CHAPTER - II.

SOME IMPORTANT PROBLEMS DISCUSSED BY Gt.

Though Gt. generally follows GV. in the line of discussion, he is interested in elaborating many important problems that are only casually discussed either by Ke or by GV. Sometimes, Gt. himself tries to raise a problem and discusses it in detail, though it is not even mentioned by his two predecessors. Some of these points are shown as under:

(1) Mançalavāda.

With the inception of Navya-Nyāya, it becomes a tradition with the commentators of different Sūtras to discuss Mançalavāda in the beginning of their commentaries. Gt. is not an exception to it. He discusses Mançalavāda in detail though GV. does not touch the point.

Mangala.- 157th

Gt. accepts the necessity of Mangala. But the point of his discussion is regarding the fruit of the same. In a dialectical method, he puts following alternatives regarding the fruit of Mangala—whether it is (i) the completion of the work, or (ii) the prior negation of the Vighna or (iii) the destruction of the obstacles. Gt. cites the opinions of scholars like Udayanācārya, Mañikāra, Pakshaçara—Mis'ra and Upāçhya-yāya.
Udayana’s view.

Udayana thinks that the aim of Mangala is the completion of the work, though the destruction of the obstacles (संघ्रण्साय समांत ) as the completion itself suggests of Vighnadhama.

Manikara’s view.

Manikara, however, does not agree with Udayana. According to him the Vighnadhama is the real fruit for Mangala. The completion is bound to follow it. It is implied and for the brevity point of view, it does not require separate mention. There is no direct connection between Mangala and the completion ( Samapta ). In order to have a completion of the work, Mangala should be free from any intervening difficulty. So, there cannot be Karana-Karysa-Sambandha between Mangala and Samapta. It is Anyatho Siddha. Therefore, Vighnadhama is the only right fruit of Mangala.

Misra’s view.

Misra’s view is altogether different. It is negative in nature. According to him, while starting

23. TT. PP. 2-4.
24. (कृष्णदत्ति प्रति भागलपुरुष अनकल्य अष्टि हवे समापि प्रति अपरिकल्य शुद्धवन्य- इत्यवसादिः: । तथा- ऐ असस्तिम फलसोऽसि कारणरूपं शुद्धवन्य-वायपदिकारीऽसि ।)
a work, the author always wishes and prays for the absence of the obstacles in his work. " [पद्म] ते संस्कृत - " is a keen desire. Therefore," says Mis'ra, "the prior negation of the obstacles ( Vighnasrāgabhāva ) is the only fruit aimed at by the Mangalakartā " It seems that Mis'ra believes in the maxim ' Prevention is better than cure ', and there is nothing much wrong in it. However, Sūparatna does not approve of this opinion. Technically Prāgabhāva is beginningless ( Anādi ). It is not born and on the contrary, with the destruction of the Prāgabhāva - its Pratiyāgī emerges. Hence, in the case of Vighnasrāgabhāva, its destruction will bring Vighna into operation. Thus, if Mangala is the cause of Vighnasrāgabhāva, there must be Anvaya-Vyatireka relation between them. But, it is not so, because even before Mangala, there exists Vighnasrāgabhāva, as the later is Anādi. In this way, there is no sufficient Pramāṇa to prove the relation between Mangala and Vighnasrāgabhāva.

**Upādhyāya's view.**

Finally, Gn. gives the view of Upādhyāya. According to him the completion only ( Samāptireva )

25. यथा वर्तनि विघ्नप्रागविषयता विध्यैर-प्रविषयति: केवल अयोध्याः। वर्तनि (विघ्नप्रागविषयता अयोध्या) कथा भगवतेऽपि विधान?। (विघ्नप्रागविषयता) प्रसावलोकयनल। १४५४. १७.
is the fruit of Mangala and not the Nirvighna-

samāptī as professed by Udayana. Upādhyāya believes
that the Samāptī is the final and the only desire of
the writer at the time of the beginning of the work,
e.g., the performer of an As'vamedha sacrifice keeps
his eyes on the attainment of the heaven - the final
result of the sacrifice - and not on any other thing
that he comes across during the process of the
sacrifice. Same is the case with Mangala and Samāptī.

Though Gn. does not give his own view, it
seems that he agrees with the last one. For, in the
next section, while discussing the nature of the
Mangala, he says, "अतः ष्ट्रृष्टिः स्वरूपः अवैधिनः".

Notion behind Mangala-vāda.

The discussion is technical rather than
an epistemological. All of these four views are
supplementary to each other rather than controversial.
For, even Udayana says that Samāptī is the real
fruit, but Vighnadhvamasa should be accepted at least
as an Avāntaravāpāra. His'ra's approach is
psychological, but as he expressed it in technical
terms, he invited the opposition.

* * *
(2) Samāsavāda.

The priority of the discussion.

After discussing Mangalvāda, Ga. tries to explain the nature of the compound (Samāsa) in the first Sūtra of NS, as quoted by Ke, in Tpk. GV also has touched this point, though Ke has not.

Curiously enough the order of the discussion is found to be changed in TT. GV discusses Samāsavāda after the discussion of Mokshaśavāda, while Gn. prefers to discuss it first.

This change of place is not a scribal error, because all the MSS. of Tpk. referred to agree regarding the place of the discussion of Samās-avāda as after Mokshaśavāda. Therefore, it seems that Gn. has changed this order deliberately. He, perhaps, thinks that this discussion should come first to understand the meaning of the N.S. I.I.I. The word "Apevaśga" comes at the end. So naturally, the compound of the sixteen categories should be explained first. In the explanation of this compound, naturally the discussion of Samāsavāda follows. So, priority given by Gn. seems to be more logical.

26. Tpk. P. 10. Vis'vanātha also prefers the discussion of Samāsavāda to that of Mokshaśavāda, vide N.S. V.9 q.
27. Besides the printed edition of Tpk by Prof. Paranjape, the MSS. Nos. 2133, 2700 resp. of L.D. Inst. of Indo. A'bad are also referred to.
The nature of the compound.

GV. states that the compound in this Sūtra is Itāretrādavandva. Gb. supporting GV. elaborately explains the different types of Dwandva compound quoting the relevant sūtra from Panini. In this discussion, he also shows the fundamental difference between Haradāraya and Itāretrādavandva and concludes that the compound in the sūtra is Itāretrādavandva.

This shows that Gb. is well conversant with the Paninian grammar, though Jainas generally studied the system of Hemacandra.

***

(3) Mokshavāda.

Moksha through Taivagamā.

The first sūtra of N.S. as quoted by Ke., tells that the right knowledge of the sixteen categories leads to the final beatitude. Ke. merely explains the meaning of the word Niḥsrayas-adhigama. GV., however, takes up the discussion and tries to solve the problem that how the knowledge of the sixteen categories is responsible for the final beatitude.

28. जनत्रवादिणि एकत्रिकृिः पा. २. २. ४.
29. प्रमाणंस्वत्‌ — — — — — — विषयंद्विधं तत्त्वंत्यात्ततं; प्रत्ययाःधार्मम दृष्टि-सयंथर्याःद्विः भुजार्ल। तु । ३
According to GV. in the beginning śāstra is the main source for tattvānāna. However, sāstra is not a synonym for Tattvānāna. Sāstra in a way produces Vyāpāra, which is a door in the attainment of Tattvānāna, ultimately leading to Moksha.

Here, GV. warns against the notion that Sāstra as well as Tattvānāna is a direct cause of Moksha. According to him Sāstra consists of words which are momentary according to Nyāya system. The Moksha comes at the end, i.e., after Tattvānāna is produced, and, therefore, the ablative in Tattvānānā should not be understood in the sense of "Hetu", but in the sense of "Prayojakaśāva". He goes a step further and declares that even Mithyā-gnānadhvamsa cannot be the Vyāpāra for Tattvānāna, as it does not start immediately after Tattvānāna. He also dispenses with S'ravana, Mānas and Nidāhyā-sans as direct means of Moksha.

31. Gaurikanta commentator on Thān. refutes this view of GV. - अनूदितः तत्तथे नानातिशेषेऽन्तत्र भवति तत्परमेव आत्मानिति
तत्त्वं व न संस्कारम्

32. Mādhavadeva commentator on Thān. together with Gaurikanta differs from GV. According to them Moksha is the direct result of S'ravana, etc. Ibid. P. 2.
Gn. faithfully follows GV. in this matter. He explains later's view more clearly by adding a few remarks of his own. With GV. he also draws our attention to the fact that though ablative case in "Tattvagnāna" is in the sequel of "Prayojaka" there is no Lekhā to be understood in the process. That, S'Sastra as well as Tattvagnāna in "Prayojaka" and not "Janaka" of the Moksha can be easily understood from the word itself. This shows Gn's interest in subtle grammatical peculiarities.

Kāśi'merana
and
Moksha.

Gn. here also refers to one more interesting topic, viz., "Kāśi'meranaṃsaṃkṣīta". The objector's view is stated that if the easy way of Kāśi'merana can give Moksha, there is no need of Tattvagnāna at all. Gn. refuting this view states that Kāśi'merana is not the direct cause of Mokti, but it produces Tattvagnāna, which leads to Moksha. Thus, Kāśi'merana is the cause of Tattvagnāna. Here the argument may follow that why one should take the trouble of studying S'Sastra and their Manana and Nididhyāsana for Tattvagnāna, leaving the easy way of going to Kāśī and die there.

33. See TT. PP. 23-28
34. Ibid. P. 30.
Though a Jain, Gn. does not put the argument referred to above. He simply states that Rāṣīmeraṇa-janya-tattvagnāna is quite different from the Tattvagnāna produced by Śāśṭra. Here Gn. only supports the view of old Naiyāyika-pundits perhaps his own teachers and thus his honesty is shown by him as a commentator.

* * *

(4) The three fold Śāśṭra-pravrutti.

Three fold divisions.

The three fold Śāśṭra-pravrutti is explained by Vatsyāyana as Uddes'a, Lakṣhapa and Parīkṣhā. The author of Tbh. is satisfied only in giving the respective definitions of these three. Gn. however, examines the pros and cons of all these definitions and ultimately declares them to be proper. Gn. takes up the discussion and elaborates the same. His zeal in entering in such types of discussions can be traced in the peculiar trend of the neo-logician's immense striving after the exactness of the meaning of each word used in the definition of an object. Really speaking, "merits of Nyāya-Nyāya speculations pre-eminently lie in their method of analysis of concepts and their formulations in exact terminology. The analysis is carried to its utmost limit."

The formation of an appropriate definition (lakṣaṇa) was considered to be a touchstone of the scholars, and hence Bn. has to examine the definition of the 'definition' itself.

Lakṣaṇa

The lakṣaṇa (i.e. definition) is defined as a 'statement' of a differentia. 39. However, to prove that a particular quality of an object, belongs only to that object exclusively - is not really an easy task. Gn. following GV. takes the substance 'Pruthvi' as an illustration and tries to define it by giving, 'water', 'prameyatva' and 'gandha (smell)' as its peculiar qualities, one by one, and examines their relative merits. Finally he ascertains 'Gandha' to be its proper peculiar characteristic.

35. N.S. 1-I-2.
36. TRK. P. 37. TT. PP. 37-51.
37. Dr. Saikari Mookerji B.P. Int. P. XIV.
38. अभोधनात्मक परस्परोक्ति। Thb. p. 7. Op. -तत्त्व (दृष्टांग्र तत्त्व
    गुणांश्रेष्ठमेव यहां। (Va. on N.S. IX-2)
The negative
nature of the
lakshana.

In fact the nature of a definition of a
'\text{lakshana}' is more or less negative. It is of
'\text{Vyatirekhdharma}' (exclusion). Its validity can
be judged better by the method of disagreement (Vyati-
reka) rather than by the method of agreement
(Anvaya). Therefore, G
. explains it as '\text{Atyantā-
\text{-bhavapratiyogitvam}}'.

In short, the main object of the \text{lakshana}
is to differentiate one object exclusively from all
other objects. All other objects should possess
its absolute negation. The quality fulfilling this
fundamental requisite alone can be called the
\text{differentia} (\text{Asāchāraṇadvharma})

40. \text{Samkhya Kas juris Aṣṭādhya Pāramārya Viśheṣa}\text{a} \text{dhyāna} \text{dharmakāya}

41. \text{Tibh.}\text{p. 7.}

42. Though G
. has accepted and elaborated GY's view
of '\text{Sāṅgītakāma}' as an '\text{Prāṇadharmakāma}' of a
'\text{svayam, nahe}' severely criticises GY. on this

\text{point.}

\text{Asāchāraṇadvharma vyālati kāraṇkāraṇaḥ}
\text{opaśīyate} \text{aśvayam, kāraṇkāraṇaḥ}
\text{svayam} \text{kāraṇkāraṇaḥ} \text{svayam} \text{kāraṇkāraṇaḥ}
\text{prāṇaḥ} \text{śvayam, kāraṇkāraṇaḥ}

\text{Jayārāja} \text{ekdā.}

\text{Though this objection is well taken, Gaurikānta has
missed the point by simply over-looking the
}\text{explanation given in the very beginning of this
discussion by GY. The later says, "}}