

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

TRADITIONAL *pāṇḍitya*, or scholarship acquired in the traditional Indian fashion, through intense study under the academic tutelage and personal nurture of an accomplished guru, is an ancient institution with a distinguished history. Sadly, it is practically extinct in modern India. Its decline is remarkably recent; it flourished in its full glory even in the 19th century, and traditionally trained scholars were numerous well into the 20th century. To a degree, the political changes that occurred in India during and after the 19th century contributed to this decline. Such changes caused the loss of many traditional sources of scholarly patronage, such as the numerous kings, princes, and feudal lords who had long been primary centres of political and economic power in India. These notables generally upheld the traditions of *rājadharmā*, or princely duties, which valued scholarly patronage highly.¹ Its subtleties, however, were entirely lost on the British overlords of India, who disdained such patronage as wasteful indulgence and focused instead on ensuring peace in their empire and on its efficient administration. To this end, they instituted a system of indirect rule, keeping in power numerous kings and princes to serve as the nominal rulers of their respective states. Happily, such rulers often continued their traditions of patronage [Ikegame 2007, Price 1996, Ramusack 2004]. As these traditional institutions diminished, however, scholars were increasingly forced to depend on erratic support from indifferent government institutions.

While the decline of traditional *pāṇḍitya* is a complex phenomenon, its proximal cause is surely the move to Western education, and away from traditional learning, by the last three generations of brāhmaṇa families.² These

¹*Rājadharmā*, as *dharmā*, defined the essence and meaning of kingship; the ruler's very legitimacy flowed from it. Its obligations, detailed even in the *Mahābhārata's Śāntiparvan*, lay beyond any sovereign immunity from laws. The manner of its practice by the king set the tenor of the times. See *Mahābhārata (Udyogaparvan 130.15)*: “*kālo vā kāraṇam rājño rāja vā kālakāraṇam | iti te samśayo mā bhūd rāja kāśya kāraṇam ||*” Also see Aiyangar [1941].

²This trend owes much to Thomas Babbington Macaulay's infamous Minute on Education persuading William Bentinck, then Governor General, to establish English as the sole medium of higher education in India [Sharp and Richey 1920]. Things may well have been different. Bentinck's action reversed the policies of his predecessor Warren Hastings, who saw far greater value in British administrators becoming familiar with Indian scholarship and traditions. Outstanding scholars like James Prinsep and Horace Wilson, themselves

latest heirs to an unbroken line of tradition reaching back four or more millennia would otherwise have been the standard bearers for this rich and venerable heritage of scholarship. Sadly, this break has inevitably resulted in the loss of connection not just with Sanskrit, in which are firmly embedded the roots of the rich scholarly values and traditions of India, but also with many subtle aspects and insights of Indian culture. Pollock [2009, 2008b] has even argued urgently that several millennia of accumulated scholarly heritage is at risk of becoming irrecoverably lost in the next generation or two, and that entire fields of Indian scholarship may already be defunct, or at best represented by one or two octagenarians.³ Compounding this decline are the many dominant actors in modern Indian politics who associate such scholarship with Brahminic traditions, with which they neither identify nor empathize. Uncertain, at best, are any prospects of governmental initiatives in India aimed at buttressing the walls of this crumbling edifice.

Dimmer still, are the prospects for such initiatives by Indian society at large, or by the brāhmana community, whose members stand justly accused of having frittered away their scholarly patrimony through utter neglect. Indifference to scholarship is widespread, whether in India or elsewhere, and such indifference would be no surprise in the absence of an intellectual tradition.⁴ Yet, among the brāhmanas, erstwhile custodians of the Indian

products of Hastings's policies, strongly opposed Macaulay, but to no avail. As Cutts [1953] shows, Macaulay's evangelical background had much to do with his antipathy to Indian scholarship and tradition. In his *Minute*, Macaulay derides Hinduism as a "false religion", Indian scholarship as "an incumbrance and blemish", and "useless", and proudly proclaims his ignorance of Sanskrit and Arabic. The irony of the contrast between this declared ignorance and the certitude of his judgments on the value of Indian learning appears to have been lost on him and his superiors.

³Aklujkar makes this same point [in Michaels 2001, p. 43]: "In 1992 Professor Robert O. Goldman came to India with a video camera with the intention of filming the pandits in action. When he asked me if I could suggest the names of some truly impressive pandits whom he could interview and capture on film, I could not come up with more than two or three names, all of them belonging to pandits close to or beyond their seventies! This may be due to my limited knowledge of traditional scholarship in India... It is also possible that the standard I was applying was too high... However, in view of what I hear from many of my knowledgeable colleagues, I am inclined to discount these possibilities. I consider it almost certain that a true pandit is now an extremely endangered species."

⁴There is a long-established and politically powerful tradition of anti-intellectualism in America, for example. Also see AAAS [2013], where the Humanities and Social Sciences Commission of the AAAS, the leading academy for these disciplines in the nation with the strongest economy in history, is obliged to make the case for a liberal education in economic terms, the only language that contemporary American society readily relates to.

scholarly tradition, it is common today for even the best-educated descendants of the finest scholars of just two generations ago to be entirely ignorant of their own scholarly heritage.⁵

This sudden decline in traditional Sanskrit scholarship presents a stark contrast to the remarkable flowering it witnessed between the 15th and 18th centuries C.E. This efflorescence brought about major innovations across a diverse collection of fields, including grammar, logic, literary theory, philosophy, and mathematics. The ideas and theories produced during this period are often judged as having been unprecedented in their quality and quantity (see, for example, Pollock [2001]).⁶

The precipitous decline of traditional *pāṇḍitya* that immediately followed hence presents a major paradox, and is the subject of much ongoing research.⁷ This institution, after all, had remained robust in the face of very adverse circumstances, such as a full millennium of Muslim rule. We can, however, point to some factors in the waning of traditional scholarship.

The 19th century is of exceptional significance in the intellectual history of India. During this time can clearly be seen the decline of traditional

⁵This is a dispiriting but common impediment faced by the intellectual historian. Sharma [1981, p. 545], for instance, laments after listing numerous scholars of *Navya Nyāya* logic: “The lack of historical material, for which the indifference of their descendants is not a little to blame, prevents a fuller account of these celebrities.” More direct is the distinguished *littérateur* Guṇḍappa [1970, v. 1, p. 25]: “The tradition of preserving biographical materials is rare among our people. Our worthies have failed to exert themselves to collect and preserve materials or memories relating to the lives of no small a number of preeminent and esteemed individuals. I can myself attest to having approached many notables, saying to them, ‘Your father was an illustrious man. I plan to write about him. I would be grateful for any relevant documents, letters, or notes in your possession,’ and on being told that no materials were available, coming away empty handed. I have been disappointed on many occasions. It is hard for us to obtain materials concerning even such luminaries as Sir T. Muttusvāmi Ayyar or Sir K. Śeṣādri Ayyar. Their very own descendants, who now enjoy the wealth bequeathed by these ancestors, show them little esteem. An interest in preserving the prestige and acclaim of forebears and filial piety both appear to be lacking among our people.”

⁶A small sample of the luminaries it produced would include Raghunātha Śiromaṇi and Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācārya in logic, Jagannātha Paṇḍita in literary theory, Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita and Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa in grammar, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in philosophy, and the astonishingly prolific Appayya Dikṣita. In mathematics, this flowering may have begun even by the 14th century, as the dates ascribed to the Keralite mathematician Mādhava of Saṅgamagrāma suggest, but this too was a tradition of excellence. It had, for example, obtained infinite series expansions of circular functions two centuries before the calculus was invented.

⁷See, for example, Pollock [2008a], Kaviraj [2005], and the “Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonization” project [Columbia 2001].

ways, and the wholesale intrusion of Western-style modernity into Indian society, and thence into the domain of scholarship. If we look specifically at the example of Maisūru, we see the classical traditions of *rājadharma* surviving more or less intact till 1868, the year of Kṛṣṇarāja Voḍeyar III's death. The British had allowed him free rein in such matters, but undertook a reorganization of his practices of scholarly and religious patronage upon his death. Perhaps for the first time, economic considerations overrode traditional criteria for royal patronage. Āmarāja Voḍeyar X, the successor, was given a Western-style education, and while he continued traditional patronage, under him began a process of economic and social transformation that reached its zenith under his son and successor Kṛṣṇarāja Voḍeyar IV. By the first quarter of the 20th century, Maisūru's social and economic fabric had been transformed, and with it, the traditions of learning and scholarship.

As the traditions of *rājadharma* declined, scholars lost not just their traditional sources of economic support, but more significantly, a major source of social status and prestige. Support of *pāṇḍitya* was a deeply held societal value, but high regard from the monarch for scholarship affirmed this value through his high-profile example.⁸ Patronage of *pāṇḍitas*, whose lives were dedicated to learning and *dhārmic* observances, flowed from the universal obligation to sustain *dharma*, which in turn sustained order and well-being in kingdom and society. This relationship between patron and *pāṇḍita*, however, was never transactional, since the *pāṇḍita*'s devotion to learning and observance arose from his own *dharma*, whose obligations he discharged regardless of patronage.⁹

In contrast, this relationship became entirely transactional with the British, who saw the *pāṇḍita* as economically unproductive, unless as teacher. Work for wages officially supplanted sustenance of *dharma*, and given policies that devalued traditional learning, such wages were always meagre. Traditional scholars lost both social and economic standing, which were now to be attained primarily through such means as Western education, knowledge of English, and government employment.¹⁰

⁸The greatest scholars were granted even the insignia of royalty. See footnotes 1 and 562.

⁹See page 167 and footnote 457 for an extraordinary instance of dedication to observance.

¹⁰See page 317: "*śāstrībhāvamapākṛtya mēstrībhāvamupākṛtaḥ*". Salaried work was essential in a cash economy. For cash's role in earlier times, see page 301. Western education brought wealth and prestige, and traditionalists fell behind. See page 315: Kāśīpati Śāstri was both a *pāṇḍita* and an engineer. Also see page 321. Such conflicts play out even to this day.

Their very devotion to learning may have nudged brāhmaṇas away from traditional *pāṇḍitya*, and even amplified their unfortunate indifference to their own intellectual heritage. Modern European thought arrived in India mature, its transition to scientific empiricism complete, and all the technical prowess it engendered on full display. Earlier invaders, such as Muslims, had learned more from Indian *pāṇḍitas* than they had taught them. In contrast, Western thought brought entirely new approaches to knowing, and offered new, secular, and practical knowledge. There was no equivalent in traditional *pāṇḍitya*.¹¹ With no doctrinal prohibitions standing in their way,¹² their scholarly traditions led brāhmaṇas inevitably to Western education.¹³

What they gained in the process is clear, but what they lost is less obvious. The loss of the traditions of debate and innovation integral to traditional scholarship, for instance, has resulted in a broad decline in the standards of all scholarly activity in contemporary India.¹⁴ This loss, sadly, is not

¹¹Though *Navya Nyāya*'s technical and analytical rigour far exceeded what the West then had to offer, its powerful tools had yet to be applied to understanding or mastering Nature.

¹²Even taboos on associating with those without caste were observed mostly in the personal and ritual spheres. High-caste Hindus had even long served in Muslim courts and armies. Dilemmas did arise, however, as with the incident involving J.G. Tait on page 318.

¹³The value of modern education was readily recognized even by some of the most traditional scholars. See the views expressed by Viśvēśvara Śāstri on page 320. At this time, western-educated scholars did not always abandon or look down upon traditional learning.

¹⁴The tradition of debate, which remained intact till quite recently, has long shaped Indian society's outlook and sensibilities. See Sen [2013]. Scholarly debates were consequential in public and popular culture. The laity often attended, drawn by interest, the event's import, or the social value of attendance; debates had prominent sponsors, such as kings, from *Upaniṣadic* times down to the 19th century. For examples, see pages 203, 218, 255, 316 of the present volume, and Ganeri [2012], who notes: "Public acts of reason were a defining feature of the intellectual world of ancient India." Also see Staal [2008, p. 185]: "If I were asked to point at the greatest contributions of the Upaniṣads and Vedānta... The first is public discussions and rational dialogues without restraints (e.g., 'political correctness')... In India, they continued to exist in religious contexts, at least until half a century ago in Kanchipuram, when I looked up at the leaders of the two main Viśiṣṭādvaita schools or sects, arguing with each other, high above me on elephant back and surrounded by throngs of followers. The name of one was Prativada Bhyāṅkaram, 'Terrible Refutation'. Logic and reason combined in one fantastic spectacle. What a lesson for the twenty-first century!" *Prativādi Bhayaṅkara* means "fearsome refuter of argument", and is typical of titles given to one who excels at scholarly debate. Staal surely witnessed a debate involving *Prativādi Bhayaṅkara* Aṅgaṅgarāçārya (1891–1983), a distinguished scholar and descendant of the 14th-century namesake *Śrīvaiṣṇava* scholar *Prativādi Bhayaṅkara* Aṅga, whose scholarly and dialectic reputation were so treasured that descendants have preserved the title as a family name for seven centuries.

just intellectual, but also deeply cultural. Indian tradition reveres scholars not merely as learned men, but as embodiments of certain moral and human ideals. The ascetic practices of the traditional Brahminic way of life and the strict discipline required for extensive mastery of a subject intersected in a traditional scholar, each complementing and contributing to the other's intensity.¹⁵ The highest measure of respect was thus paid to *vaidika* brāhmaṇas, who devoted themselves to scholarship and to upholding traditions, relying for sustenance on societal patronage or honoraria from students upon completing their studies.¹⁶ Indian society is the poorer for the decline of the true *paṇḍita*, who personified traditional ideals, living a life of the intellect, driven by precept and purity, and serving as a point of reference for the understanding and interpretation of these ideals.¹⁷ He was a visible and familiar exemplar of their meaning and attainability in practice.

Such lives are lived even now in India, but far less commonly than they were even fifty years ago. Practices, norms, and attitudes that were prevalent and widespread are now uncommon and unappreciated.¹⁸ The intellectual output of traditional scholars continues to be studied, and has indeed become more available than previously. However, relatively little material exists on the personal lives of such individuals, who were the very embodiments of scholarly, cultural, and societal traditions. Their lives are rich in reference markers that help understand transformations in these traditions.

¹⁵This point is elaborated by Michaels [2001, p. 3]: “The functions of a pandit in the traditional sense are manifold. He is a scholar, teacher, adviser, spiritual master, specialist, and legal expert. He is a symbol of purity and identity for Sanskrit scholarship. . . . In India, it is believed that a traditional pandit should have a deep commitment to learning and teaching, a special charisma, and sometimes even a sectarian initiation (*dīkṣā*. . .) . . . a pandit quite often has an ascetic way of life, with restraints on food or sexual relations aiming at a balance between knowledge and personality similar to the life of holy men. . . .”

¹⁶See footnotes 73 and 75. An illustration of society's commitment to the patronage of *vaidika* brāhmaṇas appears on page 323.

¹⁷See page 297ff. for an account of the lives of *vaidikas* and how they discharged these roles in society. At a deeper level, society had long relied on *paṇḍitas*, whether as individuals or as councils, to set norms and resolve controversies involving subtler points of both custom and *dharma*, the understanding and practice of which was seen as integral to *paṇḍitya*. For recent examples, see the account of the Tiruvāḍi council on page 320, and Gode [1956, p. 19], who records a caste dispute at the time of Pēśva Bāji Rao II resolved by a scholarly council. The title of *Dharmādhikāri* was often given to the most distinguished scholars.

¹⁸For instance, references to various subtle aspects of the Indian world-view appear frequently in the Sanskrit quotations within these biographies. The educated reader of the time was clearly assumed to be capable of understanding them in their original context, and appreciating the various associated subtleties. That assumption would not be valid today.

The biographies in this volume are about a century old, and were written precisely to provide such signposts. Their subjects are three of the finest scholars of the time, representing exceptional examples of traditional *pāṇḍ-itya*. These works also yield valuable insights into contemporary society and into the traditions of royal patronage in 19th-century Mysore, whose kings emerged as the greatest patrons of the arts and scholarship in India following the decline of the Marāthas, and after four decades of diminished patronage during the usurpation by Haider 'Ali and his son Ṭippu.

If an understanding of scholarly lives was important a hundred years ago, it is surely even more so today, given our greater remove from the tradition. Scholarly activity is a cultural process; its vitality derives from cultural and societal context. The dynamics of scholarly activity, however, are not discernible in its end products. There are even fields (grammar and logic, say, in our context), where the scholarly end product must be cast in culturally inert terms. A scholar's legacy can hence be impersonal and static, and open to imputations of cause long after the fact. Motivations aside, such imputations are dangerous to make in the absence of proper context, which of course, our modern sensibilities and perspectives could never provide.

For instance, the lively ongoing debate in India on its cultural and scholarly heritage and what it means to be Indian is not always well-informed by historical context, not least because Indian tradition has long been oblivious to its value, and indifferent to its preservation.¹⁹ The Indian and Western intellectual traditions are both deeply indebted to classical thought.²⁰ The intellectual self-confidence of the West, however, does not obtain from an effort to reach back to these ancients, but from a sense of connection to intellectual antecedents of the proximate past, a recognition among intellectuals that many of the greatest figures of their tradition lived within just

¹⁹See footnotes 5 and 6. The resulting disconnect from historical context may well underlie the anxieties discernible in this debate. It is the disconnect with the recent, rather than the remote past, that may be the cause of greater detriment; it leaves the false impression that the glories of the Indian intellectual tradition largely belong to the distant past, promoting a sense of enduring injustice and insecurity on the one side, and disdain on the other. On the other hand, a knowledge of the major achievements of the proximate past would reassure, illuminate, and quicken a sense of agency. It would pave the way for a more dispassionate and analytical understanding of how the Indian intellectual tradition has evolved.

²⁰Consider, for instance, the famous quote from Whitehead [1978]: "The safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato." The high regard in India for ancient learning, of course, needs no repeating.

the last six hundred years, and a sense of pride and privilege in keeping this tradition alive.²¹ The past is within easy reach. The context for interpreting text and tradition has been painstakingly preserved and elucidated.

Some of the very greatest figures in the Indian intellectual tradition too, flourished in the immediate past. Just a couple of generations ago, Indian scholars enjoyed the same sense of connection to their intellectual forebears as do modern Western scholars. Moreover, the Indian tradition, unlike that of the West, represented a continuum of intellectual heritage, reaching back to the most ancient of times. Recent forebears of the tradition embodied ancient traditions not just in spirit, but even in the specifics. Scholars surely derived great intellectual assurance from being rooted in an ancient tradition whose scholarly accomplishments were on par with those of any other.

Today, this sense of connection or proximity to this tradition seems to have been lost. We live, as it were, on the wrong side of a high wall dividing us from this precious intellectual heritage. Over the top of this wall, we may catch glimpses of towering but distant peaks, the presumed abode of the mighty ancients. Nothing is visible of what lies just across the wall, however, except to those who would exert themselves to scale it.²²

Many do succeed in this effort, but the loudest and most strident voices in the debate alluded to above, so full of sound and fury, often belong to those who appear to just discount the possibility of much value lying across this metaphorical wall, and to others who make extravagant claims based on

²¹Whitehead [1925] observes the following of the 17th century, a remarkable epoch in the intellectual history of the West: "A brief, and sufficiently accurate, description of the intellectual life of the European races during the succeeding two centuries and a quarter up to our own times is that they have been living on the accumulated capital of ideas provided for them by the genius of the seventeenth century."

²²Scaling this wall involves no small effort. Pollock [2001] observes: "The first and foremost problem is the complexity of the discourses themselves that they produced. In idiom and subject matter, these surely represent some of the most sophisticated and refined known to human history. And this complexity is redoubled by the fact that the seventeenth-century intellectuals were the legatees of two millennia of brilliant thought, whose most important representatives, from the earliest among them onward, always remained partners in argument. Understanding anything later, therefore, always presupposes understanding everything earlier. A second obstacle pertains to the greater social world within which these discourses were produced, and, more particularly, to the relationship between them and other forms of intellectual production, whether Persianate or vernacular. For most of the key thinkers in question, we are confronted with what is virtually a total absence of contextuality. In many cases not a shred of documentary evidence is available to help us give life to their writings, which we can only vaguely situate in time and place..."

fanciful reconstructions of a venerable but inaccessible past atop those remote peaks. One side may suffer from a lack of imagination and the other from a surfeit of it, but more information would surely be helpful everywhere.²³ Fortunately, just across the wall lies a wealth of textual artifacts, whose exploration can reveal much about who we are and how we got here.

Such philological explorations are most meaningful if done by the light of proper historical, social, and intellectual context. Well-documented biographies of individuals defining historical, social, and intellectual traditions can provide some of this missing context. Their importance goes far beyond their value to scholars. They can contribute to the evolution of a nation's self-image by informing ongoing debate.

Such considerations apply beyond societal discourse; indeed, our argument elicits resonant echoes within the domain of scholarship. Humanist scholarship is centrally the project of placing ideas into context to foster their fuller understanding.²⁴ Theory defines the terms of discourse, methods, and vocabulary. When scholarship applies these tools, it is always with context as backdrop, the frame of reference within which all is measured and all meaning construed.

The value of context is well illustrated for the domain of political philosophy by work such as that of Skinner [2002], which approaches textual artifacts as illocutory interventions in a contemporaneous debate or polemic. This approach is hard to apply to Indian texts, however, since societal and individual context are entirely absent from Indian texts [Pollock 2001]. Not only is biographical information uniformly lacking in the original texts, it is missing even from the extensive corpus of commentaries.

²³Uninformed contention is rejected in Indian tradition, which used sophisticated systems for logic and debate. See Ganeri [2012] for a discussion. In Europe, thinkers of the 17th century, such as Bacon and Descartes, clarified empiricism's role in scientific thought, set modern science apart from traditional philosophy, and led Western ideas away from the Renaissance's nostalgia, even reverence, for classical antiquity. In Indian tradition too, high esteem for innovation overrides regard for the ancients. Thus, of the revered *munitraya* of grammar—Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali—precedence goes to Patañjali, the most recent, a trend continued with later figures such as Bhartṛhari, down to Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita and Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa of the 17th and 18th centuries. *Navya Nyāya* too bestows greater regard on later innovators, whose work supercedes that of predecessors. Given Indian thought's openness to foreign ideas, and its vigour till the 18th century, it is fair to ask if the Indian intellectual tradition too might have led major innovations in thought in recent times, had it not squandered precisely the sort of accumulated intellectual capital Whitehead refers to in footnote 21.

²⁴At least, so it seems to me. I trust this will not be seen as a controversial position.

Some have therefore suggested a shift of focus to the extraordinary wealth of available textual material, arguing that when authors deliberately omit autobiographical, social, and political context to avoid distracting from their intended illocutionary acts, conclusions drawn from these omissions are valid even in Skinnerian terms, and suggest inter-textual analysis as a partial solution to these difficulties [Ganeri 2008]. Such alternatives, however, are no substitutes for context derived from primary source material. Others have thus called for more biographies of Indian scholars to be brought to light, perhaps as translations from vernaculars [Minkowski 2014].

The needs of scholars aside, a greater availability of such biographies in languages other than those of the originals would be of value to Indian society, and even to the descendants of these scholars. M.S. Puṭṭaṇṇa, even in his 1910 biography of Kuṇigala Rāmaśāstri (see page 163) laments the lack of such biographies, and the consequent inability of Indian society to view itself in the context of its own accomplishments.

I was therefore excited to receive a biography of Sōsale Garaḷapurī Śāstri, a leading 19th-century scholar of literature in the kingdom of Maisūru, from his great-granddaughter Sarōjā Veṅkaṭarām, who had obtained it through her brother, S.R. Śivasvāmi. This work is a detailed narrative of Garaḷapurī Śāstri's life and contains the family's own account of its antecedents and history. Its information comes directly from Garaḷapurī Śāstri's son Ayyā Śāstri, himself a great scholar, and the last family member to have had close associations with Sōsale, home to his ancestors for four generations.

I spent four very fulfilling days in Mysore (Dec. 24–Dec. 27, 2008), two of them sorting through a disorganized and musty pile of manuscripts and books belonging to Garaḷapurī Śāstri and Ayyā Śāstri, restoring some order to the collection.²⁵ As far as I know, these materials had lain in neglect for around seven or eight decades. Kavitāvilāsa, the house Ayyā Śāstri and his descendants had lived in since 1894, had recently been demolished and replaced with commercial property. Ayyā Śāstri's books and manuscripts had been put away in a steel closet. Time and neglect had taken their toll, but I was able to locate and identify many manuscripts in Garaḷapurī Śāstri's

²⁵This was possible due to the help of the late Mr S.K. Dwarki, whose father Sōsale Kṛṣṇasvāmi Śāstri was the second of Ayyā Śāstri's sons. See footnote 780.



(a) Maitiru Suryanarayanaiahtha Puttanna. (1854–1930).



(b) Āmarājanagara Venkataramaṇa Śāstri (1888–1945).
Image courtesy Mr C.R. Venkataramu.

Plate 1: Portraits of M.S. Puṭṭanna and Āmarājanagara Venkataramaṇa Śāstri

meticulous, calligraphic hand. I was unable to complete my task of cataloguing the manuscripts before my departure, but they were stored in plastic bags, preliminary to their fuller rehabilitation.

Immediately thereafter, they entered into the possession of Ayyā Śāstri's great-grandson Mr Sandeep Sastry, whose father Mr S.K. Dwarki inherited Kavitāvilāsa. Access to these materials has since not been possible. At the time, Mr Sandeep Sastry indicated his intention to digitize these documents. Hopefully, these efforts will proceed before too many more years, to ensure the preservation and accessibility of these precious documents.

I was also fortunate to have obtained manuscripts of Ayyā Śāstri's will and a genealogy, both in Ayyā Śāstri's own hand, from his grandson Mr S.R. Śivasvāmi. In his will, Ayyā Śāstri made the care, maintenance, and propagation of the books and manuscripts he left behind in Kavitāvilāsa, and the body of work they represent, a common charge for the family, not designating any one person as their custodian. I see my work as constituting substantial headway in this direction. I have found immense satisfaction in having rendered this small service in fulfillment of the intentions of a great scholar, a simple act that had sadly been overdue for three generations.

My original purpose had been to undertake a straightforward translation of Garaḷapurī Śāstri's biography, to make it more widely available as a record of a scholarly life, and provide some insight into the ways of those times, including a glimpse of life at the Mysore Royal Court. I later added the biographies of Śrīkaṇṭha Śāstri and Kuṇigala Rāmaśāstri, which have served to round out the original biography of Garaḷapurī Śāstri. This trilogy covers three of the leading scholarly disciplines of the time, namely, literature, grammar, and logic.

I also included a handful of excerpts from D.V. Guṇḍappa's *Jñāpaka Citrasāle*, a priceless collection of short biographies and reminiscences by an outstanding *littérateur* who seemed to know everyone who mattered in the nearly nine decades of his life. These excerpts bring us into the first half of the 20th century, a time when traditional and modern mores coexisted, and highlight some contradictions and challenges traditional scholars confronted in a society looking increasingly to Western education and norms.

The biographies in this volume are also works of literary significance. M.S. Puṭṭaṇṇa's biography of Kuṇigala Rāmaśāstri was the first major biographical work in Kannaḍa, and became the model for many later works,

including the two by Veṅkaṭaramaṇa Śāstri that appear here. These three works have served as primary source material for almost everything that has since been written about their subjects, and about many topics relating to the period. Puṭṭaṇṇa was a major literary figure of the time, and the author of numerous literary and historical works. He had excellent facility in Kannaḍa, English, Marāṭhi, Hindi, Urdu, Telugu, and Sanskrit. His deep knowledge of and respect for Indian tradition clearly shows through in his work. Yet, his outlook was thoroughly modern. He held a B.A. in logic and political science earned in 1885, and brought a Western analytical sensibility to his work.²⁶

Veṅkaṭaramaṇa Śāstri's literary stature may be lower, but his contributions to the cause of Kannaḍa are substantial. Even in the face of crippling adversity, he maintained publication of his *Kādambarī Saṅgraha Granthamālā* series, in which appeared many novels, literary works, and biographies, much of which was his own work. He is also known to have often printed material himself, page by grueling page, on a manual press he maintained at home.²⁷ Sadly, the *Kādambarī Saṅgraha* series survives only in fragments. What survives, however, is now invaluable.

My work has gone considerably beyond my original purpose. In its course, I have interpolated many details missing from the source texts, and supplied footnotes to help readers relate to these events of a long time ago. What was evident to the educated reader a hundred years ago may not be so evident today. Some footnotes provide dates for the events described, as reliable dates are sparse in the original biographies. Other footnotes of

²⁶Puṭṭaṇṇa also had enormous administrative experience, having served as *Amaldār* in the *tālūks* of Nelamaṅgala, Bāgēpalli, Čamarājanagara, Muḷabāgilu, and Hosadurga. He was notoriously independent-minded, and insisted that he himself and others around him observe strict norms of propriety and rectitude in all matters, meticulously avoiding even the appearance of wrongdoing. See Sujātā [2001] for a list of episodes illustrating this point. In one case, as *Amaldār*, he summoned to court and levied a fine of Re. 1 on his own wife for taking a few curry leaves (*Murraya koenigii*) from a tree in an adjacent yard to season her cooking. The neighbouring house had been vacant, but had belonged to the government, so she was technically guilty of misappropriating public property. Since the summons had been urgent, she had arrived with no money on her person. As the administrative officer who had levied the fine, and who was still on duty, he did not give her the money to pay the fine. She was obliged to borrow money from her household servants, who were later reimbursed by Puṭṭaṇṇa.

²⁷See the reference to "our own" Bhuvanēśvarī Press on page 73. A press by the name of Śrikanṭhēśvara Press still operates out of the home where he lived.

mine provide cultural, geographic, and historical context, or correct errors in the original, of which there are a few. The footnotes are almost exclusively mine, but I have been careful to distinguish between my footnotes and those appearing in the source texts. I have presumed little cultural or contextual knowledge on the reader's part, so some annotations may seem superfluous to those who have such knowledge. Placing annotations in endnotes would have maintained the narrative flow of the originals, but would have made the annotations accessible only through a substantial amount of page-turning. Since I do expect these annotations to be frequently used, I have chosen to make them footnotes instead. Whimsically, I note that this approach is not so alien to the Indian tradition. A traditional Indian *vyākhyā* or gloss also tracks its source page by page, and is presented directly below it, precisely as I have done with my footnotes.

The images appearing in this volume should provide additional context with regard to the individuals and situations described. Of these, only Plates 10 and 34 appear in the originals. Some of the others may have already appeared elsewhere, but it is likely that many appear here for the first time.

I have supplied dates for most of the significant events described in the source texts, placing them within boxes inset next to margins. Some of these dates are derived from the source texts, but most are based on inferences from contextual material I have discovered inside and outside these texts.

The genealogical document by Ayyā Śāstri was of special interest, as it records the memory of the migration of a scholarly family after a watershed event in South Indian history. I have examined this account in some detail, as such migrations are of intrinsic interest to intellectual historians as means and markers for the flow of ideas (see Datta [1989], for example). The stories of many such migrations are preserved in family folklore, but are hard to verify. I have found, not surprisingly, that the context for this family's move was likely different from that handed down by its oral history.

I have tried to preserve the style, sentence structure, and wherever possible, word meanings of the Kannaḍa sources. Such fidelity to the original is atypical in translations, but I have chosen to respect the originals as source material. These are almost contemporaneous accounts; Śrikaṇṭha Śāstri's biography is a first-hand account by the biographer, and in the other cases, the informants had intimate and first-hand knowledge of the subjects of the biographies.

From a literary standpoint as well, I hope such fidelity will convey to the modern reader a sense of the sometimes archaic style of the Kannaḍa originals. Puṭṭaṇṇa's is the easier and more direct style; despite the breadth of his erudition, he valued simplicity. He was also an independent thinker, and among the first Kannaḍa authors to make contemporary issues central to his novels and other works. Veṅkaṭaramaṇa Śāstri's skills as a writer are evident from his fluent and moving biography of Ćamarājanagara Śrīkaṇṭha Śāstri. His biography of Garaḷapurī Śāstri, however, is in a less even style, often switching its thematic horses midstream, and mixing short sentences with others running the entire length of a paragraph. These elaborate sentences are strung out across a scaffolding of gerunds, a style that creates a certain sense of flow in the formal, highly inflected and Sanskritized Kannaḍa of the original. In English, sadly, it comes across as stilted and ungainly. My attempts to preserve the textures of the originals have no doubt come at the cost of readability.

Preserving the character of the original has also meant retaining inconsistencies that arise naturally in the source texts, which were composed at various times by various individuals. While consistency is desirable, I have chosen to pay more regard to the voice of the source than to the stylistic sensibilities of the modern reader. Imposing an artificial uniformity also risks censoring the source writer's intent. For instance, one sees "Maisūru" and "Mahisūru" within a single original biography. "Mahisūru" is correct but more archaic, but the speaker in this case being an older person, this usage may reflect a generational variant that the source was trying to preserve. English sources frequently use anglicized forms ("Bangalore") that are inconsistent with the forms appearing in Kannaḍa sources ("Beṅgaḷūru"). Differences between Kannaḍa and Sanskrit phonology (see page xxxiii) also result in variant transliterations for the same word. Thus, we see *ēkō* and *eko*, *ślōka* and *śloka*, *maṅgaḷa* and *maṅgala*, and so on. Indian proper names may also have context-dependent spellings. The Kannaḍa original, for instance, refers to a *Dīvān* Sūrappa, but a footnote references a street in Bangalore, surely named for this same individual, but spelled "Dewan Surappa Street", causing an apparent inconsistency. I have preserved the original spellings when quoting sources in footnotes. For example, while I use "Rāv" in both the main text and the footnotes, variants spellings, such as "Rao", "Rāo", or "Ráo" may appear within a quote, depending on the source quoted. In

some cases, imposing uniformity may even risk altering meanings. For instance, variants such as *tāluk*, *tāluka*, and *tāllūk* appear in the source to refer to administrative zones, reflecting local usage. Insisting on uniformity would require me to decree a standard. But what standard? The term had different meanings at different times and places. Substituting some modern equivalent would be as misleading as reverting to the Arabic original *t'alluqa*, which referred in Mughal times to a certain type of land tenure.

With me rests the blame for any shortcomings in the typesetting of this book and the compilation of the index; both have been the result of my own modest efforts, with the versatile yet inconstant L^AT_EX at my side.²⁸ I have relished the pleasure of its company when it has been compliant, as well as the triumph of bending it to my will when it has chosen intransigence. The index, especially, falls well short of the standards I had hoped to achieve, but I hope readers will at least find it serviceable. Building a better index is a task I have chosen to defer to the future.

Finding a humanist font suitable for this work turned out to be harder than I had expected; commercial fonts do not typically support the profusion of diacritical signs needed to accommodate the several languages encountered herein. I finally compromised on Georg Duffner's EB Garamond interpretation of the classic Garamond font. Although this font is still under development, it is based on the Egenolff-Berner typography specimen, and at least to my eye, has succeeded in retaining an old-world feel that suits the archaic feel of the language of the originals.

The effort involved in this work has been rather greater than I had anticipated, and not merely due to my professional responsibilities. I have lacked access to much of the material I have required, whether manuscripts in the family's possession, government records, authoritative historical sources, or frequently, standard bibliographic material. Such frustrations notwithstanding, I have greatly enjoyed this modest foray into new territory.

Despite all efforts to correct mistakes in this book, many surely remain. I am responsible for all errors. I would be grateful to all who trouble themselves to bring these errors to my notice.

Irvine, CA, U.S.A.

July 5, 2018

²⁸Subject, of course, to the publisher's specifications and requirements.

TRANSLITERATION AND PUNCTUATION CONVENTIONS

THE transliterations in this volume use a variant of IAST, as shown in Plate 2. The language of the source biographies is modern Kannaḍa, whose phonology includes the long vowels *ē* and *ō* and the retroflex consonant *ḷ*, all absent in *Saṁskṛta*. Old Kannaḍa also had two other consonants, shown as *ṛ* and *ṣ* in Plate 2, which no longer appear in Kannaḍa speech, but survived in the written language till recently. Words in which they appeared are now written using *r* or *l*, and pronounced accordingly.²⁹ The Kannaḍa of these biographies does not use them, but *ṛ* makes an appearance on page 365 within a quotation from an archaic source, and *ṣ* appears in Tamiḻ words.³⁰ Both *ḷ* and *ḻ* are *Saṁskṛta* borrowings, and appear as diacritics in Devanāgarī and other Indic scripts. They are rare (indeed, even in *Saṁskṛta*), and needed in only a couple of places within this volume.³¹ *Varṇamālā* charts such as that shown in Plate 2 customarily omit the proliferation of conjunct digraphs and trigraphs commonly seen in Indic scripts.

Saṁskṛta words are pronounced, and by convention, written to match Kannaḍa phonology, distinguishing *e* from *ē*, *o* from *ō*, and often changing the alveolar *l* to the retroflex *ḷ* (thus, *naḷinīḍaḷa*, not *nalinīḍala*). I have hence tried to stay faithful to the originals in my transliterations.

My use of *ç* in place of *c* for the first of the palatal consonants is non-standard, but is motivated by my observation that non-specialists had difficulty reading *c* correctly, tending from habit to associate it with either the *k* sound or the *s* sound. The eye does not read letter by letter, but takes in entire words at a time, particularly in the case of Roman orthography. I was persuaded that *cāmara* was rather more likely to evoke photographic associations than *çāmara*, and *caṇḍī* more likely to evoke confectionery than *çanḍī*. I will regard this liberty as justified if it spares the reader a moment's perplexity upon reading that Kuṇigala Rāmaśāstri took along on his travels in 1840 a *cāmara* he was given by Kṛṣṇarāja Voḍeyar III (see page 213).

²⁹The common Kannaḍa words *hēru* (“carry, raise up”) and *hēḷu* (“speak, narrate”), for example, are in fact *hēru* and *hēḷu*, respectively.

³⁰We will write Tamiḻ instead of the more conventional but less accurate Tamiḷ.

³¹In one case, the Kannaḍa source is content to simply write *klupta* in place of *kḷpta*. I have reverted to the *Saṁskṛta* form since the phrase is a definition from *Navya Nyāya*.

<i>a</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ī</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>ū</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r̄</i>	<i>ḷ</i>	<i>ḷ̣</i>	}	
ಅ	ಆ	ಇ	ಈ	ಉ	ಊ	ಋ	ೠ	ಲ̣	ಲ̣̣		
अ	आ	इ	ई	उ	ऊ	ऋ	ॠ	ल	ल्ल	}	
ಎ	ಛ	ಐ	ಒ	ಓ	ಔ	ಠಂ	ಠಃ	ಱ	ಱಃ		
ए		ऐ	ओ		औ	अं	अः	ऽ	ऽ	}	
<i>k</i>	<i>kh</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>gh</i>	<i>ñ</i>	}						
ಕ	ಖ	ಗ	ಘ	ಙ							
क	ख	ग	घ	ङ	}						
<i>ç</i>	<i>ch</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>jh</i>	<i>ñ</i>	}						
ಚ	ಛ	ಜ	ಝ	ಞ							
च	छ	ज	झ	ञ	}						
<i>t</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>dh</i>	<i>n</i>	}						
ಟ	ಠ	ಡ	ಢ	ಣ							
ट <td>ठ</td> <td>ड</td> <td>ढ</td> <td>ण</td> <td rowspan="2">}</td>	ठ	ड	ढ	ण	}						
<i>t</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>dh</i>	<i>n</i>	}						
ತ	ಠ	ದ	ಢ	ನ							
त	थ	द	ध	न	}						
<i>p</i>	<i>ph</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>bb</i>	<i>m</i>	}						
ಪ	ಫ	ಬ	ಭ	ಮ							
प	फ	ब	भ	म	}						
<i>y</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r̄</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>ś</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>!</i>	<i>z</i>	}
ಯ	ರ	ಠ	ಲ	ಲ	ಶ	ಷ	ಸ	ಹ	ಛ	ಝ	
य	र		ल	व	श	ष	स	ह	छ	झ	}
<i>q</i>	<i>kh</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>‘a</i>	}						
ಕ	ಖ	ಜ	ಜ	ಆ							
ق	خ	ز	ض	ع	}						
क	ख	ज	ज	अ							

Plate 2: Transliteration equivalents in Roman, Indic, and Arabic scripts. The column corresponding to *z* shows Kannada and Tamiz equivalents.

I have stayed faithful to the original Kannaḍa in my transliterations, but have made a few concessions to convention, the most conspicuous being my use of “Voḍeyar” instead of the more accurate “Oḍeyaru”.³²

In the translated text, I follow the English convention of using initial capitals for proper nouns, regardless of their source language. I do not use capitals in sentences or phrases quoted in the original Sanskrit or vernacular. I italicise Sanskrit and vernacular words and expressions which are not typically used in English, the names of books and other works, as well as formal titles or ranks. I do not italicize Anglicised versions of Indian words, such as “Sanskrit” (but would italicise *Sam̐skṛta*), or proper nouns constituted from Sanskrit or vernacular words. Thus, I write “Parakāla Maṭha”, since this is the actual name of the institution, making it identifiable without the constituent words having to be interpreted, but would write “Sōsale *maṭha*”, since this is a reference to a *maṭha* qualified by its location in Sōsale. Its actual name, of course, would be written as “Sōsale Vyāsarāya Maṭha”. Apparent anomalies should resolve upon further analysis. The proper name Śrīnivāsācārya, for instance, would appear in Roman with an initial capital, but this individual may also be referenced as *Ācārya*, where the first part of the name has been elided. This form would take both italics and an initial capital, since Śrīnivāsācārya is just the compound Śrīnivāsa-Ācārya, which is the semantic equivalent of *Ācārya* Śrīnivāsa, in English. It is now apparent that the word *Ācārya* is a title or honorific.

The following honorifics commonly used in Karnāṭaka appear in abbreviated form in the original sources; I have retained their abbreviated forms in the translations: *Ma*|| abbreviates *Mahārājaśrī*, *Vē*|| abbreviates *Vēdabrahma* (or *Vēdamūrti*), *Br*|| abbreviates *Brahmaśrī*, *Gau*|| abbreviates *Gauravānvita*, and *Sau*|| abbreviates *Saubhāgyavati*.

PUNCTUATION CONVENTIONS

Most (but not all) Sanskrit verses in this volume have been punctuated as an aid to the non-expert but interested reader. Sanskrit is traditionally written not as a sequence of words, but as a euphonic cascade of the syllables constituting these words. The language has mandatory *saṁyoga*, *saṁhitā*, and

³²In Kannaḍa, “Oḍeyaru” is the respectful plural form of “Oḍeya”, which means “lord” or “master”. The forms “Voḍeyar” and “Oḍeyar” may betray the influence of Tamiz, which would use “Oḍeyar” as the respectful plural of the singular “Oḍeyan”.

sandhi rules of euphony which may conjoin adjacent words and transmute the syllables at their boundaries, making it hard to identify the words.³³ A framework of *samāsa* compounds commonly overlays this substructure, whether in prose or poetry.³⁴ Parsing Sanskrit requires practice and sound knowledge of the language.

Our punctuation conventions are as follows. Interpuncts (centred dots) separate the words within *samāsa* compounds. An apostrophe appearing in a Sanskrit phrase marks either a *sandhi* that has caused a phonological transformation of adjacent syllables, or a *saṃyoga* or *sambhitā* that has merged adjacent words with no concomitant phonological transformation. As an example, what might have conventionally been written as

naliniḍalagatajalamatitaralaṃ tadvajjīvitamatisayaçapalaṃ

would appear with punctuation as

naliniḍala.gata.jalam`ati.taralam tadvaj`jīvitam`atisaya.çapalam

Here, the words constituting the two *samāsas* “*naliniḍala.gata.jalam*” and “*ati.taralam*” are separated by interpuncts. The first apostrophe marks a *sambhitā* between these *samāsas*, and the second marks the *sandhi* between “*tadvat*” and “*jīvitam*”, which has changed the final *t* of “*tadvat*” to *j*.

An underscore _ marks an *avagraha*, the euphonic elision of an initial *a* sound. For example, a *sandhi* between the words *saḥ* and *aham* would change *saḥ* to *so* and elide the initial *a* of *aham*, thereby introducing an *avagraha*, so that this *sandhi* would be rendered as *so_ ham*.

³³Interestingly, despite the central importance of *sandhi* rules, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* does not use the term *sandhi*; it elaborates *sandhi* rules as operational considerations within *sambhitā* instances. See *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 1.1.7: “*balō_nantarāḥsamyoga*” (adjacent consonants constitute *saṃyoga*), *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 1.4.109: “*paraḥ sannikarṣa sambhitā*” (*sambhitā* is maximal proximity), and sections designated “*sambhitāyām*”, namely 6.1.72–157, 6.3.114–139, and 8.2.108.

³⁴*Saṃskṛta* poetry, especially, revels in constructions that permit multiple meanings to be construed by grouping or associating syllabic sequences in different ways. This is not mere gimmickry but subtle art; skilled practitioners use this device in very sophisticated ways to add depth and dimension to their compositions. A number of poetic examples appear following page 55. A rather playful example appears on page 61: “*pramadōrasikāśṣētē*”. By *sandhi* rules, this may be parsed either as “*pramadā_urasi kaḥ śētē*” or as “*pramadaḥ rasikaḥ śētē*”, to get two meanings, the first of which is a question, and the other its answer.