

KANCHI KAMAKOTI MATH A MYTH

Edited by
Varanasi Raj Gopal Sharma
Varanasi-1 (U.P.)



“शम्भोर्मूर्तिश्चरति भुवने शंकराचार्यरूपा”

Publishers:
Ganga-Tunga Prakashan
50 & 51 Hanuman Ghat
Varanasi - 1 (U.P.)
(221 001)

KANCHI KAMAKOTI MATH A MYTH

CONTENTS

Editor's Note	
1. Introduction	1
2. Date of Shri Shankara	25
3. Birth Place of Sri Shankara	31
4. Mathamnaya	33
5. Sarvagnya Peetha	44
6. Place of Disappearance	47
7. Kumbakonam - Kanchi Kamakoti Mutt (Lineage & Gururatnamala)	51
8. Sri Vidyateertha, Sri Bharati Krishna Teertha Sri Vidyanaya & three Madhavas	56
9. Copper Plates of Kanchi Kamakoti Mutt	59
10. Kanchi Kamakoti Mutt Buildings at Kanchi	72
11. Kamakshi Temple & Kanchi Kamakoti Mutt	74
12. Removal of Idols of three temples in Kanchi	79
13. Shifting of Kanchi Kamakoti Mutt headquarters from Kanchi to Kumbakonam via Tanjore	82
14. Sri Sureshwara & Sri Viswarupa	83
15. Story of Five Lingas from Kailasa	86
16. Sri Gaudapadacharya & Sri Govindapadacharya	88
17. Kanchi Kamakoti Mutt authorities (so called) — Puranic and Later Literature	88
18. The Tatanka Pratishtha - Akhilandeshwari Devi 1844 A.D.	97
19. Rebuttal & Denial letters	101
20. 'The curious case of the missing monk'	116

EDITOR'S NOTE

On the dawn of 23.8.1987, Sri. Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal (Head of Kanchi Kamakoti math) suddenly disappeared. He reappeared after a week. The media gave a wide publicity to this episode. Sri Swamigal left the math, without the knowledge of anyone, not even his guru or his sishya, at dead of night. His sacred Danda and Kamandalu were found abandoned in the Kanchi Math. That he deserted the place during the Chaturmasya period and went on a tour, after taking the oath during Vyasa Puja is significant. This unshastric action invited comments from the Jagadguru Sankaracharyas of Dwaraka and Puri- Amnaya Maths. When questioned by the Press and public on this, the Paramacharya of the Kanchi Mutt evaded the issue. He played it down later by saying "*after all, he had gone there only for some deep and peaceful meditation.*" In fact, he threatened to walk the distance from Kanchi to Talacauvery, if Sri. Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal did not return. The unshastric action is made to look insignificant by the ingenuity of the Paramacharya. Marvellous indeed! The worst crisis in the annals of the Kanchi Kamakoti Math stands defused.

The Paramacharya of Kanchi Math met the press, and in the 'Hindu' dated 10.9.1987, is reported as having said, "*It has created an opportunity for us to clarify that the Kanchi Math is the 'Moola Math' (original).*" The inspiration (or provocation?) to write this booklet is got from this statement.

'Satyameva Jayatey' say our scriptures. It is adopted in our National Emblem too. To what extent there is 'satya' or truth behind the Paramacharya's statement is critically examined in his booklet. The issue before us is that whether Sankara established at all an Amnaya Math at Kanchi or not. The issue is sidetracked by the Kanchi Math by bringing in extraneous and irrelevant facts before the public. As the Amnaya Maths stand for the four Vedas and its Mahavakyas, there cannot be a fifth Amnaya Math, unless there existed a fifth Veda and its Jpadeshtavya Mahavakya.

It is during the past couple of centuries, a relentless propaganda has been unleashed by the Kanchi Math to carve

out a place for itself among the Maths established by Adi Sankara. Among the Amnaya Maths established by the great preceptor, Sri. Adi Sankara, Kanchi finds no place. How then could a claim be made for acceptance of the Amnaya Math by people? A story is concocted that Adi Sankara established 4 Maths at Sringeri, Puri, Dwaraka and Badri for his 4 sishyas, and founded a Math at Kanchi for himself, which, therefore is the supreme institution of Sankara. Gullible people succumbed to this wily propoganda and the Math has come to be venerated as such. The purpose of this book is to examine as to what extent there is the truth in this. Readers may please go through the various facts based on historical and government records, scriptures and opinions reported in the various media given herein, and infer for themselves the truth behind the claims of Kanchi Math.

Finally, I would be failing in my duties, if I do not express my gratitude to the numerous persons who contributed their mite financially and otherwise in bringing out this publication.

V. RAJ GOPAL SHARMA
VARANASI-1

Camp: BANGALORE

“KANCHI KAMAKOTI MATH”

A MYTH

1. INTRODUCTION

The Chikkudayar Swamigal (Refer Judgement dated 12.8.1935, Subordinate Judge, Chingleput, — (The judge quotes Wallis & Ayling J.J. as having used the same designation — meaning Junior or subordinate head);

- alias Kumbakonam Mathadhipathi (as generally recognised and known);
- alias Kanchi Kamakoti Peethadhipati (after being appointed in 1842 as Trustee of Kamakshi Temple on performing Kumbabhishhekam of Kamakshi for the first time in 1839);
- alias Kanchi Sharada Math Adhipathi (Refer Madras G.O. 1260 of 25.8.1915);

with the avowed object of enhancing the prestige of the Math by laying claims to direct spiritual descent from Sri Adi Shankara himself (since there is no place for him among the four Amnaya Maths established by Sri Adi Sankara at Puri, Sringeri, Dwaraka and Badrikashram as per Mathamnaya Paddhati and assigned to four principal sishyas of Sri Adi Sankara), wants it to be believed that:

- 1) Sri Adi Sankara founded and presided over a Fifth Math at Kanchi in 508 or 486 or 472 B.C. or so;
- 2) That his Math is the Moola or Central or Chief Head Math having control over all other Maths;
- 3) That the accepted four Amnaya Maths for 4 Vedas and its four Upadeshtavya (initiation in secrecy by Sadguru Parampara) Mahavakyas and four Sampradayas at the four visible directions of Bharata are all his Sishya Maths;
- 4) That his Math's Adhipathi (Head) alone is entitled to be honoured as Jagadguru while the Heads of the four Amnaya Maths are only Gurus;
- 5) That the boyhood friend and constant companion of Sri Adi Sankara, Sri Chitsukhacharya, had compiled

Mathamnaya Padhathi under Sri Adi Sankara's instructions for Kamakoti Peetha;

- 6) That the Math at Kumbakonam (Rock edict there mentions 1821 A.D) is a continuation of that Kanchi Math;
- 7) That Sri Adi Sankara established and ascended the Sarvagnya Peetha at Kanchi;
- 8) That Sri Adi Sankara attained Nirvana at Kanchi;
- 9) That Sringeri Math is subject to the supervision of the Kumbakonam Math;
- 10) That Sri Sureswaracharya was never in the Sringeri Math lineage and further he was not a Paramahansa Sanyasi at all;
- 11) That Sri Viswarupacharya who was appointed to the Sringeri Math was an incarnation of God Yama and if it was Sri Prithvidhavacharya, he was an incarnation of Mrityu;
- 12) That the Sringeri Math had been extinct for a long time and it was Sri Vidyatirtha of Kanchi who sent Sri Vidyaranya to revive the Math;
- 13) That Sri Vidyatheertha was in the guruparampara of the Kanchi Math;
- 14) That Sri Vidyaranya never presided over the Sringeri math and he was not a Paramahansa Sanyasi and further he was a Sishya of Kanchi Math;
- 15) That Sankara Digvijaya by Madhavacharya (popularly known as Madhaviya Sankara Vijaya) is a modern publication written by the propagandist of Sri Sringeri Math and propogated as Sri Vidyaranya's work; and so forth.

The Math commenced propaganda through publications, Press and Platform from the second quarter of 19th Century, just after Kumbhabhishekam of Kamakshi in 1839 and further as time went on, additions, deletions and alterations were made to such propagandist literature and also in their so called authoritative books being answers and solutions to various publications and rebuttals raised from time to time by scholars who were in the know of true facts from the middle of 19th Century. Copies of the same book published at different

periods would confirm the changes made in the original publications. The writer has collected 70 or so (commencing from 1876) of such propaganda books, obliging journals and dailies, booklets, etc., confirming the above claims of the Kumbhakonam Kanchi Math.

Some extracts are given below from the Mathamnayasetu of the Kanchi Math:

उक्ताश्चत्वार आम्नाया यतीनां हि पृथक् पृथक् ।
ने सर्वे मत्पदाचार्य नियोगेन यथाविधि ॥
प्रयोक्तव्याः स्वधर्मेषु शासनीयास्ततः अन्यथा ।
क्वन्त एव सततं अटलं धरनीतले ॥
विरुद्धाचार संप्राप्तौ मत्पदस्य समाज्ञया ।
लोकान् संशीलयन्त्वेते स्वधर्मा प्रतिरोधतः ॥

तान् सर्वान् शासयन्त्वेते आचार्या मत्पदे स्थिताः ।
स्वस्वराष्ट्र प्रतिष्ठित्यै संचारः स्विधीयतां ॥
तैरन्यतो न गम्येत मन्मथ्याः सर्वतश्चराः ।

कामकोटिमठेत्वास्मिन् गुरुरिन्द्रसरस्वती ।
सर्वोत्तरः सर्वसेव्यः सार्वभौमौ जगद्गुरुः ॥
अन्ये गुरुवः प्रोक्ताः जगद्गुरुरयं परः ।

अन्ये मठास्तु चत्वारः आचार्य मत्पदे स्थितम् ।
संप्रदायैश्चतुर्भिः स्वैः समर्चन्त यथाविधि ॥

The authoritative books of Kanchi Math in support of the claims given above are:

- 1) Gururatnamala
- 2) Sushama and Satguru Santana Parimala-Tika
- 3) Punyaslokamanjari
- 4) Mathamnayasetu
- 5) Srimukha Darpana
- 6) Shivarahasya Navamamsha Shoddasha Adhyaya
- 7) Anandagiri Sankaravijaya
- 8) Sankara Vijaya Vilas
- 9) Sidhanta Patrika
- 10) Naishada Kavya
- 11) Vyasachaliya Sankara Vijaya
- 12) Keraliya Sankara Vijaya

- 13) Sankarendra Vilas
- 14) Markandeya Samhita
- 15) Sankarabhyudaya
- 16) Patanjali Charita etc. etc.

The Math's Propaganda was considerably intensified by the present Senior most Swamigal from the second quarter of this century. The obliging pandits, VIPs, Press and Institutions have lent their helping hand to their mutual benefit and considerations. The Kanchi Math is thus but a simple creation of the modern media. We will discuss on its claims in detail later.

The Kanchi Math is the only Math in India which is trying to change the accepted historic life incidents of Sri Adi Sankara. This should not go unchallenged as no one, however great he may be, is entitled to change the accepted history or life incidents of the great preceptor in the spiritual world. Every effort should be made to examine dispassionately the materials on which such fictitious and distorted claims are made and to enquire if they have any justification behind them. It will certainly be very inconvenient and unpalatable to Kumbakonam Kanchi Math and its followers when these claims are questioned, but the cause of truth must not be jeopardised by any feeling of false delicacy.

The Kanchi Math's untenable, baseless and exaggerated claims of antiquity and of direct spiritual descent from Sri Adi Sankara himself and the so called Amnaya Paddhati of the Kanchi Math and the superiority over others were all rebutted by scholars from 1850 or so till date through various publications and in press which exposed all the casuistry indulged in by the Math's followers. Evidently, the blinding power of self-interest knows no exception. Some of the rebuttal publications are —

— Sri Siddhanta Subramanya Sastry said in 1872;

"कूडली कम्भकोणादि मठाधिपतयश्चये श्रृंगेरिगुरु शिष्य इत्याद्रियन्ते।"

— Shankara Math Tatwa Prakasika by Kokkanda Venkataratnam Pantulu (1876 & 1915 editions);

— Vyavastha Chandrika — a declaration by 79 famous

scholars of Varanasi — 1886 (Referred by Bombay High Court);

— Acharya Charitra — in two parts by Naducauvery Bhattasri Narayana Sastry;

— Srimajjagadguru Shankarmath Vimarsha by Pt. J.G. Viswanath Sharma and Sri Pratapam Seetharam Sastry (1935);

— Kumbhakonam Math claims (1959);

— Srimadjagadguru Shankaramath Vimarsha by J.V. Raj Gopal Sharma (1963)

— Kashi me Kumbhakonam Math Vishayak Vivada by J.V. Raj Gopal Sharma (1963);

— The truth about Kumbhakonam Math by R. Krishnaswamy Iyer & Shri. K.R. Venkatarama Iyer (1963);

— Devi Kamakshi in Kanchi by K.R. Venkatarama Iyer;

— Satyaanveshana by Raj Gopal Sharma (1971);

— Sri Adya Sankaracharya — His Maths and Memorials by M.S. Dave (Judge);

— Three publications by Sri M.E. Sankarnarayana Sharma;

— Nyayalayadalli Kumbakonam Math (Kumbakonam Math in Courts) by Sri T. Ramalingeswara Rao;

— Kanchi Komakoti Math Charitra by Pisupati Subramanya Sastry;

— Kamakoti Divya Charitra Vimarsha by Sri Mallavajjhala Venkatasubbarama Sastry;

— Peetha Meemamsa, Kamakoti Shatakoti, Mahendrajala Panchagranthi, Navashankara Vijaya Vimarsha Dwishati, all four books by Sri Mudikonda Venkatarama Sastry;

— Kumbakona Math Yatartha Charitra;

— Kanchilo Kamakshi Devi;

— Shankaramnaya Math Charitra.

— etc, etc.

Such of those seekers who are anxious to have more details may usefully refer to these books. Not being content with one's

true position and status, one should not try to wrest others authority or rights by exaggerating the claims of one's own position. I quote below the words of our former President (a Rajarishi) and one of the greatest scholars, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan;

"It is by indoctrination that we seduce man from his natural generosity of spirit, of sympathy and fellowship into dubious methods. Our one aim in this world should be that we should not exaggerate, should not mis-represent, should not indulge in propaganda but listen to the voice of truth. If we are able to do it, we will be proud of what we have achieved".

It is not out of rancour or want of respect to the person of the senior most Swamigal of Kanchi Math or to the Mathadhipathi or to his designated successor that these fanciful and false claims were rebutted several times at several places in the past or even at present. We do not lag behind anybody in our genuine appreciation of the efforts they have been making to spread and uphold the standards of Dharma, even in these difficult times. But we feel that their usefulness to the religious public will be greatly enhanced if they do not stress upon or give support or give publicity to such untenable, fantastic, fanciful, false and exaggerated claims made through propaganda books, obliging journals and dailies. Truth should not be shrouded or distorted or smothered by persistent and baseless propaganda through various modern media, intended to confuse and mislead the minds of the credulous public. No one propagates that the Kumbhakonam Kanchi Math is not a Math following the Sankara Sampradaya and that the Math is not in existence from the 18th Century. The issue is whether Sri Adi Sankara established an Amnaya Math at Kanchi or not. Is it that this mutt can take up the cause of Dharma and preach only if it is considered "Sarvottara Sarvasevya Sarvabhowma Jagadguru"? Which are the Maths that the illustrious Sri Sadashiva Bramha, Sri Bhagawannama Bodha, Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa, Sri Ramana Maharishi, Sri Aravinda Yogi, adored? Did not these men of god indulge in uplifting Dharma? Why is this work of Dharma prachara always linked with trumpeteering the Math's self created glory? Pray, what is the secret? It is only when the facts of history that have

been accepted for centuries by all the wise old men are twisted, and spurious, absurd and artificial evidences are used as smoke screens to hide age old well established traditionally accepted facts that we have to enter into controversy. Facts should not be twisted to give a different meaning. In the campaign, the Math has launched to advertise its greatness, there is a sinister attempt even to change the life history of the great epoch maker Sri Adi Sankara himself (who is highly respected internationally). Is this not unjust as well as unnecessary? The aim of history is to search for and pursue truth, to build up cultural and spiritual values and to establish ideals and values before the society. The biographies of great men are an eternal source of inspiration to people. Such glorious books and historical facts should not be twisted to help advertising Kumbhakonam Kanchi Math. There is nothing wrong in their disciples, followers, devotees and others praising their glory and attainments until they encroach on the precincts of history. It is there the line has to be drawn. Let hundred maths be started. Let them all participate in the holy work of Dharma prachara. No body can object to this. Once these maths start interpolating new facts and creating controversies and tamper with true history by fanciful and false recitals, then does the problem arise.

I quote below some relevant portions from an article published in "Swadeshmitran" of 8.8.1935:

"A correspondent says that the Acharya of the Sringeri Math does not relish any enquiry into the relative status of the maths. This dislike is natural to all pious people. If this controversy is not proper, it will be proper to advise those who have started it to desist from it, it is not proper to advise those who point out the baselessness of the controversy that they should not so point out Those who do not like this controversy if they have any influence, must ask the Kumbakonam Math people to stop their propaganda"
"The Acharya of the Kumbakonam Math himself presents to several persons and to several libraries such controversial publications; several such books are published with his permission and are dedicated to him; he accepts welcome addresses where those controversial

points are specifically referred to; in his own lectures on the life of Sri Sankaracharya he emphasises these points. How then can it be said that he does not interest himself in such Propaganda?" "The only way of warding off objections is to stop raising novel and baseless contentions. It is therefore the duty of all pious people to desist from advising the disciples of the Sringeri Math and on the other hand, to see that no contentions likely to lend to controversies are allowed to rear their heads". It is needless to add to these true facts.

To cite an example, out of a list of 20 such claims: "The Mathadipaties of Kanchi Kamakoti are worshipped not only by devotees but also they are daily worshipped by Bramha, Vishnu and Indra. Infact, these gods hold them worshipful. This is what Vedavyasa seems to have written in Markandeya Samhita". This is the tenor of the Math's unbridled propaganda. What a boastful style, what a conceit and what vanity! The immortal Brahma, Vishnu and Indra may condescend to visit daily this planet from other lokas to worship these mortals, the products of their prarabdha karma! But, why do these mathadipathis encourage giving wide publicity to these fantasies and show off their vain glory in such a blatant manner through propagandist literature? Can we really believe that these ridiculous and boastful statements were uttered by Vedavyasa?

The object of this publication is to counter the Math's fanciful, untenable and exaggerated claims of antiquity, superiority and the Math's so called parampara upto the end of 17th century and to appeal to their sober mind not to indulge in such absurd propaganda which ill serve the need of the Dharma prachara. The methods of propaganda adopted by the Math and its adherents, the backing they secured by various means from VIPs, Vested institutions, Press and the People and the indifference of those who are in the know, ran the risk of unwary people believing in these false and fanciful claims.

The senior most Swamigal of Kumbakonam Kanchi Math says "Big or Small, what do I know? It is known only to those who gave me the authority. Recently, people are engaging in controversies about the status of peethas. How can I say the

last word or give decision on them? Devotees shower devotion on me and worship me like an Adi Sankara. What right have I to object? I have not engineered this affair. It is their wish and their judgement and they know. As regards the status of Maths, I can only say that I can give my verdict on interpretation of Veda and Shastras. It is not my job to fix the status of the Peethas. It is outside my power. It is left to devotees who are well-versed in Shastras. I follow their wish and their decision is final". (Panditha Patra", Varanasi — 15.10.1934). Is it not the duty of the guru to prevent his disciples from sowing prejudices and attempting to sabotage other's authority and prestige by false propoganda? In this, the sins of the disciples are shared by the guru — "Sishya Paapam Gurorapy".

In March 1935, the Kanchi Math Adhipathi told this writer "A Sishu accepts the words of the mother as a gospel of truth. The mother introduces to her sishu the other members of the family as brother, sister, uncle, aunt, father, etc. If the mother introduces a parapurusha (other than her husband) as the sishu's father, the sishu accepts the statement and believes and treats the parapurusha as his/her father. It is not a sin on the part of the sishu to accept the mother's statement as a gospel of truth. Likewise, what my poorvacharyas had written and said, I accept them as truth and propogate. It is not my creation and it is not a sin on my part". The writer of this booklet queried; "So long as the sishu is ignorant of the truth, he/she accepts the mother's statement but once he/she comes to know that the mother's statement is false, it is a sin for him/her to accept the mother's statement as truth. Once you know that your Math's claims are untenable and false, why do you propogate falsehood"? (Personal Dairy — 1935). The mathadipathi laughed and sent me away. Now he is called as sage and saint of Kanchi and lay public have been brain-washed, such that they may not accept this statement of his as true.

I would not be surprised if the senior-most Swamigal himself denies my statement. Nevertheless, truth will prevail ultimately — "Satyameva Jayathe".

Rai Sahib S.P. Sanyal writes in the "Leader" of 12.10.1934 "To my mind, it is clear that when parasites, panderers, place-hunters and profiteers become partisans, there is no end of

mischief done in this world. That is what seems to me, is being repeated in the present dispute as to the position of Kanchi Kamakoti Vis-a-vis the other four principal peethas specifically mentioned in the Sree Sankara Vijaya, which proclaim Sree Sankara's life history to the world... Some people with more enthusiasm than knowledge have rushed to raise the expected distinguished visitor to the pinnacle....".

"Leader" of 18.1.1935 reports "In this connection His Holiness referred to the grievances of some sincere Bhaktas of other Peetas with regard to the superiority of the Peethas. His Holiness clearly expressed that it was not his wish to claim superiority over any peethas and exhorted his disciple to revere all the peethas equally". Is the mathadhipathi prepared to accept the mathamnaya padhati of Sri Chitsukhacharya's "Mathamnayasetu" as false?

"Indian Express" (Madurai) dated 22.8.1963 reports -- "He (H.H. Sri Sankaracharya of Kamakoti Math) felt that in praising him, sometimes aspersions were cast upon others who were also doing great service to Hindu Dharma. If this were to continue, their work in the cause of Hindu Dharma might get hindered. There were many great people -- "Mahans' doing a lot for the propagation of Hindu Dharma The greatest help the people and the press could do for him would be to avoid praising him," said His Holiness".

"The Hindu" (Bangalore edition) dated 10.9.1987 reports "It has created an opportunity for us to clarify that the Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham is the "Moola Math" (original), the Paramacharya said",. It is the same old false and fanciful claims of the Kumbakonam Math, being repeated for the n'th time. The duplicity of the statement of the Kanchi Swamigal is worth noting. Under the guise of spreading the tenets of Dharma, the Math's preposterous claims are propagated and hence this booklet.

Adi Sankara basing his Mathamnaya system on four Vedas, four upadesha mahavakyas and four traditional sampradayas, founded only four Amnaya maths at the four directions of Bharat. The Mathamnaya text makes it clear that these four amnaya maths should consolidate their disciples and spread

and teach Dharmic tenets around the surrounding geographical areas. These preachers were all parivrajakas -- Peripatetic. Some of them with the help of people near and dear founded small maths in various places. These small maths had to take directions from the Amnaya Maths in their respective areas and do religious propaganda. They have no spiritual descent from Adi Sankara directly except through these four amnaya maths. As days rolled on, a few of these small math's heads started claiming independence for themselves. Some branch maths severed their ties with the Head maths and they created their own amnaya paddhati and started claiming direct descent of the lineage of Mathadhipathi from Adi Sankara. All Sankar maths are branches of the amnaya maths in their area. Hence, a few branch maths with the hope of claiming descent, not from four amnaya maths but from Adi Sankara himself, started creating illusory evidence to claim for themselves the amnaya procedures and proclaimed that their math was established by Adi Sankara. The Kumbakonam Math is one of such branch maths. The head of this Math "Chikkudayar Swamigal", has been accepted as Head of the "Kanchi Sharada Math" with evidence provided by the copper epigraphs. In the introduction to "Sidhanta Bindu", by Sri. P.C. Divanji of Bombay Civil Service, Judicial Branch, he says -- "During his (Sankara's) triumphant tour he took many disciples, the most notable of whom were Sureshwara, Padmapada, Trotaka and Hastamalaka and founded four maths, one in each corner of India i.e. to say at Sringeri in Southern India, Puri in Eastern India, Dwaraka in Western India, and Badarikashrama in Northern India and at each of them, installed one of his said four principal disciples The third cause of the weakening of their influence was the internal dissensions between the disciples of the same acharya due to the love of power and pelf which the occupants of the Gaddis at the maths carried with it and the consequent foundation of other rival maths and the assumption of the honorific title of Sankaracharya by their founders and their successors. Thus for instances, there are newly founded maths at Kolhapur, Belgaum, Nasik in the Deccan, Hampi and Kanchi (Conjeevaram) in Southern India, Prabhaspatnam, Dakor and Dholka in Gujarat and Benares in the United Provinces". Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, an authority in history says in his "Studies

in the history of the third dynasty of Vijayanagar" ... "Branches of this Math (Sringeri) were established at Pushpagiri, Virupakshi and Kumbakonam". The "Light of the East", in July 1894 says that all Sankara Sampradaya maths in India are the branches or sub-branches of the four amnaya maths at Puri, Sringeri, Dwaraka and Jyothi maths. "Kesari" in April 1898 says that the Kumbakonam Math is the branch math of Sri Sringeri Math. "Sri Sankara Vijaya Churnika" (Published in 1898) says that the Kumbakonam Math is a branch Math of the Sringeri Math. Dr. Burnell, District Judge, Tanjore says ... "This (Anandagiri Sankara Vijaya) seems to be quite a modern work written in the interests of the Mathas on the coromandal coast which have renounced obedience to the Sringeri Matha where Sankaracharya's legitimate successor resides". Prof. Wilson in 1855 says about Kumbakonam Math (Page No. 206) — "A Branch Math of Sankaracharya, founder of Advaita Philosophy". Sri C.N. Krishnaswami Iyer in "Life and Times of Sankara" says ---- "That this Kumbakonam Math is comparatively modern, appears to be probable..." "The Ilaqa Kutcheri, Hyderabad, dated 11.3.1845, had declared Kumbakonam Math as a branch math and the then Prime Minister of Hyderabad in a State declaration said "... If other sanyasis belonging to other Maths such as Kudalgi, Sivaganga, Avani, Pushpagiri, Virupakshi and Kumbakonam etc. come and try to pass themselves off as entitled to such honours, no one should believe them or offer them worship."

For the last 150 years or so, the Kumbakonam Math propagandists have indulged in claiming that Sri Adi Sankara started this Math and the present head is a direct descendent of this lineage, and further the four amnaya maths are the disciples of that math. Even on 10.9.1987, (The Hindu), the Senior most Swamigal has confirmed this statement. Vanity and conceit have turned these persons to indulge in a series of falsehoods and unworthy deeds. One who is just a head of a branch math now boasts that he is the original moola math head. It is thus that the Kumbakonam Kanchi Math has started the misadventure of self-glorification. In this attempt they have rejected the traditional and shastric procedures of worship and created new schedules. They have discarded the righteous old practices of guru-shisya relationship. They have

created a new panel of gurus with changes also in the religious practices. Amidst lay people, they have propagated these falsehoods and taken them into their fold. They have taken to the old trick of "Anyamindram Karishyami". The "Swadesamitran" of 8.8.1935 says --- "In the several versions of Sri Sankaracharya's life published under the auspices of the Kumbakonam Math, it is admitted that for Achara-vichara, a math at Dwaraka in the West, another Math at Badari in the North, another at Jagannath in the East and another at Sringeri in the South were established. If so, the Kumbakonam Math people have no ground to question the fact that all persons in the south inclusive of Kanchipuram and Kumbakonam are sishyas of Sringeri. There is therefore, no justification at all for characterising any particular person as a sishya of the Sringeri Math. This distinction is but the result of some believing and saying that they are not sishyas of Sringeri Math".

Some recite the slogan of equality of all Acharyas and pride themselves on their socialistic outlook. A pativrata will not claim a person other than her husband as her husband, however great that another man may be. Changing the list of real gurus is a great sin. To speak with authority and evidence, the entire South India was covered by Dakshinamnaya Sri Sringeri Sharada Peetha and its Sringeri Math founded by Sri Sankara. All the disciples who now claim Kumbakonam as their guru math were at one time disciples of Sringeri Math. Remember the saying "...Gurudwayam Sishya Nipata Hetuhu". Who does not know the plight of Trishanku who discarded his guru Vasishtha and tried to change allegiance to another guru?

Who is often raising this issue of supremacy of Kanchi Math and twisting of historical facts? If one looks into the book "Controversy in Kashi regarding Kumbakonam Math", one will know who started all this game and noise, and the institution which set the ball rolling. What is the reason behind Sri Sesa Jois, Sri Meenakshi Sundaram and Sri Jaipur Krishna Sastry and their learned coterie in condemning the false propaganda emanating from Kumbakonam math in the middle of nineteenth century? Why did Sri. K.V. Pantulu in the later half of 19th century battle against false propaganda? Why did Sri Bhattasri Narayana Sastry write the second part of

"Acharya Charitra Vimarsha" and his brother Sri Srinivasa Sastry dealt devastating blows on the math's propaganda? Why in the last quarter of 19th century, the false propaganda was condemned in a number of places all over South India? Why did clashes take place in a meeting called at Kanchi amongst the Andhra and Tamil Vidwans, when the issue of condemning Math's false propaganda was debated? Why is it that the Stanika Sthalattar and Dharmadhikari connected with Kanchi Kamakshi temple have often filed cases against the Math in the courts? Why did the Kanchi Math file a number of cases in many courts? Why did the famous pandits of Varanasi issue declarations in 1886 and in 1934 in a public meeting that Adi Sankara installed only four amnaya maths? Why did the Swamiji Sri Mahadeva VII alias Sri Sudarshanaru (1851-91) of the Kumbakonam Math's lineage meet with stern opposition all over Andhra during his propaganda tour? Why did he return from Puri without completing Teertha Yatra of North India as originally planned? Why did Sri Prabhakara Sastry (1921) condemn the math's Propaganda? Why did the Editor of "Tatwanidana" Sri Subrahmanya Iyer (1930-36) and Vemuri Sri Narasimha Sastry (1938) and others condemn the Kanchi Math's Propaganda? Why did a number of scholars, mahants, math heads, sanyasis meet in 1934-35 at Varanasi and publish a book exposing Kanchi Math's propaganda? Why did Vedamurthy Sri Subramanya Siddhanti publish in 1872, condemning Math's propagandist version? Why did the Brahman Mahamandala, Kashmir, Kashmir Sanskrit Sahitya Sammelana and M.M. Dr. Shivnath Sharma condemn the math's propaganda? Why did scholars, sanyasis and other professionals numberng 93 from Madurai (12.7.1935), 20 from Vishakapatnam (17.9.1935), 81 from Krishna and Godavari districts (18.10.35), 71 from Andhra state (7.11.1935) headed by M.M. Sri Tata Subbaraya Sastry, condemn the math's propaganda? Why did the public hold meetings and condemn the math's propaganda in Calcutta (April 1935), Madurai (June 35); Tirunelveli (July 35); Veeravanallur, Kalladaikurichi, Ambasamudram, Kadayam, Tenkasi, Melapavoor (July-August 35), Erode (Nov. 35), Vijayawada (October 38)? The Sanatana Dharma Maha Sabha held a meeting at the time of Ardha Kumbha mela at Prayag in 1936 and it was presided over by Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Puri-Govardhan Math and

passed a resolution condemning Kumbakonam Math's false propaganda. Why did the Jagadguru Sankaracharya of four amnaya maths issue Srimukha Aadesha Patra declaring that Kumbakonam-Kanchi math was not established by Sri Adi Sankara? Why did the following books "Srimad Jagadguru Shankara Math Vimarsha", "Kashime Kumbhakonam Math Vishayak Vivada", "The Kumbakonam Math's claims" and the "Truth about the Kumbakonam Math", "Satyaanveshan", etc., attack and demolish all the claims of the math in detail during 1960, 1963, and 1971?

There is no use in enlarging differences, true. But who sowed these seeds? The Kanchi Math Adipathi and his followers should have nipped them in the bud. They allowed the poisonous seeds to sprout into a big tree and started giving trouble to opponents who did not accept their offers of reward. Once they stop spreading false propaganda, this controversy will end abruptly. As long as Kanchi Math and their propagandists indulge in spreading false claims, someone has to lay bare the truth, so that people will not get misled. Those who now say that we need not contradict false propaganda are hoping that the condemnation of falsehood will stop and then these books containing twisted, false and garbled versions will be considered after a lapse of time as genuine, and thus hope to establish their claims. If this is allowed, we would be committing a sin by allowing these spurious versions to gain ascendancy over genuine texts. Why should we allow trash to multiply by keeping silent and thus allow our future generations to be misled by their fake versions?

Out of spite, the Kumbakonam Math prepared a spurious biography of Shri Adi Sankara which is highly derogatory to Shri Adi Sankara. The compiler refers to many a book and purports to quote from them. They may be roughly classified as follows:

- 1) Anonymous
- 2) Unfamiliar works of unfamiliar authors (some of them imaginary)
- 3) Unfamiliar works attributed to familiar authors (most of them untraceable) and
- 4) Misquotations.

The compiler of such spurious books had to split up even the personality of Sri Sankara into five Avatars to serve this purpose of adding to the prestige of the guruparampara of the Kanchi Math. The first Sankara was born at Kalati in 509 — 508 B.C. or 482 B.C. or 476 B.C. and wrote the Bhashya. The Second Sankara was one Krupa Shankara (26 — 69 A.D.) the 7th or 9th Head of that Math, who was the real "Shanmatastapanacharya" and who appointed a Vishwarupa to the Sringeri Math. The third Sankara was Ujwalasankara (329 — 367 A.D. — 14th or 16th Acharya of that math) who blessed a Kerala King Kulashekara to become a poet. The fourth Sankara was Mukasankarendra (398 — 437 A.D. — 18th or 20th Acharya of that Math) and he is identified with Mukakavi of Panchasati fame. The fifth Sankara was an Abhinava Sankara (788 — 840 A.D. — the 36th or 38th Acharya) and it was he that was born in 788 A.D. three years after the death of his father Vishwajith at Chidambaram and ascended the Sarvagnya Peetha at Kashmir and disappeared in the Himalayas. The original book Anandagiri Shankara Vijaya with interpolations was edited around 1845 wherein they added the story of Panchalingas and establishment of their Math and changing the number of lines in slokas they brought in other claims. A copy of this embellished edition was given to the writer by Shri Panditraj Rajeshwar Sastry of Varanasi and another copy by M.M. Sri Anantakrishna Sastry. The 60 slokas in the 16th chapter of the book Shivarashasya (of which the original is unavailable and the writer could get 13 copies of the same with different number of slokas from different libraries), were reduced to 45 slokas by them and in Markandeya Samhita they got their math's name incorporated and the Panchalinga story added. In the early 19th century, they published the books like Gururatnamala, Punyaslokamanjari, Sushama, Parimala, etc and they added the name of Rajachudamani Dikshita as the author of Shankarabhyudaya, incorporated some slokas into Patanjalicarita, manipulated the Shivarashasya and prepared a new script with new slokas in Sushama and prepared a new list of reference books (most of them extinct and not to be traced). Slokas from Madhaviya Shankara Digvijaya were transported to Patanjalicarita and they were taken into Shankarabhyudaya and a new book entitled Vyasachaliya was

prepared and Srimuka and Titles were incorporated, adding also commentary on the same (Srimukadarpana). The seal, flag and all other external symbols were prepared and on the strength of this self created evidence claimed for their math Amnaya status and the leadership as well over the other four Amnaya Maths in all the four directions of Bharat. They claimed that this Mathamnayasetu's author was Adi Sankara's boyhood friend and constant companion Sri Sarvagnya Chitsukhacharya. They have given incorrect facts and codes about the history of Amnaya Peethas and Maths, which go against Shastric texts.

It is interesting to note that during the third Mysore War in 1790-92, One Parasurama Bhavu (The maratha General) reached Bedanur with his army. One of his commanders One Raghunath Rao Patawardhan with Pindaris and similar marauders accompanying the army raided and looted Sringeri Math Temple in 1791. The reason was that the Maharathas thought that the Sringeri had sided with Hyder and Tippu Sultan who were their enemies. Tippu requested Sri Sringeri Acharya to perform Chandi Homa for the welfare of the citizens of the State and for his success in his enterprise. It is at this time the Maharatha King of Tanjore who was against Sringeri for the above said reason aided this Kumbakonam Math and with his help and the help of misled devotees and a few Vidwans, the Kumbakonam Math raised the claim of their being Adi Moola Math established by Adi Sankra himself, and went further to claim the Jagadguruship over all other four amnaya Maths. The story of Sankara installing himself in the Sarvagnya peetha at Kanchi and ending of his life in the same place were built up and widely circulated. There are indisputable evidences to show that between the 17th Century and middle of 18th century, the Kumbakonam Math was not at Kanchi. These are borne out by East India Company's Records and Rock edicts in and around Kanchi. The place occupied by Kanchi Math now was a vacant site in the 18th century belonging to Government, according to revenue records. The math at Kumbakonam was built by King Sharaboji in 1821 (Edict). At the end of 18th century, two house sites were bought at Kanchi and they were declared as the Maths. Evidences were fabricated to suggest that the maths belonged

to the hoary antiquity. The math at Tiruvanakaval was occupied by Pasupatha Shaiva, according to rock edicts (upto 1714, they were occupying it). In 17th century, this changed hands and went to Madhwas for sometime. In the later half of 18th century, this math was occupied by the Kumbakonam Math.

After building maths and preparing propaganda literature, the then Kumbakonam Adipathi, obtaining permission from East India Company, came to Kanchi in 1839, to celebrate Kumbashisekam to Kanchi Kamakshi, with his disciples and other vested interests. The report of the collector of Chingleput Mr A. Freeze and Amildar of Kanchi, Srinivasa Rao, refer to the Kumbakonam Pontiff as "Stranger to Kanchi" in clear terms. In 1839, the so-called parampara guru came to Kanchi, performed the Kumbhabisekam of Kamakshi and also installed a stone slab in the Kamakshi temple proclaiming this event. This is the only epigraph all around that has something connected with the math and all the rest of the epigraphs have nothing to do with the math. Then, with the influence spreading with the officials of East India Company and the Tanjore King, the Math chief was encouraged to petition the East India Company begging to be appointed as trustee of Kamakshi Temple. The collector ordered this trusteeship to the pontiff of Kumbakonam Math on 5.11.1842. The collector has in his reply to questions from Madras Revenue Board has stated that -- "The reason for order of granting trusteeship of Kamakshi Temple to Kumbakonam Pontiff is done based on his wealth and property he holds". So, naturally, "he has no powers and claims over the temple." So this journey from Kumbakonam to Kanchi was undertaken to justify the self-imagined claim of Amnaya Math which necessitates supervision of amnaya peetha temples. Thus, due to force of necessities was the journey undertaken. Thus, the Kumbakonam Swamiji by virtue of newly acquired Trusteeship of Kamakshi temple in November 1842, adorned himself with the title of Kanchi Kamakoti Jagadguru Shankaracharya in 1843 and undertook an extensive propaganda tour. The math head in Kanchi tried to stop other mathadipathis going in "Pallakki" in front of the math. The Math once applied for such a ban against Shaiva Siddantha.

Math head's procession and the Chingleput collector turned it down.

The designation "Chikka (Small or Junior) Udayar" implies that he is under the control of a "Dodda (Senior) Udayar", i.e, the Pontiff of Sri Sringeri Math. Except Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal and his successor, all the heads of the Math were Hoysala Karnataka Brahmins. Some of them were the descendents and relations of Minister Govinda Dikshita of Tanjore State. In olden days, the Math's seal was in Kannada. The Math's name was "Sharada Math — Kanchi" (Copper Plate). All these are borne out by old records and court judgements. "The Chikkudayar Swami is the most powerful person and head of a mutt in the Tanjore Dist. and it is hardly that if any claim was to be made on this Shrotriem, it would not have been made long ago..." (Case No. 158, 163, and 324 of 1930 and judgement delivered on 12.8.35 — Chingleput). Justice Wallis and Justice Ayling also confirmed this name "Chikka Udayar". Madras G.O. 1260 Public, dated 25.8.1915 states that "the Manager of the Math at Kumbakonam who was consulted on the point states that the name "Sharada Math" is even now borne by the Shankaracharya math at that place and the date of the removal of the math (Sharda math) from Conjeevaram to Kumbakonam happened recently about 186 years age ... i.e 1729 A.D. or so. There are different versions about the removal of the math from Kanchi to Kumbakonam:

- a) Kumbakonam Math Manager Shri N. Ganesha Iyer in his letter G. 1444/40-41 of 25.7.41 states that during the uncertain times of Carnatic wars 1743-63,
- b) Sri K.S. Ramaswamy Sastry states in "The Hindu" of 4.1.1936 — It is that Math that is now at Kumbakonam having been removed to Tanjore at the request of Raja Pratapasimha of Tanjore (1740-63) and then shifted to Kumbakonam,
- c) Sri K. Venkatesham Pantulu writes — "The 62 guru on the Kamakoti Peetha was Chandrashekarendra Saraswathi who ascended the seat in 1729 A.D. In that year the fight between the English and the muslims then the local chief of Udayarapalyam requested the guru to go over to his place and stay there",

d) Sri Venkataraman says "60-Chandrasekhar IV ---- it must have been in the time of this Acharya that the Kamakoti Peetha was permanently removed from Kanchipuram to Kumbhakonam and on the invitation of Raja Pratap Simha (1740-63) of Tanjore, the math was permanently removed",

e) About 1686 A.D, Tanjore King Pratap Simha requested the Pontiff to come to Tanjore,

f) Sri V. Vishwanathan in Epigraphica Indica, Vol. XIV says "It was at the invitation of King Sarabhoji of Tanjore that the acharya removed to Kumbakonam (1821 A.D.)

g) Sri M.K. Sreenivasan says in "Kanchi temples", that in 176 A.D, the pontiff shifted to Tanjore. Which one is true?

In Tanjore District, one Sri Ananthavadhani represents Sringeri Math interests. He was the Dharmadikari of Sringeri Math and had authority to receive contributions from disciples. Prior to this Avadhani, one Sri Narayana Ganapath and earlier to him Sri Mahadeva Sastry were Dharmadhikaris. This power was snatched away by the Kumbakonam Math (Old records of Math). Kumbakonam math appealed to Tanjore rulers and got an order passed that Sringeri Math should not receive "Gurukanika" in its territory (Math records). It is very clear from records that Sringeri Math's influence was spread all over Kanchi and Tanjore from ancient times upto the end of 18th Century. Tipu in 1792 requested Sringeri math Adhipathi to undertake a tour of Kanchi to get the Ekamreshwara shrine repaired and inaugurated by the Sringeri Jagadguru Shankaracharya performing the Samprokshana. If there were a Kamakoti Math then at Kanchi, they could have got all this done by Kanchi Math head. The Nawab of Walajabad in 1763, when there arose a dispute about Varnashrama Dharma, asked the Jagadguru Shankaracharya of Sringeri Math to give his verdict. Where then was the Kanchi Kamakoti math? This Sharada Peetha and Math at Kanchi are both the branches of original Sringeri Peetha and Math.

Sri Ramanujacharya was a resident of Kanchi itself and studied vedanta under one Shri Yadavaprakash with whom teaching he was not satisfied. If there was a Sankaracharya

the Head of a "Central Math or Moola Math", at Kanchi, could not Sri Ramanuja or Sri Yadavaprakash have sought further enlightenment from him about the advaita stand point? When Sree Ramanuja started on a tour of conquest, did he first tackle the Sankaracharya in his home town? These facts clearly show that there was no Shankaracharya at all at Kanchi at that period. It is said again of Shri Akshobhya Muni of Madhva persuasion that he met Shri Vidyaranya and had a discussion with him. Why did not Shri Akshobhya Muni seek out the so called "Head Math" Acharya for disputation? The only answer is that there was none as such. It is significant also that Sri Appayya Dikshita who lived very near Kanchi does not make the slightest reference to the math at Kanchi or any Acharya

there. Epigraphical evidence furnished by the Kanchi temples discloses that from about the 12th — 13th century several of different persuasions flourished within the city. In Sri Appayya Dikshita's case, he was prompted by Shri Nrisimhashrama Swamy to write books on pure Advaita. Shri Girvanendra was another exponent of pure Advaita and presided over a Peetha. A third was Shri Upanishad Brahmdendra. A handout issued in 1939 by the head of the math asserts that it was the "first Advaita Math of Kanchi" and "founded about 250 years ago" (Second half of 17th Century). The Sharada Math of Kanchi, if ever there was one in Kanchi, was another Math promoting advaita philosophy. In any of these institutions, there is no reference to Kanchi Math.

The Kumbakonam Math head after installing Tatanka on Khilandeshwari hoisted his flag at Trichy and returned to Tanjore in 1846. The Tanjore King gave a donation of Rs. 7,000/-. Then the propaganda commenced through books printed in Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Sanskrit. Deficiencies in evidence were covered up and wherever inconvenient questions would be raised, there was an attempt to set up answers supporting their spurious claims. In 1876, the interpolated versions of the Anandagiri Shankara Vijaya was published and widely circulated. In 1872, Vidwan Gurram Venkanna Sastry who was Kanchi Math protege translated Srimukha Vyakhya into Telugu and published it under the title "Siddantha Patrika" and put the author's name as Vedanta Ramanuja Iyengar. It is from this date numerous public

meetings were held in Madras, Chingleput, Cuddalore, Chidambaram, Mayavaram, Kumbakonam, Tanjore, Trichy, Tiruvallur, Kanchi etc. places and the false propaganda is still continuing even now by vidwans who are under the math's patronage. Rightly, Dr. Burnell (A Sankritist & Dist. Judge, Tanjore) says --- "Mathas on the coromandal coast which have renounced obedience to the Sringeri Math, where Shankaracharya's legitimate successor resided".

In Bramhavidya Vol. X (1896), it is said that Kumbhakonam Math had only 4 or 5 acharyas till then. This is very true. The 61st Guru Mahadevendra Saraswathi (V) inaugurated this math. His relationship with the Sringeri Math and how, why and when he came to Tanjore are all available in records in different places. How the Math records, copper plates, silver vessels etc were removed from Sringeri Math to Tanjore by some, can be substantiated with evidence. Shri C.S. Krishnaswamy Iyer in his book "Life and Times of Sankara" has said that "The Kumbakonam Math is comparatively modern appears to be probable". H.H. Wilson refers to the Math "Kumbakonam -- a branch Math of Shankaracharya", Dr. N. Venkataramanayya has said that "Branches of this Math (Sringeri) was established at Pushpagiri, Virupakshi and Kumbakonam". The "Kesari" of Poona (1898) confirms that the Maths at Pushpagiri, Virupakshi and Kumbakonam are branch Maths of Sringeri Math. Sri. P.C. Diwanji (Judicial Service) in his introduction to "Siddantha-bindu" says that at Hampi and Kanchi newly founded mathas commenced their rival activities against the parent math (Sringeri). The writer has in his custody a lot of records from Tanjore State, Peshwa rulers, Karnataka Nawabs, Hyderabad State, East India Company, Revenue records of Nawab of Karnataka, Madras Govt. records, etc, etc. about Kumbakonam Kanchi Math and shortly, he is publishing all of them.

Kamakoti Peetha was in existence even earlier to Shri Adi Sankara as a Upasana Peetha. It does not mean that it should become an "Amnaya Math". All over India, there were various upasana Peethas, while Adi Sankara travelled all over the land. Is there any sense in the claim that all of them are amnaya maths? The abode of celibates, students, sanyasis is called a math. Only those religious centres (Dharma Kendra) which are

invested with Amnaya status by special proclamation by the founder, can be called Amnaya Maths. The abode of Devayonis is called Peetha. Thus, there is a lot of difference among these three categories. They cannot be interchanged or mistaken for each other. Adi Sankara uses the word "Peetha" in Mathamnaya to mean the abode of Devayonis. In Lalitha Trishathi Bhashya Adi Sankara has said that "Kamakoti" means "Srichakra". Because Sri Adi Sankara pacified Ugra Kamakshi and stayed in Kanchi for sometime and reinstalled Srichakra, and even accepting for argument's sake Kumbakonam Math's fanciful claims that Sri Sankara installed and ascended a Sarvagnya Peetha at Kanchi, it does not prove that he established an amnaya matha there. Dindima commentary says Sri Sankara "Stayed only for a month in Kanchi". In Anandagiri Sankara Vijaya, the same version is found. Sri K.T. Telang has said "He went to Kanchi where he erected a temple and established the system of the adoration of the Devi". In Wilson's glossary (1855 A.D) he says --- "Whether the Sankara was more than a passing pilgrim at Conjeevaram in doubtful". In the 16th Century at the time of Vellore Lingappa Naika, the Kamakoti Srichakra was installed by Sri. Narasimhadhwari in Kanchi Kamakshi temple (Rock epigraph No. 349 of 1954-55)

The Amnaya maths direction (visible and gnyanagochara), tradition and sampradaya, Veda, Mahavakya, Yogapatta, deva devi peetha, holy river and kshetra, Dharmarajya territorial boundary etc, are all enumerated textually. All the four amnaya maths at four directions (Drishti Gochara) have such written records. The codes of three other amnyas are gyanagochara. The code of seven amnaya's are different from the code prescribed for the Kanchi Kamakoti Math which is being fancifully described as Amnaya Matha. The Archaeologists say that this Kamakshi Temple was formerly Tara Devi Mandir -- "The temple of Kamakshi was --- originally a temple of Tara Devi and as with many other temples of alien faith converted into a Hindu temple in later times". (Sri T.A.G. Rao). Sri K.R. Sreenivasan of the Archaeological Survey writes -- "Evidently she was worshipped as a form of Durga & a temple called Adi peetha Parameshwari Temple in the vicinity of the modern temple of Kamakshi, containing a very old seated four arm

sculpture with three human heads on the pedestal was perhaps the original site where the Shakti Peetha was installed after the reformation of worship by Shankara".

Perusing the declaration made by the Senior most Swamigal of Kumbakonam Kanchi Math, that the Kanchi Math is a "Moola Math", established by Sri Adi Sankara (Ref. The Hindu, dt. 10.9.1987) and some articles and write-up on the recent episode of Sri Jyendrasaraswathi Swamigal — his curious disappearance and reappearance at Kanchi, appearing in "The Week", "Illustrated Weekly of India", "Frontline", "Sunday", "The Hindu", "Indian Express", "Deccan Herald", etc (Journals & Dailies) the writer of this booklet feels that it is his duty to place before the public the relevant facts exposing their fanciful untenable claims. The treatment given here may seem inadequate requiring further amplification. Readers who are anxious to have more details may refer to the following books: "Shankaramath Tatwa Prakasika", "Srimad Jagadguru Shankaramath Vimarsha", "Kashime Kumbakonam Math Vishayak Vivada", "The truth about the Kumbakonam Math", "Kumbakonam Math claims" and "Devi Kamakshi in Kanchi".

अवैदिकमतध्वान्तं विधूय भरतावनेः ।
 श्रौतस्मार्त्ते प्रकाशेन मुखं येनोज्ज्वलीकृतम् ॥
 तस्यैवाचार्यपादस्य पवित्रं जीवनोर्दाधम ।
 यतन्नेकलपीकर्त्तुं कम्भकोणाविलैर्जलैः ॥
 अक्षणां रक्षितं धर्म्यो भारतस्यैकराष्ट्रताम् ।
 नीतिविद्वयावलम्बेन साधनान्यन्चिन्तयन् ॥
 श्रुङ्गारिद्वारिकाज्योतिर्गोवर्धन मठाख्यया ।
 चत्वारिधर्मपीठानि चतुर्दिक्षुस्वर्तिष्ठपत् ॥
 अत्रेदमवधातव्यं न विस्मर्य कदाचन ।
 येन पातो न जायेत कम्भकोणस्य किम्मते ॥
 "कम्भकोणमठः" शास्त्रामठमात्रं मतो यतः ।
 चत्वार एव पूर्वोक्तास्तेन संस्थापिता मठाः ॥
 अतोमठस्य तस्यैव प्राधान्यं प्रतिपत्तये ।
 क्रियमाणोऽखिलो यत्नो बालका पेषणोपमः ॥
 सर्वप्रमाणं समिद्धं सर्वलोकाभिर्मममतम् ।
 उक्तमर्थं निवृत्तन्तं राजगोपालमादरात् ॥
 तस्माद्रामेश्वरानन्दो वेदान्ताचार्य शब्दभाक् ।
 शर्माशापा यतीन्द्रोऽहं सम्बुद्धयित्मुद्यतः ॥

(श्रीजूनापीठाधिपति आचार्य महामण्डलेश्वर परमपूज्यपाद
 श्री प.प. श्रोत्रिय ब्रह्मनिष्ठ श्री १०८ श्रीस्वामि
 श्रीरामेश्वरानन्दजी आचार्य महाराज)

2. DATE OF SRI SANKARA

Sri Adi Sankara and his disciples have referred to some books and their authors and used their quotations and tenets both in prose and in verse. They are all significant as Acharya and his disciples wrote all of them by themselves. Sankara's date of birth could only be after the date of those quoted authors and their tenets.

- UPAVARSHA**
 Vedanta Sutra Bhashya 3.3.53. B.C. 2nd
 Upavarsha condemns Patanjali's century to
 theories. Spotavada (1.3.28) of 3rd century
 Vaiyakarani's condemned. Patanjali's A.D.
 time — Second Century.
- BHARTRUPRAPANCHA**
 Brihadaranya Bhashya. Bhartrupra- B.C.
 pancha has been ridiculed as
 "Oupanishadam manyam".
- DRAVIDACHARYA**
 Mandukyopanishad Bhashya — B.C.
 refers to Dravidacharya as
 "Aagamvit" and in Bru. Bhashya as
 "Sampradayavit".
- VRITHIKARA**
 Sutra Bhashya — Pages 57-343 (B. B.C.
 Indica Series)
- MAHAYANIKA**
 Panchapadika of Padmapada refers
 to Mahayanika which was strong in
 100 A.D. अतः स एव महायानिकः पक्षः सर्माधतः ।
 Vignyanavada belongs to Mahayani- B.C. to 100
 ka. It was in B.C. period Mahayanikas A.D.
 propagated their tenets.

f) **PASUPATHAMATHA**

Acharya condemns this school in Sutra Bhashya. In many places, Sankara had quoted puranic references. These puranas were rewritten and some were in Samhita form and were in vogue in A.D. 4th century. There is evidence that Pasupathamata was originated in 100 A.D.

A.D. 100 to rewritten puranic period A.D. 400.

g) **SABARASWAMI**

In Sutra Bhashya (B. Indica series) 58-953 there is a mention of Sabaraswami by Sri Sankara. Sabaraswami in his Mimamsa Sutra Bhashya (1-1-5) has raised the name of Upavarsha, whose time is earlier to 350 A.D. according to many scholars.

After second century A.D, some say fourth century A.D.

h) **ESWARA KRISHNA**

Sutra Bhashya 2-2, Bhikshu Paramartha had translated Sankhya Karika Tika in Chinese in 557-583 A.D.

2nd/3rd Century A.D

i) **UDYOTAKARA**

Sutra Bhashya (B. Indica series) P.57

Beginning of 4th century.

j) **DINGNAGA**

Sutra Bhashya (2-2-28). Quotations from Dingnaga's Aslambana Pariksha "यदन्तर्जयस्य". Shantaraksha's Tatwa Samgraha Commentary by Acharya Kamalashela contains these references.

Dingnaga 5th century. Shantaraksha 8th century.

k) **PRABHAKARA**

Sutra Bhashya (B. Indica series) P.57

Kumarila Bhatta's time-Said to belong to 650-720 A.D.

Shalika-natha is said to be Prabhakara's disciple.

l) **PURNA VARMA**

Hui-yen-Tsang says Purnavarma, King of Paschima Magadha, belongs to 590 A.D. (Cha. III 19-1 & Sutra Bhashya 2-1-18)

Hui-yen-Tsang 590 A.D. Cunningham 630 A.D

m) **RAJA VARMA**

Sut. Bha. 2-1-17. Kanouj's ruler Raja Sashanka known also as Raja Varma, contemporary of Purna Varma.

590 A.D. or 630 A.D.

n) **SUNDARA PANDYA**

Sut. Bha. 1-1-4. At the end, three gathas are quoted after saying "अपि चाहः" Sri Vachaspathi Mishra (841-AD) has referred to this as "ब्रह्मविदां गाथा". In Atmaswarupa's work Prabhodhaparishodini (a commentary on Panchadipika), these stanzas are said to be Sundara Pandya's work. In Suta Samhita Tika of Madhavamantri (Nyayasudha) and in "Tantra Vartika" some stanzas are quoted.

First half of 7th century A.D.

o) **DRAVIDASHISHU**

75th Stanza in Soundarya Lahari. This Dravida sishu denotes Jnana Sambandhar. Lakshmidhar (13th century) says this signifies the author Shankara himself. Kaivalyashrama has written a story on this in his commentary "Soubhagya Vardhini". He also thinks that Dravidasishu denotes Shankara. Kameshwara Suri also holds the same view.

Jnana Sambandar earlier half of 7th century.

p) **GUNAMATI**

Sut. Bha. 2-2-22. Quotation from Gunamathi's "Abhidharmakosha Vyakhya". 630-640 A.D. (Buddhist Book)

q) **KUMARILA BHATTA**

In 139 to 141 Stanzas in 18th chapter of "Upadeshasahasri" though no name is given but opinion supporting his own on karma is enumerated. Also, Sureshwara-charya in Tai. Bha. Vartika refers to Kumarila Bhatta as "मीमांसकम्पन्य" Dharmakirti's view "कल्पनापोद्धमभ्रान्तम्", are attacked in "sloka Vartika". Kumarila quotes from Bhartruhari's "Karika" "Vakyapadiya". It-sing holds Bhartruhari's demise took place around 651-52 A.D. Bhavabhuti was Kumarila's disciple. His time is 700-740 A.D. Hence, Kumarila is of a little earlier age. Some say Kumarila belongs to 700 A.D. Second half of 7th century and beginning of 8th century A.D.

r) **DHARMAKIRTI**

142nd stanza in 18th chapter of "Upadesha Sahasri's" book quotes it. 635-650 A.D. Taranath fixes 700-750 A.D. Sut. Bha. 2-2-28 in attack on Vignyanavada (Yogachara) Dharmakirti's famous stanza is referred. "महोपलम्भनियमो.....।।" Sureshwara refers to him in Bri. Bha. Vartika 4-3: "त्रिष्वेवत्वविनाभावार्दित यद् धर्मकीर्तिना।"

In the table given above, Dharmakirti's time is given as middle of 7th Century A.D. and this seems to be last author Sankara had quoted. Shankara could never have been born earlier to this. Because the story of Sankara meeting Kumarila at the end of his life time is found in all Shankara Vijayas, Sankara must belong to late 7th century or early 8th century. In "Darshana Prakasha", written in 1638 a stanza from an ancient text "Shankara Paddhati" is quoted fixing Shankara's Nirvana time as 642 shaka or 720 A.D.

When this writer visited Sringeri with his father in 1930, the then pontiff read a sloka from a book (written on palm leaf) which says that Sri Adi Sankara was born in Kalati Agrahara during the 14th year of the rule of Vikramaditya. This book (Palm leaf) dates to 17th century and in the last palm leaf, it is written that this book is copied and rewritten from the original book of 15th century. Sringeri Math (officially) has not compiled their guruparampara in the modern sense. The compiler (an outsider) took Vikramaditya as Ujjain Vikramaditya of first half century B.C. The dates of Sri Vidyateertha, Sri Bharati Krishna Teertha, Sri Vidyananya of the Sringeri guruparampara are all fixed based on stone inscriptions, copper plates etc. The compiler found the difference of about 700 years and he put it for Sureshwara as Mathadhipati for 700 years. But L. Rice pointed out that the Vikramaditya referred by the Sringeri Math belong to Badami-Chalukya Vikramaditya, son of Pulakeshi II, and not Ujjain Vikramaditya. This Chalukya Vikramaditya attacked Kanchi in 654 A.D. (Stone inscription) and after a lapse of some years he ascended the throne.

Kumbakonam Math propagates that Sankara was born five times:

- 1) Adi Sankara : 509/508 B.C. or 482 B.C. or 476 B.C. — Bhashyakara.
- 2) Kripa Sankara : 26 — 69 A.D. Shanmatasthapanacharya.
- 3) Ujjwala Sankara : 329 — 367 A.D. Blessed Kerala King Kulashekara to become a poet.
- 4) Muka Sankara : 398 — 437 A.D. Muka Kavi of Panchasati fame.
- 5) Abhinava Sankara : 788 — 840 A.D. — Born in Chidambaram — three years after the death of father and son of a widow — ascended Sarvagnya Peetha at Kashmir and disappeared from Himalayas.

Kanchi Math claims that the fifth Sankara is the Avatara of Adi Sankara and in the undue hurry and confusion, the scholars who forged the biography of the last one Abhinava Sankara have mistaken him for Adi Sankara and bodily lifted Adi Sankara's story as the story of the last Sankara's also.

By going through all the above facts, one must have observed that it would be stupid to accept Adi Sankara as having lived in B.C. era. To accept it would be to negate all the references in Adi Sankara's work relating to persons and texts and tenets that emerged in A.D. era. No sane man can believe such a theory. If Kanchi Math's claims are accepted, then one has to say that the fifth Sankara of the Kanchi Math must have written all the Bhashyas attributed to first Sankara of the B.C. era. If Adi Sankara is designated to B.C. 508, do they accept that he cannot be the author of Sankara Bhashyas? Why should Kanchi Math indulge in such acts derogatory to Shankara's prestige? In one of the propaganda books, it is claimed that Shankara has not condemned the religion of Buddha. Now arises a doubt whether the so called propagandist Vidwans engaged by the Kanchi Math have ever read Acharya's Sutra Bhashya or Upanishad Bhashyas. Not only Shankara condemn Buddhist tenets but has taken pains to demolish their arguments naming their authors and tenets. If Kanchi Math pandits had gone through the same, how could we countenance such silly statements? Kanchi Math holds that Acharya's date of birth was 509-508 B.C. or 482 B.C. or 476 B.C. This puts him very close to Buddha. Perhaps the intention behind inventing this date is to produce convenient theories to justify the absurd rationalisations. To put Shankara in 508 B.C. and invent four more Sankaras as his incarnations, the Math has adjusted these dates. Buddhists hold that Buddha will be born often and the Kanchi Math have apparently stolen this idea from them. That is why the Pandits of the Math fight shy of condemning Buddhism.

In Anandagiri Shankara Vijaya, Shankara has been called as Golakaputra (Widow's son), fixing his place of birth as Chidambaram and details are the same as given for the fifth incarnation Abhinava Sankara by the Kanchi Math. Then, do they concede that the original first Adi Sankara did not write the Prasthanatraya Bhashya? The inference is that the list of

Acharyas of the Kanchi Math, names upto 37th Place are absolutely false and only based on imagination. Dr. Sampurnananda, an authority amongst the learned, who has authored a number of books and well known for plain speaking says "--- Acharya Sankara's age is about 1200 years past. It was between 6th and 8th centuries in Vikrama Saka. But some attribute that Sankara lived 2500 years back. That means that he was a contemporary of Goutama and Mahaveera. To substantiate this claim, they invent many other Sankaras between the period of 2500 years to 1200 years or so. Then they say that Sankara who is regarded internationally as of 8th century is the fifth incarnation himself from Adi Sankara --- such a theory does not look plausible at all in my view and I want to make that clear" (Refer Vimarsha).

3. BIRTH PLACE OF SRI SHANKARA

Kalady is a sacred birth place of that great epoch maker Sri Adi Sankara, who re-established the reign of the Vedas and the supremacy of the Vedanta. After a period of neglect, Sri Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Sri Sringeri Math, Sri Sachchidananda Sivabhinava Narasimha Bharati, who unfolded the hidden stories of Kalady and through his endeavours were erected the twin shrines of Sri Sharada and Shri Shankara along with a memorial over the Samadhi of mother Aryambha. The consecration of the shrines was done on 21.2.1910.

In Anandagiri Sankaravijaya (Original), it is mentioned that Sankara was born in Chidambaram. The embellished edition of this Anandagiri Shankara Vijaya of Kanchi Math refers the birth place as Kalati. The propaganda journals and books argue that Chidambaram is another name for Kalati. With irrefutable evidence, Indologists and Archeologists have fixed Kalati as the birth place of Adi Sankara. For details, refer the book "Kalady" by Sri K.R. Venkatarama Iyer and "Vimarsha" by Varanasi Rajgopal Sharma. Even today, there is a "Brindavan" at the place where Sankara's mother was cremated. The Math, the Mandir, Patashale, Agrahara are under the charge of Sringeri Math. The senior most Swamigal of Kamakoti Math now addressed as "Paramacharya", did not visit Kalati because of the fear that the Administrative head of Sringeri Math in the

twenties of this century, Sri Srikantha Sastry would not arrange a befitting welcome to "Sarvabhowma Sarvottara Sarvasevya Jagadguru of the Central Math". But his sishya and the present Math head recently visited Kalati. The Paramacharya who could not step into Kalati said "The present Kalati is a grave" (श्रमशान) "and I will not visit a grave. Kalati is at a different place." Now it amuses one to find that the 69th head of the Math has ignored his guru's words and visited this "inauspicious place" (as per the view of the 68th head of the Kanchi Math).

All known evidence points to Kalati. Even the Buddhists, Jain and Shaiva authorities have unanimously accepted Kalati as the birth place of Sri Sankara. Even the Kanchi Math in the re-edited text of Anandagiri Sankara Vijayam has taken off. Chidambaram and named Kalati as the place of birth. A perusal of "Vimarsha" pages 147 to 184 and the "Truth about the Kumbakonam Math" — pages 29 to 40 will clear all the misconceptions about the Chidambaram theory.

The Travancore Maharaja's Government introduced in the State the provisions of the India Act of 1904 for the preservation of ancient monuments and in pursuance thereof "acquired Kundakara Puraiyadam Lekkam No. 115, registered in the name of Kaipalli Nambutiri and in the possession of Tekkemadam Swamiyar and other lands in Kalladikara Manjappa Proverthy, Kuttanad Taluq, which are associated with Sri Sankaracharya, containing the sites which are known as his birth place, the site where his house stood and the site on which the mortal remains of his mother were cremated." The government order dated, January 27, 1906, says — "As another step towards the introduction of this scheme, Government considers that measures should be adopted for the preservation of the birth place of Sri Sankaracharya, the great religious teacher and reformer, whose name is held in veneration throughout India. It is situated in the village of Kaladi, Manjappa Proverthy, Kuttanad Taluq, on the banks of the Alwaye. The locality is treated as Sanketham or place of sanctity.... There is a walled enclosure in a compound close to the ghat leading to the river also held sacred as having been used by the great reformer in performing the obsequies of his mother".

4. MATHAMNAYA

In the "Unpublished Upanishads" published from Adayar, Madras, it is said that "Mathamnaya Upanishad" is a work of Shankara. The Amnaya Paddhati was started by Sri Sankara. The same is said also in pamphlets and books published by Venkatesha Steam Press, Sanskrit Colleges, catalogues published in Mysore, Madras, Poona, Baroda, Varanasi, Calcutta, etc. In the four Amnaya Maths which have a direct lineage from Adi Sankara they have books on Amnaya and it is accepted that all the procedures etc. were laid by Sankara. Some Scholars opine that these Amnaya Paddhatis started by Sri Adi Sankara were reduced to writing in sloka form by others at a later period. A galaxy of scholars (79) of Varanasi declared in 1886 that Mathamnaya governs the fundamental doctrines and the origin of the four Maths. In one of the judgements, the Bombay High Court (Dwaraka Math case) has referred to this declaration and took cognisance of it. The High Courts of Allahabad, Patna, Calcutta, Bombay, etc., and the Supreme Court have accepted the Mathamnaya as an authoritative book and procedure on Sankara Maths. Quoted below is an extract from judgement of Patna High Court, dated 19.11.1936, ref. Original decree No. 3 of 1931, -- "The scriptures which govern the fundamental doctrines and origin of the four Maths are known as Mathamnayas, but it is said that this document is really of the eighth century and not of earlier date, which is attributed to it by tradition. The Mathamnaya is however accepted as authoritative by Hindus". The Dasanami Akhadas & Maddis such as Joon, Niranjani, Nirvani, Atal, Agni etc, etc, recognise this Mathamnaya as an authoritative document and confirm that the procedures were started by Adi Sankara. Historical evidences are available to show that some of these Akhadas existed even in 9th and 10th centuries and they have referred to the Mathamnaya as an authority on Sankara's Amnaya Maths. According to Adi Sankara for the four visual directions, four Vedas, four Upadesha Mahavakyas, four Sampradayas, Four Amnaya Maths were installed.

Patna High Court judgement says "The founder Adi Sankaracharya divided India into four jurisdictions with a Math at the head of each. Under the western jurisdiction was placed the territory roughly corresponding to that now known as

Bombay Presidency called the Sharada Math at Dwaraka ----- Northern India was placed under the Jyothi Math which is now extinct. Eastern India was placed under the Govardhan Math, the subject of the present dispute and the Southern India under the Sringeri Math in Mysore.... The Head of each Math is known by the title "Jagadguru Shankaracharya----". The Supreme Court in the Civil appeal No. 1802 of 1971, on 21.12.1979, says--- "About the 8th Century A.D. Shankaracharya, the greatest Hindu scholar and philosopher of modern India, defeated the Buddhists in argument and re-established Hinduism as the dominant religion of India. Sankara was an ascetic and founded schools of ascetics. Hindu Scholars and Philosophers like Mandana Mishra, attempted to prove against him that such ascetism was against the law of the Hindus. But all opposition was overborne by commanding influence of Sankara, who established four maths or seats of religion at four ends of India — The Sringeri math on the Sringeri Hills, in the South, the Sharada Math at Dwaraka in the west, the Jyothi math at Badrikashrama in the North and the Goverdhan Math at Puri in the east and Mandana himself became a Sanyasi disciple under the name of Sureshwara. The monks ordained by Sankara and his disciples were called Sanyasis. Each of the maths has a sanyasi at its head who bears the title of Sankaracharya in general. Sankara is said to have four principal disciples who were all Brahmins from whom the ten divisions of order — hence named the "Ten named" or "Dasanami Dandis" originated. These are — Thirtha (Shrine), Ashrama (Order), Vana (Wood), Aranya (Forest or desert) Saraswati & Bharati (The Goddess of learning and speech), Puri (City), Giri and Parvata (a hill) and Sagar (Ocean)". This Dasanami Yogapatta has been allocated to the four amnaya maths and the sanyasis owe their allegiance to the respective amnaya maths to which they are assigned, thus; Two names — Teertha, Ashrama for East, Two names — Vana, Aranya for West, 3 names — Giri, Parvatha, Sagar for North and 3 names — Saraswathi, Bharati and Puri for South. Readers attention is drawn to the judgements of the Patna High Court (Puri Math case), Calcutta High Court (Tarakeshwar Math case), Bombay High Court (Dwaraka Math case), Privy Council decisions of 19th Century and the Supreme Court Judgements (Joshi Math

case — 1974, and Civil Appeal 1802 of 1971 Judgement in 1979) declaring that Sri Adi Sankara established only four maths (Puri, Sringeri, Dwaraka and Jyothi) at the four corners of India for four vedas and its four upadesha Mahavakyas. All these decisions are based on Mathamnaya. These judgements are the laws of the country.

The Government of India in their letter No. 1471/66-S-11 dated 28.5.66, state — "The decision to replace "Sankaracharya Matha" by pilgrim centre was taken some years ago, after numerous representations had been received by the government of India that Kumbakonam math was not the seat of a Sankaracharya math and that such maths exist only at Sringeri, Dwaraka, Badrinath & Puri". The version of the Kumbakonam-Kanchi Math is at Variance from all these well settled issues on Amnaya Maths.

The Mathamnayasetu of the Kumbakonam-Kanchi math materially differs from the Mathamnayas current throughout India. That this work was brought into existence just to claim for the Kumbakonam math supremacy over the recognised four amnaya math is quite obvious from its wording, (refer quotations in the introduction). The patent object of such tall claim was to get for that math atleast a recognition as an institution founded by Sri Shankara but the attempt was so clumsy and barefaced (creation of 5th veda, 5th Upadesha Mahavakya, 5th visual direction, 11th yogapatta etc, etc), that no one took any serious notice of it till the occupant of that math chose to advance that claim and secure the support of people subject to or amenable to his (now known as Paramacharya) influence. Some of the Mathamnayas extant in the land mention that in addition to the four amnayas, three more are in the spiritual or adhyatmic plane, thus raising the number of amnayas to seven. Kanchi Math mathamnayasetu, however, mentions eight amnayas adding one more to justify its own existence. This new amnaya of Kanchi math is put between the four terrestrial amnayas and the three spiritual ones, without giving any number to the new one. It is but a clear fabrication for the purpose of claiming supremacy. This Setu does not allot any territory to the Kumbakonm math for its jurisdiction. According to the Setu the Sringeri Math is for the

South. It follows that it has jurisdiction even in the towns of Kanchi and Kumbakonam and it is not open to the Kumbakonam Math (Which relies upon the Mathamnayasetu) to question this undeniable fact which is confirmed by the Setu itself.

Kumbakonam math's propagandist trot out an extract from Dr. Hultzsch's reports of "Sanskrit Manuscripts in South India" but just above these lines as quoted by Kanchi Math, the following occur and they blackout this fact:—

"संस्थाप्य स्वमठं कृत्वा तद्गङ्गा नदीतटे । तत्रस्थित्वा द्वादशाब्दं यतिं पृथ्वीधराभिधम् ।
विद्यापीठाधिकं कृत्वा भारती संज्ञयागरुः ॥"

How do these people who claim that Adi Sankara's own Math was at Kanchi reconcile themselves to this statement?

Dictionary defines six characteristics to amnaya:—

- 1) Veda
- 2) A college where veda, Vyakarna other sastras are taught through upadesha by guruparampara
- 3) Initiation of Upadesha in secrecy by Sadguru parampara
- 4) Sampradaya
- 5) Kula and
- 6) Adhyayana (Study)

According to Dharma Sastra there are seven amnayas — four recognisable by eye (East, South, West and North) and three recognisable by Gnyana (Urdhwa, Swatma, Nishkala), where did the fifth Amnaya (recognisable by eye) emanate? Amnaya of Upasana is quite different from the amnaya of Maths code. In Vyasa puja, in some form of Shakta puja, and in others five amnayas are recognised and worshipped. This code is not applicable to amnaya math code.

The visual directions of the mathamnaya of Kanchi Math is called "Moolamnaya or Urdhwamnaya or Moulamnaya or Madhyamnaya or Mukhyamnaya". These have no support in scriptures, but are taken from different propaganda books of the Kanchi Math. They do not know which amnaya refers to Kumbakonam math or Kanchi Kamakoti Math and hence the different amnaya names. As per Dharma Sastra and Sri Sankara's Mathamnaya, there are only four visual directions.

The Mathamnaya of Kanchi Math claims:— Mbulamnaya, Sharada Math, Rig Veda, Mithyavar Sampradaya, Satya Brahmachari, Indra Saraswati Yogapatta, Kamakoti Peetha, Om Tat Sat Manavakya, Guru Math, etc., Mahabharatha, Mahanyasa Mahamantras, Narasimhatapini Upanishad, Chandogya and Mundaka Upanishads, declare only four Vedas, Rig, Yajur, Sama and Atharvana. Rig Veda is assigned to Puri Math as per Mathamnaya and its Upadesha Mahavakya is "Pragnyanam Brahma". Kanchi Math split the Yajurveda into two — Krishna and Shukla and allotted them to other maths and took Rig Veda for Kanchi Math. The Mahavakya for Yajurveda is from Shukla Yajurveda and what Mahavakya is to be assigned to Krishna Yajus? "Pragnyanam Brahma" is the Mahavakya for Rig Veda and not "Om Tat Sat" as claimed by Kanchi Math.

According to Dharma Sastra, only four Sampradayas were recognised and they are Keeta, Bhoga, Anand, Bhoori. Mityavar is a newly coined sampradaya by Kanchi Math. Sri Adi Sankara had recognised four kinds of Brahmacharis and they are — Prakasaka, Chaitanya, Swaroopaka and Ananda. Satya of Kanchi Math's invention is a counterfeit coin in circulation.

There is reference only for ten yogapathas or Dasanami-Theertha, Ashrama, Vana, Aranya, Giri, Parvata, Sagara, Saraswati, Bharati and Puri. Dharma Sastra Books say 'दशैवहि' & not more than ten. In "Yati Dharma Nirnaya", it is said that some names have subdivided into another time due to pride of the originater. So, "Indra Saraswati" and "Ananda Saraswathi" are sub-divisions in Saraswathi line. According to Dasanami Sampradaya "Saraswathi" is allotted to Sringeri Math and they should owe allegiance to Sringeri Math. "पूर्वोक्त तीर्थाश्रमादीनां मध्ये केषांचिन्नाम्नां स्वस्वशीलाचार मताभिमानेन जाताः सम्प्रदायाः तत्तन्नाम भेदाश्च इन्द्रसरस्वती आनन्दसरस्वती चेति॥"

In Sri Sankara's time, there was only "Saraswathi" yogapatta. Hence, Indra Saraswathi was a new creation of recent origin. In 16th century, we have Geervanendra Saraswathi and we understand from great scholars that before that, this Indraswaraswathi was unheard of. In 17th century there was Upanishad Brahmendra. In 16th and 17th century we come across Abhinava Narayanendra Saraswathi. The Upanishad

Brahmendra math holds that it is the earliest advaita math in Kanchi and was started during later half of the 17th century. Where was the Kanchi Math then? If this title (Indra Saraswati) was bestowed exclusively for heads of Kumbakonam Kanchi Math, as claimed by them, were the following also the heads of Kanchi Math — Sri Ramachandrendra Saraswathi (Upanishad Brahma Yogi), Vasudevendra Saraswathi, Mahadevendra Saraswathi (Upanishad Brahmendra Math), Girvanendra Sarawathi (author of Prapanchasara Sangraha), Balakrishnendra Saraswathi (author of Nyayamoda), Raghavendra Saraswathi, Ananda Bodhendra Saraswathi (Commentator of Yogavasista), Gangadharendra Saraswathi (author of Swarajya Siddi), Abhinava Narayanendra Saraswathi, Sadasivendra Saraswathi (Nerur Samadhi), Vasudevendra Saraswathi (author of Siddanta Lesha Tatparya Sangraha) and so forth?

The concocted and fantastic story about "Indra Saraswathi" and its origin and bestowed by Indra to Sankaracharya ("Indra gave his own title to the Jagadguru which is borne even to this day by the occupants of the Kamakoti Peetha") reflects no credit on any of the high personages involved in this drama and is a patent myth. Atmabodhendra of Kanchi Math does not support this claim. He says the names may be simply Saraswathi or Bharathi with the prefix Indra or Ananda. We find grafted to the Kumbakonam Math's list well known vedanta teachers as Sarvajnatma, Gyanottama, Anandagnyana, Muka Kavi, Advaitananda, Sankarananda, etc. They are all said to have presided over that math, but curiously enough none of these writers chose to make any slightest mention, in any of their works, of the Kanchi Math or of this Indra Saraswathi.

There are many Mahavakyas for meditation which give the gist of Advaita. A sentence which conveys to the reader the oneness of Jiva with Brahma is called Mahavakya and it is composed of words indicating Jiva and Brahma and indicating its oneness. But there are only four Mahavakyas for guru upadesha for four vedas. Thereafter for meditation there are many mahavakyas. Sukarahasyopanishad says "Atha Mahavakyanī Chatvari". This is confirmed also in Shiva Tatwa Sudhanidhi and Panchadashi — Prajnanam Brahma (In Rik Itareya), Aham Brahmasmi (In Yajur Shukla Brihadaranyaka),

Tatwamasi (in Sama Chandogya) and Ayamatra Brahma (in Atharvana Mandukya). Shankara in Gita Bhashya has taken Om-Tat-Sat as Brahma Nirupana words. How can this be called Mahavakya? Sri Krishna says , ऊतत्सदिति निर्देशो ब्रह्मणः त्रिविधः स्मृतः । " All the three words denote Brahma. If it is taken as Mahavakya, then one must count Sri Krishna as a Mithyavadi and Sankara made the same mistake in the Geeta commentary. Kanchi Math is only interested in one thing and that is self-advertisement. The Paramacharya, as he is now known, when he was confronted in Varanasi in October 1934, had said "Om Tat Sat" is not Kanchi Math's Mahavakya and added that all publications mentioning "Om-Tat-Sat" as Mahavakya had no sanction to publish the same from the math (Ref. Panditapatra Varanasi 15.10.34 and "Leader", Allahabad, 21.10.34). But Atmabodhendra in his commentary on Gururatnamalika would claim for it "Rig Veda Mahavakya" as "Om Tat Sat". And so the Paramacharya holds that Gururatnamala and Sushama are bogus and had no sanction to publish the same. But, unfortunately, all the claims propagated by the Kumbakonam Kanchi Math are drawn from Sushama and it is an authoritative fundamental book of the Kanchi Math.

Jagadguru Sankaracharyas of the three Amnaya Maths originally established by Sri Adi Sankaracharya, confirm the fact that Sri Adi Sankaracharya had established four Amnaya Maths only, that he ascended the Sarvagnya Peetha at Kashmir and disappeared from the Kedarakshetra in the Himalayas. One can refer 'Srimad Jagadguru Shankaramath Vimarsha' and 'Kashi me Kumbakonmath Vishayak Vivada' books for 200 opinions from scholars of national and international repute.

(A) Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Dakshinamnaya Sri Sringeri Math states in a telegram dated 13.9.1934— "your wire. In our sincere opinion the only basis clearing doubts regarding Acharya's Gaddies found in the famous work Mathamnayastrotra. If you want you may ascertain also from Dwaraka Jaganath Maths — Swamiji Sringeri Gaddi".

A Srimukha from Sringeri Math, dated 16.1.1961 states: 'महर्षिाधिकेभ्यो हायनेभ्यः प्राक् केरलेषु कालट्यां भगवत्पादानां जन्म, नमंदातीर्त्तानां श्रीगोविन्द भगवत्पज्यपादानां सकाशात् तृतीयाश्रमावाप्तिः, प्रस्थानत्रय भाष्य दण्डनम्,

आसेतोराहिमाचलं पुण्यक्षेत्राटनम्, विमतपर्ण्डत पगजयः, सर्वतो वेदान्तमतप्रचारः, तृहिनाचल-मलयाचल-मध्यगतयोः बदरी-श्रृंगेरी क्षेत्रयोः प्राचीप्रतीची सागर तीरस्थयोः पुरीद्वारावतीक्षेत्रयोः धर्मपीठानां चतुर्णां प्रतिष्ठापनम्। काश्मीरेष तत्कालप्रथित-सर्वज्ञ-पीठारोहणम्। हिमवति केदारक्षेत्रतोन्तर्धानम्। इति कथेयं प्राचीनानानैकानां ग्रन्थानां परिशीलनेन परिज्ञायते। पीठानां आचारार्दावषये मठाम्नायस्तोत्रं महता अनेहसा प्रमाणतां प्रपद्यमानं पीठस्थैः सर्वैराचार्यैः आद्रियमाणमस्ति।

(B) Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Paschimamnaya Dwaraka Math states in a Srimukha dated 7.9.1960— "----- अवैदिकमतबाह्येन हीयमाने धर्मे, प्रवर्धमानेचाधर्मे, भगवान् लोकशंकरः श्रीशंकरः कालत्यां शंकराचार्य रूपेणाऽवतीर्य वैदिक विरुद्धमतानि निस्मार्य पनस्मनातन धर्मोद्धारं चकार। उद्धृतस्यास्य धर्मस्य परिरक्षणाय चत्वारि पीठानि समस्थाप्यंत। अन्ते च हिमालयस्य केदारेक्षेत्रे स्वधामगमनमभूदिति कथा प्रमाण सिद्धा सर्वाविदित चरैव। ----- मठाचचत्वार आचार्याश्चत्वारश्च धरंधराः। संप्रदायाश्च चत्वार एषा धर्मव्यवस्थितिः।। इति आम्नायाश्चत्वारः चतसृषु दिक्षु श्रीमदादयशकर भगवत्पादैस्संस्थापिता मठाश्चत्वार एव, चत्वारश्च पीठाभिषिक्ता आचार्याः इयं धर्मव्यवस्था विलसति। शंकरानुयायिभिस्सर्वैरियं व्यवस्थाऽनमरणीया श्रेयोऽभिर्भरति शिवम्।"

PTI reports (The Hindu dated 26.8.87) "----- The Sankaracharya of Dwaraka Peetham Sri Swaroopanand Saraswati --- now camping in Poona, when asked about the disappearance, however, made it clear that Sri Jayendra Saraswathi" could not be regarded as a Sankaracharya" since he did not belong to the main four Peethams constituted by Shri Adi Sankaracharya ----- Sri Swaroopananda explained that Sri Jayendra Saraswathi could not be called Sankaracharya because the Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham was a "Shakha" (Branch) of the Sringeri Peetham, one of the four main seats instituted by Sri Adi Shankara."

(C) Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Poorvamnaya Puri Govardhan Math states in a telegram dated 13.9.1934 — "yours received. Adi Sankaracharya's all biographies mention only Govardhan Math, Shringeri Math, Dwaraka Math and Jyotir Maths established by himself. If Kumbakonam claims otherwise ask for original authorities."

Sri Sankaracharya of Govardhan Math writes in a letter dated 26.1.1935— "----- As for your proposed book, I think the best thing would be for you to depend upon and make use of

the huge number of books and booklets which have been referred to by you and which would suffice for your purpose of establishing your proposition. The references to the original Shankara Vijaya and other such authoritative evidence being there, they will speak eloquently for themselves; and there is no need for publishing any opinion from me or any other such individual on the matter." ----- "The list given by you, of material which you propose to publish, is a sufficiently huge and satisfactory one; and I wish you to be content with that. Let me assure you, it will more than serve your purpose; and nothing from me is necessary to add to the volume and weight of the evidence which you have in your possession already and which you propose to make use of."

Sri Sankaracharya of Puri Govardhan Math states, dated 29.4.1962, "----- His four great disciples and Apostolic successors i.e., Shree Padmapadacharya, Shree Sureshwaracharya, Shree Hastamalakacharya and Shree Totakacharya, whom Bhagwan Shree Shankaracharya installed with HIS own hands as successors on the four pontifical Gaddis founded and established by HIM in the four cardinal directions in India."

UNI reports (Deccan Herald 15.9.1987) that "He (The Sankaracharya of Puri Govardhan Math) asserted that there are only four Shankaracharyas, one each for every direction. 'So, according to us, the Kanchipuram Shankaracharya does not exist.'" ----- "They (Kanchi Mathadhipati) do not have any legitimacy as Adiguru Sri Shankaracharya never established any math at Kanchi. So, we four Shankaracharyas (of Puri, Badrinath, Dwaraka and Sringeri) do not recognise him. Therefore, whatever he says should not be taken seriously." (Probe-India Nov. 87).

(D) H.H. Sri 108 Swami Sivananda Maharaj of Haridwar says— "----- The Sringeri Peetha is one of the oldest monasteries of the world flourishing for over twelve centuries now. It is the first of the four seats of learning established by Sankaracharya, the other three being Puri, Dwaraka and Joshi Math, each one of them representing one of the four Vedas of the Hindus."

(E) An erudite scholar, Saint Philosopher, H.H. Sri Swami Tapasyanandji Maharaj of Sri Ramakrishna Math states, — “--- - Traditionally, four Maths are supposed to have been founded by Sankara at the four regions of India — at Sringeri in the south under Sureshwara, at Dwaraka in the West under Hastamala, at Badari in the north under Totaka, and at Puri in the east under Padmapada. ----- The theory (of four maths) seems to have originated from the fact that the Orders of Dasanami Sannyasins recognise and accept affiliation with only these four maths — The Orders known as Puris, Bharatis and Saraswathis with Sringeri Math; Giris, Aranyas and Vanas with Jyotir Math; Ashramas and Tirthas with Dwaraka Math; and Parvatas and Sagaras with Puri Math. No other Math is recognised by them. Now, if there were more Mathas of Shankara, why have the Dasanami Sannyasins limited their affiliation to these four Maths only? None of the protagonists of different Sankara Maths have answered this question. The affiliation no doubt, is only a nominal one and these sannyasins neither take Sanyasa from these Maths nor follow any direction or control emanating from them. Still the question of how they came to be thus affiliated has to be answered. The advocates of more than four maths have given no explanation. In fact, they have not at all taken into account the evidence of Dasanami Sannyasins, who have played a more active role in propagating the institution of Sannyasa and the Advaita philosophy than the Shankara Maths. From what time — whether it was from the time of Sankaracharya himself or in later times — the Dasanamis came into existence, cannot be ascertained now. Even assuming they came later and also that Sankara started more than four maths, their affiliation with these four maths above mentioned establishes at least that, at the time these sannayasin orders took shape, only these four Maths were functioning effectively.” (Ref. Sankara-Dig-Vijaya, translated into English). (Note — Irrefutable historical evidences are available about the active existence of Dasanami Sannyasins and their Akhadas during tenth century.)

(F) Dr. Rajendra Prasad (President, Indian Union) writes on 2-1-1963 about the book 'Srimad Jagadguru Shankaramath Vimarsha' — a critical and academic study on all claims made

by Kumbakonam — Kanchi Kamakoti Math and establishes the fact that Kumbakonam Kanchi Math was not established by Sri Adi Sankara and that it is a Shankara Sampradaya math established long long after Sri Adi Sankara. “स्वर्गीय श्री ज.ग. विश्वनाथ शर्मा द्वारा संकलित सामग्री के आधार पर श्रीमद्जगद्गुरु शांकरमठ विमर्श नामक ग्रंथ, जिसका संपादन उनके सुपुत्र श्री राजगोपाल शर्मा ने किया है, पठनीय और चिन्तन तथा इतिहास की दृष्टि से उपादेय है। धर्मपरम्परा, सामाजिकचिन्तन, साहित्य निर्माण और इतिहास, इन सभी दृष्टियों से आदि गुरु शंकराचार्य की जीवन गाथा तथा उनकी कृतियां देशभर के लिये एक बहुमूल्य निधि है। इस ग्रन्थ में सुयोग्य लेखक ने जो जानकारी और सामग्री प्रस्तुत की है, वह आसानी से उपलब्ध नहीं। इसलिये भी ग्रन्थ के प्रकाशन का स्वागत होना चाहिये। मुझे श्रीमद्जगद्गुरु शांकरमठ विमर्श को देखकर बहुत प्रसन्नता हुई और मेरा विश्वास है कि सभी धर्मनिष्ठ पाठकों की इस पुस्तक के प्रति यही प्रतिक्रिया होगी।”

(G) Pujya Sri Dr. S. Radhakrishnan (Vice President-Indian Union) writes on 11.6.1960 as follows — “Thank you for your letter of June 6. This is what I wrote in a book published in 1923 — ‘He established four Maths or monasteries, of which the chief is the one at Sringeri in the Mysore Province, the others are those at Puri in the East, Dwaraka in the West, and Badrinath in the Himalayas.’ This is the opinion which I hold. To my knowledge there are only 4 Mahavakyas connected with four maths. I have no comments to make on the recent controversy.”

(H) Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (Prime Minister — Indian Union) writes on 13.8.1960 as follows — “I have your letter of August 9th. What I wrote in my book 'Discovery of India' about Shri Shankaracharya is still my opinion. You may publish the extracts from my book to which you have drawn my attention.”

Extracts from 'Discovery of India' — “And yet Shankara was a man of amazing energy and vast activity. He was no escapist retiring into his shell or into a corner of the forest, seeking his own individual perfection and oblivious of what happened to others. Born in Malabar in the far South of India, he travelled incessantly all over India, meeting innumerable people, arguing, debating, reasoning, convincing and filling them with a part of his own passion and tremendous vitality. He was evidently a man who was intensely conscious of his mission, a man who looked upon the whole of India from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas as his field of action and as something that held

together culturally and was infused by the same spirit, though this might take many external forms. He strove hard to synthesize to diverse currents that were troubling the mind of India of his day, and to build a unity of outlook out of that diversity. In a brief life of thirty-two years he did the work of many long lives, and left such an impress of his powerful mind and rich personality on India that it is very evident today. He was a curious mixture of a philosopher and a scholar, an agnostic and a mystic, a poet and a saint, and in addition to all this, a practical reformer and an able organizer. He built up, for the first time within the Brahminical fold, ten religious orders and of these four are very alive today. He established four great maths or monasteries, locating them far from each other, almost at the four corners of India. One of these was in the South at Sringeri in Mysore, another at Puri on the East coast, the third at Dwaraka in Kathiawad on the West coast, and the fourth at Badarinath in the heart of the Himalayas. At the age of thirty-two this Brahmin from the tropical South died at Kedarnath in the upper snow-covered reaches of the Himalayas."

"By locating his four great monasteries in the north, south, east and west, he evidently wanted to encourage the conception of a culturally united India. These four places had been previously places of pilgrimage from all parts of the country, and now became more so."

5. SARVAGNYA PEETHA

It is the traditional belief throughout India that Sri Sankara ascended the Sarvagnya Peetha at Kashmir and disappeared from Mortal vision in the Himalayas. The Kumbakonam-Kanchi Math would however have it that Sankara installed a Sarvagnya Peetha at Kanchi and ascended the same and disappeared at Kanchi itself. Further, the Kanchi math advanced a theory that Vyasachala meant only Kanchi even when he mentioned Kashmir in sloka 30/31 and that Kanchi and Kashmir were interchangeable words!

Sri Ramanujacharya was a resident of Kanchi itself and in the whole of his life history, there is no mention of the existence of an advaita math at Kanchi or of any Sarvagnya Peetha there. When Sri Ramanuja wanted to peruse Bodhayana Vrithi before

writing his "Sribhashya", he took a special trip to the Sharada Peetha in Kashmir in the company of his disciple Sri Srivatsanka and ultimately got the work. If there were a Sharada Peetha or a Sarvagnya Peetha at Kanchi (His Own town), he need not have troubled himself to go so far as Kashmir.

Kashmir is the land of Saraswati-Sharada math in the north and Kum-kum mountains in the south with an area of about 50 yojanas. (Refer Raja Tarangini). Kashmir was famous as the land of the learned (Raja Tarangini 1/35-37 & 1/42). Kashmir was also known as Sharada Mandala or Sharada Peetha and the language was Sharadi. Vinayaka Bhatta says in Sankhyayana Bhashya that people used to go north for learning language and to hold debates on sastras. It is called Sharada Peetha because it is the land of Sharada. Devi Bhagavata and Matsya Purana say that Sharada's abode is Kashmir. An ancient text Sharada Mahatmya says that Sharada is the Goddess of this place and hence the peetha was called Sharada Peetha. The name is evident in Bilhana's works and Saraswathi Rahasyopanishad "सहोदराः कुंकुम मया प्ररोहः।" "नमस्ते शारदे देवि काश्मीरप्रवासिनि।"

Marud Vradha river mentioned in Veda was flowing in Kashmir. Uttarakuru and Deva Kshetra as mentioned in Itareya Brahmana is Kashmir itself. 'Brahmanotpathimarhandanda' says that Gauda Brahmins migrated from Kashmir to other parts of Bharat. Sri Harsha says that Kashmiri people were adept at fourteen vidyas. Bilhana says that women in Kashmir spoke in Sanskrit language. Stein says that he found memorial stones on tombs of Mohammedans written in Sanskrit language. The origin of Shaiva Siddhanta, Shaiva Vedanta and Veerashaivism are credited to Kashmir. "Spanda Karika" of Vasugupta of Kashmir in 9th century is the source of Shaivamata. 'प्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शन' is another branch of Shaivamata which originated from Kashmir. Sri Gaudapada in Mandukya Karika uses Buddhist vocabulary and even Shankara has done it. It is after the advent of Sankara, 'Mahayana' religion started declining in the 9th and 11th centuries and again Shaivism started gaining ground. In all the books of that period in Kashmir there is Shankara's influence. Shaktas consider Kashmir as the abode of their Goddess Kameshwari.

Rudratha, Mallatha, Shankuka, Ananda Vardhana, Bhattanayaka, Bhattatha, Mahendruraja, Abhinavagupta, Kuntaka, Mahima Bhatta, Kshemendra, Mammata, Allatta, Tilakata, Ruyyaka and other Kavyakaras were all of Kashmir origin. Their contribution to different branches of Kavya flowered in Kashmir. Neelamata Purana (6/7th century), the famous 'Kasika Vritti', a commentary on Vyakarana Sutra of Jayaditya and Vamana (7th Century), Vayyakarini Ksheeraswamy works, Chandragomin's contribution and Rajatarangini (1148 A.D) were of Kashmir origin. That there was a Sharada Peetha earlier to Shankara is borne out by abundant evidence. Hui-yen-Tsang visited Kashmir in A.D. 631 and says that all the learned came to debate to Kashmir Sharada Mandala. T.N. Farquhar wrote "The activities of the great Shankara fall in the first half of the eighth century and we may be sure that the traditions are right when they say he visited Kashmir during one of his controversial tours". Prof. H.H. Wilson wrote in the year 1828 and in 1832 in the Asiatic Researches and his writings had been published in 1846 at Calcutta. He says about Sri Sankara "Towards the close of his life he repaired to as far as Kashmir and seated himself after triumphing over various opponents, on the throne of Saraswathi ---- The events of his last days are confirmed by local tradition and the pitha or throne of Saraswati on which Sankara sat is still shown in Kashmir".

Sankara's "Prapanchasara" has "Sharadastuti" for its first Sloka. The author of "Prayoga Krama Deepika" (a commentary on Prapanchasara Vivarana) says that Prapanchasara was written by Sankara at Kashmir. That is why Sharada (the deity of Kashmir) is invoked at the beginning and there is more evidence to conclude that Shankara occupied the Sarvagnya Peetha at Kashmir. This is again borne out by Sri Raghavabhatta, a commentator on "Sharada Tilaka" and Sri Kalicharan, the commentator on "Shatchakra Nirupana". The word Sarvagnya indicates the possibility of only one Sarvagnya Peetha and that is in the Sharada Temple visited by all the top learned men of India in the past. In Rajatrangini of Kalhana (1148/50 AD) it is said that in the beginning and middle of the 8th century at the time of Lalitaditya's time, Gauda Brahmanas visited Kashmir and held disputations.

Albirouni (1030 A.D) says "In inner Kashmir about two or three days journey from the Capital in the direction towards mountains of Bolar there is a wooden idol called Sharada which is much venerated and frequented by scholars and pilgrims for disputations in Shastras". So, it is evident that in the 8th century when Sankara visited Kashmir the Sharada idol was there. Stein says that the road to Sharada temple in Sharadi village was difficult to pass through and in a village called 'Khuhyom' near Srinagar, a new Sharada Temple was erected. Muslims called it as "Takht-i-Suliman" (Sarvagnya Peetha). Again, Shivarahasya, Madhaviya, Sadanandiya, Vyasachalia refer to Sarvagnya Peetha in Kashmir. This again is amply borne out by other historical works on Kashmir.

6. PLACE OF DISAPPEARANCE

Kumbakonam Kanchi Math claims that Sri Sankara attained Nirvana at Kanchi, that his idol is installed in the Kamakshi temple from ancient times and the mandir is his Samadhi.

Madhava and Sadananda (authors of Shankara Vijaya) both say that immediately after ascending the Sarvagya Peetha at Kashmir, he proceeded to Himalayas and then to Kailas. Chidvilasa says that Shankara went to the Himalayas and disappeared into Dattatreya Cave. According to new Vyasachaliya, Sankara went away to the desired region immediately after ascending Sarvagnya Peetha at Kashmir. Anandagiri alone says that Sankara while at Kanchi attained Nirvana and the description of his nirvana from gross to subtle and then to causal and then "चिन्मात्रो भूत्वा अंगुष्ठमात्र पुरुषस्तदपरि पूर्णमखण्डलाकारमानन्दं प्राप्य सर्वजगदव्यापक चैतन्यमभवत्।।"

This is not acceptable to any advaitin. Shivarahasya of 60 slokas confirm his disappearance from the Himalayan region. Sri Manikya Vijaya, Guruparampara Charita, Dindima commentator, Darsana Prakash and Shankar Paddhati (referred in a book of 1638), all confirm the place of disappearance as Himalayan region. The four Amnaya Sankaracharyas also confirm the place of the disappearance as Himalayan region.

Atkinson Gazetteer - Vol II - edited in 1882/83 says "Shankara towards the close of his life visited Kashmir, where he overcame his opponents and was enthroned in the chair of Saraswati, the goddess of eloquence. He next visited Badri where he restored the ruined temples of Narayana and finally proceeded to Kedar where he died at the early age of thirty-two". Prof. H.H. Wilson (1846) says — "He next went to Badarikasrama and finally to Kedarnath in the Himalayas where he died at the age of thirty-two. The events of his last days are confirmed by local traditions ---" Prof. Wilson in Glossary of 1855 says "--- Whether he (Sankara) was more than a passing pilgrim at Conjeevaram is doubtful ---". Jagadguru Shankaracharya of Dwaraka Sharada Math says "Whatever it be, there can be no doubt that the ultimate disappearance was at Kedar Kshetra. Even to this day, the people there point out a particular place at the spot where from the great Acharya disappeared and the pilgrims visiting the spot are told to worship there; while so, it is idle to say that he attained siddhi in some place in the south and that there is a place where his mortal remains were interned. We cannot accept such contentions nor will the sishyas throughout the land of Bharat countenance them". Sri Vidyanand Saraswati Swami Maharaj, Geetasatsang, Kailas Kshetra, writes: ---" I have made special study of the history of Uttarakhand i.e., the Garhwal and Kumaon districts of U.P., particularly from the beginning of the 8th century to the present day. In my researches, I have often had recourse to Government records and other authentic sources; and all the sources corroborate admirably to establish the important fact that the Adi Sankaracharya "shed his mortal coil" and attained immortality at Kedarnath itself. The government records and folk songs reiterate the incident as a hallowed and cherished memory and history — both searched and secular clearly establishes the position of Kedarnath — as the place where the great sage and rishi attained 'Nirvana'. The most convincing and unchallengeable fact, however, is that at Kedarnath itself, there is an old structure, which has been there for centuries past, and is to the present day, the samadhi of Sri Adi Shankaracharya ----- Those that claim and seek to establish the Samadhi at Tamilnadu (Kanchi) let us hope, will realise that they are acting from ignorance and without the possession of facts and historical records and associations".

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan says "He died at Kedarnath in the Himalayas at the age of thirty two -----". Atkinson, Hunter, L. Rice, Teil, Max Muller, Duff, Telang, Tilak, J. Sircar, R.K. Mukerjee, R.C. Mazumdar, Pathak, J. Nehru, C.P. Ramaswamy, all confirm the place of Nirvana as Himalayan region.

Sri. M.G. Rajaram (Jt. Secy. Ministry of Education) writes to Sri S. Subba Aiyar of Madras 24, Ref: Letter D.O. No. 19-64/63 S.II, dt 29.5.63, 1.6.63, "In view of the vigorous elucidation so nicely brought out by you in your letter, there can be **no doubt that Sri Adi Sankara attained Samadhi only at Kedarnath and not at Kancheepuram**".

Kanchi Math claims "In the mandir of Sri Kamakshi there is a temple of Sankaracharya with his life size Murthi which is his samadhistan": According to Aagama Sastra and Dharma Sastra, there should not be a samadhi in a temple where Devayoni resides and is worshipped. This matter of Samadhi was taken up with Madras H.R.C.E. Deptt, and the Samadhi Board was removed and replaced by "Sannadhi". The Shankaracharya's murthi in Kamakshi Temple was originally a Buddha murthi and sufficient evidence was provided to HR & CE Board with a request to give their opinion. H.R.C.E. Letter — No. H.R. & C.E (Admn) Dept., L.Dis. No. 38630/60 dated 4.11.1960, Sub: Management — Sri Kamakshiamman Temple — Kanchipuram, Chingleput Dist, Removal of word "Samadhi" regarding, Ref: Your letters dated 26.9.1960 and 30.10.1960:

"You may contact specialists and experts who can offer authoritative opinions on the subject. As commissioner of H.R. & C.E. (Admn) Dept, I am not expected to express any opinion on the subject. I note that you have since been appraised of the fact that the word used in the Board in the temple is "SANNADHI".

This matter of Buddha murthi being changed to Sankaracharya Murthi in Kamakshi temple, was taken up with an expert on this subject, Prof. A. Aiyappan (Ex. Supdt. Madras Museum, Madras and Deptt. of Anthropology, Utkal University, Bhuvaneshwar). He writes on 18.10.1960 --- "Thanks for your interesting letter. When I visited Kanchi, I did not have the

particular image of Shankar (?) in mind and cannot recollect it now. **Your hypothesis is quite plausible.** Have you got a photograph of it which you can send me? Mr. P.R. Srinivasan of the Deptt of Archelogy.... is a good expert on the subject of sculptures. I would suggest your consulting him on this problem".

This matter was than referred to Sri P.R. Srinivasan and he writes on 21.10.1960 — "Your kind letter dated 17.10.1960 has reached me yesterday. I went through it with great interest. I am no longer in the service of Government Museum, Madras. I am now working in the office of the Government Epigraphist for India, Ootacamund. The contents of your letter are interesting. But I am unable to know why you are interested in this obscure subject". "Anyway as regards the Kamakshi Amman temple in Kanchi, Sri. T.A. Gopinath Rao has surmised that it was associated with Buddhism. It seems to be reasonable. But this requires further investigation. Sri Sankara image in the temple has not been seen by me. **So, I am not able to agree or disagree with the contention it was originally a Buddha Image.** In fact, I have not had an opportunity to investigate these matters more deeply. I do not know if I can do it in the near future. If an opportunity arises, I shall examine it deeply". It may be noted that both letters do not give a negative reply to my query. The evidence that I had produced before them cannot be so easily negated and if a deep study is made, one would come to conclusion that it was originally a Buddha murti.

Sri T.A.G. Rao (Arch. Survey Deptt) writes "I came upon no less than 5 images of Buddha within a radius of half a mile from the famous temple of Kamakshi Devi. I was also told that two other megalithic images of Buddha lie burried in a garden adjoining the same temple" ... "Hence it will not be wide off the mark if this figure is attributed to the beginning of the 7th century A.D" ... "The present position of the image with respect to the temple of Kamakshi can be explained by two plausible hypothesis, namely (1) that the image did certainly occupy some important place in the very temple itself or 2) that it was brought in there by some one for safe custody" ... "The temple of Kamakshi was, in all probabality, originally a temple of Tara

Devi and as with many other temples of alien faith, converted into a "Hindu Temple in later times". Sri P.R. Srinivasan, of the Archeology Survey writes "discovered in the inner most prakara of the Kamakshi temple in the town raises the question whether originally this temple was dedicated to this Buddha itself. Perhaps there was a Buddhist temple here dating from a period earlier than 600 A.D. There was probably more Buddhist temples like this in the neighbourhood "Sri K.A. Neelakanta Sastry writes" One section of Kanchipuram bore the name of Buddha Kanchi to a relatively late date and a Buddhist monk from one of the monasteries there sang the praises of a Hindu ruler of eastern Java in the 14th Century". The past history of Kamakshi temple and evidence has been adduced to show that the alleged idol of Sankara there is Buddha idol in origin (for details see "Vimarsha" pages. 488 to 508).

7. KUMBAKONAM — KANCHI KAMAKOTI MATH LINEAGE AND GURURATNAMALA

The main stay of the Kumbakonam Math is the work called "Gururatnamalika" said to have been written by Sri Sadasivendra Saraswathi, the saint of Nerur. The author finds a place in the list of the Math Acharyas. But he was never a Jagadguru nor had he the suffix of Bhagavatpada nor the intervening name Bodha as alleged by the Math propagandists. It is also claimed that he was the author of "Bodharya Prakarana". But this work is identical with "Swatmanirupanam" of Adi Sankara. To ascribe it to Sri Sadasivendra is not honest. Gururatnamalika is supplemented by a commentary "Sushama" said to have been written by Atmabodhendra Saraswathi in 1720 A.D. The others being "Parisishtta" and "Makaranda" and "Jagadguru Parampara Stotra" and "Punyaslokamanjari". The reader of this work will be struck by the frequent references in it to the Kings of Kashmir, Magadha and Ujjain and complete absence of any reference to the Kings of Chola, Chera, Pandya and Kerala countries — not even of the Kanchi territory. The compiler has taken the name of kings from Rajatarangini to give a historical background to the lineage. For stories, "Vikramacharita, Kathasarithasagara, Rajatarangini, Indian Chronology"

became handy to the compiler of such a work. It was easy to coin a string of names and make out of the whole a full fledged guruparampara. The lineage begins in the hoary antiquity from B.C. 508. The date of 60th Head of the Math was in A.D. 1704. The 60 Acharyas occupied a total of 2,213 years. Also, there is a story of Acharyas living outside Kanchi for nearly 1057 years, without visiting Kanchi. Again, there is the story of their living in Kanchi for 1156 years. But all along there is not an iota of evidence of their activities all around Kanchi. It is alleged that 12 Acharyas toured North India for 276 years continuously, supervising and touring in the jurisdictions of the other three amnaya maths (Puri-Dwaraka-Jyothir) and vanquishing Jain, Buddhist and other atheist tenets. One propagandist writes Ep.Ind.Vol.XIV that the author of Gururatnamala was Atmabodha "----One of the teachers, the third in apostolic descent from Sadasiva (1527 AD), composed a Guru-raj-ratna-mala-stava, of which the following are the closing stanzas....". But the Kumbakonam math claims that the author is Sadasiva Brahmendra. Just to show that Kanchi Math is an All India Institution, the Acharyas are said to hail from different parts of Bharat (60 Acharyas are being reviewed here)

Tamil-4, Nambudri-1, Andhra-15, Karnataka-14, North India Gowda-1, Kashmiri Gowda-1, Andhra Gowda-1, Maharashtra-3, Dravida (Tamil, Andhra, Karnataka)-15 unspecified Brahmin-5, Total=60.

For easy review and investigation the list of upto 60th acharyas has been divided into three heads:

1. From B.C. 509/508 to 788 A.D. (Since Adi Sankara quotes Dharmakirthi and meets Kumarila Bhatta, Adi Shankara could not have been born before 650 A.D. or so).
2. From 788 A.D. to 1385 (From Adi Sankara's time covering Sri Vidyateertha, Bharathi Krishna Theertha and upto Vidyanaraya of Sringeri).
3. From 1385 A.D. to 1704 A.D. (End of Vidyanaraya and the episode of a yati (Pooravashrama Hoysala Karnataka Brahmin) by name Mahadevendra Saraswathi going to Tanjore with a Srimuka from Sringeri. The list of Heads of the math is discussed threadbare in "Vimarsha" pages 368 to 426 and it is established by infallible evidence that

the entire list from the beginning upto the 60th incumbent is an invented one.

Sri. T.A.G. Rao (Editor of 10 copper plates of Kanchi Math and an ex-official of Arch. Survey) says — "The author (of Gururatnamala) cannot be regarded as an authority regarding the generations of the gurus remote to that from his time, but the tradition embodied by him in relation to epoch may be treated with some consideration". Sri. N. Venkataraman (in a propaganda book of Kanchi Math) says "When I say that the accuracy of the chronology cannot be questioned, it applies only to the latter part of it. We cannot say at present how far the older verses are genuine and of contemporary origin". Sri S.V. Venkatesan and Sri. S.V. Viswanathan say "The author cannot be regarded as an authority regarding the generations of the gurus remote from his time...." (EP.Ind.Vol-XIV), Sri Bhattasri Narayana Sastry of Nadukaveri says — "अपूर्वम्, अश्रुतम्, अज्ञातम्, अदृष्टम्।" In a propaganda book it is said "We find often that the successor belongs to the district or country where the previous guru happens to die". In an another book it is said "----Thus leaving out Sureshwaracharya, who did not occupy the Kanchi Pitha at all---" Sri N. Venkatesan says "But it is doubtful if the practice of early ordination prevailed from the very beginning". One author of the propaganda book says "Thus leaving out Sureshwaracharya who did not occupy the Kanchi Pitha at all, we have 12 Acharyas between Sankara and Gangadhara-1; and on an average of 20 years for each we get a total of 240 years for them. If we deduct this from 239 S.E. or A.D. 317, given as the date of Vidyaghana's date, we get A.D. 71 or the third quarter of the first century A.D., roughly for Sri Sankara's Nirvana". How could this be done to a Genuine and true chronology? One peculiar aspect of this list is that many of the Acharyas have two or three aliases. The compiler was bold enough to split up the personality of Adi Sankara into 5 Sankaras.

Dr. T.M.P. Mahadevan says in "Gaudapada" ---"It is to be doubted if it (Gururatnamala) is a genuine work of Sadasiva Brahmendra ---Atmabodha in his commentary on the stanza cites as authorities for the story Harimisra's Goudapadollasa and the Patanjali Charita. The former work is not to be traced.

And in the Patanjali Charita (which is the same as Vijaya) of Rambhadradiakshita, there is no mention made of the Appollongus episode'. Sri Vidyatirtha of Sringeri math has been included in the Acharya list of Kanchi Math. Sri R. Rama Rao writes in Indian Historical quarterly Vol. VI & VII----" The Kanchi tradition cannot be relied upon except for contemporary events--- There is no proof that Vidyatheertha belonged to the Kanchi Math. The Vagiswari-Ganapathi temple inscription of 1356 refers to the visit of King Bukka to Sringeri to pay his respects to Vidyatheertha---- Copper plates that eulogise Vidyateertha and his relations with Bukka are found to belong to Sringeri or places not far away from Sringeri. Neither Kanchi nor its neighbourhood has produced so far any inscription on stone or copper relating to Vidyatheertha. The list of pontiffs of this math prior to Vidyateertha given in the Punyaslokamanjari and other records of the math appear to contain the names of many of the rulers or ministers of Kashmir taken from Kalhan's Rajatarangini (12th century). It is too much to believe that the pontiffs of the math were connected with the rulers of Kashmir or their influence extended so far off". "As for Sushama, it merely exaggerates the importance of Kanchi math at the expense of Sringeri, and other maths in South India. Naturally, the writers statements are full of inaccuracies and errors. The writer of Sushama says in one place that it is wrong to identify Vidyateertha with Vidya-Sankara; elsewhere, while attributing to Vidyateertha, the connection with the seal of Vidyasankara found in the Sringeri Math, he is ready to say that Vidya Sankara, Vidyateertha and Vidyanatha are one and the same".

Sarvagnyatman — Successor to Sankara was a native of South Kerala in the 10th Century A.D. and had no connection with the Math. Anandagnyana or Anandagiri (V Guru) could not have lived before the 14th century. Mr Venkataraman admits that "the link between Jnanananda and Suddhananda is weak", Chidghana (9th guru) favoured Sivadvaita and this school rose only after the 8th century. From Ujjwala Sankara "The Kashmir period of Kanchi Math" begins. Muka Sankara, the same as Muka kavi of Panchasati fame, does not belong earlier than the 16th century. The story of Matru Gupta (6th century) is interwoven with Muka Sankara (18th guru). Gurus

from 12 to 22 lived and died outside Kanchi (Mostly in North India). Brahmanandaghana-I, is interwoven with the King of Kashmir Lalitaditya, whose conquests extended upto Kanauj and not Karnataka. Chandrasekhara II — his activities in Kashmir and defeating Buddhists is a creation of a fertile brain of the compiler. So of Vidyaghana III — The Arab Mohemmadens came upto Gujarat and not to Kanchi. Abhinava or Dhira Sankara succumbs to the lure of Kashmir. Bodha II (44 guru) is linked with a story narrated in Kathasarithsagara and it is said that Kalasa king of Kashmir came to Kanchi. Chandrasekara III was served by poets Mankha, Krishna Misra, Jayadeva and Suhala and it is very doubtful if the poets lived upto that age. Chidvilasa could not have met people who lived 100 to 200 years before him. The author of Kathasaritasagara was canonized and included in the parampara. Vidyatheertha (49th guru) (1297-1385) was not a son of Sarangapani of Bilvaranya as has been stated, nor was the name of the former Sarvagnya Vishnu. Sarvagya Vishnu (C-1400) was a son of Sarangapani and guru of Mayana — one of the two sons of Sayana. No Vaishnava will ever accept the Kanchi statement that Vedanta Desika was a pupil of Vidyatheertha. The presence of the beautiful Vidyasankara temple in Sringeri (commenced building in 1338 A.D.) is proof positive of Vidyatheertha's stay in and as headship of Sringeri math. Sankarananda (50th guru) — His Diksha guru was Anandatman and Vidyaguru was Vidyatheertha. He was not a pontiff of any math. In a sense he was a vidyaguru of Vidyaranya. The fertile brain of the compiler admitted a King of Nepal to discipleship under Purnanada Saraswathi (51 guru), Vyasachala (52 guru) — The curator, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, expresses surprise that Vyasachala has not even mentioned the Kanchi Math in his Sankaravijaya. Sarvagnya Sadasiva Bodha (54 guru) is claimed to be served by "Pravira", king of Ramnad, but in the early 16th century Ramnad state had not even been carved! Paramasivendra II, is not the Paramasivendra known as the guru of the famous Sadasivendra who lived in 17th-18th century. Atmabodha Visvadhika is not Abhinava Sankara (author of Rudrabhashya). Sadasivendra has not written the Gururatnamala. Sri Bhodendra's samadhi at Govindapuram is managed by an

independent body and not by the Kanchi Math. When HRE Board claimed jurisdiction over the Samadhi, the case was countered successfully by its management and there is no reference in this case to the Kanchi math or to Bodhendra as being the Acharya of the Kanchi Math.

Chandrasekharendra Saraswathi IV - (60 guru - 63 according to Sri Venkataraman and 62 according to Sri. Venkatesan) — finding Kanchi temple unsafe, is said to have left the place with Bangaru Kamakshi to Udayarpalayam and later to Tanjore and subsequently he chose to reside in Kumbakonam. This is rebutted elsewhere in this booklet. A careful examination shows that not only the earlier part but much of the later part of the version also is vitiated by fancifully associating persons and events and making false conclusions.

8. SRI VIDYATIRTHA, SRI BHARATI KRISHNA TIRTHA, SRI VIDYARANYA AND 3 MADHAVAS

Kanchi Math claims that Sringeri matha had ceased to exist and was restored under the Kanchi Math head Vidyatirtha's orders; that Vidyatirtha founded 8 maths with Vidyaranya over Virupakshi (implying that Vidyaranya had no connection with Sringeri); that Vidyatirtha ruled over Kanchi matha for 73 years and went to Himalayas. Sringeri has snatched Sureshwara, Sarvagnyatma and Vidyathirtha from Kanchi list and added them on to their own list.

The presence of the magnificent Vidyasankara temple in Sringeri built in AD 1338 (commenced building and completed in later years) bears ample testimony to Vidyatirtha's stay there and as head of the Sringeri Math. There are several documents to prove that this Acharya was present all throughout his life at Sringeri. Vidyatirtha did not die in the Himalayas but entered into a chamber excavated under his command in Lambika yoga and over this spot on the north bank of the Tunga river was raised a temple. He was on the Sringeri Parampara as its head between 1228 and 1333. Sri Bharati Theertha and Sri Vidyaranya were his sishyas.

Sri Vidyatirtha was the head of the Dakshinamnaya Sringeri Math. In a rock inscription dated 1346, Harihara Raya I, the Maharaja of Vijayanagar, says about Sringeri— "विद्यातीर्थाय गुरुवे परस्मै तेजसे नमः। यम्यनांगीकृतस्नेह दशाहानिः कदाचन।" In an inscription by Harihara II there is a stanza "विद्यातीर्थं यतीन्द्रोयमतिशेते दिवाकरम्। तमोहरति यत्पुंसामन्तर्बिहरहर्निशम्।।" All inscriptions by Harihara II in 1380, 1384 and 1387 belong to Sringeri Math. There are references to Vidyatirtha and Vidyaranya in Guruparampara and Bhaktisudha Tarangini also — "अविद्याश्छन्न-भावानां नृणां विद्योपदेशतः। प्रकाशयति यस्तत्त्वं तं विद्यातीर्थमाश्रये।।" --- "लम्बिकायोग निरतमम्बिकापति रूपिणम्। विद्याप्रदं नतोद्याय विद्यातीर्थं महेश्वरं। विद्यारण्य प्रमुखैः विद्यापारंगतैः सेव्यम्। अद्यापि योगनिरतं विद्यातीर्थं नमामि योगीशम्।।"

Sri Vidyatheertha gave Sanyasa in 1328 to a Brahmachari from Yekasilanagari (Warangal) and made him his disciple in the name of Sri Bharathi Krishna Thirtha (mathadhipati - 1333-1380 A.D.). His elder brother of Poorvashrama too took Sanyasa in 1331 from Vidyatheertha and assumed the name Vidyaranya (Mathadhipathi -1380-1386 A.D.). Though no evidence is available, it is traditionally accepted that his name before Sanyasa was Madhava.

There was another Madhava, the son of Choundya of Angirasa Gotra, popularly known as Madhava Mantri and yet another Madhava son of Mayana of Bharadwaja Gotra. He was the brother of Sayan. Sayana, the son of Mayana, had a son by name Madhava.

Vidyaranya took Sanyasa in 1331 and was doing tapasya in Matanga Parvata in Hampi. At the request of Bukka and Harihara, he laid the foundation of Vijayanagara empire on 18.4.1336. It is to be noted here Bukka & Harihara met Vidyaranya as a Sanyasi and not as Madhava — A Brahmachari. In 1346 Harihara visited Sringeri with all his kith and kin and the chieftains and proclaimed his loyalty to Sri Bharati Krishna Thirtha and donated lands to Sringeri Math. Bharathi Krishna Tirtha and Vidyaranya got built a magnificent structure on the Samadhi of their guru Vidya Tirtha at Sringeri which is said to have been finally completed in 1388. At the time of the opening of this Samadhi temple (Vidyasankara temple) Madhava Mantri had brought gifts from King Bukka to Sringeri. Then Vidyaranya returning from Varanasi brought Bukkaraya with him to Sringeri. The visit of Bukka is described in the inscription dated 1356 of King Bukka and therein is mentioned a land grant to the math. The kings insignia, honours, other royal symbols and gifts given by Harihara II were dedicated to Vidyathirtha. Even today, these signia and honours can be seen at Sringeri math. Vidyashankara memorial structure was commenced in Sringeri in 1338. In an inscription dated 1392, there is the mention of the installation of Vidyashankara idol and mandir and the beginning of the worship of this idol after the demise of Vidyathirtha. In a copper inscription dated shaka 1574 there is a statement that Vidyasankara also has to be worshipped along

with Sharada-- "विद्याशंकर देवस्य शारदायाश्च पूजने----।" Vidyaranya himself refers in many places to his guru as "विद्यातीर्थ महेश्वरम्।" In an inscription of Bukka, we have a stanza:— "विद्यातीर्थाज्जनिमति शंभे भारतीतीर्थपद्म, नित्यं वृत्ताद्द्वयचिदमृतानंदसौरभ्य भाजि। विद्यारण्यद्युर्मणि महिम प्राप्त लक्ष्मीविलासे, भूयोभूयो विहरति सूखी बृक्कभूपाल हंसः।"

King Harihara II made a grant in 1380 to Vidyaranya consolidating all the previous grants to the Sringeri Math with the addition of more villages and another in 1387 in memory of Vidyaranya who had since attained Videha mukti. Two temples in Sringeri stand in their memory. An agrahara named Vidyaranya-pura near the precincts of Sringeri math and several royal grants bespeak Vidyaranya's headship and Sringeri Math. Vidyaranya stayed in the imperial capital Vijayanagar for some years and the math at Virupakshi commemorates his stay there as the pontiff of Sringeri. The Veerasaiva cult had not effected Sringeri and its environment, what was then known as "मरुगरेविषय", as an inscription would attest.

During the pontificate of Sri Sachchidananda Bharati - II (1705-1741), two Veerasaiva maths were established by a Minister of Somasekhara Nayak II. The Sringeri Acharya went on a pilgrimage and was warmly welcomed by the Madhava Maths in Udipi. Sringeri Acharya returned to Haldi. Peshwa Bajirao, who was then campaigning in the Karnataka Country, sent an urgent message to the Nayak of Keladi, to have the Veerasaiva Maths in Sringeri removed immediately. The neighbouring Karnataka chiefs also urged Nayak of Keladi to make it easy for the Acharya to return to Sringeri. The Nayak issued orders for the removal of the Shaiva Maths and finally Sringeri Acharya returned to Sringeri. Baji Rao I, in 1739-40, directed that the Sringeri Math should have the first place in Socio-religious honours, such as Agrapuja etc. The agraharams continued as centres of vedic learning. The samadhis of gurus and temples, such as Janardhana Temple erected long before Vidyathirtha's time attest to the peaceful and efficient administration of an uninterrupted line of gurus in Sringeri.

All these records are taken from the publications of Archeological Survey of Mysore State and Government of

India and even today Vidyasankara temple is under their supervision, and declared as a protected monument.

Panchadasi is accepted by one and all to be a joint work of Vidyaranya and Bharathi Krishna Tirtha. Vidyaranya's disciple was one Sri Ramakrishna and he has enumerated it in the beginning and end of commentary on Pachadasi ".....नत्वा श्रीभारतीतीर्थविद्यारण्यमनीश्वरौ। मयाऽद्वैतविवेकस्य क्रियते पदयोजना। इति श्री प.प. श्रीभारतीतीर्थविद्यारण्यमनिवर्य किंकरेण----।।"

In Simhagiri near Sringeri, there is a rock pillar with its three sides adorned by Brahma, Vishnu, Maheswara and the fourth side with Vidyathirtha and his two disciples Bharati Krishna Tirtha and Vidyaranya. Above these idols is an idol of Lakshmi Narasimha. Over this idol is a Siva Linga. The entire cotirie of idols are referred to as chaturmurthi Vidyaswara. This proves beyond doubt that Vidyathirtha was the Head of the Sringeri Math and his disciples Bharati Krishna Tirtha and Vidyaranya were different persons and both were the heads of Sringeri Math in succession. To clear all this confusion caused by the casuistry of Kumbakonam Math authorities one may refer "Vimarsha" pages 348 to 367 and the "Truth about Kumbakonam Math" pages 103 to 108. Also please read Indian Historical Quarterly - Vol.No. 6 & 7, a small part of which is reproduced here under item No. 7.

9. COPPER PLATES OF KANCHI KAMAKOTI MATH

Sri Bapu Rao, an Assistant to Col. Mackenzie, reports that when he called on Kumbakonam Math authorities in an agrahara, he was informed that there were 125 copper plates (most of them of 5 or 6 plates of each) with the Kumbakonam Math. (Ref. Collection of Col. Mackenzie, Vol.II). But we are at a loss to make out what became of them as only 10 of the Copper plates grants that are published by Sri T.A.G. Rao (Ex. Official of Arch. Survey) are in the possession of the math today. It is said that many of the copper plates were melted down for being converted into copper vessels. It is learnt, in the 19th century some employees and ex-employees enimical to Sringeri math stole some copper plates and records of Sringeri Math. It is also

said that most of these stolen copper plates referred to Sharada Math; Sharada Math, Kanchi; Vijayanagar King Bukka, Tungateeravasi, Sringeri Math Adhipati's name and they were destroyed or converted into vessels. Is it because the inscriptions therein contained inconvenient truths and inconvenient to Kanchi Math? These ten plates have been edited by Sri. T.A.G. Rao in 1916.

COPPER PLATE NO. 1

Government Order. Madras Govt. No. 1260, Public 25-8-1915, says ---"It belongs to the 13th Century AD and mentions the teacher "Sankararya"---- It is not clearly stated in the record if the Matha presided over by "Shankararya" herein referred to, was identical with the Sankaracharya Math at Conjeevaram". Sri T.A.G. Rao writes — "It is only at a comparatively later period a new matha seems to have been erected in Shiva Kanchi----". Sri S.V.V. writes — "The name of the matha is evidently borrowed from the name Kamakoti Ambika of the goddess at Conjeevaram". Sri N.V. Pantulu, says ---- "For the name Kamakshi indicates that from the earliest times, the matha was situated near the Kamakshi Temple". But this copper plate mentions about a math at Vishnu Kanchi. Sri N.V. Says "If the then Sankaracharya was living there, it must have been a temporary arrangement". Again Sri T.A.G. Rao writes "In the mathamnaya, the name of the temple near which the Kamakoti Sharada Math was situated is said to be Satyavrata Kshetra, another name of Attiyur, (The present Vishnu Kanchi). Hence the Matha should have been situated in Vishnu Kanchi and near the temple of Varadarajaswami". Sri N. Venkataraman says "It does not mention by name the Sankaracharya to whom it was given". Sri H.K. Sastry of Arch. Survey says in regard to the meaning of the word "Shankararya Guruveh" — "This explanation is far fetched. To the holy guru "Shankararya" would be the plain interpretation of the phrase "Sri Sankararya Guruveh". Madras G.O. 1260, Public 25.8.1915, says — "It belongs to the 13th Century A.D. and mentions the teacher Sankararya (or Shankara Yogin) who received the grant of a village from the Chola Chief Vijayagandagopaladeva, for the purpose of feeding 108 brahmins. It is not clearly stated in the record if the matha

presided over by the Sankararya herein referred to, was identical with the Sankaracharya matha at Conjeevaram". T.A.G. Rao says — "It is only at a comparatively later period, a new matha seems to have been erected in Shivakanchi----", Kanchi math propagandists say that the math is near the Kamakshi temple whereas the Mathamnayasetu says that the math is in Vishnu Kanchi. Some books tell about the math at Shiva Kanchi. Which one out of these three is to be accepted as true? The Vishnu Kanchi math is of recent times. Its old survey No. is 620-4/Y. In government records, it is mentioned as a government site. It was a government land both in Nawab's time and in East India Co's time. In the same way the Survey No. of Shiva Kanchi Math site is according to old survey records Suv.No. 925. In Government records it is written as 'Inam dry land'. Even here the math's name is not mentioned in old records. On the strength of these records these two math's (Shivakanchi and Vishnu Kanchi) are of recent origin. There is no math in Kamakshi Mandir or adjoining the same. There were no maths here in ancient times. The math's head, became a trustee of Kamakshi Mandir in Nov. 1842. Before that period all these were in Government hands. Before Government took over the temple, it was under Sthalathar and Sthaneekar (Local trustees). There is not a whisper of Kanchi Peetha or Math in any stone edicts found in and around the temple. The official of Arch. Dept, Sri H. Krishna Sastry says — "The details of date given in lines 4 to 7 do not work correctly either for AD 1291 or for AD 1292 but in the cyclic year in AD 1351". So, the period of this plate not belonging to the Kanchi Math is of AD 1351 and not 1291. The receiver is described as "Dwijanmane" and the "Vamsha" is described as "Poppilli". The heads of the math are sanyasis and they are not identified as Dwijanmane or by Vamsha name (Intiperu). The Arch. Dept holds that this plate is not of Kanchi Math.

In an article published in Deepavali Special number of Kalki (1961) Sri Ramesam suggests the year of this copper plate as 17.7.1111 on the basis of the first plate of this grant said to have been "newly discovered recently" by the Kanchi math authorities. Mr. N. Ramesam refutes the dates of 1291/92 or of 1351 AD. A Madras professor, who was able to wangle from Prof. K.A.N. Sastry a very brief letter has shared its contents

with the readers of the journal Kamakoti Pradeepam (14.4.1963). Sri K.A.N. Sastry in his letter has put inverted commas for "Kumbakonam Math" and its significance should be noted by readers. Prof. Sastry clearly speaks of the plate published by late T.A.G. Rao and not certainly first plate of the "newly discovered recently". Mark the word plate in singular. Apart from an observation regarding the genuineness of the plate, Prof. Sastry does not say anything comfortable to this Madras Prof. Prof. Sastry has not said that the donee "Shankara Arya" was Sankaracharya, nor has he said that the math to the west of the temple Hastisailanatha was a Sankaracharya Math.

The writer of this booklet addressed a letter to Sri K.A.N. Sastry dated 27.4.1963 and quote below the relevant portions of the letter and his reply. It is proved beyond doubt that this copper plate does not refer or belong or give the title or ownership to Kanchi Math Swamigal.

"I quote below an extract from your letter dated 13.4.63 published in Sri "Kamakoti Pradeepam" of Chittirai Month, dated 14.4.63, on page 159, reading as follows — "I have long been familiar with the Gandagopala copper plate published years ago by late. T.A. Gopinath Rao among the copper plates of the "Kumbakonam Math" and have never found any reason to doubt its genuineness". The subject matter of this letter is your opinion published in the said journal in a letter form.

"It may be true that the Gandagopala copper plate is genuine. The question is whether the said copper plate refers or gives the title or ownership to Kumbakonam Math or Kanchi Math. You are aware that mere physical possession of a copper plate — genuine or ungentine — does not give the physical owner of the plate the title or ownership of the plate. Your above referred letter is not very clear and permit me to say that it is confusing and a lay reader would infer that your goodself had given the certificate that the Kanchi-Kumbakonam Math is the title owner of the copper plate. Pardon me to say that I am surprised to see a letter like this from a pen of an eminent scholar and widely respected historian like you. Do you really believe that the copper plate of Gandagopala refers and belongs to Kanchi Math and that they are the title owners of the

plate? If you are in possession of facts to prove that it refers to and belongs to Kanchi Math, would you be kind enough to enlighten me those facts? It shall clear my doubts".

----- Your inferences are untenable against facts as disclosed by other research scholars. The cause of truth must not be jeopardised by any feelings of false delicacy. However great a person may be, he is not entitled to twist historical facts and truths, however, unpalatable it may be or may be irksome and inconvenient to substantiate their false claim and propaganda or to suit their own whims and fancies. History may be good or bad and it should be left as it is and should not be tampered with. Every endeavour should be made to examine the materials on which such fanciful and fantastic claims are made and to enquire whether they have any justification behind them. If such fanciful claims are left uncontradicted, it would result as if a "PSEUDO" is being given a free licence to declare himself "GENUINE" and this would result in misrepresentation and misdirection to the coming generation. Already enough mutilations have crept in our texts and scriptures and let us not add a few more. It is in the spirit of a truth seeker, I approach you for your valued opinion. Truth must not be allowed to be shrouded or smothered by persistent and baseless intensive propaganda intended to confuse and mislead the minds of the half thinking and unthinking credulous public.

"The Gandagopala plate may be genuine but the issue now is whether it refers to Kanchi Math or is the Kanchi Math Swamiji the title owner of the Plate? I emphatically say that the plate does not refer to Kanchi Sankaracharya Math (Kumbakonam Math) and it does not belong to Kumbakonam Math. As you are an eminent scholar and in know of true facts, I shall not deal in detail with this matter and wish only to draw your kind attention to the following points, so as to enable you to arrive at a final and true decision".

1) "The above referred copper plate was granted by one "Tribhuvana Chakravarthi Mahabala Deva Sri Gandagopala" to one recipient "Shankararya Guruveh" residing in a math near the Hastishailanath temple and who is addressed also as "नित्यानन्दान, विधिसन्तार्पितात्म, द्विजन्मने, निगमान्तररहस्यार्थ,

शिष्येभ्यस्सुविवृण्वते, तपोधनाय, शिवध्यानरतात्मने, स्वात्मारामाय विद्महे, पोप्पलि प्रथितात्मने," and on "वत्सरे खरर्साज्ञते, प्राप्ते ककटिकं पुण्यराशिं कमल बान्धवे मित्रदैवत नक्षत्र युक्तायां शुक्लपक्षे इन्दोवारेण युक्तायां दशम्याम् समुत्तके" date, granting Ambikapuram village to enable feeding daily of 108 Brahmins. It is in grantha script and the granter's signature is in Tamil script. Late Sri T.A.G. Rao had published the last sheet of the complete plate and he was informed at that time that the balance sheets of the complete plate were not available and were lost. Sri T.A.G. Rao had fixed the date as 9.7.1291 equivalent to the date given in the plate. Mr. Ramesam had published in Kalki (Deepavali, November, 1961) an article on the balance part of the plate that he received recently from Kumbakonam math and he had tried to fix the date of the plate as 17.7.1111 A.D. Mr. Ramesam or the Math has not cared to give details as to where this new found plate was lying all these years, when was it obtained, from where was it obtained and why was it not given to Sri T.A.G. Rao for editing along with others, if it had been with them for all these years? Why not these copper plates are sent to epigraphists and historians and to the Arch. Survey Dept. to get them verified? Why is this hesitancy on the part of the Kanchi Math?

2) Kanchi Math own a small house in Vishnu Kanchi and they claim this math as their own from their Sri Adi Sankar's time (508 B.C). They claim this plate as their own since the plate mentions the recipient living in a math near Hastishailanatha temple. I do not go into detail and I have enough old records to show that this plate or the house never belonged to the Kumbakonam math in the past. The Govt. records show that the old Survey number of this Kanchi Math was 620-4/Y and was once the "Government Purambokku land". At a later period, this land was converted and broken to pieces as "Village sites" for use as residential purposes. The Paimaish register of the Nawab's time and the revenue records of the East India Company clearly confirm that the plot never belonged to the Kumbakonam math or Kanchi Math".

"S.I. Temple inscription No. 350 indicates that there was in Vishnu Kanchi a math named as "Vedamath" and a grant of a village had been made to "Sri P.P. Vedendrasagara Sripada" in 1378 A.D. It means that there was a math near the

Hastishailanath temple in 14th century and its past history would reveal that it had a past life also. May be that this Gandagopala plate refers to the "Veda Math". There was a number of other sanyasis and scholars living in maths in Vishnu Kanchi and Shiva Kanchi during the period 13th to 16th century (Ref. S.I. Inscription 432, I.E. of 55/56, pp 286, 346 etc). This Gandagopala plate might refer to one of those maths near the Vishnu Kanchi temple. It is not clearly stated in the plate that the presiding person of the math is identical with Sankaracharya math at Conjeevaram".

3) The recipient of the grant is "शंकरार्यगुर्वे " and not as is being now published and propagated. Sankararya (Shankara Arya) and Shankaracharya are two different names and each might even be of different Ashrama. The copper plate does not mention by name the Sankaracharya to whom it was given. Kumbakonam math claim for their math in their Mathamnaya reading as follows" ... "सर्वोत्तरः सर्वसेव्यः सार्वभौमौ जगद्गुरुः। अन्यः गुरुवः प्रोक्ताः जगद्गुरुवर्यं परः।।" and it is inconceivable (if the claim be true) that the granter would not have known the name of the Sankaracharya who was a "Sarwabhawma Jagadguru" and would forget to mention his name in the plate. Mr. H.K. Sastri (Arch. Dept) while commenting on the claims made by Kanchi Math says "This explanation is far fetched. To the holy guru Shankararya would be the plain interpretation of the phrase "Sri Shankararya Guruveh". In G.O. No. 1260 dated 25.8.1915, it is mentioned "It is not clearly stated in the record if the matha presided over by the Shankararya herein referred to was identical with the Shankaracharya math at Conjeevaram". Some qualifications and adjectives addressed to the recipient in the plate such as "नित्यानन्दान, निगमान्तर रहस्यार्थ, तपोधनाय, शिवध्यानरतात्मने, द्विजन्मने, पोप्पलि प्रथितात्मने" do not establish the fact that the plate refers exclusively to Kanchi Math only. These phrases could also be addressed to a grihasta or to a yati (except the last two mentioned above). Unless it is proved beyond doubt that there was no other math in Vishnu Kanchi except Kanchi Sankaracharya math, this plate cannot be said to belong to the Kanchi Math. Various other inscriptions as shown above go to prove that there were other maths in Kanchi during 12th to 16th century".

"You are aware of the fact that Sri Govinda Dixita (Minister of Tanjore state) was addressed as "पदवाक्यप्रमाण, पारावारप्रवीण, अद्वैताचार्य, विद्याचार्य, कर्नाटक सिंहासन प्रतिष्ठाचार्य"। Because he was addressed as Advaitacharya, Vidyacharya, could you conclude that he was a Mathadhipathi of a math or a Sankaracharya or a Yati? He was a grihasta. In the same manner, the adjectives in the copper plate referred above may be applicable to any grihasta or vanaprasta and not necessarily and exclusively to a Mathadhipati. The copper plate does not give the name of the Acharya or the math's name".

4) "Mr. H. Krishna Sastry (Arch. Dept) writes in Ep. Ind. Vol XIII -- "The details of the date given in lines 4 to 7 do not work correctly either for AD 1291 or for AD 1292: but in the cyclic year Khara which occurred 60 years after i.e. AD 1351, Monday, the tenth thithi of the bright half of Karkataka corresponding to 4th July, 1351 when the Nakshatra Visakha ended at 16 hours 20 minutes after mean sunrise and Anuradha commenced consequently in the last quarter of the day". Hence, the date as given by late Sri. T.A.G. Rao is incorrect".

"To rectify this mistake, now Mr. Ramesham has tried in vain to fix the date as 17th July, 1111 A.D. It is needless to impress on you of the fact that a Gandagopala of a feudatory, vassal State, would have used the title of "त्रिमूवन चक्रवर्ति महाबल" during the 11th century in the period of Rajendra Chola, who is said to have gone upto the banks of Ganges in North India. During 12th century first half Kullotunga, I, who invaded Kalinga twice and who was a powerful king, a vassal state chief Gandagopala could not have used "त्रिमूवन चक्रवर्ति महाबल". It was only in the second half of 12th century, after the death of Kulothunga I, the feudatory states raised their heads. In the second half of the 12th century, the Velanadu Chola became independent for a brief period. The Telugu Chola of Nellore also became independent (Vikrama Chola 1135 A.D.). But during Kullothunga III (1178-1218) period Nalla Siddhi and his brother Tammu Siddhi once again came under the influence and rule of Kullotunga (1187 A.D.). Under these circumstances, it can be clearly said that a feudatory chief Gandagopala in 1111 A.D. could not have used the title of "त्रिमूवन चक्रवर्ति महाबल".

"The copper plate mentions that this had been given in the

16th year of the reign of Gandagopala i.e, in the year 1095 AD (if 1111 AD is taken as the date of the grant as per Mr. Ramesham). This was Kullottunga's I (1070-1122) period and it is beyond conception that a minor vassal or feudatory chief Gandagopala would have used the title of "त्रिमूवन चक्रवर्ति महाबल". If Gandagopala's date as fixed by Ramesham is 1095 A.D, then how his son Tammu Siddhi ascended the throne in 1205 (as per inscriptions found in Vishnu Kanchi temple)? Look at the big gap between father and son. Many such doubts are to be cleared before we accept the date of copper plate as 1111 A.D. The date is not correct.

5) As regards Gandagopala's identity, I am not dealing with this matter in this letter., as I am afraid it would run to pages if I do so. I reserve it for some other occasion. I do agree that the copper plate was given by one Gandagopala and I do not agree that it was given to Kanchi Sankaracharya Math Swami. Please note that the copper plate gives the granter's name as "देव श्री गण्डगोपाल" and the signature in the Tamil script is done as "विजय गण्डगोपाल". Why is this difference? Do you expect a Telugu Chola Vijayagandagopala to sign his name in tamil script? In other plates, he had signed in Telugu script. Why is this difference? As regards the formation of letters, style and usual prashasti, they differ from other plates of the 12th century (early part) and I have made a thorough study on this point. Why is this difference?

6) "Please note the qualifying word of the recipient found in the plate "द्विजन्मने". "द्विजन्मने" confirms that the recipient is either a brahmachari, grihasta or a vanaprastha and certainly not a sanyasi. Sanyasis are not addressed as Dwija. Our yati Dharmasastra does not permit. Likely the manufactured new Dharmasastra of Kanchi math might allow the Kanchi Math sanyasis only to use the title of 'Dwija'. Sanyasis are "जन्म जाति रहिताः"। The recipient's name is "शंकरार्यगुरुवे" (to the sreshtha guru Shankar) and not Shankaracharya as published by the Kanchi Math. This Sreshtha guru Shankar who was a Dwija was living in a math near Hastishailanatha temple in Vishnu Kanchi. He was certainly not a sanyasin. To confirm this inference, there is another word found in the copper plate as "पोप्पिलि प्रथितात्मने". Poppilli is the house or Vamsa name. The practice of

giving Vamsa or house name was prevalent among Keralites and Telugus to their three ashramas — Brahmachari, Grihastha, Vanaprastha and certainly not to their sanyasis. Yati is never addressed by his house or vamsa name. If Adi Sankara was of Kaippilli Vamsa, it was in his pooravashram and certainly not after taking sanyasa deeksha from Sri Govindapada. Hence the recipient of the grant was the holy guru Shankar who was a "Dwij" and belonged to "Poppilli" vamsa and not Kanchi Mathadhipati".

7) Gururatnamala which is said to give the chronology of Kanchi Math from 508 BC is unreliable even in respect of its professed authorship. I have written a book on Kanchi Math chronology based on searched materials and I have conclusively proved therein that upto 17th century end the chronology is not correct and true and it is only a list of known and unknown yatis taken from various books and compiled. I do not deal with this subject here as it would entail some more pages of writing. To identify the "Sankararya" of the plate, there are five Shankaras shown in the Kanchi Math chronology. It begins from 508 BC to Shankara V of 788/840 A.D. Copper plate does not refer to any of these names. In the chronology one Chandrachuda II alias Gangeshar name is given — 1247/1297 A.D. On what evidence would you say that this Chandrachuda II was the same as "Sankararya" of the plate?

"Sri S.V.V. of Kumbakonam writes in Ep. Ind. Vol XIV, regarding Gururatnamala -- "The author cannot be regarded as authority regarding the generations of the gurus remote from his time". Kumbakonam math's propagandist Sri N.V. Writes -- "When I say that the accuracy of the chronology cannot be questioned, it applies only to the later part of it. We cannot say at present how far the older verses are genuine and of contemporary origin". Sri S.V.V. had tried to bring down the period from 508 B.C. on arbitrary basis by giving 13½ years for a generation. How could this be possible when Kanchi Math's main authority books like Punyaslokamanjari and Gururatnamala clearly give the calendar year, month, paksha, tithi, etc, for each mathadhipati? Does he agree that the Gururatnamala and Punyaslokamanjari are unreliable works?

Sri T.M.P. Mahadevan is of opinion that Sri Sadasiva Brahmendra was not the author of this book (See Gaudapada). I can quote a dozen more authority to prove its unreliability. I have dealt this matter in a separate book. Can you prove beyond doubt that this copper plate refers or belongs or gives the title or ownership to Kanchi Math Swami".

"----If you do not agree with my views based on facts revealed above, would you please take the trouble of giving me your facts to establish the right of ownership or the title to Kanchi Math".

"P.S. ---- In your book "History of South India", you have mentioned that Sri Adi Sankara had established five maths. Amnaya math and Upasana peethas are different. Kamakoti is an upasana peetha and not an amnaya math. I shall send you a book of 750 pages where I have dealt with each propaganda stunts of Kanchi Math and beyond doubts I have proved, that this Kumbakonam math was established long after Sri Sankara's time. It is so unfortunate that an eminent scholar and widely respected person like you, should lend a helping hand to substantiate the Kumbakonam math's fantastic, fanciful and baseless claims".

Prof. K.A.N. Sastry's letter dated 11.6.1963 reads — "I have had your letters registered and ordinary. Being in Madras, I should have very much appreciated it if you had chosen to come to me in person for it would have been possible for me to explain to you that your presumptions about my stand with regard to the Gandagopala copper plates are not correct".

In the earlier editions of "History of South India" book, it was published that Sri Adi Sankaracharya had established only four maths and now in the recent edition it was changed to five maths. The writer of this booklet met Prof. Sastry in the company of Sri K.R. Venkatarama Iyer (Retd. D.P.I of Pudukotta State) and Sri R.A. Sattanatha Iyer of Madras in June end 1963, and the point of mentioning five maths in his book and his views on the Gandagopala plate were raised. His answers were noted down and the two gentlemen's attestation was also obtained. Prof. K.A.N. Sastry said -- "Unfortunately my friend who was entrusted with the job of re-editing the book

made this change and it was much later after the circulation of the book, I knew about this change and it was too late for me to make amends". About the Gandagopala plate, he said, "The last plate edited by late T.A.G. Rao is a genuine plate and the donee is Shankararya and not Shankaracharya and it does not refer or belong to Kanchi Math Acharya". When asked why he did not write the letter clearly stating his views, he said "There are reasons and I do not want to discuss. Great pressure was brought on me to write an ambiguous letter and I succumbed to it. That is why I did not write to you giving my views on the copper plate. I am sorry". This reminds of some letters received from Sri C.P. Ramaswamy Iyer, Sri K.M. Munshi, Sri Sriprakasha and others as to how they were influenced and pressurised to say something which they did not want. It is false delicacy. Why should one be afraid of telling the truth and calling a spade a spade?

COPPER PLATE No. 2

This is also controversial. If the name tallies, the date does not. The donor is a Naik King. If he were not King in 1507, the recital is to be held faulty. This plate does not bear either the name of Kanchi Math nor the name of Indrasaraswathi. The gift given at the banks of Tunga river means only to the Sringeri Math or Virupakshi Math or other branches of Sringeri and not to Kanchi Math.

COPPER PLATE No. 3

The donor's death took place in 1509 April/July. In July 1509 Krishnadevaraya became king. This gift is dated Feb. 1510. That means the donor donated this item after his death. The editor of these copper plates himself accepts that this plate may have been forged.

COPPER PLATE No. 4

In this plate it is said that the gift is given to Chandrachuda Saraswati of Sharada Math in 1521-22. The Kamakoti Math is not called Sharada Math. This is a branch Math of Sringeri at Kanchi. Madras G.O. 1260, Public, 25-8-1915, says --- "He presided over the Sharada Matha at that place. Hence, we might presume that Chandrachuda Saraswathi was a member

of Shankaracharya's lineage, provided the name Sharada Math is still applied to its present seat Kumbakonam ----- If even this were so, it look suspicious why the name of Shankaracharya is not mentioned even incidentally in any one of the copper plates under reference".

COPPER PLATE No. 5

In this plate "Sharada Matha — Kanchi" is clearly mentioned. This is dated 1529-30. This is just like Plate No. 4.

COPPER PLATE No. 6

This is an incomplete record. We have the donors geneological lineage beginning from Chandrama to Raja Bukka. All the Vijayanagar Kings Bukka, Harihara, Harihara II etc were disciples of Sringeri Math. Probably this incomplete plate also belongs to Sringeri Sharada Math.

COPPER PLATE No. 7

This mentions Pudukota King in 1691 made over this gift to a brahmin living near Kanchi. Kumbakonam Math says that this receiver of gift is an employee of the Kanchi Math. The editor of the plate says "But there is nothing in the text to warrant the conclusion that he was sent to be in charge of the landed estates belonging to the Matha". Now Kumbakonam math give another version that this copper plate bears the date saka 1663 (1741 AD) not 1613 as hitherto publicised. "The note by K.R. Venkatarama Iyer presented in proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission refers to the historicity of of Kanchi Peetha" is the claim made by the Kanchi Math. But the truth is that the donor in the copper plate is not the Tondaiman Raja but his servants ("Uliyakkarakar") are the donors. The donee is one Venkitayyan residing in Kanchi.

"காஞ்சிபுரத்தில் உள்ள உள்கண்ட பவனிவிருக்கும்

There is absolutely no warrant to say that Venkitayyan was an agent of the Kanchi Math in Kanchi and the grant does not afford any such indication. This false assumption originated by T.A.G. Rao has deluded many, who hitherto had not the opportunity or inclination to examine it. The articles mentioned in the charity include among others name cloths

and female cloths. The donee was an ordinary grihastha and that he was a representative of a math was quite unwarranted. Mr. K.R. Venkataraman failed to notice this in an article of his in the journal of Indian History (VOL XXIX) and later he amended the mistakes (Refer — "The truth about the Kumbakonam Math — Part II).

COPPER PLATE No. 8

This is a gift of lands by Naik King of Madurai Naik Raja Vijayaranga Chokkanatha in Saka 1630 (1708) A.D. to Lokaguru Shankaracharya "Residing in Kanchi". This gift has been given under instructions from the then pontiff of "Sharada Math". This also is concerned with Sringeri Math. Here, the point to note is the reference "Residing in Kanchi" which is not found in other plates".

COPPER PLATE No. 9

Delhi Sultan in 1710 has given this Firman to P.P. Swami of Kanchi Sharada Math as annual gift. The name of the head of the math is not mentioned. Sultan's employee Tamad Bhanjee has signed this. This firman is dated 1677 A.D. and not 1710 A.D. The Archaeological Deptt. has proved this plate to be a spurious one.

COPPER PLATE No. 10

There is a recital of a gift to a Hoysala Brahmin by Mahadevendra Saraswathi of Kanchi Sharada Peetha in A.D. 1687-88. The Arch. Department authorities have said that "The Non-coincidence of the most important item of the date, viz., the lunar eclipse reflects upon the genuineness of the grant itself". The editor Rao says that the plate is engraved in a slipshod manner and in a kind of a nagari, quite modern and it is full of mistakes.

10. KANCHI KAMAKOTI MATH BUILDINGS

The Math at Kamakshi Temple

Kanchi Math propagate that their original old math was situated near the Kamakshi Temple -- "For the name Kamakoti indicates that from the earliest time the Matha was situated

near the Kamakshi Temple". But there is no math near the Kamakshi Temple. Kanchi math owns a residential house in the Sannadi Street (near the temple) and this building was donated by the daughter-in-law of Sri Vanchinatha Sastry to the math during 1950's or so. The sthaneekar of Kamakshi temple Sri Neelakanta Arunachala Sastry donated his house, Vinayaka temple and a six pillar mandapa to the Kamakshi temple and when Kumbakonam Swamigal was appointed trustee of the temple in November 1842, he took over these places in January 1843. This house is located at the back of Kali temple and Kumarakottam and adjoining the tank. There was some legal dispute in the court in regard to this property.

The Math at Vishnu Kanchi

This is located in Yanykatti Street and the town survey number of 1912 is 1047, 1047/1, 1044, 1044/1 and 1044/2 bearing municipal numbers 8A & B, 9A, B, C. It is residential house. In one of the books of Kanchi Math, it is said "The appearance of the Math may be disappointing for it is a very small building, more like a house and with no pretensions of any kind". The old survey No. is 620 — 4/Y and the details are as follows:

Ward No. 1: Revised survey No. and Sub-division 1025/1 to 1048; Old Survey No. 620-4/Y. Government Purrambokku land; Extent 1-82; Assessment — Nil. Registry — Village site.

This confirms that the Vishnu Kanchi Math land was Government Purumbokku land and Kanchi Math had nothing to do with this property. Since it was a village site, Government divided the land and gave it for residential purposes.

The Math at Shiva Kanchi

This is the present Headquarters of the Math in Salai Street. The town survey No. of 1912 is 2377 and the old survey No. 925. Near this math there is a mosque. In olden days (where the mosque now stands) this was the vahana mandapa of Ekamreswar temple and the mandap was demolished and a mosque was erected. The old record of this math is — Ward

No. 4; Revised survey No. and Sub-divisions 2377; Old survey No. 925, Inam drylands; Extent 0-01 cent; Assessment 0-1 Registry — Manager, Sankaracharya Matham. Originally it was Inam dryland and the math owns one cent land only i.e, 48.4 Sq. yards. Is it enough for a central head Math?

Attempts were made to inspect Paimaish Register and old records of Clive's time in regard to these properties and did not succeed in our attempts. The Sub-registrar of Conjeevaram says that they have records only after 1865 A.D. The I.G. of Registration when approached, directed the petitioner to the Registrar of Madras — Chingleput. The Registrar of Madras-Chingulpet when approached says "As the property affected in the document relates to Sub-Registrar, Conjeevaram, there may all the more possibility of its being registered in that Office". But when approached the Sub-registrar said that he had no records prior to 1865. Again, I.G. of Registration was approached and he informs ---" I write to inform you that old records prior to the introduction of Registration Act, 1865, relating to Madras and Chingleput districts are kept in Madras Record Office. You may, therefore, apply to that office for search". The Board of Revenue office (LR) was approached for search and inspection of old settlement register and paimaish register and an answer was that the old settlement register and paimaiah register for the period asked for were not available in the office or in the Madras record office, Madras. Let the readers draw their own conclusion.

11. KAMAKSHI TEMPLE AND KANCHI MATH

All inscriptions of 14th century and other records confirm that the administration of the Kamakshi temple was under "Sthalattar" (Sthanikar Dharmakartha) and they were the trustees. The following donees viz., Achutaraya of 1542, Sadasivaraya of 1543, Kampanna (16th century), Rangaraya of 1584, Krishnadevaraya and others, donated to Sthanattar. All donees accepted Sthanattar as Dharmakartha. Refer the annual report of South India Epigraphy of 1954/55 — Nos. 321/22, 327, 331, 335, 341/42, 344, Etc. Etc., and South India Temple Inscriptions — volume relating to Chingleput Dist. No

where is Kanchi math or Kumbakonam Math referred therein. Mr. Charles Stuart Crole published Chingleput Manual in 1876 and he says the temple was administered and supervised by the Hindu Maharajas. In 1817 Board of Revenue took over all the temples and the respective district collectors were administering the temples. Even at that period the temple was not in the hands of the Kanchi-Kumbakonam Math. The Udayarpalayam Zamindar Srimuthu Vijayarangappa Udayar donated lands in August 1784 to one Dharmakartha Dhakshinamoorthy — Grandson of Bangarayya and son of Sesa Iyer — all hereditary Dharmakartas — and the annual yield of the land was to be used for Ardhayama Puja and worship of Kamakshi Amman. Where was the Kumbakonam Kanchi Math then? In the records of East India Company one finds the "Sthalattar and Sthaneekar" as Dharmakarta of Kamakshi temple. The above referred Dakshinamoorthy had two sons — Ramaswamy and Iyya Sastry. On 5-11-1830 they executed an agreement wherein it was specifically stated that Ramaswamy would continue as hereditary Dharmakarta of Kamakshi temple and Ayya sastry would go to Tanjore and take up the worship of Bangara Kamakshi. Even here there is no mention of Kumbakonam — Kanchi Math. During the Karnatic War (1743-63) the family of Bangarayya — his sons and grandsons — were the Dharmakartas and they protected the temple. In one of the inscriptions in Kamakshi temple there is a mention of Tiruvegam Bhatt as Dharmakarta and he belonged to Bangarayya family. There is also a mention of Chintamani Bhatt and he belonged to the same family. Thus one could conclude that during 16th to 18th century, the Kumbakona — Kanchi math had nothing to do with the Kamakshi temple. A few other Sanyasis such as Kamakshi Bharati (ARE 286 of 1955/56) and Sri Durga Devi Sri Pandangal (ARE 346 of 1954/55) are mentioned in other Kanchi inscriptions and they had no connection with the so called Kanchi Math.

Sthaneekars Annakutti Sastry, Subbaraya Sastry, Neelakantha Arunachala Sastry, Peria Arunachala Sastry and others gave a statement on 19-11-1837 before the Tahsildar of Kanchi Sri Srinivasa Rao and this was forwarded to the collector. The statement was in regard to an appointment of a

clerk in the Kamakshi Temple. During this period the temple was under the Govt. control and the Sthaneeekars were the Dharmakartas.

Kanchi Tahsildar Srinivasa Rao received an order dated 29.7.1841. from the collector of Chingleput. The relevant portion from the order is quoted below:

“தேவஸ்தானங்களின்பேரில் இப்போது சர்க்கார் விசாரணை நடத்துவதை நிறுத்தி வேறே விதமான ஏற்பாடு செய்ய வேண்டியதற்காக அந்த அந்தஸ்தலத்தாரை விசாரிக்க வேண்டியபடி இருக்கிற படியினாலே ஸ்ரீ தேவராஜஸ்வாமி, ஸ்ரீ ஏகாம்பரநாதர், ஸ்ரீகாமாட்சி அம்மன், இந்த தேவஸ்தானங்களுடைய ஸ்தலத்தாரில் முக்கியமானவானையும் கார்யஸ்தாரையும் ஒவ்வொரு ஸ்தலத்துக்கு இரண்டு அல்லது மூன்று பேர் விழக்காடு. இந்த தாசீத் கண்ட உடனே சவாரி ஹூஜூர் கச்சேரிக்கு அனுப்பவும், அறியவும்.”

It is beyond doubt that the temple was in the hands of the Government and the hereditary Sthalattar were conducting the worship. Chingleput collector writes in Letter No. 20, Ref. No. 37A/37B, dated 3.3.1842 — “The time and cause of the pagoda (Camatchy Umman) having been brought under circar management are not known”.

Srinivasa Rao, clerk to the wardens of Kamakshi Temple, sends a petition to the Governor of Madras, dated 16.12.1842, and quote below some relevant portions” ----- “That about 50 years ago the management of the above church “Church of Camatchy Umman” together with the lands connected church amounting to Rs. 20,000/-, jewels, were chiefly procured by the wardens who collected monies amounting to Rs. 8 lakhs and erected churches and other reservoirs even in the troublous times of Hyder and Tippu when the country was ravaged by war, the wardens were instrumental in the preservation of the property and images and the keys of this church were in their possession also that of the jewels”.

“-----That after this the British Govt. interfered in the superintendence of the church and the wardens had the management of it and that they were given to understand by

the collector that government would also abolish their connection with the pagoda, whereupon your petitioner addressed a wager to that gentlemen praying that as they are the wardens from time immemorial the management of church would be given to them and no other and the collector on the 7th January of the present year endorsed on their petition desiring them to be in readiness with such documentary evidences as they may possess, which we did, and solicited that the collector would be pleased to examine the accounts of that functionary and without due enquiry wrote to the Revenue Board and **One Sankarachariar was appointed to take the management — this individual is in no way connected with this church, is an entire stranger to the country, an inhabitant of Kumbakonam in the Tanjore Zillah and is moreover a professor of a different creed and has nothing to recommend him but his wealth and we were directed to deliver up the church and other property to this individual**, and when we remonstrated against this appointment we were informed that it is the orders of the Revenue Board. We are at a loss to know by what authority and on what grounds we are deprived of this management”. “.....Moreover, your petitioner beg to bring to the notice of your Lordship that with this church there are two others, the most important of all the churches in this part of the country and the collector in issuing his orders had given the management of those churches to their respective wardens and **in our church alone a stranger has been appointed** and we are reprieved of all authority”.

The petition is self-explanatory and the readers can draw their own conclusions. It is interesting to note that the Sthalattar and Dharmakartas produced all necessary documents and accounts to the collector and inspite of it the collector writes to the Board of Revenue (letter No. 20 — of 8.2.42 and 3.3.1842) --- “The Goorookuls who applied for the superintendence have shown no right to it and not appearing to be fitted for the trust, the proposed trustees has been selected”. But how come that the goorookuls of Varadaraja and Ekamreshwara temples were found fit to be appointed as superintendants? What is the trick played? A reply dated 19.4.1843 to the petition addressed to the Governor was received and quote below a relevant portion of this letter to

conclude the tricks played at Conjeevararam --- "It does not appear from the papers relative to the Religious Institutions in Chingleput, that the subject matter referred in the petition was even specially brought to the notice of the Board of Revenue by the collector".

Collector A. Freeze, from his camp Pallikaranai, sends to the Tahsildar, Kanchi, Srinivasa Rao, a takeed dated 5.11.1842, Book No. 42, Takeed No. 28, appointing "Cumbaconam Sankara — Chariar" as trustee of Kamakshi temple and asks him to send the acceptance letter and the procedure to be followed"---"

"... அந்த அந்த தேவஸ்தானத்துக்கு நீர்குத்தாய்போய் நால்பேர் பெரிய குடித்தனக்காரரையும், ஸ்தலத்தாரையும், வைச்சுக்கொண்டு மேல் கண்ட சொத்துக்களையெல்லாம் ஒப்புவிச்சுக்கொண்டோம் என்றும் அதற்கு இதுவே ரசீதாய் காட்டிக்கொள்ள வேண்டியதென்றும் கண்டிருக்க வேணும்."

It is said that the Kumbakonam math took physical charge of the temple in January 1843. The appointment letter begins as follows — "You are hereby appointed Dharmakarta or Trustee for the Superintendence of the Camatchy Umman Pagoda which office you shall hold for life or so long as you may be desirous, from which you shall not be removed except by the sentence of a Court of Justice----". The right has been given to the individual and it is not hereditary right.

Tahsildar Srinivasa Rao in his letter No. 76 of 18.2.1839 informs collector A. Freeze that Kumbakonam Swamigal is arriving Kanchi to perform Kumbabhishekam of Kamakshi Amman and that he had budgeted for Rs. 10,000/- and a part would be given from the treasury. Collector A. Freeze in his letter dated 25.2.1839, says that the Govt. cannot grant Rs. 5,000/- but agrees to sanction Rs. 3,500/- for this purpose. The

Kumbakonam math head seeked permission from the Government to perform Kumbabhisekam of Kamakshi Amman and the same was performed in 1839 and thereafter with the help of Tahsildar Srinivasa Rao and Raja of Tanjore Kumbakonam Math Swamigal got the post of Superintendence of Kamakshi Amman in November 1842 and physically accepted the same in January 1843. So he became Kanchi Kamakoti Peethadhipati.

12. REMOVAL OF IDOLS OF THREE TEMPLES IN KANCHI

Kanchi Math claims that during the troublous time, they removed the idol of "Swarna Kamakshi" to Udayarpalayam and then to Tanjore and shifted the math from Conjeevaram to Tanjore and finally to Kumbakonam. Different dates are given (a) 1746 — 63, (b) 1729 (c) 1686 (d) 1780 (e) 1767 and (f) 1821 A.D.

Under the command of Harji Maharaj, the Maharatta army plundered and taken several towns belonging to the kingdom of Golconda and then marched to Conjeevaram. Aurangzeb sent his four commanders to Kanchi and the Mohammedan army reached Kanchi in February 1688. "Madras Diary and Consultation Book" (Page 203) says — "Having advice from the Maratha camp that Maratha forces in the Gingee country under the command of Harji Maharaj were upon their march with 2000 horses and 5000 foot, with great number of pioneers and scaling ladders, that they had plundered and taken several towns belonging lately to the Kingdom of Golconda and committed various other atrocities that most of the inhabitants left Conjeevaram and other places to secure their persons and estates". From this fact it is clear that it was in 1687/88 there was unrest in Conjeevaram and people started leaving for safety and the choatic condition prevailed in the area till 1690 A.D.

We find the following facts in "A Manual — The Chingleput" by Charles Stewart Crole, Madras Civil Service, 1879, A.D." ---- "The authorities of the three pagodas noticed above, determined to protect the idols from their apprehended

desecration by the fanatical zeal of the invader. They were accordingly conveyed away, disguised as corpses and followed by funeral processions and were carried off to the Udayarpalayam jungles in the Trichinopoly district. The image of Kamakshi was of gold and is said to have been taken possession of by the Rajah of Tanjore". Madras Govt. G.O. 985 Home (Education) dated 31.8.1920 confirms the above facts. There is no mention of Kanchi Math or its employees engaged in this episode. The Dharmakartas of these three temples removed the idols for safe keeping.

There is a stone inscription outside the mother's (Thayar) temple in the Varadaraja temple complex dated 1709/10 A.D. and it says --- "May blessings attend, in the 1632nd of the era of Salivahana saka named Virodhi in the month of Palguna, on the 30th day Saturday, instructed by Srinivasa, Lalla Tandra Mallji, disciple of Attanjeer, caused the idol Varadaraja to be brought back from Udayarpalayam to Vishnu Kanchi". A.R.E. 639 of 1919 says "----in compliance with the order of Srinivasa alias Attan Tiruvengada Ramanuja Jiyar, his pupil the Chieftain Raja Sri Lala Todarmalla brought back the images of Varadaraja and his consorts from Udayarpalayam and set them up in the temple at Kanchi".

Mr Charles Stewart Crole further says ---- "The idol of Siva Temple was restored to its place by a Brahmin called Sellambattu". The fact that the idol of Varadaraja temple was returned to its original place in 1710 A.D. would mean that the idols were removed long before this period, and hence 1688 to 1690 may seem to be correct. The other 5 dates given by Kanchi math are false.

The third idol (Bangaru Kamakshi) was taken to Tiruvarur from Udayarpalayam where unrest prevailed for some time. Sri Vishwanatha Sastry took charge of the idol and worshipped it for more than 20 years at Tiruvarur. His son Sri Shyama Sastry was born here. It is said that when Shyama Sastry was 18 years old, he took this idol to Tanjore, and met Maharaja Sri Tulja Ji (1763-1787 A.D.) and requested him to keep the idol in a safe place and arrange for its worship. It is said that Sri Vishwanatha Iyer's family shifted to Tanjore with this gold idol in 1781 A.D. Tanjore King Sri Sarbhoji II (1798-1833) built the Gopuram in

1806 A.D. There is Board of Trustees under the control of H.R. & C.E. supervision, who manage the temple. No where and at no period of time Kanchi Math had anything to do with this idol.

An interesting episode happened about this idol's worship and quote below some extracts from the memorandum sent by Staneekars of Kamakshi temple, Kanchi, to the Board of Revenue, Madras- " --And in the year 1820, Mr A. Crawley, the then Head Asst. Collector, having in his enquiry found out if such a takeed that Sthaneeks of this temple should not go and attend in Tanjore and that those of Tanjore should not serve here and received to that effect written documents from their hands and as the jewels and goddess are not inserted in the accounts of the circar, we and the inhabitants of Conjeevaram have addressed to Mr. A. Maclean in 1834 and Mr. Maclean in his takeed No. 13 of 24 September of the same year to the Tahsildar of Conjeevaram ordered him to search fully into the matter and inform and that the Tahsildar delayed to execute the command, on which we have petitioned to Mr. A. Freeze at three different times, for which he answered that he would not enter in this affair, we, therefore, humbly request your Board to look into Mr. Maclean's takeed and to the documents mentioned above and to order the goddess from Tanjore with the jewels to be brought to the original place. We also enclose Mr. Maclean's takeed together with the endorsement of the present collector". In 1820 it was decided and Mr A. Crawley endorsed the same that "the Sthaneekars of Kanchi will not go to Tanjore and the Sthaneekars of Tanjore will not visit Kanchi".

In the so called chronology of Kanchi, the pontiff was Bodha alias Yogendra alias Bhagavannama during 1638 to 1692. He was a free person and was engrossed in visiting Tirthas and spending his time in Nama Sankeerthana. He was not a pontiff of Kumbakonam math or Kanchi Math. The removal of the idol of Bangaru Kamakshi during his period is a myth.

G.O.No. 985 — Home (Education) dated 31.8.1920 says "----The historic incidents that led up to the events recorded in this inscription were that the Delhi Emperor Aurangazeb fitted out an expedition in about 1688 A.D. against the Maharattas of the South and Conjeevaram, in common with several other

important centres of South India, felt the shock of this iconoclastic invasion. The temple authorities of the three premier temples of that city therefore apprehending desecration at the profane hands of the invaders, disguised the images of the temple gods and conveyed them secretly out of the town, the Vishnu Temple images finding an asylum in the jungles of Udayarpalaym in the Trichinopoly district--". This G.O. further confirms that year Saka 1632 Virodhi is equivalent to 1710 A.D. and not 1799 A.D. as calculated by Mr. Crole in his "Chingleput Manual"

13. SHIFTING KANCHI MATH HEADQUARTERS FROM KANCHI TO KUMBakonAM

Different dates are given on this and they are dealt with below. If it is a fact and true, then the happening could be traced precisely to one date. As it happens to be a figment of imagination different dates are projected.

1. Sri N. Ganesh Iyer, Manager, Kanchi Math, writes from Camp: Nagapattinam, dated 25.7.1941 "---- During the uncertain times of Carnatic wars (1743-63) Conjeevaram was inside the danger zone ---- The Chieftain of the orthodox Hindu principality of Udayarpalyam extended invitation to the Acharya to go over to Udayarpalyam. Accordingly, the Acharya came to Udayarpalayam.....Maharaja of Tanjore...went in person to Udayarapalyam and took the Acharya with him to Tanjore".

2. Diwan Bahadur K.S. Ramaswamy writes (refer the Hindu dated 4.1.1936) "It is that math that is now at Kumbakonam, having been removed to Tanjore at the request of Raja Pratap Simha of Tanjore (1740-63) and then shifted to Kumbakonam".

3. K.V. Pantulu (a propagandist of Kanchi Math) writes ---- "the 62nd guru on the Kamakoti Peetha was Chandrasekharendra Saraswathi, who ascended the seat in 1729 A.D. In that year, the fight --- caused considerable trouble to the Hindus. Then the local chief of Udayarpalyam requested the guru to go over to his place ---- The math accordingly went over to Udayarpalayam. The Golden image

of the Sri Kamakshi was also taken over to the place with the math. The then king of Tanjore Pratapa Sinha ---- desired that the math should remain permanently at Tanjore".

4. Another propagandist Sri Venkataraman writes "60-Chandra-Shekara IV: It must have been in the time of this Acharya that the Kamakoti Peetha was permanently removed from Kanchipuram to Kumbakonam --- The gold image of Kamakshi had been removed to Udayarpalayam and then to Tanjore --- And on the invitation of Raja Pratapa Simha 1740-1763 of Tanjore the math was permanently removed to Tanjore" (Chandra-Sekhara IV 1746-1783).

5. "Ananda Vikatan" of Madras says that about 1686 the Tanjore King Pratap Simha invited Acharya to come to Tanjore. But Raja Pratap Simha ruled during 1740-63.

6. Sri V. Vishwanathan says in Ep.Ind. Vol XIV "----The tradition of the Math tells us that it was at the invitation of King Sarabhoji of Tanjore that the Acharya removed to Kumbakonam (1821 A.D.)

7. Sri M.K. Sreenivasan in the book entitled "Kanchi Temples" (1957 publication) says that when Hyder Ali attacked Conjeevaram the Acharya in 1767 A.D. moved to Tanjore.

It should be noted that the inscription in Varadaraja Temple confirms that the God's idol was restored to original place in 1710. It means that these three idols would have been removed much before its restoration in 1710. Atrocities were committed by Maharatha and Mohammedan during 1687 to 1690 and people were leaving the town and the idols were removed. The idols were removed by Sthalattar and Sthaneekar. Hence, all dates given above are not acceptable.

14. SRI SURESHWARA AND SRI VISWARUPA

Sri Sureshwara's importance is seen from the fact that when other disciples sought Sri Sankara, Sri Sankara found it necessary to seek this disciple and convert him to his side. Even the Kanchi Math's Gururatnamala concedes that Sankara stayed in Sringeri for "Some Years". Kumbakonam Math's "Sushama" (Commentary on Gururatnamala) interprets

"Some years" as 12 years. Even the unacceptable Anandagiri accepts that Sankara stayed at Sringeri for 12 years and installed his disciple Sureshwara at Sringeri. But Kanchi Math changed this version of Anandagiri and said that Padmapada was installed at Sringeri. This amendment is done just to deny Sureshwara to Sringeri. Gururatnamala says that Sureshwara stayed in Sringeri at the request of Prithividhava and Vishvarupa. Sureshwara is said to be disqualified as he became a sanyasin as a result of bet and consequently he was not a Paramahansa Sanyasi (Kanchi Version). Sureshwara's Vartika, Naishkarmyasiddhi, Manasollasa and other works are sufficient to believe that first reason. The second reason given is that being a grihasta, taking Sanyasa as a result of bet, he is not a Paramahansa. But such disqualification is quite unknown to shastras. Now Kanchi math propagate that Viswarupa cannot be identified with Sureshwaracharya and he is quite a distinct person (Refer T.S. Narayana Iyer's propaganda books — a militant advocate of Kanchi Math). Madhavacharya, Sadananda, Govindanatha, and even Kanchi Math's Vyasachala, Shankarabhyudaya and others, all refer to Sureshwara by the name of Vishwarupa. Ramatirtha-commentator of Manasollasa Vartika of Sureshwara — clearly accepts Vishwarupa as Sureshwara. Madhavacharya in Parasara Madhaviya says that Vishwarupacharya quoted this statement in his Vartika (i.e., Sureshwaracharya's work): Vidyaranya in Vivarana Prameya Sangrha and in Jivan Mukti Viveka takes the name of Shri Vishwarupa in the place of Sureshwara. Sankarananda in his Taittareya Upanishad Dipika refers to Vishwarupa in place of Sureshwara. Even the Kanchi Math so called Mathamnaya mentions Viswarupa as the Acharya of Sringeri. If Viswarupa is the same as Sureshwara and if the former was the Acharya of Sringeri, it follows that Sureshwara presided at Sringeri. Anandagiri refers Sringeri as Sankara's "मदाश्रमे, निजमठकृत्वा, भारतीसंप्रदायं, निर्जशिष्यंचकार।"

Adi Sankara was a Krishna Yajurvedi and Sureshwara was Shukla Yajurvedi and Sringeri being Dakshinamnaya Math for Yajurveda, Sureshwara was installed in Sringeri. In the preface to Siddhantabindu, it is said "Sureshwaracharya was a very pet pupil of the Acharya and was therefore installed by him in the principal Gadi of the Math at Sringeri in Mysore State". There is

also the Samadhi of Sureshwara at Sringeri (This samadhi was referred in literary works of 14th and 15th centuries) and worshipped from the time of his death and recently Kumbhabhishekam was performed. Another book "Smaraka Pushpanjali" released at that time establishes the fact of Sureshwara ascending Sringeri Math with irrefutable evidence. Even Mathamnaya, Madhaviya, Chidvilasiya, Sadanandiya, Anandagiriya, Guruparampara Charita, Guruvamsakavya and other books hold Sureshwara as the head of Sringeri Math. Bhatta Sri Narayana Sastry and Srinivasa Sastry who hail from a village near Kumbakonam accept Sureshwara as the head of Sringeri Math in their works. In Jagadguru Taravali Stuti, Halasyanatha Sastry of Kumbakonam says that Sureshwara was the head of Sringeri Math.

When Sankara was 17, he gave Sanyasa Deeksha to Mandana Vishwarupa Mishra and named him Sureshwaracharya. If Kanchi Math's version is taken that he lived in Sringeri for 12 years till Sankara was 29 years old, then the Dakshinamnaya Math at Sringeri was started by Shankara with Sureshwara as the first head of that math. What are the authorities of Kumbakonam Math to call Vishwarupa the avatar of Yama and Sureshwara the avatar of Brahma? Perhaps Kanchi math is ignorant that they are one and the same person. According to one of the Kanchi Math's publications, Sureshwara was in Sringeri for 18 years and returned to Kamakoti in Kanchi. That will place Acharya Sankara's age to 35. But Acharya Sankara ended his earthly life at his 32nd year. Then, how could Sureshwara return after 18 years stay at Sringeri and meet Shankara? So the story of Sureshwara's return to Kanchi and Sankara's stay in Kanchi all that time is a mere fiction. In poorvamnaya Jaganath Math there is a book which has given the fact that Prithividhara and Prithividhava are both the one and the same and they are the names of Hastamalaka in the past. According to this, one can conclude that Hastamalaka ascended the Gadi in Sringeri. If Adi Sankara's time is the end of 7th Century or 8th Century, then the story of Kanchi Math that Krupa Sankara sending Subhatta Vishwarupa to Sringeri in 29-69 AD falls flat. Kanchi Math's different versions are:

- a) Vishwarupa was the pontiff at Sringeri.
- b) Prithividhara or Prithividhava was the Head of Sringeri,
- c) Vishwarupa or Prithividhava was the head of sringeri,
- d) Viswarupa returned to kanchi and became the head of that math and
- e) Sureshwara stayed in Sringeri at the request of Viswarupa.
- f) Kripa Shankar of Kanchi Math sent Subhatta Viswarupa to Sringeri is another theory.

Again, Kanchi Math also says that Vishwarupa meaning Sureshwara became the Head of the Math at Kanchi. At that time in Sringeri Padmapada was the head of the Math. And thus, they have landed on quick sand! Out of the various and mutually contradictory versions invented to justify or glorify the supremacy of Kanchi Math, please choose which best suits your convenience. From such fertile inventions there emerge different versions which mutually cancel each other and thus destroying all credibility of the Kanchi Math.

15. THE STORY OF FIVE LINGAS FROM KAILASA

The Kanchi Math is in possession of a Sphatika Linga (Yogalinga) which is said to have belonged to Sri Adi Sankara and hence they claim that the math at Kanchi is a real one. Shivarahasya and Naishad Kavya are the main authority for them. Shivarahasya says that Vishweswara at Kashi (Bhookailasa) gave Sri Sankara the five lingas. But the Kanchi Math says that Shankara and Sureshwara visited (with their mortal body) Kailasa and got the 5 lingas from Ishwara — Refer Shankara Vijayam P. 232. Also, they got Saundarya Lahiri and Shivarahasya. The Sloka in reference (Panchalinga) in Shivarahasya raises some doubts, viz, Why Jaina is distinguished from Arhata? What is the difference between Mukti and Moksha? Why the word yoga is repeated twice? Can it be that all the five lingas Yoga, Bhoga, Vara, Mukth and Moksha are equally entitled to be called Yoga lingas? The word "Mishra" denotes the scholars of North India and the disputation was not held in South. Other versions of Shivarahasya are "सकामम्, ततोलोकमवापशैवम् ततो नैजमवापलोकम्, सकाञ्चामथसिद्धिमवापशैवम्" etc.

It is worthy to note that Kanchi Math's version omits two and half slokas in the middle of the chapter and 13 slokas at the end. The writer of this booklet had collected 13 copies from different places — 3 copies of 60 slokas, 3 copies of 59 slokas, 1 of 58 and 48 each; 2 of 47 slokas, 1 of 46 and 45½ and 44 slokas each (For details and critical study on Shivarahasya, see the book "The Truth about Kumbakonam Math" Page 122 to 145).

As regards Naishad Kavya, in the context of Damayanti's Swayamvara, goddess Saraswathi describes to her the several kings assembled there eager to take her hand and in this particular stanza the King of Kanchi is described. The name of Kanchi was too tempting to be disregarded by the Kumbakonam Math's advocates. There was also a mention of Sphatika and it required just a stroke to convert Yageshwara into Yogeshwara; so as to make the passage applicable to their 'Yoga Linga'! Assuming that the stanza refers to yoga Linga, Sri Harsha, in giving out the story of Nala who lived long before Sri Rama, will be guilty of gross anachronism if he were to refer to a linga obtained by Sri Sankara atleast 2000 years after the advent of Kali (Kanchi Version). In fact he does not refer at all to any math or a sanyasin or any linga in his hands. It would perhaps be more proper to equate Yageshwara with Ekamranatha, the deity presiding over Kanchi! Sri Harsha probably refer to a deity nearer home to himself, namely the linga called Yageshwara (Popularly known as Jageshwara) in a shrine at a place known as Balakailasa in the Himalayas on the way to Manasarovara. Some commentators have taken Jageswara as correct reading.

This story of five lingas in Shivarahasya says that four of them were given to four amnaya maths. Even according to this reference installation of lingas at Kanchi or movable lingam turns out to be a lie. The story of visit to Kailasa and bringing five lingas is not found in Shivarahasya. If we concede the Kanchi Math version that these Lingas were installed at Kedar, Neelakantha, Chidambaram, Sringeri and Kanchi, then we have to conclude that the lingas in the three other amnaya maths (Puri, Dwaraka and Jyothi) said to have been installed from Shankara's days have to be discounted. These three amnaya maths hold Kumbakonam Math's propaganda as worthless. Even in Anandagiri Shankara Vijaya, the story of Panchalingas

is an innovation. It is not found in the original text of the same book. Govindanatha, Chidvilasa, Vyasachalia, Patanjali Charita, Shankarabhyudaya etc are all books on which Kanchi math relies heavily. But they do not speak of any yoga linga at Kanchi. It is very very sad thing that this alleged yoga linga was stolen away near Varanasi in 1934. According to Mathamnaya procedures it is held that maths were established on the basis of amnaya codes and not based on lingas.

16. SRI GAUDAPADACHARYA AND SRI GOVINDAPADACHARYA

Kanchi Math proclaim that "Gaudapada was Brahmarakshasa. Govindapada was Patanjali. Chandra, Chandra Sharma, Chandragupta, Chandracharya are the poorvashrama names of Govindapada. He delivered Gaudapada from the curse. He had four wives belonging to four castes. He had four sons - Vararuchi, Vikramaditya, Bhatti, Bhartruhari"

It is a fantastic thesis. One shudders to read it. If you refer to pages 41 to 49 of the book "The Truth about Kumbakonam Math", all these absurd assumptions will fall flat. The entire story is built-up to adjust a few historical facts into Govindapada's biography with those Patanjali and to justify the interpolations made by them in Patanjali Charita, which has no connection with the life history of Shankara, thus making way for these absurd yams. Govindapada was in the end of 7th century A.D or 8th century A.D, Bhartruhari - 650 A.D., Bhatti was not of the same century and Patanjali was many centuries earlier to Shankara. A few spurious slokas about Shankara and Kanchi were transported into the Patanjali Charita. To make confusion worse confounding Kanchi Math is transporting a few irrelevant historical details with lives of Govindapada and Gaudapada and riding on the crest of these illusory wares and blatant falsehood.

17. KANCHI MATH AUTHORITIES (SO CALLED) PURANIC AND LATER LITERATURE

1. MARKANDEYA SAMHITA

It is not clear whether it is claimed to be a Purana or Itihasa. But it is clear that it is not any portion of the 18 Puranas and 18

Upapuranas. It is contended by the Kumbakonam Math that it consists of 100 Khandas and the passages relied upon are from the 7th and 8th Pariskanda of the 72 Khanda. On what basis the Swamiji of Kumbakonam Kanchi Math says that it forms a portion of Brahmanandapurana and that Shankara's story is in the 3rd Pariskanda is not clear. When the whole work is only imaginary, it is certainly not difficult to give such exact references safely. Undoubtedly, it is a product of a fertile brain. One stanza says that Brahma, Vishnu, Indra come to this mundane world daily to worship the Acharya of Kanchi. Another Stanza says that those who do not respect the heads of Kanchi Kamakoti peetha stand condemned and those who revere and worship are promised all kinds of bliss. The Acharyas of Kanchi Math are thus superior to Trimurthi! This is the tenor of the unbridled propaganda. It smacks of blatant arrogance, the mortals claiming supremacy even over the gods! What a pity, the Sishyas of the math are carried away by such vain propaganda! Can we really believe that such absurd statements could have been uttered by Vedavyasa? It is surprising that the author of such passages did not in the least realise the stupidity of such claims.

2. SHIVARAHASYA

The Kanchi Math claims support from Shivarahasya and Markandeya Samhita. Sri Vyasa is credited with the authorship of 18 puranas and 18 upapuranas. Neither of these two works find a place in the said 36 puranas. Shivarahasya was first claimed to have been a part of Skanda Purana but now it has been elevated to the status of Itihasa like Ramayana and Mahabharata. Curiously enough it contains references not only to Shankara but also to Haradattacharya and Appaya Dikshita. Kanchi Math through their propagandist N.K.V. Panthulu claim that Sri Sankara proceeded to Kailasa in his human form and received Sivarahasya from Lord Shiva himself. Evidently Lord Shiva had a ready made Sivarahasya with him and handed over to Sri Sankara so that Shankara might use it as a credential! Shivarahasya may be older than Kamalakara (author of many books) and this in no way proves that passages now quoted and paraded as from Shivarahasya are genuine. We are not concerned with the question whether Shivarahasya has existed

for sometime past but whether those passages have been there or not. In Achutaraya' Advaita Rajalakshmi commentary on Madhaviya (in A.D.1824), curiously enough he is commenting upon Shankara's departure from this world for Kailasa from Kedamath and no attempt is made by him to reconcile the text with the Shivarahasya's quotations, wherein Sankara is said to have passed away at Kanchi. This introduction of Shivarahasya passages which are at variance with the original text commented upon, is on the face of it, very suspicious and evidently made to give currency to such absurdities. This commentary was published with the older Dindima comentary by Dhanapati Suri just to confirm the Kumbakonam Math's version. It is interesting to note that grantha edition printed long ago at Madras contains about 16 stanzas more than what are to be found in the Kanchi Math's version. The publisher has pointed out that the omission is deliberately made with ulterior motives. The writer of this booklet had collected 13 copies from different places containing slokas ranging from 44 to 60.

3. ANANDAGIRI SHANKARA VIJAYA

Anandagiri or Anantanandagiri is the author of Shankara Vijaya and he is immodestly claims to be a Sarvagya and direct disciple of Shankara. Mr. N.K.V. Pantulu says that he is Trotakacharya and his work is the oldest and authoritative. This book has been published in Calcutta in the 19th century based on some old manuscript collected by the publisher. Another propagandist N. Venkataraman disclaims it as "Valueless and obviously a forgery." According to Sarvagya Anandagiri and direct disciple of Shankara, as alleged by Kumbakonam Math, Sankara was born in Chidambaram three years after the death of his father. His parents were Vishwajit and Visishta. In spite of its unreliability and slanderous to Sri Sankara's parentage the Kumbakonam math is not willing to give up as it mentions that Shankara relinquished his body at Kanchi. An embellished "Parishkritya" edition with significant omissions and additions is also in print in Telugu script. Another Parishkritya copy was available in Kanchi Math obtained by them from Sri Rama Taraka Math at Varanasi and a copy of the same was obtained by the writer of this booklet through Panditraj Sri Rajeshwara Sastry and M.M.Sri

Anantakrishna Sastry. The Mahant of Ramataraka Math, Varanasi, in his letter dated 14.5.1935, says: "श्री आनन्दगिरि कृत शंकरविजय आक्षेपार्थ ग्रंथ है और ये आक्षेपार्थ विषयें उस पुस्तक का अप्रामाणिक होने की 'विमर्श' पुस्तक में लोक सहाय के लिये उल्लेख है, वह सही ही है। आक्षेपार्थ आनन्दगिरि पुस्तक पर मेरी सम्मति नहीं है, यह विषय आपकी जानकारी के लिये लिखते हैं।"

(Sri Anandagiri's book "Sankaravijaya" is objectionable and unacceptable and I do not agree).

The language and contents of either of the version, as also the mention of the 12th century personage and facts therein bear clear traces of recent fabrications by unskilled hands. For some time reliance upon it was being relaxed, but recently, it is again trotted out as a very authoritative treatise on Sankara. The varying contents in those two editions also renders it unreliable.

Mr. N. Ramesham suggests authenticity for this work and relies upon the observation of Prof. Wilson for this. The same is being now quoted by many propagandists of the Kumbakonam math including the recent one in September 1987 in the journal "The Week." Mr. Ramesham quotes Prof. Wilson as follows: "It bears internal evidence of being the composition of a period not far removed from that at which he (Shankara) may be supposed to have flourished, and we may, therefore follow it as a very safe guide." This attribution of "he" as Shankara is his own and has no warrant in the original where it properly applies only to Anandagiri. Mr. Ramesham says that Sankara's birth date of 508 B.C. is to be brought down to first century B.C. or first century A.D. This Anandagiri refers to Sri Ramanujacharya of 12th century and also Sri Madhavacharya of a later date and quotes from a work of Sri Bharati Krishna Tirtha and Sri Vidyanarya of the 14th century A.D. Had Mr. Ramesham and others read Anandagiri's book, they would certainly not have interpreted the word "He" in Prof. Wilson's statement as referring to Shankar. The actual words used by Prof. Wilson are — "Some of the marvels it records of Shankara which the author professes to have seen may be thought to affect its credibility, if not its authenticity and either Anandagiri must be unblushing liar or the book is not his own. It is however, of little consequence as even if the work be not that of Anandagiri

himself, it bears intemal and indisputable evidence of being the composition of a perod not far removed from that at which he may be supposed to have flourished; and we may therefore follow it as a very safeguide in our enquiries into the actual state of the Hindu religion about eight or nine centuries ago." This passage clearly shows that Prof. Wilson did not in the least attach any historical or factual importance to Anandagiri's work, but chose to rely upon it for a very limited purpose. To tear the passage out of context and quote the truncated portion in the publication is not fair. Kumbakonam Kanchi math propagandists did not care to look into Prof. Wilson's book for they would have found there that Prof. Wilson had not left the matter in any doubt but had definitely stated that Sri Sankara had died in Kedamath area and certainly not in Kanchi. It is highly unfortunate that they should have lent their names to such publications, demeaning to Adi Sankara.

Dr. Burnell, the eminent Sanskritist, who was the District Judge of Tanjore and edited a catalogue of Manuscripts says about this Anandagiri's Sankaravijaya. "This seems to be quite a modern work written in the interests of the schismatic mathas on the coromandel coast which have renounced obedience to the Sringeri Matha where Sankaracharya's legitimate successor resides".

The Anandagiri's work is now put forward as the ancient (Prachin and Brihat) and that Madhavachari in Madhaviya Shankar Vijaya made a summary from it. Kumbakonam math has been saying that Brihat Shankara Vijaya is by Chitsukha and Prachin Sankara Vijaya is by Muka Sankarendra. How could one give a go-bye to those alleged authorities and now transfer it to Anandagiri. Atmabodhendra in Sushama does not refer to Anandagiri by name but refers to "Acharya Vijaya" and thereby he means only Acharya Vijaya, the work of Anandagiri. Old manuscripts and printed books say that Shankara was born in Chidambaram and in the embellished edition they have changed it to Kalati and that his father was Shivaguru and not Vishwajit.

Some of the life incidents of Shankara have been changed in the embellished edition to suit Kumbakonam Math's claims but the old copy of the printed and manuscript of Anandagiri give a

different version. The book as it is, bears ample evidence of being a later fabrication (for details see the books "The Truth about the Kumbakonam Math", "Jagadguru Shankar Math Vimarsha", "Anandagiri by Dr. Dakshina Murthy"). The alterations found in the new editions, are so clumsy that even a cursory reader can easily makeout the real points in the earlier texts peeping through. If Anandagiri was a direct disciple of Shankara, one wonders as to how he is able to refer to Sri Ramanujacharya of the 12th century and Sri Madhavacharya of a later date? He quotes Sri Bharati Krishna Tirtha of 14th century too? If one goes through all the old and the new versions, he would understand how demeaning it is to the great Acharya Shankara and would not even touch it again. It is likely that there was once a genuine Anandagiri Shankara Vijaya from which Dhanapati Suri, author of Dindima (Commentary of Madhaviya), was able to quote extensively as he does in Chapter XV. But the version now put forward by Kanchi Math are only parodies of the same, though here and there some passages of extracts taken from it.

Prof. K.T. Telang writes -- "Manuscripts of it do not appear to be numerous, and it is accordingly not much to be wondered at, however much we may regret it, that the only edition of the work which has been printed, namely, the edition published in the Bibliotheca Indica is one which we cannot help characterising as unsatisfactory ---- the work, therefore, cannot have been composed by a pupil of Sankara, consequently not by Anandagiri". "It may be added here that I have grave doubts as to the Sankaravijaya published at Calcutta, being really a work of Anandagiri, the pupil of Sankara". "----- And it therefore follows that the author of the Shankaravijaya cannot have lived long, if at all, before the fourteenth century after christ, and cannot therefore, be identical with the Anandagiri, who was one of the pupil of Sankaracharya".

Pandit N. Bhashyacharya (Adyar publication) writes ---- "It is very much to be doubted whether this was written by Anandagiri, the famous disciple of Sri Sankaracharya, for the work is partly in poetry and partly in prose, and the nature of the style and many grammatical errors show that the author

must have been only a beginner in the study of the Sanskrit language. It is stated therein that he refuted certain systems, philosophical and sectarian, such as those of Indra, Kubera, Yama or Chandra, which do not seem to have been mentioned in any Sanskrit work and therefore can have existed only in the imagination of the writer. It is also stated that he had disciples named Laxmana and Hastamalaka; the former was afterwards called as Sri Ramanujacharya and he preached Vaishnava religion and wrote a Bhashya (Commentary) on the Vedanta Sutras, while the later went to Udipi and preached the Dwaita philosophy. There cannot be a sillier statement. By mentioning these two reformers it is pretty certain that the writer of the Shankara vijaya lived after their times ---- and not during or immediately after the time of Sri Shankaracharya, as we might be led to think, from the writer's statement that he was his disciple". Kanchi math propagandist N. Venkataraman writes - ---- "Anandgiri's Sankara Vijaya is equally valueless and obviously forgery, for the author who claims to be a disciple of the great teacher himself, refers to Ramanuja and Madhava, who lived in the eleventh and twelfth centuries respectively".

4. MADHAVIYA SHANKARA VIJAYA

Picking up flimsy and minor points here and there (about 13 points are pointed out), Kumbakonam math and their propagandists have condemned this popular book as fictitious and unfit for acceptance. But this book is highly respected and considered as an authority by the four Jagadguru Sankaracharyas of four Amnaya maths and also by all the Mahamandaleshwaras and Mahants of various Akhadas of Dasanami. It is popularly accepted by all except Kumbakonam math and their followers. It is used for parayana during Shankara Jayanthi and considered holy. In the beginning of the book, it is mentioned "प्रणम्य परमात्मानं श्रीविद्यातीर्थरूपिणम्" and thus the author gives his guru's name Vidyatirtha. Further, the author gives the sources from where he had taken the life incidents of Shankara. Each Sarga ends with "इति माधवीय". This sets at rest any doubt about the authorship of the book.

The first commentary on Madhaviya by Dhanapati Suri (Hailing from Punjab and residing in Varanasi), popularly

known as Dindima Tika, was written in 1799 A.D, and that of Achutaraya Pandit's commentary (Advaitasamrajya Lakshmi Tika) was written in 1824-25. Dhanapati Suri had written a commentary on Sadananda Vyas's "Shankarvijayasar" in 1804, which was written in 1783 by Sadananda Vyas. Sadananda says that the source and basis of his work is "Madhaviya". This confirms that Madhaviya was available in North India before 1780/83. Kumbakonam math's Atmabodendra had written a commentary Sushama in 1720 (Kanchi Version) and he refers Madhaviya, which according to Kanchi Math would mean that Madhaviya was available in South India before 1720 A.D. Four editions of Madhaviya, Poona publications, are of 19th century, and the manuscripts consulted were of 1805, 1824, and 1835 A.D. These dates indicate that the book Madhaviya was copied from another book in those years. It does not indicate the date of authorship of the book itself, which certainly was of a much earlier period.

The Kumbakonam math and their propagandists have raised minor points against this authoritative book (about 13) and all of them are analysed critically in the "Vimarsha Book". 16 stanzas of Madhaviya is found in Patanjali Charita (Kanchi Math authority), 145 stanzas in Shankarabhyudaya (Kanchi Math authority), and 508 stanzas in Vyasachaliya (author is said to be Kanchi math head). The commentators of Madhaviya say that Vyasachala refers to Madhava, who is "व्यास इव अचल" and "नव कालिदास" is none but the author Madhava. Madhaviya contains 16 sargas and about 1850 slokas and Vyasachala contains only 12 sargas, and about 400 slokas of it are unconnected with the life story of Shankara but deal on different topic. How could this be the source and basis of Madhaviya, as alleged by Kanchi Math?

5. VYASACHALIA SANKARA VIJAYA

A Sankaravijaya attributed to one Vyasachala has recently been published by the Madras Oriental Manuscripts Library. In the introduction thereto, the curator for reasons best known to himself, has taken pains to recount the story of Sankara as propagated by the Kumbakonam — Kanchi Math and not as told in that publication. The author is claimed to be the same as

Mahadevendra Saraswathi, the 52nd Acharya of that Math from 1498-1507 A.D. He is said to have performed severe penance in a cave in a mountain called "Vyasachal" and earned the name for himself (Kanchi version). Even the Gururatnamala does not assign this alternative name to Mahadevendra Saraswathi. Atmabodhendra does not mention this in his commentary Sushama. The editor of the book says -- "It is rather strange that Vyasachal who was a Head of the Kanchi Kamakoti math has not even mentioned by name that Math, the life of the founder of which is described in this work". This can only mean that Vyasachala was not the Head of this math or that there was no such math at all when Vyasachala wrote it. As regards the antiquity of the book, the curator quotes a sloka from Madhaviya which is not found at all in any of the printed editions in the several publications in different scripts in India nor in any manuscripts in the land including very old Cadjan manuscript. A propangandist of Kanchi math urges that this and yet another stanza are found in MSS. D.12174 of Madras Government Manuscripts Library and the omission of these two stanzas must be due to the carelessness of the copyists. It should be noted that one commentator of Madhaviya was from Maharashtra and another was from Punjab. These books have been in circulation for more than a century without these two slokas and hence the explanation offered by the propangandist is too big a pill to swallow for ordinary people. The more plausible explanation will be that persons bent upon launching the Vyasachala as an ancient work have interpolated these slokas into an existing manuscript or got up a manuscript with these slokas and got a berth for it in the Library.

The editor says that Govindnatha's Sankaracharya Charita and Keraliya Sankara Vijaya have praised Vyasachala. The editor is not aware of the fact that Keraliya Sankara Vijayam is the same as Govindanatha's Acharya Charita and both these slokas in his praise appear as the 6th and 7th slokas in Chapter I of the same book. If Vyasachala was a sanyasin or head of a math, how would Govindanatha call him as "Vyasachala Kavi"?

If we carefully analyse the contents of the new Vyasachala

and if we exclude from it the irrelevant interludes and passages (400 slokas), there will be nothing in it other than the passages borrowed from Madhaviya and reshuffled without any sense of propriety.

18. TATANKA PRATISHTA CASE — AKHILANDESHWARI DEVI — JAMBUKESWARAM

**PRINCIPAL SADAR AMIN COURT (DISTRICT COURT) OF
TRICHY:**

CASE No. O.S.95 of 1844 A.D.

Of late, it is observed that the militant propagandists of Kanchi Math with the approval of the Math authorities propagate that the Sringeri Math lost a suit in the Tatanka Pratishta case when it claimed superiority over Kanchi Math on the question of renovating the Tatanka of Akhilandeswari Devi and hence it was proved and admitted that the Kanchi math was founded by Adi Sankara and the Kanchi Math's lineage is the direct lineage of Sri Adi Sankara. On the face of these absurd and silly claims, one thought that they were not worth refuting. But the dubious methods of propaganda adopted by that math, helped by the partisan press and other media, ran the risk of people believing in those claims and hence this writer feels that it is his duty herein to place the relevant facts of the case before the public. This writer has in his possession the copy of the judgment and copies of other relative documents and evidences. No intelligent reader will find any difficulty in seeing through the game and in realising that the Kanchi Math's claims are but attempts to confuse the public and camouflage the truth. This writer's great grandfather's brother Sri Jaipur Krishna Sastry took interest in this case and rendered all assistance to the petitioner of this case Shri Sessa Josier and the family has in its possession some papers and documents relating to this case.

FACTS ABOUT THE CASE

Some members of the Managing Committee of this temple (Trustees) and a few well-known citizens of the City (Trichy)

sent their request to the then Sringeri Math Acharya, humbly requesting him to renovate and install Tatanka on the ears of the Goddess Akhilandeswari, to which request the Sringeri Acharya agreed. In the past occasion also, the Sringeri Acharya renovated and installed the Tatanka. When the temple authorities were making all necessary arrangements, the collector of Trichy endorsed the request of the Trustees of the temple and requested the Sringeri Acharya to install the Tatanka. During this preparatory period, some of the old trustees were made to retire and some were removed and a few new trustee members were selected and appointed. This new committee of temple trustees took up this job of renovating and installing Tatanka. With the help of two or three newly selected members and the patronage extended by the then Raja of Tanjore, the Kumbakonam Math managed to get the approval of other trustees and saw to it that they approached Kumbakonam Math Acharya for renovating and installing the Tatanka. Rumours and gossips then and now convey the details of the intrigues played by the Kumbakonam Math and these are not dealt with here. What happened actually and how it was all manipulated to get the approval of the new trustees and the collector of Trichy are not known, but a copy of the letter addressed to the Collector by these new members requesting the Collector to cancel his previous order and to issue a new order requesting the Kumbakonam Math Acharya to renovate and install the Tatanka as approved by the new trustees of the temple is available. The collector agreed to this new request without making any further enquiries in this matter.

When the above referred news became a public matter and was commonly discussed by people in the streets of the city, one Sri Seshsa Josier (Agent and Vicharana — Kartha of Sringeri Math) filed a case in the court requesting the Court to cancel this new order of the temple trustees and the endorsement of the collector, and further to confirm the previous order requesting the Sringeri Acharya to renovate and to install the Tatanka since the right of repairing Tatanka is vested with the Sringeri Sankaracharya. The issue framed by the Court in this case was — **“Who had the exclusive and absolute authority or right to renovate (repair) and install the**

Tatanka” (ear ornaments). Nowhere and at no stage of the case the status of the Maths or the origin of the Maths or the establishment of the maths by whom, were discussed or issues framed as a part of the case.

Of course, Kumbakonam math filed rejoinders, memoranda and letter of statements supporting all their false and untenable claims they were making thereto and brought in all kinds of unconnected issues in this case. This was done with the ulterior motive that at a future date, they could propagate all these self-made claims as part of the case which is exactly what they are attempting to do now.

During the conduct of the case, the petitioner Sri Seshsa Josier filed a petition stating that he had filed all documents that were with him and he further informed the Court that he had requested the Sringeri Math to despatch all other relevant documents in their possession and that since the then Sringeri Acharya was on religious tour at that time it might take some more days before he could file other papers. The court was in a hurry and since preparations for the Tatanka Pratishta were almost complete including fixing of the auspicious date of Pratishta, the Court did not give permission for adjournment.

After perusing all the documents filed by both the parties, the judge stated clearly in the judgement that no other issues were to be dealt with here in this case and no judgement was to be delivered on other issues except the one issue framed by the Court i.e, who could prove by documents that they had the exclusive and absolute right to renovate and install the Tatanka, that party would get the approval of the Court. The petitioner, Sri Seshsa Josier was asked to prove this exclusive and absolute right. It may be noted here again that the question of the status of the maths, establishment of the maths by Sri Adi Sankara or the lineage of the maths, were not the issues of this case.

The petitioner proved by documents that in the past occasion the Sringeri Acharyas renovated and installed the Tatanka. The filed documents mentioned “Shankaracharya” only but not the exclusive and absolute right of the Sringeri Acharyas. Hence the Judge observed in his judgement that the

petitioner had filed some documents and based on those filed documents he could not find any exclusive or absolute right of the Sringeri Math Acharyas though they had the right to perform the renovation and installation of the Tatanka in a general sense. The depositions of some witnesses were self contradictory and some were against the exhibits filed by the petitioner and the judge did not believe them. Since the exclusive and absolute right of the Sringeri Math Acharyas had not been proved by Sri Sesha Josier (Petitioner), and the depositions and exhibits were self-contradictory the judge dismissed the petition (17-10-1846). **Further, the judge observed that there was no necessity to enquire, examine and to decide whether the Kumbakonam Math had this exclusive and absolute right or not,** since the law says that if one's exclusive and absolute right was not proved, there was no need for the court to decide whether the other party had this right or not. Finally, the judge rejected the petition of Sri Sesha Josier.

This is the sum and substance of the case in brief, but Kumbakonam Math propogates something else and in defence, they produce the rejoinders, memoranda, petition and statements etc filed by them in this case, which are irrelevant and unconnected to the issue of the case. Kumbakonam math confuses the public by their false claims by misinterpreting the judgement and by suggesting incorrect conclusions.

Even accepting that the Kumbakonam math renovated and installed the Tatanka, this by itself does not go to prove that the Kumbakonam Kanchi math was established by Sri Adi Sankara, or that the lineage of Kumbakonam math was that of Sri Adi Sankara himself. Amnaya maths were established on the basis of the Mathamnaya code (Padhati) founded by Sri Adi Sankara himself. For arguments sake, even if we accept that the District Court of Trichy had given its judgement that Kumbakonam math was established by Sri Adi Sankara and the Maths lineage was that of Sri Adi Shankara himself, vis-a-vis this statement, if we refer to the judgements of the superior courts, of the High Courts of Allahabad, Patna, Calcutta, Bombay, Privy council decisions in 19th century and early part of the 20th century and Supreme Court judgements of 1974

and 1979, they clearly state that Sri Adi Shankara of the eighth century had established only four Amnaya maths at the four corners of India — Puri, Sringeri, Dwaraka and Jyothi — and as these decisions were based on the specific issues framed in those respective cases and not merely were opinions or views of the judges, these decisions of the higher courts of the country, will prevail over that of the District Court judgement. Readers will now realise how attempts are being made to confuse the public and to blind it from truth.

19. REBUTTAL AND DENIAL LETTERS

A) Sri Atreya Krishna Sastry, a militant propagandist of Kumbakonam Math, is the author of the book "Jagadguru Sri Sankara Guruparampara". A copy obtained from the Kanchi Math, says that Kerala Kings had accepted and had given their decision that Kanchi Math parampara was the uninterrupted and direct lineage from Adi Sankara. H.H. The Maharaja of Cochin writes (24-6-1960) ---- "I have read the book" The Kumbakonam Math claims "which you have been kind enough to send me, and I thank you very much for the same. As to the portion written in Tamil in your letter, we have here no record or tradition to corroborate".

B) H.H. The Maharaja of Travancore writes (Ref 2511/60 of 11.9.60) "With reference to your letter dated 30th May 1960, and subsequent reminders dated 9th August and 27th August 1960 regarding the claims of Kumbakonam math as the direct descendents of Sri Adi Sankara and the establishment of their math by Sri Adi Sankara at Kanchi, I write to inform you that there are no authentic records here to prove the above".

C) Kingdom of Nepal writes (dated 13.5.1940) "In reply to your letter dated 5th April 1940, enclosing a copy of another dated 7th February 1936, addressed to H.H., I write to inform you that the Government of Nepal have never acknowledged the Head of the Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha as their Guru nor do they pay annually as tribute any portion of their income as alleged by Pandit. Atreya Krishna Sastry in their book entitled "Jagadguru Sri Sankaraguru Parampara" extract of which you have kindly translated to English"

D) Dewan and Administrator, Ramnad Samsthanam, Ramanathapuram, writes (dated 28.1.1963) "The Sethupathis are regarded as demi-gods for several hundred years past and no pilgrimage to Rameswaram is held as complete without the pilgrim paying homage to Sethupathi in Ramanathapuram. The religious heads with their paraphernalia are received in a fitting manner by the Sethupathis and helped in all possible ways in the fulfilment of their pilgrimage to Rameshwaram. **Sri Sharada Peetam (Sringeri) has particularly very long connection with the Ramnad Samsthanam and Acharyas of Sringeri Math are regarded by Setupathis as their Kulaguru**".

"This gold idol of Sri Raja Rajeswari installed at the palace temple at Ramanathapuram is stated to have been received from Vellore some 400 years back during the regime of Naicks. It is stated that the Deity was formerly known as Durga and Mahakali by name and that the form of Puja done was Vama Marga Puja (involving animal sacrifice). When the Jagadguru Sri Sachidananda Sivabhinava Narasimha Bharathi Swamigal visited Ramanathapuram in the year 1894, Sri Bhaskara Sethupathi is said to have approached His Holiness with the suggestion to alter the form of puja in view of the ugra and ferocious aspect of the Deity. It is stated the same thought was then simultaneously working in the mind of His Holiness also. Sri Bhaskara Sethupathi was informed by His Holiness that the final decision would be given the following day. That night special poojas and prayers were performed and it is stated that the Deity appeared in the dream of His Holiness first in the form of Mahakali and subsequently as Raja Rajeswari and gave HER approval to the change. Accordingly, Sri Chakra was installed, the ugra kala of Sri Raja Rajeswari Amman was withdrawn and the Vaidic form of Pooja was introduced in the temple to Sri Raja Rajeswari Amman as Shantamurthi from the following day. This greatly subdued the ferocious (ugra) aspect of Mahakali. The poojas continue to be performed in the temple now, according to vaidic rituals by archakas deputed by Sringeri Math from time to time specially for this purpose.

"-----The bungalow in which Sri Narasimha Bharathi Swamigal stayed and special poojas were performed by him and which was formerly known as Colonel Bungalow, was

since named as "Sankara Vilas" from the day of the special Pooja. His Holiness Sri Narasimha Bharathi Swamigal observed Vyasa Pooja and performed Navarathri Poojah also in that year (1894) at Ramanathapuram. Bhaskara Sethupathi endowed Pullangudi etc five villages to Sri Sringeri Math on this memorable occasion. **After the establishment of the Vaidica Pooja in the temple, Sri Bhaskara Sethupathi gave away the entire Samasthanam as a gift or daanam to His Holiness, as a token of the great veneration he had for His Holiness who in turn handed it back to Raja Rajeshwara Sethupathi Bhaskara, Sethupathi's son.**

"In the year 1908, the Samsthanam building at Ramanathapuram near Nochivayal Tank where religious Pathasalas were conducted, was given away as gift by Raja Rajeshwar Sethupathi, making it possible for Sri Sringeri Math to establish a branch at Ramanathapuram. The Sethupathis are greatly indebted to Sri Sharada Peetham, Sringeri. The successive Acharyas who have been visiting Ramanathapuram and Rameshwaram are received in the fitting manner and with great veneration and also respect. The present Acharya Sri Abhinava Vidyateertha Swamigal was received at Ramanathapuram in an appropriate manner on the first occasion of the visit on 3.11.1957 and again in 14.11.1957 after return from Rameshwaram when His Holiness was then taken out in a grand procession in the streets of Ramanathapuram", Sd/- M.V. Raghavendra Rao, Dewan & Administrator".

E) One of the propagandist of the Kumbakonam Kanchi Math Sri Velandai writes in "Kahaniya", (July) ---- "Jawaharlal Nehru in his Discovery of India paying a tribute to Sankara says ---- "by establishing five mathas ----". Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his letter No. 1731 — PMR/60 dated August 18, 1960, denies the establishment of the fifth math by Sri Adi Sankara and wanted the writer of the letter to publish the extracts from his book where he had said that Sri Adi Sankara had established four great maths or monasteries.

F) Sri 108 Brahmanisht Sri Swarni Bhagavatnand Ji Maharaj, Mahamandaleshwar, (Kavya, Sankhya, Yoga and Vedanta Teertha; Vedanta Vageesha; Mimamsa Bhushan; Vedaratna etc., etc.,) Kanakhal, Haridwar writes -- ". . . काशी में

काशी नरेश एवं बहुत से विद्वानों द्वारा जो सम्मानित हुए हैं, उनके सम्बन्ध में संशय कैसा? यह एक विश्वास का कारण है। मैंने इनकी प्रशंसा पंजाब में सुनी थी। उस समय मैं मैं लाहौर में था, सम्भवतः पण्डितपत्रादि इनके मुख्यशोगान करने वाले हैं, जिन्होंने मुझे ये सब बातें बतलाई हैं। उन्होंने इनके सम्बन्ध में मतभेद एवं दलबन्दी की कोई चर्चा नहीं की और इनके शंकराचार्यत्व के विवाद की बात तक नहीं की। यदि प्रथम मुझे इस परिस्थिति का परिचय होता तो मैं ऐसी व्यवस्था न देता। काशी के प्राचीन विद्वानों ने व्यवस्था दी है इसका मुझे पता नहीं था। 'बुडे: फलमनाग्रहः' की नीति के अनुसार मुझे इसका कोई आग्रह नहीं है। वास्तव स्थिति का पता न होने से ही ऐसा हुआ है। आपको मेरे लेख से जो मानसिक कष्ट हुआ है तदर्थ मुझे बड़ा खेद है। भविष्य में ऐसा न होगा, आशा है, आप सन्तुष्ट होंगे। और जनता को वास्तविक परिस्थिति से परिचित कर देना परमावश्यक है। मैं विद्वानों की व्यवस्था एवं प्राचीन मर्यादा का मानने वाला हूँ, परन्तु धर्म प्रचारार्थ काशी से बाहर मुझे अधिक रहना पड़ता है, अतः काशी की कतिपय बातों से अपरिचित रहना आश्चर्यजनक नहीं है। मैं आपको एतदर्थ धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मेरे सम्मुख सब बातें उपस्थित कर परिस्थिति से परिचय कराया है। मेरे से आप किसी प्रकार की शंका न करें, मैं सत्य का पक्षपाती हूँ, परन्तु दख के साथ लिखना पड़ता है कि विश्वासवश मैंने इस विषय पर पूर्ण विचार एवं तत्सम्बन्धि ग्रंथों का पूर्ण स्वाध्याय किए बिना ही मत प्रकाशित किया है। ---- विद्वान यति के रूप में सत्कार होने से किसी की विप्रतिपत्ति हो ही नहीं सकती। समझ में नहीं आता ऐसे झगड़ों का क्या रहस्य है, सत्य तो छिपाया जा सकता नहीं। आप मेरे विचारों को समझ गए होंगे ----"

GIST OF THE LETTER:

"At Kashi, the Maharaja and Vidwans had welcomed him (Kanchimath Adhipati) and how to suspect the status of such a person (in such a situation)? This is a matter of having had confidence on them. I heard his praise at Lahore and the pandits and others who sang the praise of him, were the people who carried this news to me. None of them reported to me that there was a dissident group in Kashi, who were questioning his status of being called as a Sankaracharya. Had I known previously about this matter, I would have never given my decision (Vyavastha). The fact that renowned scholars of Kashi in the past had already given their decision about the maths of Sankaracharya, was not known to me. Having not known the real situation in Kashi, this has happened. I would not have given my Vyavastha had I known the real facts. I am sorry for wounding your feelings through my article on this controversial subject. I assure you that in future, this will never happen again. It is very essential that public should be told about this issue and truth should be revealed to them. I am a follower of the decisions given by Vidwans of Kashi. I have

been outside of Kashi for a long time and it is no wonder that I was ignorant of the goings on in Kashi. I thank you very much for placing all facts before me and made me knowledgeable of facts at Kashi. Please do not doubt me, I am always for truth. But with regret, I have to say that this had happened because of my reposing trust and confidence on some who met me, and because of my not studying the facts of the case and further, not studying the related books and documents pertaining to those claims, I had given my opinion. No one would object if he (Kanchi Math Adhipati) is welcomed in Kashi as a pious Sanyasin and a Scholar, I am not able to understand the secrecy behind this affair. Truth can never be hid. Hope you would have understood my thoughts now."

G) A wellknown scholar Pandit Pravar Sri Vijayan and Tiwari writes in answer to a statement made in the Kanchi Math publication reading ----" पं. श्री. विजयानन्द तिवारी महोदया अपि सश्रद्धा एवं स्वहस्ताक्षराणि कृत्वा श्रीचरणेषु प्रणतिपत्रमर्पयामासुः।" Panditji's reply: — श्री:।। सर्वलोक नमस्कृतेभ्यः सन्यासिभ्यः प्रणति पत्रार्पणम् न कथमय्य साम्प्रतम् भवितुमर्हति, तथापि परमहंस परिव्राजकाचार्याणाम् श्रीकम्भकोण मठाधीश्वराणाम् दर्शनस्य सौभाग्यमपि मेऽद्यावधि न सञ्जातम्, का कथातेभ्यः प्रणति पत्रार्पणस्य। अतः श्रीशांकारपीठतत्त्वदर्शनेऽस्य विषयस्योत्लेखो रज्ज्वामहि बद्धिरिव भ्रमभूलक एवेति, प्रमाणीकरोति।"

GIST:

"Kanchi Math publication "Shankar Peetha Tatwa Darshana" contained a statement that pandit Sri Vijayanand Tiwari most humbly submitted a pranatipatra with his own signature to the Kanchi Kamakoti Math Sankaracharya. After perusing this false statement Pandit Sri Vijayanand Tiwari writes that he had not the fortune of meeting the Kumbakonam Mathadhipati and he never met him. Then, less said the better, of submitting a Pranatipatra. It is nothing short of a mental aberration."

H) To quote Judgement — A.S. Nos. 158, 163 & 342 of 1930 A.S. Nos 178, 189 & 382 of 1929, on the file of District Court, Chingleput. Respondent — Sri Kanchi Kamakoti Math Pithadhipati Sri Sikkudayar Swamigal ----.

"2. Sikkudayar is the name given to Sri Kanchi Kamakoti

Peethadhipathi Jagadguru Sri Shankaracharya Swamigal at Kumbakonam. He is the plaintiff in the suit which have given rise to these appeals. His case as presented to me was that ancient Hindu Rajas granted to him the Merai right over all the villages in the suit and several other villages in this district----"-
----He also says that the Mohammedan Government which succeeded the Hindu kings in this area confirmed the grant and continued it. He further says that when the British Government became the rulers of this country under the treaty with the Nawab about 1797, they recognized and continued the merai grant, ---- and this was the condition which the British Government attached to the Shrotriem grant. This last is part of the case strictly relevant to these appeals."

3. "I first take A.S. No. 163/30 which relates to Pallavaram Shrotriem. At the outset, I may say that no grant has been produced from the ancient Hindu Kings or no confirmation thereof by the Mussalman Kings of the country has been produced. No grant of the British Government recognizing or granting such a right in terms has been produced."

"10----Plaintiff has no other documents to show collection at any later time, inference is, he never collected. If the right existed, plaintiff would not have failed to collect all these 130 years since 1800. Inference of the fact which I draw from the circumstances is that the right itself never existed."

"13-----The Sikkudayar Swami is a most powerful person and head of a math in the Tanjore district and it is hardly likely that if any claims was to be made on this strotriem it would not have been made long ago----"

31----"I note here that this shrotriem village of Adambakkam has been granted to Shaiva Siddhanta Math, that is, for a math intended for the exposition of Shaiva Siddhanta----" Sankaracharya Swamigal teaches monism which is utterly opposed.

33----I have my doubts regarding this account. The math was fighting for the merai since 1817. The math agents must have been trying to extend the area of collection of this Merai and with this view-----a ledger entry, a bald one was made without any details at all----The entry itself shows it was not made in the regular course of business."

Inspite of the above judgement of 12.8.1935, that Kumbakonam math has no right to the claim of Merai, the propagandists had come out with the statement that they still hold the Merai rights...." Among the rights conferred by the Chola King of Yore, the one surviving is that of legal collection of a portion of the Govt. Kist in some taluks near Kanchi. This is called the Merai right and is recognized by successive civil courts." Is this not a disrespect to Courts?

1) Here is an example of how scholars are bought to dance to the tune of Kumbakonam Math. Sri R. Krishnaswami Iyer writes in "The Truth about Kumbakonam Math"----"It was very gratifying to note that such propaganda did not influence any genuine scholar and that Sri Baladev Upadhyaya of Varanasi (Director, Research Institute, Varanaseeys Sanskrit Vishwavidyalaya) wrote to Sri J.V.Raj Gopal Sharma as early as 29.9.1960----"I fully agree with your views that the great Acharya established only four Maths----"The idea of a fifth math at Kamakoti appears to be a later concoction made by some interested persons. In my standard book in Hindi on the life and teachings of Acharya Sankara, I have given the history of all the five Peethas but I still believe that the original establishments were four and FOUR ONLY."

"When Sri Sharma learnt that Sri S. Ramachandra Sastry was preparing a Kannada translation of that book, he was anxious that the reader should not be misled by Sri Upadhyaya's dealing with all the five maths and accordingly wrote both to Sri Ramachandra Sastry and to Sri Upadhyaya. The former replied on 15.2.64---"Personally I also feel that the claims of the Kanchi Math are fantastic and fanciful. There does not seem to be any original evidence to confirm the claims of the math. Further, there cannot be any controversy because after all Kanchi Math is only a subsidiary math of the Sringeri Sharada Peetha. It cannot be called an Amnaya Peetha." "Sri Upadhyaya immediately wrote to Sri Ramachandra Sastry himself on 20.2.1964 requesting him to add at the end of his translation a copy of his letter dated 29.9.1960 to Sri Raj Gopal Sharma" "because it clearly embodies my views about the genuinely established maths of Adi Shankaracharya. Without it, my statements in the book might be misunderstood by its readers."

I hope you would appreciate my anxiety for statement of truth in a matter which is highly controversial."

Though the translation was published only in August 1964, for some reason or other, Sri Upadhyaya's request was not complied with.

J) Copy of the letter dated 17.11.1960 addressed to Revenue Department of Madras Govt. and a copy endorsed to the The Chief Secretary, Madras Government, under a separate covering letter. No answers received so far. Will any truth seeker take-up this matter with the Government of Tamilnadu?

LETTER

SUB: Management : Certain Particulars Regarding Sri Sankaracharya Swamigal Math — Kumbakonam Town and Taluq, Tanjore District.

REF: Your Letter Dated 4.11.1960 L.DIS. 31209/60.

"I am in receipt of your letter referred above in reply to my letter of August 11th, addressed to the Chief Secretary, Government of Madras, regarding the subject cited above and file transferred to you for disposal vide Revenue Department Memo No. 98927-D2/60-1 of 19.9.1960, a copy endorsed to me for information and follow-up.

I am surprised to read the contents of your letter. The Revenue Department, Govt. of Madras, vide their letter No. 88927-D2/60-1 of 19.9.1960, transferred the file to you for disposal and it is surprising that you are now asking me to contact the Board of Revenue, who I presume, feel that your Department is competent to answer my queries and hence they transferred the file to you for disposal. Now I am being kicked from pillar to post. I am also made a victim of your bureaucratic machinery of administrative rules of your Government. The tax payer citizen is tossed and put to much inconvenience and trouble. Am I not entitled to clear the doubts from you and are you not duty bound to come to my aid in clearing the doubts? I expected fair treatment from your department.

As a Research student, I approached the Chief Secretary, Government of Madras, who in turn asked the Revenue Department to handle the matter who in their turn asked you to dispose the matter and the net result is that your answer has no value to a research student. What I am interested to know is the truth of the allegations made by the Kumbakonam Sankaracharya and referred in my letter of August 11th, and the answer should be either confirmation or denial. There is no ambiguous answer to my query.

My approach to the Government is in order and legitimate since the allegations made by the Swamiji of Kumbakonam make the Government of Madras a party to their allegations and I feel, it is for the Government either to confirm or to deny the allegations, when referred to them for verification. It is an authoritative statement made by the Swamiji himself and it cannot be underrated as allegations made by someone else who has nothing to do with the said math.

It is all the more surprising when you advice me to contact the agent of the Math. You are aware that the math itself had made these statements and it is for the Government who is made a party to the allegations, either to deny or to confirm. My approach to the math will be of no avail since they had made the statements and had said what they had to say in the matter and it is for the other party to confirm or deny.

You say that the information required by me is not available in your department. Am I to infer that the statements made by the Kumbakonam math and referred to in my letter of August 11th are all untrue and baseless or am I asked to clear the doubts from other source? My research work on the life and activities of Sri Sankara is almost complete except a few points raised for verification with the Government of Madras. This proverbial long delay of getting the statement verified from the Government is really putting me to loss, inconvenience and trouble. In the absence of a definite reply from the Government, I shall be forced to infer that the Government is either unwilling to tell the truth and each department of the government is trying to shirk their duty and responsibility on someone's shoulder or that the government denies the allegations made by the Kumbakonam math and referred to in my letter of August 11, 1960.

I have in my possession letters from three State Governments of India and a letter from an independent Country Nepal, denying the allegations made by Kumbakonam Swami in respect to matters connected with the respective governments, and I fail to understand why the Madras Government should alone feel shy to tell the truth and answer my queries. May I now expect your co-operation?" (Allegation-Bhounsley family Rajahs of Tanjore State were giving Rs. 7000/- per annum as grant and the same grant continued to be given to the math by the British India Government also).

K) "In the Illustrated Weekly of India", two articles were published by the editor Sri A.S. Raman, dated 11.8.63 and 18.8.63 about Kumbakonam-Kanchi Math. These articles were in full support of Kanchi Math's untenable and false claims. In addition to this, the writer condemned and casted aspersions on Dakshinamnaya Sringeri Math and its Acharya and so also on three other amnaya maths. It is stated that the editor Sri A.S. Raman met the Kanchi Acharya (Senior) five times and discussed this matter with him and then published the articles, It is said that the articles were to be published in three issues of the journal but only two parts were published and the third one was withheld. Hundreds of protest letters and telegrams from all over India poured in the office of this weekly.

The writer of this booklet had the honour and privilege of meeting the President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan and showed him these articles. As the saying goes "Face is the index of Mind", the writer could see the reaction in his face and he closed his eyes for a minute and said "May god forgive them and give them "Sadbuddi". If this is the reaction after reading the articles on a sober, calm and equipoised mind of our revered and scholar President — a Rajarishi — one could easily assess the quality and worth of these published articles. Ultimately, Sri A.S. Raman had to apologise and quote below his letter dated 31st August 1963 "----- It pains me to note that my recent articles on the revered chief of the Kamakoti Math have proved controversial in the context of deeply loved Sharada Peetham at Sringeri, of which I am myself an ardent devotee. I wish to assure you that I meant no offence at all to the great institution

at Sringeri established by Bhagawan Shankara himself, and I apologise for having wounded your susceptibilities inadvertently ----".

L) The methods pursued by these publicity — mongers are elusive and daring. Here is another example. A feature bearing the caption "Aikya Bharat" contributed by the Department of Public Relations, Kerala, to the Radhakrishnan Number, (A Souvenir or appreciations, 1962) mentions that "Shankara founded monasteries at Kanchi, Dwarka, Badrinath, Puri" and conveniently leaves out Sringeri. When the attention of the Kerala Publicity Department was drawn and requested elucidation, the Director of Public Relations replied, Ref. letter dated 23.1.1963 — "The facts on which the advertisement captioned Aikya Bharat was based, were supplied by a Sanskrit Scholar who is also a student of Sankara's philosophy. The advertisement is being corrected on the lines pointed out by you. Your gesture in having taken the trouble to point out the error is appreciated".

M) Of late, it is seen that article writers on Kanchi Math mention the names of H.H. The Maharaja of Banaras and Pujya Sri Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, who were at the head of the Reception Committee formed to welcome, the Kanchi Kamakoti Math Adhipati at Varanasi in Oct. 1934, as having accepted the Head of the Kanchi Math as the direct lineage of Adi Sankara and that Kanchi Math was established by Sri Adi Shankara himself. This needs clarification.

(a) The writer of this book addressed two long letters to H.H. The Maharaja of Banaras dated 8.9.1934 and 23.9.1934 and placed before His Highness all relevant facts about the Kanchi Math and humbly requested H.H. to give his opinion. The Maharaja of Banaras sent his durbar pandit Sri V. Jhaji and another pandit to study this controversial matter deeply and these two pandits called on me twice and spent several hours. They went through all the relevant books, documents and famous declaration of 1886 and they were convinced that the Kanchi Kamakoti Math was not established by Sri Adi Sankara. They called on me again and left a note. The gist of the note: "Though what you say are all true and we all should go by the path of justice and Dharma, but Sri Rajeshwar Sastry would

advice Maharaja against your stand and his influence on H.H. is very great. Sastryji is an ardent devotee and disciple of Kumbakonam Math Adhipathi. His advice is greatly respected in Highness's Durbar. Under the circumstances your efforts will be in vain". "यद्यपि आपका कथन सब मन्थ है और हम सबों को मन्थ पथ पर जाना न्याय और धर्म है, तथापि पं. राजेश्वर शास्त्री जी श्रीकाशीनरेशजी को आपके कथन विरोध ही में आदेश देंगे। शास्त्रीजी का वहन कुछ प्रभाव है और आप कम्भकोण मठाधीप के परम भक्त शिष्य हैं। उनका अभिप्राय दरबार में माननीय है। ऐसी स्थिति में आपका प्रयत्न व्यर्थ होगा।")

(b) P.P. Sri Brahmanand Saraswati Swamiji of Panchagangeshwar Math, Mahant Sri Puran Giriji of Jona Akhada, Rai Sahib S.P. Sanyal, Sri Pratapam Seetharam Sastry and the writer of this booklet met Mahamana Sri M.M. Malaviyaji on 25.9.1934 and had a discussion on the status of the Kumbakonam — Kanchi Math and all relevant books, documents were shown to Sri Malaviyaji. He was convinced but would not commit himself. After some days, Rai Sahib, S.P. Sanyal and V. Raj Gopal Sharma received a letter or note from Sri Malaviyaji, a portion of which reads as under. The note is self-explanatory. The gist of the note : Pandit Chinnaswamy Sastry says that Kanchi Kamakoti Math was established and presided over by Sri Adi Sankara and neither I have studied the related literature nor I investigated the issue. I have heard, based on old tradition, that Sri Adi Sankara had established four maths at the four directions and he left the mortal coil at Kedarnath in the Himalayas. Sringeri Math is the math for Dakshinamnaya. It is my fortune that I have close connections with the Sringeri Math. Sringeri is the abode of Mother Sharada. This is the Vyakhyana Simhasana Peetha. Once I requested the guru maharaj of Sringeri to come to Kashi and to lay the foundation of the B.H. University. In this connection, I sent my friend Mr. Dattatreya Krishna Damle to Sringeri and I received the blessings and "Gurupaduka" from Sringeri. With the blessings of Mother Sharada and Sri Guru Maharaj, the work undertaken by me went off smoothly and without any obstacles. Kanchi Mathadhipathi arrived in Kashi and our Pandits welcomed him. All these pandits requested me to join them in the reception and that is how I reached the reception place. It is not my desire either to support or to confirm the claims of the Kanchi Math. "पं. चिन्नस्वामी शास्त्रीजी का कहना है कि

कांचीमठ आद्यशंकराचार्य द्वारा प्रतिष्ठित एवं अधिष्ठित है और मैंने तत्सम्बन्धि ग्रंथों को न तो पढ़ा या इस विषय पर शोध किया। बृद्ध परम्परा से यही सन्ता आया हूँ कि श्रीशंकराचार्य ने आभ्यासानुसार चारों दिशाओं में चार ही मठ स्थापित किये और हिमालय के केदार सीमा से निजधाम पहुंचे। दक्षिणाभ्याय का मठ श्रृंगेरी मठ है। सौभाग्य की बात है कि श्रृंगेरी मठ से मेरा घनिष्ठ सम्बन्ध है। माता शारदा की मुख्य क्षेत्र श्रृंगेरी है। यही व्याख्यान सिंहासन पीठ भी है। एक समय मैंने प्रार्थना की थी कि श्रृंगेरी के गुरुमहाराज काशीधाम आकर हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का नींव डालें। इस कार्य निमित्त मैंने मेरे मित्र श्री दत्तात्रेय कृष्ण दामले को भेजा था और मुझे वहां से गुरुपादका प्राप्त हुई थी। माता शारदा एवं गुरुमहाराज की कृपा से संकल्प किया कार्य निर्विघ्न सफल हुआ। कांची मठाधीष काशीधाम आये और हमारे यहां के पण्डितों ने उनका स्वागत किया और उन सबों ने मुझसे प्रार्थना की कि मैं भी शामिल हो जाऊं तब मैं वहां पहुंचा। मेरी इच्छा नहीं है कि मैं कांची मठ प्रचारों का समर्थन या पृष्ठ करूं।")

(N) Some propagandists of Kanchi Math say that "the Conference of 1886 was not concerned with, nor was anything mentioned in that conference about the Kanchi Sankaracharya Math. This conference was held in connection with the Mulabagala Math".

In this dispute referred above, four issues were framed and a galaxy of 79 scholars of Varanasi were requested to give their opinion on these four issues. The first three issues are not relevant to the present controversy and the fourth issue was a general one viz., How many maths were established by Sri Adi Sankara and who are the persons to give "Siksha" — गुरुवाचार्य विषयिणी मठचतुष्टयाध्यक्ष मात्र विषयिणी वा). These decisions on all four issues were published in a booklet form entitled "श्रीमज्जगद्गुरु पीठाधिकार व्यवस्था चन्द्र". Some Pandits gave a dissenting decisions on the first three issues and but all of them concurred on the fourth issue referred above. This dissenting decision was published in a booklet form entitled "व्यवस्था चन्द्र परामर्श". In regard to the fourth issue both the parties agreed unanimously. Their decision was that Sri Adi Sankara had established only four maths -- "मठाश्चत्वार आचार्यश्चत्वारश्च धरन्धराः। सम्प्रदायाश्च चत्वार एषा धर्म व्यवस्थितिः।।"

This decision refers to all Shankar Maths in general throughout India and directs that all Shankar Sampradaya Maths are under the four Amnaya Maths. Kumbakonam — Kanchi Math also comes under this decision. In a case in Bombay High Court (Dwaraka Math case), this decision was accepted and was filed as evidence.

(O) Newspapers reported that Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal of Kanchi Kamakoti Math suddenly disappeared during Chaturmasya period without informing anyone leaving behind in the math his sacred Danda and Kamandalu, late in the night, on Aug. 22, 1987 and this was detected by the Kanchi math authorities only on the dawn of 23.8.87.

The Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Paschimamnaya Dwaraka Math commented on this episode, — “---if Sri Jayendra Saraswathi has left the math on his own, it amounts to a violation of Shastra which forbids a sanyasi going from one place to another during the Chaturmasya--- In reply to questions, he said if Sri Jayendra Saraswathi had left behind his Danda, it again constituted a breach of Sanathana Shastra”. (The Hindu 26.8.87).

The Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Poorvamnaya Puri Govardhan Math commented “that Swami Jayendra Saraswathi had disgraced the high seat by abandoning his Danda and Kamandalu and fleeing from Kamakoti Peetha----- Mathadheesha should never disregard these two things. After the death of a Sanyasi, his Danda is broken into three parts and cremated with his body while his Kamandalu is placed at this samadhi-----But Swami Jayendra has stooped below his level of even a common Sanyasi.” (Deccan Herald 15.9.87).

The Dharma Shastra Grantha “DHARMA SINDHU” states under the heading ‘यतेश्चातुर्मास्यवासः’ as under:

“अस्यां पौर्णमास्यां संन्यासिनां चातुर्मास्यावास संकल्पाद्गत्वेन क्षौर व्यासपूजादिकं विहितम्। अत्र कर्मणि और्दयिकी त्रिमूर्तापौर्णमासी ग्राह्या। चातुर्मास्यस्य मध्येत् वपनं वर्जयेद्यतिः। चातुर्मासं द्विमासं वा सदैकत्रैव संवसेत्। तत्रादौ क्षौरं विधाय द्वादश मृत्तिका स्नानानि प्राणायामादि विधिं च कृत्वा व्यास पूजां कुर्यात्।”-----“पूजा कार्या पूजान्ते अस्मिन् प्रतिबन्धे चतुरो वार्षिकान्मासान् इह वसामि इति मनसा संकल्प्य,-----“अहं तार्वान्निवत्स्यामि सर्वभूत हितायवै। प्रायेणप्रावृष प्राणि संकलं वर्त्म दृश्यते।। अतस्तेषामहिंसां पक्षान्वै श्रुति संश्रयान्। स्थास्यामश्चतुरोमासान् अत्रैवाऽस्मिन् बाधके।।” इति वाचिक संकल्पं कुर्यात्। ततो ग्रहस्थाः प्रतिब्रूयुः “निवसन्तु सुखेनात्र गमिष्यामः कृतार्थताम्। यथा शक्तिं च शश्रूषां करिष्यामो वयं मदा।।”

मत्स्यपुराणे — “अष्टौमासान् विहारः स्यात् यतीनां संयतात्मनाम्। एकत्र चतुरोमासान् वार्षिकान् निवसेत पुनः।।” (पराशरमाधवीये)। “मासांश्च चतुरोवसेत्(कण्वः)।।”

(परमहंसस्य विविदिषा संन्यासिनो दण्डधारणमावश्यकम्, न त्यागः स्तस्य)।

मन्---“कृत्तकेशनखश्मश्रुः पात्री दण्डी कम्भवान्। विचरे (त्रियतो नित्यं) च्चयातानत्य सर्वभूतान्यपीडयन्।” व्यास आहः “त्रिदण्डस्य परित्यागे, एकदण्डस्य धारणम्” (एकस्मिन् दृश्यते वाक्ये तस्मादस्य प्रधानता)। “हंस परमहंसयोः विविदिषा संन्यासिनोः (एकदण्डः।।” इति माधवीये धार्यतया उक्तः।। (परमहंसो विद्वान् विविदुश्चेति द्विविधः)। विष्णुः ‘कौपीनाच्छादनार्थं त् वासोऽर्धस्य परिग्रहम्। कुर्यात् परमहंसस्तु दण्डमेकं तथैव चेति।’ पराशरः ‘तत्र परमहंसा एकदण्डधारिणो मण्डा अपरिग्रहाः यज्ञोपवीतिनः-----आत्मानं सर्वं पश्यन्तः।।’ (सर्वदादण्ड धारणमाह — जमदाग्नि — वैद्यनाथीये) — ‘दण्डात्मनोत् संयोगः सर्वदैव विधीयते। न दण्डेन विनागच्छेत् इष्षेपत्रयं वधः।।”

The above quotations from the scriptures clearly state that Sanyasins have to take the oath on Sri Vyasa Puja day (compulsory for all Sanyasins); that they should stay in one place during the chaturmasya period; that no sanyasins should leave their place of stay during the chaturmasya period and further that no sanyasins should abandon their sacred Danda and they should carry the Danda always with them.

‘The Hindu’ of 10.9.87 reports: “Asked for his comments on the return of Sri Jayendra Saraswathi from Talacauvery”, the Paramacharya played it down saying----“After all he had only gone there for some deep and peaceful meditation.” The ingenuity of the Acharya in keeping silent on the unshastric act of his sishya in the first instance and gloss over it later is indeed marvellous. Paramacharya might feel that he has defused a worst crisis in the annals of the Kanchi math. But the fact remains that his sishya (Sri Jayendra Saraswathi) had violated knowingly the rules of Dharma Shastra. The Paramacharya's silence on this issue is strange. He preaches to others to follow the rules of Dharma Shastra. He seems to think that practice of those rules is not necessary for himself. ‘Do what I say and don't do what I do’ is the maxim he follows.

I heard his devotees, disciples and followers say that the Paramacharya is above all these petty Dharma Shastra rules being a jivanmukta, and his words are supreme. The faith reposed on the Paramacharya by his devotees and disciples are laudable but the unanswered question is about Paramacharya's propriety. Paramacharya dabbles in worldly affairs and so long as he does so, he has to follow the Dharma Shastra. Once he gives-up meddling with worldly affairs and attains Turiya stage, he would be above these Shastras. Why

this double standards — playing Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde — a split personality.

(P) Sri Joon Peethadhipati Acharya, Mahamandaleshwar, Sri. P.P. Shrotriya Brahmanisht Sri 108 Sri Swami Sri Rameshwaranandji Maharaj, Vedantacharya, states: (gist of the slokas given at the end of the 'Introduction' chapter.)

The great epoch maker Acharya who is effulgent by his having demolished all the prevalent and troublesome Avidic doctrines in Bharata and by establishing Vedic Sanatana Dharma, brightened the face of Bharata and from whose sacred feet flows the holy and pure ocean of Knowledge and to such a holy life of Acharya, Kumbakonam math is trying to pollute with its Kumbakonam gutter water. To protect and preserve the Vedic Dharma, to preserve the unity of one Bharata and to establish justice and Vidya, he (Sankara) established the four Dharma Peethas at Sringeri, Dwaraka, Jyotir and Govardhan (mathas) in the four directions and this fact should not ever be forgotten or lost sight of, whatever be the views or claims of the Kumbakonam math. In my view, Kumbakonam Math is only a Shakha (branch) math and the four mathas as above referred to are the only mathas established by Sri Sankara. To establish the importance and superiority of the Kumbakonam math, they are making all possible attempts and it is like making a rope out of sand. All evidences go to establish and conclude and which are accepted by all (about the establishment of four mathas only by Sri Sankara), is what Raj Gopal is publishing now and to him my (Sri. Rameshwaranand, Vedantacharya) blessings for his success in his attempts.

20. "THE CURIOUS CASE OF THE MISSING MONK"

(Illustrated Weekly of India)

This high pitched curious drama commenced with Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal of Kanchi Kamakoti Math suddenly disappearing leaving behind Danda and Kamandala

without informing anyone from his Kanchi Math premises on August 22, 1987 late night and detected by the math authorities on the dawn of 23rd August 1987 and with Presidential concern shown by his enquiries and ended on 8th September 1987, by Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal returning to Kanchi Math from Talacauvery, where he was detected on 27th Aug. 1987. The 18 year old Sri Sankara Vijayendra Saraswathi Swamigal was anointed on 24th August 1987 as his successor at Kanchi when the missing Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal turned up at Talacauvery in Karnataka. He is reported to have averred that he would never return to Kanchi. One wonders what made Sri Swamigal change his decision and return to the math. After his return to Kanchi he left for Tirupathi and again he returned to Kanchi on the night of September 13, 1987. The math had given a letter to the H.R.E. Commission stating that Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal had resumed as Mathadhipati from Sept. 14th, 1987. It seems, the installation of Sri Sankara Vijayendra Saraswathi as the 70th Pontiff on 24th August 1987 was only an interim arrangement. Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal told a press conference soon after his return to Kanchi that he would continue merely as a Sankaracharya and had handed over the administration of the Math as a "Power of Attorney" to his successor. All this is very puzzling and getting curiouser and curiouser. Now the centre of this episode is shifted to Kanchi from Talacauvery. Wait and watch is the assessment of sober and matured people.

During this period from 23rd August to September 9th, the newspapers and journals came out with the following headings:

"SRI JAYENDRA SARASWATHI MISSING: KANCHI ACHARYA MISSING: THANDAM AND KAMANDALAM HAVE BEEN LEFT BEHIND BY HIM; NO WORD STILL ON SANKARACHARYA; ACHARYA STILL MISSING; NEW HEAD FOR KANCHI MATH; NEW ACHARYA FOR KANCHI PEETHAM: NO INFORMATION ON SANKARACHARYA; ABDICATION IS NOT A SUDDEN MOVE; SEARCH ON FOR KANCHI SEER; SRI JAYENDRA SARASWATHI AT TALACAUVERY; KANCHI ACHARYA TRACED AT TALACAUVERY; SRI JAYENDRA

SARASWATI TO GO TO KANCHI MATH; SRI JAYENDRA SARASWATHI CAN DO POOJA IN MATH - PARAMACHARYA; SWAMI RETURNING TO KANCHI ON SEPTEMBER 8TH; JAYENDRA SARASWATHI MAY MAKE KAILASA ASHRAM HEADQUARTERS; NO PLANS YET ON FUTURE COURSE SAYS SRI JAYENDRA; TALACAUVERY IS KANCHI SEER'S CHOICE; JAYENDRA SWAMI LEAVE FOR KANCHI; ROUSING KANCHI WELCOME FOR JAYENDRA SWAMI; SRI JAYENDRA SWAMI BACK IN KANCHIPURAM; SWAMIJI IS IN QUANDRY; KANCHI SWAMIJI NOW AN ORDINARY SWAMI; GO AWAY GO AWAY SAYS "**MOTHER KAMAKSHI**"; WHY DID HE LEAVE; WHAT WILL HE DO NEXT; PRESIDENTIAL CONCERN; FOUR DAYS OF TENSION; THE CURIOUS CASE OF THE MISSING MONK; HE WILL NOT ASSUME CHARGE AGAIN; THE NEW PONTIFF; ETC;" The Kanchi math was the product of the media and now the media had played its part. No one can fool all the people all the time and ultimately truth will prevail.

PTI REPORTS (THE HINDU 26.8.87) "The Shankaracharya of Dwaraka Peetam, Sri Swaroopanand Saraswathi, today demanded a high level probe into the mysterious circumstances in which Sri Jayendra Saraswathi disappeared on Sunday. Sri Swaroopanand now camping in Poona, when asked about the disappearance, however, made it clear that Sri Jayendra Saraswathi "could not be regarded as a Sankaracharya" since he did not belong to the main four peethams constituted by Shri Adi Sankaracharya "Nevertheless, it is a big blow to the Hindu religion and his disappearance should be probed thoroughly, even if there is the slightest doubt of a foul play". Sri Swaroopananda explained that Sri Jayendra Saraswathi could not be called Sankaracharya because the Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham was a "Shakha" (Branch) of the Sringeri Peetham, one of the four main seats instituted by Adi Sankara". "Even so, if Sri Jayendra Saraswathi has left the math on his own, it amounts to a violation of "Sastra" which forbids a Sanyasi going from one place to another during the "Chaturmasya". "In reply to questions, he said if Sri Jayendra Saraswathi had left behind

his dandam, it again constituted a breach of Sanatana Sastra. However, not much importance could be attached to the carrying of or leaving behind the "Kamandalam".

UNI REPORTS (DECCAN HERALD 15.9.1987) "The Kanchi Shankaracharya Swami Jayendra Saraswathi did not abdicate his seat, but was forced to "becuase of his conduct and Anti-Hindu pronouncements", according to Shankaracharya of Puri Swami Niranjan Deva. The Shankaracharya of Puri told UNI here on Sunday, that Swami Jayendra Saraswathi had disgraced the high seat by abandoning his "Danda" and "Kamandala" and fleeing from Kamakoti Peetha. The controversy regarding the Kanchi Shankaracharya erupted about a fortnight ago by his disappearance and the installation of 18 year old Vijayendra Saraswati as his successor. Swami Niranjan Dev said Swami Jayendra Saraswathi had forfeited his right to remain the head of the Kamakoti Peetha by abandoning his "Danda" and "Kamandala". The Shankaracharya of Puri said "a Mathadeesha should never disregard these two things". After the death of a Sanyasi, his Danda is broken into three parts and cremated with his body while his Kamandala is placed at this Samadhi. "But Swami Jayendra has stooped below his level of even a common Sanyasi" he commented. He asserted that there are only four Shankaracharyas, one each for every direction. "So according to us, the Kanchipuram Shankaracharya does not exist".

"..... Asked about Swami Jayendra Saraswati's return to Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham, he (Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Puri Govardhan Math) said that "It was strange and surprising to note that a Sanyasi who had left his "Dandam" and Kamandalam" along with the seat of Sankaracharya, especially during the "Chaturmasa Vrata" and who even should not go anywhere beyond 200 yards from the place, could return to the same seat". (INDIAN EXPRESS dated 21.10.1987) "Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Puri says "By the way, the Kanchi Shankaracharyas are upstarts. They do not have any legitimacy as Adiguru Sankaracharya never established any math at Kanchi. So we four, Shankaracharyas (of Puri, Badrinath, Dwaraka and Sringeri) do not recognise him. Therefore, whatever he says should not be taken seriously". (PROBE-INDIA, Nov. 1987).

The two former judges of Madras High Court criticised the statement of Jagadguru Shankaracharya of Dwaraka Math and their letter to the "The Hindu" appeared in the "HINDU" of 3.9.1987. A reply dated 4.9.87 was sent to the "Hindu" and to the two above said individuals, reading as under:

REPLY TO "REMARKS CRITICISED"

This is in reply to the letter published in "The Hindu" of 3.9.87 — in the news column under the heading "Remarks Criticised". The sudden and mysterious departure of Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swami from the Kanchi Math on the dawn of Sunday, 23rd August, without informing anyone is not to be called as a "Yatra" since Dandi Sanyasis are forbidden to move out of Chaturmasya stay place after taking an OATH on the Vyasa Pooja day to another place during Chaturmasya period. Parivrajakas (Dandi Swamis) are to be on the move as the word "Vraja" indicates but during the Chaturmasya period they have to stay-put in one place. Moving out either for yatra or for other reasons is violation of our Shastra and Yati Dharma. They can undertake Yatra or move out only after Chaturmasya period on "Seemollangha" day. How could Sri Jayendra Saraswathi Swami leave or abandon the sacred spiritual staff (Danda) in the math without performing the rituals enjoined for "Danda Visarjana" and again it constitutes a breach of Sastra. Remarks made in this connection by Sri Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Paschimnaya Dwaraka math are correct and valid.

As regards the comment and opinion of Sri Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Dwaraka Math that the "Kamakoti Peetham was not one of the main peethams constituted by the Adi Sankaracharya", one is invited to read the book entitled "Srimad Jagadguru Shankara Math Vimarsha" and the "Kumbakona Math Vivada" (By R. Sharma of Varanasi 1963). The former book is prefaced by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Dr. Sampurnanand and the three holy Mahamandaleshwars of Jona, Niranjani and Nirvani and contains opinions of reputed scholars of the east and west, including the opinions of the four Jagadguru Sankaracharyas, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, Sri C.P. Ramaswamy Iyer and others. This book is an academic and critical study on all materials so far

published by the Kanchi Math and it conclusively proves that the Kanchi Math was not established by Sri Adi Shankara as amnaya math. Kindly read a booklet "Satyaanveshana" (1971) published by Varanasi R. Sharma which establishes beyond doubt that the Kanchi math was not established by Adi Shankara. Sri Venkatarathnam Pantulu in 1876 in his book "Shankara Math Tatva Prakasika" had exposed all the false propaganda emanating from the Kanchi Math. Bhattasri Narayana Sastry in "Acharya Charita Vimarsha" book had dealt devastating blows on the propaganda of Kanchi Math. The declarations of the famous Pandits of Varanasi in 1886 (referred by Bombay High Court) and in 1934-35 "Jagadguru Shankara Math Vimarsha" declare that Sri Adi Shankara had established only four Amnaya Maths. India Govt. in their letter no. 1471/66-S/11, dated 28.5.1966, after making deep study on the issues presented in numerous representations received by them, declare that the Adi Sankara's Amnaya Maths exists only at Sringeri, Dwaraka, Badri and Puri. The Jagadguru Sankaracharya of the four amnaya maths by issuing Srimukhas have demolished the fanciful claims of the Kanchi Math (Refer "Vimarsha" Book).

As regards Sri P.N. Bhagavati's personal remarks published in an edition of "Soundarya Lahari" (1986), I wish to draw the attention of the "Hindu" readers to the judgement of the Patna High Court (Puri Math case — 1936), Calcutta High Court judgement in Tarakeshwara Math case, Bombay High Court judgement in Dwaraka Math case, some privy council decisions of the 19th century and recently the judgement of the Supreme Court (Joshimath case — 1974) declaring that Sri Adi Shankara had established only four Maths (Sringeri, Dwaraka, Joshi and Puri) at the four corners of India for four Vedas and its four Mahavakyas. These judgements are the laws of the country. These judgements are the decisions of the Hon'ble High Courts on issues framed in the case and not a casual opinion of the judges, Mr. Swaminatha Iyer (Advocate — Salem) in a booklet "A Legal View" has thrown further legal light on Amnaya maths established by Adi Shankara.

Kamakoti Peetha is an "Upasana Peetha" (Older than Sri Adi Shankara) for "Devayoni" and Kanchi Math is a place for

"Manushya Yoni" (Residence of Mathadipathi) and Sri Adi Shankara had established four Amnaya maths and bound them by "Amnaya Paddhati" called "Mathamnaya". Let us not confuse and intermingle the words "Peetha and Matha".

The report of the collector of Chingleput Mr. A. Freeze and Amildar of Kanchi Sri Srinivasa Rao refer to the Kumbakonam pontiff in 1837 as "Stranger to Kanchi" in clear terms and in 1839 the then guru of Kumbakonam math after obtaining permission from the Government performed Kumbhabisekam of Kamakshi and the then pontiff petitioned the East India Company begging to be appointed as "Trustees" of Kamakshi temple. The collector ordered this trusteeship on 5.11.1842. The collector in reply to a question from Madras Revenue Board states "The reason for order of granting trusteeship of Kamakshi Temple to Kumbakonam pontiff is done based on his wealth and property he holds" and naturally he concludes "He has no powers and claims over the temple".

The Hindu of 10.9.1987 reports --- "What created a lot of mental agitation and an unpleasant note (Viharam) has turned out to be a blessing and something good (Anukoolam)" the Kanchi Paramacharya --- told the Hindu here today. He was referring to the remarks of Sri Swaroopananda Saraswathi, Sankaracharya of Dwaraka Peetham, a fortnight ago, on the sudden departure of Sri Jayendra Saraswathi from Kanchipuram. Sri Swaroopananda Saraswathi had described the Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham as a "Shakha" (Branch) and not one of the original peethams established by Adi Shankara. "It has created an opportunity for us to clarify that the Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham is the "Moola Math" (Original) the Paramacharya said". Asked for his comments, on the return of Sri Jayendra Saraswathi from Talacauvery, the Paramacharya said "After all he had only gone there for some deep and peaceful meditation ----".

The Acharya's ingenuity to convert a disadvantage to advantage is marvellous! He has cleverly defused a worst crisis in the annals of the Kanchi Math. Once again the Kanchi Math senior Swamigal has asserted the same old claim and as a Truth seeker, I feel it my duty to place before the public the relevant facts collected and marshalled over a period of time

towards finding a final solution to the problem ---- "Moola Math". The facts disclosed here exposes the myth and pious belief of Kumbakonam-Kanchi Kamakoti Math's antiquity and authenticity of fifth math. I shall feel greatly honoured and the purpose of this publication shall be achieved, if atleast a handful of intellectuals and thinking people who read this booklet, appreciate the facts presented in this work and correct their views on Kanchi Math.

"Sri Jayendra Saraswathi said, he would disclose his future plans at Kanchi on Vijayadashami Day" (Indian Express 8.9.1987). "I will make the announcement on Vijayadashami day (October 2nd), wherever I am" (The Hindu 10.9.1987). The Hindu of 3.10.1987 says:

"Social awakening movement launched by Kanchi Acharya" -- "Jan Kalyan, Jan Jagran — a socio-religious and non-political movement, was launched here today by Sri Jayendra Saraswathi, Kanchi Sankaracharya. The eagerly awaited pronouncement by the Acharya, scheduled for Vijayadashami day, today, was made in the presence of the public. The flag of the newly founded movement — in yellow with the figures of Sun and Moon — was hoisted. --- Jan Kalyan, Jan Jagran -- the movement for public welfare and awakening — had the approval of Sri Chandrasekharendra Saraswathi, the Paramacharya of the Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham and his guru, the Swamiji Said".

This announcement of Sri Jayendra Saraswathi has achieved its objective and hit the limelight. The media again played it up and projected Sri Jayendra Saraswathi as the "Saviour" of the Hindu Society. Grandiose display by the devotees and disciples were organised. The intellectuals who are in know of the true facts preferred to wait and watch rather than show their feelings. Jan Kalyan Jan Jagran is not a new idea. The Kanchi Math through its various activities are engaged in it. Hundreds of dedicated and sincere individuals and many scores of institutions — voluntary and otherwise — have been engaged in it by their dedicated work for decades — some silently and some with more of publicity than work. What is special about the present movement? It is the same old Ganga water in a new vessel. Is it for the welfare of society or to cultivate the personality?

"Indian Express" of 27.10.1987 says : "Jayendra defers Jan Jagran". Jan Jagran, a part of the Jana Kalyan, Jana Jagaran movement launched by the Sankaracharya of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham, Sri Jayendra Saraswathi, on Vijayadashami Day (October 2), this year, has now been jettisoned for the time being and the other part — "Jana Kalyan" — had taken off. Disclosing this to newsmen here on Sunday, the Sankaracharya said "Jan Jagran" (awakening of the people) had been sidelined temporarily as it needs governmental co-operation for effective implementation. He said "Jana Kalyan" had now been registered as a Society".

Now all this is very puzzling — intriguing — and getting curiouser and curiouser. Why all this grandiose display, and fanfare even at the very beginning. Was it done to advertise a person as a "Hero and Saviour" of the Hindu society rather than to the aims and ideals of the movement and for educating the masses? Sincere and dedicated work does not need any shouting from house tops. Modern media publicity is not necessary unless one wishes to propitiate his personality and image relegating the movement to the background.

FINALLY, it is my prayer and hope that this booklet should be the last one and it will put an effective stop to the untenable claims made time and again. It is my earnest desire that all sincere followers of Sri Adi Sankaracharya will close up the ranks and jointly work for the realisation of the ideals of Dharma preached by the Greatest Acharya Sri Adi Sankara.

OM SHANTIH — SHANTIH ——— SHANTIH