CHAPTER 1
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

_Vedanta_ is also known as _uttaramemanms_. It is based on _prasthynatraya_.

_Prasthynatraya_ comprises of _UpaniAdh_, _Bhagavad-gita_ and _Brahmasutra_. In the _upaniAdhs_ there are mainly two types of thoughts which are:

1. The equality of _Brahman, jeva_ and world.
2. The difference of _Brahman, jeva_ and world.

_Bjadriya_, the author of _Brahmasutra_ tried to combine these two types of thoughts.

There are five types of _Vedanta_ originated on the basis of _prasthynatraya_.

1. _Kevaladvaita_ of áa´karaˇcarya.
2. _Viśiṣṭadvaita_ of _Rimnujiˇcarya_.
3. _Dvaita_ of _Madhvajiˇcarya_.
4. _Dvaitadvaita_ of _Nimbarkajiˇcarya_.
5. _áuddhadvaita_ of _Vallabhiˇcarya_.

_Advaita_ philosophy of áa´kara is the most representative among these. The philosophers all over the world have almost recognized its greatness. 

_Bjadriya_, a codified the elixir (eternal truth) of _Ved_/s and _UpaniAdhs_ in _Brahmasutra_. áa´kara established the non-dualism on the strong basis of logic through his _bhjAy/s_. _Brahman_ is the only absolute reality. The world is
relatively real. It is indescribable. *Jeṣa* is identified with *Brahman* devoid of any *guṇa.s*. This was the chief tenet of *Advaitavedānta*. The basic doctrines of ākāra are supported by ārūti. The only reality in the *Advaita* system is *Brahman*. *Nirguṇa Brahman* is pure consciousness in character. Apart from *Brahman* everything is real. The *Brahman* is *saccidānandaśvaraṇaṇa*. *Brahman* is the ultimate cause of the universe. The world is only *nirvanaṇaṇaṇa*. 

*Rūmīnuja* was the founder of *Vijñāna-dvaita*. He belonged to the eleventh century A.D. It is also based on *prasthānatraya*. While the philosophy of ākāra is called non-dualism, the philosophy of Rūmīnuja is called qualified non-dualism. Rūmīnuja criticizes the *Advaita*’s concept of *mūyā* and gives several arguments. The world, according to Rūmīnuja is real, it has its own being apart from that of the *Brahman*, it is a part of the *Brahman* and it is one of the characteristics of *Brahman*. The *ātmāna* according to Rūmīnuja, is different from the *Brahman* and is a part of its body.

*Dvaitavedānta* was formulated by Madhva. It is based on the theories of difference and independence. He established his philosophy based on the *prasthānatraya*. The central concept of his philosophy is the idea of an

eternal and insurmountable gap between the Lord and the world, inanimate objects and sentient souls.²

The Dvaita school of Madhva, criticized the Advaita school of áa‘kara. Dvaita and Advaita are differing in fundamental aspects. The constant conflicts among the rival systems have paved the way for the progress of Indian philosophy.³ The controversy between the Dvaitins and Advaitins continued for centuries.⁴ The major points of this controversy are the status of the world, the relation between jéva and Brahman. The controversy reaches its climax in the two works, viz. Nyayamâta and Advaitasiddhi.

The works of Vedênta are divided into two, Adhikara, a prasthîna and Vêdaprasthîna. Brahmásêtra etc belong to adhikara, a prasthîna. Polemical works are under the Vêdaprasthîna. Advaitasiddhi belongs to Vêdaprasthîna. Advaitasiddhi of Madhusêdana is one of the famous works, which deal with conflict between Dvaitins and Advaitins. Among the Advaita works, Advaitasiddhi is very difficult for common people to understand. Prominent Advaitins gave five different definitions of falsity. Madhusêdana in his Advaitasiddhi has examined the concept of falsity by analyzing these five definitions.

³ V. áîçuperla Panickar, Dvaita-Advaita polemics, Swantham Books, Trivandrum, p. 127.
⁴ Ibid.
1.1. Dvaitins and Advaitins: Their controversy

The non-duality of Brahman cannot be established, if the world cannot be shown mithyā. This is why the concept of mithyā is so important in Advaita literature. This history of Indian philosophy is actually the history of conflicts between the opposing views of the rival systems. The verbal fight among the different systems is natural. These controversies between Dvaitins and Advaitins lasted for centuries. The mutts established by āaṅkara and Madhusūdana still continue the verbal fight.

The polemical literature started among the Buddhist and Nyāya logicians. Then it spread among Advaita and other philosophical systems. Advaitavedānta had to make polemics with Sūkhya, Nyāya and the Bhedabheda school of Vedānta of Bhāskara.

The main concepts of Advaitins like avidyā, adhyāsa, Jagat, mithyā, sattraividyāya, nirguṇa Brahman, bhedamithyātva, pramāṇāṁ avidyāvat viḍayatvam are not acceptable to the other systems of Indian philosophy. They challenged these concepts and the controversial discussions started. The

Buddhists, Śākya, Nyāya followers and Bhedābhedaśabdaśā out of line attacked the Advaita concepts. The early Advaita thinkers got ready to explain these concepts.

Bīdārya, a refutes several views of Dvaitins in his Brahmaśtras. Here he refutes Śākya and Naiyāyikas. Gauapida in his Miśakrīkā, negated the theories of Dvaitins. Ākāra criticized Nyāya, Śākya, and Meṃmsaka schools. Padmapida, Sureśvara, Vīcasmatiśira also criticized Nyāya, Śākya and Meṃmsaka. Prakṣitman and Ānandabodha are also followed the Advaita tradition.

The real controversy started by Āre Harāśa in his Khaṇḍakhaṇḍya and Citsukha in his Tattvapradēpikā. The controversy exists not only in viśaprasthāna but also in adhikara, aprasthāna. So both adhikara, aprasthāna and viśaprasthāna Madhva took the concepts of Advaita for review. Madhva utilized the ruti and logic to oppose Advaita position and established Dvaita doctrines. The followers of Madhva continued the struggle against Advaita. The Viśaśaśa of Jayatīrtha is the best product of this struggle. In this text the theory of māyā was refuted. Viśuddhas refuted the views of Pucapādikā, Citsukhe and Ājasiddhi.

1.2. Pre-Madhusūdana Advaitins

7. B.S.S.B., chapter II.
Pre-Madhusêdana Advaitins gave five definitions for mithya. Madhusêdana collected these five definitions and replied in the same coin which Naiyâyikas used to criticize the Advaita theory. Post Madhusêdana Advaitins also discussed the mithya concept.

1.2.1 Gau·apîda

Gau·apada is the most ancient scholar known through the literature of Advaita philosophy. He was the disciple of áuka. Some Western scholars claim him as a Buddhist saint. The evidence is that in the beginning of the fourth chapter of the Mj·Ékyak†rikj, where he addresses the ‘super man’, whom they identify with Buddha. He flourished after the Buddhist teachers like ÁvaghoÁa, Njirjuna, Asa’ga, etc. It seems particularly significant that áa’kara should credit Gau·apîda, not Bídariya,a. He was the teacher of Govinda, the teacher of áa’kara. He introduced the Buddhist epistemological method into the Vedínta.

1.2.2. Works

1. Mj·Ékyak†rikj.


2. *UttaragỀvȳ̂khȳ.

3. *Paçaekara,av̄rtikam.

4. *N̯̄̃simhat;paneyabh̄̂Ayam.

5. *Anuget;bh̄Ayam.


7. *Durḡ̃apaṭa;atevȳ̂khȳ.

8. *āubhagodayaĀ.

1.2.3. āaṅkara

āaṅkara is the great Advaita philosopher who produced the Advaitic ideals into a systematic form. He was born during the eight century B.C. at the Kaipally Illam in the village of Kalady in South India. His father was āivaguru and his mother was Ėrȳmb̄. He accepted sannȳśa from Guru Govinda. He defeated many contemporary philosophers in philosophical discussions. He travelled all over India on foot to propagate Advaita Ved̄̄nta. He established four maṭhas that is āṅgere, Badare, Pur̄e and Dv̄̄rak̄.

1.2.4. Works

His works are divided into three, bh̄Aȳas, prakara,as and stotras.

1. *Bh̄Aȳa on Brahmas̄tra.

2. *Bh̄Aȳa on Bhagavadgeti.

3. *Bh̄Aȳas on ten major Upanīads.
4. He wrote more than 30 Prakāra-granthas i.e. Vivekacūma, i., Upadeśasahasre, etc.

5. He wrote 60 stotras about Viṣṇu, Gaṇapati, śiva, goddess Durgā, etc.

6. He wrote Paucakṣ. i.e., Maneśāpaucaka, Mitṛapaucaka etc.

1.2.5. Padmapāda

Padmapāda was the first and main disciple of ākara. He flourished in 820 A.D. He was born in Chōṣapradeśa in South. He was the author of Paucapādīkā. It is an explanation of ājōkarabhāya of the Brahmaśṭra-Catuśṭatre. His prior name was Sadānanda. Among the followers of Advaita School there was a legend that is on being beckoned by ākara from the opposite bank of a river, Sadānanda stepped into the water. He did not mind the depth of the water. In his mind there was only the spiritual master. When he walked through the water, the lotus flowers sprang up from beneath as a support to his feet. ākara was impressed by Sadānanda and he accepted him as his disciple on the spot and addressed him Padmapāda. It is said that he is the only student who stood by ākara till the end.

1.2.6. Works

1. Paucapādīkā.

2. Ētmāṇjītmaṇiveka.
3. Prapaṇcasāra.
5. Viṣṇudepikā.
6. Ētmabodhavijhīkhyā.
10. Svarāṇāyubhava.

In his Paścapāḍikā, Padmapāda maintained that the concept of falsehood is based on the indescribability. He further said that the false knowledge can be removed by the knowledge of the unity of Jīva and Brahman and not by action.

1.2.7. Prakūṭman

Prakūṭman flourished in the 10th century. He was also known as Prakūṭāyubhava. He was the author of Paścapāḍikāvivara, also known as Vivara, a. It is the commentary of Padmapāda’s Paścapāḍikā. He was the disciple of Ananyāyubhava. He is the most important successor of Padmapāda. Prakūṭman’s contribution to Advaita Vedānta proved so significant that he out classed even Padmapāda and took the lead of Advaita tradition from his no-less
able predecessors. His famous work the *Vivara,a* is home to many innovative and revolutionary philosophical ideas such as self-realization resulting directly from verbal authority. He established the *Vivara,a* School, from the name of his book *Paµcapdíkkivivara,a*. The direct disciple of áa’kara, could most definitely and correctly know about áa’kara and his implications better than any other áa’karites. Two of the definitions to the *mithyítva* were contributed by Prakjítman.

**1.2.8. Works**

1. *Paµcapdíkkivivara,a*.

2. áabdanir,a.

3. *Ny¡yamuktivale*.

The work *Vivara,a* has also received a long line of commentaries from later authors and lends its name to the other important substradition in *Advaita mithyítva*, namely the *Vivarana* School.

**1.2.9. Citsukha**

Citsukha was a prominent follower and commentator of Sri HarÁa. He is a disciple of Jµ¡nottama. Like áre HarÁa, Citsukha also makes effective use of the dialectical method seen in the works of N¡g¡rjuna, the Buddhist philosopher. He wrote a number of works including the commentaries on the
Kha, anakha, akhśa, Brahmasiddhi and NaiÄkarmyasiddhi. His Tattvapradepikṣe is more famously known as Citsukhe. This book is the commentary on the Nyāyamakaranda.

1.2.10. Works

1. Bhṛ Ayabhīva prakṛtiika (BrahmasEtrabhīAya)
2. Abhiprjyaprañjika (Maan’s Brahmasiddhi)
3. NaiÅkarmyasiddhīṣek (Sureśvara’s NaiÅkarmyasiddhi)
4. Nyāyamakaranda’s commentary (Tattvapradepikṣe)
5. Kha, anakha, akhśa’s commentary.

One of the definitions of mithyātva is contributed by him.

1.2.11. Ēnandabodha

Ēnandabodha flourished in the 11th century A.D. He has not made any original contribution and says that he collected his materials from other works which existed in his time. His main book is Nyāyamakaranda. In it the Ēcṛṣya describes that the cause of the creation of the world is avidyā. The removal of

11. Maheswaran Nair, Advaitasiddhi- a critical study, p.18.
12. Na na nibandhakusumaprabhavvardṣa

avidyā is sublation. The last definition of mithyātva is taken from his Nyāyamakaranda.

1.2.12. Works

1. Nyāyamakaranda.
2. Nyāyadeppvale.
3. Pramāṇaṁ, anīlī.

1.3. Immediate Pre Madhusūdhana epoch

The challenge thrown by Vyāsatertha was taken up by Madhusūdana, in his masterpiece Advaitasiddhi retorted verbatim-et-litleratim, to the arguments.

1.3.1. Vyāsatertha

Vyāsatertha has a high place in the field of Indian philosophy. He was a champion of the philosophy of Dvaita. He was born in village Bannur in Mysore district of Karnataka on 1460.A.D. He turned an ascetic, a sannyāse at the age of sixteen from Brāhmaṇyatertha. He mastered the Nyāya, Vyākaraṇa and Māṇḍūksūtras. He studied Dvaitavedīnta under Lakṣaṃśīrya, amuni. He went to Kjucce and Malbagal for learning. The poem Vyāsayogacaritam was

composed by Somnandakavi. It is a biographical poem on Vyisatertha. A detailed account of the life of Vyisatertha and his works are given in the Vyisayogacaritam.

1.3.2. Works

1. *Nyayamritam.  

1.4. *Nyayamritam

Vyisatertha, the Karnatic saint was the author of *Nyayamritam. He brings together the scattered materials on Advaitavedanta and put it in a systematic form. It is a great landmark in the history of Dualism. It consists of the extracts from the early Advaita classics either verbatim into four paricchedas. In four paricchedas more than one hundred topics are included. The first, pariccheda deals with the repudiation of *myamda and establishes the reality of the universe. The second pariccheda examines the Advaitic doctrine of

\[\]  

Akha, śrtha and refute the same. The third pariccheda enquires into the means of liberation. The fourth pariccheda deals the Dvaita concept of liberation.\textsuperscript{16}

1.4.1. Commentaries of Nyāya

\textit{Nyāyamāta} has numerous commentaries.

1. \textit{Taraṅgi}e by Rāmācīrya.

2. \textit{Nyāyamātasaurabha}.

3. \textit{Nyāyamātmoda} by Vijayendra.

4. \textit{ārenivsatertheya}.

5. \textit{Rasakeśa kača} by Kuśalagiri śre.

6. \textit{Kaśjakoddhīra}.

7. \textit{Yādavendreya}.

8. \textit{Mithure} by Mannaru Kuśācīrya.

1.5. Madhusūdana

Madhusūdana was a bright star on the horizon of Advaitavedānta. He flourished in the second half of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. None of his works gives any information regarding his life. He was the disciple of Viśveśvarasaraswati and Mādhavasaraswati. He was a Bengali by birth.\textsuperscript{17} Divniji reconstruct the family


genealogy of Madhusëdana in detail. As it is evident that Prûraûga had five sons of whom Kamalîyana was one. Kamalîyana later became Madhusëdana. It is believed that he studied Nyåya and began his career as a Naiyåyika. Slowly he concentrated on the Advaita of áa´kara. Madhusëdana followed the integrated path of jµjna and bhakti.

“Vetti param sarasvatyë madhusëdanasaraswate

Madhusëdana saraswatyë param vetti saraswate”

1.5.1. Works

1. Advaitasiddhi.
2. Advaitaratnarakåa, a.
3. Énandamand/kine.
4. ÉtmabodhaÅekj.
6. BhågavådgêtijE-hyadhådepika
7. BhågavadbhaktirasÂjana.
8. Bhågavatapur, a prathama çloka vykhyina
9. Bhågavatapur, a idya çloka traya vykhyina.

1. Advaitasiddhi

Advaitasiddhi is a famous work in Advaitavedanta. It was written by Madhusudana one of the greatest among the Advaita philosophers. This book is a good reply to Nyaya. It is a controversy between Dvaitins and Advaitins. Advaitasiddhi is written in the method of Navya-Nyaya because in Nyaya, Vyasa employs the methodology of Navya-Nyaya. Advaitasiddhi belongs to
the V/sapras†hina. In Indian philosophy Navya-Ny¥ya has contributed much to
the growth of V/sapras†hina.

Advaitasiddhi is divided into four paricchedas. The different editions of
Advitasiddhi gave different topics and different names. Ananta Kå, a few
divides whole of Advaitasiddhi into one hundred and eight topics.19

The first pariccheda has sixty topics. The name of the first pariccheda is
saparikṣaprapadaçamithy;tvanir£pa,a. In this Madhus£danaraswati has
discussed the Advaita doctrine of falsity. Through establishing the non-duality
of the ultimate reality the all duality has to be explained as being false. The
different definitions of falsity are discussed in detail.

The second pariccheda is named itmanir£pa,a. This pariccheda
emphasizes Brahman. Brahman is the locus; the illusory world is superimposed
on them. Through proving the falsity of the world Madhus£dana emphasizes
Brahman as the only real thing. Brahman and jeva are one and same.

The third pariccheda is called árava,ácacinir£pa,a. It deals with the means
of realization of Brahman. árava,a, manana, nidadhy¡sana is the means for the
realization of Brahman.

Publications, Delhi, 1990, p. 28.
The fourth pariccheda is called muktirūpa. It discusses about liberation. It is attained through the removal of ajñāna. Realization of Brahman can be attained by annihilation of ignorance, even before the fall of the mortal body.

1.5.3. Commentaries of Advaitasiddhi

Four commentaries of Advaitasiddhi available are:

1. Siddhivyākhyā ascribed by Balabhadra.
2. Gurucandrika ascribed by Gau-abrahmānandi.
3. Lakhucandrika ascribed by Brahmānandasaraswati (Gau-abrahmānande).
4. Bjalabodhine by Mahāmahopādhyāya Yogendranātha.  

1.5.4. Influence of Navya-Nyāya in Advaitavāda.

Navya-Nyāya originated in Bihar. It is the turning point in pioneering an all together new method of philosophical investigation. Gaṅgādhara begins the new phase which was recognized by all to be new and this called Navya-Nyāya. Particular things are clearly mentioned by special words without any doubt in

the work of Navya-Nyāya. All particles with all peculiarities and good
information are given. For this Navya-Nyāya is better than prācena Nyāya. Its
language can describe an organized structure. The abstraction suffix is ‘tva’ or
its grammatical variant is — ‘ta’ (translates as — ‘ness’)

In Advaitavedānta, some texts are influenced by Navya-Nyāya. For
example Tattvapradepikā of Citsukha, Advaitasiddhi of Madhusūdana and
Kha-anakha-akhyādya of Āre Harā who first adopted the method of Naīyāyikas
refuting the Dvaitavādas. Citsukha, followed his Tattvapradepikā called
Citsukhe, not only refutes the arguments of Nyāya and Viśēśāka but also
established the fundamental concepts of Advaita. In Vedānta, Āre Harā in his
Kha-anakha-akhyādya and Citsukha in his Tattvapradepikā ably used the
Navya-Nyāya dialectical methods. When Vyāsāthertha employed Navya-Nyāya
method to criticize Advaita, Madhusūdana came forward and replied to him in
the same manner. Navya-Nyāya has contributed much of the growth of
vyāpapratstha in Indian philosophy. As a result, the dialectical method of
Navya-Nyāya came to be adopted by systems other than Nyāya.

1.6. Navya-Nyāya and its technical terms
One of the differences between the Pracēna Nyāya and Nāya-Nyāya are the use of technical terms that are used in Nāya-Nyāya. Avacchedaka, avacchinna etc. are the technical terms. The meaning of avacchedaka is vyāvartaka.

1. Kara, at, vacchedakam.
2. Kriyat, vacchedakam.
3. Viśayat, vacchedakam.
4. Viśayat, vacchedakam.
5. Lakṣayat, vacchedakam.
6. Āakyat, vacchedakam.
7. Pratiyogit, vacchedakam.
8. Anuyogit, vacchedakam.

1.7. Post-Madhusūdana Advaitins

22. Ibid.
After Madhusëdana the polemics continued. But the top level polemic is still in Madhusëdana. The post Madhusëdana Advaitins are not as important as the pre-Madhusesdana Advaitins, in the case of mithyátv.

1.7.1. Gau-Abrahmënandasaraswati

He flourished in 1600 A.D. He is the disciple of the author of ájirakaméjms/bh/Áyavrtika Nírýa,atertha. His work is Gurucandrikj. It is the vyághyàna of Advaitasiddhi.

1.7.2. Dharmarjïdhvarendra

Dharmarjïdhvarendra is believed to have flourished in the middle of the 17th century, was refuted scholar of southern India. In his discussions he adopted the method of Náyà-Nyàya. His famous work is Vedàntaparibhàj.

1.8. Twelve explanations of mithyátv

Vyßatëra the author of Nyàymàta of the 15th century, describes twelve definitions of mithyátv and its refutation. He states that it is not suitable for mithyátv.

1. Atyant-satvam mithyátvam

‘That which is completely asat is mithy, ’ Advaitins do not accept this type of definition because according to Advaitins the jagat is mithy, not

---

atyantisatvam like cāraśvā; a. If jagat is said to be atyantisatvam like cāraśvā; a then it is against the vyvahārika satt[ī] of jagat. Advaitin’s opinion is that the jagat has vyvahārikasatyatva. So the Advaitins do not agree with the definition of atyantisatvam (absolute absence). If it is agreed, then it has the defect of apasiddhyānta.

2. Anirvacaneyatvam mithyātvam

This definition is not accepted because it is the defect of syādyāprasiddhi. According to satkṣyavīdin anirvacaneyatva is not prasiddha. Nothing was anirvacaneyā different from sat and asat. The Dvaitins said the defect of aprasiddha.

3. Sadviviktatvam mithyātvam

‘That what is different from sat is mithyā.’ This definition is not accepted because the knowledge of one thing differentiates the knowledge of other thing. For example, the knowledge of pot differentiates the knowledge of clot. It was the defect of siddhasyādhanatī.

4. Satyānadhiṅkaṁ, atvam mithyātvam

‘That which is the anadhiṅkaṁ, atva of sat is mithyā.’ At first sight it seems that, this is the true definition of mithyātvā. When closely examined this definition has also fault. It does not tell that the dharma of sattva in Brahma, because according to Advaitin Brahma is nirdharmaka. If sattva dharma is
accepted in Brahma, it would not tell that the Brahma is nirdharkama. So in Brahman there is ativypty. Advaitins said that Brahman is sattvarêpa. So Brahman is not mithy; “Brahma, sattva anadhikara,am bhavati, nirdharmakatvät.” This usage is also vyghita janaka. If sattva is inculcated in Brahman then there is a possibility of vyghita follow nirdharmaka. If dharma is accepted, vyghita follows. Nirdharmakatva will not occur in nirdharmaka Brahman because the nirdharmakatva is equal to sattva. If it agrees the sattva anadhikara,atva abhivarêpatva sîdhyam in Brahman, there will follow nirdharmaka with vyghita. In this situation the absence of dharma is acceptable in Brahman. If it accepts abhivarêpa dharma, it is the destruction of nirdharmaka. So there is ativypti in Brahman. So the fourth definition of mithyitva is not accepted.

5. PramityaviAya is mithy

This Vedântavâkyajanyavâtti is also pramiti. Its subject is Brahman. So it has no ativypti. But the âuktirêpya is not PramityaviAya. The definition has the defect of asambhava. The âuktirajata is not the original pramitiAaya. âuktirajata’s vyvasyika knowledge is pramj. The Brahmayujna viAya is not bhramj but pramj. After the vyvasyika knowledge of âuktirajata there is the knowledge that “I know the âukti rajata”. This type of knowledge is anuvyasija jyûna.
6. Bhr\$ntiv\$\$yayatvam mithy\$tvam

‘The object of Bhr\$ntij\$\$na is mithy.’ This definition is not suitable. If this definition is accepted there will be the defect of ativi\$pti in Brahman because “Brahma,epyadhi\$\$ynatvena tadvi\$\$yatv\$t.”\textsuperscript{24} The locus the knowledge of Bhram\$ is seen and experienced (bh\$sate) and in Brahmadhi\$\$ynaka bhramaj\$\$na i.e. the Brahman based locus of bhramaj\$\$na is seen. So this definition is of the defect of ativi\$pti. To avoid the ativi\$pti changed the definition Bhr\$ntim\$travi\$\$yatvam mithy\$tvam. This definition is also faulty. If the word m\$\$tra (only) is added into the definition Brahman also becomes the object of the mithy\$tvav\$yajanyapram; In this definition there is no ativi\$pti but ativi\$pti is in \$uktikarajata because \$uktikarajata is the object of anuvyavas\$yaj\$\$na like ‘\$uktirajatav\$naham’. But it is not the subject of \$uktirajatamatra Bhr\$ntij\$\$na. It is also the subject of pram\$\$j\$\$na, in lak\$\$\$ya there is no known lak\$\$\$a, a so av\$\$pti is seen.

7. Bj\$dhya\"\$t\$vam mithy\$tvam

‘That what is sublated is mithy.’ So the lak\$\$\$a of mithy\$tva is Bj\$dha\$ya\$tva. Here what is meant by sublation? According to Advaitin the world is mithy\$ and according to vi\$\$nav\$\$di Bauddhists the world is k\$\$,ika. According

\textsuperscript{24} N\$\$y$m\$\$t\$tap, p.14.
to Dvaitin the world is sat and sthiti. People know this world like sat and
sthityita rEpa. So in this definition is found Siddhasdhanata defect because
samyak jijnarEpa hidhyatva is the avirodhi of prapaµca satyatva.

8. B̄dhaµujñanaviAayatvam mitytvam

When this definition is used there is ativypti in Brahman. The
knowledge of BrahmaviAayaka is the knowledge of prapaµca bh̄daka. Like this
Brahman is the viAaya of bh̄dhaµujñna. So there is the defect of ativypti in it. In
niAedhyatvarEpa the bh̄dhaµujñna viAaya’s mithyj is added, there will be some
defects in the above said definition. The knowledge of shell is not the subject of
niAedharEpa bh̄dhaµujñna. After the knowledge of silver in shell there will be
the bh̄dhaµujñna this is not rajatatvam. This bh̄dhaµujñnaniAedha happens to
be in the shell in the shop. It will not happen in pr̄tibhsikarajata because after
pr̄tibhsika rajataµjñna, rajata does not exist. It has not existed or will exist and
this will be included in the niAedha µjñna. According to Advaitin the
Pr̄tibhsika rajata has Pratibhsikasatyatva.

So it does not tell the traikjlika niAedha this type of rajata. The rajata in
shop is also the subject of traikjlika niAedha. So in niAedharEpa uktikrajata is
not the subject of bh̄dhaµujñna viAaya. So the lakAa is asambhava doAa.
9. **Jñāna nivartyatvam mithyātvam**

‘That what is sublated through knowledge is *mithyā.*’ In this definition there was the defect arthāntara. The preceding knowledge sublated by the succeeding knowledge. In it there is no mithyātvā vyavahāra.

10. **Svasamānādhikara, ātyantābhīvapratīyogītvam mithyātvam**

‘That which one gets the support of absolute absence, is Pratiyogītvā mithyā.’ This is not suitable. In this defect arthāntara it is said that samyoga etc. are avyāpyavatīti. Here the definition is not applicable.

11. **Avyāpyavatītītvārayasvasamānādhikara, ātyantābhīvapratīyogītvam**

This definition also has defect. To remove the defect of samyoga etc. the definition is changed into avyāpya vāttītva anjāraya svasamānādhikara,ātyantābhīvapratīyogītvam mithyātvam. Āropya Samyoga etc. are mithyā. So mithyātvā is the lakāya of the definition. There is no lakāya in this definition. So it is ativyapta.

12. **Avidyā tatkṛtyoranyataratvam mithyātvam**

‘Avidyā or avidyākṛtya is also mithyā.’ This is not suitable according to Advaitin’s jeva, ējvara, jevējvarabheda etc. are anjīdi. It is not avidyākṛtya
because it is anadi. The effect (kṣṛya) of avidyā is śidy. The so called anadi padṛthas are not avidyā. Jive, varabheda etc are also called mithyā. But this definition is not suited to the difference of jiva and eśvara. So there is the defect of anyyāpti. According to Madhva ajjīna and the effects of ajjīna and bheda are also real. So avidyā and effects of avidyā are real and not mithyā.

Apart from these definitions, Citsukha shows some definitions of mithyā in the form of pūrvapakṣa (opponents). Most of them are included in this. But some definitions are different. These different definitions are:

1. Pramāṇagamyatvam mithyātvam

   The non-object of pramāṇa is mithyā. This definition is also faulty. If this definition is accepted, the Brahma is also mithyā. According to Advaitin mithyātvam is svaprakāśa.

2. Aprāṇa ajjīṇa gamyatvam mithyātvam

   That is ‘ayathyṛthaajjīṇagamyatvam mithyātvam.’ These two definitions also are not suitable. If these definitions are accepted there will be the defect of arthāntara etc. According to Kāvikāvyādīrs Brahman and world is mithyā. There is ativyāpti in smṛti because some philosophers do not agree smṛti as a pramāṇa.

3. Sad vilakṣaṇa atvam mithyātvam

   ________________

   25. Tattvapradepiśi, p. 32.
‘What is different from sat is mithyā.’ If this definition is accepted the ājñātā will be exposed to the defect of ativṛpta. This is so because ājñātā is sadvilākāra, so the defect of ativṛpta. According to Advaitin the ājñātā is aleka, it is not lakṣyā.

4. Sadasat vilākā, atvam mithyātvam

‘Mithyā is different from sat and asat.’ Anything that is not sat is asat and anything that is not asat that is sat. Sat and asat is contradictory. Among the contradictory things if one is sat, the other is mithyā. If one is mithyā the other is sat.

Citsukha gave nine possible definitions of mithyā,26 which the opponents might raise and he shows one definition for mithyā in the form of a siddhānta (siddhāntarāpa). To establish the mithyātvam and to remove the doubts of opponents (pṛṇapañcarā), the post-ākāra Advaitins gave the definitions in their own view. Among these the five are very important. Vyāsatertha takes these five important definitions of famous Advaitins and criticizes it. But Madhusūdana gave answer to all critics and established that there was no fault.

In the present work I have tried to elucidate Madhusūdana’s view of falsity. The study is handled with the intention of presenting comprehensively

26. Dr. Sasikant pandey, Advaita vedānt mem māyāvad, Vidyānidhi prakāśan, Delhi, 2005, p. 375.
concepts of the *mithyātva* in *Advaitasiddhi*. The main aim of this work is to give a clear account of the *mithyātva* in *Advaitasiddhi*. It is expected that the resultant conclusion will be helpful for Sanskrit students and other Philosophers. Firstly the polemical literature started among the Buddhist and *Nyāya* logicians. Then it spread to other philosophical systems. The *Advaitavedānta* had polemics with *Sāṅkhya*, *Nyāya*, and the *Bhedabheda* school of *Vedānta* of Bhaskara.\(^{27}\)

The detailed study of *mithyātva* shows that the concepts of *mithyātva* pre-supposes *miyā*. Sankara used it in a very few number. The post-āa’kara *Advaitins* developed the *mithyā* concept.

In the **second chapter** there is a brief sketch of *Advaitavedānta*. The **third chapter** is the concept of *mithyātva* in *Advaitavedānta*. In this the position of *mithyātva* in *prastāhāyatraya* is discussed. There the *mithyātva* in the works of āa’kara is indicated. The **fourth chapter** elaborately discusses the five important definitions of *mithyātva* according to Madhusūdana. In the **fifth chapter** there is discussion of the synonyms of *mithyātva*. The **sixth chapter** is the conclusion.

**1.9. Conclusion**

*Advaitavedānta* is very important among the Indian philosophy. The concept of *mithyātva* differentiates *Advaita* from other philosophies. Thus *mithyātva* has very important place in this philosophy. āa’kara first used the

---

\(^{27}\) Prof. K.T. Pandurangi, *Nyāyamātam*, Introduction, p. 5.
term *mithyā* for projecting the unreality of the world. Post ākara *Advaitins* discussed this concept very carefully. The author of *Nyāya-māta* refuted the *Advaitin’s* concept, of the world *mithyātva* (*jaganmithyātva*). He forwarded the possible twelve definitions of *mithyātva*. He says that these definitions are not suitable because there are *doṣas* in it. The pre-Madhusūdana *Advaitins* like Prakṣāmitman etc. have given five definitions of *mithyātva*. Vyāsatertha collected these definitions and refuted them. Madhusūdana the author of *Advaitasiddhi* reply to these refutations and modify them through his *Advaitasiddhi*. The post Madhusūdana *Advaitins* also discussed this concept. Vyāsatertha used the *Navya-Nyāya* style to criticize *mithyātva*. So Madhusūdana also takes the *Navya-Nyāya* style to answer it. In these period also, *mithyātva* had its own value, and through this concept, *Advaitins* stated the unreality of world. So it is very important to make a careful study of this *mithyātva* concept.