Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

The Bukkapatnam Śrīvaiṣṇavas:

The Viśiṣṭādvaita system of philosophy which was given a form and direction by teachers like Nāṇamuni and Yāmuna was firmly established by Śrī Rāmānuja through his monumental works like the Vedārthasaṅgraha, Śrībhāṣya and the Gītābhāṣya. The post-Rāmānuja period saw the emergence of giants of learning like Pīḷḷai Lokācārya and Vedānta Deśika who strengthened the system further and made it formidable and streamlined. Several writers from different parts of the country added their own mite to the general renaissance and development of the system. The Telugu Country, for its own part, had given rise to many scholarly writers who, from time to time, reinforced the system by their dialectical works.
silencing critics belonging to the Advaita and Dvaita traditions. Among such writers who lived in Andhra and contributed to the general renaissance and reinforcement of the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, mention should be made of the descendants of the Bukkāptāṇam family.

The Surapuram Chiefs:

These writers were patronized by the chiefs of Surapuram (Shorapur). This place lies between the rivers Kṛṣṇā and the Bhīmā at a short distance in the north from the Kṛṣṇā and in a south-westerly direction from Bijapur. At present it is in the Gulbarga District of the Nizam dominions. A Telugu Kaifiyat, Surapura Rājula Vaṁśāvali\(^1\) informs us that the family of the chiefs of Surapuram came to be called Kosalavāṁśa after their ancestor Kosalanātha. One of their old head-quarters in Mudugalasimā was named Kosalapeṭa. This Kosalavāṁśa is

\(^1\) See Dr V. Raghavan, "The Surapuram Chiefs and Some Sanskrit Writers Patronised by them" Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society (JAHRS), XIII. Pt. I., pp.23-30
referred to by the Bukkapaṭṭaṇam writers Aṇṇaya II and Śrīnivāsa II and others in their works. They call themselves the court-poets of and gurus of the Kosala Chief Veṅkaṭa who was the twenty-second ruler of Surapuram. Aṇṇaya II and Śrīnivāsa II were brought to Bukkapaṭṭaṇam by one Pāmi Nāyaka. The Bukkapaṭṭaṇam writers also refer to themselves as belonging to the Śrīśaila or Tirumala Bukkapaṭṭaṇa family. Telugu was their mother-tongue.

**Important writers of the Bukkapaṭṭaṇam family:**

Among the many writers who were born in this family, mention may be made of Śrīnivāsa II, Aṇṇaya Dikṣita, Kiriṭi Veṅkaṭācārya and Bucci Veṅkaṭācārya. Śrīnivāsācārya II is the most prolific writer of this family with about eighteen works to his credit, covering various branches of learning. In his work called the *Virodha-varūthinī-pramāthinī* he states that he hails from the Śrīśaila (Tirumala) Bukkapaṭṭaṇam family. In this
work he gives his father's name as 'Śrīnidhi' Tātārya. 'Śrī+nidhi' is same as 'Śrī+nivāsa'. He also refers to one Narasirhha Tātārya who must have been Tātārya's (his father's) brother. Before going into further details of the parentage and works of our author, it is but proper to learn about the royal family of Surapuram which patronised these writers. Some of these writers were 'Rājagurus'.

**Surapuram in history:**

It appears that all these writers made Surapuram their head-quarters although they originally belonged to Bukkapatṭaṇam, which is a village in the Jammalamadugu Taluq in the Cuddapah District of Andhra Pradesh. One of the descendants of this family, Veṅkaṭācārya III states in his work Śrṅgāra-tarāṅgīṇī that the presiding deity at Surapuram is Lord Kṛṣṇa, and that he was the preceptor of the ruler Veṅkaṭa, son
of Pāmi who bore the title Bahiri\(^2\). It appears that our writers were the spiritual preceptors of the chiefs who ruled Surapuram from time to time and who embraced the Śrīvaiśṇava faith. The title Bahiri\(^7\) which Venkata, the son of Pāmi Nāyaka had, has its own history. One of the Kosala Chiefs, Cinna Hanmi Nāyaka, defeated one 'Bahiri' Vasanta Rao who was a Desai at Mudugal, and a minister under the Bijapur Sultan. As a mark of his victory over Vasanta Rao, Hanmi Nāyaka got the title 'Bahiri'. This became the common title for all the successors of Hanmi Nāyaka.

The Telugu Kāśiyat\(^3\) further points out that Surapuram was founded in the year 1713 A.D. by Pāmi Nāyaka who was the son of Peda Nāyaka. Pāmi Nāyaka passed away in 1740 A.D. and he was succeeded by his son Peda Nāyaka. Peda Nāyaka ruled for five years and died issueless in the year 1745

\(^2\) JAHRS, Vol. XIII, Pt. I., p.20

A.D. He was succeeded by his younger brother Munḍigai Vēṅkaṭappa who also died issueless in 1751 A.D. Just before his demise, he called Pāmi, one of his cousins and asked him to take care of the Estate after his death. It was thus that Pāmi became the ruler of the Surapuam Sāṁsthānam after Vēṅkaṭappa's death.⁴ The Telugu Kaifiyat further notes that the Surapuam chiefs trace their origin to Guha the hunter-chief who was a devotee and friend of Śrī Rāma of the Treta Yuga. According to this Kaifiyat Pāmi Nāyaka who stayed at Sahapuram and ruled for ten years from 1678 to 1688 wanted to take Śrīvaiṣṇava Dīkṣā. For this purpose he approached Śaṅkhavanam Śrīnivāsācārya of Ānegondi and received the Mudrās from him.

Pāmi Nāyaka who succeeded Vēṅkaṭappa in the year 1752 A.D., wanted to have a similar initiation into

⁴ See JAHRS. Vol.XIII, Pt.I., p.21
Śrīvaiśñavism. But only a boy named Śrīnivāsa belonging to the Śaṅkhavanam family was alive by that time, who did not even have his Upanayana. Therefore Pāmi approached an Ācārya from Bukkapaṭṭaṇam for initiation. Bukkapaṭṭaṇam lies in the Auku-simā near Gutti, south of the river Tuṅgabhadrā. The name of this Ācārya is given as Anṇaya, who had also a brother by name Cinnaya. These two brothers thus moved from Bukkapaṭṭaṇam to Surapuram and this took place probably between the years 1760 and 1766.

The Kaifiyat further states that the Maratha Rulers subjugated this part of the country around this time, and collected tributes from the Surapuram chiefs. Pāmi Nāyaka died in 1773 A.D. He had a son by name Veṅkaṭa and he passed away in 1802 A.D., after ruling the territory for twenty years. The authors Veṅkaṭācārya II, Anṇayācārya II, Śrīnivāsācārya II and Veṅkaṭācārya III (also called Ayyā
Veṅkaṭācārya and Kṛiṇi Veṅkaṭācārya) and Veṅkaṭācārya IV also known as Bucci Veṅkaṭācārya, the author of the popular Viśiṣṭādvaīta manual, Vedānta Karikāvali may all be assigned to a period between 1725 A.D. and 1825 A.D.

A list of works was supplied to the New Catalogus Catalogorum Office of the University of Madras in the year 1936 by one Tirumala Bukkapaṭṭanam Jātakavidvanmani Veṅkaṭācārya, who stayed at Amaracinta. This town comes in Ātmakūr Samsthānam of the Nizam's Dominions. This list mentions seven authors of this family: Śrīnivāsa, Aṣṭaya Dīkṣita, Kṛiṇi Veṅkaṭācārya, Aṣṭaya (II), Bucci Veṅkaṭācārya, Raṅgacārya and Śrīnivāsācārya. Raṅgacārya wrote four works and the last mentioned author, nineteen works. Of these nineteen, one work describes the World War I (1914-18) through which the author appears to have been a modern writer. However, his works are not available. Fortunately for us, the
works written by the Bukkapaṭṭaṇam authors contain some biographical data with the help of which one may draw their family tree.

Among the three brothers Veṅkaṭācārya II, Aṇṇayācārya II
and Śrīnivāśācārya II, the eldest one mentions one Veṅkaṭa Deśika as his Guru. But nothing is known about this teacher. Anṇayācārya II and Śrīnivāsa II\(^5\) refer frequently to Kauṇḍinya Śrīnivāsa as their preceptor. The Rasikajanarasollāsa Bhāṇa\(^6\) of one Veṅkaṭa gives the following genealogy of this preceptor:

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{Kaundinya Gotra (family at Kâmasamudram village)} \\
\text{Ahobilācārya} \\
\text{(sons)} \\
\text{(1st son)} & \text{(2nd son)} \\
\text{Ācārya Dikṣita} & \text{Sampadācārya} \\
\text{(son)} \\
\text{Vedāntācārya (wife Akkamāmbā)} \\
\text{(son)} \\
\text{Veṅkaṭa (author, Rasikajanarasollāsa)}
\end{array}\]

Veṅkaṭa informs that he had his Mantropadeśa from one Śrīnivāsādīhvarin and studied under Śrīnivāśācārya (II) who was

\(^5\) Cf. Colophon of the Jiṣṇuṣādarpāna of Śrīnivāsa: "kaundinyaśrīnivāsa-
kauṇḍinakaṭākṣavikṣāṣṭikṣita-" etc.
\(^6\) MD, 12633
the younger brother of Aṇṇayācārya (II). Śrīnivāsa II in his Taitva-mārtāṇḍa\(^7\) mentions one Ācārya Dikṣita as the guru of his seniormost paternal uncle Jayavara. Towards the end of his Nitiśataka\(^8\) he tells us that he was the son of Śrīnivāsa Tātārya (Kamalānivāsa-tātārya-sūnuḥ) and brother of Aṇṇayārya (Aṇṇayārya-sahajaḥ) and that he had been blessed by Ācārya Dikṣita (ācāryadikṣita-kaṭākṣa-dhanī). We may now identify this Ācārya Dikṣita with the person of the same name mentioned in the Rasikajana-rasollāsa Bhāṇa as the elder brother of the author Venkaṭa's grandfather, Sampadācārya. Śrīnivāsādhvarin mentioned by Venkaṭa as the one who gave him Mantropadeśa might, in all probability, be the same as Kauṇḍinya Śrīnivāsādhvarin who was the guru of both Aṇṇaya II and Śrīnivāsa II. But the exact relation Kauṇḍinya Śrīnivāsa had with the author of the Bhāṇa is not quite evident.

\(^7\) MD. 4894
\(^8\) MD 12053
Patrons of these Writers:

Anṇayācārya II states in his Tattvaguṇādāraśa that he was the court-poet and preceptor of a chief named Veṅkaṭa, son of Rāghava of the Kosala family.

"śrīmat-kosalavarnīṣa-mauktikamaṇeḥ śrīrāghava-kṣoṇibhṛṛd-garbhaṃśirапayodhi-śītamaḥsaḥ śrīveṅkaṭa-kṣmābhṛṛtah

āsthāne sthitimāsthitene bhajatā dhuryāṁ tadācāryatām
śrīśailāṇṇaya-deśikena racitah tattvārthadhidarpanaḥ ||

Anṇaya II's brother Śrīnīvāsa II (whose Siddhāntacintāmaṇi is taken up by us for a detailed study) also, in his Subhāśitas states that he wrote it for the pleasure of Kosala Veṅkaṭa:

"śrīmatkosalavarnīṣa-vāridhi-śaśī śrīveṅkaṭaḥkṣmāpatiḥ
tatsantoṣakṛte kṛtim pravidadhe Śrīśrīnīvāsaḥ sudhīḥ ||

Veṅkaṭacārya III, the second son of Anṇaya II points out in his Alamkāra Kaustubha after saluting Kṛṣṇa the presiding

9 MD. 12295
10 MD. 12132
11 MT. 369
deity at Surapuram, that he was the preceptor of the chief Veṅkaṭa, son of Pāmi who had the title Baharī:

śrīmānāniya-bahiri-birudānka-pāmi-

bhūpālaputaravara-veṅkaṭanāyakasya |
svastipraśastim aparogauryeva kurve' 

laṅkāraṅkāustubham ananyakṛtottī-lakṣyam ||

We have a similar statement in his Śṛṅgārataraṅgini 12:

"...bahiri-pāma-nāyakumāra-veṅkaṭapatināyaka-
mahāsthāna-pāṇḍita-gurutvabhūṣaṇena viracitam"

Śrīnivāsa II, our author, was born as the third son of Tātārya I and Lakṣmāmbā. In the opening portion of his Siddhāntacintāmaṇi, he refers to Āṇṇaguru as his grandfather and to his 'bhāṣyaguru', Kamalānilaya Makhīśvara. In all probability he is identical with Kaundinya Śrīnivāsādhvarin

12 MT. 5439 (b)
mentioned clearly in the concluding verse of the same text. The word 'Kamalā-nilaya' is same as 'Śrīnivāsa', the 'abode of Kamalā or Śrī'. He also pays obeisance to his elder brother (agraja) by whose grace he learnt all the scriptures. This 'agraja' is same as Aṇṇayārya II.

Although the Surapuram writers flourished about two hundred years ago, we do not have any detailed and complete biographical account of the personal life of our author apart from what we know about his ancestry. In all probability, one may glean more details from the descendents of these writers by patient inquiries. For instance, we do not know anything about the ancestry of the two brothers Veṅkaṭasutvan I and Aṇṇaya Dīksita I with whom we have started the genealogical account. History has always been a weak point in our country at least regarding our literary figures. As pointed out in the beginning,
now have a brief sketch of his compositions other than the
Siddhāntacintāmani which is the main theme of this
Dissertation.

The compositions of our author:

1. His Tattvamārtāṇḍa is a commentary on the Brahma-sūtra
of Bādarāyaṇa. In the opening verses he pays homage to
Rāmānuja, Vedānta Deśika, one Śrīnivāsa, Parakāla and one
Vīrarāghava Deśika. From this we may deduce that he belonged
to the Vaḍakalai sect. The name Parakāla suggests his
affiliation to the Parkāla Maṭha at Mysore which was founded
in the year 1360 A.D. by Brahma-mattra Svatantra Jiyar I who
was a direct disciple of Vedānta Deśika. This work is a
criticism of the Dvaita work Candrikā of Vyāsa Tīrtha.

Cf: prapadye tattvamārtāṇḍaṁ dhvānta-vidhvamsanam

śubham|

13 Madras Descriptive Catalogue, No. 4894-5
Srinivasa refers in this work to the defects pointed by Vedanta Desika in the Advaita system through his Satadusani.

2. He wrote Arundhikaranamanjari, also known as Arundhikaranasaranisvaraniti. In this work the author adopts the arguments employed by Ramanuja in the Anandamayadhikarana (I.1.13-20) of his Sribhasya.

The Mimamsakas argue that in the passage: "With the red, tawny-eyed heifer, one-year old, let one purchase the soma plant" (Taittiriya Samhita VI.1.6.7), in relation to redness which is a quality, there is no hard and fast rule that it must be associated with the one-year old heifer. This is so because it is not possible in one commandment itself to enjoin two things to the effect -- Let one purchase with the one year old heifer, and

---

14 MD. 4866-67. Dr Raghavan's article in the JAHRS. Vol. XIII., Pt. I. refers to this work wrongly as Annadhikaranamanjari and Annadhikarana-sarani-vivarani.
let that purchase be made in exchange for a red one." For this purpose, this sentence has to be split into two where the word "arunayā" occurs. The use of the feminine gender in connection with the word 'red' (arunayā) is intended to denote things which are mentioned as necessary in the context and which are of all genders. Therefore, in relation to the redness here, there is no rule compelling its invariable connection with the one year old heifer.

But Rāmānuja refutes this view stating that because the substance (heifer) and the quality (redness) are both associated with one and the same action (of buying), there is the rule that they shall together denote one and the same entity. (Pūrva Mīmāṁsā III.1.12). By means of the grammatical equation (sāmānādhikaranya) in the passage quoted above, the words aruṇayā and ekahāyanyā which denote respectively the entity (heifer) characterised by redness and one year age, ultimately
refer to only one entity but not two. Our author Śrīnivāsa has written this tract to explain this part of Rāmānuja's Śrībhāṣya.\textsuperscript{15}

3. The *Oṃkāravādārtha* known also as *Nayamaṇīkaliṅka* or *Praṇavadarpaṇa\textsuperscript{16}* is a criticism of the Dvaita view that Oṃkāra or Praṇava forms a part of each and every aphorism of the *Brahmasūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa. According to Śrīnivāsa there is no proof in support of this contention.

4. The *Jijñāsādarpaṇa\textsuperscript{17}* is another work of this writer which tries to establish the fact that enquiry into the nature of the Brahman should be preceded by the study of the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā. According to Śrīnivāsa the word 'jijñāsā' conventionally refers to 'vicāra' only as does the word 'mīmāṁsā'. He follows the Śrībhāṣya to establish this fact.

\textsuperscript{15} Cf: Introduction: "bhagavad-bhāṣyakārāstu ānandamayādhikaraṇe samānādhikāraṇaṇāḥ viśiṣṭa-ekārthavṛttim upapādayantaḥ aruṇāpadamapi ...dṛṣṭāparaḥ anumanyamānāḥ... tamimāraḥ saiddhāntikāraḥ pākṣaṁ vyavasthāpayiturī prakaraṇamidāraṁ ārabhyate"

\textsuperscript{16} R. 1295 (paper ms. in Grantha characters)

\textsuperscript{17} MD. 4883
5. The Jñānaratnaprakāśikā\textsuperscript{18} tries to prove that worship of and meditation on the Brahman lead to the attainment of liberation. This is a criticism of the Advaitins' view that knowledge of the Upaniṣadic texts like 'tattvamasi' and 'aham brahmāsmi', i.e., knowledge that the individual self is same as the supreme Brahman constitutes the means of liberation. Śrīnivāsa writes:

"iha tāvat anavarata-paramapurūsa-dhyānādeva sakala-sāṁsārika-byayanivṛttipūrvaka-parabrahmha-ānandānunabhava-rūpaṁ apavargam āmananti śrutayah ... brahmavit āpnoti param; tavemāṁvidvān amṛta iha bhavati....jñātvā devam mucyate sarvapāpāiḥ ... ityādikāḥ"

(The Scriptures such as 'one who worships Brahman attains the highest'; 'one who worships Him thus, becomes liberated here'; 'worshipping God, one becomes free from all sins'.)
etc. declare that only by continuous meditation on the Supreme Lord one becomes first free from all fears of transmigration and then attains liberation which of the nature of enjoying the bliss of the Supreme Lord Himself.)

6. The *Nāṭvadarpāṇa* explains the significance of the word "Nārāyaṇa" which is a proper name denoting Lord Viṣṇu and no other deity. He is the Supreme Brahman according to the Śrīvaiṣṇava Religion and Philosophy. The word "Nārāyaṇa" is a combination of two words, "Nāra" and "ayana", which means, (a) One who has multitudes of living beings as His abode and (b) One who is the abode of multitudes of living beings. The first interpretation makes this word a Bahuvrihi Compound (*Nārāḥ ayanam yasya saḥ*) and the second explanation makes it a Saṣṭhi Tatpuruṣa Compound (*Nārāṇām ayanam*). Accordingly the word 'Nārāyaṇa' forms an
unmistakable, exclusive, unique name of Lord Viṣṇu who abides in the hearts of all living beings (antaryāmin) and in whom all the beings live at the time of cosmic dissolution.

This work also tries to establish that Nārāyaṇa alone existed prior to the creation of the universe and that all the Upaniṣadic texts which discuss the 'cause of the universe' unmistakably refer to Him alone. Words like Sat, Brahman and Śiva ultimately refer to Nārāyaṇa alone through what is called the 'sarvaśākhā-nyāya' (Cf. Śabara on Pū. Mī. II. iv. 32: 'sarvaśākhā-pratyayam sarvabrāhmapratyayam caikam karma'). According to this interpretation all words which refer to a general entity must ultimately culminate in a particular (also called sāmānya-viśeṣa-nyāya). This is again corroborated by what is called the 'chāga-paśu-nyāya'. According to Pāṇini's aphorism, "pūrvapadāt saṁjñāyām agaḥ" (Aṣṭādhyāyī , VIII. iv. 3) (So also, 'n' is replaced by 'ṇ' when the letter occasioning the
substitution occurs in the first member of a compound; and the whole compound is a Name provided the first member does not end with the letter 'ga'). The cerebral sound 'ṇa' found in the word "Nārāyaṇa" thus makes it a Proper Noun. And this name refers only to Viṣṇu and no other deity.

Cf. nārāyaṇapade ṇatvam samjñā tvaikāntikam yatāḥ |
tena nārāyaṇo viṣṇuḥ na syuranye Śivādayah ||

7. The Pucchaḥraḥma-vāda-nirāsa\(^{20}\) is another work wherein our author refutes the interpretation given by the Advaitins to the Upaniṣadic passage, 'brahma pucham pratiṣṭhā' (Tai. II.5.1) (Brahman is the tail and support).

According to the Advaitins, the verse:

'asanneva sa bhavati asad braḥmēti veda cet |
asti braḥmēti ced veda santam enam tato viduḥ ||'

(Tai. Up. II. 6.1)
(Whoever knows the Brahman as non-existent, he becomes non-existent; whoever knows the Brahman as existent, him, therefore, they know as existing) speaks about the non-existence and existence of the self as resulting from the ignorance and knowledge respectively relating to the Brahman, but not from the ignorance and knowledge of the ānandamaya (of what consists of bliss). Accordingly the Brahman is other than the ānandamaya. For the Advaitins the Brahman constitutes the 'puccha' (tail). They contend that ānandamaya is the sheath (kośa) that comes fifth in the order after the ānāmaya, manomaya, prānāmaya and vijnāna-maya-kośas. The text 'brahma vid āpnotiparam' (One who knows the Brahman attains the highest) sets the tone for the argument that knowledge of the Brahman alone constitutes the means of liberation. It is for the easy understanding of this fact that the description of the five kośas is made. Only Brahman of that aspect becomes the
object of meditation where the reference to the Brahman comes to an end. The reference comes to an end in the passage: 'brahmapuccham pratiṣṭhā.' So the reference to the Brahman culminates in the puccha only (of the metaphorical reference to a Bird).

Our author, following the Ānandamayādhikarana of the Śrībhāṣya (1.1.13-20) tries to establish that Brahman has been declared in all the scriptures as consisting of ānanda. Brahman is the sole cause of the creation, maintenance and dissolution of the universe. The passage 'ānandāt khalvimāni bhūtāni jāyante' etc. (All these beings are produced from ānanda, sustained by ānanda and dissolved in ānanda...) concludes the description of the Brahman as consisting of ānanda alone. As such, it is but proper to conclude that the Brahman is ānandamaya alone but not puccha.
8. The Bhedadarpana\textsuperscript{21} is devoted to establish the fact that Bheda or difference is a matter of direct perception. The difference between the Lord and the world of sentient and insentient entities cannot be perceived even as the non-difference between one object and the other. Śrīnivāsa states that the difference between an object of meditation and the meditating person, between \textit{šeṣitva} and \textit{šeṣatva} (status of being the principal entity and the subsidiary entity), between \textit{śariratva} and \textit{śarīritva} (status of being a body and the soul related to that body) cannot be perceived. Only scripture is the proper proof of knowledge (\textit{pramāṇa}) capable of proving this difference. Again the difference between the \textit{upādāna} and the \textit{upādeya} (the Material Cause and the effect prepared out of it), between the world and the Lord is not a matter of direct experience for us living in this world. The scriptures :"prthag ātmānarāṁ preritāraṁ ca matvā; tadā
paśyatanyam īśam" etc. alone can prove this. The word "paśyati" in this passage cannot be taken in its literal sense of 'seeing'. "Has anybody directly seen the Lord with his normal eye?" asks Śrīnivāsa.

The meaning is that one has to realise the difference through meditation or concentration (darśana-samānākāra-
dhyāna-vidhānena .. p.11). He also quotes the famous passage "dvā suparna" (Mūndaka Up. III.1.1) to prove that only the scripture can declare the difference between man and God. Towards the end of the text the author points out that the Advaitins' method of interpretation applying the apaccheda-
nyāya in sentences which speak of the essential difference between God and man, is not justifiable.

He opens this work with the following verses:

cidacid-visajātiyaṁ advitiyaṁ guṇārṇavam |
asseṣa-šeṣiṇam ṣeṣaśāyinam tamupāsmahe ||
bhedābhedaśruti-vrāta-jāta-sandeha-hasantatāḥ |
bhedadarpāṇaṁ ādāya niścinvantu vipaścitaḥ ||

(We contemplate upon the One who reclines on the Śeṣa couch, who is the Supreme Master of all, distinct from both Cit and Acit, second to none and who is an ocean of auspicious attributes. Let the scholars who are placed in doubt by the multitudes of scriptural texts speaking of Bheda and Abheda arrive at a conclusion with the help of the Bhedadarpāṇa.) He concludes this work with the following verse:

"bhedam nirūpya katicit katicitrābhedam

tatsiddhayate 'khiṣa-śarīra-śarīra-bhāvam |
tādātmyam asya ca phalam katicit vadaṇī-
tyevam trayi bhavati sārthapadā samarthā ||

(Some try to establish Abheda [non-difference] between the Lord and the universe by proving Bheda (difference) first. Some others speak of the body-soul relation between the universe and
the Lord and then speak of 'tādātmya' and its purpose. The scriptural declaration thus becomes significant and efficient.}

In the course of this work Śrīnivāsa refers to another work of his called Guṇadarpaṇa.22 It is a matter of regret that this work is not noticed in any Descriptive Catalogue. From the reference made by the author himself it appears that this work is devoted to prove that the Apaccheda Nyāya pressed into service by the Advaitins to prove that the nirguṇa sentences of the Upaniṣads have a precedence over the saguṇa texts, is not acceptable. This Nyāya is applicable only in cases where the sequence of sentences is already fixed and irrevocable. But the case of saguṇa-nirguṇa sentences is not fixed. Hence the maxim of interpretation cited by the Advaitins cannot be applied here.

22 Cf: "apacchedanyāyaśca niyata-paurvāparyaka-svapratipādya-vākyaviṣayah aniyatapaurvāparyake etādṛśe viṣaye na pravartata iti saguṇa-nirguṇa-vākyanirūpāṇaṁvasare guṇadarpaṇe samyag upapāditaḥ iti nātra vivicyate"
9. The *Virodhanirodha*\(^{23}\) or *Bhāsyapādūkā* also known as *Virodhavarūthininī-pramāthinī* is another work of our author which defends the Śrībhāṣya of Śrī Rāmānuja against the criticisms levelled by the Advaitins and other schools of thought. It may be construed as the reply our author gives to the Advaita work *Virodhavarūthininī* of Umāmaheśvara.\(^{24}\)

This work is complete in 27 sections called 'Nirodhas'. In style it follows the Śatadūṣaṇī of Vedānta Deśika. He also refers to the Upaniṣad-bhāṣyakāra, Raṅgarāmānuja in the course of this work. He makes the following remarks in the introductory portion of this work: "iha khalu kecid aniscita-vipacid-apascimāḥ anavagafśa-śrimad-rāmānujamuni-pranita-śāriraka-mahābhāṣya-tātparyāḥ prāhuh:

"etat satam virodhanāṁ bḥāṣye rāmānujerite |
duruddharam hareṇāpi harināpi nirūpyate || "iti.

Tad viruddha-vacana-duradhva-nibaddha-svamatabhāṣya-vaidusyalabdha-daurbhāgyāt." etc.

(Some so-called scholars of doubtful attainments, unable to grasp the import of Śrī Rāmānuja's admirable commentary on the Brahmāsūtra observe: 'This is the century of contradictions in Rāmānuja's commentary. This is being demonstrated now by us in such a way that neither Lord Hara nor Lord Hari can extricate you from this.' But all this is a travesty of facts. This argument [of the critics] is the unfortunate (inevitable) outcome of their acquiring proficiency in their own traditional commentary on the Brahmāsūtra which had been composed in a wrong way and which is full of contradictory statements).

10. The Saṣṭhyarthanirṇaya25 explains the significance of the Sixth Case (saṣṭhī-vibhakti) which is elided in the Compound
'Brahma-jijnásā' forming part of the opening aphorism of the Brahmasūtra (I.i.1). The word Brahma-jijnásā is interpreted as brahmaṇah jijnásā (enquiry relating to the Brahman). But the Sixth Case of the word 'brahmaṇah' is elided and it becomes a compound with the next word jijnásā.

The Sixth Case (brahmaṇah) conveys the sense of the Objective case (karmaṇi sasṭhi) but not the usual sense of relationship (šeṣa-sasṭhi) as ordained by Pāṇini under II.3.50 (as 'sasṭhi šeṣe'). This Sixth Case is ordained by the aphorism 'kartṛkarmaṇoh kṛti' (Pāṇini II.3.65). Obviously our author follows the interpretation given by Rāmānuja in his Śrībhāṣya under the aphorism (Br. Sū. I.1.1).

11 The Nayadīyumāṇī with Dipikā26 is an exposition of the Brahmasūtrarastava composed by his own elder brother and guru, Anṇaya II in metrical form. This work is different from

---

26 MT. 1287
another work of the same name composed by Meghanādāri Sūri. In this work he contradicts the views of Haradatta as found in his work Śrutasūktimālā and those of Vyāsatīrtha expressed in his Candrikā. The author tries to repudiate the arguments levelled by others against the Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja.

In verse no. 11 of the introductory part of this work, Śrīnivāsa refers to Madhvācārya who calls himself the 'third incarnation of Wind God' and points out that the present work tries to answer the criticism raised by Madhva and his followers against the views of Rāmānuja.

12. Our author also wrote another work in the Darpaṇa series, viz., the Pradhāna-pratitāntra-darpaṇa27. The Pradhāna- pratitāntra- siddhānta (exclusive and most important doctrine) is one of the four Siddhāntas which are referred to by Gautama in his
Nyāya Sūtra under I.1.27. The Pradhāna-pratitantra-siddhānta of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school is the 'body-soul' relation (śārīra-śārīra-bhāva) which subsists between the universe consisting of the sentient and insentient entities on one hand and the Supreme Being Lord Nārāyaṇa on the other. Our author points out that the entire karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Veda which refers to several deities like Agni and Vāyu as granting the fruits of various rituals, ultimately points to Bhagavān alone as the real benefactor. In the colophon of this work the author speaks of his talents to compose one prabandha a day (pratidina-prabandha-nirmāṇa-dhurandhara).

1314. Apart from these works our Śrīnivāsa also wrote two works pertaining to Dharmaśāstra literature viz., the Dattaratna-pradīpikā which is a work on the 'adoption' of
children and the Bhuktidipīka or Grahaṇa-bhuktidipīkā which deals with the problem of eating on eclipse days.

15. He wrote one Nitiśataka, a century of verses on morals. These are beautiful with figures of speech such as śleṣa (pun) and alliteration. A few verses may be cited for the style of the author:

\[
\begin{align*}
lakṣmīcarāṇa-lākṣaika-lakṣaṇarī śubhavikṣaṇam & | \\
śeṣākṣitidharādhyakṣaṁ ambujākṣamupāśmahe & ||
\end{align*}
\]
(We contemplate upon the lotus-eyed one who is solely characterised by the (imprints of) red lack of the feet of Lakṣmī, who has auspicious glances and who abides on the Śeṣa-mountain (i.e., Lord Venkaṭeśvara).

\[
\begin{align*}
sadākṣiṇyadṛśā mitram amitram vāmayā dṛśā & | \\
vaśam nayati yah śrīmān satyam sa puruṣottamaḥ & ||
\end{align*}
\]
(He who controls the 'mitra' (friend/the Sun) with his eye marked by 'dāksīṇya' (being the right one/compassion) and the 'amitra' (enemy/the Moon) with his 'vāma' (being the left one/beautiful) eye, is certainly the one with Śrī (prosperity/Lakṣmī) and the best among Puruṣas (Lord Viṣṇu).

rājṇaḥ kalaṅkinaḥ prītim anavekṣya-anīśojjvalāḥ
prabhāvataḥ priyāḥ kecī kavyaḥ santi sarvataḥ

(There are also some kavis (poets/birds) (in this world) who/which, even without depending upon the favour of the rājā (king/moon) with kalaṅka (blemish/black spot) shine always (aniṣa) (even during daytime). They become the favourites of the prabhāvān (the sun/one with splendour).

bhujāṅgabhogād bhṛṣṭasya mandarāgasya majjanaṁ
kathāṁ bhūyānnabhogānāṁ prasādāyaṁṛtārthināṁ

(The Mandara mountain slipped from the serpent body and sank in the ocean. How does it then be a source of happiness to
those who travel by the sky (celestials) who wanted the nectar?

[How does it not contribute to the happiness of those who wanted the nectar?] )

Towards the end of this work the poet says:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{kaluṣāśayamapyaśu prasannāṁ kurute yataḥ} \\
&\text{santāḥ paśyantu satakaṁ śāntayā kalayā girā}
\end{align*}
\]

(This century of verses makes even one with perturbed mind, quickly quiet and peaceful. Let therefore the good ones look at this [bless this] work with peaceful and sweet glances [words]).

16. A collection of 'subhāśitas'\(^{31}\) (wise sayings) is also ascribed to our author. The colophon points out that Śrīnivāsa composed this for the pleasure of Kosala Veṅkaṭa Kṣmāpati.\(^ {32}\)

A few verses may be cited to show the style of the author:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{jātaḥ padmāt padmanābhasya nābheḥ} \\
&\text{bhāṣāyośāśleśadātā vidhātā}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{31}\) MD. 12132

\(^{32}\) Cf: śrīmat-kosalavarḥsa-vāridhiśaśi śrīveṅkaṭa-kṣmāpatiḥ tat-santoṣakṛte kṛtipravidadbe śrīśrīnivāsaḥ sudhiḥ |
(Brahmā the Creator who embraced the lady presiding over speech [Sarasvatī] did not get honour (worship) anywhere because he was totally attached to his lady. Indeed only the lucky (virtuous) one is worshipped but not the unlucky [unvirtuous] one.)

(O celestial sage [Nārada]! Your life is praised by the meritorious ones; your friendship is also praised by all because of your good-heartedness towards all people. You go to the house of even your enemies. Still you are blamed (by all) because you are always ready to cause quarrels.)
Works of Śrīnivāsa II’s brothers and their offspring:

We may also note in passing, the works composed by Anṇayācārya II the elder brother and teacher of our author Śrīnivāsa.

The Ānandatāratamya-khaṇḍana\textsuperscript{33} contovers the view of the Dvaitins that there is gradation or difference even in the state of liberation between one soul and another regarding the enjoyment of Supreme Bliss (Ānanda). According to the followers of Rāmānuja, the bliss enjoyed by the liberated souls is uniform in its quality and quantity with no gradation or difference.

Ācārya-vimśati\textsuperscript{34} is a hymn in twenty verses eulogising Vedānta Deśika.

\textsuperscript{33} MD. 4869. Dr. Raghavan’s article wrongly notes this as the work of Śrīnivāsa II. It was composed by Anṇayācārya II, our author’s brother-cum-guru. In the colophon the author refers to himself as the disciple of his elder brother Venkaṭācārya. He refers to himself as being capable of composing four types of poetry, and as an adept in the Pūrva and Uttara Mīmāṃsās, Vyākaraṇa and Nyāya.

\textsuperscript{34} MD. 10600
His *Tattvagunādarsa* along with auto-commentary\(^{35}\) is a Campū kāvya written in imitation of Veṅkaṭādhvarin’s travelogue, *Viśvagunādarsa*.

His *Vyāvahārikatva-khaṇḍana-sāra*\(^{36}\) which is also known as *Vyāvahārikasatyatva-khaṇḍana-sāra* refutes the view of the Advaitins that the world in which we live is conventionally real. According to Advaita, reality (*satyava*) is threefold: *pāramārthika* (ultimate reality viz., the nirguṇa Brahman), *vyāvahārika* (conventional reality which pertains to all the usages of this day-to-day world in which we live) and *prātibhāsika* (phenomenal reality as in the case of the silver we see in a nacre).

Anṇaya also wrote a Sutra *'Abhinavakarṇāmṛta'* on Lord Kṛṣṇa in 72 verses\(^{37}\).

\(^{35}\) MD. 12295-6  
\(^{36}\) MT. 6089 (d)  
\(^{37}\) Ms. in the Bikaner State Library
He wrote a Bhāṇa called 'Rasodāra-bhāṇa'.

Now let us survey the works of Veṅkaṭācārya II who is the elder brother of this Aṇṭayācārya:

Veṅkaṭācārya II was the author of Siddhānta Ratnāvali, Siddhānta Vaijayanti, Jaganmithyātva-khaṇḍana and Ānanda-tāratamya-khaṇḍana. This last-mentioned work criticises the views of one Subrahmaṇyācārya and the Mādhvas that there exists gradation in the enjoyment of bliss by the liberated souls. We have already noticed a work of the same name by Aṇṭayācārya II.

Aṇṭayācārya II had three sons viz., Śrīnivāsa III, Veṅkaṭācārya III and Bucci Veṅkaṭācārya. Veṅkaṭācārya III is

---

38 Mysore Catalogue I. p. 281
39 MD. 5063-66
40 MD. 5067
41 Adyar Library Descriptive Catalogue II. p.163a
42 MT. 5094
also known as Ayya Venkaṭācārya and Kiriṭi Venkaṭācārya. He was the pupil of his uncle Śrīnivāsa II (our author).

Venkaṭācaya III wrote a grammar tract called the Gajasūtrārtha or Gajasūtravādārtha, criticising Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's interpretation of the Pāṇinian rule (I.3.67) 'neraṇau yat karma ṅau cet sa kartānādhyāne'. He also wrote a love-poem called Kṛṣṇa-bhāva-śataka. He wrote an alaṅkāra text, Alamkārakaustubha. He authored a five-act drama called Śrīgārataranāgini. He also seems to have composed a dvisandhāna-kāvya in Telugu, called the Acalātmaiā- parinayamu describing through śleṣa, the marriages of both Sītā and Pārvatī at once. The Amaracinta list, according to Dr V. Raghavan, mentions this Venkaṭācārya III as the author of a

---

43 MD. 1520
44 Published in the Adyar Bulletin (Vol.XXXIII, Pts. 1-4, year 1969) ed. K. Parameswara Aital. The available text contains only 83 verses. Although the general meaning is simple, each verse contains an inner meaning which cannot easily be understood.
45 MT. 369 (a)
46 MT. 5439 (b) and 5501
47 Madras Telugu Triennial Catalogue, R. 41 (a)
Nyāya work, Jañjhāmārūta which is a criticism of Gadādhara, a stotra called Śrṅgāralahāri, also called Lakṣmīśatakā, Daśāvatāra Stotra, Hayagrīvadaṇḍaka and Yatirājadaṇḍaka.

Bucci Veṅkaṭācārya or Veṅkaṭācārya IV, is the third son of Anṇaṇa II. He is the author of the well-known tract Vedāntakārikāvalī in ten sections called 'avatāras', which brings out the chief tenets of Rāmānuja's philosophy in verse form. This is published by the Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras, as No. 75 of its Series. He also wrote Viṣṇu-saptavibhakti-stotra. The Amaracinta list speaks of three more works of this author: Abhinavaśrṅgāra-rasamaṇjarī an Alarhikāra work, Kalyāṇa-puraṇjana-nātaka and Śrṅgāra-sarvasva. The Śrīvaiṣṇava family of Bukkapaṭṭaṇām has thus carved out for itself a permanent place in Sanskrit literature in

48 See JAHRS, Vol.XIII. Pt. I., p. 17  
49 MD. 10352  
50 See JAHRS, Vol.XIII. Pt.I., p.18
general and Śrī Rāmānuja's Philosophy in particular. The following chapter will try to set forth some important tenets of the Viśiṣṭādvaita Philosophy which forms a preamble as it were to study the main text, the Siddhāntacintāmaṇi of Śrīnivāsa II which is concerned with supporting the doctrinal view that Lord Viṣṇu the Supreme Brahman, is both the Upādāna Kāraṇa (Material Cause) as well the Nimitta Kāraṇa (Efficient Cause) of the universe.