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FOREWORD

I have very great pleasure in acceding to the desire of my colleague and student Dr S. Padmanabhan to write a foreword to the printed version of his doctoral thesis on the Life and works of Śrī Parāśara Bhaṭṭa.

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is one of the key figures in the evolution of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school of thought and one of the most distinguished preceptors in the guruparamāparā of this school. Although one may say of this school that it is more theological than philosophical in the thought content of its preceptors, yet one has to reckon with the fact that in the Indian Philosophical tradition, the goal of philosophical speculation is to be attained through religious observance.

In the evolution of the great school of Viśiṣṭādvaita, the moving hymns of the Ālvārs played a notable role. The adoration of the Lord in all His numerous manifestations filled the Ālvārs with an awesome intensity of joy. One can imagine the fervour of their contemplation of the Lord and their eagerness to have the profoundest experience of Him as the goal of all living and being in this world. Śrī Raṅganātha Muni, Rāmānuja, — Yāmunācārya, Parāśara and Vedānta Deśika to name only a few of the celebrated founders and speculative thinkers of this school—
have reckoned upon a gracious and auspicious figure, devotion to whom is the purpose of existence and the means of salvation.

The study of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa’s available works — both original and expository that Dr Padmanabhan has given us in this work is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the thought and achievement of this great figure in the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. This work shows earnestness, profound understanding and scholarly integrity on the part of the author and it has an easy style which makes for pleasant reading.

I commend the scholar for giving us this extremely useful study of the numerous works of Parāśara Bhatta.

Dr N. VEEZHINATHAN
PUBLISHER’S FOREWORD

Śrī Parāsara Bhaṭṭa was an important and distinguished writer and preceptor of the post-Rāmānuja and pre-Vedānta Deśika period of the Viśiṣṭādvaita Philosophy. He was the son of the celebrated Śrī Kūrattālvān a close associate of Śrī Rāmānuja. It is well-known in tradition that it was Kūrattālvān, the author of Pañcastava, who helped Śrī Rāmānuja in writing the Śrībhāṣya. Following his father Parāśrā Bhaṭṭa too wrote many works for the development and propagation of this glorious tradition.

Though many of the works of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa were often printed yet no systematic effort was made to study the available works of Parāśra Bhaṭṭa collectively. This long-felt need is satisfied now by the present writer Dr Padmanabhan.

A close study of this work would reveal many facets about the Śrīvaishnava tradition of thought. The characteristics of a Śrīvaishnava, his devotion to the ācārya and Supreme lord and other details are well brought out in this work. Many interesting details regarding the life and date of Parāśara are recorded faithfully. The stotra-s of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa are marvellous pieces of lyrical poetry with philosophical import. The Tattvaratnākara-fragments point out Parāśara as a master dialectician of the pre-Vedānta
Deśika period. The Viṣṇu-sahasranāmabhāṣya of Bhaṭṭar brings out the importance of the Bhāgavata cult and the glorious and innumerable auspicious qualities of the Supreme Lord.

The Viśiṣṭādvaita Research Centre has dedicated itself for the noble task of the propagation and publication of the work of the ancient as well as modern writers. Many such books have already been published by the centre. We are pleased to add one more - the present book by Dr Padmanabhan to that list of publications to the learned readers.

(S.V.S. RAGHAVAN)
Chairman
VISHISHTADVAITA RESEARCH CENTRE
MADRAS.
PREFACE

Parāśara Bhāṭṭa occupies a pre-eminent position among the Śrīnivasāṇava-ācārya-s belonging to the post-Rāmānuja period. As a matter of fact he was a younger contemporary of Śri Rāmānuja (11th cent. A.D.) and was the son of Kūrattālvān, Rāmānuja’s foremost disciple. According to one tradition Parāśara was also the spiritual successor of Rāmānuja.

The contributions of Rāmānuja and his predecessor Yāmuna to Viśiṣṭādvaita have received the attention of scholars. The post-Parāśara polymath Vedānta Deśīka and his works have also been attracting scholars from time to time. One of the great predecessors of Vedānta Deśīka who considerably influenced his thinking was Parāśara. Dr. G. Oberhammer of Vienna University (Austria) made an analysis of the fragments from Parāśara’s Tattvaratnākara which are preserved in Vedānta Deśīka’s works. Parāśara’s stotra-s have also been published with Tamil explanation by Sri P.B. Annangaracharya Svamin of Kanchipuram. The Aṣṭaślokī and Viṣṇu-sahasranāmabhāṣya of Parāśara have also been published with English translation and explanatory notes by Sri T. Bheemacharya and Prof. A. Srinivasaaghavan respectively. The commentary on the Tirunēḍuntāṭaka stanza and the Tirumanjana-kavi-s are also published. Still no attempt has so far been made to study all the available works of Parāśara in a synthesize manner with a view to evaluate his contribution to the growth and development of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy, which is now known as the Viśiṣṭādvaita.
The present book is a humble effort to fill in this gap.

It is now my pleasant duty to thank all who helped me to prepare this book. I wish to express my sincere and grateful thanks to Dr M. Narasimhacharya, Professor and Head of the Department of Vaishnavism, University of Madras, for having suggested this topic and guided me at every stage. But for his valuable guidance, this book could not have taken this form.

I am extremely thankful to Dr N. Veezhinathan, Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras for his kind help, encouragement and to the foreword. My thanks are due to the authorities of the University of Madras for permitting me to carry on the research in the Department of Sanskrit.

I am grateful to the Vishishtadvaita Research Centre and particularly to Sri S.V.S. Raghavan who gave the consent to publish the book through the Centre by readily giving his foreword.

My sincere thanks are due to my friend Sri L. Kumaraswamy who helped me in preparing the Appendices, and to Dr V.K.S.N. Raghavan, Professor, Dept. of Vaishnavism, University of Madras for going through the proof material.

I thank Mr. S. Babu Rajendran, Assistant Section Officer Department of Sanskrit, for typing out the manuscript neatly.

Madras

(S. PADMANABHAN)
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ŚRĪ PARASARA BHAṬṬA
HIS LIFE AND DATE

All systems of philosophy bearing upon Vedic authority draw their inspiration from the triple canonical texts (prasthānatraya), namely, the Upaniṣad-s, the Brahma-sūtra-s and the Bhagavad-gītā. Teachers like Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Rāmānuja and others interpreted these texts in accordance with their own systems of philosophy. As is well-known, the Viśiṣṭādvaita system which owes its inspiration and authority to the works of earlier mystic saints like Nammālvār and Tirumaṅgai Ālvār, and teachers like Nāṭhamuni (C. 9th century) and Yāmunācārya (A.D. 918-1038) received a systematic exposition and canonical interpretation from the great Rāmānujācārya (A.D. 1017-1137). The name - Viśiṣṭādvaita is to be understood as the name of a system which recognizes the “oneness” of the Supreme Being who is qualified by the gross and subtle forms of the sentient and insentient entities, at the two states of the manifestation and dissolution of the universe.¹ The concept that the Lord is the Soul and that the world of men and matter constitutes His body, has become one of the cardinal tenets of this school.² This system from the religious standpoint is known as Śrīvaiṣṇavism. This term suggests the importance of Śrī or Lakṣmī in this school as the mother of entire creation and as the inseparable and ever approachable, compassionate and bountiful consort of the Lord. It is also to be noted that Viśiṣṭādvaita can be appreciated not merely as a system of philosophy but as a synthetic and integrated
school of religious philosophy. The circumstances under which this school originated and developed, and its liberal catholicism as can be seen from the life-accounts of Rāmānuja and his successors, are quite well known. Scholars opine that this system came into being in response to the popular demand and as a solution to the day-to-day problems of the common man.  

Another important aspect of the Śrīvaisṇava school of thought is that it relies upon the authority of the Tamil compositions of the God-intoxicated saints called Ālvār-s whose inspired utterances are traditionally recorded and handed down under the name Divyaprabandha, running to almost 4,000 in number. Another stream of tradition that has made this system a real triveni is the Āgama tradition with its two-fold division as Pāñcarātra and Vaikhanasa. Inheriting this inspiring revelation and tradition and combining his own intuition, Rāmānuja built up a meaningful system which in later years became a symbol of great authority and developed a vast literature, offering great solace to the layman tormented and tortured by the trammels of the worldly life.

As already stated, Nāthamuni was the first Śrīvaisṇava teacher of South India. His two works, the Nyāyatattva and the Yogarahasya are lost to posterity for all practical purposes. However, some passages of the Nyāyatattva culled from different sources have already been studied by scholars.

Yāmunācārya, his grandson, known under the popular name Ālavandār, is the next important teacher of this school. He wrote six works bearing upon the Vedic authority and Āgamic validity. His Āgama-prāmāṇya establishes the authority of the Pāñcarātrāgama-s. He
wrote the *Siddhitraya* in three sections called *Ātma-siddhi*, *Īśvarā-siddhi* and *Saṁvit-siddhi* dealing with the essential nature of the Individual Self, the Lord and knowledge respectively. His *Gītārthasaṁgraha* is an epitome of the *Bhagavadgītā* in thirty-two verses incorporating the traditional interpretation of the *Gītā* which he received from his own teacher, Śrīrāmamīśra. The *Catusśloki* in four verses discusses the nature of Lakṣmī and her position in this system. The *Stotratatna* is a masterly lyric of poetic grandeur glorifying the Lord in His heavenly abode and focusing His unconditional grace which is the redemptive factor in the life of suffering humanity. Yāmuna is said to have written the *Puruṣanirṇaya* also, which is lost to us. It must have been in existence at the time of Vedānta Deśika (13th century A.D.) since he refers to it in some of his works.

Yāmunācārya was succeeded by Śrī Rāmānuja, the most important exponent of Viśiṣṭādvaita. He wrote nine works and made an invaluable contribution to the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta. His *Śrībhāṣya* is an extensive commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*-s of Bādarāyaṇa. In his *Vedārthasaṁgraha*, Rāmānuja synthesises the conflicting passages of the *Upaniṣad*-s in contradistinction to the other schools of thought. His *Vedāntadīpa* and *Vedāntasāra* are the shorter versions of his own commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*-s, that is, the *Śrībhāṣya*. His *Gadyatraya* comprising *Śaraṇāgati*, *Śrīraṅga* and *Vaikuṇṭha-gadya*-s explains the concept of whole-hearted surrender called *Śaraṇāgati* according to this system, the glory of Lord Raṅganātha, the presiding deity at Śrīraṅgam (Tamil Nadu) and the highest abode of the Lord, Śrīvaikuṇṭha. In his *Nityagrantha*, Rāmānuja explains the daily routine to be observed by a Śrīvaiṣṇava.
The first and foremost among the disciples of Śrī Rāmānuja was ŚrīvatsānKiśara also known as Śrīvatsacihna, Kūreśa, Kūranātha and Kūrattālvān. The first two names indicate that he was originally called by a synonym of Viṣṇu. The rest of the names suggest that he was the ‘lord’ or an important person from the village Kūram near Kāncīpuram in Tamilnadu. Hagiological works state that he faced the fury of the Coḷa King, Kulottuṅga I for the sake of his master and lost his eyes. Traditional works like the Divyasūricarita and Prapannāmṛta state that Kūreśa was very close to Rāmānuja and was extremely helpful to his master in composing the Śrībhāṣya. Kūreśa was the author of five lyrics of exquisite charm. They are the Atimānuṣastava, the Sundarabāhustava, the Varadarājaastava, the Vaikunṭhastava and the Śrīstava. He is the second Śrīvaiṣṇava teacher to compose lyrics in praise of the Lord, Yāmuna being the first to do so.

Śrī Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, the son of Kurattālvān and Āṇḍāl, is an important Śrīvaiṣṇava teacher whose contribution to ViṣṇuistAdvaita is the subject of the present study. He is said to be the next spiritual leader after Rāmānuja’s demise in A.D. 1137. Another popular view is that Tirukkuruṅkaippirānpiḷḷān was the immediate spiritual successor of Rāmānuja. According to works on hagiology Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, henceforth to be referred to as Parāśara was born as a result of the grace of Lord Raṅganātha. He was the elder one of the twins born to his mother. It is also stated that to perpetuate the memory of Parāśara, the author of Viṣṇupurāṇa, this child was named Parāśara Bhaṭṭa and the other child as Vedavyāsa Bhaṭṭa, by Śrī Rāmānuja himself. Since Parāśara was also officiating as the chief priest and expounding the purāṇa-s in the Śrīraṅgam temple, he was also named as the purohita
of Lord Śrīraṅganātha (Śrīraṅgeśa-purohitah).\textsuperscript{11} As a youth he is said to have defeated a famous Advaita teacher Mādhavadāsa of Melkote (Tirunārāyaṇapuram). It is stated that the scholarly duel went on for a week and that finally Mādhavadāsa accepted his defeat and became a disciple of Parāśara under a new name Raṅganātha, consequent to his conversion of Śrīvaisṇavism. Raṅganātha is popularly known as Naṅjīyar in Tamil and is the celebrated commentator on the Śrīsūkta and also on the Tiruvāymoli of Nammāḻvār. It is said that he wrote the commentary on the Tiruvāymoli at the instance of Parāśara. The elaborate commentary Iḍu on the Tiruvāymoli is replete with several instances of how Parāśara interpreted and explained (nirvāha-s) some of the knotty passages of the Tiruvāymoli in accordance with the spirit of the school.

DATE OF PARĀŚARA BHĀṬṬA

The date of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is a moot point. While there is unanimity in accepting him as a spiritual teacher after Rāmānuja’s demise in A.D. 1137, the exact date of his birth could not be decided. The traditional records give the month and the day of his birth as Vṛṣabhamāsa and Anūrādhānaksatra, but do not mention the year. Naturally scholars have proposed different years corresponding to the birth of Parāśara. One such date of Parāśara’s birth is A.D. 1062.\textsuperscript{12} According to some, however, this varies from A.D. 1073 to 1078.\textsuperscript{14} The Guruparamparā of Brahmanatras-vatantra-svāmin III (A.D. 15th cent.) gives Śubhakrt as the year of his birth in Kali 4163.\textsuperscript{15} This corresponds to Friday the 24th May of A.D. 1062.\textsuperscript{16} Another tradition gives the date of Parāśara’s demise as Śukla Dvādaśī in the Jaya year.\textsuperscript{17} This corresponds to Wednesday, 11th November,
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A.D. 1114. But how far this traditional date is reliable is yet to be proved, for tradition says that Parāśara lived only for about 30 years.

In order to arrive at the approximate date of Parāśara, we have to rely upon the chronology of incidents that took place during the life-time of Rāmānuja and Parāśara. History avers that due to the persecution by the Cola king Kuloṭṭuṅga I, Rāmānuja moved to Melkote (in the modern Karnataka State). There he converted the Hoyaśla king Bīṭṭi Deva from Jainism to Śrīvaiśṇavism and gave him the new name Viṣṇuvardhana. According to the Guruparamparāprabhāva the Cola persecution took place after the marriage of Parāśara and the year of this Cola persecution is given as A.D. 1098. Tradition avers that Rāmānuja was in exile for 14 to 16 years. The conversion of the Hoyaśla King took place in A.D. 1116. So it appears that Rāmānuja might have moved to Melkote only at the beginning of the 12th century.

According to the Guruparamparāprabhāva, Parāśara got initiated into the sacred lore after his upanayana (sacred-thread investiture ceremony) at the right age. It was the practice in ancient India to have this sacred initiation at the age of eight. Parāśara had his education for sometime and then he got married to a girl - Akkacci by name. Although in some genealogical charts preserved in some ancient families we find a son was born to Parāśara under the name Madhya-pratolī-Bhattacharya, we have no authentic record corroborating this point. At the time of his marriage Parāśara must have been at least 15 years old and the marriage should have taken place towards the end of 11th century or at the beginning of the 12th century. This gives the year of birth of Parāśara around A.D. 1085 to A.D. 1090.
According to the same traditional account there was a difference of opinion between Parāśara and the then King Vīrasundara. It is stated that Parāśara objected to the King’s demolishing the house of a Vaiṣṇava to raise the outer wall of the Śrīraṅgam temple. As a result Parāśara incurred the displeasure of the king and had to live at Tirukkoṭṭiyūr in the district of Pudukkottai in Tamilnadu. It is also stated that he returned to Śrīraṅgam only after Vīrasundara’s death. However there is no historical evidence to show that there existed a king by the name Vīrasundara during this period. Yet this Vīrasundara may be one of the several titles of the contemporary King Rājarāja II or he might have been a vassal of the Cola King Rājarāja II. Parāśara returned to Śrīraṅgam from Tirukkoṭṭiyūr after Vīrasundara’s demise and continued to live for some time and then was followed by Naṅjiyār, as his spiritual successor.

It is safe to conclude, therefore, that Parāśara might have lived upto 60 or 70 years taking into consideration the facts mentioned above concerning his parentage and spiritual authority invested in him by Śrī Rāmānuja.
CHAPTER II

THE WORKS OF PARĀŚARA BHATTA -
A BRIEF ANALYSIS

Parāśara Bhāṭṭa who is thus reputed to have been a great successor of Rāmānuja was a prolific writer of great distinction. All his works-in Sanskrit or in Tamil-bear the impress of his amazing scholarship and unquestionable command of the language concerned. He wrote twelve works - ten in Sanskrit and two in Tamil apart from a good number of stray verses in Sanskrit. He is also credited with several original interesting elucidations and interpretations of some passages of Divyaprābandha which are popular in the learned traditional circles as nirvāha-s. Of the Sanskrit works only six are available in full and all of them are printed. They are: the Āṣṭaśloki, the Kriyādīpa, the Bhagavadgūṇadarpaṇa (Viṣṇu-sahasra nāmabhāṣya), the Śrīgunaratnakośa, the Śrīraṅganātha stotra and the Śrīraṅgarājastava. His three other Sanskrit works, namely, the Adhyātmakhandadvaya-vivaraṇa, or Vyākhyā, the Tattvaratnakara and the Lakṣmīkalyāṇa nātaka are available only in a few fragments preserved in the quotations of Vedānta Deśika. Parāśara’s another work, the Subālopaniṣad-vivaraṇa is quoted for once by Nṛsiṃhadeva in his commentary Ānandadāyini on the Sarvārthasiddhi which is an auto-commentary by Vedānta Deśika on his Tattvamuktākalāpa. Of his Tamil compositions, the Kaisikapurāṇa, also known as Kaisika-māhātmya is available in print. His elaborate commentary on a particular stanza - Maivaṇṇanarungunuḻi forming part of the celebrated Tamil work Tiruneduntaṇṭakam of Tirumāṅgai Āḻvār, which itself forms part of the second thousand of the Divyaprābandha is also available in print.2 As for the muktaka-s (stray
verses) mentioned earlier, they are recited on different occasions and form part of an unbroken living tradition in the South Indian Śrīvaiṣṇava temple liturgies. There is also a eulogy, called Gośṭhīstava attributed to our author. As the name suggests, it is in praise of Tirukkoṭṭiyūr, a pilgrim town in the Pudukkoṭṭai District of Tamilnadu. In Sanskrit this place is called Gośṭhīpurī. This hymn is in ten verses of which the first and the last describe the presiding deity called Saumya-nārāyaṇa. Verses 2 to 9 describe the town in terms of its scenic beauty, sanctity and the river called Maṇimuttāru. Other points of interest mentioned by the author are that the Tamil Saint Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār sang in praise of this deity and that Rāmānuja used to visit this place quite often to meet his preceptor Gośṭhipūrṇa. However, this work does not appear to have been written by Parāśara. The stotra seems to end abruptly; the style also does not commend itself as that of Parāśara. But for the opening dedicatory stanza (called Tanian in Tamil) which runs thus -

śrīparāśara-bhattāryah śrīraṅgeśa-purohitah
śrīvatsāṅkasutah śrīmān śreyase me’stu bhūyase
there is no other evidence that it is the work of Parāśara.

Given below is a brief account of all the available works of Parāśara:

(1) AṢṬAṢLOKĪ

As the very name indicates this work is in eight verses. Marked by brevity and clarity, this explains the essence of the three important secrets of the Śrīvaishnava religion and philosophy, namely, the aṣṭāksara, the dvaya and the caramaśloka. The aṣṭāksara is the eight-syllabled
mantra—Om namo nārāyanāya, held in very high esteem by a Śrīvaisṇava. It is to be repeated every day along with the dvayamantra. ‘Dvaya’ means a pair and this is the name given to the mantra with six padas (words), namely śrīmānnaśrīyaś-caraṇau śaṁaṇaḥ prapadye, śrīmate nārāyanāya namaḥ’. This expression brings out the total surrender of the devotee to the lotus-feet of Lord Nārāyaṇa who forms the Supreme Godhead along with His consort Śrī. As for the caramaśloka the verse sarvadharmān, etc., of the Bhagavadgītā (18-66) is of great importance to the Śrīvaisṇava-s- since according to them, it pinpoints wholehearted surrender as the effective means of salvation.

Parāśara’s Aṣṭaśloki, couched in such long metres as Śikharinī, Śārdūlavikrīḍita and Śragdhara very effectively brings out the importance of these three secrets which form part of the daily recitation and routine of an orthodox Śrīvaisṇava. The first four verses are devoted to the explanation of the aṣṭāksara, the next two expound the dvaya and the last two, the Caramaśloka.

(2) KRIYĀDĪPA

Strictly speaking this work appears to be an ascription, although tradition believes it to have been certainly composed by Parāśara. That it might have been composed by someone and fathered upon Parāśara cannot be ruled out. This is so because Vedānta Deśika in his Rahasyatrayasāra quotes the following three verses as from the Nityagantha of Parāśara (Bhaṭṭar nityam):

"prānavodita - taccheṣabhāvo’ham niyakarmabhiḥ ahamkāra - mamatvābhyyāmabhībhūto’pyataḥ param taccheṣatvānusandhānapūrva - taccheṣavṛttīkāḥ bhūyāsamityamam bhāvam vyanakti nama ityadah"
Further the seventy-two verses of the extant text do not show anything new or interesting since the Nityagrantha of Rāmānuja composed a little before Parāśara’s work had already been popular with the devout Śrīvaiṣṇava-s in the performance of their daily religious rites. However it appears that every spiritual teacher of those days was obliged to compose one nitya-grantha (routine manual) for the benefit of his own disciples and followers. As such, one cannot rule out the possibility of Parāśara’s composing a nitya-grantha for the benefit of his own followers too. But the point on hand is that the text referred to by Vedānta Deśika as the Nitya-grantha of Parāśara seems to be different from the one available to us as the Kriyādīpa of Parāśara. The work called Āhnika-grantha compiled by one Śrīraṅganātha-yatindra-mahādeśika, the twenty-sixth head of the pontifical chair of the Ahobilamath (early part of the 19th century) refers to the work of Parāśara as having been consulted for its composition. However no quotation from Kriyādīpa is found in this Āhnikagrantha.  

(3) THE BHAGAVADGUṆADARPANA

This is the name of Parāśara’s masterly commentary on the Viṣṇusahasranāma which forms part of the Anuśāsanaparvan of the Mahābhārata. It has to be mentioned that of all the available works of Parāśara this is the only one written in prose. It appears that Parāśara wrote it in contradistinction to Śaṅkara’s commentary on the Viṣṇusahasranāma, which was obviously written from the Advaitic standpoint. In his introduction to the commentary, Parāśara stresses the
efficacy and popularity of this *stotra* and then explains at length the *tattva* (reality or truth), *hita* (means) and *puruśārtha* (the human end) according to the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. True to the Śrīvaiśṇava concept, the author brings out the glory of the Supreme Lord as *saguṇa* (with qualities). He also discusses other important tenets of this school such as the body-soul relation (*śarīra-ātma-bhāva*) between the world and the Lord, the state of release, the supremacy of the Lord and His inseparable relation with Śrī, His consort. Another noteworthy feature of this commentary is that it quotes profusely not only from the Upaniṣad-s and Epics but also from the *Pāñcarātra* texts such as the *Sātvata*, and the Pauṣkara *Samhitā*-s and from a number of Purāṇa-s like the Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata and Varāha.

(4) SRIGUṆARATNAKOSA

This is an elegant hymn addressed to Goddess Śrī comprising sixty-one stanzas. Parāśara identifies Goddess Śrī with Sītā and identifies her again with Śrīraṅganāyakī the presiding deity at Śrīraṅgam. He describes Śrī not as an elderly matron, not even as a maiden who has attained efflorescence but as an adolescent girl who is just in the confluence of childhood and fresh youth, called by Parāśara *Śaiśavayauvana-vyatikara*. Another striking feature of this hymn is that Parāśara views Lakṣmī not only as the presiding deity of prosperity and plenty, but also as one who can bless her devotees with remarkable powers of speech, the art of poesy in particular, through her mere glance. This is one of the finest devotional lyrics in the literature of Śrīvaiśṇava *stotra*-s, kept in the tradition of day-to-day chanting (*pārāyana*) of a devout Śrīvaiśṇava. Parāśara traces the concept of Śrī to the early Vedic literature and tries to establish that even
the glory of Lord Visnu is dependent upon that of His consort Rising to supreme heights of poetic charm the author describes Laksmi as responsible even for the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe, inspiring Her Lord to carry out these cosmic functions. The graphic descriptions in which the poet excels in presenting the glorious picture of Laksmi as the presiding deity of plenty, prosperity and exquisite charm are matched by his vivid portrayal of the same Goddess as the considerate and compassionate mother of all beings full of the milk of human kindness. Perhaps the concept of Laksmi’s mediacy (purusakara) between God and men owes much to this picture of Laksmi drawn by the author. Drawing profusely from the episode of Sita in the Ramayana, Parásara justifies the motherhood of Laksmi in what may be called the dramatic style of engaging her Lord in a lively and lovely conversation, pacifying the anger of Her Lord and assuaging the fear of the errant child

(5) ŚRĪRAṅGANĀTHA STOTRA

Another beautiful lyric from the pen of Parásara is the Śrīraṅganāthastotra in six verses. All the printed versions of this stotra contain eight verses. Scholars are of the opinion that the last two are stray verses (muktaka), which are taken together along with the first six and chanted among the traditional circles. Known for its candid and clear style this brings out the pangs experienced by an ardent devotee when separated from his chosen deity. Every verse describes the feelings of the poet yearning for his daily ablutions in the river Kāveri, for worshipping Lord Ranganātha, for repeating his holy names and such devotional activities. This stotra again is in the tradition of daily repetition of an ardent Śrīvaisnava
Tradition avers that Parāśara composed this stotra when he had to go away from Śrīraṅgam due to the displeasure he incurred of the then Coḷa king Vīrasundara.⁷

(6) ŚRĪRAṆGARĀJASTAVA

This is the longest and the most important stotra composed by Parāśara. It contains 232 verses and is divided into two sections called the Pūrvaśataka the earlier hundred verses and the Uttaraśataka - the subsequent hundred verses. The first section deals at length with the glory of Lord Raṅganātha whom our author calls Raṅgarāja, the Emperor or Ruler of Śrīraṅgam. The Śrīvaishnava-āgama-s, it may be noted in this context, state that the Supreme Being should be honoured as an emperor.⁸ True to this tradition Parāśara gives a grand description of Raṅganātha - the presiding deity of Śrīraṅgam, whom he identifies with Lord Viṣṇu the Supreme Being sung in the sacred literature. Of special mention are the Lord’s innumerable perfections of which compassion is of utmost significance to the devotee. The author also provides a very beautiful description of the temple of Śrīraṅgam, its environs, the Kāverī, the gardens surrounding the temple and so on.

In contradistinction to the Pūrvaśataka, the Uttaraśataka concerns itself with several issues such as the supremacy of the Lord, the claims of the other schools of thought regarding the purport of the Upaniṣadād texts, the nature of mokṣa and the like. Parāśara, a relentless critic of other schools of thought can be seen in this piece of poetry as an uncompromising champion of the cause of the Śrīvaishnava school. It may be pointed out in this connection that Parāśara is following the example of his illustrious father Śrīvatsāṅka Miśra, who had also earlier composed his Paṅcastavī, interspersing
philosophical disquisitions and criticisms of other schools, while glorifying certain deities of his own choice. In fact Yāmuna himself has started this technique of clothing philosophical ideas and criticism of other schools in the garb of lyric poetry in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition.

7. OTHER WORKS OF PARĀŚARA

Of the lost works of Parāśara, the most important is perhaps the Tattvaratnākara. About 42 fragments of this masterly treatise on tattva (the Reality) are available now exclusively through the quotations by Vedānta Deśika. Composed in mixed prose and verse the Tattvaratnākara appears to have been an ocean (ratnākara) of several philosophical concepts of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. Although a clear picture of the plan of this work cannot be obtained due to the incomplete nature of these quotations, it is still possible to hold that it was a large work divided into several chapters called prakarana-s subdivided into several sections called pāda-s. The Nyāyapariśuddhi of Vedānta Deśika, it may be said, closely follows this work of Parāśara.

G. Oberhammer is of the opinion that the Tattvaratnākara was never completed by the author and that even Vedānta Deśika might not have known the fuller text. While tracing the possible reasons for the loss of the Tattvaratnākara, he states that the political conditions during the 12th century might have been one such cause. Or the popularity of the works of earlier Ācārya-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja and especially that of Rāmānuja’s Śrībhāṣya might have led to the comparative neglect of the Tattvaratnākara. Another reason, according to the same scholar, could have been that Parāśara’s theology foreshadowed the doctrine of the Teṅkalai school and so naturally was not favoured by the other group, namely, the Vaḍakalai school. It
remains to be observed that it is very difficult to posit any particular reason for the loss of texts in ancient India. Apart from the reasons mentioned by Oberhammer, it might also be stated that sheer ravages of time, accidents and lack of facilities for the preservation of manuscripts could have contributed to the loss of this monumental work of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa.

The Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvaya Vivarana has come down to us only in the form of two quotations found in the Nyāya-siddhāṇjana. The first quotation is concerned with the definition of śarīra (the body) given in the Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja. Introducing this quotation Vedānta Deśika says that some take Rāmānuja's statement as forming a single definition whereas, others hold it as comprising three definitions. Deśika further says that Parāśara Bhaṭṭa in his Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvaya-vivarana shows his favour towards the view which holds that this definition contains in itself three definitions. That is to say that both the sentient and insentient beings form the body of the Lord by virtue of their being controlled by the Lord, being supported by Him and by virtue of their being sub-servient to the Lord. The same definition holds good for any physical body.

Another quotation from the Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvaya-vivarana found in the Nyāyasiddhāṇjana mentions the similarity between aiśvarya (lordship) and akṣara (kaivalya) - both of which are different from liberation (mokṣa) which is the highest state of bliss. In other words aiśvarya is only the joy of experiencing material objects; akṣara which is another name for kaivalya is the bliss resulting from experiencing one's own self. These two are two different degrees of joy. Mokṣa which constitutes the supreme bliss is therefore superior to both akṣara and aiśvarya.
The *Lakṣmikalyāṇa*, another work of Parāśara, known only through three quotations is known to tradition as a *nāṭaka*. Vedānta Deśika is the only author to quote a few lines of this work in his *Sārasāra*, which forms a part of the *Sillaraīrahasyaṅgal*, in his *Gītā-bhāṣya-tātparya-candrikā* and in his *Rahasyatrayasāra*. The *Siddhopāya-codana*-section of the *Rahasyatrayasāra* refers to the expression, *ananyādīhīnakałyāṇam* which is a part of the *anuṣṭubh* verse known to tradition as follows:

ananyādīhīnakałyāṇam anyamaṅgalakāraṇam
jagannidānādadvandvam dvandvam vandāmahe vayam

In all probability this could have been the *maṅgala-śloka* of this work. The short ‘a’ which is an auspicious symbol with which this verse opens and the benediction of the *namaskriyā*-type in conformity with tradition corroborates this point. It refers to the obeisance done by the poet to the divine pair (Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa) which is the source of the entire world-manifestation, which is unparalleled, whose glory is not dependent on any cause other than Itself and which, in turn, is at the very root of the auspiciousness, prosperity or glory of every other being (human or divine).

The other quotation of the *Lakṣmikalyāṇa* is from the *Sārasāra* and it runs as follows:

svayam vastūkuryvan janamimam akasmāt sarasiṣa-prakārau padmāyastava ca caraṇau nah śaraṇayān

This statement appears to have been made by a devotee, addressing the Lord thus - ‘‘(O Lord!) you yourself have made this person (an indirect reference to the speaker himself) an existent being and out of motiveless grace made him (the speaker) whole-heartedly surrender at the lotus-feet of Lakṣmī and of your own self.’’ It is
clear from these two lines forming a part of a verse couched in *sikhaṇī* metre, that the poet is referring to the motiveless and unconditional grace of Lord Viṣṇu. The care and concern the Lord has for the devotee are clear from the fact that He makes a man what he is by showing him the *upāya*, namely, doing *prapatti* first to Lakṣmī and then to Himself. Vedānta Deśika observes that Parāśara, by this statement is voicing the ideas expressed by Nammāḷvār in the line

āreṇakku nīṇ pādamē śaraṇākattandolindāy.\(^{18}\)

The other quotation from this drama is found in the *Gītābhāṣyatātparyacandrikā* of Vedānta Deśika. Commenting on the word *dāivam* of the *Gītā* text

*dāivam caiva atra pañcamam*.\(^{19}\)

he quotes the following as from the *Lakṣmikālyāṇa*:

*dharmena pramāṇam samayastadīyo
dvāśca tattvam ca tadiṣṭhadāivam*.\(^{20}\)

It appears from this half verse composed in the *indravajrā* metre that Parāśara is listing here the sources which can be taken as an authority in matters of *dharma*. According to him the tradition of meritorious people (*śīṣṭas*), the *Veda*-s, the ultimate truth and the deity chosen by such people form the *pramāṇa* in deciding matters concerning righteousness. But the point for which Vedānta Deśika quotes this passage is that the term *dāivam* used in the *Gītā* passage *dāivam caivātra pañcamam* actually means *devatā* (a deity) but not fate or any other being though divine, lesser in importance than the supreme Being.\(^{21}\)

It may be presumed, on the basis of these three quotations available, that Parāśara might have composed this drama taking the theme of Lakṣmī being married by Viṣṇu which is well-known through the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*
and other texts. It also appears to deal with some important concepts of the Viśiṣṭādaśvaita school such as śaranañgati, the position of Śrī and the supremacy of the dual divinity of Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa. It also, perhaps, deals with other issues like the means of ascertaining dharma and the question of one’s chosen deity.

The next work, which is also lost to posterity is the commentary on the Subālopanisad which is generally referred to as Vyākhyā or Vivaranā. The quotation is as follows:

_yaduktam bhattaparāsarapādair (subālopanisad-vivaraṇe) - ‘yadi bhūtānāmapi prakṛttivām tarhi aṣṭau prakṛtayaśṣodāsa vikārāḥ iti śruteḥ kā gatiriti cet; vedopabr̥mhaṇanipuṇatara-paramarsisandarśitaiva gatiḥ; nāsmābhistadviruddhanirvahaṇe’ bhiniveṣṭa vyam’._

Parāśara in his commentary on the Šubālopanisad raises the question as to how the scriptural passage speaking of eight prakṛti-s (primordial causes) and the sixteen modifications (vikāra-s) can be justified if even the elements (bhūta-s) are accepted as the primary causes (prakṛti). He answers this _prima facie_ objection by stating that the great sage Vyāsa himself has shown the way out and as such no effort need be made by us in giving a different interpretation. The author of the Ānandadāyini, quoting from the Mokṣadharma of the Mahābhārata explains that avyakta, mahaṭ and ahaṅkāra and the five elements are the eight prakṛti-s in question. The five organs of knowledge and the five organs of action along with the five subtle forms of elements (tanmātra-s) and the mind form the sixteen vikāra-s._

In fact the above quotation is given by the author of the Ānandadāyini as the view anticipated by Vedānta Deśika in the Sarvārthasiddhi by the statement - _nanu upabṛmhaṇavīṣeṣānusārāt_, etc.
Of the Sanskrit works of Parāśara which remain to be enumerated are the Muktaka-s or stray verses (known as Tirumañjana Kaṭṭiyaṅgal or Tirumañjana Kavis in Tamil). These verses which are about 50 in number are recited in the Śrīraṅgam temple on occasions like Ekādaśī, Amāvāsyā, Ayana, Telugu and Tamil New Year days and Brahmotsava. Even today these verses are recited by the descendants of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa on the above occasions. Of these only 28 verses are available in print and the rest are with Bhaṭṭar’s family at Śrīraṅgam.25 One of these verses tvam me’ ham me received the attention of Vedānta Deśika.26

Of the Tamil compositions of Parāśara mention must be made of his commentary on the Kaiśikapurāṇa (māhātmya) forming part of the Varāhapurāṇa (Ch.48) which is held in high esteem by the Śrīvaiṣṇava-s.27 Parāśara explains in Tamil the significance of singing the glory of the Lord at the Brāhma-muhūrta which is the main concern of this section of the Varāhapurāṇa. The original text contains 92 verses and is in the form of a dialogue between Lord Varāha and his consort Bhūmi. Tradition holds that Parāśara recited the Kaiśikamāhātmya on a particular day, that is, on the twelfth day of the bright fortnight in the Viṣcikamāsa (between Nov-Dec.) in the Śrīraṅgam temple and that he was accorded the rare honour of Brahma-ratha (being carried in a palanquin by Brāhmaṇas) for his remarkable way of recitation and interpretation which act won for him the grace of the Lord.28 In his introduction to the commentary Parāśara points out that the Purāṇa-s which are meant to substantiate the teachings of the Veda can be divided as sāttvika, rājasa and tāmasa depending upon the preponderance of the qualities of sattva (serenity), rajas (activity) and tamas (inertia) respectively found in Lord Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Śiva, who happen to be the
object of glorification in these Purāṇa-s. Since the quality of sattva is helpful to achieve mokṣa and since Lord Viṣṇu is popularly known to be the very embodiment of sattva, the Purāṇa-s which expound His glory are of primary importance for those who are interested in attaining salvation. Continuing, Parāśara points out that of all the incarnations Viṣṇu has taken such as Matsya, Kurma, Varāha, Śrī Rāma and Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the Varāha incarnation is of great significance in matters concerning the upāya (means) of salvation.

Parāśara’s commentary on a particular stanza of Thirumaṅgai Āḻvār’s Tiruneduntāṇḍakam is an important landmark in the Śrīvaiṣṇava literature in Tamil. The stanza in question commences thus:

maivaṇṇanarūṅkuṉji kulal.²⁹

There is no exaggeration in saying that Parāśara’s wonderful powers of exposition and interpretation of the lyrical beauty of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār’s composition have touched the highest acme in this elaborate and versatile commentary which runs to nearly twenty-two pages in print. Parāśara offers a variety of interpretations for this verse in the general context of the entire section which contains 30 stanzas. The interpretations he offers are from different view-points taking each decade as a unit closely connected with one another. These standpoints are those of the mūlamantra (the aṣṭāksara), the dvayamantra and the caramaśloka,³⁰ the three components of the sacred syllable, namely the letters a, u and m; and so on. The main point is that the stanza in question reflects the mood and sentiment of the Āḻvār who places himself in the position of a nāyikā
and describes to her close confidant, feelings of wonder, suspense, anxiety, love, fear and thrill she experienced when she saw her beloved from close quarters as a sort of agreeable surprise, which confuses her regarding the real identity of the person, making her almost identify that person as the Supreme Lord Himself. The inner idea is that the Supreme Lord (para) with whom the nāyikā is in love, no longer appears as inaccessible but as sulabha (easily accessible). Every line of this commentary is replete with a variety of references and quotations from several sources like the Upaniṣad-s, the Rāmāyana and the Gītā and Kāvya-s like those of Kālidāsa\(^{31}\) and Bhartṛhari,\(^{32}\) testifying to the wide range of scholarship of our author and his mastery over the Divya-prabandham.

In addition to the above works of Parāśara we have quite a few Tamil nirvāha-s, which are interpretations of some of the expressions or passages found in the Divya-prabandham. These interpretations have come down to us through the references found in the commentaries on the Tiruvāyumoli such as Ārāyirappadi, Onpadināyirappadi and Muppattārāyirappadi. Parāśara who was an authority on the Divyaprabandham used to give regular discourses (kālakṣepa-s) on it in the course of which he used to explain in his own inimitable style several important and knotty passages, much to the delight of his fortunate audience. It is these interpretations, elucidations, explanations or justifications of Parāśara that are known in tradition as Bhaṭṭar-nirvāham-s.

All the available works of Parāśara including the stray verses will be taken up for a detailed study in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III
DETAILED STUDY OF THE WORKS

AŚTAŚLOKI

The opening verse of this octad explains the significance of the three syllables ‘a’, ‘u’ and ‘m’ constituting the prāṇava with which the aṣṭāksarīmantra (called mantra by the author) begins. The second verse deals with the indeclinable ‘namah’ forming the middle part of this sacred mantra. The third verse expounds the significance of the word ‘nārāyaṇāya’, used in the dative case. The fourth verse sets forth the difficulties that stand in the way of a devotee and suggests the means of avoiding them. In the fifth stanza the author recommends meditation and the benefits which can be derived from the dvaya mantra. The sixth verse speaks of the importance of resorting to Lakṣmi and getting rid of the feelings of ‘I’ and ‘mine’ which constitute the dāsyā- attitude congenial for liberation. In the seventh verse Parāśara paraphrases Lord Kṛṣṇa’s assurance found in the Bhagavadgītā - (xviii, 66) “sarvadharmān parītyajya”...1. In the last verse the author appeals to the Lord that in spite of the above assurance, he is still unable to decide on what to do. Even the idea of surrendering to the Lord stems from His grace. As such he has to wait for salvation, firmly believing that the Lord would forgive all his sins.

STANZA 1

The prāṇava constitutes the three syllables, ‘a’, ‘u’ and ‘m’. ‘A’ connotes Viṣṇu as the creator, sustainer and destroyer of the universe as both its instrumental and material cause. The syllable ‘m’ stands for the
individual soul who is a mere instrument subserving the Lord, meant for His exclusive use and satisfaction. The syllable 'u' coming in between, indicates the inseparable relationship between these two with a restriction (niyamayati). To explain, the sentient and the insentient entities are both subservient to the Lord.

STANZA 2

The indeclinable 'namas' which is the second unit in the sacred mantra (pranava + namo nārāyanāya) explains the essential nature of the individual soul. Namaḥ which literally means 'salutations to', can be split again into two syllables and is read along with the syllable 'm' of the pranava. Thus we have the clause 'm', 'na' and 'mah', which can be interpreted as ma, the jīva, na=not, mah=mine (mah is genitive singular of 'm'). In other words it means that the jīva is not for his own sake. Another interpretation: namah as a single unbroken unit means 'salutations' which is the means (upāya) of attaining salvation. Another interpretation: if we split this indeclinable as 'na+ mah' and then take namah together as a single word, we get the expression namah na mah. This means that the upāya mentioned above is not for myself, that is, even that is for the sake of the Lord. Finally by construing the two syllables na+mah along with the last word of the mantrabrahman we arrive at the expression nārāyanāya na mah, which means that even the service which is the very purpose of human existence is for the sake of the Lord and not for anybody else.

In other words the term namah, connotes that (1) the individual is the subject of the Lord; (2) the means and the goal of salvation are also dependent on the will of the Lord; (3) even the highest goal of human life, that
is, kāṅkārya, called vṛtti is meant for the Lord only; and, that (4) even the upāya is not for the jīva.

STANZA 3

The word nārāyaṇa used in the fourth case as nārāyaṇāya is explained in this verse. It is composed of two words nara and ayana, which mean ‘the abode of nara-s’, that is, the individual souls which are eternal (nitya). The expression namo nārāyaṇāya means that ‘I’ (svayam) exist for the sake of ‘a’ namely Nārāyaṇa and not for my own sake. The dative termination ‘ya’ in the expression nārāyaṇāya conveys that the service and devotion of the individual soul under all conditions and at all times are meant for the Lord alone.

STANZA 4

For one who has the erroneous attachment towards his body as the self, Parāśara offers the advice that one should constantly contemplate on the third syllable of ‘praṇava’ which is ‘ṁ’. This would help one to get rid of the mistaken identity that the body is the self, by enlightening the real nature of the individual soul. If a man becomes blinded by the feeling that he is an independent agent of actions, ignoring the fact that he is always dependent upon the Lord, Parāśara advises him to meditate upon the first sacred sound of the syllable namely ‘a’. This would put him in the right perspective, pointing out the supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu. In the case of those who wrongly believe that they are under the control of some other beings inferior to the Lord, Parāśara advises them to meditate upon the second syllable ‘u’. This ‘u’ would bestow upon them a constant awareness of their relationship with the Lord. Still if an aspirant feels that he can take care of his own self (ātmatrāṇa),
independent of the Lord, Parāśara feels that he should concentrate on the expression *namaḥ* (*na+mah*), which quickly removes any feeling of individual self-sufficiency. In the case of those who are carried away by worldly relationships and ties of blood, such persons should constantly remind themselves of the word *nārāyaṇa*. This, as explained earlier, points to the Lord as the ultimate goal of all human endeavour. Lastly, if the aspirant is enslaved by the sensual enjoyments, he should think repeatedly of the connotation of the dative suffix ‘ya’,² which means ‘for the sake of’. This, at once, brings him to the senses and reminds him of the fact that he is ‘for the sake of Lord Nārāyaṇa’, and that sensual enjoyment is not the *sumnum bonum* of human existence.

Parāśara wants to drive home the point that the *mantrabrahman* offers full protection to the erring individual soul provided he cares to recite it everyday. It never fails him and always shows him the correct path by pointing out the exact relationship in which he stands with the Supreme Being.

**STANZA 5**

The first four verses thus explain the significance of the *aṣṭākṣarī-mantra* which forms the first of the *Rahasyatrāya* of the Śrīvaishṇava school. In the fifth stanza, Parāśara explains the significance of the *dvaya-mantra*, that is, *śrīmānṇaṁ nārāyaṇacaraṇau śaraṇam prapadye and śrīmate nārāyaṇaṁ namaḥ*. This *mantra* has two parts in it comprising six words. The first term Śrī which is the name of the consort of Lord Nārāyaṇa connotes the sense of guidance or leadership (*netrīvatam*). It is Goddess Śrī who ushers the devotee unto the Lord, pleads on behalf of the devotee and ultimately secures his deliverance.³ This function is also known as *puruṣakāra*. 
The termination matup in śrīman indicates eternal relationship (nityayoga) subsisting between the Lord and Śrī. The term nārayana which literally means ‘the abode of nara-s’ brings out the benevolent qualities of the Lord (samucita-guṇa-jāta) such as compassion and easy accessibility. The word caranau meaning ‘feet’ indicates the graceful figure of the Lord (tanukhyāpanam). The word śarāṇam meaning ‘whole-hearted surrender’ points to the upāya to be employed by the soul for his own salvation. The word prapadye (‘I resort to’) explains the duty to be discharged by the devotee (kartavyabhāga). All the words of the first part of the dvayamantra are thus explained.

The second part of the mantra — śrīmate nārayanaṁ namah suggests four more essentials. The word śrīmate stands for the divine couple Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa who are the masters of all the jīva-s. The stem nārayana actually conveys the lordship and sovereignty of Viṣṇu (svāmitvam). The dative case in the word nārayanāya lays stress upon eternal service to be done by the jīva to his master (prārthana). Finally the word namah indicates the desirability of getting rid of egotism which is a very powerful impediment in securing liberation (virodhīpahāṇa). Parāśara explains further that this dvayamantra protects one who repeats it and is part of the śruti itself.

STANZA 6

The sixth verse is specially devoted to a resume of the dvayamantra treated earlier, with special reference to the role played by Lakṣmī as a meditator (puruṣakāra) between the Lord and the man. Already this concept has been dealt with by the Ālvār-s, and explained by Ācārya-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja in their Stotraratna
and Gadyatraya respectively. According to this tradition Parāśara resorts to Śrī first (śrī-prapatti) and then approaches the Lord through her mediacy. Śrī is called the mistress of all the universe (Īśānā), the consort of the Supreme Lord and ever associated with Him. The author also suggests in this context the etymologies of the word Śrī as ‘one who is resorted to by others’ (Śrīyate) and as ‘one who abides in the highest abode’ (Śrayate). This incidentally explains the term Śrīmat forming part of the dvayamantra. Explaining the word Nārāyaṇa forming part of the same mantra, Parāśara calls him ‘one who is the repository of all benevolent qualities’ which make Him one who is fit to be resorted to. According to the commentator Nārāyaṇamuni, these qualities which draw a devotee are twelve in number such as Sauśīlya (capacity of uniting easily with the layman), Vātsalya (parental affection), Kāruṇya (compassion) Audārya (generosity), Kṛtitva (the capacity to fulfil any undertaking), Kṛtajñatva (gratefulness), Svāmītvā (Lordship), Sulabhatva (easy accessibility), Sarvajñatva (Omniscience), Sarvasaktitva (Omnipotence), Paripūrṇatva (perfect plenitude) and Paramaudāryatva (remarkable magnanimity). Parāśara declares that he surrenders at the feet of Hari who is thus known as the supreme benefactor to all humanity. This, in other words, is the path of Saranāgati as distinguished from that of Bhakti.

Explaining the latter portion of the dvayamantra, Parāśara states that he aspires to render dāsya (service without any reservation or spatio-temporal condition) to the Lord who is ever associated with Śrī, she being a means towards that end. He has thus brought out the meaning of the word namah also, which is the last member of the dvayamantra. As in the mūlamantra, the word
namah here also expresses the desire to remove all the egotism and selfishness (nirmama). The commentator further points out the method of construing the sentences of this verse according to the old tradition, in which the second part (uttarakhaṇḍa) is understood first, and then the first part (pūrvakhaṇḍa).

STANZA 7

In the subsequent verse Parāśara explains the connotation of the third rahasya which in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition is known as the Caramaśloka. The word Cama means, literally, the last and final one. The Caramaśloka is the verse - sarvadharmān, etc., found as the 66th verse of the eighteenth chapter of the Bhagavad Gītā, which, strictly speaking, is not the last verse of the chapter. However the word Caramaśloka is to be understood as the verse which spells out the final upāya of salvation which is prapatti or śaraṇāgati. Though not a mantra in the regular sense of the term, this śloka is still considered as a rahasya and the sattivika-s impart it as a rahasya only to those who have surrendered to them as disciples, points out the commentator.

This Caramaśloka consists of twelve words. The first half comprising six words enjoins śaraṇāgati on one who stands helpless. The second half brings out the human end (purusārtha) which follows the implementation of śaraṇāgati and this purusārtha is of the form of removal of the impediments which are undesirable (anista). Parāśara explains the meaning of this rahasya in the words of the Lord himself: “...give up whatever dharma has been stated by Me through scriptures as the means of reaching Me, and resort to Me alone as the means of reaching me with full conviction and utter helplessness. Once you are thus determined, I, full of perfections such
as all-round Knowledge, Lordship, Independence and Mercy shall relieve you of all the impediments that stand in attaining Me. Stop grieving.”

Explaining the word *pratibandhaka* (impediment) the commentator states that both merit *punya* and demerit *pāpa* stand in the way of reaching God and hence both are to be avoided.⁶

**STANZA 8**

The final verse is in the form of the conviction made by an individual soul before the Lord. This may be explained as follows: “O Lord Hari! I am fully convinced of the fact that I am entirely dependent upon your will, at all times. As such I am unable either to implement or totally give up several disciplines mentioned by you in the *Gītā* such as those of *karma*, *jñāna* and *bhakti*. Even regarding *prapatti*, I am in the same state of mind and I am helplessly miserable. However, I remember the final means (*carama-upāya*) mentioned by you as the charioteer of Arjuna, and I am fully convinced that you are going to absolve me of all the sins or impediments that stand in the way of my reaching your feet.”

Parāśara makes it thus clear that a real devotee finds it extremely difficult to implement or give up any of the four means of salvation including *saranāgati*. The reason for such a helpless state of mind is the fact that the individual soul has no independence whatsoever to adopt any means, nor does he have any knowledge regarding the suitability of a particular means to his own peculiar condition in life. As such there is no other way for such an ardent devotee than to recollect the idea conveyed by the Lord through the *Caramaśloka*, and to be fully prepared, without any speck of doubt, to
place complete trust in the Lord that He would clear all the impediments that lie in the path of his spiritual progress. This conviction, this trust, relieves him of all undue worries and makes him happy and blissful till he attains his goal.

The commentator Nārāyaṇamuni notes towards the end that the meanings of the mūlamantra, dvayamantra and caramaśloka are explained through the first, fifth and seventh verses of this hymn respectively.\(^7\) A further point of interest according to some is that Parāśara belongs to that category of prapanna-s who adopt the sadvāraka-prapatti, that is, prapatti which is subsidiary to bhakti, and thus differs from those to whom prapatti is the principal factor (aṅgin), called advāraka-prapatti.\(^8\)

**BHAGAVADGŪṆADARPĀṆA**

The *Bhagavadgūṇadarpaṇa* is the name of Parāśara’s commentary on the Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra, which forms chapter 149 of the Anuśāsanaparvan (13th parvan) of the Mahābhārata. It has to be mentioned that this popular stotra has received nearly 40 commentaries of which Śaṅkaras commentary seems to be the earliest. Parāśara’s commentary differs from those of others in being Viṣiṣṭādvaitic in approach and very elaborate in exposition, quoting profusely not only from the Upaniṣad-s and the Epics but also from a number of Purāṇa-s. The name of the commentary *Bhagavadgūṇadarpaṇa* (‘a mirror to the qualitites of the Lord’) makes it clear that according to Viṣiṣṭādvaitins the Supreme Brahman is not nirguṇa as held by the Advaitin, but an abode of a number of auspicious qualities. In fact Parāśara discusses the relative importance of the saṅguṇa-texts and explains the nirguṇa-texts as speaking of the Lord as bereft of all the undesirable qualities.
The introduction to this commentary is very elaborate and Parāśara discusses several issues which are directly connected with the validity of the great Epic itself. It may be asked as to why Parāśara should devote so much attention and time to prove the validity of the fifth Veda as a text equal in status with the Rāmāyana. The answer is twofold: (1) Proving the authenticity of the Mahābhārata is fundamental to the establishment of the validity of the Sahasranāmastotra which forms part of the Great Epic; and, (2) the validity of certain sections of the Mahābhārata is questioned by some critics. For instance, the Śāntiparvan is known to be highly interpolated. Parāśara mentions clearly that even as the meaning of the Veda-s is to be ascertained with the help of the Itihāsa-s and Purāṇa-s, for the superiority of the Itihāsa-s over other forms of literature is to be understood with the help of Purāṇa-s. Moreover in the verse itihāsapurāṇābhhyām vedam samupabṛṁhayet, the Purāṇa-s are mentioned subsequent to the Itihāsa-s and hence the Itihāsa-s are more important.

Parāśara then speaks of the importance of the particular chapter giving the thousand names of the Lord, adducing six reasons. They are; (1) this chapter is the essence of the Mahābhārata which itself is a great supplement to the Veda-s; (2) these names are sung by great sages; (3) they have been arranged by Vyāsa, who is an authority on the Veda-s; (4) Bhiṣma considers these names and their chanting as an act of supreme merit; (5) all the great personalities have accepted it to be so; and, (6) it is in conformity with the spirit of the Gītā and other such scriptural texts. In the subsequent paragraphs Parāśara, quoting from Purāṇa-s such as the Bhāviṣyat, Matsya, Viṣṇu and Mārkaṇḍeya justifies the supremacy of the Mahābhārata and points
out that this chapter of the thousand names forms part of the *Anuśāsanaparvan* which is the heart of the *Itihāsa*. The context is where Bhīṣma expounds the duty of charity as laid down in the śāstra-s.

These thousand names are uttered with devotion by a wide range of scholars for attaining spiritual felicity and material prosperity. Medical authorities such as Caraka and literary luminaries such as Bāṇa acknowledge the efficacy of the *Sahasranāmāstotra*. Coming to the subject-matter proper, Parāśara states that Yudhiṣṭhira puts six questions to Bhīṣma which he answers subsequently in a more or less reverse order. The first question concerns the supreme deity. The question here is general in character and does not specify any deity. The second question is as to what constitutes the supreme value for a man to pursue. The next question is about an easy means of reaching the highest goal. The fourth question is regarding a more difficult means towards the same end. The fifth question concerns the highest heaven, the full conception of an ideal endeavour for man to reach the highest goal. The last question is regarding the matter for a proper *japa* (devoted chanting).

In reply, Bhīṣma takes up the last question of *japa* first. According to him, he who praises the Lord with the thousand names is always ‘above all others’. The object of worship is Puruṣottama - the Highest Being who can be approached through meditation, praise and adoration. Incidentally Parāśara introduces the concept of loving devotion to God. He defines it thus - *svāmīni dāsasya anurāgamayi sthitih*. In other words, this is the condition of a servant or a subordinate with reference to his master or Lord - a condition suffused by *anurāga* or pure love. In such a state the object of love is the highest in esteem and in fact fills the devotee with supreme
love. It is an ecstatic condition of subservience or a mere sense of dependence. It is a spiritually devoted condition wherein both the adored and the adorer share ineffable bliss. The third question is then answered by saying that the Lord alone is to be extolled. The fifth question is taken up next. Bhīṣma replies that in his considered view, the highest virtue is worshipping Lord Viṣṇu, the celebrated deity with the lotus-eyes, by means of hymns of praise and devotion. This includes worship in all aspects such as repeating sacred names (japa), singing aloud the names (stotra) and carrying out elaborate ritual worship (arcana). Elucidating this point Parāśara brings out the whole implication of Bhaktiyoga with extensive quotations from the spiritual literature of the past. Bhakti is a matter of great happiness and is easy to practise. One can realise the Godhead by this path and everyone is entitled for it. In other words the adhikāra, the qualification for practising bhakti, is universal. Distinctions of birth, knowledge and the like do not stand in the way of practising bhakti. It is also worth noticing in this context that Parāśara takes his stand on the word nara itself and seems to set aside the restrictions imposed on certain communities in the apasūdrādhi karaṇa of the Brahmasūtra itself. Likewise he explains the word sadā of the same verse to mean that no restriction of time or place or even sanctity need be observed for practising bhakti. Regarding the two other questions it is replied that attaining Lord Viṣṇu who is Brahman of the Upaniṣad-s is the highest goal of life. The nature of Viṣṇu is also explained in brief as the supreme, ultimate and auspicious Being who is the sole cause of creation, maintenance and destruction of the universe. Bhīṣma reiterates that the repetition of these thousand names of the deity purifies one from all sins and removes all sorrow.
Parāśara also discusses the point of the Supreme Being becoming the material as well as the efficient cause of the entire universe. All the beings are said to emanate from Brahman, exist in Brahman and merge in Brahman. Parāśara argues that an effect can merge only in its material cause like the web of the spider getting absorbed in the spider’s saliva itself. The letter ca of the verse further points out that Brahman is also responsible for the maintenance and activity of the universe, thus pointing to His constituting the efficient cause. Scriptural texts such as yato vā īmāni and brahma vanam and the Brahmasūtras: janmādyasya yataḥ and prakṛtiśca etc., are quoted in support. Parāśara further refutes the view entertained by some Śaiva schools that for the universe, Lord Nārāyana is the material cause and Maheśvara forms the efficient cause. Such a view is clearly non-Vedic, he points out. There cannot be any possibility of Brahman being vitiates by modification in this process because when Brahman evolves as the universe, He does so through a very minute portion of prakṛti which consitutes His body. Here again the analogy of the spider and its web is to be pressed into service.

Another point explained by Parāśara in this context is the supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu over other divinities such as Brahmā and Śiva. Several scriptures categorically declare Nārāyaṇa, also known as Viṣṇu, Puruṣottama, etc., as the supreme, referring to Him by name. Viṣṇu’s supremacy is also clear from a number of other Vedic and Upaniṣadic passages which are in tune with the above. These are the Puruṣa-sūkta, the Subālopaniṣad, the Maitrāyaṇīyopaniṣad, the Chāndogya, the Taittirīya and the Mahopaniṣad and also a number of Sāttvikapurāṇas. That the Itihāsas are emphatic on this issue is quite evident. Sages known for their direct perception and intuitive
knowledge of the highest truth, such as Vālmīki, Parāśara and Vyāsa speak of Viṣṇu as the highest being. In addition, the lordship of Viṣṇu can also be understood by His royal bearing - beatific form, weapons, vehicle and episodes bringing out His remarkable prowess and character. All the ācāryas of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition such as Yāmuna and Kūreśa have clearly expressed this view in their stotrlas. The Dahara and Vaiśvānara sections of the first chapter of the Brahmaśūtra are clear on this point.

Parāśara then enters into an elaborate discussion of the Advaitic view that the concept of Saguna-Brahman found here is only meant for people of lesser objectives of life, whereas the theory of Nirguna-Brahman alone can satisfy those who desire salvation. Parāśara in reply points out that the Advaitin is going directly against what the text itself declares. In other words, the expressions mucyate jantuḥ janma-saṁsārabandhanāt and yāti brahma sanāthanam clearly point out that repeating the names of the Lord, which is the saguna-method is the means of salvation. Moreover, if the Advaitin posits two Brahmans, one with attributes and another without attributes, the oneness of Brahman which they proclaim becomes undermined. In fact in the context under discussion, Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīṣma, “What according to you, is the best dharma?” and the reply is “This is the best in my considered opinion.” But now the Advaitin interprets repetition of the thousand names as a means lower in importance. “Whose words are we to believe in now? The Saguna and the Nirguna theories, being mutually contradictory to each other, one cannot be held as leading to the other,” states Parāśara.

Parāśara then raises the question as to how Brahman without qualities appears to be endowed with qualities.
The Advaitin would naturally reply that avidyā is the cause. If that is so, Parāśara points out, “wonderful is the interpretation of the Vedic truth”. For one desirous of mokṣa, Brahman is said to be the only goal and panacea for all evils of life. But according to the Advaitins that very Brahman is the repository of avidyā and is bereft of any perfection. If the defect in Brahman is unreal, the argument that Brahman is attributeless also becomes unreal. That is to say, Brahman becomes endowed with attributes. If, on the other hand, the state of being devoid of attributes is unreal then, Brahman’s possession of attributes becomes real. Thus on any alternative, Brahman can be proved to be free from any error, and as full of attributes.

The Advaitin has to answer another question: “Who can remove this avidyā from Brahman?” It is replied thus:- “He who realizes the oneness of Brahman.” Is it not ridiculous to say that the defect in Brahman can be set right by an individual soul who is himself caught up in the worldly existence? Moreover why should a saguna passage be treated as secondary in importance? The Advaitin replies that this is due to its being contradicted by the nirguna texts. Parāśara asks why it cannot be the other way about? Why should this distinction be drawn when both the saguna and nirguna passages are equally valid being the same part of the Upaniṣadic corpus. Again, if, as the Advaitin argues, the attributes of Brahman are to be negated only after positing them, Parāśara asks whether it is a written law that the scriptures should speak of the uncontextual things first and refute them later. “It is better to keep off the mud than to touch it and wash it off later.”

At this stage the Advaitin may try to press into service a rule of interpretation from the Mimāṃsā-sūtra
paurvāparye pūrvadaurbalyam prakṛtivat\textsuperscript{25} according to which a latter passage becomes more powerful and negates the former ones. Parāśara points out that this rule is not universal in application. In the Mīmāṁsā, however, since there was no way of understanding the latter passage without negating the former, such a contingency had to be accepted. But in the present case there is no mutual inconsistency between the saguna - and the nirguna-passages. Further, if a mere precedence or succession of the passages be the sole criterion for deciding the invalidity or validity of the concerned passages, then even Brahman should be doubted of its very existence, in the light of the later declaration that śūnya (void) is the only Reality. But such a statement may be interpreted as expressing the view of the Nihilists (Buddhists) and hence as non-authoritative. Parāśara rejoinders that even on the Advaitic view the Veda is the product of the confusion of Brahman and is thus, unreal. As a matter of fact in the Upaniṣadic text apahapatapāpma vijaraḥ vimṛtyuh\textsuperscript{26} etc., reference is made to Brahman being devoid of qualities. But Parāśara points out that this does not mean that Brahman is "qualitiless". It means that Brahman is devoid of all blemishes or despicable qualities, since the same text later on speaks of positive attributes of Brahman such as satyakāmatva and satyasaiṅkalpatva.

Therefore, scriptural texts speaking of jñāna, śakti, etc., of Brahman are to be understood as referring to His auspicious qualities. The nirguna-texts must be taken as denying bad qualities such as undue love and hatred. Passages speaking of His unfailing will and ever-fulfilled desires are clear instances of His auspicious nature. Therefore, a general negation (sāmānya-niṣedha) can be understood as restricting a particular aspect (evil qualities). Therefore, it does not follow that Brahman is without
any auspicious qualities. This can also be understood from maxims such as pada-āhavanīya and brāhma-parivṛājaka.

Moreover Bādarāyaṇa in the gunopasarāṅhārapāda of the Brahmāṇḍastra27 raises the objection that the attributes of Brahman understood in the Śāndilya, Upakosala, Dahara and other vidyā-s are mere mental exercises with no relevance to reality, and then answers that they are positive and real aspects of the Lord to be meditated upon by an aspirant.

Parāśara quotes from a number of Upaniṣad-s to justify the point that the Supreme Being is an abode of innumerable perfections in an unsurpassed measure. The Viṣṇupurāṇa, the Bhāgavata and the Mahābhārata are quoted in support.

An objection raised by certain critics is that the names of the Lord strictly do not point to any qualities as such. They just help one to attain to the nirguṇa-Brahman by their mere repetition. But this is unsound, says Parāśara. We cannot ignore the usage of words conveying specific ideas which are different from one another. Further Bhīṣma calls these names gaunāni (derived from the qualities and actions of the Lord). In other words it means that they are etymological. Some names, of course, are vikhyātāni (well-known) through convention. The Viṣṇusūkta also speaks of those who understand the meaning of the names after analysing them into their components.28 Therefore, the object of using the names is only to remind us of the qualities of the Lord. It is true that the names act like mantra-s, reminding us of the qualities of the Lord understood from scriptural passages. But this does not mean that the qualities themselves are non-existent. That is why in the
introductory portion, as also in the concluding portion of the Sahasranāmastotra, Bhīṣma extols the guṇa-s of the Lord. The enumeration of the names in the body of the stotra helps us to recollect those qualities. The point is that uttering even one of the thousand holy names of the Lord can bring us all benefits. Therefore, each name is a mantra in itself. Even when the names are uttered without the knowledge of their meaning, still one can attain the full benefit of knowing their meaning in addition to deriving mental peace and a feeling of sanctity.29

PARĀŚARA’S METHOD OF INTERPRETATION

It is interesting to note that in interpreting the thousand names of the Lord, Parāśara adopts a unique method making full use of grammar and etymology. He quotes profusely from the Aṣṭādhyāyī and the Upaniṣad-s. He also quotes extensively from the Upaniṣad-s, the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata and Purāṇa-s like the Viṣṇudharma, the Bhāgavata, the Āditya, the Garuḍa, the Matsya, the Harivamśa, the Liṅga and the Varāha. In addition he also quotes from several Pāñcarātra āgama-s like the Pauśkara, Sāttvata, Viṣṇutattva, Šanatkumāra and Jayākyasarmhitās. Parāśara, then offers what is called ārṣanirukta, that is, utilising the interpretation of these words found in the works of ancient seers. This provides ample scope for him to afford a number of interpretations for the names testifying to his profoundly devout attitude. It is worth mentioning that he does not indulge in giving five or six interpretations for one and the same word as done by the Dvaita commentator, Satyasandha.

For Parāśara, the names not only provide the basis for developing the grand concept of devotion but also
give room for a definite philosophical interpretation. The philosophy that is developed in the interpretation of the thousand names is called the Bhāgavata system which has a hoary past. Śaṅkara in his commentary on the Brahmasūtra criticises the vyūha-theory found in the Pāncarātra texts. But it is surprising to note that he supports this theory in his commentary on the Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra, while commenting on the name Caturvyūhaḥ. But for Parāśara all the thousand names are significantly connected with one another and they systematically articulate the Bhāgavata philosophy. According to the Bhāgavata system Lord Nārāyaṇa is the para-aspect of the Supreme Being, which may be called the primordial pre-cosmic form. This is fully invested with the six-fold perfection or attributes namely jñāna, śakti, bala, aiśvarya, vīrya and tejas. He then assumes the four vyuha-forms, namely Vāsudeva, Śaṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, to carry on different cosmic functions. The next aspect of the Lord is the Vibhava form. This is understood as the different incarnations of the Lord such as Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. This is followed by the iconic arcāform of Lord duly sanctified and installed in temples. The last aspect which is no less extolled than others is the antaryāmin-form where the Lord is concealed as the indwelling principle of everything in creation. For Parāśara Bhaṭṭa the entire Sahasranāmastotra is so designed as to adore the divine in all these modes. These names therefore also have particular sequence, speaking of the para, vyūha, vibhava, arcā and antaryāmin-forms in that order. Parāśara concludes his bhāṣya by declaring that the names towards the end of the stotra suggest the path of arcirādi by which the fortunate souls proceed and reach the abode of the Lord, from where there is no return.
In the course of his commentary, Parāśara criticises certain concepts of the Advaita school and given below are a few important instances:

(1) The name Viśvam is interpreted by Śaṅkara as "that which is not different from Brahman from the ultimate point of view". In other words, the reality of the universe cannot be accepted with the help of scriptural passages which posit co-ordinate predication. According to this view the world is unreal, being different from Brahman.³² Parāśara points out that this interpretation is misleading. In the first instance the word Viśva does not indicate abheda (non-difference). Even the question of co-ordinate predication does not arise here because the word Viśvam is one of the names of the Lord and names need not be construed in co-ordinate predication. That is why each word has to be taken in its own right independently. This is also clear from the same verse where the next name of the Lord is Viśṇu, which is in the masculine gender as different from Viśvam which is in neuter gender.

(2) Explaining the words mangalam param (no. 64) Parāśara finds occasion to criticise the Advaitic view that Brahman is of the nature of mere knowledge (jñaptimatra) based on texts like satyam jñānam anantam brahma.³³ Parāśara explains that the Lord is full of perfections such as Knowledge, Bliss, Power and Lordship. He is usually described as jñāna and ānanda because these qualities form His quintessential attributes. This has been explained by the sūtra—tadguṇasāratvāt,³⁴ etc. The Lord perceives directly everything by His attributive knowledge and also shines forth Himself even irrespective of that knowledge; He is also referred to as Knowledge and the Knower. That is how the statement yah sarvajñāh sarvavit³⁵ has to be interpreted.
(3) Explaining the word naikamāyah (no.303), Parasara points out that the word māya here does not mean unreality (mithyā). It mean "a remarkable phenomenon which is a source of infinite wonder" (mahāścarya). Parasara further states that māya is used in scriptures to convey the meanings of prakṛti (primordial matter), jñāna (knowledge) and a positive mysterious power which can be countered by weapons but not by the knowledge of truth or reality.36

In the course of his commentary, Parasara briefly alludes to the concept of Īśvara according to the Sāṅkhya-s. Explaining the name mahotsāhah (no.173), he points out that Īśvara accepted by the Sāṅkhya-s is no doubt an embodiment of jñāna, but still he is declared as a non-agent (akārtā), which results in his being accepted as lazy and inactive (alasa). As distinguished from such a concept, the Viśistadvaita school accepts the Lord as an infinite reservoir of wonderful dynamism, a quality which makes Him Īśvara. This quality is found in the name mahotsāhah which Parasara explains as mahān utsāhah utsahanam kartṛtvā-lakṣanam aīśvaryam. It is this quality by which the Lord, though unquestionably powerful in bringing into existence the entire universe of name and form with endless modifications so as to suit the karmic enjoyment of good or bad for all the living beings, still follows the natural order of arrangement as in the previous cycles and thus runs the course of the universe.

We also find here a refutation of the Bhedābheda view advocated by Bhāskara and Yādavaprakāśa. The followers of Bhāskara maintain that Brahman and jīva are essentially non-different and that the apparent diversity and plurality of souls are caused by limiting adjuncts (upādhi-s) namely, the bodies. This delimitation of Brahman by upādhi is similar to that of the ether by
a pot. Brahman thus delimited becomes subject to transmigration. The actual release results only when the upādhi-s are removed. Thus in the state of mokṣa, there is no difference at all between Brahman and the jīva-s.

According to the school of Yādavapракāśa which is also known as Bhedābheda, both difference and non-difference characterise the relation between Brahman and the jīvas. The advocates of this school say that there is non-difference (abheda) between the jīva-s and Brahman from the view-point of vyakti (individual) whereas, at the same time, there is difference (bheda) between them. This is illustrated through the analogy of the universal ‘cowness’ (gotva) found between a cow with broken horns (khanda) and a cow with no horns (munḍa). From the view-point of jāti there is unity between these two cows and from the view-point of the individual cows there is difference. But Parāśara points out that scriptural passages like brahmaveda brahmaiva bhavati\(^\text{37}\) speak of the oneness of the Brahman and the souls in the state of mokṣa. “How can then bheda be also real?” asks Parāśara. Likewise the other difficulty in the school of Yādavapракāśa is that it cannot account for the abheda and sāmya spoken of in respect of Brahman and souls in the state of mokṣa. To explain, if non-difference is already a matter of practical experience why should it be again described in the state of liberation? Moreover, how can the scripture which states paramam sāmyamupaiti\(^\text{38}\) be justified in as much as abheda alone is the ultimate truth? It is thus clear that in both the schools, namely, those of Bhāskara and Yādavapракāśa scriptures which describe the state of release as having sāmya and abheda at the same time cannot be properly interpreted. But, according to the Viśistadvaitins, Parāśara points out that abeda in the state of mokṣa alluded to
in the Upaniṣad-s is only the sāmya between Brahman and the jīva-s but not their essential ‘oneness’. The Viṣṇupurāṇa makes this quite clear thus: tadbhāvabhāvam āpannah tadāsau paramātmā, bhavatyabhṛdi." ³⁹

According to this, one who attains similarity with qualities like knowledge and strength of the Lord, becomes non-different from Him. The word bhāva which is used for a second time in this text would otherwise become redundant. The same Purāṇa ⁴⁰ further explains this condition thus: "the veil (namely, karma) having been dispelled, there will no longer be any difference between the forms of God and others". ⁴¹

Explaining the name Mahābuddhiḥ (no.175), our author contradicts the Mīmāṁsā view that omniscience as a quality does not inhere in any being including the Supreme Brahman. It may be noted in this context that the earlier Mīmāṁsākas of whom Kumārila Bhaṭṭa is one, do not believe in the existence of God much less in His possessing allround knowledge. ⁴² Parāśara, on the authority of several passages from the Upaniṣad-s as well as from the Pāñcarātra text Jayākhyasamhitā argues in favour of the existence of such an omniscient Being. ⁴³

This omniscience has in its scope, a direct, factual and eternal perception of all object in whatever spatio-temporal relation they may exist. Moreover this knowledge of the Lord does not depend upon any sense-organ such as eye, etc. Even if the Lord uses such an organ for any cognition, He does so out of His own free will but not as a matter of necessity as in the case of human beings. The names Puṇḍarikākṣa (no.112) and Suciśravāḥ (no.119) point to this feature. As a matter of fact for one who is endowed with remarkable powers, the cognitions of colour, taste, etc., need not be confined to particular senses only. The serpent, for example, can
use its eyes not only to see but also to hear. "How can such a power be denied in the Supreme Being?" asks Parāśara. Therefore, it is but reasonable to hold that such an Omniscient Being does exist. The statement of the Ślokavārtika refuting the Sarvajña theory should therefore be interpreted as rejecting the Buddhist theory because the context strongly supports such a possibility. Otherwise that statement is surely against śāstraic declarations.

The unmistakable conclusion to which one is led after a careful study of Parāśara's Viṣṇusahasra-nāmabhāṣya is that the thousand names of the Lord are interpreted from the view-point of an ardent devotee who tries to connect each word with the succeeding one so as to yield the beautiful panorama of the glorious personal deity whose infinite virtues, of which compassion is the most prominent, have been responsible for the different manifestations of the Lord, namely, Para, Vyūha, Vībhava and Arcā. Parāśara does not forget for a moment that the Lord is deeply committed to retrieve His devotees from the clutches of saṃsāra. He therefore weaves into his commentary the beautiful theory of avatāra-s of which those of Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Narasimha are very significantly dealt with. He also mentions other incarnations like Hamsa, Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Vāmana, Parasurāma, Buddha, Kalki, Saktīśa, Dattātreya, Kapila and even Vyāsa. He also goes into the question whether Brahmā, Rudra and others can also be treated as the avatāra-s of Lord Viṣṇu since according to the Upaniṣadic declaration sarvarāt khalvidam brahma everything in the universe starting from Brahmā the creator, down to the blade of grass is Brahman itself. Deriving his authority from the Pāncaratra texts like the Pauṣkara and the Sāttvatasamhitā, Parāśara declares that only the chief manifestations of
the Lord, that is, the Vyūha-s and Vībhava-s and no other form of another deity should be treated as Viṣṇu’s avatāra-s.

ŚRĪGUNARATNAKOṢA

A detailed study of the hymn Śrīgunaratnakoṣa reveals several facets of the genius that Parāśara Bhaṭṭa was. As already noted, our author is profoundly influenced by his predecessors like Yāmuna, Rāmānuja and his own revered father, Kūreśa, in portraying the qualities of Śrī. It must be noted at the outset that Parāśara Bhaṭṭa identifies Śrī or Lakṣmī the denizen of Vaikuṇṭha, with Sītā of Mithilā and identifies her again with Śrīraṅganāyakī, the presiding deity at Śrīraṅgam. It is also worth noting that Śrī is described here not as an elderly matron, not even as a young maiden who has attained efflorescence, but as an adolescent girl, who is just in the confluence of childhood and youth. In verse 43 Parāśara calls this stage saiśava - yauvana - vyatikara. This, it must be noted, is an original and refreshing concept of our author.

Scriptural Authority for the Concept of Śrī

It is interesting to note that Parāśara Bhaṭṭa combines in himself, the rare qualities of a first-rate poet and a critical scholar. One may ask what proof there is for the very existence of Śrī. To silence such critics Parāśara launches into a crucial discussion into the authenticity of her very concept. In verse 20, Parāśara points out that ancient seers hold that the Veda-s are the repositories for the gem-like qualities of Śrī.

devi śrutim bhagavatīṁ prathame pumāmsahḥ
tvatsadguṇauḥgaḥ maṇīkoṣa graṁham grnantī
By this Parāśara means that the Śrīsūkta glorifies Śrī eloquently as the treasure-house of several perfections. The Puruṣasūkta, which may be called the sequel of Śrīsūkta identifies Śrī as the consort of Nārāyaṇa.\textsuperscript{46}

The Itihās-ś, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, the Smṛti texts and the Purāṇa-ś clarify this point raised by the scriptures, says Parāśara.

But it is a distressing fact that unable to perceive this truth embedded in texts of great authority and obviously having fallen outside the purview of the benevolent grace of Śrī, different people have attained conflicting views regarding this world-manifestation and the status of Lakṣmī. Thus the Cārvāka-ś and other non-Vedic votaries do not accept the validity of the Veda-ś. Some the like Sāṅkhya-ś and the Mīmāṁsāka-ś refute the concept of a master for this universe. Still others speak of a master but do not attribute any perfections to Him.\textsuperscript{47} Still others call Śiva as the Supreme Being. As opinion is thus divided, it is only the devotees of Lord Viṣṇu and His consort Śrī who can see Śrī as the ultimate truth of all the Vedic texts. She is the treasure which is not seen with the naked eye, but which reveals itself to those who have the mental eye, embellished by the collyrium of devotion.\textsuperscript{48} The expression \textit{asyeśānā jagato viṣṇupatrī}\textsuperscript{49} already has set the tone for the prosperity of Lakṣmī. The Śrīsūkta in 15 verses expatiates on this glory of Hers. The Puruṣasūkta (\textit{khila} added to the tenth maṇḍala of the Ṛg-Veda) speaks of Her consort. All these texts read together thus present a picture of Lakṣmī who is the prosperous, benevolent and unique consort of the Lord of the universe.

In fact, the Rāmāyaṇa breathes the life and activities of Lakṣmī in her incarnation as Sītā. In the light of this
it is but reasonable to hold that even the Smṛti-s and Purāṇa-s (the Viṣṇupurāṇa in particular) deal with her glory in great detail.

An interesting question is raised by Parāśara in this context. Why is Śrī not separately eulogised in the Veda-s proper? Parāśara himself answers thus: when the supremacy, independence and such other aspects of the Lord are to be ascertained, the glory of Lakṣmī’s association with Him forms the corroborative proof. Since Śrī thus forms an integral part of the Lord as the determinant quality, She is not separately mentioned by the Veda-s. 50 This cannot therefore be taken as a proof of her non-existence, at least scripturally.

Śrī as the Source of Poetry

A significant point mentioned by Parāśara in the introductory portion of the present hymn is that Lakṣmī is in fact the deity who can bless her devotees with remarkable powers of speech, the art of poesy in particular, should those devotees so desire. Though in fact she is beyond the ken of the poet’s fancy or power of poetry, she can still instil in them the sense of confidence to carry on their efforts. Parāśara in all humility states that the qualities of the Goddess such as kṣānti (forbearance), audārya (magnanimity) and dayā (compassion) will become significant when she has accepted even his “unworthy” composition.51

Elaborating this idea the poet states that Lakṣmī herself (svayameva) perfected the speech of the poet by Her sweet glances. Once her favour is assured, the literary compositions become charming with choice expressions abounding in aptness and elegance.52 In verse eight Parāśara prays to Śrī to be blessed by Her with
expressions (sound and sense) untouched even by a speck of blemish. Such a composition should exude all good qualities like perspicacity and melody, and please the mind of the reader or listner instantaneously. There should be then a happy blend of words (saubhrātra). In fact all the gracious movements of Vānī - speech as well as the Goddess of speech will be present in one’s words when the benevolent glances of Lakṣmī fall upon him.\textsuperscript{53}

By this statement Parāśara suggests that Śrī is at the very root of the glories of other goddesses like Sarasvatī.

**Description of Lakṣmī**

As already noted at the beginning, Parāśara pays obeisance to Lakṣmī as She appears in the temple of Śrīraṅgam. She is called here Raṅganāyikā, consort of the Lord Raṅganātha. In what may be called an iconographic description of the Goddess, he presents Her as seated on a lotus with the right leg stretched down to touch the foot-stool, She keeps the left leg folded, so that it may rest on the throne. This may be called the ardhaparyankāsana in terms of iconography. Her hand displays the abhaya-mudrā indicating that She ever grants asylum. Her face is sweet and innocent.\textsuperscript{54} The poet then describes Her lotus-feet which have rendered the upaniṣad-s fragrant. They are tender like the petals of a lotus. (kamalapalāśa) and when they touch the garland Vaijayanū on Her Lord’s chest, the garland becomes fresh as it were by a shower of dew.\textsuperscript{55}

Her eyes and glances receive special attention of our poet. They have a remarkable effect on whom they fall. Thus kings who are blessed by a particle of Lakṣmī’s grace expressed through Her eyes become puffed up with pride. Poets cannot describe them aptly. The power of Her glances is all the more evident when Her own
Lord, who has become the target of Her full length glances becomes *punḍarikākṣa* (the eyes large as the lotuses) and is acknowledged by the *Upaniṣad*-s as the Highest Being. By this Parāśara means that the *Chāṇ dogyopaniṣad* describes Viṣṇu as the Supreme Being, only by virtue of his being *punḍarikākṣa* which, in turn, is due to the grace of Lakṣmī. The *Chāndogya* text under reference is *tasya yathā kavyāsam punḍarikam evam aksinī.*

The tenderness of Lakṣmī’s physical frame, points our poet, is beyond one’s comprehension. Even the pollen of the lotus injures Her feet. Even the looks of the young maids around Her are enough to wither Her limbs. The lotus in the hand is in fact a burden. In verse 46, Parāśara describes the Goddess as bedecked in a variety of beautiful ornaments, which add charm to Her already handsome body. This is like the addition of sugar to milk and the advent of flowers on the beautiful *kalpaka* creeper. In other words, the ornaments form a spontaneously natural feature whose charm merges in the original charm of Her body, discernible only to the prudent eye of a devotee. These are innumerable but a few can be mentioned: *kanaka raśanā* (golden girdle), *muktāhāra* (pearl necklace) *tātanka* (ear ornaments), *lalāṭikā* (ornament on the forehead), *manisara* (gem necklace) and *tulākoti* (anklets). Alluding to Her appearance from the milky ocean Parāśara observes that Śrī came out at a time when Her husband was tired in the process of its churning, with His back supporting the *mandara*-mountain. She appeared like the delightful moonlight, sending down showers of nectar on Her Lord through Her smiles and glances. Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is not happy with those poets who try to compare Her celestial body with things that are artificial and temporary
in nature. For him, though it is beyond the scope of his words, the description should be somewhat as follows: With Her head slightly bent due to the desire within to grant all that the devotees seek from Her, and with the slight inclination towards the other side to shower a glance at Her Lord; She shines like a streak of gold and waves like a garland of campaka-flowers.\textsuperscript{63}

The Qualities of Lakṣmī

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is eloquent when he describes vividly the qualities of Śrī which, it can be said are in conformity with the title of this hymn Śrīguṇaratnakoṣa (the treasure house of gem-like qualities of Śrī). These gems are different from one another with their own stamp of individuality. Though these are distinct mutually, they all subscribe in general to the charm of the lady that wears them.

The poet at the outset mentions the qualities that are common between Her and Her Lord. Thus power and strength, might and knowledge, sovereignty and victory, attractiveness and concern to the devotees, fulfilling the desires of the supplicants, fragrance, beauty, charm and brilliance - these are just a few qualities that are common to Her and Her Lord.\textsuperscript{61} In fact there are some more qualities which the divine couple possess in a mutually reflective manner as it were. They are: youth, geniality of the heart, a sense of commitment, etc., to each other.\textsuperscript{62} The Lord, has some qualities which are peculiar to Himself like sthiratva (steadfastness) and śatruśamanatva (the power to quell down enemies). The Goddess, has some qualities which are peculiar to Her alone, like mradima (softness of heart), pārārthya (subordination to her Lord),
karunā (compassion) and kṣamā (forbearance). Again certain qualities and features stand in a striking contrast between the two: the Lord is dark in colour like a rainy cloud (ghanadyutī); Śrī, on the other hand, is of golden hue (kanaka-dyuti). He is young (yuvā); She is adolescent (mugdha). All such qualities stand on one level as contradistinguished from certain special qualities of Hers like forbearance (kṣānti), Her tender affection for devotees (prīti) and perhaps most important of all, mercy (dayā) and magnanimity (audārya). As instances for Her quality of kṣānti, Parāśara cites the episodes of the Rāmāyaṇa. At Laṅkā, Sītā (none other than Śrī) saved the demonesses from the fury of Hanumān. These demonesses were the worst sinners against Her. Rāma saved Kākāsura and Vibhīṣana only when they sought His refuge. Sītā’s forgiveness was spontaneous. Thus She excelled even Her Lord in this particular quality.64 Making a special reference to Śrīraṅgam where the Goddess has manifested Herself as the consort of Lord Raṅganātha, our author notes that all the qualities like audārya, karunā and vātsalya (motherly affection) have been at their highest point of culmination. Her other incarnations like Sītā are all thrown into oblivion in comparison to Her present form as the arca image at Śrīraṅgam. The previous incarnations were only the training ground as it were for this avatāra. The quality of audārya (magnanimity) can be illustrated by a solitary example. She showers wealth, kaivalya (exclusive enjoyment of the soul) and even the highest salvation (paramapada) on any one who simply folds his hand in salutation. Even after granting all this She feels ashamed that She could not grant him more.65 The affection She has for devotees is manifest in Her very act of coming down to this world of mortals. In contrast She does not even care for the milky ocean, though it be Her own father’s place; she does not even
think of the Highest abode (vaikuntha) though it is Her husband’s home. Śrīraṅgam has become Her cherished home because She loves to be there for the sake of Her children.  

Śrī as the Source of All Prosperity

Parāśara points out Śrī throughout this hymn, as responsible for all-round prosperity in creation. Beginning from the head of a tiny village up to the omnipotent Lord (Viṣṇu), all owe their power to this Goddess of the universe. A slight degree of difference in Her glances makes all the difference between the high and the low in creation. Thus whatever is best in creation in terms of loftiness (as in mount Meru), auspiciousness (as in flower), heaviness (as in the case of Mandara mountain), etc., is but a manifestation of an infinitesimal part of Her unbounded splendour.

To explain: if one is at the top of one’s glory it is due to the glances of Śrī being directed towards that one. If one, however, is a beggar in the street, it means that the glances of Śrī are turned away from that person. In whatever direction Her glances move, in that direction will rush benefits such as bliss, wisdom, eloquence, courage, prosperity and success. The inequality in creation as between the animate and inanimate, the rich and the poor, the dumb tree and the eloquent Bṛhaspati, the strong and the weak, the good and bad etc., is to be traced to the favour of Śrī or its absence. In a later verse Parāśara emphasises the same point thus: that person on whom the glances of Lākṣmī fall profusely, is designated the Highest Brahman (Para Brahman). Those on whom only two or three glances fall are known as Indra and other minor gods. Therefore, if in the Vedic texts one reads about the glory of other gods, it is to
be understood as an indirect assertion of the overall glory of Śrī.  

The Role of Lakṣmī in the Cosmic Activities

Parāśara, an ardent devotee of Goddess Raṅganāyaki observes that the cosmic functions of Viṣṇu - Her Lord, namely, creation, sustenance and dissolution of this universe of name and form are meant for the joy of Lakṣmī. Already the picture of Lakṣmī as an adolescent has been presented by our author. It is but natural then to expect the youthful and resourceful Lord to keep His consort amused through such activities. The Chāndogya states that the Lord carries on creation, sustenance and dissolution by His mere will (saṁkalpa). This very saṁkalpa of the Lord to give the sentient and insentient their due status, with all the evolutes like the seven sheaths (āvaraṇa), buddhi (intellect), ahaṁkāra (ego), mind, the ten organs, the elements and the three worlds is only to please His beloved. Even when the Lord makes the ātma-s forget their original nature through his māyā comprising three qualities, it is but an act calculated to elicit joyous admiration from His consort.

Even in an earlier verse our author points out the decisive role Lakṣmī plays in the creation of the universe. No doubt the Upaniṣad-s do speak of the Supreme Brahman, Her consort, as the creator. But who is it that is behind this whole drama? It is Lakṣmī. The Lord creates or keeps quiet only by looking at the knitting of Her eyebrows. That Nārāyaṇa is the Supreme, is a gist of the truth arrived at by the Upaniṣad-s, only with the help of the imprints of Her feet on His chest. The infinite greatness of Lakṣmī is too great to be compared to that of the Lord.
The Affinity between Śrī and Her Lord

The mutual love and affection that this divine couple shares is something proverbial and unique. In fact it is only because of Her contact that the Lord is called auspicious - maṅgalam. When the Lord is said to be glorious and not dependent on another, it is because Lākṣmī is ever associated with Him. When we say that a gem is highly valuable it is because of its lustre which is an integral part of it. By this statement Parāśara seems to suggest that the relationship between the Lord and His consort is one of samyuktāśrayaṇa. The love that Lord Viṣṇu has for Śrī is evident from the fact that although all the five weapons (the discus, the conch, the bow, the mace and the sword) are objects of common enjoyment (possession) between both of them, the Lord alone carries them, lest they be a burden to Her. In the same way the love that Śrī has for Him is reflected in Her accompanying the Lord in all His manifestations on earth - as man or as an animal. But for this the Lord’s sportive activities would have been dull and insipid. The Viśnupurāṇa and the Rāmāyana are full of incidents which bring out in a full measure the infinite love and affection that the Lord entertains for Her. Thus the Lord churned the milky ocean for Her sake; He built a bridge across the ocean for Her sake alone; earlier He bent and broke the bow of Śiva to win Her hand; His killing the demon Rāvana and his mighty army was to claim Her back. In fact is there anything that the Lord did not do for Her sake? Likewise the love that Śrī has for Her Lord is indescribable and incomprehensible. Even if the Lord assumes thousands of hands, feet, faces, eyes etc., He cannot enjoy the grandeur of Her infinite affection. He sinks somewhere in the depth of Her unfathomable love like a mere drop.
The Relation of Man with the Divine Couple

Although a poem of lyrical beauty, the present work abounds in philosophical statements which are peculiar to the Viśiṣṭādvaita system. In this one can see that the devotee stands as a son of the divine couple. In fact the relation of a jīva with Śrī can be explained in the same language as relation to the Lord also. In verse 52 Parāśara articulates the parental relation, the divine couple has with the world of creation. As will be explained later, Śrī acts as the puruṣakāra (mediator) between God and man. But Parāśara goes a step forward and says that even the Lord stands as adorable only because He happens to be Her beloved. Otherwise there is no speciality that could be ascribed to Him. Parāśara places himself in the position of a native of the town of Mithilā. For him the Lord is only of secondary importance; He is the son-in-law (jāmātā), the beloved of “our” Sītā. Of course he accords Him all services; he goes to Him, worships Him and seeks refuge in Him. All this is only on the ground that He is the beloved of Śrī.\(^{77}\) In the last verse also Parāśara consistently mentions the supremacy and overall importance of Śrī. She is the mother, father and all that one cherishes as near and dear. If Her grace is assured, there is no room for any complaint.\(^{78}\)

ŚRĪRAṅGANĀTHASTOTRA

This stotra is again marked by Parāśara’s poetic grandeur, devotional fervour and loving attachment to Śrīraṅgam and its presiding deity - Lord Śrīraṅganātha. The first of the six verses, composed in the Sragdharā metre, highlights the majestic picture of Lord Raṅganātha reclining on His serpent-bed in the temple at Śrīraṅgam. The main icon (mūlabera) in the sanctum sanctorum
as can be seen even today, is vividly portrayed here reclining on Ādiṣeṣa, closing the eyes in yoganidrā, keeping the right hand under His head, and the other near the hip, His feet being gently pressed by Lakṣmī and Bhūmi. In fact this verse describes this picture on the Vimāna of the Śrīraṅgam temple, a temple encircled by seven courtyards. This temple is in the central region of the Kāverī delta. The poet expresses his prayerful attitude to such a deity in this verse. As is the practice, Parāśara starts the description of the deity from the feet to the crown.

The next śloka expresses his ardent desire tinged with remorse as to when he would be able to see the beautiful Face of the Lord once again. As already pointed out Parāśara composed this stotra when he was in exile from Śrīraṅgam, residing at Tirukkoṭṭiyūr consequent on some confrontation he had with the then ruler Vīrasundara. Couched in the Śārdūlavikrīḍita metre this verse goes into an enlightening and moving description of the Lord’s face which like a lotus, steals the hearts of those who behold it. It has a brilliant pearl crown atop adorning the head. The beautiful lower lip is bedecked by a sweet smile and the eyes are beatific, extending as far as the ears. In fact the first thing that attracts the attention of the onlookers is the ārdhva-puṇḍra-tilaka mark on the Lord’s forehead drawn with kastūrī (musk).

The succeeding verse in the Śīkharipī - metre brings out the poet’s agony in a spirited expression of ardent devotion.

“When am I going to attend upon the Lord seated in the presence of the Lord chanting His holy names in sheer ecstasy thus: “O Madhumathana! Mādhava! Murāra! Hari! Nārāyaṇa! and Govinda!”
Whatever aspect of the Lord the poet describes, the beautiful surroundings of Śrīraṅgam situated on the banks of the river Kāverī and the serpent-bed of the Lord never escape his notice. He repeats the words Kāverī, Śrīraṅgam and Bhogīndra (phaṇīrāt) often times in this hymn.

In the subsequent verse which is again composed in the Śikharī- metre, Parāśara wonders as to when he is going to absolve himself of his sins, by plunging into the holy waters of the Kāverī and stay on its banks covered by dense gardens capable of removing all fatigue physical and mental.

“When am I going to worship the Lord of Śrīraṅgam reclining on Ādiśeṣa possessed of lotus eyes, a repository of auspicious qualities who is adorning the holy bank of the river?”

Again here the poet grieves that he is away from his beloved Kāverī, its sand-banks, its beautiful and cool gardens and above all the Lord presiding over the whole area.

The fifth śloka which is set in the Mandākrānta- metre exclusively describes the glory of the town of Śrīrajjgam which is the abode of the Lord. It is surrounded by the Kāverī which always flows full to the brim, inundating the areca trees neck-deep, the water itself being tasty and oily. The birds of the town repeat out of joy the Vedic texts being chanted by the devotees. Another important feature is that those who walk in the streets of Śrīraṅgam pluck as it were mokṣa with their hands as they pass along. The poet draws one here to the traditional belief that those who stay at Śrīraṅgam or at least sleep one night there attain liberation.
The sixth verse composed in the Indravajrā-metre expresses the extremely considered opinion of the poet that birth in the Śrīraṅgam town even as a dog is more covetable than reaching heaven, drinking nectar to one’s heart’s content and fainting as a result in the Nandana garden of the celestials.

"I do not want any such heavenly experience. O Lord! let me be born as one among the stray dogs roaming about the streets of Śrīraṅgam."

Śloka-s seven and eight are traditionally treated as muktaka-s, not forming part of the original stotra, although they are usually chanted along with the preceding verses. The seventh verse is in the form of a poser to the Lord:

"Even for a wretched creature staying far away from you, O Lord, you show compassion and pacify (śānti) the creature, under some pretext. That being the case, I do not know how you are going to grace this wretched creature (referring to his own self) who is standing in your immediate presence."

It may be pointed out in this context that traditional scholars explain this verse as referring to a particular incident that took place in the Śrīraṅgam temple during the lifetime of Parāśara. It seems that a procession of the deity in the Śrīraṅgam Temple was delayed one day and on enquiry Parāśara came to know that a dog strayed into the temple and that the priests were busy consecrating the temple for that reason. Parāśara remarked that the dog did not actually enter the sanctum sanctorum and as such there was no need for an elaborate ritual of purification. Therefore, the expression "wretched creature" means the dog in question and the word śānti refers to the elaborate ritual of purification undertaken by the temple priests. The word mithyāpavādena means
“under false pretext”, pointing out that the whole incident was cooked up and that no śānti was really needed. Some scholars further see an undertone of sarcasm in the word mithyāpavādana. According to them the poet is referring to the practice of some greedy priests who, with a view to earn some money by suggesting such ceremonies, in fact bluff that a dog had entered the temple or sometimes they would themselves deliberately bring a dog into the temple.79 However, it is not known whether this episode is true or not. If it were true it would only form a sad commentary on the priesthood of the land, as caring more for petty monetary gains by throwing to the winds all decency and decorum in the abode of God.

The last verse found in this stotra - another muktaka, speaks of the glory of Śrī Rāmānuja as touring several divya-deśa-s. In the Śrīvaiśnava tradition, a divya-deśa is a sanctified place where regular worship had been instituted and sanctified according to the rules laid down in the Pāñcarātra - or Vaikhānasa-Āgama-s and which have figured in the Tamil songs of the Ālvārs. Tradition recognises 108 holy places.80 The places cited here are: Śrīraṅgam and Kariśāila (Kaṅcipuram) (both in Tamilnadu), Aṅjanagiri (Tirumalai or Tirupati), Tārksyādri (Ahobilam), Śrīmālā and Śrīkūrma (all in Andhra Pradesh), Pūrī (Lord Jagannātha as the presiding deity in Orissa), Badarī (the Himalayan shrine) and Naimiśāraṇya (both in Uttar Pradesh), Dvārakā in (Gujarat), Prayāga (Allahabad) Mathurā, Ayodhyā, Gayā (all in U.P.) Puṣkara (in Rajasthan) and Śālagrāma (in Nepal). A devout Śrīvaiśnava tries to make a pilgrimage to as many of these holy places as possible in his life-time.

It may not be out of place to add in this context that worshipping the iconic form of the Lord installed
in the shrines and temples is of immense significance in the Śrīvaisṇava religious history. Traces of image worship can be found in the post-Vedic literature. The Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata are replete with references to places of worship such as temples and tīrtha-s. The worship of sandals of saints and great men which can be traced to the Rāmāyana, found its way into the Buddhist religion too. Thus even in religions like Buddhism which is against adoration to any being as a God, we find even among the immediate disciples of Buddha, a tendency to conceive supernatural persons to whom worship may be offered and from whom assistance may be sought. “Though the earliest Buddhist sculptures dared not depict the Buddha as a man, by hinting his presence by such symbols as the sacred wheel and the foot-print, fullfledged images of his were gradually but freely introduced as objects of worship.”

Every religious school of Hinduism developed its own Āgama tradition and literature. The Śaiva, the Vaiśṇava-, and the Śakta-āgama-s, regardless of their sectarian leanings, laid down similar or identical canons of art. All these āgama-s comprise four sections or topics in general: jñāna (knowledge), kriyā (service - construction of temples, consecration of the idols etc.), caryā (conduct of daily rites, bestivals etc.), and yoga (devotion or concentration). Of these, the worship of idols which forms part of the kriyāpāda is based upon the conviction that the supreme Being, out of compassion for the suffering humanity condescends and ‘enters’ the idols made and installed in the prescribed way by competent persons.

According to the Bhāgavata tradition (another name for Pāñcarātra tradition) there are five aspects of the Supreme Being. They are: para, (the Highest called vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa and so on), vyūha (fourfold
emanation as Vāsudeva, Saṁkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha), vibhava (several incarnations such as Rāma and Kṛṣṇa), antaryāmin (as the inner controller of all beings) and arcā (as an icon). Of these the para aspect is in the Highest abode of the Lord and the next, namely the vyūha-s are also beyond the conception of ordinary men. The vibhava-s are the incarnations of the Lord which have already come and gone. The antaryāmin aspect is too subtle to contemplate. As such the arcā form alone is quite accessible and suitable to all who are interested in the spiritual sādhanā. Pillai Lokācārya beautifully explains the nature of these aspects of the Lord in his Śrīvacana-bhūṣaṇa. According to him the antaryāmin form is like the subterranean water which can be obtained only after great efforts. The para-aspect is like the waters which are supposed to surround the cosmic egg. The vyūha-s are like the milky ocean. The vibhava-s are like the flood waters which have already disappeared in the sands of time. The iconic form (arcā) is like the pools of water left behind by those floods.

It is in the light of this interpretation of the significance of arcā that we have to understand the descriptions of the Lord’s idols found in hymns like the Śrīraṅganāthastotra and Śrīraṅgarājastava. In fact this idea is expressed by Parāśara himself in the following verse:

śrīmadvyoma na sīma vāṅgmanasayossarve vataṇāh kvacit kāle viśvajaninametaditi dhiḥ śrīraṅgadhāmamanyatha ārtasvāgatikaiḥ kṛpaikalusitairālokitaṁairārdrayan
viśvatīrāṇinavimarśanaskhalitayā nidasī jāgaryaya Śrīraṅgarājastava (II.75)
SRIRANGARAJASTAVA

This work is in two centuries of verses called the Pūrvaśataka and Uttaraśataka with 127 and 105 śloka-s respectively. Traditional accounts record that this magnificent poetic piece came from the pen of Parāśara when he returned to Śrīraṅgam from the exile in Tirukkoṭiyūr, after the demise of the ruler Vīrasundara with whom he fell out earlier.

The first sixty-two verses of the first century describe the preliminaries of the main act namely, approaching the Lord in the sanctum sanctorum and the remaining text gives a detailed description of the arcā aspect of the Lord from top to toe. According to traditional scholars the first śataka expounds the meaning of the first part of the dvaya-mantra and the Uttaraśataka deals with the meaning of the second part of the dvaya-mantra.

In the opening verse, Parāśara pays obeisance to his revered father Śrīvatsacinha (alias Kūreśa) whose compositions form the maṅgalasūtra on the neck of trayī (the three Veda-s), personified as a woman. The expression on the ‘neck’ (kanṭhe) of this verse suggests the great contribution of Kūreśa to the vedāntic literature. The five stotra-s of Kūreśa which teem with philosophical ideas may be taken as being referred to here. In the second verse he refers to his own preceptor known as Govinda Bhaṭṭa (Embār) who, by his close attachment to the feet of Śrī Rāmānuja, is also known as rāmānujadacchāyā (‘the shade of Śrī Rāmānuja’s feet’). The three following verses refer to Śrī Rāmānuja, Yāmuna and Nāṭhamuni, the three great ācārya-s who were responsible for spreading the message of devotion and detachment in the world. Verse six pays homage to Saint Nammāḻvār who had ‘seen’ the Tamil Veda in thousand
hymns (in other words, who composed in Tamil the Tīrvāyuyōmoli which is the quintessence of the Śāmaveda which is supposed to have had thousand branches). Parāśara also describes Nammālvār as an embodiment of the ‘ardent longing’ (trṣṇā) for Lord Kṛṣṇa. Śloka-s in praise of Goddess Śrī or Raṅganāyakī the consort of Lord Raṅganātha are also found. In what may be called a doctrinal statement the poet mentions that the universe containing the distinction in terms of the ruler and the ruled is so formed because of the knitting or otherwise of the eyebrows of this Goddess. Verses 8 to 12 describe Lord Raṅganātha reclining on the serpent-bed, as the beloved consort of Lakṣmī and as the wielder of five weapons. In a beautiful simile Parāśara compares the God reclining on Ananta to the Cintāmaṇi-gem which also adorns the chest of Goddess Lakṣmī. His supremacy can be ascertained only by the foot-prints of Lakṣmī marked on His chest (in red lac). But for this, this particular entity (vastu) can never be described adequately by any term (śl. 9). Śrī Raṅgarāja is also identified with a black bee (bhrīṅga) which is always attracted to the breasts of Lakṣmī, again identified with two bunches of flowers of a kalpa-creeper. ‘May such Lord bless us with all welfare for a hundred years’, says Parāśara. The Lord is wielding five weapons always, being unable to delay any further the protection of those who surrender to Him, fancies our poet. From śloka-s 13 to 19, Parāśara in all humility justifies his undertaking to compose the present stotra on the Lord whose glory even the Veda fails to describe in definite terms, doubting its own capacity to comprehend His nature. It is, as a matter of fact, unfair to attempt to describe Him who shines in all glory through the Sanskrit and Tamil Vedic literature. But the poet wonders as to who can prevent a young elephant (namely Raṅganātha) if he, even after
a ceremonial bath, chooses to spray himself with dust\textsuperscript{83} that is, to accept the composition of Parāśara? The two main reasons which have prompted Parāśara to compose this stotra are: (1) hailing from a family of devotees of the Lord who have overcome the influence of māyā by whole-hearted surrender, and (2) the confidence aroused in him by being adopted by the Lord and His consort as their son. Further, even as the Veda-s though incompetent to do full justice to the glory of the Lord still undertake such an effort, our poet also would like to praise Him in his own way.

In the succeeding five verses (20 to 24) our poet enters into the graphic description of the river Kāverī who by her holy waters offers solace and delight to all that enter into them and who embraces the Lord by her wavy hands. The poet also gives the other names of the river like Hemāpagā or Kanakā (Ponni in Tamil) Marudvṛthā and Sahyakanyā (‘born from the Sahya mountain’). The sandbank forming the islet where the Śrīraṅgam town is situated receives the poet’s attention next. The river Kāverī surrounding the island flows in such a manner that plantain, areca, rose-apple and other trees are immersed neck-deep in its waters. These trees create the delusion that a chain of clouds is hanging down to drink water from the river. The poet identifies the present island of Śrīraṅgam with the highest abode of the Lord, namely, Śrīvaikuṇṭha where live the liberated souls. The Virajā river of the highest heavens is identified with Kāverī. The poet aspires to move about freely in the beautiful and holy gardens around the temple which are gently waited upon by Kāverī and which remove the fatigue of worldly existence for Vaiṣṇava-s These gardens also reverberate with vedic chants. In a fit of poetic fancy, Parāśara states that the trees and plants
on this island such as the areca, jack and plaintain are irrigated by the sweet and nectarine channels of water issuing from coconuts which are split by the fish that toss up in a sportive mood (śl. 25 to 27).

The holy town Śrīraṅgam, Parāśara repeats, is the same as the celestical abode of Viṣṇu known as Ayodhya and Aparājita\(^8\) glorified in the Veda-s. The chain of high mansions of this town seems to connect heaven and earth in a bid to render even the worldly life divine. Next Parāśara also pays homage to the guardian deities of the town such as Kumuda, Kumudākṣa and Puṇḍarīka who, mounted on their vehicles and wielding their characteristic weapons, always protect the people.

The sanctity of the town is further glorified by Parāśara when he says that even the eternally liberated souls (nitya-s), the liberated ones (mukta-s) and those bound souls (buddha-s) who consider this particular birth as the very last one, all resort to this town by taking up the configurations as men, animals and plants respectively (śl. 28 to 33).

The number of gopura-s and the prākāra-s (outer walls) of the temple appear to a devout person as Garuḍa himself protecting the Lord with his magnificent wings. Parāśara also records a traditional view that Parakālakavi (Tirumaṅgaī Āḻvār) constructed the manimandapa-hall by using the golden images of Buddha who were defeated by him earlier in a verbal duel (śl. 36).

What follows then is the description of the sentinels, namely, Caṇḍa and Pracaṇḍa, and the thousand-pillared hall which reminds the poet again of Śri Vaikuṇṭha, described in the Veda-s as having such a thousand pillared hall. In the following two verses, the tank called Candrapuṣkarini is described as the place in whose waters
the Lord and His consort sport and which provides them various kinds of flowers serving as umbrellas, ornaments, etc. One who dips himself in its water is sure to get rid of his tāpatraya (śl. 39-40).

The next important description is that of the Śrīraṅga-Vimāna which is a replica of the highest abode of the Lord, namely, Śrī Vaikuṇṭha, known as “Aparājitā.”

The image of Lord Narasimha on the Gopura, the images of ācārya-s and the Punnāga-tree in the precincts receive appropriate attention from our poet (śls. 46 to 49). Mention may be made here of the traditional practice of Nammālvār’s Tiruvāyumoli being constantly recited and expounded under the shade of this Punnāga-tree. The poet points out that the divine fragrance of the Punnāga-blossoms owes its origin to the constant “waterings” of its roots through these Sahasra-gītī (Tiruvāyumoli) chantings.

Viṣvaksena, his consort Śūtravatī, and his four chief attendants, namely, Gajānana, Jayatsena, Harivaktra and Kālaprakṛtī are glorified then (śl. 50-52). The next description is of Gaurḍa who is facing the Lord as His gem-studded mirror and his two consorts Rudrā and Sukīrti are followed up next (śl. 53-54).

The Lord’s five weapons, the Sudarśana in particular, Hanumān and Vibhīṣaṇa and the two pillars adjacent to the sanctum sanctorum which are called Tirumanāntaṭṭuṇ in Tamil and Āmodastambha in Sanskrit are then described (śl. 55-59). The actual description of the Lord, His consorts, His serpent-couch and His paraphernalia come in for more elaborate eulogy (śl. 60-63).

Then follows a series of metaphors where Lord Raṅganātha is identified with a pond having many lotuses in full bloom. Lakṣmī is a she-swan sporting therein and
Goddess Earth is the reflection of that swan. This lotus-pond known as Śṛiṇaṅgarāja is not artificial. It is cool with sausīlya and beautiful with gentle waves of kṛpā (grace). This pond is fit to be entered into by all for ablutions and is the eternal abode of Lakṣmī.

The Lord is "our very life" (asmad-asavaḥ) and He is sitting on the simhāsana along with Lakṣmī and Bhūmi. He is ruling over the entire universe. His great compassion for all the living beings can be vouchsafed by His abiding in the hearts of all people. His sauhṛda (friendship) and goodwill are characterised by His independence (svātantrya) and all these features are wonderfully suggested by His physical stance from the feet upto the crown ( śl. 64-67).

In another delightful metaphor the poet identifies the Lord with a beautiful ever-green pārijāta-tree which has come down to the earth from heaven. Its "fresh youth" manifests itself in all the ten directions and it forms the support and abode for the two kalpa-creepers, namely, Lakṣmī and Bhūmi. The tree is bent low under the weight of the fruits in the form of the innumerable boons meant for the devotees. "May this tree remove my fatigue of worldly existence," aspires Parāśara ( śl. 68).

The gentle smile and the charming side-glances which bring everybody under the benevolent control of the Lord create the impression on the onlookers that He is speaking to them. Addressing the people at large the abhayahasta of Lord Ranganātha seems to imply this idea: "These hands carrying the conch, mace and the discus bring you all welfare, and this pair of lotus-feet should be resorted to by you and it confers upon you prosperity and safety." The smiling face of the Lord seems to expound this idea for the benefit of the people ( śl. 70).

In another verse Parāśara addresses the Lord as
Śrīraṅgaśṛngāra which means that the Lord is the very embodiment of all charm and beauty. This verse offers a running commentary, as it were, on the Lord’s “movements” up and down the streets of Śrīraṅgam in the course of festival processions (as the utsavabera). His glances are full of affection for the devotees and the gentle smile on His lips conquers everybody by its inherent benevolence. His words are cool in the sense that they offer hope to those afflicted by the worldly miseries. His handsome figure is the target, as it were, (śaravyam) of the heart of Lakṣmī. His movements are a delight to the eyes. “What else is needed for a devotee to feast upon?” wonders Parāśara (śl. 72). His magnificent crown, brilliant tilaka-mark, large lotus-eyes, beautiful ears, broad chest, arms wielding weapons, the splendid knot of the dress at the waist and the lotus-feet draw everybody to the Lord. An ardent devotee like Parāśara aspires for the vision of the Lord of such a description wherever he casts his glances with a sincere prayer that he may have this experience for a hundred autumns (śl. 73-74).

Being attended upon by Śrī and Bhūmi on either side, by Garuḍa in front and Śeṣa in the rear, Lord Raṅganātha with His four arms sporting weapons and gesticulating abhaya- (asylum) seems to make His intention clear to everyone that He is ever ready to protect all and that there need be no fear or doubt in their hearts (śl. 75). The poet then resorts to the Lord who is like a Kalpa-tree as well as the Kāmadhenu for the devotees, the very consummation of all the prosperity of his humble self. He prays to the Lord to bless him and confer upon him the good fortune of serving Him for a long time. The Lord who is reclining in the Śrīraṅgam-temple on the soft, fragrant and broad
serpent-couch seems to be swinging gently in a cradle whenever Ādiśeṣa contracts and expands his body by his exhalations and inhalations (śl. 77). Lord Raṅganātha is the Supreme Being who can put an end to all the woes of the people who resort to Him. He is the one who appeared as the child on the banyan leaf and in the womb of Devakī, on the crown of the Veda-s, on the breasts of Kamalā, in the words of Śaṭhakopa and now visible in the sanctum sanctorum of the Śrīraṅgam temple.

In another beautiful verse (śl. 79) Parāśara describes in his own characteristic style, the Yoganidrā of Lord Raṅganātha. The Lord has completely forgotten His milky ocean, His highest abode (Śrī Vaikuṇṭha) and is now “engaged to Nidrā” in the place of Lakṣmī. It is very refreshing to note that Parāśara is fancying Nidrā to be another consort of Lord Raṅganātha with whom He is spending some time.

In the dark interior of the temple the Lord who is Himself bluish in complexion appears like an ocean drunk in by a cloud; as a mountain placed in an ocean; and also as an elephant sleeping on a bushy mountainous slope. In another interesting verse Parāśara calls Raṅganātha “the child of an ocean” (arṇavatārṇaka). A child always reclines on the bed and so does this child who is called Śrīraṅgeśaya. This Child in accordance with His parental characteristics, has coral-like lower lip, feet and hands. He is being fondled by Mother Kāverī with her wavy arms. “Remarkable indeed is this wonderful Child,” points our author (śl. 81). “Raṅganātha” is a cool dark cloud illumined by the lightning in the form of Lakṣmī and adorned by a rainbow created by the rays emanating from the gems of His ornaments. This cloud is full with the waters of compassion. “May this
cloud sanctify me by its showers,” prays Parāśara (śl. 82).

The Lord is fancied as a stream of nectar gratifying the eyes of the devotees and then as the celestial garden nandana in which Goddess Lakṣmī sports. The feet, hands and the face of Raṅganātha are the lotuses: His bodily complexion stands for the Tāpiñcha-trees and the lower lip corresponds to the Bandhujīva-flowers (śl. 83-84).

The complexion of the Lord is comparable to the marakata (emerald); His natural fragrance is enhanced by the sweet-smelling exhalations of Ādiśeṣa. His tenderness (saukumārya), personal charm (lāvanya), youthfulness (yuvatvam) brilliance, spectacular gem-studded crown with the central Cūḍāmaṇi and His beautiful face, the forehead covered by gentle locks of hair and brilliant with the ūrdhvapundra - all receive the devoted attention of our poet (śl. 85-95).

In a remarkable verse Parāśara compares the dark eye-brows of the Lord to two rows of dark bees engaged in a gentle dance, which are celebrating their victory over two lotuses which they have ultimately “brought down” that is, the eyes of the Lord (śl. 96). In the succeeding verse the poet continues to describe the Lord’s eyebrows. They must be a pair of Manmatha’s sugarcane bows fully bent because there are two flowery shafts below. Further the Šārīga-bow of the Lord which is known for its remarkable “art of dance” must have had its schooling under these eyebrows. The large lotus-like eyes of the Lord which are full of compassion make one feel that all parts of the Lord’s body are constituted of only one sense-organ, namely the eye. Cool with compassion and slightly red and white in tinge, the eyes of the Lord excel the saphara-fish in their flashful glitter.
The glances that emanate from them are full of nectarine compassion. Calm and cool, they appear to be enquiring the welfare of those who bow down. "May these glances grace me," wishes the poet (śl. 98 - 100).

The beautiful nose of the Lord is like the Kalpaka-creeper; the smile is the beautiful flower that has blossomed on it. The chin and the cheeks are the tender leaves of the creeper (śl. 101). The ear-ornaments of the Lord, His handsome face, neck, hands and lotus-like palms are again described by the poet in a picturesque manner (śl. 102-109). These hands which normally serve Lakṣmī as pillows (upadhāna) have a remarkable feature about them. The right hand which Lord Raṅganātha is resting under His head as a pillow in fact touches the crown and it seems to confirm that the Lord is superior to the rest of the deities, since crown is the symbol of supremacy. The other hand stretched over His left knee seems to point to the lotus-foot as the chief goal of all human endeavour (śl. 110). The Lord's chest then receives a wonderful description. The chest is the pleasure-house of Lakṣmī painted with sandal paste, spread over by Mālatī-gardens serving the purpose of a couch. The gem necklaces act as the canopy and the Kaustubha serves the purpose of an auspicious lamp. The chest of the Lord is also adorned by innumerable sculptures in the form of deep etchings carved out by chisels namely the horns of bulls in the form of demons (śl. 111).

The chest of Lord Raṅganātha itself declares His Supreme Lordship by such characteristics as the Tulasī-garland, the presence of Lakṣmī, the Kaustubha-gem and the Vaijayantī-garland. Be it as it may, the ornaments which Yaśodā herself put on the
Lord’s chest (around the neck of child Kṛṣṇa) such as the Pañcāyudhahāra\textsuperscript{86a} along with the nails of tortoise and tiger is itself capable of attracting us to the Lord without any fear of His transcendental prowess (paratva) (śl. 113).

The navel of the Lord, the three folds on the belly and the scar left on His tender waist when He was tied by Yaśodā with a rope, and the lotus that has sprung from His navel, being the source of Brahmā, all these point again to the Lord’s supremacy over other deities (śl. 114-117).

Adequate reference is also made to the thighs, the yellow silk garment, knees, calves and the lotus-feet of the Lord. His feet seem to have acquired their red tinge from the palms of Lakṣmī engaged in shampooing them\textsuperscript{87} (śl. 118-123).

In the last three verses of this first century, the poet eulogises the lotus-feet of the Lord which are also likened to tender leaves. Identifying Lord Raṅganātha with Kṛṣṇa the poet loses himself in a thrilling recollection of some events of Kṛṣṇa’s life. These are the feet which were adept in running about in the Brāndāvana in His sports with Gopikā-s, which danced to the sounds of the churning of curds,\textsuperscript{88} which are the sole witness of the bliss of being shampooed by Lakṣmī’s hands, which did not distinguish between the high and low and mixed freely with all and which went to the Kaurava’s court with a message of love and peace. “May these feet bring auspiciousness unto us”, prays our poet (śl. 124). The marks that these feet bear such as Vajra and Dhvaja clearly suggest the supreme lordship of Raṅganātha. The radiance emanating from the nails and fingers on the feet of the Lord which are like fresh bunches of tender
sprouts issuing from the Kalpa-trees, sanctify the whole world by the "streams of Ganges" that flows from them (śl. 125-126). These feet are again worshipped with golden lotuses by Śrī Rāma and His consort Sītā (śl. 127).

**Uttarāśataka**

As pointed out earlier this century of verses (105 verses) explains the import of the second half of the dvayamantra, which according to tradition, points to the Lord as the goal of all human endeavour and as the master (śeśin) whom the entire universe of acit and cit subserves.

After a brief statement highlighting the importance of māna (pramāṇa, the valid means of knowledge) as a gift of God to humanity with which one could distinguish between good and bad or between existing and non-existing entities and also dispel darkness (ignorance), Parāśara observes that non-Vedic schools and similar other systems do not really deliver the goods. The view of the bāhya-s is avoided by the orthodox since it contradicts not only pratyakṣa but also śrutī which is free from all defects. Further, such schools are vitiated by the usual errors of human agency and derive their authority from irrational logic (śl. 1-3). The Cārvāka believes in pratyakṣa only and does not believe in the existence of the soul beyond the body. The soul is referred to as aham and is distinct from the body, senses, etc. It is referred to normally as 'this' (idam). The confusion involving the identification of the body and soul arises because of their close association. It is only such an individual soul that becomes a qualified aspirant to perform the rites such as jyotiṣṭoma ordained by sacred texts (śl. 4). Strictly speaking, Parāśara argues that even the Cārvāka who
relies upon pratyakṣa alone should accept sruti and its meaning as matters of pratyakṣa. That is to say that even the scriptures can become an object of audible perception (śrāvana-pratyakṣa). Even as the objects of pratyakṣa are not sublatable, so also the ideas conveyed by śruti such as dharma, adharma and Īśvara are not subject to any contradiction. Therefore śruti also should be taken as a valid means of perception along with pratyakṣa. Or, if the Cārvāka can sit in yogic contemplation he would see for himself all these matters through such a perception (śl. 5).

As for the Buddhists (Saugata) who try to deny the reality of everything without accepting any particular locus (nirupadhi), Parāśara condemns them outright for their peculiar logical position. According to the Mādhyamika school the universe is neither existent (sat) nor non-existent (asat), nor both (sadasat), nor even something beyond sadasat (anubhayātmaka). The idea implied here is that one who denies everything (sarvam) is contradicting himself because even his statement sarvam nāsti becomes subject to this refutation. Further even if he refutes the reality of the universe as pertaining to some substratum, (sādhiṣṭhāna), it results in his accepting the existence of the world elsewhere. To cite an example, when the pot is broken, its shreds still continue to exist. The other Buddhistic schools such as Yogācāra, Sautrāntika and Vaibhāṣika which speak of the non-existence of the universe, the inferential nature of the universe and the momentariness of everything respectively, are also refuted by Parāśara in the three succeeding verses. These three schools notwithstanding their apparent differences, have two things in common: (a) that knowledge alone forms the self, and (b) that everything is momentary. But this cannot be accepted
when there is no abiding self as the possessor of cognitions. Since the objects of knowledge and the knowledge itself gets destroyed in a moment, one cannot account for smṛti (recollection) and pratyabhijñā (recognition). Moreover, when we have a cognition and make the judgement aham idam abhivedmi ("I know this"), one can notice the difference between the knower and the knowledge. But the Buddhists declare that all objects of cognition are unreal. Then even this cognition of the Buddhist becomes unreal and the ultimate result would be that all objects are real, which is the view of the Viśiṣṭādvaitin himself.

In the following verse a reference is made to the view of the Advaitin whom Parāśara nicknames Kalibrahmamāṁśa-s. According to them, Brahman is pure knowledge which is unqualified and self-luminous. Still it becomes subject to transmigration due to its own avidyā or māyā. The jīva who has realised the truth of the abheda-texts such as tat tvamasi can alone get itself removed of the illusion under which Brahman is smarting. Therefore, they have tried to prove that whatever is visible is unreal. To them also Parāśara gives the same reply that even the statement that "everything other than Brahman is unreal" becomes a predicate of such a negation. Ultimately the reality of the world becomes established (śl. 11).

In the succeeding verse, Parāśara ridicules the Jaina-view which tries to prove the "inconclusiveness" (anekāntatā) of the ultimate reality through their characteristic logic involving seven steps (saptabhangī). There is also the Bhedābheda school advocated by Bhāskara which admits both difference and non-difference between Brahman and the world on the basis of an upādhi such as a body. This is as ridiculous as a statement, "my mother is a barren woman." Both these schools,
adds Parāśara, sail in the same boat and are to be set aside (śl. 12).

Parāśara also refers to the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika school which do not accept the Supreme Being as the material cause (upādāna-karāṇa) of the universe, but speak of the atoms (paramāṇu) themselves as the material cause. According to them all products come into existence without any reference to any Supreme Being. This is a strange and unfortunate situation in so far as the Naiyāyika-s are concerned, points Parāśara. In other words there is no reason why they should ignore the Vedāntic declaration that Brahman alone is the upādana, and the nimittakāraṇa of the universe (śl. 13).

The Vedāntic view is that the Veda-s are apauruṣeya and that they are recollected and uttered by the Lord Himself from time to time. This itself imparts a pre-eminent position to the Veda-s as the highest authority on which are based all other texts. The fifth Veda, namely the Mahābhārata itself declares that schools like the Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Pāṣupata are valid only in part and the Pāñcarātra, being the spoken word of the Lord Himself, is valid in toto (śl. 14).

Parāśara briefly alludes to the concept of Īśvara or some such principle in other schools such as Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Pāṣupata and concludes that Viṣṇu’s supremacy is clear enough through His para, vyūha, vibhava and other aspects as described in the Pāñcarātra texts. Parāśara also states that he does not care a bit for the Buddhistic philosophy although it is believed to have been expounded by Lord Viṣṇu Himself after assuming the form of (Māyā) Mohana (śl. 15-16), since it is meant to mislead the evil-minded persons.

Turning to the question of Vedic authority, Parasara explains the impersonal character of the Veda-s. At the
end of every kalpa the Lord retains the Vedic texts in the form of samśkāra-s (latent impressions) and at the time of creation He recollects and teaches them to Brahmā. That is why the Veda-s are without any authorship and this accounts for their authority. According to Parāśara the six anīga-s of the Veda-s such as Śiksā, Vyākaraṇa, Chandas etc., and sciences like Nyāya and Mīmāṁsā and the Smṛti-s and Purāṇa-s follow the Vedic authority and form effective means of realising the goal of life (śl. 17-18).

The Veda-s are of utmost authority. Of decreasing order of importance are Smṛti-s, Itihāsa-s, Purāṇa-s, Nyāya and the like. The entire Pūrvabhāga of the Veda and the subsidiary texts constitute the means of worshipping the Lord. The latter part of the Veda-s, that is, the Upaniṣad-s speaks at length about the object or the goal of worship, namely, the Lord Himself, possessed of innumerable auspicious qualities, of unsurpassed glory and unfailing will. This point has been elaborated by Lord Kṛṣṇa in the Gītā itself.90

Parāśara is of the firm opinion that neither the performance of sacrifices, nor their latent power, nor the apūrva that arises, nor even the grace of the manes and minor gods bring the results desired by the performers of those acts. He is thereby refuting the views of Bhāṭṭa-s and Prabhākara-s. The orthodox view, however is that the performance of the japa-s, homa-s, etc., known as ḥṛṣṭa and acts such as constructing temples, tanks, etc., known as pūrta ultimately bear fruit only by the Lord’s grace and not by any other extraneous factors. Even these very acts constitute the command of the Lord (śl. 20). Parāśara further points out that the nitya and naimittika (obligatory and occassional) rites of the Veda-s are known as the ājñāvidhi-s (commandments), and the
kāmya-injunctions are known as the anujñāvidhi-s (permitted rites). There are also rites which are called the abhicāra-s meant to attract even the most stubborn people to the fold of Vedic authority (by pointing out the ways and means of attaining wealth, control over persons, etc). The entire śruti is meant for the ultimate welfare of the people and brings out the intention of the Lord who is always bent upon protecting the creatures. Thus the Veda is the eternal command of the Lord (śl. 21).

In the succeeding verse Parāśara refutes the Prābhākara view that words indicating already existing entities (siddha-vastu) do not gain validity. This is so because all Vedic texts should be construed in such a way that they point to a ‘kārya (something to be accomplished). 91 Therefore, strictly speaking, the Upaniṣadic portions of the Veda-s which speak of Brahman, an already existing entity, cannot be primarily valid. They should be converted as injunctions so as to gain validity. 92

This view is refuted by Parāśara, by saying that even sentences speaking of already existing entities are valid in their own right. Thus for instance if a reliable person tells somebody that there is a treasure in a particular place ("atṛaste nidhiḥ"), this statement becomes valid although it refers to an already existing entity, namely, treasure. Therefore, there is no justification in the Mīmāṁsāka’s denying the validity of siddhaparavākya-s. Parāśara further asserts that Upaniṣadic passages such as satyam jānam anantam brahma 93 and yah sarvajñāḥ sarvavit 94 which speak of the innumerable virtues, character and form of the Lord, should be given their due validity. It is obvious that Parāśara is following here Rāmānuja’s commentary on the Brahmaṣūtra - tattva samanvayāt (śl. 22).
Parāśara observes next that the interpretation of the *Chāndogya* passage *ekam evādvitiyam* cannot prove the unreality of the universe. The entire universe forms the inseparable attribute of the Lord even as the body belongs to the soul, the modifications (effects) pertain to the cause and *jāti* (the universal) *guna*-s (qualities) and *karman* (action) depend upon a substance (*dravya*). All these give rise to specific mental cognitions and verbal references. Thus the word *adviṣṭya* (without a second) in particular, does not on any interpretation, deny the existence of the world of *cit* and *acit* which forms the mode of the Lord. In other words, in both the subtle (*sūkṣma*) and the gross (*sthūla*) states, that is, before and after creation, the universe remains as the body of the Lord. That being the case, the theories of *māyā* (accounting for the unreality of the universe), *upādhi* (limiting adjunct causing apparent distinctions in Brahman) and *vikāra* (that Brahman undergoes essential modification) all get sublated. These three theories are those of Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Yādavaprakāśa respectively (śl. 23).

In the next verse Parāśara shows the proper way of interpreting the texts which speak of non-difference (*abheda*) between Brahman and the world. These are the passages meant here: *sarvam khalvi dam brahma*, *aitadātmyam i dam sarvam* and *tattvamasi*. These passages speak of the non-difference between Brahman and the universe including the *jīva* because everything forms the body of the Lord, being controlled by Him, pervaded by Him (supported) and being subservient to Him. The Lord’s control over the universe is evident by His creating, sustaining and destroying the universe. Therefore, the *Chāndogya* passage in question speaks of the identity between Brahman and the universe, by
the principle of co-ordinate predication (sāmānādhi-karanya), since even in common parlance the body and the soul are referred to as identical (aham sthūlah etc.) (śl. 24).

The author then refers to the views of the Naiyāyiaka-s who try to prove the existence of a Supreme Designer-Architect for this universe through reasoning alone, (who ultimately turns out to be an efficient cause), the view of the Mīmāṁsaka-s who do not accept any such Being as a master of the universe and the view of others who speak of the “trinity of gods” as equals, and again the theory of those that Rudra or Hiraṇyagarbha or such other gods are the masters of the universe. All these views, points out Parāśara, are set aside by the śruti itself which speaks of Lord Viṣṇu alone as the ruler of both cit and acit. The śruti-s - eko ha vai nārāyaṇa āsīt, patim víśvasya and so on, make it clear that all other gods are bound by karman and as such they cannot be the rulers of the universe. They further clarify that these gods are of varying degrees of powers so much so they cannot be called Supreme (śl. 25). Other gods like Brahmā and Śiva, argues Parāśara, form part of the creation itself and they act according to the dictates of Nārāyaṇa, as declared by śruti-s. Further these gods are not known to have manifested themselves through avatāra-s like Viṣṇu. Therefore, they cannot be equated with Lord Nārāyaṇa. Nārāyaṇa is therefore the unquestioned monarch of the universe in association with His consort Lakṣmī (śl. 26).

In the following verses Parāśara explains the six perfections such as jñāna (knowledge), śakti (power), bala (strength), aiśvarya (lordship), virya (energy) and tejas (effulgence), which always abide by the Lord in an unsurpassed manner, and which make Him Bhagavān.
(ś. 27-34). While explaining the quality called aiśvarya, Parāśara takes occasion to criticise the Sāṅkhya theory of the evolution of the universe. According to this, prakṛti which is inert and insentient (ajña) itself is the source of the universe and the Puruṣa by his mere presence as a sāksin (witness) provides the necessary stimulus for creation, etc. But Parāśara points out that the quality aiśvarya (lordship) which facilitates the cosmic functions such as creation, etc., is present in the Lord. Therefore, the Sāṅkhya view cannot satisfactorily explain the creation of the universe.

Parāśara also observes that the Ānandavalli-section of the Taittirīyopanisad waxes eloquent about the attributes of the Lord such as youthfulness, bliss and the like starting from the humans and ending up with Brahmā, the creator. Still the upanisad in question is unable to bring out the glory of the Lord in all its fulness. It ends up like a dumb creature. As such, what to speak of the powers of the mind and speech of a human in comprehending the virtues of the Supreme? Such divine qualities which are beyond the human ken, thought and speech including softness, skill, affection and forgiveness, are treasured as it were in the Āranyaka-like precious gems. They can now be seen and felt here in the iconic form of Lord Raṅganātha at Śrīraṅgam, which is so to speak, a veritable jewellery, remarks Parāśara (ś. 36).

The author also refers to the theory of Vyūha-s of the Pāñcarātra according to which, the four Vyūha manifestations of the Lord with different functions and characteristics facilitate the meditational exercises of the devotees (ś. 37-40). Referring to the remarkable compassion of the Lord, Parāśara observes that but for His grace, creation itself would not have taken place. Creation lies in uniting the souls of beings with proper
bodies and senses since at the time of pralaya all the souls exist Undistinguishable from inanimate matter. By His free will the Lord made the prakṛti modify and produce mahat, aharinikāra and the indriya-s ( śl. 41). Cruelty and partiality cannot be attributed to the Lord if we find the world in which we live, full of inequality and misery. The peculiar past acts (karman) performed by the individuals in their previous births should alone be held responsible for their misery or happiness in the present life. The Brahmaśūtra and the Bṛhadāranyaka upaniṣad are in support of this view.¹⁰⁷ ( śl. 42).

Parāśara here anticipates the objection that the Lord’s dependence on the past karma-s of the individual souls does not contribute to His independence. Parāśara answers by citing four analogies: (1) The agent of an action such as a potter, is independent in so far as the production of the pot is concerned, although he has to depend upon a number of auxiliaries like water, wheel, stick, etc., (2) A person who enjoys certain comforts of the physical world is also deemed to be independent regarding the enjoyment, notwithstanding his dependence on his own physical body; (3) A ruler is considered to be independent in matters of favouring or punishing his dependents although he has to depend upon the behaviour of the people concerned; and (4) A donor who is willing to offer gifts upon the needy and is thus independent, still has to depend upon those people who come to him. In other words his quality of charity becomes meaningless if nobody comes to him for favour. Still this cannot be construed as impairing the independence of the donor. In the same manner, the independence of the Supreme Being cannot be supposed to be undermined although He acts according to the karman of the beings concerned ( śl. 43).
The poet-philosopher Parāśara, then explains the process of creation itself. The Lord projects and manifests by His own free will, the cit and acit entities which form an infinitesimal part of His own body, which during the cosmic dissolution, lie dormant. This is compared to a peacock sportingly spreading forth his beautiful plumes dancing in glee, in the presence of his mate. The Lord also sports in this manner in the presence of His consort Śrī. The idea underlying here is that the essential nature, power and glory of the Supreme are not exhausted by the process of creation. It is just a sport for Him implying the total independence and disinterestedness with which He carries on the cosmic functions (śl. 44).

Parāśara then speaks of the remarkable compassion of the Lord in manifesting Himself in the world of mortals for their welfare. Time and again He is very much concerned with what may even be described as an over-enthusiasm to put the violaters of dharma on the right path. Parāśara drives home this point with the very apt analogy of a mother who swallows portions of bitter medicine so that her suckling child may become healthier (śl. 45).

The Lord’s excessive love and consideration for the universe full of unwise people is evident from every episode of His incarnations. Undaunted, He again and again tries to woo them to the path of virtue. This is like the setting in of the cycle of seasons which contributes to the welfare of the beings, and which can be inferred by the seasonal traits (śl. 46).

Parāśara then answers the question as to how the Lord’s compassion and friendliness to the living beings could be justified when it is known that He punishes the guilty. The author points out that punishing the
evil-minded is itself an act of favour extended to them for their own well-being (śl. 47).

Parāśara observes that the Lord time and again incarnates Himself for the protection of all the beings taking such forms as celestials, mortals and even animals although He Himself is birthless. An important feature of the Lord’s incarnations is that His consort Indirā accompanies Him in all His manifestations assuming appropriate forms and functions. The Lord’s nature and will and the cause and purpose behind the series of His manifestations are highly inscrutable. Only the wise can understand them, while the ignorant consider the Lord as a mere mortal and speak ill of Him (śl. 48-50).

Parāśara ridicules the theory which holds Viṣṇu to be equal with Brahmā and Śiva, all forming the trinity of Gods. If Viṣṇu who is the central figure of the trinity were to be treated like that, then what purpose would be served by such activities of the Lord as promoting the quality of sattva, showering compassion on and coming to the rescue of those who are in distress? These activities are the unmistakable signs of the Supremacy of the Lord, observes our author (śl. 51). Parāśara then enters into a long and eloquent eulogy of the avatāra-s (vībhava-s) the Lord took from time to time to protect the virtuous and to punish the vile. The avatāra-s described are: Hayagrīva (śl. 52), Harīsa (śl. 53), Vaṭapatraśāyin (śl. 54), Matsya (śl. 60-61), Kūrma (śl. 62), Varāha (śl. 63), Narasimha (śl. 64-66), Vāmana (śl. 67), Parāśurāma (śl. 68), Śrīrāma (śl. 69), Kṛṣṇa (śl. 70-72) and Kalkin (śl. 73). Of these special reference has to be made to Parāśara’s attachment to the Gajendravarada-form (which is not treated canonically as a separate incarnation), Narasimha and Śrīkṛṣṇa avatāra-s. As soon as Lord Viṣṇu heard the trumpeting of the elephant made in great agony,
He quickly took away His feet from the lotus-hands of His two consorts which were stroking them, left the serpent-bed, enlarged His lotus-eyes whose lids were extremely unsteady, wiped out from His chest the saffron-marks left by embracing Laks̄mī and started out in a huff (śl. 56). The great hurry in which the Lord dashed out of His abode to save the elephant is vividly described by the poet in another beautiful verse: The Lord was in such a tremendous 'confusion' and hurry that He did not hold the hand of Visvaksena stretched out for support, nor did He put on the gem-studded sandals. He left all the inmates of the harem in utter dismay as to what had happened to Him. Without even having the seat properly bedecked, He sat on Garuda's back. "Salutations to such a hurried condition of the Lord" exclaims our poet. As the Lord sat on his back, Garuḍa increased his extraordinary speed to a tremendous degree of velocity. Still the Lord felt that it was not fast enough and began to shout, splash him on his back and even kick at his sides with a view to making him go faster. Even after Garuḍa had increased his speed further, the Lord Himself felt it inadequate and began to lift and push him up in a frantic bid... all this to save Gajendra at the earliest moment. The poet wonders at this unique compassion of the Lord and exclaims "O Lord! when anybody just prostrates before you, you will be in utter panic!" In such a state of utter excitement and anxiety, the poet notes in another verse, the Lord put on His ornaments, garlands and silken dress in a disorderly manner, and began to blame Himself aloud "Alas! fie upon me." In this situation He resembled a lotus-pond deeply perturbed by powerful currents of wind (śl. 59).
Parāśara fancies that the man-lion (Nara-sīmha) form of the Lord which combines in itself wonderful and charming features in such a way that this form is no longer avoided or abhorred by people. When seen separately, the human and leonine forms normally cannot be admired by anyone. Therefore, the Lord had, by a stroke of His genius, brought these two features together as nara-sīmha and made it a pleasant and charming combination as that of milk and sugar, much to the delight of His devotees. The poet further observes that in His man-lion incarnation the Lord actually dispensed with His enemy effortlessly with the tip of His nails. But His fury against Hiranyakasipu, who harassed His devotee Prahlāda in the most unbecoming manner knew no bounds. As such His physical body grew twice the size of His cosmic form as Viṣṇu. The man-lion form which He assumed thus in all haste, still provided a matchless co-ordination between the human and animal forms (śl. 64-66).

Losing himself in the glories of Rāmāvatāra, the poet feels that the disappearance of Sītā (at Citrakūṭa) and her ‘hiding’ in Aśokavana was a mere sport. The poet wonders as to why the Lord had to undergo enormous pain and strain in building a bridge across the ocean and in putting an end to the demon who was puffed up by the boons he got from Brahmā and Śiva. The poet’s opinion is that Sītā, had she so desired, could have easily foiled Rāvana’s plans of seizing her. But still she allowed all this to happen and this must have been with a definite purpose behind (śl. 68-69).

Parāśara then describes in two verses the greatest of all the incarnations of the Lord, that is Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In a touching reference to Kṛṣṇa’s mother Devakī he says that she wanted the Supreme Brahma as her child.
This Supreme Brahman is the one whose complexion is of the rainy cloud which being full with water is slow to move; He is the one draped in yellow silk, one who has lotus-eyes and five weapons. The characteristics pertain to Viṣṇu alone. “Which other woman would desire such a child?” wonders the author (śl. 70-71). In the next verse the poet brings out in a unique way the amazing and sweeping influence of the sweet notes of Kṛṣṇa’s magic flute on the entire universe of cit and acit. What more, even Kṛṣṇa was no exception to the dulcet music that emanated from His own fantastic flute.¹⁰⁷a

The sweetness of the music that flowed from the flute had rendered the entire creation different from what it originally was. Mountains and fires became soft and cool respectively; sages became stupefied; the immobile trees and ignorant cowherds became highly enlightened; the mighty venomous serpents brimmed with nectar; even tigers and cows became fraternal, the rest underwent transformation and even Kṛṣṇa was one amongst them. This was what happened when the music of the Lord’s flute swept through the entire creation with its ravishing and inebriating sweetness (śl. 72).

What follows then is the glorification of the iconic form (arcā) of the Lord which forms the most easily accessible of the five-fold forms of Lord Viṣṇu - the remaining four being Para, Vyūha, Vībhava and Anatyāmin. It is true that all incarnations of the Lord are magnanimous, grand and motivated by unconditional love for the creatures. But what is more striking is the Lord’s willingness to come down to the mortal plane and animate the idols installed in temples built on earth, putting up with all inconveniences, and depending totally upon the arcaka-s (the worshippers) for His very sustenance. How deep and how great is the Lord’s concern
for His ardent devotees! The grateful lovers of God are thrilled and dumb-founded at this remarkable gesture of the Supreme Lord (śl. 74)

While an ardent devotee whole-heartedly believes in the all-pervasive presence and grace of the Lord, the arcāvatāra comes in quite handy to spiritualise His mortal existence. The Para, Vyūha, and the Vibhava aspects, it is quite obvious, are an impossible hope for the suffering humanity. It is therefore out of supreme consideration for man that the Lord has condescended as an arcā which assures salvation to one and all (viśvajanīna). The present arcā in the holy temple of Śrīraṅgam welcomes everyone and enquires about their welfare with its beatific and beautiful glances imbued by wonderful grace (śl. 75).

Parāśara also refers to the age-old mythological tradition associated with the worship of Lord Raṅganātha at Śrīraṅgam. According to the legends Brahmā the creator-god, bathed in the celestial Ganges and worshipped Lord Ranganātha offering lotuses at His feet. The idol of Lord Raṅganātha was being worshipped by the ancestors of Śrī Rāma starting from Manu. Rāma Himself worshipped the idol along with His wife Sītā. The poet also makes mention of the episode of the Lord abiding at Śrīraṅgam itself in accordance with the desire of Vibhīṣaṇa (śl. 76-78).

The succeeding four verses (śl. 79-82) describe Lord Raṅganātha employing Upaniṣadic statements such as tatsaviturvareṇyam, āpraṇakḥātsarva eva suvārṇah cakṣurmitrasya varuṇasya... yasyāsmi na tamantaremī āyuḥ prajānām, etc.

Parāśara then speaks of the glories of the Lord employing the words and ideas expressed in the Bhagavad
Gītā such as ārto jījñāsuh,\textsuperscript{115} mayi sarvāni karmāni,\textsuperscript{116} etc. (śl. 83-84). Those who realise their own self through samādhi as the twenty-fifth category, over and above the well-known twenty-four categories, and unite it with itself, attain the kaivalya state. However those who realise their self in its true nature as the twenty-fifth category and unites it with the Supreme Self become liberated (śl. 85). Those who were completely devoid of the influence of their past karman and are by their very birth bent upon serving the Lord out of spontaneous and motiveless love, sing the glories of the Lord, think of Him and salute Him. Such people live in the Lord and the Lord in turn lives in them (śl. 86).\textsuperscript{117}

In the next verse Parāśara expresses his wholehearted surrender to the Lord. Upaniṣadic passages such as yato vā īmāni,\textsuperscript{118} antah praviṣṭah śāstā\textsuperscript{119} and patim viśvasya\textsuperscript{120} declares that the Lord along with His consort is responsible for the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the entire universe of men and matter and that they are all subservient to Him. To be the means of salvation and the goal of all human effort constitutes the very nature and truth of Lord’s existence. They are not two different qualities. That is why the poet says that he is resorting to the Lord without any reservation (śl. 87). The poet then refers to the independence of the Lord in conferring mokṣa on a soul or throwing it into the endless cycle of saṁsāra. “Who is to question you? You alone should save me,” appeals the poet (śl. 88).

The author then realises his utter non-eligibility even to utter the words “I surrender before the Lord.” He is totally ignorant of Karma-yoga, Jñāna-yoga and Bhakti-yoga. Apart from the mere desire to be saved he has no other qualification. He is in a confused state of mind, and hence this appeal (śl. 89).
In a number of verses taking us from verse 90 to the last verse of this stava the poet gives expression to the remarkable qualities of the Lord such as compassion and omnipotence, and to his own ignoble qualities, sinful activities, materialistic tendencies, egoity, self-imposed status as a spiritual teacher and the like which all correspond to Kārpanya ("utter helplessness"), which constitutes naicyānusandhāna of the Śrīvaishnava tradition. But the grace of the Lord is so magnanimous and overwhelming that it would certainly forgive the sins of even the most abominable sinner. The poet puts a very clever question: "Did your grace contract, O Lord! due to its association with such sinners as the crow-demon (kākāsura) and Śisupāla?" The poet also reminds the Lord of the vow which He took that He would offer protection to whosoever surrenders to Him but once and offers himself to Him.\textsuperscript{121} (śl. 90-101). The poet places his burden at the feet of the Lord, being prompted by ācārya-s and categorically states, "O Lord! you are my refuge." The Lord therefore cannot brush side the appeal of the ardent devotee.

In a beautiful verse involving the figure of speech Vyājastutī, Parāśara points out, that strictly speaking the qualities of the Lord such as dayā (compassion), kṣamā (forgiveness) and audārya (magnanimity) do not have any role or function. "Compassion" consists in being unable to bear the misery of others. The Lord Himself being everything else and everybody else, where is the scope for the display of His grace? "Forgiveness" means winking at the faults of others. This too is rendered ineffective by the fact that the Lord is always unaware of the faults of others. When the faults of others are themselves not known to the Lord where is the occasion for His forgiving them? Likewise even the "magnanimity"
of the Lord is something difficult to understand for, whatever the Lord has, has already been made over to his devotees,¹²³ (śl. 103) and there is no scope for anything else to be aspired for afresh (śl. 103).

The grace of the Lord is such that it elevates even the lowliest of the lowly. In fact the quality of Lordship lies in fulfilling the desires of the have-nots (śl. 104). There is also no virtue, remarks the poet in fine, if the Lord extends a helping hand to those who are already at a vantage point by virtue of their performance of the karma- jñāna- and bhaktiyoga-s. Helping such people will be like pouring water to a fish which is already in water (mānapāniyanaya). But if the Lord comes to the rescue of hopeless persons like the poet, it would be a positive help, like putting up a water-tent in the midst of a desert (śl. 105).

TATTVARATNĀKARA

This monumental treatise of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is unfortunately not available to us although a number of fragments are available through the quotations of Vedānta Deśika in his Nyāyapariśuddhi, Nyāyasiddhānjana, Sesvaramīmāṁsā, Tattvamuktākalāpa and Tattvaṭīkā. Of these the majority of quotations are from the first two works mentioned above. It is clear from these quotations that Parāśara covers the whole range of the Nyāyaśāstra and interprets several principles in the light of Viśiṣṭādvaita system of thought in this work. An attempt is made here to study these fragments to the extent they are available.¹²⁴

The first quotation seeks to define and classify samśaya (doubt). It runs thus: “The cognition which apprehends several contradictory features with reference
to one and the same entity is known as doubt. It is two-fold.” The part of the text which classifies *samśaya* is not available. But we can supply the idea from Vedānta Deśika’s *Nyāyaparāśudhi*. According to this, *samśaya* is of two kinds: (1) That which is based on the common feature (*samānadharma*); and (2) that which is based on mutual discrepancy (*vipratīti*). Looking at a tall object, and being unable to decide whether it is a man or post is the illustration for the first variety. When one looks in the mirror and sees the image of one's own face there arises the doubt regarding the reality of the reflection. This forms the illustration for the second variety.

The second quotation concerns itself with the number of *pramāṇa*-s. Parāśara points out that although those who rely upon the *Veda*-s mention *smṛti* (recollection), *pratyakṣa* (perception), *aitihya* (same as *āgama* or verbal testimony) and *anumāna* (inference) as the valid means of knowledge, all recollection (*smṛti*) based upon *pratyakṣa* etc., can actually be included in its own source. As such there is no difficulty in concluding that *pramāṇa*-s are three in number.

The third fragment defines the immediacy (*āparokṣya*) of cognition. It consists in cognizing an object directly through *pratyakṣa*. This immediacy of knowledge distinguishes it from verbal and inferential cognitions. In other words fire, etc., are the objects concerning whose existence on a hill-top a man engages himself through the observation of smoke, etc., concomitant with that entity. The knowledge that arises therewith is known as inference. If a person hears somebody mentioning the existence of fire at a particular place and believes that there is fire, purely on the strength of that statement, we have an instance of verbal cognition. In the same context the mediacy of knowledge (*pāroksya*)
is the dependence on the knowledge of things which do not have a direct bearing upon the intention of the person involved. If a person wants to find out the existence of fire through smoke it constitutes his dependence on a thing (smoke) which is not actually the thing desired by him. Therefore, dependence on \textit{liṅga} and \textit{sabdā} which do not actually belong to the category of the things desired, is what is known as \textit{pārokṣya} or mediacy of cognitions.

The next fragment (4) records the ancient view regarding conjunction (\textit{samyoga}). The conjunction between an object and the sense-organ is two-fold: \textit{samyoga} and \textit{samyuktāśraya}. The contact between the sense-organs and objects is known as \textit{samyoga} (conjunction); the contact between the sense-organs and the colour, etc., of the objects is known as \textit{samyuktāśrayana} (dependence on that which is conjoined). It has to be pointed out that for the Viśiṣṭādvaitin-s \textit{samavāya} (inherence), is not acceptable since it leads to infinite regress (\textit{anavasthā}). The quotation in question also says \textit{yathāsambhavamūhyatām} meaning “this can be understood, depending upon possibility.” By this Parāśara implies that in the case of direct perception of the \textit{yogin}-s and in cases of \textit{anyathākhyāti} (misapprehension), this kind of conjunction is not applicable.

The next quotation (5) explains the difference between the \textit{savikalpaka} (determinate) and \textit{nirvikalpaka} (indeterminate) \textit{pratyakṣa} (perception). According to the Viśiṣṭādvaita school the indeterminate (\textit{nirvikalpaka}) perception does not cognise an undifferentiated and unqualified object, as held by the Naiyāyika-s and Advaitin-s. Even in this kind of perception the object is qualified by some attributes such as configuration, but it is devoid of “retrospection” (\textit{anuvṛtti} or \textit{pratyavamarśa})
since it happens to be the first object of that kind of things cognized. In the determinate (savikalpaka) perception the qualities, etc., of the object are found to exist in other individuals of the same kind.¹²⁷

The Tattvaratnākara passage states that in the nirvikalpaka perception one notices the "non-absence" (that is, presence) of "lack of relationship" of an object with its own genus (jāti), etc. Thus, in the perception of a cow for the first time, what one fails to notice is the continuity of the jāti (gotva) etc., in other individual cows. In the savikalpaka perception the cow is seen to be possessed of this genus (gotva) and as devoid of other kinds of jāti (anyayogasya vyāvṛttiḥ) such as aśvatva, mahiśatva, etc.

Pratyakṣa again is two-fold: (1) that which belongs to the ancients (anarvācina, that is, Yogins or extraordinary persons) and (2) that which belongs to the recent ones, that is, ordinary people (arvācīna). The first kind of perception belongs to the Yogin-s, the released souls and the Supreme Being; it is capable of directly visualising all things at one and the same time. The expression upapādayisyate (will be explained later) indicates that this matter was further discussed in the later portion of the Tattvaratnākara which, however, is not traceable in the available fragments.

The subsequent fragment (6) represents an ancient view regarding vyāpti (invariable concomitance). According to this, the vyāpti between the sādhana (probans) and a sādhya (probandum) is grasped by a single observation. Later philosophers, however, insist that vyāpti can be obtained only through repeated observation. The word sambandha used by Parāśara in this quotation must be understood in the sense of
mere co-ordination (*sāmānādhi karanya*). According to Parāśara all concepts by nature comprehend not only the attributes and the objects possessing those attributes but also their mutual relationship. The author urges that since the class-concept of *dhūma*, namely, *dhūmatva* is associated with every particular instance (*e.g.* smoke) the experience of any *vyāpti* between smoke and fire would mean the cognition of the *vyāpti* between the class-concept of smoke and the class-concept of fire. As already noted in fragment (4) above, the relationship between a particular instance of smoke and its genus is *samyukta-āśrita* (dependence on that which is conjoined with the sense-organ). A third kind of *sannikarṣa* (conjunction) was not dealt with in the section dealing with *sannikarṣa* because its subject is also brought out in this same context, says Parāśara. This third kind of *sannikarṣa*, we understand from Vedānta Deśika's remarks is *samyukta-āśrita-āśraya* (being based upon that which is dependent on that which is in conjunction with the sense-organ).

The next fragment (7) is a long one and it discusses the nature and scope of *upādhi* (adventitious condition) which vitiates the invariable concomitance which is vital for a valid inferential cognition. This fragment also points out that all doubts and cases of unwarranted situations can be successfully warded off by *tarka* (indirect argument) itself.

*Upādhi* is that which restricts or delimits the scope of the relationship between a means and its ends. The contact with wet fuel is the *upādhi* when one tries to prove the existence of smoke by means of fire. Another example is when we try to prove that a particular space forms the faculty of hearing by reason of its being ether. Here *karnaśaśkuli* (the external form of the ear) is the *upādhi*. The usual definition of *upādhi* is:
sādhyavyāpakatve sati sādhanāvyāpakatvam

An adventitious condition is that which is invariably pervasive of the probandum (sādhyā) and non-pervasive of the probans (sādhana). In this second illustration we find that wherever there is organ of hearing there is the ear (karnaśaśkuli), whereas there is no such concomitance between ether and the karnaśaśkuli. Another illustration for upādhi is also given: vimatah jīvah saṁsārī, jīvatvāt (the individual soul in question is liable to transmigration because it is an individual soul). Here karma, avidyā, etc., of the soul form the upādhi. While they are pervasive of saṁsāritva, they are not so with jīvatva. Udayana’s view that upādhi while not being pervasive of the sādhana (sādhana-avyāpaka), is co-extensive with sādhyā (sādhyasamavyāpti) is also referred to by Parāśara in this passage.

What is the criterion of this upādhi? Parāśara replies that it is two-fold: (1) Sometimes the sādhana is not related to its sādhyā; and (2) at the time of cognizing this relation (vyāpti) one does not have a cogent and uniform apprehension of the sādhana. In other words, there is non-conformity or “straying of the reason” (vyabhicāra) which undermines the concept of invariable relationship between the hetu and sādhyā. Another example for upādhi is also given by Parāśara: agniṣomiyahimsā adharmajanikā, himsātvāt. “Injury to animals which forms part of the agniṣomīya-sacrifice produces sin; because it is injury, like the injury done outside the sacrifice.” Here niṣiddhatva (being forbidden) forms the upādhi. Another example is also given: ātmā anityah, prameyatvāt. “Soul is non-eternal, because it is knowable.” Here kṛtakatva (being produced) is the upādhi. The reason which is co-pervasive with the probandum is noticed in the positive illustrations (sapakṣa) and it is not present in the subject (pakṣa). In such
a form, one fails to recognise its "being pervaded" which gives rise to upādhi. An instance is when we try to infer the dark complexion of a child to be born of a woman Maitrī, by the reason that he would be the son of Maitrī (since the other children of that lady are also dark). Here the upādhi is sākādyāhāraparināma (having been born as a result of digesting green vegetable).

Finally Parāśara draws the line between reasons which have upādhi-s caused by the incomplete character of their form (rūpavaikalaya) and between those reasons which have upādhi-s caused by the straying (vyabhicāra) of those reasons. In the first instance such reasons are called aprayojakā-s ('ineffective') whereas in the second we have the usual classification as bādhita, viruddha, anaikāntika, etc.

Summing up the discussion, Parāśara notes that vyabhicāra consists in the absence of invariable concomitance (pratibandha). Upādhi alone is the source of such straying of the reason. If the upādhi is present in the sādhana (probans) and if it is not present in the sādhyā (probandum) we have an instance of niṣcitopādhi (the determined). If the upādhi is not determined on the strength of some other means of knowledge (pramāṇa) we have what is known as saṅkitopādhi ('the doubted').

Fragment (8) discusses the three kinds of anumāṇa which are well known in the Nyāya system as anvayavyatirekin, kevalānvayin and kevalavyatirekin. Vedānta Deśika who refers to Yāmuna128 is of the view that the kevalavyatirekī type of anumāṇa cannot be considered as an anumāṇa at all. However Parāśara and Varadaviṣṇumiśra whom Vedānta Deśika quotes, seem to accept this three-fold classification. But Vedānta Deśika tries to remove the apparent contradiction by saying that those statements of the two ācārya-s must be understood
as presenting the pūrvapakṣa view or the view of a section of philosophers.

It appears from this quotation that the kevalavyatirekin can be two-fold - the ‘determined’ (adhyayasita), and the undetermined (anadhyayasita). Of these the first kind constitutes a good reason (saddhetu) which can prove the probandum. The second variety, that is, anadhyayasita type is of an unusual kind (asādhāraṇa) being present only in the pakṣa and absent from both the sapakṣa (positive instance) and vipakṣa (negative instance), which cannot conclusively prove the probandum. Hence it may be called the semblance of a reason (ābhāsa).129

The next fragment (9) defines lakṣaṇa. According to this, lakṣaṇa is that which is the cause of comprehending the form of an entity which is unique to itself. In this process all objects of the similar and dissimilar kinds are also precluded from the scope.

Jāti (genus) and configuration (ākāra) for instance, assist a pramāṇa (valid means of knowledge) in marking out an individual (such as cow, etc.) from species of a similar kind and a dissimilar kind. This constitutes the lakṣaṇa in so far that that particular individual is concerned.

Fragment (10) refutes the kevalavyatirekin as a type of inference. When the Naiyāyika tries to prove the “difference from other elements” (itarabhedha) in the case of earth by reason of its possession of smell (gandhatvata), Parāśara asks if earth is already known to exist through a valid means or not. If it is not known, then the defect called āśraya-asiddhi (“non-establishment in respect of the locus”) accrues. If it is already known to exist then the fallacy of siddha-sādhana (“proving the already proved”) crops up. It has therefore to be stated by the pūrvapakṣin that although the earth is known to exist
in a general form, its special features are not known. Even then, says Parāśara, the pakṣa (subject) becomes one whose attribute is not well-known (aprasiḍdha viśesana). Therefore proving the “difference from other entities” (itaravyavaccheda) becomes a futile exercise. Further, if a particular means of knowledge (pramāṇa) stands in need of another pramāṇa to substantiate its position, it will result in anavasthā (infinite regress) and the doctrine of intrinsic validity (svatahprāmāṇya) becomes negated. Therefore, an attribute (e.g. gandha) which distinguishes its substantive (the earth) from others itself becomes a definition thereof.

The next fragment (11) is regarding the classification of anumāna as svārtha (‘for one’s own self’) and parārtha (‘for the sake of others’). The Viśiṣṭādvaitins as represented by Vedānta Deśika do not accept this classification made by the Naiyāyika-s. According to them all inferences proceed on the basis of one’s own understanding and are helpful for one’s own verbal usage and activity. There is no element of parārtha in them. But it so happens that sometimes we hear a person making a statement regarding the existence of some object (arthā). Vedānta Deśika feels that even in such a case one understands the meaning of the sentence not because another person has uttered it but because of the vyāpti (invariable concomitance) contained in such a sentence. If “being produced by the sentence uttered by another person” forms the criterion of parārthānumāna, then some instances of ocular perception (pratyakṣa) and verbal testimony (āgama) which are sometimes conveyed through a sentence uttered by another person will also turn out to be parārthānumāna. Therefore, the division of pramāṇa-s must be made on a different basis: pramāṇa-s which are self-valid (svayamsiddha) and pramāṇa-s which are conveyed through the medium of sentences uttered
by others. Vedānta Deśika quotes the Tattvaratnakara in support of this. According to Parāśara all pramāna-s become valid by the totality of their own causes (sāmagri) which functions on its own (svataḥ). Alternately this totality of causes (sāmagri) may present itself through the medium of a sentence uttered by another person. This is the real basis for the two-fold classification of an inference.

The following quotation (12) concerns itself with the members of a syllogism. According to Nyāya there are five members in an anumāna-vākya meant to enlighten another person (parārtha). They are: pratijñā (declaration), hetu (reason), udāharana (example), upanaya (application) and nigamana (conclusion). But the siddhānta of the Viśiṣṭādvaitins is that there should be no hard and fast rule (aniyama) regarding their exact number. Vedānta Deśika quotes the Tattvaratnakara which apparently refers to the five members and states thus: “Ultimately, however, Parāśara also expresses the view that no restriction regarding the number should be laid.”

The Tattvaratnakara quotes a line from the Mahābhārata (Sabhāparvan (Ch.5. Śl. 8a)) pañcāvayavayuktasya vākyasya guṇadoṣavīt and says that Vedavyāsa and others accept the five-membered syllogism. But later on Parāśara himself declares that if a speaker is able to drive home a particular point to a listener using the minimum number of members, it should still be accepted as an authority since the purpose is served thereby. Moreover according to Parāśara it is not necessary that pratijñā, hetu and udāharana should appear in that order itself. The point is that vyāpti must be clearly comprehended. All other considerations are secondary. Thus if a reliable person (āpta) tells someone dhūmavān agnimāneva (that which has smoke certainly possesses fire), there is no need at all for the drīḍānta.
The subsequent passage (13) does not really constitute a quotation from the *Tattvaratnakara*. It is a recapitulation by Vedānta Deśika of a certain discussion found in the *Tattvaratnakara*. According to Parāśara, *Chala* (dialectic quibbling) and *Jāti* (unavailing objection) do not really contribute to the exclusive victory of a debater whoever his rival may be. They may however help one to make the rival “unarmed” and thus lead to one’s success. They may also help to safeguard the truth of some point (*tattva*).

The next fragment (14) points out that strictly speaking *Jāti*-s (unavailing objections) are innumerable. Still in the *Nyāyasāstra* they are enumerated as twentyfour in number. This is just for the purpose of demonstration (*pradarśana*) and is no final verdict on their number. In fact the *Nyāyasūtra* - *anyadanyasmat...* etc. (2.2.32) points to this fact.

Fragment (15) discusses the *hetvābhāsa*-s (fallacious reasons). While the *Nyāyasūtra*, I.2.45 mentions *savayahicāra*, *viruddha*, *prakaraṇasama*, *sādhyasama* and *ātītakāla* as the five *hetavābhāsa*-s, those listed in the *Tattvaratnakara*, namely *siddhi*, *aprasiddhi*, *bādhyatva*, *viruddhatva* and *aphalatva* seem to be entirely different from them. Vedānta Deśika tries to answer this apparent contradiction in his *Nyāyaparīśuddhi*. According to Parāśara an inference becomes fallacious (*ābhāsa*) when some of the *ān̄ga*-s pertaining to its *pākṣa* (subject), *hetu* (reason) and *dr̥ṣṭānta* (example) fall short of the required number necessary to make an inference full-fledged. When the *pākṣa* falls short of its *ān̄ga*-s we have the five *ābhāsa*-s of *pratijñā*, such as *siddhi* *aprasiddhi*, etc., mentioned above. To be clear, if the probandum is already proved, we have *siddha*-sādhyatā. If it is not known already, the fallacy of *aprasiddha*-sādhyatā arises. If it is stultified we have
bādhita-sādhyatā. If there is contradiction we have viruddha as a defect. If the sādhyā is not desired or intended we have aphalatva.

In what may be called a Doxography we find Vedānta Deśika mentioning that the Tattvaratnakara enters into a very detailed discussion and subdivision of the features such as aprasiddhi, bādhyaatva, viruddhatva, etc. Reverting again to the Tattvaratnakara quotation we find that it mentions some general defects of the sādhana (hetu) such as avācaka (‘that which is unworthy of statement’) sandidgā (‘that which is doubted’) and aśīla (‘that which is vulgar). All these are excluded in a definition (lakṣaṇa) by the word pakṣadharma itself (subject - adjunctness). So all these are fallacies of pratijñā. Parāśara also makes a ten-fold classification of the reason from the view-point of fallacies. They are asiddha, anadhyayasita, viruddha, viśeṣaṇaviruddha, anāikāntika, aprayojaka, bādhya, viruddha-s avyābhicārin, prakaraṇasama and siddhasādhana. He makes a further classification of a siddha into nine varieties.

Summing up the above discussion Parāśara points out that deficiency in the number of avayava constituting the definition is what is responsible for the fallacious character of anumāna. To be more precise, the fallacy of an inference consists in the absence or deficiency of vyāpyatva (‘being pervaded’) or pakṣadharma (‘subject-adjunctness’).

The 16th fragment refers to the general view that all valid means of knowledge (pramāṇa) are at the mercy (anugrāhya) of tarka (‘indirect argument or reductio ad absurdum). This, however, is not acceptable to Parāśara, because the above claim that the validity of all anumāna will have to be decided by tarka alone leads to anavasthā (infinite regress). As a matter of fact all cognitions do not require tarka at all to gain their validity. Tarka
just helps to ward off any doubt that may arise out of a contradiction (virodha) or a non-cognition (abodha). By itself it doesn’t confer validity on any inference.

The next quotation (17) is perhaps the longest one we have from the Tattvaratnakara. It tries to prove that arthāpatti (presumption) can be included in inference (anumāna) itself. It also tries to show the relative position of tarka by quoting several views which show its independent character. But the final opinion expressed by Parāśara is that tarka cannot be a separate means of knowledge like anumāna.

Arthāpatti (presumption) is only a type of inference. The sentence -  satavārṣajīvī devadattaḥ gṛhe nāsti (‘Devadatta who has a life-span of hundred years is not in his house’) shows that pratyakṣa (perception) reveals the absence of Devadatta from his house. But there is another pramāṇa (the Jyotiṣaśāstra) implied in the expression satavārṣajīvī which becomes niravakāsa (‘without any scope for application’). Pratyakṣa is the sāvakāsa-pramāṇa (‘with a wide scope’) here. According to the interpretative rule niravakāśa vidhayah sāvakāśān viddhin bādhante (‘rules which have no scope at all for their application stultify those rules which have scope for application’) the knowledge that Devadatta lives for hundred years makes us infer that he must be alive somewhere. This principle, when applied to the Vedic rites is known as sāmānya-viśeśa nyāya (‘the rule of the general and special’). In the sentence pīno devadattaḥ divā na bhūtikte (‘the plumpy Devadatta does not eat during daytime’), the implication is that he eats at night. Here we supply the words necessary to make the sense significant and complete. If the stress is on his not eating the food during daytime this sentence becomes an instance of śrutārthāpatti (‘presumption from what is heard’).
When a particular means of knowledge does not have its object ‘fully’ and clearly established it cannot be treated as independent at least in so far as the “partially unknown” portion is concerned. It is then that the question of incompatibility arises which works as the linga. Then the argument takes the form of tarka (‘indirect reasoning’) and becomes an accessory of anumāna itself.

Tarka cannot independently prove the existence of mind but still it can become a substantiating factor to the āgama texts which declare the existence of mind (even in the case ofĪśvara). Parāśara then quotes passages like manasaitān kāmān paśyan ramate, mano’ sya divyam caksuḥ and etasmāt āyate prāṇaḥ manaḥ sarvendriyāṇi ca in support of this view.

Vedānta Deśika then quotes some passages from the Tattvaratnākara which seem to state that tarka is not a separate pramāṇa in one place and that it is an independent pramāṇa in another place. Ultimately however, this contradiction is resolved by saying that tarka was mentioned as a separate pramāṇa in a few places only by virtue of its having a separate purpose and a separate form. This, therefore, does not prove the independent character of tarka.

The following fragment (18) speaks of the denotative power of words. The mutual connection between a word (śabda) and its meaning (artha) is called abhidhā and this is two-fold as primary (mukhya) and secondary (jaghanya). When a person uses a word, the meaning which is conveyed purely by its denotative power is called “primary”. If through this primary meaning we arrive at another meaning it is “secondary”.

The subsequent quotation (19) concerns itself with an important concept of the real import of words in a sentence and their mutual connection. According to
the Prabhakara-s the words in a sentence themselves have no meaning but they obtain it only through a syntactical combination (anvitabhidhana) (theory of signification in syntactical combination). The Bhattacharyya-s, however, admit that words possess a meaning independently of such a combination and hence this theory is known as abhihitavaya (‘the theory of the combination of significant terms’). In the Viśiṣṭadvaita system, the acārya-s like Yāmuna, Parāśara and Vedānta Deśika accept the Anvitabhidhana-theory. Vedānta Deśika quotes several passages from Rāmānuja’s works which seem to support the Abhihitavaya-theory and ultimately reconciles them with the prevailing view. The two verses of the Tattvaratnakara quoted here are in full support of the Anvitabhidhana-theory. In one of these Parāśara refers to Yāmunācārya himself as an advocate of this view. Parāśara further points that the theory of abhihitavaya is riddled with the problem of viparyaya (contradiction).

The next fragment (20) is in the form of a verse in the Mālini metre beginning with Upaniṣadī tu... which is prefaced by Vedānta Deśika thus: “āhuścaivam abhiyuktāḥ”. Then he quotes a few lines from Parāśara’s Śrīraṅgaraṣṭava (2.14) and then says anyatra ca. He has not specifically stated that the verse ‘upaniṣadī tu...’ etc., is from the Tattvaratnakara. The verse in question runs thus: “In all the Upaniṣad-s, Lord Viṣṇu who is an abode of innumerable perfections devoid of all defects, is declared as the Supreme Being. The Pāñcarātra texts are His own compositions (upajña). Even the Veda therefore cannot become an alternative to these texts. This has clearly been stated by Yāmuna and Rāmānuja.”

The fragment (21) that follows states that Mīmāṃsā as a śāstra deals with karma (action), devatā (deities) and Brahman (the Supreme Being) and that Jaimini,
Kāṣākṛtsna and Bādarāyaṇa composed Sūtra-s on these three topics respectively. Rāmānuja, and following him Vedānta Deśika maintain that the entire Mīmāṁsā, that is, the Pūrva and the Uttara portion put together form a single śāstra (aika-śāstrya).

The next fragment (22) enumerates the topics that are dealt with in the Pūrvāṁśāṁśāśṛtra-s of Jaimini. They are (1) Dharma (Veda-s as the authority on dharma), (2) Mānabheda (mutual difference among the rites), (3) Aṅga (the relationship between the principal and subsidiary rites), (4) Prayuktī (the relation between the prayojya and prayojaka-rites), (5) Krama (the sequence to be followed in performing certain rites), (6) Kṛtr (same as adhikāra) (those who are qualified to perform these rites), (7) Atideśa (application or supplying the aṅga-s of one rite to other rites), (8) Viśeṣa (a special treatment of the atideśa-s mentioned above), (9) Uṣha (altering certain passages in accordance with the context), (10) Bādha (the problem of stultification or contradiction among the rites), (11) Tantra (a contrivance or means which leads to two or more results) and (12) Prasaktī (same as prasaṅga, contingency).

The subsequent quotation (23) points out the status of smṛti (recollection). Since smṛti depends upon an object that has already been experienced, whatever definition applies to anubhava will also apply to smṛti. So there is no fear of over-pervasion (ativyāptī) of the definition of anubhava to cases of smṛti. In fact without ascertaining the scope of a definition in terms of its lakṣya (object) and alakṣya (that which is other than its object) how can one ever find fault with it? All mental activities in our day-to-day life have a precise demarcation of what is to be realised and what is not to be realised by such an activity, says Parāśara.
Fragment (24) discusses the role of *ceṣṭita* (*ceṣṭā*) (gesticulation as a means of communication of ideas). Parāśara points out that if a *ceṣṭā* (gesture) is confined to imparting instruction or conveying an idea to one person by another person, it may be treated as *sābdha* (verbal in character). Even in cases where there is no such restriction of gesticulation, it can still convey an idea with the help of glances. As such it need not be taken as a separate means of knowledge. Vedānta Deśika opines that *ceṣṭā* can be traced to *anumāna* itself.\(^{138}\)

The role of *Pratibhā* (revelation) is also discussed by Parāśara. Some argue that it can be accepted as a separate means of knowledge since it can cognise things without any reference to external objects. This *pratibhā* arises in some special persons through a remarkable degree of concentration and it can reveal things of past, present and future. In reply Parāśara states that though all this is true it is still difficult for us to identify the different periods of time (*kālabheda*) which become the objects of such a revelation. The actual *phala* (result or utility) of *pratibhā* will come into picture only when its validity is ascertained. But since the sense of validity arises from other means, critics (*parīkṣakāḥ*) normally do not consider *pratibhā* as a separate *pramāṇa*. Moreover this *pratibhā* leads to realisation of truth only in the case of highly pious persons. Patañjai\(^{139}\) uses the word *Pratibhā* only with reference to such an extra-ordinary yogic vision. So it does not pertain to the normal realm of validity.

The next fragment (25) speaks of the sense-organs as six in number including mind (*manas*) which is the inner organ.

Fragment 26 names the sense-organs which are the seats or the substrate of qualities. These are: ears, body
(skin), eyes, tongue and nose (with reference to śabda (sound), sparśa (touch), rūpa (colour), rasa (taste) and gandha (smell). Vedanta Deśika observes that this statement of Parāśara represents the popular view, since according to the Nyāyatattva of Nāthamuni serpents can hear through their eyes alone.\textsuperscript{140}

The following fragment (27) points out that when a flame of lamp is burning continuously one can notice, on a very minute observation that there is in fact a very subtle difference between one flame and another flame on one and the same wick.

The discussion as understood from the Nyāyasiddhāṇjana is concerning the momentariness (kṣanikatva) of a flame burning on a wick. The flame that is produced by one molecule of oil and a bit of the wick differs from the flame produced by another molecule of oil and a bit of the wick, still one does not cognise the difference between them because of their identical forms. Even if one tries to recognise them as one (pratyabhijñā) it is fallacious, being based on bhrama. The Tattvaratnākara says that even in such a case, on a close observation one can still notice a flame ending up and giving rise to a fresh flame. This is similar to the observation of subtle streams of water distinguishable in a river and the like.

Fragment 28 begins with a reference to tamas which is said to bind the beings when they prove unfaithful to Hari, and which is said to release them when they surrender to Him. So an investigation into its nature is quite relevant. The knowledge that tamas binds persons will lead to a subsequent effort to get released from it. Many wise men entertain different views regarding the nature, origination and the means of knowing tamas.
The word *tamas* here means *Prakṛti* (primordial matter). On the authority of Vedānta Deśika we understand that there is a break in the *Tattvaratnakara*-text at this point. The subsequent portion *atra ālokābhāvah...*, etc., discusses actually *andhakāra* (darkness) which is also known as *tamas*. According to the Vaiśeṣika-s darkness is the ‘absence of light’. According to the Prabhākara-s it is the simple recollection (*smaṛaṇa*) of a blue (dark) colour. The Bhaṭṭa-s think of it to be a different substance whereas those who know the truth declare it to be *pradhāna* itself. In the verse that follows Parāśara notes that *tamas* is same as *māyā*, the divine power of the Lord, which possesses three qualities and which exists in the gross and subtle forms. It is said to be both external and internal.

Vedānta Deśika observes that from these fragments we can conclude that Parāśara discussed the nature of *Prakṛti* (primordial matter) alone but not *andhakāra* (darkness) although a reference has been made to it by quoting the view of Vaiśeṣika-s and others.

The next fragment (29) is another long passage which establishes the self-luminosity (*svayamprakāśatva*) of knowledge. In the first three verses Parāśara sums up the reasons supporting this view and what follows it is an explanation of this idea. Knowledge of an object is directly acquired but not inferred through features like ‘manifestedness’ (*prākatya*). Nor can it be known through ‘*mānasapratyakṣa*’ (mental cognition). Since no other means can prove the existence of *jñāna* other than itself, it has to be admitted as self-luminous. Once knowledge arises we have the subsequent cognition “I know this”. In between the state of cognition and the subsequent verbal usage there is neither an inference nor mental cognition, for then the process of knowing would be delayed. Further, once the knowledge arises there is no
verbal statement as ‘I do not know’. That means when knowledge arises, it immediately shines forth to the self of the person concerned. Further, in stream-cognitions (dhārāvāhika-jñāna) only one object is perceived continuously. No second knowledge arises in the middle. If such a feature is accepted, there will not be stream-cognition at all. This also proves knowledge to be self-manifest. If the stream-cognition is not admitted to be self-luminous it is imperative that it gets destroyed. Then there will not be any subsequent recollection. Further, according to Parāśara, the anvaya-vyatirekīn type of inference, arthāpatti (presumption), yukti (supporting argument) and vacana (scriptures) prove jñāna to be self-luminous.

The prose passage that follows, according to Vedānta Deśika is Parāśara’s own explanation of what he stated briefly in verse-form: “The knowledge under discussion does not stand in need of anything that belongs to the same kind (sajātiya) as itself, for purposes of cognizing the objects that fall within its range. The examples given are artha (an object), indriya (sense-organ) and dīpa (lamp). These things have their own role to play in producing the knowledge of say, a pot. The pot, for its cognition, does not stand in need of another pot. It requires a vijātiya (dissimilar) entity, namely an eye, for that purpose. The eye again does not require another eye which is sajātiya (homogeneous) with it but requires a lamp. The lamp does not require another lamp because it is self-luminous. Likewise knowledge does not require another knowledge for its manifestation because it is self-luminous. The eye no doubt depends on the light, which according to the Naiyāyika-s is of the same stuff as the eye, being taijasa in nature. But according to the Viśiṣṭadvaitin-s the eye is an indriya produced from ahamkāra and hence it is dissimilar to light. Therefore, there is no fear of anaikāntya or vyabhicāra here.
An inferential statement may be made here: “The latent impressions (samśkāra-s) which are responsible for the recollection of knowledge do not require the experience (anubhava) of the jñāna which is produced in a self because they are samśkāra-s like any other samśkāra.” This needs a clarification. All the samśkāra-s do not require the experience of the knowledge which pertains to a soul. Thus when we remember a pot, the ghaṭa-samśkāra just needs the experience of the viṣaya (pot) only as seen by a person. It does not require the experience of the jñāna itself pertaining to that object. In other words jñāna by itself produces samśkāra-s regarding certain objects and these samśkāra-s in their turn just require the experience of the object only but not of the knowledge itself. Thus it can be proved that knowledge is svayamprakāśa (self-luminous) and svānubhavarūpa (of the form of the experience concerning its object). In other words, we do not say, “I have the samskāra of ghaṭa-jñāna and hence I remember ghaṭa”. We simply remember the ghaṭa.

Another inference is also made by Parāśara: “The impressions concerning an object (viṣaya-samskāra) arise simultaneously along with the impressions of knowledge (jñāna-samskāra) since the former are the impressions pertaining to an object. The samskāra of the object produced here and the samskāra regarding the knowledge of that object both come into being at one and the same time. This means that knowledge when it grasps an object produces a samskāra of that object also. In addition it produces a samskāra regarding its own essential nature. All this goes to prove that knowledge is self-existent and self-luminous.

A prima facie view is also given here: “Samskāra-s concerning an object (viṣaya) and knowledge (jñāna) can
be said to arise at one and the same time only when the knowledge that arises concerns both viṣaya and jñāna. Even the critic who claims knowledge to be self-manifest must accept that knowledge pertains to a viṣaya such as a pot only, but not to jñāna itself. That being the case how can two kinds of saṁskāra (jñāna-saṁskāra and viṣayasaṁskāra) arise simultaneously’’? This is answered by Parāśara in the following manner: ‘It is simple to accept that knowledge, as it rises, produces both viṣayasaṁskāra and jñānasamskāra. It is cumbersome to state that these saṁskāra-s are produced by knowledge which has both these saṁskāra-s as its object’.

Knowledge cannot be manifested by any other means other than by itself, for it will then become similar to pot and other objects. Parāśara quotes scriptural passages like atrāyam puruṣah svayamjyotir bhavati,\textsuperscript{142} atmaivaśya jyotiḥ\textsuperscript{143} and svena jyotiṣā āste.\textsuperscript{144} These point to the self-luminous character of the self, which is synonymous with the term jñāna. The Gītā verse yathā prakāśayatyekah (13-33) is quoted to show that even as the Sun and his effulgence are self-luminous, the soul and its knowledge are also self-manifest.

In the next fragment (30) Parāśara refutes the view of the Bhāṭṭa-s that knowledge is realised through mānasa pratyakṣa. If it is so, we should have a cognition of the mānasa pratyakṣa itself and there is nothing standing in our way of cognising the mānasa pratyakṣa. But it is not so. On the strength of the non-apprehension of this mental cognition we can conclude that mānasa pratyakṣa does not cognise knowledge. Since knowledge is self-manifest there is no need for mānasa pratyakṣa itself. If mānasa pratyakṣa is still posited, there will be
the defect of *anavasthā*. Further the Naiyāyika-s advance two reasons in support of the theory of *mānasa pratyakṣa*. (1) That knowledge is a special attribute of the self while being momentary (*kṣaṇika*) and (2) Being a special attribute of the self, it is fit to be experienced (*yogya*). But these two reasons are vitiated by the fallacies of *asiddhi* and *vyabhicāra* (for the Viśiṣṭādvaitins *jñāna* is not momentary). It cannot be grasped by mind also. Therefore the desired qualities of *kṣaṇikatva* (momentariness) and *yogyatva* (fitness) being absent in *jñāna*, there is the defect of *asiddhi*. The defect of *vyabhicāra* also accrues from the viewpoint of the merit (*dharma*) arising out of expiatory rites (*prāyaścitta*). When one performs the *prāyaścitta* rite the merit that is produced destroys the sin of that person and in the very next moment it gets dissolved. So this *dharma* arising out of *prāyaścitta* is also momentary and is special attribute to the self. Since this is not cognized by *mānasapratyakṣa* there is the defect of *vyabhicāra*. Therefore, the two reasons cannot prove the desired end. Thus due to the absence of a favourable proof and due to the presence of the stultifying proof, knowledge can never be the object of mental perception. Therefore, it is *svatassiddha* (self-existent that is, self-luminous). Parāśara also remarks that this is the method adopted in the *Samvitsiddhi* (of Yāmuna).

Fragment 31 comprises a single sentence. It is in refutation of the Advaitic theory that *pratyakṣa* cognises the "bare existence" or "being" (*sanmātra*) of an entity. Parāśara states that in the transmigratory state the knowledge of an individual is no doubt contracted; still it is to be accepted that his knowledge will be lasting as long as the sense-organ is in contact with an object.
The next fragment (32) points out that the grammarians have their own sphere of activity clearly marked out for them. They should explain the formation of words with the help of the stem (prakṛti), the suffix (pratyaya) and intonation (svara) according to the usages found in literature. The idea is that they need not enter into discussions of philosophical character.\textsuperscript{145}

Fragment 33 is quoted by Vedānta Deśika in support of the view that sabda (sound) is the characteristic feature of gagana (ether). The expression "gagana-guṇa-sabda" is what is relevant in this context.

The subsequent quotation (34), we understand, from the Nyāyasiddhāṅjana, is from the view-point of the Vaiśeṣika school but not from that of the siddhānta. A streak of fire when it consumes, say fuel, cannot itself produce a subsequent form of the object. When a streak of fire comes into contact with an object the process of pāka (cooking or baking) sets in. Here, the contact fire has with one portion of the object is different from the contact fire has with another portion of the object.\textsuperscript{146}

The next passage (35) according to Vedānta Deśika, is found in a context where Parāśara proves the atomicity (anutva) of mind. This passage apparently refutes the contact which subsists between all-pervasive substances (vibhu) which is known as aja-samyoga (literally "contact which is not-yet-born"). Deśika notes that this must be from the viewpoint of the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools because there alone the contact between vibhu-substances is denied. According to Viśiṣṭadvaita, kāla (Time) is all-pervasive and also an object of perception. Its contact with another all-pervasive entity, namelyĪśvara is also accepted. (Only then the concept of Time being the body ofĪśvara becomes meaningful). The Tattvaratnākara
passage proceeds as follows: "There is nothing inconsistent even if we do not accept the contact between two all-pervasive substances. What is the means of knowledge which cognizes the contact of a pillar, etc., with an all pervasive substance like ether, etc? It cannot be perception because in this conjunction involving two things, we have only one object perceptible. Even inference cannot be the proof of this contact because for it both the objects must be finite. The qualities of paratva (remoteness) and aparatva (proximity), the movement of the body (involving its contact with the soul), the modifications that take place in the body and the upward burning of fire can all be accounted for only by accepting an asamavāyikāraṇa (non-inherent cause) in the form of the "conjunction with soul" (ātma-samyoga) which itself is associated with adṛṣṭa (unseen merit).

Fragment 36 shows that saṃkhya (number) is known only in the second moment of the perception of an object and that it is related with its correlate through samavāya (inherence). Vedānta Deśika observes that Viśiṣṭādvaita does not accept saṃkhya as a separate category. Since the section of the Tattvaratnākara where the prameya is dealt with is lost, it is difficult to say if this view is Parāśara’s own or not.

The next fragment (37) states that bheda (difference) need not be posited as a separate quality. When dravya (substance), jāti (generality), guṇa (quality) and karman (activity) are once recognised as existent, we can, through their specific features (dharma), account for knowledge, verbal usage, action, etc. A new quality called bheda need not be accepted as subsisting between one object and another. This is why prthaktva (separateness), viśeṣa (particularity), etc., accepted by the Vaiśeṣika-s are hereby
refuted. Parāśara then says: “When we see two distinct colours like blue and white we notice that they also distinguish the substances qualified by them. \(Dvītva\) (two-ness), \(prthaktva\) (separateness) and such other features depend upon the difference of objects; the difference of objects in turn depends upon \(dvītva\), \(prthaktva\), etc. Thus there is the defect called \(ātmāśraya\) or \(ananyāśraya\). Those who subscribe to this view (those who follow the Vaiśeṣika theory) must therefore be afraid of such contingency. But we who accept that the perceived blue colour itself constitutes the difference of an object (from others), have no such fear.”

Fragment 38 gives some broad definitions of terms like \(jāti\), \(guna\), \(kriyā\) and \(dravya\). At the outset the word \(artha\) (entity) is defined as that which is contacted by senses and which is thus made the object of cognition. These are fourfold: \(dravya\), \(jāti\), \(guna\) and \(karman\). It is to be noted here that \(karman\) is mentioned separately from \(guna\). Later on we find the following statement: “If we accept that \(sāmānya\) (generality) is present in \(jāti\), \(guna\) and \(karman\), the relation between them becomes \(samyuktasamaveta-samavāya\). (The contact between the senses and objects is \(samyoga\): and the contact between \(jāti\), \(guna\) and \(karman\) with the objects is \(samavāya\) and the relation of \(sāmānya\) with them is \(samavāya\)). Here again \(karman\) is spoken of separately. Vedānta Deśīka notes that these passages do not prove that the contact with \(karman\) is something different from \(guna\). Parāśara first included \(sāmānya\) (generality) in the configuration (\(samsthāna\)) of the objects. But here he seems to treat it as a separate feature. Likewise \(karman\) which is earlier shown as part of \(samyoga\) is spoken of here as different from it. The conclusion is that one cannot treat these observations on \(karman\) and \(sāmānya\) as final.
The subsequent sentences of this quotation attempt a very broad definition for jāti, guṇa etc. "Jāti is an internal (antaraṅga) feature of a particular substance (which is the dharmīn). That special, distinct and already existent feature which is brought into being by this jāti is called guṇa. If such a distinct feature is to be created afresh (sādhyā) it is called kriyā. That which is the substratum of all these that is, jāti, guṇa and kriyā is known as dravya (substance). A very close examination of these definitions will be undertaken in the prameya-section." This section, however is lost.

Fragment 39 is a discussion on sādhṛṣya (similarity) and jāti (universal). Here again because of the non-availability of the prameya section of the Tattvaratnākara it is not possible to know the intended idea of Parāśara. According to this school, sādhṛṣya (similarity) is not something different from the samsthāna or ākriti of the things involved. The passage may be translated as follows: "Many think that sādhṛṣya (similarity between two or more objects) consists in the sameness of a majority of parts constituting those objects. Since this is different topic for discussion it will be dealt with in the section on prameya."

In the subsequent portion of this quotation we find the following discussion: "A question may be raised: dravyatva (substance-ness), prthivītva (being a portion of earth), śuklatva (whiteness) and pākatva (being a pāka - cooking or baking) must be accepted as universals (sāmānya) of dravya, prthivī, śukla and pāka respectively. If such a generality is not accepted as is done by the Vaiśeṣika-s, how can we account for the usage of the word "one" (eka) with reference to objects that have such a generality? Likewise, santati (sequence), avasthā (condition), etc., also cannot be referred to by a single
word if there were no unitary 

prayojaka (criterion). Parāśara replies that this is a question to be answered by the critic also. All the people in the world use the word sarva (everything) and think that all the things under the sun can be conveyed by it. Then will the Vaiśeṣika accept sarvatva (all-ness) as a generality pertaining to all things? If he is not prepared to accept, then it means that jāti (genus) concerning individuals cannot be conveyed through a single word.”

In the next verse and the following sentence Parāśara makes this observation: “All objects belonging to the same category can be referred to by a single expression because the objects thus conveyed have a uniform nature or form. Thus when we say ‘moon’ or ‘sun’ the meaning conveyed is that there is ‘one moon’ and ‘one sun’ but not many. Therefore the vācyārtha (the expressed object) becomes one, because it is unitary. When we utter the word ghaṭa (pot), and pāṭa (a piece of cloth) the actual individual pots and piece of cloth are no doubt innumerable but still they all share a common feature namely ghaṭatva (potness) and pāṭatva (clothiness) by reason of which they are referred to as a pot and a cloth.” This explanation is given for the sake of those who accept jāti as a distinct category. But for those who do not accept jāti as something different from the configuration of the object itself the following explanation is offered: “In the pots there is a single upādhi (limiting adjunct), namely, the configuration (samsthāna) by which all the individual pots can be referred to by a single word ‘pot’. So even if one does not accept jāti, at least an upādhi in the form of ‘configuration’ has to be accepted through which all the individual (vyakti) can be referred to through a single expression. It may again be asked as to how such a
unitary reference can be made in as much as these so-called upādh-īs (or samśṭhāna-s) keep changing. The answer is that in those configuration we can notice a ‘similarity’ (sādṛśya) or non-cognition of difference (bheda-graha), on these two grounds, we can still consider those samśṭhāna-s as one and all the individuals possessing them can be connotated by a single word.”

Fragment 40 also defines jāti and guṇa (cf: fragment 38). When the sense-organ contacts an object, what is cognized first as the very animating principle (as an indispensable feature) of that object is jāti (genus). What is cognized subsequently as a distinguishing characteristic in an object thus ‘animated’ by jāti is known as a guṇa.

The subsequent quotation is found in the Seṣvaramīmāṁsā (under Ch.I. section 1) of Vedānta Deśika. According to this Parāśara showed in the section on śabda (forming part of Tattvaratnākara) that sentences forming part of the Vedic literature gain their validity only on the ground of their impersonal character (apauruṣeyatva) although all other śabda-s are also valid in general way through śāstra like Mīmāṁsā and Nyāya.

The last fragment (42) is not an actual quotation from the Tattvaratnākara. Vedānta Deśika mentions merely the author of Tattvaratnākara (tattvaratnākara kāraiḥ) in support of his interpretation of the word vidhi found in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā (1.2.7). According to him the word vidhi means sāsana (commandment) which is same as inducement (preśaṇam). “This is the real connotation of the word vidhi in relation to the Veda-s. Others also subscribe to this view. The author of the Tattvaratnākara has also stated so,” says Vedānta Deśika.
TIRUMAṆJANAKAVI-S

As already mentioned in the second chapter of this book, Parāśara composed stray verses in connection with the *Tirumajjana* -sacred ablution - (*TirumaṆjana* in Tamil) given to the icon of Lord Raṅganātha. 28 verses are now available in print.¹⁴⁷ These verses have a scholarly and lucid interpretation by Parāśara himself in the *manipravāla* style and all of them with his commentary have been published recently.¹⁴⁸ It is quite possible that more verses were composed by Parāśara in the same context. It is even said that some of the descendants of Parāśara still possess those extra verses with them.¹⁴⁹

The first of these stray verses is in the form of an interesting dialogue between the Lord and man. This verse is read when the icon of the Lord is given the ceremonial bath, that is, when, to use the expression of the poet himself, the Lord appears as a *mrgyamadhyastha* (‘one who is in search of a referee’).

Noticing the impunity and stubbornness of the *jīva* who thinks of himself as independent, the Lord points out that the *jīva*—on the authority of *śruti*-s, *Gītā* and men of wisdom,—always belongs to the Supreme. But the *jīva* enters into a debate with the Lord. The idol of the Lord, wet due to the *abhiseka* appears to our poet as though the Lord, to prove His claim on the individual soul, is taking an oath wearing wet clothes and a garland of the basil (*Tulasī*) leaves. This practice is known as *divya* in the *Smṛti*-texts.¹⁵⁰ So Parāśara feels that in this particular context the Lord appears to be doing *jala-divya* as well as *Tulasī-divya*. The dialogue between the Lord and the *jīva* may be presented as follows:
God (G) : You are mine (you belong to me).

Man (M) : I belong to myself.

G : (No) How is it possible?

M : How about your own claim?

G : This is on the authority of the Vedas.

M : My statement is based on my experience which is beginningless in nature.

G : But this is repudiated.

M : Where and by whom is it repudiated?

G : By me, clearly, in the Gītā.

M : Who is the witness?

G : A man of wisdom.

M : Well, then, he is partial to you.

It is a stroke of Parāśara's genius that has presented this beautiful conversation between God and man, of whom the God is ever eager and ready to establish the śeṣa-śeṣi relation between Himself and the rest of the creation.

In the second verse the poet fancies the Lord to be a river (nada), employing double entendre. A river is approached by people for activities (anuvṛttī) such as bathing, drinking etc. The Lord also is approached by His devotees in several ways (anuvṛttī) such as meditation, loving devotion, worship and service. A river again is resorted to by royal swans, a host of other birds and it shines beautifully with lotuses. The Lord is served by great kings and is magnificent with His abja (conch). The river is swept over by fragrant breeze (sumarudgana). The Lord is waited upon by many celestials (sumarudgana).
In verses 3 and 6 Lord Rāganātha is identified with a suradruma (the celestial desire-yielding tree). Here again Parāśara employs pun. The tree has several broad branches (śākhā; it confers the desired boons on those who approach it; it can be resorted to only by the celestials (tridaśa). It is beautiful with its leaves (suparna) and flowers (sumanas). It is resorted to by swans and such others birds (hamsādisaddvija). The Lord is also the purport of several Vedic recensions (śākhā-s), and He is ready to confer all boons on those who surrender to Him; He is the object of enjoyment for only the nityasūri-s (tridaśa-s). He is beautiful with His Gāruḍa vehicle (suparna) and is surrounded by the devotees (sumana-s). He is served by the twice-born and the greatest saints (harīsa).

In another verse (śl. 4) we find Lord Rāgarāja identified with an ocean (jalanidhi). The ocean is dark green in colour like the marakata gems and has its body dazzling with a number of pearls and such other precious stones. It has its own aroma. It is the abode of a variety of aquatic beings, including the giant fish (mīna). Lord Raṅgarāja has a number of ornaments made of marakata and brilliant pearl-garlands. His body emits wonderful fragrance. He has created a variety of beings and assumed the form of a giant fish (mīna).

The Lord is then compared to the Veda which is endless (ananta), of the nature of nectar (amṛta-immortality) and contains everything (siddhasarvārtha) in itself. It has positive guidelines regarding the nature of the self. It confers what all one desires by its mere recitation (chanting). Lord Raṅganātha too has these features. He is of the form of immortality and infinity (amṛta and ananta). He has created the entire universe and has set standards for everything (through the Śruti
and Śrī Parāśara Bhatta and controls everything as their innermost self. The real nature of His self is known only to Himself. He blesses all when propitiated through the kīrtana-s (verse 6).

In verse 7 the Lord is identified with the beautiful (śrīmān) spring season (vasanta) which puts forth many a flower in its advent and which adorns the aśoka tree, with beautiful buds (kalikālaṅkṛta), making it attractive to bees (brahmara-hita). It is full of bliss caused by the gentle and pleasant touch of breeze (pavanaja-mahānanda). The Lord is also glorious with Śrī (śrīmān), rendering even this Kaliyuga a Kṛtayuga (kalikālaṅkṛta). He is free from misery (aśoka) and dispelling all-illusion (bhrama-rahita). Lord Raṅganātha is full of the bliss of embracing Hanumān (pavanaja-mahānanda).

Lord Raṅgarāja is conceived of as the moon in the next verse. But this is a moon with a difference. The moon normally makes the lilies bloom only at night; he is not full (pūrna) throughout; he cannot be seen in the daytime. He is full of defects and difficulties (upaplava). But this moon, namely, Lord Raṅganātha makes the Kumuda (the earth) bloom always (aniśam). He is always full (pūrna) and can be seen both day and night and is free from all defects (verse 8).

During the constellation of śrāvana which is very auspicious for Viṣṇu, Lord Raṅganātha is given a sacred bath in the early morning, being accompanied by many a twice-born (sārdham-dvijaḥ). This according to the poet, indicates that the Lord is putting into practice what He Himself has commanded others to do through the śruti and smṛti-texts (śl. 9).

In another metaphor Lord Raṅgarāja is identified with
a swan, who has a beautiful flapping up of the wings (pakṣapāta); it resorts to waters (bhuvana) and abides in the mānasa-lake (during the rainy season); it also stays in lotuses. The Lord for His part, is ‘partial’ to the virtuous (satpakṣapāta); He is the supporter of the universe (bhuvana) and is the abode of Padmā (His consort). He always abides in the hearts of the virtuous (sanmānasa) (śl. 10).

In another poetic fancy (śl. 11) the poet describes the garland of lotuses adorning the broad chest of the Lord as a series of brilliant rays emanating from the gem-studded anklets of the lotus-feet of Lakṣmī who moves about freely thereon.

The Lord is again compared to an ocean having many a precious gem (maṇivara-ruci-vāhī), the fish inside and also the white conch. The ocean never transgresses the limit (velā) and contains all the waters in himself (bhuvanabhāra). Lord Raṅganātha is bedecked by a number of jewels and He too has the matsya (as his form in the Matsya-incarnation). He bears the white conch, supports the universe (bhuvanabhāra) and does not waste time (velā) (that is, delay) in saving His devotees (śl. 12).

In verses 13 and 14 the Lord is likened to the celestial mountain (Mount Meru). The mountain by its vast slopes covers all the directions (aśāpūrti). It is famous for its gold (kalyāṇa). It has drunk as it were, the brilliance of the sky (pīta-ambara). It brings joy to all the gods by providing lofty and secure residences for them (svāsthya-utsedha). It is also the place for several animals to live (sattvanivāsa). Lord Raṅganātha fulfils the desires (aśāpūrti) of all by His manifold gestures of magnanimity. He brings in the welfare (kalyāṇa) for all and is fond
of yellow silk (pītāmbara). Because of His great concern for the well-being of the people (svāsthyotsedha). He is a source of great delight for the virtuous; He is the repository of the quality of sattva (serenity).

At the time of ablutions the Lord is also like a confluence of several sacred rivers (sarvatīrtha). In saving His dependants He is quite fast (Vegavati). The marks of saffron on His chest make Him tāmra (copper-red) (that is, the river Tāmraparnī), His shoulders are lofty, beautiful and strong which make him Tungabhadrā. His speech is gentle and affectionate which name Him a 'Narmada' and His beautiful lower lip is red in colour (Śoṇa) which makes Him the river Śoṇā (śl. 15).

The Lord in the sanctum sanctorum is also compared to the Sun dispelling the darkness within. He is red in complexion due to the heavy applications of saffron and is beautiful in the company of Lakṣmī. He has the soft red lotus as the seat. The Sun rises in all glory (udañcitasrīḥ) and is heralded by the red-hued charioteer Aruṇa and stays in gentle red lotus (śl. 16).

In the next verse (śl. 17) the presiding deity of Śrīraṅgam is figuratively spoken of as a cloud. The cloud is known for its lightning, deep rumbles and dark blue colour. It is the remover of heat, being laden with water and it gladdens Cātaka birds and the like. The Lord also has the lightning in the form of Lakṣmī and is the source for nāda (the principle of sound). His bodily complexion is dark as the indrānīla gem and He is also the remover of affliction (santāpa) of His devotees. He is full with waters of compassion and brings joy to the virtuous.

Verse 18 compares the Lord to the Sun. At the auspicious time of darśa (new moon) marked by the
performances of sacrifices, etc., the Lord is given the ablutions. His two consorts Padmā (Śṛī) and Urvī (Bhūmi) are full of joy, and in all directions one can see multitudes of dvija-s (twice-born) up and active. The darkness of the world is dispelled by Him. Even when the Sun rises, darkness is dispelled and beds of lotuses (padma) become full-blown. All the birds (dvija) wake up and fill the directions with their chirping notes.

When the Lord’s chest is applied with turmeric powder (rajanī) after the abhiṣeka, it appears like the complexion of the golden hued consort (Lakṣmī) residing there, that has become visible (śl. 19).

In verse 20, the poet makes what seems to be a non-contextual reference to other schools of thought. He says that the earth has been vitiated by innumerable interpretations (of the scriptures) offered by the non-Vedic schools as also by the so-called orthodox schools with perverted visions. As ill-luck would have it, the world is being consumed by the conflagration of the innumerable, endless and unpardonable offences (aparādha) committed against the Lord Himself. It is under such circumstances that the Śrīvaiśṇava system advocated by Sage Lakṣmaṇa (Śrī Rāmānuja) set in as the rainy season dedicated to remove the terrible (spiritual) drought seizing the earth. The Lord’s grace has started raining copiously, inundating this benign earth.

Verse 21 identifies Lord Raṅgānātha with a bee. Both of them stay in sumanas (in the hearts of good people and flowers); they are both dark in colour like the indranila gem and are pleasing to the eye; they both are popular and all-pervasive (prathita-pracāra) among the sākhā-s (the Vedic recensions and the branches of the trees). Again Raṅgarāja possesses the quality of love
for His consort (smaraguṇa) whereas the bee is set on Manmatha’s bow as its string (smaraguṇa).

The succeeding verse compares the Lord to the moon. The moon is a source of amṛta (nectar). The moon dispels the darkness of the world by its rays and pleases the people who are in love. He has (sixteen) parts (sakala) and is the source of happiness for all. The Lord, in turn, is also the source of immortality (amṛta). He, by His glory dispels the inner darkness (ignorance) and gladdens the ever-liberated beings. He is the abode of all the sixty-four fine arts (sakala) and is a source of happiness for one and all.

The verse that follows, again through the employment of pun, identifies the Lord’s janmāśṭamī marked by the jayanti constellation (characterising Kuṇāvatāra) with the Vedic lore (trayī). The Veda has as its source the tāra (Oṃkāra) which was pronounced by Brahmā (Padmaja) first. It has different ways of chanting the texts like Krama (Kramapātha) in the process of its evolution (avatāra). In the case of the Lord, He manifested (as Śrī Kuṇa) under the Rohini (tāra) constellation which has Brahmā (Padmaja) as its presiding deity. He is also known for His commitment to evolve Himself in a series of avatāra-s (avatārakrama).

In a beautiful anusṭubh verse that follows, Parāśara identifies Raṅgarāja with ‘mahīdhara’ (mountain). The mountain is dark in colour and so also is Raṅgarāja. The Lord Raṅgarāja has a crown (makuṭa). The mountain has slopes (kaṭaka) and is lofty (tūṅga). The mountain is the abode of sattva-s (animals). The Lord is the repository of the quality of serenity and enormous strength (sattva).
In another verse, Lord Raṅganātha who had just had His bath is fancied as having taken the avabhrtasnāna which marks the completion of a sacrificial undertaking (savana). The battle the Lord waged against Rāvana is the savana. Naturally all the details of the battle are worked out in the light of this metaphor. The icchāsakti of the Lord is the patnī (wife) of the sacrificer. The five weapons are the vessels used in the course of the sacrifice. His four arms are the Rtvik-priests. The offsprings or the descendants of Pulastya (Rāvana and others) are the animals sacrificed. Protection of the virtuous is the fruit (rakṣā-phalam).

In verse 26 we find Lord Raṅgarāja identified with the Mandara mountain used by the gods for churning the Ocean. The mountain is seen (used) by gods and rākṣasa-s (demons). It is resorted to by siddha-s, cāraṇa-s and others (who are fond of its slopes). It has seen the production of nectar (amṛta), the most precious of all the things brought out of the ocean. Lord Raṅgarāja is also the object of the glances of the gods and demons. He is also resorted to by siddha-s and cāraṇa-s (who sing His glory) with their hearts full of joy. He is the source of immortality (amṛta).

In another verse, Parāśara in his role as the purohita of Lord Rajgarāja informs Him about the auspicious day time, etc., which is most suitable for Him to unite with His consort Mā (Śrī). The Sun and the Moon are approaching the constellation śravana. The day is Sunday and that is admired by all (sadasī bahumata). The pusya-nakṣatra has also set in. The brilliance of the Lord is like an ocean and the Lord Himself is a bridge by whose help we can cross over to the other shore.

In the last verse of the Tirumaṅjanakavi-s available to us we have a beautiful imagery concerning the upper
cloth of the Lord. The cloth, white like the autumnal cloud, adorns the dark blue chest of Raṅganātha and resembles the celestial Ganges (which is also white) flowing across the sky which is dark blue in colour (like an Indranīla).

It is clear from the above verses that, they are all stray in character (muktaka) and are recited on different occasions, mostly during the ceremony of abhiṣeka done to the Lord. Most of these verses employ the figure of speech Rūpakā (metaphor) based upon Śleṣa (śleṣānuprāṇītārupaka).

COMMENTARY OF TIRUNEDUNTĀΝṬAKA
(stanza 21)

As noted in the previous chapter, Parāśara was a great exponent of the Divyaprābandha and his nirvāha-s on several passages of it are quite well-known in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. Of special importance is his long and learned exposition on a particular verse Maivaṁśanaruṅguṇī (stanza 21) of the celebrated Tiruneduntāṇṭaka of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. Although Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is known to have been a regular exponent of the Divyaprābandha, only this particular stanza has received his written exposition. The reason could have been that he was attracted not only by the poetic charm of the verse but also by the fact that the transcendental character (paratva) and easy accessibility (saubhāya) of the Lord are very beautifully woven into this verse by the mystic poet Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. Also, perhaps, Parāśara is touched by the reference to the bow wielded by the nāyaka described in this verse, which is an unmistakable reference to Śrī Rāma, the celebrated hero of the Rāmāyaṇa, dear to the heart of Parāśara. It is also quite evident that the utterances of Saint Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār
are full with the feelings of nāyikabhāva that shows the deepest love with her lover, unable to bear even a moment’s separation from him. Being a poet himself Parāśara could have naturally been attracted to this particular stanza which gave him ample scope for the delineation of the love-lorn condition of the Ālvār who was also a poet of extra-ordinary merit.

Introducing his commentary Parāśara gives the context in which the speaker (Ālvār or Nāyikā) describes her beloved who approached her. The Nāyikā who is now separated from her beloved, goes to a garden in the outskirts of the town under the pretext of gathering some flowers. The Nāyaka who was also pining due to separation from his lady-love comes to the same place under the pretext of hunting some wild animals. They are thus brought together and after sometime the Nāyaka leaves the scene. The verse under discussion is the Nāyikā’s expression of the experience she had with her beloved. To be more precise, the Nāyikā tells her confidant that the Nāyaka who with dark curly hair dangling on his shoulders, brilliant ear-ornaments illumining those locks of hair and vice-versa, holding the bow as a support, possessed of hands, mouth, eyes and feet resembling red lotuses, stood before her and sprang a surprise as it were. The Nāyikā, knowing fully well that he was afflicted by love for herself, mistook him for a moment though, for the Lord Himself, adding that she was struck with a sense of awe. It is also clear by the way in which the Nāyikā refers to the Nāyaka as wielding the bow and as ‘having come along with another’ that she is identifying herself with Sītā.

In his introduction Parāśara gives a brief resumé of the entire hymn of Tiruneduntāntakam which consists of 30 stanzas. These can be divided into three decades
and each decad according to Parāśara can be studied from seven different points of view, all, of course, forming a mutually connected syntactical whole. Basically, says Parāśara, the first decad may be taken as reflecting the mood of the poet himself, while the second projects the idea of the mother of the Nāyikā, and the third expresses the mood and sentiment of the nāyikā herself. He takes the line maccittāḥ madgataprāṇāḥ bodhayantāḥ parasparam (Gītā X.9a) and explains each decad as expounding the idea conveyed by each of the three expressions respectively contained in this line. Thus the first decad of Tiruneduntāntakam elaborates the idea conveyed by the Gītā expression maccittāḥ; the second decad expatiates the idea of madgataprāṇāḥ and the third decad elaborates the content of bodhayantāḥ parasparam. From another view-point these three decades explain the significance of the mūlamantra, the dvaya and the caramaśloka respectively. On another view, the ideas of bhakti, prapatti and puruṣakāra are the imports of these decades. According to another explanation, these sections also convey the meanings of the sacred syllable, the term nāmas and the term nārāyana, forming part of the mūlamantra. Or even within the praṇava itself the three components a, u and m can be brought out by these three sections. On another count these three sections can be interpreted as the illustrations for the expressions adarśane darśanamātra-kāmāḥ, dṛṣṭvā pariṣvaṅgarasaikalolāḥ and ālingitāyām punarāyatāksyā āśāsmahe vigrahayorabhedam, which constitute a verse of the Śṛṅgāraśataka ( śl. 22) of Bhartṛhari.

What follows then is a detailed account of verse 21 from the several view-points of the third decad. Each and every word of the verse receives the attention of the commentator who is at his best in diving deep into
the fathomless heart of the Ālvar. A few instances may be cited. The dark curly locks of hair of the Nāyaka are taken up for explanation. Their colour is like that of collyrium and they are also fragrant. Those who apply this collyrium to their eyes will be able to visualise everything. In other words the sight of the dark curls acts as the siddhāñjana. These locks touch the shoulders of the Nāyaka and Parāśara explains that the Nāyikā could see only this phenomenon first. The Nāyaka could not face her straight being smitten by love for her and for which reason he himself came there under the pretext of hunting. To keep himself engaged in this pretentious act of hunting, he began to search for the animal in and around the bushes. It is then that our Nāyikā had the first glimpse of the Nāyaka’s dangling dark locks of hair touching his shoulders. As for the fragrance of these locks of hair, Parāśara presumes that they must have derived it from, the Tulasī decorating his hair, or acquired it from the garlands offered by Āndāl after having decorated herself with them.

The two ear-ornaments of the Nāyaka are described next. They have the motif of fish and by their brilliance they illuminate even the face of the Nāyaka which is otherwise ‘dimmed’ by his hair. While the ear-ornaments can be of several shapes as those of fish (makara), peacock (mayūra) and swan (hamsa), the ones decorating the nāyaka’s ears are fish-shaped. This, according to Parāśara, shows that makara has a special significance with the Nāyaka being the emblem of Manmatha (who is the son of Lord Viṣṇu). Against the black background of the hair these ear-rings are like fish bouncing up in the waves of an ocean. In fact it would be difficult for one to say as to which forms the source of beauty for the other among the hair-locks and the ear-ornaments.
The bow of the Nāyaka is then the subject of description. He came with the bow as his companion, the bow which vanquished the rāksasa-s in the Daṇḍaka forest. Naturally Parāśara loses himself in the particular episode of the Rāmāyaṇa where Rāma singlehanded, is said to have killed fourteen thousand rāksasa-s. The Rāmāyaṇa-verse, tam dīṣṭvā śatruhantāram., etc. (Rāmāyaṇa III. 39b-40a) is explained in great detail in this context. The Nāyaka brought this bow because he has been pretending to have come on a hunting expedition. Or, being love-sick and unable to stand by himself he used it as a prop. Or, perhaps this is the most powerful weapon the Lord could count upon. Or perhaps he loved it most, for, it was instrument in winning the hand of his bride Sītā in his Rāmāvatāra. In the original stanza we have the expression īruvarāy vandār which means ‘he came with a second person’. For Parāśara, īruvarāy (literally ‘as two’) suggests the twin qualities of paratva (transcendental character) and saulabhya (easy accessibility). Or, it points out divinity (divyatva) and human nature (manusyatva); or, the nature of being the means (upāya) and the goal (upeya), which characterise the nature of the Supreme Being. The bow also represents, according to Parāśara, the presence of Laksmana who was providing unfailing company to Rāma.

Tha Nāyaka came and stood before her (en munṇē ninrār). He did so, so that she could have a full view of him. Or, he himself was attracted by her beauty and was struck dumb by it; or he wanted to test her real intention whether she really loves him or hates him.

What follows then is the description of the red lotus-like hands of the Nāyaka. The way Parāśara justifies this description is interesting. According to him the Nāyaka, who was thus placed himself before the Nāyikā,
folds his hands and begs for love (bhogabhikṣā). It is then that we have the full view of the palms of his hands. These worthy hands touched the foot of his bride (Sītā) during their wedding; they offer protection to those who believe in His grace; and they seem to forbid men not to indulge in deeds inimical to their spiritual progress.

The description then turns to the mouth of the Nāyaka which also is like a lotus. Since his lady-love stood speechless, he took her silence as a sign of her willingness and uttered a few words, which gives an occasion for the poet to describe the mouth. Parāśara quoting some vivāhamantra-s (imāṁ sameta paśyata, etc., Ṛgveda X.85.33) observes that this is the mouth of the Supreme Lord which uttered the mantra-s at the time of marriage. As he uttered the mantra-s he gazed at her from top to toe and this provided an opportunity for the Nāyikā to look at his eyes. This naturally leads to the description of the eyes of the Nāyaka which were like a pair of red lotuses blooming in the sky. They seem to talk to the Nāyikā by their gentle and bright glances.

Referring to the feet of the Nāyaka the Āḷvār says adiyum aḥdē (‘the feet were also like that’). Parāśara notes that instead of making a categorical statement that the feet of the Nāyaka were also like lotuses, as is done in the case of his palms, mouth, etc., the Āḷvār simply says ‘like that’, out of his personal dislike to bring in the lotus as a standard of comparison while describing the different parts of the Nāyaka’s body. Parāśara says that the comparison with lotus is visadrśa (unequal), that is, the lotuses are not match at all to the feet etc., of the Lord. It is these feet that roamed in the forest on hilly tracks (even without sandals in the Rāmāvatāra) which naturally caused great concern to the Nāyikā (that is, Sītā).
Finally the innumerable perfections such as vātsalya (parental concern), kārunya (compassion), saulabhya (easy accessibility), etc., exhibited by the Nāyaka show him off as the Supreme Being glorified in the scriptures. On seeing him the Nāyikā expresses naturally her apprehension about his real identity—that he must be the Supreme Lord Himself who is the ruler of all and is the master of the two vibhūti-s. With nobody to clarify her doubt or to allay her sense of awe the Nāyikā expresses her feelings to her confidant which takes us to the end of this verse.

It is thus clear from the detailed study of all the available works of Parāśara that he had an amazing mastery over the sacred lore of both Tamil and Sanskrit traditions (Udbhaya Vedānta) and that his compositions, be they original and independent or commentaries, reveal his deep scholarship, frankness of thought and clarity of expression. His stotra-s have their own special appeal in terms of religious feeling and poetic grandeur and the succeeding chapter is devoted to a literary study of these stotra-s.
CHAPTER IV
LITERARY ESTIMATE OF THE HYMNS OF PARĀŚARA

That Parāśara occupies a high place among the Sanskrit poets is clear by the beautiful stotra-s he composed of which the Śrīraṅgarājastava is the longest and the most elegant panegyric. The Śrīguṇaratnakośa in sixty-one verses is the second longest hymn of his, followed by the Śrīraṅganātha-stotra in seven verses. His stray verses known as Tīrumaṅjanakavi-s (of which 28 are available) also serve as good illustrations for his literary talent. All these hymns, it has to be pointed out, contain a number of philosophical statements also. The Uttaraśataka of the Śrīraṅgarājastava mostly contains such canonical statements which are characteristic of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy. The present chapter is devoted to a representative illustration and study of the literary merit of these hymns. Parāśara’s Aṣṭaśloki is not included in this study by reason of its thorough philosophic nature.

PARĀŚARA’S CONCEPT OF POETRY

According to Parāśara, a poet is one who by his command of good vocabulary and elegant style can bring out the merits of the object or person he undertakes to describe. One who does not have these required eligibilities cannot do justice to his undertaking. It is also implied that one who does not make a proper choice of topic also falls short of the estimate of critics. A proper choice of words capable of conveying the intended ideas and sentiments according to Parāśara can be acquired through divine grace. Such a composition is sure to
meet the approval of accomplished poets and connoisseurs of art. Parāśara makes repeated reference to the choice of words which characterise a first-rate poem. He also seems to contribute to the view that a kāvya should be free from blemishes and possess many qualities.

*anāghrātāvadyam bahuṅgaparīṇāhi manaso
duhānam sauhārdam paricitamivāthāpi gahanam
padānām saubhrātrādanīmiṣaniṣevyam śravanayoh
tvameva śrīrmhyam bahumukhayah vānīvilasitam
(Śrīguṇaratnakoṣa (SGRK) - śl. 8)

It is significant that this verse reminds one of the definition of Kāvya given by Mammaṭa in his Kāvyaprakāśa. In fact, Nārāyaṇa the commentator on the Śrīguṇaratnakoṣa quotes the relevant passage of the Kāvyaprakāśa in support of this view. Chronologically also, Parāśara succeeded Mammaṭa (10th cent. A.D.). Parāśara also speaks of a particular trait of a good poem, namely, its capacity to transport the mind of the listener to a world of joy. This is in fact the most important feature of a kāvya. This is what Mammaṭa has called, while enumerating the benefits of a kāvya, sadyah paranīrvṛti. The words of a Mahākavi have another feature. They appear to be familiar to the readers but they assume magnanimous dimensions and unfathomable depths once a critical mind tries to understand the full significance of these words. This is what he calls paricitamivāthāpi gahanam. There should be among the words, a close affinity and cohesion (padānām saubhrātram). This may be called śayyā or pāka which consists in a judicious juxtaposition of words in such a way that the words do not allow any substitution or change. The total effect of such a composition will be that it is sweet to hear again and again (animīṣaniṣevyam śravanayoh). The expression bahuṅgaparīṇāhi also suggests that according to Parāśara a good poem should
also have the guṇa-s such as prasāda, ojas and samatā.

THE GUṆA-S PRESENT IN THE HYMNS

Although several guṇa-s can be identified in the hymns of Parāśara only a few of them are illustrated hereunder:

(a) Prasāda

Of all the guṇa-s which mark good poetry irrespective of the presence of bhāva-s and rasa-s, Prasāda (‘clarity of word and meaning’) is very important. Ānandavardhana in his Dhvanyāloka stresses the importance of this one quality of poetry as the first requisite.⁴ It is also worth noting that he refers to the same condition while providing the fullfledged definition of dhvani.⁵ The word sphuṭatvena (with clarity) in the definition of Dhvani conveys the same idea of Prasāda.

This verse which describes the audārya (magnanimity) of Mother Lakṣmī is a beautiful illustration for the quality of Prasāda:

aiśvaryam akṣaragatim paramam padam vā 
kasmācid anjalibham vahate vitīrya 
asmai na kiṃciducitarāṃ kṛtāntiḥathāmba

tvam lajjase kathaya ko’yanudārabhāvaḥ

(SGRK - śl. 58)

Another example is the following verse:

kadā’haṁ kāverīvimalasalile vītakaluṣo

bhaveyam tattīre śramamuṣi vaseyam ghanavane

dadā vā tāṁ punyē mahati puline maṅgalaḥgum

bhajeyam rangeśam kamalanayanam śesāṣayanam

(Śrīraṅganāṭhastava (SRNS) - śl. 1)
(b) **Ojas**

This consists in the capacity of the composition to ‘kindle’ the mind of a reader or listener. This is normally effected through long compounds although this is not always the rule.\(^6\)

The verse describing Lord Raṅganātha’s throat with the lines thereon is a good instance in point:

\[
\text{ramayatu sa māṁ kāṇṭhah śrīraṅganeturudaṅcita-}
\text{ kramukataruṇāgrīvākambupralambamalimlucaḥ}
\text{praṇayavīlāgallakṣmīvīśvambharākarakandali-}
\text{kanakavalyakrīḍāsāṅkrāntarekha ivollasan}
\]  

(Śrīraṅgarājastava (SRJS) I.104)

Another instance is the following verse describing Lord Narasimha in all his fury as He tore open the chest of His enemy, splashing and besmearing the blood on his manes and shoulders.

\[
dviṣāṇadveṣodyannayananavanavahnipraśamana-
\text{bhramallakṣmīvaktraprahitamadhugandūṣasasamaiḥ}
\text{nakhaṭṣunārāṭikṣatajapāṭalairāplutasaṭā-}
\text{cchatāskandho rundhe duritiśila puṁspaṅcavadanaḥ}
\]  

{SRJS. II. 65}

(c) **Samatā**

This quality which consists in balanced expressions\(^7\) may be illustrated in the following verse:

\[
\text{āyatkritamalikollasadūrdhvapuṇḍram-}
\text{ākānpalocanamanaṅkuśakarpāsamaṁ}
\text{uphullavakṣasamudāyudhabāhumarhan-}
\text{nīvim ca raṅgapatimabjapadam bhajāmaḥ}
\]  

{SRJS I.73}
Another illustration is the following verse from the same stotra.

namah shripaniyakai yadbhruvibhramabhedatah
iishesitavyavaisarya-nimnonnatumidam jagat (I.7)

(d) Kaniti

This quality consists in a very elegant composition. The illustrations is:

abjayastadadabjamaanicitakatinsamvadidvakusaeyaka
kinctandadavagandhisamhananakam
nirvyaamandasmitam
cudacumbimukhabujam nijabhujaviisrantadivyayudham
shriange saradaasatam tata itah pasyema laksmisakham

One more instance is from the SGRK (slo. 3):

anukalatanukandalinganarambhasumbhath-
pratidisabhujasakhiasakhanoakaharddhiih
stananayanagulucchaspharapuspadvipreh
racayatu mayi laksmikalapavall kataksan

(e) Sushabdat

The quality called Sushabdat (or Sau sadya) comprises the employment of refined words and expressions. We can illustrate several verses for this quality from the works of Parasa of which the following is only a representative selection.

aravinditamanvachrapnivaktra-
api tapinchitamaancitangaakant
adharena sabandhujitam shri
niyamam nandanayeta raangacandram (SRJS I.84)
unmūlyāhara mandarādrimahinā tam sambadhānāmunā
dorbhiścañcalamālikaiśca dadhīnīmāthāṃ

mathānāmbudhistet
śrīrāṅgesvara candrakaustubhasudhāpūrvarām gṛhāṇeti te
kurvāṇasya phalegrahirhi kamalālābhena sarvāḥ śramaḥ
(Ibid. II.55)
śailo’gniśca jalāmbabhūva munayo mūdhāmbabhūvurjadaḥ
prājñāmāśurāgāssagopamārtamāṣur mahāśiviśāḥ
govyāgrāssahajāmbabhūvurapare tvanyāmbabhūvuh
prabho
tvām teṣvanyatamāmbabhūvitha
bhavadveṇukvaṇonmādane
(Ibid. II.72)

FIGURES OF SPEECH

(a) ŚABDĀLANKĀRA-S

Alanākāra-s are two-fold as those belonging to the sound (śabda) and sense (arthā). Of the śabdālāṅkāra-s anuprāsa (alliteration) is quite frequently used by our author. Although the yamaka and the bandha types also belong to this category great poets consciously avoid them for the simple reason that a lot of effort is needed for their composition which makes them more artificial.

A few instances for Anuprāsa may be cited from Parāśara’s works:

sūktim samagrayatu naḥ svayameva lakṣmīḥ
śrīrāṅgāramahisī madhuraiḥ katākṣaiḥ
vaidagdhyavārṇaṅguṇagumbhanagauravairyām
kaṇḍūla-carṇakuḥārām kavayo dhyanti
(SGRK, śl. 7)
kastūrīkalitordhvapunḍratilakaṁ karṇāntalolekṣaṇaṁ
mugdhasmeramanoharādharadalam muktākīrtōjvalam
pasyanmānasapasyatohararucah paryāyapankeruham
śrīrangādhipateh kadā nu vadanam seveya
bhūyo'pyaham
(SRNS ūl 2)

asti vastvidamitthantva-prasankhyāna-parānmukham
śrīmatyāyatane lakṣmīpada-lāksaikalaksanam
(SRJS I 9)

(b) ARTHĀLANKĀRA-S

Of the Figures of Speech of sense, only the most prominent figures may be mentioned:

(i) Upamā

In the SRJS (I 8) Lord Ranganātha reclining on the lap of Ananta is compared to the Cintāmani-gem which is ‘brought out’ as it were, by the huge serpent itself. In another verse of SRJS (I. 63) the Lord is likened to a pond containing fullblown lotuses in which sport the royal she-swan namely Lakṣmī and her shadow, the dark Bhūmi.

(ii) Utpreksā

This Figure of Speech can be met with in almost all the hymns of Parāśara. In a verse of SRJS (I 80) the dark complexion of the Lord reclining on the serpent within the dark sanctum sanctorum is fancied to be an ocean ‘drunk in’ by a cloud, a mountain placed in an ocean and an elephant reclining in the bushy tracks of a mountain. Several verses of Tirumaṅjanakavi-s form instances of this Figure Śloka 2 therein fancies Lord
Raṅganātha to be a river resorted to by several rājaharmśa-s beautiful with abja and attended upon by marudgama-s.

(iii) Rūpaka

Metaphor is the Figure of Speech often employed by Parāśara. In his SRJS (I.16) Parāśara identifies the Lord who has so far been ‘bathed’ by the Sanskṛta and Tamil compositions, with a young elephant which may again desire to spray himself with dust in the form of Parāśara’s hymns.

(iv) Śleṣa:

Several verses of Parasara’s Tīrumaṅjanakavi-s form the illustration for this Figure of Speech. For instance, verse 2 which fancies Lord Raṅganātha to be river (nada) and verse 3 identifying Him with a Suradrūma (celestial boon-yielding tree) employ Śleṣa which forms the basis for the Rūpaka also. The expressions anuvṛtti, rājaharmśa, aṇḍajāta, abja, sumarudgama, etc., of verse 2 have each two meanings. Likewise in verse 3, the words śākha, suparṇa and sumanas also have two meanings each.

METRES EMPLOYED

Parāśara has employed 45 kinds of metres in all his available stotra-s, containing a total of 337 verses. Of these, the majority of verses are in the Śārdūlavikṛīḍita metre (55) followed by Vasantatilaka (43), Śikharini (34), Mālini (31), Sragdhara (25), Harini (16), Anuṣṭūbh (14), Indra vibrations (12), Mandākrānta (10) and Upajāti (10). Of the remaining metres mention may be made of a few rare ones like Kusumatalatavellita, Kalahamsa, Prastārikā, Bhramaravilasita, Mattā, Mandākinī, Manjubhaśīni, Mattamaṇji, Mālabharini, Yugmayugala, Rukmavatī, Rucirā and Śāśikalā.
PARĀŚARA’S SCHOLARSHIP

Any one who has even a cursory glance of Parāśara’s works will be amazed by the wide range of his scholarship, apart from his remarkable mastery over Sanskrit and Tamil literatures, and by his fine gift for poetry. His mastery of Vyākaraṇa-śāstra and his love for highly refined grammatical expressions are quite evident from all his works. Parāśara is one of the foremost writers of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition whose devotional fervour is perfectly matched by his poetical style. Thus while referring to Rāmāvatāra in the VSB he states: atha mṛtasaṅjīvanam rāmacaritam. Explaining the word Śubhekṣaṇa he says, evam vidhaiśvaryasīlātīśayapiśuna- sītala - viśālodāra dirgharājīvalocanah. To express his poetic bent of mind, the following sentences may also be cited:

divyavallyā iva kalpadrumah, tasyah nityopaghanaḥ
(C. on the name Śrīnivāsa, no. 614)
ratnamanañjariva mañjūsāyāṁ śrīḥ asmin nihitā
(C. on the name Śrīnidhiḥ, no. 615)

That Parāśara’s knowledge of other schools of thought is quite deep is clear from the refutation of those schools found in his works. The systems refuted are: Cārvāka (SRJS. II.6), Buddhism (SRJS II 6-10; SGRK II), Jainism (SRJS. II.12a, b), Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika (SRJS. II.13), Śāṅkhyā-Yoga (SRJS. II.14-15, 30; VSB, name no. 173), Mīmāṁsā as represented by the Bhāṭṭa-s and Prabhākara-s (SRJS. II.20-22; VSB, name no. 175) and Advaita (SRJS. II.11, 16; VSB names no.1, 64, 303).

HIS PROFICIENCY IN GRAMMAR

The following instances may be given to demonstrate Parāśara’s perfect mastery of the Pāṇinian grammar.11
(i) abhramlihaḥ (SRJS I.119)

This word which literally means ‘licking the cloud’, is formed by adding the suffix khas after the verb liḥ when the words vaha (‘the shoulder of an ox’) or abhra (‘a cloud’), by the rule vahābhre lihaḥ (Aṣṭā. III.ii.32).

(ii) aruntuda (SRJS II.73)

This word meaning wounding the vital parts is formed by the rule vidhvaruṣastudaḥ (i.ii.35). According to this the affix khas is added to the verb tud (‘a wound’) when the words vidhu (‘moon’) and arus (‘vital part’) are in composition with it in the objective case.

(iii) ādhyambhaviṣṇuḥ (SRJS II.15)

This word meaning, ‘becoming rich’ (‘regarding one who was not originally rich’) is formed by the rule kartari bhuvah krisṇuc-khukaṇau (Aṣṭā III.ii.57). According to this when the word to be formed denotes an agent, the affixes krisṇuc and khukaṇ are added after the verb bhū (to become) when it is in composition with words ādhyा, subhaga, sthūla, etc., provided these have the sense of the words formed by the affix cvi though they are not ending in cvi. On the same principle is to be understood the expression aprīyam bhaviṣṇuḥ (SRJS II.49).

(iv) ātmambharayaḥ (SRJS. II.37, 83)

This word meaning, ‘those who feed their own stomachs’ that is, ‘those who are selfish’ is granted by the rule phalegrahirātmambhariśca (III.ii.26). This states that the phalegrahi and ātmambhari are nipāta-s (irregularly formed). The word phalegrahi meaning ‘the fruit-bearing’ (and such as, ‘a tree’) is also found in SRJS II.55.
(v) kaṇehatyā *(SRJS. II.38)*

This word means ‘to one’s heart’s content’ or ‘till one is satisfied’ is formed by the rule *kaṇemanasi śraddhāpratīghāte* (I.iv.66). This means that the words *kaṇe* and *manas* are *gati*-words when they are in composition with the verb and are used in the sense of ‘reaction by satiation’.

(vi) karnejapa *(SRJS. I.108)*

This word means ‘a tale-bearer’ or ‘one who always whispers into the ears’ and it is sanctioned by the Pāṇinian rule *stambakarnaṇayaḥ ramijapoh* (II.ii.13). This means that the affix *ac* comes after the roots *ram* (to whisper) when the case-inflected words *stamba* (a clump of grass) and *karna* (ear) are in composition with them respectively.

(vii) kūlamudvaha *(SRJS. I.100; SGRK. śl. 41)*

This word means ‘carrying away the bund’. This is formed by the rule *udikūle rujivahoh* (III.ii.31). This means that the affix *khas* comes after the verb *ruji* (to break into pieces) and *vah* (to carry) when preceded by the preposition *ut* and when the word *kula* (bank) is in composition with them as the object.

(viii) kṣemaṁkara *(SRJS. I.70)*

This word means ‘propitious’ is formed by the rule *kṣema-priya-madre an ca* (III.ii.44). According to this, the affix *an* and *khac* come after the verb *kr-*(to make) when the words *kṣema* (happiness), *priya* (pleasant) and *madra* (joy) are in composition, in the objective case.

(ix) coralāvam vilāvyah *(SRJS. II.6)*

This expression means ‘he has to be beheaded like a thief’. This is sanctioned by the rule *upamāne karmanī*
ca (III.iv.45) which means that the affix namul comes after a root when an object or an agent denoting similitude is in composition with it. It may also be noted that namul is added after a verbal root when reiteration is to be expressed. The sūtra which allows this is ābhikṣyate namul ca (III.iv.22).

Other expressions which are governed by this rule are mūkalāyam nilīye (SRJS. II.35) ('kept quiet like a dumb person'), 'niddhinidhāyam nyadhāyiṣata' (SRJS. II.36) ('preserved like a treasure') and 'dadhi- nirmātham-mathāna (SRJS. II.55) ('churned like curds').

(x) jīvanāśam naṣyati (SRJS. II.93)

This expression means 'he (she or it) perishes so that the life gets extinguished', that is, dies away. The aphorism kartroh jīvapurusayornasivahoh (III.iv.43), which means that the affix namul comes after the roots naś (to perish) vah (to carry) when the words jīva (life) and purusa (person) expressing the agent of these verbs are respectively in construction with them.

(xi) viśvasmai tiṣṭhamānam (SRJS. I.75)

This word means 'one who is indicating his intentions to the entire universe'. The aphorism prakāśana-stheyākhyayosca (I.iii.23) grants this. After the verb sthā when meaning 'to indicate one's intentions to another; or 'to make an award as an arbitrator', the Ātmanepada affix is employed. Accordingly we have tiṣṭhamāna, the Ātmanepada form of the root sthā which is otherwise a Parasmaipada root.

(xii) mālabhāri (SRJS. I.56)

This word means 'possessor or wearer of many garlands'. The word mālā becomes ā-ending by the
rule īṣṭakeśīkāmālānāṁ cita-tūla-bhārīṣu (VI.iii.65). According to this, the words īṣṭakā, īṣīkā and mālā, and expressions having these words at the end will have their final vowel shortened when followed by cita, tūla and bhāra respectively.

(xiii) mitampaca: (SRJS. II.105)

This word means ‘cooking a little’ or ‘being niggardly’ or ‘worthless’, it is formed by the rule mitanakhe ca (III.ii.34). According to this the affix khaś is employed after the verb pac (to cook) when the words mita (a small quantity) or nakha (nail) are in composition with it in the objective case.

(xiv) lunīhi lunīhīti lunīhi (SRJS. II.73)

This word means ‘you cut repeatedly’ (as if some one was always calling to you, ‘cut thou, cut thou’). This is sanctioned by the rule kriyāsamabhīhare loṭ hisvau vā tadhvamoḥ (III.iv.2). This means: ‘when the frequency or repetition of an action is indicated, the affix loṭ is added to the root and the verb is repeated. The affixes hi and sva, or the affixes (-a and dhvam are the substitutes of loṭ). In other words when the repetition of an action is expressed the imperative is used and though the second person singular is used, it also stands for the second person plural.

(xv) sugatapāsah (SRJS. II.6)

This word means ‘the contemptible Sugata’. This usage is on the authority of ‘yāpye pāṣap’ (V.iii.47). According to this aphorism, the suffix pāṣap is added to a word when the meaning of ‘contempt’ is to be conveyed.
(xvi) surājambhava (SRJS. II.15; SGRK 11)

This word means ‘the state of being a monarch in an easy or effortless way’. This is granted by the rule kārtikarmacanośca bhū-krīṇoh (II.iii.127). This means that the affix khal comes after the verbs bhū and krīṇ when the upapada-s in composition with them are an agent or an object, preceded by the words īṣat, etc., meaning hard or light, etc.

(xvii) svāgatikaiḥ (SRJS. III.75)

This word means ‘one who says welcome’ is formed by the rule svāgatādīnāṃ ca (VII.iii.7). The words read in this group (gana) do not take the suffix aic. They take the suffix thāk when the words are in composition with them in the objective case.

RARE USAGES

We also find a few interesting rare usages of words in the Śrīraṅgarājastava.

tākśaṇam

This word (II.43) which usually means ‘looking’ or ‘casting glances’ is used here in the sense of ‘being dependent on’ or ‘standing in need of’.

cātṛi (SRJS. II.30)

This is used in the sense of citrasya bhāvaḥ (‘state of being variegated’, that is, ‘having different varieties’).

Jāgaryā (SRJS. II.75)

This means ‘wakefulness’. This is an alternate form of jāgara both of which are granted by a Vārttika,
jāgarteḥ akāro vā read under the Pānini an rule icchā (III.ii.101). This Vārttika means, ‘From the root jāgr we have either jāgarā or jāgaryā. The first is formed by the affix, ‘a’ and the latter by śa which brings in yak’.

Durlalita (SRJS. I.17)

This is used in the sense of ‘naughtiness’ or ‘ill-mannered behaviour’.

Padma

This word meaning lotus which is popularly used in neuter gender, is used by our author in the masculine gender eg. nābhīpadmaḥ (SRJS I.116-117) and pādapadmau (Ibid. I.123).

Prahati

This word Prahati (SRJS I.27) is used in the sense of ‘proficiency’ or ‘scholarship’. This would be traced to the root ‘han’ (second conjugation) meaning himsā and gati of which the latter becomes relevant here (Thus, prakṛṣṭā hatiḥ becomes prahatiḥ).

Pradiḥ

The word pradiḥ (SRJS II.47) conveys the sense of a ‘present’ or ‘gift’. This is formed by adding the affix ki after a ghu-verb when an upasarga is in composition with it.

Bhramaraka

The word bhramaraka (SRJS I.94) is used in the sense of a ‘curl of hair on the forehead’.
Makaroddhau (SRJS I.102)

Here the word *uddha* is added to *makarā* in the sense of ‘beautiful’ or ‘grand’ (‘ear-rings shaped like makara-fish’).\(^{13}\)

Mrgyamadhyastha

This word is a technical one meaning ‘one who is ready to take an oath’. Parāśara uses this word in his *Tirumañjanakavī-s* (śl. 1) while describing the idol of Lord Raṅganātha when He is given the sacred ablutions. The *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* (II.22.95) refers to a practice which is known as *divya* in which a person making claims or declarations in good faith takes an oath wearing wet clothes, a garland of the basil leaves and the like.

Rājakula

This means a ‘high family’. The word *rājan* becomes the first member according to the rule *rājadantādiṣu param* (II.ii.31). Thus *kulānāṁ rājā* becomes *rājakulam*.

Rodhaḥ (SRJS II.52)

This word means ‘an impediment’. Normally this is used along with the prepositions *upa, ava, ni*, etc.

Vikṛṇoṣi (SRJS II.33)

This is used in the sense of *vikaroṣi* (‘you bring about modification’ or ‘change’). This is derived from the fifth conjugational root *kṛṇḥ himsāyām*, prefixed by the preposition *vi*.

Saṅcāraḥ (SRJS II.17)

This word has the sense of *pralaya* (‘cosmic dissolution’).
SOME NYAYAS (MAXIMS) USED IN THE ŚRĪRAṅGARĀJASTAVA

Parāśara in his Śrīraṅgarājastava uses some nyāya-s.

(a) Kośakāranyāya (II.93)

This is the illustration of a cocoon. A silk-worm weaves its web (kośa) around its own self in such a way that it gets arrested in it and is eventually killed.

(b) Daṅḍāpūpikānyāya (II.47)

This is also known as Kaimutika-nyāya. This maxim of ‘stick and the cakes’ is used to convey the sense of some event which is presumed to have taken place on the strength of another happening. If some cakes are tied to a stick and if the stick itself is carried away or eaten up by mice or some other animals, the inference is that the cakes have shared the same fate.

(c) Mīnapāniyanyāya (II.105)

This is the maxim of ‘pouring water to a fish which is already in water’. This conveys the idea of doing a thing which is not required or which is redundant.

(d) Sitāksīranyāya (II. 64)

This is the illustration of ‘adding sugar to milk’, which makes it all the more delicious. Mere sugar by itself or milk alone may not be liked by many. A happy combination of these two makes both enjoyable.

(e) Jalasthala (I.124) (from ajalasthalajña)

Parāśara uses what may be called an idiom, ajalasthalajña, literally meaning, ‘one who does not
distinguish between water and ground, that is, between the low and the high, between the rich and the poor. (This is used with reference to Krṣṇa).

**An Unclear Idea**

In one verse (*SRJS. II.65*) Parāśara fancies the blood gushing forth from the chest of Hiranyakasipu to be the spittings of the red tāmbūla, done by Lakṣmī, in order to pacify the fire of Lord Narasimha’s anger. The idea, however, is not quite clear or appealing. The blood coming out of the demon’s chest rent asunder by the Lord’s sharp nails is imagined to be the tāmbūlarasa, spat out on the demon by Lakṣmī, not only by way of expressing Her contempt for him, but also to pacify the Lord indirectly. The pacification of the Lord’s anger was extremely difficult and nobody including Lakṣmī could approach Lord Narasimha in such an enraged condition. Parāśara perhaps felt that spitting on the enemy may prove effective in its own way in bringing down His fury. But what is difficult to understand is the next statement of the poet that the Lord’s manes and shoulders were besmeared by such a blood, which has been fancied to be the spittings of Lakṣmī.

Thus a literary estimate of the *hymn-*s of Parāśara embedded by philosophical and doctrinal ideas reveal Parāśara to be a very facile poet of no mean merit. The philosophical and doctrinal ideas as could be gathered from his works will be taken up in the succeeding chapter.
CHAPTER V
PHILOSOPHICAL STUDY

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is one of the leading writers on the Śrīvaiṣṭava school of thought. All his compositions bear ample evidence to this fact. As one who occupied a pre-eminent position after Śrī Rāmānuja, he commanded great respect as is evident from a number of reverential references made to him by no less a person than Vedānta Deśika himself. In several places where there seems to be a contradiction in the available text of the Tattvaratnākara with some well-known concepts of this school, Vedānta Deśika tries to explain it away without criticising or contradicting Parāśara. While Vedānta Deśika quotes very long tracts from the Tattvaratnākara, it is quite obvious that even Vedānta Deśika did not have the full text of it before him. He clearly states that the prameya section of it was lost. The loss of this monumental philosophical treatise of the great ācārya is great no doubt; but yet his other compositions like the Bhagavadgunadarpaṇa, the three stotra-s and the Aṣṭaśloki, enable us to arrive at a more or less clear picture of Parāśara’s philosophical position. An approach to a study of the Śrīvaiṣṭava school should be guided by two considerations which are very fundamental to an understanding of this system: (1) that it is not merely a philosophy; and (2) that it is not purely religious. Viśiṣṭādvaita can best be understood as a religious philosophy. An attempt is made in this chapter to gather the ideas and concepts as are available in all these works.

EPISTEMOLOGY

From the available passages of the Tattvaratnākara we are able to have a clear idea regarding the number
and nature of the pramāṇa-s accepted by him. Pratyakṣa (perception), Anumāṇa (inference) and Āgama (verbal knowledge, also called aitihya by Parāśara) are the three pramāṇa-s accepted by the Viśiṣṭādvaitin. Smṛti (recollection), though recognised by some as a distinct means, Parāśara feels that it can be included in its own source (namely, the anubhava produced by the three pramāṇa-s). In this context it has to be stated that even Pratibhā (revelation) is claimed as a separate prāmaṇa by some. Parāśara does not accept this. (Though it is true that one can realise the reality of things through Pratibhā, it is useful only in the case of pious people.)

Dependence upon liṅga (characteristic mark) and śabda make the knowledge derived out of them, parokṣa (indirect) in nature. As contrasted with this, if the knowledge concerning an object is direct without any mediacy, it becomes aparokṣa (immediate).

Pratyakṣa is classified as determinate (savikalpaka) and indeterminate (nirvikalpaka), in the traditional manner characteristic of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. The presence of anuvṛtti (continuity) or pratyavamarśa (retrospection) characterises the savikalpaka-pratyakṣa. In the nirvikalpaka, however, though this feature is absent still the configuration of the individual seen for the first time qualifies the knowledge. It is therefore, not a bare knowledge. From another view-point perception is sub-divided as that which belongs to the ancients (anarvacina-yogin-s) and that which belongs to the ordinary people (arvacina).

Another view expressed by Parāśara in the context of the pramāṇa-s is that pratyakṣa does not cognize the ‘bare existence or being’ (sanmātra) of an entity.

Knowledge by its very nature is self-luminous (svyamprakāśa). It is not inferred through features like
prākatya (manifestedness) or through mental perception (mānasa-pratyakṣa).

According to Parāśara inference involves the mediacy of knowledge (parokṣa). Vyāpti (invariable concomitance) which is the main feature of anumāna can be understood even through a single observation. Bhūyodarśana (repeated observation) is not necessary. This invariable concomitance becomes vitiated in the presence of upādhi-s (adventitious condition). A reason (liṅga) which has an incomplete character (rūpavaikalya) has an upādhi and a reason which has lack of correspondence (vyabhicāra) also has an upādhi. The former type of reason is known as aprayojaka and the latter has the usual classification of bādhita, viruddha, anaikāntika, etc.

Kevalavyatirekin, though it seems to have been accepted as a variety of anumāna by Parāśara, was not really acceptable to him. The usual classification of anumāna as svārtha and parārtha is also discussed by Parāśara. Strictly speaking, there is no element of parārtha in the so-called parārtha-type of inference. All inferences operate and attain their validity on the basis of vyāpti. Validity is not specially conferred upon them by the fact that somebody addresses a syllogism to another.

In this context it is also to be noted that according to Parāśara all pramāṇa-s gain their validity purely on the spontaneous functioning of the totality of their causes, which proves their intrinsic nature (svataḥprāmāṇya). Sometimes this totality of causes (sāmagrī) may be found in the form of a sentence uttered by one person to another. This is the real basis for the two-fold classification of inference. As a sequel to this is the view regarding the number of the members of a syllogism in the parārthānumāna. Though the Nyāya school insists on five
members, Parāśara, following the Rāmānuja school states that there is no hard and fast rule regarding the exact number. If a reliable person tells some one dhūmavān agnīmāneva (‘that which has smoke certainly has fire’), there is no need for the illustration (dīṣṭānta) also. The most important point is that vyāpti must be properly conveyed. There is no need also to mention pratijñā, hetu and udāharaṇa in the traditional order of enumeration.

Another opinion of Parāśara is that tarka (indirect argument) need not be accorded any undue importance in the scheme of pramāṇa-s. Some are of the view, says Parāśara, that all valid means of knowledge are at the mercy of tarka. Tarka must be shown its right place. It just helps one to remove doubts that may arise due to the contradictions (virodha) or non-apprehensions (abodha) while apprehending an object. Certainly it has no independent power to confer validity on inference or any other means of knowledge.

Arthāpatti (presumption) is, according to Parāśara, a variety of inference. It is not an independent pramāṇa.

THE TWO MĪMĀMSĀ-S CONSTITUTING A SINGLE SCIENCE

One of the basic convictions of this school is that both the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra-s of Jaimini and the Uttaramīmāṃsā (the Brahmāsūtra) of Bādarāyaṇa form a single cogent unit, of which the opening sūtra is athāto dharmajñānaśā and the last sūtra is anāvṛttiḥ śabdāt anāvṛttiḥ śabdāt. This is the view expressed by Rāmānuja in his Śrībhāṣya. It is interesting to note that while supporting this view, Parāśara mentions that the karma-kāṇḍa, devatā-kāṇḍa and brahma-kāṇḍa were
treated by Jaimini, Kaśkarṣa and Bādarāyaṇa respectively, in their aphorisms.⁵

**TATTVATRAYA**

The three principles accepted in this system are cit, acit and Īsvara which constitute a single unit by virtue of cit and acit forming the śarīra of the Lord who is their soul. In his stotra-s and the commentary on the Viṣṇusahasranāma, Parāśara has emphasised the concept of Tattvatraya. In the *SRJS* (I.115) Parāśara states that the Lord has within Himself the entire universe of cit and acit, each containing within itself a three-fold classification (trividha-cidacid-ḥṛṇdaṁ). The three-fold classification of cit is: baddha (the bound souls), mukta (the liberated) and nitya (the ever-liberated); with reference to the acit (insentient matter) this classification is: śuddha sattva (the pure sattva) (which constitutes the things to be found in the highest abode of the Lord and also the ‘divine abodes of the Lord on earth’), miśrasattva (the mixed sattva) and sattvaśūnya (that which is devoid of sattva).

In another verse of the same stotra, Parāśara again mentions the cit-acit complex having the Lord as its supreme and eternal ruler (II 25: ‘śrutiḥ cidacitī...’ etc). In his *VSB*, Parāśara again mentions the Tattvatraya while explaining the name puruṣottamaḥ (name no. 24) and also the name pradhānapuruṣeśvaraḥ (name no. 20). This latter name clearly mentions pradhāna (acit) and Puruṣa (cit) as controlled by Īsvara.

**CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE**

Speaking about the creation of the Universe, Parāśara makes it clear that it takes place solely due to the
remarkable will (*icchā*) of the Lord.⁶ The Lord is Omniscient and is not a mere witness or a passive spectator. His remarkable Lordship consists in His total independence and absolute control over everything with no other extraneous force directing Him. The creation of the universe, Parāśara makes it clear, is in accordance with the peculiar *karman* (*karmavaicitri*) of the individual souls concerned. This, however, does not impair the Lord’s independence.⁷ In another statement, Parāśara says that the creation of the universe which consists in allotting different kinds of bodies to creatures in accordance with their own *karma*, points only to the Lord’s remarkable compassion for them. Otherwise, they would have been lying without any distinction of name and form from matter which is insentient, at the time of cosmic dissolution. It is only out of His own free will (*icchā*) and inability to bear the sight of the sad plight of the creatures that He made *prakṛti* evolve into different *tattva*-s.⁸ At the time of cosmic dissolution the universe of *cit* and *acit* becomes dormant (*pralaya*- *samaya*- *suptam*) in a very minute part of His own body. When He so wills He would effortlessly project the *cit* and *acit* like a peacock spanning out his beautiful tail.⁹

CREATION AS THE SPORT OF THE LORD

In his *VSB*, Parāśara while explaining the name *pradhānapuruseśvarah* (name no. 20) points out that the entire cosmic activity of creation, sustenance and dissolution is but a mere sport for the Lord. By His own *māyā* (wonderful power) the Lord binds those beings who stray away from the path of virtue. Again He releases those who surrender to Him.

This sport of the Lord is meant to please His consort Lakṣmī. Accordingly in his *SGRK* (śl. 19) Parāśara
observes that when the time is ripe for the cit and acit to come into contact with each other, the Lord creates 'cosmic eggs' by thousands and provides different varieties of sense-organs, bodies and the like to the sentient beings. This is but to please His consort. Already in the SRJS (II.44) reference had been made to the Lord's creating the universe even as a peacock spreads out his tail and dancing in the company of Śrī. This concept of krīḍā is normally brought in by the writers of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school to explain the total independence and absolute control the Supreme Being has over the world of cit and acit.

THE ROLE OF KARMA

Closely connected with the concept of world-manifestation is the law of Karma. The question of man's responsibility for his own actions and the place of God's will in relation to it is quite well-known. According to the Viśiṣṭādvaita school although the Lord is all-powerful and compassionate, the responsibility of a man in making or marring his own future cannot be ignored or even under estimated. If the world in which we are living is full of misery and is apparently beset by all kinds of imperfections it is all the making of man himself; and God is not to be blamed. The Brahmasūtra has clearly stated that God cannot be charged with partiality (vaisamya) and cruelty (nairghrnya)¹⁰, since karma alone is responsible for the prevailing inequality in creation. In his SRJS (II.42) Parāśara makes this quite evident. God creates the world as it is, full of inequality, only in accordance with the karma of the individuals concerned. The Śruti-s also are in support of this, says Parāśara.¹¹

Another interesting point explained by Parāśara is that though both jīva and Īśvara have their respective
bodies, still it is only the former that experiences the fruits of his own action, but not the latter. Īśvara is not a bhoktā (the experient) of karma. He is the bhojayitā (one who makes others experience their karma). Explaining the name pūtātmā (name no.10) Parāśara in his VSB raises an interesting question as to how karma does not affect Īśvara but only the jīva because both of them have bodies and those who have bodies do perform karma. Parāśara himself answers the question by saying that the apparent association of karma with Īśvara cannot produce any effect on Him. The analogy given is that of one who whips another person with a lash. Though the contact with the whip is common to both the punisher and the punished, still it is only the punished person who suffers but not the person who is wielding the whip. The Muṇḍakaopanīṣad passage anāśnannanyah (3.1.1) and the Gītā-text,6 'na māṁ karmāṇi limpanti...' (4.14), as also the Brahmasūtra, sambhogapraṇāptīti cet na., etc., (1.2.8) are quoted in support.

DHARMABHŪTAJÑĀNA

Another important theory of this school is that jñāna, also known as samvit, dhī, buddhi, etc., is an essential and inseparable attribute of the soul which characterises it in all the states of wakefulness, dream and deep sleep. This is technically known as dharmabhūtajñāna (attributive knowledge) which can expand and contract. Although we do not have a direct reference to this essential feature of the soul, fragment 29 of the Tattvaratnākara proves the same point. According to this, knowledge is self-manifest and is solely dependent upon the soul. The soul and its knowledge are both self-effulgent like the sun and his brilliance. Parāśara quotes the Gītā-verse,
yathā prakāśayateyekaḥ (13.34) and a number of Upaniṣadic passages declaring the self to be self-luminous, the self itself being of the nature of knowledge. We have another reference to this concept in Parāśara’s VSB under the name muktānām paramā gatiḥ (no.13). Parāśara states that jñāna, etc., are natural to the self and this is not negated even in the state of mokṣa.¹²

THE ŚEṢA-ŚEṢI-BHĀVA

One of the cardinal tenets of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school is that the relation between the universe consisting of cit and acit and the Lord is the one that subsists between a part and the whole, or between a subsidiary and the principal entity that is subserved by it, or between the body and the soul. The definition of body given by Rāmānuja in his Śrībhāṣya and the Vedārthasaṅgraha is worth noticing in this context. According to it, body is that which in its entirety depends upon, is controlled by and subserves another entity and thus forms its inseparable mode. This inseparable connection always exists between the supporter and the supported, the controller and the controlled and the principal entity and the subsidiary entity.¹³ The antaryāmībhrāhmaṇa of the Bhadāranyaka is in full support of this view.¹⁴ We have several references to this concept in the words of Parāśara who is a close follower of Rāmānuja. In the SRJS (II.23-24) he points out that the entire universe (aśeṣah prapañcaḥ) forms the subsidiary (śeṣah) and thus the body (vapuṭḥ) of the Lord who forms its soul (ātman) on several grounds such as the creation (utpattī), maintenance (sthiti), activity (pravrṭti) and dissolution (grasana) of the universe and also by virtue of His controlling (niyamana) and pervading over them (vyāpana). According to Parāśara the abheda-texts speak
of the non-difference between the Supreme and the rest of creation through the principle of co-ordinate predication (sāmānādhikarānya) only because of this kind of relation between the Lord and the universe. The SGRK (śl. 22) also explains this principle of the śeṣa-śesī-bhāva between the divine couple and the rest of the creation. Parāśara’s explanation of the names bhūtakṛt (name No. 5), bhūtabhṛt (name No. 6), bhāva (name No. 7.), bhūtātmā (name no.8) and bhūtabhāvana (name no.9) in the VSB also bring out this important concept in a clear manner. According to him all these five names clearly explain the śeṣītva of the Lord.

Creation of the beings, their maintenance and the manifestation in His sportive form are all indicative of the principal character of the Lord. Of special importance is the name bhūtātmā which spells out the śarīrātmaḥbhāva. The relation between the Lord and the universe which is known as dehātmabhāva is different from the relationship entities like wife, house, lands, etc., have with a person on whom they depend for their support. The relation that the world has with Īsvara is more internal (antaraṅga) than external. The word bhūta-bhāvanaḥ which means ‘one who nourishes the beings by being their support and benefactor’ is also indicative of the śeṣatva of the entire universe. The name muktānāṁ paramāgatīḥ (name no. 12) also according to Parāśara, shows the śeṣa-śesin relation that exists between even the liberated beings and the Lord (mukta-tat-prāpyayōḥ śeṣa-śesī-bhāvah).

Parāśara’s Aṣṭāṣloki also makes clear the idea of the śeṣa-śesin relation between the world and Lord Viṣṇu. While explaining the term - Nārāyaṇa as ‘one who is the abode or ultimate goal of all living beings’, he says
that the jīva is always subservient to Lord Nārāyaṇa who is also expressed by the letter ‘a’ constituting the sacred syllable ‘Om’. The jīva exists only for the sake of the Lord but never for his own sake (śl. 3).

THE NATURE AND MEANS OF RELEASE (MOKṢA)

In the state of release, the soul is totally subservient (śeṣa) to the Lord. This śeṣatva is as natural as jñāna (knowledge) is to the soul. By this Parāśara differ from others who says that the state of mokṣa is marked by total independence, that is, it is devoid of the feelings of bliss, etc.

While the role of bhakti as a means of release is unquestioned, the place of prapatti (also known as saranāgati or bharanyāsa) was not specifically described at least in the canonical works of Rāmānuja like the Śrībhāṣya and the Gitābhāṣya. Scholars have explained this aspect of Rāmānuja’s treatment as based upon the fact that the rival schools to whom Rāmānuja was addressing his works do not accept prapatti as a separate means of mokṣa. In fact Rāmānuja had a great heritage and a tradition behind him in this regard. Parāśara, however, makes the position very clear regarding prapatti as a means of mokṣa. In his SRJS (I.17) he states that ‘Viṣṇumāya’ can be crossed only when prapatti is done to the Lord. In the SRJS (II.87-89) we have a detailed statement about prapatti. Parāśara says that several Upaniṣad-s declare the Lord to be the supreme controller and master of cit and acit. He is both the means and goal of human endeavour (upāya and upeya). To be so is His nature but not His quality. That is why 6‘O Lord! I resort to you, who are my refuge (śarana)’ says Parāśara. In verse 89 the declaration of Saranāgati is quite clear. Parāśara states that he is devoid of any
knowledge or action or devotion; nor is he aware of anything like icchā (desire), the proper eligibility (adhikāra), the feasibility of such a hope, etc. ‘Full of sin and foolishness and with a confused state of mind, I request you to be my saviour’, says Parāśara.

jnānakriyābhadjanasampadakiñcano'ham-
icchādhikārāṣakānānuṣayānabhijñāh
rangeśā! pūrnavrjinaśsaraṇam bhaveti
maurkhyād bravīmi manasā viṣayākulena

(SRJS. II.89)

In verse 102 of the second century of the SRJS, Parāśara makes this declaration still clear. “I have been made your burden and responsibility (bhara) by my teachers. I have also orally declared that I seek refuge. Therefore, it behoves you to accept me as your entrusted burden.”

tava bharo'hamakāriṣi dhārmikaiś-
saraṇamityapi vācamudairiram
iti sasāksikayannidamadya māṁ
kuru bharam tava raṅgadhurandhara (II.102)

In his VSB, explaining the word ‘samnyāsakrt’ (name no.587) (‘one who cuts rajas and tamas through samnyāsa’) Parāśara interprets the word samnyāsa thus: ‘bhartari bhāranyāsah samnyāsah’ (‘depositing one’s burden with the Lord is samnyāsa’). This is same as prapatti. He again states sā hi bhavacikitsā (‘that prapatti indeed is the remedy for transmigration’).

In his Āṣṭaśloki (śl. 6-8) Parāśara clarifies this concept of Prapatti. In verse 6 Parāśara makes Prapatti to Lakṣmī first, before resorting to the Lord, She being the means for that end. In verse 7 he explains the meaning of Caramaśloka (Gītā, 18.66) which is in the form of the Lord’s assurance of protection to one who surrenders
to Him whole-heartedly. The last verse may be said to be the statement of prapatti by Parāśara where he expresses his inability to implement the karma, jñāna and bhakti-yoga-s as means of salvation. Even regarding prapatti he is unable to follow it because of his utter helplessness and lack of firm conviction of its implementation. Still the hope of being saved by the Lord, He being the final means, sustains him.

GRADATION AMONG THE RELEASED SOULS

In his explanation of the name muktānāṁ paramā gatiḥ (name no.12) in the VSB, Parāśara points out that the word muktānāṁ (‘of the released souls’) exhibited in the plural number makes two things clear: (i) that the released souls are different from one another; and (2) that they are many in number. They are also different from the Lord because of the difference implied by the term gati (‘the goal’). Parāśara also quotes an upaniṣadic passage prthagātmānam preritārājī ca matvā(Śvetāsvatara, Upaniṣad 1.6) and the Brahmasūtra muktopasūpyavya padeśācca (i. ii. iii) in support.

ĪŚVARA AN ABODE OF PERFECTIONS

In keeping with the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition, Parāśara believes in the Supremacy of Lord Nārāyaṇa, also known as Viṣṇu, Vāsudeva, etc., who is the infinite abode of innumerable perfections such as knowledge, lordship and strength which are collectively known as the ‘six perfections’ (śādgunya). He is also at the same time devoid of any blemishes. This is what is known as the ubhayalīṅgatva of the Lord. This has been clearly stated by Parāśara in the VSB while refuting the prima facie view that the Supreme Brahman is devoid of any positive attribute. The Lord’s omniscience is characterised by
allround knowledge which is natural to Him without any limitations of time and space (SRJS.II.29). His parental care is quite remarkable. To alleviate the sufferings of a sick child sometimes the mother takes the medicine. In the same way, the Lord also comes down into the world of mortals and undergoes all sufferings for the sake of the beings. The Lord’s friendliness is also quite appealing. Though He punishes the wicked it is only due to His genuine love for them that He does so. It is like a friend arresting with chains, etc., a mad person lest he should run out of the house and injure himself by falling into some ditch. Such an act cannot be construed as cruel, says Parāśara.

In the **SRJS**(I.9.116; II.38.51) and **VSB**(name no.122) Parāśara enters into a very detailed discussion on the question of Lord Viṣṇu’s supremacy over the rest of the divinity. The very fact that the Lord is the eternal consort and abode of Lakṣmī, the mother of the universe and His royal insignia such as the crown and five weapons, all bear ample evidence to this point. Parāśara also alludes to Purānic episodes mentioning Brahmā as born out of the lotus that has sprung out of His navel and that Śiva was the off-spring of Brahmā, in order to justify the supremacy of Viṣṇu over these important gods. Another important characteristic of Viṣṇu’s Supremacy (**paratva-piśuna**) is that He is the promoter of the quality of **sattva** which is necessary for effecting the salvation of the suffering humanity, and also His boundless concern and compassion for them which is responsible for His **avatāra**-manifestations.

As for the **vibhūti**-s (glories) of the Lord they consist of the **nitya** (the eternal) as manifested in the **Vaikunṭha** and the **līlā** which comprises the rest of the creation. Commenting on the word **durādharṣa** (**VSB** name no.82)
Parāśara takes occasion to describe the Nityavibhūti that is, Vaikuntha where the Lord is attended upon by His consort Śrī and Bhūmi, and served by many eternally liberated souls such as Ananta, Garuḍa and Viṣvaksena. Parāśara also mentions that this description is in accordance with the statement found in the Kauṣītakī and other Upaniṣad-s.

THE PĀṆCARĀTRA (SĀTVATA) RELIGION

We have quite a number of references to this religion which is also known as the Bhāgavata system. This is one of the two main divisions of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religious texts, the other being the Vaikhānasa. Explaining the name sāttvatāṁ patiḥ (no.514) in the VSB, Parāśara states that the word sāttvata is the śāstra (scripture) or the work (karman) or sattvān. Also under the name ‘jnānamuttamam’ (no.455) Parāśara interprets it to mean the Pāṇcarātra through which all other knowledge including the duties of a Śrīvaiṣṇava can be obtained. One of the important characteristics of the Pāṇcarātra religion is its Vyūha-theory. The Supreme Being has five aspects, namely, Para, Vyūha, Vībha, Arcā and Antaryāmin. The Para form is also known as Vāsudeva. The Vyūha-aspect is four-fold (caturvyūha) as Vāsudeva, Sankarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha. Explaining the names ‘Caturātmā’ and ‘Caturvyūhāḥ’ (nos.139-140) in the VSB, Parāśara mentions the four Vyūha-s and answers the question as to how one and the same God can also be four-fold. The Lord, though one, manifests Himself as these four deities for carrying out different cosmic functions, arranging and distributing those functions among these forms for the benefit of the devotees. Each of these four vyūha-s again has its own configuration, colour, ornaments, weapons, vehicle, banner, etc. In his SRJS
(II.39-40) Parāśara makes a detailed statement about the nature and function of the vyūha-s.¹⁹ The six qualities, in their totality make up the body of Vāsudeva, which is within the reach of the mukta-s (muktabhogya). Samkarṣana in whom the qualities of jñāna and bala are predominant, is responsible for the destruction of the universe. The Pradyumna-vyūha connected with āiśvarya and vīrya carries out the teaching of religion. Aniruddha connected with śakti and tejas protects the world and confers the knowledge of truth. Parāśara states that these four forms are meant for the contemplation of different aspirants and that they correspond to the four states of wakefulness (jāgrat), dreaming (svapna), deep sleep (atyalasa, that is, susupti) and the final stage (mūrcchā) respectively.

It is also clear from a verse of the SRJS (II.37) that there is a subtle difference between the Para Vāsudeva and Vyūha Vāsudeva. The Para Vāsudeva who is known as nityodita being the object of experience of the mukta-s, is the source of the three subsequent Vyūha-s.

THE CONCEPT OF AVATĀRA-S

The Avatāra-s come under the vibhava category of the Vyūha-s. In the SRJS (I.124; II.48 ff) and in the VSB, Parāśara refers to the avatāra-s of Lord Viṣṇu. Time and again the author points out that the Lord though without a birth, manifests Himself among gods, men and animals, sharing their qualities with a view to save them from the endless cycle of birth and death. In all His incarnations Lakṣmī also takes part making His activities more interesting and fruitful. Only the wise can understand the Lord’s greatness in all His manifestations. The ordinary and ignorant ones, however, unable to decipher the purposes of the Lord’s actions, find fault with Him.
ARCĀ (ICONIC FORM)

This aspect of the Lord’s vyūha is also referred to by Parāśara in the VSB (under the name arcita and kumbha no.640-641) and also in his SRJS (II.74-75). The word arcita is explained as ‘one who has assumed the arcāvatāra’. Explaining the salient features of this form, Parāśara states that it is not beyond the reach of men like the para-form; nor is it limited to a particular time or place like the vibhava-s. It is always visible to our eyes at all holy places and temples and even in our own homes. Its innermost secrecy should be ascertained through the Pāñcarātra-texts and Smṛti-s and Purāṇa-s. Quoting from a Pāñcarātra-text Parāśara states that one who prepares a pleasant idol of Lord Viṣṇu with silver, gold etc., and worships it after proper installation, will have all his sins removed. He attains Brahman having that very form which he worshipped on earth. In His arcā-form the Lord is totally dependent on the arcaka (priest) and bears with all the inconveniences, and pleases His worshippers by His magnanimity and easy accessibility.

THE CONCEPT OF ŚRĪ

Lakṣmī or Śrī, the eternal consort of Viṣṇu is not only the source of all prosperity but also a bestower of the power of poetry. Reference is made to the sadgunya in connection with Lakṣmī also. Since She is the co-performer of the Lord’s duties (sahadharmacārini), Parāśara speaks of Her role in the cosmic activity, namely creation, sustenance and destruction also. Since everything is common between Her and the Lord, She is also said to wield the five weapons. She accompanies Him in all His avatāra-s.24 The Lord does everything to please Her and even the act of creation etc., is for Her entertainment
and sport. A detailed statement of the nature of Śri as the śakti of the Lord is given by Parāśara in his explanation of the name ‘Mādhava’. She is said to be one with the Lord and different from Him, like the moon and her effulgence. All other powers are derived from Lakṣmī including the prāṇaśakti animating the entire creation. Lakṣmī alone acts however everything She does is however the expression of the Lord’s wish.

Another important aspect of Lakṣmī which is a characteristic of the Śrīvaiṣṇava school is Her role as the Mother of the beings and as mediator (puruṣakāra) between the man and the Lord. In SGRK, Parāśara draws a beautiful pen-picture of Mother Lakṣmī making an impassionate appeal on behalf of the erring humanity to the Lord to forgive the faults of their children because nobody is free from shortcomings (‘nirdoṣaḥ ka iha jagati’). She thus establishes a rapport between man and God (‘svajanayasi’). That is why She is the Mother of all (‘mātā tadasī naḥ’).

Another important concept explained by Parāśara in his Aṣṭaśloki (śl. 6) as also in the stotra-s is that one has to first surrender to Śri before resorting to the Lord. This is in accordance with the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition maintained by ācārya-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja who preceded Parāśara.

THE NIRVĀHA-S (INGENIOUS INTERPRETATIONS) ATTRIBUTED TO PARĀŚARA

In the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition Parāśara’s nirvāha-s on several words, expressions and passages of the Divyaprabandha are quite popular and are treated on a par with those of earlier ācārya-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja. The nature of Parāśara’s interpretation is to be understood as deep-rooted in his religious experiences and philosophical background of the school which he represents. These are known as aitihya-s also and are
in the form of witty anecdotes, repartees and delectable flashbacks for several epic and purānic episodes. These are to be appreciated and admired sometimes from the religious view-point and sometimes from the literary view-point. At best one may describe Parāśara’s method of interpretation as camatkārāvaha. They are even today read over and appreciated in the traditional kālakṣepa-s. No serious philosophical study can be made on these nirvāha-s. Thus for instance explaining the passage nāl vēdam kaṇḍāne, (‘one who has ‘seen’ the four Veda-s’, ‘one who has been seen by the four Veda-s’), Parāśara takes the word ‘kaṇḍān’ and interprets it as Kānappattavan (‘one who has been seen’) although it can also mean kaṇḍavan (‘one who has seen’).

Explaining the relationship between Īśvara and jīva Parāśara calls it the rakṣya-raksaka-bhāva (‘the relation between the Saviour and the saved’), Parāśara narrates an interesting anecdote explaining this point which may be taken as representing the general style of Parāśara’s nirvāha-s. A merchant went abroad leaving his pregnant wife at home and he did not come for several years. In the meantime his wife delivered a son who grew up to be a merchant like his own father. He also left on a business tour. It so happened that both the father and son with their belongings took shelter at a place which was too narrow to accommodate both. When each one of them was trying to push out the other, a third person who knew their relationship happened to come there. When he told them about it, both the father and son became one and their merchandise became one. The father became the unquestioned protector of the son and his things. This is exactly the kind of relation that subsists between jīva and Īśvara. What is needed, stresses Parāśara, is the mere knowledge of being related with the Lord
(sambandhajñāna). When this is present, everything else is taken care of.

One more important point stressed by the nirvāha-s is the importance of doing śaraṇāgati to Śrī even before doing it with reference to Lord. ‘Śrī-prapatti’ precedes ‘Nārāyaṇa-prapatti’. In Her dual capacity as the mother of jīva and the consort of the Lord, Śrī can take the errant son on Her side and see that the Lord forgives his faults. In other words She acts as the mediator between jīva and Ṛśvara.

Having thus analysed the important philosophical statements spread over the writings of Parāśara now it remains to assess his contribution to the Viśiṣṭādvaita. To this is the following chapter devoted.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: AN ASSESSMENT OF PARĀŚARA’S CONTRIBUTION

Thus on an overall review of Parāśara’s works one is convinced of the wide range of his scholarship in Tamil and Sanskrit and also of the popularity and unquestioned authority with which he strode the field of Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy like a giant in the post-Rāmānuja period, preceding Vedānta Deśika. He was an all-rounder—a poet, commentator, dramatist, philosopher, religionist and an outstanding dialectician. The immense popularity he enjoyed among his contemporaries can be vouchsafed by the statement made by Nārāyaṇa, who commented on Parāśara’s Śrīgunaratnakosa. It points out that Parāśara had the rare privilege of being carried by the Brāhmaṇa-s as a token of their admiration and appreciation of his exposition of the Kaiśikapurāṇa. The title ‘bhaṭṭa’ with which his name is associated speaks very high of his scholastic attainments. On Parāśara’s own statement, this name was given to him by Lord Raṅganātha Himself. He is also traditionally known as the foster-child of Lord Raṅganātha and His consort and according to other accounts he was the purohita of Lord Raṅganātha. His popularity in his own community can also be understood by another fact that he was a superb interpreter and exponent of the Nālāyiradivya-prabandha. The ‘Bhaṭṭar nirvāha-s’ which are famous among the Śrīvaiṣṇava traditionists support this claim. In one of the verses of the Śrēraṅgarājastava (II.90) Parāśara submits to the Lord
that assuming the role of a *Deśika* (teacher), he was cheating the world at large as though he was a great *jñānin* solely devoted to the Lord. Excluding references stemming from his humility, one can conclude that Parāśara was certainly a *deśika* of great religious and philosophical standing of his times. It may also be noted that Parāśara was a pragmatic man who had independent and frank views in the conduct of the day-to-day ritual connected with the temple. As recorded in tradition, Parāśara once resented the trivial excuses on which the priests of the Śrīraṅgam temple wanted to perform an elaborate purificatory ceremony. One of the traditional views is that Parāśara was a great exponent of the school recognised and authorised by Rāmānuja himself to carry on his work. That his life, activities and compositions became an integral part of the Śrīvaisnava tradition is clear from the recitation of the *stotra*-s and the *Tirumañjanakkavi*-s even today in the temple worship.

An in-depth study of all the available compositions of Parāśara reveals that he was an original thinker who has made very rich contributions to the growth and development of the Śrīvaisnava religious thought. He was in the order of great writers of the school like Nāṭhamuni and Yāmuna. Like the *Nyāyatattva* of Nāṭhamuni (which is lost to posterity but for a few fragments) and the *Siddhitraya* of Yāmuna, Parāśara also composed the monumental treatise the *Tattvaratnākara* (‘an ocean of *tattva*-s’).

The fragments which are collected and studied in the present book provide a wealth of information of his views regarding several topics in the fields of *Nyāya* and *Mimāṁsā*. Although a complete picture of his opinion on several of these topics could not be formed, it is still evident that he represented a very bold and independent thinking on several issues. For instance he
opines that Kāsanātra composed the *devatākānda* comprising four *adhyāya*-s which along with the twelve chapters of Jaimini’s *Pūrvamīmamsā* forms the ‘Ṣoḍaśalakṣāṇi’, which again has its sequel in Bādarāyaṇa’s *Brahmasūtra*. Quoting his opinion Vedānta Deśika in his *Adhikaraṇasārāvali* politely remarks that he is not competent to question the veracity of that statement.⁷

Parāśara is also emphatic that there can be no restriction on the components of a syllogistic statement. Also significant is his observation that *Vyāpti* between *hetu* and *sādhyā* need not be attributed to repeated observation. It can be grasped even by a single observation. What is more significant is perhaps the statement that there need be no rigid order of *pratijñā*, *hetu*, etc., His opinion that the *Kevalavyātārekīn* type of *anumāna* cannot be accepted as valid is also in tune with the opinion of Yāmuna and Rāmānuja. However in another passage of the *Tattvaratnākara* he seems to accept it which Vedānta Deśika the great conformist, tries to explain away as representing the *prima facie* view. Parāśara’s views on *tarka* are quite bold and emphatic. *Tarka* (indirect argument) can never claim an independent status in the scheme of *pramāṇa*-s, according to him. His views on *samśaya* (doubt) and *Smṛti* are traditional. It may be pointed out that Parāśara conforms to the traditional views of the school on almost all the issues coming under the category of *pramāṇa*-s, although some notice a few non-conforming views on issues like *arthāpatti*. In one place *arthāpatti* is not accepted as a separate *pramāṇa* whereas in another place it is treated as an independent *prāmaṇa*. Again, as Vedānta Deśika points out, it is difficult to frame any opinion on Parāśara’s views in view of the fragmentary nature of the *Tattvaratnākara*. It is a pity that this text was not available in full even to Vedānta Deśika.
As noted earlier, the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, as it came to be known at a later date,\(^8\) owes its development and popularity to several ācārya-s whose contributions were on the two planes of philosophy and religion. Parāśara’s contribution was also immense from these aspects. On the philosophical side his *Tattvaratnākara* undoubtedly occupies a unique position. On the religious side his *Aṣṭaśloki, Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya*, his interpretation of the *Tiruneduntāṅtaka* passage and the nirvāha-s point to his multifaceted genius. It may be stated that the interpretation of the *pranava*, the *mūlamantra*, the *dvayamantra* and the *caramaśloka* contained in the *Aṣṭaśloki* formed the basis for Vedānta Deśika’s magnificent composition, the *Rahasyatrayasāra* in the *manipravāla*-style. Parāśara’s interpretation of the *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra* provided a refreshing outlook of the real import of the *stotra* differing basically from Śaṅkara’s commentary. According to Parāśara the very fact that a repetition of sacred names of Lord Viṣṇu is itself capable of conferring the highest bliss on the reciter goes a long way to prove that Brahman is *saguna*. A *stotra* would have no meaning if it does not carry conviction with the devotees, by failing to deliver the highest good.\(^9\)

Parāśara’s beautiful *stotra*-s and the *Tirumañjanakkavi*-s not only present him as a great poet but also as an ardent devotee of Lord Śrīraṅganātha. Like Yāmuna who first composed the *Catusūṣloki* in praise of Śrī and followed it up by his *Stotraratna*, Parāśara also composed the *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* in praise of Goddess Raṅganāyakī, and the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* on Lord Raṅganātha Himself. Rāmānuja also in his *Śaraṇāgatigadaya* eulogises the Goddess first and then the Lord. Parāśara’s illustrious father Śrīvatsāṅka also
followed the same tradition in composing the *Pañcastavī* of which the *Śrīstava* is one.

**THE INFLUENCE OF EARLIER WRITERS ON PARĀŚARA**

Parāśara’s *Śrīguṇaratnakosa* and the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* contain ideas and expressions which are similar with those of his predecessors Yāmuna, Rāmānuja and Kūreśa, his own father. That the compositions of the Ālvārs provided the very basic inspiration and content for his religious philosophy goes without saying. The *Catusšloki* of Yāmuna formed the standard expression on the concept of Śrī which was followed by later writers of this school like Rāmānuja, Kūreśa and Parāśara. In this hymn Śrī has been conceived of as the inseparable consort of Lord Viṣṇu, the mother of the beings, the mistress of the two *Vibhūti-s* (*nitya* and *lilā*) and the mediator between man and God. The doctrine of *prapatti* to Śrī is also found in this *stotra* of Yāmuna. The introductory portion of Rāmānuja’s *Śaraṇāgatigadaya* where again *śaraṇāgati* to Śrī is clearly articulated, follows Yāmuna’s *stotra*. Thus Parāśara also expresses his *Śaraṇāgati* to Śrī in his *Śrīguṇaratnakosa* (śl. 59).

Rāmānuja’s influence on Parāśara can also be seen in several passages of the *Tattvaratnakāra* and the *Śrīraṅgarājastava*. Parāśara refers to the opinion of Rāmānuja and Yāmuna (obviously referring to the *Pāñcarātradhikaraṇa* of the *Śrībhāṣya* and the *Āgama-prāmāṇya* of Yāmuna) that the *Pāñcarātra*-scriptures are the compositions of the Lord Himself and as such they cannot be treated as alternative to the *Śrutī*-texts (which are recapitulated and instructed to
Brahmā). In the Śrīrāmājastava (II.22) Parāśara incorporates the view of Rāmānuja expressed in his Śrībhāṣya under tattu samanvayāt (I.i.4). Refuting the Mīmāṁsāka’s view that Upaniṣad-s which speak of the Supreme Brahman, an already existing entity (siddhārtha) are secondary in import since they do not enjoin something to be done (kārya), Rāmānuja and following him, Parāśara maintain that even sentences speaking of accomplished entities are valid in their own right, as in the sentence uttered by a reliable person, thus: atra āste nidhiḥ (‘Here is a treasure’). Such passages are not different from the vidhi-s ordaining upāsanā or phala. Thus they become relevant and connected with the human end (puruṣārtha).

Another great teacher who influenced Parāśara was his own father Kūreśa. Innumerable are the instances which can be cited in support. In the first place Parāśara pays homage to his father in the very opening verse of the Śrīrāmājastava. The Śrīstava of his father gave him the necessary impetus and background to compose the Śrīgūnāratanakaśa. That creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe is a sport of the divine couple is clearly found in the Śrīstava and faithfully followed and developed in the Śrīgūnāratanakaśa. Parāśara, like his father, prays to Goddess Lakṣmī to bless him with the power of speech. Expressions like aśvayam mahadeva and Śrīraṅgarājamahīṣi are found in the Śrīstava also. Likewise verses 29 and 56 of Kūreśa’s Varadarājastava have their echo in Śrīraṅgarājastava.

As instances of the influence of the Ālvars on Parāśara the following may be cited. The idea that one cannot adequately praise the Lord regarding whom the Śruti itself declares yasyāmatam tasya matam., etc., is found in the Śrīraṅgarājastava. In a way this is reminiscent
of Nammāḻvār's *Periyatiruvantādi* passage²³ ‘pugazhvōm pazhippōm pugazhōm pazhiyōm’. A passage from the *Tiruvāymozhi*²⁴ ‘Madiccdiyyā...’ etc., likewise, forms the model for the Śrīraṅgarājastava verse²⁵ which describes the effulgence of the Lord’s gem-studded crown as the brilliance of the moon-like face which, like a stream began to gush in the upward direction.

The *Perumāḻturumozhi*²⁶ of Kulaśekhara Āḻvār refers to the two pillars adjacent to the sanctum-sanctorum in the Śrīraṅgam temple as maṇattūn (‘the fragrant pillars’). They are held for support by those who come close to the Lord and gaze at His charm, which like a flood is sure to submerge or wash away anything that come near. The same idea is not only expressed by Parāśara in *SRJS*,²⁷ but the word ‘maṇattūn’ has been rendered as ‘āmodastambha’.²⁸ What Periyāḻvār described in a decade of verses beginning with nāvalam periya tīvinil vāzhum, etc., depicting the ravishing influence of the sweetness music of Lord Kṛṣṇa’s flute has been summarized in a single verse by Parāśara in *SRJS*²⁹ ‘śailo’gniśca jalāmbabhūva...’ etc.

**PARĀSARA’S INFLUENCE ON THE LATER WRITERS**

The great position occupied by Parāśara in the Śrīvaisṇava tradition and the depth of his scholarship exerted a profound influence on later writers also, of whom Vedānta Deśika deserves special mention. As already noticed, the credit of providing some insight into the otherwise lost text of the *Tattvaratnākara* goes to Vedānta Deśika. In all these references we find that Parāśara is mentioned by epithets expressive of utmost reverence as Bhaṭṭaparāśarapādaīh, abhiyuktaīh, etc. The entire discussion on the section on *anumāna* of the *Nyāyaparīśuddhi* is replete with references to Parāśara’s
views. It is true that Vedānta Deśika also refers to some of Parāśara’s views which seem to go against the traditional concepts. Even then Vedānta Deśika makes a very polite reference and never contradicts or criticises his views. The influence of the Aṣṭaśloki the first independent treatise on the Rahasyatrāya of this school, on the Rahasyatrayasāra of Vedānta Deśika has already been pointed out. The reference made by Parāśara (SRJS) of the pañcāheti or pañcāyudha-ornament put on Lord Kṛṣṇa by his mother Yaśoda as a talisman is found in Vedānta Deśika’s Yādavābhuyudaya. What Parāśara states in SRJS describing the śaṅtodita-state of Vyūha-Vāsudeva is found in Vedānta Deśika’s Varadarājapañcāśat also.

The popularity enjoyed by Parāśara’s works in the commentarial tradition may also be construed as an indirect indication of his influence on later writers. Thus his Śrīgūṇaratnakośa received as many as seven commentaries. His Aṣṭaśloki was commented upon by more than twelve scholars. His Śrīraṅgarājastava has at least four commentaries.

Thus on the strength of the long tradition of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy which holds Parāśara Bhaṭṭa in great esteem and on the basis of his monumental work, the Tattvaratnakara and the stotra-s which form a class by themselves, one can safely conclude that Parāśara played a very dominant role in the development of the basic concepts of the school. Notwithstanding the loss of his colossal work the Tattvaratnakara, one can still see the range of his thinking, embracing in its fold the salient features of the Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā-śāstra-s which were, in all probability, reviewed in the light of the Śrīvaiṣṇava philosophy. His contribution to the building up of the school is immense and it may be said that writers like Vedānta Deśika continued on the lines shown by him and laid it on a firm foundation.
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119. Tai. Ā. III.11.

120. Mahānārāyaṇa, IX.3.

121. See Rāmāyaṇa (VI.18. 33b-34a) ‘sakṛdeva prapannāya’...

122. Chāndogya VI.VIII.7.

123. Cf: Bhagavad Gītā (VII.18), ‘udārāssarva evaite..’

124. For a detailed study of these fragments see Gerhard Oberhammer, Materialien Zur Geschichte Der Rāmānuja Schule, ‘Parāśarabhaṭṭa’s Tattvaratnā karaḥ’. See Appendix I of this book for a list of these fragments.

125. Yatindramatadīpikā, p.51.

126. See Tarkasamgraha, p.135 and Vedāntaparibhāṣā, p.60.

128. See *Yāmuna’s Contribution to Viśiṣṭādvaita*, pp. 165-166.

129. The readings found in this fragment seem to be corrupt and hence a proper understanding of this passage was a little difficult. The commentary *Nyāyasāra* of Śrīnivāsācārya on Vedānta Deśika’s *Nyāyarpaṇiśuddhi* (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series) is quite useful in this connection.

130. Some of the acārya-s of this school seem to be divided regarding the status of *Arthāpatti* as a separate *pramāṇa*. Meghanādāri accepts *Arthāpatti* as a separate *pramāṇa* along with *Upamāṇa*. (See *Nayadyumani*, pp. 214-219). The present fragment of *Tattvaratnakara* which contains the statement ‘divatana-aśana-niśedha-mātraparām cet śrutārthā patteh’ appears to be in favour of *Śruti-arthāpatti* as a separate means although *Arthāpatti* in general is earlier denied an independent status. Earlier Yāmunācārya in his *Ātmasiddhi* tried to prove the existence of the individual soul (*ātman*) on the strength of Śrutārthāpatti (See *Ātmasiddhi*, pp. 139-140). Scriptural passages such as *jyotiṣṭemena svarga-kāmo yajeta* become incompatible if the existence of an abiding self is not accepted. Hence this becomes a *pramāṇa*. But how to account for this apparent contradiction? The word *śrutārthapatti* should not be interpreted as a separate classification of *arthāpatti* but as ‘an implication’ found in the statements heard. It can thus be included in *Śabdapramāṇa* itself.

131. *Chāndogya* VIII.XI.5.

75. Śrīguṇaratnakośa, verse 47.
76. ibid. verse 54.
77. ibid. verse 51.
78. ibid. verse 61.
79. See P.B. Annangaracharya Svamin’s commentary on Śrīraṅganāthastotra, pp. 7-8.
80. For a detailed account of these places, see Śrī Vaiṣṇava Divya Deśams compiled by L.V. Gopalan Madras, 1972.
82. See Śrīvacanabhūṣaṇa, p. 137.
See also Śrīraṅgarājastava, II.75.
83. Śrīraṅgarājastava, śl.I.16.
84. Tai Ā. I.27. 3b: ‘devānām pūr ayodhyā’.
85. ibid. I.27.3c: ‘purām hiraṇmayīṁ brahmā, viveśāparājīta’.
86. Bot. Rottleria inctoria. 86a see peṇyāḷvār Tirumolḥi 1.6.9
86a. See Periyāḷvār Tirumolḥi 1.6.9
87. Cf: Śrī Veṅkatesa-prapatti verse 8, ‘Lakṣmīmahī-tadanurūpa...’.
89. Chāndogya vi.viii.7. 89a cf. peria Tirumoḷi 5.10.3-6
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102. See ‘yo brahmāṇam’, etc. (Śvet. VI.18) and ‘brahmaṇah putrāya’ (Hiranyakesi-Gṛhyasūtra I.22.14).
103. Lord Śiva is also believed to have appeared from time to time to save his devotees but those appearances are known as svarūpa-s but not avatāra-s. For details, see Ronald M. Huttington, ‘Avataras and Yugas: An Essay in Purānic Cosmology’, Purāṇa Vol.VI.No.1 (Jan. 1964), p.13.
104. See Viṣṇupurāṇa, VI.v.79: ‘jñāna-śakti-balaiśvarya..’.
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108. See Vālmiki Rāmāyāna, Yuddha-kāṇḍa (vi.131.90b) ‘labdhvā kuladhanam rājā laṅkām prāyād vibhiṣanah’.
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116. ibid. III.30.
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119. Tai. Ā. III.11.

120. Mahānārāyaṇa, IX.3.

121. See Rāmāyāna (VI.18. 33b-34a) ‘sakṛdeva prapannāya’...

122. Chāndogya VI.VIII.7.

123. Cf: Bhagavad Gītā (VII.18), ‘udārāssarva evaite.’
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128. See Yāmuna’s Contribution to Viśiṣṭādvaita, pp. 165-166.

129. The readings found in this fragment seem to be corrupt and hence a proper understanding of this passage was a little difficult. The commentary Nyāyasāra of Śrīnivāsaśācārya on Vedānta Deśika’s Nyāyapariśuddhi (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series) is quite useful in this connection.

130. Some of the ācārya-s of this school seem to be divided regarding the status of Arthāpatti as a separate pramāṇa. Meghanādāri accepts Arthāpatti as a separate pramāṇa along with Upamāṇa. (See Nayadyumani, pp. 214-219). The present fragment of Tattvaratnākara which contains the statement ‘divatana-aśana-niṣedha-mātraparam cet śrutārthā pateh’ appears to be in favour of Śruta-arthāpatti as a separate means although Arthāpatti in general is earlier denied an independent status. Earlier Yāmunācārya in his Ātmasiddhi tried to prove the existence of the individual soul (ātman) on the strength of Śrutārthāpatti (See Ātmasiddhi, pp. 139-140). Scriptural passages such as jyotiṣṭemena svarga-kāmo yajeta become incompatible if the existence of an abiding self is not accepted. Hence this becomes a pramāṇa. But how to account for this apparent contradiction? The word śrutārthāpatti should not be interpreted as a separate classification of arthāpatti but as ‘an implication’ found in the statements heard. It can thus be included in Sabdapramāṇa itself.

131. Chāndogya VIII.XI.5.

132. Mundaka. II.I.3.


135. Yāmuna’s Āgama-prāmāṇya and the Pāñcarātra section (II.ii. 39-42) of the Śrībhāṣya are the two texts implied here by Parāśara.

136. On Kāṣakṛtsna see the New Catalogus Catalogorum Vol. IV, p.115 (a,b). See also Adhikaraṇasārāvali, śl. 15: ‘saṅkarṣaḥ kāṣakṛtsnaprabhavaḥ.’

137. See Śrībhāṣya, pp. 3-4 and NP. p.480

138. See NP. p.494.

139. See Yogasūtra of Patañjali (3.22); ‘prātibhādvā sarvam’.

140. See Nyāyasiddhāṇjana (NS) p.72.


142. Brhadāraṇyaka. IV.iii.9.

143. ibid. IV.iii.6.

144. ibid. IV.iii.9.

145. On the authority of NS. p.562 ff, we understand that Parāśara is here refuting the Sphoṭa theory of the Grammarians.

146. See NS. pp.600-601 for more explicit it reference to the pīlu and pithara-pāka-vādas.

147. They are published by Sri. A. Srinivasaraghavan along with the Viṣṇusahasranāmamastotrabhāṣya of Parāśara (pp. XIX—XXIII).

148. 5 of these verses along with Parāśara’s commentary were published serially in the Vedānta Dīpikā, Vol.XXVII. Part II pp. 15-21 III (pp.88-90), Part
CHAPTER IV

1. Cf: Śrīguṇaratnakośa, şl.6
   stotāram tamuśanti devi kavayo yo vistṛṇīte guṇān,
   stotavyasya,’ etc.

2. ibid. şl.7. sükṣtim samagrayatu naḥ svayameva
   lakṣmīḥ.

3. See Kāvyaprakāśa, I.4(a):
   tadadośau śabdārthau sagoṇāvanalaṅkṛtī punah kvāpi.

4. Dhvanyāloka, II.10:
   samarpakatvam kāvyasya yattu sarvarasān prati
   saprasādo guṇo jñeyah sarvasādhāraṇaṅkriyāh

14.
5. *Ibid*, II.33: 
sarveśveva prabhedeṣu sphuṭatvenāvabhaśanam yad 
vyāṅgyasya anigīḥūtasya tat pūrṇam dhvanilakṣanam.

6. See *Dhvanyāloka*, II.p.119: 
tatprakāṣanaparāścārtho 'nap ekṣitādīrghhasamās- 
aracanaḥ prasannavācākābhidheyaḥ

7. See *Pratāparudriya*, *Guṇaprapakaraṇa*, p.234: 
avaiśamyena bhāṇanam.

8. See *Pratāparudriya*, *Guṇaprapakaraṇa*, p.236: 
atyujjvalatvarṁ bandhasya.


11. The translations of the *sūtra*-s given here are mostly 
    from *The Siddhāntakaumudi*, translated in English 
    by S.C. Vasu.

12. See *Amarakośa*, I.i.545: 
    *vā purṇsi padmam.*

13. Vide *Amarakośa* I.i.268: 
    *prakāṇḍamuddhatallajau.*

**CHAPTER V**

1. Cf: NS. *Bhaṭṭaparāśarapādaiḥ; Tattvaratnakarakāraih,* 
   etc.

2. See fragments 7, 17 and 29.

3. See NS. p.143.

4. See *Śrībhāṣya*, pp.3—4.

5. See Appendix I, fragment No. 21.

6. Vide: *Aṣṭālokiḥ*, V.1.a. *‘jagadudayarakṣāpraṇayakṛt’*

8. **ibid.** II.41.

9. **ibid.** II.44.

10. See *Brahmasūtra*, II.i.34.

11. Cf: *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* [iv.iv.5]: sādhukārī sādhurbhavati

12. See *VSB*, p.126: ‘avarsya ātmanaḥ svābhāvikam jñānādīvat.’ etc.


14. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* 5.7: yasya pṛthvī śarīram; yasya āpaḥ śarīram; yasya ātmā śarīram’.

15. See *VSB*, p.126 (on name no.12).

16. See Prof. M.R. Sampathkumaran’s English translation of Rāmānuja’s *Gītābhāṣya*, Introduction, p.XXV.


18. See *SRJS* II.27-31: *VSB* pp.254, 289-290. See also the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (VI.v.79) which defines the term *bhagavān* as the possessor of *bhaga* which is the name of six qualities, viz., knowledge, power of action, sustaining strength, sovereignty, energy and radiance, and opposed to blemishes.

19. For an etymology of this word (vyūḥ) (‘to shove asunder’), see F. Otto Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāṇcarātra and the Ahirbudhnyā Samhitā*, p.40.

20. **SGRK**. śl.7-8, 16-18.

21. **ibid.** śl. 32-33.

22. **ibid.** 19-30; **SRJS**. II.44.

23. **SGRK** 47.
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24. ibid. 48.
25. ibid. 54.
26. SRJS. II.44.
27. VSB, name no.73.
28. SGRK śl. 52.
29. See Yāmuna’s Catusṭlokī and Rāmānuja’s Śaraṇāgatigadya, introductory paragraph.
31. SRJS, II.37.
32. Varadarājapañcāsat, śl.16.
34. This information is taken from the notes available with the New Catalogus Catalogorum, Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras.

CHAPTER VI

1. His Lakṣmīkalyāṇanāṭaka is unfortunately not available.
2. See VSB, Introductory śl.3: bhūyo bhaṭṭaparāśareti φανίταν śriṇaṅgabhartrā svayam.
3. See SRJS, I.17.
4. Cf: Taniyan on Parāśara ‘śriṇaṅgeśapurohita..’ etc., attributed to Naṅjiyar, Parāśara’s disciple.
5. See Nārāyaṇa’s commentary on SGRK, p.1. ‘dramidopaniṣadgabhīrāśayavivaṃcanaṇah..’ etc.
7. Cf: Adhikaraṇasārāvali, śl. 15: ‘saṅkarṣaṇ
kāsakṛtsnaprabhava iti kathām tattvaratnakaroktiḥ, 
atra brūmah saduktāu na vayamiha mudhā bādhitum 
kiṃcidarhāḥ...

8. See Dr V. Varadhachari, 'Antiquity of the term 

9. Cf: Viṣṇusahasranāma, śl.3. 'kim japaḥ macyate 
jantuḥ janmaśamsārabandhanāt'.

10. See SRJS I.3. 'rāmānujamunirjīyāt..' etc.

11. See fragment 20: 'bhasyakṛd-yāmunāryaiḥ'.

12. Cf: 'putraste jātaḥ'.

13. See SRJS, II.22: 'aṭrāste nidhiḥ...tvayi sakalāḥ 
samanvayante' and Cf: Śrībhāṣya, I.i.4: 'samanvayaḥ 
samyaganvayaḥ; puruṣārthatayā anvayaḥ ityarthah'.

14. SRJS, I.1: 'śrīvatsacihnamiśrebyhayah..' etc.

15. Cf: Śrīstava, śl. 1 with SGRK śl. 4 and śl.22.

16. Cf: Śrīstava śl.2 with SGRK, śl.7.

17. SGRK, śl.6.

18. ibid. śl.2.

19. Śrīstava, śl.7 and 11.

20. Śrīrāṅgarājastava, I.68, 112.


22. Śrīrāṅgarājastava I.13.

23. Periyatiruvantādi, stanza 2.

24. Tiruvāymoḻhi, III.i.1.

25. Śrīrāṅgarājastava, verse I.91.

26. Perumāḻtirumoḻhi, 1.2.

27. SRJS, I.59.
28. Cf: *SRJS* (II.56) with Tirumaṅgai Ālvār’s *Periyatirumozhi* (V.viii.3.) where the Gajendravarada-episode is recounted.


31. See Parāśara’s *nirvāha* on *Tiruvāymozhi*, I.ii.6.

32. See *Tiruvāymozhi*, I.ii.9.
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>NS</td>
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<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>NS</td>
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<tr>
<td>39.</td>
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<tr>
<td>40.</td>
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<td>41.</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>42.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>
1. "क्रृष्ण संज्ञयः कतिविचक्ष? एकस्मिनू धर्मिनि
विरूपाक्षकविरोपासामासः संज्ञयः। स च क्रियायः।"

2. "प्रत्यक्षमूलानां स्मृतिनां स्वस्मूलेनभवार्थविवषया
प्रमाणात्रित्वाविरोधः। चतुस्त्र च वैदिकावादो दर्शितः।। स्मृतिः
प्रत्यक्षमैतिथनुमानं चतुस्त्रम्थ इति प्रत्यक्षाविविशेषेण वेदानुवादाचः।"

3. "अपरोक्षप्रमाध्यक्षपरोक्षं च संविदः।
व्यवहारपरिशंभ्विज्ञानज्ञविज्ञाजनम्।।
...परोक्षं व्यवहार्यन्तरगीतवस्तुदेवनापेक्षा। तदन्तरगतितिज्ञापेनेता
पाराप्रभुमनुमादि।"

4. "अन्तः वृत्तं विद्मधामुः संयोगः सनिकर्षणम्।
संयुक्ताश्रयं शति वथासंबंबमूहुताम्।।"

5. "विशेषणानां स्वायोगव्यासृविवक्लयके।
सन्वकल्पेयद्योगस्य व्यावृत्ति: संहिता तथा।।
...क्रियायूः चातुतुः प्रत्यक्षम्। अर्वाचिनमनवाचिनं च।
युगपदश्रविष्यसाकारकारकमनवाचिनम्।। ततुः योगिमुक्तं श्रवणां
प्रभावविशेषांशीनमुष्पादिपिष्टे।"

6. "संबन्धोऽयं सकृद्धाः प्रतीतित्वसरसात् तथा।
प्रतीतयो हि स्वस्मूलित्वस्मविद्नीव विदुः।।
...सन्निविषयमूद्विज्ञितसंयुक्तस्योनिक्षेत्रस्य
तदाश्रिताश्रितविदः। संयुक्ताश्रितः। तदाश्रितनेन व्यक्तन्तराणि संप्रयुक्तानि ...
तृतीयः संनिकर्षोऽयं सनिकर्षनिरुपणे।
अनुक्रमलयेन व्यास्तेतैव साधनात।।"

7. "केनिचिन्द्रश्य संबन्धे योडवच्छेदनक एष हि।
तस्योपाध्यथाय वहेवैत्रयोधुःसंगमे।।"
श्रोत्रयोगे नमसो यथा वा कण्ठःकुकली।
संसारयोगे जीवस्य कमणिद्वादि वा यथा।
साध्वयारक: साधनायारक: इति तं लक्षयन्ति। केविन्तु
साधनायारक: साध्वसमयारितिति। च ... किमस्व इत्याकम? साधनस्य केविन्तु साध्वसमयारितिति।
संबन्धमयवेलानुयासिक्विवृवेनकल्यांवा। असंबन्धवित्यारकं
च व्यभिचारदर्शान्यू। तद्व साध्ववित्यधोरम्यकल्यां निधिते
प्रमाणवाङ्किते पश्चे विपक्षे वा हेतोरंदर्शान्यू।
अर्थीयोषायतयांच्यांमयवाङ्किते पश्चे दर्शं हि हिंसात्व मन्तव्यमात्मन
उपाधि कल्यांति। प्रमेयार्लं च नित्यालोकविशेषं
रूपमिनित्यत्वसाधने कृतकालादिकमुपायोर्करोति। सप्तशेषू व
यावदृढःविशिष्टतया साधनं साध्वसंबन्धितेन दयम; तदन्तःतुरुपविपले चेतुः पश्चे दर्शंते, तदा
व्यासरुपप्रयंतिविभाषानानुवृत्तमेवदिकायस्यति;
यथा-भावितेनवयक्तातिमल्ल्यन्त्र: अनुस्येनित्यनुवुत्तत्व: भूतुमुन्नु: दयं
शाकायाकारपरिणामविशेषम्। एवंस्यात्थेन
रूपुक्तकल्यकपितोपाधिके हेताब्रम्योजकत्वादिहसः
परीशाकाराम्। व्यभिचारकपितोपाधिकोस्तु वाचिते
विरुद्धे वैनेकान्तिक इति तदेष संक्षे: - व्यभिचार एव
प्रतिबन्धायावः। उपाधिरेव व्यभिचारनिदानाम्। प्रमाणानिन्वित
एवोपाधितें शक्नीयः। साधने सोपाधि: साध्ये
निरुपाधिरेवोपाधितेन निश्चेषः।
सर्वशास्त्रातिर्प्रज्ञानपात्नपदैति शत् तर्कः’’।

8. “अक्षयद्विधमसूत्रतु ... इयं हि
अत्यत्वसितकल्यातिरिक्तीतिमिदः। विद्यमानसपश्चापि
पश्चात्रूपति: प्रथम: | अन्यस्तविद्यमानसपक्षो
विश्लेषावृत्ताः ३९।। तत्र द्विसाध्वति सप्तमेश साधनस्य
ततो व्याख्यात्वभावाधामास्तवं स्पष्टम्। अद्वैते तु तस्मिन्
साध्यात्मन्यास्यपक्षपूर्वबोधकप्रमाणात्त्वाराध्यात्मास्तवं सुचचम्।

६। “अन्तरासाधरणाकाशृष्टिप्रतितिनिवन्धनम्।
सजातीयरिवनियववन्तेन लक्षणम्॥…
साहाय्यम्: जात्यादिराकार: प्रमेयं निष्कृतय लक्षणति: प्रमाणस्य
सजातीयविजातीयवच्छेदांश्रेष्ठ सहकाराति लक्षणसुचच्छते”

१०। “श्रौण्यादिविभ्यं प्रमाणसिद्धं न वा?
तद्विचलेत्याश्रयसिद्धिनिलेन्द्रात्मानो हेऽऽः। सिद्धोऽऽ साधनं सुधा।
स्वप्नपुस्तिरेवा प्रक्षेपति व्यवस्थ: साध्यत इति चेतु। तद्वेद तद्वपि। तथापि
हायनतसिद्धिविशेषः पक्षः स्यातः इतरवच्छेदस्य कहिन्दनालोचितचर्चातः,
सिद्धोऽऽ वा साधनवैश्यः। किं च प्रमाणस्य स्वविश्वव्यवस्थायां
प्रमाणाण्तरपेश्चाणाद्वित्यप्रयोगः: प्रमाणं प्रस्तेयभाताम्॥

तस्माद्यः: प्रमेयात्मा धर्मनिष्कर्षमाचक्यानु।
लक्षणं न प्रमाणात्मेतुलक्यैव दिशा गति:॥”

११। “सर्वं प्रमाणं सामर्थ्यं स्वतं एव प्राप्तयाः।
जन्यते परद्रययेन वृत्तया चेति हि द्विधाः॥
अनोत्नमानं द्विविधं स्वप्राप्तिवेद्यात:।
प्रत्यक्षाणमसामाल्योः परवाक्येय प्रदशिति॥
वक्षये व्यवहारवन्यनमानस्य तृतियः।
अनुमोद्वयं वाक्यं प्रयोगः: साधनं च ततौ॥”
१२. ‘अतः सर्वत्र पञ्चायत्ववाक्यमात्रियन्ते वेदाचायादयः…
‘पञ्चायत्ववृक्षय वाक्यस्य गुणदोषवित्’ इत्यादौ … न च सर्वदा
सर्वेऽयः प्रयोज्यः, न इति निर्विभ्रीमः, ब्रह्मप्रतीवृक्षसंप्रतिष्ठातू
लघुपायोपाणांनिः पदार्थावातु, लोकेण्य तथा व्यवहारात्… प्रतिपत्तिकेश्या
विकल्पमुचार्यावेन, अविकृतोऽवातु…. प्रतिज्ञा: परं हेतुदाहरणायोऽ
क्रमिनिर्भयः, व्यासितेःप्रभृतिः विद्वाणाभावात्…. सोयं गवयःपदार्थार्थियेः,
गोसहःत्वातु: न इत्यः, स तथा, यथोऽपि भासः; अयं च
गोसहः; ततःस्तत्पदाच्यः……
व्यासी द्यान्तर्हयायामवर्यं स निदर्शः
आङ्गाधन्यात्सिधिः न व्यक्तिसृष्ट्यार्थमीति
धृश्वनात्सिद्धान्वेवविस्फोटकाः तथा गति:।’’

१३. छलजात्योपरिरक्ष्यात्विज्ञायामोऽःत्वाय्त्तम�, कदाचिदविभुष्मः-
विरज्ञायाहत्मायेण तत्वाध्यक्षसायासंसर्गदक्षमक्षमम, अन्यद्वद्विपि विस्तरण
तत्कालाके प्रत्यपादिः।

१४. ‘‘अमू० जातीनानानन्त्याबवतृबिक्षणतिरसो प्रदर्शनायाः
‘अन्यद्वद्विपि’ इत्यादिना जात्यान्तर् सूचनात्’

१५. ‘‘ईद्धक्ष्याणानानामक्रियविकलपीत:।
सर्वामुनात्मानासानाः संस्कर्तकृत्व सुचितम्।
तत्तत्त्प्रक्षणास्वतसंकल्पति तथा भासानां तदभास:। तत्,
पञ्च प्रतिज्ञाहरिभासा: पञ्चवृक्षवद्योशजाः।
सिद्धसिद्धवाधिविज्ञक्षितवाक्षाकल्पतत:।
अविकृतमात्र्यायाध्यानिनेद्यादयः साधनादिविशविनाहरणानिदेशादोवा
द्रष्ट्याः। एते च लक्षणावाके पञ्चर्मांडेन व्यवर्त्याच्यातु सर्वेः
प्रतिज्ञामासाः……
अथ
हेत्वोसिद्धान्ताय्वसिद्धाविद्वेशायन्विद्वेशानीकणातिकायहेत्वोसिद्धार्थायः
विद्वेशायभिचारप्रकरणसमसिद्धाध्यायः:  इति  दसाय ।
तत्राभिमोक्षप्रमितपञ्चम्भावः: । स  स्वतो  नवथा....
सर्वानुमानाभासां  सत्त्वाभासवक्ष्यति: ।
व्याप्तपञ्चभार्ताहार्ज्यः  लघु  लक्षणम् ।’’

१६.  “अपरे  पुनः  समान्यां  तत्त्वानुग्रहतात्मायादुदाहरन्ति
यदा  तत्त्वप्रकाशयवसायविवृद्धम्.....
नैनंतरकस्पेशनं  सर्वं:  प्रमित्यो  यतः: ।
विरोधावोध्योपर्यंत  संशयं  स  चिकित्सते ।’’

२७.  “एषां  प्रसंज्ञोरेः  वा  प्रयोगः  ...  तत्त्ववादाभासानाष्ट्यादिनः
सावकाशाचायाचार्यविवृद्धविभस्यावप्रतिशयानुमानार्थायित्वतः: ।
इये मैत्रावसिद्धावस्थ्याभियो श्रेष्ठमूला  चेतु  सामान्याविद्वेशायो  न्यायो
निर्देशते  ...  पीनो  देबतो  दिवा  न  भुङ्के  इत्यत्तद्यिनी
शार्मोजनन्ततातप्यः  चेतु  अध्यायारस्यसाधारणमुः
दिवातनानसनाभेश्यात्मातपरं  चेःचुतात्यित्वेते: । यस्य  हि  प्रमाणस्य
यावतू  प्रमेयं  व्यवस्थापितं,  तत्तु  तत्त्वप्रमिते  न  स्वातन्त्र्येण
पर्यवस्थयति: । तदा  तत्त्ववसायानार्थपदांसुपपसिलियज्ञादिकं
व्याचिक्यामाणं  कर्तलक्षणाप्रबं  चेष्टयायाविद्यतः,  परोदेशप्रौढवाचार्यवाचार्
प्रमित्यपर्यवस्यानी  तत्त्वमैत्रास्यान्वयालोचनास्य  स्वातन्त्र्येण
व्याप्रियामाणं  तत्त्वप्रमाणपदं  समस्यिरोहति:....

★ यद्यपेक्ष न  तर्कः  स्वातन्त्र्येण  स्वात्त्वसमर्थनसमर्थः
तथायाचार्यानुग्रहेः  प्रभवति,  समि  चागमा:  —  मनसैतनू
कामानू  पवयनू  रमते  -  मनोस्य  दिव्यं  चंदु:  -  सोस्यं
काम्य मनसा ध्यायीतमनसेव जगतू सृष्टि - एतस्माजायते प्राणो
मनः सबविन्द्रयाणी च इत्येवमादयः प्राकृत्यार्क्येषु....

यदुक्ते न प्रमाणेन परीक्षा दोषवच तत् ।
अप्रमाणेन तर्केण परीक्षा वक्ष्यते यतः ॥
मानानुग्रहहृं युक्तः ज्ञानं तर्कोपभिधीयते ।
युक्तिः सम्बोधितसब्दिकपूर्वतो द्विधा ॥
केचिदाहाते तर्कः प्रमाणामिति मन्महे
संज्ञायादिवेदिहिमवत्तू प्रमाण्यस्य च संभवातुः ॥

प्रसङ्गलेघ्वतिरेण्त्युनुसमानेव तर्कः.....

उच्यते न प्रमा तर्कौ वेष्टेत्वोविरोषष्टतः ।
हेतुभासोजेभाशो चोऽहिः निरायको न च ॥... ।

न स सिद्धान्तः, तथाहृत्वं भवित्वमू लिः
सम्बवासंभवप्रणमदितः । यथा - बाहारसिद्धवत्वातू पुरुषाणनो
भवित्वमू, न स्थायानेति । एवं संस्कारादिनां
विश्वनवधारणग्रस्तप्रयोजनान्तमविसमेवपि
पृथगुपदानमवत्तकंवाग्रेयसमातुः, उयोगभेदस्य च न्यायपदे
दस्सिद्यमाणवत्ताचाच ठी न केवलं प्रसारसाधनं साधव्यादिवसन्निद्धमू,
अधि त्वन्यगतमेव प्रसारहेतुः, न त्वनुमानमन्यगताद्रमोतु प्रवत्तर् ।
त्तस्तस्मात् सुपटोस्य मेदः... ।

१८. अभिधानाभिधेयत्वमः शब्दार्थोऽँ: स्थितमू ।
सबन्धोसीत्रसिद्धा क्रेशः बोध्या भुस्यज्ञयतः ॥
अभिधार्थवगत्वा शब्दं व्याप्तिनिश्चयतः ।
शब्दांश्चनिनितं सा स्वार्थं मुद्याभिधीयते ॥
स्वार्थाभिधानद्वारा स्वाभज्ञायायिन्ते मता।'
19. "अब्रजयाश्रयणीयमयाचलातारणिमिषाचितचितात ।
इत्याहर्ष्यमूणाचार्य: पदरवान्निताभिधामु।
ष्टि: प्रतीतिप्रसुन्तोपपतिभि- ।
निर्दृश्योत्तोषाधिरिहान्चिताभिधा ।
सिद्धा पदेनिन्मितात्मञ्जःस्थिति- ।
विषयार्द्धित्यखिं समझसमु।"

20. "उपपदर्वा तु बहयं व्याघोष्यमदेश- ।
प्रतिहत्तपा राशिःष्पत्ये ताक्षणकेतु: ।
श्रुतिरिपु तदुपां: पञ्चराकृतिकलयं ।
न लभत इति सूच्चता माधवाकुणानाय:।"

21. "कमिदतारङ्गोचरा सा त्रियोदशी सूत्रकारत: ।
जैसिनेमुनि: काशकुत्तनेता बादसयानंदित्यत: क्रमात्।"

22. "थर्मिनीमानभेदाक्षप्रयुक्तिक्रमकोषः ।
सांतेदाशविशेषोऽवाधत्राप्रसकिम:।"

23. "यथार्थनिश्चयो नानां तत्तुथेति सूयः ।
नातिव्यासस्त: स्मृतौ व्यासितयादेवन हि सा प्रमा।"

.... अनुभूतिविवेकासुन्त्रप्रमोषः: स्मृति:; यथा - स घट इति। ननु
तामपि व्याप्रोति लक्षणमु: सत्यमु: तद्यसः नातिव्यासिः: तत्स्यापि
लक्ष्यपक्षे निखेनात्।

लक्ष्यालक्ष्य अनालक्ष्य श्रीयते लक्षणं कथमु।
लोके धीमवहारं हि लक्ष्यालक्ष्यावचिं विदु:।"

24. "व्युत्पन्नोप्योप्योप्योधकनियमं चेतु चेष्टिह शाब्दः।
आधित्यमपि सहदृश्या स्मारकमिति न पूःर्वोष्यम्मु ...
ननु च प्रतिभा कार्यम् यथाऽभिमानां भान्यास्मातातः ।
बाह्यरूपेश्येण बाह्यानांक्षामास्तु सा ॥

विशिष्टकालपुरुषार्यपाशोत्कर्षणंभवा ।
सत्यं कालाद्विदेशस्तु दुर्गित्चितोऽस्माद्धिभि: ॥

सत्यसौ व्यवहारौ नोपयोगीतपेश्यते ।
प्रतिमाया: फलं दण्डं यदा प्रमाणाननिष्ठय: ॥

लदन्तत: कृतार्थविनाशु प्रेष्यते न परीक्षःके: ।
पुष्पेषु पुष्पेषेषा भूषिदं सत्यदर्शिनी ॥

तत्सात् पतञजित् ग्राह प्रतिभाचेति तां प्रमात ॥”

२५. “तच्छ शोदा.... आन्तरं मन:”

२६ “कर्मशकुलीनिरायनगोलकसानासांकायिकाप्राणानि च तानि”

२७. “निपुपनिरीक्षणं च जलेकुपकावतू ज्वालासंक्रणं द्रष्यते”

२८. “बंगालित यद्भिन्द्रोडादु पतापत्या च मुखाते ।
जन्तुस्मस्मार्ष्टियं हरिं यतू प्रविविच्यते ॥
अतो न काकदन्तानामिव तस्य परीक्षणम् ।
उपेश्यं बन्धकवस्य ज्ञाने हानप्रयोजनानात् ॥

तत्स्वरूपपत्तलमतिग्राह्यकादिको सूरः ।
विवदन्ते ततो जात: सदिशिनिवत्तेऽद्वधुना ॥

अन्तालोकाभावस्तम इति कार्यम् । नास्ते वेक तमः,
नीलाभवस्मर्तिमृग्रिमोष एव तमोव्यवहारेऽतिरिति प्राप्तकरः: ।
ब्रह्मान्तरस्मात् कल्पितं कौमारिला: । प्रधानल्लभब तम इति
तत्तबिवद...
अत्र तत्त्वाविदः प्राहुः स्थूलसूमात्मनाः स्थिता।
दैवी गुणमयी माया बाह्यान्तरतमो मता।”

29. “धियः प्रत्यक्षमात्रात् परतस्तदसंभवात्।
पारिश्यात्मकातोभाः प्रभाणागत तत्ततः।
प्रतीतित्यविहारणात्: सन्तैहरिवर्जनात्।
सत्तायां सिद्धबत्तरात्, ज्ञानं भातीति भावितम्।
परस्यादनावाक्षादः सत्यायत्वितरिक्तः।
अर्थातेऽथ युक्तेऽथ वचनावच स्वस्वितः।

...विन्द्रितिपठा संवित् स्वगतव्यवहारं प्रति स्वाधीनकिबिक्षारे
सजातीयसंबंधानपेशा यवहारहेतुतवात् अर्थेन्द्रश्रद्धीपादितष्टः। न च चश्चुषः
सजातीयतेजोपेशायानैकान्त्यम्: तयत्रिभिवलैन, आहारिकावलैन वा,
आलोकजलिनजातीयतवात्। अन्यथा, ज्ञानसंस्कारः स्त्रिकादर्शमावार्यः
ज्ञानानुभवानपेशा: संस्काराधार्यसंस्कारवात्, विषयसंस्कारो...
ज्ञानसंस्कर्येण सहोत्पादते विषयसंस्कारात्माध्यदिसैह जानामीति
ज्ञानप्रभवसंस्कारवात्। न चोभयविशयज्ञानपूर्वकतः प्रयोजकम्; ज्ञानपूर्वकतेन
व्यासितिसद्विव्यिर्यविशोषणतवात् ... पुनश् ... संविदन्यादेनिन्यस्वरमें
व्यवहारा, [स्वविन्द्रस्वादर्थन्ते तद्भवव्यवहरनेतुतवात्। यः
स्वविन्द्रस्वादर्थन्ते तद्भवव्यवहरनेतुहः, स तयोः स्वसिनु अनन्यायीनो
दष्टः, नथा रूपार्थासाध्रुवादौ] ... व्यतिरेकं चास्तिः चिठ्ठम् ... ज्ञानं न परमक्रायम्,
वादाविष्काशाध्यशकातप्रस्थातः ... वचनानि च ... अन्तः, पुनः स्वयंत्योतिर्भवति, आत्मवायस् ज्योति:, चेन
ज्योतिषावस्ते, आत्मस्वेवं तत्ज्ञानं ब्रह्मसिद्धिमुः इत्यादीनि
ज्ञानपदवाच्यजीवस्य; स्वास्योतिर्भवत्राणि ज्ञानपदाधिभेयायां संविदा
संभवाधवायां स्याप्रकाशालं संभवायति ... मणितरणिदीपतितभाषा
साधयेण जीवतज्ञानसमर्थानां च

यथा प्रकाशायत्येकः कृतसं लोककिमं रवि:।
क्षेत्रेऽऽ क्षेत्री तथा कृतसं प्रकाश्यति भारत।॥

इत्यविधायानि ज्ञानाल्पनोऽऽ स्यायमभावत्वेन सजातीयतं ज्ञापयति, न
च किष्किदनिन्दं प्रसञ्जयेत”

30. “योग्यानवशाल्वेन सम्भवादनवस्थिते:।
इति बाधकहेतुभ्यः साधनन्धितत्वस्य च॥
असिद्धिव्यभिचारायं वैकुल्यसाध्यसाध्य्याध्याध्याध्यायने।
इत्यसाधनवाधायायं न धीमानसगोचरः॥
इति स्वतंसिद्धिर्व मांसविलिपी च पद्धति:।

31. “संकोचेदपि करणसंप्रयोगावाधिकसैवैयोभिषुभ्रमात”

32. “प्राक्षेपगतिनुसरण प्रकृतिप्रत्यपवर्तन्।
प्रकल्प वैयाकरणैवूऽ विप्रवाहविद्यत।॥”

33. “गंगुणाशब्दादिसवरस्व शस्य:। प्रविर्तत्यतं भगवतैव योग्यातिदम्येन
बायक्ष्रवाहस्य पूर्ववियोक्तत्वात्”

34. “न कह नूं पूर्वविऩारीशाव प्रकृतिरस्तोत्रातिकाः, वाकलक्षणाश्च-
संयोगानां भिन्नतत्ता”

35. “न चाजसंयोगमन्तरेन किष्किदनुपवचमु। ... स्यायमभाविद्वसंयोगे किं
मानमु? न प्रत्यक्ष प्रत्यक्षप्रत्यक्षसंयोगवात्।। न चानुवामनमु-
मूर्तिव्याख्यानिनयमादिति चेतु ... परस्यायत्वः
क्रीरागतिविद्विकारो-
व्याख्यानानां संभवार्थि विभुसंयोगालयम्भावतु”
36. "संख्या तु द्वितीयश्रण एव जास्ते, स संख्या
समवायिनोस्तीत्यविरोधः।"

37. "तदेवं कृत्रिम द्रव्यजातिगुणकर्मभिर्मिर्सदोषाणाम पुनरूक्त-
वितियाहारव्यवहारामुपपत्तेमेदो नाम न धर्माण्तरमयूर्व कल्याम्।
अत एव वैदेयरिपरित्वमा: पृथक्कंविशेषाद्योपि प्रोत्सारिता:
नीक्षिमेरितमानावण्येकावेच धर्मिनम्।
नीलं गुणं च भिन्नानौ सुवृं चुपलभामहेः॥
ये विशेषपृथ्वादितिसापेक्षं कल्पतिः तेः।
विभ्यत्यामार्यादियो न वं दृष्टवारिदिन:॥"

38. "इस्त्रोपर्यंप्रमात्वत्व ज्ञानमानोपर्यू उच्यते।
द्रव्यं जातिगुणं: कर्मेन्त्यसार्वत्थुतिकिष्:॥

... जातिगुणकर्मसु सामान्यसार्वश्रेणे संयुक्तसार्वेत
समवायसंभवत् ... द्रव्यं धर्मिनोत्तरस्त्रो धर्मविवेशोऽजातिः।
जात्युप्राप्तिकस विशेषक: सिद्धो धर्मविवेशो गुणः। तथाविधः साध्यः
क्रिया। तद्भवं क्रमश्चिति स्थिविधानि लक्षणानि। सौस्येण तु विवेच्यन्ते
प्रमेयेणुः”

39. "भूयोववसामान्यं सादस्यं बहवो विदुः।
पृथ्वक्रमेण तद्दिति प्रमेये दृष्टिष्यते॥...

ननु द्रव्यत्पृथ्विभवत्वशुकलपाकलवादेः: सामान्यस्यानायणेण वाच्यानां
स्वपृथ्विभिमितानां च सनत्यक्ष्यादीनानेवकल्पाकाणाप्रयोज्यकामावेच
कथमौक्षरायम्ूः वद तद वा कथमूः न मदोव एव भरः; सर्वोहि
हि भोकः: सर्वमित्यादिषु वहुष्य्यि श्रद्धेऽयं मन्यते...

वाच्यस्थुपेत्य तदीयपुः दृष्टियस्थाप्तवैक्षमावात्।
सादस्यमेवदाङ्गोऽथायुधवाच्यविष्कृतकरणं मतं तत्॥
.. चन्द्र: सूर्य इत्यादि वाच्यस्वपूक्यातू, घट पट पं इत्यादि तदाकैर्क्यातू”.

40. “या वस्तुं: प्राणप्रदानी प्रथमं प्रतीयते सा जाति; गुणस्तु तदनुप्राणिते
वस्तुनि भेदंको विशेषको धर्मं इति पश्चात् प्रतीयते”.

41. “तत्त्व मच्छाध्यपे पादे च सवेद्वाभायेन अन्येषु च
न्यायविस्तरप्रामाण्योपजीवनेन वैदिकेशु वाक्यविशेषात्मकोषेषु
पौराणिकविनिबन्धनं प्रामाण्यं यथा वर्णिते, तथा शब्दे प्रादीपसाम्”

42. “शासनमेव हि प्रेणमू। अपमेव च विचिनिवध्यायों वेदानामििमत
इति परेःपि केचिदनवदनिति, तत्त्वस्तवाकरार्योतम्”

तत्त्व तत्त्वादिराति नानादशुष्ट्वाङ्गाबहुतस्य भविष्यमाति यथा
शासन, वाक्य, विचिनिवध्यायों इति ग्रामाण्यपुि, पौराणिकविनिबन्धनं यथा वर्णिते, तथा शब्दे प्रादीपसाम्”
"तवं मे" 'सं हं मे' 'कुतस्तव्' 'तद्धिकुत' 'इदं वेदमूलप्रमाणात्
'एतचाँद्रिहिस्तावर्यात् अनुभवविन्यात्' 'तात्तिसाक्रोवा एव ए
'काक्रोवा: कर्म' 'गीतादिशु मम विदित:' 'कौण्ड्र राज्यी' 
सुधी: स्यात्
"हत्त तत्वपक्षादीस"'इति नुकुलहे मृगमध्यस्यवहत् त्वम्। ॥

1

नानानुवृत्तिविषयं नतराजहंसं
नानापण्डजातसमपिष्ठितमम्ब्रजसम्।
सेवावलीविशेषृमूर्द्वर्णं अद्य रक्षिन्तु।
भवासुरूप नदमि (ह?) त्यनमधवे त्वाम्॥

2

अनेकराजाघिर्यं आश्रिते भूमः
दत्ताभिकाह्यं(श्रेयं) त्रिदैविकमोग्यम्।
सुपर्णसस्य सुमनस्मेतं
सुधुमं त्वां सुधियो वदनि॥

3

मरकतमणिरस्य स्यमाणिकमुका-
फलविलसितगाध्रं प्रस्फुरुद्वलवाहम्।
विहितविविधजन्तुं प्रोक्तसम्पन्नलीलवं
सुगमजलनिधित्वां (परस्मेऽहं) ममहे रज्जराज!॥

4

अमृतवस्मानवतं सिद्धसंयंहर्जातं
नियमितसकलार्थ निष्ठितात्मावधोधम्।
किमिद: बहुनिस्त्रेत्: कीर्तनाभीयर्दं त्वां
निगममिव मनोजं रज्जराजाय मने॥

5

श्रीमनु सुत्रक्षधर्म्णी! विज्ञानवाचः
श्रीकौस्तुमक्षरितं ईस्वततदनद्रस्म।
हंसादिद्विकवर्षेनसुषोधयमाने
त्वं मनमहे सुरतं सुरायथाया! ॥

6
भवन्त श्रीमन्तं हसितकालिकाल्लहृतमिहा  
प्यज्जों कुर्विन्तं प्रमःहितमत्युत्वकरम्।  
सुक्स्मावर्षिण्यात्मवनजमहानन्दभरितं  
वसन्तं रक्षेस! प्रकटसुमुनस्क मनुष्ये॥

अनूप्त्य निर्माणं निवासायमं  
सतं दीर्घं अहसेनिं प्रच दृश्यम॥

अनुुप्तुमध्य रक्षराजं  
मनुष्ये चन्द्रमां जनो नु मान्यम॥

सार्वं द्विजं: श्रावणकर्म रक्ष्रिनू।  
कल्योचितस्फानविधि करोषि।

श्रुतिमृगित्वं व्यपिद्वयमानं  
स्वयं ममाण्यामनुवर्त्यामि॥

सत्यक्षिपतात् सुवनाध्रयत्वात्  
सन्मानसालसालन्त्यत्वात्।

पद्धोस्यत्वाच भवानिदानी  
हंसो यथा रजाजि रक्षराज!  

अत्याचते लसति हनकुमुप्दमाला  
वक्षस्य हे विनिहीता तव रक्षराज!  

स्वचन्दरारितममालुकरणारविदं-  
माणिक्यनुपुरममूर्त्तप्रपरेव॥

मणिकसरसीवाही मत्यरूपं दधानो  
लक्षमधवकाल्लो लक्ष्मणू नेव वेलामू।

वियूतमुनन्यारो वीक्ष्यसे रक्षामन्!  
अपर इशं बुम्मानापाणामधीशा:॥

अजोषाधापूर्ति विद्धतमनेकः: स्वमीभवे:  
प्रसिध्दक्लयां प्रकटतरपीताम्बलरसिम।

कृतशास्त्र्योत्तततु निविलसुमुन-प्रीतिज्ञानं  
भवन्त मन्येदां सुरक्षित्विषयं रक्षपोते॥

||
वृतत्वींगती समाश्रितजनन्त्राणे भर्तरूपसः
तामः कुकुमपतिका भुजाती ते कुकुमभ्रोज्वंतः
रञ्जाधीर! नर्मदा च भर्णिः: शोणः सुजातोधसः
तस्मात् स्नानविधौ जनोऽभिमानते त्वा सर्वतीर्थोऽत्मकम्॥

सत्चौततः सकलसत्चनिवासभूमि:
सौवर्णस्म्यविभवः सुमनोमनोऽः॥

सहानिसङ्गसमधिधितपार्थेदिः:
शैलात्मना सुपुरसि रञ्जमहीर! लम्॥

कुकूमाश्चायु मृदितिष्ठियं
कोमलारणसोजसंस्थितम्।
रञ्जमन्दिरतमोनिवारणः
श्रान्ते तपनदीधिति जनः॥

पाणविद्युद्वल्लातानविभवं गम्भीरनादाप्रचां
सान्द्रकुंपलकानिचरसंपुंसः सत्यविध्वंसिनम्।
काश्यामधुभाषरः विद्धतं सचात्कानां मुदं
मायं मेघमु अमोदपूर्णफलं रञ्जाधिपं मनंह॥

क्रियादसीं दर्शें कृत्यविधीनामुमगते
प्रवृत्तांवनस्तवं पुरुस्तदसं रञ्जतरपे।
प्रकौर्णद्विजुङ्कलमोघं प्रतिदिः
प्रहृत्या पद्मोविं भवति च जगतू ध्वस्ततिमिर्म॥

रञ्जेदा! रजनीचचरि राजते तव वक्षसि।
देव्या हिरण्यवन्या देवकान्तरिवोदिता॥

तत्तद्वाहकुकुद्धितप्रमधायःवत्वात्वायालावत्वायानं
नित्योदग्रामिनापाराधदेहनुवां समस्तं जगतं।
हुष्टावग्रहस्वरोपदवीर्वर्षसमुच्युत्तमः
दिद्ये: संप्रति रञ्जुङ्जव! द्वार्याजस्वत्वास्त्रायाये॥

अन्तस्यितः सुमनसामु अमेरेशरतः
च्छापाविकल्पितरुद्धिन्यानाभिमाः॥
आपादितस्मरणः प्रथितप्रचारः
शाखामृ रज्जनूतिपतिभुवो विभाति॥ २१

अमृतप्रभवं प्रभाप्रभाव-
प्रहतंध्वानंसद्विलासिजातम्।
सकलं सकलानुमोदेः
शङ्खिं त्वा कल्यामि रक्षराज! ॥ २२

समुन्निष्ठत्यपजतासंयंतिता
तवावताक्रमपाततत्यरा।
त्रीव रक्षेश! सम्यते जने:
असौ जयतित्वदिते प्रभुमी॥ २३

रक्षामां मुक्तोपेतं कठकाठितसुन्तंतम्।
सच्चाश्रयं रक्षराजं महीदरमवैन्यहं॥ २४

सर्वस्मात् पर सांपरायसवाने शक्तिस्तबे-चालिमिका
पत्ती पात्रगमाश्वेतिपत्य: प्रासतिर्वो श्राबः।
पौलस्त्यः परावो दशाननस्वातः: रक्षा फलं ज्ञानिनां
श्रीमन्! मजनकैतवावसमृद्धस्ताते रक्षरक्ष! ॥ २५

पर्यत्सुरसुरांगं सुमनोविकास-
सलिभ्वाचारणासमुन्निष्ठेनिवेच्यमानम्।
संदर्भास्तसातास्तातिमृतीयं
त्वा रक्षराज! कल्यामि ति मन्द्रादिम॥ २६

चन्द्रकैर रक्षधामन्! श्रवणमुग्नतो चंद्ररागरोगातः
मानो मा सञ्चन्ते सदसि बहुभुवो मित्रवार्धवेशः।
कालोदयं पुष्यदिशो भवति मध् महान् ततकालस्य यातः
तत्कालन्यथेऽथ सेतुस्तवमिस वयस्मिः प्रासतिर्वो भवाम्॥ २७

उत्तरीयपटिका विरजते रक्षराज! भवतो भुजान्ते।
सत्ये शातम्बोपल्पमेत्जाहवीव शाश्वनिर्मला॥ २८
BENIDICTOURY VERSES OF PARĀŚRA
IN THE NĀLĀYIRAIVYYAPRABANDHA

SLOKE ONE : IN OBEISANCE TO ĀLVĀR-S
AND ĀCĀRYA-S

SLOKA TWO : IN OBEISANCE TO ĀṆḌĀL

SLOKD THREE : (IN TAMIL ALONG WITH
AND FOUR
TRANSLITERATION).

IN OBEISANCE TO
NAMMĀLVĀR AND
TIRUVĀYMOZHI.

भूतं सरस महदाहय-भड्नाथ-
श्रीभक्तिसार-कुलशेखर योगिवाहनु।
भक्तिहिरण-परकाळ-यतीन्त्रमिश्रानु
श्रीमत्तराजुरामूनि प्रणतोस्मि नित्यमू।

नीलातुक्कस्सनगिरितिडीसुमुद्रदध्य कृष्णम्
पाराध्य स्वं श्रुतिशिल्पिक्ष्मकस्मथाययनी।
स्वोच्छिद्यां रजी निगलितं या बलात्कृत्य भुजे
गोदा तस्ये नम इदमिदं भूष्य एवास्तु भूषः।

भवन्तविश्वेत्यं भवन्ति गीतरामकार सर्वपल्लि हिये
अलंकु दृष्टिकेलकल अद्यपिम, कारण
पुरुष दुर्ग का-कन्नकर गीतरामकार हल्लित
श्रीकृष्णमराजारंगाकालः

vāntigazhum solai madiḻarangar vanpugazhmēl
ānra tamizhmaraigal āyiramum,-inra
mudalṭāy ṣṭṭakopan, moimpāl vaḷartta
idattāy īṟāmānusan.
பிக்க மறந்திரியும் தேவபாம் விரிதிலியும்,
தன் தரமும் தன் பார்த்து விளக்கிலியும்.
அறுவிலியும் பருவிலியும் குழாம் துருக்கமாகிக்காம்
பார்த்திக் விளக்கில்.

mikka irainilaiyum meyyām uyirnilaiyum
takka neriyum tadaiyāgittokkiyalum
ūzhvinaiyum vāzhvinaiyum ōdum kurugaiyarkōn,
yāzhinisai vedattiyal.
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