Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 66 (2012)

Heft: 2

Artikel: On the new ways of the late vedic hermeneutics : Mmms and Navya-Nyya

Autor: Diaconescu, Bogdan

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-306442

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 10.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

ON THE NEW WAYS OF THE LATE VEDIC HERMENEUTICS: MĪMĀṂSĀ AND NAVYA-NYĀYA

Bogdan Diaconescu

Abstract

This article aims to follow the process of adoption of Nāvya-Nyāya techniques of cognitive analysis in the school of Vedic hermeneutics, Mīmāṃsā, in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, in the larger context of the spread of these techniques in India. I shall argue that this process arises in Mīmāṃsā on the sidelines of the Advaita-Dvaita Vedānta controversy in South India, then subsequently flourishes in Varanasi. These techniques are adopted gradually and selectively, for not all the Mīmāṃsā thinkers choose to use them.

The South-Asian intellectual history witnessed from the eleventh century onwards the appearance of new modalities of cognitive analysis developed in the work of the most influential representatives of the Nyāya school of philosophy, the Mithilā philosophers Udayana (ca. 983)[1] and Gaṅgeśa (ca. 1320) and the Bengali philosopher Raghunātha Śiromaṇi (ca. 1510). These extraordinary innovations of the the "new" school of logic, Navya-Nyāya, enjoy an extremely creative period in the following centuries, with thinkers like Jānakīnātha Cūḍāmaṇi Bhaṭṭācārya (ca. 1540), Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya (ca. 1570), Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīśa (ca. 1600), Jayarāma Nyāyapañcānana (ca 1620), Jagadīśa (Miśra) Bhaṭṭācārya (ca. 1630), Mathurānātha Tarkavāgīśa (ca. 1650), Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācārya Cakravartin (ca. 1660) and so on up to modern times.[2] The development of these philosophical innovations in metaphysics, epistemology and theory of logic is parallel with the construction of a new technical language which informs every aspect of the philosophical discourse of Navya-Nyāya. These tools and technical procedures bring Navya-Nyāya texts to a high degree of complexity and make them the most challenging to read in the

1 Unless otherwise stated, the dates are those of the EIP, vol. 1, and of the online edition.

2 See the EIP vols. 2, 6, and 13. For a bird's-eye view in the Nyāya intellectual production after 1750, see PATIL, 2011.

whole of Indian philosophy. The new technical language is concerned with the analysis of cognition and the definition of concepts and terms and the subsequent refining of these definitions. And while the central object of inquiry of Navya-Nyāya was epistemology and theory of logic, with particular emphasis on inferential reasoning, the new idiom of analysis has been adopted in the course of time in other Brahmanical schools, among which Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta, Vyākaraṇa, in literary and aesthetic theory and rhetoric, in jurisprudence and in Jain logic. These schools, some of which are in utter disagreement with Nyāya metaphysical or epistemological tenets, adopt gradually and selectively these innovations in method and style for their own needs.

An analysis of the Navya-Nyāya technical language is far beyond the scope of the present article. There is a good amount of excellent publications that have attempted to describe it, some in detail.[3] In brief, the Nyāya philosophers seek a new method for describing structures cognized in various circumstances. They turn to linguistics and grammar for a new model, yet the new language is not a metalanguage. It is a non-symbolic development of Sanskrit, of which a central characteristic is the capacity of disambiguation with a view to greater precision in thinking and capability to describe cognitive contents. Several logical words are part of the technical language (avacchedaka "limitor," adhikaraṇa or *ādhāra* "substratum," vṛtti "occurrence," *nirūpaka* "describer," pratiyogin "counterpositive" etc.) along with other non-logical tems and with expressions pertaining to the concept of relation, to which the Navya-Naiyāyikas attach great importance.[4] Ganeri summarizes the syntax of the technical language as consisting of

> relational abstract expressions, various different kinds of term expressions – primitive, relational, abstract, and negative – and a negation particle.[5]

Ingalls condenses the Navya-Nyāya innovations into three points:

3 INGALLS, 1951, and 1955; MATILAL, 1968; MAHEŚA CHANRA, 1973; GUHA, 1979; EIP, vol. 6: 3–81 and vol. 13: 33–177; S. BHATTACHARYYA, 1990; BANERJEE, 1995; KRISHNA, 1997; ASIATIC SOCIETY (KOLKATA) ed., 2004; CHAKRABARTI, 2004; U. JHA trans., 2004; K. BHATTACHARYA, 2006; SEN, 2006; WADA, 1990 and 2007; GANERI, 2008, and 2011: 223–236. See also (of more general interest): JACOBI, 1903; HARTMANN, 1955; STAAL, 1988, and 1995.

4 These terms are discussed to various extents in the publications mentioned in the above note. See INGALLS, 1951: 28–85, for a comprehensive survey.

5 GANERI, 2011: 228.

> A new method of universalization, rendered possible by the concept of limitation (avac-*chedakatā*); the discovery of a number of laws similar to the theorems of propositional logic; a new interest in the definition of relations and the use of these relations in operations of considerable complexity.[6]

My aim in this article is to retrace the way Mīmāṃsā adopted the Navya-Nyāya techniques of analysis in the larger context of the spread of these techniques in India from Mithilā, their land of origin, and subsequently Bengal. The research has been carried out on texts in Mīmāṃsā in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, which witness the apparition and the consolidation of the use of the new techniques in Mīmāṃsā texts; these techniques continue to be used after this period. Given the limitations of the present article, I have not tried to here analyse in-depth particular doctrinal points which illustrate how and why these techniques are used and what their exact contribution is; this is attempted elsewhere.[7]

The results of this survey are bound to be provisional in at least two ways. Firstly, a number of texts in Mīmāṃsā of this period are unpublished and our knowledge of Mīmāṃsā and its position in Indian intellectual history of this period leaves much to be desired, to say the least,[8] just as our understanding of Mīmāṃsā in general for that matter. Secondly, the adoption of the new techniques in Mīmāṃsā is part of the larger process of their adoption in other Sanskrit knowledge-systems, which is still to be studied. A treatment of the adoption of the Navya-Nyāya techniques in any particular system relies therefore on a two-way methodology: the study of this process in particular systems contributes to the understanding of the process as a whole, which in turn, once better understood, will throw new lights on the particular processes.

A couple of remarks are in order here in connection with the second point. Any study of this process made by investigating individual systems must constantly take into account the entangled histories of arguments, texts, persons and systems. Ideally, the historical study of the influence of the Navya-Nyāya techniques on other Sanskrit knowledge-systems should be undertaken simultaneously on all the knowledge systems in a given period of time. The knowledge-systems are interwoven – Mīmāṃsā, for instance, with Nyāya, Vedānta, Vyākaraṇa, Dharmaśāstra, and so on – and in their interactions the Nyāya

6 INGALLS, 2001: 113.

7 An example is studied in DIACONESCU, forthcoming a.

8 A survey of the socio-intellectual history of Mīmāṃsā in early modern India is attempted in DIACONESCU, forthcoming b.

method of dialectical argumentation is prevalent; this is manifest in the dialogical structure underlying their texts. On top of this dialectical method came the new techniques, which are adopted as a neutral instrument of intellectual analysis. However, considering the complexity of such an interdisciplinary task, the present study is more modest in scope and limits itself to texts of Mīmāṃsā. Yet this study cannot escape the above mentioned interdisciplinarity. The understanding of the adoption of the Navya-Nyāya techniques in Mīmāṃsā works produced in the South requires a detour via Mīmāṃsā-Vedānta and Vedānta-Nyāya interactions. The succint excursus given below indicates in turn the need for further research on the adoption of the new techniques by authors in Vedānta. Forthermore, many of the authors of the Mīmāṃsā texts who use Navya-Nyāya features, some of which are among the most prolific in Indian intellectual history, have composed texts in several systems; a number of them have become famous in the eyes of the tradition primarily for work in other systems, not in Mīmāṃsā, like Appayadīkṣita in Vedānta and Alaṅkāraśāstra, Vijayīndratīrtha in Dvaita Vedānta or members of the Bhaṭṭa family of Varanasi in Dharmaśāstra. Moreover, the personal histories of the authors and the networks around which they are grouped offer new elements by their educational lineages, personal interactions, patronage received, political or institutional connections. Some of these authors have held debates or polemicized against each other, sometimes on topics pertaining to other disciplines than Mīmāṃsā.

While the Navya-Nyāya enjoys significant development in the fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries in Mithilā, then in Bengal – the most influential text of Navya-Nyāya, Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi* has been composed in the early fourteenth century, followed by the appearance of commentaries thereon, in parallel with commentaries on the work of Udayana and other works and the appearance of Raghunātha Śiromaṇi's writings – the Mīmāṃsā texts of this time do not appear to show Nyāya influence. Mīmāṃsā works[9] are produced in this period mainly in two centers: Mithilā and the South. In Mithilā are written works like the Vijaya of Anantanārāyaṇa (ca. 1400), which is a commentary on Paritoṣamiśra's *Tantravārttikājitā* (ca. 1150); the *Bhāṣyadīpa* of Kṣīrasāgaramiśra (ca.

9 Research for this article has been made only on published Mīmāṃsā texts, not on unprinted works, which will not be mentioned. Most of the published texts are printed independently in books or periodicals; of some texts only fragments in the secondary literature are published. For detailed reference, see the Bibliography.

1400), a commentary on the *Śābarabhāṣya* according to the Prābhākara school;[10] the *Mīmāṃsā*rasapalvala of Indrapati Ṭhakkura (ca. 1450). That Navya-Nyāya techniques do not make their way into Mīmāṃsā works at this time is clearly shown in the case of Devanātha Ṭhakkura (ca. 1540), who is a Navya-Naiyāyika – he wrote a *Pariśiṣṭa* to Jayadeva Pakṣadharamiśra's *Āloka*, a commentary on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. Among other works on various disciplines, Devanātha Ṭhakkura wrote a work on Mīmāṃsā as applied to Dharmaśāstra, the Adhikaraṇakaumudī, in which he does not use the Navya-Nyāya terminology.[11] In the South, wrote Mīmāṃsā works in this period, among others, Ravideva (ca. 1450) – the Vivekatattva, a commentary on Bhāvanātha's Nayaviveka; members of the Payyūr Bhaṭṭatiri family, like Payyūr Vāsudeva II (ca. 1450), who wrote the *Kaumārilayuktimālā*,[12] and his brother Ṛṣiputra Parameśvara (ca. 1410), whose commentary on Vācaspatimiśra's Tattvabindu, the *Tattvavibhāvanā*, is published.

Vedānta and Nyāya: Southern Networks

One key to understanding how the new technical language begins to be used in Mīmāṃsā is … Vedānta. A first attempt to retrace the spreading of Navya-Nyāya techniques in India, with special reference to their arrival in Varanasi, has been made in Bronkhorst, Diaconescu, Kulkarni (2012), without however dealing specifically with Mīmāṃsā texts. A distinction has been drawn there between passive absorption and active appropriation of the Navya-Nyāya innovations. The article shows that the journey of these techniques from Mithilā to Varanasi through Vijayanagara was of the kind called active appropriation, in the context of Vedāntic debates, whereas the direct road from Mithilā to Varanasi was initially limited to passive absorption.

10 Fragments of this text are published in RAMASWAMI SASTRI, 1951. See also KUNHAN RAJA, 1945.

11 On Devanātha Ṭhakkura, see D. BHATTACHARYA, 1958: 189–192, U. MISHRA, 1966: 370–373 and EIP, vol. 13: 207. Devantātha Ṭhakkura's father too, Govinda Ṭhakkura (ca. 1500), Navya-Naiyāyika author as well, wrote a Mīmāṃsā work, the Adhikaraṇamālā, which is not available in print. Madhusūdana Ṭhakkura, Devanātha's brother, is a leading Navya-Naiyāyika in Mithilā in the first half of the sixteenth century.

12 Fragments are published in RAMASWAMI SASTRI, 1946.

The present article completes this assertion by arguing that the integration of the Navya-Nyāya technical language in the South, first in Vedānta, then in Mīmāṃsā, is a gradual process of absorption. This process, it is shown below, appears to be due not to the sudden apparition of the new technical language – for the very process of constitution of the Navya-Nyāya techniques extends over several centuries (from Udayana to Gaṅgeśa to Raghunātha Śiromaṇi) – followed by its adoption by the Vedāntins in their doctrinal debates, but rather to centuries of constant interaction and debates of the Vedāntins with the Naiyāyikas on doctrinal points. The increasing polemical tone in the doctrinal debates between the Vedāntic schools (the Advaitins and the Dvaitins are concerned here) does not necessarily overlap with the adoption of the Navya-Nyāya technical language. More precisely, the use of dialectical skills and argumentation in the sharp controversies between Advaitins and Dvaitins and the adoption of Navya-Nyāya techniques in the context of this conflict come on top of centuries of Vedānta-Nyāya dealings in ontology, metaphysics and epistemology. These techniques integrate naturally into the ongoing Advaita, then Dvaita, relation with Nyāya.

Towards the middle of the sixteenth century, the Mīmāṃsā work of the southern thinker Appayyadīkṣita shows Navya-Nyāya technical features. The explanation lies in a complex context, given the special relation between Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta in general and, on the other hand, the particular relation between Vedānta and Nyāya and Navya-Nyāya in the centuries before the period concerned here. A detailed study of the way Vedānta came to integrate the Navya-Nyāya techniques is far beyond the scope of the present work, but I want to give the general outlines of this processs until the time of Appayyadīkṣita.

Vedāntin thinkers have not merely been familiar with the Nyāya universe of thought, they have been constantly interacting with particular Nyāya (and Vaiśeṣika) doctrinal issues – borrowing from or refuting – when developing their own metaphysics and epistemology. In early Advaita, Śaṅkara himself (ca. 710) takes issue with various Nyāya views by pointing to inconsistencies or contradictions on points like the conception of the atom or of causality, the position on universals, the relation of inherence, etc. (see for instance the second section of the second chapter of the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*). Vācaspatimiśra (ca. 960), pupil of the great Naiyāyika Trilocana (ca. 940), is not only the author of the *Bhāmatī*, after which the Bhāmatī schools is named, but of Nyāya (the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā*, a comprehensive commentary on Uddoytakara's *Nyāyavārttika*) and Mīmāṃsā works (*Nyāyakaṇikā*, on Maṇḍanamiśra's Vidhiviveka, and the Tattvabindu) as well. It is remarkable that he does not seek

to reconcile the conflicting doctrines of these systems in his respective works. Furthermore, when Vimuktātman, Jñānaghana and Prakāśātman (all ca. 1000) elaborate on the Advaita theory of error, they criticize, among others, the Nyāya view thereon.

But it is not only topics of Nyāya metaphysics or epistemology that are at stake. Prakāśātman uses in the (*Pañcapādikā-*)Vivaraṇa – a work after which a most popular post-Śaṅkara school is named – a style of analysis and argumentation akin to that of the Naiyāyikas. He establishes ignorance as a form of material cause by analyzing what the *Pañcapādikā* has said, has not said, and should have said, using largely inferential reasoning in connection with various hypotheses (Upaniṣads permitting). Dasgupta notices that between the eight and the eleventh centuries, the controversies of Vedānta with Buddhism, Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya concern principally the analysis of experience as conceived by Vedānta;[13] the logical formalism, while in steady development in the works of Śaṅkara or Vācaspatimiśra, was not central to Vedānta. On the Nyāya side, Advaita begins to clearly catch the attention of the Naiyāyikas from the time of Udayana (eleventh century).[14] A tradition has it that Udayana debated and defeated Śrīhīra, the father of the great Advaita dialectician Śrīharṣa.[15]

That changes in the twelfth (perhaps in the eleventh already) and the thirteenth centuries, when the main opponents are Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika. Indeed, at this time the objections coming from outside Advaita Vedānta gain predominance over internal discussions and disagreements and over finding the best way to present the Advaita teaching. As a result, it became central to Advaita philosophers to refute the opponents' theses and prove their central thesis – the falsity of duality and the existence and nature of ignorance – by critical discursive procedures centered around the analysis of definitions and proofs. The Advaitins' discourse shows from now on a particularly marked concern with procedures of logical analysis and dialectical argumentation – the formulation of precise definitions and proofs by way of inferential reasoning, refuting thereby the adversaries' theses and definitions. With Ānandabodha (ca. 1150), Śrīharṣa (ca. 1170), Citsukha (ca. 1220) and Ānandajñāna (or Ānandagiri or Janārdana, ca. 1300) the Advaita logico-epistemological "turn" is fully established. Śrīharṣa (Kashmir? Bengal?) relentlessly attacks Nyāya in his masterpiece Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍakhādya, that the tradition mentioned above reports as having been

13 DASGUPTA, 1922–1955, vol. 2: 125.

14 EIP, vol. 2: 15.

15 D. BHATTACHARYA, 1958: 49–51.

composed to revenge the defeat of the author's father by Udayana. Śrīharṣa criticizes indeed virulently and in great detail mainly Udayana's views.[16] Such was the impact of this work and of Śrīharṣa's method of argumentation, says D. Bhattacharya (1958: 42), that the Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya came to be regarded as one of the classical works of Navya-Nyāya! Vidyarāṇya (Mādhava, ca. 1350), the great southern Advaitin, mentions proudly Śrīharṣa's triumph over logicians in the popular *Pañcadaśī*.[17] Śrīharṣa prompts innovation in Nyāya; comprehensive response and refutation is formulated in turn by the Naiyāyikas. His criticism of Nyāya contributes to sparking significant change in Nyāya, and particularly in the process of constitution of the Navya-Nyāya, as Gaṅgeśa's refutation of Śrīharṣa's arguments show. This revolution is however rather in analytic tools and argumentative structure than in the fundamental positions.[18] The Navya-Naiyāyikas refute the arguments of the dialectical Advaitin in their various commentaries and subcommentaries of Nyāya works, and this even before Gaṅgeśa, with Maṇikaṇṭhamiśra (ca. 1300, Mithilā).[19] Significantly, they formulate their responses also in the form of commentaries on the Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya, and this over a few centuries.[20] This situation is rather unusual in the history of Indian philosophy insofar as these are commentaries on the text of an opposing school. Citsukha (ca. 1220, Andhra Pradesh?) composed commentaries, among which on Ānandabodha and Śrīharṣa, and independent works, of which the major one is the Tattva(pra)*dīpikā* or *Citsukhī*. Besides refuting Nyāya arguments, he interprets and analyses here in detail a series of central

16 On the Udayana-Śrīharṣa relation, see D. BHATTACHARYA, 1958: 41–51.

17 *niruktāv abhimānaṃ ye dadhate tārkikādayaḥ* |
harṣamiśrādibhis te tu khaṇḍanādau suśikṣitāḥ ||, quoted by D. BHATTACHARYA, 1958: 45. This is verse 6.149.

18 See PHILLIPS, 1997, who gives a comprehensive analysis of the Śrīharṣa–later Nyāya debate. Phillips makes the case that Śrīharṣa has a positive program of philosophy "as not only a skeptic and a gadfly to Logicians, but as a mystically monist Advaitin who summons us (and not just Logicians) to plumb the depths of the self." (p. 5). See also GRANOFF, 1978; DASGUPTA, 1922–1955, vol. 2: 125–147; GANGOPADHYAY, 1984.

19 PHILLIPS, 1997: 157–158. See also EIP, vol. 2: 668–681.

20 Before Gaṅgeśa – Divākaropādhyāya (or Vilāsakara, ca. 1200–1250, Mithilā). After Gaṅgeśa (c. 1325) – Gaṅgeśa's son Vardhamāna (ca. 1350, Mithilā), Śaṅkaramiśra (ca. 1430, Mithilā), Vācaspatimiśra II (ca. 1450, Mithilā), Pragalbhamiśra (ca. 1470, Mithilā?, also "a reputed teacher of Vedānta" EIP, vol. 6: 486), Padmanābhamiśra (ca. 1578, Bengali, resident of Varanasi), Gokulanāthopādhyāya (ca. 1675, Bengal).
Śaṅkaramiśra's Bhedaratna and Vācaspatimiśra II's Khaṇḍanoddhāra are summarized in EIP, vol. 6.

Vedāntic concepts. He quotes and refers to several Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika thinkers – Uddyotakara, Udayana, Vallabha, Śivāditya, Kulārka Paṇḍita, and Śrīdhara. A noteworthy technical feature is his use of a particular form of inference, the *mahāvidyā*,[21] probably devised by Kulārka Paṇḍita (ca. 1175) in the *Mahāvidyā-sūtra* and commented upon and rejected by Vādīndra (ca. 1225, Maharashtra).[22] The *mahāvidyā* inference is used and defended by subsequent Advaitins too (Amalānanda, ca. 1247, Ānandajñāna, ca. 1260, Veṅkata, ca. 1369 and others) until the fifteenth century. The remarkable fact is that no Navya-Naiyāyika of Mithilā or Bengal mentions this type of inference in their discussions.

What about the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika presence in South India around this period? Trilocana (ca. 940) was a leading Naiyāyika of the beginning of the tenth century and the well-known teacher of Vācaspatimiśra. Durvekamiśra (a Buddhist writer) describes Trilocana as belonging to Karṇāta country; it has been suggested that he came from the Mysore area. His work is lost, but many references subsist in various Nyāya works as well as in Buddhist and Jain works. We know that Bhāsarvajña, his younger contemporary (ca. 950) in Kashmir, has consulted one of Trilocana's works.[23] Furthermore, Vādivāgīśvara (ca. 1050 or 1100–1150) composed the *Mānamanohara*, a Vaiśeṣika work on seven categories that he defends against Mīmāṃsā and Advaita arguments. He was cited by various Vedāntins, among which Ānandānubhava and Citsukha, and by the Navya-Naiyāyika Śaśadhara.[24] Aparārkadeva (or Aparādityadeva, ca. 1125) is reported as having been a monarch who ruled in Konkan. Besides his Dharma-śāstra work (his commentary to the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* was recognized as an authority in Kashmir in the twelfth century), he wrote a *Nyāyamuktāvalī* in which he refers in detail to the contribution of Bhāsarvajñā to the Nyāya tradition. He is also reported to have been an Advaitin, although he criticizes Advaita in his Nyāya work.[25] Vādīndra (ca. 1225), one of the authors on the

21 Potter notices that Citsukha defends "the use of this *mahāvidyā* form of inference and his use of 'the non-locus' of cognition, because it is the only way he can prove that the state of being immediate actually exists in immediacy" (EIP, vol. 11: 624).

22 Very little is known about Kulārka Paṇḍita. Vādīndra, a Naiyāyika, gains fame with his work thereon, the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana*. See MVV, with an Introduction in English. For a summary in English, see EIP, vol. 2: 647–652. See also DASGUPTA, 1922–1955, vol. 2: 118–125.

23 EIP, vol. 2: 396–399.

24 EIP, vol. 2: 660. See also THAKUR, 2003: 310–312. Vādivāgīśvara's date is 1050 according to the EIP and 1100–1150 according to Thakur.

25 EIP, vol. 2: 603–604.

mahāvidyā inference, flourished at the court of King Śinghana of the Yādava dynasty of Devagiri (modern Daulatabad) at the beginning of the thirteenth century. His *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* is referred to by the Vedāntins Citsukha, Pratyaksvarūpa, and Amalānanda, and by Vedānta Deśika and Śrīnivāsa among Viśiṣṭādvaitins. He was the teacher of Bhaṭṭa Rāghava, the author of a commentary on Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyasāra*.[26] Furthermore, it appears that the Tarka-*bhāṣā* of Keśavamiśra (ca. 1250, Mithilā) gained such popularity in the South that the majority of its commentators (more than twenty) hail from this region.[27] One of these commentators is Cinnaṃbhaṭṭa (or Canni- or Cennubhaṭṭa, ca. 1390, Vijayanagara); he refers in his works to, among others, Udayana, Vācaspatimiśra, Varadarāja, the above mentioned Vādīndra, and Śālikanātha.[28] Another southerner Naiyāyika appears to be Nārāyaṇācārya (ca. 1420), the author of a *Dīpikā* on Udayana's *Ātmatattvaviveka*. Incidentally, Gaṅgeśa's fame seems to extend to the South only after the beginning of the fifteenth century.[29]

The Advaitins's argument with the Naiyāyikas begins to fade away as the controversies with the others branches of Vedānta gain ground from the fourteenth century on. The Nyāya universe of thought leaves however its mark on the Advaitins. The decreasing controversies over doctrinal issues occur in parallel with the gradual integration of Navya-Nyāya techniques in the dialectical argumentation in the course of the new polemics, particularly with the Dvaitins.[30] Ānandapūrṇa Vidyāsāgara (ca. 1350, Gokarṇa) produced an in-depth commentary on Śrīharṣa's Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya in which he not only explained the statements of Śrīharṣa and the thinking of Udayana, but he analyzed Nyāya points not explicitly examined by Śrīharṣa; he commented also on Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika works proper – the *Vyākhyāratna* on Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyasāra* and a commentary on Vādīndra's *Mahāvidyāviḍambana*. Rāmādvaya (ca. 1340) criticizes in his *Vedāntakaumudī* the Nyāya view of *ātman*, the inferences establishing Īśvara as cause of the universe by using the *mahāvidyā* inference, and Udayana's proofs for the existence of God. Pratyaksvarūpa (or Pratyagrūpa, ca. 1400) authored the *Nayanaprasādinī*, a commentary on Citsukha's Tattva-*pradīpikā*; he expanded Citsukha's critique of various Nyāya views by formulat-

26 For his other Nyāya works, see EIP, vol. 2: 646–647.

27 U. MISHRA, 1966: 231.

28 KAVIRAJ, 1982: 107; U. MISHRA, 1966: 463–464; EIP, vol. 6: 368–374; THAKUR, 1961, and 2003: 406–408.

29 MATILAL, 1976: 22. See also below n. 46.

30 For an analysis of the Advaita-Dvaita controversy, see DASGUPTA, 1922–1955, vol. 4, particularly pp. 204–319. See also SHARMA, 2000, and MINKOWSKI, 2011.

ing extensively possible opponent views and proving them wrong. He too used the *mahāvidyā* inference. But besides the content of the philosophical disputation between the two schools, the usage of the Navya-Nyāya terminology and style of analysis appears to gain ground in the Advaita writings at the end of the fifteenth century and in the sixteenth. A particular figure to be mentioned here, although his Advaita work is still unpublished, is Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma (ca. 1490, Bengal, then Orissa), a famous Navya-Nyāya master (he commented on Bhāsarvajña and Gaṅgeśa), said to have introduced the Navya-Nyāya in Bengal, and to have turned Advaitin then Vaiṣṇava in his later years. He was the teacher of Raghunātha Śiromaṇi and, toward the end of his life, of Caitanya.[31] He will be mentioned below in connection with the controversy with the Dvaitins. Nṛsiṃhāśramamuni (ca. 1555, South), a well reputed Advaitin who mainly follows and elaborates on Śrīharṣa and Citsukha in his many works, does use Navya-Nyāya terminology. For a single example, his *Bhedadhikkāra*, which is part of the sharp controversy on the nature of difference (bheda) between the Advaitins and Dvaitins (and Viśiṣṭādvaitins for that matter).[32] Nṛsiṃhāśramamuni is reported to have defeated in a debate Mādhava Sarasvatī (ca. 1515, Varanasi), who was disciple of Rāmeśvarabhaṭṭa, whom we will meet below in connection with Varanasi, and teacher of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī (ca 1570). The latter was one of the main thinkers of late Advaita, and his Advaitasiddhi (a refutation of a Dvaita work, the *Nyāyāmṛta* of Vyāsatīrtha, see below) is the best example of how the Navya-Nyāya style of analysis has been used in Vedānta.

But it is the other great figure of late Vedānta, Appayadīkṣita (1520–1593, South)[33] with whom we are concerned in the present research. Appayadīkṣita was the son and pupil of Raṅgarājādhvarīndra, himself an Advaitin author (the *Advaitavidyāmukura*), to whom Appaya acknowledges his indebtedness for instruction.[34] He mentions also in his works Nṛsiṃhāśramamuni, of whom he

31 See D. C. BHATTACHARYYA, 1940; G. BHATTACHARYA, 1978: 19–26; G. ŚASTRĪ 1979, KAVIRAJ, 1982: 67–72; EIP, vol. 6: 489–490, and BRONKHORST, DIACONESCU, KULKARNI, 2012.

32 Vyāsatīrtha had developed the Dvaita position in the *Bhedojjīvana*; Vyāsatīrtha's and Nṛsiṃhāśrama's treatises are however not directly connected. Vijayīndratīrtha (ca. 1560), Vyāsatīrtha's disciple, refutes in great detail Nṛsiṃhāśrama's treatise in his *Bhedavidyāvilāsa*, see below p. 277. See also SURYANARAYANA SASTRI / MAHADEVAN, 1936.

33 These dates are adopted following the research of MAHALINGA SASTRI, 1928, 1929, and 1968. See also BRONKHORST, DIACONESCU, KULKARNI, 2012.

34 UP: 162, SLS: 117; he does so in other works as well. See also SURYANARAYANA SASTRI, 1968.

was a younger contemporary. He appears to have written no Nyāya work, to the best of my knowledge, although such a work is mentioned once in the secondary literature.[35] At a time when the usage of Navya-Nyāya techniques of analysis has become common in Vedānta, albeit selectively applied, Appayadīkṣita composes several works on Mīmāṃsā issues. These works, mentioned in more detail below, appear to be among the first to use the new techniques in Mīmāṃsā.

A particularly important direction for the topic under research here is the development of the Dvaita school of Madhva and his followers from the thirteenth century on in South India. Here starts a period of vigorous polemics with the Advaitins – the doctrines of the two Vedāntic schools are opposed at the core. However, while their main adversaries are the non-dualists, the Dvaitins take issue with various Nyāya topics in the process of elaborating and systematizing their doctrines, like for instance the nature of God, the eternity of sound, the validity of cognition (svataḥ versus parataḥ) and so on; the Mīmāṃsā views thereon are also considered. More significantly, Dvaitins develop their own views on epistemological and logical matters, like, in the realm of inference, the flaws of the inferential reason and of the example, contradictions of the inference, definitions etc.; these views have been mostly disregarded by the Indian tradition itself. Madhva himself (ca. 1280,[36] Uḍupi, Karnataka), who converted from Advaita, deals with various ontological, logical, epistemological[37] points – in his *Anuvyākhyāna* for instance, and in the ten short works referred under the collective name of the *Daśaprakaraṇāni*, where he exposes polemically the basic tenets of his system.[38] His dealings with Nyāya positions occur in the context of his refutation of Advaita views, and his references to Nyāya arguments, albeit short, extend from the *Nyāyasūtra*s and Vātsyāyana to Jayanta, Bhāsarvajña and Udayana. In the *Pramāṇa*lakṣaṇa, he exposes his view on the means of valid cognition and refutes Nyāya views thereon, just as he diverges from the Nyāya five member model of syllogism. In the *Prapañcamithyātvānumānakhaṇḍana*, he refutes the inference that the Advaitins use to demonstrate that the empirical world is false (*mityā*). Like his adversaries (mainly Sarvajñātman, Ānandabodha and Vimuktātman), Madhva appears to be influenced by

35 DASGUPTA, 1922–1955, vol. 2: 218, n. 1, says that Appaya "studied Logic (tarka) with Yajñeśvara Makhīndra. See colophon to Appaya Dīkṣita's commentary on the *Nyāya-siddhānta-mañjarī* of Jānakīnātha, called *Nyāya-siddhānta*-mañjari-*vyākhyāna* (MS)." I could not find any reference whatsoever to this work of Appaya's elsewhere.

36 See SHARMA, 2000, and DASGUPTA, 1922–1922, vol. 2.

37 On Madhva's epistemology see the comprehensive analysis of MESQUITA, 2000: 239–413.

38 For an exposition in English, see SHARMA, 2000: 137–155.

Bhāsarvajña's logical theory rather than Udayana's.[39] In Madhva's biography by Nārāyaṇapaṇḍitācārya (ca. 1335, son of Madhva's disciple Trivikrama), he is also reported to have defeated logicians in debates over technical points of logical theory.[40] The *Sarvadarśanasaṃ*graha records the new system as Pūrṇa-

39 LUNSTEAD, 1977. He points out that certain Viśiṣṭādvaitins like Parāśarabhaṭṭa (12th c.) and Venkaṭanātha (13th c.), too, are influenced by the views of Bhāsarvajña, which appears to have been widely known in South India at that time. For that matter, the above mentioned southern Naiyāyika Cinnaṃbhaṭṭa mentions several of Bhasarvajña's views (like the flaws of the inferential reason) in his *Prakāśikā* on Keśava Miśra's *Tarkabhāṣā*. In the history of Nyāya, the tradition represented by Bhasarvajña disappears and Udayana's school gains pre-eminence.

40 The following account of a debate won by Ānandatīrtha (Madhva's name as head of the maṭha of his guru Acyutaprekṣa) makes reference to the technical issues involved: "After some time, a sannyāsin known to Achyutaprakṣa arrived accompanied by a large number of disciples who were experts in logic. They argued that the difference between jīva and Paramātman could be established even by inference. They proposed a syllogism that jīva and paramātman are distinct since, jīva is regulated by paramātman. This syllogism was refuted by Ānandatīrtha by pointing out that the sādhya, i.e. bhinnatva, cannot be considerated as bhinna, abhinna or bhinna-abhinna with pakṣa. The first alternative i.e. bhinna, will lead to anavasthā, i.e. infinite regress. The pakṣa and sādhya, i.e. bheda, have to be related. This relation also being distinct, it has to be related by another relation that requires one more, thus it leads to anavasthā. The second alternative, i.e. abhinna, also does not work. If pakṣa and sādhya, i.e. bheda, are identical, then, one of them only remains. The other cannot be proved with reference to that one. The third alternative viz. bhinna-abhinna is contradiction. Therefore the syllogism proposed to establish bheda cannot prove it. This refutation is intended only to show the inability of the prativādin to argue properly. It is also intended to show that bheda is not accepted merely on the ground of logic but it has to be accepted on the basis of śruti. Mere logic is not able to prove any doctrine. It cuts down both ways. It is a pramāṇa only when it is supported by śruti.

Then, they proposed another syllogism to establish the illusory nature of the worlds. 'The world is illusory, since it is cognized as in the instance of sūkti rajata.' This syllogism is countered by the syllogism. 'The world is real, since, it is cognized as the instance of jar.' Stating this counter syllogism it was pointed out that in the stance of sūkti rajata, the rajata was not actually cognized as it was not actually present while in the case of jar it is actually 'cognised.' Hence the hetu cognized establishes reality of the object concerned but not its illusory nature. There is no such an entity as sad-asad vilakṣana. Sūkti rajata is asat. Therefore, its cognition cannot establish the illusory nature of the world. On hearing this skillful analysis the scholars assembled were delighted and described Ānandatīrtha as Anumānatīrtha." (Introduction to SMV: xx–xxi).

Another debate won on logical grounds is reported in the SMV, with "another scholar by name Vādisimha accompanied by Buddhisāgara who was a Buddhist and opposed Veda arrived seeking a scholar for debate." (ibid.). On these two debates see also Padmanabha

prajña (the sannyāsin name of Madhva) darśana. However, Madhva does not systematically dwell in detail on logical matters; this will be done by his commentators, and above all by Jayatīrtha (ca. 1370, Malkhed, Karnataka).[41] This latter is the pupil of Akṣobhyatīrtha (ca. 1330), a disciple of Madhva and a contemporary of the great Advaitin Vidyāraṇya (Mādhava, ca. 1350), with whom he had a debate on the tat tvam asi issue, of which another great figure, the Viśiṣṭādvaitin Vedānta Deśika, is recorded as the arbiter, appointed by the king of Vijayanagara; Akṣobhyatīrtha is reported to have won.[42] Jayatīrtha systematizes the thought of Madhva and gives in his commentaries the final form of the Dvaita doctrine; his interpretations become basis for all the subsequent Dvaita doctrinal developments. His compendium *Nyāyasudhā* is the classic of Advaita thought and his *Pramāṇapaddhati* is the central text of Dvaita epistemology, which is said to occupy the same place in Dvaita Vedānta as the *Mānameyodaya* in Mīmāṃsā, the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* in Advaita or the *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* in Nyāya.[43] He also comments on Madhva's short works (the ten prakaraṇas), like for instance on the above mentioned Prapañca-*mithyātvānumānakhaṇḍana*.[44]

In the *Vādāvalī*, a polemical treatise that criticizes the Advaita doctrine of illusion, Jayatīrtha analyses the means of valid cognition used by the Advaitins to establish the illusory nature of the universe; half of this work is dedicated to the technical critique and refutation of the inferences of the Advaitins thereon. Many of this work's arguments will be developed by Vyāsatīrtha in another Dvaita classic, the *Nyāyāmṛta*. Generally speaking, Jayatīrtha deals in great detail with Nyāya views on issue of cognition – the means of valid cognition and the validity of cognition, theories of truth and error, the universals, or various aspects of the theory of inference (the doctrine of *vyāpti*, classification of the inference, etc).[45] In his critique of Advaita and Viśiṣṭādvaita, he discusses the

---

Char (1909: 88–91). EIP, vol. 1: 879, records one Vādisiṃha, of which the date is unknown, as author of a *Tarkadīpikā* (Jain) and a *Pramāṇanaukā*.

41 Ca. 1365–1388 according to SHARMA, 2000.

42 PADMANABHA CHAR, 1909: 30. See SHARMA, 2000: 229–230, for the textual and epigraphic evidence. Akṣobhyatīrtha is also referred to as the author of a work, the *Mādhvatattva-sārasaṃgraha*, of which nothing is known.

43 NAGARAJA RAO, 1976.

44 See thereon LUNSTEAD, 1977.

45 See NAGARAJA RAO, 1938–1939, 1976, and LUNSTEAD, 1977.

views of various schools and authors, among which Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas – Vācaspatimiśra, Bhāsarvajña, Udayana, Śrīdhara, Vallabha, Vyomaśiva or Gaṅgeśa.[46]

By systematizing and interpreting the Dvaita thought as expressed in the complex but laconic works of Madhva, Jayatīrtha inaugurates a new phase of important dialectical achievements. Beside the continuing systematization of the Dvaita doctrine in their critique of the Advaita (*mithyātva*, *upādhi*, akhaṇḍārtha, nirguṇatva are among the central concepts debated in great detail, along with ontological, logical or epistemological tenets), the Dvaitin thinkers of this period discuss comprehensively issues and developments pertaining to other schools. An innovator is Viṣṇudāsācārya (ca. 1430, Uttara Karnataka), the author of the *Vādaratnāvalī*, who, besides analyzing the inferential reasoning of his opponents, initiates the application of Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa principles of interpretation in the exposition of Dvaita positions and refutation of other systems.[47] Among these, he refers to the Mīmāṃsā upakrama–upasaṃhāra ("prior–ulterior statement") rule of interpretation of Vedic passages; the Dvaita and Advaita applications of this principle will subsequently give rise to an ample debate, as will be mentioned below in connection with Appayyadīkṣita. Viṣṇudāsācārya is a central link between Jayatīrtha and the other great doctor of Dvaita, Vyāsatīrtha (or Vyāsarāya or Vyāsarāja, ca. 1535, Karnataka)[48] in which the Dvaita dialectics has its most important representative, among other things due to his comprehensive adoption of the technical and dialectic terminology of Navya-Nyāya.[49]

While the Vaiṣṇavism of Madhva had patronage in the courts of Kaliṅga, Tuluṇāḍ and in the Ānegondi, Vyāsatīrtha gains a position of prominence at the court of Vijayanagara, particularly that of Kṛṣṇadevarāya (r. 1509–1529), in the context of a strong intellectual rivalry between Vedānta groups, related, as

46 See SHARMA, 2000: 252, for textual references. I could not verify these refererences; the reference to Gaṅgeśa appears to be in the commentary Parimala, not in Jayatīrtha's text.

47 Viṣṇudāsācārya (ca. 1390–1440 according to SHARMA, 2000) was the disciple of Rājendratīrtha (ca. 1412–1435), reported to be the first pontiff of the maṭha at Sosale, near Mysore. Both Rājendratīrtha and Viṣṇudāsācārya are reported to have travelled to Bengal. Rājendratīrtha was the disciple of Vidyādhirāja (ca. 1402), a disciple of Jayatīrtha. See SHARMA, 2000; GEROW, 1987, and GEROW, trans., 1990.

48 1478–1539 according to SHARMA, 2000, who points out that Vyāsatīrtha was the disciple of Brahmaṇyatīrtha, fourth in descent from Rājendratīrtha, the guru of Viṣṇudāsācārya (see the preceding note).

49 SHARMA, 2000: 343, mentions, for instance, that a new orientation in Vedānta dialectics is Vyāsatīrtha's manner of opening the work (*Nyāyāmṛta*) with a statement of issues (*vipratipattipradarśana*) on the pattern of Udayana's *Nyāyakusumāñjali*.

Stoker (2011) points out, to "shifting royal patronage practices that gave certain groups greater access to and influence over temple and courtly resources."[50] The *Vyāsayogīcarita*, Vyāsatīrtha's biography by Somanātha, a younger contemporary who was not a Mādhva (but seemingly a Smārta Brahmin), reports various details indicating Vyāsatīrtha's acquaintance with Nyāya. Young, he has studied thoroughly the six *darśana*s at Kāñcī, a centre of śāstric learning. At the court of Sāḷuva Narasiṃha at Candragiri, he meets scholars and conducts debates on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. A traditional story has it that after discussing with the Navya-Naiyāyika philosopher Pakṣadharamiśra (or Jayadevamiśra) from Mithilā, Vyāsatīrtha expressed his admiration for this latter's scholarship.[51] Soon after the Kaliṅga war (1516), he is charged by Kṛṣṇadevarāya to refute an Advaita Vedānta treatise (no title mentioned) sent to him for criticism by the Kaliṅga king.[52] In this connection, Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma (see above) mentions in his commentary to Lakṣmīdhara's Advaitamakaranda that he lent support to the Kaliṅga king to finding ways to humiliate Kṛṣṇadevarāya of Vijayanagara; the Advaita treatise sent to Vijayanagara was his.[53] But besides the episodes mentioned in Somanātha's biography, it is the very work of Vyāsatīrtha that shows his mastery of Nyāya, particularly the major three works: the *Nyāyāmṛta*, *Tarkatāṇḍava* and *Tātparyacandrikā*. Of these, the *Tarkatāṇḍava* is a treatise of epistemology and logic organized according to the three means of valid cognition acknowledged by the Dvaitins; Vyāsatīrtha integrates the views expressed by his predecessors, mainly Jayatīrtha. Vyāsatīrtha directs his criticism principally at Naiyāyikas, by examining the positions of Udayana in the *Nyāyakusumāñjali* and his commentator Vardhamāna, or Gaṅgeśa in the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*[54] and commentators of the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* like Pragalbhamiśra (resident of Varanasi), Yajñapati (Mithilā), etc. Besides discussing various points of divergence with Nyāya (from the issue of God and authorship of the Vedas to the validity of cognition to the theory of inference, etc.), Vyāsatīrtha establishes

50 STOKER, 2011, examines the links between doctrinal disputes and broader socio-political realities. Also SHARMA, 2000, 286ff.

51 *yadadhītaṃ tadadhītaṃ yadanadhītaṃ tad apy adhītam* |
pakṣadharavipakṣo *nāvekṣi vinā navīnavyāsena* ||, quoted by U. MISHRA, 1966: 329, and SHARMA, 2000: 294.

52 See VYC: 38, 52, 70, and the detailed English Introduction by Venkoba Rao. Also SHARMA, 2000: 287ff., and BRONKHORST, DIACONESCU, KULKARNI, 2012.

53 SHARMA, 2000: 292.

54 By way of example, in the first volume alone there are eight direct references to the Tattva*cintāmaṇi* (as "Maṇi"): TT, vol. 1, pp. 18.2, 262.1, 384.5, 396.3, 415.6, 434.3, 449.1, 485.9.

in the Dvaita intellectual analysis the systematic usage of principles of interpretation of Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa, to which he resorts in order to show that they support Madhva's interpretations. A telling example is his thorough discussion in the second section of the Tarkataṇḍava of the upakrama-upasaṃhāra ("prior-ulterior statement") rule of interpretation of Vedic passages; he argues in favor of the superiority of the upasaṃhāra, which is in opposition with the very stand of the Pūrvamīmāṃsā expressed by Śabara, Kumārila and others. Vyāsatīrtha's discussion thereon becomes subject of controversy and gives rise to a series of writings as shown below.

Vijayīndratīrtha (or Vijayīndrabhikṣu or Viṭṭhalācārya, ca. 1560, Tamilnadu),[55] a direct disciple of Vyāsatīrtha, was a prolific writer and a staunch critic of Advaitins, Viśiṣṭādvaitins and Śaivādvaitins of his time. The second half of the sixteenth century is indeed a period of intense doctrinal controversy and competition for supremacy between the branches of Vedānta. Vijayīndratīrtha does use Navya-Nyāya elements of analysis, even if only to refute his opponents' arguments which had made use of these elements. A case in point is his *Bhedavidyāvilāsa*, which aims at (re)establishing the difference between *jīva* and Brahman; the defense of the Dvaita position (with a detailed exam of possible definitions of difference) goes hand in hand with the analysis of the cognition of difference in the light of the three means of valid cognition acknowledged by the Dvaitins. This treatise is a point by point refutation of an Advaita work, the *Bhedadhikkāra* of Nṛsiṃhāśramamuni, in which the Navya-Nyāya terminology had been used. Significant for the topic under research here is the polemics with Appayadīkṣita, his contemporary: Vijayīndratīrtha devoted a couple of treatises to refuting Appaya's writings but he also confronted Appaya in lively debates at the court of Śevappa Nāyaka of Tanjavur, to which the Vaiṣṇava Tātācārya took part as well.[56] More precisely, Vijayīndratīrtha and Appaya polemicize on Mīmāṃsā issues, as it is shown below.

55 1514–1595 according to SHARMA, 2000.

56 This is attested by epigraphic evidence in a record on a grant made by Sevappa to Vijayīndra in 1580: *tretāgnaya iva spaṣṭaṃ vijayīdrayatīśvaraḥ | tātācāryo vaiṣṇavāgryo sarvaśāstraviśāradaḥ || śaivādvaitaikasāmrājyaḥ śrīmānappayyadīkṣitaḥ | yatsabhāyāṃ mataṃ svaṃ svaṃ sthāpayantaḥ sthitās trayaḥ ||* (Mysore Archaeological Report 1917: 17, quoted by SHARMA, 2000: 399).

Appayadīkṣita and Vijayīndratīrtha

Appaya has a complex relation to Mīmāṃsā. He composes a couple of treatises in which he discusses Pūrvamīmāṃsā issues, but he also puts to work his knowledge of Mīmāṃsā in works pertaining to other fields of knowledge, where he discusses issues pertaining to the Pūrvamīmāṃsā principles of textual interpretation. It has been said that "as a Mīmāṃsaka, he is in his best in his Advaita and other works."[57] Although he uses the style predominant in the technical śāstric prose – the *bhāṣya* style – he introduces in these writings, albeit in an economical manner, elements of the Navya-Nyāya technique of analysis.

Appayadīkṣita composes the *Vidhirasāyana* ("The Elixir of Duty / Injunction", on the classification of Vedic injunctions) under the patronage and order of the king Veṅkaṭadevarāja (Veṅkaṭa I) of Pennugonda, his last patron, whose accession to the throne has been dated about 1585.[58] The scope of the treatise is stated from the outset: declaring himself a follower of Kumārilabhaṭṭa, the great Mīmāṃsaka of the seventh century, Appayadīkṣita sets out to elaborate on the threefold classification of injunctions (vidhi)[59], namely *apūrva-*, niyama- and parisa*ṅkhyāvidhi*, which has been in operation in Mīmāṃsā since the *sūtra*s of Jaimini.[60] In spite of his declared adherence to Kumārila's views, Appayadīkṣita does nothing throughout this treatise but showing the inadequacy of Kumārila's discussion of the classification of injunctions, principally in terms of demonstrating the overextension (*ativyāpti*) or underextension (*avyāpti*) of these definitions in connection with one or the other injunctions of the Vedic corpus. Revisiting this traditional material, he aims, in an iconoclastic manner, at reorganising and reformulating it so that to avoid the definitions overlapping each other. Given his

57 RAMASWAMI SASTRI, 1936: 95. On the application of Mīmāṃsā interpretive principles in Vedānta, see PANDURANGI, ed., 2006.

58 Cf.: *kintu vyāpāram eva prathayati phalasaṃyojanārthaṃ* pare*ṣāṃ prāptaḥ* puṇyair agaṇyair iva vibudhagaṇo veṅkaṭakṣoṇipālam | | 5 || (VR[2]: 28).
The Vidhirasāyana consists of verses together with a prose commentary, the *Sukhopayojinī*.

59 Cf.: *yatkumārilamatānusāriṇā nirmitaṃ vidhirasāyanaṃ mayā* |
padyarūpamanatisphuṭāśayaṃ tatsukhāvagataye vivicyate || 3 || (VR[2]: 1)
vikhyātā munivaryasūktiṣu vid*hās tisro vidhisrotasām*
ācāryair viśadaṃ vivikta*viṣayās tāś ca vyavastāpitāḥ* |
ki*ṃ tatrāsti vicāryam āryamathite mārge nisargojjvale*
*nānodāharaṇais tu tāḥ praviśadīkartuṃ pravartā*mahe || 1 || (ibid.: 1–2).
See also MCCREA, 2008: 579.

60 Cf. the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*s 2.1.2.19 (*vidhir vāsyādapūrvattvāt*), 4.2.9.24 (*niyamārthā vā śrutiḥ*) and 1.2.4.34 (parisa*ṅkhyā*).

uncompromising approach, it is little wonder that refutations start to appear shortly after: a couple of years later, Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa (ca. 1593), a younger contemporary from Varanasi, wrote the detailed *Vidhirasāyanadūṣaṇa* (discussed hereafter); later on, Khaṇḍadevamiśra (ca. 1575–1665) expressed also his disagreement with Appaya's definitions and classifications of injunctions.[61] In fact, this work has given rise to a series of writings which reject or support Appaya's positions expressed therein.[62] The *Vidhirasāyana* is a highly technical treatise, not only in its in-depth discussion of the classification of injunctions, many of which are referred to in abbreviated forms (or even by a single word) and with no reference to their context, but also in the many ritual details connected with the respective injunctions, which are often incomprehensible for want of context. This treatise is, in other words, an internal Mīmāṃsā matter aimed at Mīmāṃsā experts.

Appaya uses Navya-Nyāya terms sparsely, with a marked preference for the consecrated Navya-Nyāya terminology from the lexical field of 'limitation': avacchedaka "limitor," avacchinna "limited", sometimes in relation to *uddeśya* "subject" as in *uddeśyatāvacchedaka* "limitor of subjectness" (in the context of inferential reasoning), then avacchedyatva(-sambandha) "limitedness" (relation). A few instances:

1) na hi tatroddeśyatāvacchedakāvacchedenāprāptiḥ *ihoddeśyasvarūpa evāprāptirityetāvatā kaścidviśeṣo* 'sti, vivakṣitarūpabhedenātyantāprāpter *ubhayatrāpy viśiṣṭatvāt* | (VR[2]: 85)
2) *yujyate tathānirvacanam; yadi tatpratiyogipākṣīkatvaṃ* nirucyeta | (VR[2]: 89)
3) *apūrvasādhanvrīhyādigaveṣaṇāyāṃ "vrīhibhir yajeta" "somena yajete"tyādiśāstrai*rvrīh*yādaya iva nyāyena vacanāntareṇa ca nīvārapūtīkādigatavrīhisomādibhāvayogyāvyavā api tatsādhanatvenāvagamyante iti toṣām api saṃskārānvayitayā dvāratvanirvāhāya saṃskāravākyagatavrīhyādiśabdānāṃ vrīhitvādijātivācināṃ sākṣāttadavacchinnavyaktimātralakṣaṇāmapahāya sākṣātparamparayā tadavacchedyatvayogyamātre lakṣaṇā kalpyate; nīvārādigatavrīhibhāvādiyogyāvayavāś ca vrīhyādigatāvayavā iva vrīhyādivyaktidvārā tadavacchedyatvayogyā eveti pratinidhīnāṃ mukhyasāmānavidhye na kācidanu*papattiḥ | (VR[2]: 148)
4) *tatprāptikāritvañ ca yathā kathañcidvivakṣitam, na tu kaścittatra viśeṣo* vivikṣita*ḥ* tena vidhiviṣ*ayasyānyasya vā prāptāpoditasya, atyantāprāptasya vā yasya kasya cit svarū*peṇa

61 Under BhD 1.2.4.

62 Refutation: *Vidhirasāyanadūṣaṇa* of Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa (ca. 1593), *Vidhitrayaparitrāṇa* of Veṅkaṭādhvarin (ca. 1637), Vidhidarpaṇa and Vidhiviveka of Kolluri Nārāyana Śāstrin (ca. 1680), *Vidhibhūṣaṇa* of Veṅkaṭanārāyaṇa (ca. 1740) and *Vidhicamatkāracandrikā* of Nārāyaṇācārya. Support: *Durūhaśikṣā* of Appayyadīkṣita III (ca. 1650), *Vidhirasāyanabhūṣaṇa* of Gopālabhaṭṭa (ca. 1650), *Phalasāṃ*karyakha*ṇḍ*ana of Anantadeva (ca. 1650), *Vidhiratnāvalī* of Śrīnivāsadāsa (ca. 1750). See KRISHNA, 2002: 77, and THANGASWAMI SARMA, 2002: 91.

kiñcidviśeṣaṇāntarāvacchinnatvena yena kena cidrūpeṇa prakṛtavidhyuddeśye *anyatra vā* yatra kutra cit prakṛtavidhyuddeśye *'pi sarvatra kva cid api vā kiyatyāṃ prāptau satyāmasatyāṃ vā yathākathañcitprāptiṃ* kurvannityayamartho labhyate | (VR[2]: 205)

5) *atas tatra rathantaraprāptitvāvacchinnasya, bṛhatprāptitvāvacchinasya ca kiñcinnivṛ*ttiniyatatvābhān nāvyāptiḥ | (VR[2]: 209)

The *Pūrvottaramīmāṃsāvādanakṣatramālā* ("A String of Constellations of Debates on Pūrva- and Uttaramīmāṃsā" or, in Pollock's translation, "The Milky Way of Discourses on Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta") is a collection of twenty-seven independent essays – a new literary genre altogether – on topics, as its name shows, pertaining both to Pūrva- and Uttaramīmāṃsā (Vedānta), like the ample discussion in sixteen essays of adjectival semantics (guṇa / guṇin), the meaning of dharma, the injunction to study the Veda, etc.[63] It presents, in a sparse manner, some Navya-Nyāya features.[64] Indeed, Appayya declares in the introductory verse that he expresses his views "through the easy medium of colloquial debate which is pleasant to the young" (*bālapriyeṇa mṛduvādakathāpathena*),[65] which would have been incompatible with an extensive use of the Navya-Nyāya techniques.

Furthermore, Appayadīkṣita has composed two short Mīmāṃsā texts which do not show Navya-Nyāya features. Only a couple of pages long, the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāviṣayasaṅgrahadīpikā* is a bird's-eye view of the topics contained in the twelve chapters of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*s. This text, which has circulated as an independent work, has been extracted from another of Appayadīkṣita's works, the *Śīvārkamaṇidīpikā*.[66] Appayadīkṣita has composed this work under the patronage of Cinna Bomma Nāyaka of Vellore (1549–1578), his second patron.[67] The Citrapaṭa summarizes in verses the content of the adhikaraṇas of the twelve chapters of Pūrvamīmāṃsā. Appaya composed also the *Mayūkhāvali*,

63 Appaya has briefly formulated some of the arguments discussed in this work in preceding writings, namely in the *Nayamayūkamālikā* of the *Caturmatasārasaṃ*graha, in his commentary on Śrīkaṇṭha's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣ*ya, the Ma*ṇidīpikā*, and the *Śīvārkamaṇidīpikā*. See also POLLOCK, 2004: 374, n. 16.

64 See BRONKHORST, DIACONESCU, KULKARNI, 2012.

65 VNM: 1.

66 The *Pūrvamīmāṃsāviṣayasaṅgrahadīpikā* been published in 1935 in the Journal of Oriental Research 9.4: 319–334 (edited by R. R. Chintamani and T. V. Ramachandra Diksitar) and has been reprinted in JNMV and UP.

67 For literary and epigraphic evidence, see MAHALINGA SASTRI, 1929, and RAMASWAMI SASTRI, 1936: 98–99.

a commentary on Pārthasārathimiśra's *Śāstradīpikā*, to which I could not get access.

A particular position occupies in this connection the controversy between Advatins and Dvaitins on Mīmāṃsā principles of textual interpretation. The Advaitins adopted and used them early; Śaṅkara is a case in point. The Dvaitins do not adopt them in their beginnings instead: Madhva appears to be relatively indifferent to this issue and does not enter into details; it is in the work of Viṣṇudāsa and above all Vyāsatīrtha that came out the role of Mīmāṃsā exegesis in the Dvaita doctrine. It is precisely the treatment of the upakrama ("prior statement")-upasa*ṃhāra* ("ulterior statement") principle by Vyāsatīrtha in his Tarkata*ṇḍ*ava (and *Tātparyacandrikā*) that sparked off this polemic. In brief, the point of this exegetical debate is what element – the prior or the ulterior statement – has primacy in case of conflict in a textual whole; this question is of utmost importance in the interpretation of the Veda. The bone of contention is the justification of the respective positions in connection with the Mīmāṃsā traditional stand: the Advaitins maintain, from an early period, the primacy of upakrama and claim to rely on the authority of Mīmāṃsā, whereas the Dvaitins hold the logical soundness of their stand on the basis of certain implications and admissions in the Mīmāṃsā literature thereon. In the wake of a suggestion of Madhva, Vyāsatīrtha has argued that the upasa*ṃhāra* is to be preferred. Appayadīkṣita composes in response a treatise, the Upakrama-*parākrama*, in which he defends the primacy of the upakrama; his tone is highly polemical and attempts to ridicule Vyāsatīrtha's arguments.[68] Vijayīndratīrtha refutes in turn Appaya's treatise in his Upasa*ṃhāravijaya*, which sets out to (re)establish the superiority of the upasa*ṃhāra* principle.[69] All the three texts show Navya–Nyāya terminology; its usage in Appayadīkṣita's work is however minimal in spite of its being a polemical treatise.

68 MINKOWSKI, 2011: 207, classifies Appaya's treatise as a commentary on Nṛsiṃhāśrama's *Bhedadhikkāra*, while he says a couple a pages after that "Appayya wrote no commentary on the work of Nṛsimha" (p. 224). The *Upakramaparakrāma* is indeed no commentary to Nṛsimhāśrama's work, but it was published as an appendix in the second volume of the *Bhedadhikkāra* to the 1904 edition (see BhDh in the bibliography for references).

69 The texts of Vyāsatīrtha, Appayadīkṣita and Vijayīndratīrtha have been published together in UP, see below the bibliography for references. SHARMA, 2000: 408, says that Vijayīndratīrtha referred to this discussion also in his *Candrikodāhṛtanyāyavivaraṇa* (unpublished). Vijayīndratīrtha refutes other works of Appaya's for that matter, see SHARMA, 2000: 402ff. For the upakrama–upasa*ṃhāra* principles in Mīmāṃsā, see PANDURANGI, ed. 2006. For an illustration of the upasa*ṃhāra* principle in Vedāntic exegesis, see CLOONEY, 1994.

This is not the only work of Vijayīndratīrtha on Mīmāṃsā. He writes a manual of general principles of Mīmāṃsā – the *Nyāyādhvadīpikā* – which gives a clear exposition of the Mīmāṃsā system. This work is aimed at giving an accessible survey of the topics of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*s and the *Śābarabhāṣ*ya in the original order; various exceptions and conflicts are also discussed. It is composed from the viewpoint of Dvaita.[70]

The Varanasi Connection

Varanasi held from the sixteenth century a peculiar position in the intellectual landscape of India. Scholars from the whole subcontinent, some receiving commissions and support from distant patrons, study or settle in numbers in Varanasi, which is also a major pilgrimage centre. Many of the scholarly families who settle in Varanasi hail from the South, particularly from Maharashtra and northern Karnataka.[71]

Varanasi became in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries a flourishing śāstric centre. Several generations of the Bhaṭṭa family (Deśastha Brahmins) play a central role in the adoption of the Navya-Nyāya techniques in Mīmāṃsā, both by their own work and their influence on other Mīmāṃsakas. They are also outstanding legal specialists and become extremely influential not only by their Dharmaśāstra works (which require a sound knowledge of Mīmāṃsā) but also by applying their juristic knowledge to the problem of their time and by their political connections. The Deva family, too, (Deśastha Brah-

70 It has been published in 2004 for the first time; see UP for details. SHARMA, 2000: 402–403, mentions other works of Vijayīndra's on Mīmāṃsā – unpublished to this day: the Adhikaraṇamālā "is supposed to be a work explaining the Mīmāṃsā rules of interpretation utilized in the Nym." (i.e., Vyāsatīrtha's *Nyāyāmṛ*ta). This work is not recorded in Potter's EIP, vol. 1. The *Candrikodāhṛtanyāyavivaraṇa* "is an exposition of the principles and adhikaraṇas of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā made use of in the *Candrikā* of Vyāsatīrtha, in support of Madhva's interpretation of the Sūtras. The necessity for writing such a work lay in the loud complaints made by Appayya Dīkṣita and other hostile critics of Dvaita, that Madhva and his followers had flouted the Mīmāṃsā nyāyas and often ignored them in their interpretation of the Sūtras."

71 More in SHASTRI, 1912; ARYAVARAGURU, 1912; ALTEKAR, 1937; UPĀDHYĀYA, 1994; SINGH, 2009; POLLOCK, 2001; O'HANLON, 2010, and 2011.

mins and descendants of the famous poet Eknath, 1533–1599) have an important contribution to the Mīmāṃsā intellectual production.[72]

Varanasi at this time was an important Vedāntic centre as well, both on account of the scholars settled there and the many sannyāsins; some of these authors wrote works pertaining to Mīmāṃsā and other śāstras. From the Brahmin families who moved to Varanasi from the Deccan, the majority held Advaitin views and Advaita was the establishment position in the city.[73] So are the members of the Bhaṭṭa family, as is shown below; possibly Viśvaveda (ca. 1500) and Prakāśānanada (ca. 1505); Annaṃbhaṭṭa (ca. 1560); Madhusūdana Sarasvatī (ca. 1570, Bengali, studied Navya-Nyāya at Navadvīpa with Mathuranātha Tarkavāgīśa and Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā in Varanasi under Mādhava Sarasvatī), whose Advaitasiddhi, an in-depth refutation of Vyāsatīrtha's *Nyāyāmṛta*, and Advaitaratnarakṣaṇa show his mastery of the Navya-Nyāya style of argumentation; Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita (ca. 1590); Nānādīkṣita (ca. 1590); Puruṣottama Sarasvatī (ca. 1600); Rāmatīrtha Yati (ca. 1610); Raṅgojibhaṭṭa (ca. 1610); Balabhadra (ca. 1610), Āpadeva II (ca. 1610); Dharmayyadīkṣita (ca. 1640); Sadānanda Kāśmīraka (ca. 1650); Nārāyaṇatīrtha (ca. 1700).[74]

And though not at the same level as Mithilā or Bengal, Varanasi had a significant Navya-Nyāya presence, particularly in the form of Maithili or Bengali thinkers who settle in or are connected with Varanasi, many of them Advaitins as well, renowned as teachers or authors of Advaita works. In the fifteenth century: Bhavanāthamiśra (or Duve or Ayācimiśra, ca. 1410, Maithili, apparently also a Mīmāṃsā author) and his son Śaṅkaramiśra (ca. 1430); Narahari (or Viśarada) Bhaṭṭācārya Chakravartin (ca. 1455), father of Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma, and possibly Narahari's brother Śrīnātha; Pragalbhamiśra (or Śubhaṅkara, ca. 1470), also a teacher of Vedānta; Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma (ca. 1480), the Navya-Naiyāyika and Advaitin mentioned above in connection with the Advaita-Dvaita controversy. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: Keśavamiśra Tarkācārya (ca. 1525, Maithili), who has taught both Nyāya and Vedānta at Varanasi; Balabhadramiśra (ca. 1530); Padmanābhamiśra (ca. 1578, Bengali);[75] Maheśa Ṭhakkura (ca. 1545, Maithili), who studied Vedānta and

72 See GODE, 1954.

73 See SHASTRI, 1912, and MINKOWSKI, 2011: 217.

74 See thereon MINKOWSKI, 2011, who highlights the contacts between the southern Advaitins and Varanasi, THANGASWAMI, 1980 and EIP, vol. 1.

75 At the end of the second adhyāya, first āhnika of his *Nyāyasūtraprakāśa*, he states: *sukhenādhyāpayan kaśyāṃ nyāyavedāntadarśane* |

Mīmāṃsā at Varanasi with Rāmeśvarabhaṭṭa, the founder of the Bhaṭṭa family at Varanasi, mentioned below. Vidyānivāsa Bhaṭṭācārya (ca. 1600, Bengali, nephew of Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma) is recorded to having lent his name to a document in Varanasi in 1583 (Bhattacharyya, 1937: 35), mentioned again hereafter in connection with Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa; Laugākṣi Keśavabhaṭṭa (ca. 1600, from the Laugākṣi family of Varanasi, but has flourished in Central India), who in addition to his Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika works, composed also a Mīmāṃsā work, mentioned below; Rudra Nyāyavācaspati Tarkavāgīśa (ca. 1625); Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa (ca. 1640), the well-known grammarian, who composed also Nyāya works and one on Bhāṭṭamīmāṃsā, unpublished; Gopinātha Maunin (ca. 1650); Raghudeva Nyāyālaṃkāra Bhaṭṭācārya (ca. 1657); Śrīkaṇṭha (or Śitikaṇṭha or Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita, ca 1660); Mahādeva Punataṃkara (ca. 1700, Deccani).[76]

The Bhaṭṭa *Family, Mīmāṃsā and Navya-Nyāya*

We are fortunate enough to have an insider story: the family chronicle of the early Bhaṭṭas *Gādhivaṃśavarṇ*ana, written by Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa.[77] The elements of interest for the present research from this outstanding source and other connected works can be summarized as follows. The chronicle starts with Rāmeśvarabhaṭṭa, the major character of this work, who was an Advaitin who attained fame in the South. His ancestors are not part of the chronicle, but from other works we learn that they lived, at least for three generations, in Pratiṣṭhāna (modern Paiṭhan on the Godavari in Maharashtra); his father, Govindabhaṭṭa was also a pandit well-known in southern India. Rāmeśvarabhaṭṭa is presented as learned in various śāstras; he taught in the proximity of Paiṭhan; he visited Vijayanagara and was praised by the king Kṛṣṇadevarāya, whom we have seen above as patron of Vyāsatīrtha, on the occasion of an assembly of scholars; Rāmeśvara even refused a gift of elephants from Kṛṣṇadevarāya as being prohibited in the śāstras. After the birth of his first son, Nārāyaṇa, in 1513, he

---

śrīkeśavakaviś cakre nyāyasūtraprakāśanam ||, quoted by D. BHATTACHARYA, 1958: 187. A famous teacher, he was called "Vedāntavyāsa" according to the colophon of his *Prakāśa*. See also V. MISHRA, 1966: 368–370 and EIP, vol. 13: 186.

76 Information on the activity of these Naiyāyikas mainly in D. BHATTACHARYA, 1958; U. MISHRA, 1966; KAVIRAJ, 1982; MATILAL, 1977; EIP, vols. 6 and 13; GANERI, 2011. See also BRONKHORST, DIACONESCU, KULKARNI, 2012.

77 The text is unpublished, but we have an exposition and study in BENSON, 2001. See also SHASTRI, 1912.

stayed at Dvārakā, teaching Vyākaraṇa and Vedānta, returned to Paiṭhan then moved with his household to Varanasi. A second son, Śrīdhara, is born on route and another one at Varanasi, Mādhava. At Varanasi he went on to teach; he had students from across the subcontinent. A couple of his students are mentioned in the chronicle, among which the sannyāsin Mādhava Sarasvatī, who taught Madhusūdana Sarasvatī Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta as instructor in the śāstras (*vidyāguru*). With Rāmeśvarabhaṭṭa studied Vedānta, as mentioned above, the Navya-Naiyāyika Maheśa Ṭhakkura, the author of a subcommentary of Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi*.[78] Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, Rāmeśvarabhaṭṭa's first son, has won renown as a great pandit at Varanasi and established the colony of southern pandits. His great mastery of Mīmāṃsā shows in the usage of Mīmāṃsā rules and techniques in his authoritative work on pilgrimage, the *Tristhalīsetu*, where he acknowledges that he learnt all the śāstras with his father.[79] He is said to have brought about the greatness of the Advaitins Nṛsiṃhāśrama and Madhusūdhana Sarasvatī and to have defeated Maithila and Bengali pandits. Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa had three sons: Rāmakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa and Govindabhaṭṭa. Rāmakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa was a recognized specialist in Bhāṭṭamīmāmsā;[80] he wrote a commentary on the *Tantravārttika*.

But it is Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's second son, Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa (ca. 1593; more precisely, 1550–1620), the author of the family chronicle, who appears to provide a connecting textual link with the South in his polemics with Appayadīkṣita. Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa wrote about himself in the family chronicle that he renounced travel (he was a kṣetrasa*ṃnyāsin*) and taught Mīmāṃsā (in its Bhāṭṭa version) to a couple of scholars including the grammarian Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, other ascetics and his sons. He wrote a refutation of the above discussed Appayadīkṣita's *Vidhirasāyana*, namely the *Vidhirasāyanadūṣaṇa*, in whose introductory verses he states that Appayadīkṣita has rejected Kumārila's classification of injunctions

78 KAVIRAJ, 1982: 52, notes that following his studies at Varanasi, Maheśa Ṭhakkura freed himself from the prejudices of the Naiyāyikas towards Vedānta and became tolerant, even respectful. D. BHATTACHARYA, 1958: 174; U. MISHRA, 1966: 361, and KAVIRAJ, ibid., quote the following line of Maheśa's Darpaṇa: tadetat sa*ṃ*kṣepe*ṇa vedāntimataṃ* likhita*ṃ* na *dūṣita*ṃ *śrutipurāṇa*smṛ*tiśiṣṭānuśiṣṭatvāt* |.

79 See SALOMON, 1985: 2. Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa is also attributed a commentary on a portion of Pārthasārathimiśra's *Śāstradīpikā*. A certain amount of confusion seems to reign about this work. This point need not be treated here.

80 Cf. also his son's (Kamalākarabhaṭṭa) reference to him in the Nir*ṇ*ayasindhu: *yo bhāṭṭa-tantragahanārṇ*avakar*ṇadhāraḥ śāstrāntareṣ*u nikhileṣv api *marmabhettā* | *yotra śramaḥ* kila kṛta*ḥ kamalākareṇa prīto 'munās tu sukṛtī budharāmakṛṣṇaḥ* ||, quoted by KANE, 1975: 925, n. 1421.

without understanding it properly.[81] In his harsh and detailed analysis, Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa emphasizes Appaya's misunderstanding or rather insufficient knowledge of Mīmāṃsā as well as the unnecessary critique of Kumārila. He concludes the treatise by saying that he composed it for the benefit of those who cannot themselves reject Appayadīkṣita's arguments against Kumārila's positions on the threefold classification of injunctions.[82] Just as Appayadīkṣita's treatise, Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa's text shows his familiarity with the Navya-Nyāya techniques, which are however used parsimoniously, mainly for refining arguments or definitions. Such is the case of another of his works, the *Mīmāṃsābālaprakāśa*, an independent treatise (prakaraṇa) which summarizes the contents and conclusions of the twelve chapters of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*s. His extremely concise *Mīmāṃsāsārasaṃ*graha (250 verses) does not show Navya-Nyāya features. Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa's other works on Mīmāṃsā are unpublished: a commentary on the *Śāstradīpikā*, the *Prakāśa*, to which he refers in other works of his,[83] and the Nir*ṇayacandrikā*.

The next generation of Bhaṭṭas produces further important Mīmāṃsā work. Rāmakṛṣṇa's first son, Dinakarabhaṭṭa (or Divākara-, ca. 1625), work is unpublished: the *Bhāṭṭadinakarī* or *Bhāṭṭadinakaramīmāṃsā*, traditionally considered as a commentary on the *Śāstradīpikā*, but "closer to a sa*ṃ*graha, a genre relatively new in *mīmāṃsā*".[84] His younger brother, Kamalākarabhaṭṭa (ca. 1612), a prominent legal specialist and learned in tarka, Nyāya, Vyākaraṇa, Mīmāṃsā (Bhāṭṭa and Prābhākara), Vedānta, poetics, Dharmaśāstra, as he himself declares.[85] He was already a mature scholar by 1612, the date of his authoritative Dharmaśāstra compendium the Nir*ṇ*ayasindhu, and he was still active in 1631, when he is recorded as attending an assembly in the Mukti-

81 *vārtikoditavidhyādilakṣaṇaṃ dīkṣitāḥ* kila |
abudhvaiva nirācakruritityetad iha vakṣyate || (VR[2]: 212).

82 *vidhyāditrayalakṣaṇāni racitānyācāryavaryainirā*
kurvantopy yadīkṣitā vyaracayan siddhāntajāte kvacit | (ibid.: 287).
The first half of the verse is wrongly printed as a prose portion in the edition used here.

83 See KANE, 1926: ix–x and KRISHNAMACHARYA, 1947.

84 POLLOCK, 2005: 48.

85 tarke dustarkameghaḥ phaṇipatibhaṇitiḥ *pāṇinīye prapañce* | *nyāye prāyaḥ* pragalbhaḥ prakaṭitapaṭimā *bhāṭṭaśāstrapraghaṭṭe* | *prābhaḥ prābhākarīye pathi prathitadurūhāntavedāntasindhuḥ* | *śraute sāhityakāvye pracurataragatir dharmaśāstreṣu yaś ca* ||, from *Kāvyaprakāśavyākhyā*, quoted by KANE, 1975: 925 n. 1422.
Kamalākarabhaṭṭa wrote also a Vedānta work, not mentioned by Kane, see SARMA, 1945.

maṇḍapa of the Viśvanātha temple in Varanasi.[86] From his Mīmāṃsā work, only the *Mīmāṃsākutūhala*, an independent treatise summarizing the main doctrines of the system, is in print. It does show Navya-Nyāya influence, here, too, used sparingly.[87] Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭa (literary career ca. 1610–1645),[88] Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa's fourth son and Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's cousin, another prominent Dharmaśāstra author, wrote the *Bhāṭṭārka*, a treatise on the categories of the Bhāṭṭamīmāṃsā in which he revisits both the Vaiśeṣīka and the Bhāṭṭamīmāṃsā positions on categories with a view of reorganising the traditional classifications by omitting some accepted categories and by introducing new ones. His use of Navya-Nyāya terminology is clear and obvious, though limited, particularly in connection with refining definitions.

A generation later Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa (or Gāgābhaṭṭa, ca. 1674; more precisely, ca. 1600–1685), Dinakarabhaṭṭa's son (and Kamalākara's nephew) is another eminent Mīmāṃsā thinker and prolific writer. We know that he was still alive in 1674, when he participated in the royal consecration of Śivāji in Maharashtra, from which he received patronage. He is known in Mīmāṃsā scholarship for the *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi*, which comments the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*s, of which only the *Tarkapāda* section is printed. He discusses in depth a handful of topics (like *jñānaprāmāṇya*, pratyakṣa, *īśvaravāda*, *śaktivāda*, sṛṣṭi-pralaya, *anumāna*, etc.) and the views of various authors: Someśvara, Murārimiśra II, Udayana, Gaṅgeśa, Raghunātha, Pakṣadharamiśra, Ratnakośakāra, Dīdhitikāra. He uses the Navya-Nyāya style of analysis on a larger scale than his predecessors.[89] His other Mīmāṃsā works (the Tantrakaustubha, the *Kusumāñjali* and the *Śivārkodaya*) are unpublished. Anantabhaṭṭa's (ca. 1641, son of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa) Mīmāṃsā work is unpublished: the *Śāstramālāvṛtti* on his father's *Śāstramālā* and the *Nyāyarahasya*, a commentary on the sūtras.

86 Cf. BRONKHORST, DIACONESCU, KULKARNI, 2012. Also KANE, 1975: 925–937, and O'HANLON, 2010.

87 See also BRONKHORST, DIACONESCU, KULKARNI, 2012.
Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's unpublished Mīmāṃsā work includes the *Śāstradīpikāvyākhyā Āloka*, reported to criticize Appayya Dīkṣita's own commentary on the *Śāstradīpikā* (the Mayūkhāvali); see also KRISHNAMACHARYA, 1947. The *Bhāvārtha* is a commentary on Kumārila's *Tantravārttika*, in which Kamalākara criticizes Someśvarabhaṭṭa, whom he calls a plagiarist; see MCCREA, 2008: 577. He authored two other works on Bhāṭṭamīmāṃsā, the *Śāstramālā* (a commentary on the sūtras) and the *Śāstratattva*.

88 See KANE, 1926: xxv–xxvii, and 1975: 941. EIP, vol. 1 pronounces Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭa's date unknown.

89 See DIACONESCU, forthcoming a.

Khaṇḍadevamiśra (ca. 1575–1665)

With the work of Khaṇḍadevamiśra the use of the Navya-Nyāya techniques of analysis attains its peak in Mīmāṃsā. From a reference made by Jaganātha Paṇḍita in his Rasagaṅgādhara, Khaṇḍadeva is known as the Mīmāṃsā teacher of Perubhaṭṭa, the father of Jagannātha Paṇḍita. From Khaṇḍadevamiśra's pupil Shambhu Bhaṭṭa, who wrote the commentary *Prabhāvalī* on Khaṇḍadeva's *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*, we know the place where he lived in Varanasi (the Brahmanāla muhallā), that he became sannyāsin and that he died at Benares in 1665. He knew the work of Appayadīkṣita, whom he refers to respectfully as most excellent among the Mīmāṃsakas (*mīmāṃsakamūrdhanya*).

The *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* comments the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*s from the second *pāda* of the first *adhyāya* to the end of the twelfth *adhyāya*. The exposition is much less detailed than the *Mīmāṃsākaustubha*, and follows the Navya-Nyāya style. His approach is historicist, explaining the principles of Mīmāṃsā by taking into account how they were dealt with by various Mīmāṃsā authors and refuting a certain number of views.

The *Mīmāṃsākaustubha* is a kaustubha type work which, as Pollock notes, becomes something of a new literary genre in this period; the term "figuratively points to the precious knowledge that is now believed to be uncovered as much as recovered".[90] It covers the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*s from 1.2.1 to 3.3.37 in detailed explanations in the Navya-Nyāya style. Khaṇḍadevamiśra discusses here all categories and principles of Mīmāṃsā, with great developments of particular topics like verbal cognition (*śābdabodha*), and analyses and sometimes criticizes the views of earlier thinkers.

The Bhāṭṭa(tantra)rahasya is a treatise dedicated to verbal cognition, with a particular emphasis on refuting the views of the opponent systems, Nyāya and Vyākaraṇa, as well as the positions of preceding Mīmāṃsakas, like for instance Kumārila, Pārthasārathimiśra or Appayyadīkṣita. He refutes also the view of Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa, whom he however does not name, but whose position he mentions under *kaiścit* "by some." The style is a full-fledged Navya-Nyāya style.[91]

90 POLLOCK, 2001: 8.

91 See DIACONESCU, forthcoming a.

Raghunātha Bhaṭṭācārya (16th c.?)

A particular case is the *Pramāṇaratna* of Raghunātha Bhaṭṭācārya (16th c.?) on account of the problematic identity, and thereby datation, of the author. This work, which deals with the Bhāṭṭamīmāṃsā theory of cognition, shows clear Navya-Nyāya features. It has not been mentioned in the histories of Mīmāṃsā literature, but has been published in 1991 (edition and translation in PraRa, 1991) and this book is discussed by Gerschheimer (1998). Gerschheimer points to the proposition of D. C. Bhattacharyya (1952)[92] to situate the author in the sixteenth century and to identify him with the author of another Mīmāṃsā work, the *Mīmāṃsāratna*, of which the *Pramāṇaratna* is probably the first part, and with the author of the *Anumānadīdhitipratibimba*, a commentary on Raghunātha Śiromaṇi's *Anumānadīdhiti*. Gerschheimer gives arguments in favour of identifying the same author with the author of *Padārtharatnamālā*, a short treatise on the sixteen Nyāya categories. The author was of Bengali origin, and possibly lived in Varanasi; the very manuscript has belonged to the famous Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī and is dated seventeenth century or before.[93]

And the others

However clear and intense the use of Navya-Nyāya techniques in the Mīmāṃsā work of the above authors, it is nonetheless not espoused by all the authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (or after this period for that matter). Important Mīmāṃsā works of this time do not show these features; some authors choose not to use them, or not in all their writings, be it in manuals, commentaries or various treatises. At Varanasi, Rāmakṛṣṇa (ca. 1550) does not use the Navya-Nyāya technical language in his *Yuktisnehaprapūraṇī* on Pārthasārathimiśra's *Śāstradīpikā*, just like Keśavabhaṭṭa Laugākṣi (ca. 1600), from the Laugākṣi family, who is also a well-known Navya-Naiyāyika, in the *Mīmāṃsārthaprakāśa* (a short manual); nor does Āpadeva (ca. 1610) in his *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa* or Laugākṣi Bhāskara (ca. 1660) in his Arthasaṃgraha or Jīvadeva (ca. 1650) in the *Bhaṭṭabhāskara*, and the list can continue. Among the

92 I could not get access to Bhattacaryya's book.

93 There is a certain amount of confusion concerning the *Pramāṇaratna* and his author in the EIP, vol. 1, and the online edition. Moreover, the article of Gerschheimer is mentioned there under Raghunātha Śiromaṇi and in connection with a *Pramāṇaratna(mālā)* (in manuscript) of an Ācārya Rāya Modaka (ca. 1825).

southern authors in Mīmāṃsā who do not make use of the Navya-Nyāya techniques: Veṅkateśvaradīkṣita (ca. 1620) in his commentary *Vārttikābharaṇa* and his pupil Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita (ca. 1630) in his *Tantraśikhāmaṇi*, a commentary on the sūtras (Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita wrote also Navya-Nyāya works); Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (ca. 1640) of Malabar and Nārāyana Paṇḍita in the famous compendium *Mānameyodaya*; Mahādeva Vedāntin (ca. 1645) in the *Mīmāṃsānyāyasaṃgraha*.

Conclusions

The Navya-Nyāya techniques of cognitive analysis spread and are adopted in the Sanskrit knowledge-systems in a complex array of relations between arguments, texts, authors, and disciplines. We have seen from the available Mīmāṃsā texts in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries (many Mīmāṃsā texts of this period being unpublished) that Navya-Nyāya techniques begin to be used in the second half of the sixteenth century in the South, on the sidelines of the Advaita-Dvaita Vedānta controversy, then in Varanasi. Vedāntic authors integrated the Navya-Nyāya technical language on the background of their particular interaction / confrontation with Nyāya over time and of the controversies between Vedāntic movements from the thirteenth century onwards. Appayadīkṣita and Vijayīndratīrtha compose Mīmāṃsā works (connected to the Advaita / Dvaita polemic) which show Navya-Nyāya features; these features were present in their respective works in Vedānta as well. And it is subsequently in the Mīmāṃsā work of the Bhaṭṭas, a southern family with Vedāntic background settled in Varanasi, that the use of these techniques flourished, to reach its peak in the texts of Khaṇḍadevamiśra in the first half of the seventeenth century. Varanasi was at the time an outstanding centre of learning where Navya-Nyāya techniques were used in the writings of other systems, like Vedānta, Vyākaraṇa or literary disciplines.

The authors integrate the new techniques in Mīmāṃsā writings gradually, from a sparse use in the beginning to a full-fledged Navya-Nyāya style in parts of Khaṇḍadevamiśra's work. Furthermore, they use these techniques selectively, in that they adopt them only in certain circumstances – mainly for refining arguments and definitions and / or refuting rival positions. Last, this use remains limited, insofar as only some of the authors of Mīmāṃsā texts of this period choose to use the new techniques in their texts.

This study merely offers a glimpse into the overall process of adoption of the Navya-Nyāya techniques in early modern India. In order better to understand the circumstances and conditions under which the overall process occured, further detailed research is called for, which takes into account the complex relationship between arguments, texts, authors (of which many compose works in several systems) and systems. To illustrate why and how these techniques are used and what is their contribution to intellectual analysis, it will be important to investigate in detail particular doctrinal points in one or the other systems.

Bibliography

Primary sources with abbreviations

AK DEVANĀTHA ṬHAKKURA. 1926. Adhikaraṇakaumudī. Banārasa Siṭī: Caukhambāsaṃskṛtasīrija Āphisa (Haridāsasaṃskṛtagranthamālāsamākhya Kāśīsaṃskṛtasīrijapustakamālāyāḥ: Mīmāṃsāvibhāga 50.4).

AS MADHUSŪDANA SARASVATĪ. 2005. Advaitasiddhi. With the commentaries Gauḍabrahmānandī, Viṭṭhaleśopādhyāyī, *Siddhivyākhyā* of Balabhadra and critical summary called Caturgranthi by Ananta Krishna Śāstrī. Edited by Ananta Krishna Śāstrī. Delhi: Parimal Publications.
See also NA.

BhA NĪLAKAṆṬHABHAṬṬA. 1980. *Bhāṭṭārka* (A Treatise on P*adhārtha* T*heory of the Bhāṭṭa* S*chool of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*) by Nilakantha Bhatta. Edited with Ark[a]mādhurī Commentary by Sri Anant Tryambak Pingle. Revised and seen through press by Dr. Goparaju Rama. Allahabad: Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha (Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha Text Series 7).

BhBh JĪVADEVA. 1996. Bha*ṭṭabhāskaraḥ*. Sampādakaḥ Kamalanayana Śarmā. Ilāhābāda: Śrīgaṅgānāthajhākendrīyasaṃskṛtavidyāpīṭha (Gaṅgānāthajhākendrīyasaṃskṛtavidyāpīṭhagranthamālā 42).

BhD KHAṆḌADEVAMIŚRA. 1987. The Bhatta Dipika of Khandadeva with Prabhavali the Commentary of Shambhu Bhatta. Edited by N.S. Ananta Krishna Sastri (vol. 1), S. Subrahmaniya Sastri (vols. 2–6). Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

BhDh NṚSIṂHĀŚRAMAMUNI. 1904. *Bhedadhikkāra. With a Commentary by the Author's Pupil Sree Narayanasrama.* Edited and Annotated by Paṇḍit Lakshmaṇa Śastrî Drâvida. 2 vols. Benares: Braj B. Das (Bena-

res Sanskrit Series 86 & 92). [Vol. 2 contains also the Upakrama-*parākrama* by Appayadīkṣita].

BhTR(1) KHAṆḌADEVAMIŚRA. 1970. Bhatta(tantra)rahasyam by Acharya Khandadeva. Edited Critically with Introduction and Notes by Shri A. Subrahmanya Sastri. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University.

BhTR(2) KHAṆḌADEVAMIŚRA. 1985. Khanda Deva Bhava Prakasa: A Commentary on Mahamahopadhyaya Khandadeva's Bhattarahasya by Peri Surya Narayana Sastry. Rajahmundry.

BhVV VIJAYĪDRATĪRTHA. 1945. Bheda-vidya-vilasa of Jadaguru Sri Vijayindra Tirtha Sripada. With an Introduction by R. Nagarajasarma and Synopsis by B. N. Krishnamurty Sarma. Edited by Raja S. Gururajacharya. Nanjangud: Sri Parimala Publishing House.

CP APPAYADĪKṢITA. 1934. Citrapaṭa. Edited by T. R. Chintamani. Madras: Journal of Oriental Research (Madras Oriental Series 6).

JNMV MĀDHAVA. 2005. *Jaiminīyanyāyamālā Śrīmādhavācāryeṇa Viracitā. Tadviracitavistarākhyavyākhyayā Śrīmadappayyadīkṣitaracitapūrvamīmāṃsāviṣayasaṃgrahadīpikayāca Saṃvalitā.* Dillī: Caukhambā Saṃskṛta Pratiṣṭhāna (Śrī Vrajajīvana Prācyabhāratī Granthamālā 35).

MAP LAUGĀKṢI KEŚAVABHAṬṬA. 1913. Mîmâmsârthaprakâṣa. Edited by S. P. V. Ranganathasvami Aryavaraguru. Vizagapatam: The Arsha Press (Grantha Pradarsani New Series 2).

MBP ŚAṄKARABHAṬṬA. 2009. *Mīmāṃsābālaprakāsaḥ.* Jaiminīyadvādaśādhyāyārthasaṃgrahaḥ. Śrīmukundaśāstriṇā pariśodhitam. Vāraṇāsī: Caukhambā Saṃskṛta Sīrīj Āfis.

MKau KHAṆḌADEVAMIŚRA. 1991. Mimamsa Kaustubha: An Exhaustive Commentary of Jaiminisutra. Edited by A. Chinnaswami Sastri. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

MKu KAMALĀKARABHAṬṬA. 1987. *Mīmāṃsākutūhala.* Edited with notes by Pt. Paṭābhirāma Śastrī. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University.

MM NĀRĀYAṆABHAṬṬA. 1975. *Mānameyodaya of Nārāyaṇa*: An Elementary Treatise on the Mīmāṃsā. Edited with an English Translation by C. Kunhan Raja and S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Adyar, Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.

MNP ĀPADEVA. 1986. Reprint. *The Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa.* Translated into English, with an Introduction, Transliterated Sanskrit Text, and Glossarial Index by Franklin Edgerton. 2d ed. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications. [Original publication, New Haven, 1929].

MSP INDRAPATI. 1977. *Mīmāṃsārasapalvalam.* Sampādakaḥ Kiśora Nātha Jhā. Ilāhābāda: Gaṁgānāthajhā Kendrīya Saṃskṛta Vidyāpīṭham.

MSS ŚAṄKARABHAṬṬA. 2004. *Mīmāṃsāsārasaṅgraha.* See UP.

MVV VĀDĪNDRA. 1920. *Mahávidyá-Vidambana of Bhatta Vádîndra*, with the *Commentaries of Ánandapurṇa and Bhuvanasundara Ŝuri and the Das'a-sloki of Kula'rka Pandita with Vivarana and Vivarana* Tippana. Edited with Introduction and Appendices by Mangesh Ramakrishna Telang. Baroda: Central Library.

NA VYĀSATĪRTHA, MADHUSŪDHANA SARASVATĪ, VYĀSA RĀMĀCHĀRYA, ĀNANDA BHAṬṬĀRAKA. 1994–1996. *Nyāyāmṛtam / Vyāsatīrthaviracitam. Śrīmadhusūdanasarasvatīviracitayā Advaitasiddhyā Śrivyāsarāmācāryaviracita Nyāyāmṛtataraṅgiṅī, Śrī Pāṇḍuraṅgi Ānandabhaṭṭāraka viracita Nyāyamṛ*takaṇṭakoddhāraḥ, *Śrī Śrinivāsatīrthaviracita Nyāyāmṛtaprakāśaḥ, iti vyākhyā*natrayeṇa ca sahitam. Edited by K. T. Pandurangi. Bangalore: Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation.

NTĀ CIDĀNANDA. 2008. *Nītitattvāvirbhāvaḥ. Mīmāṃsābhāṣyapariśiṣṭ*ena tantrarahasyena ca sahita*ḥ*. Edited by K. T. Pandurangi. Bangalore: Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation.

NTS VIṢṆUBHAṬṬA. 1962. "Nayatattvasa*ṅ*graha. Edited by Sri T. Chandrasekharan." Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscript Library 15: 51–108.

PraRa SAHA, Biswarup. 1991. Studies in the Pramāṇa-Ratna: A Treatise on *Bhāṭṭ*a Epistemology with Manuscript, its Decipherment, Sans. Commentary & English translation. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.

SLS APPAYADĪKṢITA. 1937. *The Siddhāntaleśasaṅ*graha of Appayya *Dīkṣ*ita. Edited by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Vol. 2: Roman and Sanskrit Texts. Madras: University of Madras.

SP NĀRĀYAṆABHAṬṬA. 1985. The Bridge to the Three Holy Cities: The *Sāmānya*-pragha*ṭṭaka of Nārāyaṇ*a Bha*ṭṭ*a*'s Tristhalīsetu.* Critically Edited and Translated by Richard Salomon. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

SMV NĀRĀYAṆĀPAṆḌITĀCĀRYA. 2000. *Kavikulatilaka Śrīnārāyaṇa*-pa*ṇḍitācā*ryaviracita*ḥ* Sumadhvavijaya*ḥ. Śrīnārāyaṇ*apa*ṇḍitācārya-viracitabhāvaprakāśikā Śrīviśvapatitīrthaviracitapadārthadīpikodbodhikā Śrīchalārīśeṣācāryaviracitamandopakāriṅī iti vyākhyānatra*yasameta*ḥ*. Prathama*ṃ* sampu*ṭ*am. Edited by A. B. Shyamachar and S. R. Pandurangi. Bangalore: Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation.

TB ṚṢIPUTRA PARAMEŚVARA. 1936. *Tattvabindu by Vācaspatimiśra with Tattvavibhāvanā by Ṛṣiputra Parameśvara.* Edited by V. A. Ramaswami Sastri. [Annamalainagar]: [Annamalai University].

TC VYĀSATĪRTHA. 2000–2003. *Tātparyacandrikā: Jayatīrthaviracita Tattvaprakāśikāyāḥ vyākhyānarūpā: Rāghavendra Tīrthaviracitā*

Prakāśikayā, Pāṇḍuraṅgi Keśavācāryaviracita Bhāvadīpikayā ca sahitā. Edited by K.T. Pandurangi. 3 vols. Bangalore: Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation.

TŚM RĀJACŪḌĀMAṆIDĪKṢITA. 1984. *Tantraśikhāmaṇi*. In: *Śābarabhāṣyam: Kumārilabhaṭṭa-śrīveṅkaṭeśvaradīkṣita-śrīrājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita-śrīpaṭṭābhirāmaśāstribhiḥ* praṇītābhiḥ *Ṭupṭīkā-vārtikā*bharaṇa*tantraśikhāmaṇi-bhāṣyasandarbhayojinībhiḥ sahitam* (tasya sapta*māṣṭamayor adhyāyayor bhārgaḥ*). Pradhāna sampādakaḥ Ḍākṭara Maṇḍnamiśraḥ. Sampādakaḥ Ācārya Paṭṭabhirāmaśāstrī 'Padmabhūṣaṇam.' Nūtana Dillī: Śrīlālabahādūraśāstrī Kendrīya Saṃskṛta Vidyāpīṭha.

TT VYĀSATĪRTHA. 1932–1943. *Tarkatāṇḍavam of Sri Vyāsatīrtha with the Commentary Nyāyadīpa of Sri Rāghavendratīrtha*. Edited by D. Srinivasachar and Vidwan V. Madhwachar. 4 vols. Mysore: Government Branch Press (Oriental Library Publication Sanskrit Series 74, 77, 79, 82).

UP VIJAYĪNDRATĪRTHA, APPAYADĪKṢITA, VYĀSATĪRTHA, ŚAṄKARABHAṬṬA. 2004. *Nyāyādhvadīpikā Vijayīndratīrthaviracitā*. Upakrama*parākramaḥ Appayadīkṣitaviracitaḥ. Upasaṃhāravijayaḥ Vijayīndratīrthaviracitaḥ. Tarkatāṇḍave Upakramaparākramabhaṅgaḥ Vyāsatīrthaviracita. Mīmāṃsāsārasaṅgrahaḥ Śaṅkarabhaṭṭaviracitaḥ*. Edited by K. T. Pandurangi. Bangalore: Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation.

VBh VENKATEŚVARADĪKṢITA. 1984. *Vārttikābharaṇa*. See TŚM.

Vij ANANATANĀRĀYAṆA. 1990–. "Vijayā, the commentary on Ajitā." Edited by Kunio Harikai. Acta Eruditorium 14 (1995), 1–55 (1.2.1); 15 (1996), 1–42 (1.2.2–4); 16 (1997), 1–30 (1.2.4 & 1.3.1); 17 (1998), 1–49 (1.3.2–3); 18 (1999), 1–52 (1.3.4–8); 19 (2000), 1–49 (1.3.9–10).

VAR AHOBALASŪRI. 1943. *The Vākyārtharatnam with the Suvarṇa Mudrikā of Ahobala Suri*. Edited by R. Rama Sastry. Mysore: Govt. Branch Press (University of Mysore Oriental Library Publications Sanskrit Series 83).

VK RĀMĀDVAYA. 1955. *Vedāntakaumudī*. Edited by S. Subrahmanya Sastri. Madras: University of Madras (Madras University Sanskrit Series 20).

VNM APPAYADĪKṢITA. 1912. Vadanakshatramala. Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press.

VR(1) APPAYADĪKṢITA. 1901. *Vidhirasāyanam*. Sarvatantrasvatantraśrīmadappayadīkṣitaviracitam. Aḍakaropanāmakaśrīmukundaśāstriṇā pariśodhitam. Kāśī.

VR(2) APPAYYADĪKṢITA, ŚAṄKARABHAṬṬA, NĀRĀYAṆABHAṬṬA. 2008. *Srī Appayyadīkṣitaviracitam Vidhirasāyanam Śrīśaṅkarabhaṭṭaviracita-vidhirasāyanadūṣaṇena Śrīnārāyaṇabhaṭṭaviracitavidhibhūṣaṇena* ca sahitam. Edited by K. T. Pandurangi. Bangalore: Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation.

VRD ŚAṄKARABHAṬṬA's *Vidhirasāyanadūṣaṇa*. See VR(2).

VT RAVIDEVA. 1937. Nayaviveka of Bhavanatha Misra with the Viveka-tattva of Ravideva (Tarkapada). Edited by S. K. Ramanatha Sastri. Madras: University of Madras (Madras University Sanskrit Series 12).

VTP VEṄKAṬĀDHVARIN. 1997. *Vidhitrayaparitrāṇam*. Veṅkaṭādhvarīti prasiddhaiḥ Śrīveṅkaṭācāryadīkṣitaiḥ viracitaṃ. Ko. Śaṭhakopācāryeṇa pariśodhya pariṣkṛtam. Ke. Anantena āṅlabhāṣopoddhātādibhiḥ pariṣkṛtya prakāśitam. Palakkad: Rajalakshmi.

VYC SOMANĀTHA. n.d. *Śrī Vyāsayogīcaritam: The Life of Śrī Vyāsarāja, a Champu Kāvya in Sanskrit.* With Historical Introduction in English by Venkoba Rao. [Bangalore]: [Mrs. M. Srinivasa Murti].

YSP RĀMAKṚṢṆA. 1988. *Yuktisnehaprapūraṇī Siddhāntacandrikā*. In: *Shāstradīpikā of Parthasarathi Mishra with the Commentary Mayu-*khamalika (From Second Pada of First Chapter to the End) by Soma-*nātha and with the Commentary Yuktisnehaprapuraṇi* (For the First Tarkapada) *by Rāmakrishṇa*. Edited by Sri Dharmadatta Jha (Baccha Jha). Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy.

Secondary sources

ALTEKAR, A. S.

1937 History of Benares: From Prehistoric Times to Present Day. Banaras: Cultural Publications.

ARYAVARAGURU, Ranganathasvami

1912 "On the Seshas of Benares." Indian Antiquary 41: 245–253.

ASHER, Catherine B., Cynthia TALBOT

2006 India before Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ASIATIC SOCIETY (KOLKATA), ed.

2004 *Navyanyāya: Language and Methodology*. Kolkata: The Asiatic Society.

BALASUBRAMANIAN, R. (ed.).

2003 *Theistic Vedānta*. New Delhi: Project of History of Indian Science Philosophy and Culture: Centre for Studies in Civilizations (History of Science, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilization 2.3).

BANERJEE, K. K.
1995 Reprint. "Navya-Nyāya and Ordinary Language." In: K. S. GUPTA / K. ROY (eds.): Language, Knowledge and Ontology. A Collection of Essays by Professor K. K. Banerjee. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, pp. 28–106. [First published 1988.]

BENSON, James
2001 "Saṃkarabhaṭṭa's Family Chronicle: The Gādhivaṃśavarṇana." In Axel MICHAELS (ed.): The Pandit. New Delhi: Manohar, pp. 105–118.

BHATTACHARYA, Dineshchandra
1958 History of Navya-*Nyāya in Mithilā*. Darbhanga: Mithilā Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning (Mithilā Institute Series 3, Studies 2).

BHATTACHARYYA, Dineshchandra
1945 "Bengali Scholars at Benares (1657 A.D.)." Indian Historical Quarterly 21: 91–97.

BHATTACHARYYA, Dinesh Chandra
1940 "Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma." Indian Historical Quarterly 16: 58–69.
1952 *Vāṅgālīr Sārasvat Avadān: Baṅge* Navya-*nyāya Carcā*. Calcutta: Sahitya Pariṣat [in Bengali, not seen].

BHATTACHARYA, Gopikamohan
1978 Navya-*Nyāya: Some Logical Problems in Historical Perspective*. Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.

BHATTACHARYA, Kamaleswar
2006 "On the language of Navya-Nyāya: An experiment with precision through a natural language." Journal of Indian Philosophy 34: 5–13.

BHATTACHARYYA, Ashutosh
1936 *Studies in post-Śaṁkara dialectics*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

BHATTACHARYYA, Sibajiban
1990 "Some features of the technical language of Navya-Nyāya." Philosophy East and West 40.2: 129–149.

BRONKHORST, Johannes, Bogdan DIACONESCU, Malhar KULKARNI
2012 "The arrival of Navya-Nyāya techniques in Varanasi: a preliminary exploration." In: Kuruvilla PANDIKATTU SJ (ed.): An Indian Ending. Rediscovering the Grandeur of Indian Heritage for a Sustainable Life-Style. A Festschrift in Honour of Prof John Vattanky SJ. Delhi: Serial Publishers, pp. 85–117 (in press).

CAMMANN, Klaus
1965 *Das System des Advaita nach der Lehre Prakāśātmans.* Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz (Münchener Indologische Studien 4).

CHAKRABARTI, Mihir Kumar
2004 *Navyanyāya: Language and Methodology*. Kolkata: The Asiatic Society.

CHAKRAVARTI BAHADUR, Rai Manmohan
1915 "History of Navya Nyāya in Bengal and Mithilā." Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal 11.9: 259–292.

CHAR, D. Prahlada
2006 "Ākāṅkṣā: The Nyāya View and its Criticism by Vyāsatīrtha." In: Manjulika GHOSH / Bhaswati Bhattacharya CHAKRABARTI (eds.): *Śabdapramāṇa* in Indian Philosophy. New Delhi: Northern Book Centre, pp. 7–22.

CLOONEY, Francis X.
1994 "The Principle of Upasaṃhāra and the Development of Vedānta as an Uttara Mīmāṃsā." In: R. C. DWIVEDI (ed.): *Studies in Mīmāṃsā: Dr.* Mandan Mishra Felicitation Volume. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp. 279–297.

DASGUPTA, Surendranath
1922–1955 A History of Indian Philosophy. 5 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DEVI, Konduri Sarojini
1990 Religion in Vijayanagara Empire. New Delhi: Sterling.

DIACONESCU, Bogdan
Forthc. a "Old topics, new formulations: *bhāvanā* in late Mīmāṃsā."
Forthc. b "Contacts, networks, influences: Towards a socio-intellectual history of Mīmāṃsā in early modern India."

DUQUETTE, Jonathan / K. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
2009 "Anyathākhyāti: A Critique by Appaya Dīkṣita in the Parimala." Journal of Indian Philosophy 37: 331–347.

EIP Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies
1995 Vol. 1. Karl H. POTTER (ed.): Bibliography (Third Edition). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Online: <http://faculty.washington.edu/kpotter/> (last visited: 2012.4.23).
1977 Vol. 2. Karl H. POTTER (ed.): Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: *The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* before *Gaṅgeśa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

1993 Vol. 6. Karl H. POTTER / Sibajiban BHATTACHARYYA (eds.): Indian *Philosophical Analysis: Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* from *Gaṅgeśa to Raghunātha Śiromaṇi*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

2006 Vol. 11. Karl H. POTTER (ed): *Advaita Vedānta from 800 to 1200*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

2011 Vol. 13. Karl H. POTTER / Sibajiban BHATTACHARYYA (eds.): *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* Philosophy from 1515 to 1660. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

GANERI, Jonardon

2008 "Towards a formal regimentation of the Navya-Nyāya technical language." In: Mihir K. CHAKRABORTY / Benedikt LÖWE / Madhabendra Nath MITRA / Sundar SARUKKAI (eds.): Logic, Navya-*Nyāya & Applications*: Homage to Bimal Krishna Matilal. London: College Publications, Part I pp. 105–121; Part II pp. 123–138.

2011 The Lost Age of Reason: Philosophy in Early Modern India, 1450–1700. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press (The Oxford History of Philosophy).

GANGOPADHYAY, M. K.

1984 Indian Logic in its Sources: On Validity of Inference. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

GEROW, Edwin

1987 "The Dvaitin as Deconstructionist: Viṣṇudāsācārya on 'Tat tvam asi': Part 1." Journal of the American Oriental Society 107.4: 561–579.

1990 The Jewel-necklace of Argument: (*the Vādaratnāvalī of Viṣṇudāsācārya*). Transl. by Edwin GEROW. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

GERSCHHEIMER, Gerdi

1998 "Le Pramāṇaratna de Raghunātha, traité de gnoséologie bhāṭṭamīmāṃsaka (Notes de lecture mīmāṃsaka I)." Bulletin d'Études Indiennes 16: 51–82.

GODE, P. K.

1940 "The chronology of the works of Khaṇḍadeva." In: B. C. LAW (ed.): D. R. Bhandarkar Volume. Calcutta: Indian Research Institute, pp. 9–16.

1954 "Āpadeva, the Author of the Mīmāṃsā-Nyāyaprakāśa and Mahāmohapādhyāya Āpadeva, the Author of the Adhikaraṇacandrikā and the Smṛticandrikā – are they identical?" In: Studies in Indian Literary History 2. Bombay: Singhi Jain Sastra Siksapith, pp. 39–48.

GRANOFF, P. E.
1978 *Philosophy and Argument in Late Vedānta: Śrī Harṣa*'s Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍakhādya. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel (Studies of classical India 1).

GUHA, Dinesh Chandra
1979 *Navya Nyāya Sys*tem of Logic: Basic Theories and Techniques. Delhi, Varanasi, Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

GUPTA, Sanjukta
2006 *Advaita Vedānta and Vaiṣṇ*avism: The P*hilosophy of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī*. London: RoutledgeCurzon (Routledge Hindu Studies Series).

HARTMANN, Peter
1955 Nominale Ausdruckformen im Wissenschaftlichen Sanskrit. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

INGALLS, Daniel H. H.
1951 Materials for the Study of Navya-*Nyāya Logic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (Harvard Oriental Series 40).
2001 "Logic in India." In: Jonardon GANERI (ed.): Indian Logic: A Reader. Richmond: Curzon Press, 2001, pp. 110–116. [Originally published in Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th edition (1955), vol. 8, pp. 311–312.]

JACOBI, Hermann
1903 "Über den nominalen Stil des wissenschaftlichen Sanskrits." Indogermanische Forschungen 14: 236–251.

JAGADISAN, S.
1987 "The Three Appaya Dīkṣitas." Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference: Thirty-Second Session, University of Gujarat, Ahmedabad, November 6–8, 1986. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, pp. 273–277.

JHA, Trilokanatha
1998 The Glory that was Mithila. New Delhi: Rasthriya Sanskrit Sansthan.

JHA, Ujjwala, trans.
2004 *A Primer of Navya Nyāya Language and Methodology: Navya-Nyāya-Bhāṣā-Pradīpa of Mm Mahesha Chandra Nyayaratna, English* Translation. Kolkata: The Asiatic Society.

JHA, V. N.
2001 *Dictionary of Nyāya Terms (Sanskrit*-English). Pune: Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Pune, Class 1, No. 2).

KANE, Pandurang Vaman

1926 "Introduction." In: *The Vyavahāramayūkha of Bhaṭṭa Nīlakaṇṭha*. With an introduction, notes and appendices by P. V. KANE. Bombay: Nirnayasagar Press, pp. i–xlvii (Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 80).

1975 *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil* Law). Vol. 1, revised and enlarged. Part II. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Government Oriental Series, Class B 6).

KAVIRAJ, Gopinath

1982 *The History and Bibliography of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣ*ika Literature. Edited by Gaurinath Sastri. Varanasi: Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya (The Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavana Studies, Reprint Series 2).

KRISHAN, Y.

1976 "Role of Nyaya Vaisesikas in Indian Religion and Society." Prachya Pratibha 41: 67–74.

KRISHNA, Daya

1997 "The Modes of Analysis and the Search for Precision: Developments in Navya Nyāya after Gaṅgeśa." In: Indian Philosophy: A New Approach. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, pp. 155–162.

2002 "Developments in Mīmāṃsā from Eighteenth Century Onwards: A Reconstruction Based on the Construction by Thangaswami Sarma Entitled, 'Development of the Literature Pertaining to Mīmāṃsā System of Philosophy'." In: Daya KRISHNA (ed.): Developments in Indian Philosophy from Eighteenth Century Onwards: Classical and Western. New Delhi: Project of History of Indian Science, Philosophy and Culture: Centre for Studies in Civilizations, pp. 67–79.

KRISHNAMACHARYA, V.

1947 "Two rare commentaries on the Śāstradīpikā." Adyar Library Bulletin 11.4: 257–262.

KRISHNAMACHARYA, V., C. KUNHAN RAJA

1952 Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Adyar Library. Vol. 9 – *Mīmāṃsā and Advaita Vedānta.* Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre (The Adyar Library Series 82).

KUNHAN RAJA, C.

1945 "The Payyūr Bhaṭṭas." Journal of Oriental Research, September: 13–17.

LUNSTEAD, Jeffrey John

1977 Madhvite Logic: A critical Edition and Translation of the Prapañca-*mithyātvānumānakhandana of Madhva and the ṭīkā of Jayatīrtha, with* Extracts from the *Commentary of Vyāsarāya and an* Introductory Essay on the development of logic in the Madvite tradition. Ph.D. diss., Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Pennsylvania.

MAHADEVAN, Telliyavaram Mahadevan Ponnambalam, ed.

1968 Preceptors of Advaita. Secunderabad: Sri Kanchi Kamakoti Sankara Mandir.

MAHALINGA SASTRI, Y.

1928 "Appayya Diksita's age." Journal of Oriental Research (Madras) 2: 225–237.

1929 "More about the age and life of Appayya Diksita." Journal of Oriental Research (Madras) 3: 140–160.

1968 "Appayya Dikshita." In: Telliyavaram Mahadevan Ponnambalam MAHADEVAN (ed.): Preceptors of Advaita. Secunderabad: Sri Kanchi Kamakoti Sankara Mandir, pp. 245–253.

MAHEŚA CHANDRA NYĀYARATNA, M.

1973 *Navyanyāya-Bhāṣāpradīpaḥ* (*Brief Notes on the Modern Nyāya* System of Philosophy and Its Technical Terms). Edited with the Commentary 'Suprabhā' and Bengali Translation by Kalipada Tarkāchārya. Calcutta: Sanskrit College (Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series 79). [Original edition, 1891, in Sanskrit.]
See also U. JHA trans., 2004.

MATILAL, Bimal Krishna

1968 The Navya-*Nyāya Doctrine of Negation: The Semantics and Ontology* of Negative Statements in Navya-*Nyāya Philosophy.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

1976 "Introduction." In: Bimal Krishna MATILAL (ed.): *Śaśadhara's Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa with Ṭ*ippana by Gu*ṇaratnasūri.* Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, pp. 1–28.

1977 *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣ*ika. Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz (A History of Indian Literature 6.2).

MCCREA, Lawrence

2002 "Novelty of Form and Novelty of Substance in Seventeenth Century Mīmāṃsā." Journal of Indian Philosophy 30: 481–494.

2008 "Playing with the System: Fragmentation and Individualization in Late Pre-colonial Mīmāṃsā." Journal of Indian Philosophy 36: 575–585.

MESQUITA, Roque

2000 Madhva: Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya. Annotierte Übersetzung mit Studie. Wien: Sammlung De Nobili, Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library 28).

MINKOWSKI, Cristopher

2011 "Advaita Vedānta in early modern history." South Asian History and Culture 2.2: 205–231.

MIŚRA, Maṇḍana

1983 *Mīmāṃsā-darśanam: Maharṣi*-Jaimini-*pravartitasya vicāraśāstras*ya *samālocanā*tmakamadhyayanam. Sampādakaḥ Ācāryaḥ Paṭṭābhirāma Śāstrī 'Padmabhūṣaṇam.' Nūtanadillī: Śrīlālabahādurśāstrī-kendriya-saṃskṛta-vidyāpīṭham.

MISHRA, Umesha

1934 "Mīmāṃsāśāstrasarvasva and its Author." The Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 20.1: 24–32.

1966 History of Indian Philosophy. Volume Two. Allahabad: Tirabhukti Publications.

MODI, P. M.

1985 Reprint. "Introduction." In: P. M. MODI: Translation of Siddhanta *Bindu: Being Madhusudana's Commentary on the Das'as'loki of S'ri S'ankaracharya*. With a Foreword by Dr. Zimmermann. Allahabad: Vohra, pp. 1–54. [Originally published, 1929.]

NAGARAJA RAO, P.

1938 "The Problems of 'Definition' and 'Perception' in Śri Madhva's Epistemology." Indian Historical Quarterly 14: 353–365.

1938–39 "Inference in Dvaita Vedānta." New Indian Antiquary 1: 492–515.

1940 "Concept of definition in Mādhva Vedānta." Indian Culture 6.3: 333–338.

1976 *The Epistemology of Dvaita Vedānta*. Adyar, Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre (The Adyar Library Series 107).

O'HANLON, Rosalind / Christopher MINKOWSKI

2008 "What makes people who they are? Pandit Networks and the Problem of Livelihoods in Early Modern Western India." Indian Economic and Social History Review 45.3: 381–416.

O'HANLON, Rosalind
2010 "Letters Home: Banaras pandits and the Maratha regions in early modern India." Modern Indian Studies 44.2: 201–240.
2011 "Speaking from Siva's temple: Banaras scholar households and the Brahman 'ecumene' of Mughal India." South Asian History and Culture 2.2: 253–277.

PADMANABHA CHAR, C. M.
1909 Life and Teachings of Sri Madhvacharyar. Madras: Progressive Press.

PANDURANGI, K. T., ed.
2006 *Pūrvamīmāṃsā from an Interdisciplinary Point of View*. History of Science, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilisation 2.6. Delhi: Centre for Studies in Civilisations.

PATIL, Parimal
2011 "The End of the Ends of Man?" In: Yigal BRONNER / Whitney COX / Lawrence MCCREA (eds.): South Asian Texts in History: Critical Engagements with Sheldon Pollock. Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, pp. 293–314.

PELLEGRINI, Gianni
2011 "Analysis of the Second and Fourth Definitions of Mithyātva in the Advaitasiddhi of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī." Journal of Indian Philosophy 39.4–5: 441–459.

PHILLIPS, Stephen H.
1997 Classical Indian Metaphysics: Refutations of Realism and the Emergence of "New Logic." Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (reprint, first published, Chicago: Open Court, 1996).

POLLOCK, Sheldon
2001 "New intellectuals in seventeenth-century India." The Indian Economic and Social History Review 38.1: 3–31.
2004 "The Meaning of Dharma and the Relationship of the Two Mīmāṃsās: Appayya Dīkṣita's 'Discourse on the Refutation of a Unified Knowledge System of Pūrvamīmāṃsā and Uttaramīmāṃsā'." Journal of Indian Philosophy 32.3–4: 769–811.
2005 The Ends of Man at the End of Premodernity. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Science.

RAGHAVAN, V.
1941 "Appayya Dīkṣitas II and III." Proceedings of the All–India Oriental Conference (Tirupati, 1940) 10: 176–180.

RAMASWAMI SASTRI, V. A.
1936 "Introduction: Part I: A Short History of the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Śāstra." In: V. A. Ramaswami SASTRI (ed.): *Tattvabindu by Vācaspatimiśra with Tattvavibhāvanā by Ṛṣiputra Parameśvara*. Annamalai, pp. 1–149.
1946 "Kaumārilayuktimālā of Payyūr Vāsudeva II." Proceedings of the All–India Oriental Conference 13: 268–275.
1951 "Bhāṣyadīpa – A New Commentary on Śābarabhāṣya according to the Prābhākara School." Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 26: 140–146.

RAMESAN, N.
1972 Sri Appayya Dikshita. Hyderabad: Srimad Appayya Dikshitendra Granthavali Prakasana Samithi.

RICHARDS, John F.
1993 The Mughal Empire. Cambridge; New York etc.: Cambridge University Press (The New Cambridge History of India 1.5).

SARMA, K. Madhava Krishna
1945 "The Vedāntakautūhala of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa." The Poona Orientalist 9.1–2: 70–72.

ŚASTRĪ, Gaurinath
1979 "Introduction." In: Gaurinath ŚĀSTRĪ (ed.): *Maṅgalavāda by Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya*. With an original Sanskrit commentary, *Prabhā*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society (Bibliotheca Indica 308), pp. 1–28.

SEN, Pranab Kumar, ed.
2006 Philosophical Concepts Relevant to Sciences in Indian Tradition. New Delhi: Centre for Studies in Civilisations (History of Science, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilisation 3.4).
1992–93 "Two Major Contributions of Dvaita-Vedānta to Indian Epistemology." Journal of Oriental Research 63: 87–99.

SHARMA, B. N. K.
2000 *History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta and its Literature: From the* Earliest Beginnings to our own Times. Third Revised Edition. Delhi: Motilal Barnarsidass.

SHASTRI, Haraprasad
1912 "Dakshini Pandits at Benares." The Indian Antiquary 41: 7–13.

SIAUVE, Suzanne
1968 La doctrine de Madhva: Dvaita-*Vedānta*. Pondichéry: Institut Français d'Indologie (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie 38).

SINGH, Rana P. B.
2009 Banaras, The Heritage City of India: Geography, History, and Bibliography. Varanasi: Indica Books.

SOLOMON, E. A.
1976–78 Indian Dialectics: Methods of Philosophical Discussion. Ahmedabad: Gujarat Vidya Sabha.

STAAL, Frits
1988 Universals: Studies in Indian Logic and Linguistics. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
1995 "The Sanskrit of Science." Journal of Indian Philosophy 23.1: 73–127.

STEIN, Burton
1989 Vijayanagara. Cambridge; New York etc.: Cambridge University Press (The New Cambridge History of India 1.2).

STOKER, Valerie
2011 "Polemics and Patronage in Sixteenth-Century Vijayanagara: Vyāsatīrtha and the Dynamics of Hindu Sectarian Relations." History of Religions 51.2: 129–155.

SUBRAMANIAN, R.
2010 *Advaita Vedānta*. New Delhi: Centre for Studies in Civilizations (History of Science, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilisation 2.2).

SURYANARAYANA SASTRI, S. S.
1968 "Raṅga Rāja." In: Telliyavaram Mahadevan Ponnambalam MAHADEVAN (ed.): Preceptors of Advaita. Secunderabad: Sri Kanchi Kamakoti Sankara Mandir, pp. 233–238.

SURYANARAYANA SASTRI, S. S. / T. M. P. MAHADEVAN
1936 A critique of difference. [Madras]: University of Madras.

THAKUR, Anantalal
1961 "Cannibhaṭṭa and the Authorship of the *Sarvadarśanasaṃ*graha." Adyar Library Bulletin 25.1–4: 524–538.
2003 *Origin and Development of the Vaiśeṣ*ika System. New Delhi: Project of History of Indian Science Philosophy and Culture: Centre for Studies in Civilizations (History of science, philosophy and culture in Indian civilization 2.4).

THANGASWAMI SARMA, R.
2002 "Development of the Literature Pertaining to Mīmāṃsā System of Philosophy (From A.D. sixteenth century to A.D. twentieth century)." In: Daya KRISHNA (ed.): Developments in Indian Philosophy from

Eighteenth Century Onwards: Classical and Western. New Delhi: Project of History of Indian Science, Philosophy and Culture: Centre for Studies in Civilizations, pp. 79–96.

UPĀDHYĀYA, B.

1994 *Kāśī kī pāṇḍitya-paramparā: Kāśīstha saṃskṛta vidvānoṃ* ke jiivana-carita evaṃ *sāhityika avadānoṃ kā pramāṇika* vivaraṇa (1200–1980). Vārāṇasī: Viśvavidyālaya Prakāśāna.

VERPOORTEN, Jean-Marie

1987 *Mīmāṃsā Lit*erature. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

WADA, Toshihiro

1990 Invariable Concomitance in Navya-*Nyāya*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

2007 The Analytical Method of Navya-*Nyāya*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten (Gonda Indological Studies 14).