CHAPTER III

NYĀYASĀRA AND ITS COMMENTARIES

INTRODUCTION

As already referred to the Nyāyasāra is an early manual of Indian logic having several original features. Many topics which are discussed elaborately in the Nyāyasūtra are not dealt with in Bhāsarvajña's treatise but on the other hand many topics which are not discussed by Gautama are treated in an elaborate manner. In fact Bhāsarvajña breaks many a traditional theory of the earlier Naiyāyikas and introduces new theories supported by his own arguments. The work belongs to the class of a prakaraṇa and naturally due to the importance of the work, which was composed when Buddhism and Jainism were at its highest glory in Kashmir, many commentaries were written on the work.

EIGHTEEN COMMENTARIES

Bhāsarvajña's bias to Buddhism and Jainism is well known and he was held in high esteem by scholars of both these sects. It was they who pointed out that there were eighteen commentaries on Nyāyasāra though only a few
are available at present. Maladhāri Rājaśekhara was the first to point out this. In his work Saddarśanasamuccaya he observes:  

"bhāsarvajñō nyāyasāratarkasūtravidhāyakah
nyāyasārābhidhe tarke tīkā āsthādaśa sputāṁ
nyāyabhūṣāṇāṁ āmi tu tīkā tāsau prasiddhibhāk".

Similarly sage Guṇaratna in his commentary called vṛtti on Saddarśanasamuccaya has mentioned that there are eighteen commentaries on Bhāsarvajña’s work. He observes as follows.  

"Bhāsarvajñāpranīte nyāyasāre āsthādaśa tīkāḥ;
tāsu mukhyā tīkā nyāyabhūṣānakhyā, nyāyakalikā jayantaviracitā, nyāyakusumāṇjalitarkasāca".

These references show that there were at least eighteen commentaries written on the work by 1348 A.D., since Maladhāri Rājaśekhara’s time is supposed to be 1348 A.D. We do not know whether any further Sanskrit commentaries were composed on the work at a later period. It is quite possible that some more commentaries in Sanskrit are

1 Saddarśanasamuccaya, Yaśovijaya Jaina Granthamālā, Benares, p.64
2 Saddarśanasamuccayavṛtti, Yaśovijaya Jaina granthamālā Benares, p.64
composed at a later period. In addition to these there is a Marathi commentary by Rangacarya Balakrishnacarya Reddi of Karnataka.

**COMMENTARIES AND COMMENTATORS**

Among the eighteen commentaries only sixteen are known by name the other two being anonymous. Of these only twelve are so far recovered. The sixteen commentaries which are known to us by name and the other two making a total of eighteen are as follows:

1. Nyāyabhūṣāṇam of Bhāsarvajña
2. Nyāyamuktāvalī of Aparārkadeva
3. Nyāyakalāṇidhi of Ānandānubhava
4. Nyāyatātparyādīpikā of Jayasimha
5. Nyāyasārapadapanicikā of Vāsudevasūri
6. Nyāyasāravicāra of Bhaṭṭarāghava
7. Nyāyanayāmbudhi of Rāmabhaṭṭa
8. Nyāyasāratikā by Vijayasimha Gani
9. Nyāyasāratikā by Jayatīrtha

---

3 For a list of the commentaries though not complete on Nyāyasāra, see Satischandra Vidyabhusana, Nyāyasāra, Asiatic Society, Calcutta 1910, Introduction, pp.6-7

S. Subrahmania Sastri, Nyāyasāraḥ, Madras Government Oriental Series No.CLXXII, Madras, Introduction, p.11 and

Dr. Umaramana Jha, Nyāyasārevicāra, Shri Ranbir Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Kashmir, 1976, pp.7-9
10. Nyāyakalānīdhi of Mādhevaśarman
11. Vyākhyāratnam of Vidyāsāgara
12. Śisūhitaiśīpi of Ratnapuri
13. Nyāyabhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇa of Vāsudeva
14. Nyāyabhūṣaṇaprakāśa of Gaddāharamiśra
15. Nyāyakusumānjaliṭīkā of Anonymous authorship
16. Nyāyakalikā of Jayanta
17. Anonymous commentary
18. Anonymous commentary

COMMENTARIES - AN ACCOUNT

The fact that there are eighteen commentaries goes a long way to establish the greatness of the work as well as the authority of its author. His leanings towards Buddhism and Jainism are attested by the fact that scholars belonging to both the sects are attributed with the authorship of some of the well known commentaries. Among the sixteen known commentaries one is an auto-commentary named Nyāyabhūṣaṇam coming from the pen of Bhāsarvajña. The other commentaries highlight the importance of the work from various angles. A short account of the commentaries is attempted here.

1) Nyāyabhūṣaṇam

This is the oldest and unique commentary on

4 Nyāyabhūṣaṇam edited by Swamiyogindrananda, Saddarśana-prakāśana pratiśthanam, Varanasi 1968. This edition also contains short foot notes given by the editor.
Nyāyasāra written by Bhāsarvajña himself. It is an independent and elaborate commentary on Nyāyasāra couched in a very scholastic language. The author examines the validity of each term in the definition and discusses the important theories of other philosophers both of the Nyāya as well as of the other systems. He establishes his own theories after examining the rival theories and rejecting them one by one. He deals with a variety of topics connected with the various systems of philosophy making it difficult to follow the work to those who desires to have a first hand knowledge of the system. Almost all the doctrines of the early Nyāya system are discussed by him. He criticises and rejects the rival theories of other logicians which go against his doctrines. He is not even averse to criticise the Sūtrakara. The Buddhists, the Jainas, the Sāmkhyas, the Mīmāṃsakas, the Vaiśeṣikas, etc., became the target of his criticism.

In the first chapter, as in the Nyāyasāra, the author accepts only three pramāṇas, viz., Perception, Inference and Verbal testimony and includes all other pramāṇas under these three. Similarly, as stated in his treatise, he tries to establish in this work that Gautama also has accepted mainly three pramāṇas. Eight different theories held by the different schools of logicians regarding the status of the content of erroneous judgement - khyātis -
viz., Akhyāti, Asatkhyāti. Prasiddhārthakhyāti, Alaukikakhyāti, Smṛtivipramoṣaḥ, Ātmakhyāti, Anirvacaniyakhyāti and Anyathākhyāti are discussed and the author supports the last one which is accepted by the Nyāya school. The Cārvāka view that all cognitions are merely causes of doubt and that neither knowledge nor error can ever be possible since one can never be sure about the truth or falsity of a cognition is analysed and proved to be untenable. The question whether the validity of knowledge is intrinsic (svataḥ prāmāṇya) or extrinsic (parataḥ prāmāṇya) is raised by the author and he supports the theory of extrinsic validity of knowledge. His definition of Karaṇa (instrument) and the discussion upon it touches the areas of logic, grammar and epistemology. Since the Nyāya theory of perception accepts the reality of the whole (avayāvi) as well as of the parts (avayava) the author enters into a very interesting discussion on the topic quoting from the works of Buddhist logicians like Dharmakīrti, etc., and justifies the orthodox Nyāya view that the whole is not merely an integration of the parts, but is separately existent, in contradistinction to the Yogācāra Buddhist doctrine of the unreality of the whole as well as parts. The argument that the judgement and its object are in fact identical because they are always realised together (sahopalambhāniyama of Dharmakīrti) is analysed and rejected on the basis that it is impossible
to establish beyond doubt that the judgement and its objects are always realised together. Bhāsarvajña also rejects the Vaiśeṣika theory that action (karma), quality (guṇa), number (sammhāra), separateness (prthaktva), disjunction (vibhāga), distance (paratva), nearness (aparatva) and impulse (vega) are separate entities. He never accepts the view that oiliness (śneha) is the quality of water alone pointing out that oiliness exists in ghee and such other objects. General problems of perception and the Buddhist definitions as given by Dignāga, Dharmakirti, etc., are analysed and criticised by him. The six types of sense-object contact (Sannikarśa) are discussed and justified. Here Bhāsarvajña emerges as the great advocate of the yogic variety of perception.

In the second chapter of the work the author examines the definition of inference (anumāna) as given in the Nyāyasāra. In this connection he discusses the threefold classification of inference accepted by earlier Naiyāyikas and rejecting them establishes that there are two types of inferences known as svārtha (for one's own sake) and parārtha (for the sake of others). The views of Cārvākas refuting the validity of inference is rejected. He offers different theories regarding the knowledge of pervasion (vyāpti) and criticises them. While discussing the topic on hetu or liṅga (reason) he considers the
problem of universal (sāmānya) also. Bhartrhari's theory of sphota is rejected by Bhāsarvajña on the basis that the cluster of letters or audible sounds make up a word and the group of words make up a sentence. Different theories regarding the nature of the sentence are analysed and the author supports anvītābhidhāna theory. Bhāsarvajña also rejects Dharmakīrti's division of hetu (reason) and he discusses casuality and induction extensively quoting from Dharmakīrti and Prajñākaragupta, only to criticise them. Six fallacious reasons (hetvābhāsas) are accepted by the author against the five accepted by the earlier Naiyāyikas. Similarly apart from the twenty-four jatis (generic attributes), he cites some more like ananyasama, sampratipattisama and vyavasthāsama.

In the third chapter, Bhāsarvajña establishes the validity of verbal testimony as a separate source of knowledge, rejecting the Buddhist arguments. He favours the view that Vedic scriptures are composed by the omnicient and are without error but rejects the Mīmāṃsaka view that they are eternal and without any known author. As pointed out, Bhāsarvajña refutes all the other means of knowledge including upamāna declaring that all of them come under the three viz., Perception, Inference and Verbal testimony. He argues that even the Sātrakāra accepted these three mainly
and there is a long discourse in connection with this in which he successively examines the views of all the other systems of philosophy. Twelve objects of knowledge (prameyas) found listed in the Nyāyasūtra are discussed one by one quoting relevant sutras. He accepts two kinds of self individual and supreme. The existence of God Mahēśvara is established through inference and verbal testimonies. The atheistic arguments of the Śāmkhya and the Mīmāṁsaka are effectively rejected. The Buddhist theory of universal flux, the Jain theory of seven tattvas, anekāntavāda, etc., the Śāmkhya doctrine of Satkāryavāda, the Advaita theory of non-dualism etc., are examined and rejected. Accepting the Nyāya theory of dualism he prescribes the yogic practices for the attainment of Release (Mokṣa).

The most important argument in the Nyāyasūtra in contrast to the earlier Naiyāyikas is that ultimate release (Mokṣa) is attended by the experience of eternal pleasure. Bhāsarvajña discusses the views of some of the renowned logicians in his work. One of them is Viswarūpacārya whose details are not known to us. He is said to have written a commentary on Nyāyabāṣya and Durvekamisra supports this view. Viśvarūpa's arguments are also

5 Nyāyabāṣyanam, op. cit., p.167
visvarūpaprabhṛtayopyevameva vyācaksate.

6 Dharmottarapradīpa, Jaiswal Research Institute, Patna, 1955, p.175
nyāyabhāṣyatīkāvarttikayorvisvarūpoddyotakaravāhatūḥ.
discussed by Vādīrāja in his work. Another logician mentioned by Bhāṣarvajña is Adhyayanapāda, a commentator on Uddyotakara’s vārttika. Durvekamīśra applauds this commentary and its name is mentioned as Rucitīkā. Karnākagomin also has quoted the views of Adhyayanapāda, in his work. The other Naiyāyikas mentioned and discussed in this work are Trilocana, Vācaspatimīśra and Jayantabhaṭṭa. Among them Trilocana is the preceptor of Vācaspatimīśra and is mentioned by Durvekamīśra, Ratnakīrti and Vādīrāja. He is said to have composed a commentary on Nyāyabhāṣya, which is not available at present.

Among the Śāmkhya philosophers he mentions the name one Mādhava though the details about the particular person are not known to us. In discussing the Śāmkhya systems he follows the Śāmkhyaśārika and the Māṭharavṛtti and the Jayamangalāvyākhyā on it. Among the Vaiśeśikas he

---

7 Nyāyaviniścayavivarana, Bharatiya Jnanapitha, Kasi, 1944, p.58
atrīha viśvarūpah ...
8 Dharmottarapradipa,opcit., p.175
adhyayanapādaḥ punaḥ rucitīkāyāmidamavocat...
9 Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāra-vṛtti, Jaiswal Research Institute, Patna, 1953, p.98
Adhyayanastvāha ....
10 Nyāyabhūṣaṇam, opcit., p.569
mādhavamatābbhyupagame tu samkhyaṇāśa eva syāt...
quotes only Kanāda and Praśastapāda. The Mīmāṃsakas quoted by him are Jaimini, Kumārilabhatṭa and the Prābhākaras. He mentions and discusses the views of the Buddhist logicians like Nāgārjuna, Vasubandhu, Dignāga, Dharmakīrti, Prajñākara-gupta, Dharmottarācārya, Śāntarakṣita, Kamalasāla, Karṇakagomin etc. Among the Jaina philosophers the names of Umāsvati, Siddhasena Divākara, Samantabhadra, Akalanka, etc., are mentioned by him. The Cārvāka system is referred to here as Gurumata or Gurusūtra. He also discusses the views of Vedāntins, Śaivas, Pāśupatas, and Śāktas. The name of one Tausalācārya\textsuperscript{11} is also mentioned by him though no details about him are available.

Nyāyabhūṣāṇa is referred to by several logicians. Maladārī Rājaśekhara and Sage Guṇaratna consider it as the most important and exalted commentary on Nyāyasāra. In another commentary, Nyāyabhūṣāṇa is referred to as vast as an ocean.\textsuperscript{12} There are so many references in philosophical literature to this work of Bhāsarvajña. Thus for instance, Valla bhācārya in his work mentions Bhūṣāṇa condemning its author for refuting some of the views of the Vaiśeṣikas.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11} ibid., p.277

\textsuperscript{12} Nyāyasāra with comm. Nyāyasārapadapāñcikā of Vāsudeva, ed. by V.S. Abhyenkar and C.R. Devadhar, Oriental Book Agency, Poona, 1922, p.98

\textsuperscript{13} Nyāyalilāvati, ed. Mengesh Ramakrishna Telang, Pandurang Javaji, Nimayasagar Press, Bombay, 1937, pp.357-8

\textsuperscript{13} taddidam ciraṁTanavaiśeṣikamatadūṣaṇam bhūṣāṇakārasyātirāpikaram ...
Udayana has also examined the views of Nyāyabhūsana. The author of Nyāyacandrikā refers to this work in connection with the topic of mokṣa. The importance of this work can be understood from the fact that the views in it were studied and discussed by scholars. The Mimāṃsā texts like Bhāvanāviveka, Prakaraṇapāṇcikāvyākhyā, the Vedānta works like Gītānandavardhini, Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakādyavāyākha, Tattvapradīpa and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika works like Nyāyakusumānjali, Tārnikaraksā, Tarkabhāṣāprakāśa etc., have discussed the views of this work. The Jaina works like Nyāyaviniścayavivaraṇa, Siddhiviniścayatīkā, Syādvādaratnākara, Syādvādamañjari, etc., also contain various references to this work. Among the Buddhist texts Apohasiddhi, Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi, etc., contain references to Bhūsana.

In short this is a unique commentary and its contribution to the development of the Nyāya system of philosophy is really great. Its production is considered as one of the most exciting events in the history of scholarship on Indian philosophy in general and Nyāya philosophy in particular, for the doctrines in this work

14 Kirnāvall, Jitendra S. Jethly, Oriental Institute, Maharaja Sayajirao University, Baroda, p.64
varām bhūṣaṇaḥ, karmāpi guṇaḥ...

(2) Nyāyamuktāvaliḥ

This commentary on Nyāyasāra was written by a king named Aparārka or Aparādityadeva. The work is also known by the name vr̥tti or vivṛtti. It is believed that the author, king Aparārka ruled over the kingdom of Konkan in the early decades of the twelfth century A.D. It is observed that Aparārka lived between 1115 and 1130 A.D., and he was a contemporary of king Jayasimha of Kashmir who lived about 1129 to 1150 A.D. He was the son of Anantadeva and grandson of Nāgārjuna and traces his descent to Jīmūtavāhana. King Aparārka is credited with two monumental works, the commentary on Nyāyasāra and commentary on Yājñavalkyasmr̥ti. Aparārka introduces himself in glowing terms as a virtuous king endowed with good qualities whose fame has reached even the quarters and ruling over the whole earth. He also declares that his work is like an ocean of the essence of the Śāstras and surpasses all other works in the field washing away 'pseudo

---

16 Karl H. Potter, Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1977, Vol. II, p. 6

17 Nyāyasāraḥ with comm. Nyāyamuktāvaliḥ and Nyāya-kalānidihi, Madras Government Oriental Series No. CLXVII, Madras, 1961

18 P.V. Kane, History of Dharmāstra, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1941, Vol. I, p. 94
arguments' which are similar to darkness and claims that it will survive for all time as the moon and the stars.¹⁹

This is an exhaustive and unique commentary prepared on the lines of Nyāyabhūṣaṇa. Desirous of making the work as exhaustive as possible, the author examines the significance of each word in the text and brings in all the controversial topics of other systems of thought. He then examines their propriety and rejects them establishing the Nyāya view, despite the fact that he was a staunch believer of Advaita. As one scholar observes "like Vācaspatimisra and Udayana who, though staunch believers of Advaita, wrote works on other śāstras and explained their tenets according to the traditions of the respective śāstras, at times even condemning Advaita only for the enrichment of those śāstras, Aparārka, though a staunch believer of Advaita wrote Nyāyamuktāvalī according to the Nyāya traditions condemning Advaita wherever it was opposed to his treatise. He condemns herein anirvacaniyakhyāti, self luminosity of knowledge, Ajñānavāda, three grades of reality and so on. He even speaks of Advaita as contradictory to the sūtras of Bādarāyana not on the conviction that they are favourable to Nyāya but unfavourable to Advaita which professes to express the purport of those

¹⁹ ibid., part II, p.168
sūtras. Thus, in the portion explaining the nature of valid knowledge, the author brings in the erroneous cognition as a contrast and discusses all the five khyātis. Following Bhāsarvajña, Aparārka includes ūha and anadhyayasāya (conjecture and non-apprehension) in doubt (samśaya) after examining the rival views and rejecting them. According to him tarka (syllogism) is not different from Samśaya (doubt) even though it is mentioned separately due to the importance of it. Out of the twenty-four qualities (guṇas) accepted by the Vaiśeṣikas, Aparārka, following Bhūṣaṇa rejects Saṅkhyā (number), parimāṇa (size), prthaktva (separateness) vibhāga (disjunction), paratva (remoteness), aparatva (nearness) and vega (impulse) as independent qualities. Taking up number (saṅkhyā) he says oneness (ekatva) is non-difference (abheda) and numbers two and above can be merged with difference (bheda). Size is not a separate quality since the conceptions, small, big, etc., are only relative. Similarly, separateness (prthaktva) is nothing but difference. Disjunction is the absence of conjunction and hence not a separate quality. Remoteness and nearness (paratva and aparatva) are only the numerical superiority and inferiority and hence have no place among the guṇas. Impulse (vega) is the generation of motion.

---

20 S. Subrahmania Sastri, *ibid.*, Introduction, p.13
in quick succession as in the case of a moving object. Discussing generality (sāmānya) Aparārka accepts both the old and new views of the Naiyāyikas that Jāti pervades all objects including the other Jātis but is manifest only in that particular object, and the Neonaiyāyika view that it pervades only that particular object and which also accepts the intermingling of Jātis. Discarding the Vaiśeṣika argument, Aparārka includes action (karma) under quality and cites the Bhūṣana and gives a definition which pervades both guṇas and karma. In his view the word guṇa signifies dependence and not colour, taste, etc. Among the dravyas (substances) he rejects kāla (time) and dik (space) as separate dravyas on the basis that there is no proof for the existence of paratva and aparatva themselves, and Īśvara will take the place of kāla.

Accepting the origin of the world from atoms Aparārka breaks all the accepted theories of Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas regarding the process of world creation. Their argument is that two atoms join together to form a diad (dvāṅuka) and the conjunction of three diads produces, a triad. Aparārka asks why not three atoms produce a triad or two atoms produce a big particle. He condemns the view that the atomic size will bring about only an atomic size of a superior nature as a result of which the size of the diad is not produced by the size of the atom
as it is not superior to it and the size of the triad is not the product of the size of the diad as it does not belong to the same class and accepts three atoms giving birth to a triad and two atoms to a big particle (mahat) saying that atomic size can produce a big size. Aparārka accepts only three pramanas, viz., pratyakṣa, anumāṇa and āgama and includes all others under these three. He also supports the Bhāsarvajña view that Gautama accepted only three though he has mentioned upamāṇa separately. Ultimate release (mokṣa) is, according to Aparārka, not only the cessation of worldly bondages but also experience of eternal pleasure and asserts that the pleasure experienced at the time of mokṣa is higher than the pleasures acquired by the attainment of heaven. The author also criticises the doctrines such as the illusoriness of the world, ajñāna, three kinds of reality, the self luminous sākṣi knowledge, self validity of knowledge and the satkāryavāda, kṣaṇikavāda, anaikāntavāda, etc., in this work.

Among the other logicians, Aparārka quotes many earlier writers on Nyāya and also other systems of philosophy. One of them is Vācaspatimiśra, whom he quotes with high reverence though he disagrees with him in the matter of extrinsicality of valid cognitions - jñānānām parataḥ prāmāṇyam. Jayantabhaṭṭa, author of Nyāyamañjarī is another logician mentioned by Aparārka, quoting him often
in support of his own arguments. The style of the work itself is on the lines of Nyāyamañjari. Another logician quoted by the author is Udayanaśārya for whom Aparārka had great regard though he never hesitates to controvert the former. Timirāra, who seems to be a Mīmāṃsaka and a follower of the Prabhākara school is mentioned by Aparārka with high regard. But there is no mention of the particular work under reference work and the person is not identified. Another Mīmāṃsaka known as Mahāvrata considered to be a follower of the Prabhākara school is also mentioned by the author. It is presumed that this Mahāvrata has written a work on Mīmāṃsā since his name is referred to in Nyāyaviveka and Prabodhacandrodaya. His views on self validity of knowledge is discussed and condemned by Aparārka.

Among the Buddhists, Aparārka discusses mainly Dharmakirti's views and condemns them on various occasions. He also discusses the views of the Buddhist monk Ānāśāri. Among the Mīmāṃsakas, the author quotes the works of Kamalaśīla, Prabhākara and Śālikānātha and their views are

21 Nyāyaviveka, op. cit.
mahāvratenaḥk tam āmradanyat madhuraśārkara ityudāḥṛtya...

22 Prabodhacandrododaya, Ed. Sitakrishna Nambiars, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Act. II.
... mahāvratī neksīta...
often rejected. Kumārila's theories of self-validity of
cognitions, non-origination of the Vedas, the eternality
of varṇas (letters) and words (pada), the all pervasive
color character of colour, the validity of arthāpatti, upamāna
etc., are discussed and rejected. Among the Prābhākara
school the author examines and rejects topics such as
Akhyāti, arthāpatti as a separate means of knowledge,
śakti as a distinct category, etc. He also rejects the
Sāmkhya views of satkāryavāda etc., along with the argu-
ments of Vācaspatimisra in support of the Sāmkhya doctrines.
Among the Vaiśeṣikas he generally agrees with Praśastapāda
though at times he disagrees with him. He vehemently cri-
ticises the Vaiśeṣika views quoting Kaṇḍa, Udayana, etc.
The syādvāda and anāikāntavāda of the Jainas are rejected
but no logician is mentioned by name. Other logicians
like Āśāmbara, Uddyotakara, Kāśikākara, Vallabhačārya,
Śrīdhara, Vyomaśiva, etc., are mentioned by him. In
writing this useful commentary on Nyāyasāra, Aparārka
seems to have followed the very lines of Nyāyabhūṣaṇa.
The author's aim in composing this work seems to be the
re-establishment of Bhūṣaṇa's views by answering the attacks
levelled against it by other logicians. The author is seen
defending the Bhūṣaṇa whenever an opposition is levelled
against it. Written in a simple style the author
summarises in verses his arguments at the end of each topic. This is a praiseworthy work to be studied and it stands in equal terms with the Nyāyabūshaṇa.

(3) Nyāyakalāṇidhi

This is another commentary on Nyāyasāra written by Ānandānubhava or Viśvanāthaśarma a reputed scholar both in Vedānta and in Nyāya. His time is calculated to be between 1150 and 1250 A.D., on the basis that Ānandagiri, a commentator on Ānandānubhava's Padārthatattvavaniṇīya and Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī, lived about 1320 A.D. Ānandānubhava's works are also quoted by Citsukhācārya who lived about 1250 A.D., in his Tattvapradīpikā. So 1250 A.D. is the upper limit of Ānandānubhava's time and since Ānandānubhava quotes the Nyāyamakaranda of Ānandabodha who lived about 1150 A.D., it is the earliest time limit which can be ascribed to Ānandānubhava. Hence it can be safely concluded that he lived about the middle of the thirteenth century A.D.

Ānandānubhava has written three more works on Darśanas apart from this commentary on Nyāyasāra, viz.,

Nyāyakalāṇidhi in its present form is incomplete. The work opens with a benedictory verse and the available portion of the first chapter ends with the portion dealing with vipratipatti. Again it emerges with the kevalānvayi portion in the second chapter. This is a simple commentary on Nyāyasāra dealing with all the topics of the text and providing all information required about the subject. The author never indulges in discussing other topics or arguments of other logicians or philosophical systems, except when it is found absolutely necessary to discuss the rival theories to make a clear understanding of the subject. Dealing with Samāya (doubt) the author holds that the five-fold division of doubt is the view of a group of logicians and that he is in favour of a three-fold division of it. Among the nigrahasthānas it seems that the author considers aprāptakāla, ādhiyā and nyūnatva which have not been mentioned by Bhāsarvajña saying that these were included in apārtha, punarukta and apasiddhānta respectively. He mentions the views of Bhattas in connection with non-eternity of words and the superfluousness of similar and dissimilar instances of sense organs. He very rarely discusses the views of old Naiyāyikas, Neo-naiyāyikas, Buddhists, etc.
The style of the work is generally lucid. The author gives the meaning of each and every difficult word and clearly brings out the purport of the theories. His aim in writing the work is to give a first hand knowledge of Nyāyasāra. It may also be noted that the author in his Padārthatattvaniṁśa, which is a manual on Nyāya philosophy, closely follows Nyāyasāra, sometimes using the very expressions of that work.

(4) Nyāyatātparyadīpikā

This is another important commentary on Nyāyasāra written by a Jaina sage of Śvetāmbara sect known as Jayasimha Śūri.24 From the autobiographical note given by him at the end of the work it is gathered that he was a disciple of Mahendra Śūri of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kacchala and the spiritual grandfather of Nayacandra Śūri, the author of Hammīra Mahākāvya and is mentioned in the work.25 In the 14th chapter of his work Nayacandra Śūri states that he was in lineal descent the grandson of poet Jayasimha Śūri but in respect of poetical composition, his son. His purpose in writing the commentary is to give a clear understanding

24 Nyāyasārah with the comm. Nyāyatātparyadīpikā, Ed. by Satischandra Vidyabhusana, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1910

of the subject which is otherwise difficult to understand since it is full of terse Nyāya doctrines. The age of Jayasimha Sūri is calculated to be 14th century, A.D., since Kumārapālacarita, another work by the same author is dated Samvat 1422 which corresponds to A.D. 1365.

The work is a very learned commentary on Nyāyasaṅga. The author frequently refers to the views of Nyāyabhaṅga. He refers to Bhāsarvajña as "Śāstrakāracakravartī" — the emperor among logicians. The author examines the propriety of each term, gives its meaning and explains clearly the purport of each of the sentences given in the text. In order to make a clear understanding of the subject he cites his own examples. He never indulges in very long discussions, at the same time he refers to the views of other logicians wherever it is unavoidable. But all his discussions on almost all the topics are based on the Nyāyabhaṅga. At the end of each topic the author summarises the content of the conclusions in a very beautiful, simple and short verses so that it may be easily grasped by a student of logic.

Following Bhāsarvajña's view, the author divides doubt into five varieties and rejects the rival views that doubt is nothing more than error (bhṛṇṭi). He includes ūha and anadhyavasāya in doubt. Coming to the portion on Viparyaya he accepts the eight types of Vipratipattis enumerated in the Nyāyabhaṅga. He also supports Bhāsarvajña's
view that there are only three pramāṇas. The other schools of philosophy referred to by the author are Advaita, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya, Buddhism, Jainism and the Cārvāka. Śrīdhara, the author of Nyāyakandali, Bhaṭṭācārya (probably Kumārila Bhaṭṭa), Vācaspatimiśra, Uddyotakara, etc., are mentioned by him. Among the works referred to by him include Praśastapādabhāṣya, Sāṃkhyasaptati, Sāṃkhyakārikā and Yogasūtra of Hemacandrasūri. The views of one Laghunaiyāyika is also referred to in this work but no details about the person are available.

The work is very valuable and indispensable for the proper study of Nyāya system especially the doctrines of Bhāsarvajña since it is mainly written to justify and establish his views. The great popularity that Bhasarvajña enjoyed among the Jainas can be inferred from the fact that a Jaina monk wrote a commentary on his work.

(5) Nyāyasārapadapañcikā

This is a very short commentary of Nyāyasāra. The author is Vāsudeva otherwise known as Vasūdeva Sūri, a native of Kashmir. His father's name was Sūrya. No

other data about his personality is available. But one of the editors\textsuperscript{27} apparently tries to establish that he was a Keralite, whose family migrated from Kashmir and settled in Kerala. He also tries to identify him with the author of Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya, who was well-versed in various sciences and a contemporary, and court poet of king Kulaśekhara alias Rājaśekhara, the author of the famous devotional lyric Mukundamāla and fixes his time as the latter part of the eighth and the earlier part of the ninth century A.D. But this view seems to be untenable since the time of the author of Nyāyasāra is supposed to be the later half of the 10th century A.D. Apart from this the colophon clearly indicates that Vāsudeva was a native of Kashmir. Whether he was an immigrant in Kerala is still to be proved.

It is not possible to fix the date of Vāsudeva, the commentator. But at the end of the work he refers to Nyāyabhūṣaṇa and never mentions any other commentaries on Nyāyasāra. Hence one may fix his date just after Bhāsarvajña, that is about the last quarter of the 10th century and first half of 11th century A.D. Another editor of the work is in support of this view,\textsuperscript{28} and holds that

\textsuperscript{27} K. Sambasiva Sastri, \textit{op.cit.}, Introduction, pp.1-2

\textsuperscript{28} C.R. Devadhar, \textit{op.cit.}, Introduction, p.4
the enthusiasm and the exceptionally strong opposition that Vāsudeva displays in the commentary points to a period when the Buddhist and Jain logic systems enjoyed wide popularity and interest among the scholars. This strengthens the view that Vāsudeva flourished soon after Bhāsarvajña, and at once disproves the argument that he was a Keralite.

Like all standard commentaries, this commentary also amply illustrates the ancient style of bhāsyas and vārttikas elucidating the abstruse tenets of the Nyāya system in brief and lucid sentences. It is unmarred by the characteristics of the dry, hard and dragging style of other commentaries like Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, and tries to give a clear understanding of the text. But in dealing with points of defeat (nigrahasthāna) the commentator includes Netuhāni, Pakṣahāni, Pratijñāvisoṣahāni, etc., under Pratijñāhāni and states that Bhūṣaṇakāra had accepted this view. In almost all other portions the commentator strictly follows Bhāsarvajña.

Other philosophers mentioned by him are Vaiśeṣikas, Naiyāyikas, Buddhists, Jainas, Mīmāṃsakas and Cārvākas. No philosopher is mentioned by name except one Bhattācārya (probably Kumārila-bhaṭṭa). He also quotes the aphorisms of Pāṇini and also some passages from Upaniṣads. It seems
that Vāsudeva has mentioned another commentary on Nyāyasāra named Bhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇa. In the portion dealing with 
pratijñāhāṇī, Vāsudeva states "evam pratijñāviṣeṣaṇa-
hānyādayośmābhīrbhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇe bhīhitāḥ tatraiva jñātavyāh." 29
The second word bhūṣaṇa is missing in one of the editions 30
and hence it is doubtful whether the author has in mind the
Nyāyabhūṣaṇa or another commentary styled Bhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇa.

This is a very brief commentary written in a
simple language and hence very helpful for the study of
Nyāyasāra. As the author has pointed out at the end of
the work, he has designed the work for those who are unable
to follow an exhaustive commentary like Nyāyabhūṣaṇa.

(6) Nyāyasāravicārah

The author of this work 31 is known as Bhaṭṭa
Rāghava or Rāghavabhaṭṭa. He is the son of Sāraṅga and
his time is supposed to be A.D.1352, on the basis of an
account given by him at the end of the work about the date
of composition. The ambiguous reference may be construed
as Śaka 1174 or 1274 which corresponds to 1252 A.D. or

---

29 Nyāyasāra, Ed. by K. Sambasiva Sastri, op.cit., p.81
30 In the edition of C.R. Devadhar the word bhūṣaṇa alone
is found instead of bhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇa. See C.R. Devadhar,
op.cit., p.57
31 Nyāyasāravicārah, Ed. by Dr. Umaramana Jha, Sri Ranbir
Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Jammu, 1976
1352 A.D. A historian of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophy prefers the former date while the editor favours the latter.\textsuperscript{33}

The editor distinguishes between Bhaṭṭa Rāghava and Rāghavabhaṭṭa, the well known personality in Kāvyā, Tantra and Dharmaśāstra literatures. Rāghavabhaṭṭa was the author of the commentaries on Abhijñānaśākuntala, Uttararāmacarita, Mālatīmādhava, Kalitattvamāna, Padarthā-darsātika, etc. There are reasons to think that both are one and the same person.\textsuperscript{34} Bhaṭṭa Rāghava was the disciple of Vādindra who was the chief preceptor of king Śrīsimha of the 14th century A.D. But there is no clear indication with regard to the place where he flourished but he is often supposed to be a South Indian. He is an ardent devotee of Lord Śiva as can be inferred from the benedictory verses occurring in the first, second and third chapters and from the concluding stanzas of the work. This is a short commentary written in a scholastic style. Like the other commentaries he discusses briefly the arguments

\textsuperscript{32} Gopinath Kaviraj, Gleanings from the history and Bibliography of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature, Indian Studies Past & Present, Calcutta, 1961, p.31

\textsuperscript{33} Umaramana Jha, op. cit., Introduction, p.15

\textsuperscript{34} ibid., pp.17-18
of the rival philosophers in as much as they are absolutely necessary for the exposition of the ideas of the text.

Other important logicians mentioned by him are Udayanācārya, Vācaspatimiśra, Vārāti̊kakāra, Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and Trilocaṇācārya. He quotes the system of Nyāya, Vaishēśika, Saṁkhya, Buddhist, Jaina, Vedāṇta and Cārvāka philosophies. The books mentioned by him include Vākyapadīṭya, Nyāyabhāṣya, Nyāyatātparyadīpikā, Nyāyamuktāvalī and Nyāyasārapadapēṇcikā.

Bhaṭṭa Rāghava mentions the name of one Rāma-bhaṭṭa who tried to explain the word 'samyak' in Bhāsarvajña's definition of inference to qualify the term 'invariable concomitance', and criticises the argument. According to the editor this Rāmabhaṭṭa is yet another commentator on Nyāyasāra who has written a commentary named 'Nyāyanayāmbudhi sopānopadhēnam' and he quotes Gopinatha Kaviraj in support of his view.

(7) Nyāyanayāmbudhi

This is an unpublished commentary on Nyāyasāra composed by Rāmabhaṭṭa. There is a reference to the

35 ibid., p.27
Rāmabhaṭṭaprabhṛtayah vyavahitānyavamahamānāḥ
samyakācāśāsavīnabhāvaśceti vyākhyātavantah
36 ibid., Introduction, p.9
37 Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Ms. No.4498
author in the Nyāyasāravicāra in connection with the definition of anumāna. No details about the author is available and it is generally supposed that he was a South Indian scholar. This is a short commentary and is helpful for the study of Nyāyasāra. No peculiar or exclusive characteristic can be assigned to this work since it is written more or less on the lines of Padapāṇḍika. The work upholds the views propounded by Bhāsarvajña in the Nyāyabhūṣaṇa.

(8) Nyāyasāratīkā

This is yet another unpublished commentary on Nyāyasāra. The author of this work is a Jaina sage named Vijayasimha Gāni. No details regarding the author are available. This is a simple but authoritative commentary on Bhāsarvajña's treatise. In it the author treats the views of the Buddhist, the Jaina and other logical systems current in his time. The commentary in a lucid manner exposes all the details regarding the text and hence it is very useful for a clear understanding of the concepts enshrined in it. In the course of the gloss he mentions

38 Nyāyasāravicāra, opcit., p. 27
39 Nyāyasāratīkā by Vijayasimha Gāni, Bhandarkar Oriental Manuscripts Library, Poona, Ms. No.1888
the Buddhist logicians like Dignāga, Dharmakīrti, Prajñā-karagupta, Dharmottaracārya, etc., and Jaina sages like
the famous Siddhasena Divākara and Manikyanandin. He also
deals with the views of other philosophers and philosophical
systems in this connection. The fact that this is composed
by a Jaina sage clearly denotes the importance of the
Nyāyasāra and the great reputation it enjoyed among the
Buddhist and the Jaina logicians.

(9) Nyāyasāratīkā

Still another commentary on Nyāyasāra written
by Jayatīrtha is Nyāyasāratīkā.40 This is a very valuable
commentary on Bhāsarvajña's work. But the work is not yet
published. In the course of the work the author in his
elegant style deals with the views of the Buddhists,
Jainas, Sāmkhyas, Vaiśeṣikas and such other allied schools.
He also mentions various systems of philosophies, closely
examines their views and rejects or supports them wherever
necessary. It is a very useful commentary like Nyāya-
muktāvalī referred to earlier. No details regarding
the time or place of the author are available. But from
the name of the author it may be assumed that he was a
scholar from Kashmir and a follower of Buddha or Jaina.

40 Nyāyasāratīkā by Jayatīrtha, India Office Catalogue
No. 3132 - 1412
He shows much leanings towards the Buddhist and Jaina logical arguments and quoting from their works rejects many views of the opponents of his own theories.

(10) Nyāyaśākālanidhi

This too is an unpublished commentary on Nyāyasaṇa written by one Mādhavaśārman. There is no proof to identify or locate the place where the author lived and the time he lived. The commentary is a simple one dealing with the important topics on Nyāyasaṇa and giving a clear exposition of the text without entering into the realm of contradictory discussions. He mentions the views of the rival schools and just explains them and very often justifies the views of Bhāsarvajña. This is a useful commentary for those who require a first hand knowledge on the text.

(11) Vyākhyāratnam

This is a short unpublished commentary on Nyāyasaṇa. The author is known as Vidyāsāgaramuni or Ānanda- pūrṇa. Details regarding the native place and parentage

---

41 Nyāyakalānīdhī of Mādhavaśārman, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, Manuscript No.776 of 1884-87.
42 Vyākhyāratnam, Nyayasaraavyakhya by Vidyāsāgaramuni alias Ammapūrṇa, Kerala University Oriental Manuscripts Library collection, Ms. No.C.897
of the author are not known. But it seems that he was a Southerner since there is no mention of such a commentator in any of the works on Nyāyasāra, most of them having been produced in the North. The only manuscript which is available at present is procured from South India and it is written in the Malayalam script. Nothing definite can be said about the commentary since the only manuscript is almost completely damaged and worm-eaten making it impossible to get a readable text. But it is composed in a very simple language as can be understood from the available portion of the gloss.

(12) Śiṣhūtaiśiṇī

This is another unpublished commentary which also is not complete. Only 580 granthas of this rare work are available.43 This is a very simple commentary couched in an elegant Sanskrit. But its value is lessened since only a small portion of the work is available in the extent manuscript. The author of the work is one Ratnapuri or Ratnapuribhaṭṭāraka. No personal data about the author is known. From the name of the commentary it is to be gathered that it was written for the benefit of students.

---

43 Śiṣhūtaiśiṇī - Nyāyasāravyākhyā by Ratnapuribhaṭṭāraka, Kerala University Manuscripts Collections Ms. No.T.672
(13) Nyāyabhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇam

Vāsudeva Śūri, the Kashmirian author of Nyāyasāra commentary on Bhāsarvajña's treatise has referred to a work as Bhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇa, probably a commentary on some Nyāya text. The reference is as follows: 44

"Evam pratijñāviśeṣahānyādayo' smābhiḥ bhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇe' bhihitāh tatraiva jñātavyāḥ".

It is evident from the reference that it is a work by Vāsudeva himself. K. Sambasiva Sastri, the editor of Nyāyasāra in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series conjectures that Bhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇa may be another name of Nyāyabhūṣaṇa attributed to Bhāsarvajña and observes: 45

"Idam ca bhūṣaṇam bhāsarvajñasyaiva mūlakārasya prasiddham kṛtyantaram Nyāyabhūṣaṇam syāt sambhavet".

Further, the editor postulates that it is possible that Vāsudeva himself might have composed yet another commentary to bring out the ideas of Bhāsarvajña. 46

44 Nyāyasāra of Bhāsarvajña, with comm. Padapaṇcikā of Vāsudeva Śūri, Ed. K. Sambasiva Sastri, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No.109, Trivandrum, 1931, p.81
45 ibid., Preface, p.2
46 ibid.
"Tadiyagranthavakyākhyānalipsayā ca nikāmam anenaiva viracitam syāt kimapi bhūṣaṇabhūṣaṇam nāma".

(14) Nyāyabhūṣaṇaprakāśa

A scholar named Gadādharamiśra is attributed with the authorship of a commentary styled Nyāyabhūṣaṇaprakāśa on Nyāyasāra. He is referred to by Maṇikanṭhamiśra in his Nyāyaratna as follows: \(^{47}\)

"Evakāro niyatasaṁānādhikaranyam iti matāntaranirāsārtha iti Nyāyabhūṣaṇaprakāśe bhūhitam Gadādharamiśreṇa".

It is not known whether this Gadādhara is the same person who has composed works in the Navyanyāya system of logic. Further, whether this work is a commentary on Nyāyabhūṣaṇa of Bhāsarvajña is also not sure. However Gadadhara may be considered as a commentator of Bhāsarvajña.

(15) Nyāyakusumāṇjalitīkā

Guṇaratna (1409 A.D.) the famous Jaina philosopher in his Ṣaddarśanasamuccayavṛtti refers to a commentary on

\(^{47}\) Nyāyaratna of Maṇikanṭhamiśra with comm. Dyutimālikā of Nṛsīmhayajvān, Madras Government Oriental Series No. CIV, 1953, p.54
Nyāyasāra styled Nyāyakusumēṇjalitikā. Nothing further regarding the work or its author can be known.

(16) Nyāyakalikā

The name of this commentary also is mentioned by sage Guṇaratna in the course of the above-mentioned work. The author of this work is said to be one Jayanta. But no definite information regarding the author and the nature of the work are known since the work itself is not discovered so far.

(17) Anonymous commentary

Guṇaratna in his Šaḍdarsanavṛtti and Maladhāri Rājasekhara in his Šaḍdarsanasamuccaya refer to this commentary of anonymous name and authorship. No further information is available in this connection.

(18) Anonymous commentary

From the reference of the above-mentioned scholars one has to postulate the existence of an eighteenth commentary

---

48 Šaḍdarsanasmuccayanavṛtti, op.cit., p.4, see also S.C. Vidyabhusana, History of the Medieval School of Indian Logic, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, New Delhi, 1977, p.53
49 S.C. Vidyabhusana, ibid., p.53
50 S.C. Vidyabhusana, A History of Indian Logic, pp.358-59
on Nyāyasāra. Here again no further details can be known.

A MARATHI COMMENTARY

A later commentary on Nyāyasāra was written in one of the regional languages of India and that is a Marathi commentary. This is composed by Rangacarya Balakrishna Reddi of Karnataka. This is a short and simple gloss written for the benefit of students. The author tries to give a clear exposition of the text giving the meaning of the difficult passages and thus making the ideas of Bhāsarvajña understandable.

CONCLUSION

Bhāsarvajña was a logician of the Neo-Brahmanic age. True to the practice of the day he borrowed the form of his treatise from the works of the medieval school, while for the subject matter he went back to the ancient school. He composed his Nyāyasāra as a Prakaraṇa or manual of logic. Some of the commentaries of Nyāyasāra quote from Parāśara Upapurāṇa the definition given to a Prakaraṇa text in order to show that the work of Bhāsarvajña too belonged to that type. It is only natural that a Prakaraṇa type

51 Nyāyasāra with Rangacarya Balakrishna Reddi's Commentary, Dharwar, 1922
52 S.C. Vidyabhusana, A History of Indian Logic, p.356
of treatise becomes popular, as a result of which numerous commentaries are composed on it. Commentators not only explain the passages of the text fully but also answer the criticism levelled against it during the later times. This general feature can be noticed in some of the commentaries on Nyāyasāra also. Many a commentator of Bhāsarvajña has tried his best to show that the text is not vulnerable. Commentators have often anticipated objections and replied to them suitably. The fact that Bhāsarvajña has attracted at least seventeen scholars in addition to a regional scholar during the period of a few centuries shows the worth of the text. These commentaries in fact complement the text by up-dating the view of thinkers and logicians. It is a pity that all the 18 commentaries are not available at present. Further, it is a matter of regret that even some of the available commentaries are not yet published. A few are available only partly making it very difficult for the editor to try his head. If all the 18 commentaries could be compared and contrasted, one could get a complete picture of our author as a great logician of the medieval period.