



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's Vedāntic Debut:
Chronology & Rationalisation
in the Nimbārka Sampradāya

Vijay Ramnarace

Submitted for the Degree of PhD by Research
The University of Edinburgh
2014

I have read and understood the University of Edinburgh guidelines on plagiarism. This thesis is my own original work except where indicated otherwise by quotations and references. No part of it has been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Signed:

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I provide an additional perspective on the development of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa who are regarded as the central divinity in many religious traditions in South Asia, by examining the primary sources of the Nimbārka Sampradāya. This school of the Hindu religious tradition of Vaiṣṇavism is unique in its identification of the ontological category of Brahman (the supreme being) solely with Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, where both are conjointly understood to be the eternal deity, not an *avatāra* (incarnation) or *vyūha* (emanation). Previous scholarship on the early phases of this *sampradāya* has focussed on issues of philosophy and doctrine, with a few attempts beset by demonstrably deficient reasoning at positing a chronology. Although the later tradition has been documented in detail, owing to the absence of a settled chronology, mechanisms of Nimbārka inter-sectarian relations at this stage of development in early modern Vraja (Braj) have not been satisfactorily established. In Part One, I provide a survey of the current theories on the development of Kṛṣṇa (who has received wide scholarly treatment) and Rādhā, re-evaluating Sanskrit and Prakrit textual and epigraphic sources with focus on the divinity of these two figures, positing that although there exist allusions to the godhood of Kṛṣṇa antecedent to the common era, the same cannot be said of Rādhā. Part Two discusses the sources available for Nimbārka and with a view to bringing to light any noteworthy findings, on the basis of comparative studies of the *Brahmasūtra* commentarial tradition I provide a new chronology for Nimbārka and his immediate followers. Following on from this, I discuss Nimbārka's works in which is presented his innovation: the deification of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. I then examine the rationalisation of this doctrine by Puruṣottama (third successor to Nimbārka), whose exegetical efforts diminish the impact of this teaching in the wider Vaiṣṇava context. In Part Three, I turn to the legacy of Nimbārka and in an important revelation for Vaiṣṇava studies, I show that whilst the early tradition reserved the theological identity of Brahman for the most eligible initiates, in 15th century Vraja a renaissance of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa devotion was instigated by Keśava Kāśmīrin, Śrībhaṭṭa and Harivyāsa Deva who influenced the contemporary and later sects which, in the modern period, have transported the phenomenon of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa devotion across the globe.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	6
--------------	---

PART ONE RĀDHĀ-KṚṢṆA BEFORE NIMBĀRKA

Introduction	14
1. Kṛṣṇa's Supremacy	16
1.1 Kṛṣṇa in Early Indian Sources	18
1.2 Sources referring to Kṛṣṇa after 2 nd century BCE	32
1.3 Kṛṣṇa's Deification	36
1.4 Kṛṣṇa in the Second Half of the First Millennium	38
1.5 Conclusion	43
2. Rādhā: from <i>gopī</i> to goddess	45
2.1 Rādhā in Pre-7 th century CE Literature	46
2.1.1 The Vedas, Epics and Early Purāṇas	47
2.1.2 Pre-7 th century CE Poetic Literature	51
2.2 Rādhā in other Purāṇas	55
2.3 Rādhā's Deification	58
2.4 Conclusion	60

PART TWO NIMBĀRKA'S INNOVATION

Introduction	61
3. Nimbārka	63
3.1 Nimbārka's Chronology	65
3.1.1 The Sectarian Position	66
3.1.2 Previous Scholarship on Nimbārka's Chronology	69
3.2 Towards a Conclusive Chronology	80
3.2.1 Schools of Vedānta before the <i>Vedāntapārijātasaurabha</i>	81
3.2.2 Alternative Theories on Nimbārka's Chronology	92
3.3 The Date & Works of Nimbārka	99
3.4 Nimbārka, Śrīnivāsa, Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja on the <i>Brahmasūtra</i>	143
3.4.1 <i>Brahmasūtra</i> Chapter 1	107
3.4.2 <i>Brahmasūtra</i> Chapter 2	110
3.4.3 <i>Brahmasūtra</i> Chapter 3	144
3.4.4 <i>Brahmasūtra</i> Chapter 4	146
3.5 Summary of the Findings from the Comparative Study	158
3.6 Śaṅkara's Tārīkikas and Nimbārka	161
3.7 Towards Nimbārka's Date	167

3.8	Conclusion: Nimbārka's Date	177
4.	Nimbārka's Life, Teaching and Impact	181
4.1	Nimbārka's Life: Hagiographies	181
4.2	Nimbārka's Soteriology	187
4.2.1	The Soteriology of the <i>Vedāntapārijātasaurabha</i>	188
4.2.2	The Soteriology of the <i>Daśaślokī</i>	189
4.2.3	The Soteriology of the <i>Prapannakalpavallī</i> and the <i>Mantrarahasyaśoḍaśī</i>	197
4.3	Rādhā in Poetic Literature after Nimbārka	200
4.4	Conclusion: Nimbārka & Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa	214
5.	Puruṣottamācārya and the <i>Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā</i>	216
5.1	Audience, Opponents and Intent	217
5.2	The <i>Lakṣmītantra</i> and Logicians: the Chronology of the <i>Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā</i>	226
5.3	Conclusion: Puruṣottama's Date	231
6.	Puruṣottamācārya's Rādhā	233
6.1	Puruṣottama's view of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa: Translation of the <i>Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā</i> Commentary to <i>Daśaślokī</i> verse 5	233
6.2	Rationalising Rādhā	237
6.3	Conclusion: Puruṣottama's Rationalisation in Context	241
PART THREE		
NIMBĀRKA'S LEGACY		
Introduction		244
7.	Harivyāsa Devācārya and the <i>Siddhāntaratnāñjali</i>	246
7.1	The Paramparā after Harivyāsa Devācārya: Paraśurāma Devācārya	247
7.2	The Paramparā before Harivyāsa Devācārya: Keśava Kāśmīri Bhaṭṭācārya	256
7.2.1	Kings and Miracles	258
7.2.2	The <i>Kramadīpikā</i> and Other Works	262
7.2.3	Keśava Kāśmīri Bhaṭṭācārya's Date	265
7.3	Śrībhaṭṭa Devācārya	269
7.3.1	Śrībhaṭṭa's Chronology	270
7.3.2	Śrībhaṭṭa's Life and Works	272
7.3.3	Śrībhaṭṭa's Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa: the <i>Yugalaśataka</i>	276
7.3.4	Śrībhaṭṭa: the first Brajbhāṣā author on the <i>aṣṭayāma līlā</i>	283
7.4	Harivyāsa Devācārya	286
7.4.1	Harivyāsa Devācārya's Chronology	287
7.5	Conclusion	291
8.	Back to Basics: Harivyāsa vs. Puruṣottama on <i>Daśaślokī</i> verse 5	293

8.1	Translation of <i>Siddhāntaratnāñjali</i> on Daśaślokī verse 5	293
8.2	Analysis of <i>Siddhāntaratnāñjali</i> on Daśaślokī verse 5	296
8.2.1	The <i>Siddhāntaratnāñjali</i> 's <i>sakhīs</i>	297
8.2.2	<i>Siddhāntaratnāñjali</i> on <i>svakīyā Rādhā</i>	299
8.3	Harivyāsa's Rādhā: <i>Siddhāntaratnāñjali</i> vs. <i>Mahāvāñī</i>	300
8.3.1	Chronology of the <i>Mahāvāñī</i>	301
8.3.2	Contents of the <i>Mahāvāñī</i>	303
8.3.3	The <i>aṣṭayāma līlā</i> of the <i>Mahāvāñī</i>	304
8.3.4	Theology of the <i>Mahāvāñī</i>	310
8.4	<i>Mahāvāñī</i> in Context: Harivyāsa, the Gosvāmins, Svāmī Haridāsa and Hita Harivaṁśa	314
8.5	Puruṣottama and Harivyāsa: Audiences, Environment and Revelation	317
8.6	Conclusion	321
CONCLUSION		323
Appendix I	The <i>Vedāntakāmadhenu</i> Daśaślokī verse 5 of Nimbārka with commentary <i>Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā</i> of Puruṣottamācārya	327
Appendix II	The <i>Vedāntakāmadhenu</i> Daśaślokī verse 5 of Nimbārka with commentary <i>Siddhāntaratnāñjali</i> of Harivyāsadevācārya	330
Appendix III	Text of the <i>Brahmasūtra</i> Commentaries analysed in Chapter 3	332
References		346

INTRODUCTION

If one were to venture into a Hindu or Vaiṣṇava Mandir, whether in India or anywhere else in the world, one will notice that the statue of Kṛṣṇa is invariably flanked by a statue of Rādhā. Her immediate situation on his left side places her in the same category as Pārvatī, always found to the left of Śiva; Lakṣmī, always found to the left of Viṣṇu/Nārāyaṇa; and Sītā, always found to the left of Rāma. In accordance with Hindu custom, the left side of a man is reserved for his wife, and as such, all of these feminine divinities are easily recognised as being the wife/consort of the male divinity. However, while detailed descriptions of these other couples exist in the earliest layers of the epics and Purāṇas, the same cannot be said of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.

Rādhā as a poetic heroine, the epitome of love, has featured in non-religious literature from early times, but somehow at a certain point in history she has transcended the boundary between popular poetry and theology. A few scholars have focussed on her theological development, amongst whom Miller (1975) and Hardy (1983) provide the best analyses from this perspective. Both, however, were unable to delineate the exact process of her deification, as they lacked access to the literature of one particular sect in India: the Nimbārka Sampradāya.

In order for these scholars to integrate the Nimbārka Sampradāya within their treatments of Rādhā, they would have had to initiate a completely new investigation into this subject, for not only were the available primary and

secondary sources scant, but, in addition, testimony from other traditions has tended to lessen the importance of Nimbārka activity.

When Indologists first investigated Vaiṣṇavism, they were confronted by the dynamic and ever-present Gauḍīya tradition in Bengal and the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition of the south. This had a conditioning effect, as both these sects were characterised by expansive textual traditions, strong hierarchies, vast infrastructure and buildings, and learned practitioners and scholars. Other traditions and personages who did not fit these criteria were almost inevitably consigned to the peripheries of surveys, doxographies and catalogues, and their fringe position would have been confirmed due to the sectarian bias of the various informants of early Indologists. However, in 1883, F. S. Growse, Magistrate and Collector of Bulandshahr, produced a local history entitled ‘Mathurā: a District Memoir’. His approach adopted an almost empirical methodology when approaching the history of the various places he visited, allotting equal importance to both scriptural and informant testimony before arriving at his own conclusions. About the Nimbārka tradition, he comments:

[Nimbārka’s] special tenets are little known; for, unlike the other Sampradāyas, his followers (so far as can be ascertained) have no special literature of their own, either in Sanskrit or in Hindi...Most of the solitary ascetics who have their little hermitages in the different sacred groves, with which the district abounds, belong to the Nimbārka persuasion (Growse 1883:194-195)

This seemingly straightforward observation actually reveals an important feature of the Nimbārka Sampradāya, the cause of most of its obscurity: this is a tradition of renunciates who until the 16th century had no interest in developing religious

institutions and the vast numbers of house-holder disciples necessary to provide for their financial maintenance. Growse's judgement regarding its dearth of literature, however, was challenged by the abbot of an Āśrama in Kokilāvan:

The one [hermit] who has a cell in Kokilaban assured me that the distinctive doctrines of his sect were not absolutely unwritten (as is ordinarily supposed) but are comprised in ten Sanskrit couplets that form the basis of a commentary in as many thousands (Growse 1883:195).

It seems that he was referring to the *Vedāntakāmadhenudaśaślokī* (*Daśaślokī*) of Nimbārka and its earliest commentary, the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* of Puruṣottama, his third successor. So, on the other hand, it is apparent from Growse's account that there were some members of the sect who appeared to be well acquainted with the tradition and others who were ambivalent. This phenomenon can be traced back to a much earlier period. In his discussion of the Nimbārka dictum, relating to the observance of the Janmāṣṭamī celebration of Kṛṣṇa's birthday (which disregards an *aṣṭamī tithi* if the lunar date commences after midnight), Kamalākarabhaṭṭa states in his *Nirṇayasindhu* (1611CE):

It should be disregarded because [the rule] is contrary to logic and scriptural statements. And anyway, worship [according to] Nimbārka is not seen anywhere these days.¹

Kamalākarabhaṭṭa was a scholar resident in Vārāṇasī. Although Harivyāsa Devācārya, the great reformer of the Nimbārka Sampradāya, was possibly resident in Vārāṇasī only a century earlier (see section 7.4.1), and though Harivaṃśa Devācārya, who had inherited the branch of his predecessor Paraśurāma Devācārya, was roughly contemporaneous with Kamalākarabhaṭṭa, Nimbārka

¹ *na, tasya nyāyavacovirodhena heyatvāt | idānīm kvāpi nimbārkaśāsanābhāvāc ceti saṅkṣepaḥ ||* Nirṇayasindhu, Dvīṭyapariccheda, Bhādrapadamāsanirṇaya.

conventions of renunciation nonetheless located them firmly outside the purview of the well supported Smārta, Śrīvaiṣṇava and other traditions. This resulted in Hindu contemporaries, who are retrospectively regarded as having been fully aware of the various groups in existence, not actually being conscious of the activity of these comparatively minor communities and therefore unable to include them in their writings.

This fact, in addition to Growse's observations, defines the Nimbārka in terms categorically different to those of other *sampradāyas*. The Nimbārka tradition did not possess any grandiose buildings in Vṛndāvana at the time of Growse's writing, but it did possess many *āśramas* and smaller hermitages both within Vṛndāvana and around the rest of Vraja (Growse 1883:194). In comparison to the Gauḍīyas, the Śrī Sampradāya or the Puṣṭimārga, the textual tradition of the Nimbārka Sampradāya is meagre, but it does exist. Whereas in other Hindu traditions initiated followers are informed about their tenets, scriptures, clerical hierarchy and other such factors, those of the Nimbārka tradition seem uncertain regarding the historical and institutional details of their sect's background. This veil of obscurity must have been discouraging to early scholars, especially in the light of the seeming inconsequentiality of the tradition in the wider Hindu landscape of India.

For very different reasons, adherents of other traditions in India exhibit an apparent ambivalence with regard to the Nimbārka Sampradāya, with the majority maintaining borderline, and in some cases outright, animosity towards the tradition (see section 7.2.1). These traditions do not even name the Nimbārka Sampradāya in

works which deal with the *sampradāya*'s tenets: rather, it is left up to readers to make the connection, which adds another layer of complexity to the task of investigating the Nimbārka Sampradāya; even Bose (1943) in her treatment of the tradition's primary source material chose to evade.

Currently the growth of the number of scholars examining the *bhakti* movement and especially its renaissance in Vraja around the 16th century means that this area of studies is receiving the critical analysis it deserves (such as Hare 2011, Hawley 2012 and 2013, Horstmann 1999 and 2006, Jones 1980 and Pauwels 1996, 2008, 2009 and 2010). Whilst every other tradition that had a presence in that region possessed a settled chronology on the basis of which theories about their development might be investigated in order to form a clearer picture of the devotional landscape, Nimbārka and his tradition remains even less studied than, say, Harirāma Vyāsa, the understanding of whom has benefitted from the laudable efforts of Pauwels (1996). Clémentin-Ojha is the only scholar to have carried out detailed investigations into the post-16th century Nimbārka Sampradāya, and her research focusing on the religious politics surrounding the court of King Sawai Jai Singh II of Jaipur (Clémentin-Ojha 1999 & 2011) has served only to reinforce the fact that the analysis of just a single manuscript of this tradition can reveal valuable information about a specific period.

This study is the first analysis of the primary sources of the early Nimbārka Sampradāya with regards to the development of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. A cursory survey of the Nimbārka tradition reveals that whilst currently it is not, or perhaps has never

been, a popular movement, it has been influential in many spheres of Indian history. Aside from its contributions to literature, art, music, politics, ritual, philosophy and theology, its most important legacy to the religious traditions of India is that both Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are revealed and justified scripturally to be the sole occupiers of the Vedāntic ontological category of Parabrahman. This innovation, it could be claimed, not only projected Rādhā from being the love-lorn damsel of poetry connoisseurs to becoming part of Brahman for Vedānta theologians, but also re-elevated Kṛṣṇa to superiority over Viṣṇu/Nārāyaṇa in the traditional religion. All other Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa traditions can be held to be philosophical heirs of the Nimbārka Sampradāya, but this insight has not been factored into many studies on Vaiṣṇava developmental studies.

Focussing on this theological innovation alone would no doubt have been adequate for the present study had there existed a settled chronology for this tradition and the major phases of its development. In the absence of this, it will be necessary to bring to light and discuss all the available sources on Nimbārka chronology in order to satisfactorily highlight the contributions made and contrast them against contemporary developments. There are many existing methodologies available for such a study, but the most relevant are Nakamura (1983 & 2004) who has been instrumental in the reanalysis of the tradition and philosophy of Śaṅkarācārya; Nicholson (2010), whose examination of Vijñānabhikṣu's philosophical stance and its ramifications brings to the fore the importance of correctly understanding the earlier history of a particular philosophical idiom in order to form a more rounded picture of a later exponent of it; and also Clémentin-Ojha (1990), whose research

demonstrates that a study focussed on the Nimbārka Sampradāya can make a sizeable contribution to our understanding of pre-modern Hinduism.

While in some instances a chronological investigation would stand somewhat distant to a study of theology, in our case however, the two strands are of equal and interdependent importance. The impact of theological developments can only be fully comprehended when juxtaposed against the innovations of contemporaries and predecessors, and this is only possible where there exists a sound chronological timeline wherein these doctrines can be located. What follows in Part One, then, is a survey of the development of the status of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa prior to Nimbārka. The actual dating of Nimbārka is discussed at the beginning of Part Two as the chronological implications of Nimbārka's novel doctrines will assist in understanding the trajectory this innovation subsequently followed. The latter half of this section deals with the paradigms of rationalisation adopted by the immediate successors of Nimbārka to justify this apparently heterodox doctrine through the established idiom of Vedāntic exegesis, providing an insight to the early development of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa devotionism. Finally, light is shed (in Part Three) on the moment in early modern India when Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa theology becomes mainstream through an investigation into the relative chronology of contemporary schools and their doctrines. It will then be possible to understand that the Nimbārkaī leaders of this era utilised innovative techniques which ensured that their theology became the foundation upon which all later developments of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa devotion could be anchored. The chronological and theological strands lead to a coherent conclusion, namely that Nimbārka's original elevation of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa to

Parabrahman is the source of all later Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa themed devotionalism in Vaiṣṇavism, which when factored into the wider Vaiṣṇava study discourse will certainly enhance the understanding of the rise of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa to prominence in a religious tradition where Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa were the major focus of devotions.

PART ONE

RĀDHĀ-KṚṢṆA BEFORE NIMBĀRKA

Introduction

Some scholars are of the opinion that the 16th century saw the sudden rise of philosophical works wherein Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa together occupied the ontological category of Supreme Brahman; most of these works issued from the Vaiṣṇava milieu of Braj, with additional contributions from Bengal (Vaudeville 1982: 2). There is apparently no precursor of this doctrine locatable, leaving some scholars looking to the *Gītagovinda* for a possible conceptual origin (Flood 1996:138). The lack of clear evidence in this regard has allowed this theory to persist. However, as scholarly methodologies have improved over the past few decades, a redress of this view is certainly plausible.

The majority of important historical works and personalities were chronologically located by early Indologists, which has allowed current scholars to focus on textual sources in terms of themes and content. Meaningful discussion is thus possible once a tentative chronological framework has been established. With regards to Nimbārka and his sect, such investigations have mostly utilised testimony from those outside the *sampradāya* as their basis, without examination of the literature of the tradition itself.

The title of this section, as I shall seek to demonstrate, is a misnomer, since Vedāntic devotion to Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa as *the* supreme Brahman is directly attributable to Nimbārka. Though Kṛṣṇa was mentioned in various early scriptures, he never occupied the ontological position of Parabrahman in Vedānta until the theology of Nimbārka, who simultaneously introduced not only Kṛṣṇa but also Rādhā to that category. Before Nimbārka, Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa occupied a position in the aesthetic realm as the epitome of sexual love beyond regulative social norms, a position which regularly manifested itself in Prakrit and Sanskrit poetry, but their relationship is never articulated in religious texts as being a mode of love shared between the supreme divinity and his consort. Indeed, texts such as the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, whose sole focus is the mythological status of Kṛṣṇa, actively deny Rādhā's existence.

It is necessary to understand the historical problems surrounding Kṛṣṇa's ascension to supremacy to gain a nuanced understanding of the process of deification of Rādhā and the controversies attendant upon this. To this end I shall now provide an overview of current scholarship on the history of Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇaite *bhakti* may have its foundations in brāhmaṇical literature from before the common era, but it was in south India that it acquired a more defined shape before beginning its journey to the north and evolving into the Kṛṣṇa *bhakti* that is identifiable today. It is on this journey that Rādhā is introduced in a divine capacity and so, in the second chapter, I seek to trace her history, showing that Rādhā's deification occurred quite a few centuries earlier than is suggested in current chronological theories.

Chapter 1

Kṛṣṇa's Supremacy

Kṛṣṇa is today perhaps one of the most widely recognised deities of Hinduism thanks to both modern and traditional Kṛṣṇa movements such as the International Society for Kṛṣṇa Consciousness (ISKCON), Gauḍīya Maṭha, the Gopal Club and ODEV Argentina of various Rādhā-Ramaṇa Gosvāmins, Vraj USA and Puṣṭimārga's other various establishments, the Sneha Bihārī Āśrama's Bhāgavat Sevā Trust and other organisations of the Bāṅke-Bihārī Gosvāmins, Śuka Sampradāya Switzerland, etc. Within 'Hinduism' these groups belong to Vaiṣṇavism, the nexus of distinct yet interrelated traditions of Viṣṇu/Kṛṣṇa worshippers.

Scholars today will, as Flood (1996:117) suggests, refer to those Vaiṣṇava sects within which Kṛṣṇa is viewed as the supreme deity as opposed to merely an incarnation of Viṣṇu, as belonging to 'Kṛṣṇaism', even though those initiated into such traditions always term themselves 'Vaiṣṇava'. The more conventional Vaiṣṇavism reveres Viṣṇu as the supreme deity who has many *avatāras*, one of which is Kṛṣṇa. This dichotomy is the direct result of the complex process involved in his historical development. Specifically Kṛṣṇaite threads of literature can be found within broader Vaiṣṇava textuality at an early period, though the vast majority of solely Kṛṣṇa-centric literary works have origins after the 10th century CE. Significant scholarly contributions to understanding this process have been made by scholars such as Hardy (1983:17-46), and especially Matchett (2001) who

has dealt extensively with the theological development of the figure of Kṛṣṇa from that of Viṣṇu/Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva/Nārāyaṇa of early literature through to Kṛṣṇa Gopāla of the later Purāṇas and other sources.

Textual attestations for Rādhā show that her development occurs in a similar manner to that of Kṛṣṇa and thus an understanding of the latter's development should enable a clearer view of the history of the rise of Rādhā to the status of goddess. Of more consequence, however, is the fact that no Vedāntic author before Nimbārka, afforded Kṛṣṇa the status of Parabrahman. Recent work by Schmid (2010) serves as the most complete survey of all available early evidence on Kṛṣṇa, providing much insight into the deification of this figure, specifically in the Mathurā region. Instead of examining Kṛṣṇa as a regional deity, it is my intention to discuss him as the supreme deity of Kṛṣṇaism. What is revealed is that whilst the Kṛṣṇa who is subordinated as an *avatāra* in more conventional Vaiṣṇavism is definitely attested in the earliest sources, the Kṛṣṇa who is the central deity for Kṛṣṇaism manifests himself in textual and epigraphic evidence that extends nearly as far back into antiquity. The following, therefore, is a summary of the current thinking on the position of Kṛṣṇa in the wider Vaiṣṇava context, focusing in particular on a discussion of the rise of this figure to the status of deity.

1.1 Kṛṣṇa in Early Sources

Kṛṣṇa, a word which has the literal meaning of ‘black’, has led some such as Dandekar (1979:204-205) to suggest an autochthonous, non-*āryan* origin for this deity. As Hardy (1983:19) suggests,

It does not seem impossible that a ‘purely human’ personality of whom the Mahābhārata and Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa have preserved vague memories, forms one of the historical cornerstones of the ‘Kṛṣṇa’ figure.

Whoever the ‘original’ Kṛṣṇa may or may not have been, he has been developed into a multidimensional character, replete with divine and mundane characteristics. At the outset, it is important to be mindful of the dangers of seeking an *ur*-Kṛṣṇa. Flood (1996:119) comments:

While it is impossible to arrive back at an original Kṛṣṇa – the historical formation of the deity is too complex – it is probably the case that Kṛṣṇa was a deified King or hero. The historicity of Kṛṣṇa is impossible to assess from sources in which hagiography and history are inextricably bound together.

Whilst a simple recap of the evidence available would suffice, I will re-examine the facts in the light of Kṛṣṇaism specifically, rather than the wider contexts of Vaiṣṇavism and Hinduisim.

Devotees of Kṛṣṇaism invoke the Vedas as providing evidence of Kṛṣṇa’s antiquity. The word ‘*kṛṣṇa*’ appears many times in the *Ṛgveda Samhitā* - five times in Maṇḍala Six,² which is one of the oldest parts of the *Ṛgveda* (Witzel 1995: 309),

² *Ṛgveda* 6.6.1, 6.9.1, 6.10.4, 6.47.21, 6.60.10.

but not in nominative case. One occurrence would appear to attest to a central pair of figures in Kṛṣṇa mythology, if only retrospectively:

The black day [*krṣṇam*] and the silvery [*arjunam*] day roll out through the two dusky realms according to their knowing ways. Agni Vaiśvānara, (even) while being born, like a king suppressed the dark shades with his light.³

Clearly ‘*krṣṇa*’ and ‘*arjuna*’ are employed here in an adjectival sense where the former is ‘dark’ and the latter is ‘bright’, so there is no scope for assuming that this verse is referring to Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna of the *Mahābhārata*. Of more consequence, however, is a reference in the *Ṛgveda* during an invocation to the Maruts:

At the Yamunā (River) a famous thing – I swept up bounty in cattle; swept down bounty in horses.⁴

Entwhistle (1989:22) suggests that this verse may have implications for the development of motifs in later Vraja mythology because of the linkage of cattle and the Yamunā river which perhaps refers to the life of pastoral folk, and also steeds, which may also hint at a *kṣatriya* presence. In any case, in both of these sources and throughout the rest of the *Ṛgveda*, there is nothing obviously referent to Kṛṣṇa as a divinity.

As for the other usages of ‘Kṛṣṇa’ in the nominative, there are two Ṛṣis named Kṛṣṇa (Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa and Kṛṣṇa the father of Viśvaka) who composed a few hymns in the *Ṛgveda* (1.116-117, 8.85, 10.42-44) who are then mentioned in

³ *ahaś ca krṣṇam ahar arjunam ca vivartete rajasī vedyābhiḥ | vaiśvānaro jāyamāno na rājāvātiraj jyotiṣāgnis tamāmsi || Ṛgveda 6.9.1, translation: Jamison & Brereton (2014:783).*

⁴ *yamunāyām adhiśrutam ud rādho gavyammṛje ni rādho aśvyammṛje || Ṛgveda 5.52.17, translation: Jamison & Brereton (2014:729).*

connection with the authorship of *Kauṣītakibrāhmaṇa* verse 30.9 (Preciado-Solis 1984:12 & Schmid 2010:30).

The *Sāmaveda*'s *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 3.17.6, refers to the mother of a Kṛṣṇa:

After Ghora Āṅgīrasa had taught the same thing to Kṛṣṇa, the son of Devakī, he continued – he was then altogether free from desires and at the point of death: ‘one should turn to these three for protection: “You are the undecaying! You are the imperishable! You are fortified by breath!”’.⁵

This verse which Olivelle (1996:338) states is a ‘somewhat difficult passage’ presents Kṛṣṇa as the son of Devakī learning from Ghora Āṅgīrasa. Matchett (2001:7) sees this as a link to the later stories where Kṛṣṇa’s mother is Devakī; however, it is just as plausible, as Hardy’s (1983:20 n.29) suggestion, that when seeking a name for the mother of Kṛṣṇa later authors found this reference a suitable source from which to frame a narrative. A similarly intriguing, if remote, possibility is that *a* Kṛṣṇa was famous in the region in which the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* originated and so was included in the text. Olivelle (1998:15) suggests that this Upaniṣad was composed in the west of the Kuru-Pāñcāla region sometime in the 8-7th Centuries BCE. This region contains many cities which are associated with Kṛṣṇa mythology, including Kurukṣetra, the supposed setting of the Mahābhārata war.⁶

Schmid (2010:33), on the other hand, takes these three Vedic instances together and discusses whether the three Kṛṣṇas (the two *ṛṣis* in the *Ṛgveda* and

⁵ *tad dhaitad ghora āṅgīrasaḥ kṛṣṇāya devakīputrāyoktvovāca | apipāsa eva sa babhūva | so 'ntavelāyām etat trayam pratipadyetākṣitam asy acyutam asi prāṇasaṁśitam asīti | tatraite dve ṛcau bhavataḥ || Chāndogya Upaniṣad 3.17.6, translation: Patrick Olivelle (1996:126)*

⁶ *Bhagavadgītā* 1.1

Kauṣītakībrāhmaṇa, and the pupil of Ghora Āṅgīrasa, the son of Devakī in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*) are the same person or not, concluding:

Enfin, la similitude des noms ne suffit pas, nous semble-t-il, à affirmer que le Krishna Angīrasa des hymnes védiques est l'élève upanishadique de Ghora Angīrasa. Le Kṛṣṇa Aṅgīrasa du Kauṣītakībrāhmaṇa ne nous paraît pas, en tout cas, être le Kṛṣṇa père de Viśvaka, car ce dernier n'est jamais qualifié d'«aṅgīrasa » et la série d'hymnes attribuée à un Kṛṣṇa Aṅgīrasa dans les trois hymnes attribués au ṛṣi-auteur Kṛṣṇa du ṚV.

La relation entre les Kṛṣṇa du ṚV, du Kauṣītakībrāhmaṇa et de la Chāndogya Upaniṣad reste ainsi, pour le moment, difficile à préciser, autant que le lien de tout personnage nommé Kṛṣṇa, avant l'épopée où le dieu porte ce nom.

Toujours est-il que ce nom de «Kṛṣṇa» est associé avec la tradition védique. Porté par un auteur védique, il apparaissait en particulier dans les anukramāṇi, index où se trouvaient recensés les auteurs des hymnes et qui constituent toujours des références pour les brahmanes. Certaines des caractéristiques attribuées aux Kṛṣṇa de ces index, telle la mention de Devakīputra, ont pu également être intégrées ultérieurement dans la légende de Kṛṣṇa. Si l'on ne saurait affirmer qu'un Kṛṣṇa proche de celui des textes épiques et puraniques existait au moment de la rédaction du ṚV, ou même de la Chāndogya Upaniṣad, il pouvait dès son apparition résonner comme familier dans une tradition littéraire et religieuse représentée, entre autres, par les anukramāṇi.

[Finally, the similarity of names is not enough, it appears to us, to confirm that Kṛṣṇa Aṅgīrasa of the Vedic hymns is the student of Ghora Aṅgīrasa of the Upaniṣads. The Kṛṣṇa Aṅgīrasa of the *Kauṣītakībrāhmaṇa* does not seem, in any case, to be Kṛṣṇa, the father of Viśvaka, because he is never qualified as 'Aṅgīrasa' and because of the series of hymns attributed to a Kṛṣṇa Aṅgīrasa in the three hymns attributed to the seer-author Kṛṣṇa of the *Ṛgveda*.

The relationship between Kṛṣṇas of the *Ṛgveda*, of the *Kauṣītakībrāhmaṇa* and of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* thus remains, for the moment, difficult to define, as well as any person named Kṛṣṇa from before the epic with a god that bears that name.

Still, it is the case that the name 'Kṛṣṇa' is associated with Vedic tradition. Borne by a Vedic author, it appears especially in the *Anukramāṇi* indexes where the authors of hymns are identified and still constitutes a reference for brāhmins. Some of the characteristics attributed to Kṛṣṇa in these indexes, such as the mention of the son of Devakī, could have also been further integrated into the legend of Kṛṣṇa. If we cannot assert that a Kṛṣṇa similar to that of the epics and Purāṇic texts existed at the time of the redaction of the *Ṛgveda*, or even the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, he could resonate, as soon as he appears, within literary and religious traditions represented, among others, by the *Anukramāṇi*].

Schmid's observations on these Vedic Kṛṣṇas are valid and it is clear to see that the Purāṇic and epic Kṛṣṇa is a different character. The Kṛṣṇa that became familiar to the literary and religious tradition after the Vedic period could be one of two types.

Matchett (2001:7) states:

Although the stories of Kṛṣṇa Gopāla became part of the main Vaiṣṇava tradition later than those of Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva, they probably circulated for some centuries earlier among the cattle-rearing tribes of north-west and western India. The tribe with which they are most often associated is that of the Ābhīras.

This view, although not untenable, seems to be subverted by the following. Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla, or Kṛṣṇa the cowherder, was indeed possibly associated with the Ābhīra tribe, who were settled in northern India sometime before 300BCE. But it is quite likely that Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva was already a hero for Mathurā dwelling clans, the Śūrasenas/Yādavas and sub-clans Andhakas and Vṛṣṇis who have been mentioned in the Vedas, and was adopted as a divinity by the Ābhīras who developed a layer of folklore based on agricultural themes familiar to them, when they arrived later (Schmid 2010:15). It is also possible that the later authors of the Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla cycle of the *Harivaṁśa* superimposed Ābhīra culture upon him due to their presence in and around Mathurā at that time (Entwhistle 1987:118 and Schmid 2010: 63). Unfortunately, due to a lack of textual or epigraphic sources for Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla at this early stage, nothing further can be stated with certainty.

Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva is a character for whom there are slightly more sources extant, but obscurity nonetheless remains. Chronologically, after the opaque reference in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, comes Yāska's *Nirukta* which is usually ascribed to the period just before Pāṇini. At *Nirukta* 2.2, Yāska states:

‘Akrūra holds the gem’, so people say.⁷

⁷ *akrūro dadate maṇim ity abhibhāṣante* || *Nirukta* 2.2

This gem has been understood to be the *śyāmantaka* jewel which plays an integral part in some of Kṛṣṇa's episodes as mentioned in the later *Harivamśa*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* (Preciado-Solis 1984:20). Akrūra, who is Kṛṣṇa's paternal uncle, kept possession of the disputed *śyāmantaka* jewel for sixty years before revealing it at Kṛṣṇa's behest to the court at Dvārakā.⁸ This source, although not mentioning Kṛṣṇa directly, is perhaps the first strong attestation of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva in literature. However, whether he was divine, or simply a ruler of Dvārakā, cannot be conclusively discerned.

An early but chronologically ambiguous source is the *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* which forms the tenth chapter of the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*.⁹ It contains a *mantra* amidst a list of *gāyatrī mantras* for different deities that has relevance to this discussion, as the *mantra* in question is also noted in the text of the *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā* of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. Even if the minimum date provided by scholars for the *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* seems a little early, there is still a definite development of the *mantra* from its form in the *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā*:

We perceive that Keśava [and] meditate on Nārāyaṇa; may that Viṣṇu inspire us!¹⁰

In the *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* the *mantra* becomes:

⁸ For a complete examination of the episode related by the *Harivamśa*, the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, and its significance, see Austin (2012: 157-158).

⁹ Gonda (1970:29) suggests that the *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* hails from the 3rd century BCE, Varenne (1960 vol. 2:5f) ascribes it to the 5th century BCE, and Flood (1996:114) places it between the 8th and 6th Centuries BCE.

¹⁰ *tat keśavāya vidmahe nārāyaṇāya dhīmahi | tanno viṣṇuḥ pracodayāt || Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā 2.9.1.8*

We perceive Nārāyaṇa [and] meditate on Vāsudeva; may that Viṣṇu inspire us!¹¹

It is clear that in the period of the composition of the *Yajurveda* namely 1200-800BCE (Witzel 2001:6), even if only in the latter strata of the corpus of the *Samhitā*, Keśava and Vāsudeva were synonymous. The identification of Vāsudeva and Viṣṇu is similarly evident here, and deification seems to have already occurred. The question of whether Kṛṣṇa is being referred to by the designations Keśava and Vāsudeva, is very difficult to answer. Some will see in the *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā*'s origins in the region south of Kurukṣetra a possible link to the area in which the *Mahābhārata*'s war was supposed to have occurred. However to infer anything further about this would involve discussion of the historicity of the war itself. Suffice it to say that these seemingly sporadic references to Kṛṣṇa and the mythology relating to him in Vedic textual material may either be the source of later developments, or indicate that the mythology was prevalent within certain sections of society.

The next attestation comes in the form of a remark by Pāṇini in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of the 6th or 5th Centuries BCE (Flood 1996:119):

The suffix *vun* (-*aka*) should be added to the names Vāsudeva and Arjuna [to denote a person who] has loyalty/devotion [to them].¹²

Hardy (1983:20) opines that 'since 'Vāsudeva' is mentioned here along with 'Arjuna', it is not unlikely that the Kṛṣṇa of the *Mahābhārata* is referred to'. In *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.1.4 and 6.2.34 Pāṇini also mentions the Andhaka and Vṛṣṇi clans of

¹¹ *nārāyaṇāya vidmahe vāsudevāya dhīmahi | tanno viṣṇuḥ pracodayāt|| Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* 10.1.6

¹² *bhaktiḥ|| 4.3.95|| vāsudevārjunābhyām vun || 4.3.98|| Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini

warriors, which is significant in as much as mythological tradition accepts that they are related to Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva. The Vṛṣṇis are also mentioned in the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* and the *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* (Preciado-Solis 1984:20). Entwistle (1987:118) further points out that Kṛṣṇa and Vāsudeva were unified in the period immediately subsequent to Pāṇini perhaps because of a relationship between the Vṛṣṇi and Yādava clans. This theory is possibly the most convincing given the paucity of evidence.

Around the 4th century BCE, the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* invokes Viṣṇu by the traditional twelve names (*dvādaśanāma*) during the *tarpaṇa* part of the *sandhyā* ritual as prescribed. While Olivelle (1999:127) states that this particular chapter features within the earliest layer of the text, it is likely that there have been interpolations. Three of the names in question are expressly associated with Kṛṣṇa, specifically Keśava, Govinda and Dāmodara.¹³ On this Schmid (2010:41) remarks:

Parmi les premiers témoignages littéraires sur l'existence du culte de Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, B. Preciado-Solis (1984:20) cite également une invocation comportant les douze noms de Viṣṇu du Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra. Ce texte donne trois de noms bien connus de Kṛṣṇa: Keśava, Govinda et Dāmodara. B. Preciado-Solis date l'ouvrage du IV^e siècle avant notre ère et s'appuie sur son témoignage pour affirmer que l'assimilation de Kṛṣṇa et de Viṣṇu est très ancienne. Mais Georg Bühler signalait déjà dans son introduction à la traduction de cette œuvre (1882) que la section ici concernée contenait de nombreuses interpolations et, plus particulièrement, que cette invocation-là ne se trouvait que dans un seul manuscrit. Le groupement de douze noms de Viṣṇu n'est pas attesté, par ailleurs, avant l'âge goupta, pas plus que la déesse Śrī (en tant que déesse de ce nom associée à Viṣṇu) qui se trouve aussi dans l'invocation en question – laquelle n'est donc sans doute pas antérieure aux III^e-IV^e siècles de notre ère.

[Among the earliest literary evidence on the existence of the cult of Vasudeva-Kṛṣṇa, B. Preciado-Solis (1984: 20) also cites an invocation with the twelve names of Visnu in the

¹³ *aum keśavaṁ tarpayāmi aum nārāyaṇaṁ tarpayāmi aum mādḥavaṁ tarpayāmi aum govindaṁ tarpayāmi aum viṣṇuṁ tarpayāmi aum madhusūdanaṁ tarpayāmi aum trivikramaṁ tarpayāmi aum vāmanaṁ tarpayāmi aum śrīdharaṁ tarpayāmi aum hr̥ṣīkeśaṁ tarpayāmi aum padmanābhaṁ tarpayāmi aum dāmodaraṁ tarpayāmi*|| *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* 2.5.9.10.

Baudhāyanadharmasūtra. This text gives three well-known names of Kṛṣṇa: Keśava, Govinda and Dāmodara. B. Preciado-Solis dates the work to the fourth century BC and based on this testimony he says that the assimilation of Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu is very old. But Georg Bühler already noted in his introduction to the translation of this work (1882) that the relevant section contained numerous interpolations and, in particular, that this invocation then was found only in a single manuscript. The group of twelve names of Viṣṇu is not attested, moreover, by the Gupta age, nor the goddess Śrī (as a goddess of that name associated with Viṣṇu) which is also found in the invocation in question - which is therefore probably not earlier than the third-fourth centuries CE].

Although Schmid in the foregoing passage refers to Śrī, as shall be demonstrated under chapter 2 this cannot be used as a basis for a common-era dating, and though it is accepted that there are interpolations in the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra*, it is not inconceivable that these names existed in an early version of the text, forming as they do a part of the *sandhyā* ritual in which similar *tarpaṇa* libations are offered to the various categories of deities and their expansions in the *mantras* previous and subsequent.

The next relevant information derives from Megasthenes' chronicle, entitled *Indica* (c.320BCE). In this work, he states that the 'Souraseni' people of 'Methora' worshipped 'Herakles' (McCrimble 1877:201). The mythology of Hercules' famous feats can be construed to parallel, partially, that of Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla. He too performs many miraculous feats that were described in the later *Harivaṃśa* (4th century CE), and so Megasthenes' reference may suggest that there was a well established cycle of legends surrounding Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla at this early date, if it is indeed possible to parallel Herakles with Kṛṣṇa. For, as Schmid (2010:47-50) points out, there might be an equally valid candidate for identification as Indra also displayed similar traits and was already worshipped as a god. Thus, it is difficult to identify the exact figure Megasthenes was thinking of, but it is safe to conclude that there existed a

hero worshipped by the Śūrasena people of Mathurā that Megasthenes could recognise as equivalent to a heroic figure in his own culture.

Although it is not possible to accept a 4th century BCE dating as supposed by Preciado-Solis (1984:21), his suggestion is that the *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* should feature next in sequence because it also alludes to Kṛṣṇa mythology. In the discussion of the proper behaviour of a king, there is a statement that:

A king who behaves contrary to it and has no control over his senses will perish immediately, even though he may rule the four ends of the earth. The Bhoja king named Dāṇḍakya, for example, who violated the young daughter of a Brāhmaṇa through passion, was destroyed along with his kinsmen and kingdom...as also the Vṛṣṇi confederacy assailing Dvaipāyana.¹⁴

This passage refers to the story of the destruction of the Vṛṣṇis as the result of a curse by the offended party, namely Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana Vyāsa. In the Mausala Parvan of the *Mahābhārata*, the individuals slighted are Viśvāmitra, Kaṇva and Nārada (*Mahābhārata* 16.2.4). While Sullivan (1990: 102-107) analyses this episode in comparison with the Jātaka and later Purāṇic versions, for our purposes it is pertinent to note the entire episode is inextricably linked to Kṛṣṇa, in whichever version it is recounted. In the section on magical spells, there is a description of a *mantra* that forms part of a certain ritual, which causes everyone in a specific place to sleep [*tat sarvaṁ prasvāpayati*]:¹⁵

I pay homage to Bali, the son of Virocana, to Śambara of 100 tricks, to Nikumbha, Naraka, Kumbha and Tantukaccha the great Asura; to Armālava, Pramīla, Maṇḍolūka, and Ghaṭobala; to the attendant of Kṛṣṇa and Kaṁsa and to Paulomī, full of fame.¹⁶

¹⁴ *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* 1.6.4, translation: Olivelle (2013:71)

¹⁵ *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* 14.3.50

¹⁶ *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* 14.3.43-44, translation: Olivelle (2013:430)

The compound used – *kṛṣṇakāmsopacāram ca* – according to Preciado-Solis (1984:21), ‘refers to the story of the birth of Kṛṣṇa’. Specifically, it refers to the attendants of Kāmsa who fell asleep by Kṛṣṇa’s *yoganidrā* powers in order to facilitate his relocation to Gokula. These powers themselves operated in a manner similar to an *upacāra*, or a type of magical/medicinal treatment to which this entire section refers: that is to say, a specific procedure to cause people to sleep so that the practitioner can enter into a place unnoticed. Preciado-Solis (1989:21) goes on to refer to verse 13.3.54 of the *Arthaśāstra* which mentions Saṅkarṣaṇa’s devotees.

Schmid (2010:148-151) doubts the dating of the *Arthaśāstra*, suggesting a more plausible chronology, however Olivelle (2013:25-31) has been able to convincingly establish a chronological sequence for the various layers of the text of the *Arthaśāstra*.¹⁷ The verses cited by Preciado-Solis above thus must be reconsidered. *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* 1.6.4 and 13.3.54 both fall within the Kauṭilya Recension and 14.3.43-44 are part of the Śāstric Redaction. The fact that 1.6.4, referring to mythology surrounding Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, mentions a different subject to that of the Mahābhārata’s recounting of the story perhaps has ramifications for the dating of the various layers of both texts, but Olivelle has not commented on this. Verses 14.3.43-44, part of the Śāstric Redaction, occur during the period of the development of the *Harivaṁśa* and the Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla mythology surrounding the childhood of Kṛṣṇa.

¹⁷ According to Olivelle (2013:25-31), there are three layers within the transmission: the Sources of Kauṭilya (c.50BCE-50CE), the Kauṭilya Recension (c.50CE-125CE) and the Śāstric Redaction (175CE-300CE).

The next relevant evidence therefore derives from the *Mahābhārata*, which is supposed to date from sometime during the 4th century BCE, with completion estimated to have occurred somewhere in the 4th century CE (Schmid 2010:59). The mythology of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva is clearly further developed therein and although perhaps not more than a heroic king in the the great epic itself, Kṛṣṇa reveals himself to be Parabrahman in no uncertain terms in the *Bhagavadgītā* which has been dated to the 2nd century BCE (Schmid 2010:75-76).

The subsequent piece of evidence comes from the *Mahābhāṣya* commentary on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* by Patañjali which was approximately contemporaneous with the *Bhagavadgītā*. In his commentary to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.2.24 regarding *bahuvrīhi* compounds, Patañjali quotes a half-verse:

May it increase the might of Kṛṣṇa with Saṁkarṣaṇa as second.¹⁸

He also supplies a quarter verse in his commentary to *sūtra* 2.2.34 which can be translated:

In the palace of the Lords of Wealth, [Bala]rāma and Keśava.¹⁹

Prāsāda could just as easily mean 'temple' instead of 'palace' but the context does not shed much more light on this (Schmid 2010:57-58). In commenting on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.3.36, Patañjali remarks that Kṛṣṇa despised his maternal uncle

¹⁸ *saṁkarṣaṇadvitīyasya balaṁ kṛṣṇasya varddhatām* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.2.24

¹⁹ *prāsāde dhanapatirāmakeśavānām* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.2.34

(Kaṁsa)²⁰. Whilst discussing *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.1.26 on the usage of the present causative, Patañjali clarifies that this tense is to be used to describe events that occurred long ago, such as the killing of Kaṁsa and Bali, which still have currency in the present due to the dramatized performances of the *śobhanikas* or the written accounts of the *granthikas* (Schmid 2010: 55). Patañjali elaborates:

They cause [Kaṁsa and Bali] to appear in the scope of the mind. That being the case, they appear variously real. Some become devotees/loyal to Kaṁsa and some become devotees/loyal to Vāsudeva.²¹

Regarding *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.2.111, Patañjali states that Vāsudeva killed Kaṁsa.²² Briefly he also alludes to followers of Akrūra and Vāsudeva during his explanation of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.2.104²³ He mentions Vāsudeva and Baladeva as belonging to the Vṛṣṇi clan in his commentary to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.1.114.²⁴

Regarding the *sūtras* above mentioned, Patañjali questions Pāṇini's motive in providing a surplus example to illustrate his original point, as even without *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.3.98 the point is clear. Patañjali surmises that there could be two reasons for this:

In that case, this is the motive: I say that the word Vāsudeva is a *pūrvanipātam* [a word that has irregular priority in a compound (Monier-Williams 1899:643)], or rather, [Vāsudeva] is not the name of [any] *kṣatriya*, but this usage refers to an honourable person.²⁵

²⁰ *asādhur mātule kṛṣṇaḥ* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.3.36

²¹ *te'pi...buddhiviṣayān prakāśayanti | ataś ca sato vyāmīsrā hi drśyante | kecit kamsabhaktā bhavanti kecid vāsudevabhaktāḥ* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.1.26

²² *jaghāna kamsam kila vāsudevaḥ* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.2.111

²³ *akrūravargiṇaḥ* and *vāsudevavargiṇaḥ* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.2.104.

²⁴ *vṛṣṇyaṇaḥ avakāśaḥ: vāsudevaḥ, bāladevaḥ* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.1.114

²⁵ *idaṁ tarhi prayojanam vāsudevaśabdasya pūrvanipātam vakṣyāmīti | athavā naiśā kṣatriyākhyā | samjñaiśā tatrabhavataḥ* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.3.98

A *tatrabhavataḥ* could refer to a king or an honourable departed person. On *sūtra* 6.3.5, Patañjali comments:

Janārdana, with himself as the fourth.²⁶

This statement possibly alludes to more developed Vaiṣṇava theology, namely that of the quadruple emanation (*caturvyūha*), but it is too brief to enable concrete conclusions to be drawn, as Schmid (2010:57) rightly concludes. However, a few salient points should be noticed at this juncture.

Firstly, it is clear that the story of Kṛṣṇa is well known to the author, for in this treatise on grammar Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva mythology is regularly referred to. Schmid (2010:58-59) states that his familiarity may reflect the possibility that Patañjali came from Mathurā. Also worthy of note is the fact that *śobhanikas* re-enacted at least the scene of Kāmsa's demise and quite possibly other episodes from Kṛṣṇa's life, although there is no further evidence in the text for such a claim. Lastly, there are also hints at the more divine aspects of Kṛṣṇa, especially due to the mention of the *prāsāda* and the possible reference to the *caturvyūha*. However, it is unwise to utilise such brief statements as the basis for inferences. The *Bhagavadgītā* could serve as a witness for such claims, but there are no overtly recognisable themes mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya* that would indicate that the author knew of the *Bhagavadgītā*, even if he was aware of it otherwise. Schmid (2010:59) is thus able to conclude that the link between the heroic divinity Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva and Mathurā definitely existed by the 2nd century BCE.

²⁶ *janārdanas tv ātmacaturtha eva* || *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 6.3.6

1.2 Sources Referring to Kṛṣṇa after the 2nd century BCE

Entwhistle (1987:118) suggests that the identification of Kṛṣṇa and Vāsudeva occurred after the time of Patañjali; however, as shown in the previous section, it is clear that this process was underway long before that, possibly as early as the latter layers of the *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā* itself, as Schmid (2010:59) too admits. At this juncture the invocation of the archaeological record dating from the 2nd century BCE is of relevance, in addition to textual sources from this period.

There are very few relevant epigraphic sources before the start of the common era, all of which have been catalogued by Entwhistle (1987:118-119). However, their pertinence to the present discussion is diminished by difficulties of dating and identification. More robust archaeological evidence comes in numismatic form: six Indian-standard silver Drachma coins of Agathocles Dikaios, the Buddhist Indo-Greek King of Bactria, dated from c. 185-170BCE. On the reverse, Kṛṣṇa is depicted with his discus, Sudarśana, and on the obverse Saṃkarṣaṇa stands wielding his characteristic plough. The coins themselves are bilingual, written in Greek and Brāhmi script, both stating that they were issued by King Agathocles (Shaw 2004:14). It is clear that Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma were depicted due to their divine status, as the other coins are of Greek gods and Buddhist symbols.

The next piece of relevant evidence is a Garuḍa-column (*garuḍastambha*) in the village of Besnagar, Madhya Pradesh, erected by the Greek ambassador of King Antialcidas to the Śuṅga King Bhāgabhadra in around 115BCE (Hardy 1983:21).

Its famous inscription states that it was dedicated to Vāsudeva by the Bhāgavata Heliodorus.²⁷ There is a similar column in the nearby village of Bhilsā which does not provide any further significant information (Schmid 2010:82). Importantly, excavations of the Besnagar site revealed that there was a building on that site dating to c. 4th-3rd century BCE, containing an edifice that has been identified as a *garbhagr̥ha* and possessing other features similar to temples of the early first millennium (Ghosh 1989:62). The Heliodorus *garuḍastambha* is the sole surviving pillar of seven for which foundational holes were found, suggesting that these pillars were dedicated to the deity worshipped in the temple, due to which, Ghosh (1989:62) identifies the temple as dedicated to Vāsudeva. Another *garuḍastambha* from Besnagar dating to around 100BCE refers to a temple of ‘Bhagavat’ and it is safe to suppose that this designation refers to Vāsudeva once more. It was established by the Bhāgavata ‘son of Gotamī’ on the twelfth coronation anniversary of the ‘Bhāgavata King’ (Preciado-Solis 1986:23 n.2 and Schmid 2010:83).

Whether this Vāsudeva is Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva or Viṣṇu is not made explicit. The identification can be clarified by examining two identical inscriptions from Chittorgarh in Rajasthan. The Ghosūṇḍī inscription is usually read together with the more complete version from Hāthibāḍā, and is dated to the 1st century BCE (Flood 1998: 231 and Schmid 2010:85):

²⁷ [*de*]vadevasa vā[sude]vasa garuḍadhvaje ayam karate i[a] heliodorea bhāgavatena diyasa putreṇa takkhasilākena yonadūtena [ā]gatena mahārājasa aṃtalikitasa upa+tā sakāsam rajño kāsīpu[tra]sa [bh]āgabhadrasa trātārasa vasena ca[tu]dasena rājena vadhamānasa|| Schmid (2010:78).

[This] enclosure [of the] Nārāyaṇa Garden for the worshipped stone icon [*pūjāśilā*] of Bhagavāns Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva, the invincible Lords of all, was effected by the Bhāgavata King Sarvatāta of the line of Gāja, the performer of an Aśvamedha sacrifice, the son of Pārāśarī.²⁸

The usage of *pūjāśilā* could actually hint to an aniconic deity, perhaps a *śālagrāma* stone; in which case there is evidence of a system of deity worship from the Chittorgarh inscriptions, although Schmid (2010:86) demurs. It is no doubt a coincidence that ‘*sarveśvara*’ is an epithet used in the inscription to describe Kṛṣṇa-Balarāma, which is incidentally the name of the main *śālagrāma* worshipped in the Nimbārka tradition. It is in fact more plausible that the term *pūjāśilā* refers to the stone-carved feet of the deity usually situated in a forest or garden, which served as the main focus for votive offerings (Willis 2009:73-75 and 114-117). The fact that this *garuḍastambha* and that of Heliodorus stood in the precincts of a temple that predated it reinforces the fact that there seems to have been a tradition of worshipping Vāsudeva-Saṅkarṣaṇa centred around shrines that received royal patronage in the centuries before the start of the common era.

Further relevant information occurs in Maharashtra. Queen Nayanikā or Nāganikā, the wife of the third Śātavāhana King Śātakarṇi (fl. 143 – 87BCE), had Prakrit inscriptions made near eight figures carved in relief in the Nāṅghāṭ Caves near Pune. These were commissioned after the death of her husband and during the rule of her sons and in the invocation, obeisance is paid to Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva²⁹ (Sinopoli 2001: 168-169, Schmid 2010:88).

²⁸ (*kārīto'yaṁ rājñā bhāgavate*)na gājāyanena pārāśarīputreṇa sa(rvatātena aśvamedhayā)jinā bhagava(d)bhyām saṅkarṣaṇa-vāsudevābhyām (anihatābhyām sarveśvarā)bhyām pūjāśilāprākāro nārāyaṇa-vāṭakā || Parentheses represent words from the Hāthibādā inscription illegible in the Ghosūṅḍī example, as added by Preciado-Solis (1984:23 fn2), my translation.

²⁹ *namo saṅkaṁsana-vāsudevāna*|| Preciado-Solis (1986:23 fn 5).

According to prevalent chronologies (though under revision currently), the next relevant evidence comes from Buddhist and Jain testimony. Possibly significant Buddhist evidence is found in the *Mahāniddeśa* (1.4.25), of the Khuddaka section of the Pali Canon, wherein Vāsudeva and Balarāma are mentioned amidst a list of various supernatural beings. It is clear that here Vāsudeva is equivalent to Kṛṣṇa due to the association with Balarāma as opposed to Saṅkarṣaṇa, which is also used to refer to the *vyūha* of the same name. The *Mahāniddeśa* is generally held to be not later than the 1st century BCE, but as mentioned, the chronology is contested (Hinüber 1996:59). Hardy (1983:20) also points out that there are references to Vāsudeva and Balarāma in the Jātakas and Jain scriptures, and Lüders (1904:687) refers to many verses, for example in Gāthā 546 of the *Mahāumagga Jātaka* (Rouse 1907 vol. 6: 216-217), that seem familiar with the early Kṛṣṇa mythology. The *Ghata Jātaka* (454) is devoted to recounting of the story of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva from a Buddhist perspective (Rouse 1901 Vol 4:54, Couture & Chojnacki 2014:149-161) providing many details surrounding his birth, transferrance to Gokula, despatching his maternal uncle Kamsa in a wrestling match, kingship over Dvāraka and so on. Studies into the various Jātakas have revealed that the earliest were possibly composed around the 3rd century BCE and the latest were finalised around the 4th century CE (Jacobsen 2005:903), though it is thought that the Jātakas with relevance here originate from around the century before to two centuries after the commencement of the common era (Schmid 2010:146). As for Jainism, there are references in the Aṅgas where he is referred to as Kaṇhe Vāsudeve (Sanskrit: Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva).³⁰ No doubt the vague chronology of the

³⁰ I refer to the *Antakṛddasāh* (Barnett 1907:13, 24, 65, 67-85, 113, 146, and Coutoure & Chojnacki

composition of the Jain sources must be taken into account (Dundas 2002: 67-73) but it can be inferred that at least by the start of the common era, some Jain sources were acquainted with Kṛṣṇa and parts of his life story, albeit skewed to suit the doctrine held by the authors of the texts in question.

Around the beginning of the common era also, the archaeological register begins to reveal evidence that point to a sectarian tradition usually called Sātvata *dharma* whose followers worshipped the five Vṛṣṇi ‘heroes’ (Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Sāmba), represented in icons of singular representations, triads, quadruples or the five together, in the vicinity of Mathurā and also Mālwā (Preciado-Solis 1984:24, Entwistle 1987:118-119, Schmid 2010: 512-562 and Willis 2009:228).

1.3 Kṛṣṇa’s Deification

Preciado-Solis (1984:24-35) provides an extensive *resumé* of the discussions and theories surrounding the sources discussed above, and Schmid (2010) re-examines these in detail. Sanderson (2001:11), whilst referring specifically to religious practice highlights an important fact regarding scripture: ‘innovation in religious practice must have preceded its scripturalisation’, and so it can be concluded that Kṛṣṇa existed as a deity for his devotees before the earliest sources which explicitly refer to him. In that case the earliest reference may be the *mantra* of the *Maitrāyaṇī*

2014:197-204), the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ* (Sumana 2009: 137-169, 350-423), the *Samavāya* (Vanitā 2009:51, 352, 357), the *Sthāna* (Vīramati 2009: 302, 347) and the *Upāṅga Nirayāvalikā* (Kiraṇa 2009: 149, 151-152) The *Mūlasūtras* also refer to Kṛṣṇa in the Uttarādhyayana chapter 22 verse 8 (Mehta 1970 vol 1:153).

Samhitā. Even if this was a later interpolation as Schmid (2010:30) posits, then definitely by the time of Pāṇini Kṛṣṇa had become divine.

The sources reveal that Kṛṣṇa was not a universal deity at this early point. However, narrative details relating to him were widely known as is clear from references to him in texts which were not specifically connected with this figure such as the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Arthaśāstra*. The *Bhagavadgītā* at least is clear about Kṛṣṇa's divinity. It must be remembered that there was no homogenized phenomenon called 'Hinduism' at the beginning of the first millennium CE. Nonetheless, elements of a Kṛṣṇa cult were amalgamated into the Bhāgavata and Pāñcarātra sects, and it can also be surmised that there existed a less formal group of followers who viewed Kṛṣṇa as the supreme divinity, as the Bhāgavatas and Pāñcarātrikas respectively demoted Kṛṣṇa to the status of an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu or the *vyūha* Vāsudeva (Willis 2009:229). Though the *Bhagavadgītā* states that Kṛṣṇa is Parabrahman,³¹ such claims were nevertheless easy to integrate into these theologies as a result of the emergence of brāhmaṇical sources such as the *Harivaṃśa* and *Viṣṇupurāṇa* which similarly transformed Kṛṣṇa into the incarnation of Viṣṇu (Schmid 2010:143). Sources that attest to Kṛṣṇa as the supreme deity were thus uncommon before the start of the common era. These sources, in my view, do not provide a glimpse of a nascent Kṛṣṇaism, but rather allow us to view an existent, perhaps folk, Kṛṣṇaism as it was being digested by the brāhmaṇical sources (Hardy 1983: 25-34).

³¹ For example, *Bhagavadgītā* 4.6, 4.7, 8.21, 10.3, 10.12-14, 18.55, etc.

The following represents a conjectural perspective on the early development of the divine Kṛṣṇa. The fact that he was at the very least a deity for an important clan can be substantiated by his occasional presence in literature and the archeological register. As his popularity grew amongst clans which had closer links with brāhmaṇical religion Kṛṣṇa was integrated, in a similar manner to Rudra-Śiva (Bisschop 2009:741-746) for example, finally achieving a supreme status by the time of the *Bhagavadgītā*. Even then, he was not the idealised quasi-Vedic god that Viṣṇu became, in that he was demoted to an *avatāra* in the later Purāṇas, or to Vāsudeva in the Pāñcarātra theology. Still, the themes and motifs represented by Kṛṣṇa the supreme must have persisted in certain strata in society. It can be inferred from the Śātavāhana epigraphical evidence that from the beginning of the common era, royal patronage supported an elaboration of Kṛṣṇa mythology and theology that would provide the foundation for the deity's entry into Vedānta philosophy.

1.4 Kṛṣṇa in the Second Half of the First Millennium CE

There are further sources that can be adduced from the beginning of the first millennium of the common era. The *Harivaṁśa*, composed between the 1st and 4th centuries CE (Schmid 2010:140) is a detailed account of the childhood exploits of Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla, which provided additional material for the brāhmaṇical integration of Kṛṣṇa with Viṣṇu, evident throughout the *Viṣṇu-* and *Brahmā-purāṇas* (Schmid 2010:143). The *Harivaṁśa* appears more interested in a divine human, while the two Purāṇas were preoccupied in eclipsing his humanity with the splendour of his

divinity; the *Bhagavadgītā* provided sound theological grounding for this development. The *Bālacarita* drama attributed to Bhāsa around this time also depicted a slightly more elaborate version of the story of Kṛṣṇa's childhood (Matchett 2001:13). It can be stated with a degree of certainty that the propitiation of Kṛṣṇa as a deity had been taken up by the Pāñcarātra and Bhāgavata communities in northern and central India by the end of the Gupta period; Pāñcarātric theology included a complex system of ritual adoration of the icon of Vāsudeva and the *caturvyūhas* as attested to by epigraphic and scriptural sources (Hardy 1983: 33-34, Schmid 2010:534-554 and Rastelli 2011:444). Much more cannot be said of the Pāñcarātra theology, as recent research has indicated that a reworking of the chronology of the Pāñcarātra scriptural tradition is necessary, based on newly discovered palm-leaf manuscripts (Leach 2012:29).

The Vaikhānasas, whose central text the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* is tentatively dated to the 4th century CE by Gonda (1954:234, Willis 2009: 117), also propound a system of temple worship which is focussed on rituals developed through a Vedic ritualist appropriation of iconocentric religion (Colas 2005:24). The scheme promulgates, amongst others, the doctrine of worshipping God in a material form, usually an icon (*mūrti/pratimā*), as a continuation of Vedic sacrifice (Willis 2009:118, 123). Their primary function, however, is to provide a valid *mokṣasādhana*, a means to salvation, which in this doctrine entails gaining entry into the eternal abode of Viṣṇu (Gonda 1977:141). In this, they might have been influenced by a nascent Vedānta, whose soteriological idiom was becoming increasingly prevalent (Nakamura 1983:45-46). This ritualistic *bhakti*, which is

acknowledged even in the early *Bhagavadgītā*³² and is then thoroughly developed in both the Vaikhānasa system and Pāñcarātra, encountered the intellectual *bhakti* adumbrated in the Purāṇas to produce the all-encompassing emotional Kṛṣṇa-*bhakti* propounded by the Āḷvārs, the much later *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* and subsequent sectarian developments. How exactly this occurred is unfortunately still shrouded in mystery (Hardy 1983:35); however in analysing the contribution of Nimbārka to this trend of *bhakti* and its focal divinity, it is hoped that new insight will be gained.

By the 7th century CE, Kṛṣṇa had become a multifaceted phenomenon. He was one of the Vṛṣṇi heroes or an incarnation of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa for the Bhāgavatas, the *vyūha* Vāsudeva for the Pāñcarātrikas, an incarnation of Viṣṇu to be approached through intellectual devotion for the brāhmanical community, and a ritual object for the Vaikhānasas (Willis 2009:228-229). The Gupta Empire (4th century CE – 6th century CE) supported Pāñcarātra and Bhāgavata religion among others, and there is an abundance of evidence for Kṛṣṇa in both literary and epigraphic sources from the time (Flood 1996: 123-124). The Valkhā copper-plate inscriptions dating to the early 4th century CE attest to the fact that the nobility had accepted that Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa were essentially the same being, and, intriguingly, it specifically mentions the king's loving devotion to the deity:

Mahārāja Bhuluṇḍa reverently bows his head to Viṣṇu with the greatest attachment, love and devotion – to Viṣṇu who...breaks the pride of Bali, Naraka, Namuci, Varaturaga,

³² *patraṁ puṣpaṁ phalaṁ toyam yo me bhaktyā prayacchati | tad ahaṁ bhaktyupahṛtam aśnāmi prayatātmanaḥ ||Bhagavadgītā 9.26.*

Kālīya, Rāvaṇa, Kāmsa, Cāṇūra, Ariṣṭa and Śiśupāla, who as Varāha lifts up the fallen earth...³³

Interpretation of the loving devotion referred to here must be qualified by awareness of the context of this copper plate. It documents *mahārāja* Bhuluṇḍa's submission to Samudragupta, by the donation of five villages for the maintenance of the rituals associated with a favourite deity of the ruling dynasty, in this case Viṣṇu (Willis 2009:72). The *bhakti* described in this inscription must be viewed as of a different tenor from the loving devotion which formed the theme of later Vaiṣṇava theology. The copper-plate is, however, a useful corroboration of the identification of Kṛṣṇa as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu (Willis 2009:229). Still, Entwistle (1987:120) suggests that there is enough evidence to lead to the conclusion that trends wherein Kṛṣṇa was the supreme deity, persisted.

With regard to the south of India, Hardy (1983:150) suggests that Vṛndāvana themes had been filtering into Tamil Caṅkam literature by the 3rd century CE. There are eight references to Kṛṣṇa/Viṣṇu in the Caṅkam literature of Madurai and Kāñci before the 6th century CE as Māyōṇ, a name which is a Tamil translation of *kṛṣṇa*, or dark (Flood 1996: 129, Hardy 1994:222-223). As the Vaikhānasas gained popularity and as folk elements were absorbed, their temple ritual worship tradition became firmly established by the 7th century CE, setting the stage for the arrival of the Āḷvārs (7th – 9th century CE). Mention must also be made of the Mahābalipuram

³³ ...mahārājabhulūḍena bhagavataḥ balinarakanamucivaraturagabhujagadaśavadanakāmsa-cānnūrāriṣṭaśiśupāladarppamathanasya jagadskannodharāṇavarāhasya...viṣṇoḥ paramēṇa bhaktisnehānurāgeṇa śirasā praṇipatya...|| Willis (2009:71)

depiction of the *govardhanadharāṇa*³⁴ in the Vārāha cave which also dates from around that time. As with the north, the south also contained two strands of religiosity regarding Kṛṣṇa, the first brāhmaṇical in tone, and the second a folk cult where emphasis was placed on his divine humanity, and especially his amorous nature (Hardy 1983: 229). The Āḷvārs represented the latter, and joined the Tamil renaissance from the northern end, specifically Kāñci and Tirumala, their work focussing on a devotional landscape centred on ninety-six temples (Hardy 1983: 242). It is also clear that although the Āḷvārs sometimes referred to Viṣṇu in their poetry, the main object of their devotions was Kṛṣṇa, and specifically the Kṛṣṇa who was the hero of a nexus of long established and memorialised narratives (Hardy 1983:287).

I will propose in chapter 3 that Nimbārka was born during the time of the Āḷvārs, when prominent Prakrit and Sanskrit poets in the central and northern areas of India were also commenting on the Rādhā dimension of Kṛṣṇa mythology (discussed in chapter 2 below). This period also saw the cave sculptures and temples at Badami and Ellora, which display acquaintance with the *Harivamśa*'s Kṛṣṇacarita in their iconography, as a parallel to the vast constructions that were taking place in the south (Hawley 1983:27).

³⁴ The episode of Kṛṣṇa lifting the Govardhana mountain, see *Harivamśa*, Viṣṇu Parvan, chapters 15-19 (Couture 1991:244-249).

1.5 Conclusion

By the time of Nimbārka, therefore, both north and south India had extremely developed ideologies of Kṛṣṇa some of which were demonstrably Kṛṣṇaite. However, those who inherited these creeds, such as Rāmānuja, who his tradition credits as being the successor of *bhakti* theology through the Āḷvārs, preferred to absorb the Kṛṣṇaite theology into a more conventional Vaiṣṇava model (Tiemeier 2010:340-341).

It can be conjectured that some of Kṛṣṇa's exploits, especially those which included the *gopīs*, were considered unsuitable for brāhmanical society whose codes of law viewed extra-marital sex as an offence (for example, *Āpastambadharmasūtra* 27.8-13, *Gautamadharmasūtra* 22.28-23.7, *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* 3.47-4.5).³⁵ It is perhaps for this reason that early, specifically Kṛṣṇaite, theological literature was not developed widely beyond the *Bhagavadgītā*. One supposes that although Kṛṣṇa and the stories surrounding him may have been influential on an individual level through the emotions evoked by the motif of his Vṛndāvana dalliances, even his status as king of Dvārka perhaps did not conform to the ideal social standard that was epitomised by Viṣṇu.

³⁵ This proved to be a crucial dichotomy, not only for the Kṛṣṇaite phenomenon itself. Nimbārka's early tradition did not benefit from the patronage that Rāmānuja, Madhva, Vallabha or the Gauḍīya traditions received; indeed, the fact that the Nimbārka worshipped Kṛṣṇa with full acceptance of his erotic episodes was one of the reasons which led to the followers of other sects being able to convince the state of Jaipur in the 18th-19th centuries that the Nimbārka tradition was not suited to be associated with the royal family, causing doctrinal squabbles that resulted in the leader of the Nimbārka tradition abandoning Jaipur (investigated by Clementin-Ojha, 1999).

Kṛṣṇa was again brought to the fore by the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, which is assigned to the 9th-10th centuries by Matchett (2001:19), in accordance with Hardy (1983:488). In the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, Kṛṣṇa appears chaste and there is no mention of Rādhā, which is seemingly absurd, if not for the understanding that the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* represented the theology of but a singular strand of Kṛṣṇa-followers (see section 2.3). This brief summary has shown that the deification of Kṛṣṇa is not a linear process. I will argue that it is this obscure, multifaceted Kṛṣṇa that is taken up by Nimbārka and introduced to Vedānta-based theology as Parabrahman, whilst simultaneously allotting equivalent status to Rādhā (see chapter 3). Before discussing the mechanisms of Nimbārka's contributions however, I turn now to Rādhā, whose process of deification displays certain parallels to that of Kṛṣṇa.

CHAPTER 2

Rādhā: from *gopī* to goddess

Rādhā, connected as she is to Kṛṣṇa, might be expected to have had a correspondingly multidimensional character; and at first glance it appears that there are two main traits identifiable herein. As Kinsley (1975:11) puts it,

In Rādhā, the intoxication, passion, longing and bliss of divine ‘madness’ are dramatically and beautifully portrayed. In Kṛṣṇa mythology and cult she becomes the supreme paradigm of *prema* – selfless, passionate love for the beloved, the highest devotion to the divine.

To this, one should add a third trait, which is noticed by Pauwels (1996:29); ‘Rādhā’s devotees affirm her superiority over Kṛṣṇa’, that is, Rādhā is conceived of as the Supreme herself. On investigation, each of these three facets is resultant from three distinct periods of development: the early period being that in which Rādhā is merely the lover of Kṛṣṇa and resides completely within the realm of the poets; the middle period in which she is elevated to the status of a divinity and thus enters the realm of religiosity; and the late period in which specific cults in 16th century Vraja further extend her majesty to surpass that of Kṛṣṇa.

Pauwels (1996:29) commented that ‘the full history of the development of this goddess, or her progressive manifestation, as her devotees would say, has not yet been written’. Mainly thanks to Pauwels’ work (1996) on Rādhā and her devotees in 16th century Vraja, Hawley and Wulff (1996), Hardy’s pioneering work on the phenomenon of *virahabhakti* (1983), Olson (1983:128-130), Vaudeville (1982:1-

12) and Miller (1975) on the *Gītagovinda*, it is possible to have a clear view of the early and later stages of Rādhā's development. It is apparent, however, that the middle stage remains difficult to define, as most scholars tend to view Rādhā's elevation to goddesshood as either an innovation suggested by Jayadeva in the *Gītagovinda* (12th century), or as a phenomenon described in the works of the Gauḍīya Gosvāmins of the 16th century (Vaudeville 1982:11, Olson 1983:129, Hawley and Wulff 1996:109). In this chapter I will initiate an analysis of the middle stage of Rādhā's development, namely her ascension to divinity. Saying that, a summary of evidence collated by Miller (1975), Hardy (1983:52-112) and Pauwels (1996:29) will be significant for my dating of Nimbārka, if only to serve as the backdrop to contextualise the innovations which he introduced.

2.1 Rādhā in Pre-7th century CE Literature

The exact origin of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa relationship may never be known, but it is certainly mentioned in early Prakrit literature. Bahl (1984:29) opines,

Whenever it was felt that the memory of the oral tradition began to fade or become extinct about something, an account of such traditionally-known matters (which existed earlier in only oral forms) was recorded and thus preserved forever. In most cases, the written records bear dates which are much later than the period in which something so recorded developed and flourished in the oral tradition, and finally faded out of its memory.

With regards to the sources available, Entwhistle (1987:48, n122) suggests that 'the oldest is Hāla's [Gāhā] Sattasāī (Gāthāsaptaśati), but most references date from the 8th century onwards'. Kinsley (1986:82) states 'although the early references are few and although they never supply lengthy descriptions of Rādhā, her character is

nevertheless clearly suggested'. So in order to get a glimpse of Rādhā's character in these early sources, Miller's catalogue (1975:657-671) is here reworked within a strictly chronological pattern. Even though this exercise may seem arbitrary, by examining the themes and motifs of the sources quoted with reference to Nimbārka, this same information will yield new and relevant results with direct impact on the understanding of Rādhā's development.

2.1.1 The Vedas, Epics and Early Purāṇas

Coincidentally following the pattern suggested for Kṛṣṇa and replicating a similar wishful thinking, devotees assign Rādhā's very first appearance to the Vedas:

Rādhā-Viśākhā, gracious Anurādhā, Jyeṣṭhā and the good constellation, protector Mūla [may I be happy].³⁶

This verse clearly refers to two particular lunar constellations. A verse which later theologians claim as a Vedic source, assigning it to the *Ṛkpariśiṣṭa*, has been untraced in that text. It is similar in tone to the previously cited *Atharvaveda* verse:

By Rādhā, the radiant Mādhava, and by Mādhava itself, Rādhā shine over people.³⁷

The theologians read this through undoubtedly Vaiṣṇava lenses, but in standard usage, Mādhava is an epithet of spring³⁸ and Rādhā is just another name for the

³⁶ *rādhe viśākhe suhavānurādhā jyeṣṭhā sunakṣatram ariṣṭam mūlam* || *Atharvaveda* 19.7.3c-d. *sukho me astu* understood from *Atharvaveda* 19.7.3b

³⁷ *rādhayā mādhavo devo mādhavenaiva rādhikā | vibhrājante janeṣu* || Puruṣottama in *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, commentary on *Daśaślokī* 5, Jīva Gosvāmin, *Kṛṣṇa Sandarbha* commentary on *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 10.29.188, etc.

Viśākhā/Anurādhā constellation. Even though these texts are clearly intended to be astrological statements, their ‘astral mythology’ retrospectively fit the current Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa idiom, with Mādhava, Rādhā and her associate Viśākhā, who, like all the other *sakhīs*, is supposed to be an expansion of Rādhā’s potency (Miller 1975:669).

The second occurrence of the name Rādhā in early literature is found in two verses in the *Mahābhārata*. I translate them as follows:

The famous husband of Rādhā (Adhiratha), the son of a charioteer, took that abandoned child and with his wife, made him their son.³⁹

Who is able to fight on the battlefield with Karṇa, the son of Rādhā, other than [Paraśu]rāma, Droṇa, Kṛpa, or Śaradvata?⁴⁰

Even though Miller (1975:658) concludes that these references to Rādhā here have ‘no apparent relation to Kṛṣṇa’s consort in later literature’, they may serve as the basis for the later poetic motif in which Rādhā is seen as a married *gopī*.⁴¹ The *Mahābhārata* does not even mention the *gopīs*, of whom Rādhā came to be accepted as the leader, let alone Rādhā herself (Hardy 1983:66). The reason for this is that Rādhā and the *gopīs* existed solely in the domain of Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla mythology, and not that of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva which was the primary focus of the great epic.

³⁸ *madhuś ca mādhavaś ca vāsantikāv ṛtū || Taittirīya Saṁhitā 4.4.11*

³⁹ *taṁ utsṛṣṭaṁ tadā garbhaṁ rādhābhartā mahāyaśaḥ | putratve kalpayāmāsa sabhāryaḥ sūtanandanāḥ || Mahābhārata 1.104.14*

⁴⁰ *ko hi rādhāsutaṁ karṇaṁ śakto yodhayituṁ raṇe | anyatra rāmāddroṇādvā kṛpādvāpi śaradvataḥ || Mahābhārata 1.181.28*

⁴¹ Caṇḍīdāsa, even employs the name Āyana for Rādhā’s supposed husband in his poetry. This is a theme propagated by Rūpa Gosvāmin who names him Abhimanyu (Beck 2005:71).

Kṛṣṇa-Gopāla mythology was expanded in the *Harivaṁśa*, and the text narrates an episode in which Kṛṣṇa sports with unmarried *gopīs* in the autumn-night's *rāsa* dance. By the time of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, the *gopīs* are married.⁴² The *Harivaṁśa* only refers to the *gopīs* as a group, but in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* there occur references to a 'clever' (*nipuṇā*) *gopī* that is singled out as a favourite (Hardy 1983:95). Considering that the consensus is that the *Harivaṁśa*'s *terminus ad quem* is the 4th century CE, it may be pertinent also to look at the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* which was finalised around the 5th century CE (Matchett 2001:18).

Viṣṇupurāṇa 5.13.31-41 is a source of prime relevance since a *gopī* depicted there evinces many of the characteristics associated with Rādhā later on. Though the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* does not specifically name Rādhā, the fact that the characteristics of this *gopī* are indeed so recognisable warrants the inclusion of this passage here:

Looking at the ground, one *gopī*, the excellent wife of a cowherdsman, spoke as the hairs on her whole body stood on end, her lotus-eyes blooming: 'O friends! Look at these footprints of Kṛṣṇa, which have left [impressions of] the lines of the flag, lightning-bolt, goad and lotus, as he goes for sportive pastimes. Which fortunate [lit. doer of meritorious deeds] maiden went with him? Her sometimes deep and sometimes shallow footprints testify that she is inebriated with passion. Here the great Dāmodara has picked flowers from high above, as only the front part of his foot has left a deep impression. Over here a flower-bedecked girl sat with him – she [must have] worshipped the super-soul Viṣṇu in another birth. Look! The son of Nanda went by that path, leaving the arrogant girl to whom he had offered a flower garland. This girl with big buttocks followed quickly after him, with these other impressions of the front part of her feet. Look at this! He held her hand and went with her; but these footprints are uneven – the cheat merely took her hand and slighted her – these footprint shows that she was walking slowly, despondent. Surely, he must have told her he would return quickly, for this trail of footprints show Kṛṣṇa returned to her. Kṛṣṇa entered here the dense forest, where the moonlight cannot reach, as not even one more footprint can be seen.⁴³

⁴² Compare for example *Harivaṁśa* 63.24: *tā vāryamānāḥ pitr̥bhir bhrātr̥bhir māt̥rbhis tathā | kṛṣṇam gopāṅganā rātrau ṛṅgayanti ratipriyāḥ ||* and *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 5.13.59: *tā varyamānāḥ patibhiḥ pitr̥bhir bhrātr̥bhis tathā | kṛṣṇam gopāṅganā rātrau ramayanti ratipriyāḥ ||*

⁴³ *vilokyaikā bhuvam prāha gopī gopavarāṅganā | pulakāñcitasarvāṅgī vikāsinayanotpalā || dhvajavajrāṅkuśābjāṅkarekhāvanty āli paśyata | padāny etāni kṛṣṇasya līlālitagāmināḥ || kāpi tena samāyātā kṛtapuṇyā madālasā | padāni tasyās caitāni ghanāny alpatanūni ca || puspāpacayamatroccaiś cakre dāmodaro dhruvam | yenāgrākrāntamātrāṇi padānyatra*

Hardy's (1983:93) analysis of this passage highlights salient points: the temporal setting of the autumnal full-moon and the *rāsa* dance that are already referred to in the *Harivaṁśa* are now fleshed-out with further particulars about the character of these *gopīs*. The *gopī* in question has the following features which are similar to those of the Rādhā of later literature: she is *kṛtapuṇyā*, 'who has done some meritorious act', that is to say she is fortunate or lucky to be singled out, this particular *gopī* has been favoured among all of them, and so could be the favourite of Kṛṣṇa. The epithet *madālasā*, 'languid with excitement', hints at her passionate nature. These two characteristics are already known to Prakrit literature that precedes the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (as described below). There are some further developments: she is described as *puṣpair alaṅkṛtā*, or 'decorated with flowers', that may have been picked by Kṛṣṇa, according to the narrator in the passage quoted. She is also walking slowly due to the weight of her buttocks (*nitamba-bhara-mantharā*). But this particular *gopī* becomes conceited in verse 5.13.36, and is abandoned. The *māna līlā* of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa leaving each other due to pride, then languishing and bemoaning their separation and finally returning for union is a very famous theme in later Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa literature such as Jayadeva's *Gītagovinda* 10.6 and Śrībhāṭṭa's *Yugalaśataka*, poem 25. Even though this section most probably is referring to *gopīs* in general, the character traits of all of them are later found amalgamated in the figure of Rādhā which is possibly the reason why

*mahātmanah || atropaviśya vai tena kācitpuṣpair alaṅkṛtā | anyajanmani sarvātmā viṣṇur
 abhyarcitas tayā || puṣpabandhanasammanakṛtamānām apāsya tām | nandagopasuto yāto
 mārgenānena paśyata || anuyātainam atrānyā nitambabharamantherā | yā gantavye drutaṁ yāti
 nimnapādāgrasamsthiṭh || hastanyastāgrahasteyaṁ tena yāti tathā sakhī | anāyattapadanyāsā
 lakṣyate padapaddhatiḥ || hastasamsparsamātreṇa dhūrtenaiśā vimānitā |
 nairāśyānmandagāminyā nivrtaṁ lakṣyate padam || nūnam uktā tvarāmīti punareṣyāmitentikam |
 tena kṛṣṇena yenaiśā tvaritā padapaddhatiḥ || praviṣṭo gahanam kṛṣṇaḥ padamatra na lakṣyate |
 nivartadhvam śaśāṅkasya naitad dīdhitiḡocare || Viṣṇupurāṇa 5.13.31-41, my translation.*

she becomes, after becoming divine, the source of *gopīs* in later religious literature (see section 8.2.1). The clever *gopī* is singled out again in verse 5.13.54:

One clever *gopī*, tired by the *rāsa* dance, through the pretext of singing his glories, hugged Madhusūdana with her lustrous arms, and kissed him.⁴⁴

The *nipuṇā* adjective is one that follows Rādhā right up to the present day, and the fact that she actually gets to kiss him (*cucumba tam*) hints at her being the only one to attain this, in this incarnation of the story at least. Hardy (1983:82) suggests that this version of the *gopī* story seems the oldest and is the source of later developments in the *Brahmāpurāṇa* and others. It is not my intention to contend that the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* is here referring to Rādhā without naming her. Rather it is being suggested that this section is most probably one of the earliest markers for the development of certain typical characteristics that went on not only to influence the personalities of various individual *gopīs*, but also of Rādhā herself. Aside from these more orthodox sources, there are a few sources in Prakrit literature that provide additional insight.

2.1.2 Pre-7th century Poetic Literature

The compilation of the 700-verse anthology in Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit named the *Gāhāsattasāī* (Sanskrit: *Gāhāsaptasāti*), is attributed to King Hāla of the Śātavāhana Empire, sometime during his reign in the 1st century CE. However, as the dates are still under discussion, I will follow Hardy's (1983:57) assumption that

⁴⁴ *kācīt pravilasad bāhuṃ parirabhya cucumba tam | gopī gītastutivyājān nipuṇā madhusūdanam|| Viṣṇupurāṇa 5.13.54, my translation.*

there are many layers in the current transmissions of the text. He suggests a *terminus ad quem* of the 3rd century CE for the verse dealing with Rādhā, placing it definitely before the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and perhaps during the early stages of the composition of the *Harivaṃśa*:

Kṛṣṇa, by [blowing] away the cow-dust from Rādhikā with the breath from your mouth, you remove the pride of these cowherd women, as well as others.⁴⁵

There are two more verses from the oldest layer of the *Gāhāsattasāi* noticed by Hardy (1983:57) which deal with *gopīs* in general, but of interest here is the verse which refers to a clever *gopī* (*nipuṇā gopī*)

The shrewd milkmaid stood close to the other *gopīs*, pretending to praise [his] dance, and kissed Kṛṣṇa in the reflection on their cheeks.⁴⁶

There is no conclusive proof in this verse as to whether it is referring to Rādhā, but the characterisation of the ‘shrewd’ milkmaid who is aloof from the other *gopīs* yet is nonetheless driven by passion to kiss even the reflection of Kṛṣṇa on their cheeks, would allow the assumption that Rādhā, who is stated to be the favourite in Gāthā 89 above, is perhaps being referred to here. There is a striking similarity here to the stanzas of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (discussed in section 2.1.1), and Hardy (1983:94 n.147) even proposes that this particular verse is based on *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 5.13.54. The above verses are attributed to different poets, with Poṭa given as the author of the first verse and Vura as the second (Hardy 1983:58-59), perhaps an

⁴⁵ *muhamāruṇa taṃ kaṇha goraṃ rāhiāe avaṇento | etāṇaṃ vallavīṇaṃ aṇṇāṇaṃ vi goraṃ harasi* || Gāthā 89. The suggested Sanskrit *chāyā* is: *mukhamārutena tvam kṛṣṇa gorajo rādhikāyā apanayan | etāsāṃ vallavīṇāṃ anyāsāṃ api gauravaṃ harasi* || In order to bring out the force of *anyāsāṃ api*, I have amended the translation provided by Miller (1975:660).

⁴⁶ *ṇaccaṇa-salāhaṇa-ṇihe'ṇa pāsa-parisaṃṭhiā ṇiṇa-govī | sari-govīṇa cuṃvai' kavola-paḍimā-gaṃ Kaṇhaṃ* || Gāthā 114, translation: Hardy (1983:59).

indication that this incident of Rādhā kissing Kṛṣṇa through some pretext during the *rāsa* in the presence of other *gopīs* was well known.

In any case, the *Gāhāsattasāi* yields the information that Rādhā is favoured over the other *gopīs*. Gāthā 112 describes Yaśodā and another epithet of Kṛṣṇa, namely Dāmodara, suggesting its audience was acquainted with the childhood pastimes of Kṛṣṇa even before the completion of the *Harivaṃśa*. As it stands, it can therefore be safely inferred that Rādhā would have existed in the poetic sphere at the very least at the same time or just after the mythology of the adolescent Kṛṣṇa came to the fore in the *Harivaṃśa* (Hardy 1983:55). It can accordingly be presumed that Rādhā also may have been widely known at least by the commencement of the common era, if not earlier, and certainly before the third century CE.

Contemporaneous to the developments of the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Gāhāsattasāi* is the *Bālacarita* drama, which is inconclusively attributed to Bhāsa; a fact discussed by Hardy (1983:79) and Gonzáles-Reimann (1993:8). Hardy (1983:79) suggests the dates of between the 2nd and 4th century CE for the work itself, but Gonzáles-Reimann (1993:7) revises that to the 5th century CE, so whoever the author may be, the *Bālacarita* deserves inclusion in the discussion here. In addition to what has already been discussed in section 2.1.1, the *Bālacarita* is another source which adds credence to the fact that the motif of Kṛṣṇa frolicking with the *gopīs* was already famed by the commencement of the common era, or at the very least by the first few centuries of the common era. The *Bālacarita* does not mention any single

gopī by name, nor does it indeed go into their characteristics, to which Hardy (1983:80) comments:

In its subject matter (as also in its primary religious understanding of Kṛṣṇa) it has a parallel in the HV, although it is difficult to identify the latter work [the HV] as the source of the drama, since both may have derived their information about Kṛṣṇa's youth from a third, now lost, source which could have been oral. Certainly the treatment of the *gopī* theme is idiosyncratic enough to suggest such a possibility.

There are two further poets to consider: Kālidāsa, who in the early 5th century CE made a veiled reference in the *Raghuvamśa* to Kṛṣṇa as the lover of the *gopīs* of Vṛndāvana (Hardy 1983:63), and Śyāmilaka who, at around the same time, in his *bhāṇa* the *Pādatāḍitaka* (discussed by Schokker 1975), refers to the separation felt by a prostitute called Rādhikā (Hardy 1983:64), which may be a jocular reference to the separation of the *gopī* Rādhā.

This leads to a problem surrounding the *gopī* episode of the *Harivamśa* and the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. In the light of the fact that Kṛṣṇa himself was refashioned as an *avatāra*, it may have been the case that Rādhā's story was deemed to lack sufficient brāhmaṇical refinement. While Rādhā's personality, clearly in existence prior to the *Harivamśa*, was definitely in literary circulation by the time of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, she is not mentioned in the latter. Rather it seems likely that at this early stage, Rādhā was considered an ordinary *gopī*. Neither she nor the other *gopīs* had been elevated to a specifically divine status; they were no more than the *avatāra* Kṛṣṇa's earthly lovers. The *gopī*'s love, by the time of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, had been assimilated within the bounds of *bhakti*, since Kṛṣṇa had by then been

connected with Viṣṇu, and so his earthly pastimes were necessarily subjected to a similar process of assimilation.

The discussion so far also highlights two separate trends. Sanskrit and Prakrit poets are aware of Rādhā/Rādhikā as the favourite of Kṛṣṇa, and authoritative texts, such as the *Viṣṇu-* and *Brahmā-purāṇas* were aware of the *gopīs*, a skillful *gopī* and the *rāsa* dance. Hardy (1983:104) suggests they also demonstrate *viraha*, or separation after sexual union.⁴⁷ After the c. 6th century and until the 8th century, there is a substantial gap in the continuation of the theme of Rādhā in both poetry and religious literature. I will argue in chapter 3 that it was around this time that Nimbārka was born.

2.2 Rādhā in Other Purāṇas

The Gupta age (4th to 6th centuries CE) saw the development of the Purāṇas beginning with the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and the *Brahmāpurāṇa*, but the exact chronology of the others is still subject to debate (as discussed by Rocher 1986:100-103 and Bailey 2003:139). Whilst the indisputably late Purāṇas are replete with references to the goddess (*devī*) Rādhā and her various pastimes with Kṛṣṇa (such as the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*'s Kṛṣṇajanmakhaṇḍa and the *Pādma-purāṇa*'s Patālakhaṇḍa), the earlier texts of this genre, including the 8th-10th century CE *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* exhibit a similar unfamiliarity, or, more likely inhibition, as do

⁴⁷ See Hardy (1983) for the complete discussion of *virahā bhakti*.

the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and the *Brahmāpurāṇa*. A few passages are noticed by Miller (1975: 658-659).

During the discussion between Devī and Dakṣa in the *Matsyapurāṇa*, she describes her different names at specific holy places:

At Śivakuṇḍa (I am) Śivānandā, Nandinī at Devikātaṭa, Rukmiṇī in Dvārakā, and in the forest of Vṛndāvana, Rādhā.⁴⁸

The *Liṅgapurāṇa*, whilst listing the *gāyatrīs* of different deities allots one for Rādhā:

We contemplate upon Her who was raised up by Viṣṇu himself – we meditate upon her. May that Rādhā inspire us.⁴⁹

Significantly the *Liṅgapurāṇa* verse occurs immediately after the *gāyatrīs* of Viṣṇu (48.12) and Lakṣmī (48.13). It would be expected that Bhū/Pṛthivī should follow on, as she is already recognised as wife of Viṣṇu (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 5.29.23). Epigraphic evidence from the Vārāha cave at Udayagiri corroborates this, showing that from as early as the 5th century, Lakṣmī and Pṛthivī were thought of as consorts of Viṣṇu (Willis 2009: 61-62). The *Liṅgapurāṇa* of the Venkatesvara Press (1906) has the variant reading of Dharā (a synonym of Pṛthivī) in place of Rādhā, which also fits the mythology of the *mantra* better, and thus it is proposed that this was actually the original reading of the version found in the *Liṅgapurāṇa* of the Vālmīki Press (1885) which was used by Miller, making it the variant.

⁴⁸ śivakuṇḍe śivānandā nandinī devikātaṭe | rukmiṇī dvāravatyām tu rādhā vṛndāvane vane || *Matsyapurāṇa* 13.38

⁴⁹ samuddhṛtāyai vidmahe viṣṇunaikena dhīmahi | tanno rādhā pracodayāt || *Liṅgapurāṇa* 2.48.14

Discounting the Liṅgapurāṇa reference then, the only noteworthy reference to Rādhā occurs in the *Matsyapurāṇa*. The *Varāhapurāṇa* can be adjudged to be the last of the early Purāṇas that refers to Rādhā. It describes a holy place known as the Rādhākuṇḍa:

Rādhā embraced Kṛṣṇa the remover of distresses, at that place. The tank near there became a holy place known by her own name. Famed as ‘Rādhākuṇḍa’, it is the auspicious remover of all sins. From bathing in the Ariṣṭa- and Rādhā-kuṇḍas, one will attain results [such as....].⁵⁰

Hazra (1940:104) ascribes this entire section of the Mathurā-Māhātmya of the *Varāhapurāṇa* to Sanātana Gosvāmin and places this claimed interpolated section in the 16th to 17th centuries, due to it being quoted in the *Haribhaktivilāsa*. As this section is of a completely different tone and subject matter to the rest of the Purāṇa which itself appears more archaic in form and content, it seems sensible to accept Hazra’s judgement in terms of this section’s interpolated nature. However, I am unwilling to endorse the ascription to Sanātana Gosvāmin as his quotation of this section does not necessarily mean that he composed it. Rather, it is safe to say that a person with similar beliefs may have introduced it to the *Varāhapurāṇa* much later than the completion of the original sections of the *Varāhapurāṇa*.

We are left, then, with the *Matsyapurāṇa*’s reference to Rādhā in chapter 13, which also is assigned a later date (along with the other chapters from 13-22) than the original layers of the text which are dated to later than the 4th century CE but

⁵⁰ *tatra rādhā samāśliṣya kṛṣṇam akliṣṭakāranam | svanāmnā viditam kuṇḍam kṛtam tīrtham adūrataḥ || rādhākuṇḍam iti khyātam sarvapāpaharam śubham | ariṣṭarādhākuṇḍābhyām snānāt phalam avāpnuyāt || Varāhapurāṇa 164.33-34*

earlier than the end of the first millennium (Hazra 1940:35-38). The fact that Devī herself is saying that she is Rādhā in Vṛndāvana would really suggest that this statement comes from a time when the worship of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa had evolved to a stage where the connection of Rādhā with Śakti was common, and so this reference too should be discounted as an early source for Rādhā.

2.3 Rādhā's Deification

Entwhistle (1987:47-48) sums up the significance of Rādhā for Kṛṣṇa's mythology thus:

The acceptance of Rādhā as the foremost of Gopīs and Kṛṣṇa's consort is the most significant development in his mythology since the end of the first millennium...exactly when she became universally acknowledged as his consort is uncertain.

With regard to the two views on the character of Rādhā noticed from the earliest sources Entwhistle (1987:49), who has examined traditional scriptural sources, comments on the first:

Rādhā is different from other Hindu goddesses. She is neither a mother, creator, or personification of wifely virtues, nor does she have anything to do with fertility. She has no independent function outside of her relationship with Kṛṣṇa, in which she plays the role of a divine and fair-complexioned mistress with whom the dark Kṛṣṇa can experience cosmic bliss.

He then only hints at Rādhā's second personality:

As the supreme consort of Kṛṣṇa, she represents all the other Gopīs, and thus the souls of his human devotees (Entwhistle 1987:49).

One Rādhā is a divine mistress; the other is the supreme consort. I would suggest that the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* and the *Gītāgovinda* are respectively the best examples

of each idiom of envisaging Rādhā, with Miller (1975:670) summing up the distinction as follows:

The heroine of the Gītagovinda is so complex that it seems absurd to seek the poet's model for her in the allusion to the arrogant girl (*drptā*) of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* episode cited by the Gosvāmins (X.30.14ff). The figure is presented there in a way which is highly critical of the exclusivism which Kṛṣṇa's relations with her represent. If the *Bhāgavata* is referring to Rādhā, it seems to be rejecting her relationship with Kṛṣṇa as an inappropriate model for the devotee...It is not unlikely that the authors of the *Bhāgavata* knew a rival cult centering on Kṛṣṇa and his *gopī* consort, and they are critical of it.

The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* represents the culmination of earlier Vaiṣṇava Purāṇic literature and the more general mood of the Āḷvārs (Matchett 2001:19), who recognise Napiṅṅai as the favourite lover of Kṛṣṇa (Māyoṇ) in place of Rādhā, who is not mentioned at all. Olson (1983:129) surmises: 'it is likely that these two female figures represent independent variants due to their different characteristics'.

According to Entwhistle (1987:49): 'It is claimed that the followers of Nimbārka were the first to worship her in conjunction with Kṛṣṇa, but the oldest and most definitive theological accounts of her are those of Rūpa and Jīva Gosvāmin'. Olson (1983:30) asserts: 'Nimbārka...raised Rādhā to a universal principle at the side of Viṣṇu', but he does not supply any further substantive material. It has been possible to examine the claims of the followers of Nimbārka by accessing their earliest documentation in the form of the *Daśaślokī* and the *Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā* which specifically discuss Rādhā. Whilst by no means exhaustive theological accounts, they undoubtedly provide the foundations upon which all later developments including those of Rūpa and Jīva Gosvāmin will be based.

2.4 Conclusion

What has become apparent when examining the history of Rādhā's development is that the notion of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa as hailing from an autochthonous historical location is just too far beyond the limits of certainty to state with any finality, even if the evidence may seem to suggest it. The Kṛṣṇa character appears to have been incorporated at an early period into the brāhmanical tradition as a result of his prominence in Mathurā. Although Rādhā or a figure similar to her may have been included in the early stories of Kṛṣṇa, she depended on the wider poetic world to promulgate the narrative of her situation. Still, it can be assumed that the symbolic power of the composite of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa meshed so clearly with the poetic concept of the completeness of the emotion of love that it enabled her to persist, with the core theme never really requiring development. On that basis it was a simple matter for Nimbārka to take the motif of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and apply it to theology, as he himself states in the *Daśaślokī*: '[Parabrahman] takes a form that is conducive to contemplation in accordance with the desire of the devotee'.⁵¹

⁵¹ *bhaktecchayopāttasucintyavigrahāt* || *Daśaślokī* 8

PART TWO

NIMBĀRKA'S INNOVATION

Introduction

As discussed above, by the 7th century Sanskrit and Prakrit literature bears witness to the regular presence of, amongst various subjects, the developed theme of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, the *gopīs* and the episodes of Vṛndāvana or the banks of the Yamunā. Vedānta had also been developing, with the final redaction of the *Brahmasūtra* occurring around the 6th century (Nakamura 1983:463). It was during the 7th century, I propose, that Nimbārka contributed to Vedānta by his innovative statement that Parabrahman is Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa.

In reference to the development from Vedic sacrifice to temple-based worship, Willis (2009:107) observes:

Those responsible for introducing the powerful theistic vision of godhead in the temple – and for introducing *pūjā* as an appropriate form of divine service – attempted to link their cult to the Veda and refer it to Vedic tradition...The point is that religious ‘innovation’ could not be defined as such – it had to be understood in terms of the Veda rather than vice versa. The aim was not to show that new practices were superior to the old, or even to shroud new cults in ancient clothing. Rather the aim was to prove that the new was nothing more than the old, a simple rephrasing of the old using contemporary theology.

This process must be separated into two stages in the case of the introduction of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa to Vedānta. The first is Nimbārka's innovation, where he states simply that Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are Parabrahman (*Daśaślokī* 4-5). However, as usual with any orthodoxy, new doctrines which challenge the established system become

difficult to accept. Even Nimbārka's own spiritual descendants seemed to have struggled with his theological concepts until the 15th century. This is apparent from Puruṣottama's *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, which drastically reinterprets the innovation of Nimbārka in order to maintain supposed Vedāntic and Vaiṣṇava integrity; fulfilling the criteria for inclusion under the second stage of the paradigm. Puruṣottama endeavoured to establish that this supposed innovation was pre-existent in scripture, and as such was simply another path within the purview of Vedānta.

However, none of this can be satisfactorily dealt with until a basic chronology is posited. Such a chronology has yet to be settled, so it would be pertinent to discuss this topic as sufficient evidence and reliable methodologies are available. A substantial portion of what follows, therefore, is an attempt to investigate these sources upon which a chronology will be suggested for Nimbārka and his early tradition up to Puruṣottama. After this, I shall investigate the approaches to Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa adopted by these teachers through a study of Nimbārka's *Daśaślokī* and its commentary the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* of Puruṣottama, followed by a discussion of its contents and the developments occurring concurrently outside of the tradition.

Chapter 3

Nimbārka

Whilst it may have been desirable, having dealt with the history of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's deification, to survey the status of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in Vedānta as the main focus of the investigation, such an approach could only be adopted in cases where a plausible chronology has been established previously, even if more reliant upon inference than verifiable facts. Without such an investigation, the various factors contributing to the development of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's status as witnessed in Vedānta would be sidestepped. As the main source of this development, Nimbārka has been cursorily mentioned in the writings of a great many scholars; however, with the exception of Bose (1943) and Satyanand (1997), no one who aimed to delineate a chronology had access to a wide selection of primary source matter from the tradition Nimbārka founded. This has given rise to all manner of conjecture and controversy, and, coupled with sect's adherents advocating an absurd date for the commencement of the *sampradāya*, has led many to simply abandon all hope of a definitive solution, and accept any of a myriad suggestions concerning Nimbārka's chronology, mostly to the end of providing support for a hypothesis which results in serious devaluation of Nimbārka and his contributions.

Indeed, due to the overlap of much of his tradition's doctrinal philosophy and practice with other, more renowned and successful traditions, Nimbārka and his tradition have effectively been eclipsed. Even the most recent and up to date survey

of the tradition as a whole still displays indebtedness to the unverified inferences of previous scholars when establishing chronologies (Clémentin-Ojha 2011: 429).

In recent scholarship, light has been shed on the similar state of chronological difficulties for Śaṅkara. Malkovsky (2001) in a recent analysis into the background of Śaṅkara provides a very solid methodology for dealing with issues of a chronological nature. Discussing the obsolete assumption of the dates 788-820CE for Śaṅkara, he says:

Although it is true that more and more scholars are inclined to reject the 788-820 hypothesis, the great majority continue to uphold it, for want of more accurate dating (Malkovsky 2001: 1).

Malkovsky (2001:2) highlights the fact that many continue to refer to an antediluvian dating for Śaṅkara simply due to the lack of a reliable dating, which is similarly the case with Nimbārka's current chronology. What follows is an attempt to accurately assess the sources, as it is important to firstly establish a satisfactory chronology for Nimbārka in order to understand the impact of any innovations he may have been responsible for. Only then will it be possible to contextualise both him and his philosophy within the framework of the development of both Vedānta and the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa motif that was gaining popularity in the rest of India. To this end, an analysis of the various theories regarding Nimbārka's chronology and historicity precedes a discussion of a decisive dating, upon which the historical, theological and philosophical factors that surround Nimbārka can be correctly recognised with a view to providing a satisfactory understanding of him, his innovations and their ramifications.

3.1 Nimbārka's Chronology

In discussing Śaṅkara, Malkovsky (2001:8) states:

Calculating exactly when Śaṅkara might have lived is not an insignificant issue. In fact, in the words of Sengaku Mayeda, "Setting the date of Śaṅkara's birth is probably one of the most controversial problems in the history of Indian philosophy," not only because of Śaṅkara's importance as an individual thinker, but also because it throws light on a "correct understanding of one of the most important and critical periods of the history of Indian thought".

Nicholson (2010:37), in discussing a later *bhedābheda* confirms that:

Yet much more work remains to be done, particularly on pivotal but little-understood figures such as Nimbārka, whose century has not even been agreed on by historians.

Nimbārka's philosophy, known as *svābhāvika dvaitādvaita/bhedābheda*, is well documented. Early scholars such as Bhandarkar (1913) may have felt compunction to include this school of Vedānta within their general surveys due to it seemingly falling within the Vaiṣṇava anti-*advaita* group, which consisted of Rāmānuja's *viśiṣṭādvaita*, Madhva's *dvaita*, Vallabha's *śuddhādvaita* and Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's *acintyābheda*. Investigations into Nimbārka's history, however, have yet to result in general scholarly acceptance of the precise details of his chronology, whether instigated by the sect itself or by Indologists.

It is perhaps unsurprising then that the dates posited for his birth span nearly a millennium (Bose 1943 vol. 3: 2-4). The traditional hagiographical accounts can be found in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*,⁵² the *Nimbārkaṅkīrti* of Audumbara,⁵³ one of

⁵² *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, Pratisargaparvan 7.67-84

Nimbārka's four main disciples, and the 18th century *Ācāryacaritam* of Nārāyaṇaśaraṇa Deva.⁵⁴ The material contained within these sources either focuses on the conferral of the name Nimbārka by Brahmā or on other various mythological events which have no bearing on the present discussion, aside from a statement of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* which perhaps is the first textual reference to any chronology of this Vedāntin.

3.1.1 The Sectarian Position

The current view held by the tradition is based on the *Ācāryacaritam* of Nārāyaṇaśaraṇa Deva (r.1700-1754CE), in which it is claimed Śrīnivāsa appeared during the rule of Vajranābha (Kṛṣṇa's grandson), and that Nimbārka was born on the sixth year of Yudhiṣṭhira, or six years after *kali yuga* started, i.e. 3096 BCE (Satyanand 1997:57). Until the composition of the *Ācāryacaritam*, there was no definite consensus on the date within the *sampradāya*. Even now, Nimbārka's belonging to the Kāṭhiyā Bābā sub-lineage base their view on astrological details provided in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, arriving at a date of fifteen years after the start of *kali yuga*, namely 3087BCE as the date of birth of Nimbārka (Satyanand 1997:64).

Bose (1943 vol. 3: 14) gives the best overview of the problem:

So far as the date of Nimbārka is concerned, we do not unfortunately get any help from the writings of his disciples, for most of them are silent about it, and the few who mention it, unfortunately, contribute nothing to the problem, their accounts being mostly based on tradition and more or less exaggerated.

⁵³ The others being the next anointed leader of the tradition Śrīnivāsācārya, Gauramukhācārya and a householder named Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa: see Śaraṇa (1972: 66).

⁵⁴ For more on the *Ācāryacaritam* see Dāsa (2008:46).

Upon closer inspection however, there are a few vague hints worth noticing. Of his four direct disciples, only the works of the next leader Śrīnivāsa, Audumbara and Gauramukha are extant. None of them mention details regarding Nimbārka's era, perhaps due to the fact they were also his contemporaries, and thus his precise dating to them was not an issue of controversy. Audumbara, the author of the hagiography, recounts former births of Nimbārka and his activities but says nothing about his time, or any specifics about his parents, perhaps again due to familiarity. Śrīnivāsa concurs with Audumbara at the start of his commentary on the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* that Nimbārka is the incarnation of the Sudarśana *cakra*, but no other identification is made.

Interestingly then, Puruṣottama, in the introduction to his *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* alludes to a time for the incarnation of the Sudarśana *cakra* in the form of Nimbārka:

The Lord Sudarśana, incarnated upon the earth as the son of the best of the Tailāṅga *Brāhmaṇas*, and known as Niyamānanda, desired to restart the Lord's own eternal tradition of Vedānta, which was destroyed in the age of Kali in that very place, through the means of composing books such as the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* which is a sentence-meaning [exposition] on the *Brahmasūtra*, thereby uniting the collected essence of the totality of the Vedānta'.⁵⁵

According to Puruṣottama then, Nimbārka was born at a time long enough after the start of *kaliyuga* for the tradition of Vedānta to have been 'destroyed' in the Tailāṅga region. Devācārya, the 12th successor of Nimbārka according to *paramparā* lists, also describes a similar temporal setting:

⁵⁵ ...bhagavān sudarśano 'vanitalāvatīrṇas tailāṅgadvijavarātmanā tasminn eva deśe niyamānandābhidho bhagavadīyām sanātanīm kalau naṣṭām vedāntasantatiṃ pravarttayiṣyan śārīrakamīmāṃsāvakyārtharūpavedāntapārijātasaurabhākhyādigrantharacanavyājena sarvavedāntārtham saṅgrahēṇa saṁdarbhayāmāsa || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

By the command of Śrī Puruṣottama, Bhagavān Sudarśana incarnated upon the earth in order to rescue the beginningless tradition of Vedānta, which though is eternal, was destroyed by *kaliyuga*...⁵⁶

Sundarabhaṭṭa, his immediate disciple, concurs with this statement. After this period, there is silence from the tradition until Keśavakāśmīribhaṭṭācārya (also known as Keśava Kāśmīrin, supposedly 33rd successor of Nimbārka, who flourished in perhaps the middle of the 15th century; see section 7.2). He refers to dating provided in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* which he names as the authoritative source of his information:

Due to the statement of Śrī Vyāsa in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, in which Śrī Nimbārka is omniscient in as much as he is addressed as ‘Bhagavat’, and thus is the most ancient of all the [other Vedānta-]ācāryas...⁵⁷

Keśava and the later authors of this tradition utilised the statement of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* as an authoritative basis for their assumptions. It reads:

At the end of *dvāpara yuga*, Sudarśana will take birth, as commanded by Kṛṣṇa. Known as Nimbāditya, he will remove *dharma*’s lassitude.⁵⁸

The end of *dvāparayuga* is traditionally held to be 3102BCE, when *kaliyuga* commenced with the Mahābhārata war (Flood 1996:112). This dating of Nimbārka is refuted simply by the fact that the teacher composed a commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa, entitled the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*. The earliest

⁵⁶ ...śrīpuruṣottamājñāyā ’nādivedāntasantatīm sanātanīm api kalau naṣṭām uddhartuṃ avanītalāvātīrṇo bhagavān sudarśana... || *Siddhāntajāhnavī* on *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.1

⁵⁷ ...bhaviṣyapurāṇe śrīvyāsavacanāc chrīnimbārkācāryasyaiva bhagavac-chabdābhīhitatvena sarvajñatvāt sarvebhyaḥ prācīnācāryāc ca... || *Bhagavadgītā Tattvaparakāśikā* introduction, ch. 1.

⁵⁸ sudarśano dvāparānte kṛṣṇājñāpto janiṣyati | nimbāditya iti khyāto dharmaglānir hariṣyati || *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, Pratisargaparvan 7.67.

layer of the *Brahmasūtra* is dated to sometime before the common era, however, as Nimbārka has commented on the extant version which dates from the 5th century CE (Nakamura 1983: 436), he must have been posterior. The sources state that he was born when Vedānta had become degraded, specifically in the lands of Tailāṅga.⁵⁹ Yet later authors of this tradition, perhaps experiencing competition from Rāmānuja, Madhva and newer traditions, sought to extend his antiquity back to the beginning of *kaliyuga* itself, thus giving him an unquestionable, almost primordial stance amongst Vedāntins in this epoch.

It seems that the early *ācāryas* were a little more correct than the later ones, but their statements are too ambiguous to be conclusive. There is a positive outcome: they counter the view of the later *ācāryas* and the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* itself. A survey of scholarly opinions on this subject will prove of value to this discussion.

3.1.2 Previous Scholarship on Nimbārka's Chronology

There were a select few scholars who noticed Nimbārka perfunctorily at the beginning of their various surveys, namely, Wilson (1861:18, 77-78), Growse (1883:192, 194-196) and Grierson (1889:28). After these scholars came those who were focussed on Vedānta. Thibaut (1890 and 1896) subjected the *Brahmasūtra* commentary of Śaṅkara to a critical study. In introducing the work, he discusses the fourteen commentaries noticed by Fitz-Edward Hall in his bibliographic index (Thibaut 1890:xvi), stating:

⁵⁹ *Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā*, introduction; *Siddhāntajāhnavī*, introduction.

It would hardly be practical--and certainly not feasible in this place--to submit all the existing bhāshyas to a critical enquiry at once. All we can do here is to single out one or a few of the more important ones, and to compare their interpretations with those given by *Sankara*, and with the text of the *Sūtras* themselves.

Judging by the fact that his next and final critical study of a *Brahmasūtra* commentary was that of Rāmānuja (Thibaut 1904), it can be assumed that at this nascent stage of Vedānta investigations these two traditions caught the attention of the early scholars, whether intellectually or due to the preponderance of their followers. At the very end of the 19th century, Monier-Williams (1899:551) mentioned Nimbārka as a founder of a tradition in his Sanskrit-English dictionary, without providing further details.

After the beginning of the 20th century, scholars such as William Crooke, Alfred S. Geden, and George Abraham Grierson who wrote in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (1908-25) had differing opinions. Crooke (1908:337), in his entry on ‘*bairāgī*’, places Nimbārka squarely after Rāmānuja:

In the United Provinces there are four sections, of which the two most important are the Rāmānuja, or Śrī Vaiṣṇava and the Nīmāvat or Nimbārak. The former, the most ancient and respectable of the reformed Vaiṣṇava communities...’

This is in accordance with Growse (1883:193), whose statement, though not quoted, appears verbatim here. Growse himself does not cite a reason for this as his dating of Rāmānuja followed what is reported by the members of the Rāmānuja tradition he encountered. Regarding the Nimbārka, he emphasises simply that they are interested in events more than their historicity, concluding:

It is to convictions of this kind that must be attributed the utter indifference of the Hindu to chronological accuracy and historical research. The annals of Hindustan date only from its conquest by Muhammadans- a people whose faith is based on the misconception of a fact, as the Hindus' is on the corrupt embodiment of a conception. Thus the literature of the former deals exclusively with events, of the latter with ideas (Growse 1883:196).

The purpose of quoting this statement is to show that Growse seems to be aggravated at Indian chronological irreverence. He had an estimate for the date of Rāmānuja and later for Madhva, but no such date for Nimbārka. Still he chose to include Nimbārka before Madhva and after Rāmānuja. It can be inferred that Growse may have been aware that the tradition was old, but due to not having even an estimated date from his informants, it could not be verified exactly how old. Given that the erudite Thibaut (1890:xviii) placed *all* Vaiṣṇava Vedāntins after Śaṅkara, and stated that Rāmānuja is the first amongst them, though not having had access to primary sources of the Nimbārka tradition, it would be ludicrous for a magistrate and collector such as Growse to entertain anything to the contrary. Crooke (1914:703-705), six years after his first entry, does not even mention Nimbārka amongst the Vaiṣṇavas in his entry titled 'Hinduism', which includes Kabīra, and he displays predictable distaste for Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, plus a grudging admiration of the 'monotheist' Rāmānuja and his followers.

Grierson (1908: 544), in his entry entitled '*bhaktimārga*' in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics remarks under the sub-heading 'the Four Churches of the Reformation':

The Sanakādi Sampradāya, founded by Nimbārka or Nimbāditya, is certainly the oldest of the Bhāgavata churches.

He contradicts Thibaut, Growse and Cooke on the basis of ‘new’ evidence that *dvaitādvaita* philosophy was mentioned in the *Prabodhacandrodaya* of Kṛṣṇamiśra which he dates to the 11th century (Grierson 1908:545fn). The text does not hint at anything remotely similar to Rāmānuja’s theology but Kṛṣṇamiśra does not name Nimbārka outright, and as represented in the recent translation by Kapstein (2009:xxxv), the overall philosophical underpinning of the play is *advaita*. The statement of Grierson then seems an erroneous conclusion based on this solitary mention of *dvaitādvaita*. If this was the case, then Śāṅkara’s own arguments against *dvaitādvaita* would have been taken into account in the first place. Still, the statement of Grierson itself is of interest. In the *Prabodhacandrodaya*’s description of the various types of religious comen in Vārāṇasi, berating all types of sects operating in that area, Ego (or in Kapstein’s translation ‘Egoismo’) is made to say:

These guys who make their living with this gimmick of a trident have broken with dualist and non-dualist paths (Kapstein 2009:51).

In his notes, Kapstein states that this may be an interpolation. In any case, this quotation is more interesting than it appears in the above translation, as the focus of Kapstein’s translation is on the drama. An emended translation of the passage in question bringing out the full force of the theological references would read:

These men who make their living teaching about the ‘triple staff’ (*tridaṇḍa*) have definitely fallen off the path of dualism-and-non-dualism (*dvaitādvaita*).⁶⁰

⁶⁰ *ete tridaṇḍavyapadeśajīvino dvaitādvaitamārgaparibhraṣṭā eva*|| *Prabodhacandrodaya* 2.14

The *Prabodhacandrodaya* dates from the time when Kṛṣṇamiśra was a counselor to Gopāla, a lord and relative of Kīrtivarman, in the years after 1060CE (Kapstein 2009:xxxii), and so the author was a contemporary of Rāmānuja. Even though the *tridaṇḍa* is mentioned as far back as the *Mahābhārata*⁶¹ and the Upaniṣads (Olivelle 1992:106), it is here being associated by Kṛṣṇamiśra with *dvaitādvaita*. Whether it is the *tridaṇḍa* of Rāmānuja, his predecessors Yāmuna or Yādava Prakāśa (as *viśiṣṭādvaita* is a kind of *dvaitādvaita*), Nimbārka, or other schools is debatable. The mention of it here is nonetheless noteworthy. Contrary to what Grierson has suggested, it seems as if the evidence he cited to substantiate the claim that the Nimbārka ‘church’ was the oldest is uncertain at the least and more likely unfounded.

It was during this time that Bhandarkar published ‘Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Other Minor Religious Sects’ in 1913. The methodology adopted by Bhandarkar to propose a dating for Nimbārka came from two *guruparamparā* lists he came across: one regarding Madhva’s lineage and the other regarding Nimbārka. As the Mādhva teachers’ list had a defined chronology, Bhandarkar worked out an average based on the date of death of Madhva (1276), and that of his 33rd successor who died 1879. The 603-year span of time saw 33 successors, which provides an average *ācāryaship* of 18.27 years per *ācārya*. Comparing this with the list of Nimbārka’s *paramparā* in his possession, in which the 33rd *ācārya* was reputed to have died in 1765, and subtracting 603 years, Bhandarkar found 1162 to be the

⁶¹ Such as *Mahābhārata* 12.308.8, 12.308.37, 3.262.16

probable date of death of Nimbārka (Bhandarkar 1913:62-63). The fundamental flaw in this reasoning is commented upon by Bhandarkar (1913:63, fn.) himself:

This calculation of ours is of course very rough and, besides, the date of manuscript No. 706 which is read as 1913 by some, but which looks like 1813, conflicts with this calculation, as nine more Ācāryas flourished after Dāmodara.

The accuracy of the calculation is further called into question when applied to current *paramparā* lists. The average span of *ācāryaship* according to the above is roughly 18 years. The *paramparā* list of the Goloka Dhāma Āśrama in New Delhi places its previous pontiff as 47th after Nimbārka, who died in 2005 (Goloka Dhāma Āśrama 2009:234-235). This would give the year of death of Nimbārka as 1146, which is quite close to Bhandarkar's date.⁶² However, the *paramparā* list of the Ṭaṭṭiyā Sthāna Āśrama held by the followers in the sub-lineage of Svāmī Haridāsa (Śaraṇa 1972:126) places its previous pontiff as 70th after Nimbārka and as having died in 1942. Applying Bhandarkar's calculation of the average to this list, the date of death of Nimbārka would be 663CE which is in fact closer to the estimate of scholars such as Satyanand (1997) and Aggrawal (2004) who dated him independent of Bhandarkar's methodology.⁶³ What this serves to support is that *paramparā* lists are not an accurate basis upon which such salient dates can be established.

With his dating of 1162 supporting what had already become, effectively, the standard theory that Rāmānuja was the first of the Vaiṣṇava *Brahmasūtra* commentators, Bhandarkar (1913:65) inevitably comments upon Nimbārka's

⁶² $18.27 \times 47 = 858.81$ years total; 2005CE-858.81 years = 1146CE

⁶³ $18.27 \times 70 = 1278.9$ years total, 1942CE-1279 years = 663CE

indebtedness to Rāmānuja, especially in respect to the doctrines set out in Nimbārka's *Prapannakalpavallī* and *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī*. Seeing that Bhandarkar's dating is in doubt, it could be equally possible that the opposite is true, namely that Rāmānuja borrowed from Nimbārka. In all likelihood, however, they both borrowed from common sources which contained existing and well-established Bhāgavata/Pāñcarātra doctrines. Yet Bhandarkar's conclusion was not to be questioned for a few decades more.

Geden (1917:373-374) in his article in volume nine of the Encyclopedia of Religions and Ethics on 'Nimāvats', assigned a 12th century date to Nimbārka, having erroneously equated him with Bhāskara. His source was Bhandarkar. He states that:

His [Nimbārka's] teaching was based on that of Rāmānuja, from whom he was not far removed in time'.

Ghate in 1918 performed the greater task of engaging with all five of the main commentaries of the *Brahmasūtra*. His work on these primary sources was focussed on comparing the systems of Vedānta as opposed to any chronological investigation. He states:

Ensuite vient Nimbārka, qui a probablement vécu quelques années après Rāmānuja. La date de sa mort paraît être 1162 après Jésus-Christ (Ghate 1918:xxvi).
[Then comes Nimbārka, who probably lived a few years after Rāmānuja. The date of his death appears to be 1162 AD]

To provide substantiation for this dating, Ghate references Bhandarkar. Radhakrishnan (1927) produced a five-page entry on Nimbārka, in which he

adopted Bhandarkar's dating, even though he had access to more source material (Radhakrishnan 1927:751). Other scholars similarly followed Bhandarkar, placing Rāmānuja ahead of Nimbārka (Clémentin-Ojha 2011:429).

In 1943 Bose's three-volume translation and thorough study on Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa's *Brahmasūtra* commentaries and the Nimbārka Sampradāya was published. Yet, due to unfortunate methodology, her dating of Nimbārka ranks as being the farthest from actuality. She dates Nimbārka to a post-Madhva period on the basis of two theories. Accepting the *Saviśeṣanirviśeṣakṛṣṇastavarāja* as a work of Nimbārka, and not as of a Nimbārka-cārya (a later title for all leaders of the tradition), she states that while the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* lacks any polemics regarding other Vedāntic *ācāryas*, in the *Saviśeṣanirviśeṣakṛṣṇastavarāja*:

There are references to Nirguṇa-vāda...Dṛṣṭi-Śrṣṭi-vāda and the doctrine that Brahman is the āśraya-viśaya of ajñāna...hence when Nimbārka refers to these doctrines he cannot but refer to Śaṅkara and his school (Bose 1943 vol. 3:15).

Interestingly, she notes that the *Saviśeṣanirviśeṣakṛṣṇastavarāja* marks a departure from Nimbārka's other works in terms of its style and content (Bose 1943 vol. 3:11). Śaraṇa (1972:82) and others such as Satyanand (1997:45-46) having performed a philological analysis of the work conclude that the hymn is of Vilāsācārya, the fourth successor of Nimbārka.

The other theory referred to by Bose (1943 vol. 3:16-17) is that Nimbārka is the author of the *Madhvamukhamardana*, which is an assault on Madhva's *dvaita* philosophy, entailing that Nimbārka would have necessarily lived after Madhva. The

Madhvamukhamardana to date has not been located by any scholar (Satyanand 1997:48), and was in fact only ever noticed in the *Catalogus Catalogorum* of Aufrecht (Bose 1943 vol. 3:12). Satyanand (1997:48) points out that the *Madhvamukhamardana* could refer to the other famous Madhva, an author of the Sāṅkhya school, who is known to have flourished in the 6th century. Rather, it is highly likely that it was wrongly ascribed. Many works of the tradition have been attributed to the wrong authors, such as the *Vedāntasiddhāntapradīpa* which was attributed to Nimbārka in R. L. Mitra's *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, No. 2826, but is in fact a work of the *advaita* tradition of Śaṅkara (Bose 1943 vol. 3:13). Satyanand (1997:46) posits that the work in question might actually be the *Madhvatantramukhamardana* of Appayya Dīkṣita. Until the *Madhvamukhamardana* is actually examined, all discussions based on it are speculative and hypothetical.

The only plausible theory that Bose (1943 vol. 3:68) posits is that Śrīnivāsa, Nimbārka's immediate successor, must be posterior to Śaṅkara due to his criticism of *pratibimba-vāda*, which was championed by Śaṅkara. However, this criticism is not focussed on Śrīnivāsa's commentary on Nimbārka's *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, the *Vedāntakaustubha*; but on another work, the *Vedāntakārikāvali*, which Bose notices in a catalogue of the British Museum (Barnett 1928:1003). Indeed this text contains criticisms of Śaṅkara and also a few departures from the exact teachings of Nimbārka (Bose 1943 vol.3:68). However, in reality, the *Vedāntakārikāvali* of 60 verses was composed by Puruṣottama Prasāda Vaiṣṇava II, a 17th century intellectual of the Nimbārka tradition, and is accompanied by an auto-commentary

called the *Adhyātmāsudhātaraṅgiṇī* (Upādhyāya 2004:14). Indeed the *maṅgala* verse of the auto-commentary shows that the author's preceptor was 'Dharmadeva' (Dharmadāsa Devācārya), of Svabhūrāma's lineage.⁶⁴ On the basis of the *maṅgala* verse of the *Vedāntakārikāvali*, Barnett (1928:1003) reports that the author of the work was Śrīnivāsa, the disciple of Nimbārka. Actually, the verse states that the author is composing the commentary 'with the sole desire of the grace of Śrīnivāsa (both Kṛṣṇa and Śrīnivāsa)',⁶⁵ to whom most commentators of this tradition offer their *maṅgalas*.⁶⁶ As a demonstration of how conflated these ascriptions can be, the Descriptive Catalogue of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Sharma 1939:48), has the author of the *Vedāntakārikāvali* as Niyamānanda (an epithet of Nimbārka). Most curiously, when describing the works of Puruṣottama Prasāda Vaiṣṇava II, Bose (1943 vol. 3:174-175) states that the *Adhyātmāsudhātaraṅgiṇī* is a commentary on Śrīnivāsa's *Laghustavarājastotram* which clearly is not the case, as a commentary with that name on the *Laghustavarājastotram* does not exist. The only extant commentary on that work is the *Gurubhaktimandākinī*, which Puruṣottama Prasāda Vaiṣṇava II did write (Mālavīya 1989:5). If, like Satyanand (1997:119-148), Bose had undertaken to examine the *Vedāntakārikāvali* against the *Brahmasūtra* commentary of Śaṅkara, she would have been able to conclude that its author was posterior to him, and its author Puruṣottama Prasāda Vaiṣṇava II definitely was. Whether Śrīnivāsa was later than Śaṅkara will be examined below. Suffice to say that even if Śrīnivāsa was post-Śaṅkara, this does not imply the same for Nimbārka; such a claim would need independent verification, as an assertion of

⁶⁴ *śrīdharmadevapādabjaṃ svabhūvamśābdhisambhavam* || *Adhyātmāsudhātaraṅgiṇī* 1.1

⁶⁵ *śrīśrīnivāsanugrahaikakāmena mayā kṛiyate* || *Vedāntakārikāvali* 1.1

⁶⁶ see for example the *maṅgala* of the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*.

being a disciple and actually having interactions with the supposed preceptor do not always go hand in hand.

Taking all of these factors into account, it can be stated that Bose's chronological assumption for Nimbārka is based on faulty grounds. Most of the literature available on Nimbārka's chronology can be traced back to two sources, Bhandarkar and Bose. Those who consider Nimbārka to be at least contemporary or post Rāmānuja such as Brockington (1996:151), Radhakrishnan (1927:751), and Clémentin-Ojha (1990:327) follow Bhandarkar (1913:62-63); while those who consider him to be post-Madhva such as Colas (2003:253), Khurana (1990:3) and Dasgupta (1940:400-401) follow Bose (1943 vol. 3:17).

Dasgupta (1940:400) bases his post-Madhva dating on the fact that Nimbārka is not mentioned in the doxography of the 14th century author Mādhava Vidyāraṇya (Mādhavācārya) entitled the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. Mādhava Vidyāraṇya was also the Śāṅkarācārya of the Śṛṅgeri Pīṭha after serving as a minister in the Vijayanagara Empire. The text displays the expected bias associated with a school that sought to exert its perceived dominance, and accordingly all other traditions are relegated to a secondary status. Rāmānuja and Madhva are not even included in the Vedānta category, but are grouped subsequent to the Pāśupatas and Śaivas and preceding the heterodox schools, suggesting the low esteem they held in the eyes of the author (Nicholson 2010:159-160). As Nicholson (2010:161) has convincingly argued, *bhedābheda* was effectively 'written out of the history of Indian philosophy' by Mādhava Vidyāraṇya's *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, where none

of the *bhedābhedins* are included, whether Bhartṛprapañca, Nimbārka, Bhāskara or Yādavaprakāśa. It would be unwise to conclude that simply because these intellectuals were not mentioned in this doxography they were necessarily posterior to it, since it is well known that all of these teachers existed before Mādhava Vidyāraṇya. The various *terminus a quo* suggested by Bhandarkar, Bose and Dasgupta for Nimbārka then all need to be finally discarded in favour of a more precise chronology.

3.2 Towards a Conclusive Chronology

Whilst the reasoning behind the post-Rāmānuja dating of Nimbārka has been demonstrated to be deficient on the grounds of weak methodology, the reasoning employed by those scholars who support a pre-Śāṅkara dating for Nimbārka requires similar analysis.

Firstly, in deciding which sources were indeed written by Nimbārka, the style of the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, which is attributed to Nimbārka by all of the early and later authors in his tradition, needs to be borne in mind. The two scholars who have investigated the text in depth have highlighted a unique feature of the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*. Bose (1943 vol. 3: 8) states, ‘it contains no attempt at refuting rival schools of thought’, and according to Satyanand (1997:25),

The [Vedāntapārijāta-]Saurabha is generally free from sectarian animosities and polemical details...without any attempt at refuting or maligning any other school of Vedānta philosophy.

Whilst the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* lacks any criticisms of theories propounded by Śaṅkara and later Vedāntins, it does deal with theories and schools that to the author are heterodox to the values of the *Brahmasūtra*.

In establishing Śaṅkara's chronology, Nakamura employed a reliable methodology which has been summarised by Malkovsky (2001:2):

It is possible to roughly estimate when Śaṅkara lived on the basis of the chronological relationship to him of other thinkers whose dates are better established than his own.

To begin the discussion of Nimbārka's dating, I will first summarise the development of the philosophical school he propounded, which may also provide insight into this early period. This will then facilitate a sound comparison of Nimbārka with his proposed contemporaries with a view to finally establishing his chronology.

3.2.1 Schools of Vedānta before the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*

The *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* supports the *bhedābheda* school of Vedānta, which advocates the view of a relationship of simultaneous unity and diversity between Brahman, the individual soul (*jīva*) and the universe (*jagat*). However, Nimbārka is not the first proponent of this school of philosophy. The *Brahmasūtra*, traditionally attributed to Bādarāyaṇa, reached its present form somewhere between 400 and 450CE (Nakamura 1983:436).⁶⁷ Nakamura's extensive work on early Vedānta,

⁶⁷ Nicholson reports a date of between 400-450BCE apparently quoting the same source (Nicholson 2010:26).

with ‘early’ delineated as the time subsequent to the Upaniṣads until Śaṅkara (Nakamura 1983:9), concludes:

We see that the Brahmasūtras took the standpoint of what was called Bhedābheda by later thinkers (Nakamura 1983:500).

The school subjected to most criticism was the Sāṅkhya tradition, with objections also being voiced against the Vaiśeṣika, Buddhist, Jain, Pāśupata and Bhāgavata traditions (Nicholson 2010:26). What Nicholson suspects is criticism levelled against the Bhāgavata school was actually aimed at the doctrines of Pāñcarātra. However, this is only the case if one was interpreting the *Brahmasūtra* in light of Śaṅkara’s commentary, where his explanation of the *sūtra*⁶⁸ in question would support such a conclusion. Nimbārka interprets this particular *sūtra* as criticizing the Śāktas, so the subject of those *sūtras* will remain undecided until it is established whether Nimbārka is before or after Śaṅkara. The *Brahmasūtra* then may represent an early, but not foundational, work of *bhedābheda*.

There are a few earlier or contemporary Vedāntins mentioned in the text of the extant redaction of the *Brahmasūtra*: Āśmarathya (1.2.30, 1.4.20), Auḍulomi (1.4.21, 3.4.45, 4.4.6), Kāśakṛtsna (1.4.21), Ātreya (3.4.44), Kārṣṇārjini (3.1), Jaimini, who is thought to be a contemporary Mīmāṃsaka opponent of Bādarāyaṇa (1.2.29, 1.2.32, 1.3.31, 1.4.18, 3.2.40, 3.4.2, 3.4.18, 3.4.40, 4.3.11, 4.4.5, 4.4.11), and Bādari (1.2.31, 3.1.11, 4.3.6, 4.4.10). Āśmarathya, Auḍulomi and Kāśakṛtsna can be identified as proponents of *bhedābheda* from the context of the inclusion of their views in the *Brahmasūtra* according to the reading of Nimbārka; however

⁶⁸ *Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya* 2.2.39, 2.2.42 in Nimbārka’s commentary

their versions of *bhedābheda* display subtle differences (Śāstrin 1972:20-23). Auḍulomi accepts *bhedābheda* (1.4.21), but it is different from Nimbārka's interpretation, as Auḍulomi holds that *bheda* persists until liberation, where there is *abheda* (Nakamura 2004: 182); but Nimbārka states that *bhedābheda* exists in all states of existence. Āśmarathya's *bhedābheda* (as evident in 1.2.30) propounds a cause and effect relationship between Brahman and the individual soul (*kāryakāraṇabhāva*) which Nimbārka accepts. Kāśakṛtsna advocates (1.4.22) a relationship of the controller and the controlled for Brahman and the individual soul (*niyamyaniyanṭṛbhāva*) which again is also admitted by Nimbārka.

Already it is apparent that there existed enough argumentation within the *Brahmasūtra* itself for Nimbārka to formulate his own interpretation of *bhedābheda*. Indeed Vedāntins before Nimbārka took heed of this. According to Nakamura (2004:7), there were fourteen Vedāntins who appeared after the *Brahmasūtra* and prior to Śāṅkara, though they are only known through the works of Yāmuna, Rāmānuja and their later follower Śrīnivāsadāsa. I will now amplify Nakamura's assessment of post-*Brahmasūtra* early Vedāntins in order to identify the Vedāntic pedigree of Nimbārka and his contemporaries.

The first of these is the 5th century CE Bhartṛhari, the famed author of the *Vākyapadīya* and proponent of what some term *śabdādvaita*, a development of *sphoṭavāda*. Then follows the late 5th century 'Bhagavān' Upavarṣa, spoken of by Śāṅkara in the commentary to *Brahmasūtra* 1.3.28, as an opponent of the *sphoṭavādins*, and in 3.3.53, quoting his view on Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*'s

commentary by Śabarāsvāmin. Bhāskara also mentions him with the same honorific title as do many others, so it can be assumed that Upavarṣa was respected by most Vedāntins and Mīmāṃsakas perhaps simply as a defender of their stances given that he wrote commentaries on both of their *sūtras* as well as one on the *Śaṅkaraṣaṅga Kāṇḍa* of Jaimini (Nakamura 2004:32). Unfortunately the fragments of his work that are quoted by later commentators are not sufficient for a confirmation of his philosophy, beyond the conclusion that he was probably a Mīmāṃsaka with Vedāntic leanings, a proponent of *ātmavāda* and a discounter of *sphoṭavāda* (Nakamura 2004:29-31).

Bodhāyana follows next at the start of the 6th century, revered by Rāmānuja as the foundational inspiration upon which he composed his own work (Nakamura 2004:80). Nakamura's survey of the various references to Bodhāyana found throughout different commentaries permits a good understanding of his philosophical stance. Bodhāyana himself commented on the same three works as Upavarṣa, but Śaṅkara is in opposition to him. For example most Vedāntins concede a necessity to first study the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā* before approaching Vedānta, whereas Śaṅkara dispenses with this notion (Bronkhorst 2007:7-9). There was also no conception of a higher and lower Brahman like that of Śaṅkara's doctrine. Bodhāyana also equates Parabrahman with Parameśvara, admits it is the source of all beings (but does not claim as Rāmānuja does that these beings reside in the body of Parabrahman), and was also a proponent of *pariṇāmavāda* (Nakamura 2004:82). A marked contrast to the usual Vedāntic stance is his view on the individual soul, which is more aligned to Sāṅkhya theory than that of the

Brahmasūtra (Nakamura 2004:84-85), but when dealing with the *sādhanas* and *mokṣa*, he again conforms to the Vedānta (Nakamura 2004:85). It is relevant to the present topic that Bodhāyana, although cited as the inspiration behind Rāmānuja's commentary, had divergent views on certain doctrines that were reworked or expanded upon by Rāmānuja later. Śaṅkara also based his teachings on the work of his predecessors, but in contrast, Rāmānuja did not follow as a direct inheritor of Bodhāyana. So in formulating a new teaching, it was not a necessity to be directly linked through initiation to those teachers who provided the root from which a new version of the philosophy was grown.

Ṭaṅka Brahmānandin Ātreya, the composer of the *Vākya* commentary on the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* and thus known as the Vākyakāra, finds his philosophy mentioned by Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Rāmānuja who quote his *sūtra*-like conclusions where needed (Nakamura 2004:87-98). This Vedāntin is estimated to have flourished during the middle of the 6th century, after Bodhāyana but definitely before Dramiḍa, who composed a commentary on Ṭaṅka's Vākya commentary. Interestingly, his work has been used as a support by both the *advaitins* and *viśiṣṭādvaitins*, but it is evident according to Nakamura (2004:102), that his views were not identical to those of Bodhāyana.

Subsequent chronologically to Ṭaṅka, as suggested by Nakamura (2004:119), is Dramiḍa who is also a 6th century Vedāntin. Both Śaṅkara's and Rāmānuja's traditions regard him as authoritative, but Dramiḍa seems further from Śaṅkara and closer to those who thought of Brahman as a personal deity, who bestows

liberation upon those who pray for his grace (Nakamura 2004:120-123). His musings on the individual soul's position during liberation (Nakamura 2004:124) lie closer to Nimbārka than they do to Rāmānuja. Śrīvatsāṅkamiśra is thought to be a contemporary of Dramiḍa and is revered by Rāmānuja's followers, but nothing further can be said about his philosophical views (Nakamura 2004:174).

Breaking with Nakamura's ordering to retain a chronologically based sequence, the next two teachers referred to are the Mīmāṃsakas Śabarasvāmin who also lived at around the same time, and Bhartṛmitra, another Mīmāṃsaka who was rejected as heterodox by Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (Nakamura 2004:153). Both of these teachers were well aware of Vedāntic doctrine but focussed on Pūrvamīmāṃsā, and so do not require further attention. Also in the latter half of the 6th century comes Sundarapāṇḍya, who advocates a more *advaita* interpretation of the *Brahmasūtra* and perhaps represents a minor, early school of *advaita* (Nakamura 2004:180), or could have been influenced by Buddhist doctrine. Instead of going into his views, focus will be centered on a very important pre-Nimbārka *bhedābhedin*.

Bhartṛprapañca is perhaps the most relevant Vedāntin to appear prior to Nimbārka, as their philosophies tally on a great many doctrinal matters. His exact stance is only known through the *Bṛhadāraṇyakahāṣya* of Śaṅkara, its *Vārttikā* by Śaṅkara's direct disciple Sureśvara (formerly Maṇḍanamiśra) and the *ṭīkā*s by the later Ānandagiri (Nakamura 2004:128). Importantly, Śaṅkara refers to these views as belonging to 'some persons' (*kecit*), whereas Sureśvara and Ānandagiri point out that the person in question is Bhartṛprapañca. Wherever they do name him,

they also add honorifics, hinting at his perhaps equal importance to Śaṅkara (Nakamura 2004:129-130). From them, it is known that Bhartṛprapañca produced commentaries on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Kāṭhaka* and *Īśa Upaniṣads* and probably lived in the middle of the sixth century CE (Nakamura 2004:131).

Bhartṛprapañca accepts that *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna* and *śruti* are valid *pramāṇas*, that Brahman's essence is both dual and non-dual (*dvaitādvaitātma*), and that the universe and the individual soul are real and have a similar relationship of being dual and non-dual in their essences with Brahman. He goes on to accept a cause-effect (*kāryakāraṇa*) relationship of Brahman with the individual soul and the universe. Somewhat different to Nimbārka's view expressed in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* that Brahman is a singular entity, is Bhartṛprapañca's position that there are three strata within Brahman, the lowest of which is further divided into eight states, all relating to the various transformations (*pariṇāmas*) of Brahman. He proposes also that liberation is to be attained by performance of meditation and, equally importantly, of *karmans*, not advocating one or the other separately. Repetition of *mantras* and reflection on the Brāhmaṇa portion of the Vedas are also expedients (*sahakārin*) according to Bhartṛprapañca. He also seems to have been a supporter of the view that householders in the *grhastha āśrama* can attain liberation (which can only occur after death), markedly different from Nimbārka, Śaṅkara and others who propose that *brahmacarya* is essential for

liberation (which can occur during one's lifetime - *jīvanmukti*). Nakamura (2004:152) says of Bhartṛprapañca's soteriology:

According to Bhartṛprapañca, through observing the religious rites and practising meditation, people after death enter the intermediate state which is the world of *Hiranyagarbha*. After passing through the process of union with *Hiranyagarbha*, they are then re-united with the Highest *Brahman*.

Govindaśaraṇa Śāstrin (1972:34-35) produced a comparison of the philosophy of Bhartṛprapañca and Nimbārka, which is reproduced below in translation from the Hindī original as a lucid summary of the major doctrinal viewpoints of both authors:

Bhartṛprapañca

1. *svābhāvika-dvaitādvaita*
2. The totality of the *śrutis* propounding difference and non-difference are equally authoritative
3. Difference and non-difference are both real and exist in all states of existence
4. Brahman is the singular efficient and material cause of the universe. The example of a sea-creature (*makara*) is given.⁶⁹
5. The individual soul is an agent, enjoyer, knower and plural.
6. The individual soul is not created, and beginningless, is a portion of Brahman as a type of energy, immutable, and a transformation of Brahman.
7. In essence the universe is real and eternal, but in its gross form is transformable and destructible.
8. Liberation is attaining a similar state as Brahman

Nimbārka

1. *svābhāvika-dvaitādvaita*
2. The totality of the *śrutis* propounding difference and non-difference are equally authoritative
3. Difference and non-difference are both real and exist in all states of existence
4. Brahman is the singular efficient and material cause of the universe. The example of a spider and its web is given.
5. The individual soul is an agent, enjoyer, possessed of knowership (*jñātrtvavat*), plural, and infinite in number.
6. The individual soul is eternal, a portion and transformation of Brahman, and immutable.
7. The universe is also real and beginningless.
8. Liberation is attaining a similar state as Brahman

⁶⁹ See Sureśvara's *Bṛhadāraṇyakavārttika* 5.1.77

9. Attaining Brahman in this life causes the destruction of accumulated and current actions but those of the current birth still remain. This is why the body remains, but the person is seemingly free from attachments to *samsāra*. This state is called 'the state of the wise one'. The actions for this birth still affect the person but the 'wise one' remains as if he were liberated in this life through it all. Supreme liberation, or attaining the state of Brahman occurs at the end of his life.

10. Brahman is the enjoyer, the substance to be enjoyed and the controller. (Brahman, *jīva* and *jagat*)

11. Due to their mutual interdependence, difference and non-difference in a singular substratum can exist without any contradiction.

9. Attaining Brahman in this life is called inferior liberation, which conforms to *jīvanmuktī* (liberation in this life). Another term for this is emancipation (*apavarga*). In reality it is caused by detachment from the material world. Because of not leaving the body, the individual soul cannot be absorbed into Brahman; however when the soul does eventually leave the body it enters a second type of liberation – supreme liberation, which is called attaining a similar nature as Brahman (*brahmabhāvāpatti*).

10. Brahman transforms into three main states: The Supreme-Soul-state, the state of the individual soul, and the state of form and formlessness (the *jagat*), termed '*rāśi*'.⁷⁰

11. Due to being the pervader and pervadable, the foundation and its dependent, having its state and actions dependent on it, mutual interdependence and other causes, difference and non-difference exists in in a singular substratum without any contradiction.

⁷⁰ There are eight further states of Brahman, but Nakamura (2004:145) is unsure of where they fit in.

As is apparent, there is striking similarity between the theological doctrines of Nimbārka and Bhartṛprapañca apart from a few minor differences of the terms utilised. When Bhartṛprapañca's doctrines are contrasted with those of Nimbārka, it appears as if Bhartṛprapañca's views were available to the latter Vedāntin; but like Śaṅkara, Nimbārka and even Śrīnivāsa do not name him specifically. Perhaps Bhartṛprapañca was one of the many teachers of the *bhedābheda* philosophy whose views, in addition to the views of other *bhedābhedins*, were available to Nimbārka from which he then developed his own theories.

However these two teachers were representatives of two different schools of theology as their religious leanings are discernibly different (as will be explained in section 3.3), assuming that Bhartṛprapañca is being faithfully reported without any added *advaita* bias by the available sources. As noticed above in regards to Bodhāyana and Rāmānuja, perhaps Nimbārka found similar philosophical foundation in the work of Bhartṛprapañca. Also, and more probable, the teachings expounded by the *bhedābheda* movement were accessible to all students of Vedānta before Śaṅkara, as that was the major theory of the *Brahmasūtra* (Nakamura 1983:500). As to Bhartṛprapañca's location and circumstances, absolutely nothing is known. Bhartṛprapañca's differences from Nimbārka perhaps would make it too difficult for the latter to borrow completely from the former, especially with regards to the views of both Vedāntins on Brahman. It can therefore be stated with a degree of certainty that Nimbārka was not an initiate of Bhartṛprapañca's tradition.

Brahmadatta in the 7th century CE is associated with a developed *advaita* perspective and he is accordingly labelled heterodox in the view of Yāmuna. Followers of Śāṅkara, concluding that he did not conform to *advaita* theory, also criticised him. Nakamura (2004:183) concludes that:

Since he was criticised by both the Advaita school and the Rāmānuja school, he had a distinctive philosophy which differed from that of these two schools. On this point he should be considered as an important thinker.

Śāstrin (1972:36) picks up the trail of Brahmadatta in accordance with the sources that mention him: Sureśvara's *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣyavārttika* and *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, Vedāntadeśika's *Sarvārthasiddhi* on the *Tattvamuktākalāpa*, and the *Maṇimañjarī* of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya. The *Maṇimañjarī* mentions that a very elderly Brahmadatta met Śāṅkara. The *Sarvārthasiddhi* states that Brahmadatta propounded that as the individual soul and the universe are expanded from Brahman and at dissolution revert to their original form indivisible from Brahman, they are both non-eternal, a position which is contrary to that of the *Brahmasūtra* (Nakamura 2004: 182). This is related via Vedāntadeśika, and it is highly unlikely that Brahmadatta would have categorised the individual soul as expressly non-eternal because its origin is the eternal Brahman, whom it then merges into at the end. As Sureśvara and Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya have not mentioned this view, it is likely that this categorisation is peculiar to Vedāntadeśika (Śāstrin 1972:37). Brahmadatta reputedly also propounded the theory that ritual observances are just as, or perhaps slightly more, important than knowledge. Nor did he have time for the theory of *jīvanmukti*, in line with most Vaiṣṇava commentators. Taking this into consideration, it seems that he is a

bhedābheda vādin, perhaps belonging to a school precursory to Bhāskara and possibly even Nimbārka (Śāstrin 1972:39).⁷¹

The motive for including this summary of Vedānta philosophers in the post-Brahmasūtra era was to demonstrate that *bhedābheda* was a well enough established idiom of *Brahmasūtra*-exegesis, if not the central philosophical viewpoint of the *Brahmasūtra* as claimed by Nakamura (1983:500). With thinkers such as Bhartṛprapañca, there are already strands within the wider *bhedābheda* philosophy that match Nimbārka. It seems that Nimbārka was then even at this early time, like Śaṅkara and later authors, able to capitalise on the work of previous teachers and incorporate his own views into this school of Vedānta.

3.2.2 Alternative Theories on Nimbārka's Chronology

Both Satyanand (1997) and Śāstrin (1972) sought to provide a sounder chronology through engaging in a comparative study of the *Brahmasūtra* commentaries of Nimbārka and possible contemporaries in order to establish their comparative chronological order, and then assign a dating to Nimbārka accordingly, assuming the date of at least one of the figures in the ordering is established. As Śāstrin is writing from within the tradition, it is important to be mindful of possible bias which may have influenced his views.

⁷¹ After him follow the famous predecessors of Śaṅkara, namely the 7th century CE Gauḍapāda and 7th-8th century CE Govinda (Nakamura 2004:7), who are well known enough not to warrant further discussion here.

Apart from Malkovsky (2001) and Shastri (2003), no other scholar has taken these works into account when dealing with the topic. Fr. Joseph Satyanand of the Indian Missionary Society carried out analytical research published towards the end of the last century, but it seems that his radical conclusions were ignored, perhaps because they would have necessitated reworking theories which had been in scholarly circulation for nearly a hundred years prior. Nonetheless, the methodology he employed is worthy of consideration. Malkovsky (2001:118), in his sub-chapter on Nimbārka, states:

In my view, Satyanand's theory is supported by the most compelling evidence for an accurate dating which has thus far been offered, and because this same theory is little known, it is necessary here to summarize some of Satyanand's arguments and attempt to determine how scholars could have erred by such a large margin in placing Nimbārka in the medieval period.

Satyanand's methodology relied on identifying actual works of Nimbārka from which a comparison with possible contemporaries could be instigated. According to Satyanand, some works traditionally ascribed to Nimbārka are to be rejected, namely the *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī*, *Prapannakalpavallī*, *Saviśeṣanirviśeṣakṛṣṇastavarāja*, *Madhvamukhamardana*, *Vedāntakāmadhenudaśaślokī* (*Daśaślokī*), *Rādhāṣṭakam*, *Kṛṣṇāṣṭakam* and the *Prātaḥsmaraṇastotram*. Satyanand (1997:46-48) argues as follows: that the *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* and the *Prapannakalpavallī* appear to borrow concepts from other authors; the *Madhvamukhamardana* is wrongly attributed and cannot be traced for investigation; and the *Saviśeṣanirviśeṣakṛṣṇastavarāja* is the work of a later author as it attacks other doctrines which are not included in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* but would have been countered had they existed at the

time of its composition. Satyanand (1997:47) also rejects the *Daśaślokī*, which he says attempts to defend *bhedābheda* from doctrinal attacks. Satyanand (1997:48) further contends that the *Rādhāṣṭakam*, *Kṛṣṇāṣṭakam*, *Prātaḥsmaraṇastotram* and the *Daśaślokī* must similarly be dismissed because they all mention Rādhā, as she was not included within theology before the 10th century.

To Satyanand and most other scholars, it seemed logical that any Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa worshipper would have flourished, at the earliest, during the early modern period.⁷² Satyanand (1997:30-31) thus sees Nimbārka's purported works which refer to Rādhā as spurious attributions from the tradition credited to the founder, who was instead a Bhāgavata Vaiṣṇava and thus a devotee of Vāsudeva, unlike the Nārāyaṇa-worshipper Rāmānuja, who was a Pāñcarātra Vaiṣṇava (Satyanand 1997:29). The assumption that Rādhā can only be traced to the early modern period has been dealt with in chapter 2 and therefore Satyanand's claim that these works were composed during that period can be stated to be erroneous.

Satyanand claims that the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* is the sole authentic work of Nimbārka based on the fact that it contains no sectarian controversies, is archaic in language and form, lacks any developed themes of *gurūpasatti* or *bhagavatprapatti* mentioned in the hymns and ritualistic documents mentioned, and does not contain reference to Rādhā (Malkovsky 2001: 118-121). That, coupled with the fact that Nimbārka seems to be aware of pre-*Kārikā* Sāṅkhya philosophy and Gupta-era Śāktism, as opposed to developed Śāktism which is clearly discernable in

⁷² I follow Richards (1997:197-198) in describing the period between c.1500-1750CE as *early modern*, as opposed to *medieval*, *late medieval* or *Mughal India*.

Madhva's works, suggests that Nimbārka can be dated to the 6th century CE (Satyanand 1997:161). Shastri's (2003:10) finding that Śaṅkara, Bhāskara, Rāmānuja and Madhva use Nimbārka's theories as *pūrvapakṣas* or seek to clarify views that he supports that they also agree with, seems to support this position.

Although Satyananda's methodology is definitely more rigorous than those previously described, a major difficulty lies in assuming that the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* is Nimbārka's only work due to its lack of sectarian controversy. However, in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* itself there are in fact clear references to what has been later termed *gurūpasatti*, surrendering to an *ācārya*, a general theme common to both Bhāgavata and Pāñcarātra Vaiṣṇava traditions (Leach 2012: 19 n.17, n.22, and Willis 2009:226-228):

Inquiry with it [Brahman] as the subject should be perpetually carried out by one who desires liberation, to whom the preceptor is the sole deity, who has whole-hearted devotion for the reverend preceptor.⁷³

This emphatic preliminary statement of Nimbārka is not paralleled by other authors from the Vaiṣṇava traditions in their introductory commentary to BS1.1.1. References to *gurūpasatti* are to be found throughout the authoritative texts, be they the *Bhagavadgītā*⁷⁴ or even the *Mahābhārata*⁷⁵, and even earlier in the

⁷³ *ācāryaikadevena śrīgurubhaktyaikahārddena mumukṣuṇā...tadviṣayikā jijñāsā satataṁ sampādanīyā|| Vedāntapārijātasaurabha 1.1.1*

⁷⁴ *tad viddhi praṇipātena paripraśnena sevayā | upadekṣyanti te jñānam jñāninas tattvadarśinaḥ || Bhagavadgītā 4.34*

⁷⁵ For example, Sanatsujāta on the importance of a Guru for *brahmavidyā*, see *Mahābhārata* 5.44

Upaniṣads, for example *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*⁷⁶ and most clearly in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*.⁷⁷ There is definitely no shortage of references to *prapatti* (surrendering to God) either; this is a major preoccupation of the theistic texts, summarised by *Bhagavadgītā* 18.66.⁷⁸ In the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, especially in commenting on *Brahmasūtra* 3.2.24⁷⁹ and 3.2.25⁸⁰, Nimbārka also touches upon these theories repeatedly even though he does not comment upon them at length (Bose 1943 vol. 3: 62). Nimbārka later elaborates on these themes in the *Prapannakalpavallī* and the *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī*, as this doctrine is specifically of concern to his disciples and not Vedāntins in general. Raman (2007:40) has remarked upon this phenomenon in her research on the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition:

This argument about Rāmānuja’s sectarianism or lack of it needs to be re-evaluated by going into issues of genre and audience. A comparison of, for instance, the Śrībhāṣya and the Gītābhāṣya can only be undertaken while keeping in mind that the former is a Vedāntic work which locates itself within the context of other pan-Indian philosophical systems. The text is not required to deal with issues relating to the practical life of the religious community or that of devotion to a personal deity, and a *prapatti* discussion requires exactly such a context.

These very same concerns need to be considered when addressing Nimbārka and his different works. Satyanand’s (1997:119-148) assessment suffers from another ill-founded theory, namely that Śrīnivāsa was posterior to Śaṅkara. Satyanand wrongly assumed that Śrīnivāsa was the author of the *Vedāntakārikāvalī*, and so it became necessary to distance Śrīnivāsa from Nimbārka in order to establish an

⁷⁶ *tad vijñānārtham sa gurum evābhigacchet samitpāṇiḥ śrotriyaṁ brahmaniṣṭham* || *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 1.2.12

⁷⁷ *yasya deve parābhaktiryathā deve tathā gurau | tasyaite kathitā hyarthāḥ prakāśante mahātmanah* || *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 6.23

⁷⁸ *sarvadharmān parityajya mām ekaṁ śaraṇam vraja | ahaṁ tvā sarvapāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucah* || *Bhagavadgītā* 18.66

⁷⁹ In *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.2.24 he quotes *Bhagavadgītā* 11.52 where Kṛṣṇa says to Arjuna that it is possible to know, see and enter into him through single-pointed devotion.

⁸⁰ *samrādhana lakṣaṇād upāyād brahmadarśanam bhavati* || *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.2.25

early date for the latter. As pointed out above (section 3.1.2), the *Vedāntakārikāvali* is not a work of Śrīnivāsa. His *Vedāntakaustubha* completely lacks reference to any of Śaṅkara's theories. In this manner, Śrīnivāsa should not be accused of being post-Śaṅkara solely on the basis of the *Vedāntakārikāvali*'s mistaken ascription.

There is another group of scholars who posit a pre-Śaṅkara dating, basing their assumptions on the conclusions of Śāstrin (1972) and Satyanand (1997) which were reiterated and expanded upon by Agrawal (2000). Whilst accepting the findings of Satyanand with regards to Nimbārka's role as a *pūrvapakṣin*, Agrawal still regards the *Mantrarahasyaśoḍaśī*, *Prapannakalpavallī*, *Daśaślokī*, *Rādhāṣṭakam*, *Kṛṣṇāṣṭakam* and *Prātaḥsmaraṇastotram* as his works. Agrawal (2000 vol. 1:xiv) simply clarifies that the doctrines of *gurūpasatti* and *bhagavatprapatti* existed in early Vaiṣṇava sources, and that both Nimbārka and Rāmānuja propounding them is not a satisfactory mark of differentiation through which one can establish a chronology, so the *Mantrarahasyaśoḍaśī* and *Prapannakalpavallī* controversy is settled: nothing precludes them from being considered works of Nimbārka.

In a way similar to the conclusions presented above, Agrawal (2000 vol 4. appendix 11:110) contends that as the founder of the doctrine that Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are Parabrahman, Nimbārka's mention of Rādhā in the *Daśaślokī*, *Rādhāṣṭakam*, *Kṛṣṇāṣṭakam* and *Prātaḥ Smaraṇastotram* should not be controversial. As to why Rādhā was then not mentioned in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, he answers along

the lines of Raman (2007:40) that the *raison d'être* of the commentary was to demonstrate that the *Brahmasūtra* was of a *dvaitādvaita* stance, and not to delineate the identity of the conjoined Brahman worshipped in his tradition, but rather Brahman as described in the Upaniṣads. The *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* is aimed therefore at an open audience, but the *Daśaślokī*, *Rādhāṣṭakam*, *Kṛṣṇāṣṭakam* and *Prātaḥsmaraṇastotram* were for the eyes of initiated members of the sect only. Okita (2014:10) indicates that this phenomenon is not unique to a specific tradition, but pervades most Hindu sects since the Veda itself insists that only those with the pre-requisite qualifications learn the scripture and participate in its rituals. He provides a detailed survey of the methods in which the Mādhva tradition maintains a distinction between what is accessible for outsiders and that which is only to be seen by insiders, or practitioners of the tradition who possess the required qualifications and are thus eligible (Okita 2014:11). The *Daśaślokī* mentions holy men (*sādhu*) as its intended audience, which one would assume would refer to his disciples, and Puruṣottama comments in detail on their qualifications in his *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, commentary to verse 10 of the *Daśaślokī* (Agrawal 2000 vol. 4 appendix 11:83-86). The term *sādhavaḥ* appears again in *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* verse 2, which its commentator Sundarabhaṭṭa explains with 'Vaiṣṇavas who follow the true *sampradāya*' (*satsampradāyānuvartinaḥ...vaiṣṇavaḥ*). Further clarification is given in reference to the soteriological means of knowledge of Brahman:

Due to its unsurpassed secrecy in as much as it is a unique method [to achieve] the uninterrupted betterment [of liberation], it should be concealed with great effort from those who do not possess the right qualifications.⁸¹

It is clear, therefore, that Nimbārka's authorship of the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, a text which is silent on sectarian matters, does not entail that he did not author these other works, as they were intended solely for the eligible members of his tradition.

The *Madhvamukhamardana*, according to Agrawal (2000 vol.1:x), is spuriously attributed to Nimbārka, and the *Saviśeṣanirviśeṣakṛṣṇastavarāja* was the work of a later Nimbārkācārya who either attributed it to Nimbārka to ensure its authoritative status, or attribution was simply confused retrospectively. Agrawal, Śāstrin and Joshi settle on the date of the 8th century based on other authors using Nimbārka as a *pūrvapakṣin* (Śāstrin 1972:47), or the fact that some of Nimbārka's unique theories were held valid and expanded upon by other authors (Śāstrin 1972:54).

3.3 The Date & Works of Nimbārka

I will now attempt to define a chronology for Nimbārka based on the methodologies of Śāstrin (1972), Satyanand (1997) and Agrawal (2000), but placing emphasis on an analytical treatment of the primary sources.

The main concern of a Vedāntin is to prove the validity of his interpretation of Vedānta by supplying substantiation for theories (*vāda*) and discrediting opposing

⁸¹ *ātyantikaśreyaso 'sādhāraṇopāyatvena niratiśayarahasyatvād anādhikāribhyo' dhikaprayatnena gopanīyā|| Mantrārtharahasya* commentary under verse 2 of the *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* (Dāsa 1937:191).

vādas by pointing out logical flaws or scriptural authority which contradicts it. The *Brahmasūtra* itself presents theories of opponents (*pūrvapakṣa*), which, aside from referring to other philosophical traditions (i.e. Buddhist, Sāṅkhya etc.), also include other Vedāntins as mentioned above, before pointing out the flaws and then providing the view of the author, or the *siddhāntapakṣa*. It is evident that Śaṅkara is antagonistic to the *bhedābheda* point of view because he defends and expands upon a completely different philosophical standpoint (Malkovsky 2001:122); supporting the fact that *bhedābheda* was perhaps the predominant school of Vedānta before him. Satyanand (1997:81) proffers two criteria to establish whether or not a *Brahmasūtra* commentary is pre-Śaṅkara:

A pre-Śaṅkara *bhāṣya* has, therefore, a two-fold characteristic. First of all, a pre-Śaṅkara *bhāṣyakāra* is unaware of the points that Śaṅkara raises against his doctrines. Secondly, a pre-Śaṅkara *bhāṣyakāra* is also unaware of the typical Śaṅkarite doctrines such as *Brahmavivartavāda*, *Avidyāvāda*, *Pratibimbavāda* etc. against which he is unable to raise any objections, since he is anterior to Śaṅkara. Among the extant *vṛttis* on the *Brahmasūtras*, the [Vedāntapārijāta-]*Saurabha* alone has this double characteristic.

The same applies to the philosophy of any of the post-Śaṅkara Vedāntins mentioned above. This in itself is significant, as every other author has criticised the views of antecedent thinkers whose theories they did not support. If this was the case, there should be evidence identifiable in their works. A major point to be mindful of is that the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* is very concise; its ‘stark brevity’ (Malkovsky 2001:122) perhaps suggests that the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* represents an earlier style of *Brahmasūtra* commentary in the manner of the authors that preceded Śaṅkara. What emerges for the purposes of the present study is that although there exist sufficient Nimbārki sources to analyse, these are still not adequate to provide the detailed comparison that is possible between, say,

Bhāskara and Śaṅkara's works. To mitigate this difficulty, the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* will also be considered in conjunction with its commentary, the *Vedāntakaustubha*.

As Malkovsky (2001:123) puts it, the ubiquitous flaw of overextension needs to be avoided, since *bhedābheda* was in intellectual circulation well before Śaṅkara:

Satyanand concedes that at times the *Bhedābheda pūrvapakṣin* who Śaṅkara attempts to contradict may in fact represent a broad tradition of *Bhedābheda* views rather than the position of a solitary thinker. In such cases it is impossible to conclude whether Śaṅkara is drawing exclusively, or at all, on the VPS. However, at times the language and arguments used by Śaṅkara to articulate the *Bhedābheda* position are sufficiently close to what is articulated in the VPS to make that work the likely basis of what Śaṅkara wishes to say in his commentary on a good many *sūtras*.

It is well documented that Śaṅkara had access to Bhartṛprapañca's *Bṛhadāraṇyakabhāṣya* at the very least (Nakamura 2004:134), and so the specific type of *bhedābheda* that Śaṅkara uses as *pūrvapakṣa* may well belong to Bhartṛprapañca. Yet Nakamura (2004:135) hints at an important fact:

As has been indicated in the present work, a great many *Bhedābheda*vādin thinkers existed before Śaṅkara. Thus it is difficult to simply say that those views are Bhartṛprapañca's.

So it is essential if investigation into Nimbārka's date is to be carried out that the dissimilarities with Bhartṛprapañca's philosophy are taken into account. These will serve as general markers of differentiation between Nimbārka and Bhartṛprapañca's specific *bhedābheda*.

Firstly, Bhartṛprapañca commented on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* of the Mādhyandīnīya school, and the *Kāṭhaka* and *Īśa Upaniṣads*, so it is imperative to assess the

quotations from these Upaniṣads individually to see whether Śāṅkara is using them in exactly the same context as Nimbārka. If there are differences, then Nimbārka is likely not to be following Bhartṛprapañca and offering his own interpretation. On epistemology, Bhartṛprapañca admits that scriptural revelation is the main source of cognition of Brahman. However, he admits on the other hand that inference rooted in worldly examples can also reveal the essence of Brahman, in the manner of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas (Nakamura 2004:135). Nimbārka, like Śāṅkara, admits that the revealed scriptures are the sole source of cognition of Brahman; inference is possible for worldly matters, but Brahman transcends this, and thus is beyond the scope of our senses and intelligence (Bose 1943 vol. 3:26).

Bhartṛprapañca describes Brahman as *paramātman*, *eka*, *para*, *pūrṇa* and *nitya*; however an extra quality he assigns Brahman is *vijñāna*, or thoughtful consciousness, while he also discounts ‘consciousness’ (*cid* or *bodha*) (Nakamura 2004:135). Nimbārka does not ascribe a specific *vijñāna* to Brahman; rather it is always *jñāna*, or rather *sarvajñā*, direct perception of everything at every moment (Agrawal 2000 Vol. 1:xxvii).

There are four relationships of Brahman, *jīva* and *jagat* proposed by Bhartṛprapañca with appropriate illustrations, namely, the universal and its particular (*sāmānya-viśeṣa*) as with the case of the dewlap of the cow; the state and the possessor of the state (*avasthā-avasthāvat*) like the foam of the sea; effect and its cause (*kārya-kāraṇa*) like the pot and clay; and parts and the whole (*bhāga-bhāgin*), like the spokes of a chariot wheel or the branches of a tree (Nakamura

2004: 139). For Nimbārka these have slight differences. So for him, the cause and effect relationship is illustrated with the example of the sea and its waves, the sun and its rays (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 2.1.13), or the snake and its coil (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.2.27-28). Also different terminology is employed by Nimbārka for the part-whole relationship; here given as *amśa-amśī sambandha*. This is an important subtle difference, as *bhāga-bhāgin* implies a physically defined separation, whereas the *amśa-amśin* speaks more of an emanation and its source. He also points to the relationships of the controller and the controlled (*niyantr-niyamya*) and the worshipper and worshipped (*upāsakopāsyā*) which does not figure in Bhartṛprapañca (Bose 1943 vol.3: 40).

Radically different to Nimbārka is Bhartṛprapañca's view on the method of creation in his version of the theory of transformation (*pariṇāmavāda*) which Nakamura (2004:144) explains as follows. From *avyākṛtabrahman*, comes *antaryāmin*, *kṣetrajña*, *daiva*, *sūtra*, *virāj*, *jāti* and *piṇḍa*. The *avyākṛtabrahman* is Brahman in an unagitated state. The *antaryāmin* is Brahman that is slightly agitated. At the peak of agitation comes the *vikāra*, transformation, of the *kṣetrajña*, or the individual soul, each different from the other, possessing a subtle body (*sūkṣma śarīra*) consisting of a conglomerate of consciousness, actions and memories of the past. The various acts of perception (*upalabdhi*) appear successively and not simultaneously, and thus is the mark of the individual soul. Then *daiva* refers to the divinities governing the evolutes (*tattvas*) and the phenomenal world. The interweaving principle (*sūtra*) is Hiraṇyagarbha, identified with *prāṇa*. *Virāj* is the manifested world. Finally *jāti* is 'genus' or perhaps bodies.

Nimbārka, in stark contrast, follows the Sāṅkhya theory (as do other theist Vedāntins) but makes the origin Brahman (Bose 1943 vol. 3:40).

Bhartṛprapañca also identifies three strata of Brahman (*rāśitrayakalpanā*): the *adhamarāśi* which contains manifest and unmanifest matter (*mūrtāmūrtarāśi*), and is the creation; the *madhyamarāśi* is that of the *jīva* and its subtle body; and the *uttamarāśi* is that of *paramātmān*. It is assumed but not formally established that the eight stages of evolution above are linked to the *adhamarāśi* (Nakamura 2004:145). Nimbārka sticks to the usual nomenclature of Brahman, *jīva* and *jagat*. These ample differences will allow the identification of specifically Nimbārka doctrines from amongst the various anti-*bhedābheda* discussions undertaken by Vedāntins.

3.4 Nimbārka, Śrīnivāsa, Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja on the Brahmasūtra

According to the above then, there appears to exist sufficient doctrinal dissimilarities between Bhartṛprapañca and Nimbārka to enable our investigation of the *Brahmasūtra* commentarial tradition. Accordingly, these specific *vādas* of Nimbārka will serve as the basis for a proposed chronology. Further concrete evidence derives from a comparison of Śaṅkara and Nimbārka's phraseology, since it should be possible to identify consistent similarities and so draw reliable inferences. It can be assumed with a degree of certainty that Bhartṛprapañca did not compose a *Brahmasūtra* commentary, and accordingly the exact phraseology utilised by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa is likely to be idiosyncratic, perhaps inspired

by the standard *bhedābheda* perspective. Any utilisation by Śaṅkara of the illustrations or phraseology employed by these two teachers would locate the *advaitin* chronologically later.

Satyanand has identified all the *sūtras* where Śaṅkara's commentary seems to parallel that of Nimbārka and thus are the most pertinent for comparison. These were revised and collated in a systematic manner by Malkovsky (2001:123). Though this section is reliant on this particular list and the observation of the scholars in question, the list in question will be treated below without the weaknesses that plagued the earlier assessments. I have found it necessary to quote the commentaries in translation at length in order to properly discuss the various subtle points that are crucial to the investigation, as simply highlighting parallels without providing the full context could lead to erroneous conclusions. Aside from my translation of the *sūtras* themselves, I have not deemed it necessary to retranslate the commentaries as Thibaut (1890 & 1896) and Bose (1943) serve as accurate translations of the Sanskrit originals (which are provided in Appendix III). This methodology, I believe, will enable a rational reassessment of Nimbārka's dating which will then allow scholars to factor in this tradition into their treatments of Vaiṣṇavism and early modern Vraja.

Śaṅkara is without a doubt the most erudite Vedāntin, as is evident in the manner in which he deals with a wide range of topics covered in his many works. This proves helpful to researchers into his period, as in the words of Satyanand (1997:81),

A *bhāṣyakāra* of Śaṅkara's calibre and ingenuity often tends to refine and systematise the views of the *pūrvapakṣin* thereby making the *pūrvapakṣin*'s views clearer...even though we may not find in the *Śaṅkarabhāṣya* verbatim quotations from the *pūrvapakṣin* still his ideas are clearly presented by Śaṅkara.

Śaṅkara on occasion also quotes from the scriptures used by the *pūrvapakṣin* in the first place to establish the very doctrine being contradicted. A *pūrvapakṣin* relies on certain scriptural quotations which display concordance with their philosophical standpoint in order to substantiate such views, even if the link is demonstrably weak. If Śaṅkara then utilises the very same quotations, this can serve as a possible marker, depending on the context, which shows that he was aware of theories and the method of substantiation employed by other authors. If Śaṅkara is tackling *bhedābheda* doctrines, then the above-noticed differences between Bhartṛprapañca and Nimbārka's theories will allow the identification of the particular *bhedābheda* principles being contradicted as belonging to either Nimbārka or Bhartṛprapañca. Further confirmation will be sought by analysing Śrīnivāsa's explanation of his predecessor's commentary and finally looking at Rāmānuja, the next major Vaiṣṇava *Brahmasūtra* commentator, will enable the verification of whether Nimbārka's views were accepted by other traditions also. Indeed, as will be shown, although subtle, the clues provided by these commentaries are indispensable for establishing a relative chronology of the authors.

3.4.1 Brahmasūtra Chapter 1

Brahmasūtra 1.1.26

In discussing whether descriptions used by scripture can actually be used to denote Brahman due to a similarity of qualities, the commentators have analogous views on the matter. *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.26, states: ‘If it be contended that because of mentioning metre, [Brahman is not being referred to], then that is not so, due to the declaration of the mind which refers [to Brahman], as it is seen [in other scriptural statements]’.⁸²

Nimbārka interprets this *sūtra* in the following manner:

If it be objected that “on account of the mention” of the meter called ‘Gāyatrī’ in the preceding text, the text referring to the feet may refer to that and not to Brahman, - (we reply:) “No, on account of the declaration of the application of the mind” to the Lord, who is denoted by the term: ‘Gāyatrī’ owing to the connection of the latter with certain qualities. Compare the word ‘virāj’ which illustrates a parallel case. (Bose 1943 vol. 1:76)

Śrīnivāsa expands on what Nimbārka hints at in his commentary:

If it be objected: As the Gāyatrī meter is referred to in the preceding passage viz.: ‘The Gāyatrī, verily, is all this’ (ChUp 3.12.1), the designation of beings as the foot, viz.: ‘One foot of him are all beings’ (ChUp 3.12.6), may refer to this very meter. It is not reasonable to hold that this text establishes Brahman.

(We reply:) “No.” Why? “On account of the declaration of the application of the mind thus,” i.e. on account of the mention of the fixing of the mind “thus” to Brahman who is denoted by the term ‘Gāyatrī’, since the latter is predicted to be the soul of all, in the passage: ‘The Gāyatrī, verily, is all this’ (ChUp 3.12.1). Here, the term ‘Gāyatrī’ denotes Brahman who inheres in the metre, it being impossible for a metre, which is a mere collection of letters, to be the soul of all. “For this very reason”, i.e. in the very same manner, a parallel case is mentioned in the Aitareya Upaniṣad, in the passage:- ‘The Bahvṛcas consider Him in the great-hymn, the Adhvaryus in the sacrificial fire, the Chandogas in the Mahāvṛata ceremony’ (AitUp3.2.3,12). The sense is that those who are

⁸² *chando 'bhidhānān neti cen na tathā ceto 'rpaṇanigadāt tathāhi darśanam*|| *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.26

conversant with the Ṛg-veda, those who are conversant with the Sāma-veda, and those who are conversant with the Yajur-veda, consider , respectively in the chief Śāstra, sacrificial fire, and the Mahā-vrata, Brahman who inheres in them severally; like this, Brahman inheres in the (Gāyatrī) metre.

Or, (an alternative explanation of the sūtra,) just as the Gāyatrī is a class of metre which consists of four feet, each consisting of six syllables, so Brahman, too, has four feet in accordance with the text: 'One foot of him are all beings, three feet, the immortal in the heaven' (ChUp 3.12.6). Accordingly, on account of the mention of the fixing of the mind to Brahman who is metaphorically denoted by the word 'Gāyatrī' in virtue of the fact that both possess the quality of having four feet, the Gāyatrī is not recognised here, but Brahman alone. "For this reason it is seen," i.e. in the very same manner, a term denoting a metre is found applied, - in a literal (as opposed to a metaphorical) sense, - even to a different object in virtue of the fact that both possess a common quality. Thus, beginning: 'These five and the other five make ten, and that is the kṛta' (ChUp 4.3.8), the text goes on to say: 'That is the Virāj, the eater of food' (ChUp 4.3.8). Here under the samvargavidyā, the term 'Virāj' which is a class of metre of ten syllables, is found applied to a collection of ten objects, or the kṛta (Bose 1943 vol. 1:77-79)

Śaṅkara's commentary on this *sūtra* (which features as 1.1.25 in his reading) is in greater detail:

We now address ourselves to the refutation of the assertion (made in the pūrvapakṣa of the preceding *sūtra*) that in the previous passage also Brahman is not referred to, because in the sentence, 'Gāyatrī is everything whatsoever here exists,' the metre called Gāyatrī is spoken of. - How (we ask the Pūrvapakṣin) can it be maintained that, on account of the metre being spoken of, Brahman is not denoted, while yet the mantra 'such is the greatness of it,' &c., clearly sets forth Brahman with its four quarters? -You are mistaken (the Pūrvapakṣin replies). The sentence, 'Gāyatrī is everything,' starts the discussion of Gāyatrī. The same Gāyatrī is thereupon described under the various forms of all beings, earth, body, heart, speech, breath; to which there refers also the verse, 'that Gāyatrī has four feet and is sixfold.' After that we meet with the mantra, 'Such is the greatness of it.' &c. How then, we ask, should this mantra, which evidently is quoted with reference to the Gāyatrī (metre) as described in the preceding clauses, all at once denote Brahman with its four quarters? Since therefore the metre Gāyatrī is the subject-matter of the entire chapter, the term 'Brahman' which occurs in a subsequent passage ('the Brahman which has thus been described') must also denote the metre. This is analogous to a previous passage (ChUp3.11.3, 'He who thus knows this Brahma-upaniṣad'), where the word Brahma-upaniṣad is explained to mean Veda-upaniṣad. As therefore the preceding passage refers (not to Brahman, but) to the Gāyatrī metre, Brahman does not constitute the topic of the entire section.

This argumentation, we reply, proves nothing against our position. 'Because thus direction of the mind is declared,' i.e. because the Brāhmaṇa passage, 'Gāyatrī indeed is all this,' intimates that by means of the metre Gāyatrī the mind is to be directed on Brahman which is connected with that metre. Of the metre Gāyatrī, which is nothing but a certain special combination of syllables, it could not possibly be said that it is the Self of everything. We therefore have to understand the passage as declaring that Brahman, which, as the cause of the world, is connected with that product also whose name is Gāyatrī, is 'all this;' in accordance with that other passage which directly says, 'All this indeed is Brahman' (ChUp 3.14.1). That the effect is in reality not different from the cause, we shall prove later on, under Sūtra 2.1.14. Devout meditation on Brahman under the form of certain effects (of Brahman) is seen to be mentioned in other passages also, so, for instance, AitAr. 3.2.3, 12, 'For the Bahvṛcas consider him in the great hymn, the Adhvaryus in the sacrificial fire, the Chāndogās in the Mahāvṛata ceremony.' Although,

therefore, the previous passage speaks of the metre, Brahman is what is meant, and the same Brahman is again referred to in the passage about the light, whose purport it is to enjoin another form of devout meditation. Another commentator is of opinion that the term Gāyatrī (does not denote Brahman in so far as viewed under the form of Gāyatrā, but) directly denotes Brahman, on account of the equality of number; for just as the Gāyatrī metre has four feet consisting of six syllables each, so Brahman also has four feet, (i. e. quarters.) Similarly we see that in other passages also the names of metres are used to denote other things which resemble those metres in certain numerical relations; for instance, ChUp 4.3.8, where it is said at first, 'Now these five and the other five make ten and that is the Kṛta,' and after that 'these are again the Virāj which eats the food.' If we adopt this interpretation, Brahman only is spoken of, and the metre is not referred to at all. In any case Brahman is the subject with which the previous passage is concerned (Thibaut 1890:93-95).

It appears that Satyanand has not been able to make the correct inference from the above commentaries. He posits that Nimbārka gives an interpretation, which Śaṅkara accepts, adding another explanation for it. According to Satyanand (1997:107), this view is repeated by Śrīnivāsa as, in his understanding, Śrīnivāsa is posterior to Śaṅkara. Contrarily, this particular example demonstrates that Śrīnivāsa's work was accessible to Śaṅkara.

Śaṅkara clearly states that another commentator is of the opinion that there is an alternate interpretation of the *sūtra* [*apara āha*]. Many opine that this is Bodhāyana, the Vṛttikāra referred to by followers of Śaṅkara (Nakamura 2004:80); but Rāmānuja in his commentary on this section does not expand on such a theory, thus precluding it from being explicitly Bodhāyana, as the follower of Bodhāyana's line of interpretation would inevitably refer to theories of his ideological predecessor. Instead, Śaṅkara seems to be in exact agreement with Śrīnivāsa; indeed the same words and syntactical arrangements are visible. Even if Śrīnivāsa was following Bodhāyana's interpretation, this does not explain Śaṅkara's virtually identical presentation of his reasoning, unless he had access to Śrīnivāsa's commentary. Moreover, Śrīnivāsa has not introduced the second interpretation in a

manner that suggests that this is another's view. Rather, he presents it as an alternate explanation based on Nimbārka's own reference to the *virāj* image which points to the numerical exposition expanded upon by Śrīnivāsa and subsequently Śaṅkara. It would also be normal that a person who is commenting upon an earlier work is more articulate in order to clarify any obscurities or doubts. Śrīnivāsa and Śaṅkara are in exact agreement here, but Śaṅkara is wordier, as if expanding on Śrīnivāsa. Śaṅkara also uses the exact same scriptural passages as Śrīnivāsa and then supplies a few more to substantiate his added *advaita* viewpoint (i.e. *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 3.12.5, 3.14.1, and *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.14). He does not omit any aspect that was dealt with by Śrīnivāsa. This definitely supports the view that Śrīnivāsa's work was available to Śaṅkara.

Brahmasūtra 1.1.32 is next cited by Malkovsky (2001:123) as being similar in both Śaṅkara and Nimbārka's commentary. On closer inspection, however, the commentaries to this *sūtra* do not yield any information significant to this investigation apart from the fact that Śaṅkara's interpretation employs similar reasoning to Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa, but to different ends.

3.4.2 Brahmasūtra Chapter 2

Examining the commentary on *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.38-39 and 2.2.40, Satyanand (1997:336) proposes that Śaṅkara incorporates what Nimbārka says in *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.38-39 into his own commentary under *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.40. This method of investigation takes into account not only the literary style of individual

sūtras, but also the possibility of reasoning from various sections of the *Brahmasūtra* being utilised at other junctures in the commentaries. *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.37 introduces the *adhikaraṇa* of ‘the Lord’, and the topic under discussion in these *sūtras* according to Nimbārka is the rationale informing the allocation of heterodox status to the followers of the Pāśupata/Śaiva doctrines. For Śaṅkara, however, it represents the dismissing of the views of all those whose views on Brahman do not agree with Vedānta: the Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya and Pāśupata schools, who hold that the Lord is merely the controller of creation, not its unified efficient and material cause.

Brahmasūtra 2.2.38

This *sūtra* states: ‘and due to the impossibility of the connection’.⁸³ Nimbārka continues his argument against the doctrine of Paśupati:

“And on account of the impossibility of relation” between Paśupati, the instigator who is without a body, and *pradhāna* [unevolved matter] and the rest, to be instigated, Paśupati is not the cause of the world (Bose 1943 vol.1:378)

Śrīnivāsa amplifies Nimbārka’s commentary:

For this reason, too, the doctrine of Paśupati is not justifiable. Why? A relation between Paśupati, the efficient cause, the instigator, and *pradhāna* and the rest, to be instigated must be admitted, and this is impossible. Thus, the Māheśvaras are to be asked the following: Do you, sirs, follow scripture or follow what is observed? If the first, then the stated conclusion, being opposed to scripture, must be rejected. If the second, then it is observed that there is a relation between potters and the rest only who are possessed of bodies, and clay and so on. Hence no relation can be established between Paśupati who is without a body and *pradhāna* and the rest, by you, following what is observed. Hence it being not possible for a bodiless being to have any relation with *pradhāna* and the rest, to be their instigator and so on, he is not the cause of the world (Bose 1943 vol.1:379).

⁸³ *sambandhānupapateś ca* || *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.38

Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa take issue with the doctrine of the Pāśupatas. In *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.37, Nimbārka clearly states that the inconsistencies in their philosophy and their practices which are contradictory to the Veda caused their heterodox status. He highlights the flaw that Paśupati, who is held to be ontologically distinct from *pradhāna* and the rest, cannot be the creator as it is inconceivable that a bodiless being might instigate creation. Śaṅkara continues his original argument against this particular doctrine of the aforementioned schools:

Against the doctrine which we are at present discussing there lies the further objection that a Lord distinct from the *pradhāna* and the souls cannot be the ruler of the latter without being connected with them in a certain way. But of what nature is that connection to be? It cannot be conjunction (*saṁyoga*), because the Lord, as well as the *pradhāna* and the souls, is of infinite extent and devoid of parts. Nor can it be inherence, since it would be impossible to define who should be the abode and who the abiding thing. Nor is it possible to assume some other connection, the special nature of which would have to be inferred from the effect, because the relation of cause and effect is just what is not settled as yet.

-How, then, it may be asked, do you -the Vedāntins- establish the relation of cause and effect (between the Lord and the world)?

-There is, we reply, no difficulty in our case, as the connection we assume is that of identity (*tādātmya*). The adherent of Brahman, moreover, defines the nature of the cause, and so on, on the basis of Scripture, and is therefore not obliged to render his tenets throughout conformable to observation. Our adversary, on the other hand, who defines the nature of the cause and the like according to instances furnished by experience, may be expected to maintain only such doctrines as agree with experience. Nor can he put forward the claim that Scripture, because it is the production of the omniscient Lord, may be used to confirm his doctrine as well as that of the Vedāntin; for that would involve him in a logical see-saw, the omniscience of the Lord being established on the doctrine of Scripture, and the authority of Scripture again being established on the omniscience of the Lord. -For all these reasons the Sāṅkhya-yoga hypothesis about the Lord is devoid of foundation. Other similar hypotheses which likewise are not based on the Veda are to be refuted by corresponding arguments (Thibaut 1890:436-437).

Though originally dealing with the Pāśupatas, Śaṅkara here focuses his argument against the Sāṅkhya-Yoga systems, which he understands in the same way as Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa. Śaṅkara is also interested in dealing with all contradictory schools, whereas Nimbārka has special focus on the Pāśupatas and the Śaivas in general.

The reason for this, I propose, is that Nimbārka's home village was supposedly Muṅgī, which is 10 kilometres southwest of Pratiṣṭhāna, one of the most important cities of the early-medieval Deccan (Bose 1943 vol. 3:9). The dating I suggest for Nimbārka would have him born just before the ascension of Vikramādityā Cālukya I [r.655-680CE] to the throne during the empire of the Cālukyas of Badāmi whose architectural remains frequently display a Pāśupata influence (Prasad 1983:8). Pratiṣṭhāna (then known as Piṣṭāpuram) was annexed to the Badāmi-Cālukya territories by Vikramāditya Cālukya's father Pulakeśin II. This dynasty appears to have favoured the Bhāgavata religion at its founding, however, during the period immediately preceding Pulakeśin II, the empire began to favour sun-worship and Pāśupata religion (Kadambi 2011:210 and 217). Nimbārka would have also crossed the regions ruled by the Kalacuris, known devotees of the Lākulīśa cult (Prasad 1983:7), and even perhaps have ventured through their capital city of Mahiṣmati, seeing at first hand the influence of the Pāśupatas on the way to Mathurā, itself associated with Pāśupata religion at the time (Entwhistle 1987:127-8). This could be inferred to be the reason for Nimbārka's focussed attacks on their doctrine in this section of his commentary. Were Śrīnivāsa subsequent to Śaṅkara, it would be expected that his commentary also contain reference to the other doctrines that Śaṅkara interpreted as the subject of this *adhikaraṇa*. Moreover, Śaṅkara, it could be argued, included these doctrines at this juncture between his references to the other *darśanas* in his commentary to *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.37, perhaps taking the lead from Nimbārka, since usually the *advaitin* is focussed on attacking the doctrine that

Brahman is merely the efficient cause, not the material cause, as is found in the Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhya and Yoga systems.

Brahmasūtra 2.2.39

The aphorism continues the discussion: ‘and due to the impossibility of a substratum’.⁸⁴ Nimbārka follows up his original assertion against the Pāśupatas with another reason for the supposed illogical nature of the school:

“On account of the impossibility” of an eternal body – since it is opposed to what is observed – as well as of a non-eternal one – since it arises later – Paśupati is not the cause of the world (Bose 1943 vol.1:379).

Śrīnivāsa does not venture additional interpretations:

If it be argued: Let him then have a body, and hence the above objection cannot be raised – (the author)- replies:

“The substratum” of all practical transactions is the body – on account of the impossibility of that, their view is not justifiable. Thus, the body of Paśupati cannot be eternal, because that is opposed to what is observed. Otherwise the bodies of potters and the rest, too, must become eternal. Again, his body cannot be non-eternal, because a non-eternal body is not possible on the part of the cause of the world, because the non-eternal objects arise later as effects, and because Paśupati, the cause, is prior to everything (Bose 1943 vol.1:379-380)

Śrīnivāsa here expands only on what Nimbārka has said. Śaṅkara interprets this *sūtra* differently:

The Lord of the argumentative philosophers is an untenable hypothesis, for the following reason also. Those philosophers are obliged to assume that by his influence the Lord produces action in the pradhāna, &c. just as the potter produces motion in the clay, &c. But this cannot be admitted; for the pradhāna, which is devoid of colour and other qualities, and therefore not an object of perception, is on that account of an altogether different

⁸⁴ *adhiṣṭhānānupapateś ca*|| *Brahmasūtra 2.2.39*

nature from clay and the like, and hence cannot be looked upon as the object of the Lord's action (Thibaut 1890:437)

Śaṅkara's line of interpretation is followed by Rāmānuja, Bhāskara, Śrīkaṅṭha and Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Bose 1943 vol.1:380). It is clear that Śaṅkara's understanding proved more reasonable to later authors than that of Nimbārka, and would have also been mentioned by Śrīnivāsa were he aware of Śaṅkara's comments.

Brahmasūtra 2.2.40

In this next *sūtra*, Śaṅkara accepts Nimbārka's reasoning. It reads: 'If it is contended: as in the case with sense-organs, [we reply:] no, due to enjoyment, etc.'⁸⁵ Nimbārka interprets it as follows:

It is not possible to suppose that the Lord has sense-organs and body like the individual soul, for there will result enjoyment and the rest (on the part of the Lord) (Bose 1943 vol.1:380).

Śrīnivāsa develops this argument:

If it be argued: Just as the bodiless individual soul, existing from all eternity, has a relation with subsequent sense-organs and body, due to preceding sense-organs and body, so like it, Paśupati may have a relation with a body; and no objection can be raised here, - (we reply:) no. "On account of enjoyment and the rest." The sense is this: If like the individual soul, the Lord, too, has such a relation with a body, then all the faults like experiencing pleasure and pain, and thereby being the agent of good or bad actions and the rest must pertain to Him also (Bose 1943 vol.1:380-381).

Śaṅkara, in his interpretation, provides information that is of consequence to this investigation:

⁸⁵ *karaṇavac cen na bhogādibhyaḥ* || *Brahmasūtra 2.2.40*

Well, the opponent might reply, let us suppose that the Lord rules the *pradhāna* in the same way as the soul rules the organ of sight and the other organs which are devoid of colour, and so on, and hence not objects of perception.

This analogy also, we reply, proves nothing. For we infer that the organs are ruled by the soul, from the observed fact that the soul feels pleasure, pain, and the like (which affect the soul through the organs). But we do not observe that the Lord experiences pleasure, pain, &c. caused by the *pradhāna*. If the analogy between the *pradhāna* and the bodily organs were a complete one, it would follow that the Lord is affected by pleasure and pain no less than the transmigrating souls are.

Or else the two preceding Sūtras may be explained in a different way. Ordinary experience teaches us that kings, who are the rulers of countries, are never without some material abode, i.e. a body; hence, if we wish to infer the existence of a general Lord from the analogy of earthly rulers, we must ascribe to him also some kind of body to serve as the substratum of his organs. But such a body cannot be ascribed to the Lord, since all bodies exist only subsequently to the creation, not previously to it. The Lord, therefore, is not able to act because devoid of a material substratum; for experience teaches us that action requires a material substrate. -Let us then arbitrarily assume that the Lord possesses some kind of body serving as a substratum for his organs (even previously to creation). - This assumption also will not do; for if the Lord has a body he is subject to the sensations of ordinary transmigratory souls, and thus no longer is the Lord (Thibaut 1890:437-438).

Here Śāṅkara offers an alternative explanation for this and the two preceding *sūtras*, which tallies exactly with Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa's interpretations (Bose 1943 vol.1: 381). Śāṅkara is usually not in the habit of offering alternative explanations unless they derive from another source (Satyanand 1997:80). It is thus obvious here, according to Satyanand (1997:81), that Śāṅkara was borrowing from Nimbārka.

Satyanand (1997:82) provides a useful discussion on Śāṅkara and Nimbārka's views on the size of the individual soul, dealt with in *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.19-29. Nimbārka supports *jīvāṇutvavāda* (the doctrine that the individual soul is atomic in size) and Śāṅkara *ātmavibhutvavāda* (the doctrine of the all-pervasiveness of the soul). Śāṅkara reads *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.19-28 as that of the *pūrvapakṣin* and *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.29 as that of the *siddhāntin*.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.19

This *Brahmasūtra* states: ‘[The individual souls is atomic in size] on account of [the scriptural mention] of departure, going and returning’.⁸⁶ Nimbārka comments simply that ‘the individual soul is atomic [in size]’ and adduces *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.2 to establish departure, *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* 1.2 for going and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.6 for returning, without elaborating on any additional details:

The individual soul is atomic, because in the texts: ‘By that light this soul departs through the eye, or through the head, or through other parts of the body’ (BṛUp 4.4.2), ‘Whoever, verily, depart from this world, all go to the moon alone’ (KauṣUp1.2), ‘Having come back from that world to this world for action’ (BṛUp 4.4.6) and so on, there is the mention “of departure, going and returning” (Bose 1943 vol.1:413)

Śrīnivāsa tends to choose more fitting scriptural passages in support of the stance of Nimbārka even if this means omitting the quotations utilised by Nimbārka from his commentary. In support of departure, Śrīnivāsa uses *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* 3.3 in place of Nimbārka’s useage of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.2:

Thus, it has been proved that the individual soul is eternal and a knower. Now its size is being determined.

On the doubt, viz. whether this soul is of a middle size, or of an all-pervading size, or of an atomic size,- if it be suggested: It must be of a middle size since pleasure and the rest are experienced all over the body. Or, it must be of an all-pervading size,-

We reply: The individual soul is capable “of departing, going and returning”. There three are not possible if it be all-pervading. Moreover, if it be all-pervading, then experiences of pleasure and the like would result everywhere. If on the other hand, it be of a middle size, there it must be non-eternal. Hence, the atomicity of the soul is the only remaining alternative. In the passage: ‘When he departs from this body, he departs together with all these’ (KauṣUp 3.3), its departure is mentioned. In the passage: ‘Whoever, verily, depart from this world, all go to the moon alone’ (KauṣUp 1.2), its going is mentioned. And, in the passage: ‘Having come back from that world to this world for action’ (BṛUp 4.4.6), its returning is mentioned (Bose 1943 vol.1:413).

⁸⁶ *utkrāntigatyāgatīnām*|| *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.19

Śaṅkara cites *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* 3.3 in his commentary here as he does not see *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.2, used by Nimbārka, as a strong enough proof for the soul's departure in this particular *sūtra*. Rather, he utilises it in the commentary to the next *sūtra*. This shows that Śaṅkara is strengthening the position of the *pūrvapakṣin* (Satyanand 1997: 82), taking clues from both Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa; here, he accepts Śrīnivāsa's more relevant sources but does not discard the original quote for departure, incorporating it where he feels relevant. Śaṅkara's commentary on this aphorism displays a strong stylistic similarity to both Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa:

We now have to consider of what size the soul is, whether of atomic size or of a medium size, or of great (infinite) size. -But, it has been shown above that the soul is not a product and that eternal intelligence constitutes its nature, whence it follows that it is identical with the highest Self. Now the infinity of the highest Self is clearly stated in scripture; what need then is there of a discussion of the soul's size? -True, we reply; but certain scriptural passages which speak of the soul's passing out, going and returning, establish the *prima facie* view that the soul is of limited size, and moreover in some places scripture expressly declares it to be of atomic size. The present discussion is therefore begun for the purpose of clearing up this doubtful point.

The Pūrvapakṣin maintains that, on account of its being said to pass out, go and return, the soul must be held to be of limited, atomic size. Its passing out is mentioned (KauṣUp 3.3), 'And when he passes out of this body he passes out together with all these;' its going (KauṣUp. 1.3), 'All who depart from this world go to the moon;' its returning (BṛUp. 4.4.6), 'From that world he returns again to this world of action.' From these statements as to the soul's passing out, going and returning it follows that it is of limited size. For motion is impossible in the case of an all-pervading being. And a limited size being once admitted, we have to conclude more especially that the size is atomic, since the hypothesis of the soul being of the same size as the body has already been refuted in our examination of the Arhata-system (Thibaut 1896:35-36).

Śaṅkara's usage of the same quotations as Śrīnivāsa could seem important, yet this is immaterial, as the intellectual Śaṅkara would always favour more compelling and substantiating quotes, as does Śrīnivāsa. Of greater interest, rather, is that the phraseology utilised by Śaṅkara in introducing the topic exactly parallels that of Śrīnivāsa. The phrase being highlighted is where both Śaṅkara and Śrīnivāsa

present the inquisitor's question, 'what size is the *atman*?' . They both respond with the three options, but with Śrīnivāsa's *siddhānta* of *aṅuparimāṇatva* replaced by Śaṅkara's *siddhānta* of *mahā-* (or *vibhu-*) *parimāṇatva* as the last option, where the *siddhānta* is usually placed (see emphasised passages in Appendix III).

It is valid to determine that Śrīnivāsa would have focussed more on refuting the extremely sharp argumentation employed by Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara's assertion of a *pariccheda* being the cause of the singular all-pervasive soul being able to undergo the states as explained in the scriptural passages would have certainly been dealt with by Śrīnivāsa, as can be seen in the case of Puruṣottama (see chapter 5). Instead, he treats the whole claim of all-pervasiveness for the individual soul with the same concise reasoning he employs to dispute the middle-size for the individual soul. Śaṅkara here does not deal with the middle-size, as he has already considered it whilst refuting the Jain doctrine; instead he focuses his energy on discussing the claim of atomic-size for the individual soul, perhaps demonstrating that he was more interested in countering the *siddhānta* of the *bhedābhedins*. Exactly which *bhedābhedin* is being treated is apparent from the manner in which Śaṅkara phrases his argument: he is countering Śrīnivāsa.⁸⁷

Further supporting the point regarding the adducing of scriptural passages according to their suitability in one's argument, Rāmānuja, who definitely had access to Śaṅkara's commentary, and evidently to those of Nimbārka and

⁸⁷ Even Rāmānuja seems to follow Śrīnivāsa's argumentation and similarly states *vibhutve hy etā utkrānty ādayo nopapadyeran* (Śrībhāṣya 2.3.20 = 2.3.19 in *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, *Vedāntakaustubha* and *Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya*) to Śrīnivāsa's *jīvātmotkrāntigatyāgatīnām yogyo 'sty etat trayam tasya vibhutve nopapadyate* (*Vedāntakaustubha* 2.3.19).

Śrīnivāsa, follows the former in quoting *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.2 for the departure of the soul instead of *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* 3.3 as utilised by Śrīnivāsa and Śaṅkara. Perhaps Rāmānuja thought that Śrīnivāsa should have followed his preceptor instead of offering his own interpretation. The mere fact that Śrīnivāsa quotes a different scriptural support for the departure of the soul from the body demonstrates nothing other than Śrīnivāsa fulfilling the remit of his preceptor, which was to expand upon their specific version of *bhedābheda*. Also of relevance is that Rāmānuja's reading of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.2 matches that of current editions, i.e. *tena pradyotena*; whereas Nimbārka's reads *anena pradyotanena*, which does not occur in available editions.⁸⁸

Satyanand's (1997:83) insistence that Śrīnivāsa is familiar with Śaṅkara because he refutes the two alternatives of the size of the soul is thus groundless. This is all the more so when it is taken into consideration that these are the three alternatives already subscribed to by different philosophies: the Jains accept *madhyamaparimāṇatva*, and the Upaniṣads themselves have passages supporting both *vibhuparimāṇatva* and *aṇuparimāṇatva*. So it is more likely that Śrīnivāsa is dealing with these statements and not referring to Śaṅkara; and rather that Śaṅkara is referring to Śrīnivāsa. This places Śrīnivāsa, and thereby Nimbārka, anterior to Śaṅkara.

⁸⁸ Śaṅkara, incidentally, in his *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya* on 4.4.2 reads it the same way as does Rāmānuja, perhaps suggesting the same *Śuklayajurveda* Kāṇva Śākhā for the two of them, and an unknown one for Nimbārka; or perhaps a more archaic version, as Nimbārka's reading is not as precise as the one favoured by Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja, contextually speaking.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.20

This *sūtra* reads continues: ‘and [there is the possibility] of the subsequent two [i.e. going and returning] through one’s self’.⁸⁹ Nimbārka, although extremely brief in his commentary, illustrates his point with the example of *grāmasvāmyanivṛtti* (the cessation of the rulership of a village)⁹⁰ to describe his position; an example which both Śrīnivāsa and Śaṅkara utilise:

Sometimes departing may be possible on the part of even one who is not moving, as in the case of the cessation of rulership of a village. But since there is possibility “of the subsequent two through one’s self” alone, the individual soul is atomic (Bose 1943 vol.1:414).

Śrīnivāsa also considers this *sūtra* to be self-explanatory and does not develop his commentary much further:

As in the case of the cessation of the rulership of a village, departing, which consists in the cessation of the rulership of the body, may sometimes be possible on the part of the soul even when it is not moving. But, since there can be the accomplishment “of the subsequent two”, viz. “going and returning”, “through one’s self” alone, it is established that the individual soul is atomic (Bose 1943 vol.1:414).

It is also very clear that Śrīnivāsa is providing a very simple gloss of the work of his teacher. Śaṅkara is a little wordier in his commentary, as these *sūtras* are interpreted as the *prima facie* view:

We admit that ‘passing out’ might possibly be attributed to the soul even if it does not move, viz. if that expression be taken to mean the soul’s ceasing to be the ruler of the

⁸⁹ *svātmanā cottarayoh || Brahmasūtra 2.3.20*

⁹⁰ Bose (1943 vol. 1:414) clarifies this: ‘i.e. when somebody ceases to be the ruler of a village, he may be said to ‘go out’.’ He ‘goes out’ from his post, without having to leave the village. This illustration is not traced in any other works, apart from the commentaries of Nimbārka’s followers and Śaṅkara’s followers so must be original to Nimbārka.

body, in consequence of the results of its former actions having become exhausted; just as somebody when ceasing to be the ruler of a village may be said to 'go out.' But the two latter activities, viz. going and returning, are not possible in the case of something which does not move; for they are both connected with the own Self (of the agent), going (and coming back) being activities abiding in the agent. Now going and coming are possible for a being that is not of medium size, only if it is of atomic size. And as going and coming must be taken in their literal sense, we conclude that the passing out also means nothing but the soul's actual moving out of the body. For the soul cannot go and return without first having moved out of the body. Moreover certain parts of the body are mentioned as the points from which the soul starts in passing out, viz. in the following passage, 'Either from the eye or from the skull or from other places of the body (the Self passes out)' (BrUp. 4.4.2). Other passages mention that the embodied soul goes and comes within the body also; so, for instance, 'He taking with him those elements of light descends into the heart' (BrUp. 4.4.1); 'Having assumed light he again goes to his place' (BrUp 4.3.11). -Thereby the atomic size of the soul is established as well (Thibaut 1896:36)

Śaṅkara is here being very thorough in order to strengthen the *prima facie* interpretation of these *sūtras* so that he can give a similarly strong *siddhānta* conclusively later, which he does under *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.29. In order to do so, he uses the strongest available *bhedābheda* arguments available to him. Clearly evident is Śaṅkara's adoption of not only Nimbārka's example, but also Śrīnivāsa's wording. He goes one step further to show that not only at the time of departure from the body, but even within the body itself, the individual soul can both go and return, in addition to departure, which is explained by the illustration. Satyanand (1997:84) comments that Śaṅkara's elaboration serves to 'refine and illustrate the *pūrvapakṣa* doctrine even better than what the opponent himself could do'. In doing so, Śaṅkara follows up the last thread of Nimbārka's commentary by including the scriptural passage of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.2 that was originally adduced by Nimbārka under *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.19. Śrīnivāsa would have also necessarily included such argumentation and the extended inference of the passage from *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.2 that was quoted by his teacher previously, had he been working with a knowledge of Śaṅkara's commentary. This is because the reasoning Śaṅkara employs is far more detailed, and includes the

reference from Nimbārka in a different but positive light, a line of enquiry that is beyond what is immediately apparent and thus would have served the purpose of enhancing the nature of the interpretation of Nimbārka on these matters, a usual trait of the work of students commenting on their teachers. Demonstrably, Śrīnivāsa is unaware of Śaṅkara and the latter is perhaps working with knowledge of the doctrines of Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa in his articulation of the *bhedābheda - pūrvapakṣin*. Rāmānuja does not comment on any of this, barely summarising the words of Śaṅkara.⁹¹ Also noteworthy is that the illustration used by Nimbārka is so obscure that it is frequently omitted by later glosses on Śaṅkara: it does not feature in the *Bhāmatī* of Vācaspati, nor the *Ratnaprabhāvyaṅkyā* of Govindānanda; that no other commentator on the *Brahmasūtra* utilises this illustration shows that it is peculiar to Nimbārka. That this particular illustration made its way to Śaṅkara demonstrates that he had access to Nimbārka's and Śrīnivāsa's commentaries. Rāmānuja chose to dismiss it completely, as to him the *sūtra* is self-explanatory, restricting commentary to a brief sentence.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.21

This aphorism continues: 'If it be claimed that [the individual soul] is not atomic [in size] because of the scriptural passage stating it not to be so, [we reply:] that is not the case, because [it refers to] a different topic'.⁹² Nimbārka is very concise in his commentary as it is self-explanatory, occurring within his *siddhāntapakṣa* in its refutation of the *pūrvapakṣa*:

⁹¹ Śrībhāṣya 2.3.21

⁹² *nāṇuratacchruter iti cen netarādhikārāt* || *Brahmasūtra 2.3.21*

If it be objected: In accordance with the text, referring to the individual soul and designating “what is not that”, viz.: ‘He, verily, is the great’ (BṛUp 4.4.22), the individual soul is not atomic, (we reply:) “no”, because in the middle, the topic is the Supreme Soul (Bose 1943 vol.1:414-415).

Śrīnivāsa develops this:

If it be objected: The individual soul is “not atomic”. Why? “Because of the scriptural mention of what is not that,”-“that” means atomicity, “what is not that” means non-atomicity, on account of the scriptural mention of that,- i.e. because in connection with the discourse on the individual soul, viz. ‘He who is made of knowledge among the vital-breaths, who is the light within the soul’ (BṛUp 4.3.7), there is the mention of greatness in the scriptural text: ‘He, verily, is the great, unborn soul’ (BṛUp 4.4.25),-

(We reply:) “No”. Why? “On account of the topic being something else,” i.e. because the topic here is something other than the individual soul referred to in the beginning, i.e. the Supreme Soul, who is the topic to be established in the middle of the section, in the text: ‘By whom the soul has been found and realised’ (BṛUp 4.4.13) (Bose 1943 vol.1:415)

Śrīnivāsa provides a quotation to show that the section of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (4.3.7) being referred to is explaining the qualities of the individual soul: it forms part of a conversation between Yājñavalkya and Janaka of Videha (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.3-4.4.25). Nimbārka only alludes to this with the words ‘*jīvaṃ prastutya*’, so Śrīnivāsa is following appropriate commentarial practice. He then continues with the passage quoted by Nimbārka, before offering the same conclusion but supplying the scriptural passage that supports it. Śaṅkara’s commentary to this *sūtra* is as follows:

Nevertheless, it may be objected, the soul cannot be of atomic size, because there are scriptural statements of what is not that, i.e. because there are scriptural statements of its size being the opposite of atomic size. So that by accepting the alternative of atomic size we should place ourselves in opposition to scriptural passages such as the following, ‘He is that great unborn Self who consists of knowledge, is surrounded by the Prāṇas, the ether within the heart’ (BṛUp 4.4.22); ‘Like the ether he is omnipresent, eternal;’ (untraced śruti) ‘Truth, knowledge, infinite is Brahman’ (TaitUp 2.1).

This objection, the Pūrvapakṣin replies, is not valid ‘on account of the other one forming the subject of discussion.’ For those statements about a size different (from the atomic one) occur under the heading of the highest Self which on account of its pre-eminence constitutes the general object of knowledge in all Vedānta-texts; and moreover

the passage, 'It is spotless, beyond the ether' (BṛUp 4.4.20), specially proves that the highest Self constitutes the subject-matter (in the passage quoted above from the BṛUp). Thus with regard to the other passages also.

But from the expressions, 'consisting of knowledge, surrounded by the prāṇas,' it appears that the embodied Self only (not the highest Self) is designated as connected with greatness. That designation, the Pūrvapakṣin replies, is founded on an intuition, vouched for by scripture, as in the case of Vāmadeva.

As therefore the statements of a different size refer to the Highest Self (Prājña), they do not militate against the view of the individual soul being of atomic size (Thibaut 1896:36-37).

Śaṅkara again strengthens the position of the *pūrvapakṣin* by his refined argumentation. Satyanand (1997:84) opines that 'later commentators including Śrīnivāsa make use of these refinements brought in by Śaṅkara'. As is apparent this is absolutely not the case. Not a trace of Śaṅkara's extra argumentation, or even hints at his ideology is visible in the commentary of Śrīnivāsa. Incidentally, in his explanation of this *sūtra*, the wording of Rāmānuja is nearly identical to that of Śrīnivāsa⁹³. It is abundantly apparent then that Rāmānuja preferred to follow the interpretations offered by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa in this case, as he does not go the further distance that was established by Śaṅkara. So clearly, Śrīnivāsa is commenting on Nimbārka alone, not making use of the 'refinements' brought in by Śaṅkara, thus undermining Satyanand's theory that Śrīnivāsa is later than Śaṅkara.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.22

Another reason is given: 'and because of the word itself and of very small measurement',⁹⁴ which Nimbārka explains:

⁹³ *Śrībhāṣyam* 2.3.22

⁹⁴ *svaśabdonmānābhām ca || Brahmasūtra 2.3.22.*

“On account of the word itself (viz. ‘atomic’) and of measure,” mentioned (respectively) in the texts: ‘This atomic soul’ (MuṇḍUp 3.1.9), ‘An individual soul is a part of the hundredth part of the tip of a hair, divided a hundredfold’ (ŚvetUp 5.9), the individual soul is atomic. (Bose 1943 vol.1:415)

Śrīnivāsa expands on Nimbārka’s commentary supplying additional scriptural passages:

The phrase: “the word itself” means the word which is denotative of its own atomicity. The word “measure” means the measure which is separated from all gross measures, i.e. an intensely minute measure. On account of these two, the individual soul is atomic. The word itself is mentioned in the text: ‘This *atomic* soul in which the five-fold vital-breath has entered is to be known by the means of thought’ (MuṇḍUp 3.1.9). The measure is mentioned in the text: ‘An individual soul is a part of the hundredth part of the tip of a hair, divided a hundred-fold’ (ŚvetUp 5.9). ‘For the lower one is seen to be like the point of the spoke of a wheel only’ (ŚvetUp 5.8) (Bose 1943 vol.1:415-416).

Śrīnivāsa explains in detail the syntactical connection of the words of the *sūtra* and then expands upon Nimbārka’s commentary in the usual manner, supplying an additional scriptural passage from the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (5.8). Śaṅkara, having already strengthened his *pūrvapakṣa* enough previously does not venture much more:

The soul is of atomic size for that reason also that scripture contains a direct statement to that effect, 'By thought is to be known that atomic Self into which breath has entered fivefold' (MuṇḍUp 3.1.9). That the Self spoken of there as atomic is the living Self, i.e. the individual soul, we see from its connection with breath. -Inference also favours the conclusion that the soul is of atomic size; i.e. we infer that from such passages as 'That living soul is to be known as part of the hundredth part of the point of a hair divided a hundred times' (ŚvetUp 5.9), and, 'That lower one also is seen small even like the point of a goad.' (ŚvetUp 5.8) (Thibaut 1896:37-38).

Śaṅkara is commenting with knowledge of Śrīnivāsa, demonstrated by utilising the quotations that were employed by Śrīnivāsa, omitting the ending of Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 5.9, *sa cānantyāya kalpate*. This is because in its literal sense this verse refers to an atomic sized individual soul also partaking (*kalpate*) of infinity (*ānanta*). This verse then is perfectly suited to a *bhedābheda* interpretation.

However, for Śāṅkara this final assertion of infinity actually means something else. His explanation in the *siddhānta* which he gives in commenting on *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.29 shows that he views the first assertion of atomic size as a reference to ignorance (*durvijñeya*) or a limiting adjunct (*upādhi*), and the second assertion as the correct, real (*pāramārthika*), meaning. His reliance on this second part to establish his *siddhānta* has prevented its use here, perhaps to avoid confusion at this early stage. As this does not actually provide any information that is relevant to the present case, it is interesting that Satyanand (1997: 84) concludes that ‘Śrīnivāsa follows the lead given by him’. The proponent of *bhedābheda* keeps the verse as it is, and the proponent of the later theory of *advaita* utilises the relevant part, discarding the rest. If anything at all, this commentary demonstrates the lengths Śāṅkara was willing to go to in order to establish his *siddhānta*; the similarity of Śāṅkara’s phrasing of his *pūrvapakṣin* and Śrīnivāsa’s own commentary being so close serves only to support the view that Śāṅkara is again using Śrīnivāsa as a *pūrvapakṣin*.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.23

This *sūtra* elaborates on the topic with an illustration: ‘Non-contradictory, as with the case of sandalwood’.⁹⁵ Nimbārka’s commentary is succinct:

Just as a drop of sandal-paste, though occupying one spot of the body, refreshes the entire body, so exactly does the soul illuminate. Hence, the experience of pleasure and the like over the whole body is not inconsistent (Bose 1943 vol.1:416).

⁹⁵ *avirodhaś candanavat* || *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.23

Śrīnivāsa develops by providing additional details regarding the exact substance being referred to:

If it be objected: If the soul be atomic in size, then how can pleasure and the like be experienced over the whole body? – we reply: There is no such contradiction. Just as one drop of yellow sandal-paste, occupying one spot of the body, produces, through its own quality, a pleasurable sensation extending over the entire body, so the soul too, occupying one spot of the body, experiences, through its own quality, the pleasure and the like extending over the entire body, in accordance with the Smṛti passage: ‘This soul, though only atomic, abides pervading its own body, as does a drop of yellow sandal-paste, pervading the whole body’. For this very reason it has been said by the Lord too: ‘ “Just as one sun illuminates this entire world, so the field-owner (i.e. the soul) illuminates the entire field (i.e. the body), O Bhārata!” ’ (BG 13.34) (Bose 1943 vol.1:416).

Śrīnivāsa develops the argument using the terminology of his teacher but additionally supplies a verse from ‘smṛti’ which is untraced. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s *Govindabhāṣya* introduces this verse as being located in the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*:

Even though this individual soul is merely atomic [in size], it exists having pervaded it’s body, in the same manner that a drop of Hari-Sandalwood [paste] pervades [all] the parts of the body.⁹⁶

The verse does not appear in the extant edition of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, or in the usual *smṛti* sources like the *Mahābhārata*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, *Brahmāpurāṇa*, *Harivaṁśa* or *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*, nor even in the later *Padmapurāṇa*, *Viṣṇudharmapurāṇa* or the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*. This *smṛti* verse is noteworthy as it elevates the plain sandalwood of the *sūtra* and Nimbārka to *haricandana*, a divine, apparently Vaiṣṇava-associated type of sandalwood (Monier-Williams 1899:1290). He then substantiates, by means of *Bhagavadgītā* 13.34, Nimbārka’s use of ‘*prakāśa*’, that is the atomic individual soul’s ability to illuminate the rest of

⁹⁶ *aṇumātro ’py ayam jīvaḥ sva-deham vyāpya tiṣṭhati| yathā vyāpya śarīrāṇi haricandanavipruṣaḥ|| Govindabhāṣya 2.3.22*

the body. Śaṅkara, on the other hand, does not share the view that the individual soul is *svayaṅjyotiḥ* and as such does not use this word in his commentary:

But, an objection may here be raised, if the soul is assumed to be of atomic size, and therefore to occupy one point of the body only, the fact of sensation extending over the whole body would appear contrary to reason. And yet it is a matter of experience that men bathing in the Ganges or in a pond experience the sensation of cold over their whole bodies, and again that in summer people feel hot all over the body.

To this objection the following Sūtra replies: 'There is no contradiction, as in the case of sandal-ointment'. Just as a drop of sandal-ointment, although in actual contact with one spot of the body only, yet produces a refreshing sensation extending over the whole body; so the soul, although abiding in one point of the body only, may be the cause of a perception extending over the entire body. And as the soul is connected with the skin (which is the seat of feeling), the assumption that the soul's sensations should extend over the whole body is by no means contrary to reason. For the connexion of the soul and the skin abides in the entire skin, and the skin extends over the whole body (Thibaut 1896:38)

Śaṅkara is averse to using the same terminology with relation to the individual soul 'illuminating' the body it occupies, as this doctrine does not find a place in his philosophy. He is concerned with an actual cognitive experience (*upalabdhi*), whereas Nimbārka is interested in a more generalised experience generated through the senses (*anubhava*). It must be acknowledged that Bhartṛprapañca included *upalabdhi*, so Śaṅkara is possibly referring to his theory here. However, it seems as if Śaṅkara is working in awareness of Śrīnivāsa due to the *smṛti* verse he quotes, which serves also as the inferred source behind Nimbārka's useage of *haricandana* in his commentary to *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.24. It appears that without any explanation the *candana* of the aphorism is referred to as *haricandana* by Śaṅkara, but because the *smṛti* verse in totality supports an atomic size for the individual soul, he has left it out intentionally, retaining only the reference to *haricandana*. Śaṅkara also uses similar terminology to Śrīnivāsa and Nimbārka when describing the *candana* illustration. Again, it is worth noting that Rāmānuja's commentary is

similar to Śrīnivāsa's,⁹⁷ even using the phrase 'āhlādañ janayati' of Śrīnivāsa as opposed to 'āhlādañ karoti' of Śaṅkara.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.24

This justifies the usage of the illustration: 'If it is contended that [the two cases are not the same] because of the peculiarity of its residence, [we reply:] no, due to the statement [of residence, such as] in the heart, indeed'.⁹⁸ Nimbārka simply expands upon it, supplying substantiation from the *Praśna Upaniṣad*:

If it be objected: The example of the sandal-paste is not parallel "on account of the speciality of the abode", (We reply:) no, on account of the understanding that the situation of the individual soul is, like the case of the yellow sandal-paste on one place on the body, that "the soul resides in the heart certainly" (PrUp 3.6).⁹⁹

Again, this commentary uses very simple language and reasoning. Nimbārka's reading of *Praśna Upaniṣad* 3.6 is different, replacing 'eṣa' that is found in the extant Upaniṣad and Śaṅkara's reading etc., with 'ayam'. Again, this could be an archaic reading. Śrīnivāsa elaborates further:

If it be objected: The example of sandal-paste is not appropriate, "on account of the speciality of abode",- it is directly observed that the drop of sandal-paste occupies one part of the body; but it is not known that the individual soul occupies one part of the body, since consciousness is experienced everywhere,-on account of such a difference of abode between the two,-

(We reply:) "No". Why? "On account of the admission," viz. that the soul, atomic in size, abides in one part of the body, i.e. "in the heart", by the scriptural text: 'He who is made of knowledge among the vital-breaths, who is the light within the heart' (BṛUp 4.4.22). The meaning of the term "certainly" is that it is the attribute of knowledge (and not the atomic soul itself) which abides in the whole body (Bose 1943 vol.1:416-417).

⁹⁷ Śrībhāṣya 2.3.24

⁹⁸ avasthītvaiśeṣyād iti cen nābhyupagamādd hr̥di hi|| Brahmasūtra 2.3.24

⁹⁹ avasthītvaiśeṣabhāvād dr̥ṣṭāntavaiśamyam iti cen na| dehaikadeśe haricandanavadd hr̥di hy ayam ātmeti jīvāvasthīty abhyupagamāt ||Vedāntapārijātasaurabha 2.3.24. Bose omits translating this particular commentary, and so the translation is my own.

Śrīnivāsa expands the argument, without providing any different insight, quoting the scriptural passage cited by Nimbārka (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.22), but not the specific wording of *Praśna Upaniṣad* 3.6, a fact that he alludes to by ‘*ity ādiṣu*’. Śaṅkara on the other hand states:

Here it may be objected that the argumentation relied upon in the last Sūtra is not admissible, because the two cases compared are not parallel. If it were a settled matter that the soul dwells in one point of the body, the drop of sandal-ointment might be adduced as a parallel instance. But, as a matter of fact, we know from perception that the drop of sandal-ointment is in contact with one spot of the body only, just as we know that it refreshes the whole body; while in the case of the soul observation tells us only that it is percipient all over the body, but not that it abides in one spot. -Should it be said that the latter point must be settled by inference, we reply that inference is here of no use, because it is not capable of removing the doubt whether the perception extending over the whole body belongs to a soul which extends over the whole body like the skin and the sense of touch inhering in it, or to a soul which is all-pervading like ether, or to a soul which, like a drop of ointment, is minute and abides in one spot only.

This objection, the Pūrvapakṣin replies, is unfounded 'on account of the acknowledgment of a speciality of abode,' an abiding in one spot of the body being admitted in the case of the soul no less than in the case of a drop of ointment. For we read in the Vedānta-texts that the soul abides within the heart; for instance, the information given (in PrUp 3.6), 'The Self is in the heart;' (ChUp 8.3.3), 'That Self abides in the heart;' (BṛUp 4.3.7), 'Who is that Self? -He who is within the heart, surrounded by the Prāṇas, the person of light, consisting of knowledge.'(BṛUp 4.4.22) -As therefore the two cases compared are not devoid of parallelism, the argumentation resorted to in Sūtra 23 is unobjectionable (Thibaut 1896:38-39).

Here, Śaṅkara shapes his *pūrvapakṣin's* argument along the same lines as Śrīnivāsa, but he develops it and expands upon the fallacious reasoning to the logical premise that is proposed. He additionally supplies two different scriptural citations that serve to strengthen his *bhedābheda-pūrvapakṣin's* stance further. Śaṅkara provides the same reading of *Praśna Upaniṣad* 3.6 as is available in current editions (Olivelle 1998:464). This suggests either that he is following a different recension, or perhaps that he has amended it with a more sensible reading, further demonstrating his awareness of Nimbārka.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.25

Another justification is suggested: ‘Or because of an attribute, like light’.¹⁰⁰

Nimbārka expands upon the illustration implied by the aphorism in his commentary:

The illumination of the body takes place only through the attribute of the soul, like the light of a lamp and the like in a room (Bose 1943 vol.1:417).

Here, for Nimbārka it is sufficient to give a solitary explanatory sentence, as the image is universal. Śrīnivāsa expands:

To the objection, viz. the doctrine that there is a relation of attribute and substratum (between knowledge and the soul) is not proper, since our purpose is served by the very nature only (of the soul), (the author) replies.

The term “or” is for disposing of the objection. The sense is that the experience of the pleasure and the like, pertaining to the entire body, by the atomic soul, occupying one part of the body, is possible through its attribute of knowledge which is all-pervading “As in ordinary life.” In ordinary life, a gem, the sun, a light and so on, though occupying one place, illuminate many places, as the case may be, through their attribute alone. Or else, (the combination) may be disjoined as: “as in the case of light”, i.e. like the light of the gems and the rest. The doctrine of an attributeless soul, as admitted by the Sāṅkhyas, has been disposed of above (Bose 1943 vol.1:417).

Śrīnivāsa gives two alternative readings of the *sūtra* as it is possible to separate the words in a bi-textual manner, thus avoiding any interpretative ambiguity, in the conventional manner of providing the *padaccheda*. He uses the slightly different sense of *āloka* to counter the doctrine that the soul has no inherent qualities (*nirḍharmakātmavāda*) of the Sāṅkhya school. Śāṅkara comments:

That the soul although atomic produces effects extending over the whole body, is not contrary to reason, on account of the pervadingness of intellect which is its quality. From ordinary experience we know that luminous things, such as lamps or gems, although occupying only one spot of a chamber, produce, by means of their light which fills the

¹⁰⁰ *guṇād vālokavat || Brahmasūtra 2.3.25*

chamber, an effect in every part of the chamber. -This Sūtra has the purpose of removing the doubts of those who might object that sandal-ointment, because consisting of parts, may perhaps refresh the entire body by the diffusion of imperceptible particles; that, however, the soul as a mere atom does not possess any parts by means of which it could diffuse itself through the whole body (Thibaut 1896:40).

Śaṅkara here is satisfied with Nimbārka's illustration rather than that of Śrīnivāsa, though he reads *lokavat* as opposed to Nimbārka's reading of *ālokavat*. Śrīnivāsa admits that there can be two interpretations, and Śaṅkara gives illustrations for both. Śrīnivāsa expands the illustration's reach to the sun and thus a more general application; however, Śaṅkara keeps to the image of a lamp in a room, using *apavaraka* as a more precise synonym of the term *koṣṭha* used by Nimbārka to denote an inner apartment. Śaṅkara also does not extend the argument to the Sāṅkhya school as Śrīnivāsa does. Rather, this is Śrīnivāsa's own interpretation, and Śaṅkara apparently did not think it relevant enough to include in his commentary; given for him the focus of the *pūrvapakṣin* is directed against the *vibhūparimāṇavāda* and nothing else, and he has already countered Sāṅkhya doctrine sufficiently. In doing so, the *advaitin* again strengthens the position of the *pūrvapakṣin*. Rāmānuja appears to simply copy Śrīnivāsa's commentary, not adding anything new, but accepting the more generalised image of the sun,¹⁰¹ and not of a room like Nimbārka and Śaṅkara. It is evident then that Rāmānuja is following Śrīnivāsa's commentary in this instance.

¹⁰¹ Śrībhāṣya 2.3.26

Brahmasūtra 2.3.26

This aphorism elaborates further on the attributes of the individual soul: ‘Extending beyond [knowledge] is as it is for smell, as [the scripture] demonstrates’.¹⁰²

Nimbārka reads this as one *sūtra*, but Śaṅkara splits it in two. Nimbārka says:

But the “extending beyond” of the attribute of knowledge fits in “as in the case of smell”. The scriptural text: ‘He has entered here upto the body-hairs and finger-nails’ (KauṣUp 4.20) “shows” the individual soul to be the substratum of such an attribute (Bose 1943 vol.1:418).

Śrīnivāsa gives a simple explanation of Nimbārka’s commentary without adducing further evidence or providing alternate interpretations:

“The extending” of the attribute of knowledge beyond the soul, its substratum which is situated within the heart, i.e. its occupying a larger space, is “as in the case of smell”, i.e. is just like smell occupying a larger space than the flower which occupies a smaller space. The scriptural text: ‘He has entered here upto the body-hairs and finger-nails’ (KauṣUp 4.20) “shows” the soul’s pervasion over the entire body by means of its attribute of knowledge, extending over a larger space (Bose 1943 vol.1:418).

Śaṅkara on the other hand has much more to say, breaking the *sūtra* into two, as well as changing ‘*hi*’ to ‘*ca*’:

But how can a quality extend beyond that in which it inheres, and abide elsewhere? We certainly do not see that the whiteness which is the quality of a piece of cloth extends beyond that piece of cloth to other places. Nor must you say that the case of the soul is analogous to that of the light diffused from a lamp; for that light itself is admitted to be (not a quality but) a substance. The flame of a lamp is substantial light with its particles crowded close to one another; the light diffused from that flame is substantial light whose particles are thin and scattered. -The reply to this objection is given in the next Sūtra: “The extending beyond is as in the case of odour”. Just as odour, although a quality, extends beyond the odorous substance--as appears from the fact of our perceiving odour even without actually grasping flowers which are the seat of odour--so the quality of intelligence also may extend beyond the soul although the latter be atomic. It therefore is an undue stretch of inference to maintain that a quality, such as colour and the like, cannot separate itself from the substratum in which it inheres, because it is a quality; for we see that odour although a mere quality does separate itself from its substratum. -The objection that odour also separates itself from its substance only with the substance (i.e. parts of the substance) we do not admit, because that would involve the dwindling away of the

¹⁰² *vyatireko gandhavat tathā hi darśayati* || *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.26.

fundamental substance from which the separation of parts takes place. But that it does not so dwindle away, we conclude from its remaining in its former condition; otherwise it would lose the heaviness and other qualities belonging to it in its former state. -Well, but perhaps the separation of the particles in which odour resides is not noticed on account of their minuteness. Nevertheless the fact may be that minute odorous atoms spreading in all directions enter the cavity of the nose and there produce the sensation of smell. -This we cannot admit, because the atoms are suprasensible, and because in some cases, as, for instance, from the blossoms of the nâgakesara-tree, a very strong odour is perceived. According to the generally prevailing idea, moreover, it is not the odorous substance which is smelled, but ordinary people rather think that they smell the odour only. -The objection that, because we do not perceive colour and so on to extend beyond their substratum, we have no right to assume that odour does so, we cannot admit, because there is no room for that conclusion, on account of the (actually existing) perception (of the smell apart from the odorous substance). Logicians must shape their inferences in such a way as to make them agree with ordinary observation, not in any other way. For, to quote another instance, the circumstance that one of the qualities, viz. taste, is perceived by the tongue, certainly does not entitle us to draw the general inference that colour and the other qualities also are perceived by means of the tongue.

“And thus (scripture also) declares” [Brahmasūtra 2.3.27 according to Śaṅkara].

Scripture also, after having signified the soul's abiding in the heart and its atomic size, declares by means of such passages as 'Up to the hairs, up to the tips of the nails' (KauṣUp 4.20; BṛUp 1.4.7), that the soul pervades the entire body by means of intelligence which is its quality (Thibaut 1896:40-42)

Śaṅkara demonstrates a particular interest in this *sūtra* and provides a full analysis of its presumed place in a syllogism in accordance with the logician's style of argumentation, and pays special attention to adducing different illustrations to show that in the view of the *pūrvapakṣin*, there is no *ativyāpti*, the fault of over-extension. The main illustration that is provided by the aphorism is that of scent, which pervades an area much greater in size than its origin. Nimbārka assumes the import of the *sūtra* is obvious and does not mention the source of the image, Śrīnivāsa clarifies the subject by expanding on it, and Śaṅkara provides detailed commentary on the whole issue. Satyanand (1997:86) focuses attention on the fact that Nimbārka's scriptural quotation seems misplaced when the *sūtra* is taken as a whole and that Śaṅkara, in splitting the *sūtra*, provides a more suitable context for this scriptural quotation. Perhaps Śaṅkara wanted to focus on the Naiyāyika element, as he names and takes issue with them on behalf of the *pūrvapakṣin*. Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa interpret the *sūtra* as referring to a more general logical

flaw, rather than an error specifically pointed out by Naiyāyikas. It would take Śāṅkara to recognise and flesh out this fact by positioning the Naiyāyikas as the objectors to the *siddhāntapakṣa* of this *sūtra*. As he views this *sūtra* as referent to the Naiyāyikas, he does not deem Nimbārka or Śrīnivāsa's line of argumentation sufficient and perhaps comments in view of the Bodhāyana interpretation, as Rāmānuja also reads this *sūtra* with 'ca' in place of 'hi', even though the *sūtra* is unbroken in his reading.¹⁰³

That Rāmānuja is much later than Nimbārka, Śrīnivāsa and Śāṅkara is confirmed as he states that inferred substance for scent is the earth, which is a specific reference to the quality of scent and its substratum as found in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* and Sāṅkhya doctrine which was only amalgamated into Vedānta after the theory of *pañcīkaraṇa* (evolution by means of divisions of the five traditional elements) was accepted, sometime after Sureśvara (Sundaresan 2002:23); a doctrine that Nimbārka, Śrīnivāsa and Śāṅkara do not refer to at all here. Rāmānuja also does not utilise the scriptural reference which Nimbārka or Śrīnivāsa do, perhaps following the lead of the Bodhāyana tradition. It is known that Śāṅkara did have access to Bodhāyana's works (Nakamura 2004:77-78), and the fact that Śāṅkara chose to infer a flower instead of the earth as the source of the scent as dealt with in the *sūtra*, and also to refer to the same scriptural passage, shows that he was aware of Śrīnivāsa's interpretation.

¹⁰³ Śrībhāṣya 2.3.27

Brahmasūtra 2.3.27

The discussion of the individual soul as a substratum of various attributes is strengthened: ‘Due to a different teaching’.¹⁰⁴ Nimbārka posits a scriptural passage which the *sūtra* is purportedly referring to:

Although there is no distinction between the soul and its knowledge in respect of being knowledge, yet a relation of substratum and attribute (between them) is indeed proper. Why? “On account of the separate teaching,” viz. ‘Having mounted the body by means of intelligence’ (KauṣUp 3.6) (Bose 1943 vol.1:418-419).

Nimbārka uses this *sūtra* to reaffirm the difference between the individual soul and knowledge, which in turn solidifies the position of *bhedābheda*. Śrīnivāsa develops Nimbārka’s argument, supplying further scriptural support:

Apprehending the objection, viz. Let knowledge be the essence of the soul. Hence here the distinction, -viz. the substratum is atomic, the attribute all-pervading,- is not proper, -(the author) replies here.

“On account of the separate teaching” of the attribute from the substratum, the soul, in the passages: ‘Having mounted the body by means of intelligence’ (KauṣUp 3.6), ‘Having taken by his intelligence the intelligence of these senses’ (BrUp 2.1.17). That is, in spite of there being no distinction between the two in respect of being knowledge, there can very well be a relation of substratum and attribute between them, since it is mentioned in scripture. Equality of nature does not necessarily mean identity, since it is found that in spite of there being no distinction between light and its substratum, -both equally being light,- there is still a difference between them (Bose 1943 vol.1:419).

Śrīnivāsa proposes a question to which the *sūtra* is the answer. He surmises that the opponent holds that there is no distinction between the soul and its attribute of knowledge, to which the *Brahmasūtra* is made to reply that such a distinction does exist because of the scriptural teaching of its difference. Śrīnivāsa also supplies a second scriptural quotation evincing the same principle. The difference as reported

¹⁰⁴ *pṛthag upadeśāt*|| *Brahmasūtra 2.3.27*.

by both Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa is that of attribute and substratum (*dharmadharmin*), as similarity of nature does not imply identity. Śaṅkara states:

From the passage 'Having by knowledge taken possession of the body' (KauṣUp 3.6) which represents the soul and intelligence as separate, viz. as respectively the agent and the instrument of action, we understand that the soul pervades the body only by means of intelligence, its quality. Again the passage 'Then (the intelligent person) having through the intelligence of the senses absorbed within himself all intelligence' (BṛUp 2.1.17) shows intelligence to be different from the agent, i.e. the embodied soul, and so likewise confirms our view. Therefore the soul is atomic (Thibaut 1896:42).

Śaṅkara (who reads this *sūtra* as 2.3.28), using the same quotations as Śrīnivāsa, infers that the *bhedābhedin* believes a difference is apparent due to the relationship of the agent and instrument. The *bhedābheda* being referred to here tallies with that propounded by Bhartṛprapañca, and not Nimbārka or Śrīnivāsa. The fact that Śaṅkara then interprets the *sūtra* along the lines of Śrīnivāsa and supplies the same scriptural references shows that although the *pūrvapakṣin* inferred by him is Bhartṛprapañca, Śrīnivāsa's argumentation along the lines of Nimbārka's interpretation is more relevant.

Śaṅkara is silent on the assertion of Śrīnivāsa that the similar nature of the substratum and attribute does not indicate *abheda*. Śaṅkara presents his *siddhānta* under the next *sūtra*, which addresses this claim, and does not discuss the topic here. It bears remembering that Śaṅkara was not the only proponent of the theory of *abheda*. Rather, Śrīnivāsa seems to be interested in countering Dharmakīrti's viewpoint, who he does name as Viprabhikṣu in commentary to *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.28 where he quotes from Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* (see chapter 5). The force of the verse serves to show that knowledge and the knower are one identical substance; only those of faulty understanding would see a difference between them

(Śāstrin 1972: 46, Bose 1934 vol. 1:363)¹⁰⁵. So here, Śrīnivāsa is undertaking a defence against Dharmakīrti, and not Śaṅkara, as Śrīnivāsa has just countered this view in the previous *pāda* of the *Brahmasūtra*.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.28

This aphorism reads, ‘But there is that teaching because of [the soul] having that attribute as its essence, like the case of the intelligent [being]’.¹⁰⁶ As this *sūtra* is the subject of an extremely lengthy commentary by Śaṅkara and Śrīnivāsa, I have provided a brief summary of the commentaries, highlighting salient points. Śrīnivāsa again expands the brief interpretation that Nimbārka provides. Nimbārka uses this *sūtra* to justify that an atomic soul has all-pervasiveness as an attribute, just like the intelligent being, Brahman, which possesses magnitude (*vibhūtvā*) because it is an attribute; and so the individual soul can be referred to as all-pervasive in the scriptures. It is all-pervasive by its attribute of knowledge. Śrīnivāsa makes it explicitly clear arguing in the same manner as Nimbārka that the scriptural teachings of all-pervasiveness refer to the Lord as opposed to the individual soul, stating that the all-pervasiveness of the individual soul is an attribute, whereas for Brahman it is its very nature, like knowledge.

This *sūtra* in Śaṅkara’s interpretation (here numbered *Brahmasūtra 2.3.29*) represents the *siddhānta* of the whole *adhikaraṇa*, and as such he begins a long refutation of the *aṅuparimāṇavāda* for the individual soul. He completely rejects

¹⁰⁵ *avibhāgo’pi buddhyātmā viparyāsītadarśanaih| grāhyagrāhakaśaṁvittibhedavān iva lakṣyate||* Vīrabhikṣu as quoted in *Vedāntakaustubha 2.2.28*

¹⁰⁶ *tadguṇasāratvāt tu tad vyapadeśaḥ prājñavat|| Brahmasūtra 2.3.28.*

the arguments put forward by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa over the previous *sūtras* and provides his *advaita* interpretations of the scriptural references utilised therein.

Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa are clearly unaware of the concerns raised by either Śaṅkara or Rāmānuja, so it is impossible that the former pair could be posterior to the latter pair. Rāmānuja is known to be countering the position of Śaṅkara, but by his time the focus of the *sūtra* as interpreted by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa has shifted from explaining how an atomic individual soul could be all-pervasive to describing primarily how the soul could be called knowledge even though knowledge is only an attribute, as all four teachers understand that knowledge is the essential nature of the soul. Even though Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa viewed each of these concerns equally, the issue of soul and knowledge was discussed in greater detail by Śaṅkara and thus by Rāmānuja (Satyanand 1997:91-92).

Brahmasūtra 2.3.30

In their commentaries on *Brahmasūtra 2.3.29* (*Brahmasūtra 2.3.30* for Śaṅkara), the teachers' respective interpretations are quite different from each other. Attention is turned instead to *Brahmasūtra 2.3.30* (*Brahmasūtra 2.3.31* for Śaṅkara): 'However due to the appropriateness of manifestation of that which is existent, like manliness etc.'¹⁰⁷ Nimbārka comments:

During the waking state there is the "manifestation" "of this", i.e. of knowledge, which is "existent" indeed during the states of deep sleep and so on. Hence, the attribute of knowledge does last so long as the soul itself does; just as in youth there is the

¹⁰⁷ *pumstvādivat tv asya sato 'bhīvyaktiyogāt|| Brahmasūtra 2.3.30*

manifestation of virility and so on, which are existent indeed during childhood (Bose 1943 vol.1:423).

Śrīnivāsa expands only a little more on this very clear statement and the illustration provided:

To the objection, viz. if knowledge, the attribute of the soul, be eternal, then why should there be no perception of it during the states of deep sleep and the rest?-(the author) replies:

The term “but” implies emphasis. Knowledge, the attribute of the soul, does last as long as the soul itself does. Why? “On account of the appropriateness of the manifestation of that which is existent”. That is, the attribute of knowledge, which is “existent indeed”, i.e. is present indeed, in a non-manifest form during the states of deep sleep and the rest is manifested during the waking state,- just as in youth there is the manifestation of “virility and so on” which are existent indeed during childhood. By the phrase “and so on” the natural qualities of magnanimity, good conduct and the like are to be understood (Bose 1943 vol.1:424)

Śaṅkara interprets the *sūtra* completely differently:

As in ordinary life virile power and so on, existing potentially only in young children, and being then looked upon as non-existing, become manifest at the time of puberty and do not originate at that time from previous non-existence, because in that case they might originate in eunuchs also-; so the connexion of the soul with the *buddhi* exists potentially merely during deep sleep and the period of general retraction, and again becomes manifest at the time of waking and the time of creation.-This explanation is appropriate, because nothing can be assumed to spring up unless from something else; otherwise we should have to suppose that effects spring up without causes. That the rising from deep sleep is due to the existence of potential *avidyā*, scripture also declares, 'Having become merged in the True they know not that they are merged in the True. Whatever these creatures are here, whether a lion or a wolf,' &c. (ChUp 6.9.2; 3).-It is therefore a proved matter that the connection of the soul with the *buddhi* and the other adjuncts lasts as long as the soul (in its *samsāra*-state) (Thibaut 1896:47-48).

As can be seen, Śaṅkara uses this *sūtra* to show that the intellect and other limiting adjuncts persist as long as the soul does in the state of transmigration. In explaining the imagery provided by the *sūtra*, he follows the line of interpretation accepted by all commentators. Although at the moment the inclusion of this *sūtra* in Malkovsky's (2001:123) list does not seem to be relevant, I have referred to it because of Rāmānuja. The *viśiṣṭādvaitin* follows the hint of Śaṅkara, refining it to

fit his views by explaining that after death there is the absence of knowledge that is linked to the experiences of birth, death and the rest, which are caused by the individual soul's connection with the elements in the state of transmigration. As before, Rāmānuja's doctrines confirm that he is chronologically posterior to Śaṅkara. If Nimbārka or Śrīnivāsa were similarly posterior to Śaṅkara, then their interpretation would also try to refute this position of Śaṅkara, as the theory of limiting adjuncts is not congruent to the *bhedābheda* perspective. This particular *advaita* doctrine was refuted by successive teachers such as Puruṣottama, the third after Nimbārka, in *Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā* 1.1. In fact, nowhere throughout the works of either Nimbārka or Śrīnivāsa is there a single refutation of *adhyāsavāda* or *upādhivāda*.

Brahmasūtra 2.3.31

The theory is developed by underlining a possible logical fallacy: 'Otherwise there is the unwanted consequence of ever-lasting perception and non-perception, or a limitation of [one or] the other'.¹⁰⁸ Nimbārka interprets this as follows:

On the doctrine of an all-pervasive soul, the perception and the non-perception, the bondage and the release of the soul must all become eternal. The soul will be either eternally fettered or eternally free,- thus there must be "a restriction with regard to the one or the other" (Bose 1943 vol.1:424).

Śrīnivāsa expands upon a crucial point:

This aphorism is meant for indicating the defects in the view of those who maintain the all-pervasiveness of the soul, which is consciousness. "Otherwise", i.e. in any view other than our view, viz. that the soul is possessed of the essential attributes of being a knower, knowledge by nature and atomic in size, i.e. on the doctrine that the soul is consciousness

¹⁰⁸ *nityopalabdhyānupalabdhiprasaṅgo 'nyatra niyamo vānyathā || Brahmasūtra 2.3.31*

merely and all-pervading, there must be the “consequence of eternal perception and non-perception”. On account of the all-pervading soul being ever undeveloped, there will be perception’ on account of the existence of mundane existence, non-perception. In this way, there will result simultaneous bondage and release, “or a restriction with regard to the one or the other”. On our view, on the other hand, the individual soul being of the size of an atom, going and returning, being enveloped and being unenveloped, the object to be approached and the one approaching, are all possible, and hence the respective difference between bondage and release, too, is possible. But on your view, there will result one or the other only of bondage and release, having the stated marks. There must be eternal bondage alone on the part of the soul which is consciousness merely and immobile; or there must be salvation alone,- such a restriction will result. Hence, it is established that the individual soul is possessed of the attribute of being a knower, is knowledge by nature and atomic in size (Bose 1943 vol.1:424-425).

Since Śāṅkara uses this *sūtra* to establish the existence of the *antaḥkaraṇa*, the internal organ, and also to develop the theory of *pratibimbavāda*, his commentary in this case does not lend further insight to this investigation. Śrīnivāsa, for his part, is very clear on the theory that is being resisted. Nimbārka interprets the *sūtra* as a refutation of the doctrine of an all-pervasive [individual] soul. Śrīnivāsa clarifies this as those who believe that the soul, which is conscious, is all-pervasive. Both Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa in commenting *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.49 identify those who accept the theory of the omnipresence of the (individual) soul (*sarvagatātmavāda*) such as Kapila, with Śrīnivāsa adding Kaṇāda and others. Nimbārka seems interested only in refuting the Sāṅkhya followers of Kapila, but Śrīnivāsa extends it to include Kaṇāda’s Vaiśeṣikas. This is a very interesting point. As pointed out by Franco (2000:162), the earliest extant mention of an all-pervasive soul in the Vaiśeṣika system occurs in the 3rd century CE. The fact that Śrīnivāsa clarifies the statement *cetanabhūtātmavibhutvavāda* with the phrase *jñānamātrasarvagatātmavāda* supports this: Sāṅkhya followers admit that the soul is a consciousness, as do the Vaiśeṣikas. Sāṅkhya and the Vaiśeṣikas both admit that knowledge is only an attribute of the individual soul, not an essential quality (Bronkhorst 2005:4). In Śrīnivāsa’s opinion, schools that subscribe to *vibhutva* or

sarvagatatva for the conscious individual soul are the target of this *sūtra*. These schools have been the focus of much of his attention, especially under *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.49. Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa would definitely have countered Śaṅkara's stance, especially on *pratibimbavāda* here if it was known, in a similar manner to the way they dispensed with the Sāṅkhyas and Vaiśeṣikas. Satyanand (1997:95) instead mistakenly concludes that Śrīnivāsa is countering Śaṅkara's viewpoint. Rāmānuja incidentally does not refute any of Śaṅkara's points here; rather, in near verbatim fashion, he follows exactly the line of reasoning presented by Śrīnivāsa, perhaps thinking that Śaṅkara was obviously misinterpreting the *sūtra* to suit his *advaita* leanings and he had already dealt with these doctrines elsewhere. It appears that to Rāmānuja, Śrīnivāsa seemed closer to the subject matter of the *sūtra*, only deviating to factor in his *viśiṣṭādvaita* position.¹⁰⁹

3.4.3 Brahmasūtra Chapter 3

Malkovsky (2001:123) proposes that the next *sūtras* which evince parallels in Nimbārka and Śaṅkara's commentary are *Brahmasūtra* 3.2.27-28. However these *sūtras*, which employ the famed analogy of the snake and its coils, do not contain much that is of relevance here, save to say that Śaṅkara takes these *sūtras* as *pūrvapakṣa*, where the *pūrvapakṣin* is a *bhedābhedin*, and naturally Nimbārka takes this as the *siddhānta*. The problem with analysing Śaṅkara here is that there is not much definition in his critique of *bhedābheda* here (especially under *Brahmasūtra* 3.2.28, which is 3.2.29 in the *Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya*), in order to

¹⁰⁹ *Śrībhāṣya* 2.3.32

differentiate exactly which school of *bhedābheda* is being referred to. There is however, one exception. As stated, Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa support a *bhedābheda* which proposes a difference between Brahman and the individual soul as *upāsaka-upāsya*. Śaṅkara says, in stating the *prima facie* view that:

These [scriptural statements] suggest a different doctrine, of the worshipper and the worshipped.¹¹⁰

This makes it very clear that Śaṅkara is in fact aware of the specific and unique particularities of Nimbārka's *bhedābheda* doctrine of *upāsyopāsaka-sambandha*. Remarkably, Śrīnivāsa is just as intent in his commentary on proving *abheda* as he is *bheda*. This would not be the case had he known of Śaṅkara's position. On the other hand, it is manifestly apparent in Bhāskara and Rāmānuja's commentaries that they are clarifying their positions in light of Śaṅkara's tenets.

Malkovsky (2001:123) then includes the commentaries to *Brahmasūtra* 3.3.13-14, based on Satyanand's (1997:336) claim that:

At 3.3.13 Śaṅkara adds what Nimbārka has to say at 3.3.14 and reserves *sūtra* 3.3.14 to take up the Kaṭha passage. All these may well point out that Śaṅkara appears to reread and readjust the Saurabha.

Having analysed these closely, there is nothing that would suggest that these *sūtras* conform to the criteria for examination here. Malkovsky also includes *Brahmasūtra* 3.3.16, which again cannot figure in the present investigation for the same reason.

¹¹⁰ ...tasminn eva saṁrādhyā-saṁrādhakabhāve matāntaram upanyasyati...||
Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya 3.2.27, my translation.

3.4.4 Brahmasūtra Chapter 4

In *Brahmasūtra* 4.2.1-13, the topic is the successive stages involved during the departure of the individual soul. Satyanand (1997:110) provides a comparative study of these *sūtras* which he suggests will ‘throw some more light on the chronology of the various commentaries themselves’. I will revisit them, refining Satyanand’s conclusions where necessary.

Brahmasūtra 4.2.1

This reads: ‘Speech in the mind, due to observing and scriptural texts’.¹¹¹ Here, the interpretation accepted by all is that the aphorism is referring to *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.8.6. Nimbarka comments:

‘The text: “Speech merges into the mind” (ChUp 6.8.6) denotes the merging in, i.e. the connection of the organ of speech with, the mind, - since it is found that the function of the mind continues even when the organ of speech has ceased to function; “also on account of the scriptural text”: “Speech merges in the mind”’ (Bose 1943 vol.2:807)

Śrīnivāsa provides a detailed exposition:

It has been said at the end of the previous quarter that the knower attains Brahman. Now the knower’s departure from the body for attaining Brahman and similar problems are being considered. First, the author determines the mode of departure which is common to a knower and a non-knower.

The doubt is as to whether in the text: “Of this person, my dear, who has departed, speech merges into the mind, the mind in the vital-breath, the vital-breath in fire, fire in the Highest Divinity” (ChUp6.8.6), the merging of the function of speech in the mind is denoted or of speech alone having the function. If it be suggested that the functions of speech and so on are directed to their respective objects by the mind. Hence the merging of the function of speech in the mind stands to reason –

¹¹¹ *vānmanasi darśanāc chabdāc ca* || *Brahmasūtra* 4.2.1

We reply: Speech alone having the function merges in the mind. Why? “On account of observation,” i.e. the function of the mind is observed to continue even when the organ of speech has ceased to function. Apprehending the objection that this is possible even if there be the merging of only the function of speech, the author states the main reason: “And on account of the scriptural text”, i.e. on account of the text: “Speech merges in the mind” (ChUp 6.8.6). There is no text to the effect that the *function* of speech merges in the mind.

‘Merging’ is to be understood here as denoting ‘connection’ and not ‘absorption’, since the absorption of speech into the mind, which is not its material cause, is impossible, since in order that the non-knower may obtain another body, it is essential that speech should continue, and since it will be stated further on that speech and the rest are absorbed in the Highest Soul alone” (Bose 1943 vol.2:807-808).

Śrīnivāsa clarifies Nimbārka’s statement, discussing what is a contentious issue in detail. Nimbārka’s assertion that the organ of speech connects with the mind could be misconstrued, unless there was to be appropriate clarification of the sort that Śrīnivāsa provided. Śaṅkara introduces the *sūtra* including an objection from the *pūrvapakṣin*:

Being about to describe the path of the gods which leads those who possess the lower kind of knowledge towards the attainment of their reward, the Sūtrakāra begins by explaining, on the basis of scriptural statements, the successive steps by which the soul passes out of the body; for, as will be stated later on, the departure of the soul is the same in the case of him who possesses the knowledge and of him who is devoid of all knowledge.

About the process of dying we have the following passage, 'When a man departs from hence his speech merges in his mind, his mind in his breath, his breath in fire, fire in the highest deity' (ChUp. 6.8.6). A doubt here arises whether the passage means to say that speech itself, together with its function, is merged in the mind, or only the function of speech.

The Pūrvapakṣin maintains that speech itself is merged in the mind. For this explanation only is in agreement with the direct statement of the sacred text, while the other alternative compels us to have recourse to an implied meaning; now wherever direct enunciation and implied meaning are in conflict the preference has to be given to the former, and we therefore maintain that speech itself is merged in the mind.

To this we reply that only the function of speech is merged in the mind. But how can this interpretation be maintained, considering that the teacher (in the Sūtra) expressly says 'Speech in the mind?'-True we reply; but later on he says 'There is non-division, according to scriptural statement' (Sūtra 16), and we therefrom conclude that what is meant in the present Sūtra is merely cessation of the function of speech. For if the intention were to express absorption of the thing (i.e. the organ of speech) itself, there would be 'non-division' in all cases, and for what reason then should 'non-division' be specially stated in another case (i.e. in the case of which Sūtra 16 treats)? The meaning therefore is that the different functions are retracted, and that while the function of the mind continues to go on the function of speech is retracted first.--Why so?--'Because this is seen.' It is a matter of observation that while the mind continues to act the function of speech comes to an end; nobody, on the other hand, is able to see that the organ of speech itself, together with its function, is merged in the mind.--But are we not justified in assuming such a merging of speech in the mind, on the ground of scriptural statement?--This is impossible, we reply, since mind is not the causal substance of speech. We are entitled to assume only that a

thing is merged in what is its causal substance; a pot e.g. (when destroyed) is merged in clay. But there is no proof whatever for speech originating from mind. On the other hand we observe that functions originate and are retracted even where they do not inhere in causal substances. The function of fire, e.g. which is of the nature of heat, springs from fuel which is of the nature of earth, and it is extinguished in water.

--But how do you, on this interpretation, account for the scriptural statement that 'speech is merged in the mind?'--'And on account of the scriptural statement,' the Sūtrakāra replies. The scriptural statement also may be reconciled with our interpretation, in so far as the function and the thing to which the function belongs are viewed as non-different (Thibaut 1896:364-365).

Śaṅkara, distinguishing between the paths of a higher and lower knower, treats this section as referring to the path of the lower knower. Nimbārka interprets this instead as indicating the path for *all* knowers. Śaṅkara has placed the views held by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa in the place of the *pūrvapakṣin*. Their argument has been expanded by Śaṅkara, encompassing the plausible logical overextension that can occur if one were to follow the reasoning as posited by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa, that the sense-organs get connected with the mind. Śrīnivāsa clarified their position by stating that absorption is the intended connection; however Śaṅkara proposes that the correct way of interpreting this is through an understanding of the non-dual nature of everything, and that this section refers to the functions of the various sense-organs being absorbed into the mind, and not connected to the organs themselves. It is quite clear that Śaṅkara is countering Śrīnivāsa's arguments, as he takes into account the solution that Śrīnivāsa offers and refutes it. Again, Rāmānuja follows Śrīnivāsa's reasoning nearly exactly, but with the addition of Śaṅkara's interpretation as that of the *pūrvapakṣin*.¹¹²

¹¹² Śrībhāṣya 4.2.1

Brahmasūtra 4.2.3

Brahmasūtra 4.2.2 as included in Satyanand’s investigation, does not in fact yield any information here relevant. He proposes that Brahmasūtra 4.2.3 displays that Śāṅkara again is employing Nimbārka’s argument as the *pūrvapakṣa*. In this whole discourse, as with the previous *sūtra*, it is not discernible whether Śāṅkara’s *pūrvapakṣin* is Nimbārka or perhaps some other author who accepted the doctrine that the sense-organs were ‘connected’ with the mind during the processes of the departure of the soul from the body. However, it is safe to assume that this particular interpretation may have been unique to Nimbārka, as there are no other extant views that tally completely with his. The *sūtra* states: ‘The mind in the life-breath, due to what is subsequent’.¹¹³ Nimbārka simply comments:

And that is united with the vital breath (Bose 1943 vol.2:810).

Necessarily, Śrīnivāsa expands on Nimbārka’s very brief statement:

Now the author points out that that is united with the vital breath. To the enquiry: In what does mind, connected with speech and the rest, merge? – we reply: “That”, i.e. the mind, connected with speech and the rest, merges in the life-breath. Why? “On account of what is subsequent,” i.e. on account of the subsequent text: “The mind in the vital breath” (ChUp 6.8.6). Thus, it is established that the mind, connected with all the sense-organs, is united with the vital breath (Bose 1943 vol.2:810).

Śāṅkara is quite elaborate in his explanation of this *sūtra*, as if irked by a persistently stubborn *pūrvapakṣin*:

It has been shown that the passage, “Speech is merged in mind,” means a merging of the function only. A doubt here arises whether the subsequent clause, “mind in breath,” also

¹¹³ *tan manaḥ prāṇa uttarāt || Brahmasūtra 4.2.3*

means to intimate a merging of the function only or of that to which the function belongs. The *pūrvapakṣin* maintains the latter alternative. For that, he says, agrees with scripture, and moreover breath may be viewed as the causal substance of mind. For scripture: “Mind is made of earth, breath of water” (ChUp 6.6.5) states that mind comes from earth and breath from water, and scripture further states that “Water sent forth earth” (ChUp. 6.2.4). When mind therefore is merged in breath, it is the same as earth being merged in water; for mind is earth and breath is water, causal substance and effect being non-different.

To this we reply as follows. “The subsequent clause” intimates that the mind, after having absorbed within itself the functions of the outer senses, is merged in breath only in the way of its function being so merged. For we observe in the case of persons lying in deep sleep or about to die that, while the function of breath persists, the functions of the mind are stopped. Nor is the mind capable of being itself merged in breath, since breath does not constitute its causal substance. But it has been shown above that breath is the causal substance of mind! This is not valid, we reply. For the relation of causality, made out in such an indirect way, does not suffice to show that mind is really merged in breath. Were it so, then mind would also be merged in earth, earth in water, breath in water. Nor is there, on the alternative contemplated, any proof of mind having originated from that water which had passed over into breath. Mind cannot therefore, in itself, be merged in breath. And that the scriptural statement is satisfied by a mere merging of the function--the function and that to which the function belongs being viewed as identical--has been shown already under the preceding sūtra (Thibaut 1896:366-367).

So according to Śaṅkara, the *pūrvapakṣin* maintains that the sense-organs merge into the mind in accordance with *śruti* texts. Śaṅkara develops the *pūrvapakṣa*, adducing *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.6.5 and 6.2.4 which support this position by showing that gross elements can merge back into their causal elements. What Śaṅkara has done here is to strengthen the case of the *pūrvapakṣin* by extrapolating out from a meagre explanation, in order that he can, using his subtle argumentation, utterly undermine this contention with the view to discredit the *pūrvapakṣin*. Undermining a single argument of the opponent leads to the invalidation of the *pūrvapakṣin*'s stance as a viable interpretation, for a comprehensive Vedānta system would need to provide water-tight exegeses on the source texts. Śaṅkara's method of argumentation ultimately proved the most successful, as Vedānta is today usually associated with Śaṅkara Vedānta. Who is this *pūrvapakṣin* with whom Śaṅkara is so vexed? It seems to be clear from the comparison provided that Śaṅkara considered Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa as his *pūrvapakṣins* in this *adhikaraṇa*. Even though Śrīnivāsa has endeavoured to clarify

the terminology employed by Nimbārka by stating that the ‘merging’ is actually a ‘connection’, Śāṅkara rejects this, as it is a fallacious overextension to allot such a meaning to *sam√pad*. Rāmānuja would go on to argue in support of Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa’s interpretation, by countering Śāṅkara’s reasoning and example.¹¹⁴

Brahmasūtra 4.2.4

This aphorism is cited by Satyanand (1997:112) as another example of Śāṅkara’s *pūrvapakṣin* being Nimbārka. It states: ‘That in the ruler, due to their coming to it, etc.’¹¹⁵ Nimbārka interprets the *sūtra* by alluding to the teaching on life-breath merging with fire:¹¹⁶

The vital breath is united with the individual soul. Why? On account of the texts indicating “its approach”, viz. “Thus, verily, do all the vital-breaths approach together to the soul at the time of death” (BṛUp 4.3.38), “He going out, the vital-breath goes out after him” (BṛUp 4.4.2), “Or, who staying should I stay?” (PrUp 6.3). The vital-breath, connected with the individual soul, is united with fire, - this is the resultant meaning (Bose 1943 vol.2:811).

Śrīnivāsa unpacks Nimbārka’s explanation, introducing a *prima facie* view concerning the connection alluded to in the previous *sūtra*:

Thus, the meaning of the text “The mind in the vital-breath” (ChUp 6.8.6) has been determined. Now, the author states the meaning of the text: “The vital-breath in the fire” (ChUp 6.8.6). On the doubt, viz. whether the text: “The vital-breath in the fire” (ChUp 6.8.6) denotes that the vital-breath is united with fire or with the individual soul, - the *prima facie* view is: Just as in the previous cases, it is known from scriptural texts that speech is united with the mind and the mind with the vital-breath, so too, it is definitely ascertained from a scriptural text that the vital-breath is united with fire alone. With regard to this we reply: “That” i.e. the vital-breath with which the mind is united, merges “in the ruler”, i.e. in the individual soul, the ruler of the body and the sense-organs, is united with it. Why? “On account of its approach,” i.e. on account of its approach, going after and

¹¹⁴ Śrībhāṣya 4.2.3

¹¹⁵ *so’dhyakṣe tadupagamādibhyaḥ || Brahmasūtra 4.2.4*

¹¹⁶ *Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.8.6*

staying. Thus to begin with, the approach of the vital-breath to ‘the ruler’ is declared in the scriptural text: “Just as the servants go towards a king who wishes to set out on a journey, so do all the vital-breaths approach together to the soul at the time of death (BṛUp 4.3.38). The going after of the vital-breaths with ‘the ruler’ is declared in the scriptural texts: “When he comes to breathe upwards” (BṛUp 4.3.38), “He going out, the vital-breath goes out after him” (BṛUp 4.4.22). The staying of the vital-breath with ‘the ruler’ is declared in the scriptural text: “Who going out, shall I go out, or who staying stay?” (PrUp 6.3). The vital-breath, united with the individual soul, is united with fire. Hence it is established that the vital-breath being united with the individual soul is again united with fire together with it (Bose 1943 vol.2:811-812).

Śaṅkara elaborates on the *sūtra*, introducing a similar *prima facie* view:

We have ascertained that a thing which has not originated from another is not itself merged in the latter, but only through its functions. A doubt now arises whether, according to the word of scripture, the function of breath is merged in heat, or in the individual soul which is the ruler of the body and senses. According to the *Pūrvapakṣin* we must conclude that the breath is merged in heat only, since the scriptural statement allows no room for doubt and we are not entitled to assume something not declared by scripture. The breath under discussion persists ‘in the ruler,’ i.e. the intelligent self (the individual soul) which possesses nescience, work, and former knowledge as limiting adjuncts; i.e. the function of breath has that soul for its substratum. Why so? ‘On account of (the *prāṇas*) going towards him,’ &c. Another scriptural passage declares that all *prāṇas* without any difference go to the soul, ‘All the *prāṇas* go to the Self at the time of death when a man is thus going to expire’ (BṛUp 4.3.38). Another passage again specially declares that the *prāṇa* with its five functions follows the individual soul, ‘After him thus departing the *prāṇa* departs,’ and that the other *prāṇas* follow that *prāṇa*, ‘And after the *prāṇa* thus departing all the other *prāṇas* depart’ (BṛUp. 4.4.2). And the text, ‘He is furnished with intelligence’ (ibid.), by declaring the individual soul to be of intimately intelligent nature, suggests that in it, viz. the soul, the *prāṇa* -into which the different organs of knowledge have been merged- has taken its abode. But scripture also says, ‘The *prāṇa* (is merged) in heat’; why then make the addition implied in the doctrine - that breath is merged in the individual soul? We must make that addition, we reply, because in the process of departure &c. the soul is the chief agent, and because we must pay regard to specifications contained in other scriptural passages also. How then do you explain the statement, ‘Breath is merged in heat?’ To this question the next *sūtra* replies (Thibaut 1986:367-368).

The fact that Śaṅkara and Śrīnivāsa hold the same *prima facie* view should not, as Satyanand understands, suggest that Śrīnivāsa was replicating Śaṅkara’s position; rather, this simply demonstrates that both authors are following conventional argumentation utilised by Vedāntic thinkers. The *pūrvapakṣin*’s position is articulated in such a way that allows Śaṅkara to respond, displaying slight consternation, as to how one could be so literal in his understanding of scripture and claim to be a Vedāntin. Traditionally this is the hallmark of the Mīmāṃsakas,

and Śaṅkara does not refer to any other group here. He postpones answering the doctrine concerning life-breaths merging with fire for the next *sūtra*, whereas Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa discuss it under this *sūtra*. Satyanand (1997:114) points out that Rāmānuja adds a wonderful example illustrating the point of view of Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa that would surely be indispensable from their commentary had they known about it, but it is completely absent from Śrīnivāsa and Nimbārka.

Brahmasūtra 4.2.5

Here the solution is provided: ‘In the elements, due to the scriptural statement to that [effect]’,¹¹⁷ and Nimbārka continues the interpretation from the previous *sūtra*:

And that (viz. union) of that (viz. the vital-breath) which is connected with the soul takes place “with the elements”, since in the text: “Composed of the earth, composed of water, composed of air, composed of the ether, composed of fire” (BṛUp 4.4.5), the soul is declared to be composed of all the elements (Bose 1943 vol.2:813).

Śrīnivāsa does not add too many additional details to his commentary:

It has been established that the vital-breath being connected with the ruler is connected with fire. Now the meaning of the word fire is being considered. ‘On account of its approach and so-on,’ the vital-breath is united with fire. Now, the question is whether the vital-breath is united with fire alone or with the elements together with fire. If it be suggested that on account of the scriptural text: “The vital-breath in fire” (ChUp 6.8.6) it is united with fire alone, we reply: “In the elements”, i.e. the words ‘in fire’ mean ‘in the elements together with fire’. Why? “On account of the scriptural declaration to that effect,” i.e. because in the scriptural text: “Composed of the earth, composed of water, composed of the air, composed of the ether, composed of fire” (BṛUp 4.4.5), the soul that is moving on is declared to be composed of all the elements (Bose 1943 vol.2:813).

Śaṅkara does not develop his commentary in a similar vein to Nimbārka or Śrīnivāsa, but provides details that provide an insight to his environment:

¹¹⁷ *bhūteṣu tac chruteḥ* || *Brahmasūtra 4.2.5*

The soul joined by the *prāṇa* takes up its abode within the subtle elements which accompany heat and form the seed of the (gross) body. This we conclude from the clause, 'Breath in heat'. But this passage declares, not that the soul together with the *prāṇa* takes up its abode in heat, but only that the *prāṇa* takes up its abode! No matter, we reply; since the preceding *sūtra* intercalates the soul in the interval (between *prāṇa* and *tejas*). Of a man who first travels from *Srughna* to *Mathurā* and then from *Mathurā* to *Pāṭaliputra*, we may say shortly that he travels from *Srughna* to *Pāṭaliputra*. The passage under discussion therefore means that the soul together with the *prāṇa* abides in the elements associated with heat. But how are you entitled to draw in the other elements also, while the text only speaks of heat? To this question the next *Sūtra* replies (Thibaut 1896:368).

Śaṅkara defers dealing with the complete topic until the next *sūtra*. Intriguingly, he understands this *sūtra* in the same way as Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa by referencing *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.8.6, namely that it designates the rest of the elements as well, and he provides an illustration of a person travelling from *Srughna* to *Pāṭaliputra* via *Mathurā*. If Śrīnivāsa was aware of Śaṅkara, surely this, or an illustration similar to it as provided by Rāmānuja in the previous *sūtra*'s explanation, would be utilised. Instead, Śrīnivāsa is unaware of this interpretation, and so it cannot be concluded on the basis of this *sūtra*, as does Satyanand (1997:114), that Śrīnivāsa is aware of Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara also inserts the scriptural passage quoted by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa in a more appropriate place, i.e. under the next *sūtra*. Satyanand has correctly singled these *sūtras* out from the rest, for although they do not display any uniquely Nimbārka's doctrines, they do demonstrate that Śaṅkara was interested in countering Nimbārka's interpretation. Most other commentators concede that the process of merging involves the function of the sense-organ, in addition, or not, to the organ itself (Bose 1943 vol. 2:815). The style of Rāmānuja's commentary appears to have been written with an appreciation of Śrīnivāsa as demonstrable both here and in the instances mentioned above.

Brahmasūtra 4.2.12

Satyanand (1997:115) then focuses on an analysis of *Brahmasūtra* 4.2.12-13. This section continues the dialogue surrounding the departure of the soul and the precise processes involved. Although lengthy, the commentaries of these authors are relevant and thus are quoted in full. *Brahmasūtra* 4.2.12 states: ‘To the objection due to the denial [in scripture, the soul of a knower of Brahman does not depart, we reply:] no, [it refers to the non-departure of the sense-organs] from the embodied soul, for [the text] of some [scriptural passages] clarifies this’.¹¹⁸ Nimbārka provides his viewpoint:

If it be objected that on account of the denial, viz., “Now, he who does not desire, who is without desire, who is free from desire, who has attained his desire, who desires for the self, - his sense-organs do not go out” (BṛUp 4.4.6), a knower’s departure from the body is not justifiable, - we reply: There is no such contradiction, since that this is a denial of the departure of the sense-organs “from the embodied-soul”, the topic of discussion, is clear from the reading “of some”, viz., “From him the vital-breaths do not depart” (Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 14.7.2.8). Scripture denies their departure from that alone (Bose 1943 vol.2:821)

Śrīnivāsa expands on Nimbārka’s commentary, supplying further scriptural passages to substantiate his views:

If it be objected: Under the aphorism “And the same up to the beginning of the path” (BS 4.2.7) it has been established that a knower too departs from the body. That does not stand to reason, “On account of the denial” of a knower’s departure from the body, in the scriptural text: “Now he who does not desire, who is without desire, who is free from desire, who has attained his desire, who desires for the self, - his sense organs do not go out. Having become Brahman alone, he enters into Brahman” (BṛUp 4.4.6) and so on. We reply: “No”. This denial is not a denial of the departure of the soul from the body. Having referred to the embodied soul, the topic of discussion by the word ‘him’ in the text: “Now, he who does not desire”, the text goes on to deny the departure of those sense-organs from the embodied soul” by the clause: “His sense organs do not go out”, since by the sixth case, ‘his’, the body, which is not mentioned before as connected with the sense-organs is not referred to. By the texts: “By that light, this soul goes out” (BṛUp 4.4.2), “He going out the vital-breath goes out after him” (BṛUp 4.4.2), “He assumes another newer and more auspicious form” (BṛUp 4.4.4) and so on, it is suggested that during the state of

¹¹⁸ *pratiṣedhād iti cen na śārīrāt spaṣṭo hy ekeṣām || Brahmasūtra 4.2.12*

transmigratory existence, the sense-organs of the embodied soul depart in order that there may be the origin of a new body, and it is this that is denied here. Further, it is suggested that at the time of the knower's departure from the final body, set up so long by the works the effects of which have already begun, he is separated from the sense-organs, and this too is denied. The sense is that the sense-organs accompany him as he proceeds through the path of gods, and are not separated from him prior to his attaining Brahman. In the reading "of some" branches, viz. "From him the sense-organs do not depart" (Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 14.7.2.8), there is an explicit denial of the departure of the sense-organs from the embodied soul, mentioned as the topic of discussion thus: "He who is without desire, who is free from desire, who has attained his desire" (Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 14.7.2.8), and indicated as an ablative by the fifth case ending (Bose 1943 vol.2:821-822).

Śaṅkara divides this *sūtra* into two parts which feature as *Brahmasūtra* 4.2.12 and 4.2.13 in his commentary. Taken together, these two *sūtras* are as follows:

From the distinction conveyed by the clause, 'and (relative) immortality without having burned' (BS 4.2.7), it follows that in the case of absolute immortality being reached there is no going and no departure of the soul from the body. The idea that for some reason or other a departure of the soul might take place in this latter case also, is precluded by the following scriptural passage, 'But as to the man who does not desire, who, not desiring, freed from desires, is satisfied in his desires, or desires the Self only, of him the vital spirits do not depart, being Brahman, he goes to Brahman' (BrUp 4.4.6). From this express denial - forming part of the higher knowledge - it follows that the *prāṇas* do not pass out of the body of him who knows Brahman. This conclusion the *pūrvapakṣin* denies. For, he says, the passage quoted does not deny the departure of the *prāṇas* from the body, but from the embodied (individual) soul. How is this known? From the fact that in another Śākhā we have (not the sixth, genitive, case 'of him,' but) the fifth, ablative, case 'from him'. 'From him the vital spirits do not depart' (Mādhyandina Śākhā). For the sixth case which expresses only relation in general is determined towards some special relation by the fifth case met with in another Śākhā. And as the embodied soul which has a claim on exaltation and bliss is the chief topic of the chapter, we construe the words 'from him' to mean not the body but the embodied soul. The sense therefore is 'from that soul when about to depart the *prāṇas* do not depart, but remain with it.' The soul of him who dies therefore passes out of the body, together with the *prāṇas*. This view the next *sūtra* refutes. [BS 4.2.13]

The assertion that also the soul of him who knows Brahman departs from the body, because the denial states the soul (not the body) to be the point of departure, cannot be upheld. For we observe that in the sacred text of some there is a clear denial of a departure, the starting-point of which is the body. The text meant at first records the question asked by Ārtabhāga, 'When this man dies, do the vital spirits depart from him or not?' then embraces the alternative of non-departure, in the words, No, replied Yājñavalkya; thereupon- anticipating the objection that a man cannot be dead as long as his vital spirits have not departed - teaches the resolution of the *prāṇas* in the body 'in that very same place they are merged;' and finally, in confirmation thereof, remarks, 'he swells, he is inflated, inflated the dead man lies.' This last clause states that swelling, &c., affect the subject under discussion, viz. that from which the departure takes place (the 'tasmāt' of the former clause), which subject is, in this last clause, referred to by means of the word 'He.' Now swelling and so on can belong to the body only, not to the embodied soul. And owing to its equality thereto also the passages, 'from him the vital spirits do not depart;' 'in that very same place they are resolved,' have to be taken as denying a departure starting from the body, although the chief subject of the passage is the embodied soul. This may be done by the embodied soul and the body being viewed as non-different.

In this way we have to explain the passage if read with the fifth case. If again the passage is read with the sixth case ('of him the vital spirits do not depart'), it must be understood as denying the departure of him who knows, as its purport manifestly is to deny a departure established elsewhere. But what it denies can only be a departure from the body; for what is established (viz. for ordinary men not possessing the highest knowledge) is only the departure (of the soul, &c.) from the body, not the departure (of the *pāṇas*, &c.) from the embodied soul.

Moreover, after the passage, 'Either through the eye or through the skull or through other places of the body, him thus departing the *pāṇa* departs after, and after the departing *pāṇa* all *pāṇas* depart,' &c., has at length described the departure and transmigration of the soul as belonging to him who does not know, and after the account of him who does not know has been concluded with the words. 'So much for the man who has desires,' the text designates him who knows as 'he who has no desires;' a designation which, would be altogether inappropriate if the text wanted to establish departure, &c., for that person also. The passage therefore has to be explained as denying of him who knows the going and departing which are established for him who does not know. For thus only the designation employed by the text has a sense. And for him who knowing Brahman has become the Self of that omnipresent Brahman, and in whom all desires and works have become extinct, departing and going are not even possible, as there is not any occasion for them. And such texts as 'there he reaches Brahman' (BṛUp 4.4.7) indicate the absence of all going and departing (Thibaut 1896:372-375).

Satyanand (1997:116) supposes that the above demonstrates that 'in the light of Śaṅkara's criticism of the doctrine of Nimbārka, Śrīnivāsa reinforces the arguments of his *guru* with more scriptural supports'. This presumption is flawed due to the fact that Śrīnivāsa's main purpose in writing the *Vedāntakaustubha* is to engage in expounding and clarifying the views of his preceptor, which were so brief as to be in most cases unintelligible to the un-initiated scholar, while countering doctrines that to them conflicted with the 'correct' interpretation of Vedānta. The fact that Śrīnivāsa is not aware of Śaṅkara is clear as the discussion between Ārtaḥḥāga and Yājñavalkya would, as it does for Rāmānuja in the *Śrībhāṣyam*, warrant an explanation to counter the interpretation offered by Śaṅkara. Śrīnivāsa did not even refer to it, because he was unaware of its inclusion in the discussion by Śaṅkara. Satyanand (1997:116) asserts that Śrīnivāsa's mentioning of *Brahmasūtra* 4.2.7 in his introduction to this *sūtra* means he took the lead from Śaṅkara. In actuality, it is clear that in order to explain the doctrine propounded by the presumed *pūrvapakṣin* in the *sūtra*, it would necessarily refer to a doubt raised on the conclusion attached

to *Brahmasūtra* 4.2.7. Satyanand (1997:117) again assumes that because Śrīnivāsa explains *ekeṣām* in *Brahmasūtra* 4.2.12 as the readings of ‘some other’ recensions that he must be taking the lead of Śaṅkara. It is quite apparent from Nimbārka’s words, however, that he is in fact alluding briefly to this topic, as he quotes the Mādhyandina and Kaṇva recensions of *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 14.7.2.8. Śrīnivāsa explains them comprehensively. Śaṅkara engages in a lengthier discussion of these readings, and given the fact that his *pūrvapakṣin* here (who is not the same as the *pūrvapakṣin* of the *sūtra*) subscribes to the same view as Nimbārka, it appears that he is responding to this *sūtra* in awareness of both Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa’s commentaries.

Brahmasūtras 4.3.6-15 as pointed out by Satyanand (1997: 69-102) in reality do not match the criteria as set out above, as the *bhedābheda pūrvapakṣin* does not have any specific traits to be used as a marker of differentiation between Nimbārka’s *svābhāvika dvaitādvaita* doctrine and any others.

3.5 Summary of Findings from the Comparative Study

The above investigation may lead to a legitimate doubt, which Satyanand (1997:88) responds to:

It is quite legitimate to doubt whether Nimbārka is summarising Śaṅkara rather than the latter elaborating the former. The first alternative cannot be accepted because when one summarises a more refined and scholarly work like that of Śaṅkara’s *bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtras*, he can ill afford to miss the more refined vocabulary, the logical clarity, the academic excellence and the scholarly perspective of the original work. He can never leave aside the more convincing and powerful illustrations as well as the apt scriptural texts of the one he is summarising. On the contrary, the one who expands a short work tends to

correct the archaic terms and to use more refined vocabulary. He can replace the misplaced texts, besides bringing more scriptural proofs.

It can be conceded that some of Satyanand's findings depend heavily on inferences drawn from *argumentum in absentia*. However, there are numerous places where Satyanand's methodology displays a manifest logical clarity, as I have shown above. Malkovsky (2001:125) comments that he deems Satyanand's arguments persuasive as a direct result of his methodological approach. A similar procedure has been used by Nakamura (2004) to date Śaṅkara and others. I have followed Śāstrin (1972) and Agrawal (2000) who both extend this mode of argumentation to the case of Śrīnivāsa. Satyanand's (1997:119-148) attempt to establish that Śrīnivāsa is posterior to Śaṅkara is unconvincing, even though he goes into great detail for, as demonstrated above, Śrīnivāsa is just as unaware of Śaṅkara's position as Nimbārka is. Throughout the *Vedāntakaustubha*, Śrīnivāsa counters contemporary, and in his view, heterodox theories. If he had been later than Śaṅkara, there is absolutely no doubt that the *advaita* doctrine would have received similar criticism. Śrīnivāsa did elaborate upon his teacher's doctrine as that was the *raison d'être* behind the *Vedāntakaustubha*, and similarities between his arguments and Śaṅkara's can be explained simply as resulting from their reliance on the work of earlier Vedāntins.

So, in terms of the *Brahmasūtra* commentaries, it can be shown that Śaṅkara is aware of Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa, not the other way around. In summary, the reasons are as follows:

1. The multiple instances where Śaṅkara's language is almost exactly the same as Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa when presenting a specifically Nimbārka *bhedābheda* theory.
2. Śaṅkara incorporates very specific doctrines of Nimbārka's *bhedābheda* into his *pūrvapakṣa*
3. Śaṅkara includes quotations and illustrations offered by Nimbārka for *bhedābheda* in his *pūrvapakṣa* before strengthening it further and then subjecting it to criticism to establish his own doctrine of *advaita*.

As Malkovsky (2001:124) puts it,

If two texts, such as Śaṅkara's BrSūBh and Nimbārka's VPS, are at all causally related, then the more developed of the two arguments on the same topic, in this case on the Bhedābheda-vāda, would represent the more recent of the two texts. That is to say Śaṅkara expands on Nimbārka's teaching, but the reverse cannot be true.

The in-depth examination of the *Brahmasūtra* commentaries that I have presented above, in my opinion, in the first instance shows that Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja had access to Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa's commentaries and therefore they do display, according to this particular relative chronology, that Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa's commentaries were completed before Śaṅkara, and disseminated widely enough that Śaṅkara felt the compunction to include their theories amidst his various *pūrvapakṣas*. Although Satyanand (1997) arrived at a similar conclusion, I have been able to demonstrate that Śrīnivāsa is also very likely to have been a chronological predecessor to Śaṅkara. Hirst's (2011) investigation on an Upaniṣad-commentary of Śaṅkara provides an additional dimension of validity to this understanding of the relative chronology of these authors.

3.6 Śāṅkara's Tārīkikas and Nimbārka

In her work on Śāṅkara's *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya*, Hirst (2011:54) reveals an intriguing fact that should initiate a re-examination of all Vedāntic commentarial traditions and the conclusions that were made based on early scholarly assumptions. Her methodology involved the application of socio-linguistic register theory to the *pūrvapakṣins* Śāṅkara created in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya*, and she found that the ubiquitous understanding of 'Tārīkika' as denoting the Naiyyāyikas does not hold up when subjected to close reading.

The first piece of evidence that enabled the identification of two possible Tārīkikas was Śāṅkara's language. When referring to the Tārīkikas throughout his works, Śāṅkara is usually measured in his refutation; however there are a few specific occasions where Śāṅkara is demonstrably vituperative. Hirst (2011:56) identifies *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya* 2.1.20 as one of these instances. Śāṅkara criticises the 'Tārīkika' *pūrvapakṣin* during the course of his commentary on this passage, utilising such terms as: 'those who think themselves to be learned', 'carried away by their own ideas', whose 'minds are defiled by appalling logic', are 'offspring of degraded marriages between *brāhmaṇas* and other castes', 'pitiable', 'bulls of Tārīkikas, lacking only a tail and horns', 'fools', 'kings of rogues and hirelings', 'small-minded', and other such language (Hirst 2011:56). She quite rightly notices that the exaggerated argumentation displayed here by Śāṅkara is quite uncharacteristic when compared to his dealings with the Tārīkikas as more

commonly understood elsewhere. Hirst (2011:57-58) discusses the application of socio-linguistic register theory to this particular instance and is supported in fact by the medieval commentators themselves in her conclusion that Śaṅkara's language demonstrates that this group was similar to him socially and perhaps were competing for the same market-share of Vedāntins. She suggests that the Tārīkikas could refer to Naiyāyikas, or all other independent groups, or possibly a Vaiṣṇava Vedāntin rival. Indeed, these are all discussed by Śaṅkara throughout his works, but the Vaiṣṇava Vedāntin rival seems to be the particular butt of Śaṅkara's diatribe in this case.

What has this group done to exasperate him so? Hirst (2011:60) brings to bear various passages from Śaṅkara that demonstrate that their view on the purport of scripture is mutually contradictory, an accusation Śaṅkara frequently uses of the *bhedābhedins*. However for these particular Tārīkikas, the scriptural authority, inference and direct perception of Vedāntic epistemology do not support a completely non-different world-view. They also insist on separate individual souls who may enjoy the fruits of their actions (Hirst 2011:61). They suppose themselves to be *aupaniṣadaḥ*, or followers of the Upaniṣads (i.e. Vedāntins), picking and choosing scriptural passages to support their apparently contradictory philosophy, i.e. *bhedābheda* (Hirst 2011:62). They accept three ontological categories (Brahman, *jīva*, *jagat*), where the individual soul possesses *karṭṛtva* etc. over the body it occupies. More importantly, they were 'relatively new on the scene'. Ānandagiri identifies this group with Bhartṛhari in his subcommentary to the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya*, composed at least five centuries later (Hirst

2011:63). Hirst (2011:64) further points out that Śaṅkara used his familiarity with Vaiṣṇavism to draw prospective followers to *advaita*. These Tārkikas have a strong sense of the difference between the *upāsaka* and *upāsya*, the worshipper and the worshipped, even though the two are reckoned to be identical, but different due to being a transformation of Brahman's energy (*brahmapariṇāmvāda*), where the individual soul is a part (*aṁśa*) (Hirst 2011:65). Indeed, in order to understand the Upaniṣad verses which appear to support difference, the assistance of a knower of the true tradition (*satsampradāyavid*) of *advaita* is necessary, such as Śaṅkara himself, demonstrating that he views himself as the correct interpreter whereas the *bhedābhedins* have failed. This group is definitely not Tārkika in the Naiyāyika sense of the word (Hirst 2011:66). Apparently too, they are not any type of Vaiṣṇavas, but specifically, worshippers of Kṛṣṇa, whom 'Śaṅkara seeks to manoeuvre out of competition' (Hirst 2011:68).

Hirst cannot identify a group that fits this description, as according to prevalent theories, the earliest recognisable Vaiṣṇava Vedāntin group is that of Rāmānuja. However, when Śaṅkara's allegations are applied to Nimbārka, who precedes him, and Śrīnivāsa, it is very clear that Nimbārka and his group are the intended target of Śaṅkara's polemics, especially in the light of the above comparison of the *Brahmasūtra* commentaries. In such a case, an identification of these specific Tārkikas, not the Naiyāyika brand, may be had from placing more emphasis on the main force of *tarka*, which is 'conjecture'; as such they may be just 'speculators' or 'controversialists', as well they were in the eyes of Śaṅkara.

The following represents Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa's views on the various topics mentioned by Hirst:

1. The entirety of scripture points to *bhedābheda*, which is mutually contradictory according to Śaṅkara:

‘The universe, consisting of the corporeal and the incorporeal abides in its own cause, viz. Brahman, in a relation of difference-non-difference...’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.2.27, Bose 1943 vol. 2:552)

‘There is such a relation (of difference-non-difference) between the individual soul and the Highest Person as well...’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.2.28, Bose 1943 vol. 2:554)

‘With a view to confirming this the reverend author of the aphorisms states his own conclusion, expounding the meaning of all Scriptures, viz. that the universe, the effect, stands in a relation of difference-non-difference to Brahman, the cause’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 3.2.27, Bose 1943 vol.2:552-553).

‘...there is a relationship of natural difference-non-difference between the soul and Brahman’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 2.3.42, 3.2.28, Bose 1943 vol.2:437, 555).

‘[Pūrvapakṣin] There being a mutual opposition between difference and non-difference, of either the texts about difference or the texts about difference must certainly be metaphorical – we reply: The individual soul is neither absolutely different from the Highest Person, nor absolutely non-different from Him but is a part of the Highest Self’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 2.3.42, Bose 1943 vol. 1:437).

‘Hence it is established that the entire Veda is in concordance with regard to Brahman alone, or Lord Kṛṣṇa, the Highest Person, omniscient, possessing infinite natural and inconceivable powers, the cause of the world, and different and non-different from the sentient and the non-sentient...’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 1.1.4, Bose 1943 vol.1:41)

2. The individual soul is separate and enjoys the fruits of its actions:

‘the individual soul...is different in every body’ (*Daśaśloki* 1).

‘the individual soul...is possessed of the attributes of being a knower, being an agent and so on...is different in every body...’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 1.1.1, Bose 1943 vol. 1:11)

‘on account of the eating [of the fruits of actions] of the individual soul’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.3.7, Bose 1943 vol. 1:149)

3. These Tārīkikas suppose themselves to be *aupaniṣadaḥ*:

‘Hence the object of inquiry is Lord Vāsudeva alone...different and non-different to all...this is the settled conclusion of the followers of the Upaniṣads (*aupaniṣadaḥ*)’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.1.4, Bose 1943 vol. 1:33)

‘Brahman, as admitted by Vedāntins (*aupaniṣadaḥ*), is One alone. He transforms himself into the form of non-sentient objects like the ether and the rest by emitting his power of the enjoyed (i.e. the *acit śakti*); having emitted the sentient power of the enjoyer (i.e. the *cit śakti*) in the form of gods [men, and the rest], and having entered within as their inner controller, makes them undergo the fruits of their respective works...’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 2.1.26, Bose 1943 vol.2: 309)

4. The Tārīkas accept three ontological categories:

‘The threefold nature [of reality] is established by the revealed and recollected scriptures’ (*Daśaślokī* 7)

‘Now there are three kinds of reality, distinguished as the sentient, the non-sentient and Brahman, because in the aphorisms as well, a trinity of reals has been mentioned’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 1.1.1, Bose 1943 vol. 1:11).

5. They have a sense of difference between the worshipper and the worshipped:

‘“On account of the designation of a difference” between the obtainer and the object obtained’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.1.18, Bose 1943 vol. 1:61)

‘Those two alone are specified as the object to be worshipped and the worshipper...’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.2.12, Bose 1943 vol. 1:110)

‘The individual soul and the Supreme soul alone are specified as that which approaches and the goal approached, as the meditator and the object of meditation’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 1.2.12, Bose 1943 vol. 1:111)

6. The individual soul is a transformation of the energy or power (*śakti*), and a part of, Brahman:

‘The individual soul is a part of the Supreme Soul, in accordance with the designation of difference...and on account of the designation of non-difference’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 2.3.42, Bose 1943 vol. 1:436).

‘The individual soul...is a part of the Highest Self... a ‘part’ means a ‘power’’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 2.3.42, Bose 1943 vol. 1:436).

‘The omniscient and omnipotent Brahman, having transformed Himself into the world by the projection of His power, becomes transformed, indeed, through His own nature, undeveloped, and possessing powers like creatorship, etc.’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.4.26, Bose 1943 vol. 1:261)

‘The omniscient and omnipotent Supreme Soul, non-deviating in nature, transforms himself into the form of the world through the projection of His own powers, consisting in His own self and superintended by Him’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 1.4.26, Bose 1943 vol. 1:262).

7. They need the assistance of a ‘knower of the true *sampradāya*’ (*satsampradāyavid*), perhaps due to the fact that Nimbārka claims that his preceptor is none other than Nārada Muni himself, and not a human teacher like Śaṅkara’s avowed preceptor Govinda:

‘The Plenty, taught by the highest teacher [Paramācārya is actually better understood as the preceptor’s preceptor], the venerable Sanatkumāra, to our preceptor, the reverend Nārada’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.3.8, Bose 1943 vol. 1:150)

‘I worship the Holy Swan [Hansa], Sanaka and the others, the Divine Sage [Nārada] and Nimbabhāskara, may a devotion for Lord Kṛṣṇa arise in us through their grace’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 1.1.1, Bose 1943 vol. 1:2)

8. They are worshippers of Kṛṣṇa:

‘We meditate upon the Supreme Brahman, Kṛṣṇa’ (*Daśaśloki* 4)

‘An enquiry is to be instituted, at all times, into the Highest Person – Ramā’s husband [Puruṣottama, Ramākānta], denoted by the term ‘Brahman’ (’ (*Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.1.1, Bose 1943 vol. 1:1).

‘May devotion for Lord Kṛṣṇa arise in us... Lord Vāsudeva, the Supreme Person [Puruṣottama]... Brahman is none but Lord Kṛṣṇa... Madhusūdana... Nārāyaṇa... Hari’ (*Vedāntakaustubha* 1.1.1, Bose 1943 vol. 1:16)

As is clear, each of the points raised by Śaṅkara noticed by Hirst match exactly the doctrine of Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa, evincing enough difference from Bhartṛprapañca’s doctrine of *svābhāvīkadvaitādvaita* for it to be apparent that the Tārkikas being referred to here are likely to be Nimbārka and his followers.

3.7 Towards Nimbārka's Date

Both Malkovsky (2001) and Shastri (2003) follow Satyanand (1997) in his estimation of Nimbārka's chronology though there were quite a few discrepancies which necessitated my re-examination of the evidence he furnished. Both Agrawal (2000) and Śāstrin (1972) utilise similar methodology but subscribe to a different view of the relationship of Nimbārka to Śrīnivāsa and thus are able to arrive at a more informed outcome. Still it will be useful to consider each of these perspectives, before taking into account the above arguments to come to a more plausible conclusion.

Through comparative study of the *Brahmasūtra* commentaries, this much is now clear: Nimbārka was a predecessor of Śāṅkara. How long before Śāṅkara he lived becomes the next most important question. Malkovsky (2001:125) states that Satyanand's approaches here are

a good deal more speculative and hypothetical than what he had said in support of his thesis that Śāṅkara knew and used the VPS, yet they are plausible in their own right.

Satyanand begins by attempting to define what stage of development of Sāṅkhya doctrine is being countered by Nimbārka, and concludes on the basis of the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* that it is pre-*Sāṅkhyakārikā* Sāṅkhya that is being criticised. As the *Sāṅkhyakārikās* and their author Īśvarakṛṣṇa are assigned to the 6th century CE by Satyanand (1997:157,165), Nimbārka should have lived before this. This dating is highly suspect, as Malkovsky (2001:125) points out. Arthur B.

Keith had pointed out quite conclusively based on work that Takakusu carried out on Paramārtha's Chinese translation of the *Sāṅkhyakārikās*, that Īśvarakṛṣṇa's time should be fixed to between c.350 and 450CE (Keith 1918:69). Larson (1979:144) on the other hand is unsure that Īśvarakṛṣṇa is identical with Vindhyavāsa which was the basis upon which the dating was established, and thus it can only be said with certainty that the *terminus ad quem* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṅkhyakārikā* is Paramārtha's translation, which is dated c.557-569CE (Larson 1979:145). De Palma (1992:176) suggests a plausible dating of c.350-450CE for Īśvarakṛṣṇa based on the prevalent theories. Satyanand does not cite any specific references by Nimbārka to pre-*Sāṅkhyakārikā* Sāṅkhya, and based on the datings for Īśvarakṛṣṇa, it seems likely that he is mistaken in his reasoning here.

Satyanand then points out that Nimbārka criticizes *śāktavāda* under *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.42-45, which is clearly aimed at a more developed form of the tradition, which dates from the late 5th century (Malkovsky 2001:125). However, these developments still predate the later form of *śāktavāda* that is criticised by Madhva in his *Brahmasūtra* commentary (Satyanand 1997:160); and according to Satyanand (1997:165) then, Nimbārka could not have lived before the religious developments following the late 5th century CE.

Satyanand (1997:166) points out in conclusion that there exists a close similarity between the doctrines propounded by Nimbārka and those of Ādiśeṣa as evident in his *Paramārthasāra* which Danielson (1980:1-2) has assigned to the early 6th century CE. Satyanand uses this evidence to suggest that these works possibly

belonged to the same sort of Vedāntic Vaiṣṇava milieu, leading to the conclusion that Nimbārka's probable dates should be around 450-525CE, which Malkovsky (2001:126) hails as a 'major contribution to Vedāntic studies'.

Malkovsky (2001:127) then suggests a further method of shoring up the somewhat 'shaky ground' of Satyanand's references to *śāktavāda*, Sāṅkhya and the *Paramārthasāra* as bases for dating. The fact that the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* is unaware of any specifically *advaita* doctrines, especially those suggested by King (1998:68-82) in his analysis of the *Gauḍapādīyakārikās*, would mean that Nimbārka would not have even been aware of Gauḍapāda and his *Āgamaśāstra* (another, more common name of the *Gauḍapādīyakārikās*), whom Nakamura (2004:308-309) dates to 640-690CE. Thus, Nimbārka's works should be sometime before those of Gauḍapāda; and Malkovsky (2001:127) agrees that all the evidence points to such a time.

Śāstrin (1972) has provided a few important additional insights. He commences by asserting that Śrīnivāsa was the direct disciple of Nimbārka, and contends that on the basis of Śrīnivāsa's *Vedāntakaustubha* it is possible to identify the earliest possible date for Nimbārka. This is because Śrīnivāsa quotes a certain 'Viprabhikṣu' twice in his commentary to *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.28:

'This has been declared by Viprabhikṣu as well thus: 'There is no understanding of the meaning of what is non-percieved. The cognitive self, though non-divided, is yet looked

upon by men of perverted understanding to be possessed of the differences of objects perceived, the perceiver and consciousness.¹¹⁹

‘On account of being uniformly perceived together, there is no difference between ‘blue’ and its cognition.’¹²⁰

These passages were quoted by Śrīnivāsa in his refutation of the Yogācāra school of Buddhism which he names at the beginning of the commentary of this *sūtra*. The second quotation was traced by Śāstrin (1972:45) to the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* of Dharmakīrti. However he could not trace the first quotation due to the lack of Sanskrit editions of the Tibetan or Chinese translated originals during his time. In fact, in the first quotation, the second and third lines come from Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇavārttikakārikā*, 2.344 (Miyasaka 1971:72). Significantly, Śāṅkara also quotes this in his *Upadeśasāhasrī* 18.142 (Nakamura 1983:76). Dharmakīrti has been quite convincingly assigned dates of 634-673CE (Nakamura 1983:76-77). Franco (1994:11) is one of the scholars that accept Frauwallner’s dating for Dharmakīrti of 600-660CE which was based on an *argumentum ex silentio*, but works by Kimura (1999), Tillemans (2000: xiii-xv) and Krasser (2011) have demonstrated sensible revisions to his dating, which Kimura (1999:209-214) defines as c.550-620CE. So, Śrīnivāsa’s *terminus a quo* is around either 620, 660 or 673CE.

As to the latest date for Śrīnivāsa, Śāstrin proposes to inspect those authors who have rejected Nimbārka’s doctrine. Rāmānuja makes a clear distinction between *aupādhikabhedābheda* and *svābhāvīkabhedābheda* in *Śrībhāṣya* 1.1.1 (Śāstrin

¹¹⁹ *uktañ ca viprabhikṣuṇāpy apratyakṣopalambhasya nārthadrṣṭiḥ prasiddhyati | avibhāge ’pi buddhyātmā viparyāsitarśanaḥ | grāhyagrāhakaśamvitti bhedaḥ iva lakṣyata iti || Vedāntakaustubha* 2.2.28, Bose (1943, vol. 1:362)

¹²⁰ *sahopalambhaniyamān na bhedo nīlataddhiyoḥ || Vedāntakaustubha* 2.2.28, Bose (1943 vol. 1:362)

1972:48). Whilst it could be contended that he is most likely refuting Yādavaprakāśa, his *bhedābhedin* predecessor, in the *Vedārthasaṅgraha* Rāmānuja makes it clear that he is also referring to those who view that the relationship of the individual soul to Brahman is one of part-whole (*amśāmśībhāva*),¹²¹ a doctrine specifically propounded by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa. However, Yāmunācārya in the *Ātmasiddhi* of his *Siddhitraya* assigns the *amśāmśībhāva* relationship of Brahman and the individual soul for *bhedābheda* to Yādavaprakāśa.¹²² Śāstrin (1972:49) is quite clear that *svābhāvikabheda* is not Yādavaprakāśa's innovation; rather he was an adherent of a pre-existing doctrine in the same manner as was Bhartṛprapañca who existed centuries earlier, not to mention Nimbārka himself. Yet, of Nimbārka and Bhartṛprapañca, it was the former who used the terminology *amśāmśībhāva*, and not the latter who denoted the relationship by the phrase *bhāgabhāgībhāva* (Śāstrin 1972:47). Nimbārka's terminology might possibly have been influenced by *Bhagavadgītā* 15.7 which asserts that the individual soul is an *amśa* of Kṛṣṇa/Brahman.¹²³

Vācaspatimiśra's *Bhāmatī* commentary on Śaṅkara's *Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya* contains the refutation of both *aupādhika* and *svābhāvika bheda*, but it

¹²¹ *ghaṭaśarāvādīsaṃsthānānupayuktamṛddravyaṃ yathā kāryāntarānvitam evam eva surapaśumanujādījīvatvānupayuktesvaraḥ sarvajñāḥ satyasaṅkalpatvādikalyāṇaguṇākara itī cet satyaṃ sa eveśvara ekenāṃśena kalyāṇaguṇagaṇākaraḥ sa evānyenāṃśena heyaguṇākara ity uktam | dvayor aṃśayor īśvarāviśeṣāt | dvav aṃśau vyavasthitav itī cet | kas tena lābhaḥ | ekasyaivānekāṃśena nityaduḥkhitvād aṃśāntareṇa sukhītvam apī neśvaratvāya kalpate | yathā devadattasyaikasmin haste candanapaṅkānulepakeyūrakaṭakāṅgulīyālamkāras tasyaivānyasmin haste mudgarābhīghātaḥ kālānalajvālānupraveśaś ca tadvad eveśvarasya syād itī brahmājñānapakṣād apī pāpīyān ayaṃ bhedaḥbhedaapakṣaḥ | aparimitaduḥkhasya pāramārthikatvāt saṃsāriṇām anantatvena dustaratvāc ca || Vedārthasaṅgraha 59.*

¹²² *yādavaprakāśapakṣamāha 'nānātva' itī | aṃśāmśībhāvalakṣaṇa ityasyānvaya ityanena saṃbandhaḥ | aṃśāmśītvādbhedābhedopapattiḥ | bhedasamānādhikaraṇābhedasyaiva tādātmyasya sāmānādhikaraṇyārthatvam itī hārdam eteṣām || Siddhitraya, Ātmasiddhi.*

¹²³ *mamaivāṃśo jīvaloke jīvabhūtaḥ sanātanaḥ | Bhagavadgītā 15.7ab*

makes the distinction clear by rejection of *aṃśāmsībhāva* in the commentary to *Brahmasūtra* 1.4.22 and 2.3.43-46 separate to his dismissal of *aupādhika bhedābheda* (Śāstrin 1972:50).

As a further support, both Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa have stated in their commentaries to *Brahmasūtra* 3.2.11¹²⁴ that the *śruti* passages that refer to *nirguṇa* Brahman actually refer to Brahman not having the faults of material modes of nature, not that it possesses no qualities at all, as it is simultaneously possessed with auspicious qualities.¹²⁵ This dichotomy of *saguṇa-nirguṇa*, or in other words *saviśeṣa-nirviśeṣa*, in the same Brahman is rejected by Vācaspatimiśra in his commentary to *Brahmasūtra* 3.2.11,¹²⁶ developing Śaṅkara's depiction of the *pūrvapakṣin* in the same *sūtra* (1972:51).

Śāstrin (1972:53) then focuses his attention on Bhāskara, the founder of the *aupādhikabhedābheda* doctrine as a reaction to Śaṅkara and others. Ingalls (1967:61) suggests a date of 800CE and Nakamura (1983:88) refines that to 750-800CE, a dating which Śāstrin (1972:53) also accepts. In deciding what the topic of *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.31 is, Śrīnivāsa declares:

¹²⁴ *yataḥ brahmanirdoṣatvasvābhāvīkaguṇātmakatvābhyām yuktāmnātam|| Vedāntapārijātasaurabha 3.2.11. yataḥ sarvatra śrutismṛtiśūbhayaliṅgam svabhāvato 'pāstasamastadoṣatvasvābhāvīkaguṇagaṇamandiratva-lakṣaṇavatparam brahma niścīyate || Vedāntakaustubha 3.2.11*

¹²⁵ *nirguṇavākyānām māyīkaguṇaniśedhapatratvena saguṇavākyānām svābhāvīkaguṇapratipādana-paratvena...|| Vedāntakaustubha 1.1.4*

¹²⁶ *tatrāpi saviśeṣatvanirviśeṣatvayor virodhāt svābhāvīkatvānupapatter ekam svato'param tu parataḥ || Bhāmatī 3.2.11*

This sūtra purports to state the faults of the doctrine that the soul, being a consciousness, is all-pervasive [in size].¹²⁷

Bhāskara concludes however that this *sūtra* is meant to counter Buddhist doctrine, where he then comments:

But further, the explanation that this sūtra purports to state the faults of those who hold that the soul is all-pervasive [in size], is incorrect.¹²⁸

The similarities in phraseology are too close to ignore. Another point made by Śāstrin (1972:54) is that the actual ordering and numbering of the individual *Brahmasūtra* themselves is particular to each author, following the arrangement that best suits their interpretation, though they do tend to adhere to a conventional structuring. The *sūtras* ‘*sukhaviśiṣṭābhīdhanād eva ca*’ and ‘*ata eva ca tadbrahma*’ are read by Nimbārka as *Brahmasūtra* 1.2.15 and 1.2.16, and similarly followed by Śrīnivāsa. Before Bhāskara, there was also the tradition which Śāṅkara adopted, and the Bodhāyana tradition, which was much later adopted by Rāmānuja (Śāstrin 1972:55). Śāṅkara does not read these as two different *sūtras*: he omits *ata eva ca tadbrahma* altogether, as does Madhva (Bose 1943 vol. 1:115, Agarwal 2000 vol. 1:xvi). Rāmānuja has a completely different reading: ‘*ata eva ca sa brahma*’,¹²⁹ suggesting that the Bodhāyana tradition followed that reading. Bhāskara, like Śāṅkara, does not include this *sūtra*. However, he makes a comment at the end of the preceding *sūtra*:

¹²⁷ *cetanabhūtātmanavibhutvavādimate doṣakathanārtham sūtram || Vedāntakaustubha 2.3.31, Bose (1943 vol. 1:424)*

¹²⁸ *yatpunar ātmavibhutvavādinām doṣakathanārtham sūtram iti vyākhyātam tad ayuktam|| Bhāskarabhāṣya 2.3.21*

¹²⁹ *Śrībhāṣya 1.2.16*

At this point, others read a sūtra '*ata eva ca tad brahma*', but others do not set it forth as such due to its import being already understood.¹³⁰

If Bhāskara is not referring to Śaṅkara's tradition, nor that of Bodhāyana, the only other tradition which could have been a candidate is that of Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa. This is perhaps one of the soundest pieces of evidence for the fact that Bhāskara is here familiar with Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa; but as his goal was to counter Śaṅkara, they featured in his discussions only where absolutely necessary (Śāstrin 1972:54). Those teachers that include this *sūtra* later also have a different reading to that of Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa, with Rāmānuja's variant as shown, and Śrīkaṇṭha following Rāmānuja (Bose 1943 vol. 1:116). For an example of the similarity of syntax and style in certain places, Śāstrin (1972:55) discusses Bhāskara and Nimbārka's commentary to *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.2, and others, where as with Śaṅkara, there are extremely close similarities. He then goes on to deal with Śaṅkara in much the same manner as Satyanand which has been stated above.

Śāstrin (1972:55) then makes a point that departs significantly from Satyanand's interpretation: Nimbārka subscribed to the *vyūhavāda* that was popular in Pāñcarātra. As Satyanand refused to accept any work other than the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* as that of Nimbārka, he was unable to notice *Daśaślokī* 4 which unequivocally states that Brahman is Kṛṣṇa, who has the *vyūhas* for his parts.¹³¹ Even though the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* does not once name Kṛṣṇa, let alone the *vyūhas*, the *Daśaślokī* does. It was well known to Śrīnivāsa as he regularly quotes from it in the *Vedāntakaustubha*. He also uses both Nārāyaṇa and

¹³⁰ ...*atrāvasare 'ta eva ca tad brahmeti sūtram anye paṭhanti tat punar gatārtham iti anyair nābhidhīyate* || *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 1.2.15

¹³¹ *vyūhāṅginam brahma param vareṇyam dhyāyema kṛṣṇam... Daśaślokī* 4

Vāsudeva as synonymous with Kṛṣṇa/Parabrahman.¹³² This is a strong indication that Śrīnivāsa was acquainted with both the Bhāgavatas and the Pāñcarātrikas, as was Nimbārka, in his capacity as author of the *Daśaślokī*. Indeed, the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta propounded by the early authors of this tradition attests to a synthesis of the tenets of these two traditions.

This reasoning is used by Śāstrin (1972:55) to argue for the following. Śaṅkara interpreted *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.42-45 as a refutation of the Pāñcarātra doctrine. Both Bhāskara and Śrīkaṅṭha (*viśiṣṭaśivādvaitin*) follow suit. While both Rāmānuja¹³³ and Madhva¹³⁴ defend Pāñcarātra, nothing can be said in this respect about Nimbārka, who uses this section to refute *śāktavāda*. Śrīnivāsa, however, states in the introduction to this section that:

It is not to be said that: those who desire for release are being benefitted through a mere exposition of the conclusion of the Vedāntins, what is the use of vilifying the views of the opponents? Since just as when a man, giving up the most beneficial food, is about to take injurious poison and the like, people try to induce him to food and to dissuade him from poison, etc. by pointing out the unwholesomeness of the latter, so the vilification of the view of the opponents is justifiable for the purpose of preventing people from accepting the views which are opposed to the Veda, and for inducing those desiring for emancipation to our own view.¹³⁵

¹³² ...parabrahmanārāyaṇavāsudevādiśabdābhidheyah śrīkṛṣṇaḥ || *Vedāntakaustubha* 1.1.1

¹³³ Śrībhāṣya 2.2.39-42

¹³⁴ pañcarātraniṣedhārthametānyācakṣate yadi | sūtrāṇyativiruddham tad yata āha sa bhārate || pañcarātrasya kṛtsnasya vaktā nārāyaṇaḥ svayam | jñāneṣv eteṣu rājendra sarveṣv etad viśiṣṭate || pañcarātravido ye tu yathākramaparā nrpa | ekāntabhāvopagatā vāsudevam viśanti te || iti gītā ca tacchāstrasaṅkṣepa iti hīritam | vedena pañcarātreṇa bhaktyā yajñena caiva hi || dr̥śyo 'haṃ nānyathā dr̥śyo varṣakoṭiśatair api | iti vārāhavacanam ślokā iti vacaḥ śrutau || vedaiś ca pañcarātraiśca dhyeyo nārāyaṇaḥ paraḥ | pañcarātram ca vedāś ca vidyaikaiva dvidheyate || ityādivedavacanaiḥ pañcarātram apodyate || *Aṇuvyākhyāna* 2.2.285-2.2.291ab

¹³⁵ na caupaniṣadasiddhāntaprakāśanenaiva mumukṣūṇām upakāre jāte kiṃ parapakṣadūṣaṇeti vācyam | yathā hitatamam annam utsr̥jyāhite viśādu pravṛttam janam taddoṣakathanādinā tato niṣedhya tatraiva tam niyojayanti tathā vedaviruddhāt pakṣān nivāraṇāya svasiddhānte mumukṣupravṛttaye ca parapakṣadūṣaṇasūcanasya yuktatvāt || *Vedāntakaustubha* 2.2.1, translation: Bose (1943 vol. 1:325-328)

With such a resolve, it would hardly be possible for Śrīnivāsa to ignore Śaṅkara and Bhāskara's comments on the Pāñcarātra system. If indeed Śrīnivāsa was posterior to even Rāmānuja as some hold, then in the manner of Madhva Śrīnivāsa would have had to defend the position. However, this is not the case and is another major support for the view that both Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa could not have been posterior to Śaṅkara. Like Nimbārka, Śrīnivāsa is unaware of any other rival views in Vedānta: the only contemporary view against the Vedānta is that of Dharmakīrti which is well dealt with by Śrīnivāsa. It would be ludicrous to assume that Śrīnivāsa therefore would not refute any objections to this by other Vedāntins. Indeed, his grand-disciple Puruṣottama emphatically refutes *advaita* in the *Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā*. So, according to Śāstrin (1972:57), Śrīnivāsa and thus Nimbārka cannot be posterior to Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and the rest; as all these commentators do refute Nimbārka's version of *svābhāvīkabhedābheda* in their works.

Agrawal (2000) comes to the same conclusion but, in accordance with the accepted late 8th to early 9th century dates for Śaṅkara, places Nimbārka in the middle of the 8th century. As clarified by the work of Nakamura (2004) and others as already stated, Śaṅkara's dates are likely to be during the early to mid 8th century, and by the same logic Nimbārka would have to be located sometime in the mid to late 7th century. On the basis of the foregoing, it is possible to put forward an updated chronology for Nimbārka that is based only upon primary sources and reasoning derived therefrom.

3.8 Conclusion: Nimbārka's Date

Terminus Post Quem

Of all the different philosophical schools that are critiqued in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and the *Vedāntakaustubha*, it is only the refutation of the Buddhist position that reveals information relevant to chronology. In the Buddhist case, however, Śrīnivāsa quotes from Dharmakīrti, and from the terminology employed in his refutations it is certain that Śrīnivāsa was definitely later than Dharmakīrti. The same cannot be said of Nimbārka, whose refutations do not demonstrate awareness of the subtleties noticed by Śrīnivāsa who even goes into details concerning the Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika dialectic within the Sarvāstivādins. Nimbārka refutes the doctrines of the Vijñānavādins,¹³⁶ the doctrine of momentariness (*kṣaṇikatvavāda*) of the Sautrāntika-sarvāstivādins,¹³⁷ and the Madhyamaka's *sarvaśūnyavāda*.¹³⁸ This particular section of the *Brahmasūtra* has resulted in the dating of the extant version of the *sūtras* to 400-450CE, with the sections dealing with the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* dating from around the start of the common era (Nakamura 1983:436).

Śrīnivāsa's critique of *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.28, unlike that of Nimbārka, elaborates on the *pūrvapakṣin's* views. To Śrīnivāsa, the *pūrvapakṣin* is best typified by Dharmakīrti. However, if it was the case that this *sūtra* was intended to refute Dharmakīrti's understanding of the non-existence of external objects, then the

¹³⁶ *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 2.2.28

¹³⁷ *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 2.2.31

¹³⁸ *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 2.2.32

Brahmasūtra would necessarily be post-Dharmakīrti which is wholly untenable. Instead, it is likely that the aphorism in question refutes the ideas promulgated by Maitreyanātha, Asaṅga and Vasubandhu, the latter's dates being c.320-400CE (Nakamura 1983:436). So Nimbārka may well not be referring to the Dharmakīrti version of Vijñānavāda. Nimbārka is familiar with the vague parameters of the doctrine perhaps, but not in the detail that Śrīnivāsa is. Śaṅkara too paraphrases Dharmakīrti in his commentary on this *sūtra*, as noticed by Nakamura (1983:78), but does not name him. Additionally, Dharmakīrti's thoughts are found throughout the works of later commentators; as representative of Buddhist logic, they served as the perfect *pūrvapakṣa* for the intellectuals that followed, and so it would be unthinkable that Nimbārka would not even allude to the doctrines he espoused, in a manner similar to Śaṅkara. So, Dharmakīrti does not have a bearing on Nimbārka's dating directly. This gives Nimbārka an independent *terminus post quem* of 450CE. This can be refined, as indirectly, Dharmakīrti does have relevance because Śrīnivāsa, who is the direct disciple of Nimbārka, is necessarily after Dharmakīrti. The result is that Nimbārka's earliest date is perhaps just before or concurrent to Dharmakīrti.

Terminus Ante Quem

Śaṅkara's dates are estimated to be between 700-750CE (Nakamura 1983:87) and Bhāskara flourished around 750-800CE (Nakamura 1983:88). It has been shown here with reasonable certainty that Śaṅkara and Bhāskara were aware of Nimbārka. However, there remains a slight problem: Nimbārka *and* Śrīnivāsa both seem

unaware of an established unambiguously non-dualist idiom of Vedānta that was being actively promulgated. They dispense with *abheda* theories with the same aplomb employed when dealing with *bheda* theories, as their objective is to establish simultaneous *bheda* and *abheda*, and not exclusively one or the other. They offer no arguments that even hint at a familiarity with Śaṅkara's actual doctrines. Yet the controversy centres on the fact that Śaṅkara was not the first exponent of *advaita*. Gauḍapāda was its first systematiser and Malkovsky (2001:127) rightly states that Gauḍapāda should form the *terminus ante quem* for Nimbārka. Nakamura fixes Gauḍapāda's dates to 640-690CE (2004:307). Gauḍapāda's disciple was Govinda, who was in turn the preceptor of Śaṅkara, which leads to Nakamura (2004:185) assigning him a period of 670-720CE.

In the light of the standard prescription of the Manusmṛti, that Gauḍapāda as a *brāhmaṇa* would have undergone the *upanayana* at age eight¹³⁹ and studied until around twenty,¹⁴⁰ then he would have begun his compilation of the *Kārikās* around 660CE. Allowing for completion of this work and for its dissemination throughout the Vedāntic schools, the latest possible date for Śrīnivāsa's *Vedāntakaustubha* would be 685CE.

¹³⁹ *garbhāṣṭame'bde kurvīta brāhmaṇasyopanayanam || Manusmṛti 2.36*

¹⁴⁰ *ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikaṃ caryam gurau traivedikaṃ vratam | tad ardhikaṃ pādikaṃ vā grahaṇāntikam eva vā || Manusmṛti 3.1.* It is common practice in Veda-*pāṭhaśālās* currently in operation, for example that of the Maḥarṣi Vedavyāsa Pratiṣṭhāna in Pune, that a student is admitted at eight and will memorise the *Śuklayajurveda Vājasaneyī Samhitā* in the Mādhyandina recension along with the *Yājñavalkya Śikṣā*, the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* (Mādhyandina recension) and the *Pāraskaragrhyasūtras*, graduating at the age 21, or the maximum age 22. The *Manusmṛti's* assertions, which assume the candidate is a Brāhmaṇa student who was administered the *upanayana* at the age of eight, would mean that the student graduated either at age 44, 26 or 17.

The Date of Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa

It can therefore be stated with some certainty that Śrīnivāsa completed his *Vedāntakaustubha* around 685CE, having written it after the dissemination of Dharmakīrti's doctrines but before the *advaita* of Gauḍapāda was popularised. That would give him a likely chronology of 660-740CE. In Śrīnivāsa's own words at the beginning of the *Vedāntakaustubha* 1.1.1 (*tadaivājñayā*), it seems that he was composing this work on the direct command of his teacher. Nimbārka, who belonged to the previous generation, could then be dated to 620-690CE, which conforms to the recalibration of Satyanand's theory as suggested by Malkovsky (2001:127).

Chapter 4

Nimbārka's Life, Teachings and Impact

Having established the dates of Nimbārka as c. 620-690CE in the previous chapter, there is now a more satisfactory chronological foundation upon which to base the investigation of his view regarding Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. In this chapter, I will outline what is known about Nimbārka's life and teachings, paying special attention to the soteriology he is known to have propounded throughout his various works. The fact that the methods for salvation he suggests in these documents differ according to the eligibility of his audiences serves to bolster my suggestion that Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa was a topic reserved for the most qualified initiates of his tradition, a view which persisted until the early modern period. Furthermore, poetry from the period subsequent to Nimbārka bears witness to the fact that although for the majority Rādhā remained the mundane lover of a divine Kṛṣṇa, some poets outside the tradition were aware of the teacher's theology, for their poetry refers to a newly divine Rādhā.

4.1 Nimbārka's Life: Hagiographies

There are many later sources for the life of Nimbārka, such as the account contained within the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, the *Ācāryacaritam* of the 18th century leader of the tradition Nārāyaṇaśaraṇa Devācārya and the 16th century *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa (Hare 2011:44). The earliest descriptions of Nimbārka's life are, predictably, by his two disciples Śrīnivāsa and Audumbara. Śrīnivāsa, in addition

to a few hints in the *Vedāntakaustubha*, authored the *Laghustavarājastotram* in praise of his preceptor. Audumbara composed a significant hagiography entitled the *Nimbārkavikrānti*, which exhibits the author's refined Sanskrit poetic techniques.

In the *Vedāntakaustubha* Śrīnivāsa reveals that Nimbārka follows in succession from Haṁsa, Sanaka and his brothers and then Nārada.¹⁴¹ In reiterating this, he calls Nimbārka the 'promulgator of the lineage of Śrī Sanatkumāra',¹⁴² who 'wrote the most mysterious *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* out of kindness for those desiring liberation'.¹⁴³ Śrīnivāsa declares in no uncertain terms that he is composing his own work at 'the behest of [Nimbārka], according to the path that he taught, for the sake of his grace, as I am his disciple'.¹⁴⁴ The *Laghustavarājastotram* is a 41-verse hymn extolling the glories of Nimbārka, his preceptor, in which many flattering adjectives and images are used without much hagiographic content. However, Śrīnivāsa does relay a few details of significance. Nimbārka is 'the lamp for illuminating the *sampradāya*',¹⁴⁵ 'is blissful in worshipping Śrī Kṛṣṇa',¹⁴⁶ 'never of an unclean mind even when of a youthful age'¹⁴⁷ (hinting perhaps at his status as a *naiṣṭhikabrahmacārin*, or perpetual celibate), and 'giver of the *pañcasamskāra*' Vaiṣṇava initiation.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴¹ *śrīhaṁsaṁ sanakādīn devarṣīm nimbabhāskaraṁ ca bhaje | kṛpayaiṣāṁ śrīkṛṣṇe paramātmani no bhavatu bhaktiḥ || Vedāntakaustubha 1.1.1, maṅgala verse.*

¹⁴² *śrīsanatkumārasantatipravartakaḥ || Vedāntakaustubha 1.1.1*

¹⁴³ *mumuḥṣv anugrahāya... vedāntapārijātasaurabhākhyaṁ atigūḍham kṛtavān || Vedāntakaustubha 1.1.1.*

¹⁴⁴ *atha tu tad ājñayā tad uktavartmanā tad anugrahakāmeṇa tac chiṣyeṇa mayā... || Vedāntakaustubha 1.1.1*

¹⁴⁵ *sampradāyaprabodhāya dīpakah || Laghustavarājastotram 4*

¹⁴⁶ *śrīkṛṣṇapūjanānandī || Laghustavarājastotram 6*

¹⁴⁷ *tārūnyam vayasā prāpto na vikāraṇāḥ kvacit || Laghustavarājastotram 11*

¹⁴⁸ *pañcasamskāradāyī ca || Laghustavarājastotram 26*

Audumbara's work focuses solely on Nimbārka's exploits. According to Audumbara, Nimbārka had previous existences as the Sudarśana discus of Viṣṇu in Vaikuṅṭha,¹⁴⁹ and therefore originally as Aniruddha of the quadruple-emanations (*caturvyūha*),¹⁵⁰ both before creation; as Havirdhāna Muni appearing to Gauramukha and other sages assembled at Naimiṣāraṇya¹⁵¹ in the *tretāyuga*, and then as Nimbārka himself at the commencement of the *kaliyuga*, named Niyamānanda at birth, the son of Aruṇa Ṛṣi and Jayantī Devī.¹⁵² Niyamānanda accepted initiation from Nārada Muni, following which he embarked on a *digvijaya*. During his travels, he destroys many demons, saves devotees on a sinking boat in the Brahmaputra river and upholds his duties to his mother and father.¹⁵³ Then Audumbara recounts the famous incident which resulted in Niyamānanda being conferred the name Nimbārka:

A *bhikṣuka* [Buddhist Monk] came to the forest in search of alms, and visited the hermitage of your mother and father. They became late, due to [being occupied] with the worship of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and the Bhikṣuka became apprehensive, due to his tradition forbidding eating at night. You called him, who was leaving to return, suffering hunger pains, out to the forest and pointed with your arm raised, as if touching the sky, pointing out that just above the *nimba* (*Azadirachta Indica*) trees, it was as if there was sunlight, together with its heat, of a million suns; as such, his mind became free from worry, and you served him [food] – just as Lord Mukunda, of inconceivable potency, saved Draupadī and the sons of Pāṇḍu from the curse of Durvāsas, so too did you save your parents from the sin [of letting a monk visiting for alms return without having eaten]; so obeisances to you, known by the name Nimbārka, who freed them from the binding duties of Dharma, in the same manner as a tangled piece of bamboo [is easily cut] when connected [to by an axe].¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁹ *Nimbārkavikrānti* 16-17, 21

¹⁵⁰ *Nimbārkavikrānti* 22

¹⁵¹ *Nimbārkavikrānti* 25-26

¹⁵² *Nimbārkavikrānti* 32-33

¹⁵³ *Nimbārkavikrānti* 37-58

¹⁵⁴ *vānasthayor āśramam āgatam tvam pitros tu bhikṣum vanam etya bhikṣām | agrāhayas tam pratiśaṅkamānam āmnāyarītyā niśi bhojanāc ca|| niryāntam āhūta ivārkakoṭiḥ śrīkṛṣṇasevāsu vilambakartroḥ | kṣutkliṣṭam āvṛtya sutarjanīnakhaṁ dīrghabāhum nabhasi prasārya || nimbāgra ādītyam iva svasūcayam tāpād gato niścitamānasam yaḥ | sadraupadān pāṇḍusutān mukundo durvāsaso yad vad acintyaśaktiḥ || nirmocayitvā pītārāv aghaughāt samyuktavamaśas tv iva nirgatas*

Following this account are descriptions of Nimbārka removing the sorrows of the sage Agastya, purifying a river of blood by the touch of his feet, revealing his form as Aniruddha to both Agastya and his father Aruṇa Ṛṣi, and visiting the deity Padmanābhasvāmin where many of the locals became followers.¹⁵⁵ According to Audumbara, *brāhmaṇas* who were jealous of his achievements attacked Nimbārka in the night at his encampment in the forest near the Padmanābhasvāmin temple. Nimbārka touched a fruit of the *udumbara* tree that had fallen to the ground in front of him with his toe, and Audumbara appeared from it, displaying the divinity of Nimbārka to all present. Undeterred by this, the *brāhmaṇas* continued with the attack, and Nimbārka surrounded them with fire just as the deity of Padmanābhasvāmin, himself angered, made his appearance on the scene ready to dispatch these opponents. Seeing that the deity was ready to destroy these *brāhmaṇas* for the offence they caused to a ‘pure devotee’ and taking compassion on them, the teacher prayed to Padmanābhasvāmin, appeasing his anger. Nimbārka went to the sea nearby and caused it to calm the forest fire that had resulted from his earlier attempts to corral the offenders. Padmanābhasvāmin blessed the teacher, and the *brāhmaṇas* became his disciples.¹⁵⁶

Nimbārka pressed on to Dvārakā, harassed as before by other jealous *brāhmaṇas* who later become his disciples after he revealed himself to be Kṛṣṇa in as much as

tau | nimbārkanāṃne 'stu namo namas te saddharmanirbandhavimocakāya || Nimbārkavikrānti 59-62. The simile given here of '*samyuktavamaśaḥ nirgataḥ*' has been interpreted by the commentator Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa to mean either, bamboo that springs forth through earth which is filled with stones, or bamboo that is easily cut when an axe connects to it. The first alternative seems a little too forced.

¹⁵⁵ *Nimbārkavikrānti* 63-68

¹⁵⁶ *Nimbārkavikrānti* 69-100

he is the incarnation of Aniruddha. In Dvārakā, he established the hot-branding ceremony of the conch (*śaṅkha*) and discus (*cakra*) insignia on the arms of initiated Vaiṣṇavas. After departing there he passed by a Jain community celebrating a festival, and on seeing him the Jains began to hurl abuse. Nimbārka dug his toe into the ground, from which sprung a mighty river that began to wash them away. Realising their folly, they prayed for him to save them, and he did, upon which they too became his followers. In this manner he travelled the remainder of his journey which Audumbara likens to completing a *digvijaya*.¹⁵⁷ If indeed this work is attributable to Audumbara, it would serve as one of the earliest mentions of a *digvijaya* in relation to an ascetic in place of the a king (which is attested to in the *Mahābhārata*), as it is generally thought that such works were composed in the centuries after Śaṅkara, with the first historically locatable works from the 13th century belonging to the Mādhva tradition (Sax 2000:47). An evidence to show that the *Nimbārkavikrānti* was perhaps earlier than accounts of Madhva comes from the routes followed. Madhva and the later *digvijaya* candidates travelled through the major cities of contemporary empires (Sax 2000:48-50), whereas Nimbārka exclusively visited pilgrimage sites, with the telling exception of Uḍupi, which is visited by all the later *digvijayins* after its establishment by Madhva (Sax 2000:50). At the very least this work should be assigned to a pre-Mādhva period, and if attributable to Audumbara, to that of Nimbārka.

His final destination was Vraja, and having established himself at Nimbagrāma, he invited his preceptor Nārada, and served him. He also dedicated himself to

¹⁵⁷ *Nimbārkavikrānti* 101-118

austerity and devotions to Kṛṣṇa. Vidyānidhi, a Śākta scholar himself on a *digvijaya* mission, tried to conquer Nimbārka as he had done all other scholars he confronted. Nimbārka revealed himself as Kṛṣṇa and then showed him the entire process of creation, the lineage that he belonged to, and instructed him on the Vedāntic principles. Finally he revealed his secret form as Raṅgadevī, one of the *aṣṭasakhī* companions of Rādhā and showed him Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa as the form of Parabrahman. Expectedly, Vidyānidhi became his disciple, and was awarded the name Śrīnivāsa. He was also anointed as the next leader of the lineage. After this Audumbara completes his work, stating that Nimbārka stayed in Nimbagrāma consuming only the juice of *nimba* (*Azadirachta Indica*) leaves, hinting at the end of his days.¹⁵⁸

Aside from the miraculous and mythological episodes, it is clear from this account by Audumbara that Nimbārka flourished at a time when there were Buddhists, Jains, Śāktas and anti-Vaiṣṇava orthodox *brāhmaṇas* perhaps Mīmāṃsaka or representatives of other exegetical schools. There were obviously those who were Vaiṣṇava at least in practice or in sympathies. The Padmanābhasvāmin deity is more commonly known as Śrī Anantapadmanābhasvāmin, who was extolled in the writings of the 7-8th century CE Nammalvar (Hardy 1983:266-267). It is noteworthy that Nimbārka is not described as having connections with any ruler or king, as is commonplace in the hagiographies of other *ācāryas* who have founded lineages. This is a significant reason for Nimbārka not featuring prominently in the historical record.

¹⁵⁸ *Nimbārkavikrānti* 119-220

4.2 Nimbārka's Soteriology

Nimbārka's philosophical position (*siddhānta*) has been adequately commented upon by many scholars, from Bhandarkar (1913), Joshi (1965), through to the most recent publication concerning the tradition, an article in the Brill Encyclopaedia of Hinduism (Clémentin-Ojha 2011). Without reiterating what is already well known, a few relevant points will be noticed.

Most scholars, due to the lack of a reliable chronology, consign most of Nimbārka's philosophy to the reactionary faction against Śaṅkara, which we have seen is untenable. Bose (1943), and especially Satyanand (1997) and Agrawal (2000), are able to bring out the most important nuances of Nimbārka's philosophy due to their reliance on primary sources. Still, Satyanand is unable to comment on Nimbārka's most important philosophical contribution, as he does not consider the *Daśaślokī*. When both the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and the *Daśaślokī* are examined together, it is apparent that Nimbārka is composing for different audiences. Whilst projecting a view of Parabrahman that was acceptable to the broader Vedāntin and Vaiṣṇava audience, he taught his initiated disciples the particular innovation that Parabrahman actually was Kṛṣṇa conjointly with Rādhā. When analysed in totality, Nimbārka's view of *bhakti* is markedly different to that which is currently commonplace in the tradition, and as such it is worthwhile to examine doctrines that were previously overlooked.

Nimbārka is quite clear in the *Daśaślokī* that *premaśiṣeṣalakṣaṇā bhakti*, or devotion characterised by a special love, is superior to *sādhana-rūpikā aparā bhakti*, or the lesser devotion characterised as a method of attaining salvation. A type of loving devotion predates Nimbārka (see section 1.4), however in that source it appears as an emotion engendered by reverence, rather than the spontaneous love that leads to constant remembrance. Of the five means of salvation that Nimbārka identifies across his works (the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, *Daśaślokī*, *Mantrarahasyaśoḍaśī* and *Prapannakalpavallī*) as noticed by Bose (discounting her mistaken attribution of the *Saviśeṣanirviśeṣakṛṣṇastavarāja*, Bose 1943 vol. 3: 41-63), the *bhakti* that is being referred to is evidently *sādhana-rūpikā bhakti*. It is noteworthy again that Nimbārka has developed different means to liberation according to the perceived calibre of various audiences.

4.2.1 The Soteriology of the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*

In the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, Nimbārka points out that *karman*, or rituals/duties which should be performed according to one's *varṇāśrama* situation, are merely an accessory, and not independent, means of salvation.¹⁵⁹ By reducing the effects of negative past actions, *karman* quickens the process of the arising of knowledge (*vidyā/jñāna*). However, *jñāna* is acknowledged in accordance with scriptural authorities as an independent path to liberation.¹⁶⁰ Nimbārka suggests in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* that *jñāna* is attained through *upāsana*, the Upaniṣadic means of worship equated with *dhyāna*, or meditation, which Nimbārka gives as a

¹⁵⁹ *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.4.22, 4.1.16, 4.1.18

¹⁶⁰ *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.1.4

synonymn for *bhakti* or devotion.¹⁶¹ It is quite clear that in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* at least, Nimbārka finds the definition of *bhakti* as developed in the *Bhagavadgītā* (chapter 12) sufficient as this is acceptable to the audience of the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*. In the very opening, Nimbārka also hints at *gurūpasatti* and perhaps *prapatti*, familiar as he is with the *Bhagavadgītā*'s quite developed doctrine of *prapatti*, but does not develop it further in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*, despite using language that betrays a deep knowledge of the topic.¹⁶²

4.2.2 The Soteriology of the *Daśaślokī*

On the style of the *Daśaślokī*, Bose (1943 vol. 3:10) concludes that:

The style of the “Daśa-ślokī” is very simple and charming, specially suited to a devotee who does not want to be bothered with abstract logical theories and hair-splitting wranglings, but wants to have the truth immediately in a nut-shell.

Paradoxically the complete *Daśaślokī* has not featured in scholarly works since Growse (1883), Bhandarkar (1913), and Agrawal (2000) where they offered a simple translation. It is prudent then to revisit the *Daśaślokī* by means of a translation and, in light of the above, notice its quite remarkable nuances.¹⁶³ The

Daśaślokī commences:

¹⁶¹ *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.2.24

¹⁶² *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.1.1

¹⁶³ *jñānasvarūpaṅ ca harer adhīnaṃ śarīrasaṃyogaviyogayogyam | aṇuṃ hi jīvaṃ pratidehabhinnaṃ jñātrtvavantaṃ yad anantaṃ āhuḥ ||Daśaślokī 1|| anādimāyāpariyuktarūpaṃ tv enaṃ vidur vai bhagavatprasādāt| muktaṅ ca baddhaṃ kila baddhamuktaṃ prabhedabāhulyam athāpi bodhyam ||Daśaślokī 2|| aprākṛtaṃ prākṛtarūpakaṅ ca kālasvarūpaṃ tad acetanaṃ matam | māyāpradhānādīpadapravācyam śuklādibhedāś ca same 'pi tatra ||Daśaślokī 3|| svabhāvato 'pāstasamastadoṣam aśeṣakalyāṇaṅaikaikarāśim | vyūhāṅginaṃ brahmaparaṃ vareṇyaṃ dhyāyema*

The individual soul has knowledge as its [essential] nature, is dependent upon Hari, worthy of association and disassociation with bodies, atomic, different in every body, possesses the quality of being a knower and is declared to be infinite [in number]. (1)

Nimbārka clarifies the characteristics of the individual soul, giving its size and qualities, stating from the very start that it is dependent upon Hari, which is a decidedly Vaiṣṇava view of Brahman. He has promoted these doctrines in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* (see chapter 3).

Indeed this [individual soul], whose form is associated with beginningless *Māyā*, is known only through the grace of God. The liberated, the bound, and the bound-liberated [classes of individual soul], as well as their many subdivisions, should be understood also. (2)

The role of grace is here quite prominent, as it is through this quality that knowledge of the individual soul can arise. In his commentary on *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.1, Nimbārka effectively states that the grace of Bhagavat results in the vision of him.¹⁶⁴ Here it seems Nimbārka is hinting at a soteriology consisting of successive stages to liberation. So it is through the grace of Brahman that one can attain self-realisation. However, this notion is developed after Nimbārka has completed his description of the ontological categories.

*kṛṣṇaṁ kamalekṣaṇaṁ harim ||Daśaślokī 4|| aṅge tu vāme vṛṣabhānujām mudā virājamānām
anurūpasaubhagām | sakhīśahasraiḥ parisevitām sadā smarema devīm sakaleṣṭakāmadām
||Daśaślokī 5|| upāsanīyaṁ nitarām janaiḥ sadā prahāṇaye 'jñānatamo 'nuvṛtteḥ | sanandanādyair
munibhis tathoktam śrīnāradāyākhilatattvasākṣiṇē ||Daśaślokī 6|| sarvaṁ hi vijñānam ato
yathārthakam śrutismṛtibhyo nikhilasya vastunaḥ | brahmātmakatvād iti vedavin mataṁ trirūpatāpi
śrutisūtrasādhitā ||Daśaślokī 7|| nānyāgatiḥ kṛṣṇapadāravindāt samdrśyate brahmaśivādivanditāt |
bhaktecchayopāttasuchintyaviḡrahād acintyaśakter avicintyasāśayāt ||Daśaślokī 8|| kṛpāsyā
dānyādiyujiprajāyate yayā bhavet premaviśeṣalakṣaṇā | bhaktir hy anyādhipater mahātmanaḥ
sā cottamā sādhanarūpikāparā ||Daśaślokī 9|| upāsyarūpaṁ tad upāsakasya ca kṛpāphalaṁ
bhaktirasas tataḥ param | virodhino rūpaṁ athaitad āpter jñeyā ime 'rthā api pañcasādhubhiḥ
||Daśaślokī 10||*

¹⁶⁴ *bhagavatprasādepsunā taddarśaneccchālampaṭena...mumuksunā || Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*
1.1.1

That which is derived from non-matter, that which is derived from matter, and time are agreed to be the forms of the insentient. It is spoken of with the words Māyā, Pradhāna etc, and has distinctions of white and the rest in it, however it remains the same. (3)

The insentient category is defined simply as a prelude to the description of the next vital category, Parabrahman:

We meditate upon the excellent Supreme Brahman, Kṛṣṇa, Hari, the lotus-eyed one, whose defects are naturally non-existent [apāsta], who is the sole reservoir of all auspicious qualities, whose body is composed of the *vyūhas*. (4)

The specific form of Parabrahman as worshipped by Nimbārka is no longer simply the Puruṣottama of the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*.¹⁶⁵ Here in the *Daśaślokī*, he reveals to his disciples that Parabrahman is Kṛṣṇa. This is the basis upon which Śrīnivāsa, who quotes this verse of the *Daśaślokī* in his commentary on the Brahmasūtra,¹⁶⁶ utilises the appellation Śrī Kṛṣṇa together with Parabrahman throughout the *Vedāntakaustubha*. This attests to the fact that the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and the *Daśaślokī* have the same author. Moreover, whereas in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* there is no mention of any overtly Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātrika views, here Nimbārka asserts that the quadruple-emanation of the *caturvyūha* comprises the body of Brahman/Kṛṣṇa. Satyanand (1997:28) claims that the *vyūha* doctrine ‘had come to the Bhāgavata religion...from the Pāñcarātras’. Srinivasan (1979:49) opposes this view, demonstrating that the *caturvyūha* is inextricably linked to both schools from the earliest of times. Satyanand is trying to distance Nimbārka from Pāñcarātra, as this sect was criticised as heretical by Śaṅkara. However in doing so, Satyanand misses an opportunity to provide further chronological clarity. The fact that Nimbārka was

¹⁶⁵ *ramākāntaḥ puruṣottamo brahmaśabdābhidheyaḥ... || Vedāntapārijātasaurabha 1.1.1*

¹⁶⁶ *Vedāntakaustubha 1.1.1*

a Vaiṣṇava of the Bhāgavata persuasion who subscribed to the *vyūha* doctrine could mean that if he was later than Śaṅkara, he would have defended the *vyūha* doctrine from Śaṅkara's attack, in the manner of Rāmānuja and Madhva. The fact that he did not do so is proof that he was certainly unaware of any such controversy. Of relevance here is that the *Daśasloki*, specifically aimed at disciples, reveals the exact identity of Parabrahman, which is not mentioned in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* as it targets a wider Vedāntic audience.

We eternally contemplate upon the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu, who delightfully shines forth on the left side of [His] body, with a corresponding beauty, who is attended on by thousands of maidservants, who is the bestower of all desires. (5)

Nimbārka here reveals his innovation. This particular verse establishes Rādhā in the same ontological category as Brahman/Kṛṣṇa, crucially 'on the left side of his body', the place traditionally reserved for the wife according to traditional custom. Nimbārka is conversant enough with stories of Rādhā to know that she is the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu (*vṛṣabhānujā*) which hints at the development of the narrative about her. Most interestingly, Nimbārka maintains the hidden nature of Rādhā by not mentioning her explicitly by the more common names of Rādhā or Rādhikā. The fact that she fulfils all desires (*sakaleṣṭakāmadā*) implies a soteriological role, which is significant as the intended audience of Nimbārka is his initiated disciples who have the sole desire of liberation, in accordance with the pre-requisite qualifications he himself outlines in *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 1.1.1. The extension of this statement therefore is that Rādhā can bestow salvation. She is further described as having beauty which corresponds to that of Kṛṣṇa. This would only be possible if the pair is originally one ontological being. This is the seed for

the development of the theory of the conjoined Brahman of the doctrine later termed *yugala upāsanā*, worship of the divine couple.

Another statement that would lead to theological developments in Vraja later on was that Rādhā is ‘attended on by thousands of maidservants’. The roots of *sakhībhāva-upāsanā*, or *mādhuryabhāva-upāsanā* of the later tradition can be found in this simple statement (see section 8.2.1). The theory that was to develop within the Nimbārka tradition is that all individual souls have an original identity as one of the *sakhīs* in service of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, and the goal of human life is to achieve liberation from transmigration in order that they may once again be situated in their eternal identity. None of this is evident in the writings of the tradition until the Vraja developments in the early modern period. It must be kept in mind that knowledge of the identity of Parabrahman is usually reserved for the initiated, a fact which the current pontifical head of the tradition, Jagadguru Nimbārkācārya Svāmī Śrī Rādhāsarveśvaraśaraṇa Devācārya, reiterated time and again in the course of our meeting in 2013. Verse 5 is a snapshot of a developed state of understanding of Rādhā and her mythology, and demonstrates that Nimbārka’s silence on the particulars does not necessarily mean that he is not aware of much more.

He should be always incessantly worshipped by people for cessation from being pursued by the darkness of ignorance; this has been taught by the [four] sages beginning with Sanandana to the reverend Nārada, the observer of the entire reality. (6)

Upāsanā here does not signify ritual worship; rather, as mentioned above, it signifies a constant, uninterrupted meditation on Parabrahman, which has been

described in the two verses antecedent to this one, as Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. Through meditation on them, ignorance is removed, which gives rise to *jñāna*, and which is the key to liberation. Intriguingly, Nimbārka reiterates his claim to a pedigree *par excellence*, as he does in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*.¹⁶⁷ He seems convinced of this fact, or he is aiming to convince the audience. In either case, it appears that he is endeavouring to confirm that his understanding of Vedānta as presented here is tried and tested, and was passed down from infallible sources.

Accordingly, all knowledge and objects are thus true, because the Vedas and *smṛtis* declare that Brahman is their essence. This is the view of the Vedic scholars, and the trinity of reals are similarly established by the Veda and [*Brahma*]sūtra. (7)

Nimbārka is here countering Buddhists and all those who contest that the Veda is authoritative, that Brahman is the essence of everything, that there are three ontological categories and that reality is permanent; not, as claimed by Bose (1943 vol.3: 9) that he is responding to the views of Śaṅkara. He follows the same pattern of argumentation utilised throughout *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 2.2 against all heterodox schools that he interprets as described within the *Brahmasūtra* itself.

No other path is observed apart from the lotus feet of Kṛṣṇa, which are venerated by the gods Brahmā, Śiva and the rest; who according to the desire of the devotee assumes a form conducive to contemplation, whose power is inconceivable and whose abode is inconceivable. (8)

This verse explicitly referring to *prapatti* describes the central image of the doctrine itself, where the devotee seeks shelter at the feet of Brahman. What is also interesting is that Nimbārka is providing a justification for contemplation of the personal form of Brahman, a doctrine not present in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*

¹⁶⁷ *paramācāryaiḥ śrīkumārair asmad gurave śrīman nāradāya upadiṣṭo...||*
Vedāntapārijātasaurabha 1.3.8

which advocates more abstract methods of Upaniṣadic meditation. This particular statement could also be extended to provide support for worship of a physical representation of the deity; however, in the light of the general disposition of Nimbārka, it is more reasonable to assume he is suggesting that the particular mode of meditation upon Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa that he has revealed in *Daśaślokī* verses 4-5 (on their form and character) is scripturally sound.

His grace is generated for those who have qualities such as humility, by which, devotion that is characterised with special love, is brought about for that great soul who has no other Lord. That is the superior [devotion], the lesser is but a means to it. (9)

This verse is crucial for Nimbārka's soteriology. The lesser devotion characterised by the usual rituals and practices is simply a means to attain this supreme devotion (*parā bhakti*). *Bhakti* features in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* as synonymous with constant contemplation, a mode different from the practise of physical meditation.¹⁶⁸ The role of grace in the soteriology of Nimbārka is further clarified: it is due to receiving the grace of Brahman, engendered through the performance of *prapatti*, that this *parā bhakti* arises, which is both the means and the goal of liberation. Therefore, Nimbārka advocates two pathways for salvation. Grace which is produced through having good qualities cultivated through practising the means of ritual, knowledge and meditation, causes the complete removal of nescience and permits self-realisation which in turns allows one to incessantly love Brahman and achieve *parā bhakti*. This is the consolidated path described here, in *Daśaślokī* 6 and in *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 4.2.16;¹⁶⁹ yet this path describes the

¹⁶⁸ *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* 3.2.24

¹⁶⁹ *śatañ caikā ca hṛdayasya nādyas tāsām mūrddhānam abhiniḥsrtaikā | tayorddhvam āyann amṛtatvam eṭīti śruty uktā nādī vartate | tām vidyāsāmarthyāt tac cheṣagatyanusmṛtiyogāc ca*

sādhana-rūpikā bhakti and is therefore the lesser of the two. The supreme path is to realise that the path of Vedānta is too difficult to accomplish which would lead one to surrender, through the doctrine of *prapatti*, to Kṛṣṇa, meditating on him in a form that is conducive to constant remembrance, and in this manner generating the auspicious character traits that cause the Lord to bestow his grace. This grace is received in the form of *parā bhakti*. The only difference between the two paths is that the former relies on the performance of the *sādhana*s, while the latter is independent.

These five things are to be known by the practitioners from the authoritative [*ācāryas*]: the nature of the Worshippable, that of His worshippers, the fruit of [the Lord's] grace, also the elixir of devotion and finally the nature of obstructions. (10)

In order to simplify the regime of the person interested in achieving *parā bhakti*, Nimbārka teaches the knowledge of five subjects (*arthapañcakajñāna*), which should be understood through the teachings of the authoritative preceptors, clearly to be regarded as the teachers of his lineage.

The *Daśasloki* as a whole adheres to typically Vedāntic ideology and illustrations whilst being simultaneously innovative in its revelation of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa as conjointly representing Parabrahman. It also reveals the difference of *parā bhakti* from conventional *sādhana bhakti* that is described in earlier scriptures such as the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (see chapter 5).

prasannena vedyenānuḡrḥīto yadā bhavati tatas tasyaiko hṛdayam agrajvalanaṁ bhavati tadā paramēśvaraprakāśitadvāras tām viditvā vidvān tayā niṣkrāmati || Vedāntapārijātasaurabha 4.2.16

4.2.3 The Soteriology of the *Prapannakalpavallī* and *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaṣī*

The *Prapannakalpavallī* is an explanation of the *śaraṇāgati mantra*, one of the two *mantras* given during initiation into the Nimbārka tradition (Śāstrin 1924). After the exegesis of the *mantra* itself, Nimbārka collects a few scriptural quotations from the *Mahābhārata* to support the theory he presents. In the first instance, Nimbārka claims a seeker of liberation should surrender himself to a *guru*, thinking of him as the protector, so that he may understand the purport of the scriptures.¹⁷⁰ The end result of the scriptures according to this document is that Brahman is the sole refuge, being like the mother, father, friend, shelter, etc.¹⁷¹ Nimbārka then refers the reader to the Pāñcarātra verses defining the six limbs of the process of surrendering to Brahman - *śaḍvidhā śaraṇāgati*, which is found in the much later *Lakṣmītantra* (17.60-62), but evidently occurs in an earlier source. This can be deduced on the grounds that Nimbārka quotes the very famous *tvam eva mātā* prayer in *Prapannakalpavallī* 7, although this verse cannot be traced in any extant Pāñcarātra scripture or version of the *Mahābhārata*, which is its most likely source. The verse does feature in the hymnal-compendium known as the *Pāñḍavagītā* as being spoken by *Gāndhārī*.¹⁷² It is highly unlikely that Nimbārka would have used a verse from a scripture belonging to such a Śākṭi-centric Pāñcarātrika outlook as the *Lakṣmītantra*, which in turn follows the philosophy of the earlier Pāñcarātra. It is more plausible that Nimbārka's description of the six-limbs of the process of

¹⁷⁰ *varaṇīyo guruḥ pūrvam goptṛtvena mumukṣubhiḥ| sarvasambandhavattvaṁ ca śrūyate śrutinirṇaye|| Prapannakalpavallī* 5

¹⁷¹ *Prapannakalpavallī* 6-9

¹⁷² *Pāñḍavagītā* 27

surrender has its origins in the early Pāñcarātra, as also might this very famous verse quoted in the *Prapannakalpavallī* 7 (see section 5.3).

Having explained all of these relationships to Brahman, Nimbārka then reiterates the process clearly. Firstly one should surrender himself and his actions to the preceptor and serve him always. He should encourage his entire family to worship Viṣṇu/Kṛṣṇa, and knowing the preceptor to be everything to him, he should serve him faithfully. Having understood that relationship completely, he attains to a divine state, developing divine qualities within himself, surrendering at the direction of the preceptor to the Lord of Ramā through the six-limbed process of surrender. Thus, meditating on Brahman, with the preceptor as his main deity, detached from the world, he becomes freed from all fetters and reaches a state similar to that of Brahman (*bhagavadbhāvāpattilakṣaṇa mokṣa*).¹⁷³

The *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* is similarly a treatise explaining the *mūla mantra*, or the main mantra of initiation of the tradition (Śāstrin 1924). Here, Nimbārka explains ‘*brahmavidyā*’,¹⁷⁴ restating that the object of this is *bhagavadbhāvāpattilakṣaṇā mukti*. Having explained the mantra, he proffers the same theology given in the *Prapannakalpavallī*, advising the same process of surrendering to the preceptor, learning from him the conclusions of the revealed scriptures, performing meditative contemplation and then finally, having offered oneself into the fiery

¹⁷³ *Prapannakalpavallī* 20-27. Incidentally, Puruṣottama uses the quotations here and paraphrases much of the *Prapannakalpavallī* in his explanation of *prapatti* in his *Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā* under the commentary to *Daśaśloka* 8.

¹⁷⁴ *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* 1

brilliance of the Lord, attaining liberation characterised by reaching a similar state to that of Brahman.¹⁷⁵

On the face of it, the *Prapannakalpavallī* and the *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* seem to prescribe a different soteriological process to the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and the *Daśaślokī*, as observed by Bose (1943 vol. 3:56) and Satyanand (1997:275). The *Prapannakalpavallī* even refers to Brahman as Viṣṇu and the lord of Ramā, clear evidence that the subject matter is aimed at novices. However, as demonstrated, both the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and *Daśaślokī* contain references to the means of *prapatti* and *gurūpasatti* that are advocated in the *Prapannakalpavallī* and the *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī*. The neophyte practitioners that are eligible to receive the teachings of *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* and the *Prapannakalpavallī* are encouraged to serve the preceptor and progress through his directions, culminating in instruction in the various principles of the scripture. The *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* picks up where these works leave off and provides a detailed hermeneutic exposition of the scriptures, after which the *Daśaślokī* concludes revealing the final hidden truth of the identity of Parabrahman. As such, these works appeal to different types of disciples, a point noticed by Bose (1943 vol. 3: 56-57):

It is clear that like self-surrender to the Lord, self-surrender to the preceptor is open to all, and not only to the upper three classes. This means is specially for those who cannot perform even the six factors of self-surrender to the Lord independently of their own unaided efforts, but are required to be led by someone else in all respects.

¹⁷⁵ *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* 15-18

Nimbārka's soteriology therefore represents an endeavour to interact with various types of practitioners in terms of their eligibility and qualification, and is an attempt to cater to their specific soteriological needs through these various treatises. To see a unified singular doctrine from one particular work of Nimbārka, in the manner of Satyanand, would diminish the impact that this intellectual had on Vedāntic exegesis and religious practice. Reserving his teachings on Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa for adept disciples meant that Nimbārka's innovation was not widely known. Still, I propose that effects of this new theology can be noticed in poetry subsequent to the 7th century.

4.3 Rādhā in Poetic Literature After Nimbārka

In chapter 2 I have treated the figure of Rādhā as a character in poetry and religious narrative until the 7th century. Even after Nimbārka allotted equal status to Rādhā with Kṛṣṇa as the conjoined Parabrahman, it would seem that other contemporary theologians did not accept the divinity of Rādhā. Indeed, Puruṣottama, himself third successor of Nimbārka, had trouble digesting this as is evident in his *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, although accepting the rest of the teachings of the founder of his line. I turn now to literature after the 7th century for an understanding of what immediate effect, if any, this had. I suggest that it is possible to detect a noticeable change in some spheres of poetry, which bears witness to an evolving theology surrounding Rādhā. Whether or not this is attributable to Nimbārka can be doubted given the extremely thin evidence available, however, given the foregoing discussion, the possibility does exist.

Rādhā is referred to in poetry from the early 8th century, a time which I suggest is post-Nimbārka. As Miller (1975, 1977), Siegel (2009) and others have dealt extensively with the *Gītagovinda*, this text will be the upper limit for the present study. Only sources mentioning Rādhā herself specifically will be dealt with rather than those which mention the *gopīs*, because, as is evident from the sources referred to in chapter 2, the name Rādhā (or Rādhikā) who is a lover of Kṛṣṇa in particular, ‘is typical of the secular poetic tradition alone’ (Hardy 1983:104). Even though both Miller and Hardy have analysed these sources, it may be pertinent here to add a layer of analysis that introduces a perspective derived from my discussion of Nimbārka’s chronology. As in chapter 2, Miller’s (1975) list is the most complete survey of all available sources that refer to Rādhā, and so I will refer to the sources therein contained in the following discussion. Analysing the textual references to Rādhā in this manner it is clear that there were indeed two divergent views on the nature of Rādhā herself – one mundane and the other divine – which have specific bearing on the literary and theological environment within which Nimbārka’s successors were operating. Hardy (1983:111) notes that there are two versions of Rādhā: the Purāṇic version, wherein Rādhā is depicted as being solely paramour *gopī*, and the version contained in poetry which could explore religious motifs beyond the constraints of the Purāṇas themselves, sometimes revealing a divine Rādhā and sometimes not. I will focus on the poetry that mentions Rādhā as divine solely, as it is my contention that poetry mentioning the divinity of Rādhā does so due the emergence of a theology that validates this. If indeed the characteristics of the divine Rādhā of the poets correlate to the conceptualisation

that Nimbārka provides, then it can be assumed that Nimbārka’s theology had an impact even if very subtle. Poetry that places Rādhā in a secondary, albeit divine, role shows the impact of the Purāṇic version noticed by Hardy (1983:111) with Rādhā becoming divine as a result of association with Kṛṣṇa, but nonetheless remaining inferior to Lakṣmī.

The first reference to Rādhā with theological implications comes from the *Gāṇḍavaho* (c.725CE), written by Vākpati, a court poet of King Yaśovarman of Kanauj:

Let the nail marks Rādhā makes remove anguish for you –
they are potent with mood;
On Kṛṣṇa’s chest they are shining
like his magical *kaustubha* gem.¹⁷⁶

The reference to Kṛṣṇa’s possession of the *kaustubha* gem shows that the author is conversant with the literature that describes his divinity and having equivalence to Viṣṇu, as this gem is, from an early period, a core element of Viṣṇu’s mythology (Parrott 1983:20). This verse, in describing the body of Kṛṣṇa, is similar to a verse of contemplation (*dhyāna śloka*) (Parker 2010:36). Unlike conventional *dhyāna ślokas*, which aside from focusing on the beauty of the deity in question, may focus on the ornaments worn by the deity (Parker 2010:37), here the ornaments are clearly the marks of love-making. Kṛṣṇa does not hide them; rather they are emblazoned on his chest, which is a place more often associated with Lakṣmī (who

¹⁷⁶ *ṇaha-reha-rāhā-kāraṇā om karuṇam harantu vo sarasā | vaccha-thalammi kottuha-kiraṇāantī om kaṇhassa || Gāṇḍavaho 22, translation: Miller (1975:660) based on Sanskrit chāyā.*

resides there as the *śrīvatsa* curl of chest-hair). Whilst this solitary reference to Rādhā in the work may at first seem unremarkable, theologically this raises an important point. Rādhā's nail marks are starkly visible on the chest that was once the sole domain of Lakṣmī revealing that Rādhā, in this poem, was given prominence, suggesting a shift in the mythology surrounding the relationship of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva and his consort. As has been explained, Nimbārka, in his *Daśaślokī* (verse 8), gave precedence to *preman* (love) over more normative *bhakti* which he relegates to a secondary place. The presiding deity of love, at least according to Puruṣottama's reading of Nimbārka's work, is Rādhā (see section 6.3). Accordingly I would suggest that the imagery of this verse confirms my discussion of Nimbārka: either it was one of many poetic compositions at the time which held Rādhā to be Kṛṣṇa's favourite lover and thus represents a development of the pre-existing sources for Nimbārka's innovation, or it was influenced by Nimbārka's new theology regarding the consort. Geographically, it was composed in the area of Nimbārka's activity in Vraja (see section 4.1). Either way, it is a significant verse in the context of our discussion.

Another reference to Rādhā is to be had from the *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* (early 10th century) of Rājaśekhara. To illustrate his discussion on the poetic theory of an imitation which resembles the similarity of two persons (*tulyadehitulya*), he compares the sighs of Śiva with those of Hari:

May Hari's sighs protect you
 As they burn forth from the fire deep within –
 Boiling the lotus-honey from his navel,
 Wilting the garland on his breast,
 Drunk and spit by the trembling serpent who forms his couch

On account of the heat,
Witnessing his memory of Rādhā's love
And heard jealously by the goddess **Kamalā**.¹⁷⁷

This verse inverts the separation theme from something that was felt by Rādhā to a separation that is being experienced in equal measure by Kṛṣṇa. It is also significant in that Lakṣmī is shown to be jealous of Rādhā. The imagery suggests the scene of Hari/Kṛṣṇa/Viṣṇu being served by Lakṣmī on the ocean of milk, resting on the Ananta-Śeṣa serpent bed. Presumably the poet envisaged this scene occurring after Kṛṣṇa's incarnation on earth. Crucially, Lakṣmī is recognised to be a separate entity from Rādhā, as there would not be any jealousy if Rādhā were the incarnation of Lakṣmī. Here, it seems that Kṛṣṇa has reverted to what is intended to be his original form of Hari. Nimbārka had suggested by this time that Kṛṣṇa was Parabrahman, but also frequently uses the name Hari/Puruṣottama/Vāsudeva as synonymous with Kṛṣṇa. So from a Nimbārka viewpoint, this verse is not problematic. It correlates well with descriptions of Kāraṇārṇavaśāyīn Viṣṇu (Viṣṇu who rests on the causal ocean) in the *Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā* of Puruṣottama, where the fact that Lakṣmī and Rādhā are different ontological entities is also discussed (see chapter 6).

The *Yaśatilakacampūkāvya* of Somadeva contains a clear reference to a divine Rādhā, a point of some relevance as this is a Jain text. This work which is dated to

¹⁷⁷ *ye kīrṇakvathitodarābjamadhavo ye mlāpitorahsrajo ye tāpāt yaralena talpaphaṇinā pūtapratāpojhitāḥ | te rādhāsmṛtisākṣiṇaḥ kamalayā sāsūyam ākarṇitā gādhāntardavathoḥ prataptasaralāḥ śvāsā hareḥ pāntu vaḥ || Kāvyaṁīmāmsā chapter 13 = Subhāṣitaratnakośa 136, and thus Ingalls' translation (Miller 1975:661). Here, I have changed his rendering of *kamalayā* which he has as 'the goddess Śrī', and kept *Kamalā*, the usual epithet of Lakṣmī. This is because of a differentiation extant within the writings of Puruṣottama, and as such can be assumed for Nimbārka, where Śrī and Lakṣmī are different. In his theology, Rukmiṇī is Lakṣmī, and Rādhā is Śrī (see chapter 5).*

959CE according to the colophon, refers to the example of the love of various famous couples (Miller 1975:662):

Thus indeed – formerly did not Gaṅgā sport with Maheśvara, Rādhā with Nārāyaṇa, Bṛhaspati’s wife with the Moon and Tārā with Bālī?¹⁷⁸

It is clear here that, for Somadeva, Rādhā occupies a role similar to that of Gaṅgā in terms of relationships. Maheśvara is married to Umā, but in this poem, Gaṅgā is presented as being an extramarital love interest. This love is rationalised later on to show that Gaṅgā is none other than Śakti herself, so there is no contradiction or allegation of infidelity; indeed iconography depicts Umā at the left side of Śiva and Gaṅgā in his locks from early times (for example the Gaṅgādharamūrti in cave 5 in Elephanta; Doniger-O’Flaherty 1983:33). A similar example is given with Nārāyaṇa, who ‘sported’ with Rādhā, but whose conventional wife is Lakṣmī. The next line requires clarification: the wife of Bṛhaspati, who in this case is also a Tārā, had adulterous relations with the Moon, whose wife was Rohiṇī. According to the *Devībhāgavatam* (1.11.1-86), the union produced the planetary divinity Budha as offspring. Then on the other hand, Tārā, an *apsaras*, was married to Vālin, and had deep affection for him. The full story is contained within the *Rāmāyaṇa*’s Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍa as it was Rāma who killed Vālin (Vālmīki’s *Rāmāyaṇa* 4.15-23). The ambiguous references to extra-marital love and marital love in this verse may be the consequence of the author’s own adherence to Jainism. Incidentally, this work was composed in Melpāṭi, Tamil Nadu (Hardy 1989:108), an area that was later heavily influenced by the Śrī Sampradāya.

¹⁷⁸ *tathā hi – purāpi kiṃ na reme gaṅgā saha maheśvareṇa rādhā nārāyaṇena bṛhaspatipatnī dvijarājena tārā ca vālinā* | *Yaśatilakacampūkāvya* chapter 4.

Whatever theological trends existed at the very least informed elements of Rāmānuja’s later tradition. It is clear that in this verse Rādhā is not treated as the chief love of Kṛṣṇa, but merely as a paramour; a view still current in the Śrī Sampradāya (Brzezinski 1990:537).

The following evidence further supports this. Miller (1975:662) refers to the copper-plate inscriptions of Vākpati-Muñja who was a Paramāra ruler of Mālwā. Three copper plates from 974, 982 and 986 CE all have the same *maṅgala* verses, one for Śiva and one for Viṣṇu. The verse praising the latter divinity reads:

May the active body of demon Mura’s enemy protect you –
Lakṣmī’s face could not please it, the ocean’s waters could not cool it,
The lotus in the lake of his own navel was powerless to pacify it,
Fragrant breath issuing from serpent Śeṣa’s thousand mouths could not soothe it,
It was so sick with the pain of separation from Rādhā.¹⁷⁹

This verse’s imagery parallels that of the verse from the *Kāvyaṁmāmsā* quoted above. Here, Lakṣmī’s beauty could not ease the torment in separation of Murāri from Rādhā, thus hinting at Rādhā’s superiority over Lakṣmī at least in the realm of love. An important theological debate occurred later within the Śrī Sampradāya over Rādhā’s status, that it was claimed that Lakṣmī was Nārāyaṇa’s original *śakti* and stands superior to any other goddess as she is the *aiśvaryaḍhiṣṭhātrī*, the deity presiding over sovereignty (Brzezinski 1990:537). Puruṣottama and the rest of Nimbārka’s followers argue that *preman* is supreme and the *premāḍhiṣṭhātrī* is Rādhā, thus she is superior (see section 6.3). It seems as if the author is at least

¹⁷⁹ *yal lakṣmīvadanendunā na sukhitaṁ yan nārdritaṁ vāridher vārā yan na nijena nābhisarasīpadmena śāntiṁ gatam | yac cheṣāhiphaṇāsahasramadhuraśvāsair na cāśvasitaṁ tad rādhāviraḥāturaṁ murarīpor velladvapuḥ pātu vaḥ ||* I have amended Miller’s translation, which originally read ‘...with the pain of Rādhā’s neglect’ (Miller 1975:662), because this reading could lend unwanted nuance to the verse.

familiar with the view that love surpasses power in supremacy, even if only in poetry. Whether this verse had a theological basis that was supplied by Nimbārka is unclear, but it is possible given the dating and location. Mālwā was on the route between Pratiṣṭhāna, Nimbārka’s place of birth, and Mathurā, his place of austerities (see section 4.1). The king himself invaded the northwestern Cālukya Empire within which Pratiṣṭhāna was situated, even though he was ultimately defeated. Later evidence suggests that Nimbārka’s successors up until the Vraja-renaissance were all descended from around Pratiṣṭhāna as he was, even though they later moved to the Mathurā area, as he did. It can be assumed that the tradition had some effect on the locales with which it had contact. The Vaiṣṇava debate about the status of Rādhā seems to be clearer, especially when the geographical details of this and the previous sources are taken into account.

Miller (1975:663-664) next refers to the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, compiled by the famous polymath Bhoja, a Paramāra king of Mālwā, as a treatise on *alaṅkāra* (poetics) sometime during his rule which extended from the early 11th century until 1055CE. The first poem to be examined is a *kamalabandha* of the name of the poet Rājaśekhara:

She who bestowed a kingdom of defects, a knower of *rasa* which gives expansion (\sqrt{ra}), who speaks pretentious speech, who does wrong to the world, the full-moon maiden, whose eyelashes are like serpent Śeṣa, whose eye leads to *nītiśāstra*, she who travels in the sky, whose love is praiseworthy, who is charming, whose penance is severe, carrier of the moon, Śrī, whose sword is sharp – let Rādhā protect me; she is the incarnation who brings down serpent knowledge for masters of will who have their egos centred in Śiva.¹⁸⁰

¹⁸⁰ *rātāvadyādhirājyā visararasavidvyāvākkṣmāpakārā rākā pakṣmābhaśeṣā nayanananayanāsvā [sā] khayā stavyamārā | rāmā vyastasthiratvā tuhinananahituḥ śrīḥ karakṣāradhārā rādhā rakṣāstu mahyaṃ śivamamamaśivyaḥlavidyāvātārā || Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa 2.249*

From the various images presented in this *kamala-bandha* emerges an important fact, namely that Śrī and Rādhā are equated, a discernably Nimbārka tenet. This is also the first poetic verse which is dedicated to Rādhā in a divine capacity outside of the Nimbārka tradition itself. The *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharāṇa* includes other poems which deal exclusively with the *śṛṅgārarasa* motifs of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa (3.110, 4.117 and 5.235). It is telling that verses laden with the *śṛṅgāra rasa* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are cited in tandem with a verse that is explicitly prayerful (2.249), as Mālwā was an important city on the route between Pratiṣṭhāna and Mathurā, perhaps showing the poet's possible awareness of worshippers of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa who resided there. The anthology does contain verses where Rādhā is definitely mundane (5.448 and 5.493), which is testimony to the differing views held on Rādhā even within one kingdom. What should be noticed is that both of these verses feature Rādhā during Kṛṣṇa's departure to Dvārakā (5.448), and Kṛṣṇa's lifting of the Govardhana mountain (5.493). These are episodes that are inextricably tied to the divinity of Kṛṣṇa, and as such it can be surmised that these verses perhaps typified the views held by those who were influenced by the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*.

There are several verses in the celebrated *Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa* of Vidyākara that refer to Rādhā. Compiled in the latter half of the 11th century CE, this anthology contains poems from the prior two centuries. Kosambi (1957:xxvii) suggests that Vidyākara was a monk at the Jagaddala Vihāra in North Bengal. Aside from the many verses on Rādhā as a mundane love interest comes the following reference:

The pilgrims in the street have warded off the painful cold
 With their broad quilts sewn of a hundred rags;
 And now with voices clear and sweet

They break the morning slumber of city folk
With songs of the secret love of Mādhava and Rādhā.¹⁸¹ by Ḍimboka

This verse was composed the Bengali poet Ḍimboka who is quoted along with Jayadeva in the later *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (Miller 1975:666 n33). The poem suggests that ‘the secret love’ of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa was sung of by pilgrims in the morning. Extrapolating from this, it can be assumed that for this poet, songs about Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa were suitable for the early morning, a time which is usually reserved for intense religious activity. This indirect testimony corroborates the fact that for at least a certain section of contemporary society Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa’s love had a religious dimension.

Between 1075CE and 1100CE, Bilhaṇa composed the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* in honour of the Cālukya king Vikramāditya VI. Again, the Cālukya territories included Pratiṣṭhāna and it is possible that the poet was vaguely acquainted with the doctrine of Nimbārka’s followers. Two verses of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* are noticed by Miller (1975:666):

Let Kṛṣṇa’s sword, ‘Delighter’, reflecting joyful Lakṣmī in its blade,
Hold out intense joy for you – For demon Mura’s enemy, it perpetually revives
The memory of graceful Rādhā in the Jamna river’s flow.¹⁸²

Even though having Lakṣmī at his side, Kṛṣṇa reminisces longingly about his time with Rādhā in Vṛndāvana. The rivalry of Rādhā and Lakṣmī is a common motif by this time, yet there is no immediate indication that Rādhā is of any divine

¹⁸¹ *rathyākārpaṭikaiḥ paṭaccaraśatasūtorukanthābala-pratyādiṣṭahimāgamārtiviśadaprasnigdha-kaṅṭhodaraiḥ | gīyante nagareṣu nāgarajanapratyūṣanidrānudo rādhāmādhavayoḥ paraspararahahprastāvanāgītayaḥ || Subhāṣitaratnakośa 980 (Miller 1965:666)*

¹⁸² *sāndram mudam yacchatu nandako vaḥ sollāsalakṣmīpratibimbagarbhaḥ | kurvann ajasram yamunāpravāhalīlarādhāsmaraṇam murāreḥ || Vikramāṅkadevacarita 1.5*

consequence, unless one reads between the lines that if the lord of Lakṣmī is not pleased with Lakṣmī herself, goddess *par excellence*, then Rādhā must be even greater, even if only in his estimations. Miller (1975:666) points out that it is when Bilhaṇa was heading south from Kashmir that he stopped at Vṛndāvana:

Broken by Rādhā's broad hips, which sway as she swings,
Even now the trees in Kṛṣṇa's playground do not recover –
When the poet had disturbed the circle of Mathurā's sages with playful banter,
He spent several days in the area of Vṛndāvana.¹⁸³

Whilst not specifically referent to the divine Rādhā, this verse provides an insight into the significance of Mathurā. Assuming that the poet is speaking with Vaiṣṇavas in that the topic is that of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, the use of the word *sūri* that Miller translates as 'sages' is noteworthy, as it usually denotes specific Vaiṣṇava adepts of Pāñcarātra. It can be supposed therefore that a Vraja-based community of renunciates was in existence at this early stage; and if so, it seems likely that they too would have been acquainted with the tradition of Nimbārka which was purportedly based near Govardhana in Nimbagrāma. This provides a different view of the widely accepted theory that Caitanya's followers 'rediscovered' Vraja mentioned, for example, by Entwhistle (1987:146-147). Bilhaṇa's route to Mathurā would feature Vṛndāvana as one of the last settlements along the route before arriving at the destination. This link between Vraja and Kashmir, aside from tourism and trade, perhaps also entailed the sharing of religious trends. Indeed later in the early modern period, the 33rd successor to Nimbārka, Keśava Kāśmīrin is known to have resided in Kashmir for a time.

¹⁸³ *dolāloladghanajaghanayā rādhayā yatra bhagnāḥ kṛṣṇakṛīdāṅgaṇavitāpīno nādhunāpy ucchvasanti | jalpakṛīdāmathitamathurāsūricakreṇa kecit tasmin vṛndāvanaparisare vāsarā yena nītaḥ || Vikramāṅkadevacarita 18.87*

Govardhana, who was praised by Jayadeva in the *Gītagovinda* for his erotic poetry (Knutson 2014:53), composed the *Āryāsaptaśatī* in Bengal during the late 12th century which contains a few verses referring to Rādhā (Knutson 2014:68):

Friend, Tulasī, garland on the head of demon Madhu’s foe,
Why compare yourself in vain with Rādhā?
All the outpouring of your fragrance is just to perfume her feet.¹⁸⁴

This verse is particularly revealing, as for the first time another divinity is being introduced in juxtaposed position with Rādhā in place of Lakṣmī herself. Whether or not the anthropomorphic Tulasī was conceived of as a divine personality is discussed at length by Carbone (2008:9 and 31-39), who argues that she represents the ‘plant form of Lakṣmī’. This particular verse then serves as evidence to supplement existing scholarship on Tulasī. Here, Tulasī is shown that her place is at the feet of Rādhā, and as the *tulasī* plant (*Ocimum Sanctum* Linn) was used in a ritual context in Pāñcarātra (Carbone 2008:32), it could be claimed that behind the immediate sense of the verse, there is an allusion to religious ritual. *Āryāsaptaśatī* 488 is as follows:

When stories of how his head was washed by water in royal ablution are told about Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā, her eye moving slowly from excessive pride, looks down at the lotus of her own feet.¹⁸⁵

This verse describes Rādhā’s reaction upon listening to accounts of the coronation of Kṛṣṇa at Dvārakā, of which he was the king and married to sixteen thousand wives (*Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 10.69), headed by Rukmiṇī, the incarnation of Lakṣmī

¹⁸⁴ *madhumathanamaulimāle sakhi tulayasi tulasi kim mūḍha rādhām | yat tava padam adasīyam surabhayitum saurabhābdhedah || Āryāsaptaśatī* 431 (Miller 1975:667)

¹⁸⁵ *rājyābhiṣekasalilakṣālitamauleḥ kathāsu kṛṣṇasya | garvabharamantharākṣī paśyati padapañkajam rādhā || Āryāsaptaśatī* 488 (Miller 1975:667)

(*Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 10.54.60). It alludes to a correlation between the bathing of Kṛṣṇa's head and Rādhā's feet; indeed contemporary and later poetry describe Kṛṣṇa bowing to (*Gītagovinda* 11.5), adorning (*Gītagovinda* 12.25), massaging (*Yugalaśataka* 76), and kissing her feet (*Mahāvāṇī* Sahaja Sukha 4). However, this verse attests to the divinity of Rādhā in a more direct manner. It refers specifically to the waters that bathed Kṛṣṇa's head during the *rājyābhiṣeka* coronation ritual (*rājyābhiṣeka-salila-kṣālita*) and suggests that Rādhā's feet also received similar treatment by Kṛṣṇa (commonly known as *pādaprakṣāḷana*), a mode of adoration which forms a part of the *pūjā* adoration ritual of a deity (Willis 2009: 109). The next relevant verse is:

In order to shame demon Madhu's enemy whose mind
was absorbed in all the cowherd girls,
Rādhā, feigning innocence, asked for the story of Śiva,
who was satisfied with half his wife.¹⁸⁶

This verse is quite relevant to the present study. Rādhā states that Śiva was satisfied with half of his wife, with the intention that Kṛṣṇa focus on her instead of the other *gopīs*. It is possible to interpret that Rādhā may be hinting at a relationship that is marital, or at least, resembles the love of a married couple. She is acting like the archetypical jealous wife when her husband is contemplating other women. A marital relationship would immediately place her amongst Lakṣmī, Pṛthivī and their subsequent incarnations.

Lovely-eyed women who live on the shores of the milky sea
eat balls of thick milk concentrate
Formed by the wind of Lakṣmī's heated sighing,
and they sing the praises of Rādhā.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁶ *lajjayitum akhilagopīnipītamanasaṁ madhudviṣaṁ rādhā | ajñeva pṛcchati kathāṁ śambhor dayitārdhatuṣṭasya || Āryāsaptaśatī* 508 (Miller 1975:667)

Rādhā, by virtue of her sway over Kṛṣṇa, has in this verse relegated the normally resplendent Lakṣmī to the state of a forlorn, almost rejected wife. If the heavenly women are singing the praises of Rādhā, even if she was originally mortal, it can be assumed that by now she has risen to divine status. Overall then, Govardhana seems to be well aware of Rādhā's theological importance, which is visible in the various motifs he deploys to describe the divine lovers. The *Gītagovinda* of Jayadeva is clear that Kṛṣṇa is the source of all incarnations and his consort is Rādhā (Miller 1975:668-669). The fact that Jayadeva and Govardhana both are poets in Lakṣmaṇasena's court (Knutson 2014:1-2) demonstrates that at the very least the nobility and literary specialists of this region would be conversant with these motifs and actively supporting their promulgation.

Revisiting the sources collected by Miller has yielded important information about the understanding of Rādhā and her theology in non-religious literature. I have been able to show that it is possible to trace the diverging views to two competing theologies. The first comes from Nimbārka and his followers, wherein Rādhā is superior to Lakṣmī. Extrapolating from the *Daśaślokī*, this is due to Rādhā being Parabrahman in tandem with Kṛṣṇa. The second seems to be developed from the brāhmaṇical sources and sees Rādhā as inferior to Lakṣmī in that Lakṣmī is the *aiśvaryaḍhiṣṭhātrī*, the superintending divinity over majesty. This particular trend, as noticed, is picked up later on by the followers of the Śrī Sampradāya – as well as in the wider Vaiṣṇava and Hindu traditions wherein Kṛṣṇa is not the supreme deity.

¹⁸⁷ *lakṣmīniḥśvāsānilapiṇḍīkṛtadugdhajaladhisārabhujah | kṣīranidhitīrasudṛśo yaśāmsi gāyanti rādhāyāḥ || Āryāśaptaśatī* 509 (Miller 1975:667)

4.4 Conclusion: Nimbārka & Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa

Nimbārka, who I have argued flourished sometime between 620-690CE, seems to have served as the mediator of a range of poetic imaginings of Rādhā found in both Prakrit and Sanskrit poetry during his time and the orthodox *brāhmaṇical* Vedānta theory of *bhedābheda*. Whereas he had predecessors such as Bhartṛprapañca upon whom to rely when formulating his particular brand of *svābhāvika dvaitādvaita*, this intellectual is unique in his efforts to bring Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa conjointly to the ontological status of Parabrahman.

Tellingly, Nimbārka does not discuss mythology surrounding Kṛṣṇa, in the same manner as he does not divulge anything beyond a tantalising glimpse of the nature of Rādhā, as he understands it. This is not to say that there was not a thriving and dynamic corpus of Kṛṣṇa mythology as preserved in the Sanskrit tradition, most notably the *Harivaṁśa* and *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. It is a similar case for Rādhā, except the details that are available from this early period appear fragmentary and disconnected, unless the implications of the poetry are explored in tandem with the theology Nimbārka posited.

Nimbārka's innovation may have been disregarded in current scholarly theories, as the paradoxical result of the first commentator on the *Daśaślokī* and his third successor, Puruṣottama, who neglects to develop Nimbārka's novel theology. In his commentary on *Daśaślokī* 5, he does not amplify this particular doctrine, but instead elects to rationalise it for an audience familiar with Vedānta and

brāhmaṇical literature. Even though Nimbārka intellectuals until Śrībhṭṭa in the 15th century refer to the *Daśaślokī* in their works, they completely avoid discussion of this verse. Particularly striking is the case of Keśava Kāśmīrin, the preceptor of Śrībhṭṭa (who wrote openly about Rādhā), who quotes the *Daśaślokī* in his commentaries on the *Brahmasūtra* (the *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā*), the *Bhagavadgītā* (the *Tattvaparakāsikā*) and the Vedastuti of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, but does not once mention Rādhā, other than in his hymnal works. In order to acquire a clearer understanding of the manner in which the later authors of the *sampradāya* viewed Nimbārka's theological contribution, I will discuss in the subsequent chapters the commentaries to *Daśaślokī* verse 5 and relevant historical developments to which they bear witness.

Chapter 5

Puruṣottamācārya and the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*

After Nimbārka, the tradition was led by Śrīnivāsa. He was in turn succeeded by Viśvācārya, whose seat was inherited by Puruṣottama, who is also thought to hail from the same area as Nimbārka (Bose 1943 vol. 3:70). Nothing more about Puruṣottama's life can be ascertained from early sources; however, later works claim that he was born on the 6th day of the bright half of the lunar month Caitra (February-March) and was the author of a commentary, the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*.¹⁸⁸

The *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* is an erudite and detailed commentary on the *Daśaślokī*, consisting of four chapters modelled on the themes of the four chapters of the *Brahmasūtra*, and containing the very first polemical debates with *advaita* recorded in the tradition. Although Puruṣottama's thoughts on *bhakti* form a substantial part of the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, the major bulk of the work is concerned with Vedāntic exegesis. Puruṣottama states at the very beginning of the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* that Nimbārka composed the *Daśaślokī* as a supplement to the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* for the sake of those who desired to understand the purport of the revealed scriptures but had not the intellectual capacity nor the perseverance required to fully comprehend the conclusion of the scriptures, yet

¹⁸⁸ *caitraśukle rasasañjñikāyām āvirbhavaṁ vai puruṣottamākhyam | vivaraṇakāraṁ nijadeśikānām kṛtasya śāstrasya guruṁ prapadye || Ācāryacaritam 8.11*

were still hopeful of liberation.¹⁸⁹ Puruṣottama then provides evidence which supports the current *paramparā* list, at least until Puruṣottama himself, stating that the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* was explained by Śrīnivāsa, who is the incarnation of Pāñcajanya, as revealed by the reverend preceptor Viśvācārya.¹⁹⁰ Having provided this pedigree, Puruṣottama then states that he is composing this treatise by way of commentary on the *Daśaślokī* in accordance with the limits of his own intellect.¹⁹¹ Whatever Puruṣottama’s intentions may have been, this is the earliest surviving commentary of the *Daśaślokī* and as such is pivotal in understanding the manner in which Nimbārka’s followers dealt with Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa as Parabrahman. In this chapter, I hope to demonstrate that Puruṣottama, although operating within the tradition established by Nimbārka, was able to present original views on this topic, perhaps influenced by the theological and philosophical environment to which he belonged.

5.1 Audience, Opponents & Intent

It seems that Puruṣottama’s intended audience was not restricted to those initiated into the tradition, as the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* is aimed at dispelling the doubts raised by *advaitins* concerning certain Vedāntic theories propounded by Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa. Puruṣottama goes about this by both defending the traditional viewpoint and also attacking that of the opponent, suggesting that he perhaps

¹⁸⁹ *mandamatīnām sarvaśāstrārthajijñāsūnām śītilaprayatnānām śāstrārthavicārāsamarthānām mumukṣūnām upakārārtham vedāntaratnabhūtām śāstrārthakāmadhenum daśaslokīm api nirmame* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

¹⁹⁰ *bhāṣitam cedam vākyam śaṅkhāvatāraiḥ śrīśrīnivāsācāryacaraṇaiḥ | uktañ ca viśvācāryacaraṇaiḥ* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

¹⁹¹ *tasyā [daśaślokyāḥ] mitākṣaraiḥ koṣṭhacatuṣṭayātmikā vedāntaratnamañjūṣākhyā mitavyākhyā yathāmati vidhīyate* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

envisaged doubters and members of rival traditions reading the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*.

A systematic examination of the text reveals which traditions are dealt with as oppositional. In his opening preamble Puruṣottama disposes of Pūrvamīmāṃsā and those who rely solely on *karman* for liberation¹⁹² after the manner of Nimbārka's own introduction in the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*. In the first chapter, which deals with the *padārthas*, Puruṣottama analyses *Daśaślokī* verses 1 through 5. Commenting on verse 1, he utilises Nimbārka's statement to counter 'the refuted view of the limiting adjunct of the *māyāvādins*'.¹⁹³ He disposes of the views of this school by adducing revealed (*śruti*) and recollected (*smṛti*) scriptural quotations against an *upādhivādin* (who hold that limiting adjuncts are the source of ontological distinctions) as his putative opponent, concluding by stating that 'this theory of the limiting adjunct should not be respected by the learned'.¹⁹⁴ He pokes fun at the *upādhivādin* opponent, who proposes that the soul possesses agency through contact with a limiting adjunct, saying: 'this cannot be the case, as if it were so then it would have to be accepted that a eunuch could sire a child from merely having contact with a woman!'.¹⁹⁵

Puruṣottama then goes on to refute the *pratibimbavādins* (who hold that the individual souls are reflections of the singular Brahman) of Śaṅkara's school by

¹⁹² *jijñāsītadharmamīmāṃsānirastakarmaphalādiviṣayasamdehakatatphalanirviṇṇabhagavaddidṛkṣālampātagurubhaktisampannamumukṣu...|| Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā 1.1*

¹⁹³ *paricchin nabāhyānām pakṣe māyāvāde 'tiprasaṅgam vārayati 'jñātrtvavantam' iti|| Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā 1.1*

¹⁹⁴ *tasmād anādaraṇīyo 'yam avacchedavādo vidvadbhiḥ|| Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā 1.1*

¹⁹⁵ *iti cen na| tathā'tve napuṃsakasyāpi strīsambandhamātreṇa prajotpattiḥ svīkaraṇīyā syāt | evaṃ kutrāpy adṛṣṭacarī anupapannā ca || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā 1.1*

first dealing with the theory of *pratibimba* (reflections) itself.¹⁹⁶ He follows by commenting upon the controversy between these two disparate views within Śaṅkara's tradition and finally disposes of them through identifying what he perceives to be logical inconsistencies, accusing them of using reasoning similar to that of the Sāṅkhyas: 'otherwise, this would fall within the theory of the proponents of Sāṅkhya who infer without the basis of [scriptural] testimony. Also the faults of such theories have been tackled previously, not to mention the fact that the theories of *avaccheda* and *pratibimba* have been refuted'.¹⁹⁷

Puruṣottama further asserts that the Naiyāyikas have been defeated already in the same manner as the 'heterodox schools' (*bāhyapakṣa*) due to a similar contention that the *ātman* is insentient¹⁹⁸ (referring specifically to the Buddhists). He then goes on to treat stock Naiyāyika argumentation much in the manner that it was treated by Śaṅkara, with a few adjustments to conform to Nimbārka's reasoning. He is apparently bemused by them: 'noticing the conclusion reached by the clever logician who is nevertheless a fool...'.¹⁹⁹ The Tārkika opponent even manages to tie himself in a knot, at which Puruṣottama jests: 'how do they not see that they are burning their own house by their own hand? This scriptural statement that you have quoted is agreeable to our view and disagreeable to yours',²⁰⁰ and because of this,

¹⁹⁶ *etenaiva brahmapratibimba eva jīva ity api nirastam* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

¹⁹⁷ *aśabdānumānikasāṅkhyamatapraveśāt | tatra doṣāṅām pūrvam evodghaṭitavāt | nirākṛtatvāc cāvachedapratibimbavādayoḥ* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

¹⁹⁸ *jñānasvarūpam ity anenaiva tārkikapakṣavyāvṛttivad bāhyapakṣavyāvṛttir apy arthasiddhā ubhayor apy acetanātmāṅgikārasāmyāt* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

¹⁹⁹ *tarkābhijñāsya devānāmpriyasya tātparyam ākalayya ...* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

²⁰⁰ *svahastenaiva svagṛhadāho nālocyate katham? bhavadbhir udāhṛtaśruter aṅuparatvenāsmad iṣtatvād yuṣmad aniṣtatvāc ca* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.1

Puruṣottama ‘disposes with the logicians and other heterodox schools that contend that the individual soul is of medium or pervasive size’.²⁰¹

Commenting on verse 3 of the *Daśaślokī*, Puruṣottama equates the Vedāntic understanding of the process of creation of the subtle elements with that of the Pāñcarātra view of the *caturvyūha* (Vāsudeva, Saṅkaraṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, the quadruple expansion of Parabrahman) as superintending deities over the mind and other *tattvas*. According to Puruṣottama, this view does not contradict the Vedāntic view, and thus counters Śaṅkara’s Pāñcarātra-centric accusations for the first time in this tradition.²⁰² He explains how the two versions of creation are essentially the same, with Candra and the other governing Upaniṣadic deities being responsible for the functioning of the universe and the *vyūha* deities being inner-controllers worthy of worship.²⁰³

Puruṣottama continues by elaborating on the various processes of creation, the elements, species of life, etc., before arriving at the topic of Brahman. He recapitulates the fact that the *ekajīvavādins* (i.e. Śaṅkara) have already been refuted.²⁰⁴ Then he turns his attention to *upāsanā* (the means to liberation, usually a specific type of worship), and specifically defends the Nimbārki insistence that the *upāsanā* enjoined in the Vedānta consists of uninterrupted contemplation of Brahman. Puruṣottama does this by describing the various types of prescription

²⁰¹ *vaibhavamādhyamaparimāṇavāditārkkikādibahyādipakṣau nirākaroti || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*
1.1

²⁰² *kvacic caiśādhiṣṭhātrtvena vāsudevādayaś caturvyūhadevatā apy ucyante...
noktasiddhāntavirodhaḥ|| Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.3

²⁰³ *candrādīnām tatpravartakatvaṁ vyūhadevānām tadantaryāmitayā tatropāsyatvam ubhayam api
ghatata evey arthaḥ|| Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.3

²⁰⁴ *bahuvacanādd hy ekajīvavādimatasya nirāsaḥ|| Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.4

(*apūrva vidhi, niyama vidhi and parisankhyā vidhi*) following the arguments of Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa, whose *Tantravārttika* (1.2.34) he quotes,²⁰⁵ at the conclusion of which he reaffirms that the *upāsanā* advocated by the *Brahmasūtra* was correctly interpreted by Nimbārka.

Commenting on *Daśaślokī* verse 4, Puruṣottama provides many more substantiating scriptural quotations to show that Brahman is Kṛṣṇa, and then continues by demonstrating that the Gāyatrī *mantra* is actually a meditation on Kṛṣṇa, and also that Kṛṣṇa is superior to other contenders for the position of Brahman such as Śiva and Brahmā. Perhaps this is to allay the fears of traditional brāhmaṇas that in following this tradition they are venturing outside the traditionally accepted *bhedābheda* viewpoint; and he adduces both revealed and recollected scriptural quotations to substantiate this position.²⁰⁶

In the course of this discussion, Puruṣottama introduces an opponent, perhaps of the Śaiva tradition, who states that while in all the quotations supplied Viṣṇu is supreme, there are statements in other Purāṇas that confirm the supremacy of either Śiva or Brahmā. Puruṣottama explains that the Purāṇas were aimed at different audiences according to the preponderance of one of the three specific modes of material nature (*triguṇa*), which meant that the Purāṇas are divided into three corresponding categories, plus an extra category reserved for Purāṇas that display a

²⁰⁵ *Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā* 1.4

²⁰⁶ Puruṣottama quotes *Mahopaniṣad* 1.1, 1.3, 1.4; the Nārāyaṇa Sūkta of the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* 4.10.3, *Gopālatāpinyupaniṣad* 1.24, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 4.1.85, *Mahābhārata* 12.8.36, 12.20.12, *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 6.1.3.8-9 to show that both Brahmā and Śiva were born from some higher potency.

combination of the three.²⁰⁷ An interesting question is posed by the opponent after this: ‘why doesn’t everyone concur with this? Why don’t they only follow the *sāttvika* Purāṇas [and their conclusion that Kṛṣṇa is Brahman]?’ To this, Puruṣottama replies: ‘This is not the case because we contend that it is due to the bad *karmas* [of these people which causes them to follow the conclusions of the other Purāṇas that favour Śiva and other deities]’.²⁰⁸ This discussion encourages the conclusion that there were many people who agreed with the *svābhāvika dvaitādvaita* doctrine from a philosophical perspective, yet were reluctant to assign theological primacy to Kṛṣṇa, perhaps due to familial allegiances to specific deities, or prior sectarian affiliation.

Puruṣottama’s next opponent appears to be a Saura (a cult in which Sūrya, the solar deity, was viewed as Parabrahman), objecting to the fact that the Nimbārka tradition has used the Gāyatrī to refer to Kṛṣṇa instead of a supreme Sūrya. Puruṣottama confirms through many scriptural quotations that the Sun is an individual soul and not the supreme soul.²⁰⁹

Refocussing again on the followers of Śaṅkara, Puruṣottama dispenses with their doctrine that Brahman is *nirviśeṣa* (without attributes), on the grounds that there are countless scriptural evidences to the contrary,²¹⁰ and he proceeds to pick apart

²⁰⁷ *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.4

²⁰⁸ *yady evaṁ tarhi sarvair apy evaṁ nirñīya sāttvikam eva kim iti na sevyate iti cen na | duṣkṛtayogād iti brūmah || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.4

²⁰⁹ *ādityasya tu niyamyatvajanyatvaparāṅgatvaparatantraprakāśakatvādīnām anīśvaraliṅgādīnām śravaṇāj jīvatvaṁ spaṣṭam eva ... tasmād gāyatrīmantrapratipādyah śrībhagavān puruṣottamo ramākānta eveti siddham || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.4

²¹⁰ *kaiścin nirviśeṣaṁ brahmābhyupagamyate | tat tuccham || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 1.4

their philosophy, employing the linguistic theory of primary, secondary and tertiary meanings to show that ‘attributeless’ means ‘without bad attributes’.

Next Puruṣottama attacks the doctrine which holds that creation is an illusory transformation of Brahman (*brahmavivartavāda*), which is different to the accepted *brahmapariṇāmavāda* that Nimbārka supports, which states that creation is a real transformation of Brahman. The *vivartavādin* contests that such a transformation would result in an alteration of Brahman. Puruṣottama proves through logic and scripture that this is not necessarily the case and clarifies the transformation as a ‘projection of potencies’,²¹¹ and though a transformation of Brahman, creation does not result in a transformation of the actual self of Brahman, just as a spider can create a web from its own cells without being existentially transformed. *Adhyāsavāda* (the theory of superimposition) is also discussed here, through the objection of another opponent here from both the Advaita *satkāryavādin* (Śāṅkara) and *asatkāryavādin* (Buddhist) viewpoint. The statement of Śāṅkara that ‘this universe is false’²¹² is also treated during this discussion, and Puruṣottama, pointing out the fallaciousness of the argumentation deployed by all of them says, ‘why don’t you, learned scholars, arrive at the conclusion that Brahman too is false by that reasoning!’²¹³

Under verse 6, Puruṣottama clarifies its claim that Nārada was Nimbārka’s preceptor. In this instance, Nārada being Nimbārka’s preceptor is not the issue;

²¹¹ *svaśaktivikṣepalakṣaṇapariṇāmavattve ’pi noktadoṣayogaḥ || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā 1.4*

²¹² *brahmasatyam jagam mithyety evamrūpo viniścayah || Vivekacūḍāmani 20*

²¹³ *tenaiva hetunā brahmaṇo ’pi mithyātvam kim iti nābhyupagamyate bhavadbhir manīṣibhiḥ || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā 1.4*

rather the fact that Nārada is subject to mundane sorrows in *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 7.1.3 is the basis for objection.²¹⁴ Puruṣottama clears this doubt by explaining that it is due to these sorrows that Nārada approached Sanaka and his brothers, and after their instruction, he became omniscient; it is these teachings which are passed down to Nimbārka, and thus to the rest of the tradition.²¹⁵ Puruṣottama also provides an alternative: ‘On the other hand, even though the Lord Nārada attained omniscience in this way, it should be known that he imitated being ignorant in the same manner that Supreme Person did in his own pastimes, in order to acquire eligibility to surrender to a preceptor; as he is an incarnation [of the Lord] for the sake of the betterment of all peoples’.²¹⁶ Through the ensuing dialogue which considers the *bhūmanvidyā* teachings of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 7.1, Puruṣottama discusses the knowledge shared by Sanandana and his brothers with Nārada and relates it to the teachings imparted by Nimbārka. The exact tone employed by Puruṣottama in his defence of Nārada’s position in the sect as an infallible source of knowledge reveals two things. Firstly, it is certain from Puruṣottama’s argumentation that the Nārada referred to was the Nārada of legendary renown and not another person. Secondly, it seems that there were some who did accept that the legendary Nārada was in fact Nimbārka’s direct preceptor, but still had reservations as to his reliability as a perfected being, and thus as a source of true knowledge of Brahman. This particular section demonstrates that there were those

²¹⁴ *so 'haṁ bhagava śocāmi* || *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 7.1.3

²¹⁵ *śrīsanandanādicaraṇopasatteḥ pūrvam śokavattve 'pi śrībhagavadgurūpadeśena sakāraṇaśokanivṛtyā sarvajñatāsiddher ity arthaḥ* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 2.6

²¹⁶ *yadvā śrīnāradasya bhagavataḥ sārvaññatvayoge 'pi sarvalokopakārārthakāvatāratvād gurūpasattirūpādhikāraṁ grāhayitum śrīpuruṣottamalīlānukāraṇavadajñātvanukaraṇam bodhyam* || *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* 2.6

who had accepted *svābhāvika dvaitādvaita* but still had concerns regarding the legitimacy of the *paramparā*.

Following on from this discussion, Puruṣottama tackles the fact that Nimbārka's stipulation, namely that Kṛṣṇa alone should be worshipped to the exclusion of other deities,²¹⁷ was unacceptable to other followers of brāhmanical and Vedāntic traditions. He demonstrates that although Brahman could denote any deity, it refers specifically to Kṛṣṇa, due to his superiority over Śiva, Brahmā and the rest, which he substantiates by quoting verses from scripture that corroborate this position under his commentary to *Daśaślokī* 8. In the remainder of the book he sets out the path of *prapatti*, *gurūpasatti* and *parābhakti* methodically, adducing scriptural quotations to validate his explanations.

It appears therefore that the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* fulfils two major roles. Firstly, it systematises the theological viewpoint of the Nimbārka Sampradāya for followers of the tradition who were by this time separated by at least two generations from Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa. Secondly, the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* functions as a rudimentary defence of Nimbārka's tenets, as that period witnessed the rise of Śaṅkara's school of *advaita*, the subsequent India-wide dissemination of its precepts and further development by intellectually gifted authors. The *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* clearly demonstrates that in Puruṣottama's view the doctrine of Nimbārka was able to withstand *advaita* critique due to its innate logic and because *advaita* philosophy is inherently flawed. The *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* does

²¹⁷ *nānyā gatiḥ kṛṣṇapadāravindāt || Daśaślokī* 8

not focus at any great length on other schools such as Sāṅkhya, Buddhism and Jainism, often referring the reader back to Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa, on the grounds that they had already undertaken this task. He does however undertake a discussion of the Nyāya doctrine, demonstrating that there was still a strong Naiyāyika presence in the philosophical sphere.

It is also clear that Puruṣottama was drawing from a common theological canon that was later utilised by Vaiṣṇavas such as Yāmuna, Rāmānuja and Madhva, who followed Pāñcarātra and especially the *prapatti* doctrine. The sources and quotations utilised in the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* confirm the conclusion that *prapatti* is not the sole intellectual property of the *viśiṣṭādvaitins*; rather, it is an earlier doctrine central to various Vaiṣṇavisms, with a scriptural tradition that developed the nascent ideology contained in the oldest sources.

5.2 The *Lakṣmītantra* and Logicians: The Chronology of the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*

The *ṣaḍvidhā śaraṇāgati* verses used in the *Prapannakalpavallī* of Nimbārka also occur in the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, but Puruṣottama turns to verses contained in the present body of the *Lakṣmītantra* in order to elucidate each of the six-limbs. Nimbārka's original quotation of the *ṣaḍvidhā śaraṇāgati* verses is most likely to have come from a text which bears witness to an early development in Pāñcarātra theology. This can be supposed because the main verses (*ānukūlyasya saṅkalpaḥ...*) in the *Lakṣmītantra* are spoken by Nārāyaṇa to Śrī. After that, Indra

enquires about the details of each limb, which Śrī then goes on to expand upon. It is clear that this represents an adoption of the verses by the *Lakṣmītantra*, which are explained by means of Śrī expanding upon the doctrine for Indra's sake. Much of what is said by Nārāyaṇa in the *Lakṣmītantra* has its origins in pre-existing Pāñcarātra theology, and the explanation to Indra which follows represents a development of the earlier teachings. It is likely therefore that Nimbārka had access to earlier Pāñcarātra theology and Puruṣottama was accessing later developments.

Gupta (2000) suggests that the *Lakṣmītantra* was composed between the 9th and 12th century due to the fact that it mentions the Buddhist goddess Tārā who is referred to in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, making the Purāṇa's upper limit the *terminus a quo* of the *Lakṣmītantra* (Gupta 2000: xx-xxi). The *terminus ad quem* was stated to be around the 13th century CE, on the grounds that Vedānta Deśika had quoted from it. There are problems with this methodology. Tārā became an object of worship during the 6-7th centuries CE (Shaw 2011:117), so the *Lakṣmītantra* could actually originate from before the *terminus ad quem* of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. On the basis that the Pāñcarātras appropriated an amount of ritual theory from Buddhist Tantra (Gupta 2000: xxxiv), it is likely that the *Lakṣmītantra* served as the mediator of this phenomenon to the Vaiṣṇava tradition before it gained the currency required to be included in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*.

On the other hand, however, Sanderson (2001:35) has convincingly pointed out that there are many instances in the current transmission of the *Lakṣmītantra* where concepts, phrases and even whole verses have been copied from Śaiva Tantric

texts, and on the basis that some of these come from the *Pratyabhijñānahṛdaya* of Kṣemarāja (c.1000-1050), he assigns the *Lakṣmītantra* a date subsequent to that period. In accepting that the current transmission of the text cannot be any earlier than the 11th century, I do think there is ground to assume that the *Lakṣmītantra* is a layered text, with the verses dealing with *prapatti* and Tārā having been compiled sometime during the 8th/9th centuries, based on the fact that Nimbārka quotes the main verses of *prapatti* in the 7th century, much before they are inserted into the *Lakṣmītantra* with the explanatory level of dialogue between Indra and Śrī, and because Tārā Devī theology is then transmitted to the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. This version would have been composed in the south, in accordance with Sanderson's (2001:38) observation that the Vedic *mantras* utilised are from the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*. The Śaiva Tantric redaction would have occurred after the 11th century as the doctrines therein promulgated became an important theory for Tantrism itself, regardless of theistic denomination. This would have occurred in Kashmir, as most of the material borrowed was composed in this area. One notices therefore that the *Lakṣmītantra* began in the south around the 8th/9th centuries and was finally redacted in Kashmir in the 11th century, displaying a similar trajectory of propagation as the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* itself. As such, Puruṣottama's chronology is not affected by his quotation of the *Lakṣmītantra*; moreover, in fixing his dates, the chronology of the earlier layers of the *Lakṣmītantra* can be similarly situated as he is the earliest of the commentators to quote from it.²¹⁸ There is also an extra verse that he quotes describing *kārpaṇyam* which is noticeably absent from the

²¹⁸ He quotes from *Lakṣmītantra* 17.60-62, 70-71, 73, 80

commentarial verses on each limb in the extant text of the *Lakṣmītantra*,²¹⁹ lending further credence to the supposition that he had access to an earlier version of the *Lakṣmītantra* than that extant.

An apparently inconsequential citation is utilised by Puruṣottama to establish the Naiyāyika's view of the relationship between word and meaning. He states:

The Logicians state that: 'convention [*saṅketa* is governed by] God's will: from this word, this meaning is to be understood'.²²⁰

However, this is phrased in a similar manner to a statement in the *Tarkasaṅgraha* of the famous Naiyāyika, Annambhaṭṭa. The problem is that this work was composed in the 17th century:

'From this word, this meaning should be understood': [expressive] power [is governed by] God's convention'.²²¹

As it stands the similarity is striking, yet it is impossible for Puruṣottama to be posterior to Annambhaṭṭa as this scholar flourished even later than Harivyāsa Devācārya. The similarity of the wording must therefore be explained in another manner. *Nyāyasūtra* 2.1.55 discusses the relationship between word and meaning, with this topic being developed through its exegetical tradition. The theory of *saṅketa*, or a convention, is observed in early Nyāya, but in later discourse, this evolved and was then understood to be analogous to *śakti*. In this case, *śakti* meant

²¹⁹ *upāyā naiva siddhyantītyapāyā vividhās tathā | iti yā garvahānis tad dainyam kārṇyam ucyate|| Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā on Daśaślokī 8, Daśaślokī 9*

²²⁰ *asmāc chabdād ayam artho boddhavya itīśvareccḥāsaṅketa iti tārkkair abhidhīyate || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā Daśaślokī 1.4*

²²¹ *asmād padād ayam artho boddhavya itīśvarasaṅketaśaktiḥ || Tarkasaṅgraha 59*

the inherent expressive power of a word, or the primary relationship between word and meaning. In Navya-Nyāya, this convention was then attributed to *īśvarecchā*, the will of God, and in modern Nyāya, the Lord's will as the source of a conventional meaning of a word has been replaced by 'will alone' (*icchāmātra*) (Jha 1992:4).

Vātsyāyana, in commenting on *Nyāyasūtra* 1.2.12 states: 'this meaning is to be expressed by this word'²²² in his *Nyāyabhāṣya*. Śabara and Jayanta also discuss this topic, and Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī* has developed the topic to 'you should understand this meaning from this word'.²²³ Udayana, whose 10th century *Nyāyakusumāñjali* is seen as the first systematic exposition of the theistic trend which becomes the basis of Navya-Nyāya, states that convention is due to God's will, and not mere convention, though later God is removed (Deshpande 1978:211). Assuming that another author likely utilised this framework to provide a succinct summary of the Naiyāyika position, and taking into account the relative chronology of these authors, it is plausible that Puruṣottama would have written his *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* sometime after Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *Nyāyamañjarī*, but not necessarily that much later. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa is said to have been in his sixties at the end of the 9th century and was the political advisor to King Śaṅkaravarman (r.883-902CE) when he wrote the *Āgamaḍambara* (Dezso 2005:15-16). This would lead to a date of around 840CE for the birth of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, who, one suspects, would have begun composing his Nyāya works from around 860CE.

²²² *asyābhidhānasyāyam artho 'bhidheyaḥ*|| *Nyāyabhāṣya* on *Nyāyasūtra* 1.2.12

²²³ *etasmāc chabdād ayam arthas tvayā pratipattavya iti*|| *Nyāyamañjarī* 4

5.3 Conclusion: Puruṣottama's Date

Aside from this textual evidence, one has to take into account the development of different theories within the Vedānta schools that are countered by Puruṣottama. He is the first leader of the Nimbārka tradition to respond to *advaita*, but he does so after the original Śāṅkara *advaita* has been developed further, so Puruṣottama is clearly posterior to Śāṅkara. He responds to *ekajīvatvavāda*, *vibhūparimāṇatvavāda*, *upādhivāda*, *adhyāsavāda*, *pratibimbavāda*, *nirguṇa-brahmavāda*, *nirviśeṣa-brahmavādavāda*, *jaganmithyāvāda* and *vivartavāda*, as mentioned above. Most of these were initiated by Gauḍapāda and Śāṅkara, and are present in their writings. *Vivartavāda*, however, was not a term specifically coined by Śāṅkara, but by Padmapāda who flourished in 720-770CE (Nakamura 1983:88), and then later developed by Prakāśātman in the 10th century (Mayeda 1979:25). It is the theory of *vivartavāda* as expounded in the *Pañcapādikā* of Padmapāda²²⁴ that is being dealt with in the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* by Puruṣottama, and not the highly evolved theory of Prakāśātman in the 10th century.

With the available factors regarding doctrinal development and intertextuality noticed in the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, it is possible to assume that Puruṣottama flourished sometime in the 9th century. This dating would take into account the development of the theories of both Padmapāda and Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and the evolution of the *Lakṣmītantra*. As a result, a tentative but novel chronology can be proposed for the early Nimbārka tradition. Nimbārka can be located at c.620-

²²⁴ eg. in *Pañcapādika* 1.4, 1.132.120, 3.9, 6.2.

690CE, Śrīnivāsa at c.660-740CE, Viśvācārya at c.730-815CE and Puruṣottama at c.800-880CE.

Chapter 6

Puruṣottamācārya's Rādhā

Examining the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, it is quite apparent that Puruṣottama was uncomfortable with the fact that Nimbārka allots Rādhā a seat on Kṛṣṇa's left side and equates her with Parabrahman. Indeed, Rādhā is not mentioned elsewhere in the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* except where she is specifically discussed by Nimbārka, in *Daśaślokī* verse 5. Even when Puruṣottama introduces his work, he makes reference to Śrī and Ramā only and not to Rādhā. He does not mention Lakṣmī by name either, but this is not without reason, since for this writer Śrī is in fact an epithet of Rādhā, so that by separating the two, namely Śrī and Ramā, he makes a clear distinction between Rādhā and Lakṣmī. There are many factors that have bearing on his stance evident from the style and manner in which he approaches the topic of the feminine divinity, and as such his commentary on *Daśaślokī* verse 5 will be examined.

6.1 Puruṣottama's view of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa: Translation of the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* Commentary to *Daśaślokī* verse 5

Having examined in section 4.3 the sources available for Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in the post-Nimbārka period, I have postulated that the writings of poets in this epoch display distinct traits with regards to the manner in which Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are presented. Some mention the divine Rādhā, whilst for others she is merely Kṛṣṇa's special, yet human, mistress. It seems that this dichotomy also was known to

Puruṣottama as he discusses the phenomenon under the commentary to *Daśaślokī* verse 5.

Throughout the bulk of the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* Puruṣottama provides thorough explanations of both the words and concepts contained in the *Daśaślokī*. When commenting on verse 5 of the *Daśaślokī*, however, Puruṣottama does not enter into the sort of detail deployed when discussing previous verses. Comprehending his doctrinal stance therefore depends heavily on identifying the various doctrines alluded to in his commentary. I now provide a translation of Puruṣottama's commentary to *Daśaślokī* verse 5, which will be analysed in subsequent sections.

Having in this way established that the Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Person, the Lord, who has not even the whiff of the scent of any faults such as ignorance, who is the ocean of infinite, incomprehensible, innate auspicious qualities, is the cause of the creation of all the Universes, is the only being to be known throughout all the Scriptures, is worthy of worship by all living beings, is the giver of liberation and is to be approached by the Liberated; now [Nimbārka], with the following verse beginning 'side', establishes the special characteristics of the 'Lakṣmī etc.,' that are spoken of in revealed scriptural statements such as this and others:

‘Śrī and Lakṣmī are his wives, day and night are his sides...’ (*Śuklayajurveda Vājasaneyī Samhitā* 31.22)

We always contemplate the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu (Rādhā) who blissfully shines with a corresponding beauty on [His] left side, who is attended on eternally by thousands of female friends, who is the Goddess that bestows all desires and wishes. (*Daśaślokī* 5)

The syntactical order is as follows: We always contemplate upon the [Goddess] who is known as Lakṣmī - Rukmiṇī, who has corresponding beauty to, and is on the left side of, Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who has the abovementioned characteristics, is capable of making the impossible possible, who is the possessor of inconceivable, infinite and manifold potencies.

Having corresponding [qualities] means possessing a form and qualities which are comparable with the qualities and form of the Lord. The separate analysis of the word is: upon Her, whose beauty is corresponding. This is stated in the recollected [scriptures] by the reverend Parāśara:

‘When He is Divine, She has a Divine body, when He is human, She has a human [body]. She makes Her own body correspond to that of Viṣṇu.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.145)

‘She becomes Sītā when He is Rāma, and Rukmiṇī in Kṛṣṇa’s birth; in all the other incarnations of Viṣṇu, She is in the same state.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.144)

At the expectation of the inquiry ‘What is She like?’, [Nimbārka] specifies: [upon] **the Goddess**. [We contemplate] upon Her, She who is the Goddess and consort of the Lord Śrī Vāsudeva, who is God, the subject of the Gāyatrī Mantra, the purport of the entire body of scriptures, as per the revealed scriptural passage:

‘I invoke the Goddess Śrī’ (*Śrīsūkta* 3)²²⁵

By these derived primary meanings, Her qualities are stated, as follows:

The goddess is she who illuminates and sports through infinite incarnations:

‘She makes Her body correspond to that of Visnu body.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.145)

The goddess is she who sports [*dīvy*] and desires to subdue the gods by appropriating their qualities of morality, etc.:

‘O beloved of Visnu! Mother of the Universe! When you turn away, all good qualities such as morality instantly become worthless.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.132)

The goddess is she who sports or behaves in various specific ways and in various specific forms:

‘Viṣṇu is meaning, she is speech; she is law, he is polity. Viṣṇu is understanding, she is intellect, he is righteousness, she is action.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.8.18)

The goddess is she who illuminates through her form and qualities per the revealed scriptural statements:

‘She is the controller of all living beings’ (*Śrīsūkta* 9)

‘Because of her fiery splendor, the benevolent Śrī is worshipped here by the Gods.’ (*Śrīsūkta* 5)

Alternatively, [the goddess is she] who is praised by the gods, starting with:

‘[Indra says] I bow to Śrī, the mother of all living beings, born of the lotus, who has eyes like a fully bloomed lotus, who resides upon the chest of Viṣṇu.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.117)

and ending with [this verse], as well as many others:

‘the tongues of Brahmā cannot possibly describe your glories. Be pleased goddess who has lotus eyes! Never ever abandon me.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.133)

Or, [the goddess is she who] is omnipresent:

‘O great *brāhmaṇa*! That Śrī is the eternal mother of creation, in the same state as Viṣṇu: just as Viṣṇu is omnipresent, so too is she.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.8.17)

‘O great mother! The mobile and immobile creation is pervaded by you and Viṣṇu’. (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.126)

Otherwise, [the goddess is she who] delights, because she is bliss personified and resides with the personification of bliss [Kṛṣṇa], according to the revealed scriptural statements:

²²⁵ The *Śrīsūkta* is found as a *khila sūkta* attached to *Rgveda* Maṇḍala 5 of the Bāṣkala recension, *Rgveda Khilāni*, 2.6.1-30.

‘She is golden like the sun’ (*Śrīsūkta* 14)
‘She is the controller of all living beings’ (*Śrīsūkta* 5)

What more is she like? [Nimbārka] says: ‘**Eternally served by thousands of female friends**’. That is, she is eternally or perpetually served by thousands, rather, limitless female friends who are her own female attendants.

Moreover, [Nimbārka] shows the purpose of [performing her] service by explaining: ‘**[she who] bestows all desires and wishes**’. She gives all four types of devotees the four goals of humankind as per their individual desires. This is evinced in the following recollected scriptural statement:

‘O radiant one, O goddess! You are the giver of the knowledge of sacrifice, the great knowledge, the secret knowledge and knowledge of the soul which confers the reward that is liberation’ (*Viṣṇupurāna* 1.9.120)

Having thus established the preeminence of Lakṣmī, [Nimbārka] now expounds the eternal union of Śrī Rādhā, the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu, who is designated by the words ‘*vrajastrī*’ (Lady of Vraja) [in the Gopālatāpinī Upaniṣad], who is the mistress of the *gopīs*, with the words ‘**Rādhā, daughter of Vṛṣabhānu**’. The word ‘and’ is to be supplied in the sense of the plurality [of wives of Kṛṣṇa]. Accordingly, the syntactical order would be, ‘We also contemplate upon Rādhā, the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu’.

After that, to shed light on her form and characteristics, [Nimbārka] explains: ‘**She resides delightfully on his left side**’. Before the word ‘on the left side’ the words ‘on the Lord’s’ should be supplied. A limb is dependent on the whole, so she resides on the left side [or resides in the left side] of the Lord.

By using the words ‘left side’, [Nimbārka] demonstrates that [Rādhā] is a wife and inseparable [*anapāyinī*], like Lakṣmī.

Blissfully – i.e. with a form of the unsurpassable bliss of love. By this statement, it is indicated that she [Rādhā] is the superintendent deity of love.

[She] shines. This means she who shines, or illumines by means of her superior bodily form and the qualities of love, kindness, etc. It is taught as such in the appendix of the Rgveda:

‘It is with Radha that Lord Madhava shines, and with Madhava that Radha does’.
(*Rk Pariśiṣṭa*, [see chapter 2 above])

By this revealed scriptural statement which sets out the mutual union [of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa], the supremacy of love and the eternal union [of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa] are described.

Even though of the two it would be proper to mention Lakṣmī first in as much as she is the superintendent deity of sovereignty and thus she is superior, still [Rādhā] is mentioned first due to the fact that the Lady of Vraja, through her being the superintendent deity of love, bestows love when her feet are meditated upon.

‘Rukmiṇī, the original *prakṛti*, consists of Kṛṣṇa and is the creatrix of the universe due to her union with Brahman – this is taught by the revealed scriptures resultant from the conversations of the *gopīs* [specifically Rādhā]’. (*Gopālotaratāpinī Upaniṣad* 56)

The meaning of this *mantra* is: the revealed knowledge that arises from, or is popular amongst, the people. From them [the *āptas* or infallible persons], who are authoritative means of knowledge, [it is proved] that there is an eternal union of these two, namely

Rukmiṇī and Rādhā [Vrajastrī] with Brahman who is known as Gopāla. This also in its general sense [describes eternal union] with Satyabhāmā [the Kṛṣṇa-*Itā* incarnation of Bhū Devī). Moreover, the Supreme Lord, the Supreme Person Vāsudeva, who is characterized by Rukmiṇī, Satyabhāmā and Rādhā should be worshipped always by Vaiṣṇavas of [our] *sampradāya*. And here, there is no superiority of his two-armed or four-armed [form] as he has these two forms through his own desire. Here the defining factor is the feeling of the meditator alone. [It is stated] as such, beginning with:

‘Meditating upon me specifically as [dwelling] in Mathurā, one gains liberation’
(*Gopālottaratāpinī Upaniṣad* 2.15)

and continuing:

‘Having the mark of *śrīvatsa* on my chest, adorned with the radiance of the *kaustubha* jewel, four-armed with the conch, discus, bow, lotus and mace.’
(*Gopālottaratāpinī Upaniṣad* 2.16)

‘Meditating on me always in the mind as the golden, gentle bodied giver of fearlessness to my devotees – or – as the wielder of the flute and horn.’
(*Gopālottaratāpinī Upaniṣad* 2.18)

[or]

‘Reflecting in one’s heart upon Kṛṣṇa, whose eyes are beautiful lotuses, who is the hue of clouds, whose clothes [are the colour] of lightning, who has two arms, is rich in wisdom, has a garland of forest flowers, is the Lord; who is surrounded by the *gopīs*, *gopas* and cows; who is found in amongst the vines and heavenly trees, is adorned with divine ornaments, resides in the middle of the jewelled lotus, and who is served by the breezes that have touched the waves of the waters of the Yamunā, one is liberated from transmigration.’ (*Gopālapūrvatāpinī Upaniṣad* 1.1-3)

Thus, [per the revealed scriptural statements above], it is the conclusion of our *sampradāya* that there is non-difference of these objects of meditation, because even though there are two types of meditation the revealed scriptures teach of the same result of liberation for the both.

6.2 Rationalising Rādhā

In light of the foregoing, Puruṣottama can be seen to stand at complete odds with Nimbārka with regards to Rādhā. Simply by adding ‘and’ (*ca*), Puruṣottama is able to create a distinction within Nimbārka’s verse, which appears forced and unnatural. Grammatically the verse is referring to one being alone, Rādhā, with the rest of the words being adjectives and descriptions of this singular feminine divinity. It may not be so easy to simply state that Puruṣottama is presenting an

original viewpoint, as there are many factors that need to be considered in order to understand his theological position when it comes to the identity of Rādhā.

Puruṣottama commences by pointing out, quite correctly, that *Daśaślokī* verse 5 is an extension of *Daśaślokī* verse 4 in that it is explaining a further characteristic of Brahman, which Nimbārka has identified as Kṛṣṇa, stating here that he possesses a wife. Forthwith, he cites *Śuklayajurveda* 31.22 by means of substantiation, which names two wives for the sacrificial Puruṣa, namely Śrī and Lakṣmī. This differentiation permits Puruṣottama to comment on the verse with the understanding that the consort of Brahman is not a position occupied solely by Rādhā. When elucidating the syntactical order and word connection of *Daśaślokī* verse 5, Puruṣottama explains that the meaning of the first clause is ‘we always contemplate the [goddess], who is known as Lakṣmī or Rukmiṇī’. He then goes on to provide scriptural sources to support Lakṣmī’s status as the *devī*, the feminine half of Brahman, quoting *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.144-45 and the *Śrīsūktam*. He even provides several alternate etymologies for *devī*, depending on which sense the root verb is understood to have. Puruṣottama goes as far as to identify the ‘thousands of female friends’ mentioned in the verse as being servants of Lakṣmī and concludes his lauding of Lakṣmī by stating that she is the bestower of all desires.

Having split up the verse in this way by focusing the first part of his commentary on Lakṣmī, Puruṣottama next seeks to explain what the ‘daughter of Vṛṣabhānu’ refers to. He supplies the word ‘and’ to show that there is more than one consort of Kṛṣṇa. Puruṣottama does insist that because she occupies the seat to Kṛṣṇa’s left

she indeed is his wife, but qualifies it with the words ‘like Lakṣmī’. He uses the fact that she shines [*virājamānām*] to link in with an oft-cited *Ṛkpariśiṣṭa* statement²²⁶ which refers to a constellation with the name of [Anu-]Rādhā, in an attempt to find a brāhmaṇically acceptable substantiation for this apparently uneasy statement of Nimbārka.

Puruṣottama tentatively explains that Nimbārka has included ‘the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu’ here due to the supremacy of love and, as Rādhā is the presiding deity of love (*premādhiṣṭhātrī*) in contrast to Lakṣmī who is the presiding deity of majesty (*aiśvaryaḍhiṣṭhātrī*), and is Kṛṣṇa’s wife in any case, there is nothing heterodox with her being allotted supremacy by Nimbārka. He then adduces a *mantra* from the *Gopālatāpinī Upaniṣad* whose import is very obscure, but could be construed in the following way:

Rukmiṇī, the original *prakṛti* [source of creation], consists of Kṛṣṇa, and is the creatrix of the universe due to her union with Brahman. This is taught by the revealed scriptures resultant from the conversations of the *gopīs* [specifically Rādhā].²²⁷

The revealed scripture containing the conversation of the *gopīs* is the *Gopālotraratāpinī Upaniṣad*, where Gāndharvī, an epithet of Rādhā, is the main interrogator.²²⁸ This verse would then imply that Rādhā herself taught that Rukmiṇī is the *mūla prakṛti*, the original source of matter, in line with the

²²⁶ *tathā cāmnāyate ṛkpariśiṣṭasrutau rādhayā mādhave devo mādhaveṇa ca rādhikā | virājata ityādi || Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā Daśaślokī 5*

²²⁷ *kṛṣṇātmikā jagatkartrī mūlaprakṛtirukmiṇī | vrajastrījanasambhūtasrutibhyo brahmasaṅgata iti mantrāt || Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā Daśaślokī 5. Vrajastrī* has been used in older poetic sources as an epithet of Rādhā.

²²⁸ *tāsām madhye hi śreṣṭhā Gāndharvī hy uvāca || Gopālotraratāpinī Upaniṣad 1*

statements of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* quoted above. Puruṣottama clarifies the sense in this manner:

The import of this *mantra* is: the revealed knowledge that arises from, or is popular amongst, the people; from them, who are authoritative means of knowledge, [it is proved] that there is an eternal union of these two, namely Rukmiṇī and Rādhā [Vrajastrī] with Brahman who is known as Śrī Gopāla. This also, in its general sense, [states eternal union] with Satyabhāmā [the Kṛṣṇa-līlā incarnation of Bhū Devī].²²⁹

Puruṣottama thereby understands that all the wives of Kṛṣṇa are eternally united with him and in particular that both Rukmiṇī and Rādhā are being referred to in this verse. Rukmiṇī is allotted a cosmologically significant role as the creatrix of the universe; Rādhā has not been endowed with any agency being simply united with Kṛṣṇa and the rest of his *śaktis*. However, in respect to the idiom of devotional religiosity of the later tradition, that Rukmiṇī is described to be superior to Rādhā is problematic.

The author then stipulates that this particular form of Brahman, Kṛṣṇa with Rukmiṇī, Rādhā and the other wives, is to be worshipped only by initiated Vaiṣṇavas belonging to his *sampradāya*. Again he tries to explain away any competition between Lakṣmī and Rādhā, this time referring back to Kṛṣṇa and stating that there is no difference in supremacy of the four-armed (Viṣṇu) or two-armed (Kṛṣṇa) forms of Brahman, with the intention that if Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa are deemed the same then their consorts will also be understood in the same manner. Finally, he concludes by reaffirming that the object of meditation namely Brahman

²²⁹ *janeṣu sambhūtāḥ prasiddhā yāḥ śrutayas tābhyaḥ pramāṇabhūtābhya ābhyām rukmiṇīvrajastrībhyām śrīgopālākhyā brahmaṇaḥ saṅgato nityasambandha itimantrārthaḥ | upalakṣaṇārtho 'yam satyabhāmāyah || Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā Daśasloki 5*

as Rādhā/Lakṣmī and Kṛṣṇa/Viṣṇu, has no internal distinction in so far as they are one and the same.

6.3 Conclusion: Puruṣottama's Rationalisation in Context

It is clear that Nimbārka had no intention of equating Rādhā with Lakṣmī in *Daśaślokī* verse 5. The image of her thousands of female friends is a motif already widely employed in earlier poetic sources; the fact that Puruṣottama has then applied this motif to Lakṣmī allows an insight into the religious environment within which he was working.

The established Vaiṣṇava religion based heavily on the Pāñcarātra and source texts such as the *Mahābhārata*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Harivaṃśa*, always refers to Lakṣmī as the divine's supreme consort. As in modern Hinduism, most Hindus are born into the orthopraxy and then adopt an orthodoxy via sectarian affiliation through initiation or instruction, and it is not unlikely that this process was the conventional method in earlier times also. According to later sources Puruṣottama hailed from the same area as Nimbārka, namely the town of Pratiṣṭhāna. If this is the case then it is more than likely that Puruṣottama was brought up worshipping at temples of Lakṣmī and Nārāyaṇa and perhaps would have been aware of an early Viṭṭhobā cult. Puruṣottama would have been active during the time of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa rulers Govinda III and Amoghavarṣa I, when the geographical, religious and political landscape was undergoing huge upheaval as the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings expanded far and wide, supporting various arts and religions (Davis 1993:36-39).

Whenever royalty becomes interested in religious affairs questions of legitimacy come to the fore. Even though it is most likely that Puruṣottama had absolutely nothing to do with affairs of state given the predominance of asceticism in the early Nimbārka tradition, this did not preclude him from discussions of Rādhā's legitimacy as Kṛṣṇa's consort, especially if potential initiates brought up in such a climate nurtured similar misgivings regarding Rādhā's sudden, and un-brāhmaṇical, rise to the status of Brahman.

Puruṣottama was thus formulating his opinion on Rādhā in a religious environment dominated by brāhmaṇic and Pāñcarātra theology. The tradition in which he was initiated revered Rādhā as the left-half of Brahman, where the only scriptural substantiation of this phenomenon was the singular mention made by Nimbārka in the *Daśaslokī*. However popular the notion was, as evinced by secular poetry, still, Puruṣottama was a theologian and through the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, he endeavoured to rationalise through exegesis the viewpoint of his tradition in accordance with scripture.

The following can be postulated about this author. It appears as if Puruṣottama was initiated into the Nimbārka tradition perhaps as a young student, without being fully aware of its theological nuances. Feeling the need to rationalise the tradition's position on Rādhā as the supreme consort of Kṛṣṇa, he assembled as many scriptural sources for this as were available during his time and concludes that Rādhā is just one among many wives of Kṛṣṇa. In doing so, Puruṣottama was successful at adhering to the normative framework of Vaiṣṇavism in general but

left a doctrinal legacy which ensured that the issue received no discussion within the tradition until the 15th century.

PART THREE

NIMBĀRKA'S LEGACY

Introduction

The situation of the Nimbārka Sampradāya today perhaps does not encourage scholars to research this tradition mainly due to the absence of evidence from the archaeological record in the form of early temples, hermitages or monasteries when compared to the traditions that sprang up much later in Vraja. There are a few comparatively old sites, such as the Paraśurāma Dvāra of Puṣkara dated to the 17th century, but sites claimed to be ancient are fictitious, do not survive or have been destroyed and rebuilt, such as the Ācāryapīṭha (the seat of the leaders of the tradition) itself in Salemabad.

At first glance then it would seem that Nimbārka's legacy is of no great consequence. On being interviewed members of the community today, even those bearing a Nimbārka *tilaka*, cannot reveal much about the history of the tradition, and Nimbārka scholars, while conversant with the basic parameters of the brand of Vedānta which they follow, generally lack insight into the history of their community.

To understand Nimbārka's legacy, therefore, the work of previous scholars will have to be juxtaposed with current scholarship on the broader context. Whereas the majority of sources, such as Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's *Nirṇayasindhu* (see Introduction)

may lead to the erroneous inference that the tradition struggled to survive after Nimbārka, existing sectarian sources can yield an adequate understanding of the development of the tradition subsequent to the early leaders.

In the following section, I begin by examining the history of the leaders who supposedly flourished during the 15th-16th centuries by working backward from the earliest available fixed dating yielding their *terminus post quem*. Subsequently, detailed analysis of testimony from both within and beyond the Nimbārka Sampradāya will be correlated to provide an accurate chronological location of the leaders in question which will lead to a more complete picture of overall sectarian trends. In turn, this will enable a fruitful discussion regarding the development of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa devotional theology during that period.

Chapter 7

Harivyāsa Devācārya and the Siddhāntaratnāñjali

Svāmī Harivyāsa Devācārya, the 35th *ācārya* of the Nimbārka Sampradāya, occupies the status of the great reformer within the tradition. Not only was he responsible for the wide dissemination of the sect's teachings, but theologically he was central to the revelation of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and their pastimes to the followers of the *sampradāya* and beyond. There is much controversy associated with him due to the similarity of the philosophy of the various Vraja-based Vaiṣṇava sects that developed during the 15th and 16th centuries, and scholars are still unsure as to his chronology and the exact position he occupied in the devotional landscape of that period. In order for the ramifications of his contributions to be understood it is necessary to define the historical context to which he belongs. There is an abundance of information available regarding this tradition, yet it remained guarded by its custodians. This situation has changed recently, thanks to the efforts of the current and 48th Jagadguru Nimbārkācārya, Svāmī Rādhāsarveśvaraśaraṇa Devācārya, and the heir apparent, Svāmī Śyāmaśaraṇa Devācārya. Investigations by Clémentin-Ojha (1999) and Dāsa (2008) have also contributed much to the understanding of this *sampradāya*.

7.1 The Paramparā after Harivyāsa Devācārya: Paraśurāma Devācārya

Though *paramparā* lists are usually dismissed as late fabrications, in this particular case Harivyāsa Devācārya himself supplies such a list in the form of the Sakhīnāmaratnāvalistotram, which represents the preface to his *magnum opus*, the Mahāvāṇī. In this Sanskrit contemplative hymnal he meditates on the forms of all the preceptors of his lineage in their eternal forms as *sakhīs* in the perpetual pastimes of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa (*nityalīlā*) in the everlasting abode of Goloka-Vṛndāvana and especially the Nikuñja groves therein. From this source it is possible to discern which preceptor he is referring to, as identifiable characteristics of each leader of the tradition mentioned inform his depiction. Indeed later *paramparā* lists follow this one, adding on successive teachers. Of the various *paramparā* lists available, that of the current Jagadguru Nimbārkācārya traces what can be deemed a historically accurate genealogy back to Harivyāsa Devācārya because the leaders after Harivyāsa Devācārya maintained a close relationship with various royal dynasties in Rajasthan. These royal houses endeavoured to adhere to religious prescriptions as a means of maintaining their stance as righteous, or *dhārmic*, rulers by performing grandiose rituals and supporting spiritual preceptors. Descriptions of these were sometimes recorded in their royal archives. By analysing this *paramparā* list and comparing it with testimony from the royal archives of the dynasties in question, it should be possible to provide a clearer chronology for the leaders of the tradition that are mentioned.

Paraśurāma's date is the subject of much contention. Authors on Vraja and the history of the *sampradāyas* in existence there, such as Mittal (1968) and Entwistle (1987) based their dating of Paraśurāma on the fact that he mentions Mīrābāī in his work so must have flourished concurrently with her or just after. Mittal claims that Paraśurāma should be accordingly located in the first half of the 17th century (1968 part II: 351). This judgement can be refined as follows.

Paraśurāma's *magnum opus*, commonly known as the *Paraśurāma Sāgara*, is actually a compilation of various types of poetry. A former head of the Royal College in Kishangarh, Ram Prasad Sharma compiled a critical edition based on his survey of manuscripts held there in 1967. The first collection of Paraśurāma's poems he noticed was dated 1620, collated by an unnamed editor, consisting of 29 parts, known as the *Paraśurāma Vāṇī*. This work was organised into the current format by Manasārāma Vyāsa in 1780 (Sharma 1967:16-17). 1620 must therefore serve as the *terminus ad quem* for Paraśurāma.

As described in Nābhādāsa's *Bhaktamāla* of between 1583-1623 (Hare 2011:44-45), Paraśurāma was the head of Harivyāsa Devācārya's twelve main disciples.²³⁰ In this work, Paraśurāma is placed in line after Śrībhṭṭa and Harivyāsa,²³¹ a fact that is corroborated in Rāghavadāsa's *Bhaktamāla* of c.1720CE (Garg 2004:778). In Nābhādāsa's *Bhaktamāla*, which mentions the most prominent of the main disciples of Harivyāsa Devācārya, accounts of the successors of Svabhūrāma Devācārya (Paraśurāma's elder god-brother) are also detailed. His third and last

²³⁰ *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa, *chappaya* 137

²³¹ *śrībhṭṭa puni harivyāsa santa mārāga anusarāī* || *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa 137, line 4.

successor mentioned, Caturacintāmaṇi Devācārya Nāgājī (also known as Caturō Nagana/Caturā Nāgā), was perhaps a contemporary of Nābhādāsa, which can be concluded from his use of the present tense when describing him.²³² Nāgājī is still the subject of controversy amongst devotees due to Puṣṭimārga *vārtā* books mentioning a supposed meeting with him and the devotees of Vallabha. For example, an excerpt from the *Śrīnāthajī Kī Prākāṭya Vārtā* states:

In the thickets of Ṭoḍa, a devotee of the Lord named Caturā Nāgā resided. There was a certain devotee of the Lord named Caturā Nāgā, who performed austerities in the thickets of Ṭoḍa. He never put his foot upon Śrī Girirāja. In order to give him an audience [Darśana], Śrīnāthajī mounted a water-buffalo and went to the thickets of Ṭoḍa, together with Rāmadāsa, Saddū Pāṇḍe and the others. That great person had the vision of the Lord and celebrated a grand festival [in his honour]. He gathered some *kīṅkoḍe* from the forests and made a vegetable-dish from it as well as *sīrā*, and offered the ritual food-offering to Śrīnāthajī. Whilst he was eating, Śrīnāthajī ordered Kumbhanadāsa to sing a *kīrtana*. Then Kumbhanadāsa sang this *kīrtana*...In this way, on Wednesday, Śrāvāṇa Śukla 13, Saṁvat 1552 (1496CE), fulfilling the desires of Caturā Nāgā, Śrīnāthajī came on top of Śrī Girirāja. In this way, all the residents of Vraja sported with the Lord.²³³

This narrative would suggest that Nāgājī was present during the time of Vallabha (b.1479) who would have been seventeen years old at the time, with Mādhavendra Purī having passed away around six years before according to accepted chronologies. However, as Entwistle (1987:141) rightly notes,

It is quite possible that, because he was a popular local saint, the Puṣṭimārga sources back-dated him in order to give him a supplementary role in the development of the cult of Śrīnāthajī.

²³² *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa, *chappaya* 148

²³³ *ṭoḍe ke ghane meṁ caturānāgā nāma kā eka bhagavadbhakta thā. eka caturā nāgā nāmaka bhagavadbhakta thā vaha toḍe ke ghane meṁ tapaścaryā kartā thā. śrīgirirāja ke ūpara kabhī paira nahī rakhtā thā. usako darśana dene ke liye śrīnāthajī bhaimse ke ūpara caḍha kara ṭoḍa ke ghane meṁ padhāre, rāmadāsajī aura saddūpāṇḍe ādi saba sātha meṁ hī the. taba usa mahāpuruṣa ne darśana kiye aura badā utsava manāya. vana meṁ se kīṅkoḍe bīna lāyā usakā śāka kiyā, aura sīrā banāyā, śrīnāthajī ko bhoga samarpita kiyā. ārogate samaya śrīnāthajī ne kumbhanadāsa ko ājñā kī ki kuccha kīrtana gāo. taba kumbhanadāsa ne yaha kīrtana gāyā... samvat 1552 śrāvāṇa sudi 13 budhavāra ke dina usa caturā nāgā kā manoratha siddha karake śrīnāthajī śrīgirirāja ke ūpara padhāre. isa prakāra saba brajavāsiyom se bhagavān ne kṛīḍā kī. Hindi translation of Brajbhāṣā original *Śrīnāthajī Kī Prākāṭya Vārtā* (2007:11-12).*

This is a ubiquitous feature of the *vārtā* literature of the Puṣṭimārga in general. Harirāya, the grandson of Viṭṭhalanātha, who was born in 1590, composed this particular account during the first half of the 17th century. At any rate, Nāgājī is the latest Nimbārkī mentioned in the more reliable *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa. Paraśurāma is listed as having flourished three generations before him, so even the most conservative of estimates would point towards approximately the period from the early/middle 16th century as an acceptable date for him, with a likely *terminus* of 1610CE. That would have allowed sufficient time for Harirāya to have encountered or heard about a very old Caturacintāmaṇi Nāgājī at the end of his career. This teacher most likely must have passed away in Harirāya's childhood, before he composed the *Śrīnāthajī Kī Prākāṣya Vārtā*.

Ramkrishna Garg (2004) compiled a critical edition and exposition of Nābhādāsa's *Bhaktamāla* and was able to trace much new information on the basis of very obscure manuscripts held in mostly private collections in addition to those in the Royal and State archives. In the various *Bhaktamālas* by writers such as Rāghavadāsa (1720) and Dyālabāla (1752) as well as Priyādāsa's *Bhaktirasabodhinī* commentary on Nābhādāsa's *Bhaktamāla*, there occurs a narrative regarding Paraśurāma which describes him living in a regal fashion with thrones and expensive clothes, donated by kings (Garg 2004:781). Judging by the fact that the rest of his lineage received royal patronage, it can be speculated that Paraśurāma, the first member of the Nimbārka tradition to preach in Rajasthan, may have also received regal support.

The Nimbārka Sampradāya's traditional accounts recount that Harivyāsa Devācārya sent Paraśurāma to Rajasthan at the entreaty of Hindus who were being harassed on their way to Puṣkara by Muslims intent on converting them (Sharma 1967:3). Paraśurāma's victory in debate over the leader, a certain Mastinga Shāh Malaṅga, earned him great renown among local rulers as Hindu royal families regularly frequented Puṣkara especially during the Kārttika Pūrṇimā festivities. Apparently, the royal family to which Mīrābāī belonged were particularly impressed by him (Dāsa 2008: 33-34). According to Rāghavadāsa, the King of Merta (Meḍatā) had invited Paraśurāma to his kingdom.²³⁴ Mīrābāī was born in c.1498 and married c.1516 to Prince Bhojarāja, heir to the throne of Udaipur who died in battle in 1526, whereas she died approximately two decades later, c.1547. While it is very possible that Paraśurāma met her family, it is highly unlikely that he encountered them whilst Mīrābāī was still in Merta, a fact which Garg (2004:782) also accepts.

Paraśurāma dedicated many poems to the various saints that he personally encountered. That Mīrābāī was known to Paraśurāma is made explicit in the Paraśurāma Sāgara which contains a reference to her having been forced to drink poison at the hands of anti-Vaiṣṇavas (Garg 2004: 782-783). However, other details about Mīrābāī's travels and miraculous end would have certainly figured amongst those poems, had Paraśurāma possessed knowledge of them. He in fact

²³⁴ *teḍai mēlyau santa meḍatai bhūpa bulāyau | rāja kāja bhava chāḍai sādha darasana kūm dhyāyau || bhagavada dhara avatāra sūtako kāraja kīyau | sailaṅga pūṭhyo yahī bhagata paricai suṣa dīyau || peṣa nirapata siṣa hoṁya sabai caraṇa saraṇa avalāṣiyau | parasarāma kī sāṣa suṇa jana darasana paṇa rāṣiyau || Bhaktamāla of Rāghavadāsa, chappaya 252 (Garg 2004:779)*

only mentions this single incident, perhaps hearing about it from her family. From this it can be deduced that Paraśurāma met with Mīrābāī's family after she was married, if he actually encountered them at all.

Rao Jaymal of Badnore (b.1507, r. 1554, d. 1568), the third son of Mīrābāī's uncle Rao Viram Deo (r.1515-1544) who succeeded her father, is mentioned in Nābhādāsa's Bhaktamāla as having turned Merta into a figurative Mathurā as a result of inviting holy men to visit the city.²³⁵ Mathurā is well known as having been the abode of the Nimbārka Sampradāya's leaders prior to Paraśurāma (see below) and it is conceivable that Jaymal, who resided in Merta before becoming the ruler of Badnore, received Paraśurāma as the head of the Nimbārka lineage that had its headquarters in Mathurā. Taking these two facts into account, it is possible to assume that Paraśurāma visited Merta between 1545-1560. The fact that Mīrābāī's Giridharagopāla deity is still worshipped in Paraśurāma's mausoleum on Gaūghāṭa in Puṣkara shows that he may indeed have had links with the family.

Drawing on a combination of legendary sources and speculation, Thielemann (2000:81) also supports a 16th century date for Paraśurāma and another poet of the tradition, Rūparasika, a less prominent disciple of Harivyāsa Devācārya. Sharma (1967), who had access to the ledgers (*bahī*) in possession of the descendants of the royal family of Khejarla (Khejaḍlā), a *ṭhikānā* of Jodhpur, identified the following entry:

²³⁵ *laghu mathurā meḍatā bhakta ati Jaimala poṣai* || *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa, *chapaya* 117

In the [*saṃvat*] 1515, fifteen hundred and fifteen, regent Arjuna's son Sāvanta Sinhajī was made prince and Sādhu/Svāmī Paraśurāma tied his *kaṅṭhī* [initiated him] on the banks of the Yamunā, and had the copper plate for Salemabad made and stamped with the royal seal.²³⁶

Vikrama Saṃvat 1515 corresponds to 1458, and even allowing for the fact that Paraśurāma is mentioned as a simple 'Sādhu' or 'Svāmī', suggesting that the initiation of Sāvanta Simha occurred before he succeeded Harivyāsa, 1458 still seems too early. This would result in a date for Paraśurāma's death around the start of the sixteenth century, which the available sources do not support.²³⁷ Gopāl Dās Bhāṭī had a fort at Khejaḍlā built for him after he aided Rājā Sūraj Mal of Jodhpur (r.1595-1619) in battle, which was completed in 1610. Arjun Singh Bhāṭī's son Sāvant/Sāmant Singh Bhāṭī was succeeded by Sīyo Bhāṭī, Āsakaran Bhāṭī and Gopāl Dās Bhāṭī, all of whom are described in sources as having received initiation from Paraśurāma (Sharma 1967:3). If a young Gopāl Dās did indeed become a disciple of the very old Paraśurāma, then the latter can definitely be located in the second half of the 16th century.

A few artefacts from the archaeological record yield information pertinent to Paraśurāma. A copper plate commemorating a land grant was given to Harivamaśa Devācārya by Mahārāja Kishan Singh of Kishangarh (b. 1575, r. 1611, d.1615).²³⁸ The date on the plate is V.S. 1669 (1612). According to Horstmann (1999:35-36) the employment of the term '*puṇya artha*' indicates that the land was donated in

²³⁶ *saṃvat 1515 pandraha sau pandraha kī sāla arjunajī rā beṭā sāvantasimhajī kaṅvara pade thā su jamunājī rai taṭai māthai sā. parasurāmajī kaṅṭhī bāmdhī tahām gāmva salemābāda tāmbā pattara sāmsaṇa karā diyō na bādasāhī naumuharo karāya diyau* || Sharma (1967:3).

²³⁷ I have searched for this particular statement in the *bahīs* in the possession of the Khejarlā Bhāṭī descendants and have been unable to trace it.

²³⁸ *śrīdha śrī mahārājā rāja śrī kiśanasimha jī vacanāyata svāmī śrī paraśurāma jī nau puṇya artha dharatī bīgha 101 anke hī eka sau eka bīghā ko seṭo 1 kasbe salemābāda mo. pīṅgaloda mem udīka kara dīdhī dharatī bañjara khīla du. śrīmukha para vānagī bhāṭī jī likhitam bā. hemarāja tā. 1 māha jilakāda sam. 1019 sam. 1669 mu. kosāthala*|| Sharma (1967:6 n3).

memory of Paraśurāma, so it can be held that at the very least he had died before that time. Harivaṁśa Devācārya also built Paraśurāma's *samādhi* at Puškara within which a stone column bears an inscription dated V.S. 1689 (1632) commemorating the installation of a Kṛṣṇa deity on the site.²³⁹ Another of Paraśurāma's disciples was the renowned Tattvavetācārya (Tattvācārya) who established in 1559 his own seat called Gopāla Dvārā in Jaitāran which fell within the kingdom of Jodhpur (Sharma 1967:9). Gautam (1975:42) refers to another entry in the *vamśāvali* of the Khejaḍlā Bhāṭīs regarding the last donations made in the name of Paraśurāma.²⁴⁰ From the terminology of the *vamśāvali*, it is apparent that Paraśurāma had died by 1611, because '*paraśurāma kau dvārā*' suggests that he had established a seat and also because '*śrī aratha*' is commonly used synonymously with '*puṇya aratha*', with a meaning equivalent to 'in the holy memory of'. In addition, this entry suggests that the Bhāṭīs had regularly donated land in the memory of Paraśurāma ('*pehalā choḍatā āyā hai so aba bhī*'), perhaps on the anniversary of his death. If such a donation was made whilst Paraśurāma was alive, the terminology would undoubtedly reflect that. This is clear evidence to support the claim that Paraśurāma died before the end of the first decade of the 17th century.

²³⁹ *śrī gopāla sarījī sati sam. 1689 bereṣe māgha sudi puranamāsī somavāra sālām svāmī śrī paraśurāma jī maṁdira bīrājamāna śrī krisna jai sātī pātisāha śrī sāhijahām rāje svāmī harivaṁśadāsa śrī parasarāma jī kā śiṣya sāmī puraṇodāsa satya sakhā miṁdara svāmī dāmodarasāsa sesa mathurādāsa sevaga rāmadāsa* || Ram Prasad Sharma 1967:7. Corrections by Gautam (1975:41): *śrī gopāla śrījī śubha samvat 1689 varṣa māgha sudi puranamāsī somavāra sālām svāmī śrī paraśurāma jī mandira bīrājamāna śrī kṛṣṇa jayati | pātisāha sāhijahān rāje svāmī harivaṁśadāsa – śrī parasarāma jī kā śiṣya – svāmī puraṇodāsa śiṣya śākhā mandira, svāmī dāmodaradāsa śiṣya mathurādāsa, sevaka rāmadāsa* || Gautam (1975) when preparing materials for his critical edition of the Mahāvāṇī of Harivyāsa, confirmed the date inscribed.

²⁴⁰ *śrī dīvāna jī vacanāyata svāmī parasarāma jī kau dvārā kasabau salīmābāda meṁ chaḥ sau hala 1 kubām 1 kadamīrā ādī pāla pehalā choḍatā āyā hai so aba bhī śrī aratha choḍām chām hajūrī rājā āsakarāṇa jī va bhaṇḍārī udāṭhākara kānaḍa dāsa tārikha 3 māha jumā ul san 1020 sāvāṇa suda 7 samvat 1668 (=1611CE)* || Gautam (1975:42)

On examination of the *Paraśurāma Sāgara* it is clear that Paraśurāma lived after Kabīra and was perhaps a contemporary of Dādū Dayāla (1544-1603), the founder of the Dādū Pantha (Callewaert 1988:15-16). For although Paraśurāma provides many details about personalities such as Kabīra (c.1440-1518) and Raidāsa, whose dates are approximately the same as Kabīr, he does not mention Dādū. Reading their works, it is apparent that both of these teachers borrow concepts that are traceable to Kabīra, the Nātha Yogīs, and Rāmānandīs. Throughout the *Paraśurāma Sāgara* it is clear that Paraśurāma is not greatly concerned with expounding the teachings of Harivyāsa and the other Nimbārkiīs, but predictably that he was writing for a particular audience. As most Rajputs claimed that their dynasties originated with Rāma through the *sūryavamśa* while others derived their genealogy from Kṛṣṇa through the *candravamśa*, Paraśurāma directed his writings at this social constituency. Therein he equates Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, adopts the stance of *nirguṇavāda* in accordance with the general idiom of the Sant movement, likens Rāma and Rahīma reminiscent of Kabīra, and describes other theological idiosyncrasies that are clearly foreign to most Nimbārka doctrine. He did stress that there is a stage beyond the methods he describes called the ‘secret worship’ (*rahasyopāsanā*) (Sharma 1967:46), which perhaps refers to the Nimbārka theology accessible only to those who have reached the highest stages of Paraśurāma’s prescribed paths. It was obviously quite successful, as no other branch of the Nimbārkiīs was able to assert such sway over their local rulers.

Sharma (1967) concludes that Paraśurāma was active until 1540. However, on the basis of the archaeological evidence, it seems that Paraśurāma could have lived

until at least just prior to the beginning of the 17th century, if not just after. Accordingly 1525 may be a good estimate for his birth. The Nimbārka's themselves claim that Harivaṁśa Devācārya was anointed as the tradition's next leader in 1607. In the absence of sources which mention the event directly, it is possible to assume that this date of the anointing of Harivaṁśa Devācārya is a good estimate of the year of the death of Paraśurāma, his predecessor. This is crucial for establishing the chronology of Harivyāsa, as the upper limit of his career can be now convincingly stated to be sometime during the latter half of the 16th century.

7.2 The Paramparā Before Harivyāsa Devācārya: Keśava Kāśmīri

Bhaṭṭācārya

The Nimbārka Sampradāya's traditional *paramparā* list starts with Haṁsa, the divine swan incarnation of Hari,²⁴¹ who is succeeded by the Kumāra quadruplets, their younger brother Nārada and finally Nimbārka. Śrīnivāsa and the following twelve *ācāryas* comprise a group called the Dvādaśācāryas in order to distinguish them from the subsequent eighteen Bhaṭṭācāryas (Aṣṭādaśabhaṭṭas). In the Dvādaśācārya grouping, those that have authored texts are Śrīnivāsa (*Vedāntakaustubha*, *Laghustavarājastotram*), Viśvācārya (*Pañcaghāṭīstotram*), Puruṣottama (*Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā*), and Devācārya (*Siddhānta Jāhnavī*, which criticizes Rāmānuja and Madhva, so must be post 13th-century). Sundarabhaṭṭa (*Siddhānta Setukā*, *Mantrārtharahasya*), who is Devācārya's immediate disciple is the first of the next grouping, the Aṣṭādaśabhaṭṭas. From Sundarabhaṭṭa until the

²⁴¹ *sa mām acintayad devaḥ praśnapāratitirṣayā | tasyāham hamsarūpeṇa sakāśam agamaṁ tadā || Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 11.13.19. The story appears to have had an earlier precedent.

last two of the eighteen, there are no works that survive in the present day. However, the penultimate Bhaṭṭa, Keśava Kāśmīri Bhaṭṭācārya (or Keśava Kāśmīrin), is the most prolific author of all the Jagadgurus in the sect.

It must be reiterated that the chronology of the tradition after Harivyāsa is more or less sound as a result of the close relations of the leadership with royal houses. Caitanya, Vallabha and their nearest disciples were connected with royalty, as a consequence of which a chronological timeline for their lives and those of their descendants is easy to obtain. However, the leaders of the sect before Harivyāsa and even Harivyāsa himself had no contact with such royal houses evident either from their own writings or from later sectarian and non-sectarian sources. These early leaders were *naiṣṭhika brahmacārins*, with no motive to actively spread the tradition: their devotees consisted in the early period, as far as can be ascertained, of students of Vedānta and others who became renunciate initiated members of the sect. It also lessens the plausibility of the early tradition being connected in an unbroken link to Keśava Kāśmīrin and the later tradition. Still, it is possible to suggest a tentative chronology for the tradition from Keśava Kāśmīrin due to the availability of both sectarian and non-sectarian source material which provides sufficient clues to improve on chronologies proffered in earlier studies.

Keśava's works comprise of a commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* known as the *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā*, the *Tattvaparakāśikā* on the *Bhagavadgītā*, on the *Vedastuti* of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* and on three of the major Upaniṣads; the *Kramadīpikā* (a Pāñcarātrika work), *Śrīgovindaśaraṇāpattistotram*,

Śrīyamunāstotram/stava, and the *Viṣṇusahasranāmāṭikā* (Bose 1943 vol. 3: 123). It is certain that Keśava Kāśmīrin flourished before Vallabha on the grounds that Keśava's usual tactic was to detail the most subtle flaws in all the other extant doctrines of his time. Vallabha's *śuddhādvaita* is not criticized anywhere in Keśava's works and so must necessarily be later (Bose 1943, vol. 3: 124). As there are no chronologically verifiable sources on Keśava, his predecessors or immediate followers, it will be necessary to make deductions based on the few sources that do mention him.

7.2.1 Kings and Miracles

There are sources both from within and beyond the Nimbārka Sampradāya regarding a purported miraculous event that can aid the investigation. A range of writers testify to the fact that Hindus were prohibited from performing ritual ablutions in the Yamunā, amongst other proscriptions, by certain Muslim rulers during their respective reigns (Clémentin-Ojha 1990:339-342), namely Ala-Ud-Din-Khilji (r.1296-1320), Firoz Shah Tughlaq (r.1351-1388), and Sikandar Lodi (r.1488-1517) (Śāstrin 1973:11 and 30). According to tradition, Keśava performed a miracle in Mathurā to free Hindus from these specific prohibitions and other conversional tactics.²⁴² Śaraṇa (1979:7) claims that the miracle in question occurred during the reign of the first prohibitionist Ala-ud-din-Khilji, a view disputed by both Śāstrin (1973:30-31) and Clémentin-Ojha (1990:339). On the basis of Prabhudayal Mittal's work, Clémentin-Ojha (1990:339) surmises this

²⁴² see Clémentin-Ojha (1990: 340), Śaraṇa (1972: 91) and Śaraṇa (1979: 6-7) for further details on the 'miracle' itself.

putative event could have occurred during the reign of Sikandar Lodi (1488-1517) which would meld better with the chronology she proposes for the rest of the tradition.

This ‘miracle’ became renowned even in Puṣṭimārgīya, Gauḍīya and Rāmānandī sources. The followers of Vallabha in the Puṣṭimārga reconfigured the narrative of the incident, for they removed Keśava Kāśmīrin from the story and replaced him with Vallabha as the hero (Clémentin-Ojha 1990: 340 n.43). Compared to other rulers, Sikandar Lodi is renowned in the Islamic histories because of being responsible for the destruction of a vast number of temples and building of many mosques and madrasas in Mathurā, which was chronicled by Ni’amet Allah (fl. 1613-30) (Dorn 1829:66). Vallabha’s dates are accepted as being 1479-1531 (Flood 1996:141) and he was thus alive during the reign of Sikandar Lodi. Based upon these dates, Śāstrin (1973:30-31) concludes that it is probable that there were two similar incidents, the earlier being that involving Keśava Kāśmīrin during Firoz Shah Tughlaq’s era and the other involving Vallabha during Sikandar Lodi’s time.

I would conclude that, most likely, the authors of the Puṣṭimārga who were keen on asserting the supremacy of their founder *ācārya* over the rest of the Vraja Vaiṣṇava milieu replaced Keśava Kāśmīrin in the narrative of the episode due to the fact that though the event was famous enough, the Puṣṭimārga account was modified at a sufficient distance from the original event to ensure that there was little concern for who the protagonist had actually been. This is borne out by Puṣṭimārga sources

themselves, which on one hand state that Keśava Kāśmīrin met Vallabha (Clémentin-Ojha 1990:341) and on the other claim that Vallabha met the famed Caturacintāmaṇi Devācārya Nāgājī, who was the third leader after Keśava Kāśmīrin in the Svabhurāma Devācārya sub-division of the Nimbārka tradition which itself was created three leaders subsequent to Keśava (Śāstrī 2002: 71). This is further corroborated by the fact that both the *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa and its commentary by Priyādāsa both state that this incident involved Keśava Kāśmīrin and do not mention Vallabha in connection with it.

The *Ācāryacaritam* assigns a date to the episode:

In the year 1424 [V.S.1424.=1368], having rescued the places of the pastimes [of Kṛṣṇa], revealing devotion to Hari in Nandigrāma and other villages; pleasing Lord Hari having eulogised him with many types of hymns and having then saved Vraja which was assailed by the *yavanas* with his prowess, the leader re-established *Bhāgavata-dharma*. Since then, Vraja became the place of residence of Bhāgavatas.²⁴³

The *Ācāryacaritam* is a work of Nārāyaṇaśaraṇa Devācārya who is the fifth Jagadguru Nimbārkācārya after Keśava Kāśmīrin himself, so exactly how reliable the given date is can be questioned. 1368 is clearly too early; however the colophon of a manuscript of Keśava's *Yamunāstotram* held in the Akhandananda Library of Vṛndāvana reveals its date of composition to be V.S.1442 (1385).²⁴⁴ It is difficult to conclude, without being able to visually verify, whether this is actually a manuscript of the *Yamunāstava* as authored by Keśava or transcribed by a

²⁴³ *vedadvivedacandrābde nandigrāmādiṣu prabhuḥ | līlāsthānam samuddhṛtya haribhaktim prakāśayat || stavair nānāvidhaiḥ stutvā harim īśam pradsādayat | vrajaṁ ca yavanākrāntam evam uddhṛtya tejasā || śrīmadbhāgavataṁ dharmam sthāpayāmāsa vai punaḥ | tato bhāgavatānām ca vāsasthānam abhūd vrajam|| Ācāryacaritam 11.18-20*

²⁴⁴ *iti śrīmatkeśavakāśmīribhaṭṭaviracitaḥ śrīyamunāstavaḥ śrīmathurāyām viśrāntataḥ samāptaḥ saṁvat 1442 || Śāstrin (1973:32). Name of manuscript found in the handwritten ledger of manuscripts held in the Akhandanand Library Vrindavan, p.249*

contemporary, or as is the more likely assumption, that this particular date was added to the manuscript at a later time.

In a manner similar to the Puṣṭimārga authors the Gauḍīya authors have also inserted Keśava into their history. The followers of Caitanya (1486-1533) were similarly asserting their presence in Vraja. The *Caitanyabhāgavata* of Vṛndāvanadāsa (c.1550) and the *Caitanyacaritāmṛta* of Kṛṣṇadāsa (17th century), describe how a twenty year-old Caitanya defeated an eighty-year-old *digvijayin* in a scholarly debate on poetics when the latter visited Nadia in Bengal with a view to defend his title. In the *Caitanyabhāgavata* there is only a reference to a ‘*Digvijayī*’ (Ādī līlā, chapter 13). In the *Caitanyacaritāmṛta*, the *digvijayin* remains nameless throughout the whole episode (Ādī Līlā 16.27-111). However, in the late 17th century, Narahari Cakravartin decided to identify this unnamed *digvijayin* with Keśava Kāśmīrin in his *Bhaktiratnākara*. He even provides Keśava’s Paramparā list in an apparent effort to bolster his claim.²⁴⁵ Clémentin-Ojha (1990:342) provides a logical explanation:

De la comparaison des récits nimbarkī, vallabhī et gaudiya vaiṣṇava, il résulte que la mention du nom de Kesava Kasmiri Bhatta sert des fins de propagande sectaire...Kesava Kasmiri était un maître renommé. Le vaincre, ou prétendre le vaincre c’était se hausser soi-même très haut.

[Comparing Nimbārkī, Vallabhī and Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava stories, it follows that the mention of the name Keśava Kāśmīri is for sectarian propaganda...as Keśava Kāśmīri was a renowned leader. Defeating, or rather pretending to defeat him was to raise oneself very high].

The conclusion must be that this claim of Narahari Cakravartin need not be taken too seriously, even though modern day followers of the Gauḍīya line propound it.

²⁴⁵ *Bhaktiratnākara* 12.2255-2276.

It certainly demonstrates that Keśava's scholarly renown and itinerant disposition remained in the collective memory centuries after his death.

7.2.2 The *Kramadīpikā* and Other Works

The *Kramadīpikā*, considered one of Keśava's early compositions, displays no connection with any Vedāntic school due to its being a Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātrika scripture. This Kṛṣṇa-centric ritual manual consists of seven chapters, with Kṛṣṇa as the supreme deity and Vṛndāvana as its main meditative focus, but it characteristically does not mention Rādhā. This has led to a debate amongst scholars as to whether the *Kramadīpikā* is correctly ascribed.

Sharan Behari Goswami (1966), a householder Gosvāmin serving the Bāṅke Bihārī temple in Vṛndāvana, was the most vocal of polemicists contesting the affiliation of the ascetic followers of Svāmī Haridāsa to the Nimbārka Sampradāya. In his work, he endeavours to prove that Haridāsa's affiliation sits better with Vallabha, in line with a debate that has persisted for centuries. He contends that, firstly, there is no mention of Nimbārka or his *paramparā* throughout the *Kramadīpikā*; secondly, that there is no mention of Nimbārka's *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* or *Prapannakalpavallī* when explaining the *gopāla mantra* or *mukunda śaraṇāgati mantra* in the *Kramadīpikā*; thirdly, that the tradition reserves *brahma vidyā* for the twice-born whereas the *Kramadīpikā* gives it to all; and finally that manuscripts of the work are found only in Bengal and not in other strongholds of the tradition in Rajasthan or Vraja (Goswami 1966:64).

Agrawal (2000) countered these claims as follows. Firstly, Keśava usually mentions his preceptor in the *maṅgala* verses of his works, but curiously he names different preceptors at the commencement of some works. In the *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā* he mentions Mukunda as his preceptor and in the *Tattvaprakāśikā* he mentions *Gāṅgalabhaṭṭa*. In the *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā* he mentions names of earlier *ācāryas* whereas in the *Tattvaprakāśikā* there is no similar statement. This demonstrates, according to Agrawal (2000 vol. 1:xxiii), that Keśava not mentioning the name of his preceptor in the *Kramadīpikā* does not indicate that he did not have one. Secondly, Keśava follows the *Mantrarahasyaśoḍaśī*'s explanation of the *gopāla mantra*, but does not mention the *Mantrarahasyaśoḍaśī* explicitly. Thirdly, Keśava flourished at a time when 'Hindus' *in toto* were facing sanctions, so an anti-*śūdra* stance is much less relevance than an expressed antipathy towards the persecutors. He follows Puruṣottama's claim in the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* that the lower class can also worship through the methods of the Purāṇas and Āgamas,²⁴⁶ thereby including all 'Hindus'. Finally, the prevalence of manuscripts of the *Kramadīpikā* in Bengal may indicate that it became popular there. Indeed, it was adopted in the rituals of the Jagannātha temple in Purī (Tripathi 2004:48), and is quoted in the *Haribhaktivilāsa* of the Gauḍīya Gosvāmins.

Agrawal's rebuttal is not watertight. The earliest manuscript of the *Kramadīpikā* accompanied by a commentary of Govinda Bhaṭṭa with the colophon attesting to

²⁴⁶ *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, chapter 4

the date of 1556, has been found in the Royal Library of Nepal.²⁴⁷ It would be reasonable to allow 80-100 years or so from the time of composition to its proliferation and appearance in the *milieu* of the library of the royal house of Nepal. There also exists three other manuscripts of the *Kramadīpikā* in this collection, which although later, show that the *Kramadīpikā* was notable for Vaiṣṇava ritual in areas where Tantra provided a prevalent idiom of religiosity. From the text of the *Kramadīpikā*, it is certain that the author was a Vaiṣṇava²⁴⁸ and revered Nārada;²⁴⁹ whether this refers to Nārada as Nimbārka's guru or Nārada as a teacher of Pāñcarātra remains uncertain. He also frequently mentions Vṛndāvana, Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs*,²⁵⁰ which later becomes the main theme for the successors of Keśava, namely Śrībhaṭṭa and Harivyāsa.²⁵¹ Keśava, when describing his vision of heaven, allots the Sanakādi quadruplets a position amongst the eternal residents.²⁵² Nimbārka states that these individuals are the preceptors of Nārada,²⁵³ a fact which is perhaps hinted at by Keśava, as he praises Nārada only two verses later.²⁵⁴ Throughout this work no mention of Nimbārka is made. It is possible that reference to this particular *sampradāya* is intentionally omitted as is frequently the case with Pāñcarātra compositions, which rarely specifically mention the preceptor's name due to the secrecy regulations of the Āgamas.²⁵⁵ Rather, it is perhaps more likely that this work was completed before Keśava took initiation

²⁴⁷ I thank Prof. Peter Biscchop (Leiden) for alerting me to this and confirming with Prof. Diwakar Acharya (Tokyo).

²⁴⁸ From his many uses of the word, such as *Kramadīpikā* 1.34

²⁴⁹ *Kramadīpikā* 1.2

²⁵⁰ *Kramadīpikā* 1.2 and the opening of the 3rd *paṭala* describe Vṛndāvana for meditation.

²⁵¹ As evinced by the *Yugalaśataka* of Śrībhaṭṭa and the *Mahāvāṇī* of Harivyāsa, below.

²⁵² *Kramadīpikā* 3.33

²⁵³ *Daśaślokī* verse 6

²⁵⁴ *Kramadīpikā* 3.35-36

²⁵⁵ *yathā yathā yatra tatra na gṛhṇīyac ca kevalam | abhaktiyā tu guror nāma gṛhṇīyāt prayatātmanā || Jayākhya Samhitā* 16.302

into the Nimbārka tradition. Because of its lack of a specific sectarian affiliation the *Kramadīpikā* was able to influence other Vaiṣṇavas, as already mentioned (Agrawal 2000 vol 1: xxiii, xxiv; Clémentin-Ojha 1990:342). The *Kramadīpikā* does contain references to the *Śāradātilaka* and the *Prapañcasāra*²⁵⁶ during the discussion on initiation rituals. According to Sanderson (2007:233), the *Prapañcasāra* was composed after the beginning of the 13th century but was completed before 1494.

7.2.3 Keśava Kāśmīri Bhaṭṭācārya's Date

Collecting all of this information, there is a discernible pattern that emerges. It is clear that Keśava Kāśmīrin wrote after Rāmānuja and Madhva but definitely before Vallabha. Madhva died in 1278, and his views were criticised by both Devācārya in the *Siddhāntajāhnavī* and Sundarabhaṭṭa in his *Siddhāntasetukā*, and so Devācārya and Sundarabhaṭṭa would necessarily have flourished after Bhāskara, Rāmānuja and Mādhva,²⁵⁷ but clearly before Keśava Kāśmīrin, who refers the reader back to them on many occasions.²⁵⁸ It is plausible to locate them in the last decades of the 13th century to the early 14th century as the style of criticism of *dvaita* shows that Devācārya and Sundarabhaṭṭa were familiar with *dvaita* only in its nascent form and were not aware of refinements to the dualist system made by

²⁵⁶ *Kramadīpikā* 4.4

²⁵⁷ *atha kiṃ prakāraṇam tad brahmeti | kiṃ śabda 'tra saṃśayaparaḥ | aupādhikabhedābhedāśrayo vā jagadatyantābhinnam vā tad atyantabhinnam vā cetanācetanāśarīrakatvena tad viśiṣṭam vā svābhāvīkabhedābhedādhikaraṇam veti yāvat || ...aupādhikabhedābhedavādinobhāskarabhaṭṭādayaḥ...bhedavādinomādhvāḥ prāhuḥ...etan matam viśiṣṭādvaitavādimukhena nirākarīṣyann āha... || Siddhāntasetukā on Siddhāntajāhnavī for Brahmasūtra 1.1.1*

²⁵⁸ For example, *maṅgala* verse 4 of the *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā* shows a special reverence to Sundarabhaṭṭa; as well as in *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā* commentaries to *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.1, 2.1.16, 4.4.7, and to other *ācāryas* who have criticized *advaita* such as Puruṣottama in *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā* 1.1.1 and 2.1.14 (Bose 1943, vol3:124 n2,3)

later intellectuals as rebuttals to *viśiṣṭādvaitin* attacks. This fact lends credence to the claims of some scholars that there may have been many fewer *ācāryas* in the Nimbārka tradition between Sundarabhaṭṭa and Keśava Kāśmīrin than the *paramparā* lists would have us believe, unless, that is, the *ācāryas* in the interim had very short periods at the helm,²⁵⁹ which in itself is not impossible, but is improbable. Keśava’s writings also feature this tradition’s first ever references to the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, which was previously never utilised as a valid authoritative text.

It is possible to deduce from the above that Keśava Kāśmīrin, possibly born in Nimbārka’s village as Nimbārkīs maintain, was recognised as intelligent from early on and after initial study, went to Kashmir for further education. Keśava is strongly associated with Kashmir as evident by his name, attested to from at least the time of Nābhādāsa’s *Bhaktamāla* whose *chappaya* 75 commences by stating that he had the *chāpa* (title) of Kāśmīra.²⁶⁰ Sikandar Butshikan (r. 1389-1413) was responsible for the destruction of many temples, imposition of many taxes on Hindus and banning them even from cremating their dead, which resulted in a mass exodus of Hindus from Kashmir. He was succeeded by his elder son Ali Shah (r.1413-1419, with a brief gap in 1418 when he set out for Mecca and installed his younger brother on the throne) who was then succeeded by Shahi Khan, the younger brother, more popularly known as Zain-Ul-Abidin (r.1419-1470). He is known for

²⁵⁹ This would result in an average of nine *ācāryas* per century from Sundarabhaṭṭa to Keśava Kāśmīrin.

²⁶⁰ *kāśmīra kī chāpa pāpa tāpani jagamaṇḍana | dṛḍha hari bhakti kuṭhāra āna dharmā biṭapa bihaṇḍana || mathurā madhi maleccha bāda kari barabaṭa jīte | kājī ajita aneka dekhi paracai bhayabhīte || bidita bāta saṁsāra saba santa sākhī nāhiṁna durī | śrī kesau bhaṭa nara mukuṭa mani jinakī prabhutā bistarī ||* Nābhādāsa’s *Bhaktamāla chappaya* 75

restoring peace and harmony and even patronising Sanskrit scholarship, poetry and arts. Haider Shah (r. 1470-1472) returned with a vengeance the policy of intolerance and is remembered for his bloody retributions. His successor, Hassan Shah (r. 1472-1484) briefly returned to Zain-Ul-Abidin's ways. After that, the squabbles of Mohammad Shah and Fateh Shah resulted in political instability (Kumar 2008:306-310).

A plausible scenario may run as follows. Keśava Kāśmīrin could have studied in Kashmir during the time of Zain-Ul-Abidin and left that region by the time of Haider Shah. Whilst there, he followed a Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra tradition, as Kashmir was a centre of Śaiva, Śākta and Vaiṣṇava Tantra. He composed the *Kramadīpikā*, which utilises the *Śāradātilaka* as a basis in order to convince Śaivas and Śāktas to use his manual. On his trips through India (his itinerant scholarly prowess is recorded in his title of *digvijayin*), he would have engaged with the Śāktas of Bengal and other places. Then, when he arrived at Mathurā for the first time, it is conceivable that he took preliminary initiation into the Nimbārka Sampradāya and studied the *Brahmasūtra* under the tutelage of a certain Mukunda, a *vidyā-guru*; composing his own *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā* on the *Vedāntakaustubha* of Śrīnivāsa. He perhaps then carried on with his tours and returned to Mathurā to resolve the disputes surrounding bathing at the Yamunā under the reign of anti-‘Hindu’ rulers. Seeing his capability and erudition, he was perhaps selected as the next leader of the tradition, which is when he received his renunciate vows at the hand of the then leader of the tradition, Gāṅgalabhaṭṭa, who would have become his *sannyāsa guru*. It was possibly after this that he wrote the *Tattvaparakāśikā*, and

it is clear to see that Vraja based *bhakti* themes make a strong appearance throughout this work. This is the likely period in which he composed his various hymns such as the *Śrīgovindaśaraṇāpattistotram* and the *Yamunāstotram*, which both mention Rādhā towards the very end of each work. He died later in Mathurā, as his *samādhī* is present in Dhruva Ṭīlā at the Rādhākānta Mandir.

The *Prapañcasāra* would be the most logical source with which to commence delineating Keśava's chronology, but as its dates are not fixed, other clues must be sought. All of Keśava's works refute the standpoints of Śāṅkara, Bhāskara, Rāmānuja and Madhva but they fail to mention Vallabha or Caitanya. The date of birth of Vallabha and Caitanya, 1479 and 1486 respectively, then serve as *terminus ante quem* for Keśava. Taking into account the putative Mathurā miracle, and to provide a sufficient time span for it to be subjected to sectarian reworkings, Keśava would have necessarily been of advanced age when he intervened with the agents of Sikandar Lodi to perform said marvel. Nābhādāsa's *Bhaktamāla* includes five generations of Nimbārkīs before his contemporary Caturacintāmaṇī Nāgājī. If Paraśurāma, the third successor after Keśava, flourished c.1525-1607, then it follows logically that Keśava Kāśmīrin flourished from c.1410-1490.

Mittal's (1968:195) refutation of Keśava's participation in the Mathurā miracle during Firoz Shah Tughlaq's time and insistence that it occurred instead during Sikandar Lodi's time has merit, but his reasoning is completely invalidated by the fact that he claims Keśava met Caitanya at the ludicrously advanced age of 125 when Caitanya was 20. In reality, it appears that Keśava was dead at least 5 years

before Caitanya's birth. The chronology I have suggested is supported by the fact that there is an abundance of later sectarian controversies regarding Keśava. The stories of Caitanya supposedly meeting an aged Keśava Kāśmīrin and Vallabha supposedly performing the Mathurā miracle are testimony to the fact that by the time both of these new-sect founders came into their prime, Keśava, of great renown, was dead. The Puṣṭimarga's assertions in the *Śrī Śrīnāthajī kī Prākāṭya Vārtā* and other *vārtā* texts that Vallabha was successful in dealing with the problems in Mathurā, perhaps demonstrate that after the time of Keśava Kāśmīrin Vallabha performed a second 'miracle' in Mathurā. However, even if true, this was not as widely renowned as Keśava's attempt, as sources for Vallabha's participation exist only in Puṣṭimārga sources. Extrapolating from this chronology would suggest c.1440-1520 for Śrībhaṭṭa and c.1470-1540 for Harivyāsa Devācārya, which are consistent with available evidence surrounding them, as will be explained.

7.3 Śrībhaṭṭa Devācārya

Keśava Kāśmīrin is the last of the Tailānga-brāhmaṇa leaders of the tradition, and Śrībhaṭṭa is the first of the Gauḍa-brāhmaṇa leaders and the final *ācārya* of the Aṣṭādaśbhaṭṭas. Śāstrin (1973:9), stating the traditional viewpoint, claims that Śrībhaṭṭa's parents, who were originally from the Hissar district of Haryana, settled in Mathurā before his birth. His brother's descendants still control the site at Dhruva Ṭīlā today and his main meditation site of Vamśī Vaṭa in Vṛndāvana (Garg 2004: 517). Śrībhaṭṭa is well renowned in Vraja Vaiṣṇava circles due to the importance of

his work, the *Yugalaśataka*, poems of which are included in the hymnal anthologies of the Vallabha Sampradāya (Goswami 1966:568). He also composed a Sanskrit hymn entitled the *Śrīkṛṣṇaśaraṇāpattistotram* in the manner of his own preceptor's *Śrīgovindaśaraṇāgatistotram*, which features the famous refrain, *śrī kṛṣṇaḥ śaraṇam mama*, perhaps the origin of the ubiquitous Vallabha Sampradāya *mantra* of the same wording. Śrībhaṭṭa's prominence in the Nimbārka tradition is well earned: he is the first *ācārya* of the tradition after Nimbārka to proclaim openly in his works that Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa conjointly are Parabrahman, and according to Colas (2003:254), he shifted the focus of the tradition from philosophical speculation to devotional love of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. Even though his life and dating remain the subject of debate, Clémentin-Ojha (1990:344) confirms that Śrībhaṭṭa started a trend that became characteristic of all Vṛndāvana based traditions in the years after his death. Investigation of his contributions to the development of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa devotional theology in the Nimbārka Sampradāya is unavoidable if a clear understanding of Harivyāsa's view of Rādhā is to be gained.

7.3.1 Śrībhaṭṭa's Chronology

The Nimbārka tradition itself claims that Śrībhaṭṭa was born some time towards the end of the 13th century (Dāsa 2008:28). As far as modern scholarship is concerned, Pandey and Zide (1965:62) provide a presumed date of 1290. Thielemann (1998:67) gives a dating without any substantive comments, of 1443-1543 and Clémentin-Ojha (1990:43) posits his birth date to be somewhere around the

beginning of the 16th century. These divergent views, which span some three centuries, can be narrowed down in the following manner.

The early datings derive from a controversial *dohā* found in one particular manuscript of the *Yugalaśataka* discovered in Bahraich, Oudh, which was mentioned in the search report of the Nāgarī Pracārīnī Sabhā, Kāśī for the years 1923-25 (Śāstrin 1973:37). The colophon records a date of composition of V.S. 1352 (1295).²⁶¹ Goswami (1966:567) suggests that the reading of *rāma* in the chronogram, which yields the number three, has been confused with *rāga* (resulting in 6), which would give the impossibly late date of V.S.1652 (1595) for the completion of the *Yugalaśataka* (Śāstrin 1973:21). He further claims that the language and style of the composition do not correspond to a work that was composed during the 13th century, and thus dismisses the date provided by the tradition itself.

It is, in fact, more logical to engage with the early date for Śrībhāṭṭa put forward by the tradition in the following manner. Being a disciple of Keśava Kāśmīrin, Śrībhāṭṭa would necessarily be later, and according to the discussion above on Keśava's date, it would be illogical to assign such an early date to Śrībhāṭṭa. Śāstrin, a Nimbārkī author, counters the dating accepted by the tradition on the basis of this single *dohā*, as the sole manuscript which contains it also has a *paramparā* list, originally written at the time of the transcription of 1813, but was also later added to in order to update the list to 1943. The additions are made with

²⁶¹ *nayana bāṇa puni rāma sasi ganau anka gati bāma | pragaṭa bhayo śrī jugala sata yaha saṁvata abhirāma* || Colophon *dohā*, Śāstrin (1973:37).

the same ink as that of the *dohā* in question. That ink does not feature anywhere else in the manuscript (Śāstrin 1973:22). Working on the basis of the chronology of Paraśurāma, the dates that I propose for Śrībhaṭṭa are 1440-1520, which I would contextualise as follows.

7.3.2 Śrībhaṭṭa's Life and Works

Śrībhaṭṭa, though based in Dhruva Ṭīlā in Mathurā, spent most of his time at Vaṁśī Vaṭa, a fact to which he alludes on several occasions in the *Yugalaśataka*. To this day a temple is maintained on the spot by his patrilineal descendants who will, upon prompting, describe in detail the reasons for Śrībhaṭṭa choosing Vaṁśī Vaṭa as his place of meditation. The traditional account, related by Śāstrin (1973:36-37), claims that Śrībhaṭṭa would travel to Vṛndāvana and engage in meditative worship on the banks of the Yamunā at Vaṁśī Vaṭa. During this time, he purportedly composed one thousand Brajbhāṣā *padas* on the *aṣṭayāma līlās* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, and after they were completed, he took them to Mathurā and offered them to his preceptor. Being the leader of the Nimbārka Sampradāya, Keśava Kāśmīrin, following the precedent already established regarding not revealing Rādhā, took the collection of poems and immersed them in the Yamunā, stating that the world is not ready for revelations of this kind. The next morning, when Keśava Kāśmīrin was bathing in the Yamunā's waters and submerged himself for the final time, he stood up and found that on his head were pages containing one hundred *padas* from the thousand that were immersed the day before. When he meditated on the situation, Yamunā herself, as the guardian of Vṛndāvana and thus the protector of

the secret exploits of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, appeared to Keśava Kāśmīrin and instructed him that this selection of poems was chaste enough to disseminate amongst initiated disciples, as the time to reveal the secret pastimes of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa had come again. With this, he handed over the poems to his disciple Śrībhaṭṭa and instructed him to teach it to his followers; and in a few months time, Keśava Kāśmīrin passed on.

All that can be stated with any certainty is that this collection became known as the *Yugalaśataka* and is also referred to as the ‘*Ādivāṇī*’, the first *vāṇī* book of the tradition. In addition to the hundred poems of the *Yugalaśataka*, there are a further three that have been collected from other anthologies, that were written by Śrībhaṭṭa (Śāstrin 1973: 35-36, Garg 2004:517-520, Dāsa 2008: 27-28).

There are a few points to consider in order for a contextualised picture of the interactions of the theologians of Vṛndāvana-Mathurā at that time. Śrībhaṭṭa’s Dhruva Ṭīlā is not too distant from Dhruva Ghāṭa, where Rūpa and Sanātana Gosvāmin would have been in residence, from 1517 and 1519 respectively. Caitanya also came to Mathurā on his way to Vṛndāvana in 1515. These future theologians would have encountered the Vaiṣṇava milieu that existed in Mathurā, which was well aware of the works and activities of Keśava Kāśmīrin nearly three decades earlier. Would they perhaps have met Śrībhaṭṭa or his followers, and would their similarity of their worship, and especially their Vedānta, bear witness to this fact? Obviously this is mere conjecture in the absence of source material clearly stating as such. The accounts provided by Caitanya’s biographers, including

the earliest account entitled the *Kṛṣṇacaitanyacaritāmṛta* by his contemporary Murāri Guptā, show that Caitanya started his tour in Mathurā, bathed at Viśrāma Ghāṭa and then proceeded on his pilgrimage guided by one ‘Kṛṣṇadāsa’, a Brāhmaṇa resident of the area (Entwhistle 1987:256). At the time of Caitanya’s visit to Vṛndāvana and Mathurā, Mādhavendra Purī had been dead for 35 years, Vallabhācārya was 36 years old and based at Aḍail near Allahabad, Hita Harivamśa was 13 years old, Harirāma Vyāsa 5 years old, Svāmī Haridāsa 3 years old, and the Śrīnātha deity (originally known as Gopāla) was installed temporarily in Gantholi to protect it from attacks by Sikandar Lodi’s forces. There were no other Vaiṣṇava *sampradāyas* in Vṛndāvana or even Mathurā before this, though undoubtedly there must have been some orthoprax Vaiṣṇavas in residence.

An interesting reference in the *Śrīnātha Jī Kī Prākāṭya Vārtā* is that on the installation day of the temple of Śrīnātha at Jatipurā on Akṣaya Tr̥tīyā 1519CE, it is recorded that many *sādhus* from Vṛndāvana attended this function, along with a *mahanta* from Vṛndāvana (Śāstrin 1973:141). As Śāstrin dated Śrībhaṭṭa in accordance with the erroneous *dohā* mentioned above, Harivyāsa appeared to him to be the likely candidate. However, with the revised dates suggested here, it could have possibly been the case that an aged Śrībhaṭṭa attended this function. None of the Vaiṣṇava traditions had an established seat at Vṛndāvana for which there was a *mahanta*, save perhaps Śrībhaṭṭa’s place of worship at Vamśī Vaṭa. Other *sādhus* from Vṛndāvana might well have included Rūpa and Sanātana, but the designation *mahanta* could only signify the very old Śrībhaṭṭa. Followers of the Puṣṭimārga were to hold Śrībhaṭṭa in respect and have included his *padas* in their anthologies,

especially the famous ode to Vṛndāvana in the springtime ‘*navala vasanta*’ (*Yugalaśataka* 84).

The theology and philosophy presented by both Keśava Kāśmīrin and Śrībhṭṭa have parallels in subsequent Gauḍīya and Puṣṭimārga literature, yet neither of these traditions speak of the interactions of the members of one tradition with the other. As such, Śrībhṭṭa was effectively expunged from the sectarian landscape that developed after him, and by thus lessening the importance of the Nimbārka tradition both the Gauḍīya and Vallabha *sampradāyas* were able to garner monetary support from donors that enabled them to embark on construction projects in Vṛndāvana and Govardhana (Entwhistle 1987:137), which might have been difficult to accomplish if questions of their legitimacy were raised by their financiers. The identity of the Nimbārkaīs was potentially particularly vulnerable, as their main deity was a transportable *śālagrāma* deity which did not require any fixed temple, and as their main focus of meditation was the forest groves of Vṛndāvana itself, not any temple building in Vṛndāvana. As a result there was initially no requirement for the Nimbārkaīs to construct any formal shrine in their natural temple of Vṛndāvana. This is in contrast to the temple established by Mādhavendra Purī for Gopālajī (later Śrīnāthajī) at Govardhana (Entwhistle 1987:137) during the time of Keśava Kāśmīrin, whose concern was with Mathurā primarily and about whom there is little regarding any connection with Govardhana in the hagiographies. Residences consisted of hermitages for the *naiṣṭhika brahmacārin* leaders of the Nimbārka tradition; they had no connections with royalty or state matters in the manner of the Gauḍīya Rūpa and Sanātana

Gosvāmins who were previously employed in royal courts, or the Vijayanagara palace debate victor Vallabha (Entwhistle 1987:141-142).

Śrībhaṭṭa, who worshipped in the sylvan shrine of Vṛndāvana and performed meditation at Vamśī Vaṭa, was based at Dhruva Ṭīlā in Mathurā, a fact which is attested to by his *carana pādukās* established next to those of his preceptor Keśava Kāsmīrin at the nearby Rādhākānta Mandir at Nārada Ṭīlā, to which were added those of his disciple Harivyāsa Devācārya (Entwhistle 1987:137). He also had another famous disciple known as Vīrama Tyāgī, attested to in other *Bhaktamālas*, whose lineage has members in Daranagar near Ayodhya in U.P., Udaipur Kalā near Kishangarh and Koṭā in Rajasthan. Śrībhaṭṭa's paternal lineage still persists, members of which are known as Śrībhaṭṭa Gosvāmins and are present in Mathurā, Kanpur, Jaipur and Dhruv Ṭīlā (Śāstrin 1973:38, Clémentin-Ojha 1990:346).

7.3.3 Śrībhaṭṭa's Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa: the *Yugalaśataka*

When analysing the *Yugalaśataka*, many scholars have restricted themselves to consideration of the first *pada* alone, and concluding that this set the tone for the rest of the work, hypothesised that its main subject is Kṛṣṇa. In fact, the first *pada* encourages the *sādhaka* to focus on the grace he has received in order to qualify him for the level of the *upāsanā* that is about to be undertaken and reminds him decisively that the *sādhaka* has sought shelter as a servant in the house of Kṛṣṇa. The *pada* then assures him that although those who do not have devotion for Kṛṣṇa will face sorrows birth after birth, Yama will always be afraid of those who have

actually received initiation.²⁶² It is merely a prelude to the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa meditations that are described in the rest of the work. In the subsequent *padas* Śrībhṭṭa's view of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and his faith in the land of Vṛndāvana become apparent. Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa for Śrībhṭṭa are simply Parabrahman, there is no space in the rest of the work for any other deity, nor any other form of Kṛṣṇa that lacks Rādhā at his side.

The innovation of Śrībhṭṭa lies in his presentation of the *aṣṭayāma-līlā*, perhaps the earliest description of the complete daily pastimes (for the eight watches of a twenty-four hour day, each lasting three hours), and specifically the *sevā* that occurs during those periods: *maṅgalā* (pre-dawn), *śṛṅgāra* (bathing and dressing), *vanavihāra* (forest-grove sojourns), *rājabhoga* (midday meal and ensuing siesta), *utthāpana* (waking and afternoon snacks), *sandhyā* (sunset), *śayana* (bedtime) and *rāsa*. The imagery presented in each of his descriptions of these services, which form the chapter entitled *Sevā Sukha* (*padas* 37-52), is similar to the works of other Vraja authors. However, as the *Yugalaśataka* is the earliest example of Brajbhāṣā *vāṇī* literature on this subject available today, any peculiarities in Śrībhṭṭa's presentation will allow a better understanding of the development of this particular doctrine. As such, what follows is a summary of his depiction.

According to Śrībhṭṭa, a day in the eternal *līlā* starts with Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa rising and rearranging their dishevelled dress and ornaments.²⁶³ The *maṅgala āratī* then takes place with the *sakhīs* performing the ritual, Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa seated on a throne.

²⁶² *Yugalaśataka* 1

²⁶³ *Yugalaśataka* 37 & 38

After the *ārati*, Śrībhaṭṭa offers them the mouth-refreshing *pāna/tāmbūla*, and having prostrated, he waves the whisk-fan over them. This is evidence that for the *mādhurya upāsanā* as propounded by the Nimbārka Sampradāya, one had to perform tasks in the *nikuñja līlās* in one's *sakhī* form, relinquishing the concept of one's own body and identity.²⁶⁴ Intriguingly Śrībhaṭṭa moves straight on to *rājabhoga*, and the fifty-six items of food that are offered in this midday meal are enumerated.²⁶⁵ He continues with descriptions of the hand washing and mouth-rinsing (*ācamana*), and they are again given *pāna*. During this whole process, Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are interacting exclusively with one another, playing and laughing, seeing which the *sakhīs* derive the immense delight, identified with the fulfilment of the goals of human birth and eternal bliss.²⁶⁶ The *rājabhoga ārati* then follows which brings to a close the first half of the day and lets them retire to the vines of the Nikuñja grove where they take a siesta, after engaging in love-making.²⁶⁷

In the afternoon, the *sakhīs* are playfully annoyed with Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, chastising them for being late in getting up; cows have been milked, the milk boiled fervently with sugar, and it is now getting cold.²⁶⁸ Finally, when Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa sit upon their throne and drink the warm beverage, Śrībhaṭṭa and the other *sakhīs* thank them,

²⁶⁴ *prāta mudita mili maṅgala gāvaim, lāla laḍaiti ko sakhī laḍāvai || Yugalaśataka 39, and, mevā pāna śavāya jai śrībhaṭṭa kari daṁḍauta caṁvara lau dhārau || Yugalaśataka 40. Also supported later: jai śrībhaṭṭa utkaṭa saṁghaṭa suṣa keli sahelī nīrantara ṭhāḍhī || Yugalaśataka 78*

²⁶⁵ *Yugalaśataka 42*

²⁶⁶ *śrībhaṭṭa juga baṁsībaṭa sevata mūrati saba sukha rāsī || Yugalaśataka 5, mana baca rādhā lāla jape jina | anāyāsa sahaḥajim yā jaga meṁ sakala sukṛta phala lābha lahyo tina || japa tapa tīratha nema punya brata subha sādhana ārādhana hī bina | jai śrībhaṭṭa ati utakaṭa jākī mahimā aparāmpāra agama gina || Yugalaśataka 9.*

²⁶⁷ *Yugalaśataka 41-47*

²⁶⁸ *byārū kī bera abera na kījai lījai bali jāūm thara thorī | kabuki bāṭa deṣi naṁdanandana maim tabahī taiṁ misrī phorī || Yugalaśataka 48*

saying ‘may this couple live forever!’.²⁶⁹ Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are also fed snacks and after they have completed their afternoon *vyārū*, again they are presented with *pāna*.²⁷⁰ Śrībhaṭṭa next moves straight to nightfall when Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are sleeping; he is present in the bed-chambers cooling them with a whisk fan, observing the way that their feet protrude from under the covers.²⁷¹ To Śrībhaṭṭa, the scene is reminiscent of Holī: the various coloured flowers that made up the bed are scattered around, the yellow scarf of Kṛṣṇa is intertwined with the blue *sāḍī* (Saaree) of Rādhā, concluding Śrībhaṭṭa’s description of the *āṣṭayāma līlā*.²⁷² Śrībhaṭṭa has only related the *maṅgalā*, *śṛṅgāra*, *rājabhoga*, *utthāpana* and *śayana* pastimes, with no description of *sandhyā* and *rāsa* (midnight), as well as the period of *vihāra* – whether *vanavihāra* or *jalavihāra* – in his description of the daily routine of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, all of which feature in the work of his disciple Harivyāsa.

In the *Vrajalīlā Sukha*, which is comprised of *padas* 11-36, there are descriptions of *līlās* which according to Goswami (1966:567) do not include Rādhā. For example, the first two *padas* paint the picture of *sakhīs* being awoken by the sound of Kṛṣṇa’s flute as he leads the cows to pasture in the morning. The *sakhīs* find it difficult to wait to see him, so under the pretext of taking him snacks while he is out in the forests, they retrieve the refreshments from Yaśodā and then go deep into the forest to give these snacks to him.²⁷³ Śrībhaṭṭa has apparently ceased talking about Rādhā, as nothing is said of her in those *padas*. However those *padas* should

²⁶⁹ *śrībhaṭṭa juṭi baiṭhe doū tana deṣi jivaim juga jīvau jorī* || *Yugalaśataka* 48

²⁷⁰ *Yugalaśataka* 49

²⁷¹ *sovata jugala camvara hau dhāraum | kabahumka seūm carana nainani mem nautana neha sudhā rasa dhāraum|| kabahumka pada pallaba rādhe kea pane naina kanīna nisāraum | kabahumka śrībhaṭṭa namdalāla ke komala carana kamala pucakāraum* || *Yugalaśataka* 50

²⁷² *Yugalaśataka* 48-52

²⁷³ *Yugalaśataka* 11-13

be read together in conjunction with the next *pada* which picks up the story, describing the *sakhīs* finding Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa sitting together in a grove in the forest. The *sakhīs* then feed them, adorn them with sandalwood paste and flower garlands and finally give them *pāna*. As they offer their prostrations, they sing the glories of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. Thus, the Vrajalīlā Sukha in its entirety does not describe the various pastimes of Vraja as contained within the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, for example, but focuses on the *sakhīs* and Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, relating only one single episode in the narrative. These together can be taken to fill the morning *vanavihāra* that is not included within the body of Sevā Sukha.

Sahaja Sukha (*padas* 53-73) contains detailed descriptions of the beauty of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in the groves on the banks of the Yamunā. After briefly mentioning that Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa engaged in the *rāsa līlā*,²⁷⁴ Śrībhṭṭa describes the episode in which Rādhā steals the flute from an exhausted Kṛṣṇa. After much effort Kṛṣṇa regains his instrument, and asks for Rādhā's flower-garland just to make sure there are no hard feelings, after which they both fall asleep.²⁷⁵ This appears to be just after Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are left alone to have their midday siesta, and could be included between *rājabhoga* and *utthāpana*.

Surata Sukha (*padas* 74-81) contains a thorough description of the erotic antics of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. The *sakhīs* have put them to sleep at night, but they know that Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are not about to sleep just yet, so they hide all around the secret grove. Śrībhṭṭa paints a picture of the *śaratpūrṇimā* night of the autumnal full

²⁷⁴ *hāsa vilāsa rāsa rādhe saṅga sīla apanapau tolaim* || *Yugalaśataka* 68

²⁷⁵ *Yugalaśataka* 69-70

moon, with a cool breeze blowing and the sounds of a calm Yamunā flowing nearby. Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are conversing, during which Rādhā falls asleep. Kṛṣṇa takes that opportunity and massages the feet of Rādhā, waking her up. She sees in his eyes that he desires a kiss, and she obliges. The *sakhīs* then comment that they wish they could always see Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in this most secret escapade as it gladdens their hearts. After they fall asleep, there is a description of the morning after, where the *sakhīs* observe Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa staring at each other upon waking up, drinking in the aftermath of the night before with their eyes. The *sakhīs* then sing their morning praises, awakening Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa for the day ahead. It is for this reason that this entire section could be inserted after the *śayana* description in the *Sevā Sukha*, filling the lacuna in the *āṣṭayāma līlā* as related therein.

Utsava Sukha (*padās* 82-100) includes descriptions of the main annual festivals, starting with the arrival of springtime, moving into the festival of Holī, after which is Jalavihāra. As this does not coincide with any particular festival in the spring-summer, and as it is described as being an early evening pastime (Shrivastav 1973:148), it again could be included within the overall understanding of the *āṣṭayāma līlā*, so it can be said that the *Yugalaśataka* does indeed relay the full *āṣṭayāma līlā*, albeit not in sequence. In the succession of annual events the monsoon pastimes are next described, which is followed by the swing festival from *hariyālī tīja* until *śrāvaṇī pūrṇimā*. The Ekādaśī that falls during that time is Pavitrā Ekādaśī, and Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are offered a *pavitrā*, a blessed cord worn around the neck. The congratulation-songs for Janmāṣṭamī and Rādhāṣṭamī follow which then leads to the description of the *mahā rāsa līlā* of *śaratpūrṇimā*. The

festive year concludes here with the description of the wedding of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, perhaps on *bihāra pañcamī*.

The *Yugalaśataka* thus provides a fairly comprehensive description of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, Vṛndāvana, the *sakhīs* and the festivals that are integral to all Vraja-based Vaiṣṇava traditions. Śrībhaṭṭa reveals for the first time in the history of all of the *ācāryas* of this tradition, without censoring, exactly what secretive events take place in the *nitya līlā* in terms of *aṣṭayāma līlā* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and thus the precise type of meditation that is reserved for the most advanced practitioners of the Nimbārka tradition. Even though the poetic imagery of the *kuñja* has already featured as the depictions of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's meetings in the *Gītagovinda* (Miller 1977:215), Clémentin-Ojha (1990:363) ascribes the first mention of the fact that these *kuñja/nikuñja* escapades occur eternally (*nitya vihāra/ nitya līlā*) to Harivyāsa Devācārya. However, Śrībhaṭṭa has already mentioned this trope:

May I serve the pastimes of the forests of the holy Vṛndāvana,
Where the auspicious form of the Divine Couple reside eternally.²⁷⁶

The idea of the eternal nature of the pastimes of Vṛndāvana has not been referred to prior to this, and it becomes a central tenet for the tradition after this point. This tenet also filters into the theology of Svāmī Haridāsa, Hita Harivaṁśa and to a lesser extent the Gauḍīya authors. Equally noteworthy is the fact that the *Yugalaśataka* is the first work in which Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are described as eternally

²⁷⁶ *seūm śrīvṛndāvipina bilāsa || jahām jugala mili maṅgala mūrati karata nirantara bāsa||*
Yugalaśataka 10

married.²⁷⁷ Furthermore, this is argueably perhaps the first work in which Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are stated to be the same being in essence:

Rādhā and Mādhava are an extraordinary couple,
The forever youthful boy and girl unified in essence
Always and eternally enjoy pastimes, never separating (*avicala*).²⁷⁸

Possibly due to the brevity of the work these themes are not sufficiently explored, as priority is given to the descriptions of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's pastimes. Though Jayadeva, Vidyāpati and other poets have previously described Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's erotic dalliances, Śrībhaṭṭa presents Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa by developing the principle of the *nitya līlā* and the *aṣṭayāma līlā* which are both centred in Goloka-Vṛndāvana's Nikuñja grove. These developments can perhaps be attributed to developments made by Śrībhaṭṭa's predecessors, however, there is no evidence available currently to corroborate this.

7.3.4 Śrībhaṭṭa: the First Brajbhāṣā Author on the *aṣṭayāma līlā*

Disregarding the current structure of the *Yugalaśataka* which was redacted through Rūparasika's editorial efforts in the late 16th or early 17th century, there are a few striking points about this work. Śrībhaṭṭa, being a Brajvāsī (Vrajavāsin) Gauḍa-Brāhmaṇa, used his mother-tongue to give expression to the hidden meditations that were prevalent at the time in Vraja, especially in the Nimbārka tradition, as hinted at in the works of the former *ācāryas* as above. The *Yugalaśataka* should

²⁷⁷ *Yugalaśataka* 99

²⁷⁸ *rādhā mādhava adbhuta jorī | sadā sanātana ika rasa biharata avicala navala kiśora kiśorī ||*
Yugalaśataka 59

not therefore be viewed as the production of a sustained integrated endeavour, but rather as the collection of various poems in accordance with the meditative mood of the author on any given day.

Śrībhṭṭa's writings display various *rasas* of *bhakti*, including *dāsyā bhaktirasa*²⁷⁹ and *sakhya bhaktirasa*,²⁸⁰ but the author manages to sublimate them into *mādhurya bhakti rasa*, giving precedence to *sakhībhāva upāsanā* when describing the various pastimes of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. Śrībhṭṭa is not the originator of these themes and motifs since they stretch back through Jayadeva to earlier Prakrit poetry. However, his innovation lies in the fact that whereas before they existed in languages such as Prakrit, Avahaṭṭha, Bengali, and the language of the lettered, Sanskrit, his efforts made this particular theology generally accessible to those familiar with the language of Vraja. Indeed, there are many *padas* devoted to the rest of *vraja līlā* in addition to *nikuñja* and *vṛndāvana līlā*, perhaps due to the status Keśava Kāśmīrin allots to the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* in his works, but for the most part Śrībhṭṭa is preoccupied with describing Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. Śrībhṭṭa was composing poetry from around the time of the birth of Sūradāsa. It is quite possible that there were many other such composers at the time of Śrībhṭṭa, whose works unfortunately do not survive. Still, from the available sources it appears that Śrībhṭṭa is the first author of Brajbhāṣā poetry on the *nitya līlās* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa not only in the Nimbārka Sampradāya, but of any *sampradāya* based in Vraja.

²⁷⁹ *Yugalaśataka* 1

²⁸⁰ *Yugalaśataka* 20

This theory finds further support in the *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa. Whilst scholarly analyses of various *chappayas* of the *Bhaktamāla* have resulted in *rasika* and *mādhurya bhāva* being thought of as the inventions of either Svāmī Haridāsa or Hita Harivaṁśa, none of these investigations take into account the *chappayas* that deal with members of the Nimbārka Sampradāya at that particular time (Gautam 1975:197-198). In comparing the *chappayas* on Śrībhaṭṭa (76), Hita Harivaṁśa (90), Svāmī Haridāsa (91), Harirāma Vyāsa (92) and others, it is clear that Nābhādāsa thinks of Śrībhaṭṭa as the original Brajbhāṣā revealer of the *mādhurya līlās* (*nitya līlās* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in the *mādhurya rasa* mood):

His heart rejoices seeing the sight of the amorous līlās of the divine couple,
filled with *mādhurya rasa*; from the heart of this poet, the showers of love pour forth.
Incessantly he bestows firm devotion to all in order for them to cross
the sea of transmigration,
For when the moon of his fame rises,
the darkness of anxiety and confusion in the hearts of devotees is dispelled.
The wise Śrībhaṭṭa,
worshipping the root of bliss that is the Son of Nanda and the Daughter of Vṛṣabhānu,
revealed the unstoppable rasa, which brought great delight to the minds of the Rasikas.²⁸¹

Nābhādāsa uses the word *rasika* elsewhere in the *Bhaktamāla* only in reference to Svāmī Haridāsa,²⁸² and he states that this is because of Svāmī Haridāsa's daily chanting of the name of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, and seeing the *līlās* in his eternal form of a *sakhī*.²⁸³ Nābhādāsa however does not attribute the phenomenon itself to Svāmī Haridāsa. Hita Harivaṁśa, as described therein, is an extremely devoted worshipper of Rādhā: but nothing is said of him revealing this type of worship for

²⁸¹ *madhura bhāva sammilita lalita līlā suvalita chavi | nirakhata haraṣata hṛdai prema baraṣata sukalita kavi || bhava nistārana heta deta draḍha bhakti sabana nita | jāsu sujasa sasi udai harata ati tam-bhrama-śram cita || ānaṁda kaṁda śrī nanda suta śrī vṛṣabhānasutā bhajana | śrībhaṭṭa subhaṭa pragatya aghaṭa rasa rasikana mana moda ghana || Bhaktamāla of Nābhādāsa chappaya 76*

²⁸² *āsadhīra uḍyota kara rasika chāpa haridāsa kī || Bhaktamāla of Nābhādāsa, chappaya 92*

²⁸³ *avalokata rahaiṁ kelī sakhī sukha ke adhikārī || Bhaktamāla of Nābhādāsa, chappaya 92*

the first time. Even though Harirāma Vyāsa terms himself a *rasika* (Pauwels 1996b:7-9), Harirāma Vyāsa is remembered by Nābhādāsa for ripping his sacrificial cord to re-string the ankle-bracelet of Rādhā which had broken during a performance of the *rāsa līlā* in Vṛndāvana which was attended by holy men (*chappaya* 92). Moreover, Sūrādāsa is allotted greatness in the realm of poetry to Kṛṣṇa, and the majesty of his compositions is lauded (*chappaya* 73). But in terms of *mādhurya rasa*, *rasikas* and even Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa themselves, Nābhādāsa does not relay these phenomena as being their contributions, otherwise this fact would have been mentioned in a manner similar to his description of Śrībhaṭṭa.

It can be supposed, then, at least from the *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa, that Śrībhaṭṭa is the first to reveal the intimate *līlās* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in Brajbhāṣā. Taking into account his chronology, it can be suggested that the Sanskrit works of the Gauḍīya Gosvāmins and the later Brajbhāṣā writings of Svāmī Haridāsa and others benefit from the theories presented in the writings of Śrībhaṭṭa.

7.4 Harivyāsa Devācārya

Harivyāsa Devācārya is known to have composed the commentary styled the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* on the *Daśaślokī*, the *Mahāvāṇī* on his preceptor Śrībhaṭṭa's *Yugalaśataka*; the *Premābhaktivivardhinī* commentary on the *Nimbārkaśatanāmastotram* of Sadānandabhaṭṭa, the ritual manual entitled *Gopālapaddhati*; and the *Gurubhaktiprakāśikā* on the *Laghustavarāja* of Śrīnivāsa. He is supposed to have composed an independent work titled the *Bhāvanāprakāśa*

on the *aṣṭayāma līlās* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, which was available in manuscript form until at least Gautam's pioneering work (Gautam 1975:79).

Harivyāsa is linked with many miraculous occurrences, the most famous of which is his initiation of Durgā at Caṭathāvala village, an episode which is recounted in *Bhaktamāla chappaya 77*.²⁸⁴ He also dispatched twelve main disciples on missionary work throughout India, each of which founded their own sub-lineage, a few of which still exist (Clémentin-Ojha 1990:345). Paraśurāma Devācārya was selected as the superintendent of the entire tradition and its sub-branches due to Harivyāsa passing on to him the Sarveśvara *śālagrāma* deity that had been worshipped by all leaders of the tradition. Consequently, the heirs to Paraśurāma's seat in Salemabad are revered as the 'Jagadguru Nimbārkācārya' and maintain *de jure* leadership over all branches of the tradition (Śaraṇa 1972:162-164).

7.4.1 Harivyāsa Devācārya's Chronology

Clémentin-Ojha (1990:350) has discussed in detail a plausible dating for Harivyāsa, which she suggests is 1494-1574. This can be refined further by assessing what is known of the leaders of the sect before and after Harivyāsa. As a result I would propose to date him to approximately 1470-1540. This dating must be based on certain assumptions. Whereas all the Nimbārkīs before Harivyāsa had probably been schooled in south India or Kashmir, Harivyāsa being a Gauḍa-brāhmaṇa from Mathurā would likely have elected to study in Vārāṇasi. In

²⁸⁴ Clémentin-Ojha (2003) is a dedicated article to this episode.

accordance with brāhmaṇical practice, an eight-year-old Harivyāsa would have been sent to study in Kāśī and would have completed his studies around twenty-two years of age.

A Pāñcarātrika scholar named Kṛṣṇadeva was the author of a ritual manual entitled *Nṛsimhaparicaryā*. According to Gopinath Kaviraj in *Kāśī kī Sārasvata Sādhanā* (1962), he noticed a manuscript of this work in the library of the Sarasvatī Bhavana of the Government Sanskrit College, Vārāṇasi, that was part of a collection of Mahīdhara, a Mādhyandinīya *Śuklayajurveda* commentator who purchased it in 1583, whose collection was later donated there for safekeeping. Annotations on the manuscript reveal that ‘Harivyāsadeva’ transcribed it in V.S. 1525, or 1468 (Kaviraj 1962:25). Clémentin-Ojha is suspicious of both the dating of this manuscript and Narayandutt Sharma’s conclusion based on it that Harivyāsa lived from 1440-1544 (Sharma 1990:349). However, the 1583 date of purchase of the manuscript by Mahīdhara is without doubt (Kaviraj 1962:25), and serves as a good indicator that Harivyāsa had passed on before then. Harivyāsa could have transcribed this particular manuscript as a young student in Vārāṇasi, but without having seen it to verify the dating on the manuscript itself, nothing further can be concluded. If indeed the dating and handwriting are consistent, then the chronology suggested here will have to be adjusted accordingly. I am sceptical of the early transcription date of 1468, as it would imply a date of birth of around 1455 for Harivyāsa. Rather than simply assume that the name and dating are spurious, a more satisfactory expedient would be to simply revise our suggested date of birth for Harivyāsa down by fifteen years to 1455, resulting in him being around eighty-

five years old at his death. Still, due to the more compelling evidence given above in regards to Keśava Kāśmīrin and Śrībhaṭṭa, it can be concluded with some degree of certainty that Harivyāsa was born at the very latest around 1470 (if not earlier), and lived up until c.1540.

This suggested date of Harivyāsa's death can be substantiated as follows. In the branch of Svabhūrāma Devācārya (Harivyāsa's eldest disciple), Caturacintāmaṇi Nāgājī features in the *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa as a contemporary, 'Caturacintāmaṇi Nāgājī resides in a house in the *kuñja* at this time'.²⁸⁵ Nāgājī can therefore be assumed to have lived from roughly 1550 to 1630, his predecessor Paramānanda Devācārya from 1520 to 1600, his teacher Karṇahara Devācārya from 1500 to 1570 and his preceptor Svabhūrāma Devācārya from 1480 to 1550, as Svabhūrāma was known to be much older than Paraśurāma Devācārya. This is in line with the assumption that Harivyāsa passed away around 1540.

Śrībhaṭṭa's *Yugalaśataka* bears witness to the beginnings of *sakhībhāva upāsanā* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, a particular theology which became commonplace amongst all Vraja based Vaiṣṇavas of that time. Harivyāsa's *Mahāvāṇī* expands upon Śrībhaṭṭa's theory concerning the *sakhīs*. Harivyāsa would have also been witness to the developments in *mādhurya rasa* aesthetic theory made by Rūpa and Sanātana Gosvāmin, and the work of Harivyāsa seems to contain definite parallels with them (Clémentin-Ojha 2011:431). The similarity ends with the *Rādhākṛṣṇaṇoddeśadīpikā* composed in 1550 by Rūpa, and the *Govindalīlāmṛta*

²⁸⁵ *caturō nagana kuñja oka je basata aba* || Garg (2004:25)

of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja (1528-1617), as the list of the names of *sakhīs* in these works displays certain subtle differences to that of the Mahāvānī (see section 8.4). This lends support to the contention that Harivyāsa had died by 1540, perhaps prompting a re-working of the *sakhī* theology from a Gauḍīya viewpoint.

As stated above, the formulation of the *aṣṭayāma līlā* motif seems to be a development subsequent to the *Gītagovinda* as opposed to an innovation of Śrībhaṭṭa, but it follows a different line of evolution from that of Caṇḍīdāsa and others who were more interested in the illicit aspect of Rādhā and love in separation. The presentation of the *aṣṭayāma* in the Nimbārka tradition differs radically from even the Puṣṭimārga presentation, which focuses on the eight-watches in a day of the child Kṛṣṇa rather than of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. It is, however, similar to descriptions by Svāmī Haridāsa and his followers, the Gauḍīyas, the Rādhāvallabhīs and other Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa worshippers (see section 8.4). Which group influenced the other is the subject of heated debate between adherents of the different traditions even today. However, it is clear that even though Harivyāsa did exert some influence, it was Śrībhaṭṭa who is remembered as a pioneer, as noticed in the *chappaya* of Nābhādāsa's *Bhaktamāla*, which states that Śrībhaṭṭa made these details of *mādhurya rasa*, and thus the *āṣṭayāma līlā* specific to the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa worshippers, public for the first time.²⁸⁶

There is another external corroborative statement pointed out by Hawley (2013) in his work on the four-*sampradāya* classification. In the doxography of Mūbad Śāh

²⁸⁶ *Bhaktamāla* of Nābhādāsa, *chappaya* 76, as above.

entitled *Dabistān-i Mazāhib* (School of Religions), there is a chapter devoted to Vaiṣṇavas and *vairāgīs*, in which he lists the names of the four *sampradāyas*, according to his, or his informant Nārāin Dās', classification. In the list of the four Vaiṣṇava *sampradāyas* he includes the peculiar name 'Harbayāntī' and in that of the four types of *vairāgī sampradāyas* he lists the name 'Nīmānuja'. These are both used as designations amongst the Nimbārki, but what is perhaps particularly significant is that at the time of the conversation between Mūbad Śāh and the Rāmānandī Vairāgī Nārāin Dās in Lahore in 1642, Harbayāntī, which is a corrupt transmission of Harivyāsī, was synonymous with the Nimbārka Sampradāya (Hawley 2013:24-25). The term Harivyāsī is first coined by Paraśurāma's contemporary Rūparasika in his *Harivyāsayaśāmṛta* and it can accordingly be assumed that Harivyāsa had been dead for a sizable amount of time in order for this term to have percolated into the purview of Vaiṣṇavas beyond the Nimbārka Sampradāya, such as Nārāin Dās, who were resident in or visiting Lahore. These facts provide strong support for my interpretation of the chronology of Harivyāsa.

7.5 Conclusion

Aside from his Brajbhāṣā *magnum opus* the *Mahāvāṇī*, which has been published in both a critical edition with an introduction (Gautam 1975) and a Hindi translation (Beriwala 1994), Harivyāsa Devācārya's lesser-known works are in Sanskrit. Bose (1943 vol. 3:133) seems to not have been acquainted with the complete list, but she does mention a commentary to the Daśāślokī entitled the *Siddhāntakusumāñjali*, which she states is attributed to Harivyāsa. This is in fact a

spurious identification, as internal evidences in the *Siddhāntakusumāñjali* demonstrate that the author is definitely posterior to Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, from whom the author borrows many concepts. In fact, Harivyāsa Devācārya's actual commentary on the *Daśaślokī* is entitled the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali*, which has been published numerous times, and adheres to the tenets of the tradition. Another work which Bose (1943 vol.3:133) points to, the *Tattvārthapañcaka* is actually an alternative name for the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* which expounds the five *tattvas* Nimbārka enumerates in *Daśaślokī* 10. These contributions render Harivyāsa Devācārya an indispensable part of the history of not only the doctrinal development within the Nimbārka Sampradāya, but of the theological advancements of Vraja as a whole. A comprehensive comparative study of the *aṣṭayāma līlās* as presented by the Nimbārka, Vallabha, Gauḍīya, Haridāsa and Rādhāvallabha traditions would be a fruitful area of investigation for those interested in the sectarian interactions of 16th century Vraja. To understand the role Harivyāsa played in the history of the Nimbārka Sampradāya, however, comparison of his theological and philosophical positions with those of his predecessors will be instigated. As he produced the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* commentary on the *Daśaślokī* and the *Mahāvāñī* exposition of the *Yugalāśataka*, it is possible to conduct such an investigation. Moreover, having discussed the chronology of Harivyāsa and suggested a plausible dating of 1470-1540, theories can now be posited regarding the impact, if any, his writings had on contemporaries and to what extent he was influenced in his work.

Chapter 8

Back to Basics: Harivyāsa vs. Puruṣottama on *Daśaślokī* verse 5

The *Mahāvāṇī* is well regarded by scholars such as Thielemann (2000:81) and Goswami (1966), and devotees alike for its beautiful poetry and exhaustive descriptions of the intimate pastimes of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in the Nikuñja groves of Goloka-Vṛndāvana. However, it would be logical firstly to analyse the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali*, as it is a commentary on the *Daśaślokī*, and compare it with Puruṣottama's *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* to understand the developments in the Vedāntic rationale behind Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in the Nimbārka tradition. Then I will turn to the *Mahāvāṇī*, comparing it with the *Yugalaśataka* to comprehend any advances in the *nitya līlā* theology of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa displayed.

8.1 Translation of *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* on *Daśaślokī* verse 5

After Puruṣottama, Harivyāsa was the only leader of the Nimbārka tradition before modern times to comment upon the *Daśaślokī*. At least five centuries separate the two, during which period there were many developments in Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa theology, as noted above. By analysing the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* specifically on the commentary to *Daśaślokī* verse 5, it will be possible to see whether Harivyāsa follows Puruṣottama's interpretation or whether he provides an alternative. The following translation of the section in question²⁸⁷ will enable further discussion.

²⁸⁷ For the Sanskrit text, see Appendix II

Next, [Nimbārka] recollects the pre-eminent form of the Lord who is to be worshipped as a couple with the verse beginning ‘on his left side’:

We contemplate Rādhā who blissfully shines with a corresponding beauty on [his] left side, who is eternally attended by thousands of female friends, who is the goddess who bestows all wished-for desires. [Daśaśloka 5]

The syntactical order is: We contemplate the daughter of Śrī Vṛṣabhānu on the left side of Śrī Kṛṣṇa who has multitudes of infinite, faultless and auspicious qualities. What is she like? She bestows all wished for desires, giving the rewards that are desired. She is the ‘devī’ [goddess], or one who is shining. She is attended on by groups of female friends who are the supreme commanders of the [various] groups [of *sakhīs*] headed by Śrī Lalitā, Raṅgadevī and the rest, who are situated in their [respective] places of attendance. She is being served completely and therefore she shines more. ‘With a corresponding beauty’ means She whose beauty is corresponding to His, as stated in the Śrī Bhāgavata[*purāṇa*]:

‘Seeing her, the beautiful Śrī, who has no other goal [but Him], who had taken a body with a form corresponding to his by way of the pastime, he was pleased. Smilingly, Hari spoke to her, whose ambrosial face [was adorned with] locks of hair, earrings, a locket on her neck, and an enthused smile.’ (*Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 10.60.9)

This is the intention. According to the statement of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata[*purāṇa*]:

‘The inseparable goddess Śrī is the soul of Hari manifest’. (*Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 12.11.20)

The eternal and inherent connection of Śrī [to Hari] is accepted by all [*pramāṇas*]. Śrī has two forms – Śrī and Lakṣmī, which is accordingly stated in the revealed scriptural passages:

‘Śrī and Lakṣmī are [his] two wives, day and night are [his] two sides’ (*Śuklayajurveda Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā* 31.22)²⁸⁸
‘Invoke here Śrī, who is the source of all fragrance, difficult to approach, eternally abundant, the fueller, the superintendent of all beings.’ (*Śrīsūkta* 9)

Of them, she who is Śrī is the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu, and she who is Lakṣmī takes the form of Rukmiṇī and the rest. Per the Viṣṇu [Purāṇa]

‘When he is divine, she has a divine body, when he is human, she has a human [body]. She makes her own body correspond to that of Visnu.’ (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.9.145)

and, according to the statement of Nārada:

‘Whichever body is taken by the Lord, the master Hari, Śrī, who is inseparable from the Lord, then takes [similar] ones [as if] unwillingly.’ (Untraced)

Śrī Rādhā is pre-eminent amongst all other forms [of Śrī], according to the authoritative [statements] of the revealed scriptures. Accordingly, the revealed scriptures [state]:

‘Rādhā with Mādhava, and Mādhava with Rādhā’²⁸⁹.
‘He who sees a difference between these two does not become liberated from transmigration’.²⁹⁰

²⁸⁸ Elsewhere it is *hrīś ca*.

²⁸⁹ *Rkpariśiṣṭa*, in a portion that perhaps refers to stars, though untraced at the moment. This is paralleled by *Taittirīyasamhitā* 4.4.11. The present verse is a variant on the oft-quoted *rādhayā mādhave devo mādhavenaiva rādhikā, vibhrājate janeṣv...*

in the *Kṛṣṇopaniṣad*:

‘On [his] left side, together, is the goddess Rādhā, the queen of Vṛndāvana’.
(Untraced).

In the *Paramāgamacūḍāmaṇi*[saṁhitā] of the *Nāradapañcarātra*, and other [recollected] scriptures, it is stated:

‘Rādhā is half of the body of Hari, Rādhā is an ocean of love. She is known as the lotus amongst lotuses, and is unfathomable for yogins.’ (Untraced)

There again:

‘One who worships Kṛṣṇa together with Rādhā daily will have devotion to the Lord, and liberation will be in his hands.’ (Untraced)

‘If one desires all riches, he should daily worship Viṣṇu and Śrī, who bestow boons and are the source of blessings.’ (*Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 6.19.9)

In the *Brahmavaivarta*[purāṇa]:

‘The esteemed Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī [Vāṇī] will take birth there, but Śrī will be the daughter of Vṛṣabhānu, Rādhā.’

In the *Bṛhadgautamīya* [Tantra]:

‘The Goddess who consists of Kṛṣṇa is said to be Rādhā, the Supreme Deity. She consists of all [Goddesses such as] Lakṣmī [etc.], having a bewitching golden hue, and [She is] the Supreme.’

Also, in the *Brahmasaṁhitā*:

‘He who is Kṛṣṇa is also Rādhā, and She who is Rādhā is also Kṛṣṇa. One who would see difference between the two will not be liberated from rebirth.’²⁹¹

In the *Sammohanatantra*:

‘From that [Original Being], the light became two-fold, having the form of Rādhā and Mādhava’. (*Sammohanatantra*’s *Gopālasahasranāmastotram*, introductory verses.)

Therefore, it is established that Śrī Rādhā is supreme [amongst Kṛṣṇa’s *śaktis*] in as much as she is the form of Śrī.

²⁹⁰ Untraced, though forms a part of a quote from a certain ‘*Brahmasaṁhitā*’ which Harivyāsa uses below. For him, this constituted a *śruti* statement.

²⁹¹ This verse does not feature in the extant *Brahmasaṁhitā*, chapter 5, of the Gauḍīyas. Interestingly, it is quoted by Nayanānanda Ṭhākura in his *Preyobhaktirasārnava* as coming from an ‘*Ādisaṁhitā*’. In his quotation, there is a variant reading of ‘Rāma’ for ‘Rādhā’, which he uses to establish the similarity of [Bala]rāma and Kṛṣṇa. Nevertheless, it is untraceable in both accounts. Matsubara (1994) gives a tentative date of 1300CE for the *Brahmasaṁhitā*. Caitanya is reputed to have re-discovered only its fifth chapter from a temple in south India, but as the verse quoted here does not feature therein, it is evident that the sources are different.

8.2 Analysis of the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* on *Daśaślokī* verse 5

Immediately striking is the brevity of Harivyāsa's commentary on this verse of the *Daśaślokī* in comparison to that of Puruṣottama. This implies that Harivyāsa was located in a tradition that had already accepted Rādhā, and more importantly, that the *mādhurya upāsanā* as promoted by his predecessor had already gained currency amongst adherents to the tradition. Puruṣottama's commentary appears decidedly defensive in order to rationalise this verse for the orthodox sensibilities of his day due to the apparent heterodox origins of Rādhā, which in turn supports the argument that the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* was composed before Rādhā became an accepted dimension of Vaiṣṇava theology. Another reason for his conciseness is that Harivyāsa does not need to elaborate on Rādhā, having done so already in the *Mahāvāñī*. It seems that Harivyāsa simply intends to adduce sufficient scriptural support for Nimbārka's statement without any further amplification.

It is equally clear that Harivyāsa understands the subject of this verse to be Rādhā alone as Parabrahman in union with Kṛṣṇa, in contrast to Puruṣottama's refocusing of the purport of the verse by altering the subject. This is particularly revealing, as Harivyāsa is boldly stating that in his understanding of the *devī tattva*, Puruṣottama is categorically wrong. Harivyāsa achieves this simply by not referring the reader back to Puruṣottama's comments on this verse, and not following the pattern he established.

Harivyāsa’s task, therefore, would appear simpler: he needs only to define Rādhā’s position. Yet this cannot be accomplished without a re-examination of the sources that were utilised by Puruṣottama. Harivyāsa carries this out by accepting the fact that Śrī and Lakṣmī are two different entities on the basis of *Śuklayajurveda Vājasaneyī Samhitā* 31.22, and the *Śrīsūkta*, which never states the names Lakṣmī and Śrī in the same *mantra* in any of its fifteen *mantras*. For Harivyāsa, Śrī is Rādhā and Lakṣmī is Rukmiṇī (in Kṛṣṇa’s incarnation), as also held by Puruṣottama; but whereas for Puruṣottama Lakṣmī is the goddess, Harivyāsa establishes the supremacy of Rādhā over all other *śaktis*. Like Puruṣottama, he supplies many scriptural passages that support his position. However, Harivyāsa employs Pāñcarātra sources where Puruṣottama endeavours to restrict himself to the accepted *śruti* and *smṛti*. Many of these Pāñcarātra sources date from after the first millennium and, most importantly, Harivyāsa also cites passages from the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, again making it clear that the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* either had not been composed by the time of Puruṣottama, or it had not attained the status of an authoritative text for these Vaiṣṇavas: Harivyāsa’s *parama guru* Keśava Kāśmīrin was the first recorded theologian of this tradition to accord the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* the status of an authoritative text.

8.2.1 The *Siddhāntaratnāñjali*’s *sakhīs*

The difference between Puruṣottama and Harivyāsa’s interpretations is substantial, especially where they comment upon another crucial phrase of *Daśaślokī* verse 5, ‘served by thousands of female friends (*sakhīs*)’. For Puruṣottama, this statement of Nimbārka refers to the servants of Lakṣmī in Vaikuṅṭha. Harivyāsa, on the other

hand, specifically states that they are ‘Lalitā, Raṅgadevī and the rest’. These figures are further described as the famed *yūtheśvarīs*, where each of the *aṣṭasakhīs* is in command of their own legion (*yūtha*) of *sakhīs*.

Though it is apparent from the *Mahāvāṇī* that Harivyāsa had detailed knowledge of *sakhī* theology, he does not refer to the *sakhīs* in any sort of detail in the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* due to the fact that the audience of the latter work would not necessarily be eligible to access detailed discussions on the *sakhīs* (Okita 2014:10). Sanskrit works of the leaders of this tradition are aimed at an audience wider than their own disciples, and especially with the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali*, it is apparent that Harivyāsa is speaking to prospective recruits and newly initiated practitioners, setting out the scriptural basis for the mode of worship they are about to undertake as followers of the Nimbārka Sampradāya. He emphasises the fact that there is eternal union between ‘Hari’ and ‘Śrī’, which in itself is suggested by the name ‘Haripriyā’, his own *chāpa* employed in the *Mahāvāṇī* to signify Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and himself interchangeably. The focus of his theology is located far from Kṛṣṇa’s exploits on earth, in which Rukmiṇī would necessarily feature as the incarnation of Lakṣmī, to a form of meditation which focuses solely on the abstract meditational construct of the *nikuñja līlās* to the exclusion of all others. Harivyāsa does not quote from the *Gopālatāpinī Upaniṣad* at all in this portion, as the focus is on the pastimes of Kṛṣṇa during his incarnation and feature Rukmiṇī, so as to reinforce Rādhā’s eternal supremacy and union by means of other scriptural supports. This is markedly different to Puruṣottama’s theology, but apparently much closer to the intended theology of Nimbārka.

There is a distinction discernible to a lesser extent in the *Yugalaśataka* but definitely in the *Mahāvāṇī*, with regards to *gopīs* and *sakhīs*. The *gopīs* of Vraja are the wives of the cowherders; some are Yaśodā's age, others are younger and a few are older. These feature throughout the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* and are referred to in the *Yugalaśataka*, where the *gopīs* take snacks out to Kṛṣṇa who has taken the cows grazing in the forest. However, when the focus is on the *nikuñja līlā*, the female friends involved are no longer *gopīs* but *sakhīs*. These friends are different in that they do not harbour the desires of the *gopīs* to enjoy Kṛṣṇa as their husband; rather they are filled with an un-selfish love for both Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa equally. They do not desire anything from them but to see them; even in the *rāsa līlā*, Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa dance with the *sakhīs* but are intimate only with each other. Scholars of the tradition such as Gautam (1975:154) infer that when Nimbārka utilises the word *sakhī* in *Daśaślokī* verse 5, he does so with the intention of referring to *sakhīs* who possess these specific characteristics, not the *gopīs* in general.

8.2.2 *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* on *svakīyā* Rādhā

Harivyāsa's commentary on *Daśaślokī* verse 5 in the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* displays unfamiliarity with the detailed scholarship of Jīva Gosvāmin, who, building on the work of Rūpa and Sanātana, developed an exegetical tradition that was able to provide sufficient scriptural support for Rādhā's superiority. Their developments moved in a slightly different direction from that of Harivyāsa and the Nimbārka's, as their highest meditations contained Rādhā as the *parakīyā* paramour, rather than the *svakīyā* wife of the Nimbārka Sampradāya traceable to at least the work of

Puruṣottama, if not of Nimbārka himself. Jones (1980: 30-35) is able to trace this phenomenon through the poets of Bengal into the Gauḍīya theology, and specifically to Rūpa Gosvāmin in his *Ujjvalanīlamaṇi* and *Dānakelikaumudī*. Although in some philosophical works both Rūpa and Jīva seem to support a *svakīya* doctrine, in Rūpa's dramas the theme is always *parakīya* (Jones 1980:43, 50-51). For Harivyāsa in both his theological and philosophical works Rādhā is *svakīya* in keeping with the general mood of the tradition, and he is able to focus on this mood by concentrating exclusively on the *nitya līlās* of Goloka-Vṛndāvana. Jīva holds that:

In the unmanifest (*aprākṛta*) Goloka, or eternal heaven, Kṛṣṇa is always married to Rādhā, but when they manifest in history for the sake of sport they appear unmarried (Jones 1980:57).

If Rūpa, Sanātana and Jīva were operating from a background familiar with the paramour themes presented in Bengali poetry which informed their devotion, it could only follow that philosophically presenting Rādhā as the *svakīya* wife of Kṛṣṇa in an eternal setting could stem from adapting to a theological *milieu* wherein such was the accepted doctrine. The influence of Śrībhakṣa's *Yugalaśataka* can thus be seen to have an effect on both Rūpa, Sanātana, and also on Jīva, a younger contemporary of Harivyāsa.

8.3 Harivyāsa's Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa: *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* vs. *Mahāvāṇī*

The *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* is another example of an authoritative work within the Nimbārka Sampradāya limiting the information that it is prepared to release to lesser-qualified Vaiṣṇavas. To understand what Harivyāsa reserved for the most

advanced of his disciples, one must turn to the *Mahāvāṇī* which is a repository of the tradition's most esoteric meditations on Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. Although Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and the *sakhīs* are first noticed in the Nimbārka tradition in the *Daśaślokī*, the importance of Vṛndāvana was highlighted first by Keśava Kāśmīrin and Śrībhāṭṭa. Consequently, the *Mahāvāṇī* focuses on four themes alone: Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, the *sakhīs* and Vṛndāvana. While philosophical developments surrounding Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in the Nimbārka Sampradāya up until Harivyāsa are clear, by examining the *Mahāvāṇī*, theological developments will also become apparent, as the meditational framework briefly touched upon in the *Yugalaśataka* is now fully explained.

8.3.1 Chronology of the *Mahāvāṇī*

Regarding the chronology of the *Mahāvāṇī*, there is perhaps one significant marker that is present in the text. The *yugala mahāmantra* (the [divine] couple's great *mantra*) is stated in Sevā Sukha 77: 'rādhe kṛṣṇa rādhe kṛṣṇa kṛṣṇa kṛṣṇa rādhe rādhe, rādhe śyāma rādhe śyāma śyāma śyāma rādhe rādhe'. It can be surmised that the *Mahāvāṇī* is posterior to Caitanya's visit to Vṛndāvana and Rūpa and Sanātana Gosvāmin's arrival in Mathurā for the following reason. Until Caitanya the *mantra* known simply as the *mahāmantra*, as read in the *Kalisanṭaraṇopaniṣad*, is: 'hare rāma hare rāma rāma rāma hare hare, hare kṛṣṇa hare kṛṣṇa kṛṣṇa kṛṣṇa hare hare'.²⁹² In order to popularise this Vedic mantra throughout all strata of society without transgressing the laws surrounding Vedic chanting, Caitanya

²⁹² *Kalisanṭaraṇopaniṣad* 2

inverted the order of the half-verses, whose original focus was either Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa or Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. It now read ‘*hare kṛṣṇa hare kṛṣṇa kṛṣṇa kṛṣṇa hare hare, hare rāma hare rāma rāma rāma hare hare*’. This is referred to by Rūpa Gosvāmin in his *Laghubhāgavatāmṛtam* 1.4, and clearly related in the earliest hagiography of Caitanya entitled the *Caitanyabhāgavata* of Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura (1507-1589).²⁹³ The order of the *yugala mahāmantra* indicates it was conceived of subsequent to this innovation of Caitanya, with ‘*rādhe*’ replacing ‘*hare*’ and ‘*śyāma*’ replacing ‘*rāma*’. Even though Beriwalla (1994:122) suggests that it was taken from the *Sammohanatantra* or the *Rāsollāsatantra*, it is untraceable therein and as such ours appears to be a plausible explanation. Another explanation is that Caitanya modelled his reconfiguration of the *mahāmantra* based on Harivyāsa’s *yugala mahāmantra*, but this seems less likely. This does not imply that Harivyāsa was posterior to Caitanya; as suggested before, Harivyāsa was an elder contemporary of Caitanya, Rūpa, Sanātana, Svāmī Haridās and Hita Harivaṁśa (see section 7.4.1). It does show that the *Mahāvāṇī* was composed after these theologians appeared in Vraja and suggests that it is necessary to further clarify the exact meditations taught by the Nimbārki *rasikas* in view of these other authors.

²⁹³ *Caitanyabhāgavata* 1.14.143-147

8.3.2 Contents of the *Mahāvāṇī*

At the outset, Harivyāsa highlights the characteristics of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa which will form the subject of his work. The first two verses of the *Sakhīnāmaratnāvalistotra*, which is the preface to the *Mahāvāṇī*, are:

Prostrations to the Lord [Bhagavat] Kṛṣṇa, whose wisdom is ever-fresh. Prostrations to him, who revels eternally in the ocean of the nectar of the lips of Rādhā. I always worship Rādhā who is verily Kṛṣṇa, and Kṛṣṇa who is [none other than] Rādhā, who are the essence of the *klīm bīja* [referred to as 'ka' and 'la' in exegetical treatises such as the *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī*], situated in Nikuñja, and [take] the form of the preceptor.²⁹⁴

Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are united, and here the union is one of intimacy. In an explanation unique to Harivyāsa, this union is expressed in the *klīm bīja mantra*, which is a marked advancement from Nimbārka's own explanation of the *Gopāla mantra* in the *Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī*. Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are residents of Nikuñja, the groves of Goloka-Vṛndāvana, and do not venture into any other landscape. After the *Sakhīnāmaratnāvalistotra*, the *Mahāvāṇī* commences.

The five chapters of the *Mahāvāṇī* are *Sevā Sukha* (128 *padas*), which describes the daily routine of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, *Utsāha Sukha* (189 *padas*) detailing the celebration of the various festivals, *Surata Sukha* (106 *padas*) revealing the intimate pastimes, *Sahaja Sukha* (107 *padas*) going into further details about the couple, and *Siddhānta Sukha* (44 *padas*) which summarises the philosophical

²⁹⁴ *namas tasmai bhagavate kṛṣṇāyākuñthamedhase | rādhādhārasudhāsindhau namo nityavihāriṇe || rādhām kṛṣṇasvarūpām vai kṛṣṇam rādhāsvarūpiṇam | kalātmānam nikuñjastham gururūpam sadā bhaje || Mahāvāṇī, Sakhīnāmaratnāvalistotram 1-2.*

position of the *nikuñja līlā* meditations. I will provide a brief synopsis of each section in the following.

8.3.3 The *aṣṭayāma līlā* of the *Mahāvāṇī*

Śrībhakṣa's *padas* were grouped together by Rūparasika on the basis of the framework of the *aṣṭayāma līlās* delineated in the *Mahāvāṇī*, possibly on the assumption that Harivyāsa as the disciple of Śrībhakṣa would be following his instruction in this regard and so placing the *padas* in the *aṣṭayāma līlā* ordering of Harivyāsa would not be problematic. The *Sevā Sukha* of the *Mahāvāṇī* commences with a statement that perhaps serves as a basis for this, as Harivyāsa praises Śrībhakṣa in his *sakhī* form as Hitū Sahacarī, who 'resides eternally with the lover and beloved' by whose grace he will describe the *līlās* of the eight watches of the day.²⁹⁵

Harivyāsa next sets out the method for meditation on such *līlās*. First, initiates should recite the *Sakhīnāmaratnāvalistotra*, then seeking the permission of the *sakhī* form of their preceptor, they themselves should enter into the mood of a *sakhī*, and join the other *sakhīs* in the plaza in front of the Mohana palace (the palace of love/congress rather than Kṛṣṇa's palace, as *mohana* can have both senses) as they begin the early morning routine of waking Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa.²⁹⁶ This

²⁹⁵ *jai jai śrīhitū sahararī bhārī prema rasa raṅga | pyārī prītama ke sadā rahata ju anudina saṅga|| aṣṭakāla baranana karūṁ tinakī kṛpā manāya | mahāvāṇī sevā ju sukha anukrama te daraśāya|| Mahāvāṇī*, *Sevā Sukha*, *dohās* 1-2

²⁹⁶ *sakhī nāma ratnāvalī stotra pāṭha tahām kīja | puni guru sakhina kṛpālu lahi yugala seva cita dīja || prātaḥ kāla hī ūṭhi ke dhāri sakhī kau bhāva | jāya mile nija rūpa so yākau yahai upāva ||*

‘Mohana Mandira’ is envisaged as being at the centre of an eight-petalled lotus, each petal serving as the station for each of the *aṣṭasakhīs* (Clémentin-Ojha 1990:363).

maṅgalā

As in the *Yugalaśataka*, Harivyāsa’s *sakhīs* describe Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa as they sleep, with clothes and limbs displaying the signs of congress from the night before.²⁹⁷ Harivyāsa then details the pre-dawn routine, developing on from the *Yugalaśataka*, with descriptions of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa resuming their love games, witnessing which causes bliss for the *sakhīs* and *sahacarīs*. So exhausted do Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa become in these games that even though they realise the sun is about to rise, they grab hold of the covers and pull them over their heads, fighting a losing battle, and due to the prompting of the *sakhīs*, they try to sit up on their bed and then come out to the main square.²⁹⁸ Another development on the theory follows, with Harivyāsa describing that particular scene:

The frolicsome duo stand in the plaza,
Arms wrapped around each other, they are coloured with the deep hues of amorous play.
Their clothes and ornaments are dishevelled; the nail marks on their chests are exceedingly marvellous,
Cheeks are [coloured with] *pīka* (the red-coloured saliva resulting from chewing *pāna*),
their lips are coloured with collyrium, their garlands are tangled up, enchanting the mind.
Their lotus eyes are reddened with exhaustion, the good-looking (*chaila-chabīle*) duo are drenched (*page*²⁹⁹) in *rasa*:
Haripriyā *sahacarī* stands in front of the adolescent couple, holding a mirror.³⁰⁰

mohana mandira cauka meṁ mili saba sakhī samāja | bīna bajāvahiṁ gāvahiṁ madhura madhura sura sāja || Mahāvāṇī, Sevā Sukha 3-5

²⁹⁷ *Mahāvāṇī* Sevā Sukha *padas* 3-6

²⁹⁸ *Mahāvāṇī* Sevā Sukha *pada* 13

²⁹⁹ This image refers to covering something in sugar syrup - *pāga meṁ page* where *pāga* is a sugar syrup, and *page* is the derived verb to mean sugar-syrup-coated or enveloped.

As Harivyāsa expands upon this image in this and the subsequent two *padas*, an important development is evident. Harivyāsa appears free to reveal the most intimate details concerning the love-play of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, which, although hinted at in the *Yugalaśataka*, are not described in these specific terms. The *Yugalaśataka* made expression of these themes possible at a particular theological moment in Vraja, with Śrībhaṭṭa as the interlocutor in the dialogue between the more brāhmaṇical concerns represented by his predecessor Keśava Kāśmīrin and the meditation of the *rasikas*, the result of which is evident not only in Harivyāsa's *Mahāvāṇī*, but in the works of Svāmī Haridāsa, Hita Harivaṁśa and their followers who also follow the paradigm of the *nitya līlā*.

śṛṅgāra

Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa then head towards the bathing grove, where seated upon a jewelled stool, they are each massaged with a cleansing mixture of clay and herbs (*uvaṭana*), followed by perfumed oils, after which they are bathed with fragrant water. Having been dried, they then head to the dressing grove, where they are seated upon a throne and are dressed and ornamented by the *sakhīs* after which they are shown a mirror. They are then given their breakfast, and Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa playfully feed each other. Upon completion, their hands and mouths are rinsed and they are given *pāna* mouth-fresheners. The *śṛṅgāra āraṭi* ceremony takes place, after which they begin their morning excursion throughout the groves, enjoying various pastimes as they go, the descriptions of which are lengthy.

³⁰⁰ *Mahāvāṇī Sevā Sukha pada* 18

rājabhoga

The midday meal (*rājabhoga*) is taken in a dedicated grove, and comprises a feast of fifty-six dishes. Upon completion, Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa wash, are offered *pāna* and then the *rājabhoga ārati* takes place. Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are escorted to another grove, and seated upon the throne, they are praised by the *sakhīs* who mention exactly how enamoured the divine couple appear, and make guesses as to what is on their minds. Finally, they conduct them back to their bed-chambers in the Yogapīṭha palace but do not enter the bedroom so that they do not cause the excited couple to become shy. This is not to say that the *sakhīs* disperse; rather they remain and watch the love sports from their hidden vantage points, affording them the bliss promised in the scriptures and making them request the lord that they may never lose the opportunity to witness this divine sport of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. The *sakhīs*, acknowledging that the divine couple are the source of all other divine incarnations and personalities, then begin to praise them.

utthāpana

After they have slept for a while, Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are woken up and escorted to the *utthāpana* grove to be fed their late-afternoon snacks, *pāna* and offered the *utthāpana ārati*. Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa then head out into the groves, but seeing that the couple are getting anxious to engage in their intimate trysts, the *sakhīs* quickly bring Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa to the *sandhyā* (twilight) grove.

sandhyā

The *sandhyā ārati* is offered. The *sakhīs* sing them praises to the accompaniment of musical instruments; some of them dance and others display their various talents. After they engage in a little love-play, the couple are escorted to another grove to have *vyārū* evening snacks and sweetened warmed milk, which is followed by more *pāna*.

śayana

Seeing that the divine couple are again restless, the *sakhīs* perform the *śayana ārati*, and then lead them to their bed where Śrībhaṭṭa's *sakhī*-self, Śrīhitū Sahacarī, massages their feet. As soon as they have fallen asleep, she leaves them and closes the doors. That cannot stop the *sakhīs* from attaining their *ānanda* (bliss), and they look through the holes of the window screens, enjoying bliss as they see the sleeping form of their Lord.

rāsa līlā

At around midnight, the *sakhīs*, knowing the desires of the Lord, awaken them and decorate them with pearl necklaces, following which they all exit the palace into the cool night and head to the *rāsa* circular platform. The couple ascend the stage and begin to dance the dance named *sudhāṅga*. Their excitement rises, seeing which the *sakhīs* prepare the marriage grove for their wedding. They adorn Rādhā-

Kṛṣṇa with wedding garments and jewellery and have the wedding performed with one goal – so that the divine couple can enjoy their eternal wedding-night.

After this, they emerge and sit upon their throne as the *sakhīs* sing them the last praises of the night, having listened to which Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa thank each of the *sakhīs* for their service and retire to their palace for much needed rest. The *sakhīs* sing lullabies and then retire to praise the leader of their troupe, Raṅgadevī, who is none other than Nimbārka, who together with Navyavāsā, Śrīnivāsa's *sakhī* form, and the rest, are responsible for causing 'supreme delight' to Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. The *sakhīs* then retire to sleep and get ready for a day filled with new delights, although adhering to the set pattern.

There is a stern warning at the end of the chapter:

Never speak about or listen to the topics contained in this [chapter entitled] *Sevā Sukha* with those who lack the requisite faith, who are atheists or who are not Vaiṣṇavas. Moreover, this should only be discussed with those who solely worship [through the path of *parā bhakti*] in the mood of the *sakhīs* as residents of [eternal] Vṛndāvana.³⁰¹

Considering the last point, it should be noted that this cannot be a reference to physically living in Vṛndāvana, as Harivyāsa himself resided in Dhruva Ṭīlā. Rather, Harivyāsa is stating that the advanced devotees should meditate always as being within Vṛndāvana as *sakhīs*. This is in contrast to the other traditions that encourage their followers to take up residence in Vṛndāvana itself.³⁰²

³⁰¹ *hīnaśraddha nāstika hari dharma bahir mukha hoi | jinasom yaha jasa mahārāsa kahau sunau jini koi || kahau sunau jini koi binā ika anamni upāsika | tāhū mem yaha bhāva sakhī vṛndāvana vāsika || Mahāvāṇī, Sevā Sukha, kuṇḍaliyā*

³⁰² For example Prabodhānanda Sarasvatī's *Vṛndāvanamahimāmṛta* 1.5, 1.75-76; *Caityacaritāmṛta*, Madhyalīlā 8.254

8.3.4 Theology of the *Mahāvāṇī*

In accordance with the views of his predecessor, Harivyāsa accepts the unified couple of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa as Parabrahman, their pastimes to be eternal, the location for the pastimes to be the Nikuṅja groves of Goloka-Vṛndāvana, and the *sakhīs* to be the liberated souls who serve Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. He amplifies a few issues which serve as points of delineation, both as markers of development from his predecessor and as boundaries of differentiation from the similar traditions of Svāmī Haridāsa and Hita Harivaṁśa.

Firstly, as noted in the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are simultaneously unified and married in accordance with the description of the *Daśaślokī* (Clémentin-Ojha 1990:364), but the manner in which this duality enables them to experience the *līlās* of Goloka-Vṛndāvana is not therein clarified. In the *Mahāvāṇī* however, Harivyāsa explains:

Eternally one in form but two in name,
Śyāmā is the delight of bliss, and the bliss of delight is Śyāma.
Forever and always the couple are one united body,
and that singular enjoys Vṛndāvana as a couple.
Hari and Priyā are the personification of incessant, eternal, wondrous and beautiful love.³⁰³

Secondly, Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are stated to be the cumulative whole of all constituent parts, the source of all emanations and incarnations,³⁰⁴ superior even to the

³⁰³ *eka rūpa sadā dvai nāma | ānānda ke āhlādani śyāmā āhlādani ke ānānda śyāma|| sadā sarvadā jugala eka tana eka jugala tana vilasata dhāma | śrī hari priyā nirantara nitapradi kāmārūpa adbhuta abhirāma || Mahāvāṇī Siddhānta Sukha 26*

³⁰⁴ *aṁsana ke aṁsī avatāra avatārī | kārana ke kāranīka maṅgala mahārī || Mahāvāṇī Siddhānta Sukha 34*

supreme deity,³⁰⁵ of whom the controller of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*, who is also known as Paramātman, is but a portion.³⁰⁶ This development is possible only in independence of the normal scriptural authorities, as nothing is recognised therein to be superior to Paramātman. Harivyāsa unmistakably describes the unsurpassable supremacy of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, but he has abandoned exegetical concerns in the *Mahāvāṇī* in favour of devotional sentiment, perhaps the dominating motive behind his formulations.

Furthermore, Harivyāsa is also emphatic that Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa are the source and substance of the *klīm bīja* that forms part of the sect's initiation *mantra*, and does not subscribe to the view, as Nimbārka would have it, that *kl* refer to Kṛṣṇa, *ī* to the preceptor and *m* to the individual soul.³⁰⁷ Furthermore, the origin of the *klīm* sound itself is described to be the jingling of the anklets of Rādhā during intercourse with Kṛṣṇa.³⁰⁸

Another point of comparison is seen in Harivyāsa's *sakhī* theology. The eternal version of Goloka-Vṛndāvana is visualised by Harivyāsa as a lotus surrounded by the Yamunā, the middle eight petals of which represent the stations for the *aṣṭasakhīs*. Surrounding them are various other groves, thickets, tanks and ponds which are the scene of the various pastimes arranged by the *sakhīs*. At the centre of

³⁰⁵ *śuddha sattva para ke parameśvara yugala kisora sakala sukharāsa || Mahāvāṇī, Siddhānta Sukha 20*

³⁰⁶ *jākau aṁsa paramātamā prakṛti purukha kau īsa || Mahāvāṇī, Siddhānta Sukha 16*

³⁰⁷ *tathaiva kl arthaḥ kṛṣṇaḥ syād dvitīyo gamayitā guruḥ | caramārthaś ca kṣetrajña iti śāstrānuśāsanam || Mantrarahasyaśoḍaśī 4*

³⁰⁸ *śrīrādhā pada kamala te nūpura kalarava hoyā | nirvikāra vyāpaka bhayo śabda brahma kahaiṁ soya || Mahāvāṇī, Siddhānta Sukha 39*

this lotus in the shade of a giant *kalpavṛkṣa* is the ‘Mohana Mahala/Mandira’ which has eight gates and is made of gold and jewels.³⁰⁹

In the points of each lotus petal are Raṅgadevī in the north, Sudevī in the north-east, Lalitā in the east, Viśākhā in the south-east, Campakalatā in the south, Citralekhā in the south-west, Tuṅgavidyā in the west and lastly in the north-west Indulekhā.³¹⁰ Harivyāsa also describes their colours and particular services, and then clarifies their ontological position as the personifications of the potency of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa’s will (Clémentin-Ojha 1990:365). Harivyāsa’s descriptions of the *sakhīs* evince slight differences from those that are presented in Rūpa Gosvāmin’s *Rādhākṛṣṇaṅoddeśadīpikā* (completed in 1550). From a comparison of Harivyāsa’s presentation in the Siddhānta Sukha with *Rādhākṛṣṇaṅoddeśadīpikā* 1.78-253, it is apparent that Harivyāsa’s description does not contain the same details for those *sakhīs* which are named commonly.

For example, when looking at Raṅgadevī out of the many instances of disparity between the two works, there are conspicuous differences. Firstly, the *Mahāvāṇī* allots her precedence,³¹¹ as Nimbārka is considered by the author to be her incarnation, whereas in the *Rādhākṛṣṇaṅoddeśadīpikā*, Rūpa Gosvāmin states that she is seventh in the list, of which Lalitā is the first.³¹² Both Harivyāsa and

³⁰⁹ *Mahāvāṇī* Siddhānta Sukha 3.

³¹⁰ *uttara śrīraṅgadevi jū disa tsāna sudevi | pūraba śrīlalitāsakhī agni bisākhā sevi || dacchina caṃpaka lattikā citrā nairitu pekhi | paścima tuṅgavidyā sakhī vāyukona indulekhi || Mahāvāṇī Siddhānta Sukha dohā 34-35*

³¹¹ *prathamahim śrīraṅgadevi manāūm | tinakī kṛpa yahai rasa gāūm || Mahāvāṇī, Siddhānta Sukha pada 16*

³¹² *saptamī raṅgadevīyaṃ padmakiñjalkakāntibhā | javārāgīdukūleyaṃ kaniṣṭhā saptabhir dinaiḥ || prāyeṇa campakalatāsadrśī guṇato matā | karuṇā raṅgasārābhyāṃ pīṭrbhyāṃ janimīyusī || asyā varekṣaṇo bhartā kanīyān bhairavasya yah || Rādhākṛṣṇaṅoddeśadīpikā 1.92-94ab*

Rūpa name the same eight *sahelīs* (friends) of Raṅgadevī.³¹³ Harivyāsa describes the appearance and mood with which Raṅgadevī performs her service, but Rūpa Gosvāmin also includes the details of the name of her husband, Vakrekṣaṇa, her parents, Karuṇā Devī and Raṅgasāra, and the fact that she is seven days younger than Rādhā.³¹⁴ In the *Ujjvalanīlamanī*, which focuses on the erotic dalliances of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, Rūpa Gosvāmin states quite clearly that Raṅgadevī³¹⁵ experiences romantic love for Kṛṣṇa, an emotion which is alien to Harivyāsa's and the wider Nimbārkī theology. Rūpa Gosvāmin is not interested in *nitya līlā* themes, focussing, especially with the descriptions of the *sakhīs* contextualised against the rest of the work, on the *vraja līlā*, and so is not included in the same category of comparison that Svāmī Haridāsa and Hita Harivaṁśa occupy. However, by noticing Rūpa Gosvāmin here, I would argue that it is possible that this theologian composed his works under the partial influence of the structure of the *nitya līlā* theology as adumbrated by Harivyāsa in the *Mahāvāṇī*. As no other contemporaneous authors from different traditions comment on the individual *aṣṭasakhīs*, it can be inferred that the Gauḍīyas and Nimbārkīs of that era share a common source for their understanding of the individual *sakhīs*, as they tally on most accounts. That original source can be stated to be Nimbārkī at the very least, even if it is not actually the *Yugalaśataka* upon which the *Mahāvāṇī* is based.

³¹³ *Mahāvāṇī* Siddhānta Sukha pada 16, and *Rādhākṛṣṇaṅganoddeśadīpikā* 1.245

³¹⁴ *Rādhākṛṣṇaṅganoddeśadīpikā* 1.92-94ab

³¹⁵ *durmānam eva mananā bahu mānayanī kiṁ jñātakṛṣṇaḥṛdayārtir api prayāsi | raṅge taraṅgam akhilāṅgi varāṅganānām nāsau priye sakhi bhavaty anurāgamudrā || Ujjvalanīlamanī* 5.99

8.4 *Mahāvāṇī* in Context: Harivyāsa, the Gosvāmins, Svāmī Haridāsa and Hita Harivaṁśa

The *Mahāvāṇī* proves to be an indispensable source for understanding the exact form of meditation to be undertaken by the advanced *rasika* devotees of the Nimbārka Sampradāya, and it yields many details of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa that do not find mention elsewhere in the Sanskrit literature of this tradition, which is instead focused on Vedānta. This work noticeably picks up where the *Yugalaśataka* left off but further focuses the devotees on the *nitya nikuñja līlās* as opposed to the wider *vraja līlās* that were of concern to the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*-based traditions such as those of Vallabha and Caitanya.

Of the Vṛndāvana based theologians, Rūpa, Sanātana and Jīva, Hita Harivaṁśa and Svāmī Haridāsa are other notable proponents of some sort of *nitya vihāra*, *aṣṭayāma līlā* and Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's *svakīya* married relationship. The Gosvāmins, however, display divergent viewpoints on these topics throughout their works, and although Jīva Gosvāmin in his *Sankalpakaḥpadruma* does cursorily refer the reader to the *nitya vihāra*, *aṣṭayāma līlā* and a *svakīya* Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, it is clear from this and his other works that this is not the main focus of the school (Brzezinski 1992:477-478). The main text of the Gauḍīyas that refers to the *aṣṭayāma līlā* is the *Govindalīlāmṛta*, composed by Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmin (c. 1528-1617), the disciple of Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmin and the contemporary of Jīva Gosvāmin. This text emphatically utilises the trope of the *vraja līlā* as a snapshot of the escapades of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa that took place during their incarnation, which the

author termed the *prākṛta līlā*, in contrast to the theology of the *nitya līlā* (Broo 2011:72).³¹⁶ The descriptions of the *sevās* that are similar appear in a greatly developed form in the *Govindalīlāmṛta*: so, for example the *rājabhoga sevā* is described in forty Sanskrit verses,³¹⁷ as opposed to two *padas* of four and six lines respectively in the *Mahāvāṇī*.³¹⁸ Even the *Yugalaśataka*'s enumeration of the fifty-six dishes served to Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa³¹⁹ appears rudimentary when compared to the elaborate descriptions in the *Govindalīlāmṛta*, with Yaśodā directing the various *sakhīs* to cook specific dishes.³²⁰ It can be inferred that due to the developed nature of the descriptions of the *aṣṭayāma līlās* the *Govindalīlāmṛta* was composed later than the *Mahāvāṇī*, perhaps to provide the *prākṛta līlā* version of the *aṣṭayāma līlā* to distinguish it from the earlier *nitya līlā* theology of Śrībhaṭṭa and Harivyāsa.

Hita Harivāṁśa also described the *nitya vihāra* and the fact that Rādhā is in a *svakīya* relationship with Kṛṣṇa; but he is markedly different in conception as he propounds the superiority of Rādhā over Kṛṣṇa (Snell 1991:329). The last possible source of eternal Nikuñja-based *aṣṭayāma-līlā* theology of a married Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, then, is Svāmī Haridāsa, another proponent of the worship of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in the *nitya līlā*, who follows the doctrines as set out by Śrībhaṭṭa, with a few minor differences, which are as follows.

³¹⁶ For more on Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmin, see Dimock and Stewart 1999: 26-37

³¹⁷ *Govindalīlāmṛta*, 3.36-113, 4.23-63

³¹⁸ *Mahāvāṇī*, *Sevā Sukha*, *padas* 33 and 34

³¹⁹ *Yugalaśataka pada* 42

³²⁰ *Govindalīlāmṛta*, 3.44-63

In the *Kelimāla* of Svāmī Haridāsa, there are instances of Rādhā (here the fair one, dressed in a blue *sāḍī* and red *cūnaḍī*) going off separately and Kṛṣṇa having to find her:

Kuñjavihārī sits, reminiscing about the blue, red and fair one.
The longer he is away from her happiness, the heavier his sorrow gets.³²¹

Also the *Kelimāla* speaks of Rādhā stubbornly staying away from Kṛṣṇa, known as the *māna līlā* (Goswami 1966:453-454). Anger, admittedly either feigned or temporary, is used therein as a mechanism for increasing love and results in the superiority of Rādhā over Kṛṣṇa in these circumstances:

Why are you being stubborn? Look how much sadness it is causing me!³²²

Throughout the entire *Mahāvāṇī*, however, this method of increasing love is not found; instead the concept of a midnight wedding leading to the daily wedding-night pastimes is the technique preferred. No instance in the *Mahāvāṇī* has the divine couple separated even for a second; rather, they go everywhere and do everything together, most of the time whilst hugging each other, arms around the other's shoulder. The *Kelimāla* and *Caurāsī Pada* also contain *padas* describing the *dāna līlā* (Kṛṣṇa's playful taxation of the *gopīs* on their way to Mathurā to sell produce), which falls within the domain of *vraja līlā* (*Kelimāla* 62, *Caurāsī Pada* 51). This does not appear at all in the *Mahāvāṇī* which is concerned solely with *nikuñja līlā*.

³²¹ *nīla lāla gaura ke dhyāna baiṭhe śrīkuñjabihārī | jyauṁ jyauṁ sukha pāvata nāhīm tyauṁ tyauṁ dukha bhayau bhārī || Kelimāla 28*

³²² *kāhe kau māna karata mohiba kata dukha deta || Kelimāla 39*

It would seem, therefore, that whilst the *Kelimāla* and *Caurāsī Pada* might have been influenced by the *Yugalaśataka* in matters of the eternal union and eternal pastimes of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, Harivyāsa's work obliquely emphasises itself as the main source for purely *nikuñja līlā* related meditations. Chronologically, this comparison demonstrates that the writings of Svāmī Haridāsa and Hita Harivaṁśa are posterior to the *Yugalaśataka*, which confirms the deduction that they are younger contemporaries of Harivyāsa. With regard to devotional philosophy both Harivyāsa and Svāmī Haridās have a similar viewpoint, with the former more focussed on *nikuñja* and the eternal continuous union of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, and the latter occasionally venturing beyond. It is due to this similarity that during the reign of Savāi Jai Singh II the ascetics of the lineage of Svāmī Haridāsa either elected to align themselves with, or confirmed themselves as members of, the Nimbārka Sampradāya (Okita 2014b: 37).

8.5 Puruṣottama and Harivyāsa: Audiences, Environment and Revelation

Both the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* and the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* contain indications that their authors were writing with a specific audience in mind. Puruṣottama clearly demonstrates that he is endeavouring to reconcile the teachings of his predecessor with the socio-religious concerns of the day (see section 5.1). Even though one would expect Harivyāsa's commentary to be free from any concerns regarding the concealment of Rādhā from the uninitiated, there are nonetheless a few indications that he did not compose the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* for advanced

devotees who would have been privy to the most esoteric secrets of the worship prescribed by him.

The *Daśaślokī* is a synopsis of the main philosophical tenets of the Nimbārka tradition, as stated in *Daśaślokī* verse 10. Its function, perhaps then as it is now, was a text provided to devotees at the outset of their initiation into the tradition. The *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* served adherents to the tradition after the mid-sixteenth century as a replacement for the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* of Puruṣottama, because his comments regarding Rādhā's ontological status did not conform to the doctrines that were popular amongst worshippers of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in Vraja, especially after the renaissance initiated by Śrībhṭṭa. Indeed, Rādhā was well known to all spiritual aspirants who travelled to the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa centre of Vṛndāvana and Mathurā, and so Puruṣottama's position would serve to undermine the work of Śrībhṭṭa. Harivyāsa then is composing a work which firmly re-establishes Rādhā's ontological status as Parabrahman conjoined with Kṛṣṇa to the exclusion of all else, a doctrine aimed at an audience broader than his own tradition.

When commenting on Nimbārka's statement that Rādhā is 'served by thousands of *sakhīs*' (*sakhīsahasraiḥ pariṣevitām*), Harivyāsa is noticeably brief. A commentator discusses the various points covered in the source text, and there are accordingly two obvious queries that can be raised to Nimbārka's statement: what is the ontological status of these *sakhīs* and what function do they serve? Harivyāsa does not provide much discussion of this in his own commentary, other than stating that these thousands of *sakhīs* are headed by Lalitā, Raṅgadevī and the rest [of the

eight main *sakhīs*]. In the *Mahāvāṇī*, however, Harivyāsa is very clear on the identity of the *sakhīs*, providing detailed descriptions of their names, roles, apparel etc. This is a particularly revealing point in respect to the intended audiences of the *Mahāvāṇī* and the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali*. It appears that the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* was composed for those intending to become followers of the tradition, or newly initiated devotees, but it does not directly disclose to them the esoteric doctrines which are contained in the *Mahāvāṇī*. Such knowledge would require a greater degree of qualification gained after many years of adherence to the tradition's various requirements regarding diligence in service to the preceptor and personal spiritual practice. As such, the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* conforms to the guidelines established by Nimbārka himself in *Daśaślokī* verse 10, which is followed by Puruṣottama in the *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*. It should be apparent, then, to devotee and scholar alike that Harivyāsa's real stance on the status of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa cannot be fully comprehended through an analysis of the *Daśaślokī* and its commentaries alone.

Having now examined the *Mahāvāṇī* as well as the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali*, it should be possible to comment on the cumulative theology of Harivyāsa in comparison to the position of Nimbārka. It can be inferred from my discussion of Nimbārka that Pāñcarātrika and brāhmaṇic regulations prevented him from documenting his most esoteric teachings, a fact which is supported by the manner in which Harivyāsa approaches such doctrines in the *Siddhāntaratnāñjali* and the *Mahāvāṇī*. Still, Nimbārka undoubtedly revealed sufficient information in the *Daśaślokī* to distinguish his theology from that of the Pāñcarātra and brāhmaṇical religion.

Similarly, Śrībhṭṭa could not be too frank about the most confidential aspects of the *nitya līlās* of Rādhā–Kṛṣṇa. Although he discloses some information about the erotic pastimes of Rādhā–Kṛṣṇa in the *Yugalaśataka*, it is clear, on inspection of the diffusion of Śrībhṭṭa’s poetry within other traditions, that the poems evoking *śṛṅgāra rasa* were also restricted to the higher-ranking disciples of the Nimbārka tradition itself.

The *Mahāvāṇī*, however, from the outset liberally describes the sensuality and eroticism of Rādhā–Kṛṣṇa, which would logically place the text outside the reach of the uninitiated. Harivyāsa himself lends support to this view, as he states towards the end of the *Mahāvāṇī*:

This book contains the [five] happinesses (*sukhas*) of service (*sevā*), excitement (*utsāha*), amorous exploits (*surata*), natural [original or innate] disposition (*sahaja*) and philosophical conclusions (*siddhānta*); filled with the pastimes of Vṛndāvana. Know that this *Mahāvāṇī* is like the exceedingly sharpened blade of a scimitar. It should be kept [secret] with great care, as it leads to attaining the ocean of bliss. The extremely rare [intimate pastimes] have become easy to be attained. If you do not have love for [them] and you contemplate [the subject matter of the *Mahāvāṇī*] in your heart [without such love, thus making it a book on mundane love], then there will be adversity in reaching the goal [of *nitya līlā praveśa*].³²³

Whether or not Nimbārka included the *nitya līlās* of Rādhā–Kṛṣṇa within his own theology cannot be inferred from the works that he has left. As has been shown, there appear to have been precedents, but the *nitya līla* would have remained a very personal meditation for Nimbārka himself, if indeed he was actually aware of this particular theology. Harivyāsa’s exegesis of *Daśaślokī* verse 5, therefore, seems to have a similar ideology to that of Nimbārka, stating the overarching supremacy of

³²³ *sevā aru utsāha sukha surata sahaja siddhānta | vṛndābipina bilāsa maya līlā rādhākānta || māhābānī jānī ju yaha kharī kharaga kī dhāra | jatana jatana som rākhiyo jyauṁ pāvau sukhasāra|| durllabhahūm tem durllabha ju so surllabha bha-ī tohi | hita cita hiya nahim dharahi tau ahita iṣṭa tem hohi || Mahāvāṇī, Siddhāntasukha concluding dohās 2-4.*

Rādhā above all other consorts of Kṛṣṇa and hinting at what the meditation could be, but stopping short of giving a fuller description. Harivyāsa, however, followed the model established by Śrībhaṭṭa which provided the basis for his own development of *aṣṭayāma līlā* and *nikuñja/mādhurya līlā* motifs. Obviously Harivyāsa was not concerned with publicising these esoteric doctrines, thus avoiding any obligation to provide scriptural validation.

8.6 Conclusion

According to the chronology suggested above and relying on the scriptural prescriptions regarding brāhmanical studies,³²⁴ it can be assumed that a twenty-three year-old Harivyāsa met his preceptor in Mathurā in 1493, just after the death of Keśava Kāśmīrin. Accordingly, he perhaps would have seen the impact of both the writings and building projects of the Puṣṭimārga, Rūpa, Sanātana and Jīva Gosvāmin, Svāmī Haridāsa and Hita Harivaṁśa, before his death in around 1540. In 1519, Śrīnāthajī was installed in Govardhana in a very grand temple, perhaps the first new development in the area for a considerable length of time. The funds for the project came from a wealthy businessman who was a devotee; but for the project of the development of Vṛndāvana allocated to the six Gosvāmins by Caitanya, the funds would have come from various rulers and nobles. Legitimacy was a central concern of the ruling classes, and having lived among them, Rūpa and Sanātana would either have shared a similar outlook, or have understood the concerns of future sponsors. The wealth of treatises which logically describe,

³²⁴ See notes 140 and 141 above.

delineate, clarify, and codify the totality of Vraja devotion that was left by them and the other Gauḍīya authors, is testament not only to their erudition, but also to their enterprise. It is apparent that there was a pre-existing requirement for such systematising, due perhaps to the poems of Śrībhṭṭa which publicised for the first time the secretive meditative traditions of Vṛndāvana. Both Harivyāsa's writing and his decision to initiate twelve sub-branches can be construed as measures taken to ensure the propagation of the tradition's theology in light of such developments. Nevertheless, Harivyāsa's main theological contributions in the field of the *nitya līlā* are contained in the *Mahāvāṇī*, and as it was composed after Caitanya's 1515 visit to Vṛndāvana but before the works of Svāmī Haridāsa, the Gosvāmins and Hita Harivaṁśa on the same subject, it could conceivably be claimed that his specific innovations may have served as the inspiration for the theologians of these traditions.

CONCLUSION

In this study, sources from the Nimbārka Sampradāya, either hitherto unseen or previously not considered, have yielded important information that lends an additional perspective to the understanding of medieval Hindu philosophical and theological developments. This original and innovative research has also provided a more reliable chronology for Nimbārka, Śrīnivāsa, Puruṣottama, Keśava Kāśmīrin, Śrībhāṭṭa, Harivyāsa and Paraśurāma Devācārya which will enable the reassessment of paradigms of inter-sectarian interaction and theological contributions. Most of the chronological information gathered in this study has been embedded amidst various detailed discussions. As such, the following table collates the chronology that has been suggested in the foregoing.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>DATE (CE)</u>
<u>Nimbārka</u>	<u>c. 620-690</u>
<u>Śrīnivāsa</u>	<u>c. 660-740</u>
<u>Viśvācārya</u>	<u>c. 730-815</u>
<u>Puruṣottama</u>	<u>c. 800-880</u>
<u>Devācārya</u>	<u>Late 13th century</u>
<u>Sundarabhāṭṭa</u>	<u>Early 14th century</u>
<u>Keśava Kāśmīrī Bhāṭṭācārya</u>	<u>c. 1410-1490</u>
<u>Śrībhāṭṭa</u>	<u>c. 1440-1520</u>
<u>Harivyāsa Devācārya</u>	<u>c. 1470-1540</u>
<u>Svabhūrāma Devācārya</u>	<u>c. 1480-1550</u>

<u>Karnahara Devācārya</u>	<u>c. 1500-1570</u>
<u>Paramānanda Devācārya</u>	<u>c. 1520-1600</u>
<u>Paraśurāma Devācārya</u>	<u>c. 1525-1607</u>
<u>Catura Cintāmaṇi Devācārya</u>	<u>c. 1550-1630</u>

Also, many important factors arising from the works of Nimbārka, Puruṣottama, Śrībhṭṭa and Harivyāsa Devācārya have been highlighted, which will aid further refining of theories regarding the deification of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, the role of *sakhīs*, the theology of *aṣṭayāma/nitya līlās* and Vedānta exegesis in the light of *svābhāvika dvaitādvaita* philosophy. When this information is applied to the wider context, the outline of the development of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa devotion changes somewhat.

Sources from before the common era attest to Kṛṣṇa's status as a supreme deity for some sections of society. In the early centuries of the common era there appears poetry most notably in the *Gāhāsattasāi* which specifically refers to Rādhā as Kṛṣṇa's favourite lover. While it is possible to assume that the poetry in question is based on themes that pre-date it, without additional evidence, it is difficult to be confident about the precise moment when Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa were viewed as an intimately connected couple.

This much is certain: the love affairs of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and the interactions of the couple with *sakhīs* were an integral theme in the imaginative conceptualisation of love in early India, as demonstrated by a wide range of poetic sources. By the latter half of the first millennium, it is clear that the relationship of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa was

becoming an increasingly significant theme in a wide range of poetry, while at the same time Vedānta became established as one of the major schools of Vedic hermeneutics. By the 7th century, Nimbārka, perhaps informed by the earlier exegetical commentary of Bhartṛprapañca, had produced a significant corpus of writings relating to the *bhedābheda* interpretation of Vedānta. He further summarised his philosophy into ten stanzas known as the *Vedāntakāmadhenu Daśaślokī*, the medium which he chose to introduce his innovative theology, which elevated the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa couple of erotic Prakrit poetry to the conjoined supreme being in his Vedāntic tradition.

The task of rationalising this doctrine was left to Nimbārka's followers, with Puruṣottama attempting to reconcile the views of the founder of his lineage with the conventions of theology established by Vedānta. The endeavours of this teacher, whilst laudable in their defence of *svābhāvika dvaitādvaita* against the freshly formulated and rapidly expanding *kevalādvaita* tradition, served to paradoxically diminish the role assigned to Rādhā by Nimbārka. Brāhmaṇical tradition continued to evolve, yet wilfully ignored Rādhā even in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, the principle text of the Bhāgavatas composed almost three centuries after Nimbārka. However, Sanskrit and Prakrit *belles lettres* continued to preserve and develop the theme of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, while displaying in certain cases, a clear familiarity with the implications of Nimbārka's theology, with Jayadeva, Vidyāpati and other poets who flourished in the early centuries of the second millennium CE devoting entire works to describing, in unabashed detail, the love-episodes that took place in the Nikuñja groves of Vṛndāvana.

As such themes gained popularity, Keśava Kāśmīrin's disciple Śrībhṭṭa, in the 15th century, amplified Nimbārka's insights and brought Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa once more into the theological foreground through the medium of Brajbhāṣā. A range of poets and theologians who flourished in the milieu of Vṛndāvana - Vallabha, Sūradāsa and the rest of Vallabha's disciples, Svāmī Haridāsa, Hita Harivaṁśa, Caitanya and the six Gauḍīya Gosvāmins - were influenced in some manner by Śrībhṭṭa. The theological insights of this particular teacher were developed by his disciple Harivyāsa, whose works reveal not only the theology of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and the *sakhīs* in the *nitya nikuñja līlās* of Goloka-Vṛndāvana, but also embody a fairly developed Vedāntic theory propagating this unique branch of *bhedābheda* philosophy, ultimately the legacy of Nimbārka's original re-envisaging of the role of Rādhā.

Whereas Rāmānuja had reinterpreted the theology of his Āḷvār predecessors, replacing their fervent Kṛṣṇaism with more conventional Pāñcarātra doctrine (Hardy 1983:221); Nimbārka mediated the transmission of the earlier poetical conceptualisation of Rādhā into the Vedāntic realm in largely unchanged form. The followers of this intellectual added the philosophical underpinnings required for its development both within and without the Nimbārka Sampradāya, its subsequent popularisation and its continued presence.

APPENDIX I

Vedāntakāmadhenu Daśaślokī, verse 5

of Nimbārkācārya

With the commentary entitled

Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā

of Puruṣottamācārya

*evam akhilāvidyādidoṣagandhasparśānarhasyānantācintyasvābhāvīkalyāṇa-
guṇasāgarasya parabrahmabhūtasya śrīpuruṣottamasya bhagavataḥ sarvajagaj
janmādikāraṇatvaṁ sarvaśāstravedyatvaṁ sarvopāśyatvaṁ mokṣapradātrivaṁ
muktopasrpyatvaṁ pratipādyedānīm śrīś ca te lakṣmīś ca patnyāv ahorātre pārśve
ityādi śrutyuktalakṣmyādi vaiśiṣṭyaṁ vidhatte –*

***aṅge tu vāme vṛṣabhānujām mudā virājamānām anurūpasaubhagām |
sakhīsahasraiḥ pariṣevitām sadā smarema devīm sakaleṣṭakāmadām ||
(Daśaślokī 5)***

*aṅge ityādinā | vāyam uktalakṣaṇasyāghaṭaḥaṭanāpaṭutarācintyānanta-
vicitraśaktimato bhagavataḥ śrīkrṣṇasya vāmāṅge 'nurūpasaubhagām
lakṣmīrukmiṇyākhyām sadā smaremetyanvayaḥ | anurūpatvaṁ nāma
bhagavadvīgrahaguṇādyupameyavīgrahaguṇādīmattvaṁ | anurūpā cāsau
saubhagā ca tām iti vīgrahaḥ | tathā ca smaryate śrīparāśareṇa –*

*devatve devadeheyam mānuṣatve ca mānuṣī |
viṣṇor dehānurūpām vai karoty eṣātmanas tanum iti ||*

*rāghavatve bhavet sītā rukmiṇī krṣṇajanmani |
anyeṣu cāvatāreṣu viṣṇor eṣānapāyinīti ||*

*kīdrśam ity apekṣāyām viśinaṣṭi devīm iti | devasya gāyatrīmantrapratipādyasya
sarvaśāstrārthabhūtasya śrīvāsudevasya patnī devī tām śrīyam devīm upahvaye
ityādi śruteḥ | anena yogavṛtṭyā tadguṇā ucyante | tathā hi -*

dīvyati krīḍaty anekāvatārair iti devī:

viṣṇor dehānurūpām vai vidhatte hy ātmanas tanum iti ||1||

dīvyati vijigīṣate devādīn śīlādiguṇāpahāreṇeti vā:

sadyo vaiguṇyam āyānti śīlādyāḥ sakalā guṇāḥ |

parānmukhī jagaddhātṛī yasya tvaṁ viṣṇuvallabha iti ||2||

dīvyati vyavaharati tat tad ātmanā tat tat prakāreṇa ceti vā devī:

*artho viṣṇur iyaṁ vāñī nītir eṣā nayo hariḥ |
bodho viṣṇur iyaṁ buddhir dharmo 'sau sakriyā tv iyaṁ iti ||3||*

dyotate svarūpeṇa guṇaiś ceti vā devī:

*īśvarīm sarvabhūtānām |
yaśasā jvalantīm śriyaṁ loke devajuṣṭām udārām iti śruteḥ ||4||*

stūyante devair iti vā:

*namasye sarvabhūtānām jananīm abjasambhavām |
śriyam unnidrapadmākṣīm viṣṇor vakṣaḥsthalāśritām ityārabhya,
na te varṇayitum śaktā gunān jihvāpi vedhasaḥ |
prasīda devī padmākṣi māsmāms tyāksīḥ kadā ca nety antena stotreṇānyaś ceti ||5||*

sarvatra gacchatīti vā:

*nityaiva sā jaganmātā viṣṇoḥ śrīr anapāyinī |
yathā sarvagato viṣṇur tathaveyaṁ dvijottamāḥ ||
tvayaiva viṣṇunā cāmba jagadvyāptam carācaram iti ||6||*

modate veti ānandamūrtitvād ānandamūrtyāśritatvāc ca:

*sūryyām hiraṇmayīm |
īśvarīm sarvabhūtānām iti śruteḥ ||7||*

*punaḥ kīdrśīm? sakhīśahasraiḥ pariṣevitām sadeti | sakhīnām svaparicārikānām
śahasrair aparimitaiḥ sadā nityam sevitām | kiñca sevanaḥ prajānam darśayan
viśinaṣṭi – sakaleṣṭakāmadā, iti | sarvebhyaś caturvidhebhyo bhaktebhyaḥ
puruṣārthacatuṣṭayaṁ tat tad icchānusāreṇa dadātīti tathā tām |*

*yajñavidyā mahāvidyā guhyavidyā ca sobhane |
ātmavidyā ca devī tvaṁ vimuktiphaladāyinīti smaraṇāt ||*

*evam lakṣmyā vaiśiṣṭyaṁ vidhāya vrajastṛīśabdavācyāyā gopīpradhānabhūtāyāḥ
śrīvṛṣabhānujāyā nityayogaṁ vidhatte – vṛṣabhānujām iti | cakāro
'trādhyāhartavyaḥ samuccayārtham | tathā ca vṛṣabhānujām ca smarema | ity
anvayaḥ | tataḥ svarūpaguṇādidyotanāya tām viśinaṣṭi – vāmāṅge mudā
virājamānām iti | vāmāṅga ity asya pūrvam śrībhagavata iti śabdo
'dhyāhartavyaḥ | aṅgasyāṅgisāpekṣatvāc chrī bhagavato vāmāṅge virājamānām |
vāmāṅgaśabdaprayogād asyā lakṣmīvat patnītvam anapāyitvam ca darśitam |
mudā niratiśayapremānandamūrtyā | etenāsyāḥ premādhiṣṭhātṛtvam sūcyate |
virājamānām | viśeṣeṇa svarūpeṇa vighraheṇa premakāruṇyādiguṇaiś ca rājate
dīpyata iti tathā tām | tathā cāmnāyate ṛkpariśiṣṭāśrutau–*

rādhayā mādhave devo mādhave na ca rādhikā |
virājata ityādi ||

anayaiva śrutaya anyo'nyasāhityavidhānaparayā nityasambandhaḥ premotkarṣaś
cokta iti bhāvaḥ | yady apy anayor madhye aiśvaryaḍhiṣṭhāṛṭvena lakṣmyāḥ
prādhānyāt tasyā eva pūrvam prayoga ucitas tathāpi vrajastriyaḥ
premāḍhiṣṭhāṛṭayā tac caraṇasmarāṇasya premadāṛṭvāt pūva prayogaḥ |

kṛṣṇātmikā jagatkarṭrī mūlaprakṛtirukmiṇī |
vrajastrījanasambhūtaśrutibhyo brahmasaṅgata iti manṛāt |

janeṣu sambhūtāḥ prasiddhāḥ yāḥ śrutayas tābhyāḥ pramāṇabhūtābhyā ābhyām
rukmiṇīvrajastrībhyām śrīgopālākhyasya brahmaṇaḥ saṅgato nityasambandha iti
manṛārthaḥ |

upalakṣaṇārtho 'yam satyabhāmāyāḥ | tathā ca
rukmiṇīsatyabhāmāvrajastrīviśiṣṭaḥ śrībhaḡavān puruṣottamo vāsudevaḥ
sāmpradāyabhir vaiṣṇavaīḥ sadopāsanīyaḥ | dvibhujāś caturbhujāś ca
svaprītyanurūpeṇobhayavidhatvāt tasya nātra tāratamyabhāvaḥ |
dhyāṛṭbhāvanāyā evātra niyāmakatvāt | tathā ca –

mathurāyām viśeṣeṇa mām dhyāyan mokṣam aśnute ity ārabhya

śrīvatsalāñcanaṁ hṛtsthakaustubhaprabhayā yutam |
caturbhujam śaṅkhacakraśārṅgapadmagadānvitam |

hiraṇmayam saumyatanaṁ svabhaktāyābhyapradam |
dhyāyen manasi mām nityam veṇuśrṅgadharām tu veti ||

satpuṇḍarīkanayanam meghābham vaidyutāmbaram |
dvibhujam jñānamudrāḍhyaṁ vanamālinam īśvaram ||

gopīgopagavātītam suradrumatalāśrayam |
divyālaṅkaraṇopetaṁ ratnapaṅkajamadyagam ||

kāliṇḍījalakallolasāṅgimārutasevitam |
cintayamś cetasā kṛṣṇam mukto bhavati saṁsṛter ity

ubhayavidhasyāpi dhyānasya mokṣahetutvaśravaṇād ubhayasya tulyaphalatvādd
heyatvāviśeṣa iti sāmpradāyarāddhāntaḥ ||

APPENDIX II

Vedāntakāmadhenu Daśāślokī, verse 5

Of Nimbārkācārya

With the commentary entitled

Siddhāntaratnāñjali

of Harivyāsa Devācārya

tatropāsya viśiṣṭeṣṭadevatā yugalasvarūpam anusmaraty aṅgety ādi –

***aṅge tu vāme vṛṣabhānujām mudā virājamānām anurūpasaubhagām |
sakhīsahasraiḥ pariśevitām sadā smarema devīm sakaleṣṭakāmadām ||
(Daśāślokī 5)***

*anantānavadyakalyāṇaguṇagaṇasya śrīkṛṣṇasya vāmāṅge śrīvṛṣabhānunandinīm
vayam smarema ity anvayah | kīdrśīm ? sakaleṣṭakāmadām | abhīṣṭaphaladām
devīm dyotamānām sakhīgaṇaiḥ sevanasthānasthitābhiḥ paramayūtheśvarībhiḥ
śrīlālītāraṅgadevyādībhiḥ sevitām sarvataḥ sevamānām | ataś cādhikātara
virājamānām | anurūpasaubhagām ity anurūpasaubhagam yasyās tām | yaś
coktam śrībhāgavate –*

*tām rūpiṇīm śriyamananyagatīm nirīkṣyayā līlayā dhṛtatanor anurūparūpām|
prītaḥ smayann alakakuṇḍalaniṣkakaṅṭham vakrollasat smitasudhām harir
avabhāṣa iti||*

*atrāsayaḥ | anapāyinī bhagavatī śrīḥ sāksād ātmano harer iti śrībhāgavatokteḥ
śriyo nityāvinābhāva sambandhaḥ sarvasammataḥ | tatra śriyo dve rūpe: śrīs ca
lakṣmīs ceti| tathā hi śrutih -*

śrīs ca te lakṣmīs ca patynāv ahorātre pārśve iti |

*gandhadvārām durādharśām nityapuṣṭām karīṣiṇīm |
īśvarīm sarvabhūtānām tām ihopahvaye śriyam iti ||*

tatra yā śrīḥ sā vṛṣabhānos tanayā | yā ca lakṣmīḥ sā rukmiṇyādirūpā –

*devatve devadeheyam mānuṣatve ca mānuṣī |
viṣṇor dehānurūpām ca karoty evātmamanas tanum iti vaiṣṇavokteḥ ||*

*yām yām tanum upādatte bhagavan harirīśvaraḥ |
tām tām śrīr asvāsena bhagavato 'napāyinīti śrīnāradokteś ca ||*

tatra śrīrādhikāyāḥ sarvasvarūpāyāḥ śreṣṭhyām śrutih pramāṇyāt | tathā hi śrutih -

*rādhayā sahito devo mādhavena ca rādhikā |
yo 'naylor bhedaṁ paśyati sa saṁsṛter mukto na bhavatīti ||
vāmāṅge sahitā devī rādhā vṛndāvaneśvarīti kṛṣṇopaniṣadi ||*

paramāgamacūḍāmaṇau śrīnāradapañcarātre ca –

*harer ardhatanū rādhā rādhā manmathasāgarā |
rādhā padmākhyā padmānām agādhā tatra yoginām ||*

punas tatraiva –

*rādhayā sahitaṁ kṛṣṇaṁ yaḥ pūjayati nityaśaḥ |
bhaved bhaktir bhagavati muktis tatra kare sthiteti ||*

*śriyaṁ viṣṇuṁ ca varadāv āśiṣāṁ prabhavāv ubhau |
bhaktyā sampūjayen nityaṁ yadīcchet sarvasampada iti ||*

brahmavaivarte ca –

*lakṣmīr vāṇī ca tatraiva janiṣyete mahāmate |
vṛṣabhāne 'stu tanayā rādhā śrībhavitā kileti ||*

bṛhadgautamīyatantre ca –

*devī kṛṣṇamayī proktā rādhikā paradevatā |
sarvalakṣmīmatī svarṇakāntisammohinī pareti ||*

brahmasaṁhitāyām ca –

*yaḥ kṛṣṇa sāpi rādhā cay a rādhā kṛṣṇa eva saḥ |
anayor antarādarśī saṁsārān na vimucyata iti ||*

sammohinī tantre –

tasmāj jyotir abhūd dvedhā rādhāmādhavarūpakam ityādinā ||

ataś ca śrīrādhikāyā eva śrīrūpatvena śreṣṭhatvam iti siddham ||

APPENDIX III

Texts of the *Brahmasūtra* Commentaries referred to in Chapter 3

The *sūtra* numberings are in accordance with Nimbārka's reading of the *Brahmasūtra*. Editions used are Agrawal (2000) for the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and *Vedāntakaustubha*, and Swami Satyanand Saraswati, (2011) for the *Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya*.

• *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.26

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

pūrvavākye gāyatrīākhyachando 'bhīdhānāt tatparā caranaśrutir astu na brahmapareti cen na| guṇayogād gāyatrīśabdābhīdheye bhagavati ceto 'rpaṇābhīdhānād dṛṣṭaś ca virāṣābdaḥ prakṛtaparaḥ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nanu pūrvatra gāyatrī vā idaṃ sarvam iti gāyatrīchandasah prakṛtatvāt tasya chandasa eva pādo 'sya sarvabhūtānīti bhūtapādavyapadeśo 'stu nāsmīn vākye brahmanirūpaṇaṃ yuktam iti cen na| kasmāt tathā ceto 'rpaṇanigadāt| tathā gāyatrī vā idaṃ sarvam iti sarvātmakatvavidhānena gāyatrīśabdavācye brahmaṇi ceto 'rpaṇanigadāc cittasamādhānasyābhīdhānāt | atra gāyatrīśabdaś chando 'nugatabrahmavācako varṇasanniveśamātrasya chandasah sarvātmakatvāsambhavāt| tathāhi darśanaṃ tathāiva dṛṣṭānta aitarīyopaniṣadi śrūyata etaṃ hy eva bahvṛcā mahaty ukthe mīmāṃsante etaṃ agnāv adhvaryava etaṃ mahāvrate chandogeti | yajurvedīnaḥ sāmavedīnaḥ ṛgvedīnaḥ kramāt pradhānaśāstragnimahāvrateṣu tat tad anugataṃ paramātmānaṃ mīmāṃsante tadvac chando 'nugataṃ brahmetyarthaḥ| athavā yathā gāyatrī śaḍakṣaraiḥ pādaiś catuṣpadāchandojātir asti tathā brahmāpi pādo 'sya sarvābhūtāni tripādasyāmṛtaṃ divīti catuṣpāda iti catuṣpāttvaguṇayogād gaṇyā vṛtyā gāyatrīśabdābhīdhe brahmaṇi cittasamādhānanigadān nātra gāyatrīabhijñāyate kintu brahmaiva| tathāhi darśanaṃ tathāiva śakyārthaguṇayogād arthāntare 'pi chando 'bhīdhāyīśabdasya prayogo dṛṣṭas te vā ete pañcānye pañcānye daśa santas tatkr̥tam iti upakramyāha saiṣā virāḍ annādīti saṃvargavidyāyām vāyvādidaśadravyasamudāye kṛte daśākṣarachandojātīvirāṣprayogaḥ||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

atha yad uktaṃ pūrvasmīn api vākye na brahmābhīhitam asti gāyatrī vā idaṃ sarvaṃ bhūtaṃ yad idaṃ kiñceti gāyatrīākhyasya chandaso 'bhīhitatvād iti tatparihartavyam| kathaṃ punaś chando 'bhīdhānān na brahmābhīhitam iti śakyate vaktum| yāvatā tāvānasya mahimety etasyām ṛci chatuspādabrahma darśitam| naitad asti gayatī vā idaṃ sarvam iti gāyatrīm upakramya tām eva bhūtapṛthivīśarīrahṛdayavākprāṇaprabhedair vyākhyāya saiṣā catuṣpadā śaḍvidhā gāyatrī tad etad ṛcābhanūktam tāvān asya mahimeti tasyām eva vyākhyātarūpāyām gāyatrīyām udāhṛto mantraḥ kathaṃ kasmād brahma catuṣpād abhidadhyāt| yo 'pi tatra yad vai tad brahmeti brahmaśabdaḥ so 'pi chandasah prakṛtatvāc chandoviśaya eva ya etām evaṃ brahmopaniṣadam vedety atra hi vedopaniṣadam iti vyācakṣate tasmāc chando 'bhīdhānān na brahmaṇaḥ

prakṛtatvam iti cen naiṣa doṣas tathā ceto'rpaṇanigadāt tathā
gāyatrīyākhya chandodvāreṇa tad anugate brahmaṇi cetaso 'rpaṇam
cittasamādhānam anena brahmaṇavākyena nigadyate gāyatrī vā idam sarvam iti|
na hy akṣarasanniveśamātrāyā gāyatrīyāḥ sarvātmakatvam sambhavati| tasmād
gāyatrīyākhavikāre 'nugataṃ jagatkāraṇam brahma tad iha sarvam ity ucyate|
tathā sarvam khalv idam brahmeti| kāryam ca kāraṇād avyতিরিক্তam iti vakṣyāmas
tad ananyatvam ārambhanaśabdādibhya ity atra| tathānyatrāpi vikāradvāreṇa
brahmaṇa upāsanam dr̥śyate etam hy eva bahvṛcā mahaty ukthe mīmāṃsanta etam
agnāv adharyava etam mahāvrate chandogā iti| tasmād asti chando 'bhidhāne 'pi
pūrvasmin vākye catuṣpād brahma nirdiṣṭam| tad eva jyotir vākye 'pi parāmr̥śyate
upāsanāntaravidhānāya| apara āha sāksād eva gāyatrīśabdena brahma
pratipādyate saṅkhyāsāmānyāt| yathā gāyatrī catuṣpādā ṣaḍakṣaraiḥ pāदैs tathā
brahm catuṣpāt| tathānyatrāpi chando 'bhidhāyī śabdo 'rthāntare
saṅkhyāsāmānyāt prayujyamāno dr̥śyate| tad yathā te vā ete pañcānye pañcānye
daśa santas tatkr̥tam ity upakramyāha saiṣā virāḍ annādīti| asmin pakṣe
brahmaivābhīhitam iti na chando 'bhidhānam| sarvathāpy asti pūrvasmin vākye
prakṛtam brahma||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.2.38**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

paśupater aśarīrasya prerakasya preryyapradhānādibhiḥ sambandhānupapateś ca
na paśupatir jagadd hetuḥ ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

ito 'pi paśupater mataṃ nopapadyate| kutah| paśupater nimittakāraṇasya
prerakasya preryyapradhānādibhiḥ sambandho vācyas tad anupapateḥ| tathāhi
māheśvarāḥ pṛṣṭavyāḥ kim bhavantaḥ śrutyanusāriṇo dr̥ṣṭānusāriṇo vā| ādya
uktasiddhāntaparit̥yāgaprasaṅgas tasya śrutiviruddhatvāt| dvitīye saśarīrasyaiva
kulālāder mṛdādisambandho dr̥ṣṭas tato na bhavadbhir dr̥ṣṭānusāribhir aśarīrasya
paśupateḥ pradhānādisambandhaḥ pratipādayitum śakyaḥ| tasmād aśarīrasya
pradhānādisambandhatatprerakatvādyasambhavān na jagadd hetutvam ||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

punar apy asāmañjasyam eva na hi pradhānapuruṣavyatirikta īśvaro 'ntareṇa
sambandham pradhānapuruṣayor īśitā| na tāvat saṃyogalakṣaṇaḥ sambandhaḥ
sambhavati pradhānapuruṣeśvarāṇām sarvagatatvān niravayavatvāc ca| nāpi
samavāyalakṣaṇaḥ sambandha āśrayāśrayibhāvānirūpaṇāt| nāpy anyāḥ kaścit
kāryagamyāḥ sambandhaḥ śakyate kalpayitum kāryakāraṇabhāvasyaivādyāpy
asiddhatvād brahmavādinaḥ katham iti cen na| tasya
tādātmyalakṣaṇasambandhopapateḥ| api cāgamabalena brahmavādī
kāraṇādisvarūpaṃ nirūpayatīti nāvaśyam tasya yathādr̥ṣṭam eva sarvam
abhyupagantavyam iti niyamo 'sti parasya tu dr̥ṣṭāntabalena kāraṇādisvarūpaṃ
nirūpayato yathādr̥ṣṭam eva sarvam abhyupagantavyam ity ayam asty atīśayaḥ|
parasyāpi sarvajñapraṇītāgamasadbhāvāt samānam āgamabalam iti cen na|
itaretarāśrayatvaprasaṅgād āgamapratyayāt sarvajñatvasiddhiḥ
sarvajñapratyayāc cāgasiddhir iti| tasmād anupapannā

sānkhyaयोगavināmīśvarakalpanā| evam anyāsv api vedabāhyāsv
īśvarakalpanāsu yathāsambhavam asāmañjasyaṃ yojitavyam ||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.2.39**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

dr̥ṣṭaviruddhatvān nityasyottarabhāvitvād anityasya ca śarīrasyānupapateś ca na
paśupatiṛ jagadd hetuḥ ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nanu śarīras tarhi sa bhavatu nātroktadoṣa ityatrāha| sarvavyavahārādhiṣṭhānam
śarīram tad anupapates tanmataṃ nopapadyate| tathāhi paśupatiśarīrasya na
tāvan nityatvaṃ sambhavati dr̥ṣṭavirodhād anyathā kulālādiśarīriṇam api syāt| na
cānityatvaṃ tac charīrasya sambhavati jagatkāraṇasyānityaśarīrānarhatvāt|
nikhilasyānityapadārthasya kāryatvenottarabhāvitvāt kāraṇasya paśupateḥ
pūrvavarttitvāc ca ||

Śarīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

itaś cānupapattis tārīkakarikalpitasyeśvarasya| sa hi parikalpyamānaḥ
kumbhākāra iva mṛdādīni pradhānādīny adhiṣṭhāya pravartayet| na caivam
upapadyate| na hy apratyakṣaṃ rūpādihīnam ca pradhānam īśvarasyādhiṣṭheyam
sambhavati mṛdādivailakṣanyāt ||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.2.40**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

jīvatvāt karaṇakalevarakalpanāpi na sambhavati bhogādiprasakteḥ ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nanu yathānādisiddhasya jīvasyāśarīrasya pūrvapūrvakaraṇakalevaranibandhana
uttarottarakaraṇakalevarasambandho 'sti tadvat paśubharttur api bhavatu neha
kaścid doṣa iti cen na| bhogādibhyo doṣebhyaḥ| ayam arthaḥ| yadi jīvatvāt
īśvarasya tāddaśaśarīrasambandhas tarhi
sukhaduḥkhabhokṛtvatannidānapuṇyāpuṇya-karmakarṭṛtvādayo doṣāḥ sarve
tasyāpi bhavayur iti ||

Śarīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

syād etad yathā karaṇāgrāmaṃ cakṣurādīkam apratyakṣaṃ rūpādihīnam ca
puruṣo 'dhiṣṭhaty evaṃ pradhānam apīśvaro 'dhiṣṭhāsyatīti| tathāpi nopapadyate
bhogādidarśanādd hi karaṇagrāmasyādhiṣṭhitatvaṃ gamyate| na cātra bhogādayo
dr̥ṣyante| karaṇagrāmasāmye cābhyupagamyamāne saṃsārīṇām īśvarasyāpi
bhogādayaḥ prasajyeran| anyāthā vā sūtradvayaṃ vyākhyāyate –
adhiṣṭhānānupapatteś ca – itaś cānupapattistārīkakarikalpitasyeśvarasya|
sādhiṣṭhāno hi loke śarīro raja rāṣṭrasyeśvaro dr̥ṣyate na niradhiṣṭhāno 'taś ca tad
dr̥ṣṭāntavaśenādr̥ṣtam īśvaram kalpayitum icchata īśvarasyāpi kiñcic charīram
karaṇāyatanam varṇayitavyam syān na ca tadvarṇayitum śakyate
sr̥ṣṭyuttarakālabhāvitvāc charīrasya prākṣr̥ṣṭes tad anupapatteḥ| niradhiṣṭhānatve
ceśvarasya pravartakatvānupapattir evaṃ loke dr̥ṣṭatvāt| karaṇavac cen na

bhogādibhyaḥ - atha lokadarśanānusāreṣvarasyāpi kiñcitkaraṇānām āyatanam śarīram kāmena kalpyata evam api nopapadyate| saśarīratve hi sati saṁsārivad bhogādiprasaṅgād īśvarasyāpy anīśvaratvām prasajyeta ||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.19**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

jīvo'ñur anena pradyotanena eṣa ātmā niṣkrāmati cakṣuṣo vā mūrdhno vā anyebhyo vā śarīradeśebhyaḥ ye vai kecanāsmal lokāt prayanti candramasam eva te sarve gacchanti tasmāl lokāt punar etyāsmāi lokāya karmaṇa ityutkrāntigatyāgatīnām śravaṇāt||

Vedāntakaustubha:

evam jīvātmano nityatvam jñātṛtvañ ca nirūpitam idānīm tat parimāṇam nirūpyate| ayam ātmā madhyamaparimāṇaka uta vibhuparimāṇaka āhosvid aṅuparimāṇaka iti saṁśaye madhyamaparimāṇako bhavatu śarīre sarvatra sukhādy upalabdher athavā vibhuparimāṇaka iti prāpte 'bhidhīyate jīvātmoṭkrāntigatyāgatīnām yogyo 'sty etat trayam tasya vibhutve nopapadyate| kiñca vibhutve sarvatra sukhādy upalabdhiḥ prasajyeta madhyamaparimāṇakatve tv anityatā syāt tasmād ātmano 'ñutvam pariśiṣyate| sa yadā 'smāc charīrād utkrāmati sahaivaitaiḥ sarvair utkrāmatītyutkrāntiḥ śrūyate| ye vai ke cāsmāl lokāt prayanti chandramasam eva te gacchantīti gatiḥ śrūyate| tasmāl lokāt punar ety asmai lokāya karmaṇa ityāgatiḥ śrūyate|| (My emphases).

Śārīrakamīmāṁsābhāṣya:

idānīm tu kiṁ parimāṇo jīva iti cintyate kiṁ aṅuparimāṇa uta madhyamaparimāṇa āhosvin mahāparimāṇa iti. nanu ca nātmoṭpadyate nityacaitanyaś cāyam ity uktam. ataś ca para evātmā jīva ity āpatati parasya cātmano 'nantatvam āmnātam tatra kuto jīvasya parimāṇacintāvatāra iti. ucyate satyam etad utkrāntigatyāgatīśravaṇāni tu jīvasya paricchedam prāpayanti. svaśabdena cāsya kvacid aṅumarimānatvam āmnāyate. tasya sarvasyānākulatvopapādanāyāyam ārambhaḥ. tatra praptam tāvad utkrāntigatyāgatīnām śravaṇāt paricchinno 'ṅuparimāṇo jīva iti. utkrāntis tāvat sa yadāsmāc charīrād utkrāmati sahaivaitaiḥ sarvair utkrāmatīti. gatiḥ api ye vai ke cāsmāl lokāt prayanti candramasam eva te sarve gacchantīti. āgatiḥ api tasmāl lokāt punar ety asmai lokāya karmaṇa iti. āsām utkrāntigatyāgatīnām śravaṇāt paricchinnaś tāvaj jīva iti prāpnoti. na hi vibhoś calanam avakalpata iti. sati ca paricchede śarīraparimānatvasyārhataparīkṣāyām nirastatvād aṅur ātmeti gamyate|| (My emphases).

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.20**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

utkrāntiḥ kadācit sthirasyāpi grāmasvāmyanivṛttivat syād uttarayoḥ svātmanaiva sambhavāj jīvo 'ñuḥ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

grāmasvāmyanivṛttivad utkrāntir dehasvāmyanivṛttirūpā kadācit sthitasyātmanah
syād uttarayor gatyāgatyos tv ātmanā svarūpeṇaiva sādhyatvāj jīvo 'nur iti
gamyate||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

utkrāntiḥ kadācid acalato 'pi grāmasvāmyanivṛttivad dehasvāmyanivṛtṭyā
karmakṣayenāvakalpate| uttare tu gatyāgatī nācalataḥ sambhavataḥ| svātmanā hi
tayoh sambandho bhavati gameḥ kartṛsthakriyātvāt| amadhyamaparimāṇasya ca
gatyāgatī aṇutva eva sambhavataḥ| satyoś ca gatyāgatyor utkrāntir apyapasṛptir
eva dehād iti pratīyate| na hy anapasṛptasya dehād gatyāgatī syātām|
dehapradeśānām cotkrāntāv apādānatvavacanāt| cakṣuṣo vā mūrdhno vānyebhyo
vā śārīradeśebhya iti| sa etās tejomātrāḥ samabhyādādāno
hṛdayamevānvavakrāmati śukramādāya punar eti sthānam iti cāntare 'pi śārīre
śārīrasya gatyāgatī bhavataḥ| tasmād apy aṣyāṇutvasiddhiḥ||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.21**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

jīvaṃ prastutya sa vā eṣa mahān ity ādivacanān na jīvo 'nur iti cen na| madhye
paramātmāno 'dhikārāt ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nanu jīvo nānuḥ kutaḥ atacchruteḥ| tad aṇutvam atad aṇutvaṃ tasya śruter yo
'yaṃ vijñānamayaḥ prāṇeṣu hṛdy antarjyotir iti jīvaprastāve sa vā eṣa mahān aja
ātmeti mahattvaśruter iti cen na| kasmād itarādhikārāt| upakrame prastutāj
jīvāditarasya yasyāṇuvittaḥ pratibuddha ātmeti madhye pratipādyasya
paramātmāno 'dhikārāt||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

athāpi syān nānur ayam ātmā| kasmād atac chruteḥ|
aṇutvaviparītaparimāṇaśravaṇād ity arthaḥ| sa vā eṣa mahān aja ātmā yo 'yaṃ
vijñānamayaḥ prāṇeṣu| ākāśavat sarvagataś ca nityaḥ | satyaṃ jñānam anantaṃ
brahmety evaṃjātīyākā hi śrutir ātmano 'nutve vipratīṣidhyeteti cen naiṣa doṣaḥ |
kasmād itarādhikārāt| parasya hy ātmanah prakriyāyām eṣā parimāṇāntaraśrutīḥ
parasyaivātmanah prādhānyena vedānteṣu veditavyatvena prakṛtatvād virajaḥ
para ākāśād ity evaṃvidhāc ca parasyaivātmanas tatra tatra viśeṣadhikārāt| nanu
yo 'yaṃ vijñānamayaḥ prāṇeṣv iti śārīra eva mahattvasambandhitvena
pratinirdiśyate| śāstradrṣṭyā tv eṣa nirdoṣo vāmadevavad draṣṭavyaḥ| tasmāt
prājñaviṣayatvāt parimāṇāntaraśravaṇasya na jīvasyāṇutvaṃ virudhyate||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.22**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

eṣo 'nur ātmā bālāgrasatabhāgasya śatadhā kalpitasya ca bhāgo jīva iti
svaśabdonmānābhyaṃ jīvo 'nuḥ ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

svasyāṇutvasya vācakaḥ śabdaḥ svaśabdaḥ sarvebhyaḥ sthūlaparimāṇebhya
uddhṛtya mānam unmānam atyalpaṁ parimānam tābhyāṁ ca jīvo 'ṇuḥ| eṣo 'aṇur
ātmā cetasā veditavyo yasmin prāṇaḥ pañcadhā saṁviveśeti svaśabdaḥ|
bālāgraśatabhāgasya śatadhā kalpitasya ca| bhāgo jīvaḥ sa vijñeyaḥ sa
cānantyāya kalpata ity ārāgramātro hy avaro 'pi dr̥ṣṭa iti conmānam||

Śārīrakamīmāṁsābhāṣya:

itaś cāṇur ātmā yataḥ sāksād evāsyāṇutvavācī śabdaḥ śrūyate eṣo 'ṇur ātmā
cetasā veditavyo yasmin prāṇaḥ pañcadhā saṁviveśeti| prāṇasambandhāc ca jīva
evāyam aṇur abhihita iti gamyate| tathonmānam api jīvasyāṇimānam gamayati
bālāgraśatabhāgasya śatadhā kalpitasya ca| bhāgo jīvaḥ sa vijñeyaḥ |
ārāgramātro hy avaro 'pi dr̥ṣṭa iti conmānāntaram ||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.23**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

dehaikadeśastho 'pi kṛtsnam dehaṁ candanabindur yathāhlādayati tathā jīvo 'pi
prakāśayatyataḥ kṛtsnaśarīre sukhādy anubhavo na virudhyate ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nānṅv ātmano 'ṇuparimāṇakatve kṛtsnadehavyāpisukhādy anubhavaḥ katham
upapadyata iti| atrocitate nāyam virodhaḥ| yathā haricandanabindur
dehaikadeśasthaḥ svaguṇena sakaladehāhlādaṁ janayati tathā jīvo 'pi
dehaikadeśasthaḥ svaguṇena kṛtsnadehavyāpisukhādikam anubhavaty aṇumātro
'py ayaṁ jīvaḥ svadehaṁ vyāpya tiṣṭhati| yathā vyāpya śarīrāṇi
haricandanavipluṣa iti smṛteḥ| ata eva bhagavatāpy uktaṁ yathā prakāśayaty ekaḥ
kṛtsnam lokam imaṁ raviḥ| kṣetram kṣetrī tathā kṛtsnam prakāśayati bhārateti ||

Śārīrakamīmāṁsābhāṣya:

nānṅv aṇutve saty ekadeśasthasya sakaladehagatopalabdhir virudhyate| dr̥ṣyate ca
jāhnavīhradanimagnānām sarvāṅgaśaityopalabdhir nidāghasamaye ca
sakalaśarīraparītāpopalabdhir ity ata uttaram paṭhaty – avirodhaś candanavat||
yathā hi haricandanabinduḥ śarīraikadeśasambaddho 'pi san sakaladehavyāpinam
āhlādam karoty evam evātmāpi dehaikadeśasthaḥ sakaladehavyāpinīm
upalabdhim kariṣyati| tvak sambandhāc cāsya sakalaśarīragatā vedanā na
virudhyate| tvag ātmanor hi sambandhaḥ kṛtsnāyam tvaci vartate tvak ca
kṛtsnaśarīravāpinīti||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.24**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

avasthiti viśeṣabhāvād dr̥ṣṭāntavaiśamyam iti cen na| dehaikadeśe
haricandanavadd hr̥di hy ayam ātmeti jīvāvasthity abhyupagamāt ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nānṅv candanadr̥ṣṭānto na yukto 'vasthitivaiśamyāc candanabindor avasthiti
dehaikadeśe pratyakṣato dr̥ṣyate jīvasyāvasthitis tu dehaikadeśe na jñāyate
sarvatra caitanyopalabdher ity evam ubhayor avasthitivailakṣaṇyād iti cen na|

kuto 'ṇuparimāṇasya jīvasyāvasthitir dehaikadeśe hṛdi yo 'yaṁ vijñānamayaḥ prāṇeṣu hṛdy antarjyotir ityādiśrutibhir abhyupagamāt| sakalaśarīre 'avasthitimś tu dharmabhūtasya jñānasyeti hi śabdārthaḥ ||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

atrāha yad uktam avirodhaś candanavad iti tad ayuktaṁ dṛṣṭāntadārṣṭāntikayor atulyatvāt| siddhe hy ātmano dehaikadeśasthatve candanadrṣṭānto bhavati pratyakṣaṁ tu candanasyāvasthitivaiśamyam ekadeśasthatvaṁ sakaladehāhladanam ca| ātmanaḥ punaḥ sakaladehopalabdhimātraṁ pratyakṣaṁ naikadeśavartitam| anumeyaṁ tu tad iti yad apy ucyate| na cātrānumānam sambhavati| kim ātmanaḥ sakalaśarīragatā vedanā tvagindriyasyeva sakaladehavyāpinaḥ sataḥ| kim vā vibhor nabhasya ivāhosvic candanabindor ivānor ekadeśasthasyeti saṁśayānativṛtter iti| atrocyate nāyaṁ doṣaḥ| kasmād abhyupagamāt| abhyupagamyate hy ātmano 'pi candanasyeva dehaikadeśavṛttitvam avasthitivaiśeṣyam| katham ity ucyate hṛdi hy eṣa ātmā paṭhyate vedānteṣu. hṛdi hy eṣa ātmā sa vā eṣa ātmā hṛdi katama ātmeti yo 'yaṁ vijñānamayaḥ prāṇeṣu hṛdy antarjyotiḥ puruṣa ityādy upadeśebhyaḥ. tasmād dṛṣṭāntadārṣṭāntikayor avaiśamyād yuktam evaitad avirodhaś candanavad iti||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.25**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

dehaprakāśo jīvagunād eva koṣṭhe dīpālokādivat ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

vāśabdaḥ śaṅkānirākaraṇārthaḥ| dehaikadeśasthasyāṇuparimāṇakasyātmāno vyāpakāḥ jñānalakṣaṇād guṇāt sakalaśarīragatasukhādy upalabdhisiddhir nānyathety arthaḥ| lokaval loka maṇidyumaṇidīpādaya ekadeśasthāpi guṇair eva svasvānurūpān bahūn deśān prakāśayanti| ālokavad iti vā chhedo maṇyādīnām ālokavat sāṅkhyādy abhimato nirdharmakātmavādaḥ prāṇ nirākṛta eva||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

caitanyaḥ guṇavyāpter vānorapi sato jīvasya sakaladehavyāpi kāryaṁ na virudhyate| yathā loka maṇipradīpaprabhṛtīmām apavarakaikadeśavartinām api prabhāpavarakavyāpinī satī kṛtsne 'pavarake kāryaṁ karoti tadvat| syāt kadācic candanasya sāvayavatvāt sūkṣmāvayavavisarpanenāpi sakaladeha āhlādayitṛtvaṁ vā tv aṇor jīvasyāvayavāḥ santi yair ayaṁ sakaladehaṁ viprasarped ity āśaṅkya guṇādvā lokavad ity uktam ||

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.26**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

guṇabhūtasya jñānasya vyatirekas tu gandhavat upapadyata etādṛśaguṇāśrayaṅ jīvaṁ sa eṣa praviṣṭa ālomabhya ānakhebhya iti śrutir darśayati||

Vedāntakaustubha:

hṛdgatajīvād guṇinas tadguṇabhūtasya jñānasya vyatireko 'dhikadeśavṛttitvam gandhavat alpadeśasthāt puspagandhasyādhikadeśavṛttitvavad ityarthaḥ|

adhikadeśavṛttijñānaguṇena sakalaśarīravṛttitvam ātmano darśayati śrutih sa eṣa praviṣṭa ālomabhya ānakhebhya iti||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

katham punar guṇo guṇivyatirekeṇānyatra varteta| na hi paṭasya śuklo guṇaḥ paṭavyatirekeṇānyatra vartamāno dṛśyate| pradīpaprabhāvad bhaved iti cen na. tasyāpi dravyatvābhyupagamāt| nibidāvayavaṃ hi tejodravyaṃ pradīpaḥ. praviralāvayavaṃ tu tejodravyameva prabheta | ata uttaraṃ paṭhati || Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya 2.3.26|| vyatireko gandhavat || yathā guṇasyāpi sato gandhasya gandhavad dravyavyatirekeṇa vṛttirbhavati| aprāpteṣv api kusumādiṣu| gandhavatsu kusumagandhopalabdheḥ| evam aṅor api sato jīvasya caitanyaguṇavyatireko bhaviṣyati| ataś cānaikāntikam etadguṇatvād rūpādivad āśrayaviśeṣānupapattir iti| guṇasyaiva sato gandhasyāśrayaviśeṣadarśanāt| gandhasyāpi sahaivāśrayeṇa viśeṣa iti cen na| yasmān mūladravyād viśeṣitasya kṣayaprasaṅgāt| akṣīyamāṇam api tatpūrvāvasthāto gamyate| anyathā tatpūrvāvasthair gurutvādibhir hīyeta| syād etat| gandhāśrayāṇām viśiṣṭānām avayavānām alpatvāt sann api viśeṣo nopalakṣyate| sūkṣmā hi gandhaparamāṇavaḥ sarvato viprasrptā gandhabuddhim utpādayanti nāsikāpuṭam anupraviśanta iti cen na| atīndriyatvāt paramāñūnām sphuṭagandhopalabdheś ca nāgakesarādiṣu| na ca loke pratītir gandhavad dravyamāghrātam iti| gandha evāghrāta iti tu laukikāḥ pratīyanti| rūpādiṣv āśrayavyatirekānupalabdher gandhasyāpy ayukta āśrayavyatireka iti cen na| pratyakṣatvād anumānāpravṛtteḥ| tasmād yad yathā loke dṛṣṭam tat tathaivānumantavyaṃ nirūpakair nānyathā| na hi raso guṇo jihvayopalabhyata ity ato rūpādayo 'pi guṇā jihvāyavopalabhyer agnir iti niyantum śakyate| tathā ca darśayati|| Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya 2.3.27|| hṛdayāyatanatvam aṅuparimāṇatvam cātmano 'bhidhāya tasyaivā lomasya ā nakhāgrebhya iti caitanyena guṇena samastaśarīravṛtvyāpitvaṃ darśayati|| 2.3.26-27 in Śaṅkara's reading.

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.27**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

jīvatājñānāyor jñānatvāviśeṣe 'pi dharmadharmibhāvo yukta eva| kutaḥ prajñayā śarīram āruhyetyādipṛthagupadeśāt||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nanu jñānam ātmatattvam astu tatrāgudharmī vyāpako dharmā iti bhedo na yukta ityāśaṅkyāha- pṛthagupadeśāt| dharmiṇo jīvadharmasya prajñayā śarīram āruhyeti tad eṣām prāñānām vijñānena vijñānam ādāyati ca pṛthagupadeśāj jñānatvāviśeṣe 'pi śrutiyuktatvāt dharmadharmiṇor bhedo yukta ityarthah| na hi sājātyam abhede niyāmakaṃ prabhātadvatos tejastvāviśeṣe 'pi bhedarśanāt||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

prajñayā śarīram samāruhyeti cātmaprajñayoḥ karṭkaraṇabhāvena pṛthagupadeśāc caitanyaguṇenaivāsya śarīravṛtvyāpitā gamyate| tadeṣām prāñānām vijñānena vijñānam ādāyati ca kartuḥ śarīratpṛthagvijñānasyopadeśa etam evābhiprāyam upodbalayati| tasmādaṅurātmeti|| 2.3.28 in Śaṅkara's reading.

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.30**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

asya jñānasya suṣuptādau sata eva jāgradadāv abhivyaktisambhāvād
yāvadātmabhāvitvam eva| yathā puṁstvāder bālye sata eva yauvane 'bhivyaktiḥ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nanu jīvabhūtasya jñānasya nityatvañ cet tarhi suṣuptyādau kutas tad apratītir ity
atrāha- puṁstvādivat tv asya sato 'bhivyaktiyogāt| tu śabdo 'vadhārane|
jīvadharmabhūtasya jñānasya yāvadātmabhāvitvam eva| kutaḥ sato
'bhivyaktiyogāt| asya dharmabhūtasya jñānasya suṣuptyādiṣu sata
evānbhivyaktirūpeṇa vidyamānasyaiva jāgarādiṣv abhivyaktiyogāt| yathā bālye
sata eva puṁstvāder yauvane 'bhivyaktiyogaḥ| audāryasauśīlyādayaḥ sahaḥ guṇā
ādiśabdena gṛhyante||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

yathā loke puṁstvādīni bījātmanā vidyamānāny eva bālyādiṣv anupalabyamānāny
avidyamānavad abhipreyamānāni yauvanādiṣv āvirbhavanti nāvidyamānāny
utpadyante ṣaṇḍādīnām api tad utpattiprasaṅgād evam ayam api
buddhisambandhaḥ śaktyātmanā vidyamāna eva suṣuptapralayayoḥ punaḥ
prabodhaprasavayor āvirbhavati| evaṁ hy etad yujyate na hy ākasmikī kasyacid
utpattiḥ sambhavaty atiprasaṅgāt| darśayati ca suṣuptyād utthānam
avidyātmakabījasadbhāvakāritam – sati sampadya na viduḥ sati sampadyāmaha iti
ta iha vyāghro vā siṁho vetyādinā| tasmāt siddham etad yāvadātmabhāvī
buddhyādy upādhisambandha iti|| 2.3.31 in Śāṅkara's reading.

• **Brahmasūtra 2.3.31**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

sarvagatātmavāda ātmopalabdhyanupalabdhyor bandhamokṣayor nityam prasaṅgaḥ
syān nityabaddho vā nityamukto vātmety anyataraniyamo vā syāt||
Vedāntapārijātasaurabha 2.3.31

Vedāntakaustubha:

cetanabhūtatmavibhutvavādimate doṣakathanārtham sūtram| anyathā
jñātṛtvādyātmadharmako jñānasvarūpo 'ṇuparimāṇaka ātmety asmatpaksād
anyaprakārake jñānamātrasarvagatātmavāde nityam upalabdhyanupalabdhyoḥ
prasaṅgaḥ syāt| vyāpakasyātmano 'nāvṛtatvād upalabdhiḥ saṁsārasadbhāvād
anupalabdhir evaṁ yugapadbandhamokṣau prasajyetām anyataraniyamo vā|
asmākaṁ tu jīvātmano 'ṇuparimāṇatvād gatyāgatyo āvṛtatvānāvṛtatvayor
gamyagantrōś ca sambhavād bandhamokṣavyavasthopapadyate| tava
tūktalakṣaṇayor bandhamokṣayor anyatara eva prasajyeta|
jñānamatrasyaācalasyātmano nityam bandha eva syād athavāpavarga eva syād iti
niyamaḥ prāpnoti| tasmāj jñātṛtvavān jñānasvarūpo 'ṇuparimāṇo jīva iti siddham|
ity utkrāntiyadhikaraṇam||

• **Brahmasūtra 4.2.1**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

vānmanasi sampadyata iti vāgindriyasya manasi saṁyogarūpā sampattir ucyate vāgīndriye uparate 'pi manaḥ pravṛttidarśanād vān manasi sampadyata iti śabdāc ca||

Vedāntakaustubha:

pūrvapādānte brahma sampadyata ityuktam iha tu brahmaprāptaye viduṣa utkrāntiyādikaṁ nirūpyate| tatreḍānīm vidvadavidvatsādhāraṇām utkrāntim nirūpayati| asya somya puruṣasya prayato vān manasi sampadyate manaḥ prāṇe prāṇas tejasi tejaḥ parasyām devatāyām ity atra saṁśayaḥ - kim atra vāgvṛtter manasi sampattir ucyata uta vṛttimatyā vāca eveti. vāgvṛttayah sveṣu sveṣu viṣayeṣu manasā pravarttante 'to vāgvṛtter manasi sampattir yukteti prāpte brūmo vāg eva vṛttimatī manasi sampadyate| kutaḥ| darśanād vāgīndriye uparate 'pi manaḥ pravṛttidarśanāt| nanv etad vāg vṛttimātrasampattau satyām api saṅgacchata ityāśaṅkya mukhyam hetum āha - śabdāc ceti| vān manasi sampadyata iti śabdāc ca| neha vāgvṛttir manasi sampadyata iti śabdo 'sti| sampattir iha saṁyogarūpā jñeyā na tu layarūpānupādānabhūte manasi vāco layāsambhavāt| aviduṣā dehāntarapatipattau vāgādyanuvṛtter apekṣitatvāt viduṣo vāgādīnām layasya paramātmani vakṣyamāṇatvāc ca||

Śārīrakamīmāṁsābhāṣya:

athāparāsu vidyāsu phalaprāptaye devayānam panthānam avatārayiṣyan prathamam tāvad yathāśāstram utkrāntikramam anvācaṣṭe| samānā hi vidvadaviduṣor utkrāntir iti vakṣyati| asti prāyaṇaviṣayā śrutir asya somya puruṣasya prayato vānmanasi sampadyate manaḥ prāṇe prāṇas tejasi tejaḥ parasyām devatāyām iti| kim iha vāca eva vṛttimatyā manasi sampattir ucyate uta vāgvṛttir iti viṣayah| tatra vāg eva tāvan manasi sampadyata iti prāptam| tathā hi śrutir anugrhitā bhavati| itarathā lakṣaṇā syāt| śrutilakṣaṇāviṣaye ca śrutir nyāyā na lakṣaṇā| tasmād vāca evāyam manasi pralaya iti| evam prāpte brūmah - vāgvṛttir manasi sampadyata iti| katham vāgvṛttiriti vyākhyāyate| yāvatā vānmanasītevācāryaḥ paṭhati| satyam etat paṭhiṣyati tu parastād avibhāgo vacanād iti| tasmād atra vṛttyupasaṁamātram vivakṣitam iti gamyate| tattvapralayavivakṣāyām tu sarvatraivāvibhāgasāmyāt kim paratraiva viśiṣyād vibhāga iti| tasmād atra vṛttyupasaṁhāravivakṣā| vāgvṛttiḥ pūrvam upasaṁhryate manovṛttāv avasthitāyām ityarthah| kasmād| darśanāt| dṛśyate hi vāgvṛtteḥ pūrvopasaṁhāro manovṛttau vidyamānāyām na tu vāca eva vṛttimatyā manasy upasaṁhārah kenacid api draṣṭum śakyate| nanu śrutisāmārthyād vāca evāyam manasy apyayo yukta ity uktam netyāhātatprakṛtitvāt| yasya hi yata utpattis tasya tatra pralayo nyāyo mṛdīva śarāvasya| na ca manaso vāg utpadyata iti kiñcana pramāṇam asti| vṛttyudbhavābhibhavau tvatprakṛtisamāśayāv api dṛśyete| pārthivebhyo hīndhanebhyas taijasasyāgner vṛttir udbhavaty apsu copaśāmyati| katham tarhy asmin pakṣe śabdo vānmanasi sampadyata iti| ata āha śabdāc ceti| śabdo 'py asmin pakṣe 'vakalpate vṛttivṛttimator abhedopacārād ityarthah||

• **Brahmasūtra 4.2.3**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:
tac ca prāṇena saṃyujyate ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

idāṇīm tat prāṇena saṃyujyata ity āha | vāgādisaṃyuktaṃ manaḥ kva sampadyata ity atrocyate tadvāgādisaṃyuktaṃ manaḥ prāṇe sampadyate| kutaḥ | uttarāt | manaḥ prāṇe ityuttarāc chabdāt | evaṃ sarvendriyasam̐yuktaṃ manaḥ prāṇena saṃyujyata iti siddham|| iti mano 'dhikaraṇam||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

samadhigatam etad vānmanasi sampadyata ityatra vṛttisampattivakṣeti | atha yad uttaravākyaṃ manaḥ prāṇe iti kim atram api vṛttisampattir eva vivakṣyata uta vṛttimsampattir iti vicikitsāyām vṛttimsampattir evātretri prāptaṃ śrutyanugrahāt tatprakṛtikatvopapattes ca| tathā hy annamayam hi somya mana āpomayaḥ prāṇa ity annayoni mana āmananty abyoniṃ ca prāṇam | āpaś cānnam asṛjanta iti śrutiḥ | ataś ca yanmanaḥ prāṇe pralīyate 'nnam eva tad apsu pralīyate 'nnaṃ hi mana āpaś ca prāṇaḥ prakṛtivilkārahedād iti | evaṃ prāpte brūmas tad apy āgrhītabāhyendriyavṛtti mano vṛttidvāreṇaiva prāṇe pralīyata ity uttarād vākyaād avagantavyam | tathā hi susupsor mumūrṣoś ca prāṇavṛttau parisandātmikāyām avasthitāyām mano vṛttinām upaśamo dṛśyate | na ca manasaḥ svarūpāpyayaḥ prāṇe sambhavaty atatprakṛtīvāt | nanu darśitam manasaḥ prāṇaprakṛtīvaṃ naitat sāraṃ na hīdṛśena prāṇādikena tatprakṛtīvena manaḥ prāṇe sampattum arhati | evam api hy anne manaḥ sampadyetāpsu cānnam apsv eva ca prāṇaḥ | na hy etasminn api pakṣe prāṇabhāvapariṇatābhyo 'dbhyo mano jāyata iti kiñcana pramāṇamasti tasmān na manasaḥ prāṇe svarūpāpyayaḥ| vṛtṭyapyaaye 'pi tu śabdo 'vakalpate vṛttivṛttimator abhedopacārād iti darśitam ||

• **Brahmasūtra 4.2.4**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

prāṇo jīvena saṃyujyate | kutaḥ | evam evamam ātmānam antakāle sarve prāṇā abhisamāyanti tam utkrāantaṃ prāṇo 'nūtkrāmati, kasmin vā pratiṣṭhite pratiṣṭhitaḥ syām iti tad upagamādibodhakavākyebhyo jīvasaṃyuktasya prāṇasya tejasi sampattir iti phalito 'rthaḥ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

evaṃ manaḥ prāṇa ity vākyasyārtho darśita| idāṇīm prāṇas tejasīti vākyasyārtham āha| prāṇas tejasīti vākye kim prāṇas tejasi sampadyata uta jīva ity sandehe yathā pūrvatra śabdānurodhena vāco manasi sampattir manasaḥ prāṇe sampattis tadvat prāṇas tejasīty uttaravākya 'pi śabdād eva niścīyate prāṇas tejasya eva sampadyata ity pūrvapakṣaḥ| tatrocyate| yatra manasaḥ sampattiḥ sa prāṇo 'dhyakṣe dehendriyādhyakṣe jīve sampadyate tena saṃyujyata ityarthāḥ| kutaḥ| tadupagamādibhyas tasyopagamānugamanapraṭiṣṭhānebhyaḥ| tatra tasya prāṇasyādhyakṣopagamas tāvac chrūyate| yathā rājānam yātreccchāvantaṃ santam bhṛtyā ābhimukhyenāgacchanty evam evamam ātmānam antakāle sarve prāṇā abhisamāyanti adhyakṣeṇa saha prāṇasyānugamanaṃ ca śrūyate| yatra itad

ūrddhvocchavāsī bhavati tam utkrāmantam prāṇo 'nūtkrāmatīty adhyakṣeṇa saha prāṇasya pratiṣṭhā ca śrūyate| kasminn utkrānte utkrānto bhaviṣyāmi kasmin vā pratiṣṭhite pratiṣṭhitaḥ syām iti jīvena saha prāṇasya tejasy api sampattiḥ| tasmāt prāṇo jīvena saṃyujya punas tena saha tejasā saṃyujyata iti siddham | ity adhyakṣādhikaraṇam ||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

sthitam etad yasya yato notpattis tasya tasmin vṛttipralayo na svarūpapralaya iti| idam idānīm prāṇas tejasīyatra cintyate kiṃ yathāśruti prāṇasya tejasy eva vṛttyupasaṃhāraḥ kiṃ vā dehendriyapañjarādhyakṣe jīve iti| tatra śruter anatiśaṅkyatvāt prāṇasya tejasy eva sampattiḥ syād āsrutakalpanāyā anyāyatvād iti| evaṃ prāpte pratipādyate so 'dhyakṣa iti| sa prakṛtaḥ prāṇo 'dhyakṣo 'vidyākarmapūrvaprajñopādhike vijñānātmany avatiṣṭhate | tatpradhānāprāṇavṛttir bhavatītyarthaḥ| kutaḥ| tadupagamādibhyaḥ| evam evam ātmānam antakāle sarve prāṇā abhisamāyanti tatraitad ūrdhvocchvāsī bhavatīti hi śrutyantarām adhyakṣopagāmināḥ sarvān prāṇān aviśeṣeṇa darśayati| viśeṣeṇa ca tam utkrāmantam prāṇo 'nūtkrāmatīti pañcavṛtteḥ prāṇasyādhyakṣānugāmitām darśayati tadanuvṛttitām cetareṣāṃ prāṇam anūtkrāmantam sarve prāṇā anutkrāmantīti| savijñāno bhavatīti cādhyakṣasyāntarvijñānavattvapradaśanena tasminn apītakaraṇagrāmasya prāṇasyāvasthānam gamayati| nanu prāṇas tejasīti śrūyate katham prāṇo 'dhyakṣe ity adhiāvapakriyate | naiṣaḥ doṣaḥ | adhyakṣapradhānatvād utkramanādīvyavahārasya śrutyantaragatasyāpi ca viśeṣasyāpekṣānyatvāt|| katham tarhi prāṇas tejasīti śrutir ityata āha ||

• **Brahmasūtra 4.2.5**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

sā ca jīvasaṃyuktasya tasya tejaḥsahiteṣu bhūteṣu bhavati pṛthivīmaya āpomayo vāyumaya ākāśamayas tejomayeti sañcarato jīvasya sarvabhūtamayatvaśravaṇāt ||

Vedāntakaustubha:

adhyakṣeṇa saṃyujya tejasā prāṇaḥ saṃyujyate ity upapāditam idānīm tejaḥ śabdena kiṃ grāhyam iti vicāryate| tadupagamādibhyo 'dhyakṣasaṃyuktasya prāṇasya tejasi sampattir bhavatu tāvad atha sā kiṃ tejomātra āhosvit tejaḥsahiteṣu bhūteṣv iti saṃśaye prāṇas tejasīti śabdāt tejomātra iti prāpta ucyate bhūteṣv iti| tajasi tejaḥsahiteṣu bhūteṣv ityarthaḥ| kutaḥ| tac chruteḥ pṛthivīmaya āpomayo vāyumaya ākāśamayas tejomayeti sañcarato jīvasya sarvabhūtamayatvaśravaṇāt||

Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya:

sa prāṇasaṃprkto 'dhyakṣas tejaḥ sahariteṣu bhūteṣu dehabījabhūteṣu sūkṣmeṣv avatiṣṭhata ity avagantavyam| prāṇas tejasīti śruteḥ | nany ceyam śrutiḥ prāṇasya tejasi sthitim darśayati na prāṇasaṃprktasyādhyakṣasyāpy antarāla upasaṅkhyātavāt | yo 'pi hi srughnān mathurām gatvā mathurāyāḥ pāṭaliputraṃ vrajati so 'pi srughnāt pāṭaliputraṃ yāṭīti śakyate vaditum | tasmāt prāṇas tejasīti prāṇasaṃprktasyādhyakṣasyaivaitat tejaḥsahariteṣu bhūteṣv avasthānam |

katham tejahsahacariteṣu bhūteṣy ityucyate yāvataikam eva tejah śrūyate prāṇas tejasīti | ata āha ||

• **Brahmasūtra 4.2.12**

Vedāntapārijātasaurabha:

athākāmayamāno yo 'kāmo niṣkāma āptakāma ātmakāmo na tasya prāṇā utkrāmantīti vipraṭiṣedhād viduṣa utkrāntir anupapanneti cet| nāyaṁ virodho yato 'yaṁ prāṇānām utkrāmanti praṭiṣedhād viduṣaḥ prakṛtāc charīrān na tasmāt prāṇā utkrāmantīti spaṣṭa ekeṣām pāthe | tasmād eva teṣām utkrāntipraṭiṣedhaḥ śrūyate||

Vedāntakaustubha:

nanu samānā cāsṛty upakramād ityādinā pratipāditā viduṣo 'py utkrāntiḥ sā na yuktāthākāmayamāno yo 'kāmo niṣkāma āptakāma ātmakāmo na tasya prāṇā utkrāmanti brahmaiva san brahmāpy etītyādikāṅvaśruter viduṣaḥ śarīrād utkrāntipraṭiṣedhād iti cen na| śarīrādayam utkrāntipraṭiṣedho na bhavati| athākāmayamāna iti prakṛtaṁ śarīraṁ tac chabdena parāmrśya na tasya prāṇā utkrāmantīty anena vākyena śarīrāj jīvāt teṣām utkrāntiḥ praṭiṣidhyate| tasyeti ṣaṣṭhyā prāṇasambandhitvenāprakṛtasya śarīrasya nirdeśābhāvāt| tena pradyotenaiṣa ātmā niṣkrāmati tam utkrāmantam prāno 'nūtkrāmaty anyann avataram kalyāṇataram rūpaṁ kuruta ityādinā saṁsārāvasthāyām śarīrārambhāya śarīrasya prāṇānām utkrāntiḥ prāptā sā niṣidhyate | viduṣaḥ prārabdhakarmopasthāpitacaramaśarīraviyogakāle prāṇānām viyogaḥ prāptas tad api niṣidhyate | devayānena pathā vrajatā tena sahaiva gacchanti brahmaprāpteḥ prān na viśliṣyanta ityarthah| ekeṣām śākhinām mādhyāndinānām pāthe tu yo 'kāmo niṣkāma āptakāmeti prakṛtān na tasmāt prāṇā utkrāmantīti pañcamyā vibhaktyāpādānatvena nirdiṣṭāc charīrāt prāṇānām utkrāntiniṣedhaḥ spaṣṭa eva śrūyate ||

Śārīrakamīmāṁsābhāṣya:

amṛtatvaṁ cānupoṣyetyato viśeṣaṇād ātyantike 'mṛtve gatyutkrāntyor abhāvo 'bhyupagataḥ| tatrāpi kenacit kāraṇenotkrāntim āśaṅkya praṭiṣedhaty athākāmayamāno yo 'kāmo niṣkāma āptakāma ātmakāmo bhavati na tasya prāṇā utkrāmanti brahmaiva san brahmāpy etīty atah paravidyāviṣayāt praṭiṣedhān na parabrahmavido dehāt prāṇānām utkrāntir astīti cen nety ucyate yataḥ śarīrād ātmana eṣa utkrāntipraṭiṣedhaḥ prāṇānām na śarīrāt | katham avagamyate | na tasmāt prāṇā utkrāmantīti śākhāntare pañcamīprayogāt | sambandhasāmānyaviṣayā hi ṣaṣṭhī śākhāntaragatayā pañcamyā sambandhaviśeṣe vyavasthāpyate | tasmād iti ca prādhānyād abhyudayaniḥśreyasādhikṛto dehī sambadhyate na dehaḥ | na tasmād uccikramiṣor jīvāt prāṇā apakrāmanti sahaiva tena bhavantītyarthah|| Śārīrakamīmāṁsābhāṣya 4.2.12||

saprānasya ca pravasato bhavaty utkrāntir dehād ity evaṁ prāpte pratyucyate – naitad asti yaduktam parabrahmavido 'pi dehād asty utkrāntir utkrāntipraṭiṣedhasya dehy apādānatvād iti yato dehāpādāna evotkrāntipraṭiṣedha ekeṣām samāmnātīnām spaṣṭa upalabhyate | tathā hy ārtabhāgaprasne yatrāyam puruṣo mriyata ud asmāt prāṇāḥ krāmanty āho netīyatra neti hovāca yājñavalkya ity anutkrāntipakṣam pariḡrhya na tarhy ayam anuktrānteṣu prāṇeṣu mriyata ity

*asyām āśaṅkāyām atraiva samavanīyante iti pravilayaṁ prāṇānāṁ pratijñāya tat
siddhaye sa ucchvayatyādhmāyatyādhmāto mṛtaḥ śeta iti saśabdaparāmṛṣṭasya
prakṛtasyotkrānty avadher ucchvayanādīni samāmananti | dehasya caitāni syur na
dehinas tatsāmānyān na tasmāt prāṇā utkrāmanty atraiva samavanīyanta ity
atrāpy abhedopacāreṇa dehāpādānasyaivotkramaṇasya pratiśedhaḥ | yady api
prādhānyām dehina iti vyākhyeyam yeṣāṁ pañcamīpāṭhaḥ | yeṣāṁ tu saṣṭhīpāṭhas
teṣāṁ vidvatsambandhiny utkrāntiḥ pratiśidhyata iti
prāptotkrāntipratiśedhārthatvād asya vākyasya dehāpādānaiva sā pratiśiddhā
bhavati dehād utkrāntiḥ prāptā na dehinaḥ | api ca cakṣuṣṭo vā mūrdhno
vānyebhyo vā śarīradeśebhyas tam utkrāmantaṁ prāṇo 'nūtkrāmati prāṇam
anūtkrāmantaṁ sarve prāṇā anūtkrāmantiṭy evam avidvadviṣaye saprapaṅcam
utkramaṇam saṁsāragamaṇam ca darśayitveti nu kāmāyamaṇa
ityupasaṁhrtyāvidvatkathām athākāmāyamaṇa iti vyapadiśya vidvāṁsam yadi
tadviṣaye 'py utkrāntyor vidvadviṣaye pratiśedha ity evam eva vyākhyeyam
vyapadeśārthavattvāya | na ca brahmavidaḥ sarvagatabrahmātmabhūtasya
prakṣīṇakāmakarmaṇa utkrāntir gatiṣ vopapadyate nimittābhāvāt | atra brahma
samaśnuta iti caivamjātīyakāḥ śrutayo gatyutkrāntyor abhāvaṁ sūcayanti|| 4.2.13
in Śaṅkara's reading.*

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Acāryacaritam* of Nārāyaṇaśaraṇa Devācārya. Manuscript. Colophon details: *iti śrīman nārāyaṇadevācāryasaṅgrhīta-śrīmaddhamsanārāyaṇādi-paraśurāmdevācāryāvadhī-saṅkṣepacaritraṃ samāptam| samvat 1916* (1860CE). 28 folios with significant water damage, handwritten with copious marginal notes and amendments. From the private collection of Jagadguru Nimbārkācārya Svāmī Śrī Rādhāsarveśvaraśaraṇa Devācārya, Śrīnimbārkācārya Pīṭha, Salemābāda.
- Āgamaḍambara* of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta. *Much Ado About Religion by Bhaṭṭa Jayanta*, edited and translated into English by Csaba Dezso, New York: Clay Sanskrit Library, 2005.
- Āgamaśāstra* of Gauḍapāda, edited by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya, 1st edition 1943, reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.
- Ahīrbudhnya Samhitā* of the Pañcarātrāgama, 2 volumes, edited by M. D. Ramanujacharya under the supervision of F. Otto Schrader, revised by V. Krishnamacharya, Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1966.
- Amarakoṣa* of Amarasimha, with *Ratnaprabhāvyākhyā* and Hindi translation of Brahmānanda Tripāṭhin, Vārāṇasi: Chaukhamba Surbharti Prakashan, 1987.
- Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, with *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, 10 volumes, edited by Vedavrata Snātaka, Gurukul Jhajjara (Rohtak): Haryana Sahitya Sansthan, 1961-1964.
- Atharvaveda Samhitā*, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 2000.
- Audumbara Samhitā* of Audumbarācārya, edited with Hindi translation by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Sarveśvara Press, 1973.
- Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*:
- *Das Baudhayana-Dharmasutra*, ed. E. Hultsch, Zweite verbesserte Auflage, Leipzig: Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 1922.
 - with *Vivaraṇa* Sanskrit gloss by Govinda Swami and critical notes by M. M. A. Chinnaswami Shastri, edited by Umesh Chandra Pandey, Varanasi: Kashi Sanskrit Series 104, 1972.
- Bhagavadgītā* with commentaries:
- *Bhagavadgītābhāṣyam* of Madhvācārya, *Sri Madhvacharya Bhagavad Gita Bhashya and Tatparyanirnaya: Sanskrit Text with English Translation*, edited with English translation and Published by Nagesh D. Sonde, Mumbai, 2011.
 - *Gītābhāṣya* of Rāmānujācārya, with Hindi translation by Harikrishnadas Goyandka, Gorakhpur: Gita Press, 2011.
 - *Gītābhāṣya* of Śaṅkarācārya, expanded 3rd edition with Hindi translation by Harikrishnadas Goyandka, Gorakhpur: Gita Press, 2010.
 - *Gītābhūṣaṇa* of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, edited with English translation by Bhanu Swami, Chennai: Sampradaya Publishers, 2005.
 - *Tattvapraśāsikā* of Keśavakāśmīribhaṭṭācārya with Hindi gloss by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Śrī Sarveśvara Special Volume, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Sarveśvara Press, 1980.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa with 10 Sanskrit commentaries of Śrīdhara, Vamśīdhara, Rādhāramaṇadāśagosvāmin, *Bhāgavatacandrikā* of Vīrarāghavācārya, Vijayadhvajātīrtha, *Ṣaṣṣandarbhā* of Jīvagosvāmin, Viśvanāthacakravartin, Śukasudhī Devācārya, *Subodhinī* of Vallabhācārya, Puruṣottamacaraṇagosvāmin, and Giridharalālagosvāmin, 18 volumes, ed. Kṛṣṇaśāṅkara Śāstrin, Nadiyāda (Gujerat), 1965.

Bhaktamāla of Nābhādāsa, with *Bhaktirasabodhinī* commentary of Priyādāsa, Hindi translation and gloss by Ramkrishnadev Garg, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Śrījī Mandira, 2004.

Bhaktiratnākara of Narahari Cakravartin, edited by Rāsabihāri Sāṅkhyātīrtha, Berhampur: Rādhāramaṇa Press, 1912.

Bhāvārtha Rāmāyaṇa of Ekanātha, edited with commentary by M. V. Gokhale, Pune: Morayā Prakāśana, 2003.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa, with Hindi translation by Bābūrāma Upādhyāya, Prayāga: Hindī Sāhitya Sammelana, 2006.

Brahmavaivartapurāṇa, 2 volumes, edited with Hindi translation by Ramesh Chaturvedi, Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2001.

Brahmasūtra with commentaries:

- *Aṅubhāṣyam* of Vallabhācārya, edited with Hindi translation by Lalit Krishna Goswami, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 2001.
- *Bhāskarabhāṣyam* of Bhāskarācārya, Vārāṇasi: Chaukhambā Vidyābhavan, 1915.
- *Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam* of Madhva (Ānandatīrtha) with the subcommentary of Jagannāthayati, edited by Gopālakṛṣṇācārya, Madras: The Grove Press, 1900.
- *Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam*, *Brahmasūtrāṅubhāṣyam*, *Brahmasūtrāṅuvyākhyānam* of Madhva (Ānandatīrtha), edited and published by T. R. Kṛṣṇācārya, Kumbakonam, 1910.
- *Govindabhāṣyam* of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, published and with Hindi translation by Kṛṣṇadāsa Kusumasarovaravāle, 1955.
- *Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣyam* of Śāṅkarācārya, with *Satyānandī Dīpikā* Hindi translation and gloss by Swami Satyanand Saraswati, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 2011.
- *Siddhāntajāhnavī* of Devācārya, with subcommentary *Siddhāntasetukā* of Sundarabhaṭṭa, edited by Madan Mohan Agrawal, vol. 4, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 2000.
- *Śrībhāṣyam* of Rāmānujācārya, 2 volumes, edited with Hindi translation by Lalit Krishna Goswami, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 2010.
- *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* of Nimbārkācārya,
 - with subcommentaries *Vedāntakaustubha* of Śrīnivāsācārya and *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā* of Keśavakāśmīribhaṭṭācārya, edited by Nityasvarūpa Brahmācārin, Vṛndāvana: Devakīnandana Yantrālaya, 1905.
 - with subcommentaries *Vedāntakaustubha* of Śrīnivāsācārya, *Vedāntakaustubhaprabhā* of Keśavakāśmīribhaṭṭācārya, *Bhāvadīpikā* of Amolakarāmaśāstrin, 3 volumes, edited by

Madan Mohan Agrawal Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishtan, 2000.

Bṛhadutsavamāṇimāla of Rūparasika Devācārya, edited by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Mādhurī Dāsa, 1962.

Caitanyabhāgavata of Vṛndāvanadāsa Ṭhākura, with English translation by Sarvabhāvanadāsa, edited by Keśidamanadāsa, Vṛndāvana: Rasbeharilal and Sons, 2001.

Caitanyacaritāmṛta of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, with English translation by A. C. B. S. Prabhupada, 17 volumes, California: Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 1974-1975.

Cāṇakyanītidarpaṇa of Cāṇakya, edited with English translation by B. S. Bist, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishtan, 2001.

Caurāsī Pada of Hita Harivarṇa, edited with English translation by Rupert Snell, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991.

Dīkṣātattvaparakāśa of Haripriyāśaraṇa Devācārya (Dulāre Prasāda Śāstrin), Vṛndāvana: Gopālājī kī Bagīcī, 1924.

Do Sau Bāvana Vaiṣṇavana Kī Vārtā of Viṭṭhalanātha, with Hindi translation by Yadunandana Nārāyaṇa Tripāṭhī, Nāthadvārā: Vidyā Vibhāga, Mandira Maṇḍala, 2008.

Gāhāsattasāī (Gāhāsaptasāī) of Hāla, edited by Umāpati Upādhyāya, Vārāṇasi: Sampūrṇānanda Saṁskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, 2000.

Garga Saṁhitā of Gargācārya, with Hindi translation and gloss by Rāmateja Pāṇḍeya Śāstrin, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishtan, 1987.

Gautamīya Mahātāntra, edited by Rāmājī Mālavīya, Vārāṇasi: Sampūrṇānanda Saṁskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, 1992.

Gītagovinda of Jayadeva:

- with Hindi translation, part of a private collection containing books from the 1920's, missing all publishers data.
- edited with English translation by Lee Seigel, New York: Clay Sanskrit Library, 2009.

Gītāmṛtagaṅgā of Vṛndāvana Devācārya, edited by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Salemabad: Śrī Nimbārkācārya Pīṭha, 1998.

Gītārthasaṅgraha of Yāmunācārya, with *Gītārthasaṅgraharakṣā* of Vedānta Deśika, edited with Hindi translation by Govindācārya, Vārāṇasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan, 2013.

Gopālapaddhati of Harivyāsa Devācārya, edited by Ḍhunḍhirāja Śāstrin, Kāśī: Vidyāvilāsa Press, 1926.

Gopālasahasranāma of the Sammohanatantra, edited with *Haribhaktiprakāśikāṭīkā* of Jvālāprasāda Miśra, Mumbaī: Kṣemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa, 1921.

Gopālatāpinyupaniṣat

- with *Tattvaparakāśikā* of Raṇachoḍāśaraṇa Devācārya, edited by Rāmeśvaraśaraṇa Brahmācārin, Vṛndāvana: Nandalālādāsa, 1938.
- with *Vedāntatattvasamīkṣā* of Bhāgīratha Jhā Maithila, Vṛndāvana: Gautama Ṛṣi Āśrama, 1949.

Govindalīlāmṛta of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, with *Sadānandavidhāyinīṭīkā* of Viśvanātha Cakravartin, edited and published by Haridāsa Śāstrin, Vṛndāvana, 1977.

- Govindaśaraṇāpattistotram* of Keśavakāśmīribhaṭṭācārya, see *Stotraratnahāra*.
- Haribhaktivilāsa* of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmin, with *Digdarśiṇī Ṭīkā* of Sanātana Gosvāmin, 2 volumes, edited by Haridāsa Śāstrin, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Gadādhara Gaurahari Press, 1986.
- Harivaṁśa*, critical edition, *The Harivaṁśa: Being the Khila or Supplement to the Mahābhārata*, 2 volumes, edited by Parashuram Lakshman Vaidya, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1969, 1971.
- Harivyāsayaśāmṛta* of Rūparasika Devācārya, edited by Girish Chandra Agrawal, Vṛndāvana: Shivahari Printing Press, 2000.
- Itihāsasamuccaya*, with Hindi translation by Pt. Vastīrāma, edited by Pt. Kālīcaraṇa Caurāsiyā Gauḍa, Lucknow: Munshi Navalakiśora Bhārgava, 1914.
- Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, *The Jaiminiya or Talavaraka Upanishad Brahmana: Text, Translations and Notes*, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, edited by Hanns Oertel, 79-260, 1896.
- Jayākhya Samhitā*, edited by Embar Krishnamacharya, Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931.
- Jayasāha Sujasa Prakāśa* of Maṇḍana Bhaṭṭa Kavi, edited by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Salemabad: Śrī Nimbārka Pīṭha Śikṣaka Samiti, 1949.
- Jñātādharmaḥkathā*, with Gujerati translation by Sādhvī Sumana, Ghāṭkopara: Guruprāṇa Prakāśana Pārasadhāma, 2009.
- Kelimāla* of Svāmī Haridāsa, edited by Jayakiśora Śaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Śrījī Mandira, 2001.
- Kramadīpikā* of Keśavakāśmīribhaṭṭācārya,
 - edited by Ramchandra Kak & Harabhata Shastri, Shrinagar: His Highness Shri Rajarajeshvar Maharajadhiraja Maharaja Harisingh Ji Bahadur of Jammu & Kashmir, 1929.
 - with Hindi translation by Sudhākara Mālavīya, Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy, 1989.
- Kṛṣṇāmṛtamahārṇava* of Madhvācārya, *Śrī Ānandatīrthabhagavatpāda sarvamūlagranthaprasthānatrayī*, edited by Govindācārya, volume 5, Udupi: Akhilabhārata Madhva Mahāmaṇḍala, 1974.
- Kṛṣṇayajurveda Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā*, edited by Śrīdhara Śarmā, Mumbai: Bhāratamudraṇālayam, 1942.
- Kṛṣṇayajurveda Taittirīya Samhitā*, edited by Vijayaraghavan Bashyam, Hyderabad, 2005 [accessed: <http://www.sanskritweb.net/yajurveda/#TS> on 02/01/2013]
- Laghubhāgavatāmṛta* of Rūpagosvāmin, with English translation by Kuśakratha Dāsa, edited by Pūrṇaprajña Dāsa, Vṛndāvana: Rasbiharilal and Sons, 2007.
- Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* of Varadarājācārya, with Hindi gloss of Govind Prasad Sharma, edited by Raghunath Shastri, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan, 2007.
- Laghustavarājastotram* of Śrīnivāsācārya, with *Gurubhaktimandākinī* of Puruṣottamaprasāda Vaiṣṇava II, edited with Hindi translation by Sudhākara Mālavīya, Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy, 1989.
- Lakṣmī Tantra*, edited with Sanskrit gloss by Pt. V. Krishnamacharya, Adyar: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1959.

- Liṅgapurāṇa*, with *Śivatoṣiṇī* of Gaṇeśa Nātū, edited by Kṣemarāja Śrīkrṣṇadāsa, Mumbaī: Śrī Veṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1906.
- Mahābhārata*, *The Mahābhārata for the First Time Critically Edited*, by Vishnu Sitaram Suthankar et al., 19 volumes, Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933-1966.
- Mahāniddesa*, edited by L. De La Vallee Poussin & E. J. Thomas, Pali Text Society, 1916.
- Mahāvāṇī* of Harivyāsa Devācārya,
 - critical edition by Rajendra Prasad Gautam, Vṛndāvana: Vidyālaya Press, 1974.
 - with Hindi translation and gloss by Ratanlal Beriwalā, Vrindavan: Harinam Press, 1994.
- Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī* of Nimbārkācārya, with *Mantrārtharahasya* of Sundarabhaṭṭa, edited by Kiśora Dāsa, Vṛndāvana: Rāmacandradāsa Vaiṣṇava, 1937.
- Manusmṛti* of Manu, edited with English translation by R. N. Sharma, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishtan, 2003.
- Matsyapurāṇa*, with Hindi translation by Pt. Kālīcaraṇa Caurāsiyā Gauḍa and Pt. Vastīrāma, Lucknow: Munshi Navalakiśora Bhārgava, 1892.
- Mumhaṇota Naiṇasī Kī Khyāta* of Naiṇasī, 2 volumes, with Hindi translation by Rāmanārāyaṇa Dūgaḍa, edited by Gorishankar Hirachand Ojha, Jodhpur Fort: Maharaja Mansingh Pustak Prakash Research Centre, 2010.
- Nāgarīdāsa Jī kī Vāṇī* of Kishangarh King Samant Singh (Nāgarīdāsa), critical edition by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Sarveśvara Press, 1966.
- Nāradabhaktisūtras*, edited by Rāmagopāla Śāstrin, Salemabad: Śrī Nimbārkācārya Pīṭha, 1983.
- Nāradapañcarātra: Jñānāmṛtasamhitā*, edited with English translation by Svāmī Vijñānānanda, Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2002.
- Nijamatasiddhānta* of Svāmī Kiśoradāsa, edited by Alabelīśaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Lalita Prakāśana, 2008.
- Nimbārkāṣṭottaraśatanāmastotram* of Sadānandabhaṭṭa with *Premābhaktivivardhinīvyākhyā* of Harivyāsa Devācārya, edited by Dhunḍhirāja Śāstrin, Vṛndāvana: Rāmacandradāsa Vaiṣṇava, 1925.
- Nimbārkavikrānti* of Auḍumbarācārya, edited with Hindi translation by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Śrījī Kī Baḍī Kuñja, 1941
- Nirṇayasindhu* of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa, edited with Hindi translation by Vrajaratnabhaṭṭācārya, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Vidyabhavan, 2003.
- Nirukta* of Yāska, with commentary of Skandasvāmin and Maheśvara, edited by Lakṣmaṇa Svarūpa, Lahore: University of Punjab, 1928-1934.
- Nyāyakusumāñjali* of Udayanācārya, with Sanskrit and Hindi glosses by Vishveshvar Siddhanta Shiromani, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Vidyabhavan, 2005.
- Nyāyamañjari* of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, edited by Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1936.
- Nyāyāmṛta* of Vyāsatīrtha, *Nyāyāmṛta and Advaitasiddhi with 7 commentaries*, edited by Anantakrishna Shastri, Calcutta: Metropolitan Printing and Publishing House, 1934.

- Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama, with *Nyāyabhāṣyam* of Vātsyāyana, edited by Tārānātha Nyāya-Tarkatīrtha, 2 volumes, Calcutta: Metropolitan Printing and Publishers, 1936, 1934.
- Padmapurāṇa*, 4 volumes, edited by Khemarāja Śrīkrṣṇadāsa, Mumbaī: Śrī Venkateśvara Press, reprint Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1996.
- Pañcaghātīstotram* of Viśvācārya, see *Stotraratnahāra*.
- Pañcapādikā* of Padmapāda, with *Prabodhapariśodhinī* of Ātmasvarūpa, *Tātparyārthadyotini* of Vijñānātman, *Pañcapādikāvivarāṇa* of Prakāśātman, *Tātparyadīpikā* of Citsukhācārya and *Bhāvaprakāśikā* by Nṛsiṃhāśrama, 2 volumes, edited by S. Sriramasastri and S. R. Krishnamurthi Sastri, Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, 1958.
- Pāṇḍavagītā* and *Haṃsagītā*, Gorakhpur: Gita Press, 2002.
- Paramārthasāra* of Ādiśeṣa, edited with English translation by H. Danielson, Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Parama Saṃhitā*, edited with English translation, with an introduction by S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1940.
- Parāśarasṃṛti*, with Hindī translation by Guruprasāda Śarmā, Vārāṇasi: Chaukhambā Vidyābhavana, 2003.
- Paraśurāma Vāṇī/Sāgara* of Paraśurāma Devācārya, 4 volumes, edited by Ram Prasad Sharma, Jaipur: Current Book Company, 1967.
- Pauṣkara Saṃhitā*, edited by P. P. Apte, Tirupati: Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1991.
- Prabodhacandrodaya* of Kṛṣṇamiśra, *The Rise of Wisdom Moon by Krishna Mishra*, edited with English translation by Matthew T. Kapstein, New York: Clay Sanskrit Library, New York University Press, JJC Foundation, 2009.
- Prapannakalpavallī* of Nimbārka, see *Stotraratnahāra*.
- Prapannapārijāta* of Nadathur Ammal (Sriguru Varavatsya Varadacharya), edited with English translation by Srirama Ramanuja Achari, Srirangam: Simha Publications, 2009.
- Prātaḥsmaraṇastotram* of Nimbārka, with *Yugmatattvaparakāśikā* of Jagadguru Nimbārkācārya Svāmī Śrī Rādhāsarveśvaraśaraṇa Devācārya Śrījī Mahārāja, Salemabad: Śrī Nimbārka Pīṭha, 1960.
- Preyobhaktirasārṇava* of Nayanānanda Ṭhākura, *The Nectar Ocean of Fraternal Devotion, composed in Bengali with Numerous Sanskrit Quotations by Śrī Nayanānanda Ṭhākura in 1731AD*, edited with English translation by Daśarathasuta Dāsa, Union City: Nectar Books, 1994.
- Rādhākṛṣṇagaṇodeśadīpikā* of Rūpa Gosvāmin, edited and published by Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā, Mathurā, 1954.
- Rādhārasasudhānidhi* of Hita Harivaṃśa, edited and rendered into Hindi verse by Rājavidya Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa Śarmā, Delhi: Radha Press, 1991.
- Rādhāṣṭaka* of Nimbārkācārya, see *Stotraratnahāra*.
- Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, with *Tilaka* of Rāma, *Rāmāyaṇaśiromaṇi* of Śivasahāya and *Bhūṣaṇa* of Govindarāja, edited by Shastri Shrinivasa Katti Mudholakar, Delhi: Parimal Publications, 1983.

- Rāsapañcādhyāyī* of Harirāmavyāsa, in *Kṛṣṇa's Round Dance Reconsidered: Harirām Vyās's Hindī Rās-Pañcādhyāyī*, Richmond: Curzon Press, 1996b.
- Revākhaṇḍa* of the *Skandapurāṇa*, edited by Onkārānanda Giri, Hoṣāṅgābāda: Jñānasatra Prakāśana Nyāsa, 1994.
- Rgveda: khilāni*, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, edited by Isidor Scheftelowitz, Breslau, 1906.
- Rgveda Samhitā* of the Śākalya Śākhā, Vārāṇasi: Chaukhamba Vidyabhavan, reprint 1992.
- Samavāyāṅga*, with Gujerati translation by Sādhvī Vanitā, Ghāṭkopara: Guruprāṇa Prakāśana Pārasadhāma, 2009.
- Sāmaveda Samhitā*, with commentary by Sāyaṅcārya, edited with Hindi translation by Pt. Ramswaroop Sharma Gaud, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, reprint 2001.
- Saṅkalpakalpadruma* of Jīvagovāmin, with English translation, ebook. [accessed: http://ebooks.iskcondesiretree.info/pdf/Gaudiya_Books%20/Jiva_Goswami/Jiva_Goswami_Saṅkalpa_Kalpadruma.pdf]
- Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* of the *Śuklayajurveda Mādhyandinīya Śākhā*, *The Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Çākhā, with extracts from the commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Harisvāmin and Dvivedāṅga*, edited by Albrecht Weber, Berlin, 1849, reprint Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 96, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1964.
- Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* of the *Śuklayajurveda Kāṇva Śākhā*, *The Śatapatha Brahmaṇa in the Kāṇvīya Recension*, 2 volumes, edited by Willam Caland, Lahore: Panjab Sanskrit Series, 1926 and 1939. 2nd revised edition by Raghu Vira, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.
- Siddhāntakusumāñjali*, wrongly attributed to Harivyāsa Devācārya, lacking all publication information, in the possession of the Jagadguru Nimbārkācārya Svāmī Śrī Rādhāsarveśvaraśaraṇa Devācārya, Salemābāda: Śrīnimbārkācārya Pīṭha, [c.1920s]
- Siddhāntaratnāñjali* of Harivyāsa Devācārya, 2 volumes, with Brajhbhāṣā translation in verse, Barsana: Vrajendra Press, 1926.
- Siddhitraya* of Yāmunācārya, with *Siddhāñjana* of Aṅṅaṅarācārya [accessed: http://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel/1_sanskrit/6_sastra/3_phil/vedanta/yaatsi_u.htm, http://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel/1_sanskrit/6_sastra/3_phil/vedanta/yaissi_u.htm, and http://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel/1_sanskrit/6_sastra/3_phil/vedanta/yasasi_u.htm on 12/12/2013].
- Śivapurāṇa*, edited by Kṣemarāja Śrīkrṣṇadāsa, book 7, parts I & II, Mumbaī: Śrī Venkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1920.
- Śloka-vārttikā* of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, with *Kāśikā* of Sucaritamīśra, edited by K. Sambasiva Sastri, 3 volumes, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. 90, Trivandrum, 1926, 1929, 1943.
- Smṛtis: Aṣṭādaśasmṛtayah: Atri, Viṣṇu, Hārīta, Auśanasī, Āṅgīrasa, Yama, Āpastamba, Saṁvartta, Kātyāyana, Bṛhaspati, Pārāśara, Vyāsa, Śaṅkha*,

- Likhita, Dakṣa, Gautama, Śātātapa, Vāsiṣṭha – smṛtir iti*, edited by Kṣemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa, Mumbāi: Venkatesvara Steam Press, 1910.
- Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanyacaritāmṛta* of Murārīgupta, edited and published by Haridāsa Śāstrin, Vṛndāvana, 1984.
- Śrīkṛṣṇaśaraṇāpattistotram* of Śrībhaṭṭa, see *Stotraratnahāra*.
- Śrīnāthajī kī Prākṛṭya Vārtā* of Harirāya, with Hindi translation by Yadunandana Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī, Nāthadvārā: Vidyāvibhāga Mandira Maṇḍala, 2007.
- Śrīyugmatattvasamīkṣā* of Bhāgīratha Jhā Maithila, Vṛndāvana: Premadhāma Press, 1951.
- Sthānāṅga*, with Gujerati translation by Sādhvī Vīramati, Ghāṭkopara: Guruprāṇa Prakāśana Pārasadhāma, 2009.
- Stotraratnahāra*, compiled by Premadāsa Mohānta, Kalakattā: Mahārāṣṭra Press, 1940.
- Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* of Vidyākara, *The Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa: An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry*, edited by D. D. Kosambi and V. V. Gokhale, Harvard Oriental Series 42, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Sukla Yajurveda, Vājasaneyī Samhitā* of the *Mādhyandinīyā Śākhā*, with *Vedadīpikābhāṣya* of Mahīdhara and *Tattvabodhinī* Hindi gloss by Rāmākṛṣṇa Śāstrin, Vārānasi: Chaukhambā Vidyābhavana, 2003.
- Sūrasāgara* of Sūradāsa, edited by Vrajesvara Varmā, Varanasi: Gyan Mandal Ltd., 1988.
- Svadharmāmṛtasindhu* of Śukasudhī Devācārya, edited by Kiśora Dāsa, Salemābāda: Śrī Nimbārka Pīṭha, 1987.
- Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, edited by A. Mahādeva Śāstrin and K. Raṅgācārya, 1900-1902, reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985.
- Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, edited by Subramania Sarma, Chennai, 2005, [accessed: <http://www.sanskritweb.net/yajurveda/#TB> on 02/01/2013]
- Tarkasamgraha* of Annāmbhaṭṭa, edited with English translation by R. D. Karmarkar, Poona 1930, reprint Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 2004.
- Tarkatāṇḍava* of Vyāsaṭīrtha, with *Nyāyadīpa* of Rāghavendraṭīrtha, edited by D. Srinivasachar, V. V. Madhwachar and V. A. Vyasachar, Mysore: University of Mysore, 1932.
- Tattvasandarbhā* of Jīvagosvāmin, with commentary by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Vṛndāvana: Vrajagaurava Prakāśana, 1999.
- Ujjvalanīlamanī* of Rūpagosvāmin, edited by Pt. Durgāprasāda and Vāsudeva Lakṣmaṇa Śāstrī Paṇaśīkara, Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, 1932.
- Ūṇādisūtras*, with Sanskrit commentary of Śvetavanavāsin, edited by T. R. Chintamani, Madras: University of Madras, 1933.
- Upāṅga Nirayāvalikā*, with Gujerati translation by Sādhvī Kiraṇa, Ghāṭkopara: Guruprāṇa Prakāśana Pārasadhāma, Ghāṭkopar, 2009
- Upaniṣads: 188 Upaniṣat Sangrahaḥ*, edited by J. L. Shastri, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970, reprint 2006.
- Vajjālaggam* of Jayavallabha and Sanskrit commentary of Ratnadeva, edited with English translation by M. V. Patwardhan, Prakrit Text Society, Ahmedabad, 1969.

- Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari, critical edition with English translation by K. Raghavan Pillai, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1973.
- Vāmana Purāṇa*:
- with Hindi translation by Pt. Śyāmasundaralāla Tripāthī, edited by Khemarāja Śrīkr̥ṣṇadāsa, Mumbaī: Śrī Venkateśvara Steam Press, reprint Varanasi: Chaukhamba Vidyabhavan, 2003.
 - with English translation, edited by O. N. Bimali and K. L. Joshi, Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2005.
- Vedāntakārikāvali* and autocommentary *Adhyātmasudhātaraṅgiṇī* of Puruṣottamaprasāda, with *Adhyātmabodhinī* Hindi translation by Vāsudevaśaraṇa Upādhyāya, Salemābāda: Nimbārkācāryapīṭha, 2004.
- Vedāntaratnamāñjūṣā* of Puruṣottamācārya:
- with *Kuñcikā* of Amolakarāma Śāstrin and Hindi translation by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Kṛṣṇa Printing Press, 1948.
 - edited by Madan Mohan Agrawal, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 2000.
- Vedārthasaṅgraha* of Rāmānujācārya, with *Tātparyadīpikā* of Sudarśanasūri, edited by Svāmī Rāma Mīśra Śāstrin, Kāśī: Medical Hall Press, 1894.
- Vedastuti* of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, with *Śrīkr̥ṣṇatattvapraśāsikā* commentary of Keśavakāśmīribhaṭṭācārya, with Hindi translation by Vrajavallabha Śaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Bhāgavata Kuñja, 1986.
- Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* of Śaṅkarācārya, edited with English translation by Acharya Pranipata Chaitanya, Tamil Nadu: Chinmaya Mission.
- Viṣṇupurāṇa*,
- Mumbai: Venkateśvara Steam Press, 1910
 - *The Critical Edition of the Viṣṇupurāṇam*, 2 volumes, edited by M. M. Pathak, Vadodara: Oriental Institute, 1997, 1999
 - Sanskrit text and English translation of H. H. Wilson, edited by K. L. Joshi, Delhi: Parimala Publications, 2002.
- Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*, edited by Kṣemarāja Śrīkr̥ṣṇadāsa, Mumbaī: Śrī Venkateśvara Press, reprint Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1998.
- Viṣṇusahasranāmastotram* with commentary of Śaṅkarācārya, edited with English translation by P. Sankaranarayanan, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 2007.
- Viṣṇutattvavinirṇaya* of Madhvācārya, edited with English translation by K. T. Pandurangi, Bangalore: Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation, 1991.
- Vṛndāvanamahimāmṛtam* of Prabodhānanda Sarasvati, 4 volumes, Vṛndāvana: Harināma Prema Saṅkīrtana Maṇḍala, 1961-1964.
- Yamunāstotram* of Keśavakāśmīribhaṭṭācārya, edited with Hindi translation by Yamunāvallabhaśaraṇa and Rāmanātha Śarmā, Vṛndāvana: Sādhū Gopāla Dāsa, 1926.
- Yugala Śataka* of Śrībhaṭṭa Devācārya,
- critical edition by Rasikamohanaśaraṇa Śāstrin and Jayakīśora Śaraṇa, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Sarveśvara Kāryālaya, 1998.
 - with Hindi gloss by Premnarayan Shrivastav, in *Śrībhaṭṭa Devācārya aura unakā Yugalaśataka*, edited by Viyogī Viśveśvara, Salemābāda: Śrī Nimbārkācāryapīṭha: 1973, 163-138.

Other Sources

- Agarwal, Madan Mohan. 1977. *The Philosophy of Nimbārka*, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan.
- Agarwal, Madan Mohan. 2005. *Nimbārka Philosophical Tradition*, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan.
- Alston, Anthony John. 1989. *Śaṅkara on Rival Views: a Śaṅkara Source-Book*, London: Shanti Sadan.
- Āravamudhan, T. N. 2009. “The Varadarāja Pañcāśat – A Study”, in *Swami Desikan’s Varadarāja Pañcāśat*, edited by Oppiliappan Koil Varadachari Sadagopan, Ahobilam: Ahobillavali. [accessed: http://sadagopan.org/index.php/categories/doc_details/357-av034-varadaraja-panchasat on 10 April 2014]
- Austin, Christopher. 2012. *The Mystery of the Syamantaka Jewel: The Intersection of History and Biography in the Harivaṁśa*, in *Religions of South Asia*, 5:1, 153-169, Sheffield: Equinox Publishing.
- Bahl, Kali Charan. 1984. “The Twin (“Yugala”) Image of Radha-Krishna in the Bhakti Literature of Northern India and its Impact on the ‘Rīti’ Poetry in the Hindi Area”, in *Journal of South Asian Literature*, 19:2, 27-40, Michigan: Asian Studies Centre.
- Bailey, Gregory. 2003. “The Purāṇas”, in *The Study of Hinduism*, edited by Aravind Sharma, 139-168, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.
- Bakker, Hans T, ed. 2004. *Growth of the Purāṇic Text Corpus: with Special Reference to the Skandapurāṇa*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bangha, Imre. 2007. “Courtly and Religious Communities as Centres of Literary Activity in Eighteenth-century India: Ānandghan’s Contacts with the Princely Court of Kishangarh-Rupnagar and with the Maṭh of the Nimbārka Sampradāya in Sālemabād”, in *Indian Languages and Texts Through the Ages: Essays of Hungarian Indologists in Honour of Prof. Csaba Tottossy*, edited by Csaba Deszo, 307-354, Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- Bangha, Imre. 2013. *It’s a City-Showman’s Show: Transcendental Songs of Ānandghan*, New Delhi: Penguin Books India.
- Barnett, L. D. 1907. *The Antagaḍa-Dasāo and Aṇuttarovavāiyya-Dasāo*, London: Oriental Translation Fund (Royal Asiatic Society).
- Barnett, L. D. 1928. *A supplementary catalogue of the Sanskrit Pali and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum acquired during the years 1906-1928*, London: British Museum.
- Beck, Guy L., ed. 2005. *Alternative Krishnas: Regional and Vernacular Variations on a Hindu Deity*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bhandarkar, Sir Ramkrishna Gopal. 1913. *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*, Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trubner.
- Bhāṭī, Hukamasimha. 2003. *Bhāṭī Vamśa Kā Gauravamaya Itihāsa*, 2 volumes, Jodhpur: Itihāsa Anusandhāna Samsthāna.
- Bisschop, Peter. 2009. “Śiva” in *Brill’s Encyclopaedia of Hinduism*, edited by Knut A. Jacobsen, volume 1, 741-754, Leiden: Brill.

- Bose, Roma. 1943. *Vedānta-Pārijāta-Saurabha of Nimbārka and Vedānta-Kaustubha of Śrīnivāsa: Commentaries on the Brahma-Sūtras*, 3 volumes, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.
- Brockington, John L. 1991. *The Sacred Thread*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2005. “Aśvaghōṣa and Vaiśeṣika”, in *Buddhism and Jainism: Essays in Honour of Dr. Hojun Nagasaki on his Seventieth Birthday*, edited by committee, 235-241, Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2007. “Vedānta as Mīmāṃsā” in *Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta: Interaction and Continuity: Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference*, edited by Johannes Bronkhorst, 1-92, New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2013. “Anekāntavāda, the Central Philosophy of Ajīvikism?” in *The International Journal of Jaina Studies*, 9:1, 1-11, London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Broo, Måns. 2011. “Defiled and Deified: Profane and Sacred Bodies in Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism”, in *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis*, 23, edited by Tore Ahlbäck, 72-78, Turku: Åbo Akademi.
- Brzezinski, Jan K. 1990. Review of *The Tamil Veda: Pilla's interpretation of the Tiruvāymoi*, by John Carman and Vasudha Narayanan. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 53:3, 536-537, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brzezinski, Jan K. 1992. “Prabodhānanda, Hita Harivaṃśa and the Rādhārasasudhānidhi”, in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 55:3, 472-497, London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Callewaert, Winand M. 1988. *The Hindī Biography of Dādū Dayāl*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Callewaert, Winand M. 2009. *Dictionary of Bhakti: North-Indian Bhakti Texts into Khaṛī Bolī Hindī and English*, 3 volumes, New Delhi: D. K. Printworld.
- Carbone, John Christopher. 2008. “Vaiṣṇava Goddess as Plant: Tulasī in Text and Context”, in *Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations*, Paper 4229, Florida: DigiNole Commons, The Florida State University.
- Chakraborty, Uma. 1993. *Kṣemendra: Eleventh Century Kashmiri Poet: A Study of His Life and Works*, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine. 1990. “La renaissance du Nimbārka Sampradāya au XVI^e siècle: Contribution a l'etude d'une secte kṛṣṇaite”, in *Journal Asiatique*, 278:3-4, 327-376, Paris: Société Asiatique.
- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine. 1999. *Le Trident Sur Le Palais: Une Cabale Anti-Vishnouite dans un Royaume Hindou a l'Epoque Coloniale*, Paris: Presses De l'Ecole Francais D'Extreme Orient.
- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine. 2003. “The Initiation of Devī: Violence and Non-Violence in a Vaiṣṇavite Tale”, in *Violence/Non-Violence: Some Hindu Perspectives*, edited by Denis Vidal et al, New Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine. 2005. “Ascetics' Rights in Nineteenth century Jaipur (Rajasthan)”, in *Asceticism and Power in the Asian Context*, edited by P. Flugel and G. Houtman (forthcoming), [accessed: http://ceias.ehess.fr/docannexe/file/2381/ascetics_rights_2005_online_since_march_2012.pdf on 12/12/2013]

- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine. 2011. "The Nimbārka Sampradāya", in *Brill's Encyclopaedia of Hinduism*, edited by Knut A. Jacobsen, volume 3, 429-439, Leiden: Brill.
- Clooney, Francis X. 2007. "Exegesis, Theology and Spirituality: Reading the Dvaya Mantra According to Vedānta Deśika", in *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, edited by Sushil Mittal, 11:1, 27-62, Berlin: Springer.
- Colas, Gérard. 2003. "History of Vaiṣṇava Traditions: an Esquisse", in *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*, edited by Gavin Flood, 229-270, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Colas, Gérard. 2005. "Rites among Vaikhānasas and Related Matters: Some Methodological Issues", in *Words and Deed: Hindu and Buddhist Rituals in South Asia*, edited by J. Gengnagel, U. Hüsken and S. Raman-Müller, 23-44, Weisbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Couture, André. 1991. *L'enfance de Krishna*, Laval: Cerf.
- Couture, André and Christine Chojnacki. 2014. *Krishna et ses métamorphoses dans les traditions indiennes : Récits d'enfance autour du Harivamsha*, Paris: Presses de l'université Paris-Sorbonne.
- Crooke, William. 1908. "Bairagi", in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by James Hastings, volume 2, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Crooke, William. 1914. "Hinduism", in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by James Hastings, volume 6, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Dandekar, Ramchandra Narayan. 1979. *Insights into Hinduism*, Delhi: Ajanta Publications.
- Dāsa, Govinda. 2008. *Śrī Nimbārka Sampradāya evaṁ Śrī Nimbārkācārya Pīṭha*, Salemābāda: Śrī Nimbārkācārya Pīṭha.
- Dasgupta, Surendra Nath. 1940. *A History of Indian Philosophy*, volume 3, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dattaray, Rajatbaran. 1974. *A Critical Survey of the Life and Works of Kṣemendra*, Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.
- Davis, Richard H. 1993. "Indian Art Objects as Loot", in *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 52:1, 22-48, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deshpande, Madhav. 1979. "Sentence-Cognition in Nyāya Epistemology", in *Indo Iranian Journal*, 20, 195-216, Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Dimock, Edward C., trans., and Tony K. Stewart, ed. 1999. *Caitanya Caritāmṛta of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja: a Translation and Commentary*, Harvard Oriental Series 56, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Doniger-O'Flaherty, Wendy. 1983. "Myths Depicted at Elephanta", in *Elephanta: The Cave of Śiva*, edited by Carmel Berkson, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Doniger, Wendy, ed. 1993. *Purāṇa Perennis: Reciprocity and Transformation in Hindu and Jaina Texts*, Albany: State University of New York Press
- Doniger, Wendy. 2010. *The Hindus: An Alternative History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dorn, Bernhard. 1829. *A History of the Afghans: translated from the Persian of Ni'amet Allah*, Part I, London: Oriental Translation Committee.
- Dundas, Paul. 2002. *The Jains*, 2nd Edition, Oxon: Routledge.
- Entwhistle, Alan W. 1987. *Braj: Centre for Krishna Pilgrimage*, Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

- Entwhistle, Alan W., 2003. *Vaiṣṇava Tilakas: Sectarian Marks Worn by Worshippers of Viṣṇu*, 2nd Edition, Vrindavan: Vrindavan Research Institute.
- Flood, Gavin. 1996. *An Introduction to Hinduism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flood, Gavin, ed. 1998. *Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Franco, Eli. 1994. *Perception, Knowledge & Disbelief: a Study of Jayarāṣi's Scepticism*, 2nd Edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Franco, Eli. 2000. "The Earliest Extant Vaiśeṣika Theory of Guṇas" in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 44, 157-163, Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences.
- Freschi, Elisa. 2011. "Proposals for the Study of Quotations in Indian Philosophical Texts", in *Religions of South Asia*, 6:2, 161-189, Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Gautam, Rajendra Prasad. 1974. *Śrī Harivyāsa Devācārya aur Śrī Mahāvāṇī*, Vrindavan: Vidyaly Press.
- Geden, Alfred S. 1917. "Nīmāvats", in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by James Hastings, volume 9, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Ghate, Vaman Sivarama. 1918. *Le Vedānta: Etude sur les Brahma-Sūtras et Leurs Cinq Commentaires*, Paris: Editions Ernest Leroux.
- Ghosh, A. 1989. *An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology*, volume 2, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.
- Goloka Dhāma Āśrama. 2009. *Śrī Goloka Śaraṇāgati*, Vṛndāvana: Harinam Press.
- Gonda, Jan. 1954. *Aspects of Early Viṣṇuism*, originally published in Leiden, 1954, reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1993.
- Gonda, Jan. 1970. *Viṣṇuism and Śaivism: A Comparison*, London: Athlone Press.
- Gonda, Jan. 1977. "Religious Thought and Practice in Vaikhānasa Viṣṇuism", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 40, 550-571, London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- González-Reimann, Luis. 1993. "La finalidad de la encarnación de Viṣṇu como Kṛṣṇa de acuerdo con el Bālacarita de Bhāsa", in *Estudios de Asia y Africa*, 28:1, 7-20, Ciudad de México: El Colegio de México.
- Goswami, Sharan Behari. 1966. *Kṛṣṇa Bhakti-Kāvya Mem Sakhībhāva*, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Vidyabhavan.
- Grierson, George Abraham. 1889. *The Modern Vernacular Literature of Hindustan*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society.
- Grierson, George Abraham. 1908. "Bhakti Mārga" in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by James Hastings, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Griffiths, Arlo, and Annette Schmiedchen. 2007. *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalādaśākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Growse, F. S. 1883. *Mathurā: a District Memoir*, originally published in 1883, revised reprint Ahmedabad: The New Order Book Co., 1978.
- Gupta, Sanjukta. 2000. *Lakṣmī Tantra: a Pāñcarātra Text*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Gupta, Tripta. 2000. *The Vedānta Kaustubha – a Study*, New Delhi: Sanjay Prakashan.

- Hardy, Friedhelm. 1974. "Mādhavendra Puri: a Link Between Bengal Vaiṣṇavism and South Indian 'Bhakti'", in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 23-41, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.
- Hardy, Friedhelm. 1983. *Virahā-Bhakti: The Early History of Kṛṣṇa Devotion in South India*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hare, James P. 2011. *The Garland of Devotees: Nābhādās's Bhaktamāl and Modern Hinduism*, Doctoral Dissertation, New York: Columbia University. [accessed: https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/download/fedora_content/download/ac:130088/CONTENT/Hare_columbia_0_054D_10017.pdf on 20/12/2013]
- Hawley, John Stratton. 1983. *Krishna, the Butter Thief*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hawley, John Stratton. 1988. "Author and Authority in the Bhakti Poetry of North India", in *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 47:2, 269-290, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawley, John Stratton. 2012. "The Four Sampradāyas: Ordering the Religious Past in Mughal North India", in *Religious Cultures in Early Modern India: New Perspectives*, edited by Rosalind O'Hanlon and David Washbrook, 28-51, Oxon: Routledge.
- Hawley, John Stratton. 2013. "The Four Sampradāyas – and Other Foursomes", in *Bhakti Beyond the Forest: Current Research on Early Modern Literatures in North India, 2003-2009*, edited by Imre Bangha, New Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- Hawley, John Stratton and Donna Marie Wulff, eds. 1982. *The Divine Consort: Rādhā and the Goddesses of India*, Berkeley: The Graduate Theological Union.
- Hawley, John Stratton and Donna Marie Wulff, eds. 1996. *Devī: Goddesses of India*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hazra, R. C. 1940. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records of Hindu Rites and Customs*, Dacca: The University of Dacca.
- Hein, Norvin. 1986. "A Revolution in Kṛṣṇaism: the Cult of Gopāla", in *History of Religions*, 25:4, 296-317, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hiltebeitel, Alf. 2001. *Rethinking the Mahābhārata: A Reader's Guide to the Education of the Dharma King*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- von Hinüber, Oscar. 1996. *Handbook of Pali literature*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Hirst, Jaqueline G. Suthren. 2011. "Who Were the Tārkikās? The Place of Polemic in Śaṅkara's Bṛhadāraṇyakabhāṣya", in *Journal of Hindu Studies*, 4, 54-78, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horstmann, Monika. 1999. *In Favour of Govinddevjī: Historical Documents Relating to a Deity of Vrindaban and Eastern Rajasthan*, New Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- Horstmann, Monika, ed. 2006. *Bhakti in Current Research 2001-2003: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Early Devotional Literature in New Indo-Aryan Languages Heidelberg 23-26 July 2003*, New Delhi: Manohar Publishers.

- Horstmann, Monika. 2012. "Theology and Statescraft", in O'Hanlon, Rosalind & Washbrook, David (eds.), *Religious Cultures in Early Modern India: New Perspectives*, 184-204, Oxon: Routledge.
- Ingalls, Daniel Henry Holmes. 1965. *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry: Vidyākara's Subhāṣitaratnaḥ*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ingalls, Daniel Henry Holmes. 1967. "Bhāskara the Vedāntin", in *Philosophy of East and West*, 17:1, 61-67, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Jacobsen, Knut Axel. 2005. "Jātaka Tales" in *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, edited by Bron Taylor, volume 1, 903-905, New York: Continuum Press
- Jamison, Stephanie W., and Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*, volume 2, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jha, Vashishtha N. 1992. "Śabdakhaṇḍa of the Nyāyasiddhāntamuktāvalī", in *Sambhāṣā*, 13, 1-42, Battaramulla: Piriven hā Āgamika Adhyāpana Depārtamēntuva.
- Jones, Craig. 1980. "Rādhā: the Parodhā Nāyikā", in *Open Access Dissertations and Theses*, Paper 2731, Hamilton: Digital Commons@McMaster.
- Joshi, Rasik Vihari. 1965. "A Note on the Doctrine of Non-Difference in Difference of Nimbārka", in *East and West*, 15:1, 92-102, Rome: Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Kadambi, Hemanth. 2011. *Sacred Landscapes in Early Medieval South India: The Chalukya State and Society (ca. AD 550-750)*, PhD thesis, Michigan: University of Michigan.
- Katre, S. M. 1949. *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of Manuscripts Deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, volume 9, part I, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kavirāja, Gopīnātha. 1998. *Kāśī kī Sārasvata Sādhanā*, 2nd Edition, Paṭanā: Bihāra Rāṣṭrabhāṣā Paṛiṣad.
- Keith, Arthur Berridale. 1918. *The Sāṃkhya System: A History of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy*, Calcutta: Association Press.
- Khurana, Geeta. 1990. *The Theology of Nimbārka: a Translation of Nimbārka's Daśaślokī with Giridhara Prapanna's Laghumañjūṣā*, New York: Vantage Press.
- Kimura, Toshihiko. 1999. "A New Chronology of Dharmakīrti" in *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy*, edited by Katsura Shoryu, 209 – 214, Wein: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- King, Richard. 1998. "Early Advaita and Mādhyamaka Buddhism: The Case of the Gauḍapādīyakārikā", in *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, 2:1, 67-83, Berlin: Springer.
- Kinsley, David R. 1975. *The Sword and the Flute: Kālī and Kṛṣṇa, Dark Visions of the Terrible and the Sublime in Hindu Mythology*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kinsley, David R. 1986. *Hindu Goddesses: Visions of the Divine Feminine in the Hindu Religious Tradition*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Knutson, Jesse Ross. 2014. *Into the Twilight of Sanskrit Court Poetry: the Sena Salon of Bengal and Beyond*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Krasser, Helmut. 2011. “Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumāriḷa”, in *Chūgoku-Indo syūkyō-shi tokuni bukkyō-shi ni okeru syomotsu no ryūtsū-denpa to jinbutsu-idō no chiiki-tokusei* [Regional characteristics of text dissemination and relocation of people in the history of Chinese and Indian religions, with special reference to Buddhism], A Report of Grant-In-Aid for Scientific Research (B): Project Number 19320010, edited by Toru Funayama, 193-242, Japan: University of Kyoto.
- Krishnamacari, Narasimhan. 2009. *Viṣṇu Sahasranāmam*, volume 4, Ahobilam: Ahobilavalli. [accessed: http://www.ibiblio.org/sadagopan/ahobilavalli/vishnu_sahasra_namam_vol4.pdf on 11th April 2014]
- Kumar, Raj. 2008. *Encyclopaedia of Untouchables: Ancient, Medieval and Modern*, Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.
- Larson, Gerald James. 1979. *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*, 2nd Edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Law, B. C., 1947. “Mathurā in Ancient India”, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 13:1, 21-30, Calcutta: The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Leach, Robert. 2012. *Textual Traditions and Religious Identities in the Pāñcarātra*, PhD Dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Lüders, Heinrich. 1904. “Die Jātakas und die Epik”, in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 58, 687- 715, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Maiduly, R. D. 1976. *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Vrindavan Research Institute*, Vrindavan: Vrindavan Research Institute.
- Malkovsky, Bradley J. 2001. *The Role of Divine Grace in the Soteriology of Śaṅkarācārya*, Leiden: Brill.
- Matchett, Freda. 2001. *Kṛṣṇa: Lord or Avatāra? The Relationship Between Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu*, Oxon: Routledge.
- Matsubara, Mitsunori. 1994. *Pañcarātra Saṃhitās and Early Vaiṣṇava Theology*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Mayeda, Sengaku, ed. 1979. *A Thousand Teachings: The Upadeśasāhasrī of Śaṅkara*, Albany: State University of New York Press
- McCrimdle, J. W. 1877. *Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian: being a Translation of the Fragments of the Indika of Megasthenes Collected by Dr. Schwanbeck and of the First Part of the Indika of the Arrian*, London: Trübner.
- McGregor, R. S., ed. 1992. *Devotional Literature in South Asia: Current Research 1985-88*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mehta, Mohan Lal & Rishabh K. Chandra. 1970. *Āgamic Index Vol. 1: Prakrit Proper Names*, Parts 1 and 2, Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology.
- Mesquita, Roque. 2000. *Madhva’s Unknown Literary Sources: Some Observations*, Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Mesquita, Roque. 2008. *Madhva’s Quotes from the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata*, Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Miller, Barbara Stoler. 1975. “Rādhā: the Consort of Kṛṣṇa’s Vernal Passion”, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 95:4, 655-671, Michigan: University of Michigan.

- Miller, Barbara Stoler. 1977. *Love Song of the Dark Lord: Jayadeva's Gītagovinda*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mīṭala, Dvārikāprasāda. 1970. *Hindī Sāhitya Mem Rādhā*, Mathurā: Javāhara Pustakālaya.
- Mīṭala, Prabhudayāla. 1968. *Braja ke Dharma Sampradāyom kā Itihāsa*, Delhi: National Publishing House.
- Mitra, Rājendralāla. 1871-1890. *Notices of Sanskrit MSS*, Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Miyasaka, Y. 1972. "Pramāṇavārttika-kārikā", *Acta Indologica*, 2, 1-206, Narita: Naritasan Shinshōji.
- Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nakamura, Hajime. 1983. *A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nakamura, Hajime. 2004. *A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy: Part Two*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nelson, Lance Edward. 1986. "Bhakti in Advaita Vedānta: a Translation and Study of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's Bhaktirasāyana", in *Open Access Dissertations and Theses*, Paper 3453, Hamilton: Digital Commons@McMaster.
- Nicholson, Andrew J. 2010. *Unifying Hinduism: Philosophy and Identity in Indian Intellectual History*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Novetzke, Christian Lee. 2007. "Bhakti and its Public", in *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, 11:3, 255-272, Berlin: Springer.
- Okita, Kiyokazu. 2014. "Hindu Theology and the Question of Qualification: A Study of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism", in *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, 18:2, 153-179, Berlin: Springer.
- Okita, Kiyokazu. 2014b. *Hindu Theology in Early Modern South Asia: The Rise of Devotionalism and the Politics of Genealogy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1992. *Samnyāsa Upaniṣads: Hindu Scriptures on Asceticism and Renunciation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1995. *Rules and Regulations of Brahmanical Asceticism: Yatidharmasamuccaya of Yādava Prakāśa*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1996. *Upaniṣads: Translated from the Original Sanskrit*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1998. *The Early Upaniṣads: Annotated Text and Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1999. *Dharmasūtras: the Law Codes of Ancient India, a New Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2013. *King, Governance and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra: a New Annotated Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olson, Carl. 1983. *The Book of the Goddess Past and Present: an Introduction to Her Religion*, New York: Crossroad.
- Oppiliappan Koil, V. N. 2009. *Vedanta Desikan, Raṅgarāja Stavam – Uttarahāgam*, Ahobilam: Śrī Hayagrīvan. [accessed:

http://sadagopan.org/index.php/categories/doc_details/547-sh069-rangaraja-stavam-uttaram-v1 on 10 April 2014]

- de Palma, Daniel. 1992. "Las Sāṃkhya Kārikās de Īśvarakṛṣṇa" in *Estudios de Asia y Africa*, 27:1, 171-191, México: El Colegio De México.
- Pandey, S. M and Norman Zide. 1965. "Mīrābāī and her Contributions to the Bhakti Movement", in *History of Religions*, 5:1, 53-71, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Parker, Samuel K. 2010. "Ritual as a Mode of Production: Ethnoarchaeology and Creative Practice in Hindu Temple Art", in *South Asian Studies*, 26:1, 31-57, Oxon: Routledge.
- Parrott, Rodney. 1983. "A Discussion of the two Metaphors in the 'Churning of the Oceans' from the Mahābhārata", in *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 64:1, 17-33, Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Patel, Deven M. 2014. *Text to Tradition: the Naiṣadhīyacarita and literary community in South Asia*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Pauwels, Heidi Rika Maria. 1996. "The Great Goddess and Fulfilment in Love: Rādhā Seen Through a Sixteenth-century Lens", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, 59:1, 29-43, London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Pauwels, Heidi Rika Maria. 2008. *The Goddess as Role Model: Sītā and Rādhā in Scripture and on Screen*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pauwels, Heidi Rika Maria. 2009. "Imagining Religious Communities in the Sixteenth century: Harirām Vyās and the Haritrayī", in *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, 11:2, 143-161, Berlin: Springer.
- Pauwels, Heidi Rika Maria. 2009b. "The Saint, the Warlord and the Emperor: Discourses of Braj Bhakti and Bundelā Loyalty", in *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 187-228, Leiden: Brill.
- Pauwels, Heidi Rika Maria. 2010. "Hagiography and Community Formation: the Case of a Lost Community of Sixteenth century Vrindāvan", in *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, 3, 53-90, Berlin: Springer.
- Prasad, Rajendra B. 1983. *Cālukyan Temples of Āndhradeśa*, New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.
- Preciado-Solis, Benjamin. 1984. *The Kṛṣṇa Cycle in the Purāṇas: Themes and Motifs in an Heroic Saga*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. 1927. *Indian Philosophy*, volume 2, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. 1960. *The Brahma Sūtra: The Philosophy of Spiritual Life*, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Raman, Srilata. 2007. *Self-Surrender (prapatti) to God in Śrīvaiṣṇavism: Tamil Cats and Sanskrit Monkeys*, Oxon: Routledge.
- Rastelli, Marion. 2011. "Pāñcarātra", in *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism*, volume 3, 444-455, Leiden: Brill.
- Richards, John F. 1997. "Early Modern India and World History", in *Journal of World History*, 8:2, 197-209, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Rocher, Ludo. 1986. *The Purāṇas*, Weisbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rouse, W. H. D., trans. 1901. *The Jātaka or the Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*, edited by E. B. Cowell, volume 4, London: Pali Text Society.

- Rouse, W. H. D., trans. 1907. *The Jātaka or the Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*, edited by E. B. Cowell, volume 6, London: Pali Text Society.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2001. "History Through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras", in *Les Sources et Temps: Sources and Time: a colloquium*, edited by François Grimal, 1-47, Pondicherry: Institute Français de Pondichéry/École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2007. "Atharvavedins in Tantric Territory: The *Āṅgirasakalpa* Texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and the Kālīkula", in *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalādaśākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmiedchen, 195-311, Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Śaraṇa, Jayakīśora. 2007. *Śrī Vṛndāvana Aṅka*, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Śrījī Mandira.
- Śaraṇa, Brahmācārī Vihārī, 1940. *Śrī Nimbārka Mādhurī*, Vṛndāvana: Prabhudayāla Mīṭala.
- Śaraṇa, Vrajavallabha, ed. 1972. *Śrī Nimbārkācārya aura unakā Sampradāya*, Salemābāda: Śrī Nimbārkācārya Pīṭha.
- Śaraṇa, Vrajavallabha. 1973. *Tattvavettācārya Carita*, Jaitāraṇa: Śrī Gopāla Dvārā.
- Sarma, Deepak. 2003. *An Introduction to Madhva Vedānta*, London: Ashgate.
- Sarmā, Lalita Kumāra. 2011. *Hindī ke Bhakti Sāhitya meṁ Rājasthānī Nimbārka Santa Kaviyom kā Yogadāna*, Salemābāda: Śrī Nimbārkācārya Pīṭha.
- Śarmā, Nārāyaṇadatta. 1978. *Nimbārka Sampradāya aur usake Kṛṣṇabhakta Hindī Kavi: Siddhānta, Viśeṣa Kavi aur Saṁskṛti Vivecana*, Mathurā: Aśoka Prakāśana.
- Śāstrin, Govindaśaraṇa. 1972. "Śrīnimbārkācārya se Paravartī Vedāntācārya", in *Śrī Nimbārkācārya aura unakā Sampradāya*, edited by Vrajavallabhaśaraṇa, 20-65, Salemābāda: Śrīnimbārkācārya Pīṭha.
- Śāstrin, Govindaśaraṇa. 1973. "Śrībhāṭṭa Devācārya kā Samaya meṁ Bhārata kī Paristhitiyām", in *Śrī Śrībhāṭṭa Devācārya aur unakā Yugalaśataka*, edited by Vīyogī Viśveśvara, 9-40, Salemābāda: Śrī Nimbārkācārya Pīṭha.
- Śāstrī, Prabhākara. 2002. *Bhagavannimbārkācāryaḥ: Siddhānta, Upāsanā evaṁ Ācārya-Paramparā*, Jaipur: Rachanā Prakāśana.
- Śāstrī, Vaiṣṇavadāsa. 2009. *Vedānta Padārtha Paricaya*, Salemābāda: Śrī Nimbārkācārya Pīṭha.
- Satyanand, Fr. Joseph. 1997. *Nimbārka: a Pre-Śaṁkara Vedāntin and His Philosophy*, Varanasi: Vishva Jyoti Gurukul.
- Sax, William S. 2000. "Conquering the Quarters: Religion and Politics in Hinduism", in *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, volume 4, 39-60, Leiden: Springer.
- Schmid, Charlotte. 2010. *Le Don de Voir: Premières représentations krishnaïtes de la région de Mathurā*, Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Schokker, G. H. and P. J. Woresley, trans. 1975. *The Pādatāḍitaka of Śyāmilaka*, Leiden: Springer.
- Shamashastry, R. 1929. *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (English Translation)*, Mysore: Wesleyan Mission Press.
- Sharma, B. N. K. 1982. *The Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya*, re-published Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Sharma, Narayandatta. 1978. *Nimbārka Sampradāya aura usake Kṛṣṇabhakta Hindī Kavi*, Mathurā: Ashok Prakashan.
- Sharma, Ram Prasad, ed. 1967. *Paraśurāmasāgara*, 4 volumes, Jaipur: Current Book Company.
- Shastri, Yajñeshwar S. 2003. *Jainism from the Point of View of the Vedāntic Ācāryas: with Special Reference to Nimbārka, Śāṅkara and Rāmānuja*, Ahmedabad: B. J. Institute of Learning and Research.
- Shaw, Julia. 2004. “Nāga Sculptures in Sanchi’s Archaeological Landscape: Buddhism, Vaiṣṇavism and Local Agricultural Cults in Central India, First century BCE to Fifth century CE”, in *Artibus Asiae*, 64:1, 5-59, Zurich: Artibus Asiae Publishers.
- Shaw, Miranda. 2011. “Tara: Saviour, Buddha, Holy Mother”, in *Goddesses in World Culture*, edited by Patricia Monaghan, California: ABC CLIO.
- Shima, Iwao. 1998. “The Viṭhobā Faith of Mahārāṣṭra: the Viṭhobā Temple of Paṇḍharpur and its Mythological Structure”, in *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 15:2, 183-197, Japan: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture.
- Sinopoli, Carla M. 2001. “On the Edge of Empire: Form and Substance in the Satavahana dynasty” in *Empires: Perspectives from Archaeology and History*, edited by Susan E. Alcock et al, 155-179, Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Solomon, Ted J. 1970. “Vaiṣṇava Bhakti and its Autochthonous Heritage”, in *History of Religions*, 10:1, 32-48, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Srinivasachari, P. N. 1950. *The Philosophy of Bhedābheda*, 2nd Edition, Chennai: The Adyar Library
- Srinivasan, Doris. 1979. “Early Vaiṣṇava Imagery: Caturvyūha and Variant Forms”, in *Archives of Asian Arts*, 32, 39-54, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Shukla, N. S. 1990. *Cultural Trends in Kashmir and Kṣemendra*, Delhi: Nirman Prakashan.
- Sullivan, Bruce M. 1990. *Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa and the Mahābhārata: a New Interpretation*, Leiden: Brill.
- Sundaresan, Vidyasankar. 2002. “What Determines Śāṅkara’s Authorship: The Case of the Pañcikarāṇa”, in *Philosophy East and West*, 52:1, 1-35, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Thibaut, George, trans. 1890 and 1896. *The Vedānta Sūtras with the Commentary by Śāṅkarācārya*, Parts 1 and 2, Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Thibaut, George, trans. 1904. *The Vedānta Sūtras with the Commentary by Rāmānuja*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Thielemann, Selina. 1998. *Sounds of the Sacred: Religious Music in India*, New Delhi: A. P. H. Publishing Corporation.
- Thielemann, Selina. 2000. *Singing the Praises of the Divine: Music in the Hindu Tradition*, New Delhi: A. P. H. Publishing Corporation.
- Tiemeier, Tracy Sayuki. 2010. “Engendering the Mysticism of the Āḷvārs”, in *Journal of Hindu Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tillemans, Tom J. F. 2000. “Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika: An Annotated Translation of the Fourth Chapter (parārthānumāna)”, in *Sitzungsberichte Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische*

- Klasse, Veröffentlichungen zu den Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens*, 675:32, 1-148, Wein: Sitzungsberichte Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Tola, F. and Carla Dragonetti. 2004. *Nāgārjuna's Refutation of Logic (Nyāya): Vaidalyaprakaraṇa*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Tomara, Kaṇikā. 1964. *Brajabhāṣā aura Brajabuli Sāhitya*, Vārāṇasi: Viśvavidyālaya Press.
- Tripathi, Gaya Charan. 2004. *Communication with God: The Daily Pūjā Ceremony in the Jagannātha Temple*, New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.
- Tubb, Gary A. and Emery R. Boose. 2007. *Scholastic Sanskrit: a Handbook for Students*, New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies, Columbia University.
- Varenne, Jean. 1960. *La Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad*, Paris: Boccard.
- Vaudeville, Charlotte. 1982. "Krishna Gopāla, Rādhā and the Great Goddess", in *The Divine Consort: Rādhā and the Goddesses of India*, edited by John Stratton Hawley and Donna Marie Wulff, Berkeley: The Graduate Theological Union.
- Venkataramiha, D., trans. 1948. *Padmapāda's Pañcapādikā*, Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Vihārīśaraṇa, Brahmācārīn. 1941. *Nimbārkamādhurī*, Vṛndāvana: Prabhudayāla Mīṭala.
- Vijñānānanda, Swāmī, trans. 1921. *Śrīmad Devī Bhāgavatam*, Part I, Allahbad: Panini Office.
- Viśveśvara, Viyogī, ed. 1973. *Śrī Śrībhāṭṭadevācārya aura unakā Yugalaśataka*, Salemābāda: Śrīnimbārkācārya Pīṭha.
- Willis, Michael. 2009. *The Archaeology of Hindu Ritual: Temples and the Establishment of the Gods*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Horace Hayman. 1861. *Sketch on the Religious Sects of the Hindus*, posthumously edited by Reinhold Rost, London: Trübner & Co.
- Witzel, Michael. 1995. "Ṛgvedic History: Poets, Chieftains and Politics" in *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia*, edited by George Erdosy, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Witzel, Michael. 2011. "Autochthonous Āryans? The Evidence from Old Indian and Iranian Texts", in *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies*, 7:3, 1-115, Harvard University.