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FOREWORD

I have great pleasure in recommending this book on 'The Philosophy of Rāmānuja' written by Dr. Bharadwaj to scholars, students and the general public.

Modern Hinduism is largely based on the teachings of five great South Indian scholarly saints, viz., Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Nimbārka and Vallabha. Though there are as many followers of Viśiṣṭādvaita school of philosophy and religion propounded by Śrī Rāmānuja as those following the philosophy of Śaṅkara, yet that philosophy has not been so widely made known to the public as the Advaita philosophy of Śaṅkara.

At a time when Buddhism was followed by a large section of the population in this country, Śaṅkara re-established the authority of the Vedas and the Vedantic religion which is commonly called Hinduism. Differing from Lord Buddha who rejected the authority of the Vedas and laid greater emphasis on 'dharma' to be followed by individuals in their relations to one another than on devotion to God or on aspiring to reach Him, Śaṅkara went to the other extreme and interpreted the Vedas, the main authority of the Hindu religion and philosophy, as establishing that God alone exists and the world is unreal and is an illusion. Rāmānuja, who followed Śaṅkara three centuries later, tried to prove from the same sources, that the world is real, that God is immanent in creation and transcendent also, that besides Him there is matter and there are individual souls which are also eternal like Himself and which He inhabits and permeates as an individual Soul dwells in a body, thus proving in substance that God alone exists and that He should be conceived as consisting of Himself as the Soul with the individual souls and matter as His body. Unlike Śaṅkara, he does not attribute māyā or ignorance to God but only to the individual soul, on account of which the soul goes on undergoing innumerable births and deaths. Though both to Rāmānuja and Śaṅkara, mokṣa or release from the cycle of births and deaths is the ultimate goal for all souls to attain, they differ as regards the means of attaining mokṣa and in the nature of mokṣa itself. Śaṅkara believes that knowledge alone is the means to attain salvation, that action and devotion constitute the preparation to the attainment of such knowledge and his idea of mokṣa is simple freedom from the
liability to births and deaths. On the other hand, to Rāmānuja Bhakti or devotion is the only means of attaining salvation, Karma or action and Jñāna or knowledge are the pre-requisites to the attainment of that bhakti, and mokṣa or release is not merely the non-liability to further births and deaths but it is the possible attainment of God who is bliss itself.

Men of thought, both eastern and western, have acclaimed the greatness of Rāmānuja's teachings. Swāmi Vivekānanda wrote, "Shankara with his great intellect had not, I am afraid, as great a heart; Rāmānuja's heart was greater. He felt for the down-trodden, he sympathised with them. He took up the ceremonies, the accretions that had gathered, made them pure as far as could be, and instituted new ceremonies, new methods of worship for the people, who absolutely required these. At the same time he opened the door to the highest spiritual worship from the Brahmin to the Pariah."

Max Muller wrote, "We ought, therefore, to look on Rāmānuja as a perfect equal of Shankara, so far as his right of interpreting Bādarāyana's sūtras according to his opinion is concerned. It is the same here as everywhere in Hindu philosophy. The individual philosopher is put the mouth-piece of tradition, and that tradition goes back, further and further, the more we try to fit it chronologically. While Shankara's system is Advaita i.e., absolute Monism, that of Rāmānuja has been called Vishishta-Advaita, the doctrine of unity with attributes, or monism with a difference."

Many ardent exponents have propounded Rāmānuja's system during the last eight centuries. And in the following pages Dr. K.D. Bharadwaj is making the most recent contribution to the bibliography of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism.

The absence of religion which has been a feature of Indian education in modern times has been deplored by even western observers. Sixty years ago Max Muller wrote, "It is feared, however, that this small remnant of philosophical learning will vanish in one or two generations, as the youths of the present day, even if belonging to orthodox Brahmanical families, do not take to these studies as there is no encouragement."

Earlier still, H.J.S. Cotton wrote, "Our State Colleges are content with chaos; their results are subversive only; the old belief is thrown off, the consequent disturbance issues in no real substitute, and the mental and moral state suffers from negation."
Denouncing a similar state of affairs in Europe, Martin Luther wrote four centuries ago, "Yea, verily, there have been holy men, but God's wrath, provoked by our sins, hath not judged us worthy to see and hear them; for it is well known that for a long time past such things have not been treated of in our universities, nay, it has gone so far that the holy word of God is not only laid on the shelf, but is almost moulded away with dust and months."

The things complained of by Luther, Max Muller and Cotton in their times, are prevailing even today.

Under the gathering darkness, it is commendable that Dr. Bharadwaj seeks to light a lamp to shed illumination, by bringing out an easily understandable account, both compact and comprehensive, of Śrī Rāmānuja’s great religion. Dr. Bharadwaj is eminently fitted to write about Rāmānuja's philosophy, being himself a great follower and devotee of Śrī Rāmānuja. His educational attainments are many, and he is a great scholar of Sanskrit. His ‘Para-Tattva-Sūtram’ is an original work in Sanskrit and ‘Vanamāla’ is an exhaustive commentary on the Para-Tattva-Sūtram. He has also written a commentary on the Brahma-Sūtra in Hindi prose and poetry.

In the present work he attempts to give a lucid and faithful exposition of the teachings of Rāmānuja as contained in his monumental works such as Śrī Bhāṣya, Gitā Bhāṣya, Vedicthā-Saṅgraha, Gadyatraya etc. He starts with a life-sketch of Rāmānuja in his introductory chapter, and then he deals with the devotional philosophy of Śrī Rāmānuja. He describes therein how Rāmānuja's system has been developed on the basis of the teachings propounded by eminent thinkers of the ancient lore such as Bodhāyana, Taṅka, Urmīḍa and Guhadeva. Śrī Rāmānuja himself states in clear terms at the commencement of his Śrī Bhāṣya that he is commenting on the Vedānta Sūtras in accordance with the doctrines contained in Bodhāyana-vṛtti, which had been preserved from the ancient past by his earlier acāryas. It is, therefore, an ancient system which was given re-orientation by Śrī Rāmānuja. The author also shows how Rāmānuja drew much of his inspiration from the Divya-Prabandham, the devotional songs of Śrī Vaiṣṇavas of South India, one of whom is said to have sung the essence of upaniṣads in Tamil Prabandham or in Tamil verses. The authority of the Pāñcarātra has also been referred to by Dr. Bharadwaj.
The philosophy of Rāmānuja is characterised as Viśiṣṭādvaīta. The word signifies that the Ultimate Reality (Para-tattva) is an integral whole comprising the cit or sentient beings and acit or the inert matter, both of which constitute the body of Īśvara. Rāmānuja admits three entities, viz., Īśvara, who is the Supreme Reality, cit which are the individual selves (jīvas) and acit, the matter. All the three are real entities, and exist for ever (nitya). These do not constitute three independent realities, otherwise it would lead to pluralism. Cit and acit depend upon Īśvara for their existence, and, as such, they are subservient to Him. Īśvara is the basis (ādhāra) for the entire universe consisting of cit and acit. The relationship of the former to the latter is that of the self to the body. The cit and acit constitute the body of Īśvara, while Īśvara Himself is the self of them. This relationship is called 'Śarira-śariri-bhāva sambandha.' This is the cardinal principle of Rāmānuja's philosophy, which constitutes the distinguishing factor of the Viśiṣṭādvaīta system of Philosophy. This is the most important contribution made by Śrī Rāmānuja, and this is based upon the upaniṣadic teachings. Although there are three different real entities, the three constitute an integral whole. To give an illustration, a tree is divided into parts such as roots, trunk and branches. Each part is different from the other, but, nevertheless, the tree as a whole constitutes one entity. Similarly, Brahman associated with cit and acit is one (viśiṣṭasya aikyaṁ). The philosophy of Śrī Rāmānuja is, therefore, called Viśiṣṭādvaīta, as compared to the Advaita of Śaṅkara.

The significance of the above doctrine lies in the fact that it accords reality to both the universe and the individual selves. In Śaṅkara's system the universe consisting of the individual selves and the matter is regarded as illusory (māya). Rāmānuja disproves the theory of māya and establishes the reality of the universe and also maintains oneness of the Reality as an integral whole without sacrificing the individualities of the selves as well as the matter.

Another contribution of Rāmānuja's philosophy is the identity established between the Absolute of the Upaniṣads and the Personal God of the religion. The Brahman is no other than the God experienced by the mystic saints. He is the Puruṣottama. He possesses infinite measure of knowledge (jñāna) and ānanda, and is devoid of all inauspicious qualities. He is characterised by unlimited auspicious qualities such as knowledge and power. He has a divine, auspicious form, and has as His bodies, the eternal and play-worlds.
He is omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent. He is everywhere in the universe and also resides in the hearts of individuals (antaryāmin). Such a teaching has an appeal to the heart and gives nourishment to the head also.

The individual selves are separate entities, although they depend on God for their existence. There are three kinds of souls: bound, released, and eternally free. The self is anu, and is essentially of the nature of knowledge and bliss. It is the knower and enjoyer of the fruits of Karma. Though it is omniscient in its true nature, the knowledge of the self is restricted due to the encrustations of the past Karma. As long as the self is associated with the body, the knowledge functions only in a restricted way. The self undergoes the cycle of births and deaths. It is only after it is emancipated, that there is real freedom for the self from bondage.

In order to get rid of the bondage, the self will have to pursue the means prescribed by the sacred texts for attaining salvation. According to Śrī Rāmānuja, bhakti or steadfast contemplation of God preceded by the Karma-yoga and Jñāna-yoga as taught in the Bhagavad-gītā is the true means of attaining the supreme goal. For those who are not in a position to practise bhakti-yoga, prapatti or the surrendering of oneself to God is prescribed as an alternative and simple means. The ocean of transmigration is hard to cross. When one feels completely helpless, one may renounce all and seek refuge in God who is all-powerful and all-merciful, and who will surely liberate oneself from all sins, as the Gitācārya himself declares. This is open to all, irrespective of the differences of cast, creed, colour, sex, position etc. If an individual crosses the ocean of bondage by adopting this means, he attains the state of bliss which enables the self to have the beatific vision of, and communion with, the Deity. There is no return afterwards to the mundane existence, as categorically declared in the last aphorism of Vedānta. This is the supreme end or summum bonum of all the human endeavour (parama puruṣārtha).

These are the essential teachings which Rāmānuja developed on the basis of the upaniṣads, smṛtis, purāṇas, itihāsas and well-established tradition.

Dr Bharadvaj has clearly brought out the above teachings of Rāmānuja in this book in an easy and flowing style. He has really rendered a great service, in publishing this book, to the Vaiṣṇava
community. It is hoped that this will prove a valuable contribution to the study of Indian Philosophy in general and to the study of Viśiṣṭadvaita system of Philosophy in particular, to the scholars, students as well as to the general reader.

New Delhi
30th Sept., 1958

Speaker, Loka-sabha
PREFACE

India has cradled several systems of Philosophy—both of Vedic and non-Vedic origin. Among the well-known six systems of the former, those of Yoga and Vedānta have explicitly stated devotion to God as a means to attaining perfection. The conception of God in Vedānta is decidedly fuller and clearer than that in the system of Yoga. The credit goes to South India to have produced five prominent interpreters of Vedānta: Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Nimbūrka and Vallabha. Rāmānuja’s was the first attempt to give us a scholarly exposition of Vedānta from a purely theistic viewpoint. He was among those thinkers whose works deserve deep study. Much has been written on Rāmānuja by scholars, yet much remains to be written. The present work is the result of my attempt to study his thought from devotional point of view.

The Philosophy of Rāmānuja is a Philosophy of devotion to God. ‘God’ is a very sweet word, and the very mention thereof inspires adoration. The Vedas proclaim that He is Father of all (savitā). The Brahma of the upaniṣads and the Brahma-sūtra, and the Bhagavān of the Bhāgavata is also the Creator. The Gītā repeats, and Rāmānuja re-iterates, the same. Fatherhood of God implies fraternity of humanity resulting in love and regard everywhere in the creation on the one hand, and in deep devotion to the Creator on the other.

To each chapter, and in some cases to each section thereof, references have been appended. They are mostly from Sanskrit works, and for the sake of convenience, I have preferred to give them in Devanāgarī script. For clarity’s sake the references, along with their sources, are cited mostly in full. With a view to facilitating the pronunciation of Sanskrit words occurring in this work, I have used diacritical marks a list of which I am giving in the beginning of the book.

The present work was my thesis under the title ‘The Bhakti School of Rāmānuja’ which I submitted, in 1951, to the University of Delhi; and I am very grateful to Dr. N.V. Banerji, M.A., Ph.D. (London), Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy, University of Delhi, who, in spite of his multifarious activities in and
outside the University, supervised my work. I was immensely ben-
fitted by his able guidance.

I am indebted as well to my elder brother, Dr R. Bharadwaj, M.A., Ph.D., who kindly revised my work and also gave other
valuable suggestions.

I am thankful to Shri K. D. Sharma, B.A., D.L.Sc., Librarian
Gr. I of the Central Secretariat, who has prepared the Index for
this book.

I must also evince gratitude to Sir Shankar Lall Charitable Trust
Society, New Delhi, for kindly undertaking the publication of this
book. But for their generosity, the work would not have seen the
light.

Modern School, New Delhi
Dipavali, 2015 Vikrama-Samvat

K. D. BHARADWAJ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diacritical Marks</th>
<th>Devanagari</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>Bharata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>राधा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ao</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>वैशेषिक</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>लक्ष्मी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aie</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>उपेन्द्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aoie</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>सूत्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>क्रष्ण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aiore</td>
<td>ऐरे</td>
<td>आईरेय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aiore</td>
<td>ऐरे</td>
<td>दैतीरीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ao</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>काठोपनिषद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>आउपमन्यव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>कौशितकी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>अखिल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>गिता</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gh</td>
<td>घ</td>
<td>सातरुघ्ना</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>गंगा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>पाणिकरात्रा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>छ</td>
<td>चांडोग्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>रामानुज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jh</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>निर्जहरा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nj</td>
<td>न्द</td>
<td>पातालियाल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>अतवी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>थ</td>
<td>कथा उपनिषद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>द</td>
<td>मान्दुक्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>धुम्भी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>नारायण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>स</td>
<td>सूत्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>वेदार्थसांग्रह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>श्रीरंगगद्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>रामानन्द</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
प्रस्तुत कार्यों के साथ, निम्नलिखित सूची देखें:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>हिंदी</th>
<th>अंग्रेजी</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पुराण</td>
<td>Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सफल</td>
<td>Sphala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निम्बरक</td>
<td>Nimbārka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भागवत</td>
<td>Bhāgavata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>महाभारत</td>
<td>Mahābhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रामायण</td>
<td>Rāmāyaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>राम</td>
<td>Rāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लक्ष्मण</td>
<td>Lākṣmāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वेद</td>
<td>Veda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्री</td>
<td>Śrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विष्णु</td>
<td>Viśṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सत्त्व</td>
<td>Śatvata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब्रह्मदर्शन</td>
<td>Brhadāraṇyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सुचिः</td>
<td>Suchīḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साम्हिता</td>
<td>Samhitā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ँ (वृत्ताक्षर) को नहीं लिखा चिह्नित किया गया है।
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श्रीगुरुकावय नमः

सन्मत्र-शेषेवः सबवर्षभ मंगलाचरणं युगमेन—
पिपिळिन प्रकृतिन निम्न युगमं सं पुष्पाति यः।
व: पारदति महातमामण्यो एव कामना:।।॥

विजय व्यापार्युच्ये यो देव एतस्मात् परतः स्थितः।
परस्माः श्रीमाते तस्माः विपण्वेवेस्तु नमो नमः।।॥

व: प्रकृति ग्रन्थसिमकामचेतनाः निम्न्य पिपिळिन तदनरतमतयाजस्वनेन पूर्वचति, पु: पालनपूरस्योऽहृत्यादिः। युगमं सं बेजवण पूर्वरमपण पुष्पाति तदनरत्यांनिमित्वा विलाभामान:। पालचति, पु: पालनपूरस्योऽऽ:। जयादिः। एवं च यो भक्तानान तत्क-परायणामालोऽव: एव कामनाकार्वहरूर्वतीतिनारिला:
पारदति पूर्वचति सफल-यतीतिय यावः, पु: पूर्व: चूडादः। विजय विरंच्छ व्यापार्युच्ये यो देव एतस्मात् परतः सिद्धांतस्माः परस्माः निरेक्षयोक्तप्तेको श्रीमाते सक्षमी-रक्षित-वामालाभास विशिष्टेशे।

प्रारम्भित-उपकरण-निवधारूप-परिसंपानाः सन्मत्र-विनम्बराओ विविद्यमानपण सिद्धांततीति केवलां विद्वान समायः। ततेव समयं विमृढ़हादिः सन्मत्रसारो विनेविद्यत:। स विद्वानानशिष्यः।

प्रकृतिपुरुषालमकात: पूर्वेन मन्वतोऽवलम्बनात्त्सरारम्भप्रकृतिकः, तथा पालनेनारिष्कुतपत: चोतित्वा, बनिष्कुठाच्छ ज्ञानानां प्रत्येकात्वें संपन्नः। भवजनान-निनिलिपतपूर्वेन संस्कारं कल्याणे-मुद्र-कल्याणकर्ता सुचित्वा। कल्याणे-प्रीतकेशे विव-संस्कारं इत्यादित्वोऽवलम्बनानां सर्वविशेषाः। यज्ञानाधिकारी विद्वानाः परायणानेतराः कृत्यते। विज्ञप्तियेन भववत एकपदिविमीत: संस्कर्य, तस्मात्च परतः स्पष्टतत्त्वादि विन्द्राविनिसिध्वत्वाय व्यवित्ततः। परस्माः परमभवन अपाक्ष-विनानोक्तटमाः सिद्धितः। भववत: श्रीमते विनयाङ्गकारां लक्ष्मीव्यक्त विविधोऽपनाशिताः साधयतः। श्रीविद्वानांसायं एव य:। परमभवनायकारो वस्मालियोऽग्रमरीत्र-भ्रमर-विमुक्तिविद्वानो विद्वतीयो द्विविद्वते। चर्मदाचार नमोवाण:। श्रीमान-राजान-वर्धन-सन्निध्यान-नुस्ल-विनायक-परम्परयोृतो भवते: प्रतिवर्ततरयः। एव अन्द्राज्ञो नवं रसीनास्यायं प्रत्यायायत:।
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

I
Rāmānuja's Biography

Born in 1017 at Sríperumbudur, the ancient Bhūtapuri—Sanctity of the place—Parentage—Early education—Marriage—Further education with Yādava Prakāśa—The teacher feels jealous of the student's genius—Intrigue—Yāmuna at death-bed—Three promises—Initiation from Pātraśākhyya—Domestic clash—Asceticism—Apostle of Śrīraṅgam—Reputation—Tour to Kāśmīra—Literary activities—Debates and discussions—Residence in Śaligrāma in Mysore for 12 years—Tour to Delhi—Return to Śrīraṅgam—Full span of life.

Ācārya Rāmānuja, a prince among the devotees, was born in 1017, in Sríperumbudur, a village in Chingleput district which is about thirty-six miles to the south of the city of Mādras. The Skanda-purāṇa has recorded a story regarding the sanctity of the place under the name of Bhūtapuri. Some of the angels in the service of Śiva celebrated, in ancient times, a festival in honour of Viṣṇu; and they built up a city to accommodate the gods invited on the occasion. Since the Bhūtas (Śiva's angels) constructed the city, it was called Bhūtapuri, the modern Sríperumbudur.

Once upon a time, King Harita, son of Yuvanāśva, propitiited the Supreme Deity, Viṣṇu, in Bhūtapurii to atone for a sin. The Deity was pleased to appear before the monarch not only to expiate him from the sin but also to confer upon him the status of a Brāhmaṇa. Harita then settled there, reconstructed and rehabilitated the city which was then lying dilapidated; and his descendants were called the Brāhmaṇas of the Hārita gotra. Keśava Yājñika, Rāmānuja's father, belonged to the Hārita gotra and was a follower of the Apastamba school of the Yajurveda. Once on the occasion of a lunar eclipse he repaired to the place where the river Kāveri meets the sea, and in the presence of an idol called Pārthasārathi (the charioteer of Arjuna) performed, along with his spouse Kāntimati, a sacrifice with a desire to beget a son. By divine grace the couple were blessed with a son on Thursday, the 5th of the
bright fortnight in Caitra in the Śaka era 939 corresponding to Vikrama era 1074 and 1017 A.D. The astrologers predicted that the child would one day become a unique person. The child’s maternal uncle, Śailapūrṇa, gave the new-born child the name of Rāmānuja.

He was invested with the sacred thread at the age of eight and he studied the scriptures from his father till the age of 16 when he was married. Subsequently he lost his father and left home with his family for Kāṇci, with a view to acquiring more knowledge. Paṇḍita Yādava Prakāśa was a famous teacher of that time, and Rāmānuja began to receive his lessons from him.

The king of Kāṇci one day invited Yādava Prakāśa to his palace and requested him to expel an evil spirit from the princess. Yādava tried his sacred formulae, but when they proved futile, Rāmānuja touched the princess’ forehead with his feet, and as a result the evil spirit departed. This miraculous feat procured Rāmānuja presents from the royal treasury, which caused jealousy in the teacher’s heart. The latter’s jealousy reached its culmination when Rāmānuja, after having listened to his teacher’s interpretation of the famous philosophical proposition “Truth, knowledge and infinite is the Brahman”, offered his own explanation from the viewpoint of qualified monism. Rāmānuja quietly bore the reproaches coming from his teacher as a result of his suggesting a novel explanation, but the relation was estranged, and the teacher and the taught remained aloof.

Having intrigued with his pupils to drown Rāmānuja at the sacred confluence of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā at Prayāga, Yādava sent for Rāmānuja and persuaded him to accompany the students bound for a religious trip. While the party was passing through a forest, one of the students, Govinda by name and a cousin of Rāmānuja, who happened to know the secret, divulged the same to Rāmānuja who at once slipped away and got astray in the wilderness. The missing person was searched for far and near, and when he was not available anywhere, the teacher and leader of the party terminated the journey, thinking that Rāmānuja had fallen a victim to some wild beast. Rāmānuja, of course, saved his life, but lost his way. He was unsafe in the forest, but God is gracious and always comes to the rescue of those who depend on Him. The Deity appeared in the form of a fowler-couple and escorted Rāmānuja safely to Kāṇci.

On reaching home, Rāmānuja related, at his mother’s advice, to Kāṇcipurṇa, a local saint, all that had taken place; and the saint
explained the incident to be an auspicious one signifying Divine mercy.

Yadava Prakāsa felt very much ashamed when he came to know about Rāmānuja’s safe return. He again feigned to be on good terms with Rāmānuja, and the latter resumed his studies with him.

Kānci purṇa’s teacher, Yāmunācārya, was a great scholar and lived at Śrīraṅgam. He was in search of a young man who could propagate the cult of devotion to Viṣṇu. He had come to know of Rāmānuja’s ability through his own pupil, and when he paid a visit to Kāñci, his pupil, Kāncipūrṇa, told him about Rāmānuja in details. On that occasion, Yāmuna could see Rāmānuja at a distance, but did not consider it proper to talk to him as he was at that time in the company of Yadava Prakāsa’s students. He, however, gave Rāmānuja his blessings and returned to Śrīraṅgam.

One day when Yadava was imparting lessons on Vedānta to his disciples, Rāmānuja was engaged massaging the teacher. In order to explain the Upaniṣadic text ‘Tasya kapyāsam yathā punḍarikam evam aksīṁ’, the teacher likened the Deity’s eyes to the red buttocks of a monkey. This wounded Rāmānuja’s heart and he began to shed tears which fell on the teacher. Thereupon the teacher expressed his surprise and interrogated Rāmānuja as to what made him weep. Asked by the teacher to explain the text otherwise, Rāmānuja compared, in his interpretation, the eyes of the Deity to the petals of a lotus opening under the sun’s rays. The difference in the elucidation of the text hurt the teacher so much that he not only gave vent to an unusual wrath, but also turned Rāmānuja out of his seminary. Rāmānuja came out, and began to utilize his leisure in devotion.

Now Yāmuna wanted to have Rāmānuja to work for the cause of devotional philosophy and, with this aim in view, he sent out Purnācārya, one of his pupils, to bring Rāmānuja to Śrīraṅgam. Rāmānuja gladly accepted the invitation and accompanied the escort, but while both were on the way to Śrīraṅgam, they got the news of Yāmunācārya’s demise. When they reached the destination, Yāmuna was lying on death-bed, with three fingers of his right hand closed. Being informed that Yāmuna had three unfulfilled desires, Rāmānuja promised in the presence of all the people assembled there that he would try his best to propagate devotion to the Deity. At this one of the fingers of the deceased saint stretched out. Rāmānuja then promised that he would write a commentary on the Brahma Sūtra from the devotional viewpoint. The result was that the second finger of the dead body became
straight. Rāmānuja then assured the audience that he would see to it that a person named Parāśara discharges the obligation to Parāśara, the father of Vyāsā, who composed the best of the Purāṇas viz. the Viṣṇu-purāṇa; and this time the result was that the third finger also unfolded itself. Some say that the three desires cherished by Yāmuna were (a) to get a commentary written on the Brahmaṣṭṭra, (b) giving the name of Parāśara to a suitable person, and (c) giving the name of Śāthakopa to another. Rāmānuja then returned to Kañcī, and informed Kañcippūrṇa of Yāmuna's demise.

After some time Rāmānuja went, under the direction of the priest of the temple, to Śrīraṅgam with a view to receiving initiation to Vaiṣṇavism. While he was en route, he met near Madura, Pūrṇācārya whom the Vaiṣṇava community of Śrīraṅgam had deputed to bring Rāmānuja in order that he could succeed Yāmuna-cārya as their leader. The succession of teachers is Nāthamuni, Puṇḍarikakaśa, Ramamiśra, Yāmuna-cārya and Rāmānuja. Rāmānuja got his initiation from Pūrṇācārya in the temple of Śri Rāma at that place; and then both came to Kañcī where Rāmānuja learnt from his preceptor the mysteries of the sect. Both the preceptor and the disciple began to live together. For some time the two families lived together peacefully, but afterwards there was a clash between the ladies in the household, and as a result the preceptor left the place for Śrīraṅgam. Rāmānuja was grieved at the incident, and as he had no mundane desire but had only one more mission to fulfil, he sent his wife to her father, and himself went to Bhūtapuri where he embraced asceticism and afterwards returned to Kañcī. Kañcipūrṇa was very glad to see Rāmānuja in his new robes, and from that time onward Rāmānuja became known as Yatirāja or the king of the ascetics.

Daśarathi and Kūreśa, his sister's sons, were the first to become his disciples. Rāmānuja's former teacher, Yādava Prakāśa, was very much impressed by his deep learning and sincerity, and became his pupil under the name of Govinda-dāsa, and afterwards composed Yati-dharma-samuccaya.

Accompanied by his disciples, Rāmānuja then visited Śrīraṅgam where Pūrṇācārya was glad to receive him and to offer the post of the superintending apostle of the temple of Śrīraṅgam. Rāmānuja humbly accepted the offer, and remained there for some time, dedicating himself to the worship of the Deity. Advised by Pūrṇācārya, he learnt from Goṣṭhipūrṇa the significance of the mystic formula, and taught it to seventyfour Brāhmaṇa devotees.
One day a jealous householder offered poisonous food to Rāmānuja as midday alms, but the wife of the man while presenting the food felt sorry and fell at the ascetic's feet. Rāmānuja was quick to suspect poison in the food offered to him and did not eat it.

Reputed for his vast erudition as Rāmānuja was, he, in order to establish his own faith, decided to refute the doctrines which were opposed to his own. Once he had to spend seventeen days in overcoming an adversary, Yajñāmūrti by name.

During his residence in Tirupati for a year he received esoteric instructions on the Rāmāyaṇa from his maternal uncle. He then started on a trip with a view to propagating the cult of devotion. He visited many places, founded several religio-philosophical centres to be run by his own pupils, and initiated deserving persons to his creed.*

Rāmānuja knew that Bodhāyana had written a commentary on the BrahmaSūtra from the point of devotion, and that the work was available in Kāśmira. He therefore went to that place with his disciple Kūreśa. The latter had a very powerful memory and easily learnt the commentary by heart. As the scholars of Kāśmira were reluctant to part with the original book to be taken home by the guest even for a short time, Rāmānuja returned to his headquarters and made use of Kūreśa's memory while writing his own commentary on the BrahmaSūtra. His short commentary on the sutras is called the Vedānta-sāra and the longer one is known as the Vedānta-dīpā. But more important than either is the Ācārya's interpretation of the aphorisms, known as the Śrī-bhāṣya, his masterpiece. Apart from these commentaries, he wrote a gloss on the Gitā and wrote an independent work, the Vedārthasangraha. His Gāḍyā-traya is replete with devotion, and is an independent work in prose divided into three parts respectively entitled Śrīrāṅga, Vaikuṇṭha and Śaranāgati.

Having finished his literary activities in connection with the cult of devotion to the Deity, Rāmānuja set out with his pupils and disciples to hold debates and discussions. He opposed and refuted the views of his opponents so successfully that they eventually accepted his views. He visited many important places, and it was in Kāśmira that the title of Bhāṣyakāra was conferred upon him. On his way back from Kāśmira he stayed at Tirupati and identified the

---

* "It is believed by some people that Rāmānuja admitted among the Brāhmaṇas a large number of people of other castes. He never did any such thing."

idol of the Deity to be that of Viṣṇu and not of Śiva and thereby set at rest a long-standing dispute.

Kūresa was the best disciple of the Ācārya; and it was under his direction that one of the former’s sons was given the name of Parāśara. It was Parāśara who, later on, wrote a commentary on the Śri Viṣṇu-sahasra-nāma. Rāmānuja gave his own cousin, Pillan, the name of Śaṭṭakopa and assigned to him the task of writing a commentary on the Tiruvoymoli.

Put to trouble by Krimikanṭha (Kulottuṅga I. C. 1070—1118 A.D.) of the Cola dynasty, Rāmānuja had to quit Śrīraṅgam under disguise. He had to suffer a great deal on account of this shifting, and on one occasion he had to go without food for several days. He settled down, and spent a long period of twelve years, in Śāligrama in the kingdom of Biṭṭideva, a Jain king of Hoysala dominion in Mysore. The king was very much influenced by the Ācārya’s piety, and accepted him as his preceptor. Having founded a temple at Melkote, he came to Delhi with a view to procuring an image of Viṣṇu which was in the possession of the then emperor. The Muslim princess used it as a toy—a playmate. Rāmānuja was very happy to have the image which is said to have approached him of its own accord. The Ācārya called it by the name of Sampat-Kumāra. The image was afterwards installed in the temple at Melkote.

Vikrama Cola, the new king, unlike his father, had a sympathetic attitude towards Rāmānuja. This induced the latter to return to Śrīraṅgam. There he installed the images of the Ālvārs.

Rāmānuja lived a full life of one hundred and twenty years, and his devotion to the Deity did never wane. Immediately before his death he spent several days in imparting religious discourses to the disciples and predicted the day of his departure from this world. All who came to know of it were very sad. With a view to leaving behind something that might console his followers, he got two images of himself made and presented them to his disciples.

A day previous to his death, he appointed Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, Kūresa’s son, as the priest in charge of Śrīraṅgam’s temple; and on the final day, he first worshipped the Deity as usual, and then asked the worshippers of Śrīraṅgam to pardon all his shortcomings and advised them to continue the worship with the same zeal as before. Then requesting the audience not to grieve but to bid a happy farewell, he lay down with his head on Govinda’s lap and his feet on the lap of Andhrapūrṇa, one of the most prominent among his seventyfour
disciples. Amid the recitals of religious hymns and chanting of the Divine names, Rāmānuja’s soul travelled to the other world. The Acārya breathed his last at midday on Saturday, the 10th of the white fortnight of the month of Māgha. Thus, as a saint did he both live and die.¹⁰
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II

Ramanuja as a Religious Teacher

Offer of a soothing outlook on life—Reality of finite souls and the external world—His influence on Hinduism—Caitanya initiated to Vaisnavism by the eighth successor of Ramanuja.

The influence which was once wielded by Buddhism, subsequently came to belong to the Advaita Vedanta as preached by Sankara. According to Advaita Vedanta, Ultimate Reality is one or rather non-dual, absolute and attributeless. In other words, the Absolute is the substratum of all objects of our experience; it appears as God (Isvara) in its association with cosmic ignorance. So both God and the universe are only empirically real, but ultimately of an illusory character. The mundane career of the individual self (Jivatman) comes to an end only on its attainment of the knowledge of the identity of itself with the One Reality, which means the absorption of the finite into the Absolute.

The view of the empirical world as illusory became widely current in India in the post-Sankara period, and the Advaita school of Vedanta lay more and more stress on the futility of the view of the world as real. In consequence, intellectual discussions took the place of true devotion to the Supreme. The man of intellect could indeed satisfy himself by considering the pros and cons of the Advaitic view, but the man of heart found no solace in it, as he wanted a firm support for his religious faith which the Advaita doctrine of the attributeless Absolute could not provide. There was no room for love and mercy in the conception of Ultimate Reality. Man is naturally inclined to approach the One who responds to earnest prayers. A devotee does not find in Nirguna Brahman of Sankara any warmth of compassion that can cheer him up in despair and distress. But the God with empirical status which Sankara assigns to Him cannot satisfy the need, as He is not the highest. The love of a devotee yearns for an object which is inferior to none. The Brahman in its empirical aspect cannot arouse a sense of devotion in the heart of the true devotee. The culmination of the feeling of
an affectionate heart is everlasting fellowship with the beloved or the thrilling enjoyment experienced in the most sacred proximity with the beloved Deity, which is foreign to non-dualistic experience.

Man cannot also find any pleasure in the affairs of the world whose existence is not more real than a myth. So the soul hankering after happiness and bliss cannot find them either here or hereafter. Even things of the highest authority, e.g. the scriptures and the preceptor, must be false in a false world. Morality, religion and rituals must be wedded to falsehood, so that nothing would be left to allay the fear of the turmoil of the world. Even the individual must know himself to be illusory and is left with no way of escape from the universal illusion except his absorption into the attributeless Brahman which is, to all human intents and purposes, no better than the Void or Śūnyam of the Buddhists.

However, logical Śaṅkara’s philosophy was, it was dry and did not afford any consolation to humanity. While people were subjected to the ravages of a dry intellectualism, Rāmānuja came forward with the offer of a soothing outlook on the universe. It appealed not only to the heart but gave nourishment to the head also. He had his own way of interpreting the texts of the scriptures. Although he elucidated the sacred books in a way different from that of Śaṅkara, he based his own on the ancient tradition. There was a vast literature—religious and philosophical—before him, and he chalked out a line of thought which ultimately came to be known as Viśiṣṭādvaita. He refuted the Advaita doctrine of Ignorance,* arguing that it (Ignorance) is incompatible with an omniscient Being. For the Absolute which is limited by Ignorance is no Absolute in the strict sense of the term. The difficulty cannot be removed by attributing the Ignorance to the finite soul, as finitude itself is due to Ignorance. To hold that Ignorance is neither existent nor non-existent is obviously unreasonable, and still more unreasonable is the view that Ignorance of an indescribable nature is something positive. If it is positive, there is no hope for man’s liberation from it.

Rāmānuja admitted the reality not only of the individual selves but also of the external world. For him, the world was not unreal as it is a place for God’s sport (līlā). As God is real, so is His līlā, and also the world which is the material setting of His līlā. In other words, the world being a plane for the Divine sport cannot be a mere illusion. The Deity is supreme and the inexhaustible substratum of

*In the Sanskrit expression ‘avidyā’ the verbal root, according to Vāsistha, is vid = to be. The word thus means ‘that which exists not.’ According to others, it is vid = to know; and the expression would therefore mean absence of knowledge or wrong knowledge.
auspicious attributes. He is an object of our adoration. He is
neither empirical, nor a mere void, but is such as can be apprehended
not only on the eternal plane but on the empirical plane also. It is
He who has created all that is, and enlivens all that He has created,
just as an individual soul enlivens its body. The whole universe is His
body, hence He is all. This gives an altogether new orientation to a
thinker who conceives the Reality as qualified. While constituting
the body of the Deity, the finite selves and physical things do not
cease to maintain their individuality and reality. Although they are
subservient to the Almighty, yet they have their own independent
being. Rāmānuja further holds that the finite selves do not lose their
individuality even in emancipation. If they lost it, they would not
enjoy the fellowship of the Deity. Every individual is striving for
bliss, and the strife has its culmination in the beatific vision of, and
communion with, the Deity who is infinite Bliss, conscious of His own
existence.

Rāmānuja held that the way leading to that vision and fellowship
is devotion which is open to all, irrespective of the differences of
caste, sex, position in society etc. All beings are His; hence He is
accessible to all. As soon as we surrender our all to Him, He
embraces us and admits us to His eternal play (līla), but we do not
thereby lose our individuality but only get a glimpse or a direct
experience of His blissful presence.

All over India, most of the Hindu forms of devotion and
worship have been influenced by Rāmānuja’s philosophy. His
chief aim, the reconciliation of the doctrines of the Upaniṣads, the
Bhagavad-gītā, the Mahābhārata, and the Purāṇas, with his own
religion and philosophy, was theological rather than philosophical. The ācāryas coming after him—Maddhva and Nimbūrka, Vallabha
and Caitanya—all followed his footsteps in refuting the doctrine of
māyā as advanced by Śaṅkara, maintained individuality of the
finite self, conceived the Deity as Ultimate Reality, and regarded
the devotion to Him as the highest of all human activities.

Rāmānanda, a follower of Viśiṣṭādvaita, introduced some
minor changes into the old faith and started a new one to which
he initiated twelve disciples. One of them was Kabīrā whose poetry
is well known for its mysticism which attracted even the modern
poet Tagore. Mīrā whose songs have been universally appreciated
in this country is said to be a disciple of Raidāsā who himself was
a disciple of Rāmānanda. Gaurāṅga Mahāprabhu is usually
regarded as a follower of the Maddhva cult, but according to
Govind-dasa, Keśava Bhārati, eighth in succession of Rāmānuja, initiated him and gave him the name of Śri Kṛṣṇa Caitanya by which he is universally known.\textsuperscript{11}

All this shows the popularity of Rāmānuja’s philosophical and theological views and their hold on the Hindu mind for centuries.
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The Sources of Rāmānuja’s Devotional Philosophy:

Mantra—Brāhmaṇa—The Upanisads—The Rāmāyaṇa—The Mahābhārata—The Purāṇas—The Pāñcarātra—The writings of Ālvars—The works of Aḻavandāra.

The Mantra portion of the Vedas.

The Vaiśṇava cult as propounded by Rāmānuja and other Vaiśṇava apostles, had its origin in the Rgveda. The sages of the hoary past used to sing beautiful songs in praise of their deities. The hymns in eulogy of Viṣṇu composed by Medhātithi Kaṇva, Dirghatama Aucathya and Vaśiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇi are simply charming. Viṣṇu means the pervasive. The Deity who pervades the whole universe is Viṣṇu. Medhātithi versified, in gāyatri metre, the three strides of Viṣṇu, the invincible, and said that those who have true knowledge, see the Divine abode of Viṣṇu. According to Dirghatama, Viṣṇu has created the worlds and has alone supported the whole universe. Praised on account of His valorous deeds, He is friendly; and His abode where His devotees live in eternal bliss is said to be extremely refugent and a source of refinement and grace. He is lord, saviour, non-injurious and fulfiller of desires. The devotees supplicate for His good will. According to Vaśiṣṭha, Viṣṇu knows all about the creation and none has reached the end of His greatness. He is entreated for the bestowal of his good thought with a view to the grant of plenty of horses and riches. His name is resplendent i.e., familiar to all; His devotees are firm i.e., unflinching and He resides beyond the region (of Prakṛti).

The ninetieth hymn of the tenth book of the Rgveda is the well-known sixteen-stanza hymn of Man where Viṣṇu is given the name of Puruṣa, and where the world is said to be His creation.

In the Yajurveda there are many stanzas relating to Viṣṇu which specially mention the offering of oblations to Him. In one passage He is invoked to fill His hands—both right and left—with wealth either from heaven or from earth or from the middle region
and to bestow it upon the devotees. 4 The thirty-first chapter, the Puruṣa-stūkta, consists of 22 stanzas of which the first sixteen are almost the same as they are in the Ṛgveda. That the hymn of Man is in praise of Viṣṇu is corroborated by the fact that its last stanza mentions Śri and Laksñī as Viṣṇu’s consorts. 5

The Sāmañveda also devotes to Viṣṇu several stanzas along with a few from the hymn of Man; and similar is the ease with the Atharva-veda where the entire hymn of Man covering sixteen stanzas is reiterated with little variation.

The Brāhmaṇa.

It is thus clear that the beginning of the cult of Viṣṇu is already there during the mantra period. Coming down to the Brāhmaṇa period, we find that Viṣṇu enjoyed the foremost position in the Hindū pantheon of the age, as is clear from a passage of the Aitareya 6 and it is in the Black Yajurveda that the word ‘Nārāyaṇa’, so popular in the later Viṣṇava literature, occurs for the first time. 7

The Upaniṣads.

The Kaṭha Upaniṣad mentions Viṣṇu’s abode as the highest destination of the wandering soul 8 and the Viṣṇava commentators are perhaps right in holding that the Brahman of the Upaniṣadic literature is another name for Viṣṇu.

According to the Nārāyaṇopaniṣad, Viṣṇu resides in the heart of every individual, and there He looks like a blue cloud encircled by lightning. The Subalopaniṣad says that He is the inner soul of all. 9 There are likewise other Viṣṇava Upaniṣads which proclaim Viṣṇu’s supremacy.

The Rāmāyaṇa.

The Rāmāyaṇa of Valmiki depicts the noble deeds of Rāma who is another form of Viṣṇu. 10 In fact, the epic helped very much the cause of the cult of devotion, and is considered to be an authoritative work on Viṣṇavism. It contains twenty-four thousand stanzas and it is said that the opening verse of each thousand begins with one of the 24 letters, in serial order, of the gāyatri mantra, which gives the book an additional sanctity and a Vedic basis.

The Mahābhārata.

In a still greater measure did the cult of Viṣṇu find support in the greater epic, the Mahābhārata, which is indeed an encyclopaedia of Hindū religion and philosophy. Apart from the Gita, the
Mahābhārata contains several other portions such as the Anu-gītā, the Viṣṇu-sahasra-nāma etc. which have popularized the Viṣṇu cult to a great extent. The section called Nārāyanīya in the Śāntiparva contains an exposition of the Vaiṣṇava point of view. The Gītā explicitly declares Kṛṣṇa, the charioteer and guide of Arjuna, as another form of Viṣṇu. Trembling at the vision of the ‘universal form’ of Śri Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna addressed Him as Viṣṇu, and requested Him to assume the four-armed, beautiful form.\textsuperscript{11}

The Purāṇas

To the Paurānic literature goes the credit of popularizing the cult of devotion, and it would not be out of place to mention a few facts about it. The word ‘Purāṇa’ means ‘the antique’. According to Yāska, it means ‘new yore’\textsuperscript{12} The Atharva-veda,\textsuperscript{13} the Śatapatha,\textsuperscript{14} the Chāndogya,\textsuperscript{15} the Rāmāyaṇa,\textsuperscript{16} the Mahābhārata,\textsuperscript{17} the Āsvalāyana gṛhya-sūtra\textsuperscript{18} and the Manu-smṛti\textsuperscript{19} contain references to the word Purāṇa. It is said that Brahmā once gave the sages a lengthy discourse on the evolution and dissolution of the universe, the genealogy of the sages and kings, and the periods of Manus. Keeping that discourse in view, Vyāsa (Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vedavyūsa) composed a Purāṇa-saṃhitā containing many stories, traditions, tales and legends,\textsuperscript{20} and taught it to his favourite disciple Romaharṣṇa whose three students also wrote such saṃhitās, one each.\textsuperscript{21} Thus four manuals were prepared on Paurānic literature, which gradually grew into eighteen volumes. Being based on the one original book written by Vyāsa, all these different books are traditionally known as Vyāsa’s works. Just as the Bhārata and the Mahābhārata, the enlarged editions of Vyāsa’s original historical poetry entitled ‘Jaya’, are held to be Vyāsa’s composition, all the Purāṇas are attributed to Vyāsa’s authorship inasmuch as they all are a sort of enlarged editions of his original work. The traditional adage that ‘the son of Satyavatī is the author of eighteen Purāṇas’ is therefore true. The number of the stanzas of all the Purāṇas taken together is said approximately to be four lakhs.

Although the number of the topics discussed in the Purāṇas is said to be five,\textsuperscript{22} yet, strictly speaking, the number is greater, it being a fact that many subsidiary topics have been introduced in elucidation of the principal ones. In fact, the Purāṇas contain discourses on geography and astronomy, chantings and recitals, rivers and shrines, worship and adoration, heaven and hell, offerings and oblations, images and temples, knowledge and devotion, and so forth. Besides the principal Purāṇas, there are eighteen secondary Purāṇas also.
Scholars have also discovered some texts whose colophons are such that they need to be included in some Purāṇa or the other, though they are not actually included in the Purāṇas already known to us. The fact is that our religious literature could not be entirely saved from foreign invaders in the medieval period with the result that most of it was lost or spoilt.

The Viṣṇu-purāṇa, Padma-purāṇa, Garuda-purāṇa, Nārada-purāṇa, Varāha-purāṇa and Bhāgavata-purāṇa are supposed to be sāttvika in character; the Brahma-purāṇa, Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa, Brahma-vaivarta-purāṇa, Mārkandeya-purāṇa, Bhaviṣya-purāṇa and Vāmana-purāṇa are rājas; and the Śiva-purāṇa, Liṅga-purāṇa, Skanda-purāṇa, Agni-purāṇa, Matsya-purāṇa, and Kurma-purāṇa are tāmāsa. Rāmānuja has quoted in the Vedārtha-saṅgraha a few lines from the Matsya-purāṇa, saying that Brahmā proclaimed the greatness of Viṣṇu in an age dominated by sattva, that he proclaimed his own greatness in an age dominated by rajas and that he proclaimed the greatness of Agni and Śiva in an age dominated by tāmas. The domination of one of the properties of prakṛti thus is, as Rāmānuja argues, the cause of difference in themes of the threefold purāṇas. These different ages called kalpas, are likewise different in character. The Purāṇas taught by Brahmā in sāttvika age are the best ones. Since Brahmā is created by the Deity, and is subject to the authority of the scriptures, he is also a Kṣetrajña or a jīva; and as such he is invested with the three properties of prakṛti. The sāttvika Purāṇas, especially the Bhāgavata, teach that Viṣṇu is the Supreme Being, and that devotion to Him brings the devotee righteousness, wealth or wisdom as he desires. So nothing is difficult for a true devotee to attain. Both worldly pleasures and the bliss of emancipation may be easily attained by a lover of God. It may be noted in this connection that the only Purāṇa from which Rāmānuja has quoted in his Śrī-bhāṣya is the Viṣṇu-purāṇa.

The Pāñcarātra

The religious data contained in the scriptures, however, do not relate exclusively to Viṣṇu. They exhibit reverence for, and the supremacy of, other gods also. But there is a literature called the Pāñcarātra which seeks to establish the exclusive supremacy of Viṣṇu, and dwells upon devotion to Him alone. As the term Pāñcarātra is not widely known, it may be necessary to make a few observations on it.
The word ‘pañcarātra’ is pretty old and we find it mentioned for the first time in the Satapatha Brahmana where it is stated that the Supreme Puruṣa, Ṇarāyaṇa, desired in ages gone by to surpass all beings and to become all, through Puruṣa-medha which was otherwise called the Pañcarātra. The word ‘Pañcarātra’ was first used as an adjective of Puruṣa-medha and then came to be used as an independent word. It means a sacrifice which is to be accomplished in five successive nights and in the following order:

Agniśṭoma, then Ukthya, then Atirātra, then Ukthya once again, and lastly Agniśṭoma for the second time. It thus starts with, and terminates in, Agniśṭoma. Hence it was called ‘Ubbayato-jyoti’. It is also called ‘Ubbayata-ukthya’ inasmuch as Ukthya is to be performed twice. Ukthya however takes more time than Agniśṭoma; and Atirātra occupies still greater time. The duration gradually increases from the first to the third day, but gradually decreases from the fourth to the fifth day. Hence it is called ‘Yava-madhya’ i.e. that which resembles a grain of barley whose middle portion is bigger than the remaining ones. Puruṣa-medha and Pañcarātra were synonymous, and the sacrifice was performed with the chanting of the Puruṣa-sūkta.

The men to be sacrificed were praised with the chanting of the hymn in the Puruṣa-medha; and when the bhrāma-priest eulogised Puruṣa or Ṇarāyaṇa, a voice came from above, ‘O embodied man, do not make these men stand by fire for sacrifice. In case you will, man will eat man’. On hearing this celestial voice, the men-animals were set free, and oblations of clarified butter were poured into fire for appeasing brahma, kṣatra, marut and tapas (representing the four castes).

It is thus clear that the Puruṣa-medha sacrifice did not demand any killing of life. Even today the followers of the pāñcarātra sect i.e. the Vaiṣṇavas abstain from destroying life in their rituals. The term ‘pañcarātra’ has, however, been interpreted in various other ways as shown below:

1. Pañcarātra is that in whose presence five scriptures of Śaṅkhya, Yoga, Bāuddha, Āthata and Kāpāla lose their lustre.

2. Just as night (rātri) comes to an end (pañcatva) at sunrise, similarly other scriptures come to an end at the rise of Pañcarātra.

3. The word ‘rātra’ signifies knowledge which is of five types, so that Pañcarātra is the name of the scripture which deals with five types of knowledge.
4. ‘Ṛtra’ means nescience and ‘pacana’ means destruction. Hence the scripture which destroys nescience is called Pañcarātra.\(^{54}\)

5. Pañcarātra is the scripture which admits the reality of God in five aspects: transcendence, immanence, emanation, descent and the consecrated idols.\(^{35}\)

6. Pañcarātra is the scripture which teaches that on the realization of God, five nights meaning the functions of the five physical senses of the embodied soul are destroyed.\(^{36}\)

7. Pañcarātra is so called because it embodies the five lectures delivered by Nārāyaṇa in five nights to Ananta, Garuda, Viṣvakṣena, Brahmā and Rudra.\(^{37}\)

8. Pañcarātra is that scripture which the Lord taught separately to Śaṅdilya, Aupamanyava, Maunjāyana, Kaśīka and Bhradvāja who are digits of His five weapons.\(^{38}\)

Pañcarātra is not only of Vedic origin, but is also called the Ekāyana Veda i.e. a Veda where the Deity is said to be the only shelter for devotees.\(^{39}\) The great sage Śaṅdilya learnt it from Saṅkarṣaṇa at the end of Duṣṇa and the beginning of Kali, and then taught it to Sumantu, Bhṛgu, Jaimini, Aupagāyana, and Maunjāyana.

The Pañcarātra deals with the following subjects:—

(a) philosophical theory,

(b) meditation,

(c) temple architecture and iconography, and

(d) certain other matters peculiar to the sect.

The Mahābhārata has termed Pañcarātra as Mahopanisad or the great Upanisad, and indicates that the Pañcarātra literature was held in high esteem in ancient times.\(^{40}\) It is said to have been taught by Nārāyaṇa Himself. Apart from the name ‘Mahopanisad’, other names e.g. śāstra, tantra, āgama, and samhitā are also given to Pañcarātra. Thus we have such titles as Pañcarātra śāstra, Pañcarātra tantra, Pañcarātra āgama, and Pañcarātra samhitā.

Numerous books were written on this branch of Vaiṣṇava literature, and they received distinctive names after their authors. Nārada Pañcarātra contains, for instance, a reference to seven Pañcarātras as Brāhma, Śaiva, Kaumāra, Vāśiṣṭha, Kāpila, Gautamiya and Nārada.\(^{41}\) Agni-puraṇa mentions twenty-five such names.\(^{42}\)

The literature on Pañcarātra increased from more to more and came to include as many as about two hundred books. But one hundred and eight Pañcarātra samhitās are held to be canonical.
Like the Purāṇas, the Pāñcarātra is also divided into three sections respectively characterised as sāttvika, rājasa and tāmasa. The samhitās taught by the Deity are called Divine. The Sāttvata samhitā, the Jayākhyā samhitā and the Pauṣkara samhitā are the best of the one hundred and eight books. The Īsvara-samhitā, the Padma samhitā and the Paramesvara-samhitā are respectively expositions of the three above-mentioned samhitās which, though separately compiled, form one complete scripture. Ācārya Yāmuna, Rāmānuja’s grand-preceptor, proved the authoritativeness of the Pāñcarātra literature in his Āgama-prāmāṇya. Later on Rāmānuja attempted to do the same in his commentary to the Brahma-sūtras 2.2.41 and 42 where he has quoted from the Sāttvata, Pauṣkara and Parama-samhitās. Still later Venkaṭatāmātha also made an effort to prove the authority of the Pāñcarātra, in his Pāñcarātra-rakṣā. The Pāñcarātra literature is, however, held to be sacred and authoritative by all the Vaiṣṇavas. Only a few of the samhitās have so far been published.

The Writings of Ālvārs

Love of God knows no limitations—geographical or historical. Men of devotion may be born at all places and in all times. But there was a time when southern India surpassed other parts of the country in producing outstanding men of religion and devotion. They were definitely twelve in number. But their dates and order of succession are not beyond dispute. Since they remained deeply absorbed in devotion all the time, they came to be known by the name of Ālvārs, a Tamil word suggestive of their state of love. Their Sanskrit names were 1 Saroyogi, 2 Bhūtayogi, 3 Mahāyogi, 4 Bhaktisāra, 5 Śaṭhakopa, 6 Kulasekhara, 7 Viṣṇucitta, 8 Gods, 9 Bhakṭāṅghirēnu, 10 Munivāhana, 11 Parakāla and 12 Madhura Kavi. They believed in

(a) the temporary character of all worldly pleasures,
(b) the permanence of bliss attained on emancipation,
(c) the cessation of worldly miseries on the attainment of communion with the Supreme,
(d) Self-surrender as the means to the Divine communion, and
(e) the eligibility of all to the cult of devotion.

The collection of their works is called the Prabandham. Though it was written in Tamil language, it was held by the devotees in the same esteem as the Vedas, was considered to be a religious authority, and was a source of inspiration for devotion.
Rāmānuja’s Devotional Philosophy

The āḻvārs lay stress on exclusive devotion, and they were followed by ācāryas who admitted action and knowledge also as useful steps. Nāthamuni, the compiler of the Prābandham of the āḻvārs, was the first ācārya. He was the son of Iśvaramuni, a devotee of Vira-nārāyaṇapuram. Yāmuna was the second apostle, and was called Ālavandāra or a king among those immersed in love of God. A profound scholar as he was, he did pioneer work in the domain of devotional philosophy. The subjects he dealt with in his Siddhistraya were: consciousness, the individual soul and God. He established the validity of the Pāṇcarātra literature in Āgama-prāmāṇya; epitomised the Gitā in Gitārthaṅsaṅgraha; established the supremacy of Viśnu in Mahāpuruṣa-nirṇaya, and composed hymns in praise of the Divine couple viz. Lākṣṇī and Nārāyaṇa, known as Catus-slokī and Stotra-ratna.47

A vast literature having a bearing on worship of Viśnu thus lay before Rāmānuja. He culled suitable material from all these sources at his disposal and prepared his own works of which the Śrī-bhāṣya is recognised on all hands as the most outstanding.

As has been indicated above, the Sāra or Vedānta-sāra, the Dipa or Vedānta-dīpa and the Śrī-bhāṣya are commentaries on the Brahma-sūtra. But it is the Gadya-traya, Nitya or Bhagavadārādhana-krama and the Vedārthasaṅgraha, and not the Vedānta-sāra and the Vedānta-dīpa as Keith has wrongly stated in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,48 that are Rāmānuja’s independent works.

The greatness of Rāmānuja really lies in the success of his effort to elucidate canonical scriptures. He was, however, not the first to do this sort of work. The theistic tradition existed even before the time of Śaṅkara, as is indicated by the stray references to it made by him.49 But Rāmānuja, while admitting that many other scholars such as Taṅka, Dramīda, Guha, and Kapardi had made attempts similar to his,50 discovered that much of the earlier theistic literature was lost and some was very brief. In consequence, he felt the need of elaborate exposition of the theistic literature that still existed. There is no doubt that he worked hard to fulfil the need for which the Vaiṣṇava community indeed owes him a debt of gratitude.
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References from 31 to 39 quoted from article XXV of J.R.A.S., 1911.

40. इदं महोपनिषदं चतुबद्वं-समिस्वतम्।
(श्रीमाये २. २४२ उद्भूतं महामार्तव्यनम्)

41. अतं गैंच च कौमार वानिष्टः कारिनल परम्।
मीतमीत नामीयंमीदं दश्विनं स्मृतम् (नारद्वेणराम्)

42. ब्रह्मानस्ति निमित्तांक संपन्नवार्तां संतोष्या।
हुणसीं सद्भरमात तत्रं नैवोविभोमहम्।
बैवंक्रं विष्णुं तत्रं प्रभुत्वं माये-मायेः।
नामादित्य च श्रीगुरं वाणिष्टः व्यासं तथा।
सत्योपातन्त श्रीमं तत्रं वरिष्टं जानसागरम्।
स्वाभावः कारिनल च ताध्यं नारायणियमकम्।
प्राणे नारायणायुक्तादिकं तथा रूपम्।
श्रीमायनं तथांथं विष्णुकं तथं सारं। (श्रीमपुराणम् ब्रह्मण: ३६)

43. सारं च वैणं च ज्ञानं तन्त्रमुलमोऽर्थमन्त्रिक्ष्यात्!

44. भृतिरस्याध्यायापिवतत्वापिविविध्विद्वेद्विध्विष्णुश्रुतं—सुप्रज्ञानोदिष्टियानात्
तद्विविध्यात्मककायमायाप्रतिकोसाहम्।............(प्र) स भगवान्—दध्रयं
वायव्यात्मायवविष्णुपरं गात्रं स्वप्नेष निरमलीतिः निर्मवादम्।
(श्रीमायम् २. २५२)

45. प्रति: कृत्वं पंचराम प्रमाणम् (श्री पंचराजवर्का, पुष्पम् ४२)

46. Arranged according to Alvāra vaibhava by P.B. Anantaracārya of Conjeevaram.

47. Rāmānuja listened to, or rather overheard, for the first time, the stanzas of this beautiful hymn recited by Mahāpūrṇa in the temple of Devaraja at Kāñci, and was so enamoured of the theme and style that he forthwith enquired of the reciter who the composer of the poem was and whether an interview with him could be granted.

48. Of special importance are only the Vedāntadipā, the Vedāntasāra, the Vedārtha-saṅgraha, which are independent works........
49. यव केवलकाद्रि मल्लकमि तदं छिन्दित
    वह्मेहागौतेवं मतुरु प्राणवप्रथथमनिष्टं स्थादिति।

50. यवोदितकमपरिलक्ष्यकलभ्य एवं भगवद्वोधायन—टक—द्विधा—
    गुह्देव—कर्ति—माहाचि—प्रभृत्यविश्यालीष्ट परिगृहीति······

(वेदांतसंहित औष्ठम् १५. १४)
CHAPTER II
GENERAL SURVEY

I

Epistemology:

The sources of knowledge in different schools—Perception—Viśiṣṭādvaita realism—Dreams—Inference—Comparison and presumption included in inference—Verbal testimony—Origin of words—Reality is qualified.

About the nature of the Ultimate Reality both Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja differ greatly from each other. The former views it as unqualified; the latter as qualified. When Rāmānuja says that Reality is qualified, he means that it has certain attributes. All the three means of knowledge, viz., perception, inference and scriptural testimony, according to him, corroborate this view. An account of Rāmānuja’s view of these three means of knowledge is given below.

The Sources of knowledge in different schools.

Gotama, the founder of Nyāya philosophy admitted four means of knowledge: perception, inference, analogy and verbal testimony.¹ Kaṇāda, the founder of the Vaiṣeṣika system of philosophy, as the tradition goes, admitted only two:—inference and perception. In this connection it may be observed that although his aphorism 1-1.3 clearly recognises the Vedas as a means of proof², yet the later philosophers of the Vaiṣeṣika school included verbal testimony and analogy within inference as is evident from the Bhāṣā-pariccheda of Viśvanātha.³ The Sāṅkhya recognised three ways of knowing: perception, inference and scriptural testimony.⁴ Patañjali, the founder of Yoga philosophy, agreed with Sāṅkhya.⁵ The Prabhakara school of Mīmāṃsā added presumption as the fifth means of knowledge to the four of the Nyāya.⁶ The Bhāṭta School of Mīmāṃsā and Advaita Vedānta* added non-perception (anupalabdhi) as the sixth instrument of knowledge.⁷ The Purāṇas added two more—sambhava (inclusion of the lower within the higher, and aitihya (tradition), and this reached

*Vasiṣṭha, however, held perception (anubhava) to be the only means to the realization of Reality.
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the total of eight. But Rāmānuja sticks to three only: perception, inference and scriptural testimony. Maddhva and Nimbarka agreed with Rāmānuja. The system of Vallabha did not admit any definite number of the sources of knowledge, but laid the greatest emphasis on scriptural testimony. The Acintya-bhedabheda school also believed in the three ways of knowing—perception, inference and scriptural testimony.

(A) Perception

It is the ātman that cognises sound, touch, colour, taste and smell; it is again the ātman that thinks and discriminates. This is the view of the Upaniṣads; and on the authority of these scriptures Bādarāyaṇa holds the same view. Rāmānuja only follows suit. The ātman does not, however, come into direct contact with the external objects but with the mind. The mind in union with the soul has contact with the sense-organs which in turn come into contact with the external objects. The sense-organs are means of knowledge in so far as they thus enable the ātman to cognise. They are of two kinds—the external and the internal. Those sense-organs which lie on the surface of the body are external. The auditory organ lies in the orifice of the ear, the tactual is spread over the skin, the visual is in the eye, the taste-organ is in the tongue and the olfactory one is in the nose. The mind, owing to its peculiar internality is rightly called the inner sense (antah karana). All these six organs are but means of knowledge as distinguished from the knower which is the ātman itself.

According to Sāṁkhya system, cognition belongs to buddhi. It is in association with the buddhi that the individual soul (purusa) cognises but does so only metaphorically. According to Nyāya, cognition is an adventitious quality of the ātman, which is due to psycho-physical contact. According to Advaita Vedānta, the ātman in its noumenal aspect is pure consciousness. It is in its phenomenal aspect that it becomes congnisant of objects. But Rāmānuja differs by holding that cognition is an attribute of the soul.

Perception is of three kinds: God’s perception, perception of the yogis and perception of ordinary persons. The last, again, is of two kinds: determinate (savikalpa) and indeterminate (nirvikalpa). “The only difference between indeterminate perception and determinate perception lies”, Dr. J.N. Sinha explains, “in the fact that the former is the perception of the first individual among a number of objects, belonging to the same class, while the latter is the perception of the second individual, third individual and so on……In determinate perception we perceive in addition to the object possessing a structure,
and the structure itself, the character of the structure as being common to the whole class. In the case of indeterminate perception, an object is perceived for the first time, so that what is perceived is only the peculiar arrangement of its parts (samsthāna). In the case of the determinate perception, on the other hand, the arrangement of the parts of an object is comprehended not as its peculiar attribute, but as the attribute of a class of similar objects, which is called anuvṛtti and which really differentiates determinate perception from perception of indeterminate kind. There is, however, a difference of opinion as to the nature of nirvikalpa pratyakṣa as understood by Rāmānuja. According to some, by nirvikalpa perception Rāmānuja means 'the apprehension of a thing at the first moment of cognition', while others take his meaning to be 'the apprehension of the first instance.' However that may be, Rāmānuja holds that indeterminate perception is, really, inadequate apprehension of things, involving the knowing of only some but not all of their qualities. He also holds that this kind of perception admits of specification, and thus differs fundamentally from the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school which conceives indeterminate perception as absolutely non-specific apprehension.

In place of the six kinds of contact between the sense-organs and the external objects admitted by the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, only two kinds are accepted in the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. They are: conjunction (samyoga) as in the case of visual perception of a lotus, and dependence on the conjunct (samyuktāśrayaṇa) as in the case of perception of colour etc. of the lotus.

But the question arises as to whether the object reaches the sense-organs, or the latter reaches the former. The answer is this. In the case of our perception of smell, taste, touch and sound, an object reaches the sense-organs. In the perception of the fragrance of a jasmine flower, for instance, the air laden with the fragrance comes in contact with the nose; and we sense it to be fragrant. The juice of an unripe mango comes in contact with the tongue; and we have the sour taste. Ice comes in contact with our skin and gives us the sensation of coolness. The sound produced by the blowing of a conch is conveyed by the air into our ears. The process in visual perception is however different. The eye does not wait for the object to approach it, but itself reaches it, however distant it may be. Just as the sun reaches, through its rays, the distant regions illumined by it, similarly the ocular rays reach in no time even the remotest objects. The Nyāya also accepts this view.

Viśiṣṭādvaita includes memory in perception, and, therefore, does not recognise it as an independent means of knowledge. Recog-
nition (pratyabhijñā) is also viewed to come under perception on the understanding that it is a combination of direct perception (anubhava) and recollection (smṛti). If I see Soma-datta today after a year and recognise him, I have the kind of knowledge known as the pratyabhijñā which obviously involves nothing but perception and memory. Conjecture, doubt and intuition are also included in perception.

Vīśiṣṭādvaita Realism

According to Vīśiṣṭādvaita, there is no knowledge which does not correspond to a real object. Even erroneous experiences are no exception to this rule. This is the view which is embodied in the doctrine of ‘Satkhyaṅti’ according to which knowledge necessarily relates to the real. What then is the nature of erroneous perception? We may mistake a distant rope for a snake, but on approaching it we find our previous knowledge to be erroneous. Now Rāmānuja holds that in the case of erroneous experience the object is real in so far as some of the attributes of a snake are existent in the rope; but they being only a few of the attributes of a snake, we cannot call the object snake. That is why our knowledge of a rope as a snake is erroneous. It is not erroneous in the sense that it does not correspond to a really existing object. Further, the rope and the snake do contain in common a certain measure of the five elements so that the former exists partially in the latter and vice versa. When an object possesses some aspect (eka-desa) of another object, they are said to be similar to each other. According to the doctrine of quintuplication (pañcikaraṇa), one element contains, in some degree, portions of other elements. Earth for example is constituted by the earth element, but it contains in addition, water, air etc. On the basis of the view, the Vīśiṣṭādvaita holds that any one thing has the qualities of all other things. So things are, in a sense, similar to one another. The similarity in some cases is so vivid as to produce confusion. This explains our erroneous perception of silver in a nacre. The silver-portion is, however, so meagre in the nacre that we do not use nacre as silver. When the nacreous qualities are perceived in profusion in a nacre, our error disappears.

On dreams

Bādarāyaṇa’s statement that a dream is māyā has been differently interpreted by Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja. For Śaṅkara, māyā is unreal from the absolute viewpoint; and dream is equally so. He holds that Brahman, the basis of all phenomenal appearance, is alone real, because it does not change; whereas the appearances being of a
changing and evanescent nature, are false. Being is absolutely real, whereas becoming is only relatively so. Whatever is subject to time, place and causation is said to possess relative existence. A dream vanishes when a person wakes up; hence its reality is relative. Even the world consisting of particular things vanishes before a man on whom true knowledge has dawned. The reality of empirical world cannot, therefore, be regarded as absolute when compared with that of Brahman. The absolute being is called real and relative illusory by the followers of Advaita. Dreams are thus unreal, according to Śaṅkara. The author of the Yoga-Śaṅkara had already declared the dream phenomena to be unreal. “The waking man” as Dr. B.L. Atreya has explained, “considers the dream experiences unreal and visionary, while to the subject of the dream its own world is really real, and the waking experience is regarded as unreal and non-existent.”

According to Viśiṣṭādvaita, on the other hand, the world is not a mere appearance; but definitely real. Things such as the sun and the moon, the oceans and the mountains do not cease to exist for us even when we attain true knowledge. On the contrary, a man of true knowledge sees in every thing the grandeur (vibhūti) of God. Rāmānuja thus holds that the world of experience is real. According to him, the phenomena of dream are very astonishing (māyā). The dreamer experiences objects that are not experienced by others in common with him. Bādarāyaṇa calls a dream māyā, because its nature is partially manifest. Only God, the Supreme Person, can project such strange objects. An individual soul also can work such a miracle at will when it attains emancipation, though its creativity is in a state of suspense when it is in a state of bondage. According to Rāmānuja, in the dream state the dreamer is made by God to enjoy pleasure or suffer pain, as the case may be, as a consequence of his minor actions. Dreams are also believed by Rāmānuja to indicate the good or the bad future of the dreamer. In this respect the dreamer has no control of his own over his dreams.

While the author of the Yoga-Śaṅkara regards wish-fulfilment as the cause of dreams, Rāmānuja holds that the cause is the will of God. The dream objects are thus real for him, because they are created by God. Rāmānuja’s view that God is the creator of dreams is akin to the doctrine of imported dreams. The others are ‘reproductive’ (anubhūta), ‘conative’ (Prārthita), ‘creative’ (Kalpita), ‘physiological’ (doṣaja) and ‘congenital’ (Bhāvaja).
All cognition is thus real. The ācārya has set forth his views on this point in details, but has not refuted the views of others. The views opposed to Rāmānuja’s are chiefly these:

(a) Atma-Khyāti of the Yogācāras,*
(b) Āsat-Khyāti of the Madhyamikas,
(c) Akhyāti of the Mīmāṁsakas,
(d) Anyatha-Khyāti of the Naiyāyikas, and
(e) Anirvācanīya-Khyāti of Advaita of Śaṅkara.41

Professor J.N. Sinha has enumerated and explained five more views in his book ‘Indian Psychology’. They are:—Alaukika-Khyāti, Sadasatkhyāti, viveka-Khyāti, Prasiddhartha-Khyāti, and Sat-Khyāti. It is needless to say that the last view in this group is advocated by Rāmānuja.42

(B) Inference

The second source of knowledge is inference. Its basis is perceptual knowledge. As perception judges its objects as qualified, so does inference. Rāmānuja distinguishes two kinds of his inference: (a) inference from the observation of particular cases i.e., inductive, and (b) inference resting on general truths i.e., deductive.43 Inference is again twofold: (a) inference for one’s own sake and (b) inference for the sake of others.44

Knowing the concomitance of fire and smoke, Devadatta goes to a mountain. There he sees a cloud of smoke rising from the peak, and recollects the relation of smoke and fire. Observing smoke on the peak, he infers that it contains fire. This is an instance of inference for oneself. The inference for others consists of five premises viz. (a) proposition (pratijñā), (b) reason (hetu), (c) example (udāharaṇa), (d) application (upanaya) and (e) conclusion (nigamana). The Viśisṭādvaita does not, however, attach much importance to the number of premises in a syllogism.45

Reason plays an important part in syllogism. If it is not valid, the inference will be unsound. The conclusion that there is fire in the mountain drawn from the existence of a cloud of dust therein will be wrong. False reason appearing in the guise of a true reason is a fallacy (hetvābhāsa). It is of five kinds:

1. Unproved (asiddha as in ‘The lotus of the sky is fragrant because it is a lotus such as the lotus of a lake’.

*Vasiṣṭha also advocated Ātma-Khyāti
2. Contradictory (viruddha) as in ‘Matter is eternal, because it is fashioned like time’.

3. Inconclusive (Anaikāntika) as in ‘Sound is eternal, because it is knowable like time.’

4. Futile (Kālātyayāpadiṣṭa) as in ‘Fire is cold, because it is a substance like water.’

5. One that has a stronger argument on the other side (prakaraṇasama) as in ‘God is non-eternal, because He is devoid of eternal qualities.’

Comparison

The followers of Gotama admit comparison (upamāna) as a distinct source of right knowledge. Knowledge by comparison is the knowledge of a thing through its similarity to another thing previously known. Recollecting that a bos gaevaeus (gavaya) is like a cow, a man concludes that the cow-like animal which he is seeing in a forest is a bos gaevaeus. This is an instance of knowledge through comparison. But Viśiṣṭādvaita does not admit it as a separate source of knowledge. It may be included, says Srinivāsādāsa, either in perception or in inference or in verbal testimony. It may be included in perception because it involves recollection. Since comparison requires a sort of concomitance, it may be included in inference. Its inclusion in verbal testimony is also admissible on the ground that recollection may be due to instruction by somebody else.

Presumption

Presumption is held to be an independent means of knowledge by the schools of Mīmāṃsā and Advaita Vedānta. It consists in the deduction of one thing from the declaration of another. If Devadatta is found fat despite his taking no food during the day, it should be presumed that he eats at night. But the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta does not regard presumption as a separate means of knowledge, but, like Gotama, includes it in inference.

It should be added here that according to the Viśiṣṭādvaita school, the object of inference is not unqualified but qualified. The reason is that inference is based on memory which in its turn is based on perception, the object of which according to this school, cannot but be qualified (saviṣeṣa).

(C) Verbal Testimony

The third means of knowledge is Śabda (word) which is either sacred or secular. The Vedas, according to the orthodox opinion
which Rāmānuja shares, are not books of human authorship. God gives the Vedas to Brahmā in the beginning of each Kalpa. The Vedas are divided into two sections. One of these deals with the sacrificial rites and rituals; the other with the nature of the Lord.

The contents of the Vedas are threefold—hymns (mantra), explanations (artha-vāda) and injunctions (vidhi). A hymn suggests the work to be done. The value of artha-vāda lies in either commending the desirable or condemning the forbidden. In other words, it is prompting and dissuading respectively for commission and omission of a particular act. An injunction consists in directing a person to do what is beneficial to the individual or society.

The Vedic statements are all authoritative and reliable. There are other traditional scriptures and they are also to be depended upon. The Purāṇa and the Itihāsa are also acceptable. Similarly the Āgamas also are held in high esteem in the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. In the Śrī-bhāṣya, Rāmānuja has argued at length the authoritative ness of Pañcarātra scripture.

Śrīnivāsadāsa holds that even the secular word is a means of right knowledge, provided that it has the merit of expectancy, compatibility and juxtaposition.

One particular word cannot convey its sense in the absence of other words required to complete an idea. The word ‘lotus’ cannot give us the idea of a complete and concrete situation. We expect to know more about it. The meaning is complete when we hear some such thing as ‘I see a lotus in the pool.’ Hence the importance of the element of expectancy in a statement.

Similarly all words should be consistently used. A sentence devoid of consistency cannot be a means of right knowledge. ‘Fire burns hay’ is an instance of compactability, whereas ‘water burns the fuel’ is not.

The third quality for a secular statement is juxtaposition. The words are to be uttered one after the other till the sentence is complete. If the proposition ‘Bring me a ring’ is divided into three parts, and each part is uttered after every half an hour, it conveys no meaning, and so cannot be regarded as a verbal testimony. Isolated words do not convey sense. They are therefore not helpful.

The Nyāya-vaisēšika school also regards these three qualities as essential to a secular word’s serving as a source of right knowledge.
In this attempt to establish that the object of knowledge derived from verbal testimony is also qualified, Rāmānuja resorts to grammar and the theory of the origin of words. He seems to follow Śakaṭāyana and Yāska who hold that words originate from verbal roots. He then argues that every word is derived from the definite union of a root and an affix. Every suffix gives some specific character to the verb to which it is added. The suffix 'r' for instance, gives a particular shade of meaning to the verb 'Kr', and as a result we have the word 'Kartṛ' meaning a doer. This is true of all affixes added to verbal roots. The suffix 'man' in Brahman must, according to Rāmānuja, add some character to the root 'Bṛhi', and the word 'Brahman', the product of the union of the two, must necessarily stand for a qualified object. Hence according to verbal testimony too, the object of knowledge is qualified (saviśeṣa).

But some words originate from onomatopoeia, others from the union of two or more words or particles; still others are the results of haplography. Even the ancient philologist Gārgya whom Yāska, the author of the Nirukta, summarily dismisses, suggests that a word should not necessarily be derived from a verbal root. Yāska, Śakaṭāyana and Pāṇini seem, however, to lay special emphasis on action. In consequence, they hold that even substantives are based on verbs signifying action. Rāmānuja is in agreement with them.

Rāmānuja makes special use of verbal testimony in proving the existence of God. How can we know with our cogent logic a thing which transcends the sense-organs? The syllogistic arguments do not carry us further. The ācārya has, therefore, laid stress on verbal testimony. Like Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja has understood pratyakṣa and anumāna of the Brahma-sūtra as śruti and smṛti respectively, and in this respect both differ from the Naiyāyikas who understand the two terms as respectively signifying perception and inference.

Rāmānuja says that arguments are ineffectual inasmuch as they may be refuted by counter-arguments. Human arguments, he opines, are production of human intellect; and the arguments advanced by a person are liable to be refuted by another person. Rāmānuja therefore adheres to the scriptural testimony in matters of a transcendental nature. The arguments put forth to support the scriptural findings are, however, to be respected; and the ācārya has cited Manu in corroboration of the view.

It has already been seen how Rāmānuja has employed perception and inference to prove the determinate nature of the object of
knowledge. It remains to see how he employs the third source of knowledge i.e., the scriptural testimony, to prove the same. It may just be noted that, according to Rāmānuja, the scriptural testimony is the only infallible proof with regard to the nature of ultimate Reality. The scriptures tell us the truth,61 he says and adds that they are more affectionate even than thousands of parents.62 They teach us that ultimate Reality is qualified. The Chāndogya, for example, declares that It is existent (Sat)63; the Brhadāranyaka states that It is bliss (ānanda) and consciousness (jñāna)64; and the Taittirīya mentions that It is infinite (ānanta).65 If Reality were unqualified, as Śaṅkara holds, how then could It be thus predicated? A predicate qualifies and characterises the subject. The scriptures ascribe to Reality names such as Brahman, Bhūman; and the very naming presupposes characterisation. The word 'Brahman' suggests that It is great and It nurtures the creation.66 Reality is thus qualified. The denial of sattava, rajas and tamas to Reality is not a denial of Its essential qualities such as truth, consciousness, bliss and infinitude.
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48. अनुमानार्थांतिमान्तिमही।

(वयायुक्तम २ २ २)

49. यो ते वेदविद प्रह्लादित तत्सम।

(वेदवाद्यर)।

50. भाराध्यांगनार्थां प्रतिपादक वृद्धाकाम्। भाराध्यप्रतिपादकमुत्तरकाम्।

(यतीन्द्रम-दीपिका)

51. विविधविवाहक।

(वयायुक्तम २ २ ६४)

52. दितिष्ठांतुरायोगिदीपियं हन्योऽश्वायमर्थ चच्चेऽ।

(वेदवाद्यवंश, पृष्ठम् २४२)

53. क्षेत्रमेव ब बाणो बाणार्याण्ये वेदविदस्य रो वेदविदस्य परम्प्रायमः

वाच्चवाच्चवाच्चवाच्चवाच्च-अभिवाच्च-अभिवाच्च अवाच्च-अवाच्च अर्थात्

शास्त्र-शास्त्र-भाषायुविके एवेश्य अवाच्च-अवाच्च अर्थात्

(शीतांतम २ २ ४२)

54. (ब) प्रयोवेद-तत्संबंधियो - वोधकृत्त - शास्त्रवययशक्तित। - लक्ष्यावी भावस्य

शास्त्रसंबंध निषिद्धेय-वस्तु-वोधना-समाध्यायः

वोधकृत्त - प्रकृति-शरीरं वद्यवाच्च-विशेष-सामनाक्षमत्

(वेदविवाहमेक, पृष्ठम् २६४)

55. तत्व नामांवाच्चाज्ञातिति व्यक्तियो नैर्यत्तमाम्यशः

(विश्लेषम् १ ५)

56. न वर्षित्यिति गाएँ म: (वृष्टिकाम्)

57. (ब) रावने प्रत्या न्यायतमाण्यम् (वृष्टिकाम्)

(ब) कथं पुनर्वयमादं संरासनकाले परमत्वति? तत्वानामानामाय शुरू

स्वस्विद्यामध्यमोः

(शास्त्रभवाज्ञा ३ २ २४)

(स) रावने च संरासने सम्प्रति प्रीणमें भविष्यपने निषिद्धो एवायस्य

साताराकारो नायत्ति तत्तमतिश्रृंगाममहयो तत्तमतिश्रृंगाममहयो

(शीतांतम ३ २ ३)

58. (ब) दशवतरस्यवृद्धिप्रयालमाण्याने

(वृष्टिकाम् ४ २ २१)

(ब) विश्वत्प्रस्थानार्थाभाव-प्रमाणवः। वृद्धिवर्तें च न हसोऽन च बुधवर्म वृद्धि विश्वापमध्यमः शास्त्रोऽस्मात्

वाच्चवाच्चवाच्चवाच्चवाच्च-अभिवाच्च-अभिवाच्च अवाच्च-अवाच्च अर्थात्

(शीतांतम ४ २ २०)

59. वृद्धिवर्तें वृद्धिवर्तें वृद्धिवर्तें वृद्धिवर्तें वृद्धिवर्तें वृद्धिवर्तें वृद्धिवर्तें कृत्वा - पुथियामे विषयदकुचं - कृत्वाकर्षणामान्याया

तक्षक्षितिछुदानानांदलालिनांको

दुनिवारः (शीतांतम)

60. (ब) गार्तिनिद्र्यमेव शास्त्रविद प्रमाणम् (शीतांतम)

(ब) प्राप्तं ध्वासपदेयं च वेद-शास्त्रविदरूपिना वस्तंक्षरानुसंधने स ध्वासं वेद

नेतरः। (मनु: १ ३/१०६)
61. यथाभूतवादि हि शास्त्रम्

62. मातापितुभवेत्रं म्योपि वस्तुलतरं शास्त्रम्

63. सदेव सोम्येदम्य प्रासीत्तु (छाम्बोय्य ६. २. १)

64. विज्ञानमानसृं ब्रह्मा (बूढंदारण्यक ३. ६. ३४)

65. तत्त्वं ज्ञानमानसृं ब्रह्मा (भातिरीष २. १. १)

66. बूढंदारण्यकृ तृषु हृदा सर्वत्र यदृ पुर्ण ब्रह्मास्मितम्

तत्रै नमस्ते सर्वविद् प्रागैतिहासिकारिन्याः (विग्बुजुपुराणम् १. १२. ५५)
II
Cosmology

God, the efficient and the material cause—Evolutionary change in God’s modes—The process of evolution—Sense organs—Evolution of gross elements—The process of quintuplication—Rāmānuja’s rejection of the atomic theory—Advaita and Viśiṣṭādvaita—Sāṅkhya and Viśiṣṭādvaita—The ‘why’ of creation.

The question as to whence this universe came into being was under discussion even in the age of the Rgveda. How beautiful Viśvākarma Bhauvana’s interrogation is—“Where did the creator sit down to forge the creation and with what implements? Which was that forest and which was that tree of which the Deity made this world?”¹ The problem of the origin of this world seemed to be so intricate and insoluble at times that once Prajāpati, the author of the famous Nāsadiya-sūkta was compelled to own his defeat when he said, “Who can know the origin of this world, who can say? It is also doubtful whether the very Supervisor of this world in the highest heaven knows it or not.”²

The sages postulated a creator of the world. Many passages bearing on the theme can be cited from the scriptures.³ God is referred to as creator in the Gāyatrī text which is held to be the essence of the Vedas.⁴ The Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad says the same thing.⁵ The creator is termed as Puruṣa, Skambha, Brahman and so on. The Yajurveda says that this universe is the creation of Puruṣa.⁶ Atharva-veda says that Skambha has propped up the heaven and the earth, the intermediate space and the directions; and that He is pervading the creation.⁷ The Taittiriya Upaniṣad says that Brahman is that from which this universe comes out, wherein it stays and to which it goes back.⁸

The popular term for the creator is Īśvara (God). The followers of the Nyāya school hold that God is the efficient cause of the world and the atoms the material cause. Orthodox Sāṅkhya does not admit the existence of God and explains the problem of creation in terms of the natural evolution of Prakṛti (matter). Advaita Vedānta
holds that Brahman is non-differentiated being and explains creation with reference to the doctrine of super-imposition and illusion.

According to Rāmānuja, God is both the efficient and the material cause of the world. Both conscious souls and unconscious matter qualify Him. It is in matter supervised by God that the process of evolution and dissolution takes place. The souls and matter are modes (prakāra) of God who is Prakārin. The changes take place in God as prakāra, whereas God as prakārin remains changeless. In the case of the individual souls also the change does not relate to its essence but only means either contraction or expansion of consciousness. It is thus that Rāmānuja holds God to be both the efficient and the material cause of the creation.

The view of God as the material cause of the universe, one might object, amounts to holding that the evolutionary change of matter is a change in the essence (svarūpa-parināma) of God. This objection Rāmānuja meets with reference to his view that the evolutionary change takes place only in the mode of God, but not in God Himself. While elucidating the relation between the prakāra and the prakārin, the ācārya has conveniently used the terms of śārira (body) and śārinin (soul). He then argues that God may be both the efficient and material cause of the world just as a person (śārinin) is both the efficient and the material cause of the nails and hair growing in him.

God, according to Rāmānuja, unites within Himself the animate and the inanimate beings. All beings from Brahmā to a tuft of grass owe their existence to His will. It is under His guidance and supervision that inanimate matter starts, in the beginning of a kalpa, to project this cosmos. It is by His will that the universe revolves. God’s will is not, however, the will of a despot, but functions in accordance with the past deeds of the embodied souls.

God wills to be many, so that it is at His will that prakṛti begins to evolve. The primeval stage of matter is technically called ‘avyakta’ or unmanifest. Of the avyakta is born the ‘mahat-tattva.’ The ‘mahat-tattva’ produces ‘aṅkāra’ which is threefold—the sāttvika, rājas and tāmasa. They are called Vaikārika, Tajāsya and Bhūtabha respectively. Eleven organs emerge from the sāttvika aspect. They are ear, skin, eyes, tongue (as an organ of taste), nose, tongue (as an organ of speech), hands, feet, anus, the generative organ and mind. The first five are the organs of knowledge, because they enable the soul to know things. The next five are the organs
of action, because it is by means of them that the soul performs actions. The eleventh is the inner sense (manas or mind).

Rāmānuja admitted only five kinds of cognitive organs, but Śrīnivāsadāsa, a later scholar of Rāmānuja school, added mind to this list and thus admitted six kinds of them. When an individual soul departs, Rāmānuja says, it is accompanied by the mind and the five sense-organs. But he did not subscribe to the view that the conative organs too accompany the departing soul. In this Rāmānuja stands upon the authority of the Gītā which clearly states that the departing soul is accompanied by six organs only. But Śrīnivāsadāsa held that all the eleven organs accompany the soul at its departure from one body to another. Vasudeva Śāstri, a commentator on Yatindramata-dipikā, has tried to interpret Rāmānuja in the light of Śrīnivāsadāsa’s view by stating that the action-organs, like the sense organs, accompany the soul at demise. The Gītā is indeed in favour of the view that only the six sense-organs accompany the soul when it leaves one body for another, a view which Rāmānuja endorses. But the Brhadāranyaka speaks of the departing soul’s being accompanied by eleven organs. As regards the number of the organs in a living being, Rāmānuja also mentions it to be eleven. There is a topic in the Brahmasūtra on the number of the organs, and both Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja are at one in interpreting it by holding that the organs are eleven and that they are subtle.

Mind is the eleventh organ. It receives different names according as its functions. It is called ‘buddhi’ when it decides, ‘aḥāṅkāra’ when it misconceives, and ‘citā’ when it thinks. Both Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja agreed on this point. Mind is auxiliary to knowledge. A soul knows an object with the help of mind. All the synonyms as well as the different phases of cognition are, therefore, used to denote mind metaphorically or in a secondary sense. The Veda says that mind is knowledge (pra-jñāna), cognition (cetas), and substratum (dhṛti); and adds that it is the internal, immortal light. It is said to be located in the heart, and is regarded as very speedy or rather the speediest of all things. It is also pointed out that nothing can be done without its assistance. It is difficult to put it under restraint, and it impels people to action through its manifold active phases, just as an adept coach sets in motion the horses through the reins held by him.


The tāmasa aḥāṅkāra produces the tanmātra of sound from which comes ether. Ether produces the tanmātra of touch whence
comes air. Air produces the tanmātra of colour which in its turn produces light. Light produces the tanmātra of taste from which emerges water. Water produces the tanmātra of smell which gives rise to earth. This process of evolution is different from that admitted by Sāṅkhya in this that according to the latter the tāmasa ahaṅkāra produces the five tanmātrās which in their turn produce respectively the five elements.

*Triplication is the work of Para Brahman.*

Triplication (trivṛtkaraṇa) of the elements is not the work of Brahmā, says Rāmānuja. Brahmā is himself born of the cosmic egg which is a conglomeration of triplicated matter. The triplication is, therefore, the work of Para Brahman. The Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha equates Brahmā with cosmic mind 'which has imagined the world idea'. 'The Brahmā creates the world through his imaginative activity with the freedom and skill of an artist.' But, according to Rāmānuja, the cosmic egg is produced by God (Para Brahma) through the triplication of the elements which he brought into existence beforehand. Earth, water and light are unable to produce anything before triplication. It is only after the elements are mixed that they can produce anything. This intermixture is suggestive of quintuplication also, according to Yatindramatadipīka.

*The process of Quintuplication.*

Veṅkaṭanātha says that having evolved the five elements, God divided each into two parts. He keeps one part intact and divides the other into four. The four sub-divisions of one element are then mixed with one each of the major divisions of the other elements. All the five elements thus intermixed are called quintuplicated (pañcikrta). The following tables will make the process clear:

**FIRST STEP**

Elements in their entirety.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SECOND STEP**

Elements divided into equal halves

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Third Step

One half of each element is kept aside, whereas the second half is sub-divided into four parts.

Fourth and the final Step

Four smaller parts of each element are mixed with the greater part of the other four elements. For instance, the first smaller part of ether will go to the greater part of air; the second smaller part will go to the greater part of light; the third smaller part will go to the greater part of water; and the fourth smaller part will go to the greater part of ether. After ether has been divided, air will be divided in the same way. Then the turn of light will come; then that of air; and lastly that of earth. Thus the scheme of quintuplication would be complete.

The universe is made up of quintuplicated elements. But then it may be asked: why do we call water water and light light, when they contain certain percentage of other elements also? The reply is this. In each conglomerated element one particular element predominates; hence a particular name is given to each.

Colour in Ether

According to Viśiṣṭādvaita, colour exists in ether too inasmuch as the process of quintuplication puts the element of light into it. The appearance of blue colour in the sky is thus explained.

Direction not a separate category

Unlike the followers of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, the Viśiṣṭādvaita does not admit Direction (Dik) as a separate category. The latter explains the existence of Dik with reference to ether by stating that it is caused by the movement of the sun.

Rāmānuja's Rejection of the Atomic Theory

Rāmānuja is opposed to the atomic theory. Gotama and Kaṇāda seem to be silent on the question of the nature of the creation and dissolution of the universe, but later writers belonging to their schools have dealt with this question. They believe in God as the creator of the universe. It is the will of God that sets the atoms on functioning in the beginning. Combination of two atoms results in a diad. Three diads are formed into a 'trasareṇu', and four such trasareṇus are formed into a caturāṇuṇa, and their further combination results in grosser things of innumerable variety. But Rāmānuja
states that the view of Kaṇāda must be rejected by those who aim at the highest bliss. He says—just as Śaṅkara had done before—that the followers of the Vedic tradition have not accepted the atomic theory of creation.38

A Contrast between Advaita and Viṣṇu-Advaita.

According to Advaita, the ears, skin, eyes, tongue and nose are produced separately, in an order of succession, from the sattva particles of ether, air, fire, water and earth.39 The combined sattva particulars of the elements produce intellect and mind.40 The organs of speech, the hands, the feet and the organs of evacuation and generation are produced separately, in an order of succession, from the rajas particulars of ether, air, fire, water and earth.41 The combined rajas particles of the elements produce the five vital airs.42 This process differs very much from that of Viṣṇu-Advaita, as will be clear from the following tables:—
COSMOLOGY ACCORDING TO ADVAITA VEDANTA

BRAHMAN

Five Elements

Uncompounded

Sattva Aspect

(Relatively)

Ears, Skin, Eyes, Tongue, Nose

Rajas Aspect

(Intellect, Mind)

Ether

Or rather:

Air

Compounded

Fire

Water

Earth

Ether

Air

Fire

Water

Earth

(Separately)

Organ of Speech

(Combined)

Plus

Organ of evacuation generation

Prāṇa, Apāṇa, Samāna, Udāna, Vyāna

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RAMANuja
*COSMOLOGY ACCORDING TO SĀNKHYA SYSTEM

MATTER

INTELLECT

EGO

Sāttvika Aspect

Ears | Skin | Eyes | Tongue | Nose | Organ of speech | Hands | Feet | Organ of evacuation generation | Mind

Tāmasa Aspect

Tanmātrās of

Sound | Touch | Sight | Taste | Smell

Gross ether | Gross air | Gross fire | Gross water | Gross earth

*According to śāṅkhyā-kārikā.
†COSMOLOGY ACCORDING TO VISISTADVAITA

MATTER

INTELLECT

EGO

Sattvika Aspect

Tamas Aspect

Ears
Skin
Eyes
Tongue
Nose
Organ of speech
Hands
Feet
Organ of evacuation generation

Mind

Sound-tanmātrā

Ether

Touch-tanmātrā

Air

Colour-tanmātrā

Fire

Taste-tanmātrā

Water

Smell-tanmātrā

Earth

†According to Yatindra-mata-dipikā.
**Rāmānuja's difference from Saṅkhya View**

According to Rāmānuja, matter evolves under the supervision of God, whereas the Saṅkhya does not postulate His existence. Even a theist should not hold, a follower of Saṅkhya would argue, that nature evolves under God's supervision, because God is regarded by the scriptures as incapable of any action.\(^{43}\) If the supervisor is a propeller, a question would arise: 'Is God a propeller of matter through His own activity or simply by His proximity? The first alternative cannot hold good, for there is no activity in God, as the follower of Saṅkhya would urge. The second alternative too, is, according to Saṅkhya, equally unsound, for in that case even a donkey, for example, may be regarded as a propeller in the case of the origin of a pitcher. The adherent to Saṅkhya, therefore, holds that just as a cow's or a mother's milk flows on, by itself, for the sake of a calf or a child; similarly unconscious matter unfolds itself without external influence, for the emancipation of the puruṣas.\(^{44}\) To this Rāmānuja objects that no non-intelligent thing can produce an effect in the absence of an intelligent guiding agent. Wood for instance cannot form itself into the shape of a house or a conveyance without the agency of a carpenter.\(^{45}\) Although some instances may be shown where the non-intelligent matter seems at first sight to work of itself, yet a deeper insight would reveal the controlling influence of an intelligent principle.\(^{46}\) In cases such as water coming down from the clouds, one may indeed say that non-intelligent water works of itself; but such a statement would be wrong, because, as Rāmānuja reminds, the scriptures teach us that God indwells and controls water and so on.

**The 'Why' of Creation.**

Just as an individual creates dreams to fulfil his wishes, similarly, according to the Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha, the Cosmic Mind creates the objective world to fulfil Its will, for 'the law of evolution of rise of an objective world is the same in the case of a dream........or of the rise of a cosmos!'\(^{47}\) The existence of cosmos is ascribed by Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha to the creative activity of Brahmā; but 'the rise of Brahmā in the ocean of Brahman' has been stated to be the most mysterious fact.\(^{48}\)

The Rgveda reveals that God created the world as it had been before.\(^{49}\) Bādarāyaṇa favours the view and maintains that the names and forms of this world are the same as in the previous creation.\(^{50}\) According to Rāmānuja, the Supreme Person remembers, at the termination of dissolution, the constitution of the preceding universe, wills
to become manifold and creates the world. The process of creation and dissolution goes on repeating itself Kalpa after Kalpa. There is no end of this cycle. He is the Lord of all, yet he has engaged Himself in the work of creation. The motive which prompts Him is nothing but sport (līla). He fashions the universe by His mere will. He is busy in the affairs of the world just as a great ruler arranges a game at balls simply for his amusement. The creation is manifold. There are beings of various types—high, middle and low. But God is not open to the charge of cruelty and partiality, Rāmacūḍa says, because inequality of creation depends upon the deeds of individual souls. On this point there is agreement between Śaṅkara and Rāmacūḍa.
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८. यतो वा इच्छायं तत्त्वाति यापने ये तत्त्वा जाताति जीवनि तत्त्वा प्रयौति मेंतियं विषिताति तदृ विजिजातस्व तदृ ब्रह्मा। (तैतिर्य ३. १)

९. मद्या प्रकृति: सल्यसपन्नेन मयाध्येजो दिता सत्याचारं जगात्स्याते।
(गीतायान्त रामाभूमि ६. १०)

१०. प्रत: प्रकृतिप्रकार-संडियते परमात्मानि प्रकारमूलकण्ययो विकार:।
प्रकारे शे चाविकार:। (वेदांवसंहारः)

११. (अ) एवमृतमृणमृवामातस्माकमातमल्लकूलका स्त्राव्या स्वाभिकस्यापि करमेणा पारमार्थिकं संकोचं विकारस्तु च भ्रुवितम्। (वेदांवसंहारः पुष्टम् ७०)
(ब) शानाणां संवर्दी-मुराना। कर्मस्यामानि संकुचितानि परं ज्योतिः संवर्दी
कर्मवर्धनये वकारस्तुपरम्परावभवि आ नानापपन:। (सन्धाम्यम् ४. ४. ३)

१२. न निष्ठ्यिततायातरानं ब्रह्म, नवादानकराणं च ब्रह्मवः। (सन्धाम्यम् १. ४. २१)

१३. Mm. Gauriśankara Hirācanda Ojha in his book 'Madhyakalina Bhāratīya Samskṛti' has erroneously attributed to Rāmānuja the view that God is only the efficient cause of the universe, while the jivas are its material cause (vide page 97 of his book).

१४. तत्-सरसा रूपतमिंदिन्त्य राजनेन्द्रयम्। तत्प्रान्ता मनोऽवनबहुवांशुरसनात्
स्त्रम्मेदात्। (तत्त्वसंदर्भतीपि ४)

१५. मनस्यावशो जीवकोके जीवयूत: सत्तान:।
मनः-पदतानीमिन्त्रशीला प्रकृतिज्ञाति कर्मिति (गीता १५. ७)
जीवमृतवस्तज्जुधितां-जानावर्ध:। कर्मलक्ष-प्रकृतिपरिशामिवायस्य-शारीरस्मानी-
मिन्त्रियां:। मनः-पदतानीस्वाभितस्तिनि कर्मनुवशायनतं:। कर्मिति (गीतायान्त रामाभूमि १५. ७)
न सत्तेनारित्तिर्याति, भवि तु एकादशया:....ग्नुवयमीवेदस्तु तत्-तत् विविधत-
गमनादिकार्याविवेकप्रयुक्ता:। (सन्धाम्यम् २. ४. ५)
कर्मभावायो:। जीवेन साक्ष न गच्छितु। (वेदान्तसल्लेप-प्रकाशः)

१६. परकारस्यावेशो लोकार्थगमनाशिवू च जीवेन सह मनमिदीन्त्रयालाम्।। कर्मनदी-
यासाः शारीरनात्मानं इति पक्षस्तु माध्याप्रितवर्षेन नेवः।। (मयौद्यमंत्रतीपि ४)

१७. ब्रह्मव भाषो संप्रदायिकरणे हस्तादीनां जीवेन सह मनमिदीन्त्रियावलीभिः
सिद्धातितमू। हस्तादीनि कर्मनिद्रायथोपि जीवेन साक्ष गच्छन्देव न तु विनय-
न्तोत्ति तद्यायः। (प्रकाश-टीका, पुष्ट ३६)

१८. (ब्रह्मचार्यम् ४. ६. ४)

१९. न सत्तेनारित्तिर्याति दिशाद्विमयां जीवेन तथो भोगो-
पकर्षणं अकार्यमेदात्चः। (सन्धाम्यम् ४. ५. ४)
20. (३) उत्क्रान्त्याविद्य पर्वतभूमि रणपलयभयावसायस्वप्न प्रायः ?

(स्रीभाष्यम् २. ४. ५)

(६) तत्त्वावधिकारश्रव्य प्रायः : शब्दसंकल्पविकृतिनि सिद्धम् (२. ४. ६. ब्रह्मसूत्रे शांकरभाष्यम्)

(४) तत्त्वात्मथम: परिभेषणाहिं। प्रायः इत्यभवस्वयमः (२. ५. ६. ब्रह्मसूत्रे शांकरभाष्यम्)

21. साधनवाचस्मिन्नार्थावति प्रक्रिया षट्याणिव मनस्तेत्तथा ब्रजविवेकाचारितविम्बकविकृतिम्।

(स्रीभाष्यम् २. ४. ५)

22. सर्वोत्तरविद्या। तैतत्त्ववत्तिति मनस्तेत्तथा वचारितविम्बकविकृतिम्। तदेव वृत्तिनेदात् वचारितविम्बकविकृतिम्।

(स्रीभाष्यम् २. ४. ६. ब्रह्मसूत्रे शांकरभाष्यम्)

23. यज्ञास्तिक्षुस्व चेततः सुविदाश्रव्यं मनस्तेत्तथा सर्वदीर्घविम्बकविकृतिम्।

(यज्ञवांश तत्रलोक ३. ४. ३)

24. हुत्त्वत्तिष्ठम्…………………

(पुवोक्तम " ३२. ६)

25. ज्योतिरम्

(पुवोक्तम " ३२. ६)

26. यज्ञवांश श्रद्धा किचन करम् किनयते

(पुवोक्तम " ३२. ६)

27. शुपपरिष्काराविव वनमण्डलस्मिन्नायतेपितीत्विम्बाविजिनः इव। (पुवोक्तम " ३२. ६)

28. राजसांहारकार-सहस्रादुपुरुषसंसहितामयंसहारकारायणविवजिन्य-हङ्गमाण्यायः-कान्ताण्तपंच महाभूतानि श्रीविज्ञाते इत्यादि। (यज्ञवांशतदार्थावति " २. ३२)

भूतादित्रस्य विजुरावेद: शब्दत्वमार्गे ततः। सत्वेऽवेद: शब्दत्वमार्गावति शब्दत्वमार्गः।

शब्दमार्गं तथाकारं भूतादित्रस्य समायोऽस्तु। प्राकाशसु विकृतिवार्ष्यविकृतिम्। शब्दमार्गं तथाकारं भूतादित्रस्य समायोऽस्तु।

इत्यादि (सांक्यकारिका " २)

29. उत्तत्त्वः पंचमृतातिनि

(सांक्यकारिका " २२)

तत्त्वावधिकारश्रव्यं वाक्यपातकः: पंचभूतान्याश्चाराणातीति।

तथा शब्दमार्गावति शब्दमुक्तमः। शब्दमार्गावति शब्दमार्गावति शब्दमार्गावति शब्दमार्गावति शब्दमार्गावति शब्दमार्गावति। (उप्रत्व-कारिकार्यं तत्त्वादिकोभद्री)

30. वनिक्षेपनं चतुर्मुखोग्नाधिपतिनि स सम्भवितः, वनिक्षेपकृतैः जीवनकः ब्रह्मान्द-मुक्तताः।

चतुर्मुखोग्नाधिपतिनि स सम्भवितः, वनिक्षेपकृतैः जीवनकः ब्रह्मान्द-मुक्तताः। (स्रीभाष्यम् २. ४. १५)

31. The Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha and Its Philosophy (page 71).

32. चतुर्मुखोक्तिवर्षेदाहस कुप्प्यकाराचारणस्याल्पाक्ष्यम्। (यज्ञवांशतदार्थावति " ४)
33. (०) पंचीकरण सप्तीकरणं च पुराणप्रसंजडम्। (सिद्धान्तशास्त्रवंशम् पृष्ठ ४२)
(१) इत्यव च सप्तीकरणौकेदासः: पंचीकरणं तदेकदेशवित्वस्तुकरंगमिति न परस्पर-शास्त्रः:
(पुरोक्तमूलम् पृष्ठ ५४)
(२) इत्यव पंचीकृतं सप्तोकुट्टवं तत्त्वज्ञानार्थमं देहातुवालिकथा (पुरोक्तमूलम्)
34. इत्या भूतानि भिल्ला पुरारितं च भिन्नितिः मेकं चतुर्गृहं, तेहःकैकिस्य भानि:
परमथेष्वावरणमेकं "मद्यं" चतुर्मिः; इत्यव पंचीकृतस्तैत्तर्यानिति स जगः तुवालिकाधिकाय-शोद्धयं: निभुवः तत्त्वालिकौपरामसमकानिरोद्धम्। (तत्त्वमुलताकालयः)
१. १६)
35. वैधेष्यातु पदार्थात्: (बहुसंस्कृतम् २. ४. १६)
36. नीति नम इति प्रतीतः: पंचीकरणप्रकियया रूपावधश। (यतीन्द्रमत्तीपिका ५)
37. सूप-परिपस्रिविनिविराजकाशावेय प्राच्याविविख्यारोपपती न पृथ्वी इत्यक्तपत्नम्।
(पुरोक्तमूलम्)
38. (०) कापिलाश्यल पुर्वयाव्यविशेष-परिपरिवत्स्यापि सत्कार्यावादादिना कथमित्वसे
बौद्ध: परिपरिवहितं, प्रथम तु कायाद्वस्त्र केनायथोनेन्द्रियाहारादुपनन
त्वाचालयन्यमनमपेशेव निःवेवसाधिकू: कायाः।
(आयूष्मायम् २. २. १६)
(१) इति तु परमायू-कारण-वादो न कृषिविद्य पि शार्ट: केनिद्वियाध्येन परिगृहोहित
हथान्तमेवादानाद्वैतीयो वेदविद्विभ:।। (२. २. १७) बहुसूर्खे
शाकरामायम्।
39. एतत्त्वाकाशादीनां साधिकांकायो व्यत्तेष्यः: पृथ्वी-पृथ्वी ऋमेरोश्वाचाते
(वेदान्तत्सार ६४०)
40. एते पुरानाकाशावादत्व-साधिकांकायो मिलितेश्व उत्प्रवचनान्
(पुरोक्तमूलम् ७०)
41. एतत्त्व (कम्बित्वाणिए) पुरानाकाशादीनां रजयोश्वायो व्यत्तेश्वः: पृथ्वी-पृथ्वी
केनायथोश्वाचाते। (वेदान्तत्सार ७६)
42. एतत्त्वाकार्य-पंचकामाकार्यार्थित-रजयोश्वायो मिलितेश्व उत्प्रवचनान्
(पुरोक्तमूलम् ८७)
43. कार्यादित्व इति कार्यादि: सगो महादिश्चु: प्रकृतयव भूते नेवरवेऽः। नेवरवाधिकृतकृत्तुनिर्यावादित्वादृभावमबाद।
(सांब्यकारिका ५६)
44. वस्त्रविभिन्ननिमित्तं कःरस्य यथा प्रभृतिरजस्य, पुरास्यविभिन्ननिमित्तं कःरस्य तथा
प्रभृति: प्रथानस्य। (सांब्यकारिका ५०)
45. दायदिरेत्तनस्य तज्ज्वाधिकृतत्वस्य कार्यार्थमामात्वसुद्धारीकथा तत्त्वाधिकृतत्वस्य
कार्यार्थमामात्वसुद्धारीकथा न प्राणाधिकृतं प्रथानं कारणं (आयूष्मायम् २. २. १)
46. यत् कार्यावादी दुर्गात्तत्वया निर्दिष्टं तत्त्वादि प्राणाधिकृतामेव प्रभृतिनां उपस्थापते
यथा मृत्निस्वावदिशुः।। (आयूष्मायम् २. २. २)
47. Yoga-Vasiṣṭha and Its Philosophy (page 62).
48. Ibid (page 72).
49. भाषा यथापूर्वमकल्पनेतृत्र्
   (श्रीमयै: १०. १५०. १)
50. समाननाम-सम्पत्तिवचनावृत्तामपविरोधो दर्शनालु स्मृतेश्च। (श्रीमयैशुमि १. २. २६)
51. स सत्यं सुद्धा समीक्षन सामान्ये पूर्वसंवधानं जगत् स्मरन् बहुः स्मार्थितिः संकल्पः
   महाद्वादि-श्रीमयैशु विशेषान्यप्रेषस्त यथापुरुषस्मृतवा
   (श्रीमयैशुमि १. ३. २)
52. श्रवणसमस्तकामस्य परिपुर्णस्य.......सर्व लीलेव प्रयोजनमः।
   (श्रीमयैशुमि २. १. ३३)
53. सूक्तमण्डलेकन्तक-कर्मसापेक्षान्वितिः
   (श्रीमयैशुमि २. १. ३४)
54. सापेक्षे हीवरो विषमा सूक्तं स्मिरितो | किमपेक्षात् इति चेदु विभंगविभेदनेति
   इति वदाम्। प्रति: सूक्तमण्डलामध्यममपिता विषमा सूक्तिं मिश्रित्तिः नायमीशवर-स्मार्थरः
   (२. १. ३४ श्रीमयैशुमि शाक्तभाष्यम्)
III

Ethics

Action, knowledge and devotion—Disinterestedness and equanimity—No forbidden action is to be done—Renunciation of acts springing out of desire—Action necessary at all stages of life—knowledge—Devotion—Śaṅkara on actions—The four kinds of action—Yajñā etc. are not to be relinquished—permission to eat prohibited food only for self-preservation—Assumption of a child's attitude—faithful discharge of duties is worship of God.

When a man comes to know that worldly pleasures are but transitory and mixed with pain, he loses interest in them, and tries to have a different form of pleasure from a higher plane, specially divine; and with a view to attaining it, he has recourse to the various sacrificial rites ordained in the Vedas. These elaborate rites, it is believed, lead the soul to the paradise of Indra, the abode of pleasures. These pleasures are undoubtedly superior to those of this world, but they are also transitory. For one is bound to return from Indra's paradise. A wise man is therefore not inclined towards such rituals which are the causes of re-birth.

The scriptures have suggested three means of attaining salvation—action, knowledge and devotion. For Rāmānuja, the last is the principal one; and the former two, its auxiliaries.

The essence of the theory of action as taught in the Gītā is that whatever action a man performs should be performed disinterestedly i.e., without aiming at the consequences. Duty is to be done for duty's sake, and not for the sake of any reward to be had here or hereafter. All actions have their appropriate consequences, but wise are those who are neither puffed up at their success, nor dejected at their failure. One who can receive success and failure with equanimity is a man of right action. It is not for us to look forward to the result; we are only to work, regardless of consequences. No forbidden action is to be undertaken, because it makes the mind impure. Acts springing out of desire (kāmya karma) are to be renounced; but sacrifices, charity and austerity are not to be relinquished. They are to be performed so long as the body persists. It is a wrong idea that man can attain salvation by giving up all actions. Action
is necessary at all stages of life. Without action life would not be worth living. An action performed in obedience to God will not produce bondage. On the contrary, such an action will please God, and produce perfection for the agent.

Knowledge consists in the correct understanding of the difference between the body and the soul. The body is an effect of prakṛti which is always changing, whereas the soul (puruṣa) is changeless. Both prakṛti and puruṣa are without beginning. The soul enlivens the body just as the sun illumines the world. The three guṇas—sattva, rajas and tamas—constitute prakṛti; hence they belong to the physical side and not to the spiritual. When the soul rises above the influence of these three guṇas, it enjoys immortality. A man who follows the path of knowledge is never disturbed by outward happenings. For him, pleasure and pain are alike. He does not aspire after praise, nor does he dread censure. He does not care for honour or dishonour, because he is firmly established within himself.

Devotion is saturated through and through with love. Every man has a desire to love and to be loved. This inborn inclination towards love results in limited pleasure. But if it is directed to the Supreme Being, it results in unlimited and endless happiness. God is to be loved as a father, a mother, a friend or a lord. He responds in an appropriate manner to whatever relation man establishes with HIM. The love that changes with changing circumstances is not true love, but selfishness. In true love there is no expectation of any reward. The true devotee cannot but love the lord. Those who love worldly things and the Lord simultaneously are persons whose love is only partial. Even such partial love is, however, better than no love. But when compared with pure, divine love, it pales into insignificance. God is Himself love concrete. He cannot ignore the devotion of a devotee. He welcomes even such an humble thing as a leaf, a flower, a fruit or water offered with devotion. The invisible God reveals His glorious, divine form to the devotee in all mercy, and grants him fellowship in His celestial abode from where there is no return to this world of misery.

According to Advaita Vedānta, action primarily purifies the mind, and devotion contributes to its concentration. Secondly, their result is the attainment of Pitrloka and Satyaloka respectively. But the veil of ignorance is removed only by true knowledge. Salvation, as Advaita Vedānta holds, can therefore be attained only through knowledge and not through action and devotion. The 'prog-
resive release' (Krama-mukti) which a devotee attains is not the
final aim of the scriptures. It is merely a stage preparatory to the
final identification of the individual with Brahman. At the dawn of
ture knowledge, a devotee attains salvation along with his deity viz.
Hiranyagarbha.18 The Krama-mukti resulting from devotion to the
lower Brahman is thus only subsidiary, whereas the 'quick release'
(sadyo-mukti) consequent upon the knowledge of higher Brahman
is primary. Devotion cannot then lead to salvation in the strictest
sense. Similarly, as Advaita holds, action can only help an aspirant
in purifying his mind, but cannot be a direct means to his emanci-
pation. The scriptures have prescribed action, according to Śaṅkara,
only for those who are still labouring under ignorance (avidyā).19
Actions are to be performed only until true knowledge dawns. They
have no value for a man of knowledge just as the digging of a well
has no value for a man who finds himself in the midst of a deluge.20
A man desirous of an empire does not make any effort to obtain a
farm.21 The various actions viz those that are to be performed ever-
day, those that are accidental and those that are desired are for a man
of knowledge as futile as the prohibited ones.22 The absolute cessa-
tion of transmigration (samsāra) is possible only in sannyāsa which
means renunciation of all actions.23 Knowledge alone is conducive
to real happiness. Even knowledge in connection with action (jñāna-
karma-samuccaya) is of no avail with regard to the attainment of
final liberation.24 The alternative view on sannyāsa and tyāga and
the preference for karma-yoga as expressed in the Gītā holds good,
according to Śaṅkara, only in the case of those who tread the path of
action and not those who have chosen the way of knowledge.25 Not
only those who follow the path of action, but also those who devote
themselves to the task of placating God are said, according to Śaṅkara,
to be living in the darkness of avidyā.26

Rāmānuja however differs from Śaṅkara. According to him,
action promotes devotion, and so it should be performed even by a
man of knowledge so long as he is alive.27 For a man who is quali-
fied to pursue jñāna-yoga, Rāmānuja says, karma-yoga has superior
advantage over jñāna-yoga, because the former is easy to perform.
One is to perform actions till the goal is not reached—salvation is
not attained.

Bādarāyana held1 that the highest benefit (puruṣārtha) accrues
to a person from vidyā and not from action.28 Rāmānuja has the
same view, and while commenting upon Brahma-sūtra 3.4.1. quotes
from the Upaniṣads such passages as 'A man of knowledge reaches
the Highest.\textsuperscript{29}\ But he holds that Bādarāyaṇa only expresses here his difference from Jaimini who held that a man is most benefitted by action.\textsuperscript{30}\ And he adds that the word ‘Vidya’ used by Bādarāyaṇa means meditation upon, and devotion to, God.\textsuperscript{31}

On the view of Rāmānuja, knowledge is only a means of redemption, so that it requires the co-operation of different kinds of action. He compared knowledge to a horse which, though a means of conveyance for his master, requires attendants, grooming etc. The horse will, of course, carry its rider, but a smooth riding requires certain actions on the part of the rider.\textsuperscript{32}\ Action is manifold—the daily (nitya), the accidental (naimittika), the desired (kāmya) and the prohibited (pratiṣiddha). That a man of piety should eschew what is prohibited by the scriptures e.g. stealing and lying goes without saying. Again, such a man has, really, no liking for them; he also gives up those actions whose origin lies in desires. To give up such actions is called renunciation which is an essential characteristic of the religious aspirant.\textsuperscript{33}\ The daily duties, however, such as ablution and oblation and the accidental ones such as bath at the time of lunar and solar eclipses are to be performed. The sacrifices, alms-giving and austerities tend to purify man and hence they are not to be relinquished.\textsuperscript{34}\ One should cultivate the habit of remaining calm, subdued, satisfied, patient and collected.\textsuperscript{35}

It may not be out of place to note that Rāmānuja agrees with Bādarāyaṇa in putting no restriction on food to be taken by the religious aspirant. A man of wisdom, according to him, may eat even prohibited food, but he may do so provided that such food is absolutely needed for his self-preservation.\textsuperscript{36}\ The ācārya has mentioned the case of UŚasti, a prominent theologian, who ate prohibited food to save himself from the ravages of a famine, but who eventually refrained from drinking prohibited water when the right kind of water was available elsewhere.

Rāmānuja holds that the duties relating to various āśramas also are to be discharged by a man of wisdom,\textsuperscript{37}\ because karma contributes to vidyā. In this respect he differs from Śaṅkara who affirms that there is no necessity of karma for a man of knowledge.

If rightly done, action is not detrimental to final beatitude. Not only the daily and the accidental actions but also the desired ones can procure emancipation, provided the agent surrenders his agency to the divinity.\textsuperscript{38}\ Such actions as the construction of temples, laying out flower-gardens, sweeping sacred places, plucking and gathering
flowers for the worship of God procure perfection for the agent; and by perfection Rāmānuja means communion with God.39

Learning is good, but no unnecessary stress is to be laid upon it. It is to be given up at some stage or another, and the attitude of a child is to be assumed, says Rāmānuja in agreement with some of the teachings of the Upaniṣads and Bādarāyana. But what is the nature of a child's attitude? Rāmānuja replies that it is an attitude devoid of pride and arrogance. It is however only the absence of pride etc. that should be aimed at by an aspirant and not the child's wilful behaviour which is prohibited by the scriptures.40 Control of speech is another special feature of the life of a man of knowledge or devotion, who is accordingly called a muni.41

All these actions are auxiliaries to the religious way of life in more or less the same sense as are the duties pertaining to the āstāmasas. The Lord has said that faithful discharge of one's own duties is itself the worship of God.42
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THE PHILOSOPHY OF RAMANUJA

मवि संवेश्त-कृत्वात्वादिकः कुष्ठामो मल्लवादः चाणास्तं पदमभवमविकल्यः प्राप्तिः।
(गौतमां रामानुजमभायम् १०. ५६)

39. मविनां कर्मायांलयनिर्माणानकर्षणांप्रदीपारोपणां-मार्जनां-अम्बुकामःपशुपती-पुष्पारुषारुपजनोद्वृतुः-नाम-कीर्तनप्रकाशानमस्कारसुधारिनं तात्तव्यं-प्रियनेताचर। 
...मवि सिरां चित्रस्थितिं सवव्या मल्लाव्यंहूपं सचिन-मवास्यसि।
(गौतमां रामानुजमभायम् १२. १०)

40. (प्र) तस्माद ब्रह्माण्डः पाणियं सिवव्य बाल्वेन सिवीतस्य।
(बुधारायक ३. १)

(प्र) ध्रुवाके प्रनाशुगुन्ततारतु।
(ब्रह्मानुम् ३. ४. ४६)

(प्र) बालस्य ब्रह्मण्डानानिविकर्षणं कर्मं ततुपालानो कर्त्तं विधानं।
(ब्रह्मानुम् ३. ४. ४६)

41. (प्र) मीनविद्वायामकषुद्धवेशातु।
(ब्रह्मानुम् ३. ४. ४६)

(प्र) प्रति: शुद्धकृतमु यज्ञादिविविधायम्यंगम्यं-मौनतूव्यियोः-पाणियंविविहारकार-विद्यते विपद्यते।
(ब्रह्मानुम् ३. ४. ४६)

42. (प्र) वतो भूतानुमुनयं विद्वायां क्रदलितीयं च सर्वमिदं तत्स्वमिदं तस्कवमेत।
(प्र) माहिस्वद्राष्ट्रारस्तवावताकपातमंधत्यं मल्लवादमत्वसारित्वं सिद्धि
कित्वं मानवः।
(गौतमां-रामानुजमभायम् १५. ४६)

(प्र) ब्रह्मविष्णुप्रतीयमानव्यायामन्यंगम्यं-मौनतूव्यियं-तस्कवमेत।
(ब्रह्मानुम् ३. ४. २२)
IV
Ontological Categories

Matter—Time—Pure essence—Consciousness—souls—God.

God is one and without a second, the scriptures say. But this according to Rāmānuja, does not mean the non-existence of individual souls and matter. What it really means is that there is only one God and that He is matchless. Yāmuna had argued in his Siddhi-traya on these lines, and Rāmānuja agreed with him. The philosophy of Rāmānuja is a philosophy of devotion; and devotion is possible only when a devotee has an object of devotion before him. Rāmānuja established the non-duality of ultimate Reality by arguing that God has all the cit (conscious) element and the acit (non-conscious) stuff as His modes (prakāra or śeṣa), but he made it quite clear that individual souls, matter and God have their own peculiar qualities by virtue of which they remain distinct from one another. While dealing with the ontological aspect of Rāmānuja's philosophy, we are therefore required to notice in particular that the Ācārya believed in three principles viz., the cit or conscious souls, the acit or unconscious matter and Iśvara. The author of the Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha has cited a verse epitomising these categories. Cit is many in number and is of three types—the bound, the emancipated and the eternal. Acit is the unconscious principle characterised by three gunas—Sattva, rajas and tamas. Iśvara is the Almighty who rules over all from within and without.

In place of the two terms employed by Rāmānuja viz. cit and acit meaning respectively the individual souls and matter, Veṅkaṭanātha has preferred to use ‘ajaḍa’ (non-inert) and ‘jaḍa’ (inert) respectively. The latter terms have been more in use especially in the writings of later Viśiṣṭādvaitins such as Anantārya and Śrīnivāsadāsa. According to Veṅkaṭanātha, substance is twofold—inert and non-inert. The
following table will give a more comprehensive idea of the various kinds of substances:
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It is clear from the above table that Venkaṭanātha divided substance (dravya) into six, namely, matter (Prakṛti), time (kāla), pure essence (suddha sattva), consciousness (jñāna), soul (jīva) and God (Īśvara). Anantārya is of the same opinion and Śrīnivāsadasa has also admitted all these categories.

An inert (jāda) substance is that which is not self-illumined, but is twofold—matter (Prakṛti) and time (kāla). Matter is beginningless, but subject to mutation. Sattva, rajas and tamas are its three qualities—the qualities which induce men to act. At the end of a Kalpa, all movable and immovable things enter into prakṛti which is then undifferentiated. Again, at the beginning of a new kalpa, prakṛti brings forth, under Divine supervision, all beings—moving and non-moving. According to Anantārya, prakṛti has four phases. In its first phase it is called ‘avibhakta tamas’ and is like a seed lying on the floor, showing no signs of change. In the second phase it is ‘vibhakta tamas’ and is like a seed which has been sown in the soil, and which is ready to undergo changes. In the third place it is called ‘aṅgala’ which is like a seed that has absorbed moisture from the earth. In the fourth phase it is ‘avyakta’ which is like a swollen seed ready to grow into a sprout. Prakṛti, then, develops gradually into ‘mahān’, ‘aṅkāra’, the sense-argans, the subtle and the gross elements. It conceals the nature of God from individual souls, Rāmānuja says, and perverts their knowledge so as to believe that it is an object of their enjoyment. This is the Divine māyā. But this māyā is not a mere appearance or purely phenomenal on the views of Rāmānuja as is on
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that of Advaita Vedānta. On the contrary, it is, Rāmānuja holds, as real as the prakṛti of Sāṅkhya or the atoms of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika.

Time

The conception of time is very old. The Rgveda mentions that God created the year after he had created rite (ṛta), truth (satya), night (rātri) and ocean (samudra). The Yajurveda tells us that all the ‘moments’ (nimeśa) came out from the Refulgent Person i.e. God. Vaśudeva Abhyaṇkara, author of Prakāśa, a commentary on the Yatindramatadipikā, supports the ancient conception of time by basing himself on the authority of Chāndogya Upaniṣad and the Taittiriyā Brāhmaṇa. According to him, the expression ‘in the beginning’ occurring in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6-2-1) ‘Only Sat it was in the beginning, O amiable’, indicates a distant past; and the word ‘then’ contained in the Taittiriyā Upaniṣad (2.8.9.3) ‘Neither asat nor sat existed then’, similarly points to a very remote past. Rāmānuja himself has not said much about time. He has, however, only incidentally referred, in the Vedārthasaṅgraha, to several divisions of time from a nimeśa to Brahmā’s life-time. According to classical Viśiṣṭādvaita, time is one of the fundamental categories. Though an inert substance, it does not possess the three qualities of prakṛti. It is eternal and three-fold—past, present and future. Time has found no place as a separate category in the Sāṅkhya system. Such statements as God transcends limitations of time, occurring in the Yoga-sūtras, do not indicate whether Patañjali and his followers recognise time as a fundamental reality. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school, however, included time in the list of substances recognised by it and this was in agreement with Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy. The minor divisions of time as recognised by Viśiṣṭādvaita school, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 nimeśas</th>
<th>30 kāsthūs</th>
<th>30 kalā</th>
<th>30 mühurta</th>
<th>15 ahorātra</th>
<th>2 pakṣas</th>
<th>2 māsas</th>
<th>3 rūtus</th>
<th>2 ayana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 kaṣṭha</td>
<td>1 kalā</td>
<td>1 mühurta</td>
<td>1 ahorātra</td>
<td>1 pakṣa</td>
<td>1 māsa</td>
<td>1 rūtu</td>
<td>1 ayana</td>
<td>1 varṣa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are then ‘yugas’, ‘manvantaras’ and ‘kalpas’.

A kalpa is a day of Brahmā. His night is also of the same duration, and his life-time is said to be his hundred years, which is
technically called ‘para’, and the half thereof ‘parārdha’. Rāmānuja, however, states that Vaikuṇṭha is not affected by the modes and changes of time. In this Śrīnivāsadāsa agrees with him.

A non-inert (ajaḍa) substance is that which is self-illumined (svayamprakāśa). It is of two kinds: the one existing by itself and the other existing for another. An individual soul is a non-inert, self-illumined substance existing by itself. God is also a substance of the same nature. Both are therefore called ‘pratyak’. The attributive consciousness of an individual soul is also non-inert and self-illumined, but it exists for another viz. the individual soul. A substance similar in nature is ‘pure essence’ or sūdha-sattva. Both are called ‘parāk’. Rāmānuja himself has not mentioned the divisions of cit (Viṣṇu's ajaḍa) into ‘pratyak’ and ‘parāk’, but the terms have been freely used in later writings of Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy.

Consciousness

Consciousness is an attribute which cannot be separated from the subject. It presupposes a self whose attribute it is. The relation of an individual soul with its attributive consciousness is like that of a gem with its luminosity. It radiates from the centre, the soul, and reveals, not only itself but the external objects also. An individual soul is not, however, identical with consciousness; both are distinct. But since the latter subsists in the former, they cannot be separated from each other. The relation of this inseparability is called ‘aprthaksiddhi’. In its empirical state, consciousness works through the mind with which it is usually identified. It is again finite in the same state inasmuch as its scope becomes limited by some action or the other with which it is specially concerned. But it becomes infinite in salvation when its contact with any specific action comes to an end.

Suddha-sattva

Suddha-sattva in Viśiṣṭādvaita is supposed to be the stuff of the bodies of God and the individuals in a state of purity. The Brahma-loka or Nitya-vibhūti is also made up of the same substance. But it is interesting to note that Rāmānuja has never said so. The Acārya has, on the contrary, mentioned that the Divine form is His own essence (svaśața) just as His bliss, consciousness and other attributes are. As regards the word ‘Brahma-loka’, he takes it to be an appositional (Karmadāraya) compound which suggests identity of the two. Nevertheless, suddha-sattva seems to have been a controversial topic on which the followers of Rāmānuja have differed from one another. According to some, as Viśnū points out, it is
inert (jaḍa); some maintain that it is primarily inert but secondarily or metaphorically non-inert; while others affirm that it is purely non-
inert.\textsuperscript{37} But all believe it to be a substance different from the sattva aspect of prakṛti.\textsuperscript{38} I propose to discuss this topic in detail in the chapter on the Divine form.

Self

The self or the individual soul is a finite,\textsuperscript{39} but real substance. It is not merely a produce of super-imposition or ignorance. It is, however, a knower or the knowing subject. It is not mere consciousness which it possesses as an attribute.\textsuperscript{40} Its nature is, really, twofold: it is consciousness and at the same time is that which has consciousness.\textsuperscript{41} By ‘cid-rūpa’ is meant self-illumination.\textsuperscript{42} But the self-illumined self is a knower and not mere illumination or knowledge. Knowledge presupposes a subject and an object too. The verb ‘to know,’ must have, like any other verb, a subject, and being a transitive verb, it must have an object also.\textsuperscript{43} The knower, Rāmānuja argues, does not merely undergo a change.\textsuperscript{44} It is, he says, a support or a substratum (āśraya) of attributive consciousness which is its own essential quality.\textsuperscript{45} The ātman who is characterised by consciousness is also the support of consciousness just as a gem is the support of its lustre (prabha),\textsuperscript{46} Anantārya holds the same view.\textsuperscript{47} According to the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, the ātman is that self-conscious principle in man which knows, ‘I smell, speak, hear and think.’\textsuperscript{48} The Bṛhadāraṇyaka says that consciousness is the eternal attribute of the soul.\textsuperscript{49} Consciousness being a soul’s inseparable, eternal and essential attribute, the soul and consciousness are some times identified.\textsuperscript{50} The followers of Kāṇva recension of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, for instance, use the word ‘Viśāma’ in a text where the followers of the Mādhyaṇḍina recension use the word ‘ātman’.\textsuperscript{51}

Souls are eternal and many in number. The Śvetāśvatara says that God is the eternal of the eternals and the conscious of the conscious.\textsuperscript{52} He is one and fulfils the desires of the many. The oneness of God and the multiplicity of souls is taught in the famous gāyatri text also. Rāmānuja regards the ātman (the individual soul) as anu.\textsuperscript{53} The word ‘anu’ is generally translated into the English word ‘atomic’, but Schraeder says that it does not mean ‘atomic’ but ‘small’.\textsuperscript{54} The heart is said to be the seat of the soul.\textsuperscript{55} The Gītā says, ‘People discuss among themselves and hear from others much about the soul, but none is able to comprehend it.’\textsuperscript{56} Why? Because the real nature of it, says Rāmānuja, is concealed by the will of God.\textsuperscript{57} None in this world has escaped the forgetfulness of one’s real nature.
From Brhaspati, the preceptor of the gods, down to a vanaspati or a blade of grass, each and every soul is suffering from its illusory identification with the body. Such concealment of the real nature of the soul is universal among mankind. It is most difficult to overcome. Devotion, however, proves to be the only way out.

It is of interest, in this connection, to notice the following classification of individual souls, offered by Srinivsadosa.
God

Rāmānuja’s God is the one object of supreme adoration, the infinite, blissful, omniscient, omnipotent, creator and ruler of the universe. The five phases of God as mentioned in Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy are:

1. The Transcendental (Para),
2. The Emanation (Vyuha),
3. The Incarnation (Avatāra),
4. The Immanent (Antaryāmi), and
5. The Consecrated Idols (Arcā).

This is the order given in the Viśvakṣena Samhitā, which is approved by Śrīnivāsadāsa. Quoting from the Pāñcarātra—rahasya, Mādhava has, however, said in his Sarva-dārśana-saṅgraha, that a devotee is to proceed gradually from the worship of the idols to the worship of incarnation; from that to the worship of emanations; then to the worship of God, the Transcendental; and finally to the worship of God, the Immanent. Rāmānuja, however, has mentioned in his commentary to the Brahma-sūtra 2.2.41 only three aspects: (1) Sukṣma i.e., Para, (2) Vyuha and (3) Vibhava or avatāra.

The first is the Transcendental aspect. The notion of God’s transcendence is as old as the Vedas. The Rgveda has clearly mentioned that Puruṣa is not only in the world, but also transcends the phenomenal universe. It further states that the entire world is only one fourth of Divinity, whereas His three-fourths are above it. As a matter of fact, God does not possess four parts; it is only for the sake of the convenience of understanding the true nature of God, Rāmānuja says, that He has been held to have four parts. In fact, the sacred text simply aims at describing the infinite glory of God. He is, really, not exhausted in the creation. He is much more than that. But Para is not the Absolute of Advaita Vedānta which has no warmth of feeling for the creation. On the other hand, Rāmānuja’s Para is an embodiment of love and grace. The Ācārya maintains that all the six Divine attributes are fully manifested in the Para aspect of God. The Divine form of Para is, according to him, made of these six attributes; and he calls this aspect of God subtle (Sukṣma). The Transcendent God has His own Divine life, and Rāmānuja holds that it is with this anthropomorphistic aspect of God that a freed soul enjoys communion which is the summum bonum of human life.

The second is the Emanation (Vyuha). It is in this aspect that we conceive of God as creator, sustainer and destroyer of the world.
The third is the Immanent (Antaryāmi). God is not only busy in the work of the world, but He also pervades it. It is He who supports matter and individual souls. He is thus the indwelling principle of the universe.

The fourth is the Incarnation (Avatāra). God assumes at times, various forms—animal, human or divine—as occasion demands, with a view to protecting the virtuous, punishing the wicked and upholding righteousness.

The fifth is the Holy Images duly sanctified. Invoked by the devotees, God is pleased to condescend to inhabit the sacred idols for the sake of His worshippers. He forgets, as it were, His almighty nature and infinite glory to accept their humble offerings such as leaves, flowers, fruits and water.
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तलरावश्च तदां च प्रश्यो मनियतः। (शब्दांच्यं चिन्तामिषय:)
31. निम्पितकुलो तु कालस्य विमानानवेंपि तस्य न स्वात्त्विकम्।
केचिन्तु तत्र कालो नास्तिकीत वदति। (सतीद्रमतदीपिकाः पृष्ठ ५०)
32. श्रस्य जानन्दसूक्ष्मसूचिव मणिप्रस्तुतीनां प्रभाष्यचतुष्मिष्यां वादायत्वमध्यविश्लेषम्।
(श्रीभाष्य)
33. श्रास्त्र मन्स:-सहकारित्वभिन्नमानम एवेदमुचाराद्वूतिमिति न विरोधः।
(सतीद्रमतदीपिकाः पृष्ठ ५६)
34. अनुस्वर्ज वर्गुपल सुकुजितजानस्य...मुक्तस्य स्वसंकृतिः जानसः।
(श्रीभाष्य ५६.३१)
35. यदि श्रास्त्रः परस्य ब्रह्मायः: स्वप्नपत्या निर्देशातु वर्सपूर्वतु प्रवत्त्वे निर्देशातु स्वप्नसूत्वम्।
(श्रीभाष्यसंह गुप्त २५०)
36. निष्पादश्चपतिनियाणेन ब्रह्माव लोको ब्रह्मालोक इति कर्मचारस्तवेव युक्तवादवः।
(श्रीभाष्य ४. ३. ११)
37. शालयं चेत्तुस्माययमविदितामिति स्वीकृतं निर्देशातुः।
पाल्पापनात्मवेषमेव प्रसिद्धि सह तत्र पाठोत्सह जं ते सा।
तत्सम्बधातुः ज्युतिविश्वः तु तह्लादिनयांग्रहेरुं परे तु।
शालवाजायक्षोकत्सागायुगमवद्युतायतात्मतीनव।।
(तत्सम्मुक्तकालप ३. ६२)
38. स्वस्ताभास्य कर्मान्य युगस्वत्वाद्विकालाम् (तत्सम्मुक्तकालप ३. ७२)
39. प्रातोगुयायामालमा (श्रीमाधव से ३. २३)
40. यदा चृतियम् गयमस्य दुःखेदोपश्रम्यमानस्य तस्मात् चृतिरक्षत्तथाया जानामीति
जातुर्यात्रेव प्रतीयमानस्य ज्ञानस्यात् न चृतिविरेण वस्तुतः दृढः।। (श्रीमाधव से ३. २३)
41. एकारमात्मा चिन्तूः एवं यह चैत्यशुद्धेऽकः।।
42. चिन्तूः यह स्वर्यप्रकाशता। स्वर्यप्रकाशोपर्यात्मा शालैव न प्रकाशारमात्म।।
43. न यह लोकयेदोजानातीवर्कर्मक्ष्यकृतः कस्य च प्रयोगाः हर्षचरः।।
44. न च शास्त्रक्षर्कितकल्पम्।
45. शास्त्रम् यह जानपुरुणात्मलम्। जानां चाश्चन्ति निग्रास्त्व स्वामाविषयचक्षुः नित्यम।।
46. जानत: प्रभासवानीवधम् जानस्य स्वाम्यायायत्व चृतिमित्रेण-प्रभावचुतष्ट्दं।।
47. स चायामात्मा जानाययो जाननिर्मय: (सिद्धान्तसिद्धाक्षरे शास्त्र ५६)
48. प्रयोग: (श्रीमाधव से ३. १२. ५)
49. न हि विवस्त्तुः विद्वानादिविगत्रितो विद्वानादिविगत्रितवादुः। (श्रीमाधव से ३. २६)
50. तत्तुवमुखार्यात्राव: विद्वान्युक्तायार्यात्रावातानो विद्वानामित्तं व्यपदेः: विद्वान्युक्तायार्य
सारसूतो दुःखः।।
51. उभये मात्यनिदन्त: कान्ताभावायांत्रयां नियमायेन वागतिरिक्तानां: स्थानमें
खारोमापि विज्ञायाचीयते य चालमय तिथिः।। (श्रीमाधव से ३. २.
52. तिथिः तिथिः तिथिः तिथिः तिथिः तिथिः तिथिः
मेको बहुः यो विद्वानाति कामान्त: (स्वेतावत्तर ६. १२)
53. प्रतोगुयायामालमा (श्रीमाधव से ३. २३)
54. The surprising solution of problem, then, is that in our passage
the word anu does not mean 'atomic' but 'small, little' in the sense
of spatially restricted.
(Schrader's Introduction to Pâñcarâtra, page 90).
55. भालमोगिः देहदेवाविशेषे स्वतित् स्वामायामातृ। हृदयेदे स्वात्मः स्वतितः तृष्णे।।
56. शास्त्र्यश्वस्तर्क्षति किरितदेव
मार्गश्रीवदु बधति तत्त्व चान्यः;
श्रीमाधव श्रम्यवक्षे यथौतिः;
श्रुताया: यद्य न वै वै किरितः।। (गीता ३. २. ४)
57. प्राक्षभाषायांसमुदयस्तस्तानां जीवम् स्वामाविषिक युप्त सिद्धिः।।
(श्रीमाधव से ३. २. ५)
58. एया यथोत्क गुणामयी मम माया हुर्या हुर्या लक्ष्यः द्वितीयमण्डः प्रसः सा हुर्या। (दीपकम् ६ १४)

59. मायेन यथािविर्ष स्वयम् बुधः सत्यमा ये प्राप्ता ते मायामेता सर्वसुयमोहिनी तरित द्वितीयमण्डः। (पूर्वकैण्तम्)

60. मम प्रकाशः पंचेति प्रायूक्तेभािन्तपरागः: परो बुधसु बिमो निष्ठता सर्वदेहिनाम्। द्वितीयवितरकः तथा द्वादृशः पुरुषविभिः। इत्येवं पंचः प्रायूक्ति राहस्यविदो जनाः।।

Viśvaksena Samhitā quoted in Prakāśa, a commentary on Yatindra-mata-dipikā, page 83

61. एवं प्रकाशि ईशः: परस्युपपर्र्वभावस्यविवितािरहरूपनेच पंचप्रकाशः। (दीपकम् ६ ३)

62. तद्विविविवचविवृत्तु-सुकामिनीसंकासः।

यथार्थिेवः बिनििगतित्या यो च प्राप्ते।

पूर्वपुरविवितयोऽयुक्त-निवेष्टिणी-कलमःः

उत्तरोत्तरुपस्तास्यविकित्तो भवेतुः। (सर्वदेहिनस्यंत्यारामातुपूवकृतम्)

63. तिरी बायुदेवावर्षः परं ब्रह्म सुभुमिसूथुविवगमेदिमार्गं।

विबराचनादू ब्रूहं श्राय प्रायूक्ताचमन्यातः

ब्रह्मा बायुदेवावर्षः सुभुम प्राप्त हि बदरिः।

(दीपकम् २ ३ ४१)

64. निरपार्धवं उदेतु पुष्पः: (दीपकम् १० ६० ४१)

65. पादरस्य विष्णुश्चुकातिण निरापदयामुत्तिदिबं (पूर्वकैण्तम्)

66. यों निरपार्धव ब्रह्म पोषेऽकल्याणं पादरस्य निराामुनिनि द्विवृत्तुपायदेशः।

स ब्रुहम्यः परंप्राप्तयोऽन्यायः। “यथा बानमनन्तः ब्रह्म” द्वितीयविभिन्नकारकाशु शुद्धिं विवितवाभावायः (दीपकम् १ २ ३२)

67. ब्रह्मो ज्यािवितकु पुष्पः: (दीपकम् १ ० ६ ३)

68. सुभुमम् तु केवलपायुपयविविवुष्टः तथा बायुदेवावर्षः परं ब्रह्म सम्युपायुष्य-वुष्टः।

(दीपकम् २ २ ४१)

69. तस्य संकर्षणः। “जगदृ-संहारः च करोति। द्वं न: \( \ldots \ldots \ldots \) सूत्ति च करोति। ब्रह्मविष्णुः: \( \ldots \ldots \ldots \) रक्षयाय स्वरुपः।।

(तत्त्वविन्द्र cited by Vasudeva Abhyaśankara in his Prakāśa commentary on Yatindra-mata-dipikā, page 85)

70. सम्बन्धान्यस्य मुगे अुगे। (दीपकम् ४ ५)

71. भज्ञ सुयुपायुष्यमानि धन्यात्मनः।।

(दीपकम् ६ २६)
CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF GOD

Part I

Rāmānuja's criticism of the views of Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Yādava.

In order to establish his theistic conception of the universe, Rāmānuja has criticized the views of his opponents. His polemic was mainly directed against Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara, besides the schools of Bhāskara and Yādava.

The Advaita-vāda usually comprises the views of Śaṅkara and his followers. Before offering his criticism of the Advaita schools, Rāmānuja points out its main features. According to Advaita, Rāmānuja says, Brahman is essentially unqualified consciousness only, and though in itself free and self-luminous, it appears to be in bondage. When true knowledge viz. 'Thou art That' dawns upon the individual, he becomes one with Brahman. The differences are not real. 'Some Vedāntists hold that there is only one finite soul and one body and all the universe with its entire multiplicity is his imagining.' Illusory are the preacher, the scripture, the reader as well as the knowledge attained through the scriptures. And all this is known through the illusory scriptures.

To Advaita position that Brahman is unqualified, Rāmānuja objects thus. The Upaniṣads say: 'It willed to become many', and 'The created beings have their origin in It, are accomodated in It, have their support in It'. 'It' stands for Brahman and we know from these scriptural texts that Brahman creates, supports and destroys the world. The scriptures also tell us that Brahman is all-knowing, all-powerful, lord of all; all beings are Its modes; none is equal to or greater than It; Its desire is true; Its resolve is infallible; It enlightens all. These and other qualities of Brahman, contends Rāmānuja, would be meaningless, should the Advaita view be taken as correct.

Rāmānuja then proceeds to refute the Advaita view that Brahman is real but the created world is unreal. He says that if the effect be unreal, then the Upaniṣadic proposition, 'One can know all
by knowing one’, would be meaningless, because in that case there would be nothing at all for us to know or there would be confusion between the real and the unreal. The proposition, therefore, can hold good only if the ‘all’ be taken to be real.

It might still be contended that some Upaniṣadic passages state that Brahma is devoid of any quality. Such passages are: ‘This was, O amiable, only Sat before’, ‘Only one without a second’, ‘Truth, knowledge and infinite is Brahma’; ‘Partless, actionless and qualityless’. To all this Rāmānuja’s reply is that here the word ‘this’ refers to the world; the world ‘before’ to the state before creation. When the scriptures state that the world was ‘sat’, the word ‘Sat’, says Rāmānuja, refers to the Sadātmaka i.e. one whose Soul is Sat (God). According to him, the names and forms could not be differentiated until the process of creation started. The subtle condition of matter in the state of chaos is indeed the cause of the gross stage of matter in the cosmos; but Brahma is associated with matter in both its aspects as its inner ruler. As Brahma is one and the same in the two cases, the cause is not separate from the effect. In fact, Rāmānuja holds that the effect is but another phase of the cause itself. Rāmānuja further states that the denial of a second to Brahma is really the denial of any other ruler of the universe. The word ‘advaita’ (one without a second), he continues, does not imply that Brahma is unqualified, one and homogeneous, but that It is peerless without there being a parallel to It.

Rāmānuja holds that the universe in its multiplicity is related to God just as a body is to a soul. God and the universe can, therefore, be no more treated as identical than soul and body can be. In support of this view Rāmānuja quotes such passages from the Upaniṣads as ‘Who dwells in ātman’, ‘Whose body is atman’, ‘Whose body is earth’. Since the universe consisting of matter and individual souls is, as it were, the body of Brahma, the names of multifarious objects ultimately denote Brahma. Thus the word ‘thou’ in the famous statement, ‘Thou art That’, signifies the indwelling God of whom the individual soul signified by the word ‘thou’ is a bodily aspect, and the word ‘That’ means God who is the primal cause of the universe and the repository of all auspicious qualities. As the Upaniṣads reveal, God is changeless and faultless, and the universe is the product of the mutations of His body viz. prakṛti.

The Advaita school holds that Brahma is unqualified consciousness, because It has been characterised as ‘consciousness alone’ by the scriptures. But Rāmānuja disagrees by holding that conscious-
ness is an attribute of Brahman, and that a substance possessing an attribute cannot but be qualified. The soul, in fact, is knower and knowledge—both in one. It has, therefore, consciousness as one of its attributes. The soul cannot be identified with consciousness for the simple reason that it is more than consciousness. Moreover, there is definite evidence in the scriptures to show that Brahman is qualified: ‘The Reality is all-knowing and all-pervading’, ‘Its perceptual and energetic activity is inherent and manifold. Consciousness is thus only one of the attributes of God. How, then, can only one of them be taken to reveal His entire nature? The mention of truth and consciousness as qualities of God leaves no doubt about the fact that He is qualified. The expressions pointing to God’s being devoid of attributes (nirguṇa) simply mean that He can not be said to possess the attributes which belong to objects other than Himself.

It is urged by the followers of Advaita that the unqualified Reality is self-luminous and that there is no need of proving that it is unqualified. All words, again, indicate the qualified nature of the thing; and if qualifications are set apart, there remains an unqualified self-luminous entity which is pure consciousness (jñāptimātra). To this Rāmānuja replies that even the word ‘self-luminous’ (jñāptimātra) signifies something particular, because the root and the affix of which the word consists together have a particular significance.

It is further urged by the followers of Advaita that Brahman is ever luminous by itself in its entirety. But Rāmānuja contends that if Brahman be purely self-luminous, the superimposition of the not-self on It is impossible. Snakehood cannot be superimposed on a rope so long as the latter is luminous. If one specific character viz jñāpti, however, be admitted to Brahman on the authority of the sacred texts, other specific qualities mentioned in the scriptures such as bliss, infinity and truth should also be attributed to It.

If it is contended that there are in the scriptures passages which deny attributes to Brahman (neti neti), it would be necessary to enquire into the nature of this denial. What, then, is the real meaning of the denial of attributes to Brahman? Rāmānuja replies that Bādarāyaṇa himself has made the point clear in the Brahma Sūtra 3-2-22. What must be denied to Brahman are the qualities which signify its limitations. The scriptural denial of multiplicity to ultimate Reality, Rāmānuja points out, means only this that nothing exists independently of God. In other words, all things in the world are animated by God; they constitute His body, so to say. There is only
one” God in the universe, and the denial of multiplicity is intended to strengthen the belief.

The followers of Advaita hold that Brahman in Itself is unqualified consciousness, but that when Its essence (svarūpa) is concealed by nescience, It appears to be many. The view, Rāmānuja contends, is not sound for the following reasons.

The concealment of luminosity by nescience may mean either of two things: (1) the obstruction of the generation of luminosity; (2) the extinction of luminosity. But since, as the Advaitin would himself agree, the luminosity cannot be generated, what he could mean here would be the extinction of luminosity which is the same thing as the extinction of the very essence of Brahman.

Two of the statements made by the Advaita school about Brahman are worth noticing here. The one is that nescience (avidyā) cannot affect the self-luminosity of Brahman; the other is that it is owing to nescience (avidyā) that Brahman, in Itself one, appears to be many. But Rāmānuja objects that the two propositions are contradictory to each other; for the former denies that nescience affects the Brahman, whereas the latter affirms that it does.

According to the Advaita school, knowledge of the identity of the jiva and Brahman—the individual and the absolute—removes nescience. Rāmānuja objects to this proposition and advances his objection in the form of a dilemma. If the disillusionment is a part of the essence of Brahman, there is no reason why anyone should make an effort to get rid of the illusion. The effort would, really, be useless. If, on the contrary, the disillusionment is distinct from Brahman, no effort on the part of anyone would succeed in getting rid of the illusion. In other words, disillusionment being either essential to or distinct from Brahman, the attempt at the attainment of disillusionment would be either superfluous inasmuch as disillusionment is eternally realized; or it would be absurd, because the disillusionment is never attainable. Besides, the knowledge which is said to be the means of the removal of nescience is itself of the nature of nescience. How can it then remove nescience?

Another difficulty, according to Rāmānuja, would arise thus. Who is it, it may be asked, that knows the world of phenomena to be unreal? It must be either Brahman or a superimposition on It. If Brahman Itself be the knower, then the Advaitin must admit, obviously inconsistently with his position, that Brahman, as characterised by the quality of knowerhood, is Sagūṇa. If on the other hand, the
knower is not Brahman Itself but a superimposition on It, then, Rāmānuja argues, the superimposition as well as its cause, viz., nescience should be admitted by the Advaitin to persist.24

The knowledge derived through illusory sources must, argues Rāmānuja, be illusory or false. Rāmānuja illustrates this argument thus. Suppose a man, while walking, sees a rope lying on the road and mistakes it for a snake and becomes afraid. Just at that moment, an acquaintance of his, whom he definitely knows to be a liar, happens to come there and tries to disillusion him. But all his efforts to persuade his friend to give up fear fail and the fear persists. Similarly, the knowledge derived from the so-called false sources of knowledge must be false and useless. So the followers of Advaita should either regard the scriptures and the contents thereof as totally real or desist from citing from them to prove their position. Rāmānuja, therefore, points out that in the sacred texts on which the school of Advaita also relies contain no words or expressions whatever which divest, or aim at divesting, Brahman of Its qualities.

Rāmānuja then turns his attention to two prominent thinkers—Bhāskara and Yādava, who while holding, like him, that Brahman is qualified, differ from him in some details.

According to Bhāskara, Brahman possesses all auspicious qualities such as sinlessness but is affected by the manifold mutations of matter which, for him, are real and not illusory. He further holds that matter limits Brahman by imposing upon It limiting adjuncts (upādhi), with the result that Brahman becomes individual souls with experiences of pleasure and pain. An individual soul, though a part and parcel of Brahman, is yet divided from the latter by Its adjuncts which are of course real.

If Bhāskara be right, then all the imperfections arising out of the limiting adjuncts must, argues Rāmānuja, belong to Brahman. But in that case the Vedic passages which proclaim that Brahman is without any imperfections or defects would be meaningless.35

Bhāskara may, of course, contend that imperfection belongs only to the individual soul which is the product of the limitation of Brahman, whereas Brahman remains unpolluted just as the vast space (mahākāsa) remains unaffected by the small space such as that which is covered by a jar (ghaṭakāsa). But it is absurd, says Rāmānuja, to conceive that a jar can divide indivisible space into parts. Just as a jar, he continues, is in direct contact with the space,
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so the upādhi must be in direct contact with Brahman which is equally partless and indivisible.86

Besides, the view that the space occupied by a jar differs from the rest of the endless space is not sound. If we remove a jar from one place to another, the space in the former case will become 'a space without a jar', and in the latter case it will become 'a space with a jar'. Similarly Brahman being one, without any spatial limits, if a limiting adjunct (upādhi viz. antaḥ-karaṇa) goes from one place to another, the Brahman of this place will become free as it were, whereas the Brahman of that place will be affected. The view held by Bhāskara, objects Rāmānuja, would characterise Brahman as free in one case and as circumscribed in another. At each step of a person Brahman would thus alternately be unaffected, and the process will continue to repeat itself throughout the space a person traverses which is ludicrous indeed.87

Another objection urged by Rāmānuja runs thus. If transmutation should be admitted as an essential feature of Brahman, the Vedic passages which have regarded Brahman as immutable would become meaningless88. Further, if transmutation be ascribed not to Brahman but to Its energy, then the difficulty would arise as to whether the energy is to be viewed as essential to Brahman or as a product of Its transformation. Rāmānuja therefore concludes that the transmutation of Brahman is absurd in either case.89

According to Yādava, Brahman possessing unrivalled, unlimited, inherent and auspicious qualities undergoes real (not illusory) transmutation into the material world and souls—human and divine. God and matter and individual souls, Yādava continues, differ from one another. God does not experience the kind of pleasure and pain which is experienced by individual souls. Again, in the state preceding Its transmutation, Brahman is undifferentiated; because, as he says, God, individual souls and matter are then one. Hence non-difference is equally real. This view is called 'Bhedābhedavāda', the doctrine of difference-cum-nondifference.40

Against Yādava, Rāmānuja's objections are as follows. Since Brahman is transformed into souls and matter, the experience of pleasure and pain which individual souls may have must belong to Brahman. It may indeed be contended that Brahman is not exhausted in the souls and matter but is more than these and that in that aspect in which It transcends them, It is possessed of all auspicious qualities such as omniscience and infallible determination. But this,
Rāmānuja argues, would mean that Brahman is only partially characterised by auspicious qualities. Besides, it would also follow that Brahman may be happy in one aspect and at the same time unhappy in another, which is absurd. Devadatta, for example, can in no way be happy, if one of his hands be besmeared with sandalwood paste and decorated with jewellery, while the other is beaten with a club or set on fire. Rāmānuja, therefore, concludes that the view of ‘Bhedābheda’ is no better than Advaita-vāda which attributes nescience or illusion to Brahman.41
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Part II

The cult of Viṣṇu is not the cult of the sun—Viṣṇu's help to Indra in the latter's fight with Vṛtrā and Śambara—The cult of Viṣṇu is not modelled on the cult of Indra—Viṣṇu is not 'Hercules-Lyra' of the sky—The cult of Trimūrti—Viṣṇu, the Brahmaṇ of the Upaniṣads—The teachings of some of the oft-quoted vidyās.

Rāmānuja's God is indeed devoid of physical qualities: sattva, rajas and tamas. But existence, consciousness, bliss and infinitude constitute His very essence. Besides, God, as Rāmānuja holds, has many other auspicious qualities such as mercy. He pervades the universe just as an individual soul pervades its body. It is due to His immanence in the physical world and the individual souls that there can be no duality in God. He is one. The universe is His body, so that all the diversities that there are in the world are contained in Him. God's relation with the universe is that of a substance with its adjuncts. But He, while being immanent in the universe, also transcends it.¹ For God is infinite and so much more than the universe.² He is the creator, sustainer and destroyer of the universe which is only an infinitesimal part of Him. The motive which prompts God to create a world is nothing else than sport (līlā).³ It is in Vaikuṇṭha, His heavenly abode situate beyond this universe, that God lives in His glory,⁴ as the Supreme Person of exquisite beauty. Those who possess true knowledge of their own selves and those who practise devotion are granted communion with Him in Vaikuṇṭha. It is from there that God generally comes to protect the pious, to punish the wicked and to uplift righteousness.

Rāmānuja believed in one God. He was by no means a polytheist. Nor do his writings betray any trace of henotheism, according to which some one god or the other is supreme over the rest. He was not a deist either. Nor was he a pantheist; for while according to pantheism, there is no God apart from nature or the universe, Rāmānuja holds that God is not exhausted in the universe but transcends it. Rāmānuja was, strictly speaking, a theist, holding
the belief that there is one God who made this world and who governs it.

Rāmānuja's God is Viṣṇu. The word 'Viṣṇu' has several meanings such as fire, one of the Vasu-gods, one of the Āditya-gods. But the Viṣṇu of Rāmānuja is not one of them. Viṣṇu, as Rāmānuja holds, is the Diety who is invoked and extolled by Vasīṣṭha and others in the Rgveda. Puruṣa, Nārāyaṇa and Brahman spoken of in the Vedic literature, and Bhagavān and Vasudeva of the epics, the Purāṇas and the Āgamas are, for him, one and the same Supreme Being. These different names are held by Rāmānuja to be only synonyms of Viṣṇu.

The Vedic seers adored many gods—Indra, Agni, Varuṇa, Soma and so on. The ancient religion as revealed by the Vedas is, therefore, held by many to be poly-theistic. But the seers realized that the underlying principle on which the creation rests is one. 'Reality is one; the sages call It differently.' They held that Reality is immanent in the creation and the term they used to denote It was Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu is one who pervades. The seers also applied the name 'Puruṣa' to Him, meaning by it one who permeates the world. The name 'Nārāyaṇa' has the same significance. The conception of an all-pervading Deity was thus quite familiar to the Vedic sages. The Rgveda has characterised Viṣṇu as beneficent, undeceivable, protector of the world, protector of the embryos, innocuous, bountiful, generous, deliverer, innoxious, wide-paced, new, eternal, having a blissful spouse, helpful to mankind, friend of Indra, wish-fulfiller, young, brave, all-pervading, lord and creator. He is said to live far beyond this world, and to have sustained all the worlds alone.

According to Macdonell, Viṣṇu 'occupies but a subordinate position in the Rgveda.' He has arrived at this conclusion by observing that Viṣṇu is extolled in 'not more than five whole hymns and part of another'. But, while it is true that Viṣṇu has been less frequently invoked than some of the other gods of the Vedas, this does not detract from the influence which Viṣṇu exercised on the minds of the seers. Take the case of the Vedic eulogies of rivers. Sarasvati should have been the most important of the rivers spoken of in the Vedas, if importance is measured in terms of the volume of praise she has received. She is lauded in three entire hymns, but this cannot, in any way, be detrimental to the greatness of Gaṅgā, although reference to her in the Rgveda is very sparse, she being mentioned directly only in one stanza. The reference to jñāna-
kāṇḍa is likewise much less than that to karmā-kāṇḍa, in the Vedas; and yet the former is usually taken to be higher than the latter. So the smallness of the number of hymns on Viṣṇu in the Ṛgveda should not, therefore, be interpreted as signifying this Deity's subordinate position.

_A review of the Sun-theory_

Viṣṇu seems, says Macdonell, to have been primarily conceived as the sun. In his opinion 'Viṣṇu's three steps refer to the course of the sun'. The three steps, he says, mean, for most European scholars, the rising, culminating and setting of the sun. He adds that Aurnāvatābhā also favoured this 'purely naturalistic interpretation'. But the view which Aurnāvatābhā exactly held on this point is not clear. He opined, according to Yāska, that Viṣṇu strode on Sāmārohaṇa, Viṣṇu-pada and Gaya-śiras. Out of these three the Gayaśiras has been taken by some to mean the setting of the sun. Dr. Lakshman Sarup interprets it as the mountain of the setting sun. But this interpretation does not seem to be satisfactory. The Gayaśiras has no connection whatever with the setting of the sun. It is, on the contrary, a sacred place in Gaya. The Bhāgavata has recommended it as one of the sacred places of India where a religious aspirant should live. The Vāyu-purāṇa advises an offering of a piṇḍa at the Gayaśiras, and has recorded the following legend to establish the sanctity of the place.

There was once a demon with a huge body, whose name was Gaya. Devoted to Viṣṇu, he performed an austerity on the Mount Kolahala in order to get a boon from the Deity. Viṣṇu was pleased with the demon and granted him the boon. Thenceforward Gaya became so sacred that whosoever saw him went to Vaikuṇṭha. At this Yama's anxiety knew no bounds, and an assembly of the gods was convened to think out how they could help Yama in the normal discharge of his duties. The result was that the gods managed to put the demon under a huge slab of rock, so that he might not move about. God Viṣṇu, then, put His foot on the slab to fix it perfectly in its position. As a result, the Gaya-śiras was rendered sacred to the limit of a kroṣa, and Gaya with a radius of five kroṣas.

The Gayaśiras referred to by Aurnāvatābhā seems to be the above-mentioned place within Gaya. The Viṣṇu-pada also, like the Gayaśiras, is a sacred spot bearing the footprint of Viṣṇu. The Viṣṇu-pada spoken of by Aurnāvatābhā may correspond to it. Investigation may perhaps reveal Sāmārohaṇa to be a third place similarly sacred. Is it
not the sacred Udyat, or Udayat hill in Gayā which, the Mahābhārata says, is worth visiting by pilgrims? Samārohana and Udyat are similar in meaning.

According to Dr. B. Barua, 'the Vedic allegory of the three strides of Viṣṇu as explained by Aurnavābha and the Paurāṇic allegory of the upheaval of the granite hills of the Kolāhala chain by volcanic action lie at the back of the Gayā-māhātmya story of Gayāsura'. He opines that 'viewed in astronomical perspective, the Holy Land of Gayā is to present a picture of a cosmographic chart of the heaven above with visible representations of its principal dwellers, the sun, the planets and the stars, and with a fanciful location of the Milky Way, the three stations of the sun in the sky during his daily course and the three stations of the sun during his annual course. The sun on the rising point (Samārohana) is emblematic of childhood, the sun in meridian (Viṣṇupada) is emblematic of glorious youth, and the sun on the vanishing point (Gaya-sīras) is emblematic of old age or death.'

Dr. Barua has thus tried to clothe Aurnavābha's theory in philosophic garb, but the point why Gayasīras has been interpreted as vanishing point or setting aspect of the sun still remains in dark. The Gaya-sīras of Aurnavābha cannot mean, in the absence of any convincing proof, to be the mountain of the setting sun. In any case it does not seem plausible to hold, as some scholars do, that the Viṣṇupada and the Gayasīras referred to by Aurnavābha respectively mean the meridian and setting of the sun. In Yāska's Nighaṇṭu the word 'Gayā' occurs, in the list of synonyms of 'offspring', (2.2), 'wealth' (2.10) and 'house' (3.4); but not in that of 'mountain'. Rai Kṛṣṇa Dāsa has said, in his book on Indian Iconography (Bhāratiya Mūrti Kāla : Page 53), that worship of footprints is very old, and has referred to Viṣṇupada near Gayasīras as mentioned by Yāska in the 8th Century B.C.

The 'parama pada' of Viṣṇu must be, according to the above view, the final step of the Deity. So if the Deity be identified with the sun, His third step would signify the setting of the sun. The 'parama pada' is said, on the contrary, to be always visible like an extensive eye placed in the sky. The sun is not visible after it sets in the west, whereas the devotees are said always to discern 'parama pada' of Viṣṇu. Again the 'parama pada' of Viṣṇu is said, in the Ṛgveda, to have honey. But we cannot trace any honey in the setting phase of the sun, the so-called final step of Viṣṇu.
The view that Viṣṇu’s three steps refer to the course of the sun is not favoured by Macdonell also. He interprets the three steps after Śakapūṇi and Bergaigne, ‘as the course of the solar deity through the three divisions of the universe’. In fact, there is hardly any reason for holding that these steps have anything to do with the sun. The Rgveda reveals that Viṣṇu ‘traversed the earthly spaces for the sake of man in distress’; 21 ‘He traversed the earth to give it to man for a dwelling’ 24 and ‘He traversed the earthly spaces for wide-stepping existence’. 23 Oldenberg, therefore, seems to be right when he states that ‘every definite trace of solar character is lacking in Viṣṇu, that he was from the beginning conceived only a traverser of wide space, and that no concrete natural conception corresponded to the three steps’. 24 The Vedic description about Viṣṇu’s three steps indeed reminds one of the Divine immanence in the three ‘lokas’ referred to in the Gītā (15.17). 25 Rāmānuja, therefore, holds that these three lokas are (a) matter, (b) embodied souls and (c) liberated souls. 26 That Viṣṇu’s striding may properly be interpreted as His immanence in the universe is shown by a parallel reference to the striding of Puruṣa. Like the hymn of Viṣṇu the hymn of Puruṣa makes a mention about the latter’s striding. 27

While enumerating the anthropomorphic traits of Viṣṇu, Macdonell has referred to ‘the frequently mentioned strides which he takes, and his being a youth vast in body, who is no longer a child.’ In this the learned scholar seems, however, to have missed one of the epithets applied to Viṣṇu, viz., Sumaj-jāni 28 meaning ‘having a blissful spouse.’

Thus Viṣṇu cannot be the sun. He is creator of the sun. The creation of the sun by Viṣṇu, in association with Indra, is unambiguously stated in a hymn dedicated to Viṣṇu. 29 This position is supported by the Puruṣa-stūkta, a hymn traditionally recited in praise of Viṣṇu, which reveals that the sun was produced from the eye of Puruṣa. 30 Moreover, the orb of the sun is a huge heap of fire, so that no human being can think of residing there. Had Viṣṇu been identical with the sun, none would say:

‘May I attain to that his well-loved dwelling,
Where men devoted to the gods are blessed:
In Viṣṇu’s highest step—he is our Kinsman
Of mighty stride—there is a spring of nectar.’ 31

Another stanza expresses the similar human desire to go to the Deity’s place. 32
Macdonnell has traced Viṣṇu's Sudarśana and also Garuḍa to the orb of the sun, the former on account of its round shape and the latter on account of its brilliance. But where, it may be asked, would he trace Viṣṇu's mace, sword, conch, bow and arrow? He has no definite answer. At one time he traces Viṣṇu Himself to the sun and at another he traces the Deity's disc and vehicle to the same.

To suit his purpose, Macdonnell has derived the word 'Viṣṇu' from the root viṣ which he holds primarily to mean 'to be active.' But this cannot be the meaning, for the root really means 'to pervade' 'to permeate', 'to enter', which goes to prove that Viṣṇu is one who pervades the universe.

*Indra's Friendship with Viṣṇu—An Instance of Euhemerism.*

Many of the European orientalists have indeed devoted themselves to the study of the Vedas, the oldest extant document of Indian civilization. They have also translated and examined them. But owing to the vast remoteness of the period to which the Vedas belong, they are not unanimous as regards the Vedic age and the meanings of the myths occurring in the Vedas. Indra is one of the gods in the Vedic pantheon to have been eulogised by the sages. He waged a war against Vṛttra, to which the Vedas refer very frequently. This warfare has been regarded as a myth by the modern scholars who have made efforts to explain it by putting forward several theories of which the following is an outline.

With reference to the view held by Yāska, the great etymologist, some scholars have opined that Vṛttra is nothing but cloud, and Indra is no other than the god of rain who disperses it. Hence the theory is known as the 'Storm theory'.

According to others, Vṛttra is nocturnal darkness which Indra (the sun) puts an end to. This may be called the 'Dawn theory'.

The third is the 'Vernal theory' according to which Vṛttra is stated to be the cold winter which freezes water, and Indra is represented as the springtime when the frozen water is melted by the rays of the sun.

The fourth holds that Vṛttra and Indra are respectively the darkness of the long nights and the light of the long days lasting alternately for six months a year in the polar regions where the primitive Aryans are supposed to have lived in the hoary past.

The truth, however, seems to be that the Vedic mythology is euhemeristic, so that the gods described therein are real personages.
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This view is based upon the historical school of the Vedic interpreters according to which the deities are not mere manifestations of natural phenomena. Veda-vyāsa, the well-known epic-writer, delineated Vedic gods in details. His writings may be taken to be of the nature of exhaustive commentaries explaining all allusions and obscure meanings. Vyāsa is not, however, the first to start the historical school. Even Yaska mentions that according to the historians, Vṛtrā is the son of Tvaśṭṛ, a demon whom the Kauśitaki Upaniṣad describes as three-headed. Though Yaska seems to belong to the naturalistic school, yet he did not refrain from quoting, whenever necessary, the views of other schools current in his time. He may have had before him histories which date back even so far as the period of the Atharva-Veda and Śatapatha. Mention has been made of the Itihāsa and Purāṇa in the Chandogya too.

There is a passage about Indra in the Rgveda, which is contradictory to the above naturalistic theories. It runs thus: ‘O men, he is Indra who found out, in the fortieth year, Śambara dwelling in mountains and who killed the powerful, sleeping demon.’ The phrase ‘in the 40th year’ is worth consideration in this connection. No natural phenomenon e.g. storm, dawn, spring etc., can be said to occur after a lapse of forty years. Even the polar light appears and reappears after the lapse of six months. Now Indra had to fight his enemy, Śambara, for many years. Viṣṇu is Indra’s friend, and it was, therefore, natural for him to help Indra. There are stray references to Viṣṇu’s giving help to Indra during that prolonged war. As a matter of fact, Indra did beseech Viṣṇu for help, and the latter responded favourably to the former’s request. They were united in their effort to destroy ninety and nine strong towns of Śambara. Elsewhere Viṣṇu is said to have shaken ninety and four, which seems probably to refer to a penultimate state of warfare. Instead of adding four and ninety together, Macdonell is inclined to multiply the two figures to get a number of three hundred and sixty which, he thinks, are the days of the year according to solar calculation.

Śambara was not, however, the only demon against whom Viṣṇu and Indra fought. They countered the deceitful feats of Vṛṣa-sipra and killed hundreds and thousands of the soldiers of Varcin. A person thus engaged in a war against enemies of one’s friend should not be imagined to be a natural phenomenon, such as the sun or its like.
In fact, Rāmānuja's Viṣṇu is not the sun, but is sun-hued and resplendent. The sun is one of His vibhūtis, and it gets its illumination from Him. His lustre is compared, in the Gītā, to that of thousands of suns. The countless stars twinkling in the blue firmament constitute God's cosmic form (viṣva-rūpa).

A critique of the view that the cult of Viṣṇu was modelled on the cult of Indra.

According to Dr. Bhagabat Kumar Goswami, there was a stage in the Vedic civilization when Indra was regarded as the king of the gods. As time went on, continues Goswāmi, ‘Viṣṇu or the all-pervading God came to be looked upon with greater favour in the matter of Divine kingship’, and all the greatness of Indra and other gods was transferred to Viṣṇu. He states further that the hymns dedicated to Viṣṇu at a later stage were modelled on the hymns dedicated to Indra. Then he adds that the Paurānic names ‘Gopeśa’, ‘Govinda’ and ‘Vraja-pati’ for krṣṇa, an incarnation of Viṣṇu, show the influence of the cult of Indra and that even Śri, the spouse of Viṣṇu, primarily belonged to Indra. As regards this view, the following observations may be made.

Indra's kingship is indeed in strict accord with the Indian tradition. But the lordship of Indra has its limitations. He is decidedly superior to the gods, but inferior to God in the Vedas. It cannot be said that the Vedas are devoid of the conception of one Supreme God and are confined to mere panegyrics to the gods. There are passages in the Vedas which express Indra's subordination and inferiority. The hymn on Man (Puruṣa-sūkta), for instance, clearly states that Indra emerged out of the mouth of Puruṣa, and tradition identifies the Puruṣa of this hymn with Viṣṇu.

The Rgveda, like the other Vedas, is an anthology of hymns composed by various seers. Some sages praised Indra; some, Agni; some Varuṇa; some, Uṣas; some, Viṣṇu and so on. So if any one holds that the hymns on Viṣṇu were modelled on the hymns on Indra, there may be others to hold just the opposite view. Goswami has built his theory on the resemblance between only a few words respectively occurring in the hymns on Viṣṇu and Indra. But this is hardly convincing. It may equally be probable that the hymns on Indra were modelled on the hymns on Viṣṇu. The extant Vedic anthologies (Samhitās) are said to have been brought into their present form and arrangement by Krṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa. Styles vary with individuals. Even contemporary people are likely to write
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both in similar and dissimilar ways. They may also happen to use similar words or phrases even without copying one another.

Goswāmi's thesis that all the greatness of Indra and some of the important attributes of other gods were transferred to Viṣṇu when the latter was once raised to the highest position, does not seem to be correct. Viṣṇu's immanence in the universe is His own greatness. Goswāmi himself has interpreted the word 'Viṣṇu' as 'the pervading God'. So he should have thought that this greatness is Viṣṇu's own, and not transferred to him from any other god. As a matter of fact, no other god in the Vedic pantheon has this greatness. It is His immanence in the world that makes Viṣṇu the Supreme. It is the climax of excellence which no other god—not even Indra—is said to have possessed. It is immaterial that the immanent God is extolled only in five or six hymns. As regards the other important attributes of Viṣṇu, some of them are indeed common to, and shared by, more than one god. Qualities can indeed belong in common to more than one individual. Both a lotus and a rose are beautiful; and two poets, one contemplating the former and the other the latter will appreciate the beauty of the objects respectively contemplated by them. But this would not obviously be a case of transferring the beauty of one of the objects to the other. Viṣṇu is depicted in the Vedas as friend of Indra, and friends are likely to have at least some common qualities. Hence there is no question of any transfer. The same may be said of other attributes. Supposing, in agreement with Dr. Goswāmi, one holds that supremeness and other attributes are not, really, the intrinsic attributes of Viṣṇu, the question would arise as to what His own attributes are. Viṣṇu is extolled in about half a dozen hymns only. And if this small number of hymns be said to refer to His attributes which are, really, not His own but transferred to Him, He cannot be spoken as having any attribute at all. As a way out of this difficulty one may only suggest that Viṣṇu was a later creation of the sages who simply evolved a new deity to impose upon him the attributes belonging to the other gods. But this would be absolutely fanciful.

As regards the view that the epithets such as 'Gopeśa', 'Govinda', 'Vraja-pati', usually the epithets applied to Kṛṣṇa, came to be applied under the influence of the Indra cult, it may be observed that it is unwarranted in view of the fact that these epithets can directly be traced to the hymns on Viṣṇu. There are clear references both to the 'cows' and 'Vraja' in the hymns on Viṣṇu, No. 154.
The statement that Śrī originally belonged to Indra but was later claimed by Viṣṇu is equally unfounded. According to a Paurāṇic legend, Durvāsā once pronounced on Indra the curse that the latter's kingdom would lose prosperity, and consequently the chief of the gods would have to face adversity. It was during that period that the demons attacked and defeated the gods. Thereupon the gods approached Brahmā who in his turn propitiated Viṣṇu for help. Viṣṇu appeared and advised the gods to make a temporary treaty with the demons and with their help to churn nectar out of the ocean. Accordingly, the gods churned the milky ocean, and Śrī was one of the celestial 'gems' that came out of it. Śrī assumed Her seat on the bosom of Viṣṇu, and bestowed Her favour on the gods and made them happy. The churning finally resulted in the advent of Dhanvantari holding a jar of nectar. Viṣṇu managed to infatuate the demons and to distribute among the gods the nectar by drinking which they became invincible. After this, the gods overcame their enemies and regained the kingdom of paradise. This is in brief the legend on which Goswāmi has based his position. Indra had been prosperous before Durvāsā’s curse fell on him. The curse undermined Indra’s prosperity. This event has made Goswāmi believe that Śrī primarily belonged to Indra. But here he erroneously identifies Śrī meaning ‘prosperity’ with Śrī, the spouse of Viṣṇu. He is perhaps not aware that the spouse of Viṣṇu has been referred to even in one of the hymns (1.156.2) of the Rgveda. The word ‘Sumajjani’ (one who has a blissful spouse) seems to have escaped his notice. Every student of Vedic literature knows that the Yajurveda has made a mention of Śrī and Lakṣmī as spouses of Viṣṇu. The name of Indra’s queen is not Śrī. Śrī is universally mentioned both in the Vedic and the classical Sanskrit literature as Viṣṇu’s spouse. According to the Paurāṇic tradition, Śrī is inseparable from Viṣṇu. She descends with Viṣṇu to this mundane order of the universe. She is represented at one time to have been born of Khyāti, the wife of Bhṛgu, and at another to have emerged from the milky ocean. It was she who appeared as Śītā and Rukmini when Viṣṇu descended in the forms of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa respectively. She has thus been, from the Vedic times to the age of the Purāṇas, associated with Viṣṇu and not with Indra as Goswami supposes.

A study of the Hercules Theory.

While the sun-theory and the Indra-theory are thus untenable, an equally untenable has been put forward by G.V.L. Raghava Rau
who on the basis of some astronomical data trends to identify Viṣṇu with the Hercules—Lyra system of the sky." As mentioned by Edward Pococke in his 'India and Greece', Colebrooke and some other oriental scholars derived the Greek word Hercules from the Sanskrit word Hari-Kuleśa. Rau thinks that the description of Hercules as given by Aratus, a poet—astronomer of Greece, resembles the Paurāṇic description of Viṣṇu. Aratus's description is as follows:

'Near to the Dragon's head, in toilspent posture
Revolves a phantom whose name none can tell
Nor what he labours at; they call him simply,
The man upon his knees. His knees seem bent
In desperate struggle, while from his shoulders
His hands are high uplifted and out spread
As far as he can stretch, his right footsole
Is planted on the crest of the coiled Dragon.'

This has, really, a close resemblance with the description of the Purāṇas where Viṣṇu is said to be reposing on a hooded serpent in the milky ocean. But how can Rāmānuja's Viṣṇu be identified with any one or two particular constellations? According to him, Viṣṇu is immanent in the entire universe containing so many constellations, all things, animate and inanimate, and yet transcending all that is.

*The cult of Viṣṇu is the cult of Pāñcarātra, Sāttvata and Bhūgavata.*

As has already been said, Viṣṇu is traditionally adored with the recital of the hymn on Puruṣa. In the remote past man-sacrifice (puruṣa-medha) was performed with that hymn. But this sacrifice, really, involved no killing of life—human or animal; only oblations were offered with clarified butter. The performance of the sacrifice occupied a duration of five nights. It was, therefore, called 'pāñcarātra' or a five-night sacrifice which was a special religious rite of the devotees of Viṣṇu. As time went on, the sect of these devotees became known by the name of Pāñcarātra. The worshippers did not indulge in the slaying of any living being, because purity (sattva-guṇa) was a predominant feature of their character. In fact, they came in course of time, to be known as sattvavat. The second va of this word was haplographically dropped and the abbreviated form sattva, replaced the original one. The word 'sattvat' is used in the Śatapatha as well as the Aitareya, and the religion of these sattvat people came to be known, in latter periods, as the sāttvata dharma.
or the religion of the sattvatas sect. It may be observed in this connection that Dr. Goswami's derivation of the term 'sattvata' is objectionable. According to him, God is Sat-vat i.e., endowed with reality and 'those who have faith in such a one are sattvatas'. But the word sat is really an adjective meaning 'real' or 'existent', and so there is no need of adding to it the suffix vat which is added to nouns only. Moreover, Goswami adds the suffix snā to satvat to get Sāttvata, whereas the correct suffix to be added here should be añ, if we rely on the authority of Pāṇini 4.1.86.64 It is, however, clear that the words 'pāñcarātra' and 'sattvata', which are widely known to the Vaiṣṇavas, owe their origin to a sacrifice performed for the propitiation of Viṣṇu designed as Puruṣa. As regards the Sanskrit word 'puruṣa', though it signifies the individual soul, ultimately means God, because He is immanent in matter as well as the individual souls.

Viṣṇu possesses innumerable auspicious qualities of which six are termed as bhaga. One who possesses bhaga in its entirety is called Bhagavān, and since none but Viṣṇu possesses it, He alone is called Bhagavān. One who is devoted to Bhagavān is called Bhagavata. This word also means the religious sect of those who are devoted to Bhagavān, that is, Viṣṇu.

Viṣṇu as one of the Trimūrti.

It might be asked, How can Viṣṇu who figures as only one of the trinity—Brahma, Viṣṇu and Śiva—be the supreme God? The answer is simply this that these three gods are the three phases of one and the same God. Some of the purāṇas bear testimony to this. The Viṣṇu-purāṇa says: 'Janārdana, the adorable one, bears three epithets of Brahma, Viṣṇu and Śiva in connection with the three functions of creation, sustenance and destruction of the cosmos respectively.65 The Śiva-purāṇa likewise declares, 'Although I am in reality undifferentiated, I assume three appellations of Brahma, Viṣṇu and Śiva while busy in creation, maintenance and dissolution of the world.66 The Bhāgavata simily states: 'Having penetrated my own māyā of three attributes, I assume three different names according as I create, maintain and dissolve the world.67

Those who adhere to the cult of Trimūrti hold that the Absolute becomes Iśvara when It is associated with the material constituents. For them Iśvara is God of popular belief, who has three phases. When associated predominantly with Sattva, He is called Viṣṇu; when associated predominantly with rajas, He is Brahma; and when associated predominantly with tamas, He is Śiva. The
cult of Trimūrti may have been in vogue for ages in India and influenced literature and the arts of painting and sculpture in this country. Bāna has begun, for instance, his famous poetical work, Kādambari, with a prayer offered to God in these three phases. It is doubtful, however, whether the cult ever had the support of any philosophical school of established repute.

The cult of Trimūrti and Advaita

Brahmā is not held to be of the same status as Viṣṇu and Śiva. According to Advaita, Brahmā has a position lower than that of Īśvara. This is clear from the designation ‘Hiranyagarbha’ which it has ascribed to the former. That Brahmā is identical with Hiranyagarbha is certain. Classical Sanskrit literature abounds in passages supporting this view. Māgha, for instance, calls Nārada ‘son of Hiranyagarbha.’ According to tradition also Nārada is an offspring of Brahmā. But the question why he has been given a lower status remains a riddle. The internal evidence in the Purāṇas shows that worship of Brahmā had become obsolete. The story about Śiva’s curse that Brahmā would not be adored is too well known to be repeated.

As against the Trimūrti doctrine which views Īśvara as associated with sattva, rajas and tamas, Advaita holds that the Absolute, in its association with Śuddha-sattva, becomes Īśvara. Śuddha-sattva may mean either pure or preponderating sattva. But neither of the two meanings can lead to the view of God as identical with Trimūrti; for the purity of sattva would allow no room for rajas and tamas which are as essential to the nature of Trimūrti as sattva. It may be noted in this connection that although later Advaitins have drawn distinction between Māyā and Avidyā, Śaṅkara recognises no such distinction. But even then they agreed with Śaṅkara that it is Māyā and not Avidyā that is God’s adjunct and that Māyā is śuddha-sattva. It, therefore, follows that ‘The Trimūrti’ is not compatible with the Advaita conception of God as having for His adjunct which is pure sattva.

Rāmānuja enters into subtle polemics, and the arguments put forward by him smack of sectarianism. He quotes from that portion of the Viṣṇu-purāṇa where Janārdana is represented as bearing the three epithets of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. The Ācārya then argues thus: The mention of Janārdana (another name of Viṣṇu) along with Brahmā and Śiva implies that He has become a member of the Trimūrti of His own accord (īchā) and in sport (līlā). But Brahmā and Śiva according to him, are, like other gods, the vibhūti of Viṣṇu.
Hence Rāmānuja holds that Brāhma is but an individual soul, a Jīva, and in this he is supported by Manu-Smṛti which narrates Brāhma’s birth thus: ‘In the beginning the Lord created water and poured His energy thereon; Brāhma was born there.’ The man created by Nārāyaṇa is called Brāhma in the world. The Śvetāsvatara also states: ‘In the beginning God creates Brāhma and verily gives him the Vedas.’ Rāmānuja argues therefrom that Brāhma is a created, finite, individual (Kṣetrajña).

As regards the scriptural texts which assign lordship to Rudra, Rāmānuja holds that they are to be explained in the spirit of sage Vāmadeva’s utterances such as, ‘I am manu, I am Śūrya, I am the learned sage Kakṣīvān.’ Prahlāda, adds Rāmānuja, also said, ‘The infinite (Viṣṇu) being all-pervasive, I am He. All is from me. I am all. All is in me.’ These bold utterances of Vāmadeva and Prahlāda sound as if both of them were almighty; but according to Rāmānuja, they were not so. The word ‘I’ in the above citations refers, Rāmānuja says, to God; and the speakers feel themselves to be at one with God, not because they are identical with God but because He indwells and permeates the individuals. Divine immanence does not necessarily mean the identity of God and the individual souls.

In the system of Rāmānuja, Viṣṇu is the Supreme Self who has all individual souls as His body. Such words as ‘I’ and ‘you’ point specifically to individual souls, though they may be construed as having references to the Supreme Self in view of the fact that God is their indwelling Soul. Just as an individual is the self of its body, so Brahman which Rāmānuja equates with Viṣṇu is the Self of all the individual selves. As the head of a Vaiṣṇava sect, Rāmānuja holds that Brāhma and Śiva are individuals like Indra; so that they are not in themselves Supreme. The Mahābhārata has recorded, he observes, a dialogue between Brāhma and Rudra where the former speaks thus to the latter: ‘Viṣṇu is the inner ruler of you, me and all the other embodied beings.’ The ācārya adds another quotation from the epic: ‘Brāhma and Rudra, the best of the gods, have sprung from (Viṣṇu’s) favour and wrath. Guided by Him they create and destroy (the universe respectively).’ The descent of Viṣṇu into the trinity, Rāmānuja concludes finally, is due to His wish and sport and aims at the good to the world.

Venkaṭanātha has also made the following observations on the point at issue:
1. Viṣṇu alone is Supreme. It is wrong to say that He has divided Himself into Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva.

2. It would not be reasonable to gather from the above-mentioned text of the Viṣṇu-purāṇa that Janārdana is a deity different from Viṣṇu. To hold that the word ‘Janārdana’ stands for a mere conscious entity is not sound, because the word ‘adorable’ (Bhagavān) is associated with it.

3. That there should be three Gods is a self-contradictory proposition. The Supreme cannot be more than one. The scriptures also show that the Ruler of all is one.

4. It is futile to think that a being other than Viṣṇu is God, because the Vedas teach that Viṣṇu is the lord of all.

5. It is not also proper to hold that Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Śiva become Gods by turn according as sattva, rajas and tamas come to preponderate in different Kalpas.

Venkaṭanātha’s observations are thus in strict conformity with the view of Rāmānuja that Viṣṇu is the Supreme lord of all.

Viṣṇu, The Brahman of the Upaniṣads.

For Rāmānuja, Brahman round which upaniṣadic teachings centre is none else than Viṣṇu. There are several doctrines or sciences (vidyās) in the upaniṣads. Some of them teach the rites for fulfilling mundane desires while others tell us about the means of realising God. The former are called Kāmyavidyās and the latter Brahma-vidyās. One who seeks liberation must take to the latter, and such an aspirant can achieve the desired end by following any one of the Brahma-vidyās. These vidyās are many. An account of some of the most popular among these with Rāmānuja’s views thereon, is given below.

1. The Doctrine of Bliss (Ānandamaya-vidyā).

God is full of bliss. Bliss has various gradations on planes—human and divine—but it finds its culmination in God. The Ānandamaya is not the individual soul, but the highest Self, the Self of the individual souls, according to Rāmānuja. The expression ‘full of bliss’ or ‘abounding in bliss’ implies the total absence of pain in God, as Rāmānuja argues. It is the blissful God that bestows bliss on the individual souls.

2. The Doctrine of the Imperishable (Aksara-vidyā).

God is not gross, not fine, not short, not red, not unctuous, not shadowy, not dark, not airy, not spacious, not attached and so on.
The idea of absence of grossness etc., says Rāmānuja, must be included in all meditations. The qualities such as non-grossness constitute God’s essential nature. God is opposed to all evil, and Rāmānuja observes that we should deny to God those attributes which relate to the empirical world. God must therefore be thought of, in all meditations, as having bliss and other attributes distinguished by the absence of grossness and so on.\(^92\) It is under guidance of such imperishable God that the sun and the moon, the sky and the earth are maintained at their proper places, and the rivers run their courses in the east and the west.\(^93\)

3. The Doctrine of Infinitude (Bhuma-vidya).

Infinitude is that on the attainment of which a devotee does not see, hear, and know anything else. It is below and above, before and after. It is all. Infinitude is bliss. It is also immortality. Rāmānuja says that infinity is an attribute of God who is immortal and blissful.\(^94\)

4. The Doctrine of Immanence (Antar-yāmi-vidya).

God pervades the earth and yet is other than the earth; the earth does not know Him; and yet the earth is His body; He controls the earth from within. Similarly He pervades all inanimate matter—water, fire, air and so on. The individual souls are also pervaded by Him. Rāmānuja says that it is only the Supreme Brahman which is the Self of all, rules over all and has all beings—animate and inanimate—as Its body.\(^95\)

5. The Doctrine of Honey (Madhu-vidya).

God is the lord, the king of all beings. All the elements, gods, worlds, sense-organs, and individual souls are fixed in Him just as spokes are fixed in the navel and the rim of a wheel. God is present everywhere. There is nothing wherein He does not exist. He is devoid of priority and posteriority and there is nothing internal and external to Him. He is omniscient. This is the essence (madhu) worth knowing.\(^96\)

6. The Doctrine preached to Upakosala (Upakosala-vidya).

God is life, bliss and infinity. He possesses all auspicious attributes and bestows upon devotees what is good. He is refulgent.\(^97\)

7. The Doctrine of the Small (Dahara-vidya).

The doctrine is named after the word ‘small (dahara)’, used as an adjective for the heart. The body of a devotee is a city within which there is a small house viz. heart wherein God lives. According
to Rāmānuja, one is to seek in God His negative and positive attributes. God is free from evil, old age, death, grief, hunger and thirst. This is the negative approach. Positively speaking, His wishes and purposes are good, true and infallible. God in the heart is the same as He who is the support of the entire universe.

8. The Doctrine of One within the Sun (Antarāditya-vidyā).

The golden person who is seen within the sun has golden hair and is of golden hue from head to foot. His eyes are like a lotus blooming under the sun’s rays. His name is Above (Ut), for He is above all evil. The form mentioned here is not a material one, says Rāmānuja, and he adds that it is God’s essential (svābhāvika) form which He individualises in a human or divine shape in consideration of the nature and quality of the devotion of his worshippers.


If a person performs sacrifices and other charitable deeds in his life-time, his soul will ascend along the path of paradise, but will eventually return from there to this world of action. When such a soul leaves a gross body, the sense-organs accompany it; and since the departing soul and the sense-organs require a sort of support at that time, the subtle elements also go with it. The doctrine of the ‘five fires’ tells us how such an individual soul is reborn. The sages explained the process of transmigration in terms of five oblations. The subtle body associated with the individual soul is offered as an oblation to the fires of

(a) yonder region (para loka),  
(b) clouds,  
(c) earth,  
(d) man, and  
(e) woman

in order that it can eventually be born as a child. These stages of ‘five fires’ are not applicable in the case of germinating plants such as the rose plant, the sweat-born creatures as the louse, and the oviparous beings such as the sparrow. These things get their gross bodies, for experiencing pleasure and pain, in a lesser number of ‘fires’. Even in the case of human beings, we find exceptions. Drona, Draupadi and Dhrṣṭadyumna, for instance, were not born of mothers, thus escaping the fifth ‘fire’. One who knows the doctrine of ‘five fires’, Rāmānuja says, attains God and does not return to this world.

10. The Doctrine preached by Śāṅḍilya (Śāṅḍilya-vidyā).

One should quietly meditate that all this is God who is the cause of the origin, sustenance and dissolution of the universe.
According to Rāmānuja, God can be apprehended only by those whose minds are pure. He is the support and controller of individual souls. He possesses a non-material, auspicious and bright form. His resolve is true, and His nature is as pure as ākāśa. The entire work is His work. To Him belong all pure objects of enjoyment such as excellent odours and tastes. Being in possession of all lordly powers, and there being nothing to be attained by Him, He abides in perfect silence.  

11. The Doctrine of Communion (Paryaṇka-vidyā).

Those who mediate upon God ascend along the path of light. Having attained God, they enjoy His communion for ever. Rāmānuja adds that Divine communion is attained by those also who know the true nature of their own selves.
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प्रकटितता" इति परमात्मनावखयं तत्त्विन्धि श्रृणुव व्यक्तम।
(वेदार्थसंस्करण: पृष्ठ १५०)

81. सबालातसन्धनास्य स एवाहमिति स्पष्टतः
(विभुपुराणम् १. १६. २६)

82. (श्र) जीवात्मविभिन्नाहितं विभाविषयवाना परमात्मस्येव परमं ज्ञातामुर्धः
(श्र) परस्य श्रावणं: सवार्त्तमतलवम्, सवाहं तत्त्वहीराीवम्, श्रीरवाचिनाः
शाब्दान्तः शारीरिति परववसभानुः
(श्रीमात्रम् १. ३. ५)

83. केतन-श्रावणिकगों परमत्वसङ्गः
(वेदार्थसंस्करण: पृष्ठ १६७)

84. श्रावणो च श्रावणसांध्रो श्रावण देवः प्रत्याह 'तत्त्वासतो त्वम प्रव' वेदसिंहिता: इति।
(वेदार्थसंस्करण: पृष्ठ १६६)

85. एतो हो विवृथ-प्रबूढः प्रताक्रिको नाम्नो यो
तद्विविधितमनानी श्रीपु-संहार-कार्को
(वेदार्थसंस्करण: पृष्ठ १६६)

86. भगवतः परववससति वामुर्धवेय निविलजगुपुकारं सवेभडा सवेनैः स्वेएः
देवार्थिभवतः।
(वेदार्थसंस्करण: पृष्ठ १६६)

87. एतो बिचारो विभवतं, बिचविकितं तत्त्वमीश्वासनस्तयोते, बिचविग्ना प्रविस्ती रस्ते,
प्रमखनियम: कल्पसाधारम् नृपायम्, इत्यार्धनामिभिः स्वाभाविज-सुवृक्षवासीवर्गीयि-
रागाः प्रवाहः; श्रवकेतयेश्वरं प्रतित्वलसदिश्यम् चैवें परास्तमः॥
(तत्त्वमुदात्तकल्प: ३. १४)

88. (श्र) श्रितिशिरविविदिते ब्रजसिद्धि ब्रजनिवासे
(श्रीमात्रमलम)
(श्र) परमात्मा परववस्य नारायणः
(वेदो सौ पृष्ठ २४६)
(श्र) परववस्य पुरोहितमो नारायणः
(गीताभायोगिकायां रामाजुः)
89. तसम्मां एतस्मां विज्ञानवादन्योज्त्तर शास्त्राज्ञान्वदयकरतः

(तैसीरी २.६)

90. स एव जीवानामंदवपतीति जीवानामामन्व-हेतुर्य अयपदिशाते।

(श्रीमायम् १. २. १५)

91. (ञ) स होवाचैतवदरं गानि ब्रह्मणा भाविबन्दयस्तृति मनस्तु

(बुधवारास्थिकोपनिषद् ३. ८. ५)

(ञ) यतः तदद्यम्……

(गुणास्थिकोपनिषद् १. १. ६)

92. हेयप्रस्तर्यनो भक्तान्तरत्वाशिषणोपाधारं रूपम्। ब्रह्मादर्शप्रभुमविश्वनाथो

मश्स्युत्तवादिपियां सर्वब्रह्मविशालम् ब्रह्मरूपः संश्राह्यम्।

(श्रीमायम् ३. ३. ३२)

93. अत्यस्त वा ब्रह्मचर्य प्रवसाहे गानि सुलभान्नदमसी विपुली तिथिष्ठः श्रावणियोव्री विपुली तिथिष्ठः—प्राचीन नालः स्तथात स्वल्पम्। पवेश्यास्त्रीयोगशास्त्रायः

(बुधवारास्थिकोपनिषद् ३. ५. ६)

94. (ञ) यो वै सुभा तदस्मृतम्

(द्रापीयोपनिषद् ७. २३. १)

(ञ) यो वै सुभा तदस्मृतम्

(द्रापीयोपनिषद् ७. २३. १)

(इ) सुभा परं प्रह्या

(श्रीमायम् १. ३. ७)

95. (ञ) य श्रामर्षी तिथिष्ठः ईश्वरः

(बुधवारास्थिकोपनिषद् ३. ७. २२)

(ञ) परस्पर ब्रह्माणि। सर्वविष्णवादिकायं सर्वनियुत्तुचं च प्रतिवाचते

(श्रीमायम् १. २. १६)

96. ब्रह्मास्वाम श्रवणं स्मृतानं मधु ईश्वरः

(बुधवारास्थिकोपनिषद् २०. ५. १४)

97. सर्वकल्पमायुभाष्यनायं सत्यसंकल्पतं वा संयमतमायं। वामनवेत्य स्वाभितेशु शोभन-प्रणकल्पम्। वामनवेत्य सर्वश्लोक्यादिन्तिन्तमु-विग्रहितुतलम्।

(द्रापीयोपनिषद् रंगरामायु-दीक्षा ४. १५. २)

98. सहरादाशिणं परं प्रह्या, तदर्स्यमसि चापह्यपापासुदवादि काम्यपुराणाज्ञातः ततुमयमन्दवियथं चिन्तितित्वम्

(श्रीमायम् १. ३. १४)

99. तस्योदितत्ति तमसं स एव स्ववेद्य पापम् उदितः

(द्रापीयोपनिषद् १. ६. ६)

100. तर्दव्य स्वाभिविकृतेत्वरं रुपमितियादि

(श्रीमायम् १. २. २१)

101. (ञ) युगमयोपाविष्टं केवलिन्ति पंचमाहुवप्रेषया देशार्थमो लोकेन स्वमयं

(श्रीमायम् ३. २. १६)

(ञ) युगमयोपाविष्टं मन-प्रभुत्वान मर्यादिनीयो विचारोनिज्ञम्

(संकर भायम् ३. १. १६)

102. पंचार्तिकन्विर्देश्वर्यचारादि गतित्ववृत्तातः वृहादर्शिनार्ध गायत्रि ब्रह्मादर्श-पुनरावृत्तित्ववृत्तातः

(श्रीमायम् ४. ३. १४)

103. श्रावकी प्रदानं। परर्रुणावत्यवर्ध वहादित्यविद्यमयं निधिन्यं जगतं तत् तुरगी-कृत्य जोयमानीयं

(श्रीमायम् १. २. २)

104. स श्राम्भवतथाविदोजसं परिद्वृत्तम्……तस्मात् ब्रह्माल्पते

(कौशिको १. ५)
CHAPTER IV
GOD AND THE WORLD

God's immanence in matter and the finite souls—The views of Lokācārya and Śrīnivāsadasa—The relation between God and the world—Divine immanence evident from certain names applied to God: Viṣṇu, Śāṅkara, Puruṣa, Nārāyaṇa and Viṣṇudeva.

The universe comes out of the Supreme and again, after a fixed period, returns to Him. To explain the nature of the evolution and dissolution of the universe, the analogy of a spider has been offered in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, which Rāmānuja made use of with great advantage. A spider evolves the web out of its body, maintains it for some time and then reabsorbs the same into its body. God is like a spider and the universe, like a web. The relation between the spider and its web is analogous to that which subsists between God and the universe. One might employ another analogy with reference to the chameleon with its varying colours. The change of its colours takes place in its body, while in its soul there is no change. Similarly all the changes in the universe take place in its exterior but not in its interior essence.

God pervades the universe in both its phases—chaos and cosmos. He also pervades all kinds of souls whether bound or emancipated or eternal. The cause and the effect are identical; so is God in His causal and effectual states. On this point, Rāmānuja may have based himself mainly on the concept of the Antaryāmi-brāhmaṇa of the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad which states: 'God dwells in the earth; is within the earth; the earth does not know Him; the earth is His body; and He rules within'. Of course, it is not the earth only that constitutes God's body, but many other things such as fire, sky, air, etc. God's relation with the individual soul is the same as that of the latter with its body. Arjuna said to Kṛṣṇa 'You enter into all things as their soul. You are therefore the All', 'You are the Soul of all the entities, the intelligent and the non-intelligent'.

It is not difficult to understand how God can be immanent in the material world. Instances like that of fire in an iron rod may explain how this may be so. But it is not easy to understand how
God is immanent in the individual soul. Rāmānuja here cares little for logic and builds up his position on the foundation of scriptural testimony. The scriptural texts like Madhyandina recension of the Bṛhadāranyaka say: ‘The Deity dwells in a soul, is within a soul, the soul does not know Him, the soul is His body, He rules the soul within’. Hence Rāmānuja holds that the relation between God and the souls must be the same as that which exists between God and matter.

Rāmānuja says in the Vedaśthasaṅgṛaha that there is a flame in the central space of the lotus-shaped heart of man, wherein the Deity resides. The flame is yellow; and the Deity, blue. The flame therefore looks like lightning which has, as it were, accommodated in itself a blue cloud resembling the Deity in colour. Rāmānuja took this idea from a passage of the Mahānārāyanopaniṣat (9.12) which runs thus: ‘Nila-toyada-madhyaśtha vidyul-lekheva bhāṣvara’. Dr. Radhakrishnan, while explaining this text, writes, ‘The God in man is like a flash of lightning in the heart of a blue cloud’. But the expression ‘nila-toyada-madhyaśtha’ is a compound which may be construed either as determinate (tatpuruṣa) or attributive (bahubrihi). Rāmānuja regarded it not as a determinate but as an attributive compound, as is clear from his explanatory phrase. The Tatparya-candrika, a commentary on the Acārya’s work, also supports the view, arguing that Rāmānuja’s interpretation is in harmony with the Vedic grammar according to which the word ‘nila-toyada’ can be put before ‘madhyaśtha’. Rāmānuja likens the Deity to a blue cloud encircled by lightning on all sides. Rāmānuja perhaps meant that colour of the Deity immanent in man is like that of a cloud and the lustre emanating from His person resembles the lightning in colour. Rāmānuja’s explanation presupposes a particular shape of God immanent in man. The author of the Artha-paścaka says that God residing in man’s heart has a form and while residing in the universe of matter. He is shapeless. But the author of Yatindramatadipikā further holds that God is pervasive not only in His essence and attributes but in His form also.

A physical body is an adjunct to an individual soul; similarly the entire physical universe and individual souls are an adjunct to God, the Supreme Soul. God is non-dual no doubt, but He is qualified inasmuch as He has this universe as an attribute. The universe being but adjectively related to God, His non-dual nature remains unaffected.
The world as an attribute exists not for itself but for the Deity. The world is śeṣa (subsidiary) and the Deity, śeṣi (principal). Śeṣa is a thing which exists for another, and that for which it exists is called Śeṣi. This is the view of the followers of Mīmāṃsā. The Sanskrit grammarians, however, say that Śeṣa is an object possessed, whereas the possessor is śeṣi (Vide Bhattoji Dīkṣita on Pāṇini 2.3.50). The universe and the Deity are, in other words, of the same predication (Sāmāṇādhikaranya) in such phrases as ‘Verily all this is God’. Since the Deity is the Soul of the universe and of every object therein, each and every substantive bears a reference to Him.

The Essence of Rāmānuja’s Teaching

Rāmānuja himself was rather indifferent as to how his philosophical position should be entitled. What he laid stress on was the correct understanding of the doctrine taught in the Vedas, which, in his view, comprises the following essential points:—

(a) The ‘non-duality’ or ‘non-difference’ of the ultimate Reality. This is expressed in Rāmānuja’s view that there is one Supreme Being of whom the entire universe is the body.

(b) ‘Difference cum non-difference.’ This is meant by him in so far as he holds that the one is many only through its modes.

(c) Duality of difference. This is conveyed by his doctrine that matter, individual souls and God are essentially different from, and hence irreducible to, one another.

To cover all these three different aspects of Rāmānuja’s theory of reality, his followers have given it the name of Viśiṣṭādvaita. But it cannot be definitely determined who it was that first used this name. The very word Viśiṣṭādvaita implies non-dualism, while the name of a treatise such as Tattva-traya suggests dualism.

Rāmānuja did not claim to have propounded a new theory of reality of his own. What he did was simply to organise the scattered bits of truth embodied in the ancient religio-philosophical literature of India. Although he does not claim any credit even for this, yet there is no gainsaying the fact that he rendered valuable service to the philosophic thought of India by preaching his views the importance of which cannot be under-rated.

Not only the Vedas and the Upaniṣads but the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and the Pāṇcarātra also yield much information about the doctrine of the immanence of God in man and nature. The Taittiriya declares, for instance, that God created the universe and
entered it afterwards. The Īṣā upaniṣad likewise states that the universe is enveloped by the Deity on all sides. The Śvetāsvatāra proclaims that the Deity is immanent in the world as fire is in the burning wood, and that the world is ever pervaded by Him. The Upaniṣads thus clearly suggest that God pervades the world as its Soul. The Rāmāyaṇa tells the same truth. At the conclusion of the war of Lāṅkā, Brahmā eulogised Rāma by saying that the whole universe is His (Rāma's) body. This obviously means that God pervades the world as its Soul. Similarly the Gītā says, 'Entering into the earth I support all creatures with my energy'. The Viṣṇu-purāṇa says, 'This whole universe, moveable and stationary, is pervaded O Mother Lakṣmī, by you and Viṣṇu'. The Jayākhyā Sanhitā says, 'The Deity pervades the whole universe; and being different from the latter, remains as non-different just as the fire resides in an iron-ball.' The Pāñcaratra has thus suggested an interesting analogy of the fire pervading a rod of iron. When a rode of iron is heated in a furnace, fire pervades the red-hot iron, although the fire and the rod are quite distinct and independent of one another. Similarly God pervades the individual souls and nature, although He is quite distinct from both of them. "They form His body in the sense that, though animated, sustained and controlled by Him for His own ends, their change and imperfections do not in any way affect His own essential nature." He only appears to be identical; but immanence is not identity.

Apart from the evidence of the Vedas and other scriptures, there is a very useful clue to the doctrine of immanence in the etymology of certain names usually applied to God: Viṣṇu, Śipīvīṣṭa, Puruṣa, Nārāyaṇa, and Vāsudeva.

Viṣṇu

The most usual name of God in the devotional philosophy of Rāmānuja is Viṣṇu and this word as well as some of its synonyms suggest God's immanence in man and nature. Viṣṇu is the object of adoration with Rāmānuja as is evident from the invocations with which he begins his writings. The word is found even in the Rgveda, the earliest of the scriptures of the Hindus. The word is derived from the root Viṣl to pervade. One who pervades all beings, moveable and immovable, the sentient and the non-sentient, is Viṣṇu. The word has several other senses viz, the sun, fire, etc. but in religio-philosophical discourses of the Vedānta, it denotes the

Supreme Reality. The Rgveda says that the ancients used to implore Him for His grace; and the Aitareya mentions that Viṣṇu is the Supreme god.

Śipiviṣṭa

We know from the Nirukṭa of Yāska that another name of Viṣṇu is Śipiviṣṭa. This name is as old as Viṣṇu, and both have the same significance. Invoking God by His thousand names, the devotees daily recite the name of Śipiviṣṭa also. But this name seems to have been second to Viṣṇu in the age of the Rgveda. It occurs four times in the 99th and the 100th hymns of book VII of the Rgveda—once in the former and thrice in the latter. Both the hymns are addressed to Viṣṇu. As regards the construction of the word, it seems most probable that the root piṣa became Śipā by metathesis. Such a metathetical process is quite familiar to the scholars of philology. The Sanskrit word for lion—Sinха—is a well-known instance of such a change of letters. The root ‘piṣa’ means to be in particles, and ‘śipī’ thus stands for a particle, the smallest portion, an atom. One who is pervaded (viṣṭa) in Śipi or each and every atom is called Śipiviṣṭa. This meaning of the word seems to have been prevalent among the ancient sages. But as the time went on, the real significance was lost sight of, and the word was interpreted in many fanciful senses. Śaṅkara has offered two alternative interpretations of the word. First, śipi is fauna, so that one who rests among animals as sacrifice is Śipiviṣṭa. Secondly, śipis are rays, and one who is present there is Śipiviṣṭa. The former interpretation is based on Taittiriya Samhitā according to which sacrifice is Viṣṇu, fauna is śipi and it is sacrifice that is among the fauna. The latter interpretation is based on the Mahābhārata according to which Śi is water because it is cold (Śīta), and because the Lord sleeps thereon (Śete); and those which protect and drink water are śipis i.e. rays. Since the Lord is in the rays, He is called Śipiviṣṭa.

Puruṣa

The third epithet is Puruṣa. The idea of God’s immanence as indicated by the derivation, grammatical and philological, of the word Viṣṇu and Śipiviṣṭa is also conveyed by the term ‘Puruṣa’ which is used by Rāmānuja in compounds such as Puruṣa-vara, Paramapuruṣa and Puruṣottama as synonyms of Viṣṇu. There is a hymn containing sixteen stanzas in the Rgveda, which has recorded the great glory of God under the name of Puruṣa (literally man),
hence the hymn is called the ‘Hymn of Man’; and Viṣṇu is traditionally worshiped through that hymn. The gist of it is that Puruṣa protecting this universe by His touch and immanence has transcended it, and that it is the Puruṣa from whom came, after the creation of Virāt or Cosmos, the Vedas, Indra, fire, air, ether, sky, sun, moon, earth, various regions, castes, birds and beasts. The same hymn is repeated in the Yajurveda where we find six more verses added to the original sixteen. The last verse contains the names of Śri and Lakṣmī, which indicates that the Person of the Puruṣa-sūkta is no other than Viṣṇu, for Śri and Lakṣmī are His consorts. According to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, all the worlds are cities as it were: and the one who resides there is Puruṣa.

Nārāyaṇa

The fourth name is Nārāyaṇa which Rāmānuja applies to the Deity. This is very important, because this name forms a part of the holy formulae of the sacred incantation practised by the followers of Viśiṣṭādvaita, and because the mantras containing this name are held to be as sacred as the final advice contained in stanza (18.66) of the Gītā. The word occurred probably for the first time in the Viṣṇugāyatri of the Maitrāyaṇi Samhita where it is mentioned along with keśava and Viṣṇu. While commenting on the hymn of Puruṣa, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa characterises Puruṣa as Nārāyaṇa. The word again occurs in the Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa which contains the Viṣṇugāyatri in an altered form. The Lāṭyāyana Śrauta sutra also makes a reference to the name. According to Manu, nāra is the cosmic (primal) water, the Deity’s abode. He is therefore called Nārāyaṇa meaning ‘one that resides on water’. Whatever is seen or heard in the universe, the Nārāyaṇopanisād says, is pervaded both inwardly and outwardly by Nārāyaṇa. The word occurs in the Rāma-yaṇa also, and the Mahābhārata has simply repeated the idea of the Manuṣmṛti. It has yet another meaning as suggested by grammarians: one whose abode (ayana) is the totality of men (nāra) is Nārāyaṇa. The totality of men i.e. humanity seems, however, to be symbolic for the whole creation.

Vāsudeva

The fifth name is Vāsudeva which also signifies the Deity is all-pervasive. Etymologically, the word is derivable from the root vas =to reside. Sages therefore called Him Vasudeva, the abode of all. It is also significant that Rāmānuja concluded his Śri-bhāṣya with the quotation of a line from the Gītā wherein the Deity Him-
self admits that it is difficult to come across a sage who has realised that all is Vāsudeva.  

Conclusion

Thus all the five names—Viṣṇu, Śipiviṣṭa, Puruṣa, Nārāyaṇa and Vāsudeva—equally point to the philosophic conception that God pervades His creation. They are all equally expressive of God's immanence in man and nature. According to Rāmānuja, God, the inner controller of man and nature, is real; but no less real are men and nature. On this point Śaṅkara differs fundamentally from Rāmānuja. Śaṅkara admits two different standpoints of viewing Reality. From one, Reality is Higher Brahman (para); whereas from the other, it is Lower Brahman (apara). The former lacks attributes which the latter possesses. It is the Lower, and not the Higher Brahman, which according to Śaṅkara, rules over and guides the animate and the inanimate nature. There is neither subjectivity nor objectivity in the Higher Brahman, but the Lower One has both. There is however no such distinction in the philosophy of Rāmānuja. He believes in one type of Brahman and unlike Śaṅkara, he regards Brahman and Īsvara as synonymous. The Supreme of Rāmānuja i.e. Brahman or Īsvara is a person but His personality is not due to any illusion (māyā). The doctrine of the immanence of God in man and nature as explained by Rāmānuja has been accepted by other exponents of Vaiṣṇavism. Commenting on the Brahma Sūtra 1.2.18, Maddhva says that Viṣṇu alone is the indweller. Nimbarka also agrees by holding that Kṛṣṇa upholds all from within. According to the Śuddhādvaita School, Kṛṣṇa as indweller (antaryāmin) pervades the world and regulates it. The Gauḍiya school of Vaiṣṇavism holds that Kṛṣṇa as Paramātmā is the immanent regulator and He is called Mahā-Viṣṇu, Garbhoda-Śāyi and Kṣiraśāyi when viewed respectively from the standpoints of (1) phenomenal totality, (2) totality of individual souls and (3) an individual soul. Thus the apostles of the Vaiṣṇava faith have believed in the Deity's immanence in man and nature. They simply expounded in their own way the doctrine which was set forth in the Pāṇcarātra literature according to which one of the five aspects of the Deity is immanence. Anantārya of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school tries to explain immanence as an inexplicable contact of Divinity with man and the world. Rāmānuja, however, sounds a note of warning. Immanence, he says, should not be confounded with transformation. God's immanence in man and nature, according to him, cannot mean that He is transformed into man and nature. What is really meant is that He pervades the creation and the created.
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CHAPTER V

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

Brahman simultaneously both Nirguna and Saguna—Difference between Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja—Patañjali and Rāmānuja—The absolute or fundamental and the relative attributes—Consciousness—Bliss—Truth—Purity—Infinitude—Attributes in relation to the universe—Attributes in relation to the individual souls in general—Attributes in relation to the individual souls in particular—The six attributes stressed in the Purāṇa and the Pāñcarātra.

Absence of Imperfection and Presence of all Blessed Qualities in God.

Although God is immanent in individual souls and unconscious matter, yet His nature is not in the least affected by their imperfections. Commenting on the Brahma-sūtra 3.2.11-25 Rāmānuja argues that God has two chief characteristics. First, He is devoid of all imperfections (nirdosa) and secondly, He is the abode of all blessed qualities (kalyāṇagunatmaka). The imperfections which belong to the individual soul in its waking consciousness, dreams, deep sleep, swoon and death do not affect the Diety. Nor does His contact with unconscious matter affect His nature. It is not merely one’s residence in a body but one’s subjection to the influence of good and evil deeds that causes one pleasure and pain. Since God is not under the influence of action (karma), His nature is ever free from pollution. The Mundra Upaniṣad says that one of the birds i. e., the jiva eats the sweet fruit while the other i. e., God looks on without eating. God, as Rāmānuja argues, is thus free from all imperfections, and at the same time has blessed qualities. The Chāndogya denies imperfections to God by stating that the Supreme Person is free from evil, free from old age, free from death, free from grief, free from hunger and thirst. It then adds that His wishes are realized and His determinations are fulfilled. ‘Śruti’ is unequivocally in agreement with Rāmānuja on this point. Its first part denies the imperfections and the second affirms the blessed qualities. The Viṣṇupurāṇa declares the same thing. ‘He has all the blessed qualities like energy, strength, might, wisdom and valour; and there are no imperfections—pain and others—in Him. Freedom from all blemishes and possession of all blessed qualities are not incompatible in the
nature of God who is simultaneously both Nirguṇa and Saguna—Nirguṇa in the sense that sattva, rajas and tamas do not exist in His essence (svarūpa), and Saguna in the sense that all blessed qualities are His essential attributes. The Viṣṇu-purāṇa clearly states that the triad of material attributes is absent in God.6 The positive blessed qualities of God are so impressing and attracting that even the emancipated souls, revelling in themselves keep themselves engaged in unselfish devotion to God.7 Endless is the number of the blessed qualities that qualify Him.8

Śaṅkara denied all attributes to the Higher Brahman and held that it is the Lower Brahman that possesses attributes. In his ṣaṭpadi (a poem consisting of six stanzas), he praised the Deity as an abode of attributes (guṇa-mandira)9 Both Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja adored Viṣṇu, but they viewed the Deity from different angles. According to the former, Viṣṇu is Brahman as associated with cosmic ignorance, whereas according to the latter, no such thing can be associated with Him. Again, according to Advaita Vedānta, attributes such as omniscience and lordship belong to the Lower Brahman and not to the Absolute, the Higher Brahman. Since the limiting adjunct of Īśvara has preponderance of pure sattva, He knows, creates and rules over all. But Brahman, the unconditioned, pure consciousness, does not have these attributes. God, according to Śaṅkara, is thus saguṇa (possessor of attributes) and He is so in virtue of His association with ignorance in its cosmic aspect. Although ignorance, as he holds, cannot be described either as being or non-being, yet it is, in his view, made of three positive qualities—sattva, rajas and tamas.10 It is because of God’s possession of these three qualities of which sattva is the most predominant, that He is saguṇa.11 The Absolute on the other hand is nirguṇa (devoid of attributes), because these qualities do not belong to it. Thus did Śaṅkara admit two aspects of Brahman.12 But Rāmānuja admitted no distinction between the Higher Brahman and the Lower Brahman. According to him, the Supreme Reality is one; and It is simultaneously nirguṇa and saguṇa. It is nirguṇa in the sense that It has no attribute in common with prakṛti. It is again saguṇa, because all the auspicious qualities such as bliss, beauty, compassion, omniscience belong to It. Maddha,13 Nimbarka,14 Vallabha,15 and Rūpa Goswāmi16 agree with Rāmānuja in admitting the absence in God of all defects that are natural to the world of matter and individual souls and the presence in Him of all auspicious qualities.

God as conceived by the Yoga system is a puruṣa endowed with pure consciousness. He is predominantly characterised by sattva17
and so comes to possess the attribute of omniscience. The omniscient aspect of God is, therefore, according to Yoga, not essential but adventitious. Cognition being a function of buddhi, its association gives God a foreign character. Yoga thus differs from Rāmānuja who holds that knowledge is not an accidental feature of God but essential to Him.

All the auspicious attributes constitute the essence of God. Rāmānuja has classified them under two heads which we might respectively call the absolute and the relative. The former are admitted in common by all systems of meditation, but the latter are admitted only by some particular ones. Rāmānuja holds that the conception of God as endowed with the absolute qualities is essential to all forms of meditation, while they may differ from one another with regard to relative attributes. Truth, consciousness, bliss, purity and infinity are fundamental qualities, while compassion etc., are relative ones. For the sake of convenience the latter may be classified as follows:

1. Attributes in relation to the universe e.g. creatorship,
2. Attributes in relation to the individual souls in general e.g. dispensation of the fruits of actions, and
3. Attributes in relation to the souls individually and separately e.g. assurance of safety to those who seek protection.

As regards the blessed attributes, Rāmānuja states that He has an infinite number of them. Those among them which he frequently mentions are as follows.

The Fundamental Attributes

Consciousness

Śankara strove his best to establish the unqualified nature of Brahman. He viewed It as devoid of all differences and held that the traid of knower, knowledge and the object known is a product of nescience. As there are no attributes in Brahman, It is unqualified. Even consciousness cannot be called an attribute of Brahman. It is, according to him, the essence of Brahman. But Rāmānuja disagrees and argues that since Brahman is the abode of infinite blessed qualities, It cannot but be qualified. It is attributes such as bliss and consciousness that constitute the essence of God, just as light and heat do in the case of fire. We cannot conceive of fire without light, heat etc.; similarly we cannot conceive of God apart from consciousness, bliss etc. Consciousness being an attribute of Brahman, the latter is a knower. Consciousness is thus the essence as well as the

*The Upaniṣads s, e.g. of several Vidyās such as Dahara-vidyā and Śāṇḍilya-vidya which prescribe different modes of meditation.
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attribute of Brahman, just as heat is the essence as well as the attribute of fire. Hence Rāmānuja calls these attributes the essential attributes of God. Brahman cannot be regarded as omniscient, if He be held to be mere consciousness. He can be spoken of as omniscient only when knowledge is considered to be one of His attributes. God is all-knowing, because He knows whatever exists. Knowledge presupposes the knower and the known. In the expression ‘omniscient’ i.e. all-knowing the ‘omni’ or ‘all’ refers to the objects and the ‘scient’ or ‘Knower’, to the subject of knowledge. Even an individual soul is a knower (of course, in a limited sense) only in so far as he has knowledge as one of his attributes. If it were not so, he would not have had the experience: ‘I am conscious’, instead of ‘I am consciousness’. Rāmānuja did not believe, like Śaṅkara, in pure, unqualified, transcendental consciousness, but held that consciousness and knowledge are synonymous. However, just as smell is different from earth, so is the attribute of knowledge different from its substratum, the ātman. Hence Viśiṣṭādvaita lays stress on the difference between a substance and an attribute. It agrees with the Naiyāyikas on this point. Keśava Miśra says that the relation between two inseparable entities is the relation of samavāya which subsists between (a) the whole and its part, and (b) substance and its attribute etc. The relation of samavāya or necessary inherence between substance and attribute of the Nyāya system is, in fact, the same as the relation of aprthak-siddhi of Viśiṣṭādvaita.

The ātman’s subjecthood is no defect in it. To be knower is to be the substratum of the attribute of knowledge which is the essential nature of the ātman. Rāmānuja does not, however, favour the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view that knowledge is an adventitious attribute of the self. On the contrary, he takes knowledge to be essentially related to the self. He does not, likewise, approve of the Śaṅkhya view that knowledge is, at the kevala stage, devoid of the difference between the knower and the known. For Rāmānuja, mere consciousness is not the self. The characteristic of the self is egoity, and on this point the ācārya agrees with Prabhākara school of Mīmāṃsā. The view that ahaṅkāra is itself the knower, Rāmānuja argues, is wrong, because ahaṅkāra is unconscious and so can never be the knower. According to Śaṅkara, the self and consciousness are one whereas the self and egoity are different; but according to Rāmānuja and Prabhākara, the self and egoity are one while the self and knowledge are different.

An individual soul depends for its knowledge on the sense-organs; hence its knowledge is dependent, voluntary and partial.
But God’s knowledge is of a different nature, being independent, spontaneous and complete. If knowledge is eternal, how is it, one might urge, that we have it in the waking state but lose it in deep sleep? The reply is that an embodied soul does not actually apprehend external objects in deep sleep because of the prevalence, during that state, of tamas, just as fire does not burn fuel when it is obstructed by a special stone, although its burning capacity is there all the time.

The followers of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school hold that substance and attribute are different. An attribute cannot be a substance. But in the philosophy of Rāmānuja consciousness is both a substance and an attribute inasmuch as it inheres in its substratum and also transcends it just as light inheres in the sun and also goes beyond it.\(^{27}\) Viśisṭādvaita thus classifies attributes under two heads viz. (a) pure attributes and (b) attributes cum substance; and places consciousness under the latter. The Vedic conception that the mind of a waking person goes away far and that of a sleeping one returns,\(^{28}\) might have suggested to Viśisṭādvaita philosophy the idea that an individual soul resides in the heart,\(^{29}\) whereas its attribute, consciousness, reaches not only all parts of the body but also goes beyond to external objects through the sense-organs.\(^{30}\) In corroboration of this view Rāmānuja put forward instances of a gem, the sun and so on, which themselves remain at one place but emit their rays far and wide.\(^{31}\)

God is omniscient. He knows all things perfectly and eternally. His knowledge is immediate inasmuch as it does not depend upon the function of the sense-organs as does knowledge in the case of individual souls. Omniscience does not, however, embrace what is self-contradictory. God cannot, for instance, be supposed to know the cessation of His own eternal being. And it would be futile to assign ignorance to God as does the author of the Nāsadiya-sūkta in the Rgveda, doubting if even the Lord Himself knows or knows not whence this creation came.\(^{32}\) Such a doubt may imply poetic beauty and suggest the unimaginable vastness and mysteriousness of the world, but philosophically speaking, creation is not due to any thing but God. It is where it has been all the time. One’s ignorance of what does not exist presupposes one’s true knowledge.\(^{33}\)

**Bliss**

Consciousness is not the only attribute of God; He has other attributes also. Lustre is not the only attribute of a piece of a diamond, it has a shape and possesses weight. A substance may thus have many attributes, but it is only natural that we should make men-
tion only of those attributes which are most prominent. We speak of lustre in a gem, sweet taste in sugar, heat in fire, light in the sun, fragrance in the flower and so on. But this does not mean that these objects do not possess other attributes. As a matter of fact, they do possess other attributes. A gem, for instance, has weight; sugar has whiteness; fire has glow; the sun has heat; and a flower has colour too. Similarly God possesses many qualities in addition to omniscience, and bliss is one of them.\(^{31}\)

Bliss has its grades, and the Taittiriya Upaniṣad has enumerated them starting from the human and ending in the Divine.\(^{32}\) It shows that God’s bliss is the highest. Bliss is an attribute of God, but sometimes the term is used as a synonym of God.\(^{33}\) Since ānanda (bliss) inheres in God, He is characterised as ānandamaya (blissful). The suffix ‘maya’ indicates profuseness or abundance and not transformation, says Rāmānuja.\(^{34}\) One might urge that the presence of abundance of bliss in God implies the presence of some measure of pain in Him. To this Rāmānuja replies that the scriptures speak of the absence of all pain in Him.\(^{35}\) ‘Rasa’ is another name for ānanda; hence God is called ‘Rasa’ too.\(^{36}\)

It is necessary to note in this connection that bliss as an attribute of God is not the same thing as the ānanda which Saṅkhya conceives as the object of an organ of action.\(^{37}\) In the case of an embodied soul the mediacy of an organ may be necessary for the enjoyment of bliss, but God’s bliss is, like His knowledge, independent, spontaneous and complete.

**Truth**

God’s existence yields to no transformation and so is absolute or supreme. The changing universe rests in God who is changeless. He is therefore called Sat. There is also no contraction in Divine consciousness as there may be in the consciousness of individual souls in association with action (karma). God is therefore the ‘real of the reals’ or the ‘truth of the truths.’\(^{38}\)

**Infinity**

God transcends both time and space i.e. He is not limited by them. The Upaniṣad says that Brahman is ananta.\(^{39}\) The Bhāgavata says, ‘Salutation to Him whose end is not known even to gods and demons alike.’\(^{40}\)

**Purity**

God is free from all imperfections of the empirical world e.g. pleasure and pain, hunger and thirst, old age and death. The above-
mentioned attributes viz. truth, consciousness, bliss and infinity are specifically characteristics of God inasmuch as they are fundamentally opposed to the evils of mundane life.\textsuperscript{44}

*Attributes in Relation to the Universe.*

God is both the efficient and the material cause of the universe. Again, the whole creation rests in Him. He supports the entire universe and He is the abode of heaven and earth and so on.\textsuperscript{45} Furthermore, God holds back all creation in Him, at the time of dissolution. He consumes all whether moving or stationary.\textsuperscript{46}

*Power (bala)*

The quality with which God supports the universe is called *bala*. The Upaniṣad says that the sun and the moon, the sky and the earth keep firm in their places under Divine order.\textsuperscript{47} God upholds all lest they should fall asunder.

*Prowess (vīrya)*

Freedom from transmutation is vīrya.\textsuperscript{48} Milk is changed into curd, and such transformation is observed everywhere in the domain of nature. But God is above such change; hence He is called *nir-vikāra.*

*Energy (Śakti)*

It is the attribute in virtue of which God makes possible what seems impossible. He can turn a mote into a mountain and vice versa, by means of His energy which is indeed incomprehensible to the human mind. The Upaniṣad says that the Supreme energy of God is multifarious.\textsuperscript{49}

*Overlordship (aīśvarya)*\textsuperscript{50}

God keeps all things under His control.\textsuperscript{51} He rules over all the sentient and the insentient beings. The antaryāmi-brāhmaṇa of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad mentions objects such as the earth, the individual soul and so on which are controlled by God. The Māṇḍukya says that God is the Lord of all,\textsuperscript{52} and Bṛhadāraṇyaka also avers that He is Master of all beings.\textsuperscript{53}

*True Desire and Infallible Resolve*

God's will is never hampered, and nothing can impede His desires. Countless things are accomplished by His resolve.
THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

Attributes in Relation to the Individual Souls in General

Source of their activity

The individual souls are inspired in their activities by the Lord. Every action depends, according to Rāmānuja, upon volitional effort and he points out that the injunctions and the prohibitions laid down in the scriptures are not meaningless. God aids the effort of the individual souls by granting them His permission. He is, however, not to be blamed as partial and cruel. Diversity of pleasure and pain generally takes place in accordance with the past actions of the individual souls. But, holds Rāmānuja, in exceptional cases, particularly in the case of extremely devoted persons, the primary effort is actuated by God.

Dispensation of the fruits of Action

Action is non-intelligent; hence it is incapable of bringing about good or bad result in future. According to Rāmānuja, it is omniscient and omnipotent. God who gives us various forms of enjoyment here or hereafter as well as release from temporal life.

Sweetness (mādhurya)

The sages who realized God found Him to be most pleasant and agreeable, and they have told about His sweetness to others. Ultimate Reality is indeed supernatural, but the sages employed certain words of everyday use to express its nature. They could not find in the vocabulary of common use better words than ‘Life’, ‘Light’ and so on; and they had to rest content with the use of such words for the purpose. They loved the Real and were happy to call it by the best names available. Bādarāyaṇa warned the readers of the Upaniṣads against the folly confounding such epithets of God as Life and Light with material life and light, and Rāmānuja, while commenting on the Brahma Sūtra 1.1.28, has clearly brought out this point.

Compassion (karuṇa)

Compassion prompts God to do good to the individual souls and to grant them salvation. This attribute has been conceived by Vadgalais as the desire to remove the pain of the afflicted devotee; and by the Tengalais, as the experience of the pain of the afflicted. Hence a point of dispute between the two sects.

Mildness of Disposition (Mārdava)

Śrīnivāsadāsa has conceived this attribute as God’s inability to bear separation from His devotees. Śri Kṛṣṇa has said, ‘I would not be
able to bear separation of my lovers from me' (Rāmānuja on Gītā 8. 14). 61

Sincerity (ārjava)

It has been understood as uniformity of thought, speech and action. 62

Dexterity (cāturya)

It is the skill of concealing the shortcomings of devotees, according to Śrīnivāsdāsa 63

Equality (sāmya)

It is the attribute of being adorable by all irrespective of differences of caste and creed. 64

Affection (vātsalya)

According to Śrīnivāsadāsa, this attribute consists in either not taking into consideration the devotees' imperfections, or in regarding their demerits as merits. 65

Friendliness (sauhārda)

God is the eternal friend of individual souls. The conception of God's friendliness is as old as the Rgveda (1.164.20). 66 The Śvetāśvatara reiterates the same (4.6). 67 The Gītā also reveals that God is friend of all beings (5.29). 68 Rāmānuja adds that all people move forward to adore friends. 69 Śrīnivāsadāsa has, however, interpreted 'sauhārda' as the quality of being engrossed in the protection of the other. 70

Attributes in Relation to the Individual Souls in Particular.

Excellence of Disposition (sausūlya)

God is affable to inferiors. He comes down to live even amongst persons of low status such as cowherds with whom He sports without the least reserve.

Generosity (audārya)

As an illustration of this attribute, Kūresa has referred, in his Octave on Nārāyaṇa or (Nārāyaṇaṭaka), to Śrī Kṛṣṇa's attitude towards Draupadi in supplying her with immense raiments. 71

Firmness (sthairya)

As an instance of this attribute one might quote, from the Rāmāyaṇa, the incident where Rāma, finding Lākṣmāna wounded on the battlefield, did not care in the least for the shower of arrows
darted upon him by the enemy, but went on taking out the missile from the brother’s wound.\textsuperscript{72}

\textbf{Valour (\textit{Śaurya})}

According to Śrīnivāsadāsa, valour is the capacity for entering into hostile forces. Rāma, for instance, chivalrously desired to face the forces led by Khara, despite his knowledge that even Lakṣmāna could overcome them.\textsuperscript{73}

\textbf{Heroism (\textit{parākrama})}

It has been interpreted as subjugation of the hostile party. Rāma’s victory over Rāvana may be quoted as an instance.\textsuperscript{74}

\textbf{Gratitude (\textit{kṛtaññātā})}

Rāma’s attitude towards Hanumān when the latter had brought the news of Šītā’s safety and whereabouts, may be mentioned as an instance of gratitude.\textsuperscript{75}

\textbf{Assurance of Safety to Those Seeking Protection (\textit{Śarañyatā})}

While extending His assurance of safety to Vibhiṣaṇa, Rāma said, “I vouchsafe fearlessness from all beings to one who even once surrenders to Me and says ‘I am thine, O Lord.’”\textsuperscript{76}

\textbf{Fortitude (\textit{dhaireya})}

It is the mental power in meeting dangers, but Śrīnivāsadāsa has interpreted it as the keeping of promises.\textsuperscript{77}

\textbf{Removal of Afflicion (\textit{ārtiharatā})}

For example, the Lord at once came to help Gajendra when the latter was attacked by an alligator. The story is well known, and is narrated at length in the Bhāgavata (Canto VIII, Chapters 2 to 4).\textsuperscript{78}

\textbf{Vigour (\textit{tejas}).}

It is the attribute in virtue of which one dominates over others.\textsuperscript{79}

\textbf{Attainability with Ease (\textit{saubhaya})}

God is easy to attain for one who yearns for eternal union with Him, says Rāmānuja.\textsuperscript{80}

Of the many attributes of God, the Viṣṇu-purāṇa lays stress on six viz consciousness, power, prowess, energy, vigour and overlordship,\textsuperscript{81} and alternatively refers to overlordship, consciousness, renown; lustre, righteousness and renunciation.\textsuperscript{82} The Purāṇa tells
us that a collective group of these six qualities is called ‘bhaga’,
and that he who possess all of them in entirety or fulness is called
Bhagavān. This word is primarily used for God, but only secondarily
for gods, sages and the like.\textsuperscript{83} The pāṭikaṭṭa view on the attributes of God tallies with that of the Viśṇu-purāṇa.\textsuperscript{84} Kūreśa has made a mention, in his octave ode to Nārāyaṇa, of another group of six attributes which appealed perhaps most to him. They are: affection, protection, removal of affliction, generosity, removal of sins and bestowal of high status.\textsuperscript{85}

Rupa Gosvāmī of the Gaudīya Vaiṣṇava School has enumerated sixty-four attributes of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The sweet sports, circle of the affectionate, playing on the flute and excellent beauty are regarded by him as Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s exclusive attributes.\textsuperscript{86} The remaining sixty are said to exist in Nārāyaṇa also.\textsuperscript{87} Śiva, Brahmā, etc., have fifty-five,\textsuperscript{88} whereas others are conceived as possessing fifty only, but of course on a small scale.\textsuperscript{89}

The view held by Rāmānuja that God’s attributes are innumerable is in accord with the teachings of the scriptural texts. Eulogizing Śrī Lākṣmī, Indra says in the Viṣṇu-purāṇa: “Even Brahmā cannot exhaustively describe thy attributes, O mother!”\textsuperscript{90} Rightly do the gods say in Kālidāsa’s Raghuvamśa (10.32): ‘That we refrain from praising thy greatness, O Lord, is due to our fatigue and incapability and not to any limitations to Thy attributes.’\textsuperscript{91}
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निवयस्य स्वाभाविकर्त्तस्य विनिवयस्य। (भ्रमायम्)
25. भ्रमर्यं एव प्रत्यागता न जातसामा्म। (भ्रमायम्)
26. न जातुल्यमानाकारस्य, न कदाचिदिप जहः सातुलमानाकारस्य शातुर्यमानाष्
मानाधवः। (भ्रमायम्)
27. ब्रह्मायवास्तो तु यात्रेषाः समनवयाः। व्यावं च गुणायं च जानाम सानय
प्रतिपदये। (यामुनाचारः)
— एवं च केवल द्वययमङ्गुयः केवलकेवल-गुणायं इति विशिष्या गुणाः। (तत्तत्रतमतदिपिकां प्रकाश ठीका)
28. यज्ञावतो डूरायुर्देति द्वं तदु मुस्तय तपयदेवि, डूरायुर्मणोऽयोऽदं
वमने: विव-वंस्वरस्मानुम्। (तत्तववर्धः)
29. डूरायेवेच हास्यम: विविष्य: हृतिति: धृतोऽवयः। (भ्रमायम् २. १. २७.)
30. (१) श्रामा स्वायुणे श्रामान सकलवेदः व्यावायविष्यः। (भ्रमायम् २. १. २६.)
(२) हृते: पादाशिषोदं चारण्ति तथा श्रामप्रवत्त्यादारा निस्स्वत्त्यां सिद्धात्यातः।
(तत्तत्रतमतदिपिका ७)
31. यथा मित्र-यु मित्रमुरुनिनामक-देशवस्तितामालोको नैकेश्वर्यायी हृतयोः।
(भ्रमायम् २. १. २६.)
32. यथा श्रायधावः परस्यो व्योमस्य तद्दर्भं यद्व वद वानवेद। (तत्तववर्धः १०. १२६.७.)
33. यज्ञायायद्वयनुयायायं सब्यतताय विवुः, आणात्मभोजस्मद्वायं खदु विवु
हानीमित्युस्मुः। (श्री अत्यतः)
34. ब्राह्मणं ब्रह्मस्य विवदानं। विवास्मानां वहः। (तैत्तिरिय २. ४.)
35. सैनिणीद्र्यम् भीष्मोऽत्ति... स एको मानुष्य ग्राहनः... ते येष संवापत्तेरान
नन्दा: स एको ब्रह्मण ग्राहनः। (तैत्तिरियोपनिषद्य २०५)
36. (१) ग्राहनं ग्रहणोऽद्य व्याजणम्।
(२) प्राणस्थापनं: सारसूत्रोऽद्य इति प्राण ग्राहनं सादेन व्यापदेशये। (भ्रमायम् २. १. २६.)
(३) वधार्यायवपदेशये। (भ्रमायम् २. १. १.)
(४) ग्राहनं: वधार्यायवपदेशये। (भ्रमायम् २. १. १.३.)
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37. ब्रह्मण्यं विकारासम्भवात्, प्रातुमयिः मयद्विविष-सज्जात्वैचार्यानत्मं परं श्रवः।

38. यद्यतम्, प्रातुमय:प्रायुक्ततःसज्जात्वैचार्यानत्मं तदस्तु प्रमाणान्तरितः
तदर्थोगमम्। (भीमायम २. १४)

39. (ल) रविशवाहिनियान्त्मयालमात्वा। (भीमायम २. २०)
(ब) रतो ैव सः। (तत्त्तरीयोपनिषद् २. २)

40. वननादन-विश्रुतांगोलिन्तावं पंचानां। (सांवभकारिका)

41. तत्य अं ब्रह्मांकः सद्यस्थ सत्तमात्मति नामकथम् यः।
जीवाणुं कर्मावृत्तमेय, ज्ञात्संकोचविकासी बिच्येत्, परममुक्तम्य लक्ष्मणावर्तमात्रानं
त बिच्येत् प्रत्येकोगमस्तं सत्यम्। (भीमायम ३. २२)

42. सल्य ज्ञान मनलं ब्रह्म। (तत्त्तरीयोपनिषद् २. १. २)

43. यववांस न विकुः सुरसुरस्यादेवाय तत्तेन नमः। (भागवतम १२. १३. २)

44. हेयप्रत्यक्षींको हानिदानविविषयमं असाधारणं हुमम। (भीमायम ३. ३३)

45. भ्रुविववादीमविन्यासतः दृष्टं ब्रह्म। (भीमायम ३. १. १)

46. चराबरस कहानयात्स्वं दृष्टं तत्स्वेव सम्भवित। (भीमायम १. २. ६)

47. एतस्तव वा प्रकारस्य प्रशासने गाणि सूयघाक्षमसी विचित्रो विद्यानि चति:।
(भूहरुणक २. ५)

48. बीयथविकारित्वम्। (बृहस्पतिद्विपि ७)

49. परात्य शरिकविविशेष भूयते स्वामित्रिकाज्ञाबलविक्याः। (कम्बादस्तक ६. ५)

50. (ल) ऐसवथ नियमन-सामथम्। (बृहस्पतिद्विपि ७)
(ब) पत्याधिक्रोम्य। (भूहरुणक २. ४१)

51. तत्त्वज्ञानसर्वाधिकारी किं भविष्यत्ति कहलं गजकम्पयः। (भीमायम १. ३. ४५)

52. एव सर्वस्वर। (भूहरुणक ६. ६)

53. सर्वबध्य वदी सर्वस्वेदनां। (भूहरुणक ४. ४. २२)

54. तत्त्वज्ञानसर्वाधिकारी परात्यमप्रमाण चतुरोऽविवर्तित। (भीमायम २. ३. ५०)

55. पुष्पवेय कुः प्रयत्नमुत्पत्तिमेकोत्स्वस्तं चप्रायदमा तत्तानुमदित्तश्च भविष्यत।
परमात्मात्मतिमत्तरं शास्त्रयुक्तिमयम्य। (भीमायम २. ३. ४१)

56. (ल) सुभाषणमे-वाक्यातदृ-केष्ठममत्स्वप्रकाशविलितम्-स्व-कर्म:। (भीमायम २. १. ३४)
(ब) केष्ठ-कामानुसरणम् वविष्णुसप्तद्विय-वाक्याम्। (भीमायम २. १. ३५)

57. स एव हि सर्वम्: सर्वभक्तिन्होहराः यायादानहोमदिशिकां व्रतां च भविष्यत।
(भीमायम ३. २. ३७)

58. (ल) मायवान्वन्द्रथि कथयाणुगुणाग्रेष-महाएम। (भूरनारम्य)
(ब) परिच्छेदनिरस्त-नियग्निमात्मन-प्रयोजनाविविषयकातियताविविषय-भगवदनुवम्। (भराराम्य)

59. (ल) परं ब्रह्मणाघात प्रकाशम्, श्रवणभित्रविमिति निर्भवम्। (भीमायम १. २४)
(ब) च एव अनुदेशादायनविद्य इति निर्भवम्। (भीमायम १. २५)

60. प्राप्तिति-विशेषमुत्तमायको माधवम्। (यत्तद्वादिपि ७)

61. तद्वयगमसहायोममृत्यु। (गीतायाय राम: १०. १४)

62. मनोवाहवेद्गुणात्मविवेयम्। (भृहस्पतिद्विपि ७)
63. यतीन्द्रमतदीपिका ७। 
64. वस्तुतिकात्त्वकर्षणेः सब्रामणेषु सवृद्धेः सभारुषस्यामेवेन समोद्हवः। 
(गीतायां रामायुजः-भाष्यम् ६। २६।)

65. बामल्य स्वपनमुंगालबुद्धिस्वादनसिद्धि वा। 
66. द्वा सुपुर्णाः सुतुरा सलायाः। 
67. द्वा सुपुर्णाः सङ्कुचा सलायाः। 
68. सुहृद् सर्वभूतानां शाल्मां स्वतिनिमुच्छति। 
69. सुहृदमारायणाय सवृद्ध्व वस्त्रोत्साहाय। (गीतायां रामायुजः भाष्यम् ६। २६।)
70. स्वस्तत्यानेषु-तदेकार्यार्थेन सौहार्दम्। 
(यतीत्वमतदीपिका ७।)

71. भो वृहस्पतिः भो वृहस्पतिः हरे भो पांडवानां सङ्केते। कार्य कार्य सुपुर्णानारायणाः भो रक्त मारायुजः। 
हृदयकृष्ण-वर्षण-सभारुषस्यामेवेन लक्ष्मणः। 
वातेऽरुपायेऽ: स भवानु नारायणाः में गति।। 
(नारायणायुजः ५।)

72. तो करायस्य परामुद्याय राय: शर्करं भयावहम्। 
वर्मय समरे कुड़ी बलवानु विचारर्य संवेग। 
तस्य निष्ठवते: शर्करं रायनेन बलीयसा। 
शर्कर: सब्रवेण्य सान्तितम ममभेदनी।। 
अभिनवपतितेऽगायं भाषणं समारिलस्य व लक्षमणः। 
स्वबीच्छ हृदयमृत्तु सुपुर्णेऽवस्य रावय।। 
स्वतं परिवर्ते तन्तोवं वानरादेहः।। 
परामुद्य मारेण वस्मो ने में भित्तिपितः।। 
(रामायुजः ६। १००४।)

73. लेव छिल तुरोर बलवानु हुस्या ऐताना संवेगः। 
स्वयं नित्यसत्तित्वम्भरचर्या वस्मीत्व निराचराचरां। 
(रामायुजः ३।२४।१४।)

74. (६) वेय पत्यन्तु रामस्य रामेय मम संवेगः। 
(भ) तस्य कोषः समवेत्यो: सिद्यान्तम्येन-नारायणः।। 
(रामायुजः ६। २००।५४।) 
(६) ते मौहणा: परारामः। 
(रामायुजः ६। १२३३।११।)

75. हृदयक्षं भावमविष्णुगो रामान्तो परिस्थिते। 
हृदयमृत्तु तदात्मानं तत्कालयुष्मांगतम्। 
(रामायुजः ६। १२४।)

76. सक्रेद्विं प्रस्ताय तस्वामीति च याचते। 
सक्रेद्विं सब्रेद्विं ददामयेतु व्ययमः॥ (रामायुजः)

77. (बि) यत नाभित्वमस्ते हित्सत्यवत्तिना नाभित्वम्। 
हित्तित्तिना न चाहिने रामो दिनोन्नित्वमैथिने। 
(वरायुजः ६।१२६।)

78. छन्दोमयेन गहिनेन सुमहानां; क्ष्ठित्वश्चोपस्यमदाहु यतो यज्ञेनः।। 
(भागवतम् ५।३।३१।)

79. तेजः परामुद्यस्य समुद्यायः। (यतीन्द्रमतदीपिका ७।)
80. तस्य नित्यसुतस्य नित्यकार्योऽनावकारस्य योगीनाशोऽसुलमः। 
(गीतायां रामायुजः ५। २५।)

81. जानतित्वकर्षणस्य वीरः तेजस्तस्यस्येत्। 
भवदुष्यदिभावती विज्ञाप्ते हृदयं गारिभिः।। 
(विभुपुरायुजः ६। ५।३६।)

82. ऐश्वर्यस्य समप्रस्य धर्मस्य वयस: नियमः।
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83. तत्त्व वृज्य-निदानादीतिन्त्व-समर्पण-सम्बन्धः
शब्दीय नोपवारेक तबन्ध शु पुच्छ:- (विक्षिप्तस्मार्क ६.५.७४)
(व) स्वाभाविक-निररितशैलानवृद्धिवो वीर्यविकसित यज: प्रभूवाचरितमोदस्मार यज:।
(श्रीमद्भाग्यम् १.३.२०)

85. वासपायाय भम-रत्नान-समयादानात्मक-निवासपायः
श्रीदाराशं दशमोह्यादराधारात्मक-अर्थः पदप्राप्तात्। (तारायणाः)

86. सब्दभूत चमकाए शीला कल्लील बारिशः
प्रतुव भुपुर रेम मण्डत प्रय मण्डलः।
विजयगम्यावकृति मुरलीकल कृकिरतः।
साधारणक रुप धी साधारणक-चरितः।
लीला-मोद्याव मिश्याविवत्य माधुर्ये वेषुरुप्योऽ।
हस्तसाक्षे वोकां गोविन्दस्य चतुर्याम्। (भक्ति रसामृतसिद्ध २.१.३३४)

87. प्रयोगस्यमेव गुणाः। पंच ये तत्त्वमादित्यम वित्तनः।
(भक्ति रसामृतसिद्ध २.१.२६)

88. प्रय पंच गुणाः मेव स्यु रक्षेत निरिक्षादित्यम। (भक्ति रसामृतसिद्ध २.१.२६)
(भक्ति रसामृतसिद्ध २.१.२६)

98. गुणगृहेत वर्णानुपि विभिन्दिग्यं व्यविधात। (भक्ति रसामृत २.१.२६)
99. न ते वर्णानुपि अन्तः हुँयानु निर्द्विमपि वेषस: (विक्षिप्तस्मार्क १.६.१३३)
100. महिमान्य युक्तीस्य तव संस्मरिर्ते वचः।
(रुपमन १०.३२)
CHAPTER VI

THE DIVINE FORM.

God’s form is His ‘svarūpabhūta’—Composed of six attributes—God does not require sense organs for perceiving objects—Suddha-sattva, visuddha-sattva, prakṛṣṭa-sattva or suddha-tattva—Views of Śaṅkara and Nimbārka—Difference of opinion between Lokācārya and Veṅkaṭanātha—M.N. Sircar, Roma Bose & Gopinātha Kavirāja on suddha—sattva—Views of the Bengal Vaiṣṇavism—Rahasyāmnāya view—Superb beauty—Blue colour—Ever budding youth—The presence of Śrī on the Divine Person.

Just as there are certain scriptural texts to show that God has attributes, so there are others to tell us that He has a form too. The Īṣa Upaniṣad, for instance, tells us that He has a most beneficial form. The Muṇḍaka informs that the colour of the Deity is like that of gold, and adds that He discloses His form to him whom He chooses. The Brhadāraṇyaka also says the same thing, and the Chāṇḍogya has compared His eyes with lotuses.

In the Vedārtha-saṅgraha, Rāmānuja bases himself on scriptural authority in his view that Brahman has really a form just as he holds, on the basis of the same authority, that He has attributes. By the word ‘form’, he means the Deity’s most beautiful man-like shape comprising eyes and ears, lips and chin, hands and feet. Commenting on the Brahma-sūtra 1.1.21 in the Śrī-bhāṣya, the Ācārya says that the scriptures deny to the Supreme Brahman only those attributes and bodies which are the products of prakṛti, but that they proclaim that He has supernatural (aprakṛta) attributes and form. He further points out that Brahman individualises the form that is natural to Him into that of man, god etc. simply for the satisfaction of the devotees.

The Divine attributes and form which have been characterised as ‘benign’ (kalyāṇa) in the Śrī-bhāṣya are termed respectively as identity-attributes and identity-form in the Vedārtha-saṅgraha. God’s form is His own nature or essence just as His attributes are. It is not made of the three constituents of matter—sattva, rajas and tamas—inasmuch as it is the manifestation of His pure essence, without the admixture of anything else. Even sattva, the most re-
fined aspect of prakṛti, has nothing to do with the Divine form. The Viṣṇu-purāṇa denies the existence of not only rajas and tamas but also of sattva in the Deity.¹⁹

The Divine attributes and the Divine form being essentially inseparable from Divinity, God is said to have a form of consciousness or one of bliss. Although the Diety is a repository of innumerable Divine attributes, and He is even regarded as having a form made of all attributes,¹⁴ yet six of them are held to be most prominent, and hence He is described by the Āgamās and afterwards by Rāmānuja as 'having a form of six attributes'.¹⁵ The form thus being identical with God, the synonyms for 'pure', 'real', 'conscious' and 'bliss' are used to denote it; and the expression 'Saccidānanda-ghana' of so common use in devotional literature in India is the most comprehensive of all. The compound word 'Saccidānanda-ghana', in which 'ghanā' means crystalline form,¹⁶ signifies pure, conscious, blissful reality in its crystalline form.

Rāmānuja's admission of the identity-form of the Deity is not, however, anything new. For the doctrine of the identity of the Deity and His form was already a part of the Paurāṇic tradition which looked upon all Divine forms as made up of pure consciousness and bliss.¹⁷

Difficulty may arise as to how the Deity feels and knows the external objects while He is devoid of a body and sense-organs which are evolutes of matter. Rāmānuja's reply is simply this that the Deity's activities such as hearing, seeing, etc. do not depend upon the function of the sense-organs, He being essentially omniscient.¹⁸ An embodied soul, of course, requires the aid of sense-organs for its perception of sound etc. inasmuch as its inherent knowledge being dormant in bondage needs external aid for its manifestation. But in case of the Deity, who is never in bondage, no such external aid is necessary for the possibility of His knowledge. Although it is difficult for us to grasp the possibility of perceiving things without the assistance of external sense-organs, yet we must believe in scriptural injunctions which clearly mention that the Diety's activities—perceptual and others—take place without the aid of sense-organs. The Śvaetāsvatara says that He holds without hands, walks without feet, sees without eyes and hears without ears.¹⁹

As a result of the evolutionary process of matter, the eleven organs—mind and others—come out of sāttvika ahaṅkāra. Since the sense-organs thus originate from ahaṅkāra, we cannot attribute them
to the Deity who is devoid of all elements of prakṛti. Divine form then is non-material, a form of bliss and consciousness. A material body indeed comprises flesh and blood which are products of food. But the Deity is not made of blood, flesh, marrow, bones and the like. He needs no food for its sustenance. Nor are there in Him changes such as birth, growth and decay. We should not extend the concomitance of human body with blood and flesh to the Divine form also. That is applicable only to those bodies which are material and born of prakṛti. Just as we cannot apply that concomitance to a statue of stone where form exists without blood and flesh; similarly it is not applicable to the Divine form which is a shape of pure reality. Just as stone is the material cause of a statue (carved out of stone) whose different parts are nothing but stone and which does not depend on blood and flesh for its existence; similarly the stuff of the Divine form is pure consciousness, its different limbs being nothing but consciousness, not depending on blood and flesh for its existence. Blood and flesh help the gross body only, but the Deity does not take up even causal and subtle bodies, not to speak of a gross one. He is devoid of the threefold material bodies, but has a form of His own essential attributes. There is nothing ugly in that most elegant form. To attribute to it anything ugly is as absurd as to attribute pungence to a salt-crystal or bitterness to a crystal of sugar.

Rāmānuja holds that the Deity is formless only in the sense that He has no material form. But He has assumed a form which is Divine, most beautiful and beyond description. The sages spend their lives in meditating upon it. According to the Viśiṣṭādvaita tradition, the Divine form is said to be made up of Śuddha-sattva. The word ‘śuddha-sattva’ needs an explanation which is given below.

Śuddha-sattva, the stuff of the Divine Form

The word ‘Śuddha-sattva’ is compound of ‘śuddha’ (an adjective) and sattva’ (a noun). In philosophical discussions the word is used to denote (a) the thinking faculty in its pure aspect and (b) the first of the three qualities of matter in its purity. I need not say anything as regards its use in the former sense, but shall restrict my discussion to its use in the latter sense only.

The followers of the Sānkhya system declare that pure sattva stands for that condition of matter in which sattva predominates over the other two qualities (viz rajas and tamas). The different aspects of
matter are characterised with reference to that particular quality of matter which is predominant at a particular time.

Sāṅkhya being atheistic, the question of the application of the word ‘Śuddha-sattva’ to God does not arise in that system. Prakṛśta sattva, a synonym for śuddha-sattva, is, however, found to have been used by Vyāsa in his commentary to Yoga-sūtras, a system of philosophy collateral with Sāṅkhya.21 Yoga admits God’s omniscience on the assumption that He is in eternal association with pure sattva or sattva in its highest perfection which, according to this system of philosophy, gives maximum knowledge.

In monistic Vedānta, Māyā is another name for śuddha-sattva. The followers of this school maintain that prakṛti has two phases—(a) one whose sattva remains in its purity and (b) the other where its purity is tarnished by the presence of rajas and tamas. The former is called māyā and the latter, avidyā.22 Māyā and avidyā are adjuncts of God and man respectively. This distinction between Māyā and Avidyā was drawn by later scholars of the Advaita school. Whereas Śaṅkara used both māyā and avidyā as synonyms, pure sattva as conceived by later Advaita Vedānta signifies Sattva in isolation from rajas and tamas. So according to this school of thought, it is not from śuddha-sattva but from matter dominated by tamas that the five elements evolve.23 Man being associated with avidyā, his body is material and made of five elements, whereas God, in so far as He is associated with māyā, has a body which is non-elemental and made of śuddha-sattva or māyā. This śuddha-sattva is sometimes called viśuddha-sattva also. Śaṅkara believed in the possibility of God’s assuming a form of māyā for the sake of showing kindness to the religious aspirants.24

Nimbārka has unequivocally stated in his Daśa-ślokī that the stuff of which supernatural beings are made is also inert.25 Puruṣottama, a commentator on Nimbārka, adds that the forms of God, the eternal souls and the emancipated souls are made of supernatural stuff.26

Rāmānuja holds that God’s form is supernatural and Divine. According to him, God’s form is made of omniscience, strength, sovereignty, constancy, power and lustre. I do not remember to have come across any statement of his wherein he regarded God’s form as made up of śuddha-sattva, although many students of his philosophy attribute this view to him. Dr. M. N. Sircar says in his ‘Comparative Studies in Vedāntism’, “We confess we cannot
understand what kind of substance Rāmānuja’s śuddha-sattva is”.27 But he never refers to Rāmānuja’s own statement on the subject of Śuddha-sattva.

Those who have not studied Vaiṣṇava literature are often misled by the concept of śuddha-sattva. The Vaiṣṇavas, therefore, sometimes use the concept of śuddha-tattva which indeed expresses more clearly the nature of the content of God’s form and His eternal abode.

Lokācārya, a leader of Tengalai school, holds that śuddha-sattva is unconscious (acit) and informs that while some took it to be self-luminous, others did not believe in its self-luminosity.28 Venkaṭanātha, a leader of Vadgalai school, however, conceives it to be a self-luminous entity of objective nature (parāk ajāda) and tells us about those who did not hold it to be self-luminous. He has given and refuted the third alternative view of those who say that śuddha-sattva is primarily inert but is figuratively called non-inert.29

Dr. Roma Bose (now Roma Chowdhury) has shown in her book on Nimbārka that Rāmānuja’s śuddha-sattva is inert. Here is an incomplete statement, for it does not embody any reference to Venkaṭanātha’s view which holds that Śuddha-sattva is self-luminous.

Mahāmahopādhyāya Gopīnātha Kavirāja, in his Hindi article published in Dvivedi Abhinandana Grantha, however, says: “The followers of Rāmānuja could not transcend the sphere of sattva. Although they have admitted a viśuddha-sattva and have held it to be different from the mundane sattva, yet they maintain its inert nature. Certainly some erudite followers of Rāmānuja speak of it as non-inert, but many learned scholars of the Rāmānuja sect admit its inertness.” Thus Kavirāja has mentioned the two views, although he too has not referred to the third alternative.

It is now necessary to consider whether there is any difference of opinion between Rāmānuja and post-Rāmānuja Viśiṣṭādvaitins on this point. Just as all those who believe in monism are not at one with Śankara on all details, similarly all those who believe in qualified monism do not completely agree with Rāmānuja. This is evident from the division of the Rāmānuja Sect into two sections. Rāmānuja himself regarded the Divine form as God’s svarūpa; but some of his followers came to treat it as distinct from Him and yet as non-inert, while others believed that it belongs to the category of inert entities.
HE DIVINE FORM

It is worth noticing in this connection that all the writers belonging to the same school of Indian thought do not agree with one another on all points. While discussing the origin of the world from Brahman, different philosophers of the Advaita Vedānta school have put forward different views. Writers on Indian Philosophy have very often overlooked such things, and the result has been a lack of the chronological development of views. Strictly speaking, we are to study philosophical notions according to their chronological history. It is, however, far from me to suggest that no two thinkers of one particular school may be identical in their views. A line of thought in the domain of philosophy may remain intact for centuries; but it may equally happen that changes in philosophical views take place suddenly and quickly. A disciple may introduce a new outlook in the thought of his master. It is, therefore, necessary that philosophical systems should be studied with reference to their historical development.

The Bengal school of Vaiṣṇavism has held śuddha-sattva to be an integral part of the energy of the Supreme. It believes that the Divine form is made of Śuddha-sattva, and that the Deity and the form are identical. Śuddha-sattva is therefore supernatural, conscious and a phase of the Divine essence. With regard to the Divine form, the view of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas agree to a large extent with that of Rāmānuja who holds that God's form of excellent beauty and grace is His swarūpa. From this viewpoint Śuddha-sattva means pure existence or essence. The following statement of Rahasyāmnāya is worth noticing in this connection:

_Question—Of what substance is the Deity’s person?_  
_Answer—Of that substance which is Deity’s._  
_Question—Of what substance is the Deity?_  
_Answer—It is consciousness._

The Excellent Beauty

The various devotional scriptures have vividly delineated the Deity's personal beauty. The Upaniṣads and the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and the Agamas have all made contributions in this direction. Beautiful is the passage wherein the Chhandogya has compared the Deity's eyes with lotuses opened by the rays of the sun. The simile was used in the hoary past by a sage who beheld the Deity face to face, and the world 'Pundarikākṣa' proved so significant to later thinkers and writers that they repeated it with love and devotion. Even today the daily devotion of the followers of the Madhyandina
school in Northern India, begins with a reference to Puṇḍarikākṣa i.e. one whose eyes are as beautiful as lotuses.* Acārya Rāmānuja has also described the personal beauty of the Deity at various places in his works. The following is a specimen:

Having lustre like a mountain of melted gold; emitting rays like a hundred of thousand suns; with eyes as pure and broad as the petals of a lotus opened by the rays of the sun and blooming on a clean stem growing in deep water; having bow-like curved brows; splendid forehead, pretty nose, smiling coral lips, rosy and glossy cheeks, conch-shaped neck, comely ears, plump and massive arms; adorned with fingers reddened by very fine and red palms; having a thin waist but a broad chest; with due proportion on the whole person; with heavenly beauty beyond description; with a lovely colour; having feet as charming as two blossoming lotuses; putting on a yellow garment befitting His form; decorated with illustrious, innumerable, wonderful, eternal, divine ornaments such as diadem, ear-rings, necklace, kaustubha-gem, armlets, bracelets, anklets and girdle; decorated by a conch (Pāṇcajanya), a discus (Śudarśana), a mace (Kaumodaki), a sword (Nandaka), a bow (Śārṅga), a footmark on chest (Śrīvatasa), and a garland of sylvan flora (vanamāla); captivating the eyes and minds of all by His boundless, excellent beauty; filling all the beings—moving as well stationary—by the nectar of His graceful elegance; possessing most wonderful, incomprehensible, eternal youth; as delicate as the blossoming smile of a flower; perfuming all the quarters with His sacred, sweet scent; whose very nature transcends the three regions; interviewing the devotees with a look replete with compassion, love and sweetness; the best of all persons; whose sports are creation, sustenance and destruction of the entire universe; in whom there is no tinge of what is despicable; abode of all auspicious qualities; different from all that does not constitute His own real Self; the Great Soul; such is Para Brahma Nārāyaṇa.32

To the question why the Lord assumed the form described above, Rāmānuja replies in the Śrī-bhāṣya by saying that it is His own desire to have it.33 The author of the Śrī-bhāṣya-vārtika reiterates the same point.34

Rāmānuja’s description of the Divine form is based mainly on the authority of the Purāṇas and the Āgamas.35 The Bhāgavata has recorded many such descriptions. One, for instance, is contained in the advice of Nārada to prince Dhruva.36 Some of the phrases

*Apavitraḥ pavitra vā sarvāvasthāni gato pi vā, yaḥ smaret Puṇḍarikākṣam sa bāhyyābhīyantaraḥ śucih.
used by Rāmānuja in his description of the form of the Deity seem to be a faithful copy of those of his teacher occurring in the Stotra-ratna, and the teacher also appears to have composed them under the influence of a hymn in the Brahma-tantra. A comparative study of the phrases makes this supposition quite probable.\(^\text{27}\)

Such a graceful description of the personal beauty of the Supreme Person is not a mere creation of imagination. Rāmānuja says that the scriptures describe the form of the Deity, because He has a form, and not because they want to ascribe a form to the formless One.\(^\text{28}\) Like Rāmānuja other Vaiṣṇava ācāryas also ascribe a most beatiful form to the Deity.\(^\text{29}\)

**The beautiful colour**

The colour of the Diety is blue, and Rāmānuja says that He is as blue as a cloud.\(^\text{30}\) The Sanskrit word for blue is nila, and the lexicon enumerates several words as its synonyms, hence we sometimes find in devotional literature the word ŚYĀMA used in place of nila and vice versa.\(^\text{41}\) Blueness of the Divine person is referred to, time and again, in the scriptures. The Mahābhārata tells us that His colour is similar to that of a flower of hemp of flex (atasi).\(^\text{42}\) Even His descents (avatāras) have the same colour. This Viṣṇupurāṇa as well as the Bhāgavata compared the colour of the Deity respectively to that of a blue lotus and a cloud, when He appeared before Devaki and Vasudeva.\(^\text{43}\) His devotees similarly conceive the Diety as having a colour similar to that of a sapphire, the neck of a peacock or the cloud-less sky in the autumn.\(^\text{44}\)

The aural rays emanating from the Deity’s form are of golden hue, hence He is sometimes described by the scriptures as of golden colour.\(^\text{45}\) On account of the presence of golden aura around Śrī Rāma’s face, Śrī Sītā, during her exile in Lāṅkā, enquired of Hāntumān whether her husband’s face kept up its golden colour in her absence.\(^\text{46}\) And prior to her enquiry, Hāntumān also had referred to Rāma’s golden hue.\(^\text{47}\) The colour of the Diety’s form is primarily blue, but it is sometimes depicted as golden on account of the aura. Sometimes the aura is so radiant that the blue colour appears to be a little lighter as is the case with the colour of the eastern sky earlier than the day dawns. It is at that time that the Deity’s person becomes as beautiful as a thick cloud whose colour is not as blue as that of the sky. And in the proximity of Goddess Lākṣmī, the sapphirine blue colour of the Deity appears to be as green as an emerald. Śrī being golden, her colour reflects on Him with the result that He assumes a velvety
green complexion. Although the Deity assumes other colours also in His emanatory forms, His principal colour is blue. The classical Sanskrit literature has many references to the Lord’s blue colour. Kalidāsa has, for instance, compared in Meghadūta the colour of the cloud to that of the Deity.

The Ever-budding Youth

In a passage of Rgveda the Deity has been depicted as young despite His being the most ancient in age. Although the Supreme Being is the oldest person, yet He ever looks young. On the basis of such testimony Rāmānuja describes the Deity to be possessed of a youth which is eternal, unimaginable, peculiar and divine. His teacher, Yāmuna, did the same, as is evident from the eulogy composed by him in praise of Viṣṇu. In fact, both Yāmuna and Rāmānuja emphasized the youthfulness of the Deity on the authority of the scriptures.

Not only in the Vedic but also in the Paurāṇic literature, Viṣṇu is almost always delineated as a youth. Vyāsa ascribes fresh youth to the Lord, as is clear from the description of the Deity given by Kapila to his mother, Devahūti, in the Bhāgavata. Fresh youth is KAIŚORA in Sanskrit, and in the light of Kāśora we can take the word ‘taraṇa’ (used in another passage) to mean one in fresh youth. Kāśora is, in fact, the best of all ages and this must be the reason why the Deity has been described in another passage of the Bhāgavata as ‘having a very handsome age’. This handsome age cannot be any other than Kāśora.

In another stanza of the Bhāgavata, the Divine angels have been represented as ‘having a new age’. The new age of the angels can easily be understood to mean kāśora. The angels being similar in looks to the Deity, we can infer that the Deity’s age is also new. Rupa Goswāmi of the Gauḍiyā Vaiṣṇava School says God generally appears as KIŚORA to all His devotees. An age near about fifteen is called Kāśora at which the Deity has the most charming form. ‘New age’, ‘handsome age’ and ‘budded youth’—the expressions used to denote the age of the Deity tend to indicate that the Deity is essentially youthful. Indian iconology reveals that sculptural images of Viṣṇu invariably present the Deity in His prime youth which is in strict accordance with the description of His form contained in the scriptural texts which Rāmānuja held in the highest esteem.
The divine form

The presence of Śrī on the Divine Person

The Deity's person is the permanent abode of Śrī who is the energy essential to Him. The word 'Lakṣmī' is synonymous with 'Śrī' as is revealed by the Purāṇic literature. The Rgveda alludes to Her as the ever-joyous spouse of Viṣṇu. The Śrī-sūkta depicts Her as golden in colour, most lustrous and beautiful, with lips adorned with a smile and with eyes, hands and feet as charming as lotuses. Yellow robes are dear to Her. She holds two lotuses in Her upper hands. Her lower right hand assures fearlessness to the devotees, while Her lower left one is in a benedictory pose. She is decked with various ornaments ranging from the tinkling anklets on the feet to the majestic diadem upon Her hair. She sits on a lotus-seat, and the chariot is Her favourite conveyance. She is merciful, generous, renowned, adored even by the gods, invincible, bestower of riches, the mother of the universe. Invoked by names such as Mādhavi, Mādhava-priyā, Hari-vallabha, Viṣṇu-patni, Viṣṇu-priya-sakhi, Rāma and Indirā, she fulfils the desires of Her devotees by granting them food and raiment, cows and horses, wives and progeny, friends and relations, health and longevity. She helps the devotees by casting Her purifying gracious look on them and strengthening thereby their devotion to the Deity.

Though beheld in a separate form, She is part and parcel of the Deity. "The two, Īśvara and Śrī, are one ontologically." He is never without Her. As Viṣṇu is all-pervading, so is Lakṣmī. She comes with Him in His descents (avatāra) too. She is Sītā when He is Rāma, and She is Rukmiṇī when He is Kṛṣṇa. When He appears as a god among gods, She manifests herself as a goddess; and when He comes as a man among men, She too appears in a human form.

Both Śrī and Viṣṇu are one but appear in two forms for the sake of the devotees. According to the Rāmāyana, She is non-different from Him as lustre is from the sun. The Jayakhya-saṃhitā says that She is non-different from Him as the waves are from the ocean. Viewed separately they are the father and the mother of all beings. Besides, She is declared by some of the scriptures to be permanently resident on His bosom, in a miniature form; Hence the Deity is known as 'Śrī-nivāsa' which name of the Deity Rāmānuja has mentioned in the initial stanza of his Śrī-bhāṣya.

Venkatachārī of the Vadgalai school held Śrī and Viṣṇu to be 'a twofold self which is one in two and two in one'. For him, Śrī is
infinite. But Lokācārya of the Tengalai school opposes this view by arguing that the admission of the existence of two infinites contradicts monotheism. He therefore holds that Śrī is finite like a jiva, though She is ever free.  

The conception of Śrī is as old as that of Viṣṇu. The Yajurveda states that Śrī and Lakṣmī are the two spouses of the Deity, and the Agamic literature has referred to more than two. The Bhāradvāja Samhitā enjoins that the Deity should be contemplated in association with Śrī, Bhu and Līlā. These three perhaps represent the Deity's cit (knowledge), sat (existence), and ananda (bliss) aspects respectively. The Jayākhya—samhitā makes mention of four: Lakṣmī, Kirti, Jayā and Maya. The Paurānic literature gives a longer list of such names. The Bhāgavata enumerates twelve: Puṣṭi, Śrī, Kirti, Tūṣṭi, Iśa, Uṣā, Vidya, Ayīḍya, Śakti and Maya. All these various names enumerated in the Agamas and the Purāṇas are so many aspects of Lakṣmī. Again, Lakṣmī is although apparently different from Viṣṇu, yet essentially She is one with Him. The Jayākhya—samhitā counsels the devotee to meditate upon these forms—Lakṣmī and others—as emanations of the Deity.
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(प्रे) सुवर्तं तु केवलविद्वतिझीविधः। अंभायमु २. २. ४५)
16. मृत्यूः चन्। (झट्टायायी ३. ३. ७७)
17. (य) सत्यानन्दसात्त्वम।ृक्कसात्त्वः
श्रवणूप-पुरुषार्तसत्त्वम् श्रापिः हृत्वानिद्ध-हर्षम्। (महाभाष १०. १३. ४५)
(व) परमानन्दसात्त्व हामानारच शर्वतः। (वाराह पुराणमु) सत्त्व-हृत्तित्वसामालखिनारः उद्गुणम्, पृथुमु १७५।
18. (य) न च परस्पारम्। करायायत्र इत्यदुक्तिकिमः।
भेष्टुः स्वभावत् एव सर्वानानातु स्वात्वक्षेत्रलवच्च स्वतः एव।
(अंभायमु १. २. १६)
(स) मरणारूपे हामाना। इति मनःप्रायस्य आशु प्राणायाम्योऽद्विष्टति च ब्रह्मायो
निवेदितेः।
(अंभायमु १. २. २२)
(स) च च रूपाधिकारारकारः। कुम्भकोसमित्वार्थाविकारनाशस्य जीवस्य चभुव्य- रिकारे जनामः, परस्पर तु स्वतः एव।
(अंभायमु १. २. १६)
19. प्रभागिनारोऽज्ञनो संक्षेपो श्रीहता परमसत्त्वः। स शुद्धाहरुवकर्षः। (जेताहबधतीतिसिद्धः
३. १५)
20. न तस्य प्राप्ता सृवंतिमाते विदतिसिद्धं सामवतः। (ईशोवरिपरे रूपकतामानवताबूधा
नारायणानेत्र प्रकाशिकातूका दीकायसुतूचुः परुराणवचनमु)
21. यमकः प्रभुः-तथोपालाधिकवर्षय शास्त्रविद्य उपर्युः: (योगसूत्रे व्यासभायमु
१. २४)
22. विहानवनम्तस्य ब्रह्म प्रतिविन्दुः समापितोः।
तमोरजः-सर्ववृत्तम् प्रकृति दिविधिं चसा।
सर्ववृद्धिविद्विधिं म.वाविधि में तत्रे। (पंडसी तत्त्वविद्वक प्रकरणमु
१५. १६)
23. तम: प्राप्तन्तेऽभूतमोऽगमेहः-श्राश्म| 
विभववतेऽविद्वानो नृत्तिः जिल्ले। (पंडसी तत्त्वविद्वक प्रकरणमु १५)
24. स्वातः परमेश्वरविद्यानाधीनाय इति वायासामायाम् रूपाः साधनातुसहार्थ्म।
(ब्रह्मसूत्रे शाक्ताभायमु १. २. १०)
25. अभासः प्राकृतिकृत च कालस्वरूपं तद्वितंतं मतम्।
माया प्राणार्थितविद्वारायं गुणविद्वेदाद्वायं समेतं तत। (बदवलोकी २)
26. तत्वच भगवद्विद्वारायंसंकल्पात्तस्तं तद्विवावनं नित्यमुक्तानं च भोगविद्वषेष्यानेवकर्ष्यपम्
तत्र भोग्यं भगवविद्धतार्थं। (केदारार्थ-मंडुखा, उद्धमः ३५)
27. Comparative Studies in Vedantism by Mahendra Nath Sircar, page 45
28. प्राचृत्य जान्युयं विकारास्तम। इह गुणसंगम मित्रपलं सत्यसूयं चेति निविष्यं केन्ततु। (जुललं) वजं वदति, केवलदं वदन्ति। (तत्त्वलम्)
29. (इ) निद्वया मूलभंगश्चत्वार्थम् ज्ञानविद्वारायं केवलदं: (तत्त्वमृतांकल्पः १.६)
(ई) केवलद्वारामुद्ध्रित समुद्धमत्तेन्द्रिकः। (सवृचिसत्तिः १.६)
(उ) ज्ञानविद्वारामुद्ध्रित समुद्धमत्तेन्द्रिकः। (सवृचिसत्तिः १.६)
(ऋ) ज्ञानविद्वारामुद्ध्रित समुद्धमत्तेन्द्रिकः। (सवृचिसत्तिः १.६)
30. (श) नूतनभं प्रत्यत्वो विविधास्येव रागः।
विज्ञानानिर्वादादिकीत्वानिर्पार्थी तत्सत्यं ततु। (प्रमेय रतनाली १.६)
(ष) गोपाल शब्रः खलु परम-प्रभुवाय-महामुद्रायां-सान्निश्चीयितं भ्रमवादमां सर्वसे
बस्तुनि मुखः। तत्समाषु ज्ञानान्त-विद्वेदान्तिरस्तक्षेत्रसंस्कृतस्तं तिष्ठम्।
(प्रमेय रतनालाय भ्रम तित्ता)
(स) सचिवान्त्य-सामान्यविद्वेदान्तसंस्कृताः। (सचिवान्त्यसामान्यसंस्कृता: २.१.६)
31. हिंदुरामक्षीर्ष्यं भवतो यद्विकः?
यात्रामको भगवान्।
निर्मातामको भवान्तु?
ज्ञातामकः। (सवृचिसत्तिः ३.६२)
32. पेराकारिकादिपदम् तत्वत्त्वींति। तस्मात्त्वर्गिर्विद्वर्गः। सहस्राण संस्कृतयुक्तिः।
गम्भीरामम्-संसारसुत्तोऽर्पितकर्मैकसंस्वयं युक्तिजरं
(वेदांवय्यसंस्थ: २४४-२४६)
33. स तु स्वाभिःसत्स्वाभिःसः युक्तौ युक्तौ प्राकृतेऽरुप। (श्रीभाष्यम् १.१.२६)
34. प्रज्ञेयित्वेति रूप सूर्यसंवादात्त्वनमकम्।
बरीरे सर्वसवन-पुरानयुक्तवय्यसत्त्वन।
सर्वसुपरम्यसधार्मविमानानं तु स्वसंवं रूप।
सुन्नु-विद्वेदार्थं वात्सु वेदोऽविग्रहयुक्ते॥
इह तदा दृश्याद्वै यथायः। भान्तो हरे:।
देहः स तु स्वाभिःसत्स्वाभिः युक्तु:।
अभासः हरे:। देहेन न देहेन कोपः सुहृत्ये।
(श्रीभाष्यवाणिकम् १.१.७६-७२)
35. (प) नमस्ते पुरुषोत्तम: संबोधनं: (विश्वदूर्गाम् १.४.२२)
(प्र) जिन्नते पुरुषोत्तम वामुर्वामित्तुः (साश्वसङ्कृताः २.२५)
36. प्रसादविभिन्नेः शतेऽक्षत्रस्तुतियद्वद्वस्यायम् ।
सुनासः सुभूतं चारकरोलं सुदुरस्तुर्दुर्दानस्य इत्यादिः (भागवतम् ४. ५२-५३)

37. विवास विक्रमाधानाः सौख्य चाराम्बुजः (भ्रातुतन्त्रविजितविठ्ठोत्सीमृ)
विवास स्वित्तपरावरालयः नमस्त्वादिभिः स्वातः (भारावर्धास्त्रोतम् ३७)
(श्र) नारायणे नमस्तेऽसु पुष्णरकायक्षेत्रः
सुभूतं लब्धं सुनतं सुभूमताधरविव्रमः
पीवन्दकाष्ठमुहर्ष श्रीकाष्ठमुहर्ष
तरुनात्रेद्वतम् पवनात्रेद्वतम् नामस्तेऽसु
विवासविक्रमाधानः सौलोकिकर्षाम्बुजः
नमस्ते पीवन्दकाष्ठं स्कुङ्खमहरङ्कुङ्खम
स्कुङ्ख-कितरीत-क्रुर्ण-हार-कौकुमसुपुष्पः (भ्रातुतन्त्रविजितविठ्ठोत्सीमृ)
(श्र)

निमन्त्यनामः तन्त्रमध्ययुक्तस्थिरावस्थ्यमहोस्तृतः (भागवतम् ४३-५३)

विातः ब्रह्मकारणक।

38. न स भक्ताया देवताया भुगुर्णदिवसंते, यथापूर्ववादिः हि शास्त्रम् (बेदार्थस्प्रहः)

39. प्रथमं महुरं वदनं महुरं नयन तथां महुरं हस्तिनं मधुरस्य।
हुवद्य महुरं गमनं महुरं मधुराधिपितेश्वरिः मधुरस्य।
वनमं महुरं चरितं महुरं वदनं महुरं विलितं मधुरस्य।
विलितं महुरं भ्रमितं महुरं मधुराधिपितेश्वरिः मधुरस्य।
(बलभारार्यप्रवर्तित-मधुराष्ट्रकारः)
महुरं महुरं वदनं मधुरं विलितं महुरं वदनं मधुरस्य।
मधुरानि भुगुर्णस्मितंतरं मधुरं महुरं मधुरं मधुरस्य।
(लीलाशुक्वप्रवर्तित श्रीकुंकुरान्तः १६१)
40. (श्र) निरतिदाययास्थाये यूलि नीलतोयस्मातां: पुष्पकर्षिणाममतालालोकोपि:।

(बेदाभ्यस्तं, पुष्पम १२१)।

(श्र) स्वरुपानीलाभमुनितस्मायत्तमप्रशुक्लेवयत्वसमु। (बेदकृष्णदाम्य)।

41. कुण्ये नीलालोकदम्यकलालोकमथाच:। (समरकोष: १४.१४)

The word 'syama' is used for 'nila' in:—

इनदीरेण दलवामस्मिरितरामनीमदंदमुलम।

वन्धत्यवन्धतमलद्वीपेषु युक्तन्दनमु।

The word 'nila' is used for 'syama' in:—

स्वरुपानिनिर्खचित-कुण्येचुलसु-कपोल-नीलालकमक्षितानन्यामु। मानापतमु ५१२.२०।

42. शतशीलकुस्मकस्य नीलादरस्यस्मान्युतमु।

ये नमस्ते देवी दिव्याय न विद्वे देवीयु:। (महाभारतमु शास्तिपदे १४६.६०)

43. (श्र) कुलनीदरवर्जनाय वतुर्विदुम्मीक्रियेन तयुमु।

श्रीवस्तेववासाय जातं तुक्तवानक-कुण्येकृ:। (विष्णुपुराणयु ५.३.५)

(व) तमसुद्वात बालकमकुपद्रेशायं चतुर्मु य ब्रह्मदानु दायुचुमु।

श्रीवस्त-लक्षमं गलशोमिन्दुतां पीताम्बरं संहार्योदयासमु। (श्रीमागमयु १०.०.५)

44. नील सरोशह नील मध्ये नील नीरतर स्वायम।

लाभिः तन सोमा निर्जी कोट्टि-कोट्टि सत काम। (रामायण तुलसीकर्त १२.६६)

45. (श्र) श्र भरातशतु सर्वे एव सुङ्गाः। (छात्रोपयु १५.६७)

(श्र) यदा पदय: पश्चाते सर्वमवायुमु। (मुण्डकोपनिषदु ३.१.३)

46. कवित्रिक तदू सर्वाष्ट्रमात्रं तस्यानां पितामहानान्वित। (रामायणयु ५.२३.२०)

47. स सुवर्णपक्षवि: श्रीमान्य रमण: स्वामी महामाया:। (रामायणयु ५.३५.२२)

48. नमो मरुकथयास्वरुपेन्दगिताः।

केदाराय नमस्तुमं समते पीतशास्तसे। (भागवतमु ५.१६.३३)

49. यथा पाण्डवशिशी यथेन्द्रायोः: यथाप्रमायेः: यथा

पुष्परीक्षमु यथा धारां विभ तयु। (बुधदार्शनक २.३.६)

50. (श्र) त्ययादातु ऋषिवनवते शांगिगो राक्षसो:। (पुराणियु ६९)

(व) श्यामः पारो भलिनियमनायुवशत्स्वेव विभ्योः। (पुर्णवेद ५०.७०)

51. यु: पुराणयेव वेदयये नदीयेवे सुवासकान्ते विम्बाये ददावात। (कृष्णवेद १.५५.२)

52. (श्र) व्रतश्च-दयास्वयमेषु हितार्यरितियोजयकश्यो-सोमव्य-सोमग्रह

सौभाग्य-लाभयो-द्वितायतन्त-कल्याण-सुगणितिस्वद्यूष्प:।

(शास्त्रमामितमु)

(व) व्रतिस्वद्यूष-लिन्यहविन्याय-स्यभावावत्यमायम्योद्यिदस्युः

विभिः: श्रियां भक्तजनक-शीवितं समयामपस्यक्रियकामः।

(यामुनाचार्य-विरचितसालभक्तलोकमु ४८)

53. बुधज्ञि रो विमितम आह्वनः।

युवा कुमार: प्रवेशयात्तमु। (कृष्णवेद १.५५.६)
54. सन्त वयस्क कैशीर भुवनामुख-कातरसु। (भागवतम् 3.28.17)
55. तन्येण रामायणामवभाष्यस्यातांतरसु। (भागवतम् 4.8.46)
56. येशावीयम् शुलोकस्य सारुणार्धिताकामियम्। (भागवतम् 10.54.27)
57. सवं च दूतवयम् सवं चारुछुबुजु बाजाः। (भागवतम् 6.2.14)
58. प्रायः किषोर एवाय सर्वभक्तेतु भासते। (भिन्नराशुमुखसिः 3.3.41)
59. (श्र) नारसिंह वधु: श्रीमानु कैचार: युयोतम:। (विष्णुसहस्नाम 16)
(श्र) महेश्वरो महाभरतो श्रीविनायः: सतां गतिः। (विष्णु सहस्नाम 31)
(श्र) सर्वभव्यन्तानि श्रीनिवासः सतां गतिः। (श्रीमद्भागवतम् 52)
(श्र) श्रीमान्त्वादः श्रीविनायः: श्रीमतः बरः। (श्रस्वाभुवसहस्नाम 77)
(श्र) श्रीविनायः: श्रीमान्त्वादः श्रीमतः बरः। (श्रस्वाभुवसहस्नाम 77)
(श्र) श्रीविनायः: श्रीमान्त्वादः श्रीमतः बरः। (श्रस्वाभुवसहस्नाम 77)
(श्र) पदाती पदातीभरससु कुस्तसिद्धः: पदाय श्री: चिरवै न:। (सामाय लक्ष्मुपदित्व)
(श्र) नमस्ते सर्वलोकानां जनसीम्यसब्याम।
(श्र) श्रीमुद्धारामाप्री श्रीमुद्धाराममालस्वयं विष्णुसहस्नाम। (विष्णुरासूर्याम् ४.६.१६)
(श्र) तदलस्मालविहिनगारसिकाम। (बैंकानाथ वर्णविनिकारकारार्यः)
60. (श्र) भगवानी भगवती क्रेयः: साधारामस्ते हँसः। (भागवतम् १२, ११, २०)
(श्र) पदनाभासम् भगवती चिर देवी नियागायानी।।।साराहृष्ट्रं प्रच्छ।।
(सर्माय गतिगतां)
61. श्रङ्गा विलोकिता देवा: सार्जायात्म: प्रजा:।।
(श्र) मेलादि गुण जनवाला लेखिने निहृदुर्विरोध परमु।
(श्र) निवाला नोभु राजपु निहृदोभाग गतावः,
(श्र) श्रीमुद्धारामालस्वयं भुवना मूलवेदीयानावः।(भागवतम् ५.५.२५-२६)
62. सुपुजास्ये विष्णुवे ददाशित (श्रेयदेव १.१५६.२)
63. हिरण्यावरोहीं हिरण्यवरोह पत्तार्ज्जामित्यारः। (श्रीसुक्तम्)
64. सुभु: पीतकोशी मातास गुमुखारु (भागवतम् ५.५.१५)
65. (श्र) प्रदुःकरंकलंस्वाय लक्षज-पु ज्ञावर्य, करकमलगंधुकारीमिदयमामुजा (सामाय लक्ष्मुपदित्व)
(श्र) भूयाद भूयाद नियागायान तत्कालिनवर्गाः। (सामाय लक्ष्मुपदित्व)
66. The Philosophy of Viśiṣṭadvaita by Srinivasachari, page 387.
67. (a) निर्देशणार्थ जयमाता विश्वायोः श्रीरत्नाविनी,
यथा सर्वगतो विच्छुदात्वर्त्त्वेयं हिंदौतम्। (भिन्नपुराणम् १, ८, १७)
(b) त्वमेवदृ विच्छुना चाम्ब्र जगद्या यातं चराचरस्।
(भिन्नपुराणम् २३७, १७)

68. (a) एवं यदा जगत्लाभी देवदेवो जनावैः।
श्रवतारंकरोपेऽतर श्रीस्तत्त्वाविनी।
राष्ट्रल्रेभवदू सीता श्रीविंदूरी कुर्णाग्रसिनिः।
(विलपुराणम् १, ५, १४२-१४४)
(b) सीता लक्ष्मीर्मचावृ विषयूः। (रामायणम् ६, १२७, २६)

69. वन्यता हि सया सीता मासकरेण यवा प्रभा। (रामायणम् ६, १५५, २०)

70. सूर्यश्च देवसि यदृम्यङ्कलाभःबेरिभ।
सर्ववथ्यः-प्रभाविणे कमल श्रीपतेस्थाय। (जयालयसिनिः ६, ७५)

71. (a) का तवया त्वमुमै देवि सर्वविश्वाय मुः।
श्रवयासि देवदेवसि गोमिनीसि गदायूः। (भिन्नपुराणम् २३७, ६)
(b) का तवया इत्यः इत्यश्र यमुदक्त वचनसि। (भिन्नपुराणम् १, ६, १२२)

72. श्रुतिसिद्धिः विद्याते श्र्र्हाटिष्ट श्रीविनाहः। (श्रीभाष्यमार्गाण्)

73. The Philosophy of Visistadvaita by Srinivasachari, page 167.

74. श्रीच ते लक्ष्मीदेवं पत्या। (यजुस्वर्ग ३७, २२)

75. चतुर्जुर्ज मुदारांगं ध्यामघ पपमिवेन्द्राम।
श्रीभुवीलोकः-सिनिः जित्येत्षु सया हुवः। (मार्तनसिनिः ३, ४५)

76. लक्ष्मीः कृतिर्जियं माया देववस्तस्याविनिः। सया।
(जयालयसिनिः ६, ७७)

77. भ्रमरा विवा जये त्यस्यविस्वाबिलिधिम
निवेशत्वमां परमेष्ठिनां पवित्रम्। (भागवतम् १०, ५६, ५७)

78. ततो भगवतिः विश्वस्वामा भास्करविख्रोतु।
लक्ष्मीदीर्घस्विनिः ध्यायेस्तुनिलग्निनिः। यथा।। (जयालयसिनिः १३, १०५, ६)
CHAPTER VII

THE MODES OF DIVINE MANIFESTATION

Part I

The Doctrine of Avatāra

Avatāra or vibhava is God’s descent—The purposes of God’s coming—When?—Rāmānuja interprets the word ‘māyā' as God’s will or desire—The body of an avatāra is divine—Venkaṭanātha’s view—God may descend on any part of the universe—Descent of Lākṣmī and other heavenly beings—Lokācāra on the primary and the secondary avatāra—Śrīnivāsadāsa’s view—Abhiruddhnya Samhitā, Śrīnivāsadāsa and Vāsudeva Abhyāśkara on the number of avatāras—Śaṅkara, Maddhva, Vallabha and Rūpa Gosvāmī on the question as to who descends—Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa.

Rāmānuja believes in the Deity’s descent on the celestial and terrestrial planes and has expressed his views on the point in his writings. God’s coming down to the material plane is called ‘avatāra’ in the Purāṇas and ‘vibhava’ in the Āgamas.

The question of the manifestation of God, the infinite being, in a finite form is perplexing to logical reasoning. Rāmānuja has, however, dealt with the question in the light of the deliverances of the scriptures. If it is once admitted, as Rāmānuja does admit, on the authority of the scriptures, that the Infinite can have a finite form of divine essence—which indeed amounts to the anthropomorphic attitude towards God, it becomes easy to believe, as Rāmānuja does, that God comes down to live amongst us in the form of an avatāra.

Rāmānuja’s conception of avatāra is not ‘the exaltation of human nature to the level of Godhead’ as interpreted by Dr. Radhakrishnan who writes: ‘When any finite individual develops spiritual qualities... we say that God is born.’ According to him, ‘the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa is...the taking up manhood into God’, a view which views divine incarnation as the emancipation of an individual soul. Radhakrishnan indeed admits the possibility of God’s descent into flesh i.e. His avataraṇa. But ‘descent into flesh’ suggests that the body which God assumes is made of ‘prakṛti’, whereas Rāmānuja is,
as we have already observed in the preceding chapter, opposed to this view. For him, the form of an āvatāra is not a product of material elements comprised within prakṛti.

God sports on the material plane (Līlā-vibhūti) not only with matter (prakṛti) but also with individual souls who are participating in the sport. In the very beginning of the creation, both conscious and unconscious beings occupy themselves with various activities at the will of God. Evolutionary changes start in the world of the unconscious and contraction and expansion of cognition in the former. Countless are the stages of that contraction and expansion. The teacher of the gods (Bṛhaspati) comes to occupy a high level of cognition, whereas things like plants (vanaśpati) stand on a very low level. The individual souls have been, from time immemorial, coming up and going down at different stages; and this process does not cease until they realize their true self and the nature of God. It is only when an aspirant, leading a pure life, reaches the highest stage of worship and feels that life is not worth living without the attainment of Divine vision, that the Deity descends from His ETERNAL PLANE (Vaikuṇṭha), comes within the easy reach of the devotee and saves him from the anguish of separation. Such is indeed the primary purpose of the Deity’s descent. Whosoever yearns for Him gets Him. The young prince Dhruva performed austerities to have a sight (dārsana) of the Lord, and the Lord, descended to Madhuvana to cast His gracious glances on the child.

The secondary purpose of the Divine descent is to punish the wicked, as is illustrated by the story of Gajendra, the king of the elephants. God saved the Elephant-king from the pangs of death, and put an end to his enemy, the crocodile. Safeguarding the interest of Vedic dharma is another purpose of God’s descent to the mundane plane.

A King, for the sake of good government, needs to encourage good people by rewarding them for their meritorious deeds and to dissuade the wicked from their vicious acts by punishing them. Similarly the need arises for the Supreme Being for His assumption of an āvatāra in order that He can establish order in the world by showing kindness to the pure and the innocent and by condemning the sinful.

The culmination of all righteous actions is the vision of the Deity, which is possible only when the jīva’s yearning for Him becomes the most intense. Yearning pre-supposes love born of attraction. With a view to attracting the jīvas, the Deity, according to the
Bhāgavata, plans captivating sports which are such that even their description cannot fail to attract their listeners.\textsuperscript{9}

There is no hard and fast rule as to when God should appear on the material plane.\textsuperscript{10} Whenever dharma is overpowered by adharma, He manifests Himself on earth. The principal descents are traditionally ten, although the number goes up to twenty-two and twenty-four in the Purāṇas\textsuperscript{11} and still more in the Agamas.\textsuperscript{12}

When, according to Rāmānuja, the Deity descends in a mundane form, people take Him to be an ordinary being born under the influence of karma.\textsuperscript{13} But the Deity is, really, above the karmic influence. Since He is enveloped in Yoga-māyā, His true nature is not obvious to all.\textsuperscript{14} He manifests Himself in the forms of celestial and terrestrial beings, but His real nature remains intact.\textsuperscript{15} In other words, he does not lay aside His Divine nature in His descents.\textsuperscript{16}

God comes here of His own accord, says Rāmānuja. It would be interesting to note that to support his view he has interpreted the word ‘māyā’, occurring in the phrase ‘sambhavāmyā’tma-māyā’ of the Gītā as meaning ‘will’ or ‘desire’ and has quoted from the Nighañtu where māyā has been taken to be a synonym for ‘will’. Rāmānuja’s interpretation differs from that of Śaṅkara who seems to have understood it in the sense of power, although Anandagiri’s commentary on Śaṅkara suggests that māyā means illusion, and that God creates an illusory form by His will. According to Śaṅkara,\textsuperscript{17} the Deity does not really assume a body; He only seems to the people of His age to be embodied. God, on Śaṅkara’s view, is not subject to birth but only appears to be born. The appearance is due to the Divine māyā.

Unlike Śaṅkara and other thinkers of the Advaita School, Rāmānuja has understood the word ‘māyā’ in the sense of ‘will’, and maintains thereby that there is nothing but His own desire to compel the Deity to manifest Himself in a finite form.\textsuperscript{18}

The form assumed by the Deity is His own; hence it cannot but be real. But there is one point worth consideration. The body of an avatarā is Divine, but people mistake it to be as mundane as the body of an ordinary being. Why does the Divine form appear as mundane to mortal beings? This is so owing to the fascinating power of the Deity, replies Venkaṭanātha.\textsuperscript{19} His meaning is that although the Divine form is real and not illusory, yet the Divine power which is at work charms and infatuates the lookers-on so as to view that form in a different way.
It is not only on this earth that the Deity descends. He may also descend, as necessity arises, in any other part of the cosmic egg. Rāmānuja points out that God comes to live amongst celestial beings and others.20 Once, he adds, God sportively filled in the gap in the celestial genealogy by descending among gods as Upeṇdra, the younger brother of Indra.21 Similarly His descent in the solar and lunar dynasties of this earth as Rāma and Kṛṣṇa was to complete, out of His own desire, those genealogies.22 The Purāṇic literature speaks of several instances of His descent on planes other than the human. The Deity once appeared in the assembly of Brahmā in Satya-loka, in the form of a swan.23

The form of the Deity in all His descents is non-material (aprākṛta), says Rāmānuja. He quotes in the Śrī-bhāṣya, in corroboration of this view, from the Mahābhārata: “The body of the Supreme Soul is not a conglomeration of material elements.”24 The Ācārya has repeated his view in the Vedārtha-saṅgraha where he emphasizes that God’s form is not made of Prakṛti even in His āvatāra as a god and so on.25 Rāmānuja seems to have formed his views on this point on the authority of some Āgamic and Paurāṇic statements which clearly deny prākṛta forms to the Deity.26

The descent of the Deity is called Divine birth, and commenting on the Gītā 4.9, Rāmānuja says that one who has a real knowledge of the Divine birth attains freedom from birth and death and finally enjoys fellowship with the Lord. With Viṣṇu Lakṣmī descends on earth. They are ontologically one but appear as two. Rāmānuja has quoted in the Vedārthasaṅgraha a passage from the Viṣṇu-purāṇa according to which She becomes a goddess when Viṣṇu is a god, and assumes the form of a woman when He becomes a man.27 The Purāṇa says that She was Śrī when He was Rāma; She was Rukmīni when He was Kṛṣṇa.28 Whenever He comes on earth, She is with Him. The Scriptures say that the Deity’s weapons, conveyance, throne etc. also descend. His couch of serpent-coil (Śeṣa), for example, appeared as Lakṣmāṇa; His disc (sudarṣāna) as Bharata, and His conch (Paṇḍajanyā) as Śatrughna.29 While Śrī Kṛṣṇa was contemplating to destroy evil and to protect Mathura when it was besieged by Jārāsandha and his forces, two Divine chariots—lustrous and equipped—descended from the sky (the Deity’s abode).30 Rāmānuja has quoted another passage from the Rāmāyaṇa to the effect that Rāma’s big bow and multifarious arrows followed him, in human shape,31 which indicates that the Deity’s weapons wait upon Him not only on the Eternal Plane (Vaikuṇṭha) but also descend on earth to serve Him.
Rāmānuja has not considered the number and kinds of avatāra, but his followers have done so on the basis of the Purāṇas and the Agamas. Tattva-traya, a later work on Viśṇavism, has classified avatāra under two heads—the primary and the secondary. Under the first category come those that have non-prāktic forms, and reflect true Divine nature. They are worth adoration by those who are desirous of emancipation. The second category includes those that are of a tutelary character, co-existing with, and presiding over, some particular souls. They are not to be worshipped by those who desire salvation.

Śrīnivāsa-dāsa, the author of Yatindra-mata-dipīkā, has distinguished several kinds of avatāra such as primary, secondary, complete, partial, and tutelary. He has enumerated ten avatāras. The fish (matsya) took back the Veda from the demon Śaṅkha and gave it to Brahmā. The Tortoise (Kūrma) supported the mount Mandara when the milk-ocean was being churned for discovering ambrosia. The Boar (Varāha) saved the earth from the deluge. The Man-Lion (Nara-simha) appeared from the pillar to protect Prahlāda. The Three-strided (Trivikrama) destroyed sin with Gangetic water. Parasurāma curbed down the wicked rulers. Rāma established righteousness and protected those who were in need of refuge. Balabhadra put an end to the demons such as Pralamba, and Kṛṣṇa showed the way to salvation. Kalki who is yet to appear will put the sinners to the sword and restore dharma, and thus put an end to the age of Kali. Some do not admit Balabhadra, but recognise Buddha instead and place him after Kṛṣṇa. Others mention Rāma (Balarāma) in place of Kṛṣṇa and add Buddha. There are other phases of each avatāra, says Śrīnivāsadāsa, but his point is not very clear. Again, he has referred to thirtysix avatāras beginning with Padma-nābha. Although he has mentioned only thirty-six avatāras headed by Padmanābha, yet the number goes up to 39 in the Ahirbudhnya-samhitā as under:

1. Padma-nābha,
2. Dhruva,
3. Ananta,
4. Śaktyātmā,
5. Madhusūdana,
6. Kapila,
7. Viśvarūpa,
8. Vihaṅgama,
9. Baḍavā-vaktra,
10. Dhārma,
11. Vāgīśvara,
12. Ekāmbhoniḥdiśayi,
13. Kamaṭheśvara,
14. Varāha,
15. Narasimha,
16. Piyuṣhaṇa,
17. Śripati,
18. Kāntātmā,
19. Rahujuṭī,
20. Kalanemighna,
21. Parijataḥara,
22. Lokanābha,
23. Śaṅtātmā,
24. Dattāṭreya,
25. Nyagrodha-sāyi,
26. Eka-sṛṅgatanu,
27. Tri-vikrama,
28. Nara,
29. Nārāyaṇa,
30. Hari,
31. Kṛṣṇa,
32. Parasurāma,
33.—36. Rāma in his fourfold aspect,
37. Vedavid,
Thus we see that the Samhitā has reckoned the number of avatāra as thirty-nine, but Śrīnivāsadāsa reduced the number to thirtysix. Vāsudeva Abhyāṅkara who has commented on Śrīnivāsadāsa holds that this reduction of the number is due to the fact that Śrīnivāsadāsa has excluded Kapila, Dattātreya and Parasūrāma from the list perhaps on the understanding that these three are not on a par with the remaining avatāras. But this view seems to be hardly correct, for Śrīnivāsadāsa has not really excluded these three avatāras from the list. Parasūrāma for example is not excluded from his list; nay Parasūrāma is one of the principal avatāras according to him. It would, therefore, be more correct to say that Śrīnivāsadāsa intended to exclude Bharata, Lakṣmāṇa and Śatrughna, because they may be included in Rāma.

According to Saṅkara, it is Viṣṇu, the Suprme Reality as associated with māyā, that appears in various forms. It is He who came to Devaki and Vasudeva as their son. According to the cult of Trimūrti also, Viṣṇu, as a member of the triad, has his incarnation as Rāma, Krṣṇa and so on.

Maddhva, like Rāmānuja, held Viṣṇu to be the source of all avatāras, but Nimbārka assigned the function of assuming various avatāra-forms to Krṣṇa, the ultimate Reality according to Dvaitādvaita school.

Unlike Rāmānuja, Vallabha held the avatāras to be descendents of Antaryāmi (Puruṣa or Bhūmī). According to the Śuddhādvaita school, the ultimate Reality is fourfold: The Supreme Person or Krṣṇa is the first, the Immutable with attributes is the second, the Immutable without attributes is the third, and the Immanent is the fourth. The forms e.g. that of ‘Fish’ are assumed by the fourth, while Krṣṇa is the Supreme Person Himself. The forms of fish etc. are called Lilāvatāras i.e., forms assumed by the Immanent for the sake of sport, while there are three Guṇāvatāras also. God has three supernatural attributes under the names of sattva, rajas and tamas which are not to be confused with the material elements. When God takes up these three attributes, He becomes Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Śiva respectively. So the position of Viṣṇu in Śuddhādvaita is not the same as in Viṣṇūdvaita, although He is considered to be superior to Brahmā and Śiva inasmuch as He resembles Krṣṇa with regard to yellow garment, sylvan garland and so on.

According to Bengal Viṣṇuvism, Krṣṇa—and not Viṣṇu—is the main source of all avatāras. Rūpa Gosvāmī explicitly says so, and commenting on him Jīva Gosvāmī has quoted the benedictory verse
from the Gita-Govinda where salutation is offered to Krṣṇa who is said to have assumed ten forms of Fish and so on. For Rāmānuja, Krṣṇa is, however, an avatāra of Viṣṇu, the Supreme.
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16. (श्र) स्ववैश्वर्य स्वमामाघृदेव (गीतायां रामातुजभाष्यम् ४, ६)।
(श्र) स्वेच्छातः सत्यश्रोत्व विग्रहर्वतात्स्वाम्यमीचारतुजभाष्यं (तत्साधारांकालाप ३, ६, ६)।
17. इश्वरो नित्यसुधुदुधुमुक्त-स्वभावोपि सत स्वमायया देहवानिव जात इति इत्य लोकानुग्रह कृपायिनय च लक्षिते।

(सीतायां शांकरभाष्योपोदाता:)।

18. (श्रु) प्रातसमायया प्रातसीयया माययो। माया बुद्धं नामनित शानपरम्योऽविन मायानिव:। तथा चामिकुपकपयोऽवि मायायया सत्तarma वेदति प्रार्थेणां च शुभाभामयैः। प्रार्थिययेन शानसतमसंक्लितेन्त्वम्। (सीतायां रामाजुजाभामयैः ४, ६)।

(श्रु) स्वलीलया जगुपकाराय स्वेच्छावतारः। वेदार्थ संग्रहः २० १०१)

19. मोहनमंत्या मनुष्यायित्वातीय-शंकास्वदेशु विवेचनेऽ

(स्वार्यचिंडः तत्त्वयुक्तकालापे:)।

20. (श्रु) यस्य देहवादिकपरिवर्तनारेणः (वेदार्थ संग्रहः २०५ ११६)।

(श्रु) मायाबतः १०, १४, २० (४) (भागवतम् १०, २, ४५)।

21. लीलया देहकपकपर्वर्गः कुवर्त उपेन्द्रवर्ष परस्येव (वेदार्थ संग्रहः २०५ ११६।

22. (श्रु) सुर्यवंशिकाराध्यसम्भावणः पराणः कुवर्तः परस्येव ब्रह्मचर्यो दायेर्वेन-स्वेच्छावतः (२०५ १२२)।

(श्रु) सोमवंश-संस्कारपुरुषः कुवर्तो भस्मो भुजाभरताय स्वेच्छाया बुधुपदव-श्रुहुज्ञातः (२०५ १२२)।

23. स मामकिंविन्यहेत्र: प्रसर्कर्या तत्स्तयः हृद्येवेव सकाशमामम तदः (भागवतम् १०, १३, १६)।

24. महाभारतवतार-स्पष्टायायामात्राकंतमुच्चते न मूत्संस्कर्यायायाय देहोऽऽव रस्मामनः (श्रु भागवतम् १०, २, २१)।

25. ब्रह्म देहवादिः-स्वेच्छावतारेवपि न प्राकृतो वेदः। (वेदार्थ संग्रहः:)।

26. (श्रु) निर्बन्धतात्सहितारुपायः गृहेश्वर हीणः। (मार्द्यावर्तारोः)।

(श्रु) सर्वं नियमः शाश्वातस्र देहाःस्त परामनः; हायाप्राप्तिविद्यः

नव प्रकृतिः क्रियाविधः (महावाराहपुराणम्, सतीकर्मविधिभिरसामायत-विनायकदुःऽत, गृहेश्वर १०१)।

27. देहते देहेश्वे धर्मायते च मानयी, विभुषोद्हारितुप्रायं वै करोतेवात्मकतमस्तुम (विभुषपुराणारभम् १, ६, १४५)।

28. राष्ट्रवेदावलस्वति शनिकिष्ठा हृद्याज्ञानः।

प्रेमे चावार्तेऽरु विभषोऽपयोऽपावायनी। (विभुषपुराणारभम् १, ६, १४४)।

29. शेषो बृहस्पती-तत्त्वयुतो सौमित्रिप्रमऽप्तुत-भोगरायी॥

बृहस्पतीकर्तारो व दिवयो केवलिष्कुनेविन्यातिकाशः (प्रभुतरामायणम् उत्तरकाण्डम् ६, १७)।

30. एवं ध्यायिति गोविन्द ध्राकाशात्तृति-अथवेचचरी॥

राजावुपस्वति सवः समृतो सपरिच्छदे।

श्रायुष्को व दिव्यान उपराज्यानि द्वित्याणि॥ (भागवतम् १०, २२, १२, १२)।
31. शरानाविवाहात्वापि भनुरायतविख्यतः।  
अन्वगचन्त्य काकृत्यू सर्व पूर्ण-विस्ताः। (रामायणम् ७, १०६, १)।
32. तत्वाप्रकृतिविश्वा भजहस्यभाव-विभावा दीपादुर्यमण-दीपदेवा विभावता मुखा- 
प्राधुर्यम्: सर्व ममगुणमुखमायिस्या। (गीताग्राहायम्)।
33. जगत: विद्वान् परिपालियिष्ठ: स भावितं नारायणायकं विविधप्रभोमस्य 
ब्रह्मको ब्रह्मात्तुल्यव रक्षणाय देवत्यं वसुदेवदेवसेन किल सम्भवुः 
(गीतायां शांकरभाष्ये उपोष्टाः)।
34. भवताराद्योविभयो: सर्व पूर्णा: प्रकटिताः: 
(मायामुहुर्भाष्यम्, भारतीयद्वारे उद्दृत्तम, पुस्तम् ४८५)।
35. श्रुतांगिः श्रुताः परं वरेयं ध्यायम् कृपुं कृपणं कमलस्वरूपं हृतिः 
(वश्यायको ४)।
उपलक्षायांस्य बुद्धायार्यां-वापतार-मूलानाम। तथा श्रुतहा भवतारास्चांगानित 
लघुवेय विवर्णते शष्या तमन्नत-मूलस्वरूपं, इति दशास्तोकी-व्यास्या वेदांत-क्रत- 
मंडलः।
36. एते चांगकलाः: पुरसं हत्यायशायान्तरयोऽवृत्तीहि पुत्रेनेवत: 
(गमनंवरणार्यवाव: पुस्तम् २६)।
37. मूलस्य चत्वारी रुपाँशिः 
(पुस्तकम् पुस्तम् १५)।
38. श्रव्यं हि सर्वः सत्तवतारायं मल्लायादीनं चूलम् 
(पुस्तकम्, १५)।
39. श्रवणामप्रेक्षायं-निहृत्यशिवा 
(पुस्तकम्, १५)।
40. बिच्छिन्नेन वल्युंजाणायापि दीपस्वर-भन्नादीनां 
पुष्पमेतम-वद्भिन्नाः बृह्णाः 
प्रकटिवेन ब्रह्मविवापेक्षोऽकल्युम् संयमुः 
(पुस्तकम्, १५)।
41. श्रवतारावः-श्रव्याबिनीयति 
(भक्तिरसामृतसमस्य: २, १, ३२)।
42. वक्षाकृतित्वं नुभ्यं नमः: 
(गीतमोहिणम्)।
THE MODES OF THE DIVINE MANIFESTATION

PART II
The Theory of Emanation (Vyuha)

God’s manifestation in relation to the creation etc. of cosmos—Pradyumna—Aniruddha—Sankarshana—Vasudeva—Further emanations—Sankara and Ramanauja on the system of Vyuha and the validity of the Pancharatra—What is ‘Lilavibhuti’?

It has already been noted that the purpose of the Deity’s descent on the mundane plane is protection of the good and punishment of the wicked. He comes to live amongst us to establish what is good and to destroy what is evil. In such activities of God one finds Him sporting in his dealings with the individual souls. The Pancharatra school, however, draws a sharp distinction between an avatar and a vyuha. The former is concerned with Divine sport (Lila) with the individual souls; the latter, with the cosmos. The manifestations of God in the form of Rama, Krsna etc. are called avatars or vibhavas; whereas the forms assumed by Him in the creation, sustenance and destruction of the universe are called vyuhas (emanations). Ramanauja has referred to the emanations of the Deity. Although he has not worked out the details of the theory of Vyuha, yet it is interesting to notice the Pancharatra view on the point.

The Deity in a sense transcends the material world, and so is beyond human comprehension. But it should not be inferred that He is only beyond and not within the world. His transcendence is not incompatible with His immanence. In fact, He is partly transcendent and partly immanent. His glory is thus two-fold. Hence the distinction between His Tripad-vibhuti, also called Nitya-vibhuti (the Eternal aspect) and His Ekapad-vibhuti, also called Lilavibhuti (the sportive aspect). The Deity is creator, sustainer and destroyer in the latter aspect. He is self-satisfied and is delighted in Him-self. His sports with prakrti are eternal, without a beginning and without an end. Man cannot fathom, with his limited capacity, the vast expanse of prakrti, the field of His great play. None can comprehend the ceaseless creation and dissolution of countless worlds. None can
understand when this sport began and when it will end. So man rests content with the belief that the Divine sport has been at work from eternity and will continue till eternity.

Rāmaṇuja says that this world is full of inscrutable mysteries, endless and manifold in character.2 The Mahā-Nārāyaṇopaniṣad speaks of countless cosmic eggs in the universe.2 The Bhāgavata has mentioned that myriads of cosmic eggs are revolving in each minute part of the Divine Being.4 The modern scientists believe in the immense magnitude of the world. Sir James Jeans, for example, says that 'about two millions of such nebulae can be photographed in all, and there are probably millions of millions of others beyond the range of any telescope'.5 But that is not all. For as Sir Arthur Edington observes, the world is still expanding. He says, 'I deal with the view now tentatively held that the whole material universe of stars and galaxies of stars is dispersing; the galaxies scattering apart so as to occupy ever-increasing volume'.6

According to the Hindu scriptures, this wonderful universe has three phases—creation, sustenance and sublation. God as creator is Pradyumna; as preserver He is Aniruddha; and as destroyer He is Saṅkarṣaṇa. Although the Deity is the repository of countless Divine attributes, yet six of them viz. knowledge, power, prowess, supremacy, energy and splendour are most important. When His knowledge and power predominate over His prowess, supremacy, energy and splendour, He becomes Saṅkarṣaṇa. His colour then is like that of the yellow topaz; and He wears a blue garb and holds a plough, a pestle and a conch in His three hands, keeping the fourth hand in a position symbolizing protection to the distressed. The emblem in His banner is palmyra. His knowledge serves to uphold the secrets of the scriptures to human beings and His power is responsible for the destruction of the world.7

When the Deity's prowess and supremacy come to predominate over His knowledge, power, energy and splendour, He becomes Pradyumna. His colour then is like that of the rays of the sun. He wears a red garment and holds a bow, arrows and conch in His three hands, keeping the fourth hand free to offer fearlessness to His devotees. The crocodile is the emblem in His banner. He propagates righteousness through His prowess and creates the universe by dint of His supremacy.8

When energy and splendour predominate in the Deity, He is called Aniruddha. His colour then is blue; and He puts on a white
dress and wields a sword, a club (khetā), a conch in His three hands, while His fourth hand extends fearlessness to man. The deer is the emblem of His banner. Lord of the individual ego, He propagates knowledge of the Self through His splendour and supports the world through His energy.  

Besides the three emanations of the Deity described above, the Deity Himself, in whom all the six attributes are simultaneously manifest, is sometimes recognised as an additional emanation. He is then called Vyūha-Vāsudeva or the Deity-in-Emanations. He is moon-like in colour; wears a yellow dress and holds a conch, a disc, & a mace in His three hands, vouchsafing absence of fear to the devotees with the fourth. The eagle is the emblem of His banner.

The Āgamic literature contains references sometimes to five, sometimes to nine, sometimes to ten and even twelve of them. The twelve emanations are Keśava, Narāyaṇa and Mādhava said to be the emanations of Vāsudeva, being respectively golden, swarthy and sappheryne in complexion. Govinda, Viṣṇu and Madhusudana are the emanations of Saṅkarṣaṇa, resembling the moon, the lotus-filament and the lotus respectively in colour. Trivikrama, Vāmana and Śrīdhara are the emanations of Pradyumna, respectively possessing the colours of fire, the rising sun and the white lotus. Hṛṣikeśa Padmanābha and Dāmodara are the emanations of Aniruddha, having respectively colours resembling those of lightning, the sun and the indragopa-insect.

Commenting on the Brahma-sūtra 2.2. 42-45, Saṅkara has referred to the treatment of the Vyūha by the Bhāgavata school and sums it up as follows:

(a) Vāsudeva is pure knowledge and He is the only Supreme Reality;

(b) While remaining Vāsudeva Himself, He has divided Himself to Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha;

(c) Vāsudeva is the Supreme Soul; Saṅkarṣaṇa is the individual soul; Pradyumna is mind; and Aniruddha is the ego;

(d) Vāsudeva is the primal cause, while Saṅkarṣaṇa and others are effects;

(e) Man attains God, when his distress comes to an end as a result of his worship for a century in the following ways: 1. approaching the temple and the idol; 2. collecting necessary articles such as flowers; 3. offering flowers etc to
the idol; 4 chanting God's names etc. and 5 contemplation on the Divine form.12

Śaṅkara does not object to the view that Vāsudeva has divided Himself into various forms, because he thinks that it is in conformity with the scriptures. Nor is he opposed to the programme of worship, because it is, as he says, approved of by the Śruti and Smṛti. But he disapproves of the view that Śaṅkarṣaṇa is born of Vāsudeva, Pradyumna of Śaṅkarṣaṇa, and Aniruddha of Pradyumna. If an individual soul (Śaṅkarṣaṇa), he argues, be regarded as the offspring of God (Vāsudeva), it would become non-eternal. For whatever is born or produced is non-eternal. Similarly, continues Śaṅkara, mind (Pradyumna) cannot be regarded as a product of an individual soul (Śaṅkarṣaṇa), because an instrument cannot be produced from an agent. An axe, for instance, cannot be produced from a wood-cutter. Likewise, the emergence of the ego (Aniruddha) from the mind (Pradyumna) is unacceptable to Śaṅkara, because no instance of this sort is to be met with in the world. Moreover, there is no Vedic text, he adds, in support of this view. If so, on the other hand, Śaṅkara continues, the forms of Śaṅkarṣaṇa etc. be regarded respectively not as soul, mind and ego, but as different Divine forms, then the doctrine of one God advocated by the Bhāgavatas would not stand. He further criticizes the view of the Bhāgavatas, saying that the Pāṇcarātra scripture stands opposed to the Vedas in so far as it states that Śaṅḍilya could not attain peace despite his study of all the four Vedas and that he could attain it only by studying the Pāṇcarātra literature.13

According to Śaṅkara, then, the question of the origin of the Vyuhas cannot arise, since producion pre-supposes non-eternity. But Rāmānuja differs from Śaṅkara in this respect. The manifestation of a vyuha, Rāmānuja observes, is not to be regarded as a case of production in the ordinary sense of the term. He contends that Vāsudeva, the Supreme Brahman, voluntarily assumes four forms in order that the devotees may find refuge in Him.14 The three forms of Śaṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha rule over souls, mind and ego respectively. In other words, the relation of the former to the latter is that of the ruler and the ruled. But sometimes Śaṅkarṣaṇa is identified with the soul, Pradyumna with mind, and Aniruddha with ego.15 The one Supreme Being presents Itself in four forms merely out of compassion for the worshippers; but God in Himself is one and not many. As regards individual souls, Rāmānuja points out that the Pāṇcarātra scripture itself denies that they are subject to birth. The Parama-samhitā, for example, clearly states that individual souls are truly without a beginning and without an end.16
As regards Śaṅkara's charge that the Pāṇcarātra is opposed to the Vedas, Rāmānuja opines that it is absolutely baseless. The statement that Śaṅḍilya did not attain peace through the study of the Vedas only serves to bring out the importance of the Pāṇcarātra and not to reject the authority of the Vedas. Like Śaṅḍilya, Nārada also could not derive knowledge of the Self from the Vedas, as the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad states. This does not mean that the knowledge that Nārada obtained from Saṅkṣetumāra was superior to that which is yielded by the Vedas. The fact that neither Nārada nor Śaṅḍilya could profit from the study of the Vedas to the same extent as they did from the study of the Bhūma-vidyā and the Pāṇcarātra respectively merely points to the importance of the scriptures instead of challenging the authority of the Vedas. The main point here is that just as the Bhūma-vidyā is intended to make the teachings of the Vedas easily intelligible, so the Pāṇcarātra serves merely to bring the teachings of the Vedas within easy reach of the people. The Parama- saṁhitā informs that Viṣṇu found out the essence of the teachings of the Vedānta (Upaniṣads) and presented the Vedas in an abbreviated form under the title of the Pāṇcarātra. Rāmānuja, therefore, concludes that the authority of the Pāṇcarātra is unchallengeable.

Although Śaṅkara dismissed the authority of the Pāṇcarātra, he did not, it is interesting to note, set aside the doctrine of Vyūha which finds mention in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas also. In his commentary on the word 'caturvyūha' occurring in Śrī-Viṣṇu-sahasra- nāma, Śaṅkara has quoted a verse from Vyāsa, which reads: 'The well-known Janārdana divides Himself into four forms of Vāsudeva and others, and executes creation etc. (of the universe)'. However, not only Rāmānuja but all Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas after him have admitted the doctrine of the Vyūhas (Deity's emanations) and held that these are the embodiments of the sportive grandeur (līlā-vibhūti) of God.

As regards līlā-vibhūti, it is a general name for the creation, sustenance and destruction, in a fixed order and under Divine law, of the myriads of cosmic eggs spread in all directions in the azure vault. Nobody knows how many worlds are created and destroyed every day in the blue expanse. The Divine sport is indeed mysterious! From the quintuplicated gross elements arises the universe consisting of various worlds, only one of which is this Earth. The eighty-four lakh types of bodies, as tradition goes, are made of compound elements, through which the feelings of pleasure, pain and infatuation are experienced by the individual souls according to their actions. Sattva is the source of pleasure, whose dominance is experienced in vernal breezes, in avenues of trees embraced by cree-
pers, in orchards full of sweet chirping, in the worship of the Deity and other pious rites and in peaceful empires, where life is prosperous, body is healthy and affection is pure. The preponderance of rajas is brought about by hot winds, leafless thorny trees, the drinking of wine, revolutionary states, heavy traffic, lust, anger etc. The predominance of tamas is visible in barren fields, floods, famines, anarchy, poverty, stupor and so on. There is no object, says Ramānuja, either on this earth or on the celestial region which is devoid of these three attributes of prakṛti. The functioning of the triple qualities of matter is, according to the Pāñcarātra view, the vibhūti of Divine sport; and His three forms respectively associated with the creation, sustenance and sublation of the universe are called Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Saṅkarṣaṇa respectively.
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   मुखं हस्तवर्णं चार्यम प्रामाण्यं हृद्यम महामते।
   वामे परस्मिन्याः प्रजः दलिते वार्ष-पंचमकम्।
   (साधवत सन्धिहा ५, १४, १६)
9. (१) एवं भजनादि-प्रतिकावः सुहितात्मक-बैश्यतमुष्टिः 
चतुर्दशं विशालावः मृगलाञ्चलसूपितमुष्टिः 
श्रद्धालोकाच्युतं मायेन स्वायत्तो कौटिल्यमुष्टिः 
दक्षिणायिनि क्रमेयः ग्रामायः बङ्कः रेखकः ||
(सांवत संहिता ५, १७, १८)
(प्रारम्भ गर्भ-संकाय-वर्णन परमेश्वरः)
सारमति उत्तरस्यं च पापस्वर्णमाननां तत्ति ||
(सांवत संहिता ४, ११)
(२) तेजः शक्तात्मनाः सौयं संहितः: परमेश्वरः: ||
(सांवत संहिता ३, ७)

10. (१) तरायें भगवद् पुरुष-कुदेकदुके-कालिन्तरुषी 
चतुर्दशं सीम्य-वर्णं पुंडरीकानस्यार्यामुष्टिः 
पीत-कोषेय-नमसं सुपविष्ण्डर-सूपितमुष्टिः 
मुख्य-दिनाज-हस्तेन भीतः नाममय्यादमुष्टिः 
विद्या-कोषेन वामेन सुभूमिता वंस्करादः
पूज्येन हायपरस्मार्थः प्राचीनो दक्षिणा वनरो
तथा-विभेदः गदा वामे निष्प्रोक्त वस्मु क्षितः ||
(सांवत संहिता ५, ६, १२)
(प्रां) प्रारम्भः सृजनः वरुणा सूनम्-कान्त्यधिकेन तु 
स्वमयसम्पेपि भगवानु वामुस्वस्करात्मना स्वयम् ||
(सारं सं ७, ५)
(५) विमज्ञातमानालम्बेन वामेवः प्रमुः
अनुभमहत-स्वम्यस्तु रामायणः वामुस्वस्करात्मना ||
(सारं सं ६, ५, ६)

11. (१) चतुर्दशम्-नव-वृहद-वन-दादाय-मुरधे: ||
(श्रवणात्मक्यं जित्तते वृहदम्)
(प्रां) सारमति नव-मुरधानामात्मृति रहिया परा ||
(भागवतम् ११, १६, १२)

12. तदाभ्यां भगवतः कृपायं भगवनायेवो कामुस्वसे 
विमर्दना-वान-स्वस्यः: परमार्थ-स्वस्यः
चतुर्दशमान् प्रतिश्रुतयो वामुस्वस्य शृङ्खल्यो वाम नमुन्याः
संस्कर्षणद्विगुः नमुना वामुस्वसे: वामार्थमोक्षेति।
संस्कर्षणाः नमुना जीवः:
प्रमु: समु: नमुन: प्रमु: समु: नमुन: जीवः:
नमुनाः समु: नमुनाः प्रमु:
नमुनाः समु: नमुनाः प्रमु:
(श्रवणां शान्तरामयम् २, २, २२)

13. वेदविन्दं प्रवर्तितं भवतिः चतुर्दशं वेदेवं परं तेजस्वतः 
कामं वामेव वेदविन्दानि वेद-निर्दाययां
तस्मात् संस्कर्षणां सर्वत्र गतः सम्मानः
(श्रवणां शान्तरामयम् २, २, २४)

14. अयं: संस्कर्षणादीपिणिः परस्परं श्रवणं: स्वेश्चित्रिलं 
हृदयं चाण्डालादायमानं भूम्या
विज्ञातं इति शृङ्खल्यावाणिः वाताल्यमानिः
स्वेश्चित्रिलं विनिः 
वाताल्यमानिः श्रवणं शान्तरामयम्
(श्रीचार्यम् २, २, २४)
15. तत्त्र जीव-मनोशक्ति-रत्नानमविस्दारा: संपर्याम प्रथम नामिन्दा इति चैवामेव जीवादिलामृत्रीमयानामविश्रामम्।

(श्रीमाध्यमः २, २, ४१)

16. विविद्या हि जीवोल्लत्तिस्तीमिन्नपि तन्ने। यथोक्तं परम-संहितायामु

श्रेयतान परास्ति च नित्या सततविक्रिया

मिलुणः कामिन्यां श्रेयं प्रक्तेतुपु मुख्येत्।

व्याधित रुपे यमं वस्त्रवस्तवास्व पुष्पस्य च

स ह्यानातिन्य्याष्ठच परमार्फ्ते निश्चितः।

इत्येव सर्वस्विन्निप संहितास्य ज्ञानस्य नित्यायवचनाज्ञीस्य-स्वस्यप्रतिष्ठातः पंचराजः

तन्ने प्रतिविर्भव।

(श्रीमाध्यमः २, २, ४२)

17. तथा बेदांवह नुरीयनिवा सुकावभोवायः शास्त्रारम्भः परमसंहितायामुख्येत्।

(पुराणम्)

18. बेदांतपेहु यया यसस्य संग्रहम् महावानहि:।

भवतानुम्यमा विदानु संविशेष ययामुः।

(२, २, ४२ ब्रह्मसौनारी श्रीमाध्योवृत्तम्।)

19. व्युज्यातमां च वाणो व वाणेवाधित-सूचितमः।

सुत्त्वादीयग्रामते विविद्याय जनादेवः। इति व्यास-वचनाच्छन्नव्यः हः।

(श्री विष्णु-सहस्रनाम शंकर-माध्ये २४)

20. पूर्विक्यां मनुष्याविदु दिववेदेपु वा प्रकृतिसंस्कृतेपु ब्रह्माविद्यावराणेपु

प्रकृतिज्ञीनविभिन्नभिभुणं पूर्वकं यत्सवर्गातं प्रआश्र्यातं न तद्विदित।

(गीतायां रामायु-माध्यम १५, ४०)
CHAPTER VIII
THE CULT OF BHAKTI
Part I

Views of Śāṇḍilya, Nārada, Patañjali, Vyāsa, Vācaspati Miśra, Bhoja, Bādariyaṇa, the Bhāgavata, the Devī-Bhāgavata, Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Madhava, Vallabha and Rūpa—Bhakti in Advaita Vedānta—A phase of consciousness—Classification according to the Bhāgavata—Āśaya bhakti—Āśaya traced to the Vedas—Unalloyed devotion—Action and knowledge auxiliaries to devotion—Para-bhakti, para jiśāna and Parama-bhakti—Human effort and grace of God in the attainment of bhakti—The path of love open to all—Various phases—Śaṅkara, Vasiṣṭha and Rāmānuja.

The cult of bhakti or devotion is as ancient as the Rgveda where we find beautiful passages replete with devotional feelings. Bhakti is derived from bhaja (to serve) which appears in Vedic utterances such as ‘Mahas te Viṣṇo sumatim bhajāmahe’ (Rgveda 1.156.3). Etymologically, the word ‘bhakti’ means service.

The root ‘ās’ with the prefix ‘upa’ was also used side by side with the root ‘bhaja’ for worship in the time of the Samhitās. We read in the Yajurveda (25.13) ‘Yasya viṣṇa upāsatē’ i.e. ‘whom all people worship’. The word ‘upāsanā’ which literally means ‘sitting near’, might have been primarily used to signify ‘sitting down for worship’. But it came later to mean worship in general. Bhakti and upāsanā are thus synonymous.

When a person becomes intoxicated with God-consciousness, and contemplates nothing but God, always sings His glory and is devoted to worshipping Him, he is indeed in the state of bhakti. In other words, when a person performs physical activities only to please God, and when God alone is the focus of all his mental activities, there arises in him the state of bhakti. Bhakti thus is the centralization of all our physical and mental functions in God. God is the basis and support of all thoughts and all actions of the devotees. He is their father, mother, friend and son; He is their learning, wealth and so on.¹

Since Divine service starts with love of God, the word ‘bhakti’ is also taken to mean love. Śāṇḍilya has defined it as deep attach-
ment to God. Narada has also defined it as deep love of God, and added that it is fully expressed in a state wherein a person dedicates his actions to God and feels extreme anguish in obliviscence of Him. Patanjali has in his Yoga-sutra called it pranidhāna. According to him, it is one of the five practices necessary at the second stage of spiritual discipline. It is also stated to be one of the various means of mental concentration. He mentions that trance in its completeness is a result of pranidhāna.

Vyāsa, the well-known commentator on Yoga-sūtras, regards ‘pranidhāna’ as a kind of devotion. While elucidating Vyāsa’s ideas, Vacaspati Miśra has added that devotion may be either mental or oral or physical. At another place, Vyāsa interprets the term as meaning ‘dedication of all actions to the Great Teacher i.e. God.’ But he perhaps realized the difficulty in dedicating all actions to God. He therefore suggested an alternative interpretation of the term viz ‘dedication of the fruits of actions to God,’ which is decidedly the better of the two interpretations in view of the teachings of the Gītā. Bhoja, like Vyāsa, has interpreted ‘pranidhāna’ as bhakti-visēṣa, which is devotion specially in the form of offering all actions to Him. A comprehensive interpretation of the term ‘pranidhāna’ is given by Vyāsa in his comment on Yoga-sūtra 2.45 where he states that pranidhāna consists in man’s offering of all his feelings (bhāva) to God. Accordingly, Patanjali’s pranidhāna may be defined as ‘putting one’s own mind into God’ which should, however, mean the dedication of the feelings of the individual rather than the individual himself to God.

Bādarāyāna calls devotion to God samārādhana in the Brahmasūtra. Brahman is usually un-manifest, but it is visible to a devotee or a man in a state of samārādhana.

According to the Bhāgavata, bhakti consists in the uninterrupted presence of the individual mind in God. The Devi-Bhāgavata says that in devotion mind remains in the Deity as steady as the flow of oil.

Rāmānuja defines bhakti as the contemplation of God, accompanied by love. According to him, Brahman, the object of contemplation, is very lovely and, for that reason, the very act of contemplation is very sweet. Thus for him, bhakti is continuous, loving meditation of the beloved; the stream of the loving thought is unbroken like the stream of oil. The Ācārya, in this connection, records the following extracts from various scriptures:

(a) On knowledge: ‘Having known Him alone one crosses beyond mortality’.


(b) On contemplation: 'The Atman is to be contemplated'\textsuperscript{21}

(c) On concentration: 'Concentrating upon Him, he then sees Him', \textsuperscript{22}

(d) On worship: 'The all-seeing Atman alone is to be worshipped', \textsuperscript{23}

(e) On remembrance: 'Mind being pure, remembrance is firm', \textsuperscript{24}

(f) On visualization: 'Atman is to be visualized'. \textsuperscript{25}

All the above extracts, Rāmānuja says, refer to deep meditation, a state in which the devotee sees God face to face, as it were, —a state closely resembling vision of God in a literal sense. God is infinite bliss par excellence. He being the Supreme Lord, the soul devoted to Him feels excessive joy in devotional approach to Him. Bhakti is thus of the nature of bliss. The enjoyment of things of a nature other than the Divine may, if at all, yield only a minute fraction of bliss, and that too only temporarily. Bliss—permanent and perfect—can be derived only from God.

According to Nimbārka, a particular type of love is bhakti which grows in the heart of man endowed with qualities such as modesty.\textsuperscript{26} Such Bhakti is of two kinds—bhakti as a means and bhakti as an end in itself.

Madhva holds that bhakti is intense devotion proceeding from knowledge of the greatness of God. It is a tie between the devotee and his Deity, and can be established in a threesfold way; through body, through speech and through mind. Almsgiving, protecting the distressed and giving shelter to the destitute are the bodily activities proper of a person of devotion. Speaking the truth, speaking the good, speaking the sweet and the recitation of sacred texts constitute devotion through speech. Kindness, faith and desire for service to the Deity are the chief constituents of devotion through mind. These physical, oral and mental activities directed to God together make up devotion in its completeness and perfection.

Vallabha believed in a twofold bhakti—the maryādā-bhakti and the puṣṭi-bhakti. In the case of the former a devotee loves the Lord in conformity with the scriptural injunctions, whereas in that of the latter, love is prompted and promoted by the grace of God Himself. Those who follow the path of puṣṭi-bhakti adore God, because they love Him most zealously. Their love is indeed of the same nature, as that which characterised the famous cow-herdesses of Vṛndāvana.
Rūpa Gosvāmī of the Gaudīya Vaishnava School has defined bhakti as intent or assiduous thought fixed on Śri Kṛṣṇa, devoid of any mundane desire, and unmixed with knowledge, action and so on. By knowledge he means the contemplation of the non-dual Brahman, and by action he means the obligatory (nitya) and the periodical (naimitika) duties. According to him, devotion has three stages: (a) śādhanā or means, (b) bhāva or sentiment, and (c) prema or love. The means or the expedient reaches the sentiment, and the sentiment terminates in love which is the highest goal of human life. Expedients are many, and Rūpa Gosvāmī has enumerated no less than sixtyfour of them. But even one expedient can suffice for the achievement of the highest goal as is shown by the example of Parīkṣīt. Parīkṣīt devoutly listened to the account of the glorious deeds of the Deity, which exemplifies Śravaṇa. Ambarīṣa, however, afforded an example of resorting to several expedients. Besides relying on Śravaṇa, he used to recite God’s names and worshipped Him and so on.

‘Expeditious devotion’ is again twofold—the vaidhi and the rāgānuṣa. The former corresponds to the sāttvika-bhakti of the Bhāgavata and the maryāda-bhakti of the Vallabha school, which is said to be actuated by scriptural injunctions; whereas the latter is analogous to the natural thirst for love in persons like Rādhā and Yaśodā.

As has been said above, all the expedients have their culmination in ‘bhāva’ which makes the mind infinitely tender. This state can be attained also through the grace of God. But no matter whether it is attained by human effort or through Divine grace, it may grow still deeper to culminate finally in ‘prema’. Like ‘bhāva’, prema also can be attained through Divine grace. Fortunate indeed is he to whom God grants the privilege of attaining to this state.

On the basis of Sanskrit rhetoric Rūpa Gosvāmī has treated bhakti as a sentiment (rasa) and distinguished its primary and secondary forms. The former, according to him, has five aspects: sānta (quiet), prita (affectionate), prayān (more affectionate), vatsala (fond) and madhura (sweet). Each preceding aspect is inferior to the succeeding one. Hence the madhura stands first and the Sānta last, in order of perfection.

According to Advaita Vedānta, devotion is contemplation of the Saguṇa or the lower Brahman. Its main object is the concentration of mind: the attainment of satya-loka is the secondary object. Śaṅkara endorses Bādarāyaṇa’s view that those who practise Yoga discover the true nature of the Ātman at the time of samādhi.
consisting in love, contemplation etc. Madhusūdana Saraswati, in his bhakti-rasāyana says, that as a result of various religious observances the mind loses its stiffness and becomes supple or rather melts, and flows like a stream into God, the Lord of all. The state thus attained by mind is bhakti.

Rāmānuja's bhakti is, however, a phase of the soul's consciousness. Consciousness is one, but it assumes various forms according to the nature of the channel through which it flows. It functions through the inner and the outer sense-organs in all living beings. The inner sense-organ is mind which is sāttvika, rājasa or tāmasa according as the one or the other of these guṇas preponderates. Consciousness occurring in a sāttvika mind differs apparently though not essentially from that which occurs in a rājasa or a tāmasa mind. Consciousness due to tamas is illusion; it is lust when it is due to rajas; in its sāttvika origin it is devotion. Śrīnivāsaḍāsa has given a long list of the different forms of consciousness in its different aspects. According to him, perception, inference, scriptural testimony, recollection, doubt, false knowledge, discrimination, perseverance, infatuation, desire for enjoyment, enmity, pride, jealousy, fortitude, fickleness, deceit, greed, wrath, arrogance, inactivity, opposition, intentness, disgust, pleasure, benevolence, malevolence, love, satisfaction, courage, peace, renunciation, lust, friendship, mercy, desire for salvation, bashfulness, endurance, consideration, desire to win, hatred, contemplation, hypocrisy, finding fault with merits, desire to kill, avidity, hoping against hopes, inclination, worship, faith, devotion, self-consecration etc., are the various aspects of consciousness and so serve to distinguish the different qualities of the soul under various conditions.

It might, of course, be contended that desire, intention, doubt, faith, faithlessness, courage, couragelessness, bashfulness, thought and fear are, as the Brhadāraṇyaka observes, only ingredients of mind, so they cannot be said to constitute consciousness. To this Śrīnivāsaḍāsa's reply is that those, really, constitute consciousness but are only figuratively attributed to the mind in view of the fact that there is a relation of co-operation between mind and consciousness. He agrees, in this respect, with Rāmānuja as is evident from the opening verse in the Śrī-bhāṣya which runs thus: 'May my intellect or understanding be devotional unto Para-Brahman.'

The Bhāgavata classifies bhakti under four heads; tāmasa, rājasa, sāttvika and nirguṇa with reference to the motives respectively underlying them. The tāmasa or the lowest form of bhakti is that which is actuated by violence, hypocrisy or malice. Better than this is the
rājasa bhakti which is practised for the sake of gaining fame, sensual enjoyment or supremacy over others. Sāttvika bhakti is that refined form of love in which the sense of duty is predominant element and which is cultivated for the destruction of the tie of actions, and is offered to God. Nārada has also admitted this classification. The nirguṇa bhakti is the highest kind of devotion. It is unmotivated and is aroused by the realization of the glory of God. It is, in fact, a state in which the individual enters into the life of God or the all-pervading Deity just as the waters of the Ganges enter into the ocean.\textsuperscript{41}

The Devi-bhāgavata, like the Bhāgavata, classifies bhakti with reference to the various motives as determine the preponderance of the different guṇas. Of the various kinds of bhakti the sāttvika is recognised as the highest and is called ‘para bhakti’—a state in which the individual mind remains fixed upon the Deity as continuously as a stream of oil. It is thus of the same nature as the nirguṇa-bhakti of the Bhāgavata and is, likewise, unmotivated.\textsuperscript{42}

Rāmānuja liked the dāśya bhakti. Although he has not fully explained the meaning of the term ‘dāśya’, it not improbable that he understood the term in the sense in which it is generally used in devotional literature. The traditional explanation of the nature of dāśya bhakti is the love of a servant towards his master.

Bhakti is service mingled with love. It has thus a sociological basis and has the following well-marked phases:

(a) the love of a son towards his parents, which is the love of the younger or inferior for the elder or senior;

(b) the love of a parent towards the son, which is obviously the love of the senior or superior for the younger or junior.

(c) the love of a friend towards a friend, which is the love of an equal for an equal.

The love of a student for his teacher or that of a servant for his master is akin to filial love, and is designated as dāśya (literally servanthood) in devotional literature. The love of a teacher for his student and that of a master for his servant is similar to parental love and is termed as vāttṣalya (literally parental affection). The love of a person for his friend is called sakhyā (literally friendship). The love of a wife for her husband may be either dāśya or sakhyā. But later Vaiṣṇavism has given it the name of mādhurya or spousal love (literally sweetness).
A devotee regards himself as son, and God as father. Although man is not born of God in the same sense as a child is born of a human father, yet God should be looked upon as father and man as son for devotional purposes. The use of the words ‘son’ and ‘father’ is obviously metaphorical in this connection. A similar metaphorical significance is attached to such relations as ‘master and servant’, ‘teacher and the taught’, in terms of which the relation between God and man is understood. Again, when a devotee addresses God as husband, the use of the word ‘husband’ is purely figurative; for there can be no marital relation in its ordinary sense between man and God. The spousal love spoken of in Vaiśṇava literature is entirely asexual and corresponds to the Greek ‘agape’, and differs from worldly love signified by the Greek word ‘eros’ or ‘erotos’.

Tastes differ. Some devotees wish to worship God with parental affection; some desire to adore Him as a friend; and some choose to invoke Him as a master. But the most proper and easiest form of bhakti is that which involves the meditation of God as father, mother, teacher, master or king. A true devotee cannot but pray, ‘O God, since my birth I have been your servant, your disciple, your son; you are my master, teacher, mother and father’. In praise of Goddess Lākṣmī, the Agni-purāṇa addresses: ‘You are the mother of all beings and Hari is the father’.

The religious aspirant may, however, choose any of the several types of devotion. What particular type he should choose would depend upon his feeling. What counts is the intensity of devotion. That is why a devotee’s attitude towards God, even when it is like that of a paramour towards his beloved, is also praised. The illicit love of a profligate for his or her lover may perhaps be very intense. Hence the devotee’s attitude towards God is sometimes called jārabhāva (i.e. the paramour’s attitude). The saint-poet Tulasīdāsa, in the closing verse of the Rāma-carita-mānasā observed: ‘I wish I could feel that endearment to the name ‘Rāma’, O God, which a niggard feels towards his pelf and a lecher does to a woman.’

The idea of meditation on God as father together with service of the dāsya type done to Him is very old. There is profuse reference to it in the Vedas. It is incumbent upon every twice-born person to adore God daily as savitā or the creator at the time of repeating the gāyatri. The term ‘Savitṛ’ means father. The conception of the ‘fatherhood’ of God is familiar to the Gītā also. Arjuna praised Śrī Kṛṣṇa thus: ‘Your glory is unique in all the three worlds. None is equal to you. How can, then, one be your superior? You are the father and the venerable Teacher of the world—moving and
stationary. This obviously involves the conception of devotion of the dasya type. According to the Bhāgavata, Śiva is the best wor-
shipper of Viṣṇu, and Śiva in his incarnation as Hanumān displayed
his attitude as a dāsa. It is exactly in this sense that Rāmānuja
understands the nature of bhakti.

Vīśistādvaita tells us about two ways of devotion: the way of a
young monkey and that of a young cat. In the case of the former, the
devotee is as active in devotion to the Deity as is a young monkey in
clasping its mother. In the case of the latter he is as passive as a
young cat is in mewing to its mother. There is a stress on human
effort in the former, and on resignation and Divine grace in the latter.
The Vadagalais prefer the way of the monkey, while the Tengalais
that of the cat.

Unalloyed Devotion.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa has said in the Gītā that four different types of people
worship him. The first is afflicted, the second is eager for knowledge,
the third wants prosperity, and the fourth is of a philosophical
temperament. Rāmānuja, however, reduces these four classes into three.
He does not distinguish between the first and the third, but holds that
both are equal, because both desire mundane pleasure and happiness.
They indeed realize their end through the grace of God, but since
they do not worship Him for the sake of salvation, they remain confined
within the domain of transmigration. Superior to them is he who
wants to know the real nature of ātman i.e., the self in its purity. He
indeed is the type of people whom God grants salvation from the
evils of worldly life. But the best indeed is he who, in the opinion of
Rāmānuja, possesses true knowledge, because it is only he who can
engage himself in exclusive devotion to the Deity. Rāmānuja has also
advised us to give all for God. Rāmānuja’s devotion to the Deity is
devotion for its own sake only. He never desired to have a mundane
good in return of his devotion. Prahlāda’s devotion to God is of this
nature. He prayed to Lord Narasimha for granting him inexhaustible
joy in his devotion to God. In fact, true men of devotion do not
care for the fivefold salvation but are anxious to stick to devotion for
its own sake. That is the reason why Sanaka and his brothers, as
Nārada informs, regarded devotion as its own reward.

The Two Auxiliaries to Devotion: Karma and Jñāna

Disinterested action purifies mind and helps the development of
devotion. Although both knowledge and devotion are necessary
for man's emancipation, yet the path of devotion is very attractive. The devotees, therefore, resort to this path and regard both action and knowledge as auxiliary to devotion. God can be realized through the path of knowledge also. Rāmānuja himself says that those who are well versed in the lore of the ‘five fires’ (pañcāgni-vidyā) which aims at the attainment of the knowledge of the self, realize God so as never to come back.⁶⁰ He also attaches importance to meditation on the soul conceived as free from all imperfections. But he points out that the conception of meditation on the soul as ‘imperishable, indefinable, indiscernible, all-entering, indeterminable, stable, immovable and eternal’ is not within the easy reason of the ordinary man who generally identifies himself with the body.⁶¹ The devotee cannot, therefore, depend solely on knowledge of the self, but finds it necessary to proceed on the path of bhakti.

Worship can bear fruit, if it is performed with the knowledge of the nature of the worshipper and the worshipped. That God is the worshipped and the soul the worshipper is a truth which every devotee must know. Bharadvāja Samhitā teaches, ‘God, the Supreme Soul, is my master. I am His servant. All that I do is His service, and it is an epitome of all knowledge’.⁶² Similarly the Brahma-tantra says, ‘O Lord, there is no other means than yourself for my welfare, not only in this life but also in lives to come. I have acquired this knowledge and I wish it might not perish in my future births’.⁶³

Supreme devotion, Rāmānuja says, is the result of knowledge which arises from love. Indeed, it is natural for man to love and to know. Besides para-bhakti, and para-jñāna, Rāmānuja admits parama-bhakti, and places them in the following order:

(a) Para-bhakti
(b) Para-jñāna, and
(c) Parama-bhakti.⁶⁴

Para-bhakti, i.e., primary love of God in the heart of a man makes him inquisitive about Godhead. But perfect knowledge acquired by him about God (Para-jñāna) culminates in the supreme devotion which the ācārya designates as ‘parama-bhakti’. Rāmānuja expresses this order in his Gadya-traya. Śrīnivāsādāsa agrees on this point.⁶⁵ In his comments on the Gītā (18.55) Rāmānuja also says that a devotee attains to God directly by devotion which, boundless and supreme as it is, arises from the knowledge of the nature, attributes and glory of God. Bhakti in its supreme form is characterised by Rāmānuja as the realization, or rather the most clear, most dear and unceasing perception of God. Such devotion arises in a person whose heart has been
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cleaned by the practice of jñāna-yoga and karma-yoga. Rāmānuja tells us that this view is based on the teachings of Yāmunācārya, his predecessor.66

*Human Effort and Divine Grace in the Practice of Devotion*

As has already been said, bhakti belongs to the consciousness of the individual soul. This, as Rāmānuja points out, means that bhakti is a matter of human effort.67 Man is to love and to pray. Prayer to God is but an effort on man’s part. A man is to engage himself in devotion to God, and he is to dedicate himself to Him. But men of devotion can perhaps be never confident that they love God to their utmost capacity. The greatness of God inspires awe in man with the result that he feels too humble to aspire after Divine love. Man therefore prays to God to give him the necessary power to know and love Him. Rāmānuja himself prayed to God for a grant of the knowledge of, and devotion to, Him.68 In fact, many devotees hold that supreme devotion is attainable also through the grace of God. In this respect Vallabha and Rūpa Goswami are in agreement with Rāmānuja. Śrīnivāsadāsa also holds that bhakti is twofold: sādhana-bhakti and phala-bhakti, the former being a result of human effort and the latter of Divine grace.69

*Universality of Bhakti*

According to Rāmānuja, God protects all irrespective of their differences. He is the refuge of all beings, high and low, irrespective of their differences of caste (jāti), contour (ākāra), creed (jñāna) and character (svabhāva).70 A man who is exclusively devoted to God is to be honoured as a prominent Vaiṣṇava even if he has transgressed the rules of conduct to be observed in his caste. The path of devotion is open to all. Women, traders, menials and even the sin-born attain the supreme state by taking refuge in Him. The Bhāgavata says: ‘Hail to that omnipotent Lord by depending upon whose devotees, the low-born people—the kirātas etc.—and other sinners become pure’.71 The later apostles of bhakti are similarly liberal in their view. They preach that everybody is entitled to enter into the relation of bhakti with God.72 The Gītā says, ‘Even if a person of the most wicked ways exclusively worships God, he is to be regarded as a saint, for he has resolved rightly’.73 One might ask: ‘How can a person of vile conduct be regarded as righteous and virtuous?’ ‘One who has not ceased from wickedness cannot attain God even though he may possess knowledge’, says the Kaṭha Upaniṣad.74 To this Rāmānuja replies that worship of God destroys the sins of the vicious person and that such a person goes to an
eternal state from which there is no return. Rāmānuja bases this view on the Scriptures. 'Recital of God's names', says the Viṣṇupurāṇa, 'destroys all sins just as fire removes all impurities of metals'.

The Vedas contain stray references to about seven phases of devotion as expressed in the following extracts:

1. One should try to have Him through hearing.
2. Firm are His people who recite.
3. (a) We all praise the deeds of the Lord.
   (b) May my praise strengthen you.
   (c) I, a feeble man, praise you, the powerful.
4. May my forceful recollection reach Viṣṇu.
5. Pay your offerings to Viṣṇu, the valiant and adorable.
6. (a) Salutations to the light pertaining to Brahman.
   (b) I bow down to Devī Mādhavī, the Spouse of Viṣṇu.
7. We meditate upon the adorable lustre of the Deity.

In the principal Upaniṣads one may distinguish five such phases:

1. Ātman is to be seen,
2. heard about,
3. pondered over, and
4. meditated upon.
5. We proclaim manifold salutation to Thee.

The Bhāgavata mentions nine and Nārada-Bhakti-sūtra elven phases of devotion. Rāmānuja has also made stray references to about nine such phases though with slight variations.

They are:

(a) Yatana or building of temples and growing of flowers for worship,
(b) Śravaṇa or listening to the narration of the Divine attributes etc.,
(c) Kirtana or recital of the Divine names, hymns etc.
(d) Arcana or worship of God with fruits, flowers and the like,
(e) Stuti or recital of hymns,
(f) Vacana or discourses on God,
(g) Vandana or salutation to God,
(h) Smaraṇa or remembrance of God, and
(i) Dhyāna or meditation upon God.
Saṅkara, Vāsiṣṭha and Rāmānuja on Bhakti

Saṅkara allows a place to devotion in the religious life of a man. He himself was a devotee of Viśṇu as is evident from some of his devotional prayers such as Carpaṭa-pañjarika and śaṭ-padi and the references to 'Śālagrāma' he has made in his comments on the Brahma-sūtra. But Yoga-vāsiṣṭha philosophy eschews—nay denounces, devotion in rather strong terms: 'Bhakti of or devotion to any particular god is not required, and is not of much use in attaining Liberation.' 'One's own direct realization of the Self through one's own efforts is what is required to experience Liberation, and not devotion to any external god, however strong or powerful he may be.' 'God Viṣṇu, however long propitiated and however pleased, cannot bestow Self-knowledge on one who does not think for himself.' For Rāmānuja, on the other hand, devotion to God is a sure means of attaining the ultimate good. Bhakti, according to him, results in God-realization. It might, of course, be pointed out that service (bhakti) has somewhere in the smṛti been coddlingingly characterised as a canine attitude. How can, then, service to God be an ideal? Rāmānuja's reply is this. The kind of service which is condemned by Smṛti is the service done by worldly people for worldly purposes. But God is the best Person worthy of service by people of all kinds. The Gītā reveals: 'He who serves God with unflinching devotion overcomes or crosses over the gunas of prakṛti and attains to the state of perfection. This devotional service, Rāmānuja says, is the Lore of Brahman (Brahma-Vidyā).
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तिमि रघुनाथ नितरतर प्रय लागु मोहि राम।
(रामचरितमानस)

48. कुणन्द ३६२, १००।
सामवेद १०,६२।
शुद्भकर्णन्द ३, ३५।
तांतिरीयसंहिता १,५,६,४।

49. विस्तारं कव्वकव चराचरतय त्वमस्य पुष्पद्व्य गुणमार्याय।
न त्वस्मीययुपमय: कुलोत्जयो कव्वकवयात्मितात्ममात्र।
(शीता ११, ४३)

50. दासोहत्व कोसलम्वकय रामायणकालिन-कोषाय:।
(रामायणम् ५, ४३, ६)

51. (ए) सततं मा निययवुत्ता निययुपमाक्रियानाय आततवत्तो महर्यय-व्यय-साधन उपसते।
(शीताय रामायणमालयम् ६, १४)

(ब) देवी गुणमायं मायं दास्पुरं शरणं तोलसे तवाकमित हति बसतारं मा तार्य।
(शरणं तितवायस्य)

(छ) नित्यकिरिकरो मवानि।
(पूवोक्तम)

(अ) महास्यक्षिप्तः नित्यकिरिकरो भव।
(पूवोक्तम)

(छ) नित्यकिरिकरो भवव्यस्य।
(पूवोक्तम)

(ब) अन्यपाले स्मृतियं तु तव कक्षाकारिता।
तामेनां भगवनन्द नियमातानुष कुछुहं ने।
(पूवोक्तम)

(भ) नित्यकिरिकरो भववानि।
(चीरंगमद्य)

(ब्र) नित्यकेक्षायु-नित्यदयत्व दास्तव्तीति महाविवदायपुर्वं भववत्तत।
नित्यकिरिकरतां प्रायवे।
(चीरंगमद्य)

(प) त्वारुपुहंत-सम्पुरुण्य-प्रतिती-कारिता-दासनातम।
(पूवोक्तम)

(प्र) परिक्षवं-मनोरय:।
(पूवुक्तम)

(च) भगवतैं नित्यविदायमातान्नी नित्यदयत्वच वधाविविक्षतमुयाधि।
(पूवोक्तम)

(छ) महाविवदायपुर्वतप्रस्तुतपरिक्षवं।
(पूवोक्तम)

(क) प्रसुद्ध-नित्य-नित्यविदाय-नित्यदयत्व-रसायनकरत्वभावः।
(पूवोक्तम)

(ल) कहाँ भगवतादायपुर्वतपतियकस्तरित्यपरिवर्त्तितवस्तेनिक्षमवस्तिचतौ नित्य-
चरित्यमी।
(पूवोक्तम)

(ग) भगवतपरिवर्त्यायामायाः वद्यमित्वव।
(पूवोक्तम)

(च) मामेकालतितितिक-परिवर्त्यकर्मणाय परिहारू-थिथ्वा।
(पूवोक्तम)
52. चतुविषया भजने मां जना: सुकुमिनाधुःन।
श्रात्रों विज्ञामुखार्धि जानी च भरवयम्। (गीता ७, १६)

53. गोविषा विवा गुणवेदावदात्तक-देवाद्वा
(नारदभक्तिसूत्रम्)

54. ऐश्वर्यान्तः प्राप्तान्तः प्रायस्यन्तः बिनायासाधितात्तितमवर्णनीयम्
(गीतायां रामानुजभाष्यम् ५, १६)

55. (श) तेवां जानी मत्युक्त एकभक्तिविविधतेः।
प्रयो हि सानिनोवर्यमहं स न मम प्रयः। (गीता ७, १७)
(श) जातिनामहं यथा प्रयस्तथा मया सवर्णः न सर्वविक्तिनापि शब्दातुः न
शब्दः। (गीतायां रामानुजभाष्यम् ७, १७)

56. (श) तात्त्वमनवस्या तद्दिरोधीदुसारीनात।
(श) ग्रन्थावधायां स्वामोजन्मतः (पुरावैतम् १०)

57. या श्रीतिकविवेकानां विषयेश्वरनवाविनी।
लिङ्गमहरस्म: सा मे हृदयविश्वासपर्यंत। (विद्युपासासूत्रम् १, २०, १६)

58. (श) यमप्रोक्ता-कामोपेशु नेत्र्या मम कदाचन।
त्वायांदर्शनं सामाधीशुरसिद्धि दीयतां मम। (ब्रह्मतत्त्वेमुद्धितत्वसौत्रम् २, १६)
(श) मोहं सासोक्षा-सार्वेष्य प्रायंचे न नरापर।
इत्यामि हि महाभाग काहर्यं तव सुयत। (पुरावैतम् १, २५)
(श) सालोक्षे-सार्वेष्य-सामीया-साधुसमघम्रुपुः
दीयमानं न श्रुत्रूति विना मलेवनं जनाः। (भाष्यतम् ३, २६, १३)

59. स्वयं फलवेतेहि ब्रह्मकुमारा।
(नारदभक्तिसूत्रम् ३०)

60. युक्तविवेकौति युक्तारसितिना गतिस्वीयुक्त एवं, एवंरिदाना गतिस्व ब्रह्म प्रायस्यमुनरार- वृत्ति-भवयास।

61. अवशकविभवपरं मनोहुतिस्वहृदयदेहासाधिमानमासूत्रः-जेनावपेते, देवनति
हि देवमेवायां मन्यन्ते (गीतायां रामानुजभाष्यम् १२, ३)

62. परमात्मा हृत: इवाती स्वतोंज्ञ तस्य निर्यात:।
कृत्यतेरियतात्तितिरियेत जान-विशेषः (राजाज-संहिता, पृष्ठ १२२)

63. विवाहं यदिवं प्रावं यदिवं ब्रह्मजितम्।
जगात्तरपि देवस्य मा सुदृढः परिशयः (ब्रह्मानुसारांत्यंत्यंजितस्य स्तोत्रम् ४)

64. (श) परम्भकित-परजनाम-पर्मभक्तिः युक्तं मा कुर्वयं।
(श) परम्भकित-परजनाम-परमभक्ति-स्वभावं मा कुर्वयं।
(श) परम्भकित-परजनाम-पर्मभक्तिविविधतामेध्य।
(श) मदीयमेव दयया निदर्श्यं निदर्श्यं-संहृतस्कं-मधुरंप्रायस्य-पुरालेकांकितकालविक-परम्भकित-परजनाम-पर्मभक्तिः-विचः।
(श) मद्वासारसेत्र-मधुरंप्रायस्य-पुरालेकांकितकालविक- परम्भकित-परजनाम-पर्मभक्तिः। (रूपणभक्तिस्वूत्रम्)

65. भक्ति: परम्भकित-परजनाम-पर्मभक्तिः-कम्यती। (महामहामायिनिका १)
66. (अ) तदुस्तः परमगुरुभिमयं ज्ञानसाधने वर्गावर्तं भवितस्य सत्स्मर्थाक्षण्यकार्याकाल्यातिक
भक्तिसिंहस्य इति, सापथयोग-कर्मयोग-संस्कृतादि-कर्मसारिकतेनः।
(वेदांवत्सन्धः पुष्यथे १४४)
(आ) जात्कारणुकृत्तिः भक्तिकौशम्बरवतारामासः
(गीतायां रामानुजाभाष्यम्-उपोष्पधातः)
67. (अ) एवमहर्ष्टुतिपुश्चिएयमानः-वर्गावर्तं भक्तिशुद्ध्यतत्रतयतातनुस्लयापनमात्रानाकारणीति:
(श्रीभाष्यम् ४, ४, २२)
(आ) मां सत्यसंस्कृतं परमाधिकारकमाधिकारवादसाध्यस्मिन्यभिविचारेएकाल्याण्य-
विषिदेन भक्तियोगेन च च: येन्ते
(गीतायां रामानुजाभाष्यम् १४, २६)
68. (अ) 'तेषां जानी नित्यनुक एक-भक्तिताविधयेते।' (गीता ७-१७)
'उदारः सर्वं एवं जानी स्वामेव मे मतम्'। (गीता ७-१८)
'बहुतो जननामातो जानवामानं प्रपाले।' (गीता ७-२६)
इति श्रीकार्योविद्धान्मिनि मां कुश्कुम्। (शरणागतिर्गमः)
(आ) 'पुराण: स परं: पार्व भक्तवस लम्बस्तनन्यता।' (गीता ६-२२)
'भक्तिया लम्बस्तनन्या शब्दः'। (गीता ६-२४)
'मदुभक्ति लम्बोः पराम्।' (गीता ६-२४)
इति श्रीवाक्योविद्धतिः-परमभक्तियुक्तं मां कुश्कुम्। (शरणागतिर्गमः)
69. सा विविधा साधनामितफलभक्तिभेदादि। उक्तसाधनत्याय साधनाभिषेकः पल-भक्तिस्वरूपायाय भजनः।
(तत्रिनादिविदिका ३)
70. (अ) जातिसत्वाकारातः स्वभावो जातेचतुर्यन्तौतोत्तक्षेपणं वर्ततातेपुरुषं स्वपनौ पुरुषेऽ समाधयोपयोग्येन समोऽकामः। (गीतायां रामानुजाभाष्यम् ६, २६)
(आ) अनालोचितविविधोपके लोकारण्यं (वृयाकृतम् ६, ३४)
(इ) विविधव-विकृतम्युन-बारात्स्यंकिते (श्रीभाष्यमंलमः)
71. किरात-हुवाल-बुद्धिस्वरूपकसा बाह्रीकरकं यवना: कसादयः।
वेन्ये च पाप युखाराष्यायः येन्ति तस्मै प्रभवितः च नमः।
(भागवतम् २, ४, १६)
72. धार्मशत: शून्यवश निस्तिनां वस्तुविद्विकारिता। (भिक्षुसामुत्सिनिष्ठ: १, २, १६)
73. धार्शर्तै रेत्युद्दहाराचारों भजते मायानन्यमाभिक तापुदेव स समेत: सम्यः आकर्षितो हि स:।।
(गीता ६, ३०)
74. नान्यिमे द्वीचरितानानातानो नासात्मासी।
नात्मानानानो वापिस चैत्यार्नेन मायानुशासी।
(कठोपनिषद् १, २, २४)
75. मदुसुधनेन विविधोपके समुद्रानृत्तरस्वयम् रजस्तमो युग:। सदा बनातिक हृदयः
शाश्वतीमुनुरावितिनी मल्यक-नेत्रोपर्याचारानिवृत्ति गच्छित:।
(गीतायां रामानुजाभाष्यम् ६, ३२)
76. वनान-कौशितेन भक्तव विलायनमुनलम्।
मैन्याण्ड्याल्पारां धातुनामित पावकः।। (वृत्तियुद्दहाराम् ६, ५, २०)
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77. श्रद्धार्थमिमांक्ष्यं विभद्यमादुः

78. श्रमावसं श्रद्धा कौरवो जनसाम्

79. तत्तद्विद्या पौलिंय शुद्धीमेरियस्य बाजुरुकस्या मीहुः

80. श्रमावसं त्वा सुप्रुढः गिरो मे

81. तं त्वा शुद्धिं विसमतत्वान्

82. द्विप्रथमे शुद्धामुद्गे नमः

83. यहे दृश्यन्त विप्रथमे चार्यत

84. यहे दृश्यन्त ग्राह्ये

85. नम नामायुक्ते-दलस्यस्माः

86. नमा देवता धीमादि

87. श्रामा दर्शे दलायम्: श्रोत्वो नवेंद्रो निधियस्यभित्यः

88. चूरिधां ते नम डाँक्लि विजेस्म

89. श्रावणं कीर्तितं विशेषानं: ह्यं नवा पादसेवनम्

90. गुणावधायंक्तांसितं-कृपासितं-पूज्यासितं-स्थारणा-समितं दायासितं-कारासितं-कृपासितं-पूज्यासितं-स्थारणा-समितं-कारासितं-पूज्यासितं-स्थारणा

91. ब्रणकर्त-स्वरुप-सुमतिः-श्रवण-वदन-यत्न-कीर्तित-मुहुण्याय-श्रीम-ध्यानार्थम्-ह्यायादि

92. श्रवण-नायायाय-नारायण-कृपानु च दृष्टेन धारणा यत्नानां

93. मदुपुण्यविशेषानीनि गन्नामात्यि सुमूल्या पुज्यविशेषानीनि हृदयगुणाद्वयतः

94. मर्दिक्षारसग्निनिमति-मनोहुपुण्यामिनम-पदद्र-करद्र-विषेशस्य-श्रवण-सुमार्गिनाधिहितित-राक्षसादेशायं-काळीरर्षिके घरायने देशदेव प्रसिद्धपतितः

95. ध्रुवाधित्यं भज ध्रुवाधित्यं गोविंदसं भज सुवर्णे

96. श्रवणमन्यत विस्म्यो दयलं मन: समय विपययुक्तेऽपाम

97. (ष) यथा शालामण्डे हरि: (पएसुः शाकरमाध्यम १, २, १)

98. Yogavasishtha and its Philosophy by Dr. B. L. Atreya, 1939, pages 88-89.

99. श्रेष्ठस्वतुसाध्यायताः

100. स श्रावणसृष्टस्यसत्सृष्टिके एव च

101. मां च योगार्थस्चारणो भक्तियोगेन स्वेते

102. इवमेव भक्तिर्ध्यवाया श्रवणविवाह
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Part II

Seven means to the development of devotion—Initiation to the devotional career—The five-time worship—A note on image-worship.

All the means to be adopted by a religious aspirant aim at the purity of mind, for only those whose mind is pure are capable of incessant meditation of God. Rāmānuja recommends the following seven means to a man of devotion.¹

The first is the discrimination (viveka) of food. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad says, ‘As a man eats, so becomes his mind.’ The Gītā too insists on the propriety of food in the case of those who practise yoga. The criterion of the purity of food is threefold: (1) Certain articles of food such as onion and garlic are held to be impure by nature. (2) In some cases it is the ownership that pollutes food. For instance, food offered by a prostitute or a eunuch is not worth eating. (3) Food may sometimes be polluted accidentally. If it is eaten by animals such as crows and dogs or seen by vicious people, it ceases to be food proper for men of devotion and those who are desirous of acquiring purity of mind.²

The second means is the giving up of desires for sensual enjoyment (vimoka). Lust, wrath, greed, infatuation, vanity and jealousy are detrimental to spiritual advancement. The Gītā calls first three the three gates to hell.³ Lust overpowers the intellect of man.⁴ Left to itself, it simply increases as fire does with oblations of butter. The sex instinct is indeed a part of human nature. Its satisfaction is necessary but only within limits. It is not possible to find out what Rāmānuja’s advice is with regard to sex instinct. But it is clear enough from his writings that he would advise the man of devotion to rise above the urges of the sex instinct.⁵ The Bhāgavata says that the religious aspirant should avoid the company of women and also of those who mix with them.⁶ The Gītā recommends the gratification of the sex instinct only in accordance with the injunctions laid down in moral codes.⁷ From the extract which Rāmānuja quotes from the scriptures, it appears that he understands
the word 'kāma' in the sense of coition and hence he recommends strict celibacy to those who desire salvation.9

It is not in the case of male devotees only that the scriptures recommend celibacy and continence. The Bhāgavata says that a female devotee should regard her husband as an illusory appearance created by God.9 For the satisfaction of the sex instinct is detrimental to her devotion to God. All family ties, ties with the husband and children etc., keep her fettered to the empirical world. Hence any woman who cares for spiritual advancement should cut them off.10 A life devoid of all family ties is, of course, proper only for those women who have adopted the way of 'nivrūti'. But one who prefers to lead the life of 'pravṛtti' should remain with her husband and look upon him as a god.

The third means is the practice of the concentration of mind on God (abhyāsa). There must be something for the mind to fix upon; and God is the fittest object to which all mental activities should be directed.11

The fourth means is the performance (kriyā) of certain actions e.g., the five daily sacrifices which are:—

(a) the study of religious books,
(b) offering oblations to the gods,
(c) offering oblation to the manes with water,
(d) setting apart a portion of the meals for the cow, the crow, the dog and other animals, and
(e) hospitality to guests.12

The importance of such duties is admitted by the Brahma-
sutra13 and the Gītā,14 and the Brahmañtantra insists on the daily performance of them by every devotee.15

The fifth means called Kalyāṇa consists in the cultivation of such virtues as compassion, straight-forwardness; equanimity, non-injury, forgiveness, purity, veracity, serenity, modesty, fortitude and cleanliness. A list of twentiesix such virtues headed by fearlessness is given in the beginning of the sixteenth chapter of the Gītā under the heading of 'daivi sampat'.16

The sixth means is non-dejection (anavasāda). Pleasure and pain indeed visit every man alternately. But a man of devotional character should not lose heart, if adversity brings him affliction and disaster. The Gītā says that a saint is he whose mind rests undisturbed, while he is overtaken by misfortune.17
The seventh and the last means is absence of elation (anuddhāraṇa). Occasions for joy indeed arise in every man’s life. But a man of devotion should remain unperturbed in the midst of merry-making and pastimes. When a person advances more and more in spiritual realization, even gods approach him with alluring offers. But a true man of character is he who is not carried away by such offers.\(^{18}\)

In the chapter on Rāmānuja in his Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha, Mādhava\(^{19}\) has given an account of the abovementioned means which Rāmānuja and his followers have recommended to a man of devotion. Dr. Radhakrishnan points out that Rāmānuja insists on ‘an elaborate preparation, which includes viveka or discrimination of food; vimoka or freedom from all else and longing for God; abhyāsa or continuing thinking of God; kriyā or doing good to others; kalyāṇa or wishing well to all; satyam or truthfulness; ārjava or integrity; dayā or compassion; ahimsā or non-violence; dāna or charity; and anavasāda or cheerfulness and hope.’\(^{20}\) But in the list of Radhakrishnan there are eleven preparations for bhakti instead of the seven we have mentioned above. Moreover, the order of the preparations in his list is different from the one given in the Yatindra-mata-dipika and the Saavadarśana-saṅgraha. Again, ‘anuddhāraṇa’ is missing in Radhakrishnan’s list. Satya, ārjava, ahimsā and dāna might be included in Kalyāṇa.

Initiation

The need of initiation to the life of devotion which Vaiṣṇavism has felt very strongly should be conceived in a historical background. The investiture of a young boy with sacred thread was in ancient times regarded so holy that it acquired the significance of his second birth.\(^{21}\) Similarly the initiation of a person at a comparatively advanced age to a sacrifice was considered to be his third birth.\(^{22}\) Those who adored Viṣṇu had to undergo initiation at the Pāṇḍarātra sacrifice.\(^{23}\) Admission of deserving people to the order of Vaiṣṇavism which was in vogue in the time of Rāmānuja, was perhaps a modified form of the old Vaidika dikṣā (initiation). The main object of initiation is, indeed, the purification of the individual which should be the pre-condition of his admission to a religious order. A piece of iron covered with dust requires thorough cleaning before it is magnetized. Similarly the finite soul needs purification before it can be God-conscious. According to Pāṇḍarātra school, the preceptor purifies the disciple and the ceremony of purification comprises the following:—
The individual should bear on his shoulders the Deity's symbols.
(b) He should further put special mark on his forehead,
(c) He should receive a devotional name,
(d) and mantras,
(e) and procure an image of the Deity.24

The Five-time Worship

The religious aspirant should devote all his time to the worship of God in the following wise:

The first item of worship is abhigamana or approach to the sacred image of the Deity in a temple or at home. This should be preceded by the performance of the morning duties such as ablation25 and oblation.

The second is upādāna or collection and arrangement of the articles needed for worship, e.g., leaves, flowers, fruits and water.

The third is iṣṭā or service which means the adoration of the Deity in five, ten, sixteen, or more formal ways (upacāra)26. According to Rāmānuja, service to God consists in offering all kinds of pleasing objects to God.27 Some of these things are externally pleasing, e.g., the waving of lamps and fanning; some are tactually pleasing, e.g., garlanding and smearing with sandal-paste; and some are pleasing through assimilation, e.g., fruits and milk.

The fourth is svādhyāya or study which consists in counting the Divine names, chanting the holy hymns or reciting the religious texts.

The fifth is yoga or concentration of mind on the Deity.

These five items should be performed in the five divisions of the day. The Jayākhya Samhitā has given the details of this worship.28 One who spends his time in worship of this kind is called a pāṇcakālika i.e. five-time worshipper. However, the first three items are to be performed before midday meals. The svādhyāya should be done in the afternoon and the yoga during night.29 The taking of meals is a part of the worship, and similarly a six-hour sleep is held to be a part of the yoga.30

Vedāntaśāstra informs in his Pañcarātrarakaśā that, according to certain samhitās, study and meditation should precede the meals.31 The Bhāradvāja-samhitā holds that a man is pāṅcarāтриka if he
performs all the five rites in an abbreviated form even once a day. Of the five items, ījā is however the most important inasmuch as it includes the remaining four. Worship is not possible unless one approaches an image; so it comprises abhigamana. Again, since there cannot be worship without flowers, fruits etc., the upādāna is likewise involved. The uttering of the mantras (svādhyāya) is equally essential to worship. Lastly, worship involves mental concentration or yoga.

The Bhāgavata advises a man to worship the Supreme Person with keen love, no matter whether he is devoid of all desires or he has all desires in him or he is desirous of salvation only. Devotion expressed through formal image-worship is a sort of aesthetic approach to God. A nicely decorated niche where the idol is placed conveys to the devotee the architectural beauty of a palace. A green leaf of the holy basil (tulasi) is to him the symbol of the grandeur of the world’s greenery. A tiny jasmine flower offered by him to the Deity represents the entire flora. The ringing of the little bell at the time of worship is but an humble simplification of instrumental music. Each line in a devotional lay conveys the idea of large-scale vocal music. The waving lamp is only a symbol of the revolving luminary planets. A dot of sandal-paste mixed with camphor, saffron and musk is a sign of most refined luxury. A small grape offered to the Deity is suggestive of the choicest food. A devotee offers all these articles of exquisite beauty to the Most Beautiful.

Image-Worship

Men of devotion who yearned for the holy vision of the adorable Deity naturally wanted to keep His memory ever fresh in their minds. Accordingly, they made images or idols of Him. Sculpture, painting, smithy and clay-medelling—all came to their help, and yielded them beautiful images of the Most Beautiful. The idol of the heart was thus ever present before the eyes. The four-armed image of Viṣṇu had twentyfour variations, each with a definite name. T. A. Gopinath Rao has given a ‘table showing the arrangement of the Śaṅkha, cakra, gadā and padma in the four hands of each of the twentyfour Mūrties of Viṣṇu according to Rūpamaṇḍana.’ He has compared the list given in Rūpamaṇḍana with that of the Padmapuruṣa and found the former to be ‘undoubtedly the correct list, inasmuch as all the twentyfour possible permutations of the four emblems are found to occur in it accurately.'
Rāmānuja was an iconolator as were the apostles of later Vaiṣṇavism. At Śrī-Raṅgam he adored Raṅganātha to whom he addressed his Śrī-Raṅga-gadāya.37 Raṅganātha is one of the three important images of Viṣṇu in south India, the other two being those of Varadarāja at Conjeevaram and Veṅkaṭeṣa at Tirupati.

The importance of idol-worship is usually emphasized from two points of view viz. that of the yoga of Patañjali and that of bhakti. Those who practise yoga aim at absolute isolation or kaivalya and follow the rules and regulations enjoined by the sages. The followers of the eightfold path of yoga require, at the sixth and seventh stages (viz dhārāṇa38 and dhyāna39), some devices to concentrate their mind and for this purpose idols are very useful. An idol is kept just in front of the eyes and gazed at for some time after which the eyes are closed but the mind goes on visualizing it. In the beginning, the mind is able to have only vague glimpses, but the view becomes clearer and clearer after prolonged practice. So long as this mental image exists in the mind of a practising yogi, he can not contemplate any object other than the idol. This state is called meditation (dhyāna). The next and the final stage is samādhi where the mental image gradually vanishes and a kind of void takes place.40 The state which thus ensues is declared by the yoga-sāstra to be the goal of Yoga, because it is in such a state that the self realizes itself.41 Paurānic literature insists on the importance of idols for the concentration of mind.42 The idols recommended for this purpose are those of the principal gods of the Vedic pantheon. The sages preferred the images of gods to those of mundane objects. Although idols are thus held to play an important part in the career of a yogi, the idol-worship which is in vogue in the Hindu temples of India is very different from what it is in the estimation of a yogi. A yogi in the true sense of the term does not pay homage to the idol as such by offering water, sandal-paste etc. For him the idol itself is just an insignificant thing made of earth, stone, wood or metal as the case may be. Nor should he depend, for his yogic practice, upon any particular image. If he cannot, for instance, procure an idol of Viṣṇu, he can carry on his meditation by using whatever idol is available to him. He may use a statue of Nepoleon or an image of Mahārāṇa Pratāp. Even a beautiful toy can be of immense value to him. In fact, the Yoga-cult only demands that there must be an image in order that the yogic aspirant can have something on which he can concentrate his mind.
But the devotional viewpoint is quite different. The devotee invokes God to come down from His supernatural abode and dwell in the image temporarily or permanently, as the case may be, in order that he can offer oblations to Him. The fervent prayer of the devotee is granted by God and He manifests Himself in His celestial form within the image. The idol, therefore, comes to be regarded as holy on account of its being the dwelling place of the Deity (Arca). Although everything in the world is God’s body, because it is pervaded with and animated by God, yet the idol is treated as His special manifestation and, in consequence, comes to be adored. The Deity and the holy image are indeed looked upon as identical. But the worshipper offers flowers, fruits and other articles not to the inanimate image but to the indwelling divine being.

Reference to reverence for a stone (image) presided over by the Deity is very old and is to be found in a verse of the Atharva-Veda. There seems to be hardly any doubt about the fact that image-worship was in vogue even in the Vedic period. The Rgveda has recorded in 4.24.10 a query of Vamadeva as to who will purchase his Indra for ten cows. Such an Indra cannot be anything else than an image of Indra. In both ancient and modern devotional literature mention is made of the idols smiling or speaking. The Sadvimśa Brāhmaṇa informs that the images dance and perform similar acts. Tulasidāsa’s Rāmāyana states that Pārvati, pleased at Sītā’s worship, expressed her pleasure with a smile and dropped her garland. In any case the devotee believes that such images are material bodies of gods and that he can realise his highest good through their worship.

It may be pointed out in conclusion that image-worship in some form or other is prevalent all over the world. Even those who preach against it, adopt it unconsciously. In fact, idolatory is natural to man. Even the avowed iconoclasts show respect to certain symbols. The Muslims kiss the black stone at Kaba, and the Christians hold the cross in high esteem. Hinduism including the Vaishnava cult, which attaches importance to idol-worship in the sense of adoration of the divine spirit dwelling in the idol and not of the idol as such, is, therefore, no exception to the rule.
References

1. (श) मनोमयः परिच्छेन मनसःकेन प्राप्तो बिबेक-विमोकादि-साधनसप्तकानुष्ठानीति
   परमात्मोपासन-निर्मलिकृतेन मनसा गृहस्ती। (श्रीमाध्वम् १, २, २)

2. (श) उपायसंज्ञानां चोपनवादिद्वारा-संकार-संस्कृतापीत-वस्त्राभ्याय-जनितं ब्राह्मण
   बिबेक-विमोकादि-साधनसप्तकानुष्ठानेमेव प्रवीणस्य स्मीरोरिति।
   (श्रीमाध्वम् १, ३, ४०)

3. (श) न हरसरीराणां देवादीनां बिबेक-विमोकादि-साधनसप्तकानुष्ठानीत-ब्राह्मण-
   पानपीवस्त्रानकं साध्यमिति। (श्रीमाध्वम् १, ३, २५)

4. (श) जातिदुष्टं कलिज-गुणातिदि,
   पारंपरिक तत्ताब्दित्व-व्यवस्थामुः,
   निमित्तलयुक्ततिप्रादिकतः। (वीरमयस्मिनिन्द्रियां प्रकाशाद्वारा, सत्ततामत्तारः)
   गुणनामक वचनानि।—

5. (श) प्रतन्त्रमणा हि सौभाग्य मनः
   (छान्दोप ६-६-१)

6. (श) नारायणदी स्वायत्तः
   (छान्दोप ७-१६, २)

7. (श) तुकाहार विहारगतः
   (गीत ता ६, १७)

8. (श) पलंकं गृहस्तं चौं जलं जालवा पलंकं तदेखं दिवहः
   (मनु ५, १६)

9. (श) लघुं गृहस्तं चौं जलवा चाण्डरयं चरेदूं (याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति १, ७, १७६)

10. (श) तिरिक्ण नरकस्वयं दारं नाशनमालमः
    काम: कृपस्वर्ग कृपस्वमादत्तत्रं ल्येतेत्।
    (गीता १६, २१)

11. (श) तद्विद्वृत्ते यो बुद्धे परशुसु स इति। बुद्धे रिपु यः परः सः कामः इत्ययः।
    (गीतायर्थ रामायणभाष्यम् ३-४२)

12. (श) भूतमाहो मुनिधादिपापस्तुदुर्गवती मो विसर्गं: संभवःमाहारुपावपः: गुरयवत्सनो
    भवितं इति भूतिस्तिः गुरुपद सम्बन्धः। किर्तिततिस्तिः भावाः सांयुक्ते जीवनान्तपीढः
    निसीत्यास्य सुभृष्टिवेदः (गीतायर्थ रामायणभाष्यम् ८, ३)

13. (श) न लघुस्य भवेन्गिरो वनमच्या-प्रसंगत:।
    योपिरस्माचारया पुरसः यथा तत्संग-संगत:।
    (भागवतम् ३-२१-३१)

14. (श) धर्मिन्द्रवाद्वपूर्वसु कार्मिकः भरतर्यः
    (गीता ५, १६)

15. (श) वदपरमन्तरमच्छिन्त वहचचरय सर्वसंपद्यं तत् पदं संहोद्यं प्रवर्यः
    (गीतायर्थ रामायणभाष्यम् ५-११)

16. (श) या मग्नं परसु मोहाभयमायायान्तरायीय:।
    स्त्रियः स्त्री-संगत: प्राध्यो वितात्पापवृहवेदः।
    (भागवतम्)
10. तामालमनो विज्ञानीयादु पत्यपत्यश्रृङ्खलकमसु।

देवोपसादिम मुख्य मूलमंगलमन यथा॥

(भागबतम)

11. (भ) तदवेदः ब्राह्मणान्यं भावनाथवयवेयं कर्मवस्त्रयमाः

परश्रुत्सृपन्तः पवारुद्वैरस्य

निबिल-जग्गुवकारय स्वेच्छा। स्वेच्छा कुयं कृत्यहरिय सेवाधर्मवत्तार इति च पवेदः

शुभाधिन्य-प्रकरणं शुभाधिन्यस्मृतमेऽः

(वेदांतग्रहं पृष्ठम् १६६)

(श्र) समस्ता: शक्तिश्रवेत्ता श्रुत्य यथा प्रतिष्ठितः।

तद्धिवफलमहूः यथपमय्यशुद्धः॥

तत्तत्वतस्मस्त-ब्रजानाथाभाग्ये तत्कृत्य॥

कुर्वितं संस्तितं या तु विषयं या युक्तंयारुः॥

शुभाधिन्य: न च तत्कस्य संबंधम्यकालमेव।

निमान्त्र्य-भावनातीतो मुख्ये योगिनि श्रुत॥

(विषयुपराण र ग्र., ७, ३०-७६)

12. पाठो हर्मचातांतीन्सं सर्वाः तपः वलिः।

एते पंच महायोगा ब्रह्मणारा-नामसः॥

(शब्दंचित्तमागुप्तुतुरं वराहुराञ्च)

13. भृगिन्होमादि तु तत्कार्ययं तत्वजोत्सतू

(भृगवूद्ध ४, १, १६)

तुलनात्मक वचनम्

तमें वेदानववबन्त्र ब्राह्मणा विविधियमित्य यसेः दाने तपायानवकस्ते॥

(वृद्धसारण ४५-४५-२२)

14. यमो दानं तपस्यं पावनामि मनोस्वारमाः।

(भीतायाम १५, ५)

15. कुर्वातं पंच महायोगानि मृहोत्कर्ममिया॥

(भृगव्यभिस्त्तात्मवं जित्सते स्तोत्रम् ५, २४)

16. भर्मो सत्तंशुद्धिश्चित्तन्योगावस्तितः हृदयादि

(भीता १५-१२)

17. ज्ञेश्वरुद्धिनमनः:

(सीतार २, ५६)

18. (भ) सुमदेव विमत-स्पृहाः

(गृहविलमुक्तम)

(श्र) स्त्रायुपनिनमनैं संग्रमस्वारकर्षणं गुरुनिनन्दः-प्रसंगावत्

(योगसूत्रम् ३, ५१)

19. तस्यिन्द्रेच बिवेकाधिन्यो भवतीत्वा वायुकर्षिककर्तम।

तत्तत्विवेकचक-विमोक्षास-किंवद-कल्याणानवद्वद्यम्: सम्बन्धविचरनाच्च

(सर्धरे दार्शनसंग्रहं रामानुजदानमम)

20. Indian Philosophy, Volume II, Page 704.

21. मातुर्वंद्रे जायते द्वितीय मौनज-वचनानां।

22. मातुर्वंद्रे तिरीवं मौनज-वचनानां,

वृत्तियं वज्रीयापं विज्ञयं श्रुतिमोदनानां॥ (सनुसृति २, १६६)

23. गुरु: ह नारायणोकामयातितिवेत्यं सवर्तित भूतानि। स वा एव पुरशमेतः।
24. तपः पुज्ये तथा नाम मन्ये यागमच पंचम:

25. स्नान-पूज्या: क्रिया: सब्र यत: सम्यक्त फलप्रदाय:

26. (प्र) चाक्ष्यायास्वाये वामुचा तु पुष्योतमम:

27. प्रीतचारिक-सायंविका सम्भवारिका-दिक-सकल-भोग-प्रायं-स्तोषी हि याम:

28. एकहृदय हि कालस्य वाचारीयः नारद

29. अबंगे नित्यम् वायश्या तत् पाठ-समसिद्धाता:

30. करिकम्याः-प्रयोगकरणामृतस्य करणस्यिमये विवाहाते व्ययमुणोतमो न निवारिते

31. एवो च स्वायायोगावाहिका नाभायात्मावृत्तमेव केले चित्तस्यिन्-विवेको या-हुःयोपविद्यं तत्

32. एवं विचारद्वादशी कुबेरसु सुद्व विभावकानिकः

33. क्रृतं भवितं वा सत्त्वमिवयव हि केवलमु

34. स्त्रांने: स्त्रीकामो वा मोलकामं उदारशि:

लक्ष्यं भक्तिस्य स्वयं यज्ञेय पुष्यं परम्।
35. लीडली दार्शनिकी वैदिक लेखा लेखा से संकल्पती।
मनोमली महिममली प्रतिमाप्रविढिता स्मृता। (भागवतम् १५, २७, २२)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Hands) Right upper</th>
<th>Left upper</th>
<th>Left lower</th>
<th>Right lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. केंद्र शांख  चक  गदा  पपा  पपा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. नरायण  पद  गदा  चक  शांख</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. माधव  चक  शांख  पपा  गदा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. मोक्षित्र  गदा  पपा  शांख  चक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. विपुल  पपा  शांख  चक  गदा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. मधुकुटन  शांख  पपा  गदा  चक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. निशील  गदा  चक  शांख  पपा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. वामन  चक  गदा  पपा  शांख</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. भीमर  चक  गदा  पपा  पपा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. हरिकेश  चक  पपा  शांख  गदा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. पपनाम  पद  चक  गदा  शांख</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. संकरित्र  शांख  पपा  चक  गदा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. संकरित्र  शांख  पपा  चक  गदा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. बाहुरस  शांख  चक  पपा  गदा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. प्रज्ञा  म  शांख  गदा  पपा  चक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. प्रज्ञा  म  गदा  शांख  पपा  चक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. प्रज्ञा  म  गदा  शांख  पपा  चक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. प्रज्ञा  म  गदा  शांख  पपा  चक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. नरायण  पपा  गदा  शांख  चक</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. प्रज्ञा  म  पपा  चक  शांख  गदा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. वामन  चक  शांख  गदा  पपा</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. उपेन्द्र  गदा  चक  पपा  शांख</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. हरि  चक  पपा  गदा  शांख</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. कुटिल  गदा  पपा  चक  शांख</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. (श्र) श्रीमण्नारायणश्रीभद्रेतम श्रीरंगानाथम मम नाथ नमोहसूदते।

38. देशवर्षिकितस्वय धारणा। (श्रीरंगानाथम)
39. तन प्रत्येकतानता ध्यानम् ।
40. तदेवतामात्र-निम्भरं स्वप्नप्रवृत्तिम समाधि: ।
41. तदा इरर: स्वप्नप्रवृत्तिम ।
42. (स) प्रसन्नवदन्त चाह-पपहा परेयोपेये नामम् ।
अनुभूतिहरुम दोषी समाधायतम-मानसम्
तारावृंदं हल्लीमुंता तमैं तूँ धारणा ॥ (विष्णुपुराणम् ६, ७, ५०, ५६)
(स) प्रसन्नवदन्तभृत्रों पथगर्भिः शुभरे नाम ।
नीलोतप्लदवयांं शंलच्रमदाराम् ।
कौतुनिष्ठोत्तरश्रस्य पुष्पश्लोक-यशस्करम् ।
व्यायामें समस्तोऽण सागरं ध्येयं ध्ययने मनः ॥ (महाभारतम् ३, २५,
१३-१५)
43. (स) उपासकानुरोपेन भजते सूर्वित-पंचकम् ।
तद्वैत-विभव-व्यूह-सूर्यमात्ययमि-शंकिमि । (श्रीमदभागवतम्
तत्त्वाद-सूर्यमात्ययमि-शंकिमि । (श्रीमदभागवतम्
(स) प्रतिमाधिकरीष्ठो स्वात् ।
(इ) लक्ष्मीपुत्रो आचार्यस्य सन्तविकातः ।
महापुष्पमन्यकृष्टु मुलांदिम्यतायान्तम: ॥ (महाभारतम् ११, ४, ४५)
44. (स) क्यों तत्र प्रतिरोदीतः
(इ) तमोद्वास प्रस्तराय ॥ (श्रीमदभागवतम् १६, २, ६)
(स) क हस्तं दर्शनमेंत्र् कीर्तिति केदौद् ॥ (श्रीमदभागवतम् ४, २४, १०)
45. देवत-प्रतिमा हस्तनि (पद्मपुराण-श्रीब्रह्मचं पंचम-पपहथको विषयसंख्यको मानसः लक्षणः)
46. खसी माल मूर्तित मुक्ताकारी (रामचरित मानस)
CHAPTER IX
THE DOCTRINE OF SURRENDER

The idea of sin and its origin—The allegory of Puranājaya—Sinners’ hope in śaraṇāgati—Śaraṇāgati, a vidyā—The self-consecration—Persons who would not resort to God—Six accessories of prapatti—Views of Śaṭhakopa, Lokācārya and Śrīnivasadāsa.

Excessive desire for worldly pleasures is apt to lead man into the path of sin which, according to Rāmānuja, consists in the indulgence in sensual pleasures. The desire for pleasure is indeed insatiable, hence man is naturally prone to sensual indulgence. Even when our senses are passive and the functions of our mind and intelligence are held in abeyance, our craving for pleasure persists and obscures our knowledge of the self. This is quite clear from the Gītā which teaches that kāma is stronger than intelligence even.

A sinner wanders far from the Divine life inasmuch as he is overwhelmed by worldly desires and is absolutely indifferent to the teachings of saints and the scriptures. He forgets God, and God turns His back upon him. It is clearly brought out by the Bhāgavata which teaches that sin originates from the Lord’s back. Sin when conjoined with Falsehood (Mrṣā) begets Deceit (Dambha) and Illusion (Māya).

The finite self usually forgets that its home is in the Infinite and being thus alienated from God enters headlong into sin. The Bhāgavata gives a beautiful allegorical description of the soul’s worldly life. Puranājaya, a king, once saw in the province of Pañcāla a city of nine gates, a beautiful lady waited upon by ten servants and a five-headed serpent as the door-keeper. Puranājaya eventually made her his queen and together with her entered the harem, accompanied by his chief servant. He was so fond of the new queen that he imitated whatever she did and thus lived together happily. But his life of happiness was afterwards disturbed by the opposition of an enemy who marched against him with three hundred and sixty soldiers. The five-headed doorkeeper protected him
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against the enemy for a century. It was not, however, the end of his misfortune; for a daughter of Kāla accompanied by Bhaya and Prajāpāra subsequently besieged his kingdom. Bhaya set his capital city on fire with the result that he was compelled to leave it. All this happened because of the fact that the king was so much under the influence of nescience that he completely forgot his original friend who alone could save him from all misfortune.

The allegory only serves to bring out how a soul is ruined under the influence of sensual enjoyment. Puraṇājaya is the individual soul, and his original friend is God. The country of Pañcāla answers to the objects of the five senses. The city of nine gates is the human body containing nine orifices. The lady attended by the maid-servants is the intellect accompanied by the five sense-organs and the five organs of action. The five-headed serpent symbolises the five breaths. The harem is the heart, and the chief servant of Puraṇājaya is mind. The imitation of the queen's behaviour by the king stands for identification of the soul with matter. The enemy with his soldiers represents the year consisting of three hundred and sixty days. The doorkeeper is the symbol of vitality. The daughter of Kāla is old age. Bhaya and Prajāpāra are diseases of the mind and body. The king's departure from the capital signifies death.

Another allegory narrated in the Bhāgavata compares the soul's worldly experiences to a man's misery in wilderness.⁷

However, Rāmānuja, as previously noticed, holds that sin consists in indulgence in sensual pleasures and adds that it is an omission in so far as what should have been done is not done and a commission so far as what is prohibited by the scriptures is done.⁸ Sin is of various forms and results in miseries and sufferings of various descriptions. A time, however, comes when the soul becomes tired of the painful experiences resulting from sin and desires real peace and happiness, and makes efforts to attain them. But few are fortunate enough to attain success in these efforts. Only those who are placed on the right path are assured of success, whereas the rest are doomed to failure. But sinners should not lose heart. The Gītā holds out a hope to them also. It has conveyed to mankind the message that whoever takes refuge in God is purged of whatever sin he has committed.⁹ On this point Rāmānuja preaches that resignation to God (Śaṅgāgati) is a most sacred tenet of the scriptures. Hence he regarded Śaṅgāgati-vidyā (doctrine of Refuge) as of the highest significance to the ultimate good of life. It is, however, curious that he has not made distinct mention of this doctrine in his commentary to the Gītā nor even in his magnum opus,
the Śri-bhāṣya (commentary to the Brahma-sūtra). It is in his Gadyatraya that he dealt with this doctrine and confessed his omission of the same from his other works in these words: ‘I bow down to that doctrine of refuge which was concealed by me even in the Śri-bhāṣya, but which is brought to light in the Gadyatraya.”

The Doctrine of Self-consecration

Man can hardly find real happiness in the affairs of the mundane life. He therefore tries to free himself from them. He learns from the teachings of saints and the scriptures that the real happiness can be had only in the kingdom of God (Brahma-loka). Thus enlightened, he feels the urge to retire from worldly life and to give up all desire for worldly pleasures and even his allegiance to ordinary creeds. He realises that he had gone astray in the past and hastens to take to the path that can lead him up to his saviour. Thus does he come to assume a new outlook and a new attitude—the attitude of surrender which seeks the protection of God from the misery of the world. In fact, this attitude consists in complete resignation to the will of God. Once a man is possessed of this attitude, he is assured of glorious future. For one who has completely resigned himself to God wins His compassion and thus attains emancipation from all evils.

It is interesting to note that the doctrine of Śaṅgāgata is as old as the Vedas. Even the sages of the hoary Rgveda invoked the gods for help. The Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad is also explicit on this point as “Who in the beginning created Brahmā and furnished him, with the Vedas, to that Deity, the illuminer of the intellect, I surrender myself with a desire for salvation.” Again, in the Gītā Śrī Krṣṇa has said, “Those who resort to me as their refuge cross this mayā which is hard for others to ford.”

It would be interesting to trace the origin of the word ‘Śaṅgāgata’. It is peculiar to the Pāñcarātra literature and was in common use in the hands of the Vaiṣṇava ācāryas. Although the word by itself does not occur in the earlier Upaniṣads and the Gītā, yet it is to be traced in the following expressions occuring in them:

(a) Śaṅgam prapadye
(b) Mām prapadyante
(c) Śaṅgam gaccha
(d) Śaṅgam vraja

The Gītā precept ‘Śaṅgama gaccha’, however, seems to me the foundation of the idea conveyed by the word ‘śaṅgāgata’. It might of course be objected that what could properly be derived from that
precept is sāraṇa-gati and not sāraṇāgati, because the verb occurring in
the phrase is ‘gaccha’ and not ‘gaccha’, which is involved in
sāraṇāgati. But the real point is that the act of resignation, while
viewed from the standpoint of the individual who resigns, would be
sāraṇa-gati, whereas it would be sāraṇāgati, when it is viewed from
the standpoint of God to whom the individual resigns himself. The
latter standpoint is obviously higher and hence sāraṇāgati is more
significant than Sāraṇa-gati.

The word ‘sāraṇa’ (Shelter) may have three meanings: first, it
denotes the place where a person becomes free from all suffering;
secondly, it refers to the very act of seeking refuge; thirdly, it implies
the person in whom refuge is sought. Sāraṇāgati obviously does not
consist in the physical act of going to a certain place. It is an attitude
which enables the individual soul to discover that God is the ultimate
end of realization and that the means to that realization also lies
through God. Hence Rāmānuja recognizes a vidyā (a science and
an art) relating to sāraṇāgati which he calls sāraṇāgati-vidyā. This
vidyā, according to him, deals with the means of the realization of
God. It is believed that prapatti which is generally used as a
synonym of sāraṇāgati is a form of bhakti. For Rāmānuja, prapatti
precedes bhakti. It consists in the surrender of the individual to God,
which is the condition of devotion or bhakti. This point Rāmānuja
has made sufficiently clear in his commentary on the Gitā (7. 15).

Bhakti as ordinarily understood, comprises many details such as
listening to the scriptures, reading of devotional texts, erection of
temples, formal worship of image, pilgrimage etc. which obviously
involve study of the scriptures, expenditure of money, perseverance
and concentration of mind on the part of the devotee. Obviously,
then, not many people can be so privileged as to resort to bhakti. But
that may not matter. For those who cannot have bhakti within their
easy reach are open to assume the attitude of prapatti and throw them-
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between the God-realization as the end and the means to it is con-
quered. Man in his helplessness may renounce all and seek refuge in
God. His attitude at this stage may be best expressed thus. ‘The
ocean of transmigration is hard to cross. I am destitute, helpless and
afraid. Save me, O Ocean of mercy, by your grace. I have
committed thousands of wrongs, and am fallen into the depth of this
fearful world. I am helpless, and have chosen you as my refuge.
Accept me through your grace only’. Indeed, no worldly tie can
bind one who is thus infused with craving for supreme bliss. Father
and mother, wife and son, brother and friend, food and jewellery,
house and property have no importance to one who surrenders himself to God. This is very well brought out by Vibhiṣaṇa who spoke to Rāma thus: 'I have forsaken Laṅkā, deserted my friends and abandoned my wealth. In you lie my kingdom, life and happiness. You give shelter to the refugees and I have come to take refuge in you.'

Rāmānuja says that there are four types of vicious persons who would never resort to God. They are:

(a) people of perverted understanding: those who think what is God's own as theirs,

(b) ignoble persons who do not love God,

(c) those who have lost the understanding concerning God by means of adverse reasoning, and

(d) those who envy the glory of God.

According to the followers of Rāmānuja, the doctrine of self-surrender is the essence of the teachings of the Gitā and the scriptures in general. It is therefore, as they hold, worthy of serious attention and deserves to be practised. Lord Kṛṣṇa whom both the Gitā and the Bhāgavata regard as the Supreme, declares this doctrine to be characterised by the greatest inwardsness. Those who are sinful will find it impossible to destroy their many and various sins the destruction of which is the precondition of the adoption of the career of bhakti. In view of this the despairing soul welcomes the divine assurance that whosoever takes refuge in God is purged of all sins. Such a soul realises that the service of God is the summary of all knowledge.

The Ahirbudhnya-saṁhitā has enumerated the following six accessories of prapatti:

1. Determination to live in conformity with God's wishes. It is indeed the attitude of the devotee to remain attuned to the will of God. He is fully convinced that his good lies in God's decree. Hence he rests content with the circumstance in which he is placed in the belief that God wills him to be so circumstanced.

2. Non-resistance. The true devotee never rebels against, nor even resents, divine decree. He regards the scriptures as of divine origin and can never think of violating scriptural injunctions.

3. Firm belief in divine guardianship. The devotee firmly believes that God is the Supreme Saviour of all at all places and at all times.

4. The choice of God as the saviour. The true devotee does not rest content merely with the belief that God is his saviour, but
goes further in ceremonially choosing God as his saviour in the same manner as a bride chooses her bridegroom.

5. The feeling of absolute dependence and destitution. With a feeling of complete dependence upon God, the devotee relinquishes the idea of his independence, and cherishes the faith that everything concerning him and even his self are dependent upon God. God alone is the devotee’s precious possession. Nothing else does he own.

6. Self-resignation. Whatever a devotee can call his own—not excepted his own self—he surrenders to the Deity. Yāmūnācārya said, “Whatever this I may be amongst the body etc. and whatever quality it may possess, I offer my ‘I’ at your feet, O Lord.”

Śrīnīvāsadāsa has reduced the last two items of prapattī (viz the feeling of destitution and self-resignation) into one, and has thus maintained only five accessories of prapattī. Again, he holds that whereas only the twice-born are eligible for bhakti, the way of prapattī is open to all. Śrīnīvāsadāsa regards prapattī as a phase of bhaktī, whereas Lokācārya holds that bhakti and prapattī are different from each other. Śāṭhakopa’s view is in agreement with that of Lokācārya. Moreover, both Śāṭhakopa and Lokācārya analysed prapattī into two aspects : the ārta-prapattī and the drpta-prapattī. In the case of the former, a devotee is anxious to get rid of the body as early as possible, whereas in that of the latter he consents to await the prescribed period of time for the same purpose. Śrīnīvāsadāsa too has accepted this analysis.

It may be of interest to note how the followers of Rāmacaṇṭha differed among themselves on the question of ‘surrender to God.’ According to the Vādgalaiṣ, resignation to God is one among several ways of realising the highest end. Only those who are incapable of adopting other means should resort to it. A resigned soul should continue to perform duties, because that is a way of pleasing God. The six factors of prapattī are sixfold preparations preceding itself. If a person of resignation (prapanna) deviates from the prescribed routine of duties, atonement for him consists in repeating the act of prapattī as often as he has deviated. A prapanna belonging to an inferior caste deserves only so much respect from the people of superior castes as can be shown in words only. But the Tengalaiṣ differ. According to them, prapattī is the only way leading to God. They go further in holding that it is God Himself but is spoken of as a way leading to Him for the sake of convenience only. The
way of prapatti is meant for all: it does not matter whether all are capable or incapable of following other paths. For a person who has already resigned himself to God there is no need to please God by performing actions. God's pleasure is spontaneous. It does not depend upon man's actions. One may, however, ever perform actions only to set an example to others. The six sections of prapatti are not its preceding conditions, but are really, its effects. Prapatti is to be performed all at once. It need not be repeated even by one who deviates from the prescribed routine of duties. Again, a prapanna of an inferior caste deserves as much respect from others as does a person belonging to a superior caste.

Now surrender on the part of the individual soul pre-supposes divine grace. If there be no divine grace for an individual, his self-surrender is impossible. The Sanskrit words for grace are prasāda, kṛpa and dayā which have been used by saints and philosophers and in the scriptures too. The Gītā and the Upaniṣads used prasāda in the sense of God's grace. Literally, prasāda means pleasure which in the case of a king or God, is grace. But it is now commonly used to denote the object granted by a priest to those who approach a deity in a temple with a worshipful attitude. 'Prasāda' primarily means grace and it is in this sense that Rāmānuja understands the word when he states in his commentary to Gītā: 'Through God's grace one overcomes all worldly obstacles and reaches Him.' The kaṭha Upaniṣad says that a person devoid of any desires realises God through His grace, and the Śvetāsvatara also reiterates the same point. The 'prasāda' of the Gītā and the Upaniṣads is 'poṣana' of the Bhāgavata, which literally means nourishment. Since divine grace (anugraha) nourishes the spiritual life of the devotee, it is called 'poṣana'. 'Puṣṭi' is another etymological form of the same word. It is the title of one of the ten principal topics of the Bhāgavata. Vallabha lays the greatest stress on God's mercy, hence his interpretation of Vedānta is called 'the path of grace' or 'Puṣti-mārga'. It may be added that the 'prasāda' of the Gītā and the 'poṣana' of the Bhāgavata seem to have originally been the 'sumati' of the Rgveda, which was cherished by those who were devoted to Divine service.
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16. तामेव शरणं गच्छ (गीता १५, ६२)
17. मामेकं शरणं ब्रज (गीता २५, ४६)
18. (र्र) शरणं ब्रजजस्त्रः (प्रभुकृपया ३, ३, ४३)
    (श्र) शरणमित्रस्य प्राप्तंवायनित्वः निवारशिवत्या समाध्यविशेषितनः
    (गीतायं रामानुजमाध्यमः ६, १८)
19. कत्सर्दराध्यं प्रायम्यधुर्वसः चानुभवः (गीतायं रामानुजमाध्यमः ७, १५)
20. भगवदुपासनापादिनीं भगवत्प्रविष्टिमु (गीतायं रामानुजमाध्यमः ७-१५)
21. धनाष्ठमागति भौंरं द्वाया पर्याः पर्याः हेरे:
    मामुदर ध्वस्तिस्यो संसारायथे: सूर्यसरायी।।
    (श्रमतव्रतश्चतत्त्वं जितनं स्तोत्रम्)
22. भवराध सहभाजनं पतितं भौमवतायानेदरे,
    अणिति शरणागतं हेरे कुपथः केवलमात्रात्तसकोः।।
    (पूर्वोत्तम)
23. पितरं मातरं दारारु पुजनं कपः कुलसी भुक्तं
    रत्नानि धनपायवानिः क्षेत्राणिः च भुगारिः च।
    सर्वमाविव भववन्य सर्वकामाविव साक्षारातुः,
    लोकनित्वानां-चरणां शरणं तेजज्ञं विभो।।
    (श्रणामातिग्रहम)
24. भवतरं सनं मूतानं शरणं शारणं गतः
    परिपलक्ताः मया लंका मित्रासिः च धनानि च
    भवदृशतं हि राज्यं में जीवितं च सुखानि च।।
    (रामायणम् ६-१६-४, ४)
25. (घ) मूडः विपरिताज्ञा: (घ) मराध्यमः—मदीनमुदानाहः
    (घ) माययापहुत्वतानास्तु मदिग्यं मदेषवयं च जानं प्रसृतं वेयं तदस्मानानावतपितामोः
    कुटुम्बिकामित्रमहत्तुते स्वपक्कसः
    (घ) भासुरः आयामातिस्तानस्तु मदिग्यं मदेषवयं-विशायं च जानं सुह्विमुपपन्ने वेयं
    देवयायेव भवतः। । उत्तरोत्तरः: वाणिज्यतः।।
    (गीतायं रामानुजमाध्यमः ७, १५)
26. सर्वमुखात्म सूर्यः नरशुरोऽर्थमवत्मानः
    इदेशसे में देवमिति ततो व्यश्चामिनि ते हितमू।।
    ममनां भव मदेशतो यवाधि मां नमस्कृतः
    ममन्द्रष्यसि सत्यं ते प्रतिज्ञानं प्रियोशि ते।।
    सर्वमहर्षिस्यपरिशोभं मामेकं शरणं च्छ।।
    यहं त्वा सर्ववापेयो मोहशिवाय सा शुच्यः।।
    (गीता १५,६४-६६)
27. भक्तियोगारम्भ-विरोधनावदि-काल-संचित-नानाविधातन्त-पापानुपुराणः तत्त्वाय-क्रितत्वपानु कुसूंद-चांद्रयगु-कुमाण्ड-बैरवानर-प्रागायतन-प्रातपति-अविवेषित-विवृद्ध-निपटानावदि नानाविधानान्तम् तवा परिमलकालविनाना दुर्गुपालो सर्वार्थानु थोरानां रामायणामनां [१०,१६]

28. परमात्मा हिरि: स्वामी स्वतोऽह तथ फिकर॥
कृपा-यमकला नितितित्रियो शानसङ्ग्रह॥ (भारद्राजसहिता पृष्ठ १२)

29. पोहा हि बेदस्वित्तन्ते बदलतिने महामुनि ।
श्रीनुक्षेत्रश्च संकल्पः प्रातिकुलस्य वर्जनम् ॥
रक्षा-वास्त्वी विवासी गोपूत्त चर्रेण तथा ।
श्रीमान्यकेश-कार्यं श्रेष्ठविव शरूकाविजीतम् ॥
(श्रीमान्यकेश ३७-२७, २६)

30. बेदनामानापताननादि-शब्दवाच्याय भक्ति: प्राप्तिकाय (प्राप्तिकाय) (यज्ञद्रमान्तविषया)

31. (म) उपायः पंद्रविविध: कर्मयोगां ज्ञायोग-भक्तियोगः प्रातिपदियोगायचाराधिमानयोगः नेताः।
(प्रायंकक ७०-८० एस। १६००, पृष्ठ ६०२)
(प्राय) भविष्योद्गतः तत्त्वात्मात्राविद्विष्ठम-स्मृतानां तत्त्वात्मात्राविद्विष्ठमात्रायां वर्णनम्-कर्मस्वायत्वायणां युमः पुराणवचः-प्रकाशे साध्याज्ञां श्रेणियोगा राजायोगा श्रेणियोगा जीवनकालम्
(पुरावत्तम पृष्ठम् ६०२)

32. भक्तिस्तु सदाचारयः समेधिताः सर्वार्थाविकार-विनेषुकिका तत्त्वात्मात्राविद्विष्ठम-स्मृतिस्तम्भान्तः। प्रतिपत्तिः स्वयंमम् दे देवताः...स्वपनमनुष्णेऽच।
(प्रायंकक-विवेकः श्रृदुपम् ४६-४६)

33. (म) सेवं प्रतिरत्नस्य देवा चेति दिविनाहः। तत्वात् िपसि:.......
हे स्वामिमु त्वकाक्ष-विरोधिनतः द्वेषद्वारं वर्षर्वं श्रीमेव ज्ञोति यत्र प्रार्थना।
हर्षां प्रतिपत्तिः यावहं हमस्व परमस्मात् ।
(पुरावत्तम पृष्ठम् ५५-५५)
(प्राय) स तु दिविनाह द्वारा-प्रतिपदियोगोऽत्र प्रतिपदियोगोऽत्र।
(लोकाचार्य-विविचारो नारायणमुद्वितोऽंशकः—जेता. ए. एस. १६००, पृष्ठ ६०२)

34. भेद-स्वामिमु-कुंजा-फलायतालिततु श्रीयास्युपालायनः।
तदात्मायथ-द्वाय-निष्कृत-वस्मिन्यन्ति च तत्त्वंति ॥
परम्यावग-विकेशयोः स्वविकेशयोः त्यासांग-हेतुवतः।
प्रायंविचारिवियो तदीयम्बनेज्ञायतार्थविव-विव्वयः:।
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35. (म) सर्वात् सांसारिकार्थ दुर्गमिन महत्सातिवेदविद्धम्।
(गौतमान रामायणमाध्यम १८-५५)
(प्राय) महत्सातिवेदविवंदव विमयनमिन्तत प्रातिष्ठत।
(पुरावत्तम पृष्ठम् ५५-५५)

36. तमकुत: पञ्चति वीशोकोऽह धातु: प्रतिपदहिमांतांमातनः।
(कठोपनिषद्, प्रथमायायिके द्वितीयकलः २०)
37. तमन्नेति परमात्मे वीषशोकस्ति
   चारुः प्रसादाम्महिमामीषाः।
   (श्वेता० ३, २०)

38. पोषणन्तदनुष्टः
    (भागवतम० २, १०, ४)

39. चतुः सर्गां विसर्गेन्न स्वानं पोषणं मूल्यं।
    मन्नतंतराशाङ्काय नितं च मुक्तिराध्यं।।
    (भागवतम० २, १०, १)

40. महस्ते विष्णुः सुमति भजामहे।
    (ष्ठुमेह १, १५६, ३)
CHAPTER X

DIVINE COMMUNION

The various inclinations of man—The nature of individual soul—The Viśiṣṭadvaita eschatology—The success of the soul—The nature of salvation—Isolation (Kaivalya)—The powers of a liberated soul—The stuff of the body in emancipation—The Kingdom of God—No fear of fall from the heaven of Viṣṇu.

The Various Inclinations of Man

Human nature has three characteristics relating respectively to the three elements of prakṛti: sattva, rajas and tamas. When the quality of sattva is predominant in an individual, he is inclined to perform righteous actions. The rajas in a predominant state inclines him towards the acquisition of things. The preponderance of tamas fosters lust. Some people depend upon their own efforts, some rely on divine grace and some while taking to the path of grace, worship gods other than Viṣṇu for the attainment of the three ends of life (trivarga). The Bhāgavata recommends the worship of Śiva to one who is desirous of learning, and that of Umā to one who is desirous of matrimony.¹ But there is no dearth of people who are exclusively devoted to Viṣṇu. They worship Him alone for the fulfilment of their desires, whether for worldly pleasures or the bliss of emancipation. Those who have no particular desire, or those who are desirous of all sorts of worldly pleasures, or those who aim at freedom from worldly miseries are advised by the Bhāgavata to worship Viṣṇu, the Supreme Person, with deep devotion.² Viṣṇu is also adored for the fulfilment of specific desires. He is invoked, for instance, in the Rgveda, to fill His hands—both right and left—with wealth from heaven or earth or the intermediate world, and to bestow it on the devotees.³ Śri is similarly prayed to, in the Śri-sūkta, for the grant of all sorts of worldly things—food, gold, cattle, servants, physical fitness, long life and progeny.⁴

There may be four different types of devotees as enumerated in the Gitā as follows:—⁵

(a) Those who are in calamity (ārta)
(b) Those who are desirous of knowledge (jijnāsu)
(c) Those who aspire after prosperity (arthārthi), and
(d) Those who possess knowledge (jñāni).

According to Rāmānuja, the first and the third come under one and the same head inasmuch as both desire worldly pleasures, whereas the second and the fourth differ in that they desire emancipation.

*The Nature of Individual Soul*

A jñāni neither desires the removal of worldly needs nor does he hanker after worldly gains. He is only keen on attaining knowledge of the real nature of the self. The individual self in its purity is devoid of all qualities of matter. It cannot be destroyed by weapons, fire, water or wind. It is, of course, different from God, and the difference is due not merely to its having an external adjunct (upādhi) as held by Advaita Vedānta but is real (pāramārthika). Yet the frailties of the body do not contaminate the individual soul’s essential nature. Nor can it be understood as an object; it is the subject, the knower, and hence it is called ‘kṣetrajña’ or ‘knower of the field’ i.e. the physical sphere. The phenomena of birth and death and other vicissitudes pertaining to the body do not touch the soul. It is unborn (aja), eternal (nitya) and unchanging (sāvata). Though old, yet is new (purātano pi navah). Free from decay, it is called imperishable (aṅkṣara). It is indiscernible (avyakta), because it is not perceptible by the senses. It is indefinable (anirdeśya), because its nature cannot be expressed by such words as ‘god’ and ‘man’. Although it is present in the bodies of gods etc (sarvatra-ga), yet it cannot be conceived in terms of these (acintya) inasmuch as it is essentially different from the latter. Not being subject to change in its contact with different bodies, it is called uniform (kūṭastha); and being generally unchangeable, it is called immovable (acala).

Rāmānuja arrives at the above conception of the self through the interpretation of Chapter II of the Gītā which deals with the question of immortality of the soul and Chapter XII of the same texts which express preference for meditation on Śri Kṛṣṇa in contrast with meditation on the individual self. Śaṅkara, however, interprets the same texts differently. In fact, Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja differ fundamentally from each other with regard to the question of the nature of the individual soul as well as on several other points. In dealing with the third verse of Chapter XII*, Śaṅkara has interpreted

---

2. *Mayāyāśya mano ye māṁ
nityayuktā upāsate
āraddhayā parāyopetās
tē me yuktatamā matāṁ
3. Ye tvaksāram anirdeśyam
avyaktam paryupāsate
sarvatragam acintyam ca
kūṭastham acalam dhruvam
the 'imperishable' as Nirguṇa Brahman, and the meditation recommended in the preceding verse is, according to him, the meditation on Saguna Brahman. According to Rāmānuja, on the other hand, the third verse contains a reference to the meditation on the self, i.e., the devotee's own individual soul; and the meditation alluded to in the preceding verse is, on his view, the meditation on God, the Supreme Reality. Again, Śaṅkara understands the word 'sarvatra-ga' occurring in the 3rd verse as meaning all-pervading Brahman, whereas it means all-entering jiva according to Rāmānuja. What Rāmānuja, really, wishes to emphasize here is that since the individual soul may find a place in the bodies of gods etc., it is 'sarvatra-ga'. The same is his interpretation of the word 'sarva-ga' occurring in the 24th verse in Chapter II. Since it is the soul's nature to penetrate into all elements, argues Rāmānuja, it is called 'sarva-gata'. Being subtler than all elements, he continues, the soul cannot be penetrated by them; and hence it is immune from the changes consequent upon the operation of matter.

The Gītā states that the individual soul is two-fold viz. the perishable (kṣaṇa) and the imperishable (akṣaṇa). Kṣaṇa is the soul which identifies itself with the body, whereas the soul in its purity is akṣaṇa. All individual souls, when they are in a state of bondage are kṣaṇa, and the emancipated once are akṣaṇa. God transcends the former and excels the latter; hence He is known as the Sublime Person (Puruṣottama)—one who pervades and sustains the three worlds (Loka). The popular conception of the three lokas (worlds) is that there are three regions called paradise, earth and hades i.e., svarga, martya and pātala. But Rāmānuja holds that the three lokas are:

(a) inanimate matter,
(b) souls in bondage, and
(c) emancipated souls.

The individual soul is characterised by Rāmānuja as cit. There are as many souls in the world, on his view, as there are individual beings. They are really many, and God is their great synthesist inasmuch as He is the Inner Controller (Antaryāmin) of all the souls. This synthetical view of Rāmānuja, however, differs from the conception of both Vasiṣṭha and Śaṅkara who regard all individual souls as identical with Brahman.

People who are engrossed in worldly enjoyments and those who worship God for worldly success have to tread, after casting off their mortal coil, on the path of darkness or ignorance. They are, indeed, extroverts who mind the business of the world and follow
the path of 'pravrtti'. The other path is the bright one of 'nivrtti'. Those who are introverts and are given to 'self-examination, turn away from worldly affairs and follow this path. Only those who are capable of concentrating their minds on the true self or of meditating upon God are alone fit to proceed on the bright path, the path of knowledge or devotion. The dark path, on the other hand, is associated with transmigration, and a man of ignorance who is bound to follow this path must remain tied down to the field of day-to-day activities even if he be transported to the abode of Brahman but the same is not true of a man of knowledge or devotion who has realised God.

According to Śaṅkara, a man of true knowledge remains where he was. Only his individual soul merges into the Universal Soul on his bodily death. This is called 'quick release' (Sadyomukti), according to Advaita Vedānta. Śaṅkara believed in another form of release—the gradual or slow release (krama-mukti) of those who meditate upon the Lower Brahman. The worshippers of Isvara ascend to the path of brightness, gradually reach the state of divinity, remain there for a very long time, and finally merge, along with the Lower Brahman, into the Higher Brahman, or the Universal Soul. But, according to Rāmacaća, all people of true knowledge or devotion have to attain to the state of Divinity; and the question of their merging in Him never arises.

A man of knowledge lives in the world in a state of detachment just as a lotus remains in water. The activities of such a man aim not at the realisation of selfish ends but at the general good of the world (lōka-saṅgraha). If he happens to do anything wrong, he is unaffected by its consequences. For, as the Gītā says, 'One who is not an egoist, is not fettered, even if he kills all beings.'

On his attainment of true knowledge all the accumulated (saṅcita) actions of a person—actions both good and evil—are at once rendered inactive. The fire of knowledge burns out the actions, as it were. Besides, man's present actions also do not bear fruit after he attains true knowledge. But the results of those actions, either good or bad, that have begun to operate (prarabdha) must be experienced even by a man of knowledge or devotion. For they can be exhausted only by enjoyment or suffering.

*The Viśiṣṭādvaīta Eschatology*

The departing soul of a self-realized person shakes off all good and evil along with his dead body. For he outgrows the necessity of either while ascending the path of 'Arcis'. The Chandogya says that the ascending soul shakes off all vice, just as a horse gets rid.
of the dust by shaking his hair.\textsuperscript{31} Kuṣitaki likewise states that the ascending soul is set free from his good and evil deeds. His friends benefit from his good actions, and his enemies suffer the consequences of the evil ones.\textsuperscript{32}

A holy soul departs through ‘susumṇa’, one of the nerves of the brain. Blessed by the Supreme Person within himself, he finds his way for pilgrimage from the temporal to the eternal.\textsuperscript{33} Proceeding on the bright path, the emancipated soul receives the help of Arcis etc. The path is, therefore, called Arcirādi. According to some, Arcis and others are, as it were, halting places for the departing soul, while others hold that they indicate but divisions of time. The Brahma-sūtra differs from both the views and holds that Arcis etc. are conscious guides.\textsuperscript{34} Both Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja agree with Bādarāyaṇa on this point maintaining that the word ‘Arcis’ means the superintending deity of light and the word ‘dina’ means the superintending deity of day-time and so on.\textsuperscript{35} The following are the guides in order of precedence:—\textsuperscript{36}

1. The deity of light,
2. The deity of day,
3. The deity of bright fortnight,
4. The deity of six months of the northern solstice,
5. The deity of year,
6. The deity of the air,
7. The deity of the sun,
8. The deity of the moon,
9. The deity of the lightning,
10. Varuṇa,\textsuperscript{37}
11. Indra,\textsuperscript{38} and
12. Prajāpati.

Prajāpati shows the way to the river Viraja which, according to the Padma-purāṇa, is the demarcation between the material world (pradhāna) and Heaven (paramāvyoma).\textsuperscript{39} The soul remains associated with its subtle body upto this stage. But as soon as the soul, on its way to the Brahma-loka, takes a dip into the river, its subtle body is cast away. As regards the constituents of the subtle body, the Advaita and Śāṅkhya hold divergent views. The following lists will make the point clear:-
According to Advaita (as interpreted by Sadananda)

| Intellect | ... | 1 |
| Mind      | ... | 1 |
| Sense-organs | ... | 5 |
| Action-organs | ... | 5 |
| Vital airs | ... | 5 |
| **Total**  |     | **17** |

According to Sankhya

| Intellect | ... | 1 |
| Ego       | ... | 1 |
| Mind      | ... | 1 |
| Sense-organs | ... | 5 |
| Action-organs | ... | 5 |
| Tanmurtas | ... | 5 |
| **Total**  |     | **18** |

The Visistadvaita view regarding the subtle body mostly tallies with that of Sankhya. However, when the subtle body is thus cast away, some non-human person, specially an angel, greets the departing soul with a touch. In consequence, the soul assumes a form similar to that of the Deity probably with the exception that it cannot, as the Bhagavata says, have Srivatsa and Kaustubha which are the marks exclusively belonging to the Deity.

The Success of the Soul

The guiding angel escorts the emancipated soul to the kingdom of God where welcome is accorded to the entrant in various ways. Just as a mother feels happy over the victory of her son in his struggle with his enemy, so Laksmi, the motherly aspect of the Deity, expresses Her felicitations on the soul's crossing the ocean of worldly life which is, really, its triumph over matter. In Her various forms such as Sri, BhU, LilA, She comes forward along Her attendants (ambayu) to admit the son to His eternal home. The released soul then approaches the Divine throne of unlimited might (amitaujas). An affectionate talk then ensues between the Father and the son. The son now comes to His journey's end, and his efforts are crowned with final success in his being absorbed in the Father's sweet words and loving glance and above all His parental embrace, the long-cherished Brahma-samsparsha. The Vadgalais interpret this as the soul's gaining God, whereas the Tengalais hold that this is God's gaining the soul. Ramanauja
is not, however, clear on this point. He seems to agree with the latter, as the concluding words of his Śrī-bhāṣya indicate. He says "Why should the Supreme Person let the released soul go away from Him, for He has Himself said in the Gītā: 'such a great soul is very rare as says that Vāsudeva is the highest goal for him'? Rāmānuja's meaning here seems to be that God's difficulty of finding a great soul is solved when a released soul reaches Him. The release of a soul is thus a definite gain to God.

According to Rāmānuja, it is with the personal God that the released soul remains in communion. God in this aspect is technically called Suksma and Para by Rāmānuja. The word 'Para' has several meanings such as 'distant', 'prior', 'another', 'enemy', 'best', individual soul, the life-time of Brahma, transcendent and God. It has been used to denote distance and comprehensiveness in the Vaiśeṣika system. But Rāmānuja uses it in the senses of excellent and transcendent. Etymologically, the word is derived from Pr-to protect and to fulfill. Para is, therefore, He who protects and fulfills the desires of his devotees. From the philological point of view the word originally had the sense of an adjective, but as time went on it gained currency as a noun. Bādarāyana has used it more than once in his Brahma-sūtra in the sense of God. It denotes, however, only the personal aspect of God in Pāñcarātra literature. Rāmānuja has used the word both as an adjective meaning 'the Supreme' and as a noun in the sense of Personal God.

The Nature of Salvation

As regards the nature of salvation, the Kaṇṣṭakī upaniṣad holds that it consists in communion (śāyujya). The Brhadāraṇyaka tells us that emancipation consists in fellowship with the Deity and in residence in His locality. The Bhāgavata informs that salvation is fivefold:

(a) residence in the Deity's locality (Śālokya),
(b) possession of lordship equal to that of the Deity (Sārṣṭi),
(c) remaining near the Deity (Śāmipya),
(d) having a form similar to that of the Deity (Śārupya), and
(e) one-ness (Ekatva).

The second kind of salvation is peculiar to the Bhāgavata which also usess the word 'ekatva' instead of 'śāyujya'.

Rāmānuja has not given us any detailed account of the state of salvation. He has simply told us that the emancipated soul gains
admission into the Kingdom of God and thereafter it becomes, as it were, saturated with the ecstasy of Divine communion. Venkaṭa nātha, however, holds that sāyujya alone is salvation proper whereas sālokya, sāmipya and sārupya are obviously subsidiary. In other words, a soul that attains sāyujya, obviously attains sālokya and sāmipya also because one cannot be in Divine communion, without being in the locality of the Deity and also being near Him. Again, since a soul in the state of sāyujya possesses the same colour and contour as those of the Deity, the sārupya also must be there.

The Viśiṣṭadvaita conception of sāyujya really means divine communion. The word 'Sāyujya' is an abstract noun derived from 'Sayujau' which occurs in the form of sayujā in the Rgveda 1.164.20. This Vedic text makes mention of two friendly and fellow birds of beautiful feathers perching on the same tree, meaning thereby the individual soul and God or two individual souls, one in bondage and the other in the state of emancipation. This word in its Vedic usage obviously points to the relation of duality between the two birds. If there can be sāyujya between two friends who are indeed numerically two, the same relation can exist between a devotee and his Deity. The Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā has likewise referred to a brāhmaṇa and a kṣatriya as sayujā.

Śaṅkara has also used the word sāyujya in the sense of fellowship. Commenting on Brahma-sūtra 4.4.17, he states that people who enjoy fellowship (sāyujya) with Iśvara as a result of their devotion to the Lower Brahman do not attain absolute lordship. Fellowship thus understood by Śaṅkara, cannot have the sense of a devotee’s being absorbed into Iśvara; it only means the individual soul’s communion with God—both being numerically distinct. The summum bonum of human life, according to Śaṅkara, is the soul’s absorption into the Nirguṇa Brahman. However, Sayujya is generally understood in the sense of absorption of the individual into, or his identity with, the Absolute. But Venkaṭanātha objects to such interpretation of the word by observing as follows in his commentary on Tattva-muktā-Kalāpa 2.67: "The word 'sayuk' is not a synonym of one, it has nor been used anywhere in this sense...... If a lexicographer says that sāyujya means oneness, then his interpretation must be ignored as one that is based on prejudice or is due to the lack of intelligence for understanding the etymology of the word." Śaṅkara has not, however, used the word in the sense of oneness, but in that of fellowship or communion. In fact,
Śaṅkara’s conception of sāyujya with Iśwara (Personal God) agrees with Rāmānuja’s conception of salvation.

Nevertheless, there is a fundamental difference between Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja with regard to the question of the nature of salvation. For the former, the highest state of salvation is the complete identity of the individual with Brahman (Kaivalya). The latter, though he recognises Kaivalya as we shall see later, in a sense different from that of Śaṅkara, regards sāyujya as the proper salvation.

The individual’s fellowship with Saguna Brahman, according to Śaṅkara, is only a stepping stone to his absorption into Nirguna Brahman. But Rāmānuja, who does not draw a distinction between Nirguna and Saguna, does not admit salvation in this sense of Śaṅkara. As previously seen, the Brahman is one. It is Nirguna inasmuch as It does not possess any of those attributes which properly belong to prakṛti. It is again Saguna in the sense that It possesses such attributes as omniscience, bliss, etc. Since the Brahman is thus both Nirguna and Saguna, the question of the emancipated soul’s absorption into Brahman cannot, as Rāmānuja points out, arise. Salvation then, concludes Rāmānuja, is nothing but the individual’s eternal fellowship or communion with God. Hence the interpretation of the term ‘sāyujya’ is in the sense of communion in devotional philosophy.

Kaivalya (Isolation)

Rāmānuja holds that those who know ‘the doctrine of the five fires’ (pañcacāgni-vidyā), like those who follow the path of devotion, attain communion with God. In this connection he seeks to derive support from the scriptures which, according to him, state that those who know the pañcacāgni-vidyā travel on the path of Arcis etc., and ultimately realise God so as never to return.74 One who knows the ‘five fires’, knows the real nature of the self. One desirous of knowing the true nature of one’s own self is, as Rāmānuja points out, called a jijnāsu in the Gitā, while one who is devoted to God is called a jñāni. The difference between a jijnāsu and a jñāni is that the former aims at isolation (kaivalya), while the latter does at the realisation of God. But both ultimately become free from metempsychosis. Rāmānuja left no doubt in his mind as to the meaning of kaivalya, but his followers differed among themselves in this respect. According to the Vadagalais, kaivalya is enjoyed somewhere in the material universe, whereas the Tengalais hold that kaivalya is trans-material so that its proper place is in the spiritual
universe. The freed soul of a jijnäsu resides, according to the latter, in isolation in a distant part of Vaikuntha just as a woman forsaken by her husband lives away from him. But the former notes that such a soul continues to reside in isolation somewhere on the material plane. According to Śrīniväsādāsa, an isolated soul (kevali) realises its own self and not God. As regards the question whether ‘isolation’ is in material or spiritual world, he mentions both the views without deciding between them. The author of the Vedāntakārikā says that the state of kaivalya is coveted only by some, and adds that people like him have no liking for it.

The Powers of a Liberated Soul

In the state of transmigration as well as other stages of life the soul’s essential qualities such as omniscience etc., are but partially manifest. A piece of diamond fresh from the mine does not appear to be precious, for all its lustre is concealed by its outer coating. It is only after its impurities have been washed away that it shines forthwith in its natural lustre. Similarly, the soul shines in its essential glory only when the impurities of matter accumulating around it are removed. The washing does not create in the gem any lustre that does not already exist in it. The removal of the impurities born of matter, likewise, cannot create consciousness and other qualities in the soul. These qualities are eternally there in it.

The desires of an emancipated soul are fulfilled as a matter of course, and its resolves never fail. But even these powers of such a soul are not unlimited. Absolute power rests with the Almighty alone. Rāmānuja, therefore, holds that a freed soul, though it is endowed with powers such as ‘anima’ (becoming small) and ‘mahima’ (becoming great), cannot create, sustain and destroy the universe. It is God—and God alone—that is responsible for these activities. However, since an emancipated soul has infallible resolves and rises above the obligations of injunctions and prohibitions in the state of salvation, it is under no one’s control and subjugation. As to whether an emancipated soul possesses a body including the sense-organs, Bādari’s reply is that it does not, and in support of his view quotes the following: An embodied one cannot be free from pleasure and pain. But Jaimini contradicts this view and finds support for himself in another scriptural statement to the effect that an emancipated soul becomes one, three, five and seven, which, as he argues, it cannot become unless it assumes bodies including sense-organs. Rāmānuja
agrees, on the point with Bādarāyāṇa who leaves to the soul itself the choice to remain either embodied or otherwise.\(^8^4\)

*The Stuff of the Body in Emancipation*

In the state of liberation the individual soul is indeed free from all kinds of bondage. Even the form which it then assumes is not made of matter (prakṛti). The Chāndogya says, 'The emancipated soul, (samprāśāda), having approached the highest light (God) manifests in its own form.'\(^8^5\) Rāmānuja says that the form assumed by a soul in the state of emancipation is not adventitious.\(^8^6\)

The life of a mortal creature depends upon a body including the sense-organs and breath; but life on the Divine plane is independent of all these things. The Bhāgavata says that the inhabitants of Vaikuṇṭha are without bodies, sense-organs and breath.\(^8^7\) The stuff of which they are made is beyond comprehension. This reminds one of a description of the spirits in Milton's *Paradise Lost* which is as follows:

"For spirits when they please:
Can either sex assume, or both; so soft
And uncompounded in their essence pure,
Not tied or manacled with joint or limb,
Nor founded on the brittle strength of bones,
Like cumbrous flesh, but, in what shape they choose,
Dilated or condensed, bright or obscure,
Can execute their airy purposes".

(1.423-30)

"All heart they live, all head, all eye, all ear,
All intellect, all sense; and as they please
They limb themselves, and colour, shape or size,
Assume as like them best, condense or rare".

6. 350—353

A similar idea is also to be found in the Nirukta. While classifying the gods under two heads, the action-born and the self-born, Yāska says that the latter are all spirit and that even their paraphernalia is all spirit, the ātman. Their chariots, horses, weapons, and arrows are nothing but the ātman.\(^8^8\)

A released soul must be in the image of God so far as its form and content are concerned. The Upaniṣad reveals, 'The pure soul attains the likeness of God.'\(^8^9\)
The Kingdom of God

The kingdom of God has various names in devotional philosophy. Being the supreme place, it is called 'Parama Pada,' 'Divya Sthāna' & 'Para Sthāna'. The Rgveda says that there is a flow of sweetness in Viṣṇu's Parama Pada, which is seen by His devotees. The Kaṭha Upaniṣad likewise points out that a man of religious practice reaches the highest abode of Viṣṇu. The Brahma-tantra addresses God thus: 'O Lord, the sages know Thy Parama Pada as the primal cause of all effects, the best object of speech and the supreme perfection of the Yogīs.' The Mahābhārata says that the Divine place is primal, non-aging, un-knowable, difficult to understand and attainable with the help of the Āgamas. The sages proclaim that it is above the abode of Brahmā. It is all lustre and auspicious. Even the gods cannot see it. The place of Viṣṇu, the Supreme, is more effulgent even than the sun and the fire. It is firm, non-decaying and non-decreasing. The Viṣṇu-purāṇa says: 'Those who are exclusively devoted to God or always meditate upon Brahmā or practise yoga, attain that supreme place which the sages visualise.' The Gīta tells us that a yogi attains the primal, supreme place and praises it as a place of no disease and a place of eternity.

Being the highest expanse, it is called Parama Vyoma. The Rgveda alludes to God, the Master of this universe, as living in the Parama Vyoma. The Taṇḍūrīya Upaniṣad reveals: 'One who knows Him to be present in the cavity of heart and in the Parama Vyoma enjoys all pleasures in the company of the omniscient Brahmā.' The Vedas proclaim that the universe is but one quarter of God, while the other three quarters are immortal in heaven. This idea later gained wide currency and in consequence, in later devotional literature, there is frequent use of the word 'Tripād-vibhūti' in the sense of Heaven and of the word 'Ekapād-vibhūti' in the sense of the physical universe. Brahma-tantra uses the term 'Mahā-vibhūti' as a synonym for Tripād-vibhūti. Being eternal, Tripād-vibhūti is also called Nitya-vibhūti.

The kingdom of God as the abode of Brahmā is also called Brahma-loka. The Praśna Upaniṣad says, 'The emancipated souls reach that Brahma-loka which is without raajas.'

The Bhāgavata calls the kingdom of God Vaikuṇṭha. It is described as that which is adored by all and is the residence of Śrī and Viṣṇu. It is refulgent, beyond tamas, and there is no apprehension of return from it.
Rāmānuja himself assigns several names to the Kingdom of God, such as Brahma-loka, Parama Pada and Vaikuṇṭha. The Ācārya must have had deep faith in the existence of the Divine world, as is evident from the Vaikuṇṭha-gadya, where he has given a detailed description of the Divine world in a very beautiful language. He tells us that one has to cross seven strata of the material world in order to reach the Divine Kingdom. He then proceeds to describe the holy Kingdom as full of mansions of superb excellence, orchards laden with fragrance of the flora, chirping birds and frisking fauna, and aromatic pools overgrown with lotuses. In such a Kingdom which surpasses all description stands the Divine Sanctuary, where on a splendid throne called the Yoga-paryāṇa reposes the Sanctum sanctorium, God Viṣṇu with all his glory, showering upon the devotees attending upon Him soft, soothing glances and entertaining them with amiable, ambrosial talk. The description is indeed such that one who reads it cannot fail to be infused with a feeling of sanctity. However, in writing out his own description of the Kingdom of God, Rāmānuja might have had before his mind the lucid description of Vaikuṇṭha in the Bhāgavata, and the brief description of Brahma-loka in the Kauśitakī. In this matter, he perhaps made the best use of what he could gather from the Upaniṣads and the purāṇas and also availed himself of the description of natural scenery in the Rāmāyaṇa. That he was much impressed by Vālmiki's poetic description of Pampā etc. is clear from the fact that a few of the phrases used by him bear close resemblance with those of Vālmiki.

The divine throne characterised as Amitaujas (infinitely strong) in the Kauśitakī is sometimes called the 'adorable seat', and sometimes the ‘Śeṣa-couch’ in the Bhāgavata. Rāmānuja has in this connection used Ananta as a synonym for ‘Śeṣa’ in his Vaikuṇṭha-gadya.

Rāmānuja says that the Deity is attended upon by celestial persons, and His form is decorated by ornaments of various colours and shapes. Similarly, the Divine weapons such as the disc and the mace also attend upon Him in their personal aspect, according to the Bhāgavata and the Rāmāyaṇa. They are all Divine beings (brahma maya). Garuda and Dāruka, the driver of the Divine coach with Saivya, Sugriva, Meghapuṣpa and Bālahaka, also remain in God’s service: The principal attendants of the Deity are said to be sixteen in number. These probably symbolise the sixteen thousand devotional songs of the Vedas. The attendants resemble the Deity

The Divine Kingdom is immune from the vicissitudes of creation and destruction.\textsuperscript{118} The Chāndogya says that the Brahmā-loka is uncreated.\textsuperscript{119} Rāmānuja expounds the word ‘Brahma-loka’ as an appositional compound (Karmadhāraya), suggesting thereby a relation of identity between God and His Kingdom.\textsuperscript{120} The Bhāgavata also equates the loka with Brahman, both thus being of the nature of eternity, truth, knowledge, light and infinitude.\textsuperscript{121} The Itihāsasamuccaya also holds the same view.\textsuperscript{122}

As to the stuff of which the Kingdom of God is made, Rāmānuja holds that it is non-material (aprakṛta), and accepts the Rgvedic view that it is beyond rajas. Since the three constituents of prakṛti viz. sattva, rajas and tamas, cannot exist in isolation from one another, the word rajas occurring in the Rgvedic view, argues Rāmānuja, is a synecdoche for matter (prakṛti) as a whole. He, therefore, concludes that God lives in a place which is beyond the material world.\textsuperscript{123} According to the Ahirbudhnya Samhitā, the Divine world is of the nature of knowledge and bliss.\textsuperscript{124} The Brhma-tantra ascribes six Divine attributes to Viśvakṣa, while denying the existence of the elements of matter in it.\textsuperscript{125}

The later followers of Vaiṣṇavasim, however, hold different views about the nature of the stuff of which Viśvakṣa is made. Although they agree that it is made of Śuddha-sattva, yet they differ as to whether it is inert (jaḍa) or non-inert (ajaḍa). Some of them regard it as inert, some say that it is really inert but figuratively non-inert, and again there are still others such as Venkaṭanātha who regard it as non-inert,\textsuperscript{126} by stating that self-luminosity in its case as in that of the ātman, is, really and not merely figuratively, an essential quality.

Śaṅkara speaks of special abodes of God,\textsuperscript{127} and points out that God as a person sits on a throne in the city of Aparājīta in Brahmā-loka.\textsuperscript{128} But all these things—the world, the city, the throne, the Divine from—are, in his view, made of māyā and hence not ultimately real. Saṅkara, therefore, holds that the worship of a personal
DIVINE COMMUNION

God can produce no better result than what would follow from the attainment of paradise or svarga. 120 But the Vaiṣṇava teachers maintain that all the paraphernalia belonging to God are super-natural (aprakṛta) and are of the highest significance to those who aspire after higher life.

No Fear of Fall from the Heaven of Viṣṇu

Once the individual soul attains emancipation and reaches the Kingdom of God, there is no fear of his return to this world. The emancipated soul looks upon God as his all, and, in fact, is in possession of Him. Nothing else than God does he want any more. God also loves beyond measure the soul that has given up pleasures of the world and taken to the path of devotion. God shall not part, Rāmānuja says, with a dear one whom He Himself considers to be rare. The chandogya says, ‘Those who travel on the path of the gods, the path of Brahman, do not return to this world.’ The Brhadāranyaka also says the same thing. 121 The Gītā re-iterates, ‘Having reached me, the great souls do not get into transmigration in the world which is non-eternal and full of miseries.’ 122 Bādarāyaṇa’s concluding aphorism runs thus: ‘No return, the scriptures say so.’ 123

In this connection mention may be made of a gnomic legend contained in the Mahābhārata. 124 Mudgala, a hermit of Kurukṣetra, had a wife and a son; and they all used to pick the grains left over by the shopkeepers on the ground (Śila) and by the farmers on the field (uḍchha). The gleanings used to last for a fortnight, and a part of them used to be offered to the gods, and the remainder used to be at the disposal of the family. But the members of the family used to partake of the latter only once a fortnight, serving to the guests whatever was left. Their heart was so pure and their austerity so severe that Indra used to come in person every fortnight to accept his share of the oblation, and a host of guests used to pour into the hermitage for food. But the sincerity of the hermit wrought miracles. His stock of food never fell short. Once the haughty sage, Dūrvāsā, wanted to test Mudgala’s patience. He came and begged for food. Mudgala offered the sage whatever he had. Dūrvāsā consumed as much of the stock as he could, besmeared his naked body with the rest and then went away. The result was that there was no food left for Mudgala. But he did not lose patience. Dūrvāsā repeated the test six times; but finding the hermit always patient and serene, he appreciated his unflinching charity.
When Durvāsā was praising Mudgala's equanimity of mind and the excellence of his character, a celestial being descended and offered Mudgala a lift in his plane for going to Indra’s paradise in recognition of his meritorious deeds. The hermit then asked the celestial messenger to describe the joys of paradise. The latter described the various pleasures of paradise and pointed out that inhabitants of Indra’s domain are not born of parents, nor do they perspire etc., nor do their garments become dirty, nor again do the flowers in their garlands wither. But, he continued, the joyful life that is enjoyed there is bound to come to an end. Some day or the other one must return from the paradise, the world of pleasures, to this world of action, and the time for one's return is indicated by the withering of the flowers in one's garland. At that time one loses his consciousness and falls, the messenger concluded.

The thought of return and the termination of celestial pleasures left Mudgala dissatisfied. He then asked the messenger to inform him of a place from where there is no return. The celestial visitor replied that such a place is the abode of Viṣṇu, lying beyond the paradise of Brahmā. It is pure and effulgent, and is known as para-Brahman. Those engrossed in the enjoyment of sensual pleasures cannot go there. Those who are addicted to avarice, wrath, infatuation, fraud and enmity are equally out of place there. Only they can go there who are free from the faults of egoism, exercise control over their senses, and practise meditation. Thereupon Mudgala, as the story goes, gave up the idea of visiting paradise, and resorted to renunciation and meditation.

The legend teaches that there is no fear of fall from the heaven of Viṣṇu, the Supreme Being, as there is from the paradise of the gods. In acceptance of this teaching, Rāmānuja believed in the eternal Heaven in preference to the temporal paradise. The paradise of the gods is subject to the mutations of time, having a beginning and an end; but not so the Kingdom of God, where time is powerless.

The above legend, in fact, teaches what is taught in the Gitā. The Gitā says that after having enjoyed the pleasures of svarga, the gods enter, when their merits get exhausted, into the world of the mortals. To those, on the other hand, Rāmānuja says, who devoutly contemplate God, He offers not only His fellowship (Yoga), but also gives assurance of non-return from His Kingdom (Kṣema).

*Yoga is 'the attainment of the unattained', and Kṣema is 'the preservation of the attained'. Rāmānuja's interpretation of the passage of the Gitā suits the devotional view and the way the Śāṅkya puts it in support of the doctrine of non-return from the Divine place, is most fascinating.
God indeed secures a divine life for a true devotee and also perpetuates His communion with him.  
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   (शीतायां रामानुजमाध्यम १२, २)
   (२) ये भवताः संगमर्मी अस्मिन्तुतिमुनं परिपूर्णमुपासते
   (शीतायां रामानुजमाध्यम १२, २)

15. सर्वं देवादेवेदेहु वामस्यास्तिनि
   (शीतायां रामानुजमाध्यम १२, ३)

16. सर्वविद्याशास्त्रं: सर्वत्वप्राणस्वभावताय
   (शीतायां रामानुजमाध्यम २, २४)
17. सर्वभूमिस्तवथा: सुभवस्वादस्य तेषालियमस्वादु: व्यायाम-कर्त्तव्याभ्या भेदन-दहन-कलेण्योपयोगानाम्।
(भीमायाः रामानुजभाष्यम् २, २४)

18. दृश्यमर्य पुराणे लोके अर्थायाय एव च।
(भीमायाः १५, १६)

19. तत: अर्थविवर्तिनिष्ठ: पुराणोज्यो जीवविवाहितपत्नीते-भ्रातास्त-पर्यंत कर्षणा-स्मावास चिन्त्समस्मुखानां
(भीमायाः रामानुजभाष्यम् १५, १६)

20. प्रत्यर्थविवर्तिनिष्ठ: कूटस्सोच्य सिस्मू समपन्निकुमार लेने रूपसाविषयो छुट्टनातमा।
(भीमायाः रामानुजभाष्यम् १५, १६)

21. लोकत: इति लोक। तत्त्वं लोकवस्य। राजेन्द्रमु, तस्तस्मृत्तस्वेतना, मुखप्राप्तिः प्रमाणावबन्धुम् एतत् यथार्थम्।
(भीमायाः रामानुजभाष्यम् १५, १६)

22. श्रीमुनालीका: पुनरार्थविवर्तितस्मु।
(भीमायाः ५, १६)

23. तां सर्वं अर्थविवर्तितस्य नर्मदयास्य सर्वकुमु नास्तात् स्वयं स्वतः यथा इति।
(भीमायाः रामानुजभाष्यम् ५, १६)

24. तदावं सर्वहाष्टो नर्मदयास्य विवाहायास्य कर्षणां मेत्यास्य प्रवेशपादमितः
शाया।
(भ्रास्वमु: शाकरभाष्यम् ४, २, १४)

25. कार्यविवर्तित-प्रवेश प्रसुप्रवती यथार्थस्य सति ततेवेदनमस्य समयावशेषः: सन्ततिद्विवेशः
हिरण्यगणेश सहाय: परं परिशुद्ध विवेशः परमं पदं प्रतिपन्न:।
(भ्रास्वमु: शाकरभाष्यम् ४, ३, १०)

26. यथा पुष्पक-पलाश भापो न स्तित्वपद्धते।
(भ्रास्वमु: ४, २४)

27. यथा नाहिकतो भावो बुद्धिनाश्य न लिप्यः
हेतुचिऩ्द्र स इमखलोकमात्र हिरण्यगणेश सहाय:।
(भीमायाः १५, १६)

28. (भ्रास्वमु: विवाहायास्य पुष्पवस्य विवाहायास्य महाभारतपूज्वाचश्चिवायोश्चिवाय विवाहायास्य विवाहायास्य
प्रकाशी यथार्थस्य सति ततेवेदनमस्य समयावशेषः: सन्ततिद्विवेशः
विन्यासमयेश सहाय: परं परिशुद्ध विवेशः परमं पदं प्रतिपन्न:।
(भ्रास्वमु: शाकरभाष्यम् ४, २, १४)

29. भोगेन्द्र विवाहस्य द्वाराधारस्तकलोऽरेष: कर्मशः।
(भ्रास्वमु: ४, १६)

30. संपरयो देहात्मर्गानाः काल एव विवुप: सुकलतुःकते निरव्यक्तम् हीनेत्वम्।
(भ्रास्वमु: ३, २७)

31. यदव इव रोमाणि विवेश पपमम्
(भ्रास्वमु: ५, १६)

32. ततु सुकलतुःकते विवुपुःते तस्म विवाहायास्य मृतं प्रविष्ये: सुकलत्तमश्चिवायो विवाहायास्य
(भ्रास्वमु: १, २)

33. तदोक्षप्रवलेन तदकाशित्याऽरेष: विवाहस्यार्थः-स्वरूपस्वृत्तियोगायः
(भ्रास्वमु: २, १६)

34. विवाधिकाश्चलिताः
(भ्रास्वमु: २, ४)

35. (भ्रास्वमु: विवाहायास्य रोमाणि श्चिवायो रोमाणि विवाहायास्य मित्रतायायाः नित्यमेति इति
(भ्रास्वमु: शाकरभाष्यम् ४, ३, ५)

(भ्रास्वमु: विवाहायास्य रोमाणि श्चिवायो रोमाणि विवाहायास्य मित्रतायायाः नित्यमेति इति
(भ्रास्वमु: शाकरभाष्यम् ४, २, १६)

(भ्रास्वमु: शाकरभाष्यम् ४, ३, ५)
36. सुभद्रा दिन-पुर्वक-पद्मद्रमायात्मा-वातांशुमयः
       गली बिचु दु-कवश्यकान-चातु-महितः
       (सतसंगमयवधयः)

37. वर्षसाध्योद्विक्षु तु उपरिस्रूपिनिवेदयितः
       (अभिमायम ४, ३, १)

38. (ा) वर्षादुसरी इत्यादी निवेदयितः
       (अभिमायम ४, ३, १)

(्ा) स इत्यादिक ने ज्ञातालोकसन स ब्रह्मलोकः
       (कौशिकी २, ३)

39. प्राण-वरमयमनोरते विरजा नदी
       (पादोलसङ्गे)

40. इव बुद्धिविनिवृद्ध: सहीता विशारमय-कोशी भवति
       मनस्तु शाशविनिवृद्ध: सहीत समनीत्यकोशी भवति
       इव प्राण-कोशी पाण्डुः कर्मिनिवृद्ध: सहीत सत्तु धारामयकोशी
       भवति। इतत् कौशायम मिलितं सत्तु सुभद्रारीमयमुधयते।
       (सदानन्दि-वेदान्तसारः ७२-८६)

41. (ा) महद्वः हृद्दालक्षेध्यक्रियसङ्ग-चतन्त्रापर्यंतम, एवं समुदायः शुद्धमारीम
       (तत्सर्वानंतर-सार्वविद्यायाय तत्सर्वविद्यायी)

42. ततस्मायोऽसायः
       (छवंधोग ४, १५, ५)

43. बिना श्रीवस्तीकोस्तोऽ
       (भागवतम ६, ६, ५६)

44. भ्रमणविचारविषयव
       (कौशिकी १, २)

45. स प्राणविश्वामिति ज्ञातं परममू
       (कौशिकी १, ५)

46. वायुदेव: सम्बन्धतसं महात्म मुदुर्वर्भ:।
       (गीता ७, १६)

47. परं ब्रह्मा वायुदेवाय सूक्षम प्राणयः।
       (अभिमायम २, २, ४२)

48. तत्त्वं कल्ल त्वमयपरातु परमात्मनं एवं हृदोत्सवुत्तिः।
       (२, ३, ४०) तमें ब्रह्मायो अभिमायम

49. पालिकुपाधाकाचारोपेतेऽप्राणं: परं।।
       (न्यायसिद्धार्थम्-मुक्तवल्ली)

50. शपरं भवतो जनम परं जनम विवेकतः।
       (गीता ४, ४)

51. ज्ञातम: प्रतिकृत्तनाति परेः स समाचरेः।
       (सुभाषितम)

52. शुद्ध हुद्योदविवेकः त्यक्तोलिततः परततः।
       (गीता २, ३)

53. घरें ब्रह्म परं घाम पवित्रं परमं भवान।।
       (गीता १०, १२)

54. (ा) परमात्मनं प्राणन्तितति रामानुजभारम्।

(ो) श्रामानं प्राणन्तितति रामानुजभारम्।

55. निजः तथा मनोऽन बायुयम्यंतरु नृणयां।
       (सूर्यपुराणसाहित्यविन्त्यमागी
       उद्वशयः)

56. बिन्दोत्तो भगवानु साजः पुरुषः; पुरुषः; परं।।
       (भागवतम १०, ३, १३)

57. परातु प्रलोऽसः
       (ब्रह्मसूत्रम २, ३, ४०)

58. खः भाराय मारा प्रसः

59. भागवता प्रतिकृत्तन परं परमर्मेऽन च
       प्राप्तमभिवेकः वायुदेवाय सत्तायः।
       (सुभाषितम)

60. परं पालन पुरुषायोः।
       परं पालन पुरुषायोः।
61. (श्र) परातु तच्छु नेतः (श्र) पराभिध्यानातु (श्र) परमुखविचारित्वकारलिपि (सविबक्षेत्र-संहिता)

62. परो श्रुतेय विषयी निव्यता सवबेरविहातु।

63. भवतु मम परसिमु शोपुपु भक्तिस्यात। (श्रीमाधवसदृष्टि)

64. (श्र) तत्कद्भव्यम परातु परमात्मन्य एव हेतुर्तीमेवति। (श्रीमाधवसु २, ३, २५)

65. सामुस्यं सम्बन्धामु। (कौपीशक्ति २, ३)

66. एतत्त्वे देवताय साध्वं समग्रता वज्यति। (वृंदवनप्रकाश १, ५, २६)

67. सालोकसाहित्रां सामीप-साहसस्वकबलमूः। (भागवतमू ३, २६, १३)

68. सालोकसाहित्रां साहित्यानुबन्धे साधूस्ववत्तले सत्त्वमलयां सवश्वषणवतु नृतयायातु सवलताः। (सत्त्वमहाकलाप २, ६७)

69. इं सुधःस्म सुध्वम सत्त्वम समायं सवावं सव्यमवतु वज्यते। (सववेद १, १६४, २०)

70. भ्रुत्व कैवय च क्षर्तं च सुध्वम चकृ। (समुद्रयसीतीर्णत्व)

71. जगद्धार्थान्तरणं श्रवणसिद्धति सववत्व। (श्रमाधवसु ४, ५, २७)

72. श्री श्रुतोत्सवस्वरातु सहेज्व मनसेवसवाटु वश्यति जगद्ध्वारान्तरणं वश्यतिः स्वरातु वश्यतिः स्वरातु वश्यतिः स्वरातु वश्यतिः। (साकर्मसायण ५, ४, २७)

73. नश्तं सन्यन्तां श्रुतं एकपदित्वस्वत्व वश्यतिः प्रयोगमारात्वः। यद्य कर्तिकने-श्रवणं एवं सार्यं भार्यं भावित वेतु तद्य स्वप्नाश्चारस्वकं श्रवणश्चारस्वकं वेतु तद्य स्वप्नाश्चारस्वकं वेतु। (सवविशेषत्व २, ६७)

74. (श्र) पंचांगविद्योत्तरार्थिनिर्देशं गतिक्रमवातु चिरवादित्वम गतिक्रमवातु चिरवादित्वम चिरवादित्वम चिरवादित्वम चिरवादित्वम। (श्रीमाधवसु ५, ३, १६)

75. (श्र) परं श्रुतं उपास्तीतिकारात्मकं च प्रकटिक्रितं ब्रह्मात्मकं मुक्तवेदीकारात्मकं गतिक्रमवातु चिरवादित्वम। (श्रीमाधवसु ५, ६, १६)

76. (श्र) प्रवर्तकं चिरवादित्वम एवं चिरवादित्वम नान्तिकारात्मकं गतिक्रमवातु चिरवादित्वम। (श्रीमाधवसु ५, ६६)
77. कौंबल्य नाम शान्तोगालु प्रकृतिविवृत्तस्वरूपानुमयकामबृपसु नम्र:। भगवदनुपुकार- 
वयतितिक-स्वात्मानुमयब्रह्मा इत्यादः।
(सतीग्रहपत्रपीषिका)

78. कौंबल्येनेतु केशराचार्यायांणामेव सम्मतम्।
शास्त्रदाहारस्तु कौंबल्य न मयनां इति स्पष्टम्।
(वेदान्तकारिकावली ५, ३)

79. रुतः प्रत्येकालमोदहङ्गापारम्भायाय: स्वाभाविका गुणाः। परं ज्योतिष्यसम्मन- 
स्वाभाविकेन, नोख्वां:। यथोत्तरं भगवता शौचकेनापि—
यथा न कृपये योक्तां मलप्राप्तालांनामां।
(श्रीमाध्वम् ४, ४, ३)

80. यज्ञ-यज्ञो निवित्त-चेतनाचेतन स्त्रकृपास्तिप्रयौतिमेदनियमनमु, तद्भज 
निरस्त-निवित्त-तिरोधासन स्तिथाय-अन्योत्तरनां मुक्तस्यवेद्यम्।
(श्रीमाध्वम् ४, ४, १६)

81. रुतः सत्त्वसंकल्पाश्रुद्वायान्यथापितवं च सिद्धम्। (श्रीमाध्वम् ४, ४, ५)

82. (ः) भावां बादरिरह रंगम्।
(प्र) न है सचारोपसर्गः। अतः विसाक्योराध्यतं श्रावीरेऽ व वीरलोक: न 
(श्रमशय ५, १२, १)

83. (ः) भाव जैननिविश्वक्यमनात्।
(श्रमशय ५, ४, १२)
(प्र) स एकधा भवति त्रिव्य भवतिः पंचधा भवति सत्त्वः।
(श्रमशय ५, २६, २)

84. (ः) द्रापाएवहेवथविन्यः वादरायामोऽतः।
(प्र) रुतः एवं संकल्पोपायवितः सचारोरसर्गः। च मुक्तं भगवानु वादरायामोऽ 
(श्रमशय ५, १२, १)

85. एव सम्प्रदास्रोदस्मार्गिकीर्यतमुक्तः परं ज्योतिष्यसंपन्नमु स्वेत रुपेयामिनिश्चकीयोः।
(श्रमशय ५, १२, ३)

86. भागलुकु-देह-परिप्रेयः हि स्वेत रुपेयोऽति विप्रेपणमर्वेक्षम् स्थाप्तः
(श्रीमाध्वम् ४, ४, ३)

87. ब्रह्मद्रव्यप्रायुष-द्वीपानां ब्रह्मद्रव्यप्रायुष-द्वीपानां।
(श्रमशय ५, ३, ३४)

88. ब्रह्मद्रव्यप्रायुष-द्वीपानां ब्रह्मद्रव्यप्रायुष-द्वीपानां अतिप्रस्तताय 
(श्रीमाध्वम् ५, १, ४)

89. निरजनः परमं साम्प्रमुच्योः।
(श्रमशय ५, १, ५)

90. विप्रण: पदं परमेष मध्य उत्स:।
(श्रमशय ५, १, १५४, ४)

91. ततु विश्वासं: परमं पदं सदा पवयति सुर्यः।
(श्रमशय ५, २२, १०)

92. स तु सुतु पदमचारोपति तिरुहाः परमं पदम:।
(श्रमशय ५, १, ६)

93. कारणां आर्यां ब्रह्मविन्यसं वाच्यपूमतमम्।
(श्रमशय ५, १, ६)
94. विश्व स्वानमेयं चाम्रमेयं दुर्विजो चाम्रमेयं स्वायम्यमाध्यमम्
स्वायम्यमाध्यमम् अहा श्रीमानार्थवचनम्

95. ब्रह्मा: सदनामहवं परं स्वायं प्रवचने।
स्वतंत्रकालदीपित तत्र स्वायं विद्योम्यहतमः।
(महाभारतम्)

96. एकानिन: सदा ब्रह्म-द्वापिनो योिनो नि ये।
तेवं तत् परम स्वायं यदृ पश्यति सुरयं।
(विष्णुपुराणम्)

97. योगी परं स्वायम्युपितं चाद्यू।
(गीता ५, २०)
पंद्गुण्डस्य नामायम्।
(गीता २, ५१)
शाश्वतं पदम्यम्।
(गीता १८, ५६)

98. यो प्रस्याय्य्याः: परमे व्योमम्।
(कामदेव १०, १३६, ७)

99. यो बेद निहितं गुरुयां परमे व्योमम्।
सौरोत्ते सर्वातुकामातु सह ब्रह्माण विपशिवत।
(तत्ततोर्य २, १, १)

100. पालार्या बिषवा भूतानि विपादः यम्मूर्धः दिव्व।
(कामदेव १०, ६०, ३)

101. महाविन्धुस्वर-संभवाय नमस्ते पुलवोधम्
(ब्रह्मस्वरायनं जतं स्वोऽम्)

102. पुलवोधानन्तर एत्य बहुलोकानु गमयत।
(ब्रह्मद्वा ६, २, ६५)

103. तेवासासि विरजो ब्रह्मालोऽः
(ब्रह्मद्वा ६, २, ६५)

104. युर्यवेवःकि किर्मम्।
(महाभारतम् ३, १५, १३)

105. (प्र) सर्वाशोक-नामस्मतम्।
(महाभारतम् ३, १५, १३)

106. (प्र) ब्रह्मालाः यद्यास्तो दीर्घनाशवसि: विवा सह
(महाभारतम् ६, ६, ६०)

107. ब्रह्मालाः दिव्याभासितोत्तर चार्यावपद्धार नमस्तं नारायणं\nभाषिलज्ञ-हुडवालारायणं।
(ब्रह्मचर्यामम)

108. (प्र) ततो ब्रह्मालामगद्ध मार्यवर तमसं परम।
(महाभारतम् १०, ८८, २५)
(प्र) यत्र नारायणं: साधन्यावबन्धनो वर्णम माति।

109. (प्र) तत्सु खलोकं भववानु समाजितं:
सन्तत्यायिन्यं परं त यत्तथं इत्यादि।
(महाभारतम् २, ६, ६)
(प्र) त एकदा भववानु ब्रह्मवालामात्मनं:
(प्र) युर्वहस्ति नामस्मतमस्मतमम्।
यव चाव: पुलवानस्ते भववानु शब्दगोर्च: इत्यादि।
(महाभारतम् ३, १५, २६)

110. तस्य हि वा एतस्य ब्रह्मालाःस्वस्तयो हृद्य इत्यादि।
(कोपितकी २, ३)

111. (प्र) पतितं: तत्मानेषु पादपपश्चवं मातिः।
(प्र) कुमारू: पश्च सहितीक प्रतिज्ञरात्मक समाजत।
(रामायणम् ४, १, १३)
(प्र) परितित: पतितं: पादपपश्चवं नानागत्वस्य दिव्यं: पुरवष:।
(ब्रह्मचर्यामम)
112. ब्रह्मायुज्यितस्य मात्रां चालुः। स्वत: एव स्वयम्।

113. सम्पत्तिः सर्वं सम्पत्तिः कालान्तरे।

114. विनाशकार्यं किं न विनाशकार्यं?

115. गुरुनामस्ते निम्नलिखितम् विश्वासाकारी।

116. शराय नानाविद्वारवाच। धुरुरात्तिक इति।

117. प्रतिवर्त्तितं विद्वृत्तिः। वास्तववाच।

118. स याति विनाशते वै दाहते। विनाशकार्यं।

119. वृत्ता वारी महातं क्षत्रिया।

120. निपादः स्वप्नपितीयेन ब्रह्मायुज्यितस्य किं कर्ममार्गविवेकै यस्मादः।

121. इति संविधा भगवानुः महाकाशीको हृद।

122. भ्रामणः सदनां दृष्टवृत्तवत्वानं विनाशकार्यं।

123. अयतं भए रजस: परमेको हृद।

124. ज्ञाननपन्नवे ज्ञाननपन्नवे देशभावं ब्रजविरुद्धं।

(भागवतम् 3 २५ ३२)
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125. लोक वैक्षेप नामान्त विच्छल्य पाद्युपयसंयोग्यम्।
भूषणवानामप्रायम् गुणन्वय-विवाहितम्।

(ब्रह्मसत्वारस्मिन् जितने स्तोत्रम्)

126. श्रीमृणुकुण्डलिय नित्यममहं तत्समायू परस्परवायू।
सागराय सम्बन्धाय नस्तति समं तेने स्वयं: पुनराय।
(सत्सागरप्रायम्)

127. प्राचनारिको योः सचित्रमुनिलालिनु विशेषायपतनेनवरसिः। पर इश्वरः।

(ब्रह्मसूत्रे शाकरभाष्यम् ४, ४, १६)

128. पर्यङ्कथां ब्रह्म।

(ब्रह्मसूत्रे शाकरभाष्यम् ३, ३, २७)

129. वैवलोके पुरीप्राप्तिः दिवसः। धयाराजिता पूः।

(ब्रह्मसूत्रे शाकरभाष्यम् ३, ३, २७)

130. सागुणविवा-विस्मृतानास्मि तैत्तिर्म स्वार्गिकविवाहायातां।

(ब्रह्मसूत्रे शाकरभाष्यम् ४, ४, २६)

131. स एतातः ब्रह्म समयतेष स्वयंप्रथम प्रतिपथामात्र इश्वर: मानवभावं

(अर्यावर्षम् ४, २५, ९)

132. तेषु ब्रह्मचारके परः परावर्तो वसन्ति तेषां न पुनरङ्गुलितः।

(इदारायक ६, २, १५)

133. मानवे मुनुमकं हृदयमबाजवतम्।

(धीता ५, १५)

134. ब्राह्मण: ब्राह्मणः।

(ब्रह्मसूत्रम् ४, ४, २२)

135. महाभारतम्, वानपिष्क्याराध्याय: २६०-२६२।

136. (य) धन्तनामलयोजोहीनाय।

(महाभारतम् ३, २६१, १६)

(य) न स्मार्यितस्मात्स्त्रिस्य दिव्यगंधा मनोमताम्।

(महाभारतम् ३, २६३, १६)

137. ब्रह्मण: सदनाञ्जुवीर्यूं तदुर्विकिरोः।

(महाभारतम् ३, २६३, ३८-४०)

138. (य) काल: समयः।

(वेदांवसप्रेते महाभारतवचनम्)

(य) न च कालविक्रमः।

(भागवतम् २, ६, १०)

(ह) न तथा कालोपनिमित्वां पर: प्रमुः।

(भागवतम् २, २, २७)

139. बल्लवहिष्करणगीतानुसूतां पुनः: पुनिनवर्तते।

(धीतायायं रामानुजभाष्यम् ६, २१)

140. तेषां नित्याभिभूतां मत्तात्मिकलाभं योगमपुनराङ्गुलितस्य कर्मम् च वहाँ।

(धीतायायं रामानुजभाष्यम् ६, २२)
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God, the Supreme Person

A careful study of the Vedas may bring out the truth that the Vedic religion was a theistic one. The sages believed in the existence of God as father and the creator and omnicient ruler of the universe. The gāyatrī which is regarded as the quintessence of the four Vedas embodies a devotional attitude towards God conceived as the Creator to whom one should pray for the promotion of wisdom. The various extant religions of the world, no matter whether they agree with or differ from one another in details, are based on that very devotional attitude which characterised the Vedic religion.

Atheism also has had its tradition. The Indian systems of philosophy founded by Cārvāka, Mahāvīra, Kapila and Jaimini are indeed atheistic in outlook. They did not admit the necessity of postulating the existence of God for explaining the origin of the universe or the possibility of the cessation of the pain and misery and suffering of mankind.

Ultimate Reality may be conceived in any of the following ways:

1. as Impersonal and unembodied (Nirguṇa—Nirākāra).
2. as Personal and unembodied (Saguṇa—Nirākāra).
3. as Personal and embodied (Saguṇa—Sakāra).

Śaṅkara is one of those who admit the first alternative. For him, Brahma is both impersonal and unembodied. According to Advaita Vedānta, the personal and embodied God is not ultimately real. The conception of the Unmanifested Logos of Theosophy is akin to that of the unconditioned Brahma of Advaita.
According to religions such as Christianity, Islam, Zoroastrianism and Sikhism, God is the Ultimate Reality and He is personal but formless. Rāmānuja agrees with those religions in regarding God as the Ultimate Reality, but differs from them, holding that He is possessed of a personal form.

Now personality comprises certain attributes or characteristics. According to Edwin Greaves, 'some of the main elements in a Christian conception of God are personality, love, holiness, righteousness, omnipotence, wisdom, mercy and grace.' According to Islam, 'God is omnipresent, omnipotent, unborn, uncreated, invisible, unique, peerless, illimitable, sportive, merciful, just, formless and immutable.' The Zoroastrian God is Datar-Ahura-Mazda: 'He is most mindful of the deeds of men and demons and a Discerner and final arbiter of all things. He is the bestower of blessings and creator of all.' According to Sikhism, 'God Himself created the world and Himself gave names to things He made by His power.' Professor John B. Noss says about God in Sikhism that 'He is eternally one, sovereign and omnipotent God.' God, according to the Aryasamajist faith founded by Śvāmī Dayānanda, is truth, consciousness, bliss, formless, omnipotent, just, merciful, unborn, infinite, immutable, beginningless, matchless, supporter of all, lord of all, all-pervading, immanent, unaging, immortal, fearless, eternal, holy and creator. The Brahmāsamajists, likewise, conceive God as 'the Eternal, Unsearchable and Immutable Being who is the Author and Preserver of the Universe.' A personal being with sublime moral attributes, God, according to them, is not, however, incarnate, and yet hears, and responds to, prayers.

Like these theistic religions, Rāmānuja conceives God as the Supreme Person; but his approach to Ultimate Reality is unique in that it is aesthetic. For him, God is not only the Supreme Person but also has the most beautiful form. Most of the Vaiṣṇava apostles agree with Rāmānuja in this respect, though they differ from him in many details.

*The Points of Difference Between the Tengalai and the Vadagalai Sects of Viṣiṣṭādvaita regarding the nature of God and the allied subject.*

Below are given eighteen cardinal points of difference between the northern or Vadagalai and the southern or Tengalai sects of Viṣiṣṭādvaita. I am putting down two alternatives in an interrogative form on each point. In each case, a reply in the affirmative to the first alternative would represent the Tengalai view and a
similar reply to the second would bring out the view of the Vadagala.

1. Grace of God. Is it spontaneous and independent, or does it depend upon the efforts of the devotee?

2. Emancipation. Is it a gain to God or to the individual soul?

and

Does the bliss involved in emancipation admit of grades or is free from them?

3. Ways of approaching God. Are they five, viz, duty, knowledge, devotion to God, surrender to God and devotion to the religious guide or only two viz, devotion to God and surrender to Him?

4. Pervasion of Śrī. Is She atomic like a finite soul or pervasive like Viṣṇu?

5. Granting of salvation. Does Śrī only recommend to the Deity a devotee for salvation or does She also grant it?

6. God's love of the finite soul. Is it an attitude of relishing the faults of a devotee, or is it that of ignoring them?

7. Mercy of God. Does it consist in the actual suffering on the part of God out of sympathy for the suffering individual, or does it consist in His desire to remove the suffering of the individual soul?

8. Surrender. Is it a devotee's correct knowledge of his relation to the Supreme, or does it mean an additional self-surrendering activity on his part?

9. The definition of a resigned soul (prapanna). Is he one who has merely studied the Prabandhas, or is he one who takes to the path of surrender, being unable to follow other ways?

10. The duties. Are they to be given up, or are they to be performed by a prapanna?

11. Compatibility of other ways with surrender. Are other ways e.g. the acquisition of knowledge and the performance of duties incompatible with surrender or are they compatible with surrender?

12. Performance of duties. Is it optional for a man of God for the sake of loka-saṅgraha, or is it compulsory for the pleasure of God?
13. The accessories of surrender. Can some of them be adopted to the exclusion of the rest, or is it obligatory to practise all of them?

14. Cause of emancipation. Is God the only cause, or is prapatti also one?

15. Expiation. Is it unnecessary for a prapanna to atone for a sin, or is it necessary for him to do so?

16. The status of a devotee of a low caste. Is he to be revered as a brāhmaṇa, or is he to be accorded proper respect only?

17. The nature of God’s relation to the individual soul. Is God internally related to the finite souls, or is His contact with them only external?

18. Isolation or kaivalya. Does one who attains kaivalya attain the stage of eternity, or is the eternal stage attained in Vaikuṇṭha?

The above questionnaire is in consonance with Dr. S. Dasgupta’s treatment of the subject. A little variant is the treatment of Shri A. Govindācārya who has also mentioned five additional points of difference. I would personally like to add to the list only one more, viz. on the question of the nature of Śuddha-sattva. Lokācārya, a Tengalai, takes it to be inert, whereas Veṅkaṭanātha, a Vadagalai holds it to be non-inert.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Gotama and Rāmānuja

Gotama, the author of the Nyāya-sūtra did not say much about God. In fact, the importance of God in the philosophy of Gotama is not very great. According to him, an individual can attain salvation by means of knowledge which does not, however, specifically refer to God. It is not clear whether Gotama regarded God as creator, preserver and destroyer of the universe. He only characterised Him as the dispenser of the fruits of man’s actions. The later exponents of Nyāya have, however, tried to prove the existence of God by various kinds of arguments. The main trend of their argument is as follows.

An effect must have a cause. When we see an earthen pot, we naturally argue the existence of a potter—its efficient cause. Similarly, the universe being of the nature of an effect, we can infer the existence of its creator. There is then the teleological argument. When we observe a machine consisting of parts well adjusted to one another, we think of an intelligent mechanic. Likewise, the well-
planned scheme of the world comprising the regular rising and setting of the sun and the moon, the regular occurrence of days, nights and seasons etc., indicates that there must be an intelligent creator of the world. According to sarva-siddhānta-saṅgraha, God of Nyāya possesses three attributes—intelligence, volition and activity.¹³ Viśvanātha has ascribed five more, viz. number etc., to Him.

Unlike Nyāya, Rāmānuja holds that God, the abode of myriad of auspicious attributes cannot be proved by arguments. For him, perception and inference are alike inadequate to prove His existence. He, therefore, depends in this matter upon the testimony of the scriptures which declare that God creates, preserves and destroys the universe periodically, dispenses the fruits of actions performed by finite souls, is possessed of a form, and so on.

*Kaṇāda and Rāmānuja*

Kaṇāda has not explicitly mentioned God in his aphorisms. According to Vaiśeṣika commentators, however, his aphorisms 2. 1. 18. and 19 hint at the existence of God.¹⁴ Things in the world have names such as the sun, moon, water and air, which indicates that some one assigned these names to them. But who could do so? The reply of the followers of Kaṇāda is: God gave these names to the objects of the world. It is due to the will of God that in the beginning the atoms of air stirred, and as a result, air was formed and moved in the space. Similarly, the atoms of light, water and earth were set to work by the Divine will to form themselves respectively into light, water and earth. Then the world came into shape and Brahmā was born therein. This view in brief is the view of Praśastapāda, the famous commentator on the Vaiśeṣika-sūtra.

It is thus clear that there is very little material on which we can base our estimate of Kaṇāda’s conception of God. But Rāmānuja has offered us an elaborate account of his own conception of God as the Supreme Personal Being endowed with a form and divine auspicious qualities.

*Patañjali and Rāmānuja*

According to Patañjali, God is a unique omniscient soul, the teacher of the ancients, ever free from five-fold miseries, the two-fold action, its fruit and the vāsanā. The repetition of OM, which is His name, is said to result in the removal of all troubles and the realization of the self. One can succeed in trance through devotion to God.
Patañjali's treatment of God is too inadequate to throw any light on the question of God's relation to the physical universe and the individual souls. God is not even regarded by him as omnipotent, omnipresent creator of the world, nor as the dispenser of the fruits of actions of the living beings. Though endowed with superior qualities, He is simply one of the many souls in the universe. The final aim of yogic practices is not the realization of God. It is, on the other hand, the realization of the self. The yogi is advised to resort to devotion to God for the sake of samādhi. Besides, devotion to God is held by Patañjali to be only one of the five means to this end and that too of a lower order. Patañjali is also silent on the question as to whether God has a form. Both Patañjali and Rāmānuja indeed agree in ascribing personality to God. But the latter's conception of the Divine personality is decidedly fuller and clearer than the former's. Again, both yoga and Viśiṣṭādvaita agree on the admission of the individuality of the finite soul both in the empirical state and the state of emancipation. But the former does not so unambiguously hold as does the latter, that the emancipated soul fully enjoys bliss. Furthermore, the Yoga doctrine of the isolation of the finite soul is too dreary to be acceptable to the human mind, whereas the Viśiṣṭādvaita ideal of bliss in communion with God is most attractive to the religious man.

Vasiṣṭha and Rāmānuja

Both Vasiṣṭha and Rāmānuja admit an all-embracing Reality behind the variety in the world. But they differ in their views regarding that Reality. The former holds that the relation between the one and the many is that of identity, whereas, according to the latter, it is analogous to that relation which subsists between a soul and its body. Again, both differ on many other points some of which are as follows.

According to Vasiṣṭha, it is Brahmā who creates the cosmos, but Rāmānuja holds that it is Brahman that creates the cosmic egg of which Brahmā is the first-born.

Vasiṣṭha maintains that all creation is novel and it is so in the sense that it is not determined by any previous Karma. Rāmānuja, on the other hand, holds that no creation is absolutely novel because the jīvas created by God owe their characteristic peculiarities to their karmas in previous kalpas.

The objective world, according to Vasiṣṭha, is an ideal construction of the mind and so is inseparable from the mind that creates
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it. But Rāmānuja completely differs from such an idealistic view of the world as is evident from his commentary to the Brahma-sūtra 2.2.27.

Vāsiṣṭha regards wish-fulfilment as the cause of dreams, whereas Rāmānuja holds that the cause is nothing but the will of God.

Vāsiṣṭha holds that the objects of common experience as well as we ourselves as individual souls are the contents of the Cosmic Mind. The universe is, as previously seen, the imaginative creation (kalpanā) of Brahmā. But what is of greater importance is that every objective content in the world as created by Cosmic Imagination is, in its turn, a subjective source of further creation of objects and that this process goes on endlessly. The countless contents of the universe have their own objective worlds, and the process of the worlds, as Dr. Atreya explains, goes on ad infinitum. The conception of the world within worlds is an original contribution of Vāsiṣṭha to the thought of Indian Philosophy. Obviously, therefore, no trace of it is found in the philosophy of Rāmānuja.

One must experience pleasure and pain consequent on one’s past actions which have begun to fructify in this life (prārabdha), and a man of devotion or knowledge is no exception to the rule. This is the view of Rāmānuja, shared by Śaṅkara. But Vāsiṣṭha differs from Rāmānuja in that the former holds that prārabdha can be overcome by the strong will of the individual.

Vāsiṣṭha emphasizes that jñāna is the only means to liberation and deprecates bhakhti which, as he declares, suits only those who are ignorant unable to think rightly, to make a right effort and to read the scriptures. Rāmānuja, on the other hand, is a strong advocate of bhakhti which, according to him, results in the soul’s emancipation.

Vāsiṣṭha’s advice is that every man should depend upon none but himself for his salvation, whereas, according to Rāmānuja, dependence on God is the most effective means to emancipation.

The divine form of Viṣṇu (holding Pañcajanya, Sudarśana, Kaumodaki etc., in hands) is the highest (para) aspect of Brahman, according to Rāmānuja, whereas it is but secondary (gaṇa) on the view of Vāsiṣṭha.

According to Vāsiṣṭha, liberation of the individual consists in its loss of individuality and also its absorption in the Absolute. But Rāmānuja holds that it consists in transcending the world of experi-
ence in Ekapād-vibhuti and in attaining communion or fellowship with God in Nitya-vibhuti.\textsuperscript{31}

There is absolutely no doubt that Vasiṣṭha’s views are entirely based upon original thinking, whereas Rāmānuja arrives at all his views through his own interpretation of the scriptures.

\textit{Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja}

According to Śaṅkara, Ultimate Reality has two phases—transcendent (para) and empirical (apara). The former is devoid of all particularities of names and forms which are held to be due to Avidyā, whereas the latter is characterised by these. It is the lower or empirical aspect of Brahman which is called Īśvara. Īśvara has a form made of Śuddha-sattva which in later literature on Advaita is called Māyā.

But Rāmānuja does not admit the two aspects of Brahman. For him Brahman and Īśvara are the same. The Ultimate Reality is both endowed with, and devoid of, attributes. The Nirguṇa Brahman, according to Rāmānuja, is God as devoid of all imperfections. The Sagūṇa Brahman is again God as possessed of divine attributes such as bliss, omniscience, omnipotence as well as the divine form which is ‘śvarūpa-bhūta’.

Both Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja agree in regarding God (Īśvara) as creator of the world and as the dispenser of the fruits of actions performed by individual human beings. Again, both believe in God’s manifestation (avatāra) and image-worship. For Śaṅkara, devotion is an auxiliary means to the attainment of knowledge which alone is the means to salvation in the strictest sense. According to him, devotion itself can lead the soul to Personal God only. For Rāmānuja, however, on the other hand, knowledge is an auxiliary to devotion which leads the soul to God, and helps its realization of God which is the only salvation.

\textit{Casual Deviation—A Bird’s-eye View}

A few facts have already been pointed in various places of this work. They, along with some more, are given below:—

\textit{Dr. A. B. Keith}

He holds that the Vedānta-dīpa, the Vedānta-sāra and the Vedārtha-saṅgraha are Rāmānuja’s independent works.\textsuperscript{32} But the truth is that the Vedānta-dīpa and the Vedānta-sāra are not
Rāmānuja’s independent works. They are commentaries to the Brahma-sūtra.

Dr. L. D. Barnett

He observes that ‘Rāmānuja’s teaching, set forth in his commentaries upon the Bhagavad-gītā, Brahma-sūtra, and several Upaniṣads, as well as in many other works, is commonly called Viśiṣṭadvaitavāda’.33 The statement is partially wrong in view of the fact that Rāmānuja wrote no commentary upon any of the Upaniṣads.

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan

He has stated that “The God in man is like a flash of lightning in the heart of a blue cloud’.34 But what Rāmānuja really means is that the Deity residing in the heart is like a blue cloud encircled by lightning on all sides.

2. Preparations for bhakti viz. viveka etc., according to Radhakrishnan, are eleven in number.35 But the correct view is that they are seven only.

Dr. M. N. Sircar

He observes: “We confess we cannot understand what kind of substance Rāmānuja’s Śuddha-sattva is”.36 But the truth is that Rāmānuja has never discussed the nature of Śuddha-sattva, nor has he mentioned anywhere that God’s form is made of this substance.

Dr. Roma Bose

1. She says: ‘Rāmānuja speaks of three kinds of the non-sentient viz prakṛti or matter, kāla or time, and Śuddha-sattva or pure matter’.37 But the fact is that Rāmānuja does not hold this view. He has nowhere mentioned Śuddha-sattva as separate entity besides matter and time.

2. Further, her statement that ‘there is not a single mention of Rādhā or Kṛṣṇa in Rāmānuja’s works’38 is not correct because Rāmānuja has mentioned Kṛṣṇa in his own works as is evident from his commentary on the Gītā 4. 4.39 and 18. 78.40

3. Equally untenable is her statement that ‘according to Rāmānuja, bhakti......arises from six essential pre-requisites;’41 for Rāmānuja has admitted not six but seven of these essential prerequisites.

Mm Gaurī Śaṅkara Hīrācanda Ojhi

1. While this writer holds that according to Rāmānuja, Brahman is only the efficient cause of the world,42 the truth is that Rāmānuja
himself regarded Brahman as both the efficient and the material cause of the world.

2. It is a mistake to characterise Rāmānuja's system as Bhedabheda or Dvaitādvaita as this author has done, because Rāmānuja's system is, really, Viṣiṣṭādvaita.

3. Nor can Rāmānuja's Śrī-bhāṣya be called, as he calls it, a commentary on the Vedānta-sutra and the Gītā and the Upaniṣads. For his Śrī-bhāṣya is a commentary only to the Vedānta-sutra. His commentary on the Gītā does not come within his Śrī-bhāṣya. And he never wrote any commentary on any of the Upaniṣads.

**Dr. Rāma Kumāra Varmā**

1. The following statement of this writer is not correct: That an aspirant cannot at once realize God's final phase vī. Arcavatārā. As we have already seen, it is not 'Arca' but 'Para' which is, according to Rāmānuja, the final phase of God.

2. His statement that the aspirant eventually realizes the Para and the Vyuha phases of God, residing in his own heart, is not correct. For it is Antaryāmin, and not Para nor Vyuha, that resides in the hearts of the finite souls. Para is God in Vaikuṇṭha and the three forms of Vyuha are respectively related to the universe as its creator, sustainer and destroyer.

**Śrī Śāntanu Vihāri Dvivedi**

That Rāmānuja has mentioned the name of the Bhāgavata and has referred to its 18 thousand stanzas in his Vedārtha-saṅgraha is not correct inasmuch as Rāmānuja has not done so.

**Hindi Šabda Sāgara**

1. The soul is related to God as a ray is related to the sun, according to Rāmānuja. But the relation, both according to Rāmānuja and his followers, is that of body and soul.

2. Similary wrong is the statement that Viṣiṣṭādvaita is also Bhedabheda or Dvaitādvaita. The fact is that the Bhedabheda or the Dvaitādvaita was preached by Nimbārka.

**A Resume of Rāmānuja's Views**

The only unfailing proof of God is scriptural testimony according to which He has certain characteristics. He is not undifferentiated and unqualified consciousness of the Advaita School, but is full of auspicious qualities such as truth, knowledge, bliss, purity and infinity. There is in Him myriad of other supernatural attributes such
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as omnipresence, omnipotence, mercy and grace. Rāmānuja calls his God by the name of Viṣṇu. Other names such as Parama-puruṣa, Nārāyaṇa, Brahman and Vāsudeva are only synonyms of Viṣṇu.

The changes which we observe in the world do not belong to the essential nature of God but to matter which God upholds from within and without as its immanent ruler. God is similarly immanent in each and every individual soul. Immanence is not identity; hence both matter and individual souls are related to God as His ‘Śeṣa’. As one who is immanent in the entire creation, God is called Antaryāmin and Śeṣin.

The universe whose diversity and vastness are bewildering to the human mind is kept under control by an infinitesimal portion of Divine Power. Out of mere sport, He engages Himself in various activities such as creation, preservation and dissolution. As controller of souls, mind and ego, He is called Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha respectively.

Having set the universe at work, God watches the process therein as a looker-on (Śakṣi). At times He appears, out of His own will, in special manifestations such as Rāma and Krṣṇa, to punish the wicked, to reward the pious, and to establish moral order in the universe.

The Divine form is not adventitious or accidental as are the bodies of individual souls—terrestrial or celestial. Nor is it made of matter made up of the three constituents—sattva, rajas and tamas. Nor can it be said to be composed of predominant material sattva (prākr̥ta sattva) as the system of Yoga and the doctrine of Tri-murti would hold, or of exclusive sattva (Śuddha-sattva) as is held by Advaita of Saṅkara. Rāmānuja had not, however, raised, as his followers did, the question as to whether the divine form is inert or non-inert. According to him, it is only super-natural being as essential to, and inherent in, God’s nature as are His attributes such as bliss and consciousness. His form is His eternal, essential manifestation; and Śrī is inseparable from Him. Even the forms assumed by God in various āvatāras are ‘a-prākr̥ta’.

One can realize God through meditation on the true nature of one’s ownself as imperishable, undefinable and indiscernible. Those who belong to the cult of Pañcāgni taught in the Upaniṣads can attain Brahman. But such meditation is really very difficult for those for whom it is difficult to rise above the view of the ātman as identical with the body. The essential nature of the finite soul is hidden from it. The way of deliverance from this state is resigna-
tion of all including the self to the Deity. Such resignation gives the religious aspirant the opportunity to cultivate love of God. All are entitled to love Him. There is no restriction of caste, colour, creed or sex in this matter. The acquisition of knowledge and performance of action as well as the pursuance of the seven expedients —discrimination of purity in food etc.—promote devotion. Rāmānuja attaches greatest importance to the dāśya type of love and holds that service is ‘knowledge of Brahman’ (Brahma-vidyā).

Rāmānuja admits that he has knowingly concealed the details of the doctrine of surrender even in his vast commentary on the Brahma-sūtra. He has, however, disclosed it in the Gadya-traya which is probably his last religio-philosophical work.

Release from worldly life does not bring about the loss of individuality as it does on the Advaita view. It is, in fact, the fullest realization on the part of the individual of God’s immanence in him. The essential nature of the self which was lying latent or partly manifest in him under the influence of action now becomes completely manifest in the state of emancipation. It is not ‘isolation’ in the sense of Kapila or Patañjali, which consists in the maintenance of individuality without the enjoyment of bliss. Nor is it a state of mere cessation of pain as admitted by Gotama and Kaṇāda. The apavarga of the former or the mokṣa of the latter makes no room for consciousness in the state of emancipation; hence either has been aptly described as a condition resembling a pebble. Śrihariṇa has humorously dubbed Gotama as a simpleton on the ground that the latter conceives of salvation as an intelligent person’s becoming stony or stupefied. For Rāmānuja, release consists in the realization of God and so is a state where action has no sway, knowledge knows no bounds and bliss of devotional communion with God is positive and perpetual.
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Abhigamana, 189, 190.
Absolute, 119, 120, 239.
Acintya-bhedabheda, 27.
Action-organs, 42.
Action, theory of, 55, 57, 58.
Advaita, 9, 25, 40, 45, 56, 57, 76,
77, 97, 114, 210, 213, 214,
233.
Ahaṅkāra, 64; sāttvika, 135.
Aitareya, 15, 112.
Aksara, 64.
Aksara-vidyā, 99.
Andhrapūrṇa, disciple of Rāma-
nuja, 7.
Antarāditya-vidyā, 101.
Antaryāmi-vidyā, 100.
Aprthak-siddhi, 66, 121.
Arātus, a poet, 95.
Arcis & Arcirādī, 213.
Atomic theory, 44.
Aurṇavābha, 87.
Avatāra, 151, 153, 155, 157.
Avidyā, 97, 137.
Ayyakta (prakṛti), 64.
Āgama, 19; prāmāṇya, 20, 21.
Anandamaya-vidyā, 99.
Alvars, writings of, 20.
Atman, 67.
Ātreyā, Dr. B. L., 239.

Bādarāyana, 49, 169, 213, 215,
219.
Barua, Dr. B., 88.
Being—supreme, 17; absolutely
real, 30.
Bhaga, 96, 128.
Bhagavadārādhana-krama, 21.
Bhagavān, 96.
Bhāgavata, 190, 198, 199, 214.
Bhakti—cult of, 168-192; dāśya
173; form of, 201, 203.
Maryādā, 170, 171; Nirguṇa,
173; Para, 176; Parama, 176.
Pūṣṭi, 170; rāṣṭrayāna, 172;
Universality of, 177.

Bhaktisūra, 20.
Bharadwaj, Dr. R. 37.
Bhāṣa-parichcheda, 26.
Bhāṣāra, 80.
Bhāṣyakāra, title of, 6.
Bhāṭṭa, Parāśara, 7.
Bhedabheda, 81.
Bhoja, 169.
Bhūma-vidyā, 100.
Bhūtapuri, modern Sripurumbu-
dur, 1.
Bhūtas (Śiva’s angles), 2, 5.
Bhutayogi, 20.
Biṣṇūdeva, 7.
Bodhisattva, 6.
Body, (subtle), 214.
Brahmā, 17, 43, 97, 98.
Brahma-loka, 66, 220, 221;
samsara, 214.
Brahman, 57, 76, 77, 80, 81, 82,
98—apara, 114; all pervading,
211; higher and lower, 114;
is alone real, 29, 30; its em-
pirical aspect, 9; nirguṇa, 9,
216, 217; para, 43, 114;
saguṇa, 217; un-manifest,
163.
Brahmasamajists, 234.
Brahmasūtra, 6, 42, 57, 118, 125,
134, 213, 215, 239.
Bṛhadāranyakā, 42, 109, 164, 172.

Caitanya, Śrikuṇḍa, 12.
Cārvaka, 233.
Catagories, ontological, 63-71.
Catus-ślokī, 21.
Chāndogya, 16, 35, 65, 67, 118,
186, 212, 222.
Christianity, 234.
Cognition—attribute of the soul,
27; is real, 31.
Communion, 85—doctrine of,
102; divine, 209, 216.
Comparison, source of right
knowledge, 32.
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Consciousness, 66, 78, 118, 120, 124.
Cosmology, 40-50. according to
advaita, 46; according to
sāṅkhya, 47; according to
vīśistādvaita, 48.

Dahara-vidyā, 100.
Dāśarathi, 5.
Dasgupta, S., 236.
Datar-Ahura-Mazda, 234.
Dayānanda, 234.
Deity, 192, 214, 221, 244.—
Colour, 141; in Rgveda, 142;
personal beauty, 140.
Devotees—types of, 209.
Devotion, 56; phases, 178; men
of, 20, 186; seven means of,
186-188; stages, 171; auxili-
liaries to, 175.
Dhruva, 152.
Dirghatāmā Aucathya, 14.
Dream, māyā, 29; phenomena
of, 30; kinds, 30.
Durvāśa, 223.
Duty, performance of, 235.

Ego, 121, 163.
Emanation, 70.
Emancipation, 236.
Epistemology, 26-35.
Evolution, process of, 42.

Fallacy, 31-32.
Food, discrimination of, 186.

Gadya-traya, Śrīraṅga, Vaiṣṇa
va and Sāranāgati, 6,200.
Gaurāṅga Mahāprabhu, 11.
Gaya, 88.
Gaya-sīrās, 87, 88.
Gāyātri—refers to God as Creator,
40; in Vedas, 233.
Gītā, 15, 179, 187, 198, 199, 200,
201, 210, 224.
Gītārthasāṅgraha, 21.
God, 56, 63, 65, 70, 77, 85, 99,
100, 101, 102, 109, 114, 118,
187, 192, 201, 216, 240;
adjunct to, 109; aniruddha,
161; attainability, 127; causal
and effectual states, 108; in
christianity, 234; Conscious,
188; efficient and material
cause of the world, 41; em-
pirical status, 98 grace of,
204; grandeur (vibhūti), 30;
in Islam, 234; meditation of,
186; modes of, 41; multipli-
city denied, 79; nature of, 76,
102; nirguṇa, 9, 78, 119;
Omnipotent, 125; Omnipresent,
125; personal, 215; phases
of, 70, 92; Pradyumna, 161;
realization of, 202; resigna-
tion to, 199; saguna, 79, 119;
saviour, 202; in Sikhism,
234; sport (Līlā), 10; super-
natural, 137, 156; supreme
person, 30, 112, 233; surren-
der to, 203; United within
himself the animate and the
inanimate beings, 41; Viṣṇu,
86; Will of, 44;—and the
world, 108-114; Worship of,
59; in Zoroastrianism, 234;

Godā, 20.
Gopēśa, 93.
Gopinath Rao, T.A., 190.
Gōṣṭhipūraṇa, 5.
Goswami, Dr. B. K., 92, 93, 96,
Rupa, 190.
Gotama, 26, 236, 244.
Govinda, 3.
Govinda-dāsa, 5.

Harita, 2.
Henotheism, 85.
Hercules, 94, 95.
Hindi Śābda Sāgara, 242.
Hinduism, 192.
Hiranyagarbha, 97.
Identity-attribute, 134;—form,
134, 135.
Iṣya or service, 189, 190.
Image-worship, 190, 192.
Immanent, 70, 71.
Incarnation, 70.
Indra, 86, 90, 91.
Inference—deductive, 31; in-
ductive, 31; five premises, 31.
Initiation, 188.
Islam, 234.
Isa Upanishad, 134.
Iswara—Creator, 40, 63, 96, 97, 114, 119, 212, 216.

Jaimini, 58, 123.
Jijäasu, 210, 217, 218.
Jaina 57, 239; Yoga, 57; Kanda, 87; para, 176.
Jaina, 217.
Jñapti, 78.

Kaisora, 142.
Kaivalya, 217, 236.
Kala, 199.
Kalpa, 17, 64, 65.
Kalyana, 187.
Kanda, 26; view, 45, 237, 244.
Kancipurna, 3.
Kapila, 19, 233, 244.
Karma, 88; influence of, 153; Kanda, 27; Yoga, 57.

Katha Upanisad, 13, 177, 204.
Kausitaki, 91, 213, 215, 221.
Kaustubha, 214.
Keith, A.B., 240.

Kesava Bhаратi; 8th in succession of Ramana, 12.
Kesava Ujjanika—Ramanuja’s father, 2.
Khyati—Wife of Bhrgu, and mother of Lakshmi or Sri, 94.
Knowledge, 57, 58, 78, 80, 210; means of, 26; sources of, 26; organs of, 41.

Kolahala—mount, 87.
Krimikantha. (Kulottunga I.C. 1070-1118 A.D.), 7.

Krsna, Charioteer and guide of Arjuna, 16; incarnation of Visnu, 92; as Paramatman, 114.
Kusaekhara, 20.
Kuresa, sister’s son of Ramana, 5; disciple of Ramana 6; 126.

Lakshmi, 143, 144, 214.
Life, three ends of, 209.

Lila, 85, 214.
Lokacarya, 138, 144, 236.

Macdonell, 90.
Madhava 188.
Madhu-vidya, 100.
Madhu Sudana Sarasvati, 172.
Madhura Kavi, 20.
Mahabharta, 15, 16, 113; contains Anu-Gita and Visnu-sahasranama, 16; Santiparva, 16.
Maharanayaopanisat, 109.
Mahapuruṣa-nirguna, 21.
Mahavira, 233.
Mahyog, 20.
Mahopanisad, 19.
Manu-smriti, 16, 113.

Matter (Prakriti), 64.
Meyution, 64, 97, 114, 153.
Meditation, 191.

Milton, 219.

Mind, 42, 163; auxiliary to knowledge, 42; (i) buddhi when it decides, 42; (ii) ahankara when it misconceives, 42; (iii) citta when it thinks, 42; concentration of, 187; cosmic, 49; disease of, 199; purity of, 186.

Mudgala, 223, 224.

Munacaka upanisad 118.
Munivahana, 20.

Narada, 98, 164; bhakti sutra, 178.

Narayana, 15, 86, 98, 113.
Narayana upanisad 15, 113.
Nasadiya-Sukta, 40.
Nahamuni, 5; compiled Prabandham, 20.

Nscience, 79, 199.
Nimbarka, 170.

Nirguna, 78, 119; Brahman 9; Nirakara, 233.

Nirukta, 219.
Nitya-vibhuti, 160, 240.
Noss, J. B., 234.
Nyaya-vaisheshika, 121, 122.
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Om, 237.
Omniscient, 120, 121, 122, 135.

Pañcakalika, 189.
Pañcaratras, 17-20, 33, 110, 114, 164, 188; also called ekāyana veda; termed as Mahopaniṣad, 19; deals with philosophical theory, meditation, temple architecture etc. 19; contains reference to seven Pañcaratras 19; divided into three sections, 20; samhitās are canonical and 108 in number, 19; interpretation, 18-19; raksā, 20, 189, sāttvata, 96.
Para, 66, 215; ārdha, 66; śthāna.
Parāk, 66.
Parākāla, 20.
Paranāma, 88, 220.
Paratā, kūreśa's son, 7.
Pārtha-sūrathī, 2.
Parikṣt, 171.
Paryanka-vidyā, 102.
Patañjali, 26, 191, 169, 237, 238.
Perception—determinate and indeterminate (savikalpa and nirvikalpa), 27; direct (anubhava), 29; interpretation of, 28-29.
Pillān, 7.
Pitrloka—attainment of, 56.
Prabhandham, 20.
Prabhadra, 98.
Prājapatī—author of 'Nāsadiya-Sūkta, 40, 213.
Prakṛti (matter), 40, 64.
Pratidhāna, 169.
Prapanna, 204.
Prapatti, 201, 202, 203; ārta, 203; drpta, 203; six accessories of, 204.
Prasāda, 204.
Prasāna-upaniṣad, 220.
Pratyak, 66.
Presumption— independent means of knowledge, 32.
Pundarikākṣa, 5, 140.
Prāṇas, 16, 110; eighteen in number, 5, 118; Padma-Prāṇa,

213; Śiva-prāṇa, 96; Vāyu, prāṇa 87; Viṣṇu-Prāṇa, 5, 118.

Purāṇa—pupil of Yāmunā-cārya, 4, 5.
Puruṣa, 70, 86, 92, 112, 113; Changeless, 56; Creator of Universe, 40; Nārāyaṇa, 113; name of Viṣṇu, 14; vara, 112.
Puruṣa-medha, 18.
Puruṣa-sūkta, 15, 18, 89, 92, 113.
Puruṣottama, 112, 137.

Quintuplication, 29, 43, 44.

Radhakrishnan, Dr. S., 188, 241.
Raghava Rau, G.V.L., 94.
Raidāsa—Disciple of Rāmānanda, II.
Rāmānanda—follower of Viṣṇu-dvaita, 11.
Rāmānuja, Ācārya—Date of birth, 3; devotional philosophy and sources, 4-21; existence of God proved through verbal testimony also, 34; iconolator, 191; independent works, 21; influence of his philosophy, II; pratyākṣa and anumāna—Sruti and Śmrīti, 34; reconciliation of doctrines of Upaniṣad, 11; religious teacher, 9-12; Śāṅkhya view contrasted, 49, 98, 210, 211, 215.
Rāmāyaṇa, 15, 16, 111; of Tulasidāsa, 192.
Reality, ultimate, 26, 35.
Recognition (pratyabhijña), 29.
Recollection (smṛti), 19.
Renunciation, 58.
Rgveda, 49, 88, 89, 92, 112, 192, 204.
Romaharsana, 16.
Rudra, 98.
Rukmini, 143.
Rupa Gosvāmi, 142.
Rūpamandana, 190.

Salvation, 55, 57, 175, 215, 216, 217, 235.
Samavāya, 121.
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Samārohana, 87, 88.
Samhitā, 19, 92; Ahirbudhnya 202; Bṛhadāranyaka 176, 189; Īśvara 20; Jayākhyā 20, 111, 143, 144, 189; Maitrāyanī 216; Padma 20; Pārameśvara 20; Pauskarā 20; Pṛṇa 16; Sāttvata, 20.
Sampat-Kumāra (image of Viṣṇu), 7.
Sāṅghya, 43, 121, 213, 214.
Sarvagocāra, 20.
Sat-khyāti, 29.
Sattva, 64, 119.
Satya-loka, 56.
Śāyujya, 216, 217.
Self, 67, 68, 78, 203, 211.
Sense-organs, 27.
Siddhi-traya, 20.
Sikhism, 234.
Soul, 42, 56, 63, 69, 125, 163, 213, 218, 220, 222.
Sport (līlā), 50.
Sotrā-ratna, 21.
Subāla-upaniṣad, 15.
Sumajjāni, 89, 94.
Sun-theory (a review of), 87.
Śambhara, 91.
Śaṅlapūraṇa, 3.
Śaṅkatāyana, 34.
Ṣaligrāma (myssore) 7.
Ṣandilya, 164; Ś-Vidyā, 101.
Ṣākāra, 97, 114, 119, 179, 210, 211, 216, 232, 239, 240, 243.
Śaṅkāgati-vidyā, 199, 201.
Satapatha, 16.
Satāhakopa, 5, 7, 20.
Suddha-sattva, 97, 136, 137, 138, 139.
Śipla-viṣṇu, 112.
Śiva (worship of), 209.
Śrī, 24, 141, 142, 143; and Lakṣmi, 113, 144; perversion of 235; Spouse of Viṣṇu, 92.
Śrī-bhāgavata 6, 17, 21, 113, 154.
Śrī-harsa, 244.
Śrī-nivūsa-dāsa, 33, 135, 218.
Śrī-rangam, 5.
Śrī-sukta, 209.
Śrī-vatsa, 214.
Śvetāsvatara upaniṣad, 200, 204.
Taittirīya, 40, 110, 112.
Tamas, 64.
Tātparya-Candrika, 109.
Tattva-traya, 135.
Tattva-mukta-kālāpa, 216.
Tengalais, 203.
Testimony, Verbal(sabda)—third means of knowledge, 32, 33, 34.
Time (divisions of), 65.
Tirupati, 6.
Tiruvomoli, 7.
Trimūrti, 96, 97.
Triplication (trivṛt-kāraṇa), 43.

Udyat (samārohana), 88.
Uma, 209.
Upakosa-vidyā, 100.
Uṣasti (a theologian), 58.

Vadagalai, 214, 217, 234, 235.
Vaikunṭha, 85, 218, 221.
Vaiśeṣika system, 215.
Vaiṣṇavism, 15, 114, 139, 142, 156, 188, 191.
Vālmiki, 221.
Vāmadeva, 192.
Varadarāja, 191.
Vaṣiṣṭha, 19, 179, 238, 239.
Vaṣiṣṭha Taittirīvaruṇi, 14.
Vāsudeva, 111, 113, 114, 163, 215—Sāstrī, 42.
Vedānta, 9, 26, 40, 111, 119, 204.
Vedānt-dīpa, 6.
Vedānt-Sāra, 6.
Vedārtha-saṃgraha, 6, 21, 134.
Vedas, 86, 110, 113—Athravaveda, 16, 192; Rgveda, 65, 86; Sāmaveda, 15; Yajurveda, 14, 40, 65, 113; (Black) 15; Contents of three-fold (i) hymns (Mantras) (ii) explanations (arthavāda) (iii) injunctions (vidhi), 33; Mantra portion of the, 14-15.
Veda-vyāsa, 91.
Venkaṭanaṭha, 98, 139, 143, 189, 218.
Venkaṭesa, 191.
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Vibhiṣana, 202.
Vikrama Cola, 7.
Viraja, (river), 213.
Viṣiṣṭādvaisha, 10, 11, 28, 29, 30, 45, 65, 110, 114, 121, 214, 234.
Viṣṇu—according to Śaṅkara, 156; Avatāra, 157; Consorts—Śri and Lakṣmī; “Created and supported the whole Universe” Dirghatamā, 14; Cult, 97; idol of, 7, 190: Indra’s friend, 93; Murties of, 190; pervades the whole Universe, 14; pervading God, 93; Pūrṇa another name, 14; Self of selves, 98; strides (three) of, 88; supremacy of, 17; supreme deity, 2, 93, 98; synonyms of, 86; Vibhūti of, 97; worship of, 21.
Viṣṇucītta, 20.
Viṣṇu-Sahasanāma, 7, 16.
Viśvanātha, 26, 237.

Vrajapati, 92, 93.
Vṛṣa-śīpa, 91.
Vṛttra, 90, 91.
Vyaśa (Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Veda-vyāsa), 16, 169.
Vyūha, 160, 162.

Worship (five-time), 189.

Yādava, 80.
Yādava Prakāśa, 3, 4, 5.
Yajñātmukti—adversary of Rāma-nuja, 6.
Yāmunācārya, 20, 21, 203.
Yaska, 34, 88, 90, 219.
Yati-dharma-samuccaya, 5.
Yatindra-mata-dipika, 42, 188.
Yoga, 153, 177, 189, 191.
Yoga-māya, 153.
Yoga-Paryanka, 221.
Yoga-Vasiṣṭha, 30, 43, 179.

Zoroastrianism, 234.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>सन्दर्भमें-प्रत्येकः।</td>
<td>सन्दर्भमें-प्रत्येकः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>While</td>
<td>While</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>infinite</td>
<td>infinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ब्रह्मव</td>
<td>ब्रह्मव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ond</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>शीतामः</td>
<td>शीतामः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>हाथमाने</td>
<td>हाथमाने</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ताक्षयं</td>
<td>ताक्षयं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Conjeeverum</td>
<td>Conjeeverum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>तद्रुच्या</td>
<td>तद्रुच्या</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ond</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>its</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>habds</td>
<td>hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>succession</td>
<td>succession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>सितम्य</td>
<td>सितम्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>प्रबुद्धमु</td>
<td>प्रबुद्धमु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>प्राणात्मके</td>
<td>प्राणात्मके</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>सत्त्वसादिका</td>
<td>सत्त्वसादिका</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>relatton</td>
<td>relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>श्रन्तकस्य</td>
<td>श्रन्तकस्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>यथो</td>
<td>यथो</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>चेतनेन्द्र</td>
<td>चेतनेन्द्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Macdonall</td>
<td>Macdonell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>abides</td>
<td>abides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>mediate</td>
<td>meditate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>पिङ्ङ</td>
<td>पिङ्ङ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>लक्ष्यमा</td>
<td>लक्ष्यमा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>द्वारा</td>
<td>द्वारा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>सुप्रित्ति</td>
<td>सुप्रित्ति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>furnance</td>
<td>furnace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>as old as old</td>
<td>as old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Simha</td>
<td>Simha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>alteted</td>
<td>altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>बररीठु</td>
<td>पररीठु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Him</td>
<td>Him'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>nevsr</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>thd</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>affliction</td>
<td>affliction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>possess</td>
<td>possesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nārāyaṇa</td>
<td>Nārāyaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>वार्द</td>
<td>वार्द</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>व्याघुतस्य</td>
<td>व्याघुतस्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>प्रतिविध</td>
<td>प्रतिविध</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Here</td>
<td>Hers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>cnn</td>
<td>can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>श्री:</td>
<td>श्री:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>पुराणम</td>
<td>पुराणम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>heavenly</td>
<td>heavenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>interesting</td>
<td>interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>af</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>supports</td>
<td>supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>उभय क्रमित</td>
<td>उभय परिक्रमित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>तत्त</td>
<td>तत्त</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>couch</td>
<td>conch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>destitude</td>
<td>destitute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>सर्वथः</td>
<td>सर्वथः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>सबीन</td>
<td>सबीन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>धर्मांशच</td>
<td>धर्मांशच</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>21, 27</td>
<td>wordly</td>
<td>worldly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>3, 6, 7</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>enternal</td>
<td>eternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>सामायवित्तेक्षन</td>
<td>सामायवित्तेक्षन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>हेरोमरमवति</td>
<td>हेरोमरमवति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>स्तीस्येंन</td>
<td>स्तीस्येंन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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