RABINDRANATH TAGORE

A BIOGRAPHY

KRISHNA KRIPALANI

Rabindranath Tagore was poet, playwright, story-teller, musician, and painter. His many achievements were but partial expressions of a restless vitality and an inexhaustible zest in living and it is these that Krishna Kripalani has succeeded in portraying in a detailed and absorbing study of the poet’s life and work. His book gives a picture of the complete man. Krishna Kripalani is married to Tagore’s granddaughter. He lived and worked with the poet at Santiniketan from 1933 until Tagore’s death in 1941. At present he is Secretary of the National Academy of Letters, New Delhi. 428 pp., 16 pp. of photographs. 35s.

“...he gives us a more intimate picture of the poet than the others who have written about him... Those who read his book will come to understand much better the poet who left so deep an impress on the life and literature of Bengal and of this country and did so much to build a new bridge between the East and the West.”

Times of India.

“...Of the spate of books which issued on the occasion of the centenary of Tagore’s birth, this biography will stand out as of permanent value.”

Mail.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
After discussing the works of Citsukha and Ānandagiri, I wish to deal with the third of the ten works referred to in my previous article. I intend to discuss only two such works as they have given rise to some controversy. The present work is one of the two and is taken up first because that, in my humble opinion, is comparatively the older one.

This work was published in the Bibliotheca Indica Series in 1881 A.D. by Jivānanda Vidyāśāgara. It is also available in ms.-form at many places. All these copies generally contain 74 chapters though the KāŚi and Śaṅkēśvara ms. have only 73 chapters. The Śaṅkēśvara mutt ms. gives the name of the work as māṭa-nībharhaṇa (refutation of theories) whereas the colophons to the first three chapters of the work in the printed edition give its name as Ācārya-Vijaya.

There are two controversial issues with regard to this work, viz. (1) Identity of the author and (2) authenticity of the work itself. I shall deal with them separately.

Identity of the author

The colophons at the end of the first 32 chapters of the printed edition of this work give the author's name as Anantānandagiri whereas the remaining 42 chapters give it as Ānandagiri. This creates the impression that one and the same person bears these two names. This impression seems to be current among many scholars even today, who believe that this work is written by Ānandagiri, the famous commentator of Śrī Śaṅkārācārya's Bhāṣyas. In my humble opinion, however, Ānantānandagiri and Ānandagiri are two distinct individuals, out of whom the first and not the second is the author of the work in question. My reasons are as follows:

(1) The Ānandārama Ms. Library, Poona, contains two mss. of this work. I have also a copy of the same procured from the Śaṅkēś-

2. (i) Ānandārama Ms. Library, Poona, (ii) Oriental Research Institute, Mysore, (iii) Shrīrāma Tāraka Mutt, KāŚi, (iv) Sarasvati Mahāl, Tanjore etc.
3. The stanzas quoted by Śuṣmā as from Ācārya-Vijaya are found in this Ś. V. The work Ācārya-Vijaya, therefore, is not an anonymous work as maintained by Mr. R. K. Aiyar in his booklet, ' Kumbakonam Mutt claims' at p. 23.
vara mutt. All these three mss. give in all the colophons the name of
the author as Anantānandagiri.

(2) At the very commencement of the work itself, the author
refers to himself as Anantānandagiri.4 At the beginning of Ch. IV,
however, of the same, he refers to Anandagiri independently and
that also by the side of Sudhānanda.5

(3) Anandagiri, the commentator of Śrī Śāṅkara’s Bhāṣyas,
invariably refers to himself as the disciple of Sudhānanda Yati whereas
we do not get a single such reference in any of the colophons either in
the printed copy or in the mss. Our author has referred to Śāṅkara as his
Paramaguru and called himself his āpratītyāvatā.6 suggesting his
contemporaryity with his Guru. Curiously enough, he refers to himself
in the third person but in the same capacity of a direct disciple, in a
later chapter.7

(4) I have already referred in my previous article, to 800 and
odd stanzas quoted by Dhanapatisūrin in his commentary Cīṇḍāma
on ch. XV of Mādhava’s S. Ś. Jaya and also shown that not even one
of these can be traced to the Ś. V. of Anantā, at present under considera-
tion and that they must have belonged to an older work which can be
identified as Pr. Ś. V. of Anandagiri, the disciple of Sudhānanda.8
These stanzas describe in details the various stages of Śāṅkara’s trium-
phant tour. The Ś. V. of Anantā, in question is mostly occupied
with a similar description. On a comparison of the two descriptions
it was found that they agreed with each other almost completely
with a similar description. On a comparison of the two descriptions
it was found that they agreed with each other almost completely with
regard to (1) the order of the various stages of the tour, (2) the names
of the opponents and also of the places where they were encountered,
(3) the descriptions of the two, (4) arguments and citations on either
side, (5) the period of Śāṅkara’s stay at every place etc. In spite of
this agreement, however, it is clear that the two descriptions are from
two different pens, for,

(a) The order of stages in Anantā’s work is different from
the three places from the one as found in the quoted
stanzas.

4. Read the opening words—अनन्तानन्दगिरिचरण—
5. Read: ऐसानन्तानन्दगिरिचरणोऽधिकारिंगत्वकरणात्मकम्
स्वविद्यतसत्त्वकरणात्मकम्
6. Read: अनन्तानन्दगिरिचरणोऽधिकारिंगत्वकरणात्मकम्
and also his salutation, just prior to this sentence—
नमामि शाङ्कराचरणपुराणातपीतरूपम्
नन्ताय।
7. Read—क्षत्रियोऽधिकारिंगत्वकरणात्मकम्
स्वविद्यतसत्त्वकरणात्मकम्
9. Vide Śāṅkara-vijaya of Anantarānandagiri—p. 75
(b) Anantā’s work contains more prose and less poetry and
much more annotative matter than is to be found in the
quoted stanzas.
(c) The bulk of the stanzas quoted cannot at all be traced to
Anantā’s work.

All these facts, I believe, are sufficient to show that Anantānanda-
giri, the author of our present work is distinct from the celebrated
Anandagiri though the question who followed whom remains undecided.
I am supported in my belief by Prof. B. Upādhyāya who also holds
the same view in this matter.9 The misconception about the identity
of the two has led the late Mr. M. R. Bodas to remark that the
stanzas “कल्पद्रुढ़ शर्यात्मकान्वयस्” etc. quoted as from Anandagiri’s
work is not found in the printed work (i.e. Ś. V. of Anantā).10 The
stanzas properly belongs to Pr. Ś. V. of Anandagiri. To decide the
question of priority and the true meaning of the expression āpratītyāvatā
we must try to settle the date of Anantā. The late Mr. Telang has
advanced mainly two arguments for the purpose.11 They are:

1. Anantā, cites in ch. XIX of his work the stanza “अनन्तानन्दगिरी
श्रीसांकराचरणस्तोत्रम्” etc. as a śruti text. According to Mr. Telang, this
stanza is not a śruti text but is one of the introductory stanzas in
Vācaspatiśāṅkhyatattvavānumdi. Vācaspati is generally assigned
to the 9th cent. A.D. Ś. V. of Anantā, therefore, has to be placed
later.

This, however, does not seem to be convincing for the stanza in
question is not only found in Śvetasvatara Up. (4:5) but has also been
quoted as a śruti text by Śrī Śāṅkara-cārya in his commentary on the
Br. Sutras. (Vide comm. on Br. Su. 1:4:8).

2. Ś. V. quotes in ch. XI and XL three stanzas as from
Adhikaranārātanāmāla or Vyāsādikaranāmāla,12 traditionally ascribed
to Mādhavācārya a/s Vidyāramba or Bhāratītirtha, his preceptor.
Both persons are generally held to belong to the latter half of the 14th
cent. A.D. at the latest. Anantā, therefore, cannot be placed earlier
than the 14th cent. A.D.

9. Vide Śāṅkara-vijaya of Anantarānandagiri—p. 11
10. Vide Śāṅkara-vijaya—p. 12
11. Vide Vidyākara-bhāṣa—p. 18
12. Vide Sūtrakritagama—p. 287
13. The stanzas are:

अनन्तानन्दगिरी श्रीसांकराचरणस्तोत्रम्
वाचस्पतिकाण्तवादधारिणि
(4:5) जगद्धर्माधिकरणाणामाला
वाचस्पतिकाण्तवादधारिणि
स्वपन्नेतरधारिणि
वाचस्पतिकाण्तवादधारिणि
वाचस्पतिकाण्तवादधारिणि
वाचस्पतिकाण्तवादधारिणि
वाचस्पतिकाण्तवादधारिणि
If this is the case, Anantā cannot be admitted to be Śankara's direct disciple, even if we accept for the latter the latest date, viz. 5th cent. A.D. The expression अन्तःतुलक्षण मात्र may, therefore, mean that Anantā came in the direct line of Śankara and nothing more.

Now, according to the line of succession of the Kāñcē mutt (which the Śrṅgeri people call into question), Sudhānanda and Anandagiri are the 6th and 7th ācāryas from the first ācārya. If this is true and if following the method adopted by modern scholars for computing time, we ascribe an average of 25/30 years to every ācārya, Anandagiri cannot be placed much later than 200 years after Śaṅkara.

Even if we choose to distrust the Kāñcē succession list, we can prove Anandagiri's priority to 1100 A.D. in another way. According to Venkata Dixit and Jayatirtha, the commentators of Rāmānujācārya and Madhvācārya, the latter criticises Śaṅkara's interpretation of the Bhāg. at many places. Now, Anandagiri has also commented upon Śaṅkara's G Bh. If he had known the criticisms of Rāmā, and Madhva, he would certainly have tried to defend Śaṅkara against them but he does not do so anywhere. This is possible only on the hypothesis that he preceded both and, therefore, also preceded 12th cent. A.D. This automatically proves his priority to Anantā, who, as already shown, cannot be placed earlier than the 14th cent. A.D.

The conclusion, therefore, seems irresistible that Anandagiri is the earlier of the two writers and that Anantā must have drawn upon his Pr. Ś.V. while writing his own Ś.V.15 In the absence of the former, it is not possible to say anything about its authenticity and the same granted also, it is not possible to say how far the Anantā has kept to the original or where and how much, if at all, he has deviated from the same. It is, therefore, unsafe to draw any inferences as to the authenticity of Anantā's work. For that, we must look to other sources and that brings me to the second of the two issues referred to at the beginning.

Authenticity of the work

Opinion is sharply divided on this point both among the traditionists and the modern scholars. The Kāñcē mutt people look upon this work as very authoritative and have taken great pains to answer objections raised against it.14 The Śrṅgeri Mutt and its adherents, however, negative the claim with equal vehemence, saying that it is more or less a fabrication for the express purpose of boosting up the claim of the Kāñcē Mutt,12 which has also published an "embellished" (परिरिक्त) edition of the same and hence it is valueless for purposes of history. The reasons given for this view may be stated as follows:

(1) Both the original and the 'embellished' editions even in its language and in its contents bear such evident traces of recent fabrication by unskilled hands that the reliance placed upon it is being relaxed for some time past;16 and that it is full of discrepancies and mistakes.17

(2) It contains references to Rāmānuja and Madhva.18 Among the moderns, Prof. Wilson alone holds that the work is sufficiently historical since it bears internal and indisputable evidence of being the composition of a period not far removed from that at which he (i.e. Śaṅkara) may be supposed to have flourished....19 Mr. Telang however has controverted this view with regard to the work. Mr. Collins Mackenzie describes this work as a "legendary life of Śaṅkara" while the editor of the catalogue of Mss. in Saraswati Mahal Library, Tanjore, says that "A perusal of the work will convince anybody that the work is very unreliable. It is full of discrepancies and mistakes."21

(8) It contains particulars, subversive of all known versions, of Śaṅkara's parentage, birth place and the place of his final disappearance.22 Thus, Śaṅkara's grand-parents are mentioned as Vidvan Mahendra (विद्वन महेन्द्र) and Kānakṣī (कानक्षी), parents as Sarvajit (सर्वजित) and Viṣīṣṭa (विषिष्ट), birth-place as Cidambaram and the place of final departure as Kāñcē. Further, he is stated to have met and received initiation into Ānāyasa from Govindamuni at Cidambaram only, from which place again, he started on his triumphant tour. His encounter with Vyāsa is very queerly narrated. Perhaps, these are the discrepancies and mistakes referred to in (1) above. We may also add that the work does very scant justice to Śaṅkara-Manḍana discussion and omits all reference to important events like the passing away of Śaṅkara's mother, acquisition of disciples like Sādhānanda etc.

---

15. Vide pamphlets "Sri Śrṅgerī Śāradā Mutṭ" and "Kāmakoti Pradeepam" by Shri S. Sunderamiah and "Kumbakonam Mutṭ claims" by Shri R. Krishnaswamy Aiyār.
It must be admitted that in this maze of conflicting opinions, it is very difficult to come to a decisive verdict either way. I may, however, state my findings as follows:

I have yet to see the 'embellished' edition of the work. I was, however, told by a Sāstrin (Sri Pollam Ramasastrin) at Mylapore, Madras, that no such edition had been published by the Kānec Mutt so far. He has written a small booklet on this particular Ś.V. in some mss. of which, available in Government Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, the additional paragraphs, pointed out by Sri R. K. Aiyar in 'Kumbakonam Mutt claims' as from the embellished edition, were to be found. The Sāstrin told me that this was being described as the 'embellished' edition of the Ś.V. He himself expressed the opinion that a critical edition of the work, putting together all the available mss. of this work in different places was a great necessity and in the circumstances this appears to be the maximum fair criticism of the additional passages.

Mr. Collins' remark, however, that the work is "a legendary life" need not be taken literally for it will be appreciated that to the average western mind, everything and every happening that does not conform to the everyday experience of the common man is a legend. This was need not be taken literally for it will be appreciated that to the average western mind, everything and every happening that does not conform to the everyday experience of the common man is a legend. This was need not be taken literally for it will be appreciated that to the average western mind, everything and every happening that does not conform to the everyday experience of the common man is a legend. This was need not be taken literally for it will be appreciated that to the average western mind, everything and every happening that does not conform to the everyday experience of the common man is a legend. This was need not be taken literally for it will be appreciated that to the average western mind, everything and every happening that does not conform to the everyday experience of the common man is a legend. This was need not be taken literally for it will be appreciated that to the average western mind, everything and every happening that does not conform to the everyday experience of the common man is a legend.

(i) Aeyutārayā Modak (1820 A.D.) in his commentary on Mādhava's S. Ś. Jaya says: "अन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽन्तऽ
All this does not mean that I regard this S.V. as absolutely authoritative. My only point is that the arguments and objections put forward against it cannot prove either the forged nature or the unreliability of the work. Palm-leaf mss. of this work are to be found throughout India, from Kāśi to Kānci and Ujjain to Mysore. The charge, therefore, that the work in question is forged by the Kānci mutt to serve their ends is as much justified as is the charge that Mādhavācārya’s S. Ś. Jaya was got up by the Śrīneri mutt to support its claim in its case against the Kānci mutt. Its authenticity, however, does not follow as a logical sequel. As a matter of fact, not one of the 16/17 biographies of Śāṅkara I have worked upon inspires confidence in its authenticity to the expected degree. We have to put together all these biographies and after they are made mutually corroborative, we are able to get only an outline sketch of the great man’s life.

ABBREVIATIONS

(i) Anantā—Anantānandagiri
(ii) Rāmā—Rāmānuja
(iii) Ś.V.—Śaṅkara Vijaya
(iv) Pr. Ś.V.—Prācīna Śaṅkara Vijaya
(v) S. Ś. Jaya—Śaṅkṣeṣa Śaṅkara Jaya
(vi) Br. Śū.—Brahma Śūtras
(vii) GBh.—Gītā Bhāṣya
(viii) JUB—Journal of the University of Bombay
(ix) I.A.—Indian Antiquary

THE Paumacariya of Vimalaśūri is one of the earliest Prākrit epics of the Śvetāmbara sect of Jainas and it depicts the Life of Rāma according to Jain traditions. The work is quite extensive and it contains about 9000 gāthās in 118 chapters. Though the date of the P.C. is a disputable question, it is more or less certain that the work must have been composed after the Christian era.

The aim of this article is to present before the readers some glimpses of the society and culture as reflected in this earliest Prākrit epic, viz. the Paumacariya of Vimalaśūri. The data given in this article should not be looked upon as anything more than a sampling of the vast material contained in the whole of the P.C., it can be the subject of thorough and systematic study on its merit. But this being not one of the direct objectives of this article, an attempt has been made to illustrate this aspect by taking out some samples of the relevant data from various portions of the text. Hence this study should be considered more or less representative and not exhaustive.

The information collected deals with the following aspects:

(A) Social Life
   (a) Society in general   (g) Women
   (b) Houses           (h) Education
   (c) Conveyance       (i) Manners and Customs
   (d) Food and drink   (j) Amusements and Pastimeś
   (e) Dress           (k) Morals
   (f) Ornaments

(B) Flora and Fauna

(C) Religion

(D) Political Life
   (a) The King and kingship (c) Law and Justice
   (b) Administration       (d) Army-Weapons