

*Adhyātma Granthāvali*

# Śri Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda Vṛttānta Sāra Sarvasva

(Life of Śri Śaṅkarācārya in essence)

Kannaḍa Original by  
Śri Swāmi Satchidānandendra Saraswati

English Translation by  
Dr. H. Rāmacandra Swāmy

Serial No. \*\*\*

Publishers  
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya  
Holenarasipur 573 211  
2014

Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda Vṛttānta Sāra Sarvasva (Life of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya in essence), Translation of Kannaḍa book into English by Dr. H. Rāmacandra Swāmy. Published by Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya, Public Charitable Trust, Holenarasipura - 573 211, India. Ph. 08175-273820. website: [www.adhyatmaprakasha.org](http://www.adhyatmaprakasha.org)

First Edition: December 2014

Number of copies:xxx

Pages:xx+xxx

Price:Rs. xxx

All rights reserved by Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya.

TypeSetting:

Satchidananda Graphics

Bangalore-560022

email:ramaprakashak@gmail.com

Printed at:

xsdfdsjfh

sdfadsfds

dfasdf



## Preface

I never had any idea that the subject matter of this book would become so complicated when I finally made up my mind in response to the constant pressurisation from Śrī B. *Narāyaṇa Bhaṭ* of Hospet, Bellary District, that I should write such a book. Also I never expected that the book would grow this big. But, through God's grace many people volunteered to give me data with support of evidences; and many volunteered to look into what has been written. Fruition of their interest has made this book to come out.

The name of Śaṅkarācārya has been spread throughout the civilized world. His contribution not only to India, but also to the world at large, is enormous. He has strived to bring home the everlasting Truth that the world we see is ultimately the supreme Truth, Parabrahman; all the *jīvas* here are truly manifestations of that Truth - through his *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas* – *Bhāṣyas* on the Upaniṣads, Bhagavadgita and the Brahma Sūtras. I was exhilarated in the beginning that in addition to translate these *Bhāṣyas* into Kannaḍa to the best of my ability, opportunity has come my way to remember his history also. But when I set myself to write this history, this excitement was gone - because, unfortunately, not even a single book is available to this date which would truly decipher the history of the Jagadgururu. Also there is no hope that we would get one in the future.

After collecting material for the history of the Ācārya, what was understood clearly is: some works of poetry called ŚaṅkaraVijayas, fictitious works involving various heresays and stories concocted by people about him and the source material prepared on the basis of these by the people of the Maṭhas purported to be established by the

Ācārya; and what some of the recent writers of historical interest have written – except these, no other evidences or references we could procure. Even the historians, being devotees of one Maṭha or the other, have made their analyses so that it would support their Maṭhas of affiliation; even the small number of impartial ones had to put together whatever they could collect as they have helplessly suffered lack of sufficient material for their study.

Although I have made use of the abovementioned types of books to write this one, I have to point out a speciality of this book in the beginning itself. Whatever matter that appeared to me as going against the opinion available in the *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas*, which have been agreed by one and all to be the works of Ācārya, I have not evaluated it without contrasting it with the touch stone of that opinion. When the opinions are not going against, I have ventured to compare and contrast with the various available works and give my opinion of what is essential and what is not.

Fearlessly giving my opinions thus, some people have felt hurt; but many who wished to know the truth, have felt happy. However, I have the satisfaction that throughout I have kept up my solemn resolve that I should not agree with anything in the Bhagavatpāda's history which would be a stigma to the worthiness of the great Ācārya without any reason to justify.

To such of those who read this book, with all humility I submit that the *Bhāṣyas* alone are history of the Ācārya; one will have to evaluate him on the basis of his stances therein; and the only way to worship that Jagadguru is through study, comprehension and assimilation of the *Bhāṣyas*. There is no better way to show our devotion to him.

It is necessary to acknowledge the names of those who have helped me while writing this *Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda Vṛttānta Sāra Sarvasva*. First and foremost, Śrī B. Narāyaṇa Bhat of Hospet has encouraged me by way of providing several books for this purpose. Secondly, Śrī Narāyaṇa Rāmacandra Kulkarni, M.A., LL.B., Principal, Janata Law College, Dharwad, has helped by lending the famous Hindi book ‘श्री शङ्कराचार्य’ (Śrī Śaṅkarācārya) of *Sahityācārya Śrī Baladeva Upādhyāya*. Thirdly, Śrī Śrī Paramahansa Abhinava Padmanābhatīrtha (earlier, *Śrī Yogīśwara Dattamurti Dixit*, Bankāpura) has lent the Marāṭhi book “*Śrī Śaṅkarācārya va tyāncā Sampradāy*” of Śrī Mahādeva Rājārāma Bodas. Most importantly I gratefully acknowledge Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman, Director of Education (Rtd.), Pudukoṭṭai, who has written the history of Śrīṅgeri Jagadguru Pīṭha entitled *The Throne of Trancendental Wisdom*. Not only he has provided me his book, but also his timely notes about the historical issues of Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha, whenever controversy arose regarding the various Maṭhas. Finally, and most importantly, the help rendered by Adhyātmavidyā Pravīṇa Śrī H. S. Lakshmīnārasimhamurti Śāstry, a scholar of the Adhyātmā Prakāsha Kāryālaya has been very laudable. When I gave the manuscripts of the Appendices, he has compared with the original works; he has prepared the manuscript of the book for the press, proofread them; and saw that the work was completed.

May the desires of all these people be fulfilled! is my fervent prayers to Bhagavān Śrīman Narāyaṇa.

Adhyātmā Prakāsha Kāryālaya,  
Holenarasipura  
24-5-1963

Author

## Helpful Works

### ŚaṅkaraVijayas

Sl.	Name of the Book	Symbol
1.	(a) <i>Anantānandagirīya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya</i> (by N. Venkaṭasubba Śāstri. Printed in Telugu. Madras, 1867). (b) <i>Anantānanda-Girīya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya</i> (devanāgarī - Calcutta, 1881).	Ā. Śam.
2.	<i>KeralīyaŚaṅkaraVijaya</i> (We have not seen this. It seems this is not the same as Śaṅkarācāryacarita of <i>Govindanātha</i> ).	
3.	<i>KūṣmāṇḍaŚaṅkaraVijaya</i> or <i>Śaṅkara-kathāmṛta-Sāra</i> (Published by Edatore Yogānanda Swāmi, Bangalore Book Depot Press, Bangalore, 1905).	Ku.Śam.
4.	<i>CidvilāsiyaŚaṅkaraVijayaVilāsa</i> (Published by Vāvilla Rāmaswāmi Śāstri, Madras. Yuva. Sam. 1875).	Chi.Śam.
5.	<i>MādhaviyaŚaṅkaraDigvijaya</i> (also known as <i>SamkṣepaŚaṅkaraVijaya</i> ). ( <i>Advaitarājyalakṣmī-Ṭikā-sahita</i> , Anandāśrama, Poona. Printed in 1891)	Ma.Śam.
6.	<i>Vyāsācalīya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya</i> (Manuscript obtained from Oriental Library, Madras)	Vyā. Śam.
7.	<i>Br̥hatŚaṅkaraVijaya</i> (We have not seen this. Purported to be at Śaṅkara Maṭha, Kumbhakoṇam)	
8.	<i>PrācīnaŚaṅkaraVijaya</i> (We have not seen this. Purported to be at Śaṅkara Maṭha, Kumbhakoṇam)	
9.	<i>ŚaṅkaraVijayaCūrṇikā</i> (Nirṇayasāgara Press)	Śam. Chu.
10.	<i>Bhagavatpādābhyudayam</i> (Lakṣmaṇasūrīviracitam) ( <i>Vāṇīvilāsa</i> Press, Śrīrangam, 1927).	
11.	<i>Śaṅkaramandārasaurabha</i> (by Nīlakaṇṭha. Modern manuscript).	

Sl.	Name of the Book	Symbol
12.	Śaṅkarācāryacaritam (govindanāthaviracitam) (Kerala Publishing House, 1926).	Go.Śam.Ca.
13.	(a) Śaṅkarābhyudaya (by Nīlakaṇṭha Śāstri. 1926). (b) Śaṅkarābhyudaya (by RājaChūḍamaṇi; we have not seen this).	
14.	(a) Śaṅkaradigvijayasāra (by Sadānanda). (b) Śaṅkaradigvijayasāra (modern; by Śrīnivāsa Kedilāya, 1959).	
15.	Śaṅkarakathāsudhānidhi (by Rāmaśarma; manuscript).	

### Traditional Books

	Name of the Book	Symbol
1.	Gururatnamālikā (Ātmabodhakṛtasuśamāvyākhyā-sahita) (Kalāratnākara Press, Madras, 1896).	Gu.Ra.
2.	Puṇyaślokamaṇjarī (Kalāratnākara Shala, Madras, Śālivāhana Śaka 1818).	
3.	Śivarahasya	Śi.Ra.
4.	Mārkaṇḍeyasaṃhitā	
5.	Guruvamśakāvya (We have not seen this).	
6.	Guruparamparāstotram (Vāṇīvilāsa Press, Śrī-rangam).	
7.	Maṭhamānyagalu-Maṭhāmnāyasetu-Mahānuśā-sana (Publications of Kāñci and Dwārakā Pīṭhas).	

## Criticisms

	Name of the Book	Symbol
1.	Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and His Kāmakoti Pīṭham (by N.K. Venkaṭesham Pantulu, M.A., A.D. 1931).	NKVS
2.	The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom (by K. R. Venkaṭarāman, A.D. 1959).	KRTTW
3.	Śaṅkarācārya The Great and His Successors at Kāñci (by N. Venkaṭarāman, M.A., A.D. 1923).	NVSSK
4.	Śrī Śrīṅgeri Śārādā Maṭha (by Kakarāla S. Sundararāmayya, A.D. 1958).	KSSS
5.	Śaṅkarācārya - His Life and Times (by C. N. Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer, M.A., L.T.)	CNKS
6.	Śrī Śaṅkarācārya (by <i>Baladeva Upādhyāya</i> , M.A., Sahityācārya, 1950) (Hindi Book).	Bala. Śam.
7.	ŚaṅkaraCaritraKālaVicāra (Kannāḍa book by Bella-ve Somanāthaiah. Irish Press, Bangalore, 1912).	So. Śam.
8.	Jagadguru Śrī ŚaṅkaraBhagavatPādācārya Caritramu (by Śreṣṭhaluru Kriṣṇaswāmayyagāru, Telugu, 1928).	Śre. Śam.
9.	Ācārya Śrīmat Śaṅkarabhagavatpūjyapādaru (lecture in Kannāḍa by the pontiff of Kuḍali Pīṭha, 1953).	Ku. Śam.
10.	Śaṅkarācārya vā tyāncā Sampradāy (Marāṭhi) (by Mahādeva Rājārāma Bodas, M.A., LL.B., 1923)	Bo. Śam.
11.	ŚrīŚaṅkarapīṭhatattvadarśanam (Chowkamba Sam-skrita Pustakālayah, <i>Vārāṇasi</i> , 1935).	Śam.pi.ta.da.
12.	gaṃgādītīrthavijayayātrā (kāṃcīpīṭhādhipānām) (Viśwāmitra Press, Calcutta, 1934).	

	Name of the Book	Symbol
13.	Havyaka Samāja mattu Śrī Gurumaṭhāda Samkṣipta Itihāsa (Kannaḍa) (Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha, Tirthahalli, 1958).	Ha.Gu.I.
14.	Dwārakā Jagadguru Samsthānada Samkṣipta Itihāsa (Kannaḍa, A.D. 1940).	
15.	Śāradāpīṭha Dwārakā Samsthānada Guruparampare (Kannaḍa) (A.D. 1957).	
16.	Jagadgurupāramparayastutiḥ (Kūḍaliśṛṅgerīsamsthānam) (A.D. 1946).	
17.	Virūpākṣi Pīṭha Guruparampare (Aindrāvati Press, Karnool, 1931).	
18.	Kuḍali Śrīṅgeri Maṭhīya Prācīna Śāsana Lekhaṇa Sangraha.	

### References Cited

	Name of the Book	Symbol
1.	Brahmasūtrabhāṣya (Ācāryabhagavatpāda-kṛta)	Bra.su.bha.
2.	Gītābhāṣya (Ācāryabhagavatpāda-kṛta)	Gi.bha.
3.	Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣya (Ācāryabhagavatpāda-kṛta)	Tai.bha.
4.	Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya (Ācāryabhagavatpāda-kṛta)	Bṛ.bha.
5.	Chāndogyopaniṣadbhāṣya (Ācāryabhagavatpāda-kṛta)	Cha.bha.
6.	Muṇḍakopaniṣadbhāṣya (Ācāryabhagavatpāda-kṛta)	Mu.bha.
7.	Kāṭhakopaniṣadbhāṣya (Ācāryabhagavatpāda-kṛta)	Ka.bha.
8.	Gauḍapāda-kārikā (Māṇḍūkyakārikā) Bhāṣya (Ācāryabhagavatpāda-kṛta)	Gow.ka.bha.
9.	Bādarāyaṇakṛtavedāntasūtra	Ve.su.

	Name of the Book	Symbol
10.	Śrīmadbhāgavata	Bhaga.
11.	Naiṣkarmyasiddhi (Sureśvarācāryakṛta)	Nai.si.
12.	Bṛhadāraṇyakavārtika (Sureśvarācāryakṛta)	Bṛ.va.
13.	Upadeśasāhasrī (Gadya)	Upa.
14.	Śloka-vārtika	Slo.va.
15.	Tantravārtika	Tan.va.
16.	Pramāṇavārtikabhāṣya (Dharmakīrtikṛta)	Pra.va.bha.
17.	Rāmatīrthavyākhyā (For Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra)	Ra.ti.
18.	Brahmasiddhi (Maṇḍanamīśraviracita)	Bra.si.
19.	Nirṇayasindhu	Ni.sin.
20.	Jaiminiyasūtra	Jai.su.
21.	Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa	Tai.bra.
22.	Pañcapādikā (Vivaraṇavyākhyāsahita) (Ed. Polagam Śrī Rāmaswāmi Śāstri)	Po. Pan. Pa
23.	Kalpataruvyākhyāna-parimaḷavyākhyāna	Ka.ta.pa.
24.	Vivaraṇavyākhyāna (Puṭa)	Vi.pu.
<b>Other Books</b>		
	Name of the Book	Symbol
1.	Maṇimaṇjarī	
2.	Maṇimaṇjarībhedinī	Mani.Bhe.
3.	Prabhāta (Weekly, Mangalore)	
4.	Gowḍeswar Jñānottama Shivācārya (by G. Śrīnivāsa Iyer)	GGs
5.	The Kumbhakoṇam Maṭha Claims (R. Kṛṣṇaswāmi Iyer, 1959)	KMC

(The sources cited in the text of this book are indicated by symbols)



### Publisher's Note

Śri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swāmiji (1880-1975) was the celebrated authority on Śaṅkara Vedānta during the twentieth century. Throughout his life he researched and worked with profound dedication and a missionary zeal for bringing out and present to the seeker the pristine pure Advaita Vedānta in the tradition of Gauḍapāda, Śaṅkara and Sureśwara.

After translating the prasthana traya bhāṣya of Śaṅkara into Kannaḍa and writing most of his major books in Kannaḍa, English and Sanskrit, Śri Swāmiji wrote another significant book in Kannaḍa, in the year 1963. This book, Śri Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda Vṛttānta Sāra Sarvasva, is a comprehensive and critical summary of all the events in the life of Śri Śaṅkarācārya. It takes in to account most of books of poetry, commonly called by the name Śaṅkara Vijaya, and the writings of recent authors having affiliation to various Śaṅkara mathas and books of independent authors. Śri Swāmiji has compared and contrasted the opinions contained in these books regarding the various events in the life of Śri Śaṅkarācārya. We believe that this book is very precious and rare and a book of this kind may not be available in other languages.

The Ādhyātma Prakasha Kāryālaya thought that an English translation of this book would help the readers and researchers not knowing Kannaḍa but knowing English, to see the 'biography' of the leading light of Advaita Vedānta in a new light and enable them to form their own opinion regarding the various marvellous incidents and miracles that are believed to have happened in his life. We believe that the English translation of Śri Swāmiji's book will be enthusiastically received

by the vedantic world, particularly the researchers and scholars in this country and abroad.

The Kāryālaya pays tribute to the translator of this work Śri Dr H. Rāmacandra Swāmy, who, after submitting his draft translation for publication, did not live to see the book in print. We greatly appreciate the tremendous efforts he had put in to translate and prepare the draft copy of the book and his spirit of service for a very worthy cause. May his soul rest in peace. We append here a brief note about him. We pray for the blessings of Śri Swāmiji on the members of his family.  
(Kāryālaya to write here acknowledgements)

### The Translator

Dr H. Rāmacandra Swāmy, popularly known in Karnataka by his 'Mahābhāratha Kathā Sangraha', 'Sankshipta Vālmiki Rāmāyana', and 'Loka Dharmagalu' (published by Śrī RāmaKṛṣṇa Ashrama), is basically a chemistry professor. He completed his Ph.D. under the guidance of Bharata Ratna Professor C.N.R.Rao at the Indian Institute of Science, but preferred to remain teaching in a small town Śringeri. He completed many ecology projects funded by the State and Central Governments. He identified twenty three new plants which had not been reported to exist in and around Śringeri. The British Ecological Society recognized his findings and awarded their honorary fellowship to Dr Swāmy.

After his retirement in the year 2000, Dr Swāmy concentrated his efforts in the fields of spirituality and philosophy. Śrī RāmaKṛṣṇa Ashrama, Mysore, supported his endeavors and published his translations and other books. He has translated all the short stories of R.K.Nārayaṇa into Kannaḍa and published them in two volumes, 'Malgudi Dinagalu' and 'Alada Marada Kelage'. He has written many Science Fiction Stories, popular science books and translated books of George Gamow and others. Four of his books are still awaiting publication.

Dr Rāmacandra Swāmy was a prolific writer. Before succumbing to throat cancer in the year 2010, the number of pages of his published works stood at 6694!, a fact which reveals the interest and enthusiasm he showed to reach people through his writings. He had experienced a state of joy in doing translations and did all his writings on the computer with great speed!

The present work is a translation of a critical biography of Śri Śaṅkarācārya written in Kannaḍa by Śri Satchidnandendra Swāmiji, whose works he adored.

### Translation Editor's Note

Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda Vṛttānta Sāra Sarvasva is a unique book on the life of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, written in Kannaḍa by Śrī Swamī Satchidānandendra Saraswathi. There are several books by a common name Śaṅkaravijaya. These are books of poetry having the common aim of describing the events of the Ācārya's life including the date and place of his birth, his parents and childhood, his studies and writings, the miracles or marvellous incidents that are believed to have happened in his life, his social reform, establishment of six sects and other accomplishments. However, these are fictitious works involving various hearsays and stories concocted by people about him. There are no direct historical evidences available about the life of the Ācārya.

Apart from the books of poetry, there are some source materials prepared by the people of the mathas purported to have been established by the Ācārya and some books of recent writers who had historical interest. These latter kind of authors, some of whom may be impartial, also have suffered because of the lack of historical evidence for supporting their claims.

Śrī Satchidānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji laments in the book- "It is a pity that the job of writing the history of such a world famous luminary fell to the lot of a few poets only; hence it is very difficult to decide what really is true about the Ācārya's life." Śrī Swāmiji is well aware that the poets do exaggerate, may be because they are overcome by their devotion to the Ācārya or because of their bias and affiliation to a certain matha or to a Vedānta prakriyā. Whatever the reason, the Swāmiji, who set out to write a comprehensive and critical

summary of all the events in the life of the Ācārya, had a fundamental principle for evaluating the source material that was available to him, and that in his own words is: “Although I have made use of these types of books to write this one, I have to point out one speciality of this book in the beginning itself. Whatever matter that appeared to me as going against the opinion available in the prasthānatraya bhāṣyas, which have been agreed by one and all to be the works of the Ācārya, I have not evaluated them without contrasting it with the touchstone of that opinion. When the opinions are not going against, I have ventured to compare and contrast with the various available works and give my opinion of what is essential and what is not.” The readers are urged specifically to note that it is this fundamental principle that Śrī Swāmiji made use of for evaluating the matter concerning the events in the life the Ācārya that makes his book a unique one.

The Kannaḍa knowing readers were blessed with this book as far back as 1963 itself, when Śrī Swāmiji was 83 years and by which time he had written most of his books- Kannaḍa translations of the prasthānatraya bhāṣyas, and his other celebrated works in Kannaḍa, English and Sanskrit. However the non Kannaḍa knowing English readers had to wait for the present English translation until now for reading a refreshingly new kind of book on Ācārya’s life and derive the benefit.

During 2008-09, when the translator of the book, Śrī Dr H. Rāmacandra Swāmy, approached the Ādhyātma Prakasha Kāryālaya for publishing the translation, the Kāryālaya sent the draft translation to me for determining the suitability of the book for publication, and also to suggest and make the required modification. Dr Rāmacandra

Swāmy had put in enormous efforts to translate the Kannaḍa book. But he was a very humble and unpretentious person as was evident when he wrote me a letter stating that he was willing to make all corrections and modifications that I might suggest, the sole aim being the offering of his service to the Kāryālaya and for a cause that was very dear to the heart of Śrī Swāmiji. Having a similar aim myself, I accepted to offer my services. I considered it as not only a privilege but a blessing of Śrī Swāmiji that the Kāryālaya wanted me to associate with this project. I express my gratitude to the Kāryālaya for this opportunity.

Translation of a book from one language to another needs not only the vocabulary, but also familiarity with other nuances of the languages like literature style, idioms etc. The translator and the translation editor must have familiarity with the subject matter of the book and the technical words in the original language. In the present case, Śrī Swāmiji's Kannaḍa belongs to that of a previous generation. The subject matter not only concerns life and events, but also the Advaita Vedānta as he has profusely quoted from the Bhāṣyas. There are chapters that deal with the Advaita Vedānta of the Ācārya as well as summary of the vārtika and vyākhyāna prasthanas. There are translations of Sanskrit verses of several puranas. To translate such a book to English, a language which is not native to this country, is, to express the least, a great challenge.

With the task of editing such a book on hand, I was challenged further as I missed the advantage of utilising the services of the translator himself to refine the book further! Due to failing health Śrī Rāmacandra Swāmy left the body and passed on to another world

even before the editing could commence, and we permanently lost his services in refining the book. However the hard base work he had done was good enough for me to continue and bring it to the present state. I did not have the opportunity either to see him or even to talk over telephone as he was having a throat problem at that time. Publishing this book is all the tribute that we can pay to his noble soul now.

It is my earnest hope that the translation has captured what Śrī Swāmiji essentially wanted to convey in the original. If the reader is familiar with English books having themes that are typically Indian and ancient, that will be an advantage. Readers with some familiarity with Sanskrit language and the Devanagari script and a background of Vedānta will surely derive full benefit. Only those Sanskrit passages and verses for which Śrī Swāmiji himself has provided Kannaḍa translations are rendered in to English in the book. Almost all the names of persons, places, books etc are transliterated with standard diacritic marks to convey pronunciation. Most of the Sanskrit passages and verses are printed in the Devanagari font only. However, it is hoped that this will not hinder an easy reading of the book. I have provided a small glossary of words at the end, which many readers may find helpful. The readers' suggestions are solicited for improvement in the future editions.

I end this note remembering the lotus feet of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and Śrī Swāmiji. It is their compassion and blessings that have shown me the purpose of this life and a direction for achieving it.

In the service of Śrī Swāmiji,  
Dr K. S. Ramanatha Sharma



Retired Professor, Principal and Administrator,  
kramanatha@yahoo.com

### Key to Transliteration and Pronunciation

	Sounds like			Sounds like	
अ	a	a in <i>rural</i>	ड	ḍ	d
आ	ā	fāther	ढ	ḍh	dh in <i>godhead</i>
इ	i	i short	ण	ṇ	n
ई	ĩ	ee	त	t	French t
उ	u	u in <i>full</i>	थ	th	th in <i>thumb</i>
ऊ	ũ	oo in <i>boot</i>	द	d	th in <i>then</i>
ऋ	r̥	ri (almost)	ध	dh	theh in <i>breathe here</i>
ए	e	e in <i>bed, there</i>	न	n	n
ऐ	ai	y in <i>my</i>	प	p	p
ओ	o	oh	फ	ph	ph in <i>loop-hole</i>
औ	au	ow in <i>now</i>	ब	b	b
क	k	k	भ	bh	bh in <i>abhor</i>
ग	g	gun	म	m	m
ख	kh	ckh in <i>blockhead</i>	य	y	loyal
घ	gh	gh in <i>log-hut</i>	र	r	r
ङ	ṅ	ng	ल	l	l
च	c	ch (not k)	व	v	w
छ	ch	chh in <i>catch-him</i>	श	ś	s in <i>sure</i>
ज	j	jump	ष	ṣ	sh (in <i>shun</i> )
झ	jh	dgeh in <i>hedgehog</i>	स	s	s
ञ	ñ	singe (siñj)	ह	h	h
ट	ṭ	t	ळ	ḷ	???
ठ	ṭh	th in <i>ant-hill</i>	ं	m̐	ng
			ः	ḥ	half h

# Contents

Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda Vṛttānta Sārasarvasva . . . . .	1
<b>1. Source material for the Biography of Ācārya . . . . .</b>	<b>1</b>
Purpose of writing this book—1; Source materials, Śaṅkara-Vijayas—3; Mādhaviya Saṃkṣepa-Śaṅkaravijaya (माधवीय संक्षेपशङ्करविजय)—3; Vyāsācaliṃya (व्यासाचलीय)—6; Cidvilāsiṃya Śaṅkara-Vijaya-Vilāsa (चिद्विलासीय शङ्करविजयविलास)—11; Anantānandagiriṃya (अनन्तानन्दगिरीय)—11; Chronology of the Śaṅkara Vijayas—15; Works of Kāncī Pīṭha Tradition—16; Purāṇas—17; Works of those of other schools of thought—18; Utilization of the source materials—18;	
<b>2. Śaṅkara's Time of Manifestation . . . . .</b>	<b>19</b>
Is Śaṅkarācārya an Incarnation?—19; The Time of Śaṅkarācārya—21; Conclusion of Traditional Date of Śaṅkara—25; Comparison of Brihadāraṇyaka and Sūtra bhāṣyas—26; Reference to Dharmakīrti in the Bhāṣya—31; Reference to Dīnnāga—32; Reference to Guṇamati—33; Evidence of the author of Bhāmatī—34;	
<b>3. Ācārya's Birth and His Parents . . . . .</b>	<b>36</b>
The Occasion of the Birth—36; Mother, Father and Grandfather of the Ācārya—38; The story of Śaṅkara's birth and his Name—40; Anantānandagiriṃya Śaṅkara Vijaya—44; Kūṣmāṇḍa Śaṅkara Vijaya—48; Legend of Kerala and the Books like Madhwavijaya—49; The Evidence of Badari—51; Queer practices of the Keralites—51; Kālaḍi—53;	
<b>4. Childhood, Learning and Renunciation in a Hurry</b>	<b>57</b>
Precocious child—57; Upanayana—57; Educational progress—60; Śaṅkara acquiring Excellence in Knowledge at an Early Age—62; Marvels exhibited by Ācārya during childhood—64; Agastya	

revealing Śaṅkara's lifespan—66; The occasion of renouncing in a hurry—69; Doubts and Reconciliations on the subject of Sannyāsa—71;

### 5. Vedānta Study at the Feet of Govinda Bhagavatpāda 74

Śaṅkara's Assurance to His Mother—74; Reinstalling the Kṛṣṇa Idol and the Ācārya leaving Home—75; Meeting Govinda Bhagavatpāda and Śaṅkara's adoration of him—75; Govinda Bhagavatpāda's name as Candra—78; Govinda Bhagavatpāda's name as Jayagovinda—80; Mythical stories about Govinda Bhagavatpāda—81; The Dialogue between Govinda Bhagavatpāda and Śaṅkara—84; Ācārya accepts Sannyāsa—86; An Inquiry about Ācārya's Sannyāsa—88; Discussion on the Mahāvākyas—90; Hitch in the preceptor-lineage of Govinda Bhagavatpāda—92; Did Śaṅkarācārya learn Yoga from his Guru?—93; What is the Method of Vedānta taught by Govinda Bhagavatpāda—94; Guru's command to Śaṅkara to write Bhāṣyas.—95; About Candramouliśwara Liṅga—98; The report found in Maṇimañjari—101;

### 6. Writing of the Bhāṣyas . . . . . 103

Did the Ācārya went straight to Kāśi leaving his Guru?—103; Accepting Padmapāda as a disciple—104; Lord Viśveśwara gives darśana in the form of an antyaja—105; Is there an argument of caste-distinction removal in Maṇiśāpañcaka?—108; What is the aim of the Ācārya's Bhāṣyas?—110; Travel to Badari—111; Refuting the Pāśupata school of thought—114; On the city of Kāśi—115; Encounter with Vyāsa—116;

### 7. Meeting with Kumārila bhaṭṭa . . . . . 122

Refuting Śivapāshandi—123; Meeting Kumārila Bhaṭṭa—123; Is Kumārila from the North?—124; Where did the Ācārya get the news

about Bhaṭṭapāda?—128; Expiation for what sin committed by Bhaṭṭa?—129; Did Bhaṭṭa get the buddhists killed?—131; In which state Kumārila Bhaṭṭa was seen by the Ācārya?—133; Where was Bhaṭṭa's expiation held?—133; Did Ācārya really meet Bhaṭṭa?—134;

### **8. A Critique of the Maṇḍana Episode . . . . . 137**

What did Bhaṭṭa say to the Ācārya?—137; Is Maṇḍana same as Viśwarūpa—140; Controversy about Maṇḍana himself being Sureśwarācārya—144; Identity of Maṇḍana and Sureśwara: Opinion of the author of this book—147; Are Maṇḍana and Umbeka the same?—151; Logical knit about the place where Maṇḍana lived—152; Who is Maṇḍana's wife?—154;

### **9. Argumentation with Maṇḍana . . . . . 156**

Maṇḍana's House—156; The Day and Manner in which Ācārya came to Maṇḍana's House—158; First Dialogue purported to have taken place when Śaṅkara arrived unexpectedly—160; Maṇḍana agrees to hold the argument—165; Propositions by the Ācārya and Maṇḍana—168; Debate with Maṇḍana: As described in Mādhavīya—171; Argumentation with Maṇḍana: As per Cidvilāsiya—185; The Importance of Maṇḍana's Arguments—187; Ācārya's opinion about Sannyāsa—190; Is Sannyāsa prohibited in Kali Yuga?—193; Jaimini's opinion not opposed to Ācārya's conclusions—194; Maṇḍana becomes the disciple of Ācārya—198;

### **10. Argumentation with Ubhayabhārati . . . . . 201**

Maṇḍana-Śaṅkara argument: When and How it came to an end?—201; Riddles of argumentation held with Ubhayabhārati—205; A critique of argumentation with Ubhayabhārati—206; Bhārati questioning about the science of love (KāmaŚāstra)—211; Parakāyapraveśa (metempsychosis)—213; A Critique of the story

of Metempsychosis—215; A Critique of the conversation between Padmapāda and Ācārya—216; Composition of poetry Amaruka—221; Disciples awaken the Ācārya by way of singing—221; What did the Ācārya do after learning Kāmaśāstra?—225; Did Ācārya enter his body which was on fire?—228; Did Lord Nṛsimha protect the Ācārya from the fire?—229; Ācārya winning over Śāradā and bringing Her to Śrīṅgeri—230; Historical Bhārati—230;

### **11. Maṇḍana becoming Disciple of Śaṅkara . . . . . 233**

The Sannyāsa of Maṇḍana—233; The Expression “tat tvam asi” (तत्त्वमसि)—235; The Meaning of “tattvamasi”—236;

### **12. Journey towards South . . . . . 240**

Winning over the Kāpālikas—240; The story of Hastāmalaka—243;

### **13. Śrīṅgeri . . . . . 248**

When did the Ācārya come to Śrīṅgeri, and why?—248; Establishment of Śāradā—251; Establishment of the Śāradā Maṭhas—253; Discipleship of Toṭakācārya—256; Critique of the Toṭaka story—258; Competition among the disciples Padmapāda etc.—261; How did the Vyākhyāna Prasthānas start off?—263; Is the story of burnt-away ‘Pañcapādikā’ plausible?—270;

### **14. Ācārya’s Devotion to His Mother . . . . . 275**

Mother’s Liberation—275;

### **15. Ācārya’s Nationwide Conquest . . . . . 283**

From Śrīṅgeri to Kāñci—283; Review of the travel upto Kāñci—284; Ācārya’s visit to Venkaṭagiri—288; Winning over the Kāpālikas in Karṇāṭaka—290; Winning over Nīlakanṭhācārya at Gokarṇa—292; Dwārakā, Ujjayini—294; Defeat of the *Arhatas* at *Bāhlika* and of the others at *Naimisha*—298; Abinavagupta in Kāmarūpa—299; Summary of the Conquest—300; Establishment of the six creeds

(षण्मतस्थापना)—302;

### **16. Ascending the Sarvajña Piṭha and Disappearance 305**

Curing of disease Bhagandara—305; Visit of Gauḍapāda—307;  
Ascending the Sarvajña Piṭha—311; Ācārya's Disappearance to His  
own Abode—313; Time of Ācārya's Disappearance—318;

### **17. Ācārya's Works: Benifits to the World at Large . . 320**

Summary of the Earlier Book—320; Ācārya and Buddhism—320;  
Establishment of the Six Sects—322; Prohibiting Mudrādhāraṇa  
indicative of the sects—323; Reforming Śākta and other Sects—  
324; Social Reform—325; Thoughts about the great works of the  
Ācārya—325;

### **18. Important Texts of Śaṅkara . . . . . 327**

Importance of Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda's Texts—327; The Prasthāna-  
traya Bhāṣyas—329; BrahmaSūtrabhāṣya—330; Upaniṣad  
Bhāṣyas—332; Gītābhāṣya—335; Other Bhāṣyas—337; Had  
Ācārya perused Books like Sūta Samhitā etc.?—338;

### **19. Teachings of Ācārya . . . . . 340**

Basis to decide what are the teachings of Śaṅkara—340; Outlines of  
Śaṅkara Doctrine—341; Sādhana Viveka (Discretion on the means  
of accomplishment)—349; Results of Devoted Practice (Sādhana  
phala)—351;

### **20. The Vedāntic Tradition of Ācārya . . . . . 356**

Earlier Teachers in the Tradition of Ācārya—356; Dravidācārya,  
Brahmanandi, Upavarṣa—357; Glossators of different traditions  
earlier than Ācārya—358;

### **21. The Systems of Sub-Commentaries on Advaita . 361**

Vārtika Prasthāna (The system of Vārtikas)—361; Knowledge  
of Ātman from meanings of scriptural statements—361; Avidyā

in Vārtika Prasthāna—362; Discrimination of Five Sheaths, Examination of the three states—363; Refutation of two kinds of liberation—364; Means for liberation (Mokṣasādhana)—364; Summarising Vārtika Prasthāna—365; The System of Pañcapādikā and Vivaraṇa—365; Important points of Vivaraṇa Prasthāna—366; Bhāmatī Prasthāna (The System of Bhāmatī)—368; The Main Arguments in Bhāmatī Prasthāna—369; Differences between the Systems of Bhāmatī and Vivaraṇa—370; Conclusions on the systems of sub-commentaries—373;

## **22. The Prakaraṇa Books of Ācārya . . . . . 374**

Classifying the Prakaraṇas—374; The Prakaraṇas published by the Kāryālaya—374; Prakaraṇas which are yet to be published—378;

## **23. Hymns that are in the name of Ācārya . . . . . 381**

Grouping of the Stotras—381; Opinion of Scholars about the Stotras—383;

## **24. Ācārya and TantraŚāstra . . . . . 384**

Has Śaṅkarācārya written books on Tantra?—384; Did Ācārya have householder disciples also?—384; Was Śrividya there in the Guru Tradition of Ācārya?—386;

## **25. Maṭhas Established by Ācārya . . . . . 390**

Difficulties regarding the Maṭhas—390; The sacred texts of the Maṭhas (*Maṭhāmṇāyas*)—390; Present state of the Maṭhāmṇāyas—391; The lineage of pontiffs of the Śringeri Maṭha—392; Names of some important pontiffs of Śringeri Pīṭha—393; The lineage of pontiffs of the Kāñci Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha—400; The important Pontiffs of Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha—400; Dwārakā, Govardhana, Jyotirmath and other Maṭhas—404; About the Maṭhas: Conclusion—404;

<b>26. Conclusion</b> . . . . .	406
<b>APPENDIX I</b> . . . . .	409
Purāṇas scrutinizing Śaṅkara—409; (A) Śivarahasya—409; (B) Mārkaṇḍeya samhitā—425; (C) From Other Purāṇas—431; (1) Liṅga Purāṇa—431; (2) Kūrma Purāṇa—432; (3) Vāyu Purāṇa—432; (4) Soura Purāṇa—432; (5) Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa—433;	
<b>APPENDIX II</b> . . . . .	434
Purāṇas that defame the Ācārya—434; (1) Padma Purāṇa—434; (2) Purāṇas considering Madhvācārya—436; (3) Story that Mādhva and Rāmānuja are incarnations of Kāma and Krodha, the ministers of Kali—436; (4) Samskr̥ta Candrike—438;	
<b>APPENDIX III</b> . . . . .	440
Opinions of People of Other Creeds—440; (1) Mahābhārata Tātparyā Nirṇaya of Madhvācārya—440; (2) Maṇimañjari—441; (3) Opinion of Theosophical Society—447;	
<b>APPENDIX IV</b> . . . . .	451
Opinions of People who have tried to establish the Date of Śaṅkara—451; (1) The ŚaṅkaraVijayas—451; (b) In Br̥hat ŚaṅkaraVijaya of Citsukhācārya—452; (c) In Śaṅkara Mandāra Sourabha of Nīlakanṭha—453; (d) In Keraleeya ŚaṅkaraVijaya—454; (e)—454; (f) Keralotpatti—455; (2) Books with different opinion—456; (a) In Jinavijaya—456; (b) In Śaṅkara Paddhati—457; (3) Conceptualizations of modern scholars—457;	
<b>APPENDIX V</b> . . . . .	462
ŚaṅkaraVijaya Texts—462; (1) The Anantānandagirīya—462; (2) Cidvilāsiya and Br̥hat Śaṅkaravijaya—463;	
<b>APPENDIX VI</b> . . . . .	468
ŚaṅkaraVijaya Texts (continued)—468; (6) The Ānandagirīya—	



468; (a) the old version—468; (b) the alternate versions—469;

**APPENDIX VII . . . . . 471**

ŚaṅkaraVijaya Texts (continued)—471; (7) The Kūshmānda  
ŚaṅkaraVijaya—471;

**APPENDIX VIII . . . . . 477**

Stotras Related to Ācārya's History—477; (1) Kanakalakṣmī  
Stava or Kanakadhārā Stuti—477; (2) Nirvāṇadaśaka Stotra -  
Daśaśloki—479; (3) Manīṣā Pañcakam—480; (4) Śrī Nrisimha  
Karāvalambana Stotra—482; (5) Hastāmālaka Stotra—484; (6)  
Toṭaka Prakaraṇa—485; (7) Śiva Bhujangaprayāta Stotra—487; (8)  
Viṣṇu Bhujangaprayāta Stotra—491;

**APPENDIX IX . . . . . 493**

Sacred Traditions of the Maṭhas and Pontiff Lineages—493; (1)  
Maṭhāmnāyaḥ (मठाम्नायः)—493; (2) Maṭhāmnāyaḥ (मठाम्नायः)—495;  
(3) Maṭhāmnāyabhāgaḥ (मठाम्नायभागः)—501; (4) Maṭhāmnāy-  
asetuḥ (मठाम्नायसेतुः)—501; The Yogapaṭṭas—511; The Daśanāmi  
Tradition—515; Pontiff Lineages of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha—516; (1)  
Pontiff Lineage of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha—520; (2) Pontiff Lineage of  
Kāñci Maṭha—526; (3) Pontiff Lineage of Dwārakā Pīṭha—540;  
Pontiff Lineage of Dwārakā (II list)—546; (4) Pontiff Lineage of  
Govardhana Pīṭha—549; (5) Pontiff Lineage of Jyotirmaṭha—  
552; (6) Sumeru Maṭha—556; The satellite Maṭhas—556; (1)  
Kuḍali Maṭha—556; (2) Śivaganga Maṭha—565; (3) Sankeśwara  
Maṭha—566; (4) Āvani Maṭha—571; (5) Śrī Rāmacandrāpura  
Maṭha—571; (6) Virūpākṣi Maṭha—574; (7) Puṣpagiri Maṭha—  
575; Conclusion—576;

**Glossary . . . . . 578**



# Śri Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda Vṛttānta

## Sārasarvasva

॥ श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥

Salutations to the Preceptors!

ओं नमो नारायणाय, नमो बादरायणाय, नमः शङ्कराय

Salutations to Nārāyaṇa, salutations to Bādarāyaṇa, salutations to  
Śaṅkara

## 1. Source material for the Biography of Ācārya

### **Purpose of writing this book**

1. It is regrettably true that those who want to know the truth regarding Śaṅkara's life, the good of the world that has been rendered by him, his works and his message, will have to somehow come out of the fortress of the varied imaginations of the biographers of Śaṅkara and those of modern critics of the archaeology and be satisfied with whatever valid conclusions that they can make. Nevertheless, in what situation do the conflicting studies of those that are involved in this hard to be accomplished task stand today? Is there a possibility of a

better critique that could lead to more satisfactory conclusions in this subject matter? We have attempted this work in order to quench the curiosity of such questioners.

There are two types of books published on Śaṅkara - those histories and criticisms written to suit the traditions of the respective *Pīṭhas* (Seats of authority established by Śaṅkara) are one group and the works of those who have used these, but given conclusions by imagining the truth from historical perspective, regardless of adherence to the traditions are the other group. No doubt the latter type of books are more useful to those who want to know the truth impartially. But it appears to us that it is not fair to come to conclusions based on majority opinions of writers, just as the judiciary comes to conclusions based on the available witnesses. We feel that it would be more satisfactory to consider not only the *Śaṅkara Vijayas* that are written as biographies of the *Ācārya* and other historic material on a comparative basis, but also to take into account the works that are undubitably established to be of Śaṅkara, and to accept all other material that are not conflict with the latter. It is obvious that those who want to know the history of Vedāntic studies ought to examine not only the works of Śaṅkara but also those of his successive disciples. But while attempting a depiction of the life or the teachings of the *Ācārya*, it is necessary to accord utmost importance to his original works and the opinions therein. Therefore with this view alone, we have tried to determine the truth from the biographies of the *Ācārya*. We beseech the readers to bear this in mind while comparing this work with the other works about Śaṅkara and evaluating our opinions.

### Source materials, ŚaṅkaraVijayas

2. The primary source material for the history are the poetry books named *ŚaṅkaraVijaya*. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has cited twenty two books of this name in his work. But many of them are not published. What we have actually seen are these: Vyāsācalīya Śaṅkaravijaya, Mādhavīya Saṅkṣepaśaṅkaravijaya, Cidvilāsīya Śaṅkaravijayavilāsa, Anantānandagiriya Śaṅkaravijaya, Sadānandavyāsa's Śaṅkaradigvijayasāra (manuscript, incomplete), Gururatnamālā-Suṣamāsaḥita, Śaṅkaramandārasaurabha (by nīlakaṇṭha), Śaṅkarakathāsudhānidhi (by Rāmaśarma, Manuscript), Śaṅkaracaritram (śaṅkaravijaya-cūrṇikā, by Gurunātha), Śrīśaṅkarābhyudaya (by nīlakaṇṭha śāstrī), Bhagavatpādābhyudaya (by lakṣmaṇasūrī), Śaṅkaradigvijayasāra (by Śrīnivāsa kedālāya, recent). Thus, although the *ŚaṅkaraVijayas* are many, since none of them belong to the times of the Ācārya, the material depicted in them are not of much historical significance. Yet, since we have nothing else as source material, we are constrained to choose unanimously agreed portions from them and place our confidence to the extent they deserve.

### Mādhavīya Saṅkṣepa-Śaṅkaravijaya (माधवीय संक्षेपशङ्करविजय)

3. It is really difficult to establish the age of such works known as *ŚaṅkaraVijayas*. We shall go on mentioning our opinion regarding about how far the historic aspects depicted in them could be believed. If the readers remember the general details of these that we are going to give now, it would be helpful to them later to evaluate our opinions.

The author of the book that has come to be known as *Mādhavīya-Śaṅkaravijaya* has referred to his work as *Saṅkṣepa-Śaṅkaravijaya*

at the end of every chapter. Many people believe that the author of this work is *Mādhavācārya* who later became the famous monk *Vidyāraṇya*. But there is no support to this belief except the remembrance of *Vidyātīrtha* in the colophons and the mention of '*Iti Śrī Mādhavīye*' (इति श्री माधवीये) at the end of every chapter. We shall presently give here some of the reasons to indicate that this work probably is not of Śrī Vidyāraṇya:

(1) Guruvaṁśakāvya, purported to be written by Kāśī Lakṣmaṇa Śāstrī as per order of the pontiff of Śringeri Śāradā Pīṭham, Śrī Satchidānanda Bhāratī, has Śaṅkara's life-history differing in details from that found in *Mādhavīya-Śaṅkaravijaya*. Guruvaṁśakāvya has been printed in Śringeram Vāṇivilās press, based upon the copy made available from the library of Śringeri Maṭha. It is impossible to believe that Śringeri Maṭha people got it written contradictory to the details depicted in *Vidyāraṇya's* work. It appears reasonable to hold that *Mādhavīya-Śaṅkaravijaya* might not have been available when Guruvaṁśakāvya was written.

(2) The author has praised himself as the modern *Kālidāsa* in two verses ['Prauḍho'yaṁ Nava-Kālidāsa-Kavitā-Saṁtāna-Saṁtānakaḥ' (Ma. Śam. 1-9); 'Vāgeṣā Nava-Kālidāsa-Viduṣaḥ' (Ma. Śam. 1-10)] ['प्रौढोऽयं नवकालिदासकवित्तासंतानसंतानकः' (Ma. Śam. 1-9); 'वागेषा नवकालिदासविदुषः' (Ma. Śam. 1-10)]. There is no evidence for *Mādhavācārya* having this title; this title was held by *Mādhava* who wrote *Bhāgavatacampū*<sup>1</sup>.

1. Although the author of *Bhāgavatacampū* has not mentioned his name as *Mādhava*, some researchers have concluded that his name is that. He has mentioned his title as Nava-Kālidāsa ['Abhinavapadapūrvaḥ kālidāsaḥ' (1-7); 'navakālidāsa-

(3) The author of the work by name Śaṅkarābhyudaya is Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita who was a poet of honour in the court of *Nāyaka*rāja. N. K. Venkaṭeṣha Pantulu (NKVS, Appendix II) holds that the poet *Mādhava* has taken 24 ślokaś of the fourth chapter of this work into the beginning of 12th chapter of his book without any change. Six chapters of this Śaṅkarābhyudaya are published; so one can guess who has stolen from whom. Rājacūḍāmaṇi belongs to 17th century; so *Mādhava* who has taken ślokaś from him must be of a later period; whereas *Vidyāraṇya* belongs to the 14th century.

(4) The author (of *Mādhavīya*-Śaṅkaravijaya) has described Śaṅkarācārya as having argued with *Bāṇa*, *Dandī*, *Mayūra* (established by historians as earlier than Śaṅkara) and also with *Śrīharṣa*, *Bhaṭṭa-bhāskara*, *Udayana* (established by historians as later than Śaṅkara). It is difficult to believe that *Vidyāraṇya* held it in this way.

(5) The author *Mādhava* has written in his invocation that [‘prāṇamya paramātmānaṁ śrīvidyātīrtharūpiṇam | prācīnaśaṅkarajaye sārāḥ saṁgrhyate sphuṭam’ (Ma. Śam. 1-1)] [‘प्रणम्य परमात्मानं श्रीविद्यातीर्थरूपिणम् । प्राचीनशङ्करजये सारः संगृह्यते स्फुटम्’ (Ma. Śam. 1-1)] ‘Saluting the Lord in the form of ‘Vidyātīrtha’ I am collecting the essence in the ‘Prācīna-Śaṅkarajaya’. He has urged the reader to see ‘Śaṅkaravākyasāra’ in his work [‘laghusaṁgrāhe’sminnūdvīkṣyatām śaṅkaravākyasārah’ (1-2)] [‘लघुसंग्रहेऽस्मिन्नुद्दीक्ष्यतां शांकरवाक्यसारः’ (1-2)]. Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman (KRTTW, p. 29) holds that *Vidyātīrtha* is none other than *Vidyāśaṅkara* who was the Guru of both *Bhāratīrtha* and *Vidyāraṇya*

---

viduṣaścaṁpūprabandhāmṛte’ (1-152)] [‘अभिनवपदपूर्वः कालिदासः’ (1-7); ‘नवकालिदास-विदुषश्चंपूप्रबन्धामृते’ (1-152)]. His style resembles the style of the author of ŚaṅkaraVijaya in yamaka, anuprāsa etc.

in the line of Śringeri pontiffs. This remembrance of *Vidyātīrtha* is the only evidence to say that the author of ŚaṅkaraVijaya is *Vidyāraṇya*. But Venkaṭarāman argues that *Vidyāraṇya* is not the same as *Mādhavācārya* (KRTTW, p. 33). If this be true, *Vidyāraṇya* cannot be held as author of ŚaṅkaraVijaya; but even if it is held that *Sāyaṇa* and *Mādhava* both are disciples of Vidyāthīrtha, we have to bear in mind the fact that nobody has enlisted this ŚaṅkaraVijaya among the books authored by *Mādhava*. The statement [‘Śrīvidyātīrtho Bhagavān Bhāṣyakāraḥ’] [‘श्रीविद्यातीर्थो भगवान् भाष्यकारः’]<sup>1</sup> of *Dhanapati Sūri* who has written ‘*Ḍiṇḍimavyākhyāna*’ (a commentary by name *Ḍiṇḍima*) to *Mādhavīya-Śaṅkaravijaya* need not be considered here since it does not fit in to any tradition.

### Vyāsācalīya (व्यासाचलीय)

4. What is this ‘*Prācīna-Śaṅkaravijaya*’ referred in the above cited *śloka*s? *Ātmabodhendra*, a follower of the traditions of Kāncī Pīṭha, has quoted some parts from a book called ‘*Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*’ in his work ‘*Suṣamā*’ at several places. Although the book from which he has quoted describes clearly the time of Śaṅkara’s birth, *Mādhava* has

1. In the commentary on the *Gururatnamālīkā* called ‘*Suṣamā*’ written by *Ātmabodha*, it is argued that *Mādhavācārya* is none other than *Vidyāraṇya*: [‘Śrūyate ca ayameva śrī śaṅkarānandendramuninā dattavidyāraṇyanāmā sahaivāṣṭabhiḥ sabrahmacāribhiḥ saccidānandādibhiracikṛpadaṣṭau maṭhānātmanaścaikamadhītuṃgabhadraṃ anuvirūpākṣeṣvaraṃ ativelapravṛddhamadhyakadadhvādīvimatapracāroddhina iti’ (su. 76).] [‘श्रूयते च अयमेव श्री शङ्करानन्देन्द्रमुनिना दत्तविद्यारण्यनामा सहैवाष्टभिः सब्रह्मचारिभिः सच्चिदानन्दादिभिरचीकृपदष्टौ मठानात्मनश्चैकमधितुंगभद्रं अनुविरूपाक्षेश्वरं अतिवेलप्रवृद्धमध्वकदध्वादिविमतप्रचारोद्धिन इति’ (सु. ७६).] This means that *Śaṅkarānanda* has given the name *Vidyāraṇya* to *Mādhava*; *Vidyāraṇya*, with his eight *brahmacāris*, established eight Maṭhas as well as one Maṭha for himself near *Virupāksheswara*, thereby stopped the wicked paths of *Mādhwa* and the like.



not given it; also there are contradictions in some of the details given by the two books. We shall point out these further at many places as we go on. Hence, the '*Prācīnaśaṅkarajaya*' mentioned by *Mādhava* is not that<sup>1</sup>.

There is another book called '*Vyāsācalīya-Śaṅkaravijaya*' which has been referred to in the *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*. The following *śloka* may be pondered over:

netā yatrollasati bhagavatpādasamjño maheśaḥ  
 śāntiryatra prakaṭati rasaḥ śeṣavānujjvalādyaiḥ ।  
 yatrāvidyākṣatirapi phalaṁ tasya kāvyasya kartā dhanyo  
 vyāsācalakavivarastatkṛtijñāśca dhanyāḥ ॥

नेता यत्रोल्लसति भगवत्पादसंज्ञो महेशः

शान्तिर्यत्र प्रकटति रसः शेषवानुज्ज्वलाद्यैः ।

यत्राविद्याक्षतिरपि फलं तस्य काव्यस्य कर्ता धन्यो

व्यासाचलकविवरस्तत्कृतिज्ञाश्च धन्याः ॥

(Ma.Sham. 1-16)

'The work for which *Maheśwara* by name *Bhagavatpāda* is the Lord, in which along with the minor Rasas like the *Śrīṅgāra*, the *Śānti Rasa* is the main, the result of (reading) which is the destruction of nescience, the writer of that work, poet *Vyāsācala*, is indeed blessed; and those who know his work are also blessed!'

For the term '*Vyāsācalakaviḥ*' the '*Ḍiṇḍima-Vyākhyānakāra*' (*Dhanapati Sūri*) has given the meaning ('*vyāsa iva acalaḥ sthiraścāsau kaviśreṣṭhaśca iti vyāsācalakavivaro mādhave dhanyāḥ*') ('व्यास इव अचलः स्थिरश्चासौ कविश्रेष्ठश्च इति व्यासाचलकविवरो माधवो धन्यः') (blessed is

1. N. Venkaṭarāman (NVSSK, p. 73) has held that this '*Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*' was written by the eighteenth pontiff by name '*Mūka-Śaṅkara*' of *Kāncī Pīṭha*. But it is not mentioned there as to why the name '*Prācīna*' has been given to that.

*Mādhava*, the poet-laurate who is unshakable like Vyāsa). Although one can guess *Mādhava*, who has called himself modern *Kālidāsa*, also might have adored himself as *Vyāsācala*, exhibiting one's commenting skill thus where the work with the title 'Vyāsācalīya' was existing implies that the commentator (*Dhanapati Sūri*) was unaware of the reality as in the case of the term '*Vidyātīrtha*'. The commentator (*Diṇḍimakāra*) seems to be the son of Pandit Rāmakumārji of *Vārāṇasi*, a sāraswat brahmin (Bala. Śam. p 13). Hence he might have commented thus without knowing the reality. Of late, the work '*Vyāsācalīya*' has been printed by Madras Government Oriental Manuscript Library; and we have a manuscript obtained from there. It has come to be known that about 520 *ślokas* are common to '*Vyāsācalīya*' and '*Mādhavīya*'. It appears that the publishers of '*Vyāsācalīya*' have cited a *śloka* commencing with 'Vyāsācala-Pramukhapaṇḍitaḥ' from the first chapter of '*Mādhavīya*' showing that '*Vyāsācalīya*' is earlier of the two. But this *śloka* is not to be found in the '*Mādhavīya*' of Telugu and Devanāgarī prints. Criticising the same point, Bellāve Somanāthaiah (So. Śam. p 1) has cited what are said to be second and third *ślokas* of the first chapter (of the '*Mādhavīya*'):

atyunnatasya kāvyadroryāsādrimukhajanmanah ।

samagrāṇyarthapuṣpāṇi grhītumahamakṣamaḥ ॥ 2 ॥

hrasvadhīṣṇinā yāvadāyāttāvadadādadat ।

saṃkṣepaśaṅkarajayasrajaṃ saṃdarbhayāmyaham ॥ 3 ॥

अत्युन्नतस्य काव्यद्रोव्यासाद्रिमुखजन्मनः ।

समग्राण्यर्थपुष्पाणि गृहीतुमहमक्षमः ॥ २ ॥

ह्रस्वधीसृणिना यावदायात्तावददाददत् ।

संक्षेपशङ्करजयस्रजं संदर्भयाम्यहम् ॥ ३ ॥

'I am unable to procure all the meaning-flowers from the high poetry-tree born at the Vyāsa-summit. With what little can be procured using my short intellect-polehook, I shall string the garland called 'Saṃkṣepa-Śaṅkarajaya' - is the meaning of these ślokas. These have disappeared from the printed books available now. Similarly, why the śloka commencing with 'Vyāsācala-Pramukhapaṇḍitaḥ' might not have been omitted? Therefore, it proves to be certain that Mādhava acknowledged the poet Vyāsācala.

It is still doubtful that the 'Vyāsācalīya' that we have now is the source for 'Mādhavīya'. Because, the story-detail of it in some places is contradicting the story-detail of the 'Mādhavīya'. We shall go on pointing them out as we proceed writing Śaṅkara's life-history. The 'Vyāsācalīya' which Mādhava has praised might be different from what 'Vyāsācalīya' we have now. It is enough to give one probable reason here for this. Opinions differ about who had performed Śaṅkara's 'upanayana' (initiation to Vedic studies); we shall give the details when we deal with this subject. Mādhava has written a śloka implying that Śaṅkara's father could not perform the 'upanayana' since he passed away when Śaṅkara was only three years old:

śivaguruḥ sa jaraṃstrisame śiśāvamṛta karmavaśaḥ sutamoditaḥ ।  
 upaniniṣitasūnurapi svayaṃ na hi yamo'sya kṛtākṛtamīkṣate ॥'  
 (Ma. Śam. 4 -11)

शिवगुरुः स जरस्त्रिसमे शिशावमृत कर्मवशः सुतमोदितः ।

उपनिनीषितसूनुरपि स्वयं न हि यमोऽस्य कृताकृतमीक्षते ॥' (Ma. Śam. 4 -11)

Ātmabodha, while commenting on the 18th śloka of 'Gururatna-mālikā' has cited this śloka as taken from 'Vyāsācalīya'; but in the 'Vyāsācalīya' that we have now, a different śloka 'तं पञ्चमाब्द उपनेतु

मनाः स एव पञ्चत्वमाप दुरतिक्रमकाल एषः' (Vyā. Śam. 4-32) with the same meaning implied. Hence this is not the source for 'Mādhavīya'. The published 'Vyāsācalīya' is incomplete; in the manuscript that is with us, someone has inserted the *śloka*s (from 112 to 135) - although they are from 'Mādhavīya' - in a place that is not at all necessary. And among them the *śloka* given above is also there! Hence it is certain that this copy is a manipulated one. Even then, since words like 'told by 'Vyāsācala' (3,4,6,10), 'Vyāsaśaila' (2), 'Vyāsādri' (5-9), 'Vyāsagiri' (12)' do occur at the end of the chapters, there is no doubt that it may at least be an abridged version of the original 'Vyāsācalīya'. Publishers of 'Vyāsācalīya' have stated that its author has been referred to in Govindanātha's 'Śaṅkarācāryacarita' (Keralīya-Śaṅkaravijaya); therefore 'Vyāsācalīya' must be earlier to that author. It is learnt that four *śloka*s, said to be from *Vyāsācalīya*, cited by *Ātmabodha* are not found in the current printed *Vyāsācalīya*. Although there is some ground for people like Sundararāmayya (KSSS, p 21,27) holding *Ātmabodha* to be partial to Kumbhakoṇa Maṭha, it cannot be said that the *śloka* 'तं पञ्चमाब्द उपनेतु मनाः' (Vyā. Śam. 4-32) cited by us is of a biased person; since *Ātmabodha* has quoted the *śloka* 'शिवगुरुः स जगन्' from 'Vyāsācalīya' with full agreement that it is contrary to his position, he is not to be blamed. All these lead to the conclusion that *Mādhava* certainly has referred to a work by name 'Vyāsācalīya'. N. Venkaṭarāman has written (NVSSK, p 98) that the pontiff of Kāncī Pīṭha by name Mahādeva (IV) was *Kuppaṇṇa*, in his previous stage of life, son of *Kāmeswara* and *Kamalāmba* of Kāñci, and that since he was living at *Vyāsācala* he was referred to by that name; and that it was he who is the author of 'Vyāsācalīya'. It is necessary that the

truth of this be explored.

### **Cidvilāsiya Śaṅkara-Vijaya-Vilāsa** (चिद्विलासीय शङ्करविजयविलास)

5. The Telugu book that is with us was published in 1875 by *Vāvilla Rāmaśāstrī* of Madras. This is written as if a Guru by name *Cidvilāsa* is narrating to a disciple by name *Vijñānakanda*. The details of the story in this differ from those in the *Mādhavīya*. One cannot say which of these is earlier. Twenty-fifth pontiff of the Kāncī Pīṭha was of the same name as the author of this (NVSSK, p 77). But one cannot say whether it was he who has written this or someone else. The author gives more details of observances of rites than others regarding Śaṅkara. We shall go on citing from this later.

### **Anantānandagiriya** (अनन्तानन्दगिरीय)

6. What people customarily call *Ānandagiriya* is truly authored by a person by name *Anantānandagiri*. We have a copy of this in Telugu print (Printed by Ne. Venkaṭasubbā Śāstrī, 10th Dec. 1867). N. Venkaṭarāman (NVSSK, Appendix) has written that this work 'is an obvious forgery and quite useless'. It appears that this book deserves such a harsh comment. Because the author, who has collected quite a lot of recent material, has claimed in the beginning that 'अनन्तानन्दगिरिरहं अप्रतिहताज्ञस्य भगवतः शिष्यः स्वगुरोरवतारप्रयोजनं वर्णयामि' (Ā. Śam. p 1) (I, *Anantānandagiri*, being the disciple of that Lord of invincible command, shall describe the purpose of the incarnation of my Guru) and that 'जयतु सकललोकैः सेव्यमानो गुरुर्मै' (Ā. Śam. p 256) (May victorious be my Guru who is to be honoured by the whole world), at the end.

Even then, this work cannot be ruled out as baseless. Because,

a commentator of *ŚaṅkaraVijaya*, one by name *Achyutarāya Moḍak*, has in his commentary by name *Advaitarājyalakṣmīḥ* (अद्वैतराज्यलक्ष्मीः) referred to an entirely different *Ānandagīrīya*. Commenting on the word *Śaṅkaravākyasāraḥ* (शांकरवाक्यसारः) in the *śloka* 1-2 of *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*

यद्वद्घटानां पटलो विशालो विलोक्यतेऽल्पे किल दर्पणेऽपि ।

तद्वन्मदीये लघुसङ्ग्रहेऽस्मिन्मुद्रीक्ष्यतां शांकरवाक्यसारः ॥

(Just as the expanse of elephant heads or of pots is reflected in a small mirror, in this short summary of mine the very essence of Śaṅkara's statements can be found) he says 'शङ्करस्य भगवतो भाष्यकारस्यायं शाङ्करः, आनन्दगिर्यभिदः । तस्य तत्प्रियशिष्यस्य वाक्यसारः' (Śaṅkara (शाङ्कर) means the endeared disciple *Ānandagiri* of the Lord the Commentator; the essence of his statement). Here, since *Mādhava* has called his work 'Laghusaṅgraha' (लघुसङ्ग्रह), short summary, one can guess that the original *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* could have been more elaborate; also the example of the small mirror would then be appropriate. But the *Ānandagīrīya* that we have presently being what little it is, we cannot say that the essence of this is *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*. Another word could be added here. The same *Achyutarāya* has commented elsewhere in his work as 'एतत्कथाजालं बृहत्शङ्करविजय एव आनन्दज्ञानाख्याऽनन्दगिरिविरचिते द्रष्टव्यं इति दिक्' (commentary on Ma. Śam. 16-103). Considering this comment 'It is pointed out that all this story has to be seen in *Bṛhat ŚaṅkaraVijaya* written by *Ānandagiri* also named as *Ānandajñāna*', it becomes evident that the *Ānandagīrīya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* was more elaborate than *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*.

Even if this be so, since it (*Anantānandagīrīya*) was written after *Ānandagīrīya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* became unavailable, people have

confused the presently available *Anantānandagīrīya* as the original *Ānandagīrīya*. Besides the name *Ānandagīri*, there is one more reason for such confusion. And that is this. Many summarization sentences of *Dhanapati Sūri* in his *Ḍiṇḍima-Vyākhyāna* (डिण्डिमव्याख्यान) of *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* are found with minor changes in this *Anantānandagīrīya*. For example, for the expression ‘अथ शिष्यवरैर्युतः’ (then, along with excellent disciples) (Ma. Śam. 15-1) *Dhanapati Sūri* comments ‘अथानन्तरं पद्मपाद-हस्तामलक-समित्पाणि-चिद्विलास-विज्ञानकन्द-विष्णुगुप्त-शुद्धकीर्ति-भानुमरीचि-कृष्णदर्शन-बुद्धिवृद्धि-विरिञ्चिपादानन्दानन्दगिरिप्रमुखैः सहस्रैः शिष्यवरैर्युतः’. The same sequence of the disciples of Śaṅkara is found in the *Anantānandagīrīya*: ‘पद्मपाद-हस्तामलक-समित्पाणि-चिद्विलास-(वि)ज्ञानकन्द-विष्णुगुप्त-(शुद्ध?)कीर्ति-भानुमरीचि-कृष्णदर्शन-बुद्धिवृद्धि-विरिञ्चिपाद-शुद्धानन्तानन्दगिरिप्रमुखैः शिष्यवरैः सेव्यमानः’ (Ā. Śam. 4, p 18). Similarly, *Dhanapati Sūri*’s commentary on the second śloka of the same Chapter commencing from ‘तथा हि श्रीशङ्कराचार्यो मध्यार्जुनं नाम शिवाविर्भूतस्थल-विशेषं प्राप । मध्यार्जुनेशानमदृष्टपूर्वं विद्यादिभिः पूजितपादपद्मम् । ऋद्धोपचारैरभजत्परेण निष्पापतां प्राप फलैकपात्रम्’ and ending with ‘शुद्धाद्वैतपरायणा बभूवुः’ is identical with what is found in *Anantānandagīrīya*. In the same manner, in the commentary on the fourth, sixth ślokas of the same Chapter, the sentences are what are found in *Anantānandagīrīya*. Since *Dhanapati Sūri* has said ‘अत्र प्राचीनानुरोधेन मध्यार्जुनं प्राप्य ततः सर्वान् ककुभो विजिगीषुः प्रथमं सेतुं प्रति प्रतस्थे इति - व्याख्येयम्’ (As per the ancient version, one has to comment including what is left over from here), people might have imagined that *Anantānandagīrīya* must be earlier to this commentary, and that that itself is the *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* which is the source for the *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*. If one thinks a little clearly, one finds that the *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* which is

bigger than the *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*, can never be the same as the little *Anantānandagirīya* that we have with us today. Not only this; *Dhanapati Sūri* has cited 581 *śloka*s in his commentary on the second *śloka* of the same Chapter; none of these are to be found in the presently available *Anantānandagirīya*. Similarly, he has cited one *śloka* for the first *śloka*, and 402 *śloka*s for the fourth *śloka*; and after the 28th *śloka*, he has cited 351 *śloka*s as introduction for the 29th *śloka*. The commentator has not cited any *śloka* of *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* mentioned by *Ātmabodha*; and the details of the story found in the *Mādhavīya* are in contradiction to those in that *vijaya*. Because of this, and because of the aforesaid reasons, one can imagine that an *Ānandagirīya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* that was entirely different from the *Anantānandagirīya* could have been available. One could also imagine that *Dhanapati Sūri*, with the idea that the author of *Mādhavīya* has summarized that work, could have cited these *śloka*s. N. Venkaṭarāman opines (NVSSK, Appendix) that a manuscript of that *Ānandagirīya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* is available at Kumbhakoṇam, and that *Dhanapati Sūri* has cited these *śloka*s from that. If this be true, we can say that *Anantānandagirīya* is a fabricated one, and that its author has used *Dhanapati Sūri*'s sentences to make up his work. Since *Dhanapati Sūri* too has mentioned a disciple by name *Anantānandagiri*, that name must have been present in the original *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*; and it could be decided that this author *Anantānandagiri* must have tried to show up that it is his name. Also because this author highlights that name again and again in his little work. Certainly, neither *Anantānandagiri* nor any other *Ānandagiri* could be a contemporary of Śaṅkara. We shall refer to



this point again and again at proper places in due course.

Another conjecture is possible here. The *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* that has been cited by *Ātmabodha* could actually have been written by somebody, a fan of Kāñci tradition, later than *Mādhavīya Śaṅkara-Vijaya*; and since at that time *Ānandagiriya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* was not available, this fan could have tried to show that its name itself is *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*. Because, it is not likely that anyone could give the title ‘प्राचीन’ (ancient) to his own work.

### Chronology of the Śaṅkara Vijayas

7. The series of names of the disciples mentioned in the *Anantānandagiriya* and in the *Ḍiṇḍima-Vyākhyāna* of *Dhanapati Sūri*, which we have cited above, leads to another corollary. One should note that there are two names *Cidvilāsa* and *Ānandakanda* in this series of disciples; and that these are the names of the preceptor and disciple in *Cidvilāsīya Śaṅkaravijayavilāsa*. *Anantānandagiri* might have written his work later than *Cidvilāsīya*; and the author *Ānandagiri* of *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* too might have written his work later than *Cidvilāsīya*. If this be true, we can say that the names of preceptor and disciple coined by *Cidvilāsa* for his work might have caused a confusion later that these names are those of Śaṅkara’s disciples. Hence, we can say that the chronology of Śaṅkara Vijayas could be *Ānandagiriya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya*, *Cidvilāsīya*, *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* of *Ātmabodha*, *Vyāsācalīya*, *Mādhavīya*, and finally *Anantānandagiriya*.

Since *Mādhava* has described his work to be only a short summary (‘अल्पसङ्ग्रह’), one could imagine that a bigger and detailed Śaṅkara Vijaya ought to have been there earlier. Could someone with this

imagination written a *Br̥hat Śaṅkaravijaya* and ascribed it to *Citsukhācārya* ? If that not be the case, who would deliberately entitle his own work as '*Br̥hat Śaṅkaravijaya*? Whatever that be, the *Br̥hat Śaṅkaravijaya* ascribed to Citsukhācārya must be an earlier work or a later work than *Cidvilāsīya*; because there are close similarities between these two works. We shall indicate this again with proof later.

### Works of Kāncī Pīṭha Tradition

8. According to the Kāncī Pīṭha Tradition, there is no authority to the *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*. They consider as authoritative only three works, viz., *Puṇyaślokamañjarī* (पुण्यश्लोकमञ्जरी) of *Sarvajña Sadāśīvabodha*, *Gururatnamālikā* of *Sadāśīva Brahmendra*, and *Suṣamā* of *Ātmabodha*. Among these three, a book in which the original version of a work entitled *Suṣamāśahita Gururatnamālikā* (सुषमासहित गुरुरत्नमालिका) is written, is with us. In this we find only some parts of *Suṣamāvyākhyāna*. Although *Ātmabodha* is of a later period than *Mādhava*, he has cited from several ancient works in his *Suṣamāvyākhyāna*. Although his attachment to the Kāncī Pīṭha is natural, it should already have become evident to the reader that when we try to evaluate the various Śaṅkara Vijayas hitherto cited by us, his work would be very helpful for comparative criticism. He has cited *śloka*s from many works not available to us, like *Prācīna-śaṅkaravijaya*, *Br̥hat Śaṅkaravijaya*, *KeralīyaŚaṅkaraVijaya*; we shall use not only his work, but many other smaller works in the discussion about the Maṭhas. And we shall mention then and there as to what historical value could be ascribed to them.

## Purāṇas

9. Not only in the Śaṅkara Vijayas stated above, Śaṅkarācārya has been referred to also in some Purāṇic statements. We have been able to obtain such references on Śaṅkara in parts of Liṅgapurāṇa, Kūrmapurāṇa, Vāyupurāṇa, Bhaviṣyottara, Mārkaṇḍeyasaṃhitā, and more important than these, in Śivarahasya. We have given these in Appendix I.

While writing the Purāṇas, it has been customary to mention some gods or ṛṣis stating that in Kaliyuga such and such things would happen. Readers with a modern critical outlook will not see any trust worthiness in such books. Their line of argument would be like this: the adherents of each school of thought have the opportunity to add *ślokas* in appreciation of their Ācāryas and state that these are told by ṛṣis or gods; because it is difficult either to establish how extensive the Purāṇas<sup>1</sup> are or to decide that such and such part is interpolated. Not only this, the histories of Śaṅkara, Mādhwa etc. have been added into the Purāṇas with praises or abuses. We have given some such examples in Appendix II; these include *ślokas* from Padmapurāṇa where Śiva appears to say that he incarnates with the intention of spoiling the world by way of bringing up *Māyāvāda* which is an *Asat-Śāstra*, non-vedic and false, the same Śiva who has declared in Purāṇas that he incarnates as *Śaṅkarācārya* for the good of the world elsewhere stating thus! What good can be expected to be arrived at from the authority of such *Purāṇas*?

---

1. see *Aṣṭādaśapurāṇadarpaṇa* (written in Hindi) by Pandit Jwālāprasāda Miśra, p. 51 wherein he has given the number of *ślokas* added into the purāṇas according to different schools of thought.

### Works of those of other schools of thought

10. Just as there are many from other schools of thought who have written admiring Śaṅkarācārya, none the less are there who have denigrated him. At any rate, there are people who have authored books like *Maṇimañjarī*, and *Madhvavijaya* aimed at showing the superiority of Madhvācārya and the inferiority of Śaṅkarācārya. These being written at a time when hatred and abusing other schools of thought were done with pride, it is to be expected that they naturally called for books to answer these. Books like *Maṇimañjaribhedinī* are of that category.

Even such books have a place historically; so we would consider them often for criticism. The opinions of such people belonging to other schools of thought are given in Appendix III (page. 440).

### Utilization of the source materials

11. We shall go on commenting citing here and there the chief Śaṅkara Vijayas that have been hitherto mentioned. *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* being the most popular and well-known among all these, we shall depict the story following its chronology. We shall go on mentioning here and there the disparities of other Vijayas and criticize. We shall also mention the opinions of the present-day critics, adding our agreement or disagreement, with reasons. No adverse opinion on the established conclusions of Śaṅkara's Vedānta being acceptable, we shall invariably support any uncommon opinion of ours quoting authoritative sentences from Śaṅkara's works. We shall consider ourselves fulfilled if there be Ācārya's blessings for the success of this endeavour even to a small extent, and if the readers be pleased with it.

## 2. Śaṅkara's Time of Manifestation

### Is Śaṅkarācārya an Incarnation?

12. On the basis of the Purāṇas (the excerpts of which are given in the Appendix I), the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas, the followers of the Maṭha traditions and in general the theists of our country believe that Śaṅkara is an incarnation of Śiva. If we try to explore whether this concept of incarnation is agreeable to Śaṅkara, we do not find any mention of the word 'अवतार' (incarnation) in his commentaries of *Prasthānatraya* (the trio - *Brahmasūtras*, *Upaniṣads* and *Gīta*). However, the Ācārya has written in his commentary on the *Brahma sūtras* that 'स्यात् परमेश्वरस्यापि इच्छावशान्मायामयं रूपं साधकानुग्रहार्थम्' (Bra. Sū. Bhā. 1.1.20) (even Parameśwara, by His will, may assume forms through *Māyā* in order to bless the aspirants). It is stated in works like *Bhīṣmastavarāja* in *Mahābhārata* that Mahāviṣṇu took the forms - Holy Fish and the like - and blessed the world; and the Ācārya in his *Sūtrabhāṣya* has cited ślokas from this *Bhīṣmastavarāja*. The *Bhāgavata* describes the incarnations of the Lord as 'infinite' (अवतारा ह्यसङ्ख्येया हरेः सत्त्वनिधेर्द्विजाः - Bhaga. 1.3.26). Ācārya also has written 'स आदिकर्ता नारायणाख्यो विष्णुर्भौमस्य ब्रह्मणो ब्राह्मणत्वस्य रक्षणार्थं देवक्यां वसुदेवादंशेन कृष्णः किल संबभूव' (Gī. Bhā. Ava.) (The original creator Viṣṇu, by name Nārāyaṇa, took birth as Kṛṣṇa from Vāsudeva and Devaki in order to protect the discipline of Brahmin, that is the Brahma of this earth). Therefore, it is but natural that believers in *Sanātana Dharma* also do believe in incarnations.

It is not imperative that the omnipotent *Īśwara* needs to incarnate on this earth for the establishment of *Dharma*. There are people objecting to the theory of incarnation of the omniscient *Īśwara*, as shortcomings are found even in those so-called incarnations. Some people imagine that the great who have taken up great tasks will be charged with Lord's inspiration for the time being, and hence people believe them to be incarnates. Śaṅkara, following the *Śruti* 'अजायमानो बहुधा विजायते' (Tai. Ā. 3.13) and the statement of *Gītā* 'अजोऽपि सन्नव्ययात्मा' (Gī. 4.6) has written in his commentary on the introduction to *Gītā* 'स च भगवान् ज्ञानैश्वर्यशक्तिबलवीर्यतेजोभिः सदा सम्पन्नस्त्रिगुणात्मिकां वैष्णवीं स्वां मायां प्रकृतिं वशीकृत्य अजोऽव्ययो भूतानामीश्वरो नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावोऽपि सन् स्वमायया देहवानिव जात इव लोकानुग्रहं कुर्वन् लक्ष्यते' (The Lord is always endowed with knowledge, sovereignty, energy, power, valour, and splendour; although unborn, unperishable, eternal, pure, illumined, liberated and Lord of all beings by nature, incorporating the three qualities of primordial nature called *Māyā*, He appears by His *Māyā* as though born, as having taken up a body and blessing the world). We can say that this sentence of the Ācārya gives all reasons to the theory of incarnation. Thus it will not be absurd at all for people having faith in Advaita philosophy to believe in the theory of incarnation. It is clear that those who raise the objection 'why should the all-powerful incarnate?' also will not be able to find any solution to objections like 'why the ever-contented Paramēśwara create the world?' 'why he should resolve that the devotees should obtain liberation only through knowledge, devotion, dispassion etc.?. It seems *Śivarahasya* emphasises Ācārya to be *Aṃśāvatāra* (partial incarnation). This is proper since the Lord appears in a certain time and at a certain place. But even

then, since the Ācārya says ‘व्यावृत्तकृत्स्नोपाधिभेदापेक्षया तु सर्वः परत्वेनाभिदीयते श्रुतिस्मृतिवाक्यैः’ (Br. Bhā. 1.4.6) (everyone is Paramātmā only, in the form that is devoid of attributes), we feel that it will not be wrong to say that he is Paramātmā only, as he realised and preached the unity of Ātmā and Brahman.

### The Time of Śaṅkarācārya

13. May be because he is Parama-Śiva, transcendent of time, it is extremely difficult to decide his time of appearance and the time of disappearance. Presently, each of the traditions of the Śaṅkara Pīṭhas gives its own time.

(1) According to the tradition of *Kāmakoti Pīṭha*:

The śloka cited by Ātmabodha from *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* (Gu. Sa. 3.86) is

तिष्ठे प्रयात्यनलशेवधिबाणनेत्रे यो नन्दने दिनमण्णावुदगध्वभाजि ।

राधेऽदितेरुडुनि निर्गतमस्तलग्ने<sup>1</sup> प्याहूतवान् शिवगुरुः स च शङ्करेति ॥

[After the onset of Kali Yuga, in the 2593rd year, called *Nandana Samvatsara*, during *Uttarāyaṇa*, *Vaishākha Shudda Pañcamī*, under the star *Punarvasu* in *Karkāṭakalagna*, he was born of Śivaguru (*Vidyādhīpati* by name). Śivaguru named him as Śaṅkara]. This school of thought agrees that the Ācārya was born in 509 B.C.

We hear (Śre. Śam. tr. 2.1) that in *Vyāsācalīya* (Vyā. Śam. 4.20-21) the following śloka is there:

अब्दे कलेरनलवर्षशराक्षिसङ्ख्ये श्रीनन्दने दिनमण्णावुदगध्वभाजि ।

राधेऽधिपञ्चमितिथावसितेतरायां वारे रवेरदितिभे शुभयोगयुक्ते ॥

---

1. In Śre. Śam. we have ‘अङ्गलग्ने’; and in the handwritten manuscript of *Suśamā* we have ‘अस्तलग्ने’. Should this be ‘अम्बुलग्ने’? Astrologers should to decide.

लग्ने शुभे शुभयुते शुषुवे कुमारं श्रीपार्वतीव सुखिनी शुभवीक्षिते च ।

जाया सती शिवगुरोर्निजतुङ्गसंस्थे सूर्ये कुजे रविसुते च गुरौ च केन्द्रे ॥

The first *śloka* is not there in the book that we possess; the second *śloka* only is in *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* (Ma. Śam. 2-71). The total meaning of the *śloka* is that Āryāmba begot his son during *Vaishākha Śuddha Pañcamī*, Sunday, under the star *Punarvasu* in *Abhijñ Subhamuhūrta*, *Karkāṭakalagna* of *Yudhiṣṭhira Śaka* 2631st year called *Nandana*, wherein planets Ravi, Kuja, Guru and Shani in high position in the centre, and Shukra in high galore, Budha having joined Shani. Here too the details are those of *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*. Only the details of *Karkāṭakalagna* are not found here; it is stated that the birth took place during *Vaishākha Śuddha Pañcamī*, a Sunday. This is also in accord of the tradition of Kāncī Pīṭha.

The same work describes the Ācārya's Siddhi in the following *śloka*:

वर्षे कलेः शरविलोचनशास्त्रनेत्रे रक्ताक्षिनाम्नि वृषशुक्लमुकुन्दतिथ्याम् ।

गच्छन् स जातु सविधे परदेवतायाः त्यक्तुं समृच्छदथ भौतिकमात्मदेहम् ॥

[In Kaliyuga, during 2625th year called *Raktākshi* (477 B.C.) on the day of *Vaiśākha Śuddha Dvādaśī*, (the Ācārya) wanted to give up his physical body, having gone near *Paradevatā*] (Śre. Śam. 2.22). This *śloka* too is not to be found in our *Vyāsācalīya. Ātmabodha* says that it has been said accordingly in the *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*.

कल्यन्दैश्च शरेक्षणाध्वनयनैः सत्कामकोटिप्रथे

पीठे न्यस्य सुरेश्वरं समवितुं सर्वज्ञसंज्ञं मुनिम् ।

कामाक्ष्याः सविधे स जातु निविशन्मुक्तलोकस्पृहो

देहं स्वं व्यपहाय देह्यसुगमं धाम प्रपेदे परम् ॥

The time of birth is just the same in *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* written by Śrī Citsukhācārya. This has been given in Appendices IV and V.



It is said that the time of Ācārya's Siddhi is given in *Br̥hat Śaṅkara-vijaya* as follows:

वह्न्यद्ध्वशास्त्रनयनाङ्गयुधिष्ठिराब्दे द्वात्रिंशत् हि शरदो धरणीं विभूष्य ।

श्रीशङ्करेन्द्रगुरुराट् चिह्नतराजसेनः संशिष्य धर्ममखिलं शिवतां प्रपेदे ॥

(Śre. Śam. tr. 27)

The purport of the *śloka* is that Śaṅkara, having dwelt on this blessed earth for thirtytwo years, having been served by *Rājasena* attained Śivatva during *Yudhishṭhiraśaka* 2663rd year (477 B.C.).

(2) *Citsukhācārya* himself has said that there is an inscription at the Dwārakā Maṭha which states that Śaṅkara was born during *Yudhishṭhiraśaka*<sup>1</sup> 2631st year *Vaiśākha Śuddha Pañcamī* and became Brahmībhūta during 2663rd year *Kārtika* Full Moon day.

Thus far, we have given the version of those who hold that the Ācārya was born in the 5th century B.C.

(3) According to the tradition of Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha, it is stated that the incarnation of the Ācārya took place during *Vikramaśaka*<sup>2</sup> 14th year called *Īśwara Saṁvatsara*, on *Vaiśākha Śuddha Pañcamī* under star *Ārdra*, in *Mithunalagna*; and Ācārya's *Kailāsagamana*, journey towards Kailāsa, took place during *Vikramaśaka* 46th year on *Jyeṣṭha Śuddha Dvādaśī*. According to this tradition, Śaṅkara's time would be from 44 B.C. to 12 B.C. In a lecture delivered by the pontiff of *Kuḍali*

1. There are different opinions regarding commencement of *Yudhishṭhiraśaka* (Śre. Śam. tr. 2. p 28-32). Here we have considered that Ācārya's birth was in the 2631st year from the commencement of Kaliyuga.

2. Lokamānya Tilak (?) is of the opinion that the *Vikramaśaka* accepted by Śrīṅgeri tradition is not the *Mālavaśaka* of the north, and we have to take *Chalūkyā Vikrama*. Since Vikrama the First ascended the throne during 670 A.D., Śaṅkara would be purported to be born on 684 A.D. and dissappeared on 716 A.D. (Bala. Śam. p. 39-40). Also see Śre. Śam. tr. p. 29.

*Samsthānam*<sup>1</sup> is stated that in the traditional list of Kuḍali Maṭha. Ācārya's incarnation in 75th year of *Vikramaśaka* (18 A.D.) and his demise in 107th year of *Vikramaśaka* (50 A.D.) is indicated. This implies Ācārya's time to be before Christ and the first century after Christ.

(4) Although majority opinion of Ācārya's birth is *Vaiśākha Śuddha Pañcamī*, there are people who say that it is *Daśamī*; similarly, his *mahā samādhi* is said to have taken place on Full Moon day instead of *Dvādaśī*. For example, Nīlakanṭha Bhaṭṭa in his Śaṅkara-Mandāra-Saurabha (शङ्करमन्दारसौरभ) says:

प्रासूततिष्यशरदामतियातवत्यामेकादशाधिकशतो न चतुःसहस्र्याम् ।

संवत्सरे विभवनाम्नि शुभे मुहूर्ते राधे सिते शिवगुरोर्गृहिणी दशम्याम् ॥

On *Vaiśākha Śuddha Daśamī* day of Vibhava saṃvatsara, in Kaliyuga, 111 less than 4000, meaning 3889th year, Śivaguru's wife gave birth to Śaṅkara - is the implied meaning. According to this, there are people in North Kaṇṇāṭaka even now who celebrate Śaṅkara's birthday on the *Daśamī*.

*Mādhaviya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* does not give the time of Śaṅkara. The *śloka* of *Vyāsācalīya* which has already been mentioned is found here also:

लग्ने शुभे शुभयुते सुषुवे कुमारं श्रीपार्वतीव सुखिनी शुभवीक्षिते च ।

जाया सती शिवगुरोर्निजतुङ्गसंस्थे सूर्ये कुजे रविसुते च गुरौ च केन्द्रे ॥

(Ma. Śam. 2.71). Hence, it is certain that one of the two - *Mādhava* or *Vyāsācala* - must have taken the *śloka* from the other.

It is stated in the 5th Sarga of *Cidvilāsiya* that

दिवसे माधवर्तौ च स्वोच्चस्थे ग्रहपञ्चके ।

मध्याह्ने चाभिजिन्नाममुहूर्ते चार्द्रयायुते ॥ ३८ ॥

1. at Bālekuduru Maṭha (Ku. Śam. p 9).

उदयाचलवेलेव भानुमन्तं महौजसम् ।

प्रासूततनयं साध्वी गिरिजेव षडाननम् ॥ ३९ ॥

Ācārya's name has not been stated here. Readers should observe that the time of birth that we have told earlier to be in *Br̥hat Śaṅkara-vijaya* has been mentioned here more or less in the same words. *Ātmabodhendra* considers *Br̥hat Śaṅkaravijaya* to be authoritative; since the same *śloka*s are found here, we have given those *śloka*s in Appendix V, so that it would be useful for those who wish to decide on the time of this work.

It is said that in *KeralīyaŚaṅkaraVijaya* (2.53) the following mention is there (Śre. Śam. tr. p 20):

प्रवृद्धे तत्र चासूत नन्दनं नन्दने शुभे । वैशाखे मासि पञ्चम्यां शुक्लपक्षे पुनर्वसौ ॥ meaning that 'Āryamba gave birth to a son on the *Vaiśākha Śuddha Pañcamī* of Nandana Saṃvatsara under the star Punarvasu'. There is no mention of śaka here.

We hear that in a book called 'Keraḷotpatti' (केरळोत्पत्ति) Śaṅkara's time has been mentioned to be Kali 3501 (400 A.D.) and that he lived for 38 years (Indian Antiquary VII p 282 - from Bala. p 31). See Appendix IV for a story from this book.

## Conclusion of Traditional Date of Śaṅkara

14. It has become certain that it is not possible to reconcile the opinions of the Maṭha traditons and those of the Śaṅkara Vijayas. They have given Śaṅkara's date right from 5th century. B.C. to 1st century. A.D. according to their own feeling. None of these belong to the times of Śaṅkara; although some of them have given the year, month, day, star and *lagnam* etc., the basis for those dates are not clear; and it is

also not clear as to what Śaka those dates belong. Even where Śaka is mentioned, there is scope for doubt. The dates theorized by modern historians on the basis of several external evidences are also numerous and do not agree with each other; and where is the end for speculation? These opinions on the subject of date are indicated in Appendix IV. Majority opinion is that Śaṅkara was born on *Vaiśākha Śuddha Pañcamī*; only very few opine on *Daśamī*. But even the stand that it is *Pañcamī* has no believable evidence. The position numbers of letters in the name 'Śaṅkara' from the left - the *nāmāksharas* (5,1,2) could have been counted in the reverse order and could have been decided that it is *Vaiśākha Śuddha Pañcamī*. We can only say that only Śaṅkara the Timeless knows the truth of this.

### Comparison of Brihadāraṇyaka and Sūtra bhāṣyas

15. Obviously, in order to determine the time of Śaṅkara, it is very important to examine the inner part of his writings. But, it is most unfortunate that it is difficult even to decide with certainty what really are his works. Most people agree that the commentaries on *Prasthānatraya* are without any doubt works of the Ācārya. The discussion on this is to be taken up when we deal with the works of Śaṅkara; but yet, one complication regarding even this is to be mentioned here. Top ranking is accorded to *Sūtrabhāṣya* by one and all. Although Sureśwarācārya, the author of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhiḥ* has verbally declared that he has written his book after serving the Lotus Feet of Śrī Śaṅkara (श्रीमच्छङ्कर-पादपद्मयुगलं संसेव्य, Nai. Si. 4.74), he has not cited any sentence from *Sūtrabhāṣya*; similarly, in the book *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika*, although the Guru is admired

as Śaṅkarabhānu (शङ्करभानु) (तस्मै शङ्करभानवे, Br. Vā. 6.25), there is no citation from *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Hence, there is no way of convincing modern researchers who depend only on concrete evidence, that these two books are authored by one and the same Śaṅkarācārya. Things become more difficult since it is not in the nature of Śaṅkara to cite by name one of his works in another. Added to this, at some places the style of *Sūtrabhāṣya* seems to be different from that of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka bhāṣya*.

Not only this. One can come across instances where some topics in one *Bhāṣya* contradicted in another<sup>1</sup>. For example, what has been said (in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka bhāṣya*) 'although prāṇas are by nature infinite and all pervading, on acquiring another body according to karma, jñāna and vāsanas the prāṇa vṛtti contracts and expands' (अतस्तद्वशात्स्वभावतः सर्वगतानामनन्तानामपि प्राणानां कर्मज्ञानवासनारूपेणैव देहान्तरारम्भवशात् प्राणानां वृत्तिः सङ्कुचति विकसति च Br. Bhā. 4.4.3, p 912), has been contradicted in *Sūtrabhāṣya* as "This being the manner of acquiring a new body according to Śruti, all other theories imagined by the human intellect, as for instance, when the karaṇas and Jīva acquire a new body as a result of past karma, they start functioning there .... are to be rejected; because they are against the Śruti (एवं श्रुत्युक्ते देहान्तरप्रतिपत्तिप्रकारे सति याः पुरुषमतिप्रभवाः कल्पनाः व्यापिनां करणानामात्मनश्च देहान्तरप्रतिपत्तौ कर्मवशाद् वृत्तिलाभस्तत्र भवति... इत्येवमाद्याः सर्वा एवानादर्तव्याः । श्रुतिविरोधात् ॥ Sū. Bhā. 3.1.1). What has been contradicted here is again upheld in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* as 'the prāṇa's equality is in the sense it occupies fully the bodies of beings like white ant etc. just

1. See in detail the same discussed in the introduction to *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* by the same author.

as cowhood (occupies fully in the cow); not in the sense that he has the measure of the body volume; because the *prāṇa* is formless, all-pervading... the *Śruti* that says “all these... are equal, all are infinite” is the authority for this; (and hence) although all-pervading, it is not contradictory to say *prāṇa* starts functioning within the limits of the body’ (पुत्तिकादिशरीरेषु गोत्वादिवत् कात्स्न्येन परिसमाप्त इति समत्वं प्राणस्य । न पुनः शरीरपरिमाणेनैव । अमूर्तत्वात्सर्वगतत्वाच्च ।... “त एते सर्व एव समाः सर्वे अनन्ताः” (बृ. १.५.१३) इति श्रुतेः । सर्वगतस्य तु शरीरेषु शरीरपरिमाणवृत्तिलाभो न विरुध्यते ॥ Br. Bhā. 1.3.22 p 141). In the *Sūtrabhāṣya*, raising doubt on the basis of the *Śruti* ‘समः प्लुषिणा समो मशकेन समो नागेन सम एभिस्त्रिभिलोकैः समो अनेन सर्वेण’ (बृ. १.३.२२) which holds *prāṇa* to be omnipresent, it is written ‘this omnipresence that is told is not from the point of view of any individual body, but from that of the universal and individual forms of the divine *prāṇa* in Hiraṇyagarbha; not only that, the *Śruti* ‘समः प्लुषिणा ... (‘equal to the white ant ...) mentions the division of the *prāṇa* into the bodies of beings, and therefore there is no flaw here’ (अधिदैविकेन समष्टिव्यष्टिरूपेण हैरण्यगर्भेण प्राणात्मनैव एतद्विभुत्वं आम्नायते नाध्यात्मिकेन । अपि च ‘समः प्लुषिणा’ इत्यादिना साम्यवचनेन प्रतिप्राणिवर्तिना प्राणस्य परिच्छेद एव प्रदर्श्यते । तस्माददोषः । Sū. Bhā. 2.4.13). Here if we recall what has been said in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya*, i.e., ‘although all-pervading, it is not contradictory to say *prāṇa* starts functioning within the limits of the body’, there is reason to speculate that an attempt at clarification is made in response to somebody’s objection that it is against *Śruti* or that it goes against reason.

Thus, the critics have to agree that although the two sides are in accordance with both *Śruti* and reason, but from different points of view, there could have been difference of opinion among Vedāntins

right from the beginning as to what has to be accepted; and that one is accepted by *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* and the other by *Sūtrabhāṣya*, as indicated by the statements 'na virudhyate' (न विरुध्यते) (Bṛ. Bhā.) and 'adoṣaḥ' (अदोषः) (Sū. Bhā.). If this be so, there is opportunity to those who argue that the authors of the two *Bhāṣyas* could be different. The two may be contemporaries, or they may be of different times; In the Chronological Table of the pontiffs of Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha written by N. Venkaṭaraman, there are names of five Śaṅkaras - ĀdyaŚaṅkara, KṛpāŚaṅkara, UjjwalaŚaṅkara, MūkaŚaṅkara and AbhinavaŚaṅkara. If this table be trustworthy, it remains to be established who among these five is the author of *Sūtrabhāṣya*. There is no complication regarding the authorship of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya*, as Sureshvarācārya himself has mentioned that the author is his Guru. Leaving the problem of substance and truth of all these to archaeological critics, we shall try to dwell on the date of the author of *Sūtrabhāṣya* presently.

### **Date of *Sūtrabhāṣya***

16. Mention of places like *Srughna*, *Mathurā* and *Pāṭaliputra* are found in *Sūtrabhāṣya* (Sū. Bhā. 2.1.8, 4.2.5); hence we have to guess that they existed at the time of the Ācārya. But we know from history that Pāṭaliputra was completely flooded in the river in 756 A.D. Hence Ācārya should have been there before that time. Similarly, a king by name Pūrṇavarma is also mentioned in *Sūtrabhāṣya* (Sū. Bhā. 2.1.18). Although there happens to be a Pūrṇavarma in Jāva Copper inscriptions, it has no relationship with the Ācārya. There is another Pūrṇavarma who had been the king of west *Magadha*. When Śaṅkara wrote the *Bhāṣyas* at *Vārāṇasi*, this Pūrṇavarma must have been crowned. The Ācārya must have been famous because

of the *Bhāṣyas* when he was ruling. Chinese traveller Huyantsang has referred to but not seen this Pūrṇavarma of *Magadha* in 637-638 A.D. By that time his ruling must have come to an end. Hence we can say that the king must have lived during the later part of 6th century A.D. The Ācārya too must have been there during that period. Thus concludes Bombay High Court Justice by name Kāśinath Tryambaka Telanga (Bhāgavatacūṛṇikā Pūrṇapīṭhikā) (भागवतचूर्णिका पूर्णपीठिका).

Here several questions arise. Did the Ācārya actually see the cities *Srughna* and *Pāṭaliputra* which he has cited (Sū. Bhā. 2.1.18, 4.2.5), or did he write as was customary at that time to write in Saṃskṛt? *Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad* says that Brahmins had come from *Kuru Pāncāla* kingdom (कुरुपाञ्चालानां ब्राह्मणा अभिसमेताः' Bṛ. 3.1.1). The commentator says -Is it not in those kingdoms, that the learned are purported to be large in number? (तेषु हि विदुषां बाहुल्यं प्रसिद्धम्). Could we say only on this basis that Ācārya had actually seen the learned of those kingdoms? From the sentence 'The Lord of the entire earth is called the king of *Ayodhya*' (यथा समस्तवसुधाधिपतिरपि हि सन् 'अयोध्यापतिः' इति व्यपदिष्यते Sū. Bhā. 1.2.7) could we imagine that the Ācārya lived during the times of a particular king of *Ayodhya*? Is there any historical evidence for the Ācārya to have gone to the *Magadha* kingdom during the time of Pūrṇavarma? Was there no other king by name Pūrṇavarma? From the sentence 'If the time limit is fixed saying that the son of a barren woman was the king before crowning of Pūrṇavarma, it cannot mean that the son of a barren woman was actually the king' (न हि वन्ध्यापुत्रो राजा बभूव प्राक्पूर्णवर्मणः अभिषेकात् इत्येवज्जातीयकेन मर्यादाकरणेन निरुपाख्यो वन्ध्यापुत्रः राजा बभूव, भवति, भविष्यति इति वा विशेष्यते Sū. Bhā. 2.1.18) if it could mean that the Ācārya



was there during the crowning ceremony of Pūrṇavarma, from the sentence 'Pūrṇavarma's service begets only the fruit of food and clothing, (whereas) Rājavarma's service begets the fruit equivalent to a kingdom' (Cha. Bhā. 2.23.1) could it mean that the Ācārya has praised Rājavarma seeing his greatness? Such questions remain to be answered. Since the Ācārya has cited Jayasimha, Kṛṣṇagupta etc., (गच्छ त्वमितो बलवर्माणं, ततो जयसिंहं, ततः कृष्णगुप्तमिति Sū. Bhā. 4.3.5) are these people contemporaries of the Ācārya? - such question can also be raised.

### Reference to Dharmakīrti in the Bhāṣya

17. In his Vārtika on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* Sureśvarācārya has said

त्रिष्वेव त्वविनाभावादिति यद्धर्मकीर्तिना ।

प्रत्यज्ञायि प्रतिज्ञेयं हीयेतासौ न संशयः ॥ (बृ. वा. ४.३७.५३)

"The assertion of Dharmakīrti "since *non-exclusiveness* is there only in the three" (cause is of three types) is to be left out'. (See Dharmakīrti's Nyāyabindu sentences 'त्रिरूपाणि त्रीण्येव लिङ्गानि । अनुपलब्धिः स्वभावः कार्यं च').

The sentence 'अभिज्ञोऽपि<sup>1</sup> हि बुद्ध्यात्मा विपर्यासितदर्शनैः । ग्राह्यग्राहकसंवित्ति-भेदवानिव लक्ष्यते ' meaning 'to those with misconception, the truly non-dual vijñāna appears as if it is with the difference *grāhya-grāhaka-samvitti*' has been cited in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* (Br. Vā. 4.3.476) as well as in *Upadeśa Sāhasrī* (Upa. 18.139). Although this *śloka* of Dharmakīrti (Pra. Va. 3.354) is enough to say that it was known to the commentator of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, people who have seen

1. From *Prāmaṇa Vārtika* of Dharmakīrti where it is printed as 'अविभागोऽपि'. In "Upadeśa Sāhasrī" it is 'अभिज्ञोऽपि' only.

the disparity among the two *Bhāṣyas* that we have presented already, could ask if there is any reference to Dharmakīrti in the *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Fortunately for us, we have in *Sūtrabhāṣya* itself: ‘अपि च सहोपलम्भनियमात् अभेदो विषयज्ञानयोरपतति’ (Not only that, since both object and its vijñāna are, as a rule, known together, there is non-difference between the two) (Sū. Bhā. 2.2.28). The Ācārya has cited this to counter the argument of the Vijñānavādins that an object cannot be different from its Vijñāna. It is said that this is present in Dharmakīrti’s *PramāṇaViniścaya*<sup>1</sup> in the form ‘सहोपलम्भनियमादभेदो नीलतद्वियोः’ (The blue and the knowledge of blueness, appearing as a rule together, are one and the same); along with this, the followers of the Vedas often cite ‘भेदश्च भ्रान्तिविज्ञानैर्दृश्येतेन्दाविवाद्भये’ (For the knowledge of the deluded, just as the one moon is seen differently, difference between these might appear) (Pra. Va. 3.389). Since Dharmakīrti’s time has been decided to be from 635 A.D. to 650 A.D., the Sūtra commentator Ācārya could not have been earlier to this.

### Reference to Diṅnāga

18. Not only this, under the same *Sūtra* of the *Sūtrabhāṣya*, the following sentences are there to deny the arguments of the Vijñānavādins: ‘यत उपलब्धिव्यतिरेकोऽपि बलादर्थस्याभ्युपगन्तव्यः उपलब्धेरेव । न हि कश्चिदुपलब्धिमेव स्तम्भः कुड्यं च इत्युपलभते । उपलब्धिविषयत्वेनैव तु स्तम्भकुड्यादीन् सर्वे लौकिका उपलभन्ते । अतश्च एवमेव सर्वे लौकिका उपलभन्ते यत्प्रत्याचक्षाणा अपि बाह्यार्थमेव व्याचक्षते “यदन्तर्ज्ञेयरूपं तद्बहिर्वदवभासते” इति । तेऽपि सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धां बहिरवभासमानां संविदं प्रतिलभमानाः प्रत्याख्यातुकामाश्च बाह्यमर्थं “बहिर्वत्” इति वत्कारं कुर्वन्ति । इतरथा हि कस्माद्बहिर्वदिति ब्रूयुः? । न हि विष्णुमित्रो वन्ध्यापुत्रवदवभासत इति

1. This work is available only in Tibetan language.

कश्चिदाचक्षीत । तस्माद्यथानुभवं तत्त्वमभ्युपगच्छद्भिः बहिरेवावभासत इति युक्तमभ्युपगन्तुं न तु बहिर्वदवभासत इति ॥' (Because it is perceived so, one has to accept that there is something different from perception; no one will call perception itself as pillar, wall etc. Rather, all people cognize a pillar, wall etc. as objects of perception. So, all people understand those others (Vijñānavādins) as assuming an external thing even while saying "that which is the content of internal awareness appears as if it is outside". Even they, in order to reject what everyone perceives as external appearance, use the expression "as if it is outside". If that not be so, why they would say "as if"? No one would say Viṣṇumitra appears as if he were the son of a barren woman. Therefore, those who agree that the truth is just as per the perception of it, should accept it "appears outside" rather than "appears as if it is outside". (Sū. Bhā. 2.2.28).

*Diñnāga's Kārikā* ("यदन्तर्ज्ञेयरूपं तद्बहिर्वदवभासते"<sup>1</sup>) is cited here in order to refute the Vijñānavādin's view that the objects of perception such as pillar and wall do not exist separately from perception. This Kārikā is the sixth śloka of an eight-śloka Prakaraṇa called *Ālambana-parikṣā*. This was printed in Adyār Bulletin, Madrās in the year 1942. Diñnāga is a disciple of Vasubandhu; hence he belongs to 5th century A.D. Therefore, it proves that the time of *Sūtrabhāṣya* could not be earlier than this.

### Reference to Guṇamati

19. In *Sūtrabhāṣya* there is a citation of a sentence 'बुद्धिबोध्यं त्रयादन्यत् संस्कृतं क्षणिकं च' [except the three - i.e., "pratisamkhyānirodha, aprati-

---

1. This is from the version printed as "यदन्तर्ज्ञेयरूपं तु".

samkhyānirodha and ākāśa, all the rest are effects (saṃskṛta) and transient (kṣaṇika)] (Sū. Bhā. 2.2.22). This is said to be in a work called Abhidharma-Kośa-Vyākhyāna (अभिधर्मकोशव्याख्यान) of an author by name Guṇamati. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* opines that since Guṇamati's time is 7th century A.D., (630-640 A.D.) the time of *Sūtrabhāṣya* cannot be earlier than this (Bala. Śam. p 34).

### Evidence of the author of Bhāmatī

20. The most ancient and complete exposition of the Ācārya's *Sūtrabhāṣya* that we have today is *Bhāmatī* of Vācaspati Miśra (An earlier exposition *Pañcapādikā* which is only partly available will be taken up for discussion later). There is a śloka in *Nyāyasūcī-nibandha* written by him: 'न्यायसूचीनिबन्धोयमकारि विदुषां मुदे । श्रीवाचस्पतिमिश्रेण वस्वङ्कवसुवत्सरे ॥'. According to this, the work was written in the 898th Samvatsara. The same Vācaspati Miśra has written *Vārtika-Nyāya-Tātparya-Ṭikā* (वार्तिकन्यायतात्पर्यटीका) on which Udayanācārya has written an exposition *Pariśuddhi*. Udayanācārya has stated that he has written a work called *Lakṣaṇāvalī* in the year śaka 906 ('तर्काम्बराङ्कप्रमितेष्वतीतेषु शकान्ततः । वर्षेष्टूदयनश्चक्रे सुबोधां लक्षणावलीम् ॥'). Following this if we accept what is told in *Nyāyasūcī-nibandha* to be śakavarsha, there will be only a eight-year difference between the original and the commentary. But historians have come to a conclusion that these two authors are not contemporaries. Therefore, Vācaspati Miśra must have told Vikramavarṣa only. If we consider thus, the time of *Nibandha* (841 A.D.) would be the middle part of 9th century A.D. Hence Ācārya's *Sūtrabhāṣya* must have been earlier to this - is the opinion of *Baladeva Upādhyāya* (Bala. Śam. p 29). We feel that this is

appropriate. Because, we find Vācaspati Miśra to have answered the objections raised by Bhāskarācārya on the *Sūtrabhāṣya* of Śaṅkara in his *Bhāmatī*<sup>1</sup>. Hence, it becomes amply evident that Ācārya Śaṅkara, who was earlier to Bhāskarācārya, must have written his *Sūtrabhāṣya* at the end of 7th century A.D. or in the beginning of 8th century A.D.




---

1. Vācaspati Miśra has expressed at the end of his *Bhāmatī* that he has written the book 'in the time of the king Nṛga, who was so famed as no other kings could be able to imitate him' ('नरेश्वरा यद्वरितानुकारमिच्छन्ति कर्तुं न च पारयन्ति । तस्मिन्महीपे महनीयकीर्त्तौ श्रीमन्मृगेऽकारि मया निबन्धः ॥'). Also it is necessary here to decide who is this Nṛga. Sūryanarāyaṇa Rao and Kuhnna Rāja have thought that he was the king of Mithilā, ruling around 962 A.D., before Nānyadeva. See their *Bhāmatī* alongwith english translation, the introduction part. This is published from Adyār, Chennai.

### 3. Ācārya's Birth and His Parents

21. It is a good fortune that there is not as much difference of opinion regarding the birthplace of Ācārya as is there regarding his time of manifestation. All the Śaṅkara Vijayas agree on Kerala being the birthplace of the Ācārya, as per what is mentioned in *Śivarahasya*. *Śivarahasya* says 'A pious brahmin by name Śaṅkara will be born from a part of mine from the womb of a brahmin housewife in *Śaśalagrāma* in Kerala' (Shi. Ra. 16.5). Kerala is the region encompassing today's Thiruvāṅkūr, Cocin and Malabār. Since the Śaṅkara Vijayas mention Kālaṭi as the name of the birthplace, one has to guess that this itself was called earlier as *Śaśalagrāma* in the local legendary.

#### The Occasion of the Birth

22. In the *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* it is mentioned thus regarding the birth of the Ācārya: 'When the Gods went to Kailāsa and prayed Śiva "Because of the proliferation of the Buddha-followers in the earth, people have given up duties according to their varṇa and Āśrama and have resorted to wrong practices. Some have given up Karma and, following Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava Āgamas, are going astray. We pray that you re-establish Dharma and thereby save all", Īśvara ordained Skanda - you take birth on earth and save *Karmakāṇḍa*. I have ordained Viṣṇu and Ādiśeṣa to save *Upāsanā kāṇḍa*. Brahma will take birth as Maṇḍana and will assist you. I myself will be born as Śaṅkara the king of monks and by way of writing Advaita-oriented commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, will dispell illusions of the people'

(Ma. Śam. 1.40-56). Accordingly, Indra and other Gods took birth in various forms. In the *Cidvilāsīya* it is mentioned that Brahma went along with Nārada and prayed; in the *Ānandagīrīya* also it is mentioned that Brahma went and prayed Śiva.

The Gods praying Śiva and later incarnating in parts is merely an echo of the description that can be found at various places in the Pūrāṇas and Itihāsas. Moreover, it is written in *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* cited by Ātmabodha thus:

श्रीशोऽभूत्स सनन्दनः कमलभूर्जज्ञे तथा मण्डनः  
 सन् हस्तामलको बभूव पवनोऽप्यासीदुदङ्गोऽनलः ।  
 सोप्यानन्दगिरित्वमापधिषणो भेजे गुहो भट्टता-  
 मीशादेशवशात् स चित्सुखवपुर्जातः प्रचेता अपि ॥  
 मृत्युः पृथ्वीधव(र) इति यमोप्याबभौ विश्वरूपो  
 दध्रे येनाखिलजनजिता तत्प्रतापाख्यधाम ।  
 लेखाश्चान्ये निगमपदवीमिन्दुसूर्येन्द्रशेष-  
 प्रख्याः प्रख्यापयितुमुदिताः खण्डनैर्मण्डनैश्च ॥

(*Nārāyaṇa* became *Sanandana*; *Brahma* became *Maṇḍana*; *Vāyu* became *Hastāmalaka*, *Agni* became *Udaṅka*, *Bṛhaspati* became *Ānandagiri*, *Guha* became *Bhaṭṭa*, *Varuṇa* became *Citsukha*, *Mṛtyu* became *Prṭhvidhava* (*dhara*) and *Yama* became *Viśvarupa*. Likewise, the Moon, Sun, *Indra*, *Śeṣa* and other Gods incarnated separately as different people and rejuvenated the path of the Vedas by way of expounding and refutation).

Likewise, in *Mādhavīya* (3. 1-9) we find the description of Gods partly incarnating as Padmapāda and others. Since all people who accomplish great things would be treasured with godly qualities, it is not new to our country to regard them as part-incarnations of Gods. As

the names mentioned in the *ślokas* from *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* cited above will be taken up further for discussion later, we have not said anything about them here.

### **Mother, Father and Grandfather of the Ācārya**

23. In the second chapter of *Mādhavīya* it is described that Lord Maheśwara incarnated on the bank of *Pūrṇa* river, on the mountain *Vṛṣabhādri*; that the king *Rājaśekhara* of the country, inspired by Lord Parameśwara in his dream, constructed a temple, that in the nearby *Agrahāra* (brahmin colony) called *Kālaḍi* there was a puṇḍit by name *Vidyādhirāja*; that he had a son by name *Śivaguru*; and that he was a *Śiva* in knowledge and a *Guru* in word and hence the name was aptly suited (Ma. Śam. 2. 1-5).

Was there a king by name *Rājaśekhara* in Kerala at that time, or is this name just an adjective that is used to highlight his greatness? Śaṅkara's grandfather's name is *Vidyādhirāja*; This also could have been an adjective aimed at highlighting his scholarship. There is a *śloka* in *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* which reads as follows:

ईशोप्यभूत्समदविद्वदभेद्यदर्पसर्पाहितुण्डिकविदग्धसहस्रसेव्ये ।

विद्याधिपत्यपरनाम्नि कुले शिवाख्यादार्यापते रविसहस्ररुचिः कुमारः ॥ (3-85)

तिष्ठे प्रयात्यनलशेवधिबाणनेत्रे... (p 19)

(Like a snake-charmer to the puṇḍits who are like serpents extremely egotistic and arrogant, born in the lineage of the name *Vidyādhipati* served by thousands of people, a son was born, of *Āryāpati*, Śiva by name, with a lustre equivalent of a thousand suns). *Vidyādhipati* could mean the name of the family lineage also. And Śaṅkara's father has the name *Śivaguru*; this could mean Śiva's father



too. If it only means that Śiva was born of him, it will not become his name. But even then, from the earlier usages like Śivākhyāt, Śiva-Śarmaṇaḥ (शिवाख्यात्, शिवशर्मणः) etc. (Gu. Ra. 16) we can safely believe that the name Śivaguru is not just *Mādhava*'s imagination. Now, regarding mother's name: in the already cited *śloka*

लाने शुभे शुभयुते सुषुवे कुमारं श्रीपार्वतीव सुखिनी शुभवीक्षिते च ।

जाया सती शिवगुरोर्निजतुङ्गसंस्थे सूर्ये कुजे रविसुते च गुरौ च केन्द्रे ॥

we have the expression 'जाया सती' jāyā satī (Ma. Śam. 2.71). In *Diṇḍimavyākhyāna* we clearly have 'Śivagurorbhāryā satī' 'शिवगुरोर्भार्या सती'. In the *Sadānandīya* (सदानन्दीय) which closely follows *Mādhavīya* we have 'sā satī suṣuve' 'सा सती सुषुवे' (Sham. Vi. Sa. 2.33). We have already mentioned that in *Vyāsācalīya* also we have jāyā satī 'जाया सती' (Vyā. Śam. 4.21). But, may be after seeing that in the above cited *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*, it is mentioned as *Śivākhyādāryāpateḥ* 'शिवाख्यादार्यापतेः', some people might have created an alternate version saying *āryā satī* 'आर्या सती'. In the *śloka* of *Mādhavīya* (Ma. Śam. 2.32) which describes that she is daughter of a puṇḍit by name magha 'मघ', there is no mention of her name. Comparing *Vyāsācalīya*, it seems that both authors agree that her name is 'satī' सती'. In *Vyāsācalīya* it is mentioned 'Vidyādhirāja-makhapaṇḍita-nāmadheyau' 'विद्याधिराजमखपण्डितनामधेयौ; since tamilians pronounce ka, kha क, ख also as ga, gha ग, घ, magha 'मघ' might have originated from makha 'मख'. The grandfather's name has not been given in *Cidvilāsīya*; but since Śivaguru is called as makhī 'मखी' (शिवगुरुर्मखी, Ci. Śam. 6.26) and as yajvā 'यज्वा' (शिवगुरुर्यज्वा, Ci. Śam. 7.1), he seems to be a dīkṣita दीक्षित. The Makhapaṇḍita मखपण्डित too might be a yajñadīkṣita यज्ञदीक्षित. Whatever that may be, we should not forget that the expressions

āryā “आर्या” and satī “सती” could also mean “venerable” and “pious” respectively. Thus, it cannot be concluded whether the names ‘satī, śivaguru, vidyādhirāja’ (सती, शिवगुरु, विद्याधिराज) that are now in vogue of the mother, father and grandfather respectively, are their real names or whether the names given by the authors.

### The story of Śaṅkara’s birth and his Name

24. It is described in the *Mādhavīya* thus: Following the indication of *Satī Devi*, Śivaguru and his wife took to penance, meditating on Śiva for a son. Bathing in a river that was nearby his house, and thriving on roots and tubers, while they were serving Śiva thus, Śiva appeared in a dream in the form of a brahmin (द्विजवेषधारी प्रत्यक्षतां शिवगुरुं गत आत्तनिद्रम्, 2.51) and asked why he took to penance and what he wanted. When Śivaguru said that he was doing this desiring a son, Śiva asked whether he wants one son who is all-knowing and with all-excellence of qualities or, as opposed to this, whether he wants several sons who are long-living and with moderate-qualities. (देवोऽप्यपृच्छदथ तं द्विजं विद्धि सत्यं सर्वज्ञमेवमपि सर्वगुणोपपन्नम् । पुत्रं ददाम्यथ बहून् विपरीतकांस्ते भूर्यायुषस्तनु-गुणानवदह्विजेशः ॥ 2.52). The brahmin replied ‘let him be an all-knowing one’. At this, Śiva said ‘All right, your penance is now over, go home with your wife’. Upon waking up from sleep, Śivaguru narrated his dream to his wife, and she was happy to hear it. The two, thinking of the brahmin in their minds, organized a ceremony to propitiate brahmins, gifted money to them liberally, received their blessings and later partook the residual food themselves. Śiva’s splendour got into that food (भुक्ते प्रविष्टमभवत्किल शैवतेजः ॥ 2.56). Sati Devi became pregnant and gave birth to a son at

an auspicious moment. By reason of making the onlookers happy, or by reason of being born by the grace of Śaṅkara after a long time (2.83), the father named the child as “Śaṅkara (Ma. Śam. 2.46-83).

Similar details are there in the manuscript copy of *Vyāsācalīya*. The *śloka* pertaining to Śivaguru's grief that there was no issue of a child, and in response to it his wife suggesting that 'we take refuge in Śiva; Upamanyu's case is the proof for the fulfilment of all desires from Him' (तत्रोपमन्युमहिमा परमं प्रमाणम् Ma. Śam. 2.48) has been incorporated with a little change after a long description of detail through the second and third chapters (एवं फलप्रदमनीश्वरमीश्वराणामीशं भजाम Vyā. Śam. 4.1). The name of the stream that was near Śivaguru's house has not been mentioned in *Vyāsācalīya*; therefore, the writing that 'there was a stream near his house' (तस्योपधाम किल सन्निहितापगैका) appears natural. But how *Mādhava*'s writing the same 'सन्निहितापगैका' after having said in the beginning of the chapter 'and then Maheśwara, who is an ocean of compassion and who has burnt the God of desire, although self-existent, incarnated in the form of a *līṅgam* in the mountain *Vṛshādri* and on the bank of the river *Pūrṇa*' (ततो महेशः किल केरळेषु श्रीमदृषाद्रौ करुणासमुद्रः । पूर्णानदीपुण्यतटेस्वयम्भूर्लिङ्गात्मनानङ्गधागाविरासीत् ॥ Ma. Śam. 2.1) is justified? Has it been taken from *Vyāsācalīya* into his work without noticing the contradiction? This needs scrutiny.

The details in *Cidvilāsiya* are the following: At the time of promising Brahma that he shall be saving the world, Śiva says 'having carried out sacrifices like *Pounḍarīka* and *Vājapeya*, having acquired mastery in all the *Śāstras*, having seen the meaning of the Upaniṣads, having understood that Brahman, known as Śiva, is the same as everyone's *Ātman*, Śivaguru has taken refuge in Me. Visualizing

the abode of Śiva and Gowri day and night, accompanied by his wife Āryā, forgetting everything else and remembering Me only, he is carrying out hard penance; is worshiping Me who is living in *Vṛṣācala*. This I am told by Saraswati. I shall grant his desire and take birth by name Śaṅkara as his son and move around on earth' (Ci. Śam. 4.37-49). Having said this, Śiva in order to avert the schools of thought that were contrary to *Śruti* and *Smṛti*, to grant a son to Śivaguru who had taken to penance, to save the people who were deluded by the concept of differences, sanctified the scholarship of the Kerala people, and came to *Vṛṣācala* which is famous as the Kailāsa of the South, to show his lilā; there flows the river *Cūrṇi* which is remover of sins like the Gaṅga ... there is the imposing town *Kālaṭi* just as the famous *Alakānagari*... The Lord of *Vṛṣbhācala* appeared before the couple in their dreams in the form of a brahmin and said 'ask for a boon, and I shall grant it'. Out of their devotion they realized that he was the Lord of *Vṛṣācala*, and with folded hands, they narrated their story. Then He asked 'shall I grant you a son of short life but an adept in all *Śāstras*, or several foolish sons who live long?' (ततस्तेनाप्यवादीत्थं सर्वशास्त्रविशारदम् ॥ २१ ॥ दास्यामि पुत्रमेकं वा चिरेतरवयोयुतम् । अथवा सुचिरायुष्कान् बहून् पुत्रांस्तु बालिशान् ॥ २२ ॥). The wife replied, 'what is the use of several foolish sons? Though short-lived, one son who is an adept in *Vedas*, *Vedāṅgas* and the *Tattva* will save our lineage!' 'All right' said Śiva and went away. Thus both of them looked at each other. Having got up in the morning, they came to the conclusion that the Lord *Girijāpati*, the Lord of *Vṛṣācala*, who has granted a son already will make this only son also live long just as he granted long life to Markaṇḍeya, (सुपुत्रं दत्तवानेव वृषाचलकृताश्रयः । चिरायुष्यं करोत्येव

मृकण्डोरिव बालकम् ॥). Thinking that the dream has fulfilled their desire, they concluded praying Śiva, went home, organised a feast to the brahmins, received their blessings, and ate the remnants of the food. In that food entered the Light of Śiva. "Āryambā became pregnant, and during the tenth month of pregnancy, gave birth to a son during an auspicious moment (Ci. Śam. 5.1-13, 37).

This detail also is similar to what we find in *Mādhavīya*. The speciality is that both of them looked at each other there. And both of them narrated their story before Śiva. While pondering on what answer to give when Śiva queried, the wife herself said that a son who is an adept in *Vedas*, *Vedāṅgas* and the *Tattva* is enough (एकोलमयमित्येवमवादीत्सा तथाग्रतः ॥). Her name is *Āryā*, not *Sati*. The name of the river here is *Cūrṇi*, not *Pūrṇa*. (चूर्णी स्रोतस्विनी यत्र गङ्गेवाघौघनाशिनी Ci. Śam. 5-6). It is necessary to add one more thing here regarding this Śaṅkara Vijaya. Already it is stated that the time of Śaṅkara is the same in both *Cidvilāsīya* and *Bṛhacchaṅkaravijaya* (page 17). Fortunately for us, the chapter on the manifestation of Śaṅkara of *Bṛhacchaṅkaravijaya*, famous as authored by Citsukhācārya, is available in its entirety. If we compare this with a parallel chapter of *Cidvilāsīya*, we realize that both are very nearly related to each other. Also this indicates that the *Cidvilāsīya* might have taken up a lot from *Bṛhacchaṅkaravijaya*. For the benefit of the curious and inventive readers, we shall give that chapter in Appendix V. With the help of this, the readers themselves should come to a conclusion.

### Anantānandagiriya Śaṅkara Vijaya

25. The aforesaid details of Śaṅkara Vijayas match to a large extent. All agree that the Ācārya was born in *Kālaḍi* of Kerala. But, the Śaṅkara Vijaya of *Anantānandagiri* differs in the place of birth, parents' names, and in the way in which Śaṅkara's birth took place. This is how it is:

'And then, Śiva, the soul of all, was famous in *Cidambarapuram* by name *Ākāśalinga*. A brahmin by name *Sarvajña* and his wife *Kāmākṣī*, got a daughter by name *Viśiṣṭā* as a result of praying Śiva for long. She was married at the age of eight to a bridegroom by name *Viśwajit*. Though she was serving on him, he left her and went to the forest for penance (तादृशीमपि सन्त्यक्त्वा ययौ विश्वजिदद्भुतम् । अरण्ये तपसे कृत्वा मनोनिश्चयतां गतः ॥). From then onwards, she was praying on Cidambara Maheśwara only. Though that Lord was omnipresent, He appeared to enter the face of that lady; seeing this people who had gathered there were wonderstruck. Having illumined thus, *Viśiṣṭā* became radiant just like Pārvati; honoured by parents and all others, she became pregnant, and the womb grew day by day. The brahmins, considering Cidambara Himself as the sacrificer, conducted purificatory rites as prescribed by Vedas, from the third month of pregnancy. In the tenth month, Mahādeva Himself was born by name Śaṅkarācārya from the womb of *Viśiṣṭā* (Ā.Gi.Śam. 2.8-9). The original *śloka*s are given in Appendix V.

*Anantānandagiri* has called himself a direct disciple of Śaṅkara. Even then, he says that Śaṅkara's mother is *Viśiṣṭā*, father is *Viśwajit* and that maternal grandfather is *Sarvajña*. If this be true, the first

objection that could be raised is how the other writers, leaving these names, could muster enough courage to call Śaṅkara's mother as *Āryambā* or *Satī*, father as *Śivaguru*, and maternal grandfather as *Magha* (or *Makha*). Not only this, he has invented the most unnatural episode that the light of Śiva having entered the face of *Viśiṣṭā* to be cause of fertilization; and has concocted that the onlookers were wonderstruck having seen this phenomenon, probably with an intention of supporting the consequence of her parents honouring her later instead of doubting her character. But how, just by hearing the onlookers, her parents and others believed the story and honoured her? Is it not natural for some to believe and honour her and of some to disbelieve and excommunicate her? Later, this could have caused a blackmark on Śaṅkara's greatness too. Since it has not happened thus, this story is not fit enough to be believed - opines Somanātha Iyer (So. Śam. 32). It appears reasonable. While all others say that the birthplace of the Ācārya is *Kālaḍi*, why this author only says that it is *Cidambaram*? While *Mādhava* and others say that Śiva manifested Himself in the form of *lingam* in *Vṛṣāḍri*, he says that it was in *Cidambaram* in the form of *Ākāśalinga*. This proves that he might have had a special affiliation to *Cidambaram* and nothing else. Later he says that Śaṅkarācārya at the time of leaving his body, sent *Mokṣalingam* through Sureśvarācārya to *Cidambaram* (Ā.Gi.Śam. 73. p1255). This also is an exhibition of his affiliation to *Cidambaram*. Since he has given totally different names to Śaṅkara's parents and birthplace, one has to say that the people of his times and place had a lack of sufficient knowledge of any of these details.

N. Venkaṭarāman (NVSK, pp18, 82-85) says that the detail that

*Anantānandagiri* gives suits the thirty-sixth pontiff of Kāncī Pīṭha tradition, known by names *Dhīraśaṅkara*, *Abhinava Śaṅkara*, and that the pontiff's biography was written by *Vākpati*, the court-poet of Jayāpīṭha, king of Kāśmīr in his work *Śaṅkarendravilāsa*. ' *Abhinava-Śaṅkarācārya* happens to be the son of a *Viśwajit*. When the father died, his young wife too tried to burn herself on the pyre, but since relatives observed the signs of her being pregnant, prevented her from doing so. After nine months of pregnancy, she did not give birth to a child; and when even after one more year she did not deliver, people started doubting that she must have been suffering from some sort of disease. But she gave birth to a child after three years of the demise of her husband; and fearing public criticism, she left the child in a forest. There a tigress, the wife of a ṛṣi by name *Vyāghrapāda*, nourished the child and brought him up. At five, the boy was initiated by the ṛṣi himself into the life of *brahmacarya* and the study of the Vedas. When Vidyāghana was in Cidambaram, Śiva conveyed the greatness of Śaṅkara to him; that is why Vidyāghana crowned him as the pontiff of the Pīṭha'. Venkaṭarāman writes (NVSK p 82) that these details regarding the names of Śaṅkara's parents, how he was born etc. are taken from Vākpatibhaṭṭa's *Śaṅkarendravijayavilāsa* (second chapter). It is said that in the same *Śaṅkarendravijayavilāsa* it is there that *Viśiṣṭādevi* gave birth to this boy during 10th day of month Vṛṣabha of Kali-Samvatsara 3889th Vibhavasamvatsara (788 A.D.).

हायनेऽथ विभवे वृषमासे शुक्लपक्ष दशमीदिनमध्ये ।

शेवधिद्विपदिशानलवर्षे तिष्य एनमुदसोऽष्ट विशिष्टा ॥

Venkaṭarāman says this on the evidence of the commentary of *Ātmabodha*'s *Gururatnamālikā* which contains the following śloka's:



निजतातमृतेः परं प्रकाशे गजगर्भे त्रिशरद्विपच्य कोशे ।

गमयन्तमिवोल्बवासशेषं गणये विश्वजितः सुतं विशेषात् ॥ ६१ ॥

परिवादभयात्प्रसूविसृष्टं विपिने व्याघ्रवधूभिरेव पुष्टम् ।

नवशङ्करमादिमाञ्च धृष्टं नव माध्यन्दिननैव बाल्यशिष्टम् ॥ ६२ ॥

परमभ्रतनोगिरिव शम्भोर्वरविद्याघनविष्टरोपलम्भी ।

अधिकाञ्जिपुरीमठं शुभं भोस्त्यधिकश्चित्त तनोतु ते विदम्भः ॥ ६३ ॥

(In the first *śloka*, it is said that the son of *Viśwajit*, as if to complete the 'balance' of womblife, spent a three-year elephant pregnancy. In the second *śloka*, the upbringing by tigresses and the education given by *Vyāghrapāda* is mentioned. In the third *śloka*, it is told that in accordance with the celestial voice of Śiva he was crowned on the Vidyāghana Piṭha of Kāñci. *Ātmabodha* has implied that he was greater than the three - i.e., greater than Śrī Śaṅkara-Bhagavatpāda, Śrīmad UjjwalaŚaṅkara and MūkaŚaṅkara). It is very necessary that researchers have to decide as to what extent this story is to be believed. According to our opinion, there is no need to say that this is against the time established by the examination of *Sūtrabhāṣya*, i.e., the first century (B.C. or A.D).

Uptill now, we have examined with the belief that what is printed in Telugu script (Ā.Gi.Śam. p8-9) is authored by *Ānandagiri*. In an english article that is included as Appendix in a Sanskrit book Śrī Śaṅkara-Piṭha Tattvadarśana (श्रीशङ्करपीठतत्त्वदर्शन), K. Kuppaswāmaiah, a retired Deputy Collector of Madras, has expressed that this part is not in the ancient manuscript of *Ānandagiri*, and that in those manuscripts the Ācārya is described as having had a natural birth. He says that there are some who are of the opinion that the version available now in print must have been the handiwork of the opponents

of Advaita or of non-conformers of Kāmakoti Pīṭha. We have given that 'ancient version' in Appendix VI. If that be true, Śaṅkara's place of birth would be *Kālaḍi* unanimously; but, unfortunately even that is not free from doubt.

### **Kūṣmāṇḍa Śaṅkara Vijaya**

26. There is a perverted book called *Kūṣmāṇḍa-ŚaṅkaraVijaya*. Bellāve Somanāthaiah has quoted a part of it in his work *Śaṅkaracaritrakālavicāra* (शङ्करचरित्रकालविचार) (p 211) as Appendix I. The essence of it is: Three rivers by names "Iḷa, Marudvṛdhā and Cūrṇā" are flowing in a country called Kerala. On the bank of the river *Cūrṇa* there is the *Padmanābha* (!) temple. There is a pilgrimage spot called *Kālaṭi*. Once *Īśwara* came in the form of a *Bhikshu*, and gave an ash-gourd seed to a devout widow saying: 'sow this in the hole near the bottom of the pillar; when the creeper grows and bears the fruit, it will detach itself; do you not pluck it' and disappeared. As was said, the creeper grew, and the fruit fell by itself from the pillar. There was a child in it. The widow narrated what happened to the people who scolded her and went away. The child was brought up by her, and *Br̥haspati* taught the child all Vedas and *Śāstras*. The boy, Śaṅkara, renounced all *Karmas* and went away to his Guru. After establishing six religious orders, he went to *Vṛṣādrīśa* (!), spent his time in prayer, and left for *Śivaloka*.

Needless to say this is a concocted story. Somanāthaiah says that *ślokas* were added to this again and again and there are several versions. We have not seen the book; but yet for the amusement of curious readers, we have given what *ślokas* could be procured in Ap-

pendix VII. The author, with an intention to make his work more fantastic than that of *Anantānandagiri*, has made Śaṅkara incarnate in an ash-gourd to present him as an *Ayonija* (not born of woman). His geographical knowledge creates river *Cūrṇa* (Pūrṇa?) and on its bank the temple of *Padmanābha*! Whatever that may be, even he had heard that Śaṅkara was born in *Kālaṭi*.

### Legend of Kerala and the Books like *Madhwavijaya*

27. There is a legend in Kerala. When a widow had gone to a Śiva temple alongwith several girls in *Kālaḍi*, some of them prayed for a male child. Along with them this young widow too having prayed, she became pregnant and gave birth to Śaṅkara (NKS, p 14). Whether this story and the *Kūṣmāṇḍa-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* were there before and on their basis the story of *Anantānandagiriya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* was born, or whether that itself was ancient and these story-writers gave spice to the story, no one can say.

On this pretext, the son *Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita* of a disciple of Madhwācārya by name *Trivikrama Paṇḍita*, in his two works *Madhwavijaya* and *Maṇimañjari* has deliberately attempted malicious propaganda of Śaṅkarācārya. Some of his sentences are given in Appendix III. For the present, we bring a *śloka* that he has written in *Madhwavijaya* to the notice of the reader:

यो भूरिवैरो मणिमान् मृतः प्राग् वाग्मी बुभूषुः परितोषितेशः ।

स सङ्कराख्योऽङ्घ्रितलेषु जज्ञे स्पृधा परेष्यासुरिहासुरेन्द्राः ॥

(The demon Maṇimantha who died previously in the hands of *Bhūma*, desirous of becoming an orator, pleased *Īśwara* and to vie with, born in *Kālaḍi* by name Śaṅkara. The other demons too

were born here). The name Śaṅkara, being deliberately written as Saṅkara, only to highlight that he was widow-born, is amply clear in *Maṇimañjari* (6. 6-7) also:

तदेव समयं दैत्यो मणिमानप्यजायत । मनोरथेन महता ब्राह्मण्यां जारतः खलात् ॥

उत्पन्नः सङ्करात्मायं सर्वकर्मबहिष्कृतः । इत्युक्तः स्वजनैर्माता सङ्करेत्याजुहाव तम् ॥

(At the same time *Maṇimantha* was born of a brahmin woman by a wicked paramour. Since the relatives called him exterminated from all the *karmas* because of his mixed caste, the mother named him as *Saṅkara*).

The reason that the author gives for mother naming her child as Saṅkara is surprising. Can any mother name her son so that the name reminds her every moment that she had been a harlot? - evidently the author did not think this way! Be that as it may, this also happens to be a proof for Ācārya's name is Śaṅkara; and his place of birth is Kālaḍi (अङ्घ्रितलेषु). *Baladeva Upādhyāya* mentions that all Kerala people agree that Śaṅkara's mother hailed from a *Nambūdiri* brahmin family by name pajura pannai illam, and that some people of that lineage are found living near Trichur even today (Bala. Śam. p 40). K. R. Venkaṭarāman has written that Śivaguru was a Nambūdiri brahmin of family kaipilli illam, and that Āryamba belonged to Velāpalur or to Palupanai Illam (KRVTTW p 9). But neither gives any evidence in support of their opinion. These families being definitely from Kerala, even from the heresay of Kerala, it becomes established that Śaṅkara hails from Kerala.

### The Evidence of Badari

28. There is one more reason to believe that the Ācārya was from Kerala. The chief priests of Badarīnath (or Paśupatinath) temples are from very long past Nambūdiri brahmins. It is said that the temples were established by Śaṅkara himself. If this be true, it is but natural to believe that with an intention of having the worship done as per scriptural injunctions, Śaṅkara might have brought the priests from his own native. We shall discuss this once again when we take up the Maṭhas established by Śaṅkara.

### Queer practices of the Keralites

29. The original inhabitants of Kerala were all brahmins. Although they were among the *PañcaDrāviḍas*, some of their practices, compared to those of the *Drāviḍas* from elsewhere, are very peculiar. They do not marry during early age. The women have practice of covering themselves fully (*Ghoṣa*); neither they eat what other *Drāviḍa* brahmins have cooked. They are puritans, very much devoted to their husbands. They do not wear gold or silver ornament except on their necks. Men leave a tuft of hair just above their foreheads. Mostly all of them are well-versed in the Vedas, celebrated traditionalists in practices, faithfully carrying out *karmas* as enjoined by the scriptures. Only the eldest son of the family will marry; the others go with Nair women. These people live in their respective gardens in houses called **illam**; each *illam* will have its own temple. Previously they were cutting dead bodies into pieces before burning; now they touch a sword here and there on the body before taking it to the cremation ground. A vast area behind the *illam* would be their cremation ground.

This description is collected from Somanāthiah's book (So. Śam.p 35-36). For the readers' curiosity, we give here the copy of an article in a collection of two letters written by Śrī Śivaprakāśānanda Swāmiji written for *Adhyātmaprakāśa Patrikā* of Jaya Samvatsara (23rd Volume), Vaishāka issue. The Swāmi has written with an intention of conveying one of the strange beliefs and queer practices of which there is so much of heresay.

### *Attangal*

[‘I am on the way to *Kālaḍi* after having *darśan* at Kanyākumāri and Trivendrum (Tiruvananthapuram) Anantapadmanābha. We do not know much regarding the brahmin *sanyāsis* of this *Malayāḷam* area. It is believed that the *sanyāsis* are **ativarṇāshramis** (of self-willed behaviour). Among *sanyāsis* the non-brahmin Malayālis are more in number. They possess lots of medicines, *yantras* and *Mantras*. Because of this, people are afraid of the ochre robe. Here there is no influence of either Śrīṅgeri or Kāmakoṭi Pīṭhas. Only some old timers know the existence of those Maṭhas. Ādya Śaṅkarācārya, the *Loka Guru*, is known to still fewer. *Kālaḍi* is 160 miles (150 miles by short-cut) from Trivendrum. It is really surprising that Śaṅkarācārya, hailing from here, is not famous even among brahmins of this area. Some *Nāḍars* and *Nairs*, accusing Ācārya with **parakāyapraveśam** and ‘*bhagandara roga*’, ask what reason could be there that such a disease can befall on a person of ‘सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म’, ‘करतलभिक्षस्तरुतलवासः’ calibre! Not even a single brahmin *sannyāsi* has come this way. The reason is that the region is hilly and food is difficult to procure. That the Śrīṅgeri Jagadguru had come to Trivendrum is known only to the retired officials of the palace. It appears that only monks who are

free come here and experience the place.

### **Kālaḍi**

**Kālaḍi** is 240 miles from Kanyākumāri via Varkale<sup>1</sup> and Quilon. Kanyākumāri upto Quilon, the 113 miles are westcoast area. Varkale and Quilon are on the seashore. From here there is 140 miles of coastal highway upto Erṇākulam (Cochin harbour). On the way there are mountains, christian and *mapillai* population. Lakes (?) and backwaters prevent easy travel and one has to take a boat to proceed. So we came some 20 miles towards east and travelled 107 miles north to *Kālaḍi* by road.

**Kālaḍi** is 16 miles away from the northern border of Travancore State. From Karṇāṭaka people can come via Jalārpet, Erode, Shoranur; and from Shoranur to *Kālaḍi* road (*Angamāli*) by rail. From there 5 miles towards south is *Kālaḍi*. From your place, one can come by bus via Chāmarājanagar and Coimbatore also.

**Kālaḍi** is in Kunnattanāḍ Taluk in Koṭṭayam Division of Travancore-Cocin State (before the two were joined, in Koṭṭayam District, Kunnattanad Taluk). River *Pūrṇa* flows towards west here. Śrī Śrī Satchidānanda Śivābhinava Nṛsimha Bhārati Swāmiji, who adorned Śringeri Śārādā Pīṭham, from 1866 to 1912 constructed an excellent flight of stone steps, some 30-35 feet down towards this river. And on the bank, he established Śārādā and Śaṅkara temples as well as

---

1. There is a temple for Janārdana swāmi here. Land of high prosperity - blessed earth. Sea lashing against the hill - beautiful place. About 30 feet above, there is a gorgeous temple similar to that in Rangoon, having a *peepal tree* spread large and beautiful on the foreground centre. The beauty of the place is beyond poets' imagination.

*Vrindāvana* for Śaṅkarācārya's mother.

'Before all this construction work and raising temples, this was forest area. Researchers who came in search of Śaṅkara's birthplace found amidst the undergrowth a three-foot wide, six-foot tall shrine in which a tiny lamp was burning. Upon enquiry they were told by the watchman and the priest that Śaṅkara's house was in that very place, and within the compound the Ācārya's mother was cremated; since their forefathers helped during cremation, they were given some 50-60 acres of land, and were told to settle there and worship. We were told that the Government was moved to acquire that area, the watchman was given compensation and land elsewhere, and that two bungalows and 14 modern houses were constructed in that area<sup>1</sup>.

'People say that the Ācārya cut the body of his dead mother into several pieces and placed them onto the funeral pyre, which was constructed using *Areca* and coconut rinds and plantain strips. These were provided by people of *Seeda* caste. Even today, Nam-būdiri (Malayāli) brahmins have no separate cremation ground. They cremate the bodies either in the backyard or in the foreground of their houses, after dropping some plantain strips for the sake of tradition. They will have to wait until *Seeda* volunteers provide the plantain strips. Those very people become the *purohitas* in the rites and provide *til*, *darbhā*, *akṣatā* etc. The funeral rites cannot be performed without them. This caste has also the names "*elayadi*" and "*nambiyādi*". Even now these brahmins touch a sword to the dead

---

1. There is a place called *Ponnar Thodata* some 6 miles west of *Kālaḍi*. There is the house where *Emblica* (*Amalaka*) fruit was given when the Ācārya went there for alms. It is said that the Ācārya sang *Kanakadhāra Stotram* here. Two rich families are there even now - the houses are called "*swarṇattillam*".



body at several places before burning; the traditionalists actually cut; then cover the pieces with plantain strips and drop them into the fire.

‘The Nambūdiris have no *Mantras*. Simple show of signs by hand; touching eyes, ears, and other organs of their body; although they do *ācamana* thrice, they do not recite Keśava, Nārāyaṇa etc. They are of two categories: *Brhaccaraṇa* and *Vaḍama*; the *Vaḍamas* are less respected of the two. The eldest Nambūdiri of the family will always - even while taking *darśan* at a temple and prostrating - hold a hand-made palm umbrella. These people have a *Guru Maṭha* at Trichur. The pontiffs of the Maṭha - *sanyāsis* - do not accept anything from these people; do not allow them even to touch their clothes. Tamilians are there to serve the pontiff. It is said that in Trichur Maṭha itself Śaṅkarācārya had his first education.

‘Śaṅkara was an *yajurvedi* by tradition. The name of his house was **kaipalli illam** (*illam* means house). There are two houses here by name *kāpalli illam* and **taleyāttam palli illam**. It is said that at the time of the passing away of Śaṅkara's mother, since one was standing near her head and another near her feet, these names have come down to their families.

‘The Nambūdiris profess that they are antagonistic to the Ācārya, on the basis of their belief in the heresay that have come down to them: (1) the Ācārya was born after passage of nine months from Śivaguru's demise; (2) although forbidden in Kaliyuga, he became a *sannyāsī*; (3) not only he gave up all the *karmas*, but also he came down heavily on *karmakāṇḍa*; (4) he had been to distant lands; who knows what he ate and from whom! (5) a *paramahamsa* does not

belong to any caste or creed; he has neither injunctions nor prohibitions; he is out of *karma*; (6) Śaṅkara ruled that only the eldest son should have the right to property of the family; and the others should come out of the house to become *sanyāsis*; and (7) he cut the body of his mother himself and performed the cremation.

'Although none of these heresays has any documented evidence, these people continue to believe in them! It is necessary that an incarnation should arrive to dispell all such beliefs from their heads, and to fill up there Śaṅkara's valued philosophy. Here only an adept in *Malayālam* is required. We have to see what great soul would carry out this task. Although I did not know the language, I felt that the words of Śrī Śrī Satchidānanda Saraswati Swāmi "heart will respond to heart" are true. With the help of english, a little musalmāni (urdu) and with an interpreter who knew Telugu, I was able to understand all these'].



## 4. Childhood, Learning and Renunciation in a Hurry

### Precocious child

30. We know only a little regarding Śaṅkara's Childhood. In the *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* it is stated thus: in the first year he learnt his mother-tongue and completed the practice of lettering; in the second year he read the written letters. Then he learnt the meaning of the Purāṇas and the Poetry without an exposition from others. Teaching him was not at all difficult for the teachers; They were teaching lessons to his fellow students as well. At the age when other children were playing in the mud and dust, he learnt all the scripts (Mā. Śam. 4, 1-4). In *Vyāsācalīya* too the same is summarily stated (Vyā. Śam. 4-31). In *Cidvilāsīya* also it is stated that he learnt "Kosha, stotra, kāvya, chandas, alankāra, Gītā, vāditra, nritta etc. within five years of age (Ci. Śam. 6, 36-37). Also in *Anantānandagirīya* (page 1) it is mentioned that he became proficient in *prākṛta*, *Māgadha*, *gīrvāṇa* languages. Hence, all have mentioned that his intellect was very sharp even in his childhood.

### Upanayana

31. All biographers agree that his *Caula*, tonsure ceremony took place in the third year and that *upanayana* was held in the fifth year. But, as already mentioned (p 6), in *Vyāsācalīya* and *Mādhavīya* it is stated that Śivaguru died before the *upanayana* ceremony took place, and that his wife carried out the ceremony with the help of brahmins (Mā. Śam. 4-11,15; Vyā. Śam. 4-32). *Ātmabodha* has

written (Gu. Ra. *śloka* 18) that a *śloka* in Keraliṃ Śaṅkara Vijaya reads ‘पञ्चमाब्दे निजं पुत्रमुपनेतुमना द्विजः । पञ्चत्वमगमत्सद्यः कालो हि दुरतिक्रमः ॥’. But, his exposition (Gu. Ra. *śloka* 18) is that this is not correct, and that Śivaguru died after performing the *upanayana* as mentioned in *Gururatnamālikā*. To show that this opinion of his does not contradict Śivarahasya, Ātmabodha has written that the expression ‘उपनीतस्तथा मात्रा’ can be interpreted as ‘शिवरहस्यवचनस्यापि...मात्रा गुरुकुलं प्रापित इत्यर्थस्य सुवचत्वाच्च’.(Shi.Ra. 16-15), mother sent him to Gurukula. In *Cidvilāsīya* it is stated that, following the sūtra that the boy becomes radiant with *Brahma-lustre* if the *upanayana* is performed in the age of five, desiring to enhance the natural charm of the boy with *Brahma-lustre*, he performed the ‘*upanayana* in the presence of relatives. ‘पञ्चमाब्दोपनीतश्चेत्ब्रह्मवर्चसमृच्छति । इति सूत्रं समालम्ब्य निजतेजः समुज्ज्वलम् ॥ ब्राह्मेन तेजसा भूयोनिर्योक्तुं दुतमैहत । अतनिष्ठोपनीतिं स समस्तैर्बन्धुभिर्युतः ॥’ (Ci. Śam. 7-3,9). Since *Cidvilāsīya* happens to be a recent work compared to *Mādhaviya*, Somanāthiah (So. Śam. p. 40) imagines that Śivaguru must have been no more, before *upanayana* took place. Regarding this, *Gururatnamālikā* mentions that ‘उपनीय दिवंगते स्वताते’ (‘since father passed away after carrying out the *upanayana*’ Gu. Ra. *śloka* 18). In order to uphold this, Ātmabodha cites a statement from *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* saying ‘चौलं कर्म समाप्य चोपनयनं ताते दिवं प्रस्थिते’ and a statement from *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* saying ‘शिवगुरुरुपनीय शङ्कराय निगममशेषमथाध्यजीगपत्तम्’. Therefore, because of *Cidvilāsīya* description, one need not have doubt in this matter; it purports to indicate the existence of two schools of thought, that is all. But descriptive sentences of *Cidvilāsīya* saying ‘अनेहसि महोदारे द्वाविडाचारसम्मतम् । पौरैः स्निग्धैर्विदग्धैश्च वृद्धैर्बन्धुभिरन्वितः । चौलोत्सवमथाकार्षीत् ॥’ (Ci. Śam.6-25,26) with regard to

the caula ceremony, 'द्राविडाचारपासगान्' (Ci. Śam. 7-5) with regard to the *upanayana*, and later, 'पत्युः साध्व्यौध्वदेहिकम् । द्राविडाचारविधिना' (Ci. Śam. 8-9) with regard to the funeral ceremony of Śivaguru, indicate that the rites were held as per the *Drāviḍa* traditions. Somanāthiah (So. Śam. 41) thinks that this indication must have been aimed at dispelling any doubt that the rites were not performed properly since the Ācārya was a keralite or with the cherished idea that Ācārya was a pure *Drāviḍa* - we too feel that this stands to reason. Cidvilāsa seems to be fond of the *Śāstras* and the more recent customs, and that is why he cites from the *smṛthis* and *sūtras* often and attempts to link Ācārya with recent customs; we shall highlight this point as and when occasions arise.

In the Telugu print of the *Ānandagīrīya* it is mentioned 'तृतीये वर्षे चौलकर्म, पञ्चमे वर्षे मौञ्जीबन्धं विध्युक्तिः कुर्वन्ति विप्रौघाः' (the brahmins performed the caula during the third year and the mauñjibandha मौञ्जीबन्ध during the fifth year - Ā. Gi. Śam. p 10). In the ancient version that has been brought out recently, it is stated that 'पञ्चवर्षस्य वर्णादिग्रहणेनास्य धीमतः । उपनीतिमकृत्वैव ममार महितः पिता' (Sham. pi. ta. da. p. 15). But in Appendix VI we have shown that even this ancient work is doubtful. Not only that, in *Suśama* of *Ātmabodha* we come across the sentence आचार्यविजये च 'तृतीये वर्षे चौलकर्म पञ्चमे मौञ्जीबन्धनं विध्युक्तिश्चक्रुर्विप्रौघाः' as cited from *Ācāryavijaya*; even if this work itself is the *Ānandagīrīya*, what was supposed to be ancient would become recent. In the print of *Ānandagīrīya*, while describing the body of the Ācārya it is mentioned 'अर्धेन्दुललाटः, पूर्णेन्दुमुखः ... साक्षाच्चिदम्बरेश इव विराजमानः'. The author *Anantānandagiri* seems to be of the opinion that the Ācārya was born in Cidambaram; if this is correct, the

‘ancient’ version that is published now could be doubted as the work of someone recent. Hence, it appears reasonable to say that the *upanayana* was performed by brahmins in the opinion of *Ānandagiri*.

### **Educational progress**

32. After *upanayana*, the celibate Śaṅkara studied Vedas and Vedānta methodically. His colleagues could not progress in their studies so fast as Śaṅkara. The preceptor too thought how to impart instructions so fast. *Mādhava*, not content with describing that Śaṅkara rose to the level of his preceptor within two or three months (Ma. Śam 4-16,18), wanders freely in the imaginary worlds of poetry:

वेदे ब्रह्मसमस्तदङ्गनिचये गार्ग्योपमस्तत्कथा  
तात्पर्यार्थविवेचने गुरुसमस्तत्कर्मसंवर्णने ।  
आसीत्जैमिनिरेव तद्वचनजप्रोद्बोधकन्धे समो  
व्यासेनैव स मूर्तिमानिव नवो वाणीविलासैर्वृतः ॥ १९ ॥  
आनीक्षिक्यैक्षितन्त्रे परिचितिरतुला कापिले कापि लेभे  
पीतं पातञ्जलाम्भः परमपि विदितं भाट्टघट्टार्थतत्त्वम् ।  
यत्तैः सौख्यं तदन्यान्तरभवदमलाद्वैतविद्यासुखेस्मिन्  
कूपे योर्थः स तीर्थे सुपयसि वितते हन्त नान्तर्भवेत्किम् ॥

‘(Śaṅkara is) equal to Brahma in Vedas, and in Vedāṅgas (he is) Gārgya himself. In the interpretation of the meaning of the Vedas he is equal to Bṛhaspati; and in explaining the Karmas therein (he is) Jaimini himself; In the matter of the knowledge of truth in the Vedic statements, he is equal to Vyāsa himself. His eloquence was as if he were Vyāsa himself born again. He was an adept in logic, unparalleled in the *Tantras*, gained (the knowledge of) *Sāṃkhya* of Kapila, drank the sea of Patañjali’s works, came to know the expositions of Bhaṭṭa

(forgetting that he is going to describe the meeting with Bhaṭṭa later, the poet here has made Bhaṭṭa earlier to Śaṅkara!). The happiness of learning all those *Śāstras* was merged in the pure bliss of Advaita; would not the gain whatever of the well-water be merged in the plentiful waters of a *tīrtha*?' And showering alliterations and figures of speech, he goes on describing the Ācārya.

At this stage, *Anantānandagiri*, after describing the Ācārya to be a Kalpavriksha, the tree that grants all desires [‘षड्दर्शनमूलः, इतिहासस्थानुः, निगमशाखः, षडङ्गपल्लवः, सूत्रपुष्पो, मन्त्रशालाटुः, ज्ञानपक्वफलः, श्रीशङ्करकल्पवृक्ष आसीत्’ (Ā. Śam. p 10)], has retained the same *śloka* mentioned above; but in the last line, after व्यासेनैव, he has changed into ‘मदीय सद्गुरुरसौ श्रीशङ्करार्यः क्षितौ’. If *Ānandagiri* is of an earlier period, we have to say *Mādhava* has taken this *śloka* from him; if not, both of them might have taken it from elsewhere. This *śloka* is not found in *Vyāsācalīya*. Hoping that those who are keen in examining might get some idea, we shall cite another *śloka* from *Anantānandagiri*:

अद्वैतार्णवपूर्णचन्द्रमभिदापद्माटवीभास्करं

विद्वत्कोटिसमर्चिताङ्घ्रियुगलं प्रद्वेषिकक्षानलम् ।

हृद्याबद्धसमस्तवेदजनितप्रोद्यद्विवेकं

परं स्विद्यद्वागमृतं परापरगुरुं श्रीशङ्करं तं भजे ॥

(Ā. Śam. p 10-11)

Here, it appears that some word containing ‘द्य’ or ‘द्व’ has been replaced by ‘श्रीशङ्करं’ in the expression ‘श्रीशङ्करं तं भजे’.

In *Vyāsācalīya*, after stating that Āryāmba had carried out the funeral rites of her husband, it is only mentioned that

सुब्रह्मचर्यमनुरुध्य निजं सवेदमध्यैष्ट वेदमपरं तमनुक्रमेण ।

एवं गुणैः (रोः?) पठितवांश्चतुरोऽपि वेदास्तन्मूलमस्य कथयन्ति यजुःसमाख्यम् ॥ (Vyā. Śam. 4-39).

The author is of the opinion that Śaṅkara, observing celibacy, studied the four Vedas methodically starting with Yajurveda and therefore he belongs to Yajurveda Śākha.

In *Cidvilāsiya*, it is stated that the father himself taught the Vedas after performing *upanayana*; that he taught the *Sūtras* of Jaimini and Vyāsa as well as the Upaniṣads (Ci. Śam. 7-24,25); that the intellect became purified after knowing the inner meaning of Vedānta (ibid., 7-27); that the boy, as if by a long and laborious study, understood the other Śāstras quickly (ibid., 7-28). Before he had to study *Kāmakalā Śāstra*, science of love, - because Śiva and Manmatha are opposed to each other - he concluded that Brahman alone is the truth, everything else is transient; he acquired detachment from all, equanimity towards every living being and got his mind established in Paramātman (ibid., 8-32). According to this author, it seems Śaṅkara had already got an all-knowing proficiency in Vedāntic knowledge!

### **Śaṅkara acquiring Excellence in Knowledge at an Early Age**

33. For those who doubt whether such a proficiency is possible at such a young age, Somanāthiah (So. Śam. p 43-45) has given the examples of several such cases including those of an english boy Kauli, who wrote poems at fifteen, of Turgo, the french royal minister who was a scholar at a very early age, of Thomas Brown of Scotland who outspoke the controversies of Bible stories at the age of four, of the English poet Coleridge who was an adept in spiritualism at the age of sixteen, of Mr. Pitt who became a minister at twenty two, of John Stuart Mill who learnt Greek and other languages at the



age of three, of the boy Heiniker of Lubbeck who could remember and speak everything that was told by others, and of William James Sidis who could lecture on mathematics at the age of eleven. Also there are several such examples in our country. Newspaper *Hitabādi* (207, Mandapur, *Vārāṇasi*) in its Vaiśākha Ekādaśī issue of Bengali year 1315, had reported the extra-ordinary memory of a boy. He had read books in Hindi, Bengali, English, Sanskrit and Pāṇini's grammar within the age of five. We have noted in our diary that he was studying Sāmaveda after *upanayana* at eight, his younger brother was an adept in mathematics at five and that the father of these boys is a Bengali brahmin by name Śrīmadvaṃśadhara Saraswati. Probably we have taken this from the biography *Śaṅkara the Sublime* written by Dharendra Nāth in 1912 and published by the Eastern Publishing Company, Calcutta; because we have made a note of this in our diary. Whatever be the truth of these examples, there is no rule that everyone must have the same intellectual power as every other. This being so, why we should doubt that Śaṅkara became aware of dharma, jñāna and dispassion at an early age? Everything said and done, the *ŚaṅkaraVijayas* are poetic, written in a fit of devotion towards Śaṅkara. So it is natural that they contain exaggerations. But, even looking from the standpoint of our examination of the bhāṣyas of Śaṅkara, we have to accept that Śaṅkara was endowed with an extraordinary and prodigious power of knowledge. This being so, the *tamas*, dullness, elicited by the author of *Maṇimañjari* (Appendix. 3) must have been of a different 'Śaṅkara', and not of Śaṅkara who is well known in the world; to think of such *tamas* in Śaṅkara would be *tamas* in itself.

### Marvels exhibited by Ācārya during childhood

34. There are several marvels ascribed to the Ācārya. Although they appear to be marvellous to us, one cannot say that they are impossible to an adept in Yoga. However, did such happenings really take place? Or, they are just imagined by those with limitless devotion to Ācārya? This has to be decided upon by archaeological investigators; we shall give some of them here:

(1) Once, brahmacāri Śaṅkara went to a poor brahmin's house for begging food along with his friends. The housewife, cursing her fate that she had nothing to give to such a brahmacāri, gave one āmalaka (*emblica* fruit). Śaṅkara, having heard her woeful soliloquy, compassionately prayed to Goddess Lakṣmi to dispel her poverty. Goddess Lakṣmi, pleased with his prayer, exclaimed 'this lady has no righteous deeds of the previous lives that would merit the riches; what shall I give her?' Śaṅkara asked her, 'Mother, now that she has given this *āmalaka* to me; give her the merit of this!' Pleased once again, Lakṣmi showered lots of golden *āmalakas* all over her household (Mā. Śam. 4, 21-31).

This story is not to be found in earlier ŚaṅkaraVijayas like *Vyāsācalīya*. The author must have concocted this, having in mind the famous Kanakadhārāstava ascribed to Śaṅkara. We have given the same in Appendix VIII for the benefit of the readers.

(2) Śaṅkara returned home to serve his mother, after completing his residence in the house of his preceptor, in his seventh year itself. His old mother Āryāmba once swooned in the hot sun when she had been to the river. Śaṅkara, with the help of people, brought her home

and nursed her.

Then he prayed the river goddess with pleasing poems; pleased with him, the river goddess blessed him saying 'tomorrow morning your heart's desire would be fulfilled'. Next day itself the river flow had come upto the Kṛṣṇa Mandir (Mā. Śam. 5, 5-9). This story is to be found in *Vyāsācalīya* also:

अद्यापि केरळजनाः समुदीरयन्ति

स्रोतस्विनीं बहुजलां विधुतौघपुञ्जाम् ।

अम्बापगेति यदि यं तनयेन मातुः

सौख्यार्थमात्मनिलयान्तिकगां व्यधत् ॥

(Vyā. Śam. 4-41).

It is said that people of Kerala call this river as Ambānadi (Mother's river). That the *śloka* 'अम्बार्थं यदि यं नीता तटिनी सद्मसन्निधिम्, अम्बातरङ्गिणीत्येव कथ्यतेऽद्यापि सा खलु' is to be found in *Cidvilāsīya*, and that there is an adoration called 'Mahāpagāstava' composed by Śaṅkara, a footnote is mentioned in *Bhagavatpādābhyudaya* (p. 29) on the basis of *Samkṣepa-Śaṅkara-Digvijaya*. In the *Cidvilāsīya* that we have there is no mention of changing the course of the river; instead of that, there is a story stating that 'the Ācārya blessed Śivaguru with realization at the time of his demise; seeing Śiva everywhere, and concentrating his mind on the Ātman, Śivaguru passed away' (Ci. Śam. 8. 3,4).

(3) The king of Kerala sent word through his minister, his wish to see this boy of superhuman deeds. The Ācārya refused to go and meet the king, giving up his Āśrama Dharma. Wondering at this, the king himself came to him, and prostrated before him with an offering of ten thousand golden coins. He showed the three dramas written by him and got his appreciation; and expressed his wish to have a worthy son. The Ācārya told him, 'please give this money in charity to the

householders; your desire shall be fulfilled'. Many learned in Vedas and *Śāstras* came to the Ācārya to learn the great *darśanas* (Mā. Śam. 5. 10-32). This is not found in the other ŚaṅkaraVijayas.

In *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*, there is a *śloka*

इत्याचार्यकुलं विसृज्य जननीमाप्ताष्टमाब्दः स्वयं

प्राप्तः संयमवाञ्छया व्यरचयत्तन्त्रं किमप्यञ्जसा ।

चूर्णमन्तिकमानिनाय जननीधाम्नः स्वराजः प्रभोः

किं वा दुष्करमत्र सर्वजगतीजालक्रियाशीलिनः ॥ (*Sushamā* of Gu. Ra. 11)

'After the age of eight, leaving the preceptor's place (he) came to where his mother was, and, desirous of Sannyāsa, adopted a plan and made the *Cūrṇi* river to flow near his mother's house. What shall be difficult to the Lord who is the creator of the universe?'

So, the story of changing the course of the river is there from the beginning. Even now we see rivers changing their courses with time. May be that the river had changed its course at the time of Śaṅkara's return to his home.

### Agastya revealing Śaṅkara's lifespan

35. The Ācārya did not spend much time living with his mother. He expressed his desire to get into *Sannyāsāśrama* as early as possible. This is described by both *Vyāsācala* (Vyā. Śam. 4-42) and *Mādhava* (Mā. Śam. 5-34) in one *śloka*:

सा शङ्करस्य शरणं स च तज्जनन्या ह्यन्योन्ययोगविरहस्त्वनयोरसह्यः ।

नो वोढुमिच्छति तथाप्यमनुष्यभावान्मेरुं गतः किमभिवाञ्छति दुष्प्रदेशम् ॥

'She is the refuge for Śaṅkara, and he is the refuge to the mother; they could not live separated from each other. But the superhuman being that he was, he did not desire to marry. Will he who has got

to the top of the mountain Meru desire to come down to the low levels?" Along with this, *Mādhava* has added another assumption. The mother was indicating that she wanted to get her son married to a girl of a good lineage. Once "Upamanyu, Dadhici, Gautama, Tritala, Agastya and other ṛṣis came to see Lord Śiva Incarnate of this Kaliyuga. Śaṅkara, along with his mother, welcomed, seated and hosted them properly. As they were talking to him about spiritual matters, the mother asked them 'if it be permissible, please let me know about this boy of extraordinary greatness'. They told her about Śivaguru getting the boon from Śiva of an all-knowing son, but of a short lifespan. Agastya told her, 'It is your fortune Lord Śiva Himself has taken birth as your son, and where can you find another all-knowing one?' When she asked 'How long shall he live? What is his lifespan?', Agastya replied, 'eight, and another eight; and by some other reason, he will live for another sixteen years!' Then the ṛṣis departed. Hearing this, when she started wailing, Śaṅkara tried to console her with the words: 'Mother, why you are distressed without reason? Is this body everlasting? How many such children have you experienced till now? Where are they now? Where are you and where am I? Just as travellers join at a place and depart after some time, people join at one place in *saṁsāra*. Therefore, I shall venture to get rid of this binding of *saṁsāra* by way of accepting the fourth stage of life'. Hearing these words which were harsh to hear, her distress increased. She started bawling 'my dear, please give up this thinking. First become a householder and perform the sacrifices; then you can become a monk. You are my only son; how can I live without you? If you too go away, who is there to carry out my funeral

rites? How is that your heart has no compassion? Please be kind to me'. Seeing this, Śaṅkara started thinking within himself 'Mother's permission is necessary for taking *Sannyāsa*. What shall I do now?' (Mā. Śam. 5. 36-59).

This detail is not to be found either in *Vyāsācalīya* or in *Cidvilāsiya*. The points to be considered for discussion here are the following:

(1) That Śaṅkara's mother thought of getting her son married at an early age was against the practice in Kerala. Child marriage was not in vogue in that part of the country. The author describes that 'at the time of completion of his studies, when Śivaguru, the son of Vidyādhiraṇṇa, was told by his preceptor "go get married and fulfill the desire of your parents", Śivaguru exhibits eagerness of taking *Sannyāsa* (Mā. Śam. 2. 8-14). And when Śivaguru returns home, several people compete with each other to give their daughter in marriage to him (Mā. Śam. 2. 27-32). This detail is there in *Vyāsācalīya* also. We cannot understand why these two authors have not taken into consideration the practice that was there in Kerala. *Cidvilāsiya* even goes to the extent to describe that Śivaguru himself had thought of the marriage of his son, and that the Ācārya thought within himself 'Alas! he does not understand the principle thought that is there in me; he does not even know that my lifespan is short; what shall I do!' (Ci. Śam. 7. 35-46). And Śaṅkara was only five-year old at that time!

(2) *Mādhava* writes that the mother asked the ṛṣis 'what would be the life-span of this boy?' when they arrived. But both *Mādhava* and *Vyāsācala* write that 'when the child was born, Śivaguru did not pose this question to the astrologers who wrote the *jātaka*; they also did not volunteer to tell; the wise do not mention bad things although

they come to know of them' (नापृच्छ जीवितमनेन च तैर्न चोक्तं प्रायो विदन्नपि न वक्त्यशुभं शुभज्ञः ॥ Mā. Śam. 2. 80; Vyā. Śam. 4. 26). *Mādhava*, fond of fantasies, who writes here that the mother asked *Agastya* about the life-span of the child, does not mention why the astrologers were not asked about the same earlier.

### The occasion of renouncing in a hurry

36. Once, when Śaṅkara had been to the river for taking bath, a crocodile caught his foot. The boy started loudly crying 'mother, a crocodile is pulling my foot!' The mother, who was at her home, hearing this cry of pain, came running. Having known what has happened, thought 'alas! even this son, my last refuge, is dying. What shall I do?' Śaṅkara said, 'mother, if you permit me to take *Sannyāsa*, this animal might give up its attempt. If you permit, I shall resolve to take the vow of *Sannyāsa*!' Then, thinking that 'anyhow he is dying; in case if he lives thus, at least I might have his *darśan* in future', she gave her consent for his *Sannyāsa* (Mā. Śam. 5. 61-67; Vyā. Śam. 4. 44-48).

The story runs in the same way in *Cidvilāsīya* but with an additional description. Immediately after Ācārya taking the vow of *Sannyāsa*, the crocodile left him and changed to the form of a Gandharva. Saluting the Ācārya, he went away saying, 'I am a *Gandharva* by name Puṣparatha. Since I did not obey the orders of Brahma, I was cursed by him to become a crocodile. When I apologized and prayed for excuse, he said "Śiva is going to be born as Śaṅkarācārya; your curse will be nullified when you touch the dust on his feet". Accordingly, I am liberated through your grace; if you permit, I shall proceed to heaven'. Āryāmba, having seen all this from the shore, was wonderstruck and

overjoyed; and she could not talk at all (Ci. Śam. 8. 22-32). This is not an imagination of Cidvilāsa; earlier author of *Prācīnaśaṅkara-vijaya* also has said the same (in the *śloka* cited on page \*66). He has said there ‘संयमवाञ्छया व्यरचयत्तन्त्रं किमप्यञ्जसा’ - desirous of *Sannyāsa*, he adopted a plan; he describes it in a further *śloka* as follows:

स्नानायेव गतोऽवगाहनविधौ ग्राहग्रहार्तिं पदे मात्रे

काञ्चिदिवोपदर्श्य मधुरं लब्ध्वाभ्यनुज्ञां ततः ।

प्रेषोच्चारणपूर्वकं सनियमं जग्राह दृष्टान्तरो नक्रः

सोऽप्यमुचत् (?) स्वशापविकृतिं पादावमर्शात्प्रभोः ॥

Having gone there as if for taking bath in the river and showing that he was distressed by the crocodile bite, thereby having obtained mother's permission delicately, and using the favourable occasion, chanted the *Praīṣa* and took the vow of *Sannyāsa*. The crocodile too, having touched the foot of Śaṅkara, got rid of its form due to the curse - is the meaning of the *śloka*.

It is true that there are crocodiles in the river *Pūrṇa* (or *Cūrṇi*). At the time when the Jagadguru of Śrīṅgeri, Śrī Satchidānanda Śivābhinava Nrisimha Bhārati established a Śaṅkara temple at *Kālaḍi*, the author of the present book also had gone there. Although it was summer, boats were rowing to and from on the *Pūrṇa* river. There was a commotion among people, caused by a news that a crocodile caught the planquin-bearer of the Swāmi of Śivaganga Maṭha. Hence, crocodile catching the foot of Śaṅkara is not to be regarded as improbable. That it happened when Śaṅkara was eight years old is agreed upon in all the *ŚaṅkaraVijayas*. The Ācārya, in several of his *Bhāṣyas*, has cited the authority of *Jābālaśruti* for those with detachment are permitted to take to *Sannyāsa* directly from



the stage of celibacy. Great as he was, it is not a wonder that he had detachment at such an early celibate age. But, it is true that all and sundry would not have such detachment.

### **Doubts and Reconciliations on the subject of Sannyāsa**

37. Do *Śāstras* permit *Sannyāsa*? Even if they permit, is it not true that some *Smṛtis* mention that it is prohibited in Kali Yuga? Even if it can somehow be proved that it is permitted by *Śāstras*, considering present situation, is it social justice to encourage beggary, fearing the world and giving up one's duties, instead of working for the good of the world? If in the name of *Sādhus* and *Sannyāsis* the number of lazy and lethargic people goes on increasing, would it not be detrimental to social development? How can one agree to the practice of taking *Sannyāsa* at an age when one's wisdom is not yet ripe? It is natural that such doubts rise in the minds of the readers. Although it would not be within the scope of the present book, we consider it necessary to give an outline of our opinion and hence we shall briefly discuss the same here.

Is *Sannyāsa* enjoined by the scriptures? Is it not forbidden in Kali Yuga? We shall discuss this question in the chapter dealing with the dialogue between Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana Miśra. We only mention here that it is according to the *Śāstras* in our opinion. Is it proper to hide oneself under *Sannyāsa* fearing the worldly duties? Our answer to this question is that those who have realized the futility of what is believed to be worldly life, would prefer a better way of life, if such be available, and surely give up worldly life. Whether their action is agreed upon by others or not, it is clear that those who have detach-

ment to worldly life, would never disregard their chosen ideal of life.

All thinking people should agree that compared to those who, without minding about the good of the world, are engaged only in planning the upkeep of their families, opportunities of working for the good of the world would be plenty for the detached, who regard that the whole world is their family as per the dictum वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्. Beggary is not to be promoted instead of striving to earn money - this objection is not at all applicable to those that are genuinely detached from family life. If one is working for the good of the world without caring for the self, and is living only on alms, it becomes the bounden duty of the society to provide him at least that much. Such people would not have taken to that life considering that it is effortless. Whether food is available or not, whether it be tasty or not, if one be contented with what one gets, always thinking one's chosen high ideal and attempting to bring people on to the right way of life, it is not reasonable to suppose that such people promote beggary. Even if one is not useful to others in any way from worldly point of view, living alone and dedicating one's life for the liberation of oneself, even such people are not to be blamed as promoters of beggary since their peace-bearing exemplifies to the whole world. That society would be at stake is beyond question if people increase in number who imitate the garb and the outward activities of *Sādhus* and *Sannyāsis* devoted to spiritual life without understanding their psychological level. There is no need to mention that refraining from respecting such mock *Sādhu* hypocrites should be the duty of society at large. When they come to know that the society disregards them, they are bound to give up their hypocrisy and change their garb.

If the government organises avenues for the people of the country by according job to one and all that suits each one physically and psychologically, the number of such fake *Sādhus* decreases. The *Smṛtis* prescribe that if unqualified people take *Sannyāsa*, the king should penalize them and adopt to free manual labour. Hence, forgetting that the responsibility of not allowing the number of lazy and lethargic to rise lies with themselves, disparaging the *Sādhus* with genuine detachment and failing to facilitate their work would be sinful on the part of both the government and society at large.

Now let us consider *Sannyāsa* “at very young age”. Since *Sannyāsa* is a special action connected with genuine detachment, when it should be undertaken cannot be prescribed externally by others. ‘यदहरेव विरजेत् तदहरेव प्रव्रजेत्’ (when one feels detached, then one must move out from one’s home) says the *Śruti*. Hence, young celebrates with detachment becoming mendicant monks is not against the scriptures. But, it appears to us that, just because the boys are celebrate, forcefully making them *Sannyāsis* is against the scriptures. This has to be carefully considered and decided by the adepts who can analyse what is proper and what is not.

It need not be emphasised that this brief discussion that we have made is only to convince the modern critics of the matters concerning *Śāstras*, and not with an intention of examining the *Sannyāsa* of superhumans like the Ācārya. The whole world knows the great good that has been effected by the Ācārya, and it is clear that, obviously, we are in no way qualified to pass a word of judgement on that matter.



## 5. Vedānta Study at the Feet of Govinda Bhagavatpāda

### Śaṅkara's Assurance to His Mother

38. Thus, after renouncing the world mentally, the Ācārya came to the shore and, with great devotion to his mother, addressed her 'Mother, please tell me what I have to do now. As a monk, I shall certainly do whatever is permissible; I shall not hesitate. These relatives who are going to take charge of my ancestral property will certainly provide you food, clothing and shelter; likewise, they will look after you if you fall sick. Since they have taken my father's earnings, and because of the fear as to what people may think of, they will definitely carry out your funeral rites also. Therefore, you do not have to fear for anything'. Hearing this, the mother said, 'My child, in the anxiety of saving you from the jaws of the crocodile, I agreed to your *Sannyāsa*; you ought to come to carry out my funeral rites when I die. Otherwise, what is the use of my giving birth to you, tell me?' Śaṅkara replied, 'Mother, whether it be day or night, when you by your own accord or by being tormented by diseases think of me, then at that time I shall give up everything and come to you; and I shall carry out your funeral rites too. Please do not think 'that this boy has left me uncared for and took to *Sannyāsa*' and consoled her. Then, he told the relatives 'I am going to distant country to lead a Sannyāsin's life; I am handing over the care of my mother to you' and wiped the tears of his mother (Mā. Śam. 5. 67-74). In *Vyāsācalīya* too it is the same (Vyā. Śam. 4. 48-55); but it is mentioned there that 'the mother, after permitting her

son's *Sannyāsa*, swooned as a result of intense feeling of sorrow; the Ācārya came and nursed her appropriately' (Vyā. Śam. 4. 48). This is the one speciality there.

### **Reinstalling the Kṛṣṇa Idol and the Ācārya leaving Home**

39. Śaṅkarācārya had earlier changed the course of the river towards his home; now the river had come near to the Kṛṣṇa Temple. Lord Kṛṣṇa, through a celestial voice, asked Śaṅkara thus: 'My child, you brought the river near for the sake of your mother; now its waves have caused crumbling of the walls of my temple and are touching me. Now you too are going; what is your consolation to me?' Śaṅkara carried that Kṛṣṇa Idol on his shoulders and re-installed it at a place where there is no danger from water. Thus, after taking permission from both Kṛṣṇa and mother, Śaṅkara proceeded to take up *Sannyāsa* in the manner prescribed in the scriptures (Mā. Śam. 5. 75-80; Vyā. Śam. 4. 58-61).

There is no mention of the Kṛṣṇa Idol in *Cidvilāsīya*. Here it is mentioned very briefly thus: immediately after coming to the shore of the *Cūrṇi* river, Śaṅkara sought permission of his mother for his departure. 'Stay at home and always pray to the Lord. Know that I shall come to you whenever you think of me' - telling thus and prostrating before her, he left for methodical *Sannyāsa* (Ci. Śam. 8. 34-37).

### **Meeting Govinda Bhagavatpāda and Śaṅkara's adoration of him**

40. *Mādhava* has described that the Ācārya, by this time, had all the qualifications for spiritual *sādhana* (Mā. Śam. 5. 82-86). The Ācārya, looking at the forest, rivers, towns, mountains, villages, people and

animals on the way, was thinking that 'just as a magician showing his magic, Brahman shows all this in this way!' (Mā. Śam. 5. 87). Travelling 'with a single staff, and wearing ochre robes', found out by the signs of the Āśrama, located the place where Govinda Bhagavatpāda lived<sup>1</sup>. Seeing a narrow opening of the cave, and hearing people say that this is the cave of Govinda Deśika, Śaṅkara prostrated before the door itself praising thus (Mā. Śam. 5. 88-93):

पर्यङ्कतां भजति यः पतगेन्द्रकेतोः पादाङ्गदत्वमथवा परमेश्वरस्य ।

तस्यैव मूर्ध्नि धृतसाब्धिमहीध्रभूमेः शेषस्य विग्रहमशेषमहं नमामि ॥ ५. ९४ ॥

I salute Thee, the personification of Śeṣa, who is bearing this earth consisting of the seas and mountains, verily the bed of the *Garuḍa*-bannered One, or the anklet of Parameśwara.

दृष्ट्वा पुरा निजसहस्रमुखीमभीषुरन्तेवसन्त इति तामपहाय शान्तः ।

एकाननेन भुवि यस्त्ववतीर्य शिष्यानन्वग्रहीन्ननु स एव पतञ्जलिस्त्वम् ॥ ५. ९५ ॥

Are you not Patañjali, who, in ancient times, when your disciples were terrified seeing your thousand-headed form, gave up that form, assumed a peaceful single-headed form and blessed them?

उरगपतिमुखादधीत्य साक्षात्स्वयमवनेर्विवरं प्रविश्य येन ।

प्रकटितमचलातटे स योगं जगदुपकारपरेण शब्दभाष्यम् ॥ ५. ९६ ॥

तमखिलगुणपूर्णं व्यासपुत्रस्य शिष्यादधिगतपरमार्थं गौडपादान्महर्षेः ।

अधिजिगमिषुरेष ब्रह्मसंस्थामहं त्वां प्रसृमरमहिमानं प्रापमेकान्तभक्त्या ॥ ५. ९७ ॥

I have come to thee with an intention of learning the way to become established in Brahman, full of all good qualities, who has known the Ultimate Goal from Maharṣi Gauḍapāda, the disciple

1. Śrī Kṛiṣṇaswāmi Iyer (Śre. Śam. p 9) says that *Acyuta* appeared in Śaṅkara's dream and directed him to take methodical *Sannyāsa* from Govinda Bhagavatpāda. We do not know what evidence he has for this! He says that chanting *Acyutāṣṭakam*, the Ācārya started from *Kālaḍi*.

of Śuka, and who has entered the netherland and learnt from Śeṣa Himself in order to bring to light Yogaśāstra and Vyākaraṇabhāṣya for the good of the world !

The readers should note that in the above *śloka*s Govinda Bhagavatpāda has been described as the incarnation of Ādiśeṣa, as Patañjali who wrote Yogaśāstra and Vyākaraṇaśāstra, and as the disciple of Śrī Gauḍapāda who was the disciple of Śuka. In *Vyāsācalīya* too it is the same:

शुश्राव तस्य निकटे किल शास्त्रजालं

यश्चाशृणोद्भुजगसद्भगतस्त्वनन्तात् ।

शब्दाम्बुराशिमखिलं समयं निधाय

यश्चाखिलानि भुवनानि बिभर्ति मूर्ध्नाम् ॥

(Vyā. Śam. 4. 64)

It is mentioned here that (Śaṅkara) learnt all the *Śāstras* sitting near that Govinda, who is bearing this whole earth on his head, and who with oath had learnt all the philological disciplines in the netherland. There is no mention of Yoga.

In *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*, in the *śloka*

गोविन्दमाश्रयदहीन्द्रमहावतारमारुतुषारकरदेहभुवस्तटिन्याः ।

(अप्यात्मजेन गळितात्मभवाभिमानेनाराधितं च हरिणा नियमं श्रितेन ॥)

it is mentioned that Govinda Bhagavatpāda who was residing on the shore of river Narmadā was the incarnation of Ādiśeṣa. (we have not translated the part in parentheses into Kannaḍa here, but are going to mention the same shortly).

In *Gururatnamālikā*, it is mentioned that

हरितल्पहराङ्घ्रिनूपुरक्ष्मा । धरसौमित्रिबलात्रिपुत्रलक्ष्मा ।

जयतादुपरेवमात्तधर्मा । जयगोविन्दमुनिः स चन्द्रनामा ॥

Victory unto 'Jayagovindamuni' who was living in an Āśrama on the shore of the river Revā, and who had the forms such as the bed of Viṣṇu, the anklet of Śiva, the bearer of Earth, Lakshmaṇa, Balarāma, Patañjali! The same opinion is implied in the 94th śloka that we have cited from Mā. Śam. above. The original source of this opinion could be *Patañjalicarita* or some other work.

### **Govinda Bhagavatpāda's name as Candra**

41. It is mentioned in Gururatnamālikā that Govinda Bhagavatpāda is also called as *Candra*. N. Venkaṭarāman (NVSN, p 24) writes that there is a story in *Patañjalicarita* of *Rāmabhadradīkṣita* depicting the relation between Gauḍapāda and this Candra. The summary of that story is as follows:

Once Patañjali was teaching Mahābhāṣya to his disciples, sitting behind a screen. The disciples, with an intention of finding out the secret of teaching so many simultaneously, lifted the screen and saw the thousand-headed and two-thousand-tongued Ādiśeṣa Himself. For violating his word and for exhibiting unnecessary curiosity, he angrily looked at them, and by that poisonous fire, all those disciples were burnt down to ashes. One who had been elsewhere at that time (this one was Gauḍapāda) came and begged pardon. For the mistake of having been elsewhere while the lesson was being taught, he was cursed to become a Brahmarākṣasa. The Guru also told that the curse will be functional till such time that he gets a suitable candidate to learn Vyākaraṇa (see Mā. Śam. 5. 95)<sup>1</sup>. Patañjali then left this

---

1. Opinions within parentheses are ours. We have modified some of them as per the commentary on Gururatnamālikā śloka 10.



world. That disciple who survived became Brahmarākṣasa, and the great teacher of Mahābhāṣya. He was eating away those disciples who, when asked ‘what is the form when the root *pac* पच् is suffixed with *niṣṭhā* निष्ठा?’ gave the answer *pacitam* पचितम्. At last one disciple answered with *pakvam* पक्वम्; and he was taken as fit enough to learn Mahābhāṣya.

That disciple was a brahmin from Ujjayini, by name Candra. The disciple of Patañjali taught the entire Mahābhāṣya to him. Candra used to write his notes on the leaves of the banian tree on which the Brahmarākṣasa lived. Finally bundling all of them in a cloth, he came to Ujjayini. Later he married four wives belonging to the four castes. He begot four children from those wives, by names Vararuci, Vikrama, Bhaṭṭi and Bhartṛhari respectively. Among these children, Bhartṛhari became a highly proficient scholar; having learnt the entire Mahābhāṣya from Candra, he was famed as a great grammarian. But because of his excessive ego, his book extending to a lakh and a quarter *ślokas* was destroyed [it seems he is the same Hari who has been mentioned in the half-*śloka* of *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* (kept in parentheses) starting as अप्यात्मजेन cited above].

The disciple of Patañjali thus being rid of the curse, approached Śuka, the son of Vyāsa, took *Sannyāsa* from him and remained in the Himālayas. He liberated an eminent Buddhist by name Ayarcyā from that religion, who was being served by the Śākya king Prākṛti of Takṣaśila and others, and also by Aparāntya yogis by name Apalūnya, Dāmiśa and the like. And then he gave *Sannyāsa* to Candra who approached him, and gave him the name Govinda. He was teaching Advaita to all of them (Mā. Śam. 96-97 - in these *ślokas*, this meaning

might have been considered).

From the above mentioned story, we will have to say that a myth that Govind *Bhagavatpāda* was an incarnation of Śeṣa, and that he is the same grammarian by name Candra was somehow in vogue even in earlier times, and that *Mādhava* too has followed the same in his work. This story is not to be found in *Vyāsācalīya*. *Ātmabodha* writes (Gu. Ra. *śloka* 10 - हरिमिश्रीय, गौडपादोल्लास, पतञ्जलिविजयादिषु निरूप्यमाणा कथा) that this detail could be found in Harimiśrīya, Gauḍapādollāsa, Pa-tañjalivijaya etc.

### Govinda Bhagavatpāda's name as Jayagovinda

42. In the *śloka* from Gururatnamālikā that we have cited above, there is the adjective 'जयगोविन्दमुनिः'. It is said that in *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* the following mention is there about this:

सततं निगदन् रसेन योऽसौ जयगोविन्द जयेति सूक्तिमेकाम् ।

श्रितमौनमभूद्य (द्यतो वि)वादे जयगोविन्दमुनिं तदाहुरेनम् ॥

It means that he is called as Jayagovinda, since he was always muttering 'Jaya Govinda Jaya!' and used to keep silent during argument. (What is the fate of the story that the name Govinda was given by Gauḍapāda?) In the next *śloka* of Gururatnamālikā (*śloka* 12) it is mentioned that the disciple of Govinda is 'Hari'. And *Ātmabodha*'s commentary says 'चन्द्रशर्मण एव सुता भर्तृहरिविक्रमभट्टिवररुचयः इति वृद्धः'. With this, it is also mentioned that 'हरिः भर्तृप्रपञ्चः । वाक्यपदीयादि महाप्रबन्धनिर्माता इति यावत् ।'. We will have to think that Bhartṛprapañca is written instead of Bhartṛhari; otherwise, we will have to say that *Ātmabodha* was not aware of the existence of a Vedāntin by name Bhartṛprapañca of Bhedābheda school of thought.

### Mythical stories about Govinda Bhagavatpāda

43. In the stories hitherto mentioned, Patañjali the pioneer of Yogaśāstra, Patañjali the commentator of Vyākaraṇa and Govinda Bhagavatpāda considered as one and the same, be only an act of courtesy and there is no evidence to consider them as the names of the same individual, or as the names of contemporaries. Since Patañjali the commentator has described Pāṇini's grammar in great detail, someone must have admired him as Ādiśeṣa Himself; and later it seems the story must have grown in imagination.

Not only this, as per the proverb 'stories do not possess legs', describing Vyāsa and Śuka who belong to Dvāpara Yuga to be Advaitins earlier to Gauḍapāda also belongs to imaginative kingdom - it may not mean Gauḍapāda to be a direct disciple of Śuka. Since he was dispassionate and always in close introspection of Brahman like the famous Śuka, someone must have earlier described him as Śuka's disciple, and that must have later led to the belief that he was actually a direct disciple of Śuka. If it not be so, we will have to imagine, quite improbably, that the Gauḍapāda of Śuka's time had been living till the time of Govinda Bhagavatpāda. May be to indicate that this is not improbable, *Mādhava* has used the adjective Maharshi ('गौडपादान्महर्षेः' Mā. Śam. 5. 97).

Another aspect has to be considered here. There is no historical evidence to say that Govinda Bhagavatpāda and the grammarian Candrāśarma are one and the same, and to imagine Vararuci, Vikrama, Bhaṭṭi and Bhartṛhari are contemporaries. It is mentioned (NVSK, p. 27) in *Rājatarāṅgiṇi* (l. 176) that Candra brought the *Vyākaraṇa*

*Mahābhāṣya* to Kāśmīr in the time of Abhimanyu. This might have led somebody to imagine that he too is Patañjali. Somanāthiah writes (So. Śam. p. 60) "It is evident from the coins of that time that this Abhimanyu must have lived around the year 3141 from the commencement of Kali Yuga. If this be true, Bhaṭṭi and Bhartṛhari are separated by at least 300 years. And none of these two seems to have been at Ujjayini or under patronage of Vikramāditya". Not only that, Bhaṭṭi the author of *Bhaṭṭikāvya* has clearly mentioned that he has composed that *kāvya* while Śrīdharaśena was ruling at Valabhi! (काव्यमिदं विहितं मया वलभ्यां श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रपालितायाम् - Bhaṭṭi. 22-34).

Somanāthiah seems to support the possibility of Govinda Bhikshu who wrote *Rasaḥṛdayatantra* (रसहृदयतन्त्र) could be the same as Govinda Bhagavatpāda. That while explaining *Raseśvaradarśana* रसेश्वरदर्शन in his *Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha* (सर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्रह), *Mādhavācārya* has used respectful adjectives like 'गोविन्दभगवत्पादाचार्यैरपि', 'तदुक्तमाचार्यैः' etc.; and that in his work *Raseśwarasiddhānta* (रसेश्वरसिद्धान्त) he has considered Govinda Bhagavatpādācārya among the line of *Rasa-siddhas* are resonant with that imagination:

देवाः केचिन्महेशाद्याः दैत्याः काव्यपुरस्सराः

मुनयो वालखिल्याद्या नृपाः सोमेश्वरादयः ।

गोविन्दभगवत्पादाचार्यो गोविन्दनायकः

चर्पटः कपिलो व्याळिः कापालिः कन्दलायनः ॥

It seems the *Rasasiddha* Govinda Bhikshu was rewarded by *Mādana Nṛpati*, the king of *Kirāta* region, born in the *Haihaya* lineage. That *Mādana Deva* too, it seems, was an adept in *Rasa Vāda*. It might be that *Kāmadeva* of *Haihaya* lineage himself is this king *Mādana*; and as per the statement in *Śiva-Śakti-Saṅgamatantra*

(शिवशक्तिसङ्गमतन्त्र) saying ‘तप्तकुण्डं समारभ्य रामक्षेत्रान्तरं शिवे । किरातदेशो विज्ञेयो विन्ध्यशैलेवतिष्ठते’ too, the Kirātadeśa is an area near the Vindhya mountain range. The Mālava country and in that Ujjayini are located north of this Vindhya mountain range, and to the south, there flows the river Narmadā. So, if we regard Govinda Bhikshu to be the same as Govinda Bhagavatpāda, it means that he must have lived in Mālava country, and that after taking Sannyāsa he must have been in penance at the shore of Narmadā which is nearby. This is, in summary, the argument of Somanāthiah (So. Śam. p. 63).

There is no doubt that all this is just imaginary. Just because there is the name Govinda Bhagavatpādācārya in the lineage of Rasa siddhas, there is no evidence to say that he is the same as the present Govinda Bhagavatpāda. How advaitins are included among the Rasa siddhas? Is there any evidence that those siddhas, verily, were the disciples of Gauḍapāda? Since the siddha lineage mentioned includes Govinda Nāyaka too (Govindabhagavatpādācārya Govindanāyakaḥ) (गोविन्दभगवत्पादाचार्यो गोविन्दनायकः), it could be that the name Govinda is taken by several Rasa siddhas. *Mādhava* writing in his sarvadarśanasāṅgraha, ‘govindabhagavatpādairapi’ सर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्रह, ‘गोविन्दभगवत्पादैरपि’ might as well indicate the methodology of rasatantra रसतन्त्र traditionalists. We see the same way of referring to the earlier teachers of the respective *darśanas* in Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha सर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्रह. Just because of that, what evidence is there to conclude that *Mādhavācārya* on his own accord has used those respectful adjectives? Not only that, in the expression ‘Govindabhagavatpādācārya Govindanāyakaḥ’ ‘गोविन्दभगवत्पादाचार्यो गोविन्दनायकः’, instead of thinking that *Mādhavācārya* has accorded the

singular honour of naming Govinda Bhikshu as 'bhagavatpādācārya' 'भगवत्पादाचार्य', is it not more reasonable to think that there could have been a Rasa Siddha by name Govinda Bhagavatpādācārya? Such series of objections could be raised.

Similarly, we feel that the reason for *Mādhava* to think that Govinda Bhagavatpāda was practising yoga in a very narrow cave with a narrower entrance (Mā. Śam. 5. 92) is just the adjective to his name 'Govindayogīndram' 'गोविन्दयोगीन्द्रम्' in the praise of the lineage of teachers that runs as Nārāyaṇaṁ Padmabhuvam 'नारायणं पद्मभुवं...!'

In *Cidvilāśya*, it is just written that Śaṅkara, after consoling his mother, with an intention of taking *Sannyāsa* methodically, went in search of an apt *Guru*, and finally came to Badari, where Lord Viṣṇu was engaged in penance (Ci. Śam. 8. 36-38). No other author has referred to Badari. It seems that Cidvilāsa, keeping in view the legend that Gauḍapāda and Bādarāyaṇa were in Badari, might have transferred Govinda Bhagavatpāda there.

Hence, no one seems to know the history of Govinda Bhagavatpāda just as that of Gauḍapāda. It appears that all are just exercising in wild imaginations. Summarily, there seems to be no dispute regarding the Ācārya becoming the disciple of Govinda Bhagavatpāda.

### **The Dialogue between Govinda Bhagavatpāda and Śaṅkara**

44. Now let us listen to the story further. Having approached Govinda Bhagavatpāda, Śaṅkara praised him, and when he awoke from *Samādhi* and asked 'who are you?', Śaṅkara replies:

स्वामिन्नहं न पृथिवी न जलं न तेजो

न स्पर्शनो न गगनं न च तद्गुणा वा ।

नापीन्द्रियाण्यपि तु विद्धि ततोऽवशिष्टो

यः केवलोऽस्ति परमः स शिवोऽहमस्मि ॥

(Mā. Śam. 5. 99)

‘I am not the earth, water, fire, air, or space; neither their qualities; nor the sense organs. Please know that the Supreme Śiva that remains after excluding all of them is what I am’. It appears that *Mādhavācārya* might have written this *śloka*, keeping in mind the *śloka* in *Nirvāṇa-Daśakastotram* (निर्वाणदशकस्तोत्रम्) of Śaṅkara that states ‘न भूमिर्न तोयं न तेजो न वायुर्न खं नेन्द्रियं वा न तेषां समूहः । अनैकान्तिकत्वात्सुषुप्त्यैकसिद्धस्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥’. We do not know how it is appropriate for a person having come in search of a Guru as an inquirer of Vedānta for taking methodical *Sannyāsa* to have mentioned the conclusion of Vedānta thus.

In *Cidvilāsiya*, it is stated thus: Śaṅkara went to Badari and saw the lustrously shining Govinda Bhagavatpāda who was performing penance. Wondering just as a digger desirous of the magic unguent and searching for the valuable herb but found a great treasure of gold, soliloquizing ‘could this be Vasiṣṭha, Śuka or Kaśyapa who has incarnated just to initiate me? Or, they say that Vyāsa lives here, and this could be just Vyāsa himself. Whoever he may be, lustrous like the Sun as he is, let me take *Sannyāsa* methodically from him’ (Chi. Śam. 8. 47-52). Then Govinda Bhagavatpāda, finding Śaṅkara prostrating before him after circumambulation, enquired him, ‘who are you? wherefrom have you come? where do you belong? what is your name? which country you come from? since how many days have you been here? why have you come here?’ Śaṅkara replied in a normal and

natural manner, 'I belong to Kerala, born as the son of Śivaguru at *Kālaḍi*. Since my father passed away during my childhood, my mother brought me up. I have studied the scriptures to some extent. Since a crocodile caught my foot in the river, I decided to take *Sannyāsa* at that moment. Searching for a Guru who would initiate me methodically into *Sannyāsa*, I have come to you. Pray you initiate me into *Sannyāsa* and fulfil my desire' (Ci. Śam. 9. 10-13).

That the purpose of "Mādhavācārya was to convey that although Śaṅkara was the incarnation of Śiva and had already known Vedānta, just to keep tradition in vogue he undertook to live with the Guru in order to set an example for others, is clear. Because, he has written in the next *śloka* that 'स प्राह, शङ्कर, स शङ्कर एव साक्षाज्जातस्त्वमित्यहमवैमि समाधिदृष्ट्या' (I am aware, beholding in samādhi, that you are verily Lord Śaṅkara).

### Ācārya accepts Sannyāsa

45. Govinda Bhagavatpāda stretched his feet out from the small opening of that cave; and Śaṅkara, to exemplify right conduct, worshipped those feet; pleasing the Guru by service etc., following the tradition, he prayed for instructions regarding Brahmatattva. Pleased by the service offered by Śaṅkara, that great ascetic Govinda, instructed him "You yourself are Brahman" using mahāvākyas chosen from the four Vedas (चतुर्भिर्वेदशेखर-वचोभिः). Sensitive as he was, Śaṅkarācārya learnt all the secrets of *Śāstras* from the compassionate Guru. In *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* it is written that Vyāsa the son of Parāśara and Satyavati, his son the Śukamuni, his disciple Gauḍapāda, and his disciple Govinda Bhagavatpāda - this is the lineage of the gurus; and



Śaṅkara heard (the secrets of *Śāstras*) from Govinda Bhagavatpāda of this lineage. (Mā. Śam. 5. 101-106). The last two *śloka*s here of *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* commencing with ‘व्यासः पराशरसुतः’ and ‘शुश्राव तस्य निकटे’ are also found in *Vyāsācalīya* also (Vyā. Śam. 4. 63,64), but no more details. In the half-*śloka* saying ‘श्रीशङ्करोऽष्टसमश्चतुरोऽपि वेदान् । स द्वादशे सकलशास्त्रकलामवाप’ (Vyā. Śam. 9. 65), it is mentioned that Śaṅkara was only twelve years old at that time.

The description in *Cidvilāsīya* is thus: observing that this boy is possessing qualities like इहामुत्रार्थफलत्याग (giving up the fruitions of this world and the other world), नित्यानित्यविवेक (discrimination to know what is transitory and what is everlasting), शमादिगुणसम्पत्ति (having qualities of self-control and the like), मुमुक्षुत्व (having desire for liberation), अनालस्य (not having laziness), देहाभिमानाभाव (not having attachment to body), एषणात्रयराहित्य (not having the three mundane desires), and deciding that he is fit for *Sannyāsa*, (the Guru Govinda Bhagavatpāda) called him near, and after he prostrated, affectionately embraced him, took him on the lap and instructed him into lofty upanishadic expressions like तत्त्वमसि, into the secrets of daily meditation followed by those desiring liberation, into the practices mentioned in *Viśveśa Smṛti* for the *Sannyāsins*, taught the essence of the scriptures and methodically initiated him to *Sannyāsa*. And he gave commandments like “realizing the truth of ‘I am Paramātmān’, see oneness everywhere. Do not talk about the other mundane aspects; do not look at women; consider son, friend, garments, treasure of money and grains, gems, mud, stone, firewood to be equal; give up violence, overeating or starvation, falsehood, acceptance of gifts, jealousy, honour or dishonor; be liberated while living and treat the

body like a burnt garment; be in possession of a loin cloth, a string round the waist, a staff and a waterpot. Be wearing ochre robe or fibre cloth; never be in one city, and never accept alms in only one house. The monk who gives up what is good for him and just lives on alms and starts collecting money will be censured. Be always aware that you are Brahman that is without qualities, stains or features and move around happily” (Ci. Śam. 9. 14-28). When Śaṅkara enquired with interest the lineages of gurus, he said ‘Śiva the Lord of all learning taught Viṣṇu; then by Viṣṇu to Brahmā; Brahmā to Vasiṣṭha, Vasiṣṭha to Śakti; Śakti to Parāśara, Parāśara to Vyāsa; Vyāsa to Śuka, and Śuka to Gauḍapāda this has been taught; and Gauḍapāda is my Guru’. Thus Gauḍapāda has been lauded upon (Ci. Śam. 9. 36-48).

### **An Inquiry about Ācārya’s Sannyāsa**

46. Now there are several things that are to be discussed by way of comparison of the three ŚaṅkaraVijayas:

First of all, the author *Mādhava* who wrote that the Ācārya, when caught by the crocodile, mentally took *Sannyāsa* (संन्यसनं मनसा व्यधात् Mā. Śam. 5. 67), says that while approaching Govinda Bhagavatpāda he was wearing staff and ochre robe (दण्डान्वितेन धृतरागनवाम्बरेण Mā. Śam. 5. 90). When did this wearing the staff and the ochre robe happen? *Mādhava* has only said that the Guru ‘initiated into the four mahākāvyas’, (Mā. Śam. 5. 103) and has not said anything about the rites performed. Does he imply that that initiation itself is the methodical *Sannyāsa*? In *Cidvilāsiya*, it is stated that Śaṅkara went in search of a Guru for getting the *Sannyāsa* in the established manner. (क्रमसंन्यासोपलब्धये Ci. Śam. 8. 37); and that Govinda Bha-

gavatpāda gave methodical *Sannyāsa* (दत्त्वा क्रमसंन्यासम् Ci. Śam. 9. 20) and then initiated him into *Tattva*. Since he has used the word *Kramasannyāsam* क्रमसंन्यासम् again and again, we have to guess that Cidvilāsa who is fond of rites and ceremonies, did that intentionally. Since he has said that the Guru instructed him to wear the loin cloth, string around the waist, staff, water-pot and ochre robe (कौपीनं कटिसूत्रं च धत्स्व दण्डकमण्डलू । काषायं वल्कलं वापि Ci. Śam. 6. 25), it appears that the Ācārya took to wearing those after the methodical *Sannyāsa*. But Śāṅkara Bhagavatpāda, while writing about the subject matter of *Sannyāsa* in *Chāndogyopaniṣad Bhāṣya* says ‘the expression ब्रह्मसंस्थ is befitting only to a paramahamsa who has renounced all karmas and the apparatus therein, and who is beyond the four stages of life. Because it is said in the *Śruti* that the result is chiefly liberation and immortality. Thus, this only is true renunciation (*pārvirājya*) according to Vedas, and not the acceptance of the sacred thread, the staff and the water-pot’ (‘ब्रह्मसंस्थशब्दो निवृत्तसर्वकर्मतत्साधनपरिव्राडेकविषये अत्याश्रमिणि परमहंसाख्ये वृत्त इह भवितुमर्हति । मुख्यामृतत्वफलश्रवणात् । अतश्च इदमेवैकं वेदोक्तं पारिव्राज्यम् । न यज्ञोपवीतत्रिदण्डकमण्डल्लादिपरिग्रहः’ Cham. Bhā. 2. 23. 1). There he has cited a *Smṛti* which implies that a monk should be without the signs depicting the stage of life. There is no doubt that the “*Sannyāsa*” given by Govinda Bhagavatpāda is Paramahamsa-Pārvirājya. As a rule, the expression ‘Paramahamsa parivrajakācārya’ ‘परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्य’ appears at the end of every work of his. Was he possessing insignia like the staff and the ochre robe? Recent writings depict possession of staff is optional for the Paramahamsa *Sannyāsis*. Paramahamsas of the present age observe a rite called ‘Daṇḍatarpaṇa’ (दण्डतर्पण); also some of them tie to the staff a cloth showing printed

insignia. Is this as per *Śruti* or *Smṛti*? In none of the *Smṛtis* we find a mention regarding this! In the *Viśveśwara Smṛti* cited by Cidvilāsa it is stated that the insignia are traditional<sup>1</sup>; but there also we do not find mention about ‘दण्डतर्पण’. As stated in *Sūtrabhāṣya* (3. 2. 20), if renouncing the rites and the accessories, having control of the mind and body, and concentrating on Brahman is to be a Paramahamsa, how is that as a rule the daṇḍa and daṇḍatarpaṇa accrue to him? If possession of staff etc. is optional, could it be taken as a sign of Paramahamsa? Scholars should think over about this.

### Discussion on the Mahāvākyas

47. Secondly, it is mentioned in *Mādhavīya* that Govinda Bhagavatpāda initiated Śaṅkarācārya into the four *Mahāvākyas* (चतुर्भिर्वेदशिखरचोभिः); in *Cidvilāsīya*, it is mentioned that he gave divine expressions like Tat Twam Asi (महावाक्यानि दिव्यानि तत्त्वमस्यादिकान्यपि Ci. Śam. 9. 18). What are these “Mahāvākyas”? If they are sentences expressing the identity of Jīva and Brahman, on what grounds they are stipulated to be only four in number? Is there any rule in *Śrutis* or *Smṛtis* that these are to be initiated into at the time of taking *Sannyāsa*? Viśveśwara cited by Cidvilāsa is not an author of a *Smṛti*; hence his prescription of initiation into the *Mahāvākyas* etc. are to be tallied with *Smṛtis* before and authenticated. From the Upaniṣadic expression ‘ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति’ it is established that meditation of *Om̐kara* is of prime importance to a *Sannyāsi*. This being so, giving up this direct instruction of *Śruti* that it (*om̐kara*) is to be meditated upon, to be in-

1. Since *Viśveśwara Smṛti* is a recent composition, Cidvilāsa too must be of recent times. One can use this as a tool to decide his time.

quired into as the means of liberation, how initiation into *Mahāvākyas* is to be regarded as appropriate? It is true that *Śukarahasyopaniṣad* upholds this; but there is not much evidence that it is held by all to be an authoritative scripture. On the basis of this Upaniṣad, it is mentioned in *Bhagavatpādābhyudaya* of Lakṣmaṇa Sūri that the Ācārya was initiated into the four *Mahāvākyas* with appropriate Dhyāna and Nyāsa procedure. (‘इति प्रशस्य भगवान् संन्यासं तस्य मानसम् । कर्मणा विशदीकृत्य महावाक्यचतुष्टयम् । उपादिशद्यतीन्द्राय ध्यानन्यासादिपूर्वकम् ॥’ Bhā. A. 3. 84-85). Śaṅkara has not regarded this Upaniṣad anywhere in his works as an authority. The *Mahāvākyas* are considered as such because they summarize the Brahman-Ātman identity which the respective Upaniṣads primarily teach, and not because they are holy syllables (*Mantras*) for the purpose of repetition (*Japa*). The Ācārya vehemently reiterates in his commentaries that the moment the meaning of the Vedāntic sentence is comprehended, all things to be done come to an end instantaneously (वाक्यार्थज्ञानसमकाल एव तु पर्यवसितो भवति । Mum. Bhā. 1.1.6). Hence to initiate one into the *Mahāvākyas* using them as *Mantras* or to use them for *Japa* would be contradicting the very Vedāntic conclusion of Śaṅkarācārya. Because, the Ācārya in his commentary on *Samanvayādhikaraṇa* (of Brahmasūtras) has declared that these vākyas just teach the Brahman-Ātman identity and that is the end of it; they do not convey Brahman as a residue of a vedic injunction. The expression *Mahāvākya* itself is not to be found anywhere in Śaṅkara Bhāṣyas<sup>1</sup>. Hence, one has to examine whether

1. It is observed that some people have changed the expression ‘वेदान्तमहाभेर्या तत्कर्णमूले ताडयमानायाम्’ (Aitareya Bhāṣya 1.3) into ‘वेदान्तमहावाक्यभेर्या तत्कर्णमूले ताडयमानायाम्’ because of their attachment to the *Mahāvākyas*. But that version is

Govinda Bhagavatpāda initiated the Ācārya into the *Mahāvākyas*.

### Hitch in the preceptor-lineage of Govinda Bhagavatpāda

48. Thirdly, while mentioning the preceptor-lineage in both *Mādhavīya* and *Vyāsācalīya*, only four - Vyāsa, Śuka, Gauḍapāda and Govinda Bhagavatpāda - are mentioned ('व्यासः पराशरसुतः... Ma. Śam. 5.1.5). But in *Cidvilāsīya* Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahma, Vasiṣṭha, Śakti, Parāśara are also added in the beginning. Those who follow the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha tradition in this country recite 'नारायणं पद्मभुवं वसिष्ठं शक्तिं च तत्पुत्रपराशरं च । व्यासं शुक्रं गौडपदं महान्तं गोविन्दयोगीन्द्रमथास्य शिष्यम्', keeping Narāyaṇa in the beginning. This very sentence is there in *Anantānandagīrīya* (Ā. Śam. Chapter 60, p 224)<sup>1</sup>. Why poet *Mādhava* has omitted the preceptors in the lineage upto Parāśara? Why he has not taken Śiva etc. present in *Cidvilāsīya*, in the *śloka* that commences with *Narāyaṇa*? This is also to be examined here. In the Śaṅkarābhyudaya-kāvya of Nīlakaṇṭha Śāstry also, it commences from *Narāyaṇa* ('हरिधातृवसिष्ठशक्तितत्तनयव्यासशुकैः सगौडपादैः । गुरुभिर्गमितां परम्परं परविद्यां महतीमवाप सः' Śam. A. 2.50). Nowadays some of the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha traditionalists have been reciting 'सदाशिवसमार्म्भां शङ्कराचार्यमध्यमाम् । अस्मदाचार्यपर्यन्तां वन्दे गुरुपरम्पराम् ॥'. On the whole, the question whether the Advaita tradition started from Sadāśiva or *Narāyaṇa* has become a hitch.

---

not acceptable by all.

1. Of late, *Anantānandagīrīya* in Devanāgarī script has been found. In this, the reference is Chapter 62, p 191. Hereafterwards the reference to this edition will be indicated as 'De'.

### Did Śaṅkarācārya learn Yoga from his Guru?

49. Fourthly, the matter to be considered here is whether Govinda Bhagavatpāda, famed as 'Govinda Yogindra', taught Śaṅkara Yoga or not. We have already given the hitches in believing him to be a Rasa Siddha (p \*82). It is not clear anywhere with whom Śaṅkara practised Yoga. Although he has rejected Yoga darśana in योगप्रत्युक्त्यधिकरणभाष्य, he has written that to whatsoever extent Sāṃkhya, Yoga etc. are not contradictory to the Vedas, he is happy with them (येन त्वंशेन न विरुध्येते तेनेष्टमेव साङ्ख्ययोगस्मृत्योः सावकाशत्वम् Sū. Bhā. 2.1.3). Elsewhere he writes that one cannot deny outrightly the *Smṛtis* stating that Yoga can beget Siddhis like Anima etc. (योगोप्यणिमाद्यैश्वर्य-प्राप्तिफलो स्मर्यमाणो न शक्यते साहसमात्रेण प्रत्याख्यातुम् Sū. Bhā. 1.3.34). And in Śaṅkara Vijayas the Ācārya's Yogic powers have been described. This being so, and although Govinda Bhagavatpāda has been described as an incarnation of Patañjali the originator of Yoga, why it is not mentioned that Śaṅkara learnt Yoga from him? This too is to be examined.

That Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda might have learnt Yoga from this Guru is evident from an amazing incident depicted in *Mādhavīya*. When the Ācārya was serving his Guru the rainy season was onset, and once the rainfall continued five days with a downpour of the size of an elephant trunk. Floodwater uprooted even trees; people were afraid what would happen. As the Guru Govinda Bhagavatpāda was in Samādhi, Śaṅkara could not communicate with him; he just put his waterpot before the flood, when all the floodwaters disappeared into it (Mā. Śam. 5. 135-159). The Guru, coming out of his Samādhi, was happy that his disciple had become an adept in Yoga so quickly

(योगसिद्धिमचिरादयमापेत्यभ्यपद्यततरां परितोषम् Mā. Śam. 5. 139). Although it is true that the story is so marvellous that the common man cannot believe in it, this enables us say that Śaṅkara learnt Yoga from his Guru (in poet *Mādhava's* opinion). We have already described the *Mādhavīya* depiction of the strange story of causing a downpour of golden āmalakas ; the other ŚaṅkaraVijayas seem not to lend support to this story.

### What is the Method of Vedānta taught by Govinda Bhagavatpāda

50. Lastly, we will have to consider an important aspect which has not been discussed in any ŚaṅkaraVijaya. What method of Vedānta that Śaṅkara was taught into by Govinda Bhagavatpāda? Did he mention the shortcomings of contemporary methods or those of earlier times? This is quite important because, if this is determined, it helps to decide upon the true form of the method of Vedānta that we have today in Ācārya's commentaries. We see the concluding sentences indicating Ācārya's name prefixed with 'श्रीगोविन्दभगवत्पूज्यपादशिष्य' in all his commentaries on *Prasthānatraya*. Although this is indicative of the Ācārya's devotion to Govinda Bhagavatpāda, it is difficult to decide whether this is written by Ācārya himself or by others. Fortunately, there is a *śloka* at the end of his commentary on माण्डूक्योपनिषत्कारिका acknowledging the benefaction of his Guru:

यत्प्रज्ञालोकभासा प्रतिहतिमगमत् स्वान्तमोहान्धकारो  
मज्जोन्मज्जच्च घरे ह्यसकृदुपजनोदन्वति त्रासने मे ।  
यत्पादावाश्रितानां श्रुतिशमविनयप्राप्तिरग्राह्या ह्यमोघा  
तत्पादौ पावनीयौ भवभयविनुदौ सर्वभावैर्नमस्ये ॥



Through the light of whose illumined intellect the darkness of delusion in my heart was dispelled, in me who was immersed in the fearful ocean of the birth-and-death cycle of *saṁsāra*, taking shelter at the feet of whom one would get unfailingly the knowledge of *Śruti*, self-control and humility, to the holy feet of him that would dispell the fear of *saṁsāra* do I offer obeisance from the whole of my being, is the meaning of this *śloka*. We may conclude on this basis that Govinda Bhagavatpāda was not only the Guru who initiated into methodical *San̥nyāsa*, but also the one who initiated the Ācārya into *Brahmavidyā*, the one who dispelled the fear of *saṁsāra* due to avidyā, bestowing liberating knowledge, and the one who instilled the qualities like self-control and humility that are characteristic of those established in Brahman. This being so, since there is no other evidence to indicate what extraordinary method of Vedānta Govinda Bhagavatpāda introduced the Ācārya into, we will have to guess the same only from the presently available bhāṣyas of Ācārya.

### **Guru's command to Śaṅkara to write Bhāṣyas.**

51. After the rainy season, it appears that the Guru beakoned his prime disciple Śaṅkarācārya near and said: 'Great souls, after having spent the rainy season being engaged in *dhāraṇa*, *dhyāna* and *samādhi* are now moving about and making the world blessed. So, you too now travel upto *Vārāṇasi*. Let me tell you a story Vyāsa had told me earlier. While Maharṣi Atri was performing *Satrayāga* in the Himālayas, I appealed to Vyāsa, "You have classified the Vedas into four, composed *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas, wrote *yogabhāṣya*, and authored the *Brahmasūtra*. But people comment variously upon

these *Sūtras* taking their meaning differently. Therefore you have to write a commentary on them". He said "a disciple who could contain the floods of the river in a water-pot would come to you in future. He will refute all the wrong theories". Now you seem to me to be that disciple; so, you go to Vārāṇasi. Thus Śaṅkara who wanted to remain there serving the Guru, was persuaded to go to *Vārāṇasi* (Mā. Śam. 5. 151-163). This story is not to be found in *Vyāsācalīya*. There it is just mentioned that Śaṅkara, leaving Govinda Bhagavatpāda, went to Badari ('तीर्थानि सेवितुमनाः स ययावुदीचीम् । काष्ठां क्षणेन बदरीं मुनिसङ्घजुष्टाम् ॥' Vyā. Śam. 4. 66). Therefore, this must be an imagination of the poet *Mādhava*.

*Mādhava*, in the same chapter, says that Govinda Bhagavatpāda had learnt by beholding in samādhi that Śiva Himself has incarnated as Śaṅkara (Mā. Śam. 5. 100); the same person telling now that he learnt Śaṅkara's greatness from Vyāsa appears not proper to us. People of our country commonly believe that Vyāsa the author of *Mahābhārata* etc. himself composed the *Brahmasūtras*. But, as Śaṅkara consistently addresses the author of the *Sūtras* as Bādarāyaṇa, and since he has not said anywhere that he is the author of *Mahābhārata* etc., nowadays researchers are of the opinion that Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa and Bādarāyaṇa Vyāsa are different, and not the same. And it is quaint and surprising that *Mādhava* refers to 'Brahmasūtra' in singular number. It is customary to refer to them as 'Vedānta Sūtras'; the Ācārya refers to them as *Śārīraka Mīmāṃsā* and as *Vedānta Mīmāṃsā*. Although it is true that there were several Sūtra commentators earlier to Śaṅkara, we are going to show later that there were none that *Mādhava* had in mind.

Since it would elicit interest for the readers, we feel that it is apt to point out from *Cidvilāsīya*, what Govinda Bhagavatpāda had said about Gauḍapāda on this occasion of Śaṅkara getting the command of his Guru. After the Guru instructed him on the essence of philosophy, Śaṅkara asked him to 'please tell about the lineage of Gurus' (Ci. Śam. 9. 34). Then the Guru told him the lineage from Īśwara to Gauḍapāda. 'That Bhagavān Gauḍapāda is my Guru. He is verily Brahmā with two arms. A knower of the essence of Vedas and Vedānta, he is the author of all the *Smṛtis*; and he has studied the *Jaimini Sūtras* thrice with meaning. He knows the purport of the divine Upaniṣads; also the essence and meaning of *Pāraśarīya Sūtras*. Having got the nectar of Advaita by churning the sea of scriptures with the churning rod of reasoning, he is roaming about as a *Jīvanmukta*. Why tell more and more? Verily he is Śiva Himself, incarnated to protect people who are confused by bad schools of thought ('नगजाजानिरेव सः'). Such great souls are moving around only to remove confusions of the world'. We do not know on what basis Cidvilāsa has written these several adjectives. It seems the author is of the opinion that Gauḍapāda has an eternal life, and is still roaming about.

Now let us listen to what the Guru had told Śaṅkara. 'My dear disciple, you are intelligent and have learnt all the *darśanas*. Not knowing their meaning, people variously comment upon *Pāraśarīya Sūtras*, the ten Upaniṣads, *Gītā*, *Sahasranāma* and *Rudrādhyāya*. You write commentary on them from Advaitic standpoint'. Having said this, he gave the idols of Candramouliśwara and Ratnagarbha Gaṇapati which had come through the lineage from Śiva Himself (इत्युक्त्वा चन्द्रमौलीशं रत्नगर्भं गणाधिपम् । शिवात्क्रमादिहायातं ददौ तस्मै स देशिकः ॥'

Ci. Śam. 9. 49-52).

It is now clear that the Ācārya had reached a stage from wherein on the basis of his knowledge of Vedānta he could dispell the ignorance of people. *Mādhava* has written that the Guru instructed Śaṅkara to write commentary mainly on the *Brahma Sūtras*; Cidvilāsa says that he instructed Śaṅkara to write 'Advaitic' commentaries on the *Sūtras*, *Gītā* and the like. Seeing this, one would get an impression that there were no Advaitic commentaries upto that time; we are going to make it clear that such an impression is uncalled for. Is the Ācārya the author of commentaries on the *Sahasranāma* and *Rudrādhyāya*? We are going to discuss on this also at a proper occasion later.

### About Candramouliśwara Liṅga

52. Another question poses itself at this juncture. The story that 'Govinda Bhagavatpāda gave Candramouliśwara liṅga and Ratnagarbha Ganapati which had come from Śiva through lineage to Śaṅkarācārya' is to be found only in *Cidvilāsīya*, and not in *Mādhavīya*. People regard *Mādhavīya* as conforming to the tradition of Śringeri Maṭha; but why these matters are not found in it? And even today Candramouliśwara liṅga and Ratnagarbha Ganapati are being worshipped at Śringeri Maṭha! This is one doubt.

There is another doubt too. In *Śivarahasya* we find the *śloka* wherein it is stated that Śiva Himself brought from Kailāsa to Śaṅkarācārya five liṅgas:

त्वदर्थे कैलासाचलवरसुपालीगतमहा-  
समुद्यच्चन्द्राभं स्फटिकधवलं लिङ्गकुलकम् ।  
समानीतं सोमोद्यतविमलमौल्यर्चय परं

कलौ लिङ्गार्चायां भवति हि विमुक्तिः परतरा ॥

and there is no scope there for the story that Govinda Bhagavatpāda got it through lineage. Also there is no mention there about Ratnagarbha Gaṇapati.

Another confusing matter is there. In essence, what Śrī Kumāra Mādhava P. S. Śrīkanṭha Śāstry, who has carried out research on how the Candramouliśwara liṅga came to Śrīṅgeri, writes is: Śrī Satchidānanda Bhārati Swamiji, who was the pontiff of Śrīṅgeri, got *Guruvamśa kāvya* written by Kāśi Lakṣmaṇa Śāstry, a contemporary scholar at Śrīṅgeri Maṭha. In the third chapter of that, there is a *śloka* in the context when Śrī Śaṅkarācārya made Sureswarācārya the pontiff<sup>1</sup> of Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha and started to proceed to *Kāñci*:

श्रीचन्द्रमौलीश्वरलिङ्गमस्मै सद्रत्नगर्भं गणनायकं च ।

स विश्वरूपाय सुसिद्धदत्तं दत्त्वा न्यगादीच्चिरमर्चयेति ॥

He gave Ratnagarbha Gaṇapati and Candramouliśwara got from siddhas to Viśwarūpa, and instructed him to be worshipping them always. This is the meaning of the *śloka*. It is said that in a commentary said to have been written by the same author there is an explanation 'Revaṇasiddhamahāyogidattam' 'रेवणसिद्धमहायोगिदत्तम्' for that! And on the basis of this, one by name Paṇḍita Kāśinātha Śāstry is said to have written in the introduction of the book with justification that Reṇukācārya gave the liṅgam to Śaṅkarācārya! Reviewing all this, Śrīkanṭha Śāstry has argued that Reṇukācārya and Śaṅkarācārya are not contemporaries, and that *Guru vamśa kāvya* is not at all an authoritative work (श्रीचन्द्रमौलीश्वरलिङ्गादिविचारप्रचार, p 19). With the

1. We shall discuss this controversial issue again when we write about the Maṭhas later.

consent of the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha, he has taken *Śivarahasya* as the authority and has cited the same *śloka* cited by us above as evidence. He has interpreted that all the five liṅgas given by Śiva have the same name Candramouliśwara. If this be true, what about Ratnagarbha Gaṇapati? Does he not accept that Govinda Bhagavatpāda gave the liṅga and Gaṇapati to Śaṅkara? Even if *Guruvamśa kāvya* which says 'Susiddhadattam' 'सुसिद्धदत्तम्' is not authoritative, the question how that kind of heresy arose remains unanswered.

One historical aspect which the same Śrīkanṭha Śāstri writes in the same work (page. 16) may excite interest in the readers. During the year Śālivāhana Śaka 1594, the king of Keladi by name Somaśekhara Nāyaka, because of some wrong committed by GurusānthaSwāmi of Bāḷehalli (Balehonnur) Maṭha, confiscated the Candramouliśwara liṅga, right-spiralling conch, a cane (ēka betta) etc. that were in possession of him, and gave them to Śrīṅgeri Maṭha and kept the *Bhūcakra*, umbrella etc. to himself; also he stopped the tribute in cash and kind that were being collected by the Bāḷehalli Maṭha from 300 villages around. This has been revealed by an inscription found at Bāḷehalli Maṭha itself (Report No. 58 of 1927 from the Department of Archives). What is the Candramouliśwara liṅga referred to in this?

At this time, the pontiff of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha was the Sixth Nrisimha Bhārati (KRVTTW p 66-67). Were there Candramouliśwara liṅga and Ratnagarbha Gaṇapati at Śrīṅgeri Maṭha before this pontiff or not? It is necessary that this has to be decided by historians on the basis of inscriptions and other evidences.

The statement 'सुसिद्धदत्तम्' of *Guruvamśa kāvya* can also be interpreted as 'given by Govinda Bhagavatpāda who was a "Siddha"' (establi-

shed in Yoga)’ because, as we have already mentioned, Govinda Bhagavatpāda was already known to be a *Yogi* and a *Rasasiddha*. But, was Śaṅkarācārya himself worshipping Candramouliśwara? This itself is doubtful. No one agrees that Ācārya established the Maṭha immediately after taking methodical *Sannyāsa*. For a Paramahansa who has renounced all rites, it is not mandatory to do any kind of worship; nowhere in the commentaries of Śaṅkara it is accepted. Just because they were given by his Guru, to imagine without any evidence that he was getting them worshipped by someone else would be too much. In the commentaries, while describing worship of symbols, many times it is mentioned ‘just as *śalagrāma* for Viṣṇu’; but not even once the worship of *Śiva* liṅga. Why this is so? If he himself was worshipping a liṅga, to say that he forgot to mention would not be correct. It is well known that the *Sannyāsis* of Śaṅkara tradition even today do ‘नारायणस्मरणम्’. This being so, whether the Ācārya really got Candramouliśwara liṅga from somebody would remain doubtful. The question why the poet *Mādhava*, who has cited many strange things, did not discuss this aspect also has remained unsolved.

### **The report found in Maṇimañjari**

53. The readers are already aware that Narāyaṇa Paṇḍita, the author of *Maṇimañjari*, has written that the Ācārya was an incarnation of *Maṇimantha*, and of mixed caste (page \*49). To imply that Śaṅkara’s intellect was not sensitive and sharp enough, he has written that the Ācārya’s mother was giving him stale food; not only that, he has written about Govinda Bhagavatpāda too so that the readers get a bad

opinion of him. According to his story, the names of Govinda Bhagavatpāda's sons (earlier to his *Sannyāsa*) are different from what we find in *Patañjalicaritre*; the story also is altered. The fictitious story of this author aims to create an impression in the minds of the non-informed readers that Gauḍapāda, the Guru of Govinda Bhagavatpāda, is a Buddhist in disguise. We have given it in the Appendix wherein we have collected the opinions of people of different schools of thought. According to this story, a Buddhist by name BakkaSwāmi somehow deluded Gauḍapāda into *Sannyāsa* and initiated him into the meditation on Brahman as *Śūnya*. Further, Govinda Bhagavatpāda and his disciple Śaṅkarācārya taught that this was Vedic, diverted the *Sannyāsins* who were on the right path and forcefully converted them into *Advaitic* thought! According to this 'learned' author, the *Nirviśeṣa Brahman* of Advaita and the 'void' of the *Mādhyamikas* are one and the same! This is an example of how religious fanatics who could not understand the method of Advaita, or even if they had grasped it to some extent, deliberately strived to generate malicious propaganda by way of their imaginations of all kinds.





## 6. Writing of the Bhāṣyas

### Did the Ācārya went straight to Kāśi leaving his Guru?

54. The story of Ācārya going to Kāśi at the behest of his Guru is neither to be found in *Vyāsācalīya*, nor in *Cidvilāsīya*. According to *Vyāsācalīya*, the Ācārya left his Guru for going on a pilgrimage to the north and reached Badari. (According to *Cidvilāsīya*, he was at Badari itself). But it is very much there in the three works *Mādhavīya*, Śaṅkara-Digvijaya-Sāra, and Śaṅkara-Mandāra-Saurabha. Also it is found in the *Suṣamā* of *Ātmabodha* wherein he criticises the story of *Mādhavīya* here and there. Also in *Cidvilāsīya*, the story of Ācārya going to Prayāga from Badari and later going to Kāśi is there. Hence, we can say that majority opinion is in favour of Ācārya having gone to Kāśi.

Kāśi is a famous centre of learning from ancient times. Since it is in between two rivers by name Varāṇā and Asi, it acquired the name *Vārāṇasi*. The Purāṇas eulogize that it is very holy and that Śiva Himself initiates those who die there into *Tāraka Mantra*, sacred liberating formula. The place is famed that Śiva “protects it on the edge of his *Trīśūla* at the time of Pralaya (dissolution of the universe). South Indians comparing their rivers to Gangā, and highlighting their holy places as southern Kāśis are indicative of the glory of this place. Thus, famous because of several reasons, this place was the capital of the king of Kāśi, was hosting scholars; so much so that, to become recognised as a scholar one had to highlight his scholarship at Kāśi. Gautama Buddha started to preach his religion here; here itself is

located Sārānāth (Sāranganāth), the famous Buddhist centre. After argumentation with the Buddhists, the Brahmins started regarding the southern part in which they had been living as Kāśī. Heresay was also created by the non-buddhists that those who die in northern part of Kāśī would be born as a donkey in their next birth. That part which was emaciated, nowadays is being rejuvenated by the Government and by the interested Buddhists. It seems Govinda Bhagavatpāda asked his disciple to proceed to Kāśī to write the commentaries and propagate Advaitic thought only because Kāśī was the famed abode of scholars. But according to *Cidvilāsiya*, the Ācārya first wrote the commentaries at Badari and then went to Kāśī to publicize his scholarship; even this contention would not be improbable.

### Accepting Padmapāda as a disciple

55. After Śaṅkarācārya got established himself at Kāśī, once a brahmin lad approached and prostrated before him. When his whereabouts were enquired, he said 'I am from Cōḷa country. There flows the river Cāvery that inspires the devotees of Hari. Moving across the country, I have come to take shelter at your feet in order to escape from the circuit of mundane existence, *saṃsāra*'. The Ācārya compassionately initiated him to *Sannyāsa*. It is said that this Sanandana became his first disciple; likewise many others became his disciples (Mā. Śam. 6. 1-16). This is the story that we find in *Mādhavīya*.

In *Cidvilāsiya* it is mentioned that this person by name Viṣṇu Śarma was the son of a brahmin couple Lakṣmī and Mādhavācārya of Ahobala kṣetra, born by the blessings of Lord Nṛsimha. After the

demise of his parents, as per the direction of Lord Narasimha in a dream, he came to the Ācārya (Ci. Śam. 19. 12-24). It appears none else has given this detail.

### **Lord Viśveśwara gives darśana in the form of an antyaja**

56. We would not know from *Mādhavīya* in which part of Kāśī the Ācārya lived. Since it is mentioned in *Cidvilāsīya* that the Ācārya came to Kāśī via Prayāg and Gayā and ‘स्वात्वेव तोये मणिकर्णिकाया विश्वेश्वरं प्रत्यहमर्चति स्म । वासं चकारानिशमेष शिष्यैः साकं स घट्टे मणिकर्णिकायाः ॥’ (Ci. Śam. 12. 2-3), that is, living at the Maṇikarṇikā Ghat with the disciples, and bathing in the river daily, was worshipping Viśveśwara - we will have to take it as such. Many people used to come to see him. One day, as per schedule, when he was going to take bath and perform the rites along with his disciples, and having seen a man of lowest caste, antyaja, along with four dogs coming, said ‘get out of the way!’ He answered philosophically, ‘when Vedānta is declaring that the Undivided One which is without a second, pure, unattached existence-knowledge-bliss Absolute, you are still having the notion of distinction. This is wonder of wonders. Some would be wearing the staff, the water-pot and the ochre robe, and talking profusely without any semblance of knowledge, and deceiving the householders; is it not? By telling “get out of the way”, do you wish to have the body at a distance or the One who dwells in it? Are you saying it thinking that one *Annamaya*, physical body, is different from another *Annamaya*? or thinking that one Witness is different from another Witness? How it would be apt to conceive difference as Brahmin and as unclean person in the indwelling Ātman? Is there any difference between the Sun reflected in

the Ganges and the Sun reflected in liquor? O great sage! that ancient *Puruṣa* is only one in all bodies; leaving Him aside, and thinking that 'I am pure *Brahmin*', and saying 'I low-born, get away!' - what is this?' Then Śaṅkara replied through *śloka*s implying 'I have now given up the thinking that you are a low-born. One who has the knowledge that everything is the Ātman, is to be saluted whether he is a Brahmin or a low-born; and he is verily my Guru'. By that time the low-born had disappeared; and Candramoulī Himself had appeared in his front. (Mā. Śam. 6. 25-39).

One cannot say what and how much of this story is true. Even *Ātmabodha* summarily mentions this story in his *Suśamā* as 'जाह्नवीतीरमासाद्य बोधितोऽन्त्यजरूपिणा । विश्वेश्वरेण भाष्यं स ब्रह्मसूत्रस्य निर्ममे ॥'.

This story is not to be found in *Cidvilāsīya*. There, after telling the story of Padmapāda, it is mentioned that one day, after taking bath and worshipping Viśveśwara, when Śaṅkara prayed 'O Maheśwara! Which is true - Advaita or Dvaita? You are the knower of the essence of scriptures; please tell before these scholars and get rid of the doubt!', Śiva came out of the Liṅgam and appeared along with His spouse Pārvati and, lifting His hand, declared thrice 'Advaita alone is the Pure Truth, not Dvaita' and then disappeared (Ci. Śam. 12. 38-41). *Anantānandagiri* too has written in his Śaṅkaravijaya the story of Madhyārjuneśwara giving His consent to Advaita (Pra. 4. p19; De. p16). Ḍiṇḍimakāra, the commentator on *Mādhaviya*, has followed the story-line of *Ānandagiri* itself. Was *Cidvilāsīya* not yet written when this Ḍiṇḍima commentary was composed? Could Cidvilāsa have translocated this heresay of Madhyārjuna to Kāśī and composed his story? The truth of this is to be established by scholars who are

adept in finding out the dates of ancient works.

It is Somanāthiah's speculation that this type of conversation could have taken place since at the time when Buddhism was prevalent, even non-brahmins were becoming learned scholars (So. Śam. p69). He has also speculated that the low-born was conceived to be Śiva Himself in the story, with the erroneous thinking that it would be an insult to Advaita if Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda calls a Cāṇḍāla, an outcast as his Guru (So. Śam. p76). His logic is that in our country where extempore poetry was in vogue, the conversation between Śaṅkara and the Cāṇḍāla could have taken place with metrical flow (So. Śam. p73). Whatever that be, it is true that there is a *Prakaraṇa* called *Maniṣā-pañcaka* with metrical *ślokas*, famous as composed by Śaṅkarācārya. It is also certain that our countrymen happily take pride in this composition as Śaṅkarācārya's<sup>1</sup>. In this composition, there are two introductory *ślokas* reading as follows: 'सत्याचार्यस्य गमने कदाचिन्मुक्तिदायकम् । काशीक्षेत्रं प्रति सह गौर्या मार्गे तु शङ्करम् ॥ १ ॥ अन्त्यवेषधरं दृष्ट्वा गच्छगच्छेति चाब्रवीत् । शङ्करः सोऽपि चण्डालस्तं पुनः प्राह शङ्करम् ॥ २ ॥' It is to be noted here that Śaṅkara was with Pārvaṭi; *Mādhava's* imagination that there were four dogs is not here. Since it is written that the incident took place while Śaṅkarācārya was on the way to Kāśi, doubt arises whether this *Maniṣā-pañcaka* was already there in some older ŚaṅkaraVijaya. It is said that there is a *Bṛhat ŚaṅkaraVijaya* by one by name Citsukhācārya at Kumbhakoṇam Maṭha; it should be the duty of scholars to find out this book and bring out the truth. Let it be aside; the stories of Vidura, Dharmavyādha etc. are there as

---

1. *Maniṣapañcaka* along with meaning is given in the collection of *Prakaraṇa Granthas*, Vol. 2, published by Adhyātma Prakāśha Kāryālaya.

witnesses to prove that even non-brahmins were educated right from the time of Purāṇas and Itihāsas. In ancient times there were women and śudras, who although not knowing how to read and write, could learn philosophy and obtain the experience of ultimate truth; even now such people are there. Hence, to say that there was a low-born who had known the Vedāntic truths at a place such as Kāśī, would not be improbable. It may be possible that someone might have composed a poem on the basis of a heresay that such a conversation took place. It would not be a wonder if the Advaitins believed that such a philosopher was worthy of respect, even like Lord Viśveśwara or like a Guru.

### **Is there an argument of caste-distinction removal in Manīṣāpañcaka?**

57. Another aspect is to be discussed at this juncture. On the basis of this story that Śaṅkara regarded a low-born as his Guru, some people feel that there was no caste-distinction in Śaṅkara and that his followers and others were responsible for strengthening it among people and spoil their unity. The outcome is that leaders today are in favour of the removal of castes by way of spreading education to all. The government supporting this opinion has made a law to punish those who accept the distinctions of low borns, untouchables, and practice the same, and has introduced the same into the Constitution. There is the law that there should be free entry to the low-born who are called Harijans, into the precincts of holy temples; and on the basis of it the social reformers are trying to make them enter into temples and the followers of caste-distinctions are opposing such a forced action; thus

unity among people further has become loose. Educating the ignorant and teaching them reading and writing are not regarded as wrong by any; the social reformers have to think over whether there is any real benefit in simply giving up right practices, and just mixing up castes without improving upon the bad ways of life in terms of food habits, pastime etc. Questions like whether the increase in the number of castes has in fact increased the feeling of high and low among people and resulted in an increase of mutual hatred? or whether the extreme competition prevalent in modern civilization (resulting in unemployment, lack of food etc.), has been responsible for the jealousy and hatred among people? yet remain to be examined. It is doubtful that if the castes are removed, people would become clean, rise to the higher realms of society and achieve equal living standards, and become friendly with each other. Because, even though most of the countries are without the caste-system, it is not to be seen there that all are educated, morally evolved and friendly with each other; instead colour-distinctions and class-distinctions seem to promote mutual hatred and dogmatic behaviour.

This social problem apart, it is necessary to make it clear that there is no trace of this kind of feeling in *Maniṣāpañcaka*. The summary meaning of this *Prakaraṇa* is that the consciousness prevailing in the waking, dream, and deep sleep states is one and the same; that the consciousness prevailing in all the living beings - from Brahman to the ants is just like a sea of consciousness and bliss without any waves; and to that Ātman there is no tarnish of characteristics of brāhmaṇa or low-born, which are bodily distinctions; and whoever has this realization, his teaching is to be regarded as Guru's teachings. In it there is

no trace of any direction that the brahmins and others are to disregard the caste-distinction and eat and marry with one another, or to the contrary. We are not in a position to understand how and what illumined soul thought of Advaita to be the social reformer's tool aimed at accomplishing a society of no distinctions whatever of caste, morals or ancestry.

### **What is the aim of the Ācārya's Bhāṣyas?**

58. When the Ācārya worshipped Śiva with great devotion, He was pleased to appear before him and said, 'My child, you have come up to a higher level. Your dedicated penance has been tested. Just as Bādarāyaṇa, you too have become worthy of my blessings. Bādarāyaṇa has classified the scriptures, composed the Brahmasūtras and refuted the bad schools of thought. Keeping only a few Vedic statements as authority, some people have written worthless commentaries that would not be acceptable to the wise; you write commentary that would refute them all. That would be respected by one and all. Refute and win scholars like Bhāskara, Nīlakaṇṭha, Abhinavagupta, Guru, Maṇḍana etc. and proclaim Advaita to be the supreme truth. You will establish disciples who would remove the ignorance of people, and finally, after having accomplished all that had to be done, you will reach me' and disappeared. A wonderstruck Śaṅkara went to the river; after the daily performances, meditated on *Īśvara* and Guru and decided to write the Bhāṣyas (Mā. Śam. 6. 45-53).

Whether the Ācārya had realization of Śiva or not, what shall we say about the poet who has imagined Śiva's consent for the Ācārya to win over Bhāskara, Abhinavagupta and Nīlakaṇṭha? This is quite



contradictory to historical fact, because these people came after Śaṅkarācārya. They are known to have refuted Śaṅkara's Advaita from their own points of view. As Cidvilāsa has said, Śiva might have appeared before Śaṅkara and, lifting his hand, declared thrice that Advaita to be true and not Dvaita; but Ācārya's commentary is not written with the prime purpose of refuting Dvaita. Just as he has refuted Dvaita, he has refuted the different methods (Prakriyas) of Advaita that was already in vogue, and has established an extraordinary Advaita Vedānta Prakriyā that was dear to his heart. We shall deliberate on this at a suitable place later.

### Travel to Badari

59. Then Śaṅkara went to Badari. In his twelfth year of age, he exchanged views with those that were established in Brahman and wrote *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Then he wrote Bhāṣyas on *Bhagavadgītā* and the Upaniṣads. After writing commentaries on *Sanatsujātīya* and *Tāpanīya*, he wrote *Upadeśasāhasrī* and others. He taught them thrice to Sanandana who was serving him with great devotion ('त्रिरापाठयत्तम्' Mā. Śam. 6. 68). Observing that the other disciples grew jealous of Sanandana, he showed a miracle to demonstrate how devoted Sanandana was. Once when Sanandana was on the other shore of Gangā, he called him aloud to come quickly. Thinking that 'if devotion to Guru's feet can make me cross the sea of *samsāra*, can it not ford me across the river?', he started walking on the river waters. And lo! every footstep of his was supported by a lotus rising from below; wondering happily, Sanandana was given the new name Padmapāda (Mā. Śam. 6. 60-71).

According to *Cidvilāsīya*, the Ācārya wrote *Sūtrabhāṣya*, authored commentaries on the ten Upaniṣads, *Gītābhāṣya*, commentaries on *Viṣṇusahasranāma* and *Śrī Rudra*, and wrote a few devotional songs like *Soundaryalahari* while he was living with his Guru at Badari (Ci. Śam. 10. 1-4). Sanandana came to him at that time (Ci. Śam. 10. 7-24). While Govinda Bhagavatpāda was telling him to remain there, since his mother thought of him, he went to his native place; from there he went to Prayāg (Ci. Śam. 10. 48). But in *Vyāsācalīya*, mention about only the *Sūtrabhāṣya* is to be found.

*Baladeva Upādhyāya* has written about the rejuvenation of the deity Badarīnath by the Ācārya when he was at Badari (Bala. Śam. p 52). It appears that people, fearing trouble from the Chinese, had thrown the idol into Naradakuṇḍa. When the Ācārya tried to bring it up, the priests warned him that it is very deep, being connected to the Alakananda river; and not fearing the danger of himself getting drowned, the Ācārya went into the water, searched out the idol; even when he attempted thrice, he got only the idol that was broken and damaged on the right side; a voice from heaven announced that 'this very idol is to be worshipped in the Kali Yuga'. Accordingly the Ācārya performed Vedic rites to establish the same idol at the temple (the evidence to this story is *Badarikāśrama Māhātmya*, 5. p 128); *Baladeva Upādhyāya* writes that there is a *śloka* 'ततोहं यतिरूपेण तीर्थान्नारदसंज्ञकात् । उद्धृत्य स्थापयिष्यामि हरिं लोकहितेच्छया ॥ २४५ ॥'.

One could imagine the Ācārya going to Badari where Bādarāyaṇa and the previous ṛṣis did penance; it was quite probable that he would get some who were established in jñāna there. Not fearing the cold, rain, stones and thorns on the way, uneven ground, and eating fruits

when he got them, Ācārya, slept where he had to, and continued to travel when got awakened - this description of *Mādhavīya* is quite but natural (Mā. Śam. 6. 57-58). *Mādhavīya* describes that he wrote *Sūtrabhāṣya* when he was twelve; *Vyāsācalīya* says that he was sixteen when he wrote *Sūtrabhāṣya* (Vyā. Śam. 4. 65, 83). *Baladeva Upādhyāya* imagines that he was twelve when he went to Badari; he stayed there for four years; then he wrote the *Sūtrabhāṣya* (Bala. Śam. p 53). We have given the *śloka* which K. B. Pāṭhak got: 'अष्टवर्षे चतुर्वेदी द्वादशे सर्वशास्त्रवित् । षोडशे कृतवान् भाष्यं द्वात्रिंशे मुनिरभ्यगात् ॥' in Appendix IV. We shall shortly take up the discussion of what are all the works given in the ŚāṅkaraVijayas would be probably Ācārya's.

Now let us discuss a little about the Padmapāda story. *Mādhavīya* does not mention his earlier name; Sanandana is the name given by the Ācārya. *Mādhavīya*, *Cidvilāsiya*, *Vyāsācalīya* - all these three describe that he belonged to Cola country. But *Govindanātha*, who has mentioned that he has closely followed *Vyāsācala*, says that he belongs to Kerala (Go. Śam. 4. 12) and says (like *Cidvilāsa*) that his earlier name was Viṣṇuśarma; tells a story that his father's name was Somaśarma and that he lived with the vocation of Vyśya, and suffered misery earlier. Since this disciple came to Śāṅkara first and was serving him with great devotion, it is to be expected that the Ācārya had more tenderness towards him. But even then, it seems that some secret is involved in telling that the others were jealous of him, and that the Ācārya taught him *Sūtrabhāṣya* thrice (Mā. Śam. 6. 67-68). We cannot really say whether the Ācārya had named him earlier as Padmapāda and the story fitting to this was constructed later, or whether the miraculous incident really took place. Somanāthiah has

written that he has seen lotus leaves five-foot wide in a lake called Udayasāgara near Udayapur, and that a ten-year old boy can easily sit on them without fear of drowning (So. Śam. p 82 footnote). But lotus with such wide leaves are not there in the Gangā. How could this support the story of lotus coming up at every footstep of Sanandana ?

### Refuting the Pāśupata school of thought

60. 'While Śaṅkara was teaching his disciples, some *Pāśupatas* came to indicate the defects in his philosophic thought. When their doubts were refuted on the basis of apt *Śruti* citations and illustrations, their arrogance came down. Then their traditional doctrines were refuted' - starting thus (Mā. Śam. 6. 72-73), poet *Mādhava* continues 'if Dvaita be true, how *Jīva* could obtain liberation that is equality with *Īśvara*? If it be through meditation, should it not die out? How could qualities of Paśupati the *Īśvara* come to paśus the *Jīvas*? Are'nt qualities without parts? The qualities cannot come and mix with the *Jīvas* just as lotus fragrance mixes with the air. Because, in this example, the mixing of part of fragrance with air would create a feeling that air itself is having that fragrance; in reality it is not like that (air as such has no smell). Would some qualities of *Īśvara* come and join the *Jīvas*, or all His qualities? If it is a part of His qualities, one would have to agree that the qualities have parts; if it is that all His qualities come and join, then it would mean that *Īśvara* is ignorant' (Mā. Śam. 6. 75-77).

There seems to be no evidence from the Bhāṣyas for this refutation of the *Pāśupatas*. Because, in the *Sūtrabhāṣya*, starting from the *Sūtra* 'पत्युरसामञ्जस्यात्' and upto 'अन्तवत्त्वमसर्वज्ञता वा' (Ve. Sū. 2. 2. 37-41), the description refutes only the *Pāśupata* theory that *Īśvara* reg-

ulates the Pradhāna and Puruṣas only as efficient cause. The mistakes of the theory pointed out are the following: *Īśwara* would Himself acquire attachment and aversion, no relationship could be shown to exist among *Īśwara*, Pradhāna and Puruṣas, it would be imperative to accept *Īśwara* having a body, and that He would have divisions and he will not be omniscient. And in no other *Bhāṣyas* the *Pāśupata* theory is taken up for examination.

### On the city of Kāśi

61. It is seen that all of a sudden *Mādhava* draws our attention on Kāśi in the same Chapter (*ślokas* 81-83). ‘Having seen the superhuman influence of that boy, “several citizens of Kāśi” were talking among themselves that “Bhāskara, Gupta, Miśra, Murāri, Vidyendraguru etc. were refuted from this exponent of all theories”. Somanāthiah thinks that the Ācārya had come to Kāśi on the basis of the adjective ‘काशीपुरस्थाः’ in this Chapter (So. Śam. p 83); C. N. Kṛṣṇa Swamy Iyer (CNKS p 28) says that Śaṅkara remained at that time in Kāśi for a long period and at Badari only for a short while. N. Venkaṭarāman has not said anything on the stay at Badari. Baladev Upādhyāya (p 55) has imagined that the Ācārya used to stay at UttaraKāśi.

The Ācārya refuted certain *Naiyāyikas* (logicians) who came to him at that time. The *Mādhavīya* describes that as and when he was giving proper responses to the objections of those who came to argue with him, the Bhāṣya of Ācārya used to shine like gold that is put into fire (Mā. Śam. 6. 100-101). It is befitting to imagine that the forthcoming interview with Vyāsa took place at UttaraKāśi itself.

## Encounter with Vyāsa

62. When Śrī Śaṅkarācārya wrote a new commentary on the (Bādarāyaṇa) Sūtras, is it not naturally to be expected that many a scholar would have objected to it? One day, at the time when the disciples had their lessons in the afternoon and the tired Ācārya was about to rise, an elderly brahmin arrived and asked ‘what are you teaching them?’. The disciples replied, ‘he is our Guru with unobstructed knowledge in all the Upaniṣads; he has written an Advaitic commentary on *Śārīraka*’. The brahmin called forth, ‘let me see, if you know, tell me the meaning to any Sūtra’. Then Śaṅkara said, ‘Salutations to the knower of the meaning of the Sūtras! I do not feel proud that I am a knower of the Sūtras; but if you ask anything in particular, I shall tell you that’. When the brahmin asked what would be the meaning of the first Sūtra in the Third Chapter, Śaṅkara replied ‘the meaning is that the *Jīva*, at the time of its departure, leaves enveloped by the subtle elements’. The brahmin distorted and refuted it in a hundred ways; Śaṅkara refuted them in a thousand ways. The adepts argued for eight days continuously. Then Padmapāda said, ‘He is Vyāsa the knower of the secrets of Vedānta; and you are Śaṅkara Himself; this being so, what am I to do, being a servant?’ Hearing this, the Ācārya started to sing the glories of Vyāsa, and Vyāsa appeared before him in real form. When the Ācārya prostrated before him in obeisance, he told ‘hearing that you have written a commentary, I came to see you. You are very dear to me. Do not think that writing the commentary is a mere adventure; spread the message of Vedānta everywhere!’. Śaṅkara’s life-span was only eight years; he had earned another eight

by way of his penance; Vyāsa blessed him saying 'May Śiva ordain another sixteen years of life to you! And may your commentary remain until the sun, moon and the stars remain!' and disappeared (Mā. Śam. 7. 1-58).

Here are some of the points about the encounter with Vyāsa which are worth discussing:

(1) This story is not there in *Vyāsācalīya* - all that is there is just this: the Ācārya, leaving his Guru, came to Badari on pilgrimage and wrote the *Sūtrabhāṣya* there (4. 65-67). Hearing this news, Vyāsa arrived there (4. 70). When after due hospitalities the Ācārya asked about the purpose of his coming (4. 71-77), Vyāsa replied that he wanted to see the *Sūtrabhāṣya*. When the Ācārya gave it to him, he was very happy (4. 78-82). Vyāsa told him to establish Advaita, and granted another sixteen years of life-span. When Vyāsa appreciated that the commentator's difficulty is no less than that of the *Sūtrakāra*, Ācārya prostrated before him saying 'may my commentary too get due publicity through the relation with your *Sūtras*' (4. 84-85). Then Vyāsa disappeared. The same story has been summarized in *Śaṅkarācārya Carita* of *Govindanātha* (Go. 3. 54-73); so it appears that the remaining story must have been of a recent origin than *Vyāsācalīya*.

(2) In *Cidvilāsiya*, the story is somewhat similar to the one contained in *Mādhavīya*, but it is not there that the argumentation continued for eight days. When the brahmin continued to raise objections even after answering his queries, the Ācārya told Padmapāda to respond. Padmapāda said, 'you are condemning our Guru, who is all-knowing; and you are talking as if you are all-knowing!' Some of the other disciples clenched their fists, and some others started search-

ing for a staff. The Ācārya told 'Poor old man, he will fall down with a mere touch; does not know a thing, let him say whatever he likes; what harm is there for us?' Then Vyāsa, beaming with a smile, appeared with his real form. Śaṅkara prostrated before him (Ci. Śam. 13. 23-40). Then Brahma appeared and said, 'Verily, he is Śiva; he has incarnated to redeem the decaying Advaita and *Sannyāsa*!' The king of Kāśī and others were looking on with wonder (Ci. Śam. 14. 8). Vyāsa said, 'but his life-span is only this much; and not one else is competent enough to teach the Bhāṣya! What shall we do?' Brahma replied, 'I know what has happened by the will of Śaṅkara; He Himself has accepted this form out of sport (*Līlāvighraha*). Let Him do as he likes (स्वच्छन्दं विहरत्वेषः - Ci. Śam. 4. 22). What am I or Viṣṇu to give? He knows everything (Ci. Śam. 4. 23)' and granted him long life (ददौ सुचिरमायुश्च - Ci. Śam. 4. 24). Mention of granting sixteen years of life is not there.

(3) The story runs in *Anantānandagīrīya* like this: Śaṅkara, after telling the meaning of the Sūtra in detail, slapped on the face of the old man and told Padmapāda 'thrash down this old man on the floor, and push him away with your foot! ('वृद्धस्य कपोलताडनमाचकार । परं च पद्मपादं निजशिष्यमाह एनं परपक्षिन्नेष्टं वृद्धं भूम्युपरि<sup>1</sup> अधोमुखं पातयित्वा पादाग्रावलम्बनादूरं अपव्रजेति' Ā. Śam. 52. p.206; De. p177). Padmapāda prostrated before his Guru and said "Śaṅkara is verily lord Śaṅkara Himself; Vyāsa is Nārāyaṇa Himself, What can I, a servant, do where a dispute has arisen between ('शङ्करः शङ्करः साक्षात् व्यासो नारायणः स्वयम् । तयोर्विवादे सम्प्राप्ते किङ्करः किं करोम्यहम् ॥') Then Śaṅkara sang the glories of Vyāsa when he appeared in his true form and blessed him (Ā. Śam. 52. p207; De.

1. These words are not in De. version. 'निजशिष्यमिदमाह' is the reading there.



p177). When Vyāsa felt happy to see the *Sūtrabhāṣya*, and wanted to leave, Śaṅkara told him, 'All-knower that you are, please witness my leaving the body now; if I give up the body in your presence, my liberation is certain!' Vyāsa said, 'How the Bhāṣya would get publicised after you have left? So, please remain here'. When Śaṅkara told him that his life-span is only sixteen years, he invoked the presence of the creator Brahma by a mantra (व्यासस्त्वाकर्षयामास ब्रह्माणं सृष्टिकारणम्). Brahma appeared and said 'This Śaṅkarācārya is verily the Lord of Kailāsa; he shall remain for eight more years on this earth and then leave' (स एव शङ्कराचार्यः साक्षात्कैलासनायकः । यावदष्टाब्दमुर्व्या<sup>1</sup> हि स्थित्वा पश्चाद्गमिष्यति ॥ Ā. Śam. 53. p208?; De. p178). Hearing these words of Brahma, Vyāsa brought some Gangā water and sprinkled it on Śaṅkara uttering 'May he live for a hundred years!' ('इति ब्रह्मवचः श्रुत्वा व्यासः काशीकृतालयः । करेणानीय गङ्गाम्बु जीवेत शरदां शतम् । इत्युक्त्वा प्रोक्षयामास शङ्कराचार्यमुत्तमम् ॥' Ā. Śam. 54. p 209; De. p179).

There is concurrence *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* and *BṛhatŚaṅkaraVijaya* that the Ācārya had a life-span of thirty two years; hence *Mādhavīya* is in accordance with that. It is strange that *Cidvilāsa* writes 'saying "May Śiva remain as long as he wishes!" he granted eternal life' and that *Anantānandagiri* writes 'Brahma gave eight years extra, making his life-span twenty four years, but Vyāsa blessed him saying "live a hundred years!"'. And in *Cidvilāśīya* Brahma appeared on his own accord, and in *Anantānandagiriya* Vyāsa attracted him by the power of his mantra !

Another strange thing is - *Cidvilāśīya* mentions that the Ācārya scolded the old brahmin, and in *Anantānandagiriya* it is stated that

1. In De. version, it is corrected as 'यावदिच्छाब्दम्' !

the Ācārya slapped him on the face and ordered Padmapāda to push him away thrashing with the foot! If this be true, what to say about the Ācārya's modesty !

(4) A *śloka* with the same meaning as 'शङ्करः शङ्करः साक्षात्' of *Anantānandagiriya* is also found in *Mādhaviya*:

त्वं शङ्करः शङ्कर एव साक्षाद्व्यासस्तु नारायण एव नूनम् ।

तयोर्विवादे सततं प्रसक्ते किं किङ्करोहं करवाणि सद्यः ॥ (Mā. Śam. 7. 11)

Although the shade of wordings are similar, the alliteration 'किङ्करः किं करोम्यहम्' of *Anantānandagiriya* appears to rhyme better. The same *śloka* is found in *Cidvilāsīya* also (Ci. Śam. 14. 31). But the occasion of that *śloka* is when Padmapāda sees all the three - Brahma, Śaṅkarācārya and Vyāsa; so it seems that it was there already in *Anantānandagiriya*. And in several other places, the sentences cited by the Dīṇḍimakāra are found in *Anantānandagiriya*; so should we take that *Mādhaviya* has this as the source? Or, as purported by some that another *Ānandagiriya* is at Kumbhakoṇam Maṭha, should we imagine that its sentences are the basis for these two? This has to be investigated.

(5) Leaving aside so many invaluable topics concerning the conclusions of Vedānta contained in Samanvaya and other Sūtras, in the Vedānta Mīmāṃsa, why did Vyāsa choose the Sūtra 'तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ' (Vedānta Sūtra 3. 1. 1) which deals with transmigration of *Jīva*, a matter that is indirect for us, for discussion? What is there in it to refute Śaṅkara's standpoint in 'a hundred' ways? And what could be Śaṅkara's refutation in turn in 'a thousand' ways? This has not been taken up either by any author of ŚaṅkaraVijaya or by the Dīṇḍima commentator. This being so, is the discussion between Śaṅkara and

Vyāsa a mere imagination? Should it be taken to be symbolic to imply that several scholars used to come with an intention of raising objections to Śaṅkara's commentary? Śrī C. N. Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer (CNKS p 28) opines that there should have been much argumentation and quarrel about the commentary of Śaṅkara, and that in many an occasion, Śaṅkara had to accept the other man's point of view. Even then, for a matter that could not be directly visualized as what happens to *Jīva* after death, why there should have been so much of vehement argumentation remains to be explained.

(6) While describing the purport of this Sūtra (3.1.1), the poet *Mādhava* has cited the very sentences of *Sūtrabhāṣya*. The readers could remember what we have already cited (page \*27) from the Bhāṣya for this Sūtra: एवं श्रुत्युक्ते देहान्तरप्रतिपत्तिप्रकारे सति याः पुरुषमतिप्रभवाः कल्पनाः ... इत्येवमाद्याः सर्वा एवानादर्तव्याः । श्रुतिविरोधात् ॥ (Sū. Bhā. 3.1.1). As we have pointed out earlier, no one has examined why the standpoint of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya has been criticised in the Sūtrabhāṣya here as 'पुरुषमतिप्रभवाः कल्पनाः'. Should we imagine that the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya was not written at that time, or guess that the commentators did not realize the contradiction between these two standpoints? We do not know.



## 7. Meeting with Kumārila bhaṭṭa

63. The Ācārya, having taken the permission of Vyāsa, made up his mind to go on a tour of conquest. According to *Cidvilāsīya*, the Ācārya was already presented with yellow silk robes, footwear studded with gems, golden water-pot, one-eyed *Rudrākṣa* bead-garlands, pearl-necklaces and ochre robes etc. by many, when he came to Kāśi from Badari. The Ācārya used to offer all these presents of people to Lord Candramoulīśwara and Ratnagarbha Gaṇapati (Ci. Śam. 12. 9-11). Upon hearing about Ācārya, the king of Kāśi came and served him alongwith his wife and children and presented him with a valuable crown, gem-studded bracelet of the upper arm, white umbrella, palanquin and two fans made up of yak-tail etc. (Ci. Śam. 12. 14-17). Śrī C. N. Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer (CNKS p29) opines that the name of this king was *Ratnasimha*; but in our books we could not find this name. Since such descriptions are there in *Cidvilāsīya* and *Ānandagīrīya*, Iyer feels that the support of the kings too might have been instrumental in bringing about success of the conquest-tour of Śaṅkara. But a better way of reasoning according to us is that, seeing the pontiffs of their time moving about with all their paraphernalia, the writers of those ŚaṅkaraVijayas might have thought that it would be apt to include such honour to Ācārya also. Whatever that be, there is no doubt that several disciples following Ācārya because of his knowledge, would have increased the respect people had on him.

### Refuting Śivapāshandi

64. *Cidvilāsīya* has written in its 15th chapter that while the Ācārya was still residing in Kāśi, several heretics called Śivapāshandis came to win over him, and that the Ācārya, after winning over them, got them give up their wrong practice of wearing burnt insignia of the lingam, trishul, ḍamaru etc. (as an imprint on the body) and drew them into the fold of Advaita. Likewise, it is written in *Cidvilāsīya* and in *Anantānandagīrīya* that on various occasions the Ācārya won over several opponents wearing various types of burnt insignia, forehead marks, Rudrakshi and Tulsi garlands etc. Such descriptions are plenty in *Anantānandagīrīya*. We know that *Anantānandagīrī* is a devotee of Cidambara. There might have been more of such practices like wearing insignia like forehead marks, weapon marks etc. And he seems to have taken much trouble to emphasise that Ācārya has stopped such practices. We shall discuss this point once again later.

### Meeting Kumārila Bhaṭṭa

65. Śaṅkara had a desire to get a *Vārtika* (a critical gloss) on his *Sūtrabhāṣya* written by Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. Hence he started travelling towards Vindhyācala in the south, and then came to Prayāga. After taking bath in the Yamunā river, got to know about Kumārila Bhaṭṭa from people, and went in search of him. He got the news that Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, for having done a sinful act, wishing to punish himself, is about to burn himself in a forest in a heap of paddy husk. When he went there to see him, Kumārila welcomed him heartily. Śaṅkara wanted to put out the fire with the water in his water-pot and wished to take action to heal his partially burnt body. But Kumārila Bhaṭṭa

stopped him and said, 'I heard that you have written a commentary on the Sūtras; I, in fact, wanted to write a *Vārtika* on that. But it was not in my fortune to do that. I studied under the Buddhists, and destroyed their entire lot; because of my concern for the Jaimini school of thought, in order to establish that liberation could be accomplished only by performing the Vedic rites, I even rejected Parameśvara. For these two blunders that I have committed, the only expiation is giving up my body. Be that as it may. If you win over my disciple Maṇḍana who is a staunch ritualist, it would be equivalent to winning over all'. The Ācārya initiated him into Advaita, got rid of his ignorance, and started travelling by arial path towards Maṇḍana Miśra's house (Mā. Śam. 7. 61-121 and 8. 1).

It is necessary to enquire into the various aspects of this summary of the story; so we will start doing that.

### **Is Kumārila from the North?**

66. There is no evidence to decide to which country Kumārila belonged. Critics are of varied opinion, some saying he belonged to south, and some saying he belonged to the north. It would not be out of place to consider here a heresay culled up by *Baladeva Upādhyāya* from Tibetan Tārānātha's historical and others' books, on the basis of Dr. Vidyābhuṣana's *History of Indian Logic* (p 305). Kumārila was uncle of Dharmakīrti; he was born in Trimale of a state by name Cūḍamaṇi in South India. A well-to-do householder, he was respected by the king of Cūḍamaṇi. Dharmakīrti was the son of a brahmin by name Korunanda; as he was interested in Buddhism, he studied at Nāḷanda Vidyāpīṭha under Sthavira Dharmapāla. Later, to know

about brahminical philosophy, he joined Kumārila as a servant; as per his wife's advice, Kumārila accorded an opportunity to him also alongwith other brahmin students. Dharmakīrti became an adept in the *Śāstras*, and after refuting other puṇḍits in debates, he even argued with Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and refuted him too. As a result of this, Bhaṭṭa became a Buddhist alongwith his five hundred disciples (*History of Indian Logic*, p 303-306).

Although in India there is no support to this story, it becomes amply evident from the summary account that we have given from *Mādhavīya* story of Śaṅkara, that Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, with an intention of knowing Buddhism, studied in the garb of a Bhikku under a Buddhist preceptor. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* opines that Bhaṭṭa's preceptor must have been Dharmapāla (Bala. Śam. p 59). The description in *Mādhavīya* is that when Bhaṭṭa was studying under his Buddhist preceptor<sup>1</sup>, one day when the Guru condemned the Vedic path, seeing tears drop down from his eyes, the other students came to know that he was a brahmin; and, waiting for a proper chance occasion, pushed him down from an upper floor. It seems Bhaṭṭa shouted 'if Vedas be authoritative, let there be no harm to me!'. Because there was a doubt element in his expression 'if Vedas be', and because he had studied in the garb of a Bhikku, he lost one eye (Mā. Śam. 7. 94-99).

If these two stories are conglomerated, it becomes clear that at that time both brahmins and buddhists used to learn each others' Śāstras somehow and used to refute each other. Whatever that be, this story helps us to understand that Kumārila was from the

---

1. It is also mentioned in Maṇimañjarī that Bhaṭṭa studied under the Buddhists.

South. But, since Anantānandagiri writes that Bhaṭṭa, coming from the north, won over Jains and Buddhists, (भट्टाचार्याख्यो द्विजवरः कश्चित् उददेशात् समागत्य दुष्टमतावलम्बिनो बौद्धान् जैनान् असङ्ख्यातान् राजमुखाद् अनेक विद्याप्रसङ्गभेदैर्निर्जित्य ... निर्भयो वर्तते<sup>1</sup> Ā. Śam.55. p 210-211; De. p180) we have to understand that he was from the north. Also, we have to say that he was from north because Śālikānātha has called him 'Vārtikakāramiśra'(वार्तिककारमिश्र); and Baladeva Upādhyāya says that there is a heresy that he was a Maithila brahmin (Bala. Śam. p 58).

If we consider the fact that the jain and buddhist trouble was more in the south, and the stories that many buddhist scholars were the brahmins from the south - we feel it is proper to believe that Bhaṭṭa was from the south. In addition to this, Bhaṭṭa has condemned the characteristic 'कल्पनापोढमभ्रान्तम्' accepted by Dharmakīrti in his Śloka-vārtika; and Dharmakīrti has condemned the Vedic authority that was dear to Kumāṛila in his Pramāṇavārtika. We have with us a commentary on Pramāṇavārtika written by one by name Prajñākara Gupta. In the introduction of that book written by Tripiṭakācārya Mahāpaṇḍita Rāhulasāṃkṛtyāyana, there is the following śloka which condemns the Vedic authority (p 5):

अपौरुषेयतापीष्टा कर्तृणामस्मृतेः किल ।

सन्त्यस्याप्यनुवक्तार इति धिग् व्यापकं तमः ॥ śloka 242 in pramāṇa vārtika commentary, Introduction.

We can understand from this that Dharmakīrti refutes the theory that Vedas are 'apauruṣeya' (अपौरुषेय). This supports the suggestion that Dharmakīrti and Kumāṛila are contemporaries. In Tantravārtika

1. In the Telugu copy, the part marked '...' is not clear. In De version, it is mentioned 'तेषां शीर्षाणि परशुभिच्छित्वा बहुषु उलूखलेषु निक्षिप्य कट(?)भ्रमणैश्चूर्णीकृत्य चैवं दुष्टमतध्वंसमाचरन्'.



there is evidence for the fact that Kumārila knew not only the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism, but also Hīnayāna which was mainly in Pāli language (Tam. Va. 1. 3. 6. p 230,237)<sup>1</sup>. This means that his belonging to the south is more probable. Explanation is given that because ungrammatical words of the *Mlecchas* are not acceptable to the Aryans, words like *chor* (cooked rice), *atar* (way), *pomb* (snake), *māl* (woman), *vayir* (stomach) - are changed into चोर, अन्तर, पाप, माला, वैरि with altered meanings (Tam. Vā. 1. 3. 5, p 225-226<sup>2</sup>). This is possible more for south Indians rather than others. It is true that he has referred to other languages also. He has mentioned that 'तद्यदा द्विविडादिभाषायामीदृशी स्वच्छन्दकल्पना, तदा पारसी-बर्बर-यवन-रौमकादिभाषासु किं विकल्प्य किं प्रतिपत्स्यन्त इति न विद्मः' (Tam. Va. 1. 3. 5. p 226). Seeing that he has written 'When the situation is like this among Dravidian languages, we do not know what all they would imagine and understand in languages like Pārsi, Barbara, Yavana, Roman' one can easily guess that Tamil was nearer to him than languages like Pārsi. We do not agree to the contention that Śālikānātha has written the name 'Vārtikakāra Mīśra' to indicate his hailing from the north because, 'Mīśra' in Sanskrit is used to indicate respect; just like Gurucaraṇāḥ (गुरुचरणाः), (Tātapādāḥ) तातपादाः etc., nothing wrong in using the word

1. Here cited is the mahāyāna quotation 'उत्पादाद्वा तथागतानामनुत्पादाद्वा स्थितैवेयं धर्मनित्यता'. The Pāli sentences 'मम विहि भिक्खवे कम्मवच्च इसी सवे ।' तथा उक्खित्ते लोडम्मि उद्धे अत्थि कारणम् । पडणेणत्थि कारणम् । अनुभवे कारणं इमे सङ्गहा धम्मा सम्भवन्ति सकारणा अकारणा विणसन्ति । (ममापि भिक्षवः कर्म वर्तत एव आ शरीरपातात् । उत्क्षिप्ते लोष्टे उत्क्षेपे अस्ति कारणं पतने नास्ति कारणम् । अस्त्युद्धवे कारणं इमे संस्कृता धर्माः सम्भवन्ति सकारणा अकारणा विनश्यन्ति ।) These Pāli sentences have come to mean that Karma would be there even for Buddha till he gives up his body; although there could be reason for the creation of a thing, there are none for its destruction.

2. These pages are of *Tantra Vārtika* printed at Ānandāśrama.

‘Vārttikakāra Mīśrāḥ’ (वार्तिककारमिश्राः) respectfully. Only when used with a proper name like Vācaspatimiśra, Maṇḍanamiśra, Miśra could be a suffix like Bhaṭṭa and Śāstrī in Rāmabhaṭṭa, Rāmaśāstrī etc. as is in vogue locally. Hence, we have to say that more evidence is needed to decide that Kumārila Bhaṭṭa is from the north.

### Where did the Ācārya get the news about Bhaṭṭapāda?

67. *Mādhavīya Śaṅkara Vijaya* mentions that the Ācārya first came to Prayāg with an intention to win over Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (प्रयागमागात्प्रथमं जिगीषुः कुमारिलं साधितकर्मजालम् Mā. Śam. 7. 62). But it is stated that Kumārila carried out his prāyaścitta (प्रायश्चित्त) in the south, both in *Cidvilāsīya* and in *Anantānandagirīya*.

In *Cidvilāsīya* it is stated that while the Ācārya was at Kāśī, engaged in refuting the bad schools of thought and converting the arguers to Advaita, a brahmin came to him and told “there is a learned scholar by name Kumārila Bhaṭṭa who got his education from the buddhists, but is refuting them”; having heard that, the Ācārya came to Ruddha Nagara alongwith that brahmin’ (Ci. Śam. 15. 44-55).

In *Anantānandagirīya*: The Ācārya stayed at Śrī Śaila for a month. Once some brahmins came from Ruddha Nagara and told him that ‘an excellent brahmin by name Bhaṭṭācārya has come from the north and, by way of debates, has won over innumerable Jains and, through the king, causing destruction of bad schools of thought, himself remaining without fear whatsoever’. Hearing about such wonderful work, the Ācārya came to Ruddha Nagara along with his disciples (Ā. Śam. 55. p 210; De. p 210).

Thus, the Ācārya learnt about the Tuṣāgniprāyaścitta (तुषाग्नि-

प्रायश्चित्त) of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa at Prayāg according to *Vyāsācalīya* and *Mādhavīya*; at Kāśi according to *Cidvilāsiya*, and at Śrī Śaila according to “Anantānandagīrīya”!

### **Expiation for what sin committed by Bhaṭṭa?**

68. The detail regarding Bhaṭṭa’s expiation for the ‘sin’ he thought he had committed is different in different ŚaṅkaraVijayas. We have already given the detail of this as per *Mādhavīya* (page \*123). It is mentioned there that the buddhists pushed him down from a high floor (page \*125). But in the first chapter of *Mādhavīya* it is explained differently. The Bhaṭṭa came to the court of a king Sudhanva where he refuted the buddhists. Although the king was a favourite of the Vedic tradition, he was posing as if he was a follower of buddhists (Mā. Śam. 1. 59). He said, ‘success and failure are, after all, dependent on one’s scholarship. Hence, let us decide that whoever can fall from the cliff of a mountain without sustaining injury is the winner’ (Mā. Śam. 1. 73). Hearing this, the buddhists were looking at each other; but the brahmin, shouting ‘If Vedas be the sole authority, may I not sustain any injury!’, fell down the cliff of the mountain; he fell like a ball of cotton, was not injured. Would Vedas not remove the difficulties of those who have taken refuge in them? - writes the same author! (1. 74-77) In the seventh chapter, the buddhists pushed him down, and in the first chapter, he himself jumped; in the seventh chapter, he lost an eye; and in the first chapter, he did not sustain any injury! The author is not contented with these contradictory statements; he even blames Bhaṭṭa for that wrong step taken in attempting to establish the authority of the Vedas by jumping down from the cliff! There is no

evidence to say that Bhaṭṭa believed in such superhuman feats; because, in Ślokaṁvārtika he ridicules such a feat purported to have been exhibited by Buddha (चोदनासूत्र, 2, p 65)<sup>1</sup>. Even after the buddhists objected to it saying 'this is not a proper standard deciding what is right; because, one can protect one's body by various means like using the influence of a gem, a spell, or a herb medicine' (Mā. Śam. 1. 80), the king hid a serpent in a pot and challenged 'tell me what is there in it; I shall crush those who fail to tell the truth in a stone crusher!' (Mā. Śam. 1. 82-83)! Writing thus the author in fact has established that the king was not at all a promoter of scholarship.

The author completes the story with another wonderful incident. The buddhists, after due meditation, said 'there is a serpent in it'; and Bhaṭṭa said 'there is Viṣṇu, the Lord who rests on the serpent!' (Mā. Śam. 1. 87). Because of this, Bhaṭṭa's two declared blunders – destroying the buddhists, and rejecting *Īśwara* - for which he went for expiation (Mā. Śam. 7. 100-102), have become false. For, according to the first chapter, he won over the buddhists in debates, and did not betray his preceptor; and, having accepted *Īśwara*, said

1. सान्निध्यमात्रतस्तस्य पुम्सश्चिन्तामणेरिव ।

निःसरन्ति यथाकामं कुडुढादिभ्योऽपि देशनाः ॥

एवमाद्युच्यमानं तु ब्रह्मधनस्य शोभते ।

कुड्यादिनिःसृतत्वाच्च नाश्वासो देशनासु नः ॥

किन्तु बुद्धप्रणीताः स्युः किमु कैश्चिदुरात्मभिः ।

अदृश्यैर्विप्रलम्भार्थं पिशाचादिभिरीरिताः ॥ (श्लोकवार्तिक, चोदनासूत्र, 138 - 140)

The statement of the buddhists that just by the presence of Buddha, like how it happens by a *cintāmaṇi*, teachings pour out even from walls profusely - is acceptable only for those who are faithfully devoted. But we do not believe in the teachings coming out of walls. (We doubt) whether those words are from Buddha or whether they are from unseen evil spirits to deceive; so we do not believe in them - is the meaning of these śloka.

that Viṣṇu is in the pot. To say that Bhaṭṭa rejected *Īśwara* is not only against *Mādhavas* own statement, but also contrary to factual reality. Because, in *Śloka-vārtika* (श्लोकवार्तिक) he has written ‘प्रायेणैव हि मीमांसा लोके लोकायतीकृता । तामास्तिकपथे नेतुमयं यत्नः कृतो मया ॥’ (Slo. Var. 1. 10). The meaning of this *śloka* is that ‘people have almost made *Mīmāṃsā Śāstra* into a *Lokāyata Darśana*; I have made this attempt with an intention of bringing that into theistic path’. In the very first *Maṅgalaśloka* of the same book he has sung the glory of *Īśwara* who is *CandrārḍhaŚekhara*: ‘विशुद्धज्ञानदेहाय त्रिवेदीदिव्यचक्षुषे । श्रेयःप्राप्तिनिमित्ताय नमः सोमार्धधारिणे ॥’.

### Did Bhaṭṭa get the buddhists killed?

69. *Cidvilāsīya* too contains the story of Bhaṭṭa studying under the buddhists; but there is no mention of his being pushed down from upper floor. When asked as to why he came to tears, Bhaṭṭa lied that it was in appreciation of preceptor’s logic (युक्तीराकर्ण्य निर्णिक्ता भवद्देशिक-निर्मिताः । समुद्यन्निर्भरानन्दतुन्दिलावशचेतसः । निससुरश्रुव्याजेन बहिरानन्दबिन्दवः ॥ Ci. Śam. 16. 16-17). Coming to know that he was a brahmin, the buddhists themselves went out to alienate him (विज्ञाय तद्विनिष्क्रम्य Ci. Śam. 16. 19); (and Bhaṭṭa,) having refuted the buddhists, got them beheaded by the king (विज्ञाप्य तन्महीश्वरम् । शिरांसि छेदयामास सौगतानां समन्ततः ॥ (Chi. Śam. 16. 20).

We have to note here the mention of Bhaṭṭa getting the buddhists beheaded by the king. In *Mādhavīya* too we read that when Kumārila Bhaṭṭa won the snake test by way of a voice from heaven, the king ordered his servants that ‘from *setu* (*Rāmeśwaram*) to the *Himālayas*, whosoever does not kill the buddhists, even the old and the infants,

should be killed' (आसेतोरातुषाराद्रेः बौद्धानावृद्धबालकम् । न हन्ति यः स हन्तव्यो भृत्यानित्यन्वशात्पः ॥ Mā. Śam. 1. 93). In the same run, *Anantānanda-giriya* too mentions that (the king) 'got their heads chopped off, pulverized and got thrown into the forest fire' ('राजमुखादनेकविद्या-प्रसङ्गप्रभेदैर्निर्जित्य तेषां शीर्षाणि पर्व(?)भिश्छित्वा झावानलेषु (दावानलेषु?) निक्षिप्य शङ्ख(?)भ्रमणै-श्रूर्णीकृत्य<sup>1</sup> चैवं दुष्टमतध्वंसमाचरन् निर्भयो वर्तते' Ā. Śam. 55. p 210-11). If this be true, we will have to believe that Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, with the help of the king, tortured the buddhists to the maximum, and that lakhs and lakhs of buddhists died at the hands of the supporters of brahmin religion. There is no evidence on the side of the buddhists even, to indicate that the decline of Buddhism in India was due to the violence of Hindus. As Hindus strived from time to time to remove the defects and deficiencies in their religion, bringing the very best teachings of Buddha into their life and practice, and as many of the low-castes transgressed into Buddhism and bad practices grew among them, Buddhism disappeared from this country. Further, history tells us that to some extent, the invasion of muslims also caused Buddhism to retreat in this country. There is no historical evidence for Sudhanva being emperor of the entire country, upto the Himālayas; so, what authors like *Mādhava* have written could only be taken as an exaggeration.

1. In the Telugu printed book, the letters are not very clear; we have taken it down as we saw. (The version in De. Chap. 18 is 'परशुभिश्छित्वा बहुषु उलूखलेषु निक्षिप्य कटभ्रमणैः').

### In which state Kumārila Bhaṭṭa was seen by the Ācārya?

70. According to *Mādhavīya*, Bhaṭṭa was inside a heap of paddy husk, and Prabhākara<sup>1</sup> and other disciples were standing nearby and shedding tears (Mā. Śam. 7. 77). In *Cidvilāsīya* it is stated that his body was already half-burnt (तथाप्यर्धविदग्धस्य जीवनं स्यात्कथं पुनः Ci. Śam. 16. 30). In *Anantānandagīrīya* it is mentioned that he wanted to burn himself stage by stage in the ritualistic fire on a pile of 108 dried cow-dung cakes of the measure of khārika [अष्टोत्तरशतरूलिका(खारिका)प्रमाणजाग(क?)रीषोपरि होमाग्निना परितः क्रमाद्गन्धे निवसितव्यम् Ā. Śam. 55. p 211]<sup>2</sup>.

Reconciling with these statements, and deciding what kind of expiation Kumārila Bhaṭṭa underwent, how and where, and in what state Ācārya found him? - is beyond the capacity of persons like us.

### Where was Bhaṭṭa's expiation held?

71. It is difficult to say anything on where is this place 'Ruddhapuri' that is mentioned in *Cidvilāsīya* and *Ānandagīrīya*. Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer guesses that it is 'Rudrapura' wherefrom king Bhadrāsena was ruling (CNKS p 38). Somanāthiah imagines that it may be Rodda near Penukonda (So. Śam. p 96). There is no evidence on the basis of which we can decide whether Bhaṭṭa's expiation was held at Prayāg or at Ruddhapuri. If Bhaṭṭa is from the north as mentioned in *Ānandagīrīya*, it could be that he came and settled in the south and refuted the buddhists from there; that he knew Dravidian language as evid-

1. It is not certain that Prabhākara was disciple of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. Some argue that he was earlier to him (Bala. Śam. p 65).

2. The version in De. (p 180) is 'का(खा?)रिका प्रमाणोपत्यकाकरीषोपरि...दग्धेन वसितव्यम्'.

enced in Tantravārtika supports this view. But we should not forget that all this is only imaginary. Somanāthiah (So. Śam. p 96) thinks that since suicide at Prayāg is not sinful, Bhaṭṭa might have entered the burning husk there. This is not correct because expiation is in accordance with the scriptures, and cannot be considered as suicide.

### Did Ācārya really meet Bhaṭṭa?

72. It is doubtful whether Ācārya really met Bhaṭṭa. Śrī C. N. Kṛṣṇaswāmi Iyer, who takes Ācārya's time to be 788 A. D., feels that this is not probable (CNKS p 39); but *Baladeva Upādhyāya* agrees that Śaṅkara and Bhaṭṭa are contemporaries, and thinks that the meeting between the two is not improbable (Bala. Śam. p 38). We have given some selected *śloka*s from Jinavijaya in the Appendix III. There is a *śloka* which reads 'पश्चात्पञ्चदशे वर्षे शङ्करस्य गते सति । भट्टाचार्यकुमारस्य दर्शनं कृतवान् शिवः ॥'. Its implication is that the Ācārya in his fifteenth year of age met Bhaṭṭa. One thing has to be considered here. Both the Ācārya and his disciple Sureśwara have made reference to several opinions of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and some they have agreed upon and some they have refuted<sup>1</sup>. But in the Vārtikas of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, we do not find the consideration of the method of Vedānta accepted by Ācārya. This does not mean that Kumārila was not conversant with Vedānta; because he writes that 'the existence of Ātman, which Śabarāswāmī cleverly establishes,

1. For example, in the समन्वयाधिकरण of Sūtrabhāṣya we find some of the Bhaṭṭa's opinions refuted, and some of them accepted. In Sureśwara's बृहदारण्यकवार्तिक, we find Bhaṭṭa's Vārtikas 'अप्रामाण्यं त्रिधा भिन्नम्' considered and his opinion that 'among false knowledge, nescience and doubt, only nescience is non-existent' (चोदनासूत्र, *śloka* 54,55) has been refuted (बृहदारण्यकवार्तिक, 1.4. 421-422).



becomes concrete by the practice of Vedānta' (दृढत्वमेतद्विषयप्रबोधः प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन । Slo. Vār. - Ātmavāda, 148). But it is doubtful whether he knew Śaṅkara's Vedānta Prakriyā. He has nowhere discussed the extraordinary prakriyas of Śaṅkara like Adhyāsa (अध्यास), Avasthā-trayaprakriyā (अवस्थात्रयप्रक्रिया), etc. Because Bhaṭṭapāda mentions points of disputation on a Jain Pandit by name Akalanka Deva, and because he has cited five ślokaś from Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*, he should be later to both of them. But *Prabhācandra*, a disciple of *Akalanka Deva*, has cited from *Tantravārtika*. Hence Bhaṭṭapāda must be a little earlier to him; that means he should be a contemporary of *Akalanka Deva*. We come to know from Somanāthaiah's book<sup>1</sup> (So. Śam. p 86-87) that K. B. Pāṭhak, a researcher on the subject, has ascribed *Akalanka Deva* to the time of *Kṛṣṇarāja* I of the *Rāṣṭrakūṭa* dynasty. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has sought to fix Śaṅkara earlier to the middle of 8th Century A. D. (Bala. Śam. p 37) on the basis of the fact that Vidyānanda, a disciple of *Akalanka Deva*, in his *Ashtā sāhasrī* has cited from Sureśwara's *Bṛhadāranyaka Vārtika*. If this be so, Sureśwara, the author of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, who has declared to have written it 'after worshipping the two lotus feet of the Ācārya', would become a contemporary of Śaṅkara; so, on this account also, we have to fix Śaṅkara around 750 A. D. in accordance with *Baladeva Upādhyāya*. Then, is it proper to imagine Ācārya to have seen Bhaṭṭapāda who is a contemporary of *Akalanka Deva*? We have already mentioned the relation between Dharmakīrti and Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (page \*126). Just as the Ācārya made reference from

1. The support of a document – proceedings of the Congress of Orientalists 1892 A.C. Vol. P. 186, by Somanāthaiah.

Kumārila, he has done it from Dharmakīrti too; and since both of these seem to have nowhere discussed Ācārya's Vedānta prakriyā, we have to somewhat hesitate to say that the Ācārya was a contemporary of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. Considering that he did not live after seeing Ācārya's Bhāṣya, we will have to somehow console ourselves that Bhaṭṭa could not possibly discuss Bhāṣya in his works.

Thus, although it becomes doubtful that the Ācārya could possibly have met Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, Kumārila's expiation in a pile of burning paddy husk need not be false. Considering the story of the traditionalists, we have to believe that Bhaṭṭa was sentimental by nature. We too agree with the statement of Śrī Kṛṣṇaswāmi Iyer (CNKS p 39-40) that if Bhaṭṭa was convinced that he had committed a sinful act, and that there is no go without a severe expiation, he is not a person to desist from such an expiation. But, only the Lord Parameśwara knows the real truth.



## 8. A Critique of the Maṇḍana Episode

### What did Bhaṭṭa say to the Ācārya?

73. If the meeting between Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and the Ācārya has turned out thus to be controversial, we can say that the matter relating to Maṇḍana Miśra, a disciple of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, is much more complicated.

First of all, let us summarize the story contained in *Mādhavīya*. Bhaṭṭapāda expressed his helplessness saying ‘Had I met you earlier, I would not have resorted to this expiation; just as I have written *Vārtika* for *Śābarabhāṣya*, I could have earned some honour by writing a *Vārtika* for your *Bhāṣya* also. I am not fortunate enough’ (Mā. Śam. 7. 104-105). When Śaṅkara offered to sprinkle water from his water-pot and rejuvenate his body (उज्जीवयामि करकाम्बुगणोक्षणेन 7. 107), he politely refused telling ‘although that is a virtuous way, since it is contrary to the ways of the world, I do not want that; instead, please initiate me into brahma tattva and make me fulfilled’ (7. 112). Then he said ‘I do not have to tell you anything; if you can win over the famous scholar by name Maṇḍana Miśra, it is as good as winning over all. Always upholding the path of yoga (karma), he is famous as Viśwarūpa. He is well-established in Vedic path; he is always engaged in the *Pravṛtti Śāstras* and indifferent to the *Nivṛtti Śāstras*. Somehow you will have to win over him. He is also known as Umbeka, and his wife is called Umbe. She was cursed by Dūrvāsa for some reason, and is born as Ubhaya Bhāratī. In fact, he is more well-versed in the

Śāstras than me; he is the dearest among my disciples. Keeping his wife as witness, win over him in debate, and get *Vārtikas* written by him on your works. You have come to me at the appropriate time; you are Lord Vishwanatha to me; so please initiate me into the liberating mantra and make me fulfilled'. Later Śaṅkara went to Mahishmati city to win over the Maṇḍana Paṇḍita (Mā. Śam. 7. 100-121; and 8. 1).

Here *Mādhava* has culled up whatever he knew about Maṇḍana and has given it in the words of Bhaṭṭa. We shall discuss about this shortly. Please note his telling to get *Vārtika* written by Maṇḍana (Mā. Śam. 7. 118). We can guess that it was the desire of the author (*Mādhava*) that it would have been better if Kumārila had written *Vārtika* on *Sūtrabhāṣya*, just as he had written one on *Śābarabhāṣya*. This feeling is not only of *Mādhava*, but also is expressed in *Vyāsācalīya*: 'अष्टौ सहस्राणि विभान्ति विद्वन् सद्वातिकानां प्रथमेऽत्र भाष्ये । अहं यदि स्यामगृहीतदीक्षो ध्रुवं विधास्ये सुनिबद्धमस्य ॥' (Vyā. Śam. 5. 14; Mā. Śam. 7. 83). 'To your first *Adhyāsabhāṣya* itself I feel eight thousand *Vārtikas* could be written; had I not taken up this expiation on myself, I could necessarily have written the *Vārtika*' is the meaning of this *śloka*.

Now, let us see what is there in *Cidvilāsiya*. When Bhaṭṭa told 'I have decided about the expiation for the sin I have committed, on the basis of the scriptures. Fortunately, you have come at the correct time; within a short while I am going to die', the Ācārya replied, 'You do not seem to know the meaning of what is expressed in the *Gītā*. Who is the killer, and who is the killed? All this is going on as ordained by *Īśwara*' (Ci. Śam. 16. 5). Bhaṭṭa wondered 'Oh, you are right. I have heard that some *Sannyāsin* has written the *Bhāṣya*; it must be you, and this could be that *Bhāṣya*. Going through it only will

enable me to tell something. My body being half-baked, how my intellect can be steady? And how could I continue to live? So, you please proceed to Kāśmīr; there is Maṇḍana Miśra, my best student. I have taught him the meaning of *Jaimini Sūtras* nearly twenty times. For him, *karma* itself is Brahman; he is Brahma incarnated. He has a wife by name *Sarasavāṇi*. Since she laughed at a wrong intonation, Dūr-vāsa had cursed her to be born as a human being; and the curse would be withdrawn when she sees Śiva in human form. Consequently, she has born as *Bhārati* and has become his wife. If you have a desire for debate, you can get that desire fulfilled there; win over him, give him *Sannyāsa*, and get *Vārtika* on the Bhāṣya written by him'. Then, being unable to get up, mentally prostrated with devotion, and bid *adieu*, singing the glories of the Ācārya (Ci. Śam. 16. 23-36; 41-43).

*Mādhavīya* tells clearly that Maṇḍana was in the city of *Māhiṣmati* (Mā. Śam. 8. 1); here it is mentioned that he was in Kāśmīr. Here also it is told that the Ācārya should get *Vārtika* done by him; but feeling bad that he himself could not do that, or getting initiated into liberation (*Tāraka mantra*) is not here. Since this information of getting initiated is also not there in *Vyāsācalīya*, it appears that it is just an imagination of *Mādhava*.

In *Ānandagīrīya* it is like this: (When the Ācārya said,) 'How come you are in such a state of ignorance? Do not you know the *Smṛti* "he who thinks he is the killer, and he who thinks he is killed, both are not knowers"?', although the body was burnt upto the knee, Bhaṭṭa showed his displeasure saying 'who is this new *Bauddha* who has arrived at the wrong time? Why he has come?' The Ācārya said, 'I am not *Bauddha*, I am Śaṅkarācārya, follower of the pure Advaitic path; I

had come for a debate with you'. Then Bhaṭṭa said, 'There is Maṇḍana Miśra, my sister's husband in the north country<sup>1</sup>; he is an all-knower; he is like Brahma for all learning. Go to him and argue until the itching on your tongue is subsided! I am now starting towards the other world, *Paraloka*, being tied up by the thread of my deeds, *karmasūtra*'. Then he closed his eyes and concentrated his mind on Brahman who is the Ātman in all beings (Ā. Śam. 55. 212-213). There is no mention of *Māhiṣmati*, no mention that Maṇḍana is his disciple, and nothing about *Vārtika*.

### Is Maṇḍana same as Viśwarūpa

74. Is Maṇḍana same as Viśwarūpa, or is Viśwarūpa a different person? We have already mentioned that in *Mādhavīya* it is clearly stated that Maṇḍana is famous by name Viśwarūpa (स विश्वरूपः प्रथितो महीतले Mā. Śam. 7. 114). It is to be enquired into whether these two names are of one person.

In *Vyāsācalīya* the story runs like this: The Ācārya started with his disciples for a pilgrimage and came to Prayāg, famous as the place where Brahma and others performed sacrifices (Vyā. Śam. 6. 4); they saw there Bhaṭṭapāda who was in the fire of paddy husk (Vyā. Śam. 6. 10). Bhaṭṭa offered hospitality through disciples, and explained how he studied with buddhists, how they pushed him down from upstairs, and how he expiated himself for the sin of deceiving his Guru (Vyā. Śam. 5. 11-33). There is no mention of getting the buddhists killed. It is stated that 'There is one disciple of mine in *Magadha* country; he will compose a writing on your Bhāṣya (मगधेषु वसन् ममास्ति शिष्यः स

1. In the Devanāgarī copy, there is no mention of 'उदग्देशेषु' (De. p 181).

तु तस्मै प्रभवत्यसंशयम् Vyā. Śam. 5. 34); he is famous as Viśwarūpa (स विश्वरूपः प्रथितो महीतले Vyā. Śam. 5. 35); he is a celebrated householder, an adept in Vedic rites; he does not approve of renunciation. If you win over him, your desire will be fulfilled. So, go there without delay' ('महागृही वैदिककर्मतत्परः । प्रवृत्तिशास्त्रे निरतः स कर्मठः ॥ निवृत्तिशास्त्रे न कृतादरः स्वयं (केनाप्यु)पायेन वशं स नीयताम् । वशं गते तत्र भवेन्मनोरथस्तदन्तिकं गच्छतु मा चिरं भवान् ॥' (Vyā. Śam. 5. 35-36). All this is about a Bhaṭṭa's disciple by name Viśwarūpa. We should note that the very ślokas of *Mādhaviya* (7. 114-115) are the ślokas of *Vyāsācalīya* (5. 35,36).

From hereonwards in *Vyāsācalīya* the story of Maṇḍana Miśra commences. Having started with 'Maṇḍana, who knew all that by staying near Bhaṭṭa, came to Śaṅkarācārya' ('तत्पाश्चवर्ती विदितार्थसङ्ग्रहः । स मण्डनाख्योऽभिजगाम शङ्करम् ॥' Vyā. Śam. 5. 37), (the story says that) Maṇḍana requested 'I had heard about you, and now I am seeing you; please accept my service and bless me'. The Ācārya told Maṇḍana, 'carry out the karmas prescribed in the Vedas, and the mind gets purified by that; if that is purified, Brahman that is of the nature of bliss will be reflected in it just as the face in a mirror' (Vyā. Śam. 5. 45). Further he continued,

त्यक्त्वा मण्डन भेदगोचरधियं मिथ्याभिमानात्मिका-

मद्वैते भव निष्ठितो मम वचस्ते रोचते यद्यतः ।

तीर्त्वा संसृतिवारिधिं परपदे ज्ञानप्लवारोहणात्

पारे स्थास्यसि निर्वृतः सुखमयो संसारवार्तोऽज्झिते ॥

'O Maṇḍana, if you feel my words to be correct, stay put at Advaita leaving all erroneous conceptions of differentiation. By taking the boat of knowledge you will cross the sea of birth-and-death cycle and stay blissfully disconnected from *samsāra*'. Thus, by way of sen-

tences leading towards Brahman, making Maṇḍana have firm devotion in the path of Ātman, he decided to proceed further (Vyā. Śam. 5. 47). Thus closes the fifth chapter of *Vyāsācalīya*. Just as the eighth chapter of *Mādhavīya* starts with the *śloka*

अथ प्रतस्थे भगवान्प्रयागात्तन्मण्डनं पण्डितमाशु जेतुम् ।

गच्छन् स्वसृत्या पुरमालुलोके माहीष्मतीं मण्डनमण्डितं सः ॥ १ ॥

(Thus Bhagavān (Ācārya), desirous of quickly winning over Maṇḍana Paṇḍita, taking arial route saw the city of *Māhiṣmati* adorned by Maṇḍana) the sixth chapter of *Vyāsācalīya* too starts with the *śloka*

अथ प्रतस्थे भगवान् प्रयागात् दिदृक्षमाणो गृहिविश्वरूपम् ।

विहायसा योगभवेन गच्छन्नवातरत्तस्य गृहाङ्गणान्तम् ॥ १ ॥

The meaning of the *śloka* is that ‘the Bhagavān (Ācārya), desirous of seeing the house-holder Viśwarūpa, taking the arial route by the power of Yoga, descended in front of the courtyard of his house’. As per *Vyāsācalīya*, Maṇḍana that was in Prayāg is different from Viśwarūpa who was in *Magadha* kingdom. And it is clear that the present debate took place not with Maṇḍana but with Viśwarūpa. *Govindanātha*, following the *Vyāsācalīya* closely, does not at all mention the name of Maṇḍana; he has made Bhaṭṭa say only ‘my disciple by name Viśwarūpa is at *Magadha*’ (Go. Śam. 5. 25).

Is the author of *Vyāsācalīya*, *Vyāsācala* described by *Mādhava*, or is he a different one? The reason for the doubt has already been mentioned (page \*9). Even if we think that the *Vyāsācalīya* that we have today is not the ancient *Vyāsācalīya* but different and recent, we cannot deny that people were there at the time of the book, who thought Maṇḍana and Viśwarūpa to be different. One Viśwarūpācārya is known as the author of a commentary to *Yājñvalky-*



*asmṛti* (याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति) having the title *Bālakrīḍā* (बालक्रीडा). The style of that book is different from the style of Maṇḍana. On this account also, it seems, the famous Maṇḍana would not have been Viśwarūpa. Rāmatīrtha writes that it is Viśwarūpācārya who wrote the commentary entitled *Mānasollāsa* (मानसोल्लास) to the *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra* (दक्षिणामूर्तिस्तोत्र) of Śaṅkara (Rāmatīrthavyākhyā (रामतीर्थव्याख्या) p 25). In the introduction to the Kannaḍa version of that book, we have shown that there are reasons to believe *Mānasollāsa* is not authored by *Sureśwarācārya*. Did Viśwarūpa who was a house-holder write that? is a question to be considered by critics. Śaṅkara is famous in this country as the author of *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra*; and nowhere in the book the author of *Mānasollāsa* mentions the name of Śaṅkara or even his name. Even then, we do not know how Viśwarūpa has come to be considered as its author. Another thing is: It is customary that Sannyāsins worship 'Ācārya Pañcaka' at the time of taking the vow of *Cāturmāsya*; in that *Sureśwarācārya*'s name is not there; *Dharma Sindhu* and other texts mention 'Viśwarūpācārya' instead. If Viśwarūpa is a householder, how come he is considered as an Ācārya? If he is a Sannyāsin, why this matter is not there in any one of his works? If Maṇḍana himself is Viśwarūpa, why at least the commentators are not calling him by that name? Thus, there are so many difficulties to consider the oneness of Maṇḍana and Viśwarūpa; to say Viśwarūpa himself is *Sureśwarācārya* too has many difficulties.

## Controversy about Maṇḍana himself being Sureśwarācārya

75. *Mādhava*, the author of *Mādhavīya* has written that Maṇḍana is the disciple of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa; could this be true? Did Ācārya argue with him? After defeat, did he become a disciple of the Ācārya by name *Sureśwarācārya*? This is another knotty question.

This question has been discussed by S. Kuppaswāmi Śāstry and Mahā Mahopādhyāya P. V. Subrahmaṇya Śāstry in their English introduction to a book by Maṇḍana, by name *Brahmasiddhi* which has been published in the Madras Oriental Manuscript Series (No. 4). They hold opposing views in this matter. Following professor Hirianna's published opinion regarding the distinctive features in their arguments based on *Guruvamśa kāvya* published with the consent of Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha in which Maṇḍana and Sureśwarācārya are considered as different, Śrī Kuppaswāmi Śāstry has argued that these two persons are different. (1) Śrī Śāstry points out that Maṇḍana has not written anywhere in his works that he is a disciple of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa; instead expressions like Ācārya Maṇḍana Miśra, Śrīman Maṇḍana Miśra, Mahāmahopādhyāya Maṇḍana Miśra, Āryamaṇḍana, Maṇḍana etc. are found (Introduction to *Brahmasiddhi*, p xxv). (In a footnote Śrī Śāstry writes that in *Vivaraṇa Prameya Sangraha* and *Parāśara Mādhavīya*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtikas* are considered as authored by Viśwarūpācārya; this means that the illusion of considering Viśwarūpa and Sureśwara as one was firmly established at the very time of Mādhavācārya. Śāstry also says that Ānandānubhava, the author of *Nyāyaratnāvali*, has written 'गृहस्थावस्थायां विरचिते

विश्वरूपग्रन्थे दर्शितवाक्यपरिग्रहो दृश्यते । न चासौ ग्रन्थः संन्यासिना विरचितः । तथा हि परिव्राजकाचार्यसुरेश्वरविरचितेति ग्रन्थे नाम लिखेत् । लिखितं तु भट्टविश्वरूपेण विरचितेति ॥'. This means that in the opinion of Ānandānubhava, Viśvarūpa is not the name of a Sanyasin. As this is not relevant presently, it can be ignored but since it bears witness to what has been discussed in the previous section, we have mentioned it here). Śāstry has pointed out that Maṇḍana has also not written anywhere in his books that he is Śaṅkarācārya's disciple either; this will not come in the way of the identity of Maṇḍana and Sureśwara if we consider these books to have been written when he was a householder. But, Śāstry says that (2) if we consider the different philosophical positions of Maṇḍana and Sureśwara; and (3) when we observe that writers of books on Advaita have cited the sentences of Maṇḍana and Sureśwara differently in association with their respective names; it becomes amply clear that they should be different persons. It is worthwhile to consider another proof that Śrī Kuppūswāmi Śāstry gives. (4) While referring to Śaṅkara's opinion that since *jñāna* and *Karma* are mutually contradictory, there is no relation whatsoever between them (Brahmasiddhi, p 32), Maṇḍana writes in conclusion 'तस्मान्नावगतब्रह्मात्मभावः, प्रागिव सांसारिकधर्मभाक् । यस्तु तथा, नासावगतब्रह्मात्मभाव इति ॥' (Brahmasiddhi, p 34). This looks as if he is echoing Ācārya's sentences of the Bhāṣya to Samanvaya Sūtra: 'तस्मान्नावगतब्रह्मभावस्य यथापूर्वं संसारित्वम् । यस्य तु यथापूर्वं संसारित्वं नासावगत-ब्रह्मात्मभाव इत्यनवद्यम्' (Therefore, for one who has established himself in the knowledge that he is Brahman, there will not be saṃsāritva as was earlier; and, one who continues to have saṃsāritva as earlier, is without conviction in the knowledge that he is Brahman. Hence there is no demerit

here.) All have to ratify the writing of *Śāstri* (Brahmasiddhi, p xlviii) when he says that Maṇḍana, as if indicating that what he writes as prima facie view to his theory of *jñāna-karma-samuccaya* is in fact Śaṅkarācārya's, includes these two unforgettable sentences in the Bhāṣya section on Reconciliation, to the concluding part of the prima facie view. As we felt it would be out of place here to point out the philosophical differences between Maṇḍana and *Sureśwarācārya*, we have left it as such. Those who wish to learn about more details are referred to the English Introduction of Brahmasiddhi.

What we have depicted till now is only one side of this argumentation. Now we have to place the other side before the readers. What P. V. Subrahmaṇya Śāstry writes about this in Introduction of the same Brahmasiddhi, is, in essence: (1) Differences in philosophical positions, whatever those be, would not be evidences for persons being different. (2) If we regard the works published in the name of Maṇḍana to be of the householder Maṇḍana who had agreed with the position of Vedāntins having attachment to *pūrva-mīmāṃsā*, should it not be that there should be differences and specialities (from those of his earlier works) appearing in his works written after getting defeated by Śaṅkara and himself becoming *Sureśwarācārya*? Such differences too are not significant enough that we cannot reconcile with by inferring a broadening of views from pre-Shaankarite to Shaankarite and to post-Shaankarite Vedāntins. Traditionalists are saying in one voice that Maṇḍana the mīmāṃsaka, after getting defeated by Śaṅkara and consequent *Sannyāsa*, himself became *Sureśwarācārya*. (3) There are a few ślokaś with similar meaning and some common sentences in both Brahmasiddhi of Maṇḍana

and Sambandha Vārtika of *Sureśwarācārya*; this is possible only if these two persons are one and the same. (4) Both the upholders and opponents of Advaita of the immediate post-Śaṅkara period regard Maṇḍana's work as authority on Advaita. In the chronological order of Advaitins given by *Kuppuswāmy Śāstri*, Maṇḍana and *Sureśwarācārya* are separated by only five years. If this be held as correct, it is not possible to suppose that *Sureśwarācārya* would have taken so many sentences from Maṇḍana without even mentioning his name in his works. (5) In *Vyāsācalīya*, Viśwarūpa is mentioned to be explaining that although earlier a follower of the Vedic karmas, he has now changed school of thought, in answer to the objection of the other disciples for writing the *Vārtika* after taking *Sannyāsa*. Therefore it is no wonder if Viśwarūpa's opinions are changed. (6) Both the persons mentioned in *Guruvamśakāvya* bear the name of Maṇḍana; one of them is a householder, and the other Maṇḍana by name Viśwarūpa has taken the name of *Sureśwarācārya* after taking *Sannyāsa*. Maṇḍana was an honorary title for some. (7) In *Ānandagirīya*, the most ancient among the ŚaṅkaraVijayas, the name Maṇḍana Miśra is clearly mentioned; and hence it is justified to accept that Maṇḍana himself lost the argumentation and became *Sureśwarācārya*.

### **Identity of Maṇḍana and Sureśwara: Opinion of the author of this book**

76. It need not be over-emphasized that each thoughtful one has to consider a controversial matter critically with an open mind and come to a conclusion. So, we shall record our conclusion about

this matter with reasons. The readers are to take what they feel as just. (1) In no Śaṅkara vijaya it is mentioned that Maṇḍana was a *Vedāntin*. Therefore there is no basis to decide that the authors of Śaṅkaravijayas have called him a ritualist just because he was biased towards mīmāṃsa. The debates depicted in the Śaṅkara vijayas take place on the basis of *karma-brahmavāda*; and Maṇḍana never accepted Vedānta as pramāṇa. (2) In both *Vyāsācalīya* and *Guruvamśakāvya* the two persons Maṇḍana and Viśwarūpa are thought of separately; Viśwarūpa has not been called as Maṇḍana. (3) Also 'Maṇḍana' cannot be considered only as a title, because Maṇḍana Miśra would not have referred to himself in his works only by title name as 'Ācārya Maṇḍana' and 'Maṇḍana Miśra'. (4) It is true that there are similar sentences and strategies (yukti) in the works of *Sureśwarācārya* and Maṇḍana; just because of that it does not get proved that they are one and the same. Advaitins like Śaṅkarācārya have been utilising acceptable advaitic prakriyas of other schools of thought. For example, Maṇḍana Miśra himself has used the opinion 'अनादिप्रयोजना अविद्या' from *Avidyopādāna-bhedavādin* school of thought (Brahmasiddhi, p 10); and has also used somewhat altered version of *Prapañca-pravilaya-vādin* school of thought (Brahmasiddhi, p 157). (5) The strategies that *Sureśwarācārya* has taken from Maṇḍana are agreeable to both; it is not possible to decide whether any previous Advaitins had used them or whether Maṇḍana has used them for the first time. *Sureśwarācārya* and later Advaitins have continued to use as their own, strategies rejecting distinctions that we find in Maṇḍana's Brahmasiddhi; also they have been countering his strategies in favour of samuccayavāda. It has to

be said that the Advaitins of different groups have been highlighting their own specialities, as well as mutually taking support with regard to their common premises. Just because of this, no support can come forth for inferring identity of authors. This would remain true even if the chronological order given by *Kuppuswāmi Śāstri* is not acceptable to all. (6) There are certain difficulties to accept that *Anantānandagiriya* Śaṅkaravijaya is the most ancient one. We have already shown that there are different versions of this book, into which things have been added and subtracted as per needed support for their views. In the Telugu version that we have with us, it is mentioned that Śaṅkarācārya went to Maṇḍana Miśra's house along with Padmapāda and Sureśwara (पद्मपादसुरेश्वरादि<sup>1</sup> शिष्यकृतकरतालैः, Chap. 56, p 212)! If we accept this, Sureśwara would be different from Maṇḍana Miśra! Some people argue that one more manuscript version of *Anantānandagiriya* Śaṅkaravijaya is in Kumbhakoṇam maṭha and that the Ḍiṇḍima commentator of *Mādhaviya* Śaṅkaravijaya has taken several ślokaś from it (NVS, Appendix). (7) *Ātmabodha* has cited from *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*, *BṛhatŚaṅkaraVijaya* etc. in his *Suśamā*. It is possible that the Maṇḍana episode is mentioned in them. In *Gururatnamālikā* itself it is mentioned that the Ācārya won over Maṇḍana Miśra in a brahmin village called Padmavana<sup>2</sup> (‘पटुमण्डनमिश्रखण्डनार्थं प्रविशन्पद्मवनं नवं जयार्थम् । तमधृष्यगिरं विधृष्य वादैर्यतिमाधात् स च पातु मां प्रमोदी ॥’ Gu. Ra. 22). This being so, it is better to imagine

1. In the Devanāgarī version, the mention is only ‘पद्मपादादि’; ‘ततः’ of Telugu version is not to be found. Also instead of ‘ढक्काकाहलध्वनिभिः’, it is mentioned as ‘ढक्काशङ्खतालध्वनिभिः’.

2. This pertains to *Ātmabodha*'s commentary; we shall take up this issue later once again.

that in these Śaṅkaravijayas written long time after Śaṅkara, people must have added whatever heresay was in vogue at their time. (8) Whatever that may be, as *Kuppuswāmi Śāstri* says, since Maṇḍana has cited sentences from Samanvayādhikaraṇa of Śaṅkara's *Sūtrabhāṣya*, we will have to accept that his Brahmasiddhi was written later than *Sūtrabhāṣya*. If this be so, it would mean that he has written this work to exhibit his extraordinary prakriyā, different from the Vedānta prakriyā accepted by the Ācārya. (9) Maṇḍana has not examined Ācārya's *Adhyāsavāda* either in his Brahmasiddhi or in his Vibhramaviveka; he is happy with establishing Viparīta Khyāti. He has proposed a new theory that *Avidyā* is neither *Sat*, nor *Asat* but *Sadasadvilakṣaṇa*; and hence *Anirvacanīya*. This argument is being used by Advaitins following Vyākhyāna-Prasthānas even now. In his works *Vidhiviveka* and *Bhāvanāviveka* Maṇḍana has refined the positions of the *mīmāṃsakas* to fit them with *Vedānta*; and he has examined the two works in his Brahmasiddhi. Whereas *Sureśwarācārya*, in his *Vārtikas*, while retaining whatever portions that would be agreeable to him, has highlighted new argumentations that Maṇḍana has not considered. Also he has refuted several that are similar to Maṇḍana argumentations.

**‘Because of all these reasons, it would be difficult to believe that Maṇḍana Miśra is a disciple of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, or that the Ācārya's winning over him in a debate, giving him *Sannyāsa* and naming him as Sureśwarācārya is a historically viable incident.**



### Are Maṇḍana and Umbeka the same?

77. Hitherto we have discussed about the names Maṇḍana and Viśwarūpa found in *Mādhavīya*. Now we will have to consider another name Umbeka mentioned by *Mādhava*. Archaeological researchers are saying that Bhavabhūti is the disciple of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, the famous *mīmāṃsaka*; he is also called Umbeka. It is said that in an ancient manuscript copy of *MālatiMādhava* of Bhavabhūti, at the end of the third Act, a mention ‘कुमारिल शिष्य(भवभूति)विरचित’ is found<sup>1</sup> ; and at the end of the sixth Act, a mention stating that it is the ‘work of Umbekācārya, one who has attained versatility by the blessings of Kumārila’ (Bala.Śam. p 65-66). The name Umbeka is also found in ancient philosophical books. One by name Pratyagrūpa Bhagavān who has written a commentary Nayanaprasādinī (नयनप्रसादिनी) on Citsukhācārya’s Tattvapradīpikā (तत्त्वप्रदीपिका) has written that Umbeka is Bhavabhūti himself (p 265). Because of these reasons, present critics opine that Umbeka and Bhavabhūti are the same. We cannot be sure that this method of research is beyond objections; because the authors of the cited works are not contemporaries of Bhaṭṭapāda, it is possible that they too might have written on the basis of the opinion in vogue at their times. Whatever that be, it is certain that this Bhavabhūti episode would not form a basis to decide that Maṇḍana Miśra had another name Umbeka as mentioned in *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*.

Thus, as per the discussion we had till now, the incidents - Śaṅkara

---

1. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has written that this copy was found with Śrī Śaṅkara Pānduranga Pandit; unless it is actually scrutinized, no opinion can be given about this.

visiting Bhaṭṭa, Bhaṭṭa expressing his opinion that he ought to have written *Vārtika* had it not been for the expiation he had undertaken, and Bhaṭṭa suggesting Śaṅkara to go to his disciple and get the *Vārtika* done by him - are all in the realm of doubtfulness. It appears as if authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas wish to indicate that the *Vedānta Vārtika* written by *Sureśwarācārya* are in no way inferior to the *Vārtika* written by Bhaṭṭapāda on Pūrvamīmāṃsa. If their opinion is just this much, we may all approve the same.

### Logical knit about the place where Maṇḍana lived

78. Where did Maṇḍana live? This question too is controversial. Although the *śloka* in which *Mādhava* mentions that Ācārya went to Māhiṣmati is found in *Vyāsācalīya* with minor changes, we have already pointed out that it is described there as Bhaṭṭa mentioning Maṇḍana to have been at *Magadha* country (page \*140).

Both Cidvilāsa and *Anantānandagiri* have written that the Ācārya met Maṇḍana at a place called Bijjalabiḍu. In the 17th Chapter of *Cidvilāsīya* it is mentioned that starting from Ruddhanagara, he came to Kāśmīr, the abode of scholars (काश्मीरं विद्वदाधारं शुभकरमवाप 17.2); and after describing the country in some *ślokas* (समुल्लसल्लता-लास्यविद्याभ्यासोचितैश्चित्तम् । विज्वलद्बिन्दुराख्यातं पुरमाप स देशिकः ॥ 17.15) it is mentioned that he came to a city called Vijwaladbindu. In the Telugu manuscript that we have of *Anantānandagirīya*, it is mentioned only that the Paramaguru reached the famous place Vidyānilaya (परमगुरुर्विद्यानिलयमिति प्रसिद्धपुरं प्राप्तः). Somanāthaiah has written (So. Śam. p 98) that the sentence reads ‘कुबेरदिङ्मार्गमवलम्ब्य हस्तिनापुरादाग्नेयभागस्थं विद्यानिलयमिति प्रसिद्धं तद्देशवासिनस्तु बिज्जळबिडुरिति वदन्ति - तत्पुरं प्रापुः ॥’ (having

taken northern direction, the Ācārya reached Vidyānilaya - the countrymen call that as Bijjalabiḍu - which is southeast of Hastināpura). In page 182 of the *Ānandagīrīya* that *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has seen, the place is mentioned as Vijwalabindu!<sup>1</sup> (an example indicating that *Ānandagīrīya* has suffered in the hands of publishers). Whatever that be - whether Bijjalabiḍu or the sanskritized Vijwaladbindu - it is not Māhiṣmati; it is in Kāśmīr according to Cidvilāsa, southeast of Hastinapura according to *Ānandagīrī* - this being so, it is not possible to locate it. It seems Maṇimañjarībhedinī (मणिमञ्जरीभेदिनी) (Chap. 3, śloka 9) also mentions Vidyālaya<sup>2</sup> (So. Śam. p 99). We learn that the mathematician-astrologer Bhāskarācārya lived in 'Vijjaḍabiḍu' from the śloka of Siddhānta-Śīromaṇi (सिद्धान्तशिरोमणि): 'आसीत्सह्यकुलाचलाश्रितपुरे त्रैविद्यविद्वज्जने । नानासज्जनधाम्नि विज्जडविदे शाण्डिल्यगोत्रो द्विजः ॥' (So. Śam. p 99). If Bijjalabiḍu is a Kannaḍa name, it should be Bijjalabeedu; since its whereabouts are not known, further discussion about it is bound to be futile.

Māhiṣmati described by *Mādhava* appears to be a fit place in which Maṇḍana with the suffix Miśra could have lived. That place, which is located on the banks of Narmadā river, is now called 'Māndhātha'. Here a rivulet by name Māhiṣmati too joins Narmadā. Here was a storied house owned by Maṇḍana; remnants are found there even now. The soil, when dug, is found to be mixed with ash; may be sacrifices were performed there. *Baladeva Upādhyāya*'s guess is that the birthplace of Maṇḍana is Mithilā; may be because Māhiṣmati

1. It is mentioned as 'विजिलबिन्दुरिति वदन्ति' in Devanāgarī book.

2. We have the book now with us; it is mentioned as 'विद्यानिलयं नाम पुरं प्रपेदे' (p 26) in the original.

was a holy place, or may be because he got supported by a king, he might have lived there. (Bala. Śam. p 72). Somanāthaiah's guess is that he is from northern part of the country, and he came to Bijjala biḍu because of a king's support (So. Śam. p 101). Speculation can take us anywhere; Whether a debate took place between Ācārya and Maṇḍana itself is controversial; therefore, what is the use for the historians, of the speculations about the place on the basis of the suffix Miśra in his name, or of the attempts to locate Māhiṣmati or Bijjalabiḍu?

### Who is Maṇḍana's wife?

79. We will have to continue with the story after considering another growth of the creeper of imagination. What about Maṇḍana's wife? According to *Mādhavīya*, she is the incarnation of Saraswati; people also used to call her as Saraswati (सरस्वतीति सा खलु वस्तुवृत्त्या लोकोपि तां वक्ति सरस्वतीति Mā. Śam. 3. 9). In the past, when the ṛṣis were studying their Vedas with Brahma, the ṛṣi Dūrvāsa erred somewhere, with a wrong intonation (swara). Hearing that, Saraswati laughed; this enraged Dūrvāsa to curse her 'take birth as a human!'. When Saraswati fell at his feet and requested again and again to withdraw the curse, and as per the prayers of the other ṛṣis, he qualified the curse that she would be released after meeting Śaṅkara in human form (Mā. Śam. 3. 10-15). According to *Cidvilāsiya*<sup>1</sup> her name is Sarasavāṇi. The story

1. The printed text 'शोणातीरे' of *Cidvilāsiya* is not correct; the name of the river is 'शोण', as used by *Mādhava* and others. Because it is नदि but नद. Both *Mādhava* and *Vyāsācala* say that she was conversant with the Vedas complete with the six Vedāṅgas (षडङ्गवेदान् काव्यादिकान् वेत्ति Mā. Śam. 3. 16; Vyā. Śam. 6. 15). Were the women permitted to study the Vedas in those days?

runs similarly as in *Mādhavīya*. All the four - Cidvilāsa (Ci. Śam. 16. 37), *Mādhava* (Mā. Śam. 3. 15,26,49,57), *Vyāsācala* (Vyā. Śam. 6. 14,26,29) and Govindānanda (Go. Śam. 5. 31) - say that she was the daughter of Viṣṇumitra who lived on the banks of Shoṇa river. She was born of a brahmin and was highly educated. A speciality of *Mādhavīya* is that Maṇḍana was the son of one by name Himamitra (-śra?) (Mā. Śam. 3. 57). Maṇḍana learnt Mīmāṃsā from Bhaṭṭapāda and was an honourable scholar in the king's palace (Mā. Śam. 3. 28). Maṇḍana and Bhārati, having heard of each others' qualities and accomplishments, were eager to see each other; and they conveyed their intention to the parents at the proper time. Accordingly they were married to each other (Mā. Śam. 3. 17-77). This detail is also found in *Vyāsācalīya* (Vyā. Śam. 6. 10-77). Maṇḍana is called in *Vyāsācalīya* as Viśwarūpa; we have already mentioned that that name is also there in *Mādhavīya*. But *Mādhava's* calling Maṇḍana as Umbeka, and writing that because of that reason Bhārati had also the name Umbe (Mā. Śam. 7. 115) is nothing but imagination (see page \*151). All the three - *Mādhava*, *Vyāsācala*, *Cidvilāsa* - write that she was the daughter of Viṣṇumitra who lived on the banks of Shoṇa river; since both Shoṇa and Narmadā are near to each other in central area of the country, this marriage is not improbable. But we have to agree upon this only when we accept that the debate between Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara really took place.



## 9. Argumentation with Maṇḍana

### Maṇḍana's House

80. *Mādhavīya* describes that after resting a while at the Lotus Garden<sup>1</sup> (प्रफुल्लराजीवने, Mā. Śam. 8. 3) and finishing off his daily observances, Śaṅkarācārya started to move from there and having seen the servant maids of Maṇḍana's house, asked 'Where is Maṇḍana Pandit's house?' (Mā. Śam. 8. 5). *Cidvilāsīya* -(17-15) mentions that he came to Vijwaladbindupura and asked a brahmin. *Ānandagirīya* describes that the Ācārya asked his disciples to stay at the gardens located east of the city and entered the city alone; and when the sun was about to lean westwards, seeing a group of servant maids, asked them the whereabouts of Maṇḍana's house (Ā. Śam. Chap. 56, p 214; De. p 183).

*Mādhava* describes that the maids replied 'know that to be Maṇḍana's house, wherein at the main door, female parrots in cages would be uttering 'svataḥ pramāṇa, parataḥ pramāṇa', "karma alone yields fruit, Īśvara alone grants the fruit", "the world is eternal, it is not eternal" (Mā. Śam. 8. 6-8). *Cidvilāsayati* gives the answer through a brahmin thus: that house is called Vidyālaya. It is as high as a palmyra tree; it is surrounded with a compound and there is a high entrance-door. It consists of a hundred stone-pillars; there are inner house, shrine, and bed rooms. And at the front there are spacious halls for study. He has got a fifteen-foot high pedestal made,

---

1. *Ātmabodha* has written that Padmavana is the name of a brahmin locality (Gu. Ra. Su. śloka 22).

on which he sits and teaches the disciples; on both sides of the house there are streets and at both entrances of the house he would be teaching Vedas, Vedāṅgas, Purāṇas etc. From the cages that are hung all around, parrots would be arguing like puṇḍits - about aphorisms from *Pātañjala*, *Kāpila*, *Jaimini*; would be singing *Ṛik*, *Yajus*, *Sāma* Vedas, reciting poetry; some would be saying Karma alone is true and some others would be saying Karma is just a proposition.

The answer that the maids gave is described in *Ānandagiriya* similarly (Ā. Śam. 56. 214-215; De. p 183-184), but the *ślokas* are more in number. The house is described by the poet. 'To the west of (Vidyānilaya)pura, Maṇḍana had constructed a huge school building as high as a palmyra tree, in front of which, in a hundred feet square area, two large platforms with parrot-cages hanging from above, occupied by about five hundred well-versed disciples - each in a different discipline. He was like Brahma with four faces, like Śeṣa with a thousand mouths, like Rudra with five faces, like Śaṇmukha with six systems of philosophy; he had prepared the disciples capable of winning over everywhere in all directions even crossing the seas. In the inner areas he had wells and water-tanks constructed by servants and servant maids and with the food grains and vegetables grown thus he and his disciples were enjoying a variety of tasty foods daily' (Ā. Śam. p 212-213; De. p 182).

We have to take note that *Ānandagiri* has written that Vidyālaya is the name of the city, and that Cidvilāsayati has written that it is the name of Maṇḍana's house. Cidvilāsa says that he had one platform in front of the house, and *Ānandagiri* says he had two platforms. On the whole, the biographers are equivocal in picturing Maṇḍana

as a great scholar with a large number of disciples, and that he was rich. In *Vyāsācalīya* there is no mention of the city or the description of the house. It is only mentioned that he was in Bhūbhṛnnik-etana (Vyā. Śam. 6. 28), or in Rājapura (Vyā. Śam. 6. 77). Both Maṇḍana and Bhāratī, after marriage, went to Rājagṛha (वधूवरौ राजगृहं समीयतुः । Mā. Śam. 3. 77; Vyā. Śam. 6. 77). Since this śloka is common to *Mādhavīya* and *Ānandagirīya*, it means that Viśwarūpa was staying at Rājagṛha; but still, we are at a loss to understand why *Mādhava* wrote the name of the city as Māhiṣmati. *Mādhava* says that the Ācārya took rest in 'Rājīva Vana' located outside the city; and *Ātmabodha* in his Gururatnamālikā says that it was in 'Padma Vana' that the Ācārya refuted Maṇḍana. We have already indicated that *Ātmabodha* says that Padmavana is an Agrahāra, i.e., name of a brahmin locality (page \*149). So, all these details are just imaginary.

### **The Day and Manner in which Ācārya came to Maṇḍana's House**

81. The Ācārya came near the outside portion of the house. The door was securely shut; seeing that it is impossible to enter, he arrived at the front-yard of the house taking the arial route by means of his yogic power (Mā. Śam. 8. 9). Seeing the details of the house, he entered through the space in the ventilator at the top floor, came down and saw Maṇḍana. He had invited for a Śrāddha ceremony Jaimini and Vyāsa through the power of his penance, and was washing their feet. Seeing the Ācārya alighting, both of them greeted him. Maṇḍana angrily objected to this (unauthorized entry). Then a peculiar argumentation took place between them. This is what is contained in



*Mādhavīya*. The contents of *Cidvilāsīya* are the following: That day Maṇḍana was performing a Śrāddha. He had seated Vyāsa in the place of his deceased father, and seeing no other brahmin equal to him, he had placed a *Lakshmīnārāyaṇa sāligrāma* in the place of *Vaiśwadeva*; and he had shut the doors (lest any trespasser might come uninvited). Śaṅkarācārya saw the door locked; since he had *pādukā ghaṭikā siddhi*, left the disciples Padmapāda etc. outside and entered the front yard of the house by the arial route. Maṇḍana who had Vyāsa in the place of his departed father, was washing his feet. Looking back he saw Śaṅkara seated in the place of *Vaiśwadeva*, became angry and argued with him as described later (Ci. Śam. 17. 29-34). In *Ānandagirīya* it is mentioned that since the door was locked, Ācārya entered by the power of *Prāṇāyama*; the details of the ceremony are similar to what is in *Cidvilāsīya* (Chap. 56, p 213-214). Maṇḍana began placing *kuśa* grass and *akshata* saying 'Welcome to *sāligrāma* representing *Viśwadeva*'; and seeing Śaṅkara's feet there, his mind was perturbed with anger. They argued as follows (Ā. Śam. Chap. 55, p 215; De. p 184).

There is no mention of the Śrāddha ceremony in *Vyāsācalīya*. Viśwarūpa had his routine observances done, and was expecting guests. Seeing Ācārya, he decided in his mind to offer alms; washed and worshipped his feet with flowers (प्रतीक्ष्यमाणोऽतिथिमातिथेयः । उदैक्षतैनं Vyā. Śam. 6. 2; स भिक्षवेऽदृष्टचराय तस्मै सङ्कल्प्य भिक्षं पदयोरमुष्य । चिक्षेप पुष्पम् 6. 3). The Ācārya did neither sip the water that Bhārati placed in his hands, nor put it down (न चापिबन्नापि मुमोच 6. 79). Asked why by Viśwarūpa, he answered, 'I shall eat in your house and drink this water if you comply by my requirement'. When Viśwarūpa said 'if

that be possible, I shall comply', the Ācārya said 'I wish to have a debate with you; if you give that *Bhiksha*, I shall drink this water' ('सार्धं त्वया वदितुमिच्छति मे मनोर्हन् । तच्चेत्प्रदास्यति भवन् प्रपिबामि पाथः ।'). Maṇḍana commenced argumentation muttering 'Is it only this much? I too wish the same; but there is none with whom I can argue' (Vyā. Śam. 6. 84-86). In *Govindanātha's Śaṅkarācārya Carita* too this detail is similar; but there it is mentioned that Maṇḍana himself offered water and not Bhāratī (यतिहस्ते जलं दत्त्वा भैक्षं दत्त्वा पुनर्जलम् Go. Śam. 5. 46).

The points that we have to observe here are: (1) In *Cidvilāsīya* and *Ānandagiriya*, the Ācārya had come along with his disciples, but had them left outside before entering Maṇḍana's house. In *Mādhavīya*, although that is not specifically mentioned, it is also not mentioned that he had left them at Prayāg. If he was accompanied with the disciples, did they too come by the arial route? Did they too possess this yogic power? From whom did they learn? These details are not to be found in any one of the Śaṅkara Vijayas. (2) He had invited Vyāsa and Jaimini through the power of his penance as per *Mādhavīya*; as per *Ānandagiriya*, he had invited only Vyāsa through the power of his mantra; also as per *Cidvilāsīya* too only Vyāsa was invited. But in *Vyā-sācalīya*, none was invited, and there was no Śrāddha ceremony; but only hospitality to guests!

### **First Dialogue purported to have taken place when Śaṅkara arrived unexpectedly**

82. The details of the dialogue that took place between an enraged Maṇḍana and Ācārya as per *Mādhavīya*, are as follows (here we shall give the sentences of Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara, with their translations):

(1) कुतो मुण्डी (wherefrom, O shaven?) आगळान्मुण्डी (shaven from above the neck)

(2) पन्थास्ते पृच्छयते मया (I am asking your way) किमाह पन्थाः? (What did the way tell you?)

(3) त्वन्माता मुण्डीत्याह (It told your mother is shaven) तथैव हि, पन्थानं त्वमपृच्छः, त्वां पन्थाः प्रत्याह (well, you asked the way; and the way gave answer to you)

(4) अहो किं सुरा पीता (what is meant is: are you drunk with liquor?; the word पीता means drunk; also means yellow.) नैव, श्वेता यतः स्मर (not at all; liquor is not yellow, it is white, do recall!)

(5) किं त्वं जानासि तद्वर्णम् (Do you know its color?) अहं वर्णम्, भवान् रसम् (I know its color, but you its taste)

(6) मत्तो जातः कलज्जाशीः (you have become arrogant having eaten meat) सत्यं ब्रवीति(षि?) पितृवत्, त्वत्तो जातः कलज्जभुक् (you are telling the truth; as father, so is the son arrogant having eaten meat) Here मत्तो जातः is born of me; त्वत्तो जातः is born of you

(7) कन्थां वहसि दुर्बुद्धे गर्धभेनापि दुर्भराम् । शिखायज्ञोपवीताभ्यां कस्ते भारो भविष्यति (O ill-witted, you are carrying a bundle that even a donkey would not! Would it be heavy for you to carry tuft and the sacred thread) कन्थां वहामि दुर्बुद्धे तव पित्रापि दुर्भराम् । शिखायज्ञोपवीताभ्यां श्रुतेभारो भविष्यति (Ill witted! yes, I carry a bundle that even your father would not; additional load of tuft and the sacred thread would be heavy for the scriptures)

(8) त्यक्त्वा पाणिगृहीतिं स्वामशक्त्या परिरक्षणे । शिष्यपुस्तकभारेच्छोर्व्याख्याता ब्रह्मनिष्ठता ॥ (leaving the wife married to you without being able to protect her, desiring the load of disciples' books instead, well exposed is the commitment of yours to Brahman!) गुरुशुश्रूषणालस्यात्समावर्त्य गुरोः कुलात् । स्त्रियं शुश्रूषमाणस्य व्याख्याता कर्मनिष्ठता ॥ (leaving the Guru without

being able to serve him and coming home, and serving the wife instead, well exposed is the committment of yours to the Vedic rites!)

(9) स्थितोऽसि योषितां गर्भे ताभिरेव विवर्धितः । अहो कृतघ्नता मूर्ख कथं ता एव निन्दसि ॥ (having had your stay in their womb, and having grown in them, O fool, how is that you are condemning the women, and what sort of ingratitude is this!) यासां स्तन्यं त्वया पीतं यासां जातोऽसि योनितः । तासु मूर्खतम स्त्रीषु पशुवद्रमसे कथम् ॥ (having drunk their breast milk, and having born from their womb, O idiot of the worst sort, how come you are enjoying yourself like a beast, in the women!)

(10) वीरहत्यामवाप्तोऽसि वहीरुद्रास्य यत्नतः । (you have been committed to the sin of *vīrahatya* for having willfully abandoning the (sacrificial) fires) आत्महत्यामवाप्तस्त्वमविदित्वा परं पदम् (you have acquired the sin of self-killing by way of not knowing the supreme goal)

(11) दौवारिकान् वञ्चयित्वा कथं स्तेनवदागतः । (deceiving the security men, how come you entered like a thief?) भिक्षुभ्योऽन्नमदत्वा त्वं स्तेनवद्भोक्ष्यसे कथम् ॥ (not giving alms to mendicants, how come you are eating like a thief?)

(12) कर्मकाले न सम्भाष्य अहं मूर्खेन सम्प्रति । (I am not the man to talk to fools at the time of performing Vedic rites) अहो प्रकटितं ज्ञानं यतिभङ्गेन भाषिणा ॥ (Oh! with a *yatibhanga* (breaking a rule of prosody) while uttering न सम्भाष्य अहम्, your knowledge has come to light)

(13) यतिभङ्गे प्रवृत्तस्य यतिभङ्गो न दोषभाक् । (for one who is engaged in defeating *yatis* (mendicants), there is no mistake of *yatibhanga*) यतिभङ्गे प्रवृत्तस्य पञ्चम्यन्तं समस्यताम् ॥ (make a compound word ending with the fifth case at यतिभङ्गे प्रवृत्तस्य; you will have (the correct meaning of) defeat from *yati*)

(14) क्व ब्रह्म क्व च दुर्मेधाः क्वायं दोषः क्व वा कलिः । (where is Brahman and

where is an evil minded one ! and where is this fault and where is *Kali!*) क्व स्वर्गः क्व दुराचारः क्वाग्निहोत्रं क्व वा कलिः ॥ (where are the Heavens and where is evil practice! and where is *agnihotra* and where is *Kali!*)

The above conversation, although not with the same sentences, is present with the same purport in the ŚaṅkaraVijayas - in *Cidvilāsīya* (Ci. Śam. 17. 34-41), *Ānandagirīya* (Ā. Śam. Chap. 56, p 215-216; De. p 184), Sadānanda's Śaṅkaradigvijayasāra (शङ्करदिग्विजयसार) (6. 13-28). Somanāthaiah writes that 'it can be taken as true... one reason is that since Maṇḍana was a scholar undefeated, the Ācārya might have wanted to convey his courage and presence of mind; and the second to destroy his peace of mind and then drag him to argumentation. With these intentions the Ācārya might have conversed like this. This is a secret plan to arrest the wits of the opponent during argumentation' (So. Śam. footnote in p 109). We do not feel that this is correct.

Firstly, Maṇḍana Miśra was a great scholar and a great soul committed to Vedic rites; He was a person to have even ṛṣis like Vyāsa and Jaimini as brahmin invitees. On the day of the ceremony when as per the words 'अक्रोधनैः शौचपरैः' (by those not inclined to passion anger, by those with internal and external purity, ...), at a time when the performer and the invitee brahmins are to maintain extremely peaceful mental poise, it does not agree with the context that he abused the yati who descended from the sky by his yogic power, using words repugnant and full of anger. And it is improbable that great ṛṣis like Vyāsa and Jaimini kept silence while he was enraged thus and was involved in such conversation.

Secondly, it is not reliable that a person like Śaṅkara barged in

uninvited and sat at the position of *Viśwedeḥva*, that he became an obstacle during the Vedic rite, that he resorted to such mean tactics of somehow disturbing the mental poise to arrest the wits of his opponent in order to win over him. Is he not the most revered person who reiterated in many places while writing his commentaries to explain the secrets of Vedānta that 'this truth becomes known to only those who have quietened their arrogance, and not to those logicians who have affection to their own school of thought'? Would such a person resort to disturb the peace of Maṇḍana and to some how defeat him in the argumentation? If he plans thus, will it not bring down his prestige as well as that of his Vedānta?

And thirdly, Maṇḍana Miśra was not just a sloth performer of Vedic rites; he too was a Vedāntin. When we find that he has never condemned *Sannyāsa* in his writings, we would surely be convinced that this conversation is most improbable. Not only that, the sarcastic utterances of Maṇḍana can never be applicable to a person like Śaṅkara who is distinguished as *Paramahansa parivrājakācārya*. Neither the *Mādhava* statement that Śaṅkara was wearing the heavy burden (of books) (Mā. Śam. 8. 20), nor the Cidvilāsa statement that he was carrying staff and water-pot (Ci. Śam. 17. 39) are tenable; we have pointed out this earlier (p \*88). Maṇḍana was not foolish enough to condemn that Śaṅkara had 'taken *Sannyāsa* being unable to foster a married wife' without inquiring into his merits. Likewise, *Mādhava* has not written the words uttered by Śaṅkara fit enough to be addressed to an honourable householder like Maṇḍana. It is ridiculous that Maṇḍana has called his guest a thief, and Śaṅkara called an honoured householder like Maṇḍana, engaged in carrying

out a Vedic rite, a *stena* (again, a thief). It is not even proper to think that they have uttered such words in a fit of anger; to imagine personalities like Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara angrily stooped down to such a low level during that sacred occasion itself is not proper. How could it be plausible that Maṇḍana, in front of a Vedāntin like Vyāsa, argued like that?

The Ācārya might have won over some *mīmāṃsaka* talking in favour of karma, or several such *mīmāṃsakas* in argument; also he might have converted them into Vedānta. Authors of recent times might have transformed that into this kind of fictitious story. On the whole, who out of these three authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas wrote this repugnant conversation for the first time is not known. However artificial *Vyāsācalīya* could be, it should be agreeable that it keeps an honourable status for Viśwarūpa and Ācārya. *Govindanātha* too (Go. Śam. 5. 41-46) follows *Vyāsācalīya* closely and describes both Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana with due honour to the respective status of their Āśrama.

### **Maṇḍana agrees to hold the argument**

83. Now let us proceed to follow the story further. While Jaimini was smiling, Vyāsa addressed Maṇḍana, ‘my dear, what you are doing is not good conduct. You should not reproach the *sannyāsin* who has given up all desires; think of the unexpected guest as Viṣṇu Himself and invite him’. Maṇḍana did likewise. Then Śaṅkara told him ‘dear sir, in food alone I am not interested; I have come for the alms in the form of a debate; let there be argumentation with the stake of the loser becoming the disciple of the winner; I do not want anything

other than spreading the path of Vedānta, and you are rejecting it. Therefore the need arises to win over you. You hold the debate, or declare that you are defeated'. Wondering at this, Maṇḍana said, 'I am not the one to follow any path other than the Vedic path. Even if Ādiśeṣa Himself comes, I am not the one to accept defeat. I am fulfilled; this is the day of victory. What shall be the debate, what shall be the stake, and who is the mediator? Let these be decided! Let us start the argument tomorrow. Now let me complete the rite that I have undertaken'. Then Śaṅkara said 'so be it! let these ṛṣis be witnesses for the debate'. As the two ṛṣis knew that Bhārati was the incarnation of Goddess Saraswati, said 'let your wife be the mediator!' Accordingly, agreeing with the proposal, Maṇḍana carried out the Vedic rite that day. After food, two disciples of Maṇḍana fanned the ṛṣis and Śaṅkara from two sides for some time to bring down the weariness. The two ṛṣis took leave and disappeared after conversing for sometime. Śaṅkara spent his night on the banks of Narmadā river (Mā. Śam. 8. 34-55). In *Cidvilāsīya*, it is specially mentioned that they decided that argumentation should be commenced right after the ceremony was over (श्राद्धानन्तरमेव वाङ्मुखविधौ तौ निश्चयं चक्रतुः Ci. Śam. 17. 47). In *Ānandagirīya*, hearing Śaṅkara's utterance that 'since I am an uninvited guest, I am the Viṣṇu!', Vyāsa told Maṇḍana to 'offer him water for cleansing the feet' (p. 216); When Śaṅkara told that he has come for a debate, Maṇḍana replied 'I shall do so after the food'. Carrying out the rite ceremoniously, they decided the stakes of the argument thus (यथाविधि पितृकर्म निर्वर्त्य वादपणमेवमाचक्रतुः Ā. Śam. 56. p216; यथाविधि पितृकर्म निर्वर्त्य वादपणमेवं व्याचक्रतुः De. p 184).

Here, it is mentioned in all ŚaṅkaraVijayas that as soon as Vyāsa



told Maṇḍana to respect the *Sannyāsin* by way of offering him the position of Viṣṇu, he did obey accordingly - is it not so? We do not see how this is appropriate in the story. Maṇḍana just then had defied *sannyāsa*; how just by Vyāsa's telling him he came to understand the respectability of Śaṅkara who had renounced all Vedic rites? Also in the next chapter of *Cidvilāsīya*, he has argued that Sannyāsa is not to be resorted to in Kali Yuga (Ci. Śam. 18. 6-15). This being so, Maṇḍana's offering the position of Viṣṇu to Śaṅkara does not look appropriate.

Secondly, *Mādhava* (Mā. Śam. 8. 55) and also Sadānanda (Sada. 6. 46) have mentioned that both Vyāsa and Jaimini told Maṇḍana to 'keep Ubhayabhārati as mediator'. But in *Cidvilāsīya*, it is mentioned that Ācārya himself suggested Maṇḍana 'let your wife be the witness' (Ci. Śam. 18. 3) and in *Ānandagirīya*, it is stated that both agreed to have her as the mediator (Ā. Śam. Chap. 56, p 216; De. p 184). Who really fixed her as the mediator? It is not known what opinion the townsfolk had in the matter. Since *Mādhava* has written (Mā. Śam. 8. 57-58) that Śaṅkara came in the morning and took his seat in the assembly; and that Maṇḍana having made his wife the mediator, was prepared to argue; therefore we have to understand that she was a great scholar, and that in those days women too used to participate in debates just as Gārgi and others. Whether this is suited to those times is a matter which historians are to decide. In *Vyāsācalīya*, although Vyāsa was not involved, Viśwarūpa, just as Maṇḍana of *Mādhavīya*, readily agreed to argue. The *śloka*s वादं करिष्यामि (Mā. Śam. 8. 46), वादे हि (Mā. Śam. 8. 47) and कः पार्श्विकः (Mā. Śam. 8. 48) are also found in *Vyāsācalīya* (Vyā. Śam. 6. 86-88). Only the second half of the

*śloka* अत्यल्पमेतद्भवतेरितं मुने । पास्यामि पाथो यदि वाददित्सुत् । (Vyā. Śam. 6. 85) has been changed to suit the situation of the story there. ‘कः पार्श्विकः’ has become ‘कः प्राशिनिकः’; may be that itself is the correct reading of Mādhavīya. Further, the *śloka* reading ‘बाढं जये यदि’ also is common to both (Mā. Śam. 8. 62; Vyā. Śam. 6. 92).

### Propositions by the Ācārya and Maṇḍana

84. Now let us look at the propositions for the debate by Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana as described by *Mādhava*. Śaṅkara says as follows (Mā. Śam. 8. 61):

ब्रह्मैकं परमार्थसञ्चिदमलं विश्वप्रपञ्चात्मना  
शुक्ती रूप्यपरात्मनेव बहुलाज्ञानावृतं भासते ।  
तज्ज्ञानान्निखिलप्रपञ्चनिलयात् स्वात्मव्यवस्था परं  
निर्वाणं जनिमुक्तमभ्युपगतं मानं श्रुतेर्मस्तकम् ॥

[The same *śloka* is there in *Vyāsācalīya* (6. 91); the text that reads there is ‘प्रपञ्चविलयात् स्वात्मन्यवस्था’; the same might be the text of the original *Mādhavīya*, and the copier might have taken it down as ‘व्यवस्था’].

“Brahman alone is the highest truth. Although it is existence, consciousness and pure, since it is covered by too much of nescience, it appears as the world, just as mother-of-pearl appears like silver. I have accepted that the ultimate liberation is remaining in ones own form, with the whole world dissolved through the knowledge of Brahman. The statement of Vedānta is the valid means of knowledge for this”. Having said this, Śaṅkara continues: “If I am defeated in the argumentation, I shall give up *Sannyāsa* and the ochre robes, accepting

white robes. May Ubhayabhārati stand witness to this!" (Mā. Śam. 8. 61-62). (Vyā. Śam. 6.92)

Viśwarūpa (of *Vyāsācalīya*) at this juncture said:

वेदान्ता न प्रमाणं चितिवपुषि पदे तत्र सङ्गत्ययोगात्  
 पूर्वो भागः प्रमाणं पदचयगमिते कार्यवस्तुन्यशेषे ।  
 शब्दानां कार्यमात्रं प्रति समधिगता शक्तिरभ्युन्नतानां  
 कर्मभ्यो मुक्तिरिष्टा तदिह तनुभृतामायुषः स्यात्समाप्तेः ॥  
 वादे कृतेस्मिन्यदि मे जयान्यस्त्वयोदितात् स्याद्विपरीतभावः ।  
 येयं त्वया भूद्गदिता प्रसाक्ष्यजानाति चेत् सा भवितावधूर्मे ॥

Vedāntic declarations are not to be taken as valid means of knowledge about the conscious entity; because word has no active relationship with an existing thing. The earlier part of the Vedas only is the valid means of knowledge regarding actions; it is known that word has function only in action. My opinion is that through karma alone salvation is achieved; and it exists throughout life for beings. If I lose the argument, may it be contrary to what you have said; and that means I shall take *Sanṇyāsa* and wear ochre robes. If my wife is aware of this, may she be the witness as you have told! (Vyā. Śam. 6. 94-95). The same *śloka*s are also found in *Mādhavīya* (Mā. Śam. 8. 64-65). We have something to say regarding these propositions.

(1) The subject about which the debate was held is not mentioned in *Anantānandagīrīya*; only it is stated 'निगमादिसर्वविद्याप्रसङ्गे क्रियमाणे' (Ā. Śam. p216). In *Cidvilāsīya*, it is written as if the main argument was only on the subject of *Sanṇyāsa*. In *Mādhavīya*, the above propositions are clearly stated; and also the detailed argumentation about them.

(2) The Ācārya held that salvation is achieved only by knowledge of Brahman; and Viśvarūpa held that it is accomplished through Vedic rites. Both agreed that the loser shall accept the Āśrama of the winner. According to Vedānta, it is regarded as a sin if a *sannyāsi* comes down to a lower Āśrama (Vedānta Sūtra 3. 4. 40); and according to Maṇḍana, it is a sin to give up fire-worship and renounce the Vedic rites. So, it has to be taken that each of them have declared that if he be the loser, he shall be the sinner accordingly. Each was confident that he alone would win the debate. Thus, the ŚaṅkaraVijayas state that both accepted the stake of change in Āśrama.

(3) Because of ignorance, Brahman appears as the world just as mother-of-pearl appears as silver. No doubt Śaṅkara Vedānta holds that liberation is, by way of the knowledge of Brahman, *Jīva* remaining in swarūpa, his own form. But we are at a loss to understand the intention of the author when he says that Brahman is covered by ignorance. The same expression 'covered by ignorance' is also there in Sadānanda's Śaṅkara-digvijaya-sāra (शङ्करदिग्विजयसार), the summary version of *Mādhavīya*. We shall discuss this veiling by ignorance once again later.

(4) The proposition stating 'Vedāntic declarations are not to be taken as valid means of knowledge of the conscious entity' is also correct. Because, in the *Samanvaya Bhāṣya*, while stating prima facie view according to the *pūrvamīmāṃsa* proposition, the Ācārya has stated that since the Upaniṣadic sentences state the Gods and the self as the doer, they might become dependent on an injunction for rites or they might imply alternate actions like upāsanā; hence they

will not be valid means of knowledge of an existing thing.

(5) The argument 'word is having function only in an action-related thing' is found in several sub-commentaries, but the Ācārya does not seem to have made a reference to it and discussed anywhere in his *Bhāṣyas*. The prima facie view that a sentence is a valid means of knowledge only when it implies follow-up action; and if there be no verb aimed at directing the action, the words in it do not become coherent - is found in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* (Br. 3. 1); the primafacie view that the scripture has only two uses - प्रवृत्ति and निवृत्ति - impelling into action and cessation from it - is found in *BrahmaSūtrabhāṣya* (Sū. Bhā. 1. 1. 4). The primafacie view that word is having function only in an action-related thing is not to be found anywhere. Hence, it appears that *Mādhava* and *Vyāsācala* have written this primafacie view only on the line of argumentation found in the sub-commentaries. How this matter itself was debated is not found in any of the ŚaṅkaraVijayas.

### **Debate with Maṇḍana: As described in Mādhavīya**

85. Now let us look at the details of the debate. The serial numbers of the *ślokas* are shown at the respective places. Our comments are given within brackets.

**Maṇḍana:** What is the pramāṇa for the identity of Jīva and Īśwara? (8. 76).

**Śaṅkara:** The instruction given to Śvetaketu and others by Udālaka *et. al.* is the pramāṇa (8. 77).

[Śaṅkara had not said anything about identity of Jīva and Īśwara in his proposition; he had told that Brahman appears as the world

because it is covered with ignorance. This leads to the identity of Jīva and Īśvara, it is true; but how come Maṇḍana gave up the matter of ignorance and objected to the identity of Jīva and Īśvara?]

**Maṇḍana:** ‘Tattvamasi’ etc. are given for the sake of ‘japa’ (repetition) just as ‘Hum’ and ‘Phat’; they are not in any way having specific intentions with any meaning (8. 78).

**Śaṅkara:** When there is no specific meaning - as in the case of ‘Hum’ and ‘Phat’ it could be for japa; but when the meaning is clear, how it is justified to say so (8. 79)?

[This *prima facie* view or conclusion is not in the Bhāṣya; but the same is found in the sub-commentaries.]

**Maṇḍana:** Although this expression, at the face of it, points to the identity of Jīva and Īśvara, since the performer of sacrifice etc. is praised, it is the remainder of the injunction about actions. (8. 80).

**Śaṅkara:** Because sentences of *Karmakāṇḍa* like ‘ādityo yūpaḥ’ etc. are for praising, they may become remainders of action; this being different, a sentence pertaining to *Jñānakāṇḍa*, how it can be a remainder of injunctions? (8. 81)

[Sentences indicative of this view are found in *Sūtrabhāṣya* (fourth sūtra) in the commentary.]

**Maṇḍana:** So, let us take it that the injunction in these sentences is to regard *Jīva* as *Paramātmān*. It is just like the injunction to keep Brahman-view in non-Brahman entities like the mind, food, sun, sky etc. This would enrich *Karma* (8. 82).

**Śaṅkara:** Just as we see elsewhere, we do not see imperative words, *līnga* (*sign*) etc, here. How it can be an injunction?

[This *prima facie* view is also found in *Sūtrabhāṣya*; but the Ācārya

has not written conclusions with these words.]

**Maṇḍana:** Just as the *mīmāṃsakas* conceive injunction in the *rātrisatra yāga* because they have consecrative fruit, since we hear about the fruit here, we can conceive injunction (8. 84).

**Śaṅkara:** If that be so, the salvation that can be obtained by action would become transient just as *swarga*; this *upāsanā* being possible to be done, not to be done, or to be done differently, is action only (8. 85).

[This prima facie view is not found in Sūtrabhāṣya; however, the logic leading to the conclusion is there.]

**Maṇḍana:** All right, let us not call this a sentence about *upāsanā*. Let it be the sentence that says Jīva becomes equal to Paramātman! (8. 86).

**Śaṅkara:** Does this sentence express spiritual equality or does it on the basis of qualities like all-knowing self, self of all etc? If it is the former, *Jīva* would become, verily, *Paramātman* and would be contrary to your thesis (8. 87).

[Neither this primafacie view nor its conclusion is found in the Bhāṣya. Neither for Maṇḍana, the *mīmāṃsaka*, to propose this nor for Śaṅkara to answer it there is occasion here. Could it be that the poet, keeping the thesis of Rāmānuja and others in mind, has added this proposition and its conclusion?]

**Maṇḍana:** It would not be wrong if we say what was not evident earlier because of ignorance, would become (evident as) equality because of eternal nature and qualities of *Paramātman* such as bliss, knowledge etc. (8. 88)!

**Śaṅkara:** If that be so, let the sentence mean that the Jīva would

be *Paramātmān* Himself in the state of *Jīvanmukti* (liberation-while-living); what is the need for being bigoted about it? Have you not agreed that due to the veiling of ignorance this equality would not become evident? (8. 89).

[Same comment as earlier on the proposition and answer applies here too.]

**Maṇḍana:** Let us say that this sentence conveys spiritual equality with the *Jīva* for *Īśvara*, who is the cause of the universe! Would it not be that, when we do so, the doctrines of *Pradhāna*, *paramānu* etc. stand refuted? (8. 90).

**Śaṅkara:** If that be so, the verb *asti* (such spirit is existent) should have been there; it should not have been *tat twam asi* (That thou are). Not only that, (when the scripture says that) 'तदैक्षत बहु स्याम्' (It thought 'I would become many') it is implied that the Spirit was already existent; there was no need of reiteration as *tat twam asi*. (The implication is that your proposition has the mistake of repetition) (8. 91).

[This objection and explanation are not found in the Bhāṣya].

**Maṇḍana:** Even if it is so, since this identity is contrary to direct perception etc, let it be that this sentence is given for repetition (*japa mantra*)! (8. 92).

**Śaṅkara:** If perception could establish the difference (between *Jīva* and *Īśvara*), contrariness would have shown that the identity is contradicted; since there is no proximity (with sense organs), the difference is not established; where is the contrariness? (8. 93).

[This kind of discussion is not there in the Bhāṣya].

**Maṇḍana:** *Jīvatman* is related to *Īśvara* by the qualifier 'I am different from *Īśvara*'. Hence, although the difference and senses are



not in proximity, the difference of the mutually non-existent type is known by the qualifier itself, is it not so (8. 94)?

**Śaṅkara:** This kind of relationship cannot be applied to qualifier itself. If such a relation is accepted, it becomes an over indulgence since then, for example, even a thing non-existent on earth can be argued to be perceptible! Therefore, only with the proximity of senses, a relationship with a qualifier can be held to be the cause of the knowledge of non-existence. But here there is no close contact between Ātman and the senses (8. 95).

[This proposition is made following the logicians' method based on direct perception. Although such propositions and theses are found in recent books like *bhedadhikkāra*, we have to keep in mind that these are not present in Bhāṣya].

**Maṇḍana:** It is not correct to say that Ātman, who supports differences, is not having proximity with the senses. *Citta, Ātman* - both being material in nature, there exist connection and support (8. 96).

**Śaṅkara:** Is Ātman omnipresent, or is he of the measure of an atom? In both cases, there is no reason for joining, which is there for entities with parts and not for partless entities - such a thing is not witnessed in the world. We have said this justification by accepting the mind as a sense organ; mind is only helpful to the sense organs like the eye, but itself is not a sense organ.

[This proposition is a continuation of the previous proposition; it would not be comprehensible to those not conversant with the speculative systems. These propositions and consequent theses are not found in the Bhāṣya. To say that the mind is not a sense organ is contradictory to *Sūtrabhāṣya* (Sū. Bhā. 2. 4. 6, 2. 4. 17)].

**Maṇḍana:** If that be so, let us not agree that the knowledge of 'difference' is generated by the senses. Let us say that it is of the form of witness! Being contrary to that discerned by the witness, how can the sentence *tat twam asi* convey absence of difference? (8. 99).

**Śaṅkara:** This perception of the form of witness conveys the difference between *Jīva* with *avidyā* and *Īśwara* with *Māyā*. Whereas the scripture states only the identity of *Jīva* and *Īśwara*. Hence there is no contradiction. Even if it is considered as a contradiction, by the *apaccheda* (cutting of) *nyāya* (अपच्छेदन्याय), the earlier perception becoming annulled by the scripture that came forth later is appropriate (8. 100,101).

[This proposition and conclusion are not found in the Bhāṣya. Although Maṇḍana and Vācaspati Miśra have used this *Apaccheda-nyāya*, the Ācārya has not used it. He has stated in some places that the perceived states of happiness, sorrow etc. are due to adjuncts like buddhi etc. related to the imagined Ātman. The Ācārya does not accept that there exists contradiction between word and perception. Is *Īśwara* with *Māyā* an object of witness perception? This is debatable].

**Maṇḍana:** This *Jīva* is having difference determined by Brahman, because, like pot etc. he is not omniscient; pot etc. are examples here - is such an inference not hinder knowledge from this sentence (*tat twam asi*)? (8. 102).

**Śaṅkara:** Are you proving difference that is ultimate by using this inference, or the difference that is imaginary? If it be the ultimate, it would not be existent in the example; If it be imaginary, we have already accepted it, haven't we! (8. 103).

**Maṇḍana:** By this inference, we have proved the support of that kind of difference which is not affected (removed) by its knowledge. It is present in pot etc., because 'difference' inherent in the pot etc. is not in any way affected by its knowledge. You have not agreed that the 'difference' is not affected by Self-knowledge, have you? Therefore, it is not that I have proved what is already accepted; the demerit of there being no example is also not there (8. 104).

**Śaṅkara:** When you said "difference" that is not affected by Self-knowledge, are you referring to the Ātman having happiness etc. by that word 'self' or to the Ātman not having them? If you mean the former, we in fact like the difference; hence you have proved only what is already accepted; and if you mean the latter, then, pot etc. cannot be examples; since the pot is imagined in the Ātman without sorrow etc., the difference will surely be affected by the knowledge of that Ātman (8. 105-106).

[Instead of answering that inference is a means of knowledge only in vyavahāra, and not in the highest reality, why does the Ācārya point out the fault in the inference !].

**Maṇḍana:** I am trying to prove difference without conditioning factors and you have accepted only difference with (upādhis) conditioning factors. Pot as an example contains the former, isn't it (8. 106)?

**Śaṅkara:** Difference between pot and *Īśvara* is also a difference with upādhis. There is this avidyā, an upādhi. Hence the demerit of non-suitable example remains as such. Not only that, in the inference you stated pot has inertness and Ātman is not inert. Since Ātman is Consciousness Itself, He is not different from *Īśvara*; He Himself is

the *Paramēśwara* - this is the appropriate inference here. Thus your inference has an opposing side; so the cause is *sopādhika* and *sat prapitpaksha* (8. 107).

[This argument too is on 'inference'. The notes for the previous argument applies here also].

**Maṇḍana:** Brahman has difference that does not get sublated by the knowledge of the counterpart of *Jīva*. Because it is not *samsārī*; pot etc. are examples. You like to think that the difference in the counterpart of Ātman is affected by the knowledge of Brahman. Since I am proving that it is not so, the mistake of proving what is already accepted is not there. By the true knowledge of pot etc. the difference due to being the counterpart of *Jīva* is not affected; so there is no fault of example (8. 108).

**Śaṅkara:** Do you say that the difference is not affected by the true knowledge of all objects (*dharmis*), or that it is not affected with respect to a particular object? Difference due to being counterpart to *Jīva* is the same whether it is with respect to Brahman or with respect to pot etc. and since we accept that the difference is not sublated by the true knowledge of pot etc, the mistake of your trying to prove what is already accepted creeps in again. Not only that, what is the meaning of *dharmi* - is it Brahman without attributes, or Brahman with attributes? It cannot be Brahman with attributes, because we have agreed that 'difference' is not affected by its knowledge. It cannot be Brahman without attributes; because - do you hold it to be something understood or not understood? If it is not understood, the support is not established; if it is held to have been understood, it becomes contradictory to the measure of apprehending objects; by such

a measure of apprehending as Vedānta, the *Paramātman* not different from *Jivatman* becomes evident, isn't it (8. 111)?

[The inferences given by us upto this point and the demerits which the Ācārya has pointed out in them could be comprehended by only those conversant with the techniques of speculative systems. So, we have not attempted to explain them further, and have kept the conversation as it is present with the help of commentaries. This kind of making variations in the primafacie view and using technical words like *siddhasādhana*, *satpratipaksha* is not at all there in Ācārya's Bhāṣya. The author must have written the primafacie views and conclusions following the recent methods of argumentation. That is all].

**Maṇḍana:** In the scriptural statement 'dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā' (Rigveda 1. 22. 164; Mun. Up. 3. 1. 1), it is stated that *Jīva* is the enjoyer and *Īśvara* is not. Let this be the factor that affects the identity (of *Jīva* and *Īśvara*) (8. 112)!

**Śaṅkara:** The difference is directly evident, and the fruit of its knowledge is not mentioned. Hence this does not come in the way of the identity (of *Jīva* and *Īśvara*) that the scripture mentions. If it is not so, something which has meaning elsewhere becomes a measure for one's own meaning (8. 113).

[It is agreed in the Bhāṣya that eulogies in *Mantras* that have meaning elsewhere may become *pramāṇas* in some cases. For example, see *Devatādhikaraṇa bhāṣya* (1. 3. 33). However, if it was written that since sentences like 'tattvamasi' etc. leave nothing for a follow up, do not get contradicted by vedic sentences that make reference to (difference), then it would have been nearer to Bhāṣyakāra's heart. See

*Sūtrabhāṣya* 2. 1. 14].

**Maṇḍana:** Just as *Śruti* is the source on matters taken up in the *Smṛtis*, let even those meanings that are directly known, be based on *Śruti*, (8. 114)!

**Śaṅkara:** While expounding unforeseen objects in the *Smṛti* people conversant with the Vedas keep *Śruti* as the source. How can the *Śruti* be the source for the differences which are known to even those who are not conversant with the Vedas? I have given this answer, assuming that this *Śruti* is telling about *Jīva* and *Īśwara*. But actually this *Śruti* discriminated *Puruṣa* from *sattva*, and is mentioning that he is *asamsārī* (one free from the cycle of birth and death) (8. 115-116).

[This second meaning is in accordance with *Paingi-rahasya Brāhmaṇa*. But the *Bhāṣyakāra* has not rejected the first meaning. In *Viyadadhikaraṇa* (Sū. Bhā. 3. 3. 34) it is mentioned that both ‘dvā suparṇā’ and ‘ṛtaṃ pibantau’ teach the same *vidyā*. In the *Bhāṣya* on *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, meaning of the same mantra is given in support of *Jīva* and *Īśwara*].

**Maṇḍana:** If this refers to the *sattva* and *Jīvas*, how can the *sattva* which is *Jada* (non-living) have the status of enjoyer (8.117)?

**Śaṅkara:** We need not be made the target of this objection; *Paingi Rahasya Mantra*, itself, in the context of this *mantra*, has elaborated as ‘तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वतीति सत्त्वमनश्शन्नन्योऽभिपश्यतीति ज्ञस्तावेतौ सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञौ’ (8. 118).

**Maṇḍana:** The word *sattva* refers to one who dwells in the body, and the word *Kṣetrājña* refers to the *Paramātman*. Therefore, even according to that *Rahasya Brāhmaṇa*, what I had said is the meaning.

**Śaṅkara:** In that *Brāhmaṇa* it is clearly stated ‘तदेतत्सत्त्वं, येन स्वप्नं

पश्यति । अथ योऽयं शरीर उपद्रष्टा स क्षेत्रज्ञः ॥' (That is *sattva* through which one sees the dream; the seer who dwells in the body is *Kṣetrajña*). By this sentence it is clear that *sattva* is the inner organ, and that *Kṣetrajña* is the dweller in the body, isn't it (8. 120)!

**Maṇḍana:** In this sentence, 'yena' means 'by the *Jīva* who is the agent and sees the dream'. 'kṣetrajñaḥ' could also mean *Īśvara* who is all-knowing (8. 121).

**Śaṅkara:** Since the verb 'paśyati' has the suffix 'tiḥ', it refers to the agent; hence, 'yena' is *karana*, expressed in the instrumental case. Not only that, the seer of dream is referred here as 'śārīra'; so he cannot be *Īśvara* (8. 122).

**Maṇḍana:** By implication that he dwells in the body, *Maheśvara* could also become 'śārīra' (8. 123)

**Śaṅkara:** How could One who dwells not only in the body but also elsewhere be referred (specifically) as 'śārīra'? Space would be present in the body too; but none calls it 'śārīra', isn't it (8. 124)?

**Maṇḍana:** If this refers only to *sattva* and *Kṣetrajña*, how could the *Śruti* that implies inert intellect to be the enjoyer by saying 'atti' be regarded as *pramāṇa* (8. 125)?

**Śaṅkara:** Just as non-burning iron becomes one that burns by contact with fire, the intellect that is inert could become the enjoyer by entry of consciousness (8. 126).

[One should not forget that Maṇḍana, although a *karmamīmāṃsaka*, has argued as if he were a Vedāntin insisting difference between *Jīva* and *Īśvara*, or as if he were a logician. A *mīmāṃsaka* would never pose a proposition that requires the authority of *Śruti* for perception. The thesis that *sattva* could have *bhoktṛtva* (enjoyment)

is contrary to Ācārya's Bhāṣya. *Kṣetrajña*, considered alone, also cannot have *bhokṛtva*. Surely the inert *sattva*, conceived by nescience, cannot be an experiencer. Just to drive home that *Kṣetrajña* is of the nature of Brahman, and is not the enjoyer, the Sūtrabhāṣya superimposes *bhokṛtva* on *sattva* (Sū. Bhā. 1. 2. 11)].

**Maṇḍana:** Let the *mantra* 'ṛtaṃ pibantau' (Katha. Up. 1. 3. 1) which holds that *Jīva* and *Īśvara* are entirely different just as sunlight and shade, be contradictory to the *Śruti* that reiterates the non-difference (8. 127)!

**Śaṅkara:** This *Śruti*, which refers to the difference seen empirically, cannot be contradictory to the *Śruti* reiterating non-difference. On the contrary, we can say that *Śruti* actually contradicts that which conveys the extraordinary meaning of difference (8. 128).

[It has already been indicated that 'dvā suparṇā', 'ṛtaṃ pibantau' both imply the same meaning].

**Maṇḍana:** The *Śruti* is strong when it has support of other *pramāṇa*. Hence it comes in the way of the *Śruti* stating non-difference.

**Śaṅkara:** Other *pramāṇas* cannot make *Śrutis* stronger. If there is a different *pramāṇa* for the same object, the *Śruti* in fact becomes weaker, as it would be conveying the meaning already known.

[Here, to think that the *Śruti* 'dvā suparṇā' has the support of *pratyakṣa* itself is not correct. Because *Īśvara* is not *pratyakṣa*].

**Maṇḍana:** Is the *Śruti* not strong when it has support of a different *pramāṇa*? Let it beat up the *Śruti* stating non-difference (8. 129)!

**Śaṅkara:** O learned one! A different *pramāṇa* cannot make *Śruti* stronger. When it reiterates the same meaning, the *Śruti* in fact be-



comes weaker (8. 130).

[Even *mīmāṃsakas* do not agree that a *Śruti* becomes stronger when supported by other *pramāṇas*. They are approvers of *svataḥ - prāmāṇya* ].

In the *śloka* ‘इत्याद्या दृढयुक्तिरस्य शुशुभे दत्तानुमोदा गिरां देव्या’ (Mā. Śam. 8. 131) *Mādhava* has mentioned that Bhāratidevi approved Śaṅkara’s all such firm logic. A question how could UbhayaBhārati manage to follow Ācārya’s argumentation engaged as she was in her jobs of the household? arises here.

The Diṇḍimakāra has given some *ślokas* to be included following ‘इत्याद्या’ in the above *śloka*. Here is how they are:

**Maṇḍana:** The *Śruti* states the difference between the liberated *Jīva* and *Īśwara* in the expression ‘सोऽश्नुते सर्वान्कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा’ (Taittirīya Up. 2. 1).

**Śaṅkara:** It is not like that. Because, *Śruti* is telling there that consequent to removal of ignorance, and attaining one’s own form of infinite consciousness, bliss, all desires become fulfilled.

**Maṇḍana:** The *Śruti* says ‘आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः’ (*Ātman* has to be seen), making *Jīva* the subject and *Paramātman* the predicate. If this is not so, the *Śruti* ceases to be *pramāṇa*, isn’t it!

**Śaṅkara:** This does not imply ultimate difference. Because, it will go against the *Advaita Śruti*. Hence, it remains *pramāṇa* for Brahman.

**Maṇḍana:** Let it be that the *Śruti* stating non-difference is implying imaginary non-difference!

**Śaṅkara:** Difference is apprehended as it is evident in empirical transactions. Non-difference is not evident likewise, and hence it is not like that.

**Maṇḍana:** Let the circumstantial inference of the *Śruti* be the pramāṇa for difference!

**Śaṅkara:** Inference without any demonstrated conclusion cannot be a pramāṇa. Hence, the *Śruti* that states non-difference is strong.

**Maṇḍana:** If there is non-difference between *Jīva* and *Īśvara*, it should have been perceived. Since there is no such perception, by the pramāṇa of non-perception, there is no non-difference.

**Śaṅkara:** Just as a pot covered by darkness is not seen, the non-difference being covered by nescience (*avidyā*), is not perceived. Such (perceived) difference is not seen by the final means of knowledge.

[Since *Ḍiṇḍimakāra* says ‘इत्यादि दृढयुक्तिजातं ग्राह्यम्’, we will have to say that there are several such strategies of argumentations in *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* that is cited by *Mādhava*. Since these *śloka*s of *Ḍiṇḍima* are not there in either *Anantānandagiriya* or *Vyāsācaliya*, it becomes evident that *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* must be an altogether different work. Let it be like that. As it is evident that even in this *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* the same argumentation about the difference or non-difference between *Jīva* and *Īśvara* took place between Maṇḍana and Ācārya, it is not a conception of *Mādhava*. Another thing is - none of these strategies of argumentations could be seen in the *Bhāṣya*. Although the argument that since Brahman is covered with nescience the non-difference of *Jīva* and *Īśvara* is not to be seen is in accordance with the initial propositions made, we have to remember that it is not found anywhere in Ācārya’s *Bhāṣya*. The Ātman who is free from nescience is not in any way affected either by nescience or its removal, either by being a support for nescience or otherwise. It goes against what is clearly stated in *Brhadāranyaka Bhāṣya*: ‘...by

the experience “I do not know anything; I am ignorant,” the Ātman would not become laid up with nescience; by this experience actually it becomes evident that the Ātman is devoid of nescience’ (Bṛ. Bhā. 4. 4. 6)].

### **Argumentation with Maṇḍana: As per Cidvilāsīya:**

86. Let us now take up the argumentation held between Ācārya and Maṇḍana as per *Cidvilāsīya*.

**Maṇḍana:** There is a *Smṛti* which reads ‘अश्वालम्भं गवालम्भं संन्यासं पलपैतृकम् । देवरेण सुतोत्पत्तिं कलौ पञ्च विवर्जयेत् ॥’ Also, there are such statements as: ‘If there is neither study nor sacrifice, however strong in practicing austerities they may be, people of the four stages of life fall down from brahminhood. *Yajñopavīta* (sacred thread) is the means for salvation for all brahmins; he who gives it up by delusion will go to hell. If one gives up tuft of hair and the sacred thread, he is not a brahmin’. ‘How is that he who does not observe the *sandhya* prayers can be a brahmin?’ ‘He who observes the Vedic rites punctually never sees the hell’. ‘O *Sannyāsin*, heaven, kingdom, offspring etc. are obtained by *karma* alone; therefore, the brahmins who are conversant with the Vedas perform the rites’. ‘The learned say that he who knows the time of observation of rites, and he who observes them at the proper time, is the knower’. ‘He who observes *karma* dutifully is the devotee, he who carries them out punctually is the man of knowledge’. *Sannyāsa* in *Kali Yuga* is prohibited by several such statements. And you have accepted the same; that too directly from *brahmacarya* stage itself (Ci. Śam. 18. 7-15).

**Śaṅkara:** My boy, listen to the authoritative statements that I am

going to quote. 'यावद्वर्णविभागोऽस्ति यावद्वेदः प्रवर्तते । संन्यासश्चाग्निहोत्रं च तावदेव कलौ युगे ॥' ('In the *Kali Yuga*, *Sannyāsa* and *Agnihotra* are only as long as the Vedas are being taught and as long as there exists the class division'). 'One should accept the better stage of life from the first, second or from the *Vānaprastha* stage, whenever the mind becomes detached'. 'Whatever be the demerits acquired in getting offspring, whatever be the sins acquired in performing the rites, all of them get burnt by *Sannyāsa*, just as the bran-fire burns (and purifies) the gold'. 'He who is detached, and he who is desirous of liberation from the ocean of *saṁsāra* should give up all bindings and become a wandering monk even from the first stage of life'. 'It is said that the Vedas prescribe four stages of life to a brahmin, three to a kṣatriya, two to a vaiśya and one to a śūdra. One should get his head shaven completely (inclusive of the tuft) and give up the external thread'. 'Brahman itself is considered the sūtra (thread) and the wise one should wear that. That which points at the all, is regarded as the ultimate goal (*parama-pada*); he is called *sūtrajña* who has known sūtra.' 'The Yogi who is in the path of *jīvanmukti* (liberating oneself while living) should give up the external thread. Those who have understood this are regarded as *jñānopavītis* (those for whom knowledge itself is the sacred thread)'... When Śaṅkarācārya went on quoting from *Śruti*, *Smṛti* and *Purāṇas*, Maṇḍana was wonderstruck and was not in a position to answer (Ci. Śam. 18. 16-35).

'O fool! what you declared earlier, and what you are seeing now? How can the *karma* that is inert give you results? But, those results are caused by *Parabrahma* which is commended by the *Śruti*. He is sinner who condemns the Vedic path, and he is a greater sinner who

condemns those who are in the *Sannyāsa* stage of life' (Ci. Śam. 18. 36-38).

In this conversation, the main emphasis is on the discussion about the *Sannyāsa* stage of life. That is why questions and answers about *karma* and *brahmajñāna* aspects do not seem to have been given importance. It appears that Maṇḍana has a cherished notion that *sannyāsa* is prohibited in Kali Yuga; and that too, the celibates should never practice that'. It may be that in *Mādhavīya* the discussion on this matter might have been finished off during the angry conversation commencing with 'कुतो मुण्डी' etc. and until Vyāsa pacified Maṇḍana, and therefore not taken up in the main conversation. The Ācārya had stood firm on the prime authority of the Upaniṣads (i.e., *Jñāna kāṇḍa*); and Maṇḍana stuck to the *Mantras* and *brahmanas* as chief authority. In *Jñāna kāṇḍa*, *Sannyāsa* is prescribed as the subsidiary part for knowledge; and in *Karma kāṇḍa*, Vedic rites are prescribed and their commendation and fruits thereof are explained. Therefore, it is more appropriate to imagine that the two great scholars must have mainly argued about observation of Vedic rites and attaining knowledge through renunciation of Vedic rites.

### **The Importance of Maṇḍana's Arguments**

87. The concept that this should have been the main thrust in the argumentation has another explanation for clarity. Buddha had severely come down on the excess indulgence in the practice of *karma*, extreme nature of penance and limitless violence in the name of sacrifices that were in vogue in his time. Many kings encouraged his teachings and themselves had become Buddhists. As a result,

the number of Buddhist monks had increased, and people in general had lost faith in the Vedic rites. At such time of transition, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, by his scholarship had tried to bring back people on to the Vedic path and had succeeded in securing the support of some kings. The Buddhists were opposing chiefly the *apauruṣeyatva* (not coming from men) of the Vedas, the divisions of class and stages of life, performance of sacrifices etc. Naturally Kumārila Bhaṭṭa tried to rejuvenate the very same aspects, and as a result of his efforts, the Buddhist menace had come down somewhat. Since they allowed people into their fold without caring for caste or class, the immaculateness of Buddhism was weakened; the *tantras* might have originated from them for the first time. Many reprehensible customs and practices showed up. Exponents of Vedic religion might have included during this time, the better part of the teachings of Buddhism, as they were acceptable, into their *Smṛtis*, *Purāṇas* and *Itihāsas*. It may be that the story of Buddha being an incarnation of Viṣṇu in order to subdue the wicked, was conceived at this time. Buddhists too might have included many good teachings of Mahābhārata etc. in their books. Accusation of Buddhist's 'stealing of texts' are found here and there in our books. As the support of the kings was in the decline, Buddhism, for the reasons stated above, suffered decline in our country.

Exactly at this time, veteran scholars upholding *Jñāna kāṇḍa* came to limelight. Since *Sannyāsa* was permissible according to the practice of class and stages of life, it might be that some people, following Buddhist practice, resorted to *Sannyāsa* although they were not fit for that. It is possible that, like Buddhists, the brahmin scholars

too prepared in their *gurukulas* youngsters to uphold their own religion. Thus the exponents of Vedic religion - the followers of *karma kāṇḍa* and *jñāna kāṇḍa* - might have had a number of argumentations with the Buddhists. Exactly at this crucial time, the Ācārya was born; taking *Sannyāsa* like the Buddhists and with exemplary purity of character and self-control, through upholding an integrated non-contradictory perspective of *karma kāṇḍa* and *jñāna kāṇḍa*, took up the great task of effecting rejuvenation of Vedic religion.

Staunch followers of Vedic rites, fearing 'our own Bhikshus along with the Buddhists coming in the way of Vedic religion', must have brought forward the *vīra karma mīmāṃsāvāda* that opposed Vedāntavāda. Fearing the very destruction of Vedic religion, the upholders of Vedic rites found it necessary to create new *Smṛtis* to counter several previous practices that might have helped the opposers of *karma*. We feel that the sentences of chapter on *kalivarjyas* (prohibited in Kali Yuga), which *Cidvilāsīya* has made Maṇḍana to pronounce, must have been added into the *dharmaśāstras* at that time. As a result of these new efforts, several argumentations must have taken place between the scholars who were protectors of the path of Vedic rites and the upholders of *Jñāna kāṇḍa*. It can be said that the Maṇḍana-Śaṅkara debate is one such most ancient and historically valuable argumentation.

It is not important here whether the Ācārya argued with Maṇḍana Mīśra, or a different person by name Viśwarūpa or with a then famous householder-scholar. Since the authors of all ŚaṅkaraVijayas are of several centuries later to the time of Ācārya they must have written the argumentation on the basis of their reading or by keeping in mind

the stories that were in vogue at their times, and imagining them with their own level of knowledge in Śāstras; therefore it is not even important whether the debate took place exactly like this or not. The question at that time was whether the *karma-mīmāṃsā-darśana* wins or whether the Vedānta (which integrates the perspectives of *Śruti*, *Smṛti*, *Purāṇas* etc.) wins. Scholars must have come from distant places and even from other countries to witness the argumentation. That is why *Mādhava* and *Vyāsācala* both have written that Brahma and other gods were listening to the argument from above, sitting in their planes (Mā. Śam. 8. 79; Vyā. Śam. 6.99).

### Ācārya's opinion about Sannyāsa

88. Is *Sannyāsa* enjoined by the Śāstras? What type of *Sannyāsa* is enjoined therein? Even now there is difference of opinion regarding this. Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda is of the opinion that the scriptures have prescribed *paramahansa pārivrājya*. There is ample evidence in his *Bhāṣyas* that there should have been people who were prone to prove that this kind of *Sannyāsa* is not in accordance with the Śāstras. How many are the stages of life? This question is discussed in *Sūtrabhāṣya*. In the expression 'trayo dharmaskandhāḥ' (Chand. Up. 2. 23. 1) it is mentioned that for those of the three stages of life - i.e., the celibate, householder and anchorite - the fruit is reaching meritorious worlds, and for the *brahmasamstha* the fruition is *amritatva* (salvation). The proposition of Jaimini is that here the four stages of life are only for consideration; there is no injunction. Bādarāyaṇa has written (Ve. Sū. 3. 4. 19) that not only it is for consideration, but also is meant for practice; continuing, he has written that *Sannyāsa* is also enjoined



(Ve. Sū. 3. 4. 20). In his Bhāṣya, Śaṅkarācārya has established that *brahmasamstha* is a Bhikshu. Also he has discussed in his Bhāṣya on the above statement of Chāndogya Upaniṣad, and has declared that *brahmasamstha* is none other than a *paramahansa parivrājaka*. In both places it is clearly stated that firmness with *karma* and firmness with Brahman are mutually contradictory.

This matter has been taken for a detailed discussion at the end of the fifth *brāhmaṇa* of the fourth chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya*. It is written that there are Śruti sentences supporting only one stage of life (of the householder) like 'aikāśramyajñāpakāni', in the Śruti 'yāvajjīvamagnihotraṃ juhuyāt (juhoti?); also there are sentences upholding other stages of life. About the subject of *Sannyāsa*, it is written that there are Śrutis and Smṛtis mentioning *krama*, *vikalpa*, *yatheshṭāśramaseva*; and there is the traditional practice by those conversant (एवं व्युत्थानविकल्पक्रमयथेष्टाश्रमप्रतिपत्ति-प्रतिपादकानि हि श्रुतिस्मृतिवाक्यानि शतशः उपलभ्यन्ते इतरेतरविरुद्धानि । आचारश्च तद्विदाम् ।). And at the end of the discussion, Ācārya has concluded about *Vidvat Sannyāsa* by writing 'विदुषस्तावत्पारिव्राज्यं सिद्धम् । सम्प्रदानादिकर्मकारकजात्यादिशून्याविक्रिय-ब्रह्मात्मदृढप्रतिपत्तिमात्रेण वचनमन्तरेणापि ।' (a man accomplishes *pārivrājya* merely by unshakable knowledge of Brahman-Ātman that is devoid of *sampradāna* and other *kāraṇas*, genus, changes in form etc. although there is no sentence to that effect) He has written 'विविदिषोरपि सिद्धं पारिव्राज्यम् ।' एतमेवात्मानं लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति इति वचनात् । (since there is the statement telling that one who is desirous of the Loka called Ātman only, should adopt *Sannyāsa*, even for a man desirous of knowledge, *pārivrājya* is admitted) and 'तस्माद्विरक्तस्य मुमुक्षोः विनापि ज्ञानेन ब्रह्मचर्यादेव प्रव्रजेत् इत्याद्युपपन्नम् ।' [therefore (pridelessness etc. achieved

mainly by self-control and knowledge-meditation-detachment etc. accomplished mentally being the helpful means) for the dispassioned seeker, although knowledge has not been yet, in view of the injunctions 'one should renounce directly from the celebrate stage of life' etc., it is established that *pārivrājya* is admitted] to conclude *Vividishā Sannyāsa*. In the third chapter of the same Upaniṣad (Bri. Up. 3. 5. 1), while expounding the implication of the sentence 'vyutthāyātha bhikṣācāryaṃ caranti' he has written 'यद्धि तदेषणाभ्यो व्युत्थानलक्षणं पारिव्राज्यं तदात्मज्ञानाङ्गम् । आत्मज्ञानविरोध्येषणा-परित्यागरूपत्वात् । अविद्याविषयत्वाच्च एषणायाः । तद्व्यतिरेकेण च अस्ति आश्रमरूपं पारिव्राज्यं ब्रह्मलोकादिफलप्राप्तिसाधनं यद्विषयं यज्ञोपवीतादिसाधनविधानं लिङ्गविधानं च' (p 813) [that *pārivrājya* by which one gives up the desires of the mundane and other worlds is the subsidiary part for attaining knowledge of Ātman; as against this there is another type of *pārivrājya* following which one would be able to obtain *brahma loka* etc., regarding which wearing of the sacred thread etc. and *līṅga* (the paraphernalia of the *sannyāsin*) are prescribed] meaning that two types of Āśramas - *paramahansa pārivrājya* and *tridaṇḍī sannyāsa* - are distinguished, and both of which are supported by the scriptures.

Similarly, the Ācārya in his Bhāṣyas on Upaniṣads *Taittirīya*, *Aitareya* etc. has demonstrated that being a *paramahansa* is in accordance of the scriptures.

It was the opinion of those raising objections at that time, that the injunctions (of the scriptures) supporting *Sannyāsa* are not aimed at giving up *karma* as per injunctions like 'one should perform *agnihotra* as long as one lives'. Because, injunctions like *agnihotra* etc. are without exceptions; whereas prescriptions of *Sannyāsa* have

exceptions. Which means Sannyāsa could be thought of as the resort of those who are not qualified to do *karma*. It is mentioned in the *Tantravārtika* of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: ‘तत्रैवं शक्यते वक्तुं येऽन्ध-पङ्गवादयो नराः । गृहस्थत्वं न शक्यन्ते कर्तुं तेषामयं विधिः । नैष्ठिकब्रह्मचर्यं वा परिव्राजकतापि वा । तैरवश्यं गृहीतव्या तेनादावेव मुच्यते ॥’ (Tam. Va. 1. 3. 2. p 192) [since for the blind, crippled etc. performing duties prescribed for householders is not possible, they are to resort to firm *brahmacarya* or *pārivrājya* out of necessity. That is why *Sannyāsa* has been prescribed for them] - this was the opinion of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsa Vārtikakāra* . The Ācārya firmly rejects this opinion. Because for such people who are not authorised, *pārivrājya* is prescribed separately as ‘स्नातकोवासस्नातको वोत्सन्नाग्निरनग्निको वा’ in the Jābālopanishad. Therefore, it is correct to say that all *karma* is only for the ignorant with desires in their heart. The Ācārya has clarified again and again in his *Gītābhāṣya*, *Bhāṣyas* on Upaniṣads like *Isāvāsyā*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Chāndogya*, *Taittirīya*, *Aitareya*, as well as in his *Sūtrabhāṣya* that it is only for such ignorant people who are having desires that *karma* is prescribed to be performed as long as they live.

### Is Sannyāsa prohibited in Kali Yuga?

Another aspect remains to be examined here. As described till now, (1) the *pāramahamsya* to be adopted by those who have known Ātman or by those seekers who are desirous of salvation, (2) the Āśrama sannyāsa that leads one to *brahmaloka* etc. and (3) the *pārivrājya* to be resorted to by such of those who are debilitated bodily and not authorised to perform karmas - the Ācārya has accepted all these three as supported by Śāstras. His ultimate opinion is that the *karmas* such

as *agnihotra* are prescribed for those who do not have the knowledge of Self and not desirous of such a realization, and the belief that if one gives up *agni*, the sin called Veerahatyā dosha would be incurred also is a matter of the ignorant. In this context, the objection whether *Sannyāsa* is prohibited in Kali Yuga (as it is held in *Cidvilāsīya*) is not posed anywhere in the *Bhāṣyas* written by Ācārya. Was this question not raised in the *Smṛtis* at the time of Ācārya? Some are holding that even *agnihotra* is prohibited in Kali Yuga. The first half of the *śloka* of *Cidvilāsīya* which reads ‘अश्वालम्भं गवालम्भं’... has been cited in Nirṇayasindhu with a variation in the text as ‘अग्निहोत्रं गवालम्भं संन्यासं पलपैतृकम् ।’. Then the objectors would face the undesirable as it would mean that just as *Sannyāsa*, *agnihotra* too is prohibited in Kali Yuga. Although the Ācārya has answered this by saying ‘संन्यासश्चाग्निहोत्रं च तावदेव कलौ युगे’ (Ci. Śam. 17), *Cidvilāsa* has not raised this issue; why? It would not be correct to imagine that *Cidvilāsa* was not aware of the altered version of the *śloka*. The author of Nirṇayasindhu has written that which is prohibited in Kali Yuga is tridaṇḍasaṁnyāsa (Ni. Sim. Kalivarjya Prakaraṇa, p 263); but we do not have any evidence to say that the Ācārya has agreed upon this. We have no statements either to decide Ācārya’s opinion on this aspect. Those who wish to integrate Dharmaśāstras for an identical opinion should consider this issue.

### **Jaimini’s opinion not opposed to Ācārya’s conclusions**

89. Before closing this subject of argumentation, it is necessary to describe another conversation between the Ācārya and Maṇḍana as mentioned in *Mādhavīya* (Mā. Śam. 9. 3-15). This is not mentioned in *Cidvilāsīya*. Getting up from his seat and prostrating before Śaṅkara

after three circumambulations, Maṇḍana said 'Sire, I beg your pardon for having abused your highest stage of life. I request you kindly to remove my ignorance, establish me in pure Advaita and make me a man of knowledge; give me sannyāsa and accept me as your disciple'. *Cidvilāsīya* gives only this much of detail (Ci. Śam. 18. 44). But *Mādhavīya* has another thing worth considering. Even after hearing Ācārya's expounding of the meaning of scriptures with reasoning and after giving up his own pride, Maṇḍana expressed one more doubt of his before him: 'I am not the least unhappy that I have lost the argument to you. But even Jaimini's exposition also are shown to be wrong! How is that the all-knower Jaimini wrote wrong things in his Sūtras?' (Mā. Śam. 9. 2-3). To answer this, the Ācārya said 'This is not the fault of Jaimini. Not knowing what he really means, we are accusing him of ignorance. Although Jaimini has purport in Parabrahman, seeing that those attached to objects are not qualified for Brahmayāgyā, he elaborated primarily *dharma* which would lead one towards obtaining knowledge. The Śruti statement 'तमेतम्' (Bri. Up. 4. 4. 22) says that study of the Vedas, sacrifice, charity and penance would lead to knowledge of Brahman; following the same lines, Jaimini has expounded the essence of *dharma* (Mā. Śam. 9. 6-7).

[Jaimini has not mentioned this kind of application for *karma*; since he has expounded *karma*, it is imagined that he had this opinion too.]

**Maṇḍana:** If it is so, why Jaimini has given the sūtra 'आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वादानर्थक्यमतदर्शनाम्' (Jai. Su. 1. 2. 1) which means 'since Vedas have main intent on *karma*, the statements which are not so are just in vain' (Mā. Śam. 9. 8)?

**Śaṅkara:** Although by tradition the Vedas are in favour of Advaita, because they have purport in the *karma* that leads towards Self-knowledge, Jaimini has told the meaning of sentences in that prakaraṇa, in terms of *karma* (Mā. Śam. 9. 9).

[Jaimini has not expressly told that the scriptures are in favour of Advaita; also he has not told that they are not in favour of Advaita. Keeping only karmakāṇḍa in his view, he has said that sentences become pramāṇa by being in terms of actions only. He has never taken up the Upaniṣadic expressions into discussion. He has not told that *karma* leads to knowledge.

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa in his *Tantra Vārtika* has clearly stated that the Upaniṣads also have internet on *karma*: ‘एतेन क्रत्वर्थकर्तृप्रतिपादनद्वारेण उपनिषदां नैराकाङ्क्ष्यं व्याख्यातम्’ (Jai. Sū. 1. 2. 7; Tam. Vā. p 114) [The Upaniṣads become free from intent only because they tell about Ātman the doer, required as part and parcel of *karma*]. Also elsewhere he has written (Tam. Vā. 1. 3. 8 p 288) ‘आत्मज्ञानं हि संयोगपृथक्त्वात् क्रत्वर्थपुरुषार्थत्वेन ज्ञायते । तेन विना परलोकफलेषु प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्त्यभावात्’ (Self-knowledge is required also for fulfilling the ends of humans; because it has to be there either for involvement in or withdrawing from *karma* that would yield the other worlds as fruits.) There he has told about a composite of *Jñāna* and *Karma*].

**Maṇḍana:** In case Jaimini had thought that the essence of the Vedas is the Ātman of the form of Existence-Consciousness, why he has rejected *Parameśvara*? (Mā. Śam. 9. 10).

**Śaṅkara:** Kāṇāda says that *Parameśvara* is established by inference: just as pot etc., this world is the effect of a Cause (a Creator). On the basis of *Śrutis* like ‘तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि’ (Br. Up. 3. 9. 26) and

‘नाऽवेदविन्मनुते तं बृहन्तम्’ (Taṭṭi. Brah. 6. 12. 9. 7) which emphasize that establishing of *Īśwara* is possible only from the Veda and not otherwise, he (Jaimini) has refuted this kind of inference done for establishing *Īśwara*, and that *Īśwara* is the bestower of the fruits, by way of a hundredfold logic. His opinion is not in any way different from the opinion of the Upaniṣad that we have said. Not being aware of this, people regard him as a non-believer in *Īśwara* (Mā. Śam. 9. 11-14).

[Neither Jaimini nor the author of *Vārtika* have established *Īśwara*. The Ācārya is saying that Brahman cannot be established by inference; the reason for that is the non-perceptability of Brahman by the senses. Although it is true that he has cited the *Śruti* ‘तं त्वौपनिषदं’, he has cited that not for the sake of inference; but to convey that the Ātman that is known by a distinct kind of instruction of the Veda is not being considered by any].

Hearing this answer from the Ācārya, all the people gathered there were happy including Maṇḍana and Śārada. Desiring to know this by Jaimini himself, Maṇḍana thought of him. Accordingly Jaimini appeared and said ‘Do not doubt this Bhāṣyakāra. What he has said is the essence of my *Sūtras*. Let alone the essence of my *Sūtras*, only he knows the essence of all the *Śāstras*, and all the happenings of the past, present and future. When my preceptor Vyāsa has concluded that the purport of the *Śrutis* lies only in Consciousness, the one essence, how can I say anything contradictory to that? Verily, he (the Ācārya) is *Parameśwara*, who has incarnated Himself to liberate people who are engrossed in *samsāra*.

आद्ये सत्त्वमुनिः सतां वितरति ज्ञानं द्वितीये युगे

दत्तो द्वापरनामके तु सुमतिर्व्यासः कलौ शङ्करः ।

इत्येवं स्फुटमीरितोऽस्य महिमा शैवे पुराणे यत-

स्तस्य त्वं सुमते मते त्ववतरेः संसारवार्धिं तरेः ॥ २२ ॥

It is clearly stated in *Śiva Purāṇa* that Knowledge would be taught to good people by Kapila in the *Kṛta Yuga*, by Dutta in the *Tretā Yuga*, by Vyāsa the wise in the *Dwāpara Yuga* and by Śaṅkara in the *Kali Yuga*. Therefore, you follow his line of thought, and cross the ocean of *saṁsāra* - having said this, Jaimini disappeared (Mā. Śam. 9. 17-22). In *Vyāsācalīya*, although the argumentation between Śaṅkara and Viśwarūpa is mentioned, neither the details of the argument nor the doubt described by *Mādhava* is given. It is just mentioned that at the end of argumentation, Viśwarūpa the truthful prostrated before Śaṅkara, offering his all at his feet (Vyā. Śam. 6. 103).

### Maṇḍana becomes the disciple of Ācārya

90. Then Maṇḍana, having prostrated before Śaṅkara, said 'I request you to pardon me for the words I have spoken without knowing your true from. When even ṛṣis like Kapila and Kāṇāda have been under delusion while expressing the meaning and purport of the *Śruti*, who else can decide on it except you, who is the incarnation of Paraśiva? (Mā. Śam. 9. 30). This earth is invaded by *abhinava-yavanas*<sup>1</sup> who bring in distinctions (bheda) in God and kill the right expressions (go, गो); how can there be any plausibility of salvation for those who follow such people? Or, for that matter, since your disciples are present everywhere in all directions, why should I bother myself

1. It seems the poet has punned here comparing the Vedāntins of his time who insisted upon distinctions with Muhammadans. But there is no evidence that Muhammadans (or even such Vedāntins) were there at Ācārya's time. (Bheda: distinction or break; Go: cow or speech. -Translator)



worrying about that? (Mā. Śam. 9. 32). You have saved me from *samsāra* by way of instructing me, because of merit due to deeds done previously' (Mā. Śam. 9. 36). Thus having eulogised the Ācārya in various ways, he said 'having renounced my wife and children, riches and householder-duties and rites, I have taken shelter at your feet; please order me what shall I do further' (Mā. Śam. 9. 43).

That Jaimini appeared at the very remembrance of Maṇḍana, that he said Śaṅkara's opinion is his in essence, meaning that Śaṅkara's words only bestow knowledge of the ultimate and for this he cited Śiva purāṇa as pramāṇa - all these being sentences written by the poet for the sake of people who have faith in *mantra siddhi* and faith in the *Purāṇas* lauding Śaṅkara, it is not necessary for us to discuss upon them here. But it is true that the readers would get a doubt and wonder that Maṇḍana Paṇḍita, who had such greatness of penance as to make Jaimini and Vyāsa manifest before him by mere remembrance, never checked with them whether his opinion was agreeable to the two ṛṣis until Ācārya came for a debate with him. And it is open for criticism how could Jaimini, who has never cited from *Purāṇas* anywhere in his *Sūtras*, cited from *Śiva Purāṇa* just for the sake of Maṇḍana.

Whatever be the opinion of Jaimini, it is true that the Ācārya has said that *karma* would be the cause for the arise of knowledge, in accordance with *Bādarāyaṇa Sūtras*. After having said by way of *Sūtra* 'अत एव चाग्नीन्धनाद्यनपेक्षा' (Ve. Sū. 3. 4. 25) that knowledge alone would be the cause for salvation, and no *Āśrama karmas* are needed to assist it, since Bādarāyaṇa has (also) said that - by way of the *Śruti* 'तमेतम्' (Brih. Up. 4. 4. 22) sacrifice, charity and penance are the means for

the arise of knowledge - those are also necessary for the seekers of liberation [‘सर्वपेक्षा च यज्ञादिश्रुतेरश्वत्’ (Ve. Sū. 3. 4. 26)]. The Bhāṣyakāra too, accordingly, has expounded in his *Bhāṣyas* on *Prasthānatraya* that *karma*, by way of purifying the mind, would lead to craving for knowledge, arising of knowledge and ability to remain established in knowledge. Just by examining his Sūtras, it is not possible to decide whether this would have been agreeable to Jaimini also or not.



## 10. Argumentation with Ubhayabhārati

### Maṇḍana-Śaṅkara argument: When and How it came to an end?

91. It is not resolved how many days the Maṇḍana-Śaṅkara argument lasted. In *Mādhavīya* the number of days is not mentioned. Having Ambe the wise one as the witness, both of them were engaged in a kind of disputation with a view to win over each other ('अम्बामुदारधिषणामभिषिच्य साक्ष्ये जल्पं वितेनतुरथो जयदत्तदृष्टी' Mā. Sham.8. 66). Ubhayabhārati, having made each of them wear a flower garland, and telling 'whenever whoever had the flower garland wither away is to be taken as the loser' would get herself engaged in arranging for their food and in other household activities (Mā. Śam. 8. 68). Day by day their argument was gaining more and more intensity; this continued for five or six days; they used to argue until she called them for partaking of food (bhiksha| bhojana) (Mā. Śam. 8. 82). The argumentation took place as described earlier; and at last 'having agreed with the lord of the *Sannyāsins*, Śaṅkara, and seeing the garland that decorated the neck of Maṇḍana withering, she beckoned both of them "please come over for the bhiksha" (भिक्षार्थमुच्चलतम्) - this is all that is mentioned there (Mā. Śam. 8. 132).

Some of the *ślokas* of *Vyāsācalīya* (Vyā. Śam. 6. 97-100) are exact replicaes of the *ślokas* of *Mādhavīya*. Even mention about the garlands is there. But there is a *śloka* stating that the argumentation was held for only six days:

सा सप्तमे दिन उपेत्य सरस्वती तौ संवीक्ष्य भिक्षितुमभूदुभयोरनीहा (पीह?) ।

उक्त्वेत्थमादरधिया वचनं स्वभर्तुरन्तर्दधे सुवदना किल शापमुक्ता ॥ (Vyā. Śam. 6. 102)

[On the seventh day, Saraswati approached and seeing both of them, said "ready for the *bhiksha*" (?) and became silent. Having said this to her husband courteously, she was liberated from the curse and disappeared]. Having said earlier that the argumentation was held for "five or six" days, (and not exactly six days) (Vyā. Śam 6. 100) and saying on the seventh day "ready for the *bhiksha*", do not match; to say that she "disappeared" after saying it, is even more unsuitable. It has to be reasoned that someone has added this *śloka* to create an impression that no debate was held with Ubhayabhārati. Or, since this *śloka* is present even in *Mādhavīya* (Mā. Śam. 8. 72), it has to be imagined that *Vyāsācala* too was of the same opinion. In *Śaṅkarācāryacaritam* of *Govindanātha*, it is stated that 'Bhārati placed staff etc. (insignia of a *sannyāsi*) before her husband and, being liberated from her curse, disappeared':

सप्तमेऽहनि विप्रेन्द्रो मस्करीन्द्रेण धीमता ।

पराजितस्तदा वाणी भाविकर्मेति निश्चिता ॥

भर्तुरग्रे निधायशु दण्डादीन् सौमनस्विनी ।

मुनिशापविनिर्मुक्ता तिरोभावं जगाम सा ॥ (Go. Śam. 5. 59-60).

We have to consider that in *Mādhavīya* she is called "Amba" (*śloka*s 8. 66 and 8. 132). Having written earlier (Mā. Śam. 7. 116) 'Umba' since she was the wife of 'Umbeka', why the poet writes here as "Amba"? Does he mean she was having both the names? Or, did he write here also as 'Umba'? This is not clear in the commentary. She is mentioned there as 'ambā sarasvatī'. Having said earlier that she placed

garlands on their necks and busied herself in the household chores, the poet now says that she "accepted Śaṅkara's logic" [यतिक्षितिपतेरनुमोद्य युक्तिम् (Mā. Śam. 8. 132)]; the commentators have not explained how it is consistent. Keeping aside the point that logic of Śaṅkara grew stronger, what is left over is the withering away of the garland flowers. Only the poet knows how the flowers did not wither in so many days, and of the two garlands placed at the same time, how only one garland withered earlier. The same poet described earlier that it was by the greatness of Vedic religion Kumārila Bhaṭṭa could sustain himself without injuries after jumping from the mountain or from upstairs; now he says withering of the garland is indicative of the wearer's defeat<sup>1</sup>. But how it can be believed that Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana who had importance for reason and experience, accepted this as the just decision?

In *Cidvilāsiya* it is like this: विद्यास्वष्टादशस्वेष तत्सङ्ख्यादिवसैरपि । वाङ्मुखं समुखीनः सन्कर्तुमेव समुत्सुकः ॥ (Śaṅkara argued on eighteen disciplines for eighteen days) (Ci. Śam. 18. 4). What are those disciplines? It is not mentioned there. It might be that the author has taken for consideration what has been mentioned in Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's *Tantravārtika*: 'परिमितान्येव हि चतुर्दशाष्टादश वा विद्यास्थानानि धर्मप्रमाणत्वेन शिष्टैः परिगृहीतानि - वेदोपवेदाङ्गोपाङ्गाष्टादशधर्मसंहितापुराणशास्त्र-शिक्षादण्डनीतिसंज्ञकानि (Tam. Vā. 1. 3. 3-7, p 201) i.e., that *dharma* requires eighteen disciplines of study. Sarasavāṇi, who was witnessing the arguments of both, rose quickly upon hearing Śaṅkara's words, and - every day she was inviting her husband for bhojana and the monk for bhiksha

1. Or, was it the imagination of the poet that the defeated Maṇḍana's agitation of mind heated up his body?

- invited both of them for bhiksha on the eighteenth day (Ci. Śam. 18. 38-41). It might be that the author has felt argumentation was held on the eighteen disciplines, and then the question - whether *Sannyāsa* was (in accordance with) *dharma* - was resolved. And the story of withering garland is not there in this.

In *Anantānandagīrīya* it is mentioned that the argumentation was held about nigama and all the other disciplines. After a hundred days, hearing that her husband's side (argument) slipped, the all-knowing Sarasavāṇi came out from the kitchen, approached her husband, and said "my lord, Maṇḍana Miśra, please rise up for bhiksha" (Chapter 56, p 216)<sup>1</sup>

Both Cidvilāsa and *Anantānandagīrī* have called Maṇḍana's wife as Sarasavāṇi. Both have not resorted to the story of withering garlands to decide that Maṇḍana was defeated. It can be reconciled somehow that the argumentation held on the eighteen disciplines was required to decide whether *Sannyāsa* was in accordance with *dharma* (as per *Cidvilāsiya*), but it was not required for the conclusions of Vedānta which Śaṅkara wanted to establish; or, even if required, was, at the most, of subsidiary assistance. We are at a loss to know why Cidvilāsa has left out the argumentation on the main subject of Vedānta. And, the statement of *Anantānandagīrī* that a hundred-day debate was held on all the disciplines of study is absurd, as far as present context is concerned; and it would not be appropriate for the further story that the Ācārya held an argumentation with the wife of Maṇḍana (or Saraswati).

---

1. It seems that something is wrong here in Devanāgarī script; unnecessary wordings have been added.

### Riddles of argumentation held with Ubhayabhārati

92. The happenings after the defeat of Maṇḍana, according to the different ŚaṅkaraVijayas are as follows:

*Mādhavīya*: After her husband sustained defeat, Bhārati said to the Ācārya 'I was knowing that Dūrvāsa's curse would be functional only till you win. Therefore I shall take leave' and prepared herself to depart. Then, just to establish that his doctrine alone is the correct one (स्वमतैकसिद्ध्यै) - and not for the honour by all as an all-knowing person - and to win over Saraswati, the Ācārya binded her by a spell of *Aranyadurga*, said 'I know that you are none other than Goddess Saraswati; I am your devotee, and You can depart only when I permit You to go' (Mā. Śam.8. 133-136). Since Maṇḍana, defeated as he was and wanted to become his disciple, Śaṅkara looked at his wife's face, (Mā. Śam. 9. 45) she said 'when I was young, a mendicant had predicted my future; it has happened exactly as he had told. But you have not yet won over my husband completely; I being his better-half, win over me and then accept him as your disciple. Although you are the Ultimate Cause of the world, the all-knower *Paramapuruṣa*, I am curious to argue with you' (Mā. Śam. 9. 56-57). Since this looked quite reasonable, the Ācārya agreed to this proposal.

*Cidvilāsīya*: Maṇḍana, after circumambulating and prostrating before the Ācārya, said 'I beg your pardon for all bad things that I have said about *Sannyāsa*. And I request you to instruct me into the knowledge of Advaita'. Accordingly, the Ācārya gave him *Sannyāsa* (Ci. Śam. 18. 43-45). Witnessing all this, Vāni, who now got herself liberated from the curse of Dūrvāsa, sang the glories of Śaṅkara and pre-

pared herself to go to her abode, the world of Truth (Ci. Śam. 18. 47). Then the Ācārya, binding her by the spell of *Vanadurga*, asked her 'Without arguing with me and winning me over, where are you going?' (Ci. Śam. 19. 2-4). She replied, 'O ye eminent *Sannyāsin*, you could not know who I am. Never it is possible for you to win over me in argumentation. Sky being my abode, how a debate can take place between me and a terrestrial being like you? Seeing you, I have become free from the curse of Dūrvāsa. Hence, please permit me to depart to my world of Truth'. When again she started departing, the Ācārya tightly binded her by the spell of *Vanadurga*, and started arguing with her (Ci. Śam. 19. 5-10).

*Ānandagīrīya*: Seeing Sarasavāṇi flying away to the abode of Brahma through the ventilator of the kitchen at the moment just before her husband's taking *Sannyāsa*, the supreme preceptor blocked all directions for her by the spell of *Vanadurga* and said 'O Sarasavāṇi! Although you are the power of Brahma, you are seen because of adjuncts as the wife of Maṇḍana Miśra, a partial incarnation of him. Therefore, have an argumentation with me and then go'. She replied, 'Well, fearing widowhood, I have left this earth which is the ground of obtaining the results of one's actions, before my husband took *Sannyāsa*. So, I cannot have terrestrial touch once again. How can I argue with you on earth?' The Ācārya said, 'Mother, even so, please be in the sky, some six hand measures higher; you can go after the debate' (Chap. 66, p 217; De. p 185-186).

### **A critique of argumentation with Ubhayabhārati**

93. Now let us take up a critical review of this part.



(1) Although the story of Saraswati incarnating as a human being as per the curse of Dūrvāsa is there in all ŚaṅkaraVijayas, both Cidvilāsa and *Ānandagiri* say that her name is Sarasavāṇi. We cannot say whether it is her parental nomenclature or whether the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijaya called her so because she was highly educated and genially talkative. It matters little even if it is thought of as her name. Bearing in mind her learning, on the basis of her name 'Vāṇi', she could have been thought of as Saraswati Herself. Even the name 'Bhārati' means the same. *Mādhava* and others might have called her 'Ubhayabhārati' to indicate that she was the mediator between Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara. Later, in order to point out that she was all-knowing, the story of Saraswati incarnating as a result of the curse of Dūrvāsa might have crept in. Beside *Mādhava*, several others could have accepted the name 'Ubhayabhārati'; this is evidenced by the following śloka of *Gururatnamālikā*:

परकीयवपुः प्रवेशशैल्या स्मरतन्त्राणि विदन्वशी न लौल्यात् ।

अकृतातनुभारतीं वशे यः सुकृतं मे सुतरां गुरुः स जीयत् ॥ २९ ॥

commented upon by *Ātmabodha* the author of *Suṣamā* as follows:  
इदं पद्यमत्रत्याः कतिपये कामरा(श्रीमदा)चार्यविजयविद्याशङ्करविजयादिषु निषण्णबुद्ध्यः  
अकृतोभयभारतीम् इति यत्किञ्चित्पदव्यत्ययेन षट्मण्डनमिश्रेति पद्यसमनन्तरं पठन्ति”

[Some people here who admire Ācāryavijaya, *VidyāŚaṅkaraVijaya* etc. read this stanza after (the 22nd) stanza *patumaṇḍanamiśra* with a little alteration of the text as 'akṛtobhayabhāratiṁ']. It seems *Ātmabodha* calls the *Mādhavīya ŚaṅkaraVijaya* as *VidyāŚaṅkaraVijaya*. Some of his followers too opined that the author of *Gururatnamālikā* had accepted the name *Ubhayabhārati* and stated that the Ācārya won over Saraswati (*Ubhayabhārati*) after first winning over Maṇ-

dana; but *Ātmabodha* has countered that here. This points out that even among the traditionalists of *Kāñci Pīṭham*, there was doubt as to when the Ācārya won over Saraswati. We shall take up this matter elsewhere as we progress further.

(2) *Ātmabodha* has written as follows regarding the curse of Dūrvāsa:

‘ये त्वभिनवोद्दण्डविद्यारण्यस्वामिभिरारचिते विद्याशङ्करविजये शिवरहस्यवचनत्वेन प्रतिपादिताः दूर्वासः शापतो भूमौ जातां वाणीम्... इत्यादयः श्लोकाः, ते न क्वापि शिवरहस्यप्राचीनमातृकासूपलभ्यन्त इत्यप्रामाणकमेव (अप्रामाणिका एव?) इति सर्वं शिवम् ॥’

[In the *VidyāśaṅkaraVijaya* written by *Abhinavoddanḍavidyāraṇya swāmi*, the *śloka*s depicting ‘दूर्वासः शापतो भूमौ जातां वाणीम्’ claimed to be the words from *Śivarahasya*, are not to be found in any ancient version of the same; hence not authoritative] Is this sentence written by *Ātmabodha* himself? Who is this *Abhinavoddanḍa Vidyāraṇya Swāmi*? Has *Ātmabodha* called *Mādhava* by this name? It does not look like that, because he says that the *Śivarahasya śloka*s are cited in the *VidyāśaṅkaraVijaya* written by *Abhinavoddanḍavidyāraṇya swāmi*; but these *śloka*s are not to be found in *Mādhavīya*; we have cited them in Appendix I from *Śrī Śringeri Śāradā Maṭha*, a book sent by Śrikakarālasundara Rāmiah to us. We learn from Somanāthaiah (So. Śam. p 8) that they are to be seen in a book printed on *Āshwa-yuja Bahula Soumyavāsara* of *Śrimukha Samvatsara* in Telugu script and published by Kalyāṇa Rāma Śāstry at Madras. *Ātmabodha* has written in his *Suśamā* commentary on the same *śloka* that it is differently stated in *Vyāsācalīya*, *BṛhatśaṅkaraVijaya*, *Keralīya-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* and *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*. Since the Dūrvāsa curse aspect is present in the handwritten copy of *Vyāsācalīya* that we have

with us, we have to say that it may not be what *Ātmabodha* has seen. May it be the true *Vyāsācalīya* or may it be a concocted one, it does not mention that argumentation took place with Ubhayabhārati. We have already mentioned (pg. \*202) - instead it is clearly stated that she disappeared immediately after the argumentation with Maṇḍana was concluded. It has to be researched and found out whether there was a *Abhinavoddanḍa-Vidyāraṇya swāmi*, whether he had written a *VidyāŚaṅkaraVijaya* and whether it had *ślokas* from *Śivarahasya*. In the tradition of Kuḍali Śringeri Maṭha, there was a *Abhinava-Vidyāraṇya swāmi* (Śālivahana Śaka 1565-1587); it is not known whether he had written any *ŚaṅkaraVijaya*. Whatever that be, we can guess from *Ātmabodha*'s writing that there were some authors following Kāncī Pīṭha tradition who accepted the Dūrvāsa curse story.

(3) It is worth examining who first started the Śaṅkara-Ubhaya-Bhārati argumentation. *Mādhava* has first stated that Śaṅkarācārya obstructed her (who was already in the sky) in order to establish that his philosophical conclusions were agreeable to all (तां जेतुमना मुनीन्द्रः ।... स्वमतैक्यसिद्ध्यै Mā. Śam. 8. 134); later he says that Ubhayabhārati herself challenged 'you have not won over me, the better half of Maṇḍana; first win over me and then make him your disciple. I am curious to argue with you' (वपुरर्धमस्य न जिता मतिमन्नपि मां विजित्य कुरु शिष्यमिमम् Mā. Śam. 9. 56; त्वयैव सह वादकृते हृदयं बिभर्ति मम तूत्कलिकाम् Mā. Śam. 9. 57). Out of these two, which one is true? And since *Cidvilāsiya* and *Ānandagiriya* contend that Śaṅkara himself provoked Sarasavāṇi for the debate, it is not clear what was the necessity for Ācārya to make an argumentation with her.

(4) Did the Śaṅkara-Bhārati debate take place before Maṇḍana's *Sannyāsa* or after? According to *Mādhavīya* it appears to be before, according to *Cidvilāsīya* it is after. According to *Ānandagiriya* it happened before.

(5) All the ŚaṅkaraVijayas contain the story of Ācārya's obstructing Saraswati by the spell of *Vanadurga Mantra*. When and with whom Śaṅkara practised the *Mantraśāstra* is not known.

(6) We shall draw the attention of the readers about one more thing before closing the critique of this event. In *Mādhavīya* and *Cidvilāsīya* it is clearly stated that the Ācārya, after giving *Sannyāsa* to Maṇḍana, gave him the name *Sureśwara* ('ततः समादिश्य सुरेश्वराख्याम्' Mā. Śam. 10. 104; सुरेश्वराचार्य इति मुदाभिख्यामदात्तदा' Ci. Śam. 18. 46); but in *Ānandagiriya* it is just mentioned that Maṇḍana Miśra, who was initiated into *Sannyāsa*, prostrated at the feet of the Paramaguru, went away towards north ('तदानीं मण्डनमित्रः परमगुरुचरणारविन्दं नत्वा तदुपदेशेन संन्यासी भूत्वा कुबेरदिशमव्रजत्' Ā. Śam. Chap. 56, p 216; De. p 185); it is mentioned that when the Ācārya started to win over Maṇḍana Miśra, he was accompanied with Padmapāda, Sureśwara etc. ('वन्दिमागधकृतस्तवैः, पद्मपादसुरेश्वरादि शिष्यकृतकरतालैः... Chap. 56, p 212). If this be so<sup>1</sup>, what name was given by the Ācārya to Maṇḍana after *Sannyāsa*? What did he do after going towards north? And according to *Ānandagiriya* who was *Sureśwarācārya* before taking *Sannyāsa*?

1. We have written 'if this be so', since the name Sureśwara is not there in Devanāgarī version.

### Bhārati questioning about the science of love (KāmaŚāstra)

94. Now let us take the story further. Let us summarize the argument held between the Ācārya and Ubhayabhārati and then discuss about it.

*Mādhavīya*: Śaṅkara, addressing Bhārati who invited him for argument, said ‘would one of good reputation argue with women?’ She replied ‘be the opponent a woman or a man, should one not argue in order to defend one’s position? Did not Yājñavalkya argue with Gārgi and Janaka with Sulabhā?’ (Mā. Śam. 9. 59-61). Since her words were reasonable, the Ācārya agreed. Both held the discussion for seventeen days (Mā. Śam. 9. 65). Then Śārada, finding that he could not be won on any other discipline of learning, questioned him on the science of love<sup>1</sup>, which, being a *sannyāsin* of tender years, he would not be knowing (Mā. Śam. 9. 67-69). Thinking that if these questions are answered it would be going against the *Sannyāsa dharma*, and if they are not answered, it would be indicating non-omniscience, what shall I do? Śaṅkara offered to answer them if a month’s time is given. When she agreed to this, he started by arial route using his Yogic power (Mā. Śam. 9. 70-73).

*Cidvilāsīya*: Both of them argued for eight days. Then Vāṇi questioned him on the science of love. The Ācārya asked for a month’s time for answering, and started from there (Ci. Śam. 19. 12-18).

*Ānandagiriya*: As requested by the Ācārya, Saraswati remained in

---

1. We have not given here Bhārati’s questions of the science of love and the probable answers the Ācārya might have given, thinking that they are unnecessary. This subject is described in works like *Vātsyāyana Kāmasūtra* and *Pañcasāyaka*.

the sky and asked questions on *Vedas*, *Purāṇas*, *Itihāsas* and other systems of learning; and with an intention of refuting him, she asked about the details of the science of love, differences in the lover and the loved etc., a realm forbidden for *Sannyāsis*. He kept quiet (Chap. 57, p 217; De. p 186). When Sarasavāṇi chided him asking ‘there are realms of learning which you do not know, are they not?’ the *Paramaguru* knowing the future told her ‘Mother, please remain here for six months; and then I will give my verdict on the arts etc.’ (Chap. 58, p 218; De. p 186).

We have already pointed out that it is doubtful and debatable whether this incident really took place. Even if it took place, the ŚaṅkaraVijayas are not equivocal regarding how long the debate was held. It is absurd to say that the Ācārya volunteered to invite Bhāratī for the debate; it is still more absurd that the Ācārya who was presenting the conclusions of Vedānta, wanted to argue on all the disciplines. That Bhāratī, or Sarasavāṇi, famed as an incarnation of Saraswati, posed questions on the science of love, a subject irrelevant to the present occasion, to a gentleman other than her husband, is not only inappropriate but is a taint to her honour. We are at a loss to know why the Ācārya or the audience did not object to such unworthy questions. To imagine Ācārya asking for a month’s or six month’s time to obtain the knowledge of the science of love, just to show that he is a knower of everything, would only be a means to show he is vainglorious and not of immaculate character but does not suit his worthiness. This imagined story has only helped those of other schools of thought to hold that the Ācārya was of a questionable character; and certainly has not helped to highlight the worthiness

of the highly revered personality. Śaṅkara's foe Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita in his *Maṇimañjarī*, though not mentioning the supposed migration of Ācārya's soul by Yoga into the body of another (*parakāyapraveśa*), has concocted filthy story regarding the character of Bhārati.

### **Parakāyapraveśa (metempsychosis)**

95. Let us consider the story further. The Ācārya, having obtained a month's (or six-months') time to find answer to Ubhayabhārati's questions, started off by arial route alongwith his disciples (Mā. Śam. 9. 73) and reached a place called *Amṛtapura* located towards north (Ci. Śam. 19. 20; Ā. Śam. Chap. 58, p 218; De. p 180). Accompanying him were only four disciples - Padmapāda etc. (Ci. Śam. 19. 19); their names were Padmapāda, Hastāmalaka, Vidhivid and *Ānandagiri* (Ā. Śam. Chap. 58, p 218). The name of the king (of that place) was *Amaraka* (Mā.Šam. 9. 77) or *Amareśwara* (Ci. Śam. 19. 40). He had come on a hunting trip, swooned and fallen dead under a tree in the forest during night (Mā. Śam. 9. 75); or, his one hundred wives and elders of the place had brought the body of the dead king to the cremation ground and had placed it on the funeral pyre (Ci. Śam. 19. 22-23; Ā. Śam. Chap. 58, p 218, De. p 180). The Ācārya said to Sanandana 'this Amaraka, having a hundred wives, is dead; I shall enter his body by Yogic power, make his son the king and come back; I shall see his wives directly'. Then Sanandana replied, 'although you are omniscient and know everything, I am telling this to you: in the past, Matsyendra left his body in the care of his disciple Goraksha and entered the body of a king and was ruling his kingdom so that the people were happy; at the suggestion of his ministers, the wives of the

king had him subjugated; Instructing him on the Reality and instilling dispassion, Goraksha had to have him return. Not only that, this may break your celebrate life and make you a sinner. Please think over all these aspects'. Then the Ācārya consoled him saying 'what you say is correct. But, detached as I am, just as Kṛṣṇa did not become lustful in the company of Gopis, I would not become attached. Since I know *Vajroli Yoga*, there will be no breaking of *Yatidharma*. Injunctions and prohibitions are for those ignorant who think they are the body, and not for those who are knowers of truth. A man of knowledge is beyond the Vedas, and hence is not the slave of its prescriptions. For him who knows that there is no world separate from Supreme Ātman, there is no binding of actions. For Indra, the all-knower, there was no smear of his sinful actions; Janaka, who carried out many sacrifices, did not get another birth; instead he gained fearlessness only. Hence, nothing wrong in considering the science of love. For the sake of virtuous conduct, I am doing this through *parakāyapraveśa*; nothing wrong in this' (Mā. Śam. 9. 76-100). Following this, the Ācārya instructed his disciples to keep his body protected and left his body in a cave of a mountain (Mā. Śam. 9. 102) or in the hollow of a tree (Ci. Śam. 19. 24); By the power of yoga he entered the dead body of the king through *brahmarandhra* (at the top of the forehead), untill the feet, slowly. Seeing the king come alive, everyone was happy (Mā. Śam. 9. 101-109).

Thus, the king, once dead and then lived, was taken into the capital city by the priests after performing sacrifices for peace. The king started ruling the kingdom with the help of the ministers. Seeing his qualities different altogether, and also the kingdom prospering, the



ministers thought 'a great soul must have entered this body; hence we should take care that he does not go back to his former body' and then passed orders confidentially that 'wherever a dead body is found, it should immediately be cremated without any second thought' (Mā. Śam.11. 9). In two ŚaṅkaraVijayas it is mentioned that it was the queen who found out this secret and passed such orders (Ci. Śam. 19. 38-43; Ā. Śam. Chap. 58, De. p 187). The new king handed over the reins of the kingdom to the ministers and engaged himself in various sorts of carnal happiness. During that time, he made an in-depth study of the *Vātsyāyana Sūtras* and commentaries on them, and himself wrote a new treatise on it. (Mā. Śam. 10-18).

### **A Critique of the story of Metempsychosis**

96. Could this story be a description of what really happened? *Mādhavīya* describes that the king who had come for hunting swooned and died below a tree; *Cidvilāsīya* and *Ānandagirīya* describe that the dead body of the king was brought to the cremation ground and laid on the funeral pyre. *Mādhavīya* says that Śaṅkara had left his body in the cave of a mountain; *Cidvilāsīya* says he had left it in the hollow of a tree. Likewise the versions of the story vary. Is it that long time after the happening of the event the story-writers wrote what they had heard, or is the story itself a concocted imagination? *Mādhavīya* describes that the Ācārya withdrew his vital airs slowly starting from the tip of the toe and finally left the body from the *brahmarandhra* at the top of the forehead, and likewise entered the body of the king at the *brahmarandhra* slowly and spread over the entire body till the tip of the toe (Mā. Śam. 9. 105). There is a *Yoga*

*Sūtra* in the *Vibhūti pāda* which says ‘बन्धकारणशैथिल्यात् प्रचारसंवेदनाच्च चित्तस्य परशरीरप्रवेशः’ (Yo. Su. 3. 39). The commentary on this *Sūtra* describes thus: ‘Mind being unsteady does not remain in one place. Under the control of the store of karma it remains bound within the body. Binding means confinement. The *karma* that is responsible for that confinement becomes loose by the power of *samādhi*. So one can know the movement of the mind by *samādhi*. Thus, by the destruction of the bondage, and by knowing the nature of movement of his mind, the Yogi can withdraw his mind from his body and place it in other bodies. The senses go after the mind so displaced. Just as the bees follow in group their leader bee, and sit when the leader bee sits, in the same way when the mind enters another body, the senses follow’. Even after reading this commentary, it is not possible for us to loosen the mind and take it out from our body or to place it in another body. And we are yet to see great souls who can convince us according to Śāstras, that it can be done. So, we are not in a position to give an opinion on whether the phenomenon of metempsychosis is possible or not. But the questions worth considering here are: Did the Ācārya use metempsychosis just for the sake of a small task? If he did, from whom he learnt this *vidyā*?

### **A Critique of the conversation between Padmapāda and Ācārya**

97. Is the reason behind Padmapāda’s forbidding metempsychosis less powerful and is the reasoning of Ācārya as depicted by the author *Mādhava* more powerful? Let us examine now. Padmapāda’s reasoning is two-fold: (1) the fear that just as *Matsyendra* having entered the

body of the king forgot himself in enjoyment, it may happen now also; (2) the fear that the Ācārya's credentials of *Sanṇyāsāśrama* be spoiled by doing so. Let historians decide whether *Matsyendra* was earlier than Ācārya or not; however, it is certain that there is the danger of the person engaging himself in metempsychosis be lost in carnal desires. And the biographers of Śaṅkara write that the same thing happened presently. And now let us examine the reasoning given by the Ācārya that there is no danger for his *Sanṇyāsa*: (1) he says that a detached person would not be lost in lust just as Śrī Kṛṣṇa did not lose himself in the company of the Gopis. This reasoning may well be adopted by the *Sādhus* and *Sanṇyāsis* who are having a delusion that they are detached, but actually not. (2) he says that since he has mastered *vajroli yoga*, he will not incur the fault of spilling (or ejaculation). The *vajroli yoga* is described in books like *Haṭhayogapradīpikā* (Haṭha. 3. 84-88); we hear that there exist persons who have in fact practised this even now. But, could we say that the vow of celibacy is not broken just because there is no ejaculation while in contact with woman? (3) *Mādhavīya* mentions the Ācārya saying that the root of desire is in *sankalpa* (resolve) and that he is not having that *sankalpa* (Mā. Śam. 9. 91). If the Ācārya had no resolve, how come he resolved to do metempsychosis, first of all? He might have exercised his will just like Parameśvara, the truth-willed One - cannot be the answer to this question, because here the resolve is of the form one is wanted and the other is not; it is different from Parameśvara's resolve in creation etc where it is dependent on the karma of the creatures. (4) the poet has introduced another supposed-to-be argument of the Ācārya here that the Vedic injunctions and prohibitions are only for those

having attachment to body and not for the knower of unborn, non-dual Brahman. It is true that the *Bhāṣyas* and *Vārtikas* contain the opinion that the man of knowledge does not engage in *karmas* as one subservient to the Vedic injunctions and prohibitions; but never in the sense that he may engage himself in any action whatsoever with a free will. We do not find Ācārya posing such an argument anywhere in his works. (5) another argument the poet has given as Ācārya's is that for a person who knows that a world separate from Brahman does not exist, there is no taint of the fruits of action, just as in the wakeful state there would be no taint of the fruits of action done in the dream state (Mā. Śam. 9. 95). This line of reasoning may establish that the fruits of actions done in the ignorant stage of life do not taint Jñāni as they are sublated by true knowledge, it cannot be a reason to say that Jñāni, after attaining knowledge, will not bear the fruits even if he commits forbidden actions. (6) yet another argument is that the man of knowledge is not touched by the merits of a thousand *Aśwamedha* sacrifices just like king Janaka, and that he is not touched by the sin of killing a brāhmaṇa just as in the case of Indra (9. 97). These are instances conveying that the fruits of actions befitting one's position, carried out with an empirical view point, after attaining knowledge, will not taint him; they do not mean assent for committing actions that do not befit the varṇa and āśrama of the Jñāni. (7) The poet cites scriptures to the effect that a man of knowledge suffers neither depreciation from sinful actions nor appreciation from meritorious actions; he will not feel remorse either for having done the former or for not doing the latter. This opinion stands rejected by the previous reasoning. The scriptures only praise jñāna saying that no sin or merit exists

from the jñāni's point of view; since he knows he is not the doer, he is always absorbed in Brahman that is without imbalance, equal to all, devoid of actions. This will not be the basis to hold that he may engage in any action. (8) Finally, the poet makes the Ācārya say 'because of virtuous conduct, I am doing this through another body; no sin will be incurred even if I pursue KāmaŚāstra through this very body' (Mā. Śam. 9. 100). As we have already pointed out, inappropriate action is not in any way justifiable in the case of a man of knowledge; and the argument that just because it is done through another body, an action becomes no action is never acceptable.

We have written here this detailed criticism only to point out that the justifications which poet *Mādhava* has given as Ācārya's, have no compatability with Bhagavatpāda's Vedāntic Prakriyā. Remembering Āchārya's sacred feet we swear and say that our intention is not to indicate that he did an unjustifiable act or that he was not aware of the demerits of that act. What we feel is that ordinary people should not be misguided in the name of the great. What opinion *Mādhava* has expressed through Padmapāda itself is ours:

व्रतमस्मदीयमतुलं क्व महत् । क्व च कामशास्त्रमतिगर्ह्यमिदम् । तदपीष्यते भगवतैव यदि । ह्यनवस्थितं जगदिहैव भवेत् ॥ ८७ ॥ अधिमेदिनि प्रथयितुं शिथिलम् । धृतकङ्कणस्य यतिधर्ममिमम् । भवतः किमस्त्यविदितं तदपि । प्रणयान्मयेरितमिदं भगवन् ॥ ८८ ॥

'Where is our incomparable *Sannyāsa dharma*, and where is this extremely contemptible *KāmaŚāstra*? The orderliness of the world itself might be upset if you accept that! What is not known to you, who is bent upon propagating on the earth this *yatidharma* which has already become slack? Even so, O revered One, I am telling this out of my devotion to you' - this is the import of these *ślokas*. However,

all the three authors of ŚaṅkaraVijaya have described that the Ācārya had various kinds of enjoyments with the ladies of the harem. Anyone must agree that this manner of describing the lifestory of a supremely detached *Sanṇyāsin*, a brahmaniṣṭha, is very painful to all the worthy people. As the *ŚaṅkaraVijayas* are poetic and imaginative compositions, one would accept the several exaggerations. but we have to say it is unpardonable that the poet *Mādhava* says that the *Bhagavatpāda* in the body of the king experienced 'uninterrupted bliss of Brahman' while experiencing the pleasure due to contact with the ladies (Mā. Śam. 10. 16). Of course, the *Śruti* says 'all the object enjoyments are traces of the bliss of Brahman'. But the import of this is that when one has the fulfilment of his desired object, people confound the bliss of supreme Self reflected in the internal organ as the object-enjoyment; not that the happiness generated by the objects like woman, garlands, incense etc. are actually 'uninterrupted bliss of Brahman'! Is it not unnecessary to appeal to the knowers of Vedānta on this point?

Not only this, Cidvilāsa writes this sentence: 'तस्यासीद्रतिलोलता त्रिपुरचित्पूर्णाकृतेरप्यहो । तद्वाणीं प्रविजित्य तां वशयितुं नेतुं पुरीं स्वामपि ॥' which means that 'in order to win over Vāṇi, and to exercise control on her and take her to his hometown, even for Ācārya, the full form of Śiva, the yearning for pleasure (rati-lolatva) happened' (Ci. Śam. 19. 52). And in *Ānandagiriya* it is stated that the king was *kāmalolupa* (longing for lust) and *atyāśābaddhabuddhi* (with a mind that is bound by extreme desire)! (Ā. Śam. Chap. 59, p 220; De. p 188). We are incompetent to pass any remark on this writing.

### Composition of poetry Amaruka

98. We have already stated that *Mādhavīya* mentions that the Ācārya, having closely examined *Vātsyāyana Kāmasūtras* and the commentaries on them, wrote a new treatise on *KāmaŚāstra*. *Ānandagiriya* says ‘अकरोच्छास्त्रममृतं शतसङ्ख्यां सतीरते’ (he wrote a hundredfold nectar-oozing book)<sup>1</sup>. *Cidvilāsīya* does not mention anything about this. Many people think that the book entitled ‘Amarukakāvya’ (अमरुककाव्य) was written by Ācārya himself. Ānandavardhana, the author of *Dhvanyāloka* (ध्वन्यालोक) etc. has reviewed *Amaruka Śataka*. Since he was a courtier of king Āvantivarma, his date is from Śālivāhana Śaka 778 to 817. There is no mention in this book or any other evidence to say that this book was written by the Ācārya. While writing a commentary on this book, Vemabhūpālaka has stated that he has removed the interpolated *ślokas* and highlighted the purport of the poet Amaruka (‘अमरुककविना रचितां शृङ्गाररसात्मिकां शतश्लोकीम् । श्रुत्वा विकसितचेतास्तदभिप्रायं प्रकाशतां नेतुम् । मूलश्लोकान् समाहृत्य प्रक्षिप्तान् परिहृत्य च । विधत्ते विदुषामिष्टां टीकां शृङ्गारदीपिकाम् ॥’). Thus we can say that during his time this work was not thought of as Śaṅkara’s. This work is not known as Ācārya’s in northern region. Because of all these reasons, Somanāthaiah has opined that it is not correct to say it is Bhagavatpāda’s work (So. Śam. p 138-140).

### Disciples awaken the Ācārya by way of singing

99. The story continues further: the time taken from Sarasavāṇi by the Ācārya had elapsed. Even after 5-6 days since the time limit was over, the Ācārya did not return to his body (Mā. Śam. 10. 20). While

1. this *śloka* is not found in De. version

the disciples were thinking ‘where could he be now? where shall we search?’, Padmapāda said, ‘why worry? we shall search for him everywhere. Since he had gone to learn KāmaŚāstra, he should be amidst the wives of this king; so, some of us remain here and the others shall go in search of him!’ and they started wandering from mountain to mountain, from country to country, and finally came to the kingdom of Amaruka (Mā. Śam. 10. 38). Hearing from people that the dead king came alive, and that he is now engrossed in music and women, they came to the palace in the garb of musicians. There they saw the king; *Mādhava* summarizes in the first *śloka* that while the courtiers were wondering, they sang in a secret code as follows:

भृङ्ग तव सङ्गतिमपास्य गिरिशृङ्गे तुङ्ग विटपिनि सङ्गमजुषि त्वदङ्गे ।

स्वाङ्गरचिताः सकलुषान्तरङ्गाः सङ्गमकृते भङ्गमुपयान्ति भृङ्गाः ॥ १ ॥

‘O bee, having lost your company, your body being stuck on a tall tree on the mountain cliff, the bees ordained to look after your body, have come away separately to meet you’ is the meaning of this *śloka*. Similarly, after two more such *ślokas*, they sang the following *ślokas* to remind him of his *atmaswarūpa* (his true form):

नेतिनेत्यादि<sup>1</sup> निगमवचनेन निपुणं निषिध्य मूर्तामूर्तराशिम् ।

यदशक्यनिह्वयं स्वात्मरूपतया जानन्ति कोविदास्तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वम् ॥ १ ॥

‘You are that Ultimate Principle which, being impossible to negate and therefore the wise accept as the Ātman, after negating the group with form and without form (non-Ātman) by the Vedāntic statement (नेतिनेति) etc’.

खाद्यमुत्पाद्य विश्वमनुप्रविश्य गूढमन्नमयादिकोशतुषजाले ।

कवयो विविच्य युक्त्यवघाततो यत्तण्डुलवदाददति तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वम् ॥ २ ॥

1. if it were ‘नेतिनेत्यादिना’ the reading runs easy.



'You are that Ultimate Principle which having created the universe begining with ether and entered the husk coverings such as the food sheaths etc., and which the wise cleverly separate and pick up like the rice grain by pounding'.

विषमविषयेषु सञ्चारिणोऽक्षाश्चान्दोषदर्शनकशाभिघाततः स्वैरम्<sup>1</sup> ।

संनिवर्त्य स्वान्तरश्मिभिर्धिरा बध्नन्ति यत्रैव तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वम् ॥ ३ ॥

'You are that Ultimate Principle, in which the wise tie up the senses that move about in sense-objects as unruly horses, by whipping them, that is seeing sinfulness, and causing them to return'.

व्यावृत्तजाग्रदादिष्वनुस्यूतं तेभ्योऽन्यदेव पुष्पेभ्य इव सूत्रम् ।

इति यदौपाधिकत्रयपृथक्त्वेन विन्दन्ति<sup>2</sup> सूरयस्तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वम् ॥ ४ ॥

'You are that Ultimate Principle, which the wise come to understand and attain as continuous through and different from the three adjuncts such as the wakeful state etc., just as the thread (in the garland) is continuous through and different from the flowers (that are tied up)'.

पुरुष एवेदमित्यादि वेदेषु सर्वकारणतया यस्य सार्वार्थ्यम् ।

हाटकस्येव मुकुटादि तादात्म्यं स्वरसमाम्नायते तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वम् ॥ ५ ॥

'You are that Ultimate Principle, which, just as gold is in the form of ornaments like crown etc., is the cause of all and its being the self of all is expressed in the *Śruti* such as "पुरुष एवेदम् विश्वम्" (all this is Puruṣa)'.

यश्चाहमत्र वर्ष्मणि भामि सोऽसौ योऽसौ विभाति रविमण्डले सोऽहम् ।

इति वेदवादिनो व्यतिहारतो यद्ध्यायन्ति<sup>3</sup> यत्नतस्तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वम् ॥ ६ ॥

1. in printed book, this has been wrongly added to the next line.

2. 'विन्दन्ति' is better than 'विदन्ति'.

3. The printed version यद्ध्यापयन्ति is not correct.

'You are that Ultimate Principle, which the upholders of Vedas are meditating by way of reciprocity such as "the I that appears to be present in this body is He; He that shines in the Sun is I".

वेदानुवचनसद्दानमुखधर्मैः श्रद्धयानुष्ठितैर्विद्यया युक्तैः ।

विविदिषन्त्यत्यन्तनिर्मलः<sup>1</sup> स्वान्ता ब्राह्मणा यद्ब्रह्म तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वम् ॥ ७ ॥

'You are that Ultimate Principle, Brahman, which the Brahmins with a heart purified by practice of study of the Vedas, charity etc. combined with upāsanā seek to realize'

शमदमोपरमादिसाधनैर्धीराः स्वात्मनात्मनि यदन्विष्य कृतकृत्याः ।

अधिगतामितसच्चिदानन्दरूपा न पुनरिह खिद्यन्ति तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वम् ॥ ८ ॥

'You are that Ultimate Principle, which Ātman the wise search and realize in themselves through the practice of control of the mind and the senses, abstaining (from enjoyment) etc. and become (one with) the infinite Existence-Knowledge-Bliss Absolute and cease from the experience of grief of this *saṁsāra*'.

*Mādhava* has written that the disciples sang these eight *ślokas* (Mā. Śam. 10. 48-55). Although in these *ślokas* he has summarised the essence of the Upaniṣads that fits into Ācārya's Vedānta philosophy, it cannot be agreed that the disciples sang only these *ślokas*. Because in *Cidvilāsiya* it is stated (Ci. Śam. 20. 1-5) that they sang five *ślokas* commencing with

निस्तमसि नीरजसि निर्गलितसत्त्वे तेजसि विवेकजुषि भेदमतिशून्ये ।

निर्वचनमानसपदादिगमचिन्त्यं तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वमसि राजन् ॥

and in *Ānandagīrīya* it is mentioned (Chap. 59, p 220; De. p 188) that they sang 'यत्सत्यमुख्यशब्दार्थानुकूलं तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वमसि राजन् ।' etc.

1. In the print version 'विमल' does not fit to the metre

### What did the Ācārya do after learning KāmaŚāstra?

100. When the king heard the song sung by the disciples, he swooned and became unconscious. In the same way as described earlier, the Ācārya entered his body and got up. *Cidvilāsīya* says that he went to his original body in the form of a bird (कलविङ्काकृतिर्भूत्वा Ci. Śam. 20. 6). There that body was being forcibly put on fire by the servants of the king; then, in order to free himself from that state, the Ācārya prayed to Lord Lakshminarasimha:

श्रीमत्पयोनिधिनिकेतन चक्रपाणे भोगीश भोगमणिरञ्जितपुण्यमूर्ते ।

योगीश शाश्वत शरण्य भवाब्धिपोत लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥

The stotra commencing with this *śloka* are there both in *Cidvilāsīya* (Ci. Śam. 20. 13-20) and *Ānandagiriya* (Chap. 60, p 221-222; De. p 189). As usual, the *Diṇḍimakāra* also has followed *Ānandagiriya*. The fire was put out by the grace of Lord Narasimha who was pleased with the stotra; and Śaṅkarācārya came out safe (Mā. Śam. 10. 60); Lord Narasimha gave his supporting hand and made Śaṅkarācārya get up and caressed him (Ci. Śam. 20. 21-22); and after caressing him thus, the Lord blessed him saying 'win over the entire world' and then disappeared (Ā. Śam. Chap. 60, p 223; De. p 190).

The Ācārya with his disciples came to Maṇḍana Miśra's house and accepted his hospitality. Then Śāradā told him, 'you are the master of all disciplines of learning; what all you have done in order to know KāmaŚāstra - without directly winning over me - is imitation of ordinary people's behaviour. Just as the degradation by the Sun is not a disgrace to the Moon, defeat from you is not a shame on both of us. Now, please permit me to go over to my abode' and disappeared.

The Ācārya, approaching her by yogic power, requested her addressing 'I know that you are the queen of Brahma. Therefore, you should bestow your presence with the name Śāradā at Ṛṣyaśringa and other places that I am going to create, accepting worship and granting the desired boons'. Saraswati agreed and went away to her abode. All were wonderstruck seeing her there without touching the earth so that widowhood does not descend on her because of her husband accepting *Sannyāsa*. Ācārya and Maṇḍana too were happy (Mā. Śam. 10. 66-73).

*Cidvilāsīya*: Along with his disciples, Śaṅkara came near Saraswati and said 'now I shall answer the questions you are going to ask'. Then, seeing the glow on his face and by his words, guessing that he has known everything, she said 'O *Sannyāsin*, I am defeated; I know that you are Śiva Himself. Now permit me to go to *Satyalo*ka'. The Ācārya singing her glories, said 'in case you are pleased with me, please come with me; I do not want anything else'. She agreed, and he happily moved along with her to the *Āśrama* of Vibhāṇḍaka ṛṣi (Śringeri) (Ci. Śam. 20. 29-49).

*Ānandagīrīya*: In the *Telugu* script that we have with us, the story is as follows: the Ācārya, approaching Sarasavāṇi, said 'I shall answer the questions that you are going to ask'. Sarasavāṇi instantly agreed that 'you are all-knowing' (Chap. 61). Then, making her bound by mantra, and establishing *vidyāpīṭha*, kept his disciples there with **Bhāratī** tradition. From then onwards, it is vogue that the pontiffs of pure Advaita, following the *Bhāratī* tradition, through the grace of the supreme Guru Śaṅkarācārya, are possessed of high scholarship (Ā. Śam. Chap. 62, p 223-224). The sentence that Somanāthaiah

cites is as follows (So. Śam. p 145): ‘ततः परं सरसवाणीं मन्त्रबद्धां कृत्वा गगनमार्गदिव शृङ्गगिरिसमीपे तुङ्गभद्रातीरे चक्रं निर्माय तदग्रे परदेवतां सरसवाणीं निधाय’ (‘binding her by the spell of the *mantra*, going by the arial route, constructing *cakra* on the banks of river Tungabhadra near Śringeri, and establishing Sarasavāṇi on that’ etc.). This sentence is there in Devanāgarī script copy also (De. p 190); alongwith that it is also mentioned ‘एवं आकल्पं स्थिरा भव मदाश्रमे इत्याज्ञाप्य निजमठं कृत्वा’<sup>1</sup> ! Why the sentences of *Ānandagīrīya* change like this from version to version, and whose handiwork it is, only *Īśwara* knows.

*Śaṅkaravijaya-Saṅgraha* (or *Kūṣmāṇḍa-ŚaṅkaraVijaya*): When Śaṅkara requested her to follow him, Vāṇi said ‘I might follow you, but you should not look back at me; if you do so, I shall go away to my abode’. While coming towards Pampāpura, the Ācārya wanted to check whether she is following him and looked back; she took his permission and went away to *Brahmaloka* (Śam. Vi. Sam. 6. 9-12). But, while coming from the north, on the way to Hampi we do not get Śringeri; so, what value we are to accord to such a story?

After this story is over, giving Sannyāsa to Maṇḍana Miśra, now named as *Sureśwarācārya*, the instructions given by Śaṅkarācārya are mentioned (Ma. Śam. 10. 74-104). After this, it is mentioned that Sureśwarācārya stayed for sometime in *Magadha* country near Narmadā river (Ma. Śam. 10. 105). We have already mentioned that according to the other two ŚaṅkaraVijayas, Maṇḍana had taken Sannyāsa much earlier. Those two opine that the Ācārya having gone alongwith four disciples he took to *parakāyapraveśa*. We have already pointed out that *Ānandagīrīya* mentions that Maṇḍana after

1. The matter regarding maṭha will be taken up again in part II2

*Sannyāsa* went away towards north (Ā. Śam. p 216) and that when the Ācārya went to win over Maṇḍana, already there was a disciple by name Sureśwara (Ā. Śam. p 212).

### **Did Ācārya enter his body which was on fire?**

101. Now let us take a critical view of the story: (1) It is clear that the details of the story are different in different ŚaṅkaraVijayas. (2) *Mādhava's* description that the disciples wandered from mountain to mountain and from country to country in search of the Ācārya like vānaras searched for Sita (in Rāmāyaṇa) does not fit into the main story, because the Ācārya himself had clearly told them that he is going to enter the body of the dead king Amaruka. (3) That the ministers, under instructions from the queen, pulled the body out of the tree hollow and kept that on funeral pyre appears more natural than *Mādhava's* contention that the disciples went in search of the Ācārya since the time Saraswati had given had run out. But it does not fit in to say that the disciples went to the court of the king after the funeral pyre was set on fire to sing and get the Ācārya to return. Doubt arises whether the body could remain without burning till all this happened. Did the disciples keep quiet when the body was set on fire? Did they not oppose the servants of the king? Or, did not the servants, not caring for them, chase them away? (4) After he swooned hearing the song, why did Śaṅkara took the form of a bird while returning? Was it not that he left his own body, and, not taking any form, entered the body of the king? Since a Yogi leaving one body and entering another is possible according to *Yogaśāstra*, this imagination is quite unnecessary. (5) That the servants of the king remained quiet

when the Ācārya entered while the body was burning on the funeral pyre and got up does not seem natural. Either they must have gone after the body was completely burnt, or, seeing the half-baked body coming to life, must have got terrified and run away. The authors of ŚaṅkaraVijaya have not said so.

### **Did Lord Nṛsimha protect the Ācārya from the fire?**

102. After the fire was extinguished by the grace of Lord Narasimha, the portion of the body that had already been burnt must remain with scars of burning. The ŚaṅkaraVijayas do not say anything on this. There is no aptly fitting expression or reason in *Lakshmīnārasimha Karāvalambana Stotra* that signifies it was composed on this occasion. We are not able to understand on what evidence the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas and Ḍiṇḍima commentator decided that this fits into that occasion. There is an expression in the eighth stanza of the *Stotra* which says ‘संसारदावदहनातुरभीकरोरुज्वालावळीभिरतिदग्धतनूरुहस्य । त्वत्पादपद्मसरसी शरणागतस्य लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥’ which means ‘the hair on my body are being burnt by the big flames of the fire of *saṁsāra*; I have taken refuge in the pond of your lotus-feet, O Lakshmīnārasimha! Please give me the support of your hand’. But there is no expression here to indicate that the body of Ācārya was in the process of burning. In the other stanzas of this *Stotra*, the *saṁsāra* has been described as fearful forest, deep well, ocean, tree, serpent, trap, elephant that has run rut etc. Just because *saṁsāra* has been described with such similies, what evidence is there to think that the Ācārya composed it while his body was on fire? Someone must have imagined that Narasimha pulled the Ācārya out from

fire, because all stanzas of this *Stotra* end with ‘मम देहि करावलम्बम्’ i.e., ‘please give me the support of your hand’.

### **Ācārya winning over Śārādā and bringing Her to Śrīṅgeri**

103. When the Ācārya returned to Maṇḍana's house, Saraswati neither enquired him why he was late, nor asked him what were his answers to her questions. Thus, (1) doubt arises as to whether she had questioned or not, in order to win over him, on the KāmaŚāstra. (2) It is not correct to say that she now realized that the Ācārya was none other than Śiva; because, knowing him to be so, she had invited him for argumentation (Ma. Śam. 9. 53, 57); why she did not argue with him now? (3) Ācārya now telling her that ‘I know (or I now know) that you are Saraswati’ also does not suit here; because, knowing her to be so, he had agreed to argue with her. (4) No mention of Śrīṅgeri was there till now; how only now all of a sudden he prays her ‘may your presence be there in the worship centres such as Śrīṅgeri’? Or, where is scope for a story that the Ācārya, either by prayer or binding her by the power of mantra, brought Śārādā to Śrīṅgeri as it is mentioned in *Cidvilāsīya* and *Ānandagirīya*? The readers should remember that in *Vyāsācalīya* etc. there is no mention of this argumentation (with Saraswati) at all.

### **Historical Bhārati**

104. A question arises whether there could be any historical evidence for the argumentation held by Ācārya with Maṇḍana and Bhārati. Since this solely depends upon our guesswork, it goes without saying that there could not be a single opinion about this matter. What C. N. Kṛṣṇaswāmi Iyer opines about this is as follows. Since Bhārati



was highly learned, it is but natural that present day people regard her as incarnation of Saraswati. Women had greater opportunities in those days to become learned than in our own time. During hightime of the Buddhists, even women were engaged in the spread of Buddhism by becoming *Sannyāsinis*. It may be that Hindus too came under their influence regarding this; hence, it would be no wonder if argumentation actually took place between Śaṅkara and Bhārati. Because of an excessive confidence in his own learning, Maṇḍana might have taken oath that he would become a *Bhikshu* in case he lost in argumentation. It may be that seeing her husband defeated, realizing that she had to part with her husband, she too might have followed her husband out of dispassion. Further, it would be a fitting tribute to her nature and caliber to imagine that when the Śringeri Maṭha was established and Maṇḍana became its pontiff, she might have come over there to spend her remaining part of life thinking about God. Although husband for her part was as good as dead there after, following his footsteps in becoming a disciple of Ācārya is appropriate. Detached and highly learned as she was, her presence might have been a great help in the spread of Advaita. To what extent this help was made use of, it would not be possible to determine now (C N K S, pp 50-52).

We leave to the readers themselves the task of deciding whether there is essence in what Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer has said. We have already mentioned another traditional story that the argumentation between Śārādā and Śaṅkara did not take place in this circumstance, but took place at Kāñci later (Section 113). *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has suggested another opinion regarding the argumentation between Maṇḍana

and Śaṅkara (Bala. Śam. p 88). This debate was in fact held between two Advaitins - Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara. Although both of these are Advaitins, there is a lot of difference in their methods (prakriyas) of Advaita; hence Śaṅkara might have felt that Maṇḍana's method of Advaita is contradictory to the Upaniṣads. Upādhyāya's guess is that Śaṅkara must have felt that as long as such a strong contender as Maṇḍana is there, it is difficult to propagate his own prakriyā, and that is why he made arguments with Maṇḍana. Certainly, if at all we believe that argumentation of Ācārya with Maṇḍana, the author of Brahmasiddhi, really took place, we will have to depend on this guess. But, in case we accept the contention of KuppūSwāmi Śāstry that Maṇḍana in fact started his argumentation referencing Śaṅkara's *Sūtrabhāṣya*, as prima facie view, then this would not become feasible. Hence regarding this opinion also, the readers will have to decide for themselves. Whatever that be, it appears to us that the argumentation with Ubhayabhāratī most probably did not take place. Because, the Kāñci traditionalists opine that argumentation with Sarasvatī took place on a different occasion; and we have already pointed out (Section 91) that *Vyāsācalīya* mentions the disappearance of Sarasvatī on the very day of Maṇḍana's defeat.



## 11. Maṇḍana becoming Disciple of Śaṅkara

### The Sannyāsa of Maṇḍana

105. We have already pointed out that Cidvilāsa and *Anantānandagiri* have written that the *Sannyāsa* of Maṇḍana occurred before winning over Saraswati. Only in *Mādhavīya* it is mentioned that it took place after the Ācārya learnt the intricacies of the KāmaŚāstra. Also we have pointed out that in *Vyāsācalīya*, since there is no debate with Bhāratī, there is no mention of *parakāyapraveśa* (Section 91). But, the instruction that the Ācārya gave to Viśwarūpa after the argumentation with Maṇḍana is the same, word by word, in both *Mādhavīya* and *Vyāsācalīya*.

In *Mādhavīya*, even after saying ‘तं समीक्ष्य नभसश्च्युतं स च प्राञ्जलिः प्रणतपूर्वविग्रहः । अर्हणाभिरभिपूज्य तस्थिवानीक्षणैरनिमिषैः पिबन्निव ॥’ (Seeing him descend from the sky, with folded hands he bowed low and offered due worship, and stood looking at him intently) (Ma. Śam. 10. 63), it is written that

स विश्वरूपो बत सत्यवादी पपात पादाम्बुजयोर्यतीशः ।

गृहं शरीरं मम यच्च सर्वं तवेति वादी मुदितो महात्मा ॥

This śloka is also found in *Vyāsācalīya* (Vyā. Śam. 6. 103). This does not fit well with *Mādhavīya* as much as it fits well in *Vyāsācalīya*. Because, ‘that truthful Viśwarūpa fell at the feet of the great *Sannyāsin*; and happily announced that “whatever is mine - body, house, everything - is yours”’ is the meaning of the śloka. The adjective ‘satyavādī’ does not fit into the context of the story of *Mādhavīya*;

since already it was mentioned that he prostrated before Ācārya, why the same is told once again in the form of half *śloka*? The question why Maṇḍana must be specifically told to be ‘satyavādī’ here finds no answer. In *Vyāsācalīya* the defeated Viśwarūpa, as per the vow he had taken in the beginning, expressing that he became Ācārya’s disciple and that he was ready for the *Sannyāsa* - the adjective ‘satyavādī’ fits in aptly. Since the story of Viśwarūpa’s *Sannyāsa* continues further, this becomes appropriate. Not only that, in *Mādhavīya*, even if this *śloka* is not there, flow is not hampered since the next *śloka* is ‘preyasā prathamamarcitaṃ...’ (‘after her husband offered worship, Śārādā with all humility addressed the Ācārya as follows’ Ma. Śam. 10. 65). Therefore it appears that somebody must have added the abovementioned *śloka* of *Vyāsācalīya* here.

And in *Vyāsācalīya* copy that we have, the following *śloka* of *Mādhavīya* seems to be necessary but missing (it appears as if somebody must have dropped it):

संन्यासगृह्यविधिना सकलानि कर्माण्यह्वाय शङ्करगुरुर्विदुषोऽस्य कुर्वन् ।

कर्णे जगौ किमपि तत्त्वमसीति वाक्यं कर्णे जपं निखिलसंस्कृतिदुःखहानेः ॥ (Ma. Śam. 10. 78)

because the meaning of the *śloka* is ‘having had all the *karmas* done as per *Sannyāsa grihyasūtra*, preceptor Śaṅkara instructed Maṇḍana with one expression “*tat tvam asi*” which is indicative of destruction of all (bondage of) *samsāra*’. Only if this *śloka* is present, the next *śloka* becomes appropriate:

संन्यासपूर्वं विधिवद्विभिक्षे पश्चादुपादिक्षदथाऽत्मतत्त्वम् ।

आचार्यवर्यः श्रुतिमस्तकस्थं तदादिवाक्यं पुनराबभाषे ॥ (Ma. Śam. 10. 76, Vyā. Śam. 6. 104). The meaning of the *śloka* is ‘Maṇḍana went begging for

alms, as per the prescribed method of *Sanṇyāsa*, and then the Ācārya instructed him the expression "*tat tvam asi*" once again and gave its meaning'. First the instruction, and then explanation of its meaning; not only that, it becomes interesting to say punaḥ (again) in the word 'punarābabhāṣe'.

As indicated above, it is not possible to decide now whether *Mādhava* himself introduced the *śloka* 'sa viśvarūpo' from *Vyāsācalīya* or someone added it recently. Many *ślokas* of *Vyāsācalīya* are found in *Mādhavīya*. Even here, the further *ślokas* of advice too are taken from *Vyāsācalīya*. The author *Mādhava* expressly mentions that he has taken down the *ślokas* of his predecessor purposefully:

यथातिरुच्ये मधुरेऽपि रुच्युत्पादाय रुच्यान्तरयोजनाह ।

तथेष्यतां प्राक्कविहृद्यपद्येष्वेषापि मत्पद्यनिवेशभङ्गी ॥ (Ma. Śam. 1. 3)

The meaning of the *śloka* is: 'just as in an already tasty food, in order to cause relish, adding another tasty material is justified, similarly, addition of my *ślokas* amidst those of the charming *ślokas* of my predecessors is to be taken'. Considering from this point of view, we have to say that *Mādhava* has taken all the present *ślokas* from *Prācīna-vyāsācala-śaṅkaravijaya*; but since there is no story of the defeat of Śāradā in that, addition of these two *ślokas* could not fit in well here.

### The Expression "tat tvam asi" (तत्त्वमसि)

106. We have to take note of the statement that the sentence "tat tvam asi" was spoken into Maṇḍana's ears by Ācārya (कर्णे जगौ किमपि तत्त्वमसीति वाक्यम्). Why *Mādhava* the author, who earlier had written that Govinda*Bhagavatpāda* instructed Ācārya on Brahman through

four Vedāntic sentences (ब्रह्मतामुपदिदेश चतुर्भिर्वेदशेखरवचोभिः Ma. Śam. 5. 103) now here says that the Ācārya instructed only one sentence “tattvamasi”? Also he goes on explaining only the meaning of this sentence. It appears that there is some secret in this. If we recollect what we had earlier said about the *Mahāvākyas*, certainly doubt arises whether it is right to give instruction with the sentence “tattvamasi” as if it were a *mantra*.

### The Meaning of “tattvamasi”

107. The instructions of the Ācārya to *Sureśwarācārya* is chiefly the description of the meaning of the sentence “tattvamasi”. This description is common to both *Mādhavīya* and *Vyāsācalīya*. The Ācārya instructed as follows: ‘You are not the body, the senses, mind, intellect, ego or the life-force; contradictory to all these, verily, you are the Ātman. In the sentence “tattvamasi”, the word *tvam* refers to the *Jīva*; *tat* refers to Brahman, the cause of the universe; identity of these two is implied in the expression. How can it be interpreted that this sentence specifies identity of all-knower and the non-knower? We have never seen the identity of darkness and light. If the literal meaning is taken, it is like that only; but as in the sentence ‘he is this very person’, if we leave the contradictory aspects and convey the identity by characteristic (lakṣaṇa), there is no contradiction. Therefore, give up the identity with body etc. The intellect etc. that get separated from each other, that do not continue from the state of waking to dream etc., while the Ātman continues - just as a crack in the floor, a snake or a stick are superimposed in the ‘this’ aspect of rope - are superimposed on *tūrīya* that is You. Know for sure that you are such fearless

Brahman; and do not be deluded as before. This inner self is quite near to the knower, and far from the ignorant. How the ignorant are searching this Spirit that pervades the inside as well as the outside! (Ma. Śam. 10. 77-92; Vyā. Śam. 7. 1-16). The one with ripened intellect would have this knowledge generated in him just by hearing the sentence once; and the one who is dull-witted would get rid of the impurities of the mind through personal service at the feet of the preceptor, repeated chanting of Om etc.; hence one should be obedient in carrying out the behest of the teacher' (Ma. Śam. 10. 95-102). Maṇḍana prostrated before his feet saying 'I am fortunate to get rid of my ignorance through your words'. And the Ācārya made him his chief disciple, ordaining him with the name Sureśwara (Ma. Śam. 10. 103-104; Vyā. Śam. 7. 19-20).

Here we come to know how well the author *Mādhava* (or, if *Vyā-sācalīya* itself is the original, the author of that work) is conversant with the Vedāntic conclusions. He had described the true nature of *Paramātman* before, through the song sung by the disciples, by interpreting the expression "tattvamasi" with the support of a number of different Vedāntic citations; here he depicts the same, logically investigating into the meaning of the words *tat* and *tvam*. And he makes the Ācārya's view clear that if one is qualified enough to receive, one would attain knowledge just by listening the sentence only once. And he mentions the *Smṛti* statement "तद्विद्धि प्रणिपातेन परिप्रश्नेन सेवया" "tad-viddhi praṇipātena paripraśnena sevayā" as a means for practice.

It is necessary to place before the readers the way in which the Ācārya has described the meaning of the words *tat* and *tvam* in his Bhāṣya. In *Sūtrabhāṣya* (4. 1. 2) he says: 'By the word *tat* is expressed

Brahman that thinks and is the cause of birth etc of the universe. This is the same Brahman that is well known in the *Śrutis* like “सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म”, “विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म”, “अदृष्टं द्रष्टु...अविज्ञातं विज्ञातृ”, “अजमजरममरम्”, “अस्थूलमनण्वहस्वमदीर्घम्” etc. Here, words like अज remove modifications in the notions like birth etc.; words like asthūla remove material properties like heaviness etc.; words like vijñāna express that it is of the form of Intelligence/Luminence. It is firmly established among the Vedāntins that this experiential thing known by name Brahman which is free from the nature of *samsāra* is the one expressed by the word *tat*. Likewise, the word *tvam* is indicative of intrinsic form of the listener; after negating body etc. that are being felt as one’s Ātman, it would be decided at the end that it is verily the Spirit. The expression “tattvamasi” cannot reveal its real meaning for such people to whom these words are not understandable because of obstacles like ignorance, doubt and misapprehension. Because, knowledge of the meaning of words in question will have to precede the knowledge of the meaning of sentence. Therefore, they will have to resort to repetitions of listening to *Śāstras* and reflection for the right knowledge of words. But people of sharp intellect not having obstacles like ignorance, doubt and misapprehension, with a single mention of “tattvamasi” would experience its meaning. Hence, for them repetition is a waste’.

Although this commentary is detailed, its translation is given here to indicate that after we have refined the meaning of the words, the identity of the meaning of words of Tat and Tvam would be unhindered. In *Mādhavīya*, even after denying body etc. as non-Ātman, raising doubts such as ‘how come “sarvajña” and “ajña” are



considered as identical? and saying that the meaning has to be taken as in 'He is this *Puruṣa*' is not proper. In recent Vedāntic treatises (*Prakaraṇa granthas*) it has become common to illustrate sentences like "tattvamasi" with *jahadajahallakṣhaṇa* and to exemplify with the sentence 'He is this *Puruṣa*'; and the author, under the influence of this practice, has given such exemplification even where not necessary.

Also there are places where the Ācārya has written the meaning of the sentence "tattvamasi" in a different way. For example, in *Upadeśasāhasrī* he writes: 'सिद्धादेवाहमित्यस्माद्युष्मद्धर्मो निषिध्यते । रज्ज्वामिवाहि-धीर्युक्त्या तत्त्वमस्यादिशासनैः' (Upa. 18. 4). Just as (people) by a suitable strategy give up the misconception of snake in a rope, where 'I' the Ātman is self-established, the job of sentences like "tattvamasi" is to discriminate the non-Ātman objects such as ego and wisely deny them. In the later Vedāntic treatises it is not in vogue to mention that this secret is hidden in the refinement of the meaning of the word *tvam*. Although presently it does not apply to *Mādhavīya*, we have mentioned it to highlight the disparity between Ācārya's teaching and the methods in the subcommentaries (*vyākhyāna prasthānas*).



## 12. Journey towards South

### Winning over the Kāpālikas

108. Soon after winning over Maṇḍana, the Ācārya started to travel towards south. Passing through Māhārāshtra and other countries *en route*, publicising the works, and refuting other schools of thought, he reached in course of time Śrī Śaila. There he took bath in *Pātālaganga* and took *darśana* of Lord Mallikarjuna and Divine Mother Bhramarāmba. *Sureśwarācārya* and other disciples of his refuted creeds like Pāśupatha, Vaiṣṇava, Vīraśaiva, Māheśwara etc. Some of those who were refuted thus became disciples and some others were wiling away their time, looking forward to their death (Ma. Śam. 10. 107-116).

Once, a Bhairava by name Ugrabhairava came in the garb of a *Sādhu* and told ‘Sire, I have never seen anyone like you helping one and all. Hearing about your omniscience, excellence of character and kindness, I have come to you. I need a great help from you. I have pleased Śiva by my penance and expressed my desire to go to Kailāsa in this very body. The Lord Bhairaveśwara told me that if I could sacrifice the head of a king or that of an all-knower, my desire will be fulfilled. Head of a king is difficult to get; since I have found you, an all-knower. I think the time of satisfying my desire has come. Great ones sacrifice their bodies just for benefiting others. If you give me your head, you would attain greater glory, and my desire will be fulfilled. Thinking that this body is after all transient, you may do as you wish’. The Ācārya replied, ‘by all means; but this has to be done

without the knowledge of my disciples; so please come all alone'. The *Kāpālika* waited for such a moment and came accordingly. At that time, the Ācārya was in deep meditation, unaware of his surroundings. Just at the time when he was about to lift his *triśūla* to cut the head of the Ācārya, Padmapāda arrived there as if sent by God. Since he was a worshipper of Lord Nṛsimha and had mantra-siddhi, he himself became Nṛsimha-like and, just as Lord Nṛsimha had split open the chest of Hiraṇyakasipu earlier, split open the chest of that Bhairava. Lord Nṛsimha was pacified by *Stotra* of the Ācārya who was awakened from his meditation by this time. Upon enquiry, he came to know that Padmapāda had the blessings of Nṛsimha near Ahobala mountains (Ma. Śam. 11th Chapter).

According to *Cidvilāsya*, it was in Rāmeśwaram that the Ācārya won over the *Kāpālikas*. Their leader was one by name Vaṭukanātha (Ci. Śam. 27. 24). At that time the Lord Bhairava Himself appeared before the Ācārya, lauded his school of thought and told him to go on winning over the evil schools of thought (Ci. Śam. 27. 41-42). And according to *Ānandagīrīya*, it was in Ujjayini that the Ācārya won over the *Kāpālikas*; and their leader was also Vatukanatha<sup>1</sup> (Ā. Śam. 23. p 119-120; De. 23. p 105-108).

We do not have any suitable historical evidence to decide whether it is a fact that the Ācārya refuted the *Kāpālikas*. The Mallikārjuna *lingam* of Śrī Śaila is one among the famous *dvādaśa* (twelve) *lingam*'s. Tāntriks and Bauddhas too were living there along with *Kāpālikas*; it is said that Nagārjuna too accomplished *siddhis* there.

---

1. In page 108 of the Devanāgarī version, the leader of *Kāpālikas* is mentioned as Vaṭuka.

It is said that on the two sides of this mountain, there were existing two Buddhist wings (*Nikāyas*) called *Pūrvaśailīya* and *Aparaśailīya*. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* mentions (Bala. p 90-91) that a stone inscription has been found which says that in 639 A.D., the Chālūkyā king Nāgavardhana, son of Pulakeshi the second, had granted free gift of village land to support worship of *Kapāleśwara*. Guess of Kṛṣṇaswāmi Iyer (CNKS p 56) is that this Ugrabhairava could be one of the *Karaḍi* brahmīns of Mahārāshtra who were, according to heresay, used to feed the pilgrims with luxurious food and other hospitalities and later, during *Navarātri* time, used to sacrifice them to the Divine Mother. But this is just a guesswork, after all. We do not have any evidence about the existence of any link between Bhairava and the worshippers of Divine Mother. *Mādhavīya* mentions that the disciples of Śaṅkara refuted the Pāsupatas, Vaiṣṇavas, Vīraśaivas and Māheśwaras; but in *Sūtrabhāṣya*, the other creeds are considered but not Vīraśaiva. We have already mentioned (Section 52; page \*99) that a story is in vogue among the people of one creed among Vīraśaivas that Renukasiddha, the originator of their creed, gave Candramouliśwara liṅga to Śaṅkarācārya. But, in the works of either Śaṅkarācārya or *Sureśwarācārya* nowhere a consideration to Vīraśaivism is to be found; never a consideration of *Kāpālīka* creed. This being so, it cannot be decided with certainty whether the Ācārya in fact won over them through argumentation or whether it is just an imagination of poet *Mādhava*. Considering the episode of Padmapāda assuming the glow of Nṛsimha on himself linked with the story of Kāpālīka, it can be said that *Mādhava* might have thought that if such supra-normal thing is included, it would increase the

glory of Ācārya. Also he mentions the fruition - absence of accidental death, mundane happiness of sorts and liberation at the end - for those who read the story thrice a day at the times of transition (Mā. Śam. 11. 75)!

### **The story of Hastāmalaka**

109. From Śrī Śaila, the Ācārya came to Gokaṛṇa. There he spent three days worshipping Mahābaleśwara, and then came to Harīśaṅkara. *Mādhava* has given a few *ślokas* (Mā. Śam.12. 9-19) that are applicable to both Śiva and Viṣṇu, purported to have been composed there by the Ācārya. From there the Ācārya set out for the place of Goddess Mūkāmbika. On the way, the Ācārya met a brahmin couple who were in grief because of the death of their only child. Inspired by a celestial voice, it seems the Ācārya brought back the life of that child (Mā. Śam. 12. 24)! Reaching Mūkāmbika Temple, he worshiped the Goddess and sang Her glories; and after a few days he came to a nearby brahmin locality called Śrī Bali. It appears there were two thousand *Agnihotris*! Among them was a brahmin by name Prabhākara, who was sad in spite of all riches because his only son was dumb right from birth. Hearing about the arrival of Ācārya with the disciples, he brought his son to him and made the boy prostrate before the Ācārya. The compassionate Śaṅkara fondly raised him. The father described the plight of his only son. The Ācārya enquired the boy, 'My dear, who are you? And why you are posing inertia?' at which the boy replied 'My Lord, I am not inert; In my presence the inert is functioning. Bereft of the six griefs and sixfold modifications, I am the very blissful Ultimate Principle!' (Ma. Śam. 12. 55) and

described himself as such through twelve *śloka*s depicting the true nature of Ātman.

निमित्तं मनश्चक्षुरादिप्रवृत्तौ निरस्ताखिलोपाधिराकाशकल्पः ।

रविलोकचेष्टानिमित्तं यथा यो स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥

‘I am that Ātman who is the eternal consciousness, without any adjuncts and like the sky and who is the cause of the transactions of the mind, eyes etc. even as the Sun is the cause of the transactions of the people. These twelve *śloka*s, each closing with ‘नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा’ are famous as a treatise by name *Hastāmalakīya*. Since they describe the nature of the Ātman as if it is like a gooseberry on one’s palm of hand, he who uttered these also got the same name (*Hastāmalaka*). Then the Ācārya said, ‘this boy, who was a yogi in his previous birth, is now born as your son. He plays dumb because he is utterly dispassioned with the mundane affairs of *samsāra*. He will be of no use to you’. Having consoled the parents thus, the Ācārya sent them home. *Hastāmalaka* joined the group of disciples of the Ācārya.

The *Mādhavīya* does not mention by which route the Ācārya came to Gokarṇa from Śrī Śaila. No other ŚaṅkaraVijaya mentions Hariśaṅkara and place of Goddess Mūkāmbika *en route*. *Vyāsācalīya* mentions that *Hastāmalaka* was found by Ācārya when he was going to Gokarṇa:

श्रीगोकर्णं यातुकामः कदाचित् श्रीवल्याख्यं ग्रामवर्यं जगाम ।

शिष्टैर्जुष्टं वेदविद्भिर्महद्भिः श्रीमान्पूज्यो देशिकेन्द्रोऽस्मदीयः ॥ (Vyā. Śam. 12. 1)

Here, the reader may take note the mention of Śrī Valli as the name of the brahmin locality, unlike as in *Mādhavīya* (अग्रहारकं श्रीबलिसंज्ञम् Mā. Śam. 12. 9). It cannot be decided whether Śrī Bali is a transformation of Śrī Valli or whether both names were in vogue for the brahmin locality. The *śloka* of Hastāmalaka's reply to the Ācārya commencing with 'नाहं जडः' is found here also just as in *Mādhavīya* (Vyā. Śam. 12. 22). We do not know why *Govindanātha*, who closely follows the story of *Vyāsācalīya*, mentions the name of that place as Śiva Vihara ('गोकर्ण यातु कामः सन्नेकदा देशिकेश्वरः । मार्गे शिवविहाराख्यं ग्रामं प्रापदनुत्तमम् ॥' Śrī. Śam. Cha. 6. 88). The remaining parts of the story of *Vyāsācalīya* is just as in *Mādhavīya*.

In *Cidvilāsīya*, the travel towards Gokarṇa is mentioned in a different context. The story of Hastāmalaka is described there as happening at Prayāg. The name of the father of the boy there is Divākarādhwari and not Prabhākara as in *Mādhavīya*. It might be that the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas have chosen names meaning a charismatic brahmin as the name could not be known correctly. Since the *śloka* of *Mādhavīya* saying 'तत्र द्विजः कश्चन शास्त्रवेदी प्रभाकराख्यः...' (Ma. Śam. 12. 43) is not present in *Vyāsācalīya*, the father's name can not be known in that book; *Govindanātha* also does not mention his name. The *śloka* in the beginning of the famous *Hastāmalakīya*

कस्त्वं शिशो कस्य कुतोऽसि गन्ता किं नाम ते त्वं कुत आगतोऽसि ।

एतद्वद त्वं मम सुप्रसिद्धं<sup>1</sup> मत्प्रीतये प्रीतिविवर्धनोऽसि ॥ (Ci. Śam. 11. 28)

is also found in *Cidvilāsīya*; if we look at the *śloka* of *Mādhavīya*

---

1. the part एतद्वद त्वं मम सुप्रसिद्धं is changed into 'एतन्मयोक्तं वद चार्भक त्वम्' now.

which says ‘कस्त्वं शिशो कस्य सुतः कुतो वेत्यस्माभिराचष्ट किलैष पृष्टः’ (Mā. Śam. 13. 28), we can guess that *Mādhava* also had known this *śloka*. The next *śloka* commencing with ‘नाहं मनुष्यो न च देवयक्षौ...’ is also found in *Cidvilāsīya*; the outward form of the treatise ‘निमित्तं मन इत्यादिपद्यैर्द्वादशभिस्तदा’ (Ci. Śam. 11. 30) is given here. There is evidence to believe that the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas were knowing that there are twelve *ślokas* in this work; but we have to say that none of them were knowing the real author of these *ślokas*. Because, the first two *ślokas* in the form of question and answer do not rise expectations that twelve *ślokas* would follow. Because, of the questions ‘My dear child, who are you? Where do you propose to go?’ etc., we may guess the boy alone was going without speaking; In the next *ślokas* he replies ‘नाहं मनुष्यो...निजबोधरूपः’ (I am not among men etc., because I am the Spirit called the Ātman). The last line of the following *śloka* ‘नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा’ is not there in this *śloka*. Another thing is the author writes: later, when the occasion arose for the Ācārya himself to review this, seeing Hastāmalaka display so much of knowledge, the happy father says ‘may this boy, who has transcended *saṃsāra* binding right from birth, be a disciple to you, the Jagadguru !’ (‘आजन्मनः संसृतिपाशमुक्तः शिष्योऽस्त्वयं विश्वगुरोस्तवैव’ Ma. Śam. 13. 31). But he also writes that the Ācārya himself said ‘this boy is not fit to be with you; inert as he is, of what benefit he would be for you?’ (‘वस्तुं न योग्यो भवता सहायं न तेऽमुनार्थो जडिमास्पदेन’ Ma. Śam.12. 59) and the like, took away that brahmin boy and went away as he wished (‘द्विजात्मजं ययौ गृहीत्वा’ Ma. Śam. 12. 62)! As though this does not suffice, there is this reputation that Ācārya has written a commentary called ‘Hastāmalakastotrabhāṣyam’! This is included among the works



of Śaṅkara by the Śrīraṅgam Vāṇīvilās Press (Śāṅkaragranthāvaliḥ, Khaṇḍa 16, p 163-183)! No wonder that such contradictories are located, since the ŚaṅkaraVijayas were written with the cherished idea of spreading the wonderful greatness of the Ācārya. But, what we shall say about the faith of those who believe, even today, that the Ācārya wrote a *Bhāṣya* on a treatise of his own disciple?



## 13. Śringeri

### When did the Ācārya come to Śringeri, and why?

110. Carrying forward the story of *Mādhavīya* in general, comparing and contrasting the variations that are found in the other Śaṅkara-Vijayas, has been the style of this book. In the same style we shall continue the story. Establishment of Śringeri Pīṭha is one incident among the several in the southern tour of Ācārya; but, in view of the importance accorded to this Pīṭha, we considered it proper to regard that as an independent stage.

Although Śringeri is not Ācārya's place of birth, and not the place where his *Guru* or *Paramaguru* lived, why he established his Maṭha there? We have no way of knowing it. While he prayed Saraswati, he says:

तस्मादस्मत्कल्पितेष्वर्च्यमाना स्थानेषु त्वं शारदाख्या दिशन्ती ।

इष्टानर्थानृष्यशृङ्गादिकेषु क्षेत्रेष्वास्वप्राप्तसत्सन्निधाना ॥

'In places such as *Ṛṣyaśringakshetra* that I am going to create, you stay by name Śāradā and fulfil the desires of those who worship' (Ma. Śam. 11. 71). The name *Ṛṣyaśringa* had never come to be considered before, and how come it suddenly flashed in his mind now? *Mādhava* does not say anything about this. While mentioning Ācārya's arrival at Śringeri, he commences with 'शृङ्गगिरिं प्रतस्थे' (he started to Śringeri) and mentions only this much:

यत्राधुनाप्युत्तममृष्यशृङ्गस्तपश्चरत्यात्मभृदन्तरङ्गः ।

संस्पर्शमात्रेण वितीर्णभद्रा विद्योतते यत्र च तुङ्गभद्रा ॥

'There (the sage) *Ṛṣyaśringa* is practising penance and inquiring

in to the Ātman; Tungabhadra,(?) the river which begets all good by the mere touch, is flowing there' (Ma. Śam. 12. 64).

In *Cidvilāśya*, 20th Chapter, the narration is as follows: Having prayed Saraswati to accompany him, Śaṅkarācārya was constantly in search of a place befittingly suitable to establish Her - a place devoid of difficulties and always full of lush green plant growth, with all desirable characteristics, full of animals free from hostility, surrounded by delightfully flowing river, having divine locations for penance, and having streams everywhere, and never known to experience drought. Searching thus, he came to the *Tapovanam* of sage Vibhāṇḍaka along with Goddess Saraswati and his disciples Padmapāda, Sureśwara, Hastāmalaka and Toṭaka (Ci. Śam. 20. 44-51). After this, the author goes on appreciating in very many ways the setting and glory of Śringeri, and then states that while the Ācārya was on his way to take bath in Tungabhadra river, he saw a frog in labour pain, suffering in the scorching Sun, and a female snake making shade on it by spreading its hood above the frog ('शालूरीमतिगर्भभारविषहं सद्यः प्रसूत्युन्मुखीं तीव्रोदग्रदिवाकरातप-परिक्लान्ताम् भुजङ्गीं फणामास्तीर्यातपवारणाय परितः पान्तीं दृशालोकत' (Ci. Śam. 21. 53) as an example of animals having given up mutual hostility there; and, later, reviewing his own story, Cidvilāsa says that the snake that spread its hood to make shade was a male ('वर्षाभ्वीं गुर्विणीं यत्र पाति स्म फणिराडपि' Ci. Śam. 24. 14). According to *Baladeva Upādhyāya*, Śaṅkara saw this wonderful sight on the way when he was going in search of a Guru for methodical *Sannyāsa* (Bala. Śam. p 48); there he has given a slightly different version of the story. We do not know what basis he had for this.

In *Kūṣmāṇḍa-ŚaṅkaraVijaya*, the story runs like this: Sarasavāṇi had agreed to follow Śaṅkara, but subject to a condition that he should not look back midway while travelling. But, on the way to Pampāpura, Śaṅkara looked back to ascertain that She is in fact following. Since he violated the condition to which he had agreed earlier, Sarasavāṇi took his permission and disappeared into her abode, Brahmaloka (तथेत्युक्त्वा पुरो गच्छन् गुरुः पम्पापुरं प्रति । आयाति वा न वैतीति पश्चाद्भागं प्रदृष्टवान् । तदागत्य गुरुं गन्तुं अनुज्ञां दातुमर्हसि । इत्युक्त्वा तु तदादृश्या ब्रह्मलोकमवाप सा ॥ Kū. Śam. 5. 9-11).

Somanāthaiah has raised objections that Cidvilāsa does not know the nature of animals - that frogs do not deliver offsprings but lay eggs, and the author of *KūṣmāṇḍaŚaṅkaraVijaya* is not aware of the fact that Śringeri is not there on the way while travelling from Maṇḍana Miśra's house in the north to Hampi (So. Śam. p 157, 159). But what is the use of subjecting imaginary stories of poets to minute scrutiny?

Somanāthaiah has also speculated that at this time the Ācārya, who was on a long travel tour, thought of his mother who was very old, was weakened by leading the life of a widow and was remorseful by the separation of her only son, and wishing to be near her, came towards south. But, because of the relatives who did not support his taking *Sanṇyāsa*, who probably would be jealous of his fame, he might have guessed that it would not be peaceful if he stayed in his native place and must have thought of living in an outer region not too far from his place. Śringeri was not more than thirty *gāvuda*s from his native place. (one *gāvuda* is about six miles). And the king of that area<sup>1</sup> also being devoted to him, might have encouraged him

1. In *Cidvilāsiya*, (24. 47) a king by name Vīrasena is mentioned. Historians will

to establish a Maṭha there (So. Śam. p 159-160). All this being just speculation, we have no way of coming to a conclusion whether it is true or not. In *Cidvilāsīya*, it is stated that when the Ācārya was still with Govinda Bhagavatpāda, he remembered his mother, went to his place, instructed her and helped her attain Vaikunṭha (Ci. Śam. 10. 47). In the case of those who agree with this time sequence, the speculation will not match. In the *Vyāsācalīya* that we have, it is stated that Śaṅkara's mother longed for him while he was giving *Sannyāsa* to the brahmin boy who had come from Cola country (Vyā. Śam. 4. 93). This also does not agree with the speculation. How can one imagine that Śaṅkara's fame had already reached the southern kings when he was learning with his Guru, or when he had accepted his very first disciple?

*Baladeva Upādhyāya* writes that although the Ācārya had written the *Bhāṣyas* staying at Uttarakāśi, there was not much opportunity to propagate them; but now he had the opportunity (Ba. Śam. 95). This appears to be more plausible. The Ācārya must have come to the south with the intention of propagating Vedānta. But why he stopped (at Śrīṅgeri)? We are at a loss to find an answer for this.

### Establishment of Śārada

III. The Ācārya constructed a large temple at Śrīṅgeri and established Śārada there. Goddess Saraswati, as She had promised earlier, remains at Śrīṅgeri by name "Śāradaṁba" granting the devotees their desired boons - thus *Mādhava* finishes off this subject with two śloka:

प्रकल्प्य तत्रेन्द्रविमानकल्पं प्रासादमाविष्कृतसर्वशिल्पम् ।

have to decide whether a king by that name was there at that time.

प्रवर्तयामास स देवतायाः पूजामजाद्यैरपि पूजितायाः ॥

या शारदाम्बेत्यभिधां वहन्ती कृतां प्रतिज्ञां प्रतिपालयन्ती ।

अद्यापि शृङ्गेरिपुरे वसन्ती प्रद्योततेऽभीष्टवरान् दिशन्ती ॥ (Ma. Śam. 12. 68-69)

Since the author writes here 'Śṛṅgeripure', it is evident that at his time the name of Śṛṅgeri was well-known.

In the twenty-first chapter of *Cidvilāsīya*, it is mentioned that - after describing the glory of Tungabhadra river and the marvellous tenderness of the incident of the frog and the snake described earlier - the Ācārya decided that this was the suitable place for the establishment of Vāgdevi. In the twenty-second chapter, the Āśramas near the Tunga river are described. In the twenty-third chapter, the story of Ṛṣyaśringa is given; and in the twenty-fourth chapter, it is stated that Śaṅkara, finding the place suitable, and as per the prayer of his disciples and of the local householders who were devoted practioners of Vedic rites, was thinking of establishing Śāradā here; at that time a celestial voice also said that this was the most suitable place for the establishment. The Ācārya got an excellent temple built at the very place where he had seen the wonderful incident; and established Śāradā and Śrī Cakra at an auspicious moment and according to the procedures of MantraŚāstra (Ci. Śam. 24. 21). He got the evil powers blocked from all directions, and established appropriate deities as well at proper places; arranged for the festival of Śarannavarātri (Ci. Śam. 24. 27); nearby established a large Śrī Maṭha and arranged for a VidyāPīṭha (Ci. Śam. 24. 32); and for protection against the evil forces, established (around Śṛṅgeri) four deities - *Bhairava* to the east, *Kālikāmba* to the north, *Mahādurgi* to the south and *Māruti* to the west (Ci. Śam. 24. 45-46).

### Establishment of the Śāradā Maṭhas

112. *Mādhavīya* contains only two things here - a high appreciation of the glory of Śringeri and the commencement of a tradition of worship of Śāradāmba. No mention of the establishment of a Maṭha is to be found. The following sentences are there in *Ḍiṇḍimavyākhyāna*: 'अत्र प्राञ्चः मठं कृत्वा तत्र विद्यापीठ-निर्माणं कृत्वा भारतीसम्प्रदायं निजशिष्यं चकार । यस्त्वैद्वैतमते स्थित्वा भारतीपीठनिन्दकः । स याति नरकं घोरं यावदाभूतसम्प्लवम् ॥ कञ्चिच्छिष्यं सुरेश्वराख्यं पीठाध्यक्षमकरोत् इति । (Ma. Śam. 12. 68). We have already given a part of one sentence of *Ānandagiriya* in Section 100. The full sentence is: 'ततः परं सरसवाणीं मन्त्रबद्धां कृत्वा गगनमार्गादेव शृङ्गगिरिसमीपे तुङ्गभद्रातीरे चक्रं तदग्रे परदेवतां सरसवाणीं निधाय तत्र विद्यापीठनिर्माणं कृत्वा भारतीसम्प्रदायं निजशिष्येषु आचकार । तदारभ्य शुद्धाद्वैतगुरवो भारतीसम्प्रदायनिष्ठाः परमगुरोराचार्यस्वामिनः कटाक्षलब्धविद्यावैशद्या इति व्यवहारः । यस्त्वैद्वैतमते स्थित्वा भारतीपीठनिन्दकः ॥ स याति नरकं घोरं यावदाभूतसम्प्लवम् ।' (Ā. Śam. Chap. 62, p 223-230, De. p 190). In the following Chapter it is mentioned: 'तत्रैव परमगुरुः द्वादशाब्दं विद्यापीठे स्थित्वा बहुशिष्येभ्यः शुद्धाद्वैतविद्यायाः सम्यगगुरुपदेशं ("सम्यगुपदेशं", De.) कृत्वा तदनन्तरं पद्मपादाख्यं कञ्चिच्छिष्यं ("कञ्चिच्छिष्यं सुरेश्वराख्यं", De.) पीठाध्यक्षं कृत्वा स्वयं निश्चक्राम' (Ā. Śam. Chap. 63, p 225, De. p 191-192)<sup>1</sup>. The same purport of the sentences is there in *Ḍiṇḍimavyākhyāna* also. No note is found in this instance on the commentary on the gloss *Advaitarājyalakshmi*. If we consider this, it appears that the commentator is of the opinion that is found in *Ānandagiriya* - the story that the Ācārya after establishing the Maṭha and commencing the *Bhārati* tradition there, made *Sureśwarācārya* the first pontiff.

A more detailed account of this is given in *Cidvilāsiya*:

1. De. version is given in parentheses here. We shall take up for discussion the subject of *Sureśvara-Padmapāda* later.

श्रीमठं तत्र निर्माय विद्यापीठमचीकृत् । चतुर्ष्वेकं वावदूकं सुरेशाचार्यमग्रिमम् ॥  
 ब्रह्मविद्यावरिष्ठं तं तत्पीठे विनिवेश्य सः । आजिज्ञपत्सुरेशार्यमित्थं देशिकपुङ्गवः ॥  
 यस्त्वद्वैतमते स्थित्वा भारतीपीठनिन्दकः । स याति नरकं घोरं यावदाभूतसम्प्लवम् ॥  
 आसेतुहिमवच्छैलं सदाचारान् विचारय । यत्र स्खलति यः को वा विप्रस्तं शिक्षयाधिकम् ॥  
 सम्प्रदायान् दशैवैतान् शिष्येष्वारचय स्वतः । तीर्थाश्रमवनारण्यगिरिपर्वतसागराः ॥  
 सरस्वती भारती च पुरीत्येते दशैव हि ॥

शिवात् क्रमात्समायातं चन्द्रमौळीश्वरं परम् । रत्नगर्भं गणपतिं पूजयेति ददौ मुदा ॥ (Ci. Sam. 24. 32-37)

(1) Establishment of the Maṭha (2) Making *Sureśwarācārya* the first pontiff of the *Pīṭha* (3) Establishing the *Bhāratī* tradition (4) Making the pontiff judge over matters of good and bad conduct (5) Commencement of the ten traditions of Tīrtha, Āśrama etc.) (6) Worship of Candramouliśwara and Gaṇapati to be performed – all these are covered here. This is not the occasion for taking up these in detail. For the present, we have to take note that just as in *Ānanda-gīrīya*, establishment of the Maṭha and making *Sureśwarācārya* the pontiff are to be found here also. We need not reiterate that the matter of establishment of the Maṭha at Śrīṅgeri is also found in recent Śaṅkara histories like Maṇimañjarībhedinī (विद्यापीठमथाकलय्य भगवांत्सद्भारतीयं मुदा 3. 31) and Bhagavatpādābhyudaya (शारदामठ इत्येव नाम चक्रे 8. 37).

With all these, the mention of the establishment of the Maṭha is not to be found in *Mādhavīya*. Believed by some as closely following *Mādhavīya*, the work by name Śaṅkara Kathā Sudhānidhi has a śloka which says:

भारती समवलोक्य मण्डनं मुण्डिनं यतिमतानुवर्तिनम् ।

तद्भयेन यतिदृष्टिवर्त्मगा नो भवेयमिति सा तिरोदधे ॥ (Sham. Ka. Su. 5. 1)



(When Maṇḍana became a *Sannyāsin*, Bhāratī just disappeared with the fear of being seen by *Sannyāsin*; and through a celestial voice she assured him 'wherever you remember me, I shall be there'). Continuing, it says that when the Ācārya arrived in Śringeri, pleased with his remembrance, she told again and again that she should be worshipped there (विधेया मुदैव पूजा नित्यं यतीन्द्रेति पुनःपुनस्तम् Śam. Ka. Su. 5. 25); accordingly, he built a beautiful Maṭha there (वाचं तदीयां बहुमन्यमानस्तथेति निर्माय मठं सुरम्यम्) - the author has expressed his own specific imagination.

Now the time has come for discussing about the establishment of *Śāradā Pīṭha*. The important points to be considered are the following:

(1) Although the establishment of the Maṭha by the Ācārya has been mentioned in many ŚaṅkaraVijayas, there are no inscriptions available as evidence. It appears that in the inscription given by Śri Vira Harihara Odeyar and others [on Śālivāhana Śaka 1268 Parthiva Samvatsara (?) Bahula Thursday] it is stated that 'ಭಾರತೀರ್ಥ ಶ್ರೀಪಾದಂಗಳವರೂ ಅವರ ಶಿಷ್ಯಾದಿಗಳೂ ಆ ಶೃಂಗೇರಿಯ ತೀರ್ಥವಾಸದಲ್ಲ, ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಮಾಡಿಹದಕ್ಕಿ' (To Bhāratī Tīrtha and his disciples for religious practices done at Śringeri during their pilgrimage) (So. Śam. p 161)<sup>1</sup>. Why there is no mention of Śāradā Pīṭha? is to be thought over.

(2) Consideration of *Mantra Śāstra* is seen in ŚaṅkaraVijayas. Invoking Gods by the power of *Mantras*, making them bound from all directions - such supernatural things are mentioned. Presently, Cid-

1. Recently we have procured a book entitled 'Śringeri Śri Maṭhīya Prāktana Lekhana Mālā Sangraha'; this is the first inscription published in that. In the inscription of Śālivāhana Śaka 1277, the wordings 'ಈ ಮಠದ ಪರಿಚರಿಯಕ್ಕಿ' (for the service of this Maṭha) are found.

vilāsa has described in detail that the Ācārya has established Śārādā Devi 'on *Śrī Cakra* written in accordance with *Mantra Śāstra*' ('श्रीचक्रं तत्र सल्लिख्य मन्त्रशास्त्रविधानतः...' Ci. Śam. 24. 21-23). *Mādhava* too, in the twelfth *sarga* of his work while describing how the Ācārya sang the glory of Mūkāmbikā, has implied that the Ācārya was conversant with *Mantra Śāstra* (Ma. Śam. 12. 27-37). But he has not told how and wherefrom he learnt that. What is the secret behind this?

(3) Cidvilāsa has reserved four chapters (one-eighth of the total) for Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha. But why there is no mention of that in *Mādhavīya*?

This and other details we shall consider for discussion when we deal with the Maṭhas.

### Discipleship of Toṭakācārya

113. During all the time of his stay at Śrīṅgeri, the Ācārya arranged for the worship of the Goddess Śārādāmba and was spending his time teaching the *Bhāṣyas* to his disciples. One of the disciples was serving the Ācārya ceaselessly with great devotion. Once, when he had gone to get the clothes of Ācārya washed, the other disciples started to chant the *Śānti Mantra*. The Ācārya told, 'let *Giri* too arrive!' Padmapāda said 'he is not such an intellegent one, also not fit for the study of the *Śāstras*; why should we wait for him?' In order to remedy Padmapāda's egotism, and desiring to show compassion towards his dependent, the Ācārya instructed *Giri* 'fourteen disciplines' by the mind only (तस्य गर्वमपहर्तुमस्वर्वं स्वाश्रयेषु करुणातिशयाच्च । व्यादिदेश स चतुर्दशविद्याः सद्य एव मनसा गिरिनाम्ने ॥ Ma. Śam. 12. 78). Through the grace of the Guru, immediately upon returning, he started singing the glories of the Ācārya with a few *ślokas* pregnant with conclusions of Vedānta, in

the *Toṭaka* metre. That work of his also is known by the name *Toṭaka*, and that disciple is also known as *Toṭakācārya* thenceforward. He became equally brilliant as *Padmapāda*, and came to be recognized as one of the chief disciples (Ma. Śam. 12. 70-86).

In *Vyāsācalīya*, it is described that *Toṭakācārya* was serving the *Ācārya* when he was suffering from the disease *Bhagandara* (Vyā. Śam. 9. 84-97). Several *ślokas* of *Mādhavīya* are found there; but there is no mention of the jealousy of the other disciples or of the incident of *Śāntipāṭha*. *Govindanātha*, who closely follows *Vyāsācala*, describes the story of *Toṭaka* only after that of *Hastāmalaka*; but there is no mention of the context of *Bhagandara*.

In *Cidvilāsiya*, it is described as if *Toṭakācārya* came to be known to *Ācārya* in *Kāshi* before he saw *Vyāsa*. At *Kāśi*, one by name *Kalānātha*, son of one *Viśwanāthādhwari*, hearing that the *Ācārya* had arrived, came singing eight *ślokas* composed in *Toṭakavṛtta* (in the metre *Toṭaka*), and fell at his feet. The first *śloka* of this is as follows:

विदिताखिलशास्त्रसुधाजलधे महितोपनिषत्कथितार्थनिधे ।

हृदये कलये विमलं शरणं भव शङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥

and thenceforward started serving the *Ācārya*, desirous of raising himself to the stature of the other main disciples. The *Ācārya* called him, and with great compassion, blessed him with extraordinary skill. Upon his request, the *Ācārya* blessed him with *Sannyāsa*, saying 'since *Toṭaka* metre has come out from your mouth, may you be famous as *Toṭakācārya*!' (Ci. Śam. 13. 1-20). It seems this story is not there in *Ānandagirīya*.

### Critique of the Toṭaka story

114. The points to be discussed in connection with this story are as follows:

(1) What was the name of Toṭakācārya before his *Sannyāsa*? is uncertain. In *Mādhavīya*, it is mentioned as Giri; some have recently converted it into *Ānandagiri* by a false impression. In *Cidvilāsīya*, it is mentioned as Kalānātha. It is clear that names are imagined by the authors so that some name would be a necessary requirement.

(2) We will have to say that these *ślokas* in the *Toṭaka* metre must have been existing earlier to ŚaṅkaraVijayas in some order, and that the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijaya must have used them in connection with one of the disciples. Since Dīṇḍimakāra, after writing five *ślokas* commencing from ‘भगवन्नुदधौ मृतिजन्मजले’ and ending with ‘यत एवमतोऽसि सदेव सदा’, has written ‘इत्यादिभिर्गुरुशिष्यसंवादेन परतत्त्वव्यञ्जकैः...तोटकवृत्तैः सह देशिकवरं श्रीशङ्करं प्रत्यागतवान् इत्यर्थः’ (he approached the best among the gurus, Śrī Śaṅkara, with these and other *ślokas* in *Toṭaka* metre depicting the Supreme Principle by way of conversations between master and the disciple), we will have to guess that during his time, the *ślokas* commencing with ‘विदिताखिलशास्त्रसुधाजलधे’ must have come after the five *ślokas* indicated above. But in *Cidvilāsīya*, the eight *ślokas* are clearly written commencing with ‘विदिताखिलशास्त्रसुधाजलधे’; and there is no indication that the other five *ślokas* were there. And in the version of the *ślokas* that Somanāthaiah has with him, only after the eight *ślokas* starting with ‘विदिताखिल’ the five *ślokas* starting with ‘भगवन्नुदधौ’ are there. We are not in a position to know from what source he has taken them. In the *Mādhavīya* which is published

from Anandāśrama, the editor has given a note: ‘अग्रिमं पद्यद्वयं पुस्तके “भगवद्बुद्धौ” इत्यादि श्लोकपञ्चकात् प्रागधिकं दृश्यते -

सकलं मनसा क्रियया जनितं समवेक्ष्य विनाशितया तु जगत् ।

निरविद्यत कश्चिदतो निखिलादविनाशिकृते यतितव्यमिति ॥ १ ॥

प्रतिपित्सुरसावविनाशिपदं यतिधर्मरतो यतिमेव गुरुम् ।

विदितात्मकलं समुपेत्य कविः प्रणिपत्य निवेदितवान् स्वमतम् ॥ २ ॥

According to this note, there was another version containing these two *ślokas* earlier to the five *ślokas* given in डिण्डिमव्याख्यान. The import of the *ślokas* is that a *Sannyāsin* who had come to a conclusion that everything produced by action has to have an ending, and hence, being detached with everything, wanting to strive to obtain that which is indestructible, came to the Guru who was also a *Sannyāsin*, and prostrating before him, expressed what was in his mind. If these two *ślokas* were truly there earlier to the present *ślokas*, this is a treatise that describes how a detached aspirant goes to a Guru and seeks to know the Real. Since it also contains the conversation between master and the disciple, we can guess that the authors might have connected this to Toṭakācārya. The readers will have to come to their own conclusion regarding this. We feel that these incidents of Hastāmalaka and Toṭaka are, similar to Padmapāda and Sureśwara stories, just figments of imagination of the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas; that is why there is a lack of connection between them in describing this matter.

On the whole, we can be sure that the Ācārya had four important disciples; also we can be sure that they were brilliant and had the blessings of the Ācārya. There is no doubt that they were truly the targets for the following hyperbolic *śloka* of *Mādhavīya*:

पुमर्थाश्चत्वारः किमुत निगमा ऋक्प्रभृतयः

प्रभेदा वा मुक्तेर्विमलतरसालोक्यमुखराः ।  
 मुखान्याहो धातुश्चिरमिति विमृश्याथ विबुधा  
 विदुः शिष्यान् हस्तामलकमुखरान् शङ्करगुरोः ॥

The import of the *śloka* is that looking at the four disciples of Guru Śaṅkara, the puṇḍits were discussing for long whether these are the four *puruṣārthas*, viz., *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Moksha*, or four Vedas, viz., *Rig* etc., or the special liberation states, viz., *sālokya*, *sāmīpya*, *sārūpya* and *sāyujya*, or whether these are the four faces of Brahṁā.

(3) When and how the chanting of *Śāntipāṭha* originate as a practice? Author *Mādhava* all of a sudden has said that the other disciples started chanting *Śāntipāṭha* before *Giri's* arrival. Previously, neither Govinda Bhagavatpāda nor the Ācārya had instructed that *Śāntim-antras* are to be chanted in a particular order before commencing to explain the meaning of Upaniṣads or the Sūtras. It is true that these *Śāntipāṭhas* do occur here and there at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of the Upaniṣads; and the *Bhāṣyakāra* has written his commentaries on them in the respective places. Neither the Ācārya nor the *Smṛtis* have prescribed that these are to be collectively chanted in a particular order. And we see that *Śāntipāṭhas* are different in different places. We can only say that at the time of *Mādhava* the practice of chanting them before reading the Bhāṣya was in vogue. We can just say that since this is a practice of the virtuous, we too should follow. But, is this a sacrament, *samskāra*? remains a question to be decided upon. The Ācārya, on the basis of the Upaniṣads, has written in his *Sūtrabhāṣya* that *upasatti* and *upanayana* are necessary for imparting the *Ātmavidyā* (Pra. Up. 1-1, Chan. Up. 5-11-7, 7-1-1 etc.). Can it be decided on the evidence of the *Smṛtis* that this *samskāra* includes

*Śāntipāṭha*? Traditionalists are to examine this issue and decide.

### **Competition among the disciples Padmapāda etc.**

115. Once Sureśwara prostrated before the Guru and with an intention of making a vivid gloss to the *Śārīraka* which has deep meaning, asked him 'please tell me what shall I do; being devoted to the Guru is the fulfilment of life!' The Ācārya told him to write a *Vārtika* on the *Bhāṣya*. Coming to know of this, Padmapāda's disciple Citsukhācārya and others met the Ācārya secretly and told "he is a scholar, an adept in Vedic rites, but had rejected *Īśwara* and had held that the *karmas* yield fruit themselves. If he writes on the *Bhāṣyas*, that work would certainly have accent on *karma*. He did not take *Sannyāsa* by wilful choice, but has done so as a consequence of his defeat in argumentation. Therefore, let him not do this work. You can tell that to somebody else. (1) Padmapāda is one having great devotion to you; or (2) *Ānandagiri*, by the grace of Saraswati, is capable of writing it closely following your opinion". Padmapāda, who had come there just at that time, said "Hastāmalaka too is capable of doing it". The Ācārya was convinced that the other disciples do not like Sureśwara doing that work. He said, 'Hastāmalaka is an introvert right from the beginning, and hence will not indulge himself in writing. You do not seem to like Sureśwara doing it; I do not wish to get it done against majority opinion!'. When the disciples told 'let Sanandana do it!', the Ācārya said, 'Well, let Sanandana write a commentary (*nibandha*) on the *Bhāṣyas*; the job of writing *Vārtika* has already been entrusted to someone else!'. Later he called Sureśwara secretly and told him, 'my child, you do not write the *Vārtika* on the *Bhāṣyas*. The other disciples

do not seem to agree to it since they feel you have purport in householdership', narrating what had happened. Then he entrusted him to write a Vedāntic work independently. Accordingly, Sureśwara wrote '*Naiṣkarmyasiddhiḥ*' which the Ācārya scrutinized from beginning to end. Pleased with the work having accent on the actionless supreme principle, the Ācārya showed it to the other disciples. Then they came to believe that Sureśwara is unparalleled in knowledge. Even today *Sannyāsins* refer to this work. However, thinking of them as obstructing his attempt at writing the *Vārtika*, Sureśwara cursed that 'even if someone else writes it, may it not come to limelight'

Thus, after writing '*Naiṣkarmyasiddhiḥ*', Sureśwara expressed himself 'I did not write this intending to get fame, riches or worship; I did it just to follow the behest of the Guru. Just because I was a householder earlier, will I lean towards it even now? I took *Sannyāsa* hearing the instructions of the Guru, not because I was defeated in argument. I had also written other books related to Nyāya etc.; well, I shall spend my time hereafterwards serving the Guru!' and remained quiet. The Ācārya, softly consoling him, said 'you write a *Vārtika* on *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* which is my traditional branch, and another *Vārtika* on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* which belongs to your traditional *Kāṇva* branch. This is my word, and is final. You need not take note of what others say'. Accordingly, Sureśwara wrote those two *Vārtikas*. As per Guru's behest, Sanandana wrote a *ṭikā* on *Sūtrabhāṣya*, the first half of which became famous as *Pañcapādikā* and the next half as *Vṛtti*. The Ācārya secretly told Sureśwara 'my child, in this work of Sanandana, only five *pādas* would become famous. Even among them, only four *Sūtras* would become famous. By your own *Prārabdha Karma* you



would be born again as Vācaspati and will write an excellent commentary on my *Bhāṣya*. He told *Ānandagiri* and others 'you too write compositions with purport in Advaita'. They also wrote such compositions. (Ma. Śam. 12. 13-75).

Similar account is found in *Vyāsācalīya* also (Vyā. Śam. 7. 28-80), but there is no mention of *Ānandagiri* and *Hastāmalaka*.

### **How did the Vyākhyāna Prasthānas start off?**

116. Let us mark the several points seen in the above description regarding the start and growth of Vyākhyāna Prasthānas (subcommentaries), one by one.

Firstly, it is difficult to believe that *Sureśwarācārya* wanted to write a (*Vārtika*) and the Ācārya gave permission. Because, *Sureśwara* has no where mentioned that as per the behest of *Guru Sūtrabhāṣya* is left out and *Vārtika* are written for only two Upaniṣads. *Kumārila Bhaṭṭa* has written two *Vārtikas* on Śābara Bhāṣya - *Śloka-vārtika* and *Tantra-vārtika* - but he did not write them during the lifetime of the author of that Bhāṣya. Many had written commentaries on the Bhāṣya, but he had felt that none of them was according to *Mīmāṃsā-Bhāṣya*; not only that, he was not in agreement with all the opinions of the author of that Bhāṣya. Therefore he wrote a very detailed commentary to suit his time, and published it. '*Vārtika*' means mentioning what has been said, what has not been said and what has been said incorrectly, explaining what is said correctly, adding what has been omitted, and pointing out what is felt as not correct. Hence, *Kumārila's* writing a *Vārtika* on the discipline of *Mīmāṃsā Śāstra* is justified. But, neither Ācārya calling his disciple and asking him to write

a *Vārtika* on his work nor the disciple requesting the Guru that he intends to write a *Vārtika* appears appropriate. Hence, it would be right to guess that Sureśwara wrote those two *Vārtikas* only after the Ācārya left the body. Both in the *Vārtika* on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* Upaniṣad and on Taittirīya Upaniṣad he has taken exceptions in some places, to the opinions of the Ācārya. If he had written it during the lifetime of the Ācārya, either he must have made it clear that he had taken his permission, or the Ācārya himself must have made it clear that what his disciple wrote would be his final conclusion; but such a thing has not taken place. The stories that, Ācārya planned to get a *Vārtika* written by Bhaṭṭapāda and if opportunity were given, *Sureśwarācārya* might have written a *Vārtika* on even *Sūtrabhāṣya*, might have been created by someone only to show that Sureśwara's *Vārtika* is no less compared to Kumārila's *ŚlokaVārtika*,

Secondly, there is no evidence that Sureśwara intended to write a *Vārtika* on *Sūtrabhāṣya*. We cannot guess either that *Sūtrabhāṣya* had not come to his notice, or that he thought it was not sufficiently worthy. Because, he has profusely cited from *Sūtras* in his work as *pramāṇa*. Not only that, we have already indicated (p. \*26) that there are some opinion differences between *Sūtrabhāṣya* and *Bṛhadāraṇyakabhāṣya*. On such instances, the author of *Vārtika* has neither pointed out why such differences have risen, nor has given his own opinions on them. Researchers have to investigate as to why this is so. He has no where given an example that in *Sūtrabhāṣya* it is written in this manner. When such is the case, how one can imagine that he in fact wanted to write a *Vārtika* on *Sūtrabhāṣya*?

Thirdly, the ŚaṅkaraVijayas are mentioning that Padmapāda was

the first disciple of Ācārya, and the other disciples were jealous of the Ācārya's special affection for him. It would not be right to guess that such a person or someone of his camp was jealous of *Sureśwarācārya*, or was having no discrimination to think that Sureśwara had taken *Sannyāsa* without properly comprehending the nature of truth.

Fourthly, it does not suit if Sureśwara is called as 'nūtna bhikṣu' in this part of the story (Ma. Śam. 13. 44). Because, later than him, Hastāmalaka and Toṭaka were *Bhikshus*. The same *śloka* is present in *Vyāsācalīya* also (Vyā. Śam. 7. 49). According to that, this epithet fits in since only *Sureśwarācārya* was the main disciple who had come after Padmapāda. Should *Mādhava's* work be regarded as an alteration of *Vyāsācalīya*? (Or, if this work is an artificial one, then of some other *Vyāsācalīya*). This has to be reflected upon.

Fifthly, it is stated that *Ānandagiri*, by the grace of Saraswati, had the capacity of commenting upon the *Bhāṣya* (Ma. Śam. 12. 20). What is the source of this story? Nowhere it is mentioned how *Ānandagiri* had become a disciple of Śaṅkara. We have already pointed out that of the author of the commentary *Advaitarājyalakshmi*, commenting on the *śloka* 'उद्दीक्ष्यतां शाङ्करवाक्यसारः' (Ma. Śam. 1. 2), has written 'शङ्करस्य भगवतो भाष्यकारस्य अयं शाङ्करः आनन्दगिर्यभिधः । तस्य तत्प्रशिष्यस्य वाक्यसारः ।' (page 7). Even there he has been called as a *praśiṣya* (disciple's disciple) and not as a direct disciple. The commentaries on the *Bhāṣyas* known as *Ānandagiriya* are even now foolishly thought of by some, as those of Śaṅkara's direct disciple. Did *Mādhava* too had this wrong conception? This has to be explored further. Surely, we cannot bring here *Anantānandagiri* who wrote a ŚaṅkaraVijaya.

Like this, we will have to examine closely the statement that

Citsukha is Padmapāda's fellow student ('अथाम्बुजाङ्घ्रेर्दयिताः सतीर्थ्यास्तं चित्सुखाद्याः' Ma. Śam. 13. 5). Did Ācārya have a disciple by name Citsukha? Atmabodhācārya, in the *Suṣamā Vyākhyāna* on the 18th śloka of Gururatnamālīkā has written as follows: 'आहुरनुक्षणमुपचरिताचार्यचरणाः, सर्ववृत्तान्तसाक्षिणः, सहजवदेवाग्रहरोत्पन्नाः, आजीवमविरहयुजः श्रीसर्वज्ञचित्सुखाचार्याः स्वकृतबृहच्छङ्करविजये' (having been serving the Ācārya every moment, having been witness to everything, having been born in the same brahmin locality just like brothers, and having not been separated from him lifelong, Śrī Citsukhācārya the all-knower, has said like this in his own work *Bṛhat ŚaṅkaraVijaya*). If this *BṛhatŚaṅkaraVijaya* is really composed as a book, it is possible that it is available at Kumbhakoṇam Maṭha; if someone finds it out, and with proper refinements publishes it, we can come to know how these epithets written by Ātmabodha are suited to Citsukhācārya. Till then, we will have to be contented saying that Citsukhācārya, the famous author of 'तत्त्वदीपिका' (Tattvadīpikā), is not a direct disciple of Śaṅkara. Because, we come to know that he was a disciple of Jñānottama from *Advaita Pradīpikā*. In this work, *Nyāyakandali* of Śrīdharācārya of recent times has been examined again and again.

Sixthly, as per Padmapāda's objection, the Ācārya is purported to have prevented Sureśwara from writing *Vārtika*; consequently, he made him write '*Naiṣkarmyasiddhiḥ*' independently. Even after examining it and everyone becoming convinced about Sureśwara's Vedāntic knowledge, why the Ācārya did not get *Vārtika* written by him? This query has not been answered by either *Mādhava* or *Vyāsācala*.

Seventhly, to have imagined that *Sureśwarācārya* did curse 'even if

someone else writes the *Vārtika*, let it not come to limelight' would be to charge him, a master of self control, with self-aggrandizement, with jealousy of others, and with mean mentality of preventing Ācārya's works from becoming famous. This narration is not befitting to the nature of that great soul.

Eighthly, the description that Padmapāda, following the direction of his preceptor, wrote a commentary on the *Bhāṣya*, and that its former part is called *Pañcapādikā* and the latter part is called *Vṛtti*, raises doubts. The authors of ŚaṅkaraVijaya have not made it clear why and how a single work could come to have two titles. The Ācārya's forecast stating 'only five chapters of this would become famous; even among those, only four *Sūtras* would be widely known' raises further doubts. Today, only one commentary on the *Bhāṣya* is famous by name *Pañcapādikā*; but what we have is commentary on only four *Sūtras*. It is well known among scholars that it is authored by Padmapāda. But the author has not stated that he has written as per the behest of his Guru. Although referred to by various authors as 'vyākhyāsyē pañcapādikām' (व्याख्यास्ये पञ्चपादिकाम्) (विवरण), 'vibhaje pañcapādikām' (विभजे पञ्चपादिकाम्) (प्रबोधपरिशोधिनी), 'vyākurve pañcapādikām' (व्याकुर्वे पञ्चपादिकाम्) (वेदान्तरत्नकोश), all of them could find commentary on only four *Sūtras*. The question also arises - whether *Mādhava* could not have concocted his story based upon indications of the commentators? In the introduction of *Pañcapādikā* (p 9) published by Polagam S. Śrīrāma Śāstry it is mentioned that an anonymous commentator has described some part of 'ईक्षत्यधिकरण' (Īkṣatyadhikaraṇa) of this work and it is available with प्राचीनग्रन्थकोशालय (Prācīnagranthakośālaya) of Madras Govern-

ment under No. R 3224. In the same book Śrīrama Śāstry writes (p 8) that the author of *Kalpataru* has written that some of the opinions refuted by Vācaspati Miśra in his *Bhāmāti* are of a ‘पञ्चपादीकार’ (Pañcapādīkāra). There is no evidence to decide whether the work referred to as ‘पञ्चपादी’ (Pañcapādi) by this author of *Kalpataru* is the present *Pañcapādīkā* or not. Since the author of *Kalpataru* has not used the title ‘Pañcapādīkā’, it is difficult to decide whether ‘Pañcapādīkā’ and ‘Pañcapādi’ are one and the same. The author of ‘Pañcapādīkā’ has implied that he is going to comment upon the entire work by saying ‘सुगतमतपरीक्षायां निपुणतरं प्रपञ्चयिष्यामः’ (we are going to explain while doing *Sugatamata parīksha*), ‘दर्शयिष्यामः’ (we are going to show how this is at the commencement of the section ‘एक आत्मनः शरीरे भावात्’), ‘प्रदर्शयिष्यामः’ (we are going to prove Vākyābhāsatva in the respective sections) and the like. Therefore, it means that ‘Pañcapādīkā’ means five sections are there in this work. ‘पदच्छेद’, ‘पदार्थोक्ति’, ‘विग्रह’, ‘वाक्ययोजना’ and ‘आक्षेपसमाधान’ are the five sections (Po. Pam. introduction, p 5-6); or, the derivation can also be done as ‘पञ्च’ (wide), ‘पाद’ (knowledge) according to *Śrīrāma Śāstri*! All this is exhibition of skill in commenting, nothing else. Although the availability of the part of this commentary on the fifth *Sūtra* could be true, we have insufficient support to decide that the work exists in full. We have to say that by some reason or the other, this work remained incomplete, and by some reason it has come to be referred to traditionally as ‘Pañcapādīkā’, and such stories were concocted later.

It is clear that ‘vṛtti’ is not indicative of some book. But there are instances of Śaṅkara himself referring to Upaniṣad Bhāṣyas as ‘vṛtti’ (for

example, Kā. Bhā., Br. Bhā.). Since Śaṅkara has refuted the opinions of earlier commentators, we can say that there were other Bhāṣyas even before Śaṅkarabhāṣya. Those opinions have been referred to as Vṛttikāras' opinions by the glossators of Bhāṣya. In 'Pañcapādikā' itself there are many references from these different 'vṛtti' authors (Pam. Pā. Varṇaka 2, p 42; Varṇaka 3, p 48). However, till now we do not have any evidence to decide why 'Pañcapādikā' became the name of that work, or why its latter part was referred to as 'vṛtti'. Such stories must have originated by those who could not research and find out why the work has ended with only four *Sūtras*.

Ninthly, the Ācārya forecasting to Sureśwara that 'you would be born as Vācaspati and will write a glorious commentary' adds substance to the view that all these are *Mādhava's* imaginations. Seeing that Vācaspati Miśra has written complete commentary and *Pañcapādikā* is only in parts, he must have nurtured such imagination. Why the Ācārya did not say (in his forecast) that Vācaspati would write a *Vārtika*? Or, is it that *Mādhava* considers *Bhāmatī* itself as a *Vārtika*? [The author of *Kalpataru* has said that such a thing also is possible: 'तर्हि वार्तिकमस्तु न हि वार्तिकस्य शृङ्गमस्ति' - (let it be a *Vārtika*; *Vārtika* is not having a horn after all) Sū. Bhā. 2. 4. 19]. Whatever that be, the view that Vācaspati Miśra is the later form of Sureśwara is not such as brings glory to Ācārya's genius of guessing a future event. Because there is no agreement between the line of thought in *Bhāmatī* and the purport of *Vārtika*. Vācaspati Miśra has used many of Maṇḍana's opinions in his work as if they were the opinions of the author of *Bhāṣya*. Ānandagiri also has made fun of him as Maṇḍanaprṣṭhasevī, attached to Maṇḍanas' back. Although

Sureśwarācārya too has used Maṇḍana's opinions in his *Vārtika*, he has refuted very clearly wherever they went against Śaṅkara's prakriyā. Viewing from whatever way, we are convinced that the story related to *Vārtika* and *Pañcapādikā* is just a concoction and nothing more.

### **Is the story of burnt-away 'Pañcapādikā' plausible?**

117. Let this story of the competition among the disciples described in *Mādhavīya* be true or false; that the Ācārya, after coming down to south, must have arranged for the propagation of the established conclusions of Advaita, and that his disciples too must have shown enthusiasm in the job - is something which all will agree.

Now let us try to go ahead with the story of Padmapāda as depicted in the ŚaṅkaraVijayas. Padmapādācārya convinced his Guru, and, taking his permission, started on a pilgrimage (Ma. Śam. 14. 1-28). The Guru stayed at Śringeri for sometime, and, knowing by yogic power the condition in which his mother was placed, went to her by the arial route. We shall describe shortly what happened there.

Padmapāda, with due permission from the Guru, completed visits to the pilgrimage centres of the north and then came to the south. There, after visiting Kālahastīśwara, Ekamreśwara of Kāñci and Kallāleśa, and bathing in Śivaganga, took the way to Rāmasetu. On the way he came to his maternal uncle's house, and as per their request, stayed with them for a few days. The uncle browsed through Padmapāda's commentary, and, although happy at the skill of the author in refuting other schools of thought, grew jealous since he had refuted his own conviction of the Prabhākara school of thought.



Outwardly he only told that the work is 'good'. Padmapāda left the book in his uncle's custody until his return from Rāmasetu (Ma. Śam. 14. 111). After his departure, the uncle, in order to somehow protect his opinions, kept the book in a separate house and set fire to the entire house so that no one could entertain doubt (115). Padmapāda, returning from his visit to Ramasetu, was immensely grieved when he heard of the accidental fire. Proceeding on his way, he heard that the Ācārya had come to Kerala. Reaching over there, he narrated before him whatever had happened. Having narrated the destruction of Pañcapādikā, he grieved 'even if I wished to write afresh, I cannot recall the various intricacies of reasoning involved; what shall I do!' Consoling him, the Ācārya said, 'I knew this beforehand, and I had also told Sureśwara about it (115); I remember the Pañcapādī part which I had heard you reading at Śrīṅgeri. I shall recall and dictate; write it down!' and dictated it from the beginning. Padmapāda felt very happy (Ma. Śam. 14. 168-170).

Now let us think about what can be plausible in this story. That the uncle and other relatives welcomed Padmapāda is not improbable at all. But that, since refutation of Prabhākara school of thought was there in his commentary, the uncle set fire to the house in which it was kept raises some doubt. This story is there in *Vyāsācalīya* almost on similar lines (Vyā. Śam. from 7. 68 to 8. 33). That Madhava and Vyāsācala both had heard that from somebody and wrote it comes out in their own expression:

एतिह्यमाश्रित्य वदन्ति चैवं तदेव मूलं मम भाषणेऽपि ।

यावत्कृतं तावदिहास्य कर्तुः पापं ततः स्याद्-द्विगुणं प्रवक्तुः ॥

(On the basis of heresay people are telling thus: for my expression

also that is the source. A sin spoken of by somebody would beget a two-fold sin than the sinner's sin) (Ma. Śam. 14. 116; Vyā. Śam. 8. 76). Saying thus, they have avoided the responsibility. Another expression they have in common:

दृष्ट्वा बुद्धिं मातुलस्तस्य भूयो भीतः प्रास्यद्भोजने तन्मनोघ्नम् ।

किञ्चिद् द्रव्यं पूर्ववन्नाक्षमिष्ट टीकां कर्तुं केचिदेवं ब्रुवन्ति ॥

(‘Although book is gone, at least my intellect is there intact’ - thinking thus, he sat to write once again. Seeing this, the uncle was all the more scared; and he mixed his food with some material which would retard his intellect; thus he was unable to write his commentary as before - say some) (Ma. Śam. 14. 142; Vyā. Śam. 9. 33).

In *Vyāsācalīya*, there is no mention of the Ācārya dictating the five sections once again. And there is no mention of Padmapāda meeting the Ācārya in Kerala! But mention is made that Padmapāda met Ugrabhairava in Kerala (Vyā. Śam. 9. 35-83). Also there is the story of Toṭākācārya (Vyā. Śam. 9. 84-96). The manuscript of *Vyāsācalīya* that we have with us may be a true copy or not, but it is certain that the story of Padmapāda's work destroyed by fire was in vogue earlier to both *Mādhava* and *Vyāsācala*.

But *Mādhava* is sole author of the story of Ācārya dictating Pañcapādikā from memory. The purpose of imagining such a story is to create an impression that the Ācārya was of an exceptional intellectual calibre. He has in fact expressly told so (Ma. Śam. 14. 169). There is another point to be considered at this juncture. In *Mādhavīya*, the Ācārya says

पूर्वं शृङ्गक्ष्माधरे मत्समीपे प्रेम्णा याऽसौ वाचिता पञ्चपादी ।

सा मे चित्तान्नापयात्यद्य शोको याताच्छीघ्रं तां लिखेत्याख्यदार्यः ॥

(At Śringeri, previously you had read *Pañcapādi* sitting near me; that has not gone away from my memory; grieve not, take that down quickly) (Ma. Śam. 14. 168). In this *śloka*, as well as in the next *śloka*, (‘आश्वास्येत्यं भाष्यकृत्पञ्चपादीमाचख्यौ’) he has used the word ‘Pañcapādi’ (and not Pañcapādikā). Could it be that having seen ‘Pañcapādi’ in the sentences of Kalpataru (which *Śrīrāma Śāstri* has looked at - page \*268) *Mādhava* has built his story thus? - a doubt like this arises. Whatever that may be, the author of Kalpataru has used the word ‘Pañcapādi’ in *Vaiśwānarādhikaraṇa* and in *Daharādhikaraṇa* and has not mentioned the word Pañcapādikā anywhere. The author of *Parimaḷa* has not told anything on this subject. Also he has not said that the author of Kalpataru has written a critique of Pañcapādikā called ‘दर्पण’ as has been imagined by Śrīrāma Śāstry. Therefore, to say that ‘Pañcapādi’ is the name of the book currently available, that it is authored by Padmapāda, that it came to be known as Pañcapādikā only after ŚaṅkaraVijayas called it by that name, and that it has a second part called ‘vṛtti’, all these become a chain of baseless imaginations.

Another *Mādhava*’s story imagined with an intention of praising the high intellect of the Ācārya has to be grouped with this. When king Rājaśekhara of Kerala, talented in poetic skill, came to meet the Ācārya, the latter enquired him whether his three dramas became famous. The king replied that they were accidentally destroyed by fire. Then Śaṅkarācārya dictated them from his memory and the king was stunned with wonder (Ma. Śam. 14. 171-173). The reader has to recall that when Śaṅkara was a young brahmacāri, he had read the three dramas of this king (page \*65). When the Ācārya could recall

those dramas which were once seen so many years back, what wonder is there that he could recall Padmapāda's work seen recently at Śrīṅgeri? - this might be the intention of poet *Mādhava*. But he has forgotten to imagine an answer to the possible question: why Padmapāda had read only the five sections of his work ('Pañcapādikā') before the Ācārya? and why not the latter 'vṛtti' part? He has also not mentioned what are these dramas of king Rājaśekhara. It is said that the belief of the scholars of Kerala is - 'बालरामायण', 'बालभारत', 'कर्पूरमञ्जरी' are these three dramas. But *Baladeva Upādhyāya* writes in a footnote (Bala. Śam. p 104) that the poet Rājaśekhara was a *Yāyāva* brahmin; his native was *Vidarbha*; and his workplace was *Kanyākubja*; and it is absurd to guess that he was a Keralite. Till it is established that there was a poet with this name, who was a king in Kerala at the time of Ācārya, all this recall story of the three dramas would just remain an imagination of poet *Mādhava*.



## 14. Ācārya's Devotion to His Mother

### Mother's Liberation

118. Now let us summarize the details of Ācārya's travel in Kerala as in *Mādhavīya*. Śaṅkara, who arrived by arial route, came to his mother and consoled her. Feeling very happy at heart, she said, 'It is good that you have come, my dear. I cannot continue to live in this body any more. Now you carry out the rites according to Śāstras and send me to the abode of merits. Meaning all good to her, the Ācārya instructed her into Brahman the attributeless, distinctionless Ultimate Principle. But she could not comprehend it. Then the Ācārya worshipped Śiva by *Śivabhujangaprayāta Stotra* of fourteen ślokas commencing with 'अनाद्यन्तमाद्यं परं तत्त्वमर्थं चिदाकारमेकं तुरीयं त्वमेयम् । हरिब्रह्ममृग्यं परब्रह्मरूपं मनोवागतीतं महःशैवमीडे ॥' (वृत्तैर्भुजङ्गोपपदैः, Ma. Śam. 14. 37). Śiva was pleased and He sent his servants. Seeing them holding tridents and bows, she said that she would not like to go with them to Śiva's abode. The Ācārya politely sent them back and sang the glories of Viṣṇu. It is not clear what was this *Stotra*. But *Mādhava* has described Viṣṇu as follows:

भुजगाधिपभोगतल्पभाजं कमलाङ्कस्थलकल्पिताङ्घ्रिपद्मम् ।

अभिवीजितमादरेण नीलावसुधाभ्यां चलमानचामराभ्याम् ॥ ३९ ॥

विहिताञ्जलिना निषेव्यमाणं विनतानन्दकृताऽग्रतो रथेन ।

धृतमूर्तिभिरस्त्रदेवताभिः परितः पञ्चभिरञ्जितोपकण्ठम् ॥ ४० ॥

महनीयतमालकोमलाङ्गं मुकुटे रत्नचयं महार्हयुक्तम् ।

शिशिरेतरभानुशीलिताग्रं हरिनीलोपलभूधरं हसन्तम् ॥ ४१ ॥

We do not know from which *Stotra* this is excerpted. Holding fast in her heart the image of Viṣṇu thus described by the Ācārya and thinking of Him only at her last moment, she gave up her body. Then the servants of Viṣṇu came with the plane, and with them she followed the path of Gods and reached the supreme abode. (Ma. Śam. 14. 42-45).

According to *Vyāsācalīya*, the Ācārya came to Kerala immediately after Sanandana became his disciple. Ācārya's mother could not comprehend the *Nirguṇavidyā* taught by him; so he described the form of Viṣṇu; meditating on that, the mother gave up her body (Vyā. Śam. 4. 94-99). There is no mention of the terrifying forms of servants of Śiva.

We have already mentioned that according to *Cidvilāsīya*, the Ācārya came to Kerala directly from Govinda Bhagavatpāda and carried out her funeral rites (page \*112). Śaṅkara's teaching of *Nirguṇavidyā* is not there, but his worshipping Śiva through *Śivabhujangaprayāta* is mentioned. It is also mentioned that he prayed Viṣṇu through *Viṣṇubhujanga prayāta*, and that Aryāmbika went to the abode of Viṣṇu, the *Vaikunṭha*, alongwith the servants of Viṣṇu (Ci. Śam. 10. 43-47).

Regarding Śaṅkara's serving his mother, we have to consider the following points:

(1) When was the demise of Śaṅkara's mother? About this, we have already pointed out that there is no unanimity in the ŚaṅkaraVijayas. It appears as if *Mādhava* thought that it would fit in the story if it happened when the Ācārya's work had come to a fulfilment.

(2) Did Śaṅkarācārya teach his mother the *Nirguṇatattva*? No doubt the Ācārya always upheld the teaching that the attributeless

Principle-without-a-second is the ultimate. but he did not press it hard on everyone. Because, in the *Gītābhāṣya*, while commenting on the twelfth chapter, we find the following sentence: 'Since he was very much considerate about the welfare of Arjuna, the Lord has taught him Karma Yoga which involves distinctions, which has no connection with सम्यग्दर्शन, the right vision' (यस्माद्भार्जुनस्य अत्यन्तमेव हितैषी भगवान्, तस्य सम्यग्दर्शनागन्धितं कर्मयोगं भेददृष्टिमन्तमेव उपदिशति । Gi. Bhā. introduction to 12.13). Looking at this sentence, how can it be plausible that the Ācārya tried to teach about the featureless Ultimate Principle to his old mother who had no benefit of any such teaching?

(3) It is certain that *Mādhava* has described a heresay that the Ācārya worshipped Śiva through *Śivabhujangaprayāta Stotra*. Because, the very first *śloka* of that *Stotra* is about the 'attributeless'. When his mother had specifically told him that the attributeless Principle is beyond her comprehension, the Ācārya would not have commenced from that *śloka*. There are some who are steadfast in believing that this is Ācārya's own composition, and on the basis of a reference to 'Paranjyoti' (Shiruttandar), a commander-in-chief of the Pallavas, imagined to be contained in the epithet 'suta-drohiṇaḥ', are trying to fix the Ācārya's time to be later than 7th century A.D. How could they have such divine insight to decide that!

(4) It is difficult to say why the same poet who describes that the parents of Ācārya got their offspring through devotion to Śiva, describes here in a manner that evokes the feeling that Śivaloka is fearful. Would, the servants of Śiva, although holding tridents, bows and the like, appear terrifying to the devotees at the time of their last breath?

(5) There should be the basis of a legend for the description that when the Ācārya worshipped Viṣṇu through *Stotra*, the servants of Viṣṇu appeared and Ācārya's mother gladly followed them to Vaikunṭha. Because, otherwise, all the three - Mādhava, Vyāsācala and Cidvilāsa - could not have brought in Viṣṇustotra in this context. There should be some reason for Cidvilāsa, atleast who had said earlier that Śaṅkara was worshipping *Śivaliṅgam*, to say that. Critics should decide on this.

(6) The departure of Ācārya's mother following the path of Gods, with the servants of Viṣṇu is described by *Mādhava* as follows:

इयमर्चिरहर्वळक्षपक्षान् षडुदङ्माससमानिलार्कचन्द्रान् ।

चपलावरुणेन्द्रधातूलोकान् क्रमशोऽतीत्य परं पदं प्रपेदे ॥ ४५ ॥

'She got salvation after crossing the abodes of *agni, ahas, śukla paksha, uttarāyaṇa, samvatsara, vāyu, surya, candra, brahma* in succession' (Ma. Śam. 14. 45). The divine passage that is described here is discussed in *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Although it is written there as 'vāyum-abdāt' (Ve. Sū. 4. 3. 2), since it is written in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* as 'मासेभ्यो देवलोकं देवलोकदादित्यम्' (Bri. 6. 2. 15), he has concluded that after devaloka, one reaches Vayu. Therefore, the abode 'devaloka' is missing here. More than that, since it is said that she attained 'param padam' after crossing 'dhātṛloka' (abode of Brahma), it is same as saying that Āryāmba was united/merged in para-brahman. This is contradictory to his own words since the Ācārya has concluded that for such of those who worship Viṣṇu with form, there would not be para-brahma prāpti without obtaining Knowledge (Sū. Bhā. 4. 4. 22). This being so, it would be absurd to have written that Āryāmba, who expressly told that she could not comprehend *Nirguṇavidyā*, attained



para-brahman through *saguṇavidyā* alone. Āryāmba had the eligibility for obtaining Knowledge, or she had not; if she had not, it is absurd to say that she attained para-brahman transcending *brahmaloka*. How can it be correct to say that just by meditating on *saguṇabrahma* she obtained *paramapada* that transcended *Brahma loka*?

119. Mādhava writes: *When* the Ācārya attempted to carry out mother's funeral rites by himself, the relatives came down on him asking what right he has to do that (Ma. Śam. 14. 46). When they did not provide fire even upon request, the Ācārya was enraged and cursed them (47). He collected dry firewood, and at the courtyard of the house itself, he burnt her body by the fire brought out by churning of her right arm (48). Then he cursed (the relatives) saying 'henceforth you be outcast from the Vedas; let no *Sannyāsin* accept alms from you; and may it be that you have your cremations in your own courtyards!' It is being practised thus right from that time. Would willfully done wrong doings in the case of the great ever bring about good? (Ma. Śam. 49-51).

It is said that the Ācārya cursed them just for not providing with fire; it is not specifically mentioned that they came in the way of carrying out the funeral rites.

The story depicted in *Cidvilāsīya* is as follows: When his mother was on deathbed, the Ācārya called the brahmins. Since they did not respond, he cursed those offenders of *Sannyāsins*: 'Be you without knowledge hereafterwards! be you engrossed in improper conduct! be you engaged in commerce and agriculture! may your place be unfit for *Sannyāsins*! if any *Sannyāsins* come to you, may they be fallen!' (Ci. Śam. 10. 40-42). Śaṅkara's turning the course of the river *Cūrṇī* so

that it flowed near his mother's house, and the present service to his mother happened while he was studying with *Govinda Bhagavatpāda* - is the opinion of Cidvilāsa (इत्यादि कथयत्येव गोविन्दभगवद्गुरौ, Ci. Śam. 10. 35).

*Mādhava* has given a reason why the Ācārya's curse became causative: Rājaśekhara the king of Kerala, after recovering his three dramas with the help of the Ācārya, prostrated before him and asked 'please order me if there is anything I should do !'. The Ācārya said: 'I have cursed the dwellers of *Kālaḍi* like this; you also do in accordance with this' (Ma. Śam. 14. 173-174).

Let us now review the story of the funeral rites a little:

(1) Could the story of Ācārya cursing the brahmins be true? It is not incredible that the people of *Kālaḍi* brahmin locality obstructed the Ācārya from carrying out his mother's funeral rites; because the scriptures say that *Sannyāsins* are not authorised to do any *karma*. And it is probable that the Ācārya, as per his own word given to his mother, might have carried out the funeral rites. But it is not certain whether the mother had insisted that Ācārya himself should do that. That the authors of Śaṅkara-Vijayas have said so may be with an intention that it will be in accordance with the forthcoming curse story. She might have expressed her anxiety that if her only son becomes a *Sannyāsin*, who will support her living? and who will carry out her funeral rites? It will not be unnatural if the Ācārya had told her that he will give all his father's earnings to the relatives so that they support her till she lived; and promised her that he would be near her at any cost at the time of her death, and that he would be carrying out the last rites. But, when he came as a *Sannyāsin* after a long time, the relatives might not

have volunteered to help him. It appears that this natural course of events has been developed into a curse story.

(2) Did the Ācārya himself carry out the last rites? It is difficult to say for certain. The story that he generated the necessary fire by churning the right arm of his mother's body might have been concocted with an intention of praising his greatness. The authors have not thought whether it is possible to generate fire by churning the right arm of a corpse. 'Just as he took *Sannyāsa* although it was considered prohibited in Kali Yuga, he carried out the last rites of his mother in defiance of the *Dharma Śāstras*', so says Somanāthaiah and opines that it is not proper to (blindly) accept all the *DharmaŚāstras* as authority at all times and places (So. Śam. p 173). We have already pointed out that the Ācārya has not mentioned anywhere in his *Bhāṣyas* about prohibitions in Kali Yuga (page \*194). Even if we agree that the *DharmaŚāstras* could be abridged in relation to time and place, it would neither be helpful nor obstructive to the question of whether a *sannyāsi* could carry out the *karma*. The *DharmaŚāstra* statements also are there which say that taking *Sannyāsa* is permissible until the study of Vedas remain. Therefore any reason in the matter of *Sannyāsa* may not be helpful to say that *Sannyāsis* may engage in *karma*. This being so, we can only say that this subject needs further examination.

(3) Did the Ācārya really curse the brahmins, and did he take the help of the king for its implementation? Seeing the peculiar traditions of Kerala which are not in vogue at other places, someone might have connected Śaṅkara's curse to it. The practice of cremating corpses in one's own courtyard might be long-standing in those areas

where people live in wide fields. It is not special to Kerala that study of scriptures slackened in course of time. Although there are instances of kings executing legislations regarding religious and group practices, unless it is proved beyond doubt that there was a king by name Rājaśekhara - we have already stated that it is debatable - and that Ācārya's fame had spread in that region also to that extent which made him follow his order, it is difficult to believe that he passed legislations accordingly, or that the Ācārya, peace personified, himself went against the *Śāstras* and also cursed the brahmins. That people may doubt why the Ācārya resorted to such practices against *Śāstras*, *Mādhava* writes in support of Ācārya's act:

यद्यप्यशास्त्रीयतया विभाति तेजस्विनां कर्म तथाप्यनिन्द्यम् ।

विनिन्द्यकृत्यं किल भार्गवस्य ददुः सुपुत्रान् कतिचिद् वृकाय ॥

'Although the act of illustrious seem to go against *Śāstras*, it is not censurable. Did not Paraśurāma kill his own mother? And some ṛiṣis gave up their own children to a wolf!' (Ma. Śam. 14. 53). It is appropriate to say that this matter of Ācārya performing the last rites and his curse still remain for further consideration.

On the whole, everyone agrees that the Ācārya arrived from a very long distance just at the right time when his mother was on her deathbed. Certainly that serves as an example for his unparalleled devotion to his mother.



## 15. Ācārya's Nationwide Conquest

### From Śrīṅgeri to Kāñci

120. Now the Ācārya had the resolve to spread his school of (Advaitic) thought throughout the Indian continent (Ma. Śam. 14. 15). First he went to Rāmasetu (Rāmeśwaram) with king Sudhanva, followed by a thousand disciples. There he had debate with the Śāktas. Having converted those people towards the path of *karma*, and having offered worship to Rāmanātha, brought under his control the Pāṇḍyas, Colas and Drāviḍas; and went to Kāñci, which was like the belt of Hastigiri (Ma. Śam. 15. 1-4). There, he drove away the *Tāntrikas*, built a temple to Bhagavati Kamākṣi with a picture that was 'paravidyācaraṇānusārī' (?) and arranged for the daily worship of Kamākṣi, in accordance with Śruti (Ma. Śam. 15. 5).

According to *Cidvilāsīya*, Śaṅkarācārya visited the holy waters of *Varāha Parvata*, the origin of the river Tungabhadra, and obtaining a direct vision of Narasimha at *Narasimha Parvata*, and below that mountain had darśana of Lord *Ṛshyaśrīṅga Maheśwara*. Having sought His directions, he proceeded to Kāñci, the capital of *Varadarāja*. This is the place where Brahma performed a sacrifice to please Viṣṇu, and where Viṣṇu came out of the sacrificial fire and appeared before him. Rudra Śakti, of *saguṇa* as well as *nirguṇa* form, dwells in a cave nearby there. The Ācārya wanted to have a township built at that place. The local king Rājasena, as per the wishes of the Ācārya, built *Ekāmreśwara* temple just besides the Kamākṣi

temple and constructed Śiva Kāñci, and alongwith the Varadarāja temple Viṣṇu Kāñci within just eight days (Ci. Śam. 25. 1-11; 28-31). The Ācārya himself wrote Śrī Cakra, and behind that established Goddess Kamākṣi; and arranged for the worship in the temples of Ekāmreśwara and Varadarāja (Ci. Śam. 25. 44-55).

According to Ānandagirīya, the Ācārya went to Ahobila, a place where Lord Narasimha had manifested, sang the glories of the Lord; and from there proceeded to Venkaṭagiri. Having converted the priests there into Advaitic school of thought, he went to Kāñci. There is Lord Ekāmresha, manifested from out of a figure of earth, in the form of a *Lingam*. He stayed there for a month, laid the foundation and constructed the town Śiva Kāñci; and to the east of it, near the place where Lord Varadarāja who had appeared from the sacrificial altar of Brahma's sacrifice, raised the town Viṣṇu Kāñci. Having appointed devoted Brahmins and others for the worship in these temples, and having made them followers of pure Advaita, he happily stayed there dwelling in the essence of all Vedānta. (Ā. Śam. 63, p 225; De. p 192). Here, the story of Kamākṣi is covered in Chapter 64 and that of Śrī Cakra in Chapter 65).

### **Review of the travel upto Kāñci**

121. The details of travel upto this point are not similar in the different ŚaṅkaraVijayas. (1) The Ācārya going with king Sudhanva and a thousand disciples (Ma. Śam. 15. 1) is not there in any other ŚaṅkaraVijaya. (2) It is not certain that he argued with the Śākteyas at Rāmasetu. (3) We do not know for certain whether the deity at Kāñci is Ekāmra or

Ekāmbara<sup>1</sup> ; Somanāthaiah's guess (So. Śam. p 177) is that Ekāmra is colloquial form of Ekāmbara. It seems there is a heresay that the mango tree at the Ekāmreśwara temple vicinity is a *Vedavrksha* and since a fruit was daily available from that tree for God's offering, the "Lingam was named as *Ekāmreśwara*! (So. Śam. p 177).

(4) *Mādhava*'s description of Kāñci to be situated on Hastigiri might have suited him for metaphorizing and for alliteration, but there is no mountain in that area. Somanāthaiah's guess is that he might have written that on hearing Vaiṣṇavas say *VaradarājaSwāmi* temple is on Hastigiri or Karigiri (So. Śam. p 176). Since worship of Kamākṣi at Śiva Kāñci is going on even now, we can believe that the Ācārya refined and rectified the *Tantric* worship that was going on earlier.

(5) Cidvilāsa is very much inclined towards Śrī Cakra. Even while describing Kāñci he gives its details in eight *ślokas* ending with 'तस्मान्मुमुक्षुभिः कार्यं श्रीचक्रार्चनमन्वहम् । शिवशक्त्यैकरूपत्वात्निर्मितं देशिकेन तत् ॥' (Therefore, everyone desirous of liberation must worship Śrī Cakra. The Guru has prescribed that to drive home the identity of Śiva and Śakti) (Ci. Śam. 25. 43). By this we can guess that there was much animosity between followers of Śiva and the followers of Śakti in this area, and that the Ācārya, or someone after his time must have convinced them about the identity of Śiva and Śakti and stopped the fighting. In *Ānandagiriya*, Kamākṣi is described as 'भगवती चिद्रूपिणी ब्रह्मविद्या रुद्रशक्तिः', (p 229; De. p 194) and 'शैवानामपि शाक्तानां चक्राणां च परस्परम् । अविनाभावसम्बन्धं यो जानाति स सर्ववित् ॥' (p 230; 'चक्रवित्', De. p

1. It is mentioned as Ekāmresha in Telugu book (p 225). In Devanāgarī version it is mentioned as Ambaresha (p 132). In Somanāthaiah's book it is Ekāmbaresha!

196). Since it is found in *Cidvilāsīya* also (Ci. Śam. 25. 40), Cidvilāsa must have taken it from *Ānandagiriya*; or both of them might have taken it from some other source. *Mādhava* too, in the context of the Ācārya worshipping Goddess Mūkāmbika in the 12th Canto says about Śrī Cakra: ‘श्रीचक्रषट्चक्रकयोः पुरोऽथ श्रीचक्रमन्वोरपि चिन्तितैक्यम्’; the commentator being fond of citing from *Ānandagiriya*, has added eight *ślokas*; among those the present ‘शैवानामपि शाक्तानां’ *śloka* is also there.

(6) Did Ācārya, as mentioned by *Ānandagiri* and Cidvilāsa, built the two townships ŚivaKāñci and ViṣṇuKāñci? In the South, Kāñci is a great centre of learning in which lots of argumentations were held incessantly between Brahmins and Buddhists, Buddhists and Jains, Jains and Brahmins, Viśiṣṭādvaitins and Advaitins, followers of *Tenkalai* and *Vadakalai* traditions. It appears that the temples here have marks indicating that they were constructed by the Pal-lavas. In the outskirts of this place are found remnants of *lingams*, *lingam-pedestals*, holy bulls etc. which bear witness that Shaivism had spread here earlier. ŚivaKāñci (also called bigger Kāñci) and ViṣṇuKāñci (also called smaller Kāñci) are about four miles apart. In between there was a forest; the Hudsonpet existing now must have been there since about a hundred and fifty years. The town must have been bigger towards ŚivaKāñci. On the inscriptions found here one commonly finds the name “Kāñci” only and not “ŚivaKāñci”; and on the inscriptions found at ViṣṇuKāñci, not even the name “Kāñci” is seen. It seems this place was known as ‘Thiruvattiyur’ earlier, till about Shālivāhana Śaka 1492. The main gate of Varadarāja Temple is facing west, and has a small tower on it. The *sanctum sanctorum*



and the image of the deity are located on a high pedestal, facing east. Opposite to these, on the eastern outskirts, there is another main gate with a very high tower called “*punyakoti vimānam*”. With walls constructed all around the high pedestal, it is said that the mountain **hastigiri** (?) is located under it. On the basis of “Topographical Notes on Kāñci by the late S. M. Natesha Śāstriar (1886), Somanāthaiah has written a plausible guesswork (So. Śam. p 181). According to this, when the temple was constructed, it perhaps was facing east; and the town Tiruvattiyur also was located east of the temple; and when the town was ruined in course of time, perhaps the worship at the temple came to a standstill. Later, *Śrivaishṇavas* rejuvenated the temple from the ruins, and perhaps walls were built around the inner *sanctum sanctorum* which was closed and on the top of it was constructed the new *sanctum sanctorum* in which the idol of Varadarāja Swāmi was established. Later, since a new township developed on the west, and since the main gate of the temple was facing away from the town, to facilitate entry for people of the town, probably the western compound wall of the temple was demolished, and a main gate and on the top of it a high tower were constructed. Afterwards, when the town gained prominence, because of Śrī Rāmānujācārya a new township came to existence, and since the Viṣṇu temple became important and the *Śrivaishṇavas* were leading, it was named ViṣṇuKāñci. The old name *Thiru-atti-ooru* was perhaps sanskritized as Śrī-hasti-giri. We have also visited both the *Kāñcis*; but we came to know the reason for the peculiarity in the construction of Viṣṇu temple only from Somanāthaiah.

In view of the description given above, Somanāthaiah's opinion

(So. Śam. p 182) that both *Ānandagiri* and *Cidvilāsa* must have written their ŚaṅkaraVijayas after the name ViṣṇuKāñci came to be well-known, seems to be reliable.

### Ācārya's visit to Venkaṭagiri

122. *Mādhava* describes that the Ācārya blessed the Andhra devotees who had come to render their services, and, after prostrating before Venkaṭācaleśwara, proceeded to the capital of Vidarbha (Ma. Śam. 15. 6).

In *Cidvilāsīya*, the description is as follows: The Ācārya, who proceeded alongwith his disciples to see Lord Venkaṭeśa, prostrated before Lord Govindarājeśwara, climbed the mountain, took his bath in the *puṣkaraṇi* (pond), worshipped Lord Venkaṭeśwara. Since the priests there had given up the *Shroutamārga* (path of Śruti) and had been following the tradition of Vaikhānasaagama<sup>1</sup>, converted them to pure Advaitic path. We have already mentioned *Ānandagiri's* description that the Ācārya had gone to Venkaṭagiri and then proceeded to Kāñci (p \*284).

The points that we have to note here are:

(1) If what *Ānandagiri* considers as Venkaṭagiri is Venkaṭācala itself, we have to say that he did not know the location of the place exactly.

(2) Although now the Lord of *Tirupati* is known as *Venkaṭaramaṇa*, it was not like that before. The *Purāṇas* call the *Tirupati* mountain as *Śeshādri*. The *Śaiva Purāṇas* like *Skānda* mention that there is a place

---

1. It is evident from their books on *Dharmasūtras* that the Vaikhānasaas are Advaitic. This has been explained in detail in the article "the aim of Vaikhānasaas" (See *Adhyātmaprakāśha*, Vol. 10, Issue 5, p 63).

called *Kapileshakshetra*<sup>1</sup> on the precincts of Śeshādri. An image on that mountain was known as *Jinamuni* when the Jainism was going strong, and during the time of the Śaivas was known as *Bhairava*. At the time of Śrī Rāmānujācārya, since there was difference of opinion between the Jains and the Shaivites, it seems Rāmānuja suggested a way to sort out the problem. Conch and Disc, Trisul and Damaru were to be prepared in gold and kept near the idol at the close of the day, the temple door to be shut, locked and sealed; and in the morning upon opening, whatever weapons were found on the idol, it would be decided as Śiva or Viṣṇu accordingly; if no weapon was found on the idol, it would be decided as *Jinamuni*. When this plan was carried out, and upon seeing in the morning, the idol was found to be bearing Conch and Disc; hence it was decided that it was the image of Viṣṇu (So. Śam. p 183-184). Even now, there is no opportunity for people to determine how the idol really looks; hence the proverb '*loguttu perumalake telusanu*' (Lord only knows the inner secret). The history of the place being so, the story that Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda, who was several centuries earlier than Rāmānuja, converted the priests of Lord Venkaṭarama into Advaita does not seem to be probable. We know from *Vaikhānasa Sūtra* that they were Advaitins who were Vaiṣṇavaitees. Without knowing this, probably just by seeing that the Vaikhānasas bearing the *Nāmam* (emblems of Vaishnavism), Cidvilāsa might have written like that.

---

1. At the foot of the mountain there is **kapila Tīrtha**. The whereabouts of *Kapileśwara lingam* is not known. In 9th Chapter of Skānda Mahāpurāṇa, it is stated that a *Shudra* by name Rangadāsa of *Pāṇḍya* kingdom served Śrīnivāsa at *Kapilesha Kshetra* on the Śeshādri: 'शनैः सम्प्राप्य शेषाद्रिं निर्झरं सन्ददर्श ह । तत्समीपं समासाद्य कपिलापूजितं शिवम् ॥'.

(3) Also the statement that the Ācārya prostrated before Lord *Govinda Rājeśwara* is similarly unreliable. 'From the works of a Śaivaite devotee *Maanikkavācahar* we come to know that the idol of Govindarāja was earlier in the precincts of Kanakasabhāpati temple at Cidambaram. When the animosity between the Śaivaites and Vaiṣṇavaitees became strong, the Govindarāja temple was demolished and the idol was "sent to the abode of Viṣṇu", i.e., it was thrown into the sea. Since that was found at the time of Rāmānuja, it was consequently established at Tirupati', - writes Somanāthaiah on the basis of *Śrī Rāmānujācārya's Life*, a book by S. Kṛṣṇaswāmi Iyengar, pp 47-49 (So. Śam. p 185). We remember to have seen the same details in *History of South India*, an English book by the same Iyengar. When the history being so, how could Śaṅkara have prostrated before Govindarāja?

### Winning over the Kāpālikas in Karṇāṭaka

123. As stated earlier, the Ācārya started from Tirupati to the capital of Vidarbha. From there, he proceeded to win over the *Kāpālikas* that were dominant in Karṇāṭaka. The king of Vidarbha warned him that 'the *Kāpālikas* are in large numbers, and they would not tolerate your being famous; they hate *Śrutis*. Please beware of the lurking danger there'. King Sudhanva promised him that 'as long as I am with you, there would never be any danger', and accompanied the Ācārya. There was a *Kāpāli* by name *Krakaca*, who was bearing *kapāla*, *trishul* and smears of *citābhasma* on his body. He came before the Ācārya and boasted of the greatness of his inauspicious practices and his school of thought. Sudhanva got his officers to drive him

away from his court. Then he came with his army to kill the Ācārya, and Sudhanva got ready for the battle. The brahmins terrified by the army of *Krakaca* sought protection from the Ācārya. The Ācārya, just by uttering 'Hum' burnt all of them into ashes. *Krakaca*, standing before the Ācārya, saying 'O follower of a bad school of thought, get the fruition of your deed!' and closing his eyes, held his *kapāla* full of liquor, meditated on Lord Kāpāli; then Bhairava appeared and said 'you are committing such a sin with regard to Me who is in the form of Śaṅkarācārya!' and cut off his head instantaneously (Ma. Śam. 15. 6-26).

This story is not there in other ŚaṅkaraVijayas. (1) May be in poet *Mādhava's* time the *Kāpālikas* were dominating or may be he had heard much about the menace that they were creating; that is why, although he had already told that the *Kāpālikas* suffered defeat at Śrī Śaila, he has told a story about them once again here.

(2) We have already indicated (page \*132) that nothing is discernable about who this Sudhanva was. How could he be a follower of the Vedic school of thought from Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's time to the time of Ācārya's nationwide conquest? How he came to get himself interested in Vedānta? The poet has told none of these things, not even why he accompanied the Ācārya in his conquest.

(3) Where is Vidarbha country? Is this today's Bīrār area? From here did the Ācārya proceed towards north or south? To what extent was Karṇāṭaka area spread in those times? These things are to be ascertained on the basis of history before we could decide about the truth of this *Kāpālika* incident.

Somewhat similar is the description of this incident by Cidvilāsa, but he narrates as if it took place at Rāmeśwaram. He writes: 'the

*Kāpālikas* met the Ācārya there, who had arrived from *Madhyārjuna*. There was king Bhojasimha behind the Ācārya. The *Kāpālika* and his disciples were talking at will, and the king thrashed them. When the *Kāpālika* meditated on Bhairava, the Lord appeared, and, pleased by Śaṅkara's Stotra, said "you are revered; knowing that you had arrived here, I have come. Now you punish these!" and disappeared. The Ācārya cursed them saying "You wretched brahmins! Be outcast from all *karmas*!" (Ci. Śam. 27th Chapter). Which is to be believed to be true - *Mādhava's* story or Cidvilāsa's? Whom did the Ācārya win over at Rāmeśwara - is it *Śāktas* as *Mādhava* says, or is it *Kāpālikas* as Cidvilāsa says? Who is the leader of *Kāpālikas* - is it *Krakaca* or *Vaṭukanātha*? Was he killed by Bhairava as *Mādhava* has said, or as per his instructions, the Ācārya cursed them?

### Winning over Nīlakanṭhācārya at Gokaṛṇa

124. Thus the Ācārya went on travelling, refuting heretic brahmins on the way, and reached the western seashore at Gokaṛṇa. There he took bath in the sea, and worshipped Śiva by *Bhujangaprayāta Stotras*. Hearing that he teaches Vedānta to the disciples who come to him, Haradatta informed his preceptor Nīlakanṭhācārya that Śaṅkarācārya, who had refuted Bhaṭṭa, Maṇḍana etc. is coming. Chuckling at what he heard, Nīlakanṭha said, 'it might be that one can dry the sea, fell the Sun from the sky, or the sky can be wrapped and folded, but I cannot be won over by this man'. When he came to Ācārya, *Sureśwarācārya* started the argumentation first. Then Nīlakanṭhācārya argued with Śaṅkarācārya. Won over by him, Nīlakanṭha surrendered and became Ācārya's disciple. Hearing this, poet

Udayana and others shuddered (Ma. Śam. 15. 31-72).

Now let us try to evaluate this story: (1) The story of Ācārya's visiting Gokarṇa is also there in *Cidvilāsīya* (Ci. Śam.29. 30). But about his worshipping Śiva through *Bhujangaprayāta Stotra* or refuting Nīlakanṭhācārya, nothing is mentioned. *Mādhava* had once stated that Śaṅkara composed that Stotra for the sake of his mother; why he mentions that here once again? Or, does he imply that there are two such Śiva Stotras?

(2) There is neither any external (circumstantial) evidence nor any indication within *Bhāṣyas* for the existence of *Viśiṣṭādvaita* philosophy at the time of Ācārya. All his opponents were Advaita Vedāntins. There is no consideration of other Vedāntins in his works. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* has this sentence: 'सर्वोपनिषत्सु हि विज्ञानात्मनः परमात्मना एकत्वप्रत्ययो विधीयते इत्यविप्रतिपत्तिः सर्वेषामुपनिषद्वादिनाम् ।' (Bṛ. Bhā. 2. 1. 20). (There is no difference of opinion among the followers of Upaniṣads, that identity is stated between *Vijñānātma* and *Paramātma* in all Upaniṣads). How over-hasty to imagine that Śaṅkara, who has written thus, argued with a *Viśiṣṭādvaitin*!

(3) It is true that Nīlakanṭhācārya has written a *Bhāṣya* on the *Sūtras*. But there is reason to believe that he has written the *Bhāṣya* only after Rāmānujācārya. Some Śrivaishṇavas opine that he has stolen material from writings of Rāmānuja. Appayya deekshita, who has written a commentary "*Śivārkamaṇi Deepika*" on Nīlakanṭha's *Bhāṣya*, has strived to point out the speciality of it over Rāmānuja's *Bhāṣya*. Rāmānuja has never considered it for criticism. This being so, it is not probable that Śaṅkarācārya could have had a debate with the author of this new *Bhāṣya*.

(4) Nīlakaṇṭha's *Bhāṣya* is not as elaborate as Rāmānuja's *Bhāṣya*. He has only summarized the various tenets, but not attempted to refute other schools of thought by using logic. With this background it is difficult to believe that Nīlakaṇṭhācārya boasted of himself as *Mādhava* describes, and that he had posed the various clever arguments against Advaita. When there is no reference to *Viśiṣṭādvaita* in either Ācārya's *Bhāṣya* or Sureśvara's *Vārtika*, how it is possible to believe that both of them argued with this Nīlakaṇṭhācārya?

(5) It is true that Haradatta is a famous Śaiva Ācārya. But, did either he or Nīlakaṇṭhācārya have any relation with Gokaṇṭha? And to say that he was a disciple of Nīlakaṇṭha Śivācārya, is there any other source except *Mādhava's* opinion? All these need investigation.

### Dwārakā, Ujjayini

125. Leaving Gokaṇṭha, the Ācārya travelled further, and carrying out propaganda of his *Bhāṣyas* in Sourāṣṭra and other countries, arrived at Dwārakā. There he won over Pāñcarātras who were professing 'five differences'. Thus winning over Vaiṣṇavas, Śaivas, Śāktas, Souras etc., he went to Ujjayini. There he refuted BhattaBhāskara who was professing *Bhedābheda* theory, and also Bāna, Mayūra, Daṇḍi and others (Ma. Śam. 15. 73-141).

Now we can review this statement. (1) *Mādhava* has not mentioned that the Ācārya established a Maṭha at Dwārakā; we have already pointed out that he has not said anything about the Maṭha at Śringeri also. Cidvilāsa has stated that the Ācārya established a Maṭha there and made Hastāmalaka in charge of that (Ci. Śam. 31. 5). Cidvilāsa also states that he established Sureśwarācārya at



Śringeri Pīṭha (Ci. Śam. 24. 33).

Cidvilāsa writes that the Ācārya went from Rāmeśwaram to Vakratuṇḍapuri and won over the Gāṇāpatyas there (Ci. Śam.28). He opines that the Ācārya went from there to Madurai and visited Mīnākshi and Sundaresha (Ci. Śam. 28. 21-22). Just as *Ānandagiri* (Chaps. 6-10), Cidvilāsa also states that he proceeded from there to Anantaśayana and won over the Vaiṣṇavas of different types - Bhakta, Bhāgavata, Vaiṣṇava, Pāncharātra, Vaikhānasa and Karmahīna (Ci. Śam. 24. 30-89)<sup>1</sup>. Further, he worshipped Kārtikeya at Vāsukikshetra (Ci. Śam. 29. 5). Then he won over Buddhists in argumentation at Mṛḍapuri (Ci. Śam. 39. 9-29). From there he proceeded to Gokaṛṇa and then to Śrīśaila. After visiting Jogulāmba, Bagalāmba, Jwalāmukhi, Nṛsimhesha and Pāṇḍurangesha, he came to Jagannatha. There he established a Maṭha and made Padmapāda the pontiff of that Pīṭha (Ci. Śam. 30. 10-11). Then he came along with Hastāmalaka and Toṭaka to Ujjayini. There he visited Lord Mahākāleśwara, won over Śāktas in argumentation and made them Advaitins. Continuing his journey he came to Dwārakā, established a Maṭha there, and made Hastāmalaka the pontiff of the Pīṭha (Ci. Śam. 30. 15-55; 31. 3-6)<sup>2</sup>.

(2) If we compare the *digvijaya* given by Cidvilāsa, we will come to understand that according to Cidvilāsa, the Ācārya went from Ujjayini to Dwārakā; and according to *Mādhava*, he went first to Dwārakā

1. Although Cidvilāsa is an Advaitin, he primely upholds Śiva in his argumentation. We have indicated that here so that it might be helpful to decide about the date of his work.

2. About Dwārakā, *Ānandagiriya* mentions only: 'द्वारकादिदिव्यस्थलविलोकनवशात्'. (p 210). There is no mention of Maṭha.

and then came to Ujjayini. Cidvilāsa says that the Ācārya defeated Śāktas at Ujjayini; *Mādhava* says he did that at setu, and won over BhattaBhāskara at Ujjayini. *Ānandagiri* says that the Ācārya defeated *Kāpālikas* at Ujjayini (Chap. 23); but Cidvilāsa makes them defeated at Rāmeśwaram and shifts Śāktas over here! We can observe that the *Kāpālika* account of Cidvilāsa is closely similar to that given by *Ānandagiri*.

(3) One has to cross river Narmadā while going to Dwārakā; when the Ācārya went over there, did he meet Govinda Bhagavatpāda? Or, had he already attained *Siddhi* at that time? No author has said anything about this.

(4) May be since it had already been narrated, Cidvilāsa does not mention the story of the Ācārya winning over *Pāñcarātras* at Dwārakā. But *Mādhava* describes it in full detail as having taken place there. Since Dwārakā is the abode of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, we can guess that *Pāñcarātras* could have been there. But, *Mādhava*'s description 'शतशः समवेत्य पाञ्चरात्रास्त्वमृतं पञ्चभिदां वदन्तः' (the *Pāñcarātras* professing the five types of differences were defeated by the Ācārya) (Ma. Śam. 15. 75) does not suit the real state of affairs. Because, in the description of *Pāñcharātra* creed given in Nārāyaṇīya of Mahābhārata, we do not find any mention of Pañcabheda. What is stated there is 'निर्गुणं निर्गुणा भूत्वा प्रविशन्ति सनातनम्' (having become attributeless themselves, the devotees become one with the attributeless Lord) (350-72); this kind of thought cannot be the one professing Pañcabheda! Even in *Sūtrabhāṣya* of Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda, while referring to the *Bhāgavata* creed, it is mentioned that 'Lord Vāsudeva Himself is the Ultimate Principle; and whoever worships Him throughout

their lives will become one with Him'. Thus, it becomes clear that only after *Pāñcarātras* came to profess the 'five types of differences' the *Mādhavīya* must have come to existence. Since Cidvilāsa has also adopted the import of the *śloka* cited by Anantānandagiri 'भक्ता भागवताश्चैव वैष्णवाचारचक्रिणः । वैखानसाः कर्महीनाः षड्विधाश्चैव वैष्णवाः' (Chap. 6 p 45; De. p 42), it is clear that both of them should have written their Śaṅkara Vijayas only after the *Bhāgavata* creed broke into the sub-creeds.

(5) The story of Ācārya winning over BhattaBhāskara is of a similar type as his winning over Nīlakanṭhācārya. Because, the poet (*Mādhava*) does not know that BhattaBhāskara, who has written *Vedabhāṣya* is different from Bhāskarācārya of *Bhedābheda* school of thought. Since Bhāskarācārya is more recent than the Ācārya, he has refuted not only the *Bhāṣya* but also *Pañcapādikā* here and there in his writings. Since Vācaspati Miśra's *Bhāmatī* contains refutations of the opinions of Bhāskarācārya, his time must be in between Śaṅkara's time and Vācaspati Miśra's time. This being so, how can we believe that the Ācārya had an argumentation with Bhāskarācārya? Because of the unbelievable nature of these stories, we have not presented what Mādhava describes as *prima facie* views of Nīlakanṭha or Bhāskarācārya, or the Ācārya's refutations of them.

(6) The imagination that Bāna, Mayūra, Daṇḍi etc. were Ācārya's contemporaries (Ma. Śam. 15. 141) being historically untenable, we need not at all comment on that. What could be the basis for *Mādhava* to say that they became interested to listen to Ācārya's *Bhāṣyas* ('निजभाष्यश्रवणोत्सुकांश्चकार') is only known to him.

## Defeat of the Arhatas at Bāhlika and of the others at Naimisha

126. When the Ācārya was in Bāhlika country teaching *Bhāṣya* to the disciples, some Arhatas came there, and were defeated in argumentation (Ma. Śam. 15. 142-155). Did the Ācārya go directly to that country, which is in northwest India? - is a point to be considered. Cidvilāsa has stated that the defeat of the Arhatas took place at Mṛḍapuri. He has written as if there is no difference between the Arhatas and Sougatas; and he has not dealt with either true Buddhism or true Jainism (Ci. Śam. 29. 9-29). He has written there that the Ācārya had positioned them with the work of caring for the footwear of the disciples, which is certainly contemptible. Presently, *Mādhava* has depicted correctly the beliefs of the Arhatas; but in the end he says:

‘इति माध्यमिकेषु भग्नदर्पेष्वथ भाष्याणि स नैमिषे वितत्य ।

दरदान् भरतांश्च शूरसेनान्कुरुपाञ्चालमुखान् बहूनजैषीत् ॥ (Ma. Śam. 15. 156)

‘Thus, after refuting the Mādhyamikas, the Ācārya spread the *Bhāṣya* at Naimisha also. He conquered the Daradas, Bharatas, Shūrasenas, Kurupāncālas and others’. This is a little out of the way, because the Arhatas are not Mādhyamikas; the Mādhyamikas are nihilists among the Buddhists!

Without telling who are these Daradas etc. and what is their line of thought, simply telling ‘conquered many people’ indicates that *Mādhava*’s purpose is only to describe that the Ācārya went to all corners of India and conquered all in argumentation - without which the poetry would not be complete and beautiful. The next *śloka* too is writ-

ten with this purpose only:

‘पटुयुक्तिनिकृत्तसर्वशास्त्रं गुरुभट्टोदयनादिकैरजय्यम् ।

स हि खण्डनकारमूढदर्पं बहुधा व्युद्य वशंवदं चकार ॥ (Ma. Śam. 15. 157)

because, to say ‘the *Khaṇḍanakāra* (author of the work *Khaṇḍana*) could not be won over even by Guru, Bhaṭṭa and Udayana’ - first of all, they are not at all contemporaries. Even if we assume the opinion that the followers of these people were unable to win over the *Khaṇḍanakāra*, it is ridiculous to say that ‘the Ācārya had to argue at length to take him into his fold’. Śri Harsha, the author of the treatise *Khaṇḍana Khaṇḍa Khādyā* belongs to a period later than that of Ācārya; devoted to him as he was, he wrote the treatise only to present a certain kind of logic for establishing Ācārya’s conclusions. *Mādhava*, without taking pains to look at the work *Khaṇḍana Khaṇḍa Khādyā*, and relying on heresay has written that the Ācārya won over him! This is a strong evidence indicating that *Mādhava* may not be the same as *Vidyāraṇya*.

### Abinavagupta in Kāmarūpa

127. Then the Ācārya proceeded to Kāmarūpa country. He won over Abhinavagupta, the author of *Śāktabhāṣya*. Realizing that it is impossible to defeat him by any other means, he was posing externally as if he were a disciple of the Ācārya. The reputation of Ācārya’s success spread in Videha, Kosala, Anga, Vanga countries. Later the Ācārya defeated Murāri Mīśra, Udayana, Dharmagupta etc. and spread his triumph in Gauḍa country also. Thus, having made *Dvaita* not to be heard in all quarters, he was solving all kinds of doubts raised by people (Ma. Śam. 15. - summary from 158 to the end of the Canto).

It is clear that the author's intention is only to impress that the Ācārya won over all. Hence, not even considering historical times, he has collected everyone to be won over by the Ācārya. Kāmarupa is an important city of Assam; although it is true that *Tāntrikas* are there, Abhinava Gupta does not belong to this part of the country. He is a famous Shaivācārya of Kāśmīr - the author of several works including *Tantrāloka*, *Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī*, *Paramārthasāra* etc. Having made him the author of *Śāktabhāṣya* which has not yet been discovered, and to have made him - he is later than Ācārya by four-five centuries - a contemporary of the Ācārya is the great feat of this poet!

### Summary of the Conquest

128. In general, the purpose of the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas appears to be to blow the trumpet of his conquest of stalwarts of all schools of thought, followers of all creeds, throughout the country by way of describing his itinerary in all directions. It is, therefore natural they have imagined that he travelled through several imaginary places and to have won over several people who were not his contemporaries. We have hitherto been following *Mādhavīya* for describing the places he visited and for the people he is purported to have defeated, only for the sake of convenience of presentation.

In the previous pages we have made occasional mention of the description of Ācārya's conquest as mentioned in *Cidvilāśīya* and *Ānandagirīya*. We had not covered there his refuting *Soura* school of thought at Cidambaram (Ci. Śam. 26. 11-32), conversion of the priests of deities Devi, Gaṇapati, Śiva, Sūrya and Viṣṇu into Advaita at the place Madhyārjuna, worshipping Rāmeśvara by giving

holy bath of Ganga and defeating Vaiṣṇavaite Viṣṇuśarma, Padmanābha, Kriṣṇa-Dvaipāyana, Vyāsadāsa, Varāhācārya etc., and at Ujjayini the Śāktas Tripurāmbākumara, Bindubhuk, Pūrṇabodhaka, Pūrṇānanda, Virashākta, Śuddhavidyākālānidhi etc. After leaving Dwārāvati, the Ācārya visited Mathurā, Gokula, Paundarika Kshetra and Kurukshetra.

In the description of these conquests, the important points we can decipher are: (1) By and large, the Ācārya travelled in a sequence of pilgrimage; (2) It appears the Maṭhas at the four places were already established at that time and the *Maṭhāmnāyās* were already well-known; (3) One of the important accomplishments of Ācārya was preventing people who were scarring their bodies with hot metals from their practices and converting them into the Vedic path; (4) Although hatred of other creeds is not seen in *Cidvilāsiya*, trend towards Śivādvaita appears to be dominant in it.

It appears Cidvilāsa has chosen several names that *Anantānandagiri* describes. Skilled in fertile imagination, he writes that the Ācārya conquered Śaivas, Śivamataikadeśis, Vaiṣṇavas, Pāñcarātras, Vaikhānasas and Karmahīnas; worshippers of Gaṇapati like Vaiṣṇava, Hairaṇyagarbha, Soura, Agnivādi, Mahāgaṇapati, Haridrāgaṇapati, Uccishṭagaṇapati, Navaneeta-svarṇa-santāna-gaṇapati; Śākteyas like Śakti, Mahālakshmi, Vāgdevathā and Vāmacāra; creeds like Kāpālika, Cārvāka, Sougata, Jaina, Bauddha, Mallāri, Viśwaksena, Manmatha, Kubera, Yama, Varuṇa, Shūnya, Varāha, Loka, Guṇa, Sāmkhya, Yoga, Aṇu, Candra, Bhauma, Kshapaṇaka, Piṭṛ, Śeṣagaruḍa, Siddha, Gandharva, Bhūta and Bhetāla! Some names among these are synonymous. It can be said that the authors have just ima-

gined fictitious names just to convey that at Ācārya's time, various traditions, practices, creeds and schools of thoughts were in vogue.

### **Establishment of the six creeds (षण्मतस्थापना)**

129. When the Ācārya was at *Māyāpuri*, Paravādi-dāvānala, Vaṭukānātha, Mahā-dhuṇḍi-Ganeśwara, Divākarācārya and Bindumādhava prostrated before the preceptor and requested him 'Revered Sir, you have proved that only Advaita is in conformation with the Vedas and Vedānta and all else is without substance. But in Kali Yuga, how can people with an impure mind have access into Advaita? Therefore, you must please propagate six creeds - Śaiva, Śākta, Vaiṣṇava, Soura, Gānāpatya and Kāpāla'. The Ācārya told them 'whosoever amongst you like whatsoever creed, may propagate those creeds; leaving aside practices against *Śruti* and *Smṛti* like marking the body, burning the body with hot metal and the like, spread the six creeds'. Accordingly those disciples started off on a conquest tour (Ci. Śam. 31. 18-23). This is the story in *Cidvilāsiya*.

The description given in *Ānandagirīya* is as follows: For the sake of people who are not fit for pure Advaita, who would otherwise go astray and in order to keep up the well-being of society by way of following the tenets of *Varṇāśrama*, the Ācārya wanted to set up creeds with a difference between *Jīva* and *Īśwara*. He called the disciple Paramatakālānala and asked him 'which creed do you like?' He replied, 'although my mind is set in Advaita, I have devotion for worship of Śiva'. The Ācārya said 'this would be apt for people who are not fit for Advaita'. Accordingly the disciple spread the Śaiva creed in the Indian subcontinent through *Śiva-pañchākshari* holy mantra



(Ā. Śam. Chap. 67). Knowing the minds of disciples Lakshmaṇa and Hastāmalaka, and after giving them *San̄nyāsa*, the Ācārya told them to propagate a Vaiṣṇava creed, which is *drisṭi-srisṭi-dosha-varjita* (?), which captures the minds of all (!), which has six types of differences (?) of *jñāna* and *Karma*, and which would possess ten types of emblems (द्विपञ्चमुद्रालिङ्गम्) through *Nārāyaṇāṣṭottara* holy mantra. They followed the directions and did likewise (Ā. Śam. Chap. 69). Similarly, *Śākta* creed through the disciple Tripurakumāra (Ā. Śam. Chap. 70), *Gānāpatya* creed through Girijā kumāra (Ā. Śam. Chap. 71) were propagated and as per the suggestion of disciple Vaṭukanātha, created the opportunity for the *Kāpālīka* creed (Ā. Śam. Chap. 72). And through Sureśwara, follower of the Indra tradition, he sent *Mokṣaliṅgam* to Cidambaram (Ā. Śam. Chap. 74).

Here, the names of the disciples who were promoters of the six creeds are different in the two ŚaṅkaraVijayas. The readers should note that there is difference in narration between the two: in *Cidvilāśīya*, the disciples took the initiative and requested the Ācārya for the propagation of the six creeds; and in *Ānandagīrīya*, the Ācārya himself thought that it would be necessary and acted.

Regarding the establishment of the creeds, we have to remember the following: (1) Although the Ācārya thought that Advaita is the Ultimate, he is of the opinion that in actual practice, worship involving *Jīva-Īśwara* difference is desirable and also is in accordance with the *Śāstras* (he has expressed so in the introduction to *Gītābhāṣya* (12-10) and in the introduction to *Ānandamayādhikaraṇa* of *Sūtrabhāṣya*). Hence it is not improbable that he provided an opportunity for Śaiva and other creeds; but they were already existent, and there was no

necessity of his establishing them anew. (2) The names of the disciples who were the promoters of the six creeds are different; and they are not mentioned anywhere else. Hence these should be the imaginations of Cidvilāsa and *Ānandagiri*. (3) Observing the entitlement ‘Ṣaṇmata-sthāpanācārya’ used by the Maṭhas, it is possible that some people of recent times might have imagined and incorporated these stories of promoting creeds. Cidvilāsa’s mention that the Ācārya told to propagate worship without markings on the body might be concocted, observing the practices of the brahmins (the followers of Śaṅkara) of recent times. *Ānandagiri*’s mention that the Ācārya propagated through his disciples the worship alongwith such markings does not appear natural. It might be ulteriorly suggestive that Rāmānuja and Mādhwa too have propagated what Ācārya had already commenced! (5) The lead given to these six creeds was when Ācārya was in *Māyāpuri* according to Cidvilāsa, and when he was in Kāñci according to *Ānandagiri*. Looking at this, the whole thing all the more appears to be figments of imagination of the two authors. Is *Ānandagiri* having a soft corner for Kāñci? We shall consider this once again.



## 16. Ascending the Sarvajña Pīṭha and Disappearance

### Curing of disease Bhagandara

130. After describing the universal conquest of Ācārya in detail, *Mādhava*, as if indicative of his imminent disappearance, explains how he got the disease Bhagandara. He got that disease as a result of occult spells of Abhinavagupta who had been defeated by the Ācārya earlier. At that time, Toṭakācārya was serving him with great devotion by way of washing his clothes etc. Expressing concern, the disciples pleaded, 'you may ignore the disease as you do not have attachment to body; but we feel extremely distressed and hence we have to find remedy for this'. Compelling the Ācārya to agree for the treatment, they searched and summoned efficient doctors; but no one could cure the disease. Finally, at the behest of Lord Śiva, the twin-gods *Ashwinī* came in the form of men and declared 'this is the result of someone's spell; and hence there is no treatment for this'. Hearing this, Padmapāda was extremely angry; and without listening to preventive appeals of Ācārya, uttered a counter spell; as a result, Abhinava Gupta died of the same disease (Ma. Śam. 16. 1-32).

This story is there in *Vyāsācalīya* also, but the story of Abhinavagupta is omitted. When the Ācārya prayed for the twin-gods *Ashwinī*, they appeared and cured the disease. In the tenth Canto of *Vyāsācalīya*, the occasion of the disciples going in search of doctors is made unnecessarily long with many descriptions. Not contented with this, the poet has used seventy five *ślokas* of the next Canto also to de-

scribe the season etc., and then says that the twin-gods *Ashwinī* were summoned after all the doctors failed! Then the Ācārya knew that they were the twin-gods. Finally the poet ends the Canto (in the 152nd *śloka*) by telling that the disciples were happy seeing their Guru cured of the disease (‘मुमुदिरे यतयो गुरुमात्मनः गतगदं परिदृश्य...’). The speciality is that there is no mention of *Vyāsācala*’s name at the end of this Canto.

(1) This story is not in either *Cidvilāsīya* or *Ānandagirīya*. But, since it is there in *Vyāsācalīya* also, we can guess that *Mādhava* and *Vyāsācala* might have imagined about this disease towards the end of Ācārya’s life, based upon a heresay that was in vogue in their times. (2) It seems people who sustain too much of body strain and intellectual stress without timely food and sleep get this disease. Therefore, it not proper to doubt why a person like Ācārya who had led such holy life should get it, as some people do. Medical science has identified several varieties of this disease; it is difficult to cure it. Somanāthaiah has written implying that Ācārya’s life was shortened because this disease was not cured (So. Śam. p 188-190). It might be because of the reason that the disease cannot be cured in the normal course, ŚaṅkaraVijayas say the twins-gods were called. But, since this story is not there in all the ŚaṅkaraVijayas and out of the two containing the story, one says the disease was cured and the other says it could not be cured, we have to ignore the matter. (3) Whether *Mādhava* has taken from *Vyāsācalīya* that Toṭaka was washing the clothes of the Ācārya and rendering other services without becoming dejected (Ma. Śam. 16. 3), or whether *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya* also contained this story, cannot be decided now.

### Visit of Gauḍapāda

131. When Śaṅkarācārya was meditating on the banks of Ganga, he saw Gauḍapāda, with a rosary in his hand, coming towards him. The Ācārya touched his feet, worshipped them and stood in obeisance. With all love and affection, Gauḍapāda enquired, 'have you learnt what Govinda has taught you? have you realized the Ultimate Principle of the nature of Existence-Knowledge-Bliss? Are your disciples serving you with peace, self restraint etc? Have you kept under control your eternal enemies? Have you developed great qualities like peace etc? Have you accomplished the eight-fold yoga?' The Ācārya replied, 'Great Sire, whatever that you say necessarily comes true; having become worthy of your grace, what could be inaccessible for me?' 'Having heard from Govinda that you have written *Bhāṣya* on my *Kārikas*, I have appeared before you!' said Gauḍapāda. Ācārya showed him the *Kārikābhāṣya*. Immensely pleased to go through it, Gauḍapāda said, 'you have grasped the intention of *Kārikā* correctly. Well, ask for a boon!' The Ācārya replied, 'What more shall I ask after seeing you? However, please bless me so that my mind may always be dwelling on the Supreme Spirit'. 'May it be so!' said Gauḍapāda, and disappeared (Ma. Śam. 17. 33-53).

(1) This story is not there in any other ŚaṅkaraVijaya. Only in this book it is mentioned that the Ācārya and Gauḍapāda met, subsequent to his getting initiated from Govinda Bhagavatpāda; nowhere else such a meet is mentioned. Could it be true? Or, could it be just a story to imply that the Ācārya got the grace of Gauḍapāda also? It is to be scrutinized.

(2) Gauḍapāda enquiring the Ācārya ‘Have you accomplished the eight-fold yoga?’ is not in accordance with his *Kārikā*. Because, only two - control of mind and realisation of the Self that is the Truth (Ātmasatyānubodha) - are mentioned as the means. The Ācārya also has refuted *Pātanjala Yoga* and has emphatically said in his *Sūtrabhāṣya* that the realisation Supreme Self is by Vedic yoga.

132. When once the Ācārya, along with his disciples, was about to sit in meditation, after finishing their ablutions in the Ganga, a celestial voice was heard saying: ‘On the whole of earth, *Jambūdweepa* is praiseworthy; in that, India is excellent; even in that, Kāśmīr, the abode of Goddess Śāradā is all the more praiseworthy. There are four entrances for that Devi temple; and there is a seat which only an all-knowing person, Sarvajña can ascend; no entry for the others. Already people from different countries have opened the eastern, western, and northern doors to that temple. But, no one from the southern country till now has been able to open the southern door and enter’.

The Ācārya wanted to find out the truth of it, and, wishing to open the southern door, started towards Kāśmīr. With the disciples announcing the scholarship of the Ācārya, he came near the southern door of the temple of Śāradā Devi. Several people obstructed the opening of the door, including followers of *Kāṇāda* school of thought, then a *Naiyyāyika*, then a *Sāṃkhya*, then a *Bauddha*, then a digambara *Jaina*, and then a follower of *Jaimini*. The Ācārya answered all their queries and questions, when they gave way to him to open the door. When the Ācārya, with a hand support from Sanandana, was about climb the pedestal, the Sarvajña Pīṭha, the Divine Mother Śārada, through a celestial voice, said ‘although you can be regarded

as omniscient since you have defeated Viśwarūpa, it is to be decided whether you are pure enough. So, do not climb the pedestal. Since you have contacted women in order to learn the KāmaŚāstra, how can you be pure?’ Then Śaṅkara countered, ‘I have never sinned through this body. By an act through some other body, how does this body become impure?’ The Divine Mother had no answer to this; then the Ācārya climbed the pedestal (Ma. Sham 16. 54-87).

This story is there in *Vyāsācalīya* also (Vyā. Śam. 12. 30-78). There, the argumentation took place between the Ācārya and, not only several scholars, but also with Saraswati; Herself remaining behind a screen set by the scholars (Vyā. Śam. 12. 56), she posed questions on *Vatsyāyana* technique. The Ācārya took seven days’ time (Vyā. Śam. 12. 60), and as described in *Mādhavīya*, underwent metempsychosis (*Parakāya-praveśa*), and, returning on the eighth day, answered all the questions (Vyā. Śam. 12. 72-73). When the Divine Mother expressed doubt about his purity, the Ācārya gave the same answer as described in *Mādhavīya*.

To what extent this story of ascending the Sarvajña Pīṭha by Śaṅkara could be true? Let us review it now.

(1) At the end of the debate with Maṇḍana Miśra, Saraswati, after subjecting the Ācārya to examination in the science of love, had agreed that he is none other than Śaṅkara (pages 225-226); at that time, she did not doubt his purity. Now the same Saraswati doubting his purity does not look proper. Since Maṇḍana Miśra has been conquered, she has agreed on his omniscience; but what has become of her earlier statement ‘you are none other than Śiva’?

(2) *Vyāsācalīya* mentioning that argumentation with Saraswati

has taken place now for the first time does not also fit in properly with the earlier story. Released from the curse upon defeat of her husband, did the all-knowing Śāradā not know that the Ācārya is none other than Śiva Himself, while disappearing?

(3) Because of the large number of scholars born in Kāśmīr, the spread of fame that its presiding deity is Śāradā is appropriate. But how did the seat for examining omniscience (सर्वज्ञपीठ) got established there although Kāśmīr is not the geographical centre of the country?

(4) How come Kalhaṇa, who has depicted the history of Kāśmīr upto Śālivāhana Śaka 1070 in his work *Rājataranṅiṇi*, has not mentioned anything regarding the 'seat of omniscience'?

(5) *Mādhava* has already told the story of Ācārya's visit to Darada country (Ma. Śam. 15. 156). While going to this country which is located north of Kāśmīr, how is that the Ācārya did not hear about this seat? If he had heard about it, why he did not try to occupy it at that time?

(6) No population following Vedic tradition were there in the directions north, east and west of Kāśmīr. How it is justified to say that from those directions people had already opened the respective doors to the *Pīṭha* and occupied it?

(7) The Ācārya's contention that the *karma* that is done with a different body would not bear fruit in this body would not be, by any means, a correct answer. The same Ācārya, on the basis of scriptures, has approved from the empirical point of view, the proposition that the fruition of one's actions would be there in other births as well as in other worlds. Could he have argued that in the same birth, the effects of karma done with another body would not be there for him



in this body? Could Goddess Śārādā too have agreed to this contention? Since we have already discussed this topic on the occasion of metempsychosis, we have reminded the reader again because of the context.

### Ascending the Sarvajña Pīṭha

133. In the context of writing about the Sarvajña Pīṭha, it is proper to review what the different books say on this subject.

(1) In *Cidvilāsiya*: After worshipping the deity, when the Ācārya was about to ascend the Sarvajña Pīṭha at Kāñci, he was wonderstruck when he heard a celestial voice ‘O Sannyāsin, would it not be proper for you to ascend only after winning over eminent scholars of all fields of learning?’ (Ci. Śam. 45. 25-49). At that time, dualist scholars hailing from the shores of Tāmraparṇi river came, argued and were defeated by him; then the Ācārya ascended the Pīṭha (Ci. Śam. 45. 49-69). We have already mentioned that Cidvilāsa has written four chapters on Śringeri itself (page \*252). Even with such noble feeling about that *Pīṭha*, he does not say anything about the Sarvajña Pīṭha of Kāśmīr, but says that the throne was at Kāñci; would it not mean that at his time Kāñcī Pīṭha was famed as the seat of all knowledge?

(2) In *Ānandagirīya* also, having come to Kāñci from Ahobila, the Ācārya argued with the scholars from the shores of Tāmraparṇi river, and converted them into Advaita (Ā. Śam. Chap. 63, p 228; De. p 194). But there is no mention of the Sarvajña Pīṭha there.

(3) In the commentary on *Gururatnamālikā* written by *Ātmabodha*: असावत्र पाठस्तूचितः । सर्वज्ञपीठारोहण एव तद्विजयस्य शिवरहस्य-बृहत्शङ्कर-विजय-प्राचीनशङ्करविजय व्यासाचलीयादिषु निरूपितत्वात् । It is proper for the śloka

starting with ‘परकीयवपुः प्रवेशशैल्याः’ (गु. र. २९) to be here; because in Śiva Rahasya etc. it is mentioned that winning over Saraswati is after the ascent of Sarvajña Pīṭha’. In what he has written, (1) we have not been able to find the cited Śiva Rahasya sentence; (2) since Kāśmīr is considered in the *Vyāsācalīya* that we have, there should have been a different *Vyāsācalīya* with *Ātmabodha*; and (3) *Ātmabodha* cites another *śloka* in *Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya*:

सर्वज्ञपीठमारुह्य ततस्तदग्रे मिश्रान् विजय्य सहसोपनतान् प्रयागात् ।

अध्यास्त काञ्चिमभिमण्डितकामकोटिपीठो मठं निजमवाप्य स शारदाख्याम् ॥ (Gu. Ra. Su. 30)

The meaning of the *śloka* is that ‘having won over Miśra who had come from Prayāg, and having ascended the Sarvajña Pīṭha, (the Ācārya) was staying in his own Maṭha, the Kāñci Kāmakoti Pīṭha’. Since here the opponents won over by Ācārya were not those from the banks of Tāmraparṇi river, it is implied that this would not be a source for either *Cidvilāsiya* or *Mādhavīya*.

Whatever that be, the Sarvajña Pīṭha was at Kāñci according to *Ātmabodha*. Hence, there seems to be two groups among the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas - those who hold that the Sarvajña Pīṭha was at Kāśmīr, and those who hold that it was at Kāñci. Thus it is clear that these are imagined stories, the former based upon of the fame of Kāśmīr as the abode of Goddess Śāradā, and the latter similarly based upon the fame of Kāñci Sarvajña Pīṭha. According to Kāñci Pīṭha traditionalists, Sarvajñatman was the first pontiff of that *Pīṭha*. Is it because of this that it has come to be known as *SarvajñaPīṭha*? This possibility has to be considered by the critics. The Ācārya had no intention of showing that he was omniscient in the sense that he was well-

versed in all the *Śāstras* and all the *vidyās*; he wanted to propagate that *Brahma-vidyā*, by knowing which everything else would be known. This being so, what was the necessity for him to have demonstrated to *Kāṇādas*, *Naiyyayikas* etc. that he was well versed in all *Śāstras* and therefore, in that sense, he is a Sarvajña, and then ascend the Sarvajña Pīṭha at Kāśmīr? Or, what was the necessity of making himself known as a “Sarvajña” just by winning over those who had come from the banks of Tāmraparṇi river or ‘Miśra’ who had unexpectedly arrived from Prayāg, and then ascend the Sarvajña Pīṭha at Kāñci? No author of ŚaṅkaraVijayas has presented this line of thought.

### Ācārya’s Disappearance to His own Abode

134. Thus the Ācārya, having ascended the Sarvajña Pīṭha in order to communicate the message that his school of thought alone is the best, had some people stay at *Ṛshyashṛṅga Āśrama* etc. and then proceeded to Badari. There he won over some followers of *Pātañjaladarśana*, got them out of that, and for some time was teaching his *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Now he was thirty-two of age. Further he went to Kedār, and, prayed Lord Śiva for the sake of disciples who were suffering because of extreme cold there. Then Lord Mahādeva let out hot stream of water from his foothold, which is flowing as a river even now. Thus, Gods Brahma, Indra etc., ṛṣis and siddhas arrived there to take Śaṅkara, the great among *San̥nyāsins*, who had successfully accomplished Lord’s work, to Kailāsa. Taking the hand of Padmapāda for support, the Ācārya mounted on the Nandi who had come there to take him, and went to his original abode (Ma. Śam. 16. 93-107).

The account in *Cidvilāśya* is as follows: The Ācārya, after estab-

lishing a Maṭha at Badari, forcefully made Toṭaka its pontiff, who was not at all inclined to anything other than service to the feet of the Guru; told his arrangements to king Ratnasinga; and, since he was weak in the body by old age (?), prayed to Lord Narāyaṇa. The Lord accordingly granted a hot-water pond; taking his bath there, and remembering the Lord's name, he used to live there for some time. At that time, ṛṣi Dattātreyā who had come there to have *darśan* of Lord Narāyaṇa, heard the story of Śaṅkara, conversed with him, and declared that as per the prayers of Nārada, Śiva Himself has incarnated in the form of Śaṅkara. The Ācārya showed his *Bhāṣyas* to him who after perusal, praised it. Holding his hand Śaṅkara entered the great door of Kailāsa, the abode of the *Pramathas*, Pārvati, Gaṇapati and Shanmukha (Ci. Śam. 31. 24-49).

**In Guruvamśakāvya:** The Ācārya went to Nepal and visited the *Siddheshwaris* and then, since all his intended works were over, renounced his Staff and Water-pot. The Staff became a tree and the Water-pot became a river. Then he reached the abode of Dattātreyā.

दत्तात्रेयं भुवनविनुतं वीक्ष्य नत्वाऽनृगादीन्

वृत्तं स्वीयं सकलमपि तान्प्रेषितान् दिक्षु शिष्यान् ।

सोऽपि श्रुत्वा मुनिपतिरदादाशिषो विश्वरूपा-

चार्यादिभ्यः सुखमवसतां तत्र तौ भाषमाणौ ॥ ३७० ॥

'Having visited and prostrated before Dattātreyā muni, (the Ācārya) narrated what all he had done and how he sent his disciples to all directions. Upon hearing this, the muni blessed Viśwarūpācārya and others. Then they were happy conversing with each other'.

**In Ānandagiriya:** Having thought of returning to his own abode, (when he was) in Kāñci, the holy place of liberation, the Ācārya

concealed his gross body in the subtle and dissolved that form into the causal, and became cinmātra and anguṣṭha-puruṣa and then, entered the bliss that is whole and pervading the entire universe, in which spiritual form he continues to exist even now (Chap. 74, p 255; De. p 216).

**In Prācīnaśaṅkaravijaya cited by Ātmabodha:**

कामाक्ष्याः सविधे स जातु निवसन् उन्मुक्तलोकस्पृहो ।

देहं स्वं व्यपहाय देह्यसुगमं धामं प्रपेदे परम् ॥ (commentary of Gu. Ra. 33)

‘Having remained near Goddess Kamākṣi, having given up worldly desires, having left his body there itself, attained the Supreme Abode that is not reachable by the body-minded’.

**In Keraḷīya Śaṅkaravijaya cited by Ātmabodha:** ‘Once the Jagadguru having remained near Goddess Kamākṣi, having left his body there itself, reached the Supreme Abode which is decayless, blissful, eternal and unobstructed light that is not reachable by the body-minded’ The same Śaṅkarācārya is present there as if consciousness personified, granting liberation to the pious. (in the commentary of the same).

**In Śaṅkarācāryacaritra authored by Govindanātha** (summary of 9th Chapter):

कामाक्ष्या नाम वाग्देव्याः स्थानं तत्पुरमवाप्तवान् ।

तत्रत्यत्सर्वविद्वद्भिः पूज्यमानं दिने दिने ॥ ३ ॥

सर्वज्ञपीठमारोढुमियेष यतिपुङ्गवः ।

वादिभिः कर्मकाण्डज्ञैः काणादाभिरप्ययम् ॥ ४ ॥

स्वे स्वे शास्त्रे रहस्यं यत् तत्पृष्टः शङ्करो महान् ।

यथावदुत्तरं सर्वं समुदीर्य महामतिः ॥ ५ ॥

Thus having answered the argumentators, and having gotten ready to ascend the Kāñci Sarvajña Pīṭha, (the Ācārya) heard the celestial voice; took seven-day's time, underwent metempsychosis (*Parakāya pravesha*) and returned; and, having answered all the questions of Saraswati, ascended the Pīṭha, and then left Kāñci. After going around the several pilgrimage centres, he came to Vṛṣācala.

तत्र दक्षिणकैलासे निवसन्नेकदा गुरुः ।

ज्ञात्वा निजशरीरान्तं सह शिष्यैः प्रसन्नधीः ।

कासारे पश्चिमे स्नात्वा नत्वा तत्रत्यमीश्वरम् ।

While he was in that southern Kailāsa, once he realized that the time for giving up the body had come; having taken bath at the western pond, saluting *Īśwara*, circumambulating the original deity and having entered the inner area, prostrated before Kṛṣṇa, and then before Nandi, Bhārgavarāma, Simhodara; and then saluting Uttaresha, Pārvati and Harihara, and having composed and sung many stotras,

इष्टैः सह महायोगी प्रदेशे कुत्रचिद्गुरुः ॥ ३२ ॥

निविष्टः सुप्रसन्नात्मा सर्वमापादमूर्ध्वजम् ।

यथावच्चिन्तयामास वैष्णवं रूपमादरात् ॥ ३३ ॥

sitting at a particular place (he) meditated upon the Vaiṣṇava form (of the Lord) from feet to the head; composed extempore and sung in *Sragdharā* metre; and the Gods showered flowers (on him).

देशिकेन्द्रो महायोगी स्तोत्रं कुर्वन् स वैष्णवम् ।

विवेश परमानन्दं भानुबिम्बान्तरस्थितम् ॥ ६२ ॥

Thus, the Mahāyogi, singing the glory of Viṣṇu, entered the supreme bliss within the Sun's Disc!

**In *Vyāsācalīya* there is a *śloka* in the 12th Chapter:**

एवं निरुत्तरपदां स विधाय देवीं सर्वज्ञपीठमधिरुह्य ननन्द सभ्यः ।

मात्रा गिरामपि तथा पुरुषैश्च सभ्यैः सम्भावितो रुचिरदेशमयं जगाम ॥ ७८ ॥

The meaning of the *śloka* is that after ascending the Sarvajña Pīṭha, honoured by worthy people and by Saraswati, (the Ācārya) went away from there according to his liking. But the same *śloka* cited by *Ātmabodha* is as follows:

एवं निरुत्तरपदां स विधाय देवीं सर्वज्ञपीठमधिरुह्य मठे स्वक्लृप्ते ।

मात्रा गिरामपि तथा पुरुषैश्च सभ्यैः सम्भावितो कमपि कालमुवास काञ्च्याम् ॥ (commentary on Gu. Ra. 22. pa.). The meaning is that (the Ācārya), honoured by everyone, stayed at Kāñci for some time. If the *Vyāsācalīya* he is referring to is the same, we will have to say that someone must have changed it according to his liking.

On the whole, where and how the Ācārya disappeared is not known to any one. There is no dearth for concocted stories regarding this. Here are presented one or two. It appears that when the Ācārya was going on an argumentation tour, during the time of debate they used to arrange for a cauldron in which oil was being heated. The challenge was that if the opponent Buddhists are made to accept defeat, they would be thrown into the cauldron of hot oil. Once, when there was a discussion in Mahācīnā (Tibet), after defeating the *Tāntrik* Buddhists, disciple *Ānandagiri* said, ‘Revered Sire, no more heating oil in the cauldron. The world is unlimited. How long you could continue argumentation in this manner?’ The Ācārya agreed, and left the emptied cauldron upside down there itself. That place is even now called *Śaṅkara Katāha*! It seems there is another rumour in Nepal and Tibet. Some people say that one Lāma (pontiff of a Buddhist Maṭha) defeated the Ācārya, and as per the challenge accepted before, the Ācārya fell into the cauldron of hot oil. Some

others say that the Lāma killed the Ācārya by the exercise of a *Tāntrik* spell! (Bala. p. 127: Prof. Venkaṭeśan - *The Last Days of Śaṅkarācārya*, Journal of Research, Madras, Vol. I) No basis needed for a concocted story!

However, it is certain that the Ācārya merged himself in Brahman at the age of thirty two. God only knows the particulars of where and how. For the present, in Kedārnāth, there is a *samādhi* said to be of the Ācārya, purported to be at the location from where he disappeared. In view of the opinion that it is not the real *samādhi*, that a new commemorative structure is to be built there, and the new monument should be near the temple and not at the present *samādhi*, Śrī Sampūrṇānanda, chief minister of Uttar Pradesh, is trying to arrange with the permission of the pontiff of Dwārakā Pīṭha (This was in the sixties of the last century; what is the present position is to be found out. -*Tr.*). Although the Ācārya - who taught the world that all the *Jīvas* including himself are truly Brahman which is without birth or death, and which transcends subdivisions of space, time and matter - could not exclusively belong to Kāñci, Tricūr or Kedārnāth, no doubt it would be worthwhile to have a monument in his name at the holy place Kedārnāth, located north of the country.

### **Time of Ācārya's Disappearance**

135. Just as his birth, dating of his disappearance too is not free of controversies. We have already given the opinions of the Maṭhas earlier (pages 22-24). Each has counted 32 years to his traditional date of birth to decide the date of his disappearance. More details are given in Appendix IV. Ancient historical dating is always controversial in



our country. Hence, without writing any more on this subject, we conclude by saying: ‘kālāya tasmai namaḥ’ (Salutations to Him, who is Time!).



## 17. Ācārya's Works: Benefits to the World at Large

### Summary of the Earlier Book

136. We have described the history of Śāṅkarācārya from his incarnation to disappearance on the basis of the ŚāṅkaraVijayas and the speculations of critics. In this history, the portions agreed upon by all are the following: It is highly probable that he was born in Kerala. He lost his father at an early age. Shortly after the *Upanayaṇa*, he uttered *Praisha*; and went to the north to take methodical *Sannyāsa* from Govinda Bhagavatpāda; received his teaching and guidance, and wrote his books - the *Bhāṣyas* etc. He taught his established conclusions to his contemporary scholars so that it was acceptable to them. He travelled throughout the country and established the traditional Advaita philosophy which was dear to his heart. Many became his disciples. His philosophical works and those of the lineage of his disciples, and the Maṭhas established in his name, are famous even now. People revere him not only in India but also in the Western countries as a master philosopher, establisher of traditional virtuous practices, a great devotee and a poet. Even today there are innumerable Indians who regard him as one to be remembered every morning (prātaḥ smaraṇīyāḥ)

### Ācārya and Buddhism

137. It is time now to review a little the benefit that has happened to the world at large by the revered Ācārya. What was the state of this country at the time of his birth? What are the transformations

effected by him with regard to society and with regard to religion and philosophy? Scholars are not unanimous in their opinion about these. Some opine that his *Sannyāsa* is an imitation of the Buddhists; that our *Purāṇas* and *Itihāsas* are composed with the intention of bringing down the Buddhist influence, and that some of the customs of the Hindus today originated from the Buddhists. We do not say that these opinions do not contain an element of truth. But we should not forget that none of these was created by Śaṅkarācārya. *Sannyāsa* as a stage of life was there from time immemorial on the basis of the *Śruti*; may be it has been reorganized later for the propagation of the path of knowledge. It is certain that it has not come from an imitation of the Buddhists. On the contrary, it can be said that the Buddhist **Bhikṣu** group was organized as an imitation of the Vedic *Sannyāsa* stage of life. The Buddhists were unpopular among the masses not because of the *Pañcaśīla* taught by the Buddha, but because they were denigrating the practice of the *Varṇa-Āśrama Dharma* and the performance of Vedic rites. The necessity of a self-controlled peaceful life, refraining from bad conduct and the like are taught in the Vedas and Upaniṣads with adulation and emphasis. May be an effort can be recognized in the *Purāṇas* and *Itihāsas* to remove some of the improper practices that were in vogue among the Buddhists of those times; and they might have emphasized faith in the Vedic rites, company of the virtuous, and devotion to God in order to protect people from transgressing their religion because of the bad influence of the Buddhists. But it is difficult to contend that the entire gamut of all the *Purāṇas* has arisen only after the time of Buddhism. Whatever that be, it is certain that the Ācārya's

incarnation took place only after people at large had become familiar with the *Purāṇas*, *Itihāsas*, *Bhagavadgīta* and the *Brahma Sūtras*. The direct attack and refutation of Buddhism that we find in the works of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa are not to be found in the works of Śaṅkarācārya; there is not much importance for such refutation in his writings.

### Establishment of the Six Sects

138. Some people believe that Śaṅkara established six sects; also there is support for that in the ŚaṅkaraVijayas. *Cidvilāsiya*, *Ānandagiriya* and *Kūṣmāṇḍa-ŚaṅkaraVijaya* openly say so. In the citations of some of the Maṭhas, the honorary title ‘षण्मतस्थापनाचार्य’ is in vogue even today. All the more, there is belief in people that the Ācārya accorded more importance to the Śaiva sect. Since most of the followers of Śaṅkara in the South have Śaiva practices, such belief is all the more agreeable to them. This belief is strengthened by the depiction of Śaṅkara as an incarnation of Śiva in the ŚaṅkaraVijayas; also by the importance of worship of *lingam* in the Maṭhas purported to be established by Śaṅkara. But, in the *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas*, considered as the important works of Śaṅkara, we do not find either the discussion of the need of harmony among the sects like Śaiva and *Vaiṣṇava*, or of even the semblance of considering difference between them. There is no evidence to indicate that either the Ācārya or his disciple Sureśvara is a Śaivaite; instead of that we find them using the name *Narāyaṇa* while referring to supreme Lord, in their discussions. They have not referred to Śaivaite *Purāṇas* anywhere in their works. The *Sannyāsins* of Śaṅkara tradition even today are doing *Narāyaṇa smaranams* only. No interest is seen to have been shown by the

Ācārya in emphasising the equality of Śiva and Viṣṇu, as he always shows on the Advaita philosophy. There is no reference at all, to the 'six sects' anywhere in his *Bhāṣyas*. Ācārya's disciple Sureśvara too is the same: he always had purport on Advaita, and not on the harmony of the different sects. Hence, it is proper to imagine that, of the many famed Śaṅkarācāryas of the Shāṅkara Maṭhas, someone or many, might have involved in this task to meet the demands of their times, leading to the use of the title 'षण्मतस्थापनाचार्य' to Śaṅkarācārya.

### **Prohibiting Mudrādhāraṇa indicative of the sects**

139. Another thing to consider is whether the Ācārya actually stopped the practice among the people of different sects, of painting "nama" on their bodies indicative of the particular sect to which they belonged, or of burning their bodies with hot metal to imprint those symbols. In ŚaṅkaraVijayas, particularly in *Ānandagirīya* and in *Cidvilāsīya*, the frenzy of insignia of this type is described in detail and the Ācārya is stated to have stopped that by the power of his instructions. There is no trace of mention of these insignia in Ācārya's *Bhāṣyas*. We will have to seek some other evidence to decide whether such practices were in vogue during the time of Ācārya. Even if they were prevalent, there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that the Ācārya was against them. This being so, we are forced to think that such practices were in vogue at the times in which the ŚaṅkaraVijayas were written, and they wrote in this manner thinking that such practices were not agreeable to the Ācārya.

### Reforming Śākta and other Sects

140. Did Ācārya stop the bad practices of the *Śāktas*, *Gāṇāpatyas* and the *Kāpālikas*? Did he take the help of the different kings of his time to do this? is another thing to consider. Even today, the practice of so-called “*vāmāchāra*” is not extinct. Smoking hemp, drinking liquor etc. in the name of Vedānta is even now practised by some; and such people are scattered here and there. No wonder if such people existed during the time of Ācārya. But it is difficult to believe that the menace was strong at that time and to stop the same Ācārya used the help of different kings. There is no mention of *Śākta*, *Gāṇāpatya*, *Kāpālika* or such other creeds in Ācārya's *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas*. Although in *Gītābhāṣya* the Ācārya says ‘भूतानि विनायकमातृगणचतुर्भगिन्यादीनि यान्ति भूतेज्याः’ (9. 25) and ‘भूतगणांश्च सप्तमातृकादींश्च अन्ये यजन्ते तामसा जनाः’ (17. 4), we can guess that he had thought of the *Śākta* and *Gāṇāpatya* sects as *tāmasa*, of the ignorant and lethargic, but we cannot say that he regarded their schools of thought as fit for refutation or that their evil practices are to be stopped with serious effort. There is not at all any mention of *Kāpālikas* in his *Bhāṣyas*. Therefore, one is forced to think that the Ācārya's argumentation with the leaders of these sects, his effort at setting right their practices, or his taking the help of the kings to be just imaginations of the authors of ŚaṅkaraVijayas, or that some other Śaṅkarācārya's doings are unjustly linked with the Ācārya. Were kings by name Sudhanva, Veerasena, Rājasena, Bhojasinga, Ratnas- inga existed historically? What were their times? Only after these things are decided by finding out from historical research, one would be able to decide from whom and to what extent help was actually

rendered to the Ācārya.

### **Social Reform**

141. Śrī Kṛiṣṇaswāmi Iyer writes that ‘Śaṅkarācārya, in his very brief lifeperiod, might not have carried out all the social reforms linked to him by the story writers; but he could have given a plan or a design for such reforms which his followers eventually carried out’ (CNKS p. 81). This is not improbable. But, it is our opinion that until and unless suitable evidence is available to show that he was involved in any reform movements also, other than his two-fold accomplishment of writing Bhāṣyas presenting his unique method of Advaita, and moving throughout the Indian continent to obtain assent of the scholars of his time for the same, there is no room for even this kind of speculation. It is also possible that after teaching Advaita to his people and disappearance, his disciples - each distributed in different parts of the country - might have attempted to refute the sects in their respective area and to stop their evil practices that were in vogue among people. Not a wonder if illustrious personalities, inspired by lofty thought that one God is being worshipped in different forms, have attempted to carry out such reforms and have guided people towards the righteous path.

### **Thoughts about the great works of the Ācārya**

142. It may be true that the Ācārya defeated several scholars in argumentation. After Buddhists dominated in this country, conversion of people, condemning other schools of thought in their books, and arranging debate platforms here and there had become common and publicised. Right from Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's time, in order to protect

and popularize their *dharma*, the followers of Vedic scriptures might have looked forward to the support of kings and help from the rich. It would appear to the readers of Bhatta's Vārtikas, that these may be true. Accordingly, the Ācārya too might have defeated opponents, converted the famous among them or seekers of liberation into *Sannyāsins* for the sake of writing books and for popularizing Advaita philosophy. We can say that such writings of the *Sannyāsins* are the invaluable treasure of books on Advaita that we have today.

The disciples of the Ācārya do not belong to any particular area. Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman writes: '... it is possible that others might have imagined that the works of the disciples are works of Śaṅkarācārya. Not only that, they might have been constantly moving about as mendicants; but while staying for sometime at a place during *cāturmāsya* they might have taught people on the basis of *Śrutis* and *Smṛtis* and their disciples might have written down that and carried out a propaganda through their followers in turn. Gradually these disciples might have established themselves at various places, and, may be for self-protection or may be in imitation of the Buddhists, established Maṭhas. The local kings might have accorded to them titles, land and riches...' (NVSK pp 36-37). It appears to us also, that this is plausible. Therefore, presently it has been difficult to decide what are the works which the Ācārya truly wrote? and what are the Maṭhas which he truly established? We shall be discussing about his works in the next chapter; and we shall take up the subject of Maṭhas established by him in another chapter.





## 18. Important Texts of Śaṅkara

### Importance of Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda's Texts

143. One can boldly proclaim that if there be benevolence of Śaṅkara accorded to the world at large that has lasted till today, it is because of his blessings in the form of his texts. May be that everyone cannot comprehend the meaning of his *Bhāṣyas*; may be some of his other works, the *Prakaraṇas*, are difficult to understand. But many of his minor works, and quite a few *Stotras* are widely spread even to nooks and corners of the country; and people of this country know them by heart and enjoying them by reciting them often in their day-to-day life. Now we are fortunate that the Ācārya's works have been translated and transliterated into English and other western languages, and also to several Indian languages.

The marvellous incidents believed by people as actually happened in the life of Ācārya, the minor *Prakaraṇas* that the people believe as the teachings he gave because of different reasons, the various *Stotras* that are widely known as his, the advice and instructions that presently the pontiffs of the Maṭhas purported to have been established by him are giving from time to time, and the ideals of *jñāna* and *vairāgya* that the independent monks, belonging to various sacred traditions and Maṭhas, are placing before people in his name – all these have been instrumental in establishing his memory permanently in the hearts of people. The celebrations of his birthday and the mass-adorations year by year, held here and there, have made his memory imprinted in the minds of people. Not only the people of our

country, but several westerners also believe that Śaṅkarācārya is a luminary who took *Sannyāsa* directly from celibate boyhood, a monk of the highest order, a great philosopher who moved throughout the country lifting up people to the high level of thinking, a *jagadguru* who stopped all kinds of evil practices among people and promoted the six sects, a great devotee and a poet of high calibre, a great soul who incarnated for the benefit of the world and spared no efforts during his life time for that cause. It is a pity that the job of writing the history of such a world-famous luminary fell to the lot of a few poets only; hence it is very difficult to decide what really is true about Ācārya's life.

In this situation, it has become imperative to determine Śaṅkarācārya's position in the history of modern India only through his world-renowned *Bhāṣyas*. The name Śaṅkarācārya might have remained in the mind of the common man mostly because of his greatness, his legendary personality; but in the world of the intellectuals, his literary works remain the pillars bearing testimony to his eminence even today. The Indian scholars of Vedānta even today extensively engage themselves in the study, teaching and discussion of Ācārya's works. So much of importance has been assigned to them that practically no seeker of truth on earth has not attempted their appreciation, description or constructive criticism. But, the most unfortunate situation is that there are so many obstacles in the path of deciding which are really Ācārya's works. There are hundreds of books that are popular in his name; it has become customary to address the pontiffs also, of the *Pīṭhas* said to be established by the Ācārya as "Śaṅkarācārya"; not only that, some pontiffs of the past are known to have had their real

name as Śaṅkarācārya. Among Ācārya's *Bhāṣyas*, no one is quoted in the other; therefore, we do not have an internal evidence that he has openly declared a particular text as his. Only the language and style have remained as the available tools of examining. The Ācārya's style is extremely easy-running and lucid even while exploring and expressing high level philosophical ideas. Therefore, one can be certain that the books that use difficult style bound with modern logic and using rare and long compound words, are not the ones authored by the Ācārya. But, it is also difficult to say the last word only on the basis of style that a book is either authored by Ācārya or not authored by Ācārya. Therefore, if a book is said to be Ācārya's, then if the subject matter presented and the manner of its examination are not opposed to those in the famous works of Ācārya, about which there is no doubt, if the close similarity in the style is unambiguous, and there be no other evidence against, we may decide that it is authored by Ācārya himself. Following this point of view, we are going to express our views here, in a summary fashion. How far this is justified and reliable, scholars who are knowledgeable in such matters have to decide.

### **The Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas**

144. Ācārya's works can be divided into three categories: *Bhāṣyas*, *Prakaraṇas* and *Stotras*. Among the *Bhāṣyas*, again there are three groupings: *Śruti Prasthāna* or the *Bhāṣya* aimed at exploring the meaning of the Upaniṣads; *Smṛti Prasthāna* or the *Bhāṣyas* aimed at expounding the meaning of the *Gītā Smṛti*; and *Sūtra Prasthāna* or the *Bhāṣya* aimed at explaining the purport of Vedānta Sūtras of

Bādarāyaṇa which themselves are composed to logically establish the purport of both *Śrutis* and *Smṛtis*. The Upaniṣads are also referred to as Vedāntas by scholars; the conclusions of Vedānta are based mainly upon the Upaniṣads. The *Gītā* is held to be actual words of Bhagawān Śrī Kriṣṇa, and written by Vyāsa; hence it is a *Smṛti*, written by a human author, remembering the meaning of *Śruti*. Since the *Smṛtis* are dependent upon the authority of *Śrutis*, the final authority would be *Śrutis* themselves. Since the *Sūtras* are composed by Bādarāyaṇa with a purpose of deciding the meaning of the *Śrutis*, they are also *Pauruṣeya* (written by a human); since they expound the subject matter on the basis of Upaniṣads and Bhagavadgīta, they are also not independent means for exploration of Vedānta darśana. Even if this be so, since they are set out to decide the meaning of Vedānta by reason, they are accorded a higher status by the investigators of truth; because, to decide whether we have grasped the meaning of *Śrutis* and *Smṛtis* correctly, we will have to testify it against the *Sūtras* only. Hence, we shall examine the works of Ācārya in the order *Sūtrabhāṣya*, *Upaniṣadbhāṣya* and *Gītābhāṣya*.

### **BrahmaSūtrabhāṣya**

145. All the ŚaṅkaraVijayas equivocally declare that the Ācārya had valued *Sūtrabhāṣya* highest. He wrote that under the impulse from Lord Viśveśwara (Ma. Śam. 6. 48), or from Govinda Bhagavatpāda (Ci. Śam. 9. 50). Some opine that he wrote that in the same place, i.e., Badari, where Bādarāyaṇa had written the *Sūtras* (Bala. Śam.p 53). Some of the modern scholars feel that Bādarāyaṇa and Vyāsa might not be the names of the same person. In *Sūtrabhāṣya* the composer

of *Sūtra* is referred to as Bādarāyaṇa, and the author of *Mahābhārata* and the *Gītā* is called as Vyāsa; therefore, they say that Bādarāyaṇa is different from Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa. As this is not important in deciding about the works of the Ācārya, let us not explore this question further. Some people opine that since *Brahma Sūtras* are referred to as 'Brahma-sūtrapadaīścaiva' in *Gītā* (13. 4), the *Sūtras* must have been composed by Bādarāyaṇa earlier; it is clear that this is not acceptable to the Ācārya, since he has written there that '*Brahmasūtras* refer to likes of 'ātmetyevopāsīta' etc.'; he has not referred to *Sūtras* there. Not only that, neither the Ācārya nor *Sureśwarācārya* has used the expression *Brahmasūtra* for the Vedānta *Sūtras*. Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda, who has written the *Sūtrabhāṣya*, has written 'एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः । अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्या-प्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते । यथा च अयमर्थः सर्वेषां वेदान्तानां, तथा वयमस्यां शारीरकमीमांसायां प्रदर्शयिष्यामः ॥' (The *adhyāsa*, which is of the form of a misconception initiates agentship and enjoyership. The Vedāntas have begun in order to eradicate this source of evil, and in order to aid the acquisition of knowledge of the unity of the Self. We are going to show in this *Śārīraka Mīmāṃsā* (Discussion about the nature of the embodied soul) how this is the purport of all the Vedāntas.) While dealing with the first Sūtra of the book, he has referred to VedāntaŚāstra as **Vedānta Mīmāṃsā Śāstra**. It can be said that the cited sentence totally summarises the purport of the *Sūtras*. We have followed here the principle that any book which goes against this purport cannot be regarded as authored by Ācārya.

## Upaniṣad Bhāṣyas

146. All are using the *Bhāṣyas* of the ten Upaniṣads which are in the name of Ācārya for study as well as for teaching. Some people believe that apart from these ten, the *Bhāṣyas* on *Śvetāśwatara* as well as *Nṛsimhatāpanī* are also authored by Ācārya (page 111).

It would be desirable to examine whether all these *Bhāṣyas* are really authored by Ācārya, that is, by the Ācārya who has authored *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Hence we are going to say a few words on this. While dealing with the eighth *mantra* of *Isāvāśya* Upaniṣad (Samhitopaniṣat, Vājasaneyā Shākhā), it is written ‘suddhaṃ nirmalam, avidyāmalarahitaṃ iti kāraṇaśarīrapraṭiṣedhaḥ’ *Śuddha* means pure, free from the dirt of ignorance; by this the causal body is negated. We do not come across *avidyā* referred to as causal body either in *Sūtrabhāṣya* or in any other Upaniṣad Bhāṣya. While writing on the twelfth *mantra*, it is written ‘asambhūtiḥ prakṛtiḥ kāraṇaṃ avidyā avyākṛtākhyā’ *asambhūti* is *prakṛti*, and the *kāraṇa* is *avidyā* called *avyākṛta*. Referring to *avyākṛta* as *kāraṇāvidyā*, casual ignorance, is not found in any other Bhāṣya. Acceptance of causal body and calling *avyākṛta* as ‘*kāraṇāvidyā*’ or ‘*mūlāvidyā*’ is not unusual in sub-commentaries; we are going to discuss this in detail later. Although these Bhāṣya sentences can be somehow interpreted to be consistent with the other *Bhāṣyas*, we will have to examine why this kind of technical terminology is used here which is not found anywhere in Ācārya’s works.

There are two *Bhāṣyas* on Kena Upaniṣad called by other commentators as *Padabhāṣya* and *Vākyabhāṣya*. The introductory sentences

of the latter are at variance when compared to the introductory sentences of the former. 'श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रं इत्यादि प्रतिवचनं निर्विशेषस्य निमित्तत्वार्थम्', 'यदि मन्यसे सुवेदेति शिष्यबुद्धिविचालना गृहीतस्थिरतायै' - introductory sentences of this kind are not found in the other *Bhāṣyas*. The Upaniṣadic text taken in the *Vākyabhāṣya* is different from that accepted in *Padabhāṣya*; and in some instances even the expounding of the subject is mutually contradictory. Commentaries on the text 'ब्राह्मी वाव त उपनिषदमब्रूमेति' can be taken as an example. *Padabhāṣya* says that 'अब्रूम' means 'we have told' and in *Vākyabhāṣya* it is 'we are going to tell'. By several such reasons, it is doubtful that *Kena Vākyabhāṣya* is authored by Ācārya.

Both *Taittirīya* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣyas* adopt an extraordinary style which is not usually found in other *Bhāṣyas*. 'गत्यैश्वर्यादि-श्रुतिविरोध इति चेत् । अथापि स्यात्, यद्यप्राप्यो मोक्षः तदा गतिश्रुतीनां च कोपः स्यात् इति चेत् ॥' (Tait. Bhā., *Shikṣā*. Conclusion). 'निरोधस्तर्हि अर्थान्तरं इति चेत् । अथापि स्यात् चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधस्य वेदवाक्यजनितात्मविज्ञानात् अर्थान्तरत्वात्, तन्त्रान्तरेषु च कर्तव्यतया अवगतत्वात् विधेयत्वं इति चेत् ॥' (Bṛ. Bhā. 1. 4. 7). In this manner, a summary statement corresponding to the *prima facie* view, ending with the indeclinable word 'चेत्' is explained with a sentence, again ending with 'चेत्'; this kind of style is found only in the *Bhāṣyas* of these two Upaniṣads<sup>1</sup>, and is not so evident in the *Bhāṣyas* of other Upaniṣads. We have already indicated some differences in the views between *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* and *Sūtrabhāṣya* (page \*26). Scholars have to examine whether there are any more differences

1. We have found one such example in *Gītābhāṣya*. 'मोक्षायैव इति चेत् । सर्वकर्मणां कृतानां ईश्वरे न्यासो मोक्षायैव न फलान्तराय योगसहितः । योगाच्च विभ्रष्टः, इत्यतः तं प्रति नाशाशङ्कायुक्तैव इति चेत् ॥' (Gī. Bhā. Intro. Ch. 6)

besides these in these two *Bhāṣyas*.

Likewise, there are a few minor differences of view between *Chāndogya Bhāṣya* and *Sūtrabhāṣya*. For example, the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad mantra* portion 'यस्त्वेतमेवं प्रादेशमात्रम्' (Ch. Up. 5. 18. 1) is referred to in the *Sūtrabhāṣya*. While commenting on the *Sūtra* 'सम्पत्तेरिति जैमिनिस्तथा हि दर्शयति' (Ve. Sū. 1. 2. 31), explaining the adjective प्रादेशमात्रम्, the Ācārya writes, 'समानप्रकरणं वाजसनेयीब्राह्मणं द्युप्रभृतीन् पृथिवीपर्यन्तान् त्रैलोक्यात्मनो वैश्वानरस्य अवयवान् अध्यात्ममूर्धप्रभृतिषु चुबुकपर्यन्तेषु देहावयवेषु सम्पादयत् प्रादेशमात्रसम्पत्तिं परमेश्वरस्य दर्शयति...' in the same instance, in the Vājasaneyi Brāhmaṇa, the limits of Vaiśvānara spread over from Dyuloka etc upto to Pṛthvi is spiritually localized, beginning from the top of the head and ending with the chin, and the Lord's existence is shown localized. However, while commenting on the same *mantra* in *Chāndogya Bhāṣya*, he writes 'शाखान्तरे मूर्धादिशुबुकप्रतिष्ठ इति प्रादेशमात्रं कल्पयन्ति । इह तु न तथाभिप्रेतः' - in a different branch of Veda, (he is) thought of as *prādeśamātra* because he is localized into head - from top to the chin - but here that is not the opinion.

Although such minor differences could be found here and there, as far as the conclusions are concerned, there are no major differences between the *Sūtrabhāṣya* and the *Bhāṣyas* on the ten famous Upaniṣads<sup>1</sup>.

But, about the *Bhāṣyas* on *Śvetāśvatara* and *Nṛsimhatāpanīya* Upaniṣads we cannot be sure thus. Both the style of composition and the method of explanation of these are entirely different from those

1. Some scholars opine that the *Bhāṣya* on Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad has some contradictions with Śaṅkara's views and that there are a few grammatical mistakes also. We feel that this is not so. We have shown that the opinions in this *Upaniṣadbhāṣya* are not different from Śaṅkara's views in our book *Māṇḍūkya Rahasya Vivṛitiḥ*.



of *Sūtrabhāṣya* and those of the ten major Upaniṣads. The introduction to the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* is unnecessarily long. In this, long passages from *Viṣṇu purāṇa*, *Līṅga purāṇa*, *Yoga vāsiṣṭha*, *Śiva dharmottara*, *Viṣṇu dharmottara* and *Vayupurāṇa* etc. have been cited. In one place, Gauḍapādācārya has been referred to by name: ‘शुकशिष्यो गौडपादाचार्यः’ (while commenting on 1.8). This way of representation is not found in any of the other *Bhāṣyas*. By such reasons, we have to say that this is not a *Bhāṣya* written by the Ācārya.

There are reasons why *Nṛsimhatāpanīya Bhāṣya* also could not have been written by the Ācārya. There one finds plenty of *Tāntrik* material. *ślokas* from *Prapañcasāra* have been cited here. These are not found in the other *Bhāṣyas*, and hence several scholars opine that this cannot be a work of the Ācārya<sup>1</sup>.

On the whole, regarding the subject matter under consideration, we can say that there is not much of a difference between the *Sūtrabhāṣya* and the *Upaniṣadbhāṣyas*.

## Gītābhāṣya

147. The *Gītābhāṣya* also is similar to the other *Bhāṣyas* in style or in the way of expounding the subject. (1) Refuting the argument that *jñāna* and *Karma* can coexist with each other (*Jñāna-karma-samuccaya-vāda*); (2) Showing that although *karma* alone may lead to

---

1. May be because of this reason, or may be because during his time the *Śvetāśvatara Bhāṣya* was already famous as a work of Śaṅkarācārya, Śrī Rāmānujācārya criticises the meaning of the citations from the *Purāṇas* here and has tried to show that they are not in accordance with the Advaita. He does not consider the famous *Adhyāsabhāṣya* at all for discussion! Researchers are to take up the question as to why is this. Since this is outside of our purview here, we leave it at this.

prosperity, if it is practised without desiring for the result and only for pleasing God it would, by way of purification of the mind, lead to the rise of knowledge of Advaita and ability to abide in Self Knowledge; and (3) Showing that evil of *saṁsāra* can be warded off by giving up all *karmas* and remaining steady in *jñāna* - these are mainly the common subjects expounded in the *Prasthāna-traya Bhāṣyas*.

One speciality of the *Gītā* is that the word *Bhakti* is encountered only in it. The Ācārya in his *Gītābhāṣya* explains that *Bhakti* is of two types: *Gauṇa Bhakti* which is of the form of affliction etc. (ārtādi), and *Parā Bhakti* which is of the form of abiding in Knowledge. How come this word (*Bhakti*) is not encountered in the other two *Prasthānas*? How is that *Parā Bhakti* is to be taken as only abiding in Knowledge? We are at a loss to understand why these questions are not discussed here by the Ācārya. Whatever that be, nothing contradictory to the other two *Prasthānas* has been presented here; rather, an effort to explain *Gītā* in accordance with the *Sūtras* and the Upaniṣads is made. Example can be given of the exposition of the *śloka* 'sarvadvārāṇi saṁyamya...' (*Gītā* 8. 12) and 'agnirjyotiḥ...' (*Gītā* 8. 24) for such an effort. The subject of meditation (*Upāsana*) is dealt with here so that it does not go against the *prasthānas* of *Sūtras* and the Upaniṣads. In the exposition of the *śloka* 'kṣetrakṣetrajañasaṁyogāt...' (*Gītā* 13. 26), it is explained that *kṣetrakṣetrajañasaṁyogaḥ* means *itaretarataddharmādhyāsaḥ* of *Kṣhetra* and *Kṣetrajañā*, i.e., on similar lines as in the introduction to *Sūtrabhāṣya*, using equivalent wording. We can take this as an example for presenting identical meaning (*ekavākyatā*) in the matter of Knowledge<sup>1</sup>.

1. The *Adhyātma Prakāśha Kāryālaya* has published in Kannaḍa, Ācārya's

### Other Bhāṣyas

148. We hear that there are *Bhāṣyas* on the Upaniṣads by name *Kauṣītaki*, *Maitrayaṇīya*, *Kaivalya*, *Mahānārāyaṇīya*, in the name of Ācārya. But there is no evidence to show that they are actually authored by the Ācārya. Someone has given to the present author the first three chapters of *Aitareya Upaniṣad Bhāṣya* (commencing from 'eṣa panthāḥ...') supposed to be written by the Ācārya, the style of which resembles that of Ācārya's *Bhāṣyas*. But, learned scholars will have to decide whether it is actually Ācārya's or not.

That the two works - *Viṣṇusahasranāma Bhāṣya* and *Sanatsujātīya Bhāṣya* - must be of the same author as *Śvetāśvatara Bhāṣya* is evident from the style of introduction and the citations from the *Purāṇas* etc. These can never be ascribed to the Ācārya, for the same reasons as indicated earlier for the *Śvetāśvatara Bhāṣya*. But we have to remember that there are several people who believe they are Ācārya's.

It is not necessary even, to mention that works like *Hastāmalaka Stotra Bhāṣya*, *Adhyātma Paṭala Bhāṣya*, *Sandhyā Bhāṣya*, *Gāyatrī Bhāṣya* cannot be Ācārya's.

It is doubtful whether *Lalitā Triśatī Bhāṣya* is a work of Ācārya's. We shall deal with this later when we discuss about the *Tāntrik* books.

People might often ascribe some glosses to the Ācārya; but by merely observing the way they are written, one would feel that they can never be Ācārya's, and hence we have not named them. *Śrī Rudra Bhāṣya* to which Cidvilāsa has referred to (page \*112) also belongs

---

*Prasthāna traya Bhāṣyas*, complete with introduction, original text, translation, notes and index. Those who are interested to know about the uniformity of Ācārya's treatment of the subject are welcome to have a look at them.

to this category. The *Soundarya Lahari* which he has cited will be referred to later when we discuss *Tāntrik* books.

### **Had Ācārya perused Books like Sūta Samhitā etc.?**

149. There is a prevalent *śloka* which means that the Ācārya read the *Sūta Samhitā* eighteen times before he wrote his *Bhāṣya*. *Sūta Samhitā* deals with *karma*, *upāsanā* and *jñāna* in detail. Someone must have thought that this is good enough to have been perused by the Ācārya, and must have composed the *śloka* to praise the book. Otherwise, Mādhava Mantri, the commentator on *Sūta Samhitā* would never have failed to say that the Ācārya too derived benefit by the book. Similarly, beliefs such as *Sūta Samhitā Bhāṣya* and *Viṣṇu Bhāgavata Bhāṣya* are Ācārya's are only indicative of the wishes of well-meaning devotees that 'it would have been good if Ācārya had written' or 'those texts are good enough for the Ācārya to write *Bhāṣya* on them', and nothing else. Although some books like *Sūta Samhitā*, *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*, *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa*, *Viṣṇu Bhāgavata* are full and overflowing with Advaitic content, there must be a reason for Ācārya not citing from them anywhere in his *Bhāṣyas*. Critics will have to think and determine why this so.

In the *Sūtrabhāṣya*, at the end of his commentary on *Samanvaya Sūtra*, the Ācārya has cited three *ślokas* commencing with 'गौणमिथ्यात्म-नोऽसत्त्वे'. The commentator on *Sūta Samhitā* has said that these *ślokas* are of Sundara Pāṇḍya. As Sundara Pāṇḍya has been referred to in the *Tantra Vārtika*, some scholars feel that he is a Vedāntin of Śaṅkara tradition (J. O. R. Vol. No. 1, p15). The oldest commentary that we have on Ācārya's *Sūtrabhāṣya* is *Pañcapādikā* in which it is said 'प्रसिद्धमेतद्

ब्रह्मविदामिति पूर्वोक्तं न्यायं संक्षेपतः श्लोकैः संगृह्णाति'; but there is no mention of Sundara Pāṇḍya. In the more recent commentary *Bhāmati* of Vācaspati Miśra also it is said 'ब्रह्मविदां गाथां उदाहरति' (cites the statement of the knower of Brahman), but no mention is made of Sundara Pāṇḍya. But the author of *Kalpataru*, which is a sub-commentary on *Bhāmati*, has made some citations from Sundara Pāṇḍya in a few places; but he also has not said that these three *ślokas* (that the Ācārya cites) are of Sundara Pāṇḍya. His name is not there in any other commentary on *Sūtrabhāṣya*. This leads us to suppose that the real authorship of these *ślokas* was not known exactly, even at the time of these commentators. Not only this, Ācārya has never cited sentences from any Śaiva books. Therefore, even if these *ślokas* were there in Sundara Pāṇḍya's book, one cannot be sure whether they were originally his or taken from some other source. This being so, it is not proper to conclude that the Ācārya belongs to the tradition of Sundara Pāṇḍya. We are going to discuss in another chapter, about the tradition to which Ācārya belongs. Then let us take this up once again. Whatever that be, there is no impediment to believe that there is no relation between Ācārya's *Sūtrabhāṣya* and *Sūta Samhitā*. The Upaniṣad commentary given under *Brahmagītā* of *Sūta Samhitā* being different from Ācārya's *Sūtrabhāṣya* at several places also gives support to such a belief.



## 19. Teachings of Ācārya

### Basis to decide what are the teachings of Śaṅkara

150. Before deciding whether the books, *Prakaraṇas* and *stotras* that are currently prevalent in Ācārya's name are really his or not, it is necessary to settle the essence of his teachings as revealed in his *Bhāṣyas*. Because, a decision would come up that whatever book goes against such an essential teaching based upon the *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas* would not be his. It goes without saying that the intended meaning of *Prasthānatraya* should be based, to the extent possible, directly upon Ācārya's *Bhāṣyas*. Fortunately for us, because of the lucid style of the Ācārya in clearly explaining his opinion in a variety of methods, the commentaries on his *Bhāṣyas* are not normally needed. We have to remember that even if the Ācārya's writings were very concise and in a difficult style, then too the commentaries on his *Bhāṣyas* would not have been helpful. Because, such commentaries are describing mutually contradictory meanings only as Ācāryas opinion; also one system of commentaries is refuting the other. We are going to make this clear shortly. The readers are to remember that the summary of Ācāryas teachings that we are going to give here has been written based upon only the *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas* of the Ācārya.

Another thing is, in the works of critics who have received modern education, aiming at expounding Ācārya's opinion, in English or in other languages, the subject matter is discussed on the presupposition that the *Bhāṣyas*, the *Prakaraṇas* and the commentaries on

*Bhāṣyas* - all have the same purport. In some such books, an attempt to link with Vedānta the opinions of western philosophers like Berkeley, Kant etc. is made. Therefore, if differences or contradictions with such books are found in what we are going to give as the summary of Ācārya's teachings, it should be remembered that the reason may be that we have based only upon his *Bhāṣyas*, whereas such critics have considered all the books available as Ācārya's are equally authoritative.

### Outlines of Śaṅkara Doctrine

151. We are going to summarize the important tenets of Śaṅkara Doctrine below:

(1) There is only one Ātman as the Ultimate Reality of us all. He is self-evident and does not need to be established by any means of knowledge. It is also not possible to deny His existence, because He is the Self of whosoever tries to establish or whosoever tries to deny him.

[न हि आत्मा आगन्तुकः कस्यचित् । स्वयंसिद्धत्वात् । न ह्यात्मा आत्मनः प्रमाणमपेक्ष्य सिध्यति । तस्य हि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणान्यप्रसिद्धप्रमेयसिद्धय उपादीयन्ते । ...न चेदृशस्य निराकरणं सम्भवति । आगन्तुकं हि वस्तु निराक्रियते न स्वरूपम् । य एव हि निराकर्ता तदेव तस्य स्वरूपम् ॥ (Sū. Bhā. 2. 3. 7)].

(2) This Ātman is of the nature of Truth; because he never transforms his nature. All else, since they have no ascertained form or nature, are not true but illusory.

[यदूपायं यन्निश्चितं तद्रूपं न व्यभिचरति तत्सत्यम् । यदूपायं यन्निश्चितं तद्रूपं व्यभिचरत् अनृतमित्युच्यते । अतो विकारोऽनृतम् ॥ (Tai. Bhā. 2. 1)].

This Ātman is of the nature of Knowledge. Here, knowledge

means not the cognition of mundane objects like pot etc. that would be arising and disappearing; what we say as 'knowledge of the pot is formed' and 'it is gone' is vritti, a mode of our internal organ, a modification of the internal-organ taking shape of the object. Just as Sun's light is his own form, the knowledge of the Ātman would be His very form. Since the vrittis appear and disappear while being pervaded by the Ātman-knowledge, and as its objects, they too shine as Knowledge, just as a tin-plate shines in sunlight; hence, people refer to them as if they were the knowledge of the Ātman, by a false opinion. True Knowledge is the very form of the Ātman.

[आत्मनः स्वरूपं ज्ञप्तिः, न ततो व्यतिरिच्यते । अतो नित्यैव । तथापि बुद्धेरुपाधिलक्षणायाः चक्षुरादिद्वारैर्विषयाकारेण परिणामिन्या ये शब्दाद्याकारावभासाः, ते आत्मविज्ञानस्य विषयभूता उत्पद्यमाना एव आत्मविज्ञानेन व्याप्ता उत्पद्यन्ते । तस्मादात्मविज्ञानावभासाश्च ते विज्ञानशब्द-वाच्याश्च धात्वर्थभूता आत्मन एव धर्मा विक्रियारूपा इत्यविवेकिभिः परि कल्प्यन्ते ॥ (Tai. Bhā. 2. 1)].

(3) Thus, confounding and mixing the Ātman, who is of the form of Truth and Consciousness, with non-Ātman which is not true, and taking the nature of one as the nature of the other, without being able to discriminate, people are unwisely transacting with the notion that they are the body, senses etc., and that son, wealth etc. that are outside belong to them.

[अन्योन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकताम्, अन्योन्यधर्माश्च अध्यस्य इतरेतराविवेकेन, अत्यन्तविविक्तयोः धर्मधर्मिणोर्मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य 'अहमिदम्, ममेदम्' इति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः ॥ (Sū. Bhā. Adhyāsavivaraṇa; Gī. Bhā. 13. 26)].

This confounding, adhyāsa, (अध्यास), of mixing up Ātman and non-Ātman thus, is called *avidyā*; on the basis of this *avidyā* only have begun all the worldly as well as Vedic transactions and also the Shastras



prescribing injunctions, prohibitions and liberation.

[तमेतमविद्याख्यमात्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः, सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि ॥ (Sū. Bhā. Adhyāsabhāṣya].

(4) It is in the experience of all that this wrong conception, *adhyāsa*, exists in everyone without beginning or end, and is causing agentship and enjoyership in them.

[एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः ॥ (Sū. Bhā. Adhyāsabhāṣya].

(5) Due to this *avidyā* of the form of *adhyāsa*, the notion of knower in Ātman appears to be natural. It is like this: without the notions 'I am the body' and 'the senses are mine', one cannot have the notion 'I am the knower'. Without feeling thus, no one can cognize objects by valid means of knowledge and attempt its acquisition, avoidance etc. Therefore, we come to know that this *avidyā* alone is the cause of the evils of *saṃsāra* of the form of 'I am the doer' and 'I am the enjoyer'.

[न हि इन्द्रियाणि अनुपादाय प्रत्यक्षादिव्यवहारः सम्भवति । न च अधिष्ठानमन्तरेण इन्द्रियाणां व्यवहारः सम्भवति । न च अनध्यस्तात्मभावेन देहेन कश्चिद्व्याप्रियते । न च एतस्मिन् सर्वास्मिन् असति असङ्गस्यात्मनः प्रमातृत्वमुपपद्यते ॥ न च प्रमातृत्वमन्तरेण प्रमाणप्रवृत्तिरस्ति । तस्मादविद्यावद्विषयाण्येव प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि च ॥ ... आस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते ॥ (Sū. Bhā. Adhyāsabhāṣya].

(6) As said above, the Ātman who is well-known to us all in the state of *avidyā*, in the forms 'I am the knower', 'I am the doer', 'I am the enjoyer', is called *ahaṃkartṛ* (self as I-awareness, *jīva*, who is the agent of actions) and *ahaṃpratyaayaṣayaḥ* (the object of I-awareness, *jīva*). Distinct from him, *Paramātman*, the Ātman of us all who is witness-

ing him directly, can only be known from the Upaniṣads; except in the Upaniṣads, that Witness has not been described either in speculative systems or in the *Karmakāṇḍa* of the Vedas. Hence, that Witness is called aupaniṣada puruṣaḥ, औपनिषद पुरुषः. Doing worldly transactions considering himself as the 'I' that appears as a result of mutual superimposition of the Ātman and non-Ātman, which are real and false, is *avidyā*; on the other hand, having known the nature of *Paramātmān*, concluding all non-Ātman to be illusory is *vidyā*. When *vidyā* arises, *avidyā* disappears; because of that the *avidyā* of the form of *saṃsāra* transactions too disappears.

[न हि अहंप्रत्ययकर्तृव्यतिरेकेण तत्साक्षी सर्वभूतस्थः सम एकः कूटस्थो पुरुषः विधिकाण्डे तर्कसमये वा केनचिदधिगतः सर्वस्य आत्मा । ...‘तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि’ (बृ. ३. ९. २७) इति औपनिषदत्वविशेषणं पुरुषस्य उपनिषत्सु प्राधान्येन प्रतिपाद्यमानत्वे उपपद्यते ॥ सू. भा. १. १. ४.

तमेतमेवं लक्षणम् अध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते । तद्विवेकेन च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्याम् आहुः ॥ ( *Adhyāsabhāṣya* ).

(7) In order to convey that according to *Śruti* Brahman, the Ātman of us all, is the cause of creation, existence and dissolution of the world, Brahman is referred to as Ātman in some places. To get rid of *avidyā* that is the cause of all the evils of *saṃsāra*, the identity of Brahman and Ātman is taught in sentences like ‘you are that Ātman’, ‘I am Brahman’ etc. Ātman of transmigratory existence does not exist at all, apart from Brahman. Hence, one has to understand that one is Brahman that is without a second. *Avidyā* gets removed thus.

[सर्वश्रुतिषु च ब्रह्मण्यात्मशब्दप्रयोगात्, आत्मशब्दस्य प्रत्यगात्माभिधायकत्वात्, ‘एष

सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा' इति च श्रुतेः परमात्मव्यतिरेकेण संसारिणोऽभावात्, 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्', 'ब्रह्मैवेदम्', 'आत्मैवेदम्' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यो युक्तमेव अहंब्रह्मास्मीत्यवधारयितुम् ॥ बृ. २. १. २०. ॥

'तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मनः' इति ब्रह्मण्येव आत्मशब्दप्रयोगात् वेदितुरात्मैव ब्रह्म ॥ तै. भा. २. १. ॥

अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते ॥ अ. भा. ॥

यथाशास्त्रं क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञलक्षणभेदपरिज्ञानपूर्वकं प्राग्दर्शितरूपात् क्षेत्रात् मुञ्जादिव इषीकां यथोक्तलक्षणं क्षेत्रज्ञं प्रविभज्य 'न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते' ॥ (गी. भा. १३. १२) ॥ इत्यनेन निरस्तसर्वोपाधिविशेषं ज्ञेयं ब्रह्मस्वरूपेण यः पश्यति क्षेत्रं च मायानिर्मित-हस्ति-स्वप्न-दृश्यवस्तु-गन्धर्वनगरादिवत् असदेव सदिव अवभासते इत्येवं निश्चितविज्ञानो यः, तस्य यथोक्तसम्यग्दर्शनविरोधात् अपगच्छति मिथ्याज्ञानम् ॥ गी. भा. १३. २६. ॥].

(8) As stated in (3) above, the Upaniṣads which are teaching about liberation also have begun presuming *avidyā*. But still, they are the valid means of knowledge to teach the Ātman that is of the nature of Brahman. Since the knowledge obtained by the teachings of the Upaniṣads remove the knowership itself of the Ātman, there will not remain any transactions using the means of knowledge at all after the rise of that knowledge. This has to be understood similar to the knowledge gained during a dream becoming invalid as means of knowledge after awakening. For this reason, the Upaniṣads are regarded as the final means of knowledge. The Upaniṣads do not teach Brahman as an object of knowledge; neither the knowledge that arises from them objectifies Brahman. Because, Brahman, in the form of our Ātman, is the eternal Subject that illumines our mind, speech etc. The function of the scriptures is only to negate what is not the nature of the Ātman. When that knowledge of what is not the Ātman is gained, the self-established Ātman shines Himself. This method of teaching

Ātman by negating what is not the nature of Ātman is called *Āgama*.

[शास्त्रादेव प्रमाणात् जगतो जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्म अधिगम्यते ॥ सू. भा. १. १. ३. ॥

शास्त्रं तु अन्त्यं प्रमाणम् अतद्धर्माध्यारोपणमात्रनिवर्तकत्वेन प्रामाण्यम् आत्मनः प्रतिपद्यते, न त्वज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन ॥ गी. भा. २. १८. ॥

न हि आत्मस्वरूपाधिगमे सति पुनः प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः सम्भवति । प्रमातृत्वं हि आत्मनो निवर्तयति अन्त्यं प्रमाणम् । निवर्तयदेव च अप्रमाणीभवति स्वप्नकालप्रमाणमिव प्रबोधे ॥ गी. भा. २. ७९. ॥

न हि शास्त्रमिदन्तया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति । किं तर्हि प्रत्यागात्मत्वेन अविषय-तया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयति ॥ सू. भा. १. १. ४. ॥

सत्यमेवम्, प्रत्यक्षादिभिः प्रमाणैर्न परः प्रत्याययितुं शक्यः । आगमेन तु शक्यत एव प्रत्याययितुम् । तदुपदेशार्थमागमं आह - अन्यदेवतद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि इति ॥ के. भा. १. ४. ॥

यद्येवं द्वैताभावे शास्त्रव्यापारो नाद्वैते । विरोधात् ॥ गौ. का. भा. २. ३२. ].

(9) The doubts such as ‘wherefrom this *avidyā* has come?’, ‘if we admit the divisions of *vidyā* and *avidyā*, *Śāstra* and *Śishya* etc., would it not be detrimental to Advaita?’ would not arise to those who remember that, as it is described till now, scriptures too function in the realm of *avidyā* of the form of *adhyāsa*; and hence the transactions - like *vidyā* and *avidyā*, *Śāstra*, *Śishya* and *Guru* and the like - remain in *avidyā*. The method of assuming such divisions for the sake of instruction and teaching the truth is called *adhyāropa-apavāda nyāya*, deliberate superimposition and later rescission. What is superimposed for the sake of instruction would become null and void with negation; hence the non-existence of divisions is the ultimate truth. It should be remembered that *dr̥gdr̥śyaviveka*: (discriminating the Seer and the seen), *sṛṣṭīprakriyā*: (method using creation), *pañcakośaviveka*: (discrimination of the five sheaths), *avasthātrayaparīkshā*: (Examining

the three states) etc. are told assuming Ātman as the knower from the point of view of adhyāropa (superimposition). *Adhyāropa* is starting the investigation on the basis of well-known empirical divisions and *apavāda* is showing that they are non-existent in reality. When it is required to express the Truth as it is, the Ultimate Reality can only be expressed only as 'not this', 'not this'; there is no other method for this.

[यथा बुद्ध्याद्याहृतस्य शब्दाद्यर्थस्य अविक्रय एव सन् बुद्धिवृत्त्यविवेकविज्ञानेन अविद्यया उपलब्धा आत्मा कल्प्यते, एवमेव आत्मानात्मविवेकविज्ञानेन बुद्धिवृत्त्या विद्यया असत्यरूप-यैव परमार्थतोऽविक्रय एव आत्मा विद्वान् उच्यते ॥ गी. भा. २. २१. ॥

कस्य पुनरयमप्रबोध इति चेत् । यस्त्वं पृच्छसि तस्य त इति वदामः । नन्वहमीश्वर एवोक्तः श्रुत्या । यद्येवं प्रतिबुद्धोऽसि नास्ति कस्यचिदप्रबोधः । योऽपि दोषश्चोद्यते कैश्चित् अविद्यया किल आत्मनः सद्वितीयत्वात् अद्वैतानुपपत्तिरिति सोऽप्येतेन प्रत्युक्तः ॥ सू. भा. ४. १. ३. ॥

ननु शास्ता, शास्त्रं, शिष्यः इति विकल्पः कथं निवृत्त इति? उच्यते...यथायं प्रपञ्चो मायारज्जुसर्पवत्, तथायं शिष्यादिभेदविकल्पोऽपि प्राक् प्रतिबोधादेव उपदेशनिमित्तः । अतः उपदेशादयं वादः शिष्यः, शास्ता, शास्त्रं इति । उपदेशकार्ये तु ज्ञाने निर्वृत्ते ज्ञाते परमार्थतत्त्वे द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥ गौ. का. भा. १. १८. ॥

प्रसिद्धं तु भेदमनूद्य बन्धमोक्षव्यवस्था प्रतिपाद्यते । भेदस्तु उपाधिनिमित्तो मिथ्याज्ञान-कल्पितो न पारमार्थिकः ॥ सू. भा. १. ४. १०. ॥

तथा च सम्प्रदायविदां वचनम् 'अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते' इति ॥ गी. भा. १३. १३. ॥

उत्पत्तिप्रलययोरभावात् बद्धादयो न सन्तीत्येषा परमार्थता ॥ गौ. का. भा. २. ३२. ॥

यस्मात् इति न इति न - इत्येतस्मात्...अन्यत् परं निर्देशनं नास्ति, तस्मादयमेव निर्देशो ब्रह्मणः ॥ बृ. भा. २. ३. ६. ॥].

(10) The names and forms that appear due to *avidyā* can neither be held as Ātman nor can be held as other than Ātman. That is why Ācārya has said they are 'तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यां अनिर्वचनीय'; just as the foam cannot be said to be water or different from water, the names and forms

cannot be held as *Paramātman* or held to be different from Him. But truly, just as foam is water only, the names and forms too are *Paramātman* only. Arising due to *avidyā*, these are referred in *Śrutis* and *Smṛtis* as *Avyākṛta*, *Māyā*, *Śakti*, *Prakṛti*, *Avyakta*, *Akṣara*, *Ākāśa*, *Bīja* etc. *Māyā* is not *avidyā* itself, but it is the imagined appearance of name and form due to *avidyā*. Just because Ācārya has told that *Māyā* is ineffable (अनिर्वचनीय), one should not think that he has expressed his inability to describe it; because he has clearly stated that the ultimate nature of *Māyā* is *Paramātman* only.

[सर्वज्ञस्य ईश्वरस्य आत्मभूते इव अविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्य, ईश्वरस्य माया, शक्तिः, प्रकृतिः इति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलप्येते ॥ सू. भा. २. १. १४. ॥

अविद्यात्मिका हि बीजशक्तिः, अव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देशया परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुप्तिः, यस्यां स्वरूपप्रतिबोधरहिताः शेरते संसारिणो जीवाः । तदेतदव्यक्तं क्वचिदाकाशशब्दनिर्दिष्टम् ... क्वचिदक्षरशब्दोदितम् ... क्वचिन्मायेति सूचितम् ॥ सू. भा. १. ४. ३. ॥

यदा तु परमार्थदृष्ट्या परमार्थतत्त्वात् श्रुत्यनुसारिभिरन्यत्वेन निरूप्यमाणे नामरूपे मृदादिविकारवत् वस्त्वन्तरे तत्त्वतो न स्तः सलिलफेनघटादिविकारवदेव, तदा तदपेक्ष्य 'एकमेवाऽद्वितीयम्', 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' इत्यादिपरमार्थदर्शनगोचरत्वं प्रतिपद्यते । यदा तु स्वाभाविक्या अविद्यया ब्रह्मस्वरूपं रज्जुशुक्तिकागगनस्वरूपवदेव स्वेन रूपेण वर्तमानं केनचिदस्पृष्टस्वभावमपि सत्, नामरूपकृतकार्यकरणोपाधिभ्यो विवेकेन नावधार्यते, नामरूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव च भवति स्वाभाविकी, तदा सर्वोऽयं वस्त्वन्तरास्तित्वव्यवहारः ॥ बृ. भा. ३. ५. १. ॥].

(11) Since the knowledge of Brahman is to culminate in experience, the *Śrutis* alone, and merely because they are *Śrutis*, are not told here as the means of that knowledge. Also since knowledge culminating in intuition arises from the Vedāntic sentences like *Tat Tvam Asi* (Thou Art That), there is no reason to doubt it either. That is why reasoning

as an accessory to intuition is told here. Accepting the explanation that Brahman is the cause of creation etc. of the world, the *Śruti* has taught the reasoning by examining the three states of consciousness and such other methods, which is also an accessory to intuition. Since the world takes birth from Brahman, remains in existence in It and gets dissolved into It, the world is not different from Brahman; since the waking and dream states are mutually exclusive, the Ātman has no contact with either of them; in deep sleep, since the *Jīva*, leaving the world, merges himself in Brahman, it means that *Jīva* too is Brahman and devoid of the world - such reasoning leads to this intuition. That is all; and mere speculation of the human intellect will not be of any use here.

[न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्, किं तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणम् । अनुभवावसानत्वात्, भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य ॥ सू. भा. १. १. २. ॥

कर्मफले हि स्वर्गादौ अनुभवानारूढे स्यादाशङ्काभवेद्वा न वा इति । अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम् । ‘यत्साक्षादपरोक्षात् ब्रह्म’ (बृ. भा. ३. ५. १) इति श्रुतेः । ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इति च सिद्धवदुपदेशात् ॥ सू. भा. ३. ३. ३२. ॥

नानेन मिषेण शुष्कतर्कस्य अत्र आत्मलाभः सम्भवति । श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेन आश्रीयते । स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोरुभयोरिततेतरव्यभिचारादात्मनोऽनन्वागतत्वम्, सम्प्रसादे च प्रपञ्चपरित्यागेन सदात्मना सम्पत्तेर्निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मत्वम् । प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रभवत्वात् कार्यकारणानन्यत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्माव्यतिरेक इत्येवंजातीयकः ॥ सू. भा. २. १. ६. ॥].

### **Sādhana Viveka (Discretion on the means of accomplishment)**

152. We have already stated that although Brahman is without distinctions, devoid of contact with anything that is second to it, the

*Śruti* uses several adjuncts (upādhi) superimposed on It as a means to teach, and has taught Its nature. Accepting special forms to the Lord, characterised by the names and forms conceived by *avidyā*, which are either differentiated (*vyākṛta*), or non-differentiated (*avyākṛta*), the *Śruti* attributes *Īśwara* to be the cause of creation etc. of the world. Though names and forms are the means adopted to teach, it is not implied that they belong to the nature of Ātman. Even if it is agreed that the knower or inquirer who wishes to know the Ultimate Principle by practising listening, reflection and concentration, *śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsana* and the Brahman that is inquired about are different from the view point of superimposition, after knowing the Truth, the knower himself becomes Brahman. But while asserting the difference between *Jīva* and *Īśwara*, and while speaking about the relation with the cause, action and its result, the Ātman is assumed to have the attributes with adjuncts made out of names and forms. Accepting these special forms of adjuncts, the scriptures prescribe the vedic rites and meditation.

[अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्मपरिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते । पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतं अपरिणतं अवतिष्ठते वाचारम्भणमात्रत्वाच्च अविद्याकल्पितस्य रूपभेदस्येति न निरवयवत्वं ब्रह्मणः कुप्यति । न चेयं परिणामश्रुतिः परिणामप्रतिपादनार्था । तत्प्रतिपत्तौ फलानवगमात् । सर्वव्यवहारहीनब्रह्मात्मभाव-प्रतिपादनार्था त्वेषा । तत्प्रतिपत्तौ फलावगमात् ॥ सू. भा. २. १. २७. ॥

अविद्याकृतनामरूपोपाध्यनुरोधी ईश्वरो भवति व्योमेव घटकरकाद्युपाध्यनुरोधी । स च स्वात्मभूतानेव घटाकाशस्थानीयान् अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपकृतकार्यकरणसङ्घातानुरोधिनो जीवाख्यानं विज्ञानात्मनः प्रति ईष्टे व्यवहारविषये ॥ सू. भा. २. १. १४. ॥

एकमपि ब्रह्म अपेक्षितोपाधिसम्बन्धं निरस्तोपाधिसम्बन्धं च उपास्यत्वेन ज्ञेयत्वेन च



वेदान्तेषु उपदिश्यते ॥ सू. भा. १. १. १२. ॥

अन्वेष्टव्यात्मविज्ञानात् प्राक्प्रमातृत्वमात्मनः ।

अन्विष्टः स्यात् प्रमातैव पाप्मदोषादिवर्जितः ॥ सू. भा. १. १. ४. ॥

यथाप्राप्तमेव कारकास्तित्वं उपादाय उपात्तदुरितक्षयार्थं कर्माणि विदधत् शास्त्रं मुमुक्षूणां फलार्थिनां च फलसाधनं न कारकास्तित्वे व्याप्रियते ॥ तै. शीक्षा. भा. उपसंहारः ॥

तत्र अविद्यावस्थायां ब्रह्मणः उपास्योपासकादिलक्षणः सर्वो व्यवहारः ॥ सू. भा. १. १. १२. ॥].

### Results of Devoted Practice (Sādhana phala)

153. (1) If the actions prescribed for the classes and stages of life are being carried out by the people belonging to respective classes and stages of life, the fruits of actions like heaven etc. that are mentioned would accrue. After enjoying them, corresponding to the remaining actions that are about to fructify, future births would be obtained. If the actions prescribed are performed only as Iswara's worship, without desiring the actions and fruits of actions, they will achieve the purity of mind and the necessary qualification for abiding in knowledge. Thereby those actions would lead to liberation.

[एतेषां जातिविहितानां कर्मणां सम्यगनुष्ठितानां स्वर्गप्राप्तिः फलं स्वभावतः । 'वर्णा आप्र-  
माश्च स्वकर्मनिष्ठाः प्रेत्य कर्मफलं अनुभूय ततः शेषेण विशिष्टदेशजातिकुलधर्मायुःश्रुतवृत्तवित्त-  
सुखमेधसो जन्म प्रतिपद्यन्ते' इत्यादिस्मृतिभ्यः ॥ गी. भा. १८. ४५. ॥

अभ्युदयार्थोऽपि यः प्रवृत्तिलक्षणो धर्मो वर्णान् आप्रमांश्च उद्दिश्य विहितः स देवादिस्थान-  
प्राप्तिहेतुरपि सन् ईश्वरार्पणबुद्ध्या अनुष्ठीयमानः सत्त्वशुद्धये भवति फलाभिसन्धिवर्जितः ।  
शुद्धसत्त्वस्य च ज्ञाननिष्ठायोग्यताप्राप्तिद्वारेण ज्ञानोत्पत्तिहेतुत्वेन च निःश्रेयसहेतुत्वमपि  
प्रतिपद्यते ॥ गी. भा. ॥ (introduction)].

(2) For the *karmis* (those who are engaged in actions), the fruition would be entering the Candra-loka, the world of Moon, of Pitrs, (an-

cestors), and after finishing the enjoyment there, returning to this world to be born again. For those who did upāsana, meditation, of the Lord, (the fruition would be) Brahma-loka, the world of Brahma, through the path of Gods; and if they acquire knowledge there, then, along with Brahma (Lord of that world), at the end of *kalpa* (final dissolution), they attain Parabrahman. This is what is known as liberation in steps, *krama mukti*. For those who purify their minds by way of actions and practise *śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsana* for the sake of knowledge, then as a result of *nididhyāsana* (*dhyāna yoga*), (the fruition would be) realization of the oneness with Brahman, liberation here itself, *sadyomukti*; they become one with Brahman (here itself). From the empirical point of view, for those who attain knowledge, the accumulated stock of *karma* (actions from previous lives and upto to the dawn of knowledge in this life) only would be destroyed; since the *prārabdha karma* has already yielded fruit, they will enjoy that till the momentum of that karma is exhausted at the death of the body, and then become one with *Paramātmān*; further they will not be born like the other *karmis*. From the transcendental point of view, since the man of knowledge would have decided that he has 'no relation with *karma* in the past, present or future', his knowledge will result in the destruction of all karmas, and he attains *sadyomukti*.

[धूमो रात्रिः धूमाभिमानी रात्र्यभिमानी च देवता । तथा कृष्णः कृष्णपक्षदेवता । षण्मासा दक्षिणायनं इति च पूर्ववत् देवतैव । तत्र चन्द्रमसि भवं चान्द्रमसं ज्योतिःफलं इष्टाधिकारी योगी कर्मी प्राप्य भुक्त्वा तत्क्षयात् इह पुनः निवर्तते ॥ गी. भा. ८. २५. ॥

देवयानेन पथा ये ब्रह्मलोकं शास्त्रोक्तविशेषणं गच्छन्ति ते तं प्राप्य न चन्द्रलोकादिव भुक्तभोगा आवर्तन्ते ॥ सू. भा. ४. ४. २२. ॥

कार्यब्रह्मलोकप्रलयप्रत्युपस्थाने सति तत्रैवोत्पन्नसम्यग्दर्शनाः सन्तस्तदध्यक्षेण सह अतः-

परं परिशुद्धं विष्णोः परमं पदं प्रतिपद्यन्ते । इत्थं क्रममुक्तिरनावृत्यादिश्रुत्यभिधानेभ्योऽभ्युप-  
गन्तव्या ॥ सू. भा. ४. ३. १०. ॥

सर्वभूतस्थं सर्वेषु भूतेषु स्थितं स्वं आत्मानं सर्वभूतानि च आत्मनि ब्रह्मादीनि स्तम्बपर्यन्तानि  
च सर्वभूतानि आत्मनि एकतां गतानि ईक्षते पश्यति योगयुक्तात्मा समाहितान्तःकरणः । सर्वत्र  
समदर्शनः । सर्वेषु ब्रह्मादिस्थावरान्तेषु विषमेषु सर्वभूतेषु समं निर्विशेषं ब्रह्मात्मैकत्वविषयं  
दर्शनादिज्ञानं यस्य स सर्वत्रसमदर्शनः ॥ गी. भा. ६. २९. ॥

तं पुराणं पुरातनं अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन विषयेभ्यः प्रतिसंहृत्य चेतसा आत्मनि समाधानं  
अध्यात्मयोगः । तस्य अधिगमः । तेन मत्वा देवं आत्मानं धीरो हर्षशोकौ आत्मनः  
उत्कर्षापकर्षयोरभावात् जहाति ॥ का. भा. १. २. १२. ॥

तस्मिन् मार्गे प्रयाता मृताः गच्छन्ति ब्रह्म ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्मोपासकाः ब्रह्मोपासनापरा जनाः ।  
'क्रमेण' इति वाक्यशेषः । न हि सद्योमुक्तिभाजां सम्यग्दर्शननिष्ठानां गतिरागतिर्वा क्वचिदस्ति ।  
न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति (बृ. ४. ४. ८) इति श्रुतेः; ब्रह्मसत्त्वीनप्राणा एव ते ब्रह्ममया ब्रह्मभूता  
एव ते ॥ गी. भा. ८. २४. ॥

न तावदनारब्धकार्यं कर्माशयं ज्ञानोत्पत्तिरूपपद्यते आश्रिते च तस्मिन् कुलालचक्रवत्  
प्रवृत्तवेगस्य अन्तराले प्रतिबन्धासम्भवात्, भवति वेगक्षयप्रतिपालनम् ॥ सू. भा. ४. १. १५. ॥

पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेषु अकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि,  
नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासं नेदानीं नापि भविष्यत्काले इति ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति ॥ सू.  
भा. ४. १. १३. ॥].

(3) Although Parameśwara is without birth or destruction, He, having full control over *Māyā* which is constituted with the three *Gunas*, appears as if he were born and possessing a body, and bestows his grace to the world. This will not be a birth for Him just as in the case of the other *Jīvas*. Some like *Apāntaratamas* will continue to live even after attaining knowledge, till their work entrusted by Parameśwara would be completed; since their *prārabdha karma* would not have been exhausted, they will independently take several bodies, and hence we cannot doubt that even the liberated will be

entering into the cycle of birth and death. Some *maharshis* practicing *saguṇa vidyā* (upāsana of God with qualities and form), would have another birth in which they will have dispassion and obtain liberation through knowledge of *Paramātmān*. Therefore, even their example would not give rise to the doubt 'whether knowledge will yield *Sadyomukti*, liberation here and now, or not?'

[स च भगवान् ज्ञानैश्वर्यशक्तिबलवीर्यतेजोभिः सदा सम्पन्नः त्रिगुणात्मिकां वैष्णवीं मायां मूलप्रकृतिं (?) वशीकृत्य अजोऽव्ययो भूतानां ईश्वरो नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावोऽपि सन् स्वमायाया देहवान् इव जात इव च लोकानुग्रहं कुर्वन् लक्ष्यते ॥ गी. भा.(introduction) ॥

एवं अपान्तरतमः प्रभृतयोऽपि ईश्वराः परमेश्वरेण तेषु तेषु अधिकारेषु नियुक्ताः सन्तः सत्यपि सम्यग्दर्शने कैवल्यहेतौ अक्षीणकर्माणः, यावदधिकारं अवतिष्ठन्ते । तदवसाने च अपवृज्यन्ते इत्यविरुद्धम् ॥ सू. भा. ३. ३. ३२. ॥

ज्ञानान्तरेषु च ऐश्वर्यादिफलेषु आसक्ताः स्युर्महर्षयः । ते पश्चात् ऐश्वर्यक्षयदर्शनेन निर्विण्णाः परमात्मज्ञाने परिनिष्ठिताः कैवल्यं प्रापुः इत्युपपद्यते ॥ सू. भा. ३. ३. ३२. ॥].

(4) To the question 'what are the means to liberation?' the answer that the Ācārya has given is: carrying out one's own duties prescribed for one's class and stage of life as an offering to *Īśwara*, *sādhana catuṣṭaya sampatti*, (four-fold qualification) *śravaṇa manana nididhyāsana* preceded by renunciation of all *karmas* - these are more and more inner practices. Because of these, knowledge is produced and one attains liberation. All these things are told from the view point of superimposition; from the transcendental point of view however, *sādhana*, *bandha*, *mukti* (means/effort, bondage, liberation) are not real; Brahman alone is the Truth.

[तस्मात्, यज्ञादीनि शमदमादीनि च यथाश्रमं सर्वाण्येव आश्रमकर्माणि विद्योत्पत्तौ अपेक्षितव्यानि । तत्रापि एवमित् इति विद्यासंयोगात् प्रत्यासन्नानि विद्यासाधनानि शमादीनि, विविदिषासंयोगात् बाह्यतराणि यज्ञादीनि इति विवेक्तव्यम् ॥ सू. भा. ३. ४. २७. ॥

तस्मात्, विद्यासंयुक्तं नित्यं अग्निहोत्रादिविद्याविहीनं च उभयमपि मुमुक्षुणा मोक्षप्रयोजनो-  
द्देशेन इहजन्मनि जन्मान्तरे च प्राग् ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः कृतं यत् तद् यथासामर्थ्यं ब्रह्माधिगमप्रतिबन्ध-  
कारणोपात्तदुरितक्षयहेतुत्वद्वारेण ब्रह्माधिगमकारणत्वं प्रतिपद्यमानं श्रवणमननश्रद्धातात्पर्या-  
द्यन्तरङ्गकारणापेक्षं ब्रह्मविद्यया सह एककार्यं भवतीति स्थितम् ॥ सू. भा. ४. २. १८. ॥

ब्रह्मज्ञानपरिपाकाङ्गत्वाच्च पारिव्राज्यस्य ॥ सू. भा. ३. ४. २०. ॥].



## 20. The Vedāntic Tradition of

### Ācārya

#### Earlier Teachers in the Tradition of Ācārya

154. Did the Ācārya establish Advaita anew? If someone were to ask this question, everyone unanimously has said no. Previous to Ācārya there were Govinda Bhagavatpāda and Gauḍapāda. The four chapters of *Kārikas* on Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad written by Gauḍapāda is recognized by all as the most ancient source work on Advaita for the Ācārya. The Ācārya too in his *Sūtrabhāṣya* has honoured Gauḍapāda by sentences like ‘तथा च सम्प्रदायविदो वदन्ति’ (the knower of the traditional method has told likewise about this subject) (Sū. Bhā. 1. 4. 14) and ‘अत्रोक्तं वेदान्तार्थसम्प्रदायविद्भिराचार्यैः’ (it has been said thus by Ācārya who knows the tradition of the inner meaning of Vedānta) (Sū. Bhā. 2. 1. 9).

In addition to these, the Ācārya has cited from some earlier Ācāryas, who are not known with certainty, in some places in his *Sūtrabhāṣya*. For example, we can see these sentences from *Gītābhāṣya*. ‘तस्मादसम्प्रदायवित् सर्वशास्त्रविदपि मूर्खवदेव उपेक्षणीयः’ (therefore, one who does not know the tradition, although knowing all the *Śāstras*, is to be ignored as a fool) (Gī. Bhā. 13. 2); ‘सत्यमेवं गुरुसम्प्रदायरहितानां’ (for those who do not have tradition of a Guru, it is like this only) (Gī. Bhā. 18. 50); ‘तथा हि सम्प्रदायविदां वचनम् - अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यत इति’ (accordingly, the knowers of the traditional method have declared ‘that which is devoid of all distinctions and details is explained through deliberate superimposition and rescission’)

(Gī. Bhā. 13. 13). In *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* the Ācārya says ‘अत्र च सम्प्रदायविदाख्यायिकामाचक्षते’ (the knowers of the tradition have cited a story here) (Bṛ. Bhā. 2. 1. 20). We have already referred to some of the Advaitic *ślokas*, purported by some as of Sundara Pāṇḍya, which are at the end of the commentary on *Samanvaya Sūtra* in *Sūtrabhāṣya* (page ). By all these, we can safely believe that the Vedāntic method of Ācārya is not his own, and that there had been so many Ācāryas of that tradition earlier to him.

### **Dravidācārya, Brahmanandi, Upavarṣa**

155. One of the earlier Ācāryas that Śaṅkarācārya has cited but not by name is Dravidācārya. In *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad Bhāṣya* he has written ‘सिद्धं तु निवर्तकत्वात् इति आगमविदां सूत्रम्’ (there is a *Sūtra* by the knowers of *Āgama* that *Śāstra* becomes authoritative by negating the superimpositions on the Ātman). Commentator *Ānandagiri* writes that the ‘knower of *Āgama*’ referred to here is Dravidācārya. Earlier, we have referred to *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* where it is said that statements of knowers of tradition exist to the effect that creation is described only to teach the identity of Ātman; this also is held by commentator *Ānandagiri* to be from Dravidācārya. The commentator has stated that Dravidācārya had written a detailed *Bhāṣya* on Chāndogya Upaniṣad. It is not known who this Dravidācārya is; but there is proof that he is not the Dramidācārya referred to by the *Viśiṣṭādvaitins*. Because, Dramidācārya holds on to the position that Brahman is with attributes; whereas the Dravidācārya that has been referred to by the Ācārya is an Advaitin.

It appears a writer by name Brahmanandi had explained the

purport of Chāndogya Upaniṣad. That he too was an Advaitin, a *Vivartavādin* becomes evident by citations of Madhusūdana Saraswati who has written a commentary on *Samkshepa Śārīraka* (3. 217). Therefore, he must be different from the author whom Bhāskara has cited by giving the example -‘परिणामस्तु स्याद्द्वयादिवत्’, and also from the author Ṭanka, a *Viśiṣṭādvaitin*, whom Rāmānujācārya has cited in his *Vedārthasamgraha*.

In *Sūtrabhāṣya* there appears a sentence: ‘अत एव च भगवता उपवर्षेण प्रथमे तन्त्रे आत्मास्तित्वाभिधानप्रसक्तौ शारीरके वक्ष्यामः इति उद्धारः कृतः’ (That is why Bhagavān Upavarṣa has stated in *Mīmāṃsa*, the first tantra, that ‘we shall take it up in Śārīraka’ whenever there arises an occasion to say Ātman exits) (Sū. Bhā. 3. 3. 53). From this it is understood that Upavarṣa is a Vṛttikāra who wrote expositions on both *Pūrva-mīmāṃsa* and *Uttara-mīmāṃsa* and that he belongs to the same Advaita tradition as Ācārya. He must be a very ancient Ācārya, since Śabara Swāmi also has referred to him as ‘bhagavān upavarṣaḥ’ (Jai. Su. 1. 1. 5). There is no basis for the belief of some people that he is none other than Bodhāyana, a Vṛttikāra of *Viśiṣṭādvaita* tradition; otherwise, Śaṅkarācārya would not have addressed him with honour as ‘bhagavān’.

### Glossators of different traditions earlier than Ācārya

156. There is evidence in *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas* that there were several advaitins of different traditions who had written their glosses, even before Śaṅkarācārya. For example, (1) In *Samanvaya Sūtrabhāṣya*, the position that scriptures teach Brahman as a remainder of an injunction on upāsanā has been refuted; (2) In *Ānandama-*



*yādhikaraṇa* (Sū. Bhā. 1. 1. 19), the position of the glossators who held that the blissful one (Ānandamaya) is none other than *Paramātman* has been refuted; (3) In *Ubhayalingādhikaraṇa* (Sū. Bhā. 3. 2. 21), the position of glossators who conceived two topics — (i) does Brahman have the characteristic of existence (*sallakṣhaṇa*), characteristic of consciousness (*bodhalakṣhaṇa*) or both (*sadbodhalakṣhaṇa*)? and (ii) does Brahman have many features or forms like the world or does It have one aspect, devoid of all variety of phenomenal manifestations, has been refuted; the position of those who uphold dissolution (*laya*) of the world also has been refuted there itself; (4) In *Āvṛtyādhikaraṇa* (Sū. Bhā. 4. 1. 2), the position of *prasankyānavādins* who held that since listening to the *Śāstra* once would not produce knowledge of Brahma, the listening to *Śāstra* and reasoning are to be practised repeatedly has been refuted; (5) In *Kāryādhikaraṇa* (Sū. Bhā. 4. 3. 14), the position of those according to whom a superhuman would guide those who proceed in *devayāna* towards Brahman is refuted; (6) In *tadananyatvādhikaraṇa* (Sū. Bhā. 2. 1. 14) the position of *bhedābhedavādins* (accepting diversity and unity) has been refuted; the same is refuted in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya* also.

All the above were those who held that the *Jīva*, when liberated, would attain Brahman without a second. It needs to be observed that the Ācārya has never considered those Vedāntins who hold that even in liberation the *Jīva* would remain separate from Brahman. Bhartṛprapañca whose position has been refuted again and again in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya*, although a *dvaitādvaitin*, had agreed upon Advaita in the state of liberation. Not only that, in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*

*Bhāṣya* the Ācārya says: ‘सर्वोपनिषत्सु हि विज्ञानात्मनः परमात्मना एकत्वप्रत्ययो विधीयत इत्यविप्रतिपत्तिः सर्वेषामुपनिषद्वादिनाम्’ (Br. Bhā. 4. 1. 20) by which it is implied that at the time of Ācārya, all the followers of Upaniṣads were unanimous in accepting the identity of *Jīva* and *Īśvara*.

By all these reasons, it can be said that the Ācārya had not set forth to establish Advaita anew. He strived to convince that (i) from the knowledge alone, arising out of Vedāntic sentences, immediate liberation could be achieved; (ii) liberation could be accomplished while living by mere getting rid of *avidyā*; and (iii) although the *Jīva* is *Paramātman* even while in the state of bondage of *saṁsāra*, without knowing it he would feel that he is in bondage because of *avidyā*. He established a unique tradition of advaita with these positions, and strived his best in driving home agreement and unanimity among the various *siddhānta-sādhana* expressions in the *Prasthānatraya*. From this point of view alone we will have to consider the sub-commentaries on Advaita, and the various *Prakaraṇas* and *Stotras* that are attributed to Śaṅkarācārya.



## 21. The Systems of Sub-Commentaries on Advaita

### **Vārtika Prasthāna (The system of Vārtikas)**

157. We have dealt with the controversy whether Sureśwara and Maṇḍana are one and the same person or not, and given our opinion about the same (pages \*142-\*150). We have mentioned there that although Sureśwara had accepted several positions of Maṇḍana, he has proposed several new arguments which Maṇḍana had not considered before. We have also mentioned *Sureśwarācārya's* attempt to write a *Vārtika* on Vedānta Sūtras, the obstructions of the other disciples of Śaṅkara on that, and, following Ācārya's directions, his writing two *Vārtikas* (pages \*261-\*267). The method (of Vedānta) followed in these *Vārtikas* is what we call *Vārtika Prasthāna*; and 'नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धिः' (Naiṣkarmyasiddhiḥ) is also a work that falls into this category. We shall summarize the main teachings of this *Prasthāna*.

### **Knowledge of Ātman from meanings of scriptural statements**

158. For those of highest qualifications, just listening to Vedāntic statements could produce knowledge of Brahmātman - is what is said by the author of *Bhāṣyas*, and Sureśwara has once again confirmed this in his 'Naiṣkarmyasiddhi'. In 'Brahmasiddhi' of Maṇḍana, two positions are taken that are contradictory to Śaṅkara Bhāṣya: that the knowledge of Ātman cannot be obtained solely by Vedāntic statements, and that a combination of *karma* and *jñāna* is necessary for liberation. The 'Naiṣkarmyasiddhi' may be said to have aimed at

refuting these two positions. Citing *Gauḍapāḍakārika* and Ācārya's *Upadeśa Sāhasrī* as authorities, Sureśwara has confirmed that his position is within Advaitic tradition.

### Avidyā in Vārtika Prasthāna

159. *Avidyā*, ignorance, in the *Vārtika* system is not knowing Ātman. [‘ऐकात्म्याप्रतिपत्तिः’ (Nai. Si. 1. 7); ‘तत्प्रतिषेधात्मकमज्ञानम्’ (Nai. Si. 3. 1); ‘न जानामीत्यविद्या’ (Tai. Var. 2. 1. 176)]. This causes misconception; the position that there is no ignorance other than misconception is not agreeable to Sureśwara (Br. Var. 1. 4. 420). Sureśwara's standpoint is that either misconception or doubt is not different from this ignorance (Br. Var. 1. 4. 440). We do not know why Sureśwara does not attempt to explain in clear terms the *anyonyādhyāsa*, mutual superimposition, which has been depicted by Ācārya in his *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Since he has clarified that the birth of illusory silver of mother-of-pearl etc. does not exist anywhere (Br. Var. 1. 4. 275-276), we can safely say that he has not accepted the birth of illusory silver or the *avidyā* that could be its material cause. Sureśwara has stated that the non-Ātman that appears as a result of *avidyā* is also *avidyā*, in a way (Tai. Var. 2. 178; Br. Var. 4. 4. 896). His opinion is that, since non-Ātman has no other form of its own than *avidyā*, it can also be called *avidyā* (Tai. Var. 2. 179). If it is stated that the world is caused by ignorance, it means that it is formed from the unknown Brahman; not from non-existence - he writes; that means he is not in favour of root-*avidyā*, *mūlāvidyā*. Even then, some people of recent times, on the strength of his statement - ‘*avidyā* is cause (upādāna) to the magic of *dvaita*’ (Br. Var. 1. 4. 371) have imputed on him the theory of root *avidyā*. This will be

made clearer when we take up a review of *Vivaraṇa Prasthāna*. He has stated, just as Bhāṣyakāra, Ātman alone is the locus of *avidyā*, and also its object; and since *avidyā* is known only by experience, he has clarified that there is no other means for knowing it. He clearly refutes the position that there is an *avidyā* the innate non-Ātman, contrary to *avidyā* of the Ātman (Br. Var. 2. 4. 200).

### **Discrimination of Five Sheaths, Examination of the three states**

160. *Sureśwarācārya*, in his *Taittirīya Vārtika* has clarified that by having a collective existence view (*samaṣṭi* view) while examining the five sheaths as well as by dissolving *kāryātma* in *kāranātma*, Brahman who is different from both (*kāryakāraṇa-vilakṣaṇa*) can be understood.

A speciality of the *Vārtika* is that an examination of the three states has been used as a help for the inward vision. When this view is adopted, the three states do not exist in the Ātman, but instead they are of the form of the Ātman only (Br. Vā. 2. 1. 264). What people call as *suṣupti* (the state of deep, dreamless sleep) is without divisions, free from *avidyā*, and is the innate form of Ātman (Br. Vā. 4. 3. 1517-1520; Tai. Vā. 2. 1566). 'I did not understand anything in deep sleep' is not a remembrance, but an imagination. It is in fact happening to us by virtue of the experience of the Ātman (Br. Vā. 1. 4. 299-300; 3. 4. 173). Thus, by examining the three states, the author of *Vārtika* has come to several excellent conclusions based upon experience.

### Refutation of two kinds of liberation

161. Bhartṛprapañca argues that the realization of Brahman while living and becoming one with of Brahman upon death are two kinds of liberation. *Sureśwarācārya* has refuted this argument (Br. Vā. 4. 2. 102). Thus he does not agree with what some recent Vedāntins accept, namely, two kinds of liberation *Jīvanmukti* and *Videhamukti*. He has refuted the argument that one's ignorance is not removed by the knowledge of scriptural statement but only by the realization obtained by practising it (Br. Vā. 4. 4. 811-829).

### Means for liberation (Mokṣasādhana)

162. The author of *Vārtika* holds on to the Ācārya's position that knowledge is the only means for liberation. He has very strongly refuted those who do not agree to this and opine that something remains to be done even after obtaining knowledge. Since he has refuted in detail the older Advaitic methodologies in both *Sambandha Vārtika* and in different parts of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya Vārtika*, we can safely believe that he was of the opinion that Ācārya's methodology only is the sure means for accomplishing Advaita. But he agrees that *śravaṇa* and *manana* are prescribed (by the scriptures). He is of the opinion that *nididhyāsana* is self-established knowledge by way of *śravaṇa* and *manana* (Br. Vā. 2. 4. 213-221). We do not know why he does not agree with Ācārya's statement (Sū. Bhā. 4. 1. 1) that *nididhyāsana* is a means (for realization of the Ātman).

### Summarising Vārtika Prasthāna

163. In summary, we can say that *Sureśwarācārya* has only clarified and strengthened the Ācārya's position. Although he has accepted some lines of argument offered in *Brahmasiddhi* of Maṇḍana, he has strictly refuted all arguments that go against the method of Ācārya's *Bhāṣyas*. Readers who want to know more about *Vārtika Prasthāna* are referred to the books *Vedāntavicārada Itihāsa* and *Naiṣkarmyasiddhiya Anuvāda*<sup>1</sup>.

### The System of Pañcapādikā and Vivaraṇa

164. Earlier, we have already narrated that Sanandana became Padmapādācārya after taking *Sannyāsa* from the Ācārya, and the reason why he got the name Padmapāda (page \*III). We have summarised the story of how the disciples requested Ācārya that he alone should write a *Vārtika* on *Sūtrabhāṣya*; how the Ācārya told that he may only write a gloss, how it was accidentally burnt and only a part of it became known as *Pañcapādikā* (pages \*261-\*271). Although the name is *Pañcapādikā*, it is a gloss on the *Bhāṣya* on only four *Sūtras*. An exposition called *Vivaraṇa* has been written on this *Pañcapādikā* by Prakāṣātman. Although there are differences of opinion on some points between these two, since, on the whole, the aim of Prakāṣātman is only explaining further what has been proposed in *Pañcapādikā*, these two works are held to be of the same

---

1. These Kannaḍa Books are published from Adhyātma Prakāsha Karyālaya; a detailed commentary by the same author in Sanskrit called '*Kleshāpahāriṇī*' on *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*. also has been published. The author has discussed *Vārtika Prasthāna* in comparison to *Bhāṣyas* in a separate chapter in his famous book *Vedānta Prakriyā Pratyabhijñā*. -Publisher

opinion, and the method is customarily called *Vivaraṇa Prasthāna*.

### Important points of Vivaraṇa Prasthāna

165. Although both *Pañcapādikā* and *Vivaraṇa* are attempts at describing the purport of *Sūtrabhāṣya* of *Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda*, some new opinions have been presented in them. We shall try to place them before the readers in a very concise form.

The author of *Bhāṣya* has very clearly explained in the introduction of his *Sūtrabhāṣya* that people experience agentship, enjoyership and knowership because they have confounded the real Ātman-without-a-second and the non-Ātman that is unreal and have mutually superimposed their properties on each other. But the *Pañcapādikā* and *Vivaraṇa* have explained as follows:

1. On the *Bhāṣya* statement ‘the transactions of the world are due to mithyājñāna, a misconception,’ the commentary is – mithyājñāna, – that is ineffable ignorance or the inert *avidyā-śakti* is the material-cause for the transactions of the nature of *adhyāsa* (Pan. p 4). The author of *Vivaraṇa* agrees upon this and has provided reasons for how this ignorance is the material cause of *adhyāsa* (Vi. p11).

2. The author of *Pañcapādikā* argues that this *avidyā-śakti* is the reason only for the external objects appearing as separate; it also causes Ātman, although of the nature of Brahman, to appear in the form of I-notion etc. (Pan. p 4-5). The author of *Vivaraṇa* explains that this ignorance, the locus and object of which is Ātman, is also the material cause of silver that appears on the mother-of-pearl etc. (Vi. p 12).

3. The author of *Pañcapādikā* holds that if *avidyā-śakti* is not



agreed upon, illusory object would not appear (Pan. p 4); the author of *Vivaraṇa* has given *perception, inference and presumption* as the means of knowledge for that *mūlāvidyā* which is of the nature of positive ignorance (Vi. p 12-14).

4. While the author of *Pañcapādikā* says that in deep sleep, the *avidyā* lies dormant as impressions and in wakeful state appears once again in the form of I-notion, etc. (Pan. p 4, 20), the author of *Vivaraṇa* gives reasons to establish that *avidyā* which is different from the three - non-apprehension, misconception and its impressions - remains in deep sleep (Vi. p 16). The *Pañcapādikā* declares that the Spirit which is of the nature of Brahman is covered up by *avidyā* which is called variously as name and form, undifferentiated, *avidyā*, *māyā*, prakṛti, non-apprehension, unmanifest, *tamas*, cause, power of absorption, great sleep, imperishable, ākāśa etc., and causes *jīvatva* (Pan. p 20). The *Vivaraṇa* presents reasons to show that the *Māyā* and *avidyā* are names of one entity, and cites support from some other authors (Vi. p 31-32). It is clear that this argument contradicts Ācārya's position in *Sūtrabhāṣya* that *Māyā* is (seed of name and form) imagined in *avidyā* (page 348).

5. The *Pañcapādikā* clearly states that *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* are statements for eulogy, and since they have elements of prescriptions for preventing an outward going tendency, they appear as injunctions (Pan. p 93). But the author of *Vivaraṇa* states that the *Śārīraka mīmāṃsa* starts with an intention of discussing about *śravaṇa* as an injunction (Vi. p 1-2); not only that, he presents reasons to show that *manana* and *nididhyāsana* are subordinates (aṅgas) to *śravaṇa* (Vi. p 104). Agreeing with *Pañcapādikā* in that even after

obtaining direct intuition there could be an illusion of indirectness (Pan. p 39), he says that *manana* and *nididhyāsana* are to remove the obstructing defects of the mind. The author of *Vivaraṇa* says that the author of *Pañcapādikā* accepts *śravaṇa* as an injunction but has said that these ( *manana* and *nididhyāsana*) are eulogies (Vi. p 203).

6. The *Pañcapādikā* states that even after *avidyā* gets removed by the knowledge of Brahman, there could remain a residual impression (*samskāra*) of *avidyā* which can cause knot of I-notion (Pan. p 48). The *Vivaraṇa* supports this standpoint and provides reasons for it; and says that the residual impression referred to here is nothing but *avidyāleśa*, a trace of *avidyā* itself (Vi. p 106) on the basis of *iśṭasiddhi*; thus accepting a trace of *avidyā* in *jīvanmukti*, gives more prominence to *videhamukti* (liberation after the fall of the body).

The above is a summary of where the *Vivaraṇa* differs from the *Bhāṣya*. Readers might have gathered that the *mūlavidyā* theory adopted here is contradictory to *Bhāṣya*<sup>1</sup>.

### **Bhāmatī Prasthāna (The System of Bhāmatī)**

166. *Bhāmatī* is a critique on *Sūtrabhāṣya* written by Vācaspati Miśra. The methods of that critique and those developed by its commentators is called *Bhāmatī Prasthāna*. Although some reasoning used in *Pañcapādikā* are seen in *Bhāmatī*, Vācaspati Miśra closely follows *Brahmasiddhi* of Maṇḍana in writing the critique on *Sūtrabhāṣya* and attempts to bring forth a new method for a

1. For more details the readers may refer the Kāryālaya Books 'Śaṅkara-Siddhānta', Vedānta-Vicārada Itihāsa, also footnotes of Prasthānatraya Bhāṣyas, all in Kannaḍa, and the Books Mūlavidyā-Nirāsaḥ, Sugamā, Vedānta Prakriyā Pratyabhijñā, Māṇḍūkya-rahasya-Vivṛtiḥ, in Sanskrit. -Publisher.

compromise between Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana. We have already pointed out with sufficient reasons (page \*147-\*150) that the story of Maṇḍana Miśra, after being defeated in argumentation with the Ācārya, assumed the name *Sureśwarācārya* cannot be believed. We have also analysed and indicated that the story of *Sureśwarācārya* deciding to write a *Vārtika* on *Sūtrabhāṣya*, the objections raised on it, and the Ācārya consoling him that in future he would be born as Vācaspati and would be writing an excellent critique - is also not believable (page \*262). We believe that the readers who have gone through *Vārtika Prasthāna*, now after going through the following summary of *Bhāmatī Prasthāna*, would be able to guess that our opinion is with firm support.

### The Main Arguments in Bhāmatī Prasthāna

167. In the beginning the *mangala śloka* itself clearly states that two ineffable *avidyās* - *kāraṇāvidyā* and *karyāvidyā* - are admitted. Since the expression 'कार्यकारणाविद्याद्वय' appears again and again at many places in the book (Bhā. 45, 54, 55, 121, ...), it appears reasonable that these are the very two *avidyās* 'अग्रहण' and 'अन्यथाग्रहण' which Maṇḍana agrees upon. But the commentary *Kalpataru* states that what is accepted in *Bhāmatī* are only these two: (1) positive ignorance (भावरूपाविद्या) which is beginningless and (2) impressions of previous and subsequent errors (Ka. Ta. p 3). Since we often come across the expressions 'अविद्याद्वय' and 'अविद्यातत्संस्कार' in *Bhāmatī*, the *Kalpataru* conception that *samskāra*, impressions constitute *avidyā*, cannot be supported. However while explaining the sentence 'अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपमायावशेन' (Sū. Bhā. 2. 2. 2), since *Bhāmatī*

clearly says ‘कारणभूतया लयलक्षणया अविद्यया प्राक्सर्गोपचितेन च विक्षेपसंस्कारेण यत् प्रत्युपस्थापितं नामरूपं तदेव माया’ *Māyā* is the name and form that are being projected by (i) the impressions of projection potentially existing prior to creation, and (ii) causal ignorance of the nature of absorption (Bhā. p 494); this means that the causal *avidyā* (कारणाविद्या) and *avidyā* having the characteristic of absorption (लयलक्षणाविद्या) are one and the same. The *Kalpataru* statement that ‘here a positive ignorance different from illusion and impressions’ based upon the *Bhāmatī* statement that ‘during the final dissolution (*Mahāpralaya*), inner faculty (*antahkaraṇa*) etc. get dissolved in indescribable *avidyā* which is their cause, and exist in a subtle form of power with the impressions of *avidyā* that would cause projections, (Bhā. p 333) cannot be outrightly rejected. *Bhāmatī* clearly states that *avidyā* is not universally the same for all *Jīvas* but each will have his own *avidyā*’ (Bhā. p 377), and although not single, since all can be categorized as *avidyā*, it is called ‘अव्यक्त’ (unmanifest) and ‘अव्याकृत’ (undifferentiated) (Bhā. p 378). This means that in Vācaspati Miśra’s view too *avidyā* is *mūlāvidyā*; what is special is that it is manifold. Hence, this view also is contradictory to that of *Sūtrabhāṣya*.

### **Differences between the Systems of Bhāmatī and Vivaraṇa**

168. *Bhāmatī* and *Vivaraṇa* differ in certain important issues, although both aim at explaining the opinions in the *Sūtrabhāṣya*. Modern Vedāntins take consolation that these can be overlooked since there is no difference between them in the final aim of *Advaita*. But, since they are contradictory to each other, and since unanimity

cannot be forged at all, between them, it has to be concluded that it is unreasonable to hold that they, both, convey what is implied in the *Bhāṣya*. We summarize here the main differences between them for the benefit of the readers. We have taken these from *Pañcapādikā Bhūmika* of *Śāstraratnākara* Polakam Su. Śrīrāma Śāstry (Po. Pam. Bhu. P 116-135).

Sl.	Bhāmatī Prasthāna	Vivaraṇa Prasthāna
1	<i>Karmas</i> cause <i>Vividiṣā</i> ( <i>desire</i> for knowing Truth)	<i>Karmas</i> cause <i>vidyā</i> or <i>jñāna</i> ( <i>knowledge</i> )
2	Mind is the instrument for realization of Brahman	Verbal testimony, <i>Śabda</i> is the instrument for realization of Brahman
3	<i>Śravaṇa</i> etc. are stated by injunction-like Vedāntic sentences	“ <i>Śravaṇa</i> ” etc. are prescribed, and desire to know is by employing injunctions only.
4	Among <i>śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsana</i> , <i>nididhyāsana</i> is the main;	Among <i>śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsana</i> , <i>śravaṇa</i> is the main; the others subsidiary
5	<i>Jīva</i> is separated from inner organ, ignorance etc.	<i>Jīva</i> is reflected in these
6	For <i>avidyā</i> , locus is <i>Jīva</i> and object is Brahman	Both locus and object of <i>avidyā</i> are one and the same
7	Each <i>Jīva</i> has separate <i>avidyā</i>	<i>Avidyā</i> is one, not many.

Sl.	Bhāmatī Prasthāna	Vivaraṇa Prasthāna
8	Conditioned Brahman is the object of mental modification that is non-fragmented (Akhaṇḍākāra-Vṛtti)	Pure Brahman is the object here
9	Discrimination stated among <i>sādhanacatuṣṭaya</i> , four-fold qualification is that between real and unreal (satya-asatya)	Discrimination stated is between eternal and non-eternal (nitya-anitya)
10	<i>Swādhyāya</i> prescribed in the Śruti includes comprehension of meaning	<i>Swadhyāya</i> prescribed in the Śruti involves only <i>akṣara</i> -letters

Not only in these ten, there are a few other differences also, between the two. In the very face of these, modern Vedāntins are holding that there are no oppositions between them. But *Sureśwarācārya* has refuted in his *Sambandha Vārtika* many argumentations of ancient Vedāntins who had accepted Advaita. Several such examples of refutations even by Śaṅkarācārya in his *Bhāṣyas* have been pointed out earlier (pages 358-359). Hence, we cannot agree that the methods (prakriyas) have no contradictions just because the final aim is the same. Further, although the authors of *Bhāmatī* and *Vivaraṇa* both have same opinion in refuting the Bhāskara School, it is well known that, more often than not, mutual refutations between themselves and between recent authors on Advaita who are followers of their traditions have continued. Therefore, the fact that at the end they would be espousing Advaita alone would not be sufficient ground to say that

these *Vyākhyāna Prasthānas* expound only Ācārya's views.

### **Conclusions on the systems of sub-commentaries**

169. The three *Prasthānas* - *Vārtika*, *Bhāmatī* and *Vivaraṇa* - are discussed in our book *Vedānta Vicārada Itihāsa* (in Kannaḍa), in somewhat detailed manner. One who peruses them would find it difficult to decide that Padmapāda the author of *Pañcapādikā* and Sureśvara the author of *Vārtika* are disciples of one and the same Ācārya. We have to say that the authors of Śaṅkara Vijayas, who have created differences of opinion between them could not decide who out of the two was dearer to Ācārya, and hence simply have described the heresay stories that were in vogue at their times. Since in many ways the *Vārtika* and the *Bhāmatī* differ from each other, the *Mādhavīya* imagination that Sureśvara himself was reborn as Vācaspati proves to be a mere imagination. The study of the entire *Vārtikas* is quite less and even the study of *Pañcapādikā* is very rare nowadays; Even then it is not wrong to say that in the present-day method of Vedāntic study the *Vivaraṇa Prasthāna* is quite strong. Although we find some who study *Bhāmatī Prasthāna* also, people more or less ignore the inner differences between the two systems, and thinking that both have same purport from the highest point of view, they make up identical meanings to the two some how. Readers are requested to remember that we have indicated the differences not because we do not find in them acceptable points at all, but with a purpose to help those researchers who would take pains to decide what are really the works of Śaṅkarācārya.

## 22. The Prakaraṇa Books of Ācārya

### Classifying the Prakaraṇas

170. *Prakaraṇas* (treatises) are small books related to a part of the scriptures, and aimed at explaining in detail an important subject matter which is not treated extensively in the scriptures. Currently a number of such books are in vogue, purported to have been written by Śaṅkarācārya. It is quite difficult to decide which among these, were actually written by the Ācārya. The name of Ācārya is given to these works, with the reason that they may be read with respect if they are in name of eminent personalities. We have given our critical conclusions about them here, but it goes without saying that readers are to exercise their own discrimination and examine them before deciding for themselves either way.

Some of the *Prakaraṇas* are published from *Adhyātma Prakāsha Karyālaya*. First we will mention them, and will criticise the others later. It is believed that it would be helpful to the readers to go through the decisions regarding the authorship given in the individual introductions to each of these books.

### The Prakaraṇas published by the Kāryālaya

171. The following are the *Prakaraṇas* which have come out of the *Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya* till now:

(1, 2) उपदेशसाहस्री: Upadeśasāhasrī has been published in two parts - prose composition and poetic composition. In the prose composition, the methodology of *śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsana*



has been explained in great detail. The style is quite matured and scholarly; nowhere there is any contradiction with the *Bhāṣyas*. In the poetic part, there are nineteen sub-*Prakaraṇas*. *Sureśwarācārya* has used several *ślokas* from this book in his 'naiṣkarmyasiddhi' and in his *Vārtikas*. There is no doubt that this is a work of the Ācārya.

(3, 4) विवेकचूडामणि, महावाक्यदर्पणः *Vivekacūḍamaṇi* is famous as a work of Śaṅkara *Bhagavatpāda*. Its style is lucid, and the subject matter is expounded attractively. There is close similarity between *Vivekacūḍamaṇi* and *Mahāvākyadarpaṇa* in style as well as in the presentation of subject matter. We have shown with reason in the introduction of the books that both these are the works of Śaṅkarānanda who is the author of 'Gītā Tātparyabodhinī'.

(5) अपरोक्षानुभूतिः *Aparokṣānubhūti* is a *Prakaraṇa* which deals with how one can obtain direct experience of the Ātman here and now. We have given reasons in the introduction for why it may not be a work of the Ācārya. The book also contains several technical words which the Ācārya has not used in his *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣya*. The exposition of philosophical principles is very beautiful.

(6) अद्वैतानुभूतिः (*Advaitānubhūti*) Because of some new technical words used, and because of the way in which certain illustrations are used, *Advaitānubhūti* may not be a work of Ācārya.

(7) स्वात्मनिरूपणः (*Svātmanirūpaṇa*) Since all the *āryas* of *Advaita Tarāvali* of Sadāśiva Brahmendra are included in this book, and since it contains some material that contradicts *Bhāṣya* we have to say that *Svātmanirūpaṇa* cannot be Ācārya's.

(8) मनीषापञ्चकः We guess that *Maniṣāpañcaka* is a *Prakaraṇa* which has been taken from some ŚaṅkaraVijaya. See this book (page \*107)

and Appendix VIII.

(9) निर्वाणष्टकः Nirvāṇaṣṭaka is also called *Ātmaṣaṭka*. It is popular among people just like *Maniṣāpañcaka*. Some of the wordings of this book are not used frequently in the *Bhāṣyas*.

(10) ब्रह्मानुचिन्तनः Brahmānucintana is a book which is helpful for inquiry of Truth. Since it is prescribed in the book that 'One has to imagine in the mind that 'I am Brahman only' and if that is not possible this sentence itself has to be practised', it cannot be a work of the Ācārya.

(11) सदाचारानुसन्धानः The wordings used as well as the manner in which the original subject matter is dealt with, indicate that Sadācārānusandhāna could not be Ācārya's.

(12) दशश्लोकीः Daśaślokī has gained prominence because of *Siddhāntabindu* of Madhusūdana Saraswati and *Nyāyaratnāvalī*, an exposition of it by Gauḍa Brahmānanda. Evidence is not available to decide that the work is Ācārya's; some of the words used in it are not found frequently in the *Bhāṣyas*.

(13) वाक्यवृत्ति and लघुवाक्यवृत्तिः *Vākyaavritti* has been cited as an authority in *Pañcadaśī*. It is said that the *Mangala śloka* 'श्रीवल्लभं विमलबोधघनं नमामि' is not Ācārya's. There is no mention of the *Mahāvākyas* in the *Laghuvākyavritti*!

(14) दृग्दृश्यविवेकः Dṛgdr̥śyaviveka has another name *Vākya Sudhā* which is not meaningful for it. In the Introduction (of Karyālayas publication) it is mentioned that the work has accepted positions that are different from Ācārya's. This work is not enlisted in publications from Vāṇīvilās Press. Different opinions are there among scholars about the authorship of this work as Ācārya's, Vidyāraṇya's etc.

(15) **सवार्तिकपञ्चीकरणः** *Pañcīkaraṇa* itself is not the main subject of the book. The purport of the book is how one can attain *samādhi* through *Om*. There is no match of the original with the *Vārtika*. It is doubtful whether this work is Ācārya's.

(16) **स्वात्मप्रकाशिकाः** *Svātmaprakāśikā* contains opinions that are contradictory to the *Bhāṣyas*.

(17) **मोहमुद्गरः** *Mohamudgara* is also referred to as *Bhaja Govinda Stotra*.

(18) **अद्वैतपञ्चरत्नः** *Advaitapañcaratna* is also called as *Ātmapañcaka*. It consists of five *ślokas* that summarize Advaita.

(19) **आत्मबोधः** Since *Ātmabodha* contains the expression 'indescribable *anādyavidyā*', it is not a work of Ācārya. It teaches the truth of *Ātman* beautifully.

(20) **जीवन्मुक्तानन्दलहरीः** *Jīvanmuktānandalaharī* contains the line saying 'one who has got initiation from the Guru and got rid of ignorance will not be deluded again' at the end of every *śloka*. Since it proclaims the practice of knowledge of the *Mahāvākyas* (16), it is not Ācārya's.

(21) **कौपीनपञ्चक or यतिपञ्चकः** *Kaupīnapañcaka* or *Yatipañcaka* probably is not Ācārya's because it says that the *Sannyāsins* resort to repetition of the *Pañcāksharī Mantra*.

(22) **मायापञ्चकः** If one looks at the technical words used in *Māyāpañcaka*, one feels that this may not be Ācārya's.

(23) **निर्वाणमञ्जरीः** *Nirvāṇamañjarī* is a *Prakaraṇa* that has twelve *ślokas*. Some versions have smaller number of *ślokas*. It has **Śivo'ham** occurring in its repeating line.

(24) **ब्रह्मज्ञानावलीमालाः** *Brahmajñānāvalīmālā* as well as the previous

one have many words that are not used in the *Bhāṣyas*.

(25) अनात्मश्रीविगर्हणः Anātmaśrīvigarhaṇa is just as the previous one.

(26) तत्त्वोपदेशः Tattvopadeśa probably is not Ācārya's. Use of the words that are not found in the *Bhāṣyas*, use of *jahallakshana* etc. in explaining the meaning of 'Tat Tvam Asi' - these create doubt.

(27) प्रौढानुभूतिः Prauḍhānubhūti is not Ācārya's. It teaches (52) that *samādhi* is necessary after *śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsana*.

(28) उपदेशपञ्चकः Upadeśapañcaka is a work that explains the steps of spiritual sādhanā. Śrī Śaṅkarānanda has cited a sentence from it in his *Gītā Tātparya Bodhinī*. Hence it should be earlier to him. But it is not certain whether it is Ācārya's.

(29) स्वरूपानुसन्धानः Svarūpānusandhāna is referred to as "Vijñāna Nauka also. It is referred as *Stuti* (praise) in the last *śloka*. It states that Complete Truth is realized in *samādhi* only.

(30) धन्याष्टकः Dhanyāṣṭaka contains eight *ślokas* that describe those who have got fulfilment from the knowledge of Brahman. Along with these there are twelve *ślokas* in some versions.

(31) लक्ष्मीनरसिंहपञ्चरत्नः In Lakṣmīnarasimhapañcaratna *Paramā-tman* is called as *Lakṣmi Narasimha*. There are five *ślokas* teaching the mind to worship Him.

### Prakaraṇas which are yet to be published

172. The following *Prakaraṇas* are going to be published from the Kāryālaya in future. These have been published by the Śrīraṅgam Vāṇivilāsa Press.

(1) शतश्लोकीः Śataślokī elucidates the Vedāntic conclusions through *ślokas* that are in long metres. Looking at the method of

exposition, the style of language and the examples therein, one would feel that it may not be Ācārya's work.

(2) सर्ववेदान्तसिद्धान्तसारसङ्ग्रहः\* SarvaVedāntaSiddhāntaSāraSaṅgraha is a big Prakaraṇa consisting of 1006 śloka. Most probably this is written by the same Śaṅkarānanda, the author of *Vivekacūḍamaṇi*, because the presentation of the subject matter is similar, and here also there is salutation to 'Govinda'. But the method of exposition (prakriyā) differs, and hence it is not as close to *Viveka Cūḍamaṇi* as *Mahāvākyadarpaṇa* is. It is necessary that learned scholars take a deeper look into this.

(3) सर्वसिद्धान्तसारसङ्ग्रहः SarvaSiddhāntaSāraSaṅgraha was published in Madras by one Professor. Rangācharlu. This has not been considered by Mādhavācārya in his सर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्रह. Two standpoints - *Vedavyāsapaksha* and *Vedāntapaksha* - have been presented here. It suggests that Govinda Yogi wrote *Bhāṣya* on *Vedānta Sūtras*. Because of this and other reasons, this cannot be taken as Ācārya's work. This is not in the list of publications of Vāṇivilās Press.

(4) प्रबोधसुधाकरः\* Prabodhasudhākara contains 19 sub-*Prakaraṇas*. The *Mangala śloka* states 'वन्दे श्रीयादवाधीशम्'. The author seems to be a devotee of Lord Kriṣṇa.

(5) प्रश्नोत्तररत्नमालिका: Praśnottararatnamālikā consists of 67 śloka that are in easy-running style. Some opine that this is a work of Śaṅkarānanda.

(6) योगतारावली: Yogatārāvalī deals with subjects like *nādānusan-dhāna*, *samādhi*, *jālandarabandha* etc. This is not a work of Ācārya.

(7) एकश्लोकी: The Vāṇivilās Press shows this as an independent work; but we remember to have seen it as a part of another *Prakaraṇa*

which is in the name of Ācārya.

(Note: Except *Ekaślokī*, *Śataślokī*, *SarvaSiddhānta Saṅgraha* and *Yogatārāvaḷī*, all other *Prakaraṇas* have been published recently from the Kāryālaya).



## 23. Hymns that are in the name of Ācārya

173. Although the Ācārya is an Advaitin, he was not antagonistic to worship of God with attributes. His opinion is that the *Śruti* advocates *Saguṇopāsanā* so that those who are not highest qualified should do upāsanā. The *Śruti* prescribes some modes of upāsanā as part of certain rites and rituals so that people who are inclined towards *karma* may have Karma strengthened, (*karmasamṛddhi*), and for those of middle qualification, some other *upāsanās* that would purify their minds and lead towards advaitic knowledge. In *Chāndogya Bhāṣya* it is stated that the *upāsanās* would lead to prosperity, and the *upāsanā* of lower Brahman, *aparabrahma*, would lead to a fruit that is close to identity with Brahman. Although this is so, it is difficult to say whether many hymns that are in the name of Ācārya are composed by him or by some other pontiffs of the Maṭhas who carry the traditional title of Śaṅkarācārya. Nevertheless, the Ācārya has not rejected idol worship; even then, it is difficult to decide that he has composed all the *Stotras* on the different deities that are in vogue presently.

### Grouping of the Stotras

174. The Vāṇīvilās Press, Srīrangam, have publicised the *Stotras* of Śaṅkarācārya. They are as follows:

1. **Stotras on Ganesha:** (1) 'Gaṇeśapañcaratna', (2) 'Gaṇeśabhujāṅga'.
2. **Stotras on Subrahmaṇya:** (3) 'Subrahmaṇyabhujāṅga'.
3. **Stotras on Śiva:** (4) 'Śivabhujāṅga', (5) 'Śivānandalaharī', (6) 'Śivapādādi-Keśāntavarṇanam', (7) 'Śivakeśādipādāntavarṇanam',

(8) 'Vedasāraśivastotram', (9) 'Śivāparādhakṣamāpaṇa-Stotram', (10) 'Suvarṇamālāstuti', (11) 'Daśaślokiṣtuti', (?) (12) 'Dakṣiṇāmūrti-varṇamālā', (13) 'Dakṣiṇāmūrtyaṣṭakam', (14) 'Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotram', (15) 'Kālabhairavāṣṭakam', (16) 'Śivapañcākṣaranakṣatra-Mālā', (17) 'Dvādaśalingastotram', (18) 'Ardhanārīśvarastotram', (19) 'Mṛtyuñ-jayamānasapūjā', (20) 'Śivanāmāvali', (21) 'Śivapañcākṣarastotram', (22) 'Umāmaheśvarastotram'.

4. **Stotras on Devī:** (23) 'Saundaryalaharī', (24) 'Devībhujāṅga', (25) 'Ānandalaharī', (26) 'Tripurasundarīvedapādaṣṭakam', (27) 'Tripurasundarīmānasapūjā', (28) 'Devīcatuṣṣaṣṭyupacārapūjā', (29) 'Tripurasundaryāṣṭakam', (30) 'Lalitāpañcaratna', (31) 'Kalyāṇavṛṣṭistava', (32) 'Navaratnamālikā', (33) 'Mātṛmātṛkāpuṣpamālāstava', (34) 'Gaurīdaśakam', (35) 'Bhavanībhujāṅga', (36) 'Kanakadhārāstuti', (37) 'Annapūrnāṣṭakam', (38) 'Mīnākṣīpañcaratna', (39) 'Bhramarām-bāṣṭakam', (40) 'Śāradābhujāṅgaprayāta'.

5. **Stotras on Viṣṇu:** (41) 'Rāmabhujāṅgaprayāta', (42) 'Lakṣmīn-arasimhapañcaratna' and Karuṇārāsa, (43) 'Viṣṇubhujāṅgaprayāta', (44) 'Viṣṇupādādikeśāntastotram', (45) 'Pāṇḍuraṅgāṣṭakam', (46) 'Acyutāṣṭakam', (47) 'Kṛṣṇāṣṭakam', (48) 'Haristuti', (49) 'Govindāṣṭakam', (50) 'Bhagavanmānasapūjā', (51) 'Jagannāthāṣṭakam', (52) 'Ṣaṭpadīstotram'.

6. **Stotras on Hanumān:** (53) 'Hanūmatpañcaratna'.

7. **Stotras on Rivers etc.:** (54) 'Narmadāṣṭakam', (55-56) 'Yamun-āṣṭakam' (two versions), (57) 'Gaṅgāṣṭakam', (58) 'Maṇikarṇikāṣṭakam', (59) 'Kāśīpañcakam', (60) 'Gurvaṣṭakam'.

8. **Miscellaneous Stotras:** (61) 'Prātaḥsmaraṇastotram', (62) 'Nir-guṇamānasapūjā'.



### Opinion of Scholars about the Stotras

175. There are at least 240 *Stotras* in handwritten manuscript books. If their style and the subject matter are examined, the greater part of them appear to be artificial; and hence it is doubtful that they are compositions of Śaṅkarācārya. At least there are fifteen 'Bhujāṅgaprayāta's, and they are *Stotras* on deities like *Gaṇeśa*, *Gaṇḍakī*, *Dakṣiṇāmūrti*, *Datta*, *Devī*, *Narasimha*, *Bhavānī*, *Rāma*, *Viṣṇu*, *Sāmba*, *Śiva*, *Subrahmanya*, *Hanumanta*. There are no ancient commentaries on these. Except 'Śivabhujāṅgaprayāta', (?) the rest are difficult to be ascribed to Śaṅkara. Besides, there are 35 'Aṣṭaka's; these are *Stotras* on deities like *Achyuta*, *Annapūrṇa*, *Ambā*, *Ardhanārīśwara*, *Kāla bhairava*, *Kriṣṇa*, *Gangā*, *Ganeśa*, *Govinda*, *Cidānanda*, *Jagannātha*, *Tripurasundarī*, *Dakṣiṇāmūrti*, *Narmadā*, *Panduranga*, *Bālakriṣṇa*, *BinduMādhava*, *Bhavānī*, *Bhairava*, *Bhramarāmba*, *Manikarnika*, *Yamunā*, *Rāghava*, *Rāma*, *Liṅga*, *Śāradāmba*, *Śiva*, *Śrichakra*, *Sahajā*, *Halāśya* (Bala. Śam. p 134). In the opinion of *Baladeva Upādhyāya*, since *Dakṣiṇāmūrti Stotra* and *Gopālāṣṭaka* have ancient commentaries, they are certainly compositions of Śaṅkarācārya; also according to him, the *Śatpadī* and *Daśaślokī* are his without any doubt. Likewise, he opines that *Ananda laharī*, *Govindāṣṭaka* and *Harimūḍe* are also Śaṅkara's (Bala. Śam. p 135-137). We feel that more scholarly research is needed in this regard.



## 24. Ācārya and TantraŚāstra

### Has Śaṅkarācārya written books on Tantra?

176. The question whether Ācārya has written any *Śākta Tantra* books has found no solution. Many people believe that he established Goddess Śārada, the manifestation of *Brahmavidyā*, on the left bank of Tunga river, on Śrī Cakra (page \*252; KRTTW 14). We have already given the account of his writing Śrī Cakra and establishing Goddess Kamākṣī on it at Kāñci (page \*284) and have mentioned that according to Cidvilāsa, the Śrī Cakra indicates the unity of Śiva and Śakti (page \*285). The works 'Āṇandalaharī' and 'Saundaryalaharī' are famous as written by Ācārya himself. It is also believed that he brought Śrī Cakra from Kailāsa, directly from Lord Śiva (Bala. Śam. 135). Now it has become a tradition that in each Maṭha a *Śakti* is being worshipped. By all these reasons, it becomes quite plausible that the Ācārya might have written books on *tantra*.

### Did Ācārya have householder disciples also?

177. We shall discuss about Ācārya's Maṭha pontiff lineage later. Now, we have to examine whether he had householder disciples also. It appears there is a *śloka* in the book *Śrī Vidyārṇava* that reads 'शङ्कराचार्यशिष्याश्च चतुर्दश दृढव्रताः । देव्यात्मानो दृढात्मानो निग्रहानुग्रहक्षमाः ॥' (1. 60). The Ācārya had 14 disciples: Padmapāda, Bodha, Gīrvāṇa, Āṇandatīrtha, Śaṅkara, Sundara, Viṣṇu Śarma, Lakṣmaṇa, Mallikārjuna, Trivikrama, Śrīdhara, Kapardi, Keśava, Dāmodara - all these were worshippers of Devi, and were supreme Siddhas. These also had their own disciples. Viṣṇu Śarma's chief disciple was Pragalbhācārya;

the disciple of his was Vidyārṇava, the author of *Śrī Vidyārṇava*. It seems this author of *Śrī Vidyārṇava* has written in his *Kāmarājavidyā* as follows:

‘सम्प्रदायो हि नान्योऽस्ति लोके श्रीशङ्कराद्बहिः ।

वादिशक्तिमते तन्त्रं तन्त्रराजं सुदुर्लभम् ॥ ९८ ॥

मातृकार्णवसंज्ञं तु त्रिपुरार्णवसंज्ञकम् ।

योगिनीहृदयं चैव ख्यातं ग्रन्थचतुष्टयम् ॥ ९९ ॥’

We have taken this from *Baladeva Upādhyāya*’s book (p 161-162). There is a book by name *Mahānuśāsana* known as Ācārya’s; we shall consider it when we discuss about the Maṭhas. It has a *śloka* (10) which says ‘the pontiff of the Maṭha should be with controlled senses, should be proficient in Veda and Vedānta, should be knowing Yoga and other Śāstras and he should be pure; if he falls short of it, the *manīshis* (learned people) should control him’. The commentators seem to have given the meaning of ‘householder disciples’ to the word *manīṣi*. Even today the burden of looking after mundane responsibilities of the Pīṭha rests on the householder disciples of the Maṭha. But in olden days, the householder disciples themselves were the administrators. The Ācārya was a worshipper of *Śrīvidyā*; in the lineage of that *vidyā*, many householder disciples also are there. The disciples of the abovementioned Sundarācārya were of three types: householders, *sannyāsins*, and heads of the Pīṭha. From him only the famous Bhāskara Rāya learnt *Śrīvidyā*. This lineage of disciples is also running unbroken - writes *Baladeva Upādhyāya* (p 163-164) on the evidence of word from *Sahityācārya Paṇḍita Narāyaṇa Śāstry Khiste*.

On the same subject the opinion of K. R. Venkaṭarāman is different: It seems Rajendralāl Mitra has discovered a book entitled

*Gadyavallari* in a place called Sītamarḍi of Musfurpur district, Bihar. It is a book on Śrīvidyā and includes *Nyasa, Japa* etc.; in this book is mentioned a lineage of disciples. The lineage runs exactly as that of Śringeri Śāradā Pīṭha - Śiva-Viṣṇu-Brahma-Vasiṣṭha-Śakti-Parāśara-Vyāsa-Śuka-Gauḍapāda... Vidyāranya; - here after the book mentions Śrī *Malayānanda-Devatīrtha Saraswati* the disciple of *Vidyāranya* upto *Ānandacitpratibimba* and then mentions his disciple to be Śrī *Nijātma-prakāśānandanātha Mallikārjunayogīndra* (KRTTW pp 42-43). If this *Guru-shishya* lineage be true, we will have to think what would be the fate of the lineage mentioned by *Baladeva Upādhyāya*.

### Was Śrīvidyā there in the Guru Tradition of Ācārya?

178. Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman writes that such books bear witness to the fact that the Śrīvidyā described by Gauḍapāda, Śaṅkara etc. is not different from *Brahmavidyā* of the Upaniṣads (KRTTW p 43). *Baladeva Upādhyāya* says that the Ācārya was famous as worshipper of Śrīvidyā (Bala. Śam. p 163). Although there is difference of opinion among the commentators about the authorship of *Soundaryalahari*, commentators like Lakshmīdhara, Bhāskara Rāya and Kaivalyāśrama have accepted that it is Ācārya's work. In *Soundaryalahari* there is mention of a *draviḍa śishu*, which got breastfeeding from Bhagavati Herself ('तव स्तन्यं मन्ये ... दयावत्यादत्तं द्रविडशिशुरास्वाद्य तव यत्' - *śloka* 75). Some people opine that the *Drāviḍa shishu* was a Śaiva saint by name *Jñānasambandhar*<sup>1</sup>. Some others opine that this saint was none other than our Ācārya! Even attempts have been made to decide

1. It seems in one of the Tamil books of *Jñānasambandhar*, it is stated that 'your breastfeeding has not been available to any human being'!

Ācārya's time on the basis of the time of this *Jñānasambandhar* (Bala. Śam. p 145). But this argumentation would become tenable only after it is established that *Soundaryalahari* is a work of the Ācārya. Similarly, *Prapañcasāra* is purported to be a work of the Ācārya, and that its commentary *Vivaraṇa* is by Padmapādācārya. Some people think that *Prapañcasāra* is a summary of *Prapañcāgama* (Bala. Śam. p 146). The Ācārya in his *Sūtrabhāṣya*, while writing on Vedānta Sūtra (1. 3. 33) quotes from *Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (2. 12) that presents the greatness of *Yoga*. While explaining this, Amalānanda, the author of *Kalpataru*, has cited a śloka from *Prapañcasāra* stating that it is Ācārya's; and in *Nṛsimhapūrvatāpinī*, the *Bhāṣyakāra* has agreed that *Prapañcasāra* is his own work. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* feels that because of these reasons, the author of *Prapañcasāra* can be taken to be Ācārya himself (Bala.Śam. p 146-147).

However, we are constrained to say that sufficient evidence has not been available to regard Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara to be worshippers of Śrīvidyā. Neither in *GauḍapādaKārika* nor in the *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣya* of the Ācārya there is consideration of *tāntric* aspects. It is quite meaningful that the Ācārya does not take up the *Śākteya* school of thought either to support or to refute! In *Gītābhāṣya* the Ācārya has mentioned that *Bhūtejyas* means worshippers of *Vināyaka*, *Matṛgaṇa*, *Caturbhaginīs* etc. (Gī. Bhā. 9. 25). He condemns such worship saying that 'only *tāmasas* worship the *saptamātrkas*, *bhūtagaṇas* and the like' (Gī. Bhā. 17. 4). We have mentioned this before (page \*324). The *Bhāṣya* does not mention about *Śāktapūja* anywhere else. Some people opine that if *Śrīvidyā* was close to *Brahmavidyā* and if the Ācārya was a worshipper of

*Śrividya*, he would not have disregarded such an important aspect in this way. Because *Soundaryalahari* and *Prapañcasāra* are now regarded as Ācārya's works, and because *Śrividya* has come down in the lineage of the Maṭha pontiffs, it appears to us that recently people must have mistakenly taken these works of some other Śaṅkarācārya to be the works of Ācārya himself. Even it is controversial that the author of *Pañcapādikā* is Padmapāda; and even if it is Padmapāda's work, there is no evidence available till now to believe that the commentator of *Prapañcasāra* is the same Padmapāda. In John Woodroffe's *Prapañcasāra*, in the introduction that is in the name of Arthur Avalon, it is written (Pra. Sa. p 17) that there were several *tāntrikas* by name Śaṅkarācārya, and that with a view that if it is published in the name of a luminary, the book may be received very well, someone might have written the book in Ācārya's name. In the second revised edition of the book, the same person writes in the Introduction (p 71) that the book might have been written by the Ācārya, citing authority of Amalānanda, Rāghava Bhaṭṭa, Bhāskara Rāya, and *Mādhavācārya*, the commentator of *Sūtasamhitā*. But he has ignored the fact that all these authorities cited by him are of very recent times than the Ācārya.

At the time of the author of *Diṇḍima*, Śiva was regarded as the author of *Soundaryalahari*; also there was the tradition that it is Ācārya's work; there was also another tradition that it is a work of Lalitā Devi. Author of *Sudhāvidyotini*, (a commentary) has mentioned that it is the work of Pravarasena, a Dravidian king. Mahādeva Śāstry in his introduction to the *Stotra* has opined that 'since Śaṅkarācārya has refined the *Śākta* cult, since *Śakti* worship is being carried out in the

Advaita Maṭhas, since Devi-Jīva identity (śloka 22) as well as Vedānta (śloka 84) both are expounded in the *Stotra*, by considering the style, and by the effort made in it to unify *samaya* and *kaula* methodologies, and also since Lakṣmīdhara and others say that this is Ācārya's, I am leaning towards believing that it is Ācārya's work only' (p 11). None of these reasons appear to us as decisive. Because, the Ācārya is not the first to declare the identity of *Paramātmān* and *Jīva*; just the common name of Vedānta cannot be suggestive of Ācārya; coordination of *samaya-kaula* paths might have been done by some recent *tāntrika* Ācārya; there is no evidence that ĀdiŚaṅkara himself did it; Mahādeva Śāstry himself has accepted that there is difference of opinion among commentators in this regard. By all these reasons, we have to say for the present, that it is not that rational at all to decide just by the name Śaṅkara, that the Ācārya himself wrote *tāntrik* books, or to decide that he regarded *brahmavidyā* and the *Tāntrika vidyā* to be one and the same.



## 25. Maṭhas Established by Ācārya

### **Difficulties regarding the Maṭhas**

179. It is well-known that the Ācārya established four Pīṭhas in four directions. As the pontiffs there are representatives of Ācārya Śaṅkara, they too are being called 'Śaṅkarācārya's. Even then, which Maṭha the Ācārya established first? How many Maṭhas are actually established by him? What are the branch-Maṭhas of these or the independent Maṭhas recently started? - it is very difficult to decide these things. Since the pontiffs of the Maṭhas are not providing enough help with this type of research, we are not able to procure the reliable information that we want. Clashing words between competitive followers of Maṭhas are not in short supply. For this reason too it is not possible to reveal with certainty, the aspects of the Maṭhas. Therefore, without giving more details about the Maṭhas, we shall summarily provide only such things about the Ācārya's history which the readers may need to know.

### **The sacred texts of the Maṭhas (Maṭhāmnāyas)**

180. It is believed that after establishing four Maṭhas in four directions and nominating his four disciples to head them, the Ācārya wrote a book entitled **Maṭhāmnāya** in which he had determined their fields of action, formulated rules and regulations for their daily practices etc. But to our misfortune, there are several books entitled **Maṭhāmnāya** with differing contents; hence it cannot be precisely told whether the Ācārya wrote such books, and whether he regulated the fields of



action of the Maṭhas. For example, we have given in Appendix IX some of the **Maṭhāmnāya** contents which we could procure. Perusal of these would enable the readers to understand how complex this question has become and how difficult it is to solve.

### **Present state of the Maṭhāmnāyas**

181. From the examples we have given, there is scope for assuming that these *Maṭhāmnāyas* could have been got written by the different Maṭhas at different times according to their own traditions. They cannot be ascribed to the Ācārya at all. People believe that the Ācārya, after establishing these Maṭhas, granted a 'Mahānuśāsana' (महानुशासन) to the pontiffs. A book entitled 'Maṭhāmnāyasetu' (मठात्मनायसेतु) containing the *Mahānuśāsanas* was printed in Śaka 1818 at Kalāratnākara Press, Madras, and was published by KuppuSwāmi Iyer, the agent of Kāñci Maṭha; We have given this in Appendix IX. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has given this under the name *Mahānuśāsana* in his book (p 209). The same is published from Navabhārati Kāryālaya in 1957 under the name 'Maṭhāmnāya tathā Mahānuśāsana'. If one looks at these two recent printings and compare them with the original 'Maṭhāmnāyasetu' one will understand that even this 'Mahānuśāsana' has several versions. Hence we have given the 'Maṭhāmnāyasetu' also in Appendix IX.

We have given a part of the 'Maṭhāmnāya' cited by *Baladeva Upādhyāya* in Appendix IX. Attention of the readers is drawn at the mention therein of Padmapāda as the son of *Mādhava*. This has to be compared to the description of Padmapāda given earlier in this book (page \*113). There should be some secret behind Padmapāda being

assigned by some to Śrīṅgeri, by some to Dwārakā, and by some to Govardhana Pīṭha. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has assigned Hastāmalaka to Dwārakā. It seems one by name Rajārājeśwara Āśrama has provided him the lineage of Śārādā Pīṭha of Dwārakā. That is why he has written to indirectly imply that the pontiff nominated anew by the Government is not the real pontiff (Bala. Śam. p 177). Still he writes that the first pontiff of that Pīṭha is *Sureśwarācārya*! What is the secret behind this is known to him only. Researchers are to examine in detail and find out whether Padmapāda was really the pontiff of any one of the Maṭhas. Whatever that be, in the present disordered situation of the *Maṭhāmnāyas*, trying to forge unanimity between them seems to us like trying to put frogs into the pan of a balance and weigh them!

### **The lineage of pontiffs of the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha**

182. Although many *Āmnāyas* declare that the Maṭhas are only four and the *Setu* of Kāñci tradition declare as five, there are some other Maṭhas not very well-known to people. By and large, Śrīṅgeri and Kāñci are known through books; we will deal with them first and then take up other Maṭhas later.

The Maṭha lineages are not so very important as far as the history of the Ācārya is concerned. But still if there be historically famous Advaitācāryas in those Maṭhas, it is necessary for us to know at least something about them. This is also not easy. For example, Bodas<sup>1</sup> writes that there are four lists of lineage of the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha. Since detailed history of the lineage of pontiffs of that Maṭha is now available in *The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom* of Śrī K. R. Venkaṭa ra-

---

1. The listings of Bodas are given in Appendix IX.

man, we shall follow his method of listing.

In this lineage, the first twelve, upto Śuka are verily ṛṣis; since this book is aimed at discussing history of the Ācārya, we may leave them from consideration here. Since *Sureśwarācārya* is claimed by the traditionalists of Śrīṅgeri, Kāñci and Dwārakā to be their pontiff, and also since the Śrīṅgeri traditionalists claim that he was pontiff for 800 years is unbelievable by people in this age, he also need not be counted. Although Venkaṭarāman gives the periods of the pontiffs, from Nityabodhaghanācārya to Nrisimhatīrtha, he also has not given the periods.

Although Bodas and others give the periods, thinking that those details may not be required for the readers, we have left out the aspect of time from consideration. Time periods are taken up only when needed for discussion. For the same reason, we have not given the names also, of all the pontiffs here.

### **Names of some important pontiffs of Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha**

183. (3) <sup>1</sup> **Nityabodhaghanācārya.** Since his name comes next to Sureśwara, some imagine that he is Sarvajñātmanamuni, the author of *Saṅkṣepa Śārīraka*. But now it is known that the Guru of Sarvajñātma is not Sureśwara.

(4) **Jñānaghana.** It seems he wrote a book called *Tattvaśuddhi*.

(5) **Jñānottamaśivācārya.** His disciple is the Guru of Citsukha, the famous author of *Tattvadīpikā*. Scholars have decided that he is not the one who has written commentaries of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* and

---

1. Such numbers correspond with the serial numbers in the lineage of Gurus of respective Maṭhas, as in the Appendix IX

*Iṣṭasiddhi*. Between the old Śāradā temple and the Tunga river in Śrīṅgeri, there are some *mantapas*, stone structures, under which the previous pontiffs were buried; there is the custom of the pontiffs going to these holy places and offering worship on special days; but it seems the custom of offering worship at the *samādhi* of Jñānotama has now been stopped. Śrī G. Śrīnivāsa Iyer writes in his English book *Gauḍeśwara Jñānottama Śivācārya* that this is because he was a *Gauḍa Sāraswata* (GGS p 11). K. R. Venkaṭarāman writes that many brahmins came from Gauḍadeśa, Madhyadeśa, Kāśmīra, and Western India to the south and settled; and the kings Rājarāja and Rājendra-*cola* had granted them land; of them, some were Śaivācāryas who followed Vedānta (KRTTW p 24). If this be true, it can be guessed from the historical point of view that worship of the *Līṅgam* might have been commenced from the time of Jñānottamaśivācārya.

(6-9) **Jñānagiri, Simhagiri, Īśwaratīrtha, Nri(Nara?)simhatīrtha.** K. R. Venkaṭarāman's guess is that the one who defeated Madhvācārya might have been the last of these four or the next (KRTTW p 36). It seems several Maṭhas were established by this time; the study of Vedānta received encouragement.

(10) **Vidyāśaṅkara or Vidyātīrtha.** It seems he gave Sannyāsa to two brahmin brothers from Ekashilānagar (Oragallu) and gave them yogapaṭṭas – Bhāratī Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha (Bhāratī Tīrtha) and Vidyāraṇya. When Bhāratī Tīrtha was the pontiff in Śrīṅgeri, Vidyāraṇya used to be on travel. It seems *Vidyāśaṅkara* got carved out the idol of Caturmūrtividyēśwara<sup>1</sup> at Simhagiri, and had foretold that after he finished

1. With Bhāratī Tīrtha and *Vidyāraṇya* in the front, *Vidyātīrtha* is in Siddhāsana facing North; Brahma in the East, Viṣṇu in the South, Pañcamukha Śiva in the West,

his *yoga* for twelve years underground, his body would take the form of that idol. When the curious servants opened the door of his underground confinement after three years, only the *Lingam* of the top of the idol was remaining. Bhārati Tīrtha consecrated that *Lingam* and built a temple above it. The power of *Vidyāśaṅkara* is felt there even today. The Maṭha mudra (seal) even now reads ‘Śrī Vidyāśaṅkara’. Some people opine that this *Vidyātīrtha* was in *Kāñci pītha* also.

(11, 12) **BhāratiKṛṣṇa Tīrtha, *Vidyāraṇya*.** There is controversy about who is this *Vidyāraṇya*:

(a) *Baladeva Upādhyāya* opines that *Vidyāraṇya* is *Mādhava* himself (Bala. Śam. p 173-174) on the basis of a copper inscription written in 1386 that presents *agrahāra* to three *Vedabhāṣya*-promoting puṇ-dits in presence of *Vidyāraṇya*, and on the basis of perusal of the books ‘तिथिदीपिका’, ‘प्रयोगपारिजात’, ‘वीरमित्रोदय’, ‘व्याससूत्रवृत्ति’ and ‘आन्ध्रभाषाव्याकरण’ (“authored by *Mādhava*’s nephew) and प्रयोगरत्नमालिका.

Śrī D. V. Gundappa supports with some arguments that *Mādhava*, the author of ‘सर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्रह’ is *Vidyāraṇya*, in his Kannaḍa book ‘*Vidyāraṇyara Samakālīnaru*’.

(b) The opinion of Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman (KRTTW pp 36-37) is that there were many people by name *Mādhava* in those times. (1) A minister *Mādhava* was there with pen-name *Mādarasa Voḍeyar*; he has written a commentary on ‘sūtasamhitā’. Bukka was bestowing grants to Śrīṅgeri through him. (2) Three brothers *Mādhava*, *Sāyaṇa* and *Bhoganātha* were sons of *Srīmati* and *Māyaṇa*. The

---

Lakshmīnārasimha above, and on the top of that, *Lingam* - the idol is like this (from Śrī *Satchidānanda Śivābhīnava NrisimhaBhārati Swāmigala Charitre* of Śrīkanṭha Śāstri).

son of this Sāyaṇa, i.e., Māyaṇṇa or *Mādhava*, is the author of ‘Sarvadarśanasanāgraha’<sup>1</sup>. Māyanna’s son, *Mādhavācārya*, is the author of ‘Parāśarasmr̥tivyākhyā’, ‘Vyavahāramādhavīya’, ‘Kālamādhavīya’, ‘Jīvanmuktiviveka’(?) and ‘Jaiminiyanyāyamālāvistara’. “Sāyaṇa is the author of ‘Vedabhāṣya’, ‘dhātuvṛtti’ etc. *Mādhava* has called himself Kāṇḍatraya Mīmāṃsā Śāstrajña, proficient in *Mīmāṃsa* (all the three Kāṇḍas) and Prativasanta Somayāji; Sāyaṇa too eulogises him as performer of great sacrifices, and as ‘Anantabhogasaṃsakta’. In no inscription of 14th century or those of a few later centuries one finds the identity of *Mādhava* and *Vidyāranya*; hence *Mādhava* must have remained as a householder.

The researchers who accept the identity of *Mādhava* and *Vidyāranya* agree that his *Sannyāsa* might have been in 1370 or 1377, before the Videhamukti of Bhāratī Tīrtha (1380). Examination of inscriptions indicate that Harihara, Bukka, and Harihara the II - all the three regarded *Vidyāranya* as *Sannyāsin*. Ferishta, Buchanan and others have expressed that Harihara and Bukka were under the influence of a *Sannyāsin*. The statement in ‘Guruvaṃśakāvyā’ that Śrī *Vidyāranya* gave ‘Vedabhāṣya’, ‘Dhātuvṛtti’ etc. to *Mādhava* and Sāyaṇa and entrusted them to complete them and get them published in their names appears reasonable here.

Doubtless this argumentation deserves to be considered further. Even while the works like ‘Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā’, ‘Pañcadaśī’ etc. of Bhāratī Tīrtha and *Vidyāranya* are so very famous, it does not look

1. Śrī D. V. Guṇḍappa argues that the author calling himself as ‘सायणदुःखाब्धि-कौस्तुभ’ implies that he belongs to the Sāyaṇa lineage; but the *Koustubha* was born directly in the *Ksheerābdhi*; not as a result of a lineage. Therefore, this appears to support those who opine that he is Sāyaṇa’s son.

proper that their individual aspects remain so doubtful. It seems Bhārati Tīrtha distributed means for livelihood to 120 eminent scholars<sup>1</sup>. Because of the support given by Harihara and other kings, the Śringeri Pīṭha grew up into a Samsthāna. The details regarding these developments are given by Śri Venkaṭarāman in his book *The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom* (pp 45-48) and must be read by the English-knowing.

Vijayanagara kingdom was established and grew by the blessings of *Vidyāraṇya*. At his behest, Harihara and Bukka built a city Vidyānagara in his name, on the bank of Tungabhadra river, opposite to Ānegondi. It is said that it was established in the shape of Śri Cakra in the year Śālivāhana Śaka 1238 (*Dhātu Vaiśākha Śukla*, on the 18-4-1336). The name Vijayanagara has been given later. Victory after victory made the king offer all his kingly insignia to *Vidyāraṇya*<sup>2</sup> as a memento; thereafterwards the Śringeri Jagadguru got the citation 'Karnāṭakasimhāsanasthāpanācārya'. During the time of *Vidyāśaṅkara*, *Bhārati Tīrtha* and *Vidyāraṇya*, the Śāradā Pīṭha rose to great hights and became a *Samsthāna* (KRTTW p 32).

Even after the downfall of Vijayanagara kingdom, the Śringeri

---

1. He utilized Bukka's grant for this purpose. Some people understand the inscription which states that Bukkarāya had the *darśan* of *Vidyāśaṅkara Tīrtha Śrīpādarugalu* wrongly as if he actually saw the pontiff. Truly he had only the *darśan* of *Vidyāśaṅkara Lingam* (KRTTW p 45).

2. We have summerised earlier (p. 4) the defects shown by some people in the opinion that the author of ŚaṅkaraVijaya himself became famous later as Sannyāsin by the name Vidyāraṇya. Several people opine that the author of Bhāgavatacampū himself is this Mādhava, who had a title 'navakālidāsa'. But if we observe that the author of campū has praised himself in the words: Abhinavapadapūrvaḥ Kālidāsaḥ, Pragalbha-trinayanadayitāyāḥ premaḍimbhastritīyaḥ, he may not be Mādhava; because Mādhava has not referred to himself a devotee of Gowri.

Pīṭha continued to enjoy the respect and regard of the kings of Keladi, the Muslim Navabs, the Mahārashṭrian authorities, and the Mysore Wodeyars. Although the Maṭha was attacked causing loss, by Muslims and the Mahārashṭrian Peshves due to political reasons, on the whole, it can be said that this Pīṭha has continued to enjoy respectful recognition from all the kingdoms of India. Details of this can be had from the book of Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman; we have given only the very concise summary here.

Śrī K. R. Venkaṭaram has written that in this lineage of pontiffs, *Mādhava Bhārati*, one of the disciples of *Śrī Śaṅkarānanda Bhārati* the 16th pontiff, established a Maṭha at Gokaṇṇa (KRTTW p 52). But this issue seems to be controversial. We shall refer to it in Appendix IX. It appears that gifts of land from various quarters were available to the disciples of this *Śaṅkarānanda Bhārati*. By 1399 A. D., the Śrīṅgeri Samsthāna had expanded and the pontiffs were acclaimed with several citations and titles; and the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha had established several branches. The Maṭha at Śivaganga was established during the time of *Śrī Abhinava Nṛsimha Bhārati*; probably the Maṭha at Āvani (?) also was established during this time. According to K. R. Venkaṭarāman, the Maṭhas at Hariharapura, Tīrthamattūr and Kuḍali also were established in the 14th century A. D. with the encouragement of the pontiff of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha (KRTTW p 44). But the Kuḍali Maṭha are not agreeing on this point (see Appendix IX).

As the Śrīṅgeri Samsthāna progressively developed the benefit of Śāradā Pīṭham was available more and more to the public. The main Maṭha and the subordinate Maṭhas helped *Sannyāsins*, spiritual aspirants and scholars; help was made available to raise temples and



to establish boarding houses for charity. In spite of political turmoils during the 17th century and the first half of 18th century - although the pontiff of Śrīṅgeri had to remain at Nāsik for a period of ten years because of this reason - the encouragement of the kings of Karṇāṭaka was available to Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha. During this time, South India was full of the Maṭhas of the Vīraśaivas of Karṇāṭaka and the Śaiva Siddhāntis of Tamiḷnāḍu, and Vaiṣṇava Maṭhas of the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* and *Dvaita* following. Although these Maṭhas were prone to argumentations and controversies, and were competing with each other, in general they were encouraging good conduct and faith and devotion to the Lord among people.

This book is not aimed at describing the entire history of the past pontiffs of the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha. By deliberating on how it went on developing as a result of the support and encouragement by the kings will not provide any supporting material to the life history of the Ācārya in any way. However, mention ought to be made of Śrī Satchidānanda Śivābhinava Nrisimha Bhārati Swāmīgal establishing the deities Śrī Śārādāmba and Śrī Śaṅkara on 21st February 1910. By virtue of knowledge, devotion, dispassion and yogic practice he had raised himself to such a high stature as to be believed by many as Śaṅkara himself reincarnated. The life history of this pontiff ought to be read in detail. Several famous *Sannyāsins* were his disciples. At the behest of this Jagadguru, all the works in the name of Śaṅkara were published at Vāṇivilās Press, Śrīrangam. The pontiff next to him was Śrī Candraśekhara Bhārati Swāmi and presently Śrī Abhinava Vidyātīrtha Swāmi; (Śrī Bhārati Tīrtha Swāmi is the pontiff adorning the Pīṭha at the time of translation).

### The lineage of pontiffs of the Kāñci Kāmakoti Pīṭha

184. As the name indicates, this was established at Kāñci but due to several reasons it was shifted to Kumbhakoṇam in the district Tanjāvūr at the end of 18th century. Details regarding the pontiffs of this Pīṭha is available in the form of several books like *Punyaślokamanjari* (written by the fifth pontiff of Kāñci Pīṭha), *Gururatnamālikā* (written by Sadāśiva Brahmendra, the disciple of Paramashivendra, the 55th pontiff) and *Suṣamā* (commentary on *Gururatnamālikā* written by Ātmabodha, the disciple of Mahādevendra, the 61st pontiff). Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman has written (NVSSK) that since the *Punyaślokamanjari* gives the day, half-month and year of the Guru's *mahāsamādhi*, these are reliable; he believes that even among these, the last part - from Vidyāghana's *videhamukti* - the dates given in the books are more reliable. The Maṭha claims that Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda attained salvation at Kāñci itself, and that the SarvajñaPīṭha also was situated at Kāñci. Majority of people accept that the Ācārya established Śrī Cakra at Kāñci. Their staunch faith goes upto claiming that Kāñci Maṭha itself is the original Maṭha established by Śaṅkara - we shall give what the adversaries have to say about this in the Appendix. For the time being, following Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman's writing, we shall give the names of some important pontiffs of this Pīṭha.

### The important Pontiffs of Kāmakoti Pīṭha

185. Apart from Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and Sureśwarācārya, a further 66 pontiffs have ruled at Kāmakoti Pīṭha. Following Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman, we too shall count the lineage from Sarvajñātma and give the names of only the important Gurus here. More details can be had

from his English book or the Sanskrit *Punyaślokanjanjari*.

(1) **Sarvajñātma:** It seems he argued with Śaṅkara himself; and seeing his brilliance, the Ācārya made him pontiff at his 7th year of age, and nominated Sureśwara to look after the affairs of the Maṭha (NVSSK p 50). Now it is known that Sarvajñātma is not disciple of *Sureśwarācārya*; his Guru Deveśwara was a disciple of Devānanda; from a *śloka* at the end of *Sankshepa Śārīraka* it becomes evident that the book was finished during the time of Manukulāditya, the king of south Travancore. Therefore, we have to say that evidence is not sufficient to believe that Sureśwara was there in Kāñci during his time.

(3) **Jñānānanda:** Śri N. Venkaṭarāman believes that he is the same Jñānottama who wrote a commentary *Candrike* on *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*. Śri G. Śrīnivāsa Iyer writes that the 5th pontiff of Śringeri lineage is the author of *Candrike* (GGS p 11). God knows which is true!

(5) **Ānandajñāna:** Śri N. Venkaṭarāman opines that he is the same as *Ānandagiri* who wrote a critique on the *Bhāṣyas* of the Ācārya. But we feel that there were many critics by name *Ānandajñāna* or *Ānandagiri*. We have clarified it in the notes to the Upaniṣads, written in Sanskrit.

(6) **Kṛpāśaṅkara:** Venkaṭarāman imagines that he is the real *Shanmatasthapanācārya*.

(18) **Mūkaśaṅkara:** Dumb by birth, it seems he got the ability to speak by the blessings of Vidyāghana. And it seems Pravarasena and Matrgupta of Kāśmīr were his devotees. It is said that he authored *Mūkapancāśati* and *Prācīna Śaṅkara Vijaya*. *Ātmabodha* has cited several *ślokas* from this *Śaṅkara Vijaya*; looking at them, we have to say that Kāñci Maṭha at that time was in its high glory. N. Venkaṭarāman

writes that we can know the time of Mūkaśaṅkara (Kali 2593) from them; not only that, the book reveals certain important happenings during his time (NVSSK p 74).

(36) **Dheera (or Abhinava) Śaṅkara:** He is the son of *Viśwajit* of Cidambaram. This is evident from Vākpati Bhaṭṭa's Śaṅkarendra-vilāsa. This has already been mentioned in this book (page \*46).

(45) **Candraśekhara the III or Candracūḍa:** It seems his devotees included Mankha (author of 'Śrīkaṇṭhacarita'), Kṛṣṇa Mitra (author of 'Prabodhacandrodaya') and Jayadeva (author of 'Prasannarāghava' etc.).

(46) **Advaitānandabodha:** He is also called Cidvilāsa. He defeated Śrī Harṣa (author of 'Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā') and Abhinava Gupta, the author of several *Tāntric* books. He has written the books including 'Brahmavidyābharaṇa', 'Śāntivivaraṇa' and 'Gurupradīpa'.

(49) **Vidyātīrtha:** He is the Guru of Sāyaṇa, the author of 'वेदभाष्य'. He is also the Guru of *Mādhava* who later became famous as *Vidyāraṇya*, and also of Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha who became the first pontiff of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha after its renaissance. In order to counter the propaganda of Mādhva school of thought, and the furore that the Roman Catholics were causing in Portugese India, *Vidyātīrtha* established eight Maṭhas and made his eight disciples the heads of these Maṭhas. He made *Vidyāraṇya* the pontiff of Virūpākṣa Maṭha near the capital of Vijayanagara Empire. *Vidyātīrtha* stayed at the Kāñci Maṭha for 73 years and then proceeded to Himālayas for penance. Out of the eight Maṭhas purported to be established by *Vidyātīrtha*, only two - Virūpākṣa and Puṣpagiri - are now continuing.

All these Maṭhas have the emblem *Vidyāraṇya* or *Vidyāśaṅkara*

on their Maṭha seals; both these names are of the same person. *Vidyāśaṅkara*, the ninth pontiff in the lineage of Śringeri Maṭha is different. He passed away at a place called Nirmala during 491 A. D.

The above details are given as in N. Venkaṭarāman's book. If one goes through what has been given under Śringeri Maṭha lineage (page \*394) for comparison and the material given in Appendix IX, it will be evident how controversial these things are.

(50) **Śaṅkarānanda:** He helped *Vidyāranya* to establish new Maṭhas. He has written 'dīpikā's to some Upaniṣads, and a commentary on BhagavadGītā called 'Tātparyadīpikā'; and also an independent work entitled 'Ātmapurāṇa'. On the basis of a *śloka* of his 'dīpikā' to Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, N. Venkaṭarāman writes that *Vidyātīrtha* was a pontiff of the Kāmakoti Pīṭha without any doubt. But this is also controversial (see Appendix IX).

(52) **Mahādeva the IV:** Since he had been at *Vyāsācala*, he is also called *Vyāsācala*. He wrote the ŚaṅkaraVijaya called '*Vyāsācalīya*'. We have mentioned this before (page \*7). There are copper inscriptions depicting the royal grants of lands to him as well as to some of the succeeding pontiffs in the lineage (for the inscriptions, see Appendix IX).

(55) **ParamaŚiva the II:** He is the Guru of Sadāśiva Brahmendra, the author of 'Ātmavidyāvilāsa'. Sadāśiva Brahmendra has also written 'Gururatnamālikā'. We have mentioned about this book earlier (page \*16).

(56) **Ātmabodha, Vishwādhika:** He has written 'Rudrabhāṣya'. He is purported to be the inspirer of 'Gururatnamālikā'.

(59) **Mahādeva the V:** He was a great *yogi*. During his time, *Ātma-*

*bodha* wrote the commentary ‘*Suṣamā*’ on ‘Gururatnamālikā’.

(60) **Candraśekhara the IV:** The Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha shifted once for all to Kumbhakoṇam during his time. The idol of Kamākṣi first went to Oḍeyara Pālya, and then to Tanjāvūr and has remained there. During the time of Rāja Pratāpasimha (1770-1763) the Maṭha shifted to Tanjāvūr, and later to Kumbhakoṇam because it is situated on the banks of Kāveri. Even now it is located there.

(66) **Jagadguru Śrī Candraśekharendra Saraswati** is in the Pīṭha at present. He has named his disciple Śrī Jayendra Saraswati Swāmi as his successor<sup>1</sup>. Because of his greatness the Maṭha’s fame is increasing.

The above summary account is based on the English book of Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman. About the controversies the readers are to refer Appendix.

### **Dwārakā, Govardhana, Jyotirmath and other Maṭhas**

186. Although the enlisted lineages of Gurus of the above Maṭhas, which are famous as established by the Ācārya, are available, no famed historical happenings are found in them. No additional material being available regarding the lifehistory of Śaṅkara, we have not mentioned them here. See Appendix for further details.

### **About the Maṭhas: Conclusion**

187. Since the pontiffs of the Maṭhas established by Śaṅkarācārya, from some time in the past, did not make any significant efforts for improving the great activities of Maṭhas, for teaching Advaita to aspirants, or in spreading Advaita through publication of books etc.,

---

1. At the time of translation of this book, he is the pontiff of Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha.

but simply concentrated their attention to the prestige of their Pīṭhas only, the devotees of these Maṭhas started ignoring them; and the Government started having a crooked eye on the holdings and earnings of the Maṭhas. By God's grace, the pontiffs of more recent times are evincing keen interest in public works like spreading education as well as in promoting faith and devotion to Ācārya among people at large. May the Guru of all the Gurus, *Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda*, bestow his grace on the Maṭhas, and may the devotees gain more and more faith and devotion in their respective Maṭhas and in the teachings of *Bhagavatpāda* is our fervent prayer to Him.



## 26. Conclusion

188. It is by the Grace of Śrīmannāraṇya and by the benevolence of Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpādācārya, this comprehensive and critical summary of life of the Ācārya has been completed; what stories we could gather, and about them what books in different languages by different people were available, we have organized them and critically reasoned about and formulated our own opinion, and wrote down into a particular form.

What benefit the readers could get by going through this history, they alone will have to think about. As far as we are concerned, with full devotion we have collected the matter, came to decisions impartially, and expressed them without any fear. We have full contentment about our writing. Whatever books are there about the Ācārya, were written as poetry several centuries after his leaving this world and departing to the Supreme abode, on the basis of heresay, imagined stories and a little bit on the basis of traditionally available material, by the respective authors. Hence they cannot be accepted as historical documents. On the top of it, blind followers of the different Maṭhas wrote some of them or promoted them in order to display the greatness of their own tradition. Therefore, we will have to regretfully accept that we in fact know very little about the history of the Ācārya.

Notwithstanding the very valuable guidance towards *Jeevanmukti*, very live and invigorating even today, available in his highly efficacious *Bhāṣyas*, some people have ignored them and have shown the audacity of resorting to propaganda that some teachings of Vedānta that have gained currency alone are the opinion of the Ācārya.



Concerning the matters of practices and deliberations on which the Ācārya has written clearly, we have not considered any of the ŚaṅkaraVijayas as authority; We have explained his opinions only on the basis of Bhāṣyas, and we have refuted in unambiguous terms, those that contradict them.

In both the aspects, i.e., Ācārya's lifehistory and his spiritual teaching, finding our candid expressions hard to accept, it is naturally expected that some would be indifferent and some would express their dissatisfaction. But those things are not important to us. If this book is helpful atleast in a small way for the readers to not regard the Śaṅkara vijayas on par with the *Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas*, but to read them as poetry and gather the essence, we feel fulfilled. If they succeed in understanding, atleast in a small way, the value of the doctrine of the Upaniṣads that are considered as the unfailing blessing of the Ācārya and also the strength of knowledge, devotion and dispassion, we feel satisfied.

Born in a good family in the south, having become a Paramahansa Parivrājaka at a very early age, having written the *Bhāṣyas* to express the great strength and vigour of Advaita Siddhanta acquired by the teachings of Guru, and having travelled by foot through length and breadth of the Indian continent, the Ācārya has been unparalleled in the renaissance of Vedic Dharma by establishing lofty traditions. Although we do not have with us his real history in detail, the very hearing of his name charges us with faith, respect and devotion - such is the sin-removing glory he was able to spread in all directions. The great respect that even today the Maṭhas, purported to have been established by him, are enjoying, in fact is the respect that

ought to go to him alone. There is no doubt that if peace has to descend on earth and this world has to become a Vaikunṭha, the supreme means is to spread the Advaitic knowledge that is in accord with experience taught by him. May his blessings render the present Maṭhas, spritual organizations, *Sādhus* and *Sannyāsins* gird up their loins and take up this great task, is our fervent prayer to him; offering infinite *daṇḍapranāms* to him, we end this writing.

*Om Namah Śaṅkarāya, Om Namo Nārāyaṇāya!*



# APPENDIX I

## Purāṇas scrutinizing Śaṅkara

(Text, page \*17)

### (A) Śivarahasya

This book has been published in the Series Śrī Jayachamarajendra Grantharatna Male from Mysore. Śrī Achyuta Rao Moḍak, a commentator of ŚaṅkaraVijaya, has cited ślokas from this. *Nirṇaya Sindhu* cites this as authority here and there (p 154, 173).

स्कन्द उवाच -

तदा गिरिजया पृष्ठस्त्रिकालज्ञस्त्रिलोचनः ।

भविष्यच्छिवभक्तानां भक्तिं संवीक्ष्य विस्मयन्<sup>1</sup> ॥ १ ॥

मौलिमान्दोलयन् देवो बभाषे वचनं मुने ।

शृणु त्व<sup>2</sup> मेभिर्गणपैर्मुनीशैश्च सुरैस्तथा ॥ २ ॥

प्रभावं शिवभक्तानां भविष्याणां कलावपि ।

1-2. Skānda told thus: O ṛṣi<sup>3</sup> , when Girije asked, the three-eyed Lord conversant with past, present and future, pondering over the devotion of the future devotees of Śiva, wondering, nodding, told: 'alongwith these group-leaders, ṛṣis and gods, you listen about the future devotees of Śiva in Kaliyuga'.

ईश्वर उवाच -

शृणु देवि भविष्याणां<sup>4</sup> भक्तानां चरितं कलौ ॥ ३ ॥

---

1. 'विस्मयन्' is usage of the ṛṣi. The commentator of *Mādhaviya* has accepted 'विस्मये' and has given the meaning 'having been wonderstruck'.

2. This is better than 'शृणुध्वम्'.

3. Skānda is telling a Ṛshi.

4. alternate version 'भविष्यत्सद्भक्तानां'.

वदामि सङ्ग्रहेणैव<sup>1</sup> श्रवणाद्<sup>2</sup> भक्तिवर्धनम् ।  
 गोपनीयं प्रयत्नेन नाख्येयं यस्य कस्यचित् ॥ ४ ॥  
 पापघ्नं पुण्यमायुष्यं श्रोतॄणां मङ्गलावहम् ।

3-4. O Devi, Listen. I am going to tell you about the devotees of the oncoming Kaliyuga. Mere listening of this will enhance devotion; not to be told to anyone and everyone, to be kept secret. This will remove sins and brings merit; enhances lifespan and causes good of the listeners.

पापकर्मैकनिरतां विरतान् सर्वकर्मसु<sup>3</sup> ॥ ५ ॥  
 वर्णाश्रमपरिभ्रष्टान् धर्मप्रस्रवणान्<sup>4</sup> जनान् ।  
 कल्यढधौ मज्जमानांस्तान् दृष्ट्वानुक्रोशतोम्बिके ॥ ६ ॥  
 मदंशजातं देवेशि कलावपि तपोधनम् ।  
 केरलेषु तदा<sup>5</sup> विप्रं जनयामि महेश्वरि ॥ ७ ॥

5-7. Observing the people bent upon committing sins, disinterested in all the rites, having fallen off from the regulations of castes and stages of life, sliding down from righteousness, with compassion on them, O Ambike, *Deveśi*, *Maheśwari*, I shall from my own part<sup>6</sup>, cause the birth of a pious brahmin in Kerala.

तस्यैव चरितं तेऽद्य वक्ष्यामि शृणु शैलजे ।  
 कल्यादिमे<sup>7</sup> महादेवि सहस्रद्वितयात् परम् ॥ ८ ॥

1. alternate version 'सङ्ग्रहेणाहम्'.

2. alternate version 'शृण्वताम्'.

3. alternate version 'धर्मकर्मसु'.

4. alternate versions 'वर्णप्रस्रवणान्', 'अधर्मप्रवणान्'.

5. alternate version 'तथा'.

6. 'From my own part' is there in *śloka*s 7, 14, 15, 37, 39. This is against 'शङ्कर एव साक्षात्' of Mā. Śam. (text, page 85).

7. alternate version 'कलाविमे'.

सारस्वतास्तथा गौडा मिश्राः कार्णाञ्चिनो<sup>1</sup> द्विजाः ।

आममीनाशना देवि ह्यार्यावर्तानुवासिनः<sup>2</sup> ॥९॥

औत्तरा विन्ध्यनिलया भविष्यन्ति महीतले ।

8-9. O Pārṇvati, I shall tell his history to you now; listen. After 2000 years of Kaliyuga, the brahmins who are the *sāraswatas*, *gowḍas* and *kārṇācinas* (*karnājinas*?), eating raw fish, take birth on this earth in the north of Āryāvarta and in the Vindhya.

शब्दार्थज्ञानकुशलास्तर्ककर्कशबुद्धयः ॥ १० ॥

जैना बौद्धा बुद्धियुक्ता<sup>3</sup> मीमांसानिरताः कलौ ।

वेदबोधितवाक्यानामन्यथैव प्ररोचकाः ॥ ११ ॥

प्रत्यक्षवादकुशलाः शल्यभूताः कलौ युगे ।

मिश्राः शास्त्रमहाशस्त्रैरद्वैतच्छेदिनोऽम्बिके ॥ १२ ॥

कर्मैव परमं श्रेयो नैवेशः फलदायकः ।

इति युक्तिपरामृष्टवाक्यैरुद्बोधयन्ति च ॥ १३ ॥

तेन घोरकुलाचाराः कर्मसारा भवन्ति च<sup>4</sup> ।

10-13. Skilled in words and meanings, having intellect hardened by logic, puṇḍits of the type Jains, Buddhists and *mīmāṃsakas*<sup>5</sup> will be born in Kaliyuga. Telling alternate meanings to the (knowledge) expressions of Vedas<sup>6</sup> and creating interest<sup>7</sup>, O Shive, skilled in direct arguments, like thorns in Kaliyuga, the *Mīśras*<sup>8</sup> flourish, cutting through Advaita by the arms of the scriptures, O Ambike, arguing with

1. alternate version 'कर्णाञ्चना', 'कर्णाजिना'.

2. alternate version without 'हि', i.e. 'आर्यावर्ता...'.

3. alternate version 'बुद्धियुता'.

4. 'कर्मभारा भवन्तथा' - version of *Mādhavīya* commentary.

5. Vedāntins' are not mentioned here.

6. the meaning of 'बोधित' (?) is this.

7. telling that these are eulogies for injunctions

8. this is told keeping in mind Maṇḍana Mīśra (also found in 9th śloka).

intelligent expressions and teaching people that Karma alone is for highest welfare and there is no *Īśwara* to grant fruition. Thus, with terrific traditions, they will profess that is the essence (of the Vedas).

तेषामुत्पाटनार्थाय<sup>1</sup> सृजामीशे मदंशतः ॥ १४ ॥

केरळे शशलग्रामे विप्रपत्न्यां मदंशतः ।

भविष्यति महादेवि शङ्कराख्यो द्विजोत्तमः ॥ १५ ॥

उपनीतस्तदा मात्रा वेदान् साङ्गान् ग्रहिष्यति ।

14-15. In order to destroy them, O *Īśwari*, I shall part from my own and create: a pious brahmin by name Śaṅkara shall be born in Kerala, in Śaśalagrāma<sup>2</sup>, from (the womb of) a brahmin's wife. Getting the sacred thread from his mother<sup>3</sup>, he will grasp the Vedas and Vedāṅgas.

आब्धावधि ततः शब्दे विहृत्य<sup>4</sup> स तु तर्कजाम् ॥ १६ ॥

मतिं मीमांसमानोऽसौ कृत्वा शास्त्रेषु निश्चयम् ।

वादिमत्तद्विपवरान् शङ्करोत्तमकेसरी ॥ १७ ॥

भिनत्येव तदा बुद्धान्<sup>5</sup> सिद्धविद्यानपि दुतम् ।

जैनान् विजिग्ये<sup>6</sup> तरसा तथाऽन्यान् कुमतानुगान् ॥ १८ ॥

16-18. Dwelling in philology for a year, intending to investigate into the conceptions born of speculation, having convinced himself in the scriptures, the fine lion Śaṅkara shall break through the Buddhists, although well-accomplished, elephants in rut as they are. He shall win over the Jains and other followers of inferior creeds.

तदा मातरमामन्त्र्य परिव्राट्स भविष्यति ।

1. alternate version 'उद्घाटनार्थाय'.

2. see text, page \*36

3. this is controversial; see text, page \*57.

4. alternate version 'विहृते'.

5. better than the alternate version 'महाविद्यान्' of the tika; the Jains are mentioned next.

6. although in past tense, to be taken in future tense.

परिव्राजकरूपेण मिश्रानाम्रमदूषकान् ॥ १९ ॥

दण्डहस्तस्तथा कुण्डी<sup>1</sup> काषायवसनोज्ज्वलः ।

भस्मदिग्धत्रिपुण्ड्राङ्गो रुद्राक्षाभरणोज्ज्वलः ॥ २० ॥

ताररुद्रार्थ<sup>2</sup> पारीणः शिवलिङ्गार्चनप्रियः ।

स्वशिष्यैस्तादृशैर्घुष्यन् भाष्यवाक्यानि सोऽम्बिके ॥ २१ ॥

मदत्तविद्यया भिक्षुर्विराजति<sup>3</sup> शशाङ्कवत् ।

19-21. Then, with the permission of his mother he becomes a mendicant monk. In this form, he will (teach) Miśra's<sup>4</sup>, who talk ill of (*Sannyāsa*) Āśrama. With three lines of ashes on his forehead<sup>5</sup>, shining with glorious *Rudrākṣa*, well-versed in the *Tāraka rudrārthas*, loving the worship of *lingam*, associated with his own disciples of that kind, declaring the *Bhāṣya vakyas*, O Ambike, with the *vidyā* that I have granted to him<sup>6</sup>, that *Bhikshu* will be shining like the (full) moon.

सोऽद्वैतोच्छेदकान् पापानुच्छिद्याक्षिप्य तर्कतः ॥ २२ ॥

स्वमतानुगतान् देवि करोत्येव निरर्गळम् ।

तथापि प्रत्ययस्तेषां नैवासीच्छ्रुतिदर्शने<sup>7</sup> ॥ २३ ॥

मिश्राः शास्त्रार्थकुशलास्तर्ककर्कशबुद्धयः ।

तेषामुद्बोधनार्थाय शिष्य(तिष्ये?)<sup>8</sup> भाष्यं वदिष्यति ॥ २४ ॥

भाष्यघुष्यमहावाक्यैस्तिष्यजातान् हनिष्यति ।

1. alternate version 'कुम्भी'.

2. alternate version 'रुद्राक्षपारीणः'.

3. must be आत्मनेपदी; आर्षप्रयोगः.

4. the word 'Miśra' once again.

5. is Śaṅkara a Śaivaite? see text, page 101.

6. we do not know what is implied here. Which *vidyā* came down to Ācārya directly from Śiva?

7. above this *śloka*, there is 'सूत उवाच' in the original; we do not know why.

8. alternate version 'यतिर्भाष्यम्'.

22-24. He will reproach and destroy through logic such of those sinners who are bent upon destroying Advaita. O Devi, without any obstruction, he will make them his followers; even then they had<sup>1</sup> no faith in *Śrutidarśana*. The *Miśras*<sup>2</sup> are skilled in expounding the scriptures; hard in logic; in order to teach them, (the *Sannyāsin*) would write the *Bhāṣya*. By the great *Mahāvākyas*<sup>3</sup> of the *Bhāṣya*, he will destroy the creeds born in Kali.

व्यासोपदिष्टसूत्राणां द्वैतवाक्यात्मनां शिवे ॥ २५ ॥

अद्वैतमेव सूत्रार्थं प्रामाण्येन करिष्यति ।

अविमुक्ते समासीनं व्यासं वाक्यैर्विजित्य च ॥ २६ ॥

शङ्करं स्तौति दृष्टात्मा शङ्कराख्योऽथ मस्करी ।

25-26. For the *Sūtras* taught by Vyāsa, which are in the form of *Dvaitic* expressions<sup>4</sup>, O Shive, he will derive exclusive *Advaitic* meaning<sup>5</sup> applying proper means of knowledge. After winning over Vyāsa<sup>6</sup> who is in Avimukta Kṣetra, through arguments, the *Sannyāsin* Śaṅkara worships (Lord) Śaṅkara.

शङ्कर उवाच -

सत्यं सत्यं नेह नानास्ति किञ्चदीशावास्यं ब्रह्म सत्यं जगद्धि ।

ब्रह्मैवेदं ब्रह्म पश्चात्पुरस्तादेको रुद्रो न द्वितीयाय तस्थे<sup>7</sup> ॥ २८ ॥

28. Śaṅkara told thus: Truly this is the truth; there is no multiplicity whatsoever in this. The world is truly Brahman, pervaded by *The*

1. verb in the past tense with a meaning of future tense.

2. the word has occurred for the third time!

3. could these be expressions like Tat Tvam Asi? see text page \*90.

4. 'having dvaitic meaning' - this does not suit the context

5. no indication here that Advaita was there before Ācārya. see text page \*358.

6. after having *darśan* of Vyāsa; see text page \*116.

7. alternate version 'द्वितीयोऽवतस्थे'(?).



*Lord.* This is verily Brahman, in the rear as well as in the front. There would be only one Rudra so that there is no place for the second.

एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढो नानाकारोद्भासि भानैस्त्वमात्मा ।

पूर्णाऽपूर्णो नामरूपैर्विहीनो विश्वातीतो विश्वरूपो<sup>1</sup> महेशः ॥ २९ ॥

29. Only one God pervading all the beings. You, the Ātman, are appearing in various forms. (You are) All-inclusive, not-full, without name and form, transcending the universe, Maheśwara in the form of the universe.

भव्यं भव्यं वर्तमानं त्वमीशे<sup>2</sup> सामान्यं वै देशकालादिहीनः ।

नो ते<sup>3</sup> मूर्तिर्वेदवेद्यस्त्वसङ्गः सङ्गेव त्वं लिङ्गसंस्थो विभासि ॥ ३० ॥

30. You are ruling the past, present and future. You are the universal free of space and time. You do not have form; although known by the Vedas, and although unattached, you appear to be attached while residing in the *Lingam*<sup>4</sup>.

त्वद्भासा वै सोमसूर्यानलेन्द्रा भीषैवोदेत्येष सूर्यश्च देवः ।

त्वं वेदादौ स्वर एको<sup>5</sup> महेशो वेदान्तानां सारवाक्यार्थ<sup>6</sup> वेद्यः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. It is due to your own light (shine) the moon, sun, fire, Indra. It is due to your fear that the Sun is rising (everyday). You are the Vedic premordial sound; you are Maheśa. (You are) the meaning of sentence having the essence of Vedānta; and you are the one to be known.

1. alternate version 'विश्वनाथो'.

2. alternate version 'त्वमीशे'.

3. alternate version 'नातो'.

4. Is it 'while in the lingadeha'?

5. Is the metre all right?

6. Sentence having the essence of Vedānta may be the great utterance of the Upaniṣads like ("Tat Twam Asi") or sentences that teaches an existing thing.

वेद्यो वैद्यः<sup>1</sup> सर्ववेदात्मविद्यो<sup>2</sup> भिद्येदृष्ट्या द्योतवद्<sup>3</sup> हृत्तमोद्य ।

ओङ्कारार्थः पुरुषस्त्व<sup>4</sup> ऋतं च सत्यज्ञानानन्दभूमासि सोम ॥ ३२ ॥

32. (You are) ought to be known, knower, of the nature of Atmavidyā that is in the form of all the Vedas; by your vision, the darkness of the heart is destroyed. You are the meaning of 'Om' - the *Puruṣa*, and the divine law; O consort of Uma, you are the truth, knowledge, bliss and infinite.

बद्धो मुक्तो नासि सङ्गी त्वसङ्गः<sup>5</sup> प्राणप्राणो मनसस्त्वं मनश्च ।

त्वत्तो वाचो मनसा संनिवृत्ता स्तवा<sup>6</sup> नन्दज्ञानिनो बद्धभावाः<sup>7</sup> ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Neither bound nor free, not attached, detached (?), you are the *prāṇa* of *prāṇa* and mind of the mind. Speech along with mind retract from you; knowers of your bliss become fixed in disposition.

त्वत्तो जातं भूतजातं महेश त्वया जीवत्येवमेवं विचित्रम् ।

त्वय्येवान्ते<sup>8</sup> सविशयेव विश्वं त्वां वै को वा स्तौति<sup>9</sup> तं स्तव्यमीशम् ॥ ३४ ॥

किञ्चिज्ज्ञात्वा सर्वभास्येव (?)<sup>10</sup> बुद्ध्या त्वामात्मानं वेद्मि<sup>11</sup> देवं महेशम् ॥ ३५ ॥

34-35. O Maheśa! from you are born this group of beings. This peculiar one lives enlivened by you, and in the end all of them will enter into you alone. Who can rightly sing the glories of such Īsha?

1. alternate version 'वेद्योऽभेद्यः'

2. alternate version 'सर्वभूतात्मविद्यो'.

3. alternate version 'भिद्येदृष्ट्वा तव मे'.

4. alternate version 'पुरुषस्त्वं'.

5. alternate versions 'सङ्गेष्वसङ्गः' or 'सङ्गो ह्यसङ्गो'.

6. if it were 'त्वय्यानन्दज्ञाने' it would have been better in metre and connection of words.

7. alternate version 'बुद्धभावाः'.

8. alternate version 'त्वामेवान्ते'

9. wrong alternate version 'स्तुवते'.

10. should it be 'सर्पभासेव'?

11. alternate version 'वेत्ति'. In the above verses of praise, the meaning of different Śrutis are collected.

Knowing a little with an intellect that appears to know everything, I have realized you to be the Deva, Maheśwara, the *Paramātmān*.

ईश्वर उवाच -

इति शङ्करवाक्येन विश्वेशाख्यादहं तदा ।

प्रादुर्बभूव लिङ्गात्स्वादलिङ्गोऽपि महेश्वरि ॥ ३६ ॥

36. Having heard this expression of Śaṅkara, although I am non-*liṅga*, I have manifested myself from my *Lingam* called 'Vishvesha'<sup>1</sup>

त्रिपुण्ड्रविलसत्फालश्चन्द्रार्धकृतशेखरः ।

नागाजिनोत्तरासङ्गो नीलकण्ठस्त्रिलोचनः ॥ ३७ ॥

वरकाकोदरानद्ध (?)<sup>2</sup> राजद्वारस्त्वयाम्बया ।

तमब्रुवं महादेवि प्रणतं यतिनां वरम् ॥ ३८ ॥

शिष्यैश्चतुर्भिः संयुक्तं भस्मरुद्राक्षभूषणम् ॥ ३९ ॥

37-39. I who am with forehead shining with the three holy ash-lines, having the half-moon on my head, wrapped with elephant skin, blue-throated, three eyed, darned with a garland (of heads) sewn with best of the shining snakes, along with you, *Ambikādevi*, addressed that greatest among *sannyāsins*, who was with four disciples<sup>3</sup>, who was adorned with holy ash and *Rudrākṣa*, and who prostrated before me, thus<sup>4</sup> :

ईश्वर उवाच -

मदंशतस्त्वं जातोऽसि भुवि चाद्वैतसिद्धये ।

1. this is not in *Mādhavīya*, but is found in *Cidvilāśīya*. See text pages 105-106.

2. does it mean 'garland of heads was tied to the snake', or 'garland of heads was such that it was touching the snake that was tied'?

3. that he was with four disciples does not suit the ŚaṅkaraVijayas.

4. here after, only verbs in past tense.

पापमिश्राश्रितैर्मार्गैर्जैनदुर्बुद्धिबोधकैः<sup>1</sup> ॥ ४० ॥

भिन्ने वैदिकसंसिद्धे<sup>2</sup> अद्वैते द्वैतवाक्यतः ।

तद्भेदगिरिवज्रस्त्वं सज्जातोऽसि मदंशतः ॥ ४१ ॥

40-41. You have born on this earth for establishing Advaita from my own part<sup>3</sup>. Since the Advaita established from Vedas was destroyed<sup>4</sup> by dwaita sentences, by the path followed by the sinful Mīśras<sup>5</sup>, and by the vicious teaching of Jains, you, who are like a thunderbolt to that mountain of distinctions, are born from my own part.

[दूर्वासः शापतो भूमौ जातां वाणीं विजित्य ताम् ।

अगस्त्यचरिते देशे तुङ्गातीरे सुनिर्मले ॥

पुण्यक्षेत्रे द्विजवर स्थापयित्वा सुपूजय ।

यत्रास्ते ऋष्यशृङ्गस्य महर्षेराश्रमो महान् ।

कलावपि ततोऽद्वैतमार्गः ख्यातो भविष्यति ॥ ]<sup>6</sup>

द्वात्रिंशत्परमायुस्ते शीघ्रं कैलासमावस ॥ ४२ ॥

42. [O best among brahmins, worship Saraswati well after conquering her who was born on earth because of the curse of Dūrvāsa, after establishing her in the land of Agastya's wandering, on the bank of Tunga<sup>7</sup>, on that pure *punyakṣetra*. There exists the great Āśrama of ṛṣi called Rīṣyaśringa. By thus establishing and worshipping, the path

1. alternate version 'योधकैः'.

2. alternate version 'वैदिकसंसिद्धे'.

3. again and again 'from my part'.

4. does it indicate that Advaita was there even before Ācārya?

5. Mīśra again!

6. Matter within square brackets is not found in some versions.

7. It is Tungabhadra in *Mādhavīya*, but we shall take it up while discussing about the Śringeri Pīṭha.

of Advaita will become famous even in Kaliyuga<sup>1</sup> ]. You will have only thirty two years of lifespan<sup>2</sup> ; quickly come over to Kailāsa<sup>3</sup> .

एतत्प्रतिगृहाण त्वं पञ्चलिङ्गं सुपूजय ।

भस्मरुद्राक्षसम्पन्नः पञ्चाक्षरपरायणः ॥ ४३ ॥

शतरुद्रावर्तनैश्च तारेण भसितेन च ।

बिल्वपत्रैश्च कुसुमैर्नैवेद्यैर्विविधैरपि ।

त्रिवारं सावधानेन गच्छ सर्वजयाय च ॥ ४४ ॥

त्वदर्धे कैलासाचलवरसुपालीगतमहासमुद्यच्चन्द्राभं स्फटिकधवलं लिङ्गकुलकम् ।

समानीत<sup>4</sup> सोमोद्यतविमलमौल्यर्चनपरं कलौ लिङ्गार्चायां भवति हि विमुक्तिः परतया<sup>5</sup> ॥

४५ ॥

43-45. Take this *pañcaliṅga*<sup>6</sup> . Wearing *Rudrākṣa* and the holy ash, repeating *śatarudrīya*, and with chanting of Om, calmly worship threetimes<sup>7</sup> with holy ash, *bilwa* leaves, flowers and offerings. (And then) go about conquering everything!<sup>8</sup> Worship this collection of

1. By telling 'even in Kaliyuga', it suggests that it was not there before (this time). *Ātmabodha* has written that the material within square brackets is not authoritative. See text, pages 208-209. This means that the opinion of some that this is added by *Bhaṭṭa Narāyaṇa Śāstri* is not correct (Śam. Pee. Ta. Da. p 18).

2. Regarding lifespan of Ācārya, see text, pages 116-117,

3. When it is said here 'come over to Kailāsa', how come it is said later that he had his siddhi in Kāñci? *Govindanātha* has said that he 'entered the extremely blissful centre of the Sun-God image'! (See text, page 316).

4. alternate version 'समासीनः'.

5. alternate version 'परतरा'.

6. Here, Śiva gave the five Lingas. In *Ānandagirīya*, (Chap. 55 p 209; not there in De. version!) it is mentioned that the Ācārya himself went to Kailāsa and brought it with his yogic power. In *Cidvilāsiya*, it is mentioned that *Govinda Bhagavatpāda* gave it to him.

7. Now it seems the three-time pūja has become obsolete.

8. Why the Ācārya did not mention the Lingam, having conquered the challengers in argumentation by the power of worshipping Lingam, just as he mentions sālagrāma often! (see text, pages 100-101).

*Lingas* brought exclusively for you, which is white like a crystal with the light of moon rising on the cliff of mountain Kailāsa and spotlessly clean like the rising moon. In Kaliyuga, worship of *Lingam* would cause highest liberation, is it not?

स शङ्करो<sup>1</sup> मां प्रणमाम मस्करी मयस्करं तस्करवर्यमार्ये ।

सङ्गृह्य लिङ्गानि जगाम वेगाद्भूमौ स बुद्धार्हतमिश्रजैनान् ॥ ४६ ॥

46. That *Sannyāsin* Śaṅkara prostrated before me, who am benevolent and Taskaravarya<sup>2</sup> (best among thieves). Having accepted the *Lingas*, he went towards Buddha, Arhata, Jaina and Miśra<sup>3</sup> who were living on earth.

तद्योगभोगवरमुक्तिसुमोक्षयोगलिङ्गार्चनात्प्राप्तजयः स्वकाश्रमे<sup>4</sup> ।

तान् वै विजित्य तरसाऽक्षितशास्त्रवादैर्मिश्रान् स काञ्च्यामथ सिद्धिमाप<sup>5</sup> ॥ ४७ ॥

47. Accomplishing victory by way of worshipping *Lingas* that would beget *yoga*, *bhoga*, *vara*, *mukti* and *sumoksha*, in his own *Āśrama* (?), having won over Miśras through un-diminishing *Śāstras* quickly, he attained *siddhi* at Kāñci<sup>6</sup> .

<sup>7</sup> [काञ्च्यां तपःसिद्धिमवाप्य दण्डी चण्डीशरूपो जगदाकलय्य ।

ब्रह्मैकविद्यां रचयन् सभाष्यं शारीरकं नाम जगाद मोदात् ॥ १ ॥

1. alternate version 'वशङ्करो'.

2. is it referring to 'तस्कराणां पतये' ?

3. since the naming Buddhist, Jaina, and Miśra comes again and again, the dominant times of these are to be researched on by the historians.

4. alternate version 'स कामम्'.

5. alternate versions 'ततो लोकमवाप शैवम्' and 'ततो नैजमवाप लोकम्' are there. But the Kāñci Maṭha accepts the abovementioned version.

6. it means that he had his *Āśrama* at Kāñci; he attained *siddhi* at Kāñci implies that he gave up his body there, which is the version of Kāñci tradition.

7. all Maṭhas do not accept the portion within square brackets; so different serial numbers (1 to 13) are given. See concluding sentences after I3.

1. After attaining tapas-siddhis<sup>1</sup>, in Kāñci the dandī<sup>2</sup> (one possessing a staff) of the form of *chanḍīśwara*, examining the world (?), composed brahmaikavidyā<sup>3</sup> - i.e., *Śārīraka Bhāṣya* - and taught (people).

व्यासेन सम्भाष्य समेत्य काशीं तन्मण्डनार्यं परिखण्डय वाणीम् ।

जेतुं शरीरान्तरमेत्य कामकलां जगाहे प्रमदावराभ्यः ॥ २ ॥

2. Having gone to *Vārāṇasī*<sup>4</sup>, having discussed with Vyāsa<sup>5</sup>, having refuted that Maṇḍanārya<sup>6</sup>, taking a different body<sup>7</sup>, he learnt the science of love from high-born women<sup>8</sup>.

पुनः स्वकं देहमवाप्य तूर्णं पूर्णं निजं काममथाकलय्य ।

वाणीं स जित्वैव तु तां मठे स्वे शृङ्गेरिकाख्ये प्रणिवेश्य तुष्टः<sup>9</sup> ॥ ३ ॥

3. Again having re-entered his body quickly, having known that his desire fulfilled, he conquered Vāṇi and established her in his own Maṭha<sup>10</sup> and rejoiced.

कापालिकं तं क्रकचं महोग्रं कर्णाटदेशे निखिलं विजित्य ।

गोकर्णमासाद्य तमीशमीडयं स्तुत्वा महाराष्ट्रपदं प्रपेदे ॥ ४ ॥

4. Having conquered completely the very ferocious *Kāpālīka*<sup>11</sup> by name Krakaca in Karṇāṭaka country, he went to Gokarṇa to worship the praiseworthy Śiva and then proceeded to Mahārāṣṭra country.

1. this meaning for siddhi is given by Śrīṅgeri traditionalists.

2. did Ācārya possess staff? See text, page \*89

3. this word is not there in the *Bhāṣyas*.

4. this is contradictory to the implication of *śloka* 26.

5. this is contradictory to the implication of *śloka* 26.

6. see text, chapters 8 and 9.

7. see text, chapter 10, page 215.

8. see text, page 250.

9. alternate version 'तिष्ठति'.

10. 'his own Maṭha' means Śrīṅgeri Maṭha in order to suit the content; but there is no mention of this Maṭha in *Mādhavīya*. See text, pages 253.

11. see text for the story of Kāpālīka, pages 290-291.

तत्र स्थितान् भास्करभट्टमुख्यान् तं नीलकण्ठं च तृणीकरिष्यन् ।  
 काश्मीरमासाद्य स शारदायाः सर्वज्ञपीठं पदमारुरुक्षन् ॥ ५ ॥  
 तत्र स्थितान् सम्प्रति सर्वपण्डितान् चार्वाकमुख्यान् विपुलान् विजित्य ।  
 स दक्षिणद्वारकवाटभेदं कृत्वा स देव्या विनिशङ्कमानः ॥ ६ ॥  
 शङ्कां निराकृत्य निविश्य पीठे ततो बदर्याश्रमवाप दण्डी ।

5-6. Having treated Nilakanṭha, Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa and others who were there with utter contempt,<sup>1</sup> he went to Kāśmīr. In order to occupy the throne of all-learning of Śārada, he conquered all puṇḍits there including Cārvakas; he got opened the southern door of Śārada Devi, settled the doubt of the Devi, sat on the throne; then the staffed one proceeded to Badari Āśrama.

नारायणं तत्र तपज्जलौघं कुण्डं प्रशीतस्य निवारणाय ॥ ७ ॥  
 ध्यात्वा शिवं तत्र निविश्यतस्थौ कैलासदेशादृषभश्च देवाः ।  
 समेत्य संस्तुत्य यदायुषस्ते कालोऽगमत्त्वं वृषभेऽधिरोह ॥ ८ ॥  
 इति प्रचीर्णं (?) प्रभुरात्मनि स्वे विचिन्त्य शिष्यान् निजगाद मोदात् ।

7-8. There he sat meditating on *Narāyaṇa* to make hot-water pond available, in order to get rid of the intense cold. The Gods and the Vṛṣabha arrived from Kailāsa, sang his glories, and requested him saying 'your lifespan is over; so please mount the Vrishbha'. The Lord pondered within himself and then gladly addressed his disciples thus:

यूयं चतुर्दिक्षु मठेषु लिङ्गैः साकं वसन्त्वित्युपदिश्य हर्षात् ॥ ९ ॥  
 विवेश पृष्ठं वृषभस्य हस्तं सङ्गृह्य वैरिञ्चमथास्य दत्तम् ।  
 सर्वैश्च देवैरभिनन्द्यमानः स शङ्करस्तन्निजगाम देवः ॥ १० ॥  
 विवेश कैलासनिवेशमच्छं सच्छब्दवृन्दारकवृन्दपूर्णम् ।  
 तदादि तच्छङ्करभाष्यमेतद्भूमौ जनं मुक्तिपदं ददाति ॥ ११ ॥

1. this is quite comparable to *Mādhavīya*.



9-11. 'You shall remain with *Lingas* in the *Maṭhas* in the four directions'. Having thus instructed them, he gladly took a hand of support from *Brahmā* and mounted on the *Vriṣabha*. Congratulated by all the Gods, the *Śaṅkara Deva* went there, the unmutilated *Kailāsa*, which is full of Gods who speak excellently (?). From then onwards, this *Śaṅkarabhāṣya* is giving liberation to people on this earth.

एतत्तेऽभिहितं देवि मुख्यं मुक्तिपदावहम् ।

शङ्करं चरितं लोके भविष्यति न संशयः ॥ १२ ॥

इति श्रुत्वा महेशानाच्चरितं शङ्करस्य सा ।

पुलकाङ्कुरसंहृष्टा प्रणमाम महेश्वरम् ॥ १३ ॥

12-13. O *Devi*, this important history of *Śaṅkara* that I have told you no doubt will grant liberation. Thus having heard the history of *Śaṅkara* from Lord *Maheśvara*, the *Devi* saluted Him, being excited with happiness, her hair standing on end.]

Śri Kakarāla S. Sundara Rāmaiah has written that the portion within square brackets (verses 1-13) is there in the printed books, in the Appendix of the book printed in 1958 from Śrīraṅgam Vāṇivilāsa Press. This material mainly is the one which is almost similar as that in *Mādhavīya*. Here too, *Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa*, *Nilakanṭha* and others are regarded as contemporaries of *Ācārya* (See text, pages 292-294). It is clear that because of the argumentation between the *Kāncī Pīṭha* and *Śrīṅgeri Maṭha* such extra material has been made incumbent. It appears some books have the following appeal:

#### विज्ञापना

एतद्देशीयेषु केषुचित्पुस्तकेषु 'काञ्च्यामथ सिद्धिमाप' इति श्लोक एव अध्यायपरिसमाप्तिर्दृश्यते । उत्तरदेशीयेषु पुस्तकेषु 'प्रणमाम महेश्वरम्' इति श्लोकान्त अध्यायपरिसमाप्तिर्दृश्यते । श्रीचित्सुखा-चार्यमाधवीयादिकृतशङ्करविजयादौ औत्तरपाठमनुसृत्यैव कथासन्दर्भस्य प्रदर्शित-

त्वेन एतादृश औत्तराहपाठ एव ज्यायान् । एतद्देशीयेषु केषुचित् पुस्तकेषु ‘काञ्च्यां तपःसिद्धि-  
मवाप्य दण्डी’ इति उत्तरग्रन्थभागः (भारते कृष्णार्जुनयोः श्रीकृष्णस्य महादेवप्रसादोद्देश्यककैला-  
सयात्राप्रतिपादको ग्रन्थभागो यथा कैश्चिदुद्धृतः, तथा) स्वाभिप्रायविरोधित्वात् कैश्चिद्देशीयैरुद्धृत  
इति निश्चित्य औत्तरीयपाठानुसारेणैव मुद्रितोऽयं ग्रन्थः ॥

The summary of the above appeal is thus: ‘Although present in some of the versions in the north, the portion given in brackets are left out by some since that is contradictory to their Maṭha. But we have included that’. But this part is not present even in the northern versions; it is not there in the handwritten version that is with Puṇḍit Lakṣmaṇa Śāstry, or in the book that is there at the government library of *Vārāṇasi*, or in the commentary of ŚaṅkaraVijaya published from Ānandāśrama, or in the handwritten version present in the Mysore government library; instead, in the introduction of *Śrī Śaṅkara Pīṭha Tattvadarśana*, it is clearly stated that the chapter of *Śivarahasya* comes to end at ‘काञ्च्यामथ सिद्धिमाप’ (pages 1-20). Truth has yet to be revealed by further research.

The subject of *Lingas* mentioned in the *śloka* 47 commencing with ‘तद्योगभोग’ is present in *Ānandagirīya*. Although the Telugu book clearly mentions the details as *Muktilinga* at Kedāra (Chap. 55, p 209; De, not mentioned); *Varalinga* at Nilakanṭha (Chap. 55, p 210; De, not mentioned); *Bhogalinga* at Śringeri (Chap. 63, p 225; De, not mentioned); *Yogalinga* at Kāñci (Chap. 65, p 231; De, not mentioned); and *Mokshalinga* at Cidambaram (Chap. 84, p 255; De, not mentioned), there must be some reason why it is not found in Devanāgarī version. It is necessary to find why the Devanāgarī version differs from the Telugu version here and there. May be since it was not there in the original Telugu copy, it might not have been

known to those who published the Devanāgarī copy; or they might have deliberately left it out thinking that it is unnecessary. God only knows the truth. It is exactly like the Telugu manuscript, in the *Ānandagirīya* version of the notes of *Śivasamhita* in the Appendix of the book on the travelogue of Kāñci pontiff entitled *Gangāditīrtha Vijayayātrā*.

Somanāthaiah has written (So. Śam. p 7) that of the above-mentioned *Vijñāpanā*, the portion upto ‘अध्यायपरिसमाप्तिर्दृश्यते’ is found at the end of *Śivarahasya* published by Kalyaṇarāma Śāstry in Telugu script at Madras on *Śrīmukha Samvatsara Aśwayuja Bahula 10 Soumyavasara*. In the continuing portion, the statement ‘the story of ŚaṅkaraVijaya by Citsukhācārya, *Mādhavārya* etc. are as per the northern version’ appears to be reasonable. But it could also be doubted that this part might have been added by some in order to suit Citsukhācārya (?) and *Mādhavarya*.

However, the *Śivarahasya* remains an unsolved secret. It is necessary to find whether this part is present in all handwritten versions, and if it be there, is it just the same? Whatever that be, the readers should not forget what we wrote that after all this is part of *Purāṇa* considering future events. (see text, page 17).

## (B) Mārkaṇḍeya samhitā

(Text, page 17)

श्रीशङ्करगुरुचरणस्मरणमभीष्टार्थकरणमखिलां (?)<sup>1</sup> ।

सम्भवतु सर्वदा मम समरससुखभाग्यदाननिपुणतरम् ॥

---

1. No serial numbers were found for the first five *ślokas*; we do not know why. It appears the *ślokas* have suffered variations here and there.

श्रीशङ्कराचार्यपदारविन्दसेवा हि सर्वेप्सितकल्पवल्ली ।  
 लभ्येत जन्मान्तरपुण्ययोगात् सुजन्मभिः शुद्धमनोभिषङ्गैः ॥  
 शङ्करगुरुचरणाम्बुजमखिलजगन्मङ्गलं मनस्यनिशम् ।  
 कलयामि कलिमलापहममितसुखदायकं बुधेन्द्राणाम् ॥  
 लोकानुग्रहतत्परः परशिवः सम्प्रार्थितो ब्रह्मणा  
 चार्वाकादिमतप्रभेदनिपुणां बुद्धिं सदा धारयन् ।  
 कालटचाख्यपुरोत्तमे शिवगुरुर्विद्याधिनाथश्च  
 यस्तत्पत्न्यां शिवतारके समुदितः श्रीशङ्कराख्यां वहन् ॥  
 ज्ञात्वा पञ्चमहायने च निखिलं शास्त्रार्थतत्त्वं सुखा  
 दश्चिन्त्याह्वयतारके यतिवरो भूत्वा नदीमध्यगः ।  
 श्रीगोविन्दगुरुप्रसादसितयार्बुध्या(?)मुहुर्विद्विषो  
 जिये(?)तिल्लवने(?)प्रशस्ततरधीः श्रीशङ्कराख्यः सुधीः  
 परितप्त<sup>1</sup> पञ्चलोहसुतिना नेना(?)तिविस्मितान् शिष्यान् ।  
 परिहृत्य परमयोगी परमैकान्तानि(?) सुखमगादखिलम् ॥ १ ॥  
 नेपाळेश्वरमाकलय्य<sup>2</sup> तदनु नीलकण्ठेश्वरं  
 हैमं शैलमपारपुण्यबदरीकेदारमारादगात् ।  
 श्रीशैलं कनकाचलं शुभमहाकैलासमासेदिवान्  
 लोकानुग्रहकाम्यया निरुपमः श्रीशङ्करार्यो गुरुः ॥ २ ॥  
 नेपाळेश्वरपञ्चवक्त्रकमलामोदातिभारोल्लसत्  
 पञ्चद्वारशुभालये निवसितं कृत्वाथ योगीश्वरः ।  
 वाञ्छासिद्धिमवाप्य विश्वजनकं श्रीनीलकण्ठेश्वरं

1. this version appears to be better than 'परितृप्त'.

2. It seems the Ācārya went to Nepal at the instance of the king Śaṅkara there. At that time there was a Vṛṣabhadeva of the sun dynasty, and since at the time of Ācārya's visit, a son was born to him and he was named as Śaṅkara to mark the occasion (Bala. Śam. p 118). Nambūdaris had been the priests of *Paśupatiśwara* temple here. Some staunch followers of Kāncī Pīṭha write that the kings of Nepal give offerings every year; but R. Kṛṣṇaswāmi Iyer negated this statement in his book (K. M. C. p 17).

प्राप्य प्रौढतपश्चचार च ततः श्रीमेरुशैलं<sup>1</sup> ययौ ॥ ३ ॥  
 तत्र स्वर्णशिलोच्चसानुशिखरप्रत्यन्तशैलान्(?) गुहाः(?)  
 वेदान्तागमसप्तकोटिसुमहामन्त्रान्महाघापहान्<sup>2</sup>  
 सम्भाव्यातितरां पुरश्चरणया लब्ध्वाष्टसिद्धीस्ततः  
 कृत्वा मेरुनुतिं(?) महार्थजनिकां कैलासशैलं ययौ  
 गत्वा कैलासशैलं जगदखिलगुरुः शङ्कराचार्ययोगी  
 दृष्ट्वा साम्बं शिवं तं स्वयमिति सुचिरं चिन्तयन्नन्तरङ्गे ।  
 लब्ध्वा पञ्चात्मलिङ्गान्य<sup>3</sup> मलतरशुभालिङ्गितान्यङ्गभाजां  
 भूयै सौन्दर्यसारं<sup>4</sup> हिमगिरिदुहितुः प्रापयन् गामयासीत् ॥ ५ ॥  
 काञ्च्यां श्रीकामकोटिं<sup>5</sup> कलिमलशमनीं कल्पयित्वा सुरेशे<sup>6</sup>  
 श्रीविद्याराज<sup>7</sup> पीठार्चनमहितमहाराज्यसाम्राज्यलक्ष्मीम् ।  
 संवेशयात्मीयशिष्ये सकलभुवनसंमोदहेतोर्महात्मा  
 चिद्रूपस्वानुभूतिं भजति भवमहाम्बोधिसन्तारणाय ॥ ६ ॥  
 शिवलिङ्गं प्रतिष्ठाप्य चिदम्बरसभातले<sup>8</sup> ।  
 मोक्षदं सर्वजन्तूनां भुवनत्रयसुन्दरम् ॥ ७ ॥  
 वैदिकान्दीक्षितान् शुद्धान् शैवसिद्धान्तपारगान्<sup>9</sup> ।  
 पूजार्थं युयुजे शिष्यान्पुण्यारण्यविहारिणः ॥ ८ ॥  
 मुक्तिलिङ्गं<sup>10</sup> तु केदारे नीलकण्ठे वरेश्वरम्<sup>11</sup> ।

1. this visit of Ācārya to Meruparvatha is not there in ŚaṅkaraVijayas.

2. No mention of accomplishing the eight siddhis through repetition of mantra is found in the ŚaṅkaraVijayas.

3. Is this the origin for the concept of the five Lingas found in Ānandagiriṇya?

4. Is this Soundaryalahari? See text, page 388.

5. The name Kāmakoṭi is mentioned here clearly.

6. Suśamā mentions that Sureśvara was installed for the protection of Sarvajñātma (Gu. Ra. p 22).

7. Śrividya has been important in the Maṭhas; see text pages 384-388.

8. This suits Ānandagiriṇya.

9. There is no special importance in Ācārya's Bhāṣyas to the Śaiva cult.

10. suits Ānandagiriṇya. See this appendix, pages 424.

11. suits Ānandagiriṇya. See this appendix, pages 424

प्रतिष्ठाप्य महायोगी परां प्रीतिमवाप सः ॥ ९ ॥  
 काञ्च्यां श्रीकामकोटौ तु योगलिङ्ग<sup>1</sup> मनुत्तमम् ।  
 प्रतिष्ठाप्य सुरेशार्यं पूजार्थं<sup>2</sup> युयुजे गुरुः ॥ १० ॥  
 श्रीशङ्करार्ययोगी शृङ्गगिरिस्थान<sup>3</sup> मगमदखिले दशः ।  
 श्रीशारदाख्यपीठे शिवलिङ्गं भोगनामकं<sup>4</sup> चक्रे  
 अहोबलनृसिंहाख्यस्थले श्रीशङ्करो गुरुः ।  
 नृसिंहयन्त्रोद्धरणं<sup>5</sup> चकार जगतां मुदे ॥ १२ ॥  
 श्रीवेंकटेशवृषशैलमुपेत्य योगी यन्त्रं<sup>6</sup> जगत्त्रयवशीकरणोद्यतं तत् ।  
 चक्रे चराचरगुरुर्जगतां विभूत्यै श्रीशङ्करो निगमशेखरपारगोऽयम् ॥ १३ ॥  
 ये वा राजकुलोद्भवा गुरुपदाम्भोजार्चनं भक्तितो नातन्वन्ति  
 न मानयन्ति न च वा संमोदमायान्ति वै  
 सत्युर्वीविभवे त एव धनधान्यैश्चर्यहीनाः क्षणात्  
 क्षीणा यान्ति<sup>7</sup> पराजयं ननु ततः श्रीदेशिकं पूजयेत्  
 ये वा गुरुचरणाम्बुजविद्वेषं तन्वते दुरात्मानः ।  
 ते दुर्गतिमचिरेण प्राप्य पतन्त्यन्धतामिसे ॥ १५ ॥  
 ये रुद्राक्षविभूतिभिः<sup>8</sup> कृतशुभालङ्कारदेहा महा-  
 देवध्यानजपार्चनासु निरतास्तैः शङ्करार्यो गुरुः ।  
 सम्पूज्यः सततं सुदूरभरणा(?)वप्यास्थितः श्रीपतिः

1. suits *Ānandagirīya*. See this appendix, pages 424.

2. Look at the expression 'पूजार्थ'. Supports *Ātmabodha's* opinion that Sureśvara was not suitable to be pontiff. (1) सुरेश्वरस्य सकलविबुधशिरोमणित्वेऽपि शपथपथैक-प्रापिताश्रमतया स्वयमपरमहंसतया च न क्वापि आचार्यतया प्रतिष्ठिता । (Suśamā. p 37). (2) अयं सुरेश्वरः स्वयमपरमहंसतया परमहंसैकसमध्यासनीये जगद्गुरुणा स्वपीठे शिष्यपीठेषु वा न निवेशितोऽपि स्वसमानवैदुष्यभावेन भाजनतया महायोगितया च सर्वपीठव्यवस्थागोपने नियुक्तस्तत्र तत्र कियन्तञ्चत्कालमुवास । (Gu. Ra. p 34; Suśamā. p 90).

3. Is it that Śringeri Pīṭha is established after Kāmakoti Pīṭha?

4. Look up the last portion of Śivarahasya for more about Bhogalinga.

5. No review of yantras is found in *Bhāṣyas*

6. there are no references to yantras in *Bhāṣya* texts.

7. Curse towards the kings who do not honour Śaṅkarācārya.

8. only Śaivas are authorized to worship Ācārya.

ब्रह्मा साम्बसदाशिवोऽपि वितरन्त्येतेषु राज्यश्रियम्<sup>1</sup> ॥ १६ ॥  
 सङ्कटसमये जगतां शङ्करगुरुचरणपङ्कजं शरणम् ।  
 इति जयघण्टाघोषः कस्य मनोहस्तिनः(?) न भूषयति ॥ १७ ॥  
 काशीप्रमुखमहास्थलसम्स्थापितसकलधर्मसारोऽयम् ।  
 गुरुरपि च मेरुमन्दरकैलासादिष्वमेयमहिमाऽव्यात्<sup>2</sup> \* ॥ १८ ॥  
 महात्रिपुरसुन्दरीरमणचन्द्रमौलीश्वर-  
 प्रसादपरिलब्धवाङ्मयविभूषिताशान्तरम् ।  
 निरन्तरमुपास्महे निरुपमात्मविद्यानदी-  
 नदीनदपतिप्रभं मनसि शङ्करार्यं गुरुम्\* ॥ १९ ॥  
 स्मरामो मानसे नित्यं शङ्कराचार्यपादुकाम् ।  
 भवाम्भोधिमहानौकां भक्तश्रीकामधेनुकाम् ॥ २० ॥  
 आदित्यं जगदम्बिकां हरिमिभेन्द्रास्यं महेशं गुरुः  
 पूजायै परिपूर्णमानसतया मेने यतिः शङ्करः ।  
 शिष्येभ्यश्चददौ मुदा सुविमलां श्रीशैवपञ्चाक्षरी<sup>3</sup>  
 विद्यावैदिकमार्गदर्शनगुरुः श्रीषण्मतस्थापकः<sup>4</sup> ॥ २१ ॥  
 जगदखिलगुरुरवादीदखिलान् शिष्यान् प्रति प्रसन्नमुखः ।  
 अद्वैतमतनिविष्टैः पञ्चायतनार्चनं<sup>5</sup> प्रकर्तव्यम् ॥ २२ ॥  
 एवं निर्णयमतनोद्वैदिकमार्गप्रवर्तको योगी ।  
 तस्माद्गुरुवरचरणे चेतःसन्धाय तन्मते तिष्ठेत् ॥ २३ ॥  
 श्रीशङ्कराचार्यपदारविन्दभक्तेषु भद्राणि भवन्ति नित्यम् ।  
 निद्रां विहायाथ समस्तलोकैर्मुद्रा तदीया शिरसैव धार्या ॥ २४ ॥  
 शङ्करगुरुवरचरितं न्यङ्कमतीनां दुरासदं भरितम् ।

1. good results for those who worship Ācārya.

2. \*meaning is not clear in the asterisked places.

3. there is no mention of Pañcāyatana (method of worship), Śivapañcākshari in the *Bhāṣyas*.

4. support for Ācārya having established the six creeds. See text, page 322.

5. the Pañcāyatana pūja method is in practice by the Smārtas in the south; but there is no mention of it in the *Bhāṣyas*.

परमामृतरसपूर्वैः परमानन्दैकदायि पठनीयम् ॥ २५ ॥

गुरुपादभजनसम्भ्रमसमरससुखभरितमानसाः सरसाः ।

संसृतिमहासमुद्रं सन्तीर्यानन्दरूपतां यान्ति ॥ २६ ॥

इति श्रीमार्कण्डेयसंहितायां शतखण्डात्मिकायां द्विसप्ततितमखण्डे सप्तमपरिस्पन्दः ॥

श्रीदेशिकः पद्मपद<sup>1</sup> प्रतिष्ठं पाषण्डषण्डार्थ(?)मतिप्रचण्डम् ।

शृङ्गाद्रिदेशे श्रिततुङ्गभद्रे नियोजयामास स शङ्करार्यः ॥ १ ॥

सुरेश्वराचार्यवरं<sup>2</sup> स्वशिष्यं काञ्चीपुरीसुन्दरकामकोटौ ।

श्रीचन्द्रमौलीश्वरपूजनार्थं नियोज्य चक्रेऽस्य धराधिपत्यम् ॥ २ ॥

श्रीकाञ्चीकामकोटीनिलयशशिकलोत्तंसपूजाधुरीणं

पारीणं श्रीकलायाः परमगुरुपदाधीश्वरं योगिराजम् ।

ये वा नार्चन्ति भूमौ शुभतरपरमाद्वैतसिद्धान्तमार्गोद्भूयते

श्रीराज्यसिंहासनपदगमहो पामरास्ते पतन्ति<sup>3</sup> ॥ ३ ॥

ये सेवन्ते गुरुं तं सततमनुगता योजनानां शतेऽपि

प्राप्तं स्थानं प्रकामं निरवधिधनधान्याद्य(?) राज्यं श्रयन्ते ।

पुत्रान् पौत्रान् प्रपौत्रान् दुहितृजनमपि प्रौढभाग्यं च भोग्यं

योग्यागाराणि रामाः शरददु(प)मुखीः(?) मोक्षसाम्राज्यलक्ष्मीम् ॥ ४ ॥

काञ्चीपीठाधिपं ये यतिपतिमखिलाचार्यमाखण्डलश्री-

सम्पन्नं पन्नगारिध्वजविधिहरि(?)भिर्भाव्यमानं शरण्यम् ।

ते सातत्यं रमन्ते कलशजलधिजाऽऽयुरारोग्ययुक्ता

स्थानेष्वानन्दभूमस्वनवरतशुभैश्वर्यभाजो महीपाः<sup>4</sup> ॥ ५ ॥

यो चोन्मत्तान्तरङ्गा गुरुवरचरणाम्भोजसेवाविहीना

हीनास्ते सर्वसौख्यैर्निरयवसतयो निन्दिताः सर्वलोकैः ।

1. that Padmapāda was nominated to Śringeri is a version of *Ānandagirīya*.

2. already it has been mentioned that Sureśvara was appointed for worship. See the previous parispaṇḍa, 10th śloka.

3. Sureśvara was kept at Kāñci since he was an adept in Śrividya.

4. these ślokas sing the glory of Kāñci.



कृत्वाकृत्वान्यदेवार्चनमपि सुकृतान्याततान्यात्मविद्या-

राहित्यादात्महानादहह कुजननं प्राप्नुवन्तीह ते वै<sup>1</sup> ॥ ६ ॥

तस्मात् सर्वात्मना सर्वपुरुषार्थैकहेतवे ।

सेतवे सर्वधर्माणां गुरवे स्पृहयेत् बुधः ॥ ७ ॥

इति श्रीमार्काण्डेयसंहितायां शतखण्डात्मिकायां द्विसप्ततितमखण्डे अष्टमपरिस्पन्दः ॥

We have not seen a complete copy of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Samhitā*. Is it a *purāṇa*, or a poetry, we dont know. From the colophone we have to conclude that it is a very big text. This is not in the form of a dialogue. The verses are long and are in poetic style. The composition is not very tight. Errors are found here and there. The matter predominantly appears to be closer to *Ānandagiriya ŚaṅkaraVijaya*, acceptable to *Kāñci Pīṭha*.

There is not much importance to *advaita* in this. *Mantra-Śāstra*, *Śrividya*, *Smārta's Śaiva* tradition, details regarding establishment of *yoga*, *bhoga* and other *liṅgas*, assigning *Sureśvara* to *Kāñci*, vilification of those who do not show respect to the *Kāñci Pīṭha*, commending those who do – these are the dominant matters here, and therefore, it is natural that the text is shown respect by those who belong to the tradition of *Kāñci Pīṭha*.

### (C) From Other *Purāṇas*

#### (1) *Liṅga Purāṇa*

निन्दन्ति वेदविद्यां च द्विजाः कर्माणि वै कलौ ।

---

1. here it is told that bad rebirth would be imminent to those who worship other deities without worshipping the Guru of *Kāñci*.

कलौ रुद्रो<sup>1</sup> महादेवः शङ्करो नीललोहितः ॥

प्रकाशते प्रतिष्ठार्थं धर्मस्य विकृताकृते ।

ये तं विप्रा निषेवन्ते येनकेनापि शङ्करम् ।

कलिदोषान् विनिर्जित्य प्रयान्ति परमं पदम् ॥ (first half - ch. 40, ślokas 20-22)

## (2) Kūrma Purāṇa

कलौ रुद्रो महादेवो लोकानामीश्वरः परः ।

तदेव(?) साधयेन्नृणां देवतानां च दैवतम् ॥

करिष्यवतारं<sup>2</sup> स्वं शङ्करो नीललोहितः ।

श्रौतस्मार्तप्रतिष्ठार्थे<sup>3</sup> भक्तानां हितकाम्यया ॥

उपदेक्ष्यति तज्ज्ञानं शिष्याणां ब्रह्मसंमितम्<sup>4</sup> ।

सर्ववेदान्तसारं हि धर्मान्(?) वेदान्तदर्शनात्<sup>5</sup> ॥

ये तं प्रीत्या निषेवन्ते येनकेनोपचारतः ।

विजित्य कलिजान् दोषान् यान्ति ते परमं पदम् ॥ (Chap. 30, ślokas 32-35)

## (3) Vāyu Purāṇa

चतुर्भिः सह शिष्यैस्तु शङ्करोऽवतरिष्यति ॥

## (4) Soura Purāṇa

चतुर्भिः सह शिष्यैश्च शङ्करोऽवतरिष्यति ॥

व्याकुर्वन् व्याससूत्राणि श्रुतेरर्थं यथोदितम् ।

स एवार्थः श्रुतेर्ग्राह्यः शङ्करप्रतिपादितः ॥

1. alternate version 'देवो'.

2. alternate version 'अवताराणि'.

3. print version 'प्रतिष्ठार्थम्'.

4. alternate version 'ब्रह्मसंज्ञितम्'.

5. alternate version 'वेदनिदर्शितान्'.

## (5) Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa

कल्यादौ द्विसहस्रान्ते लोकानुग्रहकाम्यया ।

चतुर्भिः सह शिष्यैस्तु शङ्करोऽवतरिष्यति ॥

(Chapter 36)

Note: We have gone through *līṅga Purāṇa* and *Kūrma Purāṇa*. We have based upon books chiefly of Śreṣṭhālūr Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer (Śre. Śam. p 17-18) and of Baladeva Upādhyāya (Bala. Śam. p 15-16) for *Vāyu*, *Soura* and *Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇas*. We have given whatever alternate versions available to us. The similarities in certain statements in the *līṅga-Kūrma* and *Vāyu-Kūrma Purāṇas* appear to be significant.



## APPENDIX II

### Purāṇas that defame the Ācārya

(Text, page 18)

#### (1) Padma Purāṇa

शृणु देवि प्रवक्ष्यामि तामसानि यथाक्रमम् ।  
येषां श्रवणमात्रेण पातित्यं ज्ञानिनामपि ॥  
प्रथमं हि मयैवोक्तं<sup>1</sup> शैवं पाशुपतादिकम् ।  
मद्भक्त्या<sup>2</sup> वेशितैर्विप्रेः सम्प्रोक्तानि<sup>3</sup> ततः परम्<sup>4</sup> ॥  
कणादेन तु सम्प्रोक्तं शास्त्रं वैशेषिकं महत् ।  
गौतमेन तथा न्यायं साङ्ख्यं तु कपिलेन वै ॥  
द्विजन्मना जैमिनिना पूर्वं वेदमपार्थकम् ।  
निरीश्वरेण वादेन कृतं शास्त्रं महत्तरम्<sup>5</sup> ॥  
धीषणेन तथा प्रोक्तं चार्वाकमतिगर्हितम् ।  
दैत्यानां नाशनार्थाय विष्णुना बुद्धरूपिणा ॥  
बौद्धशास्त्रमसत्प्रोक्तं नग्ननीलपटादिकम् ।  
मायावादमसच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं बौद्धमेव च<sup>6</sup> ॥  
मयैव कथितं देवि कलौ ब्राह्मणरूपिणा ।  
अपार्थं श्रुतिवाक्यानां दर्शयन् लोकगर्हितम् ॥  
कर्मस्वरूपत्याज्यत्वमत्र च<sup>7</sup> प्रतिपाद्यते ।

---

1. alternate version 'मयाचोक्तम्'

2. alternate version 'मच्छक्त्या वेशितैः'.

3. alternate version 'प्रोक्तानि च'.

4. alternate version 'शृणु'.

5. this *śloka* is the 75th one in Padma Purāṇa.

6. alternate version 'बौद्धमुच्यते'.

7. printed version 'वै'.

सर्वकर्मपरिभ्रंशान्नैष्कर्म्यं तत्र चोच्यते<sup>1</sup> ॥  
 परात्म<sup>2</sup> जीवयोरैक्यं मया तु प्रतिपाद्यते ।  
 ब्रह्मणोऽस्य परं रूपं<sup>3</sup> निर्गुणं दर्शितं<sup>4</sup> मया ॥  
 सर्वस्य जगतोऽप्यस्य<sup>5</sup> नाशनार्थं<sup>6</sup> कलौ युगे ।  
 वेदार्थवन्महाशास्त्रं मायावादमवैदिकम्<sup>7</sup> ॥  
 मयैव रक्ष्यते देवि जगतां नाशकारणात् ।

(Uttara Khaṇḍa - Chap. 264, śloka 66-75)

Note: The above *śloka*s are quoted by Vijñāna Bhikṣu in the beginning of his *Sāṃkhya Pravacana Bhāṣya* (Sam. Pra. p 5-6). He is very much interested in condemning Śaṅkarācārya's Advaita prakriyā. Here, after telling that (1) Śaiva Śāstras like *Pāśupata*, (2) *Vaiśeṣika*, (3) *Nyāya*, (4) *Sāṃkhya*, (5) *Pūrvamīmāṃsa* and (6) *Bauddha Śāstras* are all slothful, it is stated that Lord Śiva Himself has told the vicious *Māyāvāda*! Although Śaṅkarācārya's name is not there, since renunciation of *karma*, enunciation of attributeless Brahman, *Māyāvāda* etc. are all held to be non-Vedic, there is no doubt that this is criticism of Ācārya's doctrine.

It is told here that even the *Jñānis* (?) would be fallen by just hearing these slothful darśanas !

It is told here in the 4th and 5th *śloka*s of this Chapter that whoever do not have the insignia - like conch, disc, vertical mark on the forehead - that are dear to Lord Hari, are heretics. In *śloka*s from 19th

- 
1. alternate version 'सर्वकर्मपरिभ्रष्टं वैधर्म्यत्वं तदुच्यते'.
  2. printed version 'परेण'.
  3. printed version 'स्वयम्'.
  4. printed version 'वक्ष्यते'.
  5. alternate version 'अत्र'.
  6. alternate version 'मोहनार्थम्'.
  7. alternate version 'मायया यदवैदिकम्'.

to 51st, it is depicted as if Lord Viṣṇu ordered Lord Śiva that in order to delude demons like Namuci and others whom the Gods could not win over, He should create tāmasa *Purāṇas* and that He should demonstrate impure conduct and ways of life.

It cannot be anything but portions added by some fanatics of *Veera Vaiṣṇava* cult. But who could be the Śaṅkara-haters, who have added the portion of condemning *Māyāvāda*! Jwālāprasād Miśra has written (A. Pu. p 104-105) that *Padma Purāṇa* has undergone four emendations.

### (2) *Purāṇas* considering Madhvācārya

It seems in *Kūrma Purāṇa* (Muṣṇamāhātmya) and *Skānda Purāṇa* (Muṣṇamāhātmya) it has been foretold that Vāyudeva will incarnate as Madhvācārya and refute false *Śāstras* which would be created by demons in Kaliyuga. In the *Kūrma Purāṇa* that we have, there is no Muṣṇamāhātmya.

It seems in the 39th and 40th chapters of *Soura Purāṇa*, there are a few sentences condemning Madhvācārya! (See pages 9-10 of 'Madhvatantra-mukha-mardana-vyākhyāna').

### (3) Story that Mādhva and Rāmānuja are incarnations of Kāma and Krodha, the ministers of Kali

( *Skānda Purāṇa*, *Kedāra Khaṇḍa*, 61st Chapter. The Lord teaches *Kalidharma* to Garuḍa)

कामस्तु द्राविडे देशे वर्धमानो महाद्युतिः ।

कलिपूरुषसन्देशाद्विष्णुपाषण्डनामकम् ॥

व्याख्यास्यति दुरात्मासौ मोहयित्वा जनान्भृशम् ।

भङ्क्त्वसूत्राणि सर्वाणि ब्रह्माद्वैतपराणि च ॥  
 श्रुतिस्मृतीस्तथा भङ्क्त्वद्वैते संस्थापयिष्यति ।  
 कारयिष्यति पुण्ड्राणि द्विजाद्यैः श्वेतमृत्स्रया ॥  
 तप्तलोहैर्द्विजातीनां दहिष्यति कलेवरान् ।  
 त्याजयिष्यति कर्माणि वैदिकानि दुरात्मवान् ॥  
 भाषाकृतप्रबन्धानि पाठयिष्यति सर्वशः ।  
 अभेदवादिनः साधून् दूषयिष्यति दुर्मतिः ॥  
 क्रोधः कर्नाटदेशीयः कामशास्त्रं समीक्ष्य च ।  
 स्वयं व्याख्यास्यते पुत्र तद्विरुद्धमते स्थितः ॥  
 तत्त्ववादसमाख्यां च कृत्वा तस्मिन्निजागमे ।  
 श्रुतिस्मृतिपुराणानि भञ्जयिष्यति सर्वशः ॥  
 स्वयं करिष्यते धीरः पुराणानि श्रुतिस्मृतीः ।  
 अष्टादशपुराणेषु स्मृतिष्वष्टादशस्वपि ॥  
 अद्वैतनिरतं सर्वं वाक्यमुत्पाटयिष्यति ।  
 कारयिष्यति पुण्ड्राणि वेणुपत्राकृतीनि च ॥  
 स्वकल्पितपुराणानि ख्यापयिष्यति भूतले ।  
 तत्त्ववादमते स्थित्वा केचिद्ब्राह्मणबान्धवाः ॥  
 दाहयिष्यन्ति गात्राणि तप्तलोहैर्द्विजाधमान् (माः?) ।  
 दग्धदेहाश्च ते सर्वे त्यक्तवैदिकसत्क्रियाः ॥  
 ब्राह्मणानेव निन्दन्तः श्राद्धयज्ञान्महारुषः ।  
 दुरात्मानो दुराचाराः क्रिमिकूपे भयङ्करे ॥  
 पतिष्यन्ति न सन्देहो भोक्ष्यन्तेऽपि च यातनाः ।

(- cited in शङ्कराशङ्करभाष्यविमर्शः - pages 3-4)

We have taken down the above *śloka*s from a book authored by one by name Vellakoṇḍa Rāmarāyakavi (Vellakoṇḍopānāmaka Rāmarāyakavīndra, वेल्लकोण्डोपनामक रामरायकवीन्द्र).

Note: In the above *ślokas*, Rāmānuja and Mādhva are described as the incarnations of lust and anger respectively. It is clear that some fanatic, not able to tolerate their teachings, must have added these *ślokas* in the *Purāṇa*. In the *Skānda Purāṇa* that is being used by us, in the part *Kedāra Khaṇḍa*, of the subdivision *Māheśwara Khaṇḍa*, there are 35 Chapters. In that there is no mention of *Yuga dharma* at all! Therefore, it should be that the *Kedāra Khaṇḍa* that the Rāmarāya Kavindra refers to is not this. It seems there is another *Skānda Purāṇa* which is an upa-purāṇa; we are not informed whether that contains this cited part or not.

#### (4) Samskr̥ta Candrike

Two dilapidated sheets of a journal of this name were made available to us. These sheets contained material which was purported to be the *ślokas* from *Skānda Purāṇa*, *Uttara kāṇḍa*:

स्कन्द उवाच -

मणिमत्पूर्वका दुष्टा दैत्या आसन् कलौ युगे ।

ते कुशास्त्रं प्रकुर्वन्तो हरिवायुविरोधिनः ॥

तेषां मध्ये सङ्करस्तु पूर्वं यो मणिमान् खलः ।

सौगन्धिकवने दिव्ये भीमसेनहतोऽसुरः ॥

यः क्रोधतन्त्रको दुष्टो मिथ्याशास्त्रं वदन् पुनः ।

कृष्णे भीमे च विद्वेषं कुर्वन् भूमावजायत ॥

कालडीग्रामके रुद्रवराज्जगद्विमोहयन् ।

बौद्धशास्त्रपरो विप्रो यः कश्चिद्वापरशिष्यकः ॥

स सङ्करस्य संन्यस्य तस्मात्संन्यासरूपिणः ।

वेदान्तमतमित्येतदुष्टशास्त्रं चकार ह ॥



When a Mādhva inquirer questioned ‘is it right that VedaVyāsa has written in his *Purāṇas* such sentences condemning Śaṅkarācārya?’ the editor of the magazine, in his reply, asked the inquirer to have a look at the same *Skānda Purāṇa*, *Kedāra Khaṇḍa*, *ślokas* starting from ‘क्रोधः कर्नाटदेशीयः’. These *ślokas* were similar to the ones we have cited above; and he had given a *śloka* extra:

धृत्वा कैरातवेषं मनसिजरिपुणा दानवो मूकनामा  
 रक्षार्थं पाण्डुसूनोः प्रकटकिटिवपुः यो हतः पूर्वमद्रौ ।  
 सोऽयं पाषण्डवादी समजनितुलवः क्रोधनो निष्क्रियार्थं  
 गर्भे मात्सर्यबुद्धिर्धरणितलगतो भेदवादान् जजल्प ॥

Since we do not have all the sheets of this magazine, we cannot comment any more on this. It is clear that this is all blasphemy of the fanatics.



## APPENDIX III

### Opinions of People of Other Creeds

#### (1) Mahābhārata Tātparya Nirṇaya of Madhvācārya

तत्रापरांश्चैव बहूनसत्यं निरीश्वरं चाप्रतिष्ठं च लोकम् ।

सिद्धोऽहमीशोऽहमिति ब्रुवाणान् गुणान्विष्णोः ख्यापयन्वादतोऽजैत् ॥

(Chap. 22, śloka 304)

[In this *śloka*, the demons present in *Sougandhikā* forest are described as having the *Āsurī Sampat* (vicious qualities) as depicted in the *Bhagavadgīta*, and that they were claiming “I am an accomplished one”, “I am *Īśvara* Himself” etc. It is pictured as if argumentation took place between the demons and Bhīmasena regarding whether God has attributes or not, whether *Jīva* and *Īśvara* are different or not].

अग्रे निधाय मणिमन्तमजेयमुग्रं शम्भोर्वराद्विविधशस्त्रमहाभिवृष्ट्या ।

तान् सर्वराक्षसगणान् मणिमत्समेतान् भीमो जघान सपदि प्रवरैः शरैश्चैः ॥ (śloka 315)

ते हता भीमसेनेन प्रापुरन्धन्तमोऽखिलाः ॥ (śloka 317)

हताः सौगन्धिकवने मणिमांश्च पुनः कलौ ।

जातो मिथ्यामतिं सम्यगास्तीर्यापतमोऽधिकम् ॥ (śloka 318)

[Here it is described as *Maṇimantha*, after his death along with three billion (*padma-traya*) demons, was born in Kaliyuga; he spread (his) deceitful intellect everywhere and went into deep darkness. Śaṅkarācārya's doctrine that the world is illusory is indicated indirectly as *Maṇimantha's*. There is no evidence in the *Mahābhārata* for this].

## (2) Maṇimañjari

It appears that Trivikrama Paṇḍitācārya, a disciple very dear to Madhvācārya, was born in the latter part of Śālivāhana Śaka 1180 in the family of a great Pandit called Likuca at the village Koḍeyāla of Ranebennur Taluk. It seems he was defeated by Madhvācārya after an argumentation of a span of 15 days; then he became a dualist. His son by name *Narāyaṇa Paṇḍita*<sup>1</sup> wrote **Maṇimañjari**. In this book, it is described in detail how *Maṇimantha*, after becoming Śaṅkarācārya, spread his *Māyāvāda*.

A summarized story of Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata are given in the first four chapters of this book. Without any doubt, these stories have been given here to indicate that just as Hanumān killed the demons for the sake of Rāma's cause, and just as Bhīma killed the demons for the sake of Kṛiṣṇa's cause, Madhvācārya defeated the Advaitins, demons as they are, in a war of fierce argument. The evidence for this story is Madhvācārya himself declaring that he is the incarnation of Bhīma and Hanumān.

The demons held a secret conference and encouraged Maṇimantha with the suggestion 'Brother, you take birth on this earth, spoil the *Vidyā*, *Veda* and *Purāṇa*; abuse the qualities of Viṣṇu; teach the identity of *Jīva* and *Viṣṇu*. Now you do not have to fear Bhima (5-19). If you take shelter with the ascetic Paratīrtha and spread Advaita, you will become popular and respectable among people (5-22)'. The author has suggested the birth of *Maṇimantha* as Śaṅkarācārya by using

---

1. It is said that descendents of this Paṇḍita are still present in tuluva country, but having given up the Mādhva creed, they have become Smārtās once again (So. Śam. p 226). We do not know what evidence is there for this.

epithets 'Pādataloṭaja' (6-25) and 'Pattalajanmanā' (8-1). Therefore, if the time of Paratīrtha, a Vaiṣṇavite *Sannyāsin*, is determined, then it would be helpful in deciding the time of Śaṅkarācārya who was acceptable to the author Narāyaṇa Paṇḍita.

The story of Govinda Bhagavatpāda is described in the 5th chapter thus:

ततो गोविन्दनामाभूद्विजो विद्याविशारदः ।

स चतुर्वर्णजाः कन्या ऊढ्वा पुत्रानजीजनत् ॥ ३१ ॥

शबरो विक्रमादित्यो हरिश्चन्द्रोथ भर्तृहा ।

इत्येते कोविदा आसन् धृतवर्णाश्रमव्रताः ॥ ३२ ॥

In the detail given earlier (page 79) following *Patañjali Carita* Govind Bhagavatpāda in his earlier days had the name Candra Śarma, and he had four sons Vararuci, Vikrama, Bhaṭṭa, Bhartṛhari. But here it is told that the four sons are Śabara, Vikramāditya, Hariścandra and Bhartṛhari; Śabara wrote a *Bhāṣya* on Jaimini's *Sūtras*, Vikramāditya became a king and ruled, Hariścandra learnt āyurveda (?) from the Gods, and Bhartṛhari learnt the secret of *Yajñas*. Śabara had two sons by name Bhaṭṭakumāra and Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa (5 - from 38 to 51). We do not know on what basis the Paṇḍit has written thus.

After Kumārila Bhaṭṭa defeated Buddhists, he was made to enter fire following king's orders as was agreed earlier. The fifth chapter closes after mentioning that among the Buddhists, some left to a different island by ship; some went underground, Bakka and some others went to outer areas of the state in disguise (5 - from 38 to 51).

In the sixth chapter, *Narāyaṇa Paṇḍita* has named Bhāravi, Māgha, Prabhākara, Vararuci, Bāṇa, Mayūra, *Kālidāsa*, Daṇḍi, Umbeka, Maṇḍana and Rephaṇa as stalwarts of scriptures and has exhibited his

level of knowledge about *Mīmāṃsā*.

We have already mentioned how he says that Śaṅkara's birth was from a brahmin woman illegitimately (page \*50). We have critically examined there his discrimination in using an indecent word *saṅkara*. To say that Śaṅkara's mind was full of *tamas*, he imagines a story: when told to bring a few brinjals, Śaṅkara ponders within himself 'each brinjal is one and the same; there is no second at all!' (6 - 10). Such lethargic state of mind of his was due to his mother feeding him only tardy food materials! The author's excitement and his sensitive mind work quickly to say that the Advaitins derive the meaning of the *Śruti* Ekamevādvitīyam in such unwise manner. After describing the boy as dull, immediately next he mentions that the 'wise boy with oratorical skill' (6 - 13) was initiated by someone in the upanayanam ceremony. So, his description of the boy as dull is just the result of jealousy; the Ācārya cannot be dull and wise simultaneously! The basis for the author's saying that the Ācārya went to Sourāṣṭra for learning the *Śāstras* (6 - 13) is known to himself only.

*Narāyaṇa*'s description of Śaṅkara becoming a *Paramahansa* is all the more funny. While he was travelling towards north, it seems his sacred thread was swept away in a river which was in floods. Then Śaṅkara ruminates 'O thread! I had already given you up; for me without *karma*, what use I have of you?' and quickly proceeds further! Like this, when he approached 'Paratīrtha' without the sacred thread, the latter did not speak to him at all. Then it seems Śaṅkara crossed river Godāvāri, went to Badari, and before Satyaprajña, the disciple of Paratīrtha, he lied 'I am a disciple of your Guru; at his behest I have come to you' (6 -18 to 21). To go through such a story consisting of

only lies, who will not be dejected about the author?

By the sentence stating 'after having given up Satyaprajña, this demon of a person, as a result of his *karma* in his previous births, was contemplating on the oneness of Ātman as *Śūnya* or *Nirguṇa*, the author exposes his total lack of understanding of the Advaitic concept of attributeless Brahman.

One of the author's conceptions is that the demons instructed Śaṅkarācārya stating 'It seems Bakka, who had run away to some island, gave *Sannyāsa* to Gauḍapāda and taught him the *Tattva*; Govinda has taken *Sannyāsa* from him; you go to him and learn our traditional *Tattva*; start your tirade upon the qualities of Viṣṇu' (6 - 26 to 39). The purpose of the author is to make an untenable propaganda that Śaṅkarācārya is traditionally a Buddhist. Readers' attention is drawn to the fact that the Guru of Gauḍapāda has been called by a Kannaḍa name 'Bakka'. It appears that after receiving instructions from Bakka, upon reflecting over, Gauḍapāda could not see anything except an all-pervading vacuum without any feature (6 - 36). The *Māndukyakārika* of Gauḍapāda is world-famous; the Advaita that has been expounded in it is just an all-pervading vacuum to this dullard! *Nirviśeṣa*, *Nirguṇa*, *Śūnya*, *Sarvābhāva* - all these mean the same to this Paṇḍita!

After going to Govinda to become his disciple, Śaṅkarācārya became a *māyi* (*māyāvādi*); and he told Govinda 'let us hide our *śūnyavāditva* and profess that we are *Vedāntins*; otherwise people may fie upon us!' (6 - 43) and then went to Brahmadatta in order to study with the trio Prabhākara, Bhaṭṭakumāra and Bhāskara (6 - 43)! Since all of them developed different opinions, they simply diverged! The author has no hesitation that people may laugh at him,

declares that these people are all Śaṅkara's contemporaries! A lie has a thousand feet !

Then the Ācārya wrote the *Bhāṣyas*, expounding Buddhism through *Sūtras*. Having heard this, Brahmadatta shut his ears! Bhāskara condemned that *Bhāṣya*. In order to win over adversaries Śaṅkarācārya took the help of *Śakteya Mantra*. Bhairavi became his messenger! Thus he has ended his 6th Chapter.

The argumentation held between Śaṅkarācārya and Viśwarūpa has been described by this Paṇḍita by an imagined story that is extremely repulsive. Viśwarūpa became a *Sannyāsin*. Our pen retreats to write the words of brazeness with which this fellow has written an imagined relationship of Ācārya and his wife in this context. Even after hearing about this, if anyone has the courage to go through his work, he will certainly call him not a Paṇḍita, but a *bhaṇḍa* (shameless fellow). After this, Maṇḍana, who was defeated by Bhaṭṭa (!), was coming mounted on an elephant; and the conversation 'कुतो मुण्डी' etc. between him and Śaṅkara took place (!). Since these sentences have been stolen from *Mādhavīya*, nothing need be told about it. It appears that this Paṇḍita must somehow have heard that Maṇḍana and Viśwarūpa are different. The imagination that Śaṅkarācārya was staging argumentations with the power of *Bhairavi Śakti* and *Kukkuṭa Mantra* is exclusively special of this Paṇḍita.

Śaṅkarācārya had four disciples: Toṭaka, Padmapāda, Jñānottama and Beejabhuk (or Beejāda). They worked up three *siddhis* (?) and wrote Toṭaka and other four *Śāstras* that are the pathways to darkness. (?) We do not know how he could dream about the name Beejāda.

Śaṅkara's lineage of *Sannyāsin* disciples grew in course of time. He

went to the south, cremated the body of his mother, returned to his Maṭha, and was suffering from श्वासज्वर and भगन्दर (7 - 16,17). Even when he was dying, he was telling his disciples, 'destroy the disciples of Paratīrtha!' (7 - 19). While playing a game of ball in the street of *pariahs*, hearing the news of Śaṅkara there it was informed 'two for Śaṅkara, one for Padmapāda, and none for me!', meaning that Śaṅkara was to have two more rebirths. And Śaṅkara, said before dying 'Ha, ha! O Beejāda, this is my secret. I was too much engrossed in the *guṇas*. What will happen to me, what is going to be my fate!' and breathed his last. Thus ends Paṇḍita's abuse of Śaṅkarācārya.

The last chapter describes how Jñānottama and others went to Nandi grāma and burnt the Maṭha of the *Hamsa*; how they killed the cows; how they killed the lads by their *Bhairavi Śakti*; how they broke Prājñatīrtha's staff and water-pot and when he and his associates were going on a pilgrimage towards Jagannāth, how they were ambushed and threatened whether they would opt to die or to join their creed; how they were afraid and acted as if they were joining their creed outwardly, and inside kept up their own beliefs; and how Madhvācārya took *Sannyāsa* from Acyutaprekṣa of that tradition. Whether the author has tried to show that the Advaitins were fanatics, or whether it is just the result of a difference between the Vaiṣṇavas and the Śringeri Maṭha - we are not able to decide.

Condemnation of gods, gurus, reminiscence of demons, creating divisions among brahmins, impressions of passion and hatred - these would be seeded into the minds of young ones by such books; it goes without saying that keeping them in circulation, whether by Mādhva or Smārta or any other brahmins is an act of great sin. Instead, may



Lord *Narāyaṇa* inspire the publishers of books to try propagandizing devotion to God, and thereby uplift brahmins as well as the Hindu society is our fervent prayer to Him!

### (3) Opinion of Theosophical Society

#### (1) Madam Blavatsky

'Theosophy' literally means *Īśwaravidyā*. The theosophists equate the expression 'theosophical society' with *Brahmavidyāsamāja*. One of the originators of this movement, Madam Blavatsky, in her book *Secret Doctrine* has written as follows (I volume, p 271):

(a) 'The prince of Kapilavastu, Gautama, after having learnt through the secrets of brahmins, i.e., through the Upaniṣads, found that it was so close as to be not at all different from the opinions of teachers living on the snow-clad Himālayas who taught the Principle of Life. Finding that the brahmins had protected that from the non-brahmins as a great secret, this disciple of a brahmin, with resentment decided that it should be made known to all and world is to be protected. Then the brahmins... abridged the original Upaniṣads... and removed the parts containing the doctrines of transcendental secret, from the written books...'

(b) Śri Śaṅkarācārya was the one of highest intuition among the historical personalities. 'He wrote several commentaries on the Upaniṣads. But there is reason to believe that his original writings have not fallen yet to the hands of atheists. They have carefully protected them in the Maṭhas. Also there is reason to believe that the Ācārya's *Bhāṣyas* on the secret *vidyā* will not be available for many years, to anyone except the *Smārta* brahmins... (p 271). It is purported that

in the Maṭhas like Śringeri, only the *Smārta* brahmins come out from time to time, as the pontiffs who are the real knowers of Truth'.

(c) After conveying that the *Mahāyāna* Buddhists call the Advaitins as Buddhists in disguise and the Vedāntins call the Buddhists as Vedāntins in disguise, it is written that, 'if one observes closely, just as Gautama Buddha and Śaṅkarācārya appear to be closely related, the secret doctrines of both these will be known to be the same; the difference between the two is only in the external appearance and not in their doctrines' (Vol. II, p 637).

(d) 'Since he could not express all that was taught to him because of the oaths he had taken... the Buddha gave only the outer body (of the secret) to the world at large, and kept its inner soul for his dear disciples only. However, some Chinese philosophers have come to know the 'theory of the Ātman', but none of them seem to have grasped either the real meaning of it or its importance' (Vol. I, p xxi).

The above is a summary translation of the original text by the author of this book.

## (2) A. P. Sinet

He is purported to have given the following opinions in his book *Esoteric Buddhism* (A. C. 1883, Chap. IX, pp 148-155):

(1) The secret is the Śaṅkarācārya is, from all points, none other than Gautama Buddha, only with a new body. I have come to know this from an Advaitic brahmin of the South. (2) Some of the lower-incarnations of Buddha are described as shades of his Ātman; but Śaṅkarācārya is verily the incarnation of Buddha. (3) The important purpose of Buddha (to reincarnate) was to correct the mistakes of his earlier teachings and to fill up the blanks of certain omissions. (4)

Buddha tried his best in his Śaṅkara-incarnation to snub the hatred that was to happen among the different creeds. (5) Śaṅkarācārya travelled in all the regions of India and established Maṭhas in important places. (6) In his books, Śaṅkarācārya emphasized the inevitability of knowledge in the path of liberation.

### (3) Dr. Annie Besant

She has independently written several books following Advaita. Some of her opinions are interesting:

(1) Śaṅkarācārya was the abode of a flame for a period of thirty two years.

(2) Greatest among the great, he is even now living on the other side of the Himālayas in Shamballa brotherhood, unseen.

(3) The Śaṅkarācārya about whom the westerners are talking is not this but one of his lineage (*The Theosophist*, May 1908).

### (4) Sir S. Subrahmaṇya Iyer

Sir S. Subrahmaṇya Iyer of the Theosophical Society has expressed some of his opinions (*The Indian Review*, August 1911) which are peculiar:

(1) Śaṅkarācārya is the incarnation of a *siddhapuruṣa*, highly placed among the guardians of the world. (2) Taking a human from with the name Śaṅkara to teach Knowledge, this person is one with the Kumāra, of the three Divine Flames (Jwāla-daiva-traya). These are the direct disciples of the Head of the *Gurukula*. (3) First Gautama incarnated in the form of Buddha, then Kumāra incarnated in the form of Śaṅkara, and then finally Maharshi Maitreya incarnated in the form of Gopīnātha Kṛiṣṇa, in India, and in the form of Christ in the land of Palastine. (4) Since I have full faith in the research

conducted by the Guru of Theosophical Society in this regard, I have published what I have come to know from him. (5) Buddha for the upliftment of the path of *Karma*, Śaṅkara for teaching the path of *Jñāna*, and Kṛṣṇa as well as Christ incarnated for teaching the path of *Bhakti*. (6) There are two persons with the name Śaṅkara. Among the two, the ĀdiŚaṅkara was self-illuminated and therefore did not take up discipleship under anyone; he did not write any books, but taught only orally. The second, AbhinavaŚaṅkara, is the disciple of Govinda Bhagavat Pāda. He wrote the *Bhāṣyas*. (7) Both these taught only Advaita. (8) Ādi Śaṅkara is the incarnation of Kumāra. He did not waste time in writing the *Bhāṣyas*, or in the reconciliation of the Upaniṣad statements. Because of the *Bhāṣyas*, AbhinavaŚaṅkara also became famous. It is wrong to conceive that both of these are the same person.

We have collected the above information from Somanāthaiah's book (So. Śam. p 226-230). These are writings of the time when Theosophical Society was very influential. These are collected here just to indicate some examples of what all people who are adepts in imagination may say. Regarding such things which will be revealed to only such people of divine vision who have the knowledge of the three times, we, endowed with the vision of mortals are not able to say anything.



## APPENDIX IV

### Opinions of People who have tried to establish the Date of Śaṅkara

(Text, page 25)

#### (1) The ŚaṅkaraVijayas

##### (a) In ŚaṅkaraVijaya of Mādhava

We have already stated that the *Mādhavīya* (Ma. Śam. 2. 71) has not provided the date of birth of Śaṅkara (page 24). The same *śloka* of *Mādhavīya* is also found in *Vyāsācalīya* which is with us. The position of planets mentioned therein corresponds to 805 A. D. according to *Jyotiṣya Śiromaṇi* V. Pichchu Iyer, the official astrologer of the Royal Court of Cocin State; and *Divān Bahādūr* Swāmi Kannu Pillai has supported it (So. Śam. p 26; Śre. Śam. Chap. 2, p 7). According to this the *Rāshikuṇḍali* is said to be as given below<sup>1</sup>,

	रविः	बुधः, शुक्रः	चन्द्रः
			लग्नः, गुरुः
कुजः			
		शनिः	

---

1. But in this *Kuṇḍali*, the positions of *Rāhu* and *Ketu* have not been given. Hence we will have to say that this is, to some extent, incomplete.

In accordance with this, in *Anubhūtha Jātaka Tarangini*, it is stated as 'birth on Kali 3907, Śālivāhana Śaka 728 (805 A. D.), Īśwara Samvatsara Vaiśākha Śuddha Pañcamī Somavāsara Karkāṭaka Lagna Abhijin-muhūrta Ārdra I caraṇa Karkāṭaka Tritīyadrekkaṇa Śubha Shaḍvarga 'day'; but this corresponds to Pārthiva Samvatsara instead of Īśwara Samvatsara (Śre. Śam. p 3). It appears Śrī Rajendranath Ghosh in his book *Ācārya Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja* has written that the Ācārya was born on 608th Śaka Vaiśākha Śukla Tṛtīya, and that he lived for 34 years (Bala. Śam. p 39)! Some say that this yoga occurs on Kalyādi 605 Vaiśākha Śukla 5 and Kalyādi 2815th Karka Lagna (Ku. Śam. upa. p 8). These are the different opinions of astrologers for the time of birth given in *Mādhavīya*. If, as stated in the text, it is established that *Mādhava* has taken the cited śloka from *Vyāsācalīya*, the birth happens on Kali 2593rd Nandana Samvatsara Uttarāyaṇa Vaiśākha Śukla Pañcamī Bhānuvāsara Punarvasu Nakshatra. Then, what form the *Rāshikuṇḍali* will take !

### (b) In Bṛhat ŚaṅkaraVijaya of Citsukhācārya

ततः सा दशमे मासे सम्पूर्णशुभलक्षणे ।  
 षड्विंशे शतके श्रीमद्युधिष्ठिरशकस्य वै ॥  
 एकत्रिंशेऽथ वर्षे तु हायने नन्दने शुभे ।  
 मेषराशिं गते सूर्ये वैशाखे मासि शोभने ॥  
 शुक्लपक्षे च पञ्चम्यां तिथ्यां भास्करवासरे ।  
 पुनर्वसुगते चन्द्रे लग्ने कर्काटकाह्वये ॥  
 मध्याह्ने चाभिजिन्नाम मुहूर्ते शुभवीक्षिते ।  
 स्वोच्चस्थे केन्द्रसंस्थे च गुरौ मन्दे कुजे रवौ ॥  
 निजतुङ्गगते शुक्रे रविणा सङ्गते बुधे ।

प्रासूत तनयं साध्वी गिरिजेव षडाननम् ॥

According to this, the *Rashikuṇḍali* would be as shown below<sup>1</sup> :

शुक्रः	रविः, बुधः		चन्द्रः
			लग्नः, गुरुः
कुजः			
		शनिः	

*Ātmabodha* writes in his *Suṣamā* that Citsukha was a contemporary of Ācārya (Gu. Ra. *śloka* 18). This cannot be ignored just because *Ātmabodha* is of Kāñci tradition. Because *Mādhava* too says ‘thus was told in secret by *Padmapādasatīrthya* Citsukha and others’ (Ma. Śam. 13. 5). This being the position, we will have to say that either *Mādhava* has ignored the *Bṛhat ŚaṅkaraVijaya* of Citsukha although available in his time, for the reason that it belongs to Kāñci tradition, or that the book itself is artificially created later than *Mādhava*. Researchers have to find out the truth.

### (c) In Śaṅkara Mandāra Sourabha of Nilakanṭha

We have stated in the text that this book gives the date of birth of Ācārya as *Vibhava Samvatsara Vaiśākha Śuddha Daśamī* (page 24). It seems the following *śloka* is there in *Śaṅkarendravilāsa* of Vākpati Bhaṭṭodbhaṭa:

1. In this *Kuṇḍali* also the positions of rahu and Ketu are not shown.

हायनेऽथ विभवे वृषमासे शुक्लपक्ष दशमीदिनमध्ये ।

शेवधिद्विपदिशानलवर्षे तिष्य एनमुदसोऽष्ट विशिष्टा ॥

(*Viśiṣṭā Devi* gave birth to this child on *Kali 3489th Vibhava Samvat-sara* (788 A.D.) *Vriṣabhamāsa Śuklapaksha Daśamī*) (Gu. Ra. Suṣamā p 60). The Kāñci traditionalists opine that this is the matter pertaining to Abhinava Śaṅkarācārya (text, page 46).

#### (d) In Keraleeya ŚaṅkaraVijaya

प्रवृद्धे तत्र चासूत नन्दनं नन्दने शुभे ।

वैशाखे मासि पञ्चम्यां शुक्लपक्षे पुनर्वसौ ॥

(e) It is said that **Dr. K. B. Pāṭhak** got a three-sheet manuscript at Belgaum from one Mr. Govinda Bhat Erlekar containing the following *śloka*s:

दुष्टाचारविनाशाय प्रादुर्भूतो महीतले ।

स एव शङ्कराचार्यः साक्षात् कैवल्यनायकः ॥

अष्टवर्षे चतुर्वेदान्(दी?) द्वादशे सर्वशास्त्रकृत् ।

षोडशे कृतवान्भाष्यं द्वात्रिंशे मुनिरभ्यगात् ॥

निधिनागेभवह्न्यब्दे विभवे शङ्करोदयः ।

गुहाप्रवेशः कल्यब्दे चन्द्रनेत्राङ्गवह्निगे ॥

वैशाखे पूर्णिमायां तु शङ्करः शिवतामगात् ।

In this it is stated that the date of Ācārya is from 788 A. D. to 820 A. D. Some of the modern scholars now agree this date (or this source) as the date of Śaṅkara. It begins with 'आदौ शिवः' and narrates the lineage upto Śaṅkara. Śaṅkarācārya, having made Prithvīdhara the pontiff on the banks of Tunga bhadra, and having given him the title Bhārati, and mentions as under:



आगत्य स्वेच्छया काञ्चीं पर्यटन् पृथिवीतले ।

तत्र संस्थाप्य कामाक्षीं जगाम परमं पदम् ॥<sup>1</sup>

It seems it has mentioned Śaṅkarācārya to have born in a कूष्माण्ड (ashgourd) (So. Śam. p 211). Hence it must have been written by someone of Kāñci tradition; also on the basis of *Kūṣmāṇḍa-ŚaṅkaraVijaya*. Not only that, it seems it has the following:

श्रीयादवप्रकाशस्य शिष्यो रामानुजो यतिः ।

तेन वैष्णवसिद्धान्तः स्थापितो गुरुसम्मितः ॥ ९ ॥

अच्युतप्रेक्षनाम्नस्तु शिष्यो मध्वाभिधो यतिः ।

तेनैव भेदसिद्धान्तः स्थापितो गुर्व(?)सम्मते ॥ १० ॥ (So. Śam. p 214).

We have mentioned the way in which Ānandagiri has described Ācārya establishing the six creeds (text, pages 302-304). The above writing resembles the same; therefore, it is clear that this must have been written by someone of Kāñci tradition even later than Madhvācārya. Pāṭhak's article is in *The Indian Antiquary*, 1882, pp 173-175 (Bala. Śam. p 35).

#### (f) Keralotpatti

During the victorious period of Cherumāna Perumala, in the year 3901 of Kaliyuga under Ārdra star, Śaṅkara was born at Keseli village (Ku. Śam. p 2). Perumala was enthroned by Kriṣṇarāja of Ānegondi. He accepted Muslim religion and undertook a pilgrimage to Mecca. By name Abdul Rehman, he was buried at Jaffar of Arabstan. He came during A. H. 216 and died in 216; Logan has written that these years

1. To the sentence in *Āryavidyāsudhākara* of *Yajñeśvara Śāstri*, निधिनागेभवह्न्यब्दे विभवे मासि माधवे । शुक्ले तिथौ दशम्यां तु शङ्करार्योदयः स्मृतः ॥, this seems to be the source. See *Bhārati Guruparamparā Stotra* at the end of Kāñci Pīṭha lineage in Appendix IX.

are equivalent to 827-828 A. D. and 831-832 A. D. (*Indian Antiquary*, February 4) (Śam. Cu. *Pūrvapīṭhikā* p 9-10); but even here there is difference of opinion.

## (2) Books with different opinion

### (a) In Jinavijaya

ऋषिर्बाणस्तथा भूमिर्मर्त्याक्षो वाममेळनात् ।

एकत्वेन लभेदङ्गो रक्ताक्ष<sup>1</sup> स्तद्धि वत्सरः ॥

विश्वजिघ्र पिता यस्य विख्यातश्च चिदम्बरे ।

तस्य भार्याम्बिका देवि प्रसूता(?) लोकशङ्करम् ॥

(Ku. Śam. p 8).

Here it is stated that 'Of the "Yudhishṭhira Śaka 2157, Raktākshi Samvatsara, "Māgha Kṛṣṇa 14 Somavāsara "midnight" (?)', from *Viśvajit* and Ambika, the Ācārya was born at Cidambaram'. What is the evidence for "'Māgha Kṛṣṇa 14 Somavāsara midnight"?, we could not understand. This corresponds to 477 B. C. (Śre. Śam. Appendix 2-33).

[In the same Appendix, page 31, it is stated that

ऋषिर्वारस्तथा पूर्णं मर्त्याक्षौ वाममेलनात् ।

एकीकृत्य लभेताङ्गः क्रोधी स्यात् तत्रवत्सरः ॥

भट्टाचार्यकुमारस्य कर्मकाण्डैकवादिनः ।

ज्ञेयः प्रादुर्भवस्तस्मिन् वर्षे यौधिष्ठिरे शके ॥

In *Yudhishṭhira 2077 Krodhi Samvatsara*, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa was born].

पश्चात्पञ्चदशे वर्षे शङ्करस्य गते सति ।

भट्टाचार्यकुमारस्य दर्शनं कृतवान् शिवः ॥

1. alternate version ताम्राक्षः (Śre. Śam. Appendix 2-33).

When Śaṅkara was 15 years old, he saw Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (Śre. Śam. Appendix 2-32). According to this Ācārya's date of birth would be 509 B. C.

सुधन्वनामको राजा सोऽपि दुष्टस्तथा भुवि ।  
जिनानां येन साधूनां कृतं कदनमद्भुतम् ॥

Here it is stated that even the king Sudhanva tormented the Jains. It is necessary to decide whether this book is earlier to *Mādhavīya* or later.

### (b) In Śaṅkara Paddhati

युगमपयोधिरसामितशाके रौद्रकवत्सर ऊर्जकमासे ।  
वासर ईज्य उताचल माने कृष्णतिथौ दिवसे शुभयोगे ।  
शङ्करलोकमगान्निजदेहं हेमगिरौ प्रविहाय हठेन ॥

This *śloka* has been cited from *Śaṅkara Paddhati* in the book *Darśana Prakāśa* (1658 A. D.) of *Mahānubhāva* tradition. Since it is stated here that Śaṅkara's death has taken place on Śaka 642 (720 A. D.), his birth could be calculated as Śaka 610 (688 A.D.). But since it is stated that he left his body in Hemagiri by Haṭha Yoga, doubt arises as to which Śaṅkara he could be. Baladeva Upādhyāya has cited this (p.39). Readers have to decide as to how much value this could be given.

### (3) Conceptualizations of modern scholars

Here we give the logic of some of the modern scholars. It is not our opinion that these are more valuable than Dr. Pāṭhak's logic; however, we have given them so that the readers might have an idea of these.

(1) Those who hold that the date of birth of Śaṅkara is 509 B. C.:

(a) T. S. *Narāyaṇa Śāstry* (who was an advocate of Madras High Court) - on the basis of *Bṛhat ŚaṅkaraVijaya* etc. in his "The Age of Śaṅkara" (Śre. Śam. p 9) (see text, page 22).

(b) N. K. Venkaṭeśa Pantulu opines that if one observes the lineage of pontiffs of Govardhana, Dwārakā and Kāncī Pīṭhas, one would feel that this correct. Bhagavān Lāl Indrajī had brought a manuscript of a book *Inscription from Nepal*. Perusal of this would show that the Ācārya had been to Nepal during the time of Vṛṣabhadeva Varma; the king followed Advaita and named his son as Śaṅkaradeva Varma (NKVS p 6) (see text, page 23).

(c) K. S. Rāmāswāmi Śāstry (Śre. Śam. Appendix 2, p 10). He also accepts 509 B. C. on the basis of the story of Vṛṣasena.

### (2) Earlier part of the Christian Era.

On the basis of the pontiff lineage of Kāñci and Dwārakā Pīṭhas, this becomes the time. What date the scholars have decided now (788 A. D.) is the date of Abhinava Śaṅkara. From *Gururatnamālikā* (śloka 21), we come to know that Ācārya was there during the time of Hāla (king of *Magadha*). It appears that Māṇikyavācakar was influenced by Advaita Vedānta (NVSSK pp 17-22). (See Appendix IX for the lineage of the pontiffs; the authority of *Gururatnamālikā* is also discussed there).

### (3) 4th Century A.D.

R. G. Bhaṇḍārkar (KRTTW p 6).

### (4) 6th Century A. D.

Kashināth Tryambaka Telang (KRTTW p 6). See text, p 30. The citations of *Srughna*, *Madhurā*, *Pāṭaliputra* etc. are found in *Pātanjala Mahābhāṣya* (Nirṇayasāgar Press, Vol. II, p 3, 95).

### (5) 7th Century A. D.

Dr. Fleet on the basis of a book by a Buddhist by name Tārānāth (*The Indian Antiquary*, Vol. IV, p 350). Dr. Burnell has expressed the same opinion in his book *Elements of South Indian Paleology*, p 37 (Śre. Śam. Appendix II, p 11).

### (6) Later part of 8th Century A. D.

Professor Wilson supports this on the basis of the opinion of Rājā Rāmmohan Roy (*Wilson's Essays*, Vol. I, p 194) (Śre. Śam. Appendix II, p 12). On the basis of the Śringeri Maṭha lineage of pontiffs, *Mādhavīya Śaṅkara Vijaya* which mentions Buddhists in Kāśmīr and on the basis of a mention of *Sambandhār* (a tamil saint) in *Soundaryalahari*, Kṛṣṇaswāmi Iyer says that Śaṅkara's date of birth must be 788 A. D. (CNKS pp17-18). Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman, following opinions of Fleet, Logan, Dr. Bhaṇḍārkar, Max Muller, MacDonald, Bhular and Bar, writes that Śaṅkara's time must be either from 788 to 820 A. D., or from 805 to 837 (8) as per Cambodge Inscription (येनाधीतानि शास्त्राणि भगवच्छङ्कराहयात्) - the inscription says that Śīvasoma the Rājaguru studied *Śāstras* from Bhagavān Śaṅkara. On the same subject, on this inscription, *Baladeva Upādhyāya* writes as follows: Śīvasoma [the preceptor of Indravarma, the lord of Campa (877-880 A. D.)] is the grandson of the maternal uncle of Jayavarma the king II of Kāmbhoja (802-869 A. D.); since the inscription says 'भगवच्छङ्कराहयात्', it must be the reference to ĀdiŚaṅkarācārya (Bala. Śam. p 36). The other dates for Śaṅkara mentioned by *Baladeva Upādhyāya* (Bala. Śam. p 29) are as follows: Colebrooke, 800-900 A. D.; Taylor, 900 A. D.; Hogson, 800 A. D.; Wilson, 809-900 A. D.; MacKenzie, 500 A. D.; Max Muller, Kṛṣṇaswāmi and Pāṭhak, 778 A. D.; Rāmatāra Śarma, Śaka

701-765; Telang and Tilak, 688 A. D. Rājendranātha Ghosh, 686 A. D. (Śaka 608); we do not have the mind to give more details about these.

In the book *Dwāarakā Śrī Śāradā Pīṭha Guru Parampare* that we recently have procured, the following details are available:

Yudhishṭhira Śaka 2631 *Vaiśākha Śukla 5*: incarnation of Śaṅkara.

2636 *Caitra Śukla 9*: *upanayana* of Śaṅkara.

2639 *Kārtika Śukla 11*: *Sannyāsa* of Śaṅkara.

2640 *Phālguna Śukla 2*: initiation from Govinda Bhagavatpāda; there until *Jyeṣṭha Amāvāsyā*: writing of 16 Bhāṣyas at Badari Āśrama, *Narāyaṇa Pratiṣṭha*, construction of Jyotirmaṭha.

2647 *Kārtika Śukla 8*: dialogue with Bādarāyaṇācārya; arrival of Sanandana.

2647 *Mārgaśīrṣa Kṛṣṇa 3*: debate with Maṇḍana commenced.

2648 *Caitra Śukla 4*: Maṇḍana defeated.

2648 *Caitra Śukla 6*: debate with Saraswati.

2648 *Caitra Kṛṣṇa 8*: metempsychosis into Amaruka's body.

2648 *Kārtika Śukla 13*: return to his own body.

2648 *Kārtika Kṛṣṇa 1*: defeat of Bhārati.

2648 *Kārtika Kṛṣṇa 1*: attracted her (who was airborne to return to her abode) by *Cintāmaṇi mantra* at Dwāarakā.

2648 *Kārtika Kṛṣṇa 5*: Bhārati established there.

2648 From *Kārtika Kṛṣṇa 13* to *Māgha Śukla 10*: construction of Śrī Śāradā Maṭha, construction of a temple in the shape of Rudramālā, establishment of Yādavendra, establishment of Siddheśwarālaya.

2648 *Phālguna Śukla 9*: Fearing widowhood, Saraswati was returning again in the form of *Kalāshṭaka* to her abode; Śaṅkara attrac-

ted her to Śringeri by the same mantra, constructed a Maṭha and established her again, there.

2649 *Caitra Śukla* 9: Maṇḍana takes *Sannyāsa*.

2649 *Mārgaśīrṣa Śukla* 10: King Sudhanva becomes a disciple.

2649 *Māgha Śukla* 7: *Sureśwarācārya* crowned at Śāradā Pīṭha.

2650 *Vaiśākha Śukla* 3: *Digvijaya* commenced.

2654 *Śrāvaṇa Śukla* 7 and *Aashwīja Śukla* 11: Toṭaka and Hastāmalaka became disciples.

2654 *Pousha Śukla* 15: Hastāmalakācārya crowned at Śringeri and on the same day Toṭakācārya crowned at Jyotirmaṭha.

2655 *Vaiśākha Śukla* 10: Amidst *Digvijaya* he went to *Puruṣottama Kshetra*; establishment of wooden idol of Jagadīsha there; constituted *Kshetra Maryade*; established Govardhana Maṭha and crowned Padmapāda at that *Pīṭha*.

2655 From *Bhādrapada Śukla* 15 to 2662 *Pousha Kṛṣṇa Amāvasya*: *Digvijaya Mahotsava*; guidance to Sudhanva and others regarding welfare of the subjects etc.; Stay at Kāśmīr Maṭha, Śāradā Pīṭha.

2663 *Kārtika Śukla* 30: journey to Kailāsa with his body.

The book does not give what is the basis for all these dates.

Here ends the disparity of opinions about the date of Śaṅkarācārya. The readers are to see the original works of the Ācārya, and decide for themselves what value is to be given to the various speculation. We have given some of our own opinions in the text (pages 26-35).

# APPENDIX V

## ŚaṅkaraVijaya Texts

### (1) The Anantānandagiriya

(Text, page 44, 59–60, 106...)

We have given the *ślokas* from *Anantānandagiriya* corresponding to the incarnation of Śaṅkara as printed in Telugu script. If there are differences in the text of Devanāgarī script, they are also shown:

ततः सर्वात्मको देवश्चिदम्बरपुराश्रितः ।  
आकाशलिङ्गनाम्ना तु विख्यातोऽभून्महीतले ॥  
तत्र विद्वन्महेन्द्रस्य काले द्विजगणाश्रिते ।  
जातः सर्वज्ञनाम्ना तु कश्चिद्द्विजकुलेश्वरः ॥  
कामाक्षीति सती चाभूत्तस्य लक्षणलक्षिता ।  
चिदम्बरेश्वरं ध्यात्वा तावुभौ प्रापतुः सुताम् ॥  
सा कुमारी सदा ध्यानसक्ता भूज्ज्ञानतत्परा ।  
विशिष्टेति च नाम्ना तु प्रसिद्धाऽभून्महीतले ॥  
तामष्टमेऽब्दे विप्राय शान्तायाद्भुतकर्मणे ।  
प्रददौ विश्वजिन्नाम्नो सर्वज्ञो ज्ञो<sup>1</sup> पिता स्वयम् ॥  
सा सभा<sup>2</sup> पतिमद्वैतं ध्यात्वाकाशात्मकं शिवम् ।  
अस्या<sup>3</sup> राधनमत्युग्रमाचकार विवेकिनी ॥  
तादृशीमपि सन्त्यक्त्वा<sup>4</sup> ययौ विश्वजिद्भुतम् ।

---

1. alternate version 'अस्याः'

2. alternate version 'सदा पतिम्'

3. alternate version 'तस्य'

4. alternate version 'संत्यज्य'



अरण्ये<sup>1</sup> तपसे कृत्वा मनोनिश्चयतां गतः<sup>2</sup> ॥  
 तदा प्रभृति सा नारी चिदम्बरमहेश्वरम् ।  
 पूज<sup>3</sup> यामास पूजाभिर्ध्यानैरात्मगतैः सदा ॥  
 स देवः सर्वपूर्णोऽपि तस्या वदनपङ्कजम् ।  
 प्रविश्य विस्मितान् कुर्वन् जनानन्यान् समागतान् ॥  
 महोग्रतेजसा जुष्टा विशिष्टाऽभूत् दृढाम्बिका<sup>4</sup> ।  
 सर्वैः सम्पूजिता नित्यं पित्रादिभिरुपासिता<sup>5</sup> ॥  
 अतीते मासि गर्भस्य वृद्धिरासीद्दिने दिने ।  
 चिदम्बरेश्वरं कृत्वा यजमानं द्विजोत्तमाः ॥  
 तृतीयादिषु मासेषु चक्रुः कर्माणि वेदतः ।  
 प्राप्ते तु दशमे मासि विशिष्टागर्भगोलतः ॥  
 प्रादुरासीन्महादेवः शङ्कराचार्यनामतः ।  
 आसीत्तदा पुष्पवृष्टिः देवसङ्घैः प्रचोदिता ।  
 नेदुर्दुन्दुभयो दिव्याः स्वर्गलोकेऽम्बरे सुखम्<sup>6</sup> ॥

## (2) Cidvilāsīya and Br̥hat Śaṅkaravijaya

[The 32nd *prakaraṇa* of *Br̥hat ŚaṅkaraVijaya* given here is taken from the Appendix I of the Telugu book *Śrī Śaṅkarabhagavat-pādācārya Caritramu* of Śreshṭhaluru Kriṣṇaswāmi Ayyagāru. In square brackets, *ślokas* from *Cidvilāsīya* are given for comparison. (See text, page 43)]

कालट्याख्ये ग्रामवर्ये केरळालङ्कृती कृते ।

- 
1. alternate version 'अरण्यं'
  2. alternate version 'गतम्'
  3. alternate version 'तोषयामास'
  4. alternate version 'यथाम्बिका'
  5. alternate version 'पित्रादिभिरुपाश्रिता'
  6. alternate version 'चिरं सुखम्'

विद्याधिराजतनयः प्राज्ञः शिवगुरुर्बभौ ॥ १ ॥

[In *Kālaḍi* village of Kerala, Śivaguru, the son of Vidyādhiraḥ, is the father of Śaṅkara].

तदा सदाशिवः शम्भुर्लोकानुग्रहतत्परः ।

आर्याम्बाकमितुस्तस्य भक्तिवैराग्यशालिनः ॥ २ ॥

सुतार्थं तप्यमानस्य पत्न्या सार्धमहर्निशम् ।

मनोरथं पूरयितुमियेष करुणानिधिः ॥ ३ ॥

[Compare the *śloka*s of Ci. Śam. 4. 42-45 commencing from ‘मत्तो वाञ्छन् सतः पुत्राननपत्यत्वदुर्माः’ to ‘तपस्यति चिरं घोरे वर्षीयानपि निश्चलः’ with these].

ततो(पो?) महिम्ना तत्पत्न्यां प्रविवेश स्वतेजसा ।

सा दधार सती गर्भमादित्यसमतेजसम् ॥ ४ ॥

निधानगर्भा धात्रीव शमीवान्तर्हितानला ।

व्यजायत तदार्याम्बा शिवैकायत्तचेतना ॥ ५ ॥

[Compare the *śloka*s of Ci. Śam. 5. 33-35 commencing from ‘प्राचीवान्तर्निलीनेन शमीवान्तर्हितानला ।’ to ‘...निधानगर्भा धात्रीव त्रेतेवाच्छादिता तुषैः ॥...व्याराजत तदार्याम्बा शिवैकायत्तचेतना ॥’ with these].

दृष्ट्वा शिवगुरुर्यज्वा भार्यामार्यां च गर्भिणीम् ।

वृषाचलेशं सततं स्मरन्नेकाग्रचेतसा ॥ ६ ॥

दयालुतां स्तुवन् शम्भोर्दिनेष्वपि महत्स्वपि ।

ववृधे स पयोराशिः पूर्णेन्दोरिव दर्शनात् ॥ ७ ॥

[Same *śloka*s in Ci. Śam. 5.

36-37].

व्यजायत शुभः कालः पञ्चोच्चग्रहसंयुतः ।

कल्हारकलिकागन्धबन्धुरो मरुदाववौ ॥ ८ ॥

[Ci. Śam 5-44 1/2]

दिशः प्रकाशिताकाशा बभूवुः सूर्यरश्मिभिः ।

प्रायः प्रदक्षिणज्वाला जज्वलुर्यज्ञपावकाः ॥ ९ ॥

[Ci. Śam 5-45 1/2]

ननन्दुर्बान्धवाः सर्वे ननृशुश्चाप्सरो गणाः ।

ससृजुः पुष्पवर्षाणि देवा भूम्यन्तरिक्षगाः ॥ १० ॥

[Ci. Śam 5-44]

आसीत्तदा दिव्यगानं स्वर्गलोके चिरं सुखम् ।

प्रसन्नमभवच्चित्तं सतां व्रतपरामपि ॥ ११ ॥

[Ci. Śam 5-46]

ततः सा दशमे मासे सम्पूर्णशुभलक्षणे ।

षड्विंशे शतके श्रीमद्युधिष्ठिरशकस्य वै ॥ १२ ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 37, alternate

version 'मासि'].

एकत्रिंशेऽथ वर्षे तु हायने नन्दने शुभे ।

मेषराशिं गते सूर्ये वैशाखे मासि शोभने ॥ १३ ॥

शुक्लपक्षे च पञ्चम्यां तिथ्यां भास्करवासरे ।

पुनर्वसुगते चन्द्रे लग्ने कर्कटकाह्वये ॥ १४ ॥

मध्याह्ने चाभिजिन्नाम मुहूर्ते शुभवीक्षिते ।

[Ci. Śam. 5. 38, alternate version 'मुहूर्ते चार्द्रया युते'].

स्वोच्चस्थे केन्द्रसंस्थे च गुरौ मन्दे कुजे रवौ ॥ १५ ॥

निजतुङ्गगते शुक्रे रविणा सङ्गते बुधे ।

प्रासूत तनयं साध्वी गिरिजेव षडाननम् ॥ १६ ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 39. The subject of *muhūrtam* is discussed in Appendix

IV].

उदयाचलवेलेव भानुमन्तं महौजसम् ।

दुर्निरीक्ष्यैः स्वतेजोभिर्भासयन्तं दिशो दश ॥ १७ ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 39-41].

बालत्वेऽपि विशालाक्षमतिविस्तृतवक्षसम् ।

आजानुलम्बितभुजं सुविशालनिटालकम् ॥ १८ ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 59, 59 1/2 alternate version 'बालभावे'].

आरक्तोपान्तनयनविनिन्दितसरोरुहम् ।

मुखकान्तिपराभूतराकाहिमकराकृतिम् ॥ १९ ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 60-60 1/2].

शङ्खचक्रध्वजाकाररेखाचिह्नपदाम्बुजम् ।

द्वात्रिंशल्लक्षणोपेतं विद्युदाभकलेवरम् ॥ २० ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 62].

प्रमोदं दृष्टमात्रेण दिशन्तं तं स्तनद्वयम् ।

पायं पायं दृशा प्रेम्णा श्रीकृष्णमिव देवकी ॥ २१ ॥

प्रपेदे न क्षणं तृप्तिं चकोरीव सुधाकरम् ।

तादृशं बालकं दृष्ट्वा सा बभूवातिविस्मिता ॥ २२ ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 63-64; alternate version (last quarter) 'त्वार्या सा शुभलक्षणा'].

स चाद्भुतः किशोरोऽपि किञ्चद्विचलिताधरः ।

ताडयन् चरणौ हस्तौ रुरोद मधुरस्वनम् ॥ २३ ॥

[In *Cidvilāsiya*, there are *ślokas* meaning 'wonderstruck seeing the Lord Candrasekhara with four arms and three eyes, and deciding for herself that this is none other than Vṛṣācaleśwara, (she) begged Him to exhibit his child-play'. The present *śloka* commences with 'ततः किशोरवत्सोऽपि'].

तत्रत्या वृद्धनार्योऽपि यथोचितमथाचरन् ।

बालकं मेनिरे प्रोद्यदिन्दुबिम्बमिवोज्ज्वलम् ॥ २४ ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 51,51 1/2 ; the *śloka*-halves are in reverse order].

ततः श्रुत्वा पिता सोऽपि निधिं प्राप्येव निर्धनः ।

मुमुदे नितरां चित्ते वित्तेशं नाभ्यलक्ष्यत ॥ २५ ॥

स्नात्वा शिवगुरुस्तूर्णं यज्वनामग्रणीस्ततः ।

विप्रानाकारयामास पुरन्ध्रीरपि सर्वतः ॥ २६ ॥

तदोत्सवो महानासीत् पुरे सन्ननि सन्ततम् ।

धान्यराशीन् मखिभ्योऽसौ विद्भ्यो भूयः प्रदत्तवान् ॥

धनानि भूरिविप्रेभ्यो वेदविद्भ्यो दिदेश सः ।

वासांसि भूयो दिव्यानि सफलानि प्रदत्तवान् ॥ २८ ॥

पुरन्ध्रीणां च नीरन्ध्रं वस्तुजातमदादसौ ।

घटोन्नीर्बहुशो गाश्च सालङ्काराः सदक्षिणाः ॥ २९ ॥

[Ci. Śam. 5. 53-57; the same *ślokas* are in the same order].

ततः शिवगुरुर्यज्वा ब्राह्मणान् पूर्वतोऽधिकम् ।

सन्तर्प्य बन्धुभिः सार्धं मुदितो न्यवसत्सुधीः ॥ ३० ॥

सर्वज्ञानः -

श्रीचित्सुखेन्द्रगुरुराजसमुद्भवोद्यद्भूतं निशम्य नितरां हृषितं मनो मे ।

अग्रे यदद्य वद तच्चरितं क्रमेण भूयो नतोऽस्मि गुरवे भवतापहर्त्रे ॥ ३१ ॥

श्रीचित्सुखः -

सर्वज्ञानसुधीमणे सकृदिमं यो वा श्रुणोत्यादरात्

श्रीमच्छङ्करदेशिकेन्द्रचरणाविर्भावमत्यद्भुतम् ।

सोऽप्यद्धा भविता भिदा विगळितस्त्वैक्यं च जीवेशयो-

र्जीवन्मुक्त इवाचरन्नतितरां निःश्रेयसायेहते ॥ ३२ ॥

इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्य श्रीमच्छङ्करभगवत्पूज्यपादपाथोजमदनिष्यन्दास्वाद-  
तुन्दिलानन्दमिलिन्दायमानमानस श्रीचित्सुखयतीन्द्रसर्वज्ञानतपोधनेन्द्रसंवादे श्रीबृहच्छङ्कर-  
विजये शङ्कराचार्यसत्पथे श्रीशङ्करप्रादुर्भावख्यं द्वात्रिंशप्रकरणं समाप्तम् ॥

[Note: (1) In order to show that the *ślokas* of *Cidvilāśīya* are in the original *BṛhatŚaṅkaraVijaya*, we have given them in square brackets, indicating the differences also. Since this one chapter of *BṛhatŚaṅkaraVijaya* has been available, it is probable that the whole book might be there in *Kāñci Maṭha* at *Kumbhakoṇam*. It is very much necessary to search out.

(2) We could not make out whether the whole *BṛhatŚaṅkaraVijaya* is referred to as 'शङ्कराचार्यसत्पथ', or only this chapter. In the commentary *Suśamā* of *Ātmabodha* (Go. Ra. 19), it is stated as 'मौलाम्नायश्च बृहच्छङ्करविजये श्रीशङ्कराचार्यसत्पथे सविस्तरं निरूपितः'. But there are also people who doubt the authenticity of *Ātmabodha*.

(3) The conversation between the Guru and the disciple is common to both *Cidvilāśīya* and *BṛhatŚaṅkaraVijaya*. The third *śloka* of the conversation is just like this in *Cidvilāśīya*. It is our expectation that this may be of some use to researchers to theorize in some way.

## APPENDIX VI

### ŚaṅkaraVijaya Texts (continued)

#### (6) The Ānandagiriya

##### (a) the old version

(Text, page 47, 59)

Some of the *śloka*s of this version are found in a book by name 'श्रीशाङ्करपीठतत्त्वदर्शनम्' (p 15). This book is purported to have been written in Śaka 1767.

कालटाख्ये ग्रामवर्ये केरलालङ्कृतीकृते ।  
विद्याधिराजनाम्ना यः प्राज्ञः शिवगुरुर्बभौ ॥  
ततः सदाशिवः शम्भुर्लोकानुग्रहतत्परः ।  
तपोमहिम्ना तत्पत्न्यां प्रविवेश स्वतेजसा ॥  
सा दधार सती गर्भमादित्यसमतेजसम् ।  
व्याजायत शुभे काले पञ्चोच्चग्रहसंयुते ॥

\* \* \*

आनन्दं बान्धवाः सर्वे पुष्पवर्षैर्दिवश्च्युतः(?) ।  
शम्भोर्वरमनुस्मृत्य पिता शिवगुरुः किल ॥  
आयुषो ह्रस्वतां जानन्नपि नोवाच किञ्चन ।  
सर्वज्ञत्वादिसुगुणान् शम्भूक्तांस्तस्य संस्मरन् ॥

\* \* \*

तस्य शङ्कर इत्याख्यां चक्रे शिवगुरुस्ततः ।

\* \* \*

पञ्चवर्षस्य वर्णादिग्रहणेनास्य धीमतः ।  
उपनीतिमकृत्वैव ममार महितः पिता ॥

Note: Here, the *śloka* कालटाख्ये is the same as the 1st *śloka* of 32nd *prakaraṇa* of *Bṛhat ŚaṅkaraVijaya* that we have cited in the previous Appendix. The *śloka* ततः सदाशिवः is in the second *śloka* of the same *prakaraṇa*. The *śloka* तपोमहिम्ना is in fourth *śloka* there; the *śloka* सा दधार also is in the fourth *śloka* there. (Regarding the *śloka* पञ्चवर्षस्य, see text, p 59). If these similarities are considered, *BṛhatŚaṅkaraVijaya*, *Cidvilāsiya*, and the producer of this old version, it becomes clear that out of these three, one has taken material from the others. In our opinion, this old version must have been the handiwork of some अर्वाचीन, i.e., somebody of recent times. Researchers have to find out the truth.

### (b) the alternate versions

The antagonists of Kāñci Maṭha show the differences between the Devanāgarī version printed at Calcutta and the Telugu version, and argue that these are deliberately added by the Maṭha people.

Calcutta version		Telugu version
<i>prakaraṇa</i> 55, page 179	तस्मादुदङ्मार्गमवलम्ब्य	page 209
<i>prakaraṇa</i> 55, page 180	स तु नारायणः	page 210
<i>prakaraṇa</i> 62, page 190	ततः परं सरसवाणीं	page 223
<i>prakaraṇa</i> 63, page 191	तत्रैव परमगुरुर्द्वादशाब्ध	page 225
<i>prakaraṇa</i> 65, page 196	तस्मात् सर्वेषां	page 231
<i>prakaraṇa</i> 67, page 203	निजशिष्यपरम्परां शृङ्गिरिस्थानस्थां कृत्वा	page 204
<i>prakaraṇa</i> 74, page 216	ततः परं सर्वज्ञः	page 255

Note: In this Telugu version, mention of *Lingam* and Kāñci have appeared. Hence, we have to say that these changes are made by the Kāñci Maṭha traditionalists. But, Śri N. Venkaṭarāman, who is a staunch supporter of Kāñcī Pīṭha, has clearly told that this is artificial, useless book (NVSSK p 107).





## APPENDIX VII

### ŚaṅkaraVijaya Texts (continued)

#### (7) The Kūṣhmāṇḍa ŚaṅkaraVijaya

(Text, page 48)

When we were collecting information about the history of *Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda*, we were not able to procure this book; we had referred to the Appendix of Somanāthaiah's book before expressing our opinion about it (So. Śam. p 211). Now we have the whole book with us; but there arose no need to change our opinion previously expressed.

This book was given a title 'श्रीशङ्करकथामृतसार' and was published in 1905 by Śrī Yogānanda Swāmiji of Yadathore Pīṭha and the book was printed at the Bangalore Book Depot Press. After seeing the book we have made our own notes. Since it is mentioned in the original 'श्रीशङ्करविजयसङ्ग्रहे ईश्वरोपदेशो नाम प्रथमोऽध्यायः', it is clear that the author has called it as "ŚaṅkaraVijaya Sangraha. But still, the name Kūṣhmāṇḍa-ŚaṅkaraVijaya is commonly used. We shall give some *ślokas* from this here. The *ślokas* are numbered by us; it is not there in the original.

#### I Chapter

पुरा भूमण्डले कश्चिदेशः केरलसंज्ञकः ।

धनधान्यसमृद्धश्च संवृतो बहुभिर्जनैः ॥ ४ ॥

इला नाम नदी तत्र सर्वपापप्रणाशिनी ।

मरुद्वृद्धा नाम महा तटिनी<sup>1</sup> च विराजिता ॥ ५ ॥

चूर्णेति<sup>2</sup> प्रथिता लोके तटिनी पुण्यदा परा ।

---

1. alternate version 'तथा तटिनी'.

2. not mentioned as 'पूर्णा'; note the expression 'मरुद्वृद्धा'.

देवालया आश्रमाश्च तत्तीरे निवसन्ति हि ॥ ६ ॥  
 प्रख्यातं पृथिवीमध्ये पद्मनाभस्य मन्दिरम् ।  
 सर्वेषामेव लोकानां दर्शनादेव मुक्तिदम् ॥ ७ ॥  
 महत्तत्र प्रविख्यातं क्षेत्रं कालटिसंज्ञया ।  
 पुष्पितैर्फलितैर्वृक्षैर्विविधैरुपशोभितम् ॥ ८ ॥  
 कैलासाधिपतिश्शम्भुः कदाचिद्वीक्षणेच्छया ।  
 सर्वलक्षणसम्पन्नो भिक्षुरूप<sup>1</sup> समाश्रितः ॥ ९ ॥  
 चरन्कलियुगे भूमौ जनान्पापरतान्ब्रह्मन् ।  
 ब्राह्मणान्क्षत्रियान्वैश्यान्स्वधर्माचारवर्जितान् ॥ १० ॥

\* \* \*

वेदाग्निहोत्रहीनांश्च दृष्ट्वा शम्भुर्महीतले ।  
 विलोक्य कालटीक्षेत्रं सुप्रशस्तं मनोहरम् ॥ १४ ॥  
 आविर्भूयात्र दुष्टानां कर्तव्यो निग्रहो मया ।  
 इत्यालोच्य तदा स्नात्वा कालटीक्षेत्रमाविशत् ॥ १५ ॥  
 तदानीं शान्त<sup>2</sup> यतिनं दृष्ट्वैव गतभर्तृका<sup>3</sup> ।  
 देवपूजापरा नित्यं शिवभक्तिपरायणा ॥ १६ ॥  
 प्रातःस्नानार्थमायान्ती भिक्षुरूपधरं शिवम् ।  
 प्रणिपत्याथ पप्रच्छ कस्माद्देशात्समागतः ॥ १७ ॥

ईश्वरः -

आगतोऽहं<sup>4</sup> महाभागे कैलासाधिपतिः शिवः ।  
 आविर्भवामि चात्रैव सेवां कर्तुमिहार्हसि ॥ १८ ॥  
 इत्युक्त्वा खलु कूष्माण्डबीजमेकं प्रदाय च ।  
 तद्रक्षणाय यत्नेन स्तम्भमूले प्रणिक्षिप ॥ १९ ॥

1. it is mentioned here that *Īśvara* came in the form of a Sannyāsin.

2. alternate version 'इदानीं सर्व(शर्व)यतिनः'.

3. note that it is mentioned that the mother was a widow.

4. alternate version 'अगतोऽयम्'.

जलमासिञ्च्य<sup>1</sup> तन्मूले वल्लीं पुष्पं फलं तथा ।  
 मा<sup>2</sup> च्छेदय फलं पक्वं स्वयमेव पतिष्यति ॥ २० ॥  
 इत्युक्त्वान्तर्दधे शम्भुः कैलासमगमत्क्षणात् ॥

\* \* \*

इति श्रीशङ्करविजयसङ्ग्रहे ईश्वरोपदेशो नाम प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥

This chapter contains 22 *ślokas*.

## II Chapter

सा बीजं च ततः सम्यक्स्तम्भमूले निधाय च ।  
 जलमासिञ्च्य(च्य?) यत्नेन ररक्ष सुचिरं मुदा ॥ १ ॥  
 फलमेकं तदा पक्वं स्तम्भाग्राग्निपपात ह ।  
 फले च पतिते तत्र महापुरुषमीश्वरम् ॥ २ ॥  
 दृष्ट्वा बालकमादाय संररक्ष<sup>3</sup> प्रयत्नतः ।  
 तदानीं बालरुदितं श्रुत्वा तत्राखिला जनाः ॥ ३ ॥  
 आगत्य तद्गृहं शीघ्रं सबालां तामथाब्रुवन् ।  
 अपुत्रायास्तव कथं बाल एष समागतः ॥ ४ ॥  
 इत्थं जनोदितं<sup>4</sup> श्रुत्वा साऽब्रवीद्भयविह्वला ।  
 इहागत्य यतिः कश्चिद्बीजमेकं प्रदत्तवान् ॥ ५ ॥  
 रक्षेत्यवोचन्मह्यं तद्रक्षितं च मयादरात् ।  
 तत्र जातात्फलात्तद्वत्<sup>5</sup> पतितादेष बालकः ॥ ६ ॥  
 लब्धश्चान्यन्न जानेऽहमिति श्रुत्वा च ते जनाः ।  
 नारीं निर्भर्त्स्य कोपेन सर्वेऽपि स्वगृहं ययुः ॥ ७ ॥  
 ततः सा बालकं सम्यगतिहर्षादपालयत् ।  
 एतस्मिन्नन्तरे काले समागत्य बृहस्पतिः ॥ ८ ॥

1. alternate version 'बिलमासीञ्च'.

2. alternate version 'न'.

3. alternate version 'समरक्षत'.

4. alternate version 'जनवचः'.

5. alternate version 'सद्यः'.

वेदशास्त्रपुराणानि सर्वाण्युपदिदेश ह ।

ततः स वेदशास्त्रार्थं पुराणादिषु दक्षताम् ॥ ९ ॥

अगमञ्च ततः सम्यग्दिव्यज्ञानी तदाऽभवत् ।

ततः संन्यासमादाय यातो वै गुरुसन्निधिम् ॥ १० ॥

गौडपादाभिधानस्य शिष्यः सर्वविदां वरः ।

गोविन्दभगवान्प्रीत्या बालस्योपादिशन्मनुम् ॥ ११ ॥

Note the instructions of Brihaspati to the child who was born in a pumpkin; also the initiation from Govinda Bhagavatpāda. This chapter contains 12 ślokas.

### III Chapter

The Ācārya went to Badari, wrote the *Bhāṣyas*, and since his mother remembered him, came to hometown. When the brahmins there refused to help to carry out the cremation, he summoned gods (?) and got the rites performed. Then he went again to Badari, and gave *Sannyāsa* to a brahmin by name Viṣṇu Śarma. In Prayāg, Hastāmalaka became his disciple. The third disciple was Toṭaka. The Ācārya then refuted evil creeds like the *kāpālikas* in argumentation and re-established *Varnāśrama Dharma*. This chapter has 20 ślokas.

### IV Chapter

The Ācārya then went to Siddhapuri(?); there was residing a brahmin called Maṇḍana Miśra who was condemning *Sannyāśrama*. His wife's name was Suśīla. On the day of *śrāddha*, when the Ācārya sat at the position of *sālagrāma* with his legs stretched, the argument with 'कुतो मुण्डी' etc. started. [Here, the author has copied ślokas from *Mādhavīya* (ślokas 7-21)]. Further, at the instance of Vyāsa, he invited Ācārya for *Bhikṣā* (this portion is in prose). From here onwards, the composition resembles *Cidvilāsīya* closely. In this chapter, there are

37 ślokas.

### V Chapter

This chapter contains the story of debate with Vāṇi in the science of love. After the argumentation was over,

समास्थितैः सभासद्भिरित्यर्थं मानितस्तदा ।  
 वाणीं प्राह मुदा युक्तः समागच्छ मया सह ॥ ८ ॥  
 इति श्रुत्वा गुरोर्वाक्यं वाणी तु तमभाषत ।  
 आगच्छामि त्वया सार्धं पश्चान्मां नावलोकय ॥ ९ ॥  
 आलोकयसि चेत्त्वं हि गच्छामि भवनं मम ।  
 तथेत्युक्त्वा पुरो गच्छन् गुरुः पम्पापुरं प्रति ॥ १० ॥  
 आयाति वा न वेतीति पश्चाद्भागं प्रदृष्टवान् ।  
 तदागत्य गुरुं गन्तुमनुज्ञां दातुमर्हसि ॥ ११ ॥  
 इत्युक्त्वा तु तदाऽदृश्या ब्रह्मलोकमवाप सा ।

[The summary of the story upto this point has been given in the text. See page 250].

भुवं प्रदक्षिणीकृत्य जित्वा तत्र सुदुर्मदान् ।  
 षण्मतं स्थापयामास पृथिव्यां शङ्करो गुरुः ॥ १२ ॥  
 शैवं च वैष्णवं शाक्तं सौरं वैनायकं तथा ।  
 स्कान्दं च भक्तिमार्गं च(?) दर्शनानि षडेव हि ॥ १३ ॥  
 एवं क्रमेण सकलं षण्मतोद्धारणं क्रमात् ।  
 कृत्वा जित्वा च विमतान् रामसेतुमवाप सः ॥ १४ ॥  
 सुरेश्वराभिदो योगी सत्यलोकमवाप सः ।  
 पद्मपादाभिदो भिक्षुः प्राप्तवान् वैष्णवं पदम् ॥ १५ ॥  
 हस्तामलकसंज्ञस्तु शक्रलोकमवाप्तवान् ।  
 ययौ तोटकयोगी तु सूर्यलोकमनुत्तमम् ॥ १६ ॥  
 एवं शिष्यास्तु चत्वारस्तत्तद्देवांशसम्भवाः ।  
 स्वं स्वं स्थानं क्रमेणैव शङ्करानुग्रहाद्ययुः ॥ १७ ॥

ईदृशं शङ्कराचार्यचरितामृतमद्भुतम् ।

श्रोतव्यं कीर्तितव्यं च भक्त्या सर्वैर्मनीषिभिः ॥ १८ ॥

सकलभवनकर्ता सर्वपापैकहर्ता सुजननिचयभर्ता बालचन्द्रस्य धर्ता ।

अखिलसुखविधाता सर्वलोकैकनेता रजतगिरिसुयाता शङ्करः श्रीप्रदाता ॥ १९ ॥

[We are not sure whether Somanāthaiah had got the above *ślokas* describing how the disciples went to join the respective gods. It seems the book he had with him had only five chapters. In the book that we have with us, there is a 6th chapter with eight *ślokas*. There it is written that the five Pāṇḍavas became *Bhikshus* - Śaṅkara, Sureśwara, Hastāmalaka, Padmapāda and Toṭaka!]

It seems according to Somanāthaiah's book the Ācārya went to the abode of Śiva; the following are those *ślokas*:

ततः शिष्यैः परिवृतो वृषाद्रीशं गुरुर्ययौ ॥ १५ ॥

स्वायुषोऽन्तं स विज्ञाय नत्वा तत्रत्यदेवताः ।

भक्त्या कुर्वन् हरस्तोत्रं शिवलोकमवाप सः ॥ १६ ॥



## APPENDIX VIII

### Stotras Related to Ācārya's History

#### (1) Kanakalakṣmī Stava or Kanakadhārā Stuti

(Text, page 64)

अङ्गं हरेः पुलकभूषणमाश्रयन्ती भृङ्गाङ्गनेव मुकुलाभरणं तमालम् ।  
अडीकृताखिलविभूतिरपाङ्गलीला माङ्गल्यदास्तु मम मङ्गलदेवतायाः ॥ १ ॥  
मुग्धा मुहुर्विदधती वदने मुरारेः प्रेमत्रपाप्रणिहितानि गतागतानि ।  
मालादृशोर्मधुकरीव महोत्पले या सा मे श्रियं दिशतु सागरसम्भवायाः ॥ २ ॥  
<sup>1</sup> आमीलितार्थ<sup>2</sup> मधिगम्य मुदा मुकुन्दमानन्दमन्द<sup>3</sup> मनिमेषमनङ्गतन्त्रम् ।  
आकेकरस्लितकनीनिकपक्ष्मनेत्रं भूत्यै भवेन्मम भुजङ्गशयाङ्गनायाः ॥ ३ ॥  
बाह्वन्तरे मधुजितः श्रितकौस्तुभे या हारावली च<sup>4</sup> हरिनीलमणी<sup>5</sup> विभाति ।  
कामप्रदा भगवतोऽपि कटाक्षमाला कल्याणमावहतु मे कमलालयायाः ॥ ४ ॥  
कालाम्बुदालिललितोरसि कैटभारेर्धाराधरं<sup>6</sup> स्फुरति या तटिदङ्गनेव<sup>7</sup> ।  
मातुः समस्तजगतां महनीयमूर्तिः भद्राणि मे दिशतु भार्गवनन्दनायाः ॥ ५ ॥  
प्राप्तं पदं प्रथमतः खलु यत्प्रभावान्माङ्गल्यभाजि मधुमाथिनि मन्मथेन ।  
मय्यापतेत्तदिह मन्दरमीक्षणार्थं मन्दालसाक्षि<sup>8</sup> मकराकर<sup>9</sup> कन्यकायाः ॥ ६ ॥  
<sup>10</sup> विश्रामरेन्द्रपदविभ्रमदानदक्षमानन्दहेतुरधिकं मधु<sup>11</sup> विद्विषोऽपि ।

---

1. in some versions this is the fourth *śloka*.

2. alternate version 'आमीलिताक्ष'.

3. alternate version 'आनन्दकन्द'.

4. alternate version 'हारावलीव'.

5. alternate version 'नीलमयी'.

6. alternate version 'धाराधरे'.

7. alternate version 'यत्तटिदङ्गनेव'.

8. alternate version 'मन्दालसं च'.

9. alternate version 'मकरालय'.

10. in some versions this is the third *śloka*.

11. alternate version 'मुरविद्विषोऽपि'.

ईशन्निषीदतु मयि क्षणमीक्षणा<sup>१</sup>र्धमिन्दीवरोदरसहोदरमिन्दिरायाः ॥ ७ ॥

<sup>१</sup> इष्टाविशिष्टमतयोऽपि नरा यया द्रा<sup>२</sup> गृष्टास्त्रिविष्टपपदं सुलभं लभन्ते ।

दृष्टिः प्रहृष्टकमलोदरदीप्तिरिष्टां पुष्टिं कृषीष्ट मम पुष्करविष्टरायाः ॥ ८ ॥

<sup>३</sup> दद्याद्यानुपवनो द्रविडाम्बुधारामस्मिन्न किञ्चन विहङ्गशिशौ विषण्णे ।

दुष्कर्मघर्ममपहाय<sup>४</sup> चिराय दूरा<sup>५</sup> न्नारायणप्रणयिनीनयनाम्बुवाहः ॥ ९ ॥

गीर्देवतेति गरुडध्वजभामिनीति<sup>६</sup> शाकम्बरीति शशिशेखरवल्लभेति ।

सृष्टिस्थितिप्रलयसिद्धिषु<sup>७</sup> संस्थितायै तस्यै नमस्त्रिभुवनैकगुरोस्तरुण्यै ॥ १० ॥

श्रुत्यै नमोऽस्तु शुभकर्मफलप्रसूत्यै रत्यै नमोऽस्तु रमणीयगुणाश्रयायै<sup>८</sup> ।

शक्त्यै नमोऽस्तु शतपत्रनिकेतनायै पुष्ट्यै नमोऽस्तु पुरुषोत्तमवल्लभायै ॥ ११ ॥

नमोऽस्तु नालीकनिभाननायै नमोऽस्तु दुग्धोदधिजन्मभूम्यै ।

नमोऽस्तु सोमामृतसोदरायै नमोऽस्तु नारायणवल्लभायै ॥ १२ ॥

नमोऽस्तु हेमाम्बुजपीठिकायै नमोऽस्तु भूमण्डलनायिकायै ।

नमोऽस्तु देवादिदयापरायै नमोऽस्तु शार्ङ्गायुधवल्लभायै ॥ १३ ॥

नमोऽस्तु देव्यै भृगुनन्दनायै नमोऽस्तु विष्णोरुरसि स्थितायै ।

नमोऽस्तु लक्ष्म्यै कमलालयायै नमोऽस्तु दामोदरवल्लभायै ॥ १४ ॥

नमोऽस्तु कान्त्यै कमलेक्षणायै नमोऽस्तु भूत्यै भुवनप्रसूत्यै ।

नमोऽस्तु देवादिभिरर्चितायै नमोऽस्तु नन्दात्मजवल्लभायै ॥ १५ ॥

[Note: In some of the versions the *ślokas* 13, 14 and 15 are not there.]

The recitation is commonly continued with the following:]

सम्पत्कराणि सकलेन्द्रियनन्दनानि साम्राज्यदानविभवानि सरोरुहाणि<sup>९</sup> ।

1. in some versions this is the ninth *śloka*.
2. alternate version 'यया दयार्द्रदृष्ट्या'.
3. in some versions this is the eighth *śloka*.
4. alternate version 'दुष्कर्मघर्ममपनीय'.
5. alternate version 'दूरम्'.
6. alternate version 'सुन्दरीति'.
7. alternate version 'केलिषु'.
8. alternate version 'गुणार्णवायै'.
9. alternate version 'सरोरुहाक्षि'.



त्वद्वन्दनानि दुरिताहरणोद्यतानि मामेव मातरनिशं कलयन्तु मान्ये ॥ १३ ॥  
 यत्कटाक्षसमुपासनाविधिः सेवकस्य सकलार्थसम्पदः ।  
 सन्तनोति वचनाङ्गमानसैस्त्वां मुरारिहृदयेश्वरीं भजे ॥ १४ ॥  
 सरसिजनयने<sup>1</sup> सरोजहस्ते धवलतमांशुकगन्धमाल्यशोभे ।  
 भगवति हरिवल्लभे मनोज्ञे त्रिभुवनभूतिकरि प्रसीद मह्यम् ॥ १५ ॥  
 दिग्हस्तिभिः कनककुम्भमुखावसृष्टस्वर्वाहिनी विमलचारुजलप्लुताङ्गीम् ।  
 प्रातर्नमामि जगतां जननीमशेषलोकाधिनाथगृहिणीममृताब्धिपुत्रीम् ॥ १६ ॥  
 कमले कमलाक्षवल्लभे त्वं करुणापूरतरङ्गितैरपाङ्गैः ।  
 अवलोकय मामकिञ्चनानां प्रथमं पात्रमकृत्रिमं दयायाः ॥ १७ ॥  
 स्तुवन्ति ये स्तुतिभिरमीभिरन्वहं त्रयीमयीं त्रिभुवनमातरं रमाम् ।  
 गुणाधिका गुरुतरभाग्यभाजिनो भवन्ति ते भुवि बुधभाविताशयाः ॥ १८ ॥

We cannot be sure whether these last *śloka*s actually belong to this *Stotra* or not. Whatever that be, this *Stotra* does not seem to be relevant to the main story of Ācārya's life. Although the alliteration etc. exhibited here appear to agree with of Mādhaviya 'पदचित्रैः' (Ma. Śam. 4. 25), the style is not that of Ācārya. One can compare these *śloka*s with उपदेशसाहस्रि (*padya*).

## (2) Nirvāṇadaśaka Stotra - Daśaśloki

(Text, page 85)

न भूमिर्न तोयं न तेजो न वायुर्न खं नेन्द्रियं वा न तेषां समूहः ।  
 अनैकान्तिकत्वात्सुषुप्त्येकसिद्धस्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ १ ॥  
 न वर्णा न वर्णाश्रुमाचारधर्मा न मे धारणा ध्यानयोगादयोऽपि ।  
 अनात्माश्रयाहं ममाध्यासहानात्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ २ ॥  
 न माता पिता वा न देवा न लोका न वेदा न यज्ञा न तीर्थं ब्रुवन्ति ।  
 सुषुप्तौ निरस्तातिशून्यात्मकत्वात्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ ३ ॥

1. alternate version 'सरसिजनिलये'.

न सांख्यं न शैवं न तत्पाञ्चरात्रं न जैनं न मीमांसकादेर्मतं वा ।  
 विशिष्टानुभूत्या विशुद्धात्मकत्वात्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ ४ ॥  
 न चोर्ध्वं न चाधो न चान्तर्न बाह्यं न मध्यं न तिर्यङ् न पूर्वापरा दिक् ।  
 वियद्व्यापकत्वादखण्डैकरूपं तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ ५ ॥  
 न शुक्लं न कृष्णं न रक्तं न पीतं न कुब्जं न पीनं न ह्रस्वं न दीर्घम् ।  
 अरूपं तथा ज्योतिराकारवत्त्वात्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ ६ ॥  
 न शास्ता न शास्त्रं न शिष्यो न शीक्षा न च त्वं न चाहं न चायं प्रपञ्चः ।  
 स्वरूपावबोधो विकल्पासहिष्णुस्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ ७ ॥  
 न जाग्रन्न मे स्वप्नको वा सुषुप्तिर्न विश्वो न वा तैजसः प्राज्ञको वा ।  
 अविद्यात्मकत्वात्त्रयाणां तुरीयं तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ ८ ॥  
 अपि व्यापकत्वाद्धि तत्त्वप्रयोगात् स्वतःसिद्धभावादनन्याश्रयत्वात् ।  
 जगत्तुच्छमेतत्समस्तं तदन्यस्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ ९ ॥  
 न चैकं तदन्यद्द्वितीयं कुतः स्यान्न वा केवलत्वं चाकेवलत्वम् ।  
 न शून्यं न चाशून्यमद्वैतकत्वात्तदेकोऽवशिष्टः शिवः केवलोऽहम् ॥ १० ॥

[Note: We can only say that these ślokaś were popular even before the poet Mādhava].

### (3) Maniṣā Pañcakam

(Text, page 107)

सत्याचार्यस्य गमने कदाचिन्मुक्तिदायकम् ।  
 काशीक्षेत्रं प्रति सह गौर्या मार्गे तु शङ्करम् ॥ १ ॥  
 अन्त्यवेषधरं दृष्ट्वा गच्छगच्छेति चाब्रवीत् ।  
 शङ्करः सोऽपि चाण्डालस्तं पुनः प्राह शङ्करम् ॥ २ ॥  
 अन्नमयादन्नमयमथवा चैतन्यमेव चैतन्यात् ।  
 द्विजवर दूरीकर्तुं वाञ्छसि किं ब्रूहि गच्छगच्छेति ॥ ३ ॥  
 किं गङ्गाम्बुनि बिम्बितेऽम्बरमणौ चण्डालवाटीपयः-  
 पूरे चान्तरमस्ति काञ्चनघटीमृत्कुम्भयोर्वाम्बरे ।

प्रत्यग्वस्तुनि निस्तरङ्गसहजानन्दावबोधाम्बुधौ  
 विप्रोऽयं श्वपचोऽयमित्यपि महान्कोऽयं विभेदभ्रमः ॥ ४ ॥  
 जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तिषु स्फुटतरा या संविदुज्जृम्भते  
 या ब्रह्मादिपिपीलिकान्ततनुषु प्रोता जगत्साक्षिणी ।  
 सैवाहं न च दृश्यवस्त्विति दृढप्रज्ञापि यस्यास्ति चेत्  
<sup>1</sup> चण्डालोऽस्तु स तु द्विजोऽस्तु गुरुरित्येषा मनीषा मम ॥ ५ ॥  
 ब्रह्मैवाहमिदं जगच्च सकलं चिन्मात्रविस्तारितं  
 सर्वं चैतदविद्यया त्रिगुणया<sup>2</sup> शेषं मया कल्पितम् ।  
 इत्थं यस्य दृढा मतिः सुखतरे नित्ये परे निर्मले  
 चण्डालोऽस्तु स तु द्विजोऽस्तु गुरुरित्येषा मनीषा मम ॥ ६ ॥  
 शश्वन्नश्वरमेव विश्वमखिलं निश्चित्य वाचा गुरो-  
 र्नित्यं ब्रह्म निरन्तरं विमृशता निर्व्याजशान्तात्मना ।  
 भूतं भावि च दुष्कृतं प्रदहता संविन्मये पावके  
 प्रारब्धाय समर्पितं स्वपुरित्येषा मनीषा मम ॥ ७ ॥  
 या तिर्यङ्नरदेवताभिरहमित्यन्तः स्फुटा गृह्यते  
 यद्भासा हृदयाक्षदेहविषया भान्ति स्वतोऽचेतनाः ।  
 तां भास्यैः पिहितार्कमण्डलनिभां स्फूर्तिं सदा भावयन्  
 योगी निर्वृतमानसो हि गुरुरित्येषा मनीषा मम ॥ ८ ॥  
 यत्सौख्याम्बुधिलेशलेशत इमे शक्रादयो निर्वृता  
 यच्चित्ते नितरां प्रशान्तकलने लब्ध्वा मुनिर्निर्वृतः ।  
 यस्मिन्नित्यसुखाम्बुधौ गलितधीर्ब्रह्मैव न ब्रह्मविद्  
 यः कश्चित्स सुरेन्द्रवन्दितपदो नूनं मनीषा मम ॥ ९ ॥

[Note: We could not make out wherefrom the *śloka* commencing from 'सत्याचार्यस्य गमने' is taken. The commentator of AdvaitarājyaLakṣmi has stated that *Maniṣā Pañcakam* commences from

1. because of the repetition of 'एषा मनीषा मम' the *prakaraṇa* gets its name.
2. nowhere in *Bhāṣyas* the avidyā called as having the three qualities.

‘कदाचिच्छङ्कराचार्यः काशीं प्रति पुरीं ययौ’ (Ma. Śam. 6. 34). In the footnote of page 51 of *Bhagavat pādābhyudaya* of Lakṣmaṇa Sūri, it is mentioned that the śloka ‘अन्नमयादन्नमयम्’ is in *Ānandagīrīya*. But it is not found in the *Ānandagīrīya* that we have with us. Whatever that be, we will have to believe that this मनीषापञ्चक was existing somewhere already, and the story is suitably dovetailed].

#### (4) Śrī Nrisimha Karāvalambana Stotra<sup>1</sup>

(Text, page 225, 229)

श्रीमत्पयोनिधिनिकेतन चक्रपाणे भोगीश<sup>2</sup> भोगमणिरञ्जितः<sup>3</sup> पुण्यमूर्ते ।  
 योगीश शाश्वत शरण्य भवाब्धिपोत लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ १ ॥  
 ब्रह्मेन्द्ररुद्रमरुदककिरीटिकोटिसंघट्टिताङ्घ्रिकमलारुणः<sup>4</sup> कान्तिकान्त ।  
 लक्ष्मीलसत्कुचसरोरुहराजहंस लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ २ ॥  
 संसारघोरगहने चरतो मुरारे मारोग्रभीकरमृगप्रवरा<sup>5</sup> दितस्य ।  
 आर्तस्य मत्सरनिदाघनिपीडितस्य<sup>6</sup> लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ३ ॥  
 संसारकूपमतिघोरमगाधमूलं संप्राप्य दुःखशतसर्पसमाकुलस्य ।  
 दीनस्य देव कृपणा<sup>7</sup> पदमागतस्य लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ४ ॥  
 संसारसागरविशालकरालकालनक्रग्रहग्रसन<sup>8</sup> निग्रहविग्रहस्य ।  
 व्यग्रस्य रागरसनोर्मि<sup>9</sup> निपीडितस्य लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ५ ॥

1. this is called Lakshminrisimha Karuṇārāsa Stotra in the book published in Vāṇīvilās Granthamāla (Śrī Śaṅkaragranthāvalih, Vol. 11, p 300).

2. alternate version ‘भोगीन्द्र’.

3. alternate version ‘राजित’.

4. alternate version ‘अमलारुणः’.

5. alternate version ‘प्रचुरादितस्य’.

6. alternate version ‘सुदुःखितस्य’.

7. alternate version ‘कृपया’.

8. alternate version ‘ग्रसित’.

9. alternate version ‘निचयो’.

संसारवृक्षमघबीजमनन्तकर्मशाखाशतं<sup>1</sup> करणपत्रमनङ्गपुष्पम् ।  
 आरुह्य दुःखफलितं पततो<sup>2</sup> दयालो लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ६ ॥  
 संसारसर्पघनवक्त्रभयोपतीव्रदंष्ट्राकरालविषदग्ध<sup>3</sup> विनष्टमूर्ते ।  
 नागरावाहनसुधाब्धिनिवास शौरे लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ७ ॥  
 संसारदावदहनातुर<sup>4</sup> भीकरोरुज्वालावलीभिरतिदग्धतनूरुहस्य ।  
 त्वत्पादपद्मसरसी(?)शरणागतस्य<sup>5</sup> लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ८ ॥  
 संसारजालपतितस्य जगन्निवास सर्वेन्द्रियार्थबडिशाय<sup>6</sup> झषोपमस्य ।  
 प्रोत्खण्डितः<sup>7</sup> प्रचुरतालुकमस्तकस्य लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ९ ॥  
 संसारभीकरकरीन्द्रकराभिघातनिष्पिष्टमर्म<sup>8</sup> वपुषः सकलार्तिनाश ।  
 प्राणप्रयाणभवभीतिसमाकुलस्य लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ १० ॥  
 अन्धस्य मे हृतविवेकमहाधनस्य चौरैः प्रभो बलिभि<sup>9</sup> रिन्द्रियनामधेयैः ।  
 मोहान्धकूपकुहरे विनिपातितस्य लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ११ ॥  
 लक्ष्मीपते कमलनाभ सुरेश विष्णो वैकुण्ठ<sup>10</sup> कृष्ण<sup>11</sup> मधुसूदन पुष्कराक्ष<sup>12</sup> ।  
 ब्रह्मण्य केशव जनार्दन वासुदेव देवेश देहि कृपणस्य<sup>13</sup> करावलम्बम् ॥ १२ ॥  
 यन्माययोजितवपुः प्रचुरप्रवाहमग्नार्थमत्र निवहोरुकरावलम्बम् (?) ।  
 लक्ष्मीनृसिंहचरणाब्जमधुव्रतेन स्तोत्रं कृतं सुखकरं भुवि शङ्करेण<sup>14</sup> ॥ १३ ॥

1. alternate version 'शाखायुतं'.

2. alternate version 'चकितं'.

3. alternate version 'संसारसर्पविषदिग्धमहोग्रतीव्रदंष्ट्राग्रकोटिपरिदष्टविनष्टमूर्तेः'.

4. alternate version 'दहनाकर'.

5. alternate version 'सरसीरुहमागतस्य'.

6. alternate version 'बडिशाय'.

7. alternate version 'प्रोत्कम्पितः'.

8. alternate version 'निष्पीड्यमान'.

9. alternate version 'महाबलिभिः'.

10. alternate version 'यज्ञेश'.

11. alternate version 'यज्ञ'.

12. alternate version 'विश्वरूप'.

13. alternate version 'लक्ष्मीनृसिंह...'; in this verse also.

14. in Vāṇīvilās version, this happens to be first half of the *śloka*. The second half is 'ये तत्पठन्ति मनुजा हरिभक्तियुक्तास्ते यान्ति तत्पदसरोजमखण्डरूपम्'.

[Note: There is no indication here that the Ācārya sang this while his body was on fire. Even if we include the last *śloka* as part of the main *Stotra*, since it is said here that Śaṅkara made it for those who are deeply submerged in *samsāra*, we have to say that someone must have somehow linked this into the ŚaṅkaraVijaya. In the Vāṇīvilās version, the following extra *ślokas* are found:

संसारसागरनिमज्जनमुद्दमानं दीनं विलोकय विभो करुणानिधे माम् ।  
 प्रह्लादखेदपरिहारपरावतार लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ १ ॥  
 बद्ध्वा गले यमभटा बहु तर्जयन्तः कर्षन्ति यत्र भवपाशशतैर्युतं माम् ।  
 एकाकिनं परवशं चकितं दयालो लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ २ ॥  
 एकेन चक्रमपरेण करेण शङ्खं अन्येन सिन्धुतनयामवलम्ब्य तिष्ठन् ।  
 वामे करेण वरदाभयपद्मचिह्नं लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ३ ॥  
 प्रह्लादनारदपराशरपुण्डरीकव्यासादिभागवतपुङ्गवहृन्निवास ।  
 भक्तानुरक्तपरिपालनपारिजात लक्ष्मीनृसिंह मम देहि करावलम्बम् ॥ ४ ॥

### (5) Hastāmalaka Stotra

(Text, page 243-247)

[कस्त्वं शिशो कस्य कुतोऽसि गन्ता किं नाम ते त्वं कुत आगतोऽसि ।  
 एतन्मयोक्तं वद चार्भक त्वं मत्प्रीतये प्रीतिविवर्धनोऽसि ॥ १ ॥

**हस्तामलक उवाच –**

नाहं मनुष्यो न च देवयक्षौ न ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियवैश्यशूद्राः ।  
 न ब्रह्मचारी न गृही वनस्थो भिक्षुर्न चाहं निजबोधरूपः ॥ २ ॥]  
 निमित्तं मनश्चक्षुरादिप्रवृत्तौ निरस्ताखिलोपाधिराकाशकल्पः ।  
 रविलोक्योच्छेद्यनिमित्तं यथा यः स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ १ ॥  
 यमग्न्युष्णवन्नित्यबोधस्वरूपं मनश्चक्षुरादीन्यबोधात्मकानि ।  
 प्रवर्तन्त आप्त्रित्य निष्कम्पमेकं स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ २ ॥  
 मुखाभासको दर्पणे दृश्यमानो मुखत्वात्पृथक्त्वेन नैवास्ति वस्तु ।

चिदाभासको धीषु जीवोऽपि तद्वत्स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ३ ॥  
 यथा दर्पणाभाव आभासहानौ मुखं विद्यते कल्पनाहीनमेकम् ।  
 तथा धीवियोगे निराभासको यः स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ४ ॥  
 मनश्चक्षुरादेर्वियुक्तः स्वयं यो मनश्चक्षुरादेर्मनश्चक्षुरादिः ।  
 मनश्चक्षुरादेरगम्यस्वरूपः स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ५ ॥  
 य एको विभाति स्वतः शुद्धचेताः प्रकाशस्वरूपोऽपि नानेव धीषु ।  
 शरावोदकस्थो यथा भानुरेकः स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ६ ॥  
 यथानेकचक्षुःप्रकाशो रविर्नक्रमेण प्रकाशीकरोति प्रकाशयम् ।  
 अनेकाधियो यस्तथैकप्रबोधः स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ७ ॥  
 विवस्वत्प्रभातं यथारूपमक्षं प्रगृह्णाति नाभातमेवं विवस्वान् ।  
 तथा भात<sup>1</sup> आभासयत्यक्षमेकः स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ८ ॥  
 यथा सूर्य एकोऽप्स्वनेकश्चलासु स्थिरास्वप्सु चैकोऽ<sup>2</sup> विभाव्यस्वरूपः ।  
 चलासु प्रभिन्नासु धीष्वेक एव<sup>3</sup> स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ९ ॥  
 घनच्छन्नदृष्टिर्घनच्छन्नमर्कं यथा निष्प्रभं मन्यते जातिमूढः ।  
 तथा बद्धवद्भाति यो मूढदृष्टेः स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ १० ॥  
 समस्तेषु वस्तुष्वनुस्यूतमेकं समस्तानि वस्तूनि यं न स्पृशन्ति ।  
 वियद्वत्सदा शुद्धमच्छस्वरूपः स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ११ ॥  
 उपाधौ यथा भेदतासन्मणीनां तथा भेदता बुद्धिभेदेषु तेऽपि ।  
 यथा चन्द्रकाणां जले चञ्चलत्वं तथा चञ्चलत्वं तवापीह विष्णो ॥ १२ ॥

[Note: We have given the version found in the commentary of the *Mādhavīya Śaṅkara Vijaya*].

## (6) Toṭaka Prakaraṇa

(Text, page 256)

- 
1. alternate version 'यदाभात'.
  2. alternate version 'स्थिरास्वप्स्वनन्वक्'.
  3. alternate version 'एवमेकः'.

[as per *Cidvilāsīya Śaṅkara Vijaya*]

विदिताखिलशास्त्रसुधाजलधे महितोपनिषत्कथितार्थनिधे ।  
 हृदये कलये विमलं शरणं भवशङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥ १ ॥  
 करुणावरुणालय पालय मां भवसागरदुःखविदूनहृदम् ।  
 रचिताखिलदर्शनतत्त्वविदं भवशङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥ २ ॥  
 भवता जनता सुहिता भविता निजबोधविचारणचारुमते ।  
 कलयेश्वरजीवविवेकविदं भवशङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥ ३ ॥  
 भव एव भवानिति मे नितरां समजायत चेतसि कौतुकता ।  
 मम वारय मोहमहाजलधिं भवशङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥ ४ ॥  
 सुकृतेऽधिकृते बहुधा भवतो भविता पददर्शनलालसता ।  
 अतिदीनमिमं परिपालय मां भवशङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥ ५ ॥  
 जगतीमवितुं कलिताकृतयो विचरन्ति महामहसश्छलतः ।  
 अहिमांशुरिवात्र विभासि पु(गु)रो भवशङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥ ६ ॥  
 गुरुपुङ्गवपुङ्गवकेतन ते समतामयतां न हि कोऽपि सुधीः ।  
 शरणागतवत्सल तत्त्वनिधे भवशङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥ ७ ॥  
 विदिता न मया विशदैककला न च किञ्चन काञ्चनमस्ति गुरो ।  
 द्रुतमेव विधेहि कृपां सहजां भवशङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम् ॥ ८ ॥

[Note: In डिण्डिमकार 's version footnote, extra verses:

सकलं मनसा क्रियया जनितं समवेक्ष्य विनाशितया तु जगत् ।  
 निरविद्यथ कश्चिदतो निखिलादविनाशिकृते यतितव्यमिति ॥ १ ॥  
 प्रतिपित्सुरसावविनाशिपदं यतिधर्मरतो यतिमेव गुरुम् ।  
 विदितात्मकलं समुपेत्य कविः प्रणिपत्य निवेदितवान् स्वमतम् ॥ २ ॥]

भगवद्बुद्धौ मृतिजन्मजले सुखदुःखझषे पतितं व्यथितम् ।  
 कृपया शरणागतमुद्धर मामनुशाध्युपसन्नमनन्यगतिम् ॥ १ ॥  
 विनिवर्त्य रतिं विषये विषमां परिमुच्य शरीरविबद्धमतिम् ।  
 परमात्मपदे भव नित्यरतो जहि मोहमयं भ्रममात्ममते ॥ २ ॥



विसृजान्नमयादिषु पञ्चसु तामहमस्मि ममेति मतिं सततम् ।  
 दृशिरूपमनन्तमजं विगुणं हृदयस्थमवेहि सदाऽहमिति ॥ ३ ॥  
 जलभेदकृता बहुतेव रवेर्घटिकादिकृता नभसोऽपि यथा ।  
 मतिभेदकृता तु तथा बहुता तव बुद्धिदृशोऽविकृतस्य सदा ॥ ४ ॥  
 दिनकृत्प्रभया सदृशेन सदा जनचित्तगतं सकलं स्वचिता ।  
 विदितं भवताऽविकृतेन सदा यत एवमतोऽसि सदेव सदा ॥ ५ ॥

[Since it is mentioned at the end ‘इत्यादिभिर्गुरुशिष्यसंवादेन परतत्त्व-  
 व्यञ्जकैः ...सह देशिकवरं श्रीशङ्करं प्रत्यागतवानित्यर्थः’, it means there are some  
 more verses. It seems in a book entitled *Vedānta Samuccaya* pub-  
 lished by Brahmarṣi Harirāma Śarma (p 207-222), a collection of 179  
*toṭakas* are there, called *Śrutisāra Samuddharaṇa* (Bala. Śam. p 158).  
 We do not know whether this is from the same or not].

### (7) Śiva Bhujangaprayāta Stotra

(Text, page 275-277)

[गलद्दानगण्डं मिलद्भृङ्गचण्डं चलच्चारुशुण्डं जगत्त्राणशौण्डम् ।  
 लसद्दन्तकाण्डं विपद्भृङ्गचण्डं शिवप्रेमपिण्डं भजे वक्रतुण्डम् ॥]  
 अनाद्यन्तमाद्यं परं तत्त्वमर्थं चिदाकारमेकं तुरीयं त्वमेयम् ।  
 हरिब्रह्ममृग्यं परब्रह्मरूपं मनोवागतीतं महः शैवमीडे ॥ १ ॥  
 स्वशक्त्यादिशक्त्यन्तसिंहासनस्थं मनोहारिसर्वाङ्गरत्नादि<sup>१</sup> भूषम् ।  
 जटाचन्द्रगङ्गास्थिसम्पर्कमौलिं<sup>२</sup> परा(?)शक्तिमित्रं नुमः पञ्चवक्त्रम् ॥ २ ॥  
 शिवेशानतत्पूरुषाघोरवामादिभिर्ब्रह्मभि<sup>३</sup> हृन्मुखैः षड्भिरङ्गैः ।  
 अनौपम्यषट्त्रिंशकं तत्त्वविद्यामतीतं परं त्वां कथं वेत्ति को वा ॥ ३ ॥  
 प्रवालप्रवाहप्रभाशोणमर्धं मरुत्वन्मणिश्रीमहःश्याममर्धम् ।

1. alternate version ‘रत्नोरु’.

2. alternate version ‘जटाहीन्दुगङ्गास्थिशय्याक’.

3. alternate version ‘पञ्चभि’.

गुणस्यूतमेकं वपुश्चैकमन्तः<sup>1</sup> स्मरामि स्मरापत्तिसम्पत्तिहेतुम्<sup>2</sup> ॥ ४ ॥  
 स्वसेवासमायातदेवासुरेन्द्रानमन्मौलिमन्दारमालाभिषिक्तम् ।  
 नमस्यामि शम्भो पदाम्भोरुहं ते भवाम्बोधिपोतं भवानीविभाव्यम् ॥ ५ ॥  
 जगन्नाथ मन्नाथ गौरीसनाथ प्रपन्नानुकम्पिन्विपन्नार्तिहारिन् ।  
 महःस्तोममूर्ते समस्तैकबन्धो नमस्ते नमस्ते पुनस्ते नमोऽस्तु ॥ ६ ॥  
 महादेव देवेश देवाधिदेव स्मरारे पुरारे यमारे हरेति ।  
 ब्रुवाणः स्मरिष्यामि भक्त्या भवन्तं ततो मे दयाशील देव प्रसीद ॥ ७ ॥  
 विरूपाक्ष विश्वेश विश्वाधिपेश<sup>3</sup> त्रयीमूल शम्भो शिव त्र्यम्बक त्वम् ।  
 प्रसीद स्मर त्राहि पश्यावपुष्य<sup>4</sup> क्षमस्वाऽऽप्नुहीति कृपा हि क्षिपामः<sup>5</sup> ॥ ८ ॥  
 त्वदन्यः शरण्यः प्रपन्नस्य नेति प्रसीद स्मरन्नेऽव हन्याशु<sup>6</sup> दैन्यम् ।  
 न चेते भवेद्भक्तवात्सल्यहानिस्ततो मे दयालो दया<sup>7</sup> संविधेहि ॥ ९ ॥  
 अयं दानकालस्त्वहं दानपात्रं भवन्नाथ<sup>8</sup> दाता त्वदन्यं न याचे ।  
 भवद्भक्तिमेव स्थिरां देहि मह्यं कृपाशील शम्भो कृतार्थोऽस्मि तस्मात् ॥ १० ॥  
 पशुं वेत्सि चेन्मां त्वमेवा<sup>9</sup> धिरूढः कलङ्केति वा मूर्ध्नि धत्से त्वमेव<sup>10</sup> ।  
 द्विजिह्वः पुनः सोऽपि ते कण्ठभूषा त्वदङ्गीकृताः शर्व सर्वेऽपि धन्याः ॥ ११ ॥  
 न शक्नोमि कर्तुं परद्रोहलेशं कथं प्रीयसे त्वं न जाने गिरीश ।  
 तथा हि प्रसन्नोऽसि कस्यापि कान्तासुतद्रोहिणो वा पितृद्रोहिणो वा ॥ १२ ॥  
 स्तुतिं ध्यानमर्चा यथावद्विधातुं भजन्नप्यजानन् महेशावलम्बे ।  
 वसन्तं<sup>11</sup> सुतं त्रातुमग्रे मृकण्डोर्यमप्राणनिर्वापणं त्वत्पदाब्जम् ॥ १३ ॥

- 
1. alternate version 'गुणस्यूतमेतद्वपुः शैवमन्तः'.
  2. alternate version 'हेतोः'.
  3. alternate version 'विश्वादिदेव'.
  4. alternate version 'पश्यावमुक्त्यै'.
  5. alternate version 'क्षमां प्राप्नुहि त्र्यक्ष मां रक्ष मोदात्'.
  6. alternate version 'हन्यास्तु'.
  7. alternate version 'सदा'.
  8. alternate version 'भवानेव'.
  9. alternate version 'तमेव'.
  10. alternate version 'तमेव'.
  11. alternate version 'वसन्तं'.

अकण्ठे कलङ्कादनङ्गे भुजङ्गादपाणौ कपालादफालेऽनलाक्षात् ।

अमौलौ शशाङ्कादवामे कलत्रादहं देवमन्यं न मन्ये न मन्ये ॥ १४ ॥

[Note: The Vāṇivilās version has the following extra śloka:]

शिरोदृष्टिहृद्रोगशूलप्रमेहज्वरार्शोजरायक्ष्महिक्काविषार्तान् ।

त्वमाद्यो भिषक् भेषजं भस्म शम्भो त्वमुल्लाघयास्मान् वपुर्लाघवाय ॥ १ ॥

दरिद्रोऽस्म्यभद्रोऽस्मि भनोऽस्मि दूये विषण्णोऽस्मि सन्नाऽस्मि खिन्नोऽस्मि चाहम् ।

भवान् प्राणिनामन्तरात्माऽसि शम्भो ममाधिं न वेत्सि प्रभो रक्ष मां त्वम् ॥ २ ॥

त्वदक्ष्णोः कटाक्षः पतेत्त्र्यक्ष यत्र क्षणं क्ष्मा च लक्ष्मीः स्वयं तं वृणाते ।

किरीटस्फुरद्ग्रामरच्छत्रमाला कलाचीग(चिर्ग?) जक्षौमभूषाविशेषैः ॥ ३ ॥

भवान्यै भवा यापि मात्रे च पित्रे मृडाण्यै मृडायाप्यघघ्न्यै मखघ्ने ।

शिवाङ्ग्यै शिवाङ्गाय कुर्मः शिवायै शिवायाम्बिकायै नमस्त्यम्बकाय ॥ ४ ॥

भवद्गौरवं मल्लघुत्वं विदित्वा प्रभो रक्ष कारुण्यदृष्ट्यानुगं माम् ।

शिवात्मानुभाव स्तुतावक्षमोऽहं स्वशक्त्या कृतं मेऽपराधं क्षमस्व ॥ ५ ॥

यदा कर्णरन्ध्रं व्रजेत्कालवाहद्विषत्कण्ठघण्टाघणात्कारनादः ।

वृषाधीशमारुह्य दैवोपवाह्यं तदा वत्स मा भीरिति प्रीणय त्वम् ॥ ६ ॥

यदा दारुणा भाषणा भीषणा मे भविष्यन्त्युपान्ते कृतान्तस्य दूताः ।

तदा मन्मनस्त्वत्पदाम्भोरुहस्थं कथं निश्चलं स्यान्नमस्तेऽस्तु शम्भो ॥ ७ ॥

यदा दुर्निवारव्यथोऽहं शयानो लुठन्निःश्वसन् निःसृताव्यक्तवाणिः ।

तदा जह्नुकन्याजलालङ्कृतं ते जटामण्डलं मन्मनोमन्दिरं स्यात् ॥ ८ ॥

यदा पुत्रमित्रादयो मत्सकाशे रुदन्त्यस्य हा कीदृशीयं दशेति ।

तदा देवदेवेश गौरीश शम्भो नमस्ते शिवायेत्यजस्रं ब्रवाणि ॥ ९ ॥

यदा पश्यतां मामसौ वेत्ति नास्मानयं श्वास एवेति वाचो भवेयुः ।

तदा भूतिभूषं भुजङ्गावनद्धं पुरारे भवन्तं स्फुटं भावयेयम् ॥ १० ॥

यदा यातनादेहसन्देहवाही भवेदात्मदेहे न मोहो महान्ते ।

तदा काशशीतांशुसङ्काशमीश स्मरारे वपुस्ते नमस्ते स्मरामि ॥ ११ ॥

यदापारमच्छायमस्थानमद्भिर्जनैर्वा विहीनं गमिष्यामि मार्गम् ।

तदा तं निरुद्धन्कृतान्तस्य मार्गं महादेव मह्यं मनोज्ञं प्रयच्छ ॥ १२ ॥

यदा रौरवादि स्मरन्नेव भीत्या ब्रजाम्यत्र मोहं महादेव घोरम् ।  
 तदा मामहो नाथ कस्तारयिष्यत्यनाथं पराधीनमर्धेन्दुमौळे ॥ १३ ॥  
 यदा श्वेतपत्रा(?)यतालङ्घ्यशक्तेः कृतान्ताद्भयं भक्तवात्सल्यभावात् ।  
 तदा पाहि मां पार्वतीवल्लभान्यं न पश्यामि पातारमेतादृशं मे ॥ १४ ॥  
 इदानीमिदानीं मृतिर्मे भवित्रीत्यहो संततं चिन्तया पीडितोऽस्मि ।  
 कथं नाम मा भूमृता भीतिरेषा नमस्तेऽगतीनां गते नीलकण्ठ ॥ १५ ॥  
 अमर्यादमेवाहमाबालवृद्धं हरन्तं कृतान्तं समीक्ष्यास्मि भीतः ।  
 मृतौ तावकाङ्घ्र्यब्जदिव्यप्रसादाद्भवानीपते निर्भयोऽहं भवानि ॥ १६ ॥  
 जराजन्मगर्भाधिवासादिदुःखान्यसद्धानि जह्यां जगन्नाथ देव ।  
 भवन्तं विना मे गतिर्नैव शम्भो दयालो न जागर्ति किं वा दया ते ॥ १७ ॥  
 शिवायेति शब्दो नमः पूर्व एषः स्मरन्मुक्तिकृन्मृत्युहा तत्त्ववाची ।  
 महेशान मा गान्मनस्तो वचस्तः सदा मह्यमेतत्प्रदानं प्रयच्छ ॥ १८ ॥  
 त्वमप्यम्ब मां पश्य शीतांशुमौलिप्रिये भेषजं त्वं भवव्याधिशान्तौ ।  
 बहुक्लेशभाजं पदाम्भोजपोते भवाब्धौ निमग्नं नयस्वाद्य पारम् ॥ १९ ॥  
 अनुद्यल्लाटाक्षिवह्निप्ररोहैरवामस्फुरच्चारुवामोरुशोभैः ।  
 अनङ्गभ्रमद्भोगिभूषाविशेषैरचन्द्रार्धचूडैरलं दैवतैर्नः ॥ २० ॥  
 महादेव शम्भो गिरीश त्रिशूलिन्त्वयीदं समस्तं विभातीति यस्मात् ।  
 शिवादन्यथा दैवतं नाभिजाने शिवोऽहं शिवोऽहं शिवोऽहं शिवोऽहम् ॥ २१ ॥  
 यतोऽजायतेदं प्रपञ्चं विचित्रं स्थितिं याति यस्मिन् यदेकान्तमन्ते ।  
 स कर्मादिहीनः स्वयंज्योतिरात्मा शिवोऽहं शिवोऽहं शिवोऽहं शिवोऽहम् ॥ २२ ॥  
 किरीटे निशेशो ललाटे हुताशो भुजे भोगिराजो गले कालिमा च ।  
 तनौ कामिनी यस्य तत्तुल्यदेवं न जाने न जाने न जाने न जाने ॥ २३ ॥  
 अनेन स्तवेनादरादम्बिकेशं परां भक्तिमासाद्य यं ये नमन्ति ।  
 मृतौ निर्भयास्ते जनास्तं भजन्ते हृदम्भोजमध्ये सदासीनमीशम् ॥ २४ ॥  
 भुजङ्गप्रियाकल्प शम्भो मयैवं भुजङ्गप्रयातेन वृत्तेन क्लृप्तम् ।  
 नरः स्तोत्रमेतत् पठित्वोरुभक्त्या सुपुत्रायुरारोग्यमैश्वर्यमेति ॥ २५ ॥

## (8) Viṣṇu Bhujangaprayāta Stotra

(Text, page 276)

चिदन्तं विभुं निर्मलं निर्विकल्पं निरीहं निराकारमोङ्कारगम्यम् ।  
 गुणातीतमव्यक्तमेकं तुरीयं परं ब्रह्म यं वेद तस्मै नमस्ते ॥ १ ॥  
 विशुद्धं शिवं शान्तमाद्यन्तशून्यं जगज्जीवनं ज्योतिरानन्दमूर्तिम्<sup>1</sup> ।  
 आदिग्देशकालव्यवच्छेदनीयं त्रयीवर्ति<sup>2</sup> यं वेद तस्मै नमस्ते ॥ २ ॥  
 महायोगपीठे परिभ्राजमाने धरण्यादितत्त्वात्मके शक्तियुक्ते ।  
 गुणाहस्करेन्द्रानिबिम्बेन्दुमध्ये<sup>3</sup> समासीनमोङ्कर्णिकाष्टाक्षराब्जे ॥ ३ ॥  
 समानोदितानेकसूर्येन्दुकोटिप्रभापूरतुल्यद्युतिं दुर्निरीक्षम् ।  
 न शीतं न चोष्णं सुवर्णावदातं प्रसन्नं सदानन्दसंवित्स्वरूपम् ॥ ४ ॥  
 सुनासापुटं सुन्दरभूललाटं किरीटोचिताकुञ्चितस्निग्धकेशम् ।  
 स्फुरत्पुण्डरीकाभिरामायताक्षं समुत्फुल्लरत्नप्रसूनावतंसम् ॥ ५ ॥  
 लसत्कुण्डलामृष्टगण्डस्थलान्तं जपाराग(रुण्य) चोराधरं चारुहासम् ।  
 अलिव्याकुलामोदिमन्दारमालं महोरःस्फुरत्कौस्तुभोदाम<sup>4</sup> हारम् ॥ ६ ॥  
 सुरत्नाङ्गदैरन्वितं बाहुदण्डैश्चतुर्भिश्चलत्कङ्कणालङ्कृताग्रैः ।  
 उदारोदरालङ्कृतं पीतवस्त्रं पदद्वन्द्वनिर्धूतपद्माभिरामम् ॥ ७ ॥  
 स्वभक्तेषु सन्दर्शिताकारमेकं सदा भावयन् संनिरुद्धेन्द्रियस्त्वाम्<sup>5</sup> ।  
 दुराणं नरो याति संसारपारं परस्मै परेभ्योऽपि तस्मै नमस्ते ॥ ८ ॥  
 श्रिया शातकुम्भद्युतिस्निग्धकान्त्या धरण्या च दूर्वादलश्यामलाङ्ग्या ।  
 कलत्रद्वयेनामुना तोषिताय त्रिलोकीगृहस्थाय विष्णो नमस्ते ॥ ९ ॥  
 शरीरं कलत्रं सुतं बन्धुवर्गं वयस्यं धनं सत्तमं भृत्यं भुवं च ।  
 समस्तं परित्यज्य हा कष्टमेको गमिष्यामि दुःखेन दूरं किलाहम् ॥ १० ॥

1. alternate version 'रूपम्'.

2. alternate version 'वक्ति'.

3. alternate version 'गुणाहस्करे वल्लिबिम्बार्धमध्ये'.

4. alternate version 'कौस्तुभोदार'.

5. alternate version 'संनिरुद्धेन्द्रियाश्च'.

जरेयं पिशाचीव हा जीवतो मे वसामत्ति रक्तं च मांसं बलं च ।  
 अहो देव सीदामि दीनानुकम्पिन् किमत्रापि<sup>1</sup> हन्त त्वयोदासितव्यम् ॥ ११ ॥  
 कफव्याहतोष्णोल्बणश्वासवेगव्यथाविस्फुरत्सर्वमर्मास्थिबन्धाम् ।  
 विचिन्त्याहमन्त्यामचिन्त्या<sup>2</sup> मवस्थां बिभेमि प्रभो किं करोमि प्रसीद ॥ १२ ॥  
 नमस्ते जगन्नाथ विष्णो नमस्ते नमस्ते गदाचक्रपाणे नमस्ते ।  
 नमस्ते प्रपन्नार्तिहारिन् नमस्ते समस्तापराधं क्षमस्वाखिलेश ॥ १३ ॥  
 मुखे मन्दहासं नखे चन्द्रभासं करे चारुचक्रं सुरेशाभिवन्द्यम् ।  
 भुजङ्गे शयानं भजे पद्मनाभं हरेरन्यदेवं न मन्ये न मन्ये ॥ १४ ॥

[Note: The Vāṇīvilās version has the following *śloka*s instead of the last two:]

लपन्नच्युतानन्त गोविन्द विष्णो मुरारे हरे नाथ नारायणेति ।  
 यथानुस्मरिष्यामि भक्त्या भवन्तं तथा मे दयाशील देव प्रसीद ॥ १ ॥  
 भुजङ्गप्रयातं पठेद्यस्तु भक्त्या समाधाय चित्ते भवन्तं मुरारे ।  
 स मोहं विहायाशु युष्मत्प्रसादात्समाश्रित्य योगं व्रजत्यच्युतं त्वाम् ॥ २ ॥

[Note: Just as in Śiva Bhujangaprayāta, in this *Viṣṇu Bhujanga prayāta* also there is no indication that it has been told by Ācārya to his mother. This is not expressive of Viṣṇu as described in *Mādhavīya*. As in the earlier *Stotra*, here also there is alliteration; but the composition is not as tight. If it is the same *Viṣṇu Bhujangaprayāta* as told in *Cidvilāsiya*, one can only say that during his time this was known as composed by the Ācārya. The last *śloka* seems to be failing in the connection of words (anvaya). In both these *Bhujangaprayātas*, there are alternate versions; they are more in Śiva Bhujangaprayāta. In some places, the expressions are not at all intelligible]

1. alternate version 'किमद्यापि'.

2. alternate version 'असंख्याम्'.

## APPENDIX IX

### Sacred Traditions of the Maṭhas and Pontiff Lineages

#### (1) Maṭhāmnāyaḥ (मठान्नायः)

चतुर्दिक्षु प्रसिद्धासु प्रसिद्ध्यर्थं स्वनामतः ।

चतुरोऽथ मठान्कृत्वा शिष्टानस्थापयद्विभुः ॥ १ ॥

चकार संज्ञामाचार्यश्चतुर्णां नामभेदतः ।

क्षेत्रं च देवतां चैव शक्तिं तीर्थं पृथक्पृथक् ॥ २ ॥

सम्प्रदायं तथाम्नायभेदं च ब्रह्मचारिणाम् ।

एवं प्रकल्पयामास लोकोपकरणाय वै ॥ ३ ॥

१ दिग्भागे पश्चिमे क्षेत्रं द्वारिका कालिकामठः ।

कीटवालः<sup>1</sup> सम्प्रदायस्तीर्थाश्रमपदे उभे ॥ ४ ॥

देवः सिद्धेश्वरः शक्तिर्भद्रकालीति विश्रुता ।

स्वरूपब्रह्मचार्यख्य आचार्यः पद्मपादकः ॥ ५ ॥

विख्यातं गोमतीतीर्थं सामवेदश्च तद्गतम् ।

जीवात्मपरमात्मैक्यबोधो यत्र भविष्यति ॥ ६ ॥

विख्यातं तन्महावाक्यं वाक्यं तत्त्वमसीति च ।

२ द्वितीयः पूर्वदिग्भागे गोवर्धनमठः स्मृतः ॥ ७ ॥

भोगवालः सम्प्रदायस्तत्रारण्यवने पदे ।

तस्मिन्देवो जगन्नाथः पुरुषोत्तमसंज्ञितः (तम्) ॥ ८ ॥

क्षेत्रं च वृषलादेवी सर्वलोकेषु विश्रुता ।

प्रकाशब्रह्मचारीति हस्तामलकसंज्ञितः ॥ ९ ॥

आचार्यः कथितस्तत्र नाम्ना लोकेषु विश्रुतः ।

ख्यातं महोदधिस्तीर्थं ऋग्वेदः समुदाहृतः ॥

---

1. it is mentioned as 'कीटवारः' when it comes again. Perhaps it is ल here because of the rule 'रलयोरभेदः'!

महावाक्यं च तत्रोक्तं प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म चोच्यते ।

३ उत्तरस्यां श्रीमठः स्यात्क्षेत्रं बदरिकाश्रमः ॥११॥

देवो नारायणो नाम शक्तिः पूर्णगिरीति च ।

सम्प्रदायो नन्दवालस्तीर्थं चालकनन्दिका ॥१२॥

आनन्दब्रह्मचारीति गिरिपर्वतसागराः ।

नामानि तोटकाचार्यो वेदोऽथर्वणसंज्ञितः ॥ १३ ॥

महावाक्यं च तत्रायमात्मा ब्रह्मेति कीर्त्यते ।

४ तुरीयो दक्षिणस्यां च शृङ्गेर्यौ शारदामठः ॥१४॥

मलहानिकरं लिङ्गं विभाण्डकसुपूजितम् ।

यत्रास्ते ऋष्यशृङ्गस्य महर्षेराश्रमो महान् ॥ १५ ॥

वराहो देवता तत्र रामक्षेत्रमुदाहृतम् ।

तीर्थं च तुङ्गभद्राख्यं शक्तिः श्री शारदेति च ॥ १६ ॥

आचार्यस्तत्र चैतन्यब्रह्मचारीति विश्रुतः ।

वार्तिकादिब्रह्मविद्याकर्ता यो मुनिपूजितः ॥ १७ ॥

सुरेश्वराचार्य इति साक्षाद्ब्रह्मावतारकः ।

सरस्वती पुरी चेति भारत्यारण्यतीर्थकौ ॥ १८ ॥

गिर्याश्रममुखानि स्युः सर्वनामानि सर्वदा ।

सम्प्रदायो भूरिवालो यजुर्वेद उदाहृतः ॥ १९ ॥

अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति तत्र महावाक्यमुदीरितम् ।

चतुर्णां देवताशक्तिक्षेत्रनामान्यनुक्रमात् ॥ २० ॥

महावाक्यानि वेदाश्च सर्वमुक्तं व्यवस्थया ।

इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकभूपतेः ॥ २१ ॥

आम्नायस्तोत्रपठनादिहामुत्र च सद्गतिम् ।

प्राप्यान्ते मोक्षमाप्नोति देहान्ते नात्र संशयः ॥२२॥

[Note: This is copied from what is printed from Vāṇīvilās Press.  
Mahādeva Rājārāma Bodas has called this as Śringeri tradition (Bo.



p 88). It is clear that someone has written this that Ācārya established the Maṭha. In this it is said that *Sureśwarācārya* is the pontiff of Śringeri Pīṭha.

This is against *Mārkaṇḍeya Samhita* mentioning Padmapāda to Śringeri. What is 'सुरेश्वराख्यम्' in the *Ānandagīrīya* of Devanāgarī script (p 192) has been changed as 'पद्मपाद' in the *Ānandagīrīya* of Telugu script (pra. 63). We do not know why it is mentioned as *Malahānikara līṅga* instead of mentioning *Candramouliśwara līṅga*. It should be noted that the Śringeri Pīṭha pontiffs may have all names at all times ('सर्वनामानि सर्वदा'). We have already stated that the *Ānandagīrīya* and *Cidvilāsīya* mention the *Bhārati* tradition (text, page 253); also that in *Cidvilāsīya* the Ācārya instructed to arrange the दशनामी tradition].

## (2) Maṭhāmnāyaḥ (मठाम्नायः)

[शारीरब्रह्ममीमांसाभाष्यकर्ता हि सद्गुरुः ।

मुनिः श्रीशङ्कराचार्यो लोकोपकरणाय वै ॥ १ ॥

चतुर्दिशां प्रदेशेषु प्रसिद्ध्यर्थं स्वनामतः ।

चतुरः स मठान्कृत्वा शिष्यानस्थापयद्विभुः ॥ २ ॥

चकार संज्ञामाचार्यः चतुर्णां नामभेदतः ।

क्षेत्रं च देवतां चैव शक्तिं तीर्थं पृथक्पृथक् ॥ ३ ॥

सम्प्रदायांश्च नाम्नां च भेदं च ब्रह्मचारिणाम् ।

चतुर्णां च मठानां च शिष्यान्देवान्व्यवस्थया

एवं प्रकल्पयामास लोकोपकरणाय वै ॥]

[Note: The above śloka in square brackets are somewhat similar to the previous *Maṭhāmnāya*. We do not know whether someone has

added it here or whether it was like this originally. If it be so, it bears witness for saying that it is not written by Ācārya].

### अथ पूर्वाम्नायाः

[Note: Here we give two *Āmnāyās* - one at the upper part of the page and one below. The one that is above is according to Kāñci Maṭha; the lower one, since it is published by *Navabhārati Karyālaya*, can be held to be in accordance to the Dwārakā Maṭha. But, *Consise History of Dwārakā Maṭha* (1940; p 47-49) has accepted the *Āmnāya* version that is given in the upper part.

The upper *Āmnāya* places Padmapāda at Dwārakā; the lower one places Viśwarūpa. Since Padmapāda is accepted in the *Concise History of Dwārakā Maṭha* (1940; p 8), we do not know how Viśwarūpa has come into the picture here. Readers are to note that as a result of this change, Hastāmalaka has been transferred to Śringerī].

१ \*पश्चिमे काळिकापीठं द्वारकाक्षेत्र उच्यते<sup>1</sup> ।

कीटवारः सम्प्रदायस्तीर्थाश्रमपदे उभे<sup>2</sup> ॥ १ ॥

देवः सिद्धेश्वरः शक्तिर्भद्रकालीति विश्रुता ।

स्वरूपब्रह्मचार्याख्य आचार्यः पद्मपादकः ॥ २ ॥

विख्यातं गोमतीतीर्थं सामवेदस्तथोच्यते ।

तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यं च जीवात्मपरमात्मनोः ।

एकीभावं विनिर्दिश्य नामान्युक्तान्यनुक्रमात्(?) ॥ ३ ॥

२ \*द्वितीयः पूर्वदिग्भागे गोवर्धनमठः स्मृतः ।

भोगवारः सम्प्रदायो वनारण्यपदे तथा ॥ ४ ॥

तस्मिन्देवो जगन्नाथः पुरुषोत्तमसंज्ञकः ।

क्षेत्रं च सर्वलोकेषु तन्नाम्नैव हि विश्रुतम् ॥ ५ ॥

1. alternate version 'प्रथमः पश्चिमाम्नायः शारदामठ उच्यते'.

2. alternate version 'तस्य तीर्थाश्रमौ शुभौ'.



**\_\_\_\_\_**

क्षेत्रं सत्यव्रतं नाम तीर्थं कम्पानदी वरा ॥ १७ ॥

देवस्तत्र तथैकाम्रनाथ ऋग्वेद ईरितः ।

शक्तिः श्रीकामकोटचेव प्रणवश्चोपदेशवाक् ॥ १८ ॥

शुद्धा सरस्वती चेन्द्रानन्दपूर्वा च भारती ।

भगवत्पाद इत्यादिनामान्यन्यानि च स्वतः ॥ १९ ॥

मिथ्यावारः सम्प्रदायः परिव्राजकसंज्ञितः ।

आचार्यः शङ्कराचार्यस्तत्राद्वैतप्रवर्तकः ॥ २० ॥

इति मुख्याम्नायः

### सम्प्रदायनिर्वचनम्

कीटवारो भोगवारानन्दवारौ तथैव च ।

भूरिवारश्च चत्वारः पूर्वाम्नाये प्रकीर्तिताः ॥ २१ ॥

मुख्याम्नाये तु यन्मिथ्या वार्यते ब्रह्मणः परम् ।

मिथ्यावार इति ख्यातः सम्प्रदायस्ततो गुरोः ॥ २२ ॥

कीटं पातकमित्युक्तं वार्यते येन जीविनाम् ।

सम्प्रदायो यतीनां च कीटवारः स उच्यते <sup>1</sup> ॥ २३ ॥

भोगो विषय इत्युक्तो वार्यते येन जीविनाम् ।

सम्प्रदायो यतीनां च भोगवारः स उच्यते ॥ २४ ॥

भूरिशब्देन सौवर्णं वार्यते येन जीविनाम् ।

सम्प्रदायो यतीनां च भूरिवारः स उच्यते ॥ २५ ॥

आनन्देति विलासो यो वार्यते येन जीविनाम् ।

सम्प्रदायो यतीनां चानन्दवारः स उच्यते ॥ २६ ॥

---

I. it is mentioned at the end of *Navabhārati Maṭhāmnāya*:

कीटादयो विशेषेण वार्यन्ते जीवजन्तवः ।

भूतानुकम्पया नित्यं कीटवारः स उच्यते ॥

भोगो विषय इत्युक्तो वार्यते येन जीविनाम् ।

सम्प्रदायो यतीनां च भोगवारः स उच्यते ॥

आनन्देति विलासश्च वार्यते येन जीविनाम् ।

सम्प्रदायो यतीनां चानन्दवारः स उच्यते ॥

भूरिशब्देन सौवर्णं वार्यते येन जीविनाम् ।

सम्प्रदायो यतीनां च भूरिवारः स उच्यते ॥

वसिष्ठो भार्गवश्चैव काश्यपस्तदनन्तरम् ।

भारद्वाजश्च चत्वारि गोत्राणि कथितानि वै ॥ २७ ॥

[Note: We do not understand why the *Gotras* are mentioned here. In one of our books, it is written on a side that one *Gotraṣi* for each of the disciples' Maṭhas, and four *Gotraṣis* for the main Maṭha].

अथोत्तराम्नायाः

उक्ताश्चत्वार आम्नायाः पूर्वेषां तु पृथक्पृथक् ।

अथोर्ध्वशेषा गौणा ये तेऽपि ज्ञानेन सिद्धिदाः ॥ २८ ॥

पञ्चमस्तूर्ध्व आम्नायः सुमेरुमठ उच्यते ।

सम्प्रदायोऽथ काशी स्यात्पदं नाम्नाभिदं स्मृतम् ॥ २९ ॥

कैलासः(कैवल्य)क्षेत्रमित्युक्तं देवतास्य निरञ्जनः ।

देवी माया तथाचार्य ईश्वरः परिकीर्तितः ॥ ३० ॥

तीर्थं सुमानसं प्रोक्तं त्रैलोक्यशरणं महत् ।

तत्र संहारमार्गेण संन्यासं महदाश्रयेत् ॥ ३१ ॥

षष्ठे त्वात्मनि चाम्नाये परमात्ममठो महान् ।

सत्सन्तोषः सम्प्रदायः परं योगमनुस्मरन् ॥ ३२ ॥

तस्मिन्सरोवरं प्रोक्तं परहंसोऽस्य देवता ।

देवी स्यान्मानसी मायाद्याचार्यश्चेतनाह्वयः ॥ ३३ ॥

त्रिपुटी तीर्थमित्युक्तं सर्वपुण्यप्रदायकम् ।

भवपाशविनाशाय संन्यासं तत्र चाश्रयेत् ॥ ३४ ॥

सप्तमे निष्कलाम्नाये शुद्धशास्त्रार्थतो मठः ।

सम्प्रदायोऽस्य तत्सत्त्वं श्रीगुरोः पादुके पदे ॥ ३५ ॥

तत्रानुभूतिः क्षेत्रं स्याद्विश्वरूपोऽस्य देवता ।

देवी चैतन्यशक्तिः स्यादाचार्यः सद्गुरुस्ततः ॥ ३६ ॥

शास्त्रस्य श्रवणं तीर्थं जन्ममृत्युविनाशनम् ।

पूर्णानन्दक्रमेणैव संन्यासं तत्र चाश्रयेत् ॥ ३७ ॥

इत्युत्तराम्नायाः

इत्याम्नायाष्टकम्

The मुख्याम्नाय and उत्तराम्नाय that are here, are not there in other *Ām-nāyas*. It is special for the Kāñci tradition. The serial numbers shown here are ours. In the conclusion, the following *śloka* is there:

चत्वारः पूर्व आम्नायाः समुख्याश्चोत्तरास्त्रयः ।

सम्प्रदायस्तथा पञ्च नामानि दश चेरितम् ॥

After ending with ‘इति श्रीशङ्कराचार्यसत्पथे मठाम्नायाः’, a note at the end says: ‘इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यवर्य श्रीमच्छङ्करभगवत्पूज्यपादशिष्यश्रीसर्वज्ञ-चित्सुखाचार्यविरचिते बृहच्छङ्करविजये आम्नाय तद्भेदनिर्वचनम् नाम श्रीमठाम्नायापेक्षित-विषयसुनिरूपकं त्रयोदशम् प्रकरणम्’

[Note: We have left off the details regarding the names *tīrtha*, *āśrama* etc. here. This book is labelled as ‘श्रीकल्पद्रुमभजनगुरुस्वामिशर्मणा कुम्भकोणस्थापितायां श्री विद्या मुद्राक्षरशालायां मुद्रापितो विजयतेतराम् १८९४’. The copy of the book was given to us by Śrī Pūrṇānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji].

### (3) Maṭhāmṇāyabhāgaḥ (मठाम्नायभागः)

गोवर्धनमठे रम्ये विमलापीठसंज्ञके ।

पूर्वाम्नाये भोगवारे श्रीमत्काश्यपगोत्रजः ॥

माधवस्य सुतः श्रीमान् सनन्दन इति श्रुतः ।

प्रकाशब्रह्मचारी च ऋग्वेदी सर्वशास्त्रवित् ॥

श्रीपद्मपादः प्रथमाचार्यत्वेनाभ्यषिच्यत ।

[Note: This has been cited by *Baladeva Upādhyāya* (Bala. Śam. p 166)].

### (4) Maṭhāmṇāyasetuḥ (मठाम्नायसेतुः)

इदं परं पदं साक्षात्परिव्राजकसन्ततेः ।

- अस्मिंस्तिष्ठन्ति ये पीठे कामकोटिसमाह्वये ॥ १ ॥  
 शारदापीठनाम्ना तु प्रसिद्धे जगतीतले ।  
 ते सर्वदेशसञ्चारे सम्भवन्त्वकुतोभयाः ॥ २ ॥  
 एषामाज्ञा न चोल्लङ्घ्या यदिदं मे परं पदम् ।  
 मन्नाम्नैव भविष्यन्ति मत्पीठे मत्समाश्रयाः ॥ ३ ॥  
 ब्रह्मचर्याद्धि संन्यस्ता नेष्यन्तेऽन्ये मदाश्रये ।  
 देशानामपि सर्वेषामेषामाचार्यकं स्मृतम् ॥ ४ ॥  
<sup>1</sup> यस्त्वद्वैतमठे स्थित्वा शारदापीठनिन्दकः ।  
 स याति नरकं घोरं ता(या)वदाभूतसम्प्लवम् ॥ ५ ॥  
 अथाम्नायचतुर्णां च मठानां शिष्ययोगिनाम् ।  
 सविस्तरं विवेकाय वक्ष्ये वः वृणुत द्विजाः ॥ ६ ॥
- १ प्रथमः पश्चिमाम्नायः कालिकामठ उच्यते ।  
 कीटवारः सम्प्रदायस्तस्य तीर्थाश्रमौ पदे ॥ ७ ॥  
 क्षेत्रं च द्वारकानाम् देवः सिद्धेश्वरः स्मृतः ।  
 भद्रकाली तु देवी स्यादाचार्योऽद्य सुरेश्वरः ॥ ८ ॥  
 गोमतीतीर्थममलं ब्रह्मचारी स्वरूपकः ।  
 सामवेदस्य वक्ता च तत्र धर्मं समाचरेत् ॥ ९ ॥
- २ द्वितीयस्तूत्तराम्नायो ज्योतिष्मान् हि मठो भवेत् ।  
 आनन्दवारो विज्ञेयः सम्प्रदायोऽस्य सिद्धिकृत्  
 पदानि तस्य ख्यातानि गिरिपर्वतसागराः ।  
 बदरीशाश्रमः क्षेत्रं देवो बदरिकेश्वरः ॥ ११ ॥  
 देवी पुन्नागिरी ज्ञेया आचार्यस्तोटकः स्मृतः ।  
 तीर्थं त्वलकनन्दाख्यमानन्दो ब्रह्मचार्यभूत् ॥  
 तस्य वेदो ह्यथर्वाख्यस्तत्र धर्मं समाचरेत् ।
- ३ तृतीयः पूर्वदिग्भागे गोवर्धनमठः स्मृतः ॥ १३ ॥

1. what was cited earlier (text, page 253) in 'Cīdvilāsīya' and in 'Ānandagiriya' appears to be altered a little here.



- भोगवारः सम्प्रदायो वनारण्यपदे स्मृते ।  
 देवतास्य जगन्नाथः क्षेत्रं च पुरुषोत्तमम् ॥ १४ ॥  
 देवी च विमला तस्मिन्नाचार्यः पद्मपादकः ।  
 तीर्थं महोदधिः प्रोक्तं ब्रह्मचारी प्रकाशकः ॥ १५ ॥  
 शुक्लं यजुस्तस्य वेदस्तत्र धर्मं समाचरेत् ।  
 ४ तुरीयो दक्षिणाम्नायः शृङ्गेरीश्रीमठो भवेत् ॥ १६ ॥  
 भूरिवाराह्यस्तस्य सम्प्रदायः सुशोभनः ।  
 सरस्वती भारती च पुरीत्येतत् पदत्रयम् ॥ १७ ॥  
 वाराहो देवता तत्र रामक्षेत्रमुदाहृतम् ।  
 शारदा तस्य देवी स्यात्सर्वकामफलप्रदा ॥ १८ ॥  
 पृथ्वीधवा(रा)ख्य आचार्यस्तुङ्गभद्रेति तीर्थकम् ।  
 चैतन्याख्यो ब्रह्मचारी कृष्णेन यजुषायुतः ॥  
 उक्ताश्चत्वार आम्नाया<sup>1</sup> यतीनां हि पृथक्पृथक् ।  
 ते सर्वे मत्पदाचार्य<sup>2</sup> नियोगेन यथाविधि ॥ २० ॥  
 प्रयोक्तव्याः स्वधर्मेषु शासनीयास्ततोऽन्यथा ।  
 कुर्वन्त एव सततमटनं धरणीतले ॥ २१ ॥  
 विरुद्धाचारसम्प्राप्तौ मत्पदस्थ<sup>3</sup> समाज्ञया ।  
 लोकान्संशीलयन्त्वेते<sup>4</sup> स्वधर्माप्रतिरोधतः ॥ २२ ॥  
 सिन्धुसौवीरसौराष्ट्रमहाराष्ट्रास्तथान्तराः ।  
 देशाः पश्चिमदिक्स्था ये कालिकापीठशासने<sup>5</sup> ॥ २३ ॥  
 कुरुकाश्मीरकाम्भोजपाञ्चालाः गौडकोसलाः<sup>6</sup> ।

1. alternate version 'आम्नायाः कथिता ह्येते' (Bala. Śam. p 209: from here abbreviated as 'B.'). Similarly, the आम्नाय published by Navabhārati Kāryālaya as 'N.'

2. alternate version 'चतुराचार्याः' B.

3. alternate version 'आचार्याणां' B. and N.

4. alternate version 'संशीलयन्त्वेव' B. and N.

5. alternate version 'शारदापीठसात्कृताः' N.; śloka from 23 to 27 are not in B.

6. alternate version 'पाञ्चालादिविभागतः' N.

ज्योतिर्मठवशा देशा उदीच्यां दिशि संस्थिताः<sup>1</sup>  
अङ्गवङ्गकलिङ्गाश्च मगधोत्कलबर्बराः ।  
गोवर्धनमठाधीना देशाः प्राच्यं व्यवस्थिताः ॥ २५ ॥  
आन्ध्रौद्रलाटकर्नाटकोङ्कणास्तेङ्कणा अपि ।  
शृङ्गेर्यधीना देशास्ते संश्रिता दक्षिणापथम्<sup>2</sup>  
मर्यादैषा सुविज्ञेया शिष्यपीठविधानभृत् ।  
तान्सर्वान्शासयन्त्वेते आचार्या मत्पदस्थिताः<sup>3</sup> ॥ २७ ॥  
स्वस्वराष्ट्रप्रतिष्ठित्यै संचारः सुविधीयताम् ।  
तैरन्यतो न गम्येत मन्मठ्याः सर्वतश्चराः<sup>4</sup> ॥ २८ ॥  
वर्णाश्रमसदाचारा मामकै<sup>5</sup> र्ये प्रसाधिताः ।  
रक्षणीयास्त एवैतैः<sup>6</sup> स्वे स्वे भागे यथाविधि ॥  
यतो विनष्टिर्महती धर्मस्यात्र प्रजायते ।  
मान्ध्यं संत्याज्यमेवात्र दाक्ष्यमेव समाश्रयेत् ॥ ३० ॥  
परस्परविभागे तु प्रवेशोऽन्यस्य नेष्यते ।  
परस्परेण कर्तव्या ह्याचार्याणां व्यवस्थितिः ॥ ३१ ॥  
मर्यादाया विनाशेन भ्रश्येरन्गौरवान्मठाः<sup>7</sup> ।  
कलहव्यूह<sup>8</sup> सम्पत्तिरतस्तं परिवर्जयेत् ॥ ३२ ॥  
परिव्राडार्यमर्यादो मामकीनान् यथाविधि ।  
चतुष्पीठाधिकः सत्तां बिभ्रत्सम्पूजयेत्<sup>9</sup> सदा ॥  
शुचिर्जितेन्द्रियो वेदवेदाङ्गादिविशारदः ।

1. alternate version 'उदीचीदिगवस्थिताः' N.; this *śloka* is there after *ślokas* 25, 26.

2. alternate version 'आन्ध्रविडकर्णाटकेरलादिप्रभेदतः । ...ह्यावाचीदिगवस्थिताः' N.

3. alternate version 'मर्यादैषा सुविज्ञेया चतुर्मठविधायिनी ।

तामेतां समुपाश्रित्य आचार्या सम्प्रतिष्ठिताः ॥' N.

4. alternate version 'मठे तु नियतावास आचार्यस्य न युज्यते' B. and N.

5. alternate version 'अस्माभिर्ये' B. and N.

6. alternate version 'एते' B. and N.

7. alternate version 'लुप्येरन्नियमाः शुभाः' B. and N.

8. alternate version 'कलहाङ्गार' B. and 'कलहागार' N.

9. alternate version 'चतुष्पीठाधिगां सत्तां प्रयुज्याच्च पृथक्पृथक्' B. and N.



सुधन्वाद्या महाराजाः हालाद्याश्च महीश्वराः<sup>1</sup> ।  
 धर्मपारम्परीमेतां पालयन्तु निरन्तरम् ॥ ४५ ॥  
 ब्रह्मस्तम्बोदरे भूत्वा यः पीठं दूषयेदमुम् ।  
 आसुर्यानित्य लोकान्स मज्जत्यन्धे तमोभरे<sup>2</sup> ॥ ४६ ॥  
 ब्रह्मक्षत्रादिजो भूत्वा भारतीपीठदूषकः<sup>3</sup> ।  
 परार्थ्याच्छयवते चान्ते पैशाचीं योनिमाप्नुयात् ॥ ४७ ॥  
 पीठमेनं तथान्यांश्च शिष्याणां चतुरः शुचीन् ।  
 यो दूषयति दर्पेण नरः स पतितो भवेत्<sup>4</sup> ॥ ४८ ॥  
 न संव्यवहार्योऽस्मास्वग्रजन्मसु सर्वतः ।  
 नास्तिकत्वेन निर्हार्यः चौढ(बौद्ध)वत्कर्मभूमितः ॥  
 आसेतोरहिमाद्रेश्च सेव्या मत्पीठसंश्रयाः ।  
 तथा मच्छिष्यपीठीयाः सर्वेऽप्याचार्यसम्मिताः ॥  
 शृङ्गेरीमठ आचार्यो भारताख्यो बहूत्तमः ।  
 कालिकामठ<sup>5</sup> आचार्य आश्रमाख्यः सुनिर्मलः ॥  
 ज्योतिर्मठस्य विदित आचार्यः पर्वताभिधः<sup>6</sup> ।  
 गोवर्धनस्य विज्ञेयोऽरण्यनामा विचक्षणः ॥ ५२ ॥  
<sup>7</sup> कामकोटीमठे त्वस्मिन् गुरुरिन्द्रसरस्वती ।  
 सर्वोत्तरः सर्वसेव्यः सार्वभौमो जगद्गुरुः ॥ ५३ ॥  
 अन्ये तु गुरवः प्रोक्ता जगद्गुरुरयं परः ।  
 नास्य शासनमुल्लङ्घ्य नियम्यः<sup>8</sup> पीठभागभवेत् ॥

1. alternate version 'सुधन्वा हि महाराजस्तदन्ये च नरेश्वराः' B. and N.

2. this *śloka* is not there in B. and N.

3. alternate version 'ब्रह्मक्षत्रकुले भूत्वा भारतीपीठवञ्चकः' N.

4. after 48th *śloka*, next *śloka* is not there in B. and N.

5. alternate version 'शारदामठ' N.

6. alternate version '.....सततं पर्वताख्यो निगद्यते ।

शृङ्गवेरमठे नित्यं भारती बहुभावनः ॥' N.

7. *ślokas* 53-56 are not there in B. and *ślokas* 53-58 are not there in N.

8. alternate version 'नियमी'

<sup>1</sup> सवर्णाश्रमधर्माश्च पुण्यभूमौ विचारयेत् ।  
 चतुष्पीठेषु शिष्याणां तदुद्दिष्टो गुरुर्भवेत् ॥ ५५ ॥  
 निर्णयोऽसौ सुविज्ञेयः परपीठाधिकारिणाम् ।  
 नात्रव्यत्यय आदेयः कदाचिदपि वैदिकैः ॥ ५६ ॥  
 अन्ये मठ्यासु चत्वार आचार्यं मत्पदे स्थितम् ।  
 सम्प्रदायैश्चतुर्भिः स्वैः समर्चन्तु यथाविधि<sup>2</sup> ॥ ५७ ॥  
 स्वं स्वं देशं स्वमात्राभिः पालयन्तु प्रजार्चिताः ।  
 इतस्ततः सञ्चरन्तः सततं धर्मवृद्धये ॥  
 चातुर्वर्ण्यं यथा योगं वाङ्मनः कायकर्मभिः ।  
 गुरोः पीठं समर्चेत विभागानुक्रमेण वै<sup>3</sup> ॥ ५९ ॥  
 धरामालम्ब्य राजानः प्रजाभ्यः करभागिनः ।  
 कृताधिकारा आचार्या धर्मतस्तद्वदेव हि ॥ ६० ॥  
 धर्मो मूलं मनुष्याणां स चाचार्यावलम्बनः ।  
 तस्मादाचार्यसुमणेः शासनं सर्वतोऽधिकम्<sup>4</sup> ॥  
 आचार्यैः क्षिप्तदण्डास्तु कृत्वा पापानि मानवाः ।  
 निर्मलाः स्वर्गमायान्ति सन्तः सुकृतिनो यथा ॥ ६२ ॥  
 तं नामाचार्योपदेशो दण्डश्च पालयते ।  
 तस्माद्राजाचार्यौ अनिन्द्यावनिन्द्यौ<sup>5</sup> ॥ ६३ ॥  
 इत्येवं मनुरप्याह गौतमोऽपि विशेषतः ।  
 विशिष्टशिष्टाचारोऽपि मूलादेव प्रसिद्ध्यति ॥ ६४ ॥  
 तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन शासनं रक्ष्यतामिदम्<sup>6</sup> ।  
 आचार्यस्य विशेषेण ह्यौदार्यभरभागिनः ॥ ६५ ॥

1. alternate version 'न वर्णाश्रम'

2. alternate version 'मठाश्चत्वार आचार्याश्चत्वारश्च धुरन्धराः ।  
सम्प्रदायाश्च चत्वार एषा धर्मव्यवस्थितिः' N.

3. the previous *śloka* is not there in B. and N.

4. 65th *śloka* is there after this in B.; alternate version 'शासनं सर्वसम्मतम्'.

5. the *śloka* is exactly like this in N. it is not there in B.

6. alternate version 'सर्वसम्मतम्' N.

धर्मपद्धतिरेषा हि जगतः स्थितिहेतवे ।  
 सर्ववर्णाश्रमाणां हि यथाशास्त्रं विधीयते ॥ ६६ ॥  
 कृते विश्वगुरुर्ब्रह्मा त्रेतायामृषिसत्तमः ।  
 द्वापरे व्यास एव स्यात्कलावत्र भवाम्यहम् ॥ ६७ ॥  
 अथ सन्त्युत्तराम्नायास्ते विज्ञानैकविग्रहाः ।  
 पञ्चमस्तूर्ध्व आम्नायः सुमेरुर्मठ उच्यते<sup>1</sup> ॥ ६८ ॥  
 सम्प्रदायोऽस्य काशी(?) स्यात्सत्यज्ञानाभिदे पदे ।  
 कैलासो क्षेत्रमित्युक्तं देवतास्य निरञ्जनः ॥  
 देवी माया तथाऽऽचार्य ईश्वरोऽस्य प्रकीर्तितः ।  
 तीर्थं तु मानसं प्रोक्तं ब्रह्मतत्त्वावगाहि तत् ॥  
 तत्र संयोगमात्रेण संन्यासं समुपाश्रयेत् ।  
 सूक्ष्मवेदस्य वक्ता च तत्र धर्मं समाचरेत् ॥ ७१ ॥  
 षष्ठस्त्वात्माख्य आम्नायः परमात्मा मठो महान् ।  
 सत्संतोषः<sup>2</sup> सम्प्रदायः परं योगमनुस्मरेत् ॥  
 नभः सरोवरं क्षेत्रं परहंसोऽस्य देवता ।  
 देवी स्यान्मानसी माया आचार्यश्चेतनाह्वयः ॥ ७३ ॥  
 त्रिपुटीतीर्थमुत्कृष्टं सर्वपुण्यप्रदायकम् ।  
 भवपाशविनाशाय संन्यासं तत्र चाश्रयेत् ॥ ७४ ॥  
 वेदान्तवाक्यवक्ता च तत्र धर्मं समाचरेत् ।  
 सप्तमो निष्कलाम्नायः सहस्रार्कद्युतिर्मठः ॥ ७५ ॥  
 सम्प्रदायोऽस्य सच्छिष्यः श्रीगुरोः पादुके पदे ।  
 तत्रानुभूतिः क्षेत्रं स्याद्विश्वरूपोऽस्य देवता ॥  
 देवी चिच्छक्तिराख्याता सद्गुरुर्देशिकः स्मृतः ।  
 सच्छास्त्रश्रवणं तीर्थं जरामृत्युविनाशनम् ॥  
 पूर्णानन्दप्रसादेन संन्यासं तत्र चाश्रयेत् ।

1. further *śloka*s are not there in B. and N.

2. alternate version सत्वतोषः

इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यवर्य श्रीमच्छङ्करभगवत्पूज्यपादानाम् अनुशासने  
मठाम्नायसेतौ आम्नायविस्तरः सम्पूर्णः ॥

██████████ ███████████ ███████████ ███████████ ███████████ ███████████ ███████████

*Śri Baladeva Upādhyāya* (Bala. Śam. p 209), as well as those who have printed *Mathāmnāya* at the *Navabhārati* press, have published

the above *śloka*s commencing from ‘उक्ताश्चत्वार आम्नायाः’ under the name *Mahānuśāsana*. We have shown the differences between these versions by abbreviations ‘B.’ and ‘N.’ in the footnotes. Research has to be carried out to find whether (i) *Mahānuśāsana* was in some form earlier, and was altered by the Kāñci traditionalists to show their speciality by adding some *śloka*s and called it *Mahāmnāyasetu*’, or (ii) others have selected some *śloka*s from *Mahāmnāyasetu*, altered and published under the name *Mahānuśāsana*.

**Points on which discussion has to be carried out regarding Maṭhāmnāyas:**

(1) Who wrote them? Why the names, the order etc. in them are different? (2) What evidence is there that the Ācārya wrote either the *Mahānuśāsana* or the *Mahāmnāyasetu*? (3) Each Maṭha is said to have its own tradition like Bhogavāra, Kīṭavāra etc.; the descriptive *śloka*s are also given. Are these traditions in vogue now - at least as residual of the past - in any of the Maṭhas? If yes, what is the source of these? (4) Each Maṭha is said to have a god and a goddess; for example Siddheśwara, Bhadra Kāli. Is this division of god and goddess present there even now? If that be so, how come both the Dwārakā Maṭha and the Kāñci Maṭha also call themselves as ‘Śārādā Maṭha’? (5) On what principle the Maṭhas have been allotted one Veda and one *Mahāvākya* each? For example, will the allotted Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda and ‘ahaṃ brahmāsmi’ suit the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha? Although it is mentioned in *Śukarahasyopanishad* that the Mahāvakyas are only four, has it been decided by Ācārya or by some other author of Vedānta tradition? Are they initiation *Mantras*? Some people hold that the *Mahāvākya* of Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha is ‘om tatsat’; also we have seen the



expression 'Pṛaṇavaścopadeśavāk' in the *Āmnāyāṣṭaka*. How is this (see text, page 90) relevant? (6) Is the distribution of names to the *Sannyāsins* of the Maṭhas from the 'Daśanāmī' traditional names all right? For example, in one *āmnāya* the Śringeri Maṭha is allotted only Saraswati, Bhārati and Purī; and in another *āmnāya* some more names - Why is it given this way?

There is another complicated point. Not all Maṭhas have accepted the *Maṭhāmnāyasetu*. When was it released? Is there any historical evidence that the 'Maulāmnāya' - Āmnāya of the original Maṭha - contained in it was accepted by the other Maṭhas at any time? We do not have satisfactory answers till now, for any of these.

### The Yogapaṭṭas

It is well known that the pontiffs of Maṭhas as well as free *Sannyāsins* have certain special names. The details of these names are given in the following *śloka*s. We have taken them from the 'Maṭhāmnāya' of *Navabhārati Kāryālaya* and from *Baladeva Upādhyāya's* book.

तीर्थाश्रमवनारण्यगिरिपर्वतसागराः ।

सरस्वती भारती च पुरी नामानि वै दश ॥ १ ॥

त्रिवेणीसङ्गमे तीर्थे तत्त्वमस्यादिलक्षणे ।

स्नायात् तत्त्वार्थभावेन तीर्थनामा स उच्यते ॥ २ ॥

2. One who bathes in the consummation of the three rivers, i.e., *Tat Tvam Asi* etc., dwelling in the knowledge of Truth, is called by name "Tīrtha".

आश्रमग्रहणे प्रौढ आशापाशविवर्जितः ।

यातायातविनिर्मुक्त एष आश्रम उच्यते ॥ ३ ॥

3. One who is fully learned about the stage of life, who is devoid

of bondage of desires, and is free from the cycle of birth and death, is called by name “Āśrama”.

[alternate version ‘एतदाश्रमलक्षणम्’. The follower of the rules of the Āśrama; who puts on effort to get liberated from the cycle of birth and death by way of getting knowledge].

सुरम्ये निर्जने स्थाने वने वासं करोति यः ।

आशापाशविनिर्मुक्तो वननामा स उच्यते ॥ ४ ॥

4. One who is living in a beautiful place devoid of people, who is free from bondage of desires, is called by name “Vana”.

[we have left off alternate version ‘निर्झरे’ of N. and ‘स्थाने’ of B.].

अरण्ये संस्थितो नित्यमानन्दे नन्दने वने ।

त्यक्त्वा सर्वमिदं विश्वमरण्यः परिकीर्त्यते ॥ ५ ॥

5. One who has renounced this entire world and is rejoicing in the forest of bliss, is called by name “Aranya”.

वासो गिरिवने नित्यं गीताध्ययनतत्परः ।

गम्भीराचलबुद्धिश्च गिरिनामा स उच्यते ॥ ६ ॥

6. One who lives in mountainous forests studying the Gītā, and has a deep and steady intellect, is called by name “Giri”.

[alternate version ‘गीताभ्यासे’ B.]

वसन्पर्वतमूलेषु प्रौढं ज्ञानं बिभर्ति यः ।

सारासारं विजानाति पर्वतः परिकीर्त्यते ॥ ७ ॥

7. One who lives on mountain slopes, having acquired high knowledge, knows the essentials and non-essentials, is called “Parvata”.

[alternate version ‘वसेत्पर्वतमूलेषु प्रौढो यो ध्यानतत्परः । सारासारं विजानाति पर्वतः परिकीर्तितः ॥ B.]

तत्त्वसागरगम्भीरो ज्ञानरत्नपरिग्रहः ।

मर्यादां नैव लङ्घेत सागरः परिकीर्त्यते ॥ ८ ॥

8. One who has depth of tattva-ocean, having acquired the gems of knowledge, and who does not go beyond the limits of his stage of life, is called by the name “Sāgara”.

[alternate version ‘वसेत्सागरगम्भीरो घनरत्नपरिग्रहः । मर्यादाश्च न लङ्घेत सागरः परिकीर्तितः ॥]

स्वरज्ञानरतो नित्यं स्वरवादी कवीश्वरः ।

संसारसागरे साराभिज्ञो यः स सरस्वती ॥ ९ ॥

9. One who is always engaged in *swara-jñāna*, being a *swara-vādi* and the best among the knowers, and who has known the essence of the ocean of *saṁsāra*, is called “Saraswati”.

[alternate version ‘स्वरज्ञानवतो’ B. Here it is not clear what is meant by *swara*. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* says that the first word *swara* means breath, and the second *swara* refers to the intonations of Vedas. It appears that *swara* also means ‘ॐ’. Essence of the *saṁsāra sāgara* could be the knowledge of *Paramātmān*. N. version is ‘संसारसागरासारं हन्ताऽसौ हि सरस्वती’ .]

विद्याभारेण सम्पूर्णः सर्वभारं परित्यजन् ।

दुःखभारं न जानाति भारती परिकीर्त्यते ॥ १० ॥

10. One who has renounced all kinds of loads, but is complete with the load of *vidyā*, and does not know the heaviness of misery, is called “Bhārati”.

[alternate version ‘परित्यजेत्’, ‘परिकीर्तितः’ B.]

ज्ञानतत्त्वेन सम्पूर्णः पूर्णतत्त्वपदे स्थितः ।

परब्रह्मरतो नित्यं पुरी नामा स उच्यते ॥ ११ ॥

11. One who is complete with the principle of knowledge, who remains in the state of that completeness, being always resting in *parabrahma*, is called by the name “Purī”.

*Baladeva Upādhyāya* writes that from the abovementioned Ācārya's description, names were assigned in the beginning according to the attainments. (Bala. Śam.p 212). But, as it is controversial that the Ācārya himself wrote the ślokas, not much support is there for this opinion. Whatever that be, it is certain that the way of assigning these names to the sannyāsins of the tradition of Śaṅkarācārya is in vogue today. But these are not reserved only for the pontiffs of the Pīṭhas. By the expression 'इति दशविधपरिव्राजकानां योगपट्टनिर्वचनानि समाप्तानि' (N.) it is clear that these are also called *Yogapaṭṭas*.

Another point is to be considered here: the pontiff of the Kāñcī Pīṭha has the *yogapaṭṭa* called **Indra Saraswati** even now. Also, there is the expression 'एषां नाम तु व्याख्यातमिन्द्रपूर्वा सरस्वती' of the *Maṭhām-nāyasetu*. In an English book whose name means 'false claims of Kumbhakoṇam Maṭha' (KMC) by R. Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer has another half-śloka saying 'कामकोटिमठे त्वस्मिन्गुरुरिन्द्रसरस्वती'. In the 'मुख्याम्नाय' part of the 'आम्नायाष्टक' there is the śloka which says 'शुद्धा सरस्वती चेन्द्रानन्दपूर्वा च भारती । भगवत्पाद इत्यादि नामान्यन्यानि च स्वतः ॥' (Text page 499); in spite of this, the belief that the "yogapaṭṭa" of Kāñcī Maṭha is *Indra Saraswati* only, is now in vogue. Śrī N. K. Venkaṭeśam Pantulu has a story for this (NKVS p 19-22): When Śaṅkarācārya took the help of the twin Gods *Aświnī* for the sick *Sureśwarācārya's* sake, Indra became angry and launched his thunder-bolt (*Vajrāyudha*) on the twin Gods; seeing that it did not move at all, he came to know the Ācārya's prowess; and then he accorded his own name to the *Jagadguru*; and the part *Saraswati* in the name is indicative of the Ācārya winning over Goddess *Saraswati* at Kāśmīr. R. Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer and others are telling that since this story about Indra is not found in any of

the ŚaṅkaraVijayas; since this title for the Ācārya is not to found anywhere; also since this title was not accorded to many of the earlier pontiffs of the Kāncī Pīṭha; and since it is found to be enjoined with some who are not in any way related to Kāncī Pīṭha, this story is not at all the right reason for the entitlement (KMC p 49-50).

### The Daśanāmi Tradition

There are some **Gosais** who are known as *Daśanāmis*. It is difficult to decide how their tradition started. There is a legend: when once the Ācārya was on his itinerary along with the disciples, the disciples became very thirsty; seeing this the Ācārya permitted them to have a drink of toddy that was available on a wayside palm tree; all drank fully. When they proceeded further, they came across molten copper in a place. When the Ācārya told them to drink, the first four disciples, not caring that their throats would be burnt, drank it; the others quietly stayed back. The Ācārya cursed them to become 'fallen'. These are the *Daśanāmis*. The story has many variations, and God knows what element of truth it contains. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has summarized it in another form in his book (Bala.Śam. p 213).

These *Daśanāmis* adorn themselves with arms. In Rājasthān and in central areas, the leaders of these *Daśanāmis* were called **Gosais**; they used to be heads of states having their own armed soldiers. It appears there was a **parivrājaka** king during the Gupta period. One chieftain was having the name **Himmatabāhadura Giri**. Such organizations are said to be there even today in Jaipur. There are many **Akhāḍas** of *Daśanāmis*. Among them are: (1) *Pañcaiti Akhāḍa Mahānirvāṇi* with its main stay at Prayāg; they are worshippers

of God Kapila; (2) *Pañcaiti Akhāḍa Niranjani* with its main stay at Prayāg; they are worshippers of Swāmi Kārtikeya; (3) *Aṭal Akhāḍa*, worshippers of Gaṇeśa; and (4) *Bhairava Akhāḍa*; (all these four are called **Jūnās**); (5) *Akhāḍa Ānanda*, worshippers of Dattātreyā; (6) *Akhāḍa Agni* and (7) *Akhāḍa Amāna* - these, it is said, were helpful to protect Dharma at times of trouble. They were honoured by the Nawabs. It seems now the *Akhāḍas Nirvāṇi* and *Niranjani* are famous. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* writes that these *Akhāḍas* are very rich, and that they can be utilised for the good of the country (Bala. Śam. 213-214).

The relation between these *Daśanāmis* and the *Yogapaṭṭas* of the Śaṅkara tradition is yet to be explored by historians.

### **Pontiff Lineages of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha**

The listing of the pontiff lineages of the Maṭhas are not uniform. Listing of one Maṭha would always be objected to by the other Maṭhas. We give here the listings of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha Lineages taken from the Marāṭhi book ‘शङ्कराचार्य वा त्याज्या सम्प्रदाय’ written by Mahādeva Rājārāma Bodas, M.A., L.L.B. He has shown four such listings:

(1) The Tamil listing by *Siddhānti Subrahmaṇya Śāstri* written in 1879 A. D. at the behest of Jagadguru Narasimha Bhārati VIII.

(2) Listing given in the Appendix of *History of Vijayanagara* by Sūrya Narāyaṇa Rao.

(3) Listing printed at Vāṇi Vilās Press at the behest of Śrī Satchidānanda Śivābhinava Nrisimha Bhārati Swāmiji.

(4) Listing given by Rice in Mysore Gazettier (1907), Vol. I, page 473.

We have given the first of these listings below, and we have shown the differences in the other listings in the form of footnotes. We shall give Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman's listing at the end.

Name	Year of Sannyāsa	Year of demise	Total no of years
1. Śaṅkarācārya	18 B.C.	12 B.C.	6 <sup>1</sup>
2. Sureśwarācārya	12 B.C.	773 A.D.	785
3. Nityabodhaghana (Sarvajñātmamuni) <sup>2</sup>	773 A.D.	848 A.D.	75
4. Jñānaghana <sup>3</sup>	848 A.D.	916 A.D.	62
5. Jñānottamaśivācārya <sup>4</sup>	910 A.D.	953 A.D.	43
6. Jñānagiri <sup>5</sup>	953 A.D.	1038 A.D.	85
7. Simhagiri <sup>6</sup>	1038 A.D.	1098 A.D.	60
8. Īśwaratīrtha <sup>7</sup>	1098 A.D.	1146 A.D.	48

1. According to listing (2), Śaṅkara was in the Pīṭha from 36 B.C. to 12 B.C. and Sureśwara from 28 B.C. to 773 A.D. (was the pontiff for 800 years!); in the listing (3), Sureśwara has been called as Viśwarūpa; as per listing (4), Śaṅkara was born on 737 A.D., was in Pīṭha from 745 to 749; Sureśwara 753.

In *Baladeva Upādhyāya's* listing, Śaṅkara's *Sannyāsa* on Vikrama Śaka 22, siddhi on 45; from birth it is 32 years. Sureśwara's *Sannyāsa* on Vikrama 30, siddhi 695; from birth it is 725 years!

2. Author of Sankṣepashārīraka. In the listings (2), (4) his birth on 758 A.D. and he lived for 90 years. In the listing (3), he is just mentioned as Bodhaghana.

3. In the listings (2)-(4) his time is from 846-910 A.D.

4. In the listings (2)-(4) his time is from 905-953 A.D.

5. In the listings (2)-(4) his time is from 949-1038 A.D.

6. In the listings (2)-(4) his time is from 1036-1098 A.D.

7. In the listings (2)-(4) his time is from 1097-1146 A.D.

Name	Year of Sannyāsa	Year of demise	Total no of years
9. Narasimhatīrtha <sup>1</sup>	1146 A.D.	1228 A.D.	82
10. Vidyātīrtha-Vidyāśaṅkara <sup>2</sup>	1228 A.D.	1333 A.D.	105
11. BhāratiKṛṣṇa Tīrtha	1333 A.D.	1380 A.D.	47
12. Vidyāranya <sup>3</sup>	1380 A.D.	1386 A.D.	6
13. Candraśekhara Bhārati I <sup>4</sup>	1386 A.D.	1389 A.D.	3
14. Narasimha Bhārati I	1389 A.D.	1408 A.D.	19
15. Puruṣottama Bhārati I	1408 A.D.	1448 A.D.	40
16. Śaṅkarānanda	1448 A.D.	1454 A.D.	6
17. Candraśekhara Bhārati II	1454 A.D.	1464 A.D.	10
18. Narasimha Bhārati II	1464 A.D.	1479 A.D.	15
19. Puruṣottama Bhārati II	1479 A.D.	1517 A.D.	38
20. Rāmacandra Bhārati	1517 A.D.	1560 A.D.	43
21. Narasimha Bhārati III <sup>5</sup>	1560 A.D.	1573 A.D.	13

1. In the listings (2)-(4) his time is from 1145-1228 A.D.

2. His name is Sarvajñaviṣṇu; Guru of Sāyaṇa and Mādhava; he was also at Kāncī Pīṭha(?)

3. In (2)-(4) BhāratiKṛṣṇa Tīrtha's period is 1328-1380; and *Vidyāranya's* period is 1331-1386.

4. In (2)-(4), the next eight Swāmis from here have their commencing years 1368, 1387, 1406, 1428, 1449, 1464, 1472 and 1508 A. D.

5. In (2)-(4), the next two Swāmis from here have their commencing years 1557 and 1563 A. D.



Name	Year of Sannyāsa	Year of de- mise	Total no of years
22. Narasimha Bhāratī IV Nrisimha Bhāratī I	1573 A.D.	1576 A.D.	3
23. Narasimha Bhāratī V <sup>1</sup>	1573 A.D.	1599 A.D.	23
24. Narasimha Bhāratī VI	1599 A.D.	1622 A.D.	23
25. Satchidānanda Bhā- ratī I	1622 A.D.	1663 A.D.	41
26. Narasimha Bhāratī VII	1663 A.D.	1705 A.D.	42
27. Satchidānanda Bhā- ratī II	1705 A.D.	1741 A.D.	36
28. AbhinavaSatchidāna- nda Bhāratī I	1741 A.D.	1767 A.D.	26
29. AbhinavaNarasimha Bhāratī I	1767 A.D.	1770 A.D.	3
30. Satchidānanda Bhā- ratī II	1770 A.D.	1814 A.D.	44
31. AbhinavaSatchidāna- nda Bhāratī II	1814 A.D.	1817 A.D.	3
32. Narasimha BhāratīVIII	1817 A.D.	1878 A.D.	61
33. Satchidānanda Śivā- bhinava Nrisimha Bhāratī	1878 A.D.	1912 A.D.	34
34. Candraśekhara Bhāra- tī III <sup>2</sup>	1912 A.D.	1954 A.D.	42

1. In (2), the 23rd Swāmi has the prefix 'immaḍi' (which means II); 24th and 25th Swāmis have the prefix 'abhinava'.

2. This list was prepared when Candraśekhara Bhāratī was the pontiff. Śri Bal-

Name	Year of Sannyāsa	Year of de- mise	Total no of years
35. <i>Abhinava Vidyātīrtha Bhāratī</i>	1954 A.D.		

### (1) Pontiff Lineage of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha

(by Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman)

Name	Year of <i>Sannyāsa</i>	Year of samādhi	Pontiff from
1. Śrī Śaṅkarācārya	788 A.D.	820 A.D.	
2. Sureśwarācārya	813 A.D.	833 A.D.	
3. Nityabodhaghana	818 A.D.	848 A.D.	
4. Jñānaghana	846 A.D.	910 A.D.	
5. Jñānottama	905 A.D.	953 A.D.	
6. Jñānagiri	949 A.D.	1038 A.D.	
7. Simhagiri	1036 A.D.	1098 A.D.	
8. Īśwaratīrtha	1097 A.D.	1146 A.D.	
9. Narasimhatīrtha <sup>1</sup>	1145 A.D.	1228 A.D.	

adeva Upādhyāya has given Śālivāhana Śaka in his list, but has not cited any evidence favouring it. It appears that with the exception of a few in the beginning, the present list periods are quite agreeable. The immediately following list of Śrī Venkaṭarāman is the most recent available to us.

1. Upto this Śrī Venkaṭarāman has not given the periods the history, in his book. Hence these would be predictions only from historical point of view.

Name	Year of <i>Sannyāsa</i>	Year of samādhi	Pontiff from
10. <i>Vidyāśaṅkara</i> Tīrtha <sup>1</sup>	1228 A.D.	1333 A.D.	
11. BhāratiKṛṣṇa Tīrtha	1328 A.D.	1380 A.D.	
12. Vidyāraṇya <sup>2</sup>	1331 A.D.	1386 A.D.	
13. Candraśekhara Bhā- ratī I	1368 A.D.	1389 A.D.	1386
14. Narasimha Bhārati I <sup>3</sup>	1387 A.D.	1408 A.D.	1389
15. Puruṣottama Bhārati I	1406 A.D.	1448 A.D.	1408
16. Śaṅkarānanda Bhā- ratī	1428 A.D.	1454 A.D.	1448
17. Candraśekhara Bhā- ratī II	1449 A.D.	1464 A.D.	1454
18. Narasimha Bhārati II	1464 A.D.	1479 A.D.	1464
19. Puruṣottama Bhārati II	1472 A.D.	1517 A.D.	1479
20. Rāmacandra Bhārati	1508 A.D.	1560 A.D.	1517
21. Narasimha Bhārati III	1557 A.D.	1573 A.D.	1560
22. Narasimha Bhārati IV	1563 A.D.	1576 A.D.	1573
23. Narasimha Bhārati V	1576 A.D.	1599 A.D.	1576
24. Abhinava Narasimha Bhārati I	1599 A.D.	1622 A.D.	

---

1. He is also called *Vidyātīrtha*.

2. for details about him, see text. Also written some details below this list.

3. Venkaṭarāman has referred to as NrisimhaBhārati in the history for this name and ahead in his book.

Name	Year of <i>Sannyāsa</i>	Year of samādhi	Pontiff from
25. Satchidānanda Bhāratī I	1622 A.D.	1663 A.D.	
26. Narasimha Bhāratī VI	1663 A.D.	1705 A.D.	
27. Satchidānanda Bhāratī II	1705 A.D.	1741 A.D.	
28. AbhinavaSatchidānanda Bhāratī I	1741 A.D.	1767 A.D.	
29. Narasimha Bhāratī VII	1760 A.D.	1770 A.D.	1767
30. Satchidānanda Bhāratī III	1770 A.D.	1814 A.D.	
31. AbhinavaSatchidānanda Bhāratī II	1814 A.D.	1817 A.D.	
32. Narasimha Bhāratī VIII	1817 A.D.	1879 A.D.	
33. Satchidānanda Śivābhinava Narasimha Bhāratī	1866 A.D.	1912 A.D.	1879
34. CandraśekharaBhāratī	1912 A.D.	1954 A.D.	
35. Abhinava <i>Vidyātīrtha Bhāratī</i>	1931 A.D.	1979 A.D.	

(1) The third column in the above list shows the year in which the respective Swāmi became the pontiff. From this it is evident that some of the Swāmis, in their lifetime, would give *Sannyāsa* to others and have them prepared.

(2) Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman has written that *Vidyātīrtha* was the

Guru of Bhāratikriṣṇa, Sāyaṇācārya, *Mādhava* (or *Vidyāraṇya*) and Vedānta Deśika (!); that because of the extravagant propaganda of the Mādhwas and of the Roman Catholics in Portugese India, *Vidyātīrtha* established eight Maṭhas and made his eight disciples the pontiffs of them; and that *Vidyāraṇya* was made the pontiff of the Virūpākṣa Maṭha (NVSK p 93-95). Regarding this, what Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman writes to us is: "It is evident from the history of India that Vasco da Gama arrived at the port of Calicut in the year 1499 A. D. This is 150 years after the *samādhi* of *Vidyātīrtha*. It was in 1509 A. D. that the Portugese established their administration in this country through Almeida. I wonder why N. Venkaṭarāman has written like that. Śrī Madhwācārya was a contemporary of *Vidyātīrtha*, and it was only after his *samādhi* that Madhwācārya's creed was spread".

(3) Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman states that it is quite evident that Śrīṅgeri Maṭha was for a long time without pontiff, and only later it was rejuvenated by the very fact that *Sureśwarācārya* was accorded a span of 800 years (NVSK p 95). He says that all the eight Maṭhas established by *Vidyātīrtha* use **Vidyāśaṅkara** or **Vidyāraṇya** in their official seals just as Śrīṅgeri Maṭha does. We have written earlier in this book that it is the opinion of Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman that the emblem of '*Vidyāśaṅkara*' is related to *Vidyātīrtha* only. There is a traditional story that *Vidyāśaṅkara*, being in the form of an idol of Viḡneśwara, is even today supervising the affairs of the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha (KRTTW p 45). Although K. R. Venkaṭarāman has not told anything in his book regarding why Sureśwara has been assigned a span of 800 years, he has written a typed letter to us in which he says that the reasons for confusion about the periods are the following:

(1) (a) The tradition of clinging to the myth that Śaṅkarācārya lived several centuries before Christ. To come out of this difficulty, people who wrote about the Śringeri Maṭha tradition have assigned a period of 800 years to Sureśwarācārya and brought his samādhi to 8th century A. D. Kāñci traditionalists have imagined several pontiffs from 509 B. C. to 788 A. D. and have distributed several incidents related to Śaṅkarācārya to three different Śaṅkarācāryas. (text, page 401)

(b) Since the traditional practice of one pontiff in his lifetime giving Sannyāsa to one of his disciples and keeping him alongwith as the future pontiff was not known, the historians have been confused regarding their respective periods (Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman's list gives the years of their becoming pontiffs).

(c) In a span of one and a half century, there have been five pontiffs with the name Narasimha Bhāratī. This also has confused the researchers.

(2) Sūryanārāyaṇa Rao has kept the date of birth of Śaṅkara as 44 B.C. on the basis of a story. Since Śaṅkara's date of birth is kept as 788 A. D., the dates of pontiffs would be as follows.

Śaṅkarācārya's date of birth 788 A. D.	videha mukti 820 A. D.
Sureśwara's ascending the Pīṭha 813 A. D.	(vijaya caitra śukla 15)
His mukti 833 A. D.	(pramāthi māgha śukla 12)
Nityabodhaghana's ascending the Pīṭha 818 A. D.	(vilambi āswayuja śukla 12)

(3) If you add 60 years to what Rice has given, it would be the same date as what I have given. If it is corrected thus, Rices' dates are all correct; but in page 306, 1097 is printed as 1079 and 1145 (Krodhana

Māgha Śukla 11) is printed as 1114 by mistake.

(4) The Kāñci traditionalists state that *Vidyātīrtha* (1297-1385 A. D.) was the 49th pontiff of Kāñcī Pīṭha (text, page 280). Regarding this, K.R Venkaṭarāman has written to us:

“There is a monument built in 1336 A. D. in the name of *Vidyātīrtha*. So many inscriptions holding him as the pontiff of Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha, found at Śrīṅgeri as well as in other places of Karṇāṭaka, are available; whereas there is not even a single inscription about him to be found either at Kāñci or at any of the nearby places. Therefore, it is difficult to believe that he was a pontiff of the Kāñcī Pīṭha”.

(5) Was *Vidyāranya* the pontiff of Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha? Regarding this, Śrī K.R. Venkaṭarāman has written us:

“Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman objects to inclusion of *Vidyāranya* in the pontiff lineage of Śrīṅgeri. But there is not a single historian, either from India or from elsewhere, who does not say that he was a pontiff at Śrīṅgeri or that he was the founder of Vijayanagara. The answer to Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman’s objection can be found in my book *The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom*.”

“It suffices to say this much here. Harihara the II has granted in 1380 A. D. several more *grāmas* to Śrīṅgeri Maṭha in honour of *Vidyāranya* as addition to what he had granted earlier; and in 1367 A. D. - when *Vidyāranya* had already attained *videhamukti* - he established an *agrahāra* near Śrīṅgeri and named it as *Vidyāranyapura*. Two temples - Bhāratī Rāmanātha and Vidyā Viśveśvara - were built as monuments in the name of Bhāratitīrtha and *Vidyāranya*.

“Another point. *Śrī Vidyātīrtha* gave *Sannyāsa* to Bhāratitīrtha in

1328 and to *Vidyāraṇya* in 1331 A. D. Bhāratitīrtha was the pontiff of Śrīṅgeri from 1333 to 1380 A. D. At that time *Vidyāraṇya* was the junior Swāmiji, spending time in pilgrimages and in meditation while residing at Hampi. He was the pontiff from 1380 to 1386 A.D.”<sup>1</sup>

## (2) Pontiff Lineage of Kāñci Maṭha

(from Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman’s book)

Name	Piṭhādhipatya (no. of years)	Year of siddhi
Śrī Śaṅkarācārya (birth 508 B.C)	32	476 B. C.
Sureśwarācārya	70(?) <sup>2</sup>	406 B. C.
1. Sarvajñātma	102	364 B. C.
2. Satyabodha	96	268 B. C.
3. Jñānānanda	63	205 B. C.
4. Śuddhānanda	81	124 B. C.
5. Ānandajñāna	69	55 B. C.
6. Kaivalyānanda	83	28 A. D.
7. Kṛpāśaṅkara (2)	41	69 A. D.
8. Sureśwara	58	127 A. D.

1. This appears to have been written in response to the opinion of Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman (NVSK p 95) that since the dates have been shown to Bhāratikriṣṇa (1328-1380) and Vidyāraṇya (1331-1386) by Śrīṅgeri traditionalists, it is wrong to conclude that Vidyāraṇya was a pontiff.

2. Ātmabodha has written in his *Suṣamā* that Śaṅkara did not establish Sureśwara on the Piṭha because he was not a *Paramahansa*(?); but had made him to look after the affairs of the Piṭha (Gu. Ra. p 41). This may be one of the reasons why Sureśwara is not counted here.



Name	Piṭhādhipatya (no. of years)	Year of siddhi
9. Cidghana	45	172 A. D.
10. Candraśekhara (1)	63	235 A. D.
11. Satcidghana	37	272 A. D.
12. Vidyāghana (1)	45	317 A. D.
13. Gangādhara (1)	12	329 A. D.
14. UjjwalaŚaṅkara (3)	38	367 A. D.
15. Sadāśiva	8	375 A. D.
16. Surendra	10	385 A. D.
17. Vidyāghana (2)	13	398 A. D.
18. MūkaŚaṅkara (4)	39	437 A. D.
19. Candracūḍa (1)	10	447 A. D.
20. Paripūrṇabodha	34	481 A. D.
21. Satcitsukha	31	512 A. D.
22. Citsukha (1)	15	527 A. D.
23. Satcidānandaghana	21	548 A. D.
24. Prajnāghana	16	564 A. D.
25. Cidvilāsa	13	577 A. D.
26. Mahādeva (1)	24	601 A. D.
27. Pūrṇabodha	17	618 A. D.
28. Bodha (1)	37	655 A. D.
29. Brahmānandaghana	13	668 A. D.
30. Cidānandaghana	4	672 A. D.
31. Satchidānanda (2)	20	692 A. D.

Name	Piṭhādhipatya (no. of years)	Year of siddhi
32. Candraśekhara (2)	18	710 A. D.
33. Citsukha (2)	27	737 A. D.
34. Citsukhānanda	21	758 A. D.
35. Vidyāghana (3)	30	788 A. D.
36. AbhinavaŚaṅkara (5)	52	840 A. D.
37. Satcidvilāsa	33	873 A. D.
38. Mahādeva (2)	42	915 A. D.
39. Gangādhara (2)	35	950 A. D.
40. Brahmānandaghana (2)	28	978 A. D.
41. Ānandaghana	36	1014 A. D.
42. Pūrṇabodha (2)	26	1040 A. D.
43. ParamaŚiva (1)	21	1061 A. D.
44. Bodha (2)	37	1098 A. D.
45. Candraśekhara (3)	68	1166 A. D.
46. Advaitānandabodha	34	1200 A. D.
47. Mahādeva (3)	47	1247 A. D.
48. Candracūḍa (2)	50	1297 A. D.
49. Vidyātīrtha	88	1385 A. D.
50. Śaṅkarānanda	32	1417 A. D.
51. Pūrṇānandasadāśiva	81	1498 A. D.
52. Mahādeva (4)	9	1507 A. D.
53. Candracūḍa (3)	17	1524 A. D.
54. Sarvajñasadāśivabodha	15	1539 A. D.

Name	Pīṭhādhipatya (no. of years)	Year of siddhi
55. ParamaŚiva (2)	47	1586 A. D.
56. <i>Ātmabodha</i>	52	1638 A. D.
57. Bodha (3)	54	1692 A. D.
58. Advayātmaprakāśa	12	1704 A. D.
59. Mahādeva (5)	42	1746 A. D.
60. Candraśekhara (4)	37	1783 A. D.
61. Mahādeva (6)	31	1814 A. D.
62. Candraśekhara (5)	37	1851 A. D.
63. Mahādeva (7)	40	1891 A. D.
64. Śrī Candraśekhara (6)	17	1908 A. D.
65. Mahādeva (8)	7 days	1908 A. D.
66. Candraśekharendra Saraswati	present pontiff	

The abovementioned list is from Śrī. N. Venkaṭarāman's book (NVSK). He has mainly based on **Punyaślokamanjari**, **Gururatnamālikā** and the commentary '*Suśamā*' on it written by *Ātmabodha* (text, page 16). He has written 'since these authors and their times are well known, and since they do not confound Śaṅkara and his lineage of disciples with the same name, I have more faith in them than in ŚaṅkaraVijayas. They give us the post-Śaṅkara history of Vedānta; not only that, they convey some correctly dated incidents which in many occasions stand cross-verification' (NVSK p 5). He believes that 'since the list of lineage of pontiffs of Kāmakoti Pīṭha is

relevant with respect to a number of incidents in history of India, it is very important' (NVSK p 8)<sup>1</sup>.

But what Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman writes about this lineage is quite opposite to this. We have already mentioned his opinion about Śaṅkara's time, i.e., 8th century A. D. He has written to us a summary scrutiny of the lineage of pontiffs of the Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha as follows: (text pages given within brackets are those of our present book)

**1. Sarvajñātma** (Pontiff No. 1). He is the author of *Sanḥṣe-paśārīraka*; a disciple of Deveśwara. He was under the guardianship of king Manukulāditya of South Travancore. He belongs to 10th century A. D.

**2. Jñānānanda, Jñānottama** (Pontiff No. 3; 268-205 B. C.; text page 401). Earlier, he was a Gauḍa brahmin householder known as Mahopādhyāya Jñānottama Miśra. He settled on the banks of Kāveri, with the support of Cola king during 12th century A. D. He has written about himself that the name of his father's Guru, Jñānottama who was pontiff of Śringeri Pīṭha, has come to him.

**3. Ānandajñāna** (Pontiff No. 5; 124-55 B. C.; text page 284). This poet is also known by the other name *Ānandagiri*. Earlier to *Sann-yāsa*, he was having the name Janārdana. Actually, he lived in 13th century A. D. and was a disciple of Anubhūtiprakāśa and Śuddhānanda.

**4. KṛpāŚaṅkara** (Pontiff No. 7; 28-69 A. D.). He is purported to be *śanmatasthāpanācārya*, but not *ĀdyaŚaṅkara*; and to have assigned SubhaṭaViśwarūpa to Śringeri Pīṭha! Everyone knows that Viśwarūpa

1. Even N. Venkaṭarāman agrees that the times appear fanciful from Sarvajñātma upto Satchidghana in the list of lineages (NVSK p 9).

is only one, and that he was none other than Sureśwarācārya.

5. **Cidghana** (Pontiff No. 9; 127-172 A. D.). It appears he was fond of Śivādvaita. Śivādvaita came into picture in Kāśmīr after 8th century A. D.; as a reaction to Pāśupata creed of Lakuliśa.

6. **UjjwalaŚaṅkara** (Pontiff No. 14; 329-367 A. D.). It is said that from his time onwards some of the Ācāryas of Kāñci used to stay at Kāśmīr; if that be so, what was going on at Kāñci?

7. **Śaṅkara** (4) (Pontiff No. 18; 398-437 A. D.; text page 40)<sup>1</sup>. His pen-name is Mūka. Traditionally, it is said that Mūka was a priest at Kāñci, who had the skill of poetry as a result of worship. His time is by any means not earlier than 16th century A. D. The Kumbhakoṇam tradition has shifted him to Kāśmīr. A poet 'Menṭa' and his drama *Hayagrīvavadha* have been examined. This poet's time is very much later than 6th century A. D. No one knows about this drama *Hayagrīvavadha*. Similarly, *Maṇiprabha* of one by name Rāmalīla, as well as the *śloka*s cited from it are all concocted, just imagination.

8. **Candraśekhara** (1) (Pontiff No. 19; 437-447 A. D.). Matr Gupta was a palace mahut in Kāśmīr. Because of political conspiracy, he became the king for a brief period<sup>2</sup>. He became a *Sannyāsin* at Kāśi and died there. How he could have been a fit person to become a pontiff! His time is 6th century, not 5th century A.D.

9. **Satcidānandaghana** (Pontiff No. 23; 527-548 A. D.). It is said that this Guru has been cited in *Siddhavijayakāvya*. And it is another work which no one has seen.

---

1. N. Venkaṭarāman also has agreed (NVSK p. 54) that the dates regarding Sureśwara in the traditions of Śrīṅgeri as well as Kāñci are not believable.

2. N. Venkaṭarāman says that this Matr Gupta himself is the pontiff of Kāñci by name Candraśekhara (NVSK p 74).

**10. Cidānandaghana** (Pontiff No. 30; 668-672 A. D.). This name is another myth. It is said that king Lalitāditya Mukatāpīḍa of Kāśmīr came to the south on a military expedition, and dethroned the son of Raṭṭā Rāṇi of Karṇāṭaka; and he was re-crowned by this Ācārya. Lalitāditya's expedition was only upto Kanyakubja; he did not come down further. From Kanyakubja to Karṇāṭaka - from where to where! At that time, the Cālūkyas were ruling in the Deccan region. There is no evidence to say that they were dethroned by any from the North; how then the king of Kāśmīr? Instead, they had obstructed Harṣa from coming down past Narmadā. Raṭṭā is *tadbhava* of Rāshṭrakūṭa; it cannot be name of a person.

**11. Śaṅkara** (5) (Pontiff No. 36; 788-840 A. D.). His scrutiny has been dropped for the time being, due to lack of space.

**12. Bodha** (2) (Pontiff No. 44; 1061-1098 A. D.). In his earlier life, he was Somadeva, who was writing stories to please a queen. He has described gods very lightly, with negligence; has condemned dharma; his characters in the stories are idiots, robbers, rogues, murderers, wives who kill their husbands and the like. Some of his stories contain description of debauchery. What is known from his history, is that he at last became a *Śaiva sannyāsi*. It is said here that he arrived at Kāñci in a golden palanquin given by Bhoja and then he became pontiff of Kāncī Pīṭha. Not only that, it is said that he got rid of the menace of Muslims here. Historically, Kāñci was at that time one of the capitals of powerful Cola kings like Vīrarājendra, Adhirājendra, and Kulotunga I. Their reign was spread throughout South India. Such powerful kings, to get help from one by name Kalasa of Kāśmīr through a *sannyāsi* - how ridiculous! Not only that, at that time there were no

Muslims around Kāñci within a radius of about a thousand miles who could face the Colas!

**13. Candraśekhara III (?) or Candracūḍa** (Pontiff No. 45; 1098-1166 A. D.). The works of Jayadeva, Suhala etc. cited (NVSK p88-89) at this juncture are not well-known.

**14. Advaitānandabodha** (Pontiff No. 46; 1166-1200 A. D.). It is said that he won over Abhinavagupta. But Abhinavagupta was a century earlier than this Guru; and no one has heard of the writings of this Guru.

**15. Vidyātīrtha** (Pontiff No. 49; 1297-1385 A. D.; text page 284). Also famed as *Vidyāśaṅkara*, he attained *samādhi* in 1333 A. D., and not in 1385 A. D. as Kumbhakoṇam people write. His *samādhi* is there in Śringeri, in honour of which Bukka, Harihara II and others have given land in 1346, 1356 and 1375 A. D. Records are there to show this. He is said to have been known as Sarvajña Viṣṇu previous to *Sannyāsa*. This is not true; Sarvajña Viṣṇu is not the Guru of Sāyaṇa, but Guru of his son *Mādhava* (1400 A. D.).

We have mentioned earlier K. R. Venkaṭarāman's opinion about his establishing eight Maṭhas. His opinion is that *Vidyāranya* established several subsidiary Maṭhas with the help of Harihara II.

**16. Śaṅkarānanda** (Pontiff No. 50; 1385-1417 A. D.). From his writings we come to know that *Vidyātīrtha* was his *vidyāguru*; and that 'Ānandātma' was his *dikshā Guru*. It is difficult to believe that one who took *Sannyāsa* from an ordinary monk became the pontiff. *Śaṅkarānanda* was not at all the pontiff.

N. Venkaṭarāman cites (NVSK p 97) a *śloka* from *Bṛihadāranya-dīpikā* of *Śaṅkarānanda* which clearly states that he was pontiff of

Kāncī Pīṭha:

काञ्चीपीठजुषः कठोरधिषणा निर्युतदुर्ध्वहृद्वैतिव्रातदुराग्रहभयान्मायाविदूरक्रियान् ।

आचार्यान्मम चन्द्रमौलिचरणध्यानैकतानाशयान्विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरान्हृदि सदा विधोतमानान्भजे ॥

But K. R. Venkaṭarāman writes that this *śloka* is not found in any one of the manuscripts of that work.

**17. Sarvajñasadāśivabodha**<sup>1</sup> (Pontiff No. 54; 1524-1539 A. D.). He is considered to have been served by Praveera, the king of Rāmanād. Rāmanād did not at any time have a king by that name; and, at that time, the kingdom of Rāmanād was not yet formulated.

**18. Bodha (3)** (Pontiff No. 57; 1638-1692 A. D.). One by name Bhagavannāma Bodhendra was a great soul who was throughout in his life singing the glories of the Lord; has established a Maṭha called Govindapura on the banks of Kāveri. Every year his *ārādhana* is carried out even now; The Maṭha has properties for self dependence, and there is no control of Kumbhakoṇa Maṭha on those things. Nobody knows that 'Bodha' was a pontiff.

**19. ParamaŚiva (2), Ātmabodha.**

Here we can discuss two things: the statement that Sadāśiva, who is famous as Sadāśiva Brahmendra is the disciple of ParamaŚiva (2) and that the author of *Guru ratnamālikā* is Sadāśiva (Brahmendra).

**(1) Pontiffs of Kumbhakoṇa Maṭha:**

Sarvajña Sadāśiva Bodha (Pontiff No. 54), 1524-39

Disciple Paramaśiva II (Pontiff No. 55), 1539-86

Disciple Ātmabodha (Pontiff No. 56), 1586-38

**(2) Disciple lineage known from the books of Sadāśiva:**

1. N. Venkaṭarāman says that this Guru is the author of *Punyaślokamanjari*.



Abinava Nārāyaṇendra Saraswati (Author of *Pañcīkaraṇa Bhāvaprakāśikā*)

Disciple Paramaśiva (Author of *Daharavidyā prakāśa*)

Disciple Sadāśivendra (Times known: 1726, 1734, 1761)

From the above listing, it becomes evident that the Guru of Sadāśivendra, i.e., Paramaśiva is different from the Kumbhakoṇam Pontiff Paramaśiva II. Because, the Guru of the former is Abhinava Nārāyaṇendra Saraswati, whereas the Guru of the latter is Sarvajña Sadāśiva Bodha. Sadāśiva Brahmendra was the contemporary of (i) Tulasāji Maharāj of Tanjāvore, (ii) Mahārājaśri Rāmavarma *Kārtikai* Tirumala of Travancore and (iii) Rāja Raghunātharāya Tonḍimāna of Pudukoṭṭai. By way of giving initiation in 1739 A. D. to Rāja Raghunātharāya Tondimāna of Pudukoṭṭai, he came to be known as Rājaguru. Reference to his name and that of his *samādhi* at Nerur can be found in the records of that kingdom. The Rāja of Pudukoṭṭai has granted several *grāmas* in honour of the *samādhi*. How it is possible that Sadāśiva Brahmendra, belonging to 18th century, become the disciple of the pontiff of Kumbhakoṇam Maṭha who attained *samādhi* two centuries earlier? It is said that Sadāśiva wrote *Gururatnamālikā* at the inspiration of *Ātmabodha* who was at the end of 16th and at the beginning of 17th century. How come *Ātmabodha* inspired one who would be born a century later than his time? This being so, it becomes clear that Sadāśivendra neither is the disciple of the Kumbhakoṇam Pontiff, nor he wrote *Gururatnamālikā*.

20. Many absurdities are there in the Copper inscriptions obtained by Śri Gopīnātha Rao<sup>1</sup>. One of the inscriptions has the date

---

1. He was the Superintendent of the Archeological Department of the State of

of a donation that is 34 years later than the death of the donor. In another, the *grāmas* donated did not belong to the kingdom of the donor king. In yet another inscription of a donation from a Muslim, the inscription commences with praise of the Hindu Gods; and two *ślokas* therein are taken from a composition which is a century later than the date of donation. Another inscription is in no way related to the Maṭha. To scrutinize these inscriptions completely and come to conclusions, a lot of time as well as space are needed.

Hitherto we have rendered in sufficient detail the differences between Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman, the author of Kāñci Pontiff lineage and Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman, the author of Śringeri Pontiff lineage. We believe that Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman has exposed the drawbacks of the Kāñci lineage with greater historical researchmindedness. In books like *Śrī Śringeri Śāradā Pīṭha* by Śrī K. S. Sundararama Iyer and *The Kumbhakoṇam Maṭha Claims* by Śrī K. Kriṣṇaswāmi Iyer the zest in exposing the drawbacks of Kāñci Pīṭha is glaringly evident. We have already represented the several constraints and drawbacks of Śringeri lineage as well as the opinions of Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman. The long-standing mutual friction in the matter relating to the two Maṭhas, is such as not to derive conclusion about the present issue. There occurred a *śloka* 'कूडलीकुम्भकोणादिमठादिपतयश्च ये । शृङ्गेरीगुरुशिष्या इत्याद्रियन्ते क्वचिज्जनैः' in the introductory part of a *pañcāṅgam* of *Prajotpatti Samvatsara* (1871-72) authored by one by name Subrahmaṇya Siddhānti. We have already indicated the writing in *Maṭhāmnāyasetu* that all other Maṭhas are those of dis-

---

Travancore. We have one of his books (in english and sanskrit) *Copper Plate Inscriptions* (Madras, 1916) with us. As it is not of much use, we have not cited it.

ciples of Kāñci Kāmakoṭi Maṭha; this may be one of the reactions to that. The very next year, on *Āngirasa Samvatsara Caitra Bahula Caturthi* (27-4-1872)<sup>1</sup>, the laukika and vaidika devotees of both Kāñci and Śringeri Maṭhas conferred together under the presidentship of a Vaiṣṇavaite Swāmi Vedānta Rāmānuja Jeer of Tiruvellore. The conference took the decision that there is no evidence to support the said *śloka*<sup>2</sup>. Perusal of the text of Jeer's decision revealed that it upheld the stance that Kumbhakoṇam lineage is the real Śaṅkara lineage. The Jeer based his decision on two *ślokas* of *Maṇimañjari Bhedini*, Canto 3: 'स द्वादशाब्दं गुरुरत्र पीठे स्थित्वानवद्यामुपदिश्य विद्याम् । श्रीपद्मपादं च निधाय तत्र जगाम काञ्चीपुरमन्यशिष्यैः ॥' (Mani. Bhe. 3. 63) (the Ācārya, after twelve years, installed Padmapāda and went to Kāñci); and 'तत्रैकं किल नित्यबोधसुधनाचार्याख्यमेतन्मठे<sup>3</sup> (?) पीठाध्यक्षमथारचय्य स ययौ तूर्णं गुरोः सन्निधिम्' (Mani. Bhe. 4. 30) (*Sureśwarācārya* installed Nityabodhaghaṇācārya on the Pīṭha and went near his Guru); these were his reference authorities to formulate his decision!

What can be said about the learned scholars who went for the decision from a Guru of an alien creed who depended on a work like *Maṇimañjari Bhedini* to give his verdict? Śringeri traditionalists are claiming that even that Guru who presided said "they have not shown all the documents; with what was available, I have given the decision"! Whatever that be, the above incident reveals that the

1. *Śri Śāṅkara Pīṭha Tattva Darśanam*, Appendix I, p 15-16.

2. the above decision was contradicted and condemned by Bhaṭṭa *Narāyaṇa Śāstry*, Kokkaṇḍa Venkaṭaratnam Pantulu and others in the form of some publications. Both the decision as well as its condemnation carry the same weightage.

3. the Telugu sheet of Jeer's Siddānta Patrika which is with us is a little bit dilapidated.

Kāñci and Śrīṅgeri Pīṭhas are competing with each other for gaining control over the remaining Maṭhas; and that attempts are being made from quite some time to prove that Śāṅkarācārya attained *samādhi* at Kāñci. One Dr. Hultzsch gives the following lineage of pontiffs in his *Śrī Śāṅkara Pīṭha Tatvadarśana* (Madras Govt. Oriental Manuscripts Library Catalogue No. III, pp 133-134):

**भारतीगुरुपरम्परास्तोत्रम्**

आदौ शिवस्ततो विष्णुस्ततो ब्रह्मा ततः परम् ।  
 वसिष्ठश्च ततः शक्तिः ततष्पृष्ठः पराशरः ॥ १ ॥  
 ततो व्यासः शुकः पश्चाद्गौडपादाभिदस्ततः ।  
 गोविन्दा(चा)र्यगुरुस्तस्माच्छङ्कराचार्यसंज्ञकः ॥ २ ॥  
 पद्मनाभ(पादः) सुरेशश्च हस्तामलकतोटकौ ।  
 वेदान्तशिक्षागुरवः साङ्घार्यपातु<sup>1</sup> मां सदा ॥ ३ ॥  
 श्रीशङ्कराचार्यमतश्च पद्मपादं च हस्तामलकं च शिष्यम् ।  
 तं तोटकं वार्तिककारमन्यानस्मद्गुरुन्सन्ततमानतोस्मि ॥ ४ ॥  
 संस्थाप्य स्वमठं कृत्वा तुङ्गभद्रानदीतटे ।  
 तत्र स्थित्वा द्वादशाब्दं यतिं पृथ्वीभराभिदम् ॥ ५ ॥  
 विद्यापीठाधिकं(पं) कृत्वा भारतीसंज्ञया गुरुः ।  
 अगच्छत्स्वेच्छया कां(ञ्चीं) पर्यटन्पृथ्वीतले ॥ ६ ॥  
 तत्र संस्थाप्य कामाक्षीं जगाम परमं पदम् ।  
 विश्वरूपयतिं स्थाप्य स्वाश्रमस्य प्रचारणे ॥ ७ ॥  
 स्वयं काञ्चीमगात्तूर्णं श्रीपृथ्वीधरभारती ।  
 तद्भूतान्तं समाकर्ण्य तपसः सिद्धये तदा ॥ ८ ॥  
 श्रीविश्वरूपयोगीन्द्रं जप्त्वा चिद्रूपभारती ।  
 ततो गङ्गाधरयतिः ततश्चिज्ज्ञानभारती ॥  
 ततो बोधायनो मौनी ततो ज्ञानोत्तरो यतिः ।

1. the printed book may be wrong. Could it be आचार्याः पान्तु or साचार्याः पातु माम्?

तस्माच्छिवानन्दयतिः ततो ज्ञानोत्तमो गुरुः ॥  
 तस्मान्नृसिंहयतिराट् तत ईश्वरभारती ।  
 तत ईश्वरभारत्या नृसिंहाभिधभारती ॥  
 तस्माद्विद्याशङ्कराख्यो यतिः कृष्णयतिस्तथा ।  
 तस्माच्छङ्करयोगी च चन्द्रशेखरभारती ॥  
 तत आसि(आसीत्?)ततो जातः सच्चिदानन्दभारती ।  
 ततो ब्रह्मानन्दयतिस्ततश्चिद्रूपभारती ॥  
 पुरुषोत्तमयोगी च ततोऽभून्मधुसूदनः ।  
 गुरुस्ततो जगन्नाथो विश्वानन्दयतिस्तथा ॥  
 तस्माच्च विमलानन्दो यो विद्यारण्यभारती ।  
 ततो जातो त्रिस्वरूपयतिर्बोधायनस्तथा ॥  
 ततो जातो तम(ज्ञानोत्तम?)यतिस्ततः शङ्करभारती ।

The above is reproduced from a dilapidated part of a book. The serial numbers of *ślokas* are given by us. It appears that some Kāñci favourites have added *śloka* 5 to *śloka* 8. If it were possible to decide who wrote this lineage, when and why, the value of the same could be known.

This is enough of the Kāñcī Pīṭha lineage. We shall take up the lineages of the three northern Maṭhas and then we shall write about the subordinate Maṭhas. We have not given completely the material available to us regarding all the details of the date, *Śaka*, *Samvatsara*, *Māsa*, *Tithi* etc. of Śringeri and Kāñci pontiffs. Because, considering the present controversy about these things, they may be just imaginary. The same applies to the Maṭha lineages that we are going to write next.

### (3) Pontiff Lineage of Dwārakā Pīṭha

What we know about this Pīṭha is very little. There was a controversy regarding who has the authority to be the pontiff of the Pīṭha. Later, the Government intervened and decided that the presently reigning Śrīmat Abhinava Satchidānanda Tīrtha Swāmiji has the authority. Accordingly he is carrying out the work of the Pīṭha, i.e., spreading the message of Dharma and Jñāna. The list of lineage of pontiffs published by the Pīṭha in 1957 A. D. is given below. The differences with *Baladeva Upādhyāya's* list and those with the list of Bodas are also indicated.

	Pīṭha Publication	Bala.
1. <i>Sureśwarācārya</i> (Yudhi. Śaka)	2692	2691
2. <i>Citsukhācārya</i>	2715	
3. <i>Sarvajnācārya</i>	2774	
4. <i>Brahmānandatīrtha</i>	2833	2823
5. <i>Swarupābhijnā(nā)cārya</i>	2890	
6. <i>Mangalamūrtyācārya</i>	2942	
7. <i>Bhaskarācārya</i>	2995	
8. <i>Prajñānācārya</i>	3008	
9. <i>Brahmajyotsnācārya</i>	3040	
10. <i>Ānandāvirbhavācārya</i>	Vikrama 9	

The first ten in the list of Mahādeva Rājārāma Bodas are given below:

Birth of Śaṅkarācārya	2631
<i>Sannyāsa</i> of Śaṅkarācārya	2639
Niryāṇa	2663
1. Brahmaswarūpācārya	440 B. C.
2. Citsukha	416
3. Sarvajñāna	357
4. Brahmānandatīrtha	308
5. Swarūpābhijñāna	245
6. Mangalamūrthi	193
7. Bhāskara	140
8. Prajñāna	127
9. Brahmajyotsna	95
10. Ānandāvirbhāva	Samvat 25

Hereafterwards the differences are shown by the side:

	Piṭha Pub.	Bala.	Bodas
11. Kalānidhitīrtha	Vikrama 82		
12. Cidvilāsācārya	119		
13. Vibhūtyānandācārya	154		
14. Sphūrtinilaya(pāda)	203		
15. Varatantupāda	249	259	

	Piṭha Pub.	Bala.	Bodas
16. Yogārūḍhācārya	260	360	350
17. Vijayaḍiṇḍimācārya	349		
18. Vidyātīrtha	437		
19. Citsāktideśika	483	438	
20. Vijñāneśwaratīrtha	511		
21. Ritambharācārya	572		
22. Amareśwaraguru	608		
23. Sarvatomukhatīrtha	669		
24. Ānandadeśika	721		Svānandadeśika
25. Samādhirasikācārya	799		
26. Narayaṇāśrama	836		
27. Vaikunṭhāśrama	885		
28. Vikramāśrama	911	Trivikramāśrama	
29. Narasimhāśrama	960		
30. Tryambakāśrama	965		
31. Vaishṇavāśrama	1001		Vishramāśrama
32. Keshavāśrama	1060	1006	
33. Cidambarāśrama	1083		
34. Padmanabhāśrama	1109		
35. Mahadevāśrama	1184		
36. Satchidānandāśrama	1207		
37. Vidyāśankarāśrama	1265		
38. Abhinavasatchidānandāśrama	1293		



	Pīṭha Pub.	Bala.	Bodas
39. Śaśirekhāśrama	1226	1326	1326
40. Vāsudevāśrama	1351	1362	1361
41. Puruṣottamāśrama	1394		
42. Janārdanāśrama	1408		
43. Hariharāśrama	1411		
44. Bhavāśrama	1421		
45. Brahmāśrama	1436		
46. Vamanāśrama	1453		
47. Sarvajnāśrama	1489		
48. Pradyumnāśrama	1495		
49. Govindāśrama	1523		
50. Cidāśrama	1576		
51. Viśveśwarāśrama	1608		
52. Damodarāśrama	1615		
53. Mahadevāśrama	1616		
54. Aniruddhāśrama	1625		
55. Achyutāśrama	1629		
56. Madhavāśrama	1665		1685
57. Anantāśrama	1716		
58. Viśwarūpāśrama	1721		
59. Cidghanāśrama	1726		
60. Nrisimhāśrama	1735		
61. Manoharāśrama	1761		

	Pīṭha Pub.	Bala.	Bodas
62. Prakāśānanda Saraswati	1795		
63. Viśuddhāśrama	1799	Viśuddhānandāśrama	
64. Vāmanendra	1831		Vamanesha
65. Keshavāśrama	1838		
66. Madhusūdanāśrama	1848		
67. Hayagrivāśrama	1862		
68. Prakāśāśrama	1863		
69. Hayagrivānanda Saraswati	1874		
70. Śrīdharāśrama	1914		
71. Dāmodarāśrama	1928		
72. Keśavāśrama	1935		1934
73. Rajarajeśwara (Śaṅkaraśrama)	1956		1957
74. Mādhavatīrtha	1972		1970
75. Śāntyananda Saraswati <sup>1</sup>	1981		1976
76. Candrśekharaśrama	2000		
77. Śrīmadabhinava Satcidānanda- tīrtha			

Śrīmadabhinava Satcidānandatīrtha is presently in the pīṭha.

(1) With the exception of a few, the dates of all the three listings given above are agreeing with each other. Both Dwārakā and Kāñci listings give Śaṅkarācārya nearly the same date - that is, 5th century

1. Bala. and Bodas listing ends here.

B. C. In both these, for the first few pontiffs greater periods, and for the recent ones agreeable dates have been written. N. Venkaṭarāman writes that since both the Maṭhas give the same number of pontiffs for the same period, the Kāñci listing is strengthened (NVSK p 13-14). But, as the Kāñci periods themselves are controversial, not much is gained by this statement.

(2) As both N. Venkaṭarāman and *Baladeva Upādhyāya* have written, no historical incidents worth mentioning are there regarding the Dwārakā Maṭha pontiffs.

(3) Inclusion of Sureśwara in this listing is to be noted. He is said to be the pontiff of this Śāradā Pīṭha from Yudhishṭhira Śaka 2649 Māgha Śukla 7. Baladeva Upādhyāya who writes that Hastāmalaka is the Ācārya for this Pīṭha at two places (Bala. Śam. p 167, p177), also writes that the first Ācārya for the Śāradā Pīṭha is *Sureśwarācārya* (p 177).

(4) Although the *Maṭhāmnāya* mentions 'Bhadrakālī Devi' for this Pīṭha, how come it is called Śāradā Pīṭha? is a debatable question. The Dwārakā tradition holds that Śāradā was established on Yudhishṭhira Śaka 2648; then why so much prominence accorded to Bhadrakālī Devi? Although in *Maṭhāmnāyasetu* it is mentioned 'कालिकापीठशासने', in the version of *Mahānuśāsana* accepted by Dwārakā Pīṭha it is changed to 'शारदापीठसात्कृताः'. Even then, in the *Dwārakā Sankṣipta Itihāsa* it is mentioned as Bhadrakālī and not as Śārada. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has written that the Ācārya is Viśwarūpa (Bala. Śam. p 305); but in the *Maṭhāmnāya* included in the *Dwārakā Sankṣipta Itihāsa* it is mentioned as 'स्वरूपब्रह्मचार्याख्य आचार्यः पद्मपादकः' (p 48). Similarly, although it is appropriate that there

is prominence for Kamākṣi in Kāñci, the traditionalists there claim that theirs is Śāradā Pīṭha. But everyone accepts that Śāradā was established in Śringeri. The inner secret of this has to be explored.

### **Pontiff Lineage of Dwārakā (II list)**

(*Saṅkṣipta Itihāsa*, p 52)

There are only the names of the Ācāryas: Śrī Śaṅkarācārya. 1. Śrī Padmapādācārya. 2. Viṣṇuswāmi Tīrtha. 3. Brahmānanda Tīrtha. 4. Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha. 5. Kaivalyānanda Tīrtha. 6. Vijñānānanda Tīrtha. 7. Sadānanda Tīrtha. 8. Kriṣṇānanda Yogīndra Tīrtha. 9. Śivānanda Tīrtha. 10. Sadānanda Tīrtha (2). 11. Satchidānanda Tīrtha. 12. Kriṣṇayogīndra Tīrtha. 13. Sadāśivānanda Tīrtha. 14. Satchidānanda Tīrtha (2). 15. Abhinavayogīndra Tīrtha. 16. Sadānanda Tīrtha (3). 17. Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha (2). 18. Satchidānanda Tīrtha (3). 19. Sadānanda Tīrtha (4). 20. Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha (3). 21. Satchidānanda Tīrtha (4). 22. Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha (4). 23. Satchidānanda Tīrtha (5). 24. Kaivalyānanda Tīrtha (2). 25. Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha (5). 26. Sadānanda Tīrtha (5). 27. Satchidānanda Tīrtha (6). 28. AgnimūrdhaKriṣṇānanda Tīrtha. 29. Satchidānanda Tīrtha (7). 30. Abhinava Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha. 31. Abhinava Sadānanda Tīrtha. 32. Abhinava Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha (2). 33. Abhinava Sadānanda Tīrtha (2). 34. Abhinava Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha (3). 35. Śrīmadabhinava SatchidānandaTīrtha Swāmiji.

There is no correspondence between the two lists regarding either the number of Ācāryas or their names. In this listing, there is great prominence for the *yogapaṭṭa* ‘tīrtha’; and Padmapādācārya has been placed instead of *Sureśwarācārya*. We do not know any historical in-

cidents worth mentioning about the Dwārakā Maṭha. But, before the present pontiff Śrīmat Abhinava Satchidānandatīrtha Swāmiji, some incidents about the gurus who stayed in Mysore region, have been collected from the book *Śrī Dwārakā Jagadguru Samsthānada Sankṣipta Itihāsa*:

1. While the lineage of pontiffs starting from Padmapādācārya was continuing in the sacred Dwārakā Pīṭha, during Śālivāhana Śaka around 1400 years, trouble was created by the *yavanas* such that it was very difficult to live there, the then pontiff Śrī Kriṣṇānanda Tīrtha left Dwārakā and went towards south. He was honoured by the king of Vijayanagara; pleased with their treatment, established a Maṭha at Mulubāgilu and remained there doing *tapas*. Since it was established by Kriṣṇānanda Swāmiji, the Maṭha came to be called as Śrī Kriṣṇānanda Maṭha (*Itihāsa*, p 8-9).

[In the footnote it is written: There is an inscription in front of ViṭṭalaSwāmi Temple near Śrī Kriṣṇānanda Maṭha, Mulubāgilu Taluk, which reads “On 1469th *Parābhava Samvatsara Māgha Bahula Pañcamī* (1547 A. D.), seven and a half *grāmas* (Mulubāgilu Taluk Pāyasampalli and other *grāmas*) were given as charity to Śrī KriṣṇānandaSwāmi’s Maṭha in order that his lineage of disciples continues with *annasatra, deepārādhane* and other dhārmic activities”].

2. After him, Sadānandatīrtha Swāmi, and then Satchidānandatīrtha Swāmi became pontiffs of the Maṭha. The third one was Śrī Agni-mūrdha Kriṣṇānandatīrtha Swāmigal; since sparks of fire used to fly from his head when he became angry, he came to be known as Agni-mūrdha. (*Iti.*, p 9).

3. In a copper inscription given by Satchidānandatīrtha Swāmiji

to the brahmins of Bhadrasmudra Agrahāra during Śālivāhana Śaka 1588, an epithet 'ŚivaVeṃkaṭendraRacitānekārhaṇeṣu' (शिववेंकटेन्द्ररचितानेकार्हेणेषु) was included in addressing Śrī Agnimūrdha Kriṣṇānandatīrtha Swāmigal. From this it seems that Śivappa Nāyaka of Nagara has falcitated the Swāmigal ( *Iti.*, p 10). There are copper inscriptions to declare that Keḷadi Śivappa Nāyaka's younger brother Venkaṭappa Nāyaka during Śālivāhana Śaka 1583 *Shārvari Samvatsara* and Śivappa Nāyaka's another younger brother Bhadrappa Nāyaka during Śālivāhana Śaka 1584 *Plava Samvatsara* for having offered *grāmas* to the same Swāmigal. That Śrīranga Rāya VI of Vijayanagara has offered *grāmas* Raṇakaṭṭe, Hāroṇahalli and Sūrāpura (which are around Belur within about a couple of miles) to the same Swāmigal, declare stone inscriptions that are there in those villages. From this one can guess that by Śālivāhana Śaka 1575 (1653 A. D.) the Samsthāna had transmigrated from Kolar Taluk Mulubāgilu to Tīrthahalli Taluk Mulubāgilu ( *Iti.*, p 10).

4. The king of Keḷadi got a Maṭha built at Bhadrasmudra Agrahāra near Tīrtharājapura (Tīrthahalli) on the shores of Tunga river, and gave land grant etc. through inscription for the expenses of the Samsthāna. From then onwards this place also came to be called as Mulubāgilu ( *Iti.*, p 11). Swāmigal established another Maṭha at Talakāḍ, the forest area of elephants. There Bhāgavata tradition is in vogue; it is called BālaKriṣṇānanda Maṭha ( *Iti.*, p 12).

5. Śrī Abhinava Kriṣṇānandatīrtha (pontiff No. 30) toured in the entire northern region and brought up the Maṭha prestige ( *Iti.*, p 14).

6. During Śālivāhana Śaka 1795 Śrī Abhinava Sadānandatīrtha went to Gujarat on tour; people decided that he is the truly rightful

pontiff of the Dwārakā Pīṭha ( *Iti.*, p 16).

7. Śrī Abhinava Kriṣṇānandatīrtha (pontiff No. 34) took Sannyāsa during 1894 A. D. He travelled throughout India and became famous (*Iti.*, p 16-18).

Now Śrīmadabhinava Satchidānandatīrtha Swāmiji is reigning the Dwārakā Pīṭha. The above historical points are summarized here because they are related to the Dwārakā Maṭha.

#### (4) Pontiff Lineage of Govardhana Pīṭha

We do not know the history of this Pīṭha, which is located at Jagannāth Puri. We give below the pontiff lineage which is in the form of *ślokas*, what *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has given. Some variations of names are there in the list of Bodas, but since they are only names, not much is gained by the reader and hence we have not given those differences.

[माधवस्य सुतः श्रीमान्सनन्दन इति श्रुतः ।

प्रकाशब्रह्मचारी च ऋग्वेदी सर्वशास्त्रवित् ॥ १७ ॥

श्रीपद्मपादः प्रथमाचार्यत्वेनाभ्यषिच्यत ।

श्रीमत्परमहंसादिबिरुदैरखिलैः सह ॥ १८ ॥

अङ्गवङ्गकलिङ्गाश्च मगधोत्कलबर्बराः ।

गोवर्धनमठाधीनाः कृताः प्राचीव्यवस्थिताः ॥ १९ ॥

तस्मिन्गोवर्धनमठे शङ्कराचार्यपीठगान् ।

जगद्गुरुन्क्षमाद्वक्ष्ये जन्ममृत्युनिवृत्तये ॥ २० ॥]

पद्मपादः शूलपाणिस्ततो नारायणाभिदः ।

विद्यारण्यो वामदेवः पद्मनाभाभिधस्ततः ॥ २१ ॥

जगन्नाथः सप्तमः स्यादष्टमो मधुरेश्वरः ।

गोविन्दः श्रीधरस्वामी माधवानन्द एव च ॥ २२ ॥

कृष्णब्रह्मानन्दनामा रामानन्दाभिधस्ततः ।  
 वागीश्वरः श्रीपरमेश्वरो गोपालनामकः ॥ २३ ॥  
 जनार्दनस्तथा ज्ञानानन्दश्चाष्टादशः स्मृतः ।  
 मध्यकाले स्थितानेतानाचार्याख्यान्नाम्यहम् ॥ २४ ॥  
 अथ तीर्थाभिधान् श्रीमद्गोवर्धनमठे स्थितान् ।  
 अस्मदाचार्यपर्यन्तान्गुरुन्नाम्ना स्मराम्यहम् ॥ २५ ॥  
 एकोनविंश आचार्यो बृहदारण्यतीर्थकः ।  
 महादेवोऽथ परमब्रह्मानन्दस्ततः स्मृतः ॥ २६ ॥  
 रामानन्दस्ततो ज्ञेयस्त्रयोविंशः सदाशिवः ।  
 हरीश्वरानन्दतीर्थो बोधानन्दस्ततः परम् ॥ २७ ॥  
 श्रीरामकृष्णतीर्थोऽथ चिद्बोधात्माभिधस्ततः ।  
 तत्त्वाक्षरमुनिः पश्चादूनत्रिंशस्तु शङ्करः ॥ २८ ॥  
 श्रीवासुदेवतीर्थश्च हयग्रीव श्रुतीश्वरः ।  
 विद्यानन्दस्त्रयस्त्रिंशो मुकुन्दानन्द एव च ॥ २९ ॥  
 हिरण्यगर्भतीर्थश्च नित्यानन्दस्ततः परम् ।  
 सप्तत्रिंशः शिवानन्दो योगीश्वरसुदर्शनौ ॥ ३० ॥  
 अथ श्रीव्योमकेशाख्यो ज्ञेयो दामोदरस्ततः ।  
 योगानन्दाभिधस्तीर्थो गोलकेशस्ततः परम् ॥ ३१ ॥  
 श्रीकृष्णानन्दतीर्थश्च देवानन्दाभिधस्तथा ।  
 चन्द्रचूडाभिधः षट्चत्वारिंशोऽथ हलायुधः ॥ ३२ ॥  
 सिद्धसेव्यस्तारकात्मा ततो बोधायनाभिधः ।  
 श्रीधरो नारायणश्च ज्ञेयश्चान्यः सदाशिवः ॥ ३३ ॥  
 जयकृष्णो विरूपाक्षो विद्यारण्यस्तथापरः ।  
 विश्वेश्वराभिधस्तीर्थो विबुधेश्वर एव च ॥ ३४ ॥  
 महेश्वरस्तूनषष्टितमोऽथ मधुसूदनः ।  
 रघूत्तमो रामचन्द्रो योगीन्द्रश्च महेश्वरः ॥ ३५ ॥  
 ॐकाराख्यः पञ्चषष्टितमो नारायणोऽपरः ।



जगन्नाथः श्रीधरश्च रामचन्द्रस्तथापरः ॥ ३६ ॥  
 अथ ताम्रकतीर्थः स्यात्तत उग्रेश्वरः स्मृतः ।  
 उद्दण्डतीर्थश्च ततः सङ्कर्षणजनार्दनौ ॥ ३७ ॥  
 अखण्डात्माभिधस्तीर्थः पञ्चसप्ततिसंख्यकः ।  
 दामोदरः शिवानन्दस्ततः श्रीमद्गदाधरः ॥ ३८ ॥  
 विद्याधरो वामनश्च ततः श्रीशङ्करोऽपरः ।  
 नीलकण्ठो रामकृष्णस्तथा श्रीमद्रघूत्तमः ॥ ३९ ॥  
 दामोदरोऽन्यो गोपालः षडशीतितमो गुरुः ।  
 मृत्युञ्जयोऽथ गोविन्दो वासुदेवस्तथाऽपरः ॥ ४० ॥  
 गङ्गाधराभिधस्तीर्थस्ततः श्रीमत्सदाशिवः ।  
 वामदेवश्चोपमन्युर्हयग्रीवो हरिस्तथा ॥ ४१ ॥  
 रघूत्तमाभिधस्त्वन्यः पुण्डरीकाक्ष एव च ।  
 परशङ्करतीर्थश्च शतादूनः प्रकथ्यते ॥ ४२ ॥  
 वेदगर्भाभिधस्तीर्थस्ततो वेदान्तभास्करः ।  
 रामकृष्णाभिधस्त्वन्यश्चतुःशततमो मतः ॥ ४३ ॥  
 वृषध्वजः शुद्धबोधस्ततः सोमेश्वराभिधः ॥ ४४ ॥  
 अष्टोत्तरतमो बोपदेवः प्रकीर्तितः ।  
 शम्भुतीर्थो भृगुश्चाथ केशवानन्दतीर्थकः ॥ ४५ ॥  
 विद्यानन्दाभिधस्तीर्थो वेदानन्दभिधस्ततः ।  
 श्रीबोधानन्दतीर्थश्च सुतपानन्द एव च ॥ ४६ ॥  
 ततः श्रीधरतीर्थोऽन्यस्तथा चान्यो जनार्दनः ।  
 कामनाशानन्दतीर्थः शतमष्टादशाधिकम् ॥ ४७ ॥  
 ततो हरिहरानन्दो गोपालाख्योऽपरस्ततः ।  
 कृष्णानन्दाभिधस्त्वन्यो माधवानन्द एव च ॥ ४८ ॥  
 मधुसूदनतीर्थोऽन्यो गोविन्दोऽथ रघूत्तमः ।  
 वामदेवो हृषीकेशस्ततो दामोदरोऽपरः ॥ ४९ ॥  
 गोपालानन्दतीर्थश्च गोविन्दाख्योऽपरस्ततः ।

तथा रघूत्तमश्चान्यो रामचन्द्रस्तथाऽपरः ॥ ५० ॥

गोविन्दो रघुनाथश्च रामकृष्णस्ततोऽपरः ।

मधुसूदनतीर्थश्च तथा दामोदरोऽपरः ॥ ५१ ॥

रघूत्तमः शिवो लोकनाथो दामोदरस्ततः ।

मधुसूदनतीर्थाख्यस्तत आचार्य उच्यते ॥ ५२ ॥

आजन्मब्रह्मचारी यो भाति गोवर्धने मठे ।

द्विचत्वारिंशदधिकशतसङ्ख्यः सनन्दनात् ॥ ५३ ॥

श्रीमत्परमहंसादिनानाबिरुदशोभितान् ।

तीर्थाभिधानिमान्सर्वान्गुरुन्नित्यं नमाम्यहम् ॥ ५४ ॥

1. While the names ending with “tīrtha” are more in number, it seems there is no rule in this Maṭha that one should take *Sannyāsa* directly from the stage of *brahmacarya*.

2. After the famous Śrī BhāratiKṛṣṇa Tīrtha became brahmībhūta, we do not know who is the pontiff now.

### (5) Pontiff Lineage of Jyotirmaṭha

This Maṭha is twenty miles south from Badari; people commonly refer to it as ‘Joshi Maṭha’. Rāvalji, the priest of Badari, stays here. Because of extreme cold, Badari temple would remain closed from October to April; then the movable idol etc. of that temple will be brought here. Historians believe that the idol of Badari was established by Ādi Śaṅkarācārya. These details are available in *Baladeva Upādhyāya’s* book (Bala. Śam. 183). It appears people remember the pontiff lineage of this Maṭha for daily morning remembrance (Bala. Śam. p 184):

तोडको विजयः कृष्णः कुमारो गरुडध्वजः ।

विन्ध्यो विशालो वकुलो वामनः सुन्दरोऽरुणः ॥ १ ॥

श्रीनिवासः सुखानन्दो विद्यानन्दः शिवो गिरिः ।

विद्याधरो गुणानन्दो नारायण उमापतिः ॥ २ ॥

एते ज्योतिर्मठाधीशा आचार्याश्चिरजीविनः ।

य एतान्संस्मरेन्नित्यं योगसिद्धिं स विन्दति ॥ ३ ॥

[It is said here that the pontiffs whose names are expressed here live eternally; one who remembers them daily will accomplish *yogasiddhi*.]

*Baladeva Upādhyāya* thinks that this lineage was there from Vikrama Samvatsara 700 to 1000; then the lineage was broken. There were no pontiff for the Pīṭha for over four hundred years. Right from the beginning, the traditional worship of Badari temple was being carried out by these *Sannyāsins* only. The names of Badari *Mahāntas* is available from 1500 onwards. It seems they were also presiding over the Maṭha. The names of the pontiffs of earlier 400 years are not available. These presiding authorities are:

Name	Period Samvat	Pūjākālā
1. BalāKṛṣṇa Swāmi	1500 - 1557	57
2. Haribrahma Swāmi	1557 - 1558	1
3. Harismaraṇa Swāmi	1558 - 1566	8
4. Vrindāvana Swāmi	1566 - 1568	2
5. Anantanārāyaṇa Swāmi	1568 - 1569	1
6. Bhāvānanda Swāmi	1569 - 1583	14
7. Kriṣṇānanda Swāmi	1583 - 1593	10
8. Harinārāyaṇa Swāmi	1593 - 1601	8
9. Brahmānanda Swāmi	1601 - 1621	20

Name	Period Samvat	Pūjākāla
10. Devānanda Swāmi	1621 - 1635	15
11. Raghunātha Swāmi	1635 - 1661	25
12. Pūrṇadeva Swāmi	1661 - 1687	26
13. Kriṣṇadeva Swāmi	1687 - 1696	9
14. Śivānanda Swāmi	1696 - 1703	7
15. BalaKṛṣṇa Swāmi	1703 - 1717	14
16. Nārāyaṇopendra Swāmi	1717 - 1750	33
17. Hariścandra Swāmi	1750 - 1763	13
18. Sadānanda Swāmi	1763 - 1773	10
19. Keshava Swāmi	1773 - 1781	8
20. Nārāyaṇatīrtha Swāmi	1781 - 1823	41
21. RāmaKṛṣṇa Swāmi	1823 - 1833	10

From here onwards, the worship was taken over by 'brahmacāri Rāval' from the *Sannyāsins*. After RāmaKṛṣṇa Swāmi left the body in 1833, there was no heir to the Maṭha. Pradeep Shah, the Mahārāja of Gadhwāl who visited the temple, seeing that there was no priest there, accorded the position of 'Rāval' to Gopāl (a nambūdiri brahmin who was arranging for the food offering of the Lord) with all honours like *chatra*, *cāmara* etc. and kept him in the position of RāmaKṛṣṇa Swāmi. Thenceforth only 'Rāval's are there; and all of them would be nambūdiri brahmins. This 'Rāval' lineage is as follows:

Name	Period Samvat	Pūjākāla
1. Gopāla Rāval	1833 - 1842	9
2. Rāmacandra Rāmabrahma	1842 - 1843	1
3. Niladanta Rāval	1843 - 1848	5
4. Sītārāma	1848 - 1859	11
5. Narāyaṇa	1859 - 1873	14
6. Narāyaṇa (2)	1873 - 1898	25
7. Kṛṣṇa	1898 - 1902	4
8. Narāyaṇa (3)	1902 - 1916	14
9. Puruṣottama	1916 - 1957	41
10. Vāsudeva	1957 - 1958	1
11. Rāma Rāval	1958 - 1962	4
12. Vāsudeva	1962 - ...	

(Vāsudeva Rāval had resigned from his post due to some reasons; then the post was given to another nambūdiri Rāval; after his demise, once again the reign came to the hands of Vāsudeva Rāval. Hence his name has been mentioned twice).

The relationship with Badarīnath is important to these Rāvals; they are not directly related to the Maṭha. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has written that ‘the Maṭha was without a presiding pontiff for a long time; now Vidwān Brahmānanda Swāmi of Kāshi has become the president’. We do not know who is there now. We learn that this Pīṭha also has become controversial. *Baladeva Upādhyāya* has written about the glory of this Pīṭha; (Bala. Sham. p 186) but since it

is not related to the lineage, we have not given it here.

### (6) Sumeru Maṭha

We do not know much about this Maṭha, although it is included in the *Maṭhāmnāya*.

### The satellite Maṭhas

In addition to the aforementioned main Pīṭhas, there are subsidiary Pīṭhas like Kuḍali, Sankeshwar, Puṣpagiri, Śivaganga etc. The available material regarding these are historically not reliable, and hence we could not write much about them. Some important information which we know has been given in summary fashion.

### (1) Kuḍali Maṭha

(text, page 398)

Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman has written three points in his book: (1) the Tīrthamattur and Kuḍali Maṭhas were established in the 14th century under the direction of Śrīṅgeri Guru and the King (KRTTW p 44). (2) the Swāmi of the Kuḍali Maṭha motivated the Bijāpur rulers to give two villages Harakere and Maṇḍali to his control. Veerabhadra Nāyaka wrote to Khodaismal Khan, Adām Afzal Khan and Khan Ali Shah that they should not come in the way of the independence of Śrī Satchidānanda Swāmi (KRTTW p 63). (3) Kriṣṇappa Nāyaka, after his perusal of the identity of Śiva and Viṣṇu, wrote in an inscription of 1561 A. D. that “in order to remove the controversy, the all-compassionate Hari and Hara both manifested themselves in the divine form of Harihara in Kuḍali (Harihara)” (KRTTW p 73).

But the Kuḍali Maṭha's opinion is different. The Samsthāna has printed at Mysore and published a lineage (*Guruparamparā nāmamāle*) which contains the following *ślokas*:

तज्जः परिव्राट् सुत्रामा श्रीनृसिंहसुभारती ।

वारणस्यादितीर्थानां यात्रार्थमगमद्गुरुः ॥ २२ ॥

प्रत्यावृत्तो बहोः कालाच्छृङ्गेर्या च महाजनैः ।

अन्यं हठादविधिना कृतं दृष्ट्वा यतिं स्वयम् ॥ २३ ॥

तुङ्गभद्रासङ्गमं कूडलीक्षेत्रमेत्य सः ।

जगद्गुरुरपदं तत्र प्रतिष्ठाप्यावसत् सुखम् ॥ २४ ॥

The meaning of the *ślokas* is that “Śrī Nṛsimha Bhārati, the descendent of Rāmacandra Bhārati, went on a pilgrimage of *Vārāṇasi* etc. and on returning to Śrīṅgeri after a long time, found that the people had made someone as yati, by force. Seeing this, he proceeded to Kuḍali which is located at the Tunga-Bhadra confluence, established himself there as the Jagadguru and was happy”. When questioned regarding this, the present Kuḍali Śrīṅgeri Jagadguru showed a printed copy of “Prācīna Śāsana Lekhana Sangraha” (collection of ancient inscriptions) of Śrīmajjagadguru Śrī Kuḍali-Śrīṅgeri Samsthāna. In the first part of this, there are some inscriptions of the Kadamba and Vijayanagara periods. In the second part entitled “Writings of the Pontiffs etc.”, there is a letter written in Bālabodha lipi. It is dated Śālivāhana Śaka 1504 (1582 A. D.) Vishu Samvatsara Māgha Śuddha 7. After giving the traditional mention of the titles etc., the letter is written.

“ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ಪರಮಹಂಸ ಪರಿವ್ರಾಜಕಾಚಾರ್ಯವರ್ಯ... ...ಯುಷ್ಮತ್ಪುಣ್ಯಪುರವರಾಧೀಶ್ವರ  
ತುಜ್ಜಭದ್ರಾತೀರವಾಸ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ವಿದ್ಯಾಶಂಕರ ಪಾದಪದ್ಮಾರಾಧಕ ಶ್ರೀರಾಮಚಂದ್ರಭಾರತೀಸ್ವಾಮಿ  
ಕರಕಮಲಸಂಪಾದಕ ಶೃಂಗೇರಿ ಶ್ರೀನೃಸಿಂಹಭಾರತೀಸ್ವಾಮಿನಾಂ ಚರಣಸರೋಜೇಷು-

it reads as follows in Kannada:

‘ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಿಯಶಿಷ್ಯನಾದ ಶೃಂಗೇರೀ ಶ್ರೀಶಾರದಾಂಬನವರ ಪೂಜೆಗೆ ನೇಮಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರ-  
ಭಾರತಿಯು ಭಾಷಾಪೂರ್ವಕ ಬರಶಿ ವಪ್ಪಿಶಿದ ನಿಬಂಧನೇ: ಬಿನ್ನವತ್ತಳೇ ಅದಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಕರ್ತರು  
ಮಹಾಯಾತ್ರೆಗೆ ಚಿತ್ಪ್ರಸಿದ ವ್ಯಾಳ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಲದ ಮಹಾಜನಗಳು ಕೃತಿಮತನದಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ  
ಆಶ್ರಮಾಕೊಡಿಸಿ ತಾವೂ ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಾರದು ದುರಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸ್ಥಳ ಬಂದುಕಟ್ಟುಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು  
ಇದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾತ್ರೀತೀರ್ಥಾಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ತಾವು ಪುನಃ ಶೃಂಗೇರಿಗೆ ಚಿತ್ಪ್ರಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಕಲದೇಶಗಳೂ  
ಸಂಚಾರಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾಸಂಗಮ ಕೂಡ್ಲಿಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ದಿಗ್ವಿಜಯ ಮಾಡಿದ ತರುವಾಯ  
ಸ್ಥಲದ ವಿದ್ಯಮಾನಗಳ್ಳುತನ್ನೂ ದಿವ್ಯಚಿತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರುತವಾಗಿ ನಮಗೆ ಕೃತಿಮತನದಿಂದ ಆಶ್ರಮಾಕೊಡಿದ  
ಮಹಾಜನ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಸಹ ಈ ಕೂಡ್ಲಿಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಕರಶಿಕೊಂಡು ನಿಗ್ರಹಪೂರ್ವಕ ಆಜ್ಞಾ ಮಾಡಿದ  
ಕಾರಣ ನಾವು ಶ್ರೀದಿವ್ಯಚಿತ್ತದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯಾದಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆಂದು  
ವಿನಯಪೂರ್ವಕ ಬಿನ್ನಹಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪರಮ ಕಾರುಣ್ಯ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಅನುಗ್ರಹಪೂರ್ವಕ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ  
ದಯಪಾಲಿಶಿ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಶಾರದಾಂಬನವರ ಪೂಜಾ ಮುಂತಾದ ವಿನಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನಿಬಂಧನೆಪ್ರಕಾರ  
ನಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆಜ್ಞಾನುಸಾರ ನಡೆಕೊಂಬುವಂತೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಆಯಿತಾದ ಕಾರಣಾ ಅದೇ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ  
ಅಮೃತನವರ ಪೂಜಾಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕಾಲಂಪ್ರತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಹುಟ್ಟಿಮುಟ್ಟಿದ ಆದಾಯವೆಚ್ಚದ ಲೆಖ್ವಾ  
ಮಿಗತೀ ಆದ ದ್ರವ್ಯಸಹಾ ಶ್ರೀಸನ್ನಿಧಾನಕ್ಕೆ ವಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದೆನು. ಮುಂದೆ ತಾವು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ  
ನೇಮಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟವರಿಗೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಥಾನಾಪನ್ನರಾಗಿ ಕರಕಮಲಸಂಚಾರಾಗಿ ನೇಮಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟವರಿಗೂ ಇದೇ  
ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಆದಾಯವೆಚ್ಚಾ ಮಿಗತೀಹಣ ಸಹ ವಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಂಚಾರ ಆಚಾರವಿಚಾರ ಮೊದಲಾದ  
ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹವ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗದೇ ಆಜ್ಞಾನುಸಾರ ನಡೆಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕವನು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪರಂಪರಾಗತದಲ್ಲಿ  
ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಅನ್ಯಥಾ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಗುರುಚರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಥಾಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮ  
ಆತ್ಮಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಿಂದ ಭಾಷಾಪೂರ್ವಕ ಬರಶಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಶಿದ ಬಿನ್ನವತ್ತಳೇ ವಿಷುಸಂವತ್ಸರದ ಮಾಘ ಶುದ್ಧ  
೭ರಲ್ಲೂ ಇತಿ ವಿಜ್ಞಪ್ತಯಃ (ಶ್ರೀ) ||”

The letter is summarised below.

“श्रीमत्परमहंस परिव्राजकाचार्यवर्य ... .. ऋष्यशृङ्गपुरवराधीश्वर तुङ्गभद्रातीरवास  
श्रीमद्विद्याशङ्कर पादपद्माराधक श्रीरामचन्द्रभारतीस्वामि करकमलसञ्जात शृङ्गेरी श्रीनृसिंह-  
भारतीस्वामिनां चरणसरोजेषु-

‘Your dear disciple Rāmacandra Bhārati who was ordained to wor-  
ship Śrī Śāradāmba submits that when you had been on pilgrimage



the local people fraudulently gave me Āśrama so that you will not be able to return; while on your way to Śringeri you arrived at the Tunga-Bhadra confluence Kuḍali and you were in the know of things; when you summoned the local people who had given me Āśrama forcefully and myself before you to Kuḍali, with all humility I submitted before you that I shall abide by your behests; you with all compassion blessed me with an order to continue worship of Śāradāmba etc. as per rules; accordingly I continued worship etc. and from time to time submitted the account of expenditure and the remaining money to you. Further, to your descendents there too, I shall be submitting the account of expenditure and the remaining money; and shall remain as per your orders without taking liberties of travel, and the like. Also I submit before you that even in case my descendents here behave differently, that shall be nothing but defying one's Guru. I write this with my full faith and belief on this day the *Vishu Samvatsara Māgha Śuddha 7th.*'

A letter for having sent the remaining money of 548 Varaha on *Citrabhānu Samvatsara Śālivāhana Śaka 1505* (1583 A. D.) also is there.

Regarding this matter we put the following questions before the present Kuḍali Maṭha pontiff: (1) When and how the goodwill between the two Maṭhas as revealed in this letter was broken? Is there any document about this available? (2) When and how the border disputes between the *grāmas* affiliated to Śringeri Maṭha and those affiliated to Kuḍali-Śringeri Maṭha were settled? How come *grāmas* that are very near to each other happen to belong to these different Maṭhas? (3) Was the Candramoulīśwara Lingam in possession with the Kuḍali Maṭha when its pontiff went on pilgrimage? If so, when and how it went to Śringeri Maṭha again?

We did not get satisfactory answers for the first two questions. For the third question, a document of the Maṭha was read to us, in which it was stated that Śrīṅgeri Maṭha people, with the help of the king, took away the Candramouliśwara Lingam and some other valuables.

Some people have raised a controversy that among the two, which one is really the Maṭha established by Adi Śaṅkara. Śrīṅgeri is on the banks of Tunga; but Kuḍali itself was the original Śrīṅgeri. It seems there is an inscription of Chikmagalur Taluk saying that Mārkaṇḍeya, Agastya etc. did their penance on the banks of Tungabhadra (*Epigraphica Carnātica*, No. 77, p 186). A hill emerged in this place. Because of Rṣyaśringa, it came to be known as Śrīṅgeri; the place was also called by names such as Narasimha Kshetra, Kuḍali, Vidyānagara(?), Rishyāśrama etc. and that since Bhāratī Tīrtha, the Guru of *Vidyāraṇya*, chose that place for his penance in around 1346 A. D., that also came to be called by name Śrīṅgeri. It appears that majority support is not there for this line of argument till now.

Kuḍali Maṭha is now divided into two branches. One is famous by name “Kuḍali-Śrīṅgeri Maṭha”. Their contention is that they are the real pontiff of Śrīṅgeri and that the one presently on the Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha is the descendent of the one who was ordained by them to perform worship of Śāradāmba. There was a controversy about who shall be the rightful pontiff of Kuḍali Maṭha, and presently the Maṭha properties are with the present Pīṭhādhipa Śrī Satchidānanda Śaṅkara Bhāratī.

The other branch, which is claiming that they are the real rightful ones from 1873 A. D., have control over some of the land property and some of the Maṭha disciples. Their contention is that ‘when Śrī

Narasimha Bhāratī Swāmiji went on a tour around 1580 A. D., the people of Śringeri made one Narasimha Bhāratī (not Rāmacandra Bhāratī) the Śringeri pontiff by following the method of “*Pustaka Sannyāsa*”. The controversy was taken to the court of the then ruling Keḷadi Venkaṭappa Nāyaka (1553-1629 A. D.). He gave the verdict that the new *Sannyāsin* should continue to worship Śārādāmba and look after the affairs of the Maṭha<sup>1</sup>. In the 2nd and 12th inscriptions of Śringeri *Jahageeri* (*Epigraphica Carnatica*, Kadur Dist., p 348 and 374) they have made a reference as “disciple of the Lotus Feet” of Narasimha Bhāratī of Kuḍali-Śringeri Maṭha; not as “Kara Kamala Sanjāta”; even when this is the state of affairs, the Śringeri Maṭha people are claiming that they alone are the Jagadguru of Śringeri Maṭha. Many *grāmas* were donated to the new Śringeri Maṭha of Narasimha Bhāratī and his fame spread in course of time. Now it is not possible to decide how the main Śringeri Pontiff, their disciples, and the Government agreed that he was the Jagadguru. On the invitation of Sāhu Mahārāja of Satāra, there was a conference of the three Swāmis - Śaṅkara Bhāratī (disciple of Narasimha Bhāratī) of Kuḍali-Śringeri Maṭha, the Swāmi of Sankeśwara Pīṭha and the (new) Śringeri Swāmiji in 1725 A. D., and the Mahārāja fixed the areas of reignment for the three. According to his verdict, the northern part came under Sankeśwara Pīṭha, southern part came under the

---

1. Regarding this, the Śringeri Maṭha people say that there are *ślokas* in the 11th Canto of *Guruvamśakāvyā* which contradict this contention. The summary of the said *ślokas* is that “Narasimha Bhāratī, the disciple of Rāmacandra Bhāratī, deceived his Guru, and he was driven away from the Maṭha; with the King’s help, he remained in Kuḍali. Later, the King handed over the properties of the Maṭha once again to Śrī Satchidānanda Munīśwara’. We have not seen *Guruvamśakāvyā*’.

Kuḍali-Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha, and the (new) Śrīṅgeri Swāmiji was given the worship of the local deity. The history of Sankeśwara Maṭha is the basis for this. When the Śrīṅgeri Swāmiji started on a tour in 1742 A. D. with all the titles and paraphernalia of a Maṭha pontiff, the Immadi Basappa Nāyaka of Keḷadi prevented him from doing that against the practice that was there earlier. Once again, in 1806 A. D., Diwan *Pūrṇaiyah* similarly obstructed and gave orders. In spite of all these, the Śrīṅgeri pontiffs, by and large, are publicising through inscriptions etc. that theirs is the Jagadguru Pīṭha'.

The Bangalore branch of Kuḍali-Śrīṅgeri Maṭha is saying that they have taken the above detailed description from the *Indian Patriot* (issues of April 19, May 15 and June 5 of 1912 A. D.). Almost the same detail is given in a summary fashion in the "*Āḍalitha Darśana*" of Kuḍali-Śrīṅgeri Mahāsamsthānam, of *Hevilambi Samvatsara* (1879 A. D.). Therein also are the details of how not only the kings of Karṇāṭaka, but also Aurangazeb, Ibrahim Adil Shah, the *Peśwes* and kings of Mahārāṣṭra have helped the Kuḍali-Śrīṅgeri Maṭha.

In the introduction to the *Śārīraka Bhāṣya* (p 32) edited by Śrī *Kāshi Śeṣavenkaṭācala Śāstri* and printed at Venkaṭeśwara Press (of Kshema Rāja Śrī Kriṣṇadāsa Śreṣṭhi), Bombay, the following story is there:

"In the year Śaka 1422(?), Śrī Śaṅkara Bhārati Swāmiji, the tenth from Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, while travelling in Himālayas, wished to see the cave in which Govinda Bhagavatpāda (?) had lived. Before entering the cave, he said to his associates that he would come out within so many days, and if he failed to come out on the said day, they should choose one amongst themselves as Guru for the Pīṭha. Likewise, since

he did not emerge on the said day, the disciples came back to Kuḍali. And Śaṅkara Bhāratī too came back to Kuḍali in course of time. Since in Śrīṅgeri someone was on the Pīṭha by way of *Pustaka Sannyāsa*, the authorities of the Maṭha did not allow Śaṅkara Bhāratī to enter Śrīṅgeri. The disciples of the Swāmiji complained in the court of law for justice. The court verdict came on 31st January 1855 that “the new *Sannyāsin* should remain in Śrīṅgeri worshipping Śāradāmba; and Śaṅkara Bhāratī Swāmiji should tour the country and remain at Kuḍali”. It seems this is published in the Marāṭhi book **Śrī Samsthan Sankeśwara Maṭha Karavir va Sankeśwara cā Itihās**.

Now, we shall give a summary of what Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman has conveyed to us in his letter regarding this:

## I

(1) The Mysore Gazetteer (V, p 1307) reads thus: Kuḍali, a sacred village in Shimoga Taluk, at the confluence of the Tunga and Bhadra, is the seat of a maṭha connected with the one at Śrīṅgeri, the original Guru having been appointed by the Śrīṅgeri Swāmi about 528 years ago (from the publication date of the Gazetteer) to minister the smārthas of Mahārāṣṭra descent.’

(2) The pontiff who was reigning at Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha during 1500 A. D. was Puruṣottama Bhāratī; not Śaṅkara Bhāratī as Śrī Kāśī Śeṣa Venkaṭācala Śāstry says.

## II

(1) During 1582 A. D. there was no Swāmi by name Rāmacandra Bhāratī as is mentioned in Kuḍali Maṭha records; instead there was Narasimha Bhāratī (5).

(2) What is purported as the plea written by Rāmacandra Bhāratī

during *Vishu Samvatsara* and then the next year (1583 A. D.), is in modern Kannaḍa style; it does not sound like Kannaḍa of the 16th century.

(3) Narasimha Bhārati who was the pontiff at Śrīṅgeri during 1582-1583 A. D. was also called Vidyānarasimha Bhārati Swāmiji (M. A. R. 1934 No. 51).

(4) On *Yuva Samvatsara* (1576 A. D.) *Kārtika Bahula* 15, Sankaṇṇa Nāyaka scrutinized the behaviour of *Vidyāraṇya Swāmi*, the disciple of Narasimha Bhārati (Ammāji Swāmi), and as per the public opinion, gave the verdict that he is not fit to be a *Maṭhādhipati*.

(5) When one by name Brahmesha Bhaṭṭa occupied the Kuḍali Maṭha, Śivappa Nāyaka decided that he is not fit for the Pīṭha, and what lands were given to the Ammāji Swāmi were transferred to the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha (*Shārvari Samvatsara Bhadrapada* 1660 A. D.).

(6) During 1807 A. D., Diwan *Pūrṇaiiah* has passed an order that only the Śrīṅgeri Swāmiji could have the honour of *addapallakki*, (palanquin carried on the sides) and titles; and that regarding the remaining Maṭhas, the Śrīṅgeri Jagadguru has the privilege to give proper directions (1810 A. D.).

(7) Shambhu Chatrapati of Satāra has ordered that the land grants and other assets will have to go to the Śrīṅgeri Swāmiji and not to Kuḍali Swāmiji.

(8) The various appeals of Kuḍali Maṭha regarding the titles, honours enjoyed etc., submitted to at Hyderabad and Mysore were rejected and the verdicts given in favour of the Śrīṅgeri Pīṭha by the Hyderabad Government (1845 A. D.), Diwan of Mysore (1884 A. D.) and by the Resident of Mysore (1895 A. D.).

It is very natural that the details we have written above make the readers aghast with wonder. Both Maṭhas are exhibiting their records; both the Maṭhas were helped by Mahārāṣṭra, Hyderabad and Mysore; the story runs just like the Puṇḍarīka-Vāsudeva of the *Purāṇas*. Who is the real Vāsudeva? Only Lord Vāsudeva knows! There is a proverb saying that one should not go too far in search of the origin of a river and the origin of a ṛṣi. We too bow to the opinion of this proverb and stop the old story here.

In the lineage of Kuḍali pontiffs, there are 77 names. Since no historically interesting material was found, we have not written them here.

## (2) Śivaganga Maṭha

This *Samsthāna* is situated about 34 miles west of Bangalore on the northern slopes of Śivaganga hill.

What Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman writes regarding this Maṭha is: As per the prayers of Rāja Wodeyar of Mysore, Abhinava Nṛsimha Bhāratī I established a Maṭha at Śivaganga and made one of his disciples, Śaṅkara Bhāratī the pontiff there (KRTTW p 59). There are records to the effect that one of the pontiffs of this Pīṭha, Abhinavoddanda Gangadhara Bhāratī, displeased by the behaviour of his disciples, had prayed that another Swāmi will have to be made the pontiff (1841, 1843, 1847 A. D.). The Maṭha people also have given us in writing certain matters supporting this.

This is known as Śrī Śrīṅgeri Śivaganga Jagadguru Pīṭha. During establishment of the idols of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and Śāradāmba at *Kālaḍi* (by Śrī Satchidānanda Śivābhinava Narasimha Bhāratī of Śrīṅgeri, on

*Soumya Māgha Śuddha* 12 or 21st February 1910), Śivaganga Swāmiji was also present there. The author of this book has actually seen him there, and hence there is no controversy about this Maṭha.

### (3) Sankeśwara Maṭha

What Śrī Kāśī Śeṣa Venkaṭācala Śāstry writes about this Maṭha is: Śrī Śaṅkara Bhārati Swāmiji, who established Kuḍali Pīṭha, when on a pilgrimage to Kāśī, came to Vallabhagaḍ which is north of Sankeśwara village. He wanted to have darśan of Goddess Haridrādevi. Since he had a dream in which he was ordained to worship Lord Sankeśwara, he was bathing in Kalmashāpahāri (Hiraṇyakeshi) river daily and worshipping the Lord. Once Ibrahim Cadel, Chief of the Army of Bijāpur Badashah, came there and gave a few *grāmas* to him. Later, the Mahārāja of Kollāpur also gave him a few *grāmas*. From that time, the Maṭha was called Karaveera Maṭha. Since Śaṅkara Bhārati of this Maṭha gave *Sannyāsa* to a householder and made him pontiff, the same tradition is being followed by this Maṭha. The reason why both these Maṭhas have “Bhārati” in their names of pontiffs, is that both of them belong to the Śringeri Tradition (p 34-35).

#### Relation between Kuḍali and Karaveera Maṭhas

Lord Cidambareśwara entered through the face of *Viśiṣṭādevi* and born as Śaṅkarācārya during Yudhisṭhira Śaka 2723 *Sarvadhāri Samvatsara*. The Ācārya assigned four of his disciples as pontiffs to the four Pīṭhas that he had established. After residing at Śringeri for some time, in order to validate the word of Saraswati, he established a Maṭha at Karaveera Kshetra, which is famous as the southern Kāśī. Having ordered the disciples to bring up a *vidyā dharmapīṭha*



there, the Ācārya attained *samādhi* at 'vimalanirmala' Kshetra near Bombay<sup>1</sup>.

Later, after many years, Vidyānrisimha Bhārati, the pontiff of Śringeri assigned the daily worship according to scriptures, of Candramouleśwara Lingam (given by Vyāsa) to his disciple *Vidyāśaṅkara Bhārati* and proceeded on a pilgrimage. On his return, the disciple pleaded that it is not proper for the Guru to desire the Pīṭham, having placed him there himself. The Guru ignored him, a disciple, and established another Maṭha at Kuḍali and stayed there. Later, at the request of the king of Karaveera (Kollāpur), sent one of his disciples there. After some days, since the Kuḍali Swāmiji, was bed-ridden and nearing death due to old age, sent message to the disciple: 'hurry back immediately, and if you cannot, give *Sannyāsa* to a brahmin and send him here with your reply'. Before the brahmin *sannyāsi* sent by the Karaveera Swāmiji reached Harihara, the old Swāmiji had attained *samādhi*. By the time the brahmin *sannyāsi* could reach, the administrator of the Maṭha had arranged to give *Pustaka Sannyāsa* to one among his near ones and established him on the Pīṭha.<sup>2</sup> Hence, the Swāmi who had come from Karaveera simply returned to his Guru (p 37).

After sometime, Kuḍali Swāmiji came to Satāra to impress upon the Chatrapati that for him and the Karaveera Swāmiji there should be equal rights as far as traditions among people etc. are involved,

---

1. could he be the same 'Śaṅkara' whom *Ānandagiri* mentions?

2. according to this legend, it implies that the Karaveera Maṭha followers consider the Kuḍali Maṭha pontiffs as descendents of '*pustaka-sannyāsi*'. The differing second division of Kuḍali Maṭha say that, in this way, the Śringeri Maṭha does not have this stigma.

and tried to obtain his orders to that effect. The Mahārāja listened to his plea patiently, and, considering all pros and cons, convinced both the Swāmis that the Kuḍali Swāmiji should remain at Kuḍali worshipping the deity there and look after the region between Tungabhadra and Malāpahāriṇī rivers; and the Karaveera Swāmiji should have control over the area north of Malāpahāriṇī river and gave orders to that effect<sup>1</sup> (p. 36-37).

Śrī Kāśī Śeṣa Venkaṭācala Śāstry writes that this part which we have summarized has been taken from the Marāṭhi book ‘मराठ्यांच्या इतिहासाची साधने’ of Prof. Rājawāḍe.

#### Another story regarding Karaveera (Sankeśwara) Maṭha

A king by name Kriṣṇrāja of Soma dynasty was ruling at Karaveera during 13th century. As per his prayers Śaṅkara Bhārati Swāmiji (of the first story) attained his *samādhi* at ‘Vimalanirmala’, near Vasayi *grāma* near Bombay. Even now, we hear, there is a DharmaPīṭha there in his name. Similarly there are Karaveera Pīṭhas established at Sankeśwara, Khidrāpur, Nrisimhawāḍi, Golavaṇa, Paiṭhaṇa, Kāśī etc.

The abovementioned Śaṅkara Bhārati Swāmiji - the other name of his was Jagadguru Deva Gosavi - established a Maṭha at Sankeśwara around 1500 A. D. Since the Chieftain of the army of Peshwe Konhera Rao Paṭavardhan (Kāgawāḍakara) robbed the Maṭha and set fire to it, the Swāmi there remained at Sankeśwara. From that time, the first Ācārya was called the Karaveera Pīṭhādhipa and also

---

1. It should be noted that regarding this verdict of Sāhu Chatrapati, the second division of Kuḍali Maṭha have differences. Here the Karaveera Pīṭha enjoys importance; Śrī Śāstri writes that this verdict was sent by Sāhu Mahārāja to Śrīṅgeri Śrī Narasimha Bhārati Swāmiji also through a letter written on Kārtika Kṛṣṇa Somavāsara (Samvatsara is not mentioned).

Sankeśwara Piṭhādhipa. Since this was forgotten, they are claiming that Sankeśwara itself has been there all along.

In the book *Śaṅkarācārya* written by Bodas, similar story can be found with minor differences (p 69-77). He has given many other details, and we do not want to disturb the readers with them. From these stories it can be purported that (1) Adi Śaṅkarācārya, (2) Śaṅkara Bhāratī of Śringeri, or (3) Vidyānarasimha Bhāratī - one of these three - established the Maṭha at Karaveera. Even among the disciples of the Karaveera Maṭha and those of Kuḍali-Śringeri Maṭha there is confusion regarding which one of them is the *gurupīṭha* and which is the *shishya swāmi pīṭha*. Between the followers of Karaveera and Sankeśwara, therefore, there is a dispute as to which one is the original Maṭha?

Another point. When we met Śrī Kuḍali Jagadguru in person, he showed us two letters which had come from Sankeśwara Maṭha. One of them was written during 1558 A. D. which commences as follows:

”पिङ्गल संवत्सर माघ शुद्ध १५. शा. श. १४८० क्रि. श. १५५८ अत्यन्तप्रियशिष्य  
अभिनव-विद्याशङ्करभारती मठ संस्थान शङ्केश्वर याण (च?) त्रिसन्ध्याकाली विज्ञापनापूर्वक  
कृतदण्डवत्प्रणामाः

This is the letter bearing serial number 14 of the first part of ‘प्राचीनशासन-लेखनसङ्ग्रह’<sup>1</sup>. of Śrīmat Jagadguru Śrī Kuḍali-Śringeri Samsthāna, with date Pingala Samvatsara, Māgha Śuddha 15, Śā. Śaka. 1480.

The second one (serial no. 10) is a letter in which the *Samvatsara*

---

1. Śrī Śrī Swāmiji had given us a copy of this book; for reasons not known he recalled it later, with a note that there are some mistakes and they are to be corrected. Hence, it is possible that the numbers might be changed.

is not mentioned. A date guessed to be around Śālivāhana Śaka 1607 (1686 A. D. is given.

The letter commences as follows:

”श्रीमत्परमहंस परिव्राजकाद्यानेकबिरुदमालाविशिष्ट शृङ्गेरी शङ्करभारती यतीन्द्रान् प्रति  
श्रीमत्परमहंस परिव्राजकाचार्याद्यानेकबिरुदाङ्कित शृङ्गेरी नरसिंहभारती यतीन्द्रकृत परस्परं  
नारायणस्मरणपूर्वक -”

It is to be noted that this is written as if between two of the same level. It does not mention ‘शारदापूजासक्त’.

The letter is in Devanāgarī. The summary of the letter is as follows:

‘We came to know all the news from there by way of **vijñapti** sent through ‘Mokkur Mahādeva’ and also vocally by the words of Koṇḍibhatta.

‘We hear that around Bhāgyanagara, someone of Sankeśwara has, for the sake of livelihood, been claiming that “Swāmiji of Kuḍali Maṭha has given me *Sannyāsa*.” Upon enquiry we found that he is a Rīgvedī, householder, and of Gosāvi tradition. How can such a fellow become vested with authority of *Drāviḍa*, Dakshināmṇāya, Bhogavāra tradition of Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda? In this Maṭha, *Sannyāsa* after *brahmacarya*, and the *Mahāvākya* is from Yajurveda. This being so, how he can be suitable to *Sannyāsa* from this Maṭha? This hypocrite should be suitably punished by you through a letter given to Koṇḍibhatta; or, if you write to us his details, we shall take action on him’.

Perusal of these two letters would show that from one letter the Sankeshwar Maṭha is subordinate to Kuḍali Maṭha, and from another letter, it is having no authority for *Sannyāsa* of Śaṅkara tradition. With an intention to know the truth, we had a letter written to Sankeśwara

Maṭha during our 1960 Cāturmāsya at Dhārwaḍ. We came to know from the department of posts that there are three such Maṭhas<sup>1</sup>. In reply to the registered letters written to these, we got a reply in Kannaḍa from Sankeśwara Maṭha only (No. 56/60-61 dated 11-9-1960): “Regarding the information wanted by you, we shall search out from our records, and let you know. We have started the search”.

#### (4) Āvani Maṭha

Śri K. R. Venkaṭarāman has written (KRTTW p 60) that this Maṭha was established by Śriṅgeri Śri NrisimhaBhārati Swāmiji when he was residing at Kolar during March 1929. Since in his communication it is mentioned ‘श्रीशृङ्गेरी श्रीविद्याशङ्करदेवदिव्यश्रीपादपद्माराधक’ and ‘आवनीश्रिङ्गेरिमठ’ it seems authentic. But recently we have got a Kannaḍa translation of a Tamil book saying that Āvani Maṭha is an independent Maṭha of Śaṅkara Tradition; this is authored by Brahmavidyānandanātha Bhārati, who has claimed that he has based his writing on a book written by Padmapādācārya<sup>2</sup>.

#### (5) Śri Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha

Śri K. R. Venkaṭarāman has written (KRTTW p 52) that *Mādhava* Bhārati, a disciple of Śri Śaṅkarānanda Bhārati of Śriṅgeri (1448-1454 A. D.) established a Maṭha at Gokaṛṇa with a grant from the king

---

1. (1) Śaṅkarācārya, Karveeramaṭha, Kollapur, Bombay; (2) Śri Jagadguru Śri Śaṅkarācārya Sankeśwaramaṭha, Sankeśwara (Belgaum); (3) Śri Jagadguru (Karaveera) Śri Śaṅkarācārya Dr. Kurtakoṭi, Kriṣṇamandira, Pañcavaṭi, Nāsik.

2. This Swāmi was residing for many years at Mysore and attained *samādhi* there; he was also known as ‘Omkaṛa Swāmi’. He fought for his claim that he has a right for the Āvani Maṭha, but lost the case.

(A.R.S.I.E. 1916 No. 27, Sg. R. 7).

*Itihāsa Prakāśana Samiti* of the Maṭha has published a book entitled “*Havyaka Samāja mattu Śrī Gurumaṭhada Samkṣipta Itihāsa* (abbreviated as *Ha. Gu. I.*). “The details in the book are: After establishing Sureśwara at Śrīṅgeri, Śaṅkarācārya, along with his disciple Vidyānanda, came on a pilgrimage to Gokaṛṇa. There, Varadamuni, the disciple of sage Agastya, gave him six idols, i.e., Taporāma, Sītā, Lakṣmaṇa; and Paṭṭabhirāma, Sītā, Lakṣmaṇa and went away to Himālayas. The Ācārya handed them over to disciple Vidyānanda, established a Maṭha at a place ‘Asoka’ and made him the pontiff (Ha. Gu. I. p 26-27). Since Śrī Rāma was the main deity, it came to be called as ‘Raghūttama Maṭha’. Thus, by Vidyānanda, the senior disciple of Sureśwara, this Raghūttama Maṭha (now Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha), and by Nityabodhaghaṇācārya, the second disciple of Sureśwara, the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha, carried on independently (Ha. Gu. I. p 28). Rāmacandra Bhāratī, the 11th in the lineage of Raghūttama Maṭha, got help from Somaṇṇa Nāyaka of Hampi, and the statesmen of Keḷadi and Nagara and established idols of Sītā, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa in the area south of Nagara on the banks of Śarāvati, north of Agastyatīrtha, and central part north-east of Śrīkaṛṇagiri, and named the area as Rāmacandrāpura. From that time, this Maṭha was known as Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha; no more pontiffs are there at Raghūttama Maṭha thenceforward.<sup>1</sup>

From that time, the lineage of pontiffs also was carried on at Kekkār Maṭha [no detail is available in the book as to why and how

---

1. It is said that this Raghūttama Maṭha continued with one Raghūttama Bhāratī who was a disciple of Rāghaveśwara Bhāratī, 10th in the lineage (1464)

the disciples of a single Guru started running Maṭhas at two different places].

A disciple of 'Rāmacandra Bhāratī' of Kekkār Maṭha came to stay at Nelemāvu (Ha. Gu. I. p 31). Since the 29th pontiff Rāmacandra Bhāratī of Rāmacandra Maṭha was very young, the 13th pontiff Rāghaveśwara Bhāratī of Kekkār Maṭha was looking after the administration there. After his demise on *Śālivāhana Śaka* 1747, Rāmacandra Bhāratī himself became the pontiff of both the Maṭhas. Thenceforward there are no other *Sannyāsins* or pontiffs at Kekkār Maṭha. [Two Maṭhas that were separate became unified].

The 15th pontiff in the lineage, Anantendra Bhāratī, made his disciple sit at Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha and went to Bidarakālu, established a Maṭha there, and acquired some property.

During the time of the 19th Raghunātha Bhāratī, a Maṭha was established at Tirthahalli, and was doing supervision of Havyaka brahmins of that area.

During the time of 30th Rāmacandra Bhāratī, the Kekkār Maṭha became one with Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha.

During the time of 31st Rāghavendra Bhāratī, the Kombina Kai Maṭha of Siddapur Taluk, Rudrapāda Maṭha of Kalasa, Kriṣṇānanda Maṭha of Amagoḍlu and Hosalli Maṭha became unified with Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha. Similarly, the Tirthahalli Maṭha also became unified.

During the time of 32nd Rāghaveśwara Bhāratī, 500 Havyaka families of Mangalore area became affiliated with Śrīṅgeri Maṭha. A case was fought in the court of law, and verdict came that Śrīṅgeri Maṭha should not interfere with the administration of the inde-

pendent Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha. The devotee families rejoined Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha.

Now the 33rd Rāghavendra Bhārati Swāmiji is reigning.

### (6) Virūpākṣi Maṭha

Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman writes that this Maṭha was established by *Vidyātīrtha*, the 49th in the Kāñci lineage as one of the eight Maṭhas established to counteract the Mādhwa propaganda and Roman Catholic propaganda in Portugese occupied areas. His disciples led by *Vidyāranya* along with fellow disciple sannyaśins looked after those eight Maṭhas, whereas himself looked after the Virūpākṣi Maṭha. Also he rejuvenated Śrīṅgeri Maṭha which was dilapidated since 800 years (NVSSK p 95-96). He must have written this on the basis of *Suṣamā*.

“श्रूयते चायमेव श्रीशंकरानन्देन्द्रमुनिना दत्तविद्यारण्यनामा सहैवाष्टभिः सब्रह्मचारिभिः सच्चिदानन्दादिभिरचीकलृपदिष्टौ मठानात्मनश्चैकमधितुङ्गभद्रमनुविरूपाक्षेश्वरं अतिवेलप्रवृद्धमध्वकदध्वादिविमतप्रचाररोधिन इति” ॥ (Gu. Ra. Su. 75).

But the author of *Suṣamā* writes ‘it is heard to be thus’. Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman says that this does not suit the historical dates; and we have mentioned this under the discussion on the lineage of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha.

In the lineage of the pontiffs of the Virūpākṣi Maṭha that we have got<sup>1</sup>, it is mentioned that the Virūpākṣi Maṭha was established by Vidyāranya Swāmi, the author of *Vedabhāṣya*, the disciple of BhāratiKṛṣṇa Tīrtha the 11th pontiff of Śrīṅgeri lineage. And that

1. This is a Telugu book published at Karnool in 1931 by Jānapāti Paṭṭābhirāma Śāstry.



he entered *yogasamādhī* in a cave of the same area on Shobhakrit Samvatsara Vaiśākha Śukla Tṛtīya. Although Śrī K. R. Venkaṭarāman has written that the 'Shakaṭapura' (Baṇḍigadde), 'Hariharapura', 'Tīrthamattur' and 'Kuḍali' Maṭhas were established at this time, he has not mentioned the name of this Maṭha (KRTTW p 44).

### (7) Puṣpagiri Maṭha

This is one among the eight Maṭhas mentioned by Śrī N. Venkaṭarāman (NVSSK p 95).

In a book that we have got, (in this it is mentioned that the Ācārya placed Padmapāda at Jagannātha, Hastāmalaka at Dwārakā, Toṭakācārya at Jyotirmaṭha and Sureśwara at Śrīṅgeri(?); also that he brought Candramouli Lingam from Kailāsācala and gave it to the disciples) the lineage is Sureśwara - Sadānanda Saraswati - ... - Ānandagirīndra - Kriṣṇānanda Saraswati - and then *Vidyāranya*<sup>1</sup>. It is mentioned that *Vidyāranya* was at Kāñci in Śaka 1178 and that he was also at Pampā Kshetra. Having placed the disciple Candraśekhara Bhārati at Śrīṅgeri, he established Virūpākṣa Maṭha; kept the disciple Nrisimhendra Bhārati and left that place on Monday the Śubhakrit Samvatsara (?) Kṛṣṇa 3. After writing that 'After Śrī Nrisimhendra Bhārati further there were two Pīṭhas', it mentions the names of several pontiffs. Then it is mentioned that Vidyā Nrisimhendra Saraswati, the disciple of *Vidyāśaṅkara Bhārati*, in compliance to the request from the devotees, came to Puṣpagiri, established a Maṭha there, and made Nrisimhendra Saraswati its pontiff on Śaka 1329 *Sarvajit Samvatsara Vaiśākha Śuddha Saptami Bhṛuguvāra*.

---

1. This is a Telugu book printed in Śālivāhana Śaka 1777.

In this list, even the Śringeri pontiff lineage seems to be arbitrary. It is to be noted that in some places, ties with Kāñci Maṭha are made. The readers themselves have to speculate how far this lineage could be considered valuable.

## Conclusion

In his *Bhāṣya* on *Śārīraka Mīmāṃsā*, Śrī Kāśī Śeṣa Venkaṭācala Śāstry has mentioned the names of 35 Maṭhas as belonging to the Śaṅkarācārya tradition. Out of these, we have named those Maṭhas which we could find and given details above. From the history of Rāmacandrāpura Maṭha, the names of some of the subsidiary Maṭhas have been found; we have mentioned them also.

In addition to the abovementioned subsidiary Maṭhas, *Prabhāta*, a weekly from Mangalore, in its special issue “*Śrī Jagadguru Anka*” of 28th April 1963, (pages 8-9) has given some summary details of the following Maṭhas. Only the names of these are given for the readers’ reference:

1. Harihara Maṭha, Koppa Taluk; 2. Bhandigeḍi Maṭha, Koppa Taluk; 3. Yogānandeśwara Maṭha, Holenarasīpura; 4. Kodandāśrama Maṭha, Hebbur, Tumkur district; 5. Balekuduru Maṭha, Udupi Taluk; 6. Yaḍaneeru Maṭha, Kasaragod Taluk; 7. Honnavalli Maṭha, Sirasi Taluk; 8. Chitrāpura Maṭha, Shirāli, Uttara Kannaḍa; 9. Kaivalya Maṭha, Kelosi, Goa; 10. Tārakeśwara Maṭha, West Bengal; and 11. Chintāmaṇi Maṭha, Hospet.

Before concluding this Appendix, we have to make a humble appeal before the readers. The above mentioned Maṭhas and subsidiary Maṭhas are now working for the upliftment of their devotees. And it

is proper that the devotees conduct themselves with the respective Maṭhas with devotion and dedication. The history, dates, difference of opinions of scholars, and our opinions on them - all this we have written **only with the intention of showing clearly the difficulties encountered by those who view them with historical interest.** We pledge that we have not written even a word with either hatred on any Maṭha or with conceit on any Maṭha.

All the *Pīṭhādhipatis* are representatives of *Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavat-pāda*. It is highly appreciable that some of them are promoting *Sam-skṛita Vidyābhyāsa*. Where could we find people interested in the study of Vedānta in this age of frightening Kali where people are losing interest in Dharma and faith in *Guru* and God? We fervently pray *Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda* that through his grace, all the Maṭhas may join hands in establishing a *Mahāvidyāpīṭha* which devotes itself for the promotion of *karma and jñāna*.

Om Tat Sat



## Glossary

**Abhinava** – Quite new, Fresh, Modern.

**Ācamana** – Sipping of water from the palm for purification.

**Ācārya** – Preceptor.

**Ācārya pañcaka** – Groups of five acaryas (Kṛṣṇa pañcaka, Vyāsa pañcaka, śankarācārya pañcaka) to which worship is offered at the beginning of cāturmāsya pūja).

**Agni** – Sacrificial fire, the God of fire.

**Agnihotra** – Maintenance of the sacrificial fire and offering oblations to it.

**Akṣata** – Rice grains usually mixed with turmeric offered to deity during worship.

**Anuprāsa** – Alliteration.

**Apaccheda nyāya** – The principle of the subsequent sublating the earlier.

**Apauroṣeya** – Not of human origin.

**Ārdrā** – 6th of 27 stars.

**Artha** – Acquisition of wealth (a purushārtha)

**Āśwayuja** – Name of 7th month.

**Āśrama** – A stage of life (one of celebate, house holder, anchorite, ascetic), also a hermitage.

**Avatāra** – Incarnation.

**Bahula** – The dark half of a month.

**Bhagandara** – A kind of Fistula.

**Bhagavatpāda** – (Guru) always at the feet of the Lord.

**Bhashya** – An explanatory work, commentary, exposition.

**Bhedābhedavāda** – acceptance of identity in difference.

**Bhiksha** – Food obtained as alms.

**Bhokṭṛtva** – The state of being an enjoyer.

**Bhojana** – Food, feeding, giving to eat.

**Brahmacārin** – A celibate student.

**Brahmarākshasa** – Ghost of a Brahmin.

**Brahmarandhra** – The aperture in the crown of the head (through which the soul is said to move out on death).

**Brahmasamstha** – Abiding (firmly) in brahman.

**Cāturmāsya** – The seasonal observance of vows and austerities, usually for four months from the full moon day of the 4th month, āṣāḍha.

**Caula** – Tonsure ceremony.

**Chandas** – Metrical science (one of six vedāngas).

**Dakṣiṇāyana** – A half year period beginning from progress of Sun southward.

**Ḍamaru** – A small drum.

**Darbha** – Bunch of grass used for sacrificial purposes.

**Darshana** – Appearance, becoming visible, discernment.

**Daśami** – 10 day from the day of full moon/new moon.

**Dharma** – That which is established or firm, prescribed duty, discharge of prescribed duty (a puruṣārtha).

**Dharmaśāstras** – Sacred books/treatises containing sacred precepts/rules.

**Digvijaya** – Conquest in all directions.

**Dīkṣita** – Consecrated, initiated (for a religious sacrifice).

**Drāviḍa** – Drāvidian people.

**Dvādaśi** – 12th day from the day of full moon/new moon.

**Ekādaśī** – 11th day from the day of full moon/new moon.

**Gandharva** – A celestial musician, musician of gods.

**Garuḍa** – Viṣṇu's vehicle, king of birds, son of Kaśyapa and Vinata.

**Gīta** – Singing, song.

**Gurukula** – House of a Guru.

**Itihāsa** – History (legendary or traditional).

**Hiraṇyagarbha** – Brahma the Creator.

**Hum** – An onomatopoeic word used mystically in uttering incantations/spells (Ex. Kavacāya hum).

**Īshwara** – Lord, also name of a samvatsara.

**Jagadguru** – World teacher.

**Jīva** – The individual soul.

**Jīvanmukti** – Liberation when one is alive.

**Jñāna** – Knowledge.

**Jñānakāṇḍa** – The part of the Vedas relating to the liberating knowledge (Vedānta).

**Jñāni** – Man of knowledge.

**Jyeṣṭha** – 18th of 27 stars.

**Kāraka** – Who or what does/creates.

**Kāraṇa** – The cause.

**Kārya** – The effect of a cause.

**Kailāsa** – The abode of Siva.

**Kāma** – Gratification of human desire (a purushartha).

**Karaṇas** – Organs (of sense, action).

**Karma** – Deeds done, prescribed duties.

**Karmakāṇḍa** – The part of Vedas relating to sacrificial rites.

**Kārtika** – 8th month of year.

**Kartṛtva** – The state of being a doer, performer.

**Kāvya** – Poetical composition.

**Kosha** – Dictionary, lexicon, also a sheath.

**Kshetrajña** – The seer of kshetra/body, jīva.

**Kuśa grass** – Sacred grass/Darbha used for sacrificial purposes.

**Lagna** – Time or moment pointed out by astrologers as auspicious.

**Līla** – Sport.

**Linga** – A mark, sign, symbol.

**Loka** – Region, the worlds.

**Mahā** – Great, ultimate.

**Mahābhāṣya** – The great commentary of Patanjali on the sūtras of Pāṇini.

**Mahāvākya** – A principal/great Vedāntic statement like ‘Tatvamasi’.

**Mantra** – A Vedic hymn, a sacred text or speech, a sacrificial formula.

**Maṭha** – A monastery.

**Maunjī bandha** – Binding of a sacred cord/girdle of munja grass.

**Mīmāṃsaka** – An investigator, followers of mīmāṃsa system.

**Mithuna** – Zodiac sign.

**Mokṣa** – Liberation, final emancipation (a puruṣārtha).

**Muhurta** – Thirtieth part of a day (From the time of Sun rise, 30 muhurtas are counted until the following Sun rise).

**Nirguṇatva** – That which is devoid of qualities or properties.

**Nṛtta** – Dancing.

**Pāda** – a quarter, a fourth part.

**Pārvrajya** – The wandering life of a mendicant/sanyasi.

**Pañcami** – Fifth day from full moon/new moon day.

**Parabrahman** – The supreme spirit.

**Paradevatā** – The highest god.

**Paramahansa** – An ascetic/sanyasi of highest order.

**Paramāṇu** – Atom.

**Paśupati** – Lord of creatures, śiva.

**Pīṭha** – A seat of authority.

**Phat** – An onomatopoeic word used mystically in uttering incantations/spells (Ex. Astrāya phat).

**Prācīna** – Ancient.

**Pradhāna** – The primordial matter of Sāṅkhyas.

**Praisha** – Invocation/Exclamation.

**Prakaraṇa** – A treatise, monograph, book.

**Pramāṇa** – Valid means of knowledge, authority.

**Prāṇa** – Vital air.

**Prārabdha karma** – Past actions that have already begun yielding fruit.

**Prasthānatraya** – the trio: Upanishads, Brahmasūtra, Bhagavadgīta.

**Punarvasu** – Seventh of the 27 stars.

**Purāṇa** – Ancient traditional history, A class of sacred works.

**Puruṣārtha** – Object or aim of human pursuit, any one of four objects or aims of existence, which are- dharma: discharge of prescribed duty, artha: acquirement of wealth, kāma : gratification of desire, moksha — final emancipation.

**Raktākṣi** – Name of one of the 60 samvatsaras.

**Rasa** – Sentiment or feeling prevailing (in rhetoric).

**Riṣi** – Sage, Seer of Vedas.

**Rudrākṣa** – Berries of Rudrākṣa tree strung as a rosary.

**Saguṇabrahma** – Brahman with qualities, attributes.



**Sāligrāma** – Black stone found in river Gaṇḍaki worshipped as Viṣṇu pervading it.

**Sālokya** – Being in the same world of another (diety).

**Sāra** – essence.

**Sādhu** – Virtuous person.

**Samādhi** – Absorption of thought into one object of meditation.

**Sampradāna** – The act of giving.

**Samsāra** – The circuit of mundane existence.

**Samsthānam** – Any place or station, common place of abode.

**Samvatsara** – A year of 360 days.

**Sandhyā prayers** – The religious acts prescribed for the twice born to be performed at Sunrise, noon and Sunset.

**Śānta** – Tranquil, undisturbed, free from passions.

**Sanyāsi** – One who has renounced mundane life, an ascetic.

**Sarvasva** – the entirety.

**Śāstra** – Sacred books of teaching, instruction direction etc.

**Śeṣa, ādiśeṣa** – The great first born of the serpents who bears the weight of the world on his head (Mythology).

**Śārīraka** – Related to the indwelling atman.

**Śaka** – Era.

**Śālivāhana śaka** – Era beginning in 78 A.D.

**Śubha** – Auspicious.

**Śuddha** – Bright (half month period upto full moon day), pure thing(not contaminated by a second thing).

**Śrāddha** – Ceremony performed for the departed.

**Siddhi** – Accomplishment/complete attainment (of an object).

**Śiṣya** – Disciple.

**Śloka** – A verse.

**Smṛti** – That which is remembered (The whole body of sacred tradition remembered by human teachers, having accord with Vedas and including Vedāṅgas, śrauta and grīhya sūtras, Law book of Manu, Itihāsas like Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata, etc.).

**Soumya vāsara** – Monday.

**Śrīmukha** – The year by name śrīmukha.

**Śringāra** – The erotic sentiment.

**Śruti** – Scriptures- Vedas/Upanishads, heard.

**Stotra** – Hymn of praise.

**Sūtra** – A thread, Sacred thread; Aphorism

**SvataH prāmānya** – Self validity.

**Ṭīka** – commentary, gloss.

**Tila** – Sesame seed.

**Tīrtha** – Stream, Bank of sacred river.

**Tridandī** – a sanyāsi who carries three long staves tied together to form one.

**Trishul** – Trident.

**Tulasi garland** – A rosary of Tulasi beads.

**Upādhi** – Conditioning factor.

**Upanayana** – Initiation to Vedic studies.

**Upāsana** – Meditation

**Upasatti** – Approaching a teacher to learn.

**Uttarāyaṇa** – A half year period beginning from progress of Sun northward.

**Vāditra** – Musical instrument.

**Vairāgya** – distaste, aversion, freedom from worldly desires.

**Vaiśākha** – Second of the twelve months of a year.

**Vaiśvadeva** – Relating to all gods (VishvedevāH).

**Vānaprastha** – Anchorite.

**Varṇa** – Literally colour, Class of men in Hindu dharma.

**Vārtika** – A critical gloss, annotation.

**Vārtikakāra** – Author of vartika (a critical gloss).

**Vāsanā** – Impressions remaining unconsciously in the mind.

**Vedāṅgas** – Auxiliary to Vedas (Śikṣā, Vyākaraṇa, Chandas, Jyotiṣa, Nirukta, Kalpa).

**Vibhava** – name of a samvatsara.

**Videha mukti** – Liberation after the death of the body.

**Vikrama Śaka** – The era beginning 58 B.C.

**Virahatyā dosha** – Sin that accrues for abandoning the prescribed sacrificial fire.

**Vṛttānta** – history, matter.

**Vṛtti** – Mode, state, modification (of the mind);

**Yajvā** – Performer of sacrifices.

**Yamaka** – Repetition of words sounding similar but having different meaning.

**Yantra** – Any instrument that has mystical/occult power.

**Yavana** – An Ionian, Greek, muhammadan or any foreigner or barbarian.

**Yatidharma** – The duty of a yati (ascetic).

**Yudhiṣṭhira Śaka** – Era beginning in 3137 BCE.

**Yuga** – An age of the world (The four yugas: Kali yuga, Dwāpara yuga, Treta yuga, Krīta yuga).

## Śri Śaṅkarācārya

The marvellous incidents believed by people as actually happened in the life of Ācārya, the minor *Prakarāṇas* that the people believe as the teachings he gave because of different reasons, the various *Sto-tras* that are widely known as his, the advice and instructions that presently the pontiffs of the Maṭhas purported to have been established by him are giving from time to time, and the ideals of *jñāna* and *vairāgya* that the independent monks, belonging to various sacred traditions and Maṭhas, are placing before people in his name – all these have been instrumental in establishing his memory permanently in the hearts of people.

The celebrations of his birthday and the mass-adorations year by year, held here and there, have made his memory imprinted in the minds of people. Not only the people of our country, but several westerners also believe that Śaṅkarācārya is a luminary who took *Sannyāsa* directly from celibate boyhood, a monk of the highest order, a great philosopher who moved throughout the country lifting up people to the high level of thinking, a *jagadguru* who stopped all kinds of evil practices among people and promoted the six sects, a great devotee and a poet of high calibre, a great soul who incarnated for the benefit of the world and spared no efforts during his life time for that cause.

It is a pity that the job of writing the history of such a world-famous luminary fell to the lot of a few poets only; hence it is very difficult to decide what really is true about Ācārya's life.