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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 Viśiṣṭādvaīta school of thought and one of the most distinguished preceptors in the guruparamparā 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 Viśiṣṭādvaīta, the moving hymns of the Āḻvārs played a notable role. The adoration of the Lord in all His numerous manifestations filled the Āḻvārs 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—
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
Sri Parasara Bhatta was an important and distinguished writer and preceptor of the post-Ramanuja and pre-Vedanta Deśika period of the Viśiṣṭādvaīta Philosophy. He was the son of the celebrated Sri Kurattālvān a close associate of Sri Rāmānuja. It is well-known in tradition that it was Kurattālvān, the author of Pañcastavā, who helped Sri Rāmānuja in writing the Śrībhāṣya. Following his father Parāśrā Bhatta too wrote many works for the development and propagation of this glorious tradition.

Though many of the works of Parāśara Bhatta were often printed yet no systematic effort was made to study the available works of Parāśra Bhatta 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 Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition of thought. The characteristics of a Śrīvaiṣṇava, 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 Bhatta 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 Bhāṭṭar 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 Bhaṭṭa occupies a pre-eminent position among the Śrīnivasaṇava-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 Viṣiṣṭādvaita have received the attention of scholars. The post-Parāśara polymath Vedānta Deśika and his works have also been attracting scholars from time to time. One of the great predecessors of Vedānta Deśika 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 Deśika’s works. Parāśara’s stotra-s have also been published with Tamil explanation by Sri P.B. Annangaracharya Svamin of Kanchipuram. The Aṣṭaśloki and Viṣṇu-sahasranāmabhāṣya of Parāśara have also been published with English translation and explanatory notes by Sri T. Bheemacharya and Prof. A. Srinivasaagahavan respectively. The commentary on the Tiruneḍuntāntaka 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 Viṣiṣṭādvaita.
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 f 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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SRĪ PARĀŚARA BHAṬṬA -
HIS LIFE AND DATE

All systems of philosophy bearing upon Vedic authority draw their inspiration from the triple canonical texts (prasthānātraya), 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 Nammāḷvār and Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār, 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. 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. 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.³

Another important aspect of the Śrīvaiṣṇava school of thought is that it relies upon the authority of the Tamil compositions of the God-intoxicated saints called Āḻvār-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 Vaikhānasa. 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.⁴

As already stated, Nāthaṇumi was the first Śrīvaiṣṇava 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.⁵

Yāmunācārya, his grandson, known under the popular name Āḻavandār, is the next important teacher of this school.⁶ 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, Īśvara-siddhi and Samvīt-siddhi dealing with the essential nature of the Individual Self, the Lord and knowledge respectively. His *Gītārthasarāṅgraha* is an epitome of the *Bhagavadgītā* in thirty-two verses incorporating the traditional interpretation of the Gītā which he received from his own teacher, Śrīrāmamātriśra. The *Catusśloki* in four verses discusses the nature of Lakṣmī and her position in this system. The *Stotraratna* 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 Bādaraṇāyaṇa. In his *Vedārthasarāṅgraha*, Rāmānuja synthesises the conflicting passages of the *Upaniṣad*-s in contradistinction to the other schools of thought. His *Vedāntadīpa* and *Vedāntāsāra* are the shorter versions of his own commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*-s, that is, the *Śrībhāṣya*. His *Gadyatraya* comprising *Śaraṇāgati*, *Śrīraṅga* and *Vaikunṭha-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 (Tamilnadu) and the highest abode of the Lord, Śrīvaikunṭha. In his *Nityagrantha*, Rāmānuja explains the daily routine to be observed by a Śrīvaishnava.
The first and foremost among the disciples of Śrī Rāmānuja was Śrīvatsāṅkamiśra 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 Kāṅcipuram 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 Prapannāṁṛta 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 Atimānuṇastava, the Sundarabāhustava, the Varadarājastava, the Vaikuṇṭhastava and the Śrīstava. He is the second Śrīvaiśṇava teacher to compose lyrics in praise of the Lord, Yāmuna being the first to do so.

Śrī Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, the son of Kurattālvān and Āṇḍal, is an important Śrīvaiśṇava teacher whose contribution to Viśiṣṭādvaita 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 Tirukkurukaippirānpillān 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 purohitā
of Lord Śrīraṅganātha (Śrīraṅgeśa-purohitah). As a youth he is said to have defeated a famous Advaita teacher Mādhavadāsa of Melkote (Tirunārāyanapuram). 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 Śrīvaishnavism. Raṅganātha is popularly known as Naṅjiyar in Tamil and is the celebrated commentator on the Śrīśūktā and also on the Tiruvāyomoli of Nammālvār. It is said that he wrote the commentary on the Tiruvāyomoli at the instance of Parāśara. The elaborate commentary Īdu on the Tiruvāyomoli is replete with several instances of how Parāśara interpreted and explained (nirvāha-s) some of the knotty passages of the Tiruvāyomoli 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 Anūrādhānaksattra, 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. According to some, however, this varies from A.D. 1073 to 1078. The Guruparamparā of Brahmatantra-svatantra-svāmin III (A.D. 15th cent.) gives Śubhakṛt as the year of his birth in Kali 4163. This corresponds to Friday the 24th May of A.D. 1062. Another tradition gives the date of Parāśara’s demise as Śukla Dvādasī in the Jaya year. This corresponds to Wednesday, 11th November,
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 Coḷa king Kulottuṅga I, Rāmānuja moved to Melkote (in the modern Karnataka State). There he converted the Hoyasala king Biṭṭi Deva from Jainism to Śrīvaiṣṇavism and gave him the new name Viṣṇuvardhana. According to the Guruparamparāprabhāva the Coḷa persecution took place after the marriage of Parāśara and the year of this Coḷa persecution is given as A.D. 1098. Tradition avers that Rāmānuja was in exile for 14 to 16 years. The conversion of the Hoyasala 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-pratoli-Bhaṭṭārya, 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 Coḷa 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 Naṉjīyar, 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 BHAṬṬA - A BRIEF ANALYSIS

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa 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 Aṣṭaślokī, the Kriyādīpa, the Bhagavadgūṇadarpana (Viṣṇu-sahasra nāmabhāṣya), the Śrīgūṇaratnakosa, the Śrīraṅganātha stotra and the Śrīraṅgarājastava. His three other Sanskrit works, namely, the Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvayavivaraṇa, or Vyākhyā, the Tattvaratnakara and the Lakṣmīkalyāṇa nāṭaka are available only in a few fragments preserved in the quotations of Vedānta Deśika. Parāśara's another work, the Subālopiniṣad-vivaraṇa is quoted for once by Nṛsimhadeva in his commentary Ānandadāyini on the Sarvārthasiddhi which is an auto-commentary by Vedānta Deśika on his Tattvamuktākalāpa. Of his Tamil compositions, the Kaiśikapurāṇa, also known as Kaiśika-māhātmya is available in print. His elaborate commentary on a particular stanza—Maivañnanarungunji forming part of the celebrated Tamil work Tirunēdentāntakam of Tirumaṅgai Ālvar, 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 Goṣṭhīstava attributed to our author. As the name suggests, it is in praise of Tirukkoṭiyūr, a pilgrim town in the Pudukkoṭai District of Tamilnadu. In Sanskrit this place is called Goṣṭhipūrī. This hymn is in ten verses of which the first and the last describe the presiding deity called Saumya-nārāyana. 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 Goṣṭhipūrna. 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 Tanjan in Tamil) which runs thus -

śrīparāśara-bhaṭṭāryaḥ śrīrangesa-purohitaḥ
śrīvatsāṅkasutaḥ śrīmān śreyase me’stu bhūyase

here 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) AŚṬAŚLOKĪ

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 Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy, namely, the aṣṭāksara, the dvaya...
mantra—Orī namo nārāyanāya, held in very high esteem by a Śrīvaiṣṇava. 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 ‘śrīmamnārāyaṇa-caraṇau śaraṇam prapadye, śrīmata nārāyanāya namah’. 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 Śrīvaiṣṇava-s- since according to them, it pinpoints wholehearted surrender as the effective means of salvation.

Parāśara’s Aṣṭaśloki, couched in such long metres as Śikharīnī, Šārdulavikṛīdita and Šragdharā very effectively brings out the importance of these three secrets which form part of the daily recitation and routine of an orthodox Śrīvaiṣṇava. 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 Nityagrantha of Parāśara (Bhaṭṭar nityam):

“praṇavodita - taccheṣabhāvo’ham nijakarmabhīḥ ahamkāra - mamatvābhāyāmabhībhūto’pyataḥ param taccheṣatvānusandhānapūrva-taccheśavṛttikah bhūyāsamityamum 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 Āhnikagrantha 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.⁴

(3) THE BHAGAVADGUṆADARPAṆA

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
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 Śrīvaiṣṇava concept, the author brings out the glory of the Supreme Lord as saguna (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) ŚRĪGUNARATNAKOŚA

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 Śrīvaiṣṇava stotra-s, kept in the tradition of day-to-day chanting (pārāyana) of a devout Śrīvaiṣṇava. Parāśara traces the concept of Śrī to the
the glory of Lord Viṣṇu is dependent upon that of His consort. Rising to supreme heights of poetic charm the author describes Lakṣmī 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 Lakṣmī 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 Lakṣmī’s mediacy (puruṣakāra) between God and men owes much to this picture of Lakṣmī drawn by the author. Drawing profusely from the episode of Sītā in the Rāmāyaṇa, Parāśara justifies the motherhood of Lakṣmī 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) ŚRĪRAṆGAṆĀTHA STOTRA

Another beautiful lyric from the pen of Parāśara 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 Kāverī, for worshipping Lord Raṅganātha, for repeating his holy names and such devotional activities. This stotra again is in the tradition of daily repetition of an ardent Śrīvaiṣṇava.
Tradition avers that Parāśara composed this *stotra* when he had to go away from Śrīraṅgam due to the displeasure he incurred of the then Cola 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 Śrīvaisnava-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 Upaniṣadic 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 Śrīvaisnava 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 Śrī
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 poetry⁹ in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition.

7. OTHER WORKS OF PARĀŚARA

f 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 prakaraṇa-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.¹⁰ 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 Śribhāṣya 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 Vaṅkalai school.¹¹ 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 Vivaraṇa has come down to us only in the form of two quotations found in the Nyāya-siddhāṅjana. The first quotation is concerned with the definition of śarīra (the body) given in the Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja.\textsuperscript{12} 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-vivaraṇa 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.\textsuperscript{13}

Another quotation from the Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvaya-vivaraṇa found in the Nyāyasiddhāṅjana mentions the similarity between aśvarya (lordship) and aksara (kaivalya) - both of which are different from liberation (mokṣa) which is the highest state of bliss.\textsuperscript{14} In other words aśvarya is only the joy of experiencing material objects; aksara 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 aksara and aśvarya.
The *Lakṣmikalyāṇa*, another work of Parāśara, known only through three quotations is known to tradition as a *nātaka*. Vedānta Deśika is the only author to quote a few lines of this work in his *Sārasāra*, which forms a part of the *Sīlarairahasyaṅgal*, in his *Gītā-bhāṣya-tātparyacandrikā* and in his *Rahasyatrayasāra*. The *Siddhopāyacodana*-section of the *Rahasyatrayasāra* refers to the expression, *ananyādhiṃnakalyāṇam* which is a part of the *anuṣṭubh* verse known to tradition as follows:

*ananyādhiṃnakalyāṇam anyamaṅgalakāraṇam jagannidānamadvandvam 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:

*svalṣam vastūkurvan janamimam akasmāt sarasija- prakārau padmāyāstava ca caraṇau naḥ 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 śikharinī 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 Nammāḻvār in the line

ārenakku niṉ pādamē saraṇākattandolinday

The other quotation from this drama is found in the Gītābhāṣyatātparyacandrikā of Vedānta Deśika. Commenting on the word daivam of the Gītā text
daivam caiva atra pañcamam
he quotes the following as from the Lakṣmīkalyāṇa:
dharme pramāṇam samayastadiyo
vedāsa ca tattvam ca tadiṣṭadaivam.

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 (śiṣṭas), 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 daivam used in the Gītā passage daivam caivātra pañcamam actually means devatā (a deity) but not fate or any other being though divine, lesser in importance than the supreme Being.

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
and other texts. It also appears to deal with some important concepts of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school such as śaraṇāgati, 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 Subālopaniṣad which is generally referred to as Vyākhyā or Vivaraṇa. The quotation is as follows:

*yaduktam bhaṭṭaparāśarapādair (subālopaniṣad-vivaraṇe) - ‘yadi bhūtānām api prakṛtitvam tarhi aṣṭau prakṛtayaśṣoḍāsa vikārāḥ iti śruteḥ kā gatiriti cet; vedopabhrāhanyaṇipuṇatara-paramarśisandarśītaiva gatīḥ; nāsmābhistadviruddhanirvahane’ bhiniveṣṭa vyam’.

Parāśara in his commentary on the Subālopaniṣad 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 Anandadāyinī, quoting from the Mokṣadharma of the Mahābhārata explains that avyakta, mahat 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 Anandadāyinī as the view anticipated by Vedānta Deśika in the Sarvārthasiddhi by the statement - nanu upabhrāhanyaṇavisēṣāṇusārāt.., etc.
Of the Sanskrit works of Parāśara which remain to be enumerated are the Muktaka-s or stray verses (known as Tirumaṉjana Kattiyāṅgal or Tirumaṉjana 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 Brahmostsava. 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 tvaṁ me’ haṁ me received the attention of Vedānta Deśika.26

Of the Tamil compositions of Parāśara mention must be made of his commentary on the Kaisikapurāṇa (māhātmya) forming part of the Varāhapurāṇa (Ch.48) which is held in high esteem by the Śrīvaiśṇava-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 Kaisikamāhātmya on a particular day, that is, on the twelfth day of the bright fortnight in the Vṛścikamāsa (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
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, Kūrma, 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 Śrīvaishṇava literature in Tamil. The stanza in question commences thus:

\[
\text{maivaṇṇanarunkuṭji kulal.}^{29}
\]

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 āstāksara), the dvayamantra and the caramañloka,\(^{30}\) 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 Kāvyā-s like those of Kālidāsa and Bhartṛhari, 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 Tiruvāymoli such as Ārāyirappadī, Onpadināyirappadī and Muppattārāyirappadī. 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 Bhattar-nirvāham-s.

All the available works of Parāśara including the stray verses will be taken up for a detailed study in the following
CHAPTER III

DETAILED STUDY OF THE WORKS

AŚṬAŚLOKĪ

The opening verse of this octad explains the significance of the three syllables ‘a’, ‘u’ and ‘m’ constituting the praṇava with which the aṣṭāksarīmantra (called mantrabrahman 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 Lakṣmī and getting rid of the feelings of ‘I’ and ‘mine’ which constitute the dāśya-attitude congenial for liberation. In the seventh verse Parāśara paraphrases Lord Kṛṣṇa’s assurance found in the Bhagavadgītā - (xviii, 66) “sarvadharmān parityajya”...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 praṇava constitutes the three syllables, ‘a’, ‘u’ and ‘m’. ‘A’ connotes Viṣṇu as the creator, sustainer and destroyer of the universe as both its instrumental
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 naráyanāya) explains the essential nature of the individual soul. Namah 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 naráyaṇāya 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
is, *kaiṅkarya*, 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 ‘m’. 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 namah (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’, 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 summum bonum of human existence.

Parāśara wants to drive home the point that the mantra of the mantras 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 aṣṭāksarī-mantra which forms the first of the Rahasyatraya of the Śrīvaiṣṇava school. In the fifth stanza, Parāśara explains the significance of the dvaya-mantra, that is, śrīmannotrāyaṇacaranau śaraṇam prapadye and śrīmāte nārāyaṇāya namah. 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 (netrtvam). It is Goddess Śrī who ushers the devotee unto the Lord, pleads on behalf of the devotee and ultimately secures his deliverance.
The termination *matup* in *śrīman* indicates eternal relationship (*nityayoga*) subsisting between the Lord and Śrī. The term *nārāyaṇa* 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 *śaranam* 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 nārāyanāya 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 *nārāyaṇa* actually conveys the lordship and sovereignty of Viṣṇu (*svāmitvam*). The dative case in the word *nārāyaṇāya* lays stress upon eternal service to be done by the *jīva* to his master (*prārthanā*). Finally the word *namah* indicates the desirability of getting rid of egotism which is a very powerful impediment in securing liberation (*virodhiprāhāṇa*). 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 Āḻvār-s, and explained by Ācārya-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja in their *Stotratatna*
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 Sauṣīlya (capacity of uniting easily with the layman), Vātsalya (parental affection), Kāruṇya (compassion), Audārya (generosity), Kṛtitva (the capacity to fulfil any undertaking), Kṛta-jñatva (gratefulness), Svāmitva (Lordship), Sulabhatva (easy accessibility), Sarva-jñatva (Omniscience), Sarvaśaktitva (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 Saranaṅgati 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 Carama
means, literally, the last and final one. The Caramaśloka
is the verse - sarvadharman, 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 spels 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 sāttivika-s impart it
as a rahasya only to those who have surrendered to
them as disciples, points out the commentator.⁵

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 (puruṣārtha) which follows the implementation of
śaraṇāgati and this puruṣārtha is of the form of removal
of the impediments which are undesirable (anistiya).
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 extremely difficult to implement or give up any of the four means of salvation including *śaraṇāgati*. 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 secular condition in life. As such there is no other way or such an ardent devotee than to recollect the idea conveyed by the Lord through the *Caramaśloka*, and 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. 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.

BHAGAVADGUṆADARPANA

The Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa is the name of Pārāśara’s commentary on the Viṣṇusahasranāmāstotra, which forms chapter 149 of the Anusāsanaparvan (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 Viśiṣṭādvaitic 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 Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa (‘a mirror to the qualitites of the Lord’) makes it clear that according to Viśiṣṭādvaitins 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 saguṇa-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 Rāmāyaṇa. 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 itihāsapurāṇābhhyāṁ vedāṁ samupabrīṁhayet, 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) Bhīṣma 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 Bhaviṣyat, Matsya, Viṣṇu and Mārkaṇḍeya justifies the supremacy of the Gītā.
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 *Sahasranāmastotra*.\(^{10}\) 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 -svāmini dāsasya anurāgamayī 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 every one 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\(^1\) and seems to set aside the restrictions imposed on certain communities in the apāśūrdādhi karana of the Brahmasūtra itself.\(^2\) 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.\textsuperscript{13} 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.\textsuperscript{14} The letter \textit{ca}\textsuperscript{15} 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 \textit{yato vā imāni}\textsuperscript{16} and \textit{brahma vanam}\textsuperscript{17} and the \textit{Brahmasūtras: janmādyasya yataḥ}\textsuperscript{18} and \textit{prakṛtiśca}\textsuperscript{19} 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.\textsuperscript{20} Such a view is clearly non-Vedic, he points out. There cannot be any possibility of Brahman being vitiated by modification in this process because when Brahman evolves as the universe, He does so through a very minute portion of \textit{prakṛti} which constitutes 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.\textsuperscript{21} 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 \textit{Puruṣa-sūkta}, \textit{the Subālopaniṣad}, \textit{the Maitrāyanīyopaniṣad}, \textit{the Chāndogya}, \textit{the Taittirīya} and \textit{the Mahopaniṣad} and also a number of \textit{Sātvikapurāṇas}. That the \textit{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 stotras. The Dahara and Vaiśvānara sections of the first chapter of the Brahmasūtra 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 saṁathanam 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
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 wordly 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 *Mīmāṃsā-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 Mīmāṃsā, 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 saguṇa - and the nirguṇa- 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 apahatapāṃma 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 satyasāṅkalpatva.

Therefore, scriptural texts speaking of jñāna, śakti, etc., of Brahman are to be understood as referring to His auspicious qualities. The nirguṇa-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-nīṣedha) 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 \textit{pada-āhavanīya} and \textit{brāhmaṇa-parivrājaka}.

Moreover Bādarāyaṇa in the \textit{guṇopasamhārapāda} of the \textit{Brahmasūtra} raises the objection that the attributes of Brahman understood in the Śāndilya, Upakosala, Dahara and other \textit{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 \textit{Upaniṣad-s} to justify the point that the Supreme Being is an abode of innumerable perfections in an unsurpassed measure. The \textit{Viṣṇupurāṇa}, the \textit{Bhāgavata} and the \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{gaṇāni} (derived from the qualities and actions of the Lord). In other words it means that they are etymological. Some names, of course, are \textit{vikhyātāni} (well-known) through convention. The \textit{Viṣṇusūkta} also speaks of those who understand the meaning of the names after analysing them into their components. 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 \textit{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 guna-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.\textsuperscript{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 Asṭādhyāyī and the Unādi-sūtra-s. He also quotes extensively from the Upaniṣad-s, the Rāmāyaṇa 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 Pauskara, Sāttvata, Viṣṇutattva, Sanatkumāra and Jayākhyasamhitās. Parāśara, then offers what is called ārsanirukta, 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
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 Brahma-sūtra criticises the vyūha-theory found in the Pāñcarātra texts. But it is surprising to note that he supports this theory in his commentary on the Viṣṇu-sahasranāma-stotra, 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, sakti, bala, aśvarya, vírya and tejas. He then assumes the four vyuha-forms, namely Vāsudeva, Śaṅkarśaṇa, 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 arcā-form 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 Sahasranāma-stotra 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. 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 Viṣṇu, 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 (jñāptimatra) based on texts like satyam jñānam anantam brahma. 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, 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 sarvajñah sarvavit has to be interpreted.
(3) Explaining the word naikamāyah (no.303), Parāśara points out that the word māyā here does not mean unreality (mithyā). It mean “a remarkable phenomenon which is a source of infinite wonder” (mahāścarya). Parāśara further states that māyā 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, Parāśara briefly alludes to the concept of Īśvara according to the Sāṅkhya-s. Explaining the name mahotsāhāh (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 (akartā), which results in his being accepted as lazy and inactive (alasa). As distinguished from such a concept, the Viśiṣṭādvaita school accepts the Lord as an infinite reservoir of wonderful dynamism, a quality which makes Him Īśvara. This quality is found in the name mahotsāhāh which Parāśara explains as mahān utsāhāh utsahanam kartṛtvā-lakṣanam aiśvaryam. 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 Yādavaprakāśa 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 (khaṇḍa) and a cow with no horns (muṇḍa). 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\(^{37}\) 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 Yādavaprakāśa 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\(^{38}\) 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 Yādavaprakāśa scriptures which describe the state of release as having sāmya and abheda at the same time cannot be properly interpreted. But, according to the Viśiṣṭādvaītins, Parāśara points out that abeda in the state of mokṣa alluded to
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 ippanah tadāsau paramātmanā, bhavatyabhedi.’’

According to this, one who attains similarity with qualities of 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 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”.

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 all-round knowledge. Parāśara, on the authority of several passages from the Upaniṣad-s as well as from the Pāṇcarātra text Jayākhyasamhitā argues in favour of the existence of such an omniscient Being. 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 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 Sucīsravāḥ (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 Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya is that the thousand names of the Lord are interpreted from the viewpoint 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, Vibhava and Arcā. Parāśara does not forget for a moment that the Lord is deeply committed to retrieval of his devotees from the clutches of samsāra. He therefore weaves into his commentary the beautiful theory of avatāra-s of which Hose of Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Narasimha are very significantly dealt with. He also mentions other incarnations like Haṃsa, Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Vāmana, Paraśurāma, Buddha, Kalki, Śaktiśa, 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 according to the Upaniṣadic declaration sarvam āhāram brahma every in the universe starting from Brahmā the creator, down to the blade of grass Brahman itself. Deriving his authority from the Pañcarātra texts like the Pauṣkara and the Sāttvatasamhitā,
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.

ŚRĪGUNĀRATNAKOŚA

A detailed study of the hymn Śrīgunaratnakosa 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 Vaikuntha, 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 saśava - 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 śrutīṁ bhagavatīṁ prathame pumāṁsahḥ
tvatsadguṇaṁgha maṇikośa grhaṁ grāṇanti
By this Parāśara means that the Śrīśūkta glorifies Śrī eloquently as the treasure-house of several perfections. The Puruṣasūkta, which may be called the sequel of Śrīśūkta identifies Śrī as the consort of Nārāyaṇa.\(^{46}\)

The Itihāsa-s, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, the Smṛti texts and the Purāṇa-s 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-s and other non-Vedic votaries do not accept the validity of the Veda-s. Some the like Sāṅkhya-s and the Mīmāṁsāka-s refute the concept of a master for this universe. Still others speak of a master but do not attribute any perfections to Him.\(^{47}\) 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.\(^{48}\) The expression asyeśānā jagato viṣṇupatni\(^{49}\) already has set the tone for the prosperity of Lakṣmī. The Śrīśūkta in 15 verses expatiates on this glory of Hers. The Puruṣasūkta (khila added to the tenth maṇḍala of the Rg-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. 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 ksānti (forbearance), audārya (magnanimity) and dayā (compassion) will become significant when she has accepted even his "unworthy" composition.

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. 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 listener instantaneously. There should be then a happy blend of words (saubhrātra). In fact all the gracious movements of Vāṇi - speech as well as the Goddess of speech will be present in one’s words when the benevolent glances of Lakṣmī fall upon him. 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 ardhaparyāṅkāsana in terms of iconography. Her hand displays the abhaya-mudrā indicating that She ever grants asylum. Her face is sweet and innocent. 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 Vaijayantī on Her Lord’s chest, the garland becomes fresh as it were by a shower of dew.

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 puṇḍarīkākṣa (the eyes large as the lotuses) and is acknowledged by the Upaniṣad-s as the Highest Being.\(^{56}\) By this Parāśara means that the Chāndogyopaniṣad describes Viṣṇu as the Supreme Being, only by virtue of his being puṇḍarīkākṣa which, in turn, is due to the grace of Lakṣmī. The Chāndogya text under reference is tasya yathā kapyāsam puṇḍarikam evam aksīni.\(^{57}\)

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. \(^{58}\) 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) tāṭarika (ear ornaments), lalāṭikā (ornament on the forehead), manisara (gem necklace) and tulākoti (anklets).\(^{59}\) 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.\(^{60}\). 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.\(^{63}\)

**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 Śṛigunaratnakośa (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 suppliants, fragrance, beauty, charm and brilliance - these are just a few qualities that are common to Her and Her Lord.\(^{64}\) 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.\(^{65}\) The Lord, has some qualities which are peculiar to Himself like sthiratva (steadfastness) and satruśamanatva (the power to quell down enemies). The Goddess, has some qualities which are peculiar to Her alone, like mṛadīma (softness of heart), pārārthya (subordination to her Lord),
karuṇā (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 (ghanadyuti); Śrī, on the other hand, is of golden hue (kanaka-dyuti). He is young (yuvā); She is adolescent (mugdhā). All such qualities stand on one level as contradistinguished from certain special qualities of Hers like forebearance (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 Vibhīśaṇa 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, karuṇā 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.\textsuperscript{66}

\textbf{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.\textsuperscript{67} In whatever direction Her glances move, in that direction will rush benefits such as bliss, wisdom, eloquence, courage, prosperity and success.\textsuperscript{68} 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\textsuperscript{69} or its absence. In a later verse Parāśara emphasises the same point thus: that person on whom the glances of Lakṣmī 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.\textsuperscript{70}

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).\textsuperscript{71} 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), ahamkāra (ego), mind, the ten organs, the elements and the three worlds is only to please His beloved.\textsuperscript{72} Even when the Lord makes the jīva-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 Lakṣmī 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 *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 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 bounds 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 12 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 appens 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. In the 1st verse also Parāśara consistently mentions the upremacy and overall importance of Śrī. She is the mother, father and all that one cherishes as near and ear. If Her grace is assured, there is no room for any complaint.

RĪRAṆGANĀTHASTOTRA

This stotra is again marked by Parāśara's poetic randeur, devotional fervour and loving attachment to rīraṅgam and its presiding deity - Lord Śrīraṅganātha. The first of the six verses, composed in the Sragdhārā 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 Ādiśeṣa, 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 Vīmāna 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 Tirukkoṭīyūr consequent on some confrontation he had with the then ruler Vīrasundara. Couched in the Śārdūlavikrīdita 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 ūrdhva-puṇḍra-tilaka mark on the Lord’s forehead drawn with kastūrī (musk).

The succeeding verse in the Śikharinī - 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 Śikharinī 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 Mandākrāntā metre exclusively describes the glory of the town of Śrīraṅgam 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 mithyāpavādana means
“under false pretext”, pointing out that the whole incident was cooked up and that no śánti was really needed. Some scholars further see an undertone of sarcasm in the word mithyāpavādena. 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 Śrīvaiśṇava 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 Kariśaila (Kāncīpuram) (both in Tamilnadu), Añjanagiri (Tirumalai or Tirupati), Tārkyādri (Ahobilam), Simhācala and Śrīkūrma (all in Andhra Pradesh), Pūrī (Lord Jagannātha as the presiding deity in Orissa), Badarī (the Himalayan shrine) and Naimisāraṇya (both in Uttar Pradesh), Dvārakā in (Gujarat), Prayāg (Allahabad) Mathurā, Ayodhyā, Gayā (all in U.P.) Puṣkara (in Rajasthan) and Sālagrāma (in Nepal). A devout Śrīvaiśṇava 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 \textit{Rāmāyāṇa} and the \textit{Mahābhārata} are replete with references to places of worship such as temples and \textit{tīrtha}-s. The worship of sandals of saints and great men which can be traced to the \textit{Rāmāyāṇa}, 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."\textsuperscript{81}

Every religious school of Hinduism developed its own \textit{Āgama} tradition and literature. The \textit{Śaiva}, the \textit{Vaiṣṇava}-, and the \textit{Śakta-āgama}-s, regardless of their sectarian leanings, laid down similar or identical canons of art. All these \textit{āgama}-s comprise four sections or topics in general: \textit{jñāna} (knowledge), \textit{kriyā} (service - construction of temples, consecration of the idols etc.), \textit{caryā} (conduct of daily rites, bestivals etc.), and \textit{yoga} (devotion or concentration). Of these, the worship of idols which forms part of the \textit{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 \textit{Bhāgavata} tradition (another name for \textit{Pāñcarātra} tradition) there are five aspects of the Supreme Being. They are: \textit{para}, (the Highest called vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa and so on), \textit{vyuha} (fourfold
emanation as Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, 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-bhūṣana. 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’vatārāḥ kvacit kāle viśvajanīnametaditi dhiḥ śrīraṅgadhāmanyatha ārtasvāgatikaiḥ kṛpākaluṣitairālokitaireśdrayan

viśvatraṇavimarśanaskhalitayā nidrāsi jāgaryayā Śrīraṅgarājastava (II.75)
ŚRĪRAṆGARĀJASTAVA

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 Tirukkoṭṭiyūr, after the demise of the ruler Viñhasundara 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’ (kaṇṭhe) 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 (Embara) who, by his close attachment to the feet of Śrī Rāmānuja, is also known as rāmānujapadacchāyā (‘the shade of Śrī Rāmānuja’s feet’). The three following verses refer to Śrī Rāmānuja, Yāmuna and Nāthamuni, 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
hymns (in other words, who composed in Tamil the Tiruvāyumolī which is the quintessence of the Sāmaveda 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 Cintāmani-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 (bhṛṅga) 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 Ayodhyā and Aparājitā\(^{85}\) 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 (Tirumāṅgai Ālvār) 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 Vaikūṇṭha, described in the Veda-s as having such a thousand pillared hall. In the following two verses, the tank called Candrapuṣkariṇī 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 Nammāḻvār’s Tiruvāymoli 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 (Tiruvāymoli) chantings.

Viśvaksena, his consort Śūtravatī, and his four chief attendants, namely, Gajānana, Jayatsena, Harivaktra and Kālaprakṛti are glorified then (śl. 50-52). The next description is of Garuḍa 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 Vibhīṣanā and the two pillars adjacent to the sanctum sanctorum which are called Tirumanattūṅ 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
Goddess Earth is the reflection of that swan. This lotus-pond known as Śrīraṅgarāja 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-asavah) 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 Raṅganātha 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
Śrīraṅgaśīrṇgāra which means that the Lord is the very embodiment of all charm and beauty. This verse offers a running commentry, 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” (arṇavatartanaka). 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 Īṭāṭha-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 ārdhvasūtra - 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 Sārṅga-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 śaphara-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 (ś 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 (ś 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 (ś 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 (ś 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 (ś 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 Vaijayanti-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 Pañcāyudahāra⁸⁶a 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 them⁸⁷ (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 Brṇḍāvana in His sports with Gopīkā-s, which danced to the sounds of the churning of curds,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).

UTTARAŚATAKA

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 (śeṣin) 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 śruti 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 śruti 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, (sādhiśṭhāna), 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 *Kalibrahmamīmāṁsaka*-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 (*saptabhaṅgi*). 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-karaṇa) 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 upādāna, 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 Pāṇcarātra, 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 Pāṇcarātra 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, Parāśara explains the impersonal character of the Veda-s. At the
end of every *kalpa* the Lord retains the Vedic texts in the form of *samskāra*-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 *āṅga*-s of the *Veda*-s such as *Śikṣā*, *Vyākaraṇa*, *Chandas* etc., and sciences like *Nyāya* and *Mīmāṃsā* 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 Prābhākara-s. The orthodox view, however is that the performance of the *japa*-s, *homa*-s, etc., known as *iṣṭa* 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 *nītya* 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 śrutī 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). 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.

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 (‘atrāste nidhiḥ’), this statement becomes valid although it refers to an already existing entity, namely, treasure. Therefore, there is no justification in the Mīmāṃsāka’s denying the validity of siddhaparavākya-s. Parāśara further asserts that Upaniṣadic passages such as satyam jñānam anantam brahma and yah sarvajñāh sarvavit 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 Brahmaśūtra - tattu
Parāśara observes next that the interpretation of the Chāndogya passage *ekamevādvitīyam* 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 *advitiya* (without a second) in particular, does not on any interpretation, deny the existence of the world of *cīt* and *acīt* 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), *upādhī* (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 khalvidam brahma*, *aītadātmyam idam 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 (sāmānādhikaranya), 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 Naiyāyika-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 Hīranyagarbha 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 cīt and acīt. The śruti-s - eko ha vai nārāyaṇa āsīt, patim viśvasya 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), aīśvarya (lordship), vīrya (energy) and tejas (effulgence), which always abide by the Lord in an unsurpassed manner, and which make Him Bhagavān.
(śl. 27-34). While explaining the quality called aiśvarya, Parāśara takes occasion to criticise the Śaṅkhya 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)\(^{105}\) 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 Śaṅkhya view cannot satisfactorily explain the creation of the universe.

Parāśara also observes that the Ānandavali-section of the Taittirīyopanishad 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 upaniṣad 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?\(^{106}\) 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 Ārañyaka-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 (śl. 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 (śl. 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, ahamkāra 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 Brahmāsūtra and the Brhadāranyaka 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).

Parāsara 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).

Parāsara 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). Parāsara then enters into a long and eloquent eulogy of the avatāra-s (vibhava-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), Hamsa (śl. 53), Vaṭapatraśāyin (śl. 54), Matsya (śl. 60-61), Kūrma (śl. 62), Varāha (śl. 63), Narasimha (śl. 64-66), Vāmana (śl. 67), Paraśurāma (śl. 68), Śrīrāma (śl. 69), Kṛṣṇa (śl. 70-72) and Kalkin (śl. 73). Of these special reference has to be made to Parāsara’s attachment to the Gajendravaradā-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 Lakṣmi 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 Viṣvaksena 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 Garuḍa’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-simha*) 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-simha* 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 Hiraṇyakaśipu, 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 Viśṇu. 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 Rāvaṇa’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 Brahman 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, Vibhava 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.¹⁰⁸ The poet also makes mention of the episode of the Lord abiding at Śrīraṅgam itself in accordance with the desire of Vibhīṣaṇa¹⁰⁹ ( śl. 76-78).

The succeeding four verses ( śl. 79-82) describe Lord Raṅganātha employing Upaniṣadic statements such as tatsaviturvareṇyam,¹¹⁰ āpraṇakhātsarva eva suvarṇah¹¹¹ cakṣurmitrasya varuṇasya...¹¹² yasyāsmī na tamantaremí¹¹³ āyuḥ prajānām,¹¹⁴ etc.

Parāśara then speaks of the glories of the Lord employing the words and ideas expressed in the Bhagavad
Gītā such as ārto jijñāsuḥ, mayi sarvāṇi karmāni, etc. (ś. 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 (ś. 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 (ś. 86).

In the next verse Parāśara expresses his wholehearted surrender to the Lord. Upaniṣadic passages such as yato vā imāni, antah praviṣṭah śāstā and patim viśvasya 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 (ś. 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 samsāra. “Who is to question you? You alone should save me,” appeals the poet (ś. 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 (ś. 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 Ākāpāya ("utter helplessness"), which constitutes naicyānusandhāna of the Śrīvaiśñava 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.121 (Īl. 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,\(^\text{123}\) (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 \textit{karma - jñāna-} and \textit{bhaktiyoga-s}. Helping such people will be like pouring water to a fish which is already in water (\textit{mīnapāniyānaya}). 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 \textit{Nyāyapariśuddhi}, \textit{Nyāyasiddhāñjana}, \textit{Seśvaramāṁsā}, \textit{Tattvamuktākalāpa} and \textit{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 \textit{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.\(^\text{124}\)

The first quotation seeks to define and classify \textit{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 saṃśaya is not available. But we can supply the idea from Vedānta Deśīka’s Nyāyaparipāśuddhi. According to this, saṃśaya is of two kinds: (1) That which is based on the common feature (saṃnādanaḥdraṃa); and (2) that which is based on mutual discrepancy (vipratipattī). 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 (āparokṣyaḥ) 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 therefrom 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 līṅga and śabda which do not actually belong to the category of the things desired, is what is known as pāroksya or mediacy of cognitions.

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

The next quotation (5) explains the difference between the savikalpaka (determinate) and nirvikalpaka (indeterminate) pratyakṣa (perception). According to the Viśiṣṭādvaita school the indeterminate (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” (anuvṛtti or 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.\textsuperscript{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 (*anarvācīna*, 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 *sādhyā* (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 (*sāmānādhisthikaranya*). 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 *samyuktā-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 Vedanta Deśika’s remarks is *samyuktā-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 *karnaśāṇkulis* (the external form of the ear) is the *upādhi*. The usual definition of *upādhi* is:
sādhyavyāpakatve sati sādhana vyāpakatvam

An adventurous 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 (karnaśaśkuśa), whereas there is no such concomitance between ether and the karnaśaśkusī. Another illustration for upādhi is also given: vimataḥ jīvaḥ samsārī, 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 samsāritva, they are not so with jīvatva. Udayana’s view that upādhi while not being pervasive of the sādhana (sādhana-avyyāpaka), 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 sādhanā 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 sādhanā. 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: agnīśomīyahimśā adharmajanikā, himśātvāt. “Injury to animals which forms part of the agnīśomiya-sacrifice produces sin; because it is injury, like the injury done outside the sacrifice.” Here niśiddhatva (being forbidden) forms the upādhi. Another example is also given: ātmā anityāḥ, prameyatvāt. “Soul is non-eternal, because it is knowable.” Here krtakatva (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 śākādyāhāraparinjaṇa (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 (rūpavaikalya) and between those reasons which have upādhi-s caused by the straying (vyabhicāra) of those reasons. In the first instance such reasons are called aprayojaka-s (‘ineffective’)) whereas in the second we have the usual classification as bādhita, vīruddha, 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 niścitopādhi (the determined). If the upādhi is not determined on the strength of some other means of knowledge (pramāṇa) we have what is known as śaṅkitopādhi (‘the doubted’).

Fragment (8) discusses the three kinds of anumāna 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 kevalavyatireki type of anumāna cannot be considered as an anumāna at all. However Parāśara and Varadaviṣṇumīśra 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’ (adhyavasita), and the undetermined (anadhyavasita). Of these the first kind constitutes a good reason (saddhetu) which can prove the probandum. The second variety, that is, anadhyavasita 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 (abhāsa).129

The next fragment (9) defines laksana. According to this, laksana 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 laksana in so far 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” (itarabheda) in the case of earth by reason of its possession of smell (gandhavatva), 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 (aprasisddhaviśeṣaṇa). 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 (svataḥprāmāṇya) 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 anumāṇa 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 (artha). 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 parārthānumāṇa, 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 parārthānumāṇa. 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 Tattvaratnākara in support of this. According to Parāśara all pramāṇa-s become valid by the totality of their own causes (sāmagrī) which functions on its own (svataḥ). Alternately this totality of causes (sāmagrī) 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), udāharaṇa (example), upanaya (application) and nigamana (conclusion). But the siddhānta of the Viśiṣṭadvaitins is that there should be no hard and fast rule (aniyama) regarding their exact number. Vedānta Deśika quotes the Tattvaratnākara 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 Tattvaratnākara quotes a line from the Mahābhārata (Sabhāparvan (Ch.5. Śl. 8a)) pañcāvayavayuktasya vākyasya guṇadoṣavit 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 udāharaṇa 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 drṣṭānta.
The subsequent passage (13) does not really constitute a quotation from the *Tattvaratnākara*. It is a recapitulation by Vedānta Deśika of a certain discussion found in the *Tattvaratnākara*. According to Parāśara, Chala (dialectic quibbling) and Jāti (unavailing objection) do not really contribute to the exclusive victory of a debator 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 *Nyāyaśāstra* 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* - *anyadanyasmāt...* etc. (2.2.32) points to this fact.

Fragment (15) discusses the *hetvābhāsa*-s (fallacious reasons). While the *Nyāyasūtra*, 1.2.45 mentions savyabhicāra, viruddha, prakaraṇasama, sādhyasama and atītakāla as the five *hetavābhāsa*-s, those listed in the *Tattvaratnākara*, namely siddhi, aprasiddhi, bādhvatva, viruddhatva and aphalatva seem to be entirely different from them. Vedānta Deśika tries to answer this apparent contradiction in his *Nyāyaparipāśuddhi*. According to Parāśara an inference becomes fallacious (ābhāsa) when some of the aṅga-s pertaining to its pakṣa (subject), hetu (reason) and dṛśṭānta (example) fall short of the required number necessary to make an inference full-fledged. When the pakṣa falls short of its aṅga-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 aphalatvā.

In what may be called a Doxography we find Vedānta Deśika mentioning that the Tattvaratnākara enters into a very detailed discussion and subdivision of the features such as aprasiddhi, bādhyaṭva, viruddhatva, etc. Reverting again to the Tattvaratnākara quotation we find that it mentions some general defects of the sādhana (hetu) such as avācaka (‘that which is unworthy of statement’) sandigdha (‘that which is doubted’) and aśīla (‘that which is vulgar). All these are excluded in a definition (lakṣāna) by the word paksadharma 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, anadhyavasita, viruddha, viśeṣaṇaviruddha, anaiṅkāntika, aprayojaka, bādhya, viruddha-s avyabhicārin, prakaraṇasama and siddhasādhanā. 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 anumāṇa. To be more precise, the fallacy of an inference consists in the absence or deficiency of ‘vyāpyatva (‘being pervaded’) or paksadharma (‘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 anumāṇa 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.
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 - satavarṣajīvi devadattaḥ grhe 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 satavarṣajīvi which becomes niravakāśa ('without any scope for application'). Pratyakṣa is the sāvakāśa-pramāṇa ('with a wide scope') here. According to the interpretative rule niravakāśā vidhayaḥ sāvakāśāṃ vidhīn 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-visēṣa nyāya ('the rule of the general and special'). In the sentence pīno devadattaḥ divā na bhuṅkte ('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 līṅga. 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 of Īśvara). Parāśara then quotes passages like manasaitān kāmān pāśyan ramate, mano’ sya divyam cakṣuḥ\textsuperscript{131} and etasmāt jāyate prāṇaḥ manaḥ sarvendriyāṇi ca\textsuperscript{132} 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 Prābhākara-s the words in a sentence themselves have no meaning but they obtain it only through a syntactical combination (anvitābhiddhāna) (theory of signification in syntactical combination). The Bhāṭṭa-s, however, admit that words possess a meaning independently of such a combination and hence this theory is known as abhihitānvaya (‘the theory of the combination of significant terms’). In the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, the ācārya-s like Yāmuna, Parāśara and Vedānta Deśika accept the Anvitābhiddhāna-theory. Vedānta Deśika quotes several passages from Rāmānuja’s works which seem to support the Abhihitānvaya-theory and ultimately reconciles them with the prevailing view. The two verses of the Tattvaratnākara quoted here are in full support of the Anvitābhiddhāna-theory. In one of these Parāśara refers to Yāmunācārya himself as an advocate of this view. Parāśara further points that the theory of abhihitānvaya is riddled with the problem of viparyaya (contradiction).

The next fragment (20) is in the form of a verse in the Mālinī metre beginning with Upaniṣadi tu... which is prefaced by Vedānta Deśika thus: “āhuścaivam abhiyuktāḥ”. Then he quotes a few lines from Parāśara’s Śrīrāṅgarājastava (2.14) and then says anyatra ca. He has not specifically stated that the verse ‘upaniṣadi tu...’ etc., is from the Tattvaratnākara. 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 Pāṇcarātra 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 śastra deals with karma (action), devatā (deities) and Brahman (the Supreme Being) and that Jaimini,
Kāśakṛtsna and Bādāraśya composed Sūtra-s on these three topics respectively.¹³⁶ Rāmānuja, and following him Vedānta Deśika maintain that the entire Mīmāṃsā, that is, the Pūrva and the Uttara portion put together form a single śāstra (aika-śāstrya).¹³⁷

The next fragment (22) enumerates the topics that are dealt with in the Pūrvamīmāṃśasūtra-s of Jaimini. They are (1) Dharmadāhi (Veda-s as the authority on dharma), (2) Mānabhedā (mutual difference among the rites), (3) Anīga (the relationship between the principal and subsidiary rites), (4) Prayukti (the relation between the prayojya and prayojaka-rites), (5) Krama (the sequence to be followed in performing certain rites), (6) Kārtṛ (same as adhikāra) (those who are qualified to perform these rites), (7) Atideśa (application or supplying the anīga-s of one rite to other rites), (8) Viśeṣa (a special treatment of the atideśa-s mentioned above), (9) Īha (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) Prasakti (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 (atiṃvāpṭi) 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 śābda (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 anumāṇa itself.\textsuperscript{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 cognize 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\textsuperscript{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.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 (kṣaṇikatva) 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 *Tattvaratnākara*-text at this point. The subsequent portion *atra ālokābhāvaḥ...*, 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 Prābhākara-s it is the simple recollection (*smaṇa*) 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 (dhāravāhika-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-vyatirekin type of inference, arthāpatti (presumption), yuktī (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 dipa (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 Viśiṣṭādvaitin-s the eye is an indriya produced from harākara and hence it is dissimilar to light. Therefore,
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 viśaya (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 samśkāra 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 (viśaya-samśkāra) arise simultaneously along with the impressions of knowledge (jñāna-samśkāra) since the former are the impressions pertaining to an object. The samśkāra of the object produced here and the samśkāra 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 samśkāra of that object also. In addition it produces a samśkāra 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: "Samśkāra-s concerning an object (viśaya) 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 satjñāskāra (jñāna-saṃskāra and viṣayasamskāra) arise simultaneously’’? This is answered by Parāśara in the following manner: ‘It is simple to accept that knowledge, as it rises, produces both viṣayasamskāra and jñānasamskāra. It is cumbersome to state that these saṃskāra-s are produced by knowledge which has both these saṃskāra-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,142 atmaivāsya jyotih143 and svena jyotisā āste.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 (kṣaṇīka) 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 kṣaṇīkatva (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.¹⁴⁵

Fragment 33 is quoted by Vedānta Deśika in support of the view that śabda (sound) is the characteristic feature of gagana (ether). The expression "gagana-guṇa-śabda" 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.¹⁴⁶

The next passage (35) according to Vedānta Deśika, is found in a context where Parāśara proves the atomicity (anuṭva) 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 Viśiṣṭādvaita, kāla (Time) is all-pervasive and also an object of perception. Its contact with another all-pervasive entity, namely Īśvara is also accepted. (Only then the concept of Time being the body of Īśvara 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 \textit{paratva} (remoteness) and \textit{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 \textit{asamavāyikāraṇa} (non-inherent cause) in the form of the “conjunction with soul” (\textit{ātma-saṁyoga}) which itself is associated with \textit{adṛśta} (unseen merit).

Fragment 36 shows that \textit{saṁkhyā} (number) is known only in the second moment of the perception of an object and that it is related with its correlate through \textit{samavāya} (inherence). Vedānta Deśika observes that Viśiśṭādvaita does not accept \textit{saṁkhyā} as a separate category. Since the section of the \textit{Tattvaratnākara} where the \textit{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 \textit{bheda} (difference) need not be posited as a separate quality. When \textit{dravya} (substance), \textit{jātī} (generality), \textit{guṇa} (quality) and \textit{karman} (activity) are once recognised as existent, we can, through their specific features (\textit{dharma}), account for knowledge, verbal usage, action, etc. A new quality called \textit{bheda} need not be accepted as subsisting between one object and another. This is why \textit{prthaktva} (separateness), \textit{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 anyonyāśraya. 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, guṇa, 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, guṇa and karman. It is to be noted here that karman is mentioned separately from guṇa. Later on we find the following statement: "If we accept that sāmānyā (generality) is present in jāti, guṇa and karman, the relation between them becomes samyuktasamaveta-samavāya. (The contact between the senses and objects is samyoga: and the contact between jāti, guṇa and karman with the objects is samavāya and the relation of sāmānyā with them is samavāya). Here again karman is spoken of separately. Vedānta Deśika notes that these passages do not prove that the contact with karman is something different from guṇa. Parāśara first included sāmānyā (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 f here as different from it. The conclusion is that one annot treat these observations on karman and sāmānyā
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 dharmin). 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 (sādhya) 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 sādrśya (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, sādrśya (similarity) is not something different from the samsthāna or ākṛti of the things involved. The passage may be translated as follows: "Many think that sādrśya (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), prthivītvā (being a portion of earth), śuklatva (whiteness) and pākatva (being a pāka - cooking or baking) must be accepted as universals (sāmānya) of dravya, prthivi, 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 (sequenace), avasthā (condition), etc., also cannot be referred to by a single
word if there were no unitary \textit{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 \textit{sarva} (everything) and think that all the things under the sun can be conveyed by it. Then will the Vaiśeṣika accept \textit{sarvatva} (all-ness) as a generality pertaining to all things? If he is not prepared to accept, then it means that \textit{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 \textit{vācyārtha} (the expressed object) becomes one, because it is unitary. When we utter the word \textit{ghaṭa} (pot), and \textit{pata} (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 \textit{ghaṭatva} (potness) and \textit{pataṭva} (clothness) 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 \textit{jāti} as a distinct category. But for those who do not accept \textit{jāti} as something different from the configuration of the object itself the following explanation is offered: “In the pots there is a single \textit{upādhi} (limiting adjunct), namely, the configuration (\textit{samsthāna}) by which all the individual pots can be referred to by a single word ‘pot’. So even if one does not accept \textit{jāti}, at least an \textit{upādhi} in the form of ‘configuration’ has to be accepted through which all the individual (\textit{vyakti}) can be referred to through a single
unitary reference can be made in as much as these so-called *upādh-is* (or *samsthāna-s*) keep changing. The answer is that in those configuration we can notice a ‘similarity’ (*sādṛṣya*) or non-cognition of difference (*bhedagraха*), on these two grounds, we can still consider those *samsthāna-s* as one and all the individuals possessing them can be connoted by a single word.”

Fragment 40 also defines *jāti* and *guna* (*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 *guna*.

The subsequent quotation is found in the *Seśvaramīmāṃsā* (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 *Mīmāṃsā* and *Nyāya*.

The last fragment (42) is not an actual quotation from the *Tattvaratnākara*. Vedānta Deśika mentions merely the author of *Tattvaratnākara* (*tattvaratnākara kāraḥ*) in support of his interpretation of the word *vidhi* found in the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā* (1.2.7). According to him the word *vidhi* means *śāsana* (commandment) which is same as inducement (*preṣaṇam*). “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 maṇipravāla 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 maṇgyamadhyastha (‘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 abhiṣeka 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 *Veda*-s.

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\(^{151}\) and ready to establish the *šesā-šesi* 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 (*anuvṛtti*) such as bathing, drinking etc. The Lord also is approached by His devotees in several ways (*anuvṛtti*) 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 Raṅganātha is identified with a *suradruma* (the celestial desire-yielding tree). Here again Parāśara employs pun. The tree has several broad branches (*sākha*); it confers the desired boons on those who approach it; it can be resorted to only by the celestials (*trīdaśa*). It is beautiful with its leaves (*suparna*) and flowers (*sumana*). It is resorted to by swans and such others birds (*hamsādisaddvija*). The Lord is also the purport of several Vedic recensions (*sākha*-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 (*trīdaśa*-s). He is beautiful with His Garuḍa vehicle (*suparna*) and is surrounded by the devotees (*sumana*-s). He is served by the twice-born and the greatest saints (*hamsa*).

In another verse (śl. 4) we find Lord Raṅgarāja identified with an ocean (*jalanidhī*). 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 Smṛti) 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-hīta). 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-rahīta). 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 (pūrṇa) 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 (anīśam). He is always full (pūrṇa) and can be seen both day and night and is free from all defects (verse 8).

During the constellation of śrāvaṇa 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 mānasā-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-ruči-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 (āśāpūrti). 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 (āśāpūrti) of all by His manifold gestures of magnanimity. He brings in the welfare (kalyāṇa) for all and is fond
of yellow silk (pīṭāmbara). 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 (Vegavatī). 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 Tuṅgabhadrā. 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 (ṣl. 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 (udaṅcitaśrīḥ) and is heralded by the red-hued charioteer Aruṇa and stays in gentle red lotus (ṣl. 16).

In the next verse (ṣl. 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 indranīla 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 Pādā (Śrī) 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 abhiseka, 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 Śrīvaiśnava system advocated by Sage Lakṣmāna (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 indranīla 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
for His consort (smaraguna) whereas the bee is set on Manmatha’s bow as its string (smaraguna).

The succeeding verse compares the Lord to the moon. The moon is a source of amrta (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 (amrta). 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 janmāstamī marked by the jayanti constellation (characterising Kṛṣṇāvatāra) 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 Kṛṣṇa) 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 anuṣṭubh verse that follows, Parāśara identifies Raṅgarāja with ‘mahidhara’ (mountain). The mountain is dark in colour and so also is Raṅgarāja. The Lord Raṅgarāja has a crown (makuta). The mountain has slopes (kaṭaka) and is lofty (tunga). 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 *avabhṛtasnāna* which marks the completion of a sacrificial undertaking (*savāna*). The battle the Lord waged against Rāvaṇa is the *savāna*. 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 (Rāvaṇa 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 Raṅgarāja 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 *śravaṇa*. The day is Sunday and that is admired by all (*sadasī bahumātī*). The *vṛṣya-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 Rūpaka (metaphor) based upon Ślea (śleśānuprāṇitarūpaka).

COMMENTARY OF TIRUNEDUNTĀＮṬAKA
(stanza 21)

As noted in the previous chapter, Parāśara was a great exponent of the Divyaprabandha 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 Maivaṇṇanaruṅguṇji (stanza 21) of the celebrated Tiruneduntāṇṭaka of Tirumaṅgai Ālvār. Although Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is known to have been a regular exponent of the Divyaprabandha, 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 (saulabhya) of the Lord are very beautifully woven into this verse by the mystic poet Tirumaṅgai Ālvār. 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 Ālvār
are full with the feelings of nāyikābhāva 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 madgatapranāḥ bodhayantaḥ parasparam* (*Gītā* X.9a) and explains each decade as expounding the idea conveyed by each of the three expressions respectively contained in this line. Thus the first decad of *Tiruneḍuntāṇtakam* elaborates the idea conveyed by the *Gītā* expression *maccittāḥ*; the second decad expatiates the idea of *madgatapranāḥ* and the third decad elaborates the content of *bodhayantaḥ 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 *namas* and the term *nārāyaṇa*, forming part of the *mūlamantra*. Or even within the *prāṇava* 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 *adarsane darśanamātra-kāmāḥ*, *drṣṭvā pariṣvaṅgarasaikalolāḥ* and *ālīṅgitāyāṁ punarāyatākṣyā āśāsmahe vigrahayorabhedam*, which constitute a verse of the *Śrīgāraśataka* (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 Āḻvār. 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 siddhāṇjana. 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 Āṇḍāḷ 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 illumine 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 rākṣasa-s in the Daṇḍaka forest. Naturally Parāśara loses himself in the particular episode of the Rāmāyana where Rāma singlehanded, is said to have killed fourteen thousand rākṣasa-s. The Rāmāyana-verse, tam dṛṣṭvā śatruhantāram., etc. (Rāmāyana 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 ēruvarāy vandār which means 'he came with a second person'. For Parāśara, ēruvarāy (literally 'as two') suggests the twin qualities of paratva (transcendental character) and saulabhya (easy accessibility). Or, it points out divinity (divyatva) and human nature (manuṣyatva); 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 Lakṣmana who was providing unfailing company to Rāma.

Tha Nāyaka came and stood before her (en mungē 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 (īmāṁ sameta paśyata, etc., Rgveda 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 Āḻvār 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 Āḻvār 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 visadṛśa (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), kāruṇya (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 Parāsara 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 Śrīguṇaratnakoṣa in sixty-one verses is the second longest hymn of his, followed by the Śrīraṅganātha-stotra in seven verses. His stray verses known as Tirumañjanakavi-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 Uttarasataka 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 Aṣṭaślokī 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.

anāgrātāvadyam bahuguṇaparīnāhi manaso
duhānam sauhārdam paricitamivāthāpi gahanam
padānāṁ saubhrahṛadānimiśaniṣevyam śravāṇayoḥ
tvameva śūrīmyayāṁ bahumukhaya vānīvilasitam

(Sṛīguṇaratnakośa (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 Śrīguṇaratnakośa 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 listner to a world of joy. This is in fact the most important feature of a kāvya. This is what Mammata has called, while enumerating the benefits of a kāvya, sadyaḥ paranirvṛti. The words of a Mahākavi have another feature. They appear to be familiar to the readers but they assume magnuminos 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 (padānāṁ saubhrahṛtram). 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 (animiśaniṣevyam śravāṇayoḥ). The expression bahuguṇaparīnāhi 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 Laksāmi is a beautiful illustration for the quality of Prasāda:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aiśvaryām akṣaragatīṁ paramāṁ padāṁ vā} \\
\text{kasmaicid anjaliḥbaram vahate vītīrya} \\
\text{asmai na kīnciducitāṁ kṛtāṁyathāṁba} \\
\text{tvāṁ lajñase kathaya ko'yaṁudārabhāvāḥ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(\text{SGRK - śl. 58})

Another example is the following verse:

\[
\begin{align*}
kadā'ham kāverīvimalalasalīle vītakaluośo \\
bhaveyām tattīre śramamuṣi vaseyāṁ ghanavane \\
kadā vā tāṁ punye mahati puline maṅgalagunam \\
\text{bhajeyāṁ rangeśam kamalaṇyanam śeṣaśayanam} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Śrīraṅganāthastava (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:

\[ \text{ramayatu sa māṁ kaṇṭhaḥ śrīraṅganeturuduṅcita-} \\
\text{kramukataruṇagrīvākambupralambamalimlucaḥ} \\
\text{praṇayavilagallakṣmīvīśvambharākarakandali-} \\
\text{kanakavalayakriḍāsāṅkrāntarekha ivollasan} \]

\[(Śrīraṅgarājastava (SRJS) I.104)\]

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.

\[ \text{dvīśānaḍvēṣodyannayananavanavahnipraśamanā-} \\
\text{bhramallakṣmīvaktraprahitamadhuṅḍūṣasusamāiḥ} \\
\text{nakhkṣunnaṛāṛīktikṣatajapāṭalairāplutasatā-} \\
\text{cchāṭāskandho rundhe duritamiha puṁspaṅcavadanaḥ} \]

\{(SRJS. II. 65)\}

(c) **Samatā**

This quality which consists in balanced expressions⁷ may be illustrated in the following verse:

\[ \text{āyatkritāmalikollasadūrdhvapuṇḍram-} \\
\text{ākarnalocanamananāṅkuśakārnāpāśam} \\
\text{utphullavakṣasamudāyudhabāhumarhan-} \\
\text{nīvim ca raṅgapatimabjapadam bhajāmah} \]

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

namah sriraangananayakai yadbhruuribhamabhedatah
i#esitavyavaisamya-nimnonnatamidam jagat (I.7)

d) Kanti

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

abjanyastapada$bjama#citakata#isamva#dikauseyakam
ki#cittan#avagandhisamhananakam
nirvyajamandasmitam
uddacumbimukhambujam niabhujavi#rantadivyayudham
sriraenge saradassatah tata itah pasyema laksmisakham
(SRJS 1.74)

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

anukalatanukandalinganarambhassumbhatsr-patidishabhujaasakahsrisakhahnokahardddhibh
stananayanagulucchaspharapuspadvirephah
cacayatu mayi laksmikalpavalli kataksan

e) Susabdati

The quality called Susabdati (or Sau#abdyya) omprises the employment of refined words and xpressions. We can illustrate several verses for this quality from the works of Parasa of which the following is only a representative selection.

ravinditama#ghripa#nivaktrair-
api tapinchitama#citangakantya
dharenasabandhujivitamsrih

(SRJS 1.91)
unmūlyāhara mandarādrimahinā tam sambadhānāmunaṁ
dorbhiścaṅcalamālikaiśca dadhinirmātham
mathānāmbudhistet
śrīraṅgeśvara candrakaustubhasudhāpūrvam grāhāṇeti te
kurvāṇasya phalegrahirhi kamalālbhena sarvaḥ śramah
(Ibid, II.55)
śailo'gniśca jalāmbabhūva munayo mūḍhāmbabhūvurjaḍāḥ
prājnāmāsurasuragāssagopamārtaṁāsur mahāśrīvīṣāḥ
govyāghṛassahajāmbabhūvurapare tvanyāmbabhūvuh
prabho
tvam teśvanyatamāmbabhūvitha
bhavadvēnuṇkvaṇonmādane
(Ibid. II.72)

FIGURES OF SPEECH

(a) ŚABDĀLĀṅKĀRA-S

Ālanākāra-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
śrīraṅgarājamahīṣi madhuraiḥ kaṭākṣaiḥ
vaidagdyavarnṇagunagumbhanagauravairyaṁ
kaṇḍulakarkarṇakuharāṁ kavayo dhayanti
(SGRK, śl. 7)
kastūrīkalitordhvapuṇḍratilakāṁ karṇāntalolekṣaṇaṁ
mugdhasmeramanoharādharadalam muktākīrīṭijojjvalam
paśyanmānasapaśyatohararucaḥ paryāyapāṅkeruhamśrīrangādhipateḥ kadā nu vadanaṁ seveya

bhūyo’pyaham

(SRNS śl. 2)

asti vastvidamitthantva-prasaṅkhyaṇa-parāṁmukhamśrīmatyāyatane lakṣmīpada-lākṣaikalakṣaṇam

(SRJS I.9)

(b) ARTHĀLAṆKĀRA-S

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

(i) Upamā

In the SRJS (I.8) Lord Raṅganātha reclining on the lap of Ananta is compared to the Cintāmaṇi-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 lark 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 TirumaṆjanakavi’s form
Raṅganātha to be a river resorted to by several rājaharṣa-s beautiful with abja and attended upon by marudgana-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 Sanskrit 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 Paraśara’s Tirumaṅjanakavi-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, rājaharṣa, andajāta, abja, sumarudgūṇa, etc., of verse 2 have each two meanings. Likewise in verse 3, the words śākhā, 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 Śārdulaśākraṇī metre (55) followed by Vasantaśākraṇī (43), Śikharinī (34), Mālānī (31), Sragdharā (25), Hariṇī (16), Anuṣṭubh (14), Indravajrā (12), Mandākrānta (10) and Upajāti (10). Of the remaining metres mention may be made of a few rare ones like Kusumatalatévellinga, Kalaharṣa, Prastārīkā, Bhramaravilasita, Mattā, Mandākinī, Manjubhāṣini, Mattamaṅjarī, Mālabhārini, Yugmayugala, Rukmavati, Rucirā and Śaśikalā.
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 Vyākarana-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 Śrīvaiśṇava tradition whose devotional fervour is perfectly matched by his poetical style. Thus while referring to Rāmāvatāra in the VSB he states: atha mṛtasanjīvanam rāmacaritam. Explaining the word Śubhekṣaṇa he says, evam vidhaiśvaryaśīlātiśayapiśuna- śītala - viśālodāra dīrgharājīvalocanaḥ. To express his poetic bent of mind, the following sentences may also be cited:

divyavallyā iva kalpadrumah, tasyāḥ nityopaghanaḥ
(C. on the name Śrīnīvāsa, no. 614)

ratnamañjarīva mañjuśayām śrīḥ asmin nihitā
(C. on the name Śrīnīdhiḥ, 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: Čārvāka (SRJS. II.6), Buddhism (SRJS II 6-10; SGRK II), Jainism (SRJS. II.12a, b), Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika (SRJS. II.13), Sāṅkhya-Yoga (SRJS II.14-15, 30; VSB, name no. 173), Mīmāṁsā as represented by the Bhāṭṭa-s and Prābhākara-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 Pāñinian grammar.11
(i) abhramlihaḥ (*SRJS I.119*)

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

(ii) aruntuda (*SRJS II.73*)

This word meaning wounding the vital parts is formed by the rule vidhvaruśastudah (i.īi.35). According to this the affix khaś 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) ādhyaṁbhaviṣṇuḥ (*SRJS II.15*)

This word meaning, ‘becoming rich’ (‘regarding one who was not originally rich’) is formed by the rule kartari bhuvah khisṇuc-khukaṇau (*Aṣṭā III.īi.57*). According to this when the word to be formed denotes an agent, the affixes khisṇuc and khukaṇ are added after the verb bhū (to become) when it is in composition with words ādhyā, 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.īi.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) kañehatya (SRJS. II.38)

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

(vi) karṇejapa (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 stambakarṇayoh 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 karṇa (ear) are in composition with them respectively.

(vii) kūlamudvaha (SRJS. I.100; SGRK. āl. 41)

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

(viii) kṣemaṅkara (SRJS. I.70)

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

(ix) coralāvaṁ vilāvyah (SRJS. II.6)

This expression means ‘he has to be beheaded like 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 ābhīkṣṇye namul ca (III.iv.22).

Other expressions which are governed by this rule are mūkalāyāṁ nilīlye (SRJS. II.35) (‘kept quiet like a dumb person’), ‘nidhinidhāyāṁ nyadhāyīṣata’ (SRJS. II.36) (‘preserved like a treasure’) and ‘dadhi- nirmātham-mathāna (SRJS. II.55) (‘churned like curds’).

(x) jīvanāśam naśyati (SRJS. II.93)

This expression means ‘he (she or it) perishes so that the life gets extinguished’, that is, dies away. The aphorism kartroḥ jīvapurūṣayorṇaśivahoh (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 puruṣa (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-stheyākhyayośca (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 *īṣṭakeśīkāmālānām cita-tūla-bhāriṣu* (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 *kriyāsamabhihāre lot hisvau vā tadhvamoh* (III.iv.2). This means: ‘when the frequency or repetition of an action is indicated, the affix *lot* 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 *lot*). 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 pāśap’ (V.iii.47). According to this aphorism, the suffix *pāśap* 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 *kartṛkarmanośca bhū-kṛṇoḥ* (II.iii.127). This means that the affix *khal* comes after the verbs *bhū* and *kṛṇi* 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 *svāgatādīnāṁ ca* (VII.iii.7). The words read in this group (*gana*) do not take the suffix *aic*. They take the suffix *thak* 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*.

**katāksaṇam**

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’.

**caitrī (*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
jāgarteḥ akāro vā read under the Pāṇinian rule icch (III.ii.101). This Vārttika means, ‘From the root jāg, we have either jāgarā or jāgaryā. The first is formed by the affix, ‘a’ and the latter by şa which brings it 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, prakṛṣṭa hatīḥ 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 *makaraḥ* in the sense of ‘beautiful’ or ‘grand’ (‘ear-rings shaped like makara-fish’).\(^\text{13}\)

Mr̥gyamadhyastha

This word is a technical one meaning ‘one who is ready to take an oath’. Parāśara uses this word in his *Tirumaṅjanakavi*-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 *dīvya* 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 *rājadantādiśu param* (II.ii.31). Thus *kulānām rāja* 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 *vikarosi* (‘you bring about modification’ or ‘change’). This is derived from the fifth conjugational root *krṇḥ hīṁsāyām*, prefixed by the preposition *vi*.

Saṅcāraḥ (*SRJS*. II.17)

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

Parāśara in his Šrīraṅgarājastava 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) Daṇḍāpūpikānyāya (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) Mīnapānīyanyāya (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) Sīkṣīranyāya (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 ajalasthalajñā)

Parāśara uses what may be called an idiom, ajalasthalajñā, 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 Kṛṣṇa).

An Unclear Idea

In one verse (SRJS. II.65) Parāśara fancies the blood gushing forth from the chest of Hiranyakāśipu 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 reveals 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 Śrīvaiṣṇava 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.¹ 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,² 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.³ The loss of this monumental philosophical treatise of the great ācārya is great no doubt; but yet his other compositions like the Bhagavadgunadarpana, the three stotra-s and the Aṣṭāloki, enable us to arrive at a more or less clear picture of Parāśara’s philosophical position. An approach to a study of the Śrīvaiṣṇava 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
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 pratyavamarṣa (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 (anarvācīna-yogīn-s) and that which belongs to the ordinary people (arvācīna).

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 perceptio (mānasa-pratyakṣa).

According to Parāśara inference involves the mediac of knowledge (parokṣa). Vyāpti (invariable concomitance which is the main feature of anūmana can be understood even through a single observation. Bhūyodarśan (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 aprayojakā and the latter has the usual classification of bādhita, viruddha, anaikāntika, etc.

Kevalavyatirekān, 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 (sāmagri) 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
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 agnimāneva ('that which has smoke certainly has fire'), there is no need for the illustration (dṛṣṭānta) 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 MĪMĀṂŚA-S CONSTITUTING A SINGLE SCIENCE

One of the basic convictions of this school is that both the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā-sūtra-s of Jaimini and the Uttara-mīmāṃsā (the Brahma-sūtra) of Bādarāyaṇa form a single cogent unit, of which the opening sūtra is athāto dharmajñāṇā and the last sūtra is anāvṛttīḥ śabdāt anāvṛttīḥ 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
created by Jaimini, Kāśakṛtsna and Bādarāyaṇa respectively, in their aphorisms.  

**TATTVATRAYA**

The three principles accepted in this system are *cit*, *acit* and Īśvara which constitute a single unit by virtue of *cit* and *acit* forming the śarīra of the Lord who is heir soul. In his *stotra*-s and the commentary on the Viśṇusahasranāma, Parāśara has emphasised the concept of Tattvatraya. In the *SRJS* (I.115) Parāśara states that he Lord has within Himself the entire universe of *cit* and *acit*, each containing within itself a three-fold classification (*trividha-cidacid-bṛndam*). 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: *suddha-sattva* (the pure *sattva*) (which constitutes the hings to be found in the highest abode of the Lord and also the ‘divine abodes of the Lord on earth’), *niśrasattva* (the mixed *sattva*) and *sattvasūnya* (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: ‘śrutih cidacitī.’ etc). In his *VSB*, Parāśara again mentions the Tattvatraya while explaining the name *puruṣottamaḥ* (name no. 24) and also the name *pradhānapuruṣēśvaraḥ* (name no. 20). This latter name clearly mentions *pradhāna* (*acit*) and Puruṣa (*cit*) as controlled by Īśvara.

**REACTION OF THE UNIVERSE**

Speaking about the creation of the Universe, Parāśara
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 pradhānapuruṣeśvarah (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 *cīt* and *acīt* 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 *Srī* (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 *krīdā* 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 *cīt* and *acīt*.

**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 (*vaiśamya*) and cruelty (*nairghṛṇya*), 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
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 Muṇḍakopaniṣad passage anāśnannanyah (3.1.1) and the Gītā-text,⁶ ‘na māṁ karmāṇi limpanti...’ (4.14), as also the Brahmasūtra, sambhogapṛāptiriti cet na., etc., (1.2.8) are quoted in support.

DHARMABHŪTAJÑĀNA

Another important theory of this school is that jñāna, also known as samvīt, 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 prakāśayate yekāḥ (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 Vedārthasaṅgrahā is worth noticing in this context. According to it, body.s 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 antaryāmibrāhmaṇa of the Brhadāranyaka 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 I.23-24) he points out that the entire universe (aśeṣah urapañcaḥ) forms the subsidiary (śeṣah) and thus the ody (vapuh) of the Lord who forms its soul (ātman) in several grounds such as the creation (utpattī), maintenance (sthiti), activity (pravṛtti) and dissolution (grasana) of the universe and also by virtue of His ontrolling (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 (sāmānādhikaranya) only because of this kind of relation between the Lord and the universe. The SGRK (śl. 22) also explains this principle of the āša-āśni-bhāva between the divine couple and the rest of the creation. Parāśara’s explanation of the names bhūtakrt (name No. 5), bhūtabhr (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 āśitva 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 āśrīrātmabhāva. 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 Īśvara 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 āśatva of the entire universe. The name muktānāṁ paramāgatiḥ (name no. 12) also according to Parāśara, shows the āśa-āśni relation that exists between even the liberated beings and the Lord (mukta-tat-prāpyayoh āśa-āśni-bhāvah).

Parāśara’s Āṣṭāśloki also makes clear the idea of the āśa-āśni relation between the world and Lord Viśṇu. 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 śaraṇāgati or bharanyāsa) was not specifically described at least in the canonical works of Rāmānuja like the Śrībhāṣya and the Gītābhāṣya. 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 ‘Viṣṇumāyā’ 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 "O Lord! I resort to you, who are my refuge (śaraṇa)" says Parāśara. In verse 89 the declaration of Śaraṇāgati
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.

jñānakriyābhajanasaṃpadakīñcano’ham-
icchādhikāraśakanānusayānabhijñāh
raṅgēśa! pūrṇavṛjinaśśaraṇam bhaveti
mauriṅhyād 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-
śaraṇamityapi vācamudairiram
iti sasākṣikayannidamadya mām
kuru bharam tava raṅgadhurandhara (II.102)

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

In his Asṭaśloki (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 muktānām paramā gatīh (name no.12) in the VSB, Parāśara points out that the word muktānām (‘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 gatī (‘the goal’). Parāśara also quotes an upaniṣadic passage pṛthagātmānam preritāraṇī ca matvā (Śvetāsvatara, Upaniṣad 1.6) and the Brahmāsūtra muktopasṛpyavya 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’ (sādguna). 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
ullround knowledge which is natural to Him without any imitations 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, will 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 viatāra-manifestations.

As for the vibhūti-s (glories) of the Lord they consist of the nitya (the eternal) as manifested in the Vaikuṇṭha 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, Vaikunṭha 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 Kauśitaki and other Upaniṣad-s.

**THE PĀNCARĀTRA (SĀTTVATA) 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 sāttvatām 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 Pāncarātra through which all other knowledge including the duties of a Śrīvaiṣṇava can be obtained. One of the important characteristics of the Pāncarātra religion is itsVyūha-theory. The Supreme Being has five aspects, namely, Para, Vyūha, Viḥava, Arcā and Antaryāmin. The Para form is also known as Vāsudeva. The Vyūha-aspect is four-fold (caturvyūha) as Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, 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,
Parāśara makes a detailed statement about the nature and function of the vyūha-s.\textsuperscript{19} The six qualities, in their totality make up the body of Vāsudeva, which is within the reach of the mukta-s (muktabhogya). Samkaraśāna in whom the qualities of jñāna and bala are predominant, is responsible for the destruction of the universe. The Pradyumna-vyūha connected with aśvarya and vīrya carries out the teaching of religion. Aniruddha connected with sakti 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, suṣupti) and the final stage (mūrcchā) respectively.

It is also clear from a verse of the \textit{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 \textit{SRJS} (I.124; II.48 ff) and in the \textit{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.
ARÇĀ (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 Pāncarātra-texts and Smṛti-s and Purāṇa-s. Quoting from a Pāncarātra-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 poesy. Reference is made to the śadgунya 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 sport. A detailed statement of the nature of Śrī 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 prāṇāsakti 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 (‘nirdoṣah ka iha jagati’). She thus establishes a rapport between man and God (‘svajanayasi’). That is why She is the Mother of all (‘mātā tadasi 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 Śrī 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
in the form of witty anecdotes, repartees and delectable flashbacks fo 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 kaṇḍānē, (‘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 Kāṇappattavan (‘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-rakṣaka-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 Īśvara.

Having thus analysed the important philosophical statements spread over the writings of Parāśara now it remains to assess his contribution to the Viśiṣṭādvaīta. 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 Śrīgūḍaratnakosa. 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
that assuming the role of a *Deśika* (teacher), he was cheating the world at large as though he was a great *jñānīn* 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 Śrīvaiṣṇava 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 Śrīvaiṣṇava religious thought. He was in the order of great writers of the school like Nāthamuni and Yāmuna. Like the *Nyāyatattva* of Nāthamuni (which is lost to posterity but for a few fragments) and the *Siddhītraya* 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 *Mīmāṃsā*. 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 Kāśakṛtsna composed the *devatākāṇḍa* comprising four *adhyāya*-s which along with the twelve chapters of Jaimini’s *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* forms the ‘*Śodāsalakṣaṇi*’, which again has its sequel in Bādarāyaṇa’s *Brahmasūtra*. Quoting his opinion Vedānta Deśika in his *Adhikaraṇaśārāvalī* 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 *Kevalavyatīrekī* 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 *samāśaya* (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 except by Vedānta Deśika.
As noted earlier, the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, as it came to be known at a later date, 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 Tiruneḍuntāṇṭaka 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 saguṇa. A stotra would have no meaning if it does not carry conviction with the devotees, by failing to deliver the highest good.

Parāśara’s beautiful stotra-s and the Tirumanāṇjanakkavi-s not only present him as a great poet but also as an ardent devotee of Lord Śrīraṅgaṇātha. Like Yāmuna who first composed the Catuśśloki in praise of Śrī and followed it up by his Stotraratna, Parāśara also composed the Śriguṇaratnakośa in praise of Goddess Raṅganāyakī, and the Śrīraṅgarājastava on Lord Raṅgaṇātha Himself. Rāmānuja also in his Śaraṇāgaṭigadya eulogises the Goddess first and then the Lord. Parāśara’s illustrious father Śrīvatsāṅka also
followed the same tradition in composing the Pañcاستav of which the Śrīstava is one.

THE INFLUENCE OF EARLIER WRITERS ON PARĀŚARA

Parāśara's Śrīguṇaratnakośa 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 Catusśloki 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 prapattī to Śrī is also found in this stotra of Yāmuna. The introductory portion of Rāmānuja's Śaraṇāgatigadya where again śaraṇāgati to Śrī is clearly articulated, follows Yāmuna's stotra. Thus Parāśara also expresses his Śaraṇāgati to Śrī in his Śrīguṇaratnakośa (śl. 59).

Rāmānuja's influence on Parāśara can also be seen in several passages of the Tattvaratnākāra and the Śrīraṅgarājastava.10 Parāśara refers to the opinion of Rāmānuja and Yāmuna (obviously referring to the Pañcaratradhikarana of the Śrībhāṣya and the Āgamaprāmāṇya of Yāmuna) that the Pañcaratra-criptures are the compositions of the Lord Himself and such they cannot be treated as alternative to the ruti-texts (which are recapitulated and instructed to
Brahmā). In the Śrīraṅgarājastava (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 Śrīraṅgarājastava. The Śrīstava of his father gave him the necessary impetus and background to compose the Śrīguṇaratnakoṣa. 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 Śrīguṇaratnakoṣa. Parāśara, like his father, prays to Goddess Lakṣmī to bless him with the power of speech. Expressions like aśvaryaṁ mahadeva and Śrīraṅgarājamahīṣī 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 Ālvārs 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 Periyāṭiruvantādi passage 23 ‘pugazhvōi pazzhippōm pugazhōm pazhiyōm’. A passage from th Tiruvāymozhi 24 ‘Muṭiccōdiyāy...’ etc., likewise, form the model for the Śrīraṅgarājastava verse 25 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 Perumāḻtirumožhi 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 decal of verses beginning with nāvalam periya tīvinū 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 jalaṁbabhūva...’ etc.

PARĀŚARA’S INFLUENCE ON THE LATER WRITERS

The great position occupied by Parāśara in the Śrīvaiṣṇava 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 s Bhattaparāśarapādaiḥ, abhiyuktaiḥ, etc. The entire discussion on the section on anumāna of the Jyāyaparīśuddhi 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 Aṣṭāśloki the first independent treatise on the Rahasyatraya of this school, on the Rahasyatrayasāra of Vedānta Deśika has already been pointed out. The reference made by Parāśara (SRJS) of the paṇcāhēti or paṇcāyudha-ornament put on Lord Kṛṣṇa by his mother Yaśoda as a talisman is found in Vedānta Deśika’s Yādavābhuydaya.\(^{30}\) What Parāśara states in SRJS\(^{31}\) describing the śāntodīta-state of Vyūha-Vāsudeva is found in Vedānta Deśika’s Varadarājapaṇcāśat\(^{32}\) 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 Śrīgūrutaratnakośa received as many as seven commentaries. His Aṣṭāśloki was commented upon by more than twelve scholars.\(^{33}\) His Śrīraṅgarājastava has it least four commentaries.\(^{34}\)

Thus on the strength of the long tradition of the Śrīvaiśṇava religion and philosophy which holds Parāśara Bhaṭṭa in great esteem and on the basis of his monumental work, the Tattvaratnakāra 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 oss of his colossal work the Tattvaratnakāra, one can still see the range of his thinking, embracing in its fold salient features of the Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā-śāstra-s which were, in all probability, reviewed in the light of Śrīvaiśṇava 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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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. Huttinington, ‘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...’.
105. See Sāṅkhyaakārika, 19.
107. See Brh. Up., IV.iv.5. ‘sādhukārī sādhurbhavati..’ and Brahmasūtra II.i.34. ‘vaiṣamya-nairgrhīṇye na..’.
107a. Periālvār Tirumoli 3.6.8
108. See Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa, Yuddha-kāṇḍa (vi.131.90b) ‘labdhvā kuladhanam rājā laṅkāṁ prāyād vibhīṣañah’.

109. See Śrīraṅgamāḥātmya, Ch.VI. śl.10-11.

110. Rgveda, III.62.10a.

111. Chāndogya XVI.6

112. Rgveda I.115.1b.


114. Taitt. Āraṇyaka III.II.4.


116. ibid. III.30.

117. See ibid. IX.29.


119. Tai. Ā. III.11.

120. Mahānārāyaṇa, IX.3.

121. See Rāmāyaṇa (VI.18. 33b-34a) ‘sakrīdeva 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. Yatīndramatadīpikā, p.51.

126. See Tarkasamgraha, p.135 and Vedāntaparībhāṣā, 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 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 Tattvaratnakara which contains the statement ‘divātana-aśana-niṣedha-mātraparam cet śrutārthā patteḥ’ 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 jyotiṣṭhemena 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 Śabdāpramāṇa itself.

131. Chāndogya VIII.XI.5.

132. Muṇḍaka. II.I.3.


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

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

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 Nyāyasiddhānta (NS) p.72.


142. Bṛhadāraṇyaka. 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 pīlū and pīthara-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 Dipikā, Vol.XXVII. Part II pp. 15-21 III (pp.88-90), Part
IV (pp.121-124), Part II VIII (pp.189-192) and Part IX (pp.227-229). A commentary of unknown authorship on the verse "tvam-me' ham me" alone is available in the form of a palm-leaf manuscript in grantha characters deposited in the French Institute of Indology, Pondicherry, under No.20794, folios 24b-27b.D. The verses were published serially in the Yatirāja Pādukā, Vol. III, Part V, (pp.16-20), Part VI (pp.9-12), Part XII (pp.36-38) and Vol.IV, Part I (pp.12-15) and Part II (pp.35-37).

149. All the available Tirumāṇjanakavi-s are given in Appendix II of this book.

150. See Yājñavalkya-smṛti, II. 22.95 which refers to ten kinds of taking such an oath.


152. Cf: Taniyan of Bhāṭṭa: 'Śrī Parāśara-bhaṭṭāryaḥ śrīraṅgeśa-purohitah'.

CHAPTER IV

1. Cf: Šrīguṇaratnakośa, śl.6

   stotāram tampusanti devi kavyayo yo vistṛṇite guṇān, stotavyasya,' etc.

2. Ibid. śl.7. sūktim samagrayatu nah svayameva lakṣmīḥ.

3. See Kāvyaprakāśa, I.4(a):

   tadadoṣau śabdārthau sagunāvanalaṅkṛti punaḥ kvāpi.

4. Dhvanyāloka, II.10:

   samarpakatvam kavyasya yattu sarvarasān prati saprasādo guṇo jñeyah sarvasādhāraṇakriyāḥ
5. Ibid, II.33:

sarveśveva prabhedeṣu sphiṭtateṇāvabhaśanam yad
vyāṅgyasya aṅgībhūtasya tat pūrṇam dhvanilakṣaṇam.

6. See Dhvanyāloka, II.p.119:

tatprakāśanaparaścārtho 'napekṣitadīrghhasamāsa-
racanāḥ prasannavācakābhidheyaḥ

7. See Pratāparudrīya, Guṇaprakaraṇa, p.234:

avaśāmyena bhaṇanam.

8. See Pratāparudrīya, Guṇaprakaraṇa, p.236:

atyujjvalatvam bandhasya.

cac vyutpattih.


11. The translations of the sūtra-s given here are mostly

from ‘The Siddhāntakaumudī’, translated in English

by S.C. Vasu.

12. See Amarakośa, I.i.545:

vā puṃsi padmam.

13. Vide Amarakośa I.i.268:

prakāṇḍamuddhatallajau.

CHAPTER V

1. Cf: NS. Bhaṭṭaparāśarapādaīḥ; Tattvaratnākarakāraiḥ,

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: Aṣṭāslokī, V.1.a. ‘jagadudayarakṣaṇaṃ pagarāyaṃ’
8. **ibid.** II.41.
9. **ibid.** II.44.
10. See **Brahmasūtra**, II.i.34.
11. Cf: **Bṛhadāraṇyaka** [iv.iv.5]: sādhukārī sādhurbhavati
14. **Bṛhadāraṇyaka** 5.7: yasya prthvī śarīram; yasya āpaḥ śarīram; yasya ātmā śarīram’.
15. See **VSB**, p.126 (on name no.12).
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 Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya 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.
25. *ibid.* 54.
26. *SRJS.* II.44.
27. *VSB,* name no.73.
28. *SGRK* śl. 52.
29. See Yāmuna’s *Catuśślokī* and Rāmānuja’s *Śaraṇāgatigadya,* introductory paragraph.
32. *Varadarājapañcāśat,* śl.16.
33. See the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* Vol. I. pp.455-456.
34. This information is taken from the notes available with the *New Catalogus Catalogorum,* Department of Sanskrit, Unviersity of Madras.

CHAPTER VI

1. His *Lakṣmīkalyāṇanāṭaka* is unfortunately not available.
2. See *VSB,* Introductory śl.3: bhūyo bhaṭtabharṣaretī phaṇitāḥ śrīraṅgabhartrā svayam.
3. See *SRJS,* I.17.
5. See *Nārāyaṇa’s commentary on SGRK,* p.1. ‘drāmīḍopaniḥsadgabhīrāśsayavivaranaṇacānaḥ...’ etc.
kāśakṛtsnaprabhava iti katham tattvaratnākaroktiḥ, atra brūmaḥ saduktau na vayamiha mudhā bādhitum kiṃcidarhāḥ."


9. Cf: Viṣṇusahasranāma, śl.3. ‘kim japan mucyate jantuh janmasamsārabandhanāt’.

10. See SRJS I.3. ‘rāmānujamunirjīyāt..’ etc.

11. See fragment 20: ‘bhāsyakrd-yāmunāryaiḥ’.


13. See SRJS, II.22: ‘atrāste nidhiḥ...tvayi sakalāḥ samanvayante’ and Cf: Śrībhāṣya, I.i.4: ‘sam anvayaiḥ samyaganvayaiḥ; puruṣārthatayā anvayaiḥ ityarthaḥ’.

14. SRJS, I.1: ‘śrīvatsacihnamisrebhyaiḥ..’ 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. Śrīraṅgarājastava, I.68, 112.


22. Śrīraṅgarājastava I.13.

23. Periyatiruvantādi, stanza 2.

24. Tiruvāyumolhi, III.i.1.

25. Śrīraṅgarājastava, verse I.91.


27. SRJS, I.59.
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<th>20.</th>
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<th>pp. 475—476</th>
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<td>p. 480</td>
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<td>22.</td>
<td>TK</td>
<td>p. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TK</td>
<td>p. 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Śrutapraḵaśīkā p. 73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>p. 485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>pp. 494—495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p. 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p. 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p. 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 141—142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 502—509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 569—570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p. 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 599—60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 611—612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 650—651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 660—661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 674—675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>pp. 691—693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>TMK</td>
<td>pp. 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>p. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>p. 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. "कौशिक संज्ञायः कतिविवश्च? एकसिनू धर्मिणि विरूध्यानेकविशेषासमासः संज्ञायः। स च द्विविधः।"

2. "प्रत्यक्षादिकृतानां स्मृतीनां स्वस्वमूढेन्तर्भविविवश्चा प्रमाणात्विचारिंऽधः। चतुष्योऽच वैदिकानुवादो दर्शितः। (... स्मृतः प्रत्यक्षादिकृतानां चतुष्ये मूढः इति प्रत्यक्षादिकृतानां वैदिकानुवादादाः।"

3. "अपरोक्षप्रमाद्यक्षामापन्येच च संविदः। व्यवहार्यद्वैवसंविद्यान्तविविवश्च। (... परशुः व्यवहारान्तर्गतवसुवेदनापेशा। तदन्तर्गतिलिङ्गापेशा पारोक्षमनुमादैः।"

4. "अत्र वृद्ध विदामासुः संयोगः संनिकर्षणम्। संयुक्ताश्रयणं चैति यथासंभवमूढहताम्।।"

5. "विशेषणां स्वत्योगव्यावृत्तिरविकल्पकेः। सबिकलपेन्द्र्योगस्य व्यावृत्ति: संज्ञिता तथा।।

(...द्विविधं चैततु प्रत्यक्षमूः अर्धचिन्मनवर्णीणं च। युगपदेशविश्वसंस्कारात्कारकमनवर्णीणमू।। ततु योगिमुक्तेऽर्ध्रणं प्रभावविशेषाधिनुमुपादिपियते।"

6. "संबन्धोषयं सकृद्धां। तत्रितिस्वरसातू तथा। प्रतीतयो हि स्वसामृद्धमृद्धवीरीनू विदुः।।

(...संनिहितत्थूमादिविश्वकसंयुक्तस्येन्द्रियस्य तदाश्रितद्युमस्तव्यादि:। संयुक्तिः तदाश्रयवे व्यक्त्यन्तरणी संप्रयुक्तानि।।

तृतीयः। संनिहितसंख्यां संनिकर्षणं। अनुसारतद्युमस्य व्यासरैव साधनातू ततु।।"

7. "केनचिद्यसयं संबन्धे योइव्वेदेक एष हि। तस्योपाधिरि वहेराप्रीयोधूमसंगमे।।"
श्रोत्रत्वयोगे नभसो यथा वा कर्णशुषुकुली ।
संसारयोगे जीवस्य कर्माविद्यादि वा यथा ॥
साध्यव्यापकः साधनाव्यापक इति तं लक्षयति । केचित्तौ
साधनाव्यापकः साध्यसम्बन्धातिरिति च ... किमस्य ज्ञापकम्?
साधनस्य केचित्तौ साध्यसंबन्धव्यापकः,
संबन्धग्रहणवेलानुपयायिन्स्यप्रवैकल्प्यं वा । असंबन्धव्यापकं
च व्यभिचारदर्शनम् । तच साध्यविरुद्धथर्मकत्वया निष्ठिते
प्रमाणार्थविय च व रत्नोद्वर्रित्य निरघिर्भवमात्रमन
उपाधि कल्पयति । प्रभेयतं च नित्यात्मादिपश्चे
द्वीमनित्यत्वसाथे कृतकल्पादिकमुपायातीर्थिति । सपक्षेषु य
याबद्धप्रियविशेषतया साधनं साध्यसंबन्धित्वेन द्वमः,
तदन्तुत्तरप्रियः चेतुः पशे दृढ़यते, तदा
व्यासस्यप्रात्मस्थानात्
सर्वप्रविशिष्टमेवोपाधयति;
यथा-भावितनयदयामलिमनि अनुमयेर्मित्रायुततं भूतपूणञ्च दृढः
शाकायात्मारसिप्राणाविशेषम् ।
एवंजातियाके
रूपवैकल्यकल्पितपाधित्वे हेतुप्रयोजनकथ्वयपदेशः:
परिश्वकाणाम्; व्यभिचारकल्पितपाधित्वकयोस्तु वाधितो
विरुध्दोनैकान्तिक इति तदेष संप्रेषः - व्यभिचार एव
प्रतिवन्याभावः । उपाधिरेख व्यभिचारनिदानम् । प्रमाणानिशेष
एवोपाध्येत्वेन शास्त्रीयः । साधने सोपाधि: साध्ये
निरुपाधिरेखोपाध्येत्वेन निश्चयः;
सर्वाध्यात्मानिप्रसंहातपपित्यांश तथः’’ ।

8. “अक्ष्यादृश्यमसूत्रमुत । इयं हि
अत्यवसितकैवल्यतिरितिकोभिदा । विद्मानसपशोपि
पक्षमात्रपृष्ठ: प्रथम: । अन्यस्तविविधमानसपशो
विपश्चाद्यावृत्त इति । तत्र दृढं साध्यतम सपशे साधनस्य
ततो व्यावृत्तावधायावधानस्य स्पष्टम् । अद्दै तु तस्यिन्
साध्यान्यायांक्षप्पूर्वविक्षेर्वक्षेर्वक्षेत्रमाणावर्तारादनाभास्तवं सुवचेर्

९. ‘‘अर्थासाधारणाकार्यप्रतिपतिनिवन्धनम्

साधारणाविज्ञातिव्यवच्छेदन लक्षणम्’’

‘चायं जात्यादिराकार: प्रमेयं निष्कृष्य लक्षयत: प्रमाणस्य
राजाश्रीविज्ञातिव्यवच्छेदादोरो सहकारीति लक्षणमुच्यते’

१०. ‘‘क्षोण्यादिलक्ष्यं प्रमाणसिद्धं न वा?
दसिद्धावाध्यापिसिद्धिर्क्षणात्मनो हेतो: । सिद्धं च साधनं सुधा ।
वस्तुसिद्धावपि व्यवच्छेद: साध्यं इति चेतृ, तात्त्वेव तदर्भः; तथापि
श्रुप्रसिद्धबिश्वेषणं: पश्चं: स्थात, इतरव्यवच्छेदस्य कविदनालोचितञ्चर्यात्,
सिद्धं वा साधनवैध्यात् । किं च प्रमाणस्य स्वविषयव्यवस्थायां
प्रमाणान्तरापेक्षणां दक्षिणतिपरति: प्रमाणे प्रसज्ज्ञेयभावात्

तस्माद्भू: प्रमेयात्मा धर्मिनिष्कृष्माचारस्य
लक्षणं न प्रमाणात्मेत्युत्कृष्म विद्या गति:’’

११. ‘‘सर्व प्रमाणं सामर्थ्यं स्वतं एव प्रवृत्तया ।
जन्यते परस्यवेऽणं वृत्तया चेतिति हि द्रिष्या
अनोनुमानं द्विविधं स्वपरर्थार्थवेद्यत: ।
प्रत्यक्षाण्वंसमां: परस्ये प्रदशिति ॥
विभयं व्यवहाराध्वन्यनुसारस्य तृत्यते ।
अनुमोदितं वाक्यं प्रयोगं: साधनं च तत् ॥’’
२२. ‘‘अतः सर्वोत्तम पञ्चवायुवाक्यमानिर्दितं वेदाचार्यादयः—
‘पञ्चवायुवृत्तम् वाक्यस्य गुणदोषविन्दु’ इत्यादि .... न च सर्वोत्तम
सर्वप्रवा: प्रयोज्यः, न इति निर्भीर्सः, ब्रह्मप्रतिवृत्तमभूतानि
लघुपादानोपिनि दोषाभावात्, लोकेषु तथा व्यवहाराः.... प्रतिप्रत्येकस्या
विकल्पसमुच्चयावेव, अविरोधातु.... प्रतिज्ञाया: परं हेतुदृश्यायोर्न
क्रमनिर्विन्नः, व्यासितेतुपदशनि विरोषाभावातु.... सोयं गवयपदाभिषेषः,
गोसहस्तावः य इत्यस् स तथा, प्रयोजकाय\; अर्थं च
गोसहस्तः; तत्तत्त्वदवाच्यः.....
व्यासी दृश्यन्तदश्यायमवर्य स निदर्श्यते।
आगमाद्वास्थितिसिद्धी न व्यासिस्मृत्त्वर्थमिते।।
धूमवादस्त्रिमानेकत्यालोकायां तथा गति।।’’

२३. छलजात्योरिकान्ततविज्ञायभावेन त्याज्यत्मू, कदाचिदवाच्य-विज्ञायवहत्यमात्रेण
tतत्त्वाध्यवसायसंसरक्तत्मू, अन्यदन्त्यदपि विस्तरेण
tतत्त्वरत्नाकरे प्रतिपादि।

२४. ‘‘अमृषों जातिनामानन्यात्युच्छर्तितिसौ प्रदर्शिनाथे
‘अन्यदन्त्यमात्’ इत्यादिना जातन्तरसुचनानात्’

२५. ‘‘ईत्यक्ष्यभाज्ञानामेककविकलक्तत:।
सर्वनामानामानानां संस्कर्पक्ष्य सूचितमू।।
तत्त्ववाच्यादिरूपतत्त्वमस्तदपि तथा भास्मानं तदाभासः। ततः,
पञ्च प्रतिज्ञार्याभासः पञ्चविकल्पदैषोऽजः।।
सिद्धसिद्धवानित्वविरूढ्नत्वावफलतत्व:।।
अवाचकसंदर्भाश्चलनिदेशाय: साधनादिष्पिसाधारणनिदेशादोषा
द्वृत्या:। एते च लक्षणवाक्ये पक्षवर्मणेन व्यावर्त्त्वातु सर्वे
प्रतिज्ञामाभासः......
अथ

dहेतुवोसिद्धान्तव्यवसितविरुद्धविशेषणविरुद्धनैकान्तिकायप्रयोजनकार्यत्वः

विरुद्धविम्बिचारिक्रियाकरणसमसिद्धान्तः। ज्ञति दृश्या।

सर्वनुमानाभासानां तत्त्वाध्यक्षवक्षति।

व्याप्तिप्रवाहनिर्वाकल्प लघु लक्षणम्।।”

१६। “अपेर पुनः सकलप्रमाणाण्य तक्षनुग्रहात्माग्राहादहरन्ति

... तदा तक्षप्रतिक्षायक्षवसायाविरुद्धम्……

नैनं तक्षप्रेक्षन्तें सर्वः प्रमित्यो यतः।

विरोधावोधयोजति संशयं स चिन्तितस्ते।।”

१७। “एषां प्रसंज्ञारोणेन वा प्रयोगः ... तत्त्वात्यकारानात्यन्त्राविदम्

साधकास्तत्माविरुद्धविषभाष्याविषयाणामम्याण्यामममयाण्यायपति।।

इत्येकवेगाविषभाष्यवस्थितो श्रेष्ठभूता चेतु सामान्यविशेषणायो न्यायो

निदिश्यते ... पीनो देवदतो दिवा न भुज्जः इत्येतदपि

शत्रिभोजनपर्यंततात्त्वः चेतु अध्यायात्रायोद्धरणम्।

दिवात्नादानविषयंमात्रपरं चेष्टात्तात्त्वेः। यस्य हि प्रमाणये

यावतु प्रमेयं व्यवस्थापितः, ततृ तात्त्वप्रमिते न स्वातन्त्त्वेण

पर्यवस्थितः। तदा तत्त्वसानयतत्त्वादानुपपत्तिऽज्ञादिकं व्याप्तिमाणं

कर्त्तव्यमाणं हेष्टतात्त्वावत्वेः। परोद्धेषाप्रुत्तव्याप्तण्याप्रुत्

प्रमित्यितपर्यंसाने तत्त्वस्मात्नायमोत्तिचनया स्वातन्त्त्वेण

व्याप्तिमाणं तक्षप्रमाणपदं समधिरोहितं।।

★ यद्यपेवं न तर्कः स्वातन्त्त्वेण व्याससमर्थनसमर्थः।

तथायायादनुग्रहेः प्रमेयः न स्यत् चागमः – मनोसैतानस कामान्

पर्यन्त रमते – मनोक्ष्य दिव्यं चशुः – सोदनं
कामे मनसा व्यायीतमनसेवे जगत सृष्टे - एतस्माज्ञायते प्राणो
मन: संवैद्यिण्यि च इत्येवसाद्य: परावप्रकरणेषु....

यदूक्ते न प्रमाणेन परीक्षा दोषवश तत् ।
अप्रमाणेन तकैण परीक्षा बक्ष्यते यतः ॥
मानानुग्रहकं युक्त्या ज्ञानं तकौडंभिधीयते ।
युक्तिश्च समवैचित्यतिद्विपरेयतो द्विधा ॥
केचिदाश्ते तक: प्रमाणभ्य समन्हें
संशयादिबहिर्भावातु प्रमण्यस्य च संभवात् ॥

प्रसङ्गाध्यप्यतेरक्युनृमानमेव तकः....

उच्चते न प्रमा तकं बेशह्तविन्दोषेत: ।
हेत्वाभासोऽभावाः सोऽहं निराधिको न च ॥...।

न स सिद्धान्तः, तथाहितं भवितव्यम् ..... ।
संभवासंभवपरामर्शतः - यथा - बाहाद्विप्रेक्षावचस्यात् पुरुषेणानेन
भवितव्यम्, न स्थायुनेति । एवां जसावनां
विमर्शनविधारणोंविशेषसङ्गताः बाह्यसंभवेश्वरापि
पृथ्विगुणाधारावतकरावेषम्यातु, उपयोगमेतस्य च न्यायपादे
दर्शिप्रभावातवच स...। न केवल प्रसङ्गाध्यायं साध्यमार्ल्लमयांशिद्मूः,
अपि तन्यामतेव प्रसङ्गेः, च तन्नुमानमतन्यगताद्वारात्प्रवत्ति ।
तत्तस्तस्मात् सुक्ष्मस्वर्त्तेन भेदः: ...

8. अभिधानाभिमेयंत्वम: शब्दयोः स्थितमूः ।
संबन्धोऽभिभाया हेत्या बोध्या भुविज्ञनत: ॥
अभिनायात्वान्त्रात्र शब्दं व्यावयात्तः: ।
शब्दसांकिनिमित्ता सा स्वार्थं मुख्याभिधीयते ॥
स्वार्थभिन्नान्त्रारा स्वाच्छवपन्यायार्थिनं मता ।’’
19. "अप्रवक्रयितेऽवर्णितास्त्रयोऽतिरिविधीयिनिनिष्ठानितान्तित्वम्।

इत्याहुर्मुनाचार्यः पदर्वकनितापिभिः।

शक्तिः प्रतिचतिस्मृतिपूर्यत्वपतिभिः--

निर्महूर्वाचार्यिरिविधितान्तित्वम्।

सिद्धा पदर्वकनितान्तित्वस्थितिः--

विपश्याविष्किर्लं समसमां।"

20. "उपनिषद्य तु बहुर्म व्यावहोष्यामदोषः-

प्रतिहतगुणराशिम्यास्त्रये ताक्ष्यकेलुः।

श्रुतिरपि तदुपजः: पदर्वकनिताविलयं

न लभते इति सूक्तं भाष्यकृद्यामुनार्यः।"

21. "कमदिवताब्रह्मगोचरा सा निथोऽभृमी सृजनाकारः।

जैतिनेमुनि: काशकुत्स्ते बादर्वाणादित्यतः: क्रमातः।"

22. "धर्मीयानमेदाक्रमाणूंकुःक्रमकर्मसिंहिः।

सातिदेशाविष्कीर्वायुत्रक्रमसिंहिः।"

23. "यथार्थनिनश्यो मानं तत्तत्त्वतेति सूर्यः।

नातिवार्तिः: स्मृती: व्यासिर्यार्थेन हि सा प्रमा।"

...अनुभूतविष्यासंप्रमोशः स्मृतः; यथा - स घट इति। ननु

रामपि व्यायोतित लक्षणम्; सत्यम्; तद्वाती नातिवार्तिः; तत्स्यापि

क्षयपक्षे निक्रेपात्।

लक्ष्यालक्ष्य अनालक्ष्य क्षिप्तेति लक्षणं कथम्।

लोके धीर्ववहारं हि लक्ष्यालक्ष्याचिन्दं विदुः।"

24. "व्युत्प्रचयोध्वऽकनिमं चेत् चेष्टिं शाब्दम्। अनियतमपि
नन्दुः प्रतिभा कावित्वः यथार्थी मानमोघाताम् ।
बाह्यानिरेपक्षेण बाह्यज्ञानक्षमात् सा ।।
వिशिष्टकालयुपक्षोपक्षोक्ष्यसंभव ।
सत्यं कालादिबद्धस्तु दुविविचोदसदादिमि: ॥
सन्नध्यसै व्यवहृतै नोपयोगीत्युपेक्ष्यते ।
प्रतिभाया: फलं दूरं यदा प्रमाण्यनिश्चय: ॥
			तदन्त्यत: कृतार्थ्यंत् प्रेक्ष्यते न परीक्षाके: ।
			पुण्येषु पुरुषेषोषा भूतिषु सत्यदर्शिनी ॥
			तस्मात् पतालिलि: प्राह प्रतिभाचेति तां प्रमाभ् ॥”

२६. “तच्छ षोडा.... आन्तरं मन:”

२७. “कर्मशुक्लीश्रीरसन्नन्यन्योऽकसानानासिकधिष्ठानानि च तानि”

२८. “निपुणनिरीक्षणे च जलवेणिकावतू ज्वालासंस्करणं हस्तयते”

२९. “बधाति यदभिद्रोहादू यत्प्रपत्या च मुखाते ।
जन्तुमस्त्तमाध्विक्ति हरि यतु प्रविक्ष्यते ॥
अतो न काकदन्तानामिव तस्य परीक्षणामु ।
उपेक्ष्यं वन्धकवक्षयः झाने ह्याप्रयोजनात् ॥
			तत्सत्ततृतुपदतिनिश्चारकारिद्धू सूतय: ।
			विवदते ततो जातो: सन्धेहनिन्येंतेद्वधुना ॥

अन्तालोकाकावस्तम् इति कार्यपीया: । नास्त्येव तमः,
नीलभान्त्रकृपत्रिमुष्मेश एव तमोववहारहेतुरिति प्रामार्का: ।
उच्यन्तरमेवें प्रविक्ष्यति कौमारिला: । प्राणतत्त्वमेव तमं इति
			तत्त्वविद्...
अत्र तत्वंविदः प्राप्‌ स्थूलंसूत्रात्मना स्थिता।
देवी गुणमयी माया बाध्यान्तरसमो मता॥

२९. "धियः प्रत्यक्षभेदावल्लितं परतस्तदसम्भवात्।
पारिश्रम्यात्मतिइतिभास्माणां प्रमाणानां तत्स्ततः॥
प्रतीत्याविहरणं सन्देहपरिवर्जनात्।
सत्तायं सिद्धवत्करात् ज्ञानं भावीति भावितम्॥
परस्याद्रीनास्वासनवचिं विष्यतिरिक्तत्।
अर्थान्तकेषु युक्तेषु वचनानां स्वतंत्रस्मि॥

...विश्वतिप्रभा संविदृत स्वगत्वचवहारं प्रति स्वाधीनकिंविक्खिलसे सजातीयसंबंधानपेशा व्यवहारंहेतुततात् अयोनिद्रादीपादास्वत। न च चर्च्छ: सजातीयतेजोपेश्यायानेकान्ययमु; तयेन्द्रियसेन; आद्वारिकलेन वा, आलोकोकन्नाजातीयतवात्। अन्तः: ज्ञानसंस्कार: स्वेकार्थसमावायि-ज्ञानातुभवानपेशा: संस्कारत्वादि-संस्कारस्त। विषयसंस्कारो...ज्ञानसंस्करण: सहोत्यद्वते विषयसंस्कारत्वादिदमहं जानामीति ज्ञानप्रभावसंस्कारवत्। न चोभ्यविषयानपुरुषकत्वं प्रयोजकम्; ज्ञानपुरुषायन व्याससिद्धिविन्यथविशेषणत्वात् ... पुनः ... संविदंनाधीनसंबन्धम-व्यवहारौ, [स्वसम्बन्धावधारं] तद्मय्ववहारहेतुततात्। य: स्वसंबन्धावधारं तद्मय्ववहारहेतु; स तयो: स्वसमिनु अन्त्याधीनो दृष्टा, यथा रूपदिशााःसुततादी] ... वितरेच चास्ति लिङ्गाः ... ज्ञानं न परप्रकाशयमु; घटादियवधंप्रकाश्याकावारस्तज्ञतु... वचनाभि च ... अन्तः: पुपुषः स्वव्यायोतिर्भवति, आमृत्वायु ज्योतिः; स्वेन ज्योतिःसस्ते, आत्मस्वेदं त्यज्ञानं ब्रह्मसंमिज्ञतमु: इत्यादीं ज्ञानपदवाच्यजीवस्य स्वयंज्योतिस्तंडक्षणस्य: ज्ञानपदभिधेयायाः संविदायि
भवलाधवायां स्वप्रकाशात च संभाव्यन्ति ... मणितरणिदीपत्वभागमयेण जीवत्त्ज्ञानसमर्थनानि च

यथा प्रकाशयय्येक: कृत्सनं लोकमिमं रवि;।
क्षेत्रे क्षेत्री तथा कृत्सनं प्रकाशय्यति भारत॥

त्वेवेविधानि ज्ञानात्मनोऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽঃ
36. “संख्या तु द्वितीयक्षण एव ज्ञायते, सा संख्या समवायिनोस्तीत्यविरोधः”

37. “तदेव कृतमेव द्रुयजातिगुणकमिबिध्मण्डोषाणाम पुनरूक्त-वितिवाहारव्यवहाराणुपातेमेवेदो नाम न धर्मान्तरपूर्वक कल्याणम्। अत एव वैशेषिकपरिध्वसा: पुष्पमालेकोवेद्योदिपि प्रोत्सारितः

नीलमध्येतिमानाव्यनकावेव धर्मिन्यम्।
नीलं गुणं च भिन्दानो स्फुटं हुपलभामहे॥
ये विवेषपृथककादिसापेषं कल्यनिः ते।
विभवत्मामथयादिभयो न वयं दृष्टवादिनः॥”

38. “इन्द्रियपर्यथमानस्ततो ज्ञायमानोदधिः चैत्ये।

द्रुयं जातिगुणः कर्मासारवर्षैतृतिः।
...

जातिगुणकमिः सामान्यफसाभेषो संयुक्तसमवेत समवायसंभवत् .... द्रुयस्य धार्मिणोज्नातः धर्मिणोज्नातः जाति:।
जात्यन्नाभानिः तिको: सिद्धो धर्मिणोज्नातं गुणं।। त्याविद्या: साध्य:।
व्रिख्या। तद्भवें द्रुयस्य धार्मित्य स्थविनिनानि लक्षणानि। सौक्ष्येण तु विवेष्यन्ते। प्रमोक्षेपे”

39. “भूयोक्ष्यवसामान्यं साधृयं बहवो विदुः।

पृथक्प्रमेयं तद्विद्ये प्रमेये दृष्टिष्येत॥...

ननु द्रुयत्पृथ्वितिवेद्यगुणकपक्तवदे: राष्ट्रकाव्यायण वाच्यानां स्वप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तानां च सन्तत्वस्यादीनामेकपक्तवदे। प्रणयोज्यकाम्यायः कथैमैकान्धमुः? वद तव वा कथम्? न मैव एष भर्; सर्वो हि लोक: सर्वभित्यादिशु बहुष्यपि इन्द्रीयं मन्ते॥

वाच्यस्पष्टेः तद्दीयरुपे दृष्टवाच्यपर्यथबैकवाधवात।
साधृयभेदाप्रत्रतोऽध्वैशु वाच्येिविवृक्किकरणं मतं ततु॥
.. चन्द्रः सूर्यं इत्यादिः वाच्यस्वरूपङ्क्यात्, धर्मं पर इत्यादिः
तदाकरौक्यात्’.

40. "या वसुन्तः प्राणप्रदानी प्रथमं प्रतीयते सा जातिः, गुणस्तु तदनुप्राणिते
vसुन्ति भैदं विशेषको धर्मं इति पश्चात् प्रतीयते’’.

41. "तत्र च प्रथमाध्याये पादे च सर्वप्रामाण्येन अन्येषु च
न्यायविस्तरप्रामाण्योपजीवनेन वैदिकेषु वाक्यविशेषात्मकेष्व-
pौष्पेयत्वविनिवृत्यं प्रामाण्यं यथा वर्णितं, तथा शब्दे प्रादीशास्म्’’

42. "शासनमेव हि प्रेषणम्। अयमेव च विधिशब्दायोऽवेदानामभिमत
इति पौरेण केचिदनूवर्धन्ति, तत्स्वर्णात्कर्कैरैशीम्तम्’’
॥ श्री: ॥

TIRUMAṆṆJANA KAVI-S

“त्वं मे” “हे मे” “कुतस्ततु” “तद्यु कुत” “इदं वे-धूण्ड्रमाणात”
“एतचानांदिनिमहतु अनुभवविमहतु” “तहिं साखोश एव।”
“काखोश: कस्य” “गीतादिषु मम विदितः” “कोषत्र साशी”
सुधी: स्यातू
“हन्त त्वथपातासि” “इति नृकलहे मृणमायवस्थवतः लघुः॥ १

नानानुवृतिविष्यं नतराजसः
नानांवाणिज्ञसमिदेशितमनंग्रम्यू।
सेवावर्तीणुमस्रुद्रणं अद्य रञ्जन्।
भावानुपुरल नलिम (इ?) त्यन्तरत्मेहे त्याम्॥ २

अनेकशाखाश्रितं आश्रितेभ्यो
दत्ताभिकाह्य(क्षणं) विद्वैशकभोग्यमू।
सुपर्णस्यं सुमनससमेंत
सुप्रसं लवं सुधियो वादनिः॥ ३

मरकतमणिर्मायं रसमाणिक्यमुक्ता-
फलविलसितगात्र प्रस्फुरृतन्त्रवाहमू।
विद्विहितविविधाननु प्रोक्तसन्मीनानीलों
सुगमजलनिन्यत्वां (परमेंह) मन्मेहे रझराज!॥ ४

अमृतमयमन्तं सिद्धसंसर्थिजातं
नियमितसंकलायं निशिद्धालमावबोधमू।
किमिह बहुचरुकैः कीर्तनायोष्ठं लवं
निगमार्मि मनोज्ञं रझराजाय मन्ये॥ ५

श्रीमनु सुरज्जरणीश! विशालशाखं
श्रीकौशलसुकुटितं इष्टितदानदक्षमू।
इंसाधिक्षुद्विजवर्षेणस्वेयमानमं
लवां मन्महे सुरतं सुरनाथनाथ! ॥ ६
भक्ति श्रीमन्ते हस्तिक्षिपाकल्यातमिहा
प्रशोंकं कुर्कतं यमुनकुमारसमुक्षम्।
सुख्यात्रेषु क्रिष्टत्वानजमहानं दर्शति
वसन्तं रक्षेत्वा! प्रकटसुमनस्कं मनन्महे॥

अनिं न बुसुखं विकाशरङ्गं
सततं पूष्पं अहरिनं च दर्शयम्।
अनुपश्वमधि रक्षराजं
मनुस्ते चन्द्रमं जनो न मान्यम्॥

सार्थं द्रव्यं: श्रावणकर्मं रज्जिन्।
कल्योचित्स्रानविधं करोषि।
शूरितमृत्युं यथं विरंद्यमाति
स्वं ममाज्ञानुजायणम्॥

सत्याङ्गान्तः मुनालेख्यत्वात्
सन्मानशाख्यत्वात् निदित्यं वहु॥
पदालेख्यापि भवानिनां
हंसो यथा राजाति रक्षराज! ॥

अत्यावते लसति हस्तक्षणमाला
वक्षस्य: विनिहीता तव रक्षराज!
व्यवन्द्यापेक्षा रक्षराजं
याणिनयुं रूपसूक्ष्मेव॥

गैलिन्दिती भूमस्यपं दधानो
ललितायकाद्राही लक्षणो नैव वेलाम्।
विगृहमुनन्मारो वीक्ष्यसे रक्षराजम्।
अपर इव वण्मानापाणसामवीः॥

अन्योपायपूर्तिः विद्धंमनके: स्वविवैः
प्रारंभादास्यं प्रकटतर्पीताम्बोधिमहृतम्।
कृत्वास्योपोद्यात् निलिङ्गसूमनं प्रीतिजनम्
भवन्ति मनयेद्वं सूरसिक्षिर्यानं रक्षृपन्ते॥

॥ ॥
वृत्तिकृतवती समाश्रितजनन्तराणे भर्तेतसः
ताशा कक्षमपत्तिका भुजदटी ते तुज्ञभ्रोज्जला।
रज्ज्ञाविश्वर! नम्नदा च भगिन्ति: शोण: सुजातोधरः
तस्मात् स्रानविधो जानोदभिमतन्ते त्वा सर्वतीर्थित्वम्॥ १९
सत्तोवर: सकलस्तचनिवासभूमि:
सौवर्णरम्याविभवः समनोमनोऽः।
सन्त्रसस्मसमधिशिष्टपार्थनद्वा:
शैलात्मना स्तुरसि रज्ज्ञाविश्वर! त्वम्॥ २०
कक्षमासणम् उदबितश्रियं
कोषलासणसरोजसंस्थितम्।
रज्ज्ञान्त्यद्विमोनिवारणं
रक्षते तपनदीपिति जनः॥ २१
पञ्चाविभुदालकण्डविभवं गम्भीरनादाश्रयं
साम्ब्रेद्रोपलकन्तिचोरवस्पुष्यं सन्तापविध्वंसिनम्।
काल्यणमुख्यभाष्यं विद्धतं सचात्त्यां मुंत्ये
मान्ये मेघमु अमोघपूर्णक्षलं रज्ज्ञाधिपं मन्मधे॥ २२
क्रियादत्तं द्वरं हृतमविधयीनामुपगते
प्रवृत्तसानस्तं परस्मुदयसे रज्ज्ञर्तं।
प्रकर्षणोहुकुद्रिजकुलमशोषं प्रतिदिशं
प्रहुष्ठा पञ्चमेवी भवति च जगतु ध्वस्ततिर्भितम्॥ २३
रज्ज्ञा! रज्ज्ञानीच्छाँ राजते तव वक्ष्मसि।
देव्या हिरण्यवण्या देहकान्तिरिवोदिता॥
तत्त्वज्ज्ञाकुद्बध्यितसैमहाव्यासव्यासवात्वाहं
नित्योदग्रामजाप्रायदहक्षुदं समस्तं जगात्।
सुदार्शलक्ष्मणापरायणव्याप्यसमस्मृत्तिमः॥
दिखे: स्पृति रज्ज्ञुज्ञ! दयाविष्टव्यासवान्ये॥ २४
अन्तस्थित: सुमनसामु अमेशरत्-
आपादितमयुण: प्रधितप्रचारः
शाखासु रक्षनुपतिमृत्युरो विभाति॥

अमृतप्रभवं प्रभाप्रभावं
प्रहत्वान्तलसदिलासिजातम्।
सकलं सकलानुमोदहेतुं
शाशिनं त्वं कल्यावमि रक्षराज!॥

समुन्निष्टप्राणजयतारसंवृत्ति
तन्वातःकचमपाठतपरा।
वणीव रघुर! समयति जने:
असी जयतीतयुदितेयमध्यमी॥

इयामां षुक्तंेपतं कटकाधितिमुज्मतम्।
सचाश्रयं रक्षराजं महीयर्मवैण्मयहम्॥

सर्वसमानं पर सापेक्षयसवने शक्षिक्षेत्वेच्छात्मिका
पतनी पाग्रणाश्चेतिपतयः प्रासत्विज्यो बाहवः।
पैलस्या: परवो दशाननमुखा: रक्षा फलं ज्ञानिनां
श्रीमन्तं! मजनकैतवादवभृथस्तातेर रघुर!॥

शयतुरासुरगण्यं सुमनोविकासः
सतिसिद्धार्थममहुणिष्येयमाणम्।
नष्टवाचास्तरसातारामृत्वों
त्वं रक्षराज! कल्यावमि हि मंदराद्रिम्॥

सन्ताकी रक्षरामसु श्रवणसुपंगताँ चुकुराकायोगातुः
मान्यो मा सज्ञसते सदसि बहुमतो भिन्नवारप्रवेशः।
गालोंयं पुप्पदिष्टो भवति मधि महान्तौ तलकाक्ष्ययातः
तन्त्वायुर्वेष्ठं सेतुस्तवमसि वयमहं प्रासतीर्थं भवाम्॥

तरीयपटिका विराजले रक्षराज! भवतो भुजान्तरे।
त्यये शतमेकोपलाने जाहवीव शरद्रानिर्मल॥

— २१— २२— २३— २४— २५— २६— २७— २८—
BENIDICTOURY VERSES OF PARĀŚRA
IN THE NĀLĀYIRAIVYAPRABANDHA

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

SLOKA TWO : IN OBEISANCE TO ĀNDĀL

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

IN OBEISANCE TO
NAMMĀLVĀR AND
TIRUVĀYMOZHI.

भूतं सरस्थ महदाह्य-भक्तनाथ-
श्रीभक्तिसार-कुलशोकर योगिवाहानु।
भक्तात्रिषण-परकल-यतीन्द्रमिश्रानु
श्रीमत्यराकुशामुनिं प्रणातोस्मि नित्यम्॥

नीलातुज्जस्तनगरितसुसमुद्रोध्य कृष्णम्
पाराप्य स्वं श्रुतिशतसिद्धमथ्यापयन्ति।
स्वोच्छिद्याय न्यज़ निगलितं या बलाकृत्यम्
भुजे गोदा तस्य नम इदमिदं भूय एवास्तु भूयः॥

वांतिगाज्ञम् सोलई मदिलारंगः वान्पुगाञ्चः
ञ्ज्रा तमिज्ञ्मारागाल ायिरामुम्-िरा
mudaltāy śaṭakopan, moimpāl valartta
nikka irainilaiyum meyyām uyirnilaiyum
akka neriyum tadaiyāgittokkkiyalum
zhvinaiyum vāzhvinaiyum ōdum kurugaiyarkōn,
āzhinisai vedattiyal.
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