INTRODUCTION

In the history of Indian Philosophy, Uddyotakara is indeed a famous name. He was one of the most talented and ablest exponents of the early school of Nyāya philosophy.

We can say nothing exactly about his time and country. Only the following facts are definite:

Uddyotakara is mentioned by the poet Subandhu as a rescuer of the Nyāya.* Vāsavadattā itself is mentioned in the Harsacarita* ¹ by Bāna as a classical work which humbled the pride of all previous poets. The Harsacarita describes Bāna as a poet who lived at the court of King Śri Harṣa or Harṣavardhana. King Harṣa reigned in Thanesvara during the whole of the period from 629 A.D. to 644 A.D. when the Chinese pilgrim Huien-tsang travelled through India. So if Uddyotakara would be of the same period with Subandhu, and Subandhu a little earlier than Bāna, then Uddyotakara’s date can never be after 630s. But from Subandhu’s writing, it is clear that Uddyotakara’s Nyāyavārtika had attained great fame already in his time. Therefore it will not be unjust to think that Uddyotakara’s

* Nyāvasthitim ivoddvotakarasvarüpam bauddhāsaṅgatim ivālaṅkāra-bhūgitām ..... vāsavadattām dadarśa. (Vāsavadattā, p. 235, Hall’s edition.)

¹Kāvināmagalad darpo ṇunam vāsavadattayā/
Saktveva pāṇḍuputrānām satavyā karnagocarem/ (Harsacarita, ucchvāsa 1)
time must not be later than the end of 6th century.

From the clear mention of Diṅnāga’s statements and views, it is clear that the present author must be later than Diṅnāga.

"Diṅnāga must have lived before 557-569 A.D. when two of his works were translated into Chinese. Diṅnāga flourished possibly about 500 A.D. when the Buddhist kings of the Pallava dynasty ruled the eastern coast of southern India." (S. C. Vidyabhusana, A Hist. of Indian Logic, pp.272-73). Hence, it would not be unfair to say that Uddyotakara flourished in the 4th quarter of the 6th century.

Vasubandhu is mentioned by Diṅnāga in the first chapter of pramāṇa-samuccaya, and Vasubandhu’s date is accepted to be roughly the 5th century. To determine the date of Uddyotakara, S. C. Vidyabhusana has taken Vādavidhi as presumably identical with Vādanyāya of Dharma-kīrti. (A Hist. of Indian Logic, p.124). But it is evidently proved wrong.

Mallinātha (14th century) says: Kālidāsa warns his poem to avoid the 'rugged hand' (sthūla-hasta) of Diṅnāga in Meghāduta, pūrva-megha sl.no. 14.*

"Buhler, however, has shown that the author of an inscription in the Sun Temple at Mandasor of the year 473 A.D., an otherwise quite insignificant versifier named Vatsabhaṭṭi made it his business
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*Dīnācāṇāṃ pathi parihāraṇa sthūla-hastāvalépāṇ.
to compete with the great Kālidāsa, not only by imitating his style, 
but by actually taking verses from Kālidāsa's poem as the model for 
some of his own verses. If this is correct, it must be assumed that 
Kālidāsa was already a famous poet in the year 473 A.D., in which 
case Kālidāsa's age could be set between the limits 350 and 472 A.D. 
And it is necessary to remember in this connection that Chandragupta II, reigned from about 375 to 413 A.D." (Indian Literature, 
Ornate poetry - Winternitz, p. 23). S. N. Dasgupta also supports 
this view.* If the Diṅnāga episode be correct, Diṅnāga may well 
be placed in the 4th century.

Anyway, the difference of time between Diṅnāga and Uddyotakara 
may be only a century.

Nothing is known about Uddyotakara's personal life. In the 
colophon of Nyāvavārtika, iti Śriparemarṣi-bhāradvāja-pāṣupatācārya-
śrimaduddvotakarākṛtaḥ Nyāvavārtike pañcemo'jñayāh, the name 
Bhāradvāja as applied to Uddyotakara appears to be derived from the 
family to which he belonged. Again, he is called Pāṣupatācārya on 
account of his having been a preceptor of the Pāṣupata Śaiva sect. 
Besides this, Bhāsarvajñā in his Nyāvābhūṣaṇa mentions him very

--------------------

* A Hist. of Sanskrit Literature, vol I p.125.
often by the name 'Tamori' (The enemy of darkness).*

Dr. S. C. Vidyabhusana thinks† that though nothing is definitely known about the place where Uddyotakara was born, yet the only place mentioned by him, Srughna‡, which is situated on the western Jumna canal, 40 miles north of Thanesvara, might have been his residence.

Nyāyavārtika is the only book written by Uddyotakara. It is a sub-commentary on Vātsyāyana's Nyāyabhāṣya. The purpose of writing this commentary, as Uddyotakara himself declares in the introductory verse, is to defend the Śāstra of Akṣapāda by rejecting the misconceptions of the logicians who were lacking in proper critical judgment.*³ Vācaspati says that Kutārkika means Diānāga and others.

* anivamad iti Tamoriḥ - navam nivamoti sarvam vākyam sāvadhāraṇam iti. vathaisa panthāḥ srughnham gacchati iti. (Nyāvabhūṣaṇa, p.282)

Ref. sarvasmin vākye'vadhāraṇam iti tu na budhyāmehe, tad vathā gopālakena mārṣe'padiṣṭa esa panthāḥ srughnham gacchati iti nāvadhāraṇaḥsa viṣayam pasvāmah. NV (Vide Catur., p.514)

evam ca dvilaksanatrilaksanāvanvāvanvāvan labdhāvīti Tamorih

(Nyāvabhūṣaṇa, p.307)

Ref. evam dvilaksanatrilaksanāsca heturlabhvate.

NV (Vide Catur.,p.527)

*1 A Hist. of Indian Logic, p.124-25
*2 esa panthāḥ srughnham gacchati. (Vide Catur., p.514)
*3 vadaksapādah pravaro muninām sāmāya śāstram iṣāto iṣāda/
Kutārkikāhānaivṛttihetuh kariṣyate tasva mavā nibandhah//
Uddyotakara's main adversary was the famous Buddhist logician Dināgā although he has discussed and criticised the views of other Buddhist logicians also including Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu. Uddyotakara himself did not mention the name of any logician specifically, but generally Bhadanta, Baudha, Sautrāntika, Tathāgata and very often by the terms eke, apare, kecit. The names of three Buddhist texts are found in Nyāyavārtika - Vādavidhi, Vādavidhāna and Sarvābhisamayasūtra, though it is not clear whether the third one is the name of any text or any aphorism of a text.

As regards Uddyotakara's eminence, Prof. Thakur, P. Masson-Oursel and Frauwallner say that a philosophical and critical estimate of Uddyotakara must give him a place second to none among the exponents of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, if only because of the consistency with which he presents and defends the principles of realism against all manner of subtle idealistic arguments.

But there are other scholars also, who are not so well-disposed to Uddyotakara, but have doubts about his true philosophical motive. Among them Oberhammer and D. N. Shastri are the chief ones.

* Numerous articles on these Buddhist logicians and their views, in separate and comparative study, have been published in Japanese.
  *1 'Uddyotakara as a Vaiśeṣika'. - An article.
  *2 Esquisse d'une histoire de la philosophie indienne. p.206.
  *3 'Chandramati und sein Dasapadarthasastram' - An article.
"Uddyotakara ... was an author with decidedly polemic interest who
... was relatively uninterested in the true logical problems." Oberhammer.*

"He (Uddyotakara) ... lacked the philosophical grasp and depth
of Vācaspati Miśra. The latter is marked for his meticulous fairness
to his opponents, but for Uddyotakara no stick was too big
to beat his opponent with. Very often he argues by verbal twists
which even Vācaspati Miśra, otherwise so reverent to him, feels
constrained to criticize." D. N. Shastri.*¹

But from a thorough examination of Nyāyavārtika, one remarkable
point becomes clear. By the time of Uddyotakara, the conflict in
debate between the Buddhists and the Nyāya scholars has attained
such a proportion that Uddyotakara perhaps felt the necessity to
mention every hypothetical objections of the opponents and to answer
all of them. So the allegation of distortion against Uddyotakara
should not perhaps be taken too seriously. In some cases, though
not in all cases, Uddyotakara discusses in great details the
doctrines of the Buddhists, e.g. karma, transmigration, liberation,
vāsanā etc.

* 'On the sources in Jayanta Bhatta and Uddyotakara' - An article (p.140)
*¹ The philosophy of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and its conflict with the
Buddhist Dīgārṣa School, pp.110-111.
Apart from doctrinal disputes, we can trace some formal disputes also. From Uddyotakara's refutation of the term *svayam*, 'himself' in the Buddhist definition of *naka*, *svayam śādvyatvena īnsitāḥ nakaḥ*, it is notable that the Naiyāyikas do not permit in a discussion to quote freely any view of any other school of philosophy. But according to Diṇāga 'myself' in this case means 'not another one'. His principle is that every word includes a negation (*apoha*), this disputant 'himself' means 'not the initiator of the system to which the disputant adheres'. The point of Diṇāga is apparently directed against dogmatism, he wishes to vindicate the freedom of the philosopher to choose his arguments, he is not bound to quote only the arguments accepted in the school to which he belongs (*abhyaśupagama-siddhānta*).

As to the charge that Uddyotakara often indulges in mere verbal twists, it may be pointed out that Uddyotakara being a philosopher of the realist school naturally attaches great importance to common usage and verbal interpretation. To the realist, common usage of the people is generally a true index of the real order of things. If the meaning of a term or expression cannot be determined correctly with reference to the ordinary word it would become naturally useless. But the Buddhists, for example Vasubandhu and Diṇāga, belonging as they did to the idealistic group could hardly put much reliance on

* See Buddhist Logic, vol II, p.156.
common usage and verbal interpretations. Uddyotakara therefore had of necessity to take recourse to such analysis. This point is also corroborated by Sāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṅgраha* and Kamalāśīla's *Pañīkā* on it, in which the objection raised by Uddyotakara have been sought to be refuted from the Buddhist standpoint.

The first explicit reference to the Buddhist's thesis of 'momentariness' (ksanīkavāda) among the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas occurs in Vātsyāyana, who introduces this position in passing while discussing the Sāṃkhya theories. But it is Uddyotakara who first develops the extensive polemics on this point.*

The theory of *apoha* has been first started by Dinnaga in the 5th chapter of his *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*. Scarcely any older Nyāya work fails to devote some remarks to it.*1 Among them, Uddyotakara's *Nyāyavārtika*, though the first comprehensive available work on Nyāya philosophy, shows considerably a detailed discussion and refutation of this theory.

* The *Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies*, vol II p.60.
*1 *Nyāyavārtika* and *Tātparyatikā*, *Nyāya-mañjerī*, *Nyāya-bhūsana*, *Nyāya-kandali* etc. Among the Buddhist Nyāya work the first chapter of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārtika* is partly devoted to *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*. Dharmottara has written a special work on it (Bstan'-gyur, Mdo, vol 112). *Apoha-prakaranam* by Jñānaśrī. *Apoha-siddhi*, a short tract written by Ratnakīrti. Sāntarakṣita has devoted to it chapter - *Sabdārtha-parīkṣā* - of his compendium *Tattvasaṅgṛaha* and Kamalāśīla has commented upon it.
All this apart, it is also to be noted that Uddyotakara was perhaps one of the earliest exponent of the Vaiśeṣika sūtra whose views have fortunately come down to us. We hear of quite a number of commentaries, including some ancient ones, upon the sūtras of Kaṇāda. But they are generally not extant and we have generally to depend on commentators who are very much later. Uddyotakara has often quoted actual sūtras of Kaṇāda and explained them clearly substantiating the Vaiśeṣika position critically. This is another value of Uddyotakara's work. In fact, some of the sūtras of Kaṇāda can be rescued from Uddyotakara's work, which though undoubtedly original are not mentioned or explained in any commentary.

An expounder of Nyāya, Uddyotakara shows some new ventures:

(1) Presumably following some earlier teacher(s), he introduces the notion of lingaparamāraśa as a condition which must be satisfied in addition to the ones above: his idea is that the fourth member of the argument, the 'reassertion' (upanaya) reports the actual perception of the sādhyapervaded hetu as residing in pākṣa. Uddyotakara in opposition to Buddhists, Mīmāṃsakas, Sāṃkhyaśa and Vedāntins, argues vigourously that this synthetic condition is the proximate cause of a successful inference for oneself.*¹

----------

*VS 7.2.28 in NV of NS I.i.5; VS 2.2.19 in NV of NS I.i.23; VS 2.2.34 in NV of NS I.i.33; VS 5.1.16 in NV of NS I.i.40; VS 4.1.9, 4.1.10 in NV of NS I.ii.2.

*¹ The Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies, vol II p.183.
(ii) "One will probably be surprised to learn that Uddyotakara explicitly rejects the possibility of regular concomitance between hetu and sadhva. Since we frequently see smoke without fire, as well as without smoke."

(iii) Uddyotakara gives an exhaustive list of fallacious probans of 2032 kinds.

* The Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies, vol II p. 200.