Vācaspati’s Life:

Vācaspatimisra, who is taken up here for a detailed study, is the well-known author of the Bhamati, a commentary on the B.S.Bhāṣya of Śaṅkarācārya. It is generally accepted that this Vācaspatimisra, who has been respectfully referred to as Acārya Vācaspatimisra, Śaṭdarśanaṭīkārtha, Tātparyācārya etc. in the philosophical literature in Sanskrit, belonged to the sacred land of Behar, where the unique Karmayogin Janaka and the philosopher par excellence Yājñavalkya had conducted ideal philosophical debates. The word misra attached to his name and his repeated reference to the mustard oil¹ tend to stabilize this statement. As regards the details of his life, as in the case of the majority of Sanskrit writers, we know next to nothing. Although, he was a voluminous writer, he has not referred to his family or to the important incidents in his life. The legend explaining the name of his commentary on the B.S.Bhāṣya of Śaṅkarācārya and the reason why he undertook the strenuous task of commenting on all the orthodox systems of philosophy, is, as follows.

At that time, on various occasions, it was customary to

¹ T.V.III.26, Bhāmatī, pp.451,478,503...etc., N.V.T.T.p.484.
held philosophical discussions. Vācaspati, having heard such a discussion on the occasion of his own marriage, determined to compose authoritative commentaries on all the Darśanas; because, he found in that discussion that the views were not represented according to the original intentions of the expounders of the system. But, the task he undertook was so huge that it required a very long time. It was completed only when he and his devoted wife had grown old. Vācaspati could very well notice that in producing literary monuments, he had neglected his wife in not fulfilling her expectations of married life. In order to console her, or, as a sort of compensation, Vācaspati gave her name to the last and most important of his literary compositions, so that she could attain immortality through the Bhāmatī, although not through the children born of her. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstrī remarks that the story is so picturesque, so typical of the scholar's neglect and the true scholarly recompense, that it deserves to be true. But it is also just possible, as it is found in other legends, that the story might have been composed later on, after having seen the literary career of Vācaspati.

The Śāmkaradīgīvijāya of Mādhava records one more legend about Vācaspati, which, in brief, can be stated as follows. Maṇḍanamīśra, when defeated by Śāmkaračārya in open debate, became, according to the terms, the disciple of the latter and was designated as Sureśvaracārya. Sureśvara then desired

2 Introduction to Bhāmatī, p.10.
to compose the Vārtika, on the B.S.Bhāṣya of Śaṃkarācārya. But, Padmapāda and other pupils entreated the revered guru, not to allow Suresvara to compose the Vārtika, as he was the staunch Pūrvamāmsist formerly and merely a converted Advaitin, and hence he would not represent faithfully his master's views, in the Vārtika. Śaṃkarācārya, who had to submit to the suggestion of his pupils, though unwillingly, asked Suresvara not to compose the Vārtika* on his B.S.Bhāṣya but requested him to comment upon the T.U.Bhāṣya and the B.U.Bhāṣya and to compile an original work in the Advaita. Śaṃkarācārya also consoled Suresvara by telling him that in the next birth, he would be born by the name Vācaspati and would then compose a grand and immortal commentary on the B.S.Bhāṣya, which would be as valuable as a Vārtika. And this commentary, according to the legend, is the wellknown Bhāmati of Vācaspati. The last part of the legend implies that Suresvara, in the next birth, assumed the name 'Vācaspati' i.e. the latter was the incarnation of the former. This legend deserves no special attention, especially because, there is a good deal of difference between the expositions of the Vedānta by Suresvara and Vācaspati, in regard to the nature of the individual soul, the locus of Avidyā, direct knowledge from the Śabda etc. - the fact, which does not allow to admit the identity between

* मास्ये निषो भा कृष्ण वास्किं त्वेन निषो मध्य: केति दुर्बिदस्या:॥
 माधवकृषि साक्षरदिवस्य १३.४४

3 प्रारम्भिकपर्याप्तत्वात्मनस्त्वं वाचस्पतिज्ञमन्यभवते भवतिष्यति करुणरामाय।
 नत्वो विष्णुस्मिः मम माधविकामापवलक्ष्ममाधविष्यिति सा च नीमातु।॥
 माधवकृषि साक्षरदिवस्य १३.७३
Sureśvara and Vācaspati, even in different births.

There is a small controversy as to who was the preceptor of Vācaspati. Vācaspati, in the benedictory stanza* to his Nyāyakanikā, pays homage to his preceptor, whom he describes as the author of some Nyāyamanjari. This fact has tempted some scholars to consider Jayantabhaṭṭa, the wellknown author of the Nyāyamanjari, to be the teacher of Vācaspati. But, it should be noted that Jayantabhaṭṭa, in his Nyāyamanjari, has quoted Vācaspati's views -- the fact which denies his priority over Vācaspati. Moreover, Vācaspati, in his Nyāyavārtika-tātparyaṭīkā, refers to Trilocana, as his Vidyāguru. Recently in his article, Prof. Anantalāl Thākur has pointed out that in the photographic copies of the works of Jñānāśrimitra, there is a direct reference to Trilocana's Maṇjari. And a passage, cited from one Nyāyamanjari, in the Kṣanabhāṅgādhyāya of the same Jñānāśrimitra, has been summarised and attributed to Trilocana by Ratnakīrti. From all this, Prof. Thākur has

* ज्ञानतिमिकस्मी परमस्त्री न्यायमण्डली स्विचाराम्।
प्रवचनेन प्रवचनेन विवाहिते नाने गुरुवे ॥ न्यात्पूर्वक वर्णार्थम्। Verse 3.
4 ज्ञानश्रीवीरस्वातान्धाराचे। न्यायमण्डली Chaukhāmbā Ed. p.62.
5 अत्मनी: निम्नानुसारानावलिनां गोशुनांगमने-मुळे। etc. N.V.T.T. p.133.
6 In the paper, submitted to the All India Oriental Conference, held at Annamalāi Nagar, in 1955; etc. See also his article -- the Naiyāyika Trilocana as Teacher of Vācaspati -- Indian Culture Vol.XIV No.1 g.36ff.
rightly come to the conclusion that Trilocana, the guru of Vācaspāti, has been referred to in the introductory verse in the Nyāyakāṇṭikā; and no internal or external evidence can connect Vācaspāti with Jayanta.

Shri N.G. Narahari also, on the testimony of Vācaspāti's two important commentators Udayana and Vardhamāna, has held that Trilocana and not Jayanta was the preceptor of Vācaspāti.

So, Jayantabhaṭṭa's Nyāyakāṇṭikā need not be supposed as being referred to by Vācaspāti in his Nyāyakāṇṭikā and hence, Jayanta cannot be considered to be the teacher of Vācaspāti.

The reference to Mārtandaṭilakaswāmin, as being the teacher of Vācaspāti, by Aufrecht and other manuscript-catalogue-compilers like Rājendralāl Mitra, is superficially based on one of the introductory stanzas to the Bhāmatī, where he salutes Mārtandaṭilakaswāmin. Tilakaswāmin, as the Kalpataru has rightly pointed out, quoting the authority of the Yājñavalkya Smṛti, is, Tilakapriyāh Swāmī, i.e. Skanda. Thus, Mārtandaṭilakaswāmin refers to two gods -- Mārtanda i.e. Sun and Tilakaswāmin i.e. Skanda. No reference is intended to his teacher there.

6 The Poona Orientalist Vol.XXII, p.77.
7 The words Mārtanda and Tilakaswāmi are separately used in the Ratnaprabhā on the B.S.Bhāṣya III.iii.1.

---

Prाणयाबिभुषणमुद्रः॥
About his pupil, there is no direct reference, but the Kalpataru is not silent on this point. At the beginning of the fourth chapter of the Bhāmatī, there is one stanza, wherein Vācaspati himself is eulogised. The Nirṇayasāgar edition of the Bhāmatī with the Kalpataru and also the manuscript of the Bhāmatī with the Kalpataru, at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, have the word 'Sanātanasya' below the stanza. It is quite obvious that the eulogistic stanza could not have been composed in this style by Vācaspati himself. But, who this Sanātana was and why the stanza was included in the text of the Bhāmatī, would not have been quite clear in the absence of the Kalpataru, which remarks that Sanātana was the pupil of Vācaspati and the eulogistic stanza composed by him, was incorporated in the Bhāmatī, to please Sanātana.

Vācaspati flourished in the reign of King Nṛga, who, as Kalpataru points out, respected him by offering valuable gifts. And Vācaspati also describes the king in highly respectful terms. He says, "Other kings try to imitate King Nṛga but they do not succeed". It seems that King Nṛga, who himself, although this stanza is quoted below the colophon of the Ms. of the Bhāmatī, recorded in the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. in the H.H. The Maharāja's Library Trivendrum, its authority cannot be challenged, as Kalpataru has commented upon it.

9 अष्णाय कृष्ण: सनातनमा तत्त्वत: प्राप्तव प्रौढःपरासपाः।

**Bhāmatī** p.1020.
as Vācaspati remarks, had studied the Śāstras, appreciated Vācaspati's proficiency in all the existing branches of learning.

No more authentic information about Vācaspati's life is available.

Date:

In fact, there should be no vital difference of opinion as regards the date of Vācaspati, as he himself has mentioned the date of his Nyāyasucī-Nibandha, in its epilogue stanza, which runs as follows:

श्रीवाचस्पतिनिधि वस्मूँ पुत्राः
श्रीवाचस्पतिकथितयां सत्कृतयाः॥

Thus, Vasvankavasuvatsara i.e. 898 is the year of the completion of his Nyāyasucī-Nibandha. The only point which remains is that the word Vatsara in Vasvankvasuvatsara is to be taken to mean either the Vikrama era or the Śaka era. If we accept the first, Vācaspati's date would be 841 A.D. and if we admit the second, it would be 976 A.D. Thus, at the most, there would be the difference of 135 years with regard to the date of Vācaspati. Scholars like Prof. Dinesacandra Bhāṭṭācārya, Prof. Cowel, VindhyesvarIprasad DwivedI, are of the opinion that the 'Vatsara' refers to the Śaka era and thereby hold the view that Vācaspati flourished in the second half of
the tenth century A.D. But the majority of scholars, accepts for one reason or another, the Vikrama era as being referred to by the word Vatsara and Vācaspati is placed by them in the first half of the 9th century A.D. i.e. 841 A.D.

Prof. Dinesacandra¹⁰ has raised the following points against the generally accepted date (841 A.D.) of Vācaspati.

(i) His first argument is that Vācaspati has commented upon the Bhāṣya of Śamkarācārya, whose date, although uncertain, can be accepted in round numbers as 800 A.D. In the Bhāmatī, Vācaspati has refuted the views of Bhāskara, who criticised Śamkarācārya. So, Vācaspati must have been separated by a considerable length of time from Śamkarācārya. That is, he should be placed early in the 10th cen. A.D. at the earliest.

This argument of the Professor is not at all convincing, because he himself says that the date of Śamkarācārya is uncertain. So, what is the use of an argument based on uncertainties? Even if we accept that date as certain, there is no difficulty, pointed out by the Professor, because, the NyāyasucInibandha was finished in 841 A.D. and not the Bhāmatī. The Bhāmatī, as we are going to show further on, is the last work of Vācaspati. So, it is not at all impossible that ten or fifteen years after writing the Nyāyavārtika-tātparyaṭīkā — of which the NyāyasucInibandha is supposed to be an appendix, Vācaspati wrote the gloss on the Bhāṣya of

Samkara\carya. Thus, there would be at least 50 years difference between the date of the Bh\a\ya of Samkara\carya and that of Vacaspati's gloss on it -- the period, which is quite sufficient for Vacaspati to refute Bh\a\skara, who was the contemporary of Samkara\carya.

(ii) Prof. Dinesacandra's second argument is that the Buddhist writer Dhamottara is quoted by Vacaspati, with utmost respect, by actually naming him with an honorific epithet bhadanta. And this respectful reference can be explained, according to the Professor, only if we separate these scholars by a considerable length of time, not less than a century. Dhamottara, says the Professor, can be safely placed, on the Tibetan evidence and on the authority of the Rajatara\ngini, which mentions Dhamottara, as a contemporary of Jayapida. So Vacaspati cannot be placed before the tenth century A.D.

We are really amused to see such an illogical argument of Prof. Dinesacandra, when he says that because of Vacaspati's mention of Dhamottara with an honorific epithet Bhadanta, they must have been separated from each other by a century. Moreover, even if we are forced to admit that Vacaspati mentions Dhamottara with utmost respect, it is very difficult to understand why contemporary writers should not refer to each other in respectful terms. Pandit Udayav\ra S\astri\(^{11}\) has rightly pointed out that even the Buddhist scholars of to-day, like R\ahula S\ank\ry\ya\ya and \Ananda Kausaly\ya\ya are

---

\(^{11}\) S\amkhya Dar\sana Ka Itih\asa p.348.
designated by the epithet Bhadanta. Although, it cannot be said with Udayavira SastrI that much light is thrown by the epithet Bhadanta on Vacaspati's rivalry with Dharmottara, we agree with SastrIji, in saying that there is no idea of honour when Vacaspati uses that epithet. Vacaspati was not at all a follower of Dharmottara to mention him in respectful terms.

(iii) The third argument put forth by Dineshacandra is as follows. There is one passage common to the Nyayalilavati of Vallabhacarya and the Tatparyatikā of Vacaspatimiśra. Vallabhacarya here refers to Vacaspati as Tatparyacarya following the Bhūṣaṇakāra. So, according to Vallabhacarya (Cir.1100 A.D.) Vacaspati came after Bhāsarvajña, the author of the Nyaya-bhūṣaṇa, who, according to him, flourished in the 9th century A.D., as he refuted the views of the Buddhist scholar Prajinakaragupta.

The whole argument is misleading. As Udayavira SastrI has pointed out, the reference to Vacaspati in the Nyayalilavati, is not as the follower of the Bhūṣaṇakāra but as the follower of the view of Cirantanavaisesikas. If both the texts are carefully studied, Vacaspati can never be said to be the follower of Bhāsarvajña, the author of the Bhūṣaṇa. In fact, the Ācārya, who according to Vallabhacarya, is disregarded

---

12 तार्किकवेदविवृत्तिक्रियाकरणं भूषणकारस्य बलिवान्वकारम्। तार्किक-वाचकारम्। भूषणबल्लभकरकारम्॥ तथा च तदनुगामिनः तत्त्वार्थसारस्य
सिंहसिद्धः। - संविदेश मान्यत्वादिद। स्नायुवालाकी निर्णयसार ed.p.33
by the Bhūṣaṇakāra, must be Vācaspatimisra, who is referred to in the next line by the word Tātparyācārya. So, it clearly points out that Vācaspati must have flourished before Bhasarvajña and not vice-versa. So, what Prof. Dinesacandra has tried to prove, establishes quite its opposite, because, according to him, Bhasarvajña's date falls in the 9th century A.D. So, Vācaspatimisra's date can possibly be the first half of the 9th century A.D.

(iv) The fourth argument of Prof. Dinesacandra Bhaṭṭācārya is that the passage viz. न चात्माकासा तथा पवित्रद्विदिन्यात्मकात्, पुष्पिक्षवादिविदिन्याचारियाः, which is quoted by Udayana in his Kiraṇāvalī,¹³ evidently from the Tātparyaṭīkā of Vācaspati, is, curiously enough, understood by Vardhamāna in his gloss on the Kiraṇāvalī, to be from Vyomāśīva and not from Vācaspati. So, according to Vardhamāna, Vācaspati came after Vyomāśīva, who, according to the Professor, lived in the first half of the tenth century A.D. So, Vācaspati must be placed in the latter half of the tenth century A.D.

This argument is, also, far from being satisfactory. It will, at the most, prove that Vyomāśīva proceeded Udayana, and no light can be thrown on the date of Vācaspati by it. Pandit Udayavīra Śastrī has rightly pointed out that as Udayana was commenting upon the Prasāsta-pāda-bhāṣya of the Vaiśeṣika school, it was quite natural for him to quote Vyomāśīva, who had also commented upon the Prasāsta-pāda-bhāṣya.

As Vācaspati had not composed any gloss on the Praśastapāda-bhāṣya, he could not have been quoted in that connection by Udayana. The similarity of logical syllogisms in the N.V. T.T. and the Vyomavatī of Vyomasiva, is quite obvious, as the two scholars were writing on a common topic. So, the fact that Vardhamāna attributes the passage in the Kiraṇāvalī of Udayana to Vyomasiva and not to Vācaspati, cannot place Vācaspati, in the latter half of the tenth century A.D.

(v) The last argument of Prof. Dinesacandra is as follows. Śrīdhara, in his Nyayakandali, nowhere betrays his acquaintance with the works of Vācaspati. There is one quotation14 which is found common to the Nyayakandali and the Nyāyakaṇṭikā of Vācaspati, with considerable variation of readings -- the fact which shows that the two scholars drew from independent sources, unknown to each other. Also the Sāmkhya-Kārikā 67 is explained in the Kandali, but the better comment on the word 'ākāraṇa-prāptaś' by Vācaspati there, is not referred to. This silence of Śrīdhara, who came after Dharmottara, as he has quoted the latter by name, can be explained only if Vācaspati is not placed in the 9th century A.D.

This argument of the Professor, is also not convincing,

14 न च मात्राम्भावलय तत्स्यथ कुःसंस्कर्तथ छायाया: कामयमित्वये पुराणे पुष्पावेत। दुरास्य-धर्मोपदिकूलप्रार्थय। देशानुवातिनी छाया न वस्तुत्वादित्वन केलेत। - न्यायकण्ठली
and far from being true. The variation of readings, pointed out by the Professor, may be due to the copyists and no difference of source can logically be inferred from it. Also, as Udayavíra Sástri has brought to notice, Srídhara, the author of the Kandali, must be said to be acquainted with the Tattvakaumudí of Vācaspati. The passages quoted by Sástri, from all these three works -- the Yuktidípika, the Sāmkhya-tattvakaumudí and the Kandali clearly indicate, from the similarity of style, that Srídhara had drawn upon the Tattvakaumudí and not at all on the Yuktidípika. Especially it is worth noting that the order in which the Sāmkhya-kārikā -- ‘Asadakaraqāt’ -- etc. is explained in the Kandali, is the same as it is found in the Tattvakaumudí, while, it is quite different from that in the Yuktidípika. The ancient kārikā --

\[\text{अर्द्धानांगिति संज्ञच: कारणैः सत्त्वविद्यमिव}.
\text{असम्बन्धसङ्ग्र नैति सिद्धिग्रहिताः किम्}.
\]

which has been referred to by Dinesacandra, is found both in the Kandali and the Tattvakaumudí while explaining the reason -- Sarvasambhavabhāvāt --, while in the Yuktidípika, it is mentioned when the reason -- Asadakaraqāt -- is explained. So, it can be remarked with full justification that the refutation of the Satkārya theory by Srídhara, presupposes Vācaspati's treatment of the same in his Tattvakaumudí.

That Srīdhara has not taken into consideration the better comment of Vācaspati on the word 'Akāraṇaprāptau' in

\[\text{15 Sāmkhya Darśana Kā Itihāsa, p.351.}\]
the 67th Kārikā, cannot prove the priority of Śrīdhara over Vācaspati. This negative argument has no meaning at all. For, in that case, if a nineteenth century writer did not notice in his work the argument for the 'Jñānakarmasamuccaya', put forth in the Bhāgavata, we will have to remark that the Bhāgavata was not composed before the composition of that writer. Moreover, Udayavīra Śāstrī has pointed out one more line from the Kandali --  

which bears unique similarity with the line in the Tattva-vaiśāradī which runs as --  

For all these reasons, the arguments put forth by Prof. Dinesacandra Bhaṭṭācārya are not sound.

Tārānāth Sarmā, in his introduction to the Tattvakaumudī, comes to the conclusion that Vācaspati flourished after Śrīharṣa, as he refuted the Khāṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā of the latter, in his Khāṇḍanoddhāra. This is obviously wrong as the Khāṇḍanoddhāra was not written, as pointed out further, by the Bhāmatīkara Vācaspati.

Prof. Cowel puts Vācaspati in the tenth century A.D. while Bōth and Macdonald assign him to the 11th century A.D.

These views are so unhistoric that they do not deserve special treatment. Their views are more or less based on the

16 Ibid p.276.  
17 S.T.K. on 65th Kārikā.  
18 Introduction to Kusumāṇjali, p.10.  
19 History of Sanskrit literature, p.393.
presumption that Vacaspati, in his *Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi*, refers to the *Rājavārtika*, which was either a work of Bhoja of Dhāra (1018-60 A.D.) or a work dedicated to him. But it should be carefully noted that there is no manuscript evidence to show any connection of the *Rājavārtika*, referred to by Vacaspati, with Bhoja of Dhāra. Even if it be there, it must be said to be unauthoritative, as it goes against all the historical evidence. So, it would be more pertinent to point out on historical lines that Vacaspati's date cannot be later than the first half of the ninth century A.D.

The first and most important point which has not yet engaged the attention of the scholars, is that Vacaspati is refuted by Vidyananda, a Jaina Naiyāyika. Vidyananda is referred to by Prabhācandra in his *Prameyakamalamārtanda*. Prabhācandra's date is accepted as 925 A.D. So, the date of Vacaspati cannot be 976 A.D. Moreover, as Prof. Keith has pointed out, Vacaspati is refuted by the author of the *Apoha Siddhi*, a Buddhist logical tract, while Udayana, who flourished in 944 A.D. is altogether ignored by him.

Also, the date of Udayana throws the same light on the date of Vacaspati. Udayana, in his *Lakṣāṇāvalī* has mentioned the year of the completion of the work, as follows:

\[ \text{विज्ञानद्वियनिः, नित्यं क्षेत्रन्द्रनिः} \]

So the date of Udayana is 906 Śaka era i.e. 984 A.D. If the word Vatsara in the *Vasvankarasuvatsara* means Śaka year, there

---

20 *Vibhāvanādhyayamārtanda* n. p. 176.
21 *Indian Logic and Atomism*, pp. 29-30.
would be eight years' difference between Vācaspati and Udayana -- the period which is decidedly not sufficient to attain the renowned position for Vācaspati and to have a commentary by a self-confident scholar like Udayana on his Tātparyaṭīkā, showing the utmost respect for him. It is quite true that the fact that Udayana simply wrote a gloss on Vācaspati's work cannot be a convincing argument for not admitting eight years' difference between them, because these scholars of ancient Mithilā lived, at the most, in one hundred miles area which was certainly not a long distance for the scholars to come in contact with the works of others and to comment upon them. What is to be pointed out, here, is that Vācaspati could not have attained such respected position as shown, in the concluding chapter, within such a short period.

Moreover, there is one so-called internal evidence, which can be put forth in connection with the date problem of Vācaspati. That Vācaspati lived under a king Nṛga, is quite certain. But this king Nṛga was not so far identified. Dr. Ganganāth Jhā has endeavoured to identify Nṛga with some Nepalian King, who was called Naravāhana, on account of his being carried by 'men'. Nṛga, according to him means Naravāhana, who reigned sometimes before 1097 A.D. This conclusion of Dr. Jhā, is mainly based on the Simroungadhi inscription in Mithilā, wherein it is mentioned that in the year 1019 of Saka era i.e. 1097 A.D., King Nānyadeva engraved

22 Introduction to साधनात्वप्रमुखः
that inscription. So, according to Dr. Jhā, some centuries back, Nepālian kings, who were called Naravāhanas, ruled over Mithilā, and Vācaspati flourished under one of these Naravāhanas. Even if this identification, suggested by Dr. Jhā, be accepted, Vācaspati's date cannot be exactly known. But Śrī Udayavīra Śāstrīji has rightly raised objection against this view, pointing out historically that even before the ninth century A.D., the Nepālian kings ceased to rule over Mithilā. Mithilā, as the history of Bengal is recorded, was ruled over by Pāla dynasty. In 810-849 A.D. Deopāla, of the Pāla dynasty, a brave and worthy king is recorded to have been the king of Mithilā. And Vācaspati, by the word Nṛgā has referred to this Deopāla, who was not Nṛgā by name but who was as if a second Nṛgā i.e. just like Nṛgā, the famous king in the history of ancient India. Amalānanda also, while commenting on the word Nṛgā, remarks — अथः न्‍य: that is the king mentioned by Vācaspati was another Nṛgā — as famous as Nṛgā. Moreover, this conclusion is quite consistent with Vācaspati's date (841 A.D.) if the Vatsara in Vasyankavasuvatśara is taken to mean the Vikrama era. And, if, however, Vācaspati's date be admitted as 976 A.D., taking the Vatsara to mean the Śaka era, Vācaspati's reference to a brave, charitable and famous king would be meaningless, as no such king flourished at that time in Behar. On the contrary, there was, more or less, anarchy and no sovereign king who can reasonably be

23 Sāmkhya Dārsan Kā Itihaśa, p.343.
compared with Nṛga, ruled over Behar. Thus, it should necessarily be admitted that Vācaspati, by the word Nṛga, has referred to Devapala who flourished in the first half of the ninth century A.D.

From all this foregoing discussion, one is led to conclude that Vācaspati must have flourished in the first half of the ninth century, at the court of Devapala.

Vācaspati's Works:

It is intended here to study all the works that can be said to have been written by the Bhamatikara Vācaspati. The problem as to how many works have come down from the pen of this Vācaspati, is not so much difficult, as the Bhāmatī, the last work of the author, in its epilogue stanza and in the text proper, refers to the remaining works of the author. Thus we find there, a direct reference to the Nyāyakaṇṭikā, the Tattvasamīkṣā and the Tattvabindu; and a general reference to the works on the Nyāya, the Sāmkhya, the Yoga and the Vedānta. Out of these, the Nyāyakaṇṭikā is the commentary on the Vidhiviveka of Maṇḍana, the Tattvabindu is an original treatise on the word-sense relation and the Tattvasamīkṣā is not available even in the manuscript form. The Kalpataru, while commenting upon the epilogue stanza of the Bhāmatī, understands the Tattvasamīkṣā to be a commentary on the

25 य-न्यायकृषिन्यधम्मीवासत्वत्वमुदिते।
म-न्यायाध्येयज्ञनीवेदान्तान्निदेशेन।॥ ॥

p.1020.
Brahmasiddhi of Maṇḍanamiśra. By the reference to the works on the Nyāya, the Sāṁkhya, the Yoga and the Vedānta, Amalānanda understands the Nyāyavārttikatātparyatīkā, the Tattvakaumudi, the Tattvavaiśāradī and the Bhāmatī, respectively. Thus, in all, these seven works, according to Amalānanda, have been written by Vācaspatimiśra, the author of the Bhāmatī.

However, it is not impossible that there may be some work which could have been written by this Vācaspatimiśra, who has been referred to as or one who has commented upon all the six (orthodox) systems of philosophy. Curiously enough, the above-mentioned seven works belong to all the systems except the Vaiśeṣika. So, there might have been some work written by Vācaspati on the Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy, which has not come down to us.

Aufrecht, in his Catalogus Catalogorum, mentions fourteen works as being written by Vācaspati -- the author of the Bhāmatī. They are as follows:

(i) Tattvabindu
(ii) Tattvavaiśāradī
(iii) Tattvasamīkṣā
(iv) Nyāyakaṇīkā
(v) Nyāyatattvāloka
(vi) Nyāyaratnātīkā
(vii) Nyāyavārttikatātparyatīkā
(viii) Brahmaḥtvasamhitoddīpinī
(ix) Bhāmatī
(x) Yuktidīpikā
(xi) Yogasūtrabhāṣyavyākhyā
Out of these, the second viz. the Tattvavaisāradī and
the eleventh viz. the Yogasūtraabhāṣyavyākhyā are different in
name only. They stand for one and the same commentary on the
Vyāsabhāṣya on the Yogasūtras of Patañjali. Thus, Aufrecht
refers to Vācaspati's thirteen works out of which, seven are
mentioned in the Bhāmatī and discussed so far. So, it is
necessary to say something about the remaining six works.

(1) The Nyāyatattvāloka can be decidedly said not to
have been written by the Bhāmatikāra Vācaspati, as it is evident
from the fact that the author of the Khaṇḍanoddhāra and the
Nyāyatattvāloka was one and the same;26 and Vācaspati of
Khaṇḍanoddhāra -- a work refuting the Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya of
Śriharṣa, flourished in the 15th century A.D. So, there is no
possibility of the Bhāmatikāra Vācaspati being the author of
the Nyāyatattvāloka, as wrongly supposed by Aufrecht.

(2) As regards the Yuktidīpikā, a commentary on the
Sāmkhyakārikā ofĪśvarakṛṣṇa, scholars are unanimous in holding
it as not being written by the Bhāmatikāra Vācaspati, there

26 (a) चिन्तकसतत् तत्त्वारोकः मौलिकः अर्थिते विद्याबुधार्थेऽ मण्डलादनां
ed. by Vindhyesvarī Prasād, p.25.
(b) Dr. S. Vidyābhuba also refers to the Nyāyatattvāloka
as being written by Vācaspatimiśra, the Junior, who
flourished in the 15th century A.D. - History of Indian
Logic, p.151.
being already in existence one commentary viz. the Sāṃkhya-tattvākāṣumudī, on the Sāṃkhya-kārika, and there was no point in composing two commentaries on one and the same work. Also, one fails to observe in the Yuktidīpikā, the magnificence of style with which the readers of Vācaspati are conversant.

(3) With regard to the Vācaspatya, which has been referred to by Aufrecht as a work on the Vedānta, it seems that it stands for the Bhāmatī itself, because in the Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Mysore and other places, so many copies of the Vācaspatya — a work on the Vedānta, are noted down and are remarked to be a commentary on the Brahma-sūtra-bhyāṣya of Śaṃkara-cārya. Obviously, it must be the well-known Bhāmatī. It should also be understood that the Vācaspatya, merely means a work written by Vācaspati, because the Tattvavaiśāradī has been styled as the Yoga Vācaspatya.* But, as the Vācaspatya mentioned by Aufrecht is a work on the Vedānta, it should be the Bhāmatī.

(4) The Nyāyaratnatīkā, which is wrongly supposed to be written by Vācaspati, was decidedly not written by him for the following reasons: (i) The Nyāyaratna of Maṇikanṭha, on which the work under consideration is a commentary, is evidently a work on the Navya-nyāya, which flourished

---

27 Twenty-three Mss. of this work have been recorded by Oppert. Also from the Reports of Sk. Mss. in Southern India, by B.E. Hultzsch, Madras, it is clear that Vācaspatya on the Vedānta is the Bhāmatī.

* See Oppert's Catalogue.
several centuries after the Bhāmatīkāra Vācaspāti. (ii) A complete manuscript preserved at the Bhandārkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, named as the Nyāyaratnaprakāśa, which is also a commentary on the Nyāyaratna of Maṇīkaṇṭha, seems to be the same as the Nyāyaratnatīkā, noted by Aufricht. At the end of the work, the author exhibits the same sense of diffidence which we come across at the beginning of the Nyāyatattvāloka. And there, we know that the present work was written by some Vācaspāti, at the behest of queen Padvāvatī—the wife of Mahārāja Pratāparudra, who, according to Prof. Dinesācandra Bhaṭṭacārya,* flourished in the second quarter of the 15th century. This description obviously compels the reader to regard the author of the present work as being different from the Bhāmatīkāra Vācaspāti, who flourished at the court of king Nṛga, in the first three quarters of the 9th century A.D. (iii) As Prof. Dinesācandra has pointed out, this work was written by Vācaspāti II who wrote other nine works like the Nyāyatattvāloka etc.

(5, 6) The Brahmatattvasamhitoddīpinī and the Vedāntakaumudī are noticed respectively by Rajendralal Mitra and Paṇḍit Devī Prasād of Oudh. As, they were recorded by them as being preserved in some private collections and not available for copying, they do not appear to possess the fortune of seeing the light of the day. So, nothing particular can be said about them. There is one Vedāntakaumudī28 by

Rāmādvayācārya, who flourished in the first half of the 14th century. But, no reference to the Vedicatattvakaumudī is available. In these circumstances, to say something about it, would be a mere conjecture.

In this way, Aufrecht's record does not add anything to our knowledge in connection with the works of Vācaspatimisra, the Bhāmatīkāra.

In addition to the seven works, discussed so far, the Nyāyasūcinibandha was one more work written by the Bhāmatīkāra Vācaspati. It is the most important work for fixing the date of Vācaspati. But, curiously enough, it is neither included among the seven works mentioned in the epilogue stanza of the Bhāmatī, nor is it referred to by Aufrecht, in his Catalogus Catalogorum. But, the colophon to the work expressly declares its author to be Vācaspati who flourished in the Vatsara 898. It is accepted by all the scholars -- modern as well as ancient -- that this Nyāyasūcinibandha was written by Vācaspati as an appendix to his N.V.T.T. This position can possibly account for its non-inclusion in the epilogue stanza of the Bhāmatī, at least as it is understood by Amalānanda, and the absence of any reference to it in his other works.

Thus, we can say with full justification that Vācaspati wrote the following seven works:

(i) Nyāyakaṇḍika
(ii) Tattvasamākṣa
(iii) Tattvabindu
(iv) Nyāyavārtikatātparyatīkā along with the Nyāyasūcīnibandha
(v) Sāmkhyatattvakaumudī
(vi) Tattvavaisāradī
(vii) Bhāmatī

Out of these, as the Tattvasamīkṣā is not available even in the manuscript form, the study of the remaining six works is intended in the thesis undertaken.

Chronological Order of the works:

The chronological order of these works from the internal evidence can be pointed out as follows:— The Nyāyakaṇikā is referred to in the Tātparyatīkā, the Tattvabindu, the Tattvavaisāradī and the Bhāmatī. The Tattvakaumudī, although does not refer to the Nyāyakaṇikā, refers to the Tātparyatīkā, which mentions the Nyāyakaṇikā. So, it is beyond doubt that of all the available works of Vācaspati, the Nyāyakaṇikā was written first. The next thing which can be definitely said is that the Bhāmatī is the last literary composition of Vācaspati. It is clear from the epilogue stanza of the Bhāmatī which refers to all his works.
The Tattvasamīkṣā, although not available now, seems to have been composed after the Nyāyakaṇṭhikā, as the former is mentioned in the Tātparyaṭīkā, Tattvavaiśārdaya and the Bhāmatī. It must have obviously preceded the Tattvakaumudī as the latter refers to the Tātparyaṭīkā, which refers to the Tattvasamīkṣā. The only question whether the Tattvasamīkṣā preceded the Tattvabindu or vice-versa cannot be decided on these internal references, as the Tattvabindu refers to the only work -- the Nyāyakaṇṭhikā, and as the Tattvasamīkṣā is not available to see if it contains any reference to Vācaspati's any other work. But, it seems reasonable to admit that the Tattvasamīkṣā preceded the Tattvabindu for the following reasons: (i) The Nyāyakaṇṭhikā and the Tattvabindu are the works on the Purvamīmāṁsā. So, it was reasonable on the part of Vācaspati to take a work on the Vedānta between these two. (ii) It also seems probable that Vācaspati first finished his commentaries on Maṇḍana's two works (i) the Vidhiśīveka and (ii) the Brahmasiddhi -- on which the Tattvasamīkṣā is a commentary by Vācaspati. (iii) Moreover, we are going to point out at the end of this paragraph that we are inclined to accept the order of Vācaspati's works in the epilogue stanza of the Bhāmatī, as the chronological order of his works, and there, the Tattvasamīkṣā is mentioned next to
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37 On S.K. 5, 9, 12, 17
the Nyāyakaṇṭikā.

The Tattvabindu seems to have been written before all the remaining works as it is referred to in the Bhāmatī and the Tatparyaṭīkā, which itself is referred to in the Tattvakaumudi. The only difficulty is that the Tattva-vaisarāḍī does not mention either the Tattvabindu or any other work which refers to the Tattvabindu. Had there been any reference to the S.T.K. in the Tattvavaisarāḍī, as Śrī Vindhyēśvarī Prasād has wrongly noticed, there would have been no difficulty, whatsoever, in regarding the Tattvabindu as the third work of Vācaspati. But there is no such reference to the Tattvakaumudī in the Tattvavaisarāḍī. So, the priority of the Tattvabindu over the Tattvavaisarāḍī cannot be proved on the strength of these internal references. But, for the reason that there is no reference to the Tattvakaumudī in the Tattvavaisarāḍī where it should have been, for instance — while dealing with the common topics like Puruṣanānātva, we assume that both these commentaries were written side by side and hence there is no reference to the former in the latter. Thus the Tattvabindu, which preceded the Tattvakaumudī, seems to have been preceded the Tattvavaisarāḍī also. The order in which the Tattvabindu is referred to in the epilogue stanza of the Bhāmatī also suggests that it is the third literary

38 p. 284, 330
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40 See fn. 37 behind.
41 Nyāyavārtikabhūmikā, p. 149.
composition of Vācaspati. Then comes the Nyāyavārttika tātparyatīkā, which is referred to in the Tattvakaumudi and the Bhāmatī. It must have preceded the Tattvavaiśāradī also for the same reason, which is just adduced for the priority of the Tattvabindu over the Tattvavaiśāradī. Thus the Tātparyatīkā is the fourth literary monument, produced by Vācaspati. The Tattvakaumudi and the Tattvavaiśāradī, which are not referred to in any other work of Vācaspati, seem to have been composed, as said above, side by side. And the last but not the least is the Bhāmatī, which bestowed upon Vācaspati, immense reputation which he enjoys to-day. This, we suppose, is the chronological order of Vācaspati's works; and the same is found in the epilogue stanza of the Bhāmatī:

मन्यामकमकी-तत्त्वसमीतात-तत्त्वविभिन्नमि:।
मन्याम-दंकनायोपानां वेदान्तां निंचन्ति:\

In the same order, these works are studied in subsequent chapters.
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