CHAPTER VI

BHĀŚARVĀJÑĀ AND THE SĀMKHYA-YOGA SYSTEMS

Introduction

For several centuries Jainism and Buddhism exercised a potent influence on the system of philosophy and culture of the Brāhmaṇas. In South India the decline of Buddhism and Jainism commenced in the seventh century A.D., while in the North India both the systems became almost extinct by the 11th century. The Brahmans who survived them, organised their society on a secure basis and it became necessary for them to compose strict rules for the maintenance of the integrity of their society and for the prevention of new admissions to it. As a result they wrote treatises on codes of conduct imposing laws and restrictions and injunctions upon people of their province suited to their new local conditions. This helped them in the reconstruction and revitalisation of the Brahmanic culture which was facing almost a total extinction at the hands of the popular Buddhist and Jaina religions. Thus a number of different schools of thought and culture came into existence and they managed to bring back into their
fold some of the persons who left the religion attracted by the philosophy of Buddhism or Jainism. These new schools have local leanings and colours of their own which were quite different from the old schools so universal in their character and application.¹

Influenced by these new developments in the social, cultural and philosophical set up, the Brahmanic writers took it upon themselves to the study and teaching of logic in a new spirit and enthusiasm. Thus the treatises on logic composed by them borrowed their outward forms from the works of the Buddhists and Jaina systems, but for the subject matter they went back to the works of ancient schools. The Jainas and the Buddhists dealt with only one category viz. Pramāṇa. Following them some of the Brahmanic writers too chose only one category viz. Pramāṇa which they developed in such a way that it could assimilate and incorporate in itself all the remaining fifteen categories of the ancient Nyāya school. Following this practice current in his time Bhāsarvajña undertook to treat only of Pramāṇa which he divided into three kinds - Perception (Pratyakṣa), Inference (Anumāṇa) and Verbal testimony (Āgama). This threefold division of Pramāṇa, in contrast to Aksapāda's division

¹ Satischandra Vidyabhusana, A History of Indian Logic, 1965, p.355
brought Bhāsarvajña close to the Sāmkhyaas and Jainas who admitted three types of Pramāṇas but at the same time distinguished him from the Buddhists who accepted only two viz. Pratyakṣa and Anumāṇa. This prompted the author of Mānameyodaya to observe "bhāsarvajñaśca sāmkhyastrītayam" in his verse giving an account of the number of pramāṇas accepted by the different schools. Bhāsarvajña differed substantially from Akṣapāda and Kaṇāda, the authorities of old Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools and traces of the influence of the Sāmkhya-yoga as well as other philosophical systems can be observed in his treatise. All these are obvious instances of Bhāsarvajña’s anxiety to bring his treatment of subject on a line with the methods current in his time. Hence an attempt is made here to assess the influence of the Sāmkhya-yoga system upon Bhāsarvajña since it is evident from the Nyāyasāra that he had adopted many philosophical principles and arguments of that systems which were prevalent at that time.

**Influence of Sāmkhya philosophy**

As already noted, Bhāsarvajña’s admission of only three pramāṇas, rejecting comparison (upamāna) as a
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2 Mānameyodaya, Adyar Library and Research Centre, Adyar, Madras, 1975, p.9
Cārvākāstāvadekam dvitayam api punar bauddhavaiśeṣikau dvau Bhāsarvajñaśca sāmkhyastrītayam udayanā- dyāscatuṣṭkam vadanti.
separate pramāṇa, brings him close to the Sāmkhyas and the Jainas. But the influence of Sāmkhya system on Bhāsarvajña's work cannot be over-emphasised since he shows much influence of the yoga philosophy also. But in his autocommentary the Nyāyabhūṣāna, he examines the Sāmkhya doctrines in many places. In explaining these doctrines, he closely follows the Māṭharavṛtti and the Jayamaṅgalā commentaries of Sāmkhya-kārikā. Māṭhara in his commentary, in dealing with the question of the number of Pramāṇas, includes Arthāpatti and other means of valid knowledge accepted by various schools of philosophy, under the three already accepted by the Sāmkhyas. He mentions three necessities of the middle term or reason (hetu) viz. Paksadharmatva (the existence of the middle term in the minor term), Sapakṣe satvah (the existence of the middle term in a homogeneous object) and vipakṣat vyāvṛttiḥ (the absence of the middle term in a heterogeneous example which do not possess the sādhya). He also mentions fourteen types of fallacious reasons (hetvābhāsas) such as asiddha, viruddha, anaikāntika etc. Example is divided by him into two varieties, viz., Affirmative or homogeneous (sādharyya) and Negative or heterogeneous (vaidharmya). Fallacious examples are, according to Māṭhara ten in number. Inference is defined by him as that which arises out of the knowledge of the three factors viz.Pakṣa

3 Sāmkhya-kārikā with Māṭharavṛtti and Jayamaṅgalā tīkā; Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1970, p.8
4 ibid., p.9
(minor term), Hetu (middle term) and Drśānta (example). This inference when employed for convincing others by one person who has undergone the process of inference by himself and is convinced about the truth is known as inference for the sake of others (parārthānumāna) and it is divided into three types viz. pūrvavat, ṣeṣavat and sāmānyatodṛṣṭa (a priori, posteriori and the generally perceived). Twelve kinds of anupalabdhis are also mentioned by Māṭhara in his work. Apart from these there are several original ideas in this commentary and in the Jayamangalaṭīkā also one can see such a similarity of ideas. The Yuktidīpikā which is another commentary on Sāmkhyakārikā, which has propounded various arguments in support of the Sāmkhya doctrines refuting the views of opponents is also made use of by Bhāsarvajña in explaining the Sāmkhya doctrines.

From the very outset of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system one can notice many points of agreement with the Sāmkhyas, such as the treatment of the existence of innumerable individual souls, immaterial and eternal. At the time of the origin of the causality theory the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika stood midway between the Satkāryavāda of Sāmkhya and Kṣaṇika-
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vāda of Buddhism. From these it is evident that from a very early period itself the Nyāya system was influenced by the Sāmkhyas. In his rejection of Upamāna as a separate pramāṇa, the views of Bhāsarvajña differs from that of the Sāmkhyas. But the influence of this system upon him even though to be limited extent is evidently clear from his autocommentary mentioned earlier. This influence helped him to shape his arguments in support of his views dealing with the portion of fallacious reason, example and the number of Pramāṇas. But it should be remembered that in his treatment of fallacious reasons etc., he has depended on the Buddhist, the Jainas and the Vaiśeṣikas much.

Influence of Yoga philosophy

"The Sāmkhya and yoga are so much inter-related in the Sanskrit literature that whenever any occasion arises of explaining or referring to the tenets and doctrines of the Sāmkhya, those of the yoga also are not generally overlooked." One of the most important factor to be noted in Bhāsarvajña is that he shows a greater influence of the yoga-philosophy than that of the Sāmkhya. The Pratyabhijñā


8 Pulinbihari Chakravartih, Origin and Development of the Sāmkhya System of thought, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, Delhi, 1975, p.65
system of Kashmir Saivism compromises between the theism of yoga and the Advaita of Śaṅkara and at the time of Bhāsarvajña, yoga deeply influenced almost all the systems of philosophy in India and which was very much prevalent at that time in Kashmir. Living in such a religious and cultural atmosphere it is not strange that Bhāsarvajña shows much influence of the yoga system in his work and it should be remembered that the Naiyāyikas prescribe yogic practices as a means for the attainment of salvation.

The acceptance of only three pramāṇas and the rejection of upamāna as a separate pramāṇa to which the old school held fast with such a tenacity is characteristic of Bhāsarvajña's Nyāyasāra and it is to be accounted for as the effect of the influence of the Śāmkhya Yoga philosophy and he shaped his arguments in support of this doctrine based on the Māṭharavṛtti and the Jayamaṅgalā commentaries of Śāmkhyakārikā.

Bhāsarvajña's definition of Pratyakṣa may be cited as further example how yoga deeply influenced his whole mental outlook. Seeing that Gautama's definition of pratyakṣa does not apply to transcendental perception experienced by yogins, for which the contact of an object with the sense organs is not a necessary pre-condition, and which had a profound reality, Bhāsarvajña was constrained to alter the
definition of Pratyakṣa in such a way so that it will include the yogic perceptions also in all its various forms.

In his commentary on the Śāmkhyakārikā-27 Vācaspatimiśra gives a twofold division of Pratyakṣa as savikalpaka and nirvikalpaka. Of these the indeterminate (nirvikalpaka) perception is the immediate cognition of an object pure and simple while determinate (savikalpaka) is the definite cognition of an object related with its properties and qualified by its generic and specific characteristics. It is presentative as well as representative in character involving the recollection of name, class and such other properties of the object as were experienced in the past and are revived in the mind by the law of similarity. This division of perception by Vācaspatimiśra might have influenced Bhāsarvajña but no other commentators or Śāmkhya philosophers give such a division except the yoga philosophers and it is better to think that it was under the yoga influence that Bhāsarvajña made his classification of perception.

While setting forth the means for the attainment of release (Mokṣa), Bhāsarvajña prescribes kriyā-yoga consisting of tapah, svādhyāya and Īśvara-praṇidhāna. He also gives the definition of these terms in his own way. This kriyā-yoga, states Bhāsarvajña, is to serve as a helping media for the cessation of sufferings.- both mental and
physical - and through the gradual practice of the sadhanas such as yamaḥ, niyamaḥ and other yogāṇgas one can attain samādhi. He gives the same definition of the yoga-sūtras when he explains the kriyā-yoga, yogāṇgas, dhāraṇā and dhyāna, samādhi etc. But it should be noted that he has made some changes in some of the sūtras of Patañjali. Thus, according to Patañjali there are five kinds of Kleśas viz. avidyā, asmitā, rāga, dveṣa and moha, while Bhāsarvajña accepts only three of them such as rāga, dveṣa and moha. Yamas are, according to Patañjali, acts of restraint but to Bhāsarvajña they are purificatory acts not requiring place, time etc. So also niyamas defined by Patañjali as cleanliness etc., is described by Bhāsarvajña as acts of merit requiring definite place, time and so on. It also appears that the classification of prameyas in Nyāyasāra into Heya, Tannivarttaka, Hānamātyantika and Tasyopāya follows on the lines of yoga-sūtra. He gives the very same definition of heyā as it is given in the yogāsūtra.

9 Nyāyasāra, op.cit., p.38
sā ṣaṃśaṭamārṇāvadhirā.: kleśakarmakṣayasamādhitābhārthamaniṣṭānam
Yogasūtra, 2.2.
Kleśatanūkaraṇārthāḥ samādhitābhārthāsceti
10 Cf. Yogasūtra 2.1, 29; 3-1, 2.3, and Nyāyasāra, pp.38,39
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The explanation of other three terms also shows very close similarity to that of the yoga-sūtras. That Bhāsarvajña had exactly the sūtras of Patañjali in mind when he defined the prameyas is clear from the way he treated these topics in the Nyāyasāra. His contention in respect of knowledge is that Īśvara or Śiva directly perceived by the practices of Yoga bestows the eternal bliss (niratīṣayam śreyah) and his description of Īśvara is clearly on the lines of Yoga-sūtra since he gives the same attributes of Īśvara as are given in the Yoga-sūtra.16 All these are indicative of the influence of the Yogasūtras on Bhāsarvajña, for he has adopted many theories from the Yogasūtra to explain and elaborate his doctrines and it is quite natural that he has cherished the influence of the Yoga-system since the Śaivaite school of Kashmir, especially the Nakuliśa-pāśupatas, in which Bhāsarvajña was an ardent devotee, who has even composed a treatise on the Pāśupata system of philosophy called Gaṇakārikā, was the observers of Yogic practices.17

16 Yogasūtra 1-24, Nyāyasāra, op.cit., p.35
17 In his commentary Gaṇakārikā, Bhāsarvajña prescribes the yogic practices for the attainment of salvation. For details see Gaṇakārikā, Oriental Institutes, Baroda 1966. pp. 12-22. In the Yamaprakāraṇa of Viṣuddhamuni also the yogic practices are prescribed. See ibid. Appendix I pp.24-25. Similarly in the Sarvadarśana-saṅgṛaha there is a portion dealing with the Nakuliśa-pāśupatadarśana in which it is said that the yogic austerities were practiced by the Nakuliśa Pāśupatas. ibid. p.33
Thus Bhāsarvajña was very much fond of the Yoga philosophy since it was a religious custom with his own religious order. And it may be observed that in the Nakulisapāśupatadarśana we can trace the glimpses of Sāmkhya and Yoga philosophies. It may be concluded that Bhāsarvajña’s reference to the Yoga-sūtras and the influence of the system on his work are quite natural since he was biased by the system as he believed in a religion which was very keen in observing the Yogic practices, which they believed to be essential for the attainment of the eternal bliss. At any rate Śaiva influence is clearly discernible in many places in the work of Bhāsarvajña. He observes that two things are essential as the immediate antecedents to a direct vision of the Supreme Self which is mentioned by him as Śiva. Similarly final release (mokṣa) is followed by paravairāgya known as anabhirati and parābhakti towards Maheśvara. The famous Śvetāsvatara upaniṣadic passage which is a stock verse among the Śaivas, is quoted by Bhāsarvajña, in support of his argument. This is, of course, due to his Śaiva influence. The concept of Īśvara expressed in Nyāyasāra may be due to

18 yadā carnavadākāsām veṣṭayiṣyanti mānavāḥ /
tadā sivamayamjñātāvā dukhasyānto bhaviṣyatī //
Śvetāśvataraopanishad 6.20 quoted in Nyāyasāra, op.cit. p.39
the influence of Yoga as well as Śaivism, both being its probable source. The definition of Īśvara given in Nyāyasāra is almost a verbatim reproduction from the Yogasūtra of Patañjali. 19 What is to be noted is that these sūtras themselves were originally of Śaiva formulation. The word Īśvara or Paramesvara as found in Nyāya or Yoga was originally the name of Śiva, as the corresponding word Purusa or rather its derivative Puruṣottama came to mean Nārāyaṇa. In this way the philosophy behind the Īśvaravāda has close affinity with the Śaiva theology and it can be understood from the fact why Śaṅkara has referred to in his Sūtras, in dealing with Īśvaravādins the views of Vaiśeṣika and other Śaiva sects. 20 The concept of Bhakti has a prominent position in Bhāsarvajña’s Nyāyasāra. The notion of Bhakti, the invariable antecedent to jhāna, is very old in Indian thought and this conception was very familiar to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika as an integral part of its theology. Nyāya adhered to the Yoga as the direct antecedent to Mokṣa and the beginning of this doctrine also may be traced back to remote past and its connection with Nyāya is certainly due to the influence of Śaivism. In the Ratnāṭika of Bhāsarvajña, in the

19 Nyāyasāra, op.cit., pp.35 and 39
20 Nyāyasāra, op.cit., p.39
Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha and in the Saṭṭharśanasamuccaya of Rājaśekhara Sūri there are portions dealing with the Saivadarśana and all of them indicates the importance of the yogic practices and the element of Bhakti in this darśana.

Conclusion

From the above factors one may well conclude that the yoga influence and the Bhakti element etc., found its due place in Bhāsarvajña's work by means of his religious tenets. As mentioned earlier he was an ardent follower of Saivism which can be further confirmed by the benefictory verses to his works. Bhāsarvajña flourished at a time when Kashmir was a cradle of Saivism. Buddhism and Jainism were flourishing side by side. The Brahmanical writers were slowly but earnestly striving to assert their influence. Hence a kind of assimilation of other systems and interaction of the currents of thought were necessary for the survival of a particular kind of orthodox system steeped in long tradition. It is this that influenced the dialectician in Bhāsarvajña to a great extent to borrow ideas and terminologies from the systems like Sāmkhya and Yoga. This he did to develop his own tenets on a sound footing.

21 See Gaṇakārikā, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1966