Chapter VIII

CONCLUSION

Vācaspati's Personality:

From the foregoing discussion of Vācaspati's works, we are led to make the following observations.

Vācaspatimiśra, a prolific and erudite scholar, is unique as a commentator in the whole range of the philosophical literature in Sanskrit, as, no other writer has ever produced authoritative commentaries on the five orthodox systems of Indian Philosophy. All the available works of Vācaspati, with the only exception of the Tattvabindu, are commentaries. It cannot be without significance, that Vācaspati, instead of writing original treatises, preferred to comment upon the works of previous authors. Keeping himself in the background, he wanted to spread over and stabilize the Brahmanical knowledge, which was unceremoniously criticised by the non-Vedic writers. At the beginning of some of his commentaries, he has made it specifically clear that his aim in commenting upon the text was to encounter the objections raised by the hostile writers against the text. To compose a commentary may be quite an easy job for those, who belong to that class of commentators, who create mere confusion in the minds
of readers. 1 But, even after a cursory perusal, we will find that Vācaspati does not belong to this type of commentators. It has been made clear on several occasions that Vācaspati's commentaries are quite essential in order to understand thoroughly the text he commented upon. It is not very difficult to expose one's own thoughts; but to make clear the underlined ideas and concealed intentions of others and to controvert the opponent's views on their strength, is certainly much more difficult. And Vācaspati has done this with remarkable and outstanding merit, not only in one system but in five orthodox systems. As a commentator, he has achieved wonderful success in representing most faithfully the system he followed. He had no inclination for any particular system when he commented upon other systems. Thus, in writing a work on the Mīmāṃsā system, he defends the Mīmāṃsā position with as much force and ability as he condemns that position while writing a work on other systems like the Nyāya or the Vedānta. Apparently, it may look awkward that the self-same person, who justified with his utmost efforts a particular doctrine like the Satkāryavāda while commenting upon the Sāmkhyakārikā, has refuted the same when he commented upon the Vidhiyiveka and the Nyāyavārtika. Does it mean that he had no views of

1 दुःकौशिक यदतीत सत्सिद्धि स्पष्टप्रीतिशुचिकारिः।
स्पष्टप्रीतिकिन विप्रस्तुति विनिकारिः समासादिनः।
अस्थानेनुपयोगिनिः भद्रमिन्द्रैर्यथः।
श्रेयसामिति वसुविवचयः संवेदयति ठाकुराः॥


his own? No. It only means that he wanted to propound these Brahmanical systems of philosophy from their own point of view. He has remarked -- अथ च युक्तायुक्तात्वे सूत्रितिवाक्यावचनमत्रे ज्ञिते कृत परदेशाद्वकोम निलितान्तमात्राक्षयोपमानाम् । ॥

2 He repeats the phrase अन्यताभिनिविशाले meaning thereby that he agrees with the particular system, except its over-emphasis. In this way, he clearly wants to suggest that his writings were void of any such adherence. Having forgotten his own personality, he identifies himself very easily with the expounder of the system he represents. To show equal regard for all the systems is certainly a difficult thing, which requires a mature, pure and unbiased mind like that of Vācaspati.

Still, an attempt has been made here to infer his natural inclination towards any particular system. He has unconsciously revealed himself, while composing the benedictory stanza to the Nyāyārthitātātparyaṭika. The word 'Viśvamūrti', 3 which means one, whose form is the whole universe, is used as the epithet of the Highest. The word 'Viśvamūrti' obviously implies that the Highest is the material Cause of the Universe -- the concept, which has been propounded by the Vedānta alone. All other systems, which he has commented upon, have tried to refute this purely Vedāntic

2 T.K. on 51st S.K.
3 विवक्षायी विवक्षिनिः पिनाकी विवेदेश्नात्वा विवक्षःृविवृत्यः।
विवक्षाया विवक्षास्तकाया विवक्षाराज्याय राधम्यविवृत्यं नमः। N.V.T.T.p.1.
concept. And, as, there is no possibility of Vācaspati's being a follower of any sub-school of the Vedānta, as he has lost no opportunity to refute the views of Bhāskara, the then known rival of Śaṅkarācārya; and as he has shown his highest respect for Ś., one is led to infer that Vācaspati's inner voice was that of an Advaitin. But it should not be forgotten that he was not at all partial to the Advaita when he commented upon other systems. In this sense only, we have to understand the remark of Dr. Satīśacandra Vidyābhūṣāṇa that -- "Being equally at home in all the systems of philosophy and yet following none of them, Vācaspati was designated as Sarvatrantra-svatantra -- master of all systems but reliant on no one of them." Because, to the philosophical mind of Vācaspati, a logical and honest reconciliation of all these orthodox systems of philosophy would be possible only if the Advaita Vedānta be accepted as the final resort. For, in the Advaita Vedānta alone, all other systems can enjoy at least relative validity and no system would be completely scopeless. On the other hand, the Advaita Vedānta would be altogether scopeless, if any other system be treated as being ultimately authoritative.

A flood of light is thrown on Vācaspati's personality by the introductory stanzas to his Nyāyakaṇikā. In the first stanza, Viṣṇu is propitiated while in the second, he has

4 A History of Indian Logic, p.135.
saluted Śiva. This clearly shows that his mind was purely philosophical and no narrow religious views like the difference between Śiva and Viṣṇu, or the superiority of one over the other could touch his enlightened mind. The fact that he has commented, without any iota of partiality, on different systems which held quite antagonistic views, points out that he was a living philosopher, a thorough scholar, a true devotee of Sarasvatī, as if a pointed illustration of the Vedic passage -- "विश्व ने वै ब्राह्मणानन्द, गोपाय ना केवलिन्तुर्मरिंशं". (Goddess Sarasvatī approached the Brahmin (and said) protect me, I am your treasure.)

Modesty was the first and most important characteristic of Vācaspatimisra. It is really astounding to see how modest he was when he composed benedictory stanzas to the Bhāmatī and the Nyāyakāṇṭā. In the benedictory stanza, common to both of these works, Vācaspati compares his own speech to the dirty water on the road, and the original works he commented upon, are regarded to be the streams of the Ganges. He strongly believed in the purification of his speech by utilising it to explain the works of the Ācāryas. In the Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭika, as has been observed in the fourth chapter, he has given the division of perception, which is

5 Muktāpaniṣad I.51; quoted in Mirukta II.4; with slight variant in Vasiṣṭhadharmasmiti CH.II.
6 आचार्यविवेकित्वविस्तारे कौस्तुष्ठदानीनां।
रथयात्रांजितं गुरुप्रवाहं पटिक्षयती॥ Bhāmatī, p.4; N.K. p.1.
not offered either by the Bhāṣyakāra or by the Vārtikakāra. But he says that as the division was very easy to understand, it was not explained by them. That is to say, Vācaspati did not want to humiliate them and to indicate his own scholarship. It is more interesting to notice that keeping the highest regard for these Ācāryas, Vācaspati has deviated from them wherever he found it necessary. His self-confidence on the background of modesty is much more attractive. He calls himself as the "nītinaukārṇḍhāra", who has fulfilled the desire of those, who wanted to realise the highest principle, having crossed over the ocean of ignorance. In the N.V.T.T., he compares himself to the preceptor of Gods, pointing out that his name Vācaspati is true to its meaning. In the Bhāmatī, at the beginning of the fourth chapter, he says that it is not necessary to request the good to observe the work he produced, because, they would do it even without any request, and the wicked need not be solicited, as, it is of no use in their case. About his views, he is never diffident.

---

7 वदेकितपुस्तकचारू च श्रीमोदमानत्वं अवैदिक मात्यायनकिर्तिसारामायुः

8 This point has been elaborated on p. 133.

9 अवास्ताप्तेषु तीत्व नास्तिकसम्बन्धामायुः

10 निन्दान्वदशिरसेकुलसम्बन्धानामः

11 नामबध्यल किं सम्भवः कथ फूलता न केतरे शक्यमाः

Bhāmatī, p. 928.
Without any hesitation, he declares that there is some contradiction between the Śruti passage and the Brahmasūtra; and hence, the Brahmasūtra should necessarily be interpreted as not coming into conflict with the Śruti.\textsuperscript{12} Then alone, it is very easy to understand why the second explanation of the Ānandamayādhiśikaṇḍa -- especially of the Sūtra 'अनन्दमयाद्धिकारण',\textsuperscript{13} given by Śamkarācārya, however unnatural it may be, must be said to be the most logical and essential. Vācaspati's reference to himself in the plural and his peculiar use of the causal form of the root से - राज्यामि, ultimately with the normal sense, bring before our mind's eye the self-confident and big personality of Vācaspati.

Vācaspati has tried his level best to controvert the Buddhistic views. Wherever he got an opportunity. While criticising the views of the Baudhās, he has shown all his argumentative skill. But generally, in such criticisms, he does not seem to have lost his temper. The sarcastic expressions, with the use of apparently respectful terms like -- 'बुधी निगमित्व वैशाखिśिकतां परिश्रमां भेदयेक्ष्याः मयाः,'\textsuperscript{14} clearly reveal the character of Vācaspati. At the most he would say -- 'शिष्य भ्रमणः etc.'\textsuperscript{15} no long compounds full of abusive terms.

\textsuperscript{12} वेदस्वरूपियाः 'नुषे व्यथायतः' शिष्यवृत्ति सूत्राणि अन्वयम् नेत्वार्युः.

\textsuperscript{13} B.S. I.i.12.

\textsuperscript{14} N.V.T.T. p.86.

\textsuperscript{15} Bhāmatī, pp.900,996 etc.
are used to serve the purpose. Some offending words are there -- e.g. मृत्यु आदिने: पुस्तकायदेः पञ्चगमः, 16 which are not at all expected of a sober writer like Vācaspati. But, taking into consideration the bulk of his writings, they are negligible, although according to Prof. Daśarathaśarma, this abusive term suggests the existence of mental intolerance among the men and the women of the ninth century.

Estimate of Vācaspati by ancient as well as modern writers:

The highest possible tribute has been paid to Vācaspati by Udayanācārya, in the introductory stanza to his Tātparya-parisuddhi, which is a commentary on the former's Tātparyaṭīkā. Udayana, there, requests Goddess Sarasvatī as follows:—

भाद्राल्पिनि विष्णु: पुनःरैव नल्ला
कङ्कालविष्णु: विज्ञानायामवेहिः
वाक्षयेकान्नम तथा भि साराजाना
वाच्यात्मकविन न स्वयं यतेति।

(Oh, Mother Sarasvati, having bowed down again and again, I beseech thee, with my hands folded. Please listen to it. Reside attentively on my speech and mind so that they cannot step aside while commenting on the work of Vācaspati.) That means, even Udayanācārya found that it was not an easy task to comment upon Vācaspati's works, as they were full of erudition and subtleties, and that some divine grace was necessary to

16 T.K. on the 5th S.K.
make himself competent for the proper completion of the task undertaken. Thus, it is remarkable to note that even the self-confident and thoroughly erudite scholar like Udayana, who is reported to have reproached even God, who was reluctant to show Himself to Udayana, held Vācaspati in so high an esteem.

Amalānanda appropriately refers to Vācaspati as one, who preserved the Vedic tradition in tact, by defeating demon-like opponents, in logical argumentation. Appaya Dīxit, in his Śivādvaitanirṇaya, refers to Vācaspati as — परमेश्वरानुकृत — चतुर्ब्रह्मादिनिः: आचार्यावचस्मिनयिः।...

19 i.e. Ācārya Vācaspatimīśra, who knew of the exact essence of the teaching of revered Śāṅkara. In his Siddhāntaleśasamgraha also, he refers to Vācaspati as Ācārya Vācaspatimīśra. Although, Vācaspati's views are not shared by the majority of later Advaitins, he has been given a special place in the Advaita Vedānta — the fact, which is not altogether insignificant. So, even the topmost Advaitic works like theAdvaitasiddhi and the Brahmāṇandī thereon, mention Vācaspati in respectful terms

17 कैलकीपूजनोदयिता मांत्रिकाश्रवणं च च।
पुनर्भाष्यं समालोके मद्यालीकमैि च (विशिष्टिः)॥

— a stanza addressed to God by Udayana.

18 वैदिकां वाचस्पतिरिव सम्मतिः।
सन्तनविविष्कारांश्च (विषयं)॥ Kalpataru, p.3.

19 p. 74
20 p. 370.
as establishing different prasthāna or school in the Advaita itself, and his views are not at all refuted but, on the contrary, are justified by them. Vidyāraṇya, in his Sarvadarśanasamgraha, authoritatively quotes Vācaspati in connection with all the Darśanas, which he has represented; and it is highly creditable to Vācaspati. That Vācaspati's works were studied widely, is quite clear from the fact that Vidyānanda, one of the great Jain scholars, has taken special pains to controvert Vācaspati's view in regard to the division of inference. The Tātparya-Candrikā, a commentary in the Mādhva-tradition, as has been noticed in the last chapter, seems to have been specially composed for the refutation of the Bhāmatī of Vācaspati. Buddhist writers like Ratnakīrti had to take into consideration the charges levelled by Vācaspati against the Buddhist views.

Modern writers like Prof. Dasgupta, who have written on the History of Indian Philosophy, have quoted Vācaspati very liberally. Dr. Rahul Śāmkṛtyāyana considers Vācaspati to be responsible for the reputation, which Śāmkara-cārya enjoys to-day. According to him, had Vācaspati not written his Bhāmatī, the Bhāṣya of Śāmkara-cārya would have long been neglected and lost in oblivion. Prof. Rāmaswāmi Sāstri, in his learned introduction to the Tattvabindu, rightly points out that the great service that Vācaspati rendered to

21 See Chp. I. p.15; IV. p.17.
22 Introduction to Buddhacāryā, by Rahul Śāmkṛtyāyan.
23 p.54.
the Nyāya-system, is the establishment of original Nyāya doctrines as embodied in the Nyāyasūtras, as explained by Vātsyāyana and Udyotakara, but adversely criticised by eminent Buddhist Ācāryas like Dīgnāga and Dharmakīrti. Tārānātha Vācaspati rightly describes Vācaspatimīśra in the following stanza —

Vācaspati’s thorough scholarship, which is mainly responsible for the high respect, which his commentaries hold for more than thousand years, is in reality, beyond dispute. His close acquaintance with Vedic literature becomes quite clear when he deals with Mīmāṃsā topics. The fact that he commented upon the five Brahmānical systems of philosophy clearly presupposes his thorough knowledge of these systems. His knowledge of Buddhist philosophy is quite evident from the copious quotations from the Buddhistic works, in his commentaries. Here, an attempt has been made to show his acquaintance with some branches of knowledge, other than those he commented upon.

(1) Grammar:

It is quite obvious that a scholar like Vācaspati must have perfect knowledge of grammar and close acquaintance with

the well-known grammatical works. Still, some references to grammar are given here. The Sūtra -- तुपृथक्षोऽद्वितीयमेवात्र -- of Pāṇini, has been authoritatively quoted, many a time, to account for the Bhāvapradhānānirdeśa -- that is to say, the word तुपृथक्षोऽद्वितीयमेवात्र is used by Pāṇini to mean तुपृथक्षोऽद्वितीयमेवात्र; otherwise the form would have been तुपृथक्षोऽद्वितीयमेवात्र and not तुपृथक्षोऽद्वितीयमेवात्र; as the things to be denoted are three and not two. He often refers to निलोक्लादत्त्वं i.e. locative used to denote purpose, and cites the well-known illustration of बृहस्पतिः हिंदुत्त्वः i.e. he kills the elephant for hide. He explains the instrumental case in सक्तंस्विदुतिद्वारण म in the Vyāsa Bhāṣya, as विषयमोक्षवर्तमानम् तुपृथक्षोऽद्वितीयमेवात्र; i.e. the instrumental case which is used for the indicator of some change, which one has undergone. He points out the special function of the विषयमोक्षवर्तमानम् termination 'सम्भवे विषयमोक्षवर्त्तन्ते मत्तथाय: निलोक्लादत्त्वं ब्राह्मणं' 29 He remarks that the affix अयूं in the word कैलौप्य म ब्राह्मणं should be regarded as स्वाभिस्त i.e. not serving any special purpose.30 While commenting upon एष्या हृदमेति अयूं म ब्राह्मणं in the B.S. Bhāṣya, Vācaspati quotes the Sūtra 'पर्यूं यथायाय: यथायाय: 32 which derives the word यथायाय: from the word यथाय: in connection with sacrifice. He says33 that

25 Pāṇini I.IV.22
26 T.V.II.18; T.K. on the 14th SK; Bhāmatī, p.272 etc.
27 T.V.I.13; Bhāmatī, p.274.
28 T.V.III.55.
30 Ibid on 15-16.
31 Bhāmatī, p.258.
32 Pāṇini IV.i.33.
33 Bhāmatī, p.393.
the compound cannot be allowed in the case of 'पञ्चनाम' if one more word पञ्च (पञ्च पञ्चनाम:) be taken as the epithet of the word पञ्च in the compound. e.g. The compound राजपुत्र does not be allowed if there is some word like कहदस्य as the epithet of the word राज. (So not अहदस्य राजपुत्र: but अहदस्य राज: पुत्र:) The affix कृत्य in the word विकेशानावणीय is pointed out by Vācaspati as कृत्य, on the analogy of the words कृष्णाय and राजनीय. Thus, the word विकेशानावणीय has been explained as विकेशानावणीय जिति विकेशानावणीय.

In order to justify the second reading अकामस्कर, he says - मवामथ तन्त्र प्रत्ययः. 35 Pāṇini’s Dhātupāṭha has been referred to by Vācaspati. He says: 'पञ्चस्य' 'विश्वमर्गाधि' सम्प्रेषणपपुत्त्यः, 36 in order to support the meaning 'अस्त्रय', derived from the word अस्त्रयाय. In the same way, a reference has been made to the Dhātupāṭha on many occasions e.g. युप समाधि, 37 युनियोग, 38 विभ बनने etc. Also, he refers to गायि, 39 गायि, 'अ' 40 in कारायः, 'अ' 41 termination in the word कुमारी, कम्मि फ़ुलिया, 42 त्यस्य, 43 सार्वकलक्षिप्तस्ति: 44 चारूमुन्नु, 45

---

34 T.V. pp.274-5. 40 N.K. p.17.
36 Ibid, I.11. 42 Ibid, p.34.
37 Ibid, I.1. 43 T.V.II.23.
38 Ibid. 44 N.K. p.97.
the affix 'भम्स', 46 'कुः', 47 etc.

References have been made to the Nirukta also.

(1) यथा आहुः निरस्वायूः: - निरक्तकरोधेन त्वालमक्षापि कत्वो ग्रहणम् - 48 etc.

Etymological interpretations given by Vācaspāti are also indicative of his scholarship in grammar and of his method of understanding and explaining the text. He explains the word 'गमा' in the Vyāsabhāṣya as 'आगच्छति बुद्धिन्द्रार्थिः, अत्मात् अन्युपनि श्रेयोपाया: जित्यागमः' 49 The word 'अप्ता' is explained in a peculiar way as 'त्तन्द्रमहोर् वैयक्तकारणार्थवाच्यस्वामिन्य: आप्ति', त्या कति जित्याप्ति:। 50 The word 'तत्त्वाज्ञानः' is taken to mean the सूत्रा -- क्लेश दान्ते अनेन ब्रह्म व्युत्पत्ता तववान्य ज्ञातमुयम्। 51 In this way, the following derivations are worth-noting.

'अक्षुताे अनेन ब्रह्म आह्वः'। 52
'प्रधीयते नन्दे विकार्णात्मानेनेति धान्यम्'। 53
'कविष्मो विन्यति ब्रह्म विजिति प्रतिकिर्मः'। 54
'बुद्धिस्वर्गे अनेन ब्रह्म बुद्धिः। 55
'प्रभुरागिति विजिति प्रकृति, प्रथमम्। 56
'विनिष्णुप्न्न, विनिष्णुम् अनुसत्तति, स्वन्तेण निम्पणीयं क्रियत्वं नित्यम् = नित्यम्।' 57
The sentence in the Bhāmati 'न हि पुरुषः सन्ति ज्ञिति जालयों नाप्यते।' 65 from the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, indicates Vācaspati's close contact with the grammatical work par excellence. In this way, there are so many instances, which unambiguously indicate Vācaspati's close acquaintance with grammatical literature and subtleties.

**Astrology:**

Vācaspati's knowledge of Astrology is seen from the illustration, given by him in the Tātparyatīkā. While showing the possibility of invariable concomitance, even when there is no cause-effect relation and identity, Vācaspati points out that the appearance of the middle star is invariably connected

---

58 Ibid on 16th S.K.  
59 Ibid on 5th S.K.  
60 Ibid on 40th S.K.; see also अवयवसापूर्वार्थवल्लनं न मार्गादिति ज्ञिति अवक्षिप्तम्।  
61 Tattvabindu, p.55.  
62 T.K. on 41.  
63 Ibid on 71.  
64 Ibid on 2.  
65 Bhāmati, p.74; Mahā Bhāṣya, ग with slight difference.)

T.V.II.19.
with the rise and decline of the eighth from it. — "मायमनलभुर्या च अप्रमात्स्मयोऽयम्"। This simple illustration presupposes his knowledge of the sky with its division and the position of each नक्षत्र and so on.

**Ayurveda:**

In the Bhāmatī, Vācaspāti refers to कफ and the fever caused by it, as follows: यथा हि कपट्टावदिकै कपटिनिग्लि ज्वरः। कपट्ट विकेर्णादिभिः। प्रायः कपट्टावदाल्पिकर्षापदिकै प्रामयपिण्य। 66 In the Tattvakāumudī, as an illustration, he says: यथा वा वातापित्स्मयां परस्परविरोधिन: श्रीस्थार्थकारिनः। 68 The peculiar characteristic of कफ has been mentioned as 'कामस्य गुलाल्यं कपटिनिग्लि'। 69 From all these references, it is clear that Vācaspāti knew the characteristics of वात, पितृ and कफ and their functioning etc.

His knowledge of Mahābhārata, Purāṇas and smṛtī works70 is so vast that he cannot but allude to relevant portions therein, to support the discussion in his commentaries. His

66 N.V.T.T., p.163.
67 Bhāmatī, pp.999-1000.
68 T.K. on 13th S.K.; also श्रीरं वातापित्स्मयां निमित्तम्। T.K. on the first S.K.; In N.V.T.T.(p.80) he says — न हि कपटावद्वर-प्रामयाय कपटिनिग्लिः स्थाया प्रामयान्तर्विधोऽस्य, तत्केव विचित्रे। See also 'धातुवो वातापित्स्मयां।' T.V.I.30; 'वातापित्स्मयमिचित्रिनिद्धारुतम्।' T.V.I.30.
69 T.V.I.30.
70 Mainly Viṣṇu and Vāyu Purāṇas are very liberally quoted; and quotations from Manu, Yajñavalkya and Bodhayana smṛtīs are commonly found.
commentaries are replete with such hundreds of quotations, which bring grandeur and authoritativeness to his works.

His knowledge of various trees and fruits is quite evident from the passage -- यथा हि वारिदिकुमक्तिपुदुर्क असमंगि, तत्तद्विविचारानासाह, नारिकेल-ताल-ताज़े-किल्क-सिरिकिल्क-सितंबराक-प्राष्ठानकस्मपत्रित्यादिफलस्यम् परिभद्रमें च्युतस्ततविविलितकस्याययुक्ता विकल्पयते। 71

Thus, he is not lacking in general knowledge -- knowledge of the surroundings also. Although, none of the extant works of Vācaspati is on the Vaiśeṣika system, he refers to the Vaiśeṣika view in the N.V.T.T. and controverts the same in regard to the causes of invariable concomitance. 72

So, it can be maintained with full justification that Vācaspati had fully equipped himself with the necessary pre-requisites of a good commentator, before he started his career as a commentator. For this reason, his commentaries are informative and authoritative.

Style:

His peculiar style, which is also responsible for the high estimate of his commentaries, deserves special treatment.

All the four qualities of good prose viz. regularity, uniformity, precision and balance, are found in the compositions of Vācaspati. Take for instance the very first

71 T.K. on the 16th S.K.
72 यथा वैत्विकम् चेतुमागलं सम्बन्धं अलोके .... N.V.T.T. p.164.
A tinge of music is well experienced in the sentence and we cannot change even the order of words. If we do it, the charm is lost. As a prose writer, Vācaspati excels every other commentator. In addition to his success as a commentator, he earned fame as a good prose-writer. If some of the lines, especially from his Bhāmatī, are noticed, Vācaspati’s mastery over language can be very well understood.

These are some of the lines, which as if vie with the Campu literature in Sanskrit.

73 Bhāmatī, p.5.
74 Ibid, p.22.
75 Ibid, p.39.
76 Ibid, p.131.
77 N.V.T.T. p.115.
One of the most attractive peculiarities of his language is the proper use of precise but emphatic sentences, which have a colloquial tinge and can be used proverb-like, as they are universal in character. In order to emphasise the Satkāryavāda theory, he says —

The following are some of his proverb-like, attractive and forceful sentences:

1. केवल हि इस्तांबाल यादवलं करारि।
2. न हि सहस्रं रस्त्रमयः। वस्तुसंवृद्ध कातिन्नयमविधुति।
3. न कुऽ ज्ञातीर्थ्यादिदीर्मण रूहस्वेदाः। ज्ञमाः सारस्त्वां रश्यास्मातुभुः।
4. न हि रूपमन्धेन न दुःखेत ज्ञति चबुम्स्ताष्पि दुःखमानगमात्माप्रस्तः

5. न कल्वन्यामा: आश्रम्पुष्ट: कैविदाराणाचार्ये।
Such sentences surely have brought grace to Vācaspati's works. These are so pithy and impressive that without any effort they can be remembered and reproduced. There is also sometimes a tinge of humour in his sentences, which become for that reason, more forceful. e.g. While justifying liberation in this world he says — न हि कुम्भसिद्धातु: चहृदी समुपन्नर्थति कालावृत्तिायाम कुम्भायेनाम, किंचु तादात्सिवाय। 90 He wants to make fun of the Buddhists when he says -- चहृदी निमीः वैहानिक-पल्पार्द यास्यामः चाबाहृदादु चावान। 91 The same has been said with slight difference, in connection with the श्पोतावादिन as -- 'चहृदी निमीः विदिन्तापरिप्रेक्ष्यन्त्य निःसर्गमयमवान्।' 92 He uses the word 'सत्त्व' in 'तथा व न स्वरुपावृतत्त्वमेवदुक्तान्त्वम्।'; 93 'कण्मवर्णमयम्:,' 94 only, in order to ridicule the नैयायिकास. It is also clear when he introduces the primafacie view as 'पूर्वपीतकम्यासम: पृष्ठैति। 95 The word 'आयुम्भान्' 96 is also used to serve the same purpose.

Even, in regard to the Nyāyavārtikākāra, he says --

87 Ibid, p.166.
89 N.V.T.T., p.86.
90 Bhamati, p.924.
91 N.V.T.T., p.86.

92 T.B. p.36.
93 T.K. on the 9th S.K.
94 Ibid on the 14th S.K.
95 Bhamati, p.102.
96 'अस्त्यायुम्भान् भाव:' N.K., p.139.
In order to deride forcefully he says -- 'स्कन्तस्थिराद्वायुद्धाद्वायुविन्दृपेऽन्न्यमणिमू।' 98

The force in his language can be very well marked from the following sentences --

'न हि गजानामुद्रवं देवा वद्यामाकरं त्वतीयस्मिन्नानामपि अनुकूलं तेनक्षा लया भक्त्यमू।' 99

'तत्समार्दिनाधिरा दर्शनमन्यथमात्सुन्दरर्नािितमेत्यु।' 100

'नवधर्शस्मिन्नानामपि तत्समार्दिनाधिरा दर्शनमन्यथमात्सुन्दरर्नािितमेत्यु। 101

'...कृत्यं जन्मायान्नकामध्यमस्म' जिति च, 'अन्यायस्मिति श्रवणाधि।' 102

'तत्समार्दिनाधिरा दर्शनमन्यथमात्सुन्दरर्नािितमेत्यु।' 103

His commentaries are replete with such forceful sentences, which obviously attract the mind of his readers. Vācaspati knows very well that the position of the verb in a sentence is a powerful means of making a sentence more attractive. He says e.g. 'किमिति तत्कर्त्ति न कुपितु, नासिति वन्धस्यालि-मार।' 104 It requires thorough mastery over language, which is also clearly discernible in the following passage, which reminds us of the well-known simple passages from

97 N.V.T.T., p.209. 101 Ibid, p.96
98 N.K., p.2. 102 Bhāmatī, p.298.
Vācaspati's style is generally lucid and his peculiarity lies in dealing with the subject in the clearest possible manner. His treatment of śravaṇa, manana, nididhyāsana and sākṣātkaśāra in the Bhamati is worth noting from this point. "वपि च कल्पः प्रतिपपश्री ब्रह्माणि। प्रथमा तावद् अपनिधर्माः क्षेत्रादिमोचन। यो विकारहितो ब्रह्मामिति। द्वितीया श्रीमानासबिष्टम, तत्स्मादेति-पवित्र्द्वा-क्षणामच्छीते मानामिति। तृतीया चिन्ता सन्तानिःश्री यामाच्छीते निर्देशम-निविद्यति।" 106 
His treatment of the प्रतिपपसमुत्पाद also suggests his clarity of expression. In the introductory part of the T.K. he argues as :- "अतु दुः-कल्पम्, निम्नार्थिः क तद्दल्क, नक्षत्र च तद्दल्कमास्मि, सहस्त्रोऽऽ शास्त्रमं: अप्यास्तक्षर्यं, यमान्यस्त्रेलादिकाः न युक्ता निवासा।" 107 

Vācaspati is quite simple and logical when he introduces the portion from the text to be commented upon. And these introductions are very helpful in understanding these texts. Thus he says -- "तत्‍वात् तु दुः-कल्पम्, द्वितीयं: तद्दल्कं श्रीमान्यस्त्रेलादिकां मार्मणे।" 108 

The exact implication of the sentence — "स्वतंत्रस्वरूपिनिमित्तस्वरूपिनिमित्तस्वरूपि "मेष: समाधिः। भिदि।" 110
from the Vyāsabhāṣya, would not have been clear in the absence of Vācaspati's appropriate introduction to that line as — "ननु शास्त्रप्रशासिणकीर्तिविनिमित्तमोक्षिका प्रश्नेकं साधारणतेषामिति-प्रश्नेकं "कलितं आह् — संकेतते भिदि।" 111

Vācaspati is very critical (sometimes hypercritical also) when he points out different meanings of the indeclinables like 'ca'. He says: 'च पुनः' 113 'कलाराम्बृहि'। 114 'वा हेल्हि'। 115 'चस्य: अप्रा त्वुन्म सिद्धि।' 116 'च समुक्षेि'। 117 'वा भये अधारणे, आल्पै द्रवर्त्तयः।' 118 'अकारा मिनल्लणं,' सिद्धमन्त्यस्यान्तरं द्रवर्त्तयः।' 119 etc. His critical attitude is quite clear when he deliberately says — 'सेवायः अक्षमानानादेशं पाठमानात्तैवेष्वयायाता।' 120 The significance of 'pra' has also been noticed by him. In the Nyāyakārikā, while commenting on the word 'प्रतिक्रिया' in 'अत: स (विदिः) प्रतिक्रिया'। Vācaspati says 'ननु अयशं विभेद अविनाशितेस्मुप्तिम् अनपरियतो हि:।' 122 Also the word प्रतिक्रिया is explained like this — 'प्रकट्वेत ति प्रकट्वेत चात्मन् साधारणां सूचयन।' 123

111 Y.S.I.29. 119 T.K. on 18th S.K.
112 T.V.I.29. 120 T.K. on 4th S.K.
113 Ibid, III.13. 121 Vidhyāveka St.1.
Vācaspati's attitude of justifying the text, as far as possible, is worth-noting. While commenting upon the Vyāsa-Bhāṣya -- 'तत्र श्राच मूलादिनिन्मतिः क्षेमांत्यक्षरणादि च बाह्यम्'। 124 he points out that instead of saying क्षेमाः प्राप्तान्ति दिनाग्निः i.e. purity caused by eating - etc. of purifying things, the Bhāṣya-kāra says: क्षेमांत्यक्षरणादि i.e. eating - etc. of purifying things. Vācaspati justifies this by remarking 'कार्य कारण-त्वाप्तारात्' 125 because of the secondary use of the cause in the place of the effect. However, it can be remarked that instead of calling it justification, it would be more pertinent to regard it as a respectful way of pointing out a mistake. For, the figurative use of cause for effect or effect for cause, would not be justified in a work like the Vyāsa-bhāṣya, which is intended to elucidate clearly the problems in the Śūtras of Patanjali. This is the peculiar attitude of Sanskrit commentators of pointing out mistakes by way of justification. Apparently, it would look like justification but it would be revealed to a thorough-going reader that there is an improvement upon the original.

Vācaspati's diction is generally not uncommon. But, sometimes he uses uncommon words like 'णुः' 126 in the sense of something that is 'increased', 'प्रज्ञाति' 127 in the sense of knowledge, 'वाल्लु्' 128 in the sense of aquatic animal.

124 Vyāsa-bhāṣya, II.32. 127 N.V.T.T., p.10.
125 T.V.II.32. 128 T.B., p.136.
126 T.B., p.22.
The fact that Vācaspati is sometimes difficult to understand, cannot be ignored. Sometimes, it is due to his fondness for the use of pronouns e.g. In the sentence like 'तदनवाचाचने तदन्वाधातम: तस्य भूतस्थितपते', the word तद् has been used three times, and without knowing what exactly is meant by each तद् the sentence, however small it is, cannot be understood. In most cases, it is due to the use of the nyāya concepts of hetvābhāsas etc. But if one has sufficient background of the Nyāya system, these points are not at all difficult.

Vācaspati’s favourite arguments:

The most favourite argument of Vācaspati is that the absence of the vyāpaka or more extensive leads to the absence of the vyāpya or less extensive. His style of putting this is also peculiar. In the very first sentence of the Bhāmatī, he says -- व्यापकस्वतःवाधातम:; meaning thereby that there is thus the absence of the vyāpaka (here doubt (संदेह) and purpose (प्रेमान्त)), which leads to the absence of the vyāpya (here, the desire to know Brahman). This is his pet argument and is found in almost all his works. Many a time, the form is like this व्यापकं निर्देशानं व्याघ्रपि निर्देशिति., meaning ultimately the same e.g. तस्यं गृह्णत्वमयुष्म्यतिः गृह्णस्यविक्रियाश्च व्याप्तम्, तद्विद्य व्यापकं विक्रियाश्च निर्देशानं गृह्णत्वमपि निर्देशिति. 130 i.e. secondary usage is pervaded by the cognition of the difference

129 Bhāmatī, p.9.
between the primary and the secondary by those, who know both and here the pervader viz. cognition of difference eliminating itself also eliminates the secondary usage". This is a precise, effective and attractive form of refutation, which is also one of the characteristic peculiarities of Vācaspati's commentaries.

Vācaspati's most peculiar and favourite use of the root 'सच्च' in the causal e.g. राज्याम्वें and राज्याते, \(^\text{131}\) requires special treatment or rather justification. According to Pāṇini's Sutra 'सच्चस्यानां प्रयमाणः' \(^\text{132}\) in connection with roots meaning 'to cause pleasure' the person feeling pleasure is Sampradāna and hence takes the dative case. So, the proper use, in that sense, would be 'अस्मायं राज्याते' and not 'कर्त्यं राज्याम्बें' or 'तेन्द्रः राज्याते' and not 'ते राज्याते' as Vācaspati uses, even if we admit the root 'सच्च' as belonging to the 10th conjugation. For this reason, generally, in no other classical work, we come across the expressions like 'कर्त्यं राज्याम्बें' or 'ते राज्याते'. At the outset, it must be made clear that Vācaspati had nothing particular in his mind as regards its meaning when

\(^{131}\) N.K.p. 56, also pp.120, 374.

\(^{132}\) Pāṇini I.iv.31.
he used such expressions. Taking into consideration Vācaspati's style of representation and his desire to have force in the language, we feel that merely for the sake of force in the language, Vācaspati resorted to out of the way causal forms of the root 'चाच' in the normal sense, without giving the संप्रदानसंशा to the person feeling pleasure.

It is also, at the same time, not possible to hold that Vācaspati might have made a grammatical mistake in this use of the phrase like 'कर्म राक्षसः' etc. Such forms, in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, are of no help to justify Vācaspati. Appaya Dīxita's use in 'राजप्रेम कैसिन्द्र' 133 must also be remarked as the influence of Vācaspati's style, and it itself, on the other hand, cannot justify that use. Anyway, Vācaspati must have some grammatical explanation or rather justification of such forms, which clearly seem to have been deliberately used by him. And that seems to be the following one.

The meaning of the word 'सचि' in the Sūtra 'सच्याच्याना श्रीयमाण:!', is अन्यक्रृता भिलाच i.e. desire produced by some other agency -- the meaning, which has been noticed by Bhaṭṭojī Dīxita. 134 That is to say, when there is अन्यक्रृता भिलाच or liking created by another, the person feeling pleasure should necessarily be in the dative case. On the contrary, when there is स्त्रक्रृता भिलाच and not

133 Siddhāntalesasamgraha, p.108.
134 अन्यक्रृता भिलाच पाप चि:। हरिनिष्ठप्रोतेकिति: कर्म। S. Kaumudi 571.
he need not be in the dative case, as he is not then a संप्रदाय. In that case, he will take the nominative case, as usual, being the agent of the verb. To be more practical and clear, it means that when the agent of सच्चि is not in the dative, it means that the desire is not generated by any other agency. But this cannot be a rule, and we cannot use the expression like 'अहूँ राखे' instead of 'पहूँ राखे', taking the root सच्चि to mean सच्चि-कालिकाः and not अन्यक्षण्डकालिकाः -- which is needed for the dative case. Because, curiously enough, we find this use of 'सच्चि' with its agent in the nominative case, only in the causal form and not in the normal one, e.g. कं राक्षाम्य (and not कं राचाम्य) केकन राक्ष्यन्ते (and not केकन राच्यन्ते). And as the causal form has no causal meaning, the गिथ termination may be said to be स्वार्थ or as serving no special purpose.

Anyway, this is a mere justification of Vācaspati's causal use of the root सच्चि -- with the person feeling pleasure, in the nominative instead of in the usual dative -- the use of which, as noticed above, must have been made by Vācaspati for the sake of force and peculiarity in the language.

Vācaspati's use of 'न प्रस्थतिः' 134-A in the sense of 'न विस्थतिः' i.e. should not be forgotten, is also worth-noting, as, it is not commonly found in Sanskrit literature.

134-A अन्यक्षण्डकालिकाः तु िविष्णुपरिव स्वार्थकालिकाः। भा.प. ४२३
In this case, Vācaspati might be imitating Śabarāswāmin, who also says: 'सनन्दधानार्थानां वाक्यं विकारार्थाय विकारोऽक्षणकुलम्!' लतन प्रस्मित्वम् 134-B

In the same way, the expression 'प्राणेव' in the sense -- 'remote indeed', which is also not commonly used, seems to have been used for the sake of force in the language. For instance, he says: 'pypp̐'y 5?^ or^

And it is worth noting that Vācaspati borrows this sentence from Maṇḍanamiśra, with the only substitute of प्राणेव in the place of प्राणेव. 135 It should be noted in this connection that in the use of both these expressions -- 'prāgeva' and 'prasmartavyam', Vācaspati seems to have been influenced by Buddhistic works, both in Sanskrit and Pāli. The word 'prāgeva' in the sense 'much less' seems to have come from the Pāli word 'paggeva'; and it has been very often used in the Buddhistic works like the Jātakamālā. The word 'prasmartavyam' also seems to have been borrowed from the Pāli word 'pammutṭavvam' which originally means 'should be robbed', and which can secondarily be taken to mean 'should be forgotten'. It should also be noticed in

134-B Śabarabhāṣya, II.i.i.

135 Bhāmati, p.8; also pp.584,587,622 with slight change. See also – अन्यत्र अथि श्रीदर्शनामाय पूर्व मासा न सर्वं विनित्तथियु ज्ञातिष्ठ, प्राणेव जगद्यामाः; – etc. Bhāmati, p.86; 'विपश्चर्चितस्य वि- र्स्वप्तयं दुभवं प्राणेव चाकर्षणम्' T.V.I.i.; 'प्रत्यतस्य ल्यु भ्रात्रस्त्य ... अपभ्रणेय केव्य प्रतिपत्तनाल्य प्राणेव दुभवं, प्राणेव तस्याद्यभिविचारित्वम्! N.V.T.T., p.131; also Ibid, pp.42,93,603.

136 Brahmasiddhi, p.6.
connection with Vācaspāti's style in general, that the Nyāyabinduṭīkā of Dhamottāra seems to have largely influenced Vācaspāti in his style. Vācaspāti must have closely studied these Buddhistic works, may be, for refuting them. But any way, he was unconsciously influenced to a large extent, by the style of the Buddhistic works -- the style, which is forceful, attractive and full of vigour. Of course, the style of the Nyāyavārtika and the Yogasūtraghaṇḍa also made a good deal of impression on Vācaspāti. But the impression of the Buddhistic works is indelible. Even, the most striking usage of 'rocayāmahe' seems to have its origin in Buddhistic literature. The Jātakamālā says -- 'केन वासेन न रच्ये' instead of 'केन वासेन न रच्ये'. In this way, Vācaspāti, having combined the good points in the style of eminent writers -- both Vedic and non-Vedic, developed his style, quite peculiar of his own. Because of these peculiarities, there is a living force and uncommon attraction in Vācaspāti's language, for which also, his works may be gainfully studied. Pandit S. Subrahmanya Sāstri has rightly observed that Vācaspāti's flow of language is unique in Sanskrit and his works may be read not only for a mere correct understanding of the school of philosophy he expounds, but also for the beauty of the language.136-A

136-A Introduction to Ābhoga, p.XXIX.
Vācaspati's influence:

Vācaspati's influence on subsequent writers is clearly discernible. In the Advaita Vedānta, when a separate prasthāna has been started under his name, it is needless to say, how much he has influenced the Vedānta system. In his celebrated work viz. the Sarvadarśanasamgraha, Vidyārānya elucidates the Śāṅkara Darśana, fully following in the footsteps of Vācaspati's Bhamati. Without knowing the Bhamati, it is not easy to understand fully the arguments in the S.D.S. He had a close contact with the Bhamati and had been so much influenced by the latter that he reproduced some sentences word by word, from the Bhamati, as if they were his own. This, of course, cannot be said to be a case of plagiarism on the part of Vidyārānya as he, further on, quotes a stanza from the Bhamati, with a clear and respectful mention of Vācaspati.

Thus, the two lines from the Bhamati, in the S.D.S., without pointing out the source, only indicate that the author of the latter work had become completely identical with the thoughts and the arguments of the author of the former work. Whether his views were accepted or not by the majority of latter Advaitins is a different point. But, the historical necessity of Vācaspati to refute Bhāskara and the Buddhistic writers,

137 p.399ff.

138 न दिः क्रमा प्राधान्यदिविभा संवेदं जीवितंभाभरस्मस्मे येनेतुतुषाः भवति। अयथा
स्तिम्य प्रतिनिव भिभिः। तेन यथीम जीवस्य नियायास्य विधेयास्य तस्येवाविवि
समुच्चिन्तः नान्यः। Ibid, p.393.

139 तदन्नाटा आचार्यावभ्यध्ययति। S.D.S., p.393
quite logically, cannot be and is not neglected.

Even the Didhitikara, who established the Navyanyāya system had to refer to Vācaspati who in the N.V.T.T. held the view that although, the śāstra was composed even for the or those, who are not fit to be introduced in the śāstra, the sin caused by this cannot be clung to the sage, who composed the śāstra, because of his extra-ordinary power of penance. He says: टीकाकृत्तम् समाधिसंस्थर्भ्यं अनुप्रेयत्य प्रत्यवायं मुः: समादधिरे। 140

In the Mīmāṃsā system, Bhavanātha, in his Nayaviveka on the Tarkapāda, has referred to Vācaspati in connection with the Abhihitānvaya theory.

Even in the work like the Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā Vācaspati has been quoted for his views on the Nyāya. 142

In this way, Vācaspati's influence on subsequent writers in different systems, is clearly discernible. 143

140 Didhit on Prāmāṇyavāda, p.5 (ed. by Anantācārya, Shri Kānchī).
141 p.275.
142 p.817. See commentary 'Vidyāsāgarī' - वाचस्पतिर्मधु - अन्यधु etc.
143 For more such references see appendix No.IV.
Social Circumstances:

The following are the social circumstances, revealed from the writings of Vācaspatimiśra. It would not be, however, justifiable to read between the lines and to draw superficial conclusions. For example, it would be ridiculous to say that the majority of people belonged to the class of weavers and potters, at the time of Vācaspati, simply because we come across the illustrations of weavers and potters in his works. Still, an attempt has been made here, to point out some social and administrative notions, which a common sense view will not reject.

Vācaspati, in order to prove that God, as understood in the Yoga system, is one only, shows the contingency that many Gods would either quarrel among themselves or if they hold common views and rule jointly without any quarrel, none of them would possibly be said to be commanding God. There, he says — संभवात् तत् तथा वा न करिचार्यकरः, परिचारकः। From the analogy of the pariṣad or assembly it is quite clear that in Vācaspati's time, assemblies were in existence, which held discussions on controversial points and offered decision of the assembly as a whole. That is to say, nobody was designated to be the chief of the assembly but all the members of the assembly had equal rights and were held in equal respect. It obviously implies that the decision was taken on the majority principle. What rights these assemblies had and what sort of

144 T.V. I.24; also in the N.K. (p.209) he says — बिरोधार्यं सम्पूर्ण जीवं परिचारकः प्रत्येकं वा।
discussions they held cannot be understood from this remark, but some sort of democracy was in practice.

The institution of king seems to have been so much established that Vācaspati resorts to the king's minister and servant for the illustrations. The fact that the servant, as accompanied by elephants, horses etc. could alone wait upon the king and not without all this paraphernalia -- has been made clear from the following illustration:— यथा सैन्यः

हासिकःकर्मविद्याविद्यायनिन्दित्वायसोबः कालसात् छवियंकविकरः

न सैन्यपूर्वःति।...

The universal fact — that in order to please the king, his ministers or his favourite persons were to be pleased -- has been suggested by Vācaspati when he says -- अँखमाळधारैं अङ्गाराधारणामुद्यत्त्वासुरध्वनिमानी शैवोऽपि!

स्वाम्याधारणे

विक तद्वात्त्वात्तृत्त्रशिनिकाशामानणाम्।

146 The passage -- यदाद्हि सागर-शोधित: कृतुकालात् प्रणिहितस्मि: निधिंनिधित्वः निधिंनिधित्वः सागराधारणाये-

सत्यं इति सत्यवासु...पुष्पेः निधिमास्त्वाः! नामाग्निम्...।

147 -- etc. —

reveals, in a poetic way, that the king of the State was engaged in battles and was outside the capital for a long time. People held the king in high regard, and especially the ladies, standing on the terrace, with unwinking eyes, looked at the king, accompanied by his four-fold army, while entering through the gates of the city.

The custom of waving the sacred fire round the king

145 Bhāmatī, p.669.
147 N.V.T.T., p.115.
and his horse, received from other country, was in practice in Vācaspati's time. It seems that people were imperatively asked to do so. यदृच्छ्यस्तिथिः तिथिः कितीयते ...... यथा प्रामाण्यतानितानि राजाधौरानितानि नीरावमाति।

The Revenue administration in Vācaspati's time can be understood from the following passage:- यथा हि प्रामाण्य: कैदकृत्वः कर्मार्थाय किम्माधिक्षः प्रभुगति किम्माधिक्षः स्वीकारतः स च भूयमेव प्राप्तिः किम्माधिक्षः तथा वाणीविलिणि ...... 149 etc. Prof. Daśarathasarma 150 has noticed that this passage shows "that the system of revenue collection prevailing in Mithila was raiyatwar. But before reaching the king, the rent had to pass through the hands of विकार्यवाचित् and सतसमस्ति. Who this सतसमस्ति was, is not quite clear. He might have been either the head revenue officer at the capital or the governor of a division higher than the विकार्य."

Hindu armies of that period were largely composed of forces levied by village officials and provincial governors. It is clear from the following passage -- तथा जिन्निकथापारा अथातः inclination. स्त्रिया विना किस्मातः किल्ल्यापारीमिति, यथा स्त्रीयोण सह प्रामाण्यवाचित्ति सतसमस्ति मवदि। 151 It also suggests that there was no separation of civil and military in the Hindu Administration of the ninth century A.D.

149 T.K. on 36th S.K.; also यथा सतसमस्ति: सतासारास्तास्कारिकाय प्रामाण्य: कितरे हूँ प्रामाण्यवाचित्ति सतसमस्ति:। T.K. on 37th S.K.
150 Indian Antiquary Vol.Ixii, 1933.
151 T.K. on 37th S.K.
The following passage refers to some of the chief weapons of Indian armies -- lances, stalves, bows and swords.

... etc.

That the caste system was firm and rigid is known from the passages like -- 'न कु ल साग्रामेन किरातसंघर्षेण प्रतिलिपि ब्राह्मणोऽक्षरीतीं महति'।

न जातु ब्राह्मणकैशे राजत्वालम्बः सम्पादितुमहति; वैन राज्यि राजकृति अविशिष्टगायामुः।

'अक्षराणि किरातसंघर्षेण दितिः प्रति प्रतिलिपि'।

'स्मार्तवा राजनाथयानायानान्तरसंघार्यं कर्षी न विद्यते यज्ञानायानि-पानसंग्रहिकाः।' - etc.

Status of Women at the time of Vācaspati:

The strictness of the Parāda system, observed by the king's harem and kulavadhūs at that time has been pointed out by the following two passages:

(1) यथा कुलाविध्वंसिते राजदारामि न पशिदि।

(2) अक्षरव यथा हि कुलसंघर्षाक्षम सम्पादितु विविधास्तिस्वच्छं चव ब्राह्मणः परमणुचेति, ब्राह्मणो यमनां परमणुच्छः न वहिदि।

The ladies used to besmear their bodies with saffron - etc. Vācaspati has referred to the 'mangala-sutra' of ladies.
In order to have the pomegranate fruit of the greater size, blood was poured in the basin of the tree. People seem to have believed in the efficacy of any herb to counteract the snake-poison, if the herb touched the jaw of the mongoose. Vacaspati refers also to the general supposition that the eggs of ants foretell the rainfall in near future.

The fact that Kashmir was famous in those times also, for the production of saffron is clear from Vacaspati's reference to Kashmir as -- वेद मच्च कारक्य शेख, यथा कुमास्थ कर्मीर; etc.

That the process of manufacturing molasses from the juice of sugarcane, was known in those days, is evident from the extract -- शीतलसादेर्दिशुधादिदिष्णु

Abundance of mustard-seed is also known from the frequent use of the word सीतरी and -- heap of mustard seeds.
It seems that in Vācaspati's time, the Āndras were treated as Anāryas, and were regarded as Mlecchas. It is clear from the following passage in the Bhāmatī:

лат: के राज जित्यैसाध्या आयू पत्क्रितिद्वाराभावायु पिन्नेक्रामकादिः
विद्याध्यनाय स्वेष्वष्टिदर्शित आन्ध्रणी अनन्वितालो राजवन्द्रप्रसिद्धि:।
तदवारणारणा ....... तथा हि ब्राह्मणान्ध्राणै ब्राह्मणान्ध्राणु राजकुमारतरस्वले
वधामानीनायु राजयद आन्ध्रारः आरीरः भविष्यवादो मृत्योजनानु दुवस्तो। 164-A

The Kalpataru substitutes the word Mleccha for Āndras while commenting on this passage. Thus the Dravidians do not seem to have been included, so far, among the Aryans.

These are the obviously revealed social circumstances from Vācaspati’s works.

Vācaspati’s place in the History of Indian Philosophy:

Nobody will be reluctant to admit, from what has been pointed out in all the preceding chapters, that Vācaspati was a thoroughly erudite scholar of the ninth century A.D., who, by commenting upon the most important works of the Brahmanical systems, rendered tremendous service to the cause of stabilizing these systems and defending the onslaughts of the non-Vedic systems — especially of the Śauddhas. Although, because of his modesty, he never claims to have originated any new system or any novel doctrine, independent of the original text, he commented upon; it cannot be overlooked that he put forth new arguments and because of his peculiar language,

164-A Bhāmatī, pp.844-5.
thorough erudition and his way of treating the subject, he brought new life to all the systems he touched with his pen. All his works are the standard works. And in order to make the study of these systems complete, his works are to be studied inevitably. Thus, Vacaspati enjoys an important position in the history of Indian Philosophy, although, any major contribution as such to Philosophy cannot be shown to his credit. He is quite sure of his role when he calls himself नीतिकालकार\textsuperscript{165} -- just a guide to indicate the right path for the proper understanding of the Sastras. In the Tattvakaumudi, he says that he has made the path of liberation quite distinct. In the Tattvabindu, he remarks that the Tattvabindu has shown the right path for the understanding of the meaning of the sentence, by dispelling the darkness of illusion, just like the Moon.\textsuperscript{166} And it is highly essential to express our gratitude to him for elucidating many a moot point, in different systems, quite unambiguously. So, while evaluating Vacaspati, we should neither exaggerate nor minimise his importance. We should never forget his role as a commentator. And as a commentator, he is one of the most successful commentators in Sanskrit literature, mainly due to his vast erudition and clarity of expression. In order to make the topic quite clear, he consciously approves the blemish of prolixity and deals with the subject at great length. In doing this, obviously, he must have his disciples before him.

\textsuperscript{165} Bhāmatī, p.1020.
\textsuperscript{166} T.B., p.161.
as he says -- लेखने विस्तारितमुस्तादिपि प्रस्तुतज्ञानिबिधानुस्मृति निद्र म निस्तरे पालिता: स्य जिल्लिमुहतियः। (भा, प. 801). While alluding to Upaniṣadic stories, Vācaspati, especially in I. iv of the Bhāmatī, refers to the complete stories, with a view that those, who are not conversant with the Upaniṣads, should not be deluded. That this intention was to help the students or beginners is clear from his stanza --

अतीतस्तोपनिषदं व्याक्षोऽखिलं जायते।
तेव्युग्मसहायंवं भाषा नात्मकं ॥ 166-4

In this way, when Vācaspati is so much particular for his students, it is obvious that his commentaries are of great help to have a correct understanding of the text.

Because of his critical attitude, even keeping the highest respect for the authors of the texts, which he annotated, he has pointed out the defects in their texts. He has clearly remarked -- "सैत्रः पालितोऽत्मिनिविधानाद्वाटः। अवर्तिणि प्रस्तुतं शृद्धामयमयानाद्रत्यः अरं प्रतिभाद्रत्यः। 167 He has rightly suggested that the internal sense-organ is not completely free from all modifications when the steadiness of mind is practised, but it is free from the modifications due to Rajas and Tamas only, Sāttvikāvyāti being present there. 168

To prevent misapprehension as regards Vācaspati's ability and dignity, it is imperative here to discuss in detail whether Vācaspati was a blind follower of anybody, as has been

166-4 Bhāmatī, p. 302.
167 T.V.I.41.
supposed by men like the Prakṣaṭārthakāra.

Was Vācāspatī a blind follower of anybody?

We have already referred to the fact that Vācāspatī was harshly criticised by the Prakṣaṭārthakāra, as being the blind follower of Maṇḍanamiśra. Here, an attempt has been made to examine, whether Vācāspatī was a blind follower of anybody. It should be first noted that Vācāspatī had commented upon Maṇḍanamiśra’s Brahmasiddhi, although the commentary is not available now, even in the manuscript form. So Vācāspatī must have been influenced by Maṇḍana’s views. In order to know whether Vācāspatī was a blind follower of Maṇḍana, it is quite necessary to see the exact points, which can be said to have been borrowed by Vācāspatī from Maṇḍana and to notice, if possible, some instances, where Vācāspatī deviates from Maṇḍana. These are the points which have been adopted by Vācāspatī from the Brahmasiddhi of Maṇḍana.

(i) The location of Avidyā:

With regard to the location of Avidyā, Vācāspatī holds the same view as has been postulated by Maṇḍana. Of course, he thought it quite logical to accept the individual soul as the substratum of Avidyā, Pure Brahman being unable to serve that purpose, as It is ever illuminating and is of the nature of knowledge (vidyāsvabhāva). Vācāspatī’s own contribution is that he has so successfully tried to incorporate this in the system of Ś., that even the topmost work of the Advaita school like the Advaitasiddhi of Madhusūdanarasavatī, has taken
special pains to justify this concept, which was admitted only
by Vācaspati and his commentators and supported by very few
like Rāmādvayācārya,169 from the logical points of view.

(ii) In regard to the theory that the word can produce
only indirect knowledge and nididhyāsana or meditation is
essential to convert this indirect knowledge into direct one,
Vācaspati has evidently been influenced by Maṇḍanamīśra. But
even here, he has not followed him blindly. Because, Vācas-
pati ascribes the ultimate agency of the direct realisation of
Brahman to mind, associated by meditation -- the logical
necessity which was not felt by Maṇḍana. In this case, he
might have been influenced by the Nyāya concept of perception,
according to which, some sense-organ is quite necessary to
produce perception.

It is wrongly understood that Vācaspati, following
Maṇḍana expounded the theory of limitation in regard to the
nature of the individual soul. But neither Maṇḍana nor
Vācaspati did intend any such theory. Vācaspati at the most
can be said to be inclined to hold that the individual soul is
the consciousness delimited by Nescience, internal organ etc.
But this even is not viewed by Maṇḍana.

Now, it is worthwhile to take into consideration the
instances where Vācaspati contradicts Maṇḍana -- the fact,
which would obviously indicate that Vācaspati was not at all a

169 Vedāntatattvakaumudī, p.281.
blind follower of Maṇḍana.

(1) The doctrine of Sphoṭa, which is strongly propounded by Maṇḍana in his Brahmasiddhi and Sphoṭasiddhi has been controverted by Vācaspati in the Bhāmatī as well as in the Tattvabindu. Vācaspati has been designated as unwise in not following Maṇḍana in this case, by Śūryanārāyaṇaśāstrī. We have referred to this fact, on several pertinent occasions and are going to examine, in details, Śūryanārāyaṇaśāstrī's criticism against Vācaspati, before concluding this chapter.

(2) The second point of difference between Vācaspati and Maṇḍana is that Maṇḍana does not admit the possibility of the existence of the Prārabdha Karmans or the actions, in the former life, which have commenced to yield their fruit; while Vācaspati refutes the objections put forth by Maṇḍana against Śāmkaraśārya and strongly admits that possibility. In order to know the full significance of this difference, it is necessary here to enter into further details as regards the doctrine of Jīvanmukti, as being held by Śāmkaraśārya, Maṇḍanamiśra and Vācaspati.

The doctrine of Jīvanmukti, is, in brief, liberation in living state. While commenting on the Samanvayasūtra, and on the sūtra -- अनारंक्षकाः तेषु हुं पूर्वोऽद्वैतः, S. has propounded this doctrine. Vācaspati also has made S.'s position clear by remarking -- यदि वास्तवं सत्तवत्वं मेवन्न

170 B.S.I.i.4.
171 Ibid, IV.i.15.
As regards Maṇḍana’s view in this connection, we strongly maintain that he discussed both the views (that of Jīvanmukti and that of Videhamukti) without pointing out his inclination towards any one of them. If at all one has to draw any conclusion as regards his intention, that would be in favour of Jīvanmukti (and not of Videhamukti, as Prof. Sūryanārāyanaśāstri considers).  

But the acceptance of the doctrine of Jīvanmukti gives rise to one problem viz. to justify the continuation of the body even after Avidyā, the cause of the body, is destroyed, because, there is nothing which can be responsible for the existence of the body, when Avidyā is uprooted.

Śāṅkarācārya, following the Brahmasūtras, regards that the knowledge of Self destroys only saṃcīta and anārābdha-karmans, and not all the karmans. The prārabdhakarmans, which have commenced to produce their respective results, continue till the individual soul enjoys these results. Thus, because of the prārabdhakarmans, the body exists even after the acquisition of the knowledge of the Supreme Self. Maṇḍana, however, argues in a different manner. He refutes the analogy of the arrow, given by Ś. and proclaims that the body continues after the knowledge of Self, not owing to Prārabdha Karmans but because of the impressions of Avidyā. Vācaspati

---

172 Bhāmatī, p.150.
173 Intro. to Bhāmatī, p.xliii.
criticises the view taken up by Maṇḍana and strongly justifies Ś.'s position, which has been supported by the Brahma-
sūtras, in unambiguous terms. Vācaspati argues that the
actions which have not set to work, alone are destroyed by
the realisation of Self, and not the actions, as a result of
which, we are born and experiencing pleasure and sorrow,
because, this prārabdha karmam as it has started its function-
ing, is stronger than the actions whose functioning power is
not yet working. He observes that, if we do not accept the
Prārabdha Karman, as continuing its working even after the
realisation of Self, we would not be in a position to justify
the case of Gods and sages, who, as described in scriptures
and Purāṇas, possess the right knowledge of the Supreme Self
and at the same time are living a long life.\textsuperscript{174}

Although, there is no vital difference of opinion
between the views of Maṇḍana and Śamkarācārya, as Maṇḍana
will have to accept the Karman as being directly responsible
for the continuation of the body -- the body being the result
of the Karman, and Śamkarācārya also will never be reluctant
to accept the impressions to justify the prārabdha karmam, the
former has taken pains to refute the latter; and here, we want
to point out that Vācaspati deviates from Maṇḍana only to
become more logical and more consistent with the view of the
Brahmasūtras.

In this connection, it should also be observed that
\textsuperscript{174} Bhāmatī, p.958.
Vācaspati directly controverts Maṇḍana, when the latter adopts a view that the sthitaprajñā is the sādhaka and not the siddha. Vācaspati clearly remarks — स्युत्प्रज्ञार्थस्तर्तन्त्रत्वं न साधकत्वं, तत्परसत्तांत्योन्योन्योन्यां लक्षणं पूर्णव्रत्मानववस्तित्वातु — निरर्थिकस्य सिद्धांशु सिद्धांशु। स च सिद्धः केवल। The Kalpataru rightly introduces this passage as follows — तत्र स्युत्प्रज्ञां तत्परसत्तां साधकत्वान्योन्योन्यां लक्षणं पूर्णव्रत्मानववस्तित्वातु — तत्परसत्तां साधकत्वान्योन्योन्यां लक्षणं पूर्णव्रत्मानववस्तित्वातु। Thus, there is no doubt about the fact that Vācaspati directly contradicts Maṇḍana.

(iii) Maṇḍana adopts the Anyathākhyāti view, when he concludes after a long refutation of the Akhyāti — तत्परसत्तां अन्यथा प्रतित्तिव्रत्मानववस्तित्वान्योन्योन्यां लक्षणं पूर्णव्रत्मानववस्तित्वातु साधकत्वान्योन्योन्यांलक्षणं पूर्णव्रत्मानववस्तित्वातु। We have already noted the fact that Vācaspati was misunderstood by some when they supposed that he maintained the Anyathākhyāti. It has been also pointed out there that Vācaspati unhesitatingly holds the anirvacanīyakhyāti. From this, it is quite clear that Vācaspati did not follow Maṇḍana in admitting the anyathākhyāti or the viparitakhyāti.

So far, we have seen that in some respects Vācaspati definitely followed Maṇḍana but at the same time he differed from him (Maṇḍana) in regard to some points which are not altogether insignificant. In these circumstances, we can, with full justification, say that it is certainly unwise on the part of the Prakāṭārthakāra to remark that Vācaspati was Maṇḍanapratikṣhāveśi or in other words a blind follower of Maṇḍana.
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Maṇḍana. It is highly remarkable, in this connection, that Vācaspati has noticed some defects in the interpretation of Ś. also, even though his respect for the latter knew no bounds. These are the instances wherein Vācaspati's outlook is different from that of Ś.

(1) While commenting upon the passage -- 'यदा ति हे
हुमके चतुरुक्तमार्गेः' 178 - etc. in the Bhāṣya of Śaṃkarācārya, Vācaspati unambiguously remarks -- 'यदा ति हे हुमके विलिते प्रभादेकर मे पद न पतिल्। अवत्त्वतंस्यत्। बिनयत्वा हि हुमके लेखरि यथाव। न तु महत्।' 179 (while it was necessary to use the word 'dve' twice, he (Śaṃkarācārya) has used it once only, due to his mistake. Then alone, the caturuṇḍaka would be generated, otherwise, it (the thing produced) would be the dvyuṇḍaka only and not the mahat). It is also noteworthy that Vācaspati, furtheron justifies the position of Śaṃkarācārya i.e. the use of one 'dve' word, on the authority and the analogy of the grammatical rule of Pāṇini -- 'द्वेः विनयमेव जवः कल्ले।' 180 This indicates his independent thinking and at the same time his full confidence in his intellectual power of justification.

According to Amalānanda, there are three more instances where Vācaspati has not followed the Bhāṣya, in the interpretation of the Sūtras. Amalānanda, thereby, wants to justify the Bhāmatī as a type of Vārtika even. Whether the Bhāmatī can be designated as the Vārtika, is a different question, which has been dealt with, in the preceding chapter. Here, we want
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to show that Vācaspati has shown his capability of independent thinking in commenting upon the Bhāṣya of Ś. and that he was not a mere blind follower of anybody.

While commenting on the topic 'त जिन्द्रिमाणि तदादेव स", Vācaspati first gives the interpretation according to the Bhāṣya of Ś. and then introduces another view, which is designated by the Kalpataru as Vācaspati's own; while in the Parimala, the other interpretation is remarked as being held by the Vṛttikāra. The interpretation, given by Ś., is as follows. Vāk or speech and other principles are quite different from the prāṇa or the vital air, because, there is difference in regard to their designation. These Prāṇas, except the principal one, are nominated as sense-organs. The second interpretation, introduced by the words 'anye tu' is given by Vācaspati as follows. Vāk and others, except the vital air, are the sense-organs, because, only Vāk and others are designated by the term 'indriya'. Vācaspati rejects the first interpretation because of three defects in it.

First, the word 'tattvāntarāṇi' (which presupposes difference) is to be understood. Secondly, the word 'tat' in 'tadvyapa- deśat', is to be connected with that understood word -- 'tattvāntarāṇi' -- which is generally not admissible. Thirdly, if we take 'bhinnatva' as understood, the next sutra 'bheda- śruteśca' would be superfluous, as, what is told therein, is already understood in the first sutra. Thus, it is quite clear that Vācaspati here improves upon the Bhāṣya of
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It should also be noted in this connection that Appaya Dīxita, in his Kalpataru-parimala, has endeavoured to point out that Vācaspati has introduced the view of the Vārtikakāra (and not his own), with a view to showing that it is not correct. According to him, the defect in the first interpretation given by the Bhāṣyakāra, is not shown in the second interpretation. But Appaya Dīxita had to face one difficulty viz. the absence of any refutation of the second view, which, according to him, is the view, held by the Vṛttikāra. But Appaya ingeniously says that the mere intro­duction of the view of the Vārtikakāra suggests its faulty nature. He has tried his best in the Kalpataru-parimala to justify his position. He has noticed the defects in the second interpretation. The objections against the interpretation of the Bhāṣyakāra, explained in the Kalpataru, are also refuted by him. It is, however, not necessary here to examine his arguments in detail. But, impartially enough, it can be said that Vācaspati never intended the arguments in the Parimala of Appaya. Had he really intended so, he should have at least indicated the refutation of the objections against the first interpretation, raised by himself, while giving the second interpretation. Taking into consideration the whole situation, we can assert, without an iota of doubt, that Vācaspati, keeping the utmost regard for Śamkarācārya, has deviated from him in interpreting this sūtra.

Further, there is a clear difference between Vācaspati
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and as to what should be the meaning of the word Mantra in the Sūtra -- 'मन्त्रात्मकम् क गीयते।', Śamkarācārya takes the word mantra to mean the passage सत्या ब्राह्मचर्य ज्ञानम्, of the Taittirīyasaṁhitā, and by the Brāhmaṇa, he understands the passage -- 'अन्वय स्तर आत्मा आनन्दसः।', which is the viśaya-vākya of the Ānandamayādhikaraṇa, according to the interpretation of the Vṛttikāra. Vācaspati, on the other hand, understands by the word mantra, the kośacatuṣkavākya i.e. the passage, wherein the annāmaya and other kośas are described. 185

Vācaspati takes the words mantra and Brāhmaṇa in the sense of upāya and upeya. The Kalpataru remarks that just as the mantra is the upāya or the means of the prayoga, the kośacatuṣkavākya imparts the knowledge of the discrimination of Ātman from the body and others (the discrimination), which is the upāya or the means of the cognition of Brahman. It is not, however, a major difference, which can lead to the difference in regard to the ultimate conclusion.

Lastly, in the Sūtra, 'bhāva' and 'upalabdhi' are interpreted by Vācaspati very peculiarly. According to him, the word 'bhāva', in the Sūtra, includes the word 'upalabdhi', and the word 'upalabdhi' there includes the word 'bhāva'. He explains it as follows. 187 The bhāva or the existence is the object of the upalabdhi or the cognition. Thus, the 'bhāva' is the viśaya while the upalabdhi is viśayī. And by the viśaya, the viśayaviśayī i.e. the
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viṣayī viz. upalabdhi, along with the viṣaya viz. bhāva is understood, while the viṣaya viṣaya i.e. the viṣaya (bhāva) along with the viṣayī (upalabdhi) is denoted by the viṣayī - (upalabdhi) in the Sūtra. In this way, Vācaspati somehow wants to interpret the Sūtra under discussion to mean that the existence and the cognition of the effect are dependent on the existence and the cognition of the cause. Śamkarācārya interprets the Sūtra in a simple way, without taking the word upalabdhi as included in the word bhāva and the word bhāva as included in the word upalabdhi, as Vācaspati does. Vācaspati's interpretation, however necessary it may be, with a view to avoid the ativyāpti in the general rule regarding the cause and the effect, cannot be said to be intended by the Sutrakāra. Here the point is introduced only to show that Vācaspati sometimes offers interpretation quite different from that of Śamkarācārya. From all these differences, it can be very well noticed that Vācaspati has not followed anybody blindly. It is quite justifiable, as Prof. Kuppuswēmi Śāstrī has pointed out, that most of the distinctive features of Vācaspati-school have their roots in Maṇḍana's views as set forth in the Brahmasiddhi. But that, as we have in details pointed out, does not mean that he was Maṇḍanaprṣṭhasevī, as the Prakāṭārthakāra remarked.

All this discussion clearly shows that Vācaspati was not a third-rate commentator, who merely gives the meaning of the words in the texts, he annotated.

But it is a sad thing to note in the end, that Vācaspati
seems to have suffered from the jealousy of some learned people in those days. In the epilogue stanza to the Bhāmatī, while requesting the readers to observe minutely the work he produced, he has beautifully given voice to his inner feelings, in merely three words -- 'स्याहे दि कै भलयां।' 188 That is, Vācaspati wants to bring to notice that in studying his works, people will surely be benefited and hence they should not be jealous in reading his Bhāmatī. As has been noticed before, Vācaspati has described the wicked people who would not be persuaded to read his work, as -- मल्लसापिशनिन्दनमविकिल्यसमरंचकृ शेवामृ। i.e. whose disorder in humours (dhātus) due to the bile in the form of jealousy, is very difficult to be examined. This also indicates that Vācaspati had come across such jealous persons, who had no courtsey even to go through his works impartially. Still, his importance in the uplift of the orthodox systems of philosophy, has been duly recognised, later on; and his efforts have been successful. We conclude the work by paying our homage to this intellectual giant and living philosopher, whose favourite expression 'अन्यथा अभिनिवेशाय,' 189 clearly reveals his impartial character; and who will be indisputably admitted to be a man of great learning, speculative grasp and attractive literary style.

आप्रवृक्क जिना खेन व्यास्यातः शास्त्रविनिधि:।
तै ति वाचस्पति नेनि सर्वदर्शनपिण्डत्तम्॥
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