CONTRIBUTION OF JAINA WRITERS TO THE NYĀYA-VAIŚEṢIKA LITERATURE

J. N. JAITLEY

Historical Position of Jainism:

All the existing Indian philosophical systems excepting the Cārvāka have their close connection with the chief ancient religions of India, viz. Brāhmaṇa or Vedic, Jaina and Buddha. When we examine the literary work of these three religions we find that Ācāryas of these different religions studied the works of other religions. Their study of other systems is generally shown, when they have to refute the rival schools in their dialectical works. It is, however, not usual to find a scholar following one religion writing a work independently or in the form of a commentary on the tenets of other religions. There are however a few exceptions. For example, Durveka Miśra and Arcaṭa, though followers of Brāhmaṇism, wrote commentaries on the Hetubindu of Dharmakīrti, a famous Buddhist logician. The Jainācāryas provide, however, more examples of this type of activity. They have contributed in the form of commentaries to the secular as well as non-secular works of the other two religions. In this dissertation I propose to study the contribution of Jainācāryas to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature.

At the outset one is tempted to ask the question as to why the Jainācāryas should have gone out of their way to contribute to the literature of other schools. In order to understand this problem it is necessary to trace the historical position of Jainism in the main current of Indian culture.

Jainism as a sect is supposed to have had its historical existence from the time of Mahāvīra, the twentyfourth Tīrthaṅkara of Jainas. Some scholars take it as far back as Pārśvanātha, the twentythird Tīrthaṅkara, who is generally placed in the 8th Century B.C.

In the history of Indian culture Jainas and Buddhists are known as Śramaṇas. A sort of antagonism between Śramaṇas and Brāhmaṇas appears to have become part of the old tradition. The compound श्रमण ब्राह्मण according to the Pāṇini rule⁴ वेयां c विरोधः शास्त्रविदः is a clear indication of the same.

This item of our tradition requires some close consideration. For this purpose it would be interesting to note the rise of Śramaṇa sects in

---

⁴ Pātañjala Mahābhāṣya, P. 539,
their early relation to Brāhmaṇical schools as well as the historical developments of their churches. I shall limit myself to Jainas though the general problem of the rise of Śrāmaṇas pertains to all the Śramaṇa sects.

The Sūtrakṛtāṅga¹ of Jainas and the Brahmajāla-Sutta² of Baudhāyas refer to a great number of sects other than their own. Some of these may be Vedic while the others are non-Vedic and Śramaṇa. Of these sects the historicity of the three Śramaṇa sects, viz. those of Jainas, Baudhāyas and Ājīvakas is generally accepted by the scholars.

There is however a controversy about the origin of these Śramaṇa sects. The older view is that these Śramaṇa sects were more or less so many protests against the orthodox Vedic cult. The strongest argument in favour of this view is that our oldest extant literature comprises Vedas including Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads. The canonical works of Jainas and Baudhāyas are much later and assume the existence of the Vedas and Vedism. Naturally therefore one becomes inclined to regard these sects represented by later literature as in some way related to the older Vedism.

However, a more critical and thorough examination of the Vedic as well as of Śramaṇa sacred texts has given birth to the hypothesis of the independent origin of these Śramaṇa sects. Not only that, but this study has also suggested the possibility of some of the Vedic sects like Śivism, schools like Sāṃkhya-Yoga and some of the Bhakti cults being non-Vedic in origin. The bases of this hypothesis are the latest archaeo-

---

¹ Sut. refers to the creeds prevalent in the time of Māhāvīra. They are (1) किर्मिवाद, (2) अक्षिक्यवाद, (3) अज्ञातवाद and (4) विनयवाद. The same Sut. states that these four great creeds comprise 363 schools. Vide Sut. I-xii-1 also cf. Sth. 4-4-35, Bhag. 30-1-825, Uttar, 18-23 and Nāndi 47.

² BJS. in DN enumerates 62 schools under the chief eight heads viz. (1) सर्स्तवादिन्, (2) एकज्ञसस्तस्तित, (3) अन्तानस्तित, (4) अमरविषेक, (5) अधिभवसस्तस्तित, (6) उदमानस्तित, (7) उच्छवादिन्त and (8) रिद्वघ्नमनि-स्वास्वादिन्त DN 1-12-39, also cf. Svt. 1-2. It enumerates (1) कालवाद, (2) स्वभाववाद, (3) नियतिवाद, (4) यदुच्छवाद, (5) सूतवाद, (6) पृष्टवाद, and (7) ईश्वरवाद. It should be noted that according to the works of the Jaina canon referred to all the five Vādas excepting यदुच्छवाद and सूतवाद come under the head of किर्मिवाद while except सूतवाद all the six come under the head of अक्षिक्यवाद. For the detailed study vide SSJL by A. C. Sen.
logical researches, philological findings and also the literary evidences. Let us briefly review these different sources of the history.

The archaeological researches have now definitely proved the existence of a highly developed culture with which the one reflected in Vedas and Brähmanaś looks rural if not primitive. We may refer to the City culture of the Indus Valley Civilization.¹ The existence of the images of Proto-Śiva and Śakti in the monuments at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa points in the direction of the image-worship which was later on accepted by all Indian sects. It should be noted here that in the Vedas there is very little evidence of the cult of image-worship.

Similarly philologists have now shown that the Sanskrit language that was codified by Pāṇini was not the pure Aryan Vedic language. Many non-Vedic words current in the languages of the different regions of this country were absorbed in Sanskrit language with the assimilation of the different non-Vedic cults into Vedic cult. Here we are concerned with the word Pūjana² used in the sense of worship. The Vedic Aryans used the word Yajana in the sense of their daily sacrificial worship. They had no concern with image-worship. The word Pūjana indicates quite a different mode of worship which must have been then prevalent among the peoples of non-Vedic civilisation. It must have involved some sort of image-worship. With the assimilation of this image-worship, the word Pūjana also must have been assimilated in the language of the Aryans. In later times not only did Pūjana become popular and was a more prevalent form of worship among all the classes of people but even in pure Yajana of sacrifices image-worship was brought in one form or another. For example, the Pūjana of Gaṇapati acquired its priority in every type of Yajana.

D. R. Bhandārkar³ deals with the problem of non-Vedic sects in some detail in his “Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture”. In this work, he draws upon archaeological research as well as literary works like Vedas, Brähmanaś, Śūtras, Piṭakas and Āgamas. There he shows the origin of Śivism to lie in the non-Vedic Vṛtya cult. Similarly according to him Jainism and Buddhism have their origin in a Vṛṣala tribe. This tribe had its own independent civilization and stubbornly resisted the imposition of Brähmaṇic culture by the Āryans. This tribe chiefly resided in the south-east part of the country which is now known as Bihar and

² ‘Indo-Aryan and Hindi’ P. 64.
which is the birth-palace of Jainism and Buddhism. In fact he has ably discussed the relation of the non-Vedic cultures with that of Vedic ones and has shown how some of the non-Vedic cults like Yoga and others were assimilated in the Vedic cult.

The findings of D. R. Bhandarkar strengthen the older hypothesis of Winternitz pertaining to the independent origin of the Śramaṇa sects. Winternitz has discussed the problem in some detail in his lectures on ‘Ascetic Literature in Ancient India’. He has paid tributes to the scholars like Rhys Davids, E. Leumann and Richard Garbe who combated the older view of Vedic origin of the Śramaṇa sects. His chief grounds are the constant occurrences of the term Śramaṇa-Brähmana in Buddhist Piṭakas and Asoka’s inscriptions, as well as in legends, poetical maxims and parables found in the Mahābhārata as well as in Purāṇas. He closely examines the Piṭā-Putra Samvāda, Tulādhāra-Jājali Samvāda, Madhubindu parable and other such Samvādas and compares them with their different versions found in Jaina Āgamas and Buddhist Jātakas. Thus after examining thoroughly the different passages referring to Asceticism and showing their contrast with those referring to ritualism, he concludes “The origin of such ascetic poetry found in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas may have been either Buddhist or Jaina or the parallel passages may all go back to the same source of an ascetic literature that probably arose in connection with Yoga and Sāṅkhya teachings”. The Sāṅkhya and Yoga schools, as we have seen above might have been non-Vedic in origin. When some of the Vedic Brāhmaṇas were convinced of the Nivṛtti path or asceticism and left ritualism, the schools which accepted the authorities of Vedas and also the superiority of Brāhmaṇas by birth got slowly assimilated in the Vedic cult. Probably amongst Śramaṇa sects the Sāṅkhya was the first to accept the authority of the Vedas and the superiority of Brāhmaṇas by birth and perhaps this may be the reason why we find Sāṅkhya teachings reflected in early Upaniṣads.

Whatever may be the case, this brief survey points to one fact and that is that by the time of Mahāvīra and Buddha, the Śramaṇas were a powerful influence affecting the spiritual and ethical ideas of the people. By the process of assimilation the Nivṛtti outlook became a common ideal both among the thinkers of the earlier Upaniṣads as well as among the Śramaṇa thinkers. However, the Śramaṇa thinkers—Jainas and Baudhhas

---

1 ‘Some Problems of Indian Literature’, p. 21.
2 Ibid page 40.
rejected the authority of Vedas and the superiority of Brähmaṇas by birth. And their repugnance to animal-sacrifice as a form of worship made them socially distinct and proved an antagonistic force with which the powerful and well-established Vedic sects had to contend.

Here it may be noted that references in the earlier Buddhist Piṭakas and Jaina Āgamas as well as in Aśoka’s inscriptions to Śramaṇa-Brähmaṇa do not indicate any enmity but imply that both are regarded as respectable. It is only in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya which is later than Aśoka that we find the compound Śramaṇa-Brähmaṇem suggesting enmity. This may be the result of a contest of centuries between Śramaṇas and Brähmaṇas.

Whether we accept this protestant-theory of the origin and rise of the Śramaṇas or the theory of their independent pre-Vedic origin, one thing is clear that there was a great ferment of Śramaṇa-thought in or about the period of the earliest Upaniṣads and Āranyakas, i.e. about 800 B.C. As we have said above the history of Jaina church also does not start with Mahāvīra but it goes as far back as Pārśva, i.e. 800 B.C.

The Jaina Āgamas which are the earliest source for the life and teachings of Mahāvīra point to one fact very clearly and that is that the Jñātāputra Vardhamāna had to make his way through a crowd of Śramaṇa and Vedic “Titthiyas” or “Tirthikas”. Another point which becomes clear from Āgamas is that Vardhamāna’s method was to harmonize and assimilate as much of different contending sects as was consistent with his main ideal of Mokṣa. This peculiar trait of Mahāvīra’s method seems to be responsible for giving his school the name and character of Anekānta-vāda and Syādvaḍa. The essence of these Vādas lies in harmonizing the different ways of thought by regarding them as so many different points of viewing reality and grasping the truth. This character of Jainism explains why throughout its history it has always studied carefully the religio-philosophical ideas of other schools and developed the Anekānta doctrine in relation to the growth of various Darśanas.

Reflection of the thoughts of different contemporaneous sects in Jaina Āgamas:

As repeatedly said above the earliest source of Jaina history and religious thought lies in the Āgamas of Svetāmbara Jains. The Digambara Jains do not accept the present Jaina canon as genuine and therefore authentic. But the researches of the modern scholars like H. Jecobi and others have shown that these Āgamas represent more or less the earliest records of the teachings of Mahāvīra.
A careful study of Āgamas shows the reflection of the thoughts of the different contemporaneous sects. Let us take some of the passages on the point. The Sūtrakṛtāṅga is one of the earlier canonical works of Śvetāmbara Jainas. It refers to many different philosophical views prevalent in those days. Let us briefly review some of them.

Some say that this world consists of merely five elements. They are earth, water, fire, air and sky. They also explain that the soul is created out of these five elements and is destroyed with their destruction.

The commentator Śīlāṅka rightly attributes this view to the Cārvāka. It is well known that Cārvāka does not accept the independent existence of any soul from the body and looks upon it as the resultant of the combination of the five above stated elements.

(Some believe) that as though the earth is one yet is seen in different forms, similarly the whole of this world which is the form of Ātma is seen differently.

---

1 A. C. Sen attributes the view stated in verse No. 8 to तत्ज्ञव-तत्त्वार्थवादिन and criticising Jecobi states “Jecobi has linked this verse with the following one. This is not justified, for the latter refers to Vedānta.” His criticism is right as far as the latter verse No. 9 is concerned because it refers to Vedānta view. However verse No. 8 refers to the view of the Cārvāka school. The commentator Śīlāṅka is of the same opinion. The view of तत्ज्ञव-तत्त्वार्थवादिन is referred to in verse No. 11 and 12 of the same chapter, i.e. 1-1-1. The commentator Śīlāṅka commenting on them clearly states साम्वतः तत्ज्ञवतत्त्वार्थवादिदमत पूर्णप्रमाणितमाह. Even though the view of तत्ज्ञव-तत्त्वार्थवादिन does not differ much from that of the Cārvāka, still it should be noted that in verse No. 8 the view of तत्ज्ञव-तत्त्वार्थवादिन is not referred to. In fact verse No. 7 and No. 8 clearly go together and refer to the view of Cārvāka while verse No. 11 and No. 12 refer to तत्ज्ञव-तत्त्वार्थवादिन. For A. C. Sen’s criticism vide SSJL, page 19 foot-note No. 71.
The commentator Śīlāṅka attributes this view to Ātmādvaitavādins. It clearly refers to one of the Upaniṣadic views.

कुलं च कारं चेव, समवं कुलं न विन्जयं।
एवं अकारविद्या अन्य एवं तें उ परविभाग।। सू. १-१-१-१३

Some venture to say that the soul neither does any act himself nor does it do so through any agency. Thus he is non-door or Akartā.

Śīlāṅka states that this is the view of Sāṅkhya who believe that the soul is merely the witness of the act and not the agent.

Similarly he also attributes the view of Ātmaśaṣṭhavāda referred to in verse No. 15 to Sāṅkhya, who accept the authority of Vedas, and to Saivādhukārins.

Ātmaśaṣṭhavādins accept the existence of independent soul besides the five elements, viz. earth, water, fire, air and sky. The soul is eternal and independent. It is not born of the five elements as held by Čārvāka. The commentator Harṣakula mentions Vaiśeṣikas as the Ātmaśaṣṭhavādins. However the existing systems of Sāṅkhya and Vaiśeṣika accept more than these six elements. It seems that probably this view may refer to the older schools of Sāṅkhya and Vaiśeṣika types.

चे लघ वर्णेंगे वाला उ लघ जोड़ो।
अरण्णो अरण्णो घुंघरे माहें च अभृतर।। सू. १-१-१-१७

Some ignorant people say that there are merely five Skandhas having momentary existence. There is nothing like soul either different from these five Skandhas or produced from these Skandhas. There is no soul either born of some cause or born without any cause.

Śīlāṅka attributes this view to Baudhās. Similarly he also attributes the view referred to in the verse No. 18 to another school of Baudhās. This view holds that this world consists of four Dhātus, viz. earth, water, fire and air.

Similarly regarding the creation of the world the Sūt refers to Īśvara-kāraṇavāda and Prakṛti-kāraṇavāda in the following verse:

इशरेण कठे लोपं पहाण्ड तहांते।
जीवाधित समावेश सुप्रवुच्छ सहविभेध।। सू. १-२-३-६

According to Śīlāṅka, these Īśvarakāraṇavādins are Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas while Pradhāna is held as the cause of this world by the Sāṅkhya.
On the same line other Āgamas like Sthānāṅga, Bhagavatī, Uttarā-
dhyayana and others too refer to the view of the different schools and sects
prevalent in the days of their compilation.\(^1\) As for example Anuyogadvāra
refers to the different schools by their particular names as follows:—

कणमस्तरी वैसिस्यं वहसेसिस्यं हुध्यास्लणं काणिनं लोगान्तं सन्धि
त्वं मात्र पुराण वापरण नायथां.\(^2\)

The Nāndisūtra also refers to the same schools with the addition of Bhāgavayanam and Pāyaṇjalā, i.e. Bhāgavata and Pātañjala. Thus
later Āgamas clearly refer to Vaiśeṣika, Lokāyata, Kāpila and others.

Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Topics in the Āgama Literature:

The references given above are sufficiently indicative of the fact
that the Jainas from very early times kept themselves well-informed about
the schools of thought other than their own. Now let us see in more detail
their acquaintance with the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools of thought with
which we are here more directly concerned. The Sthānāṅga observes:—

अहवा हेतृ च वउविच्छेद पणन्ते, तं ज्ञाजा जावते, शावते, वंसते दृढःते;
अहवा हेतृ च वउविच्छेद पणन्ते, तं ज्ञाजा पर्वन्ते, अगुणामेण, अववभें अगमे;
अहवा हेतृ च वउविच्छेद पणन्ते तं ज्ञाजा अविचारं अविच चो हेतृ १, अविचारं
पार्थित सो हेतृ २, पार्थित्तं अविच सो हेतृ ३, पार्थित्तं मार्थित सो हेतृ ४. स्था. सू. ३३८.

The word Heu or Hetu is used here in three different senses. In the
first instance, the word Hetu means a reason or an argument. The Thāvate
or Sthāpaka is an argument whose aim is to establish a thesis, but the aim
of other Hetu viz. Jāvate, Vansate and Lūṣate or Yāpaka, Vyanasaka and
Lūṣaka is to defeat anyhow the opponent either by confusing him or by
silencing him.\(^3\) These Yāpaka, Vyanasaka and Lūṣaka may be compared
with the Aviññatārtha Nigrahasthāna, Aviññesasamā Jāti and Sāmānyacchala
respectively of Nyāyasūtra.\(^4\) Thāvate or Sthāpaka is a valid argument.
In the second instance, the word Hetu is used in the sense of Pramāṇa
and therefore they are identical with Pramāṇas of ‘Nyāyasūtra’, viz. Prat-
tyakṣa, Anumāṇa, Upamāṇa and Śabda.\(^5\) In the third case it is used

\(^1\) For the detailed study of the problem one may refer to SSJL by A. C. Sen


\(^3\) For detail vide DVN verse No. 86.

\(^4\) Vide NS 5-2-9 for Avijñā ārtha, 5-1-23 for Aviññesasamā and 1-2-13
for Sāmānyacchala.

\(^5\) Vide NS 1-1-3.
in the technical sense of Hetu in a Syllogism. The following table will give a comparative view of the Jaina and the Vaiśeṣika Hetus:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>नास्ताैज्ञ सूत्र</th>
<th>वैशेषिक सूत्र</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>हेतु—साध्य</td>
<td>संयोगी, समचायी, एकार्य समचायी ३-१-३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(१) विचि—विचि</td>
<td>and शून्य शून्यस्य ३-१-१३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(२) विचि—निवेचि</td>
<td>शून्यस्य शून्यस्य ३-१-१३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(३) निशेचि—विचि</td>
<td>अभूत शून्यस्य ३-१-११</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(४) निशेचि—निशेचि</td>
<td>कारणाभावात् कार्याभाव: १-२-१</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly Bhagavatī states:—

से किं तं परमाण? परमाण म्वयविहे पण्यते; तं जहा परमसे, अपुर्णाण, औषधम्भ, आगमे जहा अपुर्णवदारे तहा पण्यवर्त परमाण।

भगवती ५-३-१३ १-१२

Anuyogadvara also observes the same Pramāṇas as referred to by Bhagavatī. In addition to it, it also describes in detail the three types of Anumāna which are explained in Nyāyasūtra as Pūrvavat, Seṣavat and Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa. It observes:—

से किं तं अपुर्णाण? अपुर्णाण तिनिहे पण्यते तं जहा पुनर्वङ्क सेसवं विदुसाहस्वं 

अनु. पृ. २११।

Then further it describes each of these Anumānas one by one. Describing Puvvavam or Pūrvavat it states:—

माया पुरं जहा नदैः जुवाण युवाराग्व ।
काइ पुनर्वव जानज्ञा पुन्यनिहेजे केघ ।।

अनु. ४. २११-१२

A mother recognizes her lost young son on return with the help of some marks previously known. This is nothing else but Pratyabhijñāna of later writers.

Seṣavat is of five types. They are as follows:—

से किं तं सेसवं? सेसवं परसविहे पण्यतं; तं जहा (१) कारणेन, (२) कारणेन,
(३) गुणेण, (४) अवब्रेन, (५) आस एण, अनु. ६. २१२.

i.e. (1) to infer cause from effect, (2) effect from cause, (3) a substance from its quality, (4) a body from its limb and (5) a source of derivation from an object derived. Each of these types is illustrated by more than one example as follows:—

(१) संबं शंदे धेरि ताकिदे, वसं वकिकि, जोरं ज्ञिकादे हस्य हेसिए

and so on
(2) तत्वो पहस्त कारणः ण पड़ो तत्तु कारणः, बीरण कहस्त कारणः ण कड़ो बीरण कारणः, निर्मितो पहस्त कारणः ण घड़ो निर्मित कारणः।

(3) सुवर्ण निरक्षेण, पुरुष गंभेरः, घर्घः राजः, महं आसायणः, वर्त फाल्गः।

(4) महवं निगेयः, कुमुक्कु निगाणः, हल्ल्व विषाणः, वराहं दाष्टाः, मोरे विश्वेषे, आउ मुरणः वर्त नहः एव तथा so on.

(5) अण षुमेयः, सिजस बल्लाणः, बुद्ध ऑम्बविकारणः कुलुपती सीवसमायणः।

Drṣṭasādharmya or Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa is of two types, (1) Sāmānyadṛṣṭa and (2) Viṣeṣadṛṣṭa. Both are illustrated as follows:—

(1) से कि तां सामान्याविद्या ? जहा एगो परिसो तहा वहः परिसा, जहा वहः परिसा, तहा एगो परिसो। जहा एगो करिसावणो तहा वहः करिसावणा, जहा वहः करिसावणा तहा एगो करिसावणो। अन्य. पृ. २१४

This is a generalisation from one to many and many to one on the ground of similarity and therefore it is called Sāmānyadṛṣṭa or Drṣṭasādharmya.

(2) से ज्ञानार्थे केव परिसे किंच परिसं, बहुः परिसाण मजे पुलविद्या फच्छाणिणज्जा अवय से परिसे। बहूः करिसावणाण मजे पुलविद्या करिसावण पञ्जव- फच्छाणिणज्जा अवय से करिसावणे, अन्य पृ. २१५

This is a Pratyabhiṣēṇā or recognition of a particular from many which are similar and therefore it is called Viṣeṣadṛṣṭa Drṣṭasādharmya. This may be distinguished from Pratyabhiṣēṇā or Pūrvavat by the absence of any reference to similar things.

Comparing the above mentioned Anumānas with those in Nyāya-śāstra we find that the names of these three types are identical with those in Nyāyasūtras of Gautama. But the Sūtras neither explain nor illustrate them, so we cannot say whether there was any identity of explanation. The Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana explains and illustrates these three types in a different way, for example it explains Pūrvavat as follows:—

यत्र कारणे कार्यमनुमीयते, यथा:—नेवोजया भविष्यत वृद्धिरित। अथवा पूर्वविद्य यत्र यथा पूर्वः प्रत्यक्षमूलमौर्यात्मकतर्यक्षेत्रनामितोत्तरस्यअत्तत्त्वस्यायमां, यथा भूमेन- विनिरित। न्या. मा. १-६५.

Both these illustrations of Pūrvavat come under the head of Śeṣavat of Anuyoga—the former under the second type Kāraṇeṇa and the latter under the fifth type Āsaena or Aṣrayena. In the same way the explanation and illustration of Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa given by Vātsyāyana in his Bhāṣya
come under the third type of Ṣeṣavat Guṇānām because Bhāṣya infers soul from its quality like desire etc.¹

The two types of Dṛṣṭasādharmya as explained in Anuyoga repre-
sent respectively Upamāna and Pratyabhijñāna of Nyāyaśāstra.

As regards the categories, the Uttarādhyayanasūtra (28-5) enumerates three categories, viz. Dravya, Guṇa and Paryāya as the objects of know-
ledge. However in Vaiśeṣikasūtra too the term ‘Artha’ is applicable to only Dravya, Guṇa and Karma.² Anuyoga also refers to these categories.³

The definition of Paryāya, as given by Uttarādhyayana is also com-
parable with the division of Anekāśrita Guṇas by Praśastapāda. Uttarā-
dhyayana⁴ defines Paryāyas as follows:

एकलं च पुन: लं च संख्या संगठणमेव च ।
संयोगो विभागो विभागो व प्रज्ञावात्स तु लक्षणं ॥ २८-३॥

Praśastapāda enumerates the following quality as Anekāśrita Guṇas :—
संयोग-विभाग-द्वित-विभयक्ष्यायोजनकाचित्ता: ॥ प्र. मा. गुणनिर्वचन.

Following the Āgamas, the Niruytis and Bhāṣyas like those of Daśa-
vaikālikasūtra, Āvaśyakasūtra and other works also show continuous
familiarity with Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools of thought. The few references
given below will prove the same.

Ācārya Bhadrabāhu (300 B.C.) in his Daśavaikālikī-Niruykti dis-
cussing Anumāna enumerates the five Avayavas and two types of ten
Avayavas of an Anumāna.⁵ The five Avayavas, viz. Pratiṣṭhā, Hetu,
Bhāratī

Drṣṭānta, Upasamāhāra and Nigamana are identical with the similar five, viz. Pratijñā, Hetu, Udāharaṇa, Upanaya and Nigamana of Nyāya school\(^1\) and Pratijñā, Apadeśa, Nirdarsana, Anusandhāna and Pratyāmnāya of Vaiśeṣika school.\(^2\) However his enumeration of two types of ten Avayavas\(^3\) is different from the one given in Vātsyāyana Bhāṣya.\(^4\) Bhadrabāhu in his Niryuktī\(^5\) also states that in Vāda or debate merely Pratijñā and Udāharaṇa or Pratijñā, Hetu and Udāharaṇa are enough.

Even though the Āgamaś do not refer to any tradition about the origin of Vaiśeṣika school, Jinaḥhadraṇā Kṣamāśramaṇa (6th Cent. A.D.) in his Vaiśeṣāvaśyaśaka Bhāṣya gives an interesting tradition about it.\(^6\) According to this tradition, one Rohagupta or Rohagupta a pupil of Sirigutta or Śrī Gupta was the founder of Vaiśeṣika school. This Rohagupta was originally a Jaina monk but once he defeated a learned Jaina monk Pottasala who was very proud of his knowledge. Pottasala said that there were only two Rāśis, Jīva and Ajīva. Rohagupta to defeat him said that there were three Rāśis, Jīva, Ajīva and No-Jīva. As the examples of No-Jīva, he cited a cut-tail of a lizard and others; as examples of Jīva and Ajīva, all the living creatures and non-living thus like pots etc. respectively. These latter were in accordance with the Jaina view, but the example of the former was a fraud from the Jaina point of view. Therefore when Rohagupta informed his teacher about the defeat of Pottasala the teacher was not pleased with Rohagupta and asked him to go to the assembly and confess his fault and state that he accepted the third type only to defeat Pottasala. Thereupon he became angry and challenged his teacher. However he was defeated by his teacher after a long discussion of six months. But he retaliated by starting a new school. The Vaiśeṣāvaśyaśaka mentions the following as the tenets of this Nihavara or schism of Rohagupta:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{भू-जल-जलायनिव नह-काल-विसार्यम् मणो य द्वन्वाइः}
\text{मणांति नववाई सतरस गुणा य इमे अण्ये}
\text{हुप-रस-गत्व-फासा संवा-परिमाण-महुले च}
\text{संवीय-विभाग-धरापर्य भुती-भुहु-दुहर च}
\end{align*}\]

\(^1\) Vide NS 1-1-32.
\(^2\) Vide Pbh. p. 114r.
\(^3\) DVN verse No. 92-137.
\(^4\) Nbh. on NS 1-1-32.
\(^5\) DVN verse No. 49.
\(^6\) Vbh. verse No. 2951-2989.
\(^7\) Ibid verse No. 2990-93.
Contribution of Jaina Writers etc.

दच्छा-दोष-पयतना कथम् तत्वं च पंचत्रिंहः।
उक्सेयन-सक्सेयन पसारणा क्रुणवण गमणः॥
सत्स-सामण् पिय सामण् वितेसिया विदेसोऽव॥
समवायो न पप्लव्य छच्छातीसप्पोदा य व॥


(1) Ukhevaṇa-tossing up, (2) Akhevaṇa-tossing down, (3) Pasāraṇa-spread, (4) Ākuncaṇa-contraction and (5) Gamaṇa-gait are the five Karmas.

(1) Sattāśāmānyā-generality having two types.¹

(1) Viśeṣa-particularity and (1) Samavāya-inherence. These are the six categories with their thirtysix sub-divisions. The categories shown above are of Vaiśeṣika school.

This discussion based upon the references from the Āgamās, the earlier Niryuktis and Bhāṣyas clearly point to the fact that the Jainas continuously kept themselves familiar with the schools of thought other than their own. Their familiarity with Pramāṇas, Hetus, Avayavas and other topics of Nyāya school as well as with the Vaiśeṣika categories of Dravya, Guṇa, Karma, Śāmānyā, Viśeṣa and Samavāya became of great use to them in systematizing and putting their school of thought in line with Brāhmaṇical and Buddhist schools.

Jaina Dārśanikas showing the influence of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools:

Now we shall take up the works of a few prominent Jaina Dārśanikas in which the influence of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools of thought and literature is clearly seen.

¹ Dr. A. B. Dhruba also in his introduction of Syādvāda-Maṇjava (footnotes on p. XLV) quotes a passage showing three types of Śāmānyā which was also imported by Rohagupta, the founder of the sixth schism, into Jainism. In that passage opinion of someone is stated as follows:—

अनये तु उपचारते महासमार्थ इत्यत्वादि दामाश्चिर्विति: पृथिवीवत्तवदि।

According to Vaiśeṣika Śāmānyā is of two types, Para and Apara.
The Tattvārthasūtra by Umāsvāti (200-300 A.D.) is the first work in Sanskrit where all the principles of Jainism are embodied in Sūtra form. There is a Bhāṣya on these Sūtras which is also attributed to Umāsvāti. There has been some discussion about the authorship of this Bhāṣya but it is now accepted as Umāsvāti’s work by eminent scholars of Jainism like Pt. Sukhalalji.\(^1\) In these Sūtras we find the following parallels with the Vaiśeṣika school. Tattvārtha defines Dravya as गुणप्रवृत्तिः द्रव्यम् (५-१९) while Vaiśeṣika defines the same as क्रियागुणवद्वः द्रव्यम् (५-१८.) Tattvārtha defines Guṇa as द्रव्याध्यय निरुपनम्: गुणः (५-२०) while Vaiśeṣika defines it as द्रव्याध्यय गुणवान् (५-१६) Tattvārtha defines Kāla as वर्तना परिणामम्: क्रिया परत्वार्थचे च कालस्य (५-२२) while Vaiśeṣika defines it as अपरस्मितपरः विरितप्रभितिर्कालमित्वानिच (५-२६). Similarly the division on the basis of Sādharmya or similarity and Vaidharmya or dissimilarity of Pudgalas etc. shows the use of this peculiar method of Vaiśeṣikas by Umāsvāti. In his Bhāṣya establishing Nayavāda he shows the different views regarding the number of categories as follows:—

यथा सब्रकेकः सदविशेषम्। सर्वं द्वितं जीवाविशेषतमकत्वात्। सर्वं द्वितं हुण्यम् पर्यायायासरितवात्। सर्वं चतुर्वेयं चतुर्वेदनन्विपरीतवारितवात् एवं अन्यं (१-२९)

This passage when compared with the following passage of Nyāya-Bhāṣya will show Umāsvāti’s close familiarity with Nyāya-Bhāṣya. Enumerating Saṅkhyaśāntavādas, Vātsyāyana observes:—

सब्रकेकः सदविशेषम्। सर्वं द्वितं नित्याविशेषतमकत्वात्। सर्वं चतुर्वेयं चतुर्वेदनन्विपरीतवारितवात्। एवं यथा सम्भवमण्येजीतिः। यथा भाष. ५-१-४१

In the works of Kundakundācārya (about 2nd Cen. A.D.) who is one of the earliest Digambara writers on Jaina philosophy, we find the use of some peculiar technical Vaiśeṣika terms like Artha,\(^2\) Ayutasiddha,\(^3\) Mūrta and Amūrta,\(^4\) which leaves no doubt about Vaiśeṣika influence. Kundakundācārya in one of the verses of his Pravacanasāra observes:—

द्रव्याणं गुणं तेसि प्रत्ययं अतुस्मण्यं भविष्यति। (१-२६)

i.e. the term Artha is applicable to Dravya, Guṇa and Paryāya. He in his Pañcāstikāya states that Dravya and Guṇa both are Ayutasiddha or

---

1. TS (Gujarātī translation) introduction page 43.
3. Ibid 7-2-3.
4. Pbh. pp. 7-8 शिष्टि जक्ष्योपितिरितिमलनसं द्रव्यांमूःत्वपर्य्यापत्वेजगत्वात्म।
inseparable entities. Of course here he interprets the term Ayutasiddha\textsuperscript{1} to suit the Jaina point of view. He also accepts Asatkäravyavāda\textsuperscript{2} of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools of thought from the Paryāyārthika view point of Jainism. In showing the division of different substances on the basis of Sādharmyā and Vaidharmyā, though the Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra does not mention the ground of Mūrtatva and Amūrtatva, the Praśastapāda-Bhāṣya does so. As we have stated, Umāsvāti does adopt the method of Vaiśeṣika in showing the division between different substances. He considers the ground of Rupī and Arupī\textsuperscript{3} in that division. Kundakundācārya instead of Rupī and Arupī adopts the terms Mūrtī and Amūrtā\textsuperscript{4} of Praśastapāda. Thus the work of Umāsvāti and Kundakundācārya show an intimate knowledge of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika concepts and also adaptation of some terms to suit their needs.

After Umāsvāti and Kundakundācārya, both the sects of Jainism, Śvetāmbara and Digambara, have produced eminent Ācāryas in every century up to Upādhyāya Yaśovijaya (17th Cen. A.D.). As we are here mainly concerned with the contribution of Jaina writers to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature, we shall first take up only a few prominent Ācāryas by way of showing the influence of N-V. on Jain thought and then discuss in detail all the works so far known either in a printed form or in MSS dealing with N.V. proper.

\textit{Siddhasena Divākara (4th-5th cent. A.D.)}:\textsuperscript{5}

Let us first take Siddhasena Divākara of the Śvetāmbara sect. It is known that another word for Jainism is Anekāntavāda. This term Anekāntavāda as far as I know is not found in the earlier Āgamas. The idea of course was known to the early thinkers of Śramaṇa period, but the term that was more in vogue was Syādvāda. It was however after Siddhasena Divākara, the first systematizer of Jain logic, who put the doctrine of the Āgamas in a methodical form, that the term Anekāntavāda became more popular and in course of time became a synonym for Jainism. Siddhasena Divākara put forth two works—one in Prākṛta “Sanmati-Tarka-Prakaraṇa and the other in Sanskrit ‘Nyāyāvatārasūtra’. Besides these

\textsuperscript{1} Vide PK, verse No. 56.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid verse No. 60.
\textsuperscript{3} TS 5-3,4.
\textsuperscript{4} PK verse No. 104.
\textsuperscript{5} For the time of Siddhasena Divākara vide “Sri Siddhasena Divākara Samayano Praśna” (in Gujarati) by Pt. Sukhalālaji BV Vol. III, p. 152.
works he wrote 32 Dvātrimśikās or 32 treatises, each containing 32 verses. Out of these 32 Dvātrimśikās only 21 are available at present. In these Dvātrimśikā No. 12 deals with the Nyāya school while No. 14 with the Vaiśeṣika school. All these works show Divākara’s intellectual vigour and profound scholarship.

Now we find that in Nyāyasūtra and its Bhāṣya the term Ekānta¹ is used to suggest an extreme view which by that very reason is regarded as unacceptabe in them. The following passage of the Bhāṣya will show that Anekānta point of view was also known to the Nyāya school of thought.

ते खल्ले सज्जवैकाटा यदि विशेषकारित्यावर्त्तेत्वास्तापर्यय तत्त्वाच्यांते वर्तने प्रत्यक्षानुमानागमगतोपत्तिमित्यावता भवति । आयाभूस्यनेन वर्तने । समान- कार्तिकोर्धसङ्ग्रहो विशेषकारित्यावर्त्तेत्वेत्य इत्येवेकाटातत्तव जत्तिति । ते खल्ले तत्त्वान- प्रविद्यायार्यंकाटा: परीतितिता हति । न्य. सू. ⁴-१-८३

There are two other topics which may also be mentioned here.

The word Vibhajyavāda was also known in the sense of Syādvāda and Anekāntavāda to Indian philosophers. Siddhasena Divākara uses the word Bhayaṇā or Bhajaṇā² in the sense of Anekānta. Vātsyāyana in his Nyāya-Bhāṣya uses the word Vibhajya-Vacaniya³ in the sense of viewing an object from different view points.

Siddhasena Divākara in the Sanmāti-Tarka-Prakaraṇa enumerates the following six characteristics of the soul which are also worth comparing with those mentioned in the Nyāyasūtra⁴ and the Vaiśeṣikasūtra⁵.

अति आविष्कारसम्म बेत्र बेत्र अति निर्वाण ।
अति य गोक्षोवागो च सम्मतस्त ठाणाई ! ॥ २-३९ ॥

The points of similarity discussed above clearly point to the influence of the earlier Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika thought on Siddhasena Divākara. According to Jaina tradition, Siddhasena Divākara was a learned Brāhmaṇa Paṇḍita. He was converted to the faith of Jainism by Vṛddhavādi. In the light of this tradition we should not be, in any way surprised if he utilized his Brāhmaṇic learning for organizing and defending his new faith.

Ācārya Samantabhadrā (5th Cen. A.D.):

In the same age, the Digambara sect produced a great Ācārya in Samantabhadrā. Āptamāṁsā, Svayambhū-Stotra and Yuktyanuṣāsana

¹ NS 4-1-43 and also Nbhh on NS 4-1-29 and 4-1-34.
² Sanmāti 3-27.
³ Nbhh on NS 2-1-12.
⁴ NS 1-1-10.
⁵ VS 3-2-5.
are his important works. His Āptamīmāṃsā deals with Saptabhaṅgi on the Anekānta line. Applying Saptabhaṅgi Prakriyā, he refutes the views of different schools. In this connection the following verse of the Āpta-
mīmāṃsā is worth comparing with NS 4-1-43 which refutes the different Saṅkhyākāntavādās.

एकानेक विकल्पादा वृत्त्वावधि योजयेद् ।
प्रक्रियाम भूधिनीमान नवेत् नवशिष्यः ॥ बा. मी. का. २३

The verses No. 28, 37 and 41 of the same work are also worth comparing with NS 4-1-34, 4-1-29 and 4-1-25 which represent Sarvaprthaktva theory, Sarvanityatva theory and Sarva-Antityatva theory respectively. The following verse of the Āptamīmāṃsā shows that Samantabhadra adopted the terms Prāgabhāva and Pradhvansabhāva of the Vaiśeṣika school to suit the needs of Jaina philosophy. Refuting Bhavaikāntavādins, he states :

कार्य द्वयमन्दिर स्वातु प्रागामाख्यत्र निन्दने ।
प्रध्वर्तस्य च चर्माय च प्रत्येक नत्तां ब्रजेतु ॥ का. १०

Akalaṅkadeva and Ācārya Haribhadrasūri (7th-8th Cen. A.D.):

After Ācārya Samantabhadra, the Digambara-Ācārya Akalaṅkadeva and the Śvetāmbara-Ācārya Haribhadrasūri are in their respective sects well-known logicians. Akalaṅkadeva (7th Cen. A.D.) wrote a commentary Aṣṭādi on the Āptamīmāṃsā of Samantabhadra and a commentary, Tatvārtharājavārtika on the Tatvārthasūtra of Umāsvāti. But his independent contribution to Jaina logic lies in his three works, Laghīyastrayī, Nyāyaviniścaya and Pramāṇasaṅgraha popularly known as Akalaṅka-Grantha-Trayī. Of these three works his Nyāyaviniścaya is divided into three chapters, Pratyakṣa-Prastāvā, Anumāna-Prastāva and Pravacana-Prastāva. This type of division shows the influence of Tri-Pramāṇavadin on Akalaṅka. In the realm of Indian Darśanas, the Saṅkhya are known to have three Pramāṇas, viz., Pratyakṣa, Anumāna and Āgama; but Saṅkhyas are not generally drawn upon for the theory of Pramāṇas. The only other source which we can refer to, would be Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools. Though Nyāya school includes Upamāna and accepts four Pramāṇas, Vātsyāyana in his Nyāyasūtra Bhāṣya refuting different Saṅkhya theories states Pratyakṣāmānāmāmāyaṃtasya saṁyogānabhyāsāya bhavati ¹ and thus gives importance to three Pramāṇas. Kaṇāda in his Vaiśeṣikasūtra nowhere mentions the number of Pramāṇas. He however defines two Pramāṇas, Pratyakṣa and Anumāna, but mentions Śabda in an independent Śūtra

¹ Nbh. on NS 4-1-43.
Praśastapāda, however, discusses only two Pramāṇas including Śabda in Anumāna; but it appears that a commentator named Vyomaśīva and some followers of Kaṇāda seem to have interpreted his view as propounding three Pramāṇas. This becomes clear from the fact that Vyomaśīva in his Vyomavatī² clearly propounds three Pramāṇas, and also from the statement of Hemacandra in his Pramāṇamīmāṁsa³ that the Vaiśeṣikas are Tri-Pramāṇavādins.

Among Naiyāyikas, Bhāsarvajña in his Nyāyasāra⁴ recognizes three Pramāṇas. All this, as we have said above, shows that prior to Vyomaśīva there must have been an old tradition of Vaiśeṣikas professing three Pramāṇas. So we might conjecture that the above division of Akalanka’s work under the three Pramāṇa-Heads may be due to the influence of an old tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools professing three Pramāṇas. This has to be said because the Jaina tradition of Pramāṇas was different and he has not followed it in his dialectical method.

Before we come to Ācārya Haribhadraśūri (8th Cen. A.D.), a reference may be made to Ācārya Mallavādi (circa 6th Cen. A.D. approx.) the reputed author of Dvādaśāra or Nayacakravāla popularly known as Dvadaśāra-Nayacakra. The book would throw much light on the subject of our discussion as can be seen from the following passages of its commentary by Simhagani-Kṣamasramāṇa. The date of Simhagani-Kṣamasramāṇa is not yet finally settled but he is probably not later than Haribhadraśūri. Of the work Dvādaśāra only one verse has uptil now been discovered.

यत्‌तुष्टे हस्तक्षेपितः सत्त्वमभिधानः दीर्घयति दशिते [दशिते] इति सूत्रः कदन्यायायातः
‘सदस्तोवैविम्यादि’ (स्या. सू. ४९-५८) द्वारा. न. च. द्री. प. ६१०

¹ Sankara Miśra in his Upaskāra commenting on the Śūtra 2-1-17 states यस्मादिदेशोऽवैस्वर्गे नानुभूमित: तस्माद् वायुर्भिः नाम् आगमकम्। आगमो वेद:। तत: विचिन्मित्वं:।
Similarly commenting on Śūtra 3-2-8 he states आगममात्रसिद्धाचार्याः नाय मेघः:। द्वादशारयाबृद्धिः। यिद्विवि।
² Vide Vyoma. p. 578.
³ Vide PM, p. 7.
⁴ Vide Nyāyasāra, p. 2.
Kaṭāndī is the name of a commentary on Vaiśeṣika Śūtras. However this is altogether a new name. It should be noted that as shown above Simhagani also quotes Nyāya-Sūtras.

Here from the phrase Vaiśeṣika Śūtras we can say that there was a Vākyakāra, Bhāsyakāra and a Tikākāra. In short there must have been three types of commentaries on Vaiśeṣika Śūtras viz. Vākya, Bhāṣya and Tikā. Of these three Vākya is a new type not hitherto known. Bhāṣya may be probably a Bhāṣya on Vaiśeṣika Śūtras. As he quotes the opinion of Praśastamati separately, here Bhāṣya may mean perhaps some Bhāṣya other than that of Praśastapāda. Tikā means the Tikā Kaṭāndī which is referred to in the above quoted passage.¹

These passages are enough to show that Jaina logicians remained in close contact with the contemporary Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika literature.

Acārya Haribhadrasūri who is known as Yākinīmahattarā-Sūna was a prolific writer in the history of Jaina literature. His works also show his familiarity with Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools. In his Saḍdarśanasamuccaya, the first compendium of Vedic and non-Vedic Darśanas, he devotes one chapter to Nyāya and one to Vaiśeṣika schools. In his Sastrasvārta-samuccaya we find that he, after refuting Iśvarakṛtṛtva theory, makes peace with it by viewing a Tīrthaṇkara in the terms of Iśvara and Kartā.²

---

¹ The passages of Simhagani’s commentary are taken from the MS of the same which lies at present with Muni Sri Jambūvījayaśī, the learned Editor of Dvādaśāra.

² The following verses of Sastrasvārta-samuccaya shows his adaptation of the idea of Iśvaratva and Jagatkartrtvā:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ईश्वर:} & \quad \text{परमात्मीं तदुपर तत्त्व सेनानावः} \\
\text{यतो भूक्तसत्तसत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्सत्} & \quad \text{तदुपर तः संसारारूपि तत्त्व:} \\
\text{तेन तस्यापि कर्तुवच कल्याणान मुद्यते} & \quad \text{तत: केपांचिदवरः} \\
\text{कर्तारोमिति तदाध्यये यत: केपांचिदवरः} & \quad \text{अतत्त्वयुग्मप्रयोगं तत्व कर्तुवचनम्} \\
\text{परमेश्वरं सुकृतत्वानम् आर्थिक चेष्वरः} & \quad \text{स च कर्तारं निर्देशं कर्तुवचयो व्यवस्थितं} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Like Siddhasena Divākara, Ācārya Haribhadrasūri was also a learned Brāhmaṇa Paṇḍita before embracing Jainism and therefore probably felt some inner necessity of reconciling his former philosophical outlook with his new faith.\(^1\)

Vidyānanda (9th Cen. A.D.), Prabhācandra (9th/10th Cen. A.D.) and Abhayadevasūri (11th Cen. A.D.)

After Akalaṅkadeva, in Digambara sect there follow two logicians, Vidyānanda and Prabhācandra. Vidyānanda wrote a voluminous commentary, Aṣṭasāhasrī on the Āptamāṁśā of Samantabhadra, Prabhācandra wrote similar commentaries—Nyāyakumudacandra on Laghīyastraṇī of Akalaṅka and Prameyakamalamārtana on Parikṣāmukhasūtra of Māṇikyanandi. Abhayadevasūri of the Śvetāmbara sect wrote a very big commentary Tattvabodhavidhāyinī popularly known as Vāda-Mahārṇava on Sammati-Tarka-Prakaraṇa of Siddhasena Divākara. These Ācāryas exhibit in their works a mastery of style and exposition which shows their thorough study of works like Nyāya-Tītparyāti of Vācaspati Miśra. In fact Siddhasena Divākara and all the later Jaina logicians remained always familiar with the contemporary works of the different schools of Indian philosophy and to enunciate and establish their tenets on a logical basis, they studied Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools in particular. The stamp of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika logic will be clearly visible in the following passages of Aṣṭasāhasrī by Vidyānanda where he defines the terms Prāgabhāva and Pradhvansābhāva from the Jaina point of view:

\[ \text{Aṣṭasāhasrī} \]

\[ \text{Prabhācandra also defines the above terms as follows:} \]

\[ \text{नयता कार्यस्य विपक्षः स प्रधविभावं इ, प्रागन्तररिप्रणालविपक्षः मुद्रव्याख्यातं. प्र. क. मा. पृ. १२४} \]

\[ \text{The Tattvabodhavidhāyinī or Vāda-Mahārṇava of Abhayadevasūri is a veritable encyclopaedia of the Indian philosophical topics before the 11th Cen. A.D. This work shows Abhayadeva to be a great scholar of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika works along with his knowledge of other Darśanas.} \]

\(^1\) - for the list of Haribhadrasūri's works vide 'Jain Sahityano Itihāsa' (Gujarati) p. 159.
The following passages from an unknown work on the Vaiśeṣika school show his detailed study of the school.

यद्यपायमो विभूत्सारं कीर्तिचुरुपत्तमां। अवृत्ते स्वावस्यसंपर्के आश्रयायते कर्म आयते, एक्षण्यो सति किंवा सुधु गृहत्तवाद, यो ये स्वावस्यसंपर्के आश्रयायते कर्म आयते। न च चार्शिदिं किंवा सुधुपूर्णकं, अनेकसर्वत्वं व्यास्तित्वं संधानं कर्म देहकां तुषयार्थसंपर्के आश्रयायते कर्म आयते।

एक्षण्यो सति किंवा सुधुपूर्णकं व्यास्तित्वं संधानं कर्म देहकां तुषयार्थसंपर्के आश्रयायते कर्म आयते।

न च चार्शिदिं किंवा सुधुपूर्णकं, अनेकसर्वत्वं व्यास्तित्वं संधानं कर्म देहकां तुषयार्थसंपर्के आश्रयायते कर्म आयते।

This is clearly the view-point of the Vaiśeṣikas.

यद्यपायमो 'स्वावस्यसंपर्के आश्रयायते कर्म आयते। न च चार्शिदिं किंवा सुधुपूर्णकं व्यास्तित्वं संधानं कर्म देहकां तुषयार्थसंपर्के आश्रयायते कर्म आयते।

He, at various places, refers also to Nyāyaśūtra, Vaiśeṣikasūtra, their authors Aksapāda and Kaṇāda, Praśastamati, the author of Vaiśeṣikabhaṣya and many others.

Vādī Devasūri (11th-12th Cen. A.D.) abd Ācārya Hemacandra (12th Cen. A.D.)

After Abhayadevasūri we come to two great logicians of the Śvetāmbara sects, Devasūri and Ācārya Hemacandra. Devasūri got the epithet Vādī because he in an open debate held at the court of Siddharāja Jayasimha, a Solaṅkī king of Gujarāt, defeated a great dialectician named Kumudacandra of the Digambara sect. Vādī Devasūri’s Pramāṇanāyatattvālokālaṅkāra with his own commentary Śyādvādalakṣṇākara is an epoch-making work on Jain logic. The following passages from this work will show not only his detailed study of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools, but also his mastery over the dialectical method.
In the above cited passages, to prove that 'Tamas' or Darkness is an independent substance, he refutes Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika views. He quotes the views of different Naiyāyikas like Śaṅkara Miśra, Nyāyabhūṣanakārā, Kandalīkāra and Vyomśiva and then refutes them. His style of refutation resembles that of the famous logician Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, who while arguing ridicules the opponents.

Ācārya Hemacandraśūri, a Junior contemporary of Devaśūri, was a versatile genius. He left no branch of learning without his contribution and therefore he is known as Kalikālasarvajña. Anyayoga-Dvātriṁśikā and Pramāṇamīmāṁsā are his works on Jaina logic. Of these, Pramāṇamīmāṁsā is not available in its complete form. It consisted of six Adhyāyas but only two Adhyāyas are available. A passage from the available part is enough to show his deep study of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school and his scholarship.
Contribution of Jaina Writers etc.

While refuting the definition of Pratyakṣa given by the Naiyāyikas in the above passage, he draws our attention to the change in the interpretation of the Śūtra made by scholars like Trilocana and Vācaspatai Miśra. His method resembles that of the old Bhāṣyakāras like Vātsyāyana and others.

Mallīṣeṇasūri (13th Cen. A.D.):

Ācārya Mallīṣeṇasūri, the author of the famous treatise Syādvāda-maṇḍarī, a commentary on Anyayoga-Dvātrimśikā of Ācārya Hemacandra, was also a great logician of the 13th Cen. A.D. As usual, he also studied the different works of Indian philosophical systems. In his Syādvāda-maṇḍarī his detailed study of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika systems and their influence on his style are quite patent. The following passage will show the same:

Notwithstanding these, 'the interpretation of Śūtras, Śāstras, and Saṁhitās is based on the philosophy of Śāṅkara', that is, 'the Śvetāmbara view of the Śūtras' or 'the understanding of Śūtras by Śvetāmbara scholars'. This is one of the key points in the logic of Mallīṣeṇasūri.

From his style it becomes clear that he is influenced by Udayanacarya.

Upādhyāya Yaśovijayagani (17th Cen. A.D.)

After Mallīṣena, Upādhyāya Yaśovijayagani is a logician of eminence. Like Haribhadrasūri, he was also a prolific writer in the history of Jaina

---

For the list of the works and life of Upādhyāya Yaśovijayagani vide “Jaina Sahityano Itihāsa” p. 624-646.
literature. He fully digested the system of Navya-Nyāya which was propounded by Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya. In all his works of Jaina philosophy we see the stamp of Navya-Nyāya. The following passage from his Nyāyā-loka will bear this out:

यतृ नरसिंहाकारजने सामाज्यस्वयंस्वयमनvicयविद्वारीं स्वादिति ततृ
विषयविनिर्दृश्यं हि शान्त न तु विषयपरम्परा निहृप्तप्रियादिना मिश्रेनेव समाहितम्।
यतृ त्वस्विद्वेदने कृतिसमवाहिताविद्वारकहृदन्वादनवभास इत्युत्तरं, तत्विभ्रायापरिज्ञानात्।
आच्छाद्यस्वत्त्वप्रभुत्वस्य, विषयविनिर्दृश्यस्य सिद्धार्थविद्वारकहृदन्वास्य च दोषाकलक्षणकालबाह्य।
अवधिकविनिर्दृश्यां च व्यवसाययाबिद्वारें विशेषमेव प्रबर्तक्षयविद्वारकहृदन्वास्य।
इयुज्ञादक्षयविद्वारकहृदन्वास्य। न च यो यथायथमिति शान्तप्रवुत्स्यापिता,\nइयुज्ञादक्षयविद्वारकहृदन्वास्य।

स्वायालोक पृ. ६३।