

2 An historical overview of the Mādhva–Advaita debate

The *Nyāyāmṛta* was the first of Vyāsātīrtha's three major works, and it proved to be his most influential. Scores of commentaries were written on the text by leading Mādhva and Advaitin intellectuals, and the contents of the *Nyāyāmṛta* along with the *Tātparyacandrikā* laid the basis for Mādhva critiques of their Advaitin and Viśiṣṭādvaitin competitors in South India. After Vyāsātīrtha's death, networks of Mādhva scholars based throughout South India wrote commentaries on his works and tried to reconcile his often innovative philosophical theories with the works of Madhva and Jāyīrtha.

During the last forty years of Vyāsātīrtha's life, the Vijayanagara Empire was at the height of its military influence and cultural life. Vyāsātīrtha's work helped to carve out a central role for the Mādhvas in the Empire. In the early decades of the sixteenth century, the Mādhva school went from being a relatively obscure tradition based in South Kanara to a leading political force in the Vijayanagara Empire. Vyāsātīrtha enjoyed a close relationship with the emperors of the Tuḷuva dynasty of Vijayanagara, and he was able to expand the resources and influence of the Mādhva tradition considerably during this period. After his death, the Mādhva religion spread across South India, and communities were converted to the Mādhva faith as far north as Bihar. Vyāsātīrtha's arguments against the Advaita and Viśiṣṭādvaita traditions laid the intellectual basis for the Mādhva critique of these traditions as they debated one another in the South Indian polities that emerged after the Vijayanagara Empire went into decline in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Vyāsātīrtha's life is well documented in numerous epigraphical and biographical sources. These supply a rich historical context to the composition of the *Nyāyāmṛta*. Valerie Stoker (2016) has studied the connections of these sources with the philosophical arguments of the *Nyāyāmṛta*, showing how Vyāsātīrtha's philosophical project was entangled with his political interactions with the Mādhvas' Advaitin and Viśiṣṭādvaitin competitors at the Vijayanagara court. My purpose here is simply to give an overview of what is known about Vyāsātīrtha's life in order to give some historical and intellectual context to the *Nyāyāmṛta* as well as its commentaries. This chapter also gives some biographical details for the major thinkers from the Mādhva and Advaita traditions who feature in the present volume.

I begin with an overview of what is known about the interactions between Mādhva and Advaitin philosophers prior to Vyāsātīrtha's lifetime, and then go on to sketch the historical situation in which the *Nyāyāmṛta* was written. I then discuss what is known about the composition of the early Mādhva commentaries on the *Nyāyāmṛta* and their authors, before examining how Vyāsātīrtha's work came to

be studied and sometimes silently reused by Advaitin philosophers. I have left the discussion of the history of Vyāsātīrtha's engagement with Gaṅgeśa and the Navya-Naiyāyikas to Chapter 7, where I present a study of Gaṅgeśa's impact on the *Nyāyāmṛta*.

2.1 The Mādhva critique of Advaita philosophy before Vyāsātīrtha

By the time Vyāsātīrtha was writing in the sixteenth century, Mādhva philosophers had been composing critiques of the classical Advaitins for over two hundred years. Vyāsātīrtha's critique of Advaita philosophy in the *Nyāyāmṛta* draws deeply on this history of Mādhva polemics against the Advaitins. Besides his own direct teachers, Vyāsātīrtha identifies Madhva and Madhva's leading commentator Jayatīrtha as his main intellectual influences in the Mādhva tradition.¹

As a student, Vyāsātīrtha studied Madhva's works and Jayatīrtha's commentaries with his intellectual preceptor, Śrīpādarāja. It seems likely that his earliest works were the commentaries he wrote on Jayatīrtha's explanations of four of Madhva's polemical treatises. Several dates have been proposed for Madhva's lifetime, but the most widely accepted are those given by Sharma, who argued that he lived from 1238 to 1317. Besides the genealogical records preserved at the different *maṭhas* in Udupi and epigraphical evidence that alludes to the life of one of Madhva's leading converts,² the chief source of what we know about Madhva's life is the *Sumadhvavijaya*, a verse biography of Madhva written by Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya (fl. 1330), a son of one of Madhva's most important converts, Trivikrama Paṇḍitācārya.³

¹ See below, Chapter 3, p. 47, for a translation of the benedictory verses to the *Nyāyāmṛta*.

² Madhva's birth was traditionally dated to 1199 based on a verse found in his own *Mahābhārata-tātparyanirṇaya*. However, a biography of Madhva known as the *Aṇumadhvacarita* gives Madhva's birth date as 1239. Sharma and other scholars of the Mādhva tradition favoured the latter date based on inscriptions alluding to Naraharītīrtha, a leading figure in the Mādhva tradition after Madhva's death. See Sharma (1961: 77).

³ See Sharma (1933) for a detailed discussion of Trivikrama's life. Trivikrama (fl. 1300) was, like Madhva, a Śivalī brahmin. He identifies himself as a member of the *Likuca kula* of that group. His native village seems to have been Kāvugoḷi. His life is detailed extensively by his son in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth chapters of the *Sumadhvavijaya*. Madhva's initial meeting with Trivikrama was mediated by a local ruler named Jayasiṃha, according to the *Sumadhvavijaya*. Trivikrama's most important work is his *Tattvapradīpa*, the most influential commentary on Madhva's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* written before the time of Jayatīrtha. Sharma (1933: 210) notes that Trivikrama's descendents living in the early part of the twentieth century no longer followed Madhva's religion.

Madhva was born into a family of Śivaḷḷi brahmins in the village of Pājaka, eight miles from the coastal town of Udupi in modern-day Karnataka. To his followers, Madhva is an earthly incarnation (*avatāra*) of the wind god Vāyu. The tradition holds that Madhva's teachings are derived from his direct study with the compiler of the Vedas himself, Veda-Vyāsa, who is considered by the Mādhva tradition to be the composer of the *Brahmasūtra* and a full earthly-incarnation (*avatāra*) of Viṣṇu.

Madhva was a Smārta Brahmin by birth, and members of his community had traditionally studied the philosophy of Advaita Vedānta.⁴ Yet as a young student Madhva vehemently rejected Advaita philosophy. He rebelled against his teacher, Acyutaprekṣa, and eventually succeeded in converting him to his cause. Madhva established a strong tradition in South India, which came to be based around the eight monasteries (*Aṣṭamaṭhas*) in Udupi. Udupi remains the spiritual centre of the Mādhva tradition in the present day. Madhva wrote critiques of the different systems of Indian philosophy, including Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, the various schools of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā, and Buddhist philosophy. However, the Advaitins were always the central target of Madhva's critical work.

Literary sources written by members of the Mādhva school during this period suggest that the early interactions of the two traditions were extremely acrimonious. The *Sumadhvavijaya* presents the Advaitins as base villains who shamelessly resorted to nefarious methods to try to defeat Madhva and his fledgling movement. In the twelfth chapter of the work, a coven of Advaitin philosophers conspires to put an end to the career of the brilliant young upstart who threatens their system. The text portrays these Advaitins as unapologetic intellectual obscurantists who had no compunction in using the dark arts of sophistry and sorcery to compensate for the intellectual inadequacies of their system. For instance, in the twelfth chapter of the *Sumadhvavijaya*, an unidentified Advaitin conspirator remarks:

So what if non-duality does not prove provable when it is met with irrefutable arguments demonstrating that *brahman* possesses qualities? No one can defeat us, for we are protected by [Padmatīrtha and others] who know the six dark arts, and who possess magic *mantras* and potions!⁵

4 Sharma (1933: 210–211) discusses the religion of Madhva's ancestors. He says that Madhva's parents followed the *Bhāgavatasaṃpradāya*. He describes this tradition as follows: "The followers of this *Bhāgavata-saṃpradāya* are not all of them Advaitins. Their main creed is the bhakti cult. They honor Viṣṇu and Śiva as equals in which they differ from the Mādhvas; but, like the latter, wear the twelve 'tracings' of Gopīcandana on their bodies (*dvādaśapūṇḍras*) and believe in the survival of Bhakti *even in the state of release* and in the *reality of the Divine Form*—a position advocated not only by Madhva but also by the famous Śrīdharasvāmin in his commentary on the *Śrībhāgavata*".

5 *yady advaitaṃ karkaśair gauṇatarkai ruddhaṃ sādhyam naiva bhāty astu tāvat / śaṭkarmajñair divyamantrausadhādhyaair etair guptān no na jetā hi ko 'pi* // (SMV, 2:181; verse 12.20.) In his auto-

Let's go and with our cunning, plead to neutral parties: "Alas, our ancient tradition, the true scripture, is being destroyed by this newcomer!" Then, in their presence, we should smear [Madhva and his followers] with allegations, regardless of whether they are true or false!⁶

The *Sumadhvavijaya* goes on to accuse the Advaitins of theft, slander, sophistry, sorcery, assault, and even, at one point, of necromancy.

The text presents the Mādhvas as the vanguard of Indian realism, whose central purpose is to rid the world of the Advaitin menace and communicate the true meaning of scripture to beings trapped in transmigratory existence. In a verse charged with eschatological imagery straight from the eleventh book of the *Bhagavadgītā* and the burning of the Khāṇḍava forest in the *Mahābhārata*, the text presents the Mādhvas as the saviours of sentient beings from the delusions of Advaita philosophy. The plotting Advaitins finally admit to their fear of Madhva and his school as follows:

Here in this dense jungle that is our philosophy of illusion (*māyāvāda*), the Bhāṭṭas are broken, the trees are too thick for the light of the sun (*prabhākara*) to penetrate, and the travellers in the great vehicle (Mahāyānists) and the rest just tremble in fear! But we can't ignore the flaming tongue of the truth, which is poised to burn it to ashes!⁷

Madhva's polemics against the Advaitins are largely recorded in his "Ten Topical Treatises" (the *Daśaprakaraṇas*) and in his verse commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*, the *Anuvyākhyāna*. The *Daśaprakaraṇas* are relatively short polemical works that focus on a particular philosophical subject. Five of them contain detailed refutations of Advaita thought—the *Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya* ("Ascertainment of the Truth about Viṣṇu"), the *Tattvodyota* ("Illumination of the Truth"),⁸ the *Mithyātvānumānakhaṇḍana* ("Refutation of the Inference to prove that [the World] is Illusory"),

commentary on the *Sumadhvavijaya*, the *Bhāvaprakāśikā*, Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya says that the six magic arts (*ṣaṭkarmas*) referred to in this verse are: defending what is one's own, subjugating another, turning another to stone, exciting enmity, inducing another to quit his profession, and killing another (*pālana-vaśīkaraṇa-sthambhana-vidveṣaṇa-uccāṭana-māraṇāṇi*).

6 *pāramparyenāgataṃ tattvaśāstraṃ hantotsannaṃ nūtanenety udīrya / teṣāṃ doṣā varṇanīyā vidagdhaiḥ santo 'santo vāpi madhyasthaloke* // (SMV, 2:184; verse 12.22.)

7 *bhraṣṭa bhāṭṭa na prabhākṛtprabhābhūt trastā māhāyānikādyaś ca yatra / durgaṃ māyāvādasatraṃ didhakṣur nopekṣyā nas tattvavādāgnijihvā* // (SMV, 2:170; verse 12.8.) Cf. BhG 11.30.

8 The *Tattvodyota*, which is also known simply as "The Debate" (*Vāda*), is taken by the Mādhva tradition to be a record of an actual encounter that took place between Madhva and one of his Advaitin opponents. See Sharma (1981: 143–147) for a discussion of this text and its standing in the Mādhva tradition. At the end of his commentary on the *Tattvodyota*, Jayatīrtha states that Madhva's text records the events of a debate that was supposed to take place between Madhva and an Advaitin named by Jayatīrtha simply as Puṇḍarīka. According to Jayatīrtha, Puṇḍarīka was so overawed by Madhva's formidable physical strength that he fled in fear before the debate could even begin.

the *Māyāvādakhaṇḍana* (“Refutation of the Doctrine that [the World] is Illusion”), and the *Upādhikhaṇḍana* (“Refutation of the [Advaita Theory] of Conditioning Adjuncts”). Madhva developed a legalistic style of argumentation which often focused on demonstrating that the inferential arguments made by the Advaitins to defend their philosophy suffer from an array of formal fallacies. His work is steeped in the Nyāya theory of inference, and it has been argued that Madhva was influenced by the inferential theory of the tenth-century Kashmiri Naiyāyika Bhāsarvajña.⁹

Despite their antagonism towards the Advaitins, the Mādhvas studied classical Advaita philosophy extensively. Madhva himself never identified his Advaitin opponents explicitly, but it is clear from his writings that he studied several of their works in depth. One of Madhva’s main influences was Vimuktātman (fl. 950), who wrote an independent work on Advaita philosophy called the *Iṣṭasiddhi*.¹⁰ Vimuktātman’s work exerted a deep influence over the development of the Advaita tradition, and also over the work of Rāmānuja, who made extensive use of the *Iṣṭasiddhi* when reconstructing Advaita philosophy in his *Śrībhāṣya*. When Madhva was writing over two centuries after Vimuktātman’s death, the *Iṣṭasiddhi* was apparently still regarded as a classic work of Advaita thought. The *Sumadhavavijaya* states that Madhva’s teacher, Acyutaprekṣa, attempted to teach Madhva the work as a young

The contents of the *Tattvodyota* are taken to represent the devastating monologue that Madhva delivered against Advaita philosophy after his Advaitin opponent had fled. The Mādhva tradition connects this text with a story related in the twelfth book of the *Sumadhavavijaya*. According to this story, two Advaitin philosophers known as Puṇḍarīka Pūrī and Padmatīrtha led an underhanded campaign by Advaitin philosophers to undermine Madhva. Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya gives the names of these two Advaitins in his auto-commentary on the *Sumadhavavijaya*, the *Bhāvaprakāśikā* (SMV, 2:164). He says that Padmatīrtha originated from the Chola country, but gives no other details about the two Advaitins. The names of these philosophers are not known from any sources outside the Mādhva tradition. The *Sumadhavavijaya* (2:203–206) describes the incident where Puṇḍarīka Pūrī challenged Madhva to a debate. According to this account, Puṇḍarīka Pūrī was humiliated after he was left unable to explain the meaning of a passage from the Veda. In the same chapter, the *Sumadhavavijaya* narrates the infamous story in which Padmatīrtha stole Madhva’s library. Madhva and a companion quickly caught up with him, whereupon Madhva ridiculed him and again delivered a withering critique of Advaita philosophy.

9 See below, Chapter 4, p. 109, fn. 41, for a discussion of the argument for Bhāsarvajña’s influence over Madhva.

10 See Hiriyanṇa (IS: xii—xiv) and Schmücker (2001: 21–25) for discussions of Vimuktātman’s dates. Vimuktātman was known already by Rāmānuja, who wrote in the eleventh/twelfth centuries. According to Schmücker, the *terminus a quo* for Vimuktātman seems to lie in the middle of the ninth century since he quotes Sureśvara’s *Vārttika*. His *terminus ad quem* is taken to lie near the middle of the tenth century, since he is quoted by the Viśiṣṭādvaitin intellectual Yāmunācārya, whose birth date is recorded in an inscription as lying in 966–967 CE. Schmücker concludes that Vimuktātman must have lived in the first half of the tenth century. Vimuktātman refers to his own teacher as one Avyayātman. Vimuktātman’s work was quoted by Ānandabodha (see below, fn. 16).

student. The text says that Madhva was less than impressed with Vimuktātman's arguments, and he rejected the opening stanza as containing no less than thirty-two logical fallacies. Madhva's own works show that he was closely familiar with Vimuktātman's arguments.¹¹

Madhva also shows familiarity with Prakāśātman's (*fl.* 975¹²) *Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa* in his *Anuvyākhyāna*.¹³ He also shows familiarity with the works of Sarvajñātman (*fl.* 1027)¹⁴ in his *Anuvyākhyāna* and *Tattvoddhṛta*. Madhva was also clearly aware of the work of the Advaitin dialectician Śrīharṣa (*fl.* 1140), whose arguments he refers to in his topical treatises.¹⁵ As I will discuss further below in this chapter, Madhva was clearly aware of the works of the Advaitin philosopher Ānandabodha Yati (*fl.* 1220). Ānandabodha, who is sometimes known as Ānandabodha Bhaṭṭāraka, seems to have flourished at the beginning of the twelfth century. He may have been

11 The *Sumadhvavijaya* narrates the episode in which the young Madhva rejected Vimuktātman's work as follows: *guroḥ svaśiṣyaṃ caturam cikīrṣataḥ pracodanāc chrotum ihopacakrame / atheṣṭasiddhiś chalaṇātivāridhir nirādareṇāpi mahātmanāmunā // tadādyapadyastham avadyamaṇḍalaṃ yadāvadat ṣoḍaśakadvayātmakam / upary apāstaṃ tad iti bruvaty asau gurau tam ūce praṇigadyatām iti //* (SMV, 1:201; verses 4.44–45.) "At the behest of his preceptor [Acyutaprekṣa], who wished to sharpen his pupil's intellect, the great-souled [Madhva] disinterestedly studied [Vimuktātman's] *Iṣṭasiddhi*, a veritable ocean of quibbling and cavil. When [Madhva] pointed out that there were no less than thirty-two fallacies in the very first verse [of the *Iṣṭasiddhi*], his preceptor claimed they would be dealt with later in the text. 'Please, point [those rebuttals] out!', responded Madhva." In his *Māyāvādakhaṇḍana* (SMGs, 53), Madhva refers to Vimuktātman's distinctive doctrine of a "fifth level of reality" (*pañcamaparakāra*). See also Sharma (1981: 123) for a discussion of Madhva's references to the *Iṣṭasiddhi*'s discussion of "nescience" (*avidyā*) in his *Anuvyākhyāna*.

12 This is the date given for Prakāśātman in Potter's *Bibliography*. In her translation of Prakāśātman's *Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa*, Bina Gupta (2011: 7) dates the composition of the *Vivaraṇa* between 900–1050 CE. She acknowledges, however, that nothing can be said with complete certainty about Prakāśātman's life/dates, and that scholars have assigned him different dates ranging from 900–1300 CE. Gupta notes that we can safely conclude that Prakāśātman lived before the time of Rāmānuja, who critically examines the *Vivaraṇa* in his *Śrībhāṣya*. According to Gupta, the scholar T. R. Cintāmaṇi says that Prakāśātman lived later than Vācaspati Miśra, who can be dated to around 840 CE. David (2020: 37) dates Prakāśātman from 950–1000, although he indicates doubt about this time-frame.

13 Sharma (1981: 123).

14 Sharma (1981: 123 and 145–146) claims that Madhva directly summarises passages from Sarvajñātman's *Sanḥṣepaśārīraka*.

15 See Granoff (1978: 2–3) for a discussion of Śrīharṣa's biographical data. According to Sharma (1981: 141), Madhva critiqued some arguments of Śrīharṣa in his *Māyāvādakhaṇḍana* and *Anuvyākhyāna*.

a student of Vimuktātman, since he quotes Vimuktātman's *Iṣṭasiddhi* and refers to Vimuktātman as "guru" in his *Nyāyamakaranda*.¹⁶

While Madhva laid the basis for the critique of Advaita philosophy in his tradition, his writings were extremely laconic. His works attracted a number of commentaries from his followers, but it was Jayatīrtha's (1330–1388) elaborate commentaries on Madhva's writings that came to be regarded as the standard explanation of his philosophy. According to traditional hagiographies, Jayatīrtha was born into a noble family with the name Dhonḍo Pant Raghunāth. He was born in South India either in what is today the state of Maharashtra, or further south in modern-day Karnataka. At some point early in his life, Jayatīrtha came under the influence of the ascetic Akṣobhyatīrtha (fl. 1350), who is regarded by tradition as a direct disciple of Madhva himself. Jayatīrtha left his family and was initiated into the Mādhva tradition as a renunciate.¹⁷

Jayatīrtha systematised Madhva's thought by writing philosophically constructive commentaries on all of his main works (he is remembered in the Mādhva tra-

16 As R. Thangaswami (Mahadevan, 1968: 141) notes, Ānandabodha was aware of the views of Prakāśātman (fl. 975), whom he quotes in the *Nyāyamakaranda*. The Advaitin philosopher Anubhūti Svarūpācārya, who is taken to have flourished between the middle of the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century, wrote commentaries on all of Ānandabodha's works. Thangaswami thus concludes that Ānandabodha must have lived between the middle of the eleventh and the first half of the twelfth century. Hiriyanna notes that in his *Pramāṇamālā*, Ānandabodha quotes a verse from Vimuktātman's *Iṣṭasiddhi* and refers to Vimuktātman respectfully as "guru". As Hiriyanna himself acknowledges, it is not absolutely clear from this reference that Ānandabodha was a *direct disciple* of Vimuktātman. He (IS, xiii—xiv) writes: "There is a book with the title of *Pramāṇa-mālā* by Ānandabodha, a well-known exponent of the Advaita; and in it he quotes the following half-stanza which is found in the *Iṣṭa-siddhi* (i. 36), prefacing it with the words *etad evoktaṃ gurubhiḥ—nānyatra kāraṇāt kāryaṃ na cet tatra kva tad bhavet*. We may deduce from this, though we cannot at all be sure about it, that Ānandabodha was a disciple of Vimuktātman. There is nothing improbable in this, for Ānandabodha was an early writer on the Advaita, and, as shown by his references to the *Iṣṭa-siddhi* in another of his works, *Nyāya-makaranda*, he held views in regard to many a detail of advaitic doctrine which are identical with those maintained by Vimuktātman. But as Ānandabodha's date is not definitely known this conclusion, even if correct, throws no light on the chronological position of the present work". Schmücker (2001: 23) says that further research is needed to clarify the relationship between Ānandabodha and Vimuktātman. He notes that there are significant similarities between Vimuktātman and Ānandabodha's doctrines of "bliss", for instance. He writes: "Inwieweit Ānandabodha Vimuktātmans Lehre vertritt oder beispielsweise seine Annahme des 'Realitätsgrades' der Avidyā als *pañcamaparakāra* weiterführt, bedarf einer eigenen Untersuchung. Dennoch fallen bei Ānandabodhas Ausführungen zur Wonne (*ānanda*) in der *Pramāṇamālā* Ähnlichkeiten mit Vimuktātmans Aussagen zur Wonne auf. Ebenso gibt es eine Übereinstimmung mit einer Passage in Jñānottamas Kommentar. Wichtig für die Chronologie dürfte auch sein, daß Prakāśātman vor Ānandabodha liegt".

17 See Sharma (1981: 246–249) for further details about Jayatīrtha's life.

dition as the “author of the *ṭīkāś*”, the *ṭīkākāra*). His most important work is the “Nectar of Reasoning” (*Nyāyasudhā*), an extensive commentary on Madhva’s *Anuvyākhyāna*. Young students at the Mādhva *vidyāpīṭhas* in South India still study the text as a standard work of Mādhva philosophy in the present day. It includes an extensive critique of Advaita philosophy as well as an elaborate treatment of perceptual illusion known as the “The Discussion of the Five Theories of Error” (*Pañcākhyātivāda*). Jayatīrtha’s commentaries quickly eclipsed earlier glosses of Madhva’s writings, and became regarded as the standard works on them. In the benedictory verses to all three of his major works, Vyāsātīrtha acknowledges Jayatīrtha as one of his main influences in the Mādhva tradition, and he interprets Madhva’s arguments largely through the lens of Jayatīrtha’s *ṭīkāś*.

Jayatīrtha organised Madhva’s polemics against the Advaitins into a concise systematic debate treatise known as the *Vādāvalī*. The *Vādāvalī* was an attempt at a comprehensive refutation of Advaita philosophy, in which Jayatīrtha used contemporary Nyāya epistemological theory to evaluate the Advaitins’ philosophical arguments. It begins with a critique of Ānandabodha’s inferences to prove that the world is “illusory” (*mithyā*), which is also the starting point for the debate in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. The work helped lay the basis for Viṣṇudāsācārya’s (*fl.* 1400) “Pearl-Necklace of Arguments” (*Vādaratnāvalī*) and ultimately the *Nyāyāmṛta* itself. The *Vādāvalī* is still studied today by young Mādhva students as a gentle introduction to the much more difficult *Nyāyāmṛta*.

Jayatīrtha was aware of all the Advaitin philosophers whom Madhva had been aware of. As Sharma observes, he clearly displays knowledge of Vimuktātman, Vācaspati, Padmapāda, Prakāśātman, Śrīharṣa, and Ānandabodha.¹⁸ Jayatīrtha was also deeply influenced by the works of the Advaitin philosopher Citsukha (*fl.* 1220), whom it seems Madhva did not know. Along with Śrīharṣa, Citsukha is widely considered to be one of the greatest Advaitin dialecticians. He is usually taken to have worked mainly in the first half of the thirteenth century and is connected with what is today the Vizakhapatnam district of Andhra Pradesh.¹⁹ Jayatīrtha devoted a great deal of effort to refuting Citsukha’s arguments. According to Sharma, the *Vādāvalī*

¹⁸ See Sharma (1981: 250–253) for further discussion of Jayatīrtha’s influences in the Advaita tradition.

¹⁹ See David (2020: 30–31) for a recent discussion of what is known about Citsukha’s life. Citsukha has been connected with two lithic inscriptions in Telugu found in the temple of Narasiṃha in the town of Siṃhācalam in modern-day Andhra Pradesh. One of these inscriptions has been dated to 1220, the other to 1284. V. A. Sarma (1974) argues that the former can be taken to refer to Citsukha, the author of the *Tattvapradīpikā*, but the latter must refer to a different person who happens to have also been called “Citsukha”. Besides these inscriptions, we know that Citsukha was familiar with Śrīharṣa and Ānandabodha since he quotes from them and apparently wrote commentaries on both of their works. A commentary on Ānandabodha’s *Nyāyamakaranda* is attributed to Citsukha, as well

was written primarily to refute Citsukha,²⁰ and Jayatīrtha quotes from Citsukha's *Tattvapradīpikā* at length in his *ṭīkā* on Madhva's *Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya*.²¹ Although he does not usually name Advaitin philosophers in his works, Jayatīrtha does refer to Citsukha once by name in the *Vādāvalī*.²²

Scholarship by Sharma (1981: 268–285) and Edwin Gerow (1987 and 1990) has further highlighted the impact that the work of the fifteenth century Mādhva intellectual Viṣṇudāsācārya (*fl.* 1430) had over Vyāsātīrtha's thought. Gerow (1990: xiii) argues that Viṣṇudāsa's work marks a “crucial link” between Jayatīrtha and Vyāsātīrtha, and shows (1987: 565–577) how Viṣṇudāsa's twenty interpretations of the Upaniṣadic *mahāvākya* “tat tvam asi” came to influence Vyāsātīrtha's exegesis of the same text in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. Gerow notes that until the rediscovery of Viṣṇudāsa's *Vādaratnāvalī*, it was widely assumed that the twenty interpretations originated with Vyāsātīrtha himself. However, he argues that Vyāsātīrtha modelled his interpretation of the *mahāvākya* on Viṣṇudāsa's, and that Vyāsātīrtha was largely responsible for “systematising” Viṣṇudāsa's account rather than “extending” it. Gerow (1990: viii) further argues that the intellectual basis for Vyāsātīrtha's engagement with Mīmāṃsā and grammatical science was laid by Viṣṇudāsa, who began to seriously engage with the ideas of these disciplines in his critique of Advaita thought.

as another on Śrīharṣa's *Khaṇḍanakhāṇḍanakhāḍya*. Citsukha was also familiar with the works of the Vaiśeṣika philosophers Vallabha (*fl.* 1140) and Śivāditya (*fl.* 1150). As such, it seems likely that he flourished in the first half of the thirteenth century. Citsukha himself writes that he was a student of one Jñānottama, who came from Bengal. Besides the thinkers listed above, the *Tattvapradīpikā* contains quotes from Udayana, Uddyotakara, Kumārila, and Śalikanātha, along with many figures from the classical Advaitin tradition. See also Dasgupta (1932: 147–148) for a discussion of Citsukha's life and work.

²⁰ See Sharma (1981: 241).

²¹ See Sharma (1981: 250).

²² Jayatīrtha refers to Citsukha by name when refuting the concept of self-luminosity in the *Vādāvalī*: ... *avedyatve saty aparokṣavyavahārayogyatvaṃ svaprakāśatvaṃ iti tallakṣaṇam abhidadhatā citsukhenāparokṣavyavahārayogyatāviśeṣaṇakṛtyābhidhānaprastāve 'bhīhitam. na cāvīdyātvaṃ ity etāvad evāstu tallakṣaṇam iti vācyam. tathā saty atītānāgatānityānumeyeṣu cātivyapteḥ phalavyāpyatālakṣaṇavedyatvasya tatrābhāvād iti.* (VĀ: 35–36; cf. TP: 10.) Jayatīrtha very rarely refers to other philosophers by name in his works, so it seems likely that he wanted to emphasise Citsukha's identity to an audience who may not have already been familiar with his works. Jayatīrtha also quotes Citsukha directly when discussing the doctrine of indeterminacy. In this part of the text he quotes a verse that is found in the *Tattvapradīpikā*: *pratyekaṃ sadasattvābhyāṃ vicārapadavīm na yat / gāhate tad anīrvācyam āhur vedāntavedīnaḥ* // (VĀ: 4.) This verse is found on TP: 79; see below, Chapter 6, p. 165, for a translation of it.

Curiously, Vyāsātīrtha does not refer to Viṣṇudāsa in his works despite the clear influence that the *Vādaratnāvalī* had over his thought.²³

2.2 Vyāsātīrtha and the rise of the Mādhvas in the Vijayanagara Empire

Despite the work of Jayātīrtha and Viṣṇudāsa, the Mādhvas seem to have largely existed in intellectual isolation during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The tradition does not seem to have enjoyed much support among South Indian rulers during this period. Madhva himself lived under the Hoysaḷa Empire, which ruled over most of what is now Karnataka between the tenth and fourteenth centuries. He died two decades before the founding of the Vijayanagara Empire by the brothers Harihara and Bukka Rāya in 1336. The rulers of Vijayanagara succeeded in uniting the local polities of South India and formed an empire that encompassed most of the South until its capital city was ransacked by a coalition of rival powers after the battle of Talikot in 1565. The Vijayanagara emperors of the Saṅgama dynasty seem to have had a close relationship with the Smārta-Advaitin community and their *maṭha* in Śrīṅgeri. There seems to be no inscriptional or literary evidence that the early rulers of Vijayanagara were influenced by the leaders of the Mādhva religion, although modern Mādhva scholars have argued that there is evidence suggesting that Mādhva saints held some influence in the early stages of the empire's history.²⁴

Prior to Vyāsātīrtha's lifetime, there is very little evidence that Mādhva arguments were studied seriously by any of the other traditions of philosophy in India. Some of the earliest references to Madhva's works outside of the Mādhva tradition are found in the literature of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. Roque Mesquita discusses how the Viśiṣṭādvaitin philosopher Veṅkaṭanātha refers to Madhva in his critique of Advaita philosophy, the *Śatadūṣaṇī*. Veṅkaṭanātha seems to imply that Madhva

²³ Viṣṇudāsa is absent from the benedictory verses of the *Nyāyāmrta*, which refer to Madhva, Jayātīrtha, and Vyāsātīrtha's own direct preceptors. Unlike these figures, Viṣṇudāsa was a lay scholar who apparently never took *sannyāsa*. See below, Chapter 3, p. 47, for a translation of these verses.

²⁴ The modern Mādhva scholar K. T. Pandurāṅgi (2012: 273–275) has argued that the location of the tombs of the early leaders of the Mādhva religion near Hampi, as well as the fact that the early Vijayanagara rulers provided headquarters to three of the *maṭhas* of the leaders of the Mādhva tradition, suggests that the early Mādhva leaders held at least some influence at Vijayanagara. Pandurāṅgi concedes that there are no inscriptional or literary references that directly corroborate this. He further argues that Mādhva philosophers occupied leading administrative and military positions in the Yādava and Hoysaḷa dynasties.

falsified numerous texts to serve his own ends.²⁵ Mesquita further points out that Venkaṭanātha's immediate predecessor, Varadaguru (1200–1290), who was a senior contemporary of Madhva, makes similar remarks in his work on the theory of renunciation, the *Yatilingasamārthana*.

Besides the works of these Viśiṣṭādvaitin scholars, Mādhava/Vidyāraṇya's (fl. 1350) famous compendium of the different philosophies of his day, the *Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha*, contains a chapter on the *Pūrṇaprajñadarśana* ("The System of Pūrṇaprajña [= Madhva]"). It is significant that the Mādhvas were included in this work, although the *Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha* was clearly intended to be a very inclusive or even comprehensive overview of the main schools active at the time it was written. Sources in the Mādhva and Viśiṣṭādvaita traditions further speak of an oral debate between Jayatīrtha's preceptor, Akṣobhyatīrtha, and Vidyāraṇya on the subject of the Upaniṣadic *mahāvākya* "tat tvam asi" at some point in the fourteenth century.²⁶

The neglect of the Mādhva school by the other traditions of Indian philosophy changed dramatically in the sixteenth century. In the early decades of this century, Vyāsātīrtha helped propel the Mādhvas into the centre of the power-politics of the Vijayanagara Empire, thus establishing them as a leading tradition in the Indian philosophical world. Sharma has concluded that Vyāsātīrtha lived from 1460 to 1539.²⁷ The *Vyāsayogacarita*, a *campu*-style biographical work which was written by the poet Somanātha, provides an extensive account of his life. According to the text, Vyāsātīrtha was born in the village of Bannur in what is now Karnataka. His father was Ballaṇṇa Sumati. Somanātha says that Vyāsātīrtha was born to his father's second wife, Akkamma, and that he was named "Yatirāja" until his renunciation. His early education was overseen by Brahmaṇya Tīrtha, the leader

²⁵ Mesquita (2000b: 28–29).

²⁶ See Sharma (1981: 229–230) for some discussion of this debate. The dispute, which is said to have taken place in Mulbagal in modern-day Karnataka, is reputed to have been arbitrated by Venkaṭanātha. Traditional verses circulated in the Mādhva community claim that Akṣobhya defeated Vidyāraṇya in this dispute. Sharma argues that this tradition is corroborated by the works of Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as well as Mādhva hagiographical writings.

²⁷ According to Sharma (1981: 286–287), Vyāsātīrtha was born in Bannur in 1460. The dates Sharma placed directly under the title of the chapter he devoted to Vyāsātīrtha's life ("1478–1539") have sometimes been taken to indicate the dates of Vyāsātīrtha's birth/death. However, Sharma often gives the dates for Mādhva religious leaders according to the date that they assumed leadership of a *maṭha*. He is clear that he believes Vyāsātīrtha was born in 1460. Sharma's date for Vyāsātīrtha's birth is based on the dates of a great famine that took place towards the end of the fifteenth century. He (1981: 287) writes: "Some time after the great famine of 1475-1476, Brahmaṇya [Tīrtha] died. We may, therefore, assume that Vyāsātīrtha came to the Pīṭha in or about the year 1478 A.D. Assuming that he was about sixteen years old at the time of the demise of his Guru, we may easily fix the date of his birth in or about 1460 A.D.".

of a prominent Mādhva *maṭha*. Vyāsātīrtha identifies Brahmaṇya Tīrtha as his “consecration-preceptor” (*dīkṣāguru*) in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. After his early education, Vyāsātīrtha travelled to the intellectual centre of Kancipuram in Tamil Nadu, where he is said to have studied the six classical *darśanas* of Indian philosophy. After his general education at Kancipuram, Vyāsātīrtha studied with the Mādhva philosopher Śrīpādarāja (also known as Lakṣmīnārāyaṇātīrtha), whom he refers to as his “intellectual preceptor” (*vidyāguru*) in the *Nyāyāmṛta*.

According to Sharma,²⁸ there is evidence that Śrīpādarāja already exerted some influence over the emperors of Vijayanagara during the early years of its second dynasty. However, it was Vyāsātīrtha himself who seems to have led the Mādhvas to a position of prominence at Vijayanagara. The *Vyāsayogicarita* reports that Vyāsātīrtha was dispatched by Śrīpādarāja to Candragiri, which was at the time the capital of the empire. According to the text, he there impressed the emperor Sāluva Narasiṃha I (r. 1485–1491) with his abilities as a philosopher. Sharma (1981: 288) says that Vyāsātīrtha was entrusted with the worship of the god Śrīnivāsa at the Vaiṣṇava temple complex in Tirupati during Sāluva Narasiṃha’s reign. Vyāsātīrtha remained at the capital of the empire itself for several years, and continued to enjoy a close relationship with the early rulers of the empire’s third dynasty—Narasa Nāyaka, Viranarasimharāya, and Kṛṣṇadevarāya. Under his leadership, the Mādhvas established a presence for themselves at leading centres of worship throughout the empire and, with the help of patronage from the Vijayanagara emperors, expanded the institutional basis of their religion.

Vyāsātīrtha was the head of an expansive network of *maṭhas*, and that network was extended considerably during the Vijayanagara period. The Vijayanagara emperors granted him considerable resources to build new *maṭhas* and related *agrahāras* (settlements of Brahmin families). Vyāsātīrtha also succeeded in having Mādhva rituals and icons inserted into key temple complexes within the empire, including Tirupati.²⁹ There is evidence that he enjoyed a particularly close relationship with the emperor Kṛṣṇadevarāya. On the strength of the evidence of the

28 According to Sharma (1981: 461), Śrīpādarāja was the head of the Padmanābha Tīrtha Maṭha at Mulbagal. Sharma says that his life is described in the *Śrīpādarājāṣṭaka*. He was a disciple and successor of Svarṇavarṇa Tīrtha and a cousin of Vyāsātīrtha’s *dīkṣāguru* Brahmaṇya Tīrtha, who was probably roughly the same age as him. Śrīpādarāja was a contemporary of Raghunātha Tīrtha of the Uttarādi Maṭha. According to the *Śrīpādarājāṣṭaka*, he wielded considerable influence over Sāluva Narasiṃha I, and the emperor himself honoured him after his return from his military campaign in Kalinga in 1476. Sharma (1981: 461) concludes that Śrīpādarāja must have died “some time after the departure of Vyāsātīrtha to Candragiri, about the year 1486–87”.

29 See Stoker (2016: 45–72) for a discussion of the resources granted to Vyāsātīrtha by the emperors of Vijayanagara.

Vyāsayogicarita and passages of a text attributed to Kṛṣṇadevarāya himself, Sharma (1981: 289–290) argued that Kṛṣṇadevarāya regarded Vyāsātīrtha as his “personal guru”. The *Vyāsayogicarita* itself identifies Vyāsātīrtha as Kṛṣṇadevarāya’s “family deity” (*kuladevatā*), although the precise significance of this statement and the nature of Vyāsātīrtha’s relationship with Kṛṣṇadevarāya have been disputed by modern scholars.³⁰

Before Vyāsātīrtha, the Mādhva tradition had been largely confined to the western coast of Karnataka. Under his leadership, the tradition was able to expand its influence into Tamil and Telugu speaking regions of South India. Vyāsātīrtha competed with the Advaita and Viśiṣṭādvaita traditions to win patronage and resources from the Vijayanagara state. However, he also seems to have facilitated a tactical alliance with the Śrīvaiṣṇavas, which was rooted in the commonalities of their Viṣṇu-oriented religions.³¹ Tradition ascribes eight Sanskrit texts to Vyāsātīrtha, although he may have written a further work which is now lost.³²

All of these texts are philosophical in subject matter. Vyāsātīrtha wrote four independent texts. The three most important of these, which are known collectively as the *Vyāsatraya*, are the *Nyāyāmṛta*, the “The Death-Dance of Logic” (*Tarkatāṇḍava*), and the “Illumination of the Purport [of Scripture]” (*Tātparyacandrikā*). Vyāsātīr-

³⁰ See Stoker (2016: 18–19) for a summary of these different views.

³¹ See Stoker (2016: 73–105) for a discussion of the complex relationship between the Mādhvas and Śrīvaiṣṇavas during this period.

³² Sharma (1981: 297) argues that Vyāsātīrtha must have written a further work in addition to those known to modern scholarship. He says that it was called the *Sattarkavilāsa* based on what he takes to be a reference to the work in Vyāsātīrtha’s commentary on Jayatīrtha’s *Māyāvāḍakhaṇḍanaṭīkā*. Sharma (1981: 291–292) speculates that the work Vyāsātīrtha refers to here is identical with a work mentioned by Somanātha in the *Vyāsayogicarita*, which comprised a critical response to an Advaita philosophical work sent to Kṛṣṇadevarāya by Vidyādhara Pātra, whom Sharma identifies as a king of Kalinga. No manuscripts of the work had been discovered by the time Sharma finished his *History of the Dvaita School and its Literature*. Sharma’s evidence is the following statement, which is found in Vyāsātīrtha’s commentary on the *Māyāvāḍakhaṇḍanaṭīkā*: *jīvanmuktasya suṣuptyavasthāyām vṛttyabhāvena niḥśeṣāvidyānivṛttiprasaṅgād iti. prapañcas tu sattarkavilāse ’smābhīḥ kṛto draṣṭavyaḥ*: “... For, it would follow that nescience in its entirety would come to an end in the state of living liberation, since there are no mental modifications when one is in a state of deep sleep. One should see my elaboration of this point in the *Sattarkavilāsa*”. (Sharma, 1981: 597.) It might be suggested that this was in fact a reference to one of Vyāsātīrtha’s known works; the *Nyāyāmṛta* would appear to be the only plausible candidate for this. However, as Sharma points out there is no reason that Vyāsātīrtha should have referred to the *Nyāyāmṛta* by a non-synonymous name in this passage. Moreover, it seems most likely that the *Nyāyāmṛta* was composed *after* Vyāsātīrtha wrote his commentaries on Jayatīrtha’s *ṭīkā*s. Assuming that Vyāsātīrtha’s commentaries on Jayatīrtha’s *ṭīkā*s were written before his three major works, this *Sattarkavilāsa* might have been written at a very early point in his career and then faded into obscurity.

tha also wrote a relatively short independent treatise called the “Resuscitation of Difference” (*Bhedojjivana*), a defence of the category of difference which had been the subject of critiques by Advaitin philosophers from Maṇḍana Mīśra onwards.

Vyāsātīrtha’s earliest works seem to be the sub-commentaries he wrote on Jayatīrtha’s own commentaries on Madhva’s *Daśaprakaraṇas*. These are collectively known as the *Mandāramañjarī*. Vyāsātīrtha wrote these sub-commentaries on Madhva’s *Mithyātvānumānakhaṇḍana*, *Māyāvādakhaṇḍana*, *Upādhikhaṇḍana*, and *Tattvaviveka*.³³ In his colophons to these texts, Vyāsātīrtha indicates that he wrote them on the basis of his study with Śrīpādarāja. These commentaries often display strikingly original thinking about key points of doctrine, and Vyāsātīrtha clearly deviates from Jayatīrtha in his interpretation of central epistemological and ontological concepts in them. As I will discuss in Chapter 3, later texts in the Mādhva tradition frequently accept the definitions and theories Vyāsātīrtha puts forward in these texts as standard aspects of Mādhva philosophy.

Besides composing philosophical works in Sanskrit, Vyāsātīrtha played a pivotal role in the Haridāsa movement. This movement, rooted in the devotion to Mādhva’s religious doctrines, saw its members disseminating these ideas through the creation of devotional poetry in the Kannada vernacular. Its origins can be traced back to Narahari Tīrtha (fl. 1327), one of Mādhva’s direct disciples. Notably, Vyāsātīrtha’s teacher, Śrīpādarāja, is recognised as one of the movement’s leading figures. Vyāsātīrtha himself contributed significantly to this cultural and religious wave by composing numerous hymns in Kannada under the *nom de plume* (*mudrikā*) “Śrī Kṛṣṇa”. Moreover, he is acknowledged as the preceptor of two of the most eminent Haridāsas, Purandaradāsa and Kanakadāsa.³⁴

Since Vyāsātīrtha refers explicitly to the *Nyāyāmṛta* in the *Tarkatāṇḍava*, we know that he wrote the former before the *Tarkatāṇḍava*. Vyāsātīrtha also refers to the *Nyāyāmṛta* in the *Tātparyacandrikā*, and we can thus say that the *Nyāyāmṛta* was the earliest of his three major works.³⁵ According to Sharma (1981: 289), Vyāsātīrtha probably began to compose these three works during the reign of Kṛṣṇadevarāya’s predecessor, Vīranarasimha (r. 1503–1509). Vyāsātīrtha’s increasing prominence in the Vijayanagara Empire seems to have granted him new opportunities to publicise his philosophical arguments. In the introduction to his edition

33 Vyāsātīrtha’s commentary on Jayatīrtha’s *Mithyātvānumānakhaṇḍanaṭīkā* was partially translated by Jeffrey J. Lunstead in his PhD thesis at the University of Pennsylvania, 1977.

34 See Sharma (1981: 517) for a discussion of some of Vyāsātīrtha’s Kannada compositions.

35 Vyāsātīrtha refers explicitly to the *Nyāyāmṛta* when discussing Gaṅgeśa’s definition of “universal-positive” (*kevalānvayin*) properties in the *Tarkatāṇḍava*. I have translated the relevant passage in this volume; see below, Chapter 7, p. 192, fn. 11. See Sharma (1981: 302, fn. 1) for a discussion of Vyāsātīrtha’s reference to the *Nyāyāmṛta* in the *Tātparyacandrikā*.

of the *Vyāsayogicarita*, the scholar Venkoba Rao claims that Vyāsātīrtha taught the *Vyāsatraya* at the Imperial University of the Vijayanagara Empire, where he occupied the *Sarasvatīpīṭha*.³⁶

The *Nyāyāmṛta* and the *Tarkatāṇḍava* are “debate books” (*vādagranthas*). They are independent (i.e. non-commentarial) works which were written to defend Vyāsātīrtha’s position primarily against the Advaitins and the Navya-Naiyāyikas. The *Tātparyacandrikā*, by contrast, is a sub-commentary on Jayātīrtha’s *Tattvaparakāśikā*, which is itself a commentary on Madhva’s earliest commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*, the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. In both the *Tātparyacandrikā* and the *Nyāyāmṛta*, Vyāsātīrtha quotes copiously from Advaita philosophical works, frequently naming them and their authors explicitly. The *Nyāyāmṛta* was clearly intended to be an encyclopedic refutation of Advaita philosophy, and Vyāsātīrtha refers to a very wide spectrum of classical Advaitin authors throughout the text. A comprehensive study of these references in the *Nyāyāmṛta* has yet to be undertaken.

An early Advaitin whom Vyāsātīrtha quotes is Maṇḍana Miśra (*fl.* 690). Vyāsātīrtha repeats an entire *śloka* from Maṇḍana’s *Brahmasiddhi*, referring to its author simply as “Maṇḍana”.³⁷ Vyāsātīrtha also refers explicitly to Padmapāda’s (*fl.* 740) *Pañcapādikā*, which he cites in a discussion about the doctrine of indeterminacy.³⁸ Vyāsātīrtha further alludes to Sureśvara’s (*fl.* 740) *Vārttika* on the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* of Śaṅkara.³⁹ Vyāsātīrtha was clearly aware of Vācaspati Miśra’s *Bhāmātī*, and he quotes it frequently throughout the *Nyāyāmṛta*.⁴⁰ He also quotes Prakāśātman’s *Vivaraṇa*.⁴¹ Vyāsātīrtha was clearly aware of Śrīharṣa, whose *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍana-khāḍya* he refers to simply as the *Khaṇḍana*.⁴² In the opening sections of the *Nyāyāmṛta*, Vyāsātīrtha refers several times to Ānandabodha’s works, usually in connection with the formal inferences that Ānandabodha made in the *Nyāyamakaranda* and *Nyāyadīpāvalī*. It is clear that Vyāsātīrtha, like Jayātīrtha, was deeply influenced by Citsukha’s *Tattvapradīpikā*, since he refers to Citsukha’s text extensively in the opening chapters of the *Nyāyāmṛta*. He still refers to Citsukha as the “newcomer” (*navīna*) in this part of the text.⁴³

³⁶ See VYC: lxv.

³⁷ Cf. NAB, 1:510 and BS: 157. The verse in the editions of both texts reads: *sarvapratyayavedye ca brahmarūpe vyavasthite / prapañcasya pravilayaḥ śabdena pratipādyate ||*.

³⁸ See NAB, 1:37, and below, p. 85.

³⁹ See NAB, 1:37.

⁴⁰ See for instance NAB, 1:344, 364, 509, and 585.

⁴¹ See NAB, 1:37 and 176.

⁴² See for instance NAB, 1:417 and 588.

⁴³ See NAB, 1:25. Vyāsātīrtha refers to Citsukha in this way when he quotes the inferences made by Citsukha to prove the illusory status of the world in the *Tattvapradīpikā*. See below, Chapter 4,

Vyāsātīrtha also shows familiarity with the extensive body of commentarial literature written on Prakāśātman's *Vivaraṇa*. Lawrence McCrea (2015) has published a study of Vyāsātīrtha's references to Advaita commentaries on the *Vivaraṇa* in the third book of the *Nyāyāmṛta*. McCrea's analysis focuses on a chapter of the *Nyāyāmṛta* where Vyāsātīrtha refutes the Advaitins' interpretation of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 2,4.5 (*ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsītavyo maitreyī*). McCrea examines how Vyāsātīrtha carefully scrutinised the various commentaries written on the *Vivaraṇa* when critiquing the Advaitins' interpretation of this passage. In this section of the text, Vyāsātīrtha shows an awareness of Ānandapūrṇa Vidyāsāgara (*fl.* 1350),⁴⁴ Jñānaghana's (*fl.* 900) *Tattvaśuddhi*,⁴⁵ and Rāmādvaya's (*fl.* 1340) *Vedāntakaumudī*.⁴⁶ In this part of the text, Vyāsātīrtha also alludes to Citsukha's commentary on the *Vivaraṇa*.⁴⁷

2.3 An overview of Sanskrit texts written on the *Nyāyāmṛta*

The arguments made against Advaita philosophy by Madhva, Jayatīrtha, and Viṣṇudāsa largely fell on deaf ears. Vyāsātīrtha's *Nyāyāmṛta*, however, quickly attracted critical replies from Advaitin philosophers. Vyāsātīrtha's success in attracting the attention of these prominent Advaitins reflects both the intellectual quality of his work and his tradition's newly-won prominence at the Vijayana-gara court. The *Nyāyāmṛta* was clearly Vyāsātīrtha's most influential text. The *Tātparyacandrikā* also gained a certain amount of attention from other traditions, since we know that Advaitin and Viśiṣṭādvaitin scholars wrote critical replies to the text after Vyāsātīrtha's death. The *Tātparyacandrikā* further laid the intellectual basis for Vijayīndratīrtha's (1514–1595) polemics against the Viśiṣṭādvaitins.⁴⁸

pp. 107–108, for a discussion of these inferences and a translation of the relevant passages of the *Tattvapradīpikā*.

⁴⁴ See McCrea (2015: 90) and NAB, 3:606.

⁴⁵ See McCrea (2015: 90) and NAB, 3:606.

⁴⁶ See McCrea (2015: 91–92) and NAB, 3:622.

⁴⁷ See McCrea (2015: 90) and NAB, 3:606.

⁴⁸ Sharma (1981: 306) refers to a reply to the *Tātparyacandrikā* entitled *Śaṅkarapādabhūṣaṇa* by a Maharashtrian Advaitin named Raghunātha Śāstri Pārvate. See Sharma (1981: 406–407) for a discussion of the Viśiṣṭādvaitins' critical replies to the arguments of the *Tātparyacandrikā* and Vijayīndra's responses to them. He notes that several Viśiṣṭādvaitin authors wrote critical responses to the *Tātparyacandrikā*. According to Sharma, Śrīnivāsācārya wrote the *Tattvamārtaṇḍa* to refute the early portions of the *Tātparyacandrikā*. Śrīnivāsācārya also wrote a work called *Praṇavadarpaṇa* which critiqued the Mādhva interpretation of the first *Brahmasūtra*. Sharma says that a Viśiṣṭādvaitin scholar known as Mahācārya also wrote a critique of Madhva's interpretation of the *Brahmasūtra*.

The *Nyāyāmṛta* proved to be a decisive intellectual breakthrough for the Mādhvas and quickly attracted critical replies. The first known Advaita work that responded to the *Nyāyāmṛta* was the *Tattvaviveka* which was written by Nṛsiṃhāśrama in 1547.⁴⁹ Although parts of the *Tattvaviveka* were occasionally discussed by Vyāsatīrtha's early commentators, the text made little impact on the subsequent debate between the Mādhvas and the Advaitins.⁵⁰ Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's "Establishment of Non-duality" (*Advaitasiddhi*) thus marks the true beginning of the debate between the two traditions. Madhusūdana seems to have written the *Advaitasiddhi* towards the end of the sixteenth century.⁵¹ The ensuing debate

Vijayīndra wrote several texts against Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy, including the *Siddhāntasārāsāra-viveka* and the *Ānandatāratamyavādārtha*, a work defending the Mādhva theory that the individual souls stand in a permanent hierarchy according to their essences. A philosopher whom Sharma refers to as "Tātācārya" responded to Vijayīndra's arguments in a text called *Vijayīndraparājaya*, which has still not been published. Sharma argues that this philosopher is identical to the philosopher referred to in an inscription recording a grant made to Vijayīndra by Sevappa Nāyaka in 1580. The text of the grant says that Vijayīndra regularly debated with Appayya Dikṣita and the Viśiṣṭādvaitin philosopher "Tātācārya" in the Nāyaka's court. In his *Bibliography*, Potter refers to the author of the *Vijayīndraparājaya* as "Kumbakonam Tātācārya", among other names. With reservation, Potter assigns him the dates 1520–1580, although these dates might be too early if he did debate with Vijayīndra in the last decades of the sixteenth century. Sharma (1981: 407), by contrast, says that Tātācārya (i.e. the author of the *Vijayīndraparājaya*) was a younger contemporary of Vijayīndra, apparently to explain the fact that Vijayīndra did not respond to his criticisms against him in the *Vijayīndraparājaya*. Dasgupta (1949: 95–100), who summarised the contents of the *Vijayīndraparājaya*, refers to the author of that text as "Parakāla Yati".

49 See Sastri (NAK: 85) and McCrear (2015) for some discussion of the *Tattvaviveka*.

50 Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka (NAB, 1:108) quotes an extensive passage from the *Tattvaviveka* when defending Vyāsatīrtha's general critique of *mithyātva*. The passage of the *Tattvaviveka* in question contains an analysis and defence of the definition of *mithyātva* that Vyāsatīrtha attributes to Citsukha in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka refers to Nṛsiṃhāśrama by name in this passage.

51 Potter's *Bibliography* dates Madhusūdana to ca. 1570. Other dates given for Madhusūdana have placed him as early as the fourteenth century and as late as the latter part of the seventeenth century. Burnouf and Lassen (Mahadevan, 1968: 259) assigned him to the middle of the fourteenth century. Winternitz (1920: 437, fn. 4) estimated that Madhusūdana lived at the end of the fifteenth/beginning of the sixteenth century, and certainly before 1550. P. M. Modi (1929: 1), who translated Madhusūdana's *Siddhāntabindu*, concluded that he lived from 1490 to 1580. P. C. Divanji (SB: xviii–xxv), who gave a particularly detailed discussion of Madhusūdana's dates, estimated that Madhusūdana lived from 1540 to 1647. According to Sastri (NAK: 85), who assigned him to the middle of the sixteenth century, Madhusūdana is traditionally regarded to have been a contemporary of Nṛsiṃhāśrama and Appayya Dikṣita. Other scholars have taken Madhusūdana to have lived at a much later time. Sharma (1981: 375) reports that Kuppaswami Sastri, for instance, dated him to the seventeenth century. On the basis of the dates he assigned the Mādhva philosophers who influenced or responded to Madhusūdana's works, Sharma (1981: 375–378) himself concluded that Madhusūdana must be dated to 1540–1600. Vyāsatīrtha obviously preceded Madhusūdana, since Madhusū-

between Mādhva and Advaitin commentators formed one of the central genres of Vedānta philosophical literature for several centuries after the *Nyāyāmṛta* was written. Sanskrit commentarial literature continued to be written on the *Nyāyāmṛta* and *Advaitasiddhi* well into the eighteenth century, and contemporary Mādhva and Advaitin scholars still compose critical analyses of the *Nyāyāmṛta* literature in modern languages in the present day. Many of the most important contributions to this debate have already been published, although a large number still await editing in manuscript libraries in South India.

Members of the Mādhva tradition responded swiftly to Madhusūdana's arguments. The lives of the Mādhva philosophers who built on Vyāsātīrtha's work are often well-documented in the hagiographies written by members of the Mādhva tradition in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. An early commentary on the *Nyāyāmṛta* which has not yet been printed seems to have been written by Vijayīndratīrtha, who has sometimes been identified as a direct student of Vyāsātīrtha.⁵² Two early Mādhva commentaries on the *Nyāyāmṛta* were written by scholars originating from a village known as Puntamba⁵³ in modern-day Maharashtra. Puntamba

dana commented on the *Nyāyāmṛta*. The *Advaitasiddhi* was in turn critiqued by Rāmācārya and Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka. Sharma surmises that if it is correct that Rāmācārya, who was a student of Raghūttama Tīrtha (1557–1595), wrote his *Taraṅginī* in around 1590, and Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka had written his commentary by 1595, then the *Advaitasiddhi* must have already existed by about 1585, and Rāmācārya and Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka would have replied to it within a few years. According to Sastri (NAK: 85), Madhusūdana originated from Faridpur in Bengal. According to Mahadevan (1968: 255), he was ordained as a renunciate early on in his life by one Viśveśvarānanda Sarasvatī. Ganeri (2011: 78) say that Madhusūdana probably studied Navya-Nyāya with Vidyānīvāsa Bhaṭṭācārya, a nephew of Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma, or one of his contemporaries. See Sanjukta Gupta (2006) and Pellegrini (2015: 282–284) for further discussion of Madhusūdana's life and education.

52 Sharma (1981: 395–396) maintains that Vijayīndra was a direct disciple of Vyāsātīrtha, yet Vijayīndra does not generally acknowledge Vyāsātīrtha as his guru in his works. Vijayīndra seems to have been favoured by Sevappa Nāyaka (r. 1532–1560), the founder of the Thanjavur Nāyakas (Sharma, 1981: 398–399). Vijayīndra wrote a commentary on the *Nyāyāmṛta* entitled the *Nyāyāmṛta-tāmoda*. It has still not been published but, according to Sharma (1981: 399), it is available in the manuscript libraries of Thanjavur. Sharma (1981: 401) reports that the scholar R. Nagaraja Sarma cited a reference from that text where Vijayīndra also refers to a longer commentary he wrote on the *Nyāyāmṛta*. However, Sharma reports that he was not able to find this reference and no manuscripts of that work have subsequently been located.

53 The name of the town is sometimes spelled Puntambe, Punatamba, or Punatambe. It is referred to in Sanskrit works as Puṇyastambhapura. In the first chapter of the *Vidyādhiśavijaya*, it is described as a centre of brahmanical learning and Vedic religion. The town is introduced thus: *asti kṣīter bhūṣaṇam abdhikanyā vibhūṣitam bhūṣītārājamārgam / sambhāvitam sadhujanena puṇyastambhābhīdhānam nagaram gariyaḥ* // (ViV: 8; verse 8.) “There is a town known as Puṇyastambha. The greatest of towns, it is a veritable ornament of the earth, wherein dwells the Lord of Lakṣmī himself. In that town, esteemed by the virtuous, are the king's roads decked with ornaments.”

was at that time a stronghold of Vaiṣṇava religion in the region. These two works, which reply directly to the *Advaitasiddhi*, were written by Vyāsa Rāmācārya (1550–1620) and Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka (1535–1605).⁵⁴ Both of these intellectuals seem to have been disciples of Raghūttama Tīrtha, who himself flourished in the latter half of the sixteenth century.⁵⁵

What little we know about Rāmācārya's life comes mainly from the benedictory verses at the beginning of his *Taraṅginī*. As Sharma (1981: 178) observes, these verses indicate that he belonged to the *Upamanyu gotra*, and that “Vyāsa” was his family name. Rāmācārya states that his native village was “Ambāpūrī”, which, according to Sharma (1981: 179), must be identified with Puntamba. Rāmācārya clearly indicates that Raghūttama was his guru, although he credits much of his education to his elder brother, one Nārāyaṇa.⁵⁶ Anantakrishna Sastri (NAK: 88) records the story that Rāmācārya was able to study with Madhusūdana in person by approaching him in the guise of an Advaitin student. According to this story, Rāmācārya wrote the *Taraṅginī* during this period of study and presented it to Madhusūdana as a gift at the conclusion of the tuition.

We have considerably more knowledge of Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka's life. This information comes mainly from a Sanskrit biography written about his son, Vidyādhiśa Tīrtha, who was a head of the Uttarādi Maṭha.⁵⁷ The modern-day Pandurāṅgi family trace their lineage back to Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka, and they ultimately claim descent from Madhva's direct disciple, Padmanābha Tīrtha.⁵⁸ Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka is said

⁵⁴ It is now widely accepted that the *Nyāyāmṛtakāṇṭhakodhāra* was written by Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka. However, there was for a long time some dispute regarding the author of the text. Sastri (NAK: 1) noted that the *Descriptive Catalogue of the Mysore Oriental Library* ascribed the text to Vijayīndra-tīrtha. As pointed out by Sharma (1981: 383), however, the *Kāṇṭhakodhāra* directly criticises the views of Vijayīndra's *Nyāyāmṛtāmōḍa*. See Williams (2014: 126–128) for a translation and an analysis of an early passage in the *Kāṇṭhakodhāra* where Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka refers to Vijayīndra's work. It is clear that Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka was only aware of *Balabhadra's Advaitasiddhividyākhyā* and not Brahmānanda's works.

⁵⁵ See Sharma (1981: 463–464) for what is known about Raghūttama's life.

⁵⁶ *padādividyāṃ bahuvinnīṣadyāṃ adhyaiṣi tattvaiṣivarād yato 'ham / namāmi taṃ vyāsakulāvataṃsaṃ nārāyaṇācāryaṃ athāgrajaṃ me ||* (*Nyāyāmṛtataraṅginī*, NAB, 1:2.) “I offer homage to my elder brother, Nārāyaṇācārya, the crest of the Vyāsa family, the greatest of truth-seekers, from whom I learnt the science of words and so on.”

⁵⁷ Vidyādhiśa is famous partly for his debate with the Advaitin scholar Raṅgoji Bhaṭṭa (a brother of the eminent grammarian Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita) in Ikkeri at the court of the Nāyaka king Veṅkaṭappā. See Deshpande (2011) for an analysis of the conflicting accounts of this debate in traditional sources.

⁵⁸ Padmanābha Tīrtha was a great logician (*Tārkika*) originally known as Śobhana Bhaṭṭa whom Madhva converted to his movement. (See SMV, 2:14–15; verses 9.17–19, for a discussion of Śobhana Bhaṭṭa's initial debate with Madhva.) Padmanābha assumed a prominent role in the Mādhva tradition after Madhva's death (Sharma, 1981: 223–224). V. Pandurāṅgi (2017: 180) notes that several

to have been the son of a learned brahmin named Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa. He studied *śāstra* in Varanasi, before learning Mādhva philosophy with Raghūttama.⁵⁹ After this he returned to Puntamba to teach. The *Vidyādhīśavijaya* indicates that Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka wrote further works elucidating Jayatīrtha's commentaries, although these are not known to modern scholarship.⁶⁰ According to the *Vidyādhīśavijaya*, the Mādhvas living in Puntamba moved south at the end of the sixteenth century because of the Muslim invasion of the area.⁶¹ Vidyādhīśa eventually took *sannyāsa* and became head of the Uttarādi Maṭha. Unlike his father, he did not write on the *Nyāyāmṛta*, although he wrote an important commentary on the opening parts of Jayatīrtha's *Nyāyasudhā* known as the *Vākyārthacandrikā*, which is said to have been composed in Udupi. Vidyādhīśa quotes from Vyāsātīrtha's *Nyāyāmṛta* and *Tātparyacandrikā* frequently in that commentary.⁶²

Rāmācārya's *Taraṅginī* clearly precedes Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka's *Kaṇṭakoddhāra*, since Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka often criticises Rāmācārya's views. As I discuss in Chapter 7, both commentaries are highly technical and evince a deep knowledge of Navya-Nyāya; both commentators frequently quote or summarise parts of Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi* and its commentaries in their works. Sharma was of the view that

traditional Mādhva scholars have claimed that Padmanābha was an ancestor of the modern-day Pandurangi family. He claims that Padmanābha's family originally settled in Puntamba and later moved to Pandharpur with Padmanābha when Madhva died. According to Pandurangi, the earliest known ancestor of the Pandurangi lineage after Padmanābha was one Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa had a son named Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa, who is mentioned in the *Vidyādhīśavijaya*. Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka is named as one of Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa's two sons. The text states that Trivikrama was a wealthy and pious brahmin who lived in Puntamba. Pandurangi (2017: 182) recounts the story of how Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka achieved learning with divine assistance. In his youth, Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka neglected his studies. Frustrated with his situation, he relocated to the town of Kolhapur in modern day Maharashtra. After Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka propitiated the goddess Mahālakṣmī for twelve years there, she took the form of a snake before him. Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka tried to grasp the snake, touching it with all ten of his fingers, and then managed to touch it once more as it slithered away. According to the story, Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka was accordingly blessed with a lineage that would span eleven generations of great scholars.

59 See V. Pandurangi (2017: 183).

60 The *Vidyādhīśavijaya* says as follows: *nisargagūḍhāṇ jayatīrthayogipraṇītamadhvāgamapañcīkārthāṇ / āścaryam akliṣṭapadābhir ūrvyāṃ yaś tīppaṇībhiḥ prakāṭicakāra* // (ViV: 15; verse 1.20.) "He [= Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka] achieved the wonderful feat of elucidating with clear-worded glosses (*tīppaṇīs*) the meaning of the innately difficult commentaries (*pañcīkā*) written by Jayatīrtha-yogi on Madhva's scriptures."

61 V. Pandurangi (2017: 186) notes that the Muslim attack on Puntamba is recorded in the *Rāṣṭrauḍhavaṃśamahākāvya*. He infers that the Muslim invasion was led by Shahzada Murad Mirza, a son of Akbar. Pandurangi surmises that he must have invaded Puntamba around 1590 or 1595 when he attacked Ahmednagar on his father's orders.

62 See Sharma (1981: 477–478) for a discussion of the contents of the *Vākyārthacandrikā*.

Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka's works are not as intellectually accomplished as Rāmācārya's, although this evaluation has been disputed by Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka's modern descendant Veeranarayana Pandurangi (2017: 183). There are clearly sections covered in this book (for instance, the *Sattvanirukti*) where Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka's arguments against Madhusūdana are far more detailed than Rāmācārya's.

Another early commentary on the *Nyāyāmṛta* is Śrīnivāsatīrtha's (1560–1640) *Nyāyāmṛtaprakāśa*. According to the modern Mādhva scholar K. T. Pandurangi, Śrīnivāsatīrtha came from the town of Bidarahalli near Bengaluru and was a nephew and disciple of a scholar known as Yādavarya. He gained the title *Tīrtha* from Rāghavendrātīrtha on the basis of his contributions to Mādhva literature despite never actually undergoing *sannyāsa*.⁶³ The *Prakāśa* is valuable to modern scholarship since it generally explains the *Nyāyāmṛta* in conventional, lucid Sanskrit, in contrast to the more technical commentaries of Rāmācārya and Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka.

These Mādhva rejoinders to Madhusūdana's *Advaitasiddhi* were in turn challenged by Advaitin philosophers. An early commentary written to defend the *Advaitasiddhi* is the *Siddhivyākhyā* of Balabhadra (fl. 1610). Balabhadra is usually taken to have been a direct student of Madhusūdana because Madhusūdana mentions him by name at the end of his *Siddhāntabindu*.⁶⁴ The *Siddhivyākhyā* is primarily a polemical response to Rāmācārya's *Taraṅginī*, of which sections are often quoted *verbatim*. Balabhadra seems to have been unaware of Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka's *Kaṇṭakodhāra*, however. Two further commentaries were written on the *Advaitasiddhi* by Gauḍa Brahmānanda (fl. 1700).⁶⁵ These were analytic works, known generally as the *Laghu- and Guru-Candrikās* or (Gauḍa-)brahmānandīyas. The *Laghucandrikā*, as the name suggests, is a condensed version of the *Gurucandrikā*. As Nair (1990: 30) points out, there has been some doubt about the authorship of the commentaries based on in-

⁶³ See VĀ: xxxix for a discussion of Śrīnivāsatīrtha's biographical details. See also K. T. Pandurangi's introduction to his 2014 edition of the *Nyāyāmṛta* and its commentaries, p. xv, for some further discussion of his life and work.

⁶⁴ The final verse of the *Siddhāntabindu* reads: *bahuyācanayā mayāyam alpo balabhadrasya kṛte kṛto nibandhaḥ / yad aduṣṭam ihāsti yac ca duṣṭam tad udārāḥ sudhiyo vivecayantu //* (SB: 111.) "I wrote this little work for the sake of Balabhadra after much nagging on his part. May the noble and wise discriminate what is at fault and what is right in it."

⁶⁵ Sastri (NAK: 81) says that Brahmānanda was a contemporary of the poet and literary critic Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja, the Mīmāṃsaka Khaṇḍadeva, the Navya-Naiyāyika Gadādhara Bhaṭṭa, and the grammarian Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa. He claims that Brahmānanda was a "class-mate" of Gadādhara in Navadvīpa. He thus assigns him to the beginning of the seventeenth century. Sastri (NAK: 90) says that Brahmānanda refers to one Śivarāma Varṇin as his preceptor. He says that Brahmānanda's pupil was Dravidācārya, who refers to Brahmānanda in his *Vārttika* on the *Brahmasūtrasāṅkara-bhāṣya*.

ternal evidence within their texts. However, he concludes that Brahmānanda must be the author of both works. Unlike Balabhadra, Brahmānanda deals not only with the *Nyāyāmṛtataraṅginī*, but also with the *Nyāyāmṛtakāṇṭhakoddhāra*.⁶⁶ Both commentaries contain highly technical reformulations of Madhusūdana's arguments using Navya-Nyāya terminology.

The Mādhva philosopher Vanamālī Miśra (fl. 1680) critiqued Brahmānanda.⁶⁷ Vanamālī seems to have originated from Bihar in North India. Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka's son, Vidyādhīśa Tīrtha, was responsible for spreading the Mādhva religion in the North, where he converted a community of *tāntrikas* in Gayā in Bihar to the Mādhva religion in the seventeenth century.⁶⁸ Vanamālī wrote a terse commentary on the *Nyāyāmṛta* known as the *Saugandhya*. Parts of the *Saugandhya* were published by Sastri (NAK). The work has also recently been published by K. T. Pandurangi (2014) in Bengaluru. Vanamālī's works were in turn critiqued by the Advaitin Viṭṭhaleśopādhyāya (fl. 1755) in the *Viṭṭhaleśopādhyāyī*, which was written to explain Brahmānanda's *Laghucandrikā*.

Vyāsatīrtha's work thus shaped the intellectual development of his tradition profoundly, and original work on the *Nyāyāmṛta* was still being written by members of the Mādhva religion three hundred years after his death. Recent scholarship has also highlighted how the text helped to reshape the Advaita tradition. Vyāsatīrtha was one of the Advaita tradition's most ruthless critics, but he seems to have exercised a profound influence over the development of Advaita philosophy in the early modern period. While it is clear that Madhusūdana himself studied Navya-Nyāya in Bengal, Vyāsatīrtha's work in the *Nyāyāmṛta* helped to draw Madhusūdana deeply into the subject and to apply Navya-Nyāya thought to his interpretation of the works of the classical Advaitins. As I discuss in Chapter 6, Vyāsatīrtha's work on indeterminacy and the problem of contradiction also prompted Madhusūdana to develop new arguments to defend his tradition's thought on this issue.

Advaitin philosophers, of course, rejected Vyāsatīrtha's arguments against their tradition, sometimes with outright disdain. Appayya Dīkṣita (fl. 1585), for instance, wrote critiques of Vyāsatīrtha and the Mādhva system with vituperative titles like "The Grinding of the Face of the System of Madhva" (*Madhvatāntramukhamardana*).⁶⁹ Nevertheless, even Appayya seems to have reused parts of Vyāsatīrtha's works implicitly on many occasions. Jonathan Duquette (2019) has explored Vyāsatīrtha's influence over Appayya's *Śivārkamanidīpikā*. He shows that

⁶⁶ Sastri (NAK: 90).

⁶⁷ See Sastri (NAK: 91) for a discussion of his date based on the evidence of his *Taraṅginīyuktisaurabha* and *Nyāyāmṛtasaugandhya*.

⁶⁸ See Sharma (1981: 387–388).

⁶⁹ For some discussion of the titles of such works, see Minkowski (2011).

in that text, Appayya draws heavily on Vyāsātīrtha's critique of Gaṅgeśa's formal inferences to prove the existence of god in the *Īśvaravāda* of the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. Duquette shows that Appayya tacitly reused aspects of the *Īśvaravāda* of Vyāsātīrtha's *Tarkatāṇḍava* to build his own critique of Gaṅgeśa's arguments. Duquette also argues that Appayya's study of Vyāsātīrtha served to catalyse his own interest in Navya-Nyāya in general.⁷⁰

Besides helping to draw Advaitin philosophers into Navya-Nyāya thought, Vyāsātīrtha's careful historical reconstruction of Advaita philosophy in the opening chapters of the *Nyāyāmṛta* may have helped to shape the Advaita tradition's understanding of its own intellectual history. As McCrea (2015: 96–97) argues in his study of the third book of the *Nyāyāmṛta*, Vyāsātīrtha's work may have marked the origin of the tendency of Advaitin philosophers to distinguish sharply between the *Bhāmatī* and *Vivaraṇa* sub-schools of Advaita thought. McCrea writes:

Considering the sharp division he draws between these two strands of Advaita thought and the seeming lack of such clear differentiation earlier, it seems almost reasonable to describe Vyāsātīrtha as the discoverer, not to say the inventor, of the *Bhāmatī* and *Vivaraṇa* schools of Advaita Vedānta. That Vyāsātīrtha's own foray into the doxography of Advaita seems to have had such a significant impact on the way the Advaitins saw the divisions in their own field is a testament to his achievements as a scholar and as an intellectual historian. One might almost go so far as to say that Vyāsātīrtha knows the Advaitins better than they know themselves.

Thus, in the process of sparring with Vyāsātīrtha, the Advaita tradition may have absorbed some of his key ideas about their own history, and Vyāsātīrtha's historical reconstruction of Advaita tradition may have helped draw divisions that are still recognised today. Despite being one of Advaita philosophy's fiercest critics and a member of a tradition many Advaitins regarded with outright disdain, Vyāsātīrtha's work in the *Nyāyāmṛta* and *Tarkatāṇḍava* quietly helped to reshape Advaita philosophy in the centuries after his death.

⁷⁰ Duquette (2019: 20) concludes his study as follows: "Above all, Appayya's mode of engagement with the TT shows how stimulating this remarkable Dvaita work would have been for him. Not only did it compel him to elaborate a systematic critique of Dvaita views on an important topic of Mīmāṃsā hermeneutics, a critique which exerted a significant influence of its own; it also catalyzed Appayya's own engagement with the broader Navya-Nyāya tradition, the development of which he arguably pioneered together with Vyāsātīrtha in South India".

2.4 The Mādhvas and the transmission of Navya-Nyāya philosophy to South India

I will conclude this section with some general remarks about the role of the Mādhvas in the history of Navya-Nyāya thought. I will also discuss Vyāsātīrtha's use of Navya-Nyāya extensively in the introduction to Chapter 7 of this volume. I conclude this section with some remarks about the Mādhvas' engagement with the works of Navya-Nyāya before and after Vyāsātīrtha. The Mādhvas played an important role in bringing Navya-Nyāya learning to South India, and modern Mādhva scholars are still proud of their role in bringing the works of Gaṅgeśa and his followers to the South. Contemporary Mādhva scholars continue to study Navya-Nyāya philosophy, and students trained at the Mādhva *vidyāpīṭhas* in South India regularly participate in competitive debates on Navya-Nyāya works. Vyāsātīrtha was the first intellectual in his tradition, and probably the first in South India, whose works show a detailed engagement with Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. According to the dates accepted by modern scholars, Gaṅgeśa (*fl.* 1325) lived approximately 175 years before Vyāsātīrtha was in his prime. Vyāsātīrtha's earliest commentaries on the works of Madhva and Jayātīrtha show that he had an advanced knowledge of contemporary Nyāya ideas and technical language. By the time he composed the *Nyāyāmṛta*, however, it is clear that Vyāsātīrtha had studied the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* in depth. He shows an extensive familiarity with the second chapter of Gaṅgeśa's work, which deals with the theory of inference.

There is some evidence that Gaṅgeśa's arguments were already being studied in South India when Vyāsātīrtha was writing.⁷¹ However, the Naiyāyikas were not a major rival of the Mādhvas in the South. While Navya-Nyāya philosophy was undoubtedly studied in South India during the early modern period, the epicentre of Navya-Nyāya learning clearly lay in North India, first in Mithila and later in Bengal. It is difficult to identify any outstanding Nyāya philosophers in South India during the Vijayanagara period.⁷² The Mādhvas' leading competitors in the Vijayanagara Empire were the Advaita and Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedāntins, and later the Śivādvaita

⁷¹ See Williams (2014: 132–133).

⁷² One Naiyāyika who was based at Vijayanagara was Cennu Bhaṭṭa (also “Cinnam Bhaṭṭa”). Cennu Bhaṭṭa wrote commentaries on two Nyāya texts: Varadarāja's (*fl.* 1150) *Tārkikarakṣāsārasaṅgraha* and Keśava Miśra's (*fl.* 1250) *Tarkabhāṣā*. Cennu Bhaṭṭa himself probably lived towards the beginning of the fourteenth century. However, both of his extant texts are commentaries on *prācīna*-Nyāya works, and they do not show any influence from Gaṅgeśa. Bhattacharyya and Potter (2011: 368–369) give an overview of scholarship on Cennu Bhaṭṭa's life.

and Vīra-Śaiva movements.⁷³ If the Navya-Naiyāyikas were not among the leading competitors to the Mādhvas in the South, what motivated Vyāsātīrtha to engage so deeply with the school's ideas?

Until the sixteenth century, the Mādhvas had largely been ignored by the other traditions of Indian philosophy. Vyāsātīrtha's three major works clearly reflect an ambition to raise the profile of the Mādhvas as a philosophical school and to engage other traditions of philosophy in critical debate. The evidence from the *Tarkatāṇḍava* suggests that Vyāsātīrtha wanted to engage with cutting-edge Navya-Nyāya philosophers, including intellectuals like Yajñapati Upādhyāya (fl. 1460) and Jayadeva Pakṣadhara (fl. 1470), who seem to have been senior contemporaries of his. By engaging with Navya-Nyāya, a prestigious new philosophical school which already seems to have had some standing among South Indian intellectuals,⁷⁴ Vyāsātīrtha hoped to raise the profile of his own tradition and to demonstrate that the Mādhvas should be regarded as a serious intellectual presence in the Indian philosophical world.

Vyāsātīrtha's work on Navya-Nyāya seems to be part of the broader move to normalise Mādhva philosophy that is already discernible in the works of the fourteenth-century Mādhva philosopher Viṣṇudāsācārya. In the early modern period, Advaitin philosophers like Appayya Dīkṣita seized upon the fact that Mādhva himself had grounded his philosophical ideas in the controversial "lost" texts whose existence has been doubted by modern scholars. Vyāsātīrtha does not place much stress on these texts in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. The only place where he really makes use of such controversial sources is in the final book of the work, when discussing the distinctive Mādhva theory that the individual souls continue to stand in a hierarchical relationship to one another even in liberation.⁷⁵ He avoids the *Brahmatarka*, for instance, which is traditionally regarded as the basic Mādhva text on epistemology.⁷⁶

⁷³ See Stoker (2011) for an analysis of Vyāsātīrtha's critique of the Viśiṣṭādvaita theory of liberation in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. Vijayīndratīrtha, for instance, is said to have had a dispute with a Vīra-Śaiva guru at Kumbakonam. See Sharma (1981: 399).

⁷⁴ See Williams (2014: 146, fn. 25) for a discussion of a passage from the *Vyāsa-yogicarita* which suggests that Gaṅgeśa's work was already being used by South Indian philosophers during Vyāsātīrtha's lifetime.

⁷⁵ See NAB, 3:704–713. Stoker (2016: 182) discusses one of these references while analysing the relevant part of the *Nyāyāmṛta*.

⁷⁶ The Mādhva philosopher Satyanātha Tīrtha (fl. 1670), however, emphasises the authority of the *Brahmatarka* as a text in his work. At the beginning of the *Prāmānyavāda* of the *Abhinavatāṇḍava* he writes: *atha saṃsāra-kāntāre nīpatitān mokṣa-yogyān kṛpayoddidhīr-śuḥ bhagavān nārāyaṇaḥ pramāṇatattvajñānasya prameyatattvādvadhāraṇasyeva mokṣa-hetutvāt pramāṇatattvanirṇayaḥ brahmatarkaśāstram acikṣpat. tasya śāstras-yedānīṭtanair adhyetum aśakyatvena śrīmadācārya-praṇītagranthānusāreṇa mandabodhāya pramāṇatattvam atra vicāryate.* (AT: 11.) "Now, Lord Nārāyaṇa,

His engagement with key specialist disciplines of Indian thought (grammatical science, Mīmāṃsā, and Navya-Nyāya in particular) reflect this project to normalise Mādhva philosophy and to confer mainstream respectability on it by justifying it in the terms of these traditions. These factors no doubt contributed to the success of Vyāsātīrtha's work in attracting replies from leading scholars of opposing schools, including Madhusūdana.

In the opening chapters of the *Nyāyāmṛta*, Vyāsātīrtha appears keen to demonstrate to his readers that he is familiar with Gaṅgeśa's work. He alludes frequently to the chapter of the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* that deals with inference. The early portions of the *Nyāyāmṛta* show Vyāsātīrtha's knowledge of the "Discourse about Subjecthood" section of the text (the *Pakṣatāvāda*)⁷⁷ and Gaṅgeśa's inferences to prove the existence of god (the *Īśvaravāda*). In his *Prathamamithyātvaḥaṅga*, Vyāsātīrtha alludes frequently to the section of the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* dealing with "universal-negative inference" (*kevalavyatireki-anumāna*).

In the *Nyāyāmṛta*, it is clear that Vyāsātīrtha's main Navya-Nyāya influence was Gaṅgeśa. As far as I am aware, he does not refer to any post-Gaṅgeśa Navya-Nyāya philosophers, although his commentators sometimes do. By the time he wrote the *Tarkatāṇḍava*, however, Vyāsātīrtha clearly had a much deeper knowledge not only of Gaṅgeśa, but also of Gaṅgeśa's intellectual heirs in Mithila. In the *Tarkatāṇḍava*, for example, Vyāsātīrtha is clearly aware of the works of Gaṅgeśa's son, Vardhamāna Upādhyāya (fl. 1345).⁷⁸ He is also aware of Gaṅgeśa's commentator, Jayadeva Pakṣadhara, whose ideas he incorporates into his account of Gaṅgeśa's for-

desiring to save the [individual souls] fit for liberation who had fallen into the dense forest of *saṃsāra*, composed the scientific treatise known as the *Brahmatarka* in order that [they could] understand the means of knowledge; for, an awareness of the truth about the means of knowledge is an expedient to liberation just as the ascertainment of the truth about the objects of knowledge is. Since this scientific treatise cannot be understood by those belonging to the present [*kali*] age, in [this treatise,] following the works written by Madhva[Ācārya, I] deliberate on the truth about the means of knowledge to enlighten the slow-minded [beings living in this *kali-yuga*]." The *Brahmatarka* is a controversial text. As Satyanātha indicates here, it is regarded by the Mādhva tradition as being a work authored by god himself to aid sentient beings to obtain *mokṣa*. However, critics of the Mādhva tradition have long argued that the *Brahmatarka*, a text unknown outside of Madhva's works, was composed by Madhva himself to validate his own arguments. See Mesquita (2000b) for this argument.

⁷⁷ Vyāsātīrtha refers to Gaṅgeśa's definition of subjecthood (*pakṣatā*) when giving a statement of disagreement (*vipratipatti-vākya*) early in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. See below, p. 188, for a discussion of this passage.

⁷⁸ Vyāsātīrtha refers to Vardhamāna's commentary on Udayana's *Nyāyakusumāñjali* when discussing various proofs for the existence of god offered by Udayana in that text. See TT, 1:359–377.

mal inferences to prove the existence of god.⁷⁹ He is also clearly aware of Jayadeva's teacher and rival, Yajñapati Upādhyāya, particularly Yajñapati's commentary on the chapter of Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi* that deals with perception.⁸⁰ Vyāsātīrtha's commentator Rāghavendratīrtha also seems to suggest that Vyāsātīrtha was aware of Pragalbha (fl. 1470) and Rucidatta Miśra (fl. 1505), although it is not clear from his texts themselves that Vyāsātīrtha was actually aware of these thinkers.⁸¹

By contrast to the *Nyāyāmṛta*, the *Tarkatāṇḍava* fell on deaf ears. Several Mādhva philosophers wrote commentaries on it, but the Navya-Naiyāyikas seem to have ignored the text entirely. No reply to the *Tarkatāṇḍava* by the Navya-Naiyāyikas is known to modern scholarship, and the later Mādhva works on the *Tarkatāṇḍava* that have so far been published—Satyanātha's *Abhinavatāṇḍava* and Rāghavendra's *Nyāyadīpa*—do not contain any references to rejoinders written by Navya-Nyāya philosophers.⁸²

Nevertheless, Mādhva scholars after Vyāsātīrtha continued to critique Navya-Nyāya thought. Vijayīndra Tīrtha wrote a commentary on the *Nyāyāmṛta* entitled the *Nyāyāmṛtāmōḍa*. It has not yet been published, but according to Sharma (1981: 401) it is preserved in the manuscript libraries of Thanjavur. Sharma says that the

⁷⁹ The influence of Jayadeva can be observed throughout the *Īśvaravāda* of the *Tarkatāṇḍava*. In the *Nyāyadīpa*, Rāghavendra alerts us to many instances where Vyāsātīrtha incorporates Jayadeva's arguments into his analysis of Gaṅgeśa's position. See for instance TT, 1:289–290, 292, etc. Jayadeva's arguments and ideas appear regularly throughout the *Tarkatāṇḍava*, and Rāghavendra is careful to point out these references.

⁸⁰ I have discussed one passage of the *Tarkatāṇḍava* where Vyāsātīrtha was clearly influenced by Yajñapati in Chapter 7, fn. 30. Vyāsātīrtha deals with Yajñapati mainly in the section of the *Tarkatāṇḍava* that discusses veridicality (*prāmānya*), particularly on the question of whether the veridicality of a cognition is apprehended "intrinsically" (*svataḥ-prāmānyavāda*) or "extrinsically" (*parataḥ-prāmānyavāda*). See TT, 1:158–166.

⁸¹ Rāghavendra refers to Pragalbha Miśra only infrequently and usually mentions him in connection with Jayadeva. Rāghavendra does seem to ascribe a knowledge of Pragalbha's work to Vyāsātīrtha when dealing with his ideas about the nature of veridical awareness (*pramā*) (see, e.g., TT, 1:148 and 166). Rāghavendra also refers sometimes to "Rucidatta and so on" (*rucidattādī*), although he always seems to mention Rucidatta's ideas as an aside to the discussion. If Potter's dates for Rucidatta are accurate, it seems unlikely that Vyāsātīrtha was familiar with his work. However, other scholars have given earlier dates for Rucidatta. For instance, Ramanuja Tatacharya (ACT: 25) dates him to 1450.

⁸² However, Sharma has cited a number of traditions that suggest that Vyāsātīrtha made a profound impression on contemporary Navya-Naiyāyikas. These include an admiring verse apparently spoken by Jayadeva Pakṣadhara, in which Jayadeva, upon visiting Muḷbāgal in the Vijayanagara Empire, admits to being matched by Vyāsātīrtha. Sharma takes this as evidence that Jayadeva and Vyāsātīrtha met. The verse reads: *yad adhitam, tad adhitam; yad anadhitam tad apy adhitam / pakṣadharavipakṣo nāvekṣi vinā navānavyāsena* //. Sharma does not give a source for the verse other than referring to it as a "tradition". See Sharma (1981: 294).

scholar R. Nagaraja Sarma has cited a reference where Vijayīndra refers to a larger commentary he wrote on the *Nyāyāmṛta*. However, Sharma himself was not able to find this reference and the text has not been identified. Vijayīndra also wrote a commentary on the *Tarkatāṇḍava*. A manuscript of this is preserved at the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library in Mysuru. Modern Mādhva scholars are not interested in editing this work, however, in light of the corrupt state of the manuscript.⁸³

The only commentary on the *Tarkatāṇḍava* that has been published is Rāghavendra's *Nyāyadīpa*. In the text, Rāghavendra shows that he had studied the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* in depth, as well as the works of Yajñapati and Jayadeva. He quotes from Jayadeva's *Tattvacintāmaṇyaloka* frequently. He also shows that he was aware of a number of other Navya-Nyāya authors from Mithila and Bengal, including Praḡalbha, Rucidatta, Narahari Upādhyāya, either Maheśa or Madhusūdana Ṭhakkura, and Raghunātha Śiromaṇi.⁸⁴ Rāghavendra's goal in the *Nyāyadīpa* is to explain the *Tarkatāṇḍava* in lucid language; it is generally not an original work of philosophy.

An outstanding Mādhva author of the seventeenth century whose works so far have gathered little attention is Satyanātha Tīrtha (fl. 1670). According to Sharma (1981: 445), Satyanātha was a contemporary of the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb and the head of the Uttaradi Matha in Bengaluru. He seems to have been trained as a philosopher in Varanasi. He wrote a number of commentaries on the classical texts of the Mādhva tradition, as well as an independent critique of Navya-Nyāya called the *Abhinavatāṇḍava*.⁸⁵ The *Abhinavatāṇḍava* is acknowledged in the Mādhva tradition to be a highly original critique of Navya-Nyāya philosophy. Satyanātha's treatment of the luminaries of Navya-Nyāya is less than reverent. He regularly refers to Gaṅgeśa, Raghunātha, and their followers with contempt as *sthūladṛśvans*—"blockheads"! Despite the interest shown in Navya-Nyāya by

⁸³ When visiting the library in 2019, I was allowed to see this manuscript, but not to obtain copies. The text is preserved in a lined notebook in Devanagari script. The manuscript only extends for the first few *granthas* of the text, and covers only the part of Vijayīndra's commentary that deals with Vyāsātīrtha's discussion of veridicality. I was informed by the Mādhva scholar Veeranarayana Pandurangi that Prof. D. Prahladachar of the Vyāsarāya Maṭha considered editing the commentary on the basis of this manuscript, but gave up because of the highly corrupt state of the text as it is preserved in the witness.

⁸⁴ Rāghavendra quotes directly from Narahari, who is taken to have been Yajñapati's son and a student of Jayadeva; see TT, 1:24. In his commentary on the *Īśvaravāda* of the *Tarkatāṇḍava*, Rāghavendra refers twice to one "Ṭhakkura" (see TT, 1:293 and 320). Rāghavendra refers to Raghunātha when analysing Gaṅgeśa's final definition of pervasion (*vyāptisiddhāntalakṣaṇa*; see TT, 4:17).

⁸⁵ A rare edition of this text was prepared by Satyadhyāna Rāmācārya Kaṭṭi and printed by the Uttaradi Matha in Bengaluru in 1988. Several manuscripts of the text are preserved in Thanjavur by the Sarasvati Mahal Library. There is further a manuscript of the text in the private collection of Veeranarayana Pandurangi in Bengaluru.

Mādhva thinkers, Satyanātha's work does not contain any evidence that the Navya-Naiyāyikas replied to Vyāsātīrtha and his followers.

In the *Abhinavatāṇḍava*, Satyanātha shows a deep knowledge of the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, from which he quotes extensively. He is also aware of the Mithila school of Navya-Nyāya. Satyanātha refers explicitly to Yajñapati (AT: 28), Jayadeva (AT: 242), and Jayadeva's student, Rucidatta Miśra (AT: 229). Like Rāghavendra, Satyanātha was also aware of the commentaries of the Bengal school of Navya-Nyāya. He had clearly read and studied the *Dīdhiti* commentary of Raghunātha, whose views he refers to frequently in the chapter of the *Abhinavatāṇḍava* that deals with inference. He also refers to Raghunātha once (AT: 200) in the chapter of the *Abhinavatāṇḍava* that deals with the subject of negative particles (*nañārtha*). He does not refer to Raghunātha at all when discussing perception, however. He further refers to Raghunātha's teacher, Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma (*fl.* 1490) (AT: 294). Satyanātha does not explicitly refer to Gadādhara Bhaṭṭa (*fl.* 1660), who was probably a contemporary of his. However, he sometimes refers anonymously to the works of Navya-Nyāya philosophers⁸⁶ who were presumably his contemporaries. Further study is needed to ascertain the philosophers he had in mind in these parts of the text.

Some of the leading work on Navya-Nyāya in the Mādhva tradition after Vyāsātīrtha is found in Mādhva commentaries on the *Nyāyāmṛta*. Unlike Vyāsātīrtha, who does not seem to have had any extensive personal contact with Navya-Naiyāyikas in North India, Madhusūdana seems to have studied Navya-Nyāya in Bengal. According to some scholars, Madhusūdana learned Navya-Nyāya with Mathurānātha Tarkavāgīśa, who was himself possibly a student of Raghunātha Śiromaṇi.⁸⁷ The authors of two of the earliest Mādhva replies to the *Advaitasiddhi*, Vyāsa Rāmācārya and Ānanda Bhaṭṭāraka clearly had a deep knowledge of the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. Rāmācārya also refers to Raghunātha Śiromaṇi by name in his *Taraṅginī*.⁸⁸ Śrīnivāsātīrtha clearly studied the works of Rucidatta, whom he alludes to in his commentary on the *Nyāyāmṛta*.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ See, for instance, Satyanātha's discussion of pervasion (AT: 238–239).

⁸⁷ See Gupta (2006) and Pellegrini (2015) for recent discussions of Madhusūdana's education.

⁸⁸ See *Nyāyāmṛtataraṅginī*, NAB: 1:266. Rāmācārya refers here to Raghunātha's commentary on Udayana's *Āmatattvaviveka* (which Rāmācārya refers to as the *Bauddhādhikāra*). He writes: *sahopalambhaḥ sahopalambhaniyamaḥ. etac ca prapañcitam bauddhādhikāre—grāhyagrāhakayor abhede sādhye sahopalambhaniyamo hetutvenopādīyata iti. etac ca vyākhyātam śiromaṇinā—sahopalambhaniyamaḥ niyamenaikavittivedyatvam, tadaviśayakajñānāviśayatvaṃ vā, teṣaṃ mate jñānasya svaprakāśatvāt, jñānajñeyayor abhede ca jñānajñeyagrāhakābhyāṃ jñeyajñānayor api grahaṇān nāsiddhir iti.*

⁸⁹ See K. T. Pandurangi's 2014 edition of the *Nyāyāmṛta*, vol. 1, p. 55.

The practice of writing commentaries on the *Nyāyāmṛta* continued well into the eighteenth century. K. T. Pandurangi's 2014 edition of the *Nyāyāmṛta* contains a previously unpublished commentary which sheds new light on the development of the ideas of the Mādhva school in the eighteenth century. This work was written by Mannāri Kṛṣṇācārya (fl. 1780)⁹⁰ and is called the *Nyāyāmṛtamādhūrī*. It is a highly original and formidably difficult work; it gives a detailed analysis of Vyāsātīrtha's arguments in the light of Raghunātha and Gadādhara's new ideas about epistemology. It is especially concerned with refuting Brahmānanda's commentaries on the *Advaitasiddhi*. A more detailed study of this work is yet to be undertaken, but it shows that original contributions were still being made to the *Nyāyāmṛta* literature in the late eighteenth century.⁹¹

Pandurangi's edition further contains a new commentary that seems to have been written earlier than the *Nyāyāmṛtamādhūrī*. The *Nyāyakalpalatā*, written by one Kūrma Narahari Ācārya, seems to be a more derivative commentary. It quotes extensively from the earlier Mādhva commentarial literature on the *Nyāyāmṛta*, particularly the *Taraṅginī*. However, it also gives extensive explanations and glosses of the passages it quotes. It is apparently not influenced by the works of Raghunātha and Gadādhara. According to K. T. Pandurangi, Kūrma Narahari Ācārya was an expert in Mīmāṃsā.⁹²

⁹⁰ In his introduction to his 2014 edition of the *Nyāyāmṛta* and its commentaries, p. xvi, K. T. Pandurangi says that Kṛṣṇācārya was the grandson of Satyapriyātīrtha (fl. 1740), a *Pīṭhādhipati* of the Uttarādi Maṭha. However, Sharma gives the date of Satyapriyātīrtha as lying in the middle of the seventeenth century. It must therefore be that the dating of Kṛṣṇācārya to the latter half of the seventeenth century is simply a mistake for the latter half of the eighteenth century. According to Pandurangi, Kṛṣṇācārya further wrote a commentary on the *Tarkatāṇḍava*, another on Vyāsātīrtha's *Tātparyacandrikā*, and also a work on the *Tattvoddhṛta* and its commentaries.

⁹¹ A number of commentaries were written on the *Nyāyāmṛta*-literature in the twentieth century. The most outstanding is the *Bālabodhinī*, a commentary on the *Advaitasiddhi* by Yogendranath Bagchi. Unfortunately, this commentary was never completed; Sitansukhar explains in his preface to the text that Bagchi died before he could finish the work (*na vismartavyam, yad bālabodhinīkāraḥ svakṛtisamāpteh prāg eva vijñānaghane brahmaṇi vilayaṃ gataḥ*. [ASV: 3]). The commentary presents a clear explanation of the *Advaitasiddhi* for less experienced readers by synthesizing the views of the major commentators on the text. The Advaitin scholar Anantakrishna Sastri (NAK) also wrote a brief commentary entitled *Saugandhyavimarśa*, which he refers to as a "Critical Study of the *Nyāyāmṛtasaugandhya*" of Vanamāli Miśra. A notable commentary on the *Advaitasiddhi* in Hindi is the *Advaitasiddhihindivyākhyā* of Svāmi Yogīndrānanda. Yogīndrānanda's edition contains the text of both the *Nyāyāmṛta* and the *Advaitasiddhi*, but the commentary was written primarily to explain the *Advaitasiddhi*.

⁹² See K. T. Pandurangi's 2014 edition of the *Nyāyāmṛta*, p. xvi, for a brief discussion of his life and contribution to the *Nyāyāmṛta* debate.

2.5 Conclusion

In the two centuries following Madhva's death, the Mādhva tradition was largely ignored by the other schools of philosophy in South India. The *Nyāyāmṛta* finally succeeded in drawing the Advaitins and the Viśiṣṭādvaitins into critical dialogue with the Mādhvas. Vyāsatīrtha's work in the *Nyāyāmṛta* and *Tātparyacandrikā* helped reshape the discourse among Vedānta philosophers in the early modern period. In the three centuries after his death, the *Nyāyāmṛta* was a central focus of the energy of the leading Mādhva and Advaita philosophers of the day, drawing some of these traditions' leading philosophers into debate with one another. Vyāsatīrtha's rich historical construction of Advaita philosophy also subtly reshaped Advaita philosophy itself, drawing the Advaitins further into Navya-Nyāya learning and eventually leading them to reframe their own intellectual history.

As Stoker (2016) has shown, the *Nyāyāmṛta* undoubtedly helped to improve the profile of the Mādhvas in South India, and, in turn, the Mādhvas' rise to a position of prominence in the Vijayanagara Empire increased interest in Vyāsatīrtha's work. This allowed the Mādhva tradition to expand its institutional network and sphere of influence in South India considerably. Vyāsatīrtha's success in attracting patronage from the emperors of the Tuluva dynasty gave him new opportunities to publicize his work and undoubtedly contributed to the willingness of the other traditions of Vedānta to take Mādhva philosophy more seriously. The result of Vyāsatīrtha's work was thus a far more outward-looking Mādhva tradition that enjoyed new intellectual credibility alongside considerable political influence in South India.

In the next section, I will reconstruct the intellectual background to the *Nyāyāmṛta* in the Mādhva and Advaita traditions. The *Nyāyāmṛta* was primarily written as a vindication of the theology of Madhva and Jayatīrtha. In Chapter 3, I present an overview of the Mādhva theology that Vyāsatīrtha is defending in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. I focus particularly on Jayatīrtha's commentaries on Madhva's works, which Vyāsatīrtha studied with his intellectual preceptor Śrīpādarāja at Mulbagal. In Chapter 4, I turn to the rich reconstruction of Advaita philosophy that Vyāsatīrtha gives in the opening chapters of the *Nyāyāmṛta*.