

**SakalaGuṇaNidhi - A Repository of All Noble Qualities:
HH 43rd of Sri Ahobila Mutt ŚrīvaṇṢaṭhakōpa
Śrī Vīrarāghava Śaṭhakōpa Yatīndra Mahādēśikan**

Sohattur Ramanujacharyar, Bangalore.

On the 121st Tirunakṣatram of HH 43rd of Sri Ahobila Mutt, **ŚrīvaṇṢaṭhakōpa Śrī Vīrarāghava Śaṭhakōpa Yatīndra Mahādēśikan**, I heartily comply with the request of the Editor, Sri Nrisimha Priya (English) for writing an article about the great Acharya.

There are many noble qualities of Devanārviḷāgam Śrīmad Azhagiyasingar that are worth enjoying infinitely. Let me only dwell upon his impeccable *Śāstra Jñānam* here, through one of His articles appearing in *Vedanta Dīpikā*, on Brahman (ब्रह्म) as the Cause of this Universe (जगत्कारण) and its causality, i.e., अभिन्ननिमित्तोपादानत्वम्, being both the Material and Instrumental cause. *Karta* and *Prakṛti* are the words used to denote the two causes, towards the same effect.

Cause-effect analysis (कारण-कार्यविचारः)

Material cause (उपादान-कारणम्) is an entity which 'itself' transforms or becomes the 'effect', like clay to an earthen pot. *Instrumental cause* (निमित्त-कारणम्) is the one that brings about the transformation from cause-state to effect-state in the entity, like a potter in the case of a (earthen) pot etc. This cause is usually a sentient being, as the will, need/purpose, knowing start/end instants etc., regarding the transformation is called for. There are also some *auxiliary causes* (सहकारि-कारणम्) like tools/implements (like wheel, stick, water etc.), space, time etc., which are universal and hence, a cause-effect analysis (कारण-कार्यविचारः) of the Universe involves determining the relevant cause, effect etc. to enable these to be distinguished. The *Naiyayika*-s describe these as *samavāyi-kāraṇam*, *asamavāyi-kāraṇam* and *nimitta-kāraṇam*.

Essential characteristics of Kāraṇam

In the *Brahma-Sūtras*, *Bhagavān Bādarāyaṇa*, establishes *Brahman* as the Universal cause in the first chapter. Towards this, in the second sutra जन्माद्यस्य यतः, declares the causality of *Brahman* with respect to the Universe, in the *definition*, as a source effecting the creation, continuation and dissolution of it.

A definition (*lakṣaṇam*) should be free from three kinds of defects, viz. under-reach (*avyāpti*), over-reach (*ativyāpti*), and non-reach [impossibility] (*asambhava*). Reach means pervasion. Under-reach means not covering some targets. If cow is defined as 'having black colour', then it [the definition] does not apply to white cows etc., and hence is erroneous, by 'under-reach'. Similarly, over-reach covers even unintended targets [over and above those intended] as in defining cow as 'having horns'. Since this feature is found in buffaloes etc. also, this definition suffers from over-reach. *Asambhava* is absence of the definition in the target, as when one defines cow as 'having single hoof', this definition suffers from *asambhava*. Thus, a definition devoid of the three abovementioned

defects is a valid one.

When a valid definition is proposed, the adjectives/qualifiers used therein should distinguish the intended target from the rest by avoiding one of the three defects aforesaid. Now, in the definition of sutra 1-1-2, if *Brahman* is declared as the cause of creation, continuation, and dissolution of the Universe, is the causality pertaining to all three actions jointly intended? or severally? On examination, it emerges that each of these [causality] severally would suffice. But the sutra jointly refers to the three actions. This may be attributed to the Vedic passage 'यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते । येन जातानि जीवन्ति । यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति । तद्ब्रह्मेति ।' (तै.आ. 5.33) as the Sūtra-kāra has employed the Vedic word 'यतः' in the sutra as found in the Vedic text. Hence, it appears that Veda intends all three actions for *Brahman*'s causality, since for the three words denoting 'that from which', 'that by which' and 'that into which' a single or same 'that' is employed/intended. Now, can Veda employ unnecessary adjective/qualifier? This is answered as to avoid possible doubts like, if only cause of creation is mentioned, though necessary, this is not sufficient to stop thinking that the cause of continuation may be something else [other than *Brahman*] and so on. Thus, to ensure the proper definition of *Brahman* as the Universal cause covering all three actions of creation, continuation and dissolution, Veda has given the right description. 'That which is unsurpassed in greatness by presence and attributes' is *Brahman* and hence this approach is justified.

Next, we examine the kind of cause of creation etc. that is mentioned here. 'यतः' denotes 'from which', being equivalent to पञ्चमी विभक्ति fifth case [static reference point during separation - 'apādānam']. The grammatical rule 'जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः' (पा.सू. 1.4.30) description follows here, which in sum, means that *Brahman* can be प्रकृति, the material cause, as well, while in general हेतु 'cause' is mentioned. Fifth case is read in conjunction with creation alone and hence, material cause is not barred, while in the third and second cases, instrument and target are applicable [in continuation and dissolution]. *Mahābhāshya* also suggests *prakṛti* is identified with material cause only.

But then, if sutra 1-1-2 does not cover material cause, how can it be following Veda, which posits that? The word 'यतः' in the Vedic text, being in fifth case, though indicates material cause, due to the pronominal stem यत्, reiterating what is known otherwise, regarding the cause of the Universe, instrumental cause also is denoted. The passages 'सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत् । एकमेव, अद्वितीयम्' (छा.उ. 6.2.1), 'तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय' (छा.उ. 6.2.3) are the ones referred here. 'सदेव इदमग्रे एकमेव आसीत्' and 'बहु स्याम्' (तै.आ. 5.29) denote that "the cause 'sat' itself willed to become many" indicate material cause and 'अद्वितीयम्' barring the existence of anyone else and 'willing' to become many' indicate instrumental cause. So, the definition should include both type of causes and hence, fifth case associated with creation denotes material cause and the rest denote instrumental cause. Hence, though 'creation etc.' in the sutra may extend material cause to continuation and dissolution also, [cause denoted by fifth case referring to a generic cause] it is not intended. This may be inferred by the abovesaid meanings of stem and suffix having the two distinct meanings, i.e., instrumental and material causes.

Would the two types of causality together be appropriate for *Brahman* with respect to the Universe is examined by the *sūtrakāra* in the penultimate *adhikaraṇa* of the first chapter beginning with the *sūtra* - *Prakṛtiśca*. Here, the objection that the self-same entity cannot be simultaneously both material and instrument cause of the Universe, particularly when sentient and inert objects comprise the Universe, is made by Vaiśeṣhika, Yoga and Pāśupata doctrine-followers.

Vaiśeṣhika-s hold causes of three types as *samavāyi*, *asamavāyi* and *nimitta*. In the creation of an object by the relation of inherence [*samavāya* - inseparability], that which has identity [*tādātmya*] with it is its *samavāyi* cause. For such an object a cause that is related by contact, inherence etc. [other than identity] is *asamavāyi* cause. Other than these two types of causes is *nimitta* cause. Time, unseen factors [virtue, merit etc.], *Īśvara* [God] etc. are common to all effects and hence, taking *Īśvara* as *nimitta* cause, He cannot be material cause, as otherwise, we cannot define *nimitta* cause at all. Hence, Brahman is only *nimitta* cause. Material cause can be the constituent particles of objects upto atoms. This reasoning of their doctrine is not proper, as definition of *nimitta* cause would not suit in their doctrine. Since they hold that in the creation of pot, stick is *nimitta* and pot is *samavāyi* [material] cause for its attributes like form etc., *nimitta*, which should be different from *samavāyi* and *asamavāyi* causes, is not tenable. They then modify their definition of cause to mean causality different from that in *samavāyi* and *asamavāyi* causes, which means the causality of stick towards creating the pot and causality in the pot towards its attributes are distinct. But this can also be used in the case of *Īśvara* to be the material and instrumental cause of the Universe distinctly and so the objection gets overruled. Moreover, Vaiśeṣhika-s et al. also, according to their doctrine, agree that, for the contact between a pot and *Īśvara*, he is the *samavāyi* cause and being generic instrumental cause for all effects, which includes the said contact, He is instrumental cause for that also. This is no different from what Vedāntin-s aver as simultaneous material and instrumental cause of Brahman towards the Universe. This aspect is highlighted in *tattva-muktā-kalāpa* by Svāmi Vedānta Deśika, in *Nāyaka-sara*, in three quarters, as: 'कर्तोपादानमेव स्वसुखमुखगुणे स्वप्रयत्नप्रसूते संयोगं स्वस्य मूर्तेस्स्वयमुपजनयन्नीश्वरोऽप्येवमिष्टः । सर्वोपादान-भावस्तत इह घटते सर्वकर्तर्यमुष्मिन्' (3.26) [स्वप्रयत्नप्रसूते – created by one's effort, स्वसुखमुखगुणे – in the attributes like His bliss etc., उपादानमेव – one who is material cause समवायिकारण, कर्ता – is deemed as agent (instrumental cause) कर्ता - निमित्तकारणम्, इष्टः or one who is instrument himself is material cause (कर्तैव निमित्तकारणम्, उपादानम् - समवायिकारणम् (इति) इष्टः according to some.) स्वस्य – his own, मूर्तेस्सह – with tangible substances, संयोगम् - contact, स्वयम् – by self, उपजनयन् - creating, ईश्वरोऽपि – *Īśvara* also, एवम् – so [as material cause उपादान, इष्टः - accepted. ततः - hence (by agreeing to the identity of material and instrumental causes;) सर्वोपादानभावः – being the material cause of all, सर्वकर्तरि – in the instrumental cause of all, अमुष्मिन् – in *Īśvara*, घटते – fits well.]

In *Adhikarana Sārāvalī* [अधिकरणसारावलि] in the two quarters 'स्वज्ञानाद्यं स्वजन्यं भवति सृजति च स्वान्यसंयोगमीशः संयोगे मूर्तनिष्ठे प्रकृतिरपि हि तत्स्यान्निमित्तं क्रियातः ।' (1.4.16) this is mentioned. [स्वज्ञानाद्यम् – knowledge etc. in Him, ('in Him' denotes Him as material cause समवायिकारण) स्वजन्यम् – are created by self, (that is, by effort,) भवति

- becomes. ईशः - *Īśvara*, स्वान्यसंयोगम् – contact with things different from self, सृजति - creates. मूर्तनिष्ठे – in tangible things, संयोगे - contact, प्रकृतिरपि - though is material cause, तत् – He [*Īśvara*; neuter is used to agree with cause विधेयप्राधान्यात् नपुंसकलिङ्गनिर्देशः], क्रियातः – by effort, (that is by willing प्रयत्न-सङ्कल्प) निमित्तं स्यात् – can be *nimitta* निमित्त also. Or, in the contact with tangible things, प्रकृतिरपि – material उपादान, तत् – that [concrete] thing मूर्तद्रव्य, क्रियातः – by effort/action, (निमित्तं स्यादित्यर्थः) will be instrument.

Here, Svāmi following the reasoning of the opponent, 'that which is instrument for an effect cannot be material cause for it. So *Īśvara* is not material cause', refutes it thus: As in *Jīva*'s attributes like knowledge, happiness etc. created by his effort, though *Jīva* is material cause, he is also accepted as instrumental cause through the effort, as also, *Īśvara*, in creating contact with tangible objects is accepted as both material and instrumental cause, likewise, for all entities *Īśvara* can be both *upādāna* and *nimitta* simultaneously.

Another objection to Brahman being both *upādāna* and *nimitta* is put forth thus:- In the *Prakṛtyadhikaraṇam* of Śrībhāṣyam, Bhāṣyakara taking Sāṅkhya as the main pūrvapakṣi [prima facie view], is due to his rejection of the identity of *upādāna* and *nimitta* is quoting Scriptural contradiction, since, if it is disproved, then, those opposing that based on contradiction to reasoning (yukti) like Vaiśeṣika-s etc. are effectively refuted by that itself.

Sāṅkhya-s say – since *upādeya* [effect] and *upādāna* [cause] are identical, for the non-sentient primordial matter [prakṛti], how can *Īśvara*, a sentient being, be the *upādāna*? Also, Upaniṣad-s state that *Īśvara* is changeless [aparaṇāmī, nirvikāra = non-evolving] in 'निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यम्' (श्वे.उ. 6.19) [lit. 'having no parts, non-active/inert, tranquil, free from blemishes and devoid of coating/smearing'] and 'स वा एष महानज आत्माऽजरोऽमरः' (बृ.उ. 6.4.25) ['He that is big, not born, inhering, non-ageing, non-dying'] etc. They also declare prakṛti as ever-changing as in 'विकारजननीमज्ञाम्....' ['she who creates changes/evolution, non-sentient'], and as the agent of creation '....गौरनाद्यन्तवती सा जनित्री भूतभाविनी' (मात्रिक.उ) ['She who is infinite (= lit. without beginning or end) is the progenitor transforming as/the elements']. Hence, how can an unmutating *Īśvara* be the *upādāna*, material cause? Doesn't being *upādāna* imply being the substrate of change? Therefore, one must conclude that the unchanging *Īśvara* is only 'nimitta' and the ever-changing prakṛti as *upādāna*. This is also expressly stated in the upaniṣad-s (scriptures) as in 'अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत्' (श्वे.उ. 4.9) ['the Māyī (lit. one with/controlling māyā), creates this universe from māyā = prakṛti'], 'मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यात् मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्' (श्वे.उ. 4.10) ['prakṛti should be known/understood as māyā'] and in bhagavad gītā as 'मयाध्यक्षेण प्रकृतिः सूयते सचराचरम्' (भ.गी. 9.10) ['with me as the superintendent, prakṛti is being evolved into moving and non-moving entities']. Hence, as we accept that *upādāna* (cause) and *upādeya* (effect) are identical, the non-sentient *upādāna*, as it cannot bring forth the change without the control of an adhiṣṭhātā = sentient/inherent other force, like clay etc. requiring potter as superintendent to become pot etc., *Īśvara* should be the adhiṣṭhātā. Then the statements like, 'तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय' (छा.उ. 6.2.3) ['That saw = thought that let me become many, (for that let me) issue forth (evolutes)'], 'तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत' (तै.आ. 5.30) ['That created self by

itself']' etc. must be interpreted as referring to avatāra-s = incarnations as in 'तदात्मानं सृजाम्यहम्' (भ.गी. 4.7) ['then I create myself = I take incarnation'].

This is also not proper. We should consider the declaration and the many examples provided. Uddālaka, intending to create the knowledge about the brahman as one qualified by being both the upādāna and nimitta (of the world) to his son Śvetaketu, and to teach him about that only after he seeks it, (did you ask about such controller, by knowing which, all unknown become known) said, 'स्तब्धोऽस्युततमादेशमप्राक्ष्यः येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवति' (छा.उ. 6.1.3) [(you are haughty, did you enquire about that Ādeśa (= niyanta – controller) by which (being heard) all unheard of things become heard']. This is the introduction of the declaration that by the knowing of one all become known. Then, he (Śvetaketu) asks 'कथन्तु भगवस्स आदेशो भवति' (छा.उ. 6.1.3) ['how could such an ādeśa be (exist)?']. Uddālaka then replies starting as, 'यथा सोम्येकेन मृत्पिण्डेन' (छा.उ. 6.1.4) ['just as a lump of clay being known results in the earthen effects becoming known'] etc., covering mṛtpiṇḍa [lump of clay], lohamāṇi [metal/iron ball], nakhanikṛntana [nail-cutter] examples and concludes that 'likewise is that ādeśa'. If we do not accept upādānatva for Brahman, then the doctrine that 'knowledge of one leads to knowledge of all' gets violated. By just knowing the nimitta potter etc, would the knowledge of pot etc. result? A query could arise here - But, won't the knowledge of the main entity, if known, is equivalent to knowing the rest, as in the case of - if the prominent person, say Caitra, in a village, if seen, all are seen ('चैत्रे दृष्टे सर्वे ग्रामस्था दृष्टाः' = 'If Caitra is seen, all village-dwellers are seen')?, i.e., the declaration (knowledge of all by knowledge of one) is to be taken as referring to the main or prominent one is the query. The reply to this is thus – if prominence is the basis of the declaration (i.e., not in the literal sense), this is universally known and Śvetaketu, after undergoing deep study for twelve years at his Guru's place [=gurukula] and having learnt all scriptures, would not ask 'कथन्तु भगवस्स आदेशो भवति' ['how could such an ādeśa be?']. Moreover, even if he asked so, Uddālaka's reply should have been 'प्राधान्यात् सर्वं ज्ञातं भवति' ['all become known by prominence (of the one)']. Also, referring to the various examples of upādāna substances like mṛtpiṇḍa [lump of clay] etc. also does not match. After 'बहु स्यां प्रजायेय' (तै.आ. 5.29), the sentence 'इदं सर्वमसृजत' (तै.आ. 5.29) [(It) 'created all this'] follows and hence, bahubhavana – becoming many – does not refer to becoming many through the incarnations like Rāma, Kṛṣṇa etc. Similarly, in 'तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत' (तै.आ. 5.30), 'tad', being a pronoun, refers to the previous sentence 'ततो वै सदजायत' (तै.आ. 5.30), wherein, the word 'sad' signifying the state having manifest names and forms (of all worldly objects) and so, does not mean incarnations. Besides these, in reply to the question 'किं स्विद्वनं क उ स वृक्ष आसीत् मनीषिणो मनसा पृच्छतेद् तद्यदध्यतिष्ठद्बुवनानि धारयन्' (तै.ब्रा. 2.8.76) ['what was the forest, and which indeed was the tree? O contemplators! Consider mentally and seek 'that', which, supporting the worlds, was superintending?'] regarding the upādāna and nimitta for the world, the statement, 'ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीत् ब्रह्माध्यतिष्ठद्बुवनानि धारयन्' (तै.ब्रा. 2.8.76-77) ['Brahman was the forest and tree, Brahman superintended the worlds supporting them'] explicitly states Brahman as both the upādāna and nimitta of the world.

But would not the scripture attributing upādānatva [material causality] to prakṛti be violated by such interpretation? No. 'मिथो भेदं तत्त्वेष्वभिलपति भेदश्रुतिरसौ

विशिष्टैक्यादेक्यश्रुतिरपि च सार्था भगवती । इमावर्थो गोप्तुं निखिलजगदन्तर्यमयिता निरीशो लक्ष्मीशः श्रुतिभिरपराभिः प्रणिदधे ॥' (सङ्कल्पसूर्योदयः 2.94). [asau bhedaśrutiḥ = this bhedaśruti, the scriptural statements like 'द्वावजावीशनीशौ' (श्वे.उ. 1.9), 'भोक्ता भोग्यं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा' (श्वे.उ. 1.12), ['the two birthless independent and dependent', and 'contemplating the enjoyer, object of joy and the instigator'] etc., tatveṣu – among realities/entities, mithaḥ – between each other, bhedaḥ – difference, abhilapati – describe. Bhagavatī (this adjective is probably used to denote that this scripture did not create mistake in our people unlike others with crooked vision) – aikya śrutiḥ api – the aikya śruti also, 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (छा.उ. 3.14.1), 'आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्' (छा.उ. 7.25.2), ['all this is Brahman', 'all this is only ātmā'] etc., viśiṣṭaikyād – the qualified being one, sārthā – has primary meaning. Unlike others, we need not take them as secondary/IMPLIED etc. Some take bhagavatī - pūjyā ca, as the adjective to the significance of the scripture. Imau arthau – these two meanings (aspects), goptum – to protect, nirīśaḥ – one without a superior, lakṣmīsaḥ – the consort of Śrī, aparābhiḥ śrutibhiḥ – by other scriptural statements like 'यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन् पृथिव्या अन्तरः यस्य पृथिवी शरीरम्' (बृ.उ. 5.7.3) ['Who, dwelling (lit. standing) in the Earth, is different from the Earth, whose person (body) is the Earth'] etc., nikhila jagad antar yamayitā – being the immanent ruler of the entire Universe, praṇidadhē – is described. That is, the two meanings, without contradiction, are reconciled by the scriptures themselves is the view.

Thus, in our siddhānta [system of philosophy], by reconciling all scriptural statements without attributing secondary/IMPLIED significance to any of them, where is the contraction in Śruti? Sentient and non-sentient entities, being included in the Brahman's essence, Brahman qualified by subtle sentient and non-sentient entities is denoted by the term 'prakṛti'. Hence, Brahman can be the substrate of pariṇāma = evolution. Even if the sentient and non-sentient entities are not part of the essence, by being its śarīra = person, through them Brahman can be substrate of transformation. So, there is no contradiction to the scripture declaring Brahman as non-mutating. That is, even as the transformation from infancy to boyhood to adulthood etc. happens in the body and not in the ātma, but the essential characteristics of both ātma and the śarīra are well-defined and delineated [without mix-up], so also the defects in the śarīra [sentient and non-sentient entities] of Brahman do not affect it. This is mentioned in the last quarter of the verse from Tattvamuktākālāpa mentioned earlier, as 'सर्वश्रुत्यैकरस्यप्रणयिभिरुचितं द्वारमत्राभ्युपेतम् ॥'. Sarvaśrutyāika-rasya praṇayibhiḥ – by those desirous of reconciling all śruti vākya-s, atrāpi – in this case also, ucitam – suitable (proper), dvāram – intermediary, abhyupetam – assented. Connecting these words in the form of 'प्रणयिभिः अभ्युपेतं द्वारम् उचितं भवति' denotes Śrī Deśika without prejudice (partiality) concluded so.

Īśvara being distinct from all other entities, we should not assign only adhiṣṭhātṛtva = being nimitta or instrumental cause, to Him, sticking to worldly standards, since His potency is unfathomable and of myriad nature. He can, by willing so, become the world. Sage Manu also states – 'सोऽभिध्याय शरीरात् स्वात्सिसृक्षुर्विविधाः प्रजाः' (मनु.स्मृ. 1.8), i.e., (He) contemplating towards Self, from His Person, wanting to create all types of Beings (created Waters first). This is also described in the verse prior to the one quoted earlier in Tattvamuktākālāpa as -

'अस्यैवाचिन्त्यशक्तेरखिलजनयितुस्स्यादुपादानभावः
सूक्ष्माव्यक्तादिदेहः परिणमति यतोऽनेकधा स्थूलवृत्त्या ।
निष्कृष्टेऽस्मिन् शरीरिण्यखिलगुणगणालङ्कृतानन्दरूपे
संपद्यन्ते समस्तास्समुचितगतयो निर्विकारादिवादाः ॥' (3.25)

[akhilajanayituḥ - One who creates everything, acintyaśakteḥ - of unthinkable abilities, asyaiva - for Him alone, upādānabhāvaḥ - being Material cause also, syāt - is plausible. Because yataḥ - since, sūkṣmāvyaktādidēhaḥ - One Who has entities like avyakta etc. in subtle form as His Person, sthūlavṛttiyā - becomes of gross state, anekadhā - in multifarious forms, pariṇamati - evolves/transforms, (hence, no contradiction). Being adorned with infinite auspicious attributes and of Infinite Bliss as His essential characteristic, asmin - in this, niṣkṛṣṭe śarīriṇi - unqualified antaryāmi = immanent ruler, samastāḥ nirvikārādivādāḥ - all scriptural declarations stating absence of modification/unchanging nature, samucitagatayaḥ - become properly explained/suitable].

In Adhikaraṇa Sārāvalī, Ācārya states that, in the third quarter of the first chapter, 'Infinite Greatness' is the attribute described, as He is of unthinkable powers, and hence, there is no difficulty being both Material and Instrumental cause of the Universe. Also, in the scriptures, in the statement 'यद्भूतयोनिं परिपश्यन्ति धीराः' (मुं.उ. 1.1.6) being material cause is explicit. Can't this word yoni = cause, refer only to instrument? - No. Since, in reply to the query, 'कस्मिन्नु भगवो विज्ञाते सर्वमिदं विज्ञातं भवति' (मुं.उ. 1.1.3), brahman is said to be 'bhūtayoni'. Here, only if Brahman is the material cause of the Universe, can the assertion 'ब्रह्मविज्ञानात् सर्वविज्ञानम्' [= 'by knowing Brahman all is known'] be tenable.

Now, some more queries follow: - How can Brahman be upādānam (material cause), since are all upādānams not dependent on distinct [different from self-] nimitta causes? How can a solitary Brahman be material cause for mutually distinct infinite worlds? While transforming into effect [upādeya], will self-form also be concealed? These are answered by worldly examples justifying Brahman's upādānatvam in the upaniṣadic statement - 'यथोर्णनाभिः सृजते गृह्णते च यथा पृथिव्यामोषधयस्संभवन्ति । यथा सतः पुरुषात्केशलोमानि तथाक्षरात्संभवतीह विश्वम् ॥' (मुं.उ. 1.1.8). Here, as the ūrṇanābhi, the eight-legged spider (cobweb) while creating its thread, is independent of any other entity, likewise, for the Īśvara also, who gave that ability to the spider, being material cause is possible. Here, by the illustration of spider (ūrṇanābhi), a qualified entity can be upādāna and the qualificand need not be transforming are shown. The change of state is not in the person alone or soul [ātmā] alone of the spider, but in the composite [qualified = person/body + soul] entity. Similarly, being the substrate of state-change will not occur in Prakṛti alone or in brahman alone, but only in the qualified Brahman only. Even when it happens in the qualified Brahman, the essence of Brahman, [the qualificand/viśeṣya = svarūpa] will not have defects. This is explained in Adhikaraṇa Sārāvalī as - 'मृद्गृह्णन्तादिमात्राच्च च विकृतिरसौ स्यात् परस्य स्वरूपे देहद्वारोर्णनाभिप्रभृतिविकृतिवद्व्यापृतेर्दर्शितत्वात्' (1-4-15). The next two illustrations in the mantra relating to Earth [pṛthivī] and puruṣa [embodied person] denote that, a single cause can be upādānam for multiple effects [Earth spawns off many plants] and previous state not being annihilated in state-change [a live person having nails and hair growing] are fine. Similarly, upādāna and nimitta

both are possible in Brahman simultaneously.

These reasonings are consolidated in a nutshell in one verse as –

'कार्यैक्ये हि प्रतिज्ञा तदनुगुण उदाहारि दृष्टान्तवर्गः
स्रष्टुस्स्यामित्यभिध्यां श्रुतिरिह वनतां वृक्षतादिं च वक्ति ।
आत्मानं चैष एव स्वयमकुरुत तद्भूतयोनिवमुक्तं
तस्मात्कर्ताऽपि देवः प्रकृतिरपि भवेत् सर्वतत्त्वान्तरात्मा ॥' (अधिकरणसारावलि: 1-4-17)

By 'कार्यैक्ये हि प्रतिज्ञा घटते' denotes upādānatva and by import, nimittatva. Indeed, aren't the three examples mentioned in support of these? The Creator willed as 'let me be [many]' and He is described as both the forest [vanam] and the tree [vṛkṣa] in the scriptures. Statements as 'एष एवात्मानं तदकुरुत' [He alone made Himself as world] and 'भूतयोनिम्' [(all) cause of the Beings] are also made. Hence, Īśvara, as antarātmā = the immanent ruler of all tattva-s [realities] and śarīrī of all, being of infinite [limitless] greatness, can be both upādāna and nimitta.

If one were to say that Brahman alone is true, rest are illusions with Brahman as the substrate; in that case, stating Brahman as upādāna and by the knowledge of upādāna Brahman [cause], all upādeya-s [effects] can be known will not stand scrutiny. When one mistakes rope for snake, the illusory appearance of snake does not have rope as its material cause. Similarly, for the illusory jagat = world, Brahman that is true [satya] will not be the cause. Thus, as by the knowledge of rope, snake [sarpa], crack in the ground [bhūdalana], or trail of water [ambudhāra] etc. {these three examples are to account for masculine, neutral and feminine genders of illusory objects of the world} won't be known, likewise, by the knowledge of (true) Brahman, knowledge of illusory objects will not result. If one were to say – In real life, if one mistakes rope as snake, another as crack in the ground and others in many other ways, when the reality that it [the object seen] is rope is known, it can be said that all others [snake, crack in ground etc.] are known, similarly, in the scripture 'वाचारम्भणम्', jagat [world] can be known as 'illusion' [mithyā] and so, by the knowledge of one ['true' Brahman] all [other illusory objects] are known can be explained; that is also not tenable. In the scripture 'वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्', jagat [= world] does not become illusion. That statement avers there is transformation = vikāra, and name = nāmadheyam which are ārambhaṇam = touched by, i.e., connected to the substance clay/mud [mrd-dravya]. Why? Because vācā – by the word vāk is meant the conversation through speech [= to speak about], i.e., for the sake of transaction etc. For transacting, the substance mud undergoes transformation as pot [ghaṭa] etc. and gets names such as ghaṭa, is the import. Why this should be the meaning is due to the fact that further 'मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्' denotes that pot etc. are in essence, mud only as known by pramāṇa-s. So the sentence becomes, when connected, as - तथा च, यतः मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् अतः विकारः नामधेयम् आरम्भणं वाचा – In the forenoon the lump of mud [mṛt] which I saw, the same mud has now become a pot [ghaṭa] is the recollection identifying pot etc. with mud [i.e., they are not different from the mud clod]. Ghaṭa, śarāva, kapāla etc. are different transformations of the self-same clod of mud, with the attendant different nomenclatures, for various applications/uses. In fact, the meaning that mud and pot are the same substance

is to be taken. Otherwise, 'मृत्तिकैव सत्यम्' should have been said and the word 'iti' would then be futile. This is summarised in a verse as: 'वाचारम्भणमित्युक्ते मिथ्येत्यश्रुतकल्पनम् । पुनरुक्तिर्नामधेयमितीत्यस्य निरर्थता ॥' (अनुव्याख्यानं 1-4-123). So, in the vivartavāda, upādānatva and knowledge of all by the knowledge of one would not be suitable.

Now we consider the Dramida Vedanta, wherein, in the 4000 songs of Āzhvār-s, Brahman having both upādānatvam and nimittatvam, which may be difficult to lucidly understand from Veda-s, are made crystal clear by Kurukeśa [= Nammāzhvar] and others, in many places in the Divya-prabandham-s. Among them, Nammāzhvār's works are paramount as an elucidation of Veda-s [upabṛhmaṇam] as per Svāmi Desikan, as mentioned in Dramidopaniṣat Tātparya Ratnāvalī in - 'यत्तत्कृत्यं श्रुतीनां मुनिगणविहितैस्सेतिहासैः पुराणैः तत्रासौ सत्त्वसीम्लशठमथनमुनेस्संहिता सार्वभौमी ।' (द्रमिडोपनिषत्तात्पर्यरत्नावलि: 4) [munigaṇa-vihitaiḥ - those composed by sages/seers, setihāsaiḥ - along with epics, purāṇaiḥ - the Purāṇa-s, śrutinām - for Veda-s, yattatkṛtyam - whatever may be required to be done [assistance in elucidating meaning], tatra - in that, sattvasīmnaḥ - the abode of sattva quality, śaṭhamathanamuneḥ - Nammāzhvār's, saṃhitā - Veda [=Tiruvāimozhi], sārvaabhaumī - is supreme (empress)].

Also, that Nammāzhvār has summarised the essence of the entire contents of śāstra-s is said in -

'शास्त्रे देहातिरिक्तात्मनि तदधिपतौ तत्प्रसादाद्युपाये
तस्मान्निश्चयेयसाप्तौ तदपचरणतोऽनन्ततापाभिघाते ।
तद्भक्तानां प्रभावे तदुपसदनतः स्वान्तकालुष्यशान्तौ
सारं वेद्यं स्ववेदे सकलमकथयत्सानुकम्पः शठारिः ॥' (द्रमिडोपनिषत्तात्पर्यरत्नावलि: 128)

[dehātirikṭātmani - in the matter of ātmā being distinct from [above] the body, tadadhipatau - regarding his superior and [śeṣi] īśvara, tatprasādādyupāye - in the means required for pleasing Him, tasmān niśśreyasāptau - by that means obtaining release from bondage, tadapacaraṇataḥ - regarding violating His orders, anantatāpābhighāte - in destroying infinite sorrow, tadbhaktānām prabhāve - in the matter of knowing the [unlimited] greatness of His servants [= bhagavata-s], tadupasadanataḥ svāntakāluṣyaśāntau - by the service and meditation of bhāgavata-s in getting rid of the defects of the mind, śāstre - in śāstra-s, vedyam - knowable, sakalam sāram - entire essence, sānukampaḥ - the compassionate, śaṭhāriḥ - Nammāzhvār, svavede - in his veda = tiruvāymozi, akathayat - has elucidated.].

Additionally, it is said by Svāmi Deśikan that 'आदौ शारीरकार्थक्रममिह विशदं विंशतिर्वक्ति साग्रा' (द्रमिडोपनिषत्तात्पर्यरत्नावलि: 5) [iha - in the Tiruvāymozi, ādau - in the beginning, sāgrā - along with the tip [i.e., with the remainder], viṃśatiḥ - twenty verses, śārīrakārthakramam - the order of the meanings of Vedānta also called as śārīraka, vakti - describes], and in

'द्विकाभ्यां द्यष्टाङ्गिर्दुर्धिगमनीतिस्थपुटिता यदन्त्या मीमांसा श्रुतिशिखरतत्त्वं व्यवृणुत ।
तदादौ गाथाभिः मुनिरधिकविंशाभिरिह नः कृती सारग्राहं व्यतरदिह सङ्गृह्य कृपया ॥' (द्रमिडोपनिषत्सारः 4)

[dvikābhyām - by the two prior and later diads [= two chapters], dvyasṭāṅghriḥ - with sixteen quarters, antyā mīmāṃsā - the last part of mīmāṃsā śāstra

(vedānta), yat - which, śrutiśikharatattvam – the essence of summits of Veda-s, vyavṛṇuta - explained, tat – that same purport of vedānta, kṛtī – the competent, muniḥ - Nammāzvār, kṛpayā – by his grace, iha – in the Tiruvāymozi, ādau – in the beginning, adhikaviṃśābhiḥ - twenty-plus, gāthābhiḥ - verses, saṅgrhya – in a nutshell, naḥ - to us, vyatarat – has given.]

In such celebrated first twenty-odd verses of Tiruvāymozi, in the first decad that deals with the greatness [= paratvam] of ŚrīmanNārāyaṇa – the verse,

'திடவிகம் பெரிவளி நீர்நில மிவையிசை,
படர்பொருள் முழுவது மாயவையவை தொறும்,
உடன்மிசை யுயிரெனக் கரந்தெங்கும் பரந்துளன்,
சுடர்மிகு சுருதியு ளிவையுண்ட சுரனே.' (2088)

[tiṭavicumpu – Ether, that lasts longer than other elements or that which is known by stronger means of knowledge, eri - fire, vaḷi - air, nīr - water, nilam - earth, ivaimicai – on these substances, paṭar poruḷ muzuvatum – all evolutes expanding from these (the entire universe being comprised of the five elements) āy – by becoming, avai avai toruṃ – in each of all those objects, uṭal micai uyir eṇa – like the ātmā in the body, karantu – hidden/latent, eṅkum parantu – pervading inside and outside, ivai uṇṭa curan – the deity who swallows these in dissolution, cuṭar miku curutiyuḷ - in the highly luminous [due to being authorless] scripture {that is conveyed through oral tradition} is well described], upādānatvam, its supporting śarīra-ātmabhāva [= body-soul relationship], in this issue, the source of knowledge is śruti = scripture are asserted by āzhvār. Here. upādānatvam is meant is decided by, "முழுவதும் 'ஆய்' which paraphrases the scripture, [ref. "बहु स्यात्" என்கிற தன் विकासமாகையாலே வேதிகநிर्देशமிருக்கிறபடி" in iṭu sentence]. By the simile 'உடன்மிசை யுயிரென', just like being the substrate for the states of boyhood, youth etc. of the jīva [= soul] are indirectly through the body, similarly, the ātmā is with respect to īśvara, and ipso facto, He is not affected by the defects of transformation in the sentient and non-sentient beings aforesaid are all included. Also, the statements like 'நினைந்த வெல்லாப் பொருள்கட்கும் வித்தாய் முதலில் சிதையாமே' (2127), 'தானோருருவே தனிவித்தாய்' (2129), 'இவையு மவையு முவையும் இவரு மவரு முவரும் யவையும்யவரும் தன்னுள்ளேயாகியு மாக்கியுங் காக்கும் அவையுள் தனிமுதலெம்மான்' (2170) etc. clearly express upādānatvam and nimittatvam. Similarly, in further centa also as mentioned earlier in the sloka 'यत्कृत्यम्', being elucidatory, has clearly stated this aspect, without needing additional help like scriptures. There, as our desikan opines that āzvār has enjoyed the Lord as himself in the decad 'கடல் ஞாலம்' the first stanza has in the first two lines 'கடல் ஞாலம் செய்தேனும் யானேயென்னும் கடல் ஞாலமாவேனும் யானே யென்னும்' (2579) brahman has both upādānatvam and nimittatvam is shown. As these are outpourings of actual experience, there is no scope for doubting any of these aspects. 'பாரிட முன்படைத்தா னென்பரால் பாரிட மாவானும் தானானால்' (3728) in periyā tiruvantāti also has such mention.

Similarly, Tirumazicai Āzvār, who learnt many other systems of philosophy and born in the asterism of Maghā in the Tamil month of 'Tai', in his truth-laden songs of 'Tiruccandaviruttam' has extolled that Your being both Upādāna and Nimitta of the universe is not comprehensible to any non-Vedanti [Viśiṣṭādvaita philosopher] in the very first stanza as –

'பூநிலாய வைந்துமாய்ப் புனற்கணின்ற நான்குமாய்
தீநிலாய மூன்றுமாய்ச் சிறந்தகாலிரண்டுமாய்
மீநிலாய தொன்றுமாகி வேறுவேறு தன்மையாய்
நீநிலாய வண்ணநினை யார் நினைக்க வல்லரே.' (752)

[pūnilāya – present in the Earth, likewise further also. aintumāy – becoming the five aspects [of śabda {sound}, sparśa {touch}, rūpa {form}, rasa {taste}, and gandha {odour}], puṇal kaṇ niṇra – present in the Water, nāṇkumāy – the four aspects except odour, tī nilāya mūṇrumāy – the three aspects present in tējas {fire} śabda, sparśa and rūpa, ciṇṇantakāl – present in the Air, iraṇṇumāy – dual aspects of śabda and sparśa, mīnilāyatu oṇṇumāki – the sound present in (Ether) ākāśa, vēru vēru taṇmaiyāy – various entities like deities etc., nī nilāya vaṇṇam – the way You are present (embodying sentient and non-sentient objects grouped as cause-effects), niṇṇai – the material cause of the Universe {You}, yār niṇaikka vallaṛē - (other than Vedānti-s) who else can contemplate/comprehend?]

Here, the import of 'யார் நினைக்க வல்லரே!' has been elucidated by earlier commentators of this verse like Periya Āccān Piḷḷai etc., as - 'परमाणुக்கள் उपादानकारणम् என்று वैशेषिकர்களும், प्रधानम् उपादानकारणम् என்று साङ्ख्यர்களும், निमित्तोपादानங்களுக்கு भेदம் உண்டெனச் சொல்லும் शैवர்களும், चिदचिदीश्वरतत्त्वत्रयங்களும் ब्रह्मपरिणामமென்ற भेदाभेदிகளும், निर्विशेषवस्तुव्यतिरिक्तங்கள் अपारमार्थिकமென்ற मायावादிகளும் நினைக்கமுடியாமல் वेदान्तप्रमेयம் கைப்பட்டார்க்கு நினைக்கும்படியாயிருக்கிறாய்' 'those who hold paramāṇu-s [=atoms] as upādānam, i.e., Vaiśeṣika-s; Sāṅkhya-s who hold pradhāna [= Prakṛti – primordial matter] as upādānam; Śaiva-s who hold there is difference between upādāna and nimitta; Bhedābheda-vādi-s [Yādava/Bhāskara] who hold the three realities cit [sentient], acit [non-sentient] and Īśvara [their Immanent Ruler] as the evolutes of Brahman; Māyāvādi-s [Sāṅkara-s] who hold that those other than nirviśeṣa [indistinct absolute] are not absolutely true; cannot contemplate/comprehend You and You are known to only [Viśiṣṭādvaita] Vedānti-s', who have grasped the essence/intention of Upaniṣad-s.

Thus, describing upādānatva and incidentally, mentioning the attributes of Being the Immanent Controller of all Beings, he has concluded in the tenth verse thus, with a suitable illustration as follows: -

'தன்னுளே திரைத்தெழும் தரங்கவெண் தடங்கடல்
தன்னுளே திரைத்தெழுந் தடங்குகின்ற தன்மைபோல்
நின்னுளே பிறந்திறந்து நிற்பவும் திரிபவும்
நின்னுளே யடங்குகின்ற நீர்மைநின்க ணின்றதே.' (761)

[taṇṇuḷē tiraittu ezum – continually growing, taraṅkam veṇ - having waves and whiteness, taṭam kaṭal - vast ocean, taṇṇuḷē – within itself, tiraittu ezuntu – bursting forth above, aṭaṅkukinra taṇmaipōl – [and then] like its eventual subsiding nature, niṇṇuḷē – within Your Essence, piṇantu – having born, iṇantu – and being, niṇpavum – stationary objects, tiripavum – and moving objects, niṇṇuḷē – in You, aṭaṅkukinra nirmai – dissolving/resting (this) nature, niṇkaṇ - in You, niṇṇratu - resides. That is to say that the material causality [upādānakāraṇatvam] is not present in anyone else.] In this Tamil Veda, as if the examples given in Śruti are not enough, he has offered a distinct additional

illustration which clarifies that even though cit and acit entities are subsumed/dissolved in His Essence, there is no overlap/contradiction of their mutual exclusive attributes. Hence, even by looking at this illustration, jagadupādānatvam gets established. Even in further verses, incidentally Brahman's upādānatva towards the Universe has been explained. The songs of this Āzvār, who knew firsthand, many other systems of philosophy, have been aptly mentioned by our Deśikan as 'மெய்ம்மிகுத்த' ['truth-laden']. This Āzvār in his Nāṇmukan Tiruvantāti also, has sung as 'நீயே யுலகெல்லாம்' and 'நீயே எரிசுடரும் மால்வரையும் எண்டிசையும்ண்டத் திருசுடரு மாயவிலை' (3503) ['nīyē ulakellām' [You are the whole universe] is elucidated as, You alone are the various objects like the bright fire, huge mountains, eight directions, the two sources of light [=Sun and Moon] etc. Further, he has elaborated in

'வானுலவு தீவளி மாகடல்மா பொருப்பு
தானுலவு வெண்கதிரும் தண் மதியும் - மீனிலவு
கொண்டல் பெயரும் திசை யெட்டும் சூழ்ச்சியும்
அண்டந் திருமா லகைப்பு' (3520)

[vān - Ether [ākāśa], ulavu tī - burning Fire, vaḷi - Air, mākaṭal - big ocean, mā poruppu - huge mountains, tān ulavu vem katirum - [impelled by Īśvara] traversing Sun, taṇ matiyum - cool Moon, miṇilavu koṇṭal - clouds moving in the sky above, peyarum - all names, ticai eṭṭum - eight quarters, cūzcciyum - enclosure, aṇṭam - such a Cosmic Shell, tirumāl - [are] Śrīyaḥpati [= consort of Mahālakṣmī], akaippu - the manifestations. ezucci means objects as well as those created by saṅkalpa [= Divine Will]. Śrīyaḥpati Himself has become like this indicates upādānatvam and the manifestations are brought forth by His saṅkalpa denote His nimittatvam.].

Also, Tirumaṅkai Āzvār has mentioned He manifesting as the world of five elements etc. in - 'பாரு நீரெரிகாற்றினோடாகாசமுமுவையாயினான்' (1024), 'அம்பரமனல்கால் நிலம் சலமாகி நின்ற வமரர் கோன்' (1025), 'திங்களப்புவானெரிகாலாகி' (1064) etc; Periyāzvār as 'மண்ணொடு நீரு மெரியும் காலும் மற்றுமாகாசமுமாகிநின்றாய்' (428), the triad of early nectarian singers, the Mutal āzvārs [Poykaiāzvār, Pūtattzvār and Peyāzvār] as 'இறைய நிலனு மிருவிசும்பும் காற்றும் அறைபுனலும் செந்தீயுமாவான்' (3212), 'வானாகித் தீயாய் மறிகடலாய் மாருதமாய் தேனாகிப் பாலாந் திருமாலே' (3275), 'அவன் கண்டாய் காற்றுத் தீ நீர்வான் கருவரைமண் காரோதச் சீற்றத்தீ யாவானும்' (3307), 'இருநிலனும் மால்விசும்பும் காற்றும் நெருங்கு தீ நீருருவுமானான்' (3407), 'தானே எரிசுடரும் மால்வரையும் எண்டிசையும் அண்டத் திருசுடருமாயவிலை' (3421).

Our Ahobila Mutt preceptors also have reiterated the jagannimittōpādānatva [= dual cause of universe as upādāna and nimitta] described in Vedānta as 'காரணமாய்க் காரியமாய்க் கண்டிடுமிவ்வுலகத்தில் பூரணமாய் உறைகின்ற புண்ணியனாம்' and, 'அனைத்துலகமவனேயாம் நல்ல மறையுளமிதுவே' (ஸ்ரீலக்ஷ்மீந்ருளிம்ஹன் அடைக்கலப்பத்து 5,9). Considering this only it is said in Śārīraka suprabhāta, as 'इत्थं शरीरकाव्यौ शयितमुभयथा हेतुमस्यागमान्तेस्सर्वैर्वाक्यैः प्रतीतं वरदम्'.

Consolidating all this for easy comprehension of all that Śrī VedāntaDeśika, in his rahasya grantha titled 'Paramatabhangam', has summarised as follows in patatattvādhikāra - 'இப்படி சত্যசङ्कल्पனாய் சர்க்காரியகாரணமான இஷ்ரனுண்டானாலும் பல ஸ்ருதிஸ்மृतிகளினுடைய ஸ்வாஸ்யத்தாலும் லோகஊதிபிரகியையாலும் இவன் நிமித்தமாತ್ರமாம் அத்தனையன்றோ?

उपादानम् प्रकृत्यादिकं आकवेण्डावो? இங்ஙனல்லாதபோது விகாராதிதோஷங்களும் வாராவோ? என்று யோகபாசுபதவैशेषिकादिसिद्धान्तங்கள் சொல்லுமது, ஸ்ருத்யாடிகளில் ப்ரதிஜ்ஞா஢்ட்யாந்த-பஹுபவநஸङ्कल्प-வநவृக்ஷாதிநிர்देश-आत्मकारणभूतयोनिशब्दादिकளினாலே நிரஸ்தம். லோகத்திலும் நிமித்தோபாदानபேதங்கண்டாப்-போல நிமித்தோபாदानைக்஢்த்தையும் ஢்சேதநா஢்சேதநங்களிரண்டிலும் ஸ்வய்யாபாரத்தால் ஸ்வகதாவஸ்தாவிशेषங்கள் வருமிடங்களெல்லாவிடத்திலும் காணலாம். நிமித்தமாत्र ईश्वरवादிகளுக்கும் ईश्वरसमवेतसंयोगा-द्यनित्यगुणங்களில் ईश्वரனுக்கு उपादानत्वமுமிசையவேணும். அப்போ உபாदान஢்ருவ்யशरीरकनाய்க்கொண்டு उपादानशब्दवाच्यனானால், பாலன் யுவாவாம்போது आत्मस्वरूपத்தில் बाल्ययौवनங்கள் கண்டதைப் போலே नामान्तरभजनार्हविकारविशेषங்களும் क्लेशादிகளும் ईश्वरस्वरूपத்தில் தட்டாமையாலே निर्विकारादिश्रुतिविरोधமில்லை. 'सोऽभिध्याय शरीरात् स्वात्' इत्यादिकளுக்கும் ऊर्णनाभि முதலான श्रुति சொன்ன दृष्टान्तங்களுக்குமிப்படி तात्पर्यங்கண்டு கொள்வது'. [= Thus, even if an Īśvara, being i) satyasāṅkalpa, i.e., desiring truly and achieving true objectives, and ii) the cause of all effects is established, does He not emerge as only the instrumental cause based on natural intent of many śruti and smṛti statements and in line with worldly observations? Should not upādāna [material cause] be the primordial matter etc. only? If this is not conceded, won't Īśvara attract the blemish of undergoing deformation etc. [leading to non-eternality]? Such objections raised by the adherents of the systems of philosophy propagated by Yoga, Pāśupata, Vaiśeṣika-s etc., are amply countered by the declaration in śruti-s etc. like, pratijñādr̥ṣṭānta [premise declared and illustration to establish that], bahubhavanasaṅkalpa [that One Willed to become many], vanavṛkṣādinirdēśa [by questioning and answering on forest and tree and Brahman being both (for creating this universe)], ātmakāraṇa [it sis Self-made], bhūtayoni-śabda [material cause of the elements] etc. In worldly discourses also, among sentient and non-sentient beings, we observe necessarily the invariable association [concomitance] of material and instrument being different and their unity in all cases on change of state [or transformation] brought about due to the will and control of the inherent Being.

Even for those who posit Īśvara to be only instrumental cause, the contact, duration, location etc. with transforming evolutes must be conceded as inherent in Him as transitory attributes and He as their upādānam. Then, if they argue that in such cases, He only has His person [śārīra] as upādāna of those objects; similarly when a boy turns adult, the changed state association in the person's ātmā is by being subject to the name and form variation suitably; and thus for Īśvara also, the change of state from dissolution to creation happening in the person of Him by His Will are not affecting His svarūpa [essence] and so also the attendant sorrow etc. Hence, there is no contradiction to śruti-s declaring Him as nirvikāra essentially. Scriptural statements like 'sōābhidyāya śārīrāt svāt' [= he, having Willed (to create) from His Person] and illustration of ūrṇanābhi [= spider] etc. are to be understood thus.

Thus, the master of all, the sole cause of all the entities in the universe, being pleased by directed devotion or absolute surrender, grants all desired fruit [puruṣārtha-s] is the teachings of scriptures, in a nutshell.

Even if there are any defects in this exposition, I entreat the learned elders, who solely look for good in things, like the saying 'वक्तुं क्षमास्सदसती विगताभ्यसूयास्सन्तस्सृशन्तु सदयैर्हृदयैः' [let those great people, capable of sifting good from bad, are free of malice etc, bless (this endeavour) with compassionate hearts] to accept and

forgive any drawback as per the dictum 'सन्तस्तु सन्तमपि न प्रथयन्ति दोषम्' [great people don't expand defects, even if present] by discarding the bad and picking the good aspects here.

इत्थं सत्संप्रदायप्रवचनकुशलाचार्यसंशिक्षितार्थः नाम्ना लक्ष्मीनृसिंहो बुधजनसमितौ कारणत्वं मुरारेः ।
आचार्योक्तक्रमेणाकथयदिह यदि स्याद्गुणस्तद्गुणेन स्वीयत्वेनाभिसन्ध्या निरवधिकृपया चानुगृह्णन्तु सन्तः ॥

This author, by name, Śrī LakṣmīNṛsimha, well-trained about things to be learnt, by dexterous preceptors propagating the right system of spiritual knowledge, presented the Causality of Murāri [= lit. slayer of an asura named Mura = Śrīmannārāyaṇa], as propounded by Ācārya-s like Svāmi VedāntaDeśika, in an august assembly of erudite scholars. Noble persons, with unbounded mercy and with a sense of belonging, may be pleased to accept if anything is worthwhile in this and bless the same.

Śubhamastu.

