

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 Bauddha. 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 ब्राह्मणम् according to the Pāṇini rule¹ येषां च विरोधः शास्वतिकः 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

¹ 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 Śramaṇas pertains to all the Śramaṇa sects.

The Sūtrakṛtāṅga¹ of Jainas and the Brāhmajāla-Sutta² of Bauddhas 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, Bauddhas 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 Bauddhas 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 Sāṅkhya-Yoga and some of the Bhakti cults being non-Vedic in origin. The bases of this hypothesis are the latest archaéo-

¹ Sut. refers to the creeds prevalent in the time of Mahāvīra, They are (1) क्रियावाद, (2) अक्रियावाद, (3) अज्ञानवाद 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) सस्सतवादिन्, (2) एकच्चसस्सतिक, (3) अन्तानन्तिक, (4) अमरविक्खेपक, (5) अधिच्चसमुप्पन्निक, (6) उद्धमाधनिक, (7) उच्छेदवादिन् and (8) दिट्ठधम्मनिस्वानवादिन् DN 1-12-39, also cf. Svt. 1-2. It enumerates (1) कालवाद, (2) स्वभाववाद, (3) नियतिवाद, (4) यदृच्छावाद, (5) भूतवाद, (6) पुरुषवाद, and (7) ईश्वरवाद It should be noted that according to the works of the Jaina canon referred to all the five Vādas excepting यदृच्छावाद and भूतवाद come under the head of क्रियावाद while except भूतवाद all the six come under the head of अक्रियावाद. 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 Brāhmaṇas 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 Āryans. 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, Brāhmaṇas, Sūtras, Piṭakas and Āgamas. There he shows the origin of Śivism to lie in the non-Vedic Vrātya 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 Brāhmaṇic culture by the Āryans. This tribe chiefly resided in the south-east part of the country which is now known as Bihar and

¹ 'Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Valley civilisation' by John Marshall.
Vide description of plate No. XII-17.

² 'Indo-Aryan and Hindi' P. 64.

³ 'Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture', pp. 40-52.

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'.¹ 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-Brāhmaṇa in Buddhist Piṭakas and Aśoka's inscriptions, as well as in legends, poetical maxims and parables found in the Mahābhārata as well as in Purāṇas. He closely examines the *Pitā-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".² 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 Nivṛttipara 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 Bauddhas

¹ 'Some Problems of Indian Literature', p. 21.

² Ibid page 40.

rejected the authority of Vedas and the superiority of Brāhmaṇas 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-Brāhmaṇa 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-Brāhmaṇam suggesting enmity. This may be the result of a contest of centuries between Śramaṇas and Brāhmaṇas.

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 Āraṇyakas, 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 "Tīrthikas". 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 Syādvāda. 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 Jainas. The Digambara Jainas do not accept the present Jaina canon as genuine and therefore authentic. But the researches of the modern scholars like H. Jacobi 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.

संति पंच महब्भूया इहमेगेसि माहिया ।

पुढवी आउ तेऊ वा वाउ आगासपंचमा ॥ सू. १-१-१-७

एए पंच महब्भूया तेभ्यो एगेति आहिया ।

अह तेसं विणासेणं विणासो होइ देहिणो ॥ सू. १-१-१-८.

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.¹ 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.

जहा य पुढवीथूमे, एगे नाणाहि दीसइ ।

एवं भो कसिणे लोए, विन्नू नाणाइ दीसइ ॥ सू. १-१-१-९.

(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 Ātmā is seen differently.

¹ A. C. Sen attributes the view stated in verse No. 8 to तज्जीव-तच्छरीर वादिन् and criticising Jacobi states "Jacobi 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 तज्जीव-तच्छरीरवादिन् 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 साम्प्रतं तज्जीवतच्छरीरवादिमतं पूर्वपक्षयितुमाह. Even though the view of तज्जीव तच्छरीरवादिन् does not differ much from that of the Cārvāka, still it should be noted that in verse No. 8 the view of तज्जीव-तच्छरीरवादिन् 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 तज्जीव-तच्छरीर वादिमत. 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.

कुर्व्वं च कारयं चेव, सव्वं कुर्व्वं न विज्जइ ।

एवं अकारओ अप्पा एवं ते उ पगम्भिआ ॥ 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 Sāṅkhyas 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 Sāṅkhyas, who accept the authority of Vedas, and to Śaivādhikārins.

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 Cārvāka. 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 खंधे वयंतेगे बाला उ खण जोइणो ।

अण्णो अण्णो णेवाहु हेउयं च अहेउयं ॥ 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 Bauddhas. Similarly he also attributes the view referred to in the verse No. 18 to another school of Bauddhas. This view holds that this world consists of four Dhātus, viz. earth, water, fire and air.

Similarly regarding the creation of the world the Sut. refers to Īśvara-kāraṇavāda and Prakṛtikāraṇavāda in the following verse :

ईसरेण कडे लोए पहाणाइ तहावरे ।

जीवाजीव समाउते सुखदुःख समन्निए ॥ सू. १-१-३-६

According to Śīlāṅka, these Īśvarakāraṇavādins are Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas while Pradhāna is held as the cause of this world by the Sāṅkhyas.

On the same line other Āgamas like Sthānāṅga, Bhagavati, 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 :—

कणगसत्तरी वेसियं वइसेसियं बुद्धसासणं काविलं लोगायतं सट्ठियन्तं माठर पुराण
वागरण नाउगाइ.²

The Nāndisūtra also refers to the same schools with the addition of Bhāgavayam and Pāyāñjala, i.e. Bhāgavata and Pātāñjala. 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 हेऊ चउव्विहे पणत्ते, तं जहा जावते, थावते, वंसते लूसते;
अहवा हेऊ चउव्विहे पणत्ते, तं जहा पच्चक्खे, अणुमाणे, ओवम्मे आगमे;
अहवा हेऊ चउव्विहे पणत्ते तं जहा अत्थित्तं अत्थि सो हेऊ १, अत्थित्तं
णत्थि सो हेऊ २, णत्थित्तं अत्थि सो हेऊ ३, णत्थित्तं गत्थि सो हेऊ 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 Lūsate or Yāpaka, Vyansaka and Lūṣaka is to defeat anyhow the opponent either by confusing him or by silencing him.³ These Yāpaka, Vyansaka and Lūṣaka may be compared with the Avijñātārtha Nigrahasthāna, Aviśeṣasamā 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. Pratyakṣa, Anumāna, Upamāna 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

² Anu, page 36 (Devacanda Lal bhai's edition).

³ For detail vide DYN verse No. 86.

⁴ Vide NS 5-2-9 for Avijñā-ārtha, 5-1-23 for Aviśeṣasamā 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 :—

स्थानाङ्ग सूत्र हेतु—साध्य	वैशेषिक सूत्र.
(१) विधि—विधि	संयोगी, समचायी, एकार्थ समवायी ३-१-३ and भूतो भूतस्य ३-१-१३
(२) विधि—निषेध	भूतमभूतस्य ३-१-१३
(३) निषेध—विधि	अभूतं भूतस्य ३-१-११
(४) निषेध—निषेध	कारणाभावात् कार्याभावः १-२-१

Similarly Bhagavatī states :—

से किं तं पमाणं ? पमाणे चउव्विहे पण्णत्ते; तं जहा पच्चक्खे,
अणुमाणे, ओवम्भे, आगमे जहा अणुओगदारे तहा णेयव्वं पमाणं ।

भगवती ५-३-१३१-३२

Anuyogadvāra 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 Sāmānyatodrṣta.¹ It observes :—

से किं तं अणुमाणे ? अणुमाणे तिविहे पण्णत्ते तं जहा पुव्ववं सेसवं दिट्ठसाहम्भवं ।
अनु. पृ. २११ ।

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

माया पुत्तं जहा नट्ठं जुवाणं पुणरागयं ।

काइ पच्चमि जाणेज्जा पुव्वलिङ्गेण केणइ ॥ अनु. 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 सेसव्वं ? सेसव्वं पंचविहं पण्णत्तं; तं जहा (१) कज्जेणं, (२) कारणेणं,
(३) गुणेणं, (४) अवयवेणं, (५) आस एणं, 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) संखं सदेणं भेरिं ताडिणं, वसभं ढक्किणं, मोरं किंकाइणं हयं हेसिणं
and so on

¹ Ibid 1-1-5.

(२) तंतवो पडस्स कारणं ण पडो तंतु कारणं, वीरणा कडस्स कारणं ण कडो वीरणा कारणं, मिप्पिडो घडस्स कारणं ण घडो मिप्पिड कारणं ॥

(३) सुवण्णं निकसेणं, पुप्फं गंधेणं, लवणं रसेणं, मइरं आसायएणं, वत्थं फासेणं ॥

(४) महिसं सिगेणं, कुक्कुडं सिहाएणं, हत्थि विसाणेणं, वराहं दाढाए, मोरं पिच्छेणं, आसं खुरेणं वग्धं नहेणं and so on

(५) अग्निं धूमेणं, सलिलं वल्लागेणं, वुट्ठि अब्भविकारेणं कुलपुत्तं सीलसमायारेणं ॥

अनु. पृ. २१२-१३

Drṣṭasādharmya or *Sāmānyatodrṣṭa* is of two types, (1) *Sāmānyadrṣṭa* and (2) *Viśeṣadrṣṭa*. Both are illustrated as follows:—

(१) से कि तं सामण्णदिट्ठं ? जहा एगो पुरिसो तहा वहवे पुरिसा, जहा वहवे पुरिसा, तहा एगो पुरिसो । जहा एगो करिसावणो तहा वहवे करिसावणा, जहा वहवे करिसावणा तहा एगो करिसावणो । अनु. पृ. २१४

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

(२) से जहाणामए केइ पुरिसे कंचि पुरिसं, बहूणं पुरिसाणं मज्झे पुव्वदिट्ठं पच्चभिजाणिज्जा अयं से पुरिसे । बहूणं करिसावणाणं मज्झे पुव्वदिट्ठं करिसावणं पच्चभिजाणिज्जा अयं से करिसावणे, अनु. पृ. २१५

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

Comparing the above mentioned *Anumānas* with those in *Nyāyaśāstra* 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 कारणेन कार्यमनुमीयते, यथा:—मेघोन्नत्या भविष्यति वृष्टिरिति । अथवा पूर्ववदिति यत्र यथा पूर्वं प्रत्यक्षभूतयोरन्यतरदर्शनेनाजन्यतरस्याप्रत्यक्षस्यानुमानं, यथा धूमेनाग्निरिति । न्या. भा. १-१-५.

Both these illustrations of *Pūrvavat* come under the head of *Śeṣavat* of *Anuyoga*—the former under the second type *Kāraṇa* and the latter under the fifth type *Āsaṇa* or *Aśrayaṇa*. In the same way the explanation and illustration of *Sāmānyatodrṣṭa* given by *Vātsyāyana* in his *Bhāṣya*

come under the third type of Śeṣavat Guṇānām because Bhāṣya infers soul from its quality like desire etc.¹

The two types of Dr̥ṣṭasādharmya as explained in Anuyoga represent 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 knowledge. 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 comparable with the division of Anekāśrita Guṇas by Praśastapāda. Uttarādhyayana⁴ defines Paryāyas as follows :

एकत्वं च पुद्गलं च संख्या संठाणमेव च ।

संज्ञेना य विभागा य पञ्जावाणं तु लक्षणं ॥ २८-३

Praśastapāda enumerates the following quality as Anekāśrita Guṇas :—

संयोग-विभाग-द्वित्व-द्विपृथक्त्वादयोऽनेकाश्रिताः ॥ प्र. भा. गुणनिरूपण.

Following the Āgamas, the Niryuktis and Bhāṣyas like those of Daśavaikālikasūtra, 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 Daśavaikālika-Niryukti discussing Anumāna enumerates the five Avayavas and two types of ten Avayavas of an Anumāna.⁵ The five Avayavas, viz. Pratijñā, Hetu,

¹ NBh 1-1-5

² cf. VS 8-2-3.

³ Anu. 124.

⁴ However the general definition of Dravya, Guṇa and Paryāya in Uttar. is as follows :—

गुणाणामासौ दत्तं एगदन्वस्सिया गुणा ।

लक्षणं पञ्जावाणं तु उभो अस्सिया भवे ॥ २८-६

There is a difference of opinion regarding the interpretation of the last Pada उभो अस्सिया भवे The old commentaries understand by the word Ubhao, Dravya and Guṇa. While the modern scholars like Pt. Dalasukha Mālavāṇia understand more than one Dravya and see the consistency of the definition of Paryāya as given in verse No. 13 of the same Adhyayana. Vide introduction pp. 106-7 of NVV.

⁵ DVN verse No. 50 and No. 89-91.

Drṣṭānta, Upasamhāra and Nigamana are identical with the similar five, viz. Pratijñā, Hetu, Udāharaṇa, Upanaya and Nigamana of Nyāya school¹ and Pratijñā, Apadeśa, Nirdarśana, Anusandhāna and Pratyāmnāya of Vaiśeṣika school.² However his enumeration of two types of ten Avayavas³ is different from the one given in Vātsyāyana Bhāṣya.⁴ Bhadrabāhu in his Nirukti⁵ also states that in Vāda or debate merely Pratijñā and Udāharaṇa or Pratijñā, Hetu and Udāharaṇa are enough.

Even though the Āgamas do not refer to any tradition about the origin of Vaiśeṣika school, Jinabhadraṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa (6th Cen. A.D.) in his Viśeṣāvaśyaka Bhāṣya gives an interesting tradition about it.⁶ According to this tradition, one Rohagutta 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 Viśeṣāvaśyaka mentions the following as the tenets of this Nihnava or schism of Rohagupta:—

भू-जल-जलणानिल नह-काल-दिसाऽऽया मणो य दव्वाइ ।
मण्णंति नवेयाइं सतरस गुणा य इमे अण्णे ॥
रूप-रस-गन्ध-फासा संखा-परिमाण-पुहुत्तं च ।
संजोग-विभाग-परापरत्त बुद्धी-सुहं-दुखं च ॥

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.

इच्छा-दोष-पयत्ता कर्मं तयं च पंचदिहं ।
 उक्खेवण-मक्खेवण पसारणा कुंवरणं गमणं ॥
 सत्ता-सामण्णं पिय सामण्ण विसेसिया दिसेसोय ।
 समवायो न पयत्था छच्छात्तीसप्पभेदा य ॥

(1) Bhū-earth, (2) Jala-water, (3) Jalāṇa-fire, (4) Anila-air, (5) Naha-sky, (6) Kāla-time, (7) Diśa-direction, (8) Āyā-soul and (9) Maṇo-mind are the nine Dravyas.

(1) Rūpa-colour, (2) Rasa-taste, (3) Gandha-odour, (4) Fāsa-touch, (5) Saṃkhā-number, (6) Parimāṇa-measure, (7) Puhutta-individuality, (8) Sanjoga-contact, (9) Vibhāga-separation, (10) Paratta-priority, (11) Aparatta-posteriority, (12) Buddhī-knowledge, (13) Suha-happiness, (14) Dukha-misery, (15) Icchā-desire, (16) Dosa-fault, (17) Payatta-effort are the seventeen Guṇas.

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

(1) Sattāsāmānya-generalality 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 Āgamas, 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, Sāmānya, Viśeṣa and Samavāya became of great use to them in systematizing and putting their school of thought in line with Brāhmanical 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. Dhruva also in his intropuction of Syādvāda-Mañjarī (footnotes on p. XLV) quotes a passage showing three types of Sāmānya which was also imported by Rohagupta, the founder of the sixth schism, into Jainism. In that passage opinion of someone is stated as follows :—

अन्ये तु व्याचक्षते महासामान्यं द्रव्यत्वादि सामान्यविशेषः पृथिवीत्वादि ।
 According to Vaiśeṣika Sāmānya is of two types, Para and Apra.

Vācaka Umāsvāti and Kundakundācārya (2nd-3rd Cen. A.D.) :

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. Sukhalālji.¹ In these Sūtras we find the following parallels with the Vaiśeṣika school. *Tattvārtha* defines *Dravya* as गुणपर्यायवद् द्रव्यम् (५-३७) while Vaiśeṣika defines the same as क्रियागुणवद् द्रव्यम् (वै. सू. १-१-१५) *Tattvārtha* defines *Guṇa* as द्रव्याश्रया निर्गुणाः गुणाः (५-४०) while Vaiśeṣika defines it as द्रव्याश्रय्य गुणवान् (वै. सू. १-१-१६) *Tattvārtha* defines *Kāla* as वर्तना परिणामः क्रिया परत्वापरत्वे च कालस्य (५-२२) while Vaiśeṣika defines it as अपरस्मिन्नपरं चिरंक्षिप्रमिति काललिङ्गानि (वै. सू. २-२-६). 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 सर्वमेकं सदविशेषात् । सर्वं द्वित्वं जीवाजीवात्मकत्वात् । सर्वं त्रित्वं दुव्यगुण पर्यायवरोधात् । सर्वं चतुष्टयं चतुर्दर्शन-विषयावरोधात् and so on (१-३५)

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

सर्वमेकं सदविशेषात् । सर्वं द्वेधा नित्यानित्यभेदात् । सर्वं त्रेधा ज्ञाता ज्ञानं ज्ञेयमिति । सर्वं चतुर्धा प्रमाता प्रमाणं, प्रमेयं प्रमितिरिति । एवं यथा सम्भवमन्येऽपीति । न्या. भा. ४-१-४१

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 :—

द्वन्वाणि गुणा तैसि पज्जाया अट्टसण्णया भणिया । (१-८७)

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.

² Vide VS 8-2-3.

³ Ibid 7-2-3.

⁴ Pbh. pp. 7-8 क्षिति जलज्योतिरनिलमनसां क्रियावत्त्वमूर्तत्वपरत्वापरत्ववेगवत्त्वानि ।

inseparable entities. Of course here he interprets the term *Ayutasiddha*¹ to suit the Jaina point of view. He also accepts *Asatkāryavāda*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 *Sādharmya* and *Vaidharmya*, though the *Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra* does not mention the ground of *Mūrtatva* and *Amūrtatva*, the *Prāśastapāda-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*³ in that division. *Kundakundācārya* instead of *Rupī*³ and *Arupī* adopts the terms *Mūrta* and *Amūrta*⁴ of *Prāśastapāda*. 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.

Siddhasena Divākara (4th-5th cent. A.D.):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

¹ Vide PK, verse No. 56.

² Ibid verse No. 60.

³ TS 5-3,4.

⁴ PK verse No. 104.

⁵ For the time of *Siddhasena Divākara* vide “*Sri Siddhasena Divākaraṇā 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 unacceptable 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 खल्विमे सङ्ख्यैकान्ता यदि विशेषकारितस्यार्थभेदविस्तारस्थ प्रत्याख्यानं वर्तन्ते प्रत्यक्षानुमानागमविरोधात्मिकावादा भवन्ति । अथाभ्युज्जानेन वर्तन्ते । समान-कारितोऽर्थसङ्ग्रहो विशेषकारितश्चार्थभेद इत्येवमेकान्तत्वं जहतीति । ते खल्वेते तत्त्वज्ञान-प्रविवेकार्यमेकान्ताः परीक्षिता इति । न्या. सू. ४-१-८३

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-Vacanīya³ in the sense of viewing an object from different view points.

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

अत्थि आविणासधम्भी करेइ वेणइ अत्थि निव्वाणं ।

अत्थि य मोकखोवायो छ सम्मतस्स ठाणाइ ॥ ३-३५ ।

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 Vṛddhavādī. 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 Samantabhadra (5th Cen. A.D.):

In the same age, the Digambara sect produced a great Ācārya in Samantabhadra. Āptamīmāṃsā, Svayambhū-Stotra and Yuktyanuśāsaṇa

¹ NS 4-1-43 and also Nbh on NS 4-1-29 and 4-1-34.

² Sanmati 3-27.

³ Nbh on NS 2-1-12.

⁴ NS 1-1-10.

⁵ VS 3-2-5.

are his important works. His *Āptamīmāṃsā* deals with *Saptabhaṅgī* on the *Anekānta* line. Applying *Saptabhaṅgī Prakriyā*, he refutes the views of different schools. In this connection the following verse of the *Āptamīmāṃsā* is worth comparing with NS 4-1-43 which refutes the different *Sāṅkhyaikāntavādas*.

एकानेक विकल्पादा वृत्तरत्रापि योजयेत् ।

प्रक्रियां भङ्गिनीमेनां नयैर्नयविशारदः ॥ आ. 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 *Sarvapṛthaktva* theory, *Sarvanityatva* theory and *Sarva-Anityatva* theory respectively. The following verse of the *Āptamīmāṃsā* shows that *Samantabhadra* adopted the terms *Prāgabhāva* and *Pradhvansābhāva* of the *Vaiśeṣika* school to suit the needs of *Jaina* philosophy. Refuting *Bhavaikāntavādins*, he states :—

कार्यं द्रव्यमनादि स्यात् प्रागभावस्य निवृत्ते ।

प्रध्वंसस्य च धर्मस्य प्रच्यवेऽ नन्ततां व्रजेत् ॥ का. १०

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

After *Ācārya Samantabhadra*, the *Digambara-Ācārya Akalaṅkadeva* and the *Śvetāmbara-Ācārya Haribhadrāsūri* are in their respective sects well-known logicians. *Akalaṅkadeva* (7th Cen. A.D.) wrote a commentary *Aśṭaśatī* on the *Āptamīmāṃsā* of *Samantabhadra* and a commentary, *Tattvārtharājavārtika* on the *Tattvārthasūtra* 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-Prastāva*, *Anumāna-Prastāva* and *Pravacana-Prastāva*. This type of division shows the influence of *Tri-Pramāṇavadins* on *Akalaṅka*. In the realm of *Indian Darśanas*, the *Sāṅkhyas* are known to have three *Pramāṇas*, viz., *Pratyakṣa*, *Anumāna* and *Āgama*; but *Sāṅkhyas* 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 *Sāṅkhya* theories states प्रत्यक्षानुमानागमविरोधान्मिथ्यावादा भवन्ति 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 *Sūtra*

¹ Nbh. on NS 4-1-43.

एतेन शब्दं व्याख्यातम् (वै. सू. ३-२-३), implying thereby that its definition is included in Anumāna. He, however, indirectly accepts Āgama-Pramāṇa in the following Sūtras :— तस्मादागमिकम् and (वै. सू. २-१-१७) तस्मादागमिकः (वै. सू. ३-२-८)¹.

Praśastapāda, however, discusses only two Pramāṇas including Śabda in Anumāna ; but it appears that a commentator named Vyomaśiva and some followers of Kaṇāda seem to have interpreted his view as propounding three Pramāṇas. This becomes clear from the fact that Vyomaśiva in his *Vyomavati*² clearly propounds three Pramāṇas, and also from the statement of Hemacandra in his *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā*³ that the Vaiśeṣikās are Tri-Pramāṇavādins.

Among Naiyāyikas, Bhāsarvajña in his *Nyāyasāra*⁴ recognizes three Pramāṇas. All this, as we have said above, shows that prior to Vyomaśiva there must have been an old tradition of Vaiśeṣikās professing three Pramāṇas. So we might conjecture that the above division of Akalaṅka'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 Haribhadrāsūri (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 *Dvādaśāra-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 *Simhagaṇi-Kṣamāśramaṇa*. The date of *Simhagaṇi-Kṣamāśramaṇa* is not yet finally settled but he is probably not later than Haribhadrāsūri. Of the work *Dvādaśāra* only one verse has upto now been discovered.

यत्तूच्यते इत्यादियावत् सप्तम्यभिधानेन दर्शयति [दर्शितं] इति सूत्रार्थः कटन्याख्यातः
'सदसतोर्वैधर्म्यात्' (न्या. सू. ४-१-४८) द्वा. न. च. टी. पृ. ६१०

¹ Sankara Miśra in his *Upaskāra* commenting on the Sūtra 2-1-17 states
यस्माद्विशेषाकारेण नानुमितिः तस्माद् वायुरिति नाम आगमिकम् । आगमो वेदः,
ततः सिद्धमित्यर्थः ।

Similarly commenting on Sūtra 3-2-8 he states आगममात्रसिद्धएवात्मा
नानुमेयः, दृष्टसामान्यदृष्टयोर्लिङ्गयोरभावात् ।

² Vide Vyoma. p. 578.

³ Vide PM, p. 7.

⁴ Vide *Nyāyasāra*, p. 2.

Kaṭandī is the name of a commentary on Vaiśeṣika Sūtras. However this is altogether a new name. It should be noted that as shown above Siṃhagaṇi also quotes Nyāya-Sūtras.

इदानीं सूत्रकारमतं समर्थयता वाक्य-भाष्य-टीकाकाराणां मतानि समाहृत्य प्रधानानु-
गामित्वाच्छेषाणां सूत्रकारमतमेवेत्थं द्वे[द्व]षयितुमाह तत्त्वोपनिर्लनयात् सदाद्यभिधानार्थं
कारण[णे]समवेतस्य वस्तुन उत्तरकालं सत्तासम्बन्ध इति बहूनां मतम् । वस्त्व[स्तु] त्वु[त्प]-
त्तिकाल एव इति तु वाक्याभिप्रायोऽनुसृतो भाष्यकारैः । सिद्धस्य वस्तुनः स्वकारणैः स्वसत्तया
च सम्बन्धः इति प्रशस्तमतो[मतेर] भिप्रायः । अस्मदभिप्रायस्तेषां त्रयाणामप्यसत्येति ।
कस्मात् ? परस्पर विरुद्धार्थत्वात्.....कुमार ब्रह्मचारिपितृत्ववत् । द्वा. न. च. टी. पृ. ३०१

Here from the phrase वाक्यभाष्यटीकाकाराणां we can say that there was a Vākyakāra, Bhāṣyakāra and a Tikākāra. In short there must have been three types of commentaries on Vaiśeṣika Sūtras viz. Vākya, Bhāṣya and Tikā. Of these three Vākya is a new type not hitherto known. Bhāṣya may be probably a Bhāṣya on Vaiśeṣika Sūtras. As he quotes the opinion of Praśastamati separately, here Bhāṣya may mean perhaps some Bhāṣya other than that of Praśastapāda. Tikā means the Tikā Kaṭandī 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-Sūnu was a prolific writer in the history of Jaina literature. His works also show his familiarity with Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools. In his *Śaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, the first compendium of Vedic and non-Vedic Darśanas, he devotes one chapter to Nyāya and one to Vaiśeṣika schools. In his *Śāstravārtāsamuccaya* we find that he, after refuting Īśvarakartṛtva theory, makes peace with it by viewing a Tīrthaṅkara in the terms of Īśvara and Kartā.² This is typical of Jaina writers.

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

² The following verses of Śāstravārtāsamuccaya shows his adaptation of the idea of Īśvaratva and Jagatkartṛtva :—

ईश्वरः परमात्मैव तदुक्तं व्रतं सेवनात् ।

यतो मुक्तिस्ततस्तस्याः स्याद् गुणभावतः ॥

तदनासेवनादेव यत्संसारोऽपि तत्त्वतः ।

तेन तस्यापि कर्तृत्वं कल्प्यमानं न दुष्यति ॥

कर्ताऽयमिति तद्वाक्ये यतः केषाञ्चिदादरः ।

अतस्तत्स्थानुगुण्येन तस्य कर्तृत्ववेदनम् ॥

पारमैश्वर्यं युक्तत्वात्मान्त आत्मैव चेश्वरः ।

स च कर्तेति निर्दोषः कर्तृवादो व्यवस्थितः ॥ शा. वा. स. का. २०८-२०७

Like Siddhasena Divākara, Ācārya Haribhadrāsūri 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.^{-a1}

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 *Āptamīmāṃsā* of Samantabhadra, Prabhācandra wrote similar commentaries—*Nyāyakumudacandra* on *Laghūyastrayī* of Akalaṅka and *Prameyakamalamārtanḍa* on *Parīkṣāmukhasūtra* of Māṇikyānandī. Abhayadevasūri of the Śvetāmbara sect wrote a very big commentary *Tattvabodhavidhāyinī* popularly known as *Vāda-Mahārṇava* on *Sanmati-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-Tātparyatīkā* 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 Prāgabdhāva and Pradhvansābhāva from the Jaina point of view:—

ऋजुसूत्रनयार्पणाद्धि प्रागभावस्तावत्कार्यस्योपादान परिणाम एव पूर्वोऽनन्तरात्मा (अ. स. पृ. १००) तत्र ऋजुसूत्रनयार्पणात्तावदुपादेयक्षण एवोपादानस्य प्रध्वंसः । अ. स. पृ. १०१

In the *Prameyakamalamārtanḍa* Prabhācandra also defines the above terms as follows :

यदभावे हि नियमंतः कार्योत्पत्तिः स प्रागभावः ।, प्रागन्तरपरिणामविशिष्टं मृद्द्रव्यम् ।
प्र. क. मा. पृ. २१४

यद् भावे हि नियता कार्यस्य विपत्तिः स प्रध्वंसः मृद्द्रव्यानन्तरोत्तरपरिणामः ।
प्र. क. मा. पृ. २१४

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 -a. For the list of Haribhadrāsūri'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.

यदप्यात्मनो विभुत्वसाधनं कैश्चिदुपन्यस्तम् । अदृष्टं स्वाश्रयसंयुक्ते आश्रयान्तरे कर्म आरभते, एकद्रव्यत्वे सति क्रियाहेतु गुणत्वात्, यो य एकद्रव्यत्वे सति क्रियाहेतुगुणः सस स्वाश्रयसंयुक्ते, आश्रयान्तरे कर्म आरभते यथा वेगः, तथा चादृष्टम्, तस्मात् तदपि स्वाश्रयसंयुक्ते आश्रयान्तरे कर्म आरभते इति । न चासिद्धं क्रियाहेतुगुणत्वम्; अग्निरूर्ध्वज्वलनम्, वायोस्तिर्यक्पवनम्, अणुमनसोश्चाद्यं कर्म देवदत्तविशेषगुणकारितम्, कार्यत्वे सति देवदत्तस्योपकासत्वात् पाण्यादिपरिस्पन्दवत्, एकद्रव्यत्वं चैकस्यात्मनस्तदाश्रयत्वात्, एकद्रव्यमदृष्टम् विशेषगुणत्वात् शब्दवत् ।

एकद्रव्यत्वात् इत्युच्यमाने रूपादिभिर्व्यभिचारस्तन्निवृत्त्यर्थं 'क्रियाहेतुगुणत्वात्' इत्युक्तम् । 'क्रियाहेतुगुणत्वात् इत्युच्यमाने मुशलहस्त संयोगेन स्वाश्रयासंयुक्तस्तम्भादिचलनहेतुना व्यभिचारः तन्निवृत्त्यर्थम् 'एक द्रव्यत्वे सति' इति विशेषणीयम् । एकद्रव्यत्वे सति क्रियाहेतुगुणत्वात् इत्युच्यमाने स्वाश्रयासंयुक्त लोहादिक्रियाहेतुनाऽयस्कान्तेन व्यभिचारः तन्निवृत्त्यर्थं गुणत्वात् इत्यभिधानम् सम्मति. टी. ५१२४-पं. १५

This is clearly the view-point of the Vaiśeṣikas.

यस्त्वाह 'सदुपलम्भकप्रमाणगम्यत्वं षण्णामस्तित्वमभिधीयते तच्च षट्पदार्थविषयं ज्ञानं तस्मिन्सति सत् इति व्यवहारप्रवृत्तेः । एवं ज्ञानजनितं ज्ञेयत्वम्; अभिधानजनितम् अभिधेयत्वम् । इत्येवं व्यतिरेकनिबन्धना षष्ठीसिद्धा । न चाज्ञवस्था, न च षट्पदार्थान्तर व्यतिरिक्तपदार्थान्तरप्रसक्तिः, ज्ञानस्य गुणपदार्थेऽन्तरभावात् ।

सम्मति. टी. पृ. ५६६१-पं. १४

He, at various places, refers also to Nyāyasūtra, Vaiśeṣikasūtra, their authors Akṣapāda and Kaṇāda, Praśastamati, the author of Vaiśeṣika-bhaṣya 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 Solankī king of Gujarat, defeated a great dialectician named Kumudacandra of the Digambara sect. Vādī Devasūri's *Pramāṇanayatattvāloka-lāṅkāra* with his own commentary *Syādvādaratnākara* is an epoch-making work on Jaina 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.

शङ्करन्याय भूषणकारावाचक्षाते 'यो हि भावो यावत्या सामया गृह्यते तदभावोऽपि तावत्यै वेत्यालोक गृहणसामग्र्या गृह्यमाणं तमस्तदभाव एव' तदपि न किञ्चित् तयोग्रहण सामग्र्या गृह्यमाणस्यालोकस्यैव तदभावताप्रसङ्गेना नैकान्तिकत्वात् । स्या. र. ५. ८५२. पं. ८

यमपि पूर्वमतारोचकितया कन्दलीकारः स्वकीयं मार्गमुत्पेक्षाचक्रे 'रूपविशेषोऽयं मत्यन्तं तेजोऽभावे सति सर्वतः समारोपितस्तम् इति प्रतीयते' इति सोऽपि कापथः । निशादा वत्यन्तं तेजोऽभावे सत्यप्यधिकरणभूतलादि वस्तुमात्रस्याप्यनुपलब्ध्या रूप विशेषानुपपत्तेः । उपलभ्यमान एव हि कम्बो पीततारोपः प्रतीत इति । स्या. २. पृ. ८५२-पं २०

यथात्र व्योमशिवेनोपादेशि 'तदेतदसत्, भासामभावरूपत्वाच्छायायाः । तथापि यत्र यत्र वारकदुप्येण तेजसः सन्निधिनिषिध्यते तत्र तत्र छायेति व्यवहारः । वारकदुप्यगतां च क्रियामातपाभावे समारोप्य प्रतिपाद्यते छाया गच्छतीति । अन्यथाहि वारकद्रव्यक्रियापेक्षितं न स्यात्' इति सोऽयं पङ्गोस्तुरङ्ग वेगविनिर्जयमनोरथः । मुख्यार्थं बाधाय हि सत्यामारोपः प्रतिष्ठां प्राप्नोति । स्या. २. पृ. ८५३-पं. ११

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, Nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra, Kandalikāra and Vyomaśiva and then refutes them. His style of refutation resembles that of the famous logician Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, who while arguing ridicules the opponents.

Ācārya Hemacandrasūri, a Junior contemporary of Devasūri, was a versatile genius. He left no branch of learning without his contribution and therefore he is known as Kalikālasarvajña. *Anyayoga-Dvātrīṃsīkā* and *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* are his works on Jaina logic. Of these, *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* 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.

नैयायिकास्तु "इन्द्रियार्थं सन्निकर्षोत्पन्नं ज्ञानमप्यपदेश्यमप्यभिचारि व्यवसायात्मकं प्रत्यक्षम्" (न्या. सू. १-१-४) इति प्रत्यक्षलक्षणमाचक्षते । अत्र पूर्वाचार्यकृतव्याख्यावैमुख्येन सङ्ख्याविद्भिस्त्रिलोचनवाचस्पतिप्रमुखैरयमर्थो समर्थितः यथा 'इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षोत्पन्नं ज्ञानमप्यभिचारि प्रत्यक्षमित्येव प्रत्यक्षलक्षणम् । 'यतः' शब्दाध्याहारेण च यत्तदोन्तियाभिसम्बन्धादुक्तविशेषणविशिष्टं ज्ञानं यतो भवति तत् तथाविधज्ञानसाधनं ज्ञानरूपमज्ञानरूपं वा प्रत्यक्षं प्रमाणमिति । अस्य च फलभूतस्य ज्ञानस्य द्वयी गतिरविकल्पं सविकल्पं च । तयोर्द्वयोरपि प्रमाणरूपत्वमभिधातुं विभागवचनमेतद् अव्यपदेश्यं व्यवसायात्मकम्' इति ।

तत्रोभयरूपस्यापि ज्ञानस्य प्रामाण्यमुपेक्ष्य 'यतः' शब्दाध्याहारक्लेशेनाज्ञानरूपस्य सन्निकर्षादिः प्रामाण्यं समर्थनमयुक्तम् । कथं ह्यज्ञानरूपाः सन्निकर्षादयोऽर्थं परिच्छिन्तौ साधकतया भवन्ति व्यभिचारात् ? सत्यपीन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षोत्पन्नोपलब्धेरभावात् । ज्ञाने सत्येव भावात् । साधकतमं हि करणमप्यवहितफलं च तदिति ।

सन्निकर्षोऽपि यदि योग्यतातिरिक्तः संयोगादिसम्बन्धस्तीहि स चक्षुषोऽर्थेन सह नास्ति, अप्राप्यकारित्वात्तस्य । दृश्यते हि काचाभ्रस्फटिकादिव्यवहितस्याप्यर्थस्य चक्षुषोपलब्धिः । अथ 'प्राप्यकारि चक्षुः करणत्वाद्वास्यादिवदिति ब्रूषे, तर्ह्ययस्कान्ताकर्षणोपलेन लोहासन्निकृष्टेन

व्यभिचारः । न च संयुक्तसंयोगादिः सन्निकर्षस्तत्र कल्पयितुं शक्यते अतिप्रसङ्गादिति ।
प्र. मी. सू. १-१-२९. पृ. २२-२३

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 Sūtra made by scholars like Trilocana and Vācaspati 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-mañjarī*, 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-mañjarī* his detailed study of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika systems and their influence on his style are quite patent. The following passage will show the same :—

यत्तावदुक्तं परैः 'क्षित्यादयो बुद्धिमत्कर्तृकाः कार्यत्वाद् घटवदिति' । तदयुक्तम् व्याप्तेरग्रहात् । साधनं हि सर्वत्र व्याप्ती प्रमाणेन सिद्धायां साध्यं गमयेदिति सर्ववादिसंवादः । स चाज्यं जगन्ति सृजन् सशरीरोऽशरीरो वा स्यात् । सशरीरोऽपि किमस्मदादिवदृश्यशरीर-दिशिष्ट उत पिशाचादिवदृश्यशरीरविशिष्टः ? प्रद प्रथमपक्षे प्रत्यक्षबाधः, तमन्तरेणाऽपि च जायमाने तृणतरुपुरन्दरधनुरभ्रादौ कार्यत्वस्य दर्शनात् प्रमेयत्वदिवत् साधारणानैकान्तिको हेतुः । द्वितीयविकल्पे पुनरदृश्यशरीरत्वे तस्य महात्म्यविशेषः कारणम्, आहोस्विदस्मदाद्य-दृष्टवैगुण्यम् ? प्रथमप्रकारः कोशपानप्रत्यायनीयः, तत्सिद्धौ प्रमाणाभावात् इतरेतराश्रयदोषा-पत्तेश्च । सिद्धे हि माहात्म्यविशेषे तस्यादृश्यशरीरत्वं प्रत्येत्यं, तत्सिद्धौ च माहात्म्य-विशेषसिद्धिरिति । द्वितीयकस्तु प्रकारो न सञ्चरत्येव विचारगोचरे, संशयानिवृत्तेः । किं तस्यासत्वाददृश्यशरीरत्वं बान्ध्येयादिवत्, किं वाऽस्यदाद्यदृष्टवैगुण्यात् पिशाचादिवदिति निश्चयाभावात् । अशरीरश्चेत्तदा दृष्टान्तदाष्टान्तिकयोर्वैषम्यम् । घटादयो हि कार्यरूपाः सकर्तृका दृष्टाः । अशरीरस्य च सनस्तस्य कार्यप्रवृत्तौ कुतः सामर्थ्यम् आकाशादिवत् । तस्मात् सशरीरांशरीरलक्षणे पक्षेद्वयेऽपि कार्यत्वहेतोर्व्याप्त्यसिद्धिः । किं च त्वन्मतेन कालात्ययापदिष्टोऽप्ययं हेतुः । धर्म्येकदेशस्य तरुविद्युदभ्रादेरिदानीमप्युत्पद्यमानस्य विधातुरनुपलभ्यमानत्वेन प्रत्यक्षबाधित-धर्म्यनन्तरं हेतुभणनात् । तदेवं न कश्चिज्जगतः कर्तेति ।
स्या. म. पृ. २४ (आनन्दशङ्कर ध्रुवजी सम्पादित)

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

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

After Mallīṣeṇa, Upādhyāya Yaśovijayagaṇi is a logician of eminence.¹ Like Haribhadrāsūri, he was also a prolific writer in the history of Jaina

¹ For the list of the works and life of Upādhyāya Yaśovijayagaṇi 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 *Nyāyāloka* will bear this out :—

यत्तु नरसिंहाकारज्ञाने ज्ञानत्वघटत्वप्रकारकत्वोभयाश्रयज्ञानवैशिष्ट्यधीर्न स्यादिति तत्तु विषयनिरूप्यं हि ज्ञानं न तु विषयपरम्परा निरूप्यमित्यादिना मिश्रेणैव समाहितम् । यत्तु स्वसंवेदने कृतिसमवाहित्वादिरूपकर्तृत्वाद्यनवभास इत्युक्तं, तदभिप्रायापरिज्ञानात् । आश्रयत्वरूपकर्तृत्वस्य, विषयत्वरूपकर्मत्वस्य विशेषणत्वरूपक्रियात्वस्य च दोषाकलङ्कितत्वात् । अधिकविषयत्वेऽपि च व्यवसायस्यार्थविषयत्वेन प्रवर्तकत्वमविरुद्धम्, इष्टतावच्छेदकप्रवृत्तिविषयवैशिष्ट्यावगाहिज्ञानत्वेन प्रवर्तकत्वात् । न चात्र प्रमेयमिति ज्ञानात्प्रवृत्त्यापत्तिः, इष्टतावच्छेदने तद्विज्ञानिष्ठधर्माप्रकारकत्वविशेषणात् । न्यायालोक पृ. ९३.