

# SWAMY DESIKAN'S VIRODHA PARIHARAM



**ANNOTATED COMMENTARY IN ENGLISH BY:**

**SRIMATHY SAROJA RAMANUJAM AND**

**OPPILIAPPAN KOIL SRI VARADACHARI SATHAKOPAN**



sadagopan.org





## CONTENTS

Introduction: Sri V. Sadagopan	1
Moolamanthraadhikaaram: Smt Saroja Ramanujam	5
Dhvayaadhikaaram: Sri V. Sadagopan	56
Charamaslokadhikaram: Sri V. Sadagopan	62
Nigamanam	70





sadagopan.org





॥ श्रीः ॥

॥ श्रीमते रामानुजाय नमः ॥

॥ श्रीमते निगमान्त महादेशिकाय नमः ॥

## VIRODHA PARIHARAM

### INTRODUCTION

SrimAn VenkatanAthArya: kavithArkika kEsarI

VedhanthAcharya VaryOmE SannidhatthAm sadhA Hrudhi

RaamAnuja DayApAthram Jn~Ana VairAgya BhUshaNam

Srimadh VenkatanAthAryam VandhE VedhAnthA Desikam

Enormous and magnificent indeed are the granthams that Swami Desikan blessed us with for our ujevanam (uplift and salvation). They arose from him as Ubhaya VedAntham, PrakaraNa granthams, SthOthrams, Rahasya granthams, Kaavyams, Naatakam, Tamizh Prabhandhams, VyAkyAnams, Vaadha Granthams, RakshA Granthams and anushtAna granthams. His great upakAram to us flowed forth in four forms: Works in chaste Sanskrit, Sundara Tamizh, Sweet PrAkrutham and the MaNipravALam “language” used first by Thirukkuruhaip PirAn in his 6000 Pati. Swami Desikan’s power of Jn~Anam Pravachana sakthi, anushtAna srEyas and debating skills are a direct result of the anugraham of Sri Hayagreeva BhagavAn.

In his ninth & final decade of life, after a rich life involved in grantha nirmANam, Sri Bhagavadh RaamAnuja SiddhAnthA Pravachanam and Para matha Kantanam, Swami Desikan had a concern. He felt that he has left some thing undone. This concern related to the creation of an all-encompassing grantham that dealt with:

1. a lucid explanation of Tattva-Hitha –PurushArthams at one site
2. a detailed exposition there on the richness of the meanings of the three rahasyams dear to Sri VaishNavAs
3. a grantham that incorporated all the hithOpadesams for the chEthanAs in MaNipravALam format.

With the blessings of his AchaaryAs and Sri Hayagreevan arose the magnificent and incomparable grantham of SRIMADH RAHASYA THRAYA SAARAM (RTS). In its 32 chapters, the three TattvAs, the Three RahasyAs, the Artha PanchakA and Prapatthi are discussed. Today, it is one of the four granthams (Grantha chathushtayam) that Sri VaishNavAs have to learn thru KalakshEpan under their AchAryAs besides Sri Bhaashyam, GitA Bhaashyam of AchArya RaamAnuja and the Bhagavad Vishayam by KurkkEsA.

After completing this magnum opus of RTS, Swami went one step further out of his great





compassion for aRivilis (ignoramus) like us and created his final grantham in his very last years of his life on earth.

This very last grantham given to us as Kula dhanam by Swami Desikan is “VIRODHA PARIHAARAM”. This is the grantham that clears the lingering doubts of a Mumukshu (one who desires Moksham thru an understanding and practice of the three Rahasyams) Swami Desikan achieved his goal through a list of 108 Questions and answers based on PramANa Vaakhyams. It is also written in MaNi pravALam, a mixture of Sanskrit and TamiL.

VirOdha ParihAram has the following four chapters:

- (1) Moola ManthAdhikAram
- (2) DhvayAdhikAram
- (3) Charama sLOkAdhikAram and
- (4) NigamanAdhikAram.

Dr. Saroja Ramanujam will cover the Moola MantrAdhikAram and adiyEn will cover the rest (DhvyA, Charama and Nigamana adhikArAm).

There are a total of 108 doubts that Swami Desikan anticipates from the Mumukshu and answers them one by one under the headings of the above four chapters. The largest number of doubts that he answers, Eighty, pertain to Mula Manthram; the number of doubts addressed in the Dhvaya, Sarama and Nigamana adhikArAm are Ten, Ten and Eight respectively adding up to the grand total of 108 doubts and corresponding answers to those doubts.

Swami Desikan’s VirOdha ParihAra Grantham was translated and annotated by Oppiliappan Koil Navaneetham SrirAma DesikAcchAr Swamy, my manaseeka AchArya. Back in 1995, Prakrutham Poundareekapuram Andavan brought out a new edition of this grantham commented by Navaneetham Swami, which had been out of print for a while.

Both of us will be following this recent edition of VirOdha ParihAram. May Swami Desikan’s and his UpAsanA murthy’s blessings be with us as we engage in studying together the most magnificent rahasya grantham conceived as a sequel to Srimadh Rahasya Traya Saaram and try to prepare it for SamarpaNam for the avyaya samvathsara Thirunakshathrams of the Prakrutham Jeeyar of AhObila Mutt, Sri NarAyaNa Yatheendhra MahA Desikan, whose SathAbhishEka MahOthsavam will be celebrated at Srirangam on November 30, 2006.

## **MANGALA SLOKAMS IN SANSKRIT AND TAMIL FOR VIRODHA PARIHARAM SLOKAM 1**

**Sriman NaarayaNa: Swaami SaraNya: SarvadEhinAm**

**bhUyAnn nijapadha prApthi VirOdhi vinivAraka:**

(Meaning): May Sriman NaarAyaNan, who is the protector of all Janthus and who is the Master of all the Jeevans chase away all the obstacles and enemies in your efforts to reach His aasthAnam, Sri Vaikuntam.







### SLOKAM 2

udhitham bhavatha: pAyAth OushadhAdhri sameepatha:

Oushadham chEthasA sEvyam apuna: sthanya paayinAm

(Meaning): Our Lord Hayagreevan appeared near the Hill of Medicinal plants (Oushadha Giri) at Thiruvahendrapuram and He is the Oushadham (Medicine) for those, who want to be cured of the afflictions of SamsAram. May that Lord, who is the nectar for dhyAnam by the mind, protect you all, who wish not to drink again mother's milk (not to be born again in this earth). ApunarArvruthti is hinted here. The very last Brahma sUthram asserts: AnAvrutthi SabdhAth, AnAvrutthi SabdhAth {There is no return (for these released souls) because the scriptures say so}. That is what Swami Desikan is requesting the Lord as a boon for us.

### SLOKAM 3:

prapadhanamayE vidhyAbhEdhE prathishtitha chEthasa:

prathipadhamiha praj~yA dhAyam disanthu dayA dhanA:

Sataripu sukha vyAsa prAchEsAdhi nibhandhana

sramapariNatha suddhA-suddhAsayA mama DesikA:

Meaning: May our AchAryAs, who are profoundly conversant with the different aspects of Prapatthi Vidhyai serving as the means for Moksham, who have the sraddhA (faith and deep trust) in Prapatthi arising from their tireless study and clear understanding of the granthams of NammAzhwAr, Sukhar, VyAsar and VaalmIki, who have the purest of hearts brimming with compassion for us as their wealth, May those revered AchAryAs of ours bless every word of this grantham, VirOdhi ParihAram with the wealth of true knowledge (Jn~Ana Sampath).

The Rahasya Grantham, VirOdha ParihAram contains the 108 potential doubts that might arise and Swamy Desikan's responses to clear these doubts. VirOdha ParihAram is the Rahasya grantham created by Swamy Desikan after he completed his magnum opus, Rahasya Thraya Saaram out of compassion for us.

Swamy Desikan's VirOdha PrihAram is considered as His Swan Song. This was written to help us, who might have still unresolved doubts about the tatthvams covered in Srimad Rahasya Thraya Saaram.

Swamy Desikan's precocious son and AchAryA in his own right wrote a Sanskrit commentary about VirOdha ParihAram by his illustrious father and AchAryan. By the way, KumAra VaradAchAran (1316-1401 C. E) has commented on many SrI sookthis of his father (avidhya KaNDana, AasrayAnupatthi, Tatthva Traya chuLakArtha Sangraham, VirOdaparihAra ).

Swamy Desikan answers 80 doubts that might arise from improper understanding of Moola Manthram, 10 doubts that might plague one about Dhvayam and 10 more doubts associated



with the Charama SIOkam and 8 more doubts linked to NigamanaadhikAram.

The first Question/doubt for which Swamy Desikan gives the answer is: How does EmperumAn, who watches the troubles of the Jeevan can be called Sarvarakshakan (protector of All)?

The seventh Question is: How can you call animals and plants as the Daasans of EmperumAn? How do you explain that?

The 37th question for which Swamy Desikan gives His answer is: “Is there a specific time limit to Bhagavath Kaimkaryams or can they be performed at any time we choose?”

The 38th doubt is about: If the AchAryan makes a mistake, what should the Sishyan do?

The 47th doubt raised and answered is: Is it the AathmA or SarIram that experiences pleasures and pains?

The 67th Doubt removed with the brilliant answer is: What is the parama PurushArtham for a liberated soul in SrIvaikuntam? Is it Bhagavath anubhavam or Bhagavath Kaimkaryam?

The 68th doubt is: Is Parama Padha prApthi and VishNuLOka PrApthi one and the same?

The 76th doubt is: Moksham is described both as anishta nivrutthi and Ishta prApthi? How can this be reconciled? (Anishta Nivrutthi is the removal of inauspiciousness; Ishta prApthi is the gaining of what one seeks as auspicious).

In his 102nd question Swamy Desikan asks and answers why each of the three rahasyams essential?

The final doubt (108th) addressed is: How can one clear one’s doubts further about the three rahasyams? Just a sampling to demo the scope of the doubts, which Swamy Desikan anticipates that a student of Rahasya Thrayams might have, is provided here.

Srimadh VenkatanAthArya nandhanAn PraNamAmyaham

SeshasAyI padhAmbhOja sEshathva jn~Ana nirmalAn

Swami Desikan ThiruvadigaLE SaraNam,

DaasOham, Oppiliappan Koil VaradAchAri SadagOpan



## VIRODHAPARIHARA

This work of Desika is for the sake of the aspirant who wishes to clarify the doubts regarding the real purport of the three Rahasyas, namely, Moolamanthra, dvayamanthra and the charamasloka.

The three principles of visishtadvaita, thathva, hitha and purushartha are the essential requisites for an aspirant of knowledge that lead him to salvation.

1. Thathva -is the knowledge of the three reals, namely, jeeva, the sentient, jagath, the insentient and Isvara, Narayana, the Brahman of Visishtadvaita.
2. Hitha-the means of realisation, that is, bhakthi and prapatthi.
3. PurushArtha- the goal to be attained, moksha.

To the one who strives to understand the above through the means of knowledge, perception, inference and scriptural testimony, there is bound to be certain doubts due to the profoundness of the subject and the limitation of the human intellect. Unless these doubts are cleared the knowledge will not arise and the one without knowledge is like an animal says Desika, 'mumukshooNAm avasyajnAthavyEshu arTHEshu pratheeyamAnAnAm virODHANAm aprasamanE "jnAnEna heenah pasubhissamAnah"ithyavasTHA bhavEth. '

Desika further says that when it appears to an uninitiated student that there are contradictions in the scriptural statements it has to be clarified because if, only those which agree with one's own view point is accepted by rejecting others, it will land us in advaita and accepting both kinds of texts will result in bhedhabhedha philosophy while rejecting them because they seem to be self contradictory, is tantamount to accepting the views of those outside the pale of the vedas like buddhists and the like. So the Acharyas proceed to clarify the doubts that may arise in the mind of the aspirants and first the Moolamanthra is taken up for discussion.

Desika says the ashtakshara mantra is sArathamam, the essence of vedas with their angas, 'thrayO vEdhAh shadangAni cchandhAmsi viviDhAh svarAh;, sarvam ashtAntharAnthasTHam yaschAnyAdhapi vAngmayaam, ' (Naradheeya kalpa-1-9), and therefore the doubts that may arise regarding the moolamanthra are only like a piece of grass that is found in drinking water which can be easily discarded before drinking.

### MOOLMANTHRADHIKARAM

1. anAdhikAIAnuvrttha samsAra duhkhasahithAn kshEthrajnAn sarvajnathvAdhiguNasambhavEapi anuddharan Isvarah sarvarakshakah ithi vyavahArah kaTham ghatathE?

When the Lord is not redeeming the jivas who suffer in the samsara inspite of their real nature being all knowledge etc. how can He be called sarvarakshaka, protector of all?



The answer is given by Desika:



“Svami Desikan just starting from Thuppul Sannidhi”

sadagopan.org

svaropasya svabhAvasya niyamEnaiva rakshaNATH  
anishtavAraNAdhEscha yOGythvAth nithyrakshakah.

He is indeed sarvarakshaka, protector of all, because of His protection of the essential nature of all souls by rule and His removal of the suffering as far as the individual soul deserves.

There are two kinds of protection by the Lord.

(i) sarvavishayasatthAdhirakshaNaroopamEkam nithyrakshakathvam.

The protection of the very existence, satthA, the essential nature of the individual self. Just because He extends His protection to the essential nature and existence the released to soul is able to regain its natural state on attaining moksha.

(ii) samsArivishayE api anishtanivAraNAdhi rupam kAdhachitkam.

The protection from suffering of the jiva in the state of samsara only when asked for. In fact the jivas are experiencing dukkha due to their karma and making them exhaust their karma by experiencing it, is also a kind of protection and when the jiva approaches Him with bhakthi or





prapatthi the Lord will redeem the jiva through His grace. Thus His protection from suffering is yathkinchithvyAjasApEksham, depends on the effort on the part of the jiva. So in all ways He is the sarvarakshaka.

2. paragatha-athisaya-ADHAna icchayA-upAdhEyathvam Eva yasya svarupam sa seshah, parah seshee ithi sribhAshyakArAh niraNaishuh; thaTHA cha sathi bhagavathah svathassiddhAthisayathvatm kaTHam upapadhyathE?

The Lord has been denoted as seshee and everything else both permanent and impermanent as sesha to Him, by Sri Ramanuja. This means that the sentient and insentient beings are dependent on Him and exist for His use and enjoyment and controlled by Him. So if all beings exist for His use and enjoyment, how can He be called svathssiddhAthisaya, one who possesses wonderful and natural glory, not relying on anything else to add to His eminence, is the question.

Desika gives the answer to this as

svathO athisayithasyApi jnANAdhyaih nikhilaih guNaih  
yuktham guNa vibhoothyAdhEh api sarvAthisAyitha.

When one who has natural beauty wears ornaments it not only enhances the beauty but even the ornaments are made beautiful by his wearing them. The Lord who is naturally endowed with jnAna, Anandha etc. , His seshithva, AdhEyathva and other qualities in connection with the universe, which is His sesha, only enhances His glory is like that of a gem which is invaluable, is enhanced by its lustre, while its value is natural to it and not due to its lustre. 'svayAdheepthyA ratnam bhavadhapi mahArgham na viguNam na kunTasvAthanthryam bhavathi cha na cha anyAhithaguNam' (sri guNa. 31) Moreover the sentient and the insentient, permanent or impermanent, form part of the glory of the Lord by the very reason that they owe their existence to Him.

3. Nanu Ekasyaive sarvaseshithvam sasthrathah prathipAdhyathE;aTHah kaTHam ubhayAdhishTAnathvAm Ekam seshithvam ithi?

The sasthra declares that the Lord is the seshi to everything other than Himself. If so, how can the divine couple, the Lord and Sri are ascribed seshithvam together?

visvam prathi thu seshithvam mAtha pithrOriva dvayOh  
pathnyAscha pathiseshathvAth sarvaseshee parah pumAn

Desika points out that even in the wordly sense all the possessions like house etc are sesha, or property of both father and mother of the family and because the wife is the sesha of the husband the Lord is said to be sarvaseshi. 'athO bhagavathah sarvaseshithva







vyavasTHApanAth lakshmyAscha bhagavathvyathiriktha sarvaseshithvavyava stTHApanAth cha na upaplavAvakAsah. That is, the Lord is the sarvaseshi and Lakshmi is the seshi of all except the Lord and hence there is no contradiction to say that Ekaseshithvam belongs to both of them together.

4. Ittham sarvEsvarasya svAbhAvikE sarvasEshithvE ‘parijana-paribarhA-bhooshNAnyAyuDHani’ ithyAdhyuktha prkArENA tasyApyAsritha seshathva-kaTHanam kaTHamiva upapadhyathE?

In VaradarAjasthava it is said that the Lord along with His weapons, ornaments auspicious qualities etc. becomes the sesha of His devotees. The doubt is raised as to how can He become a sesha to His devotees while He is the sarvaseshi.

The answer to this is given as follows.

sathAdhibhirupAdhAnAth svArTHam chidhachidhOrapi  
seshithvam seshabhAvasthu guNAdhEva upapadhyahE

The upanishads say that the Lord creates sustains and controls the sentient and the insentient for His own use and hence the seshithva of the Lord. But the seshathva towards His devotees is due to His looking after them without expecting anything in return. So both seshithva and seshathva apply to Him and the seshathva is not due to dependence but because of the attraction by the gunas of the devotees. This was the reason He became ready to do the bidding of Visvamitha in RamAvathAra and that of Yudhishtira in KrishnAvathAra. This is not in any way undermines His seshithva.

5. jeevasya bhagavanthamprathi sEshathvasya svabhAva siddhathayA nithyathvE ‘niranjana paramam sAmym upaithi, ’ ithi mukthAvasthAyAm paramAmyavachanam pralObhanamAthram syAth; athah yAvan mokshameva seshathvam ithi vAdhah parigrAhyah.

As the seshithva of the jiva to the Lord is said to be natural and eternal, the statement of the upanishad that the jiva attains paramam sAmyam, equal status with the Lord in released state cannot be true. Hence the seshathva is to be ascribed to the jiva only till he attains moksha.

Desika refutes this saying

bhOgamAthrasamAnathvAth jagathvyApAravarjanAth  
EkadhEsEna sAmyam syAth suvarNa silayOriva.

In Brahmasuthra we have the statement ‘jagathvyApAravarjam prakaraNath asannihithathvAth cha, (BS. 4-4-17), The released soul does not have any part in the functions like creation etc. which are exclusively belong to the Lord. This has been declared by the sruthi. ’ Hence the equality, sAmya is only in respect of knowledge and bliss. The





brahmasuthra also says, 'bhOgamAthrasAmyalingAccha, there is equality in enjoyment only.' Therefore the seshathva continues even in apavarga, release. Desika says that the equality is as in the case of gold and stone when weighed as equal, that is only in form and not in any other qualities. 'thoolAdhrtha-suvarNa-vyApAra-nyAyEna EkEnApyAkArEna paramasAmyam aparENa cha AkArENA vaiDharmyam,' equality is in one respect and difference in another.

6. Evam seshatvasya nithyathvE thaththulya nyaya siddhasya pArathanthrasyaApi mukthAvasthAyAm anuvarthamAnathvAth 'sa svarAt bhavathi' ithyAdhi sruthisiddham svAthanthryam kaTHamiva anuvarthathE?

If the seshathva is eternal then the dependence also being continued in the state of release, how can the statement of the sruthi ' he becomes his own sovereign 'will be applicable to the jiva?

The reply is given as

sruthisiddhasya jeevasya pARathanthryavyavasThayA  
svAthanthryam apavargE thu kainkaryAthmasu karmasu.

The jiva who stands in relation of AdhEya, viDHEya and sEsha, with the Lord, that is, being supported by, controlled by and belonging to Him, has independence in the state of release which is in respect of service to the Lord.

The relationship between the jiva and the lord is one of sarira-sariribhAva, that of body and soul. Hence as the body is always dependent on the soul there is no absolute independence but he has the freedom in the service of the Lord like the one belonging to the retinue of the king and subject to the will of the Lord, he is free to move about and discharge his duties as ordained by the Lord. The freedom consists in being free from the shackles of karma.

7. Athmasabdha-vAchya-dhEva-thiryang-manushya-s'THAvArAdhikamsarvamapi bhagavath dhAsathvEnadhrsyathE. thath kaTHam Ethath upapadhyathe?

As the Lord is the self of both sentient and the insentient even the animals and the plants are said to be His daasas. How is this appropriate?

In Manthrarajapadhashtothra it is said that 'dAsabhoothA svathassarvE AthmAnah paramAthmanah,' all beings serve the Lord by their nature, (being His body. ) The doubt here is that even though it may be true of humans but how can this be applied to animals who have no discrimination and the plants which are insentient.

The answer is

dAsathvam khalu sEshathva-jnAnArhathvam nigadhyathE  
pasvAdheenAm tu thathjnAnam bhavEth janmAntharEshvapi.





The intention to serve may not be present in the animals and plants but they have the fitness for seshathva and the knowledge of it in subsequent lives because they are like sleeping sentient selves who are unaware of their nature. Since there is no certainty that they will be born only as animals or plants in their next life they are also fit to be called dhAsas of the Lord. The reason why they are not termed so in this life is due to the fact that their service to their masters is for this life only and hence it is not permanent whereas they are the seshas of the Lord in their whole existence and hence His dhasas.

8. katham cha chEthanAchEthanayOh bhagavantham prathi ananyArhaseshathvam abhilapyathE?

How can the sentient and insentient entities be sesha for the Lord only?

This question arises because it is seen in the world that the sentient beings such as servants of a master and the insentient like houses etc are seshas, that is belonging to the human beings due to their karma and also for the released souls and ever free souls the sentients and the insentient become sesha, that is enjoyable due to the will Of the Lord. hence they cannot be termed as solely existing for the service and enjoyment of the Lord.

The anwer is given by Desika as

nirupADHika sesham hi visvamEthath sriyah pathEh

karmAdhyupADHiniyathaseshathvamitharAn prathi

The seshathvam is of two kinds, svAbhAvikam, what is natural and aupADHikam, conditional. The seshathva of all beings to the Lord is unconditional while the seshathva to others is conditional, depending on other circumstances such as the fruit of karma, will of the Lord etc. The seshathva to the Lord is unconditional and eternal and hence there is no contradiction.

9. sEshathva avaDHArANath sareerAthmasiddhEh ithi vAchOyukthih anupapanna

How can the sarira-sariribhAva explained in terms of seshathva?

Ramanuja defines sarira as a substance which a sentient soul completely supports, *aadhara-aadheya bhava*, and controls, *niyantha-niyaamya bhava* for serving its own purpose and which is subordinate to the sentient soul, *sesha--seshi bhava* .

The world of cit and acit form the sarira of Brahman because they are supported, controlled and used by Brahman. The entry of Brahman into the cit and the acit in order to diversify them into name and form is supported by the sruti '*tadhaikshatha bahusyaam prajaayeya*' Hence they exist in an inseparable relation with Brahman similar to the body and soul.

This is what is referred to here as 'seshathva avaDhArNath sarirAthma siddhi'







The appropriateness of sarira-sariribhAva resulting from seshathva is established by Desika thus:

vyavacchEdhAdhayOgasya sareerAthmathvamishyathE  
anyayOgavyavacchEdhah nirvEdhAdhEsthu kAraNam

In the moolamanthra 'a' stands for the Lord and 'u' is explained as none else while 'm' refers to the jiva. So the praNava of the moolamanthra indicates that the jiva is sesha to the Lord and to no one else. Thus the the meaning of 'u'kAra and 'm'akAra imply a dative case ending to 'a'kAra, that is, 'a' denoting Narayana, the word 'for' is affixed to it giving the meaning that the individual soul is sesha only to Narayana. The seshathva can be explained in two ways, namely, through ayOgavyavacchEdha and through anyayOgavyavacchEdha. What the 'a'kAra of the praNava denotes is the seshathva in the former sense, which is seshathva for no reason but natural one. Being such it has to be eternal.

anyayOgavyavacchEdha on the other hand is what is denoted by the 'u'kAra o the praNava, that is seshathva to no one else. The doubt arises on account of misconception of one with the other.

The sarira-sariri bhAva through seshathva is questioned for the following reason.

All things of a person may belong to another but his sarira cannot be that of another. If it is argued that the sole criterion of sarira being that it cannot belong to another it will apply even in the case of the wife of a person, this is not so because even the wife or his own sarira can be made sesha to others but it does not mean that it has become the sarira of another. So seshathva cannot imply sarirathva.

This confusion, says Desika is due to the inability to distinguish between ayOgavyavacchEdha and anyayOgavyavacchEdha. Sarira is something which never ceases to belong to the sariri and hence the sentient and the insentient which can never be said not to belong to the Lord through ayOga vyavacchEdha, must be His sarira.

anyayOgavyavacchEdha is that the jiva is not sesha to any one else except the Lord which is implied through the 'u'kAra. This knowledge comes to the jiva through nirvEdha, that is, the sorrow born out of being slave to others, like the indhriyas so long, and he attempts to change this state of affairs through the means of prapatthi denoted by 'namah' in the moolamanthra. Thus the 'a'kAra of the praNava denotes sarira-sariri bhAva through aYogavyavacchEdha and the 'u'kAra implies the regret through the knowlege of anyayOgavyavacchEdha impelling the jiva to resort to upAya, the means of salvation denoted by the word 'namah.'

10. jeevEsvarayOh ubhayOrapi vibhuthvam aNuthvam cha pramANeshu kaTHyathE.  
kaTHam asya aNuthvam Isvarasya vibhuthvam EVa ithi niyamah upapadhyathE?

Sasthra has established that both jiva and the Lord are atomic, aNu, but all pervading, vibhu. But vedantha has shown the Lord only as vibhu. If vibhuthva is due to the ability to entry into all beings and pervading all for an atomic entity like the jiva inspite of its being aNu why could





not that be the case for the Lord as well?

This could not be accepted, says Desika.

**vibhuthva aNuthva bhEdhEna jeevEsaniyamAth sruthou  
smrthisuthrAnusArAccha nANuthvam brahmaNi sTHitham.**

From sruthi smrthi and Brahmasuthra it could be seen that Brahman is not aNu because the difference between the jiva and Isvara has been ascertained in terms of vibhuthva and aNuthva.

The sruthi says, 'ArAgramAthro hyavarOhi dhrshtah, (Svet. 5-8) the individual self which is as small as the tip of the goad, is seen to be different from Brahman. The smrthi also affirms the vibhuthva of the Lord in 'mayA thatham idham sarvam jagadhavyakthamurthinA, (BG. 9-4) all this universe is pervaded by Me in unmanifest form'. Brahmasuthra confirms the aNuthva of the jiva and the vibhuthva of Brahman. 'nANuh athacchruthEh ithi na, itharADhikArAth, (BS. 2-3-22) If it is said that it is not atomic because of scriptural statement as otherwise, it is not so, as the subject matter of those texts is Brahman.'

This refers to the text 'sa vA Esha mahAn aja AthmA, (Brhd. 4-4-22) that self is infinite and unborn,' which could prove that it is not atomic.

But the suthra refutes this by saying that it is Brahman who is referred to in those texts as can be understood from the context, the subject matter of which is Brahman. But the reference to Brahman as being atomic as in the statement 'anOraneyAn,' smaller than the atom or as in dhaharavidhya, where Brahman is said to abide in the small space within the lotus of the heart (Chan. 8-1-1) is for the sake of upAsana. Desika says this matter can be understood from the study of Sribhashya 'vistharasthah bhAshyE Eva anusandHEyah. '

**11. Ekasmin sarirEpANipAdhAdhishu sarvathra sukhaduhkhOpalambhAth sarva upalambha viruddhamaNuthvam.**

The soul being atomic there cannot be the experience of pain and pleasure in all parts of the body.

This is not so, says Desika.

**vibhthvE api hi jeevasya jnAnAdhEva sukhAdhikam  
anyaTHA sarvagam thathsyAth jnAnam chEdhiha thathsamam**

The pain and pleasure is only due to the dharmabhuthajnAna, attributive consciousness of the self and is felt where it operates as otherwise the jnAna being everywhere it will be felt all over.

If it is claimed that the jiva is vibhu, all-pervading or occupies the whole body, there is no reason for the pain and pleasure being felt in one place only. Hence it is only appropriate to accept that the individual self is atomic as declared by the sruthi and the pain and pleasure is





felt in other parts of the body due to the vyApthi, pervasion, of the dharmabhuthajna. This is compared to the light of the lamp which pervades the whole place though the lamp is situated in one place only, or like the light of the eye being inside the organ of sight is able to illuminate everything everywhere or like the mind which is able to cognise anything in the world through the power of yoga and so on.

12. SoubhariprabrtheenAm nithyANAm mukthAnAm cha anEka sariraparigrahE sarvathrApi sarirEshu svrupasAnniDhyAbhAvAth bAhyEshu vishayEshu iva aham buddhih na sambhAvyathE.

The yogis like soubhari, the released and eternal souls are suppose to occupy several bodies at the same time in which case the soul cannot be present in all bodies and so even if the experience in all bodies can be had through the dharmabhuthajna, ahambuddhi, the notion of 'I' cannot exist in all bodies.

Desika says the ahambuddhi is present in all sarira.

ahambuddhih yaTHaikasmin sarirEpi cha samsThithA  
sarvathra vyavahArArhA thaTHAnyathrApi dhrsathAm

The concept of 'I' exists only in the self but is extended to the whole body. Similarly in the cases stated above the concept of 'I' is seen in all the bodies assumed.

Desika asks the opponent whether the concept of 'aham' is all-pervading like the jiva or restricted to one part only. It could not be the first because it is due to nescience which is not accepted as all pervading even by the opponent (who is assumed to be advaitin) and it could not be the latter either because the aham buddhi is seen with respect to all parts of the body. If it is argued that it is due to the mind going to the parts, even the mind is atomic and the same objection holds good. Hence as shown in the suthra 'pradheepavath AvEsah thaTHA hi dharsayathi, (BS. 4-4-15) which means that as the light of the lamp pervades all the place, the released soul, though atomic is able to enter into all bodies to enjoy the bliss.

13. sruthisvArasya anurODHEna jeevasya aNuthvam ithi AmOkshasTHAyee ithi nirNEthavyam.

As declared in the sruthi it should be accepted that the atomic nature of the jiva is only till the release.

This argument is based on the sruthi text 'vAlAgrasathabhAgasya sathaDHA kalpithasya cha; bhAgO jeevah sa vijnEyah sa cha anathyAya kalpathe, (Svet. 5-9) the size of the individual self is of the tip of the hair divided into hundredth of its hundredth part and yet it is infinite.

The self is declared as atomic by sruthi texts such as 'ArAgrmATHra,' etc. and that it is changeless, kootastha, ' nithyO nithyAnAm chEthanashchEthanAnAm, he is the eternal of all





the eternal and sentient of all sentient. ' (Kato. 2-5-13) The suthra 'pradheepavath' (BS. 4-4-15) shows how the atomic self is able to occupy all the bodies through the pervasion of the dharmabhuthajna at the state of release. The question as to how the dharmabhuthajna becomes infinite in the state of release is answered by Desika by citing the example of the rays of the sun which pervades the whole world at once. Similar to this the natural jna of the jiva becomes infinite through the will of Isvara in the state of release. Just as the lustre of the gem is not created through cleaning it the natural jna which is infinite shines in the state of release like the rays of the sun or the light of the lamp.

14. EkasminnEva bahu sarirapaigrahe sarvANyapi sarirANi ekEnaiva aDHishTithAni ithi vakthum sakyathE ithi EkajeevavAdhah prasajyathE.

If one self is able to take many bodies it would amount to EkajeevavAdha.

Eka jeevavAdha is that there is only one real self and all the rest is an illusion.

The reply to this is given by Desika as follows:

sukhaduhkhAdhi bhEDHE thu nanAthva vyavasTHithih

anthahkaraNabhEdhEna prathisanDHA nirAkrthih

If there is only one soul the sukha and dukha in one sarira will be experienced in all the sariras. But this is not the case. It cannot be argued that due to the difference of mind and intellect in different bodies the experience is different as there is no valid proof for the same. So it is only reasonable to assume that the souls are different in different bodies.

15. Ekasya upAdhibhEdhAth prathisanDHAna abhAvasya anangeekAre rAmakrishNAdheenAm EkEsvara avathArarupathvam na yujyathe.

If it is not accepted that one soul is experiencing through different bodies due to the difference of mind and intellect, the incarnations like Rama and Krishna cannot be considered as the forms of Isvara.

This objection is raised on account of the words of Rama 'AthmAnam mAnusham manyE rAmam dhasaraTHAthmajam, I consider myself as a human being, Rama, the son of DhasaraTha, ' when he had to be reminded of his divinity. (Ram. 6-120-11, 13) Since Rama did not have the knowledge of his Narayanasvarupa it seems as though the self in the incarnation is different like all the individual selves.

But this is the argument of the ignorant, says Desika, since the actions and words in the incarnations are nothing but play-acting of the Lord.

svathanthrasyEsvarasyApi karmavasyathvanAtakam







thEna vanchayathE lokAnithyAdhyaih abhiDHeeyathE

The appearance of the result of karma in incarnations of the Lord who is independent, is only a play by which He deceives the world into thinking that He is human.

The reference is to the sloka in MahabhAratha,

thEna vanchayathE IOkAn mAyAyogEna kEsavah

yE thamEva prapadhyanthE na thE muhyanthi mAnavAh (Maha. uddhyoga. 65-25)

where Sanjaya tells DhrtharAshtra about Krishna that he deceives the world by his actions like driving the chariot for Arjuna etc. into thinking that he is mortal but those who surrender to Him know His real nature. Desika says that that the Isvara who is omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent cannot experience dukkha in His incarnations nor for the sake of His devotees who are suffering. To say so is like the sentence known as jaradgavAdhi. 'sarvakarthA sarvajnah sarvashakthih eesvarah svayamEva paradukkham uthpAdhya thaddharsanEna svayamapi paramakAruNikathayA sochathi ithi vachanam jaradgavAdhivAkyvath anavaDHEyamEva.'

The sentence referred to is as follows:

jaradhgavam kambalapAdhukAbhyAm

dvArisThithO gAyathi badhrakANi

tham brAhmaNee prcchathi puthrakAmA

rAjan rumAyAm lasunasya kOrgah

This makes no sense as it is a jumble of unconnected things mentioned together. It means, old cow with blankets and foot wear, the one at the gate sings good things and the brahmin woman who wishes for a son asks him, oh king, in Ruma, what is the price of garlic.

This is mentioned to denote the inappropriateness of the Lord experiencing dukkha in His incarnations. When He is said to grieve on account of His mercy seeing the suffering of bhaktas, 'vyasanEshu manushyANAm brsam bhavathi dukkhatthah' it is to induce bhakthi out of His pity for those who are caught in the wheel of samsara, which has a semblance of grief.

16. Evam rAmakrishnAdheenAm karmavasyathva abhinayamAthra svekArE sathi AvEsAvathArathayA pratheeyamAnAneshu api nirathisayaAnandhayOgE parasurAmAdhishu sAkshAth avathAramEva vakthum sakyam. ---anyaTHA thathra prathishTArchnvachanamapi thathra na sanghatathE.

If it is said that all the actions in the incarnations which appear to be due to karma are only play-acting on the part of the Lord why should the AvEsa avathAras, where the manifestation of divinity was said to be present for short time, be not considered as real incarnations and not partial as otherwise the worship of these forms is not possible?





The AvEsAvathAras are proved by the sashtra, says Desika, as otherwise all entities will have to be considered as incarnations.

bahupramANa siddhathvAth yuktham AvEsakalpanam  
anyaTHA vibhavE sarvam Avishtasya sriyah pathEh

The AvEsAvathara has been mentioned as such in the texts such as ‘srshtim thathah karishyAmi thvAm Avisya prajApathE’, (after creating the cosmos) I will enter in you and do the creation, oh, prajApathi (vishnudharma. 68-54) and ‘anupravisya kuruthE yathsameehitham achyuthah, the Lord enters into the jivas and do what He wants,’ (Vishnudharmam. 108-50) If this is not accepted as such, all the entities mentioned in the tenth chapter on vibhuthi yOga in Bhagavat gita will be the incarnations of the Lord, because the Lord says “it is I” in all those entities mentioned therein.

In prathardhanavidhya of the upanishad Indra tells Prathardhana to meditate on him as Brahman. There it is the Lord who is the innerself is meditated upon and not Indra. Similarly in the AvEsAvathAras the worship etc. for the form is to the Lord who is the inner self and there is nothing contrary to the concept of taking them as AvEsAvathAras.

17. ajnAna dukkhithva karmavasyathvAdhi yukthAnAm samsAriNAm jnAna Anandha  
amalathvAdhikam nithysiddham ithi vachanam viruddham Eva.

While the misery due to karma caused by ignorance is real for the souls in transmigration, to say that knowledge, purity and bliss is the permanent nature of the self is inappropriate.

There is no contradiction here also, says Desika.

jnAnAnandhAmalathvAnAm svarupE samprdhAraNath  
thadhanyavishyAjnAnadukkhAdhyam kim na uchyathe

Knowledge, bliss and purity are always present in the jiva. the suffering is due to different cause, namely ajnAna and hence it is not self-contradicting.

The dukkha is only due to the connection of the soul with the body which is the effect of karma and the sukha and dukkha do not adhere to the self which is jnAnAnandha svarupa.

18. ‘nirvANamaya EvAyam AthmAjnAnamayO amalah dukkhaajnAnamayAdharmAh  
prakrhtEh na chAthmanah’ ithi vachnOdhitha svarupasya jeevasya dukkhAjnAnAdhikam  
anthahkaraNmEva ArOpiththayA pratheeyathE na thu paramArTHa svarupam ithi  
vakthum yuktham ithi. (Vishnu PuraNa. 6-7-22)

VishnupurAna says that the self is free like the eternal souls having bliss and knowledge as his essential nature and the dukkha and ignorance is only the attributes of prakrthi and not of the self. Hence they should be attributed to the mind and intellect and not to the self. So how can they be said to be real, in the state of samsara?







Desika replies as

svabhAvAth sooritulyasya karmOpAdhivasAviha  
dukhithvam thannivrththischa thadhupADHi nivrthithah

Even though the jiva is equal to the eternal selves by nature he experiences dukkha due to the adjunct (of karma) and becomes free from it when the adjunct is removed.

Just as the jasmin flower appears white and sometimes red due to the association with the kimsuka flower, the jiva gets dukkha and ignorance due to the contraction of dharambhuthajnAna, attributive consciousness, caused by karma. When the karma is exhausted the natural knowledge and bliss is regained like the eternal souls. The expression that the dukkha and ajnAna belong to prakrthi means that it is due to the connection with prakrthi.

19. nanu svarupajnAna abhAvAth anAdhikAla prayuktha dhEhAthma bhrAnthi vasAnAm  
jeevAnam Athmasvarupam svaprakAsam ithi vachanam upalambha viruddham ithi.

It is highly improbable that the real nature of the self is present always to the jiva, as he is devoid of the knowledge of his real nature and also has beginningless delusion that he is the body.

Desika answers that

aDHishTAnapratheethih khalu ArOpasya upayujyathE  
thasmAth svarupE bhODHEna bhrAnthih naiva viruDHyathE

The delusion arises out of the existence of a substratum and hence the illusory knowledge is not contradicting that of the reality.

When there is a delusion of snake in a rope, the rope is perceived but due to the non-cognition of the difference of it from the snake the delusion arises. Hence bhranthi or illusion can only result from the perception of a real thing which is mistaken for something unreal. Here also the real nature of the self is perceived but not cognised due to the defect of avidhya. This gives rise to the illusion that self is the body. So the the real nature is present but not cognised and as this gives rise to the dhEhAthmabhrama it is not a self-contradiction at all. The concept of independence to the jiva is due to the non-cognition of the seshathva and other attributes because only the nature of self is presented which is misconstrued as something else but the attributes like seshathva, AdhEyathva etc. are not present.

20. EvamAthmanah jnAnasvarupathvE svayamprakAsathve cha susushupthAyAm api  
prakAsah prasjyEtha.





“Svami on reaching Thirukkacchi starts mangalasanam”

If the Athman is self-illuminated it should be present even in deep sleep.

But it does not, the usual experience being “I did not know anything” and this is confirmed by sruthi also, as the statement ‘svam apeethO bhavathi’ denotes only apyaya or dissolution. Hence the expression that the self is of the nature of knowledge which is self -illuminating is only aupacharikam, mentioned in a secondary sense.

In the passage referred to, the text is ‘yathra Ethath purushah svapithi nAma sathA soumya thadhA sampannO bhavathi svayam apeetho bhavathi, (Chan. 6-8-1) when a man sleeps he becomes united with Brahman and attains dissolution in his own nature.

Desika says that it is not aupacharikam but has direct meaning only.

jnAthrthvam jnAna rupathvam dhvayam sruthyaiva gamyathE

svarupam jnAyatE supthou vaisishtyam thu na buddhyathE





Sruthi shows proof for jiva being jnAnasvarupa, of the nature of knowledge as well as jnAna gunaka, having knowledge as an attribute. 'Esha hi dhrashtA sprshtA srOthA ghrAthA rasayithA manthA boddhA karthA vijnAnAthma prushah, (Pras. 4-9) this jiva is the seer, one who touches, listener, smeller, taster, thinker, feeler and doer. He is of the nature of knowledge. Thus the jiva has the attributive consciousness that cognises the sense impressions and also the essence of knowledge. Thus in sleep the nature of the self as knowledge alone is manifest and not the attributive consciousness. Hence he is not aware of himself as sleeping. The statement "I did not know anything all this while," shows the absence of objective experience while the statement "I did not know myself," denotes that the awareness of one's self as distinguished by the particular characteristics is absent. The experience that "I slept well" is the proof of the presence of the natural state alone. Therefore there is no inconsistency.

21. jeevasya jnAnasvarupathvE jnAthrthva vAdhAnAm cha aoupachAArikathvam nyAyyam. na khalu dharmabhoothajnAnasya jnAnasvarupasya jnAthrthvam upalabhAmahe.

Since the self is of the nature of knowledge, knowership is attributed to it only as aoupachArika, in secondary sense, since it is accepted that the dharmabhuthajnana has no jnAthrthva.

Desika replies to this as

upalambhasya sAmarthyAth sruthi thaAthparyathOpi cha

EkajAtheeyayOh dharmadharma-dharmithvam kim na yujyathE

Through apprehension and through the purport of the scriptures the attribute and the attributed, dharmadharma-dharmithvam, can apply to the same thing though the two belong to the same class.

For instance, when one wakes up from sleep there are two kinds of cognition. One is that of having slept well in the form of 'sukhamaham asvApsam, I slept well,' and the other is the cognition 'EthAvantham kalam na kinchith aham ajnAsisham, I did not know anything all this while.' The former is of the nature of the self as knowledge and the latter denotes the absence of the dharmabhuthajnana in sleep. Thus both the dharmi and dharmadharma aspects are denoted. The sruthi also declares the self as jnanasvrupa as well as possessing jnAthrthva.

Brahmasuthra also confirms this by 'jnO atha Eva' (BS. 2-3-19) That is, this self knows objects and hence he is the knower. To raise the question that since the Self and the dharmabhuthajnana are both knowledge how can one be the possessor of the attribute, knower and the other the attribute knowledge, is nonsensical. says Desika. 'EkajAtheeyasya dharmadharma-dharmibhAvah na ghatathE ithi chOdhyah mandhapralApa Eva,' because it is found everywhere that between dharmadharma and dharmi, attribute and the attributed, there is certain aspect similar to the class they belong to while they differ in other aspects. It is however established that there is no knowership attributed to the dharmabhuthajnana as it is only attributive and an attribute, dharmadharma, cannot be independent of the attributed, dharmi just as





the light of a gem, sun and a lamp has no existence of its own.

22. dhEhAdhivilakshaNathvena vibhakthasvaroopasya jeevasya karthavyAntharam na upalabhAmahe; athah svarupAnubhanDHi varNASramAdhirAhithyavedhinah purushAh kaTHAmiva karmADHikAriNah bhavishyanthi?

There is no karma for the jiva who is different from body etc. and therefore how can those, who know that they are the self which is beyond varNa or Asrama be fit for the karma enjoined in the vedas?

The reference here is to the slokas in Vishnupurana and Mahabharatha that declare the self as different from embodied beings.

pumAn nA dhEvO na narO na pasurna cha padhapah sareerAkrthibhEdhAsthu bhoopa EthE karmayOnayah  
(VP. 2-13-98)

Oh king! the jiva is not a deva, man, an animal or even a plant. These differences are due to that in the physical bodies caused by karma.

nAyam dhEvO na marthyO va na thiryak sthAvaropi vA  
jnAnAnandhamayasthvAthmA seshO hi paramAthmanah  
(Maha. AsvamEdhika. 43-13)

This jiva is neither a deva, nor a man, nor animal nor a plant. He is of the nature of bliss and knowledge and a sesha to the Lord.

Hence there is no karma for the jiva who has the knowledge of his real self.

Desika refutes this view saying that it will apply only to ChArvAkas, the materialists. Since they do not believe in a life after death they do not follow the karma enjoined in the vedas. For others, especially those who have the knowledge of the self,

dhEhAthmanOH vivEkE api dhEhasambandhayOginAm  
karthavyam dhersyathE yadhvath grhakshEthrAdhisAlinAm

Even after attaining the discrimination that soul is different from the body the karma is to be performed as the owners of the house and land do their karma.

All karma is according to varnAsrama which stays till death and cannot be avoided as the eating and drinking because of the connection with the body. The discrimination between the body and the soul does not preclude the karma that is to be done. Desika cites the example of where the man owning house and land which are different from him discharges certain duties according to the mandate of the king. Here the karma enjoined by the vedas are mandatory







because it is ordained by the Lord who is the king of kings, rajAdhirAja, whose command should be followed by all beings, till death, says Desika. 'Abrahmakeetam akhilairapi anuvarthaneeya-sAsanasya rAjADhirAjasya bhagavathah sarvEsvarasya sasanamapi yaTHADHikAram yAvaddhEhapAtham anuvarthaneeyam ithi prAmANikAnAm panTHAh.'

23. aTHAapi, yasyAythmarathirEva syAth Athmathrpthascha mAnavah

AthamnyEva cha santhushTah thasyaKARYam na vidhyathE (BG. 3-17)

ithyukthaprakArENa AthmAnubhavathrpthasya na kinchidhapi karthavyam.

The sloka quoted means that for the one who revels in the Self, contented with the Self and enjoys the bliss of the Self, there is nothing to be accomplished, that is, he has no karma.

Desika says in answer to this,

karthvyasya uparOdhasthu yogE mukthou cha sambhavEth

anyaTHA bhOjanOnmEsha nimEshAdhi kaTHam bhavEth

In the state of yOga and release only there is no karma. Otherwise even the actions like eating or blinking will not take place.

The statements in the sruthi and smrthi regarding the non-performance of karma applies only while doing yoga and after mukthi. If all the karma are denied in the embodied state even the ordinary actions like eating, clothing, breathing etc would not take place. So the actions enjoined by the scriptures have to be performed till death even by the man of knowledge. Visishtadvaita does not accept the concept of jeevanmukthi of the advaita.

The one who is 'nArAyaNaikanishta,' that is, a paramaikAnthi with anyabhakthi towards the Lord Narayana, does all the nithya naimitthika karma as bhagavdhArADhana, dedicating all his actions to the Lord and performing them as worship. This attitude is his japa. The perception of the Lord in everything is the dhyAna, meditation. the water that washes the feet of such a pure soul, who purifies the place where he is, becomes the holy water which purifies all. This is deemed as bhAgavathasAnam and the remainings of the food which he offers to the Lord as naivEdhya and partakes himself, becomes the prasAdha for his children and disciples.

24. BhAgavathAnAm EthadhananyArha sEshathvajnAnEna svarupayAthAthmyajnAnavathAm anyasEshathvaprApakaagneendhrAdhivyAmisrakarmANi akarthavyAnyEva.

To the devotees of the Lord who have the knowledge that they are seshas only to Him, the performance of the karmas that propitiate other devas like agni and Indra become prohibited as they imply anyasEshathva, that they are sEshas to these deities.





This is answered by Desika thus:

AjnAthilanganAyOgAth antharyAmithva dharsanAth

sAkshAdhapi avirOdhAccha karmakarthyam ishyathE

It is not a transgression of command because of the perception of the Lord as the indweller and also of direct connotation which removes any contradiction and hence the works enjoined in the vedas like yajna are to be performed by the paramaikAnthins also.

A paramaikanthin does all the karma as the offering to Lord Narayana only and therefore even when he performs yaga etc with respect to other deities like Indra and agni, his action is directed only to the Lord who is the indweller of those deities. It is like garlanding a person on his shirt, which is towards the person only and not the garment. When the Lord is meditated as the whole world consisting of insentient beings, it is not directed to the world but to the Lord whose sarira is the world. Similarly here all the activities propitiating the other deities are directed only towards the Lord. It denotes anyasEshathhvam only when these deities are worshipped for their own sake expecting them to yield the desired fruit of the karma instead of the Lord who is the indweller of them.

The Lord says in the Gita, 'aham hi sarvayajnaAnAm bhOkthA cha prabhurEva cha', (BG. 9-24) I am the enjoyer in all yajnas and the giver of fruit. Prabhu means phalapradhah, one who gives the result of the karma. Brahma suthra ascribes the etymological meaning of all words denoting the deities to the Lord only. The suthra 'sAkshAdhapi avirODHAM jaiminih' (BS. 1-2-29) declares that the words denoting Indra Varuna etc have direct connotation to the Isvara only and therefore there is no contradiction and so considers Jaimini.

Therefore to those who do all the actions as offering to the Lord till the end of their lives there is no possibility of seshathva to other deities. All the nithya naimittika karmas have to be done through out life and the prohibition refers only to the desire - motivated activities.

25. Nanu jnAnasvarupathayA cha jnAnaguNathayA cha pramANasiddhasyApi jeevasya jnAnothpatthivinasayoh prathyakshAdhipramAna siddhathvath jnAna nithyathvavAdhah sarvadhA na sanghatatha.

Of this self, who is of the nature of knowledge and has knowledge as his attribute, the attributive knowledge, dharmabhuthajnAna originates and is destroyed, as seen from pramAnas such as perception and hence it cannot be permanent.

Desika says that the dharmabhutha jnAna is eternal as declared by sasthrapramAna.

yaTHA na kriyathE jyOthsnA ithyAdhi vAkyAnusArathah

jnAnam nithyam avasTHAbhih uthpatTHyAdhisthu kaTHyathE.

As it is said that the light is not produced the knowledge is eternal and its appearance and disappearance is due to the different states in which it is experienced.







The reference here is to the sloka in Vishnudharma.

YaTHA na kriyathE jyOthsna malaprakshAlanAth manEh  
dhOshaprahAnAth na jnAnam Athmanah kriyathE thaThA

(Vishnu Dharma. 104-55)

The light of the gem is not produced by cleaning it. Like wise the knowledge is not created in the self through the removal of the defect (due to ignorance) that is, it only manifests which is already there.

Therefore the appearance and the disappearance is due to the contraction and the expansion of the dharmabhutha jnAna which is permanent.

26. aTHApi svathah prakAsasyApi jnAnasya kEnApi thirODHAnEna aprakAsathva angeekAre  
mrshAvAdhimathAvathArah prasjyEtha.

If the knowledge which is self luminous is accepted to have been concealed at times it would land one in the school of advaita. So the knowledge when it is not manifest should be considered as having become extinct.

Desika disagrees and says,

jnAnanithyathvavAdhasya sruthyaivaprathipAdhanAth  
svaprakAsathvam Ethasya vishayagrahanE sathi

That knowledge is eternal has been established by sruthi and the dharmabhutha jnAna operates only when it illuminates an object.

In sleep the dharmabhuthajnAna seems to be absent due to the non-existence of objects to cognise. This is known by the experience that “I did not know anything. “ The self illuminating character of the dharmabhuthajnAna consists in the fact that it does not need another knowledge to manifest itself.

27. asthu, jnAnasvarupah AthmA, Anandhasvarupam thu na mrshyAmahE.

It could be accepted that knowledge is the nature of the self. But it is not appropriate to say that the self is of the nature of bliss. In the world the joy is experienced only as an attribute as in the statement ‘aham sukhee, I am happy,’ Hence it is only being the dharmā, attribute of the self, how can it be the nature of the self?

Desika says that as in the case of knowledge here also there is no contradiction.

AnandhadhvayasadbhAvAth virOdhO nOpalabhyathE  
sruthirEva hi sarvathra pramANam ithi manmahE





There is nothing that is incompatible because of the existence of two kinds of joy. For this sruthi alone is the valid authority.

There are two kinds of joy, one experienced as the essence of the self and the other due to that rising out of contact with the world. The latter arises out of the dharmabhuthajna. The bliss experienced naturally by the self is the same always whereas the joy that arises out of worldly objects change. So the natural bliss which is the svarupa of the self and the joy that is the attribute of the self are not contradictory to each other.

28. Evam AthmasvarupAnandhasya nithyaprakAsathve sathi anAdhikAlam aprakAsithasvarupAnandhah yOgadhasAyAm mukthidhasAyAm cha prakAsatha ithi vachanam apahAsyam.

If the bliss that is the nature of the self is ever manifest, the statement that the bliss which is unmanifest from the beginning of existence manifests itself in the state of yOga and of release is ridiculous.

Desika says that it is not so.

vishayadviDHasambhEdhAth thirOdDhAnaprakAsayOh

Anukoolyam purAvyaktham yOgAdhEvAvabhAsathe

The manifestation of the bliss and its absence occur in respect of different circumstances and hence there is no contradiction between them. The joy which is unmanifest due to the will of the Lord because of Karma becomes manifest in the state of YOga. Though the natural bliss is always present it is not experienced due to karma and becomes manifest in the state of release.

29. sabdhAdhi vishayAnubhavarahithathaya bhagavdhanubhavarahithathayaA cha kEvalasvrupeAnubhavamAthram purushArTha mokshAbhyAm saha kaThamiva purushArThathayaA paTithum yujyatha?

The experience of the self alone (called Kaivalya) without the sense experience and without the experience of the Lord is mentioned as the salvation (that is, the paramapurushArTha, identical with moksha). How is it possible, is the question.

The mukthi is said to be the state where the soul is experiencing bliss which is his real nature along with the Lord. Hence how can the state of kaivalya where the soul is experiencing his real nature alone can be cited as the state of release?

Desika says,

sruthvAnukoolyam AthmasThamdhrshtvA vA yOgadhasanE

thadhanucchEdhasakthasya purushArTHathva vAgiyam





Hearing about the self through the scriptures and on meditating on it in Yoga one experiences the bliss of the self and continues in that state. This is known as kaivalya and denoted as the purushArTHa (moksha) This is only oupachArikam, says Desika, like the statement 'thamEvam vidhvAn amrtha iha bhavathi, ' knowing Him (Brahman) one becomes immortal here itself, ' which is only laudatory.

30. nanu 'kaivalyam bhagavantham cha manthroyam sAdhayishyathi' (brhd. Haritha. smrthi. 3-40)

ithi svarupAnubhavE kaivalyasabdhaprayOgAth, 'mukthih kaivalya nirvANa srEyo nissrEyasAmrtham, '(amarakosa-1-5-6)

ithi kaivalyasya mukthiparyAyathvEna paTanAth nyAyabhooshaNAdhimathEshviva svAthmAnandhAnubhava Eva sAkshAth mokshah. bhagavadhanubhavasthu svAthmAnandhAnubhava siddhEhupAyavisEsho asthu

In BrhadhhAreethas smrthi it is said that the mantra specified therein will secure the exclusive experience of the self and the Lord. In Amarakosa, the word kaivalya is denoted as being synonymous with mukthi, nirvANa, srEyas nissrEyas, amrtha, apavarga and moksha. Hence the word kaivalya should mean mukthi only, as claimed by the NyAya school to whom the release from dukkha is the bliss or moksha. The experience of the Lord is a means to attain kaivalya.

Desika refutes this saying,

sruthsmrtheethihAsAdhyaih vishNusEvA vimukthathA

kaivalyavyavahArasthu sarvakarmanivrtthithah

Sruthi, smrthi and purAnas etc. declare that the vishNusEva, experiencing the joy of service to the Lord alone is mukthi. It may be denoted as kaivalya only in the sense that in that state all karma has been destroyed and the self alone (kEvalam) remains.

The real moksha, sAkshAth mOkshah, is defined by Desika as follows:

By examining what has been said in the sruthi etc. one can conclude that mOksha is 'svarupaAvirbhAva poorvaka paramAthma prApthirupa paripurNa bhagavadhanubhavarasa parivAharupa bhagavathkainkaryaprApthih'.

That is, the moksha consists in the service of the Lord while being immersed in the essence of the complete experience of the Lord induced by attaining Him which precedes the manifestation of one's own nature. This can be termed as kaivalyam in as much as it is the exclusive experience of the Lord after the removal of karma caused by ajnAna and hence the self is free form embodiment and stays by itself alone.

31. Ye thu sishtAh thryo bhakthAh phalakAmA hi thE mathAh





sarvE chyavanadharmANah prathibuddhasthu mOkshabhAk

ithyuktha prkArEna aisvaryavath AthmAnubhavamAthrasyApi kshudhraphalathvAth  
chyavanadharmathvAccha nithyathvam thAvath Asankithum api na sakyathE.

The three kinds of devotees who are desirous of results. Hence the swerve from the path to mOksha and only the fourth, the jnani attains mOksha. (MB. Shanthi. 350-35)

According to the above smrthi, even the desire of AthmAnubhava is declared as being impermanent like worldly prosperity, the state of kaivalya cannot be permanent one. But at the same time since one attains kaivalya only after the destruction of all karma he cannot lapse back to samsara. So it would mean that he finds himself neither here nor there.

Desika says that it is not so.

dhvAiviDhyamkevalasyAsya bhukthvaikO mOksham ApnuyAth

anyasthu bhukthvA thadhbhOgamvishayam punarasnuthE

There are two kinds of kaivalya. In one the aspirant experiences the self through spiritual discipline and as long as he is in that state he will not lapse back to samsara, but this experience is not permanent and he may lapse back to samsara. there is another kind of aspirant who has moksha as his goal and from the experience of the self he also attains the bhagavadhanubhava and moksha. Those who practise madhuvidhya, for instance, are said to live in other lOkas and then proceed to paramapadha. This is of course possible only to those who have also done bhakthiyOga along with jnanayOga. The mention of the path of light (archirAdhi) for one who is only striving for the experience of the self is acquired through brahmavidhya such as dhaharavidhya etc., that is the meditation on Brahman inside the lotus of the heart which has been elaborated in Sribhashya by Ramanuja.

The attainment of paramapadha is ordained only for those who acquire paravidhya, the knowledge of Brahman. This is confirmed by

EkAnthinah sadhA brahmaDhyAyinah yOginO hi yE

thEshAm thathparam sThAnam yadhvai pasyanthi soorayah

Those yogis, whose minds are always turned towards Brahman alone, attain the supreme state which is witnessed by the eternal souls.

### 32. nanu kaThamiva bhAgavathasEshathvam abhiDHeeyathE?

How can the seshathva to the devotees of the Lord, bhAgavatha sEshathvam be justified as it would be against the exclusive seshathva, bhagavacchEshathvasya ananyArhathvam to the Lord. The opponent cites an example of a born-slave of a king becoming slave to another which will be the betrayal of loyalty to the king.





Desika says,

rAjadhAsasyarAjAjnAsiddhA dhAsasya vAsathA

thadhvath thadhbhakthasEshathvam yujyathE bhagavathDHIyA

Just like the dhasatva to other dhasas of the king is effected by the command of the king himself here also through the will of the Lord the bhAgavathsEshathva becomes appropriate.

As ThiruppAnAzvar says in the pAsuram ‘amalanAdhipirAn adiyArkku ennai Atpaduttha,’ the Lord Himself makes one experience the seshathva to His devotees and it happens through His grace only. Desika says ‘athra bhAgavathasEshathvasya bhagavathsEshathvAdhapi bhOgyathayA Eva bhagavathsEshathvajnAnarasikaih bhAgavathaih anugrahapalathvEna anusanDheeyamAnathvAdhapi bhAgavathasEshathvam purushArTHa rupamEva. ‘

This means, the bhAgavathsEshathvam is more enjoyable than even bhagavathsEshathvam because it causes interaction between those who know the joy of bhagavthsEshathva. The blessing of the bhAgavathas is the goal of life, purushArTha as it aids the attainment of the Lord which is paramapurushArTha. Only the seshathva to people other than bhagavAn or bhAgavathas has to be condemned.

33. Evam tharhi karmavasAth bhAgavatha vyathirikthEshu loukika vaidhika maryAdhAbhyAm avarjaneeyE sEshathvE kaTham nirvAhah?

If this is so, what would be the fate of those who become seshas to others, either in the worldly sense or as enjoined by the scripture through the effect of karma?

The question is about one who has the knowledge of his sEshathva to the Lord but due to circumstances he is forced to serve others either for his livelihood or on account of performing the vaidika karma in which he has to be the sEsha of whichever deity enjoined in the karma. If he serves others who are the sEshas of other deities it is said to be worse that serving the deity himself. Such a person may find himself neither in the group of Bhagavathas, because of his swerving from bhAgavathadharmam, nor he will join the opposite group due to his knowledge acquired of his sEshathva to the Lord.

There is no cause to fear, says Desika.

vinivArayathE vishNuh avrjyAm anyasEshathAm

kEnApyupAyabhEdhEna vinathA dhAsya bhangavath

The Lord Himself will remove the anyasEshathva by some means as in the case of the removal of the slavery of Vinatha, (by Garuda, her son. )

Even if the anyasEshathva is due to prArabdhakarma, the Lord will remove it for the one who has the knowledge of ananyasEshathva to Him. Desika compares this to the story of Vinatha,







“Svami Entering Varadan Sannidhi Expressing Utmost Joy”

mother of Garuda, who became the slave of her co-wife Kathru because of a wager which she lost due to the devious means adopted by the latter. VainathEya, (Garuda) freed her by fulfilling the condition laid out by the serpents, sons of Kathru, to fetch amrtha. Or else, as in the case of RavaNa and VibheeshaNa the Lord will affect release by causing the death of the master. This has been proclaimed by the Lord Himself in Gita by saying ‘macchitthah sarvadurgANI mathprasAddhAth tharishyathi, with his mind absorbed in Me one will get rid of all obstacles.’ All that one has to do is to pray to Him to remove the anyaseshathva by some means and the all-merciful Lord will do so Himself.

34. Bhagavathvathiriktha sEshaithvam sopAdhikam bhagavath sEshithvam nirupAdhikam ithi pramANasiddhE sathi nirupADHika miTHuna sEshathvam kaTHam sEthsyathi?

The sEshithva, being the master of all, is unconditioned in the case of the Lord, while for others (like bhAgavathas) it is with condition. (of being the sesha of the Lord and awarded the seshithvam by Him) Thus it is stated in the scripture and hence how can it be said that both the Lord and Sri together are seshi to all?







The answer is given as,

upalakshaNamAthrathvAth EkOkthE sruthyabhADHanAth  
nirupAdhika sEshathvam dhvayOrathyupapadhyathE

Through implication and by sruthi both are one and hence the conditionless sEshithva is common to both.

ParAsara bhatta says, 'thadhantharbhAvAth thvAm na prThagabhiDhatthE sruthirapi,' (SriguNa. 28) that is, the sruthi does not distinguish the Lord from Sri because she is included in Him.

The oneness of both is in no way contradictory to His being sarvaseshi and Sri being HIS sEsha as His pathni, He being the punisher and she being His purushakarabhootha, instilling mercy on Him. The Lord is the qualified and she the qualifier and hence there is no less importance attributed to Her as the attributive aspect is the essence of the Lord. Ramanuja in Sribhashya refers to the Lord as SrinivAsa in the invocatory verse implying Sri as the visEshana, qualifying entity who forms the part and parcel of the Lord. The sEshithva attributed to both is like that of offering havis to the deities Agni and Soma in the sacrifice of agnishOmeeyam.

35. For those who have become bhagavthkainkaryaparas, that is, involve in the service of the Lord and his devotees, the worship alone is the requisite dharma. So should they follow the other varNASramadharmAs, the activities enjoined for their varNa and Asrama?

Desika says that kainkaryam means abheeshtakaraNam, doing what the master wishes and not mere worship.

svAminObheeshtakaraNam kainkaryam abhiDheeyathE  
vishnOrabheeshtam akhilam sAsthAdhEvAvagamyathE

The meaning of kainkaryam is doing what is pleasing to the Lord and that is known only through the sasthanas.

The kainkaryam is of two kinds, namely, AjnA, command and anujnA, permission. The actions enjoined in the veda like soucha, inner and outer purity, Achamana, sipping of water as a ritual, snAna, bath, sandhyavandhna and upasana, that is, japa or meditation come under AjnA and to one who does not observe all this is not fit for any karma, says the sasthanas, which precludes him to do even those actions like worshipping, that come under anujnA. The latter is done to please the Lord who permits His devotees to do them but it would be displeasing to Him if the former actions are not done.

36. Evam thadheeya paryanthakainkaryapravaNasya kArthayuga dharmabhootha paramaikAnthi dharmAnushTANam kalibalakalushEshu purushEshu kaThamiva jAghateethi.





The dharmas enjoined in the pAnchrAthra and other sasthras for the paramaikAnthi seem to pertain to krthayuga and hence how far they are relevant in kaliyuga?

Sri Ramanuja has said in his NithyagranTha ‘aTha paramaikAnthinah bhagavadhArA DhanaprayOgam vakshye, I am going to elaborate on the details of bhagavadhArAdhana for the paramaikAnthi. ’ The doubt is how far this can be done in kaliyuga and whether it is enough if one does the duties enjoined in the vedas according to varna and Asrama along with the worship of the Lord.

Desika says,

kalAvapi bhavEth dharmO govindhAsakthachEthasAm  
paramaikAnthinAm prOkthah pAnchrAthrikavarthmanA

The dharma for the paramaikAnthins mentioned in the pAnchrAthra will be the dharma to be followed even in kaliyuga as in krthayuga for those whose minds are engrossed in Govindha.

In Vishnudharma it is said,

kalou krthayugam thasya kalisthasya krthE yugE  
yasya chEthasi govindhah hrdhyE yasya nAchyuthah

(Vishnudharma-109-57)

To him, who has Govindha in his heart, the kali becomes krtha and to one in whom Achyutha is not, krtha becomes kali.

Hence, says Desika, ‘parbhakthi-parajnAna-paramabhakthi-paripurNa-aDHikArisambhavAth paramaikAnthi dharmAnushTAnam karthavyamEva,’ That is, the fitness for being paramaikAnthi occurs by highest devotion and knowledge filled with complete devotion to the Lord and hence the dharma of paramaikAnthi is to be followed in kaliyuga also.

The statement that the krthayugadharmah is not to be followed in kali, ‘yasthukAthayugadharmah na karthavyah,’ in Vishnudharma denotes only the rarity of finding one fit for being a paramaikAnthin, as mentioned in the Gita,

bahoonAm janmanAm anthe jnAnavAn mAM prpadhyathE  
vAsudhEvassarvam ithi sa mahAthmA sudhurlabhah

(BG. 7-19)

A man of knowledge attains Me after many lives and to find such a great soul who considers VasudhEva is everything to him is very rare indeed.

This means that if there are men who are good in kaliyuga they are to be considered as those belonging to krthayuga and vice versa as it could be seen in the case of Ravana and Hiranyakasipu who followed kalidharma even in the other yugas.





The statement in Vishnupurana 'kalou jagathpathim vishnum sarvasrashtAram isvaram nArchyishyanthi,' which says that in kaliyuga men will not worship Vishnu is about those who fall into evil ways and does not denote a general rule.

37. Evam nithyAdhi-prathipAdhitha-paramaikAnthidharma-parAyaNaasya-svAdhikAranurupa-sakalkarmAnushTane apiprAtharArabhya-yAmamAthram abhigamanam----ithipAnchakAlikaniyama siddhih kaTHam bhavathi?

As made out in the Nithyagrantha and other works there are dharmas exclusively for paramaikAnthi but why should these rituals be done at the specified times for five times a day?

The reference here is to the five duties enjoined for a paramaikAnthin, namely, abhigamanam, upAdhAnam, ijayai, svAdhyAyam and yogam.

abhigamanam- worshipping the feet of the Lord and praying to Him to guide one in all the duties of the day.

upAdhAnam- gathering the appliances for worship like flowers sandal etc.

ijyai-performing arAdhana of the Lord.

svAdhyAyam - spending time in enjoying the bhagavatkaTha by reading ithihsa, Azvar sukthis etc.

yOgam- contemplating on the Lord's beauty quality etc.

These functions are to be followed at specific times. The question is that why should any specific time be prescribed for doing these.

Desika replies that eventhough like picking up the mango fruit whenever it falls down the bhagavatkainkarya can be done whenever one wishes, the observing the rituals at the specified times is necessary because it is enjoined in the sasthanas.

Desika quotes the example of the attendants and the courtiers of a king who serve the king at the scheduled time while those close to him do the functions according to his wish and those who live away need written document to instruct them the mode of discharging the duties.

Similarly the nithya suris who are close to the Lord need no sasthanas to tell them what to do as they do their work according to the wish of the Lord then and there. But to us the sasthanas is the only guidance as it is stated 'sAstham hi vathsalatharam mAthApithrsahsrathah, the sasthanas is more caring than thousands of parents. '

If the karma could not be performed in the specified time it should be done in the next allotted time. If the ritual prescribed in the day is left out it should be done in the first yAma of the night. If not, prAyaschittha should be done.

38. Bhagavath bhAgavatha kainkaryAbhyam AchAryakainkaryam abhyahitham ithiabhiyukthA





vadhanthi -----athah kaTHam dhEvathAntharavishaya thandulAdhi pradhAne bhagavathvishayathandulAdhi apradhAne vA parithyAja Eva ayam achyaryah?

It is said that AchArya kainkaryam is more important than bhagavath-bhAgavathakainkaryam. If so, how can one leave his AchArya even when he serves other deities or fails to serve Narayana?

This doubt arises because if one cuts himself away from his AchArya he is cut off from his guruparampara and subsequently from the Lord Himself.

Desika replies,

gurou aikAnthya rahithE gurOrantharavasTHitham

harimEva gurum vindhyAth gurum rahasi bhOdhayEth.

If the guru swerves from his state of paramaikAnthya the sishya, if he is well established in paramaikAnthya, should direct his kainkarya to the Lord who is the indweller of the guru and try to direct him secretly to the right path. This is also the kainkarya to be done to the guru. If the sishya tries to turn his guru towards the Lord both the guru and the sishya will attain salvation by the grace of the Lord.

39. Evam chEthanasya sEshathvE api 'svayam mrthpindabhoothasya parathanthrasya dhEhinah' ithi achEthanavath athyantha pArathanthrye sasthravasyathA kaTHam ghatathE?

Accepting that the jiva is sesha to the Lord, according to the statement that the jiva is like a clot of mud and completely manipulated by the Lord, how can he be influenced by the sasthras?

Further the opponent questions that when the jiva has no freedom of action it is not appropriate to say that he is bound by his karma which results in his subsequent entreaty to the Lord for freedom from the samsara.

Desika replies:

nAchidhah sAsthavasyathvam na svathanthrasya thadhbhavEth

karmavasyavisEshaya sasthravasyathvam ishyathE

There can be no influence of the sasthras on the insentient, nor for the independent. It is only those who are under the influence of karma, sasthra can exert its influence.

The sentient being, the jiva, has the ability to know and to do. So he has the freedom to act and hence he is influenced by the sasthra. Jiva is dependent on the Lord to be able to know or to act and to experience the result of the act. That is why he is mentioned as a puppet on string in Mahabharatha. the vedantha texts also confirm that the jiva has the jnathrthvam, knowership, karthrthvam, doership and bhOkthrthvam, capacity to enjoy. Thus he is different from the







insentient, for which there is no relevance to sastras and from the eternal souls who do not need the sastras.

40. Jeevasya sarvasareeriNam bhagavantham prathi ADHEyathva-viDHEyathva-sEshathvAdhishu avisEshathayA anusanDHEyEshu sEshathvamEva praDHANEekrthya kimarTham anusanDHeeyathE?

The jiva being supported by (ADHEyathva) dependent on His will (viDHEyathva) and a sesha to the Lord, all three states being of equal importance, how is it that only seshathva is held as most important than the rest?

Desika gives the reason as

antharangam hi seEshathvam avikArAdhishu thrishu

thasmAth sEshathvamEvAhuh AchAryAh praTHamam guNam

Seshathva being the innermost of the three which are all unchangeable. Therefore the acharya has declared the seshathva to be the foremost.

The AdhEyathvam defines the existence and nature of the jiva which shows him to be fit for moksha. That is, by knowing his own nature he becomes qualified for attaining mukthi. ViDHEyatrthva, the ordaining his activities according to the will of the Lord shows the means of attaining mukthi. But both of these will be of no help to the jiva if there is no aspiration to attain the Lord which is provided by the knowledge of his seshathva to the Lord, which makes him engage himself in the actions that would please the Lord, His kainkarya. The seshathva is not something to be endured but it is to be experienced with joy and with love for the Lord. This alone fetches the result, that is, mukthi. As the knowledge of the end and means of attaining it, though present, will not help a man unless he makes an effort, the seshathva helps one to attain the end. Hence it is stressed by Yamunacharya also who says in his sthothrarathna that he does not care for anything else which is not sesha to the Lord, not his body nor prANa and not even his soul.

41. NanvEvam sEshathvasya prADHAnyEna moolamanthrE sEshathvam praTHamam abhiDHEEyathE----'manniyAmyathayA maddhAsyaikasvabhAva Athmasvarupah' ithyAdhi pArathanthrasya praTHamAbhiDHANam na yujyathE.

When the seshathva is mentioned first in the ashtAkshara and the pArathanthrya later, "the nature of the self being My sEsha because of the dependence on Me" is not proper.

The reference here is to the sentence in saraNagathigadhya of Ramanuja where it is said that the individual self is the sesha of the Lord because of his dependence, pArathanthrya, on the Lord, thus putting the pArathanthrya first and sEshathva getting secondary importance.

The reply to this is,





bhagavathpArathanthryENa sEshathvamapi siDHyathi  
ithi vakthum kvachith poorvam pArathanthryasya varNanam

The sEshathva happens only due to the dependence, pArathanthrya, of the jeeva to the Lord and the mention of the pArathanthrya first in some places is to denote this only. But this is not in anyway undermining the importance of sEshathva and wherever parathanthrya is mentioned first, it emphasises only the importance of sEshathva. The attitude of sEshathva to the Lord removes the mamakAra, the idea of ‘mine’ because when one is sEsha to the Lord all that he has also belongs to the Lord.

42. Evam tharhi sareerAdheenAm oupADHikasEshathvE jnAnAdheenAm cha  
nithyasEshathvE jAgrathi nishpannajnAnasyApi aDHikAriNah thEshu  
mamakAravicchEdhabrAnthih bhavishyathi

The sarira which is due to karma and the jnana and anandha which is natural to the jiva belong to the jiva only and if the sense of belonging (mamakAra) is given up there will be confusion.

Desika denies this saying,

jnAnadhEhadhivishayamamakAra nivarthanE  
na bhrAnthirapramAmoola-mamakAranivarthanAth

Abandoning the mamakAra, the concept of ‘mine,’ there is no confusion because the mamakAra in respect of the knowledge, the body etc. are not true in the real sense of the term.

To the aspirant the mamakAra which is not conducive to the service of the Lord is to be removed completely. That is, the body, knowledge and other things are to be used for the kankarya of the Lord. The Lord has provided all the things, grha-kshEthra-puthra-kaLathrAdhi, house, land, son and wife etc. , that create mamakAra to be used in His service. Hence the devotee should feel that everything is given to him by the grace of the Lord when there is no confusion.

43. Evamapi Isvarasya nirapEksha-svAthanthryam Asritha pArathanthryam cha kaTHamiva  
sanghatatha?

How does the absolute independence NirapEkshasvAthanthryam, of the Lord and His doing the bidding of His devotees, Asritha pArathanthryam, can go together?

Desika says,

Parathanthryam SvakeeyEshu svathanhryasya ramApathEh  
svAthanthryasya-kAshTArupathvAth guNakotou nivEsyathe.





This pArathanthrya of the Lord towards His devotees is to be considered a praiseworthy quality as it is done by His own free will and denotes the height of His independence.

Desika gives an example of a king who, though all powerful, obeys the command of the people he loves like His wife and son. Similarly the Lord also out of His love does as he is told by His devotees, like being the charioteer, messenger or obeying the gopis, getting bound feigning fear etc. , which only enhances His charm. Here it is significant that Desika uses the term Ramakantha to denote Bhagavan which is highly suggestive of the meaning of His pArathanthrya.

#### 44. thadheeyAnAm anyOnyaseshasesheebhAvasthu itharEthara AsrayadhOshagrasthah

The sesha- seshi bhAva between two bhagavathas which is mutual is self-contradicting as one cannot be sesha and seshi at the same time.

Desika replies,

anyOnya -sEshabhAvE thu nAnyonyAsrayathA bhavEth

AkArabhEdhAth ubhayam ubhayaishAm hi yujyathE

The mutual sesha-seshi bhava is not contradicting, but appropriate, says Desika, because of the different role of each one towards the other at different times.

That is, when one is doing service to the other the first one becomes the sesha and the second becomes seshi and when the role is reversed the sesha-seshibhava is also reversed. Hence there is no inconsistency in the mutual service. This idea is brought about in Gita, where Krishna says,

‘macchithA madhgathprANA bhoDHayanthah parasparam

kaThayanthscha mAm nithyam thushyanthicha ramanthicha’

Those who are engrossed with the thought of Me, who exist for Me, relate to each other about Me and my actions and talk only about it, happy and reveling in it.

#### 45. bhAgavathAnAm bhAgavathsEshathvaniyamEsishyANAm api bhAgavathathvATHA chAryasyApi sishyasEshathvam prasajyEtha

If bhagavathas are sesha to other bhagavathas then sishya also being a bhagavatha the acharya should also be a sesha to his disciple.

There is nothing amiss, says Desika.

prathipannam parArThathvAm sishyadhEsikayOrapi

upakAraprbbEdhEna thayOh vrthih vyavasThitha





Acting for the sake of the other is befitting even between guru and sishya. The service to each other differs though according to their relative positions.

The service to each other is seshathva which exists even between the Acharya and the sishya. The seshathva of Acharya consists in imparting knowledge to him to the best of his ability and doing it as a kainkarya while that of the sishya is serving the acharya to the best of his ability. In this respect they are both sesha and seshi to each other.

47. kvachith ‘purushah sukhaduhkhAnAm bhOkthrvam hEthurychyathE(BG. 13. 20) kvachiccha ‘panchabhoothAthmakaih bhOgaih panchabhoothAthmakam vapuh, ApyAyathE yadhi thadhA pumsO bhOgoathra kim krthah. ’ ittham viruddhayOh pramANayOh kaTham athra nirvAhaha?

It is said in the Gita that the individual self is the cause of the sukha and dukha while in the sense experience the prakrthi is the cause. But some other pramAna says that the body consisting of the five elements is the enjoyer of the sense experience which also consists of the five elements and hence the soul cannot be the enjoyer. These two are contradictory.

Desika says,

bhOkthrupasya jeevasya bhOkthrvam na nishiDhyathE  
thEna prakrthisambanDhah prayukthathvam viDHeeyathE

The denial of bhokthrvam for the jiva is in respect of the body which is impermanent and to denote that the sukha and dukha that arise out of the connection of the soul with the body do not affect the one who has the knowledge of the real nature of the self.

48. chidhachidheesvarAthmaka-thathvathrayasya

svarupanityathvam thulyam, athah kaTHam achidhah Eva nasvarathvam?

When there are three reals, namely, chit, achit and Isvara, sentient self, insentient matter and the Lord, why is the achit alone said to be non-eternal and the other two eternal?

After the discussion on the ‘namah’ sabdha now the poorvapkshin turns to the Narayanasabdha.

Desika says,

svarupENa svabhAvEna rupAnthara viDhAyinee  
na dhrshtA vikrthih nATHE thasmAth nara itheeryathe

The chances are due to svarupa, nature and svabhava, character and both are absent in the Lord whih is denoted by the ‘nara’ sabdha.







Changes in form and state are seen in the insentient matter as in the case of pot which changes from mud to pot to potshreds and to potdust etc. in different states. The jiva is changeless in its svarupa but there are changes in svabhava due to the different states, according to the extent of contraction and expansion of the dharmabhuthajnana. This can be seen in the different states of knowledge for different individuals. The jiva is called 'nara' which denotes changelessness in as much as it is free from the changes as compared to the insentient matter. In the case of the Lord however there is no change either in svabhava or in svarupa and the modifications in His manifestations are by His own will. Therefore the narayana sabdha denotes that the sentient and the insentient (nArAh) arose from Him, while nara denotes the eternal soul. 'narasamooH nArah; narAth jAthAni thathvAni nArANi.'

49. asthu nara sabdhArTHah, nArAyaNa sabdhah kaTham?

The word nara has been explained but the opponent raises a question on the narayanasabdha. The word is derived as 'nArAh ayanam yasya, whose abode is the sentient and the insentient ' The question is that how can the Lord who is all pervading have the sentient and the insentient as His abode.

Desika denies any inconsistency regarding this.

antharyanthuh bhagavathah visvam chidhachidhAthmakam  
dhEhinO dhEhavath DhAryam vAsasTHAnam itheeryathE

The whole world consisting of chith and achith has the Lord as its innerself and controlled by Him from within. Just as the sarira is said to be the abode of the individual self the world of the sentient and the insentient, which is the sarira of the Lord, is said to be His abode. They owe their existence to Him but not vice versa.

50. aTHApi aNuroopANAm jeevAnAM anthah nASthi; vibhoonAm cha kAlAdheenAm bahirapi thaTHA; athah kaTHAM 'aNORaNeeYAn mahathO maheeyAn' ithyAdhibih aNORaNeeYathvam mahathO maheeyathvam cha srooyathE?

The individual self is said to be atomic and hence there cannot be anything smaller and be inside it. Similarly the all pervading substances like the time cannot have anything outside themselves. So how can the Lord be described as smaller than the atom and greater than the greatest, is the question.

Desika says,

aNORapi aNUthAvAdhO vibhOrapi vibhuthvavath  
thaththadvasthu pradhEsEshu thadhrAhithya nivrthay

The expression 'smaller than the atom and greater than the greatest' with respect to the Lord is





to denote that there is no space without His presence.

Where there is the existence of the atomic soul, there, the Lord also exists. Similarly even the entities like time which are all-pervading pervade along with the Lord. There is no space devoid of the presence of the Lord. It is not like saying that in the interspace of the threads the cloth does not exist or when a pot is inserted in water, though the water exists in and out, it is not in the substance of the pot. Therefore where jiva exists there the Lord also exists.

51. Evam bhagavathah sarvavyApakathvE sathi hEyarupEshvapi anuvarthamAnathvath akhila-hEya-prathyaneekathvam aghatitham.



Bashpa bindhu and thiruman starts wetting at the close proximity of Varadan

Accepting that the Lord is all- pervading, it follows that He is present also in avoidable things of the world and so how can the epithet 'free from all impurities' be applied to Him?

The reply is given as follows:

vishEshaNagathathvEna vikArah purushArTHayoh  
sarvAntharyAmiNah vishNOh yukthaivObhyalingathA

The modifications (like changes in nature and in mind) are pertaining to the world of sentient





and insentient being which form the modes of the Lord and hence both the epithets (ananthakalyANa gunavisishtathvam and hEyaprathyaneekathvam) apply to the Lord.

The physical and natural changes (birth, growth, transformation, decay and destruction) belong to the prakrthi, the insentient matter and the mental modifications like sukha and duhkha, caused by its association with the prakrthi, pertain to the jiva. Both of them do not affect the Lord who is the inner self of them all. Not only He is free from impurities but he frees the individual soul also from evil and hence in both ways the epithet suits Him.

52. Evam leelayA jagathvyApAre mOkshapradhAnE cha thadhubhayaleelArasasya poorvam avidhyamAnathvAth svayathnasADHyathvAth cha avApthasamasthKAmathvam bhagavathah kaTham vA abhiDheeyatha ?

The Lord is suppose to do creation and other activities as a sport for His own enjoyment. But He is termed as avApthasamasthKAmA, one who has had all desires fulfilled. How can this quality exist before creation etc. as the desires will be fulfilled only after the action?

Desika replies,

icchAvighAtharAhithyam isvarasya ApthakAmatha

nithyAnandhOpi bhagavAn srshtyAdhyaih abhinandhathi

The meaning of ApthakAma, desires fulfilled, is that there is nothing to obstruct the wish of the Lord. Eventhough He is always blissful the Lord pleases Himself by creation and other activities.

Being sathyasankalpa, of true will, the Lord gets whatever He desires and that is what is meant by avApthasamasthKAmathvam, and not that He has already has all His desires fulfilled. Hence the activities like creation are undertaken as His sport is not contradictory to His avApthasamasthKAmathva. The leelarsa, joy in His sport is ever existent as the creation etc. is beginningless. Even giving mukthi is leelarsa for Him.

53. Evam svaleelArThamEva jagathsrshthyAdhikaraNE krpayA jagathsrshthyAdhikam mOkshadhAnamapi kriyatha ithi vachasah nirvishayathvam.

If the activities like creation is for the sport of the Lord, to say that He is doing these and giving mukthi also out of mercy will have no meaning.

Desika says,

kreedyam krpayAjushtA kreedayA dukkhadhAraNath

kreedAnubandHiyukthAnAm apunarjananAdhapi

His leela is only filled with mercy. to remove the sorrow and also to give mukthi is all His leela only.







It is like a king giving payasam to the lame, blind etc for his own satisfaction. It is a playful action on the part of the king, that is, it is effortless but it is beneficial to the recipient. Similarly the Lord creates and sustains etc. He also gives the jnana to approach Him and removes the sorrow for those who surrendered to Him at the right time according to their karma.

54. nanu kaThamsarvavishyiNee krpA bhagavathah sambhavathi; bhagavalleelayA khalu madhukaitabha-hiraNya-rAvaNa-sisupAla-kamsa-narakAdheenAm maraNAni anishtAni prApithAni.

How can it be said that the mercy of the Lord extends to all as MaDhukaitabha and others faced death at His hands.

The reply is given by Desika as,

guNadhOshavyavasTHA hi lOkAdhEva avagamyathE

thasmAth dhandadHarasyAsya sTHAnE dhandO guNAYathE

The gunas and dhoshas are to be understood as in the world. It is a merit for the man of justice to give punishment where it is necessary. The chastisement by the father, for instance, of a son, is only for his own benefit. So too the retribution of the Lord is for redemption.

If there is no suffering there is no need for mercy. The Lord due to His mercy towards the good and the devoted has to punish the wicked who torment them. The mercy is without a cause, that is natural, whereas the punishment is for a purpose only.

If it is objected that to punish one to protect another does not absolve the Lord of cruelty, Desika says that even those who aspire for mukthi were once desirous of enjoying worldly pleasures and due to their suffering only they acquire the wisdom to strive from release from the samsara and hence to give suffering is also a way of correcting them and hence an act of mercy only. But the punishment lasts only till the jiva acquires jnana and hence the nigraha, retribution is only temporary whereas for the released and the eternally free souls the grace of the Lord extends forever making them enjoy eternal bliss and hence His anugraha is permanent. As the anugraha exists in this world which is His leelavibhoothi for His devotees and also in the state of release where they enjoy eternal bliss which is His bhOga vibhoothi, which is unconditioned by time or place. His nigraha on the other hand is limited to the existence in this world only and limited by time and place.

55. nanvEvamAsrithArTHAnAm sarvavyApArANAm leelAthvE-- kAchith leelAvibhoothih aparAcha bhOgavibhoothih ithi vyavasTHA kaTHAm ghatathE?

When everything is in the control of the Lord and all is His leela why should be there be a distinction between leelAvibhoothi and bhOgavibhoothi?







It is like this, says Desika.

avathAraih anEkaih svaih paravyAmOhanAth kvachith

leelAthvam itharathrApi bhOgO mOhanivAraNath

By His incarnations he deludes others by His mAya. This is His leela. In the eternal state there is no delusion but only enjoyment. This is His bhOga.

As the actors put on different costumes the Lord makes the jiva put on different costumes as a deva, manushya etc. and act on in the world. Without knowing this the jiva is deluded into believing that the body he is occupying is real. Similarly the Lord also puts different costumes and appears as Rama, Krishna etc. in His incarnations. and deludes the world. This is known as His leelavibhoothi. In bhOga vibhoothi the released and eternally free souls have their knowledge and bliss as their essence and there is no delusion but unalloyed bliss only This is His bhOga vibhoothi.

56. Evam sarvEsvarasya leelOpakaraNabhoothasya samsarathah jeevasya bhADhakathvEna avasTHithAnyEva mukthidhasAyAm anukoolathayA prathibhAsantha ithi ko ayam viruddhavadhah?

The same things that stand as obstacles to the jiva in transmigration become favourable to a released soul. Is this not self-contradictory?

No, says Desika,

puNyapApAnurODHEna prakrthih viviDHA purA

svAmi leelOpayOgithvasAkshAthkArAth sukhAyathE

The favourable and unfavourable quality of things is due to one's puNya and pApa. To the one who sees everything as the playthings of the Lord and perceives the Lord as the inner self of all, there is nothing but joy.

There is nothing exclusively favorable or unfavorable in this world. To the one who is in the midst of mist the rays of the sun gives comfort but the same in a hot afternoon is discomfoting. Similarly the food which gives happiness in hunger becomes unpalatable in illness. So the quality of giving joy or sorrow depends on the karma which is the cause of the situation one finds himself. On the other hand when the karma is exhausted and both punya and papa are extinguished, the same thing which gave suffering becomes enjoyable as in the case of one who is cured of bile, the milk becomes sweet again This is why in the state of release everything contributes to the joy of the soul through the grace of the Lord.

57. DramidOpanishad DhEsikaih 'thvAm vinA nAhamasmi nArayaNa, mAma cha vinA thvam nAseeh, 'ithi vAkyam prayujyathE. PramANabhoothayoh anyOnyaviroDHithayA prathibhAsamAnayOh anayOh arTHAnukoolyam kaTham.





The reference here is to the AzvAr sukthi in which NammAzvAr says, 'nAn unnai anri ilEn kandai nAraNane, nee yennaiyanri ilai, I do not exist without You nor do You exist without me.'

The opponent says that this sentence cannot possibly mean the identity between jiva and the Lord as it is against sruthipramANa, according to which the jiva and the Lord are different. Neither it can be taken in the sense of sesha-seshithva as there is no word to support this in the verse.

Desika replies thus:

ADHArENa vinA ADHEyam vinA mAnEna mEyaDheeh

nAStheethi vadhithum yuktham thvAm vinA nAhamAdhikam

Without the support there is no such thing as the supported; without the means there is no object of cognition. This is the meaning of non-existence of 'thvam' and 'aham,' one without the other.

The first sentence means that without the Lord who is the self, the jiva who is His sarira becomes non-existent. The next sentence means that without the jiva knowing the Lord He will not be known. The valid cognition of the Lord is through the scriptural texts like 'yathO vA imAni bhoothAni jAyqnthE yEna jAthAni jeevanthi yasmin abhisamvisanthi, from whom all this arises by whom all this is sustained and into whom all this merge back,' and the cognising subject is the jiva, without whom the cognition of the vibhoothi, the glory of the Lord will not be known. Thus the jiva owes his existence to the Lord whose validity in turn is proved by the jiva.

The derivation of the word Narayana is done in two ways. One is through bahuvreehi compound which is explained as 'nArAh ayanam yasya, whose abode is the world of sentient and insentient beings. Second derivation is according to thathpurusha compound which is nArANAm ayanah, the abode of the world of sentient and insentient beings. The first derivation explains the second sentence of the Azvar sukthi 'nee yennai anri ilai,' and the second derivation explains the first sentence, 'nAn unnai anri ilEn.'

58. jnanAnandhEshu vidhyamAnEshu thairEva svarupaniroopaNam kriyathAm; kaTham vibhoothyA svarupaniroopaNabhAvE svarupasya asiddhih uchyathE?

When the Lord is proved by jnana anandha etc. (sathyam jnAnam anantham brahma etc.) why should the proof depend on His vibhoothis?

Desika says,

vyAvrtthih sarvahEthuthva sarvAntharyAmithAdhibhih

prathipadhyEtha thadhvisvam vishnOh nithya niroopakam

The Lord being the cause of everything and the indwelling self of all is the distinguishing mark





which alone becomes the permanent proof.

The knowledge, bliss etc are also the characteristics of the jiva and will not be the sole proof of the nature of the Lord. The omniscience, infinite bliss and all pervading quality is known only through His being the sole cause and the indwelling self of all beings, which is His vibhoothi. This is why the word Narayana is explained that as the nArAh, the sentient and insentient beings sprung from Him and hence He is called Narayana, thus emphasizing His causality of the world.

59. Evam eesvarasya sarvajagath srshti samhAra karaNathva sarvAntharyAmithvAdhi sadhbhAve api jeevAnAm anyonyarakshakathvam IOkprasiddham---ThaTHA sathi 'karthum ishtam anishtam va kah prabhuh vishNunA vinA' ithyAdhi pramANArTHAH kaTHAmiva samghatanthE?

Even though the Lord is the creator, annihilator of the world and its sole cause, the jivas are seen to protect one another, attack one another, lead one another and so on. So how can the statements of the sasthanas to the effect that the Lord alone is the doer, protector and killer etc. be valid?

The reference is to the texts like 'Ekah sAstha na dhvitheeyO asthi, (MB. Asva. parva. -27-1) there is only one ruler without a second and 'kah kEna hanyathE janthuh kah kEna parirakshyathE, (VP. 1-18-31) who is killed by whom and who is protected by whom.'

There is nothing incongruous in this, says Desika.

bhAdhakathva-niyanthrthva-rakshakathvAdhikam thrishu  
eesvarAyattham EthasmAth kah kEnaEthyAdhiyujyathE.

Attacking, controlling and protecting, all these three are only through the command of the Lord and that is why it is said 'by whom and who,' etc.

The Lord alone is the sarvakarthA, doer of all. The jivas actions are influenced by their karma and hence not independent. Protected by one or harmed by others happen according to one's puNya or pApa in the poorvajanma. Through His grace only a jiva follows the path of devotion or prapatthi. The Lord is the kartha and kArayitha because through His will only any effort is taken by the jiva. But at the same time the Lord is also udhAseena, unconcerned as He is the cause of all actions and has no likes and dislikes. When the jiva starts an action the Lord becomes the anumanthA, one who permits, and initiates the jiva to continue the action. He is the sakshi, witness as nothing happens without his knowledge. As He aids in all endeavours He is the sahakari, the helper. He is the phalapradha, bestower of the fruit of endeavour. In short as Ramanuja has declared in his nithyagrantha 'thasmAth sarvAthmanA bhagavathparthantra Eva ayam jeevah,' jiva is dependent on the Lord in all respects.

60. NanvEvambhakthi-prapatthi -prasootha -prasAdhAth anishtanivrtthou sahaja





souhArdhAdhEva uttharothhara athisaya prApthih, gadhyE 'kEvalam madheeyayaiva dhayayA' ithyAdhinA krpAyAh anishtanivarthakathvam prasAdhasya uttharsiddhi prapakathvam cha kaTHam uchyathe

It is said that due to the Lord getting pleased by bhakthi and prapatthi the suffering is removed and due to His natural affection one attains liberation. In saraNAgathi gadhya Ramanuja says it is other way round, that is, the mercy of the Lord removes the suffering while His pleasure is the cause of mukthi. How can these two statements be reconciled?

Desika explains thus:

krpAnishtanivrththeecchA prasAdhah svaccha mAnasam

krpAprasAdhayoh thasmAth gadhyE hEthuthvam uchyathE

The word krpA means here the grace which removes the obstacles and the word prasAdha denotes the natural affection of the Lord and hence there is no contradiction. The reason for the Lord getting pleased with bhakthi and prapatthi is His natural mercy which results in His will to remove the obstacles in the path of His devotees. This again is denoted by His natural affection.

61. nanu sarvajnasyApi bhagavathah svAsritha dhOsheshu 'avijnAthA' ithyAdhibhiah avijnAthr vachanam kaTHam aviruddham?

When the Lord is omniscient how can it be said that He is oblivious of the faults of His devotees?

The reference is to the name 'avjnAthA,' in Vishnusahasranama which is explained as 'the one who does not know the faults of His devotees.'

There is nothing untoward in calling Him so, says Desika.

avijnAthrthvam eesasya sarvajnasyApi yujyathE

kEnApyupAyabhEdhEna svAsrithAgha nivAraNath

The epithet avijnAtha is quite appropriate because He removes the faults of His devotees by some means or other.

The Lord destroys the sins committed prior to prapatthi and does not mind those done inadvertently after prapatthi and even when the prapanna does something wrong intentionally the Lord frees him from that also either by making him atone for it or by punishing him to cure him of the sinful intentions. Hence even though He is fully aware of the sins committed by His devotees He acts as though He does not know by redeeming them from their sin. KoorEsa mentions this in his Varadarajasthava by saying 'yathO dhOsham bhakthEshu iha varadha naivAkalayasi, that is, the Lord Varada does not mind the faults of His devotees. This denotes the vAthsalya, affection of the Lord towards His devotees.







62. athra anyE vadhanthi ayanasabdhEna karaNavyuthpatthya upAyathvam karmavyuthpatthya upEyathvam ithi bhavadhbhiih abhiDheeyatha; thath kaTHam upapadhyathE?

The word 'ayana' in Narayana is explained in the sense of both upAya and upEya, that is, the means and the end. How is this possible for the same entity to be both upAya and upEya?

The word ayana can be derived as 'eeyathe anEna' attained through Him which is karaNavyuthpatthi, that is, in the sense of His being instrumental in attaining the result. But when it is derived as eeyathE asou, that is, He is attained, He becomes the fruit Himself. The opponent says the means and the end cannot be the same.

Desika replies,

upAyOpEya rupathvam EkasyApi cha sambhavEth

AkArabhEdhayOgEna virOdha shAnthim ApnuyAth.

The same entity can be both upAya and upEya and there is no contradiction due to AkArabhEdha, difference of form or state.

The Lord is the means, upAya, to attain Himself. Through His mercy and affection to the devotee He makes it possible for the devotee to attain Himself. Since the goal of prapatti or devotion is to attain the Lord, He becomes the upEya. So there is no contradiction here, says Desika, referring to the words of the poet Murari in his work anargha raghavam, where the Lord is being described as both the means and the end. 'sa svEnaiva phalapradhah phalamapi svEnaiva nArAyanah,' In the asvamedhayaga performed by Dhasaratha, the Lord was the giver of the fruit, namely the progeny and He himself became the fruit by being born as the son of Dhasaratha.

63. Evamphalabhoothasyaiva phalpradhatvEna upAyathvam bhakthiprapatthyOh sAdhAraNam;Evam cha sathi kaTHam prapannaAdhikAri vishayE visEshENa bhaagvathah upAyathvamanusanDHEyam ithyuchyathE?

When the Lord is said to be both means and the end because the one who is to be attained bestows the fruit of attaining Him, it is common to both bhaktha, one who follows bhakthiyoga and prapanna, one who surrenders to Him. Then why is His upAyathva is specifically mentioned with respect to the prapanna only.

Desika replies,

upAyathvam visEshENa thulyathvEpyupapadhyathE

upAyAntharasADHyasya svayamEvOpapAdhanAth

Even though both are equal for the prapanna the Lord Himself becomes the upAya in the place





of the other (bhakthiyoga), the one who surrenders gets the same result as the one who does bhakthiyoga without the effort of the latter and hence as the Lord gives him the fruit of bhakthiyoga Himself without any effort on the part of the prapanna, He is said to be the upaya especially for the prapanna.

64. Bhakthischa bhagavthprasAdhavyavaDhAnEna phalam dhadhAthi na thu sAkshAth phalahEthuh; athah vyAjamAthram Ethadhapi praptthEh thulyam;Evam cha sathi prapatthih anupAyah bhakthisthu upAyah ithi vadhathAm ko va abhiprAyah?

Even bhakthiyoga becomes fruitful only through the grace of the Lord and hence it is equally a cause for the attainment of the goal as prapatthi. So why should there be distinction between the two, regarding one being the upaya (bhakthi) and not the other (Prapatthi), because the Lord Himself is the upaya?

The reply is given thus:

bharavinyAsa rupathvAthvEdhyAkArE visEshathah  
anupAyathvam Ethasya mOkshOpAyasya yujyathE

The praptthi is not an upaya in the sense that the prapanna surrenders the responsibility and the fruit to the Lord so that He himself becomes the upAya for moksha and the fruit.

In the method of performing both differ as in Bhakthi yoga there is a lot of effort like worship and other austerities where as in the prapatthi only requisite is the total surrender, saying, 'ThvamEva upAyabhoothO mE bhava', You be the means to attain Yourself. The Lord accepts the responsibility and gives Him the fruit of bhakthiyoga, Himself taking the role of the upaya, that is, bhakthiyoga. This is why it is said that prapatthi is not a upaya.

65. 'sarvam paravasam duhkham sEvA shvavrthih AkhyAthA' ithyAdhyukthaprakArENa parasEvA rupasya kainkaryasya kaTHam purushArTHathvam?

It is said (in Manusmrthi-4-6, 4-9) that to serve others brings sorrow and service is mentioned as dog's life. Hence how can the state of being a servant can be a purushArTHa?

Even though a released soul attains bliss by enjoying the presence of the Lord, he is also said to be doing the kainkarya of the Lord. How can it be mentioned as a purushArTHa, the goal to be achieved?

Desika says that this is the argument of those who do not understand what is purushArTHa.

AthmAbhimAnAnuguNa purushArTHa vyavasTHithEh  
kimkarathvaparijnAnAth kainkaryam abhinandhyathE

The end sought depends on the attribute of the individual. To the one who has a proper





understanding of service it brings joy.

Starting from the world of Brahma the notion of happiness is relative, according to one's own attitude. To those who are aware of their dependence and seshathva to the Lord the service to Him gives happiness. The comparison of service to a dog's life is with reference to serving others who do not deserve it and does not include the service to Acharya and the Lord. Serving one's parents and elders is accepted by the dharmasasthra. It is mentioned in Vishnuthatthva 'VichithrA dhEhasampatthih eesvarAya nivEdhithum; poorvamEva krthA brahman hasthAdhAdhisamyutha', which means that we have been endowed with hands and feet and other limbs only to be used in the service of the Lord.

66. Evam asEvya sEvAyah nivarthaneeyathvE 'yOgakshEmArTham eesvaram abhigacchEth',  
ithyAdhyuktham prbhooNAm abhigamanam kaTHam vA upapadyathE?

When it is said that the service to others except to the Lord is to be avoided, how can the statement 'one should approach the king for the well being,' be appropriate?

It is said in Gouthama dharmasuthra that one should approach the king for getting wealth and to protect it. How can this be true when only service should be to the Lord, is the question.

Desika says,

prabhooNAm bhADHashAnthyarTHam

kvachith jnAnam viDheeyathE

vinA thEnApi kEshAmchith

vrthih bhAgyavathAm bhavEth

The people like a king have to be approached for protection from trouble but the fortunate ones are able to lead their lives without them.

The patronage of powerful personages like kings is needed only for those who want to acquire worldly things and to protect them. The parmaikAnthis who are endowed with sathva can live in places inhabited by saintly souls if they can, and this is the lot of a fortunate few.

67. Evam vidhyamAnadhasAyam bhagavthkainkaryasya purushArThathvE api  
mOkshAvasThAyAm kvachith anubhavah purushArTham ithyabhiDHeeyathE kvachith  
cha thathkainkaryam; Evam cha parasparaviruddhayOh vAkyayOh kaTHam avirODHah?

While in samsara the service to the Lord may be the purushArTHa but in the state of release, according to some pramAna the purushArTha consists in enjoying the presence of the Lord while in other pramANas it is said that doing kainkarya to the Lord is the purushArTha in moksha. How can these two statements be reconciled?

Desika says that the two, namely kainkarya and the anubhava go together.







pramANath purushArTHathvam jnAnakainkaryayOh dhvayOh

Ekasyaikathra kaThanAthitharasyOpalakshaNam

The purushArThathva is common to both kainkarya, the service to the Lord and anubhava, enjoyment of His presence, according to the pramANas. When one is mentioned the other is understood.



“Chandanam gets wet at Varadan's sannidhi”

‘sAyujyam prathipanna yE theevrabhakthAh thapasvinah

kimkarA mama thE nithyam bhavanthi nirupadhraAh’ (Paramasamhitha-30-94)

The meaning of the verse is that those who do bhakthi or prapatthi earnestly will attain sAyujaya and will be doing service to the Lord and will never revert back to samsara. The same idea is expressed by Ramanuja in saranAgathi gadhya by ‘bhagavadhnuhavajanitha anavaDhika athisayapreethikArithA asEshAvasthOchitha asEshasEshatha ekarathirupa nithyakinkaro bhavAni.’

The meaning is as follows:

Ramanuja in his saranagathi gadhya prays that he will be the eternal servant to the Lord on







attaining Him and the love for service is created by the wonderful and unlimited love on experiencing the joy of the presence of the Lord.

68. Nanu Evamapi vishNulokAdhikam prApthAnAm----kAlavisEshanirdhEsam sathyapi----bhagavantham prApthanAm kaTham apunarAvrtthih srooyathE?

For those who reach the world of the Lord Vishnu, the stay there is restricted, though unimaginably long. But why is it that on attaining the Lord there is said to be no return?

The reference here is to the words of the Lord in the Gita, 'mAmupEthyathu kounthEya punarjanma na vidhyathE, (BG. 8-16) on reaching Me there is no rebirth.'

Desika distinguishes between Vishnuloka and parampadha (vaikunta).

sambhavEth punarAvrtthih vishnulOkAdhivAsinAm  
nithyam chApunarAvrtthih vaikunTE thu nigadhyathE

Jivas reaching all the lokas including that of Vishnu are liable to return to earth when their punya is exhausted. But on attaining Vaikunta there is no return.

Here the vishnuloka means the realm of the trinities and does not indicate that of the Lord. The abode of the Lord Narayana is the paramapadha or vaikunta.

69. Evam punarAvrtthyabhAve sathi mukthAnam 'imAn IOkAnkAmannee kAmarupyanusancharan' ithi ihalOka sanchAravachanam nOpapadhyathE

In the event of non-return for those who attain release, the statement that the released soul moves about in all the worlds as he wishes taking the form he wishes will not be appropriate.

In Taiitiriya upanishad it is said that the realised soul leaving this body attains the blissful self and afterwards gets the power to move about in the worlds as he wishes in the form he wishes doing sAmagana. 'asmAth IOkAth prEthyath---Etham Ananadhamayam AthmAnam upasankramayya; imAn IOkAn kAmAnnee kAmarupee anusancharan; EthathsAmagAyann AsthE.' (Taitt. Brgu. 10-5)

There is nothing incongruous in this, says Desika,

mukthasya punarAvrtthih vAryathE karmasambhavA  
na thu vArya thathO vishNOh anusancharaNAdhikam

The return to samsara alone is denied and not the coming to the earth by their own will like the Lord does on His incarnations.

The free movement to wherever they want, is granted for the released souls as that for the eternal souls like Garuda and Anantha but while this is natural for the latter it is only happens





after release for the former.

70. Evam tharhi eesvaraparathanthrayA sarvathra varthamAnasya mukthasya 'svAthanthyam athulam prApya thEnaiva saha mOdhathe, ' ithyAdhi svaccahandhavihAravachanam nirvishayam Eva syAth

When the individual soul is always under the control of the Lord how can he be said to act as he likes in the state of release as per the declaration by the sruthi that he attains equal status of independence as the Lord and is happy with Him?

Desika says,

asvathanthrasya mukthasya mukthou svAthanthyamuchyathE

bhOgakainkaryayOh shakthya svathanthrEsvaraniGhnaya

The independence for the released soul who is always dependent on the Lord means that in the state of release he has the freedom to enjoy what he wants and serve the Lord as He likes.

This is because the Lord never curtails the wishes of the released soul and he has all his wishes fulfilled regarding his enjoyment of the presence of the Lord and in doing His kainkarya, alike the eternal souls, for whom however this freedom is eternal.

71. thaTHAapi sarvOpADHivinirmukthathvAth sarvEshAmapi mukthAnAm phalam EkarupamEva samuchitham;Evam cha sathi-----mOkashavishaya sAlOkya sArupya sAmeepyAdhibhEdhavachanam kaTHam upapadyathE?

Only after becoming free from all adjuncts one attains mOksha and hence the experience must be the same for all in the state of release. If so, why the different states of mOksha are mentioned like sAlOkya, sArupya and sAyujya etc. ?

sAyujyam is the real meaning of moksha. says, Desika.

mOkshah sAyujyamEvAthra sAlOkyAdhou thu thadvachah

aoupachArikamithyEva nischinvanthi vipaschithah

The real mOksha is sAyujya only and the words sAlOkya etc are used to denote mOksha in a complimentary sense.

It is said in Bhagavatha,

LokEshu vishnOh nivasanthi kEchith

sameepam rchanthi cha kEchidhanyE

anyE thu rupam sadhrsam bhajanthE

sAyujyam anyE sa thu mOkshaukthah

'Some live in the same realm with the Lord which is sAlOkya; others live very close to Him,





that is, sAmeepya; Yet others acquire a form similar to Him known as sArupyam; Some others enjoy the same pleasures with the Lord, that is sAyujya which alone is called mOksha. ‘

Those who reach Vaikunta attain the Lord and experience sAyujya which includes sAIOkya and the other states. But those who reach the vishnulOka enjoy only the states other than sAyujya. Among the states of sAIOkya, sArupya and sAmeepya each one is higher than and includes the previous one.

72. sAyujyam khalu EkeebhAva Eva thaTHA cha parabrahmana-Ekeebhoothasya jivasya kaTHam sEshathvam kaTham vA kainkaryam?

sAyujya means becoming one with the other and hence once the jiva merges into the Lord how is it possible for him to be sEsha of the Lord or do kainkarya to him?

Desika replies

EkeebhAvo na sAyujyam sabdhasAmarthyavarjanAth

bhOgyasAmyam thu sAyujyam pramAnaih avaDhAraNath

Sayujyam does not mean to become one with as the word has a different meaning. It is derived as ‘sayujO bhAvah sAAyujyam. ‘As yoga means joining, it denotes the two entities join together (without shedding their identities) as the word saha means ‘together.’ sAyujyam is to be taken in the sense of ‘mama sADHarmyam AgathAh, (BG. 14-2) they become similar to Me,’ and ‘anEna sAmyam yAsyAmi, (MB. shanthi. 312-34) I am going to be like the Lord, ‘Sruthi also confirms this by the texts like ‘dhvA suparNA sayujA sakhAya,’ (Mund. 3-1-1) where the jiva and Brahman are mentioned as closely united. The word sayujya is used only in this sense everywhere. (Cf. sAyujyam parathipannAhi--question 67)

This is why the jiva is mentioned as enjoying the same pleasures with the Lord in the released state by the sruthi text ‘sOasnuthE sarvAn kAmAn saha;brahmaNA vipaschithA.’ (Taitt. Anandha. 2) The example quoted in the upanishad to denote the state of attaining Brahman, namely that of rivers joining the sea also does not indicate absolute identity of the rivers with the sea, but only denotes that the two are inseparable. For instance, when the water from two pots are mixed the water level rises showing that they are two and not one. Therefore the equality of enjoyment is the meaning of sayujya.

73. Evam parathanthrasEshabhoothasya mukthasya svathanthraswAminah bhagavathascha kaTHam bhOgasAmyam?

When the jiva is dependent on the Lord how can there be equality in enjoyment with the Lord who is independent?

Desika replies,

sArvajnaAth ubhayOrathrabhOgaikyAvabhiyujiyathE





bhOgasAmyam yaTHA rAjnA thulyasanthOshayOgithA

Just as those close to the king enjoy the same pleasure along with the king the released souls experience the same joy as the Lord since they are enjoying Him only.

74. thathApijagathsrshTyAdhivyaAparasAlinah bhagavathah leelArasADHikyam avarjanEEyam

Even then the joy of the Lord who is engaged in the activities of creation etc for His sport excels that of the released soul.

Desika refutes this.

ganDharvavidhya nyAYEna nataprEkashakayOriva

santhOshasAmyam ubhayOh chEthanEsvarayOrapi.

Just as the pleasure of the actor and the director is equal so too here the joy of the Lord is equal to that of the muktha.

75. 'samsArakAraNanivrtthirEva mokshah' ithi bhAshyakArairapi angeekriyathE;'sarvapApEbhyo mOkshayishyAmi' ithi bhagavath Acha prathyayAyi;Evam cha sathi kaTHam anishtanivrtthih ishtaprApthih ithi dhvaiviDHyam?

In Sribhashya Ramanuja defines release as the removal of cause of samsara. The lord also has made His promise in the charamasIoka that He will release those who surrender to Him from all sins. Then how can there be the removal of the undesirable and attainment of the desired objects in Moksha?

Desika says,

asthu arTHO mOkshasabdhasya banDHa kAraNavAraNam

thaTHApyAnandhasadbhAvasiddhayE athra vivichyathE

The real meaning of mOksha is only the removal of the cause of bondage. But to prove the difference of the concept of moKsha from the views of others it is specified as the removal of the unpleasant and attainment of the pleasant since in mOksha one experimnces the bliss of Brahman.

76. aTHAapi bhavAntharAbhAva pakshE abishtanivrtthirEva ishtaorApthih syAth;thaTHA kaTham ubhayanirdhEsE pounrukthyaparihArah?

Even so, as the existence of one means the nonexistence of its opposite why should there be the mention of anishtanivrtthi and ishtaprApthi separately since it is tantamount to tautology?







It is not so, says Desika.

EkamEva svarupENa prathyOgisamanvayAth  
niroopyamANam bhEdhEna vyapadhEsArha ishyathE

It is explained in terms of its svarupa and in terms of its counter-correlate which is the difference.

To define the nature of an entity is one way and in another way it is defined by negating its counter-correlate like describing whiteness of a thing by its existing colour, that is, as white and also by denying blackness in it. Thus the anishtanivrtthi is the removal of the cause of bondage, that is the contraction of the jnana in the state of transmigration and ishtanivrtthi is the joy that is experienced on account of it.

77. mOkshadhasAyAm AgAminah jnAna vikAsaykAryathvAthkaThamnithyathvaupapatthih?

The jnana of the individual self expands to its natural fullness in the state of release. Then how is it possible to say that the jnAna is eternal?

This is quite appropriate, says Desika.

praDHvamsAbhAva-nithyathvam bhavathA yadhvadh uchyathE  
thadhvathpramANasAmarthyAth mukthajnAnasya nithyathA

As the eternity of the non-existence of destruction is accepted in Nyaya system, likewise the jnana in mukthi is proved to be eternal by the pramAna.

In Nyaya system when a pot is destroyed the destruction of the pot becomes non-existent. This is what is known as praDhvamsAbhAvAbhava, which is eternal, since it has no end. That is, when the pot is destroyed it is not going to be destroyed again and hence the non-existence of destruction in all cases after a thing is destroyed is said to be eternal. Similarly when the jnAna has attained its natural fullness, there is no more cause for it to become contracted again and hence it is said as being eternal. The pooranajnana is the natural state of the jiva which was contracted during the state of samsara due to karma and when the cause of bondage through karma, that is the nescience is destroyed the jnana reverts back to its original state. As the light of a gem is not created by cleaning, 'yaTHA na kriyathE jyothsnA malaprakshAlanAth maNeh,' the jnAna is not newly created and hence it is nithya. Once the jiva becomes a muktha his jnAna is never ceases to be fully blossomed due to the grace of the Lord. Same is the case of the eternal souls.

78. nanu mukthasya kainkaryanithyathvE kainkaryasya sareerApEkshAyAm sathyAm sareerithvam asareerithvam cha dhvithaymapi kaTham?

When the kainkarya of the released soul is eternal it requires a body to do it. So how can it be said that the muktha is both with and without body? This refers to Brahmasuthra





‘dhvAdhasAhavath ubhayaviDham bhAdhrAyaNOthah, (BS. 4-4-12) VyAsa is of the opinion that the jiva in mukth is of both forms ( with and without sarira) as in the sacrifice of dhvAdhasAha. ‘The sacrifice called dhvAdhsAha, is called sathra if many take the vow and aheena if one does. Like wise the muktha is said to have body or without it by his will

Desika replies,

svAmyabheeshtaviDHANam hi kainkaryam abhiDHeeyathE

thasmAth ubhayarupENa kainkaryam prathipadhyathe

The meaning of kainkarya is to do the bidding of the Lord. It could be done both with and without a body. As in the world the actors please their master sometimes with costumes and sometimes without, the released souls serve the Lord by assuming different forms by their will.

79. Evamapi svacchandhavrththiparihArENa paracchandhAnuvarthinah mukthasya kaTham idham kainkaryam abhinandhaneeyam?

How can this type of service, where one acts not according to his own wish but in accordance to another, be praiseworthy?

The reply to this is,

BhagavathkimkarathvEna svAthmayATHAthmyavEdhinAm

svAmyabheestaviDHANam hi svasyAbheestam ihOchyathE

For those who know themselves to be the seshas of the Lord by nature, the service to the Lord becomes their wish also. As in the world, the wives, children and the attendants of a king experience pleasure by serving him here also the released souls obtain in the service of the Lord.

80. thTHApi svAmisanthOsha Evakainkaryasya prayojanam ithi kaTham?

Even then how can it be said that the pleasure of the master is the only purpose of service?

Desika says,

pathibhOgAnushangENa siddhO nEva phalAyathE

svabhOGhah sa cha thadhbhOgaseshathvam aDHigachathi

The fruit of the service to the husband consists in his satisfaction only. Similarly the enjoyment of the muktha consists in the joy of being the sesha of the Lord.

Thus ends the MoolmanthrAdhikara.





ithi kila yathirAjOpajna mArGop aroDha  
prasamanarasikAnAm p rAkthanAnAm priyaya  
Munijanaba humAnyAmmoolamantharTha yukthim  
vyavrNu tha varadHachAryah sarvathanthrasvathanthrah

For the sake of those who wish to quell the impediments in the path advocated by Ramanuja  
The Varadacharya, explained the meaning of the moolamanthra which is revered by the sages.

ithinikhila thArkika choodAmaNina sarvathanthrasvathanthrENa  
ubhayavEdhAnthAchAtryENa srimadhvaradhanAthryENa samskrtheekrthE virOdhaparihArE  
moolamanthrADHikArah praTHamah

Sri NigamAntha Mahaa Desikaaya Nama:

Saroja Ramanujam





## DHVAYADHIKARAM



“Varadan Special sEvai for Svami”

sadagopan.org

In the section on DhvayAdhikAram, Swamy Desikan clears our doubts relating to Mantra Ratnam (Dhvyam). If Thirumanthiram deals with the upAyam and Phalan briefly, Dhvayam elaborates on the Moksha UpAyam and Moksha Phalan.

Swamy Desikan states his goals for his upadEsams on Dhvyam this way: “We resolve here the elaboration of UpAya -upEyams (ViSadha anusandhAna arTam) of Mantra ratnam (Dhvayam), which was covered succinctly by Moola Mantram, the quintessence of all tatthvArTams (Sarva SaarArTa garbhamAna Moola Mantram)”.

Swamy Desikan starts with a prayer to Thiruvaheendhrapura NaaTan:

apAsa thu tama: pumsAm anapAya-prabhAnvitha:

Aheendhra nagarE nithyam udhithOyam Ahaskara:







Meaning:

May the Sun associated with blemishless lustre, who rises always at Thiruvaheendhrapuram known as adiyavarkku Meyyan remove the darkness of ajn~Anam of all chEtanams.

81. Is PirAtti's PurushakAram (SipArsu/ Intercession) essential ?

SvabhAvika Sarvarakshakasya Parama KaaruNeekasya Bhavatha: kaTamiva PurushakAra apEksha ? -- KumAra VaradAchAr

Answer:

Periya PirAtti pleads our case with Her Lord. We call her for this reason PurushakAram. Her pleading with Her Lord to forgive our trespasses (PurushakAram) is not explicitly stated in Moola Manmtram. The padham, "Sriman" in Dhvaya Mantram clearly refers to PirAtti. The Divine couple is without beginning or end. They both are independent (svatantra). They have an agreement between them as two independent divinities that the Lord is the one who will punish those who trespass His Saasthrams and PirAtti is the one to intercede with Her Lord on behalf of their children, who have committed Mahaa aparAdhams thru Bhagavath Saasthra ullanganams. Although the Lord has wonderous guNams and sambhandhams, He (as Svatanran and SEshi) responds affirmatively to the sipArsu of His Devi, controls His anger at the offending chEtanams and changes His mind about punishing them. This is Their agreed way of operation.

82. How can one describe the activities of a Purushan (PurushakAram) and associate it with PirAtti ?

asthu PurushakArathvam, taTApi PurushakAra SaBdha: chEtana -viSEshu kaTam prayujyathE ? -- KumAra VaradAcchAr

Answer:

The words, RaajAvashDambham and Raaja kulam refer to the duties of one associated with the King (Raajaa). She pleads with Her Lord (Purushan) on behalf of the plight of Jeevans; that is why She is referred rightfully as PurushakAram.

83. The doubts about "Srimath " sabdham

In dhavyam, there is the "Srimath" Sabdham (i-e):The Lord is the One associated with His PirAtti in an inseperable manner (apruTak siddha visEshaNam). If that is so, Sri Sabdham alone is sufficeint to describe PirAtti's PurushakAram and the addition of the "Mathubh" Sabdham indicating separation from Her Lord raises doubt about Srimath SabdhArTam.





Answer:

Yes, it is true that PirAtti is inseparable from Her Lord (yEka SEshithva yOgam). She is visEshaNam for Her Lord and therefore there is no objection to adding mathubh Sabdham with SrI Sabdham to result in “SrImath” Sabdham. The situation is similar to Jeevan from whom the Jn~Anam can not be separated, which leads to the term “Jn~AnavAn (Mathubh vihuthi is added here to Jeevan). Here Jn~Anam is the visEshaNam for Jeevan. The addition of Mathubh to Jn~Anam does not separate the Jn~Anam from the Jeevan. They are not disassociated. There is therefore no virOdham (Conflict) with the central doctrine of VisishtAdhavaitham (all chEtana-achEtanams are EmperumAn’s VisEshaNam), when Srimath SaBdhArTam is interpreted as Mathubh standing united with SrI SaBdham.

The word “Srimath” has to be interpreted as the One who is inseparable with Her Lord and as One who stands as the VisEshaNam for Her Lord (SarvasyApi tattva-jaathasya Bhagavath apruTak-siddha visashEnEna YEKAM TATTHVAM ithi vaadhOapi yukthatara: ithi). In Srimath Rahasya Thraya Saaram, Swamy Desikan clarifies the place of Mathup, when it is united with SrI Sabdham:” here, the use of Mathup (mathup upayOga visEsham) is consistent with pramANams (PramANa siddham) and the union of these two words (SrI and mathup) denote Nithya yOgam (being united with Her Lord in an inseparable manner).

84. If we state Dhivya Dampathis are UpAyam (for Moksham), does not suggest that there are two upAyams for Moksham ?

All Saasthrams state: “TamEva SaraNam gaccha” (Seek Him ALONE for refuge), “MaamEkam SaraNam vraja”. In dhvayam, it asks us to consider dhivya dampathis (LakshmyA saha BhagavAn) as upAyam. Is thisn’t a conflict ?

Answer:

PirAtti is VisEshaNam for the Lord, who is the upAyam. She is inseparable from Him. Hence when we state that the Lord with His PirAtti is UpAyam (means) for Moksha phalan thru the use of “SrimAn”, there is no virOdham between this view and the one, which states “ Seek Him alone for refuge).

85. How can we explain the view that the Lord’s Thiruvadi is UpAyam instead of the Lord ?

Sarva visishtasya Bhagavatha yEva upAyathvE taccha charaNAravindha saamAnAdhikaraNam kim ?

Answer:

It is appropriate to recognize that Iswaran is Moksha upAyam. However, dhvaya mantram states that His avayavam (limb), sacred feet is the UpAyam instead of the Iswaran Himself





(Sriman NaarAyaNa charaNou SaraNam prapadhyE). ChEtanan does Prapatthi. At that time, the chEtanan has to meditate on the Lord and His ThirumEni. When we seek Him as refuge, it is easier His sacred feet have more power than His other limbs to increase the Lord's anugraham and grow His dayaa. As the servant of the Lord, it is but natural to fall at the Master's feet. Therefore it is not inappropriate to meditate on those sacred feet of the Lord that has the power to destroy all sins and these sacred feet are a delight in their own right to meditate upon.

86. How can we intepret SaraNa sabdham as UpAyam as per Ahirbudhnya samhitha (7.29) ?  
How can we conclude that SaraNa Sabdham denotes upAyam (upAyArTaika Vaachakam) whereas it fits more with the meaning of Rakshakan ?

Answer:

Prapatthi has five angams. One is Gopthruva VaraNam (i-e), the prayer to the Lord to become the supplicant Jeevan's protection as its rakshakan. The One who protects is EmperumAn. In view of his insufficiency to practise Bhakthi yOgam, the chEtanan requests the Lord to stand in the place of the tough Bhakthi yOgam and protect him and free him from the burden of his own protection. To emphasize this, it has been concluded that SaraNa Sabdham stands for UpAyam here. Not only does the Lord protect (provide rakshaNam) in the standard manner, but he protects also thru standing in place of Bhakthi yOgam. That is the reason to connect SaraNa sabdham with UpAya arTam.

87.The doubt about the verb “padh” in PrapadhyE found in the Poorva bhAgam of Dhvaya mantram:

‘padh’ means reaching (adaithal). The verb form of adaithal has another meaning, knowing (aRithal), as well according to rules of grammar. “aRithal” stands for firmness of mind. That firmness of perception is that the Lord is the UpAyam for Moksham. That awareness arises from knowledge of Saasthrams. Beyond that knowledge based on Saasthrams, there is no other direction to place the burden of protection with the five angams of Prapatthi to the Rakshakan. The word PrapadhyE and the root inside “Padh” does not reveal it. How can we assume that it goes beyond knowledge to performance of the anushtAnam of Prapatthi ?

Answer:

Many PramANams directs the Jeevan to perform Prapatthi and explain the svaroopam of Prapatthi with its 5 angams and placing the burden of protection at the Lord's sacred feet. BharanyAsam (placing the protection of the soul's rakshaNam) is now an angi. The angam of Mahaa ViswAsam (Unflinching Faith in the Lord as the Rakshakan) and the associated angi of Bhara NyAsam together are the embodiment of Jn~Anam (aRithal/adaithal) and therefore there is no objection to the use of PrapadhyE to denote the performance of the act of prapatthi





and seeking the Lord as one's rakshakan (savisvAsO bharanyAsa: prapatthi: ithi abhidheeyathE).

88. What is the purpose of the use of present tense in PrapadhyE? Why the use of present tense (varthamAna Kaalam)? It appears to suggest that Prapatthi has to be done like Bhakthi yogam until moksha siddhi. This interpretation based on the use of the present tense goes against the instructions of BhagavAn that Prapatthi for Moksham has to be done only once and not repeatedly.

Answer:

This present tense refers only to the time at which the one time Prapatthi is done. After the performance of Prapatthi (present tense), the act is over in a trice of time. Prapatthi yOgam is not like bhakthi yOgam, where it has to be practised until the Moksha Phalan is attained. Once is enough for Prapatthi. Therefore, Prapatthi can not be compared to Bhakthi yOgam in anushtAnam.

89. Doubt about the Srimath Sabdham in the utthara BhAgam of Dhvayam:

Srimath sabdham denotes Pathni sambhandham and especially Sri Devi (Periya PirAtti). Why is She singled out and not the other attributes of the Lord like His ThirumEni (Subha tanu), GuNams et al? Do they not qualify for the Muktha Jeevan's enjoyment?

Answer:

Yes, it is correct that the Muktha Jeevan enjoys the Lord as Ubhaya VibhUthi NaaTan with subha Tanu and guNams. Periya Piratti is singled out and linked to the Lord thru Srimath Sabdham to indicate that SarvEswaran accepts the kaimkaryams of the Seshan (Muktha Jeevan) as Seshi, while being united with Periya PirAtti (yEka Seshithva yOgam).

90. How can we explain the special meaning given for the Nama: sabdham (appearing at the end of the utthara khANDam of Dhvayam)?

Nama: sabdham is explained as the prayer to remove the four kinds of unwelcome thoughts, while performing bhagavath Kaimkaryam as a Muktha Jeevan. The usual interpretation of Nama: sabdham is na + mama: May the undesirable ill effects not come my way. In contrast, the special meaning of nama: sabdham indicates that it is a prayer to ward of the four kinds of vipareetha thoughts while serving the Lord. These Four are: I perform the Kaimkaryams as a Svathanthran, I do it for my phalan, I enjoy that Phalan as a svatantran and I enjoy those phalans for my own sake.







**Answer:**

In this world, these four damaging thoughts do arise. It certainly does not cross the mind of a Muktha Jeevan, while performing nithya kaimkaryam in Sri Vaikuntam. While performing Prapatthi here from the Karma bhUmi, it is not incorrect to request the kaimkaryam (yet to be enjoyed at Parama Padham) to be free of the four vipareetha beliefs. If the mumukshu (the one seeking Moksham) does not ask the Lord with such clear knowledge and faith about the kaimkaryams to be done at His supreme abode, it would be impossible for the Lord to grant the phalan of Prapatthi. There is nothing wrong in such a prayer during one's Prapatthi.





## CHARAMA SLOKADHIKARAM (91-100):

The AakshEpa-SamAdhAnams regarding the meanings of Charama SIOkam are covered here.



“Svami returning back to Thuppul (vATTam in thirumukham)”

91. The explanation for the word “Parithyajya” in Charama sIOkam: (Question): If a Prapannan following the instruction of the Lord to abandon all dharmAs, how can one do that and live like the bird and the beast and roam around ? This is worrisome.

**Answer:**

One has to focus on what are the dharmAs that are to be abandoned. The chEtanan has already abandoned the performance of dharmAs beyond his capacity as undoable. The instruction is that chEtanan is standing powerless to perform Bhakthi yogam and gain its Phalans that he aspired for. Technically, he has abandoned that dharmam due to his incapacity. This point of view clearly indicates that the chEtanan can not abndon those dharmAs, which he can do and





he must perform them. Explained in another way, the act of Prapatthi does not expect the help of any dharmams beyond its five angams. Therefore, all the other dharmAs are not angams of Prapatthi and can be abandoned. Included in this view is the assumption that the dharmAs related to Aasramam and VarNam (VarNAsrama dharmams) have to be observed for the pleasure of the Lord. There is also no injunction against doing things that please the Lord without expecting any Phalan for oneself.

### 92. Which is the UpAyam: Prapatthi or Emperumaan ?

Charama sIokam commands: 'Perform Prapatthi' and implies that Prapatthi is the UpAyam. Other vachanams state that EmperumAn is the UpAyam. There is doubt here about which one is the correct UpAyam.

Answer:

EmperumAn is SiddhOpAyam, the UpAyam that exists eternally and not invented by anyone. SaadhyOpAyam is the upAyam performed by a chEthanam (Prapatthi). Both are UpAyams. Among the two, SiddhOpAyam is mukhyam. The role of Prapatthi ends when the Lord's anger over trespasses is quenched by the act of Prapatthi. The most merciful Lord accepts the burden of chEthanams' protection and is siddhOpAyam. Hence, EmperumAn is the most significant upAyam and not the act of Prapatthi.

### 93. Doubts about Prapatthi being the direct cause for Moksham:

In Charama sIokam, Prapatthi is indicated as an angam of Bhakthi yOgam. For the successful execution of Bhakthi yOgam, it is assumed that the performance of Prapatthi as an angam of Bhakthi yOgam will remove all sins and permit rapid success in gaining Moksham. There are others who state that Prapatthi does not need any other upAyam and can lead to Moksham directly. Which position is right ?

Answer:

The Prapatthi referred to in Bhakthi yOgam is anga Prapatthi and is practised when the saadhakan uses Prapatthi to overcome obstacles that he faces to progress in bhakthi yOgam. On the other hand, any one who performs Prapatthi with Moksham as a sole goal gains Moksha Phalan. This type of Prapatthi is described as Svatantra Prapatthi. This type of Prapatthi is explained in the Gadhyaams. There is no conflict in accepting Prapatthi as a direct means to Moksham.

### 94. Is Prapatthi just PrAyscchittham for Paapams ? If so how can it compare favorably with Bhakthi yOgam, which is the direct cause for Moksham ?





Answer:

There is no virOdham in recognizing Prapatthi Yogam as a direct cause for Moksham just as Bhakthi yOgam. Both bhakthi yogam and Prapatthi yogam remove all paapams and qualify us for the limitless grace of the Lord and His ParipoorNa anubhavam, which is Moksham.

**95. Doubts about the assurance that the Lord will free the Prapannan from every kind of sin:**

Sruthi, Brahma Soothrams, Sri BhAshyam state that the sins committed after Prapatthi do not stick to one as long as they arose from unconscious acts. While this is so, Charama sLOkam says: “Sarva PaapEbhyO MokshayishyAmi”. How can we accept this, when Sruthis do not include sins acquired consciously after Prapatthi ?

Answer:

There is no virodham between the two statements (Sruthi and Smruthi). Yes, both agree that the sins acquired unconsciously do not stick and hence there is no punishment. The power of Prapatthi ends in receiving laghu (light) daNDanai (Punishment) for paapams acquired deliberately. What the Charama sLOkam states in a condensed manner is that I will release you from the effects of all kinds of sins including those acquired consciously and you will receive a lighter punishment for them because of your special status as Prapannan. I will release you from the severe punishments that a non-prapannan would receive. Further, when a Prapannan regrets over his sins (acquired deliberately) and performs the appropriate PrAyascchittham (Expiatory act), those paapams will also be destroyed.

**96. Question about release from Sarva Paapams: Charama sLOkam says that a Prapannan is released from all Paapams as a result of Prapatthi anushtAnam. If that were to be so, should not the Prapannan gain moksham right away since all his Punyams and Paapams (KarmAs) have been dispensed with ?**

Answer:

Charama sLOkam says: “ Sarva PaapEbhyO MokshayishyAmi, Maa Sucha:”. That can be read as sakala karmaas creating all the sorrows are destroyed and Moksham should be immediate. It is not so. First of all not every one wants to have instant Moksham after Prapatthi. The karmAs responsible for the existence of dEham (sareeram) remain. The phalans of such karmaas are enjoyed in this life and then Moksham comes into effect. Sareeram and Indhriyams stay as a result of residual karmaas responsible for their continued existence until the appropriate time of dissolution of them thru their anubhavams right on this earth.

**97. Question: It has been stated that those karmAs beginning to yield Phalans permits the continuation of holding on to sareeram after Prapatthi. Incase of Bhakthi yOgam, it is**







accepted that moksham is realized only after all karmAs are dissolved. How come in the case of Prapannan, Moksham is realized before the entire dissolution of KarmAs in contrast to the experience of Bhakthi yOgam ?

Answer:

In case of Prapannan, the karmAs yielding phalans have to be split into two categories and understood: (1) The KarmAs that yield sareeram after this birth and bring one back to this Karma bhUmi (2) Those karmAs yielding phalan as long as this body exists. Prapatthi was performed with the prayer to eliminate the cycles of Births and deaths and repeated garbha Vaasam. When that Prapatthi is successful, one gains Moksham at the end of this birth and does not return here ever. The Prapannan, who intensely longed to gain Moksham at the end of his prapatthi (Aartha Prapannan) can be granted Moksham instantly after Prapatthi. Thus the depth of hatred against SamsAric existence defines the duration of existence on this earth with the body and enjoys Moksha sukham after Prapatthi.

98. (Question): EmperumAn is said to be so pleased with the Prapatthi performed by the jeevan that He destroys all the karmAs. If that were to be so, how can we reconcile with the situation that one experiences all kinds of sufferings in this embodied state ?

Answer:

Prapannan did not perform prapatthi in anger to get rid of the bodily ills. Therefore that portion of the KarmAs did not go away. The reoccurrence of these bodily ills makes the chEtanam not forget about the ills of samsAram. These sufferings are sikshai for conscious trespasses after Prapatthi that has to be meted out even if they are light for a Prapannan. All these sufferings are for the betterment of the Prapannan in his remaining life on this earth.

99. Even if the Lord means well, why does not the Dhruvtha Prapannan does not have freedom from these bodily sufferings like the Muktha Jeevan ?

Answer:

One should not perform Prapatthi for Moksham in this manner. A dhruvtha Prapannan wants to gain Moksham at the end of this embodied life on earth. Implicit in this wish is to enjoy the sukham and not the dukkham. Sukham can only be appreciated in the context of dukkham. If there is no hunger and thirst, one does not need food and water. Therefore, acceptance of staying here until the end of the present life results in acceptance of some dukkham as well. One can perform prapatthi for removal of bodily sufferings and can be cured. Even this will happen only when that Prapatthi is done without blemishes in the angams of Prapatthi.





100. Charama sLOkam has the upadEsam: “Maa Sucha: “. (Do not grieve). How can we relate this upadEsam to a Prapannan? He has already surrendered all his bharams (burdens) to the Lord and lives in a state of freedom from grief (nirbharam, nirbhayam). If he grieves over some thing, does not it lead to deficeinceis in his nishtai ? It is said that even great ones like Sage VyAsa experienced grief some times. Therefore how can one in the embodied state cast away all sorrows ?

Answer:

The sorrows to be abandoned meant by “Maa Sucha:” are different from typical worldly sorrows. For instance, the sorrow of a chEtanan about his insufficiency and unfitnes to do Bhakthi yOgam to gain Moksham is one type of sorrow. Another kind of sorrow is about the worry whether he has to do some thing else to retain the boon of Moksham after the performance of Prapatthi. These are the kinds of worries and doubts that the Lord wants the Prapannan to forget about.

101. Question: How does Charama sLOkam become a Rahasyam ?

It is understandable that Thiru Manthiram and Dhvayam are to be received from AchAryan by the Sishyan in the ears as a rahasyam. Charama sLOkam is in MahA BhAratham, an ithihAsam, which can be recited in front of all as long as there is a Brahmin sits in the ghOshti. How can we justify what is sadhasyam (can be talked about in an assembly of diverse people such as Srimath RaamAyaNam or Mahaa Bhaaratham), viz., Charama sLOkam and include it among the rahasyams of Moola Mantram and dhvayam and call the three membered group as Rahasya Thrayam ?

Answer:

There is a slight difference between the three rahasyams. The text of Moola Mantram and dhvayam as well as the meanings of the aksharams and padhams can not be openly told except thru AchArya-Sishya upadEsam. The text of Charama sLOkam can be read aloud BUT the meanings of the padhams and groups of words are to be treated as rahasyams and not sadhasyams. All the three as rahasyams are for the upliftment of those who seek Moksham.

102. Why is each of the rahasya thrayam necessary?

One can understand the need for Prapatthi very clearly. One can also understand the need for Dhvayam as Mantram to perform Prapatthi and gain Moksha Phalan. For such a prapannan who has performed prapatthi, what is the relevance of Thiru Manthiram ? Why does it occupy the first place among the three rahasyams ?

Answer:





There are number of important things that should be clearly understood by a Mumukshu (One who desires Moksham): (1) The jeevan is the seshan (liege) for the dhivya dampathis alone and not to anyone else (2) The jeevan has no independence (svatantram) and (3) The Jeevan is directed and commanded by the Lord (paramAthmaa). These important aspects can only be understood by upadEsam on the meanings of the aksharams and the padhams of AshtAkshari (Thiru Manthiram).

Thirumanthiram is in the Vaidhikam and Taantrikam form so that all can access it. Vidhikam is for the use of men of all the three varNams. Taantrikam is for women of all VarNams and the men of the fourth varNam. The only difference between the Vadhika and Taantrika version is in the first letter: PraNavam; rest of the 7 leeters remain the same. There are no differences in the meanings of the aksharam or Padha Vaakyams. Since every one has to recite Thirumanthiram, it takes the first place among the three rahasyams. All the three rahasyams however are important.

### 103. If Thirumanthiram is so important, why do we need dhvayam?

SaasthrAs say that we can perform Aathma samarpaNam using Thirumanthiram as the Mantram for Prapatthi. There is no stipulation that we should use dhvayam alone for performing Prapatthi.

Answer:

Yes, one can perform Prapatthi with Thirumanthiram. One can not experience the detailed amsams of Prapatthi through Thirumanthiram. Examples of those amsams to be comprehended in depth are: (1) The PurushakAram of PirAtti (2) The presence of PirAtti always at the Lord's side, 3) The Lord's status as SidhOpAyam along with His PirAtti (4) His status as the attainable goal (upEyam), while serving as the means (UpAyam) as well (5) The angams of Prapatthi to enchant the dhivya Dampathis (Seshi dampathis). Dhvaya Mantram alone elaborately explains all of the above. Moola Mantram is very abbreviated. It is easier to reflect upon the above meanings associated with dhvaya padhams and place comfortably one's Aathma at the sacred feet of the dhivya dampathis. Therefore Dhvyam becomes indispensable.

### 104. Why is Charama sIOkam needed by us while we can reach the status of ParipoorNan through the clear comprehension of our svarropam thru Thirumanthiram and the amsams of Prapatthi thru Dhvayam ?

Answer:

Charama sIOkam instructing the performance of Prapatthi is essential since it describes the different states of akinchanan, who finds himself unfit to practise the most difficult Bhakthi yOgam. Finding himself with no gathi, the chEtanam chooses Prapatthi and seeks the burden of its protection from the Lord thru Aathma samarpaNam. Before performing Prapatthi, the





chEtanam understands the state of the small upAyam of Prapatthi standing in the place of the mighty upAyam of Bhakthi yOgam. The jeevan comprehends the state of independence of Prapatthi, where it does not need any help form any other upAyam. The jeevan understands the inability of Prapatthi to coexist with the other UpAyams just like BrahmAsthrAm, which loses its power when another asthrAm is used along with it. The jeevan comprehends the simplicity and soulabhyam of the Lord and the power of His sankalpam that destroys all residual karmAs and destroying even KarmAs that have started yielding their fruits. The Jeevan experiences the joy of gaining the bliss of kaimkaryam to the dhivya dampathis. All of these can be experienced thru anusandhAnam of Charama sIOkam. Therefore it is essential to have Charama sIOkam as the third rahasyam.

105. Why are “ jithanthE” and VarAha Charama sIOkam are not included among the rahasyams although they deal with items of interst to Mumukshus (One who desires Moksham) ?

Answer:

Yes, the above two do contain mokshArtha Vishayams but the three rahasyams house in themselves the essence of the above two prasiddha sIOkams. The three rahasyams are the Saaram (Quintessence) of what is covered by JithanthE and VarAha charama SIOkam. Therefore, the three rahasyams (Moola Mantram, Dhvayam and Charama sIOkam) were chosen by our AchAryAs as the key rahasyams for instructions on Vedanthic matters.

106. How did the unlettered cowherd girls (idaicchis), who did not have the awarenes of rahasya thrayams attain moksham?

Answer:

The illiterate idaicchis did not have sikshai on the three rahasyams but attained the state of fitness for Moksham thru poorva janma sukruthams. The residual impressions (Vaasanais) from their previous births led them to the attachment to BhagavAn’s sacred feet at BrundhAvanam and resulted in Moksham. It becomes clear that the understanding of one or more upAyams for Moksham in previous births propelled them to Sathgathy in their final births. Such is the power (long standing impact) of these rahasyams.

107. SisupAla and other enemies of the Lord attained Moksham. How is that possible ? The untutored cowherd girls gained proximity to the Lord’s feet thru poorva Janma Vaasanais. SisupAla and others displayed enimity to the Lord even in poorva Janmams. SisupAlan was granted Moksham even though he showed unceasing hostility ot the Lord even in his last birth. How can one understand the granting of MOKsham to SisupAla, the irascible enemy of the Lord ?







Answer:

Below Vaikuntam, there is a lokam known as VishNu IOkam. There were two dhvAra PaalakAs at VishNu IOkam, who comitted apachArAmS to the BhaagavathAs of the Lord and got cursed to be born in the karma BhUmi. They took three births and in each one of them, they showed unflinching enimity to the Lord and enjoyed the phalans of their Mahaa aparAdhams. When the anubhavam was concluded, they returned to their original sTaanams in VishNu IOkam.

108. How can we clear future doubts about Rahasya Thrayams?

Answer:

We explained thru this grantham the answers for many common doubts about the three rahasyams. If you have grasped these answers well and attained clarity in important aspects of the three rahasyams, You can adopt a similar approach to find answers for your new doubts. You can also consult with the great ones, who are experts in different sAsthrAs, Sri BhAshyam and Tarkam and clarify your doubts. As long as you have gained clarity on the important aspects of the three rahsyams, it does not matter if you are not sure about minor aspects of the three rahasyams.

## CONCLUDING SLOKAMS

Srimath VenkatanAyakEna vahathaa sEshAimavAj~nAm sathAm  
sEshaa aseevisha dantha pankthi sushumaa sacchAyatarkasriyaa  
adhyArOpitha tatthadhukthikalahai: adhyAthmalabdhAthmanAm  
SankhAnAm parihAr padhdathiriyam dhingmathrathO darsithaa

Here, Swamy Desikan says that he responded to the commands of the respectable elders and constructed this grantham to remove the doubts on VedAnthic matters created by the Para Matha sampradhAyins. Swamy Desikan says that he showed somewhat the way (approach) for us to address the clamorous aakshEpams of the opponents thru tarka vadham, whose lustre resembles the beautiful rows of white teeth of AdhisEshan. The key words here are: “Tarka Sriyaa iyam parihAra paddhathi: dhingmAthraa darsithaa”.

This is the concluding grantham in Swamy Desikan’s rich life. In the following sIOkam and Tamil Paasuram, Swamy sums up his role as an AchAryan and the satisfaction of establishing sishya paramparai (Brahma Tantra Swamy, NayinAcchAr) to carry on the teachings of Bhagavath RaamAnuja.

The vivEkam and VairAgyam of Swamy is revealed in this sIOkam:





sthOthum nindhithum ukthim aTavaa sODum samUDam jagath  
kim nacchinnamanantha chinthana rasE susTE sukham tasTushAm  
SishyAs-Sikshitha Buddhaya: SruthipaTE yEshAm vayam yE cha na:  
tath santhOsha samarpaNakshamam idham sADambharai: kim parai:

The world is full of ignorant ones; They can praise our utterances or condemn them or tolerate them. Their behavior does not perturb us, who are immersed in the bliss of enjoying the Lord. We have no loss over their praise or condemnations. We do not care. Our sishyAs have excelled in gaining VedAntha Jn~Anam and they will be happy over this grantham. That is all we care. We have no use for all these pompous, half baked scholars known for their ajn~Anam and Vipareetha Jn~Anam.

sadagopan.org



“Swamy Desikan After Rathotsavam-Thiruvendhipuram”

ithi nikhila tArkikaa chUDAamaNinaa sarvatantra svatantrENa ubhAyavEdAnthAchAryENa  
krutham VirOdha ParihAra nigamanAdhikAra: sampoorNam.

Sri NigamAntha Mahaa Desikaaya Nama:

Daasan, Oppiliappan KOil VaradAchAri Sadagopan

