CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing analysis of the Nyāyasāra of Bhāsarvajña one may arrive at the following conclusions.

(1) Bhāsarvajña was the true representative of the Medieval school of Indian logic. The Jaina and Buddhist logicians dealt with only one category, Pramāṇa, since it was the only one to be understood by a person desirous of attaining 'final release'. This view was widely accepted and found support among the scholars of the time and the arguments advanced in this connection were convincing to the other schools as well. This necessitated the reconstruction of Brahmanic logic for the retaining of the integral character of Hindu logical system as well as to control the desertion of scholars from Hinduism to other religions. Hence the Brahmanic writers too chose the one Pramāṇa in which the other fifteen categories were included. Bhāsarvajña was the first Hindu logician who effected this renaissance in Hindu Nyāya system while retaining the independent character of the traditional system.
(2) Conceived as the "essence of logic" and appropriately named as Nyāyasāra, the treatise of Bhāsarvajña follows no particular work. It has its own methodology in dealing with each topic and the author has his own arguments supported by apt illustration. In this respect it is original in conception and novel in execution.

(3) Treating of Pramāṇa into three, namely Pratyakṣa, Anumāṇa and Āgama as against the four accepted in the traditional Nyāya texts which accept Upamāṇa as the fourth, Bhāsarvajña comes closer to Sāmkhyas and Jainas. Melputṭur Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa mentions this fact as "Bhāsarvajñāśca sāmkhyastritayam udayanādyāḥ catuṣkam vadanti."¹ Bhāsarvajña's definitions of Pratyakṣa and Anumāṇa assimilate the terminology of the Buddhists and Jainas in his effort to make the definition faultless as far as possible.

(4) The Naiyāyikas are often called Śaivas since they look upon Śiva as their tutelary deity. One can notice that almost all Naiyāyikas were the worshippers of Śiva and in olden days the system was known as Śaivadarsāna.²

¹ Mānameyodaya, Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1975, p.9
² Gaṇakārikā, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda, 1961, Introduction, pp.1-3
Bhasarvajna too takes his due place among logicians like Uddyotakara and Vācaspatimiśra - all Śaivaites. His Gaṇakārikā a work on Śaivasiddhānta strengthens this supposition in addition to the fact that he begins his works after saluting Śiva.

(5) He was the first to synthesize the system of Brahmanic logic by adopting many features from the Buddhist and Jaina systems. Like the Buddhist and Jaina writers he too divided inference into that for oneself (svārthānumāna) and that for the sake of others (parārthānumāna). Other topics in which such influence can be noticed are the fallacies of the minor term, fallacies of example etc.

(6) That Bhāsarvajña has been influenced by the Jaina logic can be inferred from the nature of the treatment of many topics. But his relation with the Jainas were rather congenial. The Jaina logicians also quoted the Brahmanic writers in an academic spirit rather than out of rivalry. All these factors have prompted Bhāsarvajña to maintain a congenial relation with Jain writers and accept some of their arguments in as much as they are helpful to his concepts. He has referred to the views of many important logicians of the Jaina school like Bhadrabāhu, Umāsvāti, Siddhasena Divākara, Bhaṭṭa Akalanka and Māṇikyanandin in the course of his works.
(7) His relation with the Buddhist writers may be noticed in another perspective. His approach is different from that of the other Hindu logicians. He was trying to establish a system of logic whose existence was threatened by the Buddhists who attracted many Brahmamic writers into their fold. He felt it his duty to bring them back to their own system. To please these converts and to stop further conversions he evolved a new system borrowing the outward form from the Buddhists while keeping the peculiar characteristics of the Hindu system. Hence, even though there are areas of agreement between Bhāsarvajña and the Buddhists there are sharp and vehement disagreements on many points. He has also referred to the views of some of the prominent Buddhist logicians like Nāgārjuna, Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Dignāga, Dharmakīrti, Kamalaśīla, Kalyāṇa Rakṣita, Śānta Rakṣita and others in his treatise.

(8) As already mentioned, Bhāsarvajña was in harmony with many of the cardinal principles of the Sāmkhya school. He has extensively quoted from Mātharavṛtti, Jayamaṅgalā and Yuktidīpikā commentaries of the Sāmkhyakārikās.

(9) He is an exponent of the Yoga system to some extent. He not only followed the school of Patañjali but also borrowed several sūtras effecting some modifications. His definition of prameyās into four, viz., Śeya, Tannivartakam, Hēnam and Tasyopāyāḥ shows the Yoga influence on his
ideas. He also prescribes Yogic practices for the attainment of final emancipation, besides treating Bhakti as a pre-requisite for mokṣa.

(10) As a Prakaraṇa text Nyāyasāra is unparalleled in many respects. It gives a clear exposition of his concepts which are acceptable even to rival schools. Its popularity is vouchsafed by the fact that eighteen commentaries were composed on it within a short period. Some logicians even go to the extent of calling him as "one of the four pillars of Indian logic."3 His commentators include scholars from different schools of philosophy, which is a clear indication of the integral nature of the work.

Somehow in later times his popularity seems to have dwindled. He was no more considered an authority. Even then some of his theories were discussed in the works of some later logicians. This may be due to the reason that at the time of Bhāsarvajña the important rivals of Brahmanic logic were Buddhists and Jainas while in a later age the Vedāntins emerged as the main adversaries. This

---

3 Dineshchandra Bhattacharya, History of Nyaya-nyāya in Mithila, Mithila Institute of Post-graduate and Research in Sanskrit Learning, Darbhanga, 1958, p.36
necessitated the later Naiyāyikas to divert their arguments against the systems which gained prominence at that time and hence the works of Bhāsarvajña were no more considered as authority. But the fact remains that Bhāsarvajña was the underlying force that developed into Navya-nyāya system of philosophy. Gaṅgeśopādhyāya, Raghunātha Śiromāṇi etc., are heavily indebted to him in many respects.

It has to be admitted that Bhāsarvajña has spearheaded a renaissance in the field of Hindu logic. He released it from the hold of orthodox logicians and developed it on new lines and this in the long run resulted in the formulation of Navya-nyāya logic.

It may be concluded that Bhāsarvajña was a logician of great perspective and originality of thought. Steeped in the ancient tradition he set his ideals towards a progressive goal. He thus revitalised the system of Indian logic synthesizing its concept with other schools of Indian philosophy, thus regaining the power which the Hindu logical system lost with the advent of the Buddhist system.