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CHAPTER - I.

(1) The acquaintance.

It is a well established fact that Jainaśīryas, while contributing in the field of Indology, have written not only on Jain Sūtras, but have studied and explored other systems of Indian thought also. The cause for this, can be traced in their pursuit of the golden doctrine of Anekantavada that gives the noble maxim that the realization of truth can be held by various angles of approach. They have written, therefore, commentaries and sub-commentaries on a number of volumes other than their own.

In the realm of these commentaries, those on Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika seem to be conspicuous by their number. Dr. Jetly notes no less than twelve such commentaries in his edition of Tarkasamgraha. One of them is Tarkatarangini by Gunaratna Gapi. Dr. Jetly has also written a paper on TT., that appeared in JCI, Baroda, wherein the learned author suggested that his commentary might prove very useful to those who want to learn the Navya-Nyāya system.

1. Vidit. नांतेर नान्दे पर ने को रामरामानी चड़कट अन्तर्लिन शाकाक नांदे - अन्तर्लिन नांदे। - अन्तर्लिन नांदे - अन्तर्लिन नांदे।
   Pl. see also SP. Ed. by Dr. Jetly, Intro. P.P. 7 & 9.
2. Published by Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute.
This paper created a curiosity to know more about TT - a commentary on TPK of GV. - a commentary on Tbh. by Ke. On my inquiry, I found that there existed only two MSS. of this work, Viz., (i) at the Oriental Institute, Baroda, and (ii) at the British Museum, London. The commentary consists of about 7560 s'loka measure. The further inquiry inspired me to edit this un-edited and un-published text.

Dr. D.R. Bhandarkar in his introduction of Tbh. gives a long list of different commentaries on TT. TT, perhaps being a sub-commentary, is not included in it. However, Prof. Paranjape, in his introduction of the Tbh., edited together with TPK, mentions Ga, as the commentator of TPK. Prof. H.D. Velankar takes notice of the Ms. of TT. in his Jain-ratnakosa. In the catalogue of the British Museum it is shown that the Ms. of TT. is unique. However, there also exists another Ms. of this work at the Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Ga, had written TT for the use of the students - especially for his pet-student Ratnaviśāla. The author has, therefore, like a sincere teacher, made it exhaustive and simple. Almost all the important problems of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika metaphysics.

5. P. 3. 6. JRK. P. 159. 7. 329
8. शास्त्रगुरुः भथ्नात सकृति तत्त्वं म्वरण सन्य सर्व वाच्यांमय " तत्त्वं।
शास्त्रगुरुः भथ्नात सकृति तत्त्वं म्वरण सन्य सर्व वाच्यांमय " तत्त्वं।
P. 52
are discussed in this work. GV. the written, occasionally uses the terminology of Navya-Nyāya, but
Gn. in TT. displays remarkable influence of Navya-Nyāya. However, the language of the work generally maintains the simplicity that is rare in some of the later Navya-Nyāya works.

(2) The date of Gunaratna Gani.

Personal History and date.

From the colophon of the TT. we know that Gn. was a disciple of Vinayasamudra Gani, a disciple of Jinasāṃkhya, who was a contemporary of Jinasāṃkhya-śuri. Jinasāṃkhya-śuri was a contemporary of Śrīvijaya-śuri and lived in the time of the Mogul Emperor Akbar. Gn. completed a big commentary consisting of 10,500 sūkha measure on the Kavyaprakāśa's, on the 7th day of the black-half of Jyestha in V.S. 1610, i.e., 1553 A.D. The commentary was written for his pupil Ratnavidāla.

9. Śrī Jinasāṃkhya-śuri apparivaśa Śrīpravādaśuriśāstrī-śuri śāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraš
4.

CV's date re-considered.

Though the date of On. seems to be certain from the above mentioned reference, it creates the necessity to re-consider the date of 11 GV. Prof. Farenjape followed by Keith puts GV. about the end of 16th century A.D., because GV. was the son of Balabhadra and the younger brother of Padmanabha, who is known to have written a Virabhada Campu in praise of King Virabhada, in the year A.D. 1578. N. Bhattacarya thinks that Balabhadra, the author of Balabhadravarshadhara, a commentary on SP., is the same Balabhadra, and flourished in the 17th century A.D.

The acceptance of these dates creates a new problem of putting On. either earlier than GV., or at least his senior contemporary, which may not be the case.

The problem can be solved, however, by re-considering the date of GV. as the date of On. is already fixed on the strength of the colophon of his commentary of Kavyapaksa as shown above.

Balabhadra, the commentator of SP. may not be the same Balabhadra, who is the father of GV. Even the colophon of Balabhadravarshadhara suggests that this Balabhadra was a Tripathi and not a Misra. Thus, there is not any definite proof to prove the -
identity. Hence, to fix the date of Balsebhadra, the
father of GV, on the ground of SP is not of much help.

GV, himself states that he was the son of -
Balsebhadra and the younger brother of Padmanabha, in
the beginning of the TPX. This Balsebhadra has also -
written a commentary on Tbh. His date is fixed by
Prof. Paranjape. But this date is fixed only on the -
strength of the Virabhadra C'ampu. We have no proof -
eXcepting the authority of Aurecht's catalogue of -
MSS. to believe that the author of Virabhadra C'ampu
was the same Padmanabha, the elder brother of GV. -
Again, there is not much authentic information -
confirmed by history about a particular King Virabha-
dra. So GV's date, as 1578 A.D., is not proved -
satisfactorily.

It will be better to fix GV's date on the
strength of the dates of Ka' and Gn. themselves. Ka
quotes Udayana, who is generally supposed to have
flourished about the end of the 12th century A.D. -
Again we have a commentary on Tbh. by C'mnabhatay,
who lived under the auspices of Harihara and -
Bukkaraya, whose date is supposed to be between 1300-1400 A.D. -
already. So the safest period for the date of GV.
may be the later-half of the 15th century A.D. or
the beginning of the 16th century A.D.

12. Indian Logic and Atomism
   P. 38.
14. SP. P. 151.
15. P. 1.
Gn's Scholarship.

From the text, we come to know that Gn. has studied the Nyāya philosophy from Puṣkar Mis'ra, the son of Nārēyaṇa Mis'ra. Nothing is yet known about both of them. The term of Mis'ra may suggest their native place as Mithila, the seat of the learning in Nyāya-Nyāya. Gn. is a learned pupil of this scholar and master of Nyāya-Nyāya, as he quotes not only scholars like Vaiśyāṇa, Udāyana, Gangesa and Paṇḍhara Mis'ra, but he also refers to scholars like Sanatani Pandita, Ratnakarasaṅkarā, Haridāsa, and Kṛṣṇānanda. At the end of the discussion of Asomavāyikāraṇa, he calls himself the Vāda-Cakra-

C'udāmaṇi. This shows that he was not only a successful teacher and a scholar, but was also a master of dialectical discussions.

Gn's other works.

Besides the commentaries on TT and Nyāya-prakāśa's, Gn. has also written a S'as'adhāra Tippaṇa, which is a short running commentary on the Nyāyasiddhānatādīpa of S'as'adhāra Mis'ra (12 cent. A.D.). From TT, it can be assumed that perhaps he

---

18. 18. [[Nyāya]]-prāktir aṣṭapūrtakarī māyārājāya gāyatrī- 

śūrvatabhirājāya cakṣūṣṭyaś ca prājñāpya! TT p 412.

19. See Appendix II.

20. 20. """"[[Nyāya]]-prāktir aṣṭapūrtakarī māyārājāya gāyatrī- 

śūrvatabhirājāya cakṣūṣṭyaś ca prājñāpya! TT p 412.

might have written one more Tippaha on the work of S'iromani. But as nothing is known of such a work at present, no more can be said about it.

22. TT. PP. 195 & 217, a S'iromani-Tih is also referred to on P. 56.