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Preface

The following pages present the posthumous studies on the History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā by the late Professor Dineshchandra Bhattacharya who was a specialist in the much neglected branch of Indology—Study of Mss. His contributions on the History of Vaidyaka, Dharmaśāstra, Navya-Nyāya and Sanskrit Grammar scattered in the pages of different scholarly journals will immortalise him. It was in his mature years that he began to systamatis the results of his studies. His Bengali work—Vaiśe Navya-Nyāya-carcā was well-received and fetched for him the much coveted ‘Rabindra Prize’ from the Government of West Bengal.

It was a matter of gratification that he accepted my offer to write a volume on the History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā. He came to Mithilā and examined the Manuscript Libraries of the Mithilā Institute and Raj Darbhanga, thrown open to him. But the beckon from beyond impelled him to make hurry and he could not finish the work on the plan chalked out. His health was deteriorating rapidly and he breathed his last soon after he handed the press copy of the present work over to me.

The work, however, will show that the author collected every available material in India and abroad and gave his considered and impartial verdict on the problems taken up. It may be hoped that it will serve as an invitation to younger scholars to carry out further fruitful researches in the line.

A few minor omissions and anachronisms may be noticed. But in the absence of the author, I thought it fit to preserve his text as it is. Interested scholars may refer to his above-mentioned Bengali work for more details. The author could not
add his Introduction which would have much enhanced the value of the Volume.

Professor Bhattacharya’s MS. collection, so often referred to in these pages, has, as it is reported, been donated to the Sanskrit Sāhitya Pariṣad, Calcutta.

I take the opportunity to thank all those, particularly the authorities of the Raj Library, Darbhanga, Asiatic Society, Bengal, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, and Sarasvati Bhavana, Banaras, who allowed the author to utilize the materials at their disposal.

I also like to record with thanks the help I received from Prof. Anantalal Thakur of the Institute in carrying the work through the press and preparing the index for this volume.

22-4-58
Darbhanga

P. L. Vaidya
Director
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HISTORY OF NAVYA-NYĀYA IN MITHILĀ.

CHAPTER I

UDAYANĀCĀRYA AND HIS PREDECESSORS

Mithilā with her natural barriers and a compact social and cultural hierarchy has held her own through the millenniums against disruptive forces, and has shed lustre right from the Vedic times in all phases of human knowledge. Her literary history has no parallel for its antiquity, diversity and continuity. By far the greatest contribution, however, that Mithilā has made to the philosophical literature of India is the Nyāyadarśana, or applied Logic with a very wide sphere of operation. This system is broadly divided into two distinct schools, ancient and modern. In the following pages we shall attempt to give a brief account of the ample materials now available through further spade-work on the history and bibliography of Navya-Nyāya or the modern school of Indian Logic in Mithilā.¹

This modern school is commonly believed to have been founded by Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya, who only consolidated it. The real founder is the great Udayanācārya, who had the supreme privilege of occupying the threshold to ring out the old and usher the new age by his monumental works. On the

¹. Rai Monomohan Chakravarti Bahadur, who was a scholar of Botany and a member of the Executive Service, was, curiously enough, the first in the field and published the results of his unique labours in an 'excellent' paper (History of Navya-Nyāya in Bengal and Mithilā: JASB, 1915, pp. 259-292). He was followed notably by MM. Dr. Gopinath Kaviraja, who succeeded in unravelling many new facts (Sarasvati Bhavana Studies, Vol. III, pp. 81-157). Also S. N. Sinha's History of Tihar, 1922, pp. 108-88: App. A. Sanskrit writers of Mithilā. In this book family records were consulted for the first time. Also Dr. Vidyabhusana's History of Indian Logic, 1921, Part III.
one hand Udayana’s *Pariśuddhi* forms the last part of the surviving classics of the older school of the *Nyāya* popularly known as the Quadruplet or the Quintette, and on the other his *Kusumānjali* is up-till-now a text-book of the *Nyāya-Nyāya*. Fortunately all his works are now available in print except a major portion of the *Pariśuddhi*. These are:

1) *Lakṣaṇāvalī* (Vindhyēśvarīprasāda’s ed., 1897, pp. 13), a Vaiśeṣika manual. Its authenticity, which is sometimes questioned, is proved by a reference in the *Sarradarśanasāṅgraha* (Abhyankara’s ed. p. 221: the verse cited is from the present work) and by its several commentators viz. Śeṣa Śāṅgadhara (fl. 1500 A.D. in the *Nyāyamuktāvalī*, S. Gosvāmin’s ed., Benares, 1900, pp. 72), Bhāṭṭa Keśava of the Laugākṣi family of Benares (Ms. at Baroda: cf. *Tanjore Cat.* p. 4643), Mahādeva Somayādi (Mahādeva Puṇatāmkara’s Ms. copy at Sarasvati Bhavana, Benares) and Viśvanātha Jha of Darbhanga. Its date of composition 906 Saka (‘तकौम्बरांक’ ) is recorded in one single Ms. dated 1708 Śaṃvat (No. 594 of Sarasvati Bhavana).

2) *Lakṣaṇānālōṇa* : this long-lost *Nyāya* manual of Udayana has at last been discovered and published (*Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, XIX. i. pp. 44-52). As there was a later

1. Two foremost Maithila scholars Vācaspati II and Śaṅkara refer to the older classics as *चतुर्म्यरं* consisting of *भास्य-वार्तिक-तालयंत्रिकां-विंशुतिः*. Thus—

   वद्वत्तिप्रियसारं जयती सा चतुर्म्यरः
   तथा यदि भास्यरो यदि तत्स्योऽधिवेष्टिकः 

   वाचस्यसूत्र-न्यायतत्त्वालोके शास्त्रभक्ते ॥

   पद्ममालिका हृत्या मनसि भक्तायस्य कृतिनः
   चतुर्म्यर्यांनात्मकीमर्गं विभिन्नोऽन्निक्षिप्तः 

   शंकरस्तिलक्ष-निःशून्यनिविवर्णयायायस्मे ॥

Abhayatilakopādhyāya in the *Nyāyālakārikā* uses the happy term *प्रभास्य-न्यायमहत्तरं* adding the original *Sūtras* to the list:—‘धति न्यायमहत्तरं—

*श्रीलिनेत्रसुरिंशिद्यांश्रीश्रीभवतिकोपयोगाधिभिः—पद्मारर्यांनात्मकीमर्गपद्याः

*न्यायलकारद्रायाः* पद्ममीन्द्रायः समस्ततः ॥ (Rotograph preserved in the Mithila Institute).
work of the same name by Śivāditya Miśra the anonymous copy has been ascribed by the editor to the latter. But it is undoubtedly the lost work of Udayana. The first verse is identical with that of the Guṇakirāṇāvalī, and Śivāditya cannot possibly have borrowed Udayana’s verse to begin with. The learned editor has correctly noted that none of the numerous quotations from Śivāditya in the Chitsukhi-tīkā can be traced in the present work. We should add that both the quotations found in the Tārkikarakaśā (pp. 179 & 225) are exactly traced herein (pp. 46 & 50) and in both places the commentator Mallinātha clearly ascribes the present work to Udayana. The very first Sūtra of this manual (‘क्त्वानन्तैः प्रमा’) is quoted and refuted in the Khaṇḍana along with two others from the Kusumāṇḍali, and Śaṅkara Miśra correctly stated that it was taken from the Lakṣaṇamālā of Nyāyācārya (Śaṅkara p. 146). Śivāditya could have no claim to that title as against Udayana specially in Mithilā in the times of Śaṅkara. This elementary manual should be introduced in seminaries with great benefit to beginners.

3-4) Ātmatattvaviveka or Baudhādhyākṣa and Nyāya-Kusumāṇḍali, both published with commentaries in various editions.

5) Nyāyapariśīṣṭa or Prabodhasiddhi, a separate commentary on the 5th chapter of the Nyāyasūtra, the most intricate portion of the book (edited with Vardhamāna’s Prakāśa by N. C. Vedāntatīrtha, Calcutta, 1938). In the last verse Udayana woefully laments that his exposition will hardly find a reader in a world devoid of intellectual eminence.

6) Nyāya-vārtika-tātparya-pariśuddhi, better known as the Nibandha: About one-third of the book was published from the Asiatic Society with Vardhamāna’s Prakāśa (pp. 768).

All the above six works of Udayana, it should be carefully noticed, are complete and each of them ends suitably with con-
including verses. Only the \textit{Pariśuddhi} ends with a closing phrase:\textit{(ौति सर्व नितरज्ञित)} which is not metrical. (\textit{Tanjore Cat.}, p. 4487). But the next work is a notable exception on this point.

7) \textit{Kiraṇāvali}: the celebrated commentary on the Praśastapāda-Bhāṣya upon which a vast literature flourished in Mithilā and Bengal. It is, as is well-known, incomplete, and as far as available ends quite abruptly in the midst of the section on Buddhī in the second part of the Bhāṣya. There is not even the word \textit{ौति} at the end of the extant portion. The editor of the Varanasi edition (Chowkh. ed., p. 340) is quite wrong in stating that the section on Buddhī ends along with the extant text of the \textit{Kiraṇāvali}. As a matter of fact, more than a third of the section remains unexplained by Udayana and the particular section of the Bhāṣya ends only on page 348 of that edition. Only two alternatives are possible here. Either Udayana left it incomplete by sudden death or the last portion of the gloss was lost due to unknown causes. The first alternative seems to be more probable, though further investigation on the text of the \textit{Kiraṇāvali} is necessary.\footnote{It is learnt that a further portion of the \textit{Kiraṇāvali} has recently been discovered and is being edited by Muni Śrī Jambuvijayaji.}

The chronological order of Udayana’s works (including Nos. 1-2, which may be taken as preparatory manuals) is probably what we have given above. The \textit{Ātmatattvaviveka} is cited by name in the \textit{Kusumāṇjali} (under V. 3), both of which are mentioned in the \textit{Kiraṇāvali} (pp. 103 & 147). The \textit{Pariśuddhi} cites the \textit{Kusumāṇjali} (S.B. Ms. No. 51, under II. i. fol. 58b & under II. ii. foll. 63a & 66b. Also Baroda Ms. No. 1207 fol. 18a under V. ii), the \textit{Pariśīṣṭa} (under V. i-ii, Baroda Ms. foll. 7b, 10b & 16b) and the \textit{Ātmatattvaviveka} (under II. i fol. 585 along with \textit{Kusumāṇjali}: सुधिमहापलक्षाधकान्यतुमानालि आत्मतत्वविवेके न्यायत्वकुमालकः च कुतपरिमाणामनायासप्रपञ्च-}
Udayana and his Predecessors

नीयानि). Vāchaspati cites Praśastapāda’s elaborate definition of happiness under the caption यथार्थविद: (Tātparyaṭिकā, p. 81). Udayana explains it in the Pariśuddhi (B.I, ed pp. 531-32), without referring to the Kiraṇāvali, which evidently was not yet written or planned.

It is clear that Udayana wrote the independent treatises before the commentaries. We have left out Nos. 1-2 from this investigation, as they are to be taken as mere appendices to Nos. 6-7; both of them borrow benedictory verses from No. 6, which was composed evidently before them.

UDAYANA BELONGED TO MITHILĀ

For a proper understanding of Udayana’s great achievement, it is necessary to ascertain the age and environments in which he lived. Though his provenance is not mentioned in his works, it is almost universally admitted by scholars that he belonged to Mithilā. He lived in a village named Kariyona near the Railway station Kāmataula, where his descendants are said to exist still with the surname ‘Ācārya’ and the ruins of his seminary are still pointed out1. Maithila scholars still narrate his anecdotes with delight. An Udayanacarita has

1. Hist. of Tirhut, 1922, p. 174 fn. 2. Another less-known tradition is recorded in fn. 3. Vidyābhūṣana (l. c. p. 142) is quite wrong to mention Maṅroni as his birth-place. All the local traditions about Udayana should be carefully collected and properly investigated. There was a famous Udayanācārya in the Bhāduri family of the Vārendra Brahmanas of Bengal, who is stated in their genealogical works to be author of the Kusumāñjali. We quote a half-verse from an old Pāñji in our possession:

( fol. 3a )

वेदाध्यैतान निग्रह लक्ष्मान वैद्यानसाधारिनो
प्राण्यक्रियोत्पन्नां तत्त्वातुसंपादनां।

This widely current tradition is entirely baseless. This Udayana Bhāduri introduced certain reforms in the Vārendra community with the help of the famous KullūkaBhaṭṭa sometime after the reign of Ballāla Sena. He lived, therefore, late in the 13th cent. A. D. Moreover, Kusumāñjali alone
been published (by M.M. Vindhyēśvariprasāda in the Introd.
to the Nyāyavārtīka, 1916) forming the 30th chapter of
the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa-Parīśīṣṭa which is on the face of it a recent
work. It narrates the interesting story of his academic contest
with a Buddhist scholar who came to the royal court of Mithilā
with disciples and books for the purpose. Udayana came out
successful in the debate which lasted for several days, and a
miracle performed by the Buddhist before a Śālagrāma was
countered by Udayana by a greater miracle. In the final ordeal
they both jumped from the top of a palm tree in which
Udayana escaped unhurt and the Buddhist died: Udayana was
highly honoured by the Lord Jagannatha at Puri as His own
incarnation and died a natural death in old age at Kāsi. It is
clearly stated that his descendants were still living in Mithilā:—

अयापि मिथिलाया: तु तदन्यथावा द्विजा: ।
विद्वानं: शास्त्रसमप्ना: पात्यवृत्त गृहे गृहे ॥

A somewhat different version of the story was published
by Vidyābhūṣāna (l.c., p. 142: originally in the Journal of the
Buddhist Text Society, 1896, Pt. I, pp. 20-21) probably from
Tibetan sources. When the Buddhist died in the ordeal by
jumping from the top of a hill, Udayana was stigmatised by the
Lord Jagannatha as a murderer and died by self-burning, utter-
ing the following verse, still widely current among scholars,
addressing the Lord:—

ऐमय्यमद्दान्तोद्विसि मामवच्चाय चत्त्से ।
परिदिनायु भौिदशु मद्धीता तव विशिष्टि: ॥

and no other work is ascribed to him. The sharp fling at a ‘Gauḍāmīmāṇ-
saka’ in the Kusumāṇḍali itself (under III, 14) is a convincing proof that
the author never belonged to Bengal. A clever Vārendra scholar of the
last century wrote (Laghubhārata Vol. III, p. 160-61) about Udayana
Bhāduri:—

स एवोद्यनाबनायिकाय कुसमाण्डलिम ।
तीर्थर्थवर्गे लघूर्ष तत्समधे गृहे एव अवरितम् ॥
The Pauranic version of the story seems to be more reliable. Academic contests were the rule in those days, and Udayana’s contest with a proud Buddhist scholar in the presence of the king of Mithilā seems to be substantially true.

We append below an alphabetical list of authorities cited directly and indirectly by Udayana in his works. This list is obviously not exhaustive and the classical works—the Bhāṣya, Vārtika and Praśastapādabhāṣya as well as the names of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti are omitted. We have attempted to collect all available information about some of the prominent names in the list.

Aniruddha: the name of this ancient author was traced by us in the Didhiti-ṭīkā of Rudra Tarkavāgīśa (grandson of Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīśa) of Navadvīpa, who composed it about 1660 A.D.¹ There are two references both on the denotation of a pronoun. It now appears that he is probably identical with the author of the Vivaraṇa-paṇjikā, a commentary on the Bhāṣya, Vārtika and Tātparya. In Udayana’s Pariśuddhi the comment of a previous commentator on the Tātparyaṭīkā is cited and refuted in the following passage 

( cf. Tātparyaṭīkā, Vizianagram ed., p. 6, line 7). Whether this is a reference to Aniruddha we cannot say. It is our conjecture.

1. Didhiti-Raudri is an extremely rare book: there is a unique Ms. copy preserved in the Alwar Maharaja’s Library. A complete transcript in 349 folios was very kindly procured and lent to us by Maharajakumar Dr. Raghubir Sinha of Sitamau. The two passages of Aniruddha are found in fol. 21b & 22a. For Rudra’s date and works vide our Bengali book Vange Navyanyāyacarca pp. 144-47. For Aniruddha’s newly discovered commentary vide Dr. J. S. Jetly’s paper in the Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda, Dec. 1954 to March 1955, pp. 240-44. It is really surprising that a 17th century scholar of Navadvīpa could mention the long-lost name of an ancient authority on the Nyāya, who probably preceded Udayana.
titure that the following passage of the Pariśuddhi (fol. 94b under I. i. 40) may be a reference to Aniruddha:

KANDALI-KĀRA: In the whole history of Indian Logic there is only one author Śrīdharācārya who definitely stated the date of composition of his major and only surviving work, the Nyāyakandali, and the date 913 Saka (991-2 A.D.) is happily beyond any dispute.1 Rājaśekhara, a Jaina scholar, wrote a sub-commentary on the Nyāyakandali in 1226 Saka (1304 A.D.). He stated that the first commentary on the Praśastapādabhāṣya is the Vyomaratī, the second one the Nyāyakandali and the third one is Udayana's Kiraṇāralī. In other words Śrīdharā of Bengal preceded Udayana. This chronological order is exactly corroborated by internal evidence abundantly found in the three great Vaiṣeṣika classics. Though Udayana has not referred to Śrīdharā or his work by name he undoubtedly consulted his work and refuted his views at every step in the Kiraṇāralī.

(i) Vāḍindra explains the line प्रकरणादुः समाहपदेनेव वर्षितवाल (Kiraṇāvalī, Chowkh. ed., p. 5) as a refutation of Śrīdharā-

---

1. Vizianagram ed., p. 331. In the introd. (p. 22, fn. 5) the editor notes and rejects a variant 'varśābde' for 'Sākābde'. The variant is manifestly wrong, for the word 'varṣa' is a synonym of the word 'abda' and can by no stretch of exegesis be taken to mean the 'Vikrama-Samvat'. Rājaśekhara's passage is cited in the Intro., pp. 19-20. Vide also Peterson's third Report. 1887, p. 273). For Śrīdharā's account vide our Bengali work Vange. Navyayāyacharcha p. 6-8. He belonged to a village named Bhūrisṛṣṭi still existing in the Hugli district of West Bengal. Śrīdharā's profound scholarship in all the six systems of philosophy, so much in evidence in his extant work, turned his native place into a famous seat of learning in Eastern India. Kṛṣṇa Miśra, the court poet of Chāndella Kīrtivarmā, about a century after Śrīdharā describes Mr. Pride of his immortal drama Prabodhachandrodaya as an inhabitant of this very birth-place of Śrīdharā. Evidently the poet's attack was directed against a proud scholar, may be, of Śrīdharā's own family.
cārya:—इति श्रीधराचार्यस्तदुपपदमित्वाहं-प्रकरणाशुद्धः (B.I. ed., p. 622 about to be published). Vādīndra (fl. about 1225 A. n.) is the earliest commentator on the Kiranāvali so far available.

(ii) Śrīdhara's well-known views about tāmas, which he carefully recorded thrice in the Kandali (pp. 9, 179, 240), apparently as his own, were discussed in the Kiranāvali (B.I. Ed., pp. 111-12) and Vardhamāna definitely states here कन्दलीकारकमत्तुमय्यतिः. Vardhamāna vouches for the Kandali-kāra's priority to Udayana also in the Guṇaprakāśa. (S. B. Ed., p. 77 vide Kiranāvali, Ben. Ed., p. 204).

(iii) The line कथं भावधरस्थ्यारोपोद्वाच इति चेतु। न किंचितेतत्तु (p. 110) is also exactly taken from the Kandali (p. 9, last line).

(iv) Similarly the line पार्थिवपरमाणुगतसमानदिसंतने नैकान्तिकमिति चेत्त of the Kiranāvali (p. 58) refers to the Kandali (pp. 4, 11, 13-14).

(v) In the section on ākāśa (Kiranāvali, Ben. Ed., p. 109) we find अन्ये त्वात्मानंकालक्ष्यतादिति अनेकश्रवितत्वाधारयत्वाद्विति देत्यथेऽ वर्ण्यति, स हु संद्यितसिद्धः। This is also a clear reference to the Kandali (p. 60) as stated by the late Mm. V. P. Dube. (vide Intr. to the Nyāyakandali, pp. 21-22).

(vi) In the section on पृथ्वी in the Kandali (p. 31) we read:—परमाणुस्तुत्वादाय: पृथिविय: सन्ते किं प्रमाणम? अनुमानम्। अयुपपरिमाणातिरत्वम् क्वचिद् विश्वात्ते परांतत्वत्तम्यत्वात् महत्परिमाणातिरत्नमय्यतः। This argument is exactly reproduced in the Kiranāvali (Ben. Ed., p. 52, B. I. Ed., p. 224) with the heading अपराध and refuted. Mathurānātha Tarkavāgīśa in his Dravyakiranāvaliśrāhasya (Ms No. 139 of the Cal. Sans. College, fol. 88a) comments here—कन्दलीकारोक्तं परमाणुद्योगक-विशिष्टानुवादनमात्र:—अपरस्वितिः। अयुपपरिमाणातिरत्नमय्यतिः। Mathurānātha must have had access to an unknown source:
in the present case, as he is not borrowing either from Vardhamāna or Padmanābha, both of whom are silent on the point.

(vii) In the second part (Gūnakhaṇḍa) of his book also Udayana controverts the views of the Kandali in several places. For instance we read on page 160:—रञ्जतवर्तमित्र गुणावस्य मुद्रितेऽरवेश्लेष्या चशुराविन अत्यत एव प्रतीयते इति तु स्वशिष्यव्यायोंहन्न निर्दिष्टस्मात्तरेर्वोप- देशायसगमसङ्कुलात्। This is a clear reference to the Kandali (p. 94) and Udayana’s manner of refutation seems to suggest that he had contact with Śrīdhara’s pupils.

(viii) The passage न हु र्वीयमेव रूपमेव धातुकारिः (Kiraṇāvali, p. 176) is also a refutation of the Kandali (p. 104). Compare also p. 266 of the Kiraṇāvali (ततु...इति कैलिरि) with the Kandali (p. 179).

It should be mentioned here that Śaṅkara Miśra in the Kaṇādarahasya stated three cases where the views of the Kandali are refuted in the Kiraṇāvali and in every case the views controverted belong not to the Kandali at all but to the Vyomavati: Vide Kaṇādarahasya (pp. 81, 82 & 86) and the Vyomavati (pp. 488, 494 & 502). The fact remains, however, that Śrīdhara’s priority to Udayana was quite well-known in Śaṅkara’s times.

Before the publication of the Kandali it was the opinion of MM. Vindhyeśvarīprasadā that Udayana preceded Śrīdhara, who wrote the Kandali on the basis of the Kiraṇāvali (Introd., 1941 V. S., p. 25). Subsequently he held the view that they were contemporaries and made a statement, which is on the face of it almost absurd, that they cited each other’s views (Introd. to the Kandali, pp. 20-22). As a matter of fact the two instances of Śrīdhara’s citation from Udayana referred to here (ibid. p. 21 f. n. 3) are quite wrong. In the first instance Śrīdhara states that according to some scholars (and Udayana
is not certainly one of them) the age-difference between the young and the old is caused not by the time-element but by the number of revolutions of the sun (Kandali p. 64)—a view ascribed in the Lilavati (p. 283) to the Bhūṣaṇa and found already cited in the Vyomavati (p. 343) and the Tātparyatīkā of Vācaspati (p. 280). In the second instance (Kandali p. 119) it is Udayana who violently criticises (p. 204) Śrīdhara:—नष्ठ्यापि समवायिकारगुत्तविमिति तत्त्वाविकम्बैवदिकं च. Śrīdhara has nowhere referred to the peculiar views of Udayana, who proves himself to be far more advanced and intricate in his arguments than Śrīdhara, for instance on the subject of the perceptibility of Vāyu (Kiraṇāvali, pp. 82-84, Kandali p. 46). Nevertheless eminent scholars relying on the statement of the late MM. believed that Śrīdhara lived to refute the views of Udayana (Keith: Indian Logic and Atomism, 1921, p. 32: also S. B. Studies, Vol. III, pp. 111-12).

Kāśikākāra: A passage of the Ātmatattvaviveka (B. I. ed., p. 837 तत्त्वाविकप्रतिशोधरास्थलु and cf. also Kiraṇāvali, p. 101 and Nyāyalilāvati, Chowkh. ed., pp. 260-61) refers according to Saṅkara Miśra to Kāśikākāra i. e. Sucarita Miśra, author of the Kāśika on the Ślokavārttika. The variant Kaṇikākāra is evidently wrong, as we are unable to trace the passage in Vācaspati's Nyāyakanikā. Moreover, this Kāśikākāra is cited also by Ratnakīrti in two of his tracts—Īśvarasādhanadūṣana (p. 42) and Vyāptinīṇaya (p. 99) and Ratnakīrti elsewhere cites Vācaspati's Kaṇikā separately.¹

Vyomāsvācārya:—Udayana in the Kiraṇāvali (p. 114) while explaining the argument establishing 'time' as a separate entity quotes the following passage:—

1. Vide Ratnakīrtinibandhāvalī edited by Anantalal Thakur, p. 9. Also J. B. R. S., XXXVII, Pt. 3-4. Prof. Thakur's paper "Ratnakīrti and his works" (p. 4 of Reprint). The lower limit of Sucarita's date is now fixed at 1000 A. D. before the times of Udayana and Ratnakīrti. These tracts of Ratnakīrti throw a flood of light on a dark age.
The reference is evidently to Vācaspati (cf. Tātparyaṭīka, p. 280 अधि चाकाशामानी न परापरव्यतिकराकारण अर्थार्थविरूपयोगितात् प्रथित्यादिविद्याचारिः). But curiously enough Vardhamāna in his gloss here definitely identifies this Ācārya with Vyomaśivācārya¹ and not Vācaspati. This can only be explained by the assumption that according to Vardhamāna Vācaspati came after Vyomaśiva. It should be noted in this connection that a careful study of the relevant passages of the Vyomavati (pp. 342-43), Kandali (pp. 64; 168-9), Tātparyaṭīka (pp. 280-1) and Lilāvatī (p. 283), seems to show that all the scholars including Vācaspati attempted here to meet a familiar argument ascribed in the Lilāvatī to the Bhūṣaṇa (of Bhāsarvajña) —न क परत्वपरस्तविज्ञिरपि। बहुतरतपनपरिपत्रपत्तिरति- जन्मतवेवेति तड़पति: इति भूषयः। Vyomaśiva preceded both Udayana and Śrīdhara. Let us give some references on the point. On p. 46 of the Kandali the views of a scholar (kascit) on the perceptibility of vāyu is refuted. The views belong to Vyomaśiva (pp. 272-4). Udayana (pp. 82-84) mainly agrees with Śrīdhara here but criticises one of his arguments: न च स्वास्तप्रभावतः तत्र प्रतिवेदते। बायुस्ततुमालिन्यायो इति युक्तम्। On p. 52 of the Kandali the grammatical explanation of the word वसिलक्ष्या is a direct answer to Vyomaśiva’s objection (p. 300). The views of ‘eke’ on p. 134 & 136 are exactly taken from the Vyomavati (pp. 474, 477). The scathing criticism of the solution of an ‘un-schooled’ intellectual (Kandali p. 147) is also directed against Vyomaśiva (p. 490). Compare also p. 200 of the Kandali अन्ये तु with p. 563 of the Vyomavati; here also Udayana agrees with Śrīdhara. On p. 392 of the Vyomavati a temple apparently built by a contemporary monarch named Śrīharsa is referred to by way of illustration: श्रीहर्ष देवधबिमिति बलन्। This monarch cannot certainly be identical with the great Harśavardhana, who

¹ Vardhamāna’s gloss is corrected in the errata as ‘Vyomaśikhācārya,’ but the reading ‘Vyomaśivācārya’ is found in a Ms. of Kiraṇadivaliprakāśa preserved in the Vāṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad, Calcutta (fol. 61b).
reigned about four centuries before Śrīdhara. The latter’s
scathing remarks about Vyomaśiva (Kandali pp. 146-47) point
normally to a contemporary scholar, slightly senior to him. We
are inclined, therefore, to identify the monarch with Śrīharṣa-
deva of Mālava, the grandfather of the famous Bhojadeva.
This Śrīharṣa’s known dates range from 1005 to 1029 V. S.
(948-72 A. D.). The Vyomavati was written about 950 A. D.
and quickly circulated among scholars of the different parts of
India through the patronage of the Malava king. Vyomaśiva
was the pupil of a very distinguished scholar, who had written
a number of dialectical tracts mainly against Buddhist views
(vide Vyomavati pp. 46, 189, 308, 399, 546, 557, 565, 584 &
586). Unfortunately his name is not mentioned by Vyomaśiva.
A saint Vyomaśiva is abundantly eulogised in vv. 22-42 of the
Ranod stone inscription (Ep. Ind., I, pp. 351-61) and it has
been suggested that he is identical with the present author
(Introd. to Tarkasaṅgraha G.O.S., p. XIX; also I.H.Q., X, pp.
165-6). But the undated inscription has been assigned to the
end of the 10th or the beginning of the 11th cent. A. D. and
unless the date is pushed back by half a century the identifica-
tion cannot stand. It has been suggested (Journ. G. Jha R. I.
Vol. III, p. 44) that the date of the inscription along with that
of Vyomaśiva and his patron Harṣavardhana is about 645 A. D.
more than three centuries before the date indicated by paleo-
graphy. This is on the face of it impossible and places the
numerous authorities cited by Vyomaśiva (Dharmakīrti, Kumā-
rila, Prabhākara and others) even before 500 A. D., of which
we have not the slightest evidence yet discovered. Avantīvarman
mentioned in the inscription is not the Maukhari king, but
the Kāśmir monarch who reigned in the 9th century A. D. The
statement that Vyomaśiva’s views on Mokṣa have been cited by
Maṇḍana and the Jaina scholar Akalaṅka cannot be substan-
tiated.

JNANAŚRI: Udayana wrote the Ātmatattvaviveka to meet
the arguments of Buddhist scholars and among them by far the
greatest target of his attack was Jñānaśrī. Though he is mentioned by name only once in the book (B.I. ed., p. 292) we gather from Śaṅkara Miśra’s commentary that he is cited and refuted more than a dozen times (289, 292-3, 317, 356, 367, 371, 436, 453, 464-5, 489-90 & 841). The Ātmatattvaniveka is the very first work of Udayana and it should be carefully noted that the first stroke of his genius was brought forth by his conflict with the last and the greatest dialectician among Buddhist logicians viz. Ācārya Jñānaśrīmitra—a fact which is now entirely forgotten.¹ The following facts about Jñānaśrī (who should not be confused with the Kashmirian Jñānaśrībhadra) should be carefully considered. As many as twelve of his dialectical treatises in original Sanskrit have been discovered in Tibet and their photographs are now preserved in the Bihar Research Society. These are च्छणभक्ताय, व्यासिचरित्र, भेदाभेदपरीक्षा, इश्वरवत, अनुपलनविधास्त्र, सर्वशील्दभावचरित्र, अपोषकरण, कार्यकारामाव- सिद्धि, भोगिनिचरित्र, भदत्तविन्दुप्रकरण, साकारसिद्धि and साकारसमाहृत्त. Except कार्यकारामावसिद्धि, a small tract of only 6 folios, none of his works nor any of the numerous works of his disciple Ratnakīrti have been translated into Tibetan. This proves that a period of decadence has already set in among the Buddhists and that they were losing in the intellectual fight with their opponents. This is one of the reasons why Buddhism soon perished in India.

Jñānaśrī’s masterpiece is the च्छणभक्ताय and this was sharply attacked by Udayana in his youthful zeal in a masterly way. We shall refer here to one brilliant stroke of Udayana as an illustration. Jñānaśrī summarises his arguments in favour of the theory of momentariness by the logical method of difference in one single verse:—

धर्मस्य कथ्यचिद्वस्तुनि माणसिद्धा
बाषाबिधिष्यवहितः किमिहास्ति नो च वा।
कायित्वेत् कथ्यसिद्धिन्ति न दृष्टुणिनि
नास्येवेत् स्ववचनप्रतिरोधसिद्धि:॥

¹ Anantalal Thakur: Jñānaśrīmitra and His works—JBR, Buddha-Jayanti Special Issue, pp. 186-92.
This verse is quoted by Udayana in the *Pariśuddhi* (B.I.Ed. p. 713: यदृक्क ज्ञानशिरया) and by Ratnakīrti (Tracts, p. 62) under the caption यथाहुःपुरुश: But in the *Ātmatauttaviveka* it is fully answered with remarkable banter and biting criticism and hurled back at its author with the change of three words:—शालस्य काचिदपि वसुति...स्थैयेऽ (B.I.Ed. p. 423). As typical instances of Udayana’s early style we reproduce two of his remarks under this topic:—स्यायो भ्राह्म: शिष्यं न सैवें भेततो भ्राह्मितुमयि शास्ते I... तस्याद्वलसहुलिदीपिक्या भ्वान्त्यत्मविविधिमुद्रायेति II Jñānaśrī is also cited by Udayana in the *Pariśuddhi* under III. ii. 17:—तत्तवोदस्तम- दोषाचरणं ज्ञानशिरया वालिकितुदुक्तात्त्व लगती:...एश्येतावमात्मभावसुवादनपरकार्य गम्भीरतरात्रि अन्धमहाहासि:—सोवमयुपिरिपिपल्लवमानाः: कथमिवावाहासातम्या (Chap. 3, fol. 13a). It is wonderful how apparently with maturity of age and scholarship Udayana gives up his bantering style altogether. Even a banter of Jñānaśrī which he carefully reproduces here (तदि स्यायो भ्राह्म: बहुलकर्षारताः तैयाविकानाः गोपमुखात्सभिमित्तात्म- श्रुतिमुद्रहर्ति (ib. fol. 13b) could not bring out a retort from him. His answer was simple and dignified (तदेतदादि जनाकलित- तीकार्यं व्याहतम्). It is our conjecture that Jñānaśrī was alive when the *Ātmatauttaviveka* was composed, but he was dead when the *Pariśuddhi* was written. That may have been another reason for Udayana to adopt a sober style.

Jñānaśrī, according to Tibetan evidence, was born in Gauḍa and was a pillar of Vikramaśilā in Magadha. (Vidya-bhusana, p. 341). When Naropa just before his death visited Vikramaśilā (in 1038 A.D.) “he leaned on the right arm of Atīśa while Jñānaśrīmitra helped him with his left arm” (Indian Pandits in Tibet, 1893, p. 21). This proves that Jñānaśrī was junior in age to Naropa and was a true contemporary of Atīśa or Dipaṅkara Śrījñāna (982-1055 A.D.). By all circumstances of age, attainments and provenance, therefore, Jñānaśrī was a formidable opponent of Udayana, whose eminence in the field of scholarship sprang from a desire to refute this Buddhist Philosopher and incidentally the first inception of the modern school of Logic resulted from the conflict.
Trilocana: He was the professor (विद्यागुरु according to Vācaspāti) of Vācaspāti as stated by himself (Tātparya, p. 87). Udayana informs us that though a considerable literature based on the standard work Vārtika had been existing before Vācaspāti (Pariśuddhi, p. 9: बहुव निष्ठव: सन्तीति) they failed miserably because the vigorous Vārtika tradition had long vanished. It was Trilocana who revived it. Jñānaśrī at the end of his masterpiece regarded him as one of the great pillars of Indian Logic:—(J.B.R.S., XXXVI, pt. 1-2)

दुर्मिताश्रमवेदिकाहादतस्तम्भानमूनि रंककान्
न्यायालंकरण-त्रिलोचन-बचसमत्वार्थम् हेलया।
उन्नीत्व चययमक्ष्य एष विहितो यमः पुरायमधुत्त मे
तेन स्तावऽ पर्यपरागत्रिभुवने बाणातिषयोद्वं जनः॥

Actual passages from Trilocana were hitherto almost untraceable in the classical works. Only one reference to him we could trace in the Pariśuddhi under III. ii. 17, where Vācaspāti’s passage beginning with यदि मन्त्रेत् (p. 388, last line) is, according to Udayana, (fol. 12b), a refutation of Trilocana. A much more important reference is found in the following passage of Nyāyasārvācāra by Bhaṭṭa Rāghava (Ms. No. 65 of the Sarasvatī Bhavana, dated 1252 A. D.):—ये तु द्यानातद्विद्वैर्यामासा
बन्धितात्त्वे यथा (द्यानातद्विद्वैर्यामासा बन्धितात्त्वे यथा तद्विद्वैर्यास्मातृ निविश्चति यमः
स्वसंमात्त तत् सिद्धाचार्यसंस्थानु ) सिद्धाह—अन्ने तिथिति।(fol. 39a, the portion within brackets is restored in the margin: vide Nyāyasāra
B.I. ed. p. 13). This makes Trilocana earlier than Bhāsarvājña. Many important facts are now available about Trilocana from recently published Buddhist works. In Ratnakīrti’s Sarvajñāsaddhi (p. 18) there is a quotation from Trilocana’s Nyāyaprakīrti. In Durveka Miśra’s Dharmottarapradīpa (Patna, 1955) there is a long quotation from Trilocana’s Nyāyahāsyaṭīkā (pp. 173-74) ending with the enigmatic phrase:—तवेतत् कार्यस्तिकरणात्तर्त्वस्मातित्वमेव धीमतो॥ A ‘Karṇāṭa in
rags’ probably points to his place of origin in the Karṇāṭa country of South India. The most important discovery at the present
moment is the fact that Trilocana’s masterpiece was named the Nyāyamaṇjarī, probably identical with the Bhāṣyatīkā cited above. His distinguished pupil Vācaspati in his earliest work the Nyāyakaṇṭhī distinctly mentions it in his obeisance to his professor in verse 3 at the beginning:—

अष्टानातिमिर्शारमीं परदस्ती न्यायमक्रीणा रूपितराम।
प्रसब्रित्रे प्रभवित्रे विभासतर्वे नमो गुरुवे॥

That this cannot be a reference to Jayanta’s celebrated work will be convincingly proved by the following evidence. Ratnakīrti wrote all his works as abridgments of larger works of his teacher Jñānaśrī. There is a quotation from Trilocana in a tract of Ratnakīrti (B.I. ed. p. 58, Patna ed., p. 79) which is exactly borrowed from Jñānaśrī’s Kṣanabhaṅgādhyāya. But the latter refers it to the author of the Nyāyamaṇjarī (पतेन यदृपि न्यायमदरीकारः प्राह्). In a subsequent passage also Jñānaśrī clearly indicates that the Nyāyamaṇjarī is a work of Trilocana (यथा तत्तः तिलोचननस्वविषयत तथान्योरिपि नौयतामभिप्राय:—तथा च न्यायमदरी……
fol. 15a). In his Īśvaravādā�ुषाण Jñānaśrī quotes again from the Maṇjarī of Trilocana (महायां तिलोचन: पुराणं fol. 22b). It will now be quite clearly understood that Aniruddha’s numerous reference to the Maṇjarī (J.O.I., Baroda, Dec. 54–March 55, pp. 241-44) are not to Jayanta at all as mistaken by the learned Doctor but to Trilocana. The first two important references by Aniruddha are under the Sūtras II. i, 20-21 which are not even touched by Jayanta. Aniruddha refers to Trilocana by name separately, but he does not seem to be acquainted with Jayanta or his work. It should also be carefully noted that none of the Buddhist scholars ever referred to

1. Anantatal Thakur: Ratnakīrti and His Works, J.B.R.S., Vol. XXXVII.
2. We are indebted to Prof. Anantatal Thakur of the Mithila Institute for kindly drawing our attention to these passages discovered by him after painful search. The photographs of these valuable works are preserved in the Bihar Research Society. (vide Prof. Anantatal Thakur’s notes on Guru Trilocana in J.B.R.S., Vol. XLI, pt. IV, pp. 508-10 & I. C., Vol. XIV. No. 1. pp. 36-40).
Jayanta or his work. He was almost unknown in Eastern India, the venue of the great intellectual conflict between the Buddhists and the Tirthikas. A well-known definition of the term Vyāpti (ब्याप्ति: संबन्धः) is really of Trilocana (Mokṣākara’s Tarkabhāṣā, p. 23).

RATNAKĪRTI: According to Śaṅkara Miśra Udayana refuted the views of this Buddhist scholar in two places in the Ātmatattvaviveka (B.I. ed., pp. 435 & 462). Both the passages are traceable in the Chitrādvaitasiddhi, a tract of Ratnakīrti mentioned by himself in the Kṣanabhaṅgasiddhi (B.I. ed., p. 71, Patna ed., p. 90) and published recently from Patna (vide Ratnakīrtinibandhāvalī, 1957, ). Ratnakīrti was a prolific writer. Besides the ten works published he wrote at least three more, mentioned by himself, which are yet to be discovered. His works were mostly abridged from the elaborate and larger treatises of his teacher Jñānaśrī: as stated by himself at the end of the Sarvajñāsiddhi (p. 28) that work was but a summary by ‘worthy’ Ratnakīrti who was frightened at the prolixity of his teacher (सूचीपो मम रत्नकीर्तिनिर्माणितस्तत्तत्तत्त्वात्रासित: ।).

This proves that Jñānaśrī reached the peak in the dialectics of the Buddhist Logic and he lived to witness the fright of his worthy pupil who failed to meet the trenchant criticisms of Udayana against his own teacher. For it is our conjecture that like Jñānaśrī Ratnakīrti was alive when the Ātmatattvaviveka was written. Instead he only gratified himself by reproducing the arguments of Jñānaśrī against Vācaspati. The latter’s brilliant advice to his Buddhist opponent for ‘silence’ (Tātparya, p. 115) is answered by Ratnakīrti (B.I. ed. p. 64) evidently in the language of Jñānaśrī, but the retort of Udayana remains unanswered. Udayana’s sarcastic reference to Jñānaśrī’s lessons to his ‘senseless’ pupil is evidently meant as a fling at Ratnakīrti.

RĀJAKULAPĀDA: a Buddhist logician cited by Ratnakīrti (Patna ed. p. 96). He preceded Vācaspati. For under V. ii. 3

1. Introduction, Ratnakīrtinibandhāvalī.
Vācaspati (p. 496) quotes an unnamed opponent (यत्पुनरुच्यते पत्रः) and refutes his arguments with the concluding remarks:—सोश्यमीलिशोश्यमलापो भवति: शास्त्रिनिबन्धनीयो न्त्वस्माभिनिरिष्ट, व्यक्तिक्षे राजभक्तिनिरिष्टिरि. The same phrase also occurs under V. i. 17 (p. 481). There is little doubt that in both the places the reference is to this hitherto unknown Buddhist scholar, who probably belonged to a royal family.

Sānātani: Saṅkara Miśra in his Vādivinoda (p. 2) refers to this scholar, according to whom a debate (कथा) is four-fold and not three-fold as almost universally regarded. The selfsame view of Sānātani is also referred to by Vācaspati Miśra II in the Tattvālokā (fol. 82a) and the Nyāratnapraṇakṣa: (fol. 34a) as traced by us. It now appears that both Saṅkara and Vācaspati derived their information from the following illuminating passage of the Pariṣuddhi under I. ii. 1:—प्रांगांडः नैवाथिकमते चतुर्व: कथा। स श्रवस्तिस्थापनोहै स वित्तेजद्वत्र (१२१३) जगवदु वास्तव्यिन परामर्शादित। प्रसाधारणोऽणेत चतुर्वांवहरस्यमयि उपपत्तिरिष्ट सानातनि:। एक एवार्थ कथामार्ग इति बाध्यः। ते द्वे व्यवहारिके बटति नियमययः निराकृतेऽ(fol. 95b: vide Tātparya, p. 215). This proves that Sānātani was an ancient Ācārya who preceded Vācaspati and belonged to Bengal. Under V. i. 1 there is a discussion as to what is the gist of the whole chapter. According to Sānātani &c. it is scrutiny (परिक्षा) and according to others, including presumably Vācaspati (p. 473) it is definition. Udayana accepts the latter view (fol. 2a of Chap. V of the Pariṣuddhi: तत्त्ववापमिति भ्रमः). Vardhamāṇa in the Tattvabodha elaborately brings out the arguments in favour of the former view characterising it as the older one (fol. 3a:—तत्र प्राचायमवद्दामाकृतम्). Under V. i. 32 again Vardhamāṇa has a long and interesting discussion as to why the Śūtrakāra defined अनितयस्मा before नित्यस्मा by changing the order of his own list (in V. i. 1). Two former views on the intricate point are stated and rejected by Vardhamāṇa, who gave his own explanation in the matter (foll. 57-58), which as far as we know, is not touched by any other.
commentator. At the conclusion he raised the question whether the Bhāṣyakāra was really responsible for this change of order and not the Sūtrakāra. On the authority of ancient ācāryas like Sānātani Vardhamāna positively asserted that it was done by the Sūtrakāra himself:—

तथा भाष्यकारस्यैवायैं कल्पितयां न तु सूत्रकारस्य इत्येव किं न स्वातः।...

...तथा—सूत्रकारस्यैवायैं कल्पितयायां इत्यूपोष्यायां: सामानं चमुंगृतमन्त्रिमहा निवधानात्॥

So the supreme authority of this ancient scholar of Bengal, who must have written a commentary on the Nyāyadarśana, was still recognised in the times of Vardhamāna.

Śrīvatsa: was the professor of Udayana himself. This important fact, which was quite unknown till recently, is now revealed through an examination of the unpublished portion of the Pariśuddhi. Udayana begins each chapter of the Pariśuddhi with a prayer verse (vide Tanjore Cat. pp. 4483-87). But the second chapter has the following additional verse:—

संशोध्य दृष्टिनिर्भवत् महाकुमारप:।
																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
tathā tathā

It is a fact that Vācaspati's commentary is expansive on the first chapter (forming about half of the whole book), where his profound exposition has been aptly described by Udayana as desert-springs. Udayana likewise exhausted his scholarship upon this chapter and disposed of the rest very briefly (the last four chapters of the Pariśuddhi together comprising only 62 folios out of a total of 165) after taking lessons, it now appears, from Śrīvatsa. There are five quotations from Śrīvatsa in the Pariśuddhi. The first one under II. i. 68 runs:—(fol. 58b of

1. The reading in the Tanjore Ms. (Cat., p. 4484) is corrupt. We have given above the reading found in two Mss. (No. 49 & 51) of the Sarasvatī Bhavana, Varanasi, which agrees with that of the older copy (1501 Vikrama Samvat) preserved in rōtograph in the Mithila Institute, except that for तथा in the last line it reads तथा.
Udayana and his Predecessors

Ms. No. 51 of the Sarasvatī Bhavana) nātu padesamānaṁ vācyānāmiṁ -
śāntaṁ nādī vācyamate śvārth śkeśamahāpaścheśe purāṇaparinirūṣaṁ chaitaṁ. yathū ca śvāyastu
“न पद्म तद्विषं वा वाक्यावेवोऽहि लिङ्क तत सत क्रतवेंधान्यपरतिसाड” इति (तत्त्वयांतिका
पूः २५०) श्रीकर्त। ब्राह्मोत्तरः-वाक्यान्यापि कवितं संरक्षयते यथा कार्यांव्रूवृत्तामाळिं
तद्विमायेिसंह दीक्षा। II Śrīvatsa is here finding fault with Vācaspati exactly quoting his words, which are defended by Udayana. So Śrīvatsa was definitely junior to Vācaspati. Under II. ii. 1 (fol. 59a) Śrīvatsa answers the charge of overlapping of matter in the two parts of the chapter. The next quotation from Śrīvatsa is as follows:—(from a Ms. in our possession: also fol. 6ab of the rotograph, chapter III)

एवं पद्धति: प्रकरणौरत्मा परिलक्षित। शारीरिकोन्याय सर्वान्, चतुर्भुजि श्रीकर्ता:
—नन्यातपपरीचालापैकार्थया मिथ्य-साकाश्चवात् एकवाक्यत्वा च कथं नामीत्रिकस्मासः-
माथिकितिः, उच्छव, शारीरार्धकर्तकरानाभानारम्भायां शृद्धियायायायन्मुक्षेयस्य
भास्वेऽ शरीरस्वत्तुमृत्तुमृतानां च तद्वाचातात् त्वमपत्रोपसंभाष्ठकंयोपा-
धेरभावात् द्वितियाहिकोपाधिना चानुपसंभावना पारिशोषणात् प्रथमासिपिनैव कोडळी-
करणम। न कार्यान्येकार्य व्याधिःतथा भक्तिमद्वैतीतिः नातावाहिकोपाधिः: किं तु
पुनःत्तु एव। ततः किमेऽं प्रकरणानामादापिकरीत्व नारायं न च विष्णु:। नन्यायं पितापि
बिवच्छिलोपिः नाथ्याहिकोपाधिः। नमुः। प्राचार्यत्वा हि यो वस्त्रवस्त्र: स ततोपाधिरिषि
विवच्छिन्ति न तु प्रस्तः कोदापात्त: प्रयत्तोत्तो च। इह च भ्रान्यायात्मरीत्वा प्रथम-
प्रकरणौ एव। दर्शनस्तरस्तरायामकर्मचर्यायामवित्त्वेऽहि (३१११०) व्यवस्थिते
विषयेऽव्ययेः इन्द्रियेऽ्योक्तमसन्धितविषयविषयवल्लभायानां शायथता शारीराहिकोपिः व्यर्थेऽकः
साधित एव, केवलं शिष्यवृद्धिरिषिकोभावाय उत्तरं प्रणयेः। तत्साधोक्तमेव
न्यायमिति। एततान्यान् मार्श्यस्त्र्यहैत्तितिस्पकर्षणेऽ संगतितुसंबंधेः। II (fol. 7b,
under III. i. 27; cf. Tātparyaṭīkā, Vizia. Ed., p. 363)

The topic of consistent relation between the different Prakarāṇas forming a chapter, dealt with here, marks a distinct improvement upon Vācaspati’s gloss, where it is not touched upon. Udayana reproduces the arguments of Śrīvatsa here with approval. In the next quotation under III. ii. 66 (Tātparya, p. 409) Śrīvatsa finds out a fallacy not detected by Vācaspati
and here again Udayana seeks to defend Vācaspati by a simple addendum: —(fol. 18a of the rotograph) निष्कृतिनिरेवालनकालिकां तेषां पुरुषपुष्पारितमूलप्रक्ष्वलक्ष्मावेदिपि पुरुषायर्क्रियासमर्थ्यावितरी श्रीवस: । सत्यः—
कार्यवेत सत्ति: तु विष्णुवादद्वोः।। In the last quotation under V, ii. 1 Śrīvatsa finds fault, this time, with the Sūtrakāra for the absence of compound in the Sūtra and here again Udayana answers his objection: (fol. 16a of Baroda Ms. of chapter V: the name of Śrīvatsa is omitted in the rotograph, fol. 7) प्रतिविश्वासनिर्भयात्मसमासः
नित्ययोजन: नित्यस्थानानां परस्परानपेतुस्मुच्चावेति चेतुः—जातिव्ययेतस्मानमित्
यस्मात्सभीतिः श्रीवास: । अन्यतरं—समशान्त्रायाः प्रतिविश्वासनिर्भयात्मस्मासः
सुपर्विश्वकरमाः अभावाः।। Whether Udayana has quoted these passages from any written work of Śrīvatsa or from his verbal lessons it is not possible to determine at present. As no quotation of Śrīvatsa is traceable anywhere else up till now it may be conjectured that Śrīvatsa, who presumably like his distinguished pupil belonged to Mithilā, did not write any book.

VĀCASPATI: Wrote the Bhāmati, one of the classical works of the Śaṅkara school of the Vedānta, towards the end of his life. He mentioned therein all the previous works of his own in the following order:

यन्त्रायकरिकास्तवशस्त्रीयंतस्विनिदुहि: ।
यन्त्राय-सार्व्य-योगानां वेदान्तानां निवर्णने: ॥

Of these seven works the second Tattvasamīkṣa, a commentary on the pre-Śaṅkara Vedānta work of Maṇḍana named Brahma- siddhi, is lost. The rest raises Vācaspati to a position of supreme authority in all the five systems of Indian philosophy (omitting the Vaiṣeṣika which was ignored by him)—a position quite unique in the whole history of Indian culture. We are concerned here only with his Nyāya work, the Tātparyaśākā, which earns for him in the field of Indian Logic the title of Tīkākāra or better Tātparyācārya, both used by Udayana. His success in this single work was quite extraordinary, as he pushed out

of existence all the previous works upon the Bhāṣya or the Vārtika. And it is a long list, as we can gather from recent discoveries. Among those who controverted Buddhist views and wrote commentaries, like Udyotakara, on the Bhāṣya Pṛṭićandra and Bhāvivekta preceded Dharmakīrti and Avidhakarṇa came after him (vide Vādanyāya with comm., 1936, pp. 88, 96, 140 & 142: also 35, 40, 78, 92 & 109). Durveka mentions three later names Adhyayana, author of the Ruciśīkā (Dharmottarapradipa, p. 175), Trilocana (pp. 173-4) and Viśvarūpa (p. 175). All their works have perished due to Vācaspati’s pre-eminence.

Vācaspati undoubtedly belonged to Mithilā. We mention two local traditions. According to some he belonged to the village Makaranda in Mithilā. According to a note left by Chandā Jhā, the famous poet of Mithilā, Vācaspati belonged to the village Bṛḍgām within the Pargana Nirlakṣpur, now situated in Saharsa district forming the eastern boundary of Darbhanga. There is a couplet of Chandā Jhā, where eight adjacent villages, including Baḍagām, are mentioned as the place of Vācaspati:

वरसम ब्रडग्म वसन्नहि बेलद्ध थो ब्रडग्म।
बलिया बड़वन बनन्हा श्रीवंचस्य प्रतिध्वाम॥

The names of all the villages, it is curious to notice, begin with the same letter. Vacaspati’s place of origin in Mithilā can be confirmed from internal evidence found in his works. For instance, in the Nyāyakanikā (p. 301) as an illustration of an intricate argument occurs the following remarkable passage:

न खलू पाटलिपुरे उपलब्ध्य प्रासादस्य शिलाहरे सरस्रागन्तः। Silāhrada, which must have been a famous place in Vācaspati’s times is difficult to identify now. It was the birth-place of Mādhavakara,

1. Thakur ; Introduction : Ratnakirtinibandhavali.
2. Sāhitya-Parisat-Patrika, Calcutta, Vol. 11 (1904 A.D.), p. 75. The story of Vācaspati and his wife named Bhāmati is related in this paper. We are not aware where the village is situated. The next tradition seems to be more reliable.
a famous Vaidyaka author who is usually claimed as a Bengali and lived about 900-925 A.D. Presumably Vācaspati lived somewhere between Pātaliputra in Magadha and Śilāhrada in Bengal. There cannot be any doubt that Vācaspati was a native of Eastern India. In the Bhāmatī under I, iii. 1 Vācaspati mentions an unusual word ‘Hadi’ in the following passage:—

The word is explained in the Kalpataru as a wooden frame with holes to bind criminals by the leg (यत्र हु वारुणि दित्रिते निमाहाराणां पाद्योत्तनतं तदविढ़ि: ). In this peculiar sense the word is still used in Mithilā. The only lexicon where the word occurs is the Sabdamālā of Rāmeśvara (हृद: कान्तय यन्त्रेण), from which it was borrowed in Wilson’s dictionary and the Sabdakalpadrumā. Vācaspati’s peculiar verdict (Tātparyatikā, p. 346) on mustard oil, respected in Bengal and Mithilā, may also be regarded as a corroboration of his Maithila origin.

VĀCASPATI’S PATRON: At the end of the Bhāmatī Vācaspati paid a glowing tribute to a monarch named N R G A, who was reigning when that work was finished. The panegyric in a couple of verses though oft-quoted is reproduced below as it requires to be carefully analysed now under a new light.

८०पान्त्राण्यां नृसापाण्यां भृते साधारेश चक्र चक्षेश्वर, कर्माचारयिनी
कार्तिकरासुप्रसादारण्याऋषिकाः स्वथं शास्त्रविच्छेदार्थ ॥५
नरेस्वरा यथरितानुकार्मिन्याज्ञस्वतिः कर्तुः न च पारवन्ति ॥
यथित्राय महीपे महनीयकीयों श्रीमुंगोकारः मया निवन्धः ॥१६

It appears that this monarch of holy renown has then reached the peak of his glory, his exemplary life providing an unattainable ideal for contemporary kings. There is no direct reference here to his military success, which must have ended long ago. The Bhāmatī is the last work of Vācaspati. There is an important reference to a reigning monarch in the following passage

of his very first work, the Nyāyakaṇṭikā (p. 290)² :—यत्र त्वहि किवाद्वयं प्रतीयते, धशा निजसुज्वीभवेत्सत्यय श्रुतानादिशरी जष्ठति तत्र कथा वाक्यायं—स्वेदक्तम्...! जयायं च जिन्दोपार्थिवेष्य निजसुज्वीयतृत्वयाचिक्रिया इत्यप्रदानलावाम वाक्यायं :—विजयकैवेच तु प्राप्तायात्वथा।। It is tempting to identify this monarch with Ādiśūra of Bengal, who is credited in all genealogical works of Rādhīya and Varendra Brahmanas with inviting and settling their first ancestors within his dominions. But all reliable evidence places this Ādiśūra of Bengal about 700 A.D. before the rise of the Pāla dynasty. It is much more probable that Ādiśūra like Ādimalla is a honorific title and not a proper name at all. It was apparently assumed by king Nṛga when early in his career he was a ‘conquering’ (निर्गोष्ठ) monarch. We heard a tradition in Mithilā that Nṛga belonged to the Gupta dynasty. If Ādiśūra is taken as his surname he might have belonged to an extinct ‘Śūra’ dynasty of Mithilā, a scion of which migrated to East Bengal early in the 14th century.

This brings us to the great problem of his date. The following evidence, which seems to have escaped the notice of eminent scholars places him certainly in the 10th century A.D. and not before. (1) Vācaspati aligns himself definitely to the school of Maṇḍana both in Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta. In the Nyāyakaṇṭikā, a commentary on Maṇḍana’s Vidhīviveka, there is an exact quotation from a Buddhist scholar :—(p. 187) यथोक्त मदुन्तेन, मुद्दत्या कलपित्या विविकमपरियं देख्यिध्येत, तददुविदिन वाहितित। The very same quotation is found also in the Tātparyaṭṭikā (p. 339) under II. ii. 63 under the caption यथाह मदुन्त्यमोऽत्तरः। Stcherbatsky has shown (Buddhist Logic, I. p. 476 fn. & II. p. 405 ff.) that the quotation is from the Apohapakarana of Dharmottara preserved in Tibetan. According to Vācaspati Maṇḍana was refuting the views of Dharmottara in the original passage of the Vidhīviveka. This makes Maṇḍana a junior contemporary of Dharmottara. According to Tibetan works

Dharmottara flourished under King Vanapāla in the middle of the 9th century A.D., though Vanapāla is a mythical name coming after the first four or five names of the Pāla dynasty. (Vidyābhūṣaṇa: pp. 329 & 518. Also Pag Sam, Index, p. xxxiv: read Vanapāla for Nayapāla). A more definite reference to Dharmottara is found in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī (IV. 498) under the reign of Jayāpiṇḍa (circa 800 A.D.) thus:—

स्थवरे पश्चिमाणां लक्ष्ययुक्तं रथे।
वैष्णवान्तरस्यं प्रबर्तिते साध्वमान्यत॥

This clear date for both Dharmottara and Maṇḍana cannot be lightly brushed aside. There is evidence that a long period of time, say about a century, intervened between Maṇḍana and Kumārila. Maṇḍana not only quoted exact passages of Kumārila and Prabhākara (and the latter came after Kumārila) but, according to Vācaspati, views of an 'old school of Prabhākara' (जर्लाभावकर्मसं) are cited by him (Nyāyakaṇṭhika, pp. 96 & 109). Tāranātha, the Tibetan historian, records in a true historical spirit the views of two ancient historians on the exact date of the foundation of the Pāla dynasty by Gopāla I. According to Indradatta, Gopāla was elected one year after what must have been a famous event in those times viz. the death of "Āchārya Mīmāṁsaka" ('spyod-pa'), while according to Kṣemendrabhadra it was seven years after that event (Schiefner, 1869, p. 204). The reference is evidently to Kumārila, who died thus in the first or second decade of the 8th century A.D. Maṇḍana, therefore cannot be placed before 800 A.D.

There is again a long interval of time between Maṇḍana and Vācaspati. For, in the Nyāyakaṇṭhika (p. 109) Vācaspati distinguishes between an 'old' and a 'new' school of Prabhākara. The views ascribed in the passage under discussion to the new school are identical with those of Śālikanātha (vide Rjuvimāla, Madras ed., p. 37: Chowkh. ed., pp. 29-30), who therefore founded a new school of Prabhākara long after Prabhākara and
Mañḍana. He cannot thus be a direct disciple of Prabhākara and was only slightly senior to Vācaspati, who refers to him as 'navināḥ'. Sālikanātha's reference to himself as प्रभाकरगुरोः शिष्यः does not mean direct discipleship, as interpreted by most of the scholars, but only affiliation. Śrīdhara similarly refers to Kumārila in the Kandali as 'Guru' (pp. 248 & 257) and 'Mīmāṃsā-guru' (p. 220). The earliest date that can be assigned to Vācaspati is 900 A. D. about a century after Mañḍana.

(2) Mañḍana was an earlier contemporary of Śaṅkarācārya, whose date cannot be placed before 800 A. D. As Vācaspati has refuted the views of Śaṅkara’s opponent Bhāskara in the Bhāmati, we cannot place Vācaspati before 900 A. D.

(3) Śrīdhara, the Kandalikāra was thoroughly acquainted with the works of Mañḍana (vide Kandali pp. 218, 256, 271 & 274). He has cited and refuted the views of Mañḍana in the Vidhi Viveka (p. 274: तदाधित्वात्स्य शास्त्रित्वात्स्य vide Vidhi Viveka p. 231), but he was quite unacquainted with Vācaspati, who gave here (pp. 231-32) two illuminating interpretations of the particular passage of Mañḍana. Śrīdhara, moreover, in his famous dissertation on tāmas (darkness) quotes two couplets of an unknown author: — (pp. 9-10)

तदुःक्षम्
न च ्भासाभावस्य तमस्वं वृद्धिसंस्मतम्।
श्रायाः काण्डोमिभवें पुराणे भूमिपर्ययुते: \।
दूरस्तभद्रम्बद्रार्थदशतापचला ।
दैहात्तुभविनी श्रायाः न वस्तुवाहिन्ना भवेत्।।

The same verses are cited by Vācaspati in the Nyāyakanikā as from भासाभावस्य वाचनिकारः (p. 76) with considerable variation of readings; there are five lines in Vācaspati as against four lines of the Kandali. This proves that they drew from independent sources unknown to each other. Śrīdhara refutes at some length the views of the Sāṅkhya on Satkāryavāda and the ancient verse इत्त्वाभापित संबन्धः is cited there. At first sight it might
appear that Śrīdhara was refuting the views of Vācaspati's *Tattvakaumudi* (under Kārikā 9), where the same old verse is also cited. But a close examination of the passages proves that the exact words cited and refuted by Śrīdhara (e.g. योजनम् अस्तित्वाय करणं व्याकरणमध्यं p. 144) do not belong to Vācaspati at all and the ancient verse is already cited in the older work *Yuktiḍīpikā* (p. 61). The apologetic words uttered by Śrīdhara at the end of the discussion express his veneration to an unknown scholar certainly different from Vācaspati (मार्ग दृढ़ब्धति-तिबंधन ). Similarly the Kārikā 67 explained in the *Kandali* (p. 284) is unaware of Vācaspati's better comment on the word अनकारणामूर्ति. The three lines of Kumārila cited by Śrīdhara in the chapter on Sāmānya (p. 320) give again a reading somewhat different from that of Vācaspati in the *Nyāyakaṇṭikā* (p. 188). Śrīdhara quotes (p. 30) a line thus:—तथा च अन्याद्वृत्तमवः—एकं च चित्तं चेन्द्रेवत्राध्य विचारं तत् हि। Here again Vācaspati (Tātparyaṭikā, p. 454) adopts a different reading. All these point to the inevitable conclusion that Śrīdhara and Vācaspati were close contemporaries and did not consult each other's works. They both belonged, therefore, to the last half of the 10th century A.D.

(4) Trilocana preceded Bhāsarvajña as we have stated above. (p. 16) Trilocana's pupil Vācaspati was evidently junior to Bhāsarvajña. For, in the *Tātparyaṭikā* (pp. 280-81 under II, i. 39) Vācaspati meets an argument ascribed in the *Lilāvatī* (p. 283) to Bhūṣaṇa i.e. Bhāsarvajña, author of the *Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa*. Similarly Vācaspati was slightly junior to Vyomaśīva (q. v.), who wrote the *Vyomaṭvāṭ* about 950 A.D. Here again Vācaspati's close contemporaneity with Śrīdhara, who knew Vyomaśīva (and Bhāsarvajña), is confirmed.

(5) The earliest Buddhist scholar to refer to Vācaspati is, at the present state of our knowledge, Jñānaśrī (q. v.), who is followed by his pupil Ratnakīrti and a much later author.
Mokṣākara gupta (vide the latter's Tarkabhāṣā, G. O. S., p. 24). Vācaspati is not mentioned even by so late an author as Durveka Miśra, who was a disciple of Jitāri and thus a co-pupil of Atiśa. Two of Durveka's works have have been published, the Arcaṭāloka (G. O. S.) and the Dharmottarapravāpa (Patna, 1955). The sneering remarks of Jñānaśrī towards Vācaspati, as reproduced by Ratnakirti and Udayana, prove that they were not separated by a large length of time. It now appears that Ratnakirti adopted a strictly chronological order when citing the views of Saṅkara, Trilocana, Nyāyabhūṣana and, last of all, Vācaspati in the Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi (B. I. ed. pp. 57-58). Jñānaśrī was living still in 1041 A. D. and Vācaspati, the last and the greatest target of his attack, cannot certainly be placed before the 10th century A. D.

(6) Among Hindu scholars the earliest to quote from Vācaspati is Udayana's teacher Śrīvatsa (q. v.), who must have been strictly a contemporary of Jñānaśrī; the period of activity of both of them can now be confidently placed in the first half of the 11th century A.D. (1000-1050 A.D.).

(7) The cumulative effect of all the above evidences can no longer be doubted. It is simply impossible now to refer the date 898 found in Vācaspati's Nyāyasūcīnibandha to the Vikrama era corresponding to 841-42 A.D. This small tract of Vācaspati was evidently meant as a supplement to the Tātparyaṭikā, as it is not mentioned separately among his works enumerated in the Bhāmatī. It was thus composed along with his masterpiece the Tātparyaṭikā in 898 Śaka i. e. 976-77 A. D. —a date which must have been very near the birth-dates of Jñānaśrī and Śrīvatsa, both of whom might have seen Vācaspati alive in their early youth. If the books were composed in 841-42 A. D. Vācaspati's literary activity must be taken to have commenced about 825 A. D., full two centuries before Jñānaśrī wielded his powerful pen for the first time among Buddhist
scholars to meet his arguments. On the other hand we must huddle together all the host of brilliant scholars that preceded Vācaspati just within half a century—Maṇḍana, Śaṅkara, Bhāsarvacārya, Trilocana, Śālikanātha, Vyomaśīva &c. &c. On the face of it is an absurdity.

Jīnendra: Towards the end of the Ātmatattvaviveka Udayana mentions the names of several Buddhist scholars branding each of them with one or other of several stigmas. Some of the names are new and cannot be identified e. g. Sarabha, Kāṇācārya and Subhūti. The two scholars Jīnendra and Jagadindu, ¹ though outside the Brahmancial Society, had written books which are universally respected; in other words their religion did not stand in the way of their proper appreciation. This Jīnendra is identical with Jinedrabuddhi (as stated by the commentator Nārāyaṇacārya), the famous author of the Kāśikāvivaraṇapaṇḍjikā, commonly known as the Nyāsa, a classical work of the Pāṇini school of grammar. This huge work has been fully printed by the Rajshahi Museum and throws much new light on the problems connected with the composition of the Kāśikā. After a thorough examination of all available materials we had come to the conclusion that Jīnendra lived in 800-850 A.D. ² The facts are very briefly stated. Jayāditya wrote a complete Vyāti about 650 A.D. Vāmana, a Brahmanic scholar, revised the last three chapters not earlier than 700 A.D. This combined work, known as the Kāśikā, was explained by Jīnendra not earlier than 800 A.D.; for, Jīnendra had referred to previous commentaries even on the later portion of Vāmana.

This same Jinedrabuddhi had written a large commentary (the Tibetan version consisting of 349 leaves) named

---

¹ J. D.V. Raghavan suggests that he may be identical with Joindu, Jain Antiquary.
² Intro. to Paribbāsāvyāti &c. of Purusottama published by the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, 1946, pp. 2-5.
Visālāmalavati on Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccaya. Vidyabhūsana (1 c. p. 323) gives his date as about 725 A. D., when Vāmana’s portion of the Kāśikā was not yet written or circulated. According to Durveka Miśra the following passage of Arcaṭa (who was identical with Dharmākaradatta vide pp. 233, 261 & 410) refers to Jinendra’s gloss upon Dignāga:—(Baroda ed., 1949, p. 218)

यद्रा झाचायंस्थायंतदभिभित्तिः कैकियिद्व न्यायलियते...
कैकियिद्व ईश्वरसेनजनेन्द्रन्दुस्वस्वतिभि: (ib. p. 405)

This piece of evidence proves that Arcaṭa (and Dharmottara) cannot be dated before 800 A. D.

Dharmottara: one of the greatest Buddhist authorities after Dharmakīrti. He is cited both by Vācaspati and Śrīdhara (q. v.). In the Ātmatattvaaviveka, according to the interpretation of Śaṅkara Miśra, Udayana had refuted Dharmottara in one place (B.I. ed., p. 296). The actual passage of Dharmottara has been quoted by Śaṅkara. Dharmottara flourished according to the Rājatarāghini (IV. 498) in the reign of Jayāpīḍa of Kasmira (c. 800 A. D.). This date is corroborated by the references in the Arcaṭāloka (Baroda, 1249). Arcaṭa, identical with Dharmākaradatta (ib., pp. 232, 241 & 410) was the teacher of Dharmottara according to Tibetan evidence (Intro. p. xi). At any rate Dharmottara undoubtedly came after Arcaṭa (vide Durveka’s comm. pp. 240, 242-3, 377). According to Durvka (p. 405) Arcaṭa has referred to Jinendrabuddhi in one place (p. 218) and Jinendra (q. v.) cannot be placed before 800 A. D. Dharmottara must, therefore, be placed in the first half of the 9th century A.D. as the Tibetan historians recorded.

Prajñākara: cited by Udayana in the Pariśuddhi (pp. 667-8 & 730). The verse cited is evidently from Prajñākara’s masterpiece the Pramāṇavārtikālāṅkāra. Udayana
in the Ātmātattvaviveka (B.I. ed., p. 907) has recorded the important tradition about Prajñākara that like Dharmkirti he was driven out from the orthodox Brahmanic society and had no other way but to accept Buddhism. Tibetan historians place him in the 10th century A.D. (Vidyabhusana, I. c. p. 336).

**Mahāvrata**: In the Kusumāñjali Udayana in his discussion on kṣaṇikatva (Stavaka IV, p. 17) has cited and refuted the views of the 'followers of Mahāvrata' (Mahāvrata). In the first Stavaka also in the context of Kārikā 12 (p. 57) the views of Mahāvrata have been criticised according to the interpretation of Varadarāja (p. 31) who cites the following verse of Mahāvrata thereon:

कुस्मे ब्रजपुराद्यं हाकाशायासिध्यते ।
शक्तिराधितः तेन काष्ठितः कि न परस्ति ॥

The *Nyāyaśāstra* of Śrīvallabhaḥśārya quotes the same verse in a brilliant passage which is an elaboration of Udayana's words with an additional half-verse from Mahāvrata in the section on Saṁskāra (pp. 647-48):

**सुद्मपि विषं कष्टिन्मन्त्रः करोति निष्कृतिः ॥
सृजिति तद्भो काष्ठिन्द्रकस्य मुद्रोऽविभिषिक्तम् ॥

Mahāvrata is also cited in Bhavānātha's *Nyāyaviveka* (Madras ed., p. 273). There is an important quotation from Mahāvrata in M.M. Chandra's *Amṛtabindu* (Ms. No. III. F. 149 of Asiatic Society, fol. 45a) which ends:—व्यटवतः श्रावतपरिहारोऽस्वययनकः क्षणमन्त्री यहाँतः। क्र्ष्ण मिस्रा in his allegorical drama *Prabodhachandrodaya* paints Mr. Pride ('Ahaṁkāra') as well-read in the advanced courses of studies then prevailing in Eastern India; of the six classical works mentioned (Act II, v. 3) 'Māhāvrata' is the last of all. All the works belong to the Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara 'schools of the Mīmāṁsā.' According to the well-informed commentator of the drama Nāṇḍilla-Gopa, Mahāvrata belonged to the Bhaṭṭa school and was a rival of the Prabhākara scholar Mahodadhi, who was a class-mate of Śālika.
nātha and the author of a treatise named Siddhāntarahasya (महाब्रजो महत्तमतनवर्ची महोदिधिमतिस्पर्शी ). All the four scholars Śālika, Mahodadhi, Vācaspati and Mahāvrata thus belonged to about the same age. It is our conjecture, however, that the commentator has confused the affiliation of the two scholars Mahodadhi and Mahāvrata. Mahodadhi belonged to the Bhaṭṭa school as he had refuted the well-known Anvītabhidhāna theory of the Prabhākara school (vide Naya viveka, p. 271). Mahāvrata, therefore, belonged to the Prabhākara school and as a consequence he was cited with approval by M.M. Chandra, who was an authority of the Prabhākara school and referred in his work to the classics of his own school alone.

Śaṅkarācārya: This logician should be carefully distinguished from the great founder of the Advaita Vedānta. He was the earliest among orthodox scholars of Nyāya whose views were refuted by the Buddhist scholars. Jñānaśrī (q.v.) and his pupil Ratnakīrti mention his name first of all, suggesting that he preceded both Trilocana and Bhāsarvajñā who are named next to him. Ratnakīrti has preserved the name of one of his works the Sthirasiddhi, from which a passage has been cited in the Sthirasiddhidūṣaṇa (Patna ed., p. 108). Vācaspati in the Tatparyaṭīkā has referred to him as stated by Udayana in the Pariśuddhi. The passages are cited below.

कमयोगचाम्यामतिरिक्तः दृष्टीयः प्रकारः प्रतीतमयेत् प्रतीत्वत्वदिव्र न निषेधः न चेतः नतरामिति शक्राराप्यः। तत्रात्—तथा हीति। (under III, ii, 17; Tātparya, p. 387, line 14)

नन्तु नान्योरेव कमयोगचाम्यामसिशीभावः प्रकारान्तरसारसिंहितं शक्राराप्यः म्विन्येश्व विचिन्द्रनवास्मक म्वद्विन्येश्व शक्राराप्यः। यथा परासमविन्दुधिरे स्वाभाविक् प्रतिवदेशी पिरसाराप्यानः कश्चिदव्याहितिः म्वद्विन्येश्व प्रविन्येश्व। नन्तु नान्योरेव वाचस्य हीति। (ib., p. 387, last line: both from fol. 12b of the third chap. of the Pariśuddhi preserved in photograph in the Mithi Institute). Both the passages are evidently taken from the Sthirasiddhi of Śaṅkara.
It should be noticed that Vācaspati criticises Saṅkara's argument in the last case.

This passage also seems to have been taken from the *Sthirasiddhi.*

Saṅkarācārya is also cited in the *Nyāyaparīśīṣṭa* (p. 17) as the head of a band of scholars differing from the Bhāṣya-vārtikaschool.

This Saṅkara should also be distinguished from the earlier Saṅkara Svāmin referred to in Jayanta's *Nyāyaṃṇjarī* (p. 293) and other works.

Śālikanātha: According to Vardhamāna the following passage in the *Kiraṇāvalī* under the interesting topic of the ocular organ being made up of light or not, cited and refuted by Udayana, refers to Śālika.

The passage is very important, as pointing to the interesting fact, hitherto unknown, that Śālikanātha commented on the *Praśastapādabhāṣya.* This is clearly stated by Chennubhaṭṭa in the *Tarkabhāṣāprakāśikā* (Bombay ed., p. 211) where another passage is cited:—

1. Some Lost Nyāya Works and Authors:—Proceedings, AIOC, Ahmedabad.
(pp. 100-1) also quotes him upon Praśastapāda. Moreover, as is now well-known, Udayana's twitting reference to a 'Gauḍa' Mīmāṁsaka, who confounds verses from the Manu- saṁhitā as Vedic texts (!), is according to Varadarāja's note (p. 123) a fling at the 'Pañcikākāra' (i.e. Śālikanātha).

Under the same topic (Kusumāṇjali, Chap. III) Udayana in his own brilliant manner answers Śālikanātha directly with the change of a single word (आतानाम in place of पद्यानाम) in the latter's verses:—

प्राथमिकाद्विभाषात्वात्तथात्यंगमानवृधि

आतानांमेव सा शाक्तिवर्नमनुप्रसन्नताम्॥

(vide Varadarāja’s Kusumāṇjali-bodhanī, 1922, p. 127). Śālikanātha was the greatest authority of the Prabhākara school of the Mīmāṁsā. He wrote three Pañcikās, the Rjuvimalā (on the Brhatī of Prabhākara), the Dīpaśikhā (on the Laghu), and the standard work of the school, the Prakaraṇapāñcikā, besides a Bhāsyaparīśita. His works, though written in Bengal, circulated quickly throughout India. He preceded Vācaspati (q.v.). The following humorous verse is current about him in South India:—

शालिकात्यथवन्यूथो न जातो न जनिष्यते।

श्रमाकरप्रकाशाय चेन दीपशिखा कुता॥

Bhāskara: the famous exponent of the Duaitādvaita-theory of the Vedānta. He has been cited by Udayana in the Kusumāṇjali (II, p. 67: आद्यपरिदृढतिति भास्करस्योऽशुल्ये। Vardhamāna notes भास्करश्चित्रदेहनमानव्यक्तार्थिः. It is well-known that in his Bhāsyya, published at Varanasi, he refuted Śaṅkarācārya and the views of the Buddhist scholar Dharmakīrti, whom he calls 'Vipra-Bhikṣu' (p. 123). His views have been cited and criticised by Vācaspati in the Bhāmatī.

Bhūṣāṇa: i.e. Bhāsarvajña, author of the Nyāyabhūṣāna: a commentary on his own Nyāyasāra. The book, which is...
almost indispensable for studies on the history of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature, remains yet to be published, though it was discovered long ago in a Jaina library beyond the reach of scholars (Gaṇakārikā, Baroda ed., Introd. p. i.). As long ago as 1859 A. D., Hall knew (Index, p. 26) that the Bhūṣaṇa was a work of Bhāsarvajña, though there was much confusion later on. Udayana cited and refuted the Bhūṣaṇa several times in the Kīrṇāvalī. All the passages are interesting and are, therefore, reproduced below.

(1) चलतं पुनराह भूषणं—लज्जां चिन्हं लिङ्गसति पर्याय इति, तदसत्।
(Chowkh. ed., p. 43).

(2) तस्माद्वरं भूषणं—कमीचि गुर्णस्तवक्ष्ययोगाविद्या, न। (ib., p. 160).

(3) एते स्वयंप्रभृद एकत्वं स्वयंप्रभृदस्य नानात्म हितसति भूषणं: अत्यास्थ्यां। (ib., p. 192).

(4) व्यवहारासीमपि कर्मं विनाशकेमस्तु। न च चालमृतसः, भाष्याधिक्रियामयमायालयाय विनायकत्वात्। न...इति मात्याश्चातानिरास। (ib., p. 232: compare Līlāvatī p. 856).

None of the above passages is traceable in the Nyāayasāra; so they were all taken from the Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, a discursive work of great celebrity which earned for the author the epithet Bhūṣaṇakāra, by which he was almost universally known. The earliest writer, as far as can be ascertained from the present materials, who grappled with his views was the Buddhist scholar Jñānaśrī. The four great ‘pillars’ of Indian Logic (probably coming from four different quarters) were, according to Jñānaśrī, Śaṅkara, ‘Nyāyālaṅkāraṇa’, Trilocana and Vācaspati. For exigency of metre, the Bhūṣaṇa is mentioned by a synonym and before Trilocana. In the body of the books of Jñānaśrī and his disciple Ratnakirti (q. v.) the name Nyāyabhūṣaṇa is clearly given and correctly placed after Trilocana and before Vācaspati. Bhāsarvajña, who very probably belonged
to Kāsmīra, was slightly junior to Trilocana and slightly senior to Vācaspati and lived about the middle of the 10th century A. D.¹ It is known that in the Bhūṣāna the views of the Buddhist scholar Prajñākara are controverted. (Introduction to Gaṇakārikā).

UDAYANA’S PRE-EMINENCE: Udayana through his numerous works secured a position in the learned world which was quite enviable. From the 12th century onwards he was looked upon as the greatest exponent of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika doctrines and was the greatest target of all scholars of the opposing camps. Deva Sūri (1086-1169 A.D.), a foremost Jaina logician, drew up a sharp contrast between Udayana and the Kasmirian Jayanta, both of them being his targets of attack. He wrote:—

यद्र शाक्तिसिद्धि मञ्जुयुद्धन्दिपः।
जयत हुन्त का दन्त गरणा त्वयि कीतके॥
( Syādvādaratnākara, Chap. II )

Udayana’s discourse on the Nyāya theory of causation and explanation of the term ‘Sakti’ involved in it is found in the Kusumāṇjali (I, pp. 63-64). There is a magnificent pen-picture of Udayana found at the end of the first chapter of the Parisuddhi which is cited below in full. It was probably written by an admirer who actually saw him alive.

चाचस्यस्ते परि तत्त्वविचारार्थः-
तत्त्वश्चार्याद्विविद्यकरोदयद्वामिश्यानः।
आश्रयामान हि नासामसी स्वभावसे-
वर्षस्तिः पुनात्त्वोच्चलयांबमूख ॥

बुद्धियोग विचारप्रायः चतुरा वैद्यवानामस्वा
स्वायत्नेनकविविधालेखारसरसस्मित्वा।

¹. For his contributions etc. vide Bhūṣānakāra 0. Bhūṣānamata—Vangiya Sāhitya Parishat Patrikā, 1353, pp. 22-32.
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कान्ति: शान्तिमयी तनुःधृ नितरा वायी सुचायामात्रायथि
स श्रीमान्मुद्यकार सुकृती तात्त्वमुक्तिः बुधः ||

सद्वार्षीयमानंतराचलचलित्वमानान्तर-
न्यायमोनिष्ठपरिजातितिलका बाचस्वज्ञेयसि ||
श्रीव्याकारि वराह्नेव किरुणां सन्तोषवाहिन्यसौ
श्रावणामुद्येन तर्कानिकरे तात्त्वमुक्तिः सतामू ||

× ×

न्यायतात्त्वसंशुक्क्यियोक्ष्यिधान्ताहरिः ||

(fol. 103 of the Rotograph in the Mithila Institute)

How Udayana’s name was respected highly even in hostile camps would be clear from the following illustration. The great polymath Veṅkaṭanātha (1268-1369 A. D.) of the Rāmānuja school wrote the Nyāyaparīśuddhi, the bulk of which is taken up by an elaborate treatment of the Anumāna part (Chowkh. ed., pp. 92-359), more specially of the subject of debate. Unlike Gaṅgeśa, Veṅkaṭanātha has dealt with all the different classes of debate (Vāda, Jalpa and Vitanḍā) and the intricate divisions of fallacies and quibbles. He has quoted profusely from the works of his predecessors of the Rāmānuja school, who it appears grappled with the problems thoroughly and in a highly developed system of their own. The influence of Gaṅgeśa can nowhere be traced, but Udayana’s influence is clearly stamped in their views. The celebrated line of the Kusumāṇjali, परस्परविरोचे तु न प्रकरान्तरस्थितत् [III, 8] is accepted as an universal maxim (p. 133). Udayana, referred to as Nyāyācārya (p. 220), gave the best definition of the term Jāti (तब युक्तसमय p. 221), according to Veṅkaṭanātha. A former scholar Varadavisṇumisra had dealt with the classes of Jāti just according to Udayana (व्योदयन p. 235), who was thus formally regarded as the supreme authority on the subject. His well-known views on the term Tarka (sharply criticised by Śrīharsa) are respectfully cited (p. 327).
Among the manuscripts upon which the Varanasi edition of the Kiranāvali is based the scribe of one (Ms. No. 3 dated 1506 Śaka) eulogises Udayana in the following elegant verse, where he has been likened to an incarnation of Śiva, the god of learning:

बन्दू शिवं शिवभिस्वेद्यतं निदान-
मेकं गमिरनयतल्लविषेकसिन्द्रोऽः।
दोषाकरादं विविच्छ कलां भजन्तः-
मन्त्रवहाराचाचतपत्रं गुणम् सहस्रे॥

Udayana and Gaṅgeśa: There is hardly any topic dealt with in the four grand divisions of Gaṅgeśa’s work, which had not been already argued by Udayana in his main works and specially in the Kusumāṇjali. It is only in the method and mode of expression that Gaṅgeśa excelled over Udayana, whose prominent theistic background had to give place to subtleties of argument in course of time. TheĪśvaravāda portion of Gaṅgeśa failed completely to oust the Kusumāṇjali, which held its own through almost a millenium. When Vyāsatīrtha, the giant scholar of South India of the Mādhva community, grappled with the doctrines of Nātyavyāya in the Tarkatāndava, he preferred in many places Udayana against Gaṅgeśa (vide Tārkatāndava, Madras ed., I, pp. 148, 286 & 377). In fact his commentator Rāghavendratīrtha distinctly wrote in one place (p. 148) that Vyāsatīrtha controverted in the Prāmāṇyavāda (Utpattiprakaraṇa) the ‘older’ argument of Udayana, because Gaṅgeśa only embellished that argument with subtleties but could not give any new or original one of his own. Similarly the Upamāṇa part of Gaṅgeśa practically became extinct, as no scholar of any renown in Mithilā and Bengal (with the single exception of Pragalbha) ever commented on it. In its place the corresponding portion of the Kusumāṇjali (chap. III) commended itself for studies in the Nyāya seminaries. Chinnabhaṭṭa
expressly recommended the Kusumāṇḍjali on the question of Upamāna as a separate means of valid knowledge.

Vardhmāna in his several commentaries on Udayana has indicated the problems where his father Gaṅgeśa excelled in arguments. Here are a few references. In the Kusumāṇḍjali, Chapter I, there is an elaborate discussion on the much debated term ‘Sakti’; here Vardhmāna reproduced three passages of Gaṅgeśa (pp. 45, 48 & 51). In the second chapter Vardhamāna elucidated the text of Udayana on the favourite topic of Prāmāṇya, Šabdanyayatā and Jātiśakti with long and illuminating passages of Gaṅgeśa (pp. 8-11, 36-37 & 47-49). There are very many passages of Gaṅgeśa cited by Vardhamāna in the Nibandhprakāśa. Gaṅgeśa, therefore, cannot be separated from the moorings of Navyanyāya which were first laid down by Udayana in his major works specially the Nibandha and Kusumāṇḍjali. As a matter of fact, Gaṅgeśa himself displayed his utmost veneration for Udayana by quoting his words in almost every section of his large work. Among the predecessors of Gaṅgeśa by far the largest number of references belongs to Udayana. Some of these are pointed out below.

In the very first section (Maṅgalavāda) of the Pratyakṣa part there is an exact quotation from the Dravyakiranāvalī of Udayana (B. I. ed., p. 72: vide Kirāṇāvalī; Chowkh. ed., p. 3). In the next section (Prāmāṇyavāda) a well-known Kārikā of the Kusumāṇḍjali (IV. 1) on the definition of Pramāṇa is cited (p. 366) and it is interesting to note that Udayana is given the flattering epithet ‘Tāntrika’ here. In the same section there is a quotation from the Bauddhādhiṅkāra (p. 424). There are three references to ‘Ācāryāḥ’ towards the end (pp. 750, 834 & 845). Gaṅgeśa’s veneration for Udayana is best displayed in the section on Nirvikalpa (pp. 834-38), where after citing and refuting the views of Śivāditya, Gaṅgeśa formulated his final views on the topic under discussion on the basis of an exact.
quotation from the *Gunaṇakiranavali* (Chowkh. ed., pp. 201-2), which he fully explained in the manner of a regular commentator.

In the Anumāna part, it is well-known that Udayana’s definition of the term Vyāpti and its component Upādhi has been explained by Gaṅgeśa in the Pūrvapakṣa section (pp. 77-79: vide, *Kusumaṇṭjali* III. 2). Udayana’s definition of Upādhi is also critically reviewed under Upādhiṇḍa (pp. 312-13). For other references to Ācārya in this part vide pp. 593, 684, 888 (from the *Nibandha*) and 934. Udayana could not be superseded by Gaṅgeśa at all in the Iśvaravāda and Upamāna part. In the Śabda part we need only refer to the long and illuminating passage of Udayana with which Gaṅgeśa concludes the section on Vidhivāda (pp. 284 ff.). It need hardly be told that there are many other anonymous passages of Gaṅgeśa which are taken from Udayana. Commentators, specially Śārvabhauma, trace the source in many places (vide Śārvabhauma’s *Anumānanaṇḍapaniḥkṣaṇa*, fol. 53b, 110b, 139a & 161a: for the passages referred to vide B. I. ed., pp. 166, 380, 531 & 599 respectively).

**Udayana and Śrīharaṣṭa**: Owing to decay of Buddhism in India and the consequent degeneration of Buddhist scholarship, specially in the field of Nyāya studies Udayana’s powerful onslaught against the Buddhist doctrines produced no effect in the Buddhist camp. As far as we are aware no Buddhist scholar attempted to meet the arguments of Udayana, whose triumph in the controversy was almost unparalleled. It is a significant fact that the Buddhist logicians for almost a millenium quarrelled with the orthodox logicians alone and their opposition to the other schools of Indian philosophy is quite negligible. In the works of Jñānaśrī and Ratnakīrti, for instance, no Prabhākara and Vedānta author is ever mentioned or refuted. There is much truth in the assertion that in certain fundamental
doctrines the Buddhist and the Vedântin sail in the same boat. Chinnabhaṭṭa explains a passage of the Tarkabhaṣṭa as referring to सौगतश्रवाणिनी (p. 250), whose views are summarised in two interesting Kārikās. It is nothing surprising, therefore, that within a century after Udayana, a most powerful and scathing criticism of the Nyāya doctrines emerged from the pen of a Vedânta scholar. In the Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyāya of Śrīharṣa the logician's method of fixing and defining the categories with formidable precision was assailed in such a devastating manner that it was hailed throughout India as a novel contribution in the field of dialectics. Śrīharṣa's method of argument earned a special name as 'Khaṇḍanayukti' and, what is a most wonderful fact, the Khaṇḍana, as Śrīharṣa's work is commonly called, came to be regarded as one of the classical works of Navnyāya.

Śrīharṣa was a 'Gauḍa' (i.e. a native of Bengal) as categorically stated by Vidyāpati in the Puruṣaparikṣā (under Medhāvikathā: वृंभू गौडविषये श्रीहर्षो ना कविपिन्तः) and Vācaspati at the end of the Khaṇḍanoddhāra. The exact relation between Udayana and Śrīharṣa should be carefully determined, as they are the two towering figures that dominated dialectics in Eastern India for about three centuries before the work of Gaṅgeśa came to the forefront. Both the Khaṇḍana and the Naiṣadha were written at the court of Kānyakubja and it is sometimes argued that Śrīharṣa also was a native of Kānyakubja. We have collected elsewhere (I. H. Q., XXII, pp. 144-46) quite a volume of evidence, both internal and external, to prove that Vidyāpati's statement about the provenance of Śrīharṣa is undoubtedly correct. Use of the word 'ullulū' (Naiṣadha XIV. 51), 'udayabhāskara' (XVIII. 103) and the familiar name of a top still current in Bengal 'lalāḍdimba' (XXII. 53), mention of peculiar marriage customs prevalent in Bengal, indiscriminate use in alliteration of the three sibilants, the two nasals etc. and above all Śrīharṣa's writing a panegyric of the family of a Gauḍa king (गौडविषयेश्वरप्रथासि VII. 110) betray unmistakably
his Bengal origin, which is attested by many of his commentators like Candhu Pandita, Ishanadeva and Narayana. Udayana was controverted, therefore, not by a 'Pascatya' but by a 'Gauda' and this is quite in the fitness of things when we recollect that Bengal's rivalry with Mithila was more pronounced from ancient times than with any other province.

The Khandana criticises Udayana directly and right through, though the name of Udayana is not actually mentioned anywhere in the book. The very first definition of valid knowledge attacked by Sriharsha is tattvamati: sma and this again is the very first sentence of Udayana's Lakshanamala, as correctly stated by Sankara Misra (Varanasi ed. of the Svankara, pp. 143-44). Sriharsha's wonderful scrutiny of the two-worded phrase is a specimen of his profound scholarship (Chowkh, ed. with Vidyasagari, pp. 239-397). The next two definitions—vishvasramah numbar: sma (ib., pp. 397-411) and samvapkriyabodh: sma (pp. 411-27) attacked by Sriharsha are exactly taken from Udayana's Kusumankali (IV. 1 & 5).

A Jain scholar Abhayatilakopadhyaya, as we have stated before (p. 2, fn.), wrote a book of moderate length named Nyayalaankara, consisting of notes on the knotty passages of the five great classics of Nyaya including, last of all, Udayana's Parisudhi.1 According to Anandapurana (p. 129) a passage of the Nyayalaankara is cited and refuted by Sriharsha: Nyayalambhara—pratyaksnirnayecharnocchudpraya vadamantam tadnubandhi. At the end of the passage a line of Udayana’s Kusumankali is quoted in support (III. 8: praryavirinaycha hi n prakaraanarthavadi). Sriharsha thus not only criticised Udayana alone but many of his followers also and this is very

1. Gunaratana in his Saddarasanasaamuccayaavratti enumerated the works of the Nyayadarshana (B. I. ed., p. 94). His description is slightly incorrect, the name Srikantha (whose Tippana on the Purvamssanta has been discovered) should come last of all after Abhayatilaka, whose authorship of the Nyayalaankara is proved by recent discoveries.
much in evidence throughout the *Khaṇḍana*. Unfortunately the scholiasts do not specify them, except in this single instance.

Udayana has been criticised in many other places (*vide* pp. 705, 747, 1327 etc.). The most interesting passage is the one, so often reproduced by scholars, where Śrīharṣa answers Udayana by hurling the latter’s own words in the *Kusumānjali* (III. 7) against him in a slightly changed form:—( *Khaṇḍana*, p. 693)

सत्माद्याभिव्यक्तिसर्वधर्मे न खलु दुष्पठा।
त्यदृश्य्ययथायथाकरमचरणिः कियत्यथापि॥

त्यायातो यदि शास्त्रसित न चेच्छेद्या तत्त्वतराम्॥

त्यायायातबधिराश्रम तकः: शास्त्राय्यः कुतः॥

(*Khaṇḍana*, op. cit. p. 693)

It has been one of the favorite topics of students of logic. Gaṅgeśa answered Śrīharṣa in the section on Tarka (*Anumāṇa*, B. I. ed., p. 233) and all scholiasts up to Gadādhara have delightfully dealt with the age-old conflict of Udayana and Śrīharṣa.

We refer to two other typical passages of the *Khaṇḍana* where Udayana is subjected to detailed criticism. In the second chapter Udayana’s arguments for rejection of erroneous theories (अवसिद्धान्त) are cited from the *Pariśuddhi* (pp. 1018-19; Ānantaśākarṇa notes तात्त्वपरिशुचि…..उदयनीसां दृष्टिहितमुपन्यासयति) Śrīharṣa’s counter arguments go to the end of the chapter. Udayana is referred to here as कक्षितः. In the last chapter (pp. 1170-76) a long passage is cited from the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (B. I. ed., pp. 1170-1200) and refuted at length. All these place Udayana in the position of the greatest opponent whom Śrīharṣa wanted to meet by arguments.

Śrīharṣa’s *popularity*: Śrīharṣa’s great achievement was naturally hailed by the Vedāntists. Vidyāraṇya triumphantly wrote in the *Pañcadasī*:
The reception in the land of Udayana is a great revelation. Many Navyanyāya scholars of Mithilā (and Bengal) came to scoff at it but remained to pray. Divākaropādhyāya, Vardhamāna, Śaṅkara Miśra and even so late an author as Gokulanātha had written commentaries on it. So did Pragalbha, Padmanābha Miśra and Raghunātha (Vidyālaṅkāra) of Bengal. Vardhamāna attempted a refutation of it also, but it is completely lost. Vācaspati II and Śaṅkara, it is true, wrote powerful refutations. They were followed by two late scholars, Mādhava Miśra of Mithilā and Viśvanātha Paṅchānana of Bengal. But on the whole the refutation of Śrīharṣa’s arguments at the hands of the Nyāya scholars of Mithilā and Bengal is somewhat half-hearted and considerably out-weighed by their agreeable studies of those arguments.

This raises the problem of Vedāntic influence upon Udayana and other advocates of the uncompromising dualism of the Nyāya. It is now well-known that Udayana at the end of the Ātmātattvaviveka attempted a remarkable and powerful synthesis of all the orthodox systems of philosophy and, though orthodox Nyāya scholars emphasise upon the exact gradation of the systems as envisaged by Udayana the crowning glory remaining with the Nyāya, Udayana’s predilection towards the Vedānta cannot be brushed aside lightly. Phrases like सा चास्यनि न हैया मोचनगरणोपरामाणाकायान् from the pen of Udayana speak out his real mind. Maheśa Thakkura, one of the later glories of Mithilā, similarly expressed his veneration for the Vedāntic principles. The Navyanyāya, as a matter of fact, concerned itself more and more, as time went on, with the method of grappling with problems, not so much with the matter and Śrīharṣa’s method of vanquishing opponents consequently appealed to its votaries. An agreeable approach to the opponent’s views is in
evidence even in the times of Vācaspati, when the conflict with the Buddhist scholars was at its height. His application of the epithet ‘Tāyin’, of undoubted Buddhist origin to Akṣapāda in the second prayer verse of the Tātparyaṭīkā is quite revealing.

Date of Śrīharṣa is intimately related to that of Udayana and we shall discuss the problem at this place with up-to-date materials. Śrīharṣa’s date can be fixed within narrow limits from the following evidence. Towards the end of the Khaṇḍana (p. 1327), he respectfully mentions the name of the (Kasmirian) rhetorician Mahimabhaṭṭa in the following verse:

दोष न्यायविवेकेन्द्रयु कवितोकबिलोचने।
काव्यमीमांसिकः प्रात्ममहिमा महिष्मास्सद्वत॥

Mahimabhaṭṭa, who came after Abhinavagupta (1015 A.D.) and before Mammaṭa (c. 1100 A.D.), must have been living about 1050 A.D., and was probably a native of Kāśmir. The earliest date that can, therefore, be assigned to Śrīharṣa is 1075 A.D. This dismisses any attempt (cf. IA. 1913, p. 83) to place Śrīharṣa earlier. On the other hand, the earliest author, who quoted from Śrīharṣa’s Naiṣadhacarita, is Mahendra Sūri, a disciple of the famous Jaina polymath Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.). In his commentary on the Anekārthasaṅgraha of Hemacandra, he quoted many passages of the Naiṣadha as illustrations, e.g. under II, 18 (p. 8 of extracts from the commentary in Zachariae’s edn., 1893), II. 56 (p. 13), II. 274 (p. 43), II. 299 (p. 47), II. 303 (ibid.), II. 527 (p. 77) IV. 155 (p. 173) and IV. 339 (p. 184). This commentary, which was published in the name of the author’s teacher Hemacandra, was written ‘soon after’ the latter’s death (ibid. Preface p. XIII). Śrīharṣa, as a native of Bengal and a protege of the king of Kānyakubja, could not be supposed to have commanded the respects of foremost scholars of Western India unless he was at least an exact contemporary of Mahendra’s guru, Hemacandra, or slightly senior to him. None of the authorities, cited by Mahendra, as far as can be ascertained, belong to the latter-
half of the 12th century A. D. Śrīharṣa must, therefore, have written his works in the second quarter (1225-50 A. D.) of the century during the reign of Govindacandra of Kannauj (1104-54 A. D.), whose patronage of the poet is definitely stated by a commentator named Gadādhara. Śrīharṣa, probably, started his literary career with small tracts like Amarakhaṇḍanam (Madras Ms. No. R 1595) and Dvīrūpakoṣa (ibid. R 1607) with a view to enrich his vocabulary. Kṣīrasvāmin, in his commentary on the Amarkoṣa, quotes a line from Śrīharṣa saṅghāta-mātyur-marako marīmarī ca devatā (II. 6. 58). This is evidently from the Dvīrūpakoṣa or a similar work of the poet. Kṣīrasvāmin was quoted by Vardhamāna in the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi (Eggeling’s edn., pp. 306 and 430), which was composed in 1140 A. D. These early tracts of Śrīharṣa will have, therefore, to be assigned to the first decade of the century in the very beginning of reign of Govindacandra. It is possible that the poet in his very old age enjoyed the patronage of Vijayacandra (1169 A. D.) and Jayacandra, the son and grandson of Govindacandra. But the statement of Rājaśekhara Sūri that the poet wrote in the reign of the latter prince need not be taken as literally true; Rājaśekhara could not correctly record the name and relation of Jayacandra in the Prabandhakoṣa. Besides the Naiśadha and the Khaṇḍana, Śrīharṣa is known to have written many more works, mentioned by himself at the end of the several cantos of his poem. One of them is the Sthairyavīcāra mentioned at the end of Canto IV of the Naiśadha. It appears that the editor of a Vedānta work Brahmanavidyābharaṇam (published at Kumbakonam) had access to copies of this long-lost work, from which he cited in the short introduction the following important (introductory) verse:


History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā

Śrīharṣa herein glorifies the powers of one Cidvilāsa, who frustrated the black acts of a Tāntrika named Gupta. Cidvilāsa was by tradition the pontiff of the Kāmakoṭi shrine of Kānci and his encounter with, and the subsequent conversion at his hands of, the great Khaṇḍanakāra is recorded in a work named पुष्पवीणमासी also, cited in the same introduction (cf., स्वरूपकाल संपादितकाव्य... The traditional date of Cidvilāsa, according to the records of the shrine, is 4268-4301 of the Kali era (1167-1200 A.D.), which is about half a century too late for Śrīharṣa. Śrīharṣa also wrote a work named Śivaśaktisiddhi (see canto XVIII). This book also was accessible to the above editor, who quoted the following stanza from it:

Here again Cidvilāsa of the Kāmakoṭi shrine of Kānci is referred to in glowing terms and invoked for inspiration in the book which had for its subject the identity of Śiva and Śakti. The editor identifies this Cidvilāsa with Advaitānanda, the author of the Brahmavidyābharanam. But the identity seems to be quite unwarranted. Whether this Cidvilāsa is to be identified with Śrīharṣa's 'Guravāḥ' cited by him in Khaṇḍana (Chowkh. ed., p. 1316) cannot be determined at the present state of our knowledge.
Among the three royal panegyrics written by Śrīharṣa, all of them unfortunately remaining undiscovered, the Vijayapraśasti (mentioned at the end of canto v) was upon Vijayacandra, the son of his patron Govindacandra of Kanauj. We quote in support the gloss of one of the oldest commentators on the Naiṣadha named Śrīvatsesvara from a very old palmleaf copy (stopping at Canto XI) preserved in the V. R. Museum, Rajshahi (Ms. No. 809):

विजयचन्द्र या प्रशस्ति: कविना कृता, तत्र राजो जीवितवाद्य गौरवाद्या
श्रीशब्दः प्रयुक्ते।

According to another commentator Gopinātha the Vijayapraśasti was a panegyric of the Gauḍa king Vijayasena (L. 1639: विजयसेननामो गौड़ेचरस्य). But this seems hardly possible as Śrīharṣa wrote a separate Gaudorūṣakulapraśasti (Canto VII), which was more likely in praise of the Sena kings. Śrīharṣa’s connection with the court of Vijayasena, however, may be taken as a fact. His connection with another royal court is proved by another panegyric the Chindapraśasti (Canto XVII). But the Arṇavavarṇana (Canto IX) was not a royal panegyric (‘praśasti’), as is sometimes interpreted by scholars; it must have been a small lyric poem describing the ocean (cf. Śrīvatsa’s note संदर्भ सन्दर्भचित्रं प्रसिद्धितम् यावत् भवेऽव्यवस्य वर्णिते ज्ञाते).

Now we are confronted with the question—what length of time intervened between Udayana and Śrīharṣa. As early as 1884 A. D. M. M. Vindhyasvaraprasāda discovered a definite answer to the question, which seems to have escaped the notice of scholars. On the strength of a Naiṣadhaṭīkā by one Bhagiratha he stated that Śrīharṣa’s father Śrīhira had academic contest with Udayana. In other words Udayana was older than Śrīharṣa by only one generation. (vide Introd. to Vaiṣeṣikas darśana, Śrāvana 1941 V. S., p. 26). Unfortunately the actual words of the commentator were not quoted. The commentary named Gudhārthadipikā is by far the most extensive ever.
written on the Naiṣadha; a fragment of it dated 1629 Saka (probably revised by the commentator himself) is now preserved in the Sarasvati-Bhavana (vide Introd. to the Tārkikaraṇās, pp. 30-31). The colophon proves that Bhagiratha wrote it at the court of Rāja Jñānachandra of Kūrmāchala, (1698-1708 A.D.) under whom and under whose son Jagaccandra (1708-20 A.D.) he wrote several other works. At the end of Canto I of this "Bhagirathi" commentary there is a rushing flow of most fanciful etymologies of the names of Śrīharṣa and his parents (fol. 83). One such etymology of the name Śrīhira, who was the father of Śrīharṣa, runs:—यद्रा हि निक्रयेन हृतं उदयनचार्यगतिस्य कष्टते ह्वर। स्वप्नसंविंचति समासाः। ब्रम्ह बुको ह्वर: श्रीहर:। शाक्पाधिवार्ति:। ईर: गत्ता। कष्टानाथ।Another etymology, equally fanciful, of the name Śrīharṣa runs: यद्रा हुष्टे निक्रयेन पिनिराम्भवा उदयनचार्यस्य पराल्रक्रयेलो श्रीजिमानस स्वतः ह्वरः। हर्म्व स्लेहेन। प्रचारः। Bhagiratha incidentally records here two bits of an important tradition that Udayana defeated Śrīhira in the debate and Śrīharṣa avenged the defeat at the request of his parents. Bhagiratha is a very recent author; he evidently derived his information from some of the many earlier commentaries consulted by him.

One of the earliest and most learned scholiasts of the Naiṣadha was Cāndū Pañḍita, whose commentary was composed in 1353 V. S. (i.e. 1296-97 A.D.). At the very commencement Cāndū Pañḍita categorically stated that Udayana in a conquering campaign challenged Śrīharṣa’s father in a debate and defeated him and Śrīharṣa, as a faithful son, avenged the defeat by meeting Udayana’s arguments in the Khaṇḍana. The exact words of Cāndū Pañḍita are:—

(Des. Cat. of Mss., B. O. R. I., Poona, Vol. XIII, Pt. I, p. 481) It should be carefully noticed that both Cāndū Pañ-
dita and Bhagiratha (who might have based his etymological speculation on the words of the former) mention the fact of Udayana's personal conflict with Śrīharṣa's father directly without the least suspicion about its veracity. But unlike Bhagiratha Cāṇḍū Paṇḍita is more definite about the manner of Śrīharṣa's revenge, which took the form of a literary retort instead of a personal contest. It is interesting to note farther that, according to Cāṇḍū Paṇḍita, Śrīharṣa's greatest ambition in life was to write this great Refutation and he acquired all his talents (through devotions of the mystic Cintāmaṇi-mantra) with that end in view. It is substantially proved in our opinion by the fact that in his 'very angry' mood Śrīharṣa nowhere refers to Udayana by name in the Khaṇḍana.

Śrīharṣa's conflict with Udayana was a common tradition current in the Indian seminaries. The editor of the Khaṇḍana with Śaṅkara has recorded a tradition that Śrīharṣa debated directly with Udayana, who lived to answer Śrīharṣa's arguments in the Ātmātattvaviveka!! (Introd., pp. 6-7). These floating traditions have little historical value, but the definite incident of Śrīharṣa's father Śrīhīra's defeat at the hands of Udayana recorded in a commentary of the Naṅsadha within a century and a half from Śrīharṣa and exactly corroborated in later commentaries forms the kernel of truth behind them all. It is possible to fix roughly the time of this historic debate between Udayana and Śrīhīra. It could never have taken place before 1050 A.D. and probably took place in the decade 1075-85 A.D., when Śrīharṣa was a mere boy.

**Date of Udayana:** Under the above computation Udayana's date of birth would fall about 1025 A.D., and his period of activity would cover the last half of the century (1050-1100 A.D.). This is confirmed by a large volume of evidence, which is summarised below.

(1) Udayana's feeling of great diffidence expressed at the commencement of the Pariśuddhi, which was one of
his last works, proves that he was removed by some length of time from Vācaspati, who, as we have shown before, had been quoted and sometimes criticised by Udayana’s teacher Śrīvatsa. This feeling of great and almost aweful reverence for Vācaspati persists throughout the Pariśuddhi and we quote below two magnificent verses from the unpublished portion of the book. At the end of the Pramāṇa section Udayana writes: (fol. 71b of the Rotograph preserved in the Institute)

स्वच्छ्यः स्वभावशुच्योऽदितितिशेषेन गुर्वयों दुर्भेद्विद्वेद्विद्वेदरुपाक्रमहन्तः समाध्या ।
ठोकागिरो विपदपाद्विपुरो अ चेय्या कंगे नन्तु चशे जगदेव तेभाय ॥
At the end of I. ii we find (fol. 103b):—

अनन्यासहोयात् शुद्धिविवर्गमेव लालुतः
मुखमाक्षाथान्तः चुसम्मक्षमारतः पथादः ।
मनः श्रीमद्वाचस्यतिष्ठचन्द्रविन्यासविसरत
सरस्वत्यापेतन्युहुरिव सहुनिष्टवितमपि ॥

(The reading in the Tanjore copy is somewhat corrupt: Cat., p. 4482.)

* It may be surmised, therefore, that Udayana was about three generations later than Vācaspati, whose date has been fixed by us as the latter half of the 1Cth century A.D. At the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to refer the date 898 of Vācaspati’s Nyāyasūcīnibandha to the Vikrama-era and that Śaka date (corresponding to 976-77 A.D.) falls about a century before the flourishing period of Udayana under the above scheme.

(2) Udayana’s date is most intimately related to that of Śrīnāsaṅk, who was directly controverted by him in his very first work, Ātmatattvaaviveka. And the date of Śrīnāsaṅk is fixed beyond any dispute in the Tibetan works. He was an exact contemporary of Dīpaṅkara Śrīnāsaṅk, surnamed Atīśa. The latter’s life, based on contemporary sources, was dis-
covered by S. C. Das in Tibet; it was ‘printed’ in Tibet in the year called dog about the year 1250 A.D. (Journ. Buddhist Text Society, I. i., 1893, p. 7 fn.). According to the Southern System of Bṛhaspati Cycle introduced in Tibet about the year 1026 A.D., the year Śādhāraṇa (No. 44) is named Iron-dog in Tibetan (S. C. Das: Tibetan Grammar, 1915, App. V, pp. 9-10) and it fell exactly in the year 1250 A. D. Atiśa (who was born not in 980 A. D. but in 982-3 A. D.) left for Tibetan at the age of 59 in March 1041 A. D. (I. H. Q., VI, p. 159). Just three years before (i.e. in 1038 A. D.) the king of Tibet sent Nag-tsho (Vinayadharā) to Magadha for bringing Atiśa; the elaborate account of his mission, which has been published, bears on the face of it a stamp of veracity so rare in ordinary works of the type. The Tibetan learnt on arrival that among the eminent Pandits under Atiśa one of the foremost was Ratnakīrtī. In a grand assembly at Vikramaśīlā occurring soon after the Tibetan saw among others two teachers of Atiśa viz. Vidyākokila and Naropaṇa (I. c. p. 18). Atiśa consulted oracles in various places and at Vajrāsana and acted according to the instructions of ‘Ācārya Jñānaśrī’ (p. 20). Sometime after (i.e. in 1039 A. D.) Naropaṇa came on his last visit to Vikramaśīlā; “he leaned on the right arm of Atiśa while Jñānaśrīmitra helped him with his left arm”. (p. 21) Naropaṇa died soon after in the South. This definitely proves that Atiśa and Jñānaśrī were the two towering figures of Vikramaśīlā at that time, though both of them were younger in age to Naropaṇa. Jñānaśrī was then evidently retired, succeeded by his distinguished pupil Ratnakīrtī. Like Atiśa he was presumably living still in 1050 A. D. and, as we have stated before, Udayana probably wrote the Ātmatauttaviveka about this time (say within 1050-60 A. D.) when Jñānaśrī was still alive.1

1. The date of Atiśa’s starting for Tibet, which exactly coincided with the king Nayapāla’s accession to the throne, is generally taken as 1038 A. D., that is three years earlier than the date we have given (Vidyabhūsana, I. c., p. 520). This date has been practically accepted in the
(3) Udayana on the one hand was one full generation (i.e., about 40 years) later than Jñānaśrī and on the other senior to Śrīharṣa by the same period of time and both these pieces of evidence happily combine to settle his date within the last three quarters of the 11th century (1025-1100) A.D. as we have stated above.

Hist. of Bengal (Vol. I, p. 177)—where Nayapāla’s reign starts from 1038 A.D.). Before Atiśa started for Tibet there was a fight between Nayapāla and Karṇa (‘king of the Western countries’); this could not have taken place in 1038 A.D. when Karṇa was not yet on the throne. The confusion is due to the fact that the Brhaspati cycle is current in two different systems—the Prabhavādi (called the Southern system) and the Vijayādi (called the Northern system). The former and not the latter was introduced in Tibet (S. C. Das: Tibetan Grammar, p. xv & Bk. I, p. 48) and the year Vikrama, when Atiśa left for Tibet according to the Tibetan accounts, fell in 1038 A.D. according to the latter system, while it fell in 1040-41 A.D. under the former system, which is still current in Tibet. A similar confusion arose in computing the birth-date of Atiśa, which was in the Tibetan year Tsu-rta (Water-horse) corresponding to the Chitrabhānu of the Brhaspati cycle; under the Southern system that year fell in 982-83 A.D., and not in 980 A.D. “Jñānaśrī Mitra of Gauḍa” was a gatekeeper at Vikramaśilā under Canaka (Vidyabhusana, p. 520) but the Tibetan historians Tāranātha and Sampo mention five mythical Pāla kings (including Canaka) between Mahipāla and Nayapāla. Unlike them the biographer of Atiśa correctly stated that Atiśa became High priest under Mahipāla (p. 11), the patron evidently of Jñānaśrī also.
CHAPTER II

PRE-GANGEśA WRITERS

Srīvallabhācārya: is the author of the Nyāyasilāvatī, one of the few original classics of the Navyanyāya, which has been happily published with three commentaries (Chowkh. ed., 1934, pp. 864). At the very outset we should mention that the name of the author was Srīvallabha and not Vallabha. Vādindra calls him by that name (Rasasāra, p. 92), while in the Chitsukhiṭṭikā he is invariably cited under the name of Srīvallabha (Bombay ed., 1915, pp. 196, 198, 230, 298-99 &c., more than a dozen times) and not even once as Vallabha. Rājaśekhara in his commentary on the Kandali confused the name (Peterson's Report, 1887, p. 273: चतुथ्वी तु जीलावसिति ब्यातां श्रीवल्लाचार्यां वर्णनः) and mistook the book as a commentary on the Bhāṣya, but he knew that the name of the author began with a 'Srī'. Guṇaratna (1409 A.D.) also followed Rājaśekhara, but he described the book correctly (l.c., p. 282: जीलावसितकः श्रीवल्लाचार्यां: ) The Lilāvatī, as the book is commonly known, covers the same grounds as the Praśastapādabhāṣya, which be it known, was invariably called at the end of the six chapters of the book by the commentator Śrīdhara by the correct and significant name 'Padārthapraveśa' (Kandali, pp. 94, 289, 311, 321, 324 & 330). In other words, the elaboration of the six categories of the Vaiśesika system which became the prime function of the Vaiśesika scholars ever since Praśastapāda to the detriment of the original Kaṇādasūtras, formed the main thesis of Srīvallabha, the first chapter of his book named (Padārtha-) Vibhāgāpariccheda forming its great bulk (up to p. 731 of the Chowkh. ed.). Srīvallabha, however, displayed his originality by adding three small chapters at the end respectively elaborating Difference of properties (Vaidharmya), Community of properties (Sādharmany) and Operation (Prakriyā). The whole book is
divided besides into 75 separate sections falling under the four chapters. Some of these sections including the whole chapter on Operation mark a departure from the doctrines of the original Sūtrakāra and a distinct tendency towards fusion with the Nyāya. As a matter of fact, in the second introductory verse Śrīvallabha, with an excellent pun, describes Lady Līlāvatī (the actual name of his own wife according to Vardhamāna and other scholiasts) as a skilful mistress in the premises of the Science of Reasoning (सान्तीचालनवेवीरमद्वदूलाश्रीन्यायलीलावती). This proves that according to Śrīvallabha the Vaiśeṣika system as well as the Nyāya system both come under the term ‘Ānvīkṣikī’. There have been borrowings from each other. For instance, Abhāva (negation) has been accepted as a separate category into the Vaiśeṣika from the Nyāya, just as the mental organ is introduced into the latter from the former. This, says Śrīvallabha (pp. 35-6, read with Vardhamāna), does not conflict with the individuality of the two systems. The section on Abhāva (pp. 544-79) is immediately followed in the Līlāvatī by the section on Apavarga (Emancipation, pp. 580-98), both coming under the category of Guṇa.

The Līlāvatī was by far the best Vaiśeṣika treatise in the medieval period, and the most intricate one. It outshone the more or less elementary treatises of Sarvadeva (whose Pramāṇamañjarī, though popular, is only a booklet of 16 pages), Vādīvāgīśvara (author of the Mānamanohara, not yet published) and Śivādītya Misra. Like the works of Udayana on the one hand and that of Gaṅgeśa on the other the intricacy of the Līlāvatī attracted the best intellects of Mithilā even before the times of Gaṅgeśa and it enjoyed the privilege of being the only post-Udayana work before Gaṅgeśa to rank among the immortal classics of Neo-Logic.

The authorities cited in it are listed below alphabetically: Indra, a pre-Pāṇiniian grammarian (p. 625).
Udayana in *Tātparyāśuddhi* (p. 445): the passage cited is interesting, it accords Udayana’s fling at the scholars of Bengal for their incorrect pronunciation of the three sibilants still persisting in Bengal (शुरूआद्वितियनिविन्यनरनतु नीलाद्रितिबाहर: शास्त्रविद्वार चैत्यविद्वारे गौरीनाथम्...इत्यादि तत्त्वाभ्याःश्चादृश्यः).

*Kiraṇāvalīkāra* (pp. 399-400, 533-34 & 823). In the first two cases Udayana is criticised and rather violently (प्रतिपत्तिमतेत्विचारासह्यतः) in the second place, where Udayana’s novel arguments against the admissibility of Upamāṇa as a means of valid knowledge are cited at length.

*Carakācārya* (p. 816).

*Tīkā* (i.e. *Kiraṇāvalī*, pp. 38 & 39). The term is invariably applied to the *Tātparyāśūkikā* of Vācaspati, but Śrīvallabha as a protagonist of the Vaiśeṣika in a manner paid his respects to Udayana by using the term for the *Kiraṇāvalī* instead.

*Tutātita* (i.e. Kumārila) mentioned along with Kīrti, the Buddhist authority (p. 480).

*Tattvakaumudī* of Vācaspati (p. 533) cited with approval on the refutation of Upamāṇa.

*Bhāsarvajña* (p. 405): the passage is cited as very important वत्स भासाेवाचित्या तत्त्व पूर्वस्त्तत्रत्व परत्व पञ्चयात्तत्तत्वसरविशिष्टतित तत्त्व काव्यभव-पञ्चासामायविज्ञन्यप्रभुवत्।पञ्चयात्तत्तवात्तत्वातर्किकस्य निर्देशकुमारश्चादृश्यः.

*Bhūṣaṇa* (i.e. *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* of Bhāsarvajña, pp. 283, 357, 452, & 856). All the passages are important and should be carefully discussed. We need only refer to one line of Śrīvallabha, which has been noticed by many scholars. तद्धत्तपणमना-माताता भासाेवाचित्या तद्धत्तपणमायांमायम्मिन्यते तथा च तद्धत्तपणमायायायस्य सिंहनाथः—सौविदेश भासाेवाचित्यादि (p. 358). Padmanābha in his *Anunaya* commentary (Adyar Ms., p. 143 of a transcript with the present writer) explains आचार्य द्वित्वस्मीक्तारे रक्षादानः।तद्धत्तपणमः.
We should better take Prāşastapāda as the Ācārya in this passage.\(^1\) It should be stated that Padmanābha here mistook Bhāsarvajña and Bhūṣaṇa as different persons. The passage clearly indicates that according to Śrīvallabha Vācaspati (Tātparyaṭīkā, p. 277) came after Bhāsarvajña.

Paramakośākāra (p. 675: अलसो नित्रपयन्वो निर्ह्तसाह इति परस्कोष्कारबचनात्.)

Mahāvrata (p. 647), an ancient Ācārya.

Vyomācārya (p. 834: vide Vyo mavati, p. 450).

It should, moreover, be noticed that Śrīvallabha never refers to Udayana by the honorific title Ācārya almost universally attributed to him. To him Vācaspati was the ‘Ācārya’ (p. 533), the Tātparyaacārya (p. 358) and the ‘Paramanyāyācārya’ (p. 762).

Like Udayana Śrīvallabha was a powerful writer. His intricate argumentative style is interspersed with elegant passages here and there. We may refer to the splendid passages on pp. 140, 144 and 648 as instances.

Śrīvallabha undoubtedly belonged to Mithilā. In the first place from the earliest times it was commented upon by Maithila scholars of the front rank like Prabhākara, Vardhamāna and Vatsesvara and when Vardhamāna categorically states that in the first prayer verse and the second introductory verse the author had respectively referred through double entendre to his father Puruṣottama and his beloved wife Līlāvatī, there is not the remotest chance that the pedigree of a ‘foreign’ author could come within his knowledge so directly. Only a Maithila scholar’s family details could be recorded by Vardhamāna in that manner. In the second place, Śrīvallabha incidentally refers to a reigning monarch in the following elegant passage:

...and Gāganaṁśa, Anvayamuktaṁśa, Pancha, Kāśmīraḥ, Kāśmīraḥ, and (p. 290; repeated by Vardhamāna in his commentary on the passage p. 291). The passage is cited in the Nyāyamuktaṁśa, a commentary on Udayana's Laksanaṁśa by Śeṣa Śārṅgadhara (Varanasi ed., p. 41), who made it more elegant by adding the word lalana. It is also reproduced in the Citsukhi (p. 322) and in the Upaskāra of Śaṅkara Miśra (under II. ii. 10) in a modified form. It was evidently inspired by a passage of the Kiraṇavaṁśa in the same section of Kāla (Varanasi ed., p. 116: Anvayavāraśīśthitam nīlauṇ pāṭālīupāṭālīvāśā vṛddhotamānuparhantavādāt. cf. Upaskāra on II. ii. 6). Cinnabhaṭṭa localised it by mentioning Vijayanagarī and Virūpākṣa instead (p. 228). We need hardly state here that Mithilā was under the rule of a 'Kārṇaṭa' dynasty for two centuries and a half (from about 1100 to 1350 A.D.), which was the most glorious period in the cultural and social history of Mithilā. The most illustrious among the kings of the dynasty was its founder Nānyadeva (1094-1147 A.D.). If the Bhūparikramaṇa (fol. 18b) and the Puruṣaparikṣā of Vidyāpatī are to be believed this monarch 'of the Kārṇaṭa family' (kārneśvara-saṃvād) was living still in the reign of Jayacandra of Kanauj (vide Ṛuḍvīravṛkṣa). There is hardly any doubt that Śrīvallabha was referring to this monarch of Mithilā in the above passage. It should be carefully noticed that the reference is to a 'Kārṇaṭa' family and not to a 'Karnāṭa' country.

In the following interesting example of 'intuition' (Āṣṭāṅga), Śrīvallabha refers again to a local monarch, who was not, however, a 'Cakravartin' (overlord) but only a 'Nṛpati' (p. 629) yatha vā Vivekānta,ummādhārābhāvāhinaḥ bhavati—Śāriṅgaḥ nāyaptirīdāni śivakṣarṣasāśvīrāyām dṛṇāya kīlākṛtya sah nālītāmāhūrya bhūkṣhīdamaḥprītiḥ kṣaṇam. Nāḥ pāṇipātyōsaṃvādāt [bhedātmanakṣara-āśāvānlokeśāhānāntarānih, pāṇipātyōsaṃvādāt] That this is a reference to a living monarch is proved by the author's assertion that the incident known through intuition tallied with facts. Śaṅkara Miśra explains that it is an example of know-
ledge at a distance in position, not in time. (ib., p. 629 देशविमषकर्मेण उदाहरति).

Śrīvallabha frequently mentions Vārāṇasī (pp. 140, 399-400) with which he was apparently quite familiar. In the first mention (p. 140) he seems to have recorded his personal experience that a pupil’s brain improves sweetly from sips of Gaṅgā water at Vārāṇasī after tasting myrobalan. He must then have studied at Vārāṇasī and from early times Maithila students had kept up communication with that great centre of Indian culture and religion.

Date of Śrīvallabha: As we have stated above Śrīvallabha has not given the well-known epithet ‘Ācarya’ to Udayana, from whom he was not much removed in time. On pp. 37-40 he has cited the views of a scholar, partly of the same school, with whom, however, he disagrees, who quoted the Ṭīkā (i.e. the Kiranāvalī, vide Guṇa part, p. 184; Rasasāra, p. 22 and Guṇaprakāśa, p. 48) in his support. We should, therefore, place him about two generations after Udayana in the second quarter of the 12th century A.D. late in the reign of Nānyadeva. His definition of Vyāpti, as is well-known, is cited and refuted by Gaṅgeśa in the section on Pūrvapakṣa (B. I. ed., p. 83 and Lilāvatī, pp. 496). But he was not cited anywhere by Śrīharṣa, who was his exact contemporary. On the other hand, a pre-Gaṅgeśa scholar of Mithilā named Prabhākaropādhyāya commented on his work perhaps for the first time. Many authors of the 13th century A.D. like Vādīndra and Citsukha, not belonging to Mithilā, have quoted him respectfully by name. It is impossible, therefore, to place him after 1175 A.D. It should be mentioned here that Pratyagṛūpa, commentator of Citsukha in one place (Citsukhi, Nirm. ed., p. 326) refers to the Lilāvatī as a ‘recent’ book. Pratyagṛūpa’s date is about 1350 A.D.

From the following quotation which we traced in Vardhamāna’s Anvikṣānayatattvabodha it is gathered that
Besides the *Lilāvatī* Śrīvallabha wrote a commentary on the 5th chapter of the Nyāyasūtra, the most intricate part of the system. Many other scholars including Udayana tackled the chapter separately.

Chātra Śrīvallabha—यथं विरोषविविधं विपरितकारणाग्राहिकर्मयापदें जातंतरं स्वयं। सन्ति च साङ्गस्यत्तामोरसरसरानिश्रानवजान्वितम्। कत्स्मात्स्यवपदस्य वेदनोपलच्चयम्। तेन निर्विकारसामीपेये सिद्धान्तकारणेन प्रत्यवस्थानमममितः। (under V. i. 14) Vardhamāna has referred to this view of Śrīvallabha also in the *Pariśīṣṭopakāsa* (p. 38) under the caption केसविद्राहुः. Moreover, it is likely that Śrīvallabha wrote a separate tract named *Īṣvarasiddhi* cited by himself (p. 406: यथा चैतत्त्वसामासिद्धिः एवमहत्वहुतकम्), for, the reference does not seem to be to the small section on Īśvara in the *Lilāvatī* (pp. 239-62), where the relevant topic is not traceable.

*Sivāditya Miśra*: The name of this great author of various works on the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika now lives through his elementary treatise *Saptapadārthi*, which has long been published with various commentaries. Though all his polemical works have perished, his prayer at the end of the *Saptapadārthi* has been luckily fulfilled:

ॐ नमः गृहा वाहवृ वाहवृ सत्त्व धराधरः।

तावृ समप्रकाशीयास्तु वसुक्ष्मकाशिनी।

Gangeśa, who very rarely names his predecessors, made an exception in the case of Śivāditya, who is cited by name in the section on Nirvikalpa (*Prakāśa* part, B. I. ed., p. 830): the following verse in the passage has been wrongly printed as prose:

चिद्मद्विनियमाचित्तविद्वितियन्त्रत्वं सत्त्वः

देवप्रायोऽयामतौ विष्णुरूपमन्यत्।
It may be taken as a typical illustration of the style and consummate scholarship of Śivāditya exhibited in his lost works which seem to have been both in prose and verse. In the present case Śivāditya was cited by Gaṅgeśa only to be refuted. Gaṅgeśa's own views on the intricate point, the definition and function of Viśeṣaṇa and Upalakṣana, were based on a passage of Udayana (from the Kirāṇāvalī, pp. 201-2) respectfully quoted and explained by him (pp. 834-5).

Among the lost works of Śivāditya the Lakṣaṇamālā, based on Mahāvidyā syllogism (vide Citsukhiṭikā, pp. 180-81), was probably his masterpiece. We have stated before that the recently published work of that name, wrongly ascribed to him, is really a long-lost work of Udayana. Not one single sentence of Śivāditya, cited by different authorities, can be traced in it. Śivāditya's array of intricate definitions, which earned for him the epithet of a 'follower of the new crooked path' was assailed by Vāḍindra (Mahāvidyāvidāmbana, pp. 74, 79, 109 & 117) and more frequently by Citsukha (vide Citsukhiṭikā, pp. 180, 183, 192-3, 195, 200, 237, 295-6, 309, 323 & 327-8) in the second chapter of the Tattvapradīpikā. Among these dozen quotations one (p. 237) is particularly important: Citsukha refers to it as a 'crooked course' of the 'modern', which is really an elaboration of Udayana's words and anonymously quoted by Gaṅgeśa in the very beginning of the Upādhiṇḍa. It should be noticed that this very passage of Śivāditya is ascribed by Ānandapūrṇa to Nārāyaṇa-Sarvajña (q.v.). None of these definitions are traceable in the Saptapadārthi.

A very small tract of Śivāditya named Hetukhaṇḍana has been discovered (Intro. to Mahāvidyāvidāmbana, p. XIX).
In it there are references to two lost works of Śivāditya, 'Upādhiśārtika' and 'Arthāpatīśārtika' and to an unknown author of a certain 'Mayanandani' (fol. 8). Probably Śivāditya had written a comprehensive work with the appellative 'Vārtika', the above-mentioned works forming two of its parts. Besides the long quotation by Gaṅgeśa (Pratyakhya, pp. 829-30), many other passages of Śivāditya, all of them intricate and learned, are found in various works. We quote some of them below. Vardhamāna in his Tattvabodha under V. i. 37 writes:—

शिवादिष्यमिश्रस्तु प्रयत्नावस्तवाचिकाविद्वानानेन द्वान्तरित्तवृत्तम्।
तथा च साश्चल्लेत्तैः हेतुनां द्वान्त[त्त]रेखानिष्ठापादनं कार्येसमुः……ः इत्यादि।
(fol. 62b) This seems to imply that like Udayana and many other scholars, Śivāditya had written a separate commentary on the fifth chapter of Gautama. Jānakīnātha in his Nyāya-siddhāntamaṇḍari refers to an advanced view of Śivāditya thus (Chowkh. ed. with Yādava's commentary, p. 9):—

शिवादिष्यमिश्रस्तु कर्णनायाचारानुगमिताः।
कर्णनादिक्षमकेत्यहोपाधिक्रृतसामान्यमहोऽभिचक्कु।

Jānakīnātha has quoted this same view of Śivāditya at the end of the Ānavikṣikātattvatattvavivarana (fol. l66b). This classification of Upādhi into two classes, Sakhaṇḍa and Akhaṇḍa, already referred to by Gaṅgeśa (Pratyakhya, p. 842), has been variously ascribed to different scholars. Among Nyāya scholars Śivāditya seems to be the earliest. In the Saptapadārthi he divides Śāmānya (Universals) into two classes Jāti and Upādhi perhaps for the first time.

Among other original views of Śivāditya we should mention his definition of Darkness (Saptapadārthi, p 84: आरोपित-नीललेपोपसामायभावकार:) which is an adaptation of the famous views of the Kandali. Like Bhāsarvajña he accepts अन्वयवसित as a separate class of Hetvābhāsa, which according to him is six-fold. Against all Vaiśeṣika views he enumerates an eleventh 'quarter' (Dik) named 'Raudrī'. He enumerates a third variety of Śāmānya 'Parāpara'. His predilection for the Kandali-
is again manifested in his admitting ‘Citrarasa’ (p. 26). Balabhadra, the commentator, remarks चित्त्येतत् (p. 149).

Śivāditya’s date can be easily fixed as the middle of the 12th century A.D. As he was controverted by the eminent scholar of South India, Vāḍīndra, who flourished in the reign of the famous Yādava king Singhana (1210–47 A.D.) he cannot be brought down further than 1175 A.D. He certainly came after Udayana and was one of the bright stars in the galaxy of great scholars who flourished about 1150 A.D.—Śrīvallabha, Śrīharṣa, Vādivāgīśvara and others.

Kēśava Mīśra: author of the Tarkabhāṣā, an elementary treatise of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika doctrines, which is more or less popular throughout India. It is divided into two broad divisions—Pramāṇa and Prameya. It is not certain if he belonged to Mithilā. As a matter of fact among its numerous commentators (in Dr. Bhandarkar’s ed., pp. xix–xx the list contains 28 names), there is only one Gopinātha who belonged to Mithilā, but his commentary circulated not in Mithilā at all but in South India. In the most flourishing period of advanced studies on Navyanyāya in Mithilā and Bengal the smaller and elementary works never attracted scholars and they became extinct or what is more surprising, some of them created excellent fields elsewhere. There is a notable instance in the Nyāya-siddhāntamañjarī of Jānakīnātha, which was composed at Nava-dvīpa and completely forgotten there, though it was studied at Vārāṇasī and elsewhere for a long time. We believe the Tarkabhāṣā similarly was driven out of Mithilā and became popular in Vārāṇasī, from where it circulated in other parts of India.

Our reasons for regarding Keśava as a Maithila are the following. (1) The title Mīśra is found in the colophon of the Tarkabhāṣā in all manuscripts and that, prima facie, points to Mithilā as the author’s birth place. (2) Keśava was well-read in the works of Udayana. At the beginning of his work he-
started with Udayana's definition of Pramā (यथार्थांतरभच: प्रमान) taken from the Kusumāñjali IV. 1) and towards the end cited his definition of the fallacy 'Asiddhi' (also taken exactly from the Kusumāñjali III. p. 39) mentioning his name. Moreover, in the latter case Keśava attempts to meet in his own way the objection that Udayana's definition is open to the charge of overlapping. Keśava's predilection for Udayana might be taken as a good pointer to his place of origin. (3) According to Peterson (Cat. of Ulwar Mss., 1892, p. 28) the splendid Mss. Library of the Maharaja of Alwar preserves a copy (Ms. No. 653) of a commentary on the Tarkabhaṣā by Vardhamāna named Tarkaprakāśa and a sub-commentary on the same by Rucidatta. We failed to get any further information on these two unique manuscripts. If they have been correctly described by Peterson it would be a convincing proof that Keśava belonged to Mithilā. For, a superior Maithila scholar of the position of Vardhamāna could not be supposed to have wielded his masterly pen upon an elementary work of 'foreign' origin.

Date of Keśava Miśra: We are of opinion that Keśava belonged to the middle of the 12th century A.D. His direct mention of Udayana and the marked predilection for his views point to the same conclusion. He must have preceded Gaṅgeśa by a length of time. For, Cinnabhaṭṭa (late in the 14th century A.D.) commented on it at Vijayanagarī, the great cultural centre of South India, where Keśava's work must have circulated long ago. Cinnabhaṭṭa, it should be noted, himself belonged to a very distinguished family and was quite unaware of Gaṅgeśa. Vardhamāna again regarded the Lilāvatī and the Khandana, both written in the middle of the 12th century A.D., as the latest classics for him to adorn with masterly commentaries. As Keśava also seems to have attracted his pen, he cannot be later in date. Keśava is unaware of the great Khandanakāra, who was probably his contemporary. His early date is corroborated by the fact that his work bristles with a large-
number of various readings. According to Cinnabhaṭṭa, (p. 137) and following him Viśvakarmā (p. 42), Keśava has controverted the views of the Kandalikāra (vide Kandalī, p. 206) in his treatment of Anumāna. He has similarly rejected the Kandalī's views on the nature of gold (which in Nyāya falls under the substance 'light') preferring Udayana's opinion on the point (vide Cinnabhaṭṭa, p. 214). Keśava, therefore, belongs to an early period, when Udayana's controversy with Śrīdhara was still a current topic.

Dr. Bhandarkar (in his Introd., p. xxiii) suspected that Keśava Bhaṭṭa, author of the Tarkadīpikā upon the Tarkabhaṭṭa 'may be the same' as Keśava Miṣra. Keśava Bhaṭṭa, however, of the Laugāksi family was a much later scholar of Vāraṇa. He commented also on Udayana's Lakṣaṇavalī (transcript at Mithilā Institute from Baroda) and on the Saptapadārthīpadārthacandrīkā (Tanjore Cat., pp. 4458-59). This latter Tippani was composed in 1521 Āśaka (1599 A. D.): ādunetramārṣumēte shke corresponding correctly to the year Vikārin, according to the Southern system of the Brhaspati cycle.

MAHĀMAHOPĀDIHYĀYA CANDRA: One of the authors who is referred to anonymously by Gaṅgeśa. In the Sabdamāṇiparikṣā (of Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma) of which a unique manuscript is now preserved in the Sarasvatī-Bhavana, Vāraṇa, (foll. 23-143 dated 1503 Saka, the copy belonged to the famous M. M. Vidyānivāsa) we discovered the following passage: (fol. 118) āchār cha siddhānta virodha: mābhakratrata, nā to mithya vāmābhāvanāvamātī ṛṣitaatvāvyaktaārata. Tānmar vṛtāddevaḥ-candraḥkṛttvādadeṣṭēśāpāhitvād devīśāmītiuśaḥpitum. (compare Rucidatta's Sabdamāṇiprakāśa, the Pandit, VIII, p. 132). There is another quotation from Candra in the same work (fol. 70a) : agatam vṛkṣaḥ sārpaḥ sākṣihāraṁ n kāraṇā jātibhikṣaṇāvaiḥ sākṣihānaśeśaḥ vṛkṣīdābhāvaśārdarācārīvṛkṣīvedāntānyamāvādyātya Śṛṅgēnāpaṭanā. Caṇḍeśvara (in Kṛtyaratnakara, p. 82) calls him a gurumāñjāya. Two works of this scholar have been
discovered, which at one time exercised a great influence among dialecticians of Eastern India. One of it, the Amrtabindu exists in a very incorrect copy in the Asiatic Society (fol. 49), the colophon running: इति श्रीमहामहोपाध्याय-श्रीचन्दकृ ति अमृतविन्दुनार्म प्रकरण समासण। It deals with ‘Vidhi’ and ‘Apūrva’ exclusively and proves its affinity by quoting only from the Nibandhana (fol. 36b & 48a-b), Vivarana (23a, 36b & 48b, both of Prabhākara himself), Prakaraṇapariṣṭikā (of Śālikanātha, 34a) and Mahāvrata (45a). This book also has been cited in Sārvabhauma’s Śabdamaṇiparikṣa (under ‘Apūrvavāda, fol. 28b: यथतत्व स्वर्गकाद्रोहशृंखः यागविषयकं कार्यसिद्धि प्रथमतीतोऽवतानुभवे अनन्तयोजकोजयोऽयोपसितावनन्तरं यागविषयं स्वर्गकारिकायसिद्धमित्वमृतविन्दु-दृष्टितः प्रथा निर्रस्तं। Both Candra and his work, the Amrtabindu were cited also in the Śabdālokoddyota of (Sārvabhauma’s son), Vāhinīpati Bhāṭṭācārya (fol. 23a-b of Ms. of the Bhaub Daji collection at Poona).

Another work of Candra named Nayaratanākara exists in the Darbara Library at Nepal (H. P. Sāstrī: Nepal Cat., 1905, p. 113). At the end of this book Candra mentioned that he belonged to the ‘Pośāli’ family:—

अयसौ चन्द्रश्रीमाधवकुट्ट नयङ्गकारकमिं
निबन्धं पोशाली-कुलकालकेदारमिहिः।

There is no family in Mithilā, as far as we have learnt, which has Pośāli as its Mūlāgrāma, though he has been claimed for Mithilā by M. M. Dr. Umesha Mishra (Jha Commemoration. Vol., p. 243). Pośāli happens to be a well-known Śrotṛiya family of Raḍhīya Brāhmaṇas of Bengal. It still survives in Bengal by the name ‘Iṣūsilā’ belonging to the Kāśyapa gotra. In earlier genealogical works the name is mentioned regularly as ‘Pośali’ or ‘Pośāli’ (vide the texts cited by us in I. H. Q., III, p. 139). It was situated somewhere in Raḍha or West Bengal. In this book Candra refers to the Vivarana, the Viveka, the Paṇcikā (of Śālikanātha) and Śrīkara (Jha Comm. Vol., p. 245).
Candra held independent views about the categories, which according to him were eleven in number. Śaṅkara Miśra in the Vādivinoda (p. 53) and Padmanābha in his Setuṭikā (p. 105) describe him as 'Prābhākaraikadesin' for that reason. According to Candra 'Ownership' (व्यवस्था) is the eighth category. His views on the point are given and refuted by Vācaspati Miśra II in the Tattvāloka under II. i. 33 (fol. 108b: इत्यवत्यायम्: पद्धार्थः: व्यवस्थिति चन्द्रः) and anonymously by Vardhamāna in the Lilāvatīprakāśa (pp. 82-83). He was undoubtedly one of the Prābhākara scholars, whose works Gaṅgeśa specially studied under professors as stated by him at the commencement of his book (ललाम्बित्वाय ललाम्बणं सतम्). For, the Amṛtabindu exhibits to a large extent the Navyanyāya style of almost interminable streams of arguments and counter-arguments so prominent in Gaṅgeśa. Candra was one of the original sources of Gaṅgeśa in the Vidhivāda and Apūrvavāda portions of the Śabdakhaṇḍa and as such we cannot but refer to him here though we hold that he was a Bengali by origin.

According to M. M. Dr. Mishra Candra’s date is ‘before 1100 A.D.’ (Jha Comm. Vol., p. 246). This is no longer tenable. The Viveka mentioned by Candra in the Nayaratnākara is the Nayaviveka of Bhavanātha, who cites Śrīkara by name (p. 271). Bhavanātha was most probably a rival and contemporary of Bhavadeva, as indicated by Nāṇḍilla-Gopa in the commentary of the Prabodhacandrodaya (II. 3). Bhavadeva’s period of activity has been fixed by us within 1060-1110 A.D. (I. H. Q., XXII, pp. 133-35). Candra cannot, therefore, be placed before the 12th century A.D. and as he is cited by Murāri he cannot be later either.

Divākaraopādhya: a supreme authority in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature of Mithilā, better known as the Uddyotakāra. Divākara’s name is familiar among scholars from a rare quotation found in Jagadīśa’s Śabdāsaktiprakāśikā (Varanasi
ed., p. 171 in the section on Kāraka: दिवाकरसुं संस्काराविचित्रमगेव
शान्त जानास्थ्थे इत्युक्तथे मुल्यमेव कामस्व घटदीरित्याह, तमानवे.....).
Jagadīśa, a comparatively late author, borrowed this from the
Āṇvikaśīkitattvaśivavaraṇa, a separate commentary on Nyāyasūtra
(Chap. V only) by Jānakīnātha, father of Jagadīśa's teacher
Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma (Sarasvatī-Bhavana Ms. of Rāma-
bhadra's Nyāyarahasya, fol. 156a). From Pragalbha's Maṇiṣṭikā
we first came to know that Divākara preceded Gaṅgeśa. In the
Īśvaravāda, commenting on the passage अधारिषमेयभाष्यति...इति
चेतन—न (B. I. ed., p. 131), Pragalbha explains दिवाकरसमतासारात्रे—
अन्यत्वात् (Anumāna-Pragalbhī, S. B. Ms. fol. 190a and Bombay
R. A. S. copy fol. 160a). There is a passage in the Dravya-
prakāśa of Vardhamāna where two former explanations of a
statement of Udayana are cited (Kiranāvalī, Varanasi ed., p.
50 fn.: the reading in the B. I. ed., pp. 251-178 is corrupt:—
अन्यायानवस्थेयति। वर्षिपि अनवस्थामात्रं वीजाकुरसाधारणे न दूषणं तथापि
sर्वाकारंद्रव्यानाशात् पलायनान्तरं स्तूपिरिति व्यवस्थाविरह एवास्थेयते। दूषणुकारा-
व्यवस्थानेक्षत्रवारण्यवे महार्षी स्यासित्यथं इत्यति॥ Pragalbha gives here a
very informative note in the Dravya-Pragalbhī (Navadvīpa Ms.
fol. 113a): इत्यथेकं=अगाकारः। इत्यथेन=दिवाकरोपथायः.
Divākara, therefore, commented on the Kiranāvalī before Vardhamāna as
did another rival scholar of Mithilā named Prabhākara. In the
Dravya section Pragalbha has adorned his sub-commentary with
very frequent quotations from Divākara; we counted as many
as 50 (from fol. 30 to 140), which is by far the largest num-
ber from a single author. Pragalbha evidently regarded him as
a very great authority upon Udayana. Phrases like तद्बन्ध्यं
दिवाकरस्वरोपघातः (fol. 83a), इति दिवाकरस्वरत: (51b), तथेतः दिवाकरः:
(-79a, 109b, 121b & 130a) display his regard for him. Some
of these passages of Divākara also prove that Vardhamāna is
indebted to a large extent to Divākara for the formidable pre-
cision of his style in defining various terms. Medieval scholar-
ship for a long time consisted in bringing out the full signifi-
cance of every part of these definitions. The definition of
Dravyatva in *Dravyaprakāśa* (B. I. ed., p. 164) was formulated by Vardhamāna after rejecting that of Divākara (p. 163). For, Pragalbha here again gives us the information (fol. 86b: विद्वाकरमत्वं दूपयति—न चैति).

Another well-informed scholar of Bengal Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara refers to Divākara in the following revealing passage of the *Kātantrapradīpa* in the section on Kāraka (printed in Gurunātha’s ed. of the *Kalāpa*, p. 715):

यथापि सर्दनीकायाय दिवाकरादित्वः संकारावचिच्छसा बुद्धिज्ञानावदायतेर्वेष किं संकारावचिच्छस्व धातव्यंत्वादिते इति न्यायदिनकोढोढोगि इत्यदत्तः—

Here two works of Divākara have been mentioned by name, *Khaṇḍanatīkā* and *Nibandhdoddyota*. The *Uddyota* has been mentioned by Vācaspati II in the *Tattāloka* (fol. 53a) under I, i. 10. The illuminating passage is cited below: यथापि प्रकरणंपर्यायलोचनया छेत्रकानाद्वेव प्रमेर्यतेन तन्मेयवाकास्त्रेव संसारबीति अन्तः

तत्तत्त्वानानस्मिज्ञो भोगहेतुवत्। तथा च न क्रोधभीति वेद्नितवयो इत्यादिप्रमेयतेऽपि धीरजचर्चार्थवा भगवदि तत्तवानादितिः।

The illuminating commentaries on the *Nibandha*. Vāsudeva Sārvabhuma in *Anumānaṇamaṇiparikṣā* (S. B. Ms. fol. 6a) cited a doctrine of the *Pramāṇoddyota*.

Fortunately a fragment of the book is preserved in the Asiatic Society (No. 4770 of the Govt. collection), though its great importance was missed by H. P. Sastri and other scholars. This unique copy written in the Maithila script is dated 164 L. S., but the copy in palm leaves is very much injured; several leaves are missing and several torn. It begins:—

॥ अः नमः सर्वस्वल्ये ॥

śrāttvedeśeṇiṣṭrāṇaḥ हमनां वरीचकः ।

लं वृत्तिमिश्रायामभद्रायामभद्रायायम् शाश्वस् ॥
Divākaropadhyāya 71

The last folio (which is fortunately preserved with the page-mark lost, the previous folio, not however the immediately preceding one, being marked 56) is wholly reproduced, containing an extremely valuable colophon though torn at a vital place.  

...इति निरोधायेति प्रकृतिपुनःमेदुरेनिरोधायेत्यथः। यथा सांव्यपत्ति उस्त्वापिततत्र दूष्पान्सो—संसारदशायामिति श्रेष्ठ सुगमम्॥

...

तत्सूनामिकलमांसि नूत्मिन्योषोऽयोऽत् सुर्दम रंजित एत दिव्याकरेऽ॥

दिव्याकराः...तोर्यः समुष्ठतः।

न्यायाधिमात्रश्रेष्ठमुखासायतं सर्वदा॥

इति महोपाध्यायश्रीदिव्याकरकः न्याययुतीयादयांग्निवादोऽयोऽयोऽत्: समाप्:॥... 

देवयाने देवलाभीशास्त्रके पीतपाठकस्य उपाध्यायश्रीगिरीश्वरे।किर्तिविदम्। ल सं. १४५ ज्येष्ठहिं ११॥ Divākara’s father served a certain king of Mithilā in an important priestly function and the transcript (dated somewhere between 1272 and 1283 A.D.) was made when a certain king was reigning in Mithilā. As if by a conspiracy the two royal names have been torn off!

In the above extract the name of Divākara’s commentary on the Kiranāvalī has been preserved viz. Vīlāsaśa Mallinātha in his commentary on the Tārkikarakaśa once (p. 129) referred to Divākara as the Vilāskāra and cited his definition of Mokṣa (तत्र चैनिनियनिलिवद्वभावंस्तत्तत्त्रत्त्वाक्षबः मोक्षः। सुयासुधाः च प्रत्येकाकाशात्वाव-

यासिक्षेति विलासकारोऽक्षेत्रस्य मुक्षकालित्वस्य च। Pragalba also referred to him once as the Vilāskāra (Dravya-Pragalbhi, fol. 73a).
The Vilāsa is cited twice in Pakṣadhara’s Dravyaviveka (fol. 90a & 96a). In the above fragment of the Uddyota Divākara frequently cited from previous commentaries without of course naming them and in most places refuted their arguments: e.g. यस्य केवल (fol. 21a), भाष्य केवल (23b), ib. (32a), कविकल्प (33b). केवल (33b). भाष्य (55b) and एक्रव (62a). All these prove that a long line of scholiasts upon Udayana’s Nibandha existed before the times of Divākara. The following passages are extracted from the fragment as somewhat interesting:

श्री राजसुक्रमेश (7) प्रकरणार्थश्चुद्वैतमेव प्रतीये चछुरद्वैतं चिश्लान्तो व्याख्यातम (fol. 16a).

कविकल्प हत्तोतक्ययुक्तन्वें हेतुविशेषपौयै इत्यहां—तत्त, कपाययथा खरिदारेरि जलमात्युवन्युक्तत्वां (33b)

पञ्चमेवतादिर्धानं भाष्यतिजनकं न तु तकं (41a)

Buddhist doctrines are refuted in this chapter and in that connection Divākara records the important fact that he commented also on Udayana’s Baudhādhikāra: अविकर्त्ता तास्करान्तीमि बौद्धाधिकार-विवरेतसमाभिः: पर्षोविचित्तु (51b). It is interesting to note that this long-lost commentary of Divākara bore the name the Āloka the title of the famous commentary of Jayadeva (Pakṣadhara) on the Tattvacintāmaṇi.

Divākara also commented on Udayana’s Kusumāṇjali and the name of this commentary was PARIJALA. It was mentioned by Śaṅkara Misra in the following line मकरन्दे प्रकाशय वायुयाया पारिस्लेतद्वां श्री कुसुमाण्यालिकारिकाद्वयक्ष्याः: This portion of Śaṅkara’s commentary has been mysteriously tagged on to the beginning of Rāmabhadrā Sarvabhauma’s Kusumāṇjali, kārikādyakhyā; we have discussed the point under Tvantopādhyāya below. Śaṅkara evidently mentioned the three names of previous commentaries—i.e. the ascending order of chronology, proving that Divākara preceded both Vardhamāna and the Makarandakāra (i.e. Tvantopa- dhyāya). This Parimala of Divākara has been approvingly
Divākaropādhyāya

cited once by Sārvabhauma in his extensive commentary on a single phrase of Gaṅgeśa (Tattvādattāntikā, Vyāptivāda, Pūrvapakṣa, p. 87) thus:—युक्तेऽय परिमललितः पत्थः, सामानाधिकार्याभावः, विषयकत्या भावसंय हेतुवेच लाभवात्। (Anumānaṃpaniparīkṣa, fol. 26a).

The Parimala has also been cited by Rucidatta five times in the Makaranda upon Vardhamāna’s Kusumāṅjali-prakāśa (vide Chowkh. ed. Stavaka, I, pp. 22-23, III, p. 21, IV, p. 1 and V, p. 10). The Parimala is not a sub-commentary on Vardhamāna’s Prakāśa as is sometimes wrongly taken. A fragment of it was discovered long ago in a Jaina Bhandara, quite beyond the reach of scholars (Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Jain Bhandars at Pattan. Vol. I, Introd. p. 44). Divākara became famous by his great commentaries on all the major works of Udayana, though there is no evidence available yet that he had commented on the Pariśīṭa also. We shall refer to an interesting doctrine which seems to have been first promulgated by Divākara. The prepositions (Upasargas), according to a view ascribed commonly to the Kandalikāra, (compare Prakṛti-vācchimā prakāśa Kandala p. 2) directly denote meanings by the primary function of words; in other words they are vācak. Udayana denies them any such function, they only can elucidate meanings which primarily belong to the verbs to which they are attached. That is to say they are only śūetak. Divākara adopted a middle course—they are śūetak in cases where the primary meanings of verbs are contradicted by the prepositions; in the rest, they are vācak. This view has been cited and rejected by Gaṅgeśa (Śabda part, Upasargavāda, p. 856). That the view was advocated by Divākara is stated by Pundarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara in the Kātantra-pradīpa thus:—

घात्त्वर्थस्य विधाष्यः भावविभो चत्र लय्यते।

ततरामी शौतकः श्रेया वृषेण्यत्व वाचकः॥

वधि संबंधः दिवाकरात्सरपि महेन्द्राः (Gurunātha’s ed. of Kātantra-pradīpa 651).
Divākara's date can now be definitely fixed within 1200-50 A.D. He cannot be placed before 1200 A.D. as he had commented, perhaps for the first time, on the Khaṇḍana and referred to more than one previous commentaries on Udayana. On the other hand the date of the transcript of his Udyota (falling within 1272-83 A.D.) marks the lower limit of his date. The transcript might have been made within his very life-time.

Prabhākaropādhyāya: One of the greatest pre-Gaṅgeśa scholars of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, whose name had been lost for a long time. He was not a Mīmāṃsaka and it goes without saying that he is not identical with Prabhākara Miśra the founder of a Mīmāṃsā school, who preceded him by at least 500 years. He probably wrote commentaries on all the four major works of Udayana. In the Dravya-Pragalbhī (an unique manuscript preserved in the Public Library at Navadvipa dated 386 L. S., examined by us thoroughly 15 years ago) the following references to Prabhākara were traced. तथा ग्रामस्माभास्कर इत्यादि (fol. 83a). This proves that Prabhākara wrote a commentary on Udayana's Parisuddhi. तथा अभास्करे हिन्दुरायक्यो दर्शनात्त (fol. 98b: this is also from the Nibandhaṭīka). The next passage is cited in full (fol. 116b: vide Kiraṇāvali, B. I. ed., p. 221): जलावर जस्ते रावणं परमाणुरुपेतित्वी किंतु न महत्तम्। यत्र वर्त्तने न साधुमायकमदेवति ध्ययम्। न च सुधापापचितम्। न च इत्य तौत्विकतात्—सत्य परमाणुरुपे न दल्लवमवेत इति साधुव्यापकयाब्धिति अभास्कर-दिवाकराण्या स्वाभिस्थ-ज्ञानात्त। In this illuminating passage Pragalbha refers to three distinguished scholiasts on the Kiraṇāvali which include Prabhākara. In प्रामार्कोरोपायाय (fol. 133a: vide B. I. ed., p. 261), the full name with the title Upādhyāya attached should be noted. मात्रावादितिः (B. I. ed., p. 268)—पद्मार्गाय पद्मपादसूतिर-रेखानिर्दिशितिः प्रभाकरः (fol. 132b). प्रामार्क-दिवाकरो (136b).

In the Upamānasāṅgya of Pragalbha (A. S. Ms. No. 1752 dated 1643 V. S.) it is clearly stated that Gaṅgeśa quoted Prabhākara's definition (fol. 4a: प्रामार्कोपायायवक्तव्यं उपामान-
It is now possible to state that a famous passage of Gaṅgeśa in the Vyāptivāda, which has now developed into a separate section called खतेव-चतुष्ठयम्, is a quotation from this. Prabhākara. For, what Mathurānatha (following Jayadeva's note प्रभाकर अधिकृतिः) vaguely explained as प्रभाकरसंमिति (p. 165) is really a quotation from Prabhākaropādhyāya as Pragalbha definitely stated (fol. 19a of Ms. No. 298 of the Sarasvatī-Bhavana: अनौच प्रभाकरपाध्यायमतापरम्परागम्यांतेति). The mention of the title Upādhyāya conclusively proves that a particular scholar is meant here belonging evidently to the same school of neo-logic and not certainly a follower of the Prabhākara school of Mimāṃsā. Here also the passage is probably taken from Prabhākara's commentary on the Kusumānjali.

This Prabhākara also commented on the Līlāvati of Śrīvallabha. Bhagīratha in his sub-commentary on Vardhamāna's Līlāvatīprakāśa pointed out two cases where Vardhamāna cited from Prabhākaropādhyāya (Chowkh. ed., pp. 142 and 355: प्रभाकरोपाध्यायमतापरम्परा-). But in Pakṣadhara's Līlāvatīviveka there are eleven such references- (Colebrooke's copy now in London I. O.: fol. 2a, 5a, 15a, 18a, 39b, 49b, 58a, 61a, 78a and 93b). Some of these references are important. The following passages cited by Vardhamāna in his Līlāvatīprakāśa are, according to Pakṣadhara, from Prabhākaropādhyāya:

(1) p. 16 अने=प्रभाकरोपाध्यायः (fol. 5a)
(2) p. 280 यवं...संप्रदयितं । प्रभाकरोपाध्यायमत श्राह-अनेन्ति (61a)-
(3) p. 283 पूर्वं...इत्यथे । प्रभाकरोपाध्यायमतमहं-पूर्वानिति । (ib.)
(4) p. 499 तद्रेणः। अनौपाधिक: संबन्धे च्यासिरिति सत्यवादी यथासाकः—
One of the greatest pre-Gaṅgeśa authorities of Mithilā. The name of his treatise is Ratnakoṣa, which has been respectfully cited by Maṇikanṭha and Geṅgeśa. A famous tract of Harirāma Tarkavāgīśa of Navadvīpa (professor of Gadādhara goes by the name of Ratnakoṣavīcāra and its copies are available in almost every manuscript library in India. It begins:—परोऽहां निर्णयायात्सन्त्येवति सिद्धान्त: साधारणकारणां संसारायात्मकानुमितिः स्थीरत्वति। (from an old copy in our possession). The whole passage has been cited and refuted by Gaṅgeśa (Anumāna, pp. 885-88) as well as by Maṇikanṭha (p. 178). Describing a copy of Harirāma (or Gadādhara) elaborating this remarkable thesis of the Ratnakoṣa Hall wrote in 1859 (Index, p. 81) that its ‘author has not been ascertained’. Unfortunately he added the following note later on (p. 202): ‘I know of another work called Ratnakoṣa, a collection of aphorisms of definition, by one Prthvīdhara Ācārya.’ This has misled scholars for the best part of a century to believe that Prthvīdhara was the author of the Ratnakoṣa cited by Gaṅgeśa. An unintelligible aphorism of Prthvīdhara’s Ratnakoṣa has been cited by Hall (चतुर्थिं लोको
There are six important passages of *Ratnako\ṣa* cited by Vardhamāna in the *Pari\ṣṭaprakāṣa* (pp. 91, 105, 109, 110, 115 & 125). All of them belong to the section on Nigrahasthāna. Except in the last case Vardhamāna cited the passages with approval. There are four important passages of the *Ratnako\ṣa* cited in the printed portion of the *Nyaya-nibandhaprakāṣa* of Vardhamāna. In the first passage (p. 163: *तत्तदन्ते अक्षरःपरापि* "इति लक्षणसूति"; compare also *Lilāvatīprakāṣa* p. 626) the peculiar view ascribed to the *Ratnako\ṣa* and refuted by Vardhamāna is already cited under the heading *चन्द्रकेशीरधुः* by Gaṅgeśa himself (*Pratyakṣa* part, p. 842) and also refuted by the latter. The second passage is much more important elucidating the basic doctrine underlying the first passage. It runs:—*रक्षणखूष्ठलो द्विविध हि सामान्य जातिपरिप्रेक्ष्य, समवेता जाति: ब्राह्मणवें जोपापसामान्यम्। अति अवदेल: जातेर्न्यदेव अक्षदयिसामान्यः बनातिसामान्यवेदमुपेतम्। चतुः—

*योगिकानां यथा जातेर्न्यतसामान्यमिष्यते। तथा समृहसामान्यं जाति जातिविषयम्॥* (मन्त्रार्दरेण ३३१२)

*इति तथा च * कर्त्तव्यमुपापापिकर्मसामान्यमिष्यताः। ततः" (pp. 194-5). It
appears, however, that this Bhāṭṭa view was already accepted by Śivāditya Miśra (q.v.) and though Vardhamāna has not accepted it in the present passage he is distinctly cited by Pragalbhā as advocating the selfsame view (Anumāna-Pragalbhī, fol. 182a):—न चाप सिद्धान्त: जातिनिर्माणवार्षिकविवशसामान्यवक्ते।पाचे: कद मान्यरूपसीतद्विद्वेिबिन्द्वतवाद। The next passage (p. 341) cites a denition of the term Vāda from the Ratnakośa: तस्मानामयोजनात्वत्सलायति। श्रवणितवियान्यमण्यमिति रक्षोष्कार:।तथा। The last passage (p. 468) is also a remarkable one; Vardhmāna refers to it at the end of a quotation from his father Gaṅgeśa and rejects it thus:—एतेि संस्कृ: बिरोपणयता च वीि पत्रासिनि च।समवायादिनििदृशतमिति रक्षोष्कान्तमयुक्तम्। Gaṅgeśa cited this anonymously (Pratyakṣa part, p. 653 under Samavāya). Gaṅgeśa's indebtedness to the Ratnakośa is clearly stated by Vācaspati Miśra II: the refutation (ib. p. 846) of Gaṅgeśa according to him follows the viewpoint of the Ratnakośa रक्षोष्कश्राद्धाय:। दृष्ट्यति—तत्राति। (Pratyakṣa-maṇiprakāśa, fol. 59a).

Vardhamāna has also referred to the Ratnakośa in the Lilāvatīprakāśa. The passage on the section on Fallacy is reproduced below as a typical instance of the intricate style of the author.

श्यान्त्रोपनायनस्तत्त्वदिष्टारिता सामान्यत एव प्रत्येकान्तैः कर्तुरा। तद्विन्दु सद्विस्नमासिध्यतांकिलङ्गबलावर्त्यसंसर्गात्र्यक्षणमयत्वादिश्वरलिपिदृष्ट्यकारिकश्राद्धाये। यज्ञमाण्यवचारपुष्टवत्र तद्दृष्टवर्ग:। मूलम्। (Chowk. ed., pp. 608-9; Bhāgiratha notes, रक्षोष्कश्राद्धायः)

There are three passages in the Tattvāloka of Vācaspati Miśra II referring to Taranī Miśra. Under I. ii. 7 we find: लज्जर्वत तु दृष्टवलोकितसाध्विक्षिपवर्षतमिति तत्सिद्धिः। ततः। There is an illuminating passage under II. i. 38, which is also cited below fully as a typical instance of the style and scholarship of the great author.
There is another long passage of Taranī Miśra under II. i. 63 (fol. 130a), where Vācaspati II made an elaborate treatment of Vidhivāda (foll. 123-33).

Śaṅkara Miśra recorded an original view of the Ratnakoṣa admitting a fourth kind of Kathā (Vādivinoda, p. 2) and cited its definition of the fallacy prakāraśām (ib., p. 17). It should be mentioned here that Gaṅgeśa has finally accepted the definition of the term Upādhi given by the Ratnakoṣa (p. 336: लक्षणं तु परवर्तितत्). That Gaṅgeśa refers to the Ratnakoṣaṅkara in the very last definition cited by him in the Pūrvapakṣa (pp. 331-33) is clearly stated by both Śārvabhauma (fol. 94) and Jayadeva (Āloka, fol. 34b), though Maṇikanṭha (p. 86) is not quite clear on the point. It is likely that Gaṅgeśa adopted a chronological order in citing and criticising the eight definitions in the Pūrvapakṣa. If so, it may be also surmised that Taranī Miśra came slightly after Maṇikanṭha and all of them were more or less contemporaries. Taranī Miśra should, therefore, be living about 1300 A.D.
Sondadopādhyāya (also spelt Sondala): This superior scholar of Mithilā has been immortalised by Gaṅgeśa or more correctly by the scholiasts of Gaṅgeśa as the propounder of an exceptional kind of Negation ‘whose counter-positiveness is determined by an essence pertaining to a different substratum’ (व्याधिकरणपरमाणुविन्द्वप्रतियोगिताकः) and which is, therefore, universally existent. Sondaḍa consequently rejects in a manner the doctrine of Anyathākhyāti (erroneous conception) advocated by orthodox Nyāya scholars. Gaṅgeśa refers to this amazing kind of Negation in the Vyāptivāda and rejects it concisely. Sārvabhauma notes at the beginning of the particular section: तत्र केवलान्वयिनि सोदर्दीयं केवलान्वयिसाध्यान्वयनिदिमार्गहृदे—क्येति। (Anumānmāniprakāśa, fol. 13a).

The arguments against Sondaḍa were elaborated by Yajñapati and Jayadeva, but Śiromāṇi raised issues on the problem, concluding practically with an admission of that kind of negation, which marked one of the advanced courses of Navyanyāya studies and contributed to the fame and popularity of Sondaḍa, who started the debate.

According to the scholiasts, Gaṅgeśa had referred to Sondaḍa in many other places. We shall soon see under Manikanṭha that in the Upādhivāda (p. 317-22) the views cited and refuted under the heading प्रचेष्टि were ascribed to 'Saundaḍa' by Gadādhara (p. 916). In the section on Ākāṅksā (pp. 202-4) Sondaḍa's definition of that term has been cited and refuted by Gaṅgeśa.

In the Vidhivāda again a passage of Sondaḍa has been cited twice (Śabdakhaṇḍa, Pt. II, pp. 24 & 276), the last time under the heading कालास्थ. This proves that Sondaḍa, like Manikanṭha, was only slightly senior to Gaṅgeśa. A line in the प्रसाध्यवृं (p. 221?) is a refutation of Sondaḍa according to Vidyānivāsa (49b).

Mathurānātha in his commentary on Gaṅgēśa has cited two passages of Sondadopādhyāya, not found elsewhere. The first is a definition of Kevalānvayī (B. I. ed., p. 575), which has been ascribed, wrongly as far as we have ascertained, in some copies to Upādhyāya i.e. Yajñapati, in whose work it is not traceable. There is another passage of Sondāda cited by Mathurānātha under Vidhivāda (p. 217).

An intricate passage in the Siddhānta portion of the section on Parāmarṣa (pp. 508-9, beginning with ब्रह्म यो वर्णः) is cited from Sondāda; for Sārvabhauma clearly notes here: सोन्दर्दैवत्वात् समाधिमार्गाति—अथेति (Anūmanamaṇiparikṣā, fol. 131a). Sārvabhauma also quotes a long passage towards the end of the section on Bādha as from Sondāda and others (fol. 205a: इति वदन्ति सोन्दर्दप्रसूतवः). The following interesting passage is found in the Tattvāloka of Vācaspati Miśra II under I. i. 22, where various views about salvation (Apavarga) have been cited and discussed: सोन्दर्दप्रभायोऽस्तु—य एव परदुःखस्त्थासन्यत्यन्तताभाष्य: स एव सुखद-खामाभोचेद्यः। तथा च यदा ते सहकारिस्कप्री भवन्ति तदा दुःखं जन्यति नो चेतृ परदा एवेति युक्ता प्रसूतवः। न च परदुःखस्त्थात्तताभाष्यं स्वदुःखासन्यत्यन्ततात्तत्वं तत्स्वात्मात्मान्य सत्त्वं परदुःखस्त्थासन्यत्यन्ततात्तत्वं न परदुःखस्त्थासन्यत्यन्ततात्तत्वं अन्यथा विरूध्यमान्यत्यस्य ततो भिक्षुवैवैव वाच्यम्, परदेशायक्षेणेन नष्टवापि तद्भवावन्यक्षेणेनान्यत्तवः। भैरवम्। (London I. O, copy, fol. 63a). A Śāṅkara scholar of Bengal named Kṛpārāma Tarkavāgīśa composed a large treatise named Navyadharmapradīpa in 1686 Śaka (i.e. 1764-5 A.D.). In the explanation of the well-known Mīmāṁśā argument called हेतुविषयम् occurs the following passage:—चतुर्वायद्धर्मस्य कथं विधिविषयविनिमित्वात्वाच्यम्, ध्याननिष्ठे ध्यात्मान्यस्तात्तत्वस्ते अर्थात्वाद्स्य प्रमोदीतत्तत्वः। सूचया हु तथा विषयवर्णनात्त जाते एव यथायथनेत्त विषयविनिमित्त न्यायात्तिति सोन्दर्दप्रभायोऽन्यक्षेत्रः। (Ms. No. 1602 of Vangiya Sāhitya Parisad, Calcutta, fol. 84a: cf. Sabdakhanda, ii., pp. 509-12). Sondāda was regarded in his times as the supreme leader of the social hierarchy in Mithila.
This important fact is stated in a remarkable passage in the Tattvanirṇaya of Pakṣadharopādhya (fl. 1400 A.D.), a very rare Smṛti work. It runs—अत्र च महाज(ना)जो सीन्द्रलोपाय(ना)—मन्येयाच च न्यवहार नपरमस्क इत्यादि: (fol. 26a of a fragment preserved in the Mithilā Institute; under the topic of Sapiṇḍīkaraṇa to be performed on the 12th day).

Sondaḍa’s date can be safely placed about 1300 A.D., as he was regarded as a ‘recent’ scholar by both Maṇikanṭha and Gaṅgeśa. The memory of his sogial supremacy was still alive in 1400 A.D. and the intricate nature of his style and arguments betray a comparatively late age. We are not inclined, therefore, to place him before 1275 A.D.

Maṇikanṭha Misra: One of the greatest and latest authorities of Navyanyāya consulted by Gaṅgeśa, who appears to have been profoundly influenced by him. The only existing treatise by him named Nyāyaratna has been fortunately published recently in the Madras Govt. Oriental series with a commentary by Nṛsiṃhayavān (1953, pp. 249 with Introd. etc.,). It roughly covers the same ground as the Anumāna part of Gaṅgeśa, with which it bears a very fruitful comparison. It is divided into 13 sections and the latter half of the book is taken up by an elaborate treatment of all the varieties of debates and fallacies including at the very end a small section on the Mahāvidyā syllogisms. It has been stated in the English Introduction (p. xxxi) that ‘priority between Gaṅgeśa and Maṇikanṭha cannot be proved’, though it has been surmised on good grounds in the Sanskrit introduction (p. 109) that Maṇikanṭha slightly preceded Gaṅgeśa. The following evidences on the point, some of which we had published about a decade ago (G. Jha R. I. Journ., Vol. IV, p. 300) prove conclusively that Maṇikanṭha preceded Gaṅgeśa and the fact was known to earlier Navyanyāya scholars.
(1) In the Siddhānta portion of the Upādhivāda Gaṅgeśa cited a passage under the caption बि (B. I. ed., pp. 365-69). Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma distinctly notes here that the reference is to Manikanṭha—मयोक्रमणें मतमाधेय व्रत्स्य स्ति (Sarasvatī-Bhavana Ms. of Sārvabhauma’s Anumānanaṇipātikā, fol. 106b). As a matter of fact the first portion of the passage is found in the Nyāyaratna (p. 92). Gaṅgeśa did not actually controvert the views expressed in the passage, but according to a well-known convention among philosophical authors all passages ascribed to others are not their own and scholiasts invariably try to bring out the unexpressed defects. In the present case also Sārvabhauma has criticised Manikanṭha on behalf of Gaṅgeśa (fol. 107-8: इदु मयोक्रमणमन्यें वैस्य मथ्यातोदयवतैः मयोक्रमणमभिचन्द्र: —).

(2) Under the heading बित Gaṅgeśa cited and criticised a definition in the very next passage (pp. 369-74), which is immediately followed by a passage of केचित्त (p. 375) without any criticism. This latter is also taken from Manikanṭha (Nyāyaratna, p. 94) and Sārvabhauma remarks to clear the somewhat anomalous reference (fol. 108b):—यज्ञविति मतं खमवेन उपयोगिता अन्यतृतित्र प्रकाश्य—मयोक्रमणमभिचन्द्रिति...अथैव लक्ष्य:। अन्यथा अन्यतृतित्र चत्वार मयोक्रमणमभिचन्द्रिति दु: केचित्तितिति तत्तताभिवाद्य प्रथमन् न दुन्धेत।

(3) In the section on Parāmarśa the passage द्वधारमतमस्तवेन तत्र नास्ति कितु न्यास्यस्वन्धेनक्तिपि वेल—न (p. 507) is a refutation by Gaṅgeśa of Manikanṭha’s views (Nyāyaratna, p. 120, lines 9-10), as stated by Sārvabhauma (fol. 130b: मयोक्रमणमभिचन्द्रिति प्रथमः)

(4) A definition of Savyabhicāra, one of the fallacies, has been cited and criticised by Gaṅgeśa (pp. 812-13: नापि पञ्चतांतिरिक्त हत्याबि). It exactly occurs in the Nyāyaratna (p. 166) and we are again indebted to Sārvabhauma for the information (fol. 189b: मयोक्रमणमतवत्तै द्वधारमेति—नापि पञ्चतांतिरिक्ति).
We should mention here that the first two passages referred to above are quoted more exactly by Vardhamāna and in a combined form in the Kusumānjaliprakāṣa (III, p. 36) and what is much more important the first passage is also quoted in Vardhamāna’s Pramāṇapraṇakāṣa (p. 691) under the heading संप्रदायविविधत्सु. Vardhamāna, it should be noted, wrote all his works after taking lessons directly from his father and Māṇikantha was to them a recognised authority of the school of Navya-nyāya. This is amply borne out by Gaṅgeśa’s borrowings from Māṇikantha in every section common in their works. We shall cite some instances. It was Māṇikantha who first controverted the well-known retort of Śriharṣa against Udayana (in the section on Tarka, p. 19); Gaṅgeśa reproduced the argument of Māṇikantha and added to it (p. 233). There cannot be any doubt that Gaṅgeśa formulated his famous definition of the term Vyāpti (known as Siddhāntalaksāṇa, p. 100) on the basis of Māṇikantha’s own definition (p. 55). Gaṅgeśa’s section on Upādhyābhāsa (pp. 398-405) is wholly borrowed from Māṇikantha (pp. 105-108), many of whose passages (including an important one of the Mānamanoharā as noted in the commentary, pp. 106-7) have been omitted by him. Similar borrowings can be detected in the sections on Avayava and Hetvābhāsa. It should be noticed that Gaṅgeśa has entirely omitted the sections on Kathā, Chala, Jāti, Nigrahasthāna and Mahāvidyā found in the Nyāyaratna.

We should refer to one more passage, which has an important bearing on Māṇikantha’s probable age. In the section on Upādhyāvāda (pp. 82-3) Māṇikantha cited and refuted the views of a scholar under the heading नवीनास्तु. Gaṅgeśa cited the same views under the heading अन्येन तु and almost exactly reproduced the arguments of Māṇikantha in their refutation (pp. 317-22) with an additional argument of his own at the end. According to Gadādhara (Chowkh. ed., p. 916) the views refuted by Gaṅgeśa in the passage under discussion were
of Sondadopādhyāya. Though no other scholiast has mentioned this fact so categorically it is supported indirectly by Yajñapati whose words have been reproduced by Pragalbha: व्याधिकरणःप्रावर्जितमप्रतितिमाथवादिनामेवेवे नमः.......
(Anumāna-Pragalbha, fol. 33a). So also Sārvabhauma upon the same passage: साधनाल्यापकलया श्रावकतु व्याधिकरणःप्रावर्जितप्रतितिमाथवादिनामेवेवे नमः (fol. 91a), as well as Jayadeva in the Āloka (fol. 33a). As Sondaḍa has been cited by Gaṅgeśa also under the epithet नव्यालु (Vidhivāda p. 276), both Manikanṭha and Gaṅgeśa were slightly removed from the times of Sondaḍa and all the three great scholars thus become more or less contemporaries, a fact of supreme importance for the purposes of chronology.

There cannot be any question that a scholar referred to by Vardhamāna as ‘Sampradāyavid’ belonged to Mithilā. In fact, a copy of the Nyāyaratna in the Telugu characters preserved at Tanjore (Cat., p. 4735-7) mentions in the colophon, unfortunately corrupt in reading, that Manikanṭha was a ‘Tīrabhuktiya’ Misra and was the Judicial chief of a certain king. The exact reading of the colophon runs: तिरभुक्तियारितिमाथवादिनामेवेवे नमः प्रकरणं समापम्। There was a conjunct consonant (ङ ्?) in the gap bored through by insects. The other copy in Grantha character was evidently only a transcript, more corrupt in reading, of the Telugu copy. It may be surmised that the book was written at the court of a foreign kingdom (Uttaramuṣaka?) outside Mithilā; a Maithila author would not describe himself as Tīrabhuktiya in his own country. Manikanṭha may thus be among the band of scholars who carried the banners of Mithilā in other provinces.

In Mithilā also Manikanṭha’s name was respectfully mentioned by eminent scholars. Vācaspati Misra II wrote a commentary on the Nyāyaratna; we have given an account of this interesting work in a subsequent chapter. Śaṅkara Misra quo-
Manikantha's definitions of three Nigrahasthas (अभयारण्य, मतानुज्ञ, पर्यतन्योपयोगे सूक्ष्म) in the Vādivinodā (pp. 35-6). Yajña- pati's son Narahari Uadhya in the section on Pakṣatā attempted to answer an adverse criticism of his father by his teacher Jayadeva and quoted Manikantha in his own support:—न च तत्र पञ्चताबिरहर्म्यवहार एव नातीति चाच्चर्यमयीसितेन पञ्चताबिरहर्म्यवहारानात्...साधक- मानेरितिविद्वदो गंगेश्वरस्वाभि त्वरसाशः। (Tanjore Ms. No. 10944 of Anun- mānadhīsanoddhāra, fol. 70a). Jayadeva's nephew Vāsudeva in his turn attacked Narahari and concluded his argument with the humorous line चिन्तामणि सिद्धान्तवाच्यमयीसितेन पञ्चताबिरहर्म्यवहारानात् (London, I. O. copy of Vāsudeva's Chintāmaniṣṭikā, fol. 44b). All these references prove that instead of Gāngeśa's epochmaking treatise Manikantha's work continued to be studied in Mithilā for a long time and it enjoyed a pan-Indian popularity, as its copies are preserved in almost all Mss. libraries of India. It is rather surprising that an 18th century scholar of South India commented on it; the published commentary was written under a monarch Cāmarāja (of Mysore) who ruled late in the 18th century (Nyāyaratna, p. 7, Introd., p. xxxiv).

Manikantha had written another book named Nyāya- cintāmani twice quoted by him in the Nyāyaratna (pp. 108 and 220). The name of this lost work has been printed as Nayacintāmani, but the variant (printed in p. 220 f. n.) is in our opinion the correct one. For, Vācaspati Misra II in his commentary on the first passage quotes from this lost work and concludes:—अयो च विविषिपिषिको मया न्यायविनित्ताविष्णु क्रत इति वत एवावश्यकस्यमिथथः। (B.O.R.I. Ms. No. 775 of 1884-87, fol. 25a). The two references prove that it was a more elaborate work, covering partly at least the same ground as the Nyāyaratna. It was apparently superseded by Gāngeśa's work bearing almost the same name. We believe a careful search among the large number of manuscripts of Gāngeśa's work may lead to the discovery of the long-lost Cintāmani of Manikantha.
Like all Navyanyāya authors of the period Maṇikanṭha quotes Udayana more frequently than any other authority; the Nyāyaparipṛṣṭa of Udayana has been cited a dozen times towards the end in the sections on Jātī and Nigrahasthāna (from p. 202) and, what is somewhat surprising, mostly criticised. The Kusumāñjali is also cited and refuted once (p. 81). Next to Udayana the Khaṇḍanakāra was reckoned with by Maṇikanṭha and refuted four times (pp. 19, 39, 155 and 173). But the most important reference found in Maṇikanṭha is to the Ratnakośakāra (pp. 86 & 178). As far as our present knowledge goes, the Ratnakośa is cited by Maṇikanṭha alone among pre-Gaṅgeśa authorities.

Among original views of Maṇikanṭha we need only refer to two remarkable ones. Like Śiromaṇi he has rejected Sāmānyālaṅkāra (pp. 63-67), thus aligning himself for once with the Prabhākara school. Gaṅgeśa’s separate section upon that term finally establishes it as a fundamental doctrine of the Nyāya philosophy. Maṇikanṭha’s commentator Vācaspati Miśra II, therefore, attempts a compromise (fol. 14b: छत्र भ्रामायिकाः...तत्त्वार्थाय प्रत्येकदेशालङ्करतरः किं तु पूर्वायुत्तिमात्रिकरत्रपर इत्यादि). According to Maṇikanṭha again Anupasaṁhāri is not a third variety of the fallacy named Savyabhicāra as established by Gaṅgeśa, but is included in the Vyāpyatvāsiddha (pp. 165, 171-2).

Saśadharaścārya: One of the authorities consulted by Gaṅgeśa. For, it is definitely stated by Vidyānīvāsa Bhaṭṭācārya in the Pratyākṣamaṇītikā (Sarasvati-Bhavana Ms., fol. 22a) that Gaṅgeśa refuted the views of Saśadhara in a well-known passage of the Maṅgalavāda (B. I. ed., p. 110): विष्णुपुराणानुसारे रश्मिरःकलशमाह-यतु रागेति। It should be noticed that Gaṅgeśa in the passage under discussion has put in a nutshell of two lines the substance of a whole paragraph of Saśadhara (pp. 18-20). The Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa, of
Sāśdhara has been published with a commentary (Varanasi, 1924 pp. 652), though the edition is full of lecunas and incomplete towards the end. It is possible now to assess the value of Sāśdhara's work as contrasted with Gaṅgeśa's classic. It is a collection of 26 separate tracts on important topics of the Nyāya, arranged rather loosely. Bendiction (pp. 1-37) is followed by Darkness (pp. 37-78) and Luminous Gold (pp. 299-319) by Partial Etymology of words (pp. 320-49) without any relevancy. The commentary attempted to answer Gaṅgeśa's criticism (vide Gaṅgeśa's Iśvaravāda, B. I. ed., p. 96-8) of Sāsadhar's views in some places (e.g. p. 140 इत्यादि चिन्तामणिेक्षो, दूषणमल्लभाम् & p. 141 इति गशश्रेष्ठपुआमल्लभकं वेदितविधम). But the commentator is quite wrong when he supposes in one place (p. 198) that Sāsadhar anticipated Gaṅgeśa. There cannot be any question that Sāsadhar preceded Gaṅgeśa, as can be easily proved by a comparison of their respective views on common topics. The Vyāptivāda of Sāsadhar (pp. 379-410) examines about a score of definitions of the term Vyāpti, of which the fifth one, among many others, exactly corresponds with a definition found in Gaṅgeśa's Pūrvapakṣa (B. I. ed., p. 84). Similarly another intricate definition is examined by both (Saśadhara, p. 395 & Gaṅgeśa p. 72). But Gaṅgeśa's treatment of the topic is far more advanced, methodical and extensive. Sāsadhar cited towards the end of his tract (p. 406-7) a view ascribed in the commentary to a certain 'Jaran-naiyāyika', which is found almost exactly in the Vyāptipañcakaka.

It should be mentioned in this connection that Gaṅgeśa cited two similar definitions ascribed universally to two scholars, who were celebrated for their invincible career as dialecticians by the nicknames 'Lion' and 'Tiger' and Gaṅgeśa's passage on the point, which subsequently developed into a large section, came to be known as 'Simha-Vyāghṛi'. What were the actual names of the two scholars has not been stated by any scholiast. But in the seminaries of Mithilā and
Bengal their names are given out as Saśadhera (sometimes Saśidhera) and Maṇidhera. The present work of Saśadhera does not exactly contain that definition. But the fact remains that Professor L john's definition was based on 'anonyābhāva' (vide Jayadeva's Āloka on the passage: अनन्योन्यात्यन्तात्मावाबेदेन लक्षणाद्वयमाराध्य निवेदयति—नापीरि fol. 6b of a Ms. in our possession). And Saśadhera's own view was also on that same basis (p. 405). At any rate it is beyond any doubt that Gaṅgeśa's reference was to two scholars of his own region. Vidyābhūṣaṇa (l.c. pp. 207-8) made a very curious suggestion that the reference was to two Jaina scholars of Western India named Ānanda Sūri and Amarcandra Sūri. This is on the face of it improbable. The above-named Jaina scholars could never command circulation of their unknown works in Eastern India and they were not certainly so famous as to influence a superior scholar like Gaṅgeśa, who, as a matter of fact, has nowhere referred to any Jaina authority in his work. Moreover, the two Jaina scholars were given the titles 'Tiger-cub' and 'Lion-cub' respectively in their boyhood by the famous Siddharāja (1093 A.D.) and not exactly 'Lion' and 'Tiger':

वायःःसि निद्रित्ताविविज्ञान जगाद
षौ व्याब्रसिद्धशिष्यकाविभिः सिद्धराजः !

(From Udayaprabha's Dharmābhhyudaya; Peterson's 3rd Rep., App. I, pp. 16-19)

In the Īśvarānumāna Gaṅgeśa covers the same ground as does Saśadhera in the six tracts viz. Īśvaravāda proper (Gaṅgeśa: pp. 1-87), Sahajasātvāda (pp. 87-134), Ādheyaśaktivāda (pp. 134-148), Kārṇatāvāda (pp. 148-155), Muktiyāda (pp. 156-148) and Jñānakarmasamuccayavāda (pp. 184-95) and many passages of Gaṅgeśa can be traced in Saśadhera. For instance, कामीच्छरण...of Gaṅgeśa (p. 145) is a clear improvement upon Saśadhera (pp. 158-9) and the next passage (p. 145: नापि ताप्याःश्वास्त्र) is also borrowed from Saśadhera (p. 160).
Gaṅgeśa has similarly borrowed phrases from Śaśadhara in many other topics.

Śaśadhara’s date can be fairly fixed from the following evidence. Śaśadhara has approvingly quoted a Kārikā (V. 7) of the Kusumāṅjali under Vidhivāda (p. 438) and has criti-
cised Śrivallabha’s definition of Vyāpti (p. 385). Moreover, Śivāditya’s peculiar views on Darkness are cited by him (p. 76: नीलक्षणारोपविरीयते: संसर्गभावस्तम इति कैचित्). The commentary correctly notes शिरादित्यसमतमाह-नीलक्षणेति. It should be noticed that Śaśadhara has amplified the aphoristic words of Śivāditya as found in the Saptapadārthi (आरोपितारोपविरीयस्तमाह-नीलक्षणेति: p. 84 Cal. Sans. Series). There is one more important reference; in the section on the Luminosity of Gold, Śaśadhara cited and refuted an argument of Vādivāgīśvara (author of the Māna-
manohara, as the commentary correctly notes, p. 305). All the above references prove that Śaśadhara cannot be placed before the 13th century A.D. and probably lived about 1300 A.D. He is not mentioned by Citsukha nor even by the latter’s very well-informed commentator, Pratyakṣvarūpa. His elaborate and intricate style of reasoning, which verges sometimes on that of Gaṅgeśa himself, points him out as an elderly contemporary of the latter. The fact that his work survived even after the epoch-making book of Gaṅgeśa seems to show that his fame as an invincible dialectician lingered long in Mithilā and even Jayadeva wrote notes on his work as proved by a Ms. (not how-
ever examined by us) preserved at Varanasi (S. B. Studies, III, p. 136).

It is stated in the Introduction of the printed edition of Śaśadhara’s work ‘from hearsay’ (ब्रजये), that Śaśadhara belonged to the Maunasa (?) gotra and was the son of Dharaṇīdhara and grandson of Mahēśvara Paṇḍita; he had a brother Prithvi-
dharācārya by name. The whole of it seems to be a canard. Hearsay in the present century cannot record so many exact details about a scholar of the 13th century.
Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña: In the Vidyāsāgara commentary of the Khaṇḍana by the great Vedāntic scholar Ānandapūrṇa occurs the following passage (Chowkh. ed., p. 714):—

Pratisthā

Vidyāsāgara, who is known for his Vedāntic scholarship, mentions Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña in his commentary on the Khaṇḍana. The passage by Ānandapūrṇa discusses the philosophical views of Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña and his contribution to the development of Vedānta.

Here Ānandapūrṇa has cited Udayana’s definition of Upādhi as improved by a scholar named Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña. This improved version was unknown to the Khaṇḍanaka, whose argument however is hurled against the improvement by Ānandapūrṇa with some hesitation. It should be noticed that Gaṅgeśa at the very beginning of his Upādhividāda cited this version and refuted it (B. I. ed., p. 296), though none of his scholiasts mentioned the name of Nārāyaṇa as its author. Ānandapūrṇa (c. 1350 A. D.) was thus quite unaware of the far more advanced views on the subject found in Gaṅgeśa’s work.

This Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña may be identical with Sarvajña: Nārāyaṇa a famous commentator on the Manusamhitā, who has been cited about a hundred times in the Daṇḍaviveka of Navya-Vardhamāna. He was later than Govindarāja and preceded Kullūkabhaṭṭa, according to Rāghavānanda Sarasvatī, another commentator (Buhler’s Introd., S. B. E., pp. cxviii–ix). He was more probably a contemporary of Kullūka and belonged to the 13th century A. D.

Saṅkara Miśra in the Upaskāra (p. 329 under VII. ii. 10) cited and refuted the views of one Sarvajña (Pratisthā) on the term ‘Vibhāga’. It is probable that this unknown Vaiśeṣika scholar is also identical with Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña. Navya-Vardhamāna calls him Nārāyaṇa, Saṅkara calls him Sarvajña.
Anandapūrṇa calls him Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña and in the Manu-
tīkā he is Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa. Evidently one person is meant 
by all these variants of a name. The lexicographer of the same 
name cited by Rāyamukuta and the author of the Bhaṛatapra-
kāśa (on the Mahābhārata) should also be mentioned in this 
connection.

Muṇḍari Miśra: As is well-known Gaṅgeśa in the 
Prāmāṇyavāda refuted the views successively of Prabhākara, 
Bhatṭa and Miśra and Vardhamāna in the Kusumāṇjali-prakāśa 
(II, p. 9) mentioned the full name as Muṇḍari Miśra. In the 
Īśvaravāda also (B. I. ed., pp. 114-15) Gaṅgeśa referred to 
his views, summarised by Vardhamāna (Kusumāṇjali-prakāśa, 
I, p. 49). In both these cases Muṇḍari held views opposed to 
both Bhatṭa and Prabhākara, though he was himself a Ṣimāṁśā 
scholar and this has earned for him the celebrated adage 
‘Muṇḍari’s is the third way’ (मुन्दरेन्द्रस्त्रधिष्टः पञ्चम:). His views on 
the problem of the apprehension of valid knowledge has been 
traced in Muṇḍari’s commentary named Tripādi-nilinayanam on 
Mīm. Sūtra I. ii-iv (Poona Ms. dated 1644 V. S., fol. 18: vide 
Dr. Miśra’s monograph on Muṇḍari, p. 10). Another tract 
of Muṇḍari named Aṅgatvanirukti is also available in print. In 
the commentary Muṇḍari has referred to the Vivaraṇa (of 
Prabhākara), the Viveka (i.e. Nayaviveka of Bhavanātha), the 
Pañjika (of Śālikanātha) and the Paribhāṣā. Among authors the 
notable names are Candra, Nandana and Sṛīkara. The 
mention of Śrṣīkara and Candra, proves that his date falls 
after the 12th century A.D. As he is not mentioned by any 
author before Gaṅgeśa there is hardly any doubt that he 
fLOURished in the 13th century. This is confirmed by the fact 
that Gaṅgeśa quoted him in the Īśvaravāda under the caption 
‘Navyāstu’ (p. 114). He was undoubtedly one of the authors 
who greatly influenced Gaṅgeśa, as he admitted in the line 
गुरुभिस्माला गुरुह्यां मतम्. He evidently belonged to Mithilā, 
where in the pre-Gaṅgeśa period he was universally known
as 'Miśra'. The editor of the Lilāvatī (Chowkh. ed.) confused him in the index with a much later 'Miśra', who commented upon Vardhamāna.

Jagadguru: a hitherto unknown scholar who came after Udayana and before Gaṅgeśa. A passage in the Īsvaravāda (B. I. ed. p. 29) begins: अर्थे तु आनुकृत्तिसमवाहितवं कर्ति

The Īsvaravāda section of Gaṅgeśa is unfortunately neglected by Navyanyāya scholars due to the extreme popularity of Udayana's Kusumānjali. Jayadeva and his pupil Rucidatta commented on this section only concisely. The only scholar who subjected the section to a detailed examination is, as far as we have ascertained, Pragalbhācārya, whose commentary on this section (foll. 147-208) covers more than a quarter of the whole Anumāna part. Pragalba informs us that the above passage refers to a scholar named Jagadguru: जगद्घूमलगढ़-गुप्तवर्तिनिविदमुक्तम्यािलम गाजिवाल [Kiranāvaliprakāṣa, B. I. ed., p. 2] Pakṣadhara writes: विषयेति—काव्यद्रव्याधिकारम् विषेषं:।

There is evidence that this Jagadguru had also commented on the Kirṇāvali. We have traced the following quotation in the Dravyaviveka of Pakṣadhara, which is an extremely rare sub-commentary on the Dravyakiranaṇavali-prakāṣa of Vardhamāna. Commenting on the line निर्दीशी पवित्रस्तैविद्यकामािलम् कालविशेषवािलम राजिवाल (Kiranāvaliprakāṣa, B. I. ed., p. 2) Pakṣadhara writes: विषयेति—काव्यचतुर्विनिविदम् विषेषं:।

There is evidence that this Jagadguru had also commented on the Kirṇāvali. We have traced the following quotation in the Dravyaviveka of Pakṣadhara, which is an extremely rare sub-commentary on the Dravyakiranaṇavali-prakāṣa of Vardhamāna. Commenting on the line निर्दीशी पवित्रस्तैविद्यकामािलम् कालविशेषवािलम राजिवाल (Kiranāvaliprakāṣa, B. I. ed., p. 2) Pakṣadhara writes: विषयेति—काव्यचतुर्विनिविदम् विषेषं:।

The passage of the
Kirṇāvali in the section on Darkness occurs on p. 19 of the Chowkh. ed. vide p. 104 of B. I. ed. for Vardhamāna’s note). It is now apparent that Vardhamāna was indebted to Jagadguru for his explanation of the word द्रोण in the above passage of Udayana. We have cited the above passage from Pakṣadhara in full as a typical instance of valuable historical materials relating to Sanskrit literature still lying hidden in obscure books in manuscript.

Brief reference should be made of some other predecessors of Gaṅgeśa about whom much is not known. In the Maṅgalavāda of the Tattvacintāmaṇi (B. I. ed., p. 72) Gaṅgeśa attributes a view to ‘others’ (अपरे तु). Pragalbha alone identifies these ‘others’ with Raviśvara. cf. रविशवरसमस्त द्रोणियु- मुनिन्याति—अपरे त्विति (Pratyakṣa-Pragalbha, ASB Ms, 15b). The same has been ascribed to Raviśvara by Śeṣānanta in his commentary on Śaṇadhara’s Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa. One Nyāya- bhāskarākāra also preceded Gaṅgeśa according to Kaṇāda Tarkavāgīśa. Gaṅgeśa, is said to refer to this little known author in the Savyabhicāra section: (चत साधवसत्यजनकोकिलहयोप- स्थापकसंपादनाविषेषते सति हेतुभिषेत: सः... Tattvacintāmaṇi, Anumāna part p. 789-90 ). cf. भासकरुपस्तां द्रोणियुस्तथायति—अश्वेति (A. S. B. Ms, 166b). Again पयज्ञ दृष्टिविषेषतुमतः... in the Pratyakṣakhaṇḍa, Jñaptivāda (p. 268) has a complex syllogistic argument attached to it. Vācaspati II attributes this to Bhāskarākāra (cf. Cintā- manīprakāśa, Baranasi Ms. 23a). Gaṅgeśa quoted the openions of Vatsesvara, the Mīmāṃsaka of the Prabhākara school, to whom the Mīmāṃsāmāharṇava is attributed. (Pratyakṣa- Pragalbhi, ASB Ms, 88b).

We want to conclude this chapter with Harinātha Upā- dhya. He seems to be the youngest of the Naiyāyikas allu- ded to by Gaṅgeśa. The definition of ‘himsā’ has been critici- sed in the Śabdakhaṇḍa, Vidhīvāda section of the Tattvacintāmaṇi. There a passage begins with अपरे तु अन्निमिन्नित्तरान्तरव्यापार-
Mathurānātha clearly attributes this to Harinātha. We have examined the older commentary, the Śabdamāṇiprakāśa of Haridāsa Nyāyālaṁkāra on this passage. There also occurs the following introductory remark, हरिनाथभमतम (Navadvipa Ms, 76b). In fact, there is a Smṛti digest of Harinātha, which contains almost the same passage as quoted by Gaṅgeśa. cf. तत्र नरान्तरवा.पारणयवहित-प्रायवियोगफलकवापारकती साँचाद वधी...। श्रतो भयांत्रेतुभुताभिसन्धाना-विपयनरान्तरवा.पारणेचमर्मणकवापारो वधः। तत्कता वधीत्वथः: (ASSB Ms, f. 110). Gaṅgeśa here used 'vadhah' for 'hiṁsā'. It may be added that Bhavadeva (c. 1100 A.D.) also discussed the definition of 'hanana' in his Prāyaścittaprakaraṇa (pp. 1-8). But the discussion of Harinātha and Gaṅgeśa is more advanced and intricate.
CHAPTER III

GAṆGEŚA UPĀDHYĀYA & HIS SON VARDHAMĀNA

Gaṅgeśa’s achievement is quite unique in the history of philosophical literature in India. There is not another scholar in the whole medieval period who had such a spectacular success through one single book. The Tattvacintāmaṇi, a treatise of about 12000 granthas in extent, appeared like a flash to dispel the gloom of centuries succeeding Udayana and laid the solid foundation of Indian dialectics. When a devotee of the belles-lettres encountered him on an occasion Gaṅgeśa is said to have uttered the following magnificent bravado:

This accords well with his confident assertion at the commencement of his work that he was the ‘presiding professor of philosophical conclusions’ (सिद्धान्तदीर्घगुरु:). The book divided into four grand parts after the four means of valid knowledge propounded by Gotama has a total of 46 broad sections (12 + 17 + 1 + 16) exclusively dealing with the single topic of Pramāṇa (प्रमाणतत्त्ववस्त्र विविधत्ते). This well-knit marshalling of all relevant dissertations (vādas) into a single comprehensive treatise took the learned world by storm and in course of time single sentences of Gaṅgeśa, such as the Vyāptipaṅcaka, developed into separate works of considerable length. The number of sub-sections, therefore, will now count well over two hundred. The book has been ably summarised by Vidyābhūṣaṇa (l.c., pp. 407-453).

Relevancy (सङ्क्ति) is one of the favorite topics of modern scholars and every section of Gaṅgeśa’s book has been subjected in the first instance to a scrutiny on that point. Before him.
Manikantha and Saśadharma, whose works are now available in print, had made collections of dissertations on similar lines; but they failed miserably on that fundamental point, though they paved the way for Gaṅgeśa. The latter’s style also improved considerably in precision and uniformity. Methodology now became the key-note of Indian logic and its repercussion on the historical and evolutionary treatment of topics was unfortunate. Gaṅgeśa and his followers became concerned with what precisely is the argument for and against a problem and cared very little for who argued. Gaṅgeśa’s studies, as he himself stated, were confined to the Nyāya and works of the Prabhākara school, which must have dominated higher studies in Mithilā at that time. Unlike Udayana whose talents developed through his conflict with the powerful Buddhist scholars, Gaṅgeśa’s conflict was with the Prabhākaras, whose arguments are refuted by him in most places. This fact has been stated as the special feature of his work by Rucidatta. (But the wonder is that in his whole book there are barely half a dozen specific names and among them only one probably was a Prabhākara viz. Śrīkara (Iśvarānumāna, B. I. ed., p. 186). Among the rest we need only mention Jayanta who is given the epithet jantarṇāyāpya (Upamāna Pt., p. 61). It should be noticed that this is probably the earliest mention of the Kasmirian author by an Eastern scholar. Gaṅgeśa might have been a poet also in his times, as his son Vardhamāna testified to his poetic talents in the epithet śravānīśvaṇḍanānu:.

**Gaṅgeśa’s family**: Gaṅgeśa’s name has been fortunately discovered by Prof. R. Jha in the Pañjis of Mithilā and this has an important bearing on his date. We shall quote the exact words of the genealogists and discuss them carefully. There are two manuscript copies of what is called a ‘Sākhāpañjī’ preserved in the Raj Library, Darbhanga. One of them (Ms. No. 553) is very clearly written by one Puruṣottama at the village ‘Maṅgalvanī’ in 1642 Saka (ločan-vaḍ-klāśmi: šāke)
and the other of about the same date is in a dilapidated condition, both being in palm leaves. Prof. Jha is the only scholar who has studied them critically. About Ratnākara, son of Sāthu, of the बश्मनिवास family (of Vatsya gotra) it is written by Puruṣottama: छादनसं चवचित्तांमणिकारक म० म० परस्मुद्र गङ्गेश्वर दौ. In the other copy (fol. 31a) the same Ratnākara, son of Sādhukara, is described as छादनसं चित्तामणिकारक २ गङ्गेश्वरी. The figure 2 curiously stands for two M’s i.e. Mahāmahopādhyāya. दौ is an abbreviation for दौषिण. सं stands for संसूत. Gaṅgeśa thus belonged to a family of which the Mūlagrāma was Chādana, a village which remains yet to be identified in Mithilā. The family which was inferior in social status is now extinct in Mithilā. According to the Gotrapaṇī it belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. It appears, therefore, that Vardhamāna was referring to his own family when he wrote in the Kuṣumāṇjali-prakāśa (p. 7) गोत्र मथवाध्याय. The daughter’s son Ratnākara, on the other hand, belonged to one of the best families of Mithilā. The Paṇjis give elaborate accounts of the latter family, recording Ratnākara’s alliances in great details. Gaṅgeśa’s family is completely ignored and we are not expected to know even his father’s name.

There is one more reference to Gaṅgeśa in the Paṇji. About Bhavēsvara of the respectable Jajibāla family (of Śāndilya gotra). Puruṣottama wrote: छादनसं वचचित्तामणिकारक जयगुरु म० म० गङ्गेश्वरुत सुपद्वो भवदातिसंस हराधित्यु(हिंदु-हैन्दु)—सुपद्वाद्वर्थ-हराधित्युभिः कविजित्वाले। This is exactly found also in the other copy (fol. 339a). This proves that Gaṅgeśa had at least three sons, Vardhamāna, Sūpana and Harīśarmā. It is interesting to find that the Paṇjis record evidently from contemporary sources two of the highest titles with which Gaṅgeśa was endowed viz. ‘Paramguru’ and ‘Jagadguru’—an evidence of the meteoric career that he enjoyed in his own land. Only Vācaspati Miśra II enjoyed the former title according to the Paṇjis. As there is no other reference to
Gaṅgeśa we can assume that the family dwindled into insignificance again and became extinct soon after his sons' death. His native place is unknown, unless it be identical with his ancestral village Chādana. Absured stories about his illiteracy, his overnight acquisition of knowledge through divine grace without studies and his quarrels with an uncle are still told in Nyāya seminaries specially in Bengal. They are completely falsified by his own words at the commencement of his work. The well-known verse कि गच्छ नीलामुलागचि नीलाम् which he is said to have addressed to his uncle is ascribed, it should be noted, by Vācaspati Miśra II in his Khandaṇanjohāra (p. 149) to Dharmakīrti, Such stories existed from ancient times and travel from land to land to be localised wherever there are extra-ordinary talents.

Date of Gaṅgeśa: We shall discuss the problem of Gaṅgeśa’s date in some details as there is much confusion among scholars about it. Weber first suggested that Gaṅgeśa lived in the 12th century A. D. (Hist. of Indian Lit., p. 246 fn.); the authority cited (Z.D.M.G., XXVII, 168) is really based on an opinion expressed by an Indian scholar of no note without any evidence that Gaṅgeśa lived ‘700’ years ago (Mookerjee’s Magazine, 1872, p. 123). The silent acceptance of such an unwarrented opinion by a scholar of Weber’s repute produced perhaps a tendency among many scholars to place Gaṅgeśa too early. Keilh also argued (Indian Logic and Atomism, 1921, p. 33) that he lived within 1150-1200 A. D. He was evidently influenced by Suali (l. c. p. 66 note: cf. I. O., II, p. 547). The evidence he put up, especially on the connected dates of Jayadeva and Rucidatta, is absolutely wrong as we shall prove at the proper place. Vidyābhūṣaṇa (J.A.S.B., 1918, p. 282; also Indian Logic, pp. 406-7) placed him ‘about 1376 A. D.’ on the basis of a succession of generations of pupils, which is not correct and which is fundamentally useless for chronological investigation.
According to Dr. H. P. Śāstrī a Ms. of Vardhamāna’s Kusumāṇjali-prakāśa, now preserved in the Asiatic Society (No. 794), provides a positive clue to his date. The copy is divided into two parts written by two different hands with about a century intervening between them. At the end of the part which was later in date there was a date ‘1342 Śaka’ (i.e. 1420-21 A.D.). The page-mark 3 in the other part exhibits a peculiar form which was current, according to Bendall, within 1300-1360 A.D. It is, therefore, impossible to place Vardhamāna after the 13th century A.D. (Hist. of Tirhut, 1922, p. 179: Des. Cat., A. S., XI, pp. 96-7). The evidence is wholly wrong at every single step. We have carefully examined the copy; the date of the so-called later part is now completely effaced and it is impossible to surmise that the date was legible a few years back. As a matter of fact, Dr. Śāstrī gave the date as ‘1334’ to a Pandit who published it in his book ‘Kusumāṇjali-saurabha’ (1330 B.S., Introd., p. 13). He was not evidently sure of his reading of the date. The Ms. is on palm leaves and cannot be more than 400 years old by any consideration. Dr. Śāstrī, moreover, completely failed to notice that the form of the figure 3 on pages 30-39 of the so-called earlier part is quite modern in appearance and the same scribe used both the forms. It is impossible therefore, to hold, as Bendall did, that a particular form was current just within 60 years of the 14th century A.D. We have found the same form in many manuscripts of the 16th and 17th centuries.

Gaṅgeśa’s date can be fixed within narrow limits from a thorough investigation of literary evidence, internal and external, as well as facts from family history now available in abundance.

(1) Among his predecessors, whose accounts have been collected in the last chapter, there are several who belonged to the 13th century A.D. We should repeat the names of Nārā-
yaṇa Sarvajña, Divākara, Maṇikanṭha and Harinātha. The last two scholars might be living still in the first quarter of the 14th century A.D. and the terminus a quo of Gaṅgeśa's period of activity should be taken as 1325 A.D.

(2) The earliest writer to refer to Gaṅgeśa, as far as we can gather at present, is the great Maithila scholar Vaṭeśvara Upādhyāya, who must have criticised Gaṅgeśa sometime between 1350-75 A.D. Thus Gaṅgeśa's period of activity terminated, at the present state of our knowledge, in 1350 A.D.

(3) This is confirmed by the notable fact, which seems to have escaped the notice of scholars, that no 'foreign' scholar has ever referred to Gaṅgeśa before 1400 A.D. We shall cite some instances. The Nayanapradasādini commentary on the Citsukhi is truly a cheering storehouse of quotations from all philosophical works written in India till the time of the author. The Citsukhi was written in the middle of the 13th century and the commentary about 1400 A.D. We have failed to discover any reference in it to the Maithila scholars Taranī Miśra, Maṇikanṭha or Gaṅgeśa. The views of 'new' dialecticians in Vādindra's Rasasāra (p. 62) or the reference to the followers of the 'equivocque' in the Citsukhi (Bombay ed., 1915, pp. 176 and 353) are sometimes loosely ascribed (Introd. to the Rasasāra, p. 5) to Gaṅgeśa, in whose work they are not certainly traceable. Guṇaratna, who wrote one of his works in 1409 A.D., does not mention Maṇikanṭha or Gaṅgeśa in his Sadārśana-samuccayavṛtti.

Cinnabhatṭa commented on the Tarkabhāṣā under 'Śrī-Harihara-Mahārāja' (so in the colophon, Dr. Bhandarkar's ed., p. 262), who was identical with Harihara II of Vijayanagara (1377-1404 A.D.). In the commentary itself there is incidental mention of 'Vijayanagari' (p. 228), the great centre of culture in South India. But Cinnabhatṭa proves himself absolu-
tely oblivious of the great upheaval of studies on the Tarkaśāstra in Mithilā under Saśadhaba, Maṇikaṇṭha and Gaṅgeśa and was still looking upon Varadarāja ( p. 133 & 145 ) and Vāḍindra ( p. 214 ) as the latest authorities on the Śāstra. It should be mentioned in this connection that about a century after Ānabhaṭṭa, Balabhadrā of Varanasi, a profound scholar of Navya-nyāya of the Gaṅgeśa-brand, referred in his commentary on the Tarkabhāṣā to the classical works of the school like Dravyopāya and Tattvabodha of Vardhamāna ( fol. 4 of Poona Ms. No. 200 of 1884-6 ) and all the subsequent scholiasts of the book Viśvakarmā, Govardhana, Gopinātha and Gaurīkānta to name only a few, were followers of Gaṅgeśa.

Similarly the great polymath of South India Ānandapūrṇa Vidyāśāgara, whose date has been fixed by Dr. Raghavan as ‘about 1350 A. D.’ ( Annals of Oriental Research, IV. i. p. 2 ), in his standard commentary on the Khaṇḍana of Śrīharṣa quoted an advanced refinement of Udayana’s definition of Upādhi ascribed by him to one Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña ( Chowkh. ed. p. 714 ). This particular refinement, however, was cited and refuted by Gaṅgeśa at the very beginning of his Upādhipāda ( Anumāna, B. I. ed., pp. 296-9 ), where the subject was treated in a far more advanced and intricate manner, of which Vidyāśāgara was quite oblivious.

In South India the Mādhva scholars specialised in studies on the Navyanyāya to an extent not found anywhere else ( except Bengal ). They refuted the arguments of Gaṅgeśa and his followers, meeting them in their own method. But the earliest writer to launch this attack was the great Vyāsatīrtha ( 1460-1539 A. D. ), whose Tarkatāṅḍava is, as far as we are aware, a pioneer work in the field. No Mādhva scholar before Vyāsatīrtha had any acquaintance with the Maithila upheaval under Gaṅgeśa.
(4) Among Maithila scholars the date of Caṇḍēśvara, the author of the several Ratnākaras is now fixed beyond any dispute. He performed a Tulāpuruṣa in 1236 Saka (1314 A.D.), evidently in his early youth, and wrote his last work the Rājānītiratnākara about 1370 A.D. under king Bhaveśa. Long before the discovery of the last named work it was known traditionally that he survived in the reign of king Bhavasimha (Hist. of Tirhut, 1927, p. 170 fn.). His date of birth, therefore, cannot be placed before 1275 A.D. and the period of his literary activity must now be placed between 1320-70 A.D. The following synchronistic table makes Gaṅgeśa a contemporary of Caṇḍēśvara.

Devāditya of the Visphi family

Vīreśvara (1st son)  Jaṭēśvara (4th son)

Caṇḍēśvara  Sūpana  Gaṅgeśa

Γυπίσvara = daughter  daughter = Sādhukara
(of Jajibāla family)  (of Bambhaniṇām family)

daughter = Ratnākara

Ratnākara had many wives and this was his last wife. Gaṅgeśa, therefore, was very much senior to Sūpana just like Caṇḍēśvara, who was the eldest man of the family in that generation. This wife of Ratnākara, it should be noticed, was a cousin of the famous Vidyāpati. Γυπίσvara, father-in-law of Ratnākara, was ninth in descent from the first ancestor of the Jajibāla family named Daṇḍapāṇi. All these point to the conclusion that Gaṅgeśa can by no means be placed before 1300 A.D.

(5) Caṇḍēśvara’s younger cousin Rāmadatta engaged M. M. Bhavaśarman of the Khauāla family to write for him the Mahādānapaddhati. Bhavaśarman, therefore, was an exact
contemporary of Cāṇḍeśvara and wrote that book in the second quarter of the century within 1325-50 A.D. Now Bhavaśarman’s mother’s mother was the eldest daughter of M. M. Kāhnu of the Śaṅkarādhi family, who was thus about two generations earlier than Bhavaśarman. Kāhnu’s second daughter was given in marriage to Lakṣmīśvara of the Jajibāla family, sixth in descent from the first ancestor Daṇḍapāṇi Lakṣmīśvara’s (elder) cousin Subhadatta was the great-grandfather (प्रपितामह) of Harāditya (alias Jīva), the husband of Gaṅgeśa’s granddaughter (पौत्री). Gaṅgeśa therefore, like Bhavaśarman was two generations later than Kāhnu. It confirms our contention that Gaṅgeśa cannot be placed before 1300 A.D. by any means. Kāhnu’s youngest daughter’s daughter was the younger stepmother of M. M. Jagannātha of the Māṇḍara family, father of the famous Vaṭeśvara Upādhyāya mentioned above. Jagannātha was thus a contemporary of both Bhavaśarman and Gaṅgeśa, while Vaṭeśvara becomes a contemporary of Gaṅgeśa’s son Vardhamāna.¹

The Tattvacintamaṇi:

A rapid survey of the contents of the book, is however necessary for our purpose. Gaṅgeśa produced this ‘jewel’, as he states in the third introductory verse, for the decoration of scholars and for dispelling the terrible darkness of heretics. Moreover, opponents (so ably exposed herein) will no longer press their views cleverly in debates and the doctrines of his own school are stated fully without mincing matters:

विप्रज्ञापने न विचारार्थात्रि
न च स्वसिद्धान्तवचोविद्विता

The ideal has been maintained by the author throughout with conspicuous success.

¹. For other informations about Gaṅgeśa vide our ‘Vange Navyanyāyacarca’ pp. 15-19.
In the first part dealing with Perception the preliminary section on Benediction (pp. 5-114) thoroughly examines the topic in all its aspects and it has been elaborated by many later scholars, though Śiromāṇi did not touch it. Gaṅgeśa deals with only the first and foremost of the 16 topics of Gautama, viz. Pramāṇa and the next section on Prāmāṇya, divided into three sub-sections Jñāpti (pp. 114-286), Utpatti (pp. 287-371), and Pramālakṣaṇa (372-429), really forms the introduction to the whole book and consequently this section, and curiously enough this section alone of the Pratyakṣa part, is assiduously studied by all students of Navyanyāya. The next section on Anyathākhyāti or Error (pp. 430-537) also belongs to the general Introduction, being a corollary to the previous section: the views of the opposing Prabhākara school who advocate in their Akhyātivāda that no knowledge is an Error, have been elaborately examined in this section. It is interesting to find that Gaṅgeśa has quoted five rare Kārikās of the Prabhākaras (pp. 465, 468, 470, 474 & 475-6) in this section.

The four-fold division of Pramāṇa and the definition of Pratyakṣa is taken up in the next section, which particularly deals with one of the terms used in the definition viz. Sannikarṣa or Intercourse and its six varieties in the ordinary plane. The whole of this main portion including this section, which really gave the name to this first part, is now obsolete and its place has been taken by elementary works notably the corresponding portion of the Muktāvali. Śiromāṇi did not touch this portion at all, proving that it was already getting out of date about 1500 A.D.

Four of the varieties of Sannikarṣa are based on Samavāya or Inherence, one of the Vaiṣeṣika categories, which is not accepted by some schools of thought. Gaṅgeśa devotes a small section for its establishment (pp. 640-72). In the next section Anupalabdhi (Non-Perception), which is regarded as a sepa-
rate means of valid knowledge by the Vedānta and Bhaṭṭa schools, specially for the knowledge of that much debated category Abhāva (Negation), is rejected (pp. 673-92) from the Nyāya stand-point, under which Negation is perceptible through the senses. One rare Kārikā is cited in this section (p. 688), which is followed by an important section on Abhāva (pp. 693-719), which unfortunately is not studied in the seminars at present. It should be noted that in the Šabda part Gaṅgeśa refers to an Abhāvavāda, which seems to be a separate and earlier tract on the subject:—तदुद्देशमाप्नवस्येति—प्रत्येक्येऽपि तत्त्वं भूतलाभान्मत्वत्वम् | (Šabda, Pt. II, p. 475 under Saktivāda). In this section Gaṅgeśa cites the following brilliant verse of the opponents, who do not accept Abhāva as a separate category:

एतेऽत—‘हर्षस्तवद्यं चतोष्ठ व पतनं हर्षस्तवध्रुवः
हर्ष विशेषसंहितं: परिमोहको न हर्षोपयः।
लेनायत संहितं क निबिदा कि चात्र तलाकारः
स्वाधीनं कलशयं केवलमिथं हर्षः कपालावली॥’

हर्षं निरतं। युद्दरपातादि विनक्षो घटं हर्षं प्रतितीविरिक्तिविनाशायुम्भवतः
(p. 717). This very verse is traceable in Ratnakīrti’s Sthirasiddhidāsa (Patna ed. of Ratnakīrti’s works p. 111), ascribed to his teacher (वद्शाहुरगङ: i.e. the great Jñānaśrī. (Ratnakīrti reads पलिग्रस्त for कलशयः). Jñānaśrī was still a force to be reckoned with in Gaṅgeśa’s times. The verse actually occurs in his Kṣaṇabhaṅgadhyāya.

In the next section on Pratyakṣakāraṇa (pp. 720-62) the most elaborately treated subject is the peculiar Nyāya thesis that Gold is not a substance, but only a sort of light. One of the sources of Gaṅgeśa on the problem was Udayana (p. 750). In the next section (pp. 763-83) the well-known Nyāya theory that Mind is an organ and it is minute (‘āṇu’) is established. Anuvyavasāya (apperception), one of the vital things connected with Perception, is next dealt with (pp. 784-898), followed by Nirvikalpa and Savikalpa, the two kinds of Perception, with which the first part ends.
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The second part on Anumāna (Inference) is by far the most popular, though the most intricate portion of the whole book. It is now broadly divided into two halves, commonly known as the Vyāptikāṇḍa and Jñānakāṇḍa and scholars used to specialise in either of them or rarely in both. The first section on the definition of Anumiti or Inferential knowledge and establishing the validity of Inference against the views of Carvāka (pp. 1-26) is immediately followed by a grand section, Vyāptivāda dilating on the first term of the definition, viz. Vyāpti (Invariable concomitance of the middle term with the major term). There are seven sub-sections under it, viz. Vyāptipaṅcaka (five provisional definitions), Siṁha-Vyāghrī (two similar definitions of Professors Lion and Tiger), Vyadhiṣṭhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva, Pūrvapakṣa (collection of various other definitions), Siddhāntalakṣaṇa (final definition of Gaṅgeśa), Sāmānyabhāva (a separate class of Negation formulated for clearing a definition) and Viśeṣa-vyāpti (other specialised definitions). The next section on Vyāptigrahopāya (pp. 174-252) consists of two sub-sections, Tarka (confraction) and Vyāptyanugama. The first half ends with Sāmānyalakṣaṇā, a much-debated kind of preter-natural sense-contact, established by Gaṅgeśa.

The second half opens with Upādhi (vicious condition), its definition, classification, ground of vitiation and fallacious aspects. But the section is long out of date and is now almost a lost portion of the book. The remaining sections are the delight of all serious students of Navyanyāya—Paksatā (on the minor term), Parāmarśa (Deduction), Kevalānvyāyī & Kevalāvyātirekī (kinds of Anumāna), Arthāpatti (Presumption, not a separate Pramāṇa as advocated by the Mīmāṃsā), Avayava (five limbs of a syllogism) and the last section on Hetvābhāsa (Fallacy) consisting of ten sub-sections viz. Sāmānyanirukti (General definition), Savyabhicāra &c. (five kinds of fallacy with three sub-classes treated in 8 different sub-sections).
closing with a statement on the efficacy of fallacies in demonstrating inefficacy of arguments.

The latest phase of Navyanyāya studies in India for about two centuries flowed through a large number of channels cut by single sentences or phrases of this part of Gaṅgeśa's work and by far the widest channel emerged from the general definition of Fallacy. It has now assumed proportions through the efforts of all the best Indian brains in Navyanyāya, which is a world's wonder in the field of intellectual feats, though to the uninitiated it is only 'a vast mass of perverted imgnuity' (Keith: Indian Logic and Atomism. p. 35). The Īśvaravāda of Gaṅgeśa, which is the concluding section of this Anumāṇa part, is, as we have stated before, now obsolete, being lost in the unfading glory of the original Kusumāṇjali of Udayana, on which it was based.

Likewise the Upamāṇa part of Gaṅgeśa has been quite out of date for a very long time. Only one scholar of Mithilā as far as we are aware, commented on it viz. Rucidatta. Pragalbha of Bengal distinctly stated that while there are ways devised by the learned, on the three major parts, not even a 'sigh' was made in the hard Upamāṇa part, where he was 'without a prop':—


dhāra: pratyay chāramhitumāne ca kṣatyaṁ
dhāra: viṣay ca viśayakṣamatāyam kīmapi
na cha vāsāsīrṣṭyappamānanāt prākāri gahātie
nirālayā kṣatyaṁkṣatyaṁ prākāri gahātie

(Pragalbha's Upamāṇasaṅgṛaha, A. S. Ms., Introd. v. 2).

The fourth part of the Tattvacintāmaṇi deals with verbal testimony and is called the Śabdakhaṇḍa. It opens with the definition of verbal testimony—Śabdaniṛūpaṇa. A discussion on Śādbodha (verbal judgement) follows. Śabdaprāmāṇyavāda then proves the validity of verbal testimony as an independent
organ of cognition. Then follow the dissertations on ākāṅkṣā (expectancy), yogyatā (competency), āsatti (contiguity) and tātparya (word-import) which are indispensable conditions to produce verbal judgement. The Śabdānityatāvāda deals with non-eternity of sound. The uchchannapracchannavāda deals with the theory that sound is destroyed and not-concealed. The vidhi, apūrva and śaktivādas deal with Vedic Injunctions, merit and demerit and potentiality respectively. Next comes the dissertation on Lakṣanā—secondary meaning. The following sections deal with the logical implication of the grammatical problems like compound-words (samāsa), verbal suffixes (ākhyāta), the roots (dhātu) and prefixes (upasarga). The concluding section establishes the validity of the four types of cognitive instruments after refuting the validity of aitihya (tradition), janaśruti (rumour), arthāpatti (implication) and anupalabdhī (non-apprehension).

Like the Anumānakhaṇḍa, the Śabdakhaṇḍa also became highly popular and numerous commentaries were written on both of them. In the Nyāya seminaries of Mithilā and Bengal almost equal importance was attached to both.

The work of Gaṅgeśa became highly popular very soon and was studied and commented upon in various centers of culture of India. It not only cast the works of the old school of logic into oblivion but the neo-logical works of his predecessors also faded into insignificance and gradually were forgotten due to its overwhelming popularity and all embracing character. We, however, find scholars like Vardhamāna, Vācaspati Miśra II, Saṅkara Miśra and others devoting much time and energy to revive the old school of Aṅgāpatha. But their efforts met with no conspicuous success.

The influence of Gaṅgeśa’s school was felt even outside the boundaries of India and we hear of Burmese Mss. of neo-logical works in Mss. Libraries. (vide I. O. Cat. Vol. II. p. 576).
VARDHAMANA UPADHYAYA: The Tattvacintamaṇi soon established a school through the works of Gaṅgeśa's son and disciple Vardhamana. The contributions of this great logician bear the titles 'prakāśa' and 'upāya'. Later authors refer to him as 'Upāyakāraka'. It appears that Vardhamana had no sons, but his grand-children through a daughter were many and we get their accounts in the Pañjis. We give below a list of Vardhamana's Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika works:

(1) Anvikṣaṇayatattvabodha—commentary on chapter V of the sūtras of Gotama. Pt. Surendralal Tarkatirtha utilized a Ms. of this work in his edition of the Nyāyasūtravivaraṇa. M. M. Ganganatha Jha is said to have discovered two Mss, of it. One more is preserved in the Sarasvati Bhavana, Baranasi and a fourth in the Viṣvabhāratī, Sāntiniketana. We have mentioned (p. 78 above) the Trisūtritattvabodha of Vardhamana. But no other information regarding the rest of the work is available.

(2) Nyāyanibandhaprakāśa. It has partly been published in the Bibliotheca Indica series along with Udayana’s Nyāya-vārtikatātparyaparisuddhi. Vardhamana must have completed the work and chapters I & III of it are available in a manuscript (No. III. c. 123) of the Asiatic Society, Bengal. A very old palm-leaf Ms. of the Prameyanibandhaprakāśa is preserved in the Government Sanskrit College Library, Calcutta.

(3) The Nyāyaparīṣṭaprakāśa has been published in the Calcutta Sanskrit Series along with the Nyāyaparīṣṭa of Udayanācārya.

(4) The Kusumāṇjaliprakāśa has also been published long ago.

(5) The Kiranāvaliprakāśa—The Dravya and Guṇa sections have been published in the Bibliotheca Indica series and the Sarasvati Bhavana text series respectively.
(6) The *Lilāvatīprakāśa* has been published from Chawkhamba, Baranasi.

(7) A Ms. of the *Khaṇḍanaprakāśa* is preserved in the Asiatic Society, Bengal.

(8) Vācaspati Miśra II in his *Khaṇḍanoddhāra* (p. 77) mentions Vardhamāna's work bearing the same title.

(9) Padmanābha refers to the sub-commentary on the *Buddhādhikāraprakāśa* of Vardhamāna by Balabhadra in the Setu (p. 378).

(10) The *Tarkaprakāśa* on Keśava Miśra's *Tarkabhāṣā* is said to have been preserved at Ulwar (Ulwar Cat, p. 28, No. 653 with a sub-commentary on the same *Ibid*, No. 654).

It is said that an incomplete Ms. of the *Maṇiprakāśa* of Vardhamāna came to the Sarasvati Bhavana, (Venis: Benares Cat, p. 193). But we could not trace it. For various reasons we cannot accept that Vardhamāna commented on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. Vardhamāna refers to his earlier works in subsequent ones. The *Kusumāṇjaliaprakāśa* mentions the *Tattva-bodha*, the *Nibandhaprakāśa* and the *Pariśiṣṭaprakāśa*. The *Lilāvatīprakāśa* mentions the *Kusumāṇjaliaprakāśa*. Vardhamāna quotes his father’s views in numerous cases. But we find no reference to the *Maṇiprakāśa* either in his own works or in those of his successors. On the other hand the remarks added to a big quotation from the *Cintāmaṇi* in the *Nyāyānibandhaprakāśa* (pp. 677-92) seem to suggest that Vardhamāna wrote no commentary on his father’s *magnum opus*. In case of the existence of such a commentary the clarification of his father’s views in a different context would have been irrelevant. As Vardhamāna was held in high esteem both in Mithilā and Bengal, non-mention of such an important commentary of Vardhamāna if ever written, in later exegetical works on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* is impossible to conceive.
Vardhamāna tried to bridge the gulf between the two schools of orthodox Logic—the old and the new. As we have just seen, he commented on the old classics current in his days. But the views of his illustrious father were always uppermost in his mind and he made the best use of them in his works.

As a smṛti writer also, Vardhamāna commands great respects in Mithilā. He wrote the Smṛtiparibhāṣā, the Śrāddhapradīpa, the Ācārapradīpa and other smṛti digests.
CHAPTER IV
THE AGE OF EXPANSION

Jīvanātha Miśra: The eldest brother of Śaṅkara Miśra's father Bhavanātha. Śaṅkara Miśra stated clearly in almost all his works that he had only reproduced the lessons he had received on each of the classics commented by him from his own father, who again took lessons from his own brother Jīvanātha, who might be regarded as the great genius behind all the eminence achieved by Śaṅkara. In the Vādivinoda ( p. 61 ) Śaṅkara cited an important passage of Jīvanātha on the section of fallacy:—साध्यात्मन्तराभावसामानानिधिकरणयं सिद्धांशुर...इत्येके।
साध्याभावसामानानिधिकरणयमात्र न्यायिकाः। किं च गत्यप्राप्ताभावाचित्तश्लेषिविव्यां
गत्याभावान्तराभाव एव इति नायक पत्या इति जीवनानाशिष्याः। This is a refutation of Gaṅgeśa ( vide Anumāna part, B. I. ed., pp. 970-71 towards the end of the section on Bādha ). There is another quotation from Jīvanātha in the Upaskāra ( under IX, ii. 1, B. I. ed., p. 392 ); it is an extremely intricate definition of the term 'pakṣa'. Next to it, Śaṅkara cited the well-known definition of Gaṅgeśa in a rather slighting mode ( इति कैचिनु् ) and found fault with it ( एततमेव वादस्त्वलेकिं पत्या ), referring to his own. Maṇimayukha for further ( adverse ? ) discussion. Jīvanātha's antagonism to Gaṅgeśa was evidently derived from Vāṭeśvara Upādhyāya, who was his maternal grandfather according to reliable genealogical records. Vāṭeśvara's descendant Narahari in his critique on Smṛti named Dvaitaniṁmayya refers to Jīva-

नानाथास लेखको निपातमहत्मं वर्णितायाः, जीवनानाशिष्यकृत्योत्कृत्। It appears that Jīvanātha had written a critical treatise on Smṛti named Dvaitaninmayya. We traced the following rare quotation in Gokulanātha's commentary ( Pradīpa ) on Vācaspati's Dvaita-
nirṇaya (A. S. Ms. No. I. D. 5, p. 11): छत्रएव जीवनाथ-दृत-निर्भरदे इतिपरसमन्वित्याधारात्मपदाम्बाय वापितत्वादित्युक्तम्। Jīvanātha's date is about 1400 A. D.; he was evidently not alive when Śaṅkara Miśra took lessons from his younger brother and pupil Bhavana-nātha (about 1425 A. D.). Śaṅkara was not a direct pupil of his uncle Jīvanātha.

Gāṅgāditya: One of the earlier authorities upon the text of Gaṅgeśa. His name was almost completely lost till we discovered the following reference in the Pratyakṣa part of the Cintāmaṇiviśecana of Vidyānivāsa Bhaṭṭācārya. The unique manuscript of this work of Vidyānivāsa now preserved in the Sarasvati-Bhavana, Varanasi, has been thoroughly examined and fully described by us in our account of Vidyānivāsa (Vaṅge Nauṃanyāyacarca, pp. 63-78). In the section on Prāmāṇyavāda Vidyānivāsa explains:—(fol. 53a) धर्म-सुरारिन्यायमेव स्वाभावामात्म्याः-अपिद्वारस्यकृतिः च हेतुस्मिति नवगंभरपाठः वर्षमान-गाँगादित्यातुमतः। (vide B. I. ed., p. 239 fn. & Māthuri p, 240). The reading धर्म-सुरारिन्यायमेव is actually found in the Guṇaprabhāṣa of Vardhamāna (S. B. Text, p. 193). The mention of Gāṅgāditya's name along with that of Vardhamāna proves that Gāṅgāditya was an author of fairly early date, say, about 1400 A. D. and probably commented on Gaṅgeśa's work. Vidyānivāsa wrote the commentary about 1490 A. D.

Ghaṭesopādhya: Another name hitherto entirely lost mentioned by the above-mentioned Vidyānivāsa in the same book (fol. 47a):—छत्रएव धर्मश्रोपाध्यायो नियममेत तुच्छीस्तुत द्वौषिक्त्यात् पीतादिभ्रम इति स्विचरे। तद्वित्र द्वौषिक्त्यात् संसारः स्वाधिति चधतः—(vide B. I. ed, pp. 207-8). It is not unlikely that this unknown scholar, evidently belonging to Mithilā, might have preceded Gaṅgeśa himself.

Nyāyalo'gananakāra: The name of this author remains yet to be discovered. He was one of the earliest scholars.
who criticised Gaṅgeśa and evidently belonged to Mithilā. Śaṅkara Miśra in the Vādivinoda cited his definition of ‘Vyāpti’ : ( p. 57 ) साध्याभाववदृश्यतित्तयमन्यभिन्नाः। छविभिचारित्वमेव च व्यासिः। अवृत्तिगानादिविभावितमयेहि पद्धथमंत्राया असास्त्रात् न तद्भिजगतेति न्यायान्लोचनकः। The language proves that the passage is meant as an answer to the Vyāptipañcaka of Gaṅgeśa. In Sārvabhauma’s Śabdamaṇiparīkṣa there are two references to the Nyāyalocana ( Varanasi Ms., fol. 28b & 85a ), of which the first passage runs : धर्मिण्य वप्तितनाविवधं दार्शवत् तज्जन्यजनकर्त्तव्यम् प्रमाणान्तरेयस्तुन्क- निष्ठेरतिति न्यायलोचनस्यांक्षणपातम्। Here Sārvabhauma clearly indicates that the unknown author attempted to find fault with Gaṅgeśa. Yet another passage of the Nyāyalocana was traced by us in the Śabdamaṇiprakāśa of the famous Bengali scholar Haridāsa Nyāyālāṇkāra ( fol. 91b of a Ms. preserved in the Anglo-Sanskrit Public Library at Navadvīpa ). It runs :—एवं कीर्तनकर्मनाौत्तिर्धा जातेर्दत् प्रमूषिनाशः। एवं रोगादिस्थले तुष्क- विशेषय एव संस्कारानाशः। एवं नमस्कारादिकांपि पापानिवायाहसः। तथाविनाशार्थं जन्मतः तद्विं न्यायलोचनमभागम्। This also seems to be an attempt to find fault with Gaṅgeśa. As the book is not mentioned by any recent writer of Mithilā and Bengal the author must have flourished before 1400 A. D., the approximate birth date of Śaṅkara Miśra as ascertained by us.

There is an illuminating passage of the Nyāyalocana in the Tattvāloka of Vācaspati Miśra II under II. ii. 58 (fol. 153a) : न्यायलोचनकाव्यः न शक्त्वव पवयतः तदुद्भिजनकर्तिलक्ष्यकर्तं पत्रम् यथा व्यक्ति तदा तदब तद्रथी मोचिदस्मप्रकर्तिक्षु मथान्वेस्मथ शास्त्रस्मिनेन शोभासाधारणोऽवयुतमिति। कुर्ता ताहिशास्त्रायमानुपत्तिविश्वायलक्षेत्रवन्ध्वसम्यवेच पदार्थं न्युन्वतिस्तु कार्यित्व सन्धितः। कार्यित्वसम्बन्धः । न त वाक्योद्धरतासः तत्राधारणानुसरस्मि—भावात् यथा घटमानेर्वादाम्। इत्यादः। This is a clear refutation of Gaṅgeśa.

Jayadeva alias Pakṣadhara Miśra : is the only scholar of the post-Gaṅgeśa period in Mithilā who succeeded in
setting up a new school (sāmpradāya) of Navyanyāya through his immortal work—the Āloka on the three parts of Gaṅgeśa’s work (omitting the small Upamāna part). It dominated Nyāya studies throughout India for a long time. Pakṣadhara’s invincible career as a dialectician is immortalised in the line:

पञ्जाप्रतिपठो न लत्यांते काधि लोके चिसिन।

The story of his encounter with Vyāsatīrtha (1460-1539 A.D.) of Kārṇāṭa when he is said to have claimed in admiration of the latter:

यद्वशीतं तद्वशीतं यदनशीतं तद्वपयशीतं

or the far more well-founded victory over him of Siromaṇi of Bengal is really a reflex from his great glory. The following account of him collected from authentic sources, some of which were not yet properly investigated, gives many new facts about him.

His works:—He is universally known as the author of a single book, the Āloka, which practically superseded all previous commentaries on the Tattvacintāmaṇi. But among the Sanskrit manuscripts procured by Colebrooke when in India about a century and a half ago and subsequently presented by him to the India Office Library there are two works by Pakṣadhara viz. Dravyaviveka (as it is called by the author himself) and Nyāyalilāvatīviveka. A thorough examination of the two books, which it appears were not carefully scrutinized by Colebrooke himself or any other scholar, throws a flood of new light on the history of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature in Mithilā and reveals certain puzzling problems about Pakṣadhara himself. The Dravyaviveka (I. O., I, p. 665) contains no verses, devotional or otherwise, at the beginning and the name of its author is nowhere found.

1 B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma in a Vol. of Eastern & Indian Studies in honour of F. W. Thomas, p. 273. We have slightly amended the verse to suit the metre. Sri Sarma reads बिपठों and नमोन्मक्षेते।
in the body of the book itself, except the cryptic and somewhat misleading colophon at the end (fol. 103a):—इति श्रीब्रजानन्दीकायं पञ्चरथं द्रव्यप्रकाशं संपूर्णं। The superscripts on the leaves are पार्थ (foll. 1-3), पञ्चरथ (foll. 10, 12-14, 103) and पञ्चरथ (foll. 15 onwards to the end). On the cover of the last leaf, the title runs: किरणावली पञ्चरथी. It is a brief but useful commentary on the Dravyaprakāśa of Vardhamāna and is once referred to in the Līlāvatīviveka (fol. 36b) thus:—एतत् द्रव्यविवेकेः सम्भक प्रपंचिततमितीहोपेचित्तम। We have traced the reference on folio 54 of the present work (read along with Dravyaprakāśa of Vardhamāna, B. I. ed. of Kīraṇāvali, pp. 204-6). Both the works entitled Viveka are therefore from the same pen. But the most wonderful thing discovered is that the author frequently refers here to his commentary on the Tattva-cintāmaṇī also entitled the Viveka and not the Āloka. We quote one passage for example:—(fol. 7a, vide Kīraṇāvali B. I. ed., p. 10) तथापि यथाद्विष्कल्पसः ब्लूवान्धर्मिद्वाय, अन्तरोत्तरे च विभेदयते तथापि समानं तथापि तत्त्वाभावगम्यं च विचिन्तात्त्वम द्विष्कल्पसः ब्लूवान्धर्मिद्वाय, स्वरूपेऽऽथ यथाविवेकेऽपपरं च प्रपंचिततमितीहोपेचित्तम॥ The Pratyakṣaviveka is also referred to in foll 60a, 76a, 79b and 101b. Besides the Anumānaviveka (fol. 14a, 15b, 83a-b), the Guṇaviveka is mentioned once (fol. 86b) as well as the Kusumāṇjaliviveka (fol. 83a:—प्रलयात्मकसुमाण्जलिविवेकें द्रव्यम्)। There are four more references to a Viveka under a single topic (fol. 16a-b) which from the context points to the Pratyakṣaviveka. The rare authorities cited in the book are listed below alphabetically.

Kandalikāra (fol. 27b:—नन्तु मौर्यायेकोऽपि वाह्यस्तु द्रव्यमन्दकां चदति न तु गुणमिथिमायामिकोऽपि पञ्च द्रव्यस्तो बाहिनं द्रव्यायेति कुसुमाण्जलिकारद्रव्यम्। Kusumāṇjali-Vardhamāna (36b).

Jagadguru (q. v. 3b)

Pañcamaṭikā (66a: पलशारायोंचनादामिति तत्त्त्वाय, p. 499).
Bhāskara (82b : a passage in Anumānakhanda. B. I. ed., p. 633, lines 5-6 is ascribed here to a pre-Gaṅgeśa work, Bhāskara).

Lilāvatīprakāśadarpaṇau (35a :—अतएव लीलावतीप्रकाशर्पणयों—भौतिक सति संयोगान्त्रिकत्वादिकाद्विषेधत्वमिति येव पादः। vide Nyāyalilāvati, Chowkh. ed., p. 798).

Vilāsa 90a & 96a : identical with Dravakirāṇāvali vilāsa of Divākaropādhyāya (q. v.).

The Lilāvatīviveka (I. O., I, p. 668) is a much bigger work and begins with the following prayer-verse:—

बन्दे ते देवकीपुत्रं पवित्रं पद्मालोचनम्।
उन्मीलति यतं सर्वं यत्र सर्वं निमीलति॥

But the name of the author here again is nowhere mentioned in the body of the book, which ends (fol. 129a) with the colophon: इति श्रीपच्छर्को लीलावतीविचेक: परिपूर्णः। There are references to the other works of the author viz. Pratyakṣaviveka (15a, 20a, 39b, 43a, 86b, 88b, 92b, 106b, 114a & 118b), Anumānaviveka (18b, 93a, 103b, 104b & 115b), Śabdaviveka (52b), Cintāmaṇiviveka (45a & 114b) Dravyaviveka (36b) and Guṇaviveka (28b). The list of authorities cited, a much longer one, is given below arranged alphabetically:

Ācārādarśa (22a), Uddyota (18a), Upādhyāya (93b : identical with Prabhākara), Kandalīkara (39b), Kalāpapariśīṭa (66a), Kiraṇāvaliprakāśa (28a), Caturthaprakāśa (57b), Jaṭāsvarā (q. v. 100b), Darpana (1a, 2a, 6a, 7b & 28b), Dvitiyaprapakāśa (18a & 53a), Dvitiyavārtika (60b), Nibandha (103a), Padamaṇijā (2a), Puruśottamadeva (2a), Prabhākaropādhyāya (q. v. 2a &c. 11 times), Prameyaprapakāśa (53a), Bhavadeva (21b), Mahābhāṣya (2a), Reṇukakārikā (22a), Harimśra (2a).

Two more works of Pakṣadhara we are told (S. B. S. III, p. 136) exist at Varanasi, a Tippani other than the Āloka on
the Cintāmaṇi, which on examination may prove to be a part
-of the Viveka, and a Saśadharavyākhyā. Jayadeva’s nephew
Vāsudeva, who was a pupil of Jayadeva, refers to another long-
lost work of Jayadeva named Pramāṇapallava, which seems to
have been an indenpendent treatise rather than a commentary.
The passage of Vāsudeva runs:—चतत्वेऽथ प्रमाणपल्लवेधि चान्योन्याभावः
-संवेष देहुरिति सिद्धान्तितं गुरुचरणोनापीति। (Cintāmaṇītikā, London
Ms., fol. 31b).

The identity of this Viveka Kārā Pakṣadhara as distingui-
shed from the Ālokakāra is now a great puzzle before us dif-
cult to solve. Pakṣadhara as a surname of the Ālokakāra is
well-known and the scribe of the Dravyaviveka undoubtedly
supports the identity of the two—the Ālokakāra and the Viveka-
kāra—when he uses the pecuiliar abbreviation of the surname
‘Pākhū’. For, in the family records of Jayadeva we come
across exactly this very form of his nickname as current in
Mithilā. In the Bhaumāla branch of the Sodapura family the
Panji records:—सिद्धान्तायुहू-यजयेवापरतामकमहामहोमित्यपासु
-असिद्धवच्चां। But this identity can only stand on the supposition
that Jayadeva wrote two separate commentaries on the Tattva-
cintāmaṇi, the Viveka and the Āloka and that while the former
is absolutely unknown in Mithilā and Bengal the latter became
a standard work throughout India. That an early work of a
celebrated scholar, who himself refers to it frequently, would
become extinct among his own direct disciples is extremely
doubtful. At the beginning of the Pratyakṣāloka, Jayadeva
after saluting Śiva (also invoked in the next part) clearly
states:—

श्रीभीम जयदेवेन हरिसिद्धान् पिलब्धयत।
tतत्त्वचिन्तामोहित्यमातोकोवः प्रकाश्यते॥

This normally means that the Āloka was his first literary ven-
ture and it would almost amount to an absurdity if we suppose,
as we must in case the Viveka be also ascribed to him, that the
Āloka was composed after finishing a large number of scholia on almost all the standard works of Navyanyāya (including the Tattvacintāmaṇi) under the common appellative Viveka.

Among the direct pupils of Jayadeva, Bhagīratha (alias Megha) covered the same ground as the Dravyaviveka and the Līlāvatīviveka of Pakṣadhara. He very frequently refers to a previous commentator entitled ‘Miśrāḥ’ (Līlāvatī, Chokhambha ed., pp. 4, 11, 18 &c. more than 25 times), who, as we have ascertained, was neither Saṅkara Miśra (who did not comment on Vardhamāna) nor the author of the Līlāvatīviveka under discussion. One passage of Bhagīratha (p. 45) runs:—

एवं चेष्य फक्किका क्रिमित्त्वानन्तरस्त्र तु तत्त्वातिश्रद्धिः मिश्रार्थः लिलावती चिन्तयम्।

We have traced this peculiar solution of an intricate text in Pakṣadhara also. Thus:—(fol. 13a of the Līlāvatīviveka) सांप्रदायिकाः तत्त्वातिश्रद्धिः फक्किकानन्तरस्त्र परिवर्तते फक्किकां संसारां योजयति।

This proves that Miśra of Bhagīratha preceded the Vivekakāra, whose arguments against the solution are not reproduced by Bhagīratha. It is impossible, therefore, to identify the Vivekakāra with Jayadeva in the present state of our knowledge.

The Dravyaviveka was superseded by the much more expansive works of Rucidatta and Bhagīratha. Many passages of the Viveka are found incorporated in Rucidatta’s commentary without acknowledgement. Bhagīratha also seems to have referred to the Viveka e.g. under the term ‘kechit’ (Līlāvatī, Chokh. ed., p. 53 cf. Līlāvatīviveka, fol. 15a). It is, therefore, certain that the Vivekakāra preceded both by a length of time and he probably lived about 1450 A.D. He cannot be identical with Pakṣadhara Upādhyāya of the Māṇḍara family, who lived about 1400 A.D. Moreover, the author of the Darpana, cited in both the Vivekas before us, was Vaṭeśvara, the father of Pakṣadhara Upādhyāya. But this filial relation is not at all borne out in the two Vivekas.
while in the *Tattvanirṇaya*, a Śruti work of this Pakṣadhara (L. 1845) his father Vāṭēśvara is praised and saluted eloquently. We conjecture that the Vivekakāra is a third Pakṣadhara of unknown parentage and in our opinion, he is identical with ‘Śrīmat-Pakṣadhara’ of Amarāvati who transcribed the Viṣṇupūrāṇa in 345 L. S. Jayadeva never refers to his nickname ‘Pakṣadhara’ in the Āloka and it is extremely doubtful if a scholar of his eminence and celebrity could find time to transcribe a Purāṇa. But hitherto all scholars have taken this Pakṣadhara of Amarāvati as identical with Jayadeva. (Vidyābhūṣaṇa, l. c., p. 456 fn. &c.)

Jayadeva’s Professors:—As we have stated above, Jayadeva distinctly mentions the name of his uncle Harimiśra as his teacher in Nyāya both in the Pratyakṣa and the Anumāna parts of the Āloka. The Pañjis record that ‘Mahāmahopādhyāya’ Harimiśra was the eldest of the three brothers, but he was not a ‘Mahāmahopādhyāya’ of great eminence and did not probably compose any work. The following quotation in the *Lilāvatīviveka* probably refers to a grammarian of earlier date¹. हरिमिश्राकु—कमेंधारय एव समासः। न चोतमापद्वर्भूः-निपातावतिः: विशोषणविश्वासभावः प्रति कामचारात्। यथा हि, उत्तमोत्तमतः पुरुषान्तरहितोपवतिः तथा पुरुषवस्मपुत्रमात्रादिविष्यत्॥ (fol. 2a)

Many portions of Jayadeva’s Āloka were published long ago in the complete edition of the text of Gaṅgeśa, as complements to Mathurānātha’s commentary. In the Pratyakṣa part the published portion covers the sections from Samavāya-vāda to Nirvikalpavāda (B. I. ed., pp. 640-838). In the Anumāna part the whole of the Īśvaravāda as well as the last section of the main part (B. I. ed., pp. 983-97) is adorned with the Āloka. In the Sabda part, where the Āloka begins

¹. For Harimiśra the grammarian and a commentator on the Kāśikā, vide Puruṣottamadeva’s *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* &c. (Rajshahi, 1946) App., p. 128 & Introd. p. 5.
with a salutation to Viṣṇu (न जाने श्रीजाने) instead of Siva आस in the first two parts, the sections from the Jātiśaktivāda to the end (B. I. ed., Pt. II, pp. 556-866) are illuminated by the Āloka. It is a pity however, that no complete edition of the Āloka, the greatest post-Gaṅgeśa work of Navyanyāya in Mithilā, is likely to be published in the near future.

But there is almost an universal tradition in Mithilā and Bengal that Jayadeva was a pupil of the celebrated Yajñapati Upādhyāya. For instance, we find in the Śabdakalpadrumā (Pt. II, 1749 Śaka, p. 1791) यज्ञपुपुषायथाय च पञ्चगर्मित्रि कृत्ति तद्यथारकारः। (“न्याय”-राज्ये) This tradition is substantially corroborated by Jayadeva himself. Any one who will take the pains of comparing the works of Yajñapati and Jayadeva will be struck by the interesting fact that Jayadeva has controverted the views of Yajñapati at every step. In one such passage, cited below, Jayadeva distinctly refers to Yajñapati as ‘Guru’. Commenting on the text of Gaṅgeśa beginning with the word यज्ञमिळ्टव्च्छित्वेन (Anumāna, Upādhisiddhānta, B. I. ed., p. 436) Jayadeva writes (Anumānaloaka, A. S. Ms. III. A. 25, fol. 56a):—यज्ञ व क व्यंजनवेदितसिफळे दोषाय तत्त्वाय। एवं सति जनतिसीम्बरभास्य सतिरासमयासागौरवं च गुरुः फिरस्ङ्गुरुः फिरव्यासाद। The whole controversy has been elaborately treated by Yajñapati’s son Narahari (foll. 57-66 of Tanjore Ms. No. 6268). Moreover, Padmanābha Miśra while explaining the above passage of Jayadeva clearly writes in the Pkṣadharoddhāra (Poona Ms. No. 785 of 1887-91, fol. 54b):—एवमिति। व्यज्ञनवल्लेरतिस्कृतस्त्रूक्ष्यय यज्ञपुपुषायथायेश्वरविश्वसाधनायापक्तो व्यज्ञनवल्लेरतिस्कृतसाधनायापक्तेति लक्षणाधिक निरुक्तो न च चैवेन तत्र यथति” (vide Narahari’s Dūṣanoddhāra, fol. 60).

**Mithilā’s glory in Navyanyāya:**—This conflict between the professor and the pupil marked the most glorious period of Navyanyāya studies in Mithilā and its echo reached the farthest corners of the country. The whole intelligentsia, so to
Jayadeva alias Pakṣadhāra Miśra

... speak, of Mithilā and Bengal was divided into two rival camps. Yajñapati's son Narahari, himself a direct pupil of Jayadeva, gave a spirited reply to all the points of controversy raised by his teacher and defended his father's views. Vāsudeva, a nephew and pupil of Jayadeva, defended his uncle against the attacks of Narahari and many others of the rival camp. Padmanābha Miśra, belonging to a Bengali family settled at Varanasi and adorning various royal courts of North India, wrote a commentary on the Āloka named Pakṣadharodhāra wherein he met the arguments of Narahari and others. Padmanābha's date falls in the latter half of the 16th century A.D. The healthy controversy, therefore, raged in Mithilā and the adjacent tracts for well over a century. It is a curious and significant fact that with the cessation of this controversy Mithilā's literary glory practically came to an end.

Studies in Pratyakṣa and Anumāna—The above controversy was confined to the first two parts of Gaṅgeśa's work: and in consequence, studies on the earlier classics of Udayana, Śrivallabha and Vardhamāna considerably declined from this period. An intensive and extraordinary switch on Gaṅgeśa henceforth assumed proportions which have no parallel in the literary history of the world. By Nature's laws the highest pitch, reached specially in Bengal on portions of the Anumāna part alone, marked after a certain period of lull a sharp decline that swept out the very foundations of Navyanyāya, including the solid work of Jayadeva.

Jayadeva's family still survives in Mithilā. He belonged to one of the premier Śrotriya families of Mithilā named Sodarapura of Sāndilya gotra. Varāhanātha, 10th (or 11th) in descent from the first ancestor Halāyudha, settled in the village Bhāuāla, after which this branch of the family came to be known. He was Jayadeva's grandfather. According to tradition Jayadeva lived in the village named Yamasama. He...
had a son named Mahāmahopādhyāya Mādhava. There is evidence that this worthy son of Jayadeva wrote in defence of his father against the arguments of Narahari. The following passage in the Maniṣṭikā of Jayadeva's nephew Vāsudeva refers to the long-lost work of Jayadeva's son. In the section on Kevalānvayī (B.I. ed., p. 566) Jayadeva’s views (fol. 93a) are refuted by Narahari (fol. 83b) Vāsudeva begins his long note here thus: —(fol. 58a) नलु तदा रूपाभावति बायों रूपसमवायोऽन स्वादभावाभावस्वप्ततासत्य। न चेष्टापति: स्वर्णसमवायोऽंति तदाः स्वादवक्तव्रद्धिति चेत्—(these are Narahari’s words in a nut-shell) न, तद्र विशेषः-नताबन्धित्रहुपाभावस्वप्तातु रूपविशेषत्वता च नास्त्येव। ह्यात् परं विशेषः——सा विशेषत्वता बायुतेवास्माति। तत्मते समवाययो फलतो न कथित्वदित्य हिति। स्रोतयं पितृचन्दनं नवकौचनिवामनो व्यामोहः। इस्युः तु चिन्त्यते।

This proves that Mādhava, son of Pakṣadhara, was senior to Vāsudeva. This is exactly corroborated in the family records. Gāṅgu of the Māṇḍara family had five daughters. Mādhava (son of ‘Pākhū’) married the third daughter named Gaurī, while Vāsudeva married the daughter of the second daughter Jayamati.

Date of Jayadeva: It can now be confidently asserted that all evidences, internal and external, point to the latter half of the 15th century a.d., as Jayadeva’s period of activity and the Āloka was written sometime between 1465-75 a.d. Those who speculated on his date and identity without examining his work and without consulting a single person of Mithilā, where Pākhū’s name is a house-hold word, naturally made astounding statements. Keith, for instance, took Jayadeva to be ‘no doubt’ identical with the author of the Prasannarāghava against a volume of evidence to the contrary (I.O., II, p. 560). It

1. Vide Prof. R. Jha’s illuminating paper on Kaviyajja Bhanudatta in the Patna University Journal, p. 12 of offprint containing the genealogical table.
need hardly be stated that Jayadeva, son of Mahādeva of the Kaundinya gotra and with a title Piṣāvarṣa is quite a different person, who flourished two centuries before the Ālokakara. Moreover, the gotra Kaundinya is of a very inferior rank among Maithila Brāhmaṇas. Similarly the long-drawn controversy about the date of a copy of the Pratyakṣāloka (L. 1976)—whether it was 159 L. S. or 1509 Śaka—is quite meaningless. There should not have been any question but that it is 1509 Śaka. Jayadeva must have survived till about 1500 A. D. when he gave lessons to the illustrious Bhagīratha, one of his last pupils. On the other hand he was a generation later than Śaṅkara Miśra who belonged to the same family and was his uncle (पितर्जन) in relation.

Jayadeva's style: The formidable and intricate style of Navyanyāya works, which first took shape from the pen of Gaṅgeśa and some of his predecessors, further developed in the hands of Jayadeva, whose manner of arguing a point became the delight of all serious and hard scholars. Methodology now became the highway of almost all these scholars, who cared very little, as time went on, for the original doctrines and their sources. Gaṅgeśa, Jayadeva or Śiromaṇi, with whom this intricate style culminated by joining hands with a formidable conciseness, rarely name their sources and their works are almost completely wanting in historical materials. The only specific names we could trace in the Āloka are Vaṭteśvara, author of the (Mīmāṁsā-) Mahārṣava, Makaranda (a lost commentary on the Kusumbanta) and the Darpana in the Pratyakṣa part and Bhāskara and a very rare name Pramāṇaparādāyaṇa (fol. 131b) in the Anumāṇa part.

Jayadeva's pupils: There was perhaps no scholar in Mithilā and Bengal who could claim so many and such a galaxy of distinguished pupils as Jayadeva had in his seminary. He gave lessons to Narahari, the son of his professor, to Mādhava,
his own son; to his nephew Vāsudeva, to Suciṣkara Upādhyāya
(according to tradition), to the famous scholiast Rudicatta
(who gives him the highest literary title known in India ‘Jagad-
guru’) and last of all to the great prodigy Bhagiratha. We
should state here that according to the latest evidence neither
Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma nor his pupil Śiromāni of Bengal ever
came to Mithilā for studies (vide Vaṅge Navyanyāyacarca,
pp. 36-37 & 40). Śiromāni’s pupillage under Jayadeva is there-
fore a myth.

Jayadeva’s popularity in Bengal: We heard a curious
tradition in Mithilā, though not widely current there, that Jaya-
deva left Mithilā in his old age and took shelter in Bengal;
This tradition is without foundation, but it is substantially cor-
rect in a cultural sense. Jayadeva’s school emerged out of his
great conflict with Yajñapati, whose adherents were ultimately
routed at the hands of Jayadeva’s followers. No author, except
perhaps Śiromāni, could claim like Jayadeva a band of scholars
forming in his very life-time a separate school on the basis of
his work, which they adorned with regular commentaries. One
of his earliest commentators was Jalaśvara Vāhinīpati, a son of
Jayadeva’s contemporary Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma; he wrote a
Sabdālokodyota (Vaṅge Navyanyāyacarca, p. 43) probably in
the lifetime of the Alokakāra. His preference for the Alokā
over his own father’s commentary the Parīkṣa (ib., pp. 37-41).
is an eloquent tribute to the spectacular success of Jayadeva.
This popularity of Jayadeva among Bengali scholars is a fact of
supreme importance. It is now completely forgotten that all
the scholars of Navadvīpa who commented on Śiromāni almost
invariably commented on Jayadeva also. This continued for
about two centuries and what is a marvellous fact, the Alokā
survived as a text-book at Navadvīpa for over a century after it
practically disappeared in Mithilā itself. For, in the 17th cen-
tury Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācārya (1604-1709 a. d.) the last great
scholiast of Bengal commented on all the three parts of the
Aloka (ib., pp. 178-79). At Varanasi the Bengali scholars Rudra Nyāyavācaspati, Raghudeva Nyāyālaṅkāra and Jayarāma Nyāyapānācānana of the same century commented on the Āloka. We have already stated that Padmanābha of Bengal origin commented on the Āloka, but not on Siromāni. We refrain from mentioning all the earlier names from (Siromāni's fellow-science) Haridāsa Nyāyālaṅkāra onwards, full accounts of whom are given in our Bengali work.

In South India only the renowned scholar Annam Bhaṭṭa is known to have written a commentary named Siddāṇjana on the Āloka (R. 1536-37). A more recent and less-known scholar named Agnihattra Bhaṭṭa wrote a Sphūrti on the Āloka, of which parts of the Pratyakṣa and Anumāṇa sections exist in manuscripts at Tanjore (Nos. 6095-97). It is however a curious fact that Jayadeva's pupil Rucidatta became more popular in South India. His Cintāmaṇi-prakāśa much more than the Āloka succeeded in founding a sort of a sub-school of Navyanyāya and many distinguished scholars wrote sub-commentaries on it.

Jayadeva is described by his pupil Bhagiratha as a 'Paṇḍita-kavi' i.e. he was both a scholar and a poet like his namesake who wrote the Candrāloka and the Prasannarāgham and with whom he is mostly confused. Whether any poem can be ascribed to him should be a matter of investigation. His poetic talents are also expressed in the following obituary verse about him which was discovered by us on the cover of the Ms. of Pragalbha's Upamānasaṅgraha preserved in the Asiatic Society (No. 1752 dated 1643 V. S.). It is a magnificent panegyric of the great scholar evidently from the pen of his direct pupils:

पञ्चिताकवी जागदेभ लक्ष्यं
साध्यपेतेऽविषवपितं गता नवानि।
TVANTOPADHYAYA: The extra-ordinary eminence of Jayadeva alias Pakṣadharā put to shade all the previous scholiasts of Gaṅgeśa, whose commentaries became extinct in no time. In our attempt to rescue the names of some of these long forgotten scholars we came across the extremely peculiar name of Tvantopādhyaśya which was completely lost. Some years ago we thoroughly examined the Ms. copy of the Anumānakhaṇḍa of a commentary named Pakṣadharoddhāra (B. O. R. I. Ms, No. 735 of 1887-91: vide fol. 39b for the actual name of the commentary). In this commentary Padmanābha wrote learned discourses on favourite topics of Navyanyāya and one of them is a long note on the (Vyāpti—) Siddhāntalakṣaṇa (fol. 22a-26a). Towards the end (fol. 25b) we come across the following passage:—

वेषधिष्टोिपमवाक्षयात धृमादित्यातिवित्वात वारिष्टुं यदवचिथ्यािपिकपस्ता-बच्चेत्ति साध्यायािपिक्याित्वार्धस्य वकन्यतया पूर्णशीलियाथर्यस्य तत्त्वगते दृष्टश्चार्थिति विचारसंशेषः। (The very unusual name found in the manuscript here looks like 'Tkanta', altogether a doubtful reading). Our suspicion, that the name of one of the earliest commentators of the Tattvacintāmaṇi has been preserved in this passage, turned into a conviction in a most unexpected manner. Sometimes ago we went to Triveni (in the Hooghly district of Bengal) to examine what remained of the library of Jagannātha Tarakapāṇīcānana (1694-1807 A. D.) the greatest scholar of his age in Bengal. A bundle of stray leaves was all that we could lay our hands upon, from which we recovered a very old copy in corypha leaves of Aniruddha’s Pitṛdayitā. A stray palm-leaf, torn at both ends was found in this copy containing a most interesting book list. We reproduce the whole of it below as a piece of direct evidence on the courses of advanced studies in Bengal in the middle of the 16th century.
It is dated 'Sam 430, 23 Śrāvaṇa' evidently referring to the Lakṣmaṇa era which was adopted by the Nadia scholars from Mithilā. The date falls in the 5th decade of the 16th century A.D. The superscript reads 'Tālika-pustaka-bandha(ka) Nadia' (i.e., a list of books bartered at Nadia, the popular name of the city of Navadvīpa):

(Column 1) Kāvyaprakāśa, Pūrvakhaṇḍana, Anumāṇa-Miśra, Pratyakṣa-Kaṇṭako(ddhā)ra, Bauddhādhikāra (5). (Column 2) Śabdakhaṇḍa, Tattvāloka, Pratyakṣa-Miśra, Vyavahāra(cinta)-maṇi, Bauddhādhikāra-Śaṅkaramiśra (5). (Column 3) Lilāvatyupāya (i.e. Lilāvatiprakāśa of Vardhamāna). Tat-Jalada (i.e. comm. on-do-(the above) by Bhagīratha whose surname was 'Megha', and Jalada is again a synonym of Megha), Kusumāṇjalyupāya, Guṇa (i.e. the portion of Udayana’s Kiranāvali on Guṇa, Śrāddhakalpa (5). (Column 4) Dravyopāya (i.e. Vardhamāna’s comm. on the Dravya part of Kiranāvali), Kusumāṇjali-Jalada, Śabda-Tvanta, Guṇa-Jalada (4). (Column 5, torn) Guṇopā(ya), Śabda-Gopi(nātha), Ācārā(darśa), Manu, Dra(vya?) (5).

The list is a good evidence that the Bengali scholars at that time assiduously studied all up-to-date Maithila works, specially on Navyanyāya. The mention of Pratyakṣa-kaṇṭakodādhāra by Madhusūdana Ṭhakkura is important as indicating the later limit in the date of its composition. The mention of 'Śabda-Tvanta' (the reading is quite clear and beyond any doubt) is certainly the most valuable feature of the list. It proves that the long-forgotten Maithila scholar Tvanta wrote a commentary on the Tattvacintāmaṇi, of which the last part (Śabda-khaṇḍa) was procured for the private library of Nadia. Padmanābha’s reference is to the second part of the same commentary. That he commented also on the first part of Gaṅgeśa’s work is proved by the following quotation traced by us in a unique copy of the Pratyakṣālokaprasāraṇi by Kṛṣṇadāsa Sārvabhauma, one of the earliest scholars of Nadia.
who lived in the second quarter of the 16th century. (vide Kṛṣṇadāsa’s full account in our Bengali work Vaṅge Navyanyāyāracarē, pp. 114-23).

Vantopādhyāya—चत्र तन्त्राद्यायाः—नन्द श्रेयो मानां प्रवर्तकं वा परिशोषणामविशेष्यथीपतिः
प्रकटवक्ष्य वा। आशी ‘‘परिशोषणामविशेष्यथानिश्चार्यक्रमेय प्रकट(त)’
त्वाद् कृतिसाध्यत्वपेत्रवापति। हितो एतात्तदर्शस्य व्यर्थ्यातः मक्खळ सफलं
(स)मातिफलं समाप्तोयायायेव सति सफलताबिर्यायेव सम्यक्त्वात् हि
दृष्टं एवः’’। (fol. 7a of a dilapidated Ms. in our possession: beginning of Maṅgalavāda, B. I. ed., p. 9). At the present state of our knowledge this Vantopādhyāya happens to be the earliest known commentator on Gaṅgeśa’s Tattvacintāmaṇi, for he preceded both Jayadeva Miśra (Pakṣadhara) and Śaṅkara Miśra as we shall presently see.

Vantopādhyāya’s commentary on the Kusumāñjali named Makaranda. The Kārikās of Kusumāñjali were commented upon, among others, by Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma and this ‘Rāma-
bhadrī’ was extensively studied in the Nyāya seminaries of Bengal till the last century. This Rāmabhadra was a son of the famous Jānakinātha Bhaṭṭācārya Cūḍāmaṇi, author of the Nyāyasiddhaṁantarājanī. He mentioned his father’s name in most of his works, e.g., (1) in the beginning of the Nyāya-
rahasya, श्रीभद्धार्याचूड़ामणितनयः कर्म रामभद्रार्थित्वात्। This commentary on the Nyāyasūtras goes to the end of Chapter IV only, where the colophon runs—इति महामहोपायश्रीभद्धार्याचूड़ामणितनयश्रीभद्धार्याचू
ड़ामणीप्रभूमीद्वारा न्यायरस्वः चतुर्थेव उद्धायः’ (fol. 120b of Nyāya-
Vaiśeṣika manuscript. No. 9 of the Sarasvatī-Bhaṭvaṇa, Benares. The commentary on chapter V proves on examination to be a separate work named Ānvikṣikītattavavivarana by Rāmabhadra’s father Bhaṭṭācārya-Cūḍāmaṇi himself (Vide Sāhitya-Pariṣat-
Patrika, Vol. 51, pp. 69-70). (2) In the beginning of the Guṇaraḥasya—
चूढ़ास्तार्कारां पूँढे येषविषयकम् ।
रामभद्राचर्मीभृद्धाचार्यविषयते ॥
( v. 2, Ms. in our possession)
(3) In the beginning of a small work on Smṛti named Samayarahasya:

हरिहरपरमेण पितरं वार्तिकचूदासमजी नतव।
किविके समयस्य शाखानां सार्वभौमेन॥

(Ms. in our possession)

(4-5) In a well known verse in the beginning of Rāmabhadra’s Padārthatattvaṭīkā (Benares Ed., p. 81) and Naṅvādatīkā R.A.S.B. Ms. No. III. G. 148, a unique copy dated 1957 Śaka):

वातस्य वक्तसरसरीहकानेषु, चूहामपेदिनेमसोऽश्रृंगाराः प्रश्रयः।
श्रीरामभद्रसुङ्ग्रही क्रतिना हिताय, लोकवर्धान विनाय कौमुकात्मतोति॥

All doubts about the identity of Rāmabhadra and his father should now be finally dissolved (cf. I.H.Q., XX, pp. 190-92). The strange introductory verses found in the beginning of Rāmabhadra’s Kusumāṇjaśālīkārikāvyākhyā in all available Ms. copies—and we have examined scores of them—which created a baffling problem before two generations of scholars, must now be regarded as the composition of some scholar other than Rāmabhadra. The first verse of benediction (आमोदः परिसोषिता:) has been traced in the Āmoda, a commentary on the whole of Kusumāṇjalī and not on the Kārikās alone) by the famous Saṅkara Miśra of Mithilā, whose parents are again unmistakeably invoked in the second verse:

भवानीभवनादायां पितृभयों प्रशुमानम्यहम्।
वप्रसङ्गादिद्व शास्त्रं कर्त्तरेऽपरं क्रतम्॥

Saṅkara has referred to his father Bhavanātha’s instructions in many of his works, e.g., Vādivinoda, Lilāvatīkāntāhābharaṇa and Upaskāra. It was MM. Dr. Gopinātha Kavirāja who first discovered a superscript in a Ms. copy of the ‘Rāmabhadrī’ (fol. 6a, स्वत्वं रक्षिमिष्ठुतं वतं सार्वभौमीयम्), which clearly stated that the first 4 or 5 leaves of the book were of Saṅkara Miśra’s composition and the rest Sārvabhauma’s. (Kusumāṇjalihodhāni, S. B. Text, Introd., pp., II-III f. n.) The ‘Rāmabhadrī’, has.
been published in the 'Āsutoṣa Sanskrit Series' of the Calcutta University (edited by Prof. N. C. Vedāntatīrtha). There is indelible evidence in the commentary itself that it is a medley of two different compositions. The fourth kārikā (‘sāpeksa-tvāt...’) is introduced twice in two different places, once on p. 11 (falling under Śaṅkara Miśra’s portion of the commentary) thus:—तत् चार्चिक्षेदमाकृतत् ्न हि कारणेत्र प्रत्येकं प्रमाणं दुस्हादृः।

It should be noticed that the prose line immediately preceding the kārikā is explained in this portion. On pp. 13-14 again we read, तत् चार्चिक्षेदमाकृतत् भावः, कार्यकारणभावे न तात्त्व प्रत्येकं प्रमाणं...कार्यार्थाया: संभावनयेत् तदुपपत्तेन रजाह—सापेक्ष्यादि...। Here the explanation of the prose line is omitted and the rest of the earlier gloss is presented in a more elaborate and improved language. We should mention that this twice repeated explanation is found in all the Ms. copies we have examined including the two in our own possession. That the earlier part was from the pen of Śaṅkara Miśra is directly stated in three more manuscripts we have examined. We are in possession of a very old copy where it is written distinctly in the margin of the front page, ‘Śaṅkaramiśrasya Kusumāṇjali-nyākhya’ and on fol. 5a after लिङ्गादेशभावाविरि the portion तत् श्राह...सापेक्ष्यादि is cancelled by smearing yellow pigment upon which it is written clearly इत्यत् श्रीमच्छकरसिंहकतं कुमारादिकारिकान्यायम्। तत्त्वपरं सार्वभौमीयम्। In the ancestral library of the late Paṇḍita Daksinācaraṇa Smṛtiṅrtha of Calcutta we found another copy where it is written (fol. 6a) लिङ्गादेशभावात् इत्यतं शांकर-सिंहीयं तत् सार्वभौमीयम्। Yet another copy was examined by us in a village Sātgeche in the Burdwan district among the remnants of a magnificent library which belonged to (Rāma-) Duḷāla Tarkavāgīśa (1731-1815 A.D.) one of the greatest Naivyāvikas of Bengal, whose ‘Patrikās’ on Navyanyāya became popular at one time throughout India. On fol. 5a it is written, सापेक्ष्याविरि। इति शांकरसिंहेऽपि समार्थः तत्त्वपरं सार्वभौमीयम्। This earlier portion, however, is not identical with the extant Āmoda commentary of
Sāṅkara. Why this is so and what became of the first part of Rāmabhadra’s own commentary are not known and are likely to remain an unsolved mystery.

The third verse in the beginning of Śaṅkara Miśra’s part of the Rāmabhadrī is as follows:—

मकरन्दे प्रकाशे या व्याल्या परिमलेश्वरा ।
ततोपिता पितुर्वाल्यापान्यातुपयुक्तम् ॥

Of the three earlier commentaries on the Kusumāṇḍali mentioned in this important verse the Prakāśa by Vardhamāna is long available in print. The ‘Parimala’ is by Divākaropādhyaṇīya and a direct commentary on the text.

Who was the author of the Makaranda, mentioned in this list by Śaṅkara Miśra? Not certainly Rucidatta, the author of the sub-commentary Prakāśamakaranda, who as a direct pupil of Jayadeva Miśra (Pakṣadhara) was at least one generation later than Śaṅkara Miśra. In fact this Makaranda is an earlier commentary directly on the Kusumāṇḍali and we have traced a citation from it in the Pratyakṣāloka of Jayadeva (towards the end of ‘Prāmāṇyavāda’):—अतएव मकरन्दे अनन्यास्व-चूर्णित न पद्यविस्मरण व्याल्यात्मिति। (fol. 28a of a very old copy with us). Jayadeva was not certainly referring here approvingly by name to any work of his own pupil Rucidatta. In fact a comparison with the corresponding passage in Rucidatta (St. II, p. 7) proves that the view cited by Jayadeva does not belong to Rucidatta. So the Makaranda happens to be a long-lost commentary on the Kusumāṇḍali. Fortunately about two years ago we succeeded in getting hold of the above mentioned copy of the Rāmabhadrī in the collection of Dulāla Tarkavāgīśa, where an inquisitive copyist wrote down the following invaluable marginal notes upon the third verse cited above:

(1) Makarande—“TvantoPādhyaṇīya—kṛṣṭa-śāstre”
(2) Prakāśa—“Vardhamānopādhyaṇīya-kṛ(ṭa-? gra-)ntθe”
(3) Parimala—“Granthaviśeṣe”
Date of Tvantopâdhyâya: Šaṅkara Miśra in the above list of previous commentators has omitted other famous names, notably the Bodhâni of Varadarâja, who was a Kasmirian. It may be presumed that he preferred to confine himself to Mai-thila works only. As Vardhamâna came after Divâkara, we are of opinion that Šaṅkara drew up the above list in an ascending order of chronology. In other words, Tvantopâdhyâya came after Vardhamâna, though all three preceded Šaṅkara’s father Bhavanâtha as the words of Šaṅkara seem to imply. Now Šaṅkara’s father and teacher Bhavanâtha lived about 1400 A. D. and the date of composition of the two works of Tvantopâdhyâya—Maṇiṭikā and Makaranda—may be placed within 1375-1400 A.D. We can hail the latter’s name, therefore, as the earliest commentator of Gaṅgeśa so far discovered. We should state here that Kṛṣṇadâsa Sârvabhauma’s quotation from Tvantopâdhyâya, reproduced above, is followed by two other quotations from unnamed scholiasts, who evidently came after Tvantopâdhyâya.

Śaṅkara Miśra: is a name to conjure with in Mithilâ. He was a poet (in Paṇḍitavijaya and Rasârṇava), a dramatist (in Gaurî-Digambara-Prahasana), a Smṛti writer and above all a foremost Nyâya-Vaiśeṣika scholar. He belonged to a most distinguished Śrotiśya family of Mithilâ and maintained two large seminaries in his celebrated homestead which is a place of pilgrimage in Mithilâ. We shall confine ourselves in this account to his philosophical works only. The late M. M. Dr. Gaṅgânâtha Jha published in 1915 an edition of his Vâdivinoda with an introduction containing a most interesting account of the great scholar of extra-ordinary talents. He confronted the reigning monarch (probably the famous Śivasimha) when barely five years old with the extempore verse, still recited by Maitila students in wonder and worship:—

बाणोश्र ह जग्नानन्द ! न मे बाला सरस्वती।
अपूर्व अथ बर्ष बर्षःयासि जगत्रयम्॥
this royal visit fetched him money which by promise went to
the drummer woman, whose drum sounded by itself at the
time of Śaṅkara’s birth! She dug a tank with the money,
which still goes by her name in the vicinity of Śaṅkara’s house.
There is a copy of the Harivaṃśa preserved in his house which
was written by his students in one night. A copy of the Gitāṭīkā
from his house ends:—

आहो सर्पपाणात्यभेरत्वाणीत्सचनाऽः ।
यामयुमेन चत्रातिभित्वस्त्रात्तदयम् ॥

These are some of the wonderful relics still bearing testimony
to the halo that strode over Mithilā 500 years ago.

Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika works of Śaṅkara: In the first flash of
his great genius Śaṅkara tackled all the hard classics of Navya-
nyāya without exception and wrote commentaries on each of
them. His earliest work in this line seems to be (1) the
Maṇimayukha radiating on the work of Gaṅgeśa. It has been
mentioned by him in most of his works, e.g. in the Vādivinoda
(p. 59), Kaṇḍarahaśya (p. 103), Līlāvatikanṭhābhāraṇa
(p. 73), Upaskāra (pp. 154, 161, 189, 341, 351 & 405)
and the Ātmatattva viveka kalpalata (B. I. ed., p. 534). He
seems to have regarded it himself as one of his best contri-
butions. But the fact remains that in the heyday of Navya-
nyāya studies over the work of Gaṅgeśa under Yajñapati and
his disciple Jayadeva, the Mayukha of Śaṅkara practically lost all
its lustre. As far as we are aware none of the eminent
Nyāya authorities of Mithilā and Bengal, from Yajñapati
downwards, ever took any notice of the Maṇīṭīkā of Śaṅkara,
whose name is quite unknown in the main group of Nyāya
led by Gaṅgeśa. Why it is so is really a great mystery.
Uptill now only one single copy of the last part of Śaṅkara’s
Mayukha has been discovered, proving that its circulation was
very much limited. This unique copy is now preserved in
Jammu, Kasmira beyond the reach of scholars. It is complete in
There are certain revealing features even in the small extracts. In the post-colophon statement the titles (M. M. and Sanmiśra) are attached to Bhavanātha alone, who was evidently still alive, and none to Saṅkara, confirming our suggestion that this was his first work. In the opening verse Saṅkara betrays his predilection for a book named Mahārṇava; it was Mīmāṃsāmahārṇava by Vateśvara belonging to the school of Prabhākara. This Prabhākara influence upon him might be one of the reasons for his unpopularity in the Gaṅgeśa group, though, pathetically, he claimed the Mani as his own. In the first verse at the end Saṅkara absolves himself curiously from both merits and demerits of his work, which attach only to his father and not to him; his task was only to write down what his father said! This sentiment is expressed by Saṅkara in most of his subsequent works (vide Lilāvatīkāntāhārana, the lacuna in the last verse should be filled up accordingly and Ātmatattvāvivekakalpalatā at the end).
(2) *Trisūtrinisbandhavyākhyā*: a commentary directly on the first portion of Udayana's *Parśuddhi* which was popularly known as *Nibandha*. A single copy of this extremely rare book of Śaṅkara was discovered by H. P. Śāstrī at Dinajpur (*Notices*, III, No. 136). It was complete in 123 folios written in the Bengali script. Śaṅkara admits at the commencement that he endeavours only to construe the text, which was adorned already with three illuminating commentaries viz. *Prakāśa* (of Vardhamāna), *Darpana* (of Vaṭeśvara) and *Uddyota* (of Divākara). The book is practically lost. Śaṅkara has not referred to it in any of his works.

(3) *Kiraṇāvaliniruktiprakapā*: this also seems from the name itself to be an analysis of the great treatise of Udayana. It is referred to only once in the *Kāṇḍāraḥasya* (p. 177). It also remains yet to be discovered.

(4) *Bhedaprakapā*: published fortunately in the Sarasvatī-Bhavana Texts (under the name of *Bhedaratna* 1933, pp. 73 from a Ms. dated 1579 V. S.). It is a bold refutation of Vedāntic Monism from the standpoint of the stout dualism of the Nyāya. In striking contrast with Vācaspatī's *Khaṇḍanodahāra*, which lost itself so to speak on dialectic skill without grappling with the fundamental doctrines, Śaṅkara struck at the very root of the controversy with an array of both Vedic texts and arguments. It was for this reason selected as the target in preference to Vācaspatī's work by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, who as the leader of the Śaṅkarite saints of Varanasi, wrote a full refutation in the *Advaitaratnarakṣaṇam* in a violent and most unsaintly language. There is an imaginary conversation towards the end of the latter book where Śaṅkara is addressed as an aged bull (दुष्कोष्ठ): And Śaṅkara's mild protest also is recorded: The *Bhedaprakapā* was one of Śaṅkara's earliest works. It is mentioned already in the *Vādivinoda* (p. 44). Hall (*Index*, p. 85) examined a copy at Varanasi and the very same
copy is now preserved at Jammu (Stein’s *Jammu Cat.*, 1894, pp. 327-28). The date of transcript is 1519 V. S. Caitra-Pūrṇimā, Tuesday (corresponding correctly to March 16, 1462 A.D.) and it was copied at Kāśi, in the lifetime of Śaṅkara.

(5) *Khaṇḍanaṭikī*: This was completely published from Varanasi as early as 1888 A.D. (edited by Bhāgavatācārya, pp. 732) and made Śaṅkara’s name well-known throughout the learned world. It was written after the *Bhadraprakāśa* which is twice cited (pp. 61 & 124: विजयप्रकीर्तिः आयुसिद्धी श्रेष्ठाचारी and before the *Vādvinoda* probably. Like most of his works Śaṅkara wrote this after taking ‘illuminating’ lessons from his father, who again was indebted to his elder brother Jīvanātha (not Jayanātha). The concluding verse as printed should be emended slightly thus:

स्वभिमानिनानाचयः न्यायांकुर्माक्यात्वानु ययः ।
सतिष्ठा भवनाथो यं तामिलालिन्युपञ्चवलाम्॥ (p. 732)

There is an interesting colophon at the end of the section on Anupalabdhi (p. 415):—

न्यायानन्दसस्माकं यथा पितृभक्षतया ।
न्यायानुशासनोपायं संबन्धं सतिष्ठति एवम्॥

The next section begins with another interesting verse:

या सुकिर्मिभनाथवर्णकन्यकलुट्टवरी तद्यतः ।
सौभाग्यं त्रित्यं श्रद्धांतर्विविषयं: श्लाघापदं लंभिता ।
न्यस्ता राजन्मानसि विजयतामापुष्पवन्तोद्वयं
प्रम्यमन्वितिनिर्मोचनाय रचना बाचामिवं शाश्वे॥

It is a magnificent expression of his own talents coupled with a sense of rare filial obligation. Śaṅkara evidently regarded this commentary as one of his masterpieces and the learned world seems to have endorsed it by accepting it as Śaṅkara’s best work. In the very life time of Śaṅkara a superior scholar Pragalbhaṭcārya, who it should be noted, was not a Maithila, regar-
ded it as an authoritative work, upon which his own commentary on the Khanda was based. For, Pragalbha clearly states at the beginning of his commentary, Khanda nadarpana श्रीमच्छषुद्र-वायूमायरयौधितपायन् विलोक्यापि च (verse 4: Khanda with 5 commentaries. Chowkh. ed., p. 4) Śaṅkara appears in a dual role in this undertaking. In the first place he attempted to explain the views of Śrīharṣa faithfully from the standpoint of the Vedānta, but in many places (vide pp. 93-124) he attempted equally to meet the arguments of Śrīharṣa from the standpoint of dualism. Everywhere, however, he marvellously concluded with a compromise on behalf of Śrīharṣa and the phrases he used are quite amusing. Such are:—

तथापि “महापात्तो यत्दृष्टकाशिसिद्धांयं विनायमनाः” इत्यादिवेच तात्त्वयन्मू (p. 95).
तथापि “स्वपकारासिद्धमेव श्राद्वात्त्वम्” इति भावः। (p. 98).
तथापि “सत्संस्कारस्तप्रस्तसामादिवेच भूत्वा” इत्यत्र तात्त्वयन्मू। (p. 103).
तथापि “स्वपकारोंवेतात्त्वयन्मू”। (p. 109).

Śaṅkara’s comments must have raised protests from staunch followers of the Vedānta. One of them was Raghunātha (Vidyālaṅkāra) author of the Bhūṣāṇi, the longest commentary on the Khanda. We have cited elsewhere Sārvabhauma’s retort as recorded by Raghunātha, who was his grand-pupil. The passage of Śaṅkara exactly occurs in the Khandaṇaṭikā (p. 95). In one place Śaṅkara answers Śrīharṣa in a masterly way by twisting a verse of the latter:—

प्रतिकृज्ञानां वायूमायरयौधितपायनं विलोक्यापि च (p. 98).

Raghunātha’s criticism here, quoted in the footnote, ends with a most interesting remark, throwing a side-light on Śaṅkara’s popularity among his contemporaries as a poet rather than a scholar.

इत्यज्ज्वल्यान्त्रयं काल्याणकाठिरश्रास्ति। सत्संस्कारांप्रवर्तनोर्विवेच्छन्न यज्ञवल्लभम्य।
There is a very old copy of Śaṅkara’s Khaṇḍānatīkā, preserved in the Sarasvatī-Bhavana, Varanasi (Ms. No. 134 of the Dhuṇḍhirāja collection). The post-colophon runs:

शुभसमस्ति पुरस्तकाय कत्तुलैककाय च।

गौर्द राज्यम्यसम्म शृविद्यति यत्रास्ति पूरोच्छः

श्रुत्वारमृतचिकारपुर्वसस्य × × × सतीतये।

भूपो चतुः सुरेश्वरस्य सङ्क्रो विप्रा शुरुपदिनी-

सत्त्रोपप इमामसः समलिकता श्रीवासुदेवः कृती॥

संवत् १५२६ समये शाब्ः चार्ण वदि द्वादशी शुक्लदिने।

श्रीमत् काय्या विषेधर-राजधान्या। The date works out to be August 1473 (not 1472) a. d., when Śaṅkara Miśra was alive, as the scribe clearly indicates.

(6) Kaṇḍādarahasya: A very useful Vaiśeṣika manual of moderate length fortunately published at Varanasi (Chowkh., 1917, pp. 177). Śaṅkara gives here a complete survey of all Vaiśeṣika doctrines after the manner of Prasastapāda and though he has not indicated his sources, it is clear that he wrote after consulting all up-to-date works on the subject. The flogging at the ‘Gaudas’ (p. 48) for their incorrect pronunciation of the three sibilants is exactly borrowed, for instance from the Līlāvatī (p. 445). As we have stated before (p. 10), Śaṅkara wrongly ascribed three views of the Vyomāvatī to the Kandali (pp. 81, 82 & 87), each of them refuted by Udayana. Śaṅkara has punctuated the manual with many Kārikās drawn from various sources (pp. 7, 23, 25, 26, 47, 88, 93, 98, 100, 109, 123, 152 & 163). He betrays the influence of his age by waxing eloquent whenever a Gaṅgeśa brand topic crops up (e.g. Vyāptivāda and Upādhihāda on pp. 93-100). Like an orthodox Vaiśeṣika Śaṅkara divided the book into six sections without adding one on Negation.

(7) Vādivinoda: a remarkable manual exclusively dealing with rules of debate and specially how to defeat a
proud opponent. It was edited by M. M. Dr. Gaṅgānātha Jha (Allahabad, 1915, pp. 4-73). It is divided into 5 Ullāsas under the scheme set forth in verse:

कथातः प्रश्नतः प्रक्षेपालाववते: ||
प्रश्नात्तत्त्वतः कापिय पराद्वारसावलम् ||

The bulk of the book is taken up by the first chapter (pp. 1-44) on the rules of debate and the third (pp. 47-71) on the exact connotation of a problem containing a brilliant survey of all philosophical topics. Unlike the other works of Śaṅkara this book refers to many early authors and works, some of which are important. An alphabetical list is appended here.

Anumānāmayukha (p. 59), Ācārya (17), Candra (53), Cintāmaṇi (17), Jīvanātha Miśra (61), Nyāyalocana (57), Bhedaprakāśa (44), MaṇiKaṇṭha Miśra (17, 35-36), Ratnakoṣa (2, 17), Mahānava (53), Murāri Miśra (53), Līlāvatī (41), Vallabhācārya (41), Śaṅkara (41), and Sānātani (2). The Vādīvinoda is mentioned in the Kaṇḍādaraḥasya (103 & 177) and the Upaskāra (p. 397).

(8) Vaiśeṣikasūtrapakṣāra: The original Vaiśeṣikasūtras of Kaṇāda, like the Sāṅkhyaśūtras of Kapila, were neglected by scholars ever since Prāśastapāda composed the excellent manual named Padārthapraṇevaṣa which ousted all previous works of the school and came to be regarded as the Bhāṣya, which it was strictly not. The paucity of literature upon the Sūtras as against that upon the so-called Bhāṣya-of Prāśastapāda is well-known and by a stroke of genius Śaṅkara Miśra immortalised himself by writing this running commentary upon the Sūtras. Śaṅkara was quite conscious of the adventurous nature of his task, which he likened to sporting in the sky, but his ambition was more than fulfilled when we find that the Upaskāra became the standard work on the subject throughout India, Śaṅkara had written thus at the commencement of the book:—
The only previous work Saṅkara had before him was a certain Vṛtti, which he had frequently cited (B.I. ed., 1861, pp. 6, 51, 55, 58, 161, 200, 260, 264, 283, 411, 414 & 419). It was an early work, as indicated by Saṅkara and is now completely lost. But Saṅkara admits in the second verse of the introduction that he was indebted to two persons for his knowledge on the Tantra viz. the ancient sage Kaṇāda and the recent scholar Bhavanātha, his own father. Probably he had only fragments of the Vṛtti before him. Naturally Saṅkara had adorned his commentary with brilliant summaries of Navyanyāya topics, whenever he found an opportunity. For instance, the Maṅgalvāda (pp. 3-6), the Muktivāda (pp. 10-18), the Vyāptivāda (pp. 149-55), Pākānumāna (pp. 285-92), Dvitvaprakaraṇa (pp. 318-24) and references to his own Maṇīṭikā betray his predilection. Nevertheless the Upaskāra is the only work now available on the Sūtras of Kaṇāda, which were shaped into a regular text-book, though how far they represent the original work of Kaṇāda remains a matter of investigation and speculation.

(9) Lilāvaṭīkaṇṭhābharaṇa: A complete commentary on the work of Śrīvallabha. It explains the original text and is not a sub-commentary of Vardhamāna’s Prakāśa. It was written after the Vādivūnoda and the Kaṇādarahasya (both mentioned on p. 777). The references to Bhāsarvajñācārya (wrongly printed in the Chowkh. ed., p. 771) and the Kandalīkāra (p. 842: vide Kandalī p. 119) should be noted. As this work is now fortunately published along with Vardhamāna’s Prakāśa (Chowkh., ed., 1934, pp. 834) we invite the attention of scholars to a remarkable feature in it. Saṅkara has nowhere mentioned the name of Vardhamāna in this commentary. On the other hand in many places Vardhamāna’s
views have been cited anonymously (e.g. इत्यके p. 13) and mostly criticised (वनप्रेम p. 2, ब्रह्मक p. 10 & 76. Also pp. 47-48, where Vardhamāna had refuted the words of a previous commentator). Śaṅkara apparently did not belong to the group of Vardhamāna, who was looked upon somewhat in a spirit of rivalry. This feeling towards Vardhamāna was undoubtedly acquired by Śaṅkara from his father and senior uncle. For, he has stated at the end of his commentary that all his explanations had been derived from his father, who again learnt them from his elder brother:

स्वातुर्जीविनायकस्य न्यायायमाद्वानवानम् यत् ।
ममिति मन्नवयो वा तामिद्विहालिकसुतमामस् ॥

(p. 864: also Ātmattattvavivekakalpalata, B. I. ed., p. 948)

Vācaspati Miśra II: One of the greatest academic figures of Mithilā and regarded as the foremost authority in Maithila Smṛti. He wrote in his old age the Śrāddhakalpa (i.e. Pitṛbhaktitaraṅgini) when he was the crest jewel of all the assemblies of (Maithila) scholars (according to the epithet सकलपितामहः दयालीसिद्धोपिज्ञान found in the colophon of the book: L. 2001). In the following verse at the end of the book he recorded the total number of his previous works:

शास्त्रे दसा स्मृती विशालिकवन्या चेन धावने ।
लिखितासतेन चरसे वर्णवेष विनिमितम् ॥

‘Śāstra’ as distinguished from ‘smṛti’ means here the Nyāya philosophy. For, Vācaspati himself states at the end of his Krtyapradīpa (Des. Cat. of Mithilā Mss., Vol. I p. 67):

वंशो जात: कलेपरहिते कर्मीनसमासकानाम्
भान्विज्ञाया गुस्तकोणया लघुवचवाचयोधः ।
श्रीमान् वाचस्पतिरहिपि श्रीतवे पुष्पवाजाः
नद्वा नद्वा कमलनन्यं कुत्यदीपं तनोमि ॥
The smṛti works of Vācaspati have engaged the labours of many distinguished scholars, notably M. Chakravarti (J.A.S.B. 1915, pp. 394-400) and Kane (Hist. of Dharmasastra, I, pp. 399-400). We shall only attempt to give a brief account of the Nyāya works of Vācaspati in this book and assign his proper place in the history of Navyanyāya in Mithilā.

Vācaspati wrote what appears to be one of the best commentaries on the Nyāyasūtras of Gotama—(1) the Nyāya-(or Naya-) Tattvāloka, better known as Tattvāloka. No complete copy of the book has yet been discovered. The largest fragment is preserved in London (I.O., I, pp. 610-11) which was examined by us thoroughly. The third introductory verse, cited by us before (p. 2), where the six earlier commentaries are respectfully mentioned, proves along with the author’s sense of diffidence exhibited in vv. 4-5 that it was one of the earliest works of Vācaspati, if not his very first work.

An alphabetical list of the authorities cited in the book is given below.

1. Eggeling’s descriptive note requires correction. The last folio with a blank reverse which is marked ‘182’ in a decidedly later hand is really ‘164’ which is missing in its proper place; this real page mark is still visible behind the present correction. Fol. 165-181 contain the commentary on the whole of the first ‘āhnikā’ of Chap. III (with its colophon in 176a) and of the whole of the first three ‘prakaraṇas’ of the second ‘āhnikā’. This portion has a new pagination (fol. 1-17) along with the old one. The Ms. is in the Bengali script from three different hands (1-20, 21-26, 127-81). Fol. 113 is missing; in its place there is a f. o. l., marked 33, from the same hand but belonging to quite a different book. Of the five colophons two (81a, 176a) name the book ‘Nyāyatattvāloka’, two (134b, 164a) ‘Nyāya’ and one (92a) simply ‘Tattvāloka’.
Ačārya (i.e., Udayana) 36a, 51b, 92b, 99b, 128b and 129b.

Uddvota 53a.
Kandalīkāra 33a (on tamas).
Kirti (i.e., Dharmakirti) 42a & 109b.

Khaṇḍanoddhāra-kārādāyaḥ 84b: the reference is to the earlier work of Vardhamāna cited by Vācaspati in his own Khaṇḍanoddhāra, p. 77.

Candra 108b.
Cārvāka 41a & 166a.
Cintāmaṇikṛtaḥ 3b, 9a, 21b, 28b, 34a, 72a, 73a, 75b, 89a, 137a & 158.
Jayanta 48b.
Jaimini 41a & 41b.
Tīkākṛtaḥ 65b, 103a & 117a (i.e., the earlier Vācaspati Miśra).

Taraṇi Miśra 88a, 112a & 130a.
Tāṇḍibrāhmaṇa 121a.
Dignāga 14a, 36b, 40b, 47ab, 70b, 723b & 74b. All the passages are taken from the Tātparyaṭīkā of earlier Vācaspati.
Nyāyalocanakṛtaḥ 153a.
Prajñākara 42a.
Prabhākaropādhyāya 70b: a later Nyāya scholar.
Prameyaprakāśa (Tītiyaprakāśa) 53a (of Vardhamāna).
Bhartṛhari 77b.
Bhāgavṛtti 77b.
Bhāṣya 11b, 14b & 94b.
Bhāskara 12a, 21b, 53a & 67a.
Mādhyamaka 95a.
Murārimiśra 62b.
Vaṭṣeṣvara 127b.
Vasubandhu 40b, 70b, 73b & 76a (all taken from the Tātparyaṭīkā).
Vācaspati Miśra (I) 62a.
Vāmanavr̥tti 77b.
Vārstyagāṇya 41a (also taken from the Tātparyaṭīkā).
Vaibhāṣikā 10b & 22b.
Śabara 50b.
Śivāditya Miśra 75a.
Sānātanī 82a.
Sandalopādhyāya 63a.
Sautrāntikā 10ab & 22b.

We have omitted in the above list the numerous references to unspecified sources like Prāṇcaḥ, Navyāḥ, Saugataḥ, Saṅkhyaḥ, etc. The largest number of references belongs to Gaṅgeśa. In fact the Tattvāloka is one of the earliest attempts to explain the Nyāyasūtras under the new light of Gaṅgeśa's epoch-making work. Whole chapters of the Cintāmaṇi have been summarised by Vācaspati under different sūtras, e.g., Maṅgalavāda in the beginning, Muktivāda under I. i. 22, Vidhivāda under II. i. 63 etc. With the ever increasing popularity of the Cintāmaṇi the study of the original Nyāyasūtras declined. It is a remarkable and interesting fact that the Tattvāloka is more than double the size of the Nyāyaratnasūtras the next commentary on the Nyāyasūtras which was written by Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma of Navadvīpa more than a century after Vācaspati—the corresponding portion of the present fragment of the Tattvāloka ends on folio 88a of the Bārānasi Ms. of the Nyāyaratnasūtras of about the same size. About a century later again, Viśvanātha Pañcānana wrote the Vṛtti, which is much smaller in size than the Nyāyaratnasūtras and
in the 18th century, the Vṛtti of Viśvanātha again was summarised by an unknown scholar! It should be noted that Vācaspati has not referred to any of his own works in the Tattvāloka.

The text of the Nyāyasūtras as determined by himself was shown by Vācaspati in a seperate booklet named (2) Nyāyasūtroddhāra. It was written when he was adorning the court of a certain king of Mithilā. The total number of Sūtras according to him is 531 as against 528 arrived at by the earlier Vācaspati in the Nyāyasūcīnibandha. It appears that the late Mahāmahopādhyāya V. P. Dvivedi had access to a Ms. of this work copied in Caitra 1428. The socalled Gautamsūtram printed along with the Nyāyabhāṣya in pp. 28 with the introductory verse,

श्रीचामक्षपतिमिश्रषेश मिथिलेश्वरसुरिण्या
लिथ्ये मुनिमूर्त्य श्रीगौतमसंत महः॥

is not an edition of the Nyāyasūtroddhāra, as is sometimes supposed, but only a text of the Nyāyasūtras prepared by the editor of the Bhāṣya after cosulting various books including a copy of the Sūtroddhāra.

The next work of Vācaspati—(3) the Nyāyaratnaprakāśa—seems to have escaped the notice of all scholars. It is a commentary on the Nyāyaratna of Manikantha Miśra, a pre-Gaṅgāsa Navyanāya scholar of Mithilā.

There is a complete copy of Vācaspati's commentary at Poona which we have thoroughly examined. The beginning and the end of this unique book are exactly reproduced below:—( B. O. R. I. Ms. No. 775 of 1884-87, foll. 71 )

Begins—क्लकक(ललक्लस्मधिरा)कुकारप्रधितनवन्दुग्मसेवकज्याबुज्ज्जीः।
नवगगतमलयामलामन्दुग्जः चुपयथ सम कम कौसक्रू(मित्रः)॥१॥
(जीवातु)क्लककर्वव्यथम् रमणीयवध्वीचामुः
कारस्यकनिषेत्वम् त्रिजगतामुलितिविबं महः॥
History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithila

चतुर्कृष्णभक्तिभूतमनन्दलुक्तकालांच्छेदा
निष्प्रतियुपादित्यत्येष्विविषयविवेचनानि: पांडवाध्योश्रामस्त: ॥ २ ॥
भाषोत्तरलक्षणाधिकीयो लोचनार्थपरमेश्वर निलोधःः
हृद्यरायनामार्धपराभवम् हृद्येऽरेऽ महाभाषा: पुनःन्तु न: ॥३॥
यथा प्रांचः समजनित चोरिपाला: सहखः
राक्षसन्त्रासोऽस्मिन्न विश्वविषयात्मायः
सोडवं शोभीराधिविलिकः कोठिपि 'चौहारिणे'वर्षोः
संसो राजाज्ञि नववतामभवं 'चौराण्यानु' ॥४॥

dक्ष्यान्तोऽधः नृपाणां नयनवतामभवायः: शौर्यभाजः
सीमा 'पंचाल'भूमीवलयपरिषुः: फिक्रो नन्दसूरोः
वध्वर्तितालाभिनिविनिविक्षेपत्यनागानीः
राजः 'श्रीमलतापा' व ध हस्ति व ध हस्ति संसारवंतः ॥५॥
तत्सार्थिति विश्वभूगत्रीयपरिपार्थिकम् हीलावती कनकज्ञमकल्पवहः
'पद्धारतो'ति सुन्यसिद्धातिमिच्छा श्रुण्यवाचविधवभवा महिषी नृपस्य ॥६॥
त्या नियोगपाठिगम्य महिष्यमोन्या 'बाचस्यति'पुरुषधर्मानुजगार्नार्शिनिः
त्या नियान्ताकार्तिरकरिकरठतरं श्री'न्यायलनम'मलं विशारदीकरोति ॥७॥

dहृद्य प्रविष्ठार्थे श्रीमता महाणकाताचिर्येण जगदुपालनमहिमान्यमुन्यायणविषये
गताँ सन्त्रासोऽस्मिन्न विश्वविषयायकविषये श्रुतिः कर्मचियं प्रारंभिले शिवधारारुपमितश्रुतिः
शोधितकर्मचियतां महेंस्मार्थिमस्यो नोपनिबद्धम् । न हि उपनिषदःपिण्डभोगात्योऽस्मि
( fol. 1a )

Ends:—विभूषयति विरवेषः विदुष्यं हृदयस्थलीम।
'न्यायलकृताः'दयं श्रोवाचसपतिना दृष्टः ॥
तर्कपर्यार्थाय: स्वल्पिनि प्रायशो विषयः ॥
तत् समाध्यति प्राप्ता एष धर्मः सनातन: ॥

इति श्रीसमस्यादितियाविन्दावकाशस्माधाराजाधिराजस्माधाराजाधिराजश्रीमराजप्रकाशः समाधः ॥ संवत् १६६
'महर्षिस्तुर्रावर्तसाने वृद्धिग्राहने श्रीरामी कार्तिके मासिः श्रीस्लायवः छोड़ियाहुः
The date of the copy works out regularly to be 1616 V. S. when Kārtika Badi 3 actually fell on a Friday, corresponding to Nov. 17, 1559 A.D. The commentary was written by Vācaspati at the request of Padmāvati, queen of Mahārāja-dhirāja Pratāparudra (son of Vīryabhānu), a 'Chauhāni' prince of Paṅcālabhūmi. We are unable to trace the name of the king who must have flourished somewhere in the United Provinces in the second quarter (1425-50 A.D.) of the 15th century. A doubt will naturally arise whether this Vācaspati is identical with the famous scholar of Mithilā. The following facts however substantially prove the identity. The last verse at the end of the commentary embodying the author's diffidence and humble approach towards scholars is exactly reproduced in the beginning of the Khaṇḍanoddāra.¹ The views expressed in the present commentary regarding 'maṅgalā-caraṇa' exactly tally with those found in the Tattvālokā². Moreover, a Navyanyāya work of Mithilā is not likely to engage the labours of a non-Maithili or non-Bengali scholar in the 15th century.

The question now is what led Vācaspati to leave his native land and seek patronage of a foreign prince. We conjecture that there was trouble at Mithilā when Narasiṁha of the junior-most branch of the Raj family became chief after the death of Śivasimha and Padmasimha of the senior branch sometime between 1425 and 1435 A.D. He came back probably when Bhairavasiṁha became the undisputed king of Mithilā.

¹ Introd. verse 4, (with the reading गिरे for धिये:)
² The first leaf, which is torn, leaves lacuna in the first two verses which are filled up from readings in a small fragment (foll. 20 only) of this very commentary preserved in the Oriental Institute, Baroda (Ms. No. 10287): this fragment goes up to the fol. 11b of the Poona Ms.
The Nyāyaratnaprakāśa, unlike other works of the great author, is not discursive but concise. It practically contains no references to works and authors other than those found in the Nyāyaratna itself. Manikantha quotes from the Ratnakosa; one of the passages is:—सरसविनिविद्धमहाविषयायुक्तमितिजनकत्वं सत्वित्वप्रत्यथाविदिति रत्नकोशः.1 Vācaspati comments तरणिप्रभमत्तमाह-सन्त्रा धैति and then (fol. 37b), exactly reproduces the argument of Gaṅgeśa in refutation of this view. This finally settles Taranimisra's authorship of the Ratnakosa.

Vācaspati next wrote three independent treatises viz.,
(4) Pratyakṣanirṇaya, not yet discovered but cited in the Khaṇḍanoddhāra (p. 139).

(5) Anumānanirṇaya, also cited in the Khaṇḍanoddhāra (pp. 72, 83-4 & 90); a Maithila fragment of this work is reported from Nepal, wrongly described as a commentary on the Anumānakhaṇḍa. The introductory verse cited below proves that like the Tattvacintāmaṇi it analyses the Nyāya and Mīmāṁsā views on inference. (Sastri: Nepal Cat., I. p. 94).

श्यालोकवादविकसितयम्यादयद्य गोतममात सह जैमिनीयम्।
सारं विविधः महोर्ज्ञोरशेषं वाचस्पतिविनिशाद्यन्त्यमानामाग्नम्।

(6) Šabdaniṁrṇaya, cited in his own Dvaitanirṇaya, (Darbhanga ed., p. 8).

(7) The Khaṇḍanoddhāra is a bold refutation of Śrīharṣa's Khaṇḍana from the standpoint of the Nyāya. It is a learned work and best displays the author's dialectical skill and vastness of learning. The numerous references found in the book are collected here alphabetically.

1. Fol. 34b of the R. A. S. B. Ms. of the Nyāyaratna: this passage is also cited by Gaṅgeśa in a very much expanded form as from the Ratnakosakāra, Tattvacintāmaṇi, B. I. Ed., Anumāna, pp. 885-88.
Vācaspati Miśra published in the Pandit, 1903-07, pp. 171

References are to the Khanḍanoddhara published in the

Vācaspati's contemporary Śaṅkara Miśra of Mithilā also wrote a Bhedaratna about the same time. Both of them were regarded as the greatest opponents of the Vedānta at that time and drew forth a sharp and interesting retort from their younger contemporary Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma of Bengal, who had a distinct leaning towards the Vedānta, though he was also a distinguished commentator of the Tattvacintāmaṇī. We quote this important passage of the Khanḍanabhūṣāṇa of Raghu

किं च, सर्वभिः परेती मिथ् भवतित्व बुद्धि: प्राप्ताये सति क वात्यावचक-भावकल्पना; न हि प्रथेवत्वदिविनाथि न सर्वभिः मन्याते हि श्रवणभिः श्रवणस्वतत्रस्मरणे: सार्वभीम-ञ्जनारायणः

वात्स्यायनस्वालकणो-भौतिक(क)तथा(दिति)शास्त्रवाचविक्षोऽः।

निर्वाच्यायाम् गर्भेनक्र भ्रान्तमादायः ॥

1. vide fol. 68b of Ms. No. 95 of Sans. Coll., Calcutta and fol. 50b of Ms. at Sarasvati-Bhavana, Varanasi. Compare Bhedaratna (S. B. Text, p. 53) and Khanḍanoddhara (pp. 45-47).
The implication of the passage should not be ignored; Raghunātha the author of the *Khaṇḍanabhūṣāmaṇī*, who calls Sārvabhauma his ‘Paramaguru’ becomes quite different from the famous Raghunātha Śiromaṇi, who was according to reliable evidence his direct pupil (*vide* *Vaṅge Navyanyāya- carcā*, pp. 36-37). The language of the above couplet of Sārvabhauma seems to show that Vācaspati slightly preceded Śaṅkara Miśra; for, by ordinary rules of grammar, the compound should have been शाक्तराजस्याम् as in the *Dāṇḍaviveka* of Vardhamāna II (introd., v. 6).

(8) Vācaspati also commented on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, perhaps last of all; for, he has not referred to this commentary in any of his previous works as far as available. There is a unique Ms. of the Pratyakṣa chapter of the *Cintā- maṇiprakāśa* preserved in the Sarasvatī Bhavana1. The colophon runs—

इति महामहोपाध्याय-सर्वनिष्ठ-श्रीवाचस्पतिकाँ चिन्तामणिप्रकाशे प्रत्यय- परिख्येत् । शालेज्ञ श्रुविनाथेनं...

As we shall presently see it is probably the earliest extant commentary on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*.

(9) That Vācaspati also commented on the Anumāna chapter of Gaṅgeśa will be apparent from the following evidence. Kanāda Tarkavāgīśa, who was by tradition a fellow-student of Śiromaṇi, commented on the *Cintāmaṇi*. We have come across the following passage in the (Vyāpti-) Pūrvapakṣa-prakaraṇa of Kanāda’s *Anumānamānavyākhyā* :

वाचस्पतिनिरूपनम् शास्त्रकौर्यस्वतान्तर्योगवाचस्मृतिकालमेधयोः सिद्धगुहालोकन- न्यायेऽनुसूचिः प्रत्ययस्वतात्—सहिन्तासदाविती। उक्तव्याहारवात् = शास्त्रकौर्यस्वतान्तर- योगस्वतात्। युक्तो वेदेऽन्वाचस्मृत्यान्तर तत्त्वकाल्योगार्थस्वतिः प्राप्तं। वाचलोकनरूपः……(fol. 15b of a Ms. in our possession)

This peculiar interpretation of Vācaspati has also been cited under his name by Jagadīśa Tarkalāṅkāra in the Mani-mayūkha² apparently borrowing from Kaṇāda. Pragalbhācārya also respectfully quotes the interpretation under the flattering epithet "Sampradāyavidāh". Moreover, in the Anumiti-prakaraṇa of Anumānāloka of Jayadeva (Pakṣadharā) the passage न च संसात्त्विस्तरे विशिष्ठधीरे न तादशिति वाच्यम् (fol. 4b) refers, according to Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīśa, to an interpretation of Vācaspati वाच्यपतिमतमार्गाय निषेधति—न नेत्रि⁴. It should be noticed that both the passages of Vācaspati cited above have reference to particular text of the Cintāmaṇi and are not likely to belong to his independent treatise Anumānāparṇaya.

What was the tenth or the last work of Vācaspati on the Nyāya remains a matter of speculation. It may be the Sabdakhaṇḍa of this Cintāmaṇiprakāśa or a commentary on the Nyāyalīlāvatī, if the following passage, which we traced in a fragment of an unidentified commentary on the Līlāvatī-Sīromāṇi preserved in a private collection at Navadvīpa warrants such a conjecture:— न च व्यापी चरमदर्शनपद्म मणिध्वंसतजनयवाचस्य मण्डः पादानीयत्वाभावात् व्यभिचारचारकः सत्यः तु किमस्मिति वाच्य स्वास्त- शरीरस्य आत्मानम् संयोगसर्वात्मानः एव एव अन्येऽथ‍ व्यभिचारचारकः इति वाच्यपतिमित्रय: | तत्र, (fol. 103b). Vācaspati also wrote a Sahasrādhikāraṇa on the Pūrvamāmsā rules of interpretation. 'Two references to this work were traced by us in the Nāvyadharma-pradīpa of Kṛpārāma Tarkavāgīśa written in 1686 Saka (1764-5 A. D.)⁶ याधूस्वरूपी तात्त्विक प्रतिमेति सायन:’'हुन्बवशृष्टिकः साधवाचार्यः इति सहस्ताधिकरणां वाच्यपतिमित्र: | This long-lost work on the Mīmāṃsā may also have been included in his philological works.

1. Fol. 12a of a fragment of 'Mūla Jāti' in our possession.
2. संयस्यधिश्रयः सिद्धक्षेत्रन्नत्वे पूर्वस्यराहोययारिषावयायः | Fol. 10a of (Anumānā-) Pragalbhī, Ms. No. 298 of the Sarasvatī Bhavana, Benaras.
3. Fol. 16a of Bhavānanda’s Ālokamaṇīsāra, Ms. No. 361 of the Sarasvatī Bhavana.
4. Fol. 16b of Ms. No. 1602 of the Vangīya Sāhiya Parīṣad, Calcutta; the book is mentioned also in fol. 43b.
Vācaspati and his contemporaries: As the author of the above ten works Vācaspati chronologically stands at the top of a galaxy of Navyanyāya scholars of Mithilā and Bengal. As we have stated above Vācaspati preceded both Jayadeva and Pragalbhācārya. A more convincing proof of Vācaspati's relation with the other great scholars of the period has been traced by us. In the Prāmāṇyavāda (of the Pratyakṣakhanda) Vācaspati comments on the second 'Vipratipatti' thus:—

Both the solutions suggested here for meeting the two objections, the word 'Samānādhihikaraṇa' as an addendum being Vācaspati's own peculiar solution in preference to the word 'Janya' suggested by a previous commentator, have been referred to and rejected by Jayadeva viz.—"न च समानादिकरणपदज्ञ-पदायुपादानमेव तत्र ग्रहितात्तत्त्विच युक्त वर्तते अव्यधिबिरोधेण्वत्तान्". Bhāvananda Siddhāntavāgīśa in his Pratyakṣālokārāmaṇjari stated in his comment on the present passage. उपाध्याय-वाचस्पतितिम्बिरोधेऽरतं निराचरण्डे-न चेति। द्वितीयतत्त्वसाधारण्यं: समानादिकरणां जन्यत्वं वा विशेष्यां-भिन्नत्वेऽन्त। In this comment Bhāvananda mentions the name of Upādhyāya (i.e. Yajñapati) before Vācaspati. This is not chronologically correct. Bhāvananda was a pupil of Kṛṣṇadāsa Sārvabhauma, from whom evidently he got the information. Kṛṣṇadāsa's Pratyakṣālokāprasāraṇi has been recently discovered by us. He correctly notes here:—वाचस्पतितिम्बिरोधाया,योंहेतु-मार्गद्वारा निपेघति-न चेति (fol. 34a of Ms. in our possession). It was known to Kṛṣṇadāsa that both chronologically and exegeti-

1. Fol. 10b of Pratyakṣacintāmaniprakāśa of Vācaspati.
2. Fol. 14a of a Ms. of the Pratyakṣāloka in our possession.
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cally Vācaspati preceded Upādhyāya. Pragalbhaścārya has also referred to the above solution of Vācaspati, but the ground of his rejection of it is different:—चप्पा इस्थलमालन सिद्धसाधनवार्षाय तदादायासांमवार्षाय च तक्षानविषयकसमानानाधिकरणश्चानाजन्यसमानाधिकरणे साध्यम्। तत्तत्त्वस्य वस्तुताविदिषा वामान्यगच्छति तत्त्वान्यमुनि गर्भावंतो न्यायमते सिद्धसाधनात्, न्यायन्ये न्यायिरंकसाधने बाधाः। Rucidatta, the pupil of Jayadeva, reproduces here both the grounds of rejection (fol. 32a, of A. S. Ms. No. III. C. 120):—परमात्मेन्नव्ययिर्विश्वासत्वात्, सामान्यलक्षणादिजन्यवानमालन्यते तथापि पूर्वांकड़ोपान्तः। Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma’s comment on the point is not available, but his pupil Śiromani, curiously enough, sticks to the solution of Vācaspati ignoring the adverse criticisms (Prāmāṇyavāda, 1901, p. 66). For the purposes of chronology all the above important references are, however, thrown to the shade by the momentous discovery that Yajñapati formulated his own solution of the problem after rejecting that of Vācaspati. Yajñapati comments on the point:—अन्ये तीर्थपर्वतान्म सिद्धसाधनवार्षाय तदादायासांमवार्षाय च वार्षाय तक्षानविषयकसमानानाधिकरणश्चानाजन्यसमानाधिकरणे साध्यम्। कर्यमियत्। (Pratyakṣa-prabhā, Paris copy, fol. 22b: Pratyakṣa-prabhā, Paris copy, fol. 23b: Pratyakṣa-prabhā, Paris copy, fol. 24b). Yajñapati’s son Narahari reproduces his father’s argument in the Pratyakṣa-prabhā thus:—(fol. 29b of London copy). न च तक्षानविषयकसमानानाधिकरणश्चानाजन्यसमानाधिकरणे साध्यम्। विधिकोपध्ये इति वाच्यम्। तत्तापि सामान्यलक्षणादिजन्यवानानिन विधिकोपध्ये तत्त्वसाधनस्य चतुर्वेदस्यादिगृहस्य। तक्षानविषयकसमानानाधिकरणश्चानाजन्यत्वसमानानाधिकरणे साध्यम्। तक्षानविषयकसमानानाधिकरणश्चानाजन्यत्वसमानानाधिकरणे साध्यम्। तत्त्वसाधनस्य चतुर्वेदस्यादिगृहस्य। तक्षानविषयकसमानानाधिकरणश्चानाजन्यत्वसमानानाधिकरणे साध्यम्। तत्त्वसाधनस्य चतुर्वेदस्यादिगृहस्य। तक्षानविषयकसमानानाधिकरणश्चानाजन्यत्वसमानानाधिकरणे साध्यम्।

Vācaspati, therefore, composed the commentary on Gāngēśa’s work sometime before the whole band of brilliant scholars, both of Mithilā and Bengal, occupied the field. Jayadeva, who wrote between 1460-75 A. D., was preceded by his teacher Yajñapati (about

1. Fol. 31b of R.A.S.B. Ms. No. 4010.
2. Fol. 29b of Pratyakṣa-Pragalbhi, R.A.S.B. Ms. No. 1175, a very old copy dated 1575 V. S. i. e., 1518 A. D.
1450 A. D. who again came after Vācaspati. On the other hand, Śiromāni’s teacher Sārvabhauma was preceded by Pragalbhācārya, who was slightly senior to Jayadeva. All of them Sārvabhauma, Pragalbha and Jayadeva criticised Yajñapati and sometimes violently. All these point to the conclusion that Vācaspati’s Nyāya works were composed not later than 1440 A. D. and among his Nyāya works, it should be noted the Maṇiprakāśa was probably the latest. Vācaspati lived long enough to witness in his old age the flying colours of Yajñapati and Jayadeva which fully eclipsed the glories of his early life in the field of Navyanyāya. It is thus that the pathetic appeal at the end of his last work the Śrāddhakalpa becomes significant:

पद्याक्षमाननिपुणाः करतलकुवलयापमानविध्वंशाः।
श्रवलोक्यवत छतिनिमां कर्माकारस्रास्याचेन हृदयेन।

Vācaspati probably concentrated on studies in Smṛti since the advent of Yajñapati and Jayadeva in the field of Navyanyāya.

Vācaspati’s family: As stated by himself Vācaspati belonged to a ‘spotless’ family of Karmamīmāṁsakas. In other words, all his ancestors were devotees of the Vedic culture and well-versed in Mīmāṁsā, the logic of the Veda. The Mūlagrāma of his family is named ‘Pāli’ or ‘Pallī’ belonging to the Vatsya gotra, of which a branch is named after Vācaspati’s native village ‘Samauli’. Quite a bewildering mass of materials of Vācaspati’s family connections are scattered in the Pañjis, where he is given the supreme title ‘Paramaguru’, which was never enjoyed by any other scholar in Mithilā with the single exception of Gaṅgēsa. These valuable genealogical data have been critically studied and published by Prof. Jha (Svadeśa, I. iii. pp. 137-44). We need only refer to a few prominent details of chronological significance. He had four wives. His first wife’s father was a grandson of Mahārāja Bhogisvara and his eldest son (by this wife) Lakṣmīnātha married the daughter’s daughter of M. M. Rudradhara Upādhyāya, the famous
Smārta, who was thus an exact contemporary and probably slightly senior in age to Vācaspati. His second wife's father was the daughter's son of Mahārāja Bhaveśvara. His third wife of the respectable 'Satalakhā' family was the first cousin of Śaṅkara Miśra's third wife. His fourth, wife of the respectable 'Sodarapura' family was a cousin of Śaṅkara Miśra, who was thus his exact peer in age, relation and, let us add, learning. His youngest son (by the third wife) Mahopādhyāya Śrīhari Miśra gave his daughter in marriage to Bhavanātha, a son of M. M. Śucikara Upādhyāya of the Kujauli family. Vācaspati had a very large number of descendants; he had at least 28 grandsons, among whom only one M. M. Keśava (son of M.M. Narahari) made his name in the learned world as the author of the Dvaitapariśīṭa.

Vācaspati's patrons: In his early life Vācaspati went abroad and was patronised by Queen Padmāvatī of Pañcāla. His connection with the rulers of Mithilā was, however, long and intimate. He wrote many works on Smṛti in the name of Harinārāyaṇa, the royal title of King Bhairavasiniha, who was a cousin of his third wife. The most famous compilation of Vācaspati ascribed to Harinārāyaṇa is the Smṛtimahārṇava. This king Bhairava had five wives, according to the Pañjīs, and the second wife named Jayāno is abundantly praised by Vācaspati in the introduction to his great discursive work Dvaitanirṇaya (verses 4-10). She was the mother of 'Rājadhirāja' Puruşottamadeva, who was younger to Rāmahadra and did not evidently ascend the throne. She ceremoniously employed Vācaspati, 'the master of all sciences' (v. 7: निक्खिलतत्त्वचिद्) to write that book. It was written when Bhairava was still reigning. This Prince Puruşottama was sonless, though he had four wives.

There is a copy of Mahādānanirṇaya at Nepal (Sastrī: Nepal Cat. Vol. I, pp. 122-3); it is ascribed to Harinārāyaṇa in the beginning and to Rupanārāyaṇa at the end. This has
caused some confusion, and it has been surmised that Bhairava enjoyed both royal titles (S. N. Sinha: Hist. Tirhut, p. 75). But it is extremely unlikely that father and son should have the same 'Viruda'. The copy is not available for examination. It is much more likely that Bhairava was dead when the book was finished and his son Rāmabhadrā was on the throne at the time. Vācaspati's last work the Pitṛbhaktitaraṅgini was expressly written at the fag-end of his life at the request of the latter king.

Date of Vācaspati: Since the discovery of the Kandahā Inscription of Narasiṅhadeva (i.e. Darpanārāyaṇa, the father of Bhairava &c) dated 'शकादेव शरसभवदनालिं' which undoubtedly means 1375 Saka corresponding to 1453-4 A. D., it is clear that Bhairava and his two sons Rāmabhadrā and Puruṣottama, all mentioned by Vācaspati, were living about 1480-1590 A. D. We should conclude, therefore, that the birth-date of Vācaspati cannot be placed before 1400 A. D. nor can it be placed after 1410 A. D., in consideration of the fact that his philosophical works, all written in his 'youth', could not have been composed after 1440 A. D., as we have stated above. He must have survived till about 1490 A. D. if not later still. Perhaps he was a man of the whole century.

Yajñapati Upādhyāya: Better and more commonly known as simply Upādhyāya was the author of a commentary named Prabhā on the three parts of Gaṅgeśa's work (omitting as usual the Upamāna part). Copies of the Prabhā are extremely rare. There is a copy of the Pratyakṣa part in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (A. Cabaton's Cat. of Mss., 1907, p. 150, No. 904, foll. 100); a facsimile is now preserved in the Asiatic Society. It is in Maithila script (not Bengali as written in the Cat.) and begins:—

1. J. B. O. R. S., XX, pp. 16-19. Jayaswal took it to mean 1357 Śaka as Narasiṅha's son Dhirasiṅha was already (on the throne?) in 321 L. S. But all canons of chronology go against the interpretation. (vide Dr. S. Jha: Vidyāpati-Gītasāṅgara, Introd., pp. 44-46.
There is an old copy of the second part of the Prabhā preserved in the Darbhanga Raj Library (foll. 125, 5 lines to a page: the copy belonged to one Balarāma Chakravartī. 7 foll. of Sūtras are added in the copy ending with the date 1408 Śaka Śrāvana 28 i: e. 1486 A. D.). It begins:—

No copy of the last part of the Prabhā has yet been discovered as far as we are aware. That Yajñapati had commented on this part also may be inferred from the fact that a quotation of his son Narahari, who defended his father against the attacks of Jayadeva, has been found in Rāghavendratīrtha's
Nyāyadīpā on the *Tarkatāṇḍava* (Mysore ed., Vol. II, p. 35) referring to the Yogyatā section of the last part. Upādhyāya is also cited in the *Śabda-Pragalbhī* (Poona copy, fol. 2). Many unfounded traditions existed about Yajñapati in the seminaries specially of Bengal. It was given out for instance that Yajñapati was a son of Vardhamānopādhyāya and was more brilliant than the latter. In the *Śabdakalpadruma* (p. 1791 under the word ‘Nyāya’) it was stated that he was a pupil of both Gāṅgeśa and Vardhamāna: (तपोश्चाली मृगिमिश्रयत्वपश्चाद्व्यायी मृगि-प्रभाकरी). The extracts given above dispell all these traditions as entirely baseless and prove the following facts which should be carefully noted. (1) His father named Śivapati had written a certain book (‘grantha’) which does not seem to be a commentary and was probably an independent treatise on the Nyāya doctrines and Yejñapati based his commentary on that book of his father. He does not clearly state that he read with his father.

(2) Yajñapati’s *Prabhā* superseded all previous commentaries on Gāṅgeśa’s work and laid, so to speak, the solid foundation upon which the latest phase of Navyanyāya studies upon Gāṅgeśa flourished and quickly attained almost inconceivable heights in subtlety. Some of the views of Upādhyāya are now permanently embodied in the current texts. The *Prabhā* created quite a sensation in the learned world. We have cited above the commencement of the second part of the *Prabhā* on the initial point of relevancy (‘saṅgati’). Yajñapati’s pupil Jayadeva boldly characterised his reading of the text as spurious: (कैरिहे सांगत्रिः इत्यहि परस्परमाय कार्यारागाभावः सन्ततिरिविव-सन्निध्यानां सत्यश्रोपावलक्ष्यार्थविदि पाठ कल्पयति। *Anumāna-āloka*, fol. 1). Unlike Jayadeva, Pragalbhācārya exactly quoted the words of Yajñapati and improved upon it by adding two arguments (see *Anumāna-Pragalbhī*). Śiromāni also accepted the reading of Yajñapati and wrote his brilliant thesis on ‘saṅgati’, where Upādhyāya’s views were not ignored. The antagonism of Jaya-
deva towards Yajñapati had far-reaching effects as we have stated elsewhere on the cultural history of Mithilā.

Hundreds of passages are now available where Yajñapati has been criticised by various scholars besides Jayadeva. We shall refer to two great names whose works are still unpublished. Pragalbha (whose Maṅgalavāda has been published in the S. B. Texts under the wrong idea that he belonged to Mithilā) cited Yajñapati’s views at every step and criticised them. We believe Pragalbha referred to his name only twice in the second part, the first time, it should be noted, respectfully in the plural number (इति वज्ञपति: । तत् अग्राधिक्षित्यविन्न्ति Anumāna-Pragalbhī, fol. 22b under the section Kevalānvayī: also 63a under the same section) and his criticisms have always been sober and dignified. Not so, however, Sārvabhauma who was slightly junior to Pragalbha. In the only existing fragment of Sārvabhauma’s Anumānamaniparikṣā we counted as many as 52 references to Yajñapati by name (from fol. 29a), by far the largest number to a single author and some of Sārvabhauma’s criticisms have been violent. For instance, इति वज्ञपतेनस्तम्भिततानां च प्रकृतिपतिः (fol. 42b under Viṣeṣavyāpti), तत्को वज्ञपतेरन्तः प्राधमसत्वन्यो भावेत (49a under the same section), अत्र वज्ञपतिरस्तत्ततातिरित्यत्र (66a under Tarka & 84a under Upādhi), इति वज्ञपतिरपन्थापयेतिति: पत्नया: (150a under Kevalānvayī). Who were the scholars “deceived by Yajñapati” cannot be spotted now in Mithilā or Bengal. When Sārvabhauma wrote, somewhere between 1460-80 A.D., Yajñapati and his unknown pupils formed a powerful group in Mithilā, as indicated by Sārvabhauma.

We shall refer here to an interesting passage, upon which a somewhat heated wrangling continued for sometime both in Mithilā and Bengal. In the section on Kevalavyatirekā Gāṅgeśa scrutinised a passage of Udayana (B. I. ed. pp. 599-601), for both Pragalbha उदयानाः परमाधित्यविन्न्ति—एक्तेति (fol. 67b) and Sārvabhauma अत्याधिक्षितमाधित्यविन्न्ति—एक्तेति (fol. 161a) clearly indi-
cated the source here. Gaṅgeśa is extremely sober and dignified in almost all his criticisms; but surprisingly enough he closed his criticism here with the phrase इति शिष्यधन्तनम् (p. 601, the word धन्तनम् ‘causing confusion’, though not Sanskrit, is locally used in Mithilā and Bengal). Gaṅgeśa’s stricture against Udayana was rightly answered by Yajñapati (as found in the Maṇisāra, Trivandrum ed., p. 98) with a closing retort शिष्यधन्तनत्वाभिधानं शिष्यधन्तनम्. Jayadeva, as usual with him, attacked Yajñapati closing with the phrase शिष्यधन्तनत्वाभिधाने शिष्यधन्तनत्वाभिधानं स्वस्येव शिष्यधन्तनम्! ib. p. 98). Upon this Gopinātha correctly observes तत्र शिष्यधन्तनत्वारोप एव महतामतुचित इति। A rare case of a confusion many times confounded! It should be noted that Gopinātha cited a ‘Gauḍa’ view also on the topic (p. 99), which, however, cannot be traced in Sārvabhauma or Pragalbha and Śiromāṇi did not touch the topic at all.

Yajñapati’s age and family: We have stated under Vācaspati Miśra II that Yajñapati cited and refuted an exposition of the latter. His date of composition of the Prabhā cannot, therefore, be placed before 1450 A.D. Nor can it be placed after 1460 A.D. when his pupil Jayadeva along with the Bengali scholars Pragalbha and Sārvabhauma became probably acquainted with his views. This is confirmed in our opinion by his family history, so elaborately treated in the Paṇjis of Mithilā. We shall refer to some of his numerous alliances;

(1) He belonged to the celebrated Māṇḍara family of Kāśyapa-gotra. He was closely and doubly related to Śaṅkara Miśra as shown in the chart below.
Vāteśvara  M. M. Viśvanātha  Vāteśvara
(of Māṇḍara family) (of Sodarapur family) (of Māṇḍara family)

Paśupati (1st) = daughter  Ravinātha (3rd son) = daughter
Śivapati (2nd son)  Bhavanātha (2nd son)
Yajñapati (1st son)  Śaṅkara (1st son)

This makes Yajñapati only slightly junior to Śaṅkara, both belonging to the same generation. Viśvanātha’s daughter was the second wife of Paśupati and Śivapati her second son. Paśupati’s sister’s husband Ravinātha again was the first son of the second wife of Viśvanātha. If Śaṅkara Miśra was born in the first decade (1400-10 A. D.) of the century Yajñapati was born, say, in the second decade (1410-20 A. D.).

(2) Yajñapati was also related to his distinguished pupil and critic Jayadeva (Pakṣadhara), though not quite so closely, as shown in the chart below.

M. M. Viśvanātha (Sodarapuriya)

Rāmanātha (first son)  daughter = Paśupati
Varāhanātha (only son)  Śivapati (second son)
Gūne (second son)  Yajñapati (only son)
Jayadeva (second son)

Yajñapati is thus one generation senior to Jayadeva; but as Jayadeva belongs to the senior-most branch of the family, Rāmanātha being the first son of the first wife of Viśvanātha, his difference in age with Yajñapati cannot be more than a decade or two. Jayadeva’s birth-date would be about 1435 A.D. according to our surmise. In other words Yajñapati was about 20 years senior to him. This date of
Yajñapati is not in conflict with that of this great-grandfather Vaṭeśvara, who preceded him by one full century and was born, according to our surmise, in the first decade (1300-10 A.D.) of the 14th century. It should be noted that between Vaṭeśvara and Yajñapati all except Śivapati were eldest sons and it would be reasonable to take 35 years to a generation as the average in this case.

Yajñapati was a Mahāmahopādhyāya, which in Mithilā generally meant a master of all sciences. Apparently Yajñapati was regarded in his times as an authority on the Dharmaśāstra also. For, his son Narahari in his critical work on Smṛti named Duaitaniṇaṣya quoted a passage of his father (p. 7: वद इत्येव प्रयोगार्थमर्मिति विनृचरणः) on the topic of Daṅṣinādāna). It is probably a verbal verdict and does not refer to any Smṛti work of Yajñapati.

VATEŚVAROPĀDHYA: a doyen of his times in the cultural aristocracy of Mithilā, though his name is now almost forgotten. He was universally known as the Darpanākāra both in Nyāya and Smṛti. In the Pratyakṣaṇaloka Jayadeva answers an adverse argument of the Darpanā to a passage of Gaṅgēśa in the Siddhānta portion of Maṅgalavāda (B. I. ed., pp. 89-90: Gaṅgēśa handled the intricate nāgṛhātividhiṣṭeṣaḥpāṇyaḥ in his argument here). The particular passage of the Āloka runs: इह विश्रान्म सामूतद्वित्वेवदमार्कापिणि विरोपणस्तवात् न्यायसम्बन्धिततु दर्पणस्त दूष्पदर्भासुकिसंभववेच इत्यत्व्य प्रतियोगिनि विमे विरोपणस्तवात् न तेजवाचे। (From an old Ms. in our possession, vide p. 157 of Tatvavacintāmaṇi with comm., S. B. Texts, [1939, wrongly printed in the Pūrvapakṣa portion]). The name of this Darpanākāra was quite unknown till we discovered the passage fully cited by Narahari Upādhyāya in the Pratyakṣaṇadūṣaṇoddhāra (fol. 19a of a unique Ms. preserved in I. O. London): तत्त्र नामोदिति। चत्रत्र कृत्त्रापिणीमाह-वन्देशरोधपाययाचरणः—यत्र कल्पनीयादयकंकल्पनोपपत्ति।।न्यायसाम्यमवजनीयमेयेचिति दूषपाणाः। The first portion
of Vaṭeśvara’s argument (not cited in the Āloka) was restated by Vaṭeśvara’s great-grandson Yajñapati, who was cited and criticised by many scholars (vide the Pragalbhi printed in the S. B. Texts, pp. 162, 164; Madhusūdana’s Kantaśod-

dhara, ib. p. 158). We need only cite an unpublished note of Mādhava Miśra in the Pratyakṣālokadīpika on the point

वटेश्वराम मतमुन्नत्यवत्—हेष्ट ग्रीष्म इति। अर्थायमारायः—यत्र कलपनीयः

कामनाया अधिष्ठयत्वाभ। (fol. 44b of a unique Ms. preserved in the Darbhanga Raj Library). It can now be stated confidently that the healthy conflict between Yajñapati and his pupil Jayadeva (so aptly described by Gokulanātha once as a ‘family quarrel’: इति मित्रायुणपाणायेवः सह स्वर्गोत्कलोकवशिष्यते

fol. 88b of A. S. Ms. of Siddhāntatattvaviveka), which marked the most glorious period of the literary history of Mithilā really started about a century earlier with Vaṭeśvara as a bold opponent of Gaṅgeśa. This rivalry subsisted for about two centuries mainly through the descendants and relatives of Vaṭeśvara and exercised a profound influence upon the cultural history of Mithilā as we shall presently see.

Vaṭeśvara must have written several works both on Smṛti and Nyāya with the appellative ‘Darpana’. But he was more famous as a Nyāya scholar. One of his sons Pakṣadharopādhyaśaya wrote at the beginning of his Smṛti work named Tattvanirnaya:—

न्यायार्थंयपरिश्रान्तसौरितार्यसेतु।

गुरुः श्रीमदशाखाय शराक्षस्वते नमः ॥

श्रीमत्सादारैयो मयाम्य चित्रं गुरुम् ।

वेदशर विस्मादान्त्र कियते तत्त्वनिर्यं ॥

(Ms. preserved at Mithilā Institute: compare L, 1845). In the fragment examined by us (foll. 40 only) Pakṣadharā has quoted his father’s views on Smṛti topics (fol. 5b, 28a & 35b); of these the second passage (28a) is long and extremely important, as Vaṭeśvara has cited therein with approval an opinion
of Divākara Miśra’s Śuddhibimba, which is quite a new discovery in the Śruti literature of Mithilā. Vaṭeśvara has also been cited twice by his descendant Narahari in the Dvaitanirṇaya (Darbhanga ed., pp. 10 & 32). The first passage (वृद्धशरिष्टमहे-वेदिश्रोपणाण्यव्यवव्यवाचनप्रमुह्मेवत्थ संबद्धति | तथाहि।। इति दर्पमेव तल्लितम् p. 10), where Vaṭeśvara quotes approvingly from a work named Śrāddhapallava, proves that his Śruti work was named (Śruti-)Darpana.

Among his Nyāya works, all of which seem to be now lost, we have so far discovered the following names.

(1) Nyāyanibandhardarpana: Śaṅkara Miśra at the commencement of his Trisūtrimibandhavyākhyā (H. P. Śāstri; Notices, II, No. 136) wrote:—

प्रकाशदर्पणोऽयोगोत्तक्षित्विण्यायं खृतीण्वला।
तथापि योजनामात्रमुह्विष्यायं समोथम:॥

Of the three illuminating scholia on Udayana’s Nibandha which Śaṅkara had before him, the Uddyota (by Divākara) is the earliest and possible the three names have been mentioned in the ascending order of chronology. In that case the author of the Darpana must have slightly preceded Vardhamāna, whose Prakāśa is mentioned first of all. This Darpanakāra is undoubtedly Vaṭeśvara (and not Maheśa Ṭhakkura as surmised by M. Chakravarti: J. A. S. B., 1915, p. 259: vide S. B. Studies, III, pp. 148-49). Only one Darpanakāra was known in Mithilā in the 15th century A.D., whose identity was beyond any question.

(2) Nyāyalilāvatidarpana: A reference to this long-lost book is found in the following passage of Pakṣadhara’s Dravyaviveka: अष्टादश लिलावतीप्रकाशादपैयो:—“भाज्वेव सति संयोगान्यप्रत्यासत्यावेवलम्” इत्यय पात: (London, I. O. copy, fol. 35a: vide Lilāvatī, Chowkh. ed. p. 798). Five more references have been traced in Pakṣadhara’s Lilāvatīviveka; these are:—
Vāṭeśvaropādhyāya
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वच्चपैति। वच्च प्रतीक: पुरुषोत्तमाय नम: उत्पत्तियाँ कतुमुखित: दर्ष्यि पि तथै-वासीति (London I. O. copy, fol. 1a, very beginning), संज्ञासार्थवे-नात्र कतुपतितिति दर्ष्यि: (fol. 2a) न च भावपदुःवाम उत्पत्ति दर्ष्यि (fol. 6a: vide Lilāvati, p. 18), अत्र सीमास्तंकानामिति (ib., p. 21) अथाप्तिसीमास्तंकानामवर्तमानानाधिकारस्यस्यस्यस्य नित्य पर्यि: (7b), अत्र विभत्तिसनत्ततिज्ञानिति सूति: (p. 101) अत्र वच्च पि सर्गार्धविद्विस्वायापक: तथा सन्ततेर्मावात्तथापि नाश्ययवस्थायफासाधारशायपाणानाविकम्यनोपलोपितिनिति- (fol. 28b). The name of the author is not mentioned in any of these references but, as we have stated before, there was only one Darpanākara known in Mithilā in the middle of the 15th century and he was undoubtedly Vāṭeśvara Upādhyāya.

There is an anonymous work named Upādhidarpana preserved at Poona (B. O. R. I. Ms. No. 6 of 1898-99, fol. 9). It begins:—

श्रीरामचन्द्रे शिरसा प्रवणय गृहु च वलिकरस्मदीयमू।

उपाधिविस्मान्तविशेषबद्धविश्वदितिनिः शृंगवे गभीरः।

The references are to Udayana (fol. 2b, 5a), Varadarāja (2a), Vādindra 6b: चार्दम्यसार्वाठूर्वाधिकृतम न भवत्ति भारतीं, Śivāditya Miśra (3a: तिहास भागायस्मास्तन्वच्चायावपक: वती साधारणायापकलमिति शिवादित्यमोचारे नोपलोपितिनिः भवतु) and Śrīdharācārya (3a). They prove that the author was fairly old and probably preceded Gaṅgeśa, as we are unable to trace any Gaṅgeśa-brand passage in the book. Moreover, Vāṭeśvara is not likely to suppress his name if he were the author of the book, as the title would tempt one to surmise.

Vāṭeśvara’s passage, where he had criticised Gaṅgeśa was probably taken from the Nibandhadarpana. The following passage, which we traced in Sārvabhauma’s Maṇipārīkṣā, is likely to be from the same source.

उच्चते। अवच्चेदक्रमानेन दुष्पै इत्याहारः प्रतितिनित्यांमयकः स्वहपस्वयः प्रतियोगित्वात्। तदुक्तं दर्ष्यि-अवच्चेदक्रमं विशेषात्तवावतोः साचारिक: स्वहपस्वयत्वायस्तेतदत्तिति (fol. 50a under the section on Viśeṣavāyāpti,
B. I., ed., pp. 156-57). It should be noticed that Sārvabhauma cited the extract in support of his own contention. It appears that the intricate analysis of the term ‘avacchedakatā’, which subsequently culminated in the works of Śiromaṇi and his followers, was first taken up by Vaṭeśvara.

Vaṭeśvara’s Age and Family: Vaṭeśvara must have been a leader of the Maithila community in his times. In the following verse of the Hariharaśubhaśita Vaṭeṣa has been held as an ideal Śrotriya, he adorned his scholarship by successful teaching and his riches by charities.

विद्याम्ब्रवानेमर्पितं नित्यमलिकुस्।
पुरा कौन्तिच्चवेतेश्वरिनाविशेषामुनाध्वना॥ (XII. 25)

(Prof. R. Jha’s ed., p. 76)

He was a distinguished member of the Māṇḍara family, which has for its first ancestor, as recorded in the Puṇjis, one Naraśimha with a very peculiar title तक्कर्कांचारस्त्रयन्त्रीविद्यापाराप्रभुम्बाय proving that at that time (in the 12th century A.D.) some of the scholars at least had a kind of military training. Vaṭeṣa was 7th in descent from this Narasiṃha. But in an old Palm-leaf copy of a Śākhāpanji, preserved in the Darbhanga Raj Library, the genealogy of the Māṇḍara family starts from one Trinayana Bhaṭṭa, about 15 generations before Narasiṃha (the leaf unfortunately is torn with many names lost), the antiquity of the family, one of the oldest in the whole of India, going back to about 600 A.D. Vaṭeṣa was the third son of his father M. M. Jagannātha and his maternal grandfather was one महँतकविवाधवर belonging to a family named गडनिखतो. Vaṭeśvara himself had a numerous family and was closely connected with many distinguished families of Mithilā. His date can be fairly fixed from reliable clues furnished by his family alliances, some of which we have examined elsewhere. His father was a contemporary of Gaṅgeṣa. This is confirmed by the following fact. Vaṭeśvara.
was a close relative and contemporary of M. M. Viśvanātha of the Sodarapurī family, two of whose daughters were given in marriage to the eldest (Paśupati) and third son (Āṅgaṇi) of Vaṭeśvara by his first wife, while a daughter of Vaṭeśvara was married to the third son (Ravinātha) of Viśvanātha. Now Viśvanātha’s second wife (i.e. the mother of Ravinātha) was a daughter of Prītiśarmā of the ṇaronaye family, who again was an exact, if not a bit younger, contemporary of Bhavaśarma and consequently of Gangeśa also. For, Prītiśarma’s mother’s mother was the younger sister of Bhavaśarma’s mother’s mother. Paśupati, as we have stated under Yajñāpati, was the latter’s grandfather.

Vaṭeśvara’s second son Raghupati had a son named Prajñāpati who married Kamalā the daughter of Maharaja Śivasiṅha’s own sister. According to the latest evidence Śivasiṅha was defeated by Ibrahim of Jaunpur in 1415-16 A.D. (Bengal, Past and Present, LXVII, 1948, p. 36 fn.) and not earlier. Śivasiṅha’s sister’s daughter was born, say, in 1385 A.D. at the earliest and her husband’s grandfather Vaṭeśvara was born not earlier than 1300 A.D.

Vaṭeśvara’s youngest son Surapati was the father of Viṣṇupuri’s mother’s mother. This also places the birth of Vaṭeśvara not earlier than 1300 A.D.1

Vaṭeśvara’s fifth son (i.e. first son of his second wife) was Pakṣadhara, whose eldest son Mahīpati was the father of M. M. Rucidatta’s sister’s husband Amarapati. Even if we

1. Prof. R. Jha calculated Viṣṇupuri’s date from that of Śivasiṅha (Patna University Journal, offprint, pp. 9-11). Taking 1416 A.D. as the date of Śivasiṅha’s death, the birth of Surapati’s daughter’s daughter Maura should be 1400 A.D. and Vaṭeśvara’s birth cannot be placed before 1300 A.D., even if we assume an interval of 120 years between the birth-dates of Vaṭeśvara and his grand-daughter (i.e. Surapati’s daughter) Bhavano, the mother of the above-mentioned Maura.
suppose that Amarapati was born in \(1425 \text{ A.D.} \) at the earliest, Vaṭeśvara's birth cannot take place before \(1305 \text{ A.D.} \). We conclude, therefore, that Vaṭeśvara was born in the first decade of the 14th century.
CHAPTER V

THE AGE OF FOUR M's

MādhaVā Miśra: Son of the famous Jayadeva Miśra alias Pakṣadhara (q. v.). He was also a M. M. and probably wrote a work, where he defended his father against the arguments of Yajñāpati's son Narahari and others of that group.

MādhaVā Miśra, Son of Gadādhara, wrote a Bheda-dīpikā in refutation of Vedantic monism. Pandit Rāmanātha Tarkaratna of the Asiatic Society visited Tirhut in search of Sanskrit manuscripts. He came across a copy of this extremely rare book sometime in 1878-79 A. D. (L. 1879: foll. 60) and gave a good summary of it, from which it appears that the author was well-read in the Vedānta. The Bhāmaṭi, the Khāṛ-Dhana and the Citsukhī are among the works examined and refuted by him. Two verses are reproduced here from the Report:

\[ \text{\begin{quote}ं श्रीमती श्रीरपरा गदाधरा-} \\
\text{द्वृत्त शास्त्रामुक्षियापराध्वनः ।} \\
\text{श्रीमाधवो न्यायमहात्मिनः ।} \\
\text{विशेष बिज्ञातिपथे स खेलति ।} \\
\text{माधवेन हरिमक्षिताः ।} \\
\text{शेषकिकिशमभरेन तन्यते ।} \\
\text{मेद्वत्तमिनि विवेकदीपिका ।} \\
\text{माधवमोहित्यःपनुत्तत्वये ।} \end{quote} \]

Fortunately the name of the author has been traced in the Panjīs. He belongs to a senior branch of the famous Sodarapura family, a common ancestor of which named Ratnēśvara had three sons, M. M. Haleśvara being the eldest one. Mādhava's descent from him is as follows: Haleśvara—Rāju—Yogīśvara—
Varāha—Rati—Hore—Gadādhara—M. M. Mādhava. He was thus three generations later than Śaṅkara Miśra of the same family, who was fifth in descent from the second son of Ratnesvara. This Mādhava Miśra lived, therefore, in the middle of the 16th century a. d., about a century after Śaṅkara Miśra. Mādhava Miśra, son of Jayadeva, was a generation earlier.

Bhagīratha Thakkura: An elder brother to Mahārajādhirāja Maheśa Thakkura was a celebrated logician of Mithilā. He completed his studies under Jayadeva at the age of twenty years. He commented upon the Dravyaprakāśa, the Guṇaprakāśa, the Kusumānjali-prakāśa and the Liṅgavati-prakāśa. His works are either called Prakāśikā or Jalada or Megha after his nickname ‘Megha’. It is presumed that Vardhamāna’s Prakāsas on the Nibandha, the Nyāyapariśīṭa and the Ātmatattvaviveka were not so much in use during Bhagīratha’s time. He read the Prakāśa on the last named work (cf. Liṅgavati-megha, Baranasi ed. p. 9) but commented on the Ātmatattvaviveka (published in the Bibl. Ind. series) itself.

Bhagīratha and Raghunātha Śiromāni were contemporaries and lived in about 1500 a. d. but did not see the works of each other. His Liṅgavatijalada, Kusumānjalijalada and Guṇajalada are mentioned in a list of books prepared in 430 L. S. (p. 129). Again the Dravyamegha and the Guṇamegha have similarly been mentioned in another list of 409 L. S. The lowest limit of his scholastic activities may thus be fixed in 1905 a. d.

Maheśa Thakkura: One of the best scholiasts on the Āloka of Jayadeva. The Darpana, as his sub-commentary is named, seems to have extended to the first two parts of the book as no copy of the Śabdālokadarpana has yet been discovered. The first section (Maṅgalavāda) of the Pratyaksā part has been published along with the Āloka and two other commentaries in the Sarasvati-Bhavana Texts, A
new edition of the Āloka and the Darpana is being published from the Mithilā Institute. Maheśa read Nyāya with M. M. Śucikara Paṇḍita of the Kujauli family; this fact is stated in the introduction to a drama named Anandavijaya by Śucikara’s great-grandson M. M. Rāmadāsa Upādhyāya:

तक पद्मय दुकानः ।
करोत्तथे युध पद्मयः ।

तीतय सिंहः महेश लक्ष- ।
नरेश आशाय मांडः ॥

[तक्कपद्मयाकरोत्तरथ् शुचिपरिवर्तः ।
तदीयतिर्यो महेशी लक्षनरेशान्तिपरिवर्तः ॥]

This Nāṭikā was written for Sundara Thākura, a grandson of Maheśa, and, therefore, it is stated afterwards in the Prastāvanā:—वही गुस्कुलतया पूजनीयोत्तरथ् कवि: सुन्दरनरेशायः। It is not known if this Śucikara had written any book, but in a book-list dated 409 L. S. we found the name of a work ‘Līlāvatī-Suci’, which may be a work of this Śucikara, a commentary on the Nyāyalīlāvatī.1 There is evidence that Maheśa, probably after finishing his Nyāya studies, went to Vāraṇasi, where he read (Vedānta and Mīmāṁsā) with Rāmeśvara Bhaṭṭa. Rāmeśvara’s grandson Saṅkara Bhaṭṭa wrote his family history in a Mahākāvyya named Gadhivaṁśānuvarṇanam (fragment now preserved in the Sarasvati Bhavana). In the sixth sarga of the poem we find:

कष्ठचय ठक्रुरमहेशाः इति प्रसिद्धः ।
स्त्रियां या नृसुखाजितस्यास्तुः ।

ठीकां विषय जू पतिपरिवर्तरां ।
चक्रे सुखाकसिद्ध प्रथम फिलान्ये ॥ (v. 5, fol. 8b)

1 This Śucikara belonged to the Bhakharauli branch of the Kujauli family of Kātyāyana gotra. There was another Śucikara belonging to the Govindaavana branch of the same family and his grandson Saṅkara, author of the Śmṛtisudhākara (composed in 1677 A.D.) stated that his grandfather was a renowned Nyāyāyika.
As a result of his studies at Varanasi he formed a bias towards the Vedānta which was reflected in the following remarkable passage in the Anumāna portion of the Darpana:—तदेतत् संज्ञेयं
चेदनिमत्तं निर्भितं न दूषितं श्रुतिपरायणमुत्तिरिग्रहंशिष्टम्।
(cited by M M. Dr. Kaviraja in S. B. S., III, p. 142). Maheśa’s fame as a logician spread far and wide as proved by the interesting epithet (‘the great dialectician of Tīrabhukta’) used by Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa, who was himself a leading scholar of Varanasi. Moreover, Annam Bhaṭṭa, the famous polymath of South India, wrote his commentary on the Āloka named Siddhārṇjana after consulting previous glosses (on the Āloka) notably by the four great M’s of Mithilā—Megha, Maheśa, Madhusūdana and Madhava (R. 1536). He has actually cited and refuted Maheśa’s views (R. 1537). This fame of Maheśa rested on his single work in logic viz. the Darpana and it is not known that he had written any other book in Nyāya. A thorough examination of the book is necessary for ascertaining Maheśa’s position among contemporary scholars.

The date of composition of the Darpana can be fairly fixed from the following evidence.

(1) Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa has left clear chronological date in his family history. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, the eldest son of Rāmeśvara, was born in Vaiśākha 1435 Śaka (early in 1513 A. D.,) (V. 6). The family removed from Vidyānagara to Dvārakā in the 4th year of Nārāyaṇa, whose Upanayanana was performed there (V. 16). Rāmeśvara settled at Kasi sometime after, say in 1522 A. D. (VI. 1). His first disciple at Kasi was a Koṅkaṇa (VI. 2), then two ascetics Dāmodara and Mādhaṇa Sarasvatī (VI. 3). Maheśa’s name is found in VI. 5 and in the very next verse it is stated that a Gurjara pupil read the Mahābhāṣya along with Śrīdharā, the second son of Rāmeśvara, who was born on his way to Kasi (not earlier than 1521 A. D.). It is, therefore, probable that Maheśa read with him sometime be-
ween 1530-35 A.D. and the Darpana was written within 1535-40 A.D. very early in his literary career.

(2) According to genealogical works authentically preserved in Mithilā Mahēśa was the youngest child of his parents—youngest of four brothers and six sisters. All his brothers were great prodigies viz. Mahādeva, (q.v.) and Dāmodara, who composed their works within the first quarter of the century. At the end of his very first work the Dravyaparakāśikā Bhagiratha has mentioned the name of Mahēśa, who was born, therefore, just within 1500-10 A.D. and wrote the Darpana when his age was about 30 only.

(3) This agrees with the tradition that he went to the court of Rāṇī Durgāvati of Garh Mandla, probably after the death of his immediate elder Dāmodara, who was patronised by Saṅgrāma Sāha (d. 1530 A.D.).

(4) The acquisition of the Darbhangā Raj by Mahēśa is dated in 1478 ('randhra-turaṅgama-śruti-mahi') Śaka i.e. 1556-57 A.D., when his age was about 50 according to our calculation.

(5) In his old age he abdicated the throne and most of his works on Smṛti were composed after abdication. For, in his Tithitattvacintāmaṇi he has referred to Raghunandana and Gopāla of Bengal (Ms. No. 66 of the Mithilā Institute, fol. 9a:-गोइरघुनन्दगोपालभृतयस्य) Raghunandana wrote the Jyotiṣatattva (No. 20 in the list of his works) after 1489 Śaka (1567 A.D.). Mahēśa, therefore, must have written this treatise in the last quarter of the century. But the mention of Gopāla is a great puzzle, for both the smṛti writers of that name, the Kaumudīkāra Siddhāntavāgīśa and the Nīmaya-kāra Nyāyapaṇcānana were junior to Raghunandana and were living still in the first two decades of the 17th century. Probably the reference was to an earlier Gopāla. At any rate Mahēśa becomes a contem-
porary at least of Raghunandana and his date of birth can never be placed before 1500 A.D.

It should be mentioned here that the late Dr. H. P. Sastrī discovered a letter written by Maheśa to one 'Tārkika-cūḍāmaṇī', whom he took to be identical with the famous Raghunātha Śiromaṇi. This letter was exhibited by him in the Asiatic Society in April 1907 (Proc. A. S. B., p. lxxv) and was discovered in a book named Vaiivasvatasiddhānta written in 1529 A.D. (Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 9). The letter has been published in vol. X of the Des. Cat. of the Society (p. 235). Dr. Sastrī's conjecture about the identity of the person (Maheśa Śarman') who wrote the letter is entirely wrong. The letter was written in the Bengali script, and though not dated is somewhat later than the manuscript of the work (named Jyotiṣārasāgara composed in 1450 Saka, Vivavatasiddhāntasāra being only a part). The author of the work (Gaurinātha of the Mukherji family) and all the persons referred to in the letter including Maheśa undoubtedly belonged to Bengal. Maheśa Thakkura of Mithilā could never be supposed to have identified himself so immediately with the family of a Bengali scholar. There is absolutely no evidence that he was a pupil of Siromaṇi or Cūḍāmaṇi of Bengal. The very idea of a Maithila pupil taking lessons from a Bengali scholar was quite unthinkable at that period.

MADHUSŪDANA THAKKURA: might be regarded as the greatest Nyāya scholar of Mithilā in the first half of the 16th century A.D. The first section (Maṅgalavāda) of his masterpiece the Kantakodhāra has been published (Tattvacintāmaṇi with Comm., S. B. Texts, 1939). In the third introductory verse he has boldly stated that his able arguments have removed all thorns in the Āloka and the Maṇi and in the fourth verse he proudly advertised his scholarship in eight different branches of literature (Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika,
Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta, Mahābhāṣya, Kāvyā, Dharmaśāstra and Mantraśāstra). That it is not a mere idle boast will be apparent even from a study of the small printed portion of his work. His masterly elaboration of Mīmāṃsā doctrines (pp. 60-64, 94-103, 141-45) and his quotations from Śrīdatta (p 40), Nyāyamahārṇava (p. 41), Mahābhāṣya (p. 42), Dravyaprakāśa (p. 60), Vaṭeśvara (p. 37, 67, 175), Uddyota (p. 67, 119) and his own father (p. 34, 37, 76, 183) as well as his frequent refutations of previous glosses of unnamed scholars are some of the exceptional features of his performance. Unfortunately the printed portion forms only a hundredth part of his whole work. We add, therefore, brief notes on the unpublished parts.

The first part of the Kāṇṭakoddhāra ends with the colophon: इति महामहोपाध्याय सहदुर्गेश्वरोढिकुलकलकोहारे अत्यचलिनः परिपूर्णः (fol. 120a of A. S. Ms. No. G. 1439, dated 491 L. S., copied at Vikramapura in Mithilā). The copy extends from the Prāmāṇyavāda to the end. We traced three references to Pragalbha (4a, 12b & 16a) and an interesting one to an unknown scholar (20b: कल्पकम्यास्तु-तद्धत्तुर्वेम्). We quote one remarkable passage (fol. 58b):—अनुसारं वैशिष्ट्यिनिर्मिति मूलम् (p. 653 under Samavāyavāda).

नन्द—

ैविषिष्ट्यै वद्यं ैविषिष्ट्यं तद्वा स्थायनवस्थिति: ।
श्रवण तत्र न ैविषिष्ट्यं तद्वा स्थायनवस्थिति: ॥

ैविषिष्ट्यै तद्भावोपि ैविषिष्ट्येनेव निर्घेषेत् ।
तदन्तरेण नामावेद ैविषिष्ट्यं हि त्वपेष्येत् ॥

तथा च कथमेवविविधत वेदयीम्। There are two fragments of this part at Tanjore (Foll. 27 and 131: vide Tanjore Cat., pp. 453-437). The colophon cited (p. 4537) from the larger fragment (fol. 126, at the end of the section on Sannikarṣa) is extremely important. According to it Madhu-
sūdāna wrote this commentary under the patronage of one ‘Mahārājaīdhirāja’ Rāmarāja described, among others, as ‘Karṇāṭaka-Cakravartī’. The identification of this monarch is a great puzzle; there was no paramount king of that name in South India in the 16th century A.D. as far as we are aware. We shall discuss the point later on. In a Darbhanga copy of this part (No. p. 321, foll. 94) the author refers to his own invincibility thus: (verse 2).

There are two copies of the second (Anumāna) part in the Asiatic Society (Nos. G. 1444, foll. 174 and G. 1572, foll. 142) both incomplete towards the end. It begins with the third verse of the first part. Madhusūdana is commonly believed in Mithilā to have successfully controverted the views of Siromāni of Bengal. This tradition is partially correct. There are eight passages in this part where Madhusūdana has cited and refuted ‘Gauḍa’ views (No. 1572, fol. 21a, 23a, 28b, 31a, 71b, 81a, 91b & 103b). Of these the second quotation is the well-known definition of the term Vyāpti technically known as kūtadhyat originally formulated by Sārvabhauma (Anumānaṃpatīpārikṣā, fol. 14) and included among the famous ‘fourteen definitions’ of Siromāni. Here Madhusūdana also cited and refuted a passage of Pragalbhā (fol. 23a). The next passage runs:—

The passage exactly occurs in Siromāni at the very beginning of the Pūrvapakṣa section of Vyāptivāda. It is an original explanation of Siromāni and not borrowed from Sārvabhauma or Pragalbhā. As far as we are aware Madhusūdana was the first among Maithilī scholars to quote from Siromāni. The long passage quoted in the section on Tarka (fol. 71b) is also taken from Siromāni, who under the heading कैष्ठि put in a nutshell various
comments on the point found in Sārvabhauma (fol. 63-65). The remaining five passages cannot be traced in Śiromaṇi, Sārvabhauma or Pragalbha and were evidently cited from other Gauḍa scholars, whose names and works were lost during Śiromaṇi's great mastery. The ending verses and colophon of this part is cited below from a Palm-leaf copy preserved in the Darbhanga Raj Library.

इति कल्याणस्तु मे ॥
शालोकसुत्रे सुमार्गो निवर्ते ॥
शुचि: सुवर्णारुरविन्दा या ।
सा रामगुप्तै अधोत्साना—
मालक्षमाकल्यु कीर्तिरेषा ॥

महुर्द्दनेन यज्ञान्मीमासान्यायार्गो सुतः ।
सुचिरं सुधारु सुजनानातोके कल्यंकोर्याः ॥

छत्रिमेतामनमयम् मदर्यामसमस्या ।
मार्गो यः परिक्रमस्मन्य: स शोच्यः पशुपालचन् ॥

इति महाराजाधिराजकालकृतकवित्त्वधुस्तबलमीम — समस्तदिशिविजयाजितेन
समप्त्यायोरितिनिविष (ल)भूमुखदलश्रीरामराजकारितायां महमहोपायायस्तुकु र्योमधुः
सूतुन्त्रतावाग्नालोककल्यंकोर्याः समुरूपमैति ॥ ल सं ५२६ फाल्युन्यक्लाषम्यात
मध्यप्रयासलिना श्रीरघुवेश्यर्ग्या मार्मामेःप्रूदीविषि ॥ The scribe happens
to be a grandson of the famous Bhagīratha Ṭhakkura, the elder brother of Maheśa Ṭhakkura. The author's extra-ordinary confidence about his own ability is reflected in the last verse. It should be carefully noted that this valuable copy gives the author's patron the important epithet 'Kāṟṇaṭa-Cakravarti' found in the Tanjore copy and it is a clue to the identity of the unknown monarch, who evidently belonged to the famous 'Kāṟṇaṭa' family of Nānyadeva and not to the Kāṟṇaṭa country. It is our conjecture that after the overthrow of the last 'Oinwara' monarch Lākṣminātha Kaṃsanārayaṇa about 1526 A. D. and before Maheśa Ṭhakkura acquired the kingdom of
Mithilā in 1556 A. D. there was confusion in Mithilā for about 30 years when many distinguished scholars left Mithilā to seek foreign patronage. For sometime at least a scion of the long lost 'Kāṇṭha' family might have taken the reins of Government in Mithilā and under this monarch named Rāmarāja Madhusūdāna wrote his monumental work somewhere within 1525-40 A. D. If it were written in a 'foreign' land Madhusūdāna would not have failed to refer to his Maithila origin in the colophon.

The last part (Śabda) is preserved at Darbhanga Raj Library in three different fragments constituting the whole. The first portion (Ms. No. P. 110, foll. 148, up to Vidhivāda) begins as usual with the verse मधुसूदनस्यवृत्ति—&c. The next portion (No. P. 981, foll. 81) is on Apūrvavāda and the last portion (No. 97, foll. 72) goes to the very end, closing with the verse मधुसूदनेन यज्ञात् &c. with the usual colophon, without however, the mention of the patron's name as found at the end of the first two parts. Perhaps the reign of Rāmarāja had ended by that time, though the non-mention of the patron's name should be confirmed from other copies. The Varanasi copy (S. B. Studies, III, pp. 155-6) also seems to omit the patron's name.

Madhusūdana composed a commentary named 'Jīrnoddhāra' on the Smṛti work Samayapradīpa of Śrīdatta (Ms. No. P. 326, foll. 43, dated 1652 Śaka) and another on Vācaspati's Dvaitanirṇaya (vide L. 1853, foll. 121, named 'Jīrnoddhāra'). We examined the A. S. copy (No. G. 1589, foll. 107, called -Prakāśa) of the latter. It was written after Śabdakanṭakoddhāra (mentioned in fol. 31a) and after the Samayapradīpa-jīrnoddhāra (fol. 86a): He refers once to his own Śāradāṭīkā (fol. 15a). Partly due to maturity of age and partly also to the nature of the subject Madhusūdana's style is distinctly more sober here. He does not, moreover, refer to his royal
patron, whose connection with the great scholar must have been short-lived. We quote an interesting passage where the viewpoints of the Nyāya and the Smṛti are contrasted: न हि तत्काल्या
इव धर्मशास्त्रेऽपि पादराधितुरुपशास्त्रमिनिहकाय न्यायारम्भोंपितु धर्मशास्त्रमिनिहकायचे (fol. 38a).

Madhusūdana's age and family: Madhusūdana belonged to one of the premier Śrotriya families of Mithilā named 'Ghusota' of the Vatsa-gotra. He was the seventh son of his parents and his father was Govinda Ṭhakkura, the celebrated author of the Kāvyapradīpa and Pujāpradīpa. Madhusūdana has quoted many passages of his father in the Kaṇṭakodddhāra as well as the Jīrnodddhāra (fol. 106a), proving that his father was also a scholar of the Nyāya and the Smṛti, in both of which he must have given lessons to his pupils, though it is doubtful if he had actually written any works on the two subjects. Madhusūdana's date is quite beyond any dispute now. It can be fixed from the following evidences. In the first place his elder brother Devanātha, the fifth son of Govinda, wrote one work in 400 L. S. and his last work in 1486 Śaka (1564 A.D.) at a very old age. Taking Madhusūdana to be about 6 years younger to Devanātha his date of birth would be about 1500 A.D. So that he was an exact peer in age of Mahēśa Ṭhakkura. As a matter of fact the Darpaṇa and the Kaṇṭakodddhāra do not refer to each other, as far as can be ascertained. In the first flush of youthful zeal Madhusūdana must have wielded his powerful pen somewhere between 1525-35 A.D. to combat the opponents of the Āloka both of Mithilā and Bengal. In a book-list dated 430 L. S. (i.e. within 1540-50 A.D.) the mention of the Pratyakṣa-Kaṇṭakodddhāra (see p. 129 above) proves that the book already circulated in Bengal in 1540 A.D. This is confirmed by the following fact. Madhusūdana's mother was a daughter of Mahopādhyāya Vācaspati of the Māndara family, a first cousin of the famous Yajñapati Upādhyāya. In other words she was a sister of Narahari. A
copy of the Pujapradipa was transcribed in 432 L. S. at the request of Madhusūdana (preserved at Darbhanga).

Madhusūdana's eminence: Madhusūdana, more than any other scholar of his age in Mithilā, was recognized as an authority in other lands. Besides the famous Annam Bhaṭṭa of South India he has been quoted by name in the Vyākaraṇa-Siddhāntasudhānidhi of Viśvesvara (Varanasi ed., pp. 58 & 69) and in the Nyāyasiddhāntamālā of Jayarāma (S. B., Text, p. 161). Moreover, it is our conjecture that one of the greatest scholars of Bengal Guṇānanda Vidyāvägīśa was a student of this Madhusūdana. For, in one of his works the Sabdāloka-viveka he referred to his professor thus (Ms. No. 366 of the Sarasvatī-Bhavana):

मधुसूदनसद्व्याकरणसुधानिद्धित्वः

गुणानन्देन कृतिना राज्यालोकी विविधच्यते॥

This echoes Madhusūdana's opening verse in all the parts of his work. Guṇānanda was a contemporary of Bhavānanda and flourished in the last half of the 16th century A.D. His pupilage under a Maithila scholar, if true, is a fact of supreme importance in Bengal's relation with Mithilā, which continued to attract superior scholars from Bengal even after the great mastery of Siromāṇī.

M. M. MĀDHAVA MIṢRA: One of the last great Navyanyāya scholars of Mithilā, who had written regular and expansive commentaries on the Āloka. He was the last of the four great M's of Mithilā, whose names are respectfully mentioned by the great Annam Bhaṭṭa of South India at the beginning of the latter's Ālokaṭīkā named Siddhārjana (Madras copy R. 1536, verse 5):

मैथिली महेशमधुसूदनमाधवाचे

व्याकरण शिरोमणिग्रंहामित्र सारम्॥
Annam Bhaṭṭa, who consulted all the four great authorities upon the Āloka, evidently mentioned their names in the chronological order. Mādhava, therefore, came last of all and this is confirmed by internal evidence.

As far as we are aware there is only one copy of the first part of Mādhava's commentary now preserved in the Darbhanga Raj Library. This unique Ms. in palm-leaves (Ms. No. 130, foll. 204) is unfortunately incomplete towards the end. It goes up to the end of the section on Anyathākhyāti and stops in the next sentence upon the original text of Gaṅgēśa (B.I. ed., p. 538). Mādhava calls himself a 'satkavi' and this is amply borne out by the elegant verses at the beginning of this part, which are fully reproduced below.
History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā

अनुमानमन्वितेऽग्रहणम्

मममुन्मण्डलकालिनि

तत्त्वारुपिणिं

निग्रहणम्

मद्विरुचिकल्पार्थिवः

प्रसंगादितिः—शिक्षाध्यायीयोजनकमकालिनिवल्लभतः

भवेयवचनलवहरूमोपेश्यनर्त्तवादितिः।

The small portion we had examined of this book proves that a vast literature had grown up round theĀloka of Jayadeva and Mādhava has cited passages from many authors, whose works are now lost. There are several passages from a ‘Gauda’ (fol. 48, 158 etc.), of which the first passage is from Siromāni. The Dūṣanodhara (of Narahari) is cited in the section on Prāmāṇya (fol. 49); we have actually traced it in the Pratyaṅkṣadūṣanodhāra (London I. O. copy, fol. 20b). Several passages are cited from ‘Gurukaraṇa’ (i.e. his father and teacher Khāntara Miśra: fol. 49, 194 etc.). But by far the largest number of quotations are from Upādhyāya (i.e. Yajñāpati) almost on every page from folio 1. We shall specially refer to a passage, which probably refers to the Darpana of Maheśa, who is curiously called by the contemptuous epithet ‘unreasonable’: निर्युक्तिस्तु

नान्यथेत्ययदिकारपठावाचित्वत्

सहिष्ठाप्राइत्वेवचितरः

अपि तु स्वहस्तिंवचनवत्त्वार्थां

कारणावाचित्वत्

इत्यक्षेम्

मिलिततत्त्वात्मकं साध्यमित्वाह।

तत्।

(fol. 4).

This substantially agrees with Maheśa’s views (Ālokadarpāṇa, S. B. Text, pp. 17-18).

There is a complete copy of the Anumāna part of Mādhava’s work, cited by himself under the name of Anumānālokaprakāśa in the former part (fol. 3-4), in the Sarasvati Mahal Library of Tanjore (Des. Cat., pp. 4523-24). There is no opening verse. It ends (fol. 293):
The manuscript is dated 1632 V. S. ‘Asādha-Sudi 6 Some’—this corresponds regularly to June 15, 1575 A.D. Monday. It was transcribed at the instance of Viśvanātha Tīrtha (probably of Varanasi, author of a commentary named Komalā on Saśdharā’s Nyāyasiddhāntādīpa). The colophon proves that Mādhava did not comment on the last part of the Āloka. The most important fact stated in the ending verse is that Mādhava became famous by vanquishing the proud scholars of the court of Gajapati Muktunda, evidently the last great independent monarch of Orissa. Mukunda reigned from about 1552 A.D. to 1568 A.D. when he was defeated by the Sultan of Bengal. Mukundadeva’s name is mentioned in the Saccaritamāṁśa of Vidyānīvāsa composed in 1480 Śaka (1558 A.D.) (Vide Vaṅge Navyanāyaacarā, p. 69 & 75). Mādhava, therefore, must have composed this work about 1555 A.D., probably before Mahēsa Ṭhakkura (whom he had characterised as ‘unreasonable’) acquired the kingdom of Mithilā. The date of the transcript (1575 A.D.) also points to the same conclusion. The author’s triumph as a debater and a scholiast is further confirmed by Annam Ḍhāṭṭa, who mentioned his name in his own commentary.

Mādhava’s family: Mādhava Miśra’s name has been traced in the Paṭṭijis of Mithilā. He belongs to the famous Sodarapura family, whose celebrity is considerably enhanced by the discovery of his name and that of his father there. His
name is found in the ‘Kātaka’ branch of the family and his descent is as follows. Ratnēśvara’s second son was M. M. Sureśvara, the common ancestor of many distinguished scholars. The branch of Sureśvara’s family runs: M. M. Sureśvara—M. M. Viśvanātha—Ratinātha—Ḍālu—Aphela—Divākara—‘Prabhākarāparanāmaka—M. M. Khāntara’—M. M. Mādhava—Mahopādhyaḥya Bhagīratha. This Mādhava is, therefore, one generation later than his namesake (the son of Jayadeva) and the author of the Āloka, on which he commented, was his grand-uncle. It was for this reason probably that Mādhava expressed his contempt for Maheśa Ṭhakkura, who belonged to a different family. This Mādhava like many distinguished scholars of Mithilā was equally famous in Smṛti, in which he wrote a book named Divyadīpikā. A copy of it is preserved in the Darbhanga Raj Library (vide Mithilā Mss., Vol. I, pp. 225-26). One of the charming opening verses is cited below:

श्रीगोपालमुरोगिरो गुरुतरा मुक्ता इवाम्मोनिषे-
राधाय हिंजभूषणेऽऽण गुरुणा श्रीलोकेऽलाईतात्।

लक्ष्मी दित्यरसायाधिकरस: श्रावस्वरोधेवसे-
दित्यालयो विघ्यो विवेष्चतुरे: श्रीमायवेश्रव्युत्तातः।

K EŚA VA MIŚRA T A R K ā C āR Y A: author of a commentary on the original Nyāyāsūtras named Gautamīya-sūtraprakāśā. There is a copy in palm leaves (Ms. No. 52, foll. 92) preserved in Raj Library, Darbhanga. It is unfortunately wanting in the beginning and the end. In the Asiatic Society there is a copy of scattered leaves (Ms. No. 3105, 24 leaves in total), containing, however, the first leaf, full of lacunas, and the last.

It begins: [श्रावस्वरो] केशोदेवरीवां [राधा]नयनान्तसस्तन्त्रम्।
तेजस्मालालोमेः [शर्यांग्यतस्त्पर्यं बन्दे]।।
श्रावस्वरोधेव पूर्णपिंडविभक्तता न्यायवेद संस्कार[तामान्त्राय लघुपि केशवकुवेराचार्याय गुम्फन।]
Keśava Miśra Tarkācārya

The valuable end and colophon run: (fol. 15b)

The total number of Śūtras is thus recorded at the end: I. 40 + 20 = 60/II. 68 + 68 = 136/III. 69 + 73 = 142/IV. 68 + 49 = 117/V. 43 + 24 = 67. After this there are three figures 60/5/22. The number of Śūtras totalling 522 is lesser than the earlier standard versions. This copy on paper belonging to one Gopi Bhaṭṭa is very old, but the Darbhanga copy is older still. The title ‘Tarkācārya’ is not found in the Darbhanga copy, where at the end of the first chapter the following important colophon occurs:

It is also recorded at the end of II. i that the author taught both Nyāya and Vedānta at Kāśi:

It was apparently due to his residence at Varanasi that his fame as a teacher of more than one thousand pupils reached the
shore of the ocean. The following two notes found in the fifth chapter of the book prove that he had previously written a treatise named *Tarkatandava* (fol. 23a). The same authority as in the previous note (fol. 34b).

Fortunately the author has clearly mentioned the name of the family to which he belonged as well as the particular branch of it, in another treatise named *Sankhyaparimana* (Ms. No. 43-2 of the Darbhanga Raj Library, foll. 31). Verses 4-5 at the beginning of this work run:

**वीरभुक्तिमहोपालपरिष्यनमस्वरूपियम्**
**श्रीकेशाकरवीन्द्रश्चन्दस्वरूपियाः विधवेते**
**संविदायामगृहवादेवविधायाकनिषेधके**
**श्रृङ्गस्तृपुत्राशास्त्रीय वाक्ये स्त्रीकरोपम्यहम्**

तत्रावृत्ती मूलपरिमाणा...

It ends:

**प्रादृढावाकागते विते याजनायागते तथा**

**कामक्षेत्राः (ग)ते दृष्टा कोविदते न विच्छिन्ते**

**हृदिमहामहोपाय्य-वटकवासितेर्दुर्गुर्ग्रह्वदिवाकर-सिद्धश्रीकेशाकरकुलस्तव्यापरिमाणयुक्तं समासम्**

In the *Paññis* the name of the author has been traced exactly in the *Kaṭaka* branch of the famous Sodarapura family. The genealogy is as follows: M.M. Viśvanātha—Ratinātha—Miśra Dālu—Miśra Gadādhara—Mahopādhyāya Viśo (3rd. son)—Mahopādhyāya Keśava. He had four sons and his wife's name was Šobhā. He was thus a second cousin of Khāntara Miśra (q.v.) and two generations later than Saṅkara Miśra. He must have written his works about 1525 A.D. and was the leading scholar evidently at the court of Mahārāja Laksminātha Kañsanārāgyaṇa of Mithilā, the last monarch of the Oinwara dynasty. His name, therefore, is one more addition to the list of the galaxy of scholars belonging to the Sodarapura
family that shed lustre on the cultural history of Mithilā for several centuries.

Devānātha Ṭhakkura Tarkapañcānana: a renowned author of Mithilā, better known as the ‘Sapta-kau-mudīkāra’. The names of these ‘seven’ Kaumudīs are:—

3. Kāvyakaumudī on Rhetorics. (Peterson’s 3rd Rep.)
4. Tantrakaumudī written in 1486 Śaka (1564-5 A. D.).
5. Mantrakaumudī written in 400 L. S.
6. Siddhāntakaumudī (cited in No. 1, p. 6)
7. Smṛtikaumudī (published in Mithilā Granthamālā up to p. 144). None of these works, however, belong to Navyāyāya in which he is known to have composed a work named Āloka-pariśiṣṭa. A copy of this rare book was discovered at Dinajpur in Bengal (H. P. Sāstri: Notices, III, pp. 74-5, foll. 143); it was transcribed at the request of the author himself (Mahāhbāra-ṭakātraśrēdevaṁthamahastavānāraṇyaud) in 443 L. S. (चैत्रबधि एकादशां चन्द्रे). There is a copy preserved at Poona (B. O. R. I., No. 310 of 1880-81 foll. 1-42, 48-105). It begins:—

रामेन्द्र दादर्दिनांतिसमं विनाक- 
ढाक्षरश्रवर्ते जनकातिसजया:।
पाठ्र मसोदभर्तेलदन्तक्र- 
माक्षिकमायतसमुस्यिनित: कपोल:।

1. The date ‘Śaka 1486’ at the end of a copy in Assamese bark (in possession of the present writer) is certainly that of composition as the copy itself is not so old. The date of the Mantrakaumudī is thus recorded in copies of 436 and 442 L. S. (examined by Prof. R. Jha):—छब्बे लक्षण- 
सेनस्य बिच्छवयाबिच्छिन्ते। The reading बिच्छ वर्न्तिः (Mithilā Mss., II, Introd., p. 4) seems to be wrong.
It should be noticed that unlike the present copy where the author proves himself an worshipper of Rāma and Sītā the Dinajpur copy makes him a devotee of Śiva, though the 2nd introductory verse is the same in both. The first passage is from the Āloka. It ends with a long note on a passage of the Upamāna part, which no other scholar of Mithilā ( except the versatile Gokulanātha ) ever touched.

Devanātha has recorded many important facts about himself and his father. He was the fifth son of his father ( गोविन्दप्रकाशमुखो विदितो जगत्वाम्, Mantrakāumudi, v. 7, Tantrakaumudi v. 4 ). When the Mantrakāumudi was written in 400 L. S. ( not later than 1519 A. D. ) his father was alive ( गोविन्द एषु सुवने विदितो च चकालित v. 3 ). He must then have been quite young, for he states at the end of the book:—

He has given his genealogy from Ravikara ( v. 3 ) and described his father as well-versed in Mīmāṁsā, Vedānta and Nyāya: ( v. 4 ).
At the end also his father is extolled as wedded to Lady Logic:

यस्तक्तल्लभसद्विलाशीकारिकान्तो
गोविन्दे एष शुद्धेन विद्वत्त: सुकृतिः।

There cannot be any doubt, therefore, that Devanātha (and his younger brother Madhusūdana) read Nyāya with his own father and the ‘Gurucarana’ mentioned in the Ålokaparīśīṭa evidently refers to his own father. In the Adhikaranacakanmudi Devanātha mentions a separate teacher named Soma Bhaṭṭa, who seems to have been a non-Maithila scholar possibly of Varanasi. At the end of the Tantrakaumudi he advertised his all-round scholarship, just like his brother Madhusūdana, as follows:—

मीमांसास्यज्ञानक्तल्लभसद्विलाशीकोषयं
ह्यांशृद्धेनपुराणाभारतसत्याएवत्कक्तेष्टबन्धनः।

dveśvasi ċakkataḥ: dvārakāśvānapravartikaṁ
dvārasaṁgrahaḥ kramadārṣṭaṁ yadā difficulte
dvāraśārīraḥ dvāraśārīraṁ pratyakṣeṇāt kṣīṇenaśi }

Here we are confronted with the problem of his patronage by the king of Kamatā, which is identical with the kingdom of Kuchvihara. Devanātha distinctly says in the colophon that the book was written at the request of Malladeva Naranārāyaṇa, who reigned from 1555 to 1587 A. D. The colophon runs:—

इति समस्तप्रक्ष्याबिराज्ञानमहाराजाधीराजश्रीमहादेशनरायणायकारितायाम् महामहोपाध्यायकक्तेष्टबन्धनश्रीदेवनाथाधित्यायम् विनाक्रयाय पद्धतिपरिशुद्ध: समासः।

शक १७७६। (fol. 100). The date of composition (1564-5 A. D.) falls in the first decade of the reign, proving that Devanātha came to Kuchvihara soon after the coronation of Malladeva in 1555 A. D. The Tantrakaumudi also states that before he came to Kuchvihara he had enjoyed the patronage of another monarch Gajapati Govindadeva:—
The identity of this monarch is yet to be established. There cannot be any doubt that Devanātha left Mithilā after the overthrow of the Oinwara dynasty about 1526 A.D. and adorned more than one royal courts outside Mithilā. The *Mantrakau-mudī* was certainly written when he was still in Mithilā. It is our surmise that his Nyāya work was composed about 1525 A.D. when he was still in Mithilā. About a decade older than his brother Madhusūdana, the seventh son of his father, Devanātha was born about 1490 A.D. and wrote the *Tantrakau-mudī* when he was full 75 years old. We refrain from citing the magnificent panegyrics of Malladeva found in abundance in the latter book, where the author's poetic talents are displayed in full.
CHAPTER VI

MODERN SCHOLARS

M. M. Gokulanātha Upādhyāya: The greatest academic figure of Mithilā during the last 400 years. There is hardly any branch of Sanskrit literature, which he has not adorned by his masterly pen. He wrote learned works, big and small, on Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Vedānta, Philosophy of Grammar, Rhetorics, Poetry and Drama, Astronomy and Astrology, Civil Laws as well as Rituals. Unfortunately no attempt has yet been made to give a complete picture of his literary achievements and properly assess the value of his works, which are likely to reach three figures in total number. And the wonder is that his towering figure emerged late in the Mughal period, when there was all-round decay and disaster everywhere in India.

Gokulanātha was born, as far as we can ascertain, in the decade 1640-50 A.D. The Mūlagramā of the family is Phanandaha (whence Phannahavāra) belonging to the Saṃdīlya gotra (Mādhyandina Śākhā of the Sukla Yajurveda). This family was originally an inferior one and was raised in status only recently. He read with his own father M. M. Pitāmbara Vidyānīdhi and became what was commonly known in Mithilā a ‘Śarayantrī’ after passing the public test of highest scholarship. In a declaration, recently discovered, by his grandson M. M. Datta a complete succession list of professors through whom Lady Logic (चान्तीविद्वीकी विद्या) was handed down lineally through 13 generations, covering about 300 years, has been
carefully recorded. Gokulanātha is number IX in this list, immediately following his father Pītāmbara (No. VIII). Pitāmbara was a pupil of M. M. Vāmadeva Upādhyāya (No. VII), whom Gokulanātha has actually cited as his ‘Paramaguru’. So the list can be taken as authentic. Gokulanātha was a versatile genius from his boyhood as stated by himself. One of his best and most learned works is a commentary on Vācaspati’s Dvaitanirñaya which was named Kādamvaripradīpa in commemoration of his deceased daughter. At the end of this work he wrote:—

श्रवाल्यादेकममत् नम्य युयुपासिता:।

युपासित: सर्वेन्यास्ति: कृतं साहायकं मम॥

So, according to his own admission his studies covered all the

1 Proc. of the Oriental Conf., Benares, 1946, pp. 309-25—an illuminating paper by Prof. R. Jha on ‘The Declaration of a Śrāvyaniṭ’. Vide pp. 318-23 for an account of Gokulanātha and his family with a genealogical table. Jagaddhara (fol. 56b of Tattvādipini on Vāsaavadātā A. S. Ms. No. 9276 ) explains: शरणन्त्रं ‘सरत’ इति क्यातः...शरणन्त्रारोपिततत्तत्त्वांकाताहिंपर—मुस्तकसंगति... | A Ms. of Gaṅgāsa’s work dated 4(0)1 L. S., now preserved in the Raj Library, Darbhanga, was presented to a scholar ‘upon a Śrāvanīṭa’ शरणन्त्रे दत्तमिदं पुत्रक (fol. 126b ). So the word did not mean strings.

2. Ms. No. I. D. 5 (pp. 10-75 ) of the Asiatic Society. On p. 20 at the end of the section on Nāmadvaita Gokulanātha records the pathetic prayer:

श्रवाल्यादेकममत् नम्य युयुपासिता:।

बल्स साहायः तत् कृतित्: कङ्गवर्ध न्यथविधाय॥

There is another large work, divided into 16 ullāsas, named Kūḍa-Kādambari, preserved in the Raj Library ( complete in 95 foll. ), where there is a still more pathetic reference to his beloved daughter.

द्या द्या सुलच्चरति गृहौः कृतिता कङ्गुर्ममं

श्रीशति स्म प्रथयति सदा स्थानत्रृती प्रभोद्धम्।

सैवदनी स्मृतिप्रसागला शिश्पमाणिनि नामा—

निरेष्य वा दश्ति दुःखिता द्यन् कादम्बरी माम्॥
branches of Sanskrit literature. His assiduity in studies was helped according to tradition, by a Divine Grace. At the beginning of the above Šarayantra declaration it is written that the first professor received the Vidyā 'through the grace of Dakṣīṇāmūrti' (दक्षिणामूर्ति: प्रसादात). Though the family of Gokulanātha is well-known in Mithilā as devoted to the Tāntrika cult, it is said, it was initiated through divine inspiration to the mystic formula of the supreme God of Knowledge: also for sometime and the none too high Phanandaha family shot up in the learned world beyond all expectation. It is also said that the family dwindled into insignificance again when the formula was passed on against the divine bidding to a scion of a different family. Maṅgroni near Madhubani the native village of Gokulanātha became as famous as Navadvīpa or Varanasi since the times of Gokulanātha, but though its fame has not yet vanished the God of Knowledge had forsaken the family of Gokulanātha long ago.

It is said that Gokulanātha left Mithilā in his early life and was a courtier of a Mahomedan(?) ruler Fateh Sah of Garhwal at the foot of the Himalayas (Sinha’s Hist. of Tirhut, p. 133). He must have gone there in the last quarter of the century as Fateh Sah died in 1699 A.D. According to tradition he wrote seven works while at Garhwal, of which one Ekāvali on Prosody is preserved in the Darbhanga Raj Library. It was written under ‘Fattepatisāhabhūpah’. Gokulanātha next adorned the court of Mahārāja Mādhava Sinha of Mithilā (1700-1739 A.D.) and, according to tradition, died at Varanasi when he was about 90 years old (Intro. to Gokulanātha's drama Amṛtodaya, Muzaffarpur, 1925). The date of his death would fall in our surmise in the decade 1730-40 A.D. A definite date is recorded by Gokulanātha in his learned work on Astronomy named Māsamimāṇsā. The whole passage is cited below.
Among the 13 professors mentioned in the above-mentioned declaration only Gokulanātha is specially panegyrized in the following words: ये हि सकलसिद्धान्त युक्त्या सर्वद्वितिक शिरोमणि-सौनम्यपनेतुं सिद्धान्ततत्त्वप्रभुवीन् न्यायनिवन्धनानां बदुः प्रमोदवन्ति-सर्वसिद्धान्त-दीर्घागुरवो भभवन् व्याजन् (lines 8.10) Gokulanātha rose to be the Supreme Head of the University of Mithilā, so to speak, making decisions on all conceivable subjects. The greatest literary achievement of Gokulanātha was his attempt to discredit Śiromāṇi, the great refuter by arguments of all previous decisions, and he wrote many works like the Siddhāntatattva to that end. This statement of his grandson is important for the history of Navyanyāya in Mithilā and as we shall presently see, is substantially correct.

Nyāya works of Gokulanātha: Among all the branches of Sanskrit literature mastered by Gokulanātha the hardest nut cracked by him was of course Navyanyāya, which had already reached the final stage of development in the hands of Gadādhara of Bengal (1604-1709 A.D.) about a generation before Gokulanātha. In the final colophon to his work on Smṛti named Kusūkkādāmvarī (Ms. at Raj Library, Darbhanga) Gokulanātha’s title is recorded as ‘Mahamahopādhīya Śaṭtarkapāñcānana’ (i.e. a lion in all the six divisions of dialectics), a true description of his invincible career as a dialectition. Among his works on Navyanyāya the following have been so far discovered.
Giridharopādhyāya

(1) Cakraraśmi—commentary on the Tattvacintāmanī.
(2) Dikkālanirūpana—Ms. Raj Library, Darbhanga.
(3) Dīhitividyota—com. on Raghunātha’s Tattvacintāmanidīdhi.
(4) Kusumañjaliṭippana.
(5) Khāṇḍanakutṭhāra—Ms. Raj Library, Darbhanga.
(6) Lāghavagauravarahasya.
(7) Mithyātvanirukti.
(8) Nyāyasiddhantatattva.
(9) Padavākyaratnākara.
(10) Śaktivāda.

GIRIDHAROPĀDHYĀYA: The chance discovery of a single manuscript and the enterprise of an eminent logician of Mithilā, Jīvanātha Miśra Tarkatīrtha Nyāyaratna² are responsible for the publication of the Vibhaktyarthanirṇaya (Chowkh. ed., 1902, pp. 477), one of the best books on the subject ever written in India. A cousin and pupil of the great Gokulanātha of Maṅgroṇi, the author treated the subject in such a masterly way both from the grammarian’s and logician’s point of view that even Gokulanātha must have yielded his palm to him in many places. When Giridhara wrote, say, about 1720 A. D. the most glorious period of Navadvīpa has definitely ended with the death of Gaddadhara in 1709 A. D. and the signs of a distinct revival of the ancient glory of Mithilā were discernible at Maṅgroṇi. Pāṇinian studies, which never influenced the works of Jagadīśa and Gaddadhara of Bengal, shed lustre on Giridhara’s

1. Jīvanātha was the second ‘Tarkatīrtha’ of Mithilā and passed in 1893 as a pupil of Yadunātha Sārvabhauma of Navadvīpa. He lived at Sugaunā and belonged to the Sodarapura family. The first ‘Tarkatīrtha’ of Mithilā was Sāntagopāla Jhā, who passed in 1892 as pupil of Kailāsa Śiromāni of Varanasi. Umeśa Miśra (pupil of Śivacandra Sārvabhauma of Mulajore College) and Vecana Jhā (pupil of Yadunātha Sārvabhauma of Navadvīpa) passed in 1895. In the very first year of examination in 1879 passed two scholars evidently of Mithilā, who should be identified: Khadgaṇātha Jhā and Apuccha Jhā ‘Tarkopādhyāya’.
work, which succeeded in keeping the enormous subtleties of Gadvâdhara within reasonable bounds without discarding them. Unlike his professor Gokulanâtha, who had displayed some animus against the Bengal authorities, Giridhara cited Siromañi with due regard.

Giridhara began his work with an obeisance to the god Śiva and to his own parents. It is interesting to note that he gives the epithet Ātmicchālaśīlīśīvamôdvarvî to his father Mahopâdhyâya Vagîsa, who was also, therefore, a distinguished logician. Vagîsa was the younger brother of Gokulanâtha's father, being the fourth son of his parents (vide the family table published in the Proc. Or. Conference, Benares session, p. 318.). He frequently refers to his teacher Gokulanâtha and his famous work Padavâkyaratnakâra and mostly approves his views with additional arguments (गुरूरसाहसः......इति पदवाक्यरतनाकरे प्राहुः। गुरूवते चाक्षःयः......॥ pp. 37-40. See also pp. 45, 58, 126-30, 142, 166, 184, 207, 225, 284-5, 312, 323-25, 342, &c. up to p. 443.). To give an idea of the courses of studies then current in the greatest centre of Sanskrit culture in Mithilâ an alphabetical list of the authorities cited by Giridhara is given below.

Anumânânaîdhitî (p. 369), Ākhyātavâda (pp. 24, 85 & 114) of Siromañi. Ātmatattavavivekâdhitî (194), Kaśikâ (51, 53-4), Kusumânjali (कुसुमाङ्लियमसूतिमूलमन्ये p. 31), Kaiyyâta (375), Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa (p. 200), Gauḍâh (339, 346-47 being a refutation of Jagadîśa’s Šabdâśaktipraṇâkśikâ II. 129 & 359), Darpañ Īṭhakurâḥ: this important passage runs as follows:-

च्छतव चात्मानविशेषारिसत्त्वात्रिदिने तूले (Pratyakṣa part, B. I. ed. 833) चतविशेषवसादराचित्राधिनन्तः इति स्याः इत्युद्ध:। आशे विशेषो जटासंबन्धः वच्च्चुदवे दुर्शमसंच एव गृहणा त्यक्तेर्वत्र विचरणवाणाय तीकाश्चाल्यः। Didhitikrt (p. 80), Prakâśa (प्रकाशे महामहोपाध्यायवचण: p. 366 the reference is to the Dravyakiranâvalipraṇâkâ of Vardhamâna), Pratyakṣâloka (प्रत्यव्यालोके मित्रे p. 251), Bhaṭṭapâda (p. 106), Bhâṣya-Vârtika-Tâtparya (p. 117), Maṇḍana Miśra (p. 121-22),
Māgha (p. 74), Miśra i.e. Jayadeva (pp. 37, 202 & 251), Śabdāloka (शब्दालोके मिश्रा: p. 202), Śāṅkarabhāṣya (p. 137), Śivāditya (p. 251), Soddandaśopādyāya (? read Sondaşa p. 161), Hari i.e. Bhartṛhari, author of the Vākyapādiya (pp. 128-9 & 449), The Kārikā हेते: कमःशूरशिवसमात् &c. has been ascribed to Bhartṛhari evidently on the authority of Jagadīśa's Śabdāsakti-prakāśikā; the mention of Bhābhata, who was most probably posterior to Bhartṛhari, proves the ascription to be extremely doubtful, if not positively wrong. The Kārikā has not been quoted by any writer before Jagadīśa and seems on the face of it of non-Pāñinian origin.

Giridhara proves himself very well-read in the Mithilā and Bengal authors of the Navyanyāya as well as the recent Pāñinian works written at Varanasi. The mention of Mahēśa Thakkura's Darpana proves that it was studied at Maṅgroni, obviously from patriotic considerations. No other commentary on the Āloka is mentioned in the list.

M. M. Rūpanātha Thakkura (Takkaratna): a protege and close relative of Mahārāja Mādhava Simha (1775-1807 A.D.) of Mithilā, at whose request he wrote a sub-commentary on the Ālokdarpana of Mahēśa. We reproduce below verses 3-6 from its beginning:—

श्रीमद्धुरिनिमित्त्य सुकृतिवाच्यविशिष्टव व ।
दुर्बोधव च दर्पणस्य रचितस्य भावव्याकरणाभियाम्।

दीक्षां वेलम्बनम् वासना परिणती हस्तमेत्तम्राशु
स्वावेशा सफला मुक्तस्वरुप्ये भक्तिः भ्राता यतः ||३

ब्राह्मणं यो संगीतलापे नरपति: श्रीमान सहेजः सुचिकरः
स्तवयोगाः नान्या: श्रमश्रम द्वारा ब्रह्मकुरु इति व्याख्यात तत्त्वायम्।

श्रीनारायणालोकोयस्य तत्त्वात्: श्रमश्रमानां शुचिकरः
नन्दो भृत्योयस्य तदनुवाक्षरोपक्षाः सुतः ||४
Rūpanātha was a direct descendant of M. M. Dāmodar Thakkura, the immediate elder brother of Maheśa Thakkura. He belonged to the village Sarvasimā, where his descendants still survive. He was 7th in descent from Dāmodar and was born evidently about 1750 A.D. For, in the interesting Judgement (Vyavasthāpatra) in Sanskrit dated in 1716 Śaka (1794 A.D.) Rūpanātha’s name along with that of his eldest son Madhusūdana is mentioned; Rūpanātha’s father was the defendant in the suit. Rūpanātha died shortly before 1750 Śaka (1828 A.D.), in which year his son Mahopādhyāya Acyuta Thākura established a temple of Śiva named ‘Acyutesvara’.

1. All the above details about Rūpanātha are taken from an excellent monograph in Maithili named ‘Candraptikula praśasti’ written by Pandit
It should be noticed that Rūpanātha prosecuted his studies on Navyanyāya neither at Navadvīpa nor at Varanasi, but in Mithilā under Mahāmahopādhyāya Subodha, who must have been a superior scholar in the second half of the 18th century, though his name is now completely forgotten. Among the own sons of Rūpanātha two became scholars of repute viz. Acyuta and M. M. Mukunda Thākura and both of them specialised in Navyanyāya, but they are not known to have composed any work on the subject.

**Vīśvanātha Jhā**: a celebrated Navyāyika of of Darbhanga. He belonged to a famous Śrottriya family of Ṭhaḍhi. He originally read with Parameśvara Jhā and Rddhinātha Jhā the talented scholars of Cakauti village and finished his studies at Navadvīpa with Goloka Nyāyaratna, the famous Patrikākāra, and after his death with Prasanna Tarkaratna. He was exclusively a scholar of the latest phase of Navyanyāya. When Maheśa Nyāyaratna visited his seminary at Darbhanga in 1891 he had eight students, the largest number of Nyāya students in the whole of Mithilā. He wrote a learned Patrikā named Siddhāntasāra on Vyadhikarana, one of the knottiest sections of Gaṅgeśa. He also composed an extensive commentary named Prakāśa on Udayana’s Lakṣanāvali, which was fortunately published from Varanasi (1822 Śaka, pp. 195). At the end of the book he has given the following account about himself:—

श्रायीत सोदरपुरमूलभियामात्रो भवानीपति—
यें श्रीकृष्णविनयमस्मालमति: व्यातातिलो: सदर्गुणोः।

History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā

The editor noted that it was composed in Caitra 1805 Śaka (1884 A.D.: शरवियदुगजन्धनिथि रक्षके p. 195). There are quotations from the Muktāvalī (p. 19) Jagadīśa (p. 24), Śaṅkara Miśra whose views on Tejastva are refuted (p. 47) and the Vādivinoda of Śaṅkara (p. 55), which was not yet printed. Viśvanātha has divided the original book into four parts (Pratyakṣa etc.) after Gaṅgeśa (pp. 113, 163: Upamāna finished in only a few lines). This is quite novel, though quite in keeping with the commentator's profession. For, all up-to-date scholars of Navyanyāya bring down every topic under the four grand divisions of Gaṅgeśa's work.

KAVIRATNA: There is a copy in palm leaves of a commentary on the Pratyakṣasakhandṇa of Gaṅgeśa by one Kaviratna preserved in the Darbhanga Raj Library (Ms. No. P. 10, foll. 88 incomplete towards the end). It begins:

प्रत्येक्षांप्रपश्यि: प्रत्येके दृष्टि गुड़िः

अथ श्रीकविरलन्च चौरे नीरे निहृत्ते

It seems to be an attempt to point out all erroneous explanations upon Gaṅgeśa. The only Kaviratna known in Mithilā is a grand pupil of Gokulanātha. He is thus eulogised by the famous Maithila poet Candā Jhā:

इन्द्रपरोहिततुल्या गोकुलनाथाय श्याता:।

तेषां शिष्या श्रास्त्र विभिन्नतरलेण गामी:॥
It should, however, be mentioned here that Vāgīśa was the name of an uncle (younger brother of the father) of Gokulanātha and it is extremely unlikely that the uncle took lessons from the nephew. If some other Vāgīśa, pupil of Gokulanātha, is mentioned in the above tradition it requires careful investigation. Otherwise the tradition cannot be accepted as beyond any dispute.

Dharmadatta Jhā (alias Bācca Jhā) was the most renowned scholar of Mithilā in recent times, who earned for his versatility and profundity of learning the title 'Master of all sciences' (Sarvatantara-svatantra). He belonged to one of the premier Śrotriya families of Mithilā named Gaṅgauli of the Sāndilya gotra. His granfather M. M. Ratnapāni Jhā adorned the courts of Mahārāja Chatra Śiṅha (1807-39), his son Rudra Śiṅha (1839-50) and the latter's son Maheśvara Śiṅha (1850-50). Under their patronage he wrote a dozen works, mostly on Śrēti. Baccā Jhā was born in March 1860 A. D. He studied, taught pupils and composed works all his life and died in harness in August 1918 at the age of 59 only, when he was serving the Muzaffarpur Sanskrit College as its Principal. He took lessons successively from Jaṭādhara Jhā (of Pilokhwar), Viśvanātha Jhā (of Ṭhāḍī, his maternal uncle), Babujana Jhā (of Pilokhwar), Bāla Śāstrī and Viśuddhānanda Sarasvatī (both of Varanasi). When M. M. Maheśa Nyāyaratna, Principal of the Cālcutta Sanskrit
College, visited his seminary at Nowani in 1891, he had 19 students with him reading six different subjects. As a consummate scholar he wielded his powerful pen in many subjects, though most of his works remain unpublished. In Vedānta he wrote a gloss on the Advaitasiddhicandrikā, while his sub-commentary Gūḍhārthatattvāloka on Madhusūdana's Gītāṭikā has been published. He wrote besides a Campū named Sulocanā-Mādhava. He wrote many dissertations and glosses on the latest phase of Navyanyāya, some of which have been published securing for him a permanent place among the authors of Mithilā. The published books are:


The closing verses are reproduced as a specimen of his style:

रेणुमाप्तरेण हन्तार्थो मवेशीया विचारारात्ता
तरसाराभिधमने पूर्णो सिद्धान्तसारकः ||
श्रीधरमदक्ततिनां रचितेन यज्ञा-
देवेन मा मुदुमपेतू जनोधिपि विनिनायाम ।
वालोपकारकमेनमोचांत्यसुकं
तीतो मुद्यं भजतु चाष्ठ्यमयूलकस्व च: ||
स्ववारिच्छलगङ्गलच्छरीकः
संचारिचाहरराजस्रस्वस्वभूत ।
चेतोमुप्रविचित्त: परिचिन्तनेकः
लघुण्य सिद्ध्विष्णुसारसम्ब्रह्म||

3. Vivṛti on Gadādhara’s Sāmānyanirukti (Varanasi, 1935, pp.).

4. Gūḍhārthatattvāloka on Gadādhara’s Vyutpattivāda (Bombay, 1912, Published in his lifetime). This elaborate work made the author’s name celebrated throughout India.
The following is a list of his unpublished works. Advanced notes on Jagadīśa’s *Avacchedakatvaniruki*, *Vyāptyanugama*, *Pakṣatā*, *Avayava*, *Savyabhicāra*, *Satpratipakṣa* and Gadādhara’s *Saktivāda*. He also commented on the *Khaṇḍana* and on Vardhamāna’s *Kusumānjalipraṅkha*. His explanation of Ānanda-pūraṇa’s two knotty phrases on Īśvarānumāna, which taxed the brains of all the best scholars of his times, has been published (Chowkh. ed. of *Khaṇḍana* with 5 commentaries, pp. 5-7). He, moreover, proved his acumen by writing commentaries on the older classics the *Nyāyabhāṣya* and Vācaspati’s *Ṭātparyatīkā*, whose studies revived only late in his life. His masterly style is illustrated in the following closing verses of his gloss on the *Avacchedakatvaniruki*, which convey a double meaning:

\[
\begin{align*}
राजेशसंपक्कवर्षादिवाघात् \\
र्यामिर्यमेण फिल तारकारिकम् । \\
अपोषवदुं रघुनाथविचा \\
सुकृतिकाळ्या इव वस्तलत्वात् । ॥ \\
अभूद्वच्छेदवकनामणेयो \\
वस्त्रासत्वप्रलंभतीनो, जगत्वत्बुरु । ॥
\end{align*}
\[
\begin{align*}
कत्ये करोत्त्वय बतोरिक्षे \\
रनुवहं श्रीजगदशिनामाः ॥
\end{align*}
\[
\begin{align*}
वस्त्रात्तिकणम्बरवच्छेदरस्व \\
र्यालापिता श्रीशापदे मुद्रे स्मात् । ॥
\end{align*}
\[
\begin{align*}
सतां समालम्ब्य बतासिं धर्मे- \\
दुयेन सम्प्रभुचता प्रयज्ञाताः ॥
\end{align*}
\]

Many of his pupils and grand-pupils are still carrying his banners in various parts of India.

1. We are indebted to one of his worthy pupils Pandit Śaśināth Jhā for some of the details given above. He has himself emulated his great teacher by writing a very advanced thesis on ‘*Trītalāvacakchedakataśvāda*’ (lit. three-storied edifice of the term *Avacchedakatā*), which, happily, has been published by the Mithilā Institute. For list of Baccā Jhā’s works vide Introd. to his gloss on *Śāmānyaniruki* (Kashi Sans. Series, 1935).
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| Gāḍhivamśānucarita | 173  |
| Gaṇākārikā | 36  |
| Gaṇaratnamahodadhi | 47  |
| Gaṅgāditya | 114  |
| Gaṅgānātha Jhā | 110, 134, 141  |
| Gaṅgeśopādhyaya | 1, 38-41, 44, 55f, 60-63, 65f, 69, 73-102, 106-9, 113, 115f, 122f, 125, 128-30, 134f, 146, 150, 150n, 152, 155, 160-62, 165, 167-9, 183, 194n, 201f, 205  |
| Gauḍa | 198  |
| -Mimāṁsaka | 6n, 35  |
| Gaurīdigambarapraḥasana | 134  |
| Gauḍorviṣakuaprāṣasti | 42, 49  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Author or Concept</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Gaurikānta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 105, 151</td>
<td>Gautama (cf. Gotama)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Gautamasūtra (cf. Nyāyasūtra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186f</td>
<td>Gautamīyasūtraprakāśa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Ghaṭeśopādhyāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197, 199</td>
<td>Giridharopādhyāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Gitāṭikā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Goloka Nyāyaratna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45, 113, 190, 193f, 194n, 195-8, 202f</td>
<td>Gokulanātha Upādhyāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175, 183</td>
<td>Gopāla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49, 64, 102, 162</td>
<td>Gopinātha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1n, 131</td>
<td>‘Kavirāja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96, 150</td>
<td>Gotama (cf. Gautama also)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Gotrapaṇḍiṣṭha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Govardhana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Govinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47, 49</td>
<td>‘candra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>‘rāja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>‘Thakkura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Guḍhāṛthādipikā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>tattvāloka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Guṇānanda Vidyāvāgīsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43n, 55, 101</td>
<td>Guṇaratna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Guṇa (-kiranāvalī)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129, 172</td>
<td>‘Jalada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>‘Megha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>‘rahasya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60, 114, 172</td>
<td>‘prakāśa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>‘upaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117f</td>
<td>‘viveka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Gupta-a Tantrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Haleśvara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95, 115</td>
<td>Haridāsa Nyāyālaṅkāra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Hariharasubhāṣita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118, 121</td>
<td>Harimśra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121n</td>
<td>-Grammarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94f, 101</td>
<td>Harināthopādhyāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Hari Śarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Harirāma Tarkavāgīsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Harivānśa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f</td>
<td>Harṣavardhana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hemacandra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Hetukhaṇḍana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54n</td>
<td>History of Bengal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>History of Dharmaśāstra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>History of Indian Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1n</td>
<td>History of Indian Logic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1n</td>
<td>History of Navuyanyaya in Bengal and Mithila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 137</td>
<td>History of Tirhut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Indian Logic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 99</td>
<td>Indian Logic and Atomism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Indra-Grammarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Indradatta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Īśānadeva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 69</td>
<td>Iśvaravāda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>‘dūṣana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Iśvarasiddhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Iśvarasena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Iśvarasādhanaḍūṣaṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Jagaccandra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194n</td>
<td>Jagaddhara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagadguru</td>
<td>93, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagadindu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagadīsa Tarkālaṁkāra</td>
<td>68f, 153, 197-9, 202, 204f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagannātha Tarkapañcanāna</td>
<td>128, 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaimini</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalada</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaleśvara Vāhinīpati</td>
<td>67, 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambūvijaya</td>
<td>4n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānakīnātha (Bhaṭṭacārya- cūḍāmaṇi)</td>
<td>63f, 69, 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayanārāyaṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyāyapañcānana 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayarāma</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayacandra</td>
<td>47, 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadeva (Pakṣadharma)</td>
<td>72, 75, 80, 85f, 89f, 93, 99,115, 120, 122-8, 130, 133, 135, 153-6, 159-65, 171f, 184, 199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadeva (Pīyūśavarṣa)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāditya</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayanta</td>
<td>17f,34,37,97,145,151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāpīda</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinendrabuddhi</td>
<td>30f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīnoddhara</td>
<td>180f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jītārī</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīvānanda Tḥākura</td>
<td>201n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīvanātha Miśra</td>
<td>113f, 138, 141, 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñānacandra</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñānāśrībhadrā</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñānāśrīmitra</td>
<td>13f, 14n, 15,17f, 28f, 33, 36, 41, 52-4, 54n, 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyotiḥsārasaṅgraha</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyotiṣataṭṭva</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailāśa Śiromaṇi</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiyyaṭa</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālakaumudi</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalāpapariśiṣṭa</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇabhakṣa (Kaṇāda)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇācārya</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇāda</td>
<td>57f, 141f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇādarahasya</td>
<td>10, 135, 137, 140-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇīcanamālini</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandalī (Nyāya-)</td>
<td>9-13,22f,73, 55, 63, 66, 76, 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandalikāra</td>
<td>8f, 27, 66, 73, 76, 117f, 142, 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇikākāra (Vacaspati I)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇṭakoddhāra</td>
<td>165, 176f, 179, 181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°(Pratyakṣa)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapila</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpā</td>
<td>54n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāryakāraṇabhāvasiddhi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṣikā</td>
<td>11, 30f, 121n, 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśikākāra</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśikāvivaraṇapañjikā</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśiśivastuti</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kātantra</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°pradīpa</td>
<td>70, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumudīkāra</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumudīkāra -Siddhāntavāgīṣa</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaviratna</td>
<td>202f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kavyakaumudi | 189
°pradīpa | 181
°prakāśa | 129
Keśava | 11, 99, 124
Keśava | 65f, 187
son of Narahari | 157
-Miśra | 64, 111, 188
-Miśra Tarkācārya | 186
Khaḍganātha Jhā | 197
Khaḍgesea | 203
Khanḍana(-khanḍakādya) | 3, 42-4, 46f, 50f, 74, 91, 102, 139, 150f, 171, 205
°bhūṣāmanī | 151f
°kuṭhara | 197
°prakāśa | 111
(Pürva-) | 129
°śīkā | 70, 138-40
-uddhāra | 42, 99, 111, 137, 145, 149-51, 51n
Khanḍanakāra (kṛt) | 48, 65, 87, 91
Khanḍanoddhārakāra | 145
Khāntara Miśra | 183f, 186
Kiranāvali | 4f, 8-11, 34, 36, 39, 57, 59f, 62, 69, 71, 74, 93f, 117
(Dravya°) | 40
(Guna°) | 3, 10, 41
Kiranāvalikāra | 57
Kiranāvaliniruktiprakāśa | 137
-Pakṣadhari | 117
-Prakāśa | 12n, 118
Komalā | 185
Kṛpārāma Tarkavāgīśa | 81, 153
Kṛṣṇadāsa Sārvabhauma | 129f, 134, 154
Kṛṣṇa Miśra | 8n, 32
Kṛṣṇamūrti Ārman | 116n
Kṛtya-pradīpa | 143
°ratnākāra | 66
Kṣanabhāṅgādhyāya | 14, 106
Kṣanabhāṅgasiddhi | 18, 29
Kṣemendrabhadra | 26
Kṣirasvāmin | 47
Kullūkabhaṭṭa | 91
Kumārila | 13, 26-28, 57
Kuṇḍakādambāri | 194n, 196
Kusumāntari (Nyāya kṛt also) | 2-4, 5n, 32, 35, 37-41, 43f, 65, 72, 75, 87, 90, 93, 108, 130, 133, 151, 198
-bodhāni | 35, 131
-Jalada | 129, 172
-Kārikāvyākhyā | 72, 131
-makaranda | 72f, 125, 130, 133f
-prakāśa of Vardhamāna | 72f, 84, 92, 98, 100, 110f, 117, 133, 172, 205
-Saurabhā | 100
-ṭippana | 197
-upāya | 129
-viveka | 117
-vyakhyā (Śaṅkara Miśra) | 132
Lāghavagauravarahasya | 197
Laghubhārata | 6n
Laghū
Lakṣaṇamālā 2f, 43
(of Śivāditya) 62
Lakṣaṇāvalī 2, 59, 66, 201
-prakāśa 202
Lilāvati (also Nyāya-) 11f, 55, 60f, 75, 93, 120, 140f, 166
°jalada 172
°kanṭhābharaṇa 131, 135f, 142
Lilāvatīkṛt 151
Lilāvatī-megha 172
°prakāśa (or upāya)
68, 75, 77, 111, 118, 129, 142, 166, 172
°Śiromaṇi 153
°sūcī 173
°upāya-Jalada 129
°viveka 75, 117, 118, 120f, 166
Mādhava 45, 124f, 165, 174, 182, 184f
°kara 23
°ācārya 153
°Miśra (Son of Gadhara) 171f
*(Son of Jayadeva) 171f, 186
*(Son of Khāntara) 182
°Sarasvatī 174
Madhusūdana Sarasvatī 137
Ṭhakkura 129, 165, 174, 176-8, 180-2, 191f, 200, 204
Mādhya-makā 145
Māgha 151, 199
Mahābhārata 92, 191
Mahābāṣya 118, 174, 177
Mahādāna-nirnaya 157
-paddhati 103
Mahādeva 175
-Somayājī 2
Mahāvidyāvidambana 62
Mahāvrata 32f, 58, 67
Mahendrasūri 46
Mahesa Nyāyaratna 201, 203
Ṭhakkura 45, 166, 172, 174-6, 179, 181f, 185f, 199f
Mahimabhaṭṭa 46
Mahīpāla 54n
Mahīpati 169
Mahodadhi 32f
Maighī (cf. Jalada & Megha) 182
Maitreya 157
Mallinātha 3
Makarandakāra 72
Mammaṭa 46
Mānmanohara 56, 84, 90
Māṇḍana Miśra 13, 22, 25-7, 198
Maṇi (Tattvacintāmaṇi) 176, 183
Maṇidhara 89
Maṇikaṇṭha Miśra 76f, 79f, 82-7, 97, 101f, 141, 148, 150f
Maṇikaṇṭhatikā 149
Maṇimayūkha 113, 135, 153
°prakāśa 111, 156, 167f
| Manisāra | 162 | Narasīṁha | 151, 168 |
|ôtika | 69, 124, 134f, 142 | Nārāyaṇa | 43 |
| Maṇjarī | 17 | oĀcārya | 30 |
| Mantrakūmudī | 189, 189n, 190, 192 | oSarvajña | 62, 91, 101, 102 |
| Mantrasāstra | 177 | Nāropānta | 15, 53 |
| Manusamhitā | 35, 91, 129 | Navyadharmapradīpa | 153 |
| ôtika | 92 | Nayanaprasādinī | 101 |
| Māsamimānsā | 195 | Nayaviveka | 68, 92 |
| Mathurānātha Tarkavāgīśa | 9, 75, 81, 95, 121 | Nayapāla | 26, 53n, 54n |
| Māthuri | 114 | Nibandha (cf. Pariśuddhi) | 3,40, 70, 72, 118, 137, 172 |
| Mayanandani | 63 | Nibandhadarpaṇa | 167 |
| Megha | 172, 174 | Nibandhakṛt | 157 |
| Mīmāṃsa | 150, 156, 173, 177, 190f | Nibandhana | 67 |
| Mīmāṃsaka | 167 | Nibandhapraṇāsā | 40, 111 |
| Mīmāṃsāmaharāṇava | 94, 125, 136, 141, 151 | ôtika | 74 |
| Mithyātvanirukti | 197 | uddyota | 70f |
| Mokṣākara Gupta | 18, 29 | Nirmayakāra | 175 |
| Mookerjee’s Magazine | 99 | Notices (H. P. Sastri) | 137, 166, 189 |
| Murāri Miśra | 68, 92, 114, 141, 146 | Nṛga | 24 |
| Muktavalī | 105, 202 | Nrṣīṁhayājvan | 82 |
| Mukunda Ṭhākur | 201 | Nyāsa (cf. Kaśikāvivaraṇa-panjika) | 30, 176 |
| Nag-tsho | 53 | Nyāya | 187, 190, 193 |
| Naiṣadha(carita) | 42, 46f, 49f | Nyāya-bhāskarakāra | 94 |
| ôtika | 49 | Nyāyabhaṣya | 147, 198, 205 |
| Nandana | 92 | oḥṣyaṭīka | 16 |
| Nāṇḍīlya Gopa | 32, 68 | oḥuṣaṇa | 29, 35f, 57 |
| Nāṇvādaṭīka | 131 | Nyāyācārya | 3, 151 |
| Nānyadeva | 59f | Nyāyacintāmaṇi | 86 |
| Narahari | 86,113,122-125,155, 157,159,164,166,171,181,184 | odarśana | 1, 20 |
| | | oḍīpa | 160 |
| | | okanḍali | 8 |
Nyāyakaṇṭhikā 11, 17, 22f, 25-7
°kusumāṇjali 3
°alamkara 2n, 43, 43n
Nyāyālamkaraṇa (Bhāsārvajña) 16, 36
Nyāyalilāvati (also Lilāvati) 32, 55f, 118, 153, 173
°darpana 166
°locaṇa 115, 141
Nyāyalocanakāra(kṛt) 114f, 145
Nyāya-mahāraṇava 177
°maṇjarī (of Jayanta) 17, 34
°muktāvali 2, 59
°muktāvalidarpana 166
°nibandhaprakāśa 77, 110f
°pāriśīṣṭa 3, 34, 87, 110, 172
°pāriśīṣṭapraṇakāśa 110
°pāriṣuddhi 38
°prakīrtaka 16
°rahasya 69, 130, 146
°ratna 77, 82-6, 148, 150, 150n
°ratnākara 67f
°ratnaprakāśa 147f, 150
°sāra 16, 35f
°sāravicāra 16, 36
°siddhāntadīpā 87, 94, 182, 185
°siddhāntamaṇjarī 64, 130
Nyāyasiddhāntatattva 197
°sucinibandha 29, 52, 147
°sūtra 3, 61, 69, 144, 146f, 186
°sūtravivarana 110
°sūtravṛtti 146f
°sūtroddhāra 147
°tattvāloka 144, 144n
°vārtika 6, 198
°vārtikatātparyaparinsūddhi 3, 110
Padamaṇjarī 118
Padārthapravēsa 55, 141
°tattvaśīkā 131
Padavākyaratānākara 197f
Padmanābha Miśra 10, 45, 57f, 68, 111, 122f, 127-9
Pag. Sam. 26
Pakṣadhara 72, 75f, 93f, 115f, 118f, 121, 128, 133, 153, 163, 166, 169
Pakṣadhara (Dravya-) 117
Pakṣadharaśodhāra 122f, 128
Pakṣadharpādhyāya 82, 118, 165
Pakṣatā 205
Paṅcadaśī 44
Paṅcamāṭikā 117
Paṅcikākāra (cf. Sālikanātha) 35
Paṅditavijaya 134
Pāṇini 30, 197
Prabodhasiddhi 3
Pragalbhācārya 45, 69, 71, 74,
78, 85, 93f, 108, 127,
138f, 153-6, 160-2, 179
Pragalbhā 165
(Pratyaka°) 94, 155n
Prajñākara 31f, 37, 145
Prakaranāpanīcīkā 35, 67
Prakāśa 59, 137, 166, 172,
198, 201
makaranda 133
Prakāśikā (of Bhagiratha) 172
Pramāṇa-maṇjarī 56
pallava 119
pārāyaṇa (of Śālika-nātha 125
prakāśa 84
samuccaya 31
uddyoṭa 70
vartikālaṁkāra 31
Prameyanibandhaprakāśa 110,
118, 145
Prasannarāghava 124, 127
Prasanna Tarkaratna 201
Prāṣastapāda 5, 35, 58, 141
Prāṣastapādabhāṣya 4,7f,34,55
Pratyagrupa 60
Pratyakṣa (cintāmaṇi) 61, 63,
77, 94, 123, 198
alośa 119, 125, 127,
133, 159n
alośākṣaraṇaṇjari 154,
164, 198
alośadipīka 165
Raghupati 169
Rājakulapāda 18
Rājanītiratnākara 103
Rājaśekhara 8, 8n, 47, 55
Rājasūtra 72
Rājatarangini 31
Rāmabhadrā Sārvabhauma 69,
72, 130, 133, 146
Rāmabhadrī 130f, 133
Rāmadāsa Upādhyāya 173
R(amānāthā) Jhā 124n, 169n,
194n
Rāmanāthā Tarkaratna 171
Rāmānuja school 38
Rāmarāja 178-80
Rāmesvara 24
Bhaṭṭa 173
Rasāṃava 134
Rasāśā 34, 55, 60, 101
Ratnākara 103
Ratnakīrti 11, 11n, 15-17,
17n, 18, 28, 33, 36,
41, 53, 106
Ratnakīrtinibandhāvalī 11n,18,
18n, 23n
Ratnakoṣa 76-79, 87, 141,
150f
Ratnakoṣakāra 76,78f,87,150n
Ratnakosavicāra 76
Ratnapāṇi Jhā 203
Ravinātha 163, 169
Raviśvara 94
Rāyamukuta 92
Rddhinātha Jhā 201
Reṇukakārikā 118
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report: Bhandarkara</th>
<th>47n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>: Peterson</td>
<td>8n, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rjuvimalā</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°pañcikā</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucīṭikā</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucidatta</td>
<td>65f, 77, 93, 97, 99, 108, 120, 126f, 133, 155, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudradhara Upādhyāya</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudra Nyāyavācaspati</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudra Tarkavāgīśa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūpanātha Ṭhakkura</td>
<td>199-201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śabara</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śabda (cintāmaṇī)</td>
<td>80f, 94, 106, 108f, 121, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°āloka</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°ālokhaviveka</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°ālokoddyota</td>
<td>67, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Gopīnātha</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°kalpadruma</td>
<td>24, 122, 160, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°māla</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°maniparīkṣā</td>
<td>66f, 95, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°manipraṅkāśa</td>
<td>66, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°nirṇaya</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Pragalbhi</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°saktipraṅkāśika</td>
<td>68, 198f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Tvanta</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saccaritamāṁsā</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣaḍḍarśanasamuccayavṛtti</td>
<td>43n, 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahasrādhikarana</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sākārasaṅgrahaśāstra</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°siddhi</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śākhāpanī</td>
<td>97, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaktivāda</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śālikanātha (See Pañcikākāra also)</td>
<td>26f, 32-5, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śālivāhana</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāmānyanirukti</td>
<td>200, 205n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samayapradīpa</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°pradīpājñānoddhāra</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°rahasya</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śānātani</td>
<td>19f, 141, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṅkara</td>
<td>34, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṅkara bhāṣya</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṅkara Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>173f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Ācārya</td>
<td>27, 33, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Ācārya (Vedāntin)</td>
<td>35, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Mīśra</td>
<td>2n, 3, 10f, 14, 19, 43, 45, 59, 68, 70, 72, 79, 85, 91, 109, 113-5, 125, 130-43, 151f, 157, 162f, 166, 172, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°(Naiyāyika)</td>
<td>16, 29, 33f, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Śvāmin</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṅkara</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°(on Khaṇḍana)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṅkhya</td>
<td>27, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅkhya-parimāṇam</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅkhyasāra</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°sūtra</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāntagopāla Jhā</td>
<td>197n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saptapadārthī</td>
<td>61-3, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°padārthacandrikā</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarabha</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarayantra</td>
<td>194n, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°yantrî</td>
<td>193, 194n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārvabhauma</td>
<td>41, 67, 73, 80f, 83,85, 115,152, 156, 161f, 168, 178f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarvadeva</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarvajña</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°nārāyaṇa</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarvajñasiddhi</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarvaśabdābhāvacarca</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaśadharācārya</td>
<td>87, 89f, 94, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaśadharavyākhya(Pakṣadhara)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaśinātha Jhā</td>
<td>205n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaśtri H.P. 100, 137, 150, 157, 166, 176, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satpratipakṣa</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saugata</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sautrāntika</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savyabhicāra</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāyana</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiefner</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šeṣānanta</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šeṣaśārṅgadharā</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setuṭikā</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhāṅjana</td>
<td>127f, 182f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhāntalakṣaṇa</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°kaumudi (Devanātha)</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°rahasya</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°sāra</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°tattva</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°tattvaviveka</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siddharāja</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siṅghana</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siṅha-vyāghri</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinha S. N.</td>
<td>1n, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiromaṇi 80,87,105,116,125f, 152, 155f, 160, 162, 168, 176, 178f, 184, 196, 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivacandra Sārvabhauma</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivāditya Miśra 3, 40, 56, 61-4, 78,146,90,167,199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivapati</td>
<td>159f, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivaśaktisiddhi</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivasiṅha</td>
<td>169, 169n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ślokavārtika</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smṛti-kaumudi</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°mahārṇava</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°paribhāṣā</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°sudhākara</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sondaḍopādhyāya 80-2, 85, 146, 199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphūrti</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrāddhakalpa 129, 143, 156 °pallava</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°pradīpa</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīdatta</td>
<td>177, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīdhārācārya 8, 8n, 9-13, 27f, 31, 55, 66, 167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīhari</td>
<td>157, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīharṣa 12, 38, 41-51, 54, 60, 64, 84, 102, 139, 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīharṣadeva</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīhīra</td>
<td>49-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīkānṭha</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīkara</td>
<td>67, 92, 97, 183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Śrivallabhācārya 55-61, 64, 75f, 90, 123, 142
Srīvatsa 20-2, 29, 49
Srīvatseśvara 49
Stcherbatsky 25
Stein 136, 138
Sthairyavicāra 47f
Sthīrasiddhi 33f
°duṣaṇa 33, 106
Suali 99
S(subhadra) Jhā 158
Subhūti 30
Subodha 200f
Sucarita Miśra 11, 11n
Sucikara Upādhyāya 126, 157, 173, 173n
Śuddhibimba 166
Sulocanāmādhava 204
Sum po 54n
Sundara Ṭhākura 173
Surapati 169, 169n
Surendralal Tarkatīrtha 110
Sureśvara 186
Sūtrakāra 20, 22, 56
Tandibrāhmaṇa 145
Tāntrakaumudī 189-91
Tantravārtika 77
Tāranātha 26, 54n
Taraṇī Miśra 76-9, 101, 145, 150
Tārāpati 202
Tarka 191
Tarkabhaṣa (of Mokṣākara) 18
°(of Keśava) 29, 42, 64f, 102, 111
°prakāśika 34

Tarka-prakāśa 111
°saṅgraha 13
°tāṇḍava 39, 102, 160
°(of Keśava) 188
Tārkikacuḍamaṇi 176
Tarkikaraṅka 3, 50, 71
Ṭātparyācārya 22, 58, 58n, 151
Ṭātparya(pari)śuddhi 37f, 57
Ṭātparyatīkā 5, 7, 11, 16, 19, 21f, 24, 28f, 33, 46, 57f, 146, 198, 205
Tattvabindu 22
°bodha 19, 63, 102, 111, 151
°cintāmaṇi (Cintāmaṇi & Mani also)
°śānti 72, 94, 96, 104, 108, 111, 116f, 120, 128-130, 150, 150n, 151-2, 159, 164, 176
°śuddhi 197
Tattvacintāmaṇikāra 98
Tattvadīpī 194n
°kaumudi 28, 57
°āloka 68, 70, 78, 81, 115, 129, 144n, 146, 149, 151
°nirmaya 82, 121, 165
°pradipikā 62
°samīkṣā 22
Ṭīkā (Ṭātparya-) 15, 60, 151
Ṭīkā (Kirāṇāvali-) 57
Ṭīkākāra 22, 145
Ṭippanaka (of Śrīkanṭha) 43
Tīhittattvacintāmaṇi 175
Tridandaṃtabhāṣyakāra 35
Trilocana 6, 16, 23, 28f, 33, 36f
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tripādīnītinirṇaya</th>
<th>92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trīṣūṭrī-nibandhavyākhyā</td>
<td>137, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°tattvabodha</td>
<td>78, 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trītalāvacchedakatavāda</td>
<td>205n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautāṭika</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tvantopādhyāya</td>
<td>72, 128-30, 133f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayabhadra</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayanācārya</td>
<td>1-11, 11n, 12, 14-5, 18, 20-2, 29, 31, 35, 37f, 40-5, 50-2, 54, 56-66, 69, 72, 74, 84, 87, 91, 93f, 97, 102, 108, 110, 123, 137, 145, 161f, 166f, 201f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayanacarita</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uddyota (on Nibandha of Divākara)</td>
<td>70, 72, 118, 137, 145, 166, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uddyotakāra</td>
<td>23, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umāpati</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umesha Miśra</td>
<td>67f, 197n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upādhidarpaṇa</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°vārtika</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upamāna(-cintāmaṇi)</td>
<td>75, 97, 108, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°saṅgraha</td>
<td>74, 108, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaskāra (Vaišeṣikasūtra-)</td>
<td>59, 91, 113, 131, 141f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upāyakāraka</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vācaspati I 5, 11f, 16-23, 23n, 24, 24-9, 31, 33-38, 46, 52, 57f, 81, 87, 146f, 153, 158, 205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vācaspati II 2n, 11, 19, 45, 68, 70, 77-9, 85f, 98f, 109, 111, 137, 143, 145f, 149-56, 162, 181, 194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccumā Jhā (Dharmadatta)</td>
<td>203, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vādanyāya</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vādiviśvara</td>
<td>56, 64, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāḍindra</td>
<td>8f, 55, 60, 62, 64, 101f, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vādivinoda</td>
<td>19, 68, 79, 86, 113, 115, 131, 134f, 137, 140-2, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāgīśa</td>
<td>198, 202f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaibhāṣika</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśeṣika</td>
<td>2, 176, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśeṣikadarśana</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°sūtra</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°sutravṛtti</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaivasvatasiddhānta</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°sāra</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vākyapadiya</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallabhācārya</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmadeva Upādhyāya</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmana</td>
<td>30f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmanavṛtti</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanapāla</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaṅge Navyanyāyacarca</td>
<td>8n, 104n, 114, 126, 130, 152, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varadarāja</td>
<td>35, 102, 134, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varadaviśnumiśra</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardhamāna (author of Gaṇapratnamahodadhi)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardhamāna (Navya)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 9f, 12, 16, 19f, 34f, 40, 45, 56, 58-61, 63, 65, 68-70, 72, 74-8, 84f, 92-4, 97f, 100, 102, 104, 109-12, 114, 117, 123, 129, 133f, 137, 139, 142f, 145, 151, 160, 198, 205</td>
<td>Vārṣagānīya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 16, 23</td>
<td>Vārtika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Vāsavadattā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Vasubandhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, 119, 123f, 126</td>
<td>Vāsudeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66, 70, 83, 126, 151, 155</td>
<td>Sārvabhauma (see Sārvabhauma also)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 94, 118, 120f, 125, 136, 146, 151, 163-9, 169n, 170, 177, 101, 104, 113, 164</td>
<td>Vaṭeśvara (Upādhyāya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197n</td>
<td>Vecana Jhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Veda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 35, 41, 151, 171, 173, 177, 187, 190, 193, 204</td>
<td>Vedānta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Vedāntatīrtha, N.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Veṅkatanātha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Vedānta school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Venis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Vibhaktyarthanirṇaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 27</td>
<td>Vidhiviveka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vidyābhūṣana, S.C. In, 5n, 6, 15, 26, 31f, 53n, 54n, 89, 96, 99, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66, 80, 85, 87, 114</td>
<td>Vidyānivāsa Bhaṭṭācārya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42, 59</td>
<td>Vidyāpati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Vidyāpatigītasaṅgrahā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Vidyāraṇya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Vidyāśāgara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 91</td>
<td>Vidyāśāgara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47, 49</td>
<td>Vijayacandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Vijayapraśasti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Vijayasena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Vilāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Vilāsakāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Viśālāmalavatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Viśnupuriṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169n</td>
<td>Viśnupuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Viśuddhānand Sarasvatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187f</td>
<td>Viśvedhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66, 102</td>
<td>Viśvakarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163, 169, 186, 188</td>
<td>Viśvanātha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 201-3</td>
<td>Viśha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45, 146f</td>
<td>Viścānana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Viśṭhīla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Viśvarūpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Viśveśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67, 92, 151</td>
<td>Viśvarāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Viśvaranakāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Viśvaranapāṇjikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Vivecana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67f, 119</td>
<td>Viveka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-21</td>
<td>Vivekakāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Vīrti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Vṛtti (Kaśikā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Vyākaraṇasiddhānta- suddhānīdhī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vyaktiviveka 46 | Vyomavati 8, 10-3, 58, 140
Vyāpticārā 14 | Weber 99
Vyāptiniranyā 14 | Wilson 24
Vyāptipānca 204 | Yadunātha Sārvabhauma 197n
Vyāpyanugama 205 | Yajñapati 80f, 85f, 122f, 126,
Vyavahāracintāmaṇi 129 | 135, 154-56, 158f, 161,
Vyāsatīrtha 39, 102, 116 | 163, 165, 169, 171, 184
Vyomaśīkhācārya 12n | Yajñēśvara 167
Vyomaśivācārya 11f, 12n, | Yoginīmāya 14
13, 58 | Yuktidīpikā 28

Errata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>line</th>
<th>for</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>प्रस्तुत्वाच्छचिद्धालिनी</td>
<td>प्रस्तुत्वाच्छचिद्धिलास</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Udyota</td>
<td>Uddyota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>व्याघिकरणं</td>
<td>व्याघिकरणं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lecunas</td>
<td>lacunas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>exactly</td>
<td>exactly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jaṭeśvara</td>
<td>Vaṭeśvāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pkṣadharoddhāra</td>
<td>Pkṣadharoddhāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vṛitti</td>
<td>Vṛitti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yejñapati</td>
<td>Yajñapati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>quarrel</td>
<td>quarrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>महत्तकं</td>
<td>महत्तकं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gurukarana</td>
<td>Gurucarana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mahomedan(?)</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a few cases ‘ch’ has inadvertently been used instead of ‘c’ for चlah
MITHILA INSTITUTE SERIES

A. Works of Ancient writers critically edited
   with Introductions etc.

1. Tattvacintāmaṇi : Neo-logic, by Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya with
   Āloka of Jayadeva and Darpaṇa of Maheśa Thakur ; edited by
   Dr. Umesha Miśra (Vol. I, pt. I), 1957, Rs. 12.00

2. Kāvyaparīkṣā : Rhetorics, by Śrīvatsalānchana Bhaṭṭācārya,
   edited for the first time by Dr. P. L. Vaidya, 1956, Rs. 8.00

3. Pārijātaharana : Epic poem, by Kavikarṇapūra edited for
   the first time by Prof. Anantalal Thakur, 1956, Rs. 8.00

4. Kāvyalakṣaṇaratnaśri : Rhetorics, by Ratnaśrīrāṇya of
   Ceylon (on the Kāvyādarṣa of Daṇḍin) edited for the first
   time by Prof. Anantalal Thakur & Prof. Upendra Jha, 1957,
   Rs. 15.00

5. Vaiśeṣikadarśana : with an old and anonymous commentary,
   edited for the first time by Prof. Anantalal Thakur, 1957,
   Rs. 6.50

6. Abhijñānaśakuntalam : Drama, Maithil version with the
   commentaries of Śaṅkara and Narahari edited for the first time
   by Prof. Ramanath Jha 1957, Rs. 15.00

7. Āgamaḍambara : Drama of Jayanta Bhatta,
   In preparation

8. Lilāvatī with Vāsanā : Astronomy,
   In the Press

9. Viṣṇupurāṇa : critical edition,
   Undertaken
B. Works by Modern Sanskrit Scholars

1. Miscellaneous Writings of late Pandit Ramavatara Sharma
   Vol. I, 1956, Rs. 10.00

2. Trītalāvacchedakatāvāda: by Pandit Shashinath Jha, 1956,
   Rs. 4.50

3. Līṅgavacananvicāra: by the late Pandit Dinabandhu Jha,
   1954, Rs. 4.00

4. Vimandalavakravicāra: by Pandit Dayanath Jha, 1954,
   Rs. 2.00

C. Studies in English

1. History of Mithilā: by Dr. Upendra Thakur, 1956,
   Rs. 17.50

2. Vācaspati Miśra on Advaita Vedānta: by Dr. S. S. Hasurkar,
   In the Press

3. History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā: by Prof. Dineshchandra Bhattacharya, 1958,
   Rs. 13.50

N.B.—Copies of these publications, postage paid can be had of the
   Director, Mithila Institute, Darbhanga, on payment of price
   marked either by M. O. or Postal Order or Cash.
"A book that is shut is but a block."
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