

### CHAPTER- III.

#### PURUSOTTAMA'S WORKS.

(I)

##### Introductory.

Vallabha and his followers have enriched the Vedāntic literature with a large number of books. It would be no exaggeration to state that Puruṣottama tops the list of the authors in the Sāṃpradāya. He wrote on almost all the topics connected with the Śuddhādvaita school. Over and above a series of independent works, he has written extensive commentaries on almost all important works of Vallabha and Viṭṭhaleśa. The fame of this prolific writer so reached the scholars of the school, that the commentary of Puruṣottama came to be regarded as a standard to judge the authenticity of a particular work. Thus the authorship of a work which has not been commented upon by Puruṣottama is considered with some doubt. Shree H.O. Shastri records a case of this type.<sup>1</sup> One work Bhagavat-Pīṭhikā has not been commented upon by Puruṣottama, nor is it referred to by him in any of his works. Hence some scholars in the Sāṃpradāya doubt whether Vallabha himself wrote Bhagavat-Pīṭhikā.

---

1. Cf. Avatāravādāvalī: Hindi Intro. pp. 5-6.

Works of Puruṣottama are listed by Shree H.O.Shastri and Shri. M.T.Telivala.<sup>2</sup> I am giving below the list as given by H.O.Shastri.

- (1) Bhāṣya-Prakāśa.
- (2) Suvarṇa-sūtra.
- (3) Āvaranabhanga.
- (4) Subodhinī-prakāśa.
- (5) Prasthānaratnākara.
- (6) Commentaries on sixteen tracts.
- (7) Prastāvāda.
- (8) Paṇḍitakarabhindipālavāda.
- (9) Sṛṣṭibhedavāda.
- (10) Āvirbhāvatirobhāvavāda.
- (11) Khyātivāda.
- (12) Pratibimbavāda.
- (13) Andhakāravāda.
- (14) Brāhmaṇatvādidēvatāvāda.
- (15) Jīvavyāpekātva-khaṇḍanavāda.
- (16) Jīvapratibimb-tva-khaṇḍanavāda.
- (17) Ūrdhva-puṇḍranirṇayavāda.
- (18) Tulasīmālādhāraṇavāda.
- (19) Śaṅkha-cakra-dhāraṇavāda.
- (20) Mūrtipūjana-vāda.

---

2. Ibid.p.4: Telivala's artical on Puruṣottama's life in Puṣṭibhaktisudhā.Vol.V.No.3.

- (21) Bhāgavataśāṅkīrāṣavāda.
- (22) Upadeśaśāṅkīrāṣavāda.
- (23) Bhaktyutkāṣavāda.
- (24) Vastreśavāda.
- (25) Bhedaśāṅkīrāṣavāda.
- (26) Abhāṣavāda.
- (27) Ātmavāda.
- (28) Svavṛttivāda.
- (29) Jayāśrīkṛṣṇaśāṅkīrāṣavāda.
- (30) Utsavapratāna.
- (31) Dravyaśuddhi.
- (32) Bhaktiśāṅkīrāṣavivṛti.
- (33) Bhaktiśāṅkīrāṣavivṛti.
- (34) Pūrvamīmāṃsāśāṅkīrāṣavivaraṇa.
- (35) Nyāyāśāṅkīrāṣavivṛti.
- (36) Gāyatrīkārikāvivṛti.
- (37) Vallabhāṣṭakavivaraṇa.
- (38) Kaivalyaopaniṣaddīpikā.
- (39) Brāhmaṇopaniṣaddīpikā.
- (40) Nṛsiṃhatāpinyupaniṣaddīpikā.
- (41) Chāṇḍogyaḍīpikā.
- (42) Śvetāśvataraḍīpikā.
- (43) Upaniṣadārthasaṅgraha.
- (44) Dvātriṃśadaparādhaśāṅkīrāṣavivaraṇa.

(45) Adhikaraṇamālā.

(46) Bhāvaṇaparakāśikāvṛtti

Shri.M.T.Telivala gives almost the same list.He adds the Khelālapanaṇavidhvāṃsavāda and the Māṇḍūkyopaniṣaddīpikā. As regards the Dīpikās on the Kaivalya,Brahma,and Nṛsiṃhatāpinīya Upaniṣads,Telivala calls them Arthasaṅgrahas. Regarding the Dīpikās on the Śvetāśvatara and Chāndogya, he says that they are not available.

To study the works of Puruṣottama,we may divided them into two broad divisions-independent works and commentaries.Even here the division cannot be followed fastidiously,because a work which,strictly speaking,can be called a commentary may have close connection with an independent work or viceversa. Thus for example, Puruṣottama's own commentary on his Prahastavāda is considered together with the Vāda. Similarly the Śoḍaśaprakaraṇagranthasaṅgati which is an independent work will be dealt with while examining Puruṣottama's glosses on the sixteen tracts.Some of the works are, again,not found by me.I have simply referred to them in my account of the works/~~that have been described~~connected with them.For the sake of describing them it will be convenient to deal with them in four sections dealing with the Avatāravādāvalī,Puruṣottama's other independent works, his commentaries on the works of Vallabha and Viṭṭhaleśa and those on other works.A list of the works that have

been described in the following pages is as follows:-

Avatāravādāvalī .

- (1) Prahastavāda.
- (2) Commentary upon Prahastavāda.
- (3) Paṇḍitakarabhindipālavāda.
- (4) Bheda-bheda-Svarūpanirṇeye.
- (5) Pratikṛtipūjanavāda.
- (6) Sṛṣṭibhedavāda.
- (7) Khyativāda.
- (8) Andhakāravāda.
- (9) Brāhmaṇatvādidovatāvāda.
- (10) Jīva-pratibimbatvakhaṇḍanavāda.
- (11) Āvirbhāvatirobhāvavāda.
- (12) Pratibimbavāda.
- (13) Bhaktyutakarsavāda.
- (14) Khalālapana-vidhvaṁsavāda.
- (15) Nāmanavāda.
- (16) Mūrtipūjanavāda.
- (17) Ūrdhva-puṇḍradhāraṇavāda.
- (18) Śaṅkha-cakradhāraṇavāda.
- (19) Tulasīmālādhāraṇavāda.
- (20) Upadeśa-viśaya-śaṅkā-nirāśavāda.
- (21) Bhāgavata-svarūpa-viśaya-kaśaṅkā-nirāśavāda.
- (22) Svavṛttivāda.

- (23) Jīvavyāpakatvakhaṇḍanavāda.
- (24) Abhāvavāda.
- (25) Vāstrasevāvāda.
- (26) Ātmavāda.
- (27) Bhaktirasatvavāda.

Other independent works.

- (28) Prasthāmaratnākara.
- (29) Samarpaṇanirṇaya.
- (30) Muktacintāmaṇi.
- (31) Dravyaśuddhi.
- (32) Utsavapratāma.
- (33) Utsavabhāvanukrama.

Commentaries on the works of Vallabha and Viṭṭhaleśa.

- (34) Anubhāṣyaprakāśa.
- (35) Nyāyamālā.
- (36) Suvarṇasūtra.
- (37) Āvaraṇabhāṅga-Yojanā.
- (38) Śoḍaśaprakaraṇagranthasaṅgati.
- (39) Commentary on Yamunāṣṭaka.
- (40) Commentary on Bālābodha.
- (41) Commentary on Siddhāntamuktāvali.
- (42) Commentary on Puṣṭipravāhamaryādā.
- (43) Commentary on Siddhāntarāhasya.
- (44) Commentary on Navaratna.
- (45) Commentary on Antaḥkaraṇaprabodha.
- (46) Commentary on Bhaktivardhinī.
- (47) Commentary on Jalabheda.

- (48) Commentary on Pañcapādyā.  
 (49) Commentary on Saṁnyāsaniṣṭhaya.  
 (50) Commentary on Nirodhalakṣaṇa.  
 (51) Commentary on Sevāphala.  
 (52) }  
 (53) } -Commentaries on the Bhaktihansa.  
 (54) Bhāvarthā<sup>pāda</sup>~~śikṣā~~abhāṣyaprakāśa.  
 (55) Pūrvamīmāṃsāśālikāvivaraṇa.  
 (56) Subodhinīprakāśa.  
 (57) }  
 (58) } -Minor Commentaries on the Bhāgavata.  
 (59) Cāyatriyādyarthaprakāśaśālikāvivaraṇa.  
 (60) Nyāsādeśavivaraṇa.  
 (61) Patrāvalambanāṭikā.  
 (62) Vallabhāṣṭakavivaraṇa.  
 ( ) Commentaries on other works.  
 (63) Māndūkyaopaniṣaddīpikā.  
 (64) Nṛsiṁhottaretāpinyupaniṣaddīpikā.  
 (65) Kaivalyopaniṣadārthasaṅgraha.  
 (66) Brahmopaniṣadārthasaṅgraha.  
 (67) Introduction to Amṛtatarāṅginī.

We shall now attempt a short description of these works.

(II).

Avatāravādāvalī.

Puruṣottama's Avatāravādāvalī is not one work, but it is a collection of many Vāda-Granthas. Puruṣottama is said to have written fiftytwo Vādagranthas; According to tradition. There is also another view that he has composed twentyfour Vādas. The number twentyfour seems to have some connection with the number of twentyfour incarnations of Viṣṇu and therefore the title given to this collection is Avatāravādāvalī.<sup>3</sup> All the Vāda-Granthas have not been printed and some of them which are mentioned by Shri.M.T. Telivala and Shri.H.O.Shastri in the list of Puruṣottama's works are not found. Again, while the colophons of some of the Vādas bare the number of the Vāda, many of them do not bare the number and so it is not possible to be exact in that matter. The numbers that are found in the Colophons of some individual Vādas will be given while dealing with them. It is, however, impossible to treat them all in a definite order because while we know the numbers of some Vādas, we cannot ~~filling~~ fill in a large number of

---

3. c.f....Puruṣottamasya Ōkṛtāv Avatāravādāvalyām... etc

Brh.p.246.



gaps that still remain.

In the beginning of the Avatāravādāvalī, Puruṣottamas says that he has composed the string of Vādas after carefully going through the Upaniṣads, the Śrutis, the Smṛtis, the Bhāṣyas and the Sūtras together with the various Prasthānas.<sup>4</sup>

He further says that the Vādas which are subtly incorporated in the works like the Tattva-dīpa-nibandha, the Anubhāṣya etc are revealed by him by means of reasoned out sentences, after suggesting them in verses.<sup>5</sup> Puruṣottama thus explains the method which has been followed in these treatises. A Vāda-grantha is a short treatise which discusses a particular topic fully. Puruṣottama begins his treatise with the-- introductory verse, the contents of which are challenged by the Opponent and then the discussion starts. All these topics he says, are discussed on the basis of the suggestions that are found in the major works like the Anubhāṣya and Tattva-dīpanibandha. Many of these discussions are found in Puruṣottama's commentaries on those works.

---

4. Saṁvīkṣyopaniṣacchṛtismṛtiganam bhāṣyāṇi sūtrāṇyapi;

Prasthānair vividhair yutāny atha mayā vādāvalī tanyate.

Prh.V.3.p.2.

5. Ye tattvadīpabhāṣyaprabhṛtiṣu sauksmyeṇa susthitā vādāḥ;

Padye tām avatārya prakāṭīkurve' tra yuktimadvākyaiḥ.

Prh.V.4.p.3.

## (1.2). Prahastavāda and its commentary:-

The first Vāda is called Prahasta. It is one of the well-known works of Puruṣottama. The word 'Prahasta' means a slap. The rather curious title of the work owes its origin to the circumstance in which it was composed, and the aim it desired to achieve. Appayya Dīkṣita, who was a prolific writer was also a staunch follower of Śaivism. He has written a metrical work Śiva-tattva-viveka in 64 verses. In this work he maintained that Śiva is the highest Lord, greater even than Viṣṇu, and Brahmā. This short work roused a great deal of controversy in those days of sectarian enthusiasm and the followers of Vaiṣṇavism could not tolerate it. The work was hailed by the Śaivas and condemned by the Vaiṣṇavas. Puruṣottama reacted against it sharply and, in his youthful zest, wrote out this 'slap', passing as many strictures or perhaps more on Śaivism, as has been done by Dīkṣita on Vaiṣṇavism.

The Prahasta is divided into three Sub-vēdas. The first is Vedāntatātparyanirūpaṇa, the second is Bhārantaśaiva-nirākarṇa, and the last is Mūlarūpanirdhāra. The introductory verse of the Prahasta contains starting points for all the three discussions.

The first part discusses and proves that all the Vedāntic texts teach of Brahman. Brahman is possessed of

supramundane qualities, the negative descriptions in the sacred texts refer to the worldly attributes, which Brahman is devoid of. Here the author attacks the Upādhivāda and the Māyāvāda and explains the avikṛtaparināmavāda as the correct theory. The second chapter is the most important part of the work, because here the author strongly repudiates almost all the statements of Dīkṣita. He refers to all the authorities, referred to by Dīkṣita and many more. He thoroughly discusses all these texts and proves that according to him all of them extol Viṣṇu rather than Śiva, who is the Chief Vibhūti of Viṣṇu.<sup>6</sup> In the third part Puruṣottama says that Kṛṣṇa is the highest Reality. Puruṣottama proves this on the basis of the Tāpanīyas, Bhāgavatapurāṇa, Brahmaivaivartapurāṇa and the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. He also refutes the charge that Kṛṣṇa-Svarūpa is illusory. At the end, again, after the customary salutes, he says that there are rogues who call themselves

---

6. Para-brahmaṇas tad eva mukhyaṁ svarūpaṁ, itarāṇi tu taratamabhāvāpennāni vibhūti rūpāni, teṣu śivo mukhyavibhūtirūpa ity eva sakalāśāstrīya-niścayaḥ-Prh. p.

Vaidikas and who harass the good. This slap is hurled at them so that they may lose their strength.<sup>7</sup>

That Puruṣottama gave importance to this work can be seen from the fact that he has himself written a commentary upon it. He says that he is commenting upon the Vāda for the understanding of those who do not possess mature--intelligence.<sup>8</sup> The last verse of the commentary, however, informs us that Puruṣottama wrote this commentary for Viṭṭhalarāya.<sup>9</sup> The pertinent point here is whether Puruṣottama thought of writing similar commentaries upon all the Vādas. The first verse of the commentary shows that he thought of writing Vivṛtis on all the Vādas.<sup>10</sup> The verses at the end of all the three parts confirm this view.<sup>11</sup> The

7.Prh.V.2.p.246.

8.Bālabodhavidhaye'dhunāmayā vādavāravivṛtir vitanyate.

Prh-vivṛti.p.1.

also

Bālābodbodhanakṛte'racayac ca ṭikā.Prh-vivṛti.p.246.

9.Kṛtavan/ etēmpṛahasta-ṭikā Viṭṭhalarāya-pramodāya.

Prh-vivṛti.p.246.

10.Vādavāra vivṛtir vitanyate.Prh-vivṛti.p. 1.

11.Ādyamvādam nijakṛtau vyāvṛnot Puruṣottamaḥ-Prh-vivṛti.<sup>P</sup>34.

Uvitiyam vyāvṛnot vādam svakṛtau Puruṣottamaḥ-Prh-VivṛtiP.233

Trtīyavādam svakṛtau vyāvṛnot Puruṣottamaḥ. Prh-vivṛti P.246.

question here is about the exact meaning of the term nijakṛtau, or svakṛkau. Does it mean Avatāravādāvalī or Prahastavāda? I think, it means the former, because while the Prahasta really begins with the verse: 'Śrutiśirasi yasya mahimā etc', the commentary begins with the introductory portion which consists of four verses. Not only so, but for the above-mentioned verse Puruṣottama says that-Ādyaṃ vādam avatārayati śrutīty ādi.<sup>12</sup> I think that Puruṣottama first thought of writing a commentary on all the Vādas, but finding it unnecessary, he commented upon the Prahasta only, which he thought important. It was probably after he stopped writing commentaries, that the Vivṛti was dedicated to Viṭṭhalarāya. This view is, however, open to objection. Svakṛtau or Nijakṛtau may be said to mean the Prahasta and the numbers ādya, dvitīya and tritīya at the end of each part refer to the Vādas which form part of the Prahasta. This brings in the question of the structure of the Prahastavāda.

As we have seen above, the work contains three parts, and this has been made clear in the commentary also.<sup>13</sup> Only one

---

12. Prh-vivṛti. p. 3.)

13. Atrājavāntarās trayo Vādāḥ. Pūrvam Vedāntatātparyanirūpana-rūpaḥ. Sarvamūlatvād asya prāthamyaṃ. Dvītīyas tu bhrāntaśaivanirākaraṇarūpaḥ. Trītīyas tu Bhagavato mūlarūpanirdhāraḥ. Prh-vivṛti. p. 3.

introductory verse is given in the text for starting all the three discussions. In the Vivṛti again, Puruṣottama says that the Vāda is based upon the Tattvadīpanibandha. A careful perusal of all the three parts <sup>40</sup>shows that except for their having only one verse as the starting point, they are independent of one another. Some sort of connection can be established among them by pointing out that, while the first discusses Brahman as the subject of the Vedāntic texts, the second is negative in approach, since it proves that Śiva is not the highest God; whereas the third again discusses the original form of Brahman viz. Kṛṣṇa. The Vāda, thus, not only rejects the contentions of Dīkṣita, but reinforces the position of the Vaiṣṇavas. The argument, however, is not so impressive for in that way all the Vādas have some connection with one another. I believe that the Prahasa is a composite, rather than an integrated work and the three component parts are independently understandable. The term Svakṛtau or Nijakṛtau should better refer to the Avatāravādāvalī. In fact, Puruṣottama himself is not ~~exact~~ <sup>clear</sup> on this point.

There is not much to be said about the commentary, as such. It explains the text, but more than that it fills in the gaps by adding important discussions. It does not repeat or unnecessarily elaborate the statements made in the text.

## (3) Paṇḍitakarabhindipālavāda:-

It is a shorter work written with the same purpose. In fact, it supplements the second part of the Prahasta. ~~Which is~~ This is made clear by Puruṣottama himself in his Prahastā-vivṛti when he says that whatever regarding the Purāṇas has not been stated here, is stated in the other Vāda, the Bhindipāla.<sup>14</sup> Here he refers to the Bhāgavata, Kūrma, Śiva, Garuḍa and Padma Purāṇas. He also explains how even the highest Lord is said to worship Śiva. He refers to the Śrutis and corroborates his statements by the Bṛhmasūtras. Puruṣottama himself explains the word Bhindipāla, which here means a sling. He says that the good should take the Bhindipāla in their hands and easily hurl stone-balls for protecting the line of fields which are crowded by bad twice-borns.<sup>15</sup> Not only that, but he even asks the wise to challenge his arguments if they find any drawback in his reasoning.<sup>16</sup> Both Prahasta and Bhindipāla are written by Puruṣottama in a challenging mood.

---

14. Norkam purāṇaviṣayeyad ihāprasāṅgād

Vādāntare tad uditam khelu Bhindipāle. Bṛh-vivṛti. p. 233.

15. Durdvijasamājasaṅkulanigamakṣetrālirakṣaṇāyālam;

Adāya Bhindipālam santo gulikāḥ sukhād ajata. Bhindipāla. p. 277.

Bhindipāla means a javelin or an arrow that can be shot by hand or in a tube. It also means a sling. The word Gulikāḥ in the verse has led me to understand the term as meaning a sling.

16. Bhindipāla: last verse p. 277.

## (4) Bhedābheda-Svarūpa-Nirṇaya:-

This is known as Bhedābheda-vāda also. It is a short work which discusses the theory of Tādātmya viz. <sup>16</sup> Bhedasahiṣṇur abhedah-identity which tolerates diversity. This is pure Monism- Śuddha Advaita. Puruṣottama proves it on the authority of the Śrūtis, while refuting the absolute Monism of Śaṅkara. The number of this Vāda is six, as given in the colophon. <sup>17</sup>

## (5) Pratīkṛtipūjanavāda:-

Also called Bhagavatpratīkṛtipūjanavāda or Bhagavatpratīpūjana, it discusses how the worship of an idol is a source of uplift for a Brahmanavādin, while this is not the case with those who follow other systems. Again, the worship of an idol does not presuppose the want of intellect in a worshipper; on the other hand it is better from the point of view of Karma and Jñāna also. He argues out at the end for his preference of the idol of Kṛṣṇa. The last verse informs us that the Vāda depends upon the eleventh book of the Bhāgavat and

---

17.1ti.... Puruṣottamena kṛtō vatāravādāvalyām

Bhedābheda-svarūpenirṇayo Nāma Ṣaṣṭho vādaḥ...

Vādāvalī.p.23.



the Sarvanirṇaya chapter of Tattvadīpanibandha. We know from the colophon that the number of the Vāda is fifteen.<sup>18.</sup>

(6) Sṛṣṭibhedavāda:-

It is a small but very important work, from the point of view of the Śūdhādvaita. It discusses the various views of causation. Puruṣottama refutes the atomism of the Vaiśeṣika and the pariṇāmavāda of the Anīśvara sāmkhya. He gives the refutation of the Sāmkhya as given by the Māyāvādins and then refutes the adherents of Māyāvāda also. Finally, Puruṣottama explains the Brahmvāda and proves it, on scriptural and other grounds. The Vāda, as said by our author is based upon the Mibandha and other works. Its number is five.<sup>19.</sup>

(7) Khyātivāda:-

Like the Sṛṣṭibhedavāda, it deals with the theory of Khyāti. Here the author discusses all the different theories of Khyāti, as advocated by the Buddhists, the Mīmāṃsakas, the Māyāvādins, the Sāmkhya, and the followers

---

18. Iti....Puruṣottamaviracito Bhagavat<sup>P</sup>ratipūjanah  
pañcadaśo vādah... Vādāvalī.p. 81.

19. Iti...Pañcamaḥsṛṣṭibhedavādah...Vādāvalī.p.118.

of Madhva, Rāmānuja and other teachers. Puruṣottama refutes all these theories except that of Rāmānuja, which also is not accepted in toto. In the Śūdhādvaita, akhyāti is accepted for those who have obtained knowledge and anyakhayāti for those who have not. The Vāda is based upon Subodhinī and does not bear any number.

(8) Andhakāravāda:-

This Vāda is a short work proving that darkness is a substance. Other theories are discussed and rejected. The Vāda is based upon Subodhinī and bears number nine.<sup>20</sup>

(9) Brāhmaṇatvādevatāvāda:-

This Vāda is an interesting work, which tries to prove that Brahminhood is some Devatā. A man is a Brahmin or otherwise according as this deity is present or not. It is based upon Subodhinī and is tenth in number.<sup>21</sup>

(10) Jīvapratibimbatvekhāṇḍanavāda:-

Also called Pratibimbatvekhāṇḍanavāda, it is a polemical work directed against the Pratibimba-theory of the followers of Śaṅkara. Here all the six explanations of

20. Iti....Navamo'ndhakāravādaḥ. Vādāvalī.p. 141.

21. Iti....Brāhmaṇatvādevatāvāda daśamaḥ...Vādāvalī.p. 169.

the theory are thoroughly refuted. It is proved at the end that the individual soul is a part of Brahman and yet Brahman is not partite. The number given to this Vāda is twelve. <sup>22</sup>

(11) Āvirbhāvatirobhāvavāda:-

It explains, in eleven pages, how Āvirbhāva and Tirobhāva are powers of Brahman. While so doing, Puruṣottama refutes the positions of other systems. This Vāda bears no number and like the previous one, is not based upon any particular work of Vallabha.

(12) Pratibimbavāda:-

This is a short discussion on the real nature of an image according to the Śuddhādvaita. Number eight is given to this Vāda. <sup>23</sup> It is based upon Tattvādīpanibandha.

(13) Bhaktyutkarṣavāda:-

As its name indicates, it is intended to show the superiority of devotion to other means of emancipation. It is based upon Subodhinī and bears no number.

(14) Khalālapanaavidhvāmsavāda:-

This is a metrical work in 102 verses. Just as the Prahasa and Bhindipāla are written against the Śaiva

---

22. Iti....Dvādaśaḥ Pratibimbavakhaṇḍanavādaḥ. Vādāvalī. p. 182.

23. Iti....Aṣṭamaḥ Pratibimbavādaḥ. Vādāvalī. p. 201.

system, this Vāda is written against the Śāktas. An important difference between the two cases is that while the Prahasa and Bhindipāla are offensive in character, this work is defensive. The Śāktas have contended that Vaiṣṇavas are really speaking Śāktas because the ornamentation on the image of God leads to its being understood as that of Śakti. The arguments is further corroborated by the composition of a work styled Svāminīstotra by Viṭṭhaleśa and by the consecration of the image of Sarasvatī during the Navarātrī days. Puruṣottama refutes all these arguments. The Vāda can be divided into three parts as has been done by some. The first part consists of 39 verses, in which the author emphasises the masculine character of God. The second part begins with the fortieth verse and ends with the seventysixth. It deals with the Svāminīstotra. A separate title has been given to it by some. viz. Svāminīyastakaviṣayakeśāṅkānirāśavāda. The third part dealing with the Sarasvatīsthāpanā begins with the seventyseventh verse and is continued till the end. To this also a title viz. Sarasvatīsthāpanaviṣayakeśāṅkānirāśavāda, has been given. The Vāda bears no number, nor does it mention any work upon the basis of which it is composed.

(15) Nāma-vāda:-

It is variously known as Jayasrīkṛṣṇaccāraṇavāda

or Nāmaphalāḍiprakāravāda. The last is given by Puruṣottama himself in the colophon. The doubt here expressed is whether the name of God, known or otherwise, will bear fruit. The conclusion arrived at after discussion is that the main fruit can be secured only by knowing the name of God. The Vāda is based upon Subodhinī, Vidyaṃmaṇḍana and Tattva-dīpanibandha. It bears no number.

(16) Mūrtipūjanavāda:-

This Vāda is intended to establish that the image of Lord Kṛṣṇa should be worshipped by the Vaiṣṇavas. This Vāda is not numbered nor are we informed about its basis.

(17). Ūrdhvapundradhāraṇavāda:-

It deals with the Sāṃpradāyic practice of having a vertical mark on the forehead with Candana etc. The mark with the ashes is a Śaiveite~~tem~~ custom and so that should not be adhered to by the Vaidikas. The Vāda bears no number.

(18) Śaṅkhaśakradhāraṇavāda:-

It also deals with the Sāṃpradāyic practice of marking the conch and the disc with clay. The prohibitions against such marks found in other works do not hold water during the actual worship of God. The Vāda is eighteenth in number and is based upon the Nibandha.<sup>24</sup>

24. Iti....Śaṅkhacakredhāraṇavēdaḥ Astādaśah...Vādāvalī p.281.

## (19) Tulasīmālādhāraṇavāda:-

Also named, Mālādhāraṇavāda, this Vāda intends to prove that the followers of Vaiṣṇavism should invariably wear the string of Tulasī beads. The discussion more or less follows the same pattern as in the previous two Vādas. The Vāda is seventeenth in number. It is written on the basis of various Nibandhas and the practice followed by the Vaiṣṇavas.

## (20) Upadeśaviśyāśaṅkānirāsavāda:-

Also called Bhaktimārgīyopadeśaviśyāśaṅkānirāsa, this is not a very short work. It deals with the topic of initiation in the Śuddhādvaita. Puruṣottama first states that the Cāyatrī brings in only the Brahminhood which is a prerequisite of karma. Devotion to God is necessary for an individual soul, and the Sāṃpradāyic initiation is a prerequisite of devotion. In the path of devotion, therefore, the Śaraṇamāntropadeśa is required. After discussing this Puruṣottama says that there is no harm if both a husband and his wife have only one preceptor. The devotees are of various types, out of which a Śuddha-bhakta is the best. The Vāda does not bear any number.

## (21) Bhāgavatasvarūpaviśayakaśaṅkānirāsavāda:-

It bears number thirteen and deals with the Bhāgavata

Purāṇa, which is accepted in the Puṣṭimārga as one of the Prasthānas. He says that the Bhāgavata is a Mahāpurāṇa and should be included in the list of eighteen Purāṇas. He also quotes references from various works to prove that the Bhāgavatapurāṇa is very ancient. The work is based on the Tattvadīpanibandha.

(22) Svavṛttivāda:-

It has been published in the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā Vol.III. No.9. The work deals with the Vṛtti of the maintenance of a teacher. It is a very short manual discussing the Vṛtti of a Guru which should be in keeping with the usual practice of the sect and the purity etc. of the pupil. The Vāda appears to be based upon the Tattvadīpanibandha.

(23) Jīvaṇyāpakatvakhandaṇavāda. (24) Abhāvavāda and

(25) Vestrāsevāvāda could not be traced. Over and above these one (26) Ātmavāda has been ascribed to him by Shri.

Telivāla and Shri.H.O.Ghastri.

Jīvaṇyāpakatvakhandaṇavāda has been referred to by Puruṣottama himself twice. <sup>25</sup> We shall see in the next

---

25- Idam Sarvam Mayā Jīvaṇuvāde samyak prapēñcitam  
ato nātrocyate. A.B.P. II. <sup>iii</sup> 32.p.735 and  
Ity Anvātmavādaḥ. TS. Ab. 53.p.95.

chapter how many of the Vāda-granthas contain the same arguments and even the same phrases found in other important works of the same author. And again, the sentence—"Ity Anvātma-Vādah" in the Āvaranabhanga coming after the refutation of the Jīva-vyāpakatva is very suggestive. We can safely say that the said Vāda should therefore be considered, as dealing with the problems connected with the atomic measure of the soul; and must be containing the same arguments which are found at the places where the work is referred to.<sup>26</sup>

Similar is the case with the Abhāvavāda. In the Prasthāneratnākara, a thorough discussion on the concepts of Prāgabhāva and other Abhāvas is followed by a remark—"Ity Abhāvavādah."<sup>27</sup> The arguments that are found here, are also found in the Āvaranabhanga on the Sarvanirṇaya chapter of the Tattvadīpanibandha.<sup>28</sup> It thus appears that the Abhāvavāda contained a refutation of various Abhāvas as separate concepts.

26. In the Manuscript-Library of Pandit Gattulalji in Bombay there is an incomplete Manuscript of Jivānutvavāda. It has nine folios. It ends abruptly. It is dated Śaka 1796. The number of the manuscript is 147. It begins with -  
Ātmā nityaś citsvarūpaḥ... etc.

27. Pr. p. 123.

28. T Sn. A B. 117. pp. 89-92.



Vastrasevāvāda could not be found, and the present writer was unable to find any references to it in the works of Puruṣottama, he studied. It may however, be conjectured, that it may be dealing with the worship of the clothes of the Ācārya and not of any image of God. Even today, there is a section of Vaiṣṇavas who worship the clothes of the Ācāryas. The followers of Gokulaṇātha do not worship any image of God.

The word Ātmavāda has been used by Puruṣottama while discussing the Satkāryavāda.<sup>29</sup> He argues that the invisible (Adṛṣṭa) should not be understood as regulating the rise of a particular effect from a particular cause, because 'Ātmavāde tasyāpi dūṣyatvāt.' It is difficult to state whether Ātmavāda, here, should refer to a book or a theory. It seems that the reference here, is to a work rather than a theory, because Puruṣottama does not argue out against the Adṛṣṭa here. One Ātmavāda of Gopeśvara has been printed in the Vādāvalī. Puruṣottama, seems to have been written one Ātmavāda, but unfortunately we have not got it.

One (27) Bhaktirasatvavāda is printed in the Vādāvalī. It is ascribed to Pītāmbara. This short work is written with the intention to show that devotion is a Rasa,

---

29. T.S. Ab. 82. p. 141.

different from the nine Rasas accepted by the rhetoricians.

The work is also published in the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā, where the editor Ganpatiram Kalidas Shastri says that this is in fact composed by Puruṣottama.<sup>30</sup> If the style of the writer is taken to prove the authorship, the opinion of C.K. Shastri seems to be correct because the analysis that we find in the works of Puruṣottama, is found here also. The way in which Sneha is differentiated from desire, knowledge and all that, is found in the Suvernāsūtra.<sup>31</sup> The phraseological and ideological similarities may thus be adduced in support of Puruṣottama's authorship.

We have already referred to <sup>the</sup> absence of any authentic information regarding the number of the Vādas written by our author. It <sup>is</sup> quite possible that he might have composed more Vādas than those which are known to us. Any way, we know of twenty-six Vādas.

A short analysis of the Vādas, that we have seen above, would reveal that out of the twenty-six Vādas,

---

30. Iyam kṛtir vastutaḥ ŚrīmatPuruṣottamagoṣvānicaranam. eva. Pn.P.B.S. Vol. III. No. 5.

31. Compare-Snehaś ca mecchāviśeṣaḥ... etc. Vādāvalī. p. 204. with Snehaś cātmano manaso vā yogyo dharmaviśeṣaḥ na tv ichhā... etc. S.S. p. 7.

we have referred to, four are not extant. Out of the remaining works, which are extant, twelve are numbered. The highest number is eighteen given to Śaṅkhaśāstradhāraṇa-Vāda. Puruṣottama himself informs us about the basis of thirteen Vādas. One of them Tulasīlādhāraṇavāda is based on various works and the Sāṃpradāyic practice, the Pratikṛtipūjenavāda is based on Subodhinī and Tattvadīpanibandha. Out of the remaining, six are based upon Tattvadīpanibandha, and five upon Subodhinī.

From the point of view of contents, these works can be classified as follows:-

(i) Works dealing with Philosophical concepts:-

The first part of Prahasṭavāda,  
 Bheda-bheda-vāda,  
 Pratikṛtipūjenavāda,  
 Sṛṣṭi-bheda-vāda,  
 Andhakāravāda,  
 Khyativāda.  
 Pratibimbavāda,  
 Āvirbhāvatirobhāvavāda,  
 Bhakti-yutkarṣavāda,  
 Bhakti-rāst<sup>ā</sup>tvavāda, and  
 Ātmavāda.

(ii) Works mainly polemical in character:-

The second part of Prahasṭavāda,  
 Bhindipāleavāda,

Jīvapratibimbatvakhaṇḍanavāda,  
 Khalālapanaavidhvāṁsavāda,  
 Jīvavyāpakatvakhaṇḍanavāda, and  
 Abhāvavāda.

(iii) Works dealing with the Sāṃpradāyic beliefs and practices:-

The Third part of Prastāvāda,  
 Brāhmaṇatvādidēvatāvāda,  
 Nāmanavāda,  
 Mūrtipūjanavāda,  
 Ūrḍhvapauṇḍradhāraṇavāda,  
 Śaikhacakraśāstraṇavāda,  
 Tulasīmālādhāraṇavāda,  
 Upadeśaviśayaśāṅkānirāsaṇavāda,  
 Svavṛttivāda, and,  
 Vāstraśeṇavāda.

(iv) Work dealing with one particular book:-

Bhāgavataviśayaśāṅkānirāsaṇavāda.

### (III)

#### Other independent works.

(28) Prasthānaratnākara:-

This is one of the most important works of our author. Unfortunately, it is not complete. The part of the work, that is extant, includes the first chapter called Pramāṇaprakaraṇa, and a part of the second chapter named Prameyaprakaraṇa.

The second chapter is not complete.

A short analysis of the contents of the first chapter and a part of the second will show how the work is planned and how it is carried out by Puruṣottama.

After paying homage to the God Nēmodara (Nēmnā baddhaḥ) Puruṣottama says that whatever is found scattered, explained or unexplained, in the authoritative works has been described here with reasoning.<sup>32</sup> He says that Vyāsa has first discussed the principles on the strength of Śabda-pramāṇa and has then thought of the Prameya, Sādhana and Phala. Vallabhācārya has done the same thing in his Subodhinī. This is quite proper, because the Mēya depends upon the Māna. Hence in this work also Pramāṇa is described in the beginning. After explaining that the word Pramāṇa means uncontradicted knowledge, as also the means for obtaining such knowledge Puruṣottama begins the discussion on the theory of knowledge. This<sup>is</sup> followed by a full-fledged discussion on the Pramāṇas, Śabda, Pratyakṣa, and Anumāna. He discusses other Pramāṇas and rejects them. Finally he enters into a discussion whether

---

32. Yat prameyam urudhā'kore sthitam

Nopapāditam utopapāditam;

Viprakīrṇam iti tanmanīṣayod-

Grhya yuktibhir ihopavarnyate. Pr.V. 2.p. 1.

the Prāmānya of knowledge is directly understood or indirectly. At the end he says that whatever is left undescribed and whatever is described but was lying scattered in the authoritative works regarding the Pramāna has been put together here by him. <sup>25</sup> In the beginning of the Prameyaprakaraṇa Puruṣottama says that Brahman is the main Prameya. He explains the Sṛṣṭiprakriyā and then gives the three divisions- Svarūpakōṭi, Kāraṇakōṭi and Kāryakōṭi. He thoroughly discusses the twentyeight principles which are included in the Kāraṇakōṭi. At the conclusion of this the extent part of the work comes to an end.

From the foregoing short analysis of the extant portions of Prasthānamākars, we can understand quite clearly the plan of the work as thought out by our author. He first refers to Vyāsa, the author of the Brahmasūtras and says that he has carried out his work according to a certain plan- Pramāṇas, Prameya, Sādhana and Phala. This is also the position in Vallabhācārya's Sabodhinī. We may add here that in the Sarvanirṇayaprakaraṇa of the

---

33. Evam pramāṇaviśaye' nupapāditam yat,

Yed viprakīrṇam upapāditam Ākaraṇa

Saṅgrhya tad geditam atra mayā tathānyat

Prāsāṅgikam ca sujanavrajatoṣṇāya. Pr.p. 155.

Tattvadīpanibandha, Vallabha has also followed the same plan. Puruṣottama thus thought of writing four chapters dealing with Pramāṇa, Prameya, Sādhana and Phala. He actually refers to the Sādhana-prakaraṇa in the beginning. 34

That the second chapter is not finished can also be easily understood. The chapter does not contain the colophon or any concluding verse. Again, it does not discuss each and every problem connected with the Prameya, e.g. the Kāryakoṭi, the Jīvasvarūpa, the distinction between the Jagat and the Saṁsāra etc. These points are really important and we can not believe that Puruṣottama has neglected them.

The pertinent point, which remains to be seen is whether Puruṣottama finished the work and some <sup>of</sup> its portions were lost or that he left the work unfinished. When Puruṣottama has written so many works, it is difficult to imagine that he might have left unfinished so important a work. The work is really a treasure, a Ratnākara and quite naturally Puruṣottama must have completed it.

Again, many references to it are found in his other works like Bhāṣya-prakāśa and Āvaraṇa-bhaṅga. If these references

---

34. Siddhānte Prakāraṣu tu sādhanaprakaraṇe vakṣyate.

are a clue to the earlier composition of Prasthānaratnākara , we should accept that it was finished by our author and it is our misfortune that we have not been able to obtain the complete text.

(29) Samarpananirnaya:-

In the manuscript Library of Pandit Gattulalji in Bombay, there is one work of Puruṣottama called Samarpananirnaya or Ātmanivedanapaddhati. The manuscript bears number 150 and consists of 16 folios. It is a small work which contains, as its name indicates, the discussion on the Samarpana or surrender to God.

(30) Mukticintāmaṇi:-

In the same Library we have one work mukticintāmaṇi, also called Bhagavatprasādanāhātmya. The manuscript has 11 folios and is dated V.S.1728. Number of the manuscript is 176 and the name of the scribe is Vāgbhata. The colophon runs : 'Iti Śrī mukticintāmaṇau Śrīpuruṣottamadevena Saṅgrhya viracītaḥ.' It is not improbable that Śrī. Puruṣottamadeva is our author. The work is just a compilation and Puruṣottama might have written it at the young age of 14, which would have been his age in V.S.1728.



## (31) Dravyaśuddhi:-

Dravyaśuddhi is an important contribution of Puruṣottama to Dharmaśāstra. The work, apart from collecting the rules of purification, as its name indicates, is written with an express purpose. While the rules of purification have been laid down by the works on Dharmaśāstra, for the purpose of maintaining purity and sanctity of things and men, Puruṣottama felt it to be his duty to review them and bring them in line with the Sāṃpradāyic practices. The devotion to God, thanks to the imagination of Viṭṭhaleśa, has been a fairly long procedure in the Puṣṭimārga, involving the use of a lot of things and requiring ~~ix~~ a good deal of time. It was thus necessary to preserve the purity of all the utensils used in the Harisevā. Hence the rules of Śuddhi had to be so adjusted and explained as to get sanction for the Sāṃpradāyic traditions. Puruṣottama makes this quite clear in the first verse. 35

Another important point is also to be noted. Puruṣottama, as we have seen, flourished at the time when

---

35. Nstvā Śrīvallabhācāryān harisevopakārikā,  
bāhyāchāḍhyantarī dravyaśuddhir atra vicāryate.

Dravyaśuddhi.p.4.

the throne of Delhi was occupied by Aurangzeb, under whose reign the Hindu society was always in danger. The Hindus who had to struggle for their existence became more and more conservative; all the rules formulated and observed since centuries had to be reviewed in the context of the new situation that arose. Puruṣottama felt it to be his duty to put together and interpret the rules which appear in different works.<sup>36</sup>

The work contains 29 sections as follows:-

- (i) Śnānēcamaṇḍimittavicāra,
- (ii) Vāstrādyaṇṭaritasparśe buddhipūrvakasparśe ca śnānādivicāra,
- (iii) Śītoṣṇodakamaṇāvicāra,
- (iv) Rātrou śnānavicāra,
- (v) Rātrou kedyādijalāśnānavicāra,
- (vi) Rātrou jāma-ṇṭirajhaṇṣu kālaviḥāgādivicāra,
- (vii) Caturthadīnēdeṇ rajasvalāśudhivicāra,
- (viii) Parimiteḍinottaram punā rajodarśanevicāra,
- (ix) Rajasvalāyē aśucyaḥ parasparsaḥ rajasvalayoḥ parasparsasparśe ca vicāra,

---

36. Nibandheṣu vivicyoktāpy adhunā budhahidoṣataḥ,

Yeṣāṃ na bhūṣate samyag tata eṣa samudyamah.

Dravyasūddhi. p. 4.

- (x) Rajasvalāśnānādivicāra,
- (xi) Atah param etadvyastiriktasūnānādiyoganimitlavicāra ,
- (xii) Sperśe doṣābhāvavicāra, -
- (xiii) Bhagavatsevāyām caivapitryekarmasu snānādina  
śuddhasya ke vā āśucihetaveḥ kṛkṣa katham vā  
tataḥ śuddhir iti vicāryate,
- (xiv) Vastrādiviṣaye śuddhivicāra,
- (xv ) Pātrādiśuddhivacāra,
- (xvi) Uchhiṣṭasprṣṭapātraśuddhivicāra,
- (xvii) Amoghya-sprṣṭapātraśuddhivicāra,
- (xviii) Śaṅgyādiśuddhivicāra,
- (xix) Dhānyādiśuddhivicāra,
- (xx) Siddhāntaśuddhivicāra,
- (xxi) Chṛtapāyasaḍdibām śuddhivicāra,
- (xxii) Chṛtapācitādīnām bhakṣyābhakṣyevicāra,
- (xxiii) Uḍakaśuddhivicāra,
- (xxiv) Jalāśayaśuddhivicāra,
- (xxv ) Bhūśuddhivicāra,
- (xxvi) Oṣhaśuddhivicāra,
- (xxvii) Rathyāśuddhivicāra,
- (xxviii) Prakāraśuddhivicāra, and
- (xxix) Ātmaśuddhivicāra.

The work is full of quotations from standard  
treatises on the subject, like the Śartīś, Nirṇayasindhu,

Dinakarodyeta, Bhagavad Bhāskara etc. Puruṣottama tries to make it as complete as possible by leaving out nothing that is important.

(32) Utsavapratāna:-

Festivals have played an important part in the Puṣṭi Saṁpradāya. We have got many works of the scholars of the Saṁpradāya, discussing when and how certain important festivals are to be celebrated. The Utsavapratāna enjoys a very high position in these works. It begins in the form of a commentary on the Jan/māṣṭamīnirṇaya of Viṭṭhaleśa, and after it is finished, Puruṣottama begins to discuss other festivals independently. <sup>37</sup> While so doing, he also includes a commentary on the Rāmanavamīnirṇaya of Viṭṭhaleśa.

Apart from the description of the festivals, Puruṣottama's purpose is to decide the exact time when these festivals are to be celebrated. This <sup>is</sup> what he himself says in the first verse. <sup>38</sup> He says the same

---

37. Atah paṇam svantaṁtratayā nirṇīyante. U.P.p.107.

38. Śrīmad ācāryacareṇa n prabhūn Śrīviṭṭhaleśvarēn,  
Nativotsavānām samayaḥ sopapattika ucyate. U.P.p.90.

thing at the end also.<sup>39</sup> Thus the Utsavapratāna is more or less a Kālanirnayagrantha. It should be noted in this connection that the title of the work, as given in the Colophon, is Samvatsarotsavakālanirnayapratāna. The work contains a critical discussion on all the festivals referring to the views of many authoritative works like Kālamādhava, Bhagavad Bhāskara, Dinakarodyota, Nirñayasindhu and many Purāṇas and other works. The work sometimes makes an interesting reading, especially in the description of various festivals. Thus for instance, while dealing with the Balipūjāvidhi, Puruṣottama refers to the tug of war (Rajjvākarsaṇa) as described in the Āditya Purāṇa.<sup>40</sup>

Sri. D. H. Shastri of Surat has edited a collection of the available works on the subject by the writers in the Sampradāya. The title given to it is Yāvatprāpya-utsavanirnaya-granthasamuccayaḥ. In this we find another work of Puruṣottama named Vijayānirñaya, dealing with the festivals of Vijayādaśamī. Śāstrī Gaṅgādhara in his Utsevapratānodāharaṇa says that Puruṣottama has written two works on the Vijayādaśamī, and he has commented upon both of them.<sup>41</sup> One Vijayāviveka of Gaṅgādhara Shāstrī is printed in the collection stated above.

---

39. Samvatsarotsavānehonirñayo yam mayā kṛtāh. U.P.p.156.

40. U.P.p.116.

41. U.P.p.65.

It explains the portion of the Utsavapratāna, dealing with the Vijayādaśamī. As for the other work dealing with the Vijayādaśamī, which is printed in the said collection and which, Gaṅgādhara says, he has commented upon, I could find after a careful study that it is just a larger version of the relevant portions in the Utsava-pratāna. I do not think, therefore, that it deserves separate consideration.

The high esteem in which this work was held, can be seen from the fact that it was actually abridged and explained either wholly or partly by the followers of the Saṃpradāya. A short explanation of difficult words and sentences has been named Pratāna-tippaṇī. The manuscript of the work together with the Tippaṇī is dated V.S. 1758 and was copied in Surat. The Tippaṇī refers to Puruṣottama as 'Guru' ; it thus appears to have been composed by one of his disciples. <sup>42</sup> We have already noted that one Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī wrote commentary called Vijayāviveka on the portions of the Pratāna, dealing with the Vijayādaśamī. The Vijayādaśamīvāda alias Vijayādaśamīnirṇaya of Gaṅgādhara Bhaṭṭa is also based upon the same. The Vratotsavenirṇaya of Bhaṭṭa Tulajārāma, written in the Vraja dialect is based upon the

---

42. U.P.p.156.

Utsavapratāna.<sup>43</sup> Similarly there is one Utsavapratāna-sandoha written in the Vraj dialect. The manuscript is dated V.S.1785 and copied by Vaiṣṇava Nṛsiṅhadāsa.<sup>44</sup>

Govardhana, son of Rāmakṛṣṇa, commented upon the Candana-yātrotsava in the Pratāna. The Utsavapratānodāharana of Śāstrī Gaṅgādhara is also written in the Vraj dialect.

Rāmakṛṣṇa's son Govardhana wrote one Vijayādaśamī-Pratānāśayaprakāśa and the Dolotsavapratānaprakāśa in Sanskrit. Jagannātha Śāstri has translated Utsavapratāna in Hindi.

(33) Utsavabhāvanukrama:-

It is a short compilation of verses appropriate for different festivals that have been described and discussed in Utsavapratāna. The work is also called Utsavakramabhāvanā. It is published together with the 'Prakaranānām saṅgati' in the collection of Vrata-works, referred to above.

43. Iti ŚrīmatPurusottamajīkṛta-utsavapratānamate

Vacanasaṅgrahapūrvaka Utsavanirnaya...Etc. U.P.p.26.

44. U.P. p. 27.

## (IV).

commentaries on the works of Vallabha and Vitthalesa.

## (34) Anubhāsyaprakāśa:-

This voluminous commentary on the Anubhāsyā of Vallabhācārya is the magnum opus of Puruṣottama. Vallabha wrote his Bhāsyā on the Brahmasūtras, which are taken to be one of the Prasthānas of the Vedāntic philosophy. He thus tried to explain through this his theories of the Śuddhādvaita. The Anubhāsyā, however, was written in a laconic style and stood in need of commentaries for its explanation. Puruṣottama, by carrying out this great work, has supplied to us more than what was needed.

The Anubhāsyā is a work of dual authorship. On the authority of Puruṣottama, we know that the Anubhāsyā from the beginning upto III.ii.3<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> was composed by Vallabhācārya, while the remaining portions were written by his son Vitthalesa. <sup>45</sup> Puruṣottama must have definitely noticed the distinction between the two portions. In the beginning of the fourth Adhyāya there are eighteen verses while there are

---

45. Ita ārabhya Prabhūnam iti pratibhāti. A.B. P.III.ii.34



only five in the beginning of the third, and there is no such metrical introduction to the first two Adhyāyas. The style of Vallabha is terse and laconic, almost ~~ex~~ epigrammatic while that of Vitthaleśa is more explanatory, and tends to be ornate with long compounds, and descriptions full of imagination, sometimes uncalled for in such a work. Further, the former part of the Bhāṣya contains violent attacks on other theorists, especially Śaṅkara; this is not the case with the portions written by Vitthaleśa. Vallabha often refers to the older Upaniṣads, whereas Vitthaleśa refers more to the minor Upaniṣads and the Purāṇas. The second interpretation of the Sutra I.i.11. ~~is~~ is from the pen of Vitthaleśa, as has been pointed out by Puruṣottama. <sup>46</sup>•Puruṣottama's ~~ex~~ commentary itself would, on a careful reading, show the case of dual authorship very clearly. Puruṣottama has to explain much more while commenting upon the portion written by Vallabha than upon those ~~commented~~ by Vitthaleśa.

We have noted above that on account of the laconic

---

46. Sāmpṛatam tu Prabhucaraṇair akhaṇḍabrahmavādena...etc.

style of Vallabha, Anubhāṣya stands in need of an explanation for its complete understanding. A host of commentaries, besides the Prakāśa of Puruṣottama, have been written with that purpose. Giridhara (born in V.S. 1819) has written Vivaraṇa on the Anubhāṣya, while a similar work of Muralīdhara is called Vyākhyā. One Mathurānātha who was a great mīmāṃsist has written one Prakāśa. The Pradīpa of Icchārāma Bhaṭṭa and the Yojanā alias Gūdhārthadīpikā of Lālu Bhaṭṭa are easier explanations helpful to a student. Besides these there are other commentaries also like Vedāntacandrikā, probably of Vrajarāja, Vāgīśaprasāda of Bālakṛṣṇa, the Merīcikā of Bhaṭṭa Vrajanātha etc.

Of all the commentaries on the Anubhāṣya, the best and the most important is that of Puruṣottama. He introduces the Sūtras, explains the Bhāṣya fully and then notes the interpretations of other Bhāṣyakāras and views of other theorists on the particular topic at the end of the Sūtra or the Adhikaraṇa as the case may be. He discusses the views of others and refutes them if so required. Thus Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Śaiva, etc. are referred to a hundred times. Udayana, Vācaspati-miśra, Jayatīrtha and many others are often mentioned. Thus the commentary is more critical than explanatory.

Sometimes we feel that the Prakāśa is very scholastic and difficult to be understood. Gopeśvara has written a fairly long sub-commentary over the same called Raśmi, in which he explains the Prakāśa and adds many more discussions which, he thinks, are necessary.

One very important question has been raised with regard to the larger version of the Anubhāṣya called the Śrīmadbhāṣya or the Brhadbhāṣya and the Bhāvaprakāśikā-vṛtti. The problem requires a discussion here, in as much as it has some bearing on the Anubhāṣyaprakāśa of Puruṣottama.

A case has been made out by Shri.Telivala<sup>47</sup> and Prof:M.G.Shastri to the effect that Vallabha wrote two commentaries on the Brahmasūtras; the one known as the Anubhāṣya which is extant and well-known, and the other which has been lost to us but which was voluminous and consequently called Brhadbhāṣya or Śrīmadbhāṣya.

Prof:Jethalal G. Shah does not agree to this and refutes the arguments advanced by Shri.Telivala and Prof.M.G. Shastri.<sup>48</sup> The important arguments and counter-arguments

---

47. A.B. with P. and R.III.i.Intro.p.5,6.

48. Prof:J.G.Shah: Anubhāṣya:Gujarati Translation

Vol.I.intro.p.9ff.

are as follows.

The title of the Bhāṣya- Anubhāṣya-itself, shows that this commentary is smaller than the other, which may be named Brhadbhāṣya or Śrīmadbhāṣya. Prof: Shah says that the term Anu stands for the atomic measure of the individual soul as against the Vibhutva of the same as propounded by Śaṅkara. It should be remembered that Vallabha considers Śaṅkara as his chief adversary. It is necessary for us to understand exactly what Shri. Teliwala has to say in this connection. In the editorial note at the end of the Anubhāṣya(with Prakāśa and Reśmi)III.iii.he says , " It seems Vitthalesvara got Vallabhācārya's Bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtras upto III.ii. 33. It seems this was the only portion in his possession when he composed the Vidvanmandana. It was at a late stage.... that he undertook to complete the Bhāṣya-fragment of his father on the Brahmasūtras. In order to distinguish this Bhāṣya from that of his father, he seems to have named it Anubhāṣya. In Subodhinī,Vallabhācārya does not refer to his commentary on Brahmasūtras as Anubhāṣya, but only as Bhāṣya without the word Anu." The argument thus based on the word Anu, does not appear to be plausible,because if we believe that Vitthalesa

has given the name Anubhāṣya, naturally it does not mean that the portion written by Vallabha himself also represents a smaller version of the original text. The explanation of the term Anu, as given by Prof: J.G. Shah may not appear to be satisfactory, because it is unbelievable that Vallabha, even if he wanted to distinguish his System from that of Śaṅkara, would have hit upon not so very important a point.

Vallabha in his Prakāśa on the Śāstrārtha Prakarāṇa of Tattvadīpenibandha says: "Cakārān Mīmāṃsādvayabhāṣyam. 49

This, says Telivāla, would rather suggest an accomplished fact. Similarly in the Subodhinī on Bhāgavatapurāṇa. II. i. 5 he refers to the Pūrvamīmāṃsābhāṣya also, as an accomplished fact. 50 Telivāla further points out that in the Subodhinī on the Veda-stuti, Vallabha says: "Bhāṣye Vistarasyektatvāt." No such Vistāra has been found in the extant Anubhāṣya. Similarly in the Subodhinī on the Bhāgavata III. iv. 7. Vallabha says: "Itāny eva guṇopasamhāra-pāde śoḍaśadhikeranyā pratipāditāni." This means that

---

49. T.S.P. V. 5. p. 33.

50. Bhāvanēpakṣaś ca Pūrvamīmāṃsābhāṣya eva nirākṛtaḥ.

sixteen Adhikaraṇas of the Brahmasūtras III.iii. are regarded as Viśeṣaṇas. There is no such reference in the extant Anubhāṣya. Puruṣottama does not seem to have known this in the beginning. He knew this after writing his Prakāśa on Subodhinī on the third book of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. So he added the required references in his Anubhāṣyaprakāśa in the revised version.

In reply to the argument of Teliwala that the references to the Bhāṣya suggest an accomplished fact, Prof. Shah says that when one author is writing commentaries on various works simultaneously, he may think of discussing a certain point in a particular work and may forget the same thing while actually writing that portion of that particular work. The argument of Prof. Shah is convincing. Naturally, the references to the Bhāṣya in other works can not prove an accomplished fact.

Shri. Telivala has further pointed out certain inconsistencies in the extant Anubhāṣya. In the Īkṣatyadhikaraṇa, there is no refutation of the Sāṃkhya theory; however, in the beginning of his Bhāṣya on Brahmasūtras I.iv, it is said that the Sāṃkhya theory is refuted in the Īkṣatyadhikaraṇa as unscriptural.

Similarly, the Tadananyatvādhikaraṇa should contain a discussion on the theory of Āvirbhāva-tirobhāva, but it is silent. Prof. Shah says that even though the word Sāṃkhya is not used in the Īkṣatyādhikaraṇa, the refutation is, in fact, implied. As for the second case Prof. Shah just says that the arguments/ is equally weak. It is surely too much to imagine a separate Bhāṣya on account of these inconsistencies. The explanation of the inconsistencies, given by Prof. Shah is very farfetched. Inconsistencies, if they are there, should be accepted as such and it is useless to give a farfetched explanation to prove otherwise.

Shri. Telivala has further pointed out that we find ~~the~~ some Sūtras of the third and fourth Adhyāyas of the Brahme-sūtras, explained in the Subodhinī, the explanation of these Sūtras as given in the Subodhinī, is different from that given in the Anubhāṣya; hence the explanations as found in the Subodhinī must be concurring with those in the Brhadbhāṣya. Prof. Shah says that the explanations should be viewed in the context in which they are given. One important point, which we should note, is that such Sūtras belong to the portions of the commentary written

by Viṭṭhaleśa.

Shri. Telivala argues that on a perusal of the Anubhāṣya itself, we find that it is an abridgement of a bigger work and that almost all the works of Vallabhā-cārya have double editions. Prof. Shah correctly dismisses the first argument on the ground of the laconic style of Vallabha. He also says that the arguments of double editions is not conclusive, because there are other works which do not have two editions e.g. Patrāvalambana ~~and~~ and the sixteen tracess except the Sevāphala.

The whole discussion has enjoyed prominence by the publication of some parts of the said Śrīmadbhāṣya or Brhadbhāṣya in the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā Vol. VI. Prof. M. G. Shastri wrote an article about it 'Prāptamīmāṃsā-bhāṣyavibhāgārtha' in Puṣṭibhaktisudhā.<sup>51</sup> In this article Prof. Shastri says that the parts of the Bhāṣya published in the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā, are really speaking portions of the said Śrīmadbhāṣya or Brhadbhāṣya. Shri. Telivala, however, observes 'In conclusion we ought not to omit reference to one work which passes in the name

---

51. Puṣṭibhaktisudhā (Vol. VIII, Nos. 5-6, p. 75), referred to by J. G. Shah: Śrīmad Brahma-sūtra-anubhāṣyam - Guj Trans. Vol. I. Intro. p. 9



of Śrīmad Bhāṣya of Śrī.Vallabhācārya.... From the style this seems to be a clumsy attempt of a writer of recent times. All copies seen by us are new. The style is such as leaves little doubts in our minds as to the spurious nature of this production." <sup>52</sup>. Thus, the proof, that has been made much of, loses its value.

All this rather long discussion has a direct bearing on the study of Puruṣottama. It has been stated by the scholars of the Sāṃpradāya that the erudite performance of Puruṣottamajī, seen in the comparative method as found in the Anubhāṣyaprakāśa, is an abridgement of the said Śrīmadbhāṣya. <sup>53</sup> One thing, that we must note in this connection is that never in his works, Puruṣottama refers to the alleged Śrīmadbhāṣya. Puruṣottama, as the study of his works reveals, is not a plagiarist and if he has borrowed bodily from the Śrīmadbhāṣya of Vallabha himself, there is no reason why he should not refer to such a work

---

52. Anubhāṣya with Prakāśa & Rāśmi.III.i.Intro.p.12.

53. Śrīmadbhāṣye Śaṅkarācāryādinām pūrvabhāṣyakṛtām  
samīkṣā kṛtāsti, saiva Śrīpuruṣottamakṛteprakāśa  
Udalekhīti sāmpradāyikāh. Anubhāṣya-Ed.S.T.Pathak

Vol.II.Intro.p.48).

at all.

The Bhāvaṇprakāśikāvṛtti, ascribed to Kṛṣṇacandra, is a work that poses a problem for a student of the Śuddhādvaita. Is it written by Puruṣottama or Kṛṣṇacandra? If it is written by Kṛṣṇacandra, how much does Puruṣottama owe to it? Is it based upon the Śrīmadbhāṣya, other than the extant Anubhāṣya? All these questions require a careful study.

The Bhāvaṇprakāśikāvṛtti is an independent commentary on the Brahmasūtras, based upon the Bhāṣya of Vallabha. It explains the Sūtras in line with the explanations offered by Vallabha and Viṭṭhaleśa in the Bhāṣya and also discusses some other important points. The explanation on the first Adhyāya appears to be critical though not so much as the Prakāśa of Puruṣottama. Thus, for instance, in the very beginning there is a discussion on the adhyayanavidhi and the views of various thinkers on the same. Again, there are references to Śaṅkara and others, while explaining I.i.2. etc. This, however, does not go on for a longer time, and after some Adhikaraṇas, the Vṛtti is more or less explanatory. Thus the Vṛttikāra does not criticise Śaṅkara in the Ānandamaya Adhikaraṇa and the work is, on the whole free from polemics. The Vṛtti on the

Adhyāyas II, III, and IV is still less critical and sometimes barely explanatory. Thus, for instance, the Vṛtti on the Tadananyatva-adhikaraṇa is less critical even than the Bhāṣya of Vallabha. The strictures which have been passed again/<sup>st</sup> Sāṅkara by Vallabha in II.i.15, II.ii.8 etc. are totally absent. Thus the nature of the work is that of a short explanatory imitation of the Anubhāṣya.

As for the authorship of the work, we should ~~to~~ take into account the colophons. The colophon~~s~~ at the end of the first Pāda of the first Adhyāya reads: "...Śrīkṛṣṇacandra-viracitāyām tacchiṣyaPuruṣottamaśaṁgrhītāyām Bhāvaprakāśikā-bhīdhāyām brahmasūtravṛttau...etc." <sup>54</sup> That at the end of the second Pāda substitutes "Tacchiṣyapurūṣottamalikhitāyām" instead of "Śaṁgrhītāyām." Thereafter, there is no reference to Puruṣottama in any colophon. Shri.M.T.Telivala in his Sanskrit introduction to Adhyāya IV says that the manuscript of the Vṛtti is written by Puruṣottama himself. The last folio is written by one Kṛṣṇadatta in V.S.1850. Someone has written on it, "Iyam Vṛttiḥ Gosvāmipurūṣottamaih svagurunāmnā kṛteti śrutam." Thus the Sāṁpradāyic tradition

---

54. Bhāvaprakāśikā I.p.45.

is that the work has, actually, been composed by Puruṣottama and fathered upon his teacher Kṛṣṇacandra. Puruṣottama has actually done so and used the names of his father and his grandfather as the authors of his own works, as we shall see in this chapter. It does not however appear that the Bhāva-prakāśikā is really a work of Puruṣottama. We should not forget that the Vṛtti, as it is, is more critical in the first Adhyāya than in the other three. Not only so but the comparative and argumentative style of Puruṣottama is not found in the three Adhyāyas. Again, the word 'Saṁgrhīta' in the colophon is a pointer for this purpose. It seems to me that the work, especially the beginning of it, is revised by Puruṣottama, when he prepared a manuscript copy of the work. The later portions do not appear to have been even revised.

The relation of this work with the Prakāśa can be and should be discussed, because it ~~is~~ has been argued that Puruṣottama owes much to his teacher Kṛṣṇacandra. It has been said that Puruṣottama has been obliged by two descendants of Vallabha. It was due to Vrajarāya that he got the service of the image of Bālakṛṣṇa but the profound scholarship that Puruṣottama shows to have possessed is due to his teacher Kṛṣṇacandra. Thus, it is said that Puruṣottama's Prakāśa contains so many

passages, that are found in the Bhāva-prakāśikā. If they are not copied out, they are atleast summarised or expanded.

A careful comparative study of the two works, has, however, led me to quite another conclusion. The Bhāva-prakāśikā very rarely contains the references to other commentators, which is the chief merit of the works of Puruṣottama; and even the references, which are found, are suspicious, because they might have been added by Puruṣottama himself. One instance will be sufficient for this. In the very beginning, we have a discussion on the Adhyayana-vidhi, which is found in both the works. In the Bhāva-prakāśikā, the author first refers to the Bhāṭṭas, the Prābhākaras, Rāmānuja, Śaṅkara, Śaiva, Bhāskara, Madhva and Bhikṣu. Out of them the Śaiva, Śaṅkara, Bhikṣu and Madhva are just mentioned. Then follows the siddhānta. The views of others are put in as less words as possible. In the Prakāśa we have a complete explanation of the theories of the Bhāṭṭas, Prābhākaras, Rāmānuja, Śaiva and Bhāskara. Puruṣottama does not refer to Śaṅkara, Bhikṣu and Madhva separately, perhaps because they follow one or other of those views. After this, follows a detailed explanations of the Siddhānta, accompanied with the refutation of others' views when required. Last comes a definite refutation of the Śaiva. If we compare the two,

we find that the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā does not refute the views, held by others and that it mentions Śaṅkara, Bhikṣu and Madhva separately. If now Kṛṣṇacandra has written these portions himself, why did he not refute the views of others? Is it that an author like Kṛṣṇacandra should have thought of enumerating the views without arguing against them? It seems that these portions have been added to the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā by Puruṣottama himself after finishing his Prakāśa. Hence he might not have thought it necessary to give the arguments all over again. He, again, might have thought of mentioning the names of Śaṅkara, Bhikṣu and Madhva also when he revised the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā, so as to make the list more complete and up-to-date. That comparative study of various views is actually ~~by~~ added by Puruṣottama and does not belong to the original, can be made out by some more arguments also. Firstly, at two places I.ii.32 and I.iv.27, the references to others' views are not found in the earlier manuscripts, while they are found in the later ones. These passages are again found ad verbatim in the Bhāṣyaprakāśa. This is said by Shri. Telivala himself.<sup>55</sup> Secondly, we may actually compare a

---

55. Cinhāntargato bhāgo matsannidhau vidyamāneṣu Prācīna-  
-hastalikhitatṛiṣv api pustakeṣu nāsti. Bhāṣya-prakāśe  
yam bhāgo kṣeraṣo mudrito dr̥ṣyate. Sa evātra niveśita  
iti pratibhāti. Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā I.p.71. footnote. See also  
footnote on p.123.

passage or two. Let us take, for instance, the discussion on the Adhyayanavidhi. In the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā the views of the Bhāṭṭas is given in only one long sentence with numerous clauses and phrases. The same is given at some greater length in the Prakāśa, with shorter sentences. Similar is the case with the views of the Prābhākaras, Rāmānuja, and Bhāskara. This, however, is not the usual style which we meet with in the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā. It thus appears that these passages are actual summaries of those in the Anubhāṣyaprakāśa. Thus the lack of uniformity in style is an additional argument.

It is stated that the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā-vṛtti is based upon the alleged Śrīmadbhāṣya or Brhadbhāṣya.<sup>56</sup> We have discussed the various arguments and counter-arguments for the Śrīmadbhāṣya. As regards the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā itself we have to note the following points.

In the beginning the author salutes Vallabha and

---

56. Pūrvokteśrīmadbhāṣyam anusṛjyaiva Bhāvaṇaprakāśākhya  
vṛttir vartate- Anubhāṣya: Ed. S. P. Pathak. Vol. II.  
Intro. p. 48.

Vitthaleśa and says that he intends' to speak out' the Sūtravṛtti in accordance with the Śrīmadbhāṣya.<sup>57</sup> What is meant by Śrīmadbhāṣya here? Is it the title of some work or is the term Śrīmad just honourific? At three places, the author refers to the Bhāṣya. In I.i.3. while arguing against Rāmānuja the author enters into a discussion and then says - 'Viśeṣas tu Bhāṣyavibhāgād avadhātavyah'.<sup>58</sup> Under the same Sūtra again at the end, we have the sentence:- 'Viśeṣo Bhāṣyavibhāge prapañcitah'.<sup>59</sup> Here the author is arguing for the Samavāyitva of Brahman. Under I.i.10 he says that some persons understand the Īkṣatyadhikarṇa as a refutation of the Sāṃkhya theory. Then he says: 'Idam yathā takhā matāntarānām dūṣaṇam Bhāṣyavibhāgād avagantavyam'.<sup>60</sup> Before that, however, he says that even the refutation of the Sāṃkhya view may be accepted.<sup>61</sup> Which Bhāṣya-vibhāga

---

57. Śrīmadbhāṣyānusāreṇa sūtravṛttim bruvē' dhuna.

Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā.I.p.1.

58. Ibid p.12.

59. Ibid.p.14.

60. Ibid.p.21.

61. Tadyāpy ānuṣaṅgikatvenāsmākaṃ abhimatam.

Ibid. p. 21.



is referred to here? It can not ~~be~~ surely be the Anubhāṣya which does not contain any such discussion.

It may appear that the references here are to the Śrīmadbhāṣya. We may, however, note here that, while the attempts to prove the composition of a larger version of the Bhāṣya have not been found conclusive, as we have seen, there are certain other points also particularly regarding the Bhāṣyaprakāśikā. The colophons of the Bhāṣyaprakāśa and the verses in the beginning and at the end would show that Puruṣottama himself refers to the Bhāṣya, simply as Bhāṣya and not Anubhāṣya.<sup>62</sup> Only at one place the name Anubhāṣya is mentioned.<sup>63</sup> Thus even Puruṣottama does not appear to make any distinction between Bhāṣya and Anubhāṣya, as such. Again, in the Bhāṣyaprakāśikāvṛtti, in the Ānandamaya-adhikaraṇa the interpretation of Viṭṭhaleśa has been summarised and separately noticed.<sup>64</sup> Again,

---

62. See Anubhāṣyaprakāśa: Tam Vyāsāśayagocaram prathayitum yair bhāṣyam ābhasitam. V.4, p.1; Bhāṣyaprakāśe prayate' tidīno... V.8. p.2; Bhāṣyārtham yo' tigūḍham prakṛtitaṃ akarot.... V.1. p.1441. All the colophons read: Puruṣottama-sya kṛtau Bhāṣyaprakāśe...

63. Sri. Viṭṭhaleśapadābjaprasādavaralābhataḥ  
Prakāśam Anubhāṣyasya Vitanven Puruṣottamaḥ. A.B.P.V.4.  
P.1441.

64. Prabhucaraṇās tu annamayādīnām api... tebhyo bhedaṃ  
varṇakāntareṇa sādhayanti. Bhāṣyaprakāśikā. I. p.23.

the Bhāva-prakāśikāvṛtti clearly distinguishes between the portions of Vallabha and Viṭṭhaleśa. At the end of III.ii.34 we have : "Ita ārabhya Prabhūṇām lekha iti pratibhāti."<sup>65</sup> Further we should note that the interpretations of all the Sūtras, even the latter part, fully concur with those given in the Anubhāṣya. Thus if we believe that the Vṛtti follows the alleged Śrīmadbhāṣya, we shall have to accept that the said Śrīmadbhāṣya also has dual authorship and is in complete agreement with the Anubhāṣya. This would cut the very ~~base~~ basis upon which the super structure of the Śrīmadbhāṣya is worked out.

It thus appears that the Bhāṣyavibhāga to which the Vṛtti refers, cannot be the Śrīmadbhāṣya. What else can it be? I think that the reference here is clearly to the Anubhāṣya-prakāśa of Puruṣottama. The reasons are as follows:-

These discussions are actually found in the Anubhāṣya-prakāśa. Again the term used at all these places is Bhāṣyavibhāga and not Bhāṣya. It should also be noted that such references are found in only the first Adhyāya and not in the other Adhyāyas of the Vṛtti, and as we have seen above, there is every reason to believe that only the

---

65. Ibid. III. p. 30.

first Adhyāya is revised by Puruṣottama and not the other three. At the end of the whole discussion we may arrive at the following conclusions:-

(a) The Bhāvaṇīprakāśikāvṛtti was written by Kṛṣṇacandra and its first Adhyāya was revised by Puruṣottama.

(b) It is not based upon the Śrīmadbhāṣya, the composition of which is more or less a piece of imagination of some scholars rather than a fact.

(c) The revision of the Vṛtti by Puruṣottama was undertaken after the composition of the Anubhāṣyaprakāśa.

(d) There is no evidence of value to show that the Anubhāṣyaprakāśa is based upon the Vṛtti and is an expansion of the same.

Another important point also requires consideration in this connection. Shri. Telivala has found out one commentary on the Guṇopasamhārapāda, which he has printed as an appendix in the Anubhāṣya with Prakāśa and Rāśmī III. iii. In the editor's note he says: 'We beg to draw the attention of the scholars of the Sāṃpradāya as well as others to the Parīṣiṣṭa printed here. It is almost a complete commentary on the Guṇopasamhāra Pāda of the Anubhāṣya... On a comparison of the same with the Prakāśa, we find that almost the whole of it is incorporated in the Prakāśa. It seems possible from the style of expression and method of writing

that Puruṣottamajī owes much to this. Its style resembles that of Kṛṣṇacandrajī's Vṛtti. If so, the comparative method of exposition followed by him in Prakāśa owes its origin to the genius of Kṛṣṇacandrajī....It is possible that Kṛṣṇacandrajī wrote his commentary from the very beginning and the same is incorporated in the Prakāśa... The copy of the Guṇopasamhārapāḍavivarana....seems to be the original in Kṛṣṇacandrajī's own hand.'

The portions which have been published are not complete. The commentary breaks off in the middle and runs upto III,iii.53 only. The Vivarana does not contain any colophon, and naturally bears no date. We have no means to understand how Shri.Telivala could find out the handwriting of Kṛṣṇacandra. There may appear to be some truth in the statement that the whole of it has been incorporated in the Prakāśa, because the similarities are surely there. But even here, we find that the Vivarana is very short and its references to the views of others are not so clear as in the Prakāśa. The Vivarana, for instance, does not contain any refutation of Śaṅkara and others though they are mentioned at the end of the Sūtra III.iii.4. The Prakāśa contains such refutations. The Vivarana is again not Sūtrawise but Adhikarana-wise and it does not explain the whole of the Bhāṣya. The author seems to be

more interested in bringing out the arguments contained in the Adhikaraṇas rather than writing an explanatory commentary. The distribution of the Sūtras in to Adhikaraṇas in the Vivaraṇa is also different from that in the Prakāśe, as will be seen from the following table:

<u>Vivaraṇa.</u>		<u>Anubhāsyaprakāśa.</u>	
Adhikaraṇa	Sūtras.	Adhikaraṇa.	Sūtras.
1	1- 4	1	1-15
2	5- 8		
3	9-11		
4	12-15		
5	16-17	2	16-17
6	18-19	3	18-23
7	20-23		
8	24	4	24
9	25	5	25-26
10	26		
11	27-28	6	27-28
12	29	7	29
13	30	8	30
14	31	9	31
15	32	10	32
16	33	11	33-34
17	34		
18	35-36	12	35-37

<u>Vivarana.</u>		<u>Anubhāsyaprakāśa.</u>	
Adhikaraṇa.	Sūtras.	Adhikaraṇa.	Sūtras.
19	37		
20	38	13	38-39
21	39		
22	40-41	14	40-41
23	42	15	42
24	43	16	43
25	44-53	17	44-53

If Puruṣottama would have followed this Vivaraṇa, we can not understand why he did not follow the Adhikaraṇa-vyavasthā also. The Vivaraṇa need not be compared with the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikāvṛtti, for, while the former is critical and succinct, the Vṛtti is more explanatory. Its style of course does not resemble the Vṛtti though it may be said to resemble the Prakāśa. Any way, it is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion on account of our scanty knowledge. The only thing, which I want to point out, is that had there existed an old commentary like this, Puruṣottama's words- 'Sāmpṛadāye nivṛtte' at the end of the Prakāśa<sup>66</sup> would have lost all their force. Perhaps he might not have made such a statement in the face of such a commentary written by his own teacher.

---

66. A.B.P.V.1.p.1441.

Thus the Anubhāṣyaprakāśa does not owe much to the Bhāvaprakāśikāvṛtti. The so-called Vivaraṇa is doubtful in nature. The Anubhāṣyaprakāśa is really the *Magnūopus* of Puruṣottama and we should fully endorse the high praise of Pandit S.T.Pathak that Puruṣottama by composing the Anubhāṣyaprakāśa has become the very life-blood of the 'Suddhādvaita'.<sup>67</sup>

(35) Nyāyamālā:-

It is a short work, written with the express purpose of summarising the Sūtras according to the Anubhāṣya and facilitate the undersending of the same by those, who are unable to go through the whole of the Bhāṣyaprakāśa. This is stated by Puruṣottama himself in the beginning.<sup>68</sup> He repeats the same thing at the end also.<sup>69</sup> The work is popularly known as the Adhikaraṇamālā or the

---

67. Vayam tv etatkathane'pi na sāhasam aṅgikūrmo yat  
Bhāṣyaprakāśapraṇayanena Śrīpuruṣottamamahārājā  
jīvātubhūta eva 'suddhādvaitametasyeti.

Anubhāṣya: Ed. S.T.Pathak. Vol. II. Intro. p. 45.

68. Bhāṣyaprakāśe vistīrṇo' rtho' vagantum na śakyate,  
Sarvair ato' rtham saṅgrhya Nyāyamālā vitaneyate.

69. Vedāntīyanyāyamālām Anubhāṣyānusārinim  
Saukaryēyārthebodhasya cakāra Puruṣottamaḥ.

Vedāntādhikarāṇāmālā, but the author himself gives the title Nyāyamālā or Vedāntīyanyāyamālā in the first and the last verses respectively. That is why I have accepted that title.

Shri. Telivala and Sankalia believe that the work seems to have been composed by our author at an advanced stage. We can be sure that the work must have followed the Anubhāsyaprakāśa rather than preceded it. We cannot say whether it follows the revision of the Bhāvaṇaprakāśikā also, though it is very likely.

Ordinarily an Adhikarāṇāmālā is a summary explanation of the purport of each Adhikarāṇa. Puruṣottama however, gives the purport of all the Sūtras except in III.iii.&iv. In the very beginning he gives the purport of the whole Sāstra. In the beginning of each Adhyāya, he states the purport of all the Pādas. In every Adhikarāṇa he clearly shows the five component parts—Viśaya, Viśaya, Pūrvapakṣa, Uttarapakṣa and Saṅgati.

The Adhyāya IV of this work was not found by Gopeśvara, who thereupon wrote a Caturthādhyaya-adhikarāṇāmālā himself. It is interesting to compare the two. Gopeśvara, though a very great scholar, does not appear to be as vigorous or pointed as Puruṣottama.



## (36) Suvarṇasūtra:-

Suvarṇasūtra is a commentary of Puruṣottama on the Vidvanmandana of Viṭṭhaleśa. Vidvanmandana or 'The ornament of the learned' is one of the independent works of Viṭṭhaleśa. Besides finishing the incomplete work of his father, Viṭṭhaleśa wrote some independent works also out of which the Vidvanmandana is the most important. It is divided into 58 sections. After the usual Maṅgala/verse the author immediately discusses a question of Brahman and its attributes, including the problem of the Brahman being the material as well as the efficient cause of the world. (Sections. 1, 2) This is followed by a discussion on the theory of Nescience and Superimposition as advocated by Śaṅkara's school. (Section 4-5). Then follows the discussion on the theory of Avidyā, as related to the individual soul and a spirited refutation of the bimḃapratibimḃa bhāva and the imaginary nature of the individual soul. (Sections 6-9). Viṭṭhaleśa then proves and fully explains the theory of Āvirbhāva-tirobhāva, replying to the objections raised against it. (Sections 10-13). He explains the Mahāvākya. (Section 14). Viṭṭhaleśa again attacks the theory of Avidyā (Section 15)., and the Kalpitakartr̥tva of Brahman in connection with the individual souls. (Section 16).

Thus the author introduces the problem of the individual soul which is an *Aṅśa* of Brahman, (Section 17) and which has the *tādātmya*-relationship with Brahman. (Section 18-19)

This again brings in the question of variety in the effects of only one cause. After answering it on the ground of the desire of God, the author uses the same argument to remove the contingency of the *Kṛtāhēni* and *Akṛtābhyāgama* and to show that Brahman is not dependent upon the actions of the *Jīvas*. (Sections 20-22) The *Āśatva* of the soul is not ~~metaphorical~~ but real and the spark-fire analogy shows that the individual souls have emanated from Brahman and not created by Him. (Sections 23-25). The size of the individual soul is atomic. It is discussed with all the arguments based on scriptural authorities. (Section 26-29). Viṭṭhaleśa then enters into a fairly ~~long~~ long discussion that Brahman is endowed with contradictory attributes, which are <sup>P</sup>*Su~~t~~r*aworldly and which are not illusory or imagined. (Sections 30-40) All the remaining sections are devoted to the consideration of the *Līlā* of God. This *Līlā* is eternal and real, there by implying the reality of the world. This includes a discussion on the *Bhakti*. (Sections 41-57) In these, 4 sections 53-56

are used to show that the Prabhāṣīya Līlā is illusory.  
The last section is made <sup>up</sup> of the verses in which  
Viṭṭhaleśa pays homage to his father and God. (Section 56)

According to Shri. J. K. Shastri, who has written  
a Sanskrit preface to the work, the Vidvanmandana is  
worth comparing ~~it~~ with the Khandanakhandakhāḍya of  
Śrīharsa. Just as that is an important work of the  
Kevalādvaita system, this is an authoritative treatise  
on the Śuddhādvaita. In the benedictory verse Śrīharsa,  
by saying : "Vande 'numayā pi tam", implies that Brahman  
is an object of inference while for Viṭṭhaleśa Kṛṣṇa  
is an object of perception. That is why he says:  
"Asmādrśām viśayaḥ sadā", in the benedictory verse.

Similarly the second verse in the Khandana implies  
the love in separation by the words 'manāpanodanavinoda'  
while Viṭṭhaleśa expresses the love in union by  
'Prabhuh prakāṭibhavat pratiyuvatisambhedena'.

Whatever it may be, perhaps the subtle and acute  
dialectics, found in the Khandana cannot be found in the  
Vidvanmandana.

The purpose of this work, as stated in the  
Suvarṇasūtra by Puruṣottama is: Here Prabhucarena who

is not able to bear the grief caused by the non-propagation of the main path of devotion and the theory of Brahmvāda, necessary for the same, has composed this ornaments of the learned.<sup>70</sup> These words of Puruṣottama reveal that for Viṭṭhaleśa the propagation of the path of devotion was the main thing and the Brahmvāda was subordinate to it. A glance at the analysis of the work, as given by us above, will show that Viṭṭhaleśa cared more for the refutation of the theories of Śaṅkara rather than the explanation of his own doctrines. He launches a violent tirade against Śaṅkara for whom he uses condemnatory words as has been done by his father.<sup>71</sup> At one place he jeers at Śaṅkara<sup>72</sup> by using his own words against him. Even in the first of the verses at the end, he calls Śaṅkara and his followers as Buddhists in disguise.<sup>73</sup>

In spite of all this, it should be admitted that Viṭṭhaleśa is clearer in his writing than Vallabha. Whereas Vallabha is too laconic and can not be understood

---

70. S.S.p.2.

71. Pracchannanāstika.VM p.63, Pracchannabauddho'si.....  
Atidhrsto'si.VM.p.56.etc.

72. Bādham bravīsi, nirāṅkuśatvāt te tundasya.VM.p.57

73. Pracchannabauddhās tu te.VM.p.353.

without the help of a commentary, this is not the case with Viṭṭhaleśa. Especially when the objects of devotion are described he is even verbose.<sup>74</sup> One may not perhaps like the fantastic interpretations of the Vedic verses given by him.<sup>75</sup> One should however note that there was a tendency among the mediaeval teachers to give flagrantly wrong interpretations for their own purpose and Viṭṭhaleśa could not be an exception to this.

The Vidvanmandana, because of the authority it enjoyed in the Śuddhādvaita, was commented upon by many scholars. The Suvarṇasūtra appears to be the earliest and the most important commentary. Many other commentaries are also found. Giridhara, son of Gopāla and Kṛṣṇāvatī wrote a commentary called Haritoṣiṇī alias Dīpikā. It explains the words of the Vidvanmandana and sometimes elucidates the topics. Bhaṭṭa Gaṅgādhara Śāstri's commentary is very short and concise. The colophon seems to call it Vidvanmandanavivṛti.<sup>76</sup> The verse at the end however suggests

---

74. Cf. VM p. 280, 289 etc.

75. Cf. VM p. 293, 296, 305, 313, etc.

76. Gittopāhvagaṅgādharaḥṭṭasya kṛtiḥ Śrīmad Vidvanmandana-vivṛtiḥ sampūrṇā. VM. p. 355.

the name Gaṅgādharaśobhinī, while J.K. Shastri calls it Mandanaprakāśa. Siddhāntaśobhā is another commentary, which is unfortunately anonymous and incomplete. The commentary ends abruptly while explaining sections 32. It is full of discussions which are critical and scholarly. The commentary is surely not explanatory. J.K. Shastri says that though the manuscript of the work seen by him bears the title Lekha, the author accepts Siddhāntaśobhā as the title, as can be seen from his own suggestion.<sup>77</sup> A short anonymous commentary called Vidvanmandanavākyaṛtha has been seen by J.K. Shastri. It just gives the meanings of words and does not elucidate the topics.

One Sadānanda, at the end of the nineteenth century, wrote a work Sahasrākṣa with the express purpose of refuting the Vidvanmandana. As a rejoinder Viṭṭhalanātha Gosvāmi of Kōtā composed a work called Prābhāṅjana. Pandit Cattulalji wrote a critical commentary on this called Mārutaśakti. In both these works many parts of the Vidvanmandana and Suvarṇasūtra are explained. Important explanations from these works have been collected together and compiled in the Tippanī, which is also published together with other commentaries.

---

77. Asyām Siddhāntaśobhāyām viśadīkariṣyāmeḥ.

Of all the commentaries, the Suvarṇasūtra of Puruṣottama is the most important and authentic. Puruṣottama calls it Suvarṇasūtra or the Golden String which may be used for holding the Vidvanmaṇḍana or the Jewel of the Learned.<sup>78</sup> The commentary, as is usual with Puruṣottama, not only explains the words and sentences but whenever necessary adds discussions to elucidate the knotty problems suggested by Viṭṭhaleśa. As a true commentator, he even shows the figure of speech in the benedictory verse.<sup>79</sup> While explaining dozens of scriptural passages he gives the interpretations of the Suddhādvaita thinkers side by side with those given by Śaṅkara and others. He also shows the distinction between the interpretations.<sup>80</sup>

Puruṣottama again refers to the six views regarding the Pratibimba quite independently of Viṭṭhaleśa and refutes them.<sup>81</sup> He refers to Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Śaiva, Bhikṣu,

---

78....Puruṣottamas tanute; Vidvanmaṇḍanayuktau Suvarṇasūtram

S.S. Introductory. V. 4. p. 2; also  
Vidvanmaṇḍanadhārane sukaratāsiddhyai yathābuddhyayam  
Taddāśah Puruṣottame Vyāracayat Sauvarṇasūtram mudā.

S.S. Verse. 4. at the end p. 357.

79. S.S. p. 7.

80. S.S. p. 12-19.

81. S.S. p. 61-62.

Vanamālīdāsa, Bhāskara, Jayatīrtha, Udayanācārya, Vācaspati Miśra, Mīmāṃsēkas, Sāṃkhya, Niruktamata, Navīnamata, Sāṃpradāyikamata, Abhinavamata and a host of such schools and authors. In its dialectics Suvarṇasūtra is comparable to the Siddhāntasobhā but while the latter does not care to explain the text, Puruṣottama does. It is therefore quite proper that J.K. Shastri has given it the first place.<sup>82</sup>

(37) Āveranabhaṅge-Yojanā:-

Puruṣottama commented upon the Tattvadīpanibandha of Vallabha. It is an authoritative metrical treatise divided into three chapters: Śāstrārtha-prakarana, Sarvanirṇaya-prakarana and Bhāgavatārtha-prakarana. Vallabha has also written a commentary called Prakāśa on the first two chapters and a part of the third, upto V.33. on Skandha IV. Viṭṭhaleśa tried to finish it and began writing the Prakāśa from V.34 on Skandha IV, but he could write only up to V.135 on Skandha V. It is quite possible that Vallabha might have finished the whole of the Prakāśa and Viṭṭhaleśa would not have been able to secure it in its entirety. Similarly there is a possibility of Viṭṭhaleśa's having finished the Prakāśa, but the portions after V.136 on Skandha V. might have been gradually lost. Any way Puruṣottama had before him the Prakāśa only up to V.135.

---

82. Tatraitāsu epi prāmāṇyaprakarsavaśena Suvarṇasūtravivṛtiḥ

Sarvataḥ Prathamam sanniveśya sabhājita. VM. Vol. III. Intro. p.9.



on Skandha V. Puruṣottama wrote his Āvaranabhanga on the Tattvadīpenibandha and the Prakāśa up to V.135 on Skandha V. As for the remaining verses of the third chapter, he wrote an independent commentary which he called Yojanā. All these chapters have been treated below separately.

### Chapter. I.

The Śāstrārtha Prakaraṇa consists of 104 Kārikās. A brief analysis of the contents is given below:-

In the introductory verses 1-6 Vallabha pays homage to Lord Kṛṣṇa and states his plans for writing the three chapters. This followed by a brief mention of the Pramāṇas as accepted in the Śuddhādvaita. (V.7-12).

Vallabha then discusses the Sādhanaśūnā, Karma and Bhakti, and the Adhikāra. (V.13-22). The regular Śāstras begins with V.23. Verses 23-53 contain the Sat-prakarana. It begins with the discrimination between Jagat and Samsāra, and an explanation of Avidyā. (V.23-24). Then follows the description of the nature of Brahman, the Jada, Jīva, and Antarātmā (V.25-30), the Samsāraprakāra of the Jīvas, Vidyā and Avidyā. (V.31-34), the Vilaya-Prakāra of the Jīvas as also their Brahmabhāva. (V.35-36).

This is followed by a discussion on creation.(V.37-41).

Vallabha explains the nature of devotion (V.42) and various forms of the Highest Lord(V.43-44),followed by the five divisions of Vidyā.(V.45-46)Finally Vallabha discusses the question of emancipation,tīrthas,love to God etc.(V.47-52)

From V.53 begins the Cit-Prakarana dealing with the individual souls. They are atomic in measure. (V.53-55).

Their sentiency is known only by means of the divine sight.(V.56). The Ābhāsavāda and the Pratibimbavāda are wrong.(V.57-60). The Mahāvākya is discussed,it does not teach the Mithyātva and Jīva-brahma-aikya as taught by Sāṃkara.(V.61-63). Vallabha again brings in his theory of devotion (V.64).From verse 65 begins the Brahma-prakarana.

The nature of Brahman is explained as possessed of contradictory attributes(V. 65-67,71) and as the cause of the world (V.68).Brahman is everything(V.69-70),and it is because of its capacity of Āvirbhāva and Tirobhāva that it is manifested in various ways.(V.72-75)Because of self-creation the contingencies of partiality and cruelty do not arise,Brahman is the Kartā and is yet not Saguna.(V.76-77).

Vallabha then enters into the refutation of other theories.

The Māyāvāda is refuted in verses 78-91,dualism in V.92, the Sāṃkhya and Yoga are dealt with in verses 93 and 94

respectively. While V.95 refers to the means of liberation, V.96-100 refutes others' theories from the point of view of Pralaya. The path of love is established in V.101-103, while V.104 gives the conclusion.

The foregoing analysis will show that almost all the theories taught by Vallabha are found in this ~~work~~ work. He calls it the Śāstrārtha-prakaraṇa and explains Śāstrārtha as Gītārtha.<sup>83</sup> It is also stated that the Gītā is the only 'Śāstra'.<sup>84</sup> The chapter however does not seem to be so closely connected with the Gītā, as the third chapter is connected with the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Shri. H. O. Shastri in his Sanskrit introduction has tried to show how the doctrines taught in the Gītā are incorporated here and he has given a list of 25 topics of the Gītā that are dealt with here.<sup>85</sup> But it cannot be said that the chapter necessarily deals with the Gītā. If we are to depend upon the list of topics dealt with in the Gītā and in this chapter, we can as well say that almost all the Śāstras, the scriptures, the Sūtras, the Purāṇas and all that can be shown to teach the same thing. Just as two verses-25b-26a, 90-are direct quotations

---

83. Śāstrārtho gītārthah. T.S.P. V.5.p.31.

84. Ekam Śāstram Devakīputragītam. T.S.V.4.

85. T.S. Sanskrit intro. P.11 ..

from the Gītā, three verses 43, 44, and 69 are bodily quoted from the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. V. 27, 58 contain references from the Upaniṣads.<sup>86</sup> V. 58 speaks of the Jīva as 'Gandhavad vyatirekavān' which is very close to the Brahmasūtra II.iii.26. 'Vyatireko gandhavat'. V. 83 runs :'

'Vācārambhaṇavākyaṇi tadananyatvañodhanāt,  
Na mithyātvēya kalpante jagato Vyāsagauravāt.'

It should be placed by the side of the Brahmasūtra II.i.14.

'Tadananyatvam ārambhaṇaśabdādibhyah'. Similarly V. 61-62 explain the famous Mahāvākya: 'Tat tvam asi.' Many more such instances may be found to prove that the chapter is quite independent of and is in no way closely connected with the Gītā so as to be even an independent free exposition of the Gītā. The term Śāstrārtha thus should refer to all the Śāstras. Even H.O. Shastri admits this.<sup>87</sup> Why then should Vallabha have explained the Śāstrārtha as Citārtha? My explanation is just this: It has long been the tradition in India that the founder of a new system of philosophy should comment upon all the Prasthānas.

Now, Vallabha has commented upon only the Brahmasūtras and the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, which also is a Prasthāna in his

---

86. 'Bahu syām prejayeya' in V. 27 and 'Dvā suparnā' and 'Guhām pravistau' in V. 58.

87. Vastutas tu Śāstraśabdeḥ śabdapramāṇabodhake eva.

opinion. He has dealt with the important passages of the Upanisads, while explaining the Brahmasūtras. Though the Gītā has been referred to in the Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, and explanation of the same cannot be taken for granted. Vallabha did not write a separate commentary on the Gītā and that is why perhaps he stated that the Śāstrārtha given in this chapter is the Gītārtha, or it is not different from the teachings of the Gītā.

Prakāśa is Vallabha's own commentary written to explain the verses and elucidate the arguments contained therein. The Prakāśa is of course in the usual terse style of Vallabha and very often needs an explanation. We are also informed by Puruṣottama that the Prakāśa on V.75 beginning with, 'Yed vā evam nirūpatvena, nirākāratvam brahmany āyāti ty ārucyā pakṣāntaram āha- athaveti.' is from the pen of Viṭṭhaleśa. It is actually a different interpretation given by Viṭṭhaleśa to make his father's point more clear.

Four commentaries are available on the Prakāśa. The Tippanī of Kalyāṇarāya and Satsnehabhājana of Gattulalji are available on only some portions of the Śāstrārthaprakaraṇa, as said by Prof. J.G. Shah.<sup>88</sup> Lālūbhāṭṭa has

---

88.T.S.Preface. p.5.

written a commentary called *Yojanā*, Puruṣottama's commentary is named *Āvaranabhanga*. The last is the best of all because it is the most scholarly and exhaustive. It not only explains the verses and the *Prakāśa*, but gives so many other discussions with arguments and quotations to corroborate the position of Vallabha. 'Thus by adopting the method of comparison, elucidation, corroboration and argumentation, it proves to the scholars of immense value for the thorough understanding of both the *Kārikās* and the *Prakāśa*.'<sup>89</sup> The very name of the commentary is suggestive. Puruṣottama himself says that he wants to break open and uncover the meaning of Vallabha's statements.<sup>90</sup>

The question that arises in connection with this work is that of authorship. The *Āvaranabhanga* in the first chapter is fathered upon Pītāmbara, and not Puruṣottama. The colophon reads: 'Iti ..... Gosvāmi Śrī. Yadu patisutasya Śrī Pītāmbarasya kṛtau Tattvedīpaprakāśāvaranabhange Śāstrārthaprakaraṇam prathamam sampūrṇam.' We should also note that in the *Suvarṇasūtra* Puruṣottama refers to this

---

89. T.S. Preface . p.8.

90. Vivecayann āśayam atra Tattva-  
Dīpaprakāśāvaranam bhanajmi.

T.S. AṬ. Intro. Verse. 4.

work as a composition of his father.<sup>91</sup> The Sāṃpradāyic tradition however records that Puruṣottama, out of respect to his elders, passed on some of his works to them and this is one such case. We shall thus have to depend upon the internal evidence for the authorship. The last verse of the commentary reads:

Bhagavata iha śaktyā Tattvadīpaprakāśe-

Varaṇabharaviḥhange prakriyādyā samāpnot. 92.

It shows that the author planned to write a commentary on all the three chapters. That on the second and third is written by Puruṣottama, so we would naturally conclude that Puruṣottama wrote the commentary on the first chapter also. It may be argued that Pītāmbara might not have been able to finish all the three, and the second and the third might have been left to Puruṣottama, but it is difficult to understand why in that case Puruṣottama does not state a single word for it. In the last verse of the commentary on the second chapter, it is said that the Āvaraṇabhanga has been finished even on this chapter,

---

91. Tad asmatpitṛcaranair Āvaraṇabhange samyak pradarśitam  
iti neha prapñocyate. S.S.p.340.

92. T.S.Ab.p.168.

because of the merciful glances of the Highest Lord.<sup>93</sup>

The force of the word 'api' is a pointer to the single authorship with regard to both the chapters.

Further, the remarkable characteristics of Puruṣottama's comparative style and treatment are found in the Āvaranabhanga on the Sāstrārthaprakaraṇa. The same style is seen in the Āvaranabhanga on other two chapters and in other works of Puruṣottama. We find here references to Puruṣottama's own works.<sup>94</sup>

Under V.53 the author discusses that the individual soul is atomic and not pervasive. At the end of the discussion he says : 'Ity Anvātmavādaḥ.'<sup>95</sup> Puruṣottama is said to have written a Vāda dealing with that topic. Under V.57-58 there is a discussion on the nature of an image and a refutation of all the six theories of

93. Yat tasya pūrṇaiḥ karuṇākataḥsaiḥ

Pūrṇo bhavat Sarvavinirṇaye pi

....Āvaranasya bhaṅgaḥ. T.Sn.Ab.p.232.

94. See T.S.Ab.Prahasta and Bhindipāla are referred to on p.48; Prasthānaratnākara on p.94,95,97,125.

Andhakāravāda on p.126; Tāpanīya-prakāśa on p.136,146; commentary on Gaudapāda's Kārikās on p.158.

95. T.S.Ab.p .95.



Pratibimba of the Jīva. The same discussion is found almost bodily in the Pratibimbavāda and the Jīva-pratibimbatvakhendānavāda, both of which are written by Puruṣottama. All these arguments, as also the phraseological and ideological similarities that this work bears with the other works of Puruṣottama, lead us definitely to believe that the work is actually written by Puruṣottama and dedicated to his father by writing his father's name as the author.

### Chapter.II.

The second chapter, Sarvanirṇaya is fairly longer than the first. It has 329 verses. It has four sections, the Pramāṇa (V.1-83), the Prameya (V.84-184), the Phala (V.185-294), and the Sādhana (V.295-329). We may analyse the contents as follows:-

(a) Pramāṇaprakaraṇa: The first 32 verses deal with the Vedic Literature viz. the Śrutis. He gives a general interpretation of the Pūrva and the Uttara Kāṇḍas. Verses 33-48 deal with the Smṛtis, their importance, their contents, their basis, their authority in relation to the Śrutis and their purpose. The subject matter of verses 49-71 is the Purāṇas, their subject matter, their number, their relative authority in respect to the Śrutis and Smṛtis, their divisions according to the

Kalpas etc. Just as the Gītā is the leading Smṛti, the Bhāgavata is the foremost among the Purāṇas. The six Vedāṅgas are touched upon in verses 72-78, the Upavedas in V.79, the Kāvya in V.80, Rāmāyana in V.81, the Vāsiṣṭharāmāyana and other works in V.82-83.

(b) Prameyaprakaraṇa: Hari is the only Prameya, for the sake of convenience it may be understood in three forms. (V.84-85) The causal form has 28 elements, but the causality is only of the Sat and not <sup>cit</sup> or ānanda. (V.86-87) The effect form is manifold. (V.88) The Swarūpa is three-fold. Its description and Pramāṇas are given in V.89-92. The effects are many and need not be enumerated. (V.93) Vallabha mentions 28 elements and says that the Ādhyātmika is the same as the Ādhidaivika; and the Māyā etc are not separate categories. (V.94-97). Vallabha then explains the Akṣara (V.98-108), Kala (V.109), Karma (V.110-112) and Svabhāva and the theory of Āvirbhāva, Tirobhāva. (V.113-116) The Abhāvas cannot be included in the causal form (V.117) The effects are then discussed with their classification. (V.118-119) With all this there is complete unity in all these forms. (V.120) There is a discussion on the Ādhidaivika, Ādhyātmika and

Ādhibhautika.(V.121-134)Vallabha then explains the Jñāna and Kriyā(V.135)He refutes the theory of Pratibimba(V.136), and describes the Vṛtti of Buddhi,Jñāna-Phala etc.(V.137-139). Then follows an explanation of the theory of Āvirbhāva-Tirobhāva.(V.140-145)The Prakārabhedas do not pose any problem.(V.146)Ordinary perception is not a Pramāṇa but only the Vedas should be depended upon.(V.147-149)Even the Vedas are Pramēya.(V.150)Here Vallabha enters into a discussion on the Nāmāprapañca.(V.151-161)He refers to the Purāṇas, the poems of Kālidāsa etc. (V.162-163)Only that which concerns with the Vedas should be accepted as Pramāṇa(V.164-165) Then ~~the~~ follows the problem of Varnanityatva etc.(V.166-176). Kṛṣṇa alone is the pravartaka and not the words. (V.177-182) Verses 183-184 conclude this section.

(c)Phalaprakaraṇa:At first is given the Phala according to the dharma of men,belonging to a particular varṇa and a particular āśrama.(V.185-195)Then the author touches the point of Bhakti. (V.196-197) Vallabha discusses the Sadyomukti and Kramamukti according to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga.(V.198-207); and says that there is only hell for those who do not follow the path laid down by the Vedas. (V.208-214)So only the Bhāgavatamārga should be adhered to(V.215-216).The fruit for those who are born śūdras is explained.(V.217)Vallabha

speaks of the fruit in the Bhaktimārga first (V.218-219) and then in all the remaining paths. (V.220-223) He then tells us about the Sāttvikas, their Gurus, how they should worship, their connections in the family, the tīrthas etc. (V.224-235) He then shows the phala in the Karmamārga, the worship of other Gods etc. (V.256-273) He explains the result in the Sāmkhya and Yoga (V.274-276) & the Śākta (V.277-285). The explanation of sukha and duḥkha follows: - (V.286-292) The Bhoktr is treated at the end. (V.293-294).

(d) Sādhana-prakaraṇa: - The chapter begins with an explanation of and a discussion on the Jñāna as the means of liberation. (V.295-302) Bhakti is stated to be the best. (V.303-307) Other Sādhana's are not helpful. (V.308-311) Vallabha again discusses Jñāna and Bhakti and finally says that 'Love' is Highest. (V.312-328) The last verse (V.329) is just a conclusion indicating the next chapter.

The foregoing analysis will show that the chapter is carefully planned and written. It contains Vallabha's views on many points which are not touched upon in other works. Puruṣottama has enriched the work with his scholarly commentary. He informs of that the passages from <sup>1</sup>Yad,uktam

kiñca.....tannirūpanam,<sup>96</sup> and ' Atreṣam.....sādhikā!<sup>97</sup> are added in the Prakāśa by Viṭṭhaleśa.

### Chapter.III.

This chapter called the Bhāgavatārthaprakaraṇa contains 1920 Verses divided into 12 chapters according to the 12 Skandhas of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Vallabha gives in this work a summary exposition of the meaning of the Bhāgavata. He says that the meaning has to be understood in seven ways: (i) the Śāstra, (ii) the Skandha, (iii) The prakaraṇa, (iv) The Adhyāya, (v) The Vākya, (vi) The Pada, and (vii) The Akṣara.<sup>98</sup> In the chapter, under consideration, Vallabha explains the Bhāgavata from the first four points of view. It is thus something like an independent interpretation of the Purāṇa, while Subodhinī is a regular commentary.

Vallabha wrote his prakāśa on the kārīkās only upto kārīkā 33 on Skandha IV. The work of finishing the Prakāśa was undertaken by Viṭṭhaleśa. Puruṣottama informs us of this when he says: ' Etad antam Śrīmadācāryaiḥ kṛtā vyākhyā, etad agre Prābhaviyā.' <sup>99</sup> There are other proofs also for this.

---

96. T. Sn. Ab. p. 24.

97. T. Sn. Ab. p. 114.

98. T. Bh. V. 2.

99. T. Bh. Ab. p. 170.

The Prakāśa on V.6 reads: 'Tattveṣu sarveṣāṃ āsaktyabhāvāya Ācāryaiḥ kālas tattveṣu pravista...etc.'<sup>100</sup> The mention of Ācārya found here shows definitely that Vallabha has not written it. Similar mention is also found in the Prakāśa on V.132.<sup>101</sup>

Even Viṭṭhaleśa could not finish the Prakāśa. He could go only up to V.135. So, from V.136 Puruṣottama himself began his Yojanā.<sup>102</sup>

Puruṣottama's Āvaranabhanga in this chapter is not so long but is comparatively short. The reason perhaps is that there are not many discussions in this chapter, which explains only one work. His Yojanā is more extensive, because here he explains the kārīkās and he has no Prakāśa to comment upon. He begins his Yojanā with a separate Maṅgala and says that the Yojanā was shown to him by Prabhucaraṇa.<sup>103</sup> It is very likely that there might have been some short of traditional explanation of the unexplained verses handed down orally by

100. T.Bh.P.p.261.

101. Tarhy Ācāryair adholokamānam kuto noktam iti ced...etc.

T.Bh.P.p.305.

102. Iyad avadhy eve Prabhucaraṇā nibandham Prakāśitavantah.

T.Bh.Ab.p.307.

103. Cf. Iti Śrīmatprabhucaraṇaiḥ Puruṣottamasya darsitā ...

Nibandhayojanā.... in all the colophons.

Vitthaleśa and his sons and Puruṣottama might have incorporated it in his Yojanā.

It will not be out of place here to consider the inter-relation of the three chapters. Vallabha says in the beginning of the first chapter that he will compose the Śāstrārtha, Sarvenirṇaya and Bhāgavatārtha chapters.<sup>104</sup> He explains the term Śāstrārtha as the Gītārtha in his Prakāśa. As for the second chapter, Puruṣottama says that it is the Nirṇaya or decision of the knowledge and the like as means of liberation, and of the things as found in the world, such as this is of this nature, this is the fruit or means of this etc.<sup>105</sup> Vallabha also says that the second chapter is for removing the asambhāvenā and viparītabhāvenā. The Śāstrārtha is a smaller chapter and so the Bhāgavatārtha is for its vistāra. Puruṣottama says that the Sāttvikas are of various kinds, those who are bent upon the pramāṇa are satisfied with the first, while the second chapter is

---

104. T.S.V.5.p.30-32.

105. Jñānāder mokṣasādhanaṁmārgasya prāpañcikādīpadārthajātasya  
vā yo'yaṁ nirṇayaḥ, idem evamrūpam evambhūtaphalasādhanaṁ  
iti niścayaḥ, saṁparikarāḥ svarūpaniścayo vā.

for those who prefer the prameya and for whom asambhāvanā is possible.<sup>106</sup> In the Prakāśa on the last verse, Vallabha says that he has explained the Śāstrārtha by taking recourse to the pramāṇabala, and now he will speak out the Sarvenirṇaya by resorting to the prameyabala.<sup>107</sup> Puruṣottama's explanation here is almost the same as given above, though here he adds an explanation of the Pramāṇabala and Prameyabala. In the Āvaranabhanga on the second chapter, Puruṣottama explains in the beginning the saṅgati and the purpose of this chapter at some length. He explains how the Asambhāvanā and Viparītebhāvanā are possible. Thus for instance, the Śrutipramāṇa cannot prove something which is contradicted by perception. What again of the Smṛtis? Again, when the scriptural authority is established what about their teaching? Is everything entirely one with Brahman or has Brahman something more than the Jīvas? So many Sēdhanas have been taught, why then accept devotion only? What is the difference in the fruits obtained by pursuing various Sēdhanas? All these questions would naturally

---

106. T.S.Ab.p.32-33.

107. Pramāṇabalam āśritya śāstrārtho vinirūpitaḥ;

Prameyabalam āśritya sarvanirṇaya ucyate.



arise, to those who are of mediocre intelligence or who are dull. As for those who are wise, such decisions as of these questions would just reinforce the theories in their minds.<sup>108</sup>

The connection of the third chapter with the second is easily found out by Vallabha. Vallabha ends his second chapter with a discussion on the Prema-bhakti. By knowing the meaning of the Bhāgavata alone, such devotion can arise. If the Bhāgavatārtha is not understood or is wrongly understood, there can be no Bhakti. Hence Vallabha finds out a remedy for this and explains the Bhāgavata.<sup>109</sup>

To a modern reader, the distinction between the Pramāṇabala and the Premeyabala is also between the Uttamā on the one hand and the Madhyama and Manda on the other may not have a strong appeal. Both the chapters may be taken quite independently. Some of the questions that may arise in the first chapter and that are not answered in it are found in the second. The second

---

108. T.Sn.Ab.p.1-2.

109. Śrībhāgavatātātāvāṛtham ato vaksye suniścitam

Yejjñānāt paramā prītiḥ kṛṣṇaḥ śīghraṁ phaliṣyati.

T.Sn.Verse.329. See also:

Bhāgavatārthe ajñāte, anyathājñāte ca bhaktir na bhavatīti.

Adhikāre'pi jāte phalam na bhaviṣyatīti mayāopāyaḥ kriyate,

Tattvārtho vivicyocyate. T.Sn.P.p.231,

chapter is definitely more elaborate and goes into the details of various problems. There are however certain points in the first chapter, which are not found in the second. Thus for instance the Jagat-samsāra-bheda, the

Jīva-parimāṇa, and the whole question about the individual soul—all these is not touched upon in the second chapter. Thus the chapters mutually supply the missing links of one another. Even then, ~~the~~ they are independently understandable.

Similarly the third chapter is also something like a long appendage very loosely connected with the first two chapters. While the first two chapters are of the nature of an independent composition, the last is a summary as also an interpretation of one particular work. If we have to take into account the connection of chapters II, III as given by Vallabha, we can say that the summary-cum-interpretation of any of the Prasthānas can be easily tagged on with these chapters and connections can be found out. The work is thus not an integrated whole, but a composite one made up of three independent units.

(38)     Śoḍaśaprakeraṇagranthasaṅgati:

Before dealing with this work we may make some preliminary observations, regarding Puruṣottama's

commentaries on the sixteen<sup>110</sup> tracts. Vallabha's sixteen tracts known as the Sōḍaśagranthas have remained very popular among the followers of Puṣṭimārga. Puruṣottama is said to have commented upon all of them. I have not however been able to trace all the commentaries, and I doubt whether he actually wrote Vivṛtis on all of them. Thus for instance in the Introduction to the Vivekadharmyaśraya, the Editor Shri.C.H.Shastri says that only four commentaries are available on this work, those of Gopīśa, Gokulotsava, Raghunātha and Vrajarāya. As Shri.Shastri had at his disposal a good deal of manuscript-literature, I do not think we should doubt his statement. It is very likely therefore that Puruṣottama did not comment upon all the sixteen tracts. Before however taking a short notice of the tracts and Puruṣottama's commentaries upon them, we should note one independent article, not even a work of Puruṣottama,

In the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā Vol.V.No.8-9 is printed the Sōḍaśaprekarenegranthānām saṅgatiḥ of Puruṣottama. A similar Saṅgati is also printed in the collection of Vrata-works, edited by Shri.C.H.Shastri, Surat. <sup>110</sup> Here Puruṣottama has explained the inter relation-not the chronological order-of these tracts in two ways. The

---

110.U.P.p.52.

Lord of the world has ordered devotion to Kṛṣṇa by mind, speech and body. After explaining the removal of sins and love to Mukunda in the (1) Yamunāstaka, and deciding the 'sāstrārthe' in the (2) Bēlabodha, devotion as a principle is expounded in the (3) Siddhāntamuktāvalī. Devotion is two-fold, external and internal. For the former it is necessary to maintain the purity of the external objects as taught by the Ācārya in the (4) Siddhāntarahasya. For the internal devotion purity and steadiness of mind are required. The (5) Navaratna and the (6) Antahkaranaprabodha are for teaching this. The (7) Vivekadhairyāśraya describes both the types of devotion. The (8) Kṛṣṇāśraya makes our dependance on Kṛṣṇa steady, while the (9) Catuḥślokī explains in short the sarvanigamaṇa. This <sup>is</sup> followed by the (10) Puṣṭi-pravāha-maryādā-grantha which expounds the three different paths. Devotion begins with this and its increase is told in the (11) Bhaktivardhinī. Bhajana requires the speaker and the hearer, for which we have the (12) Jalabhedā and the (13) Bhaktalakṣaṇa. (Is it Pañcapādyā?) Renunciation is determined in the (14) Sannyāsanirṇaya. Then comes the (15) Nirōdhalakṣaṇa which tells of 'Bhāvo bhāvanayā siddhah'. Finally we have the (16) Sevāphala.

Another way of understanding the inter-relation of these works is this: The (1) Yamunāstaka is the first followed by the (2) Bālābodha for acquiring the Svarūpayogyatā. Svakīyatā being established, one's own way is preached in the (3) Siddhānta-muktāvalī. For a description of the Jīva in that path, the teacher has written the (4) Puṣṭipravāhaṁaryādā. This is followed by a desire to know the duties which are told in the (5) Siddhāntarahasya, taught by the Lord himself. Then comes the (6) Navaratna to remove the worry as to whether or not the Lord has accepted the Jīva. The ātaropadeśa is taught in the (7) Antahkaraṇaprabodha and the tadāṅgopadeśa in the (8) Viveka-dhairyaśraya. This is followed by the (9) Kṛṣṇāśraya which should be adhered to even without the upadeśas. The (10) Catuḥśloki serves to remove the doubt that this is the path of others. After thus teaching devotion it is increased in the (11) Bhaktivardhinī. The hearer and the speaker are described in the (12) Jalabheda. The (13) Pañcapādyā is independent. The (14) Saṁnyāsanirṇaya is for knowing the time of renunciation as taught in Bhaktivardhinī. Its sādhana is told in the (15) Nirodhalakṣaṇa. The fruit of one who follows this path is explained in the (16) Sevāphala.

The Saṅgati printed in the collection of the Vrata-works corresponds to the second order given above. We shall now turn to those works which have been commented upon by our author.

(39) Commentary on the Yamunēṣṭaka:-

Yamunēṣṭaka is a small tract in nine stanzas in the Prthivī/ṭyē metre. It is written in praise of the river Yamunā. In fact it is an aṣṭaka but the last verse is something like the Phalaśruti. It is a good piece of work, having some poetic qualities also, so rarely found in Vallabha's writing.

The commentary of Viṭṭhaleśa is more or less explanatory. Puruṣottama in his sub-commentary has, however, made good the loss by bringing in a halo of sanctity and explained fully each and every word trying to fit it in with the accepted principles of Vallabha's system. He refers to Harirāya twice in V.1,7 and under the first verse shows how according to Harirāya these eight verses bring out eight kinds of Aśvarya of the river. He points out what has been left unexplained by Viṭṭhaleśa,<sup>111</sup> and explains it fully.

(40) Commentary on the Balabodha:

Balabodha has nineteen verses and a half. Vallabha says in the very first verse that he wants to decide the

---

111. Namatu Kṛṣṇetūryapriyām...etc.V.3.

Siddhāntasāṅgraha for the enlightenment of those who are ignorant.<sup>112</sup> Puruṣottama explains that the Bāla here refers to those who are confused on account of the various ways of worshipping many Gods, various ways of liberation and all that.<sup>113</sup> He begins with a statement of four Puruṣārthas and then discusses only Mokṣa. He refers to the concept of Mokṣa according to the Sāṅkhya and Yoga. He then explains the Parāśrayaṁ Mokṣa. Viṣṇu gives Mokṣa while Śiva gives Bhoga. Finally Vallabha comes to the point of devotion with love and surrender. The commentary of Puruṣottama is critical as well as explanatory. He refers often to the other commentators Dvārakeśa and Devakīnandana and shows how their explanations differ from his; he does not refute them. His Vivṛti is definitely more extensive than those of the other two.

(41) Commentary on the Siddhāntamuktāvalī:

Siddhāntamuktāvalī in 21 verses begins with the teaching of Kṛṣṇasevā. Kṛṣṇa is the Highest Lord. Vallabha then

---

112. ....Servasiddhāntasāṅgraham,

Bālaprabodhanārthāya vedāmi suvinīścitam. V.1.

113. ....Iti Sandihānānām svānām sandehajanakam tatra  
tatropādeyatābhṛamam vārayitum...etc. Under V.1.

explains the Akṣara which is manifested as the world and which is meditated upon by those, who follow the path of knowledge. It is explained with the long drawn out metaphor of Gaṅgā. The same metaphor is continued through ~~out~~ the work to explain the distinctions between the Puṣṭi, Pravāha and Maryādā also in the course of which Vallabha says that devotion is higher than knowledge. Thus according to Vallabha the work explains the mystery of the Śāstra.<sup>114</sup>

It would be interesting to note here that while Vallabha himself says nothing regarding the title of this work, Viṭṭhaleśa calls it Siddhāntavāṇmālā. The colophon of the work reads-Iti Śrīvallabhācāryaviracita Siddhāntamuktāvalī sampūrṇā. The last verse of Viṭṭhaleśa's commentary runs:

Iti Śrīpitṛpādābjaparāgarasasikṭhāt

Śrīviṭṭhaleśa tatsiddhāntavāṇmālām hrdaye dadhau.

Puruṣottama also calls his work Siddhāntavāṇmālāprakāśa.

The colophon reads -Iti....Puruṣottamasye kṛtau Śrīmad-  
ācāryasiddhāntavāṇmālāprakāśaḥ sampūrṇaḥ. In the last verse  
also he says -Svīyasiddhāntavāṇmālā kṛpayā samprakāśitā.

Kalyāṇarāya in the last verse of his commentary gives the

---

114. Evam svaśāstrasarvasvam mayā guptam nirūpitaṁ.



title Siddhāntamuktāvalī. Other commentators generally give the same title. It is very likely that originally the title might have been Siddhāntavāṇmālā.

The work is commented upon by Viṭṭhaleśa, Gokulanātha, Kalyāṇarāya, Puruṣottama, Vallabha, Vrajanātha and Lālu Bhaṭṭa have written sub-commentaries. Dvārakeśa's commentary is not complete. One Haridāsa has explained verses 15 b-17a. Of all these the commentary of Puruṣottama is very helpful in understanding the work. Puruṣottama is as usual not only explanatory but also critical.

(42) Commentary on Puṣṭipravāhamāryādā:

This is an incomplete work. Vallabha here sets out to explain the characteristics of Puṣṭi, Pravāha and Māryādā. He differentiates them in the beginning and then explains the prayojana, sādhanā, aṅga, kriyā, phala etc. of the Puṣṭi souls. The work then breaks off. Gokulanātha in his commentary says that only this part of the work is well known. Raghunātha says: 'Ita ūrdhvaṃ granthaḥ trītiḥ.' Puruṣottama says: 'Etadagre pravāhamārgīya prayojanasādhana-ṅgaphalāni māryādāmārgīyaprayojanasvarūpāṅgakriyāḥ Sādhanaṃ phalaṃ ca yēvatā jñāyate tāvān grantho'pekṣita iti jñeyam.' He is thus the only commentator who informs us about what is wanting. It is not possible that Vallabha

might have himself left it incomplete. It is likely that the portions might have been lost on account of a quarrel between the wife of Gopīnātha and Viṭṭhaleśa. It may also be possible that the portions dealing with the Pravāha and Maryādā being uninteresting to the exclusive tendencies of Viṭṭhaleśa might have been neglected with the result that even Gokulēnātha was not able to find them.

The commentary of Puruṣottama is very helpful and critical. The only problem is that it goes under the name of his father Pītāmbara. In the editor's note Shri Telivela says that the Vivṛti of Pītāmbara is actually written by Puruṣottama who seems to have dedicated it to his father. The style, he says, is evidently the familiar one which we meet with, in the other writings of Puruṣottama. Teliwala adds that a perusal of the six manuscripts of the Vivṛti reveals that the author has revised it sometime after writing it. As Puruṣottama was a great authority in the Sāmpradāya, both the revised and the original versions became current. It is difficult to come to any conclusion regarding the authorship. The analytical approach as found in this commentary is the same as that found in other works of our author. The discussions on the term Puṣṭi under V.2, on the reality of the world under V.9

bear the same arguments and phraseology as found in the works of Puruṣottama. The author of the commentary refers to the Vivṛti of Gokulenātha, Brahmasūtras, Vidvanmandana, etc., but never to the works of Puruṣottama. At one place there is a reference to the explanation of the last Sūtra in the Ānandamaya-adhikaraṇa, as given in the Vidvanmandana and Viṭṭhaleśa's interpretation of the first Sūtra of the same Adhikaraṇa. It should be noted that here the interpretation of Vallabha are not referred to. Thus we have no reason to disbelieve the tradition which fathers the work upon Puruṣottama, though it is very likely that Puruṣottama might have revised his father's work.

(43) Commentary on Siddhāntarahasya:

Siddhāntarahasya contains only eight stanzas and a half. In spite of it, its immense popularity has led to the composition of many commentaries upon it. Vallabha here says that he is speaking out *ad verbatim* what the Lord told him at night on the bright eleventh of the month of Śrāvaṇa. All the five faults of the individual souls will be destroyed by the Brahma-sambandha. Hence everything should be surrendered to the Highest Lord.

In the last two lines Vallabha gives the analogy of the

river Gaṅgā. Vallabha in this work teaches the doctrine of Samarpana or self-surrender.

The work is commented upon by Gokulanātha, Raghunātha, Kalyāṇarāya, Vrajotsava, Gokulotsava, Harirāya, Viṭṭhaleśvara, Giridhara and Lālu Bhaṭṭa, besides Puruṣottama. There is also one anonymous commentary. Puruṣottama has abely discussed the problems regarding the Brahma-saṁbandha and has fully explained the text.

(44) Commentary on Navaratna:

Navaratna is so called perhaps because it has nine verses. Here Vallabha thinks of the devotees, who should merge themselves completely in the service of God. After they have surrendered themselves they should not worry at all. Everything will be done of them by the Lord. Thus the grace of God is the gretest sādhanā for such a man.

The text has been explained by Viṭṭhaleśa in his Vivṛti, upon which four sub-commentaries are written. Puruṣottama's sub-commentary is critical and explanatory. He explains the term cintā(V.1), differentiates between Dāna and Nivedana(V.2), the nature of surrender(V.3), and shows what should be done when a conflict arises between the desire of the Lord and the orders of the Guru(V.7) etc.

## (45) Commentary on Antahkaranaprabodha:

Antahkaranaprabodha is a small tract written for enlightening the internal Spirit. God is independent and the devotees are dependent upon Him. We can not know what God desires and so we must obey His commands. The devotee should think that whatever is necessary for him will be done by God. He should only carry out His orders. He is ~~not~~ like a worldly boss who gets angry at the faults of his employees. He knows that the devotees are likely to commit mistakes. They should not care even for their own bodies. A total unconditional surrender is the best remedy for crossing over the Māyā of the Lord. This is the teaching contained in this work. It however reveals a personal tone, as Vallabha refers to the commands of the Lord to himself in V.5b -6-7a. Puruṣottama's commentary contains all the merits which are found in his other works. He gives the summary of the work at the end. He also discusses fully the various Ājñās (V.5b-6-7a). On these however he has written an independent Lekha which is also printed in the same book. Here he gives a different interpretation.

## (46) Commentary on Bhaktivardhinī:

Bhaktivardhinī in eleven verses is mainly for the increase of devotion for the hīna-adhikārī. They

should live the life of a householder and observe the duties of varṇas and āśramas. Worldly pursuits should be given up. They should worship Kṛṣṇa. If the worldly pursuits cannot be given up, their minds should be concentrated on Hari, until the seed of Bhakti is germinated and love and passion are produced. The destruction of the worldly passions is the test of divine love, the test of āśakti is gr̥ha-aruci, and that of vyasana is inability to live without Devine presence. Bad association of evil food may make the attainment of this stage difficult. Such a devotee should therefore stay near a temple and should keep the company of devotees, so that his mind may not be defiled by external forces. Vallabha says that one who is always engrossed in the service of the Lord or the conversation regarding Him will never perish.

The work is so popular that it has called for 14 commentaries, of Bālakṛṣṇa, Gokula-nātha, Raghunātha, Kalyāṇarāya, Harirāya, Gopēśvara, Puruṣottama, Vallabha, Jayagopāla Bhaṭṭa, Lālu Bhaṭṭa, Bālakṛṣṇa son of Vallabha, Giridhara, Dvārakēśa and one anonymous commentary. Every commentator has explained the text from his own point of view. Puruṣottama's commentary, written in his usual style

explains the text and elucidates important points. Thus, for instance he explains the word Bhakti(V.1) fully from all points of view. He also refers to the explanations of others.(V.5)

(47) Commentary on Jalabhedha:

Jalabhedha has 21 verses. It gives the characteristics of different teachers of religious subjects. The Taittirīya-Saṁhitā 7.4.12. gives a mantra stating 20 types of waters. On the analogy of these 20 kinds, Vallabha has given 20 kinds of teachers. Dr. Rajendra Lal Mitra says that it is a work on hydropathy. Telivala rightly says that it is not so.

Four commentaries are written on this work, of Kalyāṇa-rāya, Puruṣottama, Vallabha, and Bālakṛṣṇa. The term Agni in V.14 has raised a controversy. Some thought it to refer to Rudra while others to Vallabha himself. Puruṣottama does not enter into this controversy at all but explains Agni as 'The speaker of the Agni Purāṇa.'

(48) Commentary on Pañcapādyā:

Pañcapādyā has 5 verses, as its name indicates. It explains the five types of 'Hearers', those who are purely of the Puṣṭimārga (V.1), of the Puṣṭimārgyēdāmārga (V.2),

Maryādāpustimārga (V.3-4) and finally those who are generally adhikārins for Śravaṇabhakti.(V.5).Two commentaries, of Herirāya and Puruṣottama are available.There is some difference of opinion in their explanations.

(40) Commentary on Saṁnyāsanirṇaya:

This work gives Vallabha's ideas regarding renunciation. He says that Saṁnyāsa should not be taken in the Karmamārga. For those who follow the path of knowledge, Saṁnyāsa may be taken for desire of knowledge.Similar is the case with those<sup>who</sup>/are already learned. Both of them are however not commendable. Regarding the followers of the path of devotion,renunciation accepted for the sake of sādhana is not likely to produce happy results.If it is for the Phela, it should be done only for experiencing the separation from the Lord,if the Lord so inspires.

Of all the commentaries on this work,that of Puruṣottama is the best. He refers to the views of Gokulanātha,Raghunātha, Gokulotsava, Dvārakēśa,Gopīśa etc and states his own opinion.

(V.1)He also explains why renunciation should not be accepted in the Karmamārga by referring to Jaimini.(V.2).

He shows that the term 'Virahānubhava' can be understood in



three ways(V.7)Puruṣottama shows after Vallabha the distinction between the paths of knowledge and devotion,in favour of the letter(V.10-11-12,14,17 etc.)At the end he describes how Vallabha himself took the Sannyāsa.

(50) Commentary on Nirodhalakṣaṇa:

Nirodhalakṣaṇa explains the Nirodha which means complete attachment to the Lord by a devotee who has forgotten the world. Thus the work is intended to lead the service of the Lord on a dāvine level. The work is explained in six~~th~~ different~~e~~ commentaries.Puruṣottama's Vivṛti is surely very helpful.He explains the Nirodha as'Prapañcavismṛtipūrvakabhagavadāsakti-rūpa.'(V.1)He explains the utility of the work in the beginning. He also refers at the end to the different order in which the text has been read by Ūācā Gopīśa and Harirāya and says that he has followed the text of Vrajarāya. He also says that he has not referred to different interpretations.

(51) Commentary on Sevāphala:

Sevāphala is a very small work of seven verses and a half. It explains the fruits of Sevā. Vallabha has himself written a commentary on this. The work has become difficult on account of the terse style of Vallabha. Eleven commentaries are written on this and commentators have widely differed on the meanings of particular words. Puruṣottama refers to

the views of his predecessors often (e.g.V.1).Puruṣottama generally followed the śāstriya method in interpreting the term Sāyujya,while Harirāya and others followed the point of view of Bhaktimārga.

Puruṣottama does not seem to have commented upon the remaining three tracts-Vivekadhairyaśraya,Catuḥślokī and Kṛṣṇāśraya. Any way, I have not been able to find his commentaries on them.

(52-53) Commentaries on Bhaktihamṣa:

Bhaktihamṣa is an important work of Viṭṭhaleśa explaining the nature of true devotion,as the principal means of emancipation in the Śuddhādvaita system. Viṭṭhaleśa here fully discusses the paths of action,knowledge and devotion. He also explains the trip of Pravāha,Maryādā and Puṣṭi. Besides this he also shows the distinction between the Upāsana and Bhakti,Pūjā and Bhakti etc.Puṣṭi is solely dependent upon the grace of God.

Raghunātha,born in V.S.1611 commented upon it.His commentary is called Bhakti-taraṅginī.Puruṣottama has written a sub-commentary on it called Tīrtha,so that people can enter the river of devotion through this passage and

happily see the 'swan of devotion' <sup>115</sup> Puruṣottama has also written an independent commentary upon it called Viveka. Though Puruṣottama does not say anything expressly, he might have in his mind the famous Nīrakṣīranyāya of the Haṁsa, while naming the commentary. It is interesting to compare the two commentaries of the same author. There are naturally so many similarities and almost every idea of the one is repeated in the other in the same manner though not in the same place. To take an example we may note that the explanation of the nine steps of devotion in the Tīrtha is on page 42, while in the Viveka it is on p. 57. In the Tīrtha at the end Puruṣottama gives seven verses for the Granthārthasaṁgraha. They are not found in the Viveka. In the Viveka however Puruṣottama gives an additional interpretation of the last verse of the Bhakti-haṁsa so as to avoid the yati-dōṣa. It is not found in the Tīrtha. It is rather difficult to explain why Puruṣottama would have written two works, when one could have been sufficient.

Puruṣottama ~~has~~ is also said to have commented upon the Bhakti-hetunirṇaya of Viṭṭhaleśa. It has not been found by me.

---

115. Praviśyānena tīrthena ninnāṁ Bhaktitarāṅginīm ,

Gāhamāṇāḥ prapaśyantu Bhaktihaṁsaṁ mudānvitāḥ.

Tīrtha. Last Verse p. 72.

(54) Bhāvērthādhikāraṇaśāstraparakāśa:

Vallabha is said to have commented upon the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras of Jaimini also. Unfortunately however, only a part of the same is available. Vallabha's commentary on the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras II.i., known as the Bhāvērthapāda has been published in the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā Vol.VII.no.2-4. The Vivaraṇa alias Prakāśa thereon has been published in the same journal Vol.VII nos.5,6,7,8 and 9. There are 49 Sūtras in all in this Pāda. This work has been examined by Prof.G.H.Bhatt in two articles from the point of view of Vallabha's interpretations as also from the textual point of view.<sup>116</sup>

The commentary Prakāśa bears the name of Yadupati as the author. This Yadupati was the grandfather of Puruṣottama. The colophon of the commentary runs: 'Iti Śrīmadvallabha-  
Mandanaceranēdāsānuśāsāśrīpītāmbaratānujāśrīyadupativiracitam  
Śrīmadācāryaviracetajjiminīyabhāsyabhāvērthapādavivaraṇam  
sāmpūrṇam.' Tradition however informs us that the author is Puruṣottama himself, who, out of respect for his grandfather passed off this work in his name. The commentary though short reveals the special characteristics of Puruṣottama's

---

116. 'Vallabhācārya and Pūrvamīmāṃsā' Journal of the  
Oriental Institute, Vol.I.no.4.p.353ff. and 'Vallabhācārya's  
text of the Jaimini Sūtras' II.i.' Vol.II.no.1.p.68ff.

authorship. There is a reference to the theory of Nityatvavāda, and to the Vedāntimata under Sūtra 1. The commentator also refers under Sūtra 5 to those who arrange the first five Sūtras in only one Adhikaraṇa and says 'Tad etat sūtra-viruddham'. Besides, there is one strong ground to accept that Puruṣottama is the author of this commentary. In the Prakāśa on Anubhāṣya I.i.3 a similar discussion occurs. There Puruṣottama makes a reference to these Sūtras and then refers to the present work as his own.<sup>117</sup>

The beginning of the Vivaraṇa is note worthy. It runs: 'Śrīmatprabhucaraṇakṛpayā bhāvārthacaraṇabhāṣyam yathāmati vivriyate.' It appears from this that though Vallabha might have finished his Bhāṣya, Puruṣottama could secure only this portion and hence he commented upon it. One cannot be definite about this because it may be that Puruṣottama might have secured and commented upon the whole of the Bhāṣya, which is lost to us.

(55) Pūrvamīmāṃsākārikāvivarāṇa:

42 Pūrvamīmāṃsākārikās of Vallabha together with the Vivaraṇa of Puruṣottama have been published in the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā Vol.V.no.2. A short analysis of the contents

---

117.A.B.P.I.i.3.p.109.

is given here. The author explains the Anubandhacetuṣṭaya in the beginning. (V.1-12a), followed by a discussion on the question whether the Mīmāṃsā is svatantra or vidhimūleka. (V.12b-23a) The relation of the two Mīmāṃsās forms the next topic of discussion. (V.23b-25a) Vallabha then discusses the meaning of the word 'atha' in the Sūtra 'Athāto dharmajijñāsā,' whether it should be understood in the sense of adhikāra or in any other sense. If the latter, we shall have to agree to the vidhi-adhyāhāra. (V.25b-36). Last six verses again discuss the inter relation of the two Mīmāṃsās in the light of the ~~word~~ meaning of the word 'atha' from the point of view of those who understand both the Mīmāṃsās as forming only one Śāstra. (V.37-42). Vallabha is so brief and his style so compact that it is rather difficult to understand the verses without the help of the Vivaraṇa of Puruṣottama.

Vallabha has written the Pūrvamīmāṃsābhāṣya which, as we have seen above, is unfortunately not fully extant. The Kārikās which we have are something like a metrical commentary on the first of the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras. Puruṣottama says in the beginning: Śrīmadācāryacaranāḥ pūrvamīmāṃsābhāṣyam cikīrṣantaḥ tatra vistareṇa pratipīdayiṣitaḥ

jijñāsāsūtrārthan sankṣepena kārīkābhiḥ saṁjighrksantah ॥  
 etc. 'At the end he says: 'Iti Śrīmadvallebhācāryacarana  
 viracitadharmajijñāsāsūtrārthanirṇāyaka-kārīkāvivarṇanam  
 Śrīpītāmbaratānujaśrīpuruṣottamakṛtam sampūrṇam.' It is  
 important to note that the fortysecond kārīkā does not  
 seem to contain any suggestion that it is the last. It is  
 again doubtful as to whether Vallabha has fully discussed  
 even the first Sūtra. I am rather inclined to believe that  
 Vallabha wrote some or many kārīkās more than 42 and  
 perhaps he wrote or intended to write a matrical summary-  
 cum-commentary on the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras. This is what  
 Vallabha has done for the Bhāgavatapurāṇa also, when he  
 wrote the kārīkās in the last chapter of the Tattvadīpa-  
 nibandha over and above the Subodhinī commentary. Any way  
 Puruṣottama had before him only 42 verses. He commented  
 upon them and called them 'Nirṇāyaka-kārīkās' on the first  
 Sūtra.

(56) Subodhinīprakāśa:

Vallabha maintained a very high regard for the  
 Bhāgavatapurāṇa which was reised by him to the status of  
 a Prasthāna. Vallabha wrote his commentary Subodhinī on the  
 first three books, on the tenth book and began writing the  
 same on the eleventh. On the eleventh book he could comment

only up to the second verse of the fifth Adhyāya. Vallabha is also said to have written a shorter commentary on the Bhāgavata called Sūksmatīkā but it is not extant. Vallabha's Subodhinī on Skandhas IV.-IX and on the remaining part of XI and the Skandha XII is unfortunately not available. The Sāmpredāyic tradition relates that Vallabha was asked by God not to open the mysterious doctrines in the Bhāgavata. He did not obey the orders in the beginning but when the command came forcefully, he had to carry it out. Thus there is kramebhaṅga and apūrṇatā.

Viṭṭhaleśa wrote a sub-commentary on Skandha X called Tippiṇī. Puruṣottama is said to have written his Prakāśa on the whole of the Subodhinī including the Tippiṇī, but his Prakāśa on the Uttarārdha of the Skandha X has not been found. Even in the Skandha XI his Prakāśa is found on the Subodhinī only up to V.20 of Adhyāya 4. The extant part of the Prakāśa on the Skandha X is fathered upon Pītāmbara. Tradition however runs that it is also written by Puruṣottama. Evidently the style is that of Puruṣottama, as can be seen from his comments on the interpolated chapters (Adhyāyas between X.11 and 12.)

We have noted above while dealing with the last chapter of the Tattvadīpanibandha that, while that chapter



is a summary-cum-commentary written independently though related to the Bhāgavata, Subodhinī is regular running commentary. Here he has dealt with the vākya, pada, and akṣara of the Bhāgavata. This is what Puruṣottama says when he informs us: 'Ayaṁ atra nibandhād viśeṣaḥ. Vākya-padaḥkṣarārthāḥ atra vaktavyatvāt; tatra tu śāstrārthādy-upayogina evārthasyoktatvād iti.' <sup>118</sup> Vallabha also says in the beginning of the Subodhinī: 'Arthatrayam tu vakṣyāmi nibandhesti catuṣṭayam.' <sup>119</sup>

(57,58) Minor commentaries on the Bhāgavata:

(I) 'Kathā imāste' ity etad vivaraṇakārikāvyaṅgyā:

Viṭṭhaleśa ~~has~~ written 20 verses on the Bhāgavata XII. iii.14. Discussing the concept of Rasa in the Puṣṭimārga. Puruṣottama has explained them in his usual style.

(II) Vṛtrāsura-catuhśloka-vivṛti: The four verses known as the Vṛtrāsura-catuhśloka occurring in Bhāgavata VI are said to deal with the four Puruṣārthas. The first three verses are commented upon by Viṭṭhaleśa while the last by Vallabha. It is on the last verse that Puruṣottama, Harirāya and Śrīvallabha have written their sub-commentaries. The verse is explained in two ways so as to belong to the

---

118. Subodhinī-prakāśa III.i.1.

119. Subodhinī.I.i.

Maryādāpustī on the one hand and the Pustīpustī on the other. Puruṣottama's commentary does not contain anything quite peculiar.

(59) *Gāyatrīyādyarthaprakāśakārikāvivarana:*

An attempt has been made by Vallabha and his followers to explain the well-known Sāvitrī R. in such a way as to suit their own theory. Vallabha himself has written a commentary on this verse. Viṭṭhaleśa wrote on it a metrical commentary in 35 verses. Puruṣottama has commented upon it. Besides these, there is also one prose passage by Gokuleśa alias Śrīvallabha. Though Prof. M. G. Shastri calls it an independent work it is not different in nature from a commentary on Vallabha's Gāyatrībhāṣya. Further there is also one Gāyatrīyarthavivarana in 76 verses by an unknown author. There are also prose works of Indireśa and Govardhana Bhaṭṭa trying to explain the purport of the Gāyatrī. All these have been printed in a collection of the Sāṃpradāyic works on Gāyatrī, edited and published by Prof. M. G. Shastri.

The Sāvitrī verse is a simple prayer to the Sun God Savitr, the inspirer. It was slowly surrounded with a halo of sanctity and became the Veda-bīja or the seed of the scriptures. Attempts were then made to interpret the verse so as to suit the interpreter's own beliefs and there grew

a tendency to mystify each and every syllable of the verse. Vallabha shows how it teaches the doctrine of Grace. Viṭṭhaleśa goes a step further by explaining each and every word, the metre, the ṛsi etc.-all explained by means of fanciful etymology and fantastic imagination. Viṭṭhaleśa says that here the teaching is not just of the doctrine of Grace but even of Love, of Śrīgāra. Puruṣottama explains all the 35 verses in his usual analytical method. Under V.25 he refutes the interpretation of the Śaivas. Some of his explanations are also equally fanciful.

(60) Nyāsādeśavivṛtivivaraṇa:

The Nyāsādeśa is one verse explaining the famous verse in the Bhagavad Gītā: 'Sarvadharmān parityajya...etc.'

(Bhagavad Gītā XVIII.66) The verse runs:

Ṭhe/Nyāsādeśeṣu dharmatyajanavacanato kiñcanādhikriyo-  
-ktā,

Kārpanyeṣvāṅgem uktam meditarabhajapekṣaṇam vā  
vyapodham;

Duḥsādhyeccchodyamaṇ vā kvacid upaśamitāv anyā-  
sammelane vā;

Brahmāstranyāya uktas tad iha na vihotē dharmā  
ājñādisiddhah.

In the Bhagavad Gītā the Lord tells Arjuna of Niskāma karmayoga and performing one's dharma without

attachment. How can the verse XVIII.66 be reconciled with this teaching? The Nyāsādeśa verse tries to solve this riddle in various ways. Viṭṭhaleśa has written a commentary on it explaining it in two ways. Puruṣottama has written a sub-commentary on it. Puruṣottama does not say much about the Puṣṭi, Maryādā, and all that, as does Viṭṭhaleśa. He refers to Rāmānuja, Śaṅkara and Madhusūdana, refutes them all except the first with whom he shows just the difference of approach. Puruṣottama also refers to the Sāmpredāyika Mīmāṃsakas and their method of reconciliation. He does not agree with them in toto.

Who is the author of this verse? Some scholars in the Sāmpredāya think that it is written by Vallabha. This is not correct. It is the fifteenth verse in the Nyāsāvimśati of Ācārya Vedāntadeśika, who was a follower of Rāmānuja.<sup>120</sup>

It is difficult to state what is the opinion of Viṭṭhaleśa and Puruṣottama about this. Viṭṭhaleśa begins by saying:

'....vicāra-kāntaḥkaraṇa-kalileṇ apanayans tad vākya -

Tātparyam ekena ślokenāha...etc.' He ends with: '... Iti

pitṛcaraṇa-kṛpāto gopīpaticerana reṇu dhenuṇā yaḥ.

---

120. Cf. Rāhasya-ratna-jātaṁ : Nyāsāvimśati. p. 20.

Śrīvitthalena vivṛto bhāvo māyī sa sthīro bhavatu.'

Puruṣottama begins his commentary with:

Śrīmadvallabha-nandanacaranāmbhoje' nusandhaya,  
Nyāsādeśavivarāṇasyāśayam atra sphuṭīkurve.

The last verse also has almost the same purport. Thus there is no reference to Vallabha. Again, whenever Viṭṭhaleśa refers to the author he says 'āha' and not 'āhuḥ' which he might have used, had he thought the verse to be of Vallabha. Thus probably even Viṭṭhaleśa and Puruṣottama did not mean that the verse was written by Vallabha.

(61) Patrāvalambanastīkṣā:

The Patrāvalambana is a work in 40 verses with prose passages coming between verses 29 and 30, and between 34 and 35. At the end of the prose passage after V29 Puruṣottama says that there is something wanting in the text. V.30 has only the second line and the refutation of the Māyāvāda which is referred to in V.36 is not found here. <sup>121</sup>

---

121. Atra yadyapy etāvateiva nirvāho bhavati tathāpy  
upasaṃhāre māyāvādo nirākṛta iti kathanāṁ atra ca  
prathemapādād ito'gre etāvati tṛtīr iti pratibhāti.

Patrāvalambanastīkṣā.p.29.

The work is intended to show the correct theories according to the Brahmvāda and to refute the theories of Bhedavāda and Māyāvāda.

The title Patrāvalambana has a curious origin. As Puruṣottama informs us, when Vallabha was staying at Ceraṇādri, various followers of Māyāvāda and the Bhāṭṭa-school of Mīmāṃsā went there from Kashi for discussion. This resulted in obstruction to his work of devotion and service to God. He thereupon came to Kashi himself and wrote this tract, placing it at the doors of Kāśivīśveśa temple. Hence it is called Patrāvalambana. Vallabha's idea seems to be that other scholars should first read this and then alone should approach him if their doubts are not resolved.

Puruṣottama's commentary is explanatory. It is very helpful in understanding the text.

(62) Vallabhāṣṭakavivarana:-

The Vallabhāṣṭaka in eight verses was written by Viṭṭhaleśa. It describes the nature of Vallabha as 'Fire' in the beginning and as 'Kṛṣṇa' at the end. It is said that the name of the Ācārya is explained in the Sarvottamastotra, his qualities in the <sup>Sphur</sup> ~~the~~ kṛṣṇapremānta

and his nature in the Vallabhāṣṭaka. Puruṣottama's commentary is faithful and explanatory.

(V).

Commentaries on other works.

(63) Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad-dīpikā:

Before dealing with this work we would like to write a few lines on the commentaries of Puruṣottama on the Upaniṣads. Vallabha himself did not write commentaries on the Upaniṣads. Puruṣottama is however credited with some such commentaries. He is said to have written the Dīpikās on the Kaivalyaopaniṣad, Brahmopaniṣad, Nṛsiṃhottara-tāpiny upaniṣad, Chāndogyaopaniṣad, Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad and Śvetāśvataraopaniṣad. He is also said to have written the Upaniṣad-artha-saṃgrahas. I have been able to find out his Artha-saṃgrahas on the Kaivalya and Brahma, while Dīpikās on the Māṇḍūkya and Nṛsiṃhottaratāpinī. It is possible that Puruṣottama might have written the Commentaries, which he has been credited with and might have composed Arthasaṃgrahas on many Upaniṣads, and they might have been lost.

Bhatt Ramanath Shastri published in V.S. 1980 the Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣaddīpikā of Puruṣottama, in Bombay. It contains the commentary not only upon the prose passages of the

Māṇḍūkya but also upon the first two chapters of the Kārikās ascribed to Gauḍapāda. It may appear rather curious that Puruṣottama should have commented upon the verses of Gauḍapāda, the grand-teacher of Śaṅkara. Puruṣottama has explained the Upaniṣad and the Kārikās from the point of view of Śuddhādvaita.

While only the commentary upon the first two chapters of the Kārikās is extant, we should admit that he commented upon the other two chapters also. At the end of the second chapter he says: 'Sūchenāntarāṇām smārtānām upāśanānām ca sattvāt kim iti Jāṇasrīyāyupadeśa ity etaddvayanāmatam advaitākhye vicārayiṣye.' <sup>122</sup> Thus he intended to write on the third chapter also. In Āvaranabhāṅga he refers to his commentary thrice. <sup>123</sup> All these references, especially the

---

122. Māṇḍūkyopaniṣaddīpikā. p. 55.

123. (1) Yat tu Gauḍavārtike- 'Bhogārtham sṛṣṭir ity enye krīḍārtham iti cāpare' ity evaṃ prajayānam vikalpya- 'Devasya iṣa svabhāvōyam ūptakāmasya kṛṣṇa sṛṣṭā'-iti siddhānta uktaḥ. Tatrāpi krīḍākeranām eva svabhāvo vaktavyaḥ. T.S. Ab. V. 68. p. 116.

(2) Etena Gauḍavārtikanurodhenāpi ye grāhītatvam vidadhātī, te'pi pratyuttarītā bodhyāḥ. Gauḍavārtākaprakaraṇacatuṣṭayā rthas tu mayā tadvyākhyāne sopapattiko nirūpita ity tato' vadheyāḥ. (T.S. Ab. V. 91. p. 153. (3) Tena Gauḍavārtikokta-satkārya-vādaśoṣa api Vikāraṅgikārād eva parihṛtāḥ. (T.S. Ab. V. 140



second, make it quite clear that Puruṣottama not only intended to write but actually wrote his commentary upon all the four chapters of the Gauḍapāda-kārikās. It is really unfortunate that ~~the~~ we have not been able to secure the commentary in full.

(64) Nṛsiṃhotṭaratāpinyupanīṣaddīpikā:

The Nṛsiṃhotṭaratāpinī is a minor Upanīṣad belonging to the Atharvaveda. It begins with the four divisions of 'Om' in the fashion of the Māṇḍūkya. It has nine khaṇḍas, ~~in~~ which it appears to teach the absolutism of Śaṅkara. The influence of the Māṇḍūkya and the Gauḍapāda-kārikās is distinctly traceable. It also combines with this absolutism, the theistic trends as seen in the elevation of Nṛsiṃha. Puruṣottama has commented upon this work from the point of view of Śuddhādvaita. He seems to care only for proving that the Upanīṣad does not teach the Kevalādvaita of Śaṅkara. That is why his commentary is very short. It is strange that he does not explain so many passages.

Regarding the Arthasaṅgrahas of Puruṣottama, Telivala makes an interesting observation at the end of the Kaivalyopanīṣadarthasaṅgraha.<sup>124</sup> He says that Puruṣottama is said to have written 52 Vādagranthas. It

---

124. Cf. Puṣṭibhaktisūdhā. Vol. V. No. 6.

does not appear to be correct. It is likely that Puruṣottama might have written 52 Upaniṣad-arthasaṅgrahas, and they might have been styled Vādagranthas by some. Dayaram, the well known Gujarati poet has said in his Guru-śiṣya-samvāda, that the Upaniṣads are only 52. Hence it may be said that Puruṣottama wrote 52 Arthasaṅgrahas. It is difficult to say anything for or against this view.

What is the difference between an Arthasaṅgraha and a Dīpikā? The two terms do not appear to have any wide divergence in their connotation so far as the works of Puruṣottama are concerned. It may be said that the Arthasaṅgraha is a shorter commentary while the Dīpikā is an extensive commentary. But the Nṛsiṃhottaratāpinī-upaniṣad-dīpikā is surely not a long commentary. Puruṣottama seems to have used these words without any difference in their meanings.

(65) Kaivalyopeniṣadarthasaṅgraha:

It has been published in the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā Vol. V No. 6. The Kaivalya is a small Upaniṣad, which like the Nṛsiṃhottaratāpinī, appears to contain the absolutism of Śaṅkara with the theistic tendencies leaning towards Śaivism. Puruṣottama has interpreted the same so as to find out the Śuddhādvaita and Vaiṣṇavism from it.

(66) Brahmopeniṣad-arthasaṅgraha:

It has been published in the Puṣṭibhaktisudhā Vol.III No.1. The Brahmopeniṣad is a short work with the idealistic doctrines. Puruṣottama has explained it in such a way as to show that the first khaṇḍa shows the grandeur of Brahman, the second gives the four states of consciousness as found in the Māṇḍūkya, the Viruddhadharmāśrayatva etc.

Shri.G.K.Shastri at the end in a foot note says that this appears to be a part of a bigger work called Upaniṣad-arthasaṅgraha. This is similar to the suggestion of Telivala referred to above.

(67) Introduction to Amṛtatarāṅginī:

The Amṛtatarāṅginī commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā raises a question of authorship. It has been printed together with other commentaries in the publication of the Gujarati Press. Prof.M.G.Shastri, in his introduction to his

collection of the Śuddhādvaita works on the Gītā says :

'Śrīmatpuruṣottamaviracita (Śrīmadvrajarāyagoṣvāmiviraciteti vṛddhah) Gītāmr̥tatarāṅginī :...etc.' <sup>125</sup>

Thus according to some the work goes under the name of Puruṣottama, while in the opinion of others it was written by Vrajarāya. The last

---

125. Śrīmad Bhagavad Gītā with Tattvadīpa etc. Bhūmikā. p.5.

ten verses are not useful in throwing light upon this problem. It is a really a difficult point. We shall have to rely solely upon the internal evidence.

The commentary begins with an introduction which gives various views regarding the purport of the Bhagavad-Gītā, of Śaṅkara, Madhusūdana Sarasvati, Śrīdhara and Rāmaṇuja.

The author refutes the opinions of the first three and shows partial agreement with that of the last. The author then gives an important discussion on the purport of the Gītā as understood in the Śuddhādvaita.

The regular commentary is however far different from the introduction in its spirit. It explains only the words of the Gītā at almost all the places. It does not refer to the interpretations of other commentators even though sometimes it may be necessary. Not only so but sometimes it may appear that the meaning given in the commentary is far fetched. We may just take an instance or two. The Gītā II.28 reads: 'Avyaktādinī bhūtāni...etc.' It may be understood in a simple way that the beings are invisible before they are born, they are visible when they are alive and they are again invisible when they die. So in the beginning & at the end they are Avyakta, in the middle they are Vyakta. This is the

meaning generally accepted by the commentators, except the author of Amṛtatarāṅgiṇī. He says that Avyakta means Akṣara, which is the ādi or utpatti of the bodies, which according to him is the meaning of 'bhūtāni'. 'Vyaktamādhyāni' is explained as: 'Vyaktam jagat tad eva madhyam sthitirūpam utpattilayaḥ or madhyam yeṣāṃ tāni'. Similarly 'Avyaktanidhanāni' means:

'Avyakta akṣara eva nidhanam layo yeṣāṃ tāni te'. The commentator then adds 'Atrāyam arthaḥ. Yata utpattis tatraiva nāśe śokaḥ svasyānucita ity arthaḥ. Svasyāpi tanmāraṇāntaram na narakādisambhāvanā yata utpattisthala eva svasyāpi nāśo bhaviṣyati.' <sup>126</sup> The commentator's meaning is not convincing.

The commentator again brings in the topic of Bhakti every now and then, even at places where it is entirely uncalled for.

Thus for instance in Gītā I.36, He gives two interpretations.

In the second interpretation he says 'Tavakā prītiḥ syād'

and thus brings in the idea of Bhakti. He adds after some

discussion: 'Ātātāyīmāreṇa doṣābhāvas tu dharmaśāstra vicāreṇa-

rthaśāstravicāreṇa vā nirūpita na tu bhaktivicāreṇa, bhakti-

mārgāt tu tayoṛ durbalatvāt tanmāraṇenāsmākaṃ pāpam eva bhavet

pāpāc ca bhagavatsambandho na syād ata eva narāṇāṃ kṣīṇa-

pāpāṇāṃ iti nirūpitaṃ.' <sup>127</sup> It is really very difficult to agree

---

126. Śrīmad bhagavad Gītā with seven commentaries. p.91.

127. Ibid. p.30.

with this. We need not take many more instances to show that the explanations given in the commentary are not convincing.

A perusal of the works of Puruṣottama will show that the body of the commentary does not contain anything which may enable us to say that the work is from the pen of Puruṣottama. Not only so, but the essential characteristics of Puruṣottama's style and ~~the~~ treatment are totally absent. Puruṣottama is never unreasonable, especially when he is commenting upon some important philosophical work and if we look to the instances referred to above, we are not inclined to believe that it is written by him. Again the present writer has not been able to find references to this commentary in any of the works of Puruṣottama, though references to the Gītā are very often found. Some of the explanations of the verses in the Gītā as given by Puruṣottama elsewhere, are different from the explanations given in the said commentary. While explaining the V.21 of the second chapter of the Tattvādīpanibandha, Puruṣottama explains the term 'Vedavādaratāḥ' occurring in the Gītā II.42. as:— 'Vādaratāḥ na tu tatparyajñātārāḥ'.<sup>128</sup> In the commentary on the other hand it is stated: 'Vedavādaratā iti vedoktaphalakarmakaraṇam

---

128. T. Sn. Ab. V. 21. p. 22.

evocitam na tu niṣkāmatayā te tathā'.<sup>129</sup> Similarly Puruṣottama explains 'Traigunya-*viśayāḥ*' occurring in the Gītā II.45. as :

'Traigunyam guṇatrayasamudāyo viśayo bodhyo yeṣāṃ te tathā'.<sup>130</sup>

The Commentary however explains it as: 'Traigunyāḥ triguṇa-*srṣṭau srṣṭā ye jīvās tadviśayās tadartham svargaphalaka-  
karmabodhakā vedāḥ*,' and 'Vedās traigunya-*viśayās triguṇātmaka-  
svarupaphalapratipāḍakāḥ na tu sāksād bhagavatsambandha-  
pratipāḍakāḥ*.'<sup>131</sup> Again the tirade against the Vedas in the

Gītā is explained by Puruṣottama in his Āvaraṇabhāṅga as:

'Laukikim pratītim ēdāyaiva vakti.'<sup>132</sup> No such explanation/

is given in the Amṛtatarāṅgiṇī. Thus it may be said that the Amṛtatarāṅgiṇī is not written by Puruṣottama but by Vraja-rāya.

The introduction is however quite differently conceived and contains all the characteristics of Puruṣottama's pen. Thus

we think that it was prefixed to the commentary *why* Puruṣottama.

It is very easy to undersatnd how the work passed off under the name of our author. Puruṣottama has written many

129. Śrīmad Bhagavad Gītā with 7 commentaries. p.107.

130. T.Sn. Ab. V. 21. p. 22.

131. Śrīmad Bhagavad Gītā with 7 commentaries. p.111.

132. T. Sn. Ab. V. 21. p. 22.

works and fathered them upon his elders, so the Amṛtatarāṅginī also, to which he has written only an introduction, might have been understood to be his.

(VI).

Remarks.

We have described above 67 works of Puruṣottama in all. Puruṣottama might have written many more independent works or commentaries than those which have been noted above by me. The Sāṃpradāyic tradition has attributed to him such literature that can not be described as anything but vast. He is said to have written as many as nine lacs of verses.<sup>133</sup> Some of his works might have been lost to us. It is also possible that some of his works might have been known and studied by some one or other scholar of the Sāṃpradāya and I may not have been able to secure the same. The commentary on the Dvātrīṃśadaparādhakṣamāpāna-stotra was not found by me. It is possible that there may be some such other works also. Any way, I have given an account of as many works of Puruṣottama as I could get. I think that I have reviewed almost all his important works and many of his minor works.

---

133. Cf. 'Yah sarvam navalakṣapadyakamitapraudhāprabandham

vyadhāt'

3rd line from the Sāṃpradāyic verse regarding Puruṣottama.



They are more than sufficient to show how Puruṣottama was a prolific writer who tried to explain almost all the important works of his great ancestors and who also wrote dozens of independent works to elucidate clearly the principles of the Śuddhādvaita system, and to criticise the theories, which were unacceptable to him.

Is it possible to find out a chronological order of his works? We have one piece of evidence for this purpose. Puruṣottama very often refers to his own works and we can easily say that the works which are referred to are definitely earlier than those in which the references are found. The evidence is however not conclusive. It is possible that Puruṣottama might have been writing some works simultaneously. It is also possible that Puruṣottama might be referring to the works which were being written or which he might have only planned to write at the time of referring to them and might not have actually written them. Hence the arguments based on these references does not appear to be sound.

Is it necessary to find out the chronological order of his works at all? The question of the chronological order

of the works of many authors has been discussed and debated, but I may be excused to say that more often than not the discussions of this type appear to be without much value.

The chronological order of the works of a particular author should be attempted if and when we are in a position to point out the development of the genius of the author and if we are able to study how the author attained to that particular state of maturity. If we can not do this, the whole question of the chronological order loses its importance and value.

What is the position of Puruṣottama? A study of the works of Puruṣottama reveals no such development or attainment of maturity. We have the same author, the same dialectician, with the same manner of presentation through out in all his works, whether they may be important commentaries or independent works or just minor tracts. We do not therefore think it necessary to enter into such a discussion at all.