CHAPTER XIII

Gn.'s contribution to the Nyaya-Vaisesika System.

The survey of the important problems discussed in \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdagger}} \) will show even at the first glance Gn.'s deep study and acumen in the Nyaya-Vaisesika system. He is quite at home in both the trends - Old and New - of the Nyaya School. He refers not only to Gotama, Va\-layana and Udayana, but also to Ganges'a, Vardhamana and Raghun\-atha S\-iroma\-ni. It will be seen, however, that he is lured by the charm of Nyaya Nyaya more, and that can be justified because of the time in which he lived and also because he has studied this system from a Guru, who, probably, belonged to Mith\-la. His writing is, therefore, pergenant with the Nyaya-Nyaya terminology. But at the same time, it should be noted that in no way it becomes too much hair-splitting to be comprehended. He does not suffer from "the morbid" concern - for the precision of language - concern which, on account of its morbidity led to the paradoxical consequence that Nyaya-Nyaya texts constitute the least comprehensible sector of our \( 339-A \) philosopohical literature."

339\textsuperscript{a} viz., "\textsuperscript{\textdagger} \textsuperscript{\textdagger}\textsuperscript{\textdagger}" T.T.P. 412.
He is always clear and precise and generally never ambiguous. For instance, while explaining the "नृत्यकला" of "असुरम्" he says:

"* नृत्यः फलशर्त तथा याग यथा यथा वस्तुम्यायम् \\
असुरमित हाणा। न्यायशास्त्रिको भवति द्रष्टव्याः \\
प्रथम अवधारम्। तत्रसः भ्रामिनः 341.

or while explaining the fifth kind of "सत्यार्थसिद्ध"

"कुस्तोदेशपति कुस्तोदेशाया न्यायसिद्धः। द्वितीयशस्त्रोऽस्मिन् \\
स्वयं यथा श्रव्यं वर्त्ते तथा कुस्तोदेशपति वर्त्तेऽस्मिन् \\
स्वयं स्वयमथा कुस्तोदेशपति अस्मिन् \\
सत्यार्थसिद्धः 342.

or on "उपलब्धेन श्रुतः" he says,

"वन व्यापकतिणुसिद्धोऽभ्यासस्मतयं व्यापकाय माख्यम् \\
नियुक्तिरस्थितं भवति। यथा व्यापको भवति उपलब्धः। श्रुतकोषस्यशक्ति यथा व्यापकायो जन्य उपलब्धः। \\
स्योजान्त्यस्यादयं स्वप्नः भवति स्मयं व्यापकायो जन्यते। \\
वन चालाययास्तः दद्द्वारकस्य अस्तित्वम् \\
बहुतार्थयो अवशेषं वन दद्द्वारकः। \\
स्योर्बालाययास्तः अवशेष्यो वन दद्द्वारकः। \\
वनोऽस्यायनात् व्यापको भवति 343.

Similar instances are scattered in abundance in TT., and hence no more purpose can be served by multiplying them here.

Simplicity, however, is not maintained in TT., at the cost of the sincerity to explore the hidden significance of the problem under discussion. So, at times, Gn. applies technical phrasology also. The whole of the Chapter on "प्रतियोगितानाथिकरण" will furnish a proper example on this. However, two examples are given here for ready reference: - While discussing "साधनसंप्रमण" he explains "उपादित" as:

"तथा - अ प्रतियोगितानाथिकरण हेतु लाघवताचेहदं गुरुरस्वामिनिधि च वर्त्तमानकारकः। प्रतियोगितानाथिकरणार्कस्य व्याख्या।"

or, - he gives the final "उपादित" or "उपार्ध" as,

"अर्थोत्तपोपोपोपोपोषणां साधनमानाधिकारण - साधनमानाधिकारण प्रतियोगितानाथिकरणां तथा प्रतियोगितानाथिकरणां देतु समाधिकरणां हेतु अनुपोषणां साधनमानाधिकारणां विदुरुपेन साधनमानाधिकारण प्रतियोगितानाथिकरणां देतु समाधिकरणां हेतु अनुपोषणां साधनमानाधिकारण प्रतियोगितानाथिकरणां देतु समाधिकरणां हेतु अनुपोषणां साधनमानाधिकारण प्रतियोगितानाथिकरणां देतु समाधिकरणां हेतु अनुपोषणां साधनमानाधिकारण प्रति‌
At the same time, it should be accepted to Gn.'s credit that wherever such complicated technical expression are used, Gn., takes special pains to analyse their intricacy. He shaffs the husk of jargon and brings out the kernel of comprehension.

That the language is tinted with the phræsology of Nāyāya-Nyāya, especially in the - " सार्वभौमात्मक " is due to the considerable influence of Ganges'a on our author. It seems, in fact, that Gn. has digested " [[-]] संप्रदायिक " and has presented before us its results in mature, if not in simple language.

The obvious reason for the lucidity and comprehensiveness of Gn., lies in the solemn purpose of writing this work to instruct his pet disciple Ratnaviśēla in the Nyāya system.

His ability as a teacher, deserves our respect and appreciation. He wants his disciple to know every possible corner of this special branch of philosophy. At times, he seems to make him conversant with not only the main principles, - but also in the intricate subtleties of discourse. This discussion on " प्रकृति " stands as a better example for this purpose.

347. Ibid. PP. 412 and 621.
348. Ibid. PP. 494-497.
He selects the topic of discussion, explains it first in general, then clarifies the probable objections and also gives the views of several scholars, when possible. Amidst even the more complicated discussion, he never forgets his disciples. He, therefore, explains one and the same point again and again till he feels satisfied - that his disciple is able to comprehend. So, the words, "ग्राहे प्रयोऽ्ये", "ग्राहे साधी", "ग्राहे आचर्ये", "आपि पुजारे"., "दक्षिणे", "अचार्य पदक्षये", etc., are used most frequently.

Thus, for example, while explaining -
the definition of "ग्राहे", GV., suggests that it should be understood in proper context only. -
He says, "यदाद्वारं दक्षिणं दक्षिणं पूरं कार्यं तत्त्वं यथसङ्गमं तदनथं श्रेष्ठं धर्माद्वारं दक्षिणं तत्त्वं श्रेष्ठं धर्माद्वारं दक्षिणं तत्त्वं श्रेष्ठं धर्माद्वारं दक्षिणं तत्त्वं श्रेष्ठं धर्माद्वारं दक्षिणं तत्त्वं श्रेष्ठं धर्माद्वारं 349 ."

GV., first explains the above statement in simple language. He then proceeds to explains each of -
the words, e.g. "तत्त्वं तदनथं श्रेष्ठं धर्माद्वारं दक्षिणं तत्त्वं यथसङ्गमं प्रभावम् । ... यथसङ्गमं पूर्णकारणं सभायास्त्वे धर्माद्वारं दक्षिणं तत्त्वं यथसङ्गमं पूर्णकारणं धर्माद्वारं दक्षिणं तत्त्वं यथसङ्गमं पूर्णकारणं ... एकं यथं ॥ etc. Again, by giving an -
example of "छठे", etc., he says, "आचार्य पदक्षये यथा तदनथं पदक्षये । 350 ."

350. Tt. PP. 60-65.
This should not be considered a repetition of the treatment of any subject, but a teacher's method.

After giving several views, sometimes he winds up the discussion beginning with, "अनुमा-का, etc. While sometimes, he concludes the discussion like a learned professor in the class, with a suggestion to refer to some scholarly work for further details.

Generally, Gn., does not seem to be persistent in giving his own view, when he presents more than one views in case of a particular problem. However, from the general shift of such discussions, it can be inferred that he may have shared the last one. Sometimes, he specifically gives his own view rejecting other ones, e.g. he thinks that "घोर-का एविलकारणे" is not proper. His impartial and candid approach to the problem under discussion can be visualized in TT. Though a devoted student of Navya-Nyaya, Gn. at times, differs from the views of "अधिकार:"

352. s.a. "गितस्तेन विवरणसानुसारस्यकायिकोऽधिकम्". Ibid. P. 195, "तेन विवरणसानुसारस्य कोणम्". Ibid. P. 217 "उदाहरणसानुसारतः यथाश्रयस्नान उदाहरणमेव इति, स्वतं". Ibid. P. 227, etc.
353. See his discussion on " "(TT, PP. 1-8), on " " (PP. 114-119), etc. " (PP. 187 to 227) etc.
354. Ibid. P. 169.
even authority like Gangesa is not an exception to it. For example, he disagrees with Gangesa's at least for once, who believes "त्रिपूरेषु" to be the "प्राणः ोऽन्तः भगवद्गुरुः".

Gn. is a faithful commentator. Though a Jain saint, he shows considerable restraint in his treatment. No Nyaya theory is contradicted or mingled with any Jain doctrine. On the contrary, certain Nyaya-principles that have met severe criticism in Jain school of thoughts, are faithfully presented and justified to be proper. For example, the "करुणाप्रसाधनाभिगम्य" of "उत्तरम" - a theory acceptable to Jains-is criticised and "विद्याविख्यातिवा", the Nyaya-Vais'esika - theory is proved to be valid. The conception of "सत्तात्", is another proof for his honesty as a commentator.

Similarly, his faithfulness to GV. is also remarkable. Excepting the definition of "पन्धुरुत्त्यय", where Gn. slightly differs from GV. and the priority of the order in discussion of "सफलसत्तावः" and "शीतकालकाल", Gn. accepts and justifies almost all the conclusions arrived at by GV. Following GV., he does not mention "आचे" "एतिहासिक" and "(वृद्धि): " He prefers to discuss

355. Ibid. P. 169. See also P. 176, "तत्त्वं विस्तृतं वर्णनं", Pr 208, Pr. 563, where the "त्रिपूरेषु" of "ध्यानसत्तम" is rejected on the point of "उत्तरम", etc.
356. Ibid. P. 416.
357. Ibid. PP. 534-537.
"इत्यादिको" according to GV.'s scheme. It seems, he is concerned more with GV. than with Ke., as he comments on Tpk and not on Tdk directly. That is why, perhaps, he agrees with GV. in stating that the illustration given by Ke. for "अयुष्णसमिश्रिताः" is improper, and it should be placed under "समाधिपति". Not only that, but at least at one time, he is so concentrated on GV. that he does not read Ke. carefully. As a result, in reference to the destruction of the final "धिति", Gn. subscribes a view to Ke., which, the later has actually presented as belonging to a "पूर्वस्तादि".

His devotion to GV., however, does not present Gn. to explore some of the more interesting topics that are not referred to by GV. He is a commentator not to be satisfied with furnishing the simple explanations of the difficult words only. TT., in no way, is a short-cut to Tpk. It is a thesis pregnant with scholarly discussions - that may enrich even the value of the original work, just as "अक्षमांकी" enriches the NSM.

Following are some of the topics that are discussed by Gn., though slightly touched -

358. Ibid. PP. 499-500.
359. Ibid. P. 10. He also has his own views regarding the "विचारंकुशारे". Ibid. PP. 167-170.
360. Ibid. P. 523.
or not touched at all either by Krs. or by GV.:-

(i) Mangalvāda ( PP. 1-9).

(ii) Death of Kāśī and Liberation (PP. 29-33).

(iii) Details on Uddesa - Īkṣaṇa and Parīkṣa ( PP. 37-51).

(iv) Definition of a Cause ( PP. 93-95 ).

(v) Subtleties of a Non-inherent Cause ( PP. 119-157 ).

(vi) Sixfold Contact ( PP. 167-177 ).

(vii) Vyāpti ( PP. 187-227 ).

(viii) The meaning of the term Avacc' edaka.

(ix) Sāmānya Īkṣaṇa Pratyāśatti with other two Pratyāśattis ( PP. 251-260 ).

(x) Three-fold division of a "Hetu" ( PP. 261-274 ).

(xi) Difference between Satpratipaksha and Sandeha ( P. 618 ).

(xii) The non-eternity of a S'abda ( PP. 318-324 ).

(xiii) Ārya on S'abda Pramāṇa ( PP.333-336 ).

(xiv) Īkṣaṇa ( PP. 337-339 ).

(xv) Three theories of Nīmaṇiṇekas on Pramāṇyangvāda and their refutation ( PP. 361-367 ).

(xvi) S'aristave as a Jāti ( PP. 438-439 ).

(xvii) Pralaya ( PP. 455-467 ).

(xviii) Definition of Guna ( PP. 480-482 ).

(xix) Citrarūpa ( PP. 485-487 ).

(xx) Pāka Prakriya ( PP. 452-453 and 491-497 ).

( xx) Difference between Pruthskaṭva and mutual negation ( P. 509 ).

( xxii) Anyathākhyati ( P. 529 ).

( xxiii) Difference between absolute negation and mutual negation ( PP. 543-551 ).
Thus, it will be seen that Gn. is a lover of details. He is not inclined to furnish any new theory of his own. He is concerned more with presenting the subtle points of Navya-Nyāya, that he has digested from the works of his predecessors. His originality, therefore, lies in the novelty of approach rather than in the novelty of ideas. And because of that, TT. can serve a handy volume for the beginners of the Navya-Nyāya, and at the same time it may be a volume of ready reference to the scholars of Oriental philosophy in general.