**Paramaikāntis’ Svastivācanam**

(Sri U.Ve. Villur Nadadur Karunakarachariar Swamy, Chennai)

I asked my friend, “Why are you saying that I am an unyielding person?” For that, he looked at me and said, “Some people are creating a view that Emperumānār was not in favor of interpreting the Veda mantrās to mean divyadeśa Emperumāns. However, you seem to be least bothered about that view and interpret this mantrā to mean Vānamāmalai and continue to interpret the veda mantrās to mean different divyadeśams. What is wrong in calling you as an unyielding person?”.

I replied to him, “Emperumānār himself has taken a veda mantrā and explained that it denotes Tiruvġṅkaṭamudaiyān” and mentioned that mantrā.

He asked, “Why are you suddenly dropping a bomb shell?”

I explained as follows:

“During Emperumānār period, one Yādavā king was ruling Tiruvġṅkaṭam. Anantāzhvān was doing service to the Lord at Tiruvġṅkaṭam at that time.

During that period, some śaiva fanatics complained to the king showing wrong evidences to claim that the Lord there was śivā and vaiṣṇavās had forcefully occupied that place.

The king was confused. He asked Anantāzhvān to clarify the same.

To establish that the presiding Deity is the consort of Tirumagaḻ (Goddess Lakshmi), Emperumānār came to the assembly of the king and debated with the śaivites, as per the request of Anantāzhvān.

During that time, he explained that even the timeless and authorless veda has mentioned that the Lord in that place is none other than śrīnivāsan, who bears Goddess Lakshmi in his chest.

The following mantrā comes in ṛg veda, eighth aṣṭhakā, 8th adhyāyā, 12th anuvākā:

अरायि काणे विकटे गिरिं गच्छ सदान्वे।

शिरिम्बिठस्य सत्वभिस्तेभिष्ट्वा चातयामसि॥

arāyi kāṇe vikaṭe giriṁ gaccha sadānve |

śirimbiṭhasya satvabhistebhiṣṭvā cātayāmasi ||

Emperumānār has explained that this ṛk shows that the Lord in Tiruvġṅkaṭam is Srinivasa.

The explanation given by Emperumānār is as follows:

This mantrā is an instruction (upadeśam) given by Veda to the ordinary souls (jīvātmās) who are bonded to this worldly life and are suffering.

Veda calls them,”Oh! jīvātmās”.

“You are like ‘arāḥ’. ‘rai’ in Sanskrit means wealth. This word ends with ‘ai’. The same word in the first case (nominative case) singular form will become ‘rāḥ’. On that basis the word ‘arāḥ’ indicates people not having any wealth. Veda indicates that the soul is devoid of the wealth of doing service to devotees in this world and doing service to Lord along with His consort, in the other world.

It is a literary tradition to indicate that word in the seventh case (locative case) to give the meaning ‘if such a person exists’. This is shown by the grammar rule as ‘satisaptamī’. The nominative case word ‘arāḥ’ becomes ‘arāyi’ in the locative case.

Veda further continues as ‘kāṇe’ to mean ‘if you are blind to the fact that you are devoid of such a wealth’. ‘kāṇaḥ’ means blind. Its locative case word is ‘kāṇe’. (tvayi) kāṇe (sati) is ‘satisaptamī’.

kaṭaḥ means misery. To mean that the person has a great misery, the word becomes vikaṭaḥ. There are three types of miseries in this world. They are:

ādhyātmikam – misery caused to the body like diseases

ādhibhautikam – troubles caused by neighbors, relatives, rat, cockroach, insects, mosquitoes etc…

ādhidaivikam – troubles caused by natural catastrophes such as thunder, storm, tsunami etc…

These three types of miseries are called as ‘tāpatrayam’. ‘vikaṭan’ is one who is troubled by ‘tāpatrayam’. To mean, ‘if you are a vikaṭan’, it comes in the locative case as ‘vikaṭe’. (tvayi) vikaṭe (sati) is satisaptamī.

Further, the sins committed by you will reside with you as demonic forces and prevent you from getting rid of the above. ‘dānavan’ means demon. The person who is with demon is known as ‘sadānavan’. To mean, ‘if you are with the demon’, the word will come in locative case as ‘sadānave’. The same will get modified to ‘sadānve’ in Vedic literature. Here, (tvayi) sadānve (sati) is satisaptamī.

Oh Friend! If you are devoid of the wealth (arāyi), devoid of that sense of missing the wealth (kāṇe), troubled by great miseries (vikaṭe) and living with the demonic forces of sins (sadānave), do you know what you should do?

śirimbiṭhasya – of śrī pīṭhan – i.e. śrīnivāsan who has the abode (chest) on which śrī, daughter of lotus, resides (śrīpīṭhasya is distorted to become śirimbiṭhasya).

girim – to Tirumalai

satvabhiḥ – along with His devotees, who are having the strength of satvam; in other words, who are called by Vedas as people who have as in ‘santam enaṁ tato viduḥ’.

gaccha – reach (go)

There,

tebhiḥ – along with His devotees

tvā – you (tvam has distorted and become tvā)

cātayāmasi – pray to Him to protect and bless

Thus Veda itself has established that the Lord there is none other than ‘Tirumāl’. Emperumānār showed evidences like this one and won the debate with śaivites. Yādavā king got his doubts clarified and became a disciple of Emperumānār. Thus Emperumānār protected Tirumalai from the śaivites.

This history of Emperumānār interpreting Vedas to mean divyadeśams is present in Guru paramparā. One great scholar in the lineage of Anantāzhvān compiled all such facts about Tirumalai and published a book by name ‘vġṅkaṭācala itihāsa mālā’. This has been published by TTD. Multiple editions of the book have been published. This has been translated to Tamil as well. śrīmadubhayave Nyāya Vedānta Mahāvidvān Tirumalai Anandāṇ Piḻḻai Kṛṣṇamācārya Svāmi, who was residing in Tirupati till recently and has become a Vaikuṇṭhavāsi now, has explained this well in the fifth part of his book ‘Tirumalaiyappan Tiruvaruḻ’.

The compilation of the discourses made by Emperumānār in the sannidhi of Tirumalaiyappan (and as per his wish) has become the book ‘vedārtha saṅgraham’. This has been clearly explained by śrī Sudarśana Vedavyāsa Bhaṭṭar, who created the commentary by name ‘vedārtha saṅgraha dīpikai’, by documenting the meanings blessed by śrī Naḍādūr Ammāḻ, when he underwent the study under his lotus feet. The evidence for this can be seen in the verse written by him at the very beginning of the book:

śrībhāṣyakṛdupanyastaḥ yaśśrīśailapateḥ puraḥ|

vedārthasaṅgrahasyāsya kurmastātparya dīpikām ||

Why did Emperumānār named the book as ‘vedārtha saṅgraham’, instead of ‘vedāntārtha saṅgraham’?

In the beginning of śrībhāṣyā, why did he choose the name ‘śrīnivāsan’ to remind śirimbiṭhan as ‘śrutiśirasi vidīpte brahmaṇi śrīnivāse’, instead of śrī Raṅganāthan or śrī Varadarājan?

Why did Svāmi Deśikā call Tirumalai as ‘vġṅkaṭa vepena viḻaṅgum vġda vepe’ to mean ‘holy place glorified by veda’?

If we connect the history shown in the guruparampara as well as vġṅkaṭācala itihāsa mālā with the above questions, then we cannot get a doubt on the fact that Emperumānār explained the ṛk ‘arāyi kāṇe’ to mean divyadeśam of Tiruvġṅkaṭam.

Hence, is it correct to spread the opinion that Emperumānār was not agreeable to interpret Vedas on the lines of divyadeśams?”

This was my explanation.

“Not only that. śrī Sāyaṇācāryar himself has given two interpretations for the ṛk which follows the above ṛk in the 12th anuvākā of 8th adhyāyā of 8th aṣṭhakā. The mantrā there is:

अदो यद्दारु प्लवते सिन्धोः पारे अपूरुषम्।

तदारभस्व दुर्हणो तेन गच्छ परस्तरम्॥

ado yaddāru plavate sindhoḥ pāre apūruṣam |

tadārabhasva durhaṇo tena gaccha parastaram ||.

In the first interpretation, he has explained the mantrā in the context of holy place ‘Puri’ (Puruṣttaman). His explanation is:

adaḥ – that which is there in the distant place

apūruṣam – that which is not sculpted by man

yat – which

dāru – the holy body of Puruṣttaman, made of wood

sindhoḥ pāre – near the seashore

plavate – exists on the water

tat – that

durhṛṇa – (you praise Him; hence you become indestructible) oh! One who praise and indestructible!

ārabhasva – worship (that person who is worshipped by you and who is having a wooden body)

tena –by that deity (by the blessings of that deity)

parastaram – śrī Viṣṇu lokam, which is the greatest place

gaccha– will attain (reach)

Now you yourself opine. If people bemoan that the glory of Vedas are affected if they are interpreted to mean divyadeśams, then we need to accord a place for śrī Sāyaṇācāryar also in the group which reduced the glory of vedas, right?”

My friend said, “That could be the probable reason why śrī Sāyaṇācāryar gave another meaning of that mantrā, isn’t it?”

For that I said, “If that is the case, he should have made the first interpretation as the pūrvapakṣam, then refute it to establish the second interpretation. He did not do that. He writes the second meaning as ‘apara āha’, which means, ‘as said by another’. If authors write like this, then we need to interpret that they accept both the interpretations”.

My friend excitingly said, “You show evidences for your arguments. It is greatly commendable that you do a deep research of multiple books to come out with this. If people refuting you also show evidences, then we can compare the same”.

I told him, “Svami! All these commendations should go to śrīmuṣṇam śrīmadāṇḍavan, who is a master of various arts. He only showed this to me and blessed”.

My friend asked interestingly, “Is it? Please share the details with me”.

Oh! Readers of Pādukā! I understand that you also want to know those details. Please bear with me till the next issue of Pādukā.