

Cūlika women ; nor can it well mean the country of the Cūlikas, because I can think of no country which has a feminine name. It might mean the Cūlikā town, or the whole word might perhaps be derived from *Cūlikā Paśicī*, these two words being run into one with the affix *ka* added, before which the *ī* would be shortened.

F. E. PARGITER.

#### TENGALAI AND VADAGALAI

A note has been received from A. Govindacharya Svāmin discussing various references to the Teṅgalais and Vaḍagalais made by Dr. Grierson in his Introduction to the Svāmin's translation of the *Artha-pañcaka* on pp. 565 ff. of the Journal for 1910. The note is too long to publish in its entirety, but the following is an abstract of the more important points raised by him, so far as they have not appeared in other papers by its author which have been issued of late. The longer note may on a future occasion be useful.

p. 566. Differences between the so-called Northern (*Vaḍagalai*) and Southern (*Teṅgalai*) Śrī-Vaiṣṇavas. The names "Northern" and "Southern" must be confined to the tract of country comprising the Drāviḍa, between the Tirupati Hills in North Arcot and Cape Comorin. Conjevaram (*Kāñcī-puram*) was the northern seat of Sanskrit learning. Prior to Rāmānuja, in the days of the Āzhvārs and the Ācāryas who preceded him, the neighbourhoods of Śrīraṅgam (Trichinopoly) and of Tiru-nelveli (Tinnevelley) were localities where Drāviḍa (Tamil) Scriptures were largely studied. If a line were drawn across the Peninsula along the parallel of latitude crossing Conjevaram, all the tract north of it up to the Tirupati Hills would be the Northern division, and all to the south of it the Southern. It is a purely local denomination which did not come into vogue till two generations or so

after Rāmānuja ; and except that they have Vēdāntācārya and Rāmya-jāmātr-muni<sup>1</sup> as their respective pontiffs, the two divisions, in ethnic, philosophic, ethic, religious, and social affairs, constitute one Śrī-Vaiṣṇava body.

p. 566. Co-operative grace, and Irresistible grace. The Sanskrit terms for these are, respectively, *sa-hetuka-kṛpā* and *nir-hetuka-kṛpā*, i.e. grace sought, and grace unsought. The *sa-hetuka-kṛpā* implies that the asking for grace by the soul is the reason that compels grace. The *nir-hetuka-kṛpā* leaves God's grace unaffected by any savour of barter or bargain, such as is involved in the contention that grace is contingent on first being initiated by the soul's asking, and that without this demand grace would remain inoperative.

p. 566. The views expressed regarding Śrī. She is not a mere "form or phase of the Supreme", as stated by Dr. Grierson. As shown in the paper on The Pāñcarātras or Bhagavat-śāstra, in the number of this Journal for October, 1911, She is a distinct personality. This is true for both schools, according to whom She belongs to the category of the Eternals (*nityas*, see JRAS., 1910, 573). The authority for both schools is Viṣṇu Purāṇa, I, viii, 17 :—

*Nityānvāṣā jagan-mātā Viṣṇoś Śrīr an-apāyini |*  
*Yathā sarva-gato Viṣṇus tathānvéyam, dvijóttama ||*

"Maitreya, the Mother of the universe, is eternal, and never separable from Viṣṇu. As Viṣṇu is omnipresent, so also is She."

Śrī, for both schools, fulfils the function of mediation.

For the doctrinal differences between the two schools regarding Śrī, see JRAS., 1910, p. 1104. To these it may be added that the Vadagalais ascribe Causation (i.e. the being the cause) of the universe also, to Her, and ascribe further the characteristic of "in-dwelling" or "in-ruling" (*antar-yāmitva*); whereas the Tengalais refer

<sup>1</sup> Or Maṇavāla Mahāmuni.

both these attributes to God alone. According to the latter the function of Śrī is that of *ācārya*, i.e. Mediator or Saviour alone.

p. 567. Lokācārya was not "the first great teacher of the Teṅgalai school". In his day there was no distinction of such schools. If any schism arose in virtue of differences of interpretation, it is in all probability to be attributed to the time of Vedāntācārya (or Vedāntadeśika, 1268 A.C.), who lived a generation after Lokācārya. In Vedāntācārya's works such differences in interpretation of the teachings that prevailed before his day are clearly discernible.<sup>1</sup>

p. 567. As to Rāmānanda, there is proof that he belonged to the Teṅgalai school, if such a school could be predicated as existent in his time. His date is uncertain. In the list of his apostolic predecessors given by Dr. Grierson in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxii, pp. 265-6, 1893, the name of Vedāntācārya does not occur, although there are two Lokācāryas, the second of whom is the author of the *Artha-pañcaka*, the first being Nambillai.

p. 567. The statement that the Vaḍagalais stop at *bhakti* is not correct. *Prapatti* and *ācāryābhīmāna*, as well as *bhakti*, are common to both schools. The word *prapatti* is rendered better by "resort to" or "refuge in" God, rather than by its radical sense of mere "approaching"; and the corresponding attitude on the part of the soul is *passive* according to the Teṅgalai school, and *active* according to the Vaḍagalais. Both these characteristics pertain to *prapatti*,—not the former to *prapatti* and the latter to *bhakti*. Who the Northern commentators are

<sup>1</sup> To the credit of Vedāntācārya, however, it must be said that he looked upon the opinions of those from whom he differed as simply due to specialization of certain aspects of truth:—

*Mahatām api keśameid atirūlāḥ pythag-vidhāḥ |*  
*Tat-tad-artha-prakāśādi- tatparatrūd abādhitāḥ ||*

[*Stotra-Bhāṣya* 53.]

No *odium theologicum* could be imputed to him.

that equate *bhakti* with *prapatti* must first be ascertained, but the equation is wrong. The radical meanings of the two words are entirely different. *Bhaj* = adore, and *pad* = go, or throw oneself at or on. The former (*bhakti*) requires active concentration on God on the part of the soul (adoration); whereas the latter (*prapatti*) simply demands resignation or unconditional capitulation, making no terms with God, but variegated by the two attitudes,— (1) active, or aggressive; and (2) passive, or expectant, on the part of the soul. Rāmānuja's commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gītā* must be studied together with his *Gadya-traya*, before venturing on the remark made by Dr. Grierson that his commentary "is much to the same effect".<sup>1</sup>

p. 568. Dr. Grierson's correction as to the meaning of Kaivalya is not complete. Kevalas might employ other means besides knowledge, *jñāna*, for their soul-realization. They might also resort to *bhakti*, *prapatti*, or *ācāryābhimāna*, provided they resort to one or other of them as long as their goal is no other than that isolate state.

#### NOTE BY DR. GRIERSON ON THE ABOVE

Every student of Vaishnavism will be grateful to Govindacharya Svāmin for the light thrown by him in the above notes on a most obscure branch of the subject. Space will not allow me to discuss them here, and I am ready to assume that, so far as doctrines of Southern Vaishnavism are concerned, the corrections are all justified. I therefore content myself with two remarks. As regards Rāmānuja's explanation of the word *prapadyatē* in *Bhagavad-Gītā*, vii, 19, it is translated "worships" by the Svāmin himself in his excellent English version of the poem with Rāmānuja's commentary. In the famous *carama-ślōka* (xviii, 66), which Vaishnavas look upon as

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 127 ff. of my *Yatindra-mata-dīpikā*, just out.

containing the quintessence of the teaching of the poem, we have—

*sarva-dharmān parityajya mām ekaṁ śaraṇam vraja*  
 “Renouncing all Dharmas, hold Me as thy sole refuge.”

On this Rāmānuja says: “*All Dharmas* = All the paths of righteousness inculcated in the *Bhagavad-gītā* as means to *mōkṣa*, viz., *karma-yōga*, *jñāna-yōga*, and *bhakti-yōga*. *Renouncing* = The practising of these means as modes of my worship, and in love; but entirely renouncing the fruit thereof (*phala-tyāga*), the personal ownership of the act (*karma-tyāga*), and personal authorship of act (*kartrtva-tyāga*).” To this the Svāmin adds in a footnote: “Rāmānuja gives here the ordinary interpretation meaning *bhakti*, whereas a higher interpretation is *prapatti*.” The rest of R.’s commentary on this verse is most instructive. It is plain that he considered that Kṛṣṇa instructed Arjuna to hold to Him, so as to enable Arjuna to “launch on *bhakti-yōga*”, the only means of salvation. I have not seen the *Gadya-traya*, but it is plain that in his commentary to the *Bhagavad-gītā* Rāmānuja either ignored the modern *prapatti* altogether, or else considered it as included in the term “*bhakti*”. This is, of course, not the only interpretation of the verse, which has probably had more treatises written concerning it than any other passage in the poem.

As regards the *Kēvalas*, see the Svāmin’s description of them on p. 575 of the Journal for 1910. “These are the men who embark particularly upon the path of *jñāna yōga*, which is chiefly the means to secure this coveted ‘zoistic’ state.” The fact that they can also employ the other means is an interesting addition to our knowledge.

G. A. G.

CAMBERLEY.

December 5, 1911.