

When such is the case, Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, the famous grammarian, has expressed in his *Laghu siddhānta māñjūṣā* the following views on Bhrama. The object super-imposed in, the case of Bhrama exists in the mind only and not outside. He also refutes Mūlāvidyā, Anirvacanīyapadārthopatti etc., which are the strongholds of the Advaitins. Strange enough, he goes further to quote Bādarāyaṇa, Śaṅkarabhagavatpūḍa and Vācaspatimiśra in support of his views.

This is, however, not at all correct. The acceptance of Mūlāvidyā and Anirvacanīyapadārthopatti by Bhagavatpūḍa and his Commentators like Vācaspatimiśra and also of the Vārtikakāra Sureśvarācārya has been proved after elaborate discussion in the Sanskrit Introduction by refuting the views of Nāgeśa. Even Abhinava Draviḍācārya, who was a pupil of both Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa and Gauḍa Brahmānanda Sarasvatī, accepts Mūlāvidyā.

Following the views of Nāgeśa, a certain recent author, who wrote *Mūlāvidyānirūpa* and *Sugama* a Commentary on Adhyasābhāṣya before and after taking the order of Sannyāsa, has refuted Mūlāvidyā as if he is expressing his own views. Hence they are not dealt with separately.

The Advaitic thought after Śaṅkara flowed in two channels towards the same goal. One is represented by *Bhāmātī* of Vācaspatimiśra and the other is *Vivaraṇam* by Prakāśātman. There are a few differences in their approach which have been fully discussed in the Sanskrit Introduction. They are however condensed below for easy reference.

## Bhāmātī

## Vivaraṇam

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. The performance of Nitya-karma promotes the desire for knowledge. | 1. The performance of Nitya-karma is for the sake of knowledge itself. |
| 2. The mind is the means for realisation of Brahman.                 | 2. The words propounding the philosophy are the means.                 |
| 3. There is no enjoinder for hearing Vedānta.                        | 3. The hearing of Vedānta is ordained, though in a particular manner.  |

## Bhāmātī

## Vivaraṇam

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 4. Nididhyāsana is the result of Śravaṇa and Manana.                                | 4. Śravaṇa is the result of Manana and Nididhyāsana.   |
| 5. Avacchedakavāda.   | 5. Pratibimbavāda.   |
| 6. Ajñāna rests in Jiva and covers Brahman.   | 6. Ajñāna rests in and covers the Śuddha Brahman.  |
| 7. Difference of Mūlāvidyā in respect of every Jiva.                                | 7. It is not so. But the same Mūlāvidyā assumes different modes in respect of different Jivas. |
| 8. The qualified Brahman is the object of Akhaṇḍākāravṛtti.                         | 8. Śuddha Brahman is the object of Akhaṇḍākāravṛtti.   |
| 9. Discrimination of the eternal and the ephemeral is one of the four direct means. | 9. Discrimination of the eternal and the ephemeral is the only direct means.                   |
| 10. Adhyāyanavidhi enjoins both the Akṣaragrahaṇa and Arthagrahaṇa.                 | 10. Adhyāyanavidhi enjoins only the Akṣaragrahaṇa.   |

The above are a few important differences between the two schools of thought and the others may be gathered in the course of the study of the book.

It will not be out of place to mention in this brief Introduction about the identity between Sundarapāṇḍya and Draviḍācārya on the one hand and Taṅka and Brahmānandin on the other. In the present edition of the *Prabodhapariśodhini*, a commentary on the *Pañcapādikā*, it is stated in the Samanvayādhikaraṇa that Sundarapāṇḍya is the author of the three verses beginning with 'गौडसिद्धयान्नोऽसत्त्वे.' This is corroborated by Mādhavācārya in his commentary on the *Sūtasamhitā*. But Śrī Bālakṛṣṇānanda Sarasvatī, also known as Abhinava Draviḍācārya, refers to these three verses as of Draviḍācārya.\*

\* vide. *Sūrirakamīmāṃsābhāṣya vārtika* published in Asutosh Sanskrit Series at Calcutta. Page 403.