CHAPTER - 1

Madhusudana Sarasvati: Life-Date-Works.

Introduction:

Madhusudana Sarasvati, an exquisite thinker, a great organizer, a faithful commentator, and an independent writer of the advaita School kept the fire of the Śāṅkara School burning inspite of the dust thrown on it by the other schools of Vedānta.

This man of genius was so unassuming that he has not left any of his biodata regarding his place of birth, name of parents, education and where he lived his glorious life. This very fact should be enough to lead us to agree with Macdonell's quotation: "History is the weak point of India". And the only sources which help us to know something about his life are the introductory verses and the colophons of his works.

Various Madhusūdanas:

Aufrecht Theodar mentions in his 'The Catalogus Catalogarum Vol. I-III, that, there are several authors in Sanskrit literature, who bare the name of Madhusūdana. They are as under:
(i) Madhusúdana Vácaspati.

(ii) Madhusúdana, who was a Grammarian.

(iii) Madhusúdana of Páthapura.

(iv) Madhusúdana of Tírtha.

(v) Madhusúdana of Máithilā.

(vi) Madhusúdana Sarasvatī.

The books which bare the name of Madhusúdana are probably twenty five in number. Out of these Madhusúdanas, some bore the honorific title of Sarasvatī and others Tírtha. Generally in Sanskrit literature, a person well learned in Darśana, Sástra or Sáhitya is honorably respected as Tírtha, Sarasvatī, Bhāṭṭa, Upādhyāya, Ácārya etc. In some places, the appellation Sarasvatī does not indicate that he is an incarnation of the Goddess of Learning, but it represents the third Áśrama. Among the authors, bearing the name Madhusúdana, there was one named Thakkara, who was learned in Nyāya and Vedánta, flourished in Vángáša, and wrote commentaries on works of Gangeśopádhyāya. Another Madhusúdana regards himself as Krénadváipáyanaputra; he was thoroughly read in the Vedas. Still another Madhusúdana has written short treatises on Púrvamímámsā. The rest of the Madhusúdanas wrote commentaries on various subjects. The
commentaries being called Śataka, Darpana, Mahājari etc.

Mahāmohopādhyāya Vāsudeva Sāstri Abhyankara States that out of twenty five Madhusūdanas, there are five, who bare the affix 'Sarasvatī' applied to their name. Out of these five, the first is 'Śrī Sarasvatī-Śīyā', who was the author of 'Anandamandākīnī', 'Kṛṣṇakutūhala', 'Harilīlā', 'Vedastutīvyākhyā' etc. The second is our author, namely Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, who was the author of 'Siddhāntabindu', 'Advaitasiddhi' etc. The third one is known as the author of 'Advaitabrahmasiddhi'. The fourth is said to be the author of 'Kusuma-vaśayalīki'. The fifth was the disciple of Viśveśvara Sarasvatī, namely Puruṣottama Sarasvatī, whose intellect rendered valuable service in the field of Nyāya, Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā.

1. सर्वव्यत्यत्नमणस्वरिणु मद्युदेशू प्रक्षि गुण्यकृत्तेऽस्मि स्थातिष्ठाता
उपलब्धकेऽ- Siddhāntabindu - edited
with an original commentary by Mahāmohopādhyāyasūdev
External Evidences And Life Story:

As Madhusudana Sarasvatī, the author of the 'Siddhānta-bindū' has never mentioned his birth-place in any of his works, we have to look for external evidences for collecting information which would throw light on his life story.

Mr. Divanji states that he had heard from an Udasin, who is no more on this earth, and who had lived at Vṛṇḍāvana, Lahore, Haradvāra, Rṣīkēśa for a number of years, that Madhusūdana had lived in that part of India as a South Indian Brahman, by birth who had migrated to Vṛṇḍāvana in the later part of his life.

According to the manuscript, named 'Vaiḍikavāda Māmāsā' (A work of Pt. Haridasa Vidyāvāgīsa, based on other available Chronicles), Madhusūdana was one of the four sons of one Purandarācārya, a direct dependent of the sixth degree, of a Śukla yagurvedī Brahman, named Rāma Miśra, who was the original inhabitant of Kānōj, a town about fifteen miles north of Kānpur in U.P. This Rāma Miśra, with several other

Brahmans left this place because of religious persecutions by Shāhbdin Ghōrī and settled at Navadvīpa, the modern Nadia in the Burdwan district. This Hindu king of the Gaudas ruled there. This Rāma Miśra had a son named Gopal Miśra, who later on become well known as Mādhava Miśra. He had a son named Sanatana Miśra. This Sanatana Miśra had a son named Guṇāravācārya, who once went to Yaśohara, to a town on the Madhumatī river, to meet his father-in-law, and settled there. He had a son named Purāṇa. He was once invited by Mādhava Pāṣā, a Hindu king of Vraja to his capital. On his way back, he saw a beautiful suburb of Kotālipāḍa, and decided to settle at its hamlet named Uṣaśiyā. He built a house, named Purandaravātikā and a temple of Śrī Dākṣināmūrtikālika. People say that still it exists. This Purandara had four sons, namely, Śrīnātha, Śrīvatsa, Vedānta-Kalpalatikā of Madhusūdana

2. It was described as a suburb of the town of Farīdpur on the strength of its description in the Harilīlā— as

"Kotālipāḍā" is the correct Bengali form, the Bengali pronunciation of 'kotвал' being 'Kotāl'. But Kotālipāḍā is the form adopted by the local Post-office. Kotālipāḍā is still a Paraganā with a Police Station and a sub-registrar's office and though, at present, included in the district of Farīdpur lies on the border of the two adjacent district town of Farīdpur to be called its Suburb. It was originally included within candraadvīpa and even fifty years back formed part of the district of Bārisal. - Article : Madhusūdana Sarasvatī : His life and works - A Rejoinder by Chintaharana Chakravarti. Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,
Yādavānanda, Kamalajana, and Vāgīśa. Among these, the youngest of all died at a very early age. The remaining three


1. Mr. Nagendra Nāth Vasu in his 'Vāngra Jātiya Ītīhāsa' (Vaidika kanda) has noted that, a work in MS. form called 'Vaidika-vāda Mīmaṁsā' is in the possession of Pt. Haridāsa Siddhānta Vāgīśa - a member of the same family, had a work named - 'Bhāvabhūmivārtā', a history of Koṭālipāda, composed by Rāghavendra Kaviśekhara in A.D. 1667, states that Madhusūdana was the younger brother of Purandara and not his son. contd...
became famous later on as Śrīnātha Cūḍāmai, Yādavānanda Nyāyācārya and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.

There are some legends regarding the life of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, one of them relates that, Purandara once being invited by the king of Chandradvīpa, residing at Mādhava Pāśa, went to the court with his two sons, namely, Yādavaṇanda and Madhusūdana. This king was struck by Madhusūdana's brilliant ability. Purandara intended to have a grant for a piece of land. The king did not fulfil it. As a result of that, Madhusūdana first became exasperated, but later on was filled with a sense of remorse and begged permission of his father to become a recluse, which was granted. He became a Dāndin Ṣamnyāsin. He got himself formally initiated.

---

1. The very name Chandradvīpa suggests its connection with Chandra dynasty. It still exists in the district of Bārisal. — Encyclopaedia India, XII No. 18
into the Brahmaciyā by Viśvesvara Sarasvati, and resided at Gopāla Nath on Catusāsthi Gātha in Banaras. His fame spread speedily on account of his observance of thorough penance and practice in Yoga, and he at once became respected in the learned circle of that period. His other two Gurus were Śrīrāma and Madhava Sarasvati. Akṣṇāmānda is also considered to be his Guru.

1. He is said to be the author of (i) कलिप्रेष्यासंग्रह
   (ii) परमस्परप्रतिवादसंग्रह
   (iii) यतियष्यप्रकाश
   (iv) यतियष्यप्रमुख
   (v) यत्यचारसंगीत-संस्कार-प्रयोग: || Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum V. I. P. 587.

2. Śrīraṁavimśeśvaranātha
   पुष्पाकुण्ठारदासकुंडलि।
   तेषाः पुष्पाकुण्ठमसिर यौग्यः
   शिलापिण्यकल्लक्ष्यमेयः: || - स्रव्याकैपिका।

3. "पक्षोपदेश्ता योगस्त्राणात्मकसिद्धो गुरुहू।"
   पुष्पाकुण्ठोक्तोलेलस्वस्महेयः व् श्रीपाला। ||
   The Colophon of the 'राजा प्रतिबोध' (a manuscript).
Another story about the life of Madhusūdana runs thus:

Once he came near the overflooded river Yasohara. On its bank, he prayed to God Varuṇa to give him a passage through the river, and due to the mercy of God, he crossed the river on foot without any obstacle. The people therefore, named the river after him.

It is said that Poet Tulasīdāsa was his contemporary, and also lived at Banaras. When they came to know each other, Tulasīdāsa sent his Rāma-carita-mānasa to Madhusūdana. Having been highly impressed by it, Madhusūdana sent it back with this eulogistic verse:

"शान्तकाने काश्यां तुल्यति वदुम्वत:।
कंकिता फ-जरी यस्य रामचरितमयदिता॥।" 1

Madhusūdana was once invited by the Emperor Akbar at

---

1. "शान्तकानन is not a place near Banaras but is Banaras itself. It is one of the names given to Banaras on account of its religious associations. When performing any religious ceremonies at Banaras. We say in the Samkalpa-vākyā".....शान्तकानने, महाराष्ट्रात, तात्त्विकतेत्रे "....."

his court, and the Pandits, having been struck by his wide and profound learning, praised him for his scholarly personality and paid him the following high encomium:

\[
\text{"Væci pàræsàrastvà} \text{Madhusudanà} \text{Ràstra} \text{Pàra Daksinàmûr̄tikà.} \]

Pandit Íśvarcândra, who claims to belong to the same family as that of Madhusúdana, states that there exists a villa in Koñalīpāṭā near Farīḍpur, known as Purandaravāṭikā, and there is a temple of the Goddess Daksinàmûr̄tikālikā.

Prof. J. N. Farguhar is of the opinion that, Madhusúdana and Vallabha knew each other and perhaps exchanged their views also. This inference is based on a tradition in the literature of the religious sect of Vallabha, and it is further supported by the fact that Madhusúdana is the first Acārya of the school of Sañkara Vedánta who used the word Suddhadvaita for Mayāvāda or Kevaladvaita, the well-known term by which Sañkara's Siddhánta is generally known.

1. 'Vedañkalpalatikā' - ed. R. D. Kamarkar. p.XII.
'Kulpanjika' referred to by Rāma Pāndeya Vyākaranopādhyāya in his 'Vedānta Kalpalatikā', throws light on some informative sources of Madhusudana's life story. According to that, the ancestor of Madhusudana was Rama Misra, a Brāhmaṇa living in Varāghadesa. His generation lived in 'Kotalipāḍā', a suburb of Farīdpur. Madhusūdana's forefather Pramodanā Purandarācārya was a famous person. He had four sons. Śrīnāthacūḍāmaṇī, Yādavānanda Nyāyācārya, Kamalajanayana, and Vāgīśa Goswāmi. Among these, the second one became a respected person among the courtiers of the king Pratapāditya. Having been highly impressed by his intellectual brilliance, the said monarch offered him the title of 'Avilambha Sarasvatī'. He later on became well-known as 'Mādhava-Sarasvatī'. The third son of Purandarācārya, namely, Kamalajanayana went to Navadvipa, and studied 'Nyāyasāstra' there; and having known the variety of the world, became a monk. Tradition says that his vidyāguru was Mādhava Sarasvatī. This Mādhava Sarasvatī was the disciple of Rāmeśvara Bhatta, who was the disciple of his father, Narāyaṇa Bhatta.

1. Rāma is mentioned as the Guru of Mādhava Sarasvatī by Aufrecht in his 'Catalogous Catalogorum', Vol. I, p. 505.
Rāmeśvara Bhatta once went to Dwārakā. He had a son in 1514 A. D. March. He became famous as Nārāyana Bhatta. He came to Dwārakā and studied Mahābhāṣya, Suresvara vārtika for four years and went to Pratiṣṭhānapura. There he obtained fame for his wide knowledge and in order to gain emancipation, went to Vārānasī with his two sons, namely, Śrīchāra and Sāgrītīta. Rāmeśvara Bhatta was quite old in age, when Nārāyana Bhatta was born. He had three disciples.

(i) Ananta Bhatta (ii) Dāmodara Sarasvatī (iii) Mādhava Sarasvatī. Amongst them, Mādhava Sarasvatī was the teacher of Mādhusūdana Sarasvatī. It is also pointed out Rāmājī-3 Pāndey, that the same of Balabhadra mentioned in the 'Siddhāntabindu' by Mādhusūdana, and Puruṣottama Sarasvatī, the commentator of 'Siddhāntabindu' indicates that Bala-
bhadra Bhaṭṭacārya was a favourite pupil of

1. Indian Antiquary, 1912, 9.
2. Nārāyana Bhatta wrote कृतस्ताकारकोक्तिका in VSS. 1602 (1545 A.D.)
3. बलबहद्राय प्रसिद्धहकरता कल्पद्रुष्य कूले कूले निकर्णः।
   यद्युभिभिासिति यज्ञ दुष्टे तदुदाराः सुप्रियो विशेषवस्तु।
   - सिद्धान्तबिन्दु verse-4 at the end.
Madhusūdana efid that the Surname Bhattācārya being a Bengali surname, and he being the favourite pupil of Madhusūdana, Madhusūdana also must have been a Bengali. But this is not convincing. Again, this account contains another discrepancy. Yādavānanda, Madhusūdana's own brother, who later on came to be known as Mādhava Sarasvatī cannot be his Guru.

We have seen that Rānajīnā Pāndeya, in his preface to the Vedāntakalpalatikā, has associated the title 'Avilamba-Sarasvatī' with Yādavānanda who had the title of 'Nyāya-cārya'. And there also he has not been clear and has made a confusing combination of Yādavānanda and Mādhava. It is

1. 'कलोरी प्रहाराय: वश्कन चकलशिष्यः परमेस्वद्वन्तशास्त्रविहिताः.'

   - Purusottama's commentary on 'Siddhānta-bindu' verse No. 4 at the end.

2. 'तत्त्व यात्रवनन्द-यात्तवायायचाय: फलापालिकस्य राजः समालोच्यापी प्रकृति प्रकृते राजा ते अविलम्ब परस्कर्ती
   इत्युपना व नष्ट समलं चक्षिके। पापकर्मकर्मकृत्यावस्याव ते तेषां
   नुस्तोष्यं शरीरार्थः।'


(कृपया)
inconceivable how the same man came to be known both as Yadava and Mādhava.

On the other hand, Mādhavānanda Avilamba Sarasvatī is the full name of the son of Yādavānanda Nyāyācārya given in the 'Vahger Jātiya Itihaśa' (History of the Castes and Cheeds of Bengal) by Mr. Nagendranath Vasu.

Mr. Chintaharan Chakravarti says that "the descendants of Yadavānanda Nyāyācārya have three well-known subdivisions tracing their lineage from three sons of Yadavānanda viz. Mādhava Avilamba, Viśvanātha and Raghunātha". This statement clearly goes against the indentification of Avilamba with Yadavānanda.

Mr. P. C. Divanji, in his introduction to 'Siddhāntabindu' has given a brief outline of Madhusudana's ancestors based on the record of Mr. Chintaharana Chakravati, who states that he belongs to the same family as was honoured by the birth of Madhusudana.

---
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Sri Rama Misra

Madhava

Gopala

Ganapati

Sanatana

Krsna-gunamaya

Jitamitra Acaryasekhara Puranadara

Srinatha Yadavendra Kamalajanayana Vagisa Name Unknown

Sugama Nyayasarya (also known as Goswami Madhusudana Sarasvati)

Gauridasa Viswanatha Raghunatha Madhava Avilamba Sarasvati

Vajinatha

Rudrarana

Chanasyama

Ramapati

Gauriprasada

Madanamohana

Jhanadakanta

Cintaharana
Various Views Regarding the Date of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī:

Thus, this heterogeneous matter concerning the life of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, gives no definite pointer towards the removal of our difficulty for fixing the exact date of the author. It still remains an open question, for, the great task of understanding and interpreting lives purely on the basis of legends, which, of course, is not impossible, but difficult because of the variety and magnitude of the legends.

A well-known fact is that, Madhusūdana flourished a considerable period after Śaṅkarācārya, for Śaṅkara is highly commended in the Sundry passages of his commentary on the Gītā, and our author almost seems to be content to waive his right to be called an independent commentator, accepting somewhat inferior position as an interpreter.

In the preface to his edition of Schegel’s Bhagavatgītā, Prof. Lassen refers to an opinion of Bumouf identifying our author with Madhusūdana, who is mentioned by Mādhavācārya in his Dhātuvṛtti. Bumouf himself is not clear in

1. Burnouf's words: "Colebrooke speaks of a Madhusūdana whom he gives as one of the commentators of the Bhāgavatop. contā...
identifying these two. And Prof. Lassen stated that he is not quite prepared to accept the view. He provisionally, as suggested by Burnouf, assigns our author to the middle of the 14th century A.D. placing Madhavacarya at the close of that century.

Mr. Kasinatha Trimbak Telang says that, "Madhusūdana must have flourished, not before, but sometime after Madhavacarya". In order to emphasise his view, he gives internal evidences from Gītā-Gūḍhārthadīpikā. Commenting on Gītā, VI 36, Madhusūdana explains some of the passages from the Yogavāsiṣṭha, and adds some observations, and further states- "अशिष्टं जीवान्मुक्तिविद्येषु विभिन्नध्वनिसंहस्यम् "- "The rest may be seen at length in Jīvanmuktiviveka". Now, Dr. F. E. Hall refers to Jīvanmuktiviveka as a work ascribed to Vidyārāṇya.

of वृद्ध विद्याराण, and whom Śāyana cites in his Dhātuvṛtti: "—

But the question remains, whether he is the same Madhusūdana as the one to whom Colebrook has attributed several works on Vedānta Philosophy.

or Madhavācārya. Accepting Madhavācārya to be the author of 'Jīvanmuktiviveka', Mr. Telang argues that Madhusūdana must have flourished after Madhavācārya. Further he quotes a verse of the Gūḍhārthadīpīkā, stating that "This easily intelligible commentary, which has been composed by me after obtaining the favour of the preceptors, Śrī Rāma, Viśvesvara and Mādhava, is offered to their lotus-like feet!"

He identifies Mādhava with the author of 'Jīvanmuktiviveka' and states that Madhusūdana probably flourished about the end of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th Century A.D.

Dr. Winternitz supporting the opinion of Mr. Telang says that Madhusūdana must have flourished during about 1495-1585 or 1490-1602 A.D.

1. In the Bibliography of 'Indian Philosophical systems' p. 133. Hall refers to Prof. Weber's Berlin Catalogue containing an account of the Jīvanamuktiviveka. p.205.

2. श्रीरामचंद्रेश्वरमाराजवान्न प्रकाशाङ्गासाध मया गुणानांस ।
   ब्राह्मणमेकतिष्ठति सुवोच समयमें तीर्थराह एकौऽ्य ए । - Gūḍhārthadīpīkā
Prof. Lassen further adds that, while commenting on Śrimad Bhagavadgītā, Madhusūdana has said: "एवंकलन प्रक्ष्ये प्रति श्रीयः " VI 27. According to him, Śrīdhara lived and wrote at the beginning of the 14th Century A.D. or half a century before Madhusūdana. So, the date of Madhusūdana should be latter half of the 14th century or the beginning of the 15th century A.D.

Shree Rāmājñā Pāṇḍeya fixes the date of Madhusūdana Sarāsvatī in his Sanskrit introduction to 'Vedāntakalpalatikā' and puts him in the period between 1540-1623 A.D.

Mahlmahopadhyāya Vāsudeva Sāstri Abhyankara says that an intellectual atmosphere was created in the 17th century by the learned ones. Among them, the first was Jagannātha, the author of "Rasagangādhara", who lived in Telangadeśa. The second was 'Khaṇḍadeva Maṭrā', the author of 'Bhattā-dīpikā', a well-known work of Pūrvaṁimāṃsā. The third was Gadādhara Bhaṭṭa who formed a tradition of Navadvīpānyāya.

The fourth was Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭa, who lived in Kāśi and wrote valuable books on Vyākaraṇa, Yoga, Dharma, Alankāra etc. The fifth is Madhusūdāna Sarasvatī, the author of Siddhāntabindu, Advaitasiddhi, etc. They were all contemporaries, and they flourished in the same century.

So according to Mr. Abhyankara, Madhusūdana flourished in the 17th Century.

Pandit Bālasarasvatī says that the date of Appaya Dīksita is 1587-1660 A.D. and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī flourished after Appaya Dīksita.

Mr. Chintaharana Chakravarti writes that Madhava-Madhusūdana's nephew, being the son of his brother Yādavānanda Nyāyācārya who was a contemporary of Pratāpāditya, flourished in the later part of the 16th and beginning of the 17th Cent. This may point to the middle of the 16th Cent. as the date of Madhusūdana.

Allowing 30 years roughly for one generation, this gives 1538 A.D. circa as the probable time when Madhusūdana can be supposed to have flourished.
Goswami Dāmodar Śāstri in his introduction to Bhaktirāṣṭyaṇa, with a commentary assigns Madhūsūdana Sarasvatī to the 16th Century.

Prof. Dinesh Bhāṭṭācārya has pointed out that a list of talented personalities of Akbar's time occurs in Ain-I-Akbari (Ain.30 book II). The list is classified into the faculties in which they show excellences. Among these, the first group, described by Abul Fazl, consists of the names of philosophers and ascetics. There we find a name 'Madhū Sarastī'. And Prof. Bhattachārya shows that the name as spelt in the original Persian text clearly suggests Mādhava Sarasvatī. The name which immediately follows is that of Madhusūdana. Other relevant names also found in that group are kṛṣṇa Pandita. They all flourished in the 16th cent. So, Madhusūdana must have flourished in the 16th cent. Moreover, Abul Fazl wrote Ain-I-Akbari in 1597 A.D. So the Scholars listed in it must have

flourished earlier. And so it can be conjectured that by
the time of Ain-I-Akbari, Madhusūdana too was an old
scholar. From this evidence, one may come to the conclusion
that Madhusūdana flourished at least in the middle of the
16th Century. 1

Mr. Divanji has stated that Madhusūdana flourished
in 16th century i.e. between 1540 to 1647. 2

Mr. P.M. Modi states in the introduction to
'Siddhāntabindu' that Madhusūdana lived roughly between
1495-1585 A.D. or 1490 - 16023.

Harihara śāstri, in his Sanskrit preface to the
'Advaitamahājari Series' and Pandit Haridāsa in the introduction
to his edition of the Harilīlā, mentions a commentary of
Madhusūdana on Appaya Dīkṣitas'. 'Siddhāntaleśa Samgraha'
and states that Appaya Dīkṣita was prior to Madhusūdana.
Appaya Dīkṣita flourished in the later half of the 16th
Century. So, Madhusūdana have lived in the beginning of the

1. Indian Historical quarterly. Vol.XIII.1037 P.31.
2. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī - His life and works by P.C.
   Divanji - Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research
   Śāmaldās College, Bhavnagar 25-6-1929, Page 27.
17th Century. But this statement remains only as a guess, because, there is no such commentary available which was written by Madhusūdana on Appaya Dīkṣitās 'Siddhāntaleśa - Saṅgraha'.

The Reliability of the views mentioned and the date of the author:

Mr. Telang opines that Vidyāraṇya, who is identical with Mādhava has written 'Jīvanamuktiveka'. This particular person has been mentioned as a minister of king Bukka of Vijayanagar, by Macdonell in the History of Sanskrit literature. (p. 257). According to Macdonell, the book must have been composed by him in the last quarter of the 14th Century. However, there is no recorded tradition suggesting Vidyāraṇya's direct contact with the scholars of Benāres, and that too with Madhusūdana.

Madhusūdana's identification with Mādhava Avilamba Sarasvātī as also Mādhava Avilamba Sarasvātī's identification with lādavānanda, is illogical, for, Mr. Chakravarti's while accepting Mr. Chakravarti's view, we are on the safe ground, for, Mādhava was patronized by king Pratāpāditya of Bengal, who fought with Akbar, and seems to have flourished in the
later part of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century.¹

Madhusūdana is referred to by Sesa Govinda, in his Sarvasiddhānta Rahasya vivaraṇa. Therein we are told that Kṛṣṇa Govinda, the father of Sesa Govinda, was the preceptor of Bhatṭoji Dīkṣita, Sesa Govinda refers to Madhusūdana as his Guru.² Bhatṭoji Dīkṣita and Sesa Govinda were contemporaries. As they were contemporaries, so were Kṛṣṇa Govinda and Madhusūdana Sarasvati.

---


2. "यत्रादृश्यानितिपितुपरमाध्यायमः।
साक्ष्यवन्मातृ कर्मणंकर्मणं।। इति श्रीशुरभविते श्रीसाधुभार्षणोक्तिका-
विरििते भौतिकद्वैविध्यविवरणो माधुपल:। समाजः।। शुच्यां मुख्योऽति यह यतः
शुच्यांपुरस्तलकसौपरिष्ठयु। दिव्यं फ्राहीस्थूर्द मयासिन्मु महावचनं-कान्त-पूर्वकायूँ॥

Pt. Haridas Vidyavagis, Prof. R.D. Karmarker, and Abhyankarji, the editors of Harilila, Vedantakalpalatika, and the ‘Siddhantabindu’ respectively state that Tulsidas, who composed Ramacaritamanasa in Avadhī language, Gadadhara Bhattacarya, well-known thinker of Nyayastra, Bhattoji Dikshita, a well-known figure in Alankarastra, and Madhusudana Sarasvati flourished in the reign of Akbar.

The conclusion, which has been thus arrived at, does not fit with the Nijaśarta of the Vallabha Sect, considered by Prof. Modi. If Vallabha were Madhusudana’s contemporary, then there would have been at least a few references in the writings of Madhusudana. But no such reference is seen in the works of Madhusudana. Tradition says that when Madhusudana met Vallabha in Ayaga, he was at least 50 years old in age i.e. in 1516 A.D., and having lived at Devasi for 15 years he died in 1531 A.D. This does not appeal to us as cogent. If this is supposed to be true, then he would have been 90 years old even at the time of the accession of Akbar, and considering the fact that an interview referred to by Farqubbar must have taken
place only when the emperor was well-settled that interview would have become impossible because then Madhusudana would, according to the calculation, be over 100 years old, and so could not have travelled from Benares to Delhi, in those days when there were not comfortable conveyances as we have these days.

And a story, that for a review, Madhusudana and Tulsiśāsa exchanged their works namely Advaitasiddhi and Rāmacaritamānasā seems to be impossible. Because, the date of a Ms, which occurs in the library of the Queen's college at Benares, states it to be written in 1584 A.D. If we allow 107 years to our author, then only the story becomes true.

It is said that Nṛśimha Sarasvatī or Nṛśimhāsraya, and Nādhava Sarasvatī were the Gurus of Madhusudana Sarasvatī who overpowered Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa in debate. This Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, is a commentator of Sadānanda's 'Vedāntasāra' who, in his commentary 'Subodhī' writes that he had composed it in S'aka 1510, that is 1588 A.D. If we accept
1490 A.D., as the birth year of Madhusūdana, even then he would be 98 years old at the time of the composition of his work 'Subodhini' of Nṛsimhārāma. But there also, naturally, his Guru Mādhava would be still older by about 20 years. That age is not quite comfortable, for participation in a heated debate. So, the episode narrated in the Nījavārta, referred to by Mr. P.M. Modi also reveals nothing except the date of Madhusūdana viz. 1540 A.D.

That Appaya Dīkṣita was prior to Madhusūdana Sarasavatī is an accepted fact. Appaya Dīkṣita flourished in the later half of the 16th Century. Tradition says that in the later part of his life, he went to Benāres, and there he came into contact with Jagannātha, the well-known author of Rasagangādhara. It seems quite strange that there is not a single reference to his meeting with Madhusūdana, who was living in the same period in Benāres. It leads to think, that Madhusūdana must have left Benāres for Harādwar at the time when Appaya Dīkṣita came to Benāres. According to the tradition, Appaya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha came to known each other in the court of
Emperor Shāh Jahān. This very Emperor ruled India from 1626 to 1658. His son imprisoned him. Having come to know this story, Madhusūdana must have left Benares for Haradwār, and due to this reason, his contact with Appaya Dīksita could not have become possible.

Considering the events noted above, Madhusūdana approximates to 1540-1647 A.D., the period in which he must have gained a revered position in the field of the Vedānta doctrine of Absolute monism preached by Śrīmad Śaṅkarācārya.

Works:

The list of various works generally attributed under the heading of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in Aufrechter's 'Catalogorum Catalogorum' (Part I, Page: 427) runs as follows:

(i) Advaitabrahamādhi
(ii) Advaitaratna-rakṣana
(iii) Ātmabodhīkā
(iv) Ānandamandākīnī
(v) Rgvedajatādy-
śavikṛti-vivarāṇa
(vi) Kṛṣṇakutūhalanātaka
(vii) Prasthā-
nabheda
(viii) Bhaktisāmānyanirūpāṇa
(ix) Bhagavadgītā
gūḍhārthadīpikā
(x) Bhagavadbhaktirasāyana
(xx) Sarvavidyāsiddhānta-vayāna. (xxi) Harilāl-vyākhyā.
(xxii) Siddhāntabindu.

Mr. Divanji adds one more name—Aṣṭavikṛtivivraṇa or Vivṛti. The editor of Harilālvyākhyā also seems to refer to this work in his introduction. May be this is identical with Ṛgvedajātyāṣṭvivṛtivivṛta.

Mahamahopādhyāya Ganapati Śastri has noted one more title as a work of Madhusūdana, viz. Īśvarapratipattiprapakaśa.


Dr. Dasgupta, in the 'History of Indian Philosophy' Vol. II (page 225) mentions one more title as a work of Madhusūdana, viz. Advaita-mañjarī.

Shree P. M. Modi in his introduction to 'Siddhāntabindu'
mentions the following works under the name of Madhusūdana, stating that these are mentioned only by Aufrecht, but we do not find them.

(i) Citrarūpavāda or Citrārupavicāra, (ii) Tarkasūtra-bhāṣyaṭīkā (iii) Anyāpadesaśāstaka. (iv) Bhagavadgītāṭātyast-paryakārīkā (v) A commentary on Mahānāṭaka (vi) Anyathākhyāṭikante-koddhāra.

It is difficult to ascribe these works, with any fair certainty, to a single pen.

We mostly come across the abridged title 'Bhaktiśāyana' instead of the full title 'Bhaktiyāśayanānirūpāna' mentioned by Aufrecht in his catalogue catalogorum. Next, 'Bhāgavatapurāṇa Prathamaślokavyākhyā' and 'Bhāgavatapurāṇādyāślokatrayavyākhyā' are separately mentioned by Aufrecht. It seems that the former is not different from the latter but included in it. The editor of 'Harilīlā- vyākhyā' says that the 'Bhāgavatapurāṇādyāślokatraya-vyākhyā' was published in Bengal. To be on the safe ground, we should accept Mr. Divanji's view that, *Aufrecht was perhaps misled by the omission of the word 'Traya' from
the title of that commentary in any of the MSS. that may have come into his own hand or by a wrong description given in any of the Catalogue on which he relied, and as for the third, he himself has expressed a doubt whether it is not identical with Prasthānabeda and the doubt is probably well-founded."

Regarding 'Sarvavidyāśiddhāntavāraṇa,' Aufrecht puts a question mark into the bracket, and writes 'Prasthānabeda.' In Dr. R. L. Mitra's 'Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts,' there is a note of a Ms. of 'Ātmabodha-tīkā' by Madhusūdana, wherein the work 'Ātmabodhārthaprakaraṇa' is described as 'Sarvavedāntasiiddhāntasamgraha.' Dr. Modi says that it is not an additional work of Madhusūdana, but another name of 'Ātmabodha'a work of Śrī Śankarācārya. A commentary written on 'Siddhāntaleśasaṃgraha' of Appaya Dīksita by Madhusūdana is, as I think, a lamentable mistake made by Aufrecht; for, it is hardly possible to believe this, for they both flourished not only in the same century, but almost at the

same time. And there is not a single reference of Madhusudhana's commentary on his contemporary Appaya Diksita's work. Aufrecht has made another mistake. He has mentioned the title 'Advaitabrahmasiddhi'. But it is a work of Sadananda Yati. The editor of the 'Harililavakyakhyā' calls the same work as 'Advaitasiddhi' and Mr. Divanji calls it as 'Advaitabrahmasiddhi'. The statements of both of them misleads us; because, Madhusudana Sarasvatī himself has used the word 'Advaitasiddhi' instead of 'Advaitabrahmasiddhi' or 'Advaitasiddha', in the introduction of the said work.

Published Works Of the Author:

Advaitasiddhi:

It was first published by S. S. Ayyar as no. 1 of the 'Advaitamañjarī' series in 1893 with a commentary of Brahmānanda Sarasvatī. The author has made an obeisance to his Gurus in the second and the third introductory verses of

10  'वैद्य वादिकिन्यायं व सत्वराणामः
   योज्येत्सिद्धि: कयस्तु मुदे बुधानाम् || 8 || बोधेत्सिद्धि
called Atmanirupana the native of the Atman is dealt with.

The third chapter describes the means of Absolution and raises and answers the question whether śiṣṭavāna or Jñāna can be the object of vidhi or not and whether śabda can lead to direct knowledge or not. The fourth chapter expounds the nature of Mukti.

Advaitaratnāyakṣaṇa:

It was printed by the Nirmayasagar Press, Bombay in 1917 A.D. It is considered to be the work of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, because he frequently refers to 'Advaitasāstra' 1 as his own work. The author also refers to 'Vedantakapalikā' 2 as his own work. At the end, the author has paid

8. अद्वैतरत्नायण, निर्मयासागरप्रेस पुंक्त, प्र० ६, २५, २६, २७, २८ ज्युत्पाविन्यासंतिसिद्धि I प्र० ६
हर्ष अद्वैतसिद्धि कित्तुर् I प्र० २५
हर्ष अद्वैतसिद्धि कित्तुर् I प्र० २६
प्रमाणविन्यासंतिसिद्धि: अद्वैतसिद्धि ।
सन्तिसिद्धिसन्दर्भे हर्ष उपर्युक्ते I प्र० २५
निस्पातन्नविन्यासंतिसिद्धि I प्र० २७
शत्यादिविनिस्पातन्नविन्यासंतिसिद्धिकर्मक्षरतात्त्वादिनिः सिद्धि I, इत्यादि प्र० ४४।
homage to his Guru Viśveśvara, and the colophon is slightly different from that of Advaitasīthi.

Vedāntakalpatītika :  

This work was printed in the Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavan text series. The author has mentioned the name of Viśveśvara in the introductory verses. The colophon at the end of this work mentions the name of the author as well as his Guru. It omits the number of the 'Stabaka'.

This work has been referred to in 'Advaitasīthi' six times, in 'Advaitaratnakara' once, in 'Siddhāntabindu' and in

---

1. खल्लियोऽयं श्रीविश्वेश्वरपादयोऽः श्रृंवापितमभैरवेन वाकां स व्यमानिचि: ।
2. इति श्रीमद्वरतस्वप्रभाकराचार्यकृतिज्ञेश्वरस्वरूपापपुज्यपद श्रीमद्वरतस्वरूपकृतिनिर्विकाराचार्यम् समाप्तम् ।
3. दुरापः शास्त्रायं नियत्तमावैरपि बुधेः
4. सम्प्राप्तु श्रवणी मलिनकृति यथापि मया ।
5. इति श्रीविश्वेश्वरचर्चणप्रकरणस्य खः -
   खुशारमः 'श्रवणी' न कथापि रितार्थमं मकित ।
6. इति श्रीमद्वरताचार्यकृतियोऽयं श्रीविश्वेश्वरस्वप्रभा -
   मुख्यं प्रभास्तर सजायात पश्चातनिर्वर्णं नाम खयकः ।
'Mahimnastotratikā' twice, and in 'Bhaktipasāyanam' once. In 'Vedāntakalpalatikā', there are promises of the treatment of particular topics in detail later on, but none has been fulfilled in the subsequent part. This leads us to think, that, it is the first portion of the 'Stabaka' and the rest of the portion has been destroyed. The colophon does not mention the name of his guru Viśvesvara, but he has mentioned his name in the introductory verse. It shows that it should be the earlier work of the author. Mr. Rāmājñā Pāndeya, in his introduction to the 'Vedāntakalpalatikā' shows this with a particular reference. He says that 'Advaitasiddhi' contains a reference to his Gitā-nibandhana and the Śrīmad Bhaṭṭavatātikā,
both these works of Madhusūdana contain references to his Bhaktirasāyana, and this Bhaktirasāyana refers to the 'Vedāntakalpatikā'. This shows that the 'Vedāntakalpatikā' is an earlier work of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.

Regarding the subject matter of this work, it explains the nature of emancipation and its means, refutes the views of others regarding emancipation and shows how the cessation of ignorance takes place.

Vedāntakalpatikā has been referred to twice in the commentary of the Mahimnastotra, and five times in the Advaitasiddhi. We find references to Vedāntakalpatikā in 'Siddhāntabindu' and vice versa. Some of the passages of this work throws light on the Bhaktimārga followed by Madhusūdana.

9. जौपिनिषदास्तु भक्तमार्ग नारायणानुग्रहीता
   निरतिस्मान-दोषाय वात्स्यानात्मकियानिग्रहतिर्थलिङ्गम मौर्यावते ॥
Samkṣepaśāriraka - Sarvasaṅgraha:

It is a commentary on the Samkṣepaśāriraka of Sarvajñātma Muni. It has been published in the Ānandāśrama Sanskrit series, with the commentaries of Agnicit Purusottama Miśra and Kṛṣṇatīrtha. The author has made an obeisance in the introductory verse of the text. In the colophon, at the end of the first chapter the word 'पुज्यादि' is used but in the remaining three chapters, the word श्रीप्रादशिप्र is used. The name of his guru is 'Śrīvīśvēśvarānanda referred to in the colophon of the first chapter, but the remaining three chapters have Śrīvīśvēśvara Sarasvatī in their colophons. Of course, it does not make any difference for accepting Madhusūdana's authorship of this work. The first

\[
9. \text{श्रीरामविभृङ्गवास्मावान्} \\
\text{पुरुषपादपुष्पपूर्णविशुन्} \\
\text{तेष्यं प्रभावाद्यस्मिः} \text{ योग्यः} \\
\text{शिलारः कैलायमलक्ष्ये} \text{ येमि: II}
\]
line of the introductory verse of the 'Advaitasidhi' is one and the same. Madhusudana's other works neither mention this work, nor does this work mention any other work of his, yet the internal evidences in the work lead us to believe that this work has been composed by his excellent pen. We have the same type of discussion in Siddhantabindu and 'Samksepa Sariyaka' concerned with the topic 'That thou art'.

In this work of Madhusudana, we find the names of Visvaveda and Pratyag Visnu as the teacher of his own teachers.

Gudharthadipika:

It is a running commentary on the great work Srimad Bhagavadgita. It was published by the Native opinion Press Bombay in Saka 1802, and the same together with

---

1. किशोराविष्कृत्य पुत्यग्रिहणोघ्यं गुड़योः।
   अस्यावत् ब्रह्मांश्च लेखि गुड़यां तैहि नौ गुरुः॥
the 'Subodhinī', the commentary on the same work by Śrīdhara, by Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay in 1905 A.D. The wording of the colophons of the chapters of the Guḍhārthadīpikā corresponds to those of the colophone of the chapters II, III & IV of the Sankṣepaśārīrakasāṅggrahaṭīkā, and as in the colophons of both these works Viśvesvara Saravatī is mentioned as the guru of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, it is established beyond doubt. Viśvesvara Sarasvatī was the guru of Madhusūdana. Next, that the first line of the last of the verses put at the end of the work is the same, as the line of introductory verse No.2 in the 'Advaitasiddhi'. The author mentions the work Bhaktirāsāyaṇa which indicates his authorship. This work shows him

1. I went through a manuscript of 'Guḍhārthadīpikā' which I had from L.D.Institute of Indology. It is upto XII Aṣṭāṣṭika only, written in 1793 Vikrama Samvat.

"भगवन्तुर्विश्वमार्गः प्रथमैः साक्षरः तथानामस्य प्रस्तुतां कथमात्रा साक्षरः तथानामां दिक्षितां।" VII.16
not as a Staunch believer of Advaita monism, but as an ardent devotee who firmly follows the path of Bhakti, and this leads him to occupy a unique position in the field of Indian philosophy

Bhagavadbhaktirasāyana:

It is another work on religious philosophy. The path of devotion is expounded in this work. It has been published by Goswāmi Dāmodara Śāstri in the Achyuta Granthamālā series. The colophon of this work declares Madhusūdana as a peripatetic teacher who preached the gospels given by Paramahānasās. It does not contain the name of his paramaguru i.e. Viśveśvara, which has been mentioned in many of his other works. The kārikā no. 19 of the first ullāsa, contains a reference to 'Vedāntakalpalatikā' and the Kārikā No. 23 of the same ullāsa contains a reference to 'Siddhāntabindu'. This proves Madhusūdana's authorship of

1. "हि श्रीपारमशिवपरिक्रमाकारायणेषु सरस्वतीविरलितमक्कल-पथिकरसाये..........."
the same work. Moreover on the other hand, the Gūḍhārtha-
dīpikā States that the topic on hand is further developed by
the author in his 'Bhaktirasāyana'. This definitely proves
it to be a work of Madhusūdana.

bhāgavata Prathamaśloka Vyākhya:

It is a theological work of Madhusūdana. It was
published by Nitya Swarūpa Brahmacāri of Vṛndāvana in Śaka
1955, with ten commentaries. The author seems to have
intended to write a commentary on the whole work or on the
major portion of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, for, the colophon
which occurs at the end of each of his works is absent from
this particular work. The last line indicates the name of
Bhaktirasāyana saying that "all the varieties of experience
of the sentiment of Bhakti have been stated by us in the

1. भाक्तिरसायणेऽक्षणिः सब्ज्ञेश्वरः प्राप्तिक्षत || VII. 16 ||
Bhaktirasāyaṇa. Few will be described here.¹ The subsequent portion, of the work, does not even refer to them.

Madhusūdana's authorship of this work is beyond doubt.

This tīkā has been divided into three parts by Madhusūdana. In the first part, the aupanīṣada interpretation is given; and the second and the third parts respectively contain paurāṇika and kevalabhakti explanation.

The first part of the tīkā explains the terms 'Tat' and 'tvam'. Summarising the Brahmasūtras of Bāḍāryaṇa, Madhusūdana gives the explanation of first four sutras, which seems to be somewhat similar to Vallabha's interpretation.

In the second part, the terms - Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Aniruddha and Pradyumna have been omitted and instead of that, Madhusūdana has used Virāṭ, Hiranyagarbha, Agyākṛta and Śākṣin. All of them are one and the same, the difference that appears to us, is because of Upādhi. The first three stand for the limited consciousness and the last one for the Pure

¹. महितरसाययायनाः सर्वैः प्रयोपायिनः महितरसाययायामः भवापि किया-कस्यैं ॥
Consciousness. In the third interpretation of the Kevala Bhakti, Madhusūdana explains the theory of Devotion in brief.

Mahimnastotratīkā:

The original stotra has been composed by Puspadantācārya, and Madhusūdana wrote a commentary on it. It was published by Nirmayasagara Press, Bombay, in 1900. In the beginning of the commentary, Madhusūdana pays homage to his preceptor Viśveśvara and the colophon at the end of the text mentions himself as a bee sitting on the lotus feet of the illustrious Viśveśvara Sarasvatī. Moreover, there is a distinct reference to Vedāntakalpatīkā, in the commentary on the verses no. 26 and 27. These evidences confirm that this work can be included amongst the works ascribed under the name of Madhusūdana.

1. इतिश्रीमतिः पुष्पदात्रीपदश्वरवर्णार्थानिद्ध्वसृष्ण ।
   श्रीमधुसूदनस्वरूपीविचित्रिता महिमसूतिवधायत्वं सम्बूण्ड ॥

2. कवितेये यासुस्वाय पूजान्तकल्पतिकायां भागेये ॥
   - Comm. on verse No. 26.

   तथा व्रजश्रीमतिस्मारितेन्तकल्पतिकायामिलस्यस्य ॥
   - Comm. on verse No. 27.
In the commentary, Madhusudana praised both Siva and Visnu. He first refers to 'ancient acaryas' but does not mention them. As he was a devotee of Visnu he holds that Puspadanta himself praised both Siva and Visnu in the same stotra to show that they are non-different. He has given a brief list of works on various branches of sanskrit literature of his days. He does not comment on verses 32-36.

Siddāntabindu:

It is a commentary on Sankara's Daśaślokī. It was first published at Benares by Babu Govindadasa Gupta in V.Sam 1944. It has later editions also. In this work, the author has made obeisance in the first benedictory verse at the beginning of the commentary. The colophon of this work resembles almost exactly with that of the 'Advaitaratna-akaṇṇa'. The Vedāntakalpalatikā and Advaitasiddhi refer to

1. पुरौचार्यकृत्वा व्यास्यायः 'किष्ठ' मया - Comm. on verse no: 7.
2. बन्यचन्द्र गन्धाराज्ञि महाकुशलत्वांि एकेवेष शोभैर्वन्यायः यथासूति करित्या च हरिःश्रावः सूतिः: तथाप्रेष्यज्ञानायामहिष्ठति।
3. श्रीसंज्जयाचार्याकारः विश्वेश्वरं विश्वेश्वरं प्रणामः।
4. तदान्तव्यादयं अत्वात्तात्त्वादात्त्वादात्त्वादात्त्वादाय विस्मृति: सिद्धान्तान्तु:।
5. विश्वेश्वरदेशः परिवाराचार्याकारः विश्वेश्वरभाष्कराचार्याकारः।
6. विश्वेश्वरभाष्कराचार्याकारः विश्वेश्वरभाष्कराचार्याकारः।
7. व.क.प.87.
8. विश्वेश्वरभाष्कराचार्याकारः। विश्वेश्वरभाष्कराचार्याकारः। व.क.प.490.
Siddhāntabindu, and Siddhāntabindu refers to 'Vedāntakalpalātikā' This proves that he is the reputed author of this work.

Prasthānabhedā:

It was published with a Hindi translation by Pt. SarayuPrasada Misrā of Bankipura Patana in 1897 A.D. and by the Vāṇīvīśa Press, Śrīraṇgam in 1912. This work does not have a colophon, so, one cannot firmly regard Madhusūdana as its author. Mr. P.C. Divanji is of the opinion that 'Prasthānabhedā' is an independent work, and not a part of the commentary on the 7th verse of the 'Mahimnastotra.' He assumes that having been inspired by the idea, contained in the 7th verse of the Mahimnastotra be

\[
\text{Verse No: 7.}
\]
Madhusūdana may have written it as an independent work. It may also be possible, that some copyist may have incorporated the whole of it, with slight variations, in the commentary, thinking that one and the same idea identically runs through both the works. On the other hand, the author, may have taken out the relevant portion from the commentary on verse 7 of the stotra, and have written the first one or two lines as an introduction, giving the name 'Prasthānabheda'.

Mr. Chattopadhyaya holds the view that 'Prasthānabheda' is a part of the 'Mahimnastotratīkā' on verse no. VII. He says that words of the verse no. 7 "त्रयी सांख्य योगः........." cannot be understood if the Prasthānabheda be taken as an independent work. we have an account of त्रयी, सांख्यशारस्त्रम्
RiHci^T and cjwrqfsj discussed in the same order as they were in the verse. And the conclusion:

"तत्र तैनां तात्पर्यसङ्ग्हम् वैदिकवेदः तात्पर्यसङ्ग्हमानास्त्व-पाद्यक्षेत्र गृहान्तो जनः नानापथुर्णां मानन्ति स्वैस्तन्तः।"
is also the same as is found in the verse. Next, the text begins with the sentence: "अन्य सुरेण्यां शास्त्राणां मानवत्वतः तात्पर्यः वाः शास्त्राः शरणां वैति समासे तैनां प्रस्तुतामेवादश्चूच्चे हितस्तः।" and the mangalstánzā which occurs invariably in almost each and every work of his, is absent in this work only. Had Madhusúdana written it as a separate work, he would have started the work with mangalstánzā. It proves that it is not an independent work of Madhusúdana but a commentary on verse 7 of the Mahimnastotra.

Harililā Vyākhyā:

It is a commentary on the 'Harililā' of Vopadeva - a synopsis of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. It was published with a preface in Sanskrit by Pt. Ṣwarachandra Śāstri and Pt. Haridāsa Vidyāvāgīśa in the Calcutta oriental series no.3 in 1920 A.D. It is divided into twelve chapters, each
containing the same colophon. The last verse of this work gives the name of the author, without any information about him. The preceptor of the author is nowhere mentioned. Nor is there reference to any other work of Madhusūdana. There is neither any external nor any internal evidence to prove that this work is composed by Madhusūdana, the author of the Siddhāntabindu. It evinces neither the depth of the metaphysic thought nor wide knowledge and experiences, which characterise the works of Madhusūdana the author of the Siddhāntabindu. The editor of this book and Prof. Modi have regarded this work as one written by Madhusūdana, the author of Siddhāntabindu.  

Mr. Abhayankara Śāstri states that there were five Madhusūdana Sarasvatīs, and the one, who was a disciple of Śridhara Sarasvatī, was the

1. इति श्रीवैपदविरिक्तिहितावलायि मधुसूदनसरस्वतीप्रगटिः प्राप्तिः

author of this work, he being a different person from the
author of the 'Siddhántabindu'. But he does not throw
any more light on this particular matter, and, so, the
authorship of Harilīlā-Vyākhyā remains an open question.

Anandamandakini:

It has been twice published in the Pandit of Benāres New Series. Vol.I. and in the Kavyamala of Bombay Guchchakā II. It is a fine stotra, containing 102 Stanzas, in the Sārdulavikrīdita metre in a beautiful diction and lucid style, giving a brief description of Lord Kṛṣṇa, and his various heroic deeds. The last Stanza of this work gives the name of the author, and the colophon contains some information about Madhusūdana, that he was a devotee of the son of Nanda. As the author does not mention the name of his preceptor, which was a customary practice among the authors, Mr. P.M. Modi comes to the conclusion that Anandamandakini was an earlier production of the author.

1. Siddhántabindu - P.M. Modi - The Sujna Gokulji-Zala
   UPNEETI 1924 - Page : 37.
   Vedanta Prize 1934. Page 33.
MiJfee. Abhayankara Sastri says that the Anandamandakini, Kṛṣṇakutahala, Harililā - Vyākhyā and Vedastuti are the works of one Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, who was a disciple of Śrīdhara Sarasvatī. But if it were so, the author would have given the name of his preceptor, and we could have an idea of the other Madhusūdana. But not a single reference is found in this connection which would lead us to think of another Madhusūdana. And MiJfee. Abhyankarji also cannot throw any light on this matter. So, the problem of the authorship of this work is still undecided.

Unpublished Works:

Rājñāratibodhah:

Mr. S.N. Tadpatrikara has given a short survey of the contents as found in the manuscript. The work has been divided into three parts:


The colophon of the first part states that Madhusūdana was the disciple of Akhandānanda and not of Viśveśvara Sarasvatī. The colophon at the end of the second part omits the name of his Guru, and the colophon of the third part has the name of the work. The author of this work is Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. From this fact only, Mr. Aurfrecht and Mr. Tadpatrikara have attributed this work to Madhusūdana.

1. परिक्षोपदेश्तः योंलक्षणदान-दामिनिगुरुः।
   मुखपादातःक्लेशचिह्नवृत्ति
   तू कीमति।। ॥ ॥
   इति \text{\small केशा}।

2. हति \text{\small श्रीमतृभरमहेंपरिज्ञानकार}।
   \text{\small श्री मुखलक्षणदानन्दकृत्तिविरचिते।}
   \text{\small पञ्चकारविवरणमुद्गराये।}
   \text{\small सम्पूर्णमिव।}
   \text{\small Ibid.}

3. हति \text{\small श्रीमतृभरमहेंपरिज्ञानकार}।
   \text{\small श्री मुखलक्षणदानन्दकृत्तिविरचिते।}
   \text{\small कशरस्त्रितवृंक्षमहाराजाय।}
   \text{\small सम्पूर्णमिव।}
   \text{\small Ibid.}
Sarasvatī. It is true, that the colophon of the first part has the name of the author, but, instead of stating Madhusūdana's residential place at Benāres, it mentions him as a resident of Ratnādri cave on the Ratnagangā. This type of reference is not found in the works of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the author of AS. This means that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the author of this work, is not identical with the author of 'Siddhāntabindū' and 'Vedāntakopalatikā'.

Aṣṭavikṛti-Vivarana or Vivriti:

It has been noted in Mr. Divanji's introduction to 'Siddhāntabindū' that 'This work was published with a commentary, at Calcutta in Saka 1811 by S.S. Bhattacharya."¹ Mr. Kshetreshachandra Chattopādhyaya does not consider this work to be a work of Madhusūdana. The reasons which he gives for his belief are (i) the name mentioned in that

---
work is Madhusudana Maskarin and not Madhusudana Sarasvati.  
(ii) the author mentions Nṛsiṁha as his Guru while  
Madhusudana himself has mentioned Viśvesvara, Śrīrāma and  
Mādhava as his Guru in his other works. (iii) Madhusudana  
Maskarin mentions himself as a son of Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana  
while we have seen before, that, Madhusudana was a son of  
Puvandarācārya.  

I could not get any information about the above work  
of Madhusudana Sarasvatī.  

Kṛṣṇakutahala Nātaka:  

Mr. Divanji has given a brief account of this work,  
which he gathered from a manuscript. According to that,  

1. "श्रीमती श्रीगुरुद्वात्रकारणाभासिन्द्रिय कैतसि ………"

2. "मुक्तीकृष्णद्वापायतनम्" The comm. explains –  
"मुक्तीकृष्णद्वापायतनम्" by तत्कालातत्त्वतः तत्काल इत्यभिवृहित हति यावव।

the colophon of the work has the name of Madhusudana Sarasvati. The introductory portion of the work states that he was a son of Arundhati and Ngrayana of the Sandilya Gotra, and was a devotee of Visnu from his childhood, and was a disciple of Krṣṇa Sarasvati. He says that the idea of composing the play occurred to him when he saw Lord Visnu in a dream. He then gives the list of dramatical

1. इति श्रीपरमहंसपरिवारज्ञानावृत्तिमभुद्वाकरसरस्वतीवितः।
कृष्णानुसरणं नाम नारदं समाप्तः। Iibid p. 2.

2. सूत्रवारः (सहायया-संबद्धया) नौ भी। विं कृष्ण प्रकटनविनिविनिविनि ययकृष्णाक्षोलकाय वनकृष्णपत्रिकाय। निबंधः। समाप्तियन्तु।
एकादशिकं-अङ्कम् कविपुराणं विकथितः।
शास्त्रिकायः व्याख्यानोदितः। विभाषणं प्रदत्तः।
श्रीया कृष्णायाप्रयोगानाश्रयेश्वरेव वेद्याः।
संयतात मधुकुल: बुधपुरो केति स तिनं कुलः। Iibid p. 2.

3. वाराणसीविश्वासिनीकथामयरसायकः सुपत्तूकः विनायकश्रीपुराणालं-द्रवीशकृष्णानं-तैन ब्रह्मांद्रां युक्तः भक्तिभक्त: व्यियक्तक्षेत्रालं समुदायसहितस्य व्रतकृष्णानं कृष्णानुसारं दृश्यकृष्ण: समुदायसहितस्य। स्वयंप्रकृष्णानं-निश्चितमाचारं ग्रहणितम्। Iibid p. 3.
plays which were composed by his Guru - Gopacāyana,
Kāmakutūhala, Dārāvinodana, Tayanivihāya, etc. In the same
act, he says that his paramaguru, Mukunda was a great devotee
of Viṣṇu. All these details which occur in the manuscript,
go against Madhusūdana, the son of Pūṇḍaraśya, and
the disciple of Viśvesvara Sarasvatī, being the author of
the work. It may have been written by some other person,
named Madhusūdana.

Īśvarapratipattiprakāśa:

This work was brought to light by Mr. Ganapati Śastri
of Trivenḍrama in 1921. He, in his preface States that
the work has been composed by Madhusūdana, the author of
Siddhāntabindu. Prof. Modi and Mr. Divanji agree with him.
As I could not see this work, I am not in a position to
express my opinion.

Ātmabodhaṭṭikā:

Dr. R.L. Mitra's Notices of Sans. Ms. at No. 1677,
notes this work under the name of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.
The colophon of this manuscript States that it has been
composed by Madhusūdana. Miss. Abhyankara Śastri holds that
there is no doubt regarding this work, having been composed by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the author of 'Siddhāntabindu'. I have not been able to see this manuscript, and so cannot express any opinion regarding its authorship.

I have not been able to get any manuscript, nor could I get any further information about 'Vedastutiṭikā', 'Śāndilyaṭrāṭikā', 'Śastraśiddhantesṭikā', 'Jatādyāṣṭakṛti', 'Tattvacintāmānyalokakanṭakodāhāra', and Advaitamañjarī, except the names as noted by some scholars under the name of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.

However, not all, but some of the works, which are ascribed to Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, yield some internal evidence bearing upon the conclusion that they are the outcome of the same pen -

II) (i) Siddhāntabindu - a commentary on Śaṅkara’s Daśasloki
(ii) Advaitasiddhi. (iii) Advaitaratanaraksana (iv)
(v) Samkṣeṣaśārirakasārasaṃgrahatikā
(vi) Gudhārḍhatipīkā. - a commentary on Gītā.
(vii) Bhagavadbhaktirasāyaṇa (viii) Bhāgavata-Pratham-
śloka-Vyākhyā. (ix) Mahimnatotratikā (including Prasthānabhedā).
(II) The works which, though, they bear the names of Madhusūdana as their author, cannot with confidence be attributed to him are - (i) Harilīla Vyākhyā (ii) Ānandamandāskīni (iii) Ātmabodhāṭikā.

(III) The works which even when they bear the name of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, cannot be considered as his own works are - (i) Rājñāmpratibhodhah (ii) Kṛṣṇakutumālaḥ-Nātaka. (iii) Aṣṭavikṛtivivaraṇa.

(IV) And the works about which not a single piece of information has been available and hence which cannot be directly or indirectly considered to be his works are - (i) Vedastutiṭikā. (ii) Śāndilyastāṭraṇī (iii) Śāstrasiddhāntalesāṭikā. (iv) Tattvacintāmanyālokakṣaśa-koddhāra. (v) Jatādyāṣṭavikṛti. (vi) Advaitaśaṁjñārī.

Conclusion:

After a detailed discussion about the authorship of works attributed to Madhusūdana, truly or falsely, we can say that he must have achieved an established status and popularly owing to his power of expression style and judgement as evidenced in his works.
A rich developed, impartial philosophical attitude is found in the works of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. His works reveal him, not only as a staunch follower of the doctrine propounded by Śrīmad Śānkara-cārya, but also differs from Śāṅkara on several issues and boldly gives his own opinion. Of course, his courage in this regard is noteworthy, for the orthodox atmosphere in which he lived, was not quite favourable for the show of such courage. Because the hypnotic grip of Śāṅkara's ideas on the intellectuals of his age was tremendous.

His works reveal his most successful attempt to synthesis the religious and philosophic thoughts. The doctrines of Vedānta have been systematically developed by Upaniṣadic Quotations. So also the doctrine of bhakti has been propounded and established with the help of Quotations taken from Murtis. (The development of both - the Advaita philosophy and bhakti has reached its climax in his scholastly works.)

As a commentator, Madhusūdana's power of interpreting the text and revealing the hidden meaning is remarkable.
And as an author, his literary as well as intellectual excellences are of a high order. His contribution to Indian philosophy is outstanding. (We find in him a rare combination of a Vedantic philosopher and an ardent preacher of devotion.)