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FOREWORD

I have great pleasure in writing a foreword to this study on Sāyana and Mādhava-Vidyārānyā a Ph. D. Thesis of the karnatak university, Dharwar, prepared under the direction of prof. K. Krishnamoorthy, by my friend and a student of prof. C. Kunhun Raja, Dr. M. Kripacharyulu.

The author has examined the available material, literary and epigraphical, on the various problems connected with Sāyaṇa and Mādhava-Vidyārānyā before coming to his conclusions.

This is divided into two parts, containing ten chapters. Part one is devoted to the lives of the two brothers, Sāyaṇa and Mādhava. The historical backgound of the Vijayanagara empire and the contribution of the rulers to the revival of Hindu religion and culture are discussed in detail. He supports the view that Harihara and Bukka were the real founder of the Vijayanagara empire. He refutes B.A. Saletore’s view about Sāyaṇa and Mādhava and their patrons Harihara and Bukka being karnatakas and is convinced that they belonged to Andhra. He refutes T.M.P. Mahadevan’s view about the identity of Bhāratītīrtha and Vidyārānyā and proves that Saṅka-rāṇanda and Sri Vidyātīrtha are identical. He considers that it was Mādhava who took to Sannyāsa under the name of Vidyārānyā and that Bhāratītīrtha was his teacher. He assigns to Mādhava-Vidyārānyā the two basic texts Pañcadaśī and Vivaraṇa-prameyā Sangraha and rejects the view of the editors of the
work, Saileśvar Sen and others. The works of Sāyaṇa and Mādhava are discussed in separate chapters in part II. There is a special chapter on Vidyāranya's contribution to Advaita philosophy wherein the important concepts of Māyā etc. are dealt with. The author explains the editorship and other particulars regarding Bhāṣyas on Vedic texts: Samhitās and Brāhmanas in the ninth and tenth chapters.

Here is a very useful and comprehensive survey of the life and works of Sāyaṇa and Mādhava-Vidyāranya, likely to inspire serious scholars to enter the field with confidence. I am sure that it will be welcomed by scholars and the general public interested in Indian culture.

Director
Adyar Library
25-11 1986

K. Kunjunni Raja
When I proposed this subject, my guide Prof. K. Krishnamoorthy stared at me and said, "how can you take it? It is too vast." I replied, "Yet I want to take the subject, sir." "Then what are your special studies for choosing this; other than what you did for the exams"? he enquired of me. I replied: "as far as Vyākarana is concerned I studied Praudha-manoramā with Śabdaratna, a commentary (upto Kārakānta), Paribhāśenduṣekhara (upto Antaraṅga paribhāṣā), and Mahābhāṣya (only Paspaśāhnika); regarding Vedānta I studied Advaita Paribhāṣā, some upaniṣads viz. Īṣa, Kena, Kaṭha, Praśna, Taṭtirīya and Śvetāśvatara and Bhagavadgītā with Śaṅkarabhāṣya; in respect of Veda I got byheart some portions like Rudrādhyāya, Citti praśna Mahānārāyanopaniṣad Taṭtirīyopaniṣad; MahāSaura and I studied about ten Sūktas in Rgveda with Sāyaṇabhāṣya, further, I have obtained the initiation of Paṇcadasī in my sixteenth year; so I had acquainted myself with Mantra Śāstra also. And as regards History I taught some students Indian history."

With this information the professor was satisfied and gave me a letter to Dr. M. Rama Rao, Retd. Professor of History, to provide me with some bibliography on the subject - "Sāyaṇa and Madhava-Vidyāraṇya: A Study of their lives and letters", as it has great historical importance. After going through the letter Dr. Rama Rao said 'This subject is too vast and full of controversies. Several candidates
may do research for their Ph. D. Degrees on this subject. Any way you have chosen this. Try your luck. I shall give you some bibliography, please come tomorrow.” I thanked him for his kind and favourable response.

The next day he gave me a few names of the books which paved my way in due course, to get through a large number of historical works and inscriptions, though they demanded much concentration strenuous effort and large amounts of money, from me for some years. However, I found the solutions for all the problems and completed the historical background and also I dealt with their monumental works including Vedabhāsyas.

Mādhavācārya-Vidyārāṇya and his brother Śāyaṇācārya, who were the celebrated commentators of all vedas and prolific writers on almost all branches of Vedic religion and Advaita philosophy and great politicians served as Prime Ministers under the early kings viz. Harihara, Bukka and others for a long time in the city and empire of Vijayanagara from its initial stage. Since their political and literary activities are equally noteworthy, this thesis is scrupulously divided into two equal parts containing five chapters each.

The first part dealing with the historical background is based on a study of the historical works including epigraphs, introductions and colophons of the works written by them as well as by the subsequent writers. Even the historical works can be divided into two classes cultural and political. In the historical works of political interest, A Forgotten
Empire, Sources of Vijayanagara History etc., there are only some sporadic references to Sāyaṇa and Mādhava-Vidyāranya. In the second type of sources Vidyāranyavṛttānta, Kelaḍinrpavijaya etc. are often mutually contradictory regarding incidents of their lives. Among modern works, only two, Sri Vidyāranya-Mādhavācāryacarita and Ācārya Sāyaṇa ur Mādhav, deserve mention here. The former is a Telugu work and deals with the subject both historically and mythologically and attributes the role of Madhavamantrin to Mādhavācārya Vidyāraṇya and also gives an alphabetical list of ninety-five works attributed to him most of which are now known to be apocryphal. Moreover, this author V. V. Sivavadhani invokes tradition for the total number of Vidyāranya’s works being mentioned as fourteen hundred. The latter is a Hindi work and deals with their lives historically but without going deep into the controversial points and with their works very briefly.

I have, therefore, tried to collect first hand information from the sources available in various libraries, and sought, to the best of my ability, to give a consolidated account of the problems such as the nativity the childhood and the parentage of the brothers, the identity of Vidyāranya with Mādhavācārya and also Śankarānanda with SriVidyatīrtha, the contrast between Mādhavācārya and Mādhava Mantrin, the conversion of Harihara and Bukka, the distinction of the roles of Vidyāraṇya and Bhāratitīrtha etc. I have shown, too the untenability of the arguments of Prof. R. Rama Rao and Prof. P. D. Desai against the identity theory and the origin
of the founders of Vijayanagara respectively. I have also given the etymological derivations of the names of Sāyaṇa and Vidyāranya.

In the second part, the sixth and seventh chapters are devoted to the critical appreciation of the works of Sāyaṇa and Mādhowacārya-Vidyāranya respectively by refuting the misconception of Prof. S. Suryanarayana Sastri, Prof. Saileshvar Sen and Prof. T.M.P. Mahadevan in regard to the genuineness of Vidyāranya’s authorship of Vivarṇaprameyasamgraha and Pañcadaśī. I have made an attempt to explain the nature and the paramount importance of every independent work of theirs and to give a brief resume of the contents in respect of the very important works. I have justified the titles of some of their works by explaining the significance and inner meaning from the probable view point of the authors. I have devoted the eighth chapter to the distinct merit of Vidyāranya’s contribution to Advaita Philosophy with reference to Māyā Avidyā, Jīva, Īśvara and Sākṣin. In the penultimate chapter I have attempted to explain the necessity and importance of Sāyaṇa’s commentaries on the five Samhita texts viz. Rgveda, Yajurveda, Sāmaveda, Śukla Yajurveda and Atharvaveda. I have dealt with the division of each text on which Sāyaṇa composed his commentary and indicated the chronological order. The tenth and last chapter is devoted to the outline of the commentaries of Sāyaṇācārya on the respective Brāhmaṇas of the above five Samhita texts and justified the traditional eight-fold division of Sāma-Brāhmaṇas and also the two-fold division of Rgveda into Aṣṭakas and Maṇḍalas which were criticized by
Dr. B.R. Sarma, Director of Kendriya Samskṛta Vidyāpīṭha, Tirupati, and Prof P.D. Gune respectively.

In the appendix, I have, on account of its demerits and disadvantages, rejected the obscure etymology of the name Sāyaṇa published with opinions of several scholars in the journal of American Oriental Society.

I have supplied the references in the foot-notes on each page as it would be easier for ready reference. I have given the list of abbreviations at the beginning itself. I have also given the chapter wise contents, the select bibliography and word index too.

In the historical background, regarding some proper nouns I had to follow different spellings like Śringeri, Śyngeri, Śringagiri etc. according to different authors whom I had to quote at various places.

I conclude by mentioning that I have tried to the best of my knowledge and ability to be objective in my approach to all the problems and I hope my research would contribute to a clearer picture of the lives and contributions of these two great geniuses and celebrities.

I am happy to record here the solemn significance of this year 1986 or Kṣaya the cyclic year in which this thesis is coming to light is the six hundredth Ārādhana year, of Śrī Vidyāraṇya.
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Part One
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND
INTRODUCTION

Nativity:

There are a large number of books¹ and inscriptions² describing the life and achievements of Sāyaṇa and Mādhava - Vidyāraṇya. The city of Vijayanagara, which was an abode of Hindu culture and under the patronage of Harihara and Bukka, gave a fillip to the revival of Vedic culture in all its bearings. Vijayanagara became the centre of all the cultural and literary activities.

Whether they (Sāyaṇa and Mādhava - Vidyāraṇya) were Āndhra Brahmins or Karṇaṭaka Brahmins is made a prestige issue by modern scholars belonging to the two regions, each claiming that the scholars belong to their own state. Vijayanagara being a bilingual area, there is every possibility for the people to be accustomed to mutual adoption of the culture and the civilization of both the states. This bilingual nature of the city might be the reason for the scholars to doubt whether Sāyaṇa and Mādhava - Vidyāraṇya were Āndhra Brahmins or Karṇaṭaka Brahmins.

1. A Forgotten Empire. Sources of Vijayanagara History, Further sources of Vijayanagara History, Parāṇaramādhava, Mādhaviya Dhātuṛiti, Colophons of Vedic Commentaries etc.
2. Epigraphia Carnatica, Epigraphia Indica. Inscriptions of Nellore District, Mysore Archaeological Report, Indian Historical Quarterly, Indian Antiquary, etc.
Some scholars say that Sāyana and Māyana might be Kārnāṭakas, because the word 'Anna' or 'Ana' appears at the end of their names. It is true, but this word 'Anna' or 'Ana' appears to be commonly added even to the names of Telugu people, in the past and in the present too. For example Nāchana, Tikkana, Potana, Peddana, Mārana, Sūrana, Singana, Timmana, had been the famous poets in Telugu, some of whom were greatly honoured by the rulers of Vijayanagara empire. Moreover, if we critically study the proper noun 'Sāyana' it also appears to be a Telugu word. Burnell, in his preface to Vaṅśa-brāhmaṇa, writes that 'Sāyana' is a Telugu word. The etymology of the word 'Sāyana' is as follows:

There are two words in Telugu 'Sāyamu' and 'Anna'. The first word means help and the second word is an honorific epithet (Śreṣṭhavācaka) when employed at the end of the nouns to denote persons expresses honour or simply means brother. The above two words by undergoing prescribed grammatical operation (Lopaśca Vibhaktyādeḥ śabdeśu syat samāsakāṅgeṣu, Śabda Cintāmanī - halantapariccheda, 45) constitute the compound word 'Sāyana' or 'Sayanna'. But where there is cerebral sound in the name of 'Sāyana', it can be recognized to have taken place, by the influence of Kannada or Tamil or by the analogy of some word like lavaṇa which contains a cerebral sound. Sanskritic etymology of the word 'Sāyana' is also given in the foot-note', which in

1. सायणति, पदार्थायं संज्ञयं विभूतद्वारः, बंदर्थयं निर्भितनीति
प्रकाशनीति वा (अन्तर्कम्बिकाय मोक्ति: प्यन्तात् नन्दादि पाटात् ल्युल्लबे) सायणः।
English means he who, avoiding doubts, decides or brings the meaning of Veda to light.

Further, the same word ‘Sāyamu’ to which if the word ‘Amma’ or ‘Ama’ is added, becomes a compound word ‘Sāyamma’ or ‘Sāyama’ and denotes generally the name of a female person.

Another evidence is that Ahobalapāṇḍita, who was obviously a native of Vinukonda in Guntur District, in his introduction to his work Ahobalapanḍītya, a commentary on ‘Ṣabdacinṭōmaṇi of Nannaya, an authoritative grammar of the Telugu language, mentions that he was the nephew of the same person Mādhavācārya who was Sāyaṇa’s elder brother and who became Vidyāranya after taking Sannyāsa and that he received his education from him only.

In addition to this, there is another authentic document cited by Baladeva Upadhyaya in his Hindi work Ācārya Sāyaṇ aur Mīdhav that Sāyaṇa himself wrote ‘Asmākam Āndhrāṇām’ which means ‘to us Āndhras’. Another evidence is that V. Venkata-sivavadhani, quoting the opinions of Burnell and others, states that Mādhavācārya-Vidyāranya is a Telugu Brahmin.

Lastly, Kona Venkataraya Sarma, the author of a Telugu work dealing with generals, writes that Sāyaṇa was a Telugu Karaṇa Kamma Niyogi Brahmin. This sect exists only in Telugu nadu or Andhra pradesh.

1. Ācārya Sāyaṇ aur Mīdhav, p. 62.
2. Śrī Vidyāranya Mādhavācārya Caritamu, p. 169 (Telugu)
3. Daṇḍanāsthulu, p. 188.
In view of the above-mentioned facts, it is quite reasonable to conclude that they were Āndhras.

**Parentage:**

Māyaṇa was Sāyaṇa's father and was known as a minister of Sangama, a petty king related to Yadava clan who ruled over a small area with capital city of Mangalanilaya, the present Mangalagiri on the southern bank of the river Krishnaveni. 'Srīmati was his mother's name and is mentioned in many places; but a stone slab of the temple of Arulala Perumal at Kanchi or Kanjeevaram speaks of her name as 'Srīmāyi.' It is probable that Srīmāyi was her original name and Srīmati the Sanskritized form. Sāyaṇa's eldest brother was Mādhaṇācārya, the great scholar, the outstanding statesman, the Prime Minister of Harihara and the mighty protector of Vedic Religion. His youngest brother Bhoganātha was an accomplished poet and flourished in the Court of Sangama II. Sāyaṇa's sister Singale (Śrīkāla might be the Sanskritized form) married Rāmarasa, a Karnataka Brahmin and gave birth to a son called Lakṣmīdhara. But Ahobalapanḍita, who was known as the nephew of Mādhaṇācārya - Vidyāranya might have been another son of Singale.

Here the following point deserves to be noted. Ahobalapanḍita, in the introduction to his commentary on Šabdacintāmaṇi a grammatical work of Nan-


श्रीमती जननी यस्य सुकृतिमीमोण: पिता-सायणो भोगनाध्र मनोऽधृति सहोदरो।

naya, mentioned only his uncle’s name as Mādhavācārya-Vidyārāṇya and praised him at length, but he did not mention even the names of his parents. The reason, why there had been no mention of his father and mother in his work, may draw the attention of the scholars to think over the following fact. He must have mentioned and paid his homage to his father and mother in at least one verse, but the later grammarians like Rāmachandra who, after two hundred years of the death of Ahobalapanḍita, copied it might have purposefully eliminated the verses. It seems to be their purpose that they wanted not only to copy it but also to make the grammar full-pledged by way of interpolating a number of linking prose passages and the number of verses composed by the poets even of 17th century for the purpose of illustrations.

In such a case, if they retained those particular verses referring to his parents and also his uncle Mādhavācārya-Vidyārāṇya ‘Vedānāmeta,’ the readers could know that the author of Ahobalapanḍītiya must have lived in the second half of the fourteenth century and that the illustrating verses composed by the poets, who lived in 17th century and other linking prose passages were interpolations. Hence, it may, reasonably, be supposed that the later grammarians who wanted to cut the Ahobalapanḍita’s relationship with his uncle Mādhavācārya-Vidyārāṇya along with his parents had purposefully eliminated the verses quoted by R. Narasimhachar the well-known archaeologist of India. Consequently, the verse ‘Vedānām...’ etc. found no place in the present editions of Ahoqala-
paññītya and also in manuscript copies available in Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.¹

Childhood:

Adequate information about the childhood of the celebrated brothers is not available anywhere in the literary sources. Nevertheless, some important information gleaned from the inscriptions can be considered to trace their birth place, scholastic life, etc.

There is one copper plate inscription dated 1376 A. D. unearthed quite recently while ploughing near a village called Brāhmapāraka 10 Kilometres from Kavali in Nellore District (A. P.) This inscription purports that the village was granted to some Vedic Scholars by Harihara II during the funeral ceremonies for the liberation of his father Bukka I. Further it speaks of the renaming of the village of Brāhmaṅakrāka as Śrībukkarāyapura at the time of its granting.

In this grant the great Vedic commentator Sāyaṅacārya is mentioned as one of the donees in an Anuṣṭūpa verse.² From this evidence it can plausibly

¹. वेणां भाष्यकर्त्तां विद्वान् मूनिवचा धातुवर्तविद्वाता प्रोबद्ध-
विद्वारगर्यं हरिहरनपतेः सार्वभौमतवदाय्य। वाणी नीलांति
वेणी सरसिज निलया किंकरीतिप्रसिद्धा, विशारणोपनगण्यो-
प्रवदिकल्लहुः षंकरो वीताशंकः।


². यो वेद भाष्यकृतीमातृ मायणाचार्य नंदनः।
असी श्रीसायणाचार्यं भार्द्धाजो यजुर्निधि।।
be presumed that Sāyaṇācārya, son of Māyaṇācārya must have been a native of this village belonging to Kavali Taluq in Nellore District.

Moreover, there is another inscription called *Bitragunta grant* of Sangama II dated Samvat 1278. This inscription registers the grant of the village called Bitragunta to twenty eight Vedic scholars as given by Sangama II on the occasion of the first anniversary of his father's death Samvat 1277 (A. D. 1355). Further it says it is Śrīkaṇṭhanātha at whose request the King made the grant to procure immortality for his father Kamparāya and also after whose name the village was renamed as Śrīkaṇṭhapura. The naming of the village after Śrīkaṇṭhanatna shows how much regard King Sangama bears for his spiritual teacher Sāyaṇa. Bitragunta or Śrīkaṇṭhapura also belongs to Kavali Taluq in the same district about 15 Kilometers from Śrī-Bukkarāyapura. The nearness of the two villages and the similar occasion of the two grants suggest that Śrīkaṇṭhanatha must have been native of Bitragunta as Māyaṇa was a native of Śrī-Bukkarāyapura.

Māyaṇa was a minister under Sangama King of Mangalanilaya the present Mangalagiri which is half way between Vijayawada and Guntur on the trunk road. Even in the early times of British rule Mangalagiri was in Nellore District, because Nellore District was extending up to the Southern bank of the river Krishna. Then Guntur was being called only circle.

\[1\] बित्रगुंट मिनीह प्रथितपर्नाम शालिनस्तत स्
प्रकट्यतिस्थ समन्द्र प्राय: श्रीकण्ठपुरपियति प्रययम्।

1. बित्रगुंट मिनीह प्रथितपर्नाम शालिनस्तत स्
प्रकट्यतिस्थ समन्द्र प्राय: श्रीकण्ठपुरपियति प्रययम्।
Since Śrīkaṇṭhapura and Śrībukkarāyapura the native villages of Śrīkaṇṭhanadha and Mayanācārya are very near to each other; the sons of the latter namely Sāyaṇa, Mādhava and Bhoganātha naturally became the disciples of Śrīkaṇṭhanadha who was a great scholar in vedas and sāstras. The three brothers having prosecuted their studies in vedas and also sāstras became profound scholars by the grace of Śrīkaṇṭhanādha. Hence Śrīkaṇṭhanādha should be considered as the first guru or teacher of the three brothers Sāyaṇa, Mādhava and Bhoganāda. So much so, Bhāratītīrtha and Śrīvidyātīrtha were their second and third gurus respectively.

Baladeva Upadhyaya in his Hindi work Sāyaṇ auro Mādhav by name states that Śrīkaṇṭha was Sāyaṇa’s last teacher (Antimaguru). He had just mistakenly stated it because, he considered only the order in which Mādhāvācārya praised the three gurus in a verse at the beginning of his work Kālanirṇaya. But he has not considered the order of preference. Mādhāvācārya’s view is that when a student resorted from one teacher to another teacher for higher and higher studies he generally keeps himself in close contact with the present teacher and naturally gives him first priority, but not to the former teacher. Accordingly Mādhāvācārya praised his gurus in order of preference.

1. सोइँ प्राप्य बिवेकतीर्थ पदवी माम्यायतीर्थ परं
   मज्जन सज्जन संग तीर्थनिपुणः सद्वृत्तीर्थ अयनू।
   लब्धा माकलयन् प्रभावलहरः श्रीभारतीर्थतं
   विद्वातीर्थसुपाश्रयन् हृदि भजे श्रीकण्ठ महान्मयमू।
Here this point must be observed that Mādhavācārya says in the same verse that "Śrībhāratītīrtha-lo Vidyātīrtha mupāšrayan" meaning in English he resorts from Bhāratītīrtha to Vidyātīrtha. It must be said that even among the two gurus Bhāratītīrtha and Śrīvidyāthirtha he gives supreme priority to Śrīvidyātīrtha. To the same extent he praises Śrīvidyātīrtha in his last and penultimate works Anubhūti prakāśa¹ and Jīvanmuktiveka.² Sāyaṇa also in the introductory verses to his vedic commentaries praises in the same way as his brother Mādhavācārya (Vidyāranya) has done in the very beginning of Jīvanmuktiveka.³

Hence, Śrīkāṇṭhanātha must be accepted as the native of Bitragunta and the first teacher of Māyaṇa’s three sons Sāyaṇa, Mādhava and Bhoganātha. Thus the three celebrated brothers spent their childhood or rather boyhood in Sri Bukkarāyapura and Śrīkāṇṭhapura in learning the vedas and śāstras under Śrīkāṇṭhanātha whom Bhoganādha the youngest brother of Mādhava in his work Mahāgana-pathistava in a verse extols as a celestial tree (Maṇḍāra) as a

---

¹. अन्तः प्रविष्ट प्रशास्तति योन्तयामी भूतिरिति. ।
   सोस्त्यान्त मृत्युपूर्वः पात्र विद्वानीर्य महेष्वरः ।।

At the end of the 12th Chapter.

². जीव-मुक्ति विबंधने तमोहादं निवारयन् ।
   पुमर्य मखिं देयाद् विद्वानीर्य महेष्वरः ।।

At the end of the book.

³. यस्य निधिशिनिं वेदा: यो वेदेष्योशिलं जगत् ।
   निम्नमें तमाहं वर्ते विद्वानीर्य महेष्वरस् ।।
golden mountain (Meru) as a milk ocean (Kṣīrāṇava) and finally declares that there is no equivalent teacher to him (Śrikaṇṭhanātha) in the three worlds Śwarga, Martya and Pātāla. Here it must be said that Bhoganādha did not resort to Bhāratīrtha and Śrīvidyāīrtha to receive spiritual and higher education. So he praised only Śrīkaṇṭhanātha as his supreme guru.

Migration:

Amidst the many tales and traditions recorded in the works of various writers, some have not been taken into account here as they are mutually conflicting and do not give any definite information. Only important references are given below, as they shed some light on the ancestral abode of the two outstanding scholars and illustrious brothers; Śāyāna and Mādhava.

I. Robert Sewell mentions: “One has it that two brothers named Bukka and Harihara who had been in the service of the king of Warangel at the time of the destruction of that kingdom by the Muhammadans in 1323 A.D. escaped with a small body of horse to the hill country about Anegundi, being accompanied in their flight by the Brahman Mādhava or Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya, and by

\[ \text{मद्यारणी तह: परेशिंि तरवो मेहमं शेंल: परेस-प्याशेला: कमना गूहस्थं शयनं चाभिष: परेशयब्धय:।} \\
\text{श्रीकण्ठसं गुस्त: परेशिंि गुरवो लोकत्येवयदत्सुतम्} \\
\text{भक्ताधीन भवामुं देवत महो सर्वेष्यभीं देवता:।} \]
some means not stated became lords of that tract afterwards founding the city of Vijayanagara.

II. In _Kedainrpa Vijaya_ it is said—"Then the householder Mādhava who was living on the banks of Krishna migrated to the southern country and having settled down at Pumapa".

III. In _Vidyāranya Vṛttānta_ it is recorded, —"In the city of Maṅgalanilaya there ruled a Yadava Chief of the name of Saṅgama. He had five sons who were known by the names of Hariharārāya, Kamparāya, Bukkarāya, Mādapparāya and Muddapparāya. Of these five Harihara and Bukka displayed considerable valour from the early years of their rule, and Sāyaṇa-and Māyaṇa assisted them as ministers in the administration of their estate. Harihara and Bukka went to the city of Orugallu where they entered into the service of its king Pratāparudra".

IV. In _Guruvaṃśa Kāvya_ it is stated that — In the city of Maṅgala-nilaya and in the dynasty of Yadu, there was a virtuous king called Saṅgama, whose sons by name were Harihara, Kampa, Bukka, Madappa and Muddappa, of whom the first and the third sons were very famous for eminent scholarship and Valour respectively. All of them were hailed happily with the association of the ministers, Māyaṇa and others. Harihara and Bukka, by virtue of their

own ability and honesty were appointed as treasury officers in Warangal by its king Pratāparudra. 1

In the light of the above passages the following facts can be drawn. (1) Sāyāna and Mādhava were the sons of Māyaṇa, who was a minister of Saṅgama (2) Saṅgama ruled over a small area with the capital city of Maṅgalanilaya (present Maṅgalagiri) on the southern bank of the river Krishnaveni in present Guntur District. (3) He had five sons who were known by the names of Harihara, Kampa, Bukka, Madappa and Muddappa. (4) Harihara and Bukka were appointed as treasury officers in Warangal by Pratāparudra. On the basis of the above facts the following may be postulated.

1. मंगलेकिनिले यथवंशे संगमापिंद्र महीपति राजीव
   संगताहि सुगुणा अमुमेवोपं मितुयुज्य सार्थनामाः
   पंच ते हरिहर भिश्वसाय: किंचं कंपन्नुप बुक्क महीनो
   मारपरितित मुक्प राजो सूचयोपत्त तनया: चिर मासन्
   पण्डितो हरिहरेश्वर उव्वे मंडन्न च किल बुक्क महेद्रः
   पांडवेश्वर गुप्ताणितर पायो चंड विक्रमगुरुता वचकासाम्
   तत तत्र धरणो सङ्कलते धात्तवीशिपद भाज उदाराः
   न्यायमर्थविवृत्युपरोक्तन्तः सार्याणादिसिवेऽ सहह रेजु: 11
   एकमेकथसुवनमेता नाकलन्य विकुवाविति रम
   बीरहडनूपती रणभूमी पारगापितंदनुभंर नाथ: 11
   आदिवर्भप्रवकारणदेवा आदिनेयप्रविष्टी पुरोहा: 11
   मौर्याराजमभवत्सनुपाधा: मंजु भेजु राधिकारिण एनम् 11
   विक्रमी हरिहरस्वतिताल्य बुक्क भूमुदपि चाल्सनधो वो 11
   मुख्य कौशभवने विनियुक्तो चक्रिणा चतुर्धाय परेना 11

V canto, Verses, 46-52.
Sangama, as he was a petty chief under Kakatiya ruler, perhaps on the royal demand and also on the advice of his minister Māyaṇa, might have sent his first and third sons, Harihara and Bukka, being accompanied by Sāyaṇa and Mādhava the sons of his minister, and the prospective ministers of his sons, to the capital city of Warangal, where, they, by their ability and sincerity, were appointed as superintendents of its treasury, who in the same capacity served for a short time of three or four years, till 1323 A.D. when that kingdom was plundered and destroyed by the Muhammadan invasion.

If the above fact is not taken for granted, what Sewell explained to be the most reasonable account—Harihara and Bukka, being accompanied in their flight by, Mādhava Cārya escaped to the hill country etc.—would cease to be relevant. If Sewell’s account has to be accepted as reasonable and relevant, the above postulation has also to be corroborated.

If it were possible, however, to justify Sewell’s account by some other fabrication of the event, instead of accepting the accompaniment of Mādhava Cārya, then, Vidyāranyakritānta and Guruvamśa Kāvyā, which in this regard almost unanimously give the most consistent reasonable and reliable account, would become highly impossible to be interpreted in any other way.

And still if it happens to be called in question as to why the author of Keladinrpavijaya did not mention when it is an historical fact, the answer is that KNV is chiefly intended to describe the victorious deeds done by the king and not the petty things or
the paraphernalia of minor characters like Mādhava and others. Yet he has a mention of his native place Maṅgalanilaya, further migration and ultimate settlement etc. As a result of the above discussion, it can be said reasonably that the original dwelling place or the ancestral abode of Sāyaṇa and Mādhava was Maṅgalanilaya (present Maṅgalagiri) and that owing to the political circumstances they had to migrate to the southern bank of the Thuṅgabhadra and settle at Pumpa.

The Contemporary Political condition of India:

Now it is necessary to know about the political condition of India in 14th century prior to 1336 A.D. which really prompted Mādhavācārya-Vidyārāṇya to establish or to help Harihara and Bukka to establish the city and empire of Vijayanagara, from where he along with his brother Sāyaṇa, rendered ageless and agelong services to preserve Hindu culture in almost all its bearings. At that time the whole of northern India down to Vindhya mountains was firmly under Muhammadan rule. Besides, they had captured Devagiri and inhumanly flayed alive the unfortunate prince Haripaladeva setting up his head at the gate of his own city. Warangal also fell into their hands. The remaining part of Deccan too was threatened with the same fate. Although the whole country south of Krishna was still under Hindu domination, the supremacy of the old Hindu Royal dynasties was shaken to its base by the terror of Muhammadan forces rapidly advancing from the north.

1. Forgotten Empire, PP. 4, 5.
Above all, the five Pandyans at Madura become too weak to protect Hinduism owing to their interanimosity and alliance with Muhammadans which were the common characteristics of most of the Hindu kings.\(^1\) The Hoyasalas also were unable to resist the Muslims and left the capital city of Dora samudra and went to Tiruvan\ñ\ñmalai.\(^2\)

**Threat to Hindu Religion:**

When the whole peninsula was also found under Muhammadan domination, the suffering in every aspect of the life of its people knew no bounds. There was prevalent an unthinkable danger and an indescribable terror for the life of Hindus who could not but keep their heads down before the inhuman activities and inexplicable atrocities of Muslim rulers. Then Hindus were rather destined and prepared to tolerate, not to escape; to suffer not to resist; to lose, not to gain and to die not to live and to obey whatever the cruel rulers liked to do. As a contemporary record, *Vilasa grant* of Prolayan\ñyaka or Prol\ñenedu of Musun\ñuri family, thus speaks of the piteous condition of the Hindu nation, irrespective of rank, caste and creed, male and female, young and old, in the beginning of the second quarter of the fourteenth century. The summary of *Vilasa grant* is as follows.

In a hundred sinful ways the rich were tortured for money. Merely on beholding the Mussalmans some abandoned their lives. Brahmins were disallowed to perform religious rites and rituals and also to

---

enjoy Agra varas. Temples were destroyed and idols were desecrated and broken. The husbandmen were deprived of the fruits of their cultivation. Both the rich and the poor got ruined. In that great calamity, people could not protect their money, other earthly belongings and even their wives. Although the above account of the atrocities of the Yavanas described in Vilasa grant was confined only to the Hindus of Tilinga, it cannot be gainsaid that the Hindus living in all other parts throughout the length and breadth of India were forced to suffer the same lot.

**Plan for a check:**

As a result of frequent invasions made during about 250 years, the whole of northern India down to the Vindhya mountains was gradually brought and permanently kept under the clutches of the oppressive rule of the dreadful Mussalmans. In that period and even in the subsequent period of seventy-five years, millions of Hindus, living in the land lying between the Vindhya and Himalaya mountains, were forcibly converted to Islam. All the rest of the Hindus who had inherent affection and blood relationship with the large number of the converted and who were also enjoying some privileges and rare dignities happened to be reluctant to revolt against the Mussalmans. Hence they were firmly and permanently established at Delhi. But the case in the Deccan was entirely different from what obtained in the northern India. Firstly, unlike the people of northern India, the people of the Deccan were not accustomed to the frequent invasions con-

---

ducted by Muhammedans. Secondly, it was the most laborious and costliest game for them often to invade the Deccan as it was far from Delhi. Thirdly, it can be attributed to want of diplomacy and use of rude methods such as slaying, raping, robbing etc., which made them unpopular and unfit to win over the hearts of the people of unflinching loyalty and skilled warfare. So the people of the Deccan were no longer able to suffer under the oppressive and tyrannical rule of the Muhammedans, who seldom hesitated to cause any amount of distress to the people, everywhere in the country never showing compunction.

Some time after the fall of Warangal, it was the Telugu people who were restless and unable to look at the most pitiful condition of the old mighty kingdoms which had crumbled down, of the old royal families that were almost ruined by way of treachery and butchery, of the intelligentsia like Sāyana and Mādhava, who were themselves submerged in pitch darkness of the Hindu Dharma which was craving for a helping hand and who for the first time designed the plan for the movement of freedom in order to shake off the bondage and to throw off the yoke of the Muhammedans and executed it together with the generals, ministers and chieftains who survived the catastrophe of Warangal, to a grand and successful termination.

Then Kolani Rudradeva, the Superintendent of the seventy-two durgas and Annamantri the commander of the elephant forces both of whom were in the service of Pratāparudra till the fall of Waran-
gal advised the electorate to elect Prolayanâyaka of Musunûri family as the leader of the freedom movement, whose was the first rebellion of the series of revolts that took place against Sultan Muhammad-bîn-Tughlaq and who became the first ruler of the coastal region of Andhra country after Pratâparudra. ¹ Further, Kâpayanâyaka who was as energetic as he was enthusiastic and as daring and powerful as his cousin Prolayanâyaka, from whom the former learnt his first lessons in organisation, statesmanship and in the art of warfare, set out to liberate the Telingana and at the instance of the latter, having raised the standard of revolt with the co-operation of the neighbouring Hindu monarchs and local chiefs attacked Malik Maqbul, the Naib Wazir of Telingana, who quite unable to withstand the allied forces, fled from the capital city of warangal, wherein, he (Kâpayanâyaka) rehoisted the flag as a symbol of Hindu independence and his spotless patriotism and assumed the proud titles 'Āndhra Suratâna' the Sultan of Āndhra country and 'Āndhra Desâdhîśvara' 'Lord of the Āndhra Country'.²

About the same time Harihara, the brother of Bukka, who, by the grace of the pleased Sultan of Delhi, became Governor to rule over the Kampili region with the help of Vidyârânya, the pontiff of the Virûpâkṣa Temple at Humpi, apostatized from Islam and made revolt against the Sultan and succeeded in wresting the country of Kampili from Mussalmans and in establishing his independence. This can

1. Ibid. pp. 24 to 37
2. Ibid: pp 45, 46, 64, 65.
be made evident by the following passages of contemporary writers.  

Zia Barni writes: "One of the relations of Kanyakaiik, whom the Sultan had sent to Kambala, apostatized from Islam and stirred up a revolt. The land of Kambala (Kampili) also was thus lost and fell into the hands of the Hindus."

Another contemporary writer, Isamy, writes: "Tilang having rebelled, the fort of Tilang (Warangal) passed away from the hands of the Turks. An apostate (from Islam) conquered the country of Kannad from Guty as far as the boundary of Mabar."

Founding the city of Vijayanagara, Harihara along with his five brothers Bukka and others ruled over a vast empire and preserved Hindu culture and protected the Vedic religion from Muslim danger and ravage.

1. Ibid. pp. 65, 66.
CHAPTER II

*Principles of historical reconstruction:*

Before entering into a discussion of the details pertaining to the foundation of the city of Vijayanagara, which is rather controversial, it is essential to make note of the principles on the practical observation of which historical conclusions have to be drawn from the sources of information in order of preference. The evidence that inscriptions produce must be treated as the most authentic, in case they are genuine and not spurious. The second preference must be attached to what contemporary writers say, if it does not contradict the epigraphical data. Thirdly it is near-contemporary evidence that has to be considered as the next best and resorted to as trustworthy testimony, only when it gives more details having no fundamental contradiction with the above. But under no circumstances can remote or later works be needed, unless they are based upon the ground prepared by, and intended to provide against the incompleteness of the information gathered out of the above-mentioned sources.

Supposing any type of controversy arises between genuine inscriptions and contemporary writers, the evidence of the latter should be set aside without consideration. In the same way, in the case of other sources also, when there arises a controversy the preceding one can never be overruled in preference to the succeeding one. But in case of absence of the evidence of the preceding one amidst all types of
sources the immediately succeeding one is entitled to be considered as notable authority. Further, it should be kept in mind and followed cautiously, that when there are certain perplexing gaps at certain places and if none of the above sources can provide the means of definite information required for historical reconstruction, the writer must employ his rational knowledge to bridge them and get over the critical situation.

Finally, the study of inscriptions must be exhaustive and systematic, lest the interpretations should go wrong and the conclusions should become untenable. Another most important principle is that when a controversy arises between two genuine inscriptions or two works belonging to the same division, only that which, according to the preference specified above, finds stronger support in the threefold sources as already classified or epigraphy respectively, must be taken as the authoritative document and the other should be left out with no consideration.

Date of the foundation:

"In the year 1336 the city of Vijayanagara was founded, and a new dynasty stepped into the shoes of Kampila Deva. The circumstances of this event have been the subject of prolonged investigations and numerous controversies, but the matter may now be held to be settled by the latest views of the most successful searcher in this field, Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, whose conclusions are fully supported by a further examination of the Persian sources" says J. Duncan M. Derrett, in his work.¹

¹. T. H., p. 167.
Robert Sewell, to whom the foremost credit, of collecting all the material from inscriptions, archaeological reports, chronicles etc., and of constructing the main portions of the skeleton goes, fixes the year in which the great city of Vijayanagara sprang into existence as 1336 and the same date is accepted by many scholars like Dr. N. Venkataramanayya. The Kapālur plates dated 1386-37 A.D. however, state that Vidyānagara was built by Harihara I, according to the instructions of Vidyāraṇya.¹ B. Suryanarayana Rao in his work Never to be forgotten empire writes that these brothers Harihara and Bukka, with the help of their teacher Vidyāraṇya founded the city of Vijayanagara in the year 1336.² V. A. Smith in his work Oxford History of India writes that there are many strong evidences to show that these brothers are identical with the persons who fled from the city of Warangal and founded the city in the year 1336.³ The opinion of the writer of T. H., about the date, has already been quoted above. Thus almost all the writers are agreed regarding the date of the foundation of the city of Vijayanagara.

The reason, why the galaxy of writers accepted the same date given by Sewell has to be understood. Firstly it is not against the conclusions drawn from the inscriptions and contemporary and near-contemporary literature. Secondly, in all probability of the circumstances they could not find another more authentic date possible to be fixed. Thirdly, it finds stronger support in many later works like Vidyāraṇya-

2. N. F. E., p. 19.
śikka etc. In V. S. which might be the work of the 17th century, it is stated that "these young men came to the Guru, or spiritual teacher, Vidyārānya, who was head of the monastery, of Śrīngeri and the latter founded for them the city of Vijayanagara. This was in 1336". Further, G. V. K. in its eighth verse of the sixth canto gives definitely the exact date, month and year of the foundation of the city of Vijayanagara as 18-4-1336 A. D. corresponding to Śaka year 1258, and cyclic Dhātu year, Vaiśākha month, bright moon fortnight, Saptami, Sunday, Makha Star.

Hence, it may be safely concluded that the date 18-4-1336, which was first historically fixed by Robert Sewell and further elucidated with the details recorded in Śrīngeri Matha, by G. V. K., is against neither the epigraphical data nor the literary facts regarding the foundation of the city of Vijayanagara, and that it has adequate justification of truth and historicity, to be accepted beyond doubt.

**Founders of Vijayanagara**

Three theories, concerning the founders of Vijayanagara have been found in the field of sources. They are as follows:

1. Ballala III after conceding victory to the Muhammadans over his capital city of Dwāra-

---

1. F. E., p. 20.

2. नागेश्वरकैमित इह शके शालिवाहस्य याते । धात्यः मे शुभसमु-<br>चिते माति वैशाखनामिन ॥ शुक्ले पक्षे सुगुणपितृमे सूर्यवारे<br>सुलगने । सप्तमां श्रीविजयनगरी निर्मिमे निर्मिमेन्त्रः ॥
samudra, and laying foundation of a new city called Hosapattana which subsequently became Vijayanagara, left for Tiruvañgamalai as his capital.¹

2. Vidyāranyā himself founded the city of Vijayanagara for his spiritual students, Harihara and Bukka, and installed Harihara as its king.²

3. The two brothers, Harihara and Bukka who were in the service of Prataparudra as Treasury Officers, after the destruction of Warangal by Muhammadans, fled, being accompanied by Mādhava-vācārya-Vidyāranyā to Anegondi and took service under its ruler Rāmanātha. The same brothers, Harihara and Bukka, whom the Muhammadan soldiers took as prisoners to Delhi after putting Rāmanātha to death and whom the wise Sultan having satisfied himself that they were trustworthy and converting them to Islam, sent the first as a king and the second as a minister to rule over Anegondi, founded the city of Vijayanagara ³

The first one, as it has no ground in history except in later literature, is refuted by many scholars, of whom Dr. N. Venkataramanayya is considered the prominent. He says that Ballala III who had no strength to protect even his existent capital city Dvārasamudra, from the Muhammadan forces advancing from the north and who fled with the paraphernalia to extreme south where there is Tiruvañgamalai, could not, at the same time, be

---
¹ K.V., p. 22
expected to establish a new city with a view to safeguarding the northern region of his kingdom. Further, there is no evidence in epigraphy coming from contemporary or even later period, that either directly or indirectly supports Ballāla as the founder of Vijayanagara. Nor is there any evidence available in literature belonging to the contemporary period to prove him to be the founder.¹

The author of T. H., J. Duncan M. Derrett, says that "The erroneous belief that Ballāla III himself founded the city, naming it after a son called Vijaya, was based upon a faulty tradition found in the Cennabasaveśvara - devarasadbhakti - kālajñāna and picked up by Ferishta."²

Even in the later Kannada works like Paradāra-sodara Rāmanā Katha by Nanjunda and Kumāra Rāmanasaṅgalya by Gaṅga there is no evidence to prove that Ballāla founded the city. Hence it may be said that Ballāla was not the founder of the city of Vijayanagara.

The second one finds support in the contemporary inscriptions assigned to the year 1336 and 1347, which refer to the city of Vidyā distinguished as the abode of Vijaya (victory) made by Vidyāraṇya.³

However, their evidence is corroborated by the Virūpākṣa Campu of the contemporary writer Ahobalapati who refers to Devanṛpati as the king-emperor of

1. Ibid., pp. 20-24.
the city built by Vidyāraṇya. Devanṛpati is identified with Harihara I.  

V K. J., a Sanskrit work of the 16th century, says that the two brothers, Harihara and Bukka, who were serving under Pratāparudra as Treasury Officers, after the fall of Warangal at the hands of the Muhammadans, fled to Kampili and took service under its ruler Rāmanātha. The soldiers of Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq killed Rāmanātha in a battle and carried off the two celebrated brothers to Delhi. When they were undergoing imprisonment in Delhi and while the Sultan was sleeping at night a violent thunderstorm took place. owing to which, all the officers of the jail being quite unable to guard deserted their posts. The Sultan being disturbed came out and found the two brothers standing inside far away from the gateway. Then the wise Sultan, having decided that they were most trustworthy got them released and presented them with the country of Karnata. In accordance with the command of the Sultan, Harihara and Bukka, having crossed the river Krishnaveni waged war against Ballala III and were defeated. Consequently, the two brothers, being tired, resorted to the shade of a tree in the midst of a forest and Harihara fell asleep, keeping his head on the lap of his brother Bukka and found in a dream a crystal linga of Cāndramaulīśvara handed over by a yogasiddha called Revana who having said that he would thereafter be crowned with permanent success and become the master of a throne advised him to meet the sage Vidyāraṇya and

disappeared. Immediately waking up Harihara told his dream to his brother Bukka and with the forces which joined them, again went to the sage Vidyāraṇyā and being blessed and encouraged by him went once again to Ballāla and overthrew him with a grand success and brought his region under his rule. Afterwards, they discovered a throne (simhāsana) which was abandoned on the battlefield, and taking possession of it, settled in Hastikona (Anagondi) on the northern bank of the river Tungabhadra.

After some time, the two brothers went on a hunt in the thick forest on the southern bank of the Tungabhadra and found a hare. When their followers, who released a band of well-trained hounds to capture it, saw the hounds take fright and turn back away from the hare, reported the mysterious instance to them, they in their turn brought the incident to the notice of the holy sage Vidyāraṇyā. On hearing that, Vidyāraṇyā went along with the two brothers to the spot where that mystery took place and after inspecting the place that engendered heroism and considering it most worthy for their plan of action began to build a capital city, Vidyānagara by name for the two brothers and their successors."

Another legend entitled K. N. V. the Kannada work of the 18th century, says the householder Mādhava who migrated from the banks of the Krishnaveni to the southern country and settled at Pampā, performed severe penance about the goddess

of wealth (*Lakṣmī*) with a view to getting immense wealth. The goddess appeared and consoled him saying that she would fulfil his wishes in his next birth but not in that birth. Then he went to Vidyāsaṅkara and from him took Sannyāsadīkṣa, which was tantamount to next birth, with the name Vidyāraṇya. As a result of it the goddess, in a dream, ordered him to build a city in that country and set up a king to punish evil and protect virtue. While he was reflecting upon the meaning of the dream; Harihara, who dreamed that he would become a great king, if he, as a protege and having been accompanied by his brother Bukka, would approach the sage Vidyāraṇya, approached and explained his dream to him. Then the sage told Harihara that the God Virūpākṣa was the Lord of the whole kingdom and that they should first become the devotees of the God and then obtain his sanction to carry on the administration of the kingdom as a virtuous king with the name Harihararāya. Subsequently, the sage Vidyāraṇya, having appointed a man to blow a conch at the auspicious time which he fixed previously, kept himself waiting with everything ready to lay the foundation stone or śaṅku to construct a capital city called Vidyānagara for Harihara Rāya, but being misled by a Vaiṣṇava mendicant, who had blown his own conch, laid down the foundation stone or śaṅku and heard a few minutes later another conch blown. After verification he came to know that he laid the foundation stone or śaṅku a few minutes earlier than the fixed time, and predicted that the city would get ruined by the Muhammadans after two hundred and fifty years.\[^1\]

---

\[^1\] *Ibid*, PP. 7, 8.
Some other Sanskrit works called V. V., and G. V. K., also, as far as the foundation of Vijayanagara is concerned, given more or less a similar account to what is given in V.K.J. and K.N.V. Thus two contemporary inscriptions dated A. D. 1347 and a contemporary Sanskrit work called Virūpākṣa Campū along with many other traditional Hindu legends attribute the entire credit of the foundation of the city and empire of Vijayanagara to Vidyāraṇya.

But a few scholars doubt the traditional view on various grounds. R. Narasimhachar says that Bhāratītīrtha was the Śrṅgeri Guru who must be associated and not Vidyāraṇya whose inscriptions are all in the times of Bukka I and Harihara II.¹

T. A. Gopinatha Rao says Vidyāraṇya who rose to prominence only in the reigns of Bukka I and his son Harihara II cannot be the person who advised Harihara I to construct the city of Vijayanagara.²

Rice says that in the list of Śrṅgeri all the gurus succeeded one another, excepting the two Vidyāraṇya and his immediate predecessor Bhāratīkṛṣṇatīrtha.³

Heras says that both seem to have ruled together for a long period of time as their respective dates overlap; Bhāratī Tīrtha from 1328 to 1380 and Vidyā-

---

1. I. A., 1916, pp. 1 to 6 and 16 to 22.
3. S P L V E , VOL. 1, p. 6
ranya from 1331 to 1386. The fact is that in 1380 Vidyāranya seems, as seen above to have assumed rulership; and it is at least evident that he was not the Jagadguru prior to this date. These overlapping dates were undoubtedly put at the time of the falsification of these documents in order to show that Mādhava - Vidyāranya was already the ruler at Śrīneri at the time of the foundation of Vijayangara as asserted in the story.¹

Dr. Saleatore says that "much credence cannot be given to the story of the hare, the ascetic, and the five brothers and the consequent founding of the city of Vijayanagara with the help of Vidyāranya."²

If the passages are critically studied the following questions will arise:

1. Why is Bhāratītīrtha supposed to have been associated with the event of the foundation of Vijayanagara?

2. Is there any contemporary or near-contemporary epigraphical evidence to show whatever role played by Bhāratītīrtha in connection with the foundation of the city of Vijayanagara?

3. Can the above writers show any document existing in contemporary or near-contemporary or at least later literature to prove Bhāratītīrtha as the person who advised Harihara to found the city of Vijayanagara?

¹ B.V.H. p. 35, Note 3.
4. If it is a fact that Bhāratītīrtha was the real adviser of Harihara I in respect of the foundation of the city, why do all the inscriptions, from Kāpalūru, Kolār, Tumkur, Kadur etc., from the contemporary period and many from a later period, instead of mentioning Bhāratītīrtha, mention Vidyāraṇya as having been responsible for the foundation of Vijayanagara?

5. Why does Ahobalapati a contemporary writer of V. C. (Sanskrit) who is considered as a personal witness to the pomp of the first rulers of Vijayanagara, mention Vidyāraṇya as the builder of the city of Vijayanagara and why does he not mention Bhāratītīrtha?

6. Moreover, why do numerous works of Sanskrit and Kannada ranging from the 16th to the 18th century like V. K. J., K. N. V. all in all, unanimously attribute the entire credit of the foundation of the city of Vijayanagara to Vidyāraṇya and not to Bhāratītīrtha?

Nobody can say that all the authors of the above mentioned works have had disrespect towards Bhāratītīrtha and high respect for Vidyāraṇya and so changed the role of the one to the other.

The evidence, from two quotations of Rice and Heras, shows only Vidyāraṇya's unique personality owing to which the rulership of Śringeri Matha courted him. and not the falsification of the documents as he assumed erroneously. This assumption of Heras cannot be justified either historically or
logically. Although the then legal head of the Śrīneri Matha was Bhāratītīrtha, he seemed to have been in need of the assistance or the services of the great sage Vidyārāṇya to meet the time-honoured problems and improve the condition of the Matha. If Vidyārāṇya did not rise to prominence till (1380) the reign of Bukka I and Harihara II as R. Narasimhachar and T.A. Gopinatha Rao think, his services would not have been required by the Matha and hence he must have been a prominent figure even prior to 1331. As a matter of fact, after Śaṅkarācārya there is not such a great person as Vidyārāṇya in the entire list of Gurus of Śrīneri Matha. He is well-versed in all the Vedas and Śāstrās and even worldly affairs. He practised yoga and performed sacrifices and underwent Tapas or penance all of which enabled him to attain supernatural and divine powers. Hence a saint or a sage like Vidyārāṇya can, at his will, establish a city or an empire and can demolish it. For instance, Mahatma Gandhi who led a modern saintly life was able to terminate or finish the British rule and establish independence in India, which was not possible for hundreds of kings, living then. Hence, no one can doubt that a superior saint like Vidyārāṇya, whose brilliant feats were described in an inscription of Harihara II assigned to the year 1380 as more wonderful than those of Brahmā, had done a lesser thing than what a modern saint did.

As a matter of fact, when all the traditional legends, except V.A.K. J, unanimously put forth that Vidyārāṇya founded the city of Vijayanagara, there seems to lurk an element of certainty of historical
fact even in them, which also must be examined and not to be left off as fictitious. According to the principles of historical reconstruction, when there is no controversy with the historical data and more details are available in the remote or later literature, it must also be taken into consideration. Here, the controversy with regard to the foundation of the city of Vijayanagara may be got rid of by considering the following fact.

There is a tradition for generations and it is obviously being followed even in modern times that the laying of the foundation stone, etc. should be celebrated through celebrities but not by themselves. Following the same tradition, Harihara and Bukka might have requested the great sage Mādhava-Vidyārāṇya Śrīpāda to lay the foundation stone for a new capital city and also as a mark of their supreme reverence and honour for him they called it Vidyānagara after his holy name. Thus Harihara and Bukka showed Vidyārāṇya the highest reverence by giving the two-fold credit which no other person living then so richly deserved. When Vidyārāṇya himself laid the foundation stone which is fit to be considered as an important part of the construction of the city and also when the city itself is named after his holy name; these two prominent events might have induced the authors of the traditional legends to attribute the entire credit of the building of the city of Vijayanagara to Vidyārāṇya and it is not wrong.

If the above view is accepted, V.A.K. J., which expounds that Harihara Raya, who ruled from Ane
gondi as his capital for seven years, constructed the city of Vijayanagara for his new capital and reigned from there for another seven years does not incur contradiction with the other legends of its type. Hence, it can conclusively be said that the traditional works which coincide somewhat with the historical facts and try to give more details of importance, must not be treated as unhistorical stuff, but, as Robert Sewell says, truths may be culled from them as they are always combined with the certainties of historical fact. Otherwise, if the historians rely upon the epigraphical evidence alone, no history is possible for them to write.

The third theory, unlike the first and second ones, has got wide currency of popularity of having many believers and followers not only owing to its historical justification of truth but also to its cogency of coinciding traditional Hindu legends. As far as epigraphical justification for this theory is concerned, firstly there is an extant inscription, of the earliest king Harihara who constructed a fort at Baraküru on the west coast in 1336 A.D.,¹ which speaks indirectly of the founder of the city and empire of Vijayanagara as none else than Harihara-I. Secondly, the Kāpalūru inscription assigned to the year 1336-37 A.D.,² however states that Vidyānagara was built by Harihara I according to the instructions of Vidyāranya. Thirdly, another couple of inscriptions emerging from Atakalagundu³ in Kurnool District and

1. Sturrock South Canara Manual, P. 55
Bādāmi in Bijapur District, dated 1339 and 1340 respectively, prove that Harihara is the founder of Vijayanagara. The first one provides an elegant description of Harihara I as ‘Pūrva paścima samudrādhipati’ (Lord of the eastern and the western seas). The second one also echoes the same extraordinary appellation of Harihara as in the first one. Fourthly, an inscription coming out of the heart of the Hoyasala kingdom dated 1340 A.D. speaks of his most exalted rank by virtue of the highest appellation ‘Catussamudrādhipati’ (Lord of the four seas).

If Ballāla was really the founder of Vijayanagara and if Harihara was a feudatory under him, it would have been highly impossible for Harihara to assume the rare and very extraordinary titles ‘Pūrva-paścima Samudrādhipati’ etc., which his so-called overlord could not have. Finally, there is a very large number of inscriptions in Sanskrit, Kannada and Telugu, relating to the rule of Harihara and Bukka out of which none can prove Ballala III either directly or indirectly as the founder, whereas, all of them unequivocally speak that Harihara and Bukka were the founders of Vijayanagara.

Next to epigraphical evidence, the evidence of contemporary writers supports this theory as follows. The Muslim contemporary writer Barani puts forward the fact “that in the reign of Muhammad-bin-Tughilaq a rebellion against the Muslim rule arose under the leadership of Kanyānāyaka in the Warangal region. This resulted in the flight of the Sultan’s Governor of the province to Delhi. About the same

time a relation of Kanyānāyaka whom the Delhi Sultan had sent to Kampili (Humpi region) as its Governor apostatized from Islam and stirred up a revolt. This was successful and the territory was lost to the Hindus,”1 afterwards founding the city he became the lord of that region.

'Isamy a contemporary Muslim writer speaks of the loss of territories to the Delhi Sultan as a result of the rebellions in different parts of the empire and alludes to the seizure of the country from Gutti to Ma'bar by an apostate'.

Ibn Batuta, another contemporary Muslim writer, after describing the subjugation of the Kampili principality by the Sultan's forces, informs that eleven sons of its ruler were taken as prisoners to Delhi and converted to Islam. Two of them became trusted servants of the Sultan.

Although, the Muslim writers in their respective passages do not denote the actual founders of the city by name, they mention a few names of some persons along with some events with which the real founders are invariably connected. The names are as follows: A relation of Kanyānāyaka of Warangal-Sultan of Delhi-Kampili principality; and the events are as follows:- War-captivity-conversion to Islam-appointment of Governor to rule over Humpi region- apostatization from Islam.

1. *Ibid*, p. 306
If the above names and events are critically studied they would, beyond doubt, suggest that the persons who are not mentioned directly by name and two brothers Harihara and Bukka are identical.

Next to contemporary writers, in this context, what Nuniz, a Portuguese near-contemporary writer, states has also to be considered. He says in his chronicles, that "in the war against the Sultan all the members of the Royal family of Anegondi (i.e. Kampili) died and his six old officials were captured and taken to Delhi. The two of them were later sent to govern over Humpi region." who after some time constructed the city of Vidyānagara on the advice of a sage called Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya.¹

Thus the evidence of Nuniz shows that they, whom the Sultan's forces captured and took to Delhi, were not the sons of the ruler of Kampili but his old officials who were previously serving under him as treasury officers and substantiates the above identification. Robert Sewell also accepts and supports this identification as follows, "—eventually the Sultan restored the country to the Hindus, raising to be Rajah and Minister respectively the two brothers who had formerly been minister and treasurer. These were Harihara I and Bukka I."²

In the light of the above discussion, as far as historical justification is concerned, it can safely be concluded that Harihara and Bukka were the founders of the city and empire of Vijayanagara.

---

1. F. E. p. 283.
2. Ibid. p. 22.
CHAPTER III

The Conversion of Harihara and Bukka:

Very few scholars doubt the conversion and the apostatization of the two brothers, Harihara and Bukka, for the reason that only Muslim writers had mentioned it, but not Hindu writers. Partly it is not correct, because Nuniz a Portuguese writer, also mentioned it and he was not expected to be a Muslim. Partly it can be doubted that the conversion of the two brothers might not be a fact since at least one of the legends (Hindu accounts) had not referred to it.

There, it has to be said that the authors or the poets of the legends have to observe the poetic principles and restrictions. The prominent one of them is propriety (aucitya). According to this principle, the writers, as they should not describe any improper event pertaining to the heroes in their legends, or Kavyas, might have eliminated the conversion and the apostatization of Harihara and Bukka. But these principles do not apply to historical writings. The historians can write only the facts whatsoever they may be. In that period of time, when conversions were taking place on a large scale, many Hindus, no doubt, indulged in protecting and benefiting themselves by way of conversion, as there was no other way for them; so also Harihara and Bukka. But it did not belittle their name or fame, on the other hand, it proved, that they were men of timely action and worldly wisdom. According to the circumstan-
ces, then prevailing, having felt that it was not wrong in view of Āpaddharma and also it was necessary to appease the Sultan, they outwardly and temporarily accepted Islam to achieve their objects fully well. Under perilous conditions men may do anything to protect themselves and nothing is forbidden for them. Viśvāmitra ate dog’s flesh by stealing it even from the Candāla house, nay on the day of Amāvāsyā (the 15th day of the dark fortnight)⁸. Then this question may arise, why the Mahābhārata described the improper event relating to Viśvāmitra. There it has to be understood that the aim of the Mahābhārata is quite different from that of a legend or poem or Kāvyā and more over, the Mahābhārata proposes to deal with everything that exists in the universe. As Vyāsa asserts that ‘Yadihāṣti tadanyatra-yannehāṣti Na tat Kvacit’ - what is described here (in the Mahābhārata) it is in the world and what is not described here it is nowhere in the world. So it is dealt with.

Unlike the others who, after conversion, continued as Muslims, the two brothers Harihara and Bukka apostatized from Islam with the help of Vidyāranya-Mādhavācārya and protected their land and its people from the danger of Muslims. Had they not been converted to and apostatized from Islam the great city and the mighty empire of Vijayanagara which served India for two hundred and fifty years to rise in its political cultural, religious,

---

1. अपि सर्वभृत्यूख्य रक्षेदात्मानमात्मवात्
2. सर्वोपायेनपायक्षो दीनमात्मानमुफ्तेऽत् — Ibid, P. 232.
and spiritual aspects of the people, would not have been established.

Origin of the founders of Vijayanagara:

Although the information about the pedigree of the founders of Vijayanagara, coming from inscriptions, hitherto discovered, is rather insufficient; contemporary Muslim accounts, Nuniz chronicles and traditional Hindu accounts have been capable of shedding ample light to lead the writers to search and put forward various theories on the subject. Of all these theories, that which has been accepted by a large number of historians, is the Andhra Origin of the first dynasty of Vijayanagara kings. The other theories, which have not had firm basis in history, were rejected by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya who successfully searched in this field and received a valid support from eminent scholars like J. Duncan M. Derret. At first it is imperative to quote some of the views put forward by the prominent writers who support this theory of Andhra Origin.

1. Wilks says that "this origin of the new government at once explained the ascendancy of the Telinga (Telugu) language and nation at this capital of Carnataca, and proves the state of anarchy and weakness which had succeeded the ruin of the former dynasty. The government founded by the foreigners was also supported by foreigners; and in the centre of Canara a Telinga court was supported by a Telinga Army, the descendants of whom speaking the same language, are to be traced at this day nearly to Cape Comorin, in the remains of numerous estab-
lishments, resembling the Roman colonies, which were sent forth from time to time for the purpose of confirming their distant conquests, and holding the natives in subjection. The centre of the west, probably the whole of the dominions of the late dynasty, including the greater part of the modern state of Mysore, were subdued at an early period; but a branch of the family of Ballala (= Hoyasala) was permitted to exercise a nominal authority at Tonnoor until 1387, in which year we begin to find direct grants from the house of Vijayanagar as far south as Turkanamby beyond the Caveri'.

2 Dr. Vincent A. Smith in his O. H. I. writes "Good authority exists for regarding the brothers (Hariraha and Bukka) as fugitives from eastern Telinga or Telugu kingdom of Warangal".

3 Mr Suryanarayana Rao also is inclined to admit the Andhra origin of the first dynasty of Vijayanagara rulers.

4 Mr. Rangachari opines that "Rayas of Vijayanagara were probably Telugus, though their capital was in the Canarese country."

5 Mr. Lewice Rice also writes, "the Telugu origin seemed plausible. They may have descended from feudatories either of the Hoyasala Ballalas or Prataparudra of the Kākatīya family."
6. Sewell in his F. E. writes: "...the two brothers (Harihara and Bukka), Hindus of the Kuruba caste, who were men of strong religious feeling, serving in the treasury of the king of Warangal, fled from that place on the sack and destruction in 1323 and took service under the petty Rajah of Anegondi".¹

7. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya writes "Therefore, on the evidence of the contemporary historian Barni, we are justified in asserting that Harihara and Bukka, the founders of the empire of Vijayanagara, were persons of Telugu extraction, probably related to the Kākatīya royal family of Warangal."²

8. In Kākatīya Sanchikā (Telugu) Dr. M. Ramarao says that we believe that the founders of the empire of Vijayanagara were Āndhras since, they lived in the Kākatīya empire of Pratāparudra just as the founders of the kingdoms of Reddi and Padmanāyaka.³

Besides, the following sporadic references, in literature and inscriptions, also substantiate the Āndhra origin of the kings of the Sangama dynasty.

The Kanarese writer Sarvajña refers to Bukka I as 'Orugallu Bukka'.⁴

"Bukka I was the patron of the Telugu poet Nācana Soma, the author of Uttara Harivamsa. The book itself is dedicated to Hariharanātha which is taken to be a covert alluion to Harihara I. The

¹ F. E. P. 23.
³ K. S. P. 98.
⁴ Sarvajña’s Kalajnana, V. 131 or Mss. Lib. 19-2-14, P. 156.
similarity of the views of the king and the poet, regarding sectarian differences as revealed by a comparative study of Harivamsa, and the so-called 'Ramanujachari Edicts' shows that the relations between them were very intimate. It is significant that the only vernacular poet whom Bukka ever patronised was a Telugu poet. We also learn from some of the inscriptions of the time that several families of Telugu goudas migrated to the Kanarese country; and there is reason to believe that the migration was due to the initiative of the state. Again Mārappa, one of the five brothers who founded the Vijayanagara empire granted a village in Chandragutti Rajya as an agrahāra to Telugu Brahmans who were dependent upon him.

Lastly, Gaṅgādevi the daughter-in-law of Bukka I, in her Madhurāvijayam, while offering the customary praises to the Sanskrit poets mentions, in addition to the great writers like Kālidāsa, Daṇḍin, some poets that flourished at Warangal about the time of Pratāparudra II. The names of these writers are Agastyā and Viśvanātha. It is also very interesting to note that she speaks of a poet called Tikkayajwan whose name is not known to the students of Sanskrit literature: The Tikkayajwan mentioned by Gaṅgādevi is the famous Kavibrahma, the Tikkana, the author or the translator of the Telugu Mahābhārata and Nirvacanottara Rāmāyana.²

1. E.C., Vol. VIII Sb 375 & E.C., Vol. XII PP. 18, 72, 82 etc.

2. तिक्कयज्वं कवेसृष्टि: कौमुदीविक कलानिष्ठः ।
सतृण्ण कविधिः स्तैरं चक्रोरित्वेक्षयते ॥
These indications although dim, point distinctly to the Telugu descent of the Sangama line of kings.¹

The inscriptions explicitly state that Harihara and Bukka the founders of Vijayanagara were the sons of Kāmāmbikā and Sangama of Yādava clan. According to Rāja-Kālanirṇaya a Sanskrit chronicle and a Sanskrit poem called G V.K. which were written at the commencement of the 17th and the 18th centuries respectively, Sangama was a chieftain who, with the assistance of his minister Māyana, ruled over Mangalanilaya or Mangalapuri which was identified with present Mangalgiri existing on the southern bank of the river Krishnaveni, by the evidence of Māruturu Inscription of Pulakesin II dated 615-16 A.D.²

Further, it is known from the above Sanskrit sources that the first and the third sons of Sangama, Harihara and Bukka by name, were holding the offices of the treasurer and the usher respectively at the court of Pratāparudra of Warangal. After the destruction of Warangal they fled from Warangal to Ānegondi (Kampili) and took service under its ruler Rāmanātha to whom, according to Paradāra Sodara Rāmana Kathe they (Harihara and Bukka) were the nephews. After the death of Rāmanātha in a battle the two brothers were taken as prisoners to Delhi by the Sultan's soldiers. The Sultan of Delhi converted

them to Islam and sent them back to rule Karnata region on his behalf, whom the contemporary Muslim writer Barni identifies with the relations of Kanyanayaka of Warangal. The near contemporary writer Nuniz also affirms the above view of identification. Hence, it can be said that the theory of Andhra origin of the first rulers of Vijayanagara, which has its firm basis or taproot in epigraphy, trunk in contemporary Muslim accounts, branches in near contemporary chronicles, leaves, flowers and fruits in traditional Hindu accounts, seems to be believable and acceptable.

Justification of Andhra origin:

Dr. Saletore, in his article "theories concerning the origin of Vijayanagara," shows some reasons for his denial of Telugu origin which are not strong enough to stand scrutiny. The first reason is that "King Someśvara, who, as the inscription to the right of the north Mahādvāra of the Virūpākṣa temple of Humpi, informs us, in A. D. 1236, gave to the Temple some grant of money."

By this evidence, he proposes to say that Humpi was within the Hoyasala Kingdom in 1236 A. D., which appears not to be acceptable, since he gave money to the temple but not a village or at least a piece of land. If Humpi region was under Hoyasala King Someśvara he would have given at least a village to the temple. The grant of money itself shows that no single village or any piece of land in the region was under the Hoyasalas in 1236 A. D. No

King, in his own country gives only money to the temples but, in other's kingdom it may be given.

Further, Dr. Saletore does not accept the following historical and traditional facts like Harihara's subordination to the Sultan of Delhi, his conversion to Islam, his being appointed as Governor to rule over the Hampi region, the animosity between the sons of Sangama and the Hoyasalas and apostatization of Harihara and Bukka, which are accepted by most eminent historians. Without considering, at least, what the contemporary Muslim writers, Barni Ibn Batuta and Isamy, from their personal experience, say and what Nuniz, belonging to the first half of the 16th century, puts forth, the author Dr. Saletore tries to give much credence to what Ferishta and Buchanan, who belonged to the 17th and 19th centuries respectively, say, and asserts without adequate proof and satisfactory reasons that the copper plate grants are untrustworthy and remarks that the traditional works V.K.J. and Pitumahasamhita, which were written in the 16th century are not contemporary and hence "they must be dismissed as untrust worthy sources of information for events that took place two centuries earlier". He also believes in P.D.S.R.K. and K.R.S. which belong to the 16th and 17th centuries and denies war between Kampila and Hoyasala described in them. Hence, it is not possible to consider his conclusions as authoritative on historical grounds.

Similarly, without any positive evidence, he refuses to accept the relationship that Harihara had

1. Ibid, p. 139-159
with Kanyānāyaka which was first oriented by the contemporary Muslim writers, further substantiated and established by Nuniz and accepted by most of the modern writers. He further denies that the Vijayanagara rulers had borrowed the Varaha crest from Kākatīyas and says that it was borrowed from Cālukyas. So far as the sources on the subject are concerned Harihara’s relationship with Cālukyas is unthinkable, on the other hand, that with Pratāparudra is proved by the evidence of contemporary and near contemporary writers and also traditional works. So how can the hypothetical conclusion which has no base in history be accepted and how can the fact proved historically and traditionally, be ignored?

Another point he puts forward, is that “if the Telugu origin of the rulers of Vijayanagara were an established fact, why for instance, in A. D. 1347 only a year after the foundation of the kingdom of Vijayanagara, the Brahmans who received grants of villages at the hands of Prince Mārappa, one of the five brothers who founded the kingdom of Vijayanagara should have been styled as people coming from Āndhra desa and not as Brahmans hailing from our own country, the Āndhra desa‘. This point also need not be taken seriously, since it is not righteous on the part of good kings to exhibit any type of regional feeling towards their subjects and therefore Mārappa the prince might have called the learned simply Brahmans coming from Āndhra desa. So, this point cannot disprove the Telugu origin.

1. Ibid, pp. 139-159.
On the other hand, it gives rise to a counter question to his inclination. Is there any single instance to show that Marappa or any one of the five sons of Sangama mentioned Bhrahmans of Kannada, who received grants of any type as Bhrahmans hailing from ‘our own Karnāta deśa’?

Further, he says that ‘anti-Telugu propensity of the early Vijayanagara rulers is seen in the distinctive ‘biruda’ ‘a lion to the scent elephant’. As a matter of fact, it does not, in any way, indicate the anti-Telugu propensity but it is indicative of any enemy whoever he may be, irrespective of nation, to whom Harihara II himself considered as a lion or if that enemy was positively said to be an Āndhra king even then anti-Telugu propensity cannot be suggested, since, virtuous kings are always free from partiality of any type in punishing evil and encouraging virtue. Hence it may safely be held that the above reasons mentioned by Dr. Saletore in order to refute the Āndhra origin of the founders of Vijayanagara are merely meretricious and hypothetical and based on grounds neither historical nor traditional. According to the traditional view which some modern scholars like D.V. Gundappa like to support, if Vidyāraṇya is accepted as the founder of the kingdom of Vijayanagara, he is also said to be an Āndhra. It is explained with details in the previous topics, like, nativity of Sāyaṇa and Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya. There is another inscription ascribed to Harihara II discovered recently at Brāhmaṇa Krāka, in Nellore District, published in “Hindu Weekly magazine”¹ which explains that Sāyaṇa, brother of

¹ *H. W. M.*, dated 31-10-1971, p. II.
Madhava-Vidyāraṇya was perfectly an Andhra and belonging to Nellore District. Burnell, in his preface to Vamśa Brāhmaṇa, (p. viii) states that they were Telugu Brahmans claiming descent from Bharadvāja. In both ways Andhra origin of the founders of Vijayanagara holds good and seems to be acceptable.

Karnāṭa origin of the founders:

Dr. Saleatore, who wants to establish Karnāṭa origin of Saṅgama’s family, says that “there is nothing which proves so much the Karnāṭa origin of the founders as the fact that the tutelary God of the first three dynasties was always a Karnāṭak deity. The family God of Saṅgama and his wife Kāmāmbikā and of their sons, was the Guru of all gods’ God Virūpākṣa. It may reasonably be affirmed that this partiality of the founders to the family deity at Humpi was due to the influence of the great sage Madhavacārya-Vidyāraṇya who was then guiding the destinies of the empire.” If the above quotation is studied critically it is evidently understood that the God Virūpākṣa was not the tutelary god of Saṅgama’s family but owing to the instigation of Madhava-Vidyāraṇya the first rulers of Vijayanagara showed devotion and performed worship to the God Virūpākṣa. Secondly, it is the foremost duty of an ideal king to encourage his subjects in their religious aspect of life as well as in other aspects, political, cultural and spiritual. Hence, Virūpākṣa can never be the tutelary God of Saṅgama’s family. Here, the question may arise that if Virūpākṣa, according to Dr. Saleatore, was the

tutelary God of the first rulers of Vijayanagara, why no one of the kings from the beginning till the decay of the empire in 1465 A.D. was named after the God. Contrary to the inclination of Dr. Saleatore, the eldest son of Saṅgama, and the first ruler of Vijayanagara, seems to have been named after Harihara, a new God, the combined figure of Viṣṇu and Śiva who was regenerated in Āndhra desa at the beginning of the 13th century to avoid the conflict and establish peaceful co-existence between two powerful religions Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism.

Kavibrahma Tikkana, whom Gaṅgādevi, the daughter-in-law of Bukka I in her Madhurāvijaya, praised, also dedicated his stupendous Telugu work on Mahābhārata of Vyāsa, to the same God Harihara. Another important point is that if the first rulers of Vijayanagara were Kannadigas, why did Gaṅgādevī, in her Madhurāvijaya, not praise Kampa, a great Kannada poet, who translated the Mahābhārata of Vyāsa into Kannada, but praised Tikkana instead.

Hence, it may conclusively be said that Dr. Saleatore’s efforts in this regard are successful neither in refuting the Āndhra origin nor in establishing the Karnāṭa origin of the first rulers of Vijayanagara.
CHAPTER IV

Etymology and significance of the word "Vidyāranya"

Vidyāranya, the famous head of the Śrīneri Maṭha, the celebrated author of several works, the great commentator of the Vedas, the political adviser and the spiritual teacher of Harihara and Bukka, and the founder of the city and empire of Vijayanagara, is indeed, the most striking figure in the medieval history of India. The word Vidyāranya is one of the titles like 'Tīrtha' assumed by a person who retires from the worldly affairs and becomes a Sannyāsin. Some writers like Robert Sewell say that it is the surname which Bhāratī Tīrtha and Mādhavācārya possessed in common. It seems to be rather incorrect, because, tradition does not allow a Sannyāsin like Bhāratī Tīrtha, the head of the Śrīneri Maṭha, to have any surname. Since, Mādhavācārya is a householder, he does not have any objection to have his surname but his father Māyaṇa and his brothers Sāyaṇa and Bhoganātha also must have the same. No evidence is available to say that they were also having the surname Vidyāranya. Hence, it is not proper to say that the word Vidyāranya is the surname but an appellation of a Sannyāsin, like Tīrtha, Indra, Sarasvati etc.

The compound word Vidyāranya which is coined out of two words, Vidyā and Aranya, means forest

of knowledge. The significance of the word may be explained as follows. Vidyāranya looks attractive and delightful by way of possessing the sound knowledge of all the Vedas and Śāstras (fourteen types of viyās) like a grand forest, with the association of varied trees, creepers and bushes which are full of flowers and fruits, of animals, beasts and birds, moving in different forms and colours, of mountains and hills, of waterfalls, streams, lakes, etc.

Another significant meaning is that if the compound word ‘Vidyāranya’ is split into two words as vidyābhīṣ and raṇyaḥ for the purpose of analysis (vigrāha) it expresses an excellent person, who can fight or enable one to fight with enemies in wars and debates (Śāstrārthas). He (Vidyāranya) being equipped with fourteen types of viyās and supernatural powers and as a great general minister, guides Hari-hara and Bukka, so that many grand victories crowned them through many battles and, as a great scholar himself vanquished Akṣobhyatīrtha who is said to be equally great, in a debate relating to philosophy.

A different meaning is that Vidyā means two Vidyās, Parā and Aparā, in the form of two araṇis, Uttararaṇi and Adharaṇi (two pieces of wood of ‘Śamī tree’) by attrition of which araṇya (sacred fire) gets kindled for the purpose of sacrificial performances. It is evident that Vidyārana was solely responsible for the re-establishment of Vaidika Dharma, by way of founding the Hindu kingdom and commenting on all the Vedas and Śāstras and performing in every spring Soma sacrifices which were threa-
tended and prohibited by other religions, and occupying the pontifical seat of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha and also writing many valuable works to enrich the Hindu religion and Advaita philosophy.

The fourth meaning of the word Vidyāraṇya is that the word Aranya means light, manifested out of Arandi the Sun who is in the form of Vidyā or spiritual knowledge to drive out the darkness in the form of ajñāna, which prevailed in the hearts of devotees or disciples.

The fifth one is that Vidyāraṇya is one who, unlike ordinary sages living in ordinary forests, lives in the forest which is in the form of knowledge of fourteen types of Vidyās, since he is even in his post-sannyāsa stage said to be guiding the destinies of the kingdom of Vijayanagara.

Vidyāraṇya is the greatest of all pontiffs of Śrīṅgeri Maṭha and is also regarded as the family guru of the early rulers of Vijayanagara. His extraordinary and marvellous greatness is described in an inscription of Harihara II as follows:

"May the wonderful glances of Vidyāraṇya which resemble showers of camphor dust, garlands of kalhāra flowers, rays of the moon, sandal paste, and waves of the Milk-ocean, and which shower the nectar of compassion bring you happiness. Can he be Brahmā? We do not see four faces. Can he be Viṣṇu? He has not got four arms. Can he be Śiva? No oddness of the eye is observed. Having thus argued for a long time, the learned have come to the
conclusion that Vidyāraṇya is supreme light incarnate”¹ (Paraṇjyotisvarūpa).

His supreme occult powers also have been described in a copper plate inscription found in a Kadita in the Śrṅgeri Maṭha, dated 1360 as follows:

“Vidyāraṇya’s (Mādhava’s) feats are stated to be more wonderful than those of Brahmā seeing that he can make the eloquent dumb and the dumb the most eloquent ²

_Vidyāraṇya’s identity with Mādhavācārya_

A number of scholars of high repute like R. Narasimhachar have dealt with the life and achievements of Vidyāraṇya, the head of the Śrṅgeri Maṭha. They identified Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya, the brother of Sāyaṇa and the author of various works, Parāśara-smṛti-vyākhyā etc., by the evidence of inscriptions and literary works.³ This identity theory was fully supported by a number of modern scholars, who further examined the facts present in the sources. But a few writers do not accept the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya, of whom Prof. R. Rāma Rao may be considered as the chief.⁴ At first the material objections raised by him to disprove the identity theory have to be

---

2. Ibid p. 56.
examined carefully, whether they are factual and reasonable or not. They are as follows:

1. In the first place, not one of the several inscriptions which refer to Vidyāraṇya and his several predecessors and successors in the Śrīneri Maṭha, where he was Pontiff, ever identifies him with Mādhavācārya.

2. Similarly, the few inscriptions that refer to Mādhavācārya and his brother Sāyanācārya never indicate any connection between him and Vidyāraṇya.

3. The details about the life of Mādhavācārya as found in his own works not merely fail to show any connection between him and Vidyāraṇya but prove him to be quite distinct from Mādhavācārya.

4. From the writings of Mādhavācārya it is therefore evident that he was a brahmin householder, a performer of Vedic sacrifices (which involve animal slaughter) and as a minister subordinate to King Bukka of Vijayanagara. How could he be identified with Vidyāraṇya, who was a sannyāsin and could not as such worship fire or harm animal life and who was the Pontiff of the Śrīneri Maṭha under whose orders grants are recorded to have been made by kings and princes in inscriptions?

5. If Mādhavācārya and Vidyāraṇya are one and the same individual why is there no reference in Mādhavācārya’s works either to Harihara I or to Harihara II?
6. Not merely do the writings of Mādhava and Śāyāna fail to show any connection between them and Vidyāraṇya, but no work can be cited either of contemporary author or even of writers who flourished one or two centuries later which might clearly prove the identity.

7. Even the traditional works like V. K. Ā., K. N. V., and S. T. R. are opposed to the theory of the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya.

The first two objections raised by Prof. R. Rama Rao have no significance at all, because some references to Vidyāraṇya and Mādhavācārya, in contemporary inscriptions and in literary works composed by them, seem to point, though they do not explicitly state, the identity of the two. A few of epigraphical references are as follows:

A copper plate inscription of Harihara II dated 1386, speaks of a grant given in the presence of Vidyāraṇya Śripāda, to the three scholars, namely, Nārāyaṇa Vājapeyayāji, Narahari Somayāji and Paṇḍari Dīksita, who helped Śāyāna and Mādhava in the composition of the commentaries on the Vedas.¹ According to the introductory verses of Taittiriya Samhitā Bhāṣya, Mādhavācārya, the famous scholar, was first asked by the king Bukka I to write commentaries on the Vedas. He told Bukka I that his brother Śāyāna, who knows everything con-

---
cerning the Vedas, may be employed in commenting on the Vedas.\(^1\)

Accordingly, king Bukka ordered Śāyaṇa to comment on the Vedas with the assistance of the above three scholars. From the introduction of the Purusārtha-Sudhānīdhi, it is known that Mādhavacārya, who was an accomplished scholar in all the (fourteen) vidyās, taught Śāyaṇa all the purāṇas and Upapurāṇas and got him qualified to comment even on the Vedas.\(^2\) The Vedas have to be interpreted with the knowledge of Itihasa and Purāṇa as the authority goes: "Itihāsapurāṇābhyām Vedārtham Upa-bṛṇḥhayet".

It is clearly known from the above facts that Mādhavacārya had a great deal to do with the commentaries on the Vedas and that the grant was made most probably at his instance to the above-mentioned scholars for their assistance in writing the great monumental works.

---

1. आदिसत्त्व माधवाचार्य वेदार्थस्य प्रकाशने ।
   स प्राह तृपति राजन् सायणायों ममानुजः।
   सर्व वेदैयेव वेदान्त व्याख्यातः से नियुक्तायम्।
   इत्युक्तो माधवार्ज्जु वीरव्रतमहीपति।
   अन्वशास्त्र सायणाचार्य वेदार्थस्य प्रकाश्ये।
   कुपालुमधवाचार्यों वेदार्थ वक्तुपुस्तः।

2. ..........माधवः प्रत्यभाषत अर्थ हि कृतिमानाचः सायणायों
   ममानुजः। पुराणोपपुराणेषु पुष्पाध्योपयोगिनी।
   उपदेश्ता मया राजन्त.......... ।

S-4-A
If Vidyāraṇya was a distinct person from Mādhavācārya Harihara II would have no necessity to make the grant in his presence to the three scholars. Hence, Vidyāraṇya and Mādhavācārya must be identical.

There is no other source, either epigraphical or literary for the most important information, that the above scholars cooperated with Sāyaṇa and Mādhava in writing the commentaries on the Vedas. The three families of the descendants of the three scholars have been enjoying the special honours and privileges even today by having the first, second and third houses at the Śrīneri Maṭha.

An inscription of Harihara II dated 1386 refers to another grant of Nārāyaṇa Vājapeyayāji, the first scholar of the above three, and another of A.D. 1416 records a grant to Vidyā. .. Bhaṭṭa, son of Pāṇḍari Deva, who is, most probably, identical with Pāṇḍari Dīkṣita, one of the above three scholars. As only one plate of the inscription is available, it is referred to in the above paragraph. It is to be regretted that the complete inscription is not discovered so far. Yet it is very interesting to note that this single plate refers to a former grant, given to the same scholars in the year 1381 A.D. by the son of Harihara II, Chikkarāya, who was the then Governor of Araga kingdom. This grant is consisting of lands which can yield an annual income of 60, 40, 50 Varahas respectively.

The above inscription makes it quite clear that Mādhavācārya was a sannyāsin under the name of

Vidyārāṇya in 1386 A. D. And also another inscriptions dated 1378 A. D. informs that Mādhavācārya was a sannyāsin in the same year and that the grant registered in it has been made by order of Vidyārāṇya Śripāda.

Here, it may also be added that another inscription of Harihara II dated 1380 A.D. mentions Vidyārāṇya. In the light of the above facts, it can be said that the scholars who identified Vidyārāṇya with Mādhavācārya, the brother of Sāyana, and who supported the identity theory by their further examination of the sources, both historical and literary, seem to be most reasonable, since, the opponents of the identity theory cannot show another person, who as far as historical and literary evidence is concerned, has greater probability to be identified with Vidyārāṇya.

His third objection also cannot stand in the way of the identity theory, since details about the life of Mādhavācārya found in his own works, Parāśaramūti-Bhāṣya etc., prove that Mādhavācārya and Vidyārāṇya are one and the same individual. A verse from the introduction to Parāśara-Mādhavīya describes Mādhavācārya as the family guru of Bukka I, the king of Vijayanagara, and also as his minister. Moreover, in the same verse, Mādhavācārya is compared to Arundhatīsāhacara which means Vasistha and Bukka is described as Rāma. Vidyārāṇya is already known

1. Ibid, 1916. p. 56.
2. इत्याध्यायग्निरस्तः नलस्वयः सुमति: श्रृवः श्रीमति: मेघतिषिष्ठ: 
   समयोऽध्यायस्तत्स: वैनन्दयते: स्वैमण्यमानमी:।
   प्रत्ययंहृदिन्तरूहवत्ती सहचरो रामस्य पुण्यतमो
   यहतस्य विमोरसृष्टिनाः कृतंमृत्ती तथा माधव:।

1. Ibid, 1916. p. 56.
2. इत्याध्यायग्निरस्तः नलस्वयः सुमति: श्रृवः श्रीमति: मेघतिषिष्ठ: 
   समयोऽध्यायस्तत्स: वैनन्दयते: स्वैमण्यमानमी:।
   प्रत्ययंहृदिन्तरूहवत्ती सहचरो रामस्य पुण्यतमो
   यहतस्य विमोरसृष्टिनाः कृतंमृत्ती तथा माधव:।
as the family guru of the early kings of Vijayanagara. As Vidyāraṇya is known to have guided the destinies of the empire of Vijayanagara, so also, Mādhava-cārya is very well-known to have guided the destinies of the same empire. In addition to the above, all the works of Mādhavācārya are said to have been the works of Vidyāraṇya-Srīpāda and vice verse. The span of life of Vidyāraṇya is as long as that of Mādhavācārya. Above all, the dates of birth and death of Mādhavācārya are the dates of birth and death of Vidyāraṇya.

It is said that according to Maṭhāmnāya, Vidyāraṇya took sannyāsādikṣa in the year 1331 A. D.¹ But a stone inscription dated 1377 A. D. speaks of Mādhavācārya that he was then a minister to Bukka I. Hence, it is evident that Mādhavācārya had not received sannyāsādikṣa in 1331 A. D. The year given by Maṭhāmnāya, in this regard, cannot be taken into consideration as an authority, since, it contradicts many historical facts. The traditional scholars, who do not like Vidyāraṇya, the head of the Śrṅgeri Maṭh, to be a house-holder and a minister in his pre sannyāsa stage (Purvāśrama) seemed to have planned in their works Guruvaṃśa Kāvya etc. to show Vidyāraṇya as a quite distinct person from Mādhavācārya. As the result of their plan, Vidyāraṇya, before his becoming a sannyāsin, is characterised as an insignificant Brahmin celibate, a nameless person from Ekaśilānagara, who on a search for his younger brother, went to Śrṅgeri where he saw his brother a sannyāsin with the name of Bhāratīkṛṣṇa-

¹ A S. & M., P. 149.
Tīrtha. Then he too took Sannyāsadīkṣa from Śrī-Vidyātīrtha with the name of Vidyāranya in the year of 1331. This is how the traditional writers tried to change some historical facts, pertaining to the life of Mādhavācārya, in order to keep up the convention of the Maṭha at Śrīneri, that only a celibate but not a householder should become Sannyāsin to occupy the pontifical seat of the Maṭha, just as Ādiśankara who took yellow robes directly from celibacy (Brahmacarya). In spite of the changes, made by the traditional writers, the celebrated historians like Prof. Krishnaswami Ayyangar and Rao Bahadur R Narasimhachar traced the facts and established the identity between the two, Madhavacarya and Vidyāranya Śrīpāda.

S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar quotes three verses dealing with the character of Vidyāranya, which agree, point by point, with the description of Mādhavācārya, the brother of Śāyana.

He further states that the very terms in which Cauṇḍappa refers to Vidyāranya, unmistakably indicate Mādhavācārya to be the brother of Śāyana.

1. G. V. K 4th Canto, Verses from 21 to 35.

2. पदवाच्चप्रमाणानं पारद्रभा महामति: ।
   सांख्योगरहस्सः ब्रह्मविद्यापरायण: ।
   वेदार्थविशदीक्तं बेदवेदाङ्कुपारितं ।
   विद्यार्थ्यतिजोति श्रीतस्मात्तिरियार: ।
   श्रीचौलप्यप्रमुखविद्याद्भिष्ठार्थोत्तम: ।
   व्याच्चवाच्चवाच्चवरत्नव तव समन्नारथमिति स्फूटम् ।
S. V. H., pp 3, 4.
From the above considerations, it is clear that Vidyāraṇya is identical with Mādhavācārya, the brother of Sāyana; and that the same Mādhavācārya became a Sannyāsin, most probably, in the year 1372 A.D. with the name of Vidyāraṇya and occupied the pontifical seat of the Maṭha at Śṛṅgeri in 1374 A.D. How the dates are determined will be explained while dealing with the fourth objection of Prof. R. Rama Rao.

With reference to his fourth objection, it can be said that it is neither improbable nor incompatible if Mādhavācārya, a Brahmin householder, a performer of Vedic sacrifices, and a minister to Bukka I the king of Vijayanagara turns into a sannyāsin under the name of Vidyāraṇya and occupies the position of the pontiff of the Maṭha at Śṛṅgeri and also guides the kings Bukka I and Harihara II to give grants of lands to the scholars who helped Sāyana in commenting on the Vedas. But, the following question may arise:

When all the pontiffs of the Śṛṅgeri Maṭha from Ādiśaṅkara to the present pontiff, Abhinava Vidyātīrtha, have been celibates (Brahmacārīns) before they became sannyāsins and the pontiffs of the Maṭha, why was Vidyāraṇya a house-holder and also a Somayājin in his pre-sannyāsa stage (Pūrvaśrama) allowed to occupy the pontifical seat of the Maṭha at Śṛṅgeri? Although, it is a convention that only a Brahmacārīn should become sannyāsin to qualify himself to occupy the pontifical seat of the Maṭha at Śṛṅgeri, but not a house-holder, Vidyaranya's case is, no doubt, an exceptional one, since there
was no so great a person as Vidyaranya in the entire list of the heads of the Matha after Adisanakara, in many aspects such as outstanding scholarship in all the fourteen vidyaśa, political influence among the people and in the Government and supernatural powers, out of which he could establish a Hindu kingdom and build a marvellous temple for Śrīvidyaśaṅkara at Śringeri and practise severe penance and bring about rain of gold and protect the culture, religion and philosophy of the land of his own, by way of writing commentaries on all the Vedas and also other valuable works. Hence, in Vidyāranya’s case the break of the convention has no significance and therefore it was not considered at all. As he was so powerful beyond measures, Vidyāranya succeeded Śrīvidyātīrtha as pontiff and improved the general condition of the Matha, while it was running through evil days, since the death of Suresvarācārya, the prominent and direct disciple of Ādiśaṅkara.

Moreover, according to Madhavyaśaṅkaradigvijaya, it has to be observed that Suresvarācārya who was ordered to occupy the pontifical seat of the Matha at Śringeri by Ādiśaṅkara himself, had been a house-holder and a performer of Vedic sacrifices, Maṇḍanamiśra or Viśvarūpācārya by name in his pre-sannyāsa stage (Pūrvāśrama). If Suresvarācārya, according to G. V. K. is said to be identical with Viśvarūpācārya, but not Maṇḍanamiśra, he too had been a householder in his pre-sannyāsa stage. Hence, it can be said that it is not wrong if a householder becomes sannyāsin and occupies the position of the head of the Matha at Śringeri. But the convention that only Brahmaçārins should become
sanyāsins to occupy the pontifical seat of the Maṭha at Śrṅgeri, seems to have been adopted quite recently; otherwise Ādiśankara would not have installed Šureśvarācārya in the same seat.

Another important point that deserves to be discussed here is the date of Mādhavācārya's sannyāsa dīkṣa. Šankaramatīhavimarśa says that Vidyāraṇyas' Sannyāsa dīkṣa took place in the year 1331 A.D. just five years before the foundation of the city and the empire of Vijayanagara. Although all the traditional works of recent times also unanimously put forth the same date given above, it cannot be accepted, since Vidyāraṇya is identified with Mādhavācārya, who was, according to the evidence of an inscription dated 1376 A.D., still a minister to Bukka I. Supposing, that Mādhavācārya had not become sannyāsin with the name of Vidyāraṇya until 1376 the following evidence, available in the record of the Maṭha, will have to be rejected. In the year 1356 Bukka I wrote to Vidyāraṇya, who was then living in Banaras, a letter requesting him to come back to Vijayanagara. As he was not sure of Vidyāraṇya's paying any heed to his request he secured a Šrīmukha from Śrīvidyātīrtha and sent it together with his letter to Vidyāraṇya. Accordingly Vidyāraṇya returned to Vijayanagara, in order to fulfil the wishes of both Bukka I and Śrīvidyātīrtha.

Here it can be said that, according to Baladeva Upadhyaya, it was not as Vidyāraṇya that he was living in Banaras in 1356 A.D. but as Mādhavā-

---

cārya.¹ So, the date of sannyāsadīkṣā of Mādhavācārya, recorded in Śrṅgeri Maṭha, cannot be accepted, as it is against historical evidence. On the other hand, it can be questioned that if the nameless person (according to the tradition) was already a sannyāsin long before the date of foundation of Vijayanagara, with the name of Vidyāraṇya, why was he not mentioned in any inscription, out of many, ever since the reign of Bukka I and Harihara II and why was he not present at least on the grand occasion of Vijayotsava celebrated in 1346 at Śrṅgeri? Hence it is evident that Mādhavācārya was not a Sannyāsin till the end of the reign of Bukka I.

Baladeva Upadhyaya says that just two or four years before the death of Bukka I Mādhavācārya, having retired from his Ministership, received sannyāsadīkṣā with the name of Vidyāraṇya. Hence, the probable date of Sannyāsadīkṣā of Mādhavācārya, according to Baladeva Upadhyaya, can be fixed as 1372 or 1374 A.D.² Since Bukka I died in the year 1376, the date of death of Bukka I is also made evident by a recently discovered copperplate inscription of Harihara II dated 1377, published in Hindu Weekly Magazine, Sunday, October 31, 1971.

From the evidence of a stone inscription at Kaduru, S. Canara Dt., dated October 25, 1375. Thursday (Mad. EP. Rep; 1929 No. 463) it is clearly known that Vidyāraṇya was already a sannyāsin and the head of the Śrṅgeri Maṭha in 1375 A. D.

¹ A. S. & M. p. 148.
² Ibid, p. 149.
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Even Prof. R. Rama Rao says that they (the advocates of the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya) can claim for him (Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya) the headship of the Śrīneri Maṭha from about 1375 to 1386.

In view of the above facts, the date 1331 A.D. for the Sannyāsadīkṣa of Mādhavācārya given in S.M.V. etc. cannot be accepted and it must have to be placed in 1372.

If the date 1372 A. D. for Mādhavācārya to become Sannyāsin and the date 1374 A.D. to occupy the pontifical seat of the Maṭha at Śrīneri is accepted, there is no contradiction with the evidence of any genuine inscription discovered so far.

Regarding the fifth objection it can be said that in the period of Harihara I's reign Mādhavācārya might not have completed any work and therefore there was no reference to him. However in some editions of his Jaiminīyanyāyamālavistara a verse appears at the end to be praising Harihara which runs as follows:—"Vedānām sthitikṛt purā Hariharah... etc."

But Prof. R. Rama Rao doubts whether that verse is interpolated or to be intended to praise God Harihara or Harihara II, king of Vijayanagara. When the author intentionally used the word Harihara, without specifying Harihara I or Harihara II, it can safely mean Harihara I and Harihara II and also God Harihara; because these three meanings also are probable and helpful to construe the verse

through properly understanding the lofty view or the intention of the author, aiming at which it is composed. Now the question may arise as to why the verse does not appear in all the editions of the work. There it can be said, that the opponents of the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya might have eliminated the verse when they were copying the same. Consequently the verse does not appear in some editions. As it appears in other editions, it may safely be considered as a genuine verse, which can serve the purpose of evidence: Moreover, Vidyāraṇya mentions Harihara II at the end of Pancadāśi, a treatise on Advaita Philosophy.¹ Hence, the objection, raised by Prof. R. Rama Rao, that there is no mention of Harihara I and Harihara II in the works of Mādhavācārya, is not in any way tenable.

In his above work namely J.N.M.V. Mādhavācārya had mentioned Vidyātīrtha as his Guru and Bukka as his patron and himself as an ornament to the science of Mimāmsa of three kāṇḍas and also the performer of Soma sacrifices, in every spring (Prati-vasaṁta Somayājin).

As regards the sixth objection, it is said that the two passages—one from the colophon of Vedic commentary and the other from the contemporary

---

1. प्रीयावरोऽज्ञने ब्रह्मानन्देन सर्वंदा ।
   पायाच्च प्राणिनस्वर्तान् स्वाग्रितान् शुद्धमानसान् ॥

2. कृपामंडिवाचार्यों वेदार्थं वाक्तुमुखत: ।

T. S. B. B. Intro. 6th verse
author of ĀpastambhavatāraṇaVyākhya or Prayogaratnamālā, Caundapācārya by name, explicitly state that Mādhavācārya is the author of the commentaries on the Vedas. G.V.K., a legend from the 18th century attributes the authorship of the commentaries on the Vedas to Vidyāraṇya. And also, all the traditional scholars unanimously believe that Vidyāraṇya is the commentator of all the Vedas. Hence, it automatically follows that Mādhavācārya and Vidyāraṇya are identical, otherwise Vidyāraṇya cannot be proved as the author of Vedic commentaries on historical grounds. The following evidence, from the authors, who belong to the contemporary and near contemporary periods can also prove that the two persons, Mādhavācārya and Vidyāraṇya, are identical.

Mitrāmiśra, the author of Vīramitrodaya, a digest of Dharmaśāstras of the 16th century, mentions, in the Vyavahāraṇādyaya (pp. 583, 672) Vidyāraṇya as the author of ParāśarasmṛtiVyākhya, and Narasimha, the author of ŚrāutasmṛtaKriyāPrayogapārijāta, who lived from 1360 to 1435 A.D. refers to Vidyāraṇya as the author of Kalanirnaya which are obviously known as the works of Mādhavācārya.

1. वेदार्थविशेषविदेश ज्ञापनं ।
विद्वार्थग्रन्थार्थिष्ठत: श्रीतत्सातकैक्यार्थ: ॥
I. H. Q. Vol. VIII, pp. 611-615 (Vidyāraṇya & Mādhavācārya)

2. Ibid. p. 614,

3. श्रीविद्वार्थग्रन्थार्थिष्ठत: कालनिर्मये प्रतिपादित: प्रकार: प्रति-पाबने ।
According to the above authors Vidyāraṇya must be identical with Mādhavācārya.

Narasimha suri, the author of TīthiPradīpikā, says in his introductory verses that Kalinirṇaya was written by Vidyāraṇya and others.¹

It is very well known that Kālanirṇaya, which if otherwise known as Kālamādhavīya is the work of Mādhavācārya, the brother of Sāyaṇa. The evidence coming from the above writers strengthens the view that Vidyāraṇya and Mādhavācārya are identical.

Ahobala Paṇḍita, the great grammarian of the Telugu language and the nephew of Mādhavācārya, in an introductory verse of his work called Kaviśirobhūṣana mentions Mādhavīyadhūtvṛtti as the work of Vidyāraṇya. The verse is already quoted in the introductory chapter of this thesis.

The juxta-position of the names of Mādhavācārya and Vidyāraṇya, referred to in the above extracts, disproves the arguments advanced by Prof. R. Rama Rao and other opponents of the Identity theory of Mādhavācārya and Vidyāraṇya.

In regard to the seventh and last objection, it can be said that the traditional legends V. K. J. and K. N. V. etc. are not to be considered as purely

---
¹ अन्नतांतर्वर्तियाँ मन्त्रणा मंचितल्पुनः।
विश्वासवय्यतीन्द्राय: निर्णात: कालनिर्णाय:।।
अनिनिसिंढूकास्तौः मम दृष्ट्याः कियानां कियानु:।

Indian Antiquary, 1986, p. 18.
historical works, but the works of Prabandha category and that they had been written out of the stories necessarily checked from having certain historical facts, which are opposed to the sentiment or Rasa and are improper to the hero. Hence, the authors of the above legends or Kavyas might have purposefully thought that Vidyāraṇya, the head of the Śrīneri Maṭha, must be characterised as celibate and free from political power such as ministry, etc., even in his pre-sannyāsa stage (Pūrvaśrama). But, in history, Vidyāraṇya, the head of the Śrīneri Maṭha, has no objection to be mentioned as a house-holder and a minister in pre-sannyāsa stage and a guide in post-sannyāsa stage, when they are factual.

Another point is that, Vidyāraṇya is nowhere mentioned either in introductions or in the colophons as the author of the commentaries of the Vedas. Each part of the Vedic commentaries appears to be under the authorship of Śayana and Mādhava. But the poems (Kavyas) G. V. K. etc. describe him (Vidyāraṇya) as the commentator of the Vedas. To avoid the contradiction, G V K. says that the entire commentary on all the Vedas and the other works such as Dhātuvṛtti, originally composed

1. तंतदा सविनयः स यवचे संतति सुचितेः परितोष्य।
सत्तंते सकलेवेच्छिद्वैतं संतति तेन युक्वो भैवितस्ते।। 5 - 42
तत्रिशाम्य वचनं बहुविचारपदबिद्वसारायुगोऽन्ताद्।
वित्तमतिः बहुं तदस्मृताय पुत्रीणां गतिमविपय वेतं।। 5 - 43
माधवकीयमिति साधारणीयमित्वाद्वित यत्तिविरोधित्य आध्यायम्।
वेदशङ्करः सकलस्ता: साधु संविधित्य तदद्यन्तिः।।

5 - 44
by Vidyāraṇya and were permitted to be known as Sāyaṇiśa and Mādhavīśa as they are written by Sāyaṇa and Mādhava (who approached the sage Vidyāraṇya, wishing themselves to be blessed with progeny) since each literary work can be considered as good as a son.

According to a verse of Alankārā Sudhānīdhi, an unpublished treatise on Alankāra Śāstra, Sāyaṇa had three sons1 and Mādhavacārya also had a son called Māyaña.² As the above information coming from G V K. is contradicting the historical and literary facts, it has to be rejected.

In addition, a genuine copper plate inscription dated 1386 A D. speaks that Harihara II gave, in the presence of Vidyāraṇya Śrīpada, who was the then head of the Śrīneri Matha, a grant, consisting of lands to the three scholars namely Nārāyaṇa Vājapeyayāji, Narahari Somayāji and Paṇḍari Dīkṣita, who helped Sāyaṇa and Mādhava in the composition of the commentaries on the five Samhitā texts of the Vedas, and other respective Brāhmaṇas, etc.³ If Vidyāraṇya, according to the evidence of G V K. was the person, who really wrote the commentaries on the Vedas and if Sāyaṇa and Mādhava had nothing to do with them, the inscriptive informa-

1. तत्संबंधजय कंपण व्यसनि: संगोत्तस्त्वे तव प्रीति मायण गच्छवरचनापापिण्डितययूःनृत्रय। शिक्षां दशौ शिंगण कमजटचचासु बेरैद्धिवति स्वान् पुजानुत्पुलालयनः गृहगतः सम्मोदते सायणः॥


tion of contemporary type that Nārāyaṇa Vājapeyayāji, Naraharī Somayāji and Paṇḍari Dīkṣitā assisted Sāyaṇa in commenting upon all Vedas would go falsified. Thereupon, the person, who gave the grant (Harihara II) and the person at whose instance it was given (Vidyāraṇya) would have to be considered as untrustworthy. Above all, the genuine inscriptions would have to be denied the due preference and the recent traditional works would have to be given undue preference. It is quite against the principles of historical reconstruction. Hence, since there is no other way to avoid inconsistency, the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavacārya would have to be accepted, otherwise it would not be possible for the opponents of the identity theory, to prove Vidyāraṇya’s authorship of the Vedic commentaries on valid grounds because Vidyāraṇya’s name is nowhere mentioned in them but that of Sāyaṇa and Mādhava.

Mr. T. Sivamurthy also, in his article, ‘problem of identity’ published in B. O. R. I., supports the Identity Theory.¹

¹. Vol. LV, 1974, pp. 177-188.
CHAPTER V

Vidyārānya's Contemporary Scholars:

According to the evidence available in literary sources some great scholars namely Akṣobhyatīrtha, Vedāntadesīka, Mādhavamantrī. Caundapācārya and Kāsīvīlāsakriyāsakti are said to be Vidyārānyā's contemporaries. There are some stories or rather incidents, recorded in traditional works like Guru-parampara-prabhāva of Parakāla Yatīndra, relating to Vidyārāṇya and the above scholars. An interesting anecdote quoted by Parakālayatīndra in his work is as follows:—

Once there was a serious debate or Śāstrērtha between Akṣobhyatīrtha the reputed Madhva Philosopher and Śrī Vidyārāṇya, the head of the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha on the purport of 'Tattvamāsi' Mahā-vākyā which is one of the four great Vedic dictums. The contentions of both the scholars pertaining to their own philosophies-Dvaita and Advaita respectively were communicated for an arbitration to Vedānta Deśīka a gifted author of one hundred and fifty works of high order dealing with Viśīśṭādvaita. Critically basing on the merit of the argument Vedāntadesīka decided in favour of Akṣobhyatīrtha in the form of an anusṭup sloka.¹

Further, the author writes that Vidyārāṇya, on hearing the sloka, became angry over Vedāntadesīka

¹. असिना तत्त्वसिना परजीवप्रभेदिना ।
विद्यार्थमहारथमसोभमूलिनिरविचारत् इ। G P. P. p. 140
and attacked his Śatadūṣani, one of his famous works in respect of the misuse of a cakāra in a particular place. But Advaitins say that in the above debate, Vidyāraṇya vanquished Akṣobhyatīrtha and read thus the second half of the verse of Vedāntadesīka’s decision in their favour.¹

Contrast between Mādhavācārya and Mādhavamantrin:

Here it is essential to make note of the distinction between Mādhavācārya and Mādhavamantrin, since some scholars mistakenly attributed the achievements of the latter to the former mainly owing to the similarity in respect of the name the two possessed, the service the two rendered as ministers under Bukka I and Harihara II, and profound scholarship the two acquired and also the eminent authorship the two attained. Yet, Rao Bahadur R. Narasimhachar and others already proved by means of epigraphical and literary evidence that Mādhavācārya and Mādhavamantrin are quite distinct persons.

A stone inscription dated 1368 A.D. speaks of Mādhavamantrin’s father, gotra and guru as Caundappa, Āngirasa and Kāśīvilāsakriyāsakti respectively.²

1.  अक्षोभ्यं शोभ्यामास विश्वारण्यो महामुनि: ।

2.  गोविंदे योगिरसां प्रचण्डतपस्वादुव्याप्तिसुर- प्रमाणप्रद्धत्वेत्य नीतिसर्वो दल्लो धियं धेष्विम ।
    सूरिस्सुरापि सर्वदा नवमनःप्रहासदानोविवृताः
    वद्भूयं कविताम व्यविन्तक तनुते नो कस्य तेनाद्धुतम ॥
Besides, it is also known that he received 'Śivadīkṣā' from Kāśīvilāsakriyāśakti and that he assumed the title of 'Upaniṣanmārgapravartakācārya' as a result of his extraordinary research in the field of Upaniṣads to find out a path of the philosophy of 'Śivādvaita'. In an inscription dated 1347 A.D. he was mentioned as a minister to Mārappa, the youngest brother of Harihara I, who, living in Candragutti as his capital, ruled over the region of the west coast. After Mārappa, he continued as a minister under Bukka I. In 1376 when Bukka died he further continued under Harihara II. Thus he rendered services as a minister under three early kings of the Vijayanagara empire. As an able minister and accomplished warrior, Mādhavamantrin drove out, from the region of the west coast, the Muhammadans, who plundered Hindu temples and broke the idols. He got the temples rebuilt and the idols reinstalled therein. For the marvellous deeds done by him,

\[\text{E C. (Sikarapura) Vol. VII, p. 281.}\]
Bukka I gave him the title ‘Bhuvanaikavāra’ and also made him ruler of Banavāsi. While he was ruling Banavāsi, Mādhavamantrin gave, to the Brahmins a grant of village, Māchalāpura dated 1391 under the name of his mother and also another grant of village Mādhavapura, he gave, under his own name, to twenty-four Brahmins, corresponding to the number of the letters of Gāyatri Maṅtra. From the evidence of the following colophon, it is known that he composed a commentary on ‘Sūtasaṅhita called Tātparyadīpikā a great scholarly work.’

This brief account of Mādhavamantrin proves that he is quite distinct from Mādhavācārya, the brother of Sāyāṇa. The particulars of Mādhavācārya and Mādhavamantrin are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Mādhavācārya</th>
<th>Mādhavamantrin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gotra-</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>Āṅgirasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Father-</td>
<td>Māyaṇa</td>
<td>Caundappā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mother-</td>
<td>Śrīmatī</td>
<td>Mācāmbica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Brothers-</td>
<td>Sāyāṇa and Bhoganātha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guru-</td>
<td>Śrīvidyātīrtha</td>
<td>Kāśivilāsas-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhāratītīrtha and Śrīkanṭhanātha</td>
<td>Kriyāśakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Works-</td>
<td>Parāsara</td>
<td>Tātparyadīpikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mādhaviya etc.</td>
<td>only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Death-</td>
<td>1386 A. D.</td>
<td>1391 A. D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. श्रीमत्तकाशीविलासायक्यक्षीयास्तीशोविना, श्रीमत्त्यंबकपादाहस्वनिष्णात्रष्ट्रत्सविना।
Political Life of Mādhavācārya:

It is already explained in the context of migration that Mādhavācārya along with Sāyana followed the two brothers Harihara and Bukka, who had been appointed as treasury officers in Warangal, by its ruler Pratāparudra. This may be taken for granted as the beginning of the political career of Mādhavācārya, in spite of the absence of the evidence to show that he had played any important role in Warangal along with Harihara and Bukka. And also in the period, between the fall of Warangal and the rise of Vijayanagara, no important political activities of Mādhavācārya are known from historical sources. But some literary sources, like *K.N.V.*, which express that “the house-holder Mādhavācārya, who was living on the banks of the Krishna-river, migrated to the southern country and having settled down at Paṃpa meditated on the Goddess Lakṣmi”, seem to be pointing to the activity of his practising penance, with a view to achieving immense wealth and supernatural powers, which are useful for the establishment of a Hindu kingdom to punish evil and to encourage virtue. Hence, the penance, the householder Mādhavācārya performed, in the same period from 1323 to 1336 A.D. when Harihara and Bukka

---

were serving in the treasury of Anegondi under its king Rāmanātha; can be considered as a means to his political and religious achievements, since it is this underground powerful work, that enabled him successfully to found a Hindu kingdom as he desired and to make Harihāra I its first ruler. As the above mentioned literary fact has no contradiction with any historical evidence, it can be accepted. But the same work K.N.V., deviating from the historical point of view, further says that Mādhavācārya went to Vidyāśaṅkara the pupil of Śaṅkarācārya, got himself ordained as a sannyāsin and assumed the name of Vidyāraṇya, before 1336 A. D- the date of the foundation of Vijayanagara.¹ As this above point has no ground in history, it cannot be taken into consideration as an authority. According to the epigraphical evidence it is definitely known that Mādhavācārya, having been a house-holder served Bukka I as his prime minister upto 1372 A.D. as has been previously proved. Hence, it can safely be affirmed that Mādhavācārya as a house-holder founded the kingdom of Vijayanagara or helped the two brothers Harihara and Bukka to found the same.

Even after founding the kingdom of Vijayanagara, he seems to have been striving in all the ways possible, in order to get it expanded into an unrivalled empire during the first part of the reign of its first ruler Harihara I. At the time, when Mādhavācārya felt that the things were well settled in Vijayanagara affairs, he left for Banaras mainly to consult the scholars in planning for the

¹. Ibid, p. 7
protection and propagation of the vedic religion through various means, such as commenting on the Vedas and the Śāstraś. The date when he left for Banaras can safely be decided as 1344 A. D. just two years before the Vijayotsava, celebrated in Śṛṅgeri in 1346 A.D. because he was not mentioned in the inscription then recorded as he was not present on the occasion. If Mādhavacārya were anywhere in the kingdom of Vijayanagara, he would not have missed to share the pomp of Vijayotsava and the inscription must have had his name mentioned. Hence, it can be said beyond doubt that he might have left for Banaras in 1344 A. D. Here the tradition explains the reason for the absence of Vidyāraṇya (Mādhavacārya) who, owing to some difference of opinion with Bukka I. had not attended the Vijayotsava, and keeping Bukka I as a bad king in mind, wrote the 7th introductory verse of Śaṅkaradigvijaya. 1

From the following fact that in 1356 Bukka I wrote a letter of his request and sent it together with the Śrīmukha from Śrīvidyātīrtha to Mādhavacārya to come back to Vijayanagara, it is evidently known that he had stayed in Banaras upto the date of the letter 1356 A.D. In accordance with the letter from Bukka I and the Śrīmukha from his guru Śrīvidyātīrtha he came back to Vijayanagara within

1. धन्यम्मन्त्रिविशे:कृष्णधेयसुज्ञनमन्थादिष्कर्यान्ती-नृत्योपनमतनारविपाधमकिश्यासमद्विद्वृष्टकंदम:।
दिग्वंसंगीतरमदशंकरसुकृतोदासमुखजशः:
पारावारसमुच्चलज्जलशे: संक्षल्पायमे स्फुटम्॥
reasonable time and assumed the position of prime minister to solve the problems, arising then in the administration of both the empire of Vijayanagara and the Maṭha at Śrṅgeri. Although he had continued in the service as prime minister to Bukka I until 1372 from the evidence of the introductory verses of *J. N. M. V.*, it can be said that he had been, side by side, discharging his duties, decided for execution, in Banaras out of the consultations and the discussions with the celebrated scholars of the most ancient *Mahāvidyāpīṭha* for the protection of the Vedic religion.

In the light of the discussion of the above facts, it is clearly known that Mādhavācārya, having been a householder, played a notable part along with Harihara and Bukka in founding the city of Vijayanagara and enhancing the glory of the empire of Vijayanagara upto 1372 A.D. and then he retired from worldly affairs and received Sannyāsādikṣa with the inspiring name of ‘Vidyāraṇya’ and also became the head of the Maṭha at Śrṅgeri. From the evidence of an inscription of Harihara II, which speaks that “by the grace of Vidyāraṇyamuni he acquired an empire of knowledge unattainable by other kings” it has also to be said that even after he

1. स खलुप्रात्रेत्वा सर्वशास्त्रविशारदः ।
   बकरोजेज्ञिनितेन व्यायामालाः गरीयसीम् ।
   तं प्रशस्य सभामध्ये वीरश्रीबुबक्मूपति ।
   कुरु विस्तरस्यास्त्वविचितः माधवमादिशारतु ॥
   तिरिमाय माधवाचार्यो विव्हेदानन्दवदायिनी ।
   जैमिनीयम्यायालार्य व्याचन्ते बालबुद्धे ॥
became a sannyasin and the head of the Maṭha at Śrīṅgeri, he used to be guiding Harihara II in both ways, politically and spiritually, until his last breath in A.D. 1386.\textsuperscript{1} Corresponding to the traditional date kṣaya 1309 Śaka year Saturday 13th Lunar day the dark fortnight of jyeṣṭha. Further, it is known from the tradition that he wrote Pancadaśī in an easy style to teach Harihara II Advaita philosophy and also dedicated it to him in a dignified manner.\textsuperscript{2}

Political Career of Sāyana:—

In his thirty-first year Sāyana's political career begins with the Chief Ministership under Kampaṛaya, the second son of Sangama I, who was permitted by Bukka I, to rule over the Nellore region in 1346 A.D. This fact is known from a stone inscription, discovered at Kodavalūru in Nellore District dated 1346 A.D.\textsuperscript{3} Another undated stone inscription, discovered at the same place describes Sāyana as Sāvana Odayalu.\textsuperscript{4} 'Odayalu' is a Telugu word and it means king or ruler. In his remarkable anthology called Subhāṣītasudhānīdhi he declares himself Minister to Kampaṛaya.\textsuperscript{5}


\textsuperscript{2} प्रायोगिकरौंजेन ब्रह्मान्तन्दे सर्वन्
पायाच्च प्राणिनः सर्वन् विज्ञार्थान् शुद्धमानसान्।

P. D., last verse.

\textsuperscript{3} E. C., Vol. IX. p. 104.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid, p. 791.

\textsuperscript{5} वैश्वदीक्षेराजोस्तिरिवुश्च संचरनिनिधि:।
यतक्रितिकामिनीहस्ते ब्रह्माण्ड कन्नुकायते।।
S-6
There is a beautiful pun on the second half of the seventh verse, occurring in *Upodghāṭapaddhati* or path of introduction, and it gives a most significant meaning as follows:—Owing to the counsel of the Chief Minister Śāyaṇa the enemies are not able to move or even to crawl like the serpents on account of the spell of a snake-charmer. As he specially selects the word *Bileśayāś* out of many to mean serpents, it seems to point to the derivative meaning, in consideration of which it can be said that the iear-ridden enemies of Kamparāya are sleeping always inside their houses, as the serpents sleep coiled in their ant-hills.

In the colophon of *S S.N.*, Śāyaṇa styles himself the prime minister (Mahāpradhāni) of Kamparāja.¹

From the evidence of the seventh introductory verse of *S S. N.*, Śāyaṇa is known to be the most benevolent minister.²

The meaning of the verse is that his (Śāyaṇa's) courtyard, being transformed by the overflowing

---

1. इति पूर्वपवित्रसयुज्ज्वललिंगप्रभुविहींकर्षितीकरणेः।
भारद्धवस्थितिकायमात्मानसुद्धाकर-माधव
कष्ट्यसहोदर-सायणायविविठतेः सुभाषितसुधानिषी।
संयमवश समाप्तम्। || *S S. N.* p. 48

2. यस्य दानांचां परः पुक्ते प्राणयं सूहः।
लम्ण पारदमिनोदतुः न शक्तोति वृष्ण कवचित्॥
waters preceding his ceaseless gifts into a quagmire, does not allow even an Ox to lift up its leg. It is suggested that Dharma (righteousness) was standing firmly and straight on its four legs (Pādās) in Sāyaṇa’s reign as in Kṛta age.

Besides, Sāyaṇa, the Prime Minister of Kampa-rāya, is known to have patronized a number of learned scholars according to the evidence of the eighth introductory verse of the same work.¹

The verse means that when Sāyaṇa got himself firmly on the throne of benevolence (dāna) along with Lakṣmī (the Goddess of wealth) Sarasvati (the Goddess of learning) left him (Sāyaṇa) on account of jealousy and got herself on the remarkable throne of the tongue of the learned. The following may be considered as the suggested sense of the verse that when Sāyaṇa became Viṣṇu with the association of Lakṣmī the scholars had become Brahmas with the enthronement of Sarasvati on their tongues.

In the light of the above suggested sense Sāyaṇa, as his brother Mādhava, is known to have patronized a number of great scholars to assist him in commenting on the voluminous parts of Vedic literature: such as Samhitās, Brāhmaṇās, Āraṇyakās and Upaniṣads of each Veda.

When Kamparāya, the brother of Harihara I, after ruling 9 years left this world in 1355 A.D., having placed the responsibility of his only son (who

¹ दानसिद्धासनालुक्ते परमेत्रा सहस्म्या सह स्विषयः ।
तद्भारतैं च विदुषां जिज्ञासिद्धास्ते स्तिष्ठता ||
was still a minor) and also the kingdom, in the hands of his prime minister Sāyana, he (Sāyana) himself had to serve as both prime minister of the kingdom and guardian of Sangama II. As he was loyal to his late lord Kamparāya, Sāyana discharged both the duties concerned with the state and the prince Sangam II to the best of his ability. He brought up Sangama II with the utmost care and affection coupled with honour and educated him in all the Śāstrās which richly enabled him to rule over his kingdom as an able king.

Sangama II also was praiseworthy in following the very foot-steps of Sāyana as both his son and disciple. The above fact is made evident by a couple of verses from Alankāra-sudhānidhi, partly written by Sāyana and partly by his younger brother Bhogānātha by name.²

Although, Sangama II was well trained to rule over his kingdom with much ability, Sāyana's responsibility had not lessened. Because, the king Sangama II was said to be Sacivāyattasiddhi, and dependent upon Sāyana, just like Vatsarāja who depended upon his prime minister Yaugandharāyaṇa. This can be

1. E. I. Vol. III, p. 23

2. आन्त्विकिष्ठ्यामधिकविक्षतं हर्षशोकश्चयुदासे
   मागोत्लेखं विद्धति नृणां मानवे धर्मशास्त्रे ।
   सम्यक्षिष्ठां सत्विविगमितं: श्रीशवे साव्यार्ये
   प्रोढ़ि गाढं प्रत्ययति ते संगमेन्द्र: प्रयोगे ॥

S. S. N. Introduction, p. 6
made quite clear by the evidence of the verses from *Alankārasudhānidi*.¹

Śāyaṇa is further known, from the evidence of another couple of verses of the same work, as a valiant fighter on the battle-field and also to have conquered Campa, the king of Garudanagara, before the eyes of the God Narasimha of Puṇyakoti and came back to King Sangama II with distinguished fame.²

And also from the colophon of *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti* it is known that Śāyaṇa had very great respect, inspite of the affection, towards Sangama II and as a token of his respect the above work namely *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti* was dedicated to him.³

---

1. सत्यं नहीं शास्ति सायणायं
   संप्रास्त्थोगसुखिनः सकलाश्च लोकः
   तदैविरास्तदिः शैलवानन्तरेऽपु
   शुध्यत्यमन्तमुखिनिषबसिता: श्रुधार्तः
   सायणसंविवायतः संगमराजस्य पश्य राज्यमिदं
   विद्याविनेदरसिकः: विद्वद्धभ: भहुमताभोगम्

2. विष्ण्या दैवित्कभावसंभृतमहासंपदं विशेषोदयम्
   जित्वा चापनरेन्द्रमूर्जितयश: प्रत्यागत: सायणः
   श्रीमतं संगमभूमिपाल भवतंसंग्रामलीलाविधिः
   साक्षादास्विधपुष्यकोटिशिखरस्वामी हिरण्यांतकः

Ibid, Introduction, pp. 6 & 7 respectively

3. इति पूर्वदिष्क्यविष्क्ममुद्राणीवर्षकराघ
   सुतसंगमराजमहामलित्रा मायणपुलेष माधवसहदेरण
   सायणेन विरचितायां माधवीयायाः
   धातुवृत्तिशब्बिकरणः भवादयः M. D. V., p. 308
In view of the facts stated above, it can be said that Sāyaṇa was regarded as not only a great scholar and renowned author but also as a valiant fighter and celebrated administrator. Thus Sāyaṇa had served as the prime minister under Sangama II for a period of eight years from 1355 to 1363 A.D.¹

Further, Sāyaṇa is known to have entered into the third stage of his political career, when his service begins with 1364 A.D. as the prime minister under Bukka I, who during the early years of Harihara I's reign, was governing the western districts of the Telugu country. In a stone inscription of Nellore District dated 1364 A.D. Sāyaṇa is known to have been permitted by Bukka I to rule over the Nellore Region as Mahāmaṇḍalesvara.

This fact is further strengthened by the evidence from the colophon of Rgveda Samhitābhāṣya.²

The period of twelve years from 1364 to 1376 A.D., in which Sāyaṇa had been ruling the Nellore region as Mahāmaṇḍalesvara and serving under Bukka I, the emperor of Vijayanagara, as Mahāpradhāni, as it was the highest position of his political life with manifold activities and had been writing all the monumental works of Vedic commentaries with

2. इति श्रीमद्ब्रजराजपरमेश्वरप्रदिक्षार्थकत्वाद्य-श्रीवीरबुक्क-भूपालसाम्राज्येंवरंडरक्तः सायणाचार्यें विरचिते माधवीये वेदार्थप्रकाशे ऋक्षसहिताभाष्ये प्रथमाष्ट्रके प्रथमोद्वयायः समाप्तः ।
versatile genius at the behest of Lord to recall the Vedic religion to its normal life, may reasonably and conclusively be said to be the most glorious one.

According to the evidence of a copper plate inscription of Harihara II dated 1377 which was (near Kavali in Nellore District) discovered recently, Bukka I left for Heaven in the year 1376 A.D. In the very year Harihara II the son of Bukka I was installed on the throne of Vijayanagara empire by Mādhavācārya-Vidyāranya, the head of the Śrīṅgeri Maṭha. Sāyaṇa continued in the same position as prime minister under Harihara II. It is made evident by the colophon of his work Yajñatantrasudhānidhi (unpublished) which was dedicated to Harihara II¹

His service as prime minister under Harihara II is said to be for eleven years till 1387 A.D. Thus, Sāyaṇa, the worthy brother of Mādhavācārya, having rendered an excellent service as prime minister under four kings of Vijayanagara, for a long period of forty years, as a unique statesman left for another world to its boundless joy in A.D. 1387 in his 72nd year.³

1. इति श्रीमद्राजाधिकारिपरमेश्वरहरिरामहाराजसकलसाधारणमुरुर्वरस्य वैदिकमायांस्यपनाचार्यस्य साधनाचार्यस्य कृतः वज्रतन्त्रसुधानिधिः...। S S N., Intro. p. 15.
CHAPTER VI

Puruṣārthasudhānīdhi (P. S. N.)

This work, skillfully compiled by Sāyaṇācārya at the behest of Bukka I through his brother Mādhavaśācārya, is a collection of selected portions from various Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas. His authorship is known from the colophons at the end of every Skandha.

His intention, in composing this work is to enlighten the ordinary people, who are not very brilliant, but are anxious to know about the four values of life, i.e. Puruṣārthas. Sāyaṇa begins this work with the verse ‘Sathyaiṣṭha’ etc. eulogizing Bukka I and refers to his brother Mādhavaśācārya. He praises Vyāsa in a single verse and in another verse adores Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Gāṇeṣa and his Guru namely Śrīkanṭha. Sāyaṇa himself estimates this work, P.S.N. as equivalent to Vedabhāṣya for it serves the

1. तस्मादाध्यात्मकपाणि सुखोपायानि सुन्तत ||
   पुरुषार्थोपयोगिति व्यासवाक्यानि मे वद ||

2. सर्वप्रत्यतानि विषमेन्द्र गहनांवल्यमेवसाम ||
   जातु व्यक्तं शक्यते पुरुषार्थीविनामपि ||

3. नमो व्यासाय गुरुवे महते महतामपि ||
   संसारानलतप्तानां यस्य सृतं रसायनम ||

4. ब्रह्माण्ड विष्णुभीधानं गणेशं वागधीश्वरसम ||
   श्रीकृष्णं च भजन्तु वश्ये पुरुषार्थसुवधानिष्ठम ||
purpose of the readers and listeners, giving them happiness on earth and Heaven after death.\(^1\)

This work is divided into four Sk\textit{\textasciitilde}andhas or parts named Dharmaskhandha, Arthaskandha, K\textit{\textasciitilde}maskhandha and Mok\textit{\textasciitilde}askandha, dealing with four values of life. Each part or Sk\textit{\textasciitilde}andha is further divided into chapters or Adhy\textit{\textasciitilde}yas. The first part deals with Dharma elaborately in forty-five chapters, the second one elucidates Artha in twenty-three chapters, the third one describes K\textit{\textasciitilde}ma in fourteen chapters, and the fourth and last part explains Mok\textit{\textasciitilde}a in nineteen chapters.

In this work P. S. N., S\textit{\textasciitilde}ya\textit{\textasciitilde}a's plan is to teach the four recognised values of life by means of a number of selected authoritative stories form several Pur\textit{\textasciitilde}nas and Upa-pur\textit{\textasciitilde}nas. In the first part of the work namely Dharmaskandha, the author wants to teach only Dharmas: Devotion to the husband, Devotion to the father, Frankness, Loyalty to the Master, Giving food (Annad\textit{\textasciitilde}na) etc. Instead of quoting a mere list of Dharmas, S\textit{\textasciitilde}ya\textit{\textasciitilde}a intentionally prefers to narrate a selected story, by which a particular Dharma can be illustrated; the benefits derived out of the observance of that Dharma can automatically be explained; ultimately the moral instruction, that every one, who wants to get the same benefit, must put the same Dharma into practice, can be given; and also consequently a warning, that he who neglects it, will lose the benefit, can be proclaimed. He gives also

---

1. \textit{अयं वेदार्थसमित: पुराधामसुध्गानिधिः}।
\textit{भुजितः मुक्तिः च कुर्हते शृण्वतां पठतामिप}।

\textit{P.S.N., Intro. Verses 6, 5, 14, 15 & 13.}
certain Adharmas: abandonment of the foodgiver, stealing of Brahmin's property, performance of a bad act, advised by teacher or guru, and non-performance of a good act in spite of guru's being unfavourable; and narrates a selected story to illustrate each Adharma. so that the reader or the listener understands that adharmakṛtyas should never be done.

In the second part of the work (Arthaskandha) the author deals with the duties of a king; some vices like hunting, good and bad servants, etc., in the same way and with the same technique which he has adopted in Dharmaskandha.

In the third part of the work Kāmaskandha, the author deals with marriage, the qualifications of a good bride, praise of beauty, blame of passion, blame of arrogance, etc., by giving a story for illustrating each.

In the fourth and last part of the work Mokṣaskandha Sāyaṇa expatiates upon the blame of attachment, praise of good character, result of pilgrimage, non-violence, the efficacy of chanting the name of Śiva, etc.

Although there are so many competent works of eminent authors dealing with Dharma in Dharma Śāstra, Artha in Artha Śāstra etc. seperately, there is no single work like the present one dealing with all the four values of life viz. Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. Hence, Sāyaṇa planned and composed this monumental work called P. S. N. as the foundation of Vedic or rather Hindu religion.
Sāyana, at the end, justifies the title of this unique work *P. S. N.* as follows: The stories which are illustrative of the four values of life are said to be in the form of Nectar or Ambrosia, and this collection of the stories is likened to a Reservoir or ocean of Nectar or Ambrosia. Readers of the work are said to be similar to those who drink Nectar and to be able to get rid of the threefold Tāpa, caused by *Saṁsāra* just like thirst, hunger and fatigue. Sāyana explains the merit accruing from reading the work as tantamount to the reading of all the *Purāṇas.*

*Subhāṣitasudhānidhi (S S N.)*

It is known from the colophons and the introductory verses that the work S.S.N. was composed by Sāyana, while he was holding the position of Prime Minister of Kamparāya (the second son of Saṅgama) who ruled over the Telugu Region of the Nellore District, with Udayagiri as his Capital town or Rājadēhāni. This work begins with the famous verse *Śuklāmbaradharam* - etc. Sāyana devotes five verses,
(two to six) to eulogizing his patron, Kamparāya and four verses (seven to ten) to describing himself.¹ This work is critically edited for the first time by Prof. K. Krishnamoorthy and published by the Karnataka University.

It is divided into four parts or Parvans and they are named after the four values of life (Purusaarthas) namely Dhārma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. The first part (Dharma Parvan) contains thirty-five paths or Paddhatis: Upodghāta, Prarocana, Namaskāra etc. The second one (Artha-parvan) embraces one hundred and thirty-seven Paths like Viṣayapratijña, Rājalakṣaṇa, and Rājapraśamsā. The third part (Kāmaparvan) comprises forty-seven paths: Purapraśamsā, Veṣyāpraśamsā, Veṣyānindā, etc. The forth and last part (Mokṣa Parvan) admits only fifteen paths: Viṣayanindā, Anityatā, Soka etc.

Colophons are available only at the end of the first two chapters Dharma-parvan and Artha-parvan. Artha-parvan and Kāmaparvan begin with the same verse—“Lakṣmi Sarvasvati” etc.² devoted to the praise of the author Śāyaṇa himself. Three chapters: Artha-parvan Kāma-parvan, and Mokṣa-parvan, begin with their respective indices and phalaśruti is not described at the end of the work as in P.S.N.

1. वीरश्रीकम्पराजोजित्विदृढङ्गसंचरतिधिः।
   यत्करितकामिनीहस्त्रेष्टांक्रुद्यातुष्करूपकायते।
   मतिमांसत्तम्भराजोपूर्तमन्चमयणायणः।
   यत्मन्वेणंसपर्न्त्ततित्यशुद्भृविलेशयः।।
2. लक्ष्मीसरस्वतीकितिविद्यानितित्स्यलमू।
   आचार्यदत्तार्कंजीयानममस्तमयणायणः।।
Chapter V

The significance of the title S. S. N. and its division into four parvans named after the four recognised values of life: Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha may be explained as follows: Subhāsitas mean maxims or fine sayings of great writers, Vyāsa and others and Sudhānīdhi means the moon. The word parvan as the general name of the parts of the work means, here the fullmoon day viz.: Pūrṇimā (fifteenth day of the bright fortnight) when the moon shines with all her digits or Kalas, so delightfully. Similarly, this work S. S. N., an excellent collection of maxims (fine sayings) from great writers, Vyāsa and others and verily like the moon, sheds its lustre on each parvan dealing with each puruṣārtha which can delightfully be seen in the firmament of Sanskrit literature, As long as the moon shines in the sky for the joy (Āhlāda) of all the people of aesthetic taste, this S. S. N. enables all its readers of religious faith to know the four Values of life Dharma etc.

In Sanskrit literature there are a few anthologies of which Bhartrharisubhāsita receives the highest value and occupies a unique place. Bhartrhari, in whom scholars find a famous king, an accomplished grammarian, a renowned philosopher and a great poet, wrote his anthology called B. H. S. in three centuries (Śatakas) namely, the century of conduct, the century of love and the century of renunciation and also each century is to be describing ten paths or paddhatis, Sujana, Durjana etc. Yet it reflects only his own celebrated individuality, and versatile faculty influenced by his worldly experience But the S. S. N. is composed out of a large number of great works, Mahābhārata etc., so as to reflect the
four values of life: *Dharma, Artha, Kāma* and *Mokṣa*, upon which the sixfold Vedic religion\(^1\) is founded.

Further, the question as to why, *P.S.N.* of the same author, divided into four *Skandhas* and *S. S. N.* divided into four *parvans* and the parts of both the works named after the four values of life, may be explained as follows: The two works of the great writer Sāyaṇa, viz., *P. S. N.* and *S. S. N.* are similarly illuminating the four recognised values of life *Dharmā Artha, Kāma* and *Mokṣa*, resembling the *Bhāgavata* and *Mahābhārata* respectively,\(^2\) gladdening the hearts of the people and especially the Kings, belonging to the Lunar dynasty,\(^3\) and stabilizing the Vedic religion. Lastly, it may also be said that Sāyaṇa gave to most of his own works a title with the association of the word *Sudhānīdhi* to eulogise the kings of Vijayanagara. As Nannapārya translated *Mahābhārata* into Telugu at the behest of his patron, Rājarājanarendra and dedicated it to him, Sāyaṇa composed the above two works *P.S.N.* and *S.S.N.*, dealing with the four values of life as *Bhāgavata* and *Mahābhārata*, and dedicated the former work to Bukka I and the latter to Kamparāya to equate them with Rājarājanarendra.

---

1. शौचं च, वैष्णवं, शाक्तं, तौरं, वैनयं तथा।
   स्कान्दं च भक्तिमार्गस्य दर्शनानि पालिये हि।

2. *Bhāgavata* and *Mahābhārata* are mainly describing the lives and the achievements of the kings, belonging to Lunar dynasty and also dealing with the four values of life.

3. The early kings of Vijayanagara, Harihara, Bukka and others are said to be the descendants of Lunar dynasty. In the rays of the Moon was born yadu after whom kings of the race became known yādas. Among them valiant Bukka I, son of Sangama, *My.A.R.* 1916, pp. 58, 59,
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Madhaviyadhatuvrtti (M. D. V.)

The M.D.V., a commentary on the Dhātupātha or the list of classified verbal roots of Pāṇini, is distinctly known from the introductory verse and the colophons, appearing at the end of every Gaṇa or chapter from Bhvādi to Curādi and also Pratyayānta nāmadhātu vṛtti, to be the work of Sāyaṇa, who then was the Prime Minister of Saṅgama II. But a verse, appearing only in one manuscript copy, speaks that it is written by Kuṇḍinārya, who is not known elsewhere in Sanskrit literature. Besides this a couple of verses appearing at the end of the commentary on the roots, ‘Kramu’ and ‘Mayya’, speaks that, that particular portion is composed by Yajñanārāyaṇa. Yajñanārāyaṇa’s name comes once again in the midst of the commentary on the root ‘vada’. As the

1. तेन मायणपुञ्जेन सायणेन मनीषिणा ।
   आध्यया माधवीयें धातुबृत्तिवर्च्यते ॥

   . . . इति श्रीपौर्णवदक्षिणपल्लिविश्रासंसूदारवैश्रव्यकराणारम्भसुता संगम-राजमहामन्त्रिणा मायणपुञ्जेन माधववस्तोदरते सायणेन विर-चितायां माधवीयां धातुबृत्तिशब्विकरणः । श्रवादयः ॥

2. सुधातुबृत्तिविहिता बुधानां श्रीवस्तस्वच्छेन कुले हि नाके ।
   सुधातुबृत्तिविहिता बुधानां श्रीकुण्डिनायणेन कलापपीह ॥

3. यज्ञारायणायेण प्रक्रियेयं प्रपन्धिता ।
   अस्या निश्चेष्टस्तस्तु बोधारो भाष्यपारणः ॥
   अधापि श्रीधाभोधाय प्रक्रियेयं प्रपन्धिता ।
   यज्ञारायणायेण बुध्यन्तरा भाष्यपारणः ॥

4. वदते व्याकरणे यज्ञारायणायः . . .
result of the two verses, some doubt about the authorship of this work has arisen in the minds of scholars. To clear the doubt Swami Dwarkadasa Shstri, who edited this work, expresses the following view in his introduction. Yajñanārāyaṇa is another name of Śāyāṇa relating to the star which then was with the association of the Moon at the time of his (Śāyāṇa's) birth, and that ‘Kuṇḍinārya’ is the corrupt from of Yajñanārāyaṇa (Nakṣatranāma), the second name of Śāyāṇa' further he puts forward the view that the word ‘Śāyāṇa’ is the hereditary name or Vaiśṇavāna and that it is already used in the same sense of Vaiśṇavāna by the author Mādhavācārya himself at the beginning of Sarvadārasanasāngraha.¹

Here, in fact, Śāyāṇa, the commentator of the Vedas and the brother of Mādhavācārya is compared to the ocean of milk or Dugdāhābdhi and the author of S. D. S., Mādhava himself, the son of Śāyāṇa is compared to the Divine Diamond called Kausturbha, which according to Indian mythology, was born from the Milk ocean at the time of its being churned by Gods and Demons.² This Mādhava is different from Mādhavācāraya, the prime minister of Bukka I and the brother of Śāyāṇa and Bhoganātha, but he is the son of Śāyāṇa and the disciple of Sarvajñavisṇu.

1. श्रीमत्सायणदुर्धाराधिकास्तुभेन महोजसा।
   क्रियते माधवर्यण सर्वदशास्त्रश्रुद्धः॥

   M. D. V. Edited by Swami Dwarkadasasastri, Intro. p. 17

2. कास्तुभास्मृहत्तल पवरागो महोदवः॥

   Srimadbhāgasvata purāṇa, 5th verse of 8th chapter of 8th Skandha.
Sāyaṇa, owing to deep gratitude and high regard towards his brother Mādhavācārya-Vidyārāṇya, named his son after him as Mādhava. This Sāyaṇa's son Mādhava became a great scholar and composed the S. D. S., but not Mādhavācārya-Vidyārāṇya, the brother of Sāyaṇa and Bhoganātha. Dwarkadasa-sastri has erroneously identified the two Mādhavas and hence his hypothesis about Sāyaṇa's identity with Yajñanārāṇya and the interpretation of the word Sāyaṇa as the family name or Vaiṣṇavāṇa cannot be accepted.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, who edited Kṣīratarān-gini, a commentary on Pāṇini's Dhātupātha in his introduction (Bhūmika) infers that Yajñanārāṇya might be one among the scholars who helped Sāyaṇa in completing this work Dhātuvrarti. It is a well known fact, that some works in addition to the commentaries on the Vedas, ascribed to Sāyaṇa and Mādhava are not the works written by themselves alone, but with the assistance of a large syndicate of scholars. The assistance from the scholars required by the authors Sāyaṇa and Mādhava must be understood not because of their inability to write but because of their multifarious activities, which were political, cultural, religious and spiritual, hardly allowing them to find time to write all the works published under their name. These scholars were paid fairly and honoured duly by the authors, Sāyaṇa and Mādhava, for their scholarly assistance. The great project of writing works in various branches and commentaries on the Vedas, was proposed and executed by the two illustrious brothers Sāyaṇa and Mādhava to whom the entire credit must go. Hence,
the scholars, who helped them as they (Śāyāna and Mādhava) required in completing the works like Dhātuwṛtti and the commentaries on the Vedas, cannot be considered as the authors, even if they inserted their names in some corners of the works surreptitiously as Yajñanārāyaṇa and Kuṇḍinārya did in M. D. V. When the grand colophons with royal insignia just like vaitālikas praise the distinguished authorship of Śāyāna; how can either Kuṇḍinārya or Yajñanārāyaṇa be admitted as the author of this work M. D. V.?

This work is divided into eleven chapters. Ten chapters, from the first, are devoted to an analysis of all the roots classified into ten conjugations from Bhvādi to Curādi and the last chapter explains the Nāma roots, the Sautra roots, and the Nāmapratyaya roots. Among the few scholars who commented upon the Dhātupāṭha of Pāṇini before Śāyāna, Kṣīrasvāmin and Maitreyarakṣita are important. The commentary composed by Kṣīrasvāmin and called Kṣīratarārāgni is brief and the other commentary, written by Maitreyarakṣita, a Buddhistic scholar, called Dhātu-pradīpa is briefer.

As the Dhātupāṭha is the most important portion of Sanskrit grammar, Śāyāna felt the need of an elaborate and exhaustive commentary on it and composed this work namely M. D. V. Unlike the other commentators, Śāyāna explained decidedly all the forms of ten lakāras belonging to ten conjugations and also all the forms relating to Nyāanta, Sannanta, Yāṇīanta, Yaṅluganta, Kvībanta, Bhāve and Karmaṇi and also all the derivative forms
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(Kṣantarūpāṇi) after discussing the authoritative schools of thought. There are two schools in respect of the Dhātupāṭha of Pāṇini. The first school is of the opinion that pāṇini laid down the Dhātupāṭha without stating their meanings and the second is of the belief that Pāṇini accepted the Dhātupāṭha with the association of meanings also. Sāyaṇa followed the second school. He composed this work in order to help the scholars to know all the subanta forms derived from the roots and also Tiṅṇaṅta forms. This is the only work from which we can glean the how and what of the exact method of the teaching of the Dhātupāṭha before Siddhāntakaumudi of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita came to be taught. Yudhiṣṭira Mimāṃsaka in his Hindi work called the history of Sanskrit grammar, says that this work of Sāyaṇa namely M. D. V. is as useful and helpful as Kāśikāvṛtti for the teachers and students of Sanskrit grammar alike.¹

Sāyaṇa quoted the following authors: Arasimha, Amoghavistara, Āśvalāyana, Kaiyyata, Kṣapaṇaka, Gonardiya, Durga, Jinendrabuddhi, Kṣirasvāmideva, Jayāditya, Maitreyarakṣita, among others in this work M. D. V.

Alaṅkārasudhānidhi (A. S. N.)

This unpublished work is a treatise on Alaṅkāra śāstra or Rhetoric. According to New Catalogus Catalogorum four manuscripts of this work are available in the Manuscripts Library of Mysore, but no one of them is complete.² Every one ends with Upa-

---

2. Oriental Manuscript Library, Mysore. (1) S. A. 615 (Devanāgarī) (2) S. P. 223 (Telugu) (3) S. P. 718 (Kannada) (4) S. P. 862 (Grantha)
meyopamā. The beginning portion of the text is available only in the last one S. A. 862 and the concluding portion of the text is also found only in one manuscript. In this copy some interpolated portions are found. According to the colophons, this work is known to have been written by Sāyana, who was the minister to Saṅgama-II who reigned from 1355 to 1363. Several writers reviewed this work, of whom the earliest was Rao Bahadur R Narasimhachār. This work contains three parts, namely, Kārikas, Examples and Vṛtti, just like many other works in Rhetoric. All the examples glorify the innumerable qualities of Sāyana. Hence, they are said to be written by his brother Bhoganātha, since a scholar like Sāyana would not praise himself immoderately. It is also said that Bhoganātha wrote Udāharaṇamālā only to serve the purpose of the illustrations of the Kārikās of A. S. N. The vṛtti also seems to have been written by a different scholar, for Sāyana is often mentioned in the third person in the Vṛtti. So the Kārikās, the illustrative verses, and the Vṛtti of A. S. N. may be understood to have been written by Sāyana, Bhoganātha and some unknown scholar, respectively.

1. इति श्रीमत्तूर्वपश्चिमदक्षिणोतरसम्बद्धात्मिकताकराजप्रथम-
    देशकमाध्यमाचार्यान्नजनम: श्रीमत्तूर्वपश्चिमदक्षिणोतरसम्बद्धात्मिकताकराजप्रथम-
    रस्य तकन्तिरतिक्रियाप्रसंस्कृतस्य भोगनाथार्जनम: सायणां =
    मात्रायथृत्वावलंकारसुधारिनिधी काश्यमालग्रीविषाध्रापान्
    नाम प्रयोगामेष: ॥

2. I. A. 1916, pp. 22-4; A. S. N. by M. P. L. Sastri, Indian
    Culture (1939-40) Vol. VI, pp. 439-47. etc.
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In her article, "A Critical Study of A. S. N."
(Published in Golden jubilee Vol. B.O.R.I., pp. 253-287), D. C. Sarasvati, quotes a broken passage without source, and argues vaguely that just as Ekāmṛanātha wrote Ayurvedasudhānīdhi and attributed it to Sāyaṇa, so also, some scholar hitherto unknown, composed it and fathered it on him. Unlike A V S. N., U. M., Gaurīnāthaśṭaka and Mahōgaṇapatiśastava, Tri- purāvijaya, Srīgāramaḥjari from which the Kārikās of A. S. N. had been illustrated, are known to have undoubtedly been written by Bhogānātha, the younger brother of Sāyaṇa. So, A S N. cannot be doubted as others' work. But it may be said that Ekāmṛanātha may be considered as one among the number of scholars, who assisted Sāyaṇa in completing the works he planned. For this reason after all, so-called assistants cannot be the authors; because every accomplished writer of even modern times happens to seek some or other sort of assistance from available sources. Then, how would it be possible for a very busy person with multifarious activities and regal responsibilities without assistance from scholars, to write several works and to comment on a number of voluminous parts of Vedic texts etc.?

This work is divided into three chapters or Unmeṣas. In the first chapter we have these topics: the importance of the Kāvyas, Rasa as akin to Brahmā-nānda, difference between Kāvyā and Veda, Śakti Vyutpati and its kinds, the result of reading great Kāvyas the greatness of poets, the poet's superiority over the creator Brahmā, Kāvyapraśamsō, principal theories of Sankrit poetics, Ānandavardhana's view, division of Kāvyas, importance of Dhwani and Rasa, the theories of Rasa, the Kāvyātman and three kinds of poetry.
In the second one, Sāyana discusses among others the following:- Three kinds of Śabda and Artha separately, three Vṛtis and their varieties, various Vyañjakas, varieties of Dhwani, Gunibhūtanyānga, Rasasūtra, and its various interpretations, Abhinavagurta's interpretation of Rasa, Śṛngāra, its kinds, and also its Avasthās, Vibhāvas, varieties of Nāyikā, causes of Vipralambha, varieties of Pravāsa, difference between Śṛngāra and Karuṇa, Sambhoga and its definition, Śṛngāraceṣṭhas, further varieties of Nāyikā, Bhāvas, their definitions and illustrations. Hāsa and its two varieties, Hāsa and its kinds, Vīra and its kinds, Adbhuta, Bibhatsa and its three kinds, Bhayānaka and its two kinds. Raudra of two kinds, Karuṇa of three kinds, mutual relation of Rasas, compatibility and incompatibility, Śānta only in Śravya Kavyas and not in Drama, distinction between Rati, Pṛiti and Bhakti, Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa and innumerable varieties of Dhwani.

In the third chapter are explained the following: Citra Kavya and its two varieties, Śabda Citra and its varieties, Vakrokti, Anuprāsa. Yamaka, Śleṣa Citra Pularuktaavabhāsa and their sub-varieties, illustrations, Arthālankāra Upamā, its two kinds, Luftpā, its 19 varieties, Pūrṇā its kinds. Ananvaya and Upameyopamā...... Here ends the text.

Verses from Bhoganātha’s hitherto unknown works are given in the A. S. N. as illustrations to the Kārikās. It may be said that Bhoganātha’s U. M. seems to be similar to Jagannāthapandita’s Bhāmini-vilāsa,
In this work A. S. N. the following works and authors are quoted:

Abhinavagupta, Ānandavardhana, Udāharana-mālā, Udbhaṭa, Kālidāsa, Kāvyaprakāśa, Kuṅtaka, Gaṇapatistava and Gadyacūdāmaṇī, Gopālasvamin, Gaurināthāṣṭaka, Camatkāra-jyotsnā of Viṣvapati-kavi, Camatkāramaṇījari of Viśvesvara, Tripurāvijaya, Nagānanda, Brhatkathā, Bhaṭṭanāyaka, Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa, Bharata, Bhāmaha, Bhāsa' Bhoganātha, Bhoja, Maṅkhuka, Mammata, Mahāgaṇapatistava, Mahābhāṣya, Mahāvyāracarita, Mahimabhaṭṭa, Mālatimādhava, Mūṣikāṣṭaka, Rāmolāsa, Rudraṭa Locana, Vāmana, Vāsavadatta, Vidyādbhara, Viṣamabāṇālīla, Vēṇīsainkāra Vyaktiveka, Śaṅkuka, Śrṅgāraprakāśa, Śrṅgāramaṇījari and Śaṭsāhasrīkṛt.

A S N. is written mainly on the model of Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammatā and Pratāparudrīya of Vidyā-nātha. Although it cannot claim much originality it is a useful work on the subject.

It gives a detailed account of Kavi, Kāvyā, Kāvyabīja, Alaṅkāra, Guṇa, Raṣa, etc. but no account is available on Doṣa. This work also sheds light on the works of Bhoganātha.

The illustrative verses written by Bhoganātha also give us information about the manifold activities and the greatness of Śāyaṇācārya.

A few specimens from Bhoganātha's works, hitherto unknown, given in A. S. N. as illustrations to the Kārikas are provided under foot note.¹

¹ शिखरेशु शिलानलेषुरामस्तहस्तस्तु तलेदरीरे दरीशु ।
सरसीशु च विवर्षययु दुर्गन्धों पर्व पार्श्वानि तां
श्नासन्योतू ॥ (रामोल्लास.)
Xaiññatantrasudhānīdhī (Y. T. S. N.)

The Y.T.S.N. is an unpublished work of Sāyaṇa. Five manuscripts of this work are available in the Sarasvati Mahal Library of Tanjore Maharaja Ser-

पौलोम्या: कर्माण्यतन्त्रविद्वाराः;
   दीर्घा या दशशतलोचने पपात ।
   तस्मान प्रकरणकर्तर्विकर्तर्विकर्तर्विकर्तर्विकर्तर्विकर्तर्वि-
   व्रजस्तब्धरूढःक्रेवनालमासितु ॥ (चिन्हरविजय:) ।
   संभाव्यते भरितभुजना: सागरोपातंत्रवातः;
   विषुद्रूढलीवविनयतपुरुषविभ्रमः: कालेन्द्रा: ।
   अयोध्याग्वजनकर्मविकासमतरा गोपिकानाः;
   रासोदारसिकर्मानां रागिणा दैवतेन ॥ (भुगारबंजरी) ।
   मूढाय प्रतिकूलकालकालण्यमुल्लिभाय
   हृदिच्छुतप्रौढाय प्रवचनपोडकलह्वृढाय गाढांसे ।
   गूढाय प्रथमानदुरंदुर्ततलाहुठाय सोडाखिल,
   गोरिनाय गणाधिशय जनक प्रोणातु महां भवान् ॥
   कल्याणकुलाचलाय बवतस्तुवृष्टस्तृतस्तृतस्तृतस्तृत
   त्वत्वृष्टकारभृगुवंश पृष्ठतानाथय तस्मै नमः ।
   यद्येषुन गुणान्तवातसुहृदया यादृच्छिकेनकालिना:
   श्रीप्रभुः अप्यसकृत्युपमस्यमः: पूर्णाः: समुष्टवकार्यवा: ॥
   (मूलकामकसः) ।

मन्त्रार्थ तहः पौरेश्वरीतरयो महेश्वरी शेल: पौरेश-
   व्याशिला: कमलाभृतश्वयं चान्धिः: पौरेशव्याश्यः ।
   श्रीकाविधा गृहः पौरेश्वरी गुर्वो लोकविश्वनिध्वभृतम्
   महाबीन भवान्न पौरेश्वरी हृदेन्तमो सर्वेद्वत्वी देवता: ॥
   (सहायणपरिस्परः) ।

इत्यमयेगुणान्तरी भेदः: श्रीभोगनाथविरचितेषु
   गद्यचूडामणिप्रभृतिपूःनेत्या: । (गद्यचूडामणिः)
All of them are written in Devanāgari script, but none of them is complete. Y. T. S. N. is a popular treatise dealing with Srautoprayoga based on Bodhāyana school of Black Yajurveda to which Sayana belongs, and also Āśvalāyana school of Rgveda. The available portion in the first and the second manuscripts, which contain thirty-nine and sixty-five sheets respectively, deals with Ādāna only. The third and fourth manuscripts which contain 65 and 47 sheets respectively are devoted to the description of Cāturmāṣya only, while the third one, according to the colophon, belongs to the school of Āśvalāyana;¹ but the editor P. P. S Sastri, wrongly describes it as belonging to Bodhāyana’s Śūtrās.

This work begins with the famous verse Vāgīśa etc., devoted to the praise of Gajānana. Śāyana pays homage to Bodhāyana but he has not mentioned his own Gurus. He eulogizes Bukka I and HariharaII. He praises his father Māyana and styles himself as Kulaguru of Harihara II and also states that he per-
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formed *Tulāpurusādāna.* Further, he says that a large number of scholars who, from various parts of the country, came to attend the celebration of *Tulāpurusādāna*, requested him to write this unique and important work, called *Y. T. S. N.*, as there was no other scholar as great as Sāyaṇa, and accomplished thoroughly in all the Vedas and their relative Sastric literature and also competent to compose such a work as *Y. T. S. N.*, which would clear the doubts arising in various places, and enable the qualified persons to perform their sacred rites successfully, and to reap their rewards in the sacrificial field. Hence this work deals with the duties of Adhvaryu, Hota and Udgāta who, must be well versed in *Yajurveda, Rgveda* and *Sāmaveda* respectively. As a great commentator of all the Vedas and Brāhmaṇas and a profound scholar in all Śāstras, Sāyaṇa is certainly competent to write the work *Y. T. S. N.* It is a pity that no complete manuscript of this work is available. At the end of the work there is a colophon, speaking that this work is written by Sāyaṇa while he was the prime minister of Harihara II.

*Prāyaścittasudhānīdhi (P. C. S. N.)*

The work *P. C. S. N.*, dealing with the expiation of sins, is known from the evidence of colophons and

---

1. Weighing oneself with gold and offering it to Brahmans is said to be *Tulāpurusādāna*, 10th Intro. Verse.
2. Intro. Verses from 10 to 20.
3. इति श्रीमद्राजाधिराजपरस्मर्तवर्हितिहरसकलसाम्राज्यपुरुषः।
वर्हितकलसाम्राज्यपुरुषः।
धन्विकमर्याचार्य्ययथः।
वर्हितकलसाम्राज्यपुरुषः।
धन्विकमर्याचार्य्ययथः।
कृती यज्ञतत्
वुधानिधि आधानप्रकरणं संपूर्णम्।

II
the introductory verse to have been written by Sāyāṇa.¹ It is otherwise known as Karmavipāka or Karmavipākapraśvaścittasudhānīdi. Several manuscripts of this work are available in various Manuscript Libraries, but none of them is complete and nor do they correspond with one another.² It has been edited by Ramakrishnasastri and published in Grantha characters.³ This work comprises thirty-two chapters or prakaraṇas.

The entire first chapter of this work forms the introduction and it is designed as Sāstrasamsthāpanaprabhā. Unlike the other works, the author begins this work with the famous verse ‘Suklämbara’ etc. It is known from the introductory verse that Sāyāṇa composed this work while he was the prime minister under Saṅgama II⁴ The author’s aim in composing this work is to prescribe various remedies well known from the Vedas and Dharma Śāstras for the people

---

1. श्रीमन्माधवभोगनाथसहोदरस्य मायणन्दनस्य सायणाचार्यस्य कृति: कर्मविपाकप्रायश्चितसुधानिधि: समांत: ।
   तेन मायणपुत्रेण सायणेन मनीषिणा ।
   प्रनव: कर्मविपाकाश्च: क्रियते कहणावता ॥

2. Two manuscripts are available in the G. O. Ms Library Madras, numbering R. 382, D. 3491. Four Mss. in Maharaja Serfoji’s Sarasvatimahal Library, No. 18701, 2, 3, 4 out of four first one is complete. Two manuscripts in Adayar Library No 73882, 75366.


4. अस्ति श्रीसंगमास्य: पृथ्वीतलपुर्वदरः ।
   यत्करितिमूलकादेव तिलोकी प्रतिविबिन्ता ॥

Intro. 3rd Verse.
who suffer from various diseases caused by their sins committed knowingly or unknowingly in the same birth or in the previous births. All the remedies specifically recommended in this work are in the form of Dana, Japa, Homa, Vrata, etc.¹ In view of the author’s intention the above are the better remedies than medicines, since Dāna, Japa, etc., are not only capable of curing the diseases but are also powerful in destroying the root cause viz., sin.² Otherwise, the great scholar Sāyaṇa who is said to be the author of A. V. S. N. and who is familiar with Carakasamhita etc., the ancient and famous medical works, would not have written this work called P. C. S. N. Hence it must be said that Sāyaṇa through this work wished to treat the root cause of the diseases by providing various remedies for various diseases so that they cannot sprout up and attack again.

Three chapters from the second to the fourth deal with various Niyamas or regularities: the definition of Vīrāsana, the disciplines during the time of Vrata like Sāntāpana etc., the mode of Japa and Homa, Tuberculosis, Cough; Leprosy and its kinds, wounds, ulcers, fevers, dry, spreading itch, sterility etc. in six chapters, from the fifth to the tenth, some remedies like Dāna, Japa, Homa are prescribed. Ten chapters from the eleventh to the twentieth are devoted to explain the root-cause and remedy for fractures, Atisāra or diarrhoea, dysentery and their remedies; some Mukharogās and their remedies; piles and Eye diseases, and their remedies; Calavāta.

2. महासौरसूत्र, शास्त्राध्याय ॥ Intro. 22nd Verse.
3. पूर्वजम्बकृति पापं व्याधिरूपेन बाधते ॥ Intro, 20th Verse.
Rheumatic pains, Heart diseases, Prameha, Mahodara etc. Rogas and their remedies are discussed. In eleven chapters from the twenty-first to thirty-first, the root causes and the remedies for Indigestion, Fistula in the anus or Pudendum, Cancers, Boils, Swellings, sweat on hands and legs, Epilepsy, Madness, Inflammatory fever, (Dāhajuvara) Diabetes, Jaundice, Pimples etc., and the remedies for them are discussed. In the thirty-second and last chapter the author expounds poverty as a great disease and its fourteen root causes and their remedies. The author completes this work P. C S. N. by a verse instructing the people to do Japa, Homa and Dāna necessarily for the liberation from the diseases and poverty.

1. दारिद्र्यमय महाव्याधिः निदानानिविन्दुर्दृश्य ।
रजस्वलाभिमणं तदुत्तिष्ठात्स्य भोजनम् ॥
विद्बागमनं चैव कन्यकागमनं तथा ॥
वषोद्रूप्तिकुष्टानां जनानां व सहासिका ॥
तैस्तानं शयनं चापि नेत्रामुच्छित्वभोजनम् ॥
योनिचास्तवादं चैव जिज्ञासेशुनमेवच ॥
देवध्रुवं ह्याप्राप्यव्यायां चोरता तथा ॥
दुष्परिष्ट्यमुशृङ्गरथवं तथा दुष्टान्यभोजनम् ॥
नित्यानं विहितानां च प्रश्वायवता तथा ॥
कर्मणां वानुष्ठानं तेषां निष्कृतिस्वयं ॥

Prajāpatya etc are the remedies for the first five sins, Pañcagavya etc., are for the next three, service is for further next 3, Candraśāna for the last 3 sins, Kṛcchra, Atikṛcchra, Gangāsūna, Śrīmūrtidūna, Ájyamaha and the pārāyaṇa of Śrīsikta, pavānāsūkta and Bhāgajasūkta are prescribed for the last three as additional.

2. तस्मादवशं कर्त्यं दानोममज्ञात्वादिकम् ।
दारिद्र्यरोगाभिभूतत्तत्त्रोगान्त्यम् ॥
In this work, Sāyaṇā quotes the following authors: Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Harita, Samvartaka, Yama, Vasiṣṭha, Bodhāyana, Angira, Śamkha, Likhita, Śatātapa, Āpastamba, Vāmadeva, Vyṛddhagautama, Garga, Śaunaka, Jābali, Kāśyapa, Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana, Yājñavalkya, Kātyāyana, Čyavana, Dhanvantari, Bharadvāja, Kauśika, Mārkaṇḍeya, Ātreya, Romasā and Maheśvara.

Āyurvedasudhānidhi (A.V.S.N.)

This unpublished A.V.S.N is also known to have been written by Sāyaṇācārya from the evidence of a verse occurring in A.S.N.¹ and also the style of the title of the work...Sudhānidhi.

Another reference to this work is that Śrīśailanātha, in his medical work called ‘Praśnottaramālā’ stated the fact in a verse² that his grand-father at the instance of Sāyaṇācārya wrote a compendium on Indian Medicine called A.V.S.N. This reference may be considered similar to that of Yajñanārāyaṇa and Kuṇḍinārya in Dhātuvṛtti of Sāyaṇa.

The above verse is quoted by R. Narasimhachar in his article ‘Mādhavācārya and his younger brothers’ published in Indian Antiquary, (1916, p. 22.)

Except the above reference, not even a single manuscript of this unpublished work is found in the descriptive catalogues of Sanskrit manuscripts of several libraries. like Sarasvatimahal at Tanjore, etc.

¹ Abdurra'isuddin volume: Śrīsāyaṇaśāhīṃdīmat Bhāṣājīmya
² Abdurra'isuddin volume: एकास्मनांयो यत्ततः सायणामात्र्यांमुद्दितः।
   समप्रहीतव्याधिर्य आयुर्वेदसुधानिधिम्।
CHAPTER VII

Parāsaramādhavīya (P. M.)

Mādhavācārya's authorship of this work is clearly known from its colophons and introductory verses.¹ It is a commentary on Parāśarasamṛti and it is dedicated to Bukka-I.² As the colophon states, he was the most revered teacher and also the prime minister of Bukka I.³ At the outset of this work he praises his three gurus, Bhāratītīrtha, Vidyātīrtha Śrīkaṇṭha.⁴ He pays homage to his parents and mentions his two brothers namely Sāyana and Bhoganātha.

1. इति श्रीमद्राजाधिराजजराजपरमेश्वरदिकालिनप्रवर्तकश्रीवीर-बुक्कभूपालसाम्राज्यधरुंधरस्य माधवाचार्यस्य कृति पराशर-स्मृतिवाच्यायां प्रथमोऽध्यायः।

2. सर्वेक्षणपत्तको हिंदुङ्गीस्वामै चतुर्वेदिता, पंचस्त्रक्कृतीय वदन्युद्धस्तांगसर्वसंह:। अष्टयत्विकलायो नवनिधि: पुप्प्यहरस्तिय:। स्मार्तोऽख्युर्धरो विजयते श्रीबुक्कणकाम्पितः;

3. इत्यस्यागिरस्तो नलस्यसुमुखतिशृङ्खलव्यस्य मेघातिथिः, धौस्यो ग्रामसुतस्य वैण्यूपते: स्वोजा निवेद्यान्तिमः। प्रत्यगृहिष्ठिरतृघ्नीसहवरो रास्यस्य पुप्प्यात्मोऽ, यद्वस्य विवोद्रमूलपुलुकुल्लुकुलम्बन्ती तथा माधवः।

4. सोऽश्राप्य विबेकतिथ्यपदवीमान्यातीतित्यपरः, मण्डलससुज्जनतीथ्यसंगमित्यपुष्पसूक्तीतिथ्यंबन्तु। लक्ष्मापलयं प्रभावलहरौ श्रीभारतीतिथ्यतो, विवाहीत्यमुपाययन् हृदि भजे श्रीकुण्डमन्याहुतम्।
and also announces his Gotha, Sūtra and Śākha. It contains twelve chapters. The first three chapters deal with Ācāra or Dharma; the next eight chapters deal with Prāyaścitta or Pāpakṣayārtha Naimittika Karmaśeṣa and the last and twelfth chapter deals with various penitential rites which are aptest to the Kali age. It was edited and published several times in India.

The importance of the work is explicitly stated by the author himself in its introduction. The Parāṣarasmyti was not commented upon by any scholar down to his time, though it is as important as any other smṛti. Moreover, it should also be said that according to the popular tradition approved by lawgivers, like Manu on the basis of the capacity of the penitents in each Yuga, those expiatory penances laid down by holy Parāśara must be observed in the

1. श्रीमति जन्मी यस्य सुर्प्रसिद्धिमण्डल: पिता।
   सायणो श्रोगनाथस्वर मनोजुधी सहोदरी॥
   'यस्य बोधायन सूत्रं शाखा यस्य च याजुधी।
   भारतवाजंकुलं यस्य सर्वजंजस्सहि माधवः॥

2. It was first edited with notes by Mahāmahopādhyāya, Candrakānta tarkālaṅkāra, Prof. Sanskrit College, Calcutta, printed at the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta in 1892 A. D. and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1) Then it was first edited and published with English translation by Manmathanatha Dutt (Sastri) M. A., Re ctor, Kesab Academy and printed by H. C. Das, Elysium Press, Calcutta in 1906 A. D. (2)
Kali age. That is why it is said *Kalau Pārāśaras-ṃrtah*.1

P. V. Kane, in his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, says, that it is not a mere commentary on Parāśara's text but it is in the nature of a digest of civil and religious law. The ṛtta of Parāśara originally contains no verses on Vyavahāra but as Mādhavācārya hangs on the slender peg of a single verse8 of Parāśara, calling upon the king to rule his subjects with righteousness, has treatise on vyavahāra that comes a little over a fourth part of the whole commentary.

His style is very lucid and he does not indulge in lengthy and abstruse discussions. As it is not his independent work, detailed contents are not given here. In addition to numerous ṛtikāras and purāṇas he quotes the authority of the following authors and works.


1. पराशरस्मृति: पूर्वेन व्याख्याता निवन्धूमि: ।
   मयाती माधवायण तद्वस्मिस्य प्रयत्यः ॥
   कृते तु मानवा: प्रोक्ता: तेतायां गौतमा: स्मृता: ।
   द्वापरे संबलिबिता: कली पाराशरस्मृता: ॥

2. क्षतियो हि प्रजा रक्षानु मस्त्रपाणि: प्रदश्वान् ।
   निजिष्ठ्य परसैन्यानि स्विन्ति ध्रेण राजयेतु ॥
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Kūlanirṇaya (K. N.)

This important work is written by Mādhavācārya after he completed his commentary on Parāśara’s Smṛti, as he himself expresses in the fourth introductory verse¹ and it is dedicated to Bukka I. As P.V. Kane says, the P. M. and the K. N. are the two most important Dharmaśāstra works of Mādhavācārya.² Nearly sixty works with the same title as K. N. written by various scholars at different times are seen in new Catalogus Catalogorum.³ It must be said that there can scarcely be seen any other Sastraic work written by so many scholars under the same title as K. N. Although a large number of works appearing under the same title K. N. were written before him, Mādhavācārya the brightest star in the galaxy of Dākṣinātya authors on Dharma Śāstra” wrote his own work with the same title; as Parāśara wrote his own Smṛti in spite of his being quite aware of all the existing number of Smṛtis. Further it must be said according to Parāśara’s view, that the change of Dharmas from Yuga to Yuga necessitates a new law code, so also Mādhavācārya’s view is that the time, at which Dharmas laid down by Parāśara are to be performed,

1. व्याख्याय माघवाचायो धर्मत् पाराशरान्य ।
   तद्रूष्टानकालस्य निष्यं वक्तुमुद्यतः: ॥
   (In some editions it is 5th intro. verse) 4th Intro. verse.


3. N. C. C. Vol. IV, pp. 24,25. Edited by Dr. V. Raghavan, M. A., Ph. D., Prof. & Head of the Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Madras, 1968.
necessitates another K. N. or a new time-table. Kāla or time occupies a very important place in Indian way of life in respect of all activities, whether cultural or religious, which should be performed only at particular, auspicious time determined by Śāstra.

The K. N. of Mādhavācārya has been published several times in India. It is a short work of one hundred and twenty-four verses, dealing with the exact periods, when religious rites are to be performed, and it forms a supplement to his bigger work P. M. This work is divided into five chapters or Prakaraṇas.

In the first Upodghāta or introductory chapter containing ten verses; he establishes the existence of time by refuting the rival views of Kapila, Kaṇāda, and others. He divides time into nitya and janya and also identifies nitya with God. In the second chapter he deals with the division of time into four parts (i.e.) Abda (year) Ayana (equinoctical and Solstitial points) Rtu, Māsa, and Pakṣa; again he subdivides the year into five kinds, viz., Cāndra, Saura, Sāvana, Nāksatra

1. अन्ये कलयुगे धर्मः लेतायां द्रापरे परे।
   अन्ये कलियुगे नृणां युगस्वायुसारतः॥
   प. मा. आचारकाण्ड, श्लो. २२.

2. (a) Kālamādhavakārikas with Vivaraṇa by Bhāṭṭa Vaidyanaṁś Tūri, Edited by Saṅkara Sāstṛi, son of Raṅkaṇātha Bhāṭṭa, Printed at Anandaśarma, Poona, 1942.
   (b) Kālamādhava with two commentaries Lakṣmi & Vaidyanaṁśthī Printed at the Calcutta Oriental Press Ltd. 1941.
and Bṛhaspathya and specifies the religious rites to be performed under each. Then he divides Ayana, Ṛtu, Māsa and Pakṣa and prescribes certain rites to be performed and certain others to be avoided under each. In the third chapter, he explains the nature of tithis and gives their names and kinds and specifies certain religious rites to be performed on each tithi. In the fourth, Dwitiyādi chapter, he applies the rules of pratipad to all the tithis from the second to the fifteenth and determines the number of vratās, such as Gaurīvrata, Jāmāśṭamīvrata, Ekādaśīvrata, etc., to be performed on particular tithis. In the fifth and last called miscellaneous chapter, the author deals with the rules to determine the Nakṣatra for certain religious activities, defines Yoga and Karana and also recommends the proper actions (Kriyās) to be performed on the eve of Saṅkrānti and Eclipses of the Sun and the Moon.

The K. N. quotes, in addition to the names of several Rṣis, Epics, Astronomical and Astrological writers, the following works and authors: Kālādarśa, Bhoja, Muhūrthavidhānasāra, Vasiṣṭarāmāyaṇa, the Siddhāntaśiromaṇi, Hemādri’s Vratakhaṇḍa and Dānakhaṇḍa.

Jaiminīyā Nyāyamālavistāra (J. N. M. V.)

This celebrated compendium of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā philosophy written by Mādhava-cārya is based on Dvādaśalakṣaṇī of Jaimini. Hence it is titled after Jaimini, the illustrious disciple of Bādarāyaṇa. The

1. H. D. S., Vol. I, P. 376 (by P. V. Kane, B Q R I 1930)
author eulogizes Bukka I in one and a half verses and shows reverence to his gurus namely Śrīvidyātīrtha, each in a separate verse, but his third guru, Śrīkaṇṭha is not mentioned. Here also he styles himself as family teacher and minister of Bukka I and maintains comparison with Brhaspati and others. It is learnt from the introduction to his commentary called Vistara on J. N. M., that Mādhavācārya wrote this work after he had completed P. M., as he thought that this former work (P. M.) would be useful for the people of all castes but the latter work J. N. M. V. only for those Traivarnikas who are qualified to perform Srautakarmas or Vedic rites Darśapūrṇamōsāu etc.

1. युक्ति मानवतीं विदन्त स्थिरवृत्तिः से विषेषार्थभा-

2. स भव्याद्भारतीशंतीश्च चतुरान्नाति

3. इत्यस्तांगिरसो नलस्य सुमिति: श्रेयस्य मेधातिथि: 

4. शृद्धिस्मृतिसदाश्रयपालको माधवो बुध:

J. N. M. V., Introductory Verses, 2, 3, 7 & 4 respectively.

J. N. M. V., 5th Intro. verse.
The author first versified the two thousand seven hundred and forty five sūtras of Daśāda lakṣaṇi of Jaimini in brief into Anuṣṭūps under the title of J. N. M. and then wrote according to Bhāṭṭamata a commentary upon it called Vistara. His aim in composing this work was to avoid the difficulty that readers face in studying the entire Pūrva Mīmāṃsā revealed by Jaimini in thousands of Sūtras and explained by Śabaravāmin, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and others in their commentaries and treatises in order to promote and uphold the ancient Vedic Culture and regenerate interest in practising various activities and performing numerous sacrifices as prescribed in the Vedas and also to maintain people's self-respect.

This work is divided into twelve chapters or Adhyāyas and sixty subsections or pādas, which contain irregular number of Adhikaraṇas. Only three chapters (out of the twelve) 3rd, 6th and 10th contain eight subsections each; the remaining nine chapters contain four each.

The first chapter which contains forty two Adhikaraṇas and one hundred and fifty sūtras dealing with pramāṇa in the form of vidhī, Arthavāda etc., is versified into one hundred and fifty-seven Anuṣṭūp slokas. The second one consisting of forty-seven Adhikaraṇas and one hundred and thirty-nine sūtras explaining Karmabheda viz., yogadāna etc., is written in one hundred and twelve Anuṣṭūb stanzas. The third one comprising one hundred and fifty-seven Adhikaraṇas and three hundred and sixty-eight sūtras, shedding light on the point that prayōja etc., are the Āṅgas as they are intended for Darsāpurūṇamāsa etc.,
is composed in two hundred and ninety-nine verses. The fourth one embracing sixty-two Adhikaraṇas and one hundred and sixty sūtras, dealing with discharge of Godohana aimed at puruṣārtha, is completed in one-hundred and eight Anuṣṭups. The fifth one which includes forty four Adhikaraṇas and one hundred and twenty eight sūtras explaining Karmaniyati, Vidheyatva etc., is written in ninety verses. The sixth one which has one hundred and nine Adhikaraṇas and three hundred and forty eight sūtras explaining Adhikāra is finished in one hundred and fifty-five Anuṣṭup verses.

The seventh one, in which twenty-three Adhikaraṇas and one hundred sūtras took place to deal with Atideśa in general is written in forty Anuṣṭup verses. The eighth one that runs into thirty-five Adhikaraṇas and one hundred and thirty-nine sūtras explaining Atideśa in particular is made up in forty Anuṣṭup stanzas. The ninth one which in original consists of sixty-seven Adhikaraṇas and two hundred and twenty-two sūtras elucidating uthānāha-vicāraṇa relating to Atidiṣṭapadārthas is maintained in ninety-two Anuṣṭup verses.

The tenth one which possesses in original one hundred and seventy-nine Adhikaraṇas and five hundred and seventy six sūtras enlightening Bādha or Padārthanivṛtti is epitomized in two hundred and eighty-three Anuṣṭup ślokas. The penultimate one that comprises sixty-four Adhikaraṇas and two hundred and forty-seven sūtras shedding light on Tantrarūpa is composed in eighty-three Anuṣṭup ślokas. The twelfth and last chapter which consists of sixty-eight Adhikaraṇas and one hundred and sixty-eight
śūtras dealing with prasaṅga is written in eighty-one Anuṣṭup verses.

According to numerology, the total number of śūtras of Dvādaśalakṣaṇi of Jaimini is Meghasakha (i.e.) 2745 and the whole book is abridged and versified by Mādhavācārya into one thousand five hundred and forty Anuṣṭup verses. This work in its entirety comprises nine hundred and seven Adhikaranaṇas.

Quotations from various sections of this work are found in the various commentaries on Taittiriya Samhita and Brahmana. It has been published in India and abroad.¹

Vivaraṇaprameyasaṅgraha (V. P. S.)

The V.P.S, is also a work written by Vidyāraṇya who had the name of Mādhavācārya in his Pūrvāśrama and who held the office of the Prime Minister to Bukka I king of Vijayanagara. The colophons of manuscripts refer to him as the author. Same lines occur in the context of Adhyayana Vidhi Vicāra of both P. M. and V. P. S. Rāmakṛṣṇa, the commentator on Pañcadaśi accepts Vidyāraṇya’s authorship of this work. Baladeva Upādhyāya also accepts the Vidyāraṇya’s authorship of V. P. S. ² But in a prin-

---

¹ J. N. M. V. Edited by Sivadatta Sarma, son of Dadhica Pandita Badarinatha, Printed and published by Chimnaji Apte at the Anandasarma Press, Poona, 1892.


The editors who ascribed this work to Bhāratītīrtha, expressed a reason for their doubt that Śaṅkarānanda, to whom Namaskāra is offered at the outset of the two works viz., V. P. S. and P. D., cannot, as there is no definite information from any source, be identified with Vidyāśaṅkarātīrtha or Śrīvidyātīrtha of whom Vidyāranya (Mādhavācārya is known to be a student. As a matter of fact, there is nothing to doubt about the identification of Śaṅkarānanda with Śrīvidyātīrtha because Ramakrishna Pandita, who wrote a valuable commentary on Pañcadaśi, interpreted the word Śaṅkarānanda as Paramātman, identified with his Guru (i.e.) any one among the three: Vidyātīrtha or Bhāratītīrtha or Śrīkaṇṭa may possibly be understood.

Although, at the opening of the work V. P. S. Śaṅkarānanda is praised as his guru, at the end of the same work the same guru is praised with the name of Vidyātīrtha. This identification may be taken as an authentic and definite information re-

\[1\] विद्यातीर्थसूत्रेण हृद्यृपान्यां न रोचते तस्मात् ।
स्तव्वेश्वा प्रक्षेत्रित्वा श्रीविद्यातीर्थपादसूत्सेवा ॥
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quired by the editors (Prof. S. S. Suryanarayanana Sastri and Prof. Saileshwar Sen) to keep away the doubt from the identity of Śaṅkarānanda with Vidyā tīrtha. Besides the above, there is another evidence available in the commentary by Vidyāraṇya on Nṛśimhottarapañītyopaniṣad, consisting of nine chapters or Khāṇḍas from the colophons of which Vidyāraṇya is known to be the student of Śaṅkarānanda, as he himself, at the end of his commentary on all the chapters (nine) of the above Upaniṣad, styles himself as a disciple of Śaṅkarānanda.¹

Further, it may also be said, that Vidyāraṇya paid homage to his guru in an indirect way, firstly, as to how the author of the Vivaraṇa of Pañcapādika namely Prakāśātmayatīndra or Prakāśānaṇḍadayaṭti would be pleased to receive the homage, secondly, as to how Ādiśaṅkara would be pleased to receive the same, thirdly all the Śaṅkarācāryas who occupied the pontifical seat of the Maṭha at Śrīṅgeri would receive the honour, and forthly, Sadāśiva from whom Philosophy of Advaita started would receive the glory.²

Hence, Vidyāraṇya’s authorship of this work V. P. S need not be doubted as in the case of Jivan-muktiviveka.

¹. [Footnote: इति श्रीमाताम् सपूतिताज्ञानकाराय श्रीमछकराटतवादशिष्यश्रृंगधाराप्रमुन्नेश्वरश्रूतिः श्रीनुसिंहवत्सरतपनवेशः पतिपदिः प्रथमः खण्डः ||

2. [Footnote: सदाशिवसमार्थं शंकराधिवेशप्रमाणं। अस्माताम् श्रीवर्षभं वनमेव गुप्तरस्वस्मः ||]
Chapter VII

Padmapāda wrote a commentary called Pañcapāḍika only on the Catussūtri portion of Śaṅkarācārya’s Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya. Prakāśātmayatīndra wrote a commentary called Vivaraṇa on Pañcapāḍika, only on that Vivaraṇa, Vidyārāṇya wrote this present work viz., V. P. S.

The Vivaraṇa on the first Aphorism contains four Varṇakas, that on the second contains only one Varṇaka and on that the third and fourth Aphorisms contains two Varṇakas each.

Nṛsimhottaratapanīyapaniṣaddīpika (N. U. T. U. D.)

Dīpika is a commentary, known from the colophons, to have been composed by Vidyārāṇya on N. U. T. U. belonging to Adharvaveda. This Upaniṣad is devided into two main parts namely Nṛsimhapūrvatāpanīya and Nṛsimhottaratāpanīya. The former consists of five Upaniṣads upon which Śaṅkarācārya wrote a commentary or Bhāṣya where- in he explained a method of Upāsana or meditation on Sagunabrahman in the shape of Nṛsimha for the fruit of Nirguṇaparabrahmavidya. As he left out Utтарatapanīya uncommented upon, Vidyārāṇya felt the necessity of adding a commentary to it and composed the Dīpika on it.

Vidyārāṇya begins his commentary with ‘Om Namo Bhagavate Śrī Divya Lakṣmīnṛsimhāya Namaḥ’ and

1. इति श्रीमतपरमहंसपरिवाचार्य श्रीमण्डकरान्न्दपूज्यपाद-शिष्य श्रीमद्विवारणपुनिमहरक्ती श्रीनृसिंहोतरतपायं वष्टो- पनिष्ठि प्रथमः। खण्डः।
devotes a verse also to the salutation of ṇrisimha the God on whom the method of meditation is to be commented upon here.\footnote{1} In another verse he pays homage to his gurus in general without mentioning any name.\footnote{2} But the colophons appearing at the end of all Khaṇḍas alike, speak unequivocally that Vidyāraṇya is the disciple of Śaṅkarācārya who is, from the evidence of the benedictory verse of V. P. S. etc., proved beyond doubt to be identical with Śrīvidyātīrtha. This part of Upaniṣad is said to be the the sixth Upaniṣad belonging to Atharvaveda and it contains nine chapters or Khaṇḍas.

In the first chapter it is said the Gods asked Prajāpathi to explain Praṇava or Omkāra, which is the symbol of Brahman and subtler than the atom and which is the cause even for the Anuśṭup viz., Mahāmantra commented upon by Śaṅkarācārya in Purvañcārya. Vidyāraṇya comments elaborately on the contest, according to Mantrarājakalpa, as the Praṇava consisting of four Mātras or parts viz., Akāra, Ukāra, Makāra and a Mātra called Dhruva holding the three Mātras, representing the four padas of the Mahāmantra and also four Vedas which came out of Prajāpati’s four

\footnote{1} निरस्त्रिभिस्तानिधर्मार्थस्मेदादृशिष्ये।
नृसिंहयो नमस्कृत: सर्वंचवृत्तिसाक्षिणे॥

\footnote{2} चरणग्राहंरोवलेशसम्प्रकृतिसहस्रस्वचक्त्।
सर्वसंसारदीनोहैं तत्पतःसमस्त गृहनु सदा॥

2nd Introductory Verse
months. (Vaktrā)¹ In subsequent chapters the commentator expounds various details pertaining to this Mahāmantra such as its similarity with Brahma vidya the method of its meditation, its efficacy result, etc. Vidyārāṇya further offers several definitions and derivations to the word Nṛsimha² to make it denote Brham and identifies it with Praṇava, which ultimately destroys the bonds of the meditator’s or the Upāsaka’s own self. He also delineates some secret factors regarding this Mahāmantra which are necessary for the Sadhakas namely Pujāmantrās, several methods of Nyāsa, keeping different Gods who are subordinate to the main God or Upāśya Devatā, on various limbs and parts of the body, by chanting the digits or Khandas (or Bijas) of Mahāmantra like Aṅganyāsa, Karanyāsa, Mukhanyāsa, Brahmayoga, Viṣṇuyoga and Rudrayoga, Bhedayoga, Abhedayoga, etc.³

Vidyārāṇya quotes in his commentary the authoritative works and authors viz., Mantrarājakalpa, Vārtikakāra, Praṇavannayaya, etc.

Pañcadaśi (P. D.)

From the evidence of the colophons in a large number of manuscripts and printed editions, Vidyā-

1. चतुर्मातृत्वकालासरकाचविद्वादि महामनः।
वक्त्रेश्यो मम संज्ञतः मन्त्रविधेश्वरेऽश्च।।
श्रवणेःस्यकाराणां उकारान्तो वजर्मतयः।
सामवे दे मकारान्तु सर्वग्राहें ततो ध्वनः।।
N. U. T. U. D., Anandasrama, Poona, 1929, pp. 71 & 72 respectively.


3. Ibid, Passim 96 to 104.
ranya is known to be the real author of *P. D.*, a versified treatise on Advaita Philosophy. A few of the manuscripts however appear under the authorship of Bhāratītīrtha and the rest are found even without the author's name mentioned therein. Out of twenty-six complete Manuscripts of this work, listed in the Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts, Sanskrit University Library, Vāranāsi, 1961; nineteen manuscripts are found under the authorship of Vidyārāṇya, while only five are ascribed to Bhāratītīrtha and the rest have no mention of the name of any author. Out of three manuscripts of the same work listed in the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts of the Sarasvati Mahal Library, Tanjore, two are ascribed to Vidyārāṇya, whereas only one is found under the authorship of Bhāratītīrtha.

Prof. T. M. P. Mahadevan, in his "Philosophy of Advaita" relying upon the evidence of the compound word, *Bhāratītīrthaguruḥ* mentioned by Rama-krishnapanditā, at the beginning of his commentary on *Trūptidīpa*, explains it as indicating Bhāratītīrtha’s authorship not of that chapter alone, nor of that and the succeeding chapters alone, but of the whole book. But the colophon of the same chapter namely *Trūptidīpā* unequivocally refers to Vidyārāṇya as its author. Moreover the same commentator in his commentary on the third verse of the same chapter, *Trūptidīpa*, states that Vidyārāṇya is the


2. इति श्री विद्यारण्यकृतम् पंचदश्या तृतीयोपन्नम् ॥
author of Tattvavivekagrantha of P.D.x Besides, Acyuta Kṛṣṇānandatīrtha, in his commentary on the Siddhānta leśa Samgraha of Appayyaḍīksita, also many a time refers to Vidyāraṇya’s authorship of Paṇcadaśī. Finally an internal evidence is also available to prove Vidyāraṇya’s authorship not of a few chapters but of the entire P. D.x

In view of the above mentioned evidences, Prof. T. M. P. Mahadevan’s view that the early chapters are not the work of Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya has to be rejected. In an edition of this work, fifth time printed, together with the commentary of Ramakrishnapandita, (at the Nirṇayasāgara Press, Bombay, 1926); eight chapters out of fifteen speak with their colophons about Vidyāraṇya as the author only three chapters speak about the joint authorship of Vidyāraṇya and Bhāratītīrtha and the remaining four chapters remain without colophons at all. As far as the above edition is concerned Bhāratītīrtha is nowhere mentioned as the single author of at least one of the fifteen chapters of the work, except the compound word ‘Bhāratītīrthguruḥ’ which can also refer to Vidyāraṇya, when it is interpreted as a Bahu-vrīhi compound.

P. V. Kane, the author of the History of Dharmaśāstra agrees that Vidyāraṇya was originally Mādhava

1. तत्त्वविवेकाभ्ये प्रख्ये श्रीमद्विबारणण्युपचिनिरूपितम्।
2. ताति भृतितत्त्वयथापित्तः श्रीविवारणण्युपस्त: चित्रवे सद-श्तान्त निरूपितानि।
3. उभयं तृप्तिदीपे हि सम्बन्धसार्यीरीरितम्। P. D. 14, 49
and that he is the author of Jivanmuktiviveka and P.D.¹ Prof. Baladeva Upadhyaya also accepts Vidyāraṇya’s authorship of P. D. in his Hindi work “Ācārya Śāyān Aur Mādhav” and says that according to some scholars Bhāratītīrtha might have had a hand in completing this work, and Vidyāraṇya might have helped in completing Vaiyāsikīnayamālā and other works found under the authorship of Bhāratītīrtha.² In spite of the internal evidence in its fourteenth chapter to prove the sole authorship of Vidyāraṇya, Niścalānanda the author of Vṛttiprabhākara, opines that the first ten chapters are the work of Vidyāraṇya and the other five are that of Bhāratītīrtha. Even the view of Niścalānanda that accepts Vidyāraṇya’s authorship of the first ten chapters of P. D. is refuted by Prof. T. M. P. Mahadevan by means of Appayya Dīksīta’s single reference.³ Appayya Dīksīta attributes Viva- raṇa Prameya Saṅgraha also to Bhāratītīrtha. Vidyāraṇya offered salutation to Śaṅkarānanda at the beginning of the P. D. and the V. P. S. As the identity of Śaṅkarānanda with Vidyātīrtha is already explained while dealing with the authorship of V P.S., it need not be repeated here. Another salient point deserves to be observed here, that the very habit of versification of Śastraic works is a typical method of Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya, very well known to the scholarly world from his early works, K. N., J. N. M. V. etc., which persuades scholars to believe that the author of P. D. is none other than Vidyāraṇya-

1. A. S. & M. in the context of dealing with P. D.
2. The Philosophy of Advaita (by Prof. T. M. P. Mahadevan) Introduction, P. 6
Mādhavācārya. However, it may be said that, as Sāyana, owing to great respect, liked his brother Mādhavācārya to be the author of some of his works Vedabhāṣyās and Dhātuṛṭṭi, Vidyāraṇya also might have liked his work P. D to be under the joint authorship of both Guru and Sisya namely Bhāratītīrtha and Vidyāraṇya. Otherwise the confusion in relation to the authorship of this work stands unresolved.

Vidyāraṇya begins this work with a verse devoted to the adoration of his revered teacher Śaṅkarānanda and completes it by the verse devoted to the benediction of King Harihara II, the son of Bukka I and also his subjects. From the first half of the benedictory verse of this work, P. D. the following fact may be gleaned. King Harihara II, the son of Bukka I, might have requested Vidyāraṇya to teach him the Philosophy of Advaita. Then, Vidyāraṇya for the fulfilment of his king’s desire, composed this versified treatise on the philosophy of Advaita, in an easy style, with popular illustrations, immediately sustaining the interest of the learned scholars as well as ordinary persons, who are not well versed in the Vedas and Śāstras and who are tender in mind (Sukumāramatīs) in fifteen chapters dealing with every aspect and all the fundamentals of the subject, systematically arranged from Tattvaviveka to Brahmānanda. There is no other parallel treatise so popu-

1. नमः ब्रीशंकरानन्दगुहणादाम्बुजनम्।
   सविलासमहामोहार्यायासैककर्मणे।
   प्रोयादिक्षोज्जनेन ब्रह्मानन्देन सर्वदा।
   पाण्डवच्छ्यद्नस्ववाच्चक्षाेणात् शुद्धमानसान्।
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lar on Advaita Philosophy as the P. D., in Sanskrit literature and hence this unique work has been translated into all important Indian Languages and into some European languages too.

This work P. D. is divided into three parts, Vivekaباءंकaka, Dipaباءंकaka and Brahmanandapaña nightclub. Pāñcaka means a collection of five. Vivekaباءंकaka consists of five chapters, namely Tattvaviveka, Mahābhuṭaviveka, Pāñcakośaviveka, Dvaitaviveka and Mahāvākyaviveka. Viveka means true knowledge. This part deals with the supreme-self and the individual self, the means to realize the identity of the above two, the qualities, Serenity, Activity and Inertia, Senses of ten kinds, Mind, five sheaths, the creation of Jīva and Īśvara and the four great Vedic Dicta: Thou art that, etc. The second part, comprising five chapters viz., Chitradiṣṭha, Truptidiṣṭha, Kūṭasthadiṣṭha, Dhyānadiṣṭha and Nītrakadiṣṭha, explains the four stages in the Supreme Self as in a coloured cloth, the difference between Jīva and Īśvara, particulars regarding Upāsana, the nature of Jīva and Īśvara and so on and so forth. The third and last part, called Brahmanandapaña nightclub containing five chapters, Yogānanda, Ātmānanda, Advaitānanda, Vidyānanda and Viṣayānanda, describes the means: Guru and Śastra for the attainment of Supreme bliss, i.e., Brahmānanda, the nature of love or Prema, indifference towards name and form (Nāma and Rūpa) that results in Brahmānanda, the four-fold Vidyānanda, the three-fold function of Mind, etc.

The title of this work P. D. and the very system of its division into three main parts or Khaṇḍas, each
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containing five chapters, may spontaneously lead scholars to think over Pañcadaśākṣarīmahāvidyā or Pañcadaśi which also contains similar division of three main Khaṇḍas or Kūṭas, each Khaṇḍa containing five Bijaśaras. Scholars already considered the Jīvanmuktiviveka the penultimate work of the same author is a supplement to this work Pañcadaśi as its sixteenth chapter. Then the totality of the two works besits to be treated as pūrṇavidyā or Śrīvidyā. Other particulars regarding and resembling Mahāvidyā are being left for further research. Moreover, both Pañcadaśis are regarded as Brahavidyās equally to help the follower or Sādhaka to attain Brahmasākṣātkāra. In Brahman there are three component parts namely, Sat, Cit and Ānanda by which the three Khaṇḍas of both Pañcadaśis may separately deserve to be represented respectively. Hence, the two Pañcadaśis may virtually claim to be denoted as Saccīdānandalaharis : the waves of Sat, Cit and Ānanda for the Sādhakas or Mumukṣus to swim on the crests.

Besides the ten major Upaniṣads Vidyāraṇya quotes Amṛtabindu, Uttarāpanīya, Śvetāsvatara, Kaivalya Upaniṣads and also the works like Brahmasūtra, Bhagavadgīta, Gauḍapā dakārikās.

Saṅkaradigvijaya (S. D. V.)

S D. V. is a legend or kāvyā describing the life and the victories of Saṅkarācārya. From the colophons appearing at the end of all cantos, it is known to have been written by Mādhavācārya Vidyāranya.¹

¹ इति श्रीमाधवाचार्य तदुपोद्धातपरश्रृः ।
संक्षेपसंकराये सर्गाध्य प्रथमाचार्यत् ॥
Although there are many works dealing with the life and achievements of Śaṅkarācārya, only this work or Mādhavāchārya is being regarded as authoritative or Prāmāṇika, by almost all the scholars throughout India. Some scholars, basing on the evidence of the word ‘Navakālidāsavidusah’ in the tenth verse of the introductory canto, say that this work might have been written by Navakālidāsa, who is different from Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya. Then the question will arise as to why the colophons of all the cantos (sixteen in number) unanimously speak of Mādhavācārya as its author, and not Navakālidāsa. Naturally and generally, no poet desires to write a colophon to speak about any one other than himself as the author or poet of his own work. Hence, Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya is, as the colophons speak, the author of the S. D. V. But the word Navakālidāsa must be a self-styled befitting title of Mādhavācārya whose poem has to be estimated as excellent or even better than the poetry of Kālidāsa.

In fact, as Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya was a great scholar, poet and propagator of Advaita Philosophy, he must have seriously felt the necessity for a legend or Kāvyā dealing mainly with Caranimpurusārtha or Mokṣa Unlike Veda and Purāṇa which are said to be similar to a king and a friend (Prabhū and Suhṛt) respectively, in instructing Trīvarga, a Kāvyā is similar to a darling, and points out the desired object in a convincing manner, with the sweetest tongue, and makes the beloved reader pro-
ceed enthusiastically to achieve the same.\(^1\) Accordingly, Mādhubhācārya, inclined to propagate the applied Philosophy of Advaita even through a legend or Kāvya, produced this marvellous work namely S. D. V. Mahākāvya, which has no parallel or rival so far.

Mādhubhācārya-Vidyāranya selected Śaṅkarācārya a Sannyāsin as the hero of his legend who is said to be an incarnation of God of Gods Śiva and also who excels Rāma, the hero of Rāmayana of Vālmīki, and Krṣṇa, the hero of Bhāgavata of Vyāsa; because Rāma and Krṣṇa established Dharma on the physical plane by way of destroying evil, while Śaṅkarācārya, by writing and teaching Prasthānâtraya Bhāṣyas (commentaries on Brahmasūtra, Upanisads and Gītā) not only established Nivṛtti dharma, which is far superior or Supreme Dharma; but also kindled the fire of knowledge on the spiritual plane to burn the seeds of Samsāra viz. Avidyā, Kāma and Karma, and to attain Brahmānanda. Hence, Śaṅkarācārya, the hero of the legend must be regarded as Vijñānāvatāra relating to Kali, as Kapila in Krṣṭa, as Dattātreya in Treta and as Bādārāyaṇa in Dvāpara\(^2\). He must be deemed as an extra-ordinary

---

1. यहेतात्प्रभुवासमितद्विगतं शब्दव्राह्मनाप्भिरः
   यत्वाचर्यप्रवचनात्तुराणवचनादिष्टं सुहुस्मितस्ताः।
   कान्तसमितियया सरसतामपावकपनविद्यिविषयः
   कस्लंते कुतुकी व्यं विरचितस्तत्तथे स्पृहां कुमारेण II

8th verse of Nāyakaprakaraṇa of Pratāparudriya by Vidyānātha.

2. वायूः सत्यमुनिस्ततं वितरति ज्ञानं ह्वतो विद्वतेः युगे ।
   दत्तो ह्वापरनामके तू सुमातिव्रेष्टं करी शंकरः II

S. D. V. 9th Canto; 22nd Verse
hero (Lokottaranāyaka) as he possessed innumerable virtues, far beyond description. One has to understand Śaṅkarācārya as a great philosopher, a profound scholar, a renowned poet, an excellent commentator, a shrewd political genius, an intrepid religious reformer, an invincible debater and an accomplished mystic. In the sixty-third verse of the fourth canto, Mādhavācārya-Vidyārānya extols the hero of the legend as one who has no equal, since there is no one blessed with even a sixteenth part of Śaṅkarācārya’s virtues, in the three worlds: Svarga, Martya and Pātāla. In the seventy-first verse of the same canto the poet eulogizes Śaṅkarācārya the hero of his legend (Mahākāvya) as one to whom there was no equal among the ancients none among contemporaries and would not be any among the people of the times to come; as there is no mountain equal to Meru (the fabulous golden mountain). Hence, Śaṅkarācārya being an extraordinary hero (Lokottaranāyaka) by his limitless virtues, causes the legend S. D. V to be highly commendable and brilliant. So also Bhāmaha says - ‘Upāslokyasya Mahātmyaḥ Ujjvalāh Kāvyasampadāh’.

The next important thing after the hero in a legend or Mahākāvya is Rasa or sentiment. Out of the nine sentiments described in the legend, Śānta-

1. कलयापि तुलानुकारिणं कलयामो न वयं जगत्त्वे।
   विद्वतां स्वस्मो यदि स्वयं भविता नेति न चदन्ति तत्र केः॥
2. न बभूव पुरातनेषु तत्सदृशो नाखतनेषु दृष्टे।
   भविता किमनागतेषु वा न सुभृतीसदृशो यथा निरिः।॥
3. P R , p. 7 (Edited by Dr. V. Raghavan, Published by Sri T. V. Viswanatha Aiyar, 1970).
vīra occupies the place of the principal sentiment and other sentiments are subservient to it. Śānta-vīra is not absolutely different from Śānta and Vīra, but it is only Vīra that predominantly glorifies Śānta. A Nṛsimharasa may also be accepted, as Nṛsimha-laṅkāra. Because of the fact that Śaṅkarācārya is a typical Ālambanavibhāva for Utsāha, which transforms into Vīra at the stage of the declaration of the victory over Maṇḍana or Viśvarūpācārya who takes to Sannyāsa on his defeat, as a result of the terrible bet in the form of mutual adoption of each other's Āśrama, agreed by both in the course of their debate on Jñānakāṇḍa and Karmakāṇḍa. The author says Śānta is a main sentiment. (Śaṅtir jatra Pracakati Rasān) Śrṅgāra is not left out though it is virodhī to Śānta. Śaṅkarācārya the hero of the legend is unobjectionably described as an Ālambana Vibhāva even to Rati the Sthāyibhāva of Śrṅgāra. It is distinctly seen when Śaṅkarācārya, being questioned by Ubhaya Bhārati, the incarnation of Sarasvati and the wife of Viśvarūpācārya or Maṇḍnamiśra about Kusumāstra śāstrāhṛdaya;1 asked for one month's time, and entered by Yogavidyābala into the dead body of a king called Amaruka, and observed the entire Kāmaśāstra on the ladies in the harem, and also wrote at the same time a hundred Muktakās called Amaruśataka, every Muktaka or śloka of which is Śrṅgārarasanāsya-

1. इति संप्रवर्त्य पुनर्घोयमना कथने प्रसंसर्गमत्र संगतिः: । यथिनि सदस्यामुपपूतादि कुसुमास्त्रशास्त्रहर्दय विदुषी ।। कला: कियतथा वद पुष्पद्वनन: किमातिमका: किच पद समाधिता: । पूर्वेऽ च पक्षे कथमत्यासितति: कथ युवत्यां कथमेव पूर्वेऽ ।।

S. D. V. 9th canto. verses 68, 69.
andi and is said to be equal to a Prabandha, as affirmed by Ānandavardhana.  

It is not out of place to say unmistakably that this incident alone is enough to serve as an example for Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya’s or rather Navakālidāsa’s Kāvyakalānaipuṇya and to excel any number of incidents, like Śāpakalpana in Abhijñāna Śākuntala, etc., of old Kālidāsa. Hence the title Nava-kālidāsa of Mādhavācārya can be justified as a challenge to old Kālidāsa.

In addition to the above, Ubbhayabhārati and Viśvarūpa are also described as mutual Ālambanavibhāvas for each other’s Rati until it transforms into an excellent Śṛṅgāra. Adbhutarasa is being enjoyed by the connoisseurs or the Sahāryās, when Śaṅkarācārya, the hero of the legend, praised the Goddess of Wealth (Lakṣmī) to help the poor Brahmin’s wife, who gave him a single emblic myrobalam fruit, (Āmalakaphala) and nothing else for Bhikṣa, on account of her miserable poverty; she (Lakṣmī) having been pleased at the Stotra (Kanakadhāaśtava) of Śaṅkarācārya, filled her house with the golden emblic myrobalam fruits or Kanakāmalakaphalās. Nevertheless, Śaṅkarācārya is again described as typical Ālambanavibhāva for Vismaya, the Sthāyī of Adbhuta, when he, having seen the river Narmada, flowing with horrible floods which caused the villagers, living on its banks, to suffer heavily; attra-

---

1. अमस्कर्स्य कवे: मुक्तका: श्रृंगाररसस्यन्दित: प्रबन्धायमाना: प्रसिद्दा एव।

In the commentary on seventh Kārika of Third Udyota.
cted the entire water into his Kamaṇḍalu by his superhuman power, as Agastya drank all the oceans in a single culuka. Other sentiments are also described here and there as subservient to the main sentiment. According to aucitya, for example, Āryāmba must be taken as an Ālambanavibhāva for Śoka, the Sthāyī of Karuṇa, when she laments for her only son who resolved to adopt Sannyāsa.

The third important thing to be considered in a Mahākāvyya is the itivṛtta or Kathāvastu. Generally Itivṛtta is being taken from purāṇas and Itihāsas like the Mahābhārata; but Mādhavacārya-Vidyārṇya resorted to the biographical account and grand victories of Śaṅkaracārya, a Sannyasin, as an Itivṛtta for his legend. This legend consists of sixteen cantos.

The first one is regarded as the introductory canto or Upodghāta Sarga. The celebrated and greatly accomplished poet Mādhavacārya begins simply with a verse dealing with the adoration of his Guru namely Śrīvidyātīrtha, in the first half, and the declaration of the adumbration of ancient Śaṅkaravijaya in the second half. It must be said that the earlier Śaṅkaravijaya, on the essence of which the present one is based, does not appear to be extant now. Among all the extant Śaṅkaravijayās Mādhavacārya - Vidyārṇya's is said to be the most ancient and consistent one according to traditional scholars while others seem to be unhistorical with reference to date of Śaṅkaracārya and arbitrary regarding some incidents.

S-9A
In the introductory canto, Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya draws the attention of the readers towards the starving condition of the Gods, due to the abandonment of the Sacrifices (Yajñas) by the predominance of Buddhists, Śaivās, Vaiśnavās, Yavanās and others; and their approach to Śaṅkara the God of Gods for remedy, and Śaṅkara's promise to redress their grievances, by incarnating himself as Śaṅkarācārya to pave the path of Śrauta, by producing Commentaries or Bhāṣyas on Prasthānatraya, and his behest to his son Śkanda to incarnate as Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, and to Brahma and Indra to incarnate as Maṇḍana or Viśvarūpa and Sudhanvān to cooperate with Kumārila in upholding the position of Karmakāṇḍa and also his (Śaṅkara's) revelation of the incarnations of Viṣṇu and Śeṣa as Śaṅkaraśaṇa and Patañjali who had already done their best to make the position of Middle (Upāsana and Yoga) Kāṇḍa of Veda better.

In the second canto, Sadāśiva's manifestation as Svayambhūlinga on Vṛṣādri in Kerala State, and the birth of Śivaguru as the worshipper of the God (Svayambhūlinga) and his marriage with Āryāmba and Śaṅkarācārya's manifestation as the son of the couple (Śivaguru and Āryāmba); in the third canto, the incarnations of Viṣṇu, Vāyu, and Vāyu's tenth digit (aṃśa) and Brahma as Padmapāda, Hastāmalaka, Toṭaka and Maṇḍana or Viśvarūpa and also Sarasvati's incarnation as Udbhayabhāratī and her marriage with Viśvarūpācārya or Maṇḍanamiṣra; in the fourth, Śivaguru's Pañcataprapāti, Śaṅkarācārya's Upanayana, and Śāstrabhyāsa; in the fifth, his adoption of Sannyāsa, Āryāmba's lamentation, Śaṅkarācārya's tattvopadesa and his promise to discharge his duties
as son after her death. His Upasadana to Govinda-bhagavatpāda, his attraction of the water of Narmada into his Kamanḍalu, when it was in full flood in the sixth, the dialogue between Saṅkarācārya and Saṅkara who is in the disguise of Candaśa, the latter’s advice to the former to write a commentary or Bhāṣya on Brahmasūtra of Vyāsa, Saṅkarācārya’s teaching of his Bhāṣya to Sanandana and other disciples; in the seventh, Saṅkarācārya’s confrontation with Bhaṭṭapāda or Kumārilala Bhaṭṭa, while being on the fire of husk for undergoing Prāyaścitta his (Bhaṭṭapāda’s) advice to Saṅkarācārya to meet Viśvarūpācārya or Maṇḍanamiśra for debate etc.; in the eighth, the battle of debate between Saṅkarācārya and Viśvarūpācārya, while Udbhayabhārati’s being in the chair as mediator or adhyakṣa, Saṅkarācārya’s victory over Maṇḍanamiśra or Viśvrūpācārya; in the ninth, Udbhayabhārati’s questions pertaining to Kāmaśāstra; in the tenth, the Ācārya’s appeal for one month’s time, and his Parakāyapraveśa, Udbhayabhārati’s defeat and antardhāna or disappearance, Maṇḍana’s Sannyāsasvīkāra with the name of Suresvara; in the eleventh, Padmapāda’s becoming Nṛsimha to slay the Kāpālika called Ugrabhairava, who came to kill Saṅkarācārya; in the twelfth, Saṅkarācārya’s reaching Gokarna, his prayer to Harihara; in verses, his acceptance of Hastāmalaka as disciple, his reaching Śrīgagiri with disciples, the establishment of Śāradāpīṭha, Toṭaka’s becoming sīṣya to Saṅkarācārya; in the thirteenth, Saṅkarācārya’s behest to Suresvara or Viśvarūpa to write Brhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣhya Vārtika and other works, Naiṣkarmya siddhi etc; in the fourteenth, his reaching his mother’s presence, his mother’s paralokāyātra etc; in the fif.
teenth, the Ācārya’s digjaitrayātrā, confutation of several religions and philosophies; in the sixteenth and last the Ācārya’s affliction with Bhagandara or fistula disease, his behest to the four celebrated disciples Suresvara, Padmapāda, Hastāmalaka and Totaka to be the heads of the four Āmnāyapīthaḥ at Śṛngeri, Dvāraka, Badarī and Pūri, the Ācārya’s Sarvajñapīthādhirohaṇa, lastly his Kailāsagamana on the back of Vṛṣabha are described

In every respect, the Śaṅkaradīvijoyamahākāvya strikes one as highly beautiful and delightful, and claims comparison only with the celestial Tree or Cow and also destroys Kalimāla and purifies everyone when it is heard even at least once in life.

Bṛhadāraṇyakavārtikāśāra (B A. V S )

This work is also, undoubtedly, known to have been written by Vidyāraṇya, from the evidence of Maheśvaratīrtha’s commentary which, occasionally, refers to him as its author. Suresvara wrote Vārtikas for the Bhāṣya by Śaṅkara on Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad which is considered as the backbone of Advaita Philosophy. This Upaniṣad is related to white Yajurveda, to which Suresvara, the author of B. A. V, belongs in his Pūrvāśrama. Suresvarācārya wrote Vārtikas also on the Bhāṣya on Taittirīyopaniṣad belonging to Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda which is said to be Śaṅkarācārya’s Śākhā, in his Pūrvāśrama. The two works of Suresvarācārya are considered to be the most important ones. According to some traditional scholars it is also stated that unless Śānti is performed for the above two works, the Prasthānatraya-Adhyāyana would be treated as incomplete.
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The Vārtikas of Sureśvara on Brhadāranyaka are eleven thousand one hundred and fifty one in number. Vidyāraṇya summarised them into four thousand eight hundred and thirty-three verses of his own and called it B A V S. It is divided into four Adhyāyas or chapters. Vidyāraṇya adopted the famous verse 'Vāgisādya'...etc. as Maṅgalācaraṇaśloka, with which all the Vedic commentaries begin. In the first chapter there is an introductory portion or Upodghāta, called Sambandhavārtika. Sambandha means relationship between the two Kāṇḍas of Veda namely Karma-kāṇḍa and Jñānakāṇḍa, which apparently seem to be opposed or contradictory to each other, since the one enjoins performance of Karma and the other enjoins abandonment of Karmas. To avoid that contradiction and to maintain Sādhyasādhanaḥbhāva between the two Kāṇḍas and also to explain Adhikārin, etc. Sureśvara wrote one thousand one hundred and thirty-six verses or Vārtikas and Vidyāraṇya could summarise it only into one thousand and forty-five verses under the name of Sambandhavārtikasāra. Here there is not much for him to summarise as this portion is purely argumentative and as he thought brevity should not be the case with ambiguity. Śaṅkarācārya, in his Bhāṣya on Brhadāranyaka explained the Sādhyasādhanabhāvasambandha only in a few lines. Hence Sureśvarācārya has to be regarded as the master-philosopher and his Vārtikas are the master pieces in the field of Advaita Philosophy.

Śaṅkarācārya, as he was fully aware of the fact that no other disciple was better qualified than Sureśvara — who was a constant and faithful follower of
Karmakāṇḍa in his Pūrvāśrama, with the name of Viśvarūpācārya or Maṇḍanamiśra — to grasp the superiority and the greatness of the jñānakāṇḍa, ordered him to write Vārtika for his Bhāṣya on Brhadāranyaka and Taittirīya Upaniṣad. Sambandhavārtika deals with Adhikāriparīkṣa, Sambandhaparīkṣa, Prāmāṇyaparīkṣa and Prameyaparīkṣa. Besides, Sambandhavārtika, the first chapter, gives the essence of the Vārtikas for the Bhāṣya of Śaṅkara on six Brāhmaṇas. In the second chapter, Vidyārāṇyā provides the essence of the of the Vārtikas for the commentary by Śaṅkara on six Brāhmaṇas. In the third and fourth chapters, the author prepares the essence of the Vārtikas of Suresvara for the Bhāṣya of Śaṅkara on nine and six Brāhmaṇas of Brhadāranyaka respectively.

Vidyārāṇyā’s aim in composing this work is not only to epitomize the Vārtikas of Suresvara, but also to make the Vārtikas which are composed in the toughest philosophical terminology (Jaṭila Dārśanika Paribhāṣa) easy for the readers to understand the substance. Hence, the author Vidyārāṇyā wrote this celebrated compendium of Advaita Philosophy in quite a simple and easily understandable style and also he reduced the bulk into less than half of its original, without causing any damage to the spirit of the Vārtikas of Suresvara.

In the initial verse Vidyārāṇyā draws the attention of the scholars, by way of comparison with bees, flying around the lotus feet of Suresvarācārya, to be contented with sipping the juice of sugarcanes in the
form of Vārtikas. Here it should be understood, that the ordinary scholars, who are equated with bees are said to be unable to procure the substance out of the Vārtikas of Sureśvara, which are very hard like sugarcanes, and they may be happy with the juice (Sāra) brought out by Vidyāranya. Hence, the Vārtika sāra of Vidyāranya is very important, useful and helpful work to the scholarly world to know the highest philosophy of Sureśvarācārya. It should also be stated that Vidyāranya is the follower of Sureśvarācārya; for he wrote not only the Sāra of his Vārtikas, but also supported and strengthened his Ābhāsa theory as the theory of reflection (pratibimba). But that does not mean that he does not differ from Sureśvarācārya anywhere.

Vidyāranya, in three verses from the ninth to the eleventh of the fourth Brāhmaṇa of the chapter employs and explains a novel and beautiful simile of Apāmārgalatā, to illustrate Bhāva or Samsāra, that gives opposite results to the people of two kinds of spiritual outlook and worldly outlook. Pratyagdrk and Parāgdrk or Antarmukha and Bahirmukha. This simile is said to be Vidyāranya's original and not

1. स्रीमतिः मुलाकाष्ठाराचार्यपादाम्बज्ञानमाः हेमः ।
वातिकेशुरसं पीत्वा तुप्यन्त्वात्मानुभूतिः ॥

2. अयामार्गेन्तेवाः विषुवतेवाः भवः ॥
प्रत्यगद्र्कम् विमोक्षाय संसाराय परात्माशाम् ॥
अयाद्विदो माजेने सा न लगा कंडके करे ॥
मुलाकाष्ठाय माजेने तू लगा स्वाद् बहुधा करे ॥
एवमत्स्तु शस्यायं संसारो नैव दुःखद् ॥
बहुस्तुष्ठतु संसारे दुःखादुःखतरं प्रजेत् ॥
seen anywhere in the Vārtikas of Suresvara or in the commentaries of Śaṅkara. The Apāmārgalatā gives pain to one who holds it top-wise (Mūla to Agra) and pulls through the prickly edges with his palm. The same creeper does not prick him if he holds it at the top and strips it from the top to the root or Agra to Mūla. Similarly, Samsāra gives sorrow to him who moves as Parāgdṛk or Bahirmukha outward-faced, and gives pleasure to him, who moves as Pratyagdṛk or Antarmukha, or inward-faced.

Hence, it should be clearly stated that Pravṛtti Dharma causes the follower sorrows and grievance, while Nivṛtti Dharma gives (follower) happiness and bliss, or even Supreme bliss (Brahmānanda).


*Jivanmuktiviveka (J.M.V)*

The J.M.V. was composed by Mādhavācārya after he had become a Sannyāsin with the appellation of Vidyāraṇya. Hence he does not indulge in introducing himself as in his other works P.M. etc.; with all other particulars regarding his great personality. He simply begins with a single (Anuṣṭup) verse1 devoted to singing the celestial excellences of his Guru namely Śrīvidyātīrtha, by way of identifying him with Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Mahēśvara.

1.  यथा निष्वसितं बेदं: यो बेदेयोजितिः जगत् ।
    निर्ममें तमरं वन्मे विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरस् ॥

The author's aim in producing the treatise on Sannyāsa may be understood as follows. Vedic religion is based on four castes or varṇas viz. Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra and four Āśramas viz. Brahmacarya, Gārhaṭya, Vānaprastha and Sannyāsa and also four Puruṣārthaḥ namely Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. All these things are already explained elaborately in religious works like P. M. etc., but Sannyāsa is explained in its turn very briefly. When some verses of Dharmaśāstras, Smṛtis and Puruṇas are warning the people not to take Sannyāsa since it is prohibited in Kali age, Vidyāraṇya could not help feeling, that, if Sannyāsa is prohibited the Paramapuruṣārtha viz: Mokṣa would find no place anywhere in the world of Vedic religion, thereupon, the Jñānakṛdha or Upaniṣadabhaga or the head of Veda which is dealing with Mokṣa would be meaningless and ultimately the Vedic religion would stand headless, being ready to fall suddenly at any time.

Nirṇayaisindhu, Chapter III, p. 56. (Only the name of the book is given and other particulars are not given. Hence the number of the book (Adyar Library) is noted here. H. 297, Kam, NS, Var. S-10
Then Vidyāraṇyā selected various passages from Śrutis, Smṛtis and Purāṇas and compiled this valuable and unique work JMV, dealing with Sannyāsa systematically in respect of its authorities, varieties, validities, duties, results etc. exhaustively. This important work has been published several times in India.

This work contains five chapters: (1) Authority bearing testimony to jīvanmukti or liberation in this life, (Jīvanmuktipramāṇa) (2) obliteration of latent desire, (Vasanākṣaya) (3) Dissolution of mind, (Mannōṣa) (4) purpose of the attainment of Jīvanmukti, (Svarūpāsiddhiprayojana) and (5) Renunciation of the enlightened (Vidvatsannyāsa).

In the first chapter the author deals with Renunciation and its two kinds vividīṣā Sannyāsa (the renunciation of the seeker) and vidvatsannyāsa (the

1. JMV, rendered into English by Manilal Dvivedi, B.A., sometime professor of Bhavanagar Sanskrit College, published by Tookaram Tatya, F.T.S. for the Theosophical publication fund, 1897.


(c) Edited by P. Vasudeva Sastri and K. V. S. R. G. Ganesasastri Printed & Published Anandasrama Press, Poona 1916.

renunciation of the enlightened) various scriptural and mythological authorities thereof, two kinds of Paramahamsas, and their definitions, the state of Jīvanmukta and the definition of Videhamukta, etc. In the second one the three means to acquire Jīvanmukti gnosis etc. definition of mind, the results of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, three kinds of action etc., are discussed. In the third chapter the necessity of the dissolution of mind, two kinds of Yogins, the definition of Recaka, Pūraka and Kumbhaka, the result of Prāṇāyaṃa, the definition of Āstāṅgayoga and the two kinds of Samādiḥ: Samprajñāta and Asamprajñāta are defined. In the fourth one the five-fold aim of Jīvanmukti and seven Yogabhūmikās and their definitions etc. are explained. In the last and fifth chapter, the variation between the paths, duties and conditions of Yogin, and Paramahamsa and also the possibility of fall of Yogin, from the sublime path owing to the indulgence in acquisition of clairvoyance floating in the sky and other divine powers etc. are explained.

Vidyāranya quotes from works like Yogavāsiṣṭha, which were not quoted by the philosophical writers

1. ज्ञानरक्षा तपोविसंवादाभाव दुःखनाशसुखाविश्वासाव: सन्ति सन्ति पञ्चप्रयोजनानि।
2. ज्ञानभूमि: भुबोहताश्या प्रथमस समुदाहृता। विचारणा हितीयस्य तृतीया तनुमानंगा। सत्वापिन्त्रातुर्थी स्वाततोसंसक्ततामिव। पदार्थार्थाविनी षड्ढी सप्तमी तुर्णमा स्मृता।
3. ज्ञानमुलेन तृत्तिये कुक्तक्त्यस्य योगिनः। नेवास्त्ति किंचित्तृ कर्त्तव्यस्मिति चेष्ट सत्त्ववतः।
before him. His aim was to achieve integration among the sciences and to improve the status of Advaita Philosophy. In the second chapter Vidyārṇya says that Gnosis (Tattvajñāna), Obliteration of latent desire (Vasanākṣaya) and dissolution of Mind or Manonāśa would be effective only when they are simultaneously practised. Otherwise they, being separately practised, yield no fruit or Siddhi to the practiser, just as the three Hymns, (Mantras) quoted from Yogavāsiṣṭha to substantiate the above, Apohiṣṭha etc. The Apohiṣṭha etc. three Hymns, which are collectively prescribed for Mārjanas or sanctification in course of Sandhyāvandana (Twilight salutation) cannot be effective when they are recited each on a separate day. He also gives, another worldly example: just as a dinner with curry, dal, rice etc., cannot be good enough if each of the above items are served on a separate day.

In the third chapter called Manonāśa, Vidyārṇya quotes Gaudapādakārikas in order to answer the question put by Arjuna in the Gīta, as to why his

1. बयमेते सम्यात्वस्वव्यस्तता मूढमुदृष्ट:।
   ताक्रमपरस्परप्लेत: भवत्यपि समाश्वते।।
   एकस्यो निप्रेक्ष्यन्ते यशोते चिरमध्यलम्।
   तत्त सिद्ध प्रयम्यप्रसंग मन्त्र: संकलिता इव।।
   J. M. V. pp. 93, 94. Published by Chowkamba, Skt. 1913

2. उल्लेक उदबेवेश्वरां कृष्णस्यैःकविनन्दन।
   मनसो निक्रमस्वकर्म भवेदपरिवर्जिन:।।
   बहुधिमथ विरोधवा एकनापि बलीयस।
   स पराधमानान्ति समुद्र इव दिट्टभात।।
   Ibid, p. 274
mind goes out of control like a violent wind. Just as the ocean which can be made empty with ceaseless effort by taking away the water drop by drop at the tip of a Kusa blade, so also mind can be brought under control. He refers to a fable to explain thus: The ocean carried away with its waves, the eggs of a bird called Tittibha lying on the shore. Being enraged Tittibha decided to dry up the ocean drop by drop with its beak. Although Tittibha was requested by a large number of its relatives, not to provoke the mighty ocean, it did not stop from taking revenge. On the contrary Tittibha solicited their co-operation. As there was no other way, all the birds along with Tittibha were struggling to dry up the ocean. Nārada going along the sea shore, saw the birds with sympathy and pity, and also asked Garuda to help the poor birds, his kith and kin. Then the Lord of birds, with a dreadful wind produced by his wings, decided to dry it up. Then Samudra shuddering with fear of Garuda, restored the eggs of Tittibha.

This work is of inestimable value, as there is no other work of its kind in the vast Vedānta literature in Sanskrit. This work might be regarded as his penultimate work, if Saṅgītasāra is set aside.

Vidyāranya concludes with a verse devoted to the benediction of his Guru namely Sri Vidyātīrtha-maheśvara.

Anubhūtiprakāśa (A. P)

The A. P. or the discovery of experience is known, from the colophons, to have been written by
Vidyāranya¹, in verses dealing with the interpretation of several Upaniṣads. The author himself, at the end of the work, states that this work is *Anekopaniṣatāśparyarūpa*, in the form of the substance of various Upaniṣads. It is in twenty chapters. At the end of every chapter the author states that he gives the quintessence of the particular Upaniṣad only either by the grace of his guru, or to propitiate his guru, namely Śrīvidyātīrtha Mahēśvara.² Hence it must be said that Vidyāranya composed this metrical compendium of several important Upaniṣads besides *P. D. & J. M. V.* only after he became a Sannyāsin. He begins this work not with any verse devoted to the praise of his guru as was the case with his other works, but with direct introduction to the subject. It may suggest the propensity of his identity or oneness with his guru which can be indicative of *Advitiya Brahmātmabhāva* attained by him.

In the first chapter, Vidyāranya summarises the Science of Supreme Self, explained in *Aitareyopaniṣad* up to the end of the second forest treatise (*Āaranyaka*) belonging to Rgveda about ‘Prajñānam Brahma’ one of the four *Mahāvākyas* (great Vedic dictums).

In the second one, the author epitomizes *Brahmavidya*, expounded by Tittiri in *Brahmavalli* of *Taittirīyopaniṣad* belonging to *Kyṛṣṇayajurveda*.

---

¹ इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिकले अनुसूतिप्रकाशे ऐतरेयोपनिषतं दिब्बरणियान् नाम प्रथमोध्यायः।

² ऐतरेयशब्दविवा व्यास्यात् संग्रहादिदिमास्।

...सूत्रियारामस्य सुन्ततियोढ़ियमेष्ट्रः॥
Chapter VII

In the third chapter, Vidyārānya, basing on the sixth Prapāṭhaka of Chandogopanisad, belonging to Sāmaveda, explains briefly the science of Supreme Self (Brahmavidya) initiated by Āruṇī to his son Śvetaketu who studied all the Vedas and became very proud of his wisdom Āruṇī induces Śvetaketu to know that particular thing (Brahman) from the knowledge of which everything would be known, and initiates him into the secret of Tattvamasi, one of the four great Vedic Dicta.

In the fourth one, the author gives the essence of Brahmanvya explained in the seventh Prapāṭhaka of the same Upaniṣad by Sanatkumāra to Nārada who became very sad inspite of his exhaustive studies of all the Vedas, Śāstras and Purāṇas and could not find contentment and solace.

In the fifth one, Vidyārānya explains briefly the Brahmanvya recorded in the eighth Prapāṭhaka of the same Upaniṣad (Chandogya) as Prajāpati taught Indra and Virocana, the lords of Gods and Demons respectively.

In the sixth chapter, the author gives the particulars in brief about the two sciencees (Vidyas)—Para and Apara—which were explained by Angiras to Śaunaka according to Mūndakopanisad belonging to Atharva Veda. It is to be known that the fourth Mahāvākyya (great Vedic dictum) ‘Aham Ātma Brahma’ relates to the Atharva Veda.

In the seventh chapter, the author provides the essence of Praśnopanisad belonging to the above Veda wherein, Pippalāda enlightens the six sages namely,
Kātyāyana, Bhārgava, Kauśalya, Gārgya, Satyakāma and Bharadvāja by way of answering the questions put by them about various aspects of the Supreme Self.

In the eighth, Vidyāraṇya expounds briefly the experience of the Soul (Ātmānubhava) as explained by Indra to Pratardana in the third chapter of Kauśitakibrāhmaṇopanisad belonging to Rgveda.

In the ninth chapter, the author gives a brief account of the knowledge of Brahman recorded in the fourth Adhyāya of the same Upaniṣad as explained by Ajātaśatru to Vālāki who came with pride and false knowledge of the Supreme Self to the former to teach him about Brahman.

In the tenth chapter, Vidyāraṇya explains the Soul (Ātman) according to Maitrāyanīya Śākha belonging to Sāma Veda, wherein, the sage Śākāyanya taught a king called Brhadhratha the nature of the Soul (Ātmatattva) which was first explained by Prajāpati to Vālākhilyas (the famous sages for perfect celibacy) and again was explained by Maitra to Śākāyanya.

In the eleventh, the author expounds the science of Soul briefly according to Vaivasvata, the son of the Sun, who taught the same (Brahma-vidya) to Nāciketas which was recorded in Kathopanisad belonging to Yajurveda.

In the twelfth chapter, he gives the summary of Śvetāsvataraopanisad belonging to Yajurveda. Here Śvetāsvatara explained the science of Self (Ātmavidya)
to the Ātyātramīns Ascetics or Avadhūtas living in the highest order of renunciation (Sannyāsa).

Vidyāraṇya deals with various aspects related to the science of Supreme Self (Brahmavidya) in six chapters from the thirteenth to the eighteenth of this work, basing on Bhādaranyakopanīṣad belonging to white Tajurveda, from which the great Vedic Dictum ‘Aham Brāhma śmi’ hails and enriches the Advaita Philosophy.

In the thirteenth chapter, the author summarises several aspects in respect of the Meditation on Virāt, etc., according to Ātmabrāhmaṇa of the third chapter (Adhyāya).

In the fourteenth, Vidyāraṇya deals with the science of Supreme Self according to Ājātaśatru, the king of Vāraṇāsi, present Banaras, who taught Vālāki the meditator of Prāṇa, further lessons, in three Brāhmaṇas from the first of the fourth chapter of the same Upaniṣad namely Bhādaranyaka.

In the fifteenth chapter, the author explains the science of Supreme Self Brahmavidya according to Yājñavalkya who taught his wife Maitreyi in the fourth Brāhmaṇa of the fourth chapter of the same Upaniṣad.

In the sixteenth, Vidyāraṇya deals with Madhu Vidyā an Upāsana or Meditation explained in the fifth Brāhmaṇa of the fourth chapter by Dadhyāṇātharvaṇa to Aśvins.

In the seventeenth, the author deals with the Science of Supreme Self (Brahmavidya) by way of S-10A
narrating the story of Yājñavalkya who reaches Janaka's Court with a desire to conquer Asvala and other Philosophers, according to the fifth chapter of the grand forest treatise, Brhadāraṇyaka.

In the eighteenth, he explains briefly the Science of Reality (Tattvavidya) what is described in the sixth chapter of the grand Forest Treatise as Yājñavalkya, the great practiser of Yoga, explained to Janaka the king of Mithila.

In the nineteenth, the author summarises several details pertaining to the Science of Supreme Self described in Talavakāraśākha or in Kenopanishad belonging to Sāmaveda.

In the twentieth and last chapter, Vidyāranya explains the Meditation of Nirguṇa Brahman according to the path of Praṇava as Prajāpati described to the Gods in Nṛsimhottarāpanīyopanishad belonging to Atharva Veda.

It is known from the colophons that Vidyāraṇya dedicated every chapter of this work as a separate versified treatise on Advaita philosophy to his Mukhyaguru namely Śrī Vidyātīrtha Maheśvara by whose grace, as the author states at the end of all the chapters, he had completed this work.¹

The name of the work A. P. and the way in which Vidyāraṇya selected the portions from several important Upaniṣads belonging to all Vedas, lead

¹. सोःस्मान् मुख्यगु: पाल: विषादतीर्थस्यहिँ:।

(Chapter 12 Verse 29)
scholars to appreciate his exhaustive studies, his analytical approach, his remarkable abridging ability, his vast practical experience, and his wonderful wisdom enriched with his stupendous memory and finally bow down before his visualized holy feet with deep devotion.

The word Anubhūti may be interpreted as Aparokṣānubhūti or direct perception or direct experience of Brahman. The Science of Supreme Self or Brahma-vidya cannot be understood when explained by one who has no aparokṣasāksātārkā or direct experience of Brahman. Further, it should be said that there are gradations among the students of the Philosophy of Advaita, viz. dull, mediocre, and brilliant as in the case of many other sciences. Besides, there are many kinds of students, some of whom are very proud of their wisdom acquired out of the study of Vedas and Śāstras like Bālāki, some are very sad in spite of their exhaustive study in vedas, Śāstras, Purāṇas, etc., like Nārada. Some are very arrogant like Gods owing to their welth and victory over the Demons. To explain Brahmavidya, the most difficult science, to all kinds of students (Adhikārins) Vidyārṇya, who is well and fully qualified as he is a Brahmajīna, culled portions from various Upaniṣads and wrote this unparalleled and unprecedented ultimate work with the utmost significant title namely Anubhūtiprakāśa.

But R. Muthukrishna Sastri, who wrote a commentary on this work, called Śrutisamayojini, writes that the Anubhūtiprakāśa does not apply to the chapters from one to seven but only applies to the remaining thirteen chapters from eight to twenty. For, the
author himself named the first seven chapters as *Caturvedavidyāprakāśa* and remaining thirteen chapters as *Anubhūtiprakāśa*.

It cannot be accepted as it appears to be quite inconsistent and impertinent. Inconsistent because the title *Caturvedavidyāprakāśa* which the commentator advocated appears nowhere in the book except in the first verse of the eighth chapter, where as the title *A. P.* is well known not only from every colophon of every chapter but also seen on all pages from cover to cover of the work; and impertinent because the great writer Vidyāraṇya whose versatile Sastraic works are of very high order, whose poetic talent is beyond our imagination, whose wisdom knows no bounds, in whose mind the entire universe, at his will, reflects, could not give his last and final philosophical work an appropriate title.

If vidyāraṇya had the intention to give this work a literally applicable title he would have given a title like *Anekopaniṣattītparyadipika* or *Dvādaśopaniṣatsūra* just like *Bṛhadāraṇyakavārttikasūra*. But he wanted to give a title which is emperically applicable to this work and it will not strike the minds of ordinary scholars if they wish to give a name to their philosophical works.

As he had a marvellous, rich and direct experience of Brahman by means of Upaniṣadic study and practice and as he wished other aspirants (*Mumuksus*) also to have the same through his experience he culled some special portions from and reduced the bulk of the intended upaniṣads and versified in an easy classical Sanskrit and simply titled it *Anubhūtiprakāśa*.​
The Sublime result of Advaita philosophy is Nīś-
sreyaśa and the experience or the enjoyment of that
is the last and final stage. Yato vāco nivārinte aprāppy
manasā saha.

Vidyārāṇya’s aim in composing this work is to
enable the aspirants to have the knowledge of Brah-
man within a short time for the liberation from the
web of Samsāra by this airbus-like Ā. P. without
undergoing the voyage by ocean-like prasthānatraya-
Bhāṣyas.

Sāṅgītasa(r)a (S. S.)

This treatise on Music of Karnataka School
namely S. S. is known to have been written by Vidyā-
raṇya-Mādhavācārya, as his authorship is referred
to in the second chapter of Sāṅgītasa(r)uda by Raghun-
āthanāyaka. The authorship of this work on music
shows that Vidyāraṇya was a great scholar even in
Karnataka Music as well as in other sciences, Mīmāṃsa etc.

Sundaram Ayyar’s article ‘Śrī Vidyāraṇya and
Music’ published in Vijayanagara Sex Centenary
Commemoration volume (pp 333 to 342) furnishes
many details about Vidyāraṇya’s theory concerning
Karnatak Music.

The Eighty-five verses, quoted from S. S. by
Raghunāthanāyaka in his Sāṅgītasa(r)uda, shed some

1. संगीतसारं समवेष्य विचारण्याप्रविध्यशीर्षकप्रणीतम् ...
2 करणादिकार्यान्तायिविचारण्याप्रविध्यशीर्षकप्रणीतम्।
 आरम्भ रागात्र प्रभुप्रयोगानु प्रवाहाय चालके वहंगान्
 तेशां मतां। पर्चतश्चवेक्षेतः ... (संगीतसारा २. ४१३)
light on Rāga-Ālāpa, about nineteen Rāgas of Meha category and thirty-five Rāgas of Janya Category. And also Raghunāthanāyaka refers to the critical knowledge of Śrī Vidyārāṇya with reference to the music performance and the required qualifications to be present in an accomplished musician.

It may also be said that Śāyana's son Kampana known from the evidence of a verse, "Tatsamoyānja-yā Kampana Vyasaninaha Saṅgīta Śāstre tava", already quoted in historical background while dealing with the identity of Vidyārāṇya with Mādhavacārya, to have been an expert, might have learnt Music from his uncle, Mādhavacārya-Vidyārāṇya. Even a manuscript of this work has not been found so far.
CHAPTER VIII

Vidyārāṇya's contribution to Advaita Philosophy

Of the followers of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, whose philosophy is called Advaita, Vidyārāṇya is second to none. Vidyārāṇya wrote a number of works of manifold nature like commentaries, abridgements, original treatises etc., to revive Vedic religion and Advaita philosophy. In the field of Advaita philosophy his works are Pañcadaśī, Jīvanmuktivivekā, Viṣṇu-rahaprameyasaṅgraha, Brahadāranyaka Vārtikasūra, Śaṅkaradīgviṣaya, Upaniṣadādīpika and Anubhūtirūpāna. He not only enriched the Advaita philosophy by writing the above valuable works but also vanquished the opponents or rival philosophers like Dvaitins by adducing stronger and more powerful arguments with quotations from the most authentic sources and also by appealing illustrations which are well-known and which remain a monument to his vast and refined experience.

Here a modest attempt is being made to show a spark of Vidyārāṇya's outstanding merit in systematising and reorienting some important concepts like Māyā, Śāṅkī, Jīva, Īśvara etc., and also in writing authoritative treatises on Śrī Śaṅkarācārya's philosophy of Advaita.

In the first place Māyā or Avidyā (Ignorance) deserves to be taken as a vital centre around which the entire philosophy of Advaita, which is otherwise known as Māyāvāda, is established. When Māyā or Avidyā is not convincingly established, its Āvarāna, or power of concealment becomes inexplicable; and
Vikṣepa or the power of projection becomes impossible; when there is no Vikṣepa then knowledge or jñāna becomes ineffective. When jñāna or knowledge is futile, there is no necessity of this philosophy the very intention of which is to explain jñāna for the attainment of caramapurusārtha or Mokṣa or salvation. Hence the importance of Māyā or Avidyā in Advaita philosophy is beyond question. Although Māyā has its paramount importance in Advaita philosophy, it was not radically dealt with by any writer down to Vidyāraṇya. The definition of Māyā and Avidyā, the difference between Māyā and Avidyā, the distinction in respect of the function of the two, the Āsraya or the base for the two and also the validity of the two, were all left undistinguished and unexplained. It was Vidyāraṇya who dealt with this important concept (Māyā) elaborately and systematically by way of adducing and garnering the sporadic references to Māyā and Avidyā from the Upaniṣads', the Bhagavadgītā, the BrahmaSaūtras and the like.

1. मायां तु प्रकृतिः विषादः मायिने तु महिष्ठार्थम् ||
तस्यायवभूतस्तु व्यां तु सम्मित स्वतः ज्ञातु || SAU. 4-1.
ष्ट्रे अक्षरे श्राह्यपरे त्वनत्ते विषादियन्ते निहिते यत् गृहे ।
क्षरं त्वारिता हम्मृतं तु विषाद विषादिते इश्ते यस्तु सोऽस्य: ||
Ibid. 5-1

2. अजोपि सच्चव्ययाया भूतानामी भ्रोपि सन्तु ||
प्रकृतिः स्वामविष्ठाय सम्भवामयायायाया || B.G. 4-6.
देवी होवा गुणमयी नम माया हुत्ययाय ।
मामेव ये प्रपन्तै मायेमेतां तरति ते ||
Ibid. 7-4.

3. मायामात्रं तु कालस्थंचांतिमिश्चत्तस्वहुपत्तारो || B.S. 3-2-1-3.
नासदासीनो नसादोतदानी नासीद्विशो नो भयोम || R.V.S.8-12.
Pañcadaśi is one of his original works on Advaita philosophy. It is an excellent treatise and is considered to be the prakāraṇa-granṭha on the subject. It is in fifteen chapters. In the second chapter called Pañcabhūta-vivekaprakaraṇa in the forty-seventh Kārikā he defines Māyā as follows:

The Tattva of Māyā is not possible to be distinctly defined from that of Paramātman which is the cause of the universe. It can be inferred by the Kārya (Universe). It (Māyā) is the power of Brahman just like the power of fire. The power cannot be perceived elsewhere before its action.

In the forty-eighth verse of the same chapter he further explains that the power (Śakti) of Brahman is neither Sat (existence) nor one identified with Brahman; Then what is the characteristic of the power of Brahman?

In the forty-ninth verse he refutes Śūnyavāda of Buddhists by saying that Māya cannot be considered as Śūnya (nonexistence) because the Māyākārya or the world has to be accepted as derived out of Śūnya. It is quite impossible. Then what else would be the characteristic of Māya?

1. निस्तल्या कार्यगम्यत्वम् शक्तिमात्यायनिनिश्चितत् ।
   न हि शक्तिः स्तवित् कैशचित् बुध्यते कार्यत्: पुरा ॥
   
P.D. 2-47.

2. न सदन्त्सु सत: शक्ति: न हि बलेः स्वशक्तिता ।
   सत्तुलक्षणताया तु शक्ते: कि तत्त्वमुप्पताम् ॥
   P.D. 2-48.

3. शून्यत्वमिति चैष्ठूल्यं मायाकार्यभितीर्दितम् ।
   न शून्यं नापि वदु वदुप्तु तद्रक्षत्वविभ्यताम् ॥
   P.D. 2-49.
S-11
Showing the authority of the hymn of creation (Sṛṣṭisūkta) of Rgveda which is otherwise known as Nasadiyasūkta,\textsuperscript{1} he finally defines Māya as being neither ‘Sat’ (existent) nor ‘Asat’ (non existent) but only ‘Tamas’ before the creation of the world. Generally existence cannot be attributed to ‘Tamas’ but owing to attachment with the ‘Sat’ (Paramātman) it can be accepted to have it. Hence Māya, the power of Brhma, cannot be considered as a separate one from Brahman. Māyā the power of Brhma like the power (Sakti) of a man (Chaitra) cannot be seen or drawn separately,\textsuperscript{2} but it can be inferred out of his (Brahman’s) action viz., world as that of Chaitra out of his action viz., war etc.

Further, he explains the three-fold definition and the three-fold function of Māyā in Chapter 6 and in Chapter 13 respectively as follows.\textsuperscript{3} The Māyā staying in Brahman executes the three-fold function, viz., creation, preservation and destruction—Sṛṣṭi, Sthiti and Laya in Sanskrit.

\textsuperscript{1} नामस्वदासीन्नो सदासीतदानीं किं त्वसूतमः।
सर्वोगात्रस: सत्वं न स्वतस्ततस्विधातार।
\textsuperscript{P.D. 2-50:}

\textsuperscript{2} अत एव हि द्वितीयतथं शुत्यव्यन्नहि गणयो।
न लोके चैवतर्कश्वयोजीवित सिद्धते पुष्करं।
\textsuperscript{Ibid 2-51.}

\textsuperscript{3} तुम्म्त्वद्यान्नर्वतनीया च वास्तवौ वेतृसी तिर्था।
ज्ञा माया तिर्थोर्व्यो: धौतयोगलोकार्यः।
\textsuperscript{Ibid. 6-130}

चैव चिन्तामण्डलिताः माया चौत्संविश्वत्वकारिणी।
\textsuperscript{Ibid. 13-86}
Chapter VII

The difference between Māyā and Avidya will be dealt with while dealing with the difference between Jīva and Īśvara the individual self and the Highest Self.

It is essential to note in the context that in the history of Advaita philosophy, the original and universal approach of the Upaniṣads, Brahmasūtras, and Bhagavadgītā inevitably gave place to a trend of commentaries like Bāhyas, Tīkās etc., which further came to be hardened with dialectical treatises of only academic interest. There is no wonder that the Indian public at large could not keep pace with the highly technical and pedantic style of the later philosophical works and therefore lost interest in them. To rescue and revive popular interest, large works like Bhāgavata and Vāsishṭha Rāmāyaṇa arose serving the purpose of an applied philosophy. But their bulk again was a deterrent to the common public.

And then Vidyārāṇya rose to the occasion. He realised the lowered prestige of the philosophy of Advaita of his time and the trend of the people. Since he was an outstanding scholar with deep knowledge in all the Vedas and with advanced erudition in all the Śāstras, he found out the defects of the philosophy which gave scope to the rival philosophers to criticise it and also which caused the people to be disinterested in it.

He wrote a number of works in an easily understandable diction and style and created a new enthusiasm in the world of Advaita philosophy. He
reduced the tedious bulk of some works like Vīra-rāṣṭrapameya-Samgraha to inculcate a genuine interest in the minds of readers and also he prepared the Sāra (quintessence) out of Bhādaranyaka-Bhāgya-Vartika of Suresvarācārya the greatest of all philosophical works He wrote Pañcadasī, the most lucid and compact handbook of Advaita philosophy, in fifteen chapters and produced the Jīvamukti-Viveka which is considered to be the supplement to Pañcadasī as its sixteenth chapter. He wrote Anubhūtirakāśa, another excellent work, consisting of twenty chapters and covering the important portions of the twelve famous Upaniṣads, Īṣa etc., which were already commented upon by Śankarācārya. Regarding the Anubhūti-prakāśa the following point deserves special mention. In the first chapter of the work dealing with Aitareyopaniṣad he has vividly delineated Pañcakośas (five sheaths) and Śākṣin (witnessing self) in a very masterly manner. Similarly, in the twentieth chapter, he explained the method of Upāsanā relating to Pranava or Om and the result of it in an unprecedented and wonderful way.

Śākṣin:

Śākṣin is otherwise known as Kūtastha. Under the title of Kūtasthadīpa a chapter of Pañcadasī is devoted to the Śākṣin. Many schools of thought have entertained different views about the concept of Śākṣin or Witnessing Self. The author of Tatvapradīpikā expresses his view that the attributes i.e., “Kevala and Nirguna” (Absolute and Unattributed) cannot in any way be construed as consistent in Paramēśvara (God) who is associated with Māyā or Ignorance; and therefore pure Self different from Jīva,
(limited self) as a personal associate uninterfering and uninfluencing, has to be accepted.¹ The author of Kaumudi quotes the eleventh Mantra (Hymn) from the sixth chapter of the Svetasvatara Upanishad² according to which he defines Sākṣīn or Kūṭastha as follows. Sākṣīn is one who, with a form different from that of Paramesvra (God), all pervasive and staying in all living beings, and permits Jīva or limited Self without interfering in his actions and inactions and keeps himself neutral.

Vidyāraṇya defines Sākṣīn in different places in his different aspects and offers picturesque illustrations which leave an everlasting impression on the minds of the readers. In Citradipa the sixth chapter of the Pañcadasī, he explains the nature of Sākṣīn as follows:— Sākṣīn, otherwise known as Kūṭastha is he who is Self (Ātman) delimited by both gross and subtle bodies which are constituted by Avidyā or Ignorance and also who remains like an anvil (Kūta) unaffected.³ In the eighth chapter, Kūṭasthadīpa he draws a distinction between Kūṭhstha and Jīva or

1. तत्त्वज्ञानीपि मायास्वलिते सगुणे परमेश्वरे, केवलो निगृण्ण हि विशेषणानुपप्ते: सर्वप्रत्येकं विशुद्धं वह जीवात् भोजन साक्षीति प्रतिपावते ।
   p. 171 — S.L.S. Telugu Character.

2. एको देव: सर्वभृतेऽवृद्ध: सर्वभवापि सर्वभृतान्तराति ।
   कर्मच्यास: सर्वभृताधिबास: साक्षी चेता केवलो निगृण्णः ॥
   S A U. — 6-11

3. बिधिष्ठानया देवहृदयार्मिकेश्वेतन: ।
   कृत्तिविद्विकारेष स्वत: कृत्स्य उच्यते ॥
   P P. 6-22
individual self as follows. Although consciousness (Caitanya) is common in both Jīva and Kūṭastha, he who experiences birth and death is denominated as Jīva, and the other who gets no Vikāra (change) is specified as Kūṭastha or witnessing self.¹ In the twenty-fifth verse of the same chapter he establishes Kūṭastha by quoting verbatim from ancient preceptors, Śaṅkarācārya etc., ‘Antahkarana-tad-vṛtti-sākṣi’.² It is to show the most ancient authority in order to refute the other schools of thinkers who do not accept Sākṣin as other than Jīva. Śaṅkarācārya and other ancient preceptors accepted Sākṣin as a witness of the sentient inner organ (antahkarana) and its modifications (Vṛttis) and also as one personified with pure consciousness (Caitanya Vigrahah) and bliss (ānandarūpāḥ).

Further, in the 10th Chapter, Nāṭakadīpa of Pañcadaśi Vidyāranya describes Sākṣin elaborately in fifteen verses from the ninth to twenty-third. Sākṣin is one who being Cidvapuḥ (consciousness bodied) with a single effort makes Kārū (doer) Kriyā (action) and mutually different Viṣayās smell etc., perceived by Ghrāṇa etc., five sense organs shine.

---

1. हिस्बणीक्षतवैतये ज्ञनानाधामुमूल्यतः: ।
अकूटस्य तदनयतु कूटस्यमविकारः:। ।
Ibid. 8-24

2. अन्तःकरणत्रृतिसाक्षीत्रातिवादनेन्द्रः ।
कूटस्य एव सर्वत्र पूर्वांचायविनिनिष्ठः:।
Ibid. 8-25

भगवतदादवाभूत: ।
अन्तःकरणत्रृतिसाक्षी चैतन्यविग्रहः:।
आनन्दरूपसत्यसौ दृश्य नात्मानं भष्यले।।
Ibid. 8-25
Besides, he tries to explain Sākṣīn by means of an interesting simile of a lamp in a dancing hall. With a single effort, the Sākṣīn illumines the tripūti namely, Draṣṭā (who sees) Darśana (sight) and Drśya (the object of vision).

The lamp in the dancing hall illumines the king; the spectators sitting in the hall and also the dancing lady equally and even when none of them are present, it (the lamp) shines by itself as well. Similarly, Sākṣīn makes Ahamkāra (egoism) Dhī (intellect) and also the objects of the sense organs shine and in the absence of the above egoism etc., shines only by himself. While Sākṣīn, who is self-effulgent shines forth always, Buddha (intellect) being illuminated by Sākṣīn's light, gets changed after the shapes of ghaṭa (pot) paṭa (cloth) etc.

For the easy understanding of the readers the author extends the aforesaid simile of the lamp so much so that the egoism, the objects of the sense organs, the intellect, the sense organs and the lamp

---

1. कतारं च किंयं तद्र्द्वाबृत्विषयानि
स्फोर्येदेकयलेन योद्घी सास्यव चिह्नुः ||
P.D. 10-9

2. ईशे शृणोमि जिज्ञासानि स्वादयामि स्पृशामयहृ
इति भास्यते सवे नृत्यशालास्थः दीपवत् ||
Ibid. 10-10

3. नृत्यशालास्थितो दीपः प्रभु सम्पायं न तत्क्रीमु
दीपेविशेषेण तदभावेवपि दीप्यते ||
Ibid. 10-11

4. अहंकारं भिंयं साक्षी विषयानि भास्यति
अहंकारावभावेवपि स्वयं भास्येव पूवबत् ||
Ibid. 10-12

5. निरन्तरं भास्याने कृतस्ये वशिष्कुलतः
तद्भासा भास्यमायेभु बुद्धिवृत्तक्षयंकाध ||
Ibid. 10-13
are personified as king, spectators dancing lady, orchestra and Sākṣīn respectively. It means that the Sākṣīn causes the egoism etc., to shine, just as the lamp standing in its own place makes all the objects on all sides shine. Even also Sākṣīn without getting himself changed or without being affected makes everything inside and outside shine. This division regarding inside and outside is due to Dehāpeksā (association with the body) and this Dehāpeksā has no place in Sākṣīn. Viṣayās (the objects of the sense organs) are to be seen outside the body and the Ahaṅkāra (egoism) is inside the body. Buddhi (intellect) existing inside the body along with Indriyas (sense organs), goes outside and spreads on the Viṣayās (the objects of sense organs). The unsteadiness of Buddhi is being uselessly imposed upon Sākṣīn. For example, A ray of sunlight entering the house through window, is quite steady; but it seems to be dancing when a man waves his hand in the Sunlight. In

1. अहंकारः प्रभुः सम्प्रत्र विषया नर्तकी मति: ।
   तातादिधारीप्रकरणी दीपः साध्वधारासकः ॥
   *Ibid.* 10-14

2. स्वस्त्वात्सस्त्रवितो दीपः सर्वतो भासवेधणा ।
   सिद्धरस्थायी तथा साधी बहिर्हन्तः प्रकाश्वेतु ॥

3. बहिर्हन्तलवभगास्यं वेद्यपेशो न सामिशिनः
   विषया वाद्यदेशस्या वेद्यान्तरहुक्षितः ॥
   *Ibid.* 10-16

4. अन्तःस्था धीः सहवासो बहिर्हयमति पुनः पुनः ।
   वाद्यसूदित्वारामस्यं सांक्षिण्यारोपण्ये वृषाः ॥
   *Ibid.* 10-17
fact the sunlight never moves. The Sākṣin, who stays only in his own place, and does not go outside or come inside, yet appears as if he is doing so. Why is it so? It is only because of the unsteadiness of the intellect (Buddhi-cāācālya). The two places inside and outside are there only for the intellect to roam about, but Sākṣin never has any place. He is there, ever self-effulgent, even where five organs of sense and action (Jñānendriyas and Karmendriyas) and even intellect cannot have any function. If it is said that the Sākṣin has no particular place then the question will arise as to how can he be said to be Nijasthānasthitā (standing in his own place). The answer is that the conjecture of all places itself is indicative of his being present everywhere (Sarvagata) but this Sarvagatatva is not his own natural characteristic. Whatever place, whether inside or outside, the intellect conjectures (goes) similarly whatever thing it conjectures (contemplates) he (Sākṣin) sees it means becomes witness to it yet he remains
unexplainable and unthinkable (Vāgyuddhyagocara)¹ and this Sākṣin is the real form (Vāstavam rūpam) of the limited self (Jīva)². Sākṣin is consciousness of the limited self (Jīva). It is the witness to whether Jīva creates, preserves and destroys in his dream.³ Consciousness of God (Paramēśvara) is the witness to the creation, preservation and destruction of the world.⁴

Vidyārāṇya concludes this topic by giving a clue to the readers to know the Sākṣin. If you (reader) ask how can it be grasped when it is unexplainable and unthinkable (Avāṁmānasagocara) he says: don't worry! Let it not be grasped! When you realise that everything other than Ātman is false or unreal, then only the pure reality (Ātman) remains.⁵

Jīva and Īśvara

Teachers of Advaita philosophy expounded divergent views about Jīva and Īśvara. The author of Prakāśārtihavivarana namely Prakāśātmayati who is celebrated as Vivaraṇācārya puts forth his definition

1. वर्णपौर्णि कल्पतेत बुद्धाय तत्तत्त्वाकाशयन ।
   वर्ण तत्त्व भवेतु साक्षी स्वतो वाधाभुतगोमिरः।
   Cit. 10-23
2. प्रहाणं कर्तृदेहादि साक्षिस्वरूप वदसि ततः ।
   जीवस्तवं रूपं इत्येवं निर्णयं भवेतु।
   A. P. p. 1-96
3. स्वक्ष्यमूर्तिस्तिथितिलया जेवभित्तेत्यक्षाभिका:।
4. जगक्ष्यमूर्तिस्तिथितिलया बहुरूपेत्यक्षाभिका:।
   Ibid. 1-104
5. कष्ठं तादृक्षमयेऽश्च इति चेन्मेव गृहसमु ।
   परंप्रयोगपर्यायनी स्वमेवाभिशिष्यति।
   A.D. 10-24
of Jiva as follows. Isvara is the consciousness reflected in Mayā which is indefinable, the prime cause of Bhūtās, having no beginning. Jiva is the consciousness reflected in innumerable places associated with two powers (i.e.) Avarāṇa and Vikṣepa (the power of concealment and the power of projection) in the name of Avidyā relating only to that Mayā. Sarvajñātma-Muni, the author of Samkepa Śāntaka, took a different path and defined Jiva and Isvara in the light of a scriptural passage of Sukarahasypoṇiṣad as follows The word Kārya in the passage here means the sentient inner organ (Antahkarana) and the word Kāraṇa means Avidyā. He explains Jiva and Isvara according to the above-quoted scriptural passage thus. The consciousness reflected in the Antahkarana (sentient inner organ) is Jiva and the consciousness reflected in Avidyā is Isvara.

Mayā and Avidyā

Vidyārāṇya thought that it would be inconsistent and inappropriate if the difference between Mayā and Avidyā is not maintained, as done by ancient Ācāryas. He draws a distinction between Mayā and Avidya and shows it in the Tattaviveka

1. अनातिरिक्तत्वतीया भूतपूर्वकार्यलयस्मातसम्भविती मायाः
   तत्स्या चित्त्रतिविष्मै ईश्वरः ।
   S. L. S. (Telugu Character) p. 71

2. तत्स्या एव परिक्रियान्तरस्वेतत्र ज्ञातरंपथेपुरातिरित्स्मतः
   बिविषानीयानेत्रु चित्त्रतिविष्मो जीवः ।
   Ibid. p. 71

3. कार्यान्तरश्रीः कार्योपाधिकरीभ्रः ।
   A. U. C. p. 482 - Published by V. R. & Sons, Madras, 1954
section of his work, *Pancadasa*, as follows¹. The state in which the three qualities viz., *Satya* (serenity), *Rajas* (activity), and *Tamas* (inertia) are equally proportionate is called *Prakṛti*. It is of two kinds, namely, *Māyā* and *Avidyā*. When *Suddhasatva* (pure serenity) is pre-eminent without being dominated by *Rajas* and *Tamas*, it is designated as *Māyā*; and when *Malinasatva* (Impure serenity) is dominated by *Rajas* and *Tamas* it is termed as *Avidyā*.

After defining *Māyā* and *Avidyā*, Vidyaranya defines *Jīva* and *Īśvara* in the same context. The consciousness (*Cit*) being reflected in *Māyā* keeping it (*Māyā*) under its control is called *Īśvara* and is said to be Omniscient (*Sarvajñā*). The *Cit* (consciousness) which is reflected in *Avidyā* being in its (*Avidyā's*) control is designated as *Jīva*. He (*Jīva*) gets innumerable varieties of forms according to the nature of *Avidyā*.²

Even with regard to *Caitanya* or *Cit*, Vidyāranya has his own viewpoint. Many writers of Advaita philosophy accepted the three-fold division or *Trairūḍhyaprakṛtya* of Caitanya, according to the authority of “*Jīva Īśo Viśuddhā *Cit*” etc. The author of *Samkṣepasārīrraka*, viz., Sarvajñātmamunī opined that the pure consciousness is Bimba (Brahman) and the *Jīva* and the *Īśvara* are the reflections of Brahman, in *Avidyā* and *Māyā* respectively.

---

¹ *P.D. 1-15*

² *P.D. 1-16*
But Vidyārānya introduced the four-fold procedure \( \text{Caturvidhāypakrīya} \) based on a citation drawn from the \text{Māṇḍukyopanisād}. In \text{Citradīpa} the sixth chapter of \text{Pancadāsi}, he describes Caitanya consistently and impressively as shown below. He explains Caitanya as of four kinds, Kūṭastha Caitanya, Brahma Caitanya, Jīva Caitanya, and Īśvara Caitanya, by giving the simile of Ākāśa. Although ether is said to be one, it is for the purpose of \text{Vyavahāra} (procedure) described as \text{ghaṭākāsa}, \text{Mahākāsa}, \text{Jalākāsa} and \text{Meghākāsa}. \text{Ghata} means pot. The Ākāśa delimited by \text{ghaṭa} is called \text{ghaṭākāsa}. \text{Mahākāsa} is one which is everywhere and in which the Sun and the Moon and also all the planets (Stars) and even Brahmāṇḍas exist. \text{Jalākāsa} is an Ākāśa which is reflected along with clouds and stars in the water existing in a pot. And \text{Meghākāsa} is an

---

1. जागरितस्थानो बहिष्प्रज: सत्तांग एकोनिन्धितसमुखः स्थूलभुध- 

2. कूटस्यो ब्रह्मजीवाक्तविभें बिच्छुप्तविधाः।

P. D. 6-18
Ākāśa inferred in the form of reflection in the water existing in a multitude of clouds moving in the midst of the Mahākāśa. In fact Ākāśa is one; yet it is divided into four kinds—ghaṭākāśa etc., according to Ṣūkhibheda (kind of limiting adjunct); similarly, Caitanya is also one; yet it is divided into four: Kūṭastha Caitanya otherwise known as Sākṣi-Caitanya, is elaborately dealt with under a separate head. It is compared to ghaṭākāśa. The second one is Brahma-Caitanya. It is pure consciousness, unlimited and unassociated with Māyā or Ignorance. It is compared with Mahākāśa. The third one is Jīvacaitanya. Jīva is limited self as already explained; and the consciousness of limited self (Jīva-caitanya) is compared with Jalākāśa. The last and fourth one is Īśvara-Caitanya the consciousness of God. The concept of Īśvara is already elucidated; and it may be added here that the consciousness of God is compared to Meghākāśa, in this context.

Vidyāranya establishes the above theory of four-fold consciousness or self (Ātman) with the illustration of Citrapāla or painted cloth wherein four stages are seen: (ie) dhauta, (washed) ghaṭśīta (anointed with boiled rice), laṅchita (designed) and raṅjīta (painted) with colours. So also in paramātman or the supreme self the four stages can be seen as Cit, Antaryāmin, Sūtratman and Virāt. The four stages in painted cloth as well as in paramātman be
explains as follows. The first stage dhauta refers to the cloth which is originally pure. This stage is equivalent to that of Cit (pure consciousness). This Cit is also originally pure because of its being not associated with Māyā or Avidyā. The second stage is ghāṭīta or that ‘anointed with boiled rice.’ It is equal to the stage in the self or Antaryāmin associated with Māyā. The third stage is laṅkhaṇita or ‘designed or outlined with pencil or something.’ This stage is similar to that of Śutrātman or Hiranya-garbha identifying itself with the totality of all the subtle bodies. The final stage in Citraṇāsā is raṇjita or that painted with colours. This stage corresponds to that of Virāt identifying itself with the totality of all the gross bodies. ¹ This four-fold consciousness theory of Vidyārāṇya is much more consistent, and appropriate than other theories like ‘three-fold’ or manifold theories of consciousness.

The next important thing that deserves to be explained here is the theory of reflection or prati-bimbavāda. According to the authority of Upanisads and Brahmasūtrās, the ancient commentators on Prasthānātraya, while dealing with Jīva and Īśvara, formulated three theories viz. Ābhāsā Vāda or the theory of semblance, Pratibimbavāda or the theory of reflection and Avacchedavāda or the theory of delimita-

¹ स्वतः भूषोऽत्र छोट: स्यातृ ब्रज्यातोज्विरलेपनात्।
मध्याकारात्वांविज्ञेत: स्यात्रेवितो वर्णपूर्णात्॥

Ibid. 6-3

स्वताभ्यांत्यात्मा तु मायावा स्वसुभव्यः ॥
स्वात्मा स्वप्नमुद्ग्रे विरविर्युक्ते पर:॥

Ibid. 6-4
As the theory of Ābhāsa is not absolutely different from the theory of Pratibimba or reflection, the two theories are considered as one theory. The theory of Avaccheda is brought in by Vācaspatimiśra, the author of Bhāmatī on Brahma Sūtrabāṣya of Śrī Sankarācārya. Vidyrāṇya is a votary of Pratibimba theory or the theory of reflection. He enriched this theory by showing its merit with apt illustrations. He draws this theory into discussion in the Kūṭastha-dīpa chapter of his Pañcadaśī (cf. verses 28-32.)

He first finds fault with the theory of Avaccheda by raising an objection: If Kūṭastha itself, owing to delimitation of Buddhi, becomes Jīva why should not anything, when delimited by the pot, or by the wall or by the like become Jiva or the limited self? If it is said that Buddhi is different from pot etc.,

---

1. "जीवेशाशाभासेन करोति मायाचाविद्या च स्वयं भवति।"

2. श्रुण्यसंगः परिच्छेदमात्रजीवो भवेत्रथि।

---

Verses from 20 to 24
because of its purity and transparency, in respect of quantity (Pariccheda), the purity or the transparency has nothing to do with the prastha (particular measure); and the question will not arise whether it is made out of wood or bronze, as it makes no difference and shows no advantage to a rice-purchaser. Although there is no difference in respect of quantity, reflection (pratibimba) is the distinguishing factor as regards the prastha made out of Bronze which (reflection) cannot be had in the prastha made out of wood.

He further says that there is no difference between Ībhāsa and pratibimba because the suffix A added to the word Bhāsa is in the sense of Īsat or a little. So also the reflection or pratibimba looks like bimba or the object without having the Bimbalakṣaṇa or characteristic of the object.

Although it is not main component of my thesis I touched upon a few salient points only in order to arouse the curiosity or interest in the minds of readers about Vidyāranya's writings or to point the direction of his merit relating to the definitions and illustrations of certain subtle and fundamental concepts of Advaita Philosophy, Just like Śākhā-candramasanyāya (pointing a particular branch of the tree to show the moon).
CHAPTER IX

Taittirīyasamhitābhāṣya (T.B.)

From the evidence of the colophons\(^1\) and introductory verses, Sāyaṇa is known to have written the commentaries on all the voluminous parts of the Vedas: five Samhitā texts, eleven Brāhmaṇa texts and two Āranyaka texts including Upaniṣads. As the colophons and some introductory verses referred to Mādhavācārya-Vidyāraṇya he is also said to be the author of Vedic commentaries, as well as Sāyaṇa.\(^2\) From the evidence of some inscriptions the following fact also deserves to be mentioned here.\(^3\) Great scholars like Nārāyaṇavājapeyayājī, Narahari Somayājī, Pandari Dīkṣita, Nāgābharanā, Vāmana Bhaṭṭa, Aubalādhvari, Narasimhayajvan and others helped and assisted Sāyaṇa and Mādhava in completing the commentaries on Vedic literature; but unlike Yajñanārāyaṇa and Kuṇḍinārya nowhere did they insert their names in the commentaries. As the inscriptions of Harihara II speak, the above sub-commentators, Nārāyanavājapeyayājī and others were duly honoured with titles, viz. promoters of Vedas (Vedārthapraṁvatakas) and richly rewarded by granting of the Agrahārās and were granted honorific privileges for their scholarly assistance.

\(^1\) Iti śrīmadrājādhirāj.... sāvyānacārī virciṣṭe vedārṣe... ... ||

\(^2\) Kṛpalūpādačārīṃ bṛdārṣe vaktumūhyt:....

T.S.B., Intro. Verse 6

Above all, Sāyaṇācārya (the brother of Mādhavācārya) was given the unique position of general commentator and his authorship of the commentaries on all the Vedas was legally approved by King Bukka I and Harihara II, and accepted by Mādhavācārya and the scholars who assisted him. The contemporary celebrated scholars of India also seemed to have recognised Sāyaṇa as the general commentator of the Vedic Texts

Hence Sāyaṇa’s command on Vedas and Vedāngas, Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas is definitely unquestionable. Even the most ancient Mahāvidyā-pīṭha at Benaras where there were scholars (Mahāpaṇḍitas) each renowned as Dvivedi, Trivedi, and Caturvedi, besides with proficiency in all Śāstras, might have bowed down before Sāyaṇācārya and Mādhavācārya of Vijayanagara. As there was none similar to Sāyaṇa, the early kings of Vijayanagara viz. Bukka I and others with the advice of Mādhavācārya and with the support of the learned syndicate of scholars, ordered him to take charge as the Prime Minister under him and also as the general commentator of the Vedas in order to pave the path of Śrauta for the protection of Vedic religion in the land.¹

Then the question arises as to why Bukka I ordered Sāyaṇa to comment on the Vedas. Here it is to be understood that without commentary Veda

¹ इति श्रीमद्राजांगिराज परमेश्वर वैदिकमार्गप्रवर्तक श्रीदीर-बुक्कमूलपालसाराज्यधुरंधरेण सायणाचार्येण विरिते माधवीये वैदार्यप्रकाशे तैत्तिरीयस्त्रहिताभाष्ये प्रथम: काण्डसमाप्त:।
is very difficult to comprehend. In view of this only, Yāska, in the long past, wrote the Nirukta which explained a list of obscure words (Samāmnāya) coming down from tradition. Later on, the help given by Yāska through his Nirukta was not enough to enable the readers to understand the Veda. According to this necessity, several commentators namely Bhavasvāmin, Bhaṭṭabhāskara, Guhadeva, Kṣura, on Taittirīyasamhitā, Mādhavabhaṭṭa, Skandasvāmin, Venkatamādhava, Ānandatīrtha, Ātmānanda and others on Rgveda; Mādhava, Bharatavāmin, Guṇavīṣṇu and others on Sāmaveda, Halāyudha Mahīdhara and others on Śuklayajurveda, wrote their commentaries¹ and helped the readers. But still Atharvaveda was not commented upon and certain Brāhmaṇas also remained uncommented upon. On the other hand, the commented parts also, as they were commented upon by many independent commentators, with their independent interpretations were lacking consistency and coherency among them; and the readers were unable to find definite path. Hence Bukka I ordered Śāyaṇa to bring the meaning to light by way of writing commentaries under his general editorship on all the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas Āranyakās and Upaniṣads to show them a definite path leading to Svarga and Apavarga through karma and its Sannyāsa.

Thus Śāyaṇa begins his first commentary significantly titled Vedārthaprakāśa on Taittirīyasamhitā

otherwise known as *Kṛṣṇayajussamhitā* with a verse *Vāgīśādyā...* etc.,¹ devoted to the salutation of Śrī Gaṇeśa. In the second introductory verse he offers Namaskāra to his Guru namely Śrīvidyāṭīrthamaheśvara, in the third he eulogizes Bukka I, and sets forth the royal order to Mādhavācārya to write commentaries on the Vedās. In the fourth Mādhavācārya's, reply that his brother Sāyana, who knows everything in respect of the Vedās, may be ordered to do so, in the fifth Bnkarājā's command to Sāyana, in the sixth Mādhavācārya's enthusiasm to explain *Vedārtha*, and in the seventh and last he declares that *Mantrārtha* will be explained by means of *Brāhmaṇās* with the authority of *Kalpasūtras*, *J.N.M.* and also Pāṇini's grammar. Sāyana gives a brief introduction explaining the word Veda, its definition the qualified students, the subject, the purpose, the relationship and its authority.

1. वण्णिशाश्चाः सुमनसः सत्विनिधानामप्रक्रमः।
   यं न्यात् क्रतुकत्यास्युतं नामाति गजाननम्।
   यस्य निधिसिद्धं वेदा यो वेदेम्योद्धितं जगत्।
   निम्त्येत् तमं हस्ते विद्वतीथमहेश्वरम्।
   यक्त्यक्षेण ततौपं दध्यबुक्तमहिपति।
   आदिशभाषान्वितं वेदार्थस्य प्रकाशने।
   स प्राहु नृपति राजनू सायणायोममानुजः।
   सर्बं वेद्येष सेवानां व्याक्यातृत्वे नियुव्यताम्।
   इत्युत्को माधवार्यों वीरु क्रमहिपति।
   अन्वशात् सायणाचार्यों वेदार्थस्य प्रकाशने।
   ये पूर्वोत्तरसमांसे ते व्याख्यायातिसंप्रस्थत्।
   क्षपालुमध्वाचार्यों वेदार्थ वक्तुमुखत।
   ब्राह्मण कल्पसूत्रे द्वे मीमांसों व्याक्तित तथा।
   उद्दाहरण तेः सर्वेषन्त्रार्थः स्पष्टमीर्यते।
Sāyaṇa commented on the entire Samhita text of Kṛṣṇayajurveda divided into seven parts or Kāṇḍas containing eight, six, five, seven, seven, six and five chapters or Prapāṭhakās respectively.

This commentary or Bhāṣya by Sāyaṇa on T. S. or K. T. S. together with the text has been published several times in India.¹

Ṛgvedasamhitābhāṣya (R. V. S. B.)

Sāyaṇa composed his commentary or Bhāṣya upon the text of Ṛgvedasamhitā while holding the office of the Prime Minister under Bukka I. This is made evident by the colophons of R. V. S. B.² This commentary also begins with the verse Vāgiśādyā etc. devoted to the salutation of Gaṇapati. In the second introductory verse the author offers salutation to his Guru namely Śrīvidyātīrthamahēśvara as in the beginning of T. S. B. or K T. V. S. B. In the third verse he refers to the King’s command to Mādhavācārya to explain Vedartha. From the fourth verse it is learnt that Mādhavācārya, having commented upon Pūrvamāṁśā and Uttaramāṁśā, briefly, turned to comment upon Rksamhitā, or Ṛgvedasamhitā. Here it must be noticed that Mādhavācārya received the King’s command and simply followed it, but as in the fourth introductory verse of T. S. B. or K T. V. S. B. he did not advise the King to

---


² इति श्रीमद्माजाधिराज परमेश्वर वैदिकमार्गप्रवर्तक वीर्यो बुकेपूर्णसाधारणश्रुध्रं धर्मसाधारणं विरचितं ऋषिवेद-सह्यादियेऽप्रमास्तकेवस्तरोत्स्माय: समाप्तः।
employ his brother, Śāyaṇācārya for the same. Nevertheless Śāyaṇa's name is referred to as the author in the colophons. It might be for this reason that readers should know the commentator is not only Śāyaṇa but also Mādhava. Although Śāyaṇa was a general commentator he must have consulted Mādhava at every stage in the commentary. Both Śāyaṇācārya and Mādhava were the most illustrious and ideal brothers and they had great regard towards each other and also there was very little difference either in their ideological aspect or in their scholastic aspect but there could be some difference only in respect of their ages and some Yogic powers. There is an edition of Śāyaṇa's commentary published in Telugu Characters in the second half of the last century which speaks of Śāyaṇa-Mādhava as the commentators. (Śāyaṇa-Mādhava Bhāṣyasaḥitā.)

In the fifth introductory verse the author gives the reason as to why Yajurveda was commented upon first, instead of Rgveda which is the most ancient and is considered by tradition as the first Veda. As the role of the Advaryu is most important in every sacrifice, Yajurveda was taken up first for writing commentary upon. According to the seventh introductory verse of the commentary on Sāmaveda, the role of Hotṛ priest is next in importance and hence the second importance is given to Rgveda. In the sixth and last introductory verse the author says that if one chapter or Adhyāya of the commentary

1. निर्मितिस्ते किया स्पौल्नार्थायुर्यूष यज्ञियः वपुः।
   तदनुक्रिये होता ब्रह्मदृष्टतेत्यमी वयः॥
is learnt from the traditional scholars then the whole commentary can be understood and there would be no difficulty for the readers to face in course of Adhyayana.

Sāyana writes an elaborate introduction to Rgveda and therein he discusses various indispensable problems of which two occupy the pride of place; how Jaimini restored the Prāmāṇya for Mantras and also for Arthavādas through a lengthy discussion.

The Samhitā text of Rgveda has been divided in two ways: (1) into eight Aṣṭakas (2) into ten Maṇḍalās. Each Aṣṭaka is a collection of eight subsections or Adhyāyas and each Adhyāya is again divided into eight Vargās. According to the division of Maṇḍala, each Maṇḍala is divided into Anuvākas and each Anuvāka consists of its own number of Sūktas or Hymns. The total number of Hymns of Rgveda, as Sāyana recorded at the outset of his actual commentary, is a little more than one thousand, the number of Rks is a little more than ten thousand, the number of Anuvākas is eighty-five, the number of Adhyāyas is sixty-four and the number of Vargās is a little more than two thousand Sāyana commented on all the Hymns of Rksāṃhitā after commenting on its Brāhmaṇa and Āranyaka namely Aiḷareyabrāhmaṇa and Aiḷerayārāṇyaka.

It has been published several times in India and abroad. It is F. Max Muller who for the first time

1. एवत्तिस्मि प्रथमोऽध्यायः ब्रोतवः संप्रदायत् ।
व्युत्प्रत्सावता सर्व बोद्धु शक्नोति बुद्द्मान् ॥
edited and brought to light Ṛgveda-Samhitā together with Sāyaṇabhāṣya and Anukramani in seven volumes, through Oxford University Press, London 1849-74 (A.D.). This first and famous edition stirred Indian scholars to promote their studies in the field of Vedic research.

Sāmavedasamhitābhāṣya (S.V.S.B)

Sāyaṇa having completed his commentary on Ṛgveda turns to comment on Sāmaveda as it is the next in importance to Ṛgveda. Sāmasamhitā is said to be the text of Udgātṛ priest who, in every sacrifice, is given a place next to Hotṛ priest. Sāyaṇa’s authorship of the commentary on Sāmaveda is evidently known from the colophons and introductory verses. The author begins his commentary with the famous verse Vāgīśādyā etc., to salute Gaṇapati; and with the same verse as in the introductions of the previous commentaries, he offers salutation to his Guru, Śrīvidyātīrthamahēśvara. Then Sāyaṇa eulogizes Bukka I and is prepared to explain Vedārtha by his direct command. Here it must be noticed that Mādhavācārya’s name hereafter does not appear in the introductory verses of Vedic commentaries. Perhaps Bukka I due to some difference of opinion with Mādhavācārya might have ordered Sāyaṇa not to mention his name. Further Sāyaṇa states that as Sāmans are dependent upon the Rks, Sāmasamhitā has to be commented on immediately after commenting on Ṛgvedasamhitā. Except Seventy-five Sāmans, the entire text of Sāmasamhitā has been directly taken from Ṛgvedasamhitā.

In the ninth introductory verse the author explains the following fact; if there is any mistake com-
mitted by the three priests namely Adhvaryu, Hotṛ and Udgātṛ, Brahmā rectifies it and protects the sacrifice or Yajña from Vaigunya or defect which prevents the manifestation of Apūrva. The commentator further describes in the thirteenth verse of the introduction, that Yajus is the body of Yajña or sacrifice. Ṛks are regarded as the ornaments and Sāmans are said to be pearls and diamonds studded in the above said ornaments. The comparison with diamonds and pearls shows that Sāmans have to beautify the Ṛks as diamonds and pearls beautify the golden ornaments. Hence, Sāmans form part of Ṛṣveda as pearls and diamonds form part of ornaments.

Sāyana adds a long introduction to his commentary on Sāmaveda which occupies a place next to that of his commentary on Ṛṣveda. In this introduction or Bhūmikā he deals with a large number of important points, like the nature of the Mantra, Bnāhmanā Stobha, and how, according to Kumārilabhaṭṭa, Mantras must be chanted with their meaning kept in mind.

S V. S. has got its varied divisions according to the tradition to which a particular commentator belongs. According to Sāyana the S V. S. is divided into five Adhyāyas. The first four contain twelve Khāṇdās each. Khanda means a Daśati. The last Adhyāya is divided into eleven Khāndas. The first Adhyāya is named as Āgneyaparvan and, the next three Adhyāyas form Aindraparvan and the fifth and last Adhyāya constitute the Pavamānaparvan.

1. यजुर्जाते यज्ञदेहे स्याद्विधवस्तिद्विधूषणम् ।
   सामाख्या मणिमुकावा। सन्तु नासु समाधिता ॥
The commentary together with the Samasamhitā text has been published several times in India.  

Śuklayajurvedasamhitabhāṣya (S.V.V S.B.)

After completing the commentary on S. V. S., Śāyaṇa turned to comment upon Kāṇvasamhitā or the S Y.V.S. According to the colophons he composed this commentary while he was Prime Minister under Bukka I. Śāyaṇa begins this commentary usually with the same couple of verses, Vāgīśādyā etc., devoted to the propitiation of Gaṇeśa and his Guru Śrī Vidyātīrthamaheśvara customarily. Śāyaṇa mentions his patron and states that he had already explained Vedārtha, according to the second half of the fourth introductory verse (Vedārtham Vyākarot Khalu), but not as in the case of the previous commentaries, that he is about to comment (Vedārtham Vaktumudyatāh). Perhaps, having completed his commentaries on Trayī or a collection of Three Samhitā Texts, Rgveda, Krṣṇayajurveda, and Sāmaveda along with their Brāhmaṇās and Āranyakās, he felt happy and said that he had explained Vedārtha. It does not mean that he commented on all the Vedas actually. He knows that he has to comment upon two more Samhitā texts apart from their respective Brāhmaṇās and Āranyakas, viz. Śuklayajurveda and Atharvaveda.

From the fifth to the thirteenth introductory verses Śāyaṇa narrates an interesting story regarding

both the *Yajurvedas, Sukla* and *Kṛṣṇa.* The disciple of Vaiśampāyana namely Yājñavalkya studied Veda-vidyā. Being asked by his Guru Vaiśampāyana, who became angry for some unknown reason to return the Veda studied from him, Yājñavalkya, from fear of his Guru having given a shape to it by *Yogasakti,* vomited the same. Vaiśampāyana asked the other disciples to have it. Inspite of unwillingness, they became Tittiri birds and ate it. As it was vomited bit by bit by Yājñavalkya, it lost its previous sequence or *Ānupūrṇī.* Consequently, it happened to be unsystematic ie., somewhere *Ādhvaryava* and somewhere *Hau-
trā. Besides, it has become Black (Krṣṇa) owing to uncleanness (Mālinya) both in the mind of Yājñavalkya who vomited it and also in the minds of the disciples of Vaiśampāyana who ate it. Afterwards, Yājñavalkya having propitiated the Sun God, learned a systematic Yajurvedasamhitā. Hence, it is called Suklayajurveda.

Śāyāna further says that this story relating to mythology or Purāṇas, is narrated by the Ācāryas from their memory. He also states that he himself heard the story from Vamsabrāhmaṇa belonging to Kāṇvavedasamhitā that Yājñavalkya obtained the entire text of the white Yajussamhitā from the God namely Āditya.

Śāyāna, in the introduction to his commentary on white Yajurveda, discusses several important factors like the division of the subject of Veda and specific definitions of three-fold Mantras: Rks, etc.

Kāṇvavedasamhitā or Suklayajurveda has been divided into forty chapters or Adhyāyas. All of them are commented upon by Śāyāna while he was holding the Prime Ministership under Bukka I.

Śāyānācārya’s commentary on this Suklayussamhitā Text has been published several times at several places in India.¹

Atharvavedasamhitābhasya (A.V.S.B.)

After completing his commentaries on the four Samhitā Texts, Śāyāna takes up the fifth and last Samhitā text, namely Atharvaveda. By that time Bukka I; under whose patronage Śāyāna was able

to complete the commentaries on the most important Vedic texts, four in number, left this world and his son Harihara II succeeded him and also continued his patronage to Sāyana. The Commentary on the text of Atharvavedasamhitā was composed by Sāyana while he was Prime Minister under Harihara II. This point is made evident by the introductory verses and colophons. The author begins his commentary on A.V.S. with the same symbolic couple of verses, Vāgīśādyā etc., devoted to the adoration of God Gaṇapati and Guru Vidyātīrthamahēśvara. Here in the third introductory verse a peculiarity deserves to be noted. Sāyana, for the first time, prays to Vidyārāṇya to accept his adoration. Here it must be known that by that time Mādhavācārya became Vidyārāṇya.

Then he eulogizes the son of Bukka I, namely Harihara II, the new king and his patron as ‘Dharma-brahmādhyānya’ etc., and mentions his command to comment upon A. V. S. In the tenth and last introductory verse’, Sāyana explains the importance and greatness of the A. V. S. The Trayī which is al-

1. विजितरातिव्रतातो बीरश्रीहृदिर्हयमानीभ्रिष: ||
धर्मश्रीहृतवय: कल्य स्वच्छिरतेन कुतुंग कुर्ले ||
तत्त्वमूलमूत्तलोच्च वेदाध्वर्गाभिमभवम् ||
आदिशत्सायणाचायं तद्धर्वस्य प्रकाशने ||

2. श्रीविशाभानुसंस्कृतो विधारणांमहं भजे ||
यद्कर्तरस्वमानमत्यं प्रीतिकारणम् ||

3. धर्मश्रीहृतवय: . . . . . . . श्रीमान् हृदिर्हयव: ||
. . . . . . . . आदिशत्सायणाचायं तद्धर्वस्य प्रकाशने ||

4. व्याक्याय वेदतितयं आमृतभिमक्रल्प्रम् ||
एहिकामृतभिमक्रलं चतुरं व्याक्षीष्ठितम् ||
ready commented upon, yields fruit after death, (Āmuṣmikaphala) but A. V. S. gives result both in this birth (Aihika) and after death (Āmuṣmika). Hence, it should be stated that the A. V. S. is not only as important as but also more important than the other vedās. Although all the acts (Kriyas) regarding the sacrifices can be performed by the three vedas viz., Rgveda, Yajurveda and Sāmaveda Brahmā cannot dispense with Atharvaveda. He must be wellversed in the A. V. S. also as well as in the other four vedas. Hence Sāyaṇa says that he has inclination to comment upon the A. V. S. Here in this context he uses the word Vyācikīrsati, which means that he desires to comment. It is different from the word of the same context in the previous commentaries on the Samhitā texts, Vyākarutumudiyataḥ which means that he is prepared to comment. Consequently, he left out some chapters uncommented upon.

Sāyaṇa adds a long introduction or Bhumikā equivalent to the two introductions to his commentaries on both the Yajurvedas wherein he discusses the most important topics, namely the greatness of the A. V. S., and observances regarding coronation or Pattābhiṣeka, etc.

The A.V.S is divided into twenty Kāṇḍas, each Kāṇḍa being subdivided into Anuvākas. Sāyaṇa commented upon all the chapters or the Kāṇḍas except eight i.e 5, 9, 10 and from 12th to 16th Kāṇḍas. But the commentary on the 20th Kāṇḍa also ends from the fifth Anuvāka abruptly. There is no evidence to show that Sāyaṇa commented upon these parts or left them uncommented, except the word Vyācikīrsati which suggests here only his desire, but not his vigorous attempt, perhaps his death might be the reason for its remaining incomplete.

This commentary has been published, together with the text A.V.S. several times in India.¹

¹ Nirmayasagar Press, Bombay, 1895.
CHAPTER X

Commentaries on Brāhmaṇas and Aranyakas

Among the commentaries on Brāhmaṇa literature, Śāyaṇa commented on Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, including its Aranyaka first. The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa is divided into three Aṣṭakās and these are subdivided into Praśnās and they are further divided into Anuvākas. The Aranyaka is divided into ten Prapāthakas; again they are divided into Anuvākas. Śāyaṇa's next commentary is on the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and its Aranyakas. The first is divided into eight Pañcikas, they are again divided into Adhyāyas and Adhyāyas are further divided into Kāṇḍas. Aitareyāranyakas are five in number and each is divided into Adhyāyas and the Adhyāyas are further divided into Kāṇḍas.

Śāyaṇa's commentary on the above Brāhmaṇas and Aranyakas begins with the symbolic verses Vāgī-śādya etc., with which the commentaries on Samhitā texts are beginning. Śāyaṇa shows adoration to his Guru Śrīvidyātīrthamaheśvara. The colophons of all the above commentaries speak of Śāyaṇa's authorship.

The Brahmaṇas belonging to Śāmaveda number eight, namely Tāṇḍya or Praudha, Śadvimśa, Śaṁavidhāna, Ārseya, Devatadhyāya, Upanisad, Samhitopanisad and Vamśa. 1 Tāṇḍyamahābrahmaṇa is divided into

1. अष्टो हि ब्राह्मणप्रन्व: प्रौढः ब्राह्मणमादिमम् ।
पद्विशाख्य द्वितीय स्यात्तः सामविधिर्भवेत् ॥
आर्षेयं देवताध्यायो भवेदुपनिषतः ।
संहितोपनिषतं ध्रुव्यावष्टाबुद्धिरितः: ॥
twenty-five chapters and each chapter contains its own number of *Khaṇḍas*. *Ṣadvimśabrāhmaṇa* is divided into six *Adhyāyas* and the *Adhyāyas* are divided into an irregular number of *Khaṇḍas*. The third *Brāhmaṇa* of *Sāmaveda* is *Sāmavidhāna*. It is divided into three *Prapāthakas* and these are subdivided into *Khaṇḍas*. The fourth *Brāhmaṇa* of *Sāmaveda* is *Ārṣeya*. It is divided into six *Adhyāyas* and each *Adhyāya* is divided into *Parvans* and the *Parvans* are subdivided into *Khaṇḍas*. The fifth one is *Devatādhyāyabrāhmaṇa*. It is divided into four *Khaṇḍas*. The sixth *Brāhmaṇa* of *Sāmaveda* is *Upaniṣadbrāhmaṇa* or *Chāndogyabrāhmaṇa*. It is divided into two *Prapāthakas* and these are subdivided into *Khaṇḍas*. The seventh *Brāhmaṇa* is *Samhitopaniṣad* and it is divided into five *Khaṇḍas*. The eighth and last *Brāhmaṇa* of *Sāmaveda* is *Vamsabrāhmaṇa*. It is divided into three *Khaṇḍas*. All the *Brāhmaṇaṇas* mentioned above were commented upon by *Śāyaṇa* while he was the Prime Minister under *Bukka I*.

*Ṣatapathabrāhmaṇa* belongs to White *Yajurveda*. It contains fourteen *Kaṇḍas*, a hundred *Adhyāyas*, sixty-eight *Prapāthakas*, four hundred and thirty-eight *Brāhmaṇas*, and seven thousand six hundred and twenty-eight *Kaṇḍikas*. *Śāyaṇācārya*, commented upon this stupendous *Brāhmaṇa* while he was holding the office of the Prime Minister under *Harihara II*.

Dr. Bellikoth Ramachandrasarma, Director, Kendriya Samkrita Vidyapitha, Tirupati and the editor of almost all the *Brāhmaṇaṇas* of *Sāmaveda*, writes—“whatever may be the so-called tradition and opinion of scholars today, the very title of these *Brāhmaṇaṇas*
and the topics dealt with therein support my contention. Pañcavimśa, Śadvimśa, Devatādhīyā, Mantra, Ārṣeya, and Samhitopaniṣad are indeed very strange titles for independent and distinct works. They only speak of the books or chapters of a common work just as Sabhā, Drona, Karṇa, etc. speak of the Parvans or different books of a greater work, i.e. Mahābhārata. We, therefore, feel that all these eight Brāhmaṇas were once regarded as eight chapters of the main Brāhmaṇa which was known as Mahābrāhmaṇa. Besides the above, the editor sets forth his view: ‘But our inference is that the commentary on the minor Brāhmaṇas of the Śāmaveda was not by Śāyāna’.

As the editor himself admits, his view is not the orthodox one. On the contrary, it is well-known that Śāyāna’s view is purely orthodox and is backed up by a large syndicate of traditional scholars, who are described as ‘Caturvedaprayaktārah’ in the grants offered to them by the early kings of Vijayanagara, for their scholarly assistance to Śāyāna in commenting on Vedic literature. Śāyāna quotes a large number of authorities from Śadāngas, Purāṇas, Upapurāṇas and also the previous commentaries to support his view or stand in the course of various critical arguments. Nearly twelve hundred years ago, Kumārilabhaṭṭa, the author of Tantravārtika referred to the same eight-fold division of the Brāhmaṇas of Śāmaveda.

1. Introduction to Ārṣebrāhmaṇa, PP. 10, 11, 13.
2. Introduction to Samhitopaniṣadbrāhmaṇa, P. 29.
3. ब्राह्मणाणि हि तारायणी सरह्दस्यस्यचायते।
   छठदेशास्त्रेषु सर्वेशु न कष्ट्विन्यतस्वरः।
Tantravartika, 1. 3. 12 (Anandasrama Poona, 1929).
Chapter X

The eight-fold division of Sāmabrāhmaṇa is not strange as put by Dr. Ramachandrasarma. This kind of division appears to be in Aitareyāranyaka also. Aitareyāranyakas are enumerated and commented upon by Śāyana as five separate books or works, with separate introductions,¹ which begin with the verse Vāgīśādyā etc and with fully descriptive colophons (not small ones appearing at the end of subsections) Śrīmadrajaṭdhirāja etc. Can these also be considered as subsections of one major work? Nay: Vedas are divided as four by Bādarāyana. According to Vīyu-Purāṇa, at first, all the Vedas were only one and there was not even the thought of names like Rgveda but there was only one name ie. ‘Tajus’ for the entire abundant stock of Vedic literature.² It is Vyāsa who divided it into four Vedas with the names Rgveda Yajurveda, Sāmaveda and Atharvaveda. And again he divided Yajurveda into two Śuklayajurveda and Krṣnaayajurveda and attached them to different Pratiṣākhyaś and Śrautasūtras. Is it possible to amalgamate at least these two Yajurvedas, which are almost under one name, into one major work called Mahā Yajurveda in two sections?

Besides, why did Vyāsa divide Rgveda in two ways according to Maṇḍala and Aṣṭaka? One way of division is enough and the other way of division is not at all necessary. Is it possible to abolish either of the two divisions, to avoid confusion and help the readers?

¹ Introduction to Aitareyāranyakabhāṣya.
² Introduction to Satapathabrāhmaṇa, Part I. P. 8
P. D. Gune, in his article ‘Sāyaṇa’s Commentary Its Composition’ explains the purpose of the Āṣṭaka division as follows: “It came easy to Sāyaṇa to entrust or distribute work among the scholars to comment on the Āṣṭaka basis.” If it is only for merely entrusting portions to the scholars to comment on unit basis, certain number of Hymns or Rks could have been considered as a unit and given to the scholars more accurately.

Here the traditional view is that the Āṣṭaka division is intended only for the purpose of getting by heart or Adhyayana while Maṇḍala division is a hereditary one indicating the Rṣis namely Grītsamada, Viśvāmitra, Vāmadeva, Atri, Bharadvāja, Vaśiṣṭha and others.

Hence, the division of the Brāhmaṇas of Śāmaveda into eight and Veda samhitas into five need not be questioned.

Although Sāyaṇa is reputed to be the author of many works, only his ocean-like commentaries on Vedic literature, which is said to be the primary source of Indian culture and civilization, perpetually stand to his immortal eredit. The object of the Vijayanagara empire or rather Hindu kingdom was successfully achieved. Although the material empire of Vijayanagara had gone and its pomp remained in ruins at Humpi owing to the Islamic onslaughts, the spiritual kingdom of Vijayanagara stands enternal and immovable as the earth.

APPENDIX

Etymology of the name ‘Sayana’

There are mainly two reasons for the scholars to write about the etymology of the name ‘Sāyaṇa’. The first is that Sāyaṇa was a great commentator on Vedic Literature. In fact, there are a number of commentators like Skandāsvāmin, Uvvata, Mahīdhara, and others, but none of them had commented upon the entire Vedic Literature which is said to be the primary source of our Indian Culture and civilization. It is Sāyaṇa alone, who got the credit of providing each of the stupendous Samhita texts, five in number, and their related Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas and Upanisads with a citadel like commentary. Besides, he is accredited to be the author of many valuable works. The other reason is that his name Sāyaṇa which has a peculiar ending with ‘Ana’, occurs very rarely among the Sanskrit writers. The names ending with Anna or Ana are common in Telugu desa and Kannada desa. The terms Telugu and Kannada have there Sanskrit names Āndhra and Karnāṭa respectively. They denote desa and language. The people who live in Āndhra desa and who speak the Āndhra language as their mother tongue are called Āndhras. Similarly, those who live in Karnāṭa and speak the Karnāṭa language as their mother tongue Karnāṭakas. Since Sāyaṇa was a very great personage, some scholars for prestige seemed to be inclined to state that he belongs to their own state even in the absence of evidence for it.

As a matter of fact, there is nothing obscure with reference to the origin of Sāyaṇa because a number of scholars belonging to 19th and 20th Centuries, bas-
ing on inscriptional and literary evidence, wrote that Sāyāna was an Āndhra Brahmin; for example, in the year 1873 Burnell, in his preface to Vamśa Brāhmaṇa had explicitly stated that Sāyāna is a Telugu Brahmin. Thus his verbatim report regarding Sāyāna’s origin runs: Sāyāna was probably an only surviving child. In the east, the superstition of the evil eye and of malignat spirits is universal and its effects are to be noticed in the minutest details of life. If parents, in South India, repeatedly lose children in their infancy, they give the next child born to them a name to propitiate the evil influences that have (they think) destroyed the others, and Sāyāna is one of the names used by the Telugus. In the year 1900 V. Venkata Śivāvadhāni, in his Śrī Vidyārānya Carita, undoubtedly stated that Sāyāna is an Āndhra Brahmin. In 1925 Prof. Baladeva Upadhyaya of Hindu University, Benaras, in his ‘Ācārya Sāyān ou Mādhav’ (a Hindi work) gave a quotation from the works of Sāyāna as Sāyāna himself asserted about his origin as ‘Asmākamāndhrāṇām’ which means to us Āndhrs. While I was writing the historical background of this book, I tried, through a letter addressed to the author of the above work, whether he would be able to enable me to trace the primary source of the quotation out of the vast ocean-like literature of Sāyāna. But he replied with regrets in a letter dated 5-9-1971.

1. Baladeva Upadhyaya, Praptavakasa Samchalahaka, Anu-
sandhana Samsthana, Varanaseya Samskrita-Vidyalaya
—Vidya Vilas, Ravindrapuri, Durgakunda, Varanasi-5
Sri Kripacharyulu,

I am externally delighted to receive your letter and appreciate your honest inquiry. But I regret I cannot fulfill your wish. At this distance of time I do not recollect the proper
In the year 1972 an inscription dated 1376 unearthed while ploughing near a village called Brahmanakraka, 10 Miles from Kavali in Nellore District and deciphered by Dr. N. Ramesan, speaks that Sāyana is one of the Āndhra Brahmin donees of the grant of the village from the hands of the king Harihara II on the occasion of his father Bukkaraya’s funeral ceremony. Moreover, a large number of scholarly writers like Vincent A. Smith, Dr. N. Venkata Ramanayya accessvly searched and decided that Sāyana was an Āndhra and it was accepted by many scholors some of whom are Prof. M. Rama Rao and Prof. G.S. Diksit, Dr. J. Duncan M. Derrett.

Although a lot of information about the origin of Sāyana as an Andhra is available, yet some writers without considering it tried to explain the word Sāyana etymologically as a Kannada one. For instance, in the year 1971 Mayrhofer Manfred published an enquiry into the etymology of the name Sāyana and summarized the whole thing in the Sanskrit etymological dictionary in 1972. Further in an international exchange of letters he had called on the knowledge of Dravidiana of a number of scholars, including especially Dr Bh. Krishnamurthy, Zwelebil and Emeneau.' They came to the conclusion that this so-called Sanskrit name of very rare type is really an example of a common Dravidian type of formation ending in a respectful, endearing kinship term, that

source of the quotation given in the book. If ever I am able to trace the quotation, I will write to you.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-BALADEVA UPADHYAYA.

the phonology of the name looks to Kannada origin rather than Telugu. But as they themselves asserted the first element of the name Sāyaṇa had not yet been identified.

Prof. Bh Krishnamurthy of Osmania University suggested two Sanskrit words for the first element of the name Sāyaṇa as ‘Sahāya’ or ‘Chāya’ neither of which seems to be paralleled or convincing.

Prof. Zwelebil of Madras University put forth ‘Say’ beauty or ‘Say’ to die. But scholars are not prepared to accept it as they have possibility in being female names.

Prof. Kusalappa Gouda of Annamalai University suggests and prof. Emeneau of California University agrees that the first element is a derivative of Sanskrit ‘Swāmi’ and its tadbhavas given in Kittel’s dictionary 1894 as Sāyi or Sovi etc. which is not accepted by scholars due to its lacking in historicity and origin.

But none of the scholars tried to derive the word Sāyaṇa from Telugu though his Telugu origin is definitely known from the writings of many authors.

When Sāyaṇa’s origin is definitely known as Telugu, then what should be the propriety in trying to derive his name from other languages like Kannada? Truth must be preserved and recorded. So, it is proper to derive the word Sāyaṇa from Telugu. The way in which I showed the Telugu etymology of the word Sāyaṇa in the context of the nativity at the out set of the introduction and therefore it need not be repeated here. Sanskritic etymology of the name Sāyaṇa is also shown in the same context as it is not done by any scholar so far.
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