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SAŃKṢEPA ŚAṄKARA JAYA OF MĀḌHAṆVĀCĀRYA

OR
ŚAṄKARA DIGVIJAYA OF ŚRĪ VIDYĀRĀṆYAMUNI

Dr. W. R. ANTARKAR, M.A., LL.B., Ph.D.,
Khalsa College, Bombay.

Introductory:

In two previous articles,1 I discussed three biographies of Śrī ŚaṅkaraŚastra. The next work to be considered is Saṅkṣeṣa Saṅkara Jaya of Mādhavācārya or as it is more popularly called, Saṅkara Digvijaya of Śrī Vidyārāṇyamuni. Hence the alternative title given to the article. The first is the title as found throughout the work while the second is the popularly known one. If the first is practically unknown to anyone except the readers of the work, the second is altogether unknown to the work itself. The common man's knowledge of the life of Śrī ŚaṅkaraŚastra is based on this work only and religious preachers like the kirtankaras rely on this work only for his life-history.

Title and the author:

The work is available in mss. as well as in print. It was first printed by the Ānandāsram Press, Poona as far back as 1863 A.D. Though, as stated already, the work is generally called Saṅkṣeṣa Saṅkara Jaya and has been ascribed by popular tradition to the celebrated Vidyārāṇyamuni, the work itself does not mention either name anywhere. The name of the work as given in all the colophons is Saṅkṣeṣa Saṅkara Jaya and it has been uniformly attributed to Mādhava. An old tradition says that Mādhava was the brother of Śāyaṇa, the famous commentator of the Vedas and that he became known as Vidyārāṇyamuni after he became a Sannāyais. There has been a great controversy regarding the identity of these

figures but one asthâna pundit of Śrṅgeri Śāradā Mutt—Śrī Kṛṣṇa Jois Śastrī—told me that according to his knowledge and belief, there were three Mādhavas, none of whom ever became a Sannyāsī and then he cited the authority of Guruvaṁśa Kavya, a poem in 19 cantos, composed by Kāli Laxman Sūrin, a Śrṅgeri mutt pundit, at the instance of Śrī Saccidānanda Bhāratī Svāmī, the then ruling Svāmīji of the said mutt, on the strength of information, supplied by the latter to the former. Scholars have debated this issue of identity in a number of articles and yet there has been no definite conclusion. Till such time, therefore, as such a conclusion is reached, I would prefer to keep the two distinct. I am going to show later that the work under consideration cannot be said to have come from the pen of Śrī Vidyāraṇyaśmi.

**Extent and Nature:**

All the available copies of the work I have inspected so far contain 16 chapters of unmixed poetry, with a total number of about 1848 stanzas. One Śastrī (Śrī Mahādeva Śastrī) from Kumbakonam showed me some additional stanzas as from the same S. S. Jaya but not found in the printed edition thereof. Now, the Govt. Oriental Ms. Library, Madras contains one solitary mss. of this work (their ref. no D. 12174) and on comparing the first chapter of the same, of which I have procured from them a copy, with the one in the printed book, I found that it did contain one additional stanza just in the same place as noted by the said Śastrī i.e., between stanzas 4 and 5 of the printed edition. From this, it may be inferred at least tentatively that the said ms. is very likely to contain the other additional stanzas also.

The work purports to be an epitome of an earlier work called Prācīna Śaṅkara Jaya. I have discussed the question of the identity of this earlier work in my first article in this series. I am, therefore, unable to accept the contention of the Kānei Mutt that the Ś. V. of Anantānanda-giri was the basis of this S. S. Jaya. In fact, it is more likely that both these works are indebted to that earlier Pr. Ś. V. In the absence of this Pr.Ś.V., it is not possible to say how far Mād. laid it under obligation and how faithfully.

**Date:**

It seems possible to settle somewhat correctly the period of composition of this work. The clues are as follows:—

1. There are two commentaries on this work, viz., Diṇḍīma of Dhanapatiśirī and Advaita-rājya-Laxmī of Acyutarāya Modik. At the end of these commentaries, both the writers have given the years of their completion. Thus, Diṇḍīma says that it was completed in the year 1798 A.D. and A.R.L. says that it was completed in 1824 A.D. This gives us 1798 A.D. as the terminus ad quem of the work.

2. It will be shown later that S. S. Jaya has borrowed from Śaṅkarābhīyudaya of Rāja D., who is said to have flourished towards the middle of the 17th Cent. A.D. If this is correct, the work must have been written after 1650 A.D. which is the terminus et quo.

The work, therefore, seems to have been composed sometime between 1650 A.D. and 1800 A.D.

**Authenticity of the work:**

Regarding this work, there has been a very great controversy, which can be stated as follows:—

Sri T. S. Narāyaṇa Śaṅstrī said in 1916 A.D. and Mr Bodas agreed with him in 1923 A.D. that the work of Mādhava, as available in print, was not the original one and that it was printed somewhat hastily by the Ānandāsrama Press, Poona, with many additions and prepared specially by some adherent of the Śrṅgeri
Sarada Mutt to counteract the claim of the Kânêl Mutt. Sri K. Kuppuswamy Aiyya quotes in माधवाचार्य संस्कृति विश्वासपति,8 a Kânêl Mutt publication, the following extract from a Telugu article by one Sri Vemuri Prabakar Sastri of the Government O. Mss. Library, Madras:

"I happened to meet at Baptla, Brahmarsi Vemuri Narasimha Sastri during my recent tour in the Guntur District last year, in quest of manuscripts. I mentioned casually to him my reasons for doubting the authorship of Mâdhaviya Śaṅkara Vijaya. Then he gave out the following secret. When he was about 15 years ago, he had the acquaintance of the late Śri Bhâṭṭaśri, who wrote the Ś. V. published in the name of Vidyârânya and that four others helped him in this production. They, who were attached to Śṛṇgeri Mutt, had to do so to support the superiority of the Śṛṇgeri Mutt over the Kânêl Mutt, which was also claiming to be the chief one, presided over by Śri Śaṅkara. The importance of the Śṛṇgeri Mutt is very much in evidence in this Śaṅkara Vijaya. It is not so found in Vyāsācala Grantha."

The extract seems to voice the same charge against Mâdhaviya's S. Ś. Jaya. Sri Aiyyya, however, does not seem to be convinced and remarks:

"It is clear from the above that Bhâṭṭaśri Nârâyaṇa Śaṅkara should have been either the real author of the work or was falsely giving out that he was the author."

I was told at Kânêl that a dispute arose in 1844 A.D. between the Kânêl and the Śṛṇgeri Mtts. regarding the right to perform the Tâtaṅka Pratiṣṭâ to the Goddess Akhilândesvari at Jambikeśvaram. When asked by the Court to furnish evidence for their respective rights, the Kânêl Mutt produced Śiva-rohaṣasya and Mârkaṇḍeya Samhitā. The Śṛṇgeri Mutt had no such work and hence produced what now passes as Vidyârânya's Śaṅkara Digvijaya.

If now the Telugu article, written in 1922 A.D., is to be believed, the work must have been composed prior to 1905 A.D., when the meeting of Bhâṭṭaśri and Brahmarsi Vemuri N. Śaṅkara

must have taken place. According to the second story, the work must have come into being shortly after 1844 A.D. Even if we reconcile somehow these two calculations, the total reckoning will be found to conflict with the date 1798 A.D. before which the work in the present form must have come into existence. I have shown already that there is sufficiently strong evidence for such an inference.

Moreover, I have seen personally very old mss.—some even on palm-leaf—of this same work with the same extent, in libraries all over India. There are some small portions also of this work, preserved in some places, like Lâghu-Śaṅkara-Digvijaya,9 Maṇḍana Paṇḍita Vijaya10 &c., and the text therein was found to conform to the corresponding printed text. It is not reasonable to suppose that mss. of a work of so recent an origin as about 1845 A.D. should be found spread on such a scale throughout India, particularly when printing facility had become available, more or less. We have therefore, to set aside the charge against S. Ś. Jaya of Mâdhava as unproved and even disproved by evidence to the contrary.

This, however, should not be construed to mean that I accept Vidyârânya's authorship of the historical authenticity of the work. I have come to the conclusion that the work is no independent composition of one single author but is merely a collection of stanzas from four or even more earlier works, put together to form this work. It is for this reason again that I feel that it is unworthy of a genius like Vidyârânya. My findings are:

Out of a total of about 1848 stanzas, comprising the 16 chapters of this work, about 1100 stanzas are found to be common to 4 other works as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Stanzas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vâyâ's Ś. V.</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiru. D.'s Śaṅkarâbhuyudaya</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râja. D.'s Śaṅkarâbhuyudaya</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râma.'s Pat. Ch.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1084</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most of the cases, verbatim stanzas in succession are found common. In a few cases, only some lines are common while in still fewer cases, substance is the same but stanzas have been composed afresh. The following are a few instances of each:

**Verbatim:**

Mādhava: I: 29 to 32 = Tiru. D. I: 27 to 30
I: 34 to 40 = , I: 31 to 37
I: 55 to 97 = , I: 42 to 84
II: 49 to 65 Vyā. IV: 3 to 19
III: 10: c, d, to = VI: 10 to 36
37: a, b
III: 37: c, d & = VI: 37 (3rd line dropped)
38: a
III: 38: b, c, d, = VI: 38 to 42
to 43: a
III: 44 to 77 , VI: 44 to 77
V: 57 to 58 = Tiru. D. II: 76 to 99
V: 69 to 66 = Vyā. XI: 127 to 133
V: 68 to 80 = , IV: 49 to 61
V: 87 & 90 = Pet. Ch. VIII: 18 & 19
V: 92 to 95 = , VIII: 63 to 66
V: 98 to 101 = , VIII: 67 to 70
VI: 21 to 29 = Tiru. D. III: 61 to 69
VI: 68 to 71 = Rāja. D. II: 16 to 19
VII: 104 to 107 = , II: 33 & 35 to 37
VII: 67 to 70 = , II: 24 to 26 & 29
XII: 1 to 37 = , IV: 1, 2, 6, 7, 14 to 33 and 50 to 62
VII: 81 to 100 = Vyā. V: 12 to 81
VII: 74 to 180 = Tiru. D. IV: 54 to 110
IX: 1 to 21 , V: 1 to 21
IX: 48 to 67 = , V: 81 to 55
X: 30 to 42 = , VI: 46 to 57 & 59

**New stanzas for common substance:**

Mādhava: II: 66 to 72 = Rāja. D. I: 21 to 27
(except st. 27)
II: 76 = , I: 29
II: 88/0/7 = , I: 81/2/8
VI: 44 = Tiru. D. III: 37
VI: 79 = Vyā. V: 10
101 = Tiru. D. IV: 26
VIII: 183 = Rāja. D. II: 50
XII: 83 = Tiru. D. III: 95
XIII: 40 = Vyā. VII: 46
XIV: 101 = , VIII: 71
XV: 8 & 29 = Rāja. D. III: 39 & 42

These are only a few of the many instances to be found in Mādhava's work, when compared with the other three or four works. It will be seen from a comparison of the verbatim quotations in Chapter III of Mādhava's work with Ch. VI of Vyā's work that Mādhava also combines half-stanzas of the latter to form his own complete stanzas. The same group discloses that in some cases, he has formed his stanzas by taking three lines of one stanza and the first line of the next stanza from the latter.

A very natural question is here likely to be raised, viz., what evidence is there to show that Mādhava has borrowed from these other writers and not vice-versa? My reasons for such a deduction are:

Firstly, Mādhava definitely refers to Vyāśacala in the stanza आत्मार्थमप्रमुखाविद्वान & c., cited earlier. Moreover, I personally believe that there is a covert reference to the poet Vyāśacala at
I: 17 of Mādhava’s work, though the actual context favours the commentator’s interpretation thereof, as referring to himself.

Secondly, Vṛṣ’s work is cryptic in style and arrangement while in the work of Mādhava, there is more elaborate arrangement and amplification of material.

Between Vṛṣ and Mādhava, therefore, Vṛṣ seems to be earlier than Mādhava.

Further, it has been found that the stanzas, single or in succession, found common between Mādhava and the other writers, fit into the contexts of the latter quite well while in Mādhava, they give rise to repetitions and contradictions. A few illustrations will bear out this point.

(1) While describing Śaṅkara’s education, Mādhava tells us that at the age of 2 only, he learnt to read and write the characters and then, after a single hearing of the Kavyas and the Purāṇas, he understood them without instruction. The next stanza tells us in a general way that he learnt without a teacher and taught his colleagues. The next two stanzas tells us again that when it was still time for playing, he mastered all the scripts (śri+bhū), learnt the Vedas without any instruction and mastered Kavya and Nyāya. The first two stanzas from Mādhava correspond to two in Vṛṣ (XI: 114/5) while the next two correspond to two in Tiru. D. (II: 12 & 14).

(2) While describing the encounter between Śaṅkara and Kumārila, Mādhava gives the following three stanzas in the same 7th chapters:—

(a) अप्रीती सहस्त्राणि विभवनि विभ्रानि । सदत्रिकानां प्रयोगेऽति भाष्ये ।
(b) भाष्य प्रीतं वाचेति वर्णित् । अवक्रेष्ठ तत्राणि विधाय वृत्तम् ।
(c) भाष्यं न मेजनि हि साधकमयतः —

The idea that Kumārila missed the chance to attain fame by writing a commentary on Śaṅkara’s Brhadaprakāśa because he was obviously repeated, more particularly in the second and the third stanzas. It is interesting to note that these three stanzas correspond verbatim to stanzas in three different works, viz. Vṛṣ. V: 14, Tiru. D. IV: 28 and Rāja. D. II: 35.

(3) A similar repetition is found with regard to the two sins which, Kumārila says, he has committed, viz. ईवतनिरास्त and पुष्पाधि. The following stanzas from Mādhava may be noted:

(a) दोषसमस्याम विनिश्चीतर्ं । यथाहृदात निगीतिनामवासम् ।

(b) प्रवीणसन्तु सदाध्यायनशास्त्रम् ।

These correspond verbatim to Tiru. D.: 27 and Rāja. D. II: 35: a, b.

(4) When Śaṅkara offers to revive Kumārila, the latter admits Śaṅkara’s capacity to do so but politely refuses to be revived. In this connection, the following stanzas have been given by Mādhava:—

(a) संक्रेयमय विक्रमसम्बन्धः च लः ।

(b) जाने तस्माद भावाङ्गाय । संहृय गृहनि पतंगिवावतं ।

(c) नामयुतेऽऽिकृत वृत्तितिर्द ।


On the contrary, Kumārila requests Śaṅkara to instruct him into ताराका ब्रह्म and thereby make him कृतार्थ. Read:

(a) तत्तारकै वेदसंहृतम् च ।

(b) तत्तारकै वेदसंहृतं च समवेतसंहृतं ।

These correspond to Tiru. D: 81: c, d and Rāja. D. II: 48: c, d.
(5) While Kumārila is asking Śaṅkara to go to Maṇḍana, Madhava gives the following:—

(a) विलंबितवायन्त्ययः विचित्रायोः
    यथाविज्ञि वविशिष्टं विस्तारत || VII : 113 : c, d ||

(b) सदा वषोपपदम् महान्
    स विवक्ष: प्रतिव त महीतेः || VII : 114 : a, b ||


Apart from these repetitions, if we look to Vyā. V: 3411 which precedes सदा वषोपपदम् & c., (V: 85) quoted above, we shall find that the two present participles वत्सन् and वदन् in V: 34 and V : 85 in Vyā. connect these two stanzas better syntactically than the two consecutive stanzas in Madhava, which are from Tiru. D. and Vyā., respectively.

(6) While narrating the incident of Śaṅkara’s Parakāyapraveśa, Madhava gives the following two stanzas:

(a) स वदन्तं कुष्ठिविद्याभिषेकं विज्ञवचनं विभास्यसंस्कारं
    महुजेष्वं परिपूर्णं प्रकायप्रायस्सितं मार्गश्रावणं || IX : 74 ||

(b) अयो वितांलेष्वरान्त्ववा मूले तरयोवेश्वरारुपमुः
    तं बीः कार्यमार्जः नूपातः सन्तवं प्राह स संबज्जषेन || IX : 75 ||

The latter of these two stanzas corresponds verbatim to Rāja. D. IV : 34. In Rāja. D., Śaṅkara is described as being on tour. He is going from place to place. Rāja. D. has described the revival by Śaṅkara of a dead child at Ka०ऽंभि and thereafter, he describes this incident of Prakāyapraveśa. In this context, therefore, the word अयो denotes अत्याठवम् while in Madhava, the second stanza repeats very clearly what has been stated in the first and thus leaves the word अयो without any propriety. This shows that Rāja. D.’s work is earlier than that of Madhava.

11. Read: भगवत्रयायामपायामेऽः महतो भाष्यानिवर्तये स्पष्टम्।
    मग्नेयं वसम्बांधति विव्य:। स हु तस्मे प्रत्यवत्सात्त्वम् || V : 34 ||

(7) While describing in Ch. XI the Ugra-Bhairava incident, Mādhava says that when the Bhairava approached Śaṅkara for his head, so that by offering it to Lord Śiva, he (i.e. चैरिः) might go to heaven with his human body, he pointed out to Śaṅkara the perishable nature of the human body and cited the example of Dadhichi, who had surrendered his own for परेर्वतार and attained immortal fame. The instance of Dadhichi occurs in Mādhava thrice in three different stanzas, 17, 18 and 21,12 which correspond to Vyā. IX: 40 (c, d), Tiru. D. VII: 15 (a, b) and Rāja. D. IV: 65 (b)

Regarding contradictions, we find the following:—

While describing the discussion between Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana, Mādhava tells us at VIII: 180 in his work that Bhārati, Maṇḍana’s wife, saw that Maṇḍana’s garland had faded. She then asked both Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana to come in for meals and then said to Śaṅkara thus:—

(a) कीर्तितिरुक्तस: शतस: पुरा माम्। दुर्वासा तदविविहितो जयस:।
    साधो यथारत्मपूर्णशिशूभौगोप्यीः—
    दृष्टः सतोभ्रमणम् निवेदित्या गायनीम् || VIII : 183 ||

(b) अभिशष्ठितकःप्रवर्तनरूपः। मार्गश्रावणं ततः जेतुः जूनिनकः।
    ज्योतिः तथा: स्वभाससिद्धम्।
    सर्वज्ञ: स्वेष्य च मार्जः || VIII : 184 ||

(c) ज्ञाति वेदेऽ महति विभाष:।
    देवस्य भाषः पुराविभासिनं || VIII : 185 : a, b ||

These stanzas clearly show that after noticing Maṇḍana’s defeat, Bhārati was going back to her heavenly abode, as per the limit of the curse laid down by Durvāsas and that then, Śaṅkara detained her by a charm for the purpose of entering into argument with her and defeating her also. As against this, we are told by Mādhava in Ch. IX of his work that when Maṇḍana surrendered to

12. Read: (a) दृष्टः निलेनन्तं हृदयकाय बहुः।
    दातीदारासलिकि वाविभक्ताः || XI : 17

(b) दच्छोधिन्य: शाम्भिष सरीरः।
    स्वस्नाया याचरयं स्वयं शान्त्वरोऽर्भः || XI : 18

(c) व्रीमातसहो तिजिष्ठस्य हि:।
    दधारितिरुचिमुख यदूः द्रवगः।
    आकृत्रतारकौमसामधुमुः प्राप्ती यः। कामस: गतो ||
    श्री XI : 21 ||
Sāṅkara and asked him to initiate him into the order of Sannyāsins, Śaṅkara looked at Bhārati significantly. She understood what he meant and then told him a story from her child-hood that it was predicted by an ascetic that she would enter into an academic discussion with a great Yati in her later life. She then said that she was the other half of Maṇḍana, whom, therefore, Śaṅkara had conquered only half. She then called upon Śaṅkara to defeat her first and they only to make Maṇḍana his disciple. She ruled out Śaṅkara’s objection to a Yati like him entering into an argument with a lady and said that even if Śaṅkara were the Highest Reality, she had an ardent desire to argue with him.

All this narration seems to be so very different from—nay, even foreign to—the earlier one of binding Bhārati by means of a charm and detaining her for a discussion when she was going back to her heavenly abode. There, she seems to have had no desire to argue with Śaṅkara while here she almost challenges him to a discussion before he could make Maṇḍana his disciple. In my humble opinion, this contradiction is due to Madhava’s attempt to put together stanzas from the works of Rāja D. and Tiru D., with his own changes. The stanza कोपातिक्रमकता & c. (Mad. VIII: 188) is worth a comparison with Rāja. D. II: 50, which runs thus:

कोपातिक्रमकता: श्रापता पुरा माम्। शापविशिष्टस्य व्ययो निहितो विभाजा।
साह सवागतकथ्या शाक्तिवीरे—लघुलक्ष्याकुस्तिगतानांना।

Now, according to Rāja D., Bhārati disappeared immediately after this and this agrees with Rāja’s story because he does not describe any discussion between Bhārati and Śaṅkara and the subsequent story of Parakṣāpārāśa. Madhava has changed the last quarter of the above stanza and connected it with the next stanza of his own in a different metre. The subsequent portion relating to Śaṅkara-Bhārati-discussion and the incident of Parakṣāpārāśa is the narration of Tiru D., who does not describe the disappearance of Bhārati as done by Rāja. D. and hence there is no contradiction in his version also. The contradiction in Madhava is quite clear and it is obviously due to his attempt to combine stanzas from the works of the two writers.

Moreover, it has to be noted that in Madhava, Bhārati’s discussion with Śaṅkara is cut off from the story of Śaṅkara’s binding her by the charm by another story of Maṇḍana’s binding that Śaṅkara had proved Jaimini wrong and Śaṅkara’s telling him how he had not done so and how Jaimini’s followers had misunderstood and misinterpreted him. Tiru D. does not give this story and hence there is at least no break in his version. Madhava, who gives it, breaks up the story of Śaṅkara-Bhārati discussion, in which he follows Tiru D. verbatim.

(2) Contradiction appears in the form of confusion in names and some technical terms also.

(a) VII: 113 (S. Ś. Jaya) refers to Maṇḍana while st. 114 refers to Viśvarūpa, and st. 116 identifies the latter with Umveka. St. 118 corresponds to Tiru. D. IV: 32, St. 114 to Viṣṇu, V: 85 and St. VII: 116 corresponds verbatim to Rāja. D. II: 41. This means that Madhava has rolled all the three—Maṇḍana, Viśvarūpa and Umveka—into one person who later on became Suresvara, who thus becomes identical with all these three. In this connection, it has to be noted that Tiru D. mentions Maṇḍana only while Viṣṇu and Rāja D. mention both Maṇḍana and Viśvarūpa but keep them distinct and describe an encounter between Śaṅkara and Viśvarūpa, and the latter’s conversion into a Sannyāsin as Suresvara.

This confusion is found at two other places. After describing the birth of Suresvara from Brahmā and alternatively that of Maṇḍana from Brahma (Mad. III: 6, 8) (implying that Maṇḍana and Suresvara are identical), Madhava gives an account of Udbhaya-Bhārati, presumably Maṇḍana’s wife, but in the course of this narration, Maṇḍana becomes Viśvarūpa throughout, implying once again an identity of the earlier Maṇḍana and this Viśvarūpa. When Śaṅkara comes to Māliṣmati, this same pair has been referred to as Maṇḍana and Udbhaya-Bhārati throughout Ch. VIII. In this case, it has to be noted that almost the entire narration about the marriage of Viśvarūpa and Udbhaya-Bhārati is to be found in Viṣṇu, who, as stated above, refers to Viśvarūpa only.

Still later in Ch. XIII, Suresvara, who is asked by Śaṅkara to write a commentary on his Br. Śū. Bh., has been referred to as such in the very first stanza, then as Maṇḍana in st. 39 and thrice as Viśvarūpa in stanzas 21, 54 and 68. Out of the last three stanzas, the first is found in Rāja. D. (II: 53) and the other two are found
in Vyā (VII : 58 & 70). Once again, all the three have been rolled into one.

(8) Even like the first name of Suresvāra, Mādhava does not seem to be either particular or certain about what Śaṅkara wanted him or Kumārila to write on his Br.Śū.Bh. In connection with Kumārila, Vyā. and Rāja. D. refer to Vṛttikas while Tiru. D. mentions Vṛtti but Mādhava mentions in Ch. VII both, in stanzas, which correspond to stanzas in all these three.\(^\text{15}\)

Again in Ch. XIII, where Suresvāra is asked to write the commentary, the very first stanza refers to Vṛtti while the later stanzas, which are common to Vyā.'s works mention Vṛttikas.\(^\text{16}\) Two stanzas (XII : 21 & 73), which correspond to Rāja. D.II : 43 & 60, use the word Ṭīkā. All these three words—Vṛtti, Vṛttika and Ṭīkā—are technical terms and have certain connotations.\(^\text{17}\)

In addition to repetitions and contradictions, we also find that there is in Mādhava a lot of elaboration and a greater element of the supernatural, in comparison with the other three writers. Both these factors have been regarded as indications of a later date of any work.

If we look at the various incidents in Śaṅkara's life, as described by these four writers, we find that Vyā. does not give a large number of them while Mādhava gives them all. Between Tiru. D. and Rāja. D., Tiru. D. gives some of them and omits the others and so does Rāja. D., there being no agreement between the two regarding the same.

Thus, Tiru. D. and Rāja. D. agree in giving the stories of Śaṅkara's meeting with king Rājaśekeśa and Śaṅkara's offer to Kumārila to revive him. Tiru. D., however, gives a number of stories like those of (1) the golden Amalakas even while Śaṅkara was in the Gurukula, (2) very learned persons coming to him for instruction, immediately after his return from the Gurukula, (3) the visit of the sages to his house, who told his mother about his life-span &c., (4) Śaṅkara's making the waters of the Narmadā enter the karaka, shortly after he went to the hermitage of Govinda and the subsequent explanation of that deed by Govinda and (5) Śaṅkara's encounter with Lord Śiva in the form of an Antyaja. None of these stories has been given by Rāja. D. who, however, gives three other stories—one about the curse of a Gandharva upon the crocodile, which had caught Śaṅkara's foot in the Cūrṇī river, the other, occurring at the end of the Ugra-bhairava incident, about Padmapāda's power to invoke Lord Nṛsiṁha at will and the third about Śaṅkara who, being prevailed upon by his other disciples not to allow Suresvāra to write Vṛttikas on his Br. Śū. Bh., consoled him by saying that he would be reborn as Viśrṣavatī and write Bhāṣya-Ṭīkā, which would become famous and which would make him famous also. Tiru. D. is silent over these stories, the one about the crocodile having been omitted by him altogether.

None of these stories has been given by Vyā. while Mādhava has given all of them. In addition to these, Mādhava gives some stories, which have not been given by any one of these three writers. Thus, the stories of Lord Mahēśa manifesting Himself on the Viṣṇaparvata in Keśala and some king Rājaśekeśa's building, in pursuance of a directive received in a dream, a temple to that God and arranging for His worship, marks of Maṇḍana's house with the refrain जन्मी तथातं सम्मुदायित:-\(^\text{18}\) the initial wrangle between Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana,\(^\text{19}\) Śaṅkara's reviving his own body in flames after his flight back from the body of Amārika, Padmapāda's curing with his own power, Śaṅkara's Bhagandara disease, which even the divine Asvins, sent by Lord Śiva, could not cure, Śaṅkara's invoking, at the instance of his dying mother, Lord Śiva, whose Gaṇas then came to take her away but with whom she refused to go and then Śaṅkara's invoking Lord Viṣṇu, whose Gaṇas came in an aerial car and took her away in the same\(^\text{20}\) and finally, Śaṅkara's encounter with the Krakaca Kāpālin.

Out of these, the stories of learned pundits coming to Śaṅkara for instruction, king Rājaśekeśa's encounter with Śaṅkara, marks of Maṇḍana's house and the initial wrangle between Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana are without any element of the supernatural but are


VII : 107 and 118 = Rāja. D. II : 37 and 48 (Vṛttikas)

VII : 103 = Tiru. D. IV : 28 (Vṛttis)


20. Mād. XIV : 42 tells us that Śaṅkara's mother gave up her life like a Yogin and stanza 44 says that after her death, messengers of Lord Viṣṇu came in an aerial car, that she was delighted to see them and praised her son. . . . & c.

How could she be delighted and/or how could she praise her son after she had given up her body?
clearly additions to the original by way of elaboration. The story of the pundits is obviously in anticipation of Sāṅkara's future greatness and is clearly out of place. The story of king Rājaśeṅkara appears to be a historical anachronism. Moreover, out of Tiru.D., Rāja.D. and Mādhava, who give the story, Tiru. D. refers to Rājaśeṅkara once only and devotes only 4 stanzas to him. Rāja. D. mentions Rājaśeṅkara twice but has not more than about 5 stanzas in all. His first reference is to the king's reading out his three dramas to Sāṅkara while the second describes in 4 stanzas only how the dramas were destroyed in a fire and how Sāṅkara, at the king's request, dictated them to him from memory. Mādhava refers to Rājaśeṅkara thrice, once at II : 2, as some king of Kerala and then twice as in Rāja. D. In his second reference, Mādhava adds the story of a boon by Sāṅkara to the king for getting a son at the instance of the latter and Sāṅkara's asking him in private to perform an istic for the purpose. Mādhava's elaboration here is quite obvious and otherwise also, this second reference is more elaborate that the ones in Tiru. D. and Rāja. D. The four stanzas in the third reference are just the same as in Rāja. D. (Mad XIV : 171-174 = Rāja. D. III: 85-88). Mādhava's posteriority to both (as also to Vyā.) is, I think, beyond doubt here.

These two stories have been given by Tiru. D. and Rāja. D. but the other two have been given by Mādhava only. Out of them the story of the marks of Maṇḍana's house may be accorded some probability-value but the story of the wrangle raises a number of doubts and questions, which have convinced me that it is highly improbable, in addition to being extremely damaging to both Sāṅkara and Maṇḍana as also to the others present there.22

Out of the remaining stories, those of the appearance of Lord Maheśa on the Vṛṣāḍri, the curse on the crocodile, the golden Amalaaks, the visit of the sages and their prediction, the waters

of the Narmadā entering the karaka, Sāṅkara's encounter with the Antyaja are instances of addition of new supernatural stories altogether while the other stories of Sāṅkara's revival of his own body in flames, Padmapāda's power to invoke Lord Nṛsiṅha at will, his curing Sāṅkara of the Bhagandara disease and killing Abhinava-Gupta and Sāṅkara's invoking Lord Śiva first and Lord Viṣṇu afterwards and so on are all extensions of the supernatural, which existed already in the stories as narrated by the other three also. The story of Krākaca is a new addition altogether by Mādhava.24

The appendages, whether by way of elaboration or by way of introducing a new or a greater element of the supernatural, render the story unnatural and highly improbable, in comparison with the earlier versions—even factually and many a time, cause an unpardonable damage to the character of Sāṅkara, whose divine status the biographers have acknowledged and started with. The writers seem to be totally unaware of the harm they have thus caused to the character of Sāṅkara. It is true that Tiru. D. and Rāja. D. are also somewhat guilty on this score but it is more than clear that Mādhava is all the more so and is at times almost outrageous in this regard. Vyā. is almost free from these faults when compared with the other three.

Added to this is the fact of sudden and most unnaturally frequent changes of metre, which is clearly the result of Mādhava's attempt to fuse together stanzas from the three works. This is particularly in evidence where Mādhava has borrowed from all the three writers in the same place and context. That has given rise to change of metre in every alternate stanza or in every two or three stanzas. The other three writers are also found to introduce such changes of metre but they are neither so frequent nor so unnatural or forced. The impression of artificiality and force, which is absent in them, is strongly bad in Mādhava.

24. The story of Sāṅkara-Vyāsa meeting, given by all the four, has been made by Mā. similarly derogatory to Sāṅkara. According to Vyā-, Tiru. D. and Rāja D., Vyāsa as Vyāsa comes to Sāṅkara and being satisfied with his Bṛ. Sū. Bh., grants him an extension of life by 16 years. Mā. only makes Vyāsa come in the form of an old brahamin and then, after a discussion between the two for 8 days, Suśrutasa intervenes to point out Vyāsa's identity to Sāṅkara and then Sāṅkara implores his pardon &c. It is not understood how Sāṅkara failed to realise what his disciple was able to do and had to point out to him.

Mādhava again makes Sāṅkara express to Vyāsa a desire to end his life in the Ganges. Wherefore this weakness in a Brahman like Sāṅkara? The story is an elaboration and a modification of the version of the other three writers and in the process, discards the figure of Sāṅkara.
All these factors have driven me to the conclusion that Vyāsa is the oldest and Mādhava the latest of the 4 writers, Tiru. D. and Rāja. D. standing midway between the two. Hence also my conclusion that Mādhava has borrowed from the other three and not vice-versa. This question of priority is very important and that is my justification for dealing with the evidence at such length, my object having been to try to decide the issue beyond the pale of a doubt. I think that the examples cited are sufficient to decide the point at issue. At least, I do not understand how to explain them otherwise. It is possible to argue that the other three writers have picked up from Mādhava the portions or stanzas, according as they thought fit and prepared their works but this leaves unanswered the question of the condition of Mādhava's own work. I have not exhausted all the evidence and feel convinced that further examination and analysis of the work will only confirm my conclusion. In fact, the more I read, the more I found that the work of Mādhava was nothing but a plagiarised version of a number of earlier works like those of Vyāsa and others and then I was very strongly reminded of Śaṅkara's remark: "सत्यव्यक्ति ज्ञातव्यराज वेदान्तसंस्कार उपपत्तिमत्ताय परीक्षये तथात्त्वा निलामकुन्दीत्यदत्ते एव। न काविवयोपप परम:।" Br. Sū. Bh. II : 2 : 82.

With regard to Pat. Ch. by Rāmabhadrāsurin, it is an independent work, which has only 11 stanzas in common with that of Mādhava. It seems unnatural that it should have borrowed only about a dozen stanzas from Mādhava without any material gain and that they should include a couple of stanzas concerning an incident, which has been consistently omitted by all the biographers of Śaṅkara, viz., the passing away of Govinda-numi.

Tiru. D.'s work breaks off in Ch. VII in the midst of the Ugra-bhairava incident and looking to the large number of stanzas found common already between that work and that of Mādhava, it would not be unreasonable to infer that many more might have been traced to the remaining part of Tiru.'s work, if found out. Moreover, I have shown in my first article how two stanzas, said to belong to Pr. S. V. of Ānand, are found in the work of Mādhava also, with one word changed. If that Pr. S. V. were to come to light, it is possible that still more stanzas would be traced to that work also.

If we look to the other i.e. unborrowed part of Mādhava's work, we come across many instances of loose and untenable writing, a few instances of which may be noted. Independent instances of greater elements of the supernatural have been noted already.

(1) While describing the birth of Padmapāda, Maṇḍana and Sureśvara, Mādhava makes conflicting statements.

(a) Thus, at III : 2, Padmapāda is said to have been born from Viṣṇu while III : 6 tells us that Aruṇa was born as Sanandana. Now, all are agreed that Sanandana and Padmapāda were one and the same person but then, how could one person be born from two gods?

(b) Similarly, III : 6 says that Sureśvara was born from Brahmā and Ānandagiri from Brhaspati (विष्णु निष्ठ) while III : 8 states as an alternative view (दृष्टि विष्ठ) that Maṇḍana was born from Brhaspati and Ānandagiri from Nandīśvara. This means that the author has no definite information on the point.

(2) While describing the re-entry of Śaṅkara into his original body (in the incident of Pārśuśvātira), Mādhava gives the following stanzas:

(a) उद्धोरिणिः सदसिन तैराधिन्यम् मुच्छिः। निर्गति राजनुतुलि निरतनविवेच।

(b) तदनु कृतरघ वूहातं। तदनुित्तमविवेच।

In addition to change of metre, both the stanzas repeat that Śaṅkara entered his original body. The first says clearly that he entered the body as he had left it (पुरुसोत्तमेऽपि पुरुसोत्तमं—वसं), regained consciousness and woke up as before. The second stanza says that thereafter (तदनु), Śaṅkara came to the cave and seeing his body in flames, entered it suddenly. In addition to the repetition, which leaves the word तदनु without propriety or sense, there is a contradiction between the two stanzas since the first contains no reference to the body being in flames. Dhanapati's attempt to explain this by saying that stanza 58 describes how Śaṅkara entered the body in flames is meaningless because Stanza 57 has explained that also by the word पुरुसोत्तमेऽ. The repetition and the contradiction are, to my mind, inescapable facts.
I have commented already on the story of the initial wrangle between Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana. It is so childish and silly and so very derogatory to the characters of all the persons involved in it that it would, I think, be highly unjust to hold that a man like Vidyāraṇya was responsible for it. I have shown in my thesis on Śaṅkara’s life the many absurdities involved in this story which is, therefore, most unworthy of a man like Vidyāraṇya.

A similar thing is found in the description of the first meeting of Śaṅkara and Govindamuni. When the latter asked Śaṅkara who he was, Śaṅkara burst forth into the following:

(3) S. S. Jaya—V : 99.

Is this the way any genuine disciple—and particularly one like Śaṅkara—on the spiritual path would speak to his Guru at the very first meeting? He would indeed be a specimen of devotion and humility. Moreover, if he has the spiritual illumination described in the stanza, why at all did he need a Guru? If he had it not, does the answer not sound impudent and vain? And will such a writing do credit to any biographer of Śaṅkara—particularly Vidyāraṇya?

We also find that Mādhava is guilty of many historical anachronisms in that he makes Śaṅkara argue with men like Bhaṭṭa-Bhāskara, Śri Harṣa of Kaṇḍana Kaṇḍa Khāḍya, Udayana, Abhinava Gupta and Nilakaṇṭha, who came centuries after Śaṅkara, even if we accept 5th cent. A.D. as the correct date of Śaṅkara and with men like Bāṇa, Mayūra and Daṇḍin, who preceded Śaṅkara by a century or two. Moreover Abhinava-Gupta, according to Mādhava, belongs to Kāmārupa (modern Assam) whereas he actually belonged to Kāśmīr. All this shows the writer's lack of historical knowledge and the unhistorical character of his work.

The unhistorical nature of the work is shown by the following facts also:

(1) Like many other biographies of Śaṅkara, this work also begins the story of Śaṅkara’s life in the mythical Puranic fashion.

Thus, Nārada comes to the earth, sees that the people have become irreligious, then goes to Kailāsa and reports the matter to Lord Mahādeva and requests Him to be born on earth. Lord Mahādeva then asks Brahmā and the other gods to go ahead and be born on earth, to prepare the background for Him when He would be born. Then different persons like Kuṃārila, Maṇḍana, Padmapāda and Hastāmālaka are born from the different gods.

(2) As soon as Śaṅkara was born, all the elements of nature became favourable, birds and beasts gave up their age-old animosity and began to live together in peace. Similarly, books fell down from the hands of those, who held views contrary to those of the Advaitins and the mind-lotus of Vyāsa bloomed. This is sheer anticipation as in the other stories of the learned pundits, prediction by the sages and so on, just to proclaim in advance the future greatness of Śaṅkara.

With all those and such other details, Mādhava does not give the date of any single incident or event in Śaṅkara’s life, including his birth and passing away.

The late Śrī Bājāḷaśrī Hardas, a very great scholar from Nagpur, had also, after a careful study, come to the conclusion that the biography in question was not from the pen of the celebrated Vidyāraṇya. Professor B. Upadhyaya of Benares also holds the same view. These two scholars together hold that this work was written by one Mādhava-Bhaṭṭa, the author of Bhārata Campū and who refers to himself as Nava-Kalidasa. Professor Upādhīya and following him, Śrī Hardās, give the following arguments in support of their view:

(1) Vidyāraṇya was one of the pontiffs of the Śrūgeri mutt. There is, however, a lot of difference between the events and incidents described in S. S. Jaya and Guruvaiyās-Kāvyā, an authorised Śrūgeri version of Śaṅkara’s life.

(2) The writer of S. S. Jaya refers to himself as Nava-Kālidāsa, which title is not found mentioned in any of the known

works of Vidyārṇya. This work, therefore, seems to have been composed by some Mādhava-Bhaṭṭa, holding the title Nava-Kālidāsa.

(8) A list of Vidyārṇya’s works is available. The list does not contain the name of this work, viz. S. S. Jaya.

(4) The style of this work does not have the grace and the finish of the celebrated Mādhava-cārya (i.e. Vidyārṇya-muni).

(5) This work has borrowed verbatim 25 stanzas from Rāja. D., who belongs to the 16th Cent. A.D. Vidyārṇya flourished in the 14th Cent. A.D.

All these arguments lead to two conclusions:

(1) The present work is not older than 2 centuries and hence cannot have been written by Vidyārṇya of the 14th Cent.

(2) It has been written by some Nava-Kālidāsa and one Bhaṭṭaśri Nārāyaṇa Śāstri introduced into it as many changes as he liked with the help of Kokkonda Venkataratnam Guru and Subramanya Śāstri from Bangalore. Bhaṭṭaśri openly admitted having done this. (Sri B. Hardās).

In fine, this Mādhaviya Ś. D. is neither Mādhaviya nor Śaṅkara Dīgviṣaya. (Sri B. Hardās).

On the strength of evidence adduced by me so far, I also agree with the view of the two learned scholars, viz., that the present S. S. Jaya has been written, not by Vidyārṇya-muni but by one Mādhavabhaṭṭa, the author of Bhāratacāmpṣa and that it must have been written sometime between 1630 A.D. and 1800 A.D. It is quite possible that it was tampered with by Bhaṭṭaśri Nārāyaṇa Śāstri, as suggested by Sri Hardās, though certainly not written by any one person at such a late period. In conclusion, I hold that this work—S. S. Jaya of Mādhava—is historically quite valueless as an independent work of one single genius, being, as said already, only a combination of some earlier works and that as such, it is absolutely unworthy of a great intellectual and spiritual genius like Sri Vidyārṇya-muni.