required to do so, for the sake of lokasaṅgraha. Tilak defines the lokasaṅgraha as a jñāni setting an example for ordinary people, with reference to Rāmdās, when Tilak argues:

The saints, not being angry with selfish people, or not letting their equability of mind to change on account of the greed (lobhabuddhi) of the people, on the contrary, perform their duties, for the welfare of such people, for the sake of their duty, and with renunciation. Having borne this principle in mind, Śrī Samartha Rāmdās Svāmi, in the first part of the Daśbodh told first what the brahmajñāna is, and then started to describe in the eleventh chapter (daśak)

---
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how the sthitaprajña or the best person does his duty disinterestedly and for the sake of lokasahāgraḥa, in order to make people wise (Dāṣ. 11.x; 12. viii-x; 15.ii), and later on in the eighteenth chapter said that all people should learn ... the stories, stratagem, devices, ... cleverness, diplomacy, forbearance, ... generosity, adhvaṭmajñāna, devotion ... equability... and other numerous qualities of jñānins (Dāṣ. 18.ii).

Again,

He (Rāmdās) has said, that ordinary people should learn to perform their own Actions, by seeing how the Siddhas, who have become perfect by realising the pure form of the Parameśvara, keep performing their own Actions, desirelessly, according to their own qualifications, and in order to 'make many people wise' (Dāṣa.19.10.14); and after repeating several times that 'unless a man does nothing, nothing happens' (Dāṣa.19.10.25; 12.9.6; 18.7.3), he has said as follows in the last dixaine /dāṣak/, in order to establish a complete harmony between the power of Karma and the redeeming power of Devotion:

Strength lies in activity / the strength will be his who is active / But in such a man there must be / the seat of the Blessed Lord // (Dāṣa. 20.4.26).

Tilak repeats the idea in another place and brings out an important conclusion, as follows:

'jāṣā vartato lokakalyāṇakāri / jāqi vartati sarvahityā prakāri // (i.e. as a public benefactor acts, so also all act in the similar manner, in the world), is the stanza (ślok) of the Samartha (Rāmdās) in Marathi, which is the translation of this stanza /namely, Gī. iii. 21/. The person of the Samartha (Rāmdās), who does public benevolent deeds (lokakalyāṇakāri puruṣ) is the 'supreme' (śreṣṭha) karmayogi of the Gītā.
'Sreṣṭha' does not mean 'saṁnyāsi' with self-realization (ātmajñāni)' (Gr. v. 2). When a Self-realized person (ātmajñāni puruṣa) has abandoned selfish mind (svārtha-buddhi) he cannot be excused from actions of public wellbeing (lokakalyāṇācārī kārme)...

Ti̇lak also understands lokasaṅgraha in terms of maintaining social order through the punishment of the wicked by saintly persons (sthitaprajña). Again he relies on Rāmdās when he argues:

But the evil deeds of the wicked cannot be prevented by such saintly actions, or if the wicked do not comply with gentle measures (sāmopacār) or mediation (ṣiṣṭā), then according to the principle (nyāya) 'kaṇṭakenaiva kantakam' (i.e. taking thorn out by another thorn) it becomes necessary to take out the thorn, which cannot come out by an application of potash, by simple thorn or by an iron thorn, that is needle (Dās. 19.ix.12-31). Because, it is ethically the first duty of a saintly person to punish (nigraha) the wicked in the interest of wellbeing of the people (lokasaṅgraha), as the Blessed Lord does.

Tilak considers this principle of social behaviour very important and elsewhere repeats it with added emphasis, as follows:

But as a disinterested (niḥsprha) person has to live among greedy people, the Samartha (Rāmdās) has given the ultimate advice:

It is required (agatya kari) that we meet boldness with boldness and to meet impertinence with impertinence

---

155 GR. p. 598 (M); p. 928 (E).
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and villaincy (khatnat) with villaincy (Dās, 19.ix.30).

It has been shown that Tilāk developed the concept of sthitaprajña on the basis of the teaching of Tukārām and Rāmdās, in the sense of disinterestedly doing benevolent deeds as an expression of one's identification with the interests of others. Now, we have to examine whether Tilāk's idea of sthitaprajña is similar to that of the Marāṭhā saints, as far the spirit of dedicating one's actions and their fruit to the deity is concerned. Tilāk argues in several places that the sthitaprajña worships Brahman by dedicating his actions and fruit of actions to Brahman. In this context, Tilāk defines the Bhāgavat Dharma, as follows:

Continually performing all worldly actions (karma) as pure duties (kartavya) and conscientiously dedicating them to the Parameśvara (Parameśvarāpan buddhi) and thereby making sacrifices to, or doing devotion of, the Parameśvara, such is the jñānayuktā (i.e. grounded or accompanied by knowledge) pravṛttimārga (i.e. activistic way) of Karmayoga of the Gītā, this alone (yāsac) is called 'Bhāgavat Dharma'.

It was argued that Marāṭhā spirituality is characterized by the principle of ātmasamarpaṇa or ātmanivedana to God. Tilāk argues for the idea of dedicating one's actions and
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their fruit to Brahman by reference to Tukārām, as follows:

As there is no conflict (virodha) between knowledge and desireless action (niṣkāma karme) so also there cannot arise a conflict between devotion (bhakti) and actions done in the spirit of dedicating them to Kṛṣṇa (Kṛṣṇārpan-buddhi). Saint Tukārām, top-most (sīromani) saint among devotees of the Blessed Lord, in Mahārāṣṭra, has explained his identity (tādātmya) with the Paramēśvara's form (achieved) by devotion...

Tukārām is less minute than an atom and as big as the sky. I have swallowed (giluni) and vomitted out (sāndile) ... the form of the cosmic illusion (bhavabhrama). I have transcended the threefold (triputi)/Prakṛti/; a light is lighted in the body (ghatī), Tukārām says, "Now, I am living only for philanthropy.

Tukārām has thus said clearly that he was living only for philanthropy. ... He has not said that he has nothing to do as the followers of samnyāsamārga would say (Gā. 3587).

E) Conclusion:

In this quotation, Tilak has argued not only the principle of jñānottara karma of the sthitaprajña but also the principle of ātmanivedana, on the basis of Tukārām's poems.

In this chapter, we have discussed how Tilak rejected all bhāyas and commentaries because they prescribe either jñānamārga or bhaktimārga as the final way of liberation and they ultimately support samnyāsa and their jñāni or bhakta is a samnyāsi. Tilak differs from them all because he holds Karmayoga as a synthesis of jñāna, bhakti, and karma and holds
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that the sthitaprajña continues to act after the release (jñānottara karma). We have discussed how the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra holds that its bhaktimārga is a synthesis of jñāna, bhakti, and karma, and its devotee or saint continues to act after the release (jñānottata karma). We have thus demonstrated the basic similarity between the ethical theology of the Marāṭhā Bhāgavat Dharma and the ethical philosophy of the Gītārahasya. We have argued, on the basis of the evidence in the Gītārahasya, that Tilak was critical of the samnyāsi mode of life as the Marāṭhā saints were; Tilak defined true samnyāsa in terms of renunciation of selfish motive (sankalpa), as the saints have done; Tilak favoured a harmony between prapanca and paramārtha, as the saints have done; and Tilak developed the idea of the sthitaprajña who continues to act after the release (mokṣa), for the sake of the wellbeing of others and in the spirit of dedicating his deeds and fruit thereof to the deity, in direct dependence on Tukārām and Rāmdās. From these arguments we can conclude that Tilak was dependent in a major way on the Marāṭhā saints in working out his solution to the problem of saintly action. In other words, the Marāṭhā spirituality was a major source among other sources which contributed to and in this sense influenced the thesis of Tilak in the Gītārahasya.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

This dissertation is an investigation of the hypothesis that the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical ideas of the prominent Marāṭhā saints namely, Jñānesvar, Tukārām, and Rāmdās, influenced Tilāk's Gitārahasya. Jñānesvar and Tukārām belong to the Vārkārī Saṃpradāya, and Rāmdās to the Rāmdāsi Saṃpradāya. These two Saṃpradāyas have many ideas in common but they differ on other issues. These two Saṃpradāyas together constitute the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra.

This thesis shows how Jñānesvar and Tukārām on the one hand and Rāmdās on the other hand responded to the claims of Hindu orthodoxy and a strict hierarchical social order. It also shows how they formed their philosophical and ethical ideas. The thesis then shows how Tilāk defined his position on those issues in dependence on the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra.

We first examine the socio-religious ideas of the saints. The Marāṭhā saints responded to the five facets of Hindu orthodoxy- Vedasāpekṣatā, Brāhmaṇasāpekṣatā, Āryasāpekṣatā, Yajñāpekṣatā, and Sanskrītaśāpekṣatā- in the following way. They upheld the final authority of the Vedas in principle, but they, and especially Jñānesvar, turned more to the Gītā than would the orthodox teachers. In practice they took their
position on socio-religious issues in the context of the Gītā. Unlike Rāmdās, Jñānēśvar and Tukārām did not uphold all the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas. They distinguished between Vedic knowledge and salvific knowledge, and held that Vedic knowledge was not a pre-requisite for liberation. They praised the Gītā for not maintaining distinctions such as varṇa and caste, male and female, in granting of liberation. They imparted religious knowledge to all irrespective of their caste and sex. All saints, including Rāmdās, held the view that salvific knowledge is the fruit of bhaktimārga. Jñānēśvar and Rāmdās held that a jñāni should do the rituals (vajñāsāpeksatā) in a disinterested frame of mind. All saints justified the use of Marāṭhi, the vernacular of the masses, for religious discourses and writings.

Ṭīlāk took his position on orthodoxy in accord with that of the Bhāgavat Dharma of Mahārāṣṭra. He defended the traditional authority of the Vedas, but he did not fight exclusively for the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas (brāhmaṇasāpeksatā) and his struggle transcended caste distinctions. He also held the view that salvific knowledge is a fruit of bhaktimārga. He stood for the equal rights of all in pursuit of the religious goal. He favoured the vernaculars as the chief means of mass education and national awakening.

Jñānēśvar and Tukārām made a distinction between varṇa vyavasthā and the caste system. They justified varṇa vyavasthā
in terms of the guna-karma theory. They criticized the shortcomings of the caste system. They attempted to unify Hindu society on the basis of dharma. They emphasized bhāv (devotion) as a criterion of judging the spiritual value of an individual, rather than birth and heredity. They taught the performance of one's religious and social duties (dharma) with a disinterested frame of mind.

Ṭiḷāk developed his position on the social order in agreement with the saints in most cases. He also justified the varṇa vyavasthā in terms of the guna-karma theory. He criticized the shortcomings of the caste system and wished to remove them. He tried to unify Hindu society on the broad basis of dharma. He considered bhāv (devotion) rather than birth the criterion by which to judge the spiritual worth of an individual. He emphasized the performance of one's socio-religious duties (svadharma) with a disinterested frame of mind.

Having thus summarized how the socio-religious ideas of the Marāṭhā saints influenced Ţiḷāk's socio-religious thoughts let us proceed to summarize how the advaitic theology and activistic ethics of the saints influenced the Gitārāhasya.

Rāmdās developed his advaitic theology in full agreement with Śaṅkara's advaita Vedanta. Jñāneśvar and Tukārām, however, were not in full agreement with Śaṅkara's system. Their advaitic theology has some points of similarity with Śaṅkara's system, but their theological system differs from Śaṅkara's system on
crucial issues. Because of these differences, Śaṅkara's system is called *kevala advaita* (pure or abstract non-dualism), and Jñānesvar's and Tukāraṃ's system is called *purṇa advaita* (perfect or complete non-dualism). The crucial difference between these two systems is that in the *purṇa advaita* system, the three-fold identity among *Brahman* (the Absolute), Ātman (an individual self) and *jagat* (world) is taken seriously, while in the *kevala advaita* system the identity between *Brahman* and Ātman is taken seriously but the identity between Ātman and *jagat* (ātmaupamya) is left out. Even though Rāmdās fully agreed with Śaṅkara's system he accommodated a system of ethics arising out of the principle of Ātmaupamaya in his theology. Tilak adopts the principle of *purṇa advaita* and Ātmaupamya in his system and agrees with the theological system of the Marāṭhā saints.

The bhaktimārga of the Vārkari saints and Rāmdās is characterized by two features. The bhaktimārga accommodates *jñāna* (knowledge) and *karma* (action); it is *pravṛttipara* (activistic) and *karmapradhāna* (i.e. in which action is predominant). The devotee (bhakta) continues to discharge his socio-religious duties (svadharma) even after release (mokṣa). The bhaktimārga of the Marāṭhā saints does not approve of the śamnāyasi mode of life (i.e. physical withdrawal from society), and it interprets śamnāyāsa in terms of renunciation of selfish motives (saṅkalpa). It harmonizes prapañca (i.e. domestic life)
and paramārtha (i.e. religious life). It encourages its devotees to discharge their socic-religious duties even after release, for the sake of welfare of others and in the spirit of dedicating their actions and the fruit thereof to the deity.

Tīlak followed the teaching of the Marāthā saints very closely. According to the Gitārahasya, Karmayoga is a synthesis of bhakti (devotion), jñāna (knowledge), and karma (action). Tīlak rejected the bhāsyas (commentaries on the Gītā) written by the acāryas and others, because they prescribe either jñānamarga or bhaktimarga as the final way of liberation and they ultimately support sāmnyāsa and their jñāni or bhakta is a sāmnyāsi. The Gitārahasya does not approve of the sāmnyāsi mode of life, but it interprets sāmnyāsa in terms of the renunciation of selfish motives. It harmonizes prapanca and paramārtha and its jñāni or sthitaprajña continues to act even after release (mokṣa), for the sake of welfare of others and in the spirit of dedicating his deeds and the fruit thereof to the deity.

From all these facts, we can conclude that the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical ideas of the prominent saints of Mahārāṣṭra namely, Jñānesvar, Tukārām and Rāmdās, contributed much to the religious, social, philosophical, and ethical thoughts of the Gitārahasya.
APPENDIX

Sayings of the Marāṭhā Saints

Note: These sayings are referred to in the body of the thesis. The first figure denotes the page number and the second figure denotes the quotation number.
पुष्प के साथ तथा मुख्यत्व निस्क्रियापूर्वक।
श्रीरामणैं गीताशास्त्र। प्रकट केले।
कैसे गीता मूल केलीं। कैसे केवल पाँच आठे बोधा।
हे महानो तरी प्रसिद्ध। उपतत्ति सागी।
तरी ज्याके निश्वासी। जन्म इत्यादि केदाराण।
तो सत्यप्रतिप भैलों। लोकों स्मृतिः।
महाराणिनी केदार मूल्य। गीता महेन्द्रा है होध उक्त।
आपितुक्री पुँकी कैसै। उपतत्ति असै।
तरी काञ्चामात्मक। श्राव्यताअत्क।
गीतेराणीं असे सठहु। बीजी बैला।
महाराणिनी केदारे बीज। श्रीगीता होमें है मम।
यमेआपितु सहज। दिस्तही आहै।

तानेशवरी १४१२६-१४१२।

थै-हकौं तरा फादस्वत। अंत शुद्ध नक्ती।
वाहेरी कर्म दो तत्क्त। बिखुइ गा।
पृथ बैला श्रुण्णारिता। गठब तीर्थं न्माणिता।
कड़ दुधिया माणिता। गृढ़ बैला।
वोस पृथी तौरण डाँडी। कां उपायी अभन। डंपिते।
कंहे जोयदेन। कांहे हं।
कंहे ठिमावे पोखड़। जोड़े वरील ते झालावः।
काय कसे चिन्त्रेच फट | आतू रौणा।।

तैसे कृभरिचिकृ कहां। न सरे धोर मोळे कुंडा।

नवेण मदिरेरा बटा। पक्ष्यरे जी।।

स्नानी अन्तरी बान व्हावें। मा बाह्य ठाणे स्वभावे।

वरी तान्त्रके संतों। पूजं के जोड़े।।

माणणी बाह्य भाग। कीं कुक्ला चंग।

ताने पिटला वंग। अतरिच्चा।।

केच अंतर बाह्य गेले। मन्नस्त्वत पक बाह्यें।

किंतु ऊरे। मूर्तिच्चि।।

तानेवरू १२.७४-७५

84.34

स्नूलीची चवा। दशु जाणू गात्यदिया धा।

निष्टं ग्नेचा। पाईं कर।।

पू व्याकरणां छोड़ा। तरीं अतिगादा

परी पक आत्मानी फुटा। बाल्यां जो।।

मोराश्वी जगोंची। पिचे अस्तीं डाळावे।

परी पक्की इतरी नसे। तैंहूं गा।।

तैंहूं सांतात बाणा। आराव्हि अर्नान।

बार्या अन्यायमवानावर्या। पक्की।।

तानेवरू १२.८२२-८२१

85.35

नक्श अक्काराची गेढी। विरोधा न लों अवानासाठी।

स्वानाचे इतांबे कंडी। नाना संकटी नाचवी।।

तानेवरू १२.५९
85.36
किंविन अङ्गे करते दशा। ते ब्रह्मत्व गा सुदंशा।
हे तो पाखे ते पेशा। नागे भ्रे॥
पुष्पां इहि रिंगं। कल जो माणा जगीं।
हे ब्रह्मत्व त्यावानो। पतिभूता॥

तानेश्वरी 14.298-299

85.37
पूं श्रीकुलवस्थिता। श्रीभक्तवश्चिता मुक्ति।
हा औदार्ये आग्नि केवलाः। मूं जाना॥
केवल स्थान हृदय ढार्वः। परिकृष्णु ऐश्वर आनु नाहीं।
वे कानी जागा लिही। वर्णार्थ्योऽच।]
मेरा भव्यर्थः ठेल्यां। स्त्रीशुद्धार्थिका प्राणियां।
अन्वतस्त गांवियां। राहिण्यं अहे॥
तरी कन पाहतं ते भगीठ ज्ञो। फेराक्षा मी तापणे।
केवल ठेला भज्यां। सेव्य होआक्ष्या॥

तानेश्वरी 14.1856-1859

87.39
ये मन्दिरभिषिक्य नागरे। भगवन्विषया सुलक्ष करीं
धर्मं देनं सुताकीरी। हों देईं या जगा।

तानेश्वरी 14.18
35.41 माझा महाराजाच्या दोळे फोळूळे। परी अभूतपूर्व ही पैला जिले। पैसी असारे रसिके। मेहरी।

तळांकनेरी ६.१४

१५.४२ जिथे सागरे बांधवे। संभाली बंदराले।
केवल देवोंना शाकरे वे। पाहीले तात्त्वी।
अग्रण्य अंगरक्षके। स्मृतिपी सूचाते देशे।
या मृतकेडी न देवे। सुंगी कानू।
या लागी आम्ही प्राप्तसे। देशिकारे कों गीता।
स्मृतिपी हें अनुभवता। तात्त्वी तोहे।

तळांकनेरी १६.७१६-७२०

९.४७ शास्त्रांचे ने सारे केचांची जो मृत्ती। तो आम्ही सांगती प्राप्तसे।

लुकाराम महाराजचे अभ्यं ३२५४।१

९.४८ केह न्या माली। आम्ही त्याची संगती।
नाय धरिते केंद्री। अथा सांकिका पोटी।

लुकाराम महाराजचे अभ्यं १९४६।१-२

९.४९ जाणनिंशा तीयथा काय तुम्हां केंद्र कस्त्रें। बस्ते प्रकाशिके वरी वरी
क्षत्रीये शुष्क कायसाने बाले। नुपुण तां केंद्र आपण्या।
कुटेक कफ वाक्यांचं वाचते। नीतिपीठ थारा मोळे।
तुका म्हणो नाहीं शर्तंति हांमा दया। तोबरी क्षणात फुंडा तुम्ही

तुकाराम महाराजाने अंशम् १८५०

90.50
काय खैं वाताव्र अन्न। काय ध्यान वगावे।
केलेचं बुद्धि लोही। मरलें पोटी वाहूँ॥
काय जंदिर नाहीं धावतीं। राह न ठावी गाडव।
तुका म्हणून सुसर जनी। काठकी कों न ज्ञाती॥

तुकाराम महाराजाने अंशम् १७५१

90.51
तीर्थेचं कींगो फोटिवणी। नाहीं देल्ही ठंडी॥
बही त्याचे ज्याधिक्रया। न देलेवि स्मरण॥
योग याग अंत फेंडे। नाहीं स्मरण देल्हे॥
तुका म्हणून विखुलायां। अंत तीर्थेचं ठंडी नाही।

तुकाराम महाराजाने अंशम् २६४

91.54
थोर ते गमाही पाठिले अहंता। उपदेशा देता सुंदर वाटे॥
त्यां मोरवी कीं फांतां। बोरवी क्षंत शूद्ध नाहीं॥
पोडे काय थोडे वागव्यं आँधे फ्यारेक्रिण तरी पाठांतां
तुका म्हणून ध्या निमश्यंत भाव। जरी सूघीराच पाठिले ते॥

तुकाराम महाराजाने अंशम् २६४
नहैक्रमण बोलता है सिद्ध। जब हा आत्मवीर्य ना होग चित्त।
काय कार्यी वाया लिखिताची पाल्हाचे श्रम तो केवळ जाणिवेचा
मध्ये देव देण सांभालीया या देवांचा। विषाखान्या खुला घाटोळनियां।
अमृतची गोदी पुढिला सांभाली। आपण यम्वाची मरोऩिया।

तुकाराम महाराजांनी अभ्यं १४.२०१-५

९२.५६

केदाचा तो अर्थ आम्बाची ढावा। येशमीं वाहावा भार नाहीं।
लादूल्याची गडडी देखील घडी नाहीं। भार धन वाही मुरलीचे।
तुका महान आम्हां साप्पड़े मूळ। आपणची फाट आहे हाता।

तुकाराम महाराजांनी अभ्यं २१६०

९५.६५

केद आम्बाची सोऩेनिया मेळा। आम्ही त्यान्या वाहा
घरीले केठी।

आम्ही केंदकाची। आपें याची कारणाची
वौळ्यिंचे के कारी। साच माले कल्याण।
झाडूं संकाची मारण। आडळाने मले बाग।
कळक्कातून भाग। झोळा उठा तो केंद
अर्थ धौळी पुरणो नारा केळा राखवावे।
विषाखान्या मन। साधन हे बड्डकळे
पिंट भलीची डागारा। क्लोकाच्या दराचा
तुका महान करा। जमम्बार आनंद।

तुकाराम महाराजांनी अभ्यं २१६
96.66
केदारागी साम्पूर्ण नसे। तरी या केदास कोण पुसे।
स्वयनोनि केदार साम्पूर्ण असे। जन छदराक्या।
केदासर घडे ज्यासी। तो कोके पुण्यस्ती।
= हुण्यैन केदार साम्पूर्णसी। नाम ऊणे।

दास्वरूप ५-५-१५-१०

96.67
केदा प्रकाशिणैं चर्च्चि। केदा विरहित सूर्य काही।
तौ केदा कौणापार्ने दासर्म श्रद्धा। तेचि कस्तू हंकै।
स्वानुभै कब्री लागे। त्याचा महिमा कनी सगे।
प्रेसा कव्या।
विविष्ट क्रा ये माजेवी। परी कोक्री न संबळे कस्तूवी।
नान्नातिता अस्ताची। संत सोय सांगती।

दास्वरूप ५-५-१५-१४

97.68
स्नानस्यं पिंडः नमो। कुश्चार लिङ्ग नवे।
नाचार मोडः नये। त्रिकृपणे।
हरिस्यं सांडः नये। निर्मण तौँडः नये।
परमार्थस्य मोडः नये। प्रमोचके हः。

दास्वरूप ५-५-२४-२५

97.72
स्नान स्यं जप ज्यान। लीलाचार्या मन्दूर्मन।
नित्यनेन प्रविश्वण। अंतराशुद्ध अपावे।

दास्वरूप २-९-२०
98.73

अय प्रक्ति है प्रान्त। न लो शास्त्रवा अनुभान।
अथवा शास्त्रीं तरी पाहोन। प्रत्यौए आणावा।
प्रत्यर्थीवीण में दोषां। ते अत्यधि इंताखाणे
लौँड पसन्न नें शुच। स्तेन मेे।
तथें काव्य हो पूलौगे। आणान काव्य श्राधून पाहावे।
तथे प्रत्ययाध्यां नावे। शृण्याकार।

दासवच ०.५.१४-१६

98.74

प्रति विवेण में तान। तो आवधारि अनुभान।
तथैं वृन परलिखत। प्राणवांसी।
या कारणं भुव्य प्रत्ययं। प्रत्यर्थीवीण काना कने।
उपायासारिषा अपाय। श्राधाने वाहानी।

दासवच १४.५.१४-१६

99.75

महूःस्त्रं इक्षुव्रजां नाड आह। ज्ञा निपक्ष्ये यें तो ही
न साह। वती भादवी शास्त्रबोधे विरोधे
वती इंती दानवाधे प्रवाधे
श्रुति न्यायः नीनाक्षे तक्षाणे। स्मृति केवलेदांत कर्वे
विविष्ठे। तच्चो शोण्ण मीनाक्षा स्वीर पाहे।
म्मा स्मृ जाणिव साहून राहे।

म्माचे श्लोक १५५-१५६
99.76 प्रवीतातील औपचारक अथवा। प्रवीत नसल्याविने प्रयः करणे।
प्रवीतातील ताना सांगणे। या नाव भूम

दासबिध १०-६-३२

99.77 जेणेमध्ये महिषी भक्ती करणावेचा। त्या भोजनाची स्थानी
प्राप्त केली। अंबाव ज्या मानसिंचा विट्टेना
त्या दान हे अन्न पोटी विरुना।

मनावे श्लोक ५६

100.78 भहुकं आरणा व्युत्पत्ति। प्राणेन बोळे छहकाण
दुराशा आरणा अभिमान। घरी तो येक नलसुङ।

दासबिध २-१०-२

100.79 भक्तेव न्यो देव। निष्काये ताकती मान्य
ऐसा आहे अभिप्राय। इती प्रयः।

दासबिध १६३.८

100.80 नर्त्ते क्री, ना धर्म, ना योग काही। नर्त्ते योग,
ना धर्म, ना योग काही।

100.81 महीने दास विनिवास नामी धरावा। प्रभाते मनीं राम
मिलते जावा।

मनावे श्लोक ५६
नीचे प्राणी गुस्तव पाक्ष। के आचारी ढाला
क्षेत्राभस्माहमणाचा कोण पुषे॥
कहमदानाचा किवास। त्याचा ब्राह्मणासीच अधिकार।
'कर्णाणां ब्राह्मणेन गुस्तः' ऐसे वक्त॥
ब्राह्मण कुद्दिपासन बैठे। आचारापासून क्रयकळे
गुस्तव आंदू राजन। शिष्य शिष्याचे॥
गुस्तव आंदू बीस्माती। काहीकें वाढली महुली।
राहु आचार कटिवली। ब्राह्मणान्वा॥
हे ब्राह्मणास कैला। त्यांची वृत्तिव बोलेना॥
मिश्या अभिमान कैला। मूल्यणाचा॥

दासवाळे: १४.७.३९-२५
102.83
नीचे यात्रीचा गुफा। तोही कालेन्द्र विवाह।
महेंद्रेन्द्री सृजा चोस। तेसा ददै।
महेंद्रे देवतां त्यांचे तीर्थ नये देतां।
अभ्या प्रसाद सेविता। प्रायश्चित पडै।
तीर्थप्रसादाची सांस केली। तेथे नीच्चता दिले नाही।
गुजबाई ते स्तंभी। बेकाबेकी।
गुजची क्षणदा राखता। ग्राहणां कारणेची तत्क्षता
तेथे ग्राहणं रक्तू बातां। हुस्तशोभ छाई।
ऐं संक्षेिं दोही खेळैः तेथे प्रस्ताव घेम।
नीच्चतीच गुजतच न घाई। या कारणे।

dास्तोध ५.३.४७६९

102.86
गुफा तो स्वर्गेंची ग्राहणा। जरी तो जाशा भ्रमाहीन।
तरी त्यासीच शारणा। अनन्याचे अशाचे।

dास्तोध ५.१.६

103.89
संह रक्तन वाण सावे। जेश्वें केदारात भ्रमी।
उत्तम सन्मान लावै। प्राणिमाण्यांसी।

dास्तोध ५.२.६५
104.91 पुर्ण मात्र महान्त | त्याहूँ संस्कृत श्रेष्ठ
t्या संस्कृतामध्ये स्पष्ट | धोर तो बेदांत

दास्वाध ५.६.२६

104.92 ने पुर्णी बोलिए अद्वैत | तो महान्यं को प्राकृत |
तत्त्व बाणावा वेदांत | अर्थ विसर्ज |
प्राकृत के वेदांत की | संबंध रास्ती पाठतां मिठे
आणि समाचार निवेदे | क्षत्युःमी |
ते प्राकृत महान्यं नने | जेथे बाणावेच विषय|
मूल्यस्व ते को काय | मुख्ता नारिकेद बैठे |
आता जुनसे हे वोज्यो | अधिकारस्त्रं रेणे |
झूठपाठी शुद्ध मुक्त उन्न | महान्यति नने |

दास्वाध ५.१०.४६-४९

105.93 भाणापाठे काही | अर्थ बाणा जात नाही
कर्मस्वस्वते ते स्वते | अर्थचारांती |
कामापि प्राकृतार्थिता | संस्कृतार्थ सार्थकता |
वे-ही त्या मुक्तार्थीं कोण जाणून |
आता असो हे वोज्यो | भाणात त्यागति अर्थ घेणो |
उत्तम धेरून त्याग करणे | साधीतर्फा जाणवा |

धूस्वाध ५.१०.४१-४२
166.72

तैचि चारी वर्ण। पृष्ठि जर्री कोण कोण।
तरी जयां मुद्य ज्ञाहण। हृदें क्रिय।
हेर हर्षीय वैसेष दौनह। तेही ज्ञाहणाचंचि मानिंचे मानि।
जे ते वैदिकविधानं। यौग्य सहस्त्रोनी।
चौथा झाँढू धमल्या। केदार लाग कीर नाहीं तया।
तरी वत्तिक वर्ण्यं। अधीन तथाव।
तिचे वूल्मीकियां जविक्यां। वर्ण्यं ज्ञाहणां दिल्या।
अहो झाँढू ही की देवा। चौथा जात।
केसरां पुष्पाचेनिं श्रंगते। तातुतु कौंकियों भीति।
त्ये विद्धले झुंडाते। स्वीकारी यूळं।
पृष्ठि गा वात्य। हे क्लेष्यं व्यस्तिं।
कें आतं क्रियां। यांचिया स्तं।

तानेश्वरी १४५१०-१२
यही आत्मप्रकृतिचं ईंद्रं। गुणां सत्यादिकं तिनं।
केमेव बौधा चूह गई। वानितीय वणिकं।
कैसे कामे बोधिते लेखं। वानिते सूत्रं मार्ग पाठिका।
नाना व्यापार सेकं। स्वामिनं तैलं।
कैसी प्रकृतिचा गुणं। जया क्माँची वेछ्नाचणी।
केंद्र आहे वणिकं। चूह ईंद्रं।
लेख सत्ये आप्तं अगं। समीनिमीनिमागं।
दोधे केळे नियोगी। अकालं हासिकं।
आणि चं पपी सार्विचं। तेष ठेकिके वेछ्नाच ठेक।
स्वयं करके। तेष रात्रं तेस।
कैसा पुष्पनी प्राणीवृंदं। नै चंद्रनिंदं।
नुयंगंचि ईंद्री पुकळं। केदार जाण।

चानेश्वर १६८६७६-६२
169.75
आतं माहिपरि जान। है चा-ही वर्णा
पुजिये म्यां गुण न। कर्मिन्ये।
उन प्रकृति ने नामारे। गुणाचैनि व्याधिबारे।
कैं तदनुवारे। किबिचि॥
हानेश्वरी ५.५५-५६

170.77
प्रां लंबि वहाँ वैहृ। जबं न पक्ती गणाण।
मां होजन ठात्ति केवै। गणास्य॥
काँ हैर चंदन काप्पे। हे विक्षिता लंबि घटे।
जब न धापति पुष्करे। अप्नीमाजी॥
तैसे दासिक्य वैश्म फ्लिया। काँ शून्य शत्यकारि इया।
जाति लंबि गणगालिया। जब न पक्ती माते॥
पण जाति व्यक्ति पै धिंदू। बेचन्या भाव होती म्या मनि।
तैसे ल्याणकण धातै। सागरामाजी॥
हानेश्वरी ६.६५५-६६१
171.78

न सैंगीं रे भावे ठाकरे रे छूटे हो।
रामकृष्णी ठाही नित्य फाड़े। जात बिल्ल गोत कुछ
शांत भात। अगे कों त्वरित्व भावनायक्त।
दानदेवा ध्यानी रामकृष्ण मनी। ब्रजरथकही धर केते।

हरिपाठ १४.२-४

171.79

अगा कुमारिया चौधरणा नह्य। अभिनात्य झाणी
स्थाया। व्युत्ततिवा वायगा। तोहु कों वाहावा।
कों स्पे व्यसा माजा। आधिष्ट्यण सुं माजा।
पके खाब नाहीं माझारा। तरी पाखळाहे ते। ...
ते पास्प्यानी नुह। पूर्व नेखे कों द्राढ़
परी माझ्या ठारी छठ। छर्भावे।
ते पास्प्यानीहे होतु कों। ते हुताबील्ही न होतु कों।
परी कसीं तुकिता तुका। तुटी नाहीं हे।
येहु दैत्यकृ हातोकारे। परी हुताही सरी न लादे ठारे।
मृणावनी कल्प गा केम सरे। जाति अभुषण।

दानेश्वरी ९.८३४-६५२
172.80 स्मरोऽनि कुछ जाति वालः। है आद्वैति या अकारत।
सैं अर्यन नामावरणः। सार्थक एकः।।

द्वानेश्वरी १६४५-४६७

176.85 विषयः आत्मपूज़ियें ईहिः। गुणां सत्वादिकां तिहिः।
कर्म वौषा चहू ठहरी। वांटिजः वर्णां।
ऐसे वापे जोड़ियं रेता। वांटिजः सहे मार्ग पाथिक।
नाना व्यापार देशकां। स्वामीमें ऐसे।
तस्में प्रकृतीयः गुणां। ज्याः कविः केल्लाचितीरूः
केंद्र आहें वर्णां। चहू ईहिः।।

द्वानेश्वरी १६४९५-४९६

177.86 नातरी ज्ञदिनः। पाणिया ठिचल सरिता।
सुप्रलेधि प्रथः। चिप्पु ठिचल।।
तसे वाणाभः। ते बलयोः आहें असे।
गोरेखा अंगा ऐसे। गोरेपण।।
तथा स्वभावविहिता क्षाा। शास्त्राचेरिं फूः वीरोत्तम।
प्रक्तर्वक्यावरणः प्रमा। अख्रः कीचे।।

द्वानेश्वरी १६४५६-५५७
तुम्हा वर्णविशेषाकर्ष। आम्ही हा स्वर्ण बिहिला असे।
याहें उपासना करावे। पुढीत काम।
तुम्ही कृत निम्न न करावे। शारीराते न पीडावे
दृष्टि कसीं न बचावे। तीथार्सि गाण।

वानेश्वरी १६०७

179.90
केदरविहिल तुम्ही आकर हो करूं। भोज्यां ती वसे श्रंगणुके
चारी वर्ण जाळे पुकारवे क्षणः। पापपुप्पु भागीं विभागिते
पुन्न भावी पाविकिला पूर्णः। आदि मभय खंत नहीं ना अहीं।
अनं दौरी क्ष वान्हुता हँदन। गुणगुण सिन्ह अभिन फळ।
तुम्हा सहीं मन उन्म भो होय। लौँवरि हे सोय विधि पाणीं

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं १५०

179.91
देव आड आणा। तौ भी भोजिता आणा अवया निरिता।
श्रीणन श्रुफळभाचा। जीवरावंवाच भाजते केले ढिंढाया
कौतुकें। नेत्रीं येवं लोकें। हा आभास अनित्य।
किंगाम्य सलं जग। तेसे लागलें लाग। वाढविले विभाग।
वर्णंहर हा केलं। अभ्यं पुकारीच कीणा। तेसे केला
भिन्नभिन्न वेदपुस्तक नारायण तेणूं केळा निवाहा।
प्राणादाचा रस। तुम्हा लाजका वृषस पायहार्सी वाटे
निक्द नर्सै निराम।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं १५०
182.95 ग्राहण तो नःछे ऐसी ज्याची वृद्धित। पाहा भूती मधी विचारतीन। जयासी नावे हरिनाम कीतैन। आणि अक तत्त्व वैणगवचैः। सत्य त्याचे तेरे घडा व्याविभार। मातीस सैःहार श्रृंक्षाचा।।

ग्राहण तो याती क्षेत्र अक्षा। मानावा तत्वाणि निश्चयेसी। रामकृष्णनामे ऊँचारी तरवे। अख्ती साहे रूप की।

शांति हाना रिता अश्वार अणी। अंग प्रसारी प्रेयोऽगुः।
तुषा म्हणूँ गैल्या जाइम्पॅर्स्क ध्वनि। सोऽहुनिया भा ग्राहणातो।।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं ५४५-५५९

183.96 ज्यासी आच्छी हरिनामाची। तौरे पुक बहू शुंचि।
जो एक हरिनाम बीज। तौरे वर्णांमाजी न्यियंते।।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं १०६२-१०२

183.97 अनंत ग्राहणात जटले त्याचे तेंते। काय त्यासी रांड प्रसङ्गी।
वैणगव बांधार धन्य त्याची माता। श्रृंद अंकत तूः म्हणूः
याती। पैला हा निवाडा जाजे पुलाण। नत्ते माझी वाणी फारंबी।
तुषा म्हणूँ आणी लागो धोरणाआ। दृष्ट त्या तुळ्णा न पडा माझा।।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं ५५५
184.98

केदारनाथी यात्री वाणी जो आपण। भोगी तो फलन कुम्भपाकी।
पैरी केदाऱ्णी वौझी पुराणी। नाही ते दृणाणे हरिभक्ता।
छब नीच करण न मुणावा कोणी। ते को नारायणी
प्रियम होते। चूंक वरणसीही असे अधिकार। करिता
नमस्कार दौडा नाही। जैसा शारिरान न मुणावा
पाणाण। होय पुल्यान सर्वांशी। । ...... नानां
जे पंगेले। स्वये तेघ झाड़े देवस्थप।।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं ३२५

184.99

सकल शास्त्राचे सार हे तेणाचे गद्दर। पाहतां विचार
हाचि करिती मुरणो।। जागण लाक्ष्य कैस्य शुद्ध, चौळांक्यी
अधिकार। आते नारीन आदिकोनी कैस्याही। तुका
स्नान अनुशः आस्खी पाडियणे ठावे। आणीक्षी देवें
स्नान कैसी मारिके।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं ४०५-४०६-६
185.100 लै की माड़ियें वाक्करी। घाई नाचती दैनिक भाई रे।
कोई अभिमान केला पाकरणी। पुल पुल लगती हुआ पाली
रे। ...... कुछी नादी लगी समाधि। मूढ जन नर
नारी ठोकर रे। मनित तानी योगी महान्नाव। पुक्के
किंकराजां रे। वणाराजान बिसरणी यात्रि। पुक्के
कोटाकरणी जाती रे। .... तुका स्वामे सीपी के ली पाय्याल
तराया भक्तजय रे।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अंग १७०५

185.101 किसल्या आम्ही कदिकी वे बालीन्या। वणार्ही कुंवरा
पुक्क हारा। पुक्क हारा केला कुणालिया खुले।
नियं।पुक्क भांड़े वैंकीठ।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अंग १७६४-५

186.104 हिंच नीत कोंडी नैणो नफकं। लिषे माध्वक देवसन्या।
दासीपुत्र काल्या कदुराचा मकान। दैल्या धर्म राही प्रक्षादासी
वृंद रंग ठागे राहिल्यासाही। कबिराचे मागे झोठे विजणी।
वजन काल्या विंश ठागे माण। माच्या सावल्यास दुरुप
ठागे। नरेण्या सोनारा धसुं पुकुं ठागे। ठोल्यामेंव्यासी
ढोंगे ठोडी।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अंग १२९५-९५
186.105 इ दोषा घड़े न फिटे करिता काहीं। सर्वे कुत्रा पाणी जाते तेसे॥ नामसा को हो कण्ठ नये कंटिकार। नाक्ती निश्चित पांडुरंगा। नाक्तिने नये पेंड़े ज्या केला। त्या दिले पंख बैठाँचे। तुऱ्या मुहूऱे के रे पुकाचा आभार वही मथं भार वाहनिया॥

तुकाराम न्हाराजाचे अभ्यं १५४५

187.107 माझे साच काय के केले मुखिले। वर्ण गाती कणू अभिमान
क्रुडारी मलुऱे कणू बैलडी केले। काय त्याले साचण।

तुकाराम न्हाराजाचे अभ्यं १५५६-१-२

188.108 पृंढित वैदिक अभ्यं दशाृमणी। परि सरी न पक्ती तुकाराजाची॥
शास्त्राची पुराणें गीता निम्न नेम। वाचिताती देसे न केळी
त्यांची।। कणू अभिमाने वर्णू अभिमाने। नाडळे वाहेंणा
कण्यांमां।। तेसा नहीं वाणी व्यक्तां। भाव त्याचा पायी
विदेशाचे॥

तुकाराम न्हाराजाचे अभ्यं १५५२-४-४
काय तो विवाद असे मेदानें । साधा परमानंद फुर्मावे ।
निघोन आयुष्य जाते हातोधात । विवारी पां हित उक्ताही ।
तुका महणे मानवान्त हे कारण । नागवी दुःखण दुम लोची ।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं १५५४.१-२

आसुरी स्वाभाव निर्दय श्वर । मानसी निःस्वर अत्तिवादी ।
माति कृत कृषि असे अपूर्वाण । गुणाचे कारण असे अर्णी ।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं १५५५.१-२

कामया पाणाणे पुंजिलों पितः । अद्य धातु लढ़ मावेणिणा ।
भाविचि कारण । भाविचि कारण । मोहावे साधन बोक्योऽके
काय करित जपमाना कळमाना । करिखी बेखोऽखी विलायलम ।
काय करिखी पितः ते वाणी । अक्षरात्मानी थोर होय ।
कायं करिखी कृपाश्च गामन । अंतरी महीण क्षुद्रिण ते ।
तुका महणे माव नाहीं करिखी सेवा । तेंणू काय देवा योम्य होसी ।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं १५५९
190.115

विज्ञानय जग बैग गावावाचा क्षेत्रे। पेटाभेद्दम अंगवा।
आईका जी तुम्ही भक्त भागवत। कराढ दें हिंत संजय करा।
कौणाही जीवाचा न पडावा मल्ल। काम सर्फिकव पुन्नाचे तुका महणो फुका देहाचे अवयव। सुधुःख जीव भोग पावे।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं ३१

190.116

पुसा व्याचा अम्ब्र। विशिष्ट देव सत्यत्वे।
देव त्या बवी असे। पाप नासे दशव्ये।
कामकोष नाही बाढी। मूली बाढी समला।
तुका महणो पेटाभेद। गेळा वाद खीत्यानि।

तुकाराम महाराजाचे अभ्यं ३१२०

193.120

ैकलाची ऊँड जाला। ऊँडची ैकला पडिला।
आपणास साप गुच्छा। सांस्कृतिक।
ैक असैन पूटी बाढी। पूटी असैन सिल्लू ैकली।
विचित्र कंठ पुसा की। महाणिवासी।

दासलोक १५५०५२५
193.121 निर्माणस्थली मूलभारत जाने। तद्या पौष्टी आचरण गुणभारत।
सुनामीपाटी जाना सत्त्वागुण। सत्त्वी स्वस्थागुण खण्डकाला।
खण्डकाला सजायुगान्त तमोगुण। तमोगुणी जाना व्यापार जानें।
व्यापारीपाटी वायु वस्त्रापाठी तेज। तेजी ते सहज आप आँग।
आपातापावृत्तियाँ भजनें होणें। राजस्थानी कहने दास मुण्डी।

राजस्थान स्वभाविक कळ्यां 591

193.122 सक्त करणे ईश्वरणा। भणारोअरीं भों निर्माण केला।
खर्चमुळे होता मेला। ठाव केला।
फुलिंदनांकित पुनर्गत्य नेल। लिंगायट सहजची अभेद।
नेल अभेद हा खंडन। मामागुणो।

दासलोक १००५१६१८

194.123 राव राज कृत्मादिक। सक्तै मानभ कता येते。
नाना वाहीरे चालने। इद्विद्वारे
त्यास परमात्मा लीकूट। सक्त कर्मसृजने जाणती।
परी तो नाकेल प्रवीणी = किके पाहाणी।
लोक नाना देश देखती। किके देशांत पाहाणी।
पंडित समझने वेली। येणे प्रवाहरे।

दासलोक ११०५१२०१४
नाना वर्णा नाना ढेर। जीवनास्सुं सन्देह अनेकः
अनेक आराधना परम श्रूँदः। प्रभृत्तिज्ञेयाः
अम्लीकरिता सुमधुरी वाई। अम्लीकरिता लोक धाठे।
अम्लीकरिता सकः स्वायते। ख़ानाकेह अत्मणूहैः अम्ली आराध्या। त्यासद्भाषा नाही दोषिता।
सरचाँ सूर्य पवित्र जाजः वैश्वानसः।

dासवोधः १६५२५२१२

नरःहृ नाना ढेर| अनंत मेंढ़ं ज्वापदः
कनवे ज़रुरे आन्दे। ख़ंडा करिति
त्या सन्नातामें वायु बेचे। सेवकसुल्ल अनंते वे
ठोऱ सन्नोचे ढाईः। वायोकरिता

dासवोधः १६५२५२१२
1.126
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रामायणातून रंजकर। अक्षय महुब्याचिका दारी।
काठ सान सरी केळी काळी।
देव दानव मानव। नीच मानी हीन जीव।
पाप भ्रूणत अभिप्राच। शरद बाहे।
मंगळें जा चाहे। परी सामथ्री कणंताचे।
मंगळें मुख केले। मंगळें रवरव।
शाक माती पृथ्वी होय। परी ते माती बातान्य।
गाऱ्य माप नसुऱ्य काय। परी तें कोटे।
पुण्यत्न आर्थिपापत्न। दोहीकडे बंत्तात्न।
साधु मोदु धीमा। सांबूच नमे।
उत्तर येकलो रेखें। परी सागरे गेघु न येती माहारे।
पौडल आर्थिप चाहे पारे। येक केळी।

दासमाधे १३००६-५१

१९६.१३१
केळे केळे रे मनु। कारतल मूर्त जन।
ध्वजस्वाच नमन केळे। तेंम्हे धाबाड फांडळे।
चूष नीच सारिकं को दास महरण हालं हो छी।

रामदास व्यामी अभिन ६९१०-३१
198.132  
ब्राह्मण पाहेने मेदामेद। मशिका समास अभेद।
परो तीस जाना शानबोध। हे तो न घडे की।

दासबाण्ड १०.०६

199.133  
नाना शुक्लाचे फला। तो हा नरदेह केवल।
त्याहीम्यं मार्ग सफऱ। तरीव सत्तारां लगेगे।
नरदेहीं विशेष ब्राह्मण। त्याहीवरी संध्यास्नान।
सज्जास्ना संवलसमन। घडे पूर्णपणे।

दासबाण्ड २०.४.१२।
भाषण के सक्षरी भाषण। जो के तो नाजा फर्थाही।
तरी क्यासी रर भाग अन्यथा एकाइ।
आहे या भाषण कारण। अवतार ऐतका नारायण।
विषय श्रीकर्त्ता मिरचिके। को संवत ते किती।
भाषण के प्रमाण। होती शुद्धात्रे भाषण।
धारणा वर्ण देवरण। भाषणाचैनि देखे।
हंगी के उरूचिरित। तो शुद्धात्र निग्रांत।
विद्यामी स्मरण संकल। विद्या असं नाम व्याखे।
सक्षरी पूर्व भाषण। हे मुख्य वेदाध्या प्रमाण।
वेदिके हत स्मरण और मर्या।
भाषणी योग याग – ब्रह्मण दान। भाषणी 'सक्षर तो'धारणे।
क्षेत्राचर भाषणाचि ( हर्षार नाही )।
भाषण वेद पूर्वमिति। भाषण तोंचि मर्या।
पूर्व होती मनोरथ। विद्या वाके कलाति।
भाषण सो पूर्व 'दुसं दृश्ये। हर्षात नहं मर्या।
भाषण लोक अनं गति। वाक्ती प्राणी।
खण्डमारे पूर्व भाषण। भाव पतितिके कोण पूरे।
असे भाषण सुरूवेट रूदिती तेषे मानव वापसे किली।
जती भाषण मुड्मलति। तरी तो नामलद्ध।

dasbodh 5.1.6-14
201.135 यज्ञ सार्थिण याज्ञ । अध्ययन सार्थिण अध्यायन ।
स्वयं करो दानपुष्प । तां सत्यपुष्प ॥

दासबाध २.७.१२ ॥

201.136 त्या देहामध्ये नर दे हो । त्या नरदेहां ब्राह्मण दे हो ।
त्या ब्राह्मण देहास पाहो । सधिकार वेदी ॥

दासबाध १०.२.१५ ॥

202.138 अयास जिवाचे वारे म्याचे । त्याने शार्मर्म करू नये ।
कोणी तरी कलन खुळाचे । गोंड भरावे ॥
विनयु वर्णी नकेहोती । वाचून मेतां माठी फणिती ।
मिर्गलेक रूठोंक काळी । पहाणा काँ ॥
मारितां मारितां भरावे । तेंणे 'मतीस पावा'वे ।
फिराने येता' भोगावे। महद्याग्य।।
मद्दृत्तस्मृति साध्य।। द्विः भूणेप्राप्त होता। न यथा।।
कारण प्रस्तुत समय। आह्वान।।
समस्ती कथित। 'शांकरम'।
रामानुज काव्ये राज्यम्। शास्त्री खाके शांकरम्।
भाष्मणि काव्ये स्वर्णम्। नाना प्रकाशं।।
समस्ती कथित। 'राज्यम्'।
परमात्मा स्वस्ति। व्यापक। परमात्मा जनेकीं येक।
परमात्माधिक रिक्षेक। अन्यथा बाह्य।।
असी परमात्माधिक रिस्ती।। बोलताती वेदान्तात।
परमात्मा पाविबन प्रख्यात। येथे खंडन नाहीं।।

दासवाद्धे ४००८-९।

204.145
चद्दू वर्णेन नामाधिकार। नानीं नाहीं लहानधोर।
नः पुष्प प्रेमयार। पापकी नस्मे।।

दासवाद्धे ४००१४।
स्क्यंभर कर्नें बुड़वण। या नाते परमार्थें बुड़वण।
भुङ्गकू न स्क्यंभरं करण। अगत्य आधी।
कर्नें करी मथाकिं। सौंतर पड़ता नुपने लंद।
तरी सातै भारि दुराये। निरंबहेली।
आवारे कर्नें टाकै। हे क्राम आणुळे मन नेये।
व्यावा नो स्क्यंभरें तैसै। त्वारूः न्ये सवंथ।
झेक्झीस समाशी अथात जुमा दासबंधः २०४४-२०।
विमाण दुसरा
प्रकरण चौथे

256.68 तेसा व्यासाचा मागेनाते चेतु। भाष्य करारंते वाट भुक्तु।
ब्रम्हया ही मी न पक्तु। के जाबीन।

शानेच्याचे ४९१७२२

258.72 की मृत बीज अक्षित। शुपालिता राखे घनवत।
तेन जुदे ते फलवत। नाणे बाळे।
तेसे विचारलिता निरस्ते। ते प्रपन्ध सहने सांडलेह।
मंग तत्क्षा तत्व बुरेल। श्रामिवधी

शानेच्याचे ४९१२०-२२

258.73 केवी खाली प्रतिमा। ज्ञानाची विंवा।
बेतारा मागेनामा। काही बाळे।
पैं पक्तु भन्त्र। कैं बुधेंद्र सागर।
भिन्नो बाळवारा। केशाचा गा।
अूर्वाणि दूं बाष्य आउने। हे दिसलाई देहिंधी।
मंग स्माच्च्या विशाली। मोफि होसी।

शानेच्याचे ४९१२५-२५

258.74 कैं बुधेंद्र गोकुण्ड कोचे। बाष्य चंद्रिका ते सर्दींच
पैं। तेसा श्रुपािवनाती न दिसेई वैपािविष।

शानेच्याचे ५५६४४
259.75  हे नादाची टाक्साणाऱ्या वेळावर वेळावर ।
हे बम्पकाराचे वेळावर वेळावर ।
किचुकुला सक्ते लेट निमित्ते ॥
ते कुंत्याच्या प्रलयात होते। ते निमित्ते सांसारिकात ॥
हे असात अतुतु । मोहन हे ॥

शानेश्वरी १२.१९५-१९६।

260.77  पिले पिलिवच ग्रांधु । तो हा नायसेंतोरा देलु ।
परी दाबून गेला बुरेलु । श्री महाविनयु ॥

शानेश्वरी ६.१३८।

262.80  तेळविचारिता निरस्ते । ते प्रेमु सहने सांबवले ।
मग तत्त्वात तत्त्व भुरले । बाबिुमासितः ॥

शानेश्वरी २.१४१।

266.88  माझे मा किस्मतारामशावेंद्री नावे हे जगीच नाहीं जावे ।
ते दुःख पुराते प्रभावे । तरी तेषु देयी ॥
का बोगीच नाहीं तत्तत । अथवा महागारीच अत्त्वात ॥
तेसा मग प्रेक्षा किस्मतान । ते हे जग ॥
हे अन्यक्षणे भिक्षु । तेवच मग विस्मित्तरे बोधितले ।
तेसे अन्तू मुक्तिमयित्वा किस्मतारले । वेलेवा जाने ॥

शानेश्वरी ५.७४-७५।
66.89 महोगन हा मूताकार। जेत्रनि तैति त्यामो आधार।
कस्तोइ सागर। निम्मापरी

शानेश्वरी १२.२१२

67.93 महोगन बन्धु गाँविन्म ज्योति। दोनही वन्हीति केलं।
लेवी मो गा सकल। संबंध नाहें।

शानेश्वरी १४.२२१

68.95 महोगन नम परोते। साक्तनि पाहिजे नातें।
लेखा तो हे बुक्ते। गापवे मोळी।

शानेश्वरी १५.२२८

68.96 महोगन विश्वपण जावे। मयं ते मातें घेमावे।
लेखा नव्हे गापवे। सक्ती ही।

शानेश्वरी १६.२९४

69.97 अविभानिते। कथे इश्वरम् कहैं।
ते मी नेढे, हे नामहें। अपेक्ष बसे।
केवल नाम मात्र लुढ़े। ये-हवी मुलाच हे लुढ़े।
कं माती मुल्यांहैं। नेमा परो।

चांगदेव पास्वति ६-९

71.105 महोगन आपस पाण्य विश्व देखिन्हे। गापिन्म आपस विश्व होजिन्हे।
महोदि आपणपासे विश्व देखिले । आपण आपण विश्व होतोले ।
असे साम्प्रदाये वेकुंड मुळतो । पाँडव राज ॥
हे कुते वहून लावलो । आम्ही महाव याचिलामी ।
वे साम्यापरात्ति नषी । पाणित नाहीं ॥

शानेश्वरी ६४०९ - ४१०

73.106

जग अरघें देव । पुण्य सुपदेशवी ठेव ॥

कुकारांम महाराजांचे अर्थण ५५०४

273.107

विश्वी विश्वमर । बोलै बैदांताचे सार ॥
नरीं नागदीर । मार्गे वदती साक्षात ॥
व्यापिले हे नारायणं । अखंड यक्षें पुराणे ॥
नरी नारायण । ईंत नरती कम ॥

कुकारांम महाराजांचे अर्थण २३०३.४-५
तरी कभी महर्षि ने स्वभावें। अनेक विम्याकार बुद्धि।
ते सम्प्रभु आचार्य नामाते। लागे भेष।।

बानेंकरी ४०९

४०.१९

सुशिक्षित असेऊं च स्वभावें। गोपुर निमित्ति बारवें।
परी तो गोपुरक्ता नव्वें। निम्मक्षेरी।।
तेसे जग किनितिके ले। तो केवला पुर्णपणे।
येक महुती पूर्णपणे नज तोबि जगदीश।।
अवे जगदीश तो केवला। जगनिमित्त त्याचिकी क्षण।।
तो स्वामिच्छे परी निराहा। असाने सर्वी।।
महुणैनि मूर्तां वा कर्भु। यासी भिन्नत बार्मारामु।
अतिपायुनि नामाईनु। सत्यचि वारें।।
मायोपायी जगदंक। बाहे सवेंवि साचार।
असा हा विपृतित विचार।। कोटेवि नाहीं।।
महुणैनि जग मिथ्या साच आत्मा।। सवारि जो परमात्मा।
अतिभावयं अतिभाव। त्यापुरुषक पसे।।
त्यास्त महुणैनि देव। मेरे हे अवयोच वाव।
असा बाहे अतिभावय वेदान्तचिका।।

दासबोध ४०१६५-६५
निगुण मात्मा तो निरंक । केवल आकाश आलराज । ... 
जविनाथ के उपर निगुण । नासे ते माया समुच । ---
केवल आत्मस्तिथिति संपत । तेस माया केवल नाली ।
केवल आकाशी वाहिली । श्रद्धा वायूनी ॥
वायूपासूनि जारे । तेनासूनि आप निपजें ॥
आपासूनि आकाशे ॥ पुरुषल ॥
पुरुषासूनि शुटकी । जीव जाने लेखों किती ।
पर्वतं ब्रह्म आर्द्रितिः 'व्यापुनि कसे छो ॥
जे जे काढी निमाणिः जारे ॥ ते ते अवधार नाक्षे ॥
परी मुखी 'ब्रह्म' ते संबन्धे । जे जे लेओ ॥
प्रतापुराण आकाश बहे ॥ प्रतापम्यं आकाश भासे ॥
प्रत फुटतां न नासे । आकाश जेवं ॥
लेये 'परब्रह्म' केवल । अवध बाणी अद्व ॥
किम्यं होत नात सक्षे । स्वराचर ॥

दासबोध ६.२.१५।

282.123 यात्रे जे ऐसे बलिकअन। ब्रह्म ने को सनातन।
लेके माया मिथ्या मान। कित्वैत्तथ मासे ॥

दासबोध ६.२.२।
82.124

माँकिन्यों पुष्पी कफ्ली । कामिनीनें पिवड़ी जाली ।
सत्निपातिश्रायण हनुमदली । लेखी माया ॥
कृष्णेश्वर पदार्थकार । शुभाचि दिस्मे मासमात्र ।
अनन्याचा अन्य प्रकार । लेखी माया ॥

दासबोध १४५०.३०-३२ ॥

82.125

मांजावसी काम मूढ़क्षे पाहों । मूढ़ीते लेपें काही जालें नाही ॥
नाहीं का महणता प्रत्यक्ष दिलें। सत्यले पासलें चाराचर ॥
चाराचर सत्य हे कैवि पढ़ें । अंधारी छुड़े रचित्रीब ॥
मिथ्या होंय स्तवन नागृती आशिष्या । लेख निजतिष्या ॥
सत्य वाटे ॥
सत्य वाटे मिथ्या मिथ्या वाटे सत्य ।
केसे जाले कृत्य अविकेरे ॥

रामदास स्वामीचे अर्थ ४२७०४-०१
84.128 इष्टीस दिले मनस नासे । लिहुके कार्रांतरी नासे ।
स्यानोनि इश्यातील असे । परम्परे ते "॥
परम्परे ते शास्त्रे । माया तेचि ममाखल ।
अंसा बोलिला निश्चिततर्थे । नाना रास्त्रे "॥

दासबोध ६०५४५-४६

86.130 जाप्ल्या कामासंतततः । लोळ असती खानथोर ।
लेखाचि कऱी परापकार । मनापाणि ॥
हुस-माथ्या हुंसे हुस्वे । हुस-माथ्या मुले सुस्वे ।
अवघेचि मुखी असावे । अहेची वासना ॥

दासबोध ६०५४३२-३३
सरीर परोपकारीं जावावे। बहुतावृत्त कार्याचं मांवै।
हुणे पडो नेदावे। कौण्यकाचे।
बाँधों नाखळे नाणावे। यथान्यन्त्रित कमाचाळ गावे।
मृदुकाने भूखे गावे। कोणीये कासी।
दुस्याच्या दुःखे दुःखावे। परंतु तोऱे भ्रमावे।
प्राणिमात्रासे मेधुन घ्यावें। बलणा गवऱे।

दासबोध १२.१०.५-६
मात्रक श्रेय पाते । भारिण केदार मानवि खेलने ।
तत कीर भाचाते अश्ले । स्वराण नियां ॥
धारकी देखिला ब्रह्मा । महाभृति वाक्त्र योगम्यां ।
भारिण अध्ययनी सारस । नाही लेख ॥
सो एव धारित जानिन्द्री स्वंगमे ।
तिही बहुती श्रमे । सत्यलोक ठाकिला ॥
तपी अवस्था देखिले । भारिण अम्मांद्रि भुप्पण सानिले ।
अभी तपसाधनना जे देहे । अर्पारते ॥
तेन्हे तुना अनायासे । विभवसर देखिले असे ॥
तिथे मनुष्यलोकी लेहे । न फाकेबी ब्रह्मा ॥

शानेश्वरी १५.६५५-६२१ ।

योगहुलावे साहे । सेवक कुटौनि स्त्रोहाहे ।

शानेश्वरी १२.४
314.61 सों हैं लिख्पोले लैङे । पादिस्वर दूं।।
शानेम्बरे १२.४

314.62 स्वभाविक चोलेडी । मन पूजा करनि मठी ।
लेप प्रसाग्दे आक्षी । शाननिष्टेः।।
ले शाननिष्टा केचे हातشعبे । लेख मृग्न माणि बुल्लासे ।
तिशा मजही समरसें। दुस्सिमा होय।।
शानेम्बरे १४.१२४५-१२४६।

315.64 कैद्या कृद्यानं जपताप अनुभवान । अवधेजोङे नाम श्रुत्वारिता ।
न वेषे मोह कण्ठो । न लक्ष्मी ज्ञायताः । तरी कौ आक्षेस
करिसी झणी।।
कैदे हे सार कों ने चेसी प्रकाशे । काय कुंजे केवे मोह त्या।।
दुकारान महाराजाचे अभ्यंत १५४५.२-२
हैरि माझं तप हैरि माझे दान । हैरि अनुष्ठान नाम कुऱे ॥
हैरि माझे तीथे हैरि माझे भ्रत । सत्य हे भुक्त नाम कुऱे ॥
हैरि माझे कर्न हारि माझा धर्म । हारि निक्यनेत नाम कुऱे ॥
हारि माझा गांग हारि माझा यथा । हैरि तपध्यान नाम कुऱे ॥
हारि कुंभचार हारि कुंभचर । हारि निक्यनेत नाम कुऱे ॥
हा माझा बाचार हा माझा विचार । हा माझा निधार नाम कुऱे ॥

कुराराण महाराजांचे अभंग १५५१-५६

317.67

आलाई गुहारिक वाघां । ते कौठी न कुणे त्यानां ।
ने पेले जाह्ले स्वानां । निःशंग मृण्युनि ॥
देशे अभिन विश्रोनि नामं । मग ने राज्यांत केळू हाये ॥
ते तें काप्से हिवू भें । निप्राप्ती ॥
लैंचा अस्तौनि आपावी । नारकिने तो बर्तकारी ॥
न्यारिवे दुर्धिद्व । संकल्प नाहि ॥
मृण्युनि कल्याना जेंसाहें । तेचं गा सन्यासु घडे ॥
निले कारणे दोनी सांगें । सन्यासुयांगु ॥

ब्रानेड्वरी ५.३३-३५ ।
318.68
ताहें नाहें संन्यासु। माणावरी धावे हृद्यामुिु।
ते नेण्णी हृद्यामुिु। वाया होती कासाविकु।
विष्ट्विनि काया दें धरी करी। हिंदेः धराचारि नवल पाहे।
आमाधारी विष्ट्विनि 'विष्ट्विनि। तरी दें तें तें काजा कावली।
स्थितिको असलाई को गा विष्ट्विनि। नवहें संन्यासी दूँ जाण केसा।

ब्राह्मणराजे अभाग ५६०-५६१।

318.69
निजाभ्याय वास संन्यासी त्यागी। सब्बेंसें केवली।
तासां तो संन्यासी। संगी असच्चा तासे जाण संन्यासी।
स्वतंत्र त्यागारी 'अतिरं आः।

ब्राह्मणराजे अभाग ५६१.२।
कা सांहिकी गुहाश्रम । का सांहिकी क्रियाकर्मः ।
कास्मय सांहिकीं कुठोचे घरः । थाहे तें करी वेगळे ।।

चानेश्वराचे अभ्यें ४६५.३

होळैनि सैन्यासी माहीं लुङ्कः । वास्ता न लोङ्के विष्णुची ।।
निशिदती क्रान्त बिच्वलीं देवान्नः । पाहाताती मान आदराचा ।।
लुङ्क म्हणे अंगे दांभिक मजः । त्या जादून घेते केवळः ।।

लुङ्काराम मळऱावाचे अभ्यें २०५ऱ.

अंत्सा फेखी कों रे सैन्यास । कों संस्कृत्याचा नाम ।।
मग दूं राहे फळे ठामी । नी कों लाघे माही ।।
तोळीं जाणिवळी कठा । होळी कृतीसी वेगळा ।।

लुङ्काराम मळऱावाचे अभ्यें २९६१. ३-२
320.75
वान्ग्नस्थः तरी संयोगें वियांगः। संयोगः तां व्यागः संक्लयाप्या।

चुकाराम महाराजावः अर्ग्यु १८२४।

321.76
मुहस्थाः भवावः 'वाजः'। क्या छो आधीचे आहे सह्ये।
की तीनी संयोगसं काठवधे। सरी 'पुढळी।'
महांवनं अभिन्नवेव न सहुँ हिता। क्षारी रेवा नोब्रा डिला।
आहे योग्युब स्वमाक्तः। आश्यमंत्यी।

चानेशवरी ६५० - ५४।

323.80
भेसे माझेंनन नामत्तनें। नाहीच वरी विशवाची 'टुळ्ये।
अक्वेज ननवः महांसुः। दुःसमिति मरले।
ते पहँठविण पाहावित। अमुर्खविण जीववित।
यांगेविण दावित। केवळ डोळ। ----
केही 'अंकाघें वेंव्हं जावें। तिही वेंजुवचि कसे आघवें।
भेसे नाम घाय गोळवें। धक्कळे 'विशव।

चानेशवरी ६५००-५५१।
कथा जागचे सांबर्य फेरठित। श्रीमतींदास भारती सुतप्पित।
निधि जैसा भास्कर। प्रदर्शन।
तेसी बाघली सोडीत। भुजाली काढील।
सांक्षा फेरठित। भालबंधा।
किंचिंदु किंवदंती। गुडलाचे शुभ शुन्नती।
भावीत भावीत स्वार्थी। प्रेमविश्व।

झानेश्वरी १६००-१४९।

हे कां राखे मांलें। त्यांच्या म्हणे जो आपले।
तोंच साधु आपलवापूर। तेंच तेंची जाणवच।
त्यांचा आपल्यांना नाहीं। त्यांच्या घरी जो हयां।
द्या करणे जे पुढासो। तेंच दासा भावी दासी।
तुका म्हणे सांगू किंतु। त्यांची मर्क्स्ताच्या मूली।

लक्षारम महाराजांचे अभ्यं २०४।
नगच्छा किल्ला आतामासी विनिवृति। देह करूकिती परलुपकारे।
भूमाची दम है माँडळ तंता। मारुली ममता नाही देखो॥
तुमा स्नाने मुख पराविया झुळ। मुरूळे है मुखे भक्तचे॥

तुकाराम महाराजांचे अभ्यं १०४९.२-५॥

325.88
महणी लद्या श्रव्हा तमा। फलेशी क्रिया जिया।
लोटि हुतु आम्हा मोगच्छा। कहीरी तुरो॥
अंगिन तदा त्सके। श्रमे। लेख नुगणून क्रमे॥
शैत आहिली न मसे। मेके बाळे॥
बातं आकारें बादरिले। तत्कारें समाप्ते॥
जियां रोतीं ज्ञा बाळे। ब्रह्मचत कराम॥

चार्वारी १५.२७५-२७६॥
326.89 मग अभिनवहृती तीजे घातली । तिैं सेवुंदने केली मुक्ती ।
केली न फलतिको नज झरिली । मुगांणे ॥

शानेिकरी ५.५०२

327.91 प्रेयः नाम दासबोध । गुरुसिद्धांचा संवाद ।
मेघ बॉळ्ढू विसद । मक्तार्ग ॥
नविक्षवा मक्त सारण गान । बॉळ्ढूंने वंगामाचे लक्षण ।
झूठा अच्छात्मनिरंपण । निरूकिन्दे ॥
मक्तवैनयांगे देख । निम्बळे पावली मानव ।
अंत ग्राहे अभिप्राच । जिमे प्रेयः ॥

दासबोध १०४२-४

328.92 अगाध महिमा न कधे कदला । नाम गहुल न खुण्डरला ।
हण्डकापासून सुला । प्रत्येक वेंदूली ॥
चूंकि नामधिकार । नामी नाहीं उहानाथर ।
ढ मूळ पेल्यार । पावली नामे ॥

दासबोध ४.२-२६-३४
नन्हे कमी, ना धर्म, ना यांग काही ।
नन्हे मोह, ना त्याग, ना सांग पाहीं।।
स्वयं दास विवाह नामीं घराच ।
प्रभाते महीं राम विलीन जावा ।।

मनाचे म्हणक ५६।

328.93

329.95

dेवास वोळ्याव जाता । तैहे नाही लहानता ।

dेवमक्तविवाह । मुख्य नाहीं।।

विवाह नाहीं महानोन मक्ख । कब्द नाहीं महानोन गुल्ला ।
अनुक्रम नाहीं बोलणे मुख्य । शास्त्रागारें।

dेवामक्ताचे पाहतां मुख । होय मेदाचे निम्नळ ।

येक पारमात्मा सक्षम । हेमापेष्मा ।। !!!!

शास्त्रांवेदनाचे ठूली । ने कों कवळी अवेद मक्ख ।

तैहे नाते सायंज्ञामुखी । सत्य नाणावी ।।

जो संतानी सरण गेला । अवदेशितसंपरक बांधला ।
मंग जरी तो वेष्मा केला । तरी होणार नाही ।। !!!!

dेव मक्ख मुळीं येक । ज्ञासों कठोर हा निवेद ।

साधुको भायसदायक । तार्च येक ।।

दासबोध ५६.५५-६१।
329.97 मृणालिनी निकुञ्जा मोहामध्ये। निकुञ्ज समानांचा स्वभाव।
असाने धके देवधिदेव। पाविने केहा॥

dासबोध २०.५.१२।

330.98 मोळा माह सिंहदी जाव। हा ज्ञानराचा शुभाव।
रोक्कर मोठाचा अभिन्नाव। किवे केहाना॥

dासबोध ५.७.४९।

330.99 जान बाणी झुपासना। दोनी थेकि पाहाना।
झुपासनेकरिता कना। नगदुद्दार॥

dास १२.३.६।

330.102 क्रियेविण समोळान। तेवी म्हणालेच कन।
मले तेथे अवलोकन। केदारिने करितो॥

dासबोध १२.१०.१०॥
32.104

नाना वेष नाना आश्रम। सवंचे गृह गृहस्थाश्रम।
अथे पावली विश्राम। श्रेपक्षवासी।

देव त्रिवेठी मुनीयो योगी। नारा लापसी वीलाराणी।

फल्जाधिकतन विषयं। उत्तम अभ्यासात।

गृहस्थाश्रमी निमण्धन आवे। आपला आश्रम ठाकून मेंे।

परंतु गृहस्थाश्रमी पिंडों लागले। कीर्तितते।

याकारणे गृहस्थाश्रम। सन्तोषाच्ये उत्तमोत्तम।

परंतु पार्थिवे चक्रवर्ती। आरण मृत्युमया।

अथे प्रकर्ष चालली। किंयुक्त स्वयं आघारली।

दाशबोध १४.५.१४-५

32.105

वार्षापुरुष वारली। प्राणियांतात।

अर्थी प्रथ्यावे करावा। नग छ्यावें परमार्थावंगावे।

अथे आध्यात्मिक कर नाही। विवेकानंद।

प्रथ्याव सांडूं परमार्थ वर्ता। तेशे तुम्ही कसून व्यर्था।

प्रथ्याव परमार्थ वाल्वाल। ताही तुम्ही विकेर।

प्रथ्याव सांडूं परमार्थ केला। तारी जन्म भेलेना वायुवा।

सण लगा कर्त्याळा। परमार्थावंगावे।

परमार्थ सांडूं प्रथ्याव करिसी। तारी दूः मम्मातं मार्गिता।

अंती परम कसून होसी। मम्मातं मार्गिता।

दाशबोध १२०४-५
333.108
क्यू क्रीती आवली । फळासाँची नाहीं गोंडी ॥
श्रावण क्षमा आर्पण दगा । सवे सत्यमानी ज्ञा ॥ ---
स्वायं सांहिनय देवे । नित्य देवे श्रावणये ॥

रामदास स्वामीचे अभ्यं १५७५-१५७६।

333.109
आपण स्तवे तटात । क्यासंहि सुपेर्ण आले ।
क्रीतिश्रवणे आले । अभ्यं मावाचिं ॥

दासवले १५५३।
325.113

बृक्षा निवेदनार्थ ध्यान देवासि वाहावे आपण।
कावे,'तत्त्विकरण। म्हणावे कधे।
तत्त्व विचार क्रावा। देव कोण तो वोळ्यावा।
आपण आपण शोध ध्यावा। वैतमाणी।
मी कोण असा निवादा। पाहोजावा तत्त्वार्था।
विचार पाहावाले धूप्पा। आपण नाहीं।

तत्त्वार्थाप सक्ष्म पासे। विवेक पाहावाले निरसे।
प्रकृतिलिकर्षे वात्त्या असे। आपण केवा।
आपण निध्या साच देव। देव मक्ष अनन्यसाव।
या कनाचाच अभिध्याघ। अनुभवी आणणी।
या नाभ भावानवेवन।

नकाम महत्त्र भावानवेवन। न होतां न चुके जनमण।
हे कन शब्द 'प्रम्पाण। अन्यथा नकहे।
अंशी हे नवकाया महत्त्र। केव्या पाविए सामुभुप्तक्षी।
सामुभुप्तक्षीस केव्यांती। यद्द नाहीं।

दासवाण ४.२५-२६।

325.114

मी क्तर्भ मेवे महण्डी। तेने दूं दूं कव्ही होसे।
राम क्तर्भ महण्डां पावकी। यत्र कोवित्त प्रस्ताप।

दासवाण ६.७.२६।
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