

argument, however, seems to be more general and seems to present a counter-dilemma to all those who manufacture such dilemmas and ask them as to how they can regard their own refutation as valid or establishing anything. At another level, it seems to suggest that all extreme positions are vitiated by the same defect and that perhaps the structure of reason itself is such that it pushes thought to logical extremes which, when reflected upon, seem equally untenable.

The whole section needs to be carefully examined from the view point of the structure of reason and the pure logic of argumentation, an approach later developed by Kant in the western tradition. The discussion also needs to be differentiated from the way dilemmas have been treated in the western logical tradition in order that a clearer picture may emerge of the way Gautama has treated the subject.

### 5.2

The discussion on nigrāhatāna in 5.2 seems to be the most puerile and useless discussion that one finds in the Nyāya sūtra. It also shows that the discussion and debate held during those times were not concerned with exploring the truth or finding answers to questions by engaging in a joint exploratory intellectual activity. Instead, the whole thing seems to have centred around 'winning' an argument which seems to have become the centre of intellectual life in those times. The inclusion of the topics from *vāda* onwards in the sūtra 1.1.1 explains this aspect, as otherwise the discussion about them will make no sense. The situation seems to have vitiated even the Upaniṣads as is found by what happened in the discussion at Janaka's court.

## Chapter 4

### A Short Note on Jayanta and Bhāsarvajña

Jayanta's *Nyāya Mañjarī* is a strange work in the Indian tradition. It is not a Bhāṣya or a Vārttika or even a Tīkā on the Nyāya Sūtras. And, though it calls itself a *Vṛtti*, it is nothing of that kind. It is an independent work, related only tangentially to the Nyāya Sūtras and, in fact, falls outside the interpretative tradition set up by Vātsyāyana and followed by Uddyotakara, Vācaspati Miśra I and Udayana. In this, it reminds one of Bhāsarvajña whose work entitled "*Nyāya Bhūṣaṇa*" is also an independent work standing outside the main tradition formed by the four thinkers mentioned above.

There seems, however, a difference between Jayanta's work and the work of Bhāsarvajña, as there seems to have been no commentary on the former during the whole period of about 1200 years, if we believe Potter's data mentioned in his Bibliography of Indian Philosophy. Bhāsarvajña, on the other hand, seems to have found commentators on his work.

It is true that Jayanta seems to have mentioned Vācaspati Miśra I, though scholars differ regarding the identity of the exact person referred to by the name of Vācaspati in Jayanta's work. Udayana, on the other hand, seems to have referred to him as an 'old' Naiyāyika; the term used is "jaraja" and as contrast, he calls himself an *ādhunika*.

Jayanta's work discusses the 16 *padārthas* mentioned in the Nyāya Sūtra 1.1.1, ignoring details of the discussion in the Nyāya Sūtra, and though he refers to both Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara,

he does not seem to take them as seriously as, say, Vācaspati Miśra I or Udayana who wrote directly on them.

Strangely, half of the work of Jayanta is concerned with elucidation and discussion of the first *padārtha*, that is, the *pramāṇas* which shows that, according to him, this was the heart of the matter and that the rest of the *padārthas* were marginal in nature. 392 pages are devoted to the discussion of this one topic only, while the rest numbering 15 get only 208 pages in the edition published in the Kashi Sanskrit Series, number 106.

The break-up of the pages devoted to the other topics mentioned in sūtra 1.1.1 is as follows:

*prameya* 117, *samśaya* 7, *prayojana* 1, *dr̥ṣṭānta* 1/2, *siddhānta* 2, *avayava* 13, *tarka* 3, *nirṇaya* 2, *vāda* 1, *jalpa* 1, *vitaṇḍā* 1/2, *hetvābhāsa* 15, *chala* 3, *jāti* 17, *nigrahasthāna* 18.

Among the *prameyas*, *ātmā* gets 43 pages, *śarīra* 3, *indriyas* 8, *artha* 3, *buddhi* 8, *manas* 2, *pravṛtti* 1, *doṣa* 2, *pretyābhāva* 3, *phala* 1, *duhkha* 2, *apavarga* 40.

A break-up of Jayanta's discussion of the *pramāṇas* reveals a strange picture as the number of pages occupied by the discussion on *śabda* far outnumber the pages devoted to all the other *pramāṇas*, even when they are taken together. The *śabda pramāṇa* occupies 260 pages. The other three *pramāṇas*, that is, *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna* and *upamāna*, occupy together only 78 pages. The remaining 60 pages deal with the nature of *pramāṇa* in general. Among the three *pramāṇas*, *pratyakṣa* occupies 40 pages, *anumāna* 32 and *upamāna* only 6 pages. In case the number of pages is treated as an index of the importance of the subject for the author concerned, there can be little doubt that *śabda pramāṇa* occupies the pride of place for Jayanta followed by *pratyakṣa* (40), *anumāna* (32) and *upamāna* (6). Perhaps, the *upamāna* was included by him only because Gautama had mentioned it as an independent *pramāṇa* in the Nyāya Sūtra.

The relative importance of the respective *pramāṇas* gets even more sharply focussed in Bhāsarvajña. He eliminates *upamāna* as an independent *pramāṇa* and gives the lion's share to *śabda*

*pramāṇa* which occupies 219 pages in his work entitled *Nyāya Bhūṣaṇa* as compared with *pratyakṣa* which occupies 187 pages and *anumāna* 188. There seems to be, *prima facie*, a greater balance in the treatment of the three *pramāṇas* in Bhāsarvajña than one finds in Jayanta. Not only this, Bhāsarvajña seems to organise the material differently, and treats the whole issue of *śabda pramāṇa* as a part of the wider problem of *āgama prāmāṇya* which later on becomes an independent issue as evidenced in the work of Yāmunācārya entitled *Āgama-Prāmāṇya*. Bhāsarvajña's discussion of *śabda pramāṇa* in *āgama pariccheda* specifically treats both Buddhists and Jains as belonging to this tradition. Besides this, he squarely places the discussion of both *ātmā* and *Īśvara* in this part of his work. His extended discussion on *Īśvara* is another evidence that, by the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, God had begun to occupy an important place in Nyāya discussion and that Udayana alone should not be credited with making Nyāya theistic in intent, as has generally been said by writers on the subject. Interestingly, Bhāsarvajña raises the issue of *abādhitva* of knowledge and thus seems to bring into focus the problem raised by Śāṅkara in his formulation of *abādhitva* as a criterion of reality. The exact formulation of the issue is as follows:

(p 3 96) The advaitins do not seem to have faced the problem squarely as they seem to have assumed that the knowledge of *Brahman* is *abādhitva* in principle, and not merely *abādhitva* as a fact. The problem was later formulated by a thinker belonging to the *Vallabha Sampradāya* who formulated the distinction as obtaining between knowledge that was *abādhitva* and knowledge that was *bādhayogya-vyatirikta*, a distinction which does not seem to have caught the attention of other thinkers in the Indian philosophical tradition.

Bhāsarvajña also uses the term *jaraja* to refer to older *Naiyāyikas*, a term which is also found later in Udayana. The context of Bhāsarvajña's discussion seems to suggest that he is referring to Vātsyāyana (p.419) and hence the term seems to mean 'older' without implying any explicit negative connotation as it

seems to do in Udayana who contrasts it with *ādhunika* or *naveen* in his writings. Bhāsarvajña also uses the term '*pratiyogī*' (p.434) thus suggesting that, by his time, the *anuyogī-pratiyogī* mode of analysis had come into being, though it is not clear whether it had taken the specific form which it acquired in later *Navya Nyāya* formulations. As Udayana (984 A.D.), who comes only a little after Bhāsarvajña, is supposed to have carried the *anuyogī-pratiyogī* mode of analysis further, it appears that the analysis of negative statements was creating a problem for the Naiyāyikas and that Śivāditya's proposal to accept *abhāva* as an independent *padārtha* in his *Sāptapadārthi* around 1180 A.D. merely reflects an ontological acceptance of something that had become an epistemological necessity. It was thus the Naiyāyikas who seem to have precipitated the acceptance of *abhāva* as a new *padārtha* rather than the other way a round, as has generally been thought up till now. This all, of course, depends on the acceptance of the relative dates of the writers concerned.

## Chapter 5

### The Possible Extension of the Methodology for the Understanding of Other Texts in the Indian Tradition

THE methodology developed above in chapters two to six is illustrative of an approach towards the understanding of India's *Śāstric* texts in various fields of knowledge. The 'approach' treats the 'texts' as evidence of someone's serious engagement in the cognitive enterprise of his times. It places it in his historical context and sees it as "taking off" from what earlier 'entrepreneurs' in the tradition had achieved and relates it to the questions and problems which had given rise to the enterprise itself in earlier times. It also 'sees' it in the light of his successors whose critical and creative responses reveal the achievements and limitations of the text in a way in which one could never have seen it if one had confined one's attention to the text as if it was cut off from them, isolated and self-sufficient unto itself.

The process, in fact, starts from the 'present' in which one is cognitively situated and moves backwards to understand the text through an interrogative dialogue with it, asking questions, raising doubts and seeing the problems with which the writer of the text was struggling in order that some solution to them may be found to the satisfaction of oneself and one's peers. The 'questions' and 'problems' arise from a close study of the text and the text is seen in their light and the whole is seen once again in the context of the contemporary concerns which obtain in that field of knowledge. Each affects the other, and while the present

cognitive 'concerns' affect the apprehension of the past, the latter also substantially affect the former.

The methodology takes another turn when it self-consciously seeks to understand the way successive thinkers tried to understand the 'original' text from which the particular tradition of philosophizing is said to have started. The text now is seen through the successive mirrors in which its meaning is reflected. These inevitably are juxtaposed against the 'refractions' which occur through the cognitive mirror, that is, the mind of the author of this work, built by the intellectual training in the 'modern' world which is primarily shaped by the western intellectual tradition in all fields of knowledge, including philosophy.

The juxtaposition, strangely, not only brings out the unconscious prejudices and pre-suppositions of the intellectual enterprises of the past and the present but also illumines each other and increases our appreciation and understanding of both in a way which would not have been possible otherwise. Beyond this, it challenges one to think about the questions and problems once again in a manner which is "freed" from the intellectual bondages of both the past and the present. This perhaps is only a hope, or just an illusion; but there can be little doubt that unless the ground is clear and one becomes self-conscious of the intellectual prejudices and pre-suppositions involved one can hardly think of going further.

India's intellectual traditions are rich and diverse. They need to be looked at afresh, cultivated anew, questioned again and again in order that they may yield their intellectual insights for further development in the contemporary context. For this, they have to be seen as human enterprises engaged in by fallible men who were infected with doubt and uncertainty like each one of us and whose achievements, however great, are only human, all too human. Also, they have to be disengaged from much of their irrelevancies in which they are inevitably involved, just as 'our's' are involved in our own times.

The methodology that has been explored and exemplified in

this work is independent of the specific results achieved therein. Like all other methodologies it is flexible and modifiable, depending upon the person who uses it, the nature of the text and the field of knowledge with which one is concerned. It's cognitive usefulness can only be determined by the 'results' it may achieve in the hands of diverse persons in the future.

## Chapter 6

### Conclusion

**T**HE tradition of Nyāya which starts from the Nyāya Sūtra and continues down upto recent times is a complex, variegated tradition which has deep internal tensions and conflicting directions within itself. These, however, have generally been ignored or pushed under the carpet and treated as insignificant so that a unitary, monocromatic picture of the school may be built up to the satisfaction of all concerned. The Nyāya tradition of philosophizing is usually described as “*āstika*” in character and ultra-realistic in its epistemological intent. Its ontological commitments are supposed to be the same as those of the Vaiśeṣika, assuming that the latter have no inbuilt ambiguity and are not ‘problematic’ in their characterization. No one seems to take seriously the fact that the seventh *padārtha* of the Vaiśeṣika was added only much, much later, sometime around 1180 A.D. if Śiṣvāditya’s date as given in Potter’s bibliography is accepted and if it is also accepted that before his *Saptapadārthī*, *abhāva* was not accepted as an independent *padārtha* in the Vaiśeṣika ontology. Not only this, Praśastapāda’s radical reformulation of the number of *guṇas* and the various criteria on the basis of which they need to be classified has to be totally ignored to make the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika marriage seem full of harmony and joy. Strangely, the Naiyāyikas do not even seem to feel that the radical distinction drawn by Kaṇāda in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtras between *padārthas* which are *buddhyāpekṣā* and those which are not renders the so-called ultra-realism of Nyāya split at its very foundations as both *sāmānya* and *viśeṣa*

are not supposed to be independently existing *padārthas* in themselves. Imagine the fate of Nyāya realism if each *sāmānya* is supposed to be *buddhyāpekṣā*, the way Kaṇāda wanted them to be understood. And, what would the Naiyāyikas do if ‘*buddhi*’ is taken as ‘*upalabdhī*’ or ‘*jñāna*’, the sense in which Gautama defines it in the Nyāya Sūtra. The neglect of Kaṇāda’s distinction by the Naiyāyika gave rise to insoluble problems later in Navyānyāya analysis of *Śabda-bodha* where epistemological necessities gave rise to ontological ‘reals’ which proliferate endlessly without any means in the Naiyāyika armoury to check them. Udayana’s valiant attempt to demarcate between universals and pseudo-universals did not seem to have helped the later Naiyāyikas as they do not seem to know how to stop the proliferation of universals in their analysis.

There is a deeper problem about Nyāya which stems from Gautama himself and which seems to have hardly been seen by the Naiyāyikas who seem to feel that the tradition of Nyāya has solved all problems and that they are only to present it as the realist system *par excellence* to contemporary students of the subject. The term ‘*buddhi*’, as used in the Nyāya sūtras is so misleading as to make it impossible for even a sophisticated student of the subject to see that what is being talked about is not ‘reason’ or ‘intellect’ which it is usually taken to mean in its philosophical usage in the Sanskrit language, even though it may have overtones which are not usually associated with the term in the English language. In fact, there is no such ‘faculty’ in the Nyāya framework, as the term is supposed to mean only *upalabdhī* or *jñāna* as defined in the sūtra 1.1.16. It is surprising that no Naiyāyika since Gautama’s times has asked himself the simple question as to how one can have *anumāna* as a *pramāṇa* if there is no such thing as ‘*buddhi*’ in the usual sense of the term. In fact, there are only *indriyas*, the *manas* and the *ātman* besides, of course, the *indriyārthas* or the sense-objects. But as *manas* itself has only a negative or a restrictive function as defined in the N.S. 1.1.10, there remain only the *indriyas* and the *ātman* to play any

active role or perform any positive function in the context of either knowledge or action. The *ātman*, however, is only a residual category in the Nyāya Sūtras whose postulation is necessitated because *icchā, sukha, dveśa, prayatna, dukkha* and *jñāna* can not be ascribed, for some reason or other, to either the body, the senses or the mind. But, strangely, the *ātman* which is postulated in order that these may belong to it is defined in such a manner that it is impossible in principle for these to belong to it. The *ātman*, as is well-known, is supposed to be totally bereft of consciousness in its pure state or state of liberation and in case it is so, it can not in reality be said to have *icchā, sukha, dukkha, dveśa, prayatna, jñāna* in it. To think that they belong to it is to have *mithyā jñāna*, or to suffer from the foundational illusion which, according to it is, or ought to be, the root cause of suffering which is in all *pravṛtti*, that is, *sukha, dukkha* etc. But, if *jñāna* or knowledge can not belong to the *ātman* because of its very nature, then how can *mithyā jñāna* belong to it either, or produce the consequences that it is supposed to produce according to the analysis presented in sūtra 1.1.2 and explained in detail later?

In fact, if the criterion of *pravṛtti sāmānyā* is taken to be the criterion of the truth of any *jñāna*, then the so-called *mithyājñāna* will have to be accorded the status of 'real' knowledge as it has *pravṛtti sāmānyā* of an order that the so-called real *jñāna* is only *postulated* to have and is 'believed' to have only on grounds of faith or belief in the authority of the *āpta puruṣa* whose *āptatva* can hardly be established on the grounds of any *pramāṇa* independent of the belief that they are so. One wonders if the criterion of *pravṛtti sāmānyā* can reasonably be applied to the *upadeśa* of an *āpta puruṣa* in order to determine whether it is 'true' or not.

There is another problem in respect of the criterion of *pravṛtti sāmānyā* which, as far as I know, is accepted as the criterion of *pramāṇatva* of knowledge in Nyāya. The criterion is applied in the context of the achievement of *sukha* or pleasure and the

avoidance of pain (*dukkha*), but both *sukha* and *dukkha* are supposed to be the result of knowledge that is *apramā* in character, or what has been called *mithyā jñāna* in the system.

The sūtra 1.1.2 reminds one of the Buddhist analysis of human situation and, in fact, seems to represent the standard Indian analysis which completely ignores the self-contradiction involved in it. The usual Indian analysis is centered around the hedonistic view of human nature which sees it as naturally seeking pleasure and avoiding pain and has a pragmatic view of knowledge which sees the 'truth' of knowledge in terms of its ability to avoid pain and afford pleasure to the humankind. But on this view no distinction is possible between the human and the animal world as the latter also is supposed to seek pleasure or avoid pain and 'sees' the 'truth' of its knowledge in terms of the 'success' achieved by it in this enterprise. In fact, the whole learning theory in modern psychology and the training of animals is based on this premiss.

Yet, what is really surprising in the standard analysis which is epitomized both in the notions of *pravṛtti sāmānyā* and *arthakriyā kāritva* is the fact that it totally ignores the first step taken by Indian thought in distinguishing the animal and human world. The human world is differentiated in the well-known saying ascribed to Manu that man is distinguished by the awareness of the distinction between good and bad, right and wrong or, in other words, what is called '*dharma*' in the Indian tradition. The pursuit of *dharma*, it should be remembered, does not care for pleasure and pain and does not even think in terms of them, at least as far as one's own self is concerned. The total neglect of considerations of *dharma* in the philosophical traditions of India including Nyāya, is astounding, even if it is sought to be explained by saying that these are *mokṣa śāstras* or concerned with *mokṣa* and not *dharma* which is the business of the *dharma śāstras* or the *smṛti* texts in the tradition.

In fact, the omission, specially in Nyāya, appears to be even more surprising if it is remembered that it had defined the *śabda*

*pramāṇa* in terms of the *upadeśa* of an *āpta puruṣa* where the term *upadeśa* surely covers, or should cover, advice regarding what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. The discussion of this *pramāṇa* in the Nyāya tradition seems to be concerned more with extraneous and perhaps even irrelevant issues such as those of *nityatva* and *apauruṣeyatva* than with those which arise from the very definition of *pramāṇa* as given in 1.1.7. It does not discuss either the criterion of being an 'āpta' or as to what is to count as an *upadeśa*. The commentaries do discuss the issues related to the problem but mostly in a tangential and indirect manner. In fact, the discussion of the first issue is taken up in an intensive manner in a Jain work by Samantabhadra which is devoted to the whole issue and is titled *Āpta mīmāṃsā*. As for the second issue, it has been discussed at the deepest philosophical level, not in Nyāya, but in Mīmāṃsā which has explicitly argued for the *pramāṇatva* of *śabda*, that is, of the Veda or the *Śruti*, only in respect of the *vidhi-niṣedha vākyas* contained therein. Nowhere in the world, the 'injunction-centric' character of language has been explored or emphasized to the extent it has been done in this school of Indian philosophy. Not only this, it has argued most consistently for the subservience of the informational character of language to its injunctive character and, at a different level, even for the understanding of what may be called the imaginative-creative and poetic function of language as essentially subserving the purpose of injunction which perhaps has never been done by any other school of linguistic meaning elsewhere.

The strange situation thus created by the fact that the Nyāya definition of *śabda pramāṇa* comes so close to what the Mīmāṃsā says in this regard and yet departs from it radically is perhaps the result of their non-acceptance of the authority of the *śruti* or the Veda which was an article of unquestioned faith amongst the Mīmāṃsākas in the tradition. The pre-supposition becomes explicit in the reorganisation of Bhāsarvajña who treats *Śabda pramāṇa* under *āgama pariccheda*, thus, clearly indicating that the *pramāṇa* in question concerns the whole authority of what has

been called *āgama* in the Indian tradition and not just the *Veda* and the *śruti* as understood by the Mīmāṃsākas.

The problem today may be seen in a still wider perspective as we have not only other 'revelatory' traditions in the world, but face the question of 'authority' in every field of knowledge and action as evidenced explicitly in the field of law and implicitly in the discussion of all knowledge claims made in any domain whatsoever.

The Nyāya definition thus tries to capture what may be called the 'secular' aspect of the necessity of postulating an authority so that any claim may be settled, however temporarily, at the human level. But it is not clearly aware as to why the necessity is there or why it need be confined only to statements giving advice regarding what ought to be done. The heart of Nyāya however is not in this *pramāṇa* or even that of *upamāna*, even though some Naiyāyikas like Bhāsarvajña devote a substantive portion of their work to it. Its interest lies in the discussion of *pratyakṣa* and *anumāna*, and at a still deeper level in the intrinsic rationality of self-consciousness in its ratiocinative aspect where it questions every formulation of itself and tries to resolve the doubt or the *saṁśaya*, however temporarily, with all the resource at its command. There is, thus, an integral relationship between *saṁśaya*, the third *padārtha* in the Nyāya Sūtra and the *pramāṇa vyāpāra* which along with *prameya* constitute the first two *padārtas* in the Nyāya Sūtra. This has not generally been appreciated by those who have written on the Nyāya. Nor has it been seen that the Nyāya, like most other schools of philosophy, wants to establish through reason what is believed on grounds of faith by the culture in which it is situated. The mention of the *prameyas* in the Nyāya Sūtras attests to this fact and it is surprising that no one has seen the 'absurdity' of a *pramāṇa śāstra* which decides in advance what *prameyas* it wants to establish. This seemingly impossible 'absurdity' defines the paradoxical situation of Nyāya in the Indian tradition.

But, at a still deeper level, the paradox defines the human

situation as life can not wait for the certitudes of thought as action has to be undertaken and choices made even when one knows that, there is no “certainty” either about the knowledge on which the action is based or the ends for which the action is to be pursued. Wisdom seeks a way out of the impossible situation where, action is defined by the uncertain relation of the present with the future and where “knowledge” both seeks and asserts a certainty which has nothing to do with time.

The history of Nyāya after Udayama needs to be looked at in the light of these considerations alongwith the break and the continuity with what has occurred in the first millennium A.D. which has been covered to some extent in the preceding chapters. The methodology involved, however, is not confined to the text of the Nyāya Sūtra alone but can easily be extended with modification to apply to other texts in the tradition. And, basically, what has been attempted in terms of the methods used has, in principle, no restrictions to the texts of any one culture or civilization. It will be interesting to apply it to the foundational works of, say, western philosophical traditions and find how the text of Plato or of Aristotle functions when subjected to the above methodology. Ultimately, the methodology developed here is only an elaboration of that which naturally takes place when one really “reads” anything or when one “listens” to what someone else is saying. To “read” or “listen” in such a way is to question in order that one may understand what is being said and to “understand” is to “see” the significance, the imperfections and the undeveloped possibilities in that which one apprehends through what one ‘hears’ or reads.

## Appendix 1

### The Text of the Nyāya Sūtras: Some Problems\*

THE Indian intellectual and literary traditions are not known for any special concern for discovering the originals of their texts. In fact, normally the question itself does not arise, and hence the problem of additions, modifications, deletions, interpolations, etc., is not even seen as a problem which needs to be tackled. The recent search for the so-called *Ur texts* and their reconstruction on the basis of diverse criteria is due to the demands which western scholarship has imposed in the field of all classical studies, including those relating to India. It is therefore surprising to find that even in classical times attempts had been made to fix the authoritative text of the Nyāya Sūtras, the foundational work for Nyāya in the Indian tradition. Till now little thought has been given to these attempts to ascertain why there were these attempts in the first place, and to assess their significance.

This exercise in fixing the text of the Nyāya Sūtras becomes even more intriguing if we remember that Nyāya has had a more continuous and sustained tradition of thought and discussion than any other philosophical school not only in India but, perhaps, elsewhere also. From Gautama to Gadādhara or Baccā Jhā<sup>1</sup> or Badrinatha Shukla<sup>2</sup> is certainly a long period of sustained intellectual inquiry to be found anywhere in the world. The first attempt to settle the text of the Nyāya Sūtras was made by no less a person than Vācaspati Mīśra I who, in his *Nyāya-Sūcī-Nibandha*, not only fixed the text of the Nyāya Sūtras, but also divided them in proper order. This fact is well known to scholars, yet no one seems to have asked himself the simple question as



to why Vācaspati Mīśra I felt the necessity of fixing the text of the Nyāya Sūtras, specially when sensitivity to textual purity does not seem to have been a distinctive characteristic of Indian scholarship, then or now. Vācaspati Mīśra does not seem to have undertaken this exercise with respect to the text of any other philosophical school on which he had also written his commentaries. He was also not the first commentator on the Sūtras, as both Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara had already written their *Bhāṣya* and *Vārttika* on them. As Vācaspati Mīśra's own work on Nyāya is supposed to be a *Ṭikā* on Uddyotakara's *Vārttika*, it may be assumed that it was available to him. The relation between Uddyotakara's *Vārttika* and Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya* is not clear as a *Vārttika* is not supposed to be a full commentary like the *Bhāṣya*. It would be interesting to know what were the special issues chosen by Uddyotakara to write his *Vārttika* upon. The same thing applies to the work of Vācaspati Mīśra I as well as to those of subsequent writers on Nyāya. Unfortunately, neither the traditional pandits, nor modern scholars of Indian philosophy have been interested in undertaking this task.

It has been said that Vātsyāyana had no *Sūtrapāṭha* before him to write his *Bhāṣya* upon, or that there is even a 'hidden *vārttika*' in 'the *Bhāṣya* itself.'<sup>3</sup> The suggestion seems to be that there was a 'floating body of *sūtras*' from which he picked out some and treated them as authoritative. In other words, he first did what Vācaspati Mīśra I was to do later, though more explicitly and clearly than Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya*? There are supposed to be technical difficulties in this as the way in which the *sūtras* are referred to is not such as to clearly demarcate them from those that are not part of the original *sūtras*. In fact, there seems to be a lot of confusion even about such a simple fact as the manuscripts of the *Nyāya Sūtras* themselves. H.P. Sastri, in his article entitled *An Examination of the Nyāya Sūtras*, published in 1905, has stated that "ninety-nine percent of the manuscripts of this work are accompanied with some commentary or other. Manuscripts giving the *sūtra* only are extremely rare."<sup>4</sup> However, Gaṅgānātha

Jhā has referred to at least three manuscripts containing only the *sūtras* which he had consulted for his own translation of the text along with the *Bhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana and the *Vārttika* of Uddyotakara. He refers to "A palm-leaf Manuscript of the *Sūtra* only," "Paper manuscript of the *sūtra* only belonging to Jagadish Mishra," and "Paper Manuscript of *Sūtra* only belonging to Babu Govindadasa."<sup>5</sup> He does not mention any discrepancies in the manuscripts. Instead, according to him, "Every one of these manuscripts was found to be quite correct."<sup>6</sup> Gopinātha Kavirāja, in his Introduction to this monumental work of translation of Pt. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, seems to be unaware of any problem regarding the paucity of manuscripts containing the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras* only. Instead, he writes that "a critical edition of the *Sūtra-Pāṭha* of Nyāya, based upon a collection of all available manuscripts of different recensions and of the *Sūtras* as accepted by the various glosses and commentaries still existing, is the greatest desideratum of the day, and until this is done it is vain to endeavour to determine the *sūtratva* of a particular aphorism."<sup>7</sup> This obviously implies that it is not the absence of manuscripts of the *Nyāya Sūtras* which has made their collation impossible, but only the fact that nobody has tried to undertake it. In fact, Karl Potter in his bibliographical entries under Gautama refers to a host of editions of the *Nyāya Sūtras* published between 1821 and 1977, and it may be assumed that at least some of them would have consulted the original manuscripts of the work.<sup>8</sup> The reference in the *New Catalogus Catalogum* X, p. 276 at the beginning of the bibliography on the *Nyāya Sūtras* may be treated as additional evidence for this assumption.

Yet, though the *Nyāya Sūtras* seem to have been edited and translated a number of times, no one appears to have made an exhaustive list of the variant readings of the text, or of their significance. Even H.P. Sastri, who writes of discrepant readings, does not give any concrete examples of the discrepancies he is referring to. What is, perhaps, even more surprising is the fact that nobody accepts the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras* as given in the

*Nyāyasūcīnibandha* of Vācaspati Miśra I as finally authoritative, though no one has given reasons for doubting either their authenticity or his authority. Pt. Gopinātha Kavirāja, for example, has said in his Introduction to Gaṅgānātha Jhā's work that "in the translation efforts have been made to determine this, as far as possible. From the very nature of the present work, the translation has had to rely upon the verdict, direct or implied, of the *Bhāṣya*, the *Vārttika*, *Tātparya* and also upon Vācaspati Miśra's *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*; but help was also derived from two old manuscripts, obtained from two different sources."<sup>9</sup>

This statement is surprising in more ways than one. Firstly, it does not indicate in what ways the sources he has cited differ between themselves with reference to the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras*. Normally, one would have expected either Gopinātha Kavirāja or Gaṅgānātha Jhā to have pointed out the issue, discussed the discrepancies, and given reasons for their choice or reconstruction of what they considered to be the correct rendering of the sūtras. Gaṅgānātha Jhā has not given even the Sanskrit version of the sūtras so that one could do the required exercise oneself. Not only this, Gopinātha Kavirāja finds no problem in referring both to the *Tātparya* and the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* as independent sources for the determination of the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras*. By the *Tātparya*, he presumably means the *Nyāya-Vārttika-Tātparyaṭikā*. But if this is so, then as everybody knows, both the *Tātparya* and the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* are works of one and the same person, that is, Vācaspati Miśra I, and it would be strange to think that there are discrepancies between the two. The *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*, it should be remembered, was itself written to establish the authentic *sūtras* and must have been based not only on Uddyotakara's *Vārttika* on which the *Tātparyaṭikā* is ostensibly written, but also on Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya* to which the *Vārttika* is related and which must have been available to him independently. The only reason for postulating a divergence between the text as given in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and those found in the works of Vātsyāyana

and Uddyotakara would lie in the assumption that the texts of these works which were available to Vācaspati Miśra I were different from those that are available to us today. But, then, it should have been the task of Gaṅgānātha Jhā, if not of Pt. Gopinātha Kavirāja, to have pointed out the discrepancies between the text of the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and those found in the texts of the *Bhāṣya* and the *Vārttika* as they are found today.

What is, however, even more surprising is the total lack of any reference to the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* either by Gaṅgānātha Jhā or Gopinātha Kavirāja when that work also tries to fix the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras* like the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* to which they refer to. It is inconceivable that either of these scholars, justifiably renowned in their times, did not know of this work. Gopinātha Kavirāja explicitly refers to Haraprasada Sastri's article published in 1905<sup>10</sup> which specifically refers to the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. The translation of the *Nyāya Sūtras* by Gaṅgānātha Jhā was originally published in *Indian Thought* (Vols. IV-XI) from 1912 to 1919. Thus, a careful scholar such as Jhā also may be assumed to have known of H.P. Sastri's article. But even if he did not, he should have known independently of the work as it had already been published in the Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series in 1896 as their publication No. 9 along with the *Nyāya Bhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana. Pt. Gopinātha Kavirāja does write about it later in his work entitled *Gleanings from the History and Bibliography of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Literature*, but even there he neither mentions where it has been published, nor discusses its discrepancies with the text of the *sūtras* as given in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. He treats it only as a Maithila recension of the *Sūtras*. In his own words, "this booklet was intended to determine the number and true readings of the genuine *sūtras* as distinguished from those which have been interpolated into the text from time to time. This work is therefore in its object, of a similar nature with its predecessor, the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* of Vācaspati Māśra I. Its principal interest however consists in the fact that it represents the Maithila recension of the *Sūtrapāṭha*."<sup>11</sup>

It is unbelievable that a scholar of Pt. Gopinātha Kavirāja's eminence should have failed to see the problems raised by this statement. He did not ask himself the simple question as to why Vācaspati Miśra II felt even the necessity of settling the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras* when Vācaspati Miśra I had already done so, or what were the interpolations that he thought needed to be rectified, and what were the discrepancies between the text as established by Vācaspati Miśra I and the text as established by Vācaspati Miśra II. His conclusion seems even stranger, for if his intention was "to determine those which have been interpolated into the text from time to time" then how can it be treated as a mere Maithila recension of the text? And, what is the evidence of its being such a recension? Has the whole Maithila school accepted it? And, is not Vācaspati Miśra I himself supposed to belong to Mithilā?

Not only does Pandit Gopinātha Kavirāja fail to raise these questions, he does not give any indication of the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* he is referring to, whether in published or manuscript form so that one could establish the truth of what he is saying.

Haraprasad Sastri is himself, of course, mistaken in his reference to the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. First, though writing in 1905, he is under the mistaken impression that the work has not been published at all till it was given by him to Dr. Venis, and it was published at Benaras. He writes "I got one from Midnapore, and gave a copy of it to my friend Dr. Venis and it was published at Benaras."<sup>12</sup> Secondly, he seems to be under the Impression that both the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* and the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* are the works of the same person. He writes, "The difficulty which I feel in regard to the *Nyāya-Sūtras* was also felt about a thousand years ago, when Vācaspati Miśra, who flourished about the end of the tenth century, twice attempted to fix the number of Sūtras and their readings, namely, the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* and in *Nyāyasūcinibandha*, both of which go by his name. If both are the works of one man, as they profess to be, it is apparent that

the author did not feel sure of his ground."<sup>13</sup> It is obvious that the writer is not aware of the existence of Vācaspati Miśra II, who flourished centuries after Vācaspati Miśra I, the author of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*.

The neglect of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* by such outstanding scholars even after its publication as early as 1896 in one of the most prestigious Sanskrit Series defies all explanation. The facts about this work seem to have been wrongly given even in prestigious bibliographical reference works. Potter's classic reference work on Indian philosophies published as late as 1983 does not seem to be aware of the fact that the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* had already been published, and that too as early as 1896. The entry under *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* only states "(Partly in ms., acc. To DB, 147; cf. Also UM, 292)."<sup>14</sup> Similarly, in the Volume on *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, the only reference to Vācaspati Miśra II occurs not with reference to his work entitled *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* but in connection with the name of the author of the *Ratnakośa* mentioned by him.<sup>15</sup> There is a reference to the publication No. 9 of the Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, but without any mention of the fact that it published the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* for the first time.<sup>16</sup>

Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya has tried to deny the authenticity of the text as being the text of *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* of Vācaspati Miśra II. He writes, "the so-called Gautamasūtras printed along with the *Nyāyabhāṣya* in pp. 28 with the introductory verse, *Śrīvācaspatimiśreṇa mithaleśvarasūriṇā likhyate munimūrdhanyaśrīgautamamatam mahat*, is not an edition of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, as is sometimes supposed but only a text of the *Nyāyasūtras* prepared by the editor of the *Bhāṣya* after consulting various books including a copy of the *Sūtroddhāra*."<sup>17</sup> However, this is a statement unsubstantiated by any evidence whatsoever. Not only this, he does not state as to what is the authentic text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* in manuscript or published form, and how this text departs from it. Furthermore, as he has not here given exact reference to the edition of the *Bhāṣya* he

is referring to, it is not easy to check what he is referring to. Later, of course, in his article entitled *Nyāya Works of Vācaspati Miśra II of Mithilā*, he does give the reference in the footnote as Viz. ed. 1896<sup>18</sup> which obviously refers to Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī's edition of the *Nyāyabhāṣya* published in that series. But if it refers to that, then it has to be explained as to why the *Sūtrapāṭha* given therein has been preceded by the verse he has quoted, for it ascribes it to Vācaspati Miśra and not to the editor Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailaṅga. Secondly, in case he is the compiler of the *Sūtra-Pāṭha*, as alleged by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya, why should he have given such extensive footnotes to the *Sūtras* claiming in the case of many of them that the *pramāṇa* of their *sūtratva* does not seem to be available, a point we will discuss in detail later on. Also, though the editorial statement in the beginning (*prthaka sūtrapāṭhaśca Vāscapatimiśrakṛt sūtroddhāranāmakaṁ bangākṣaralikhitaṁ nātiprācīnaṁ pustakamālocya samyojitāḥ*) is capable of being interpreted the way Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya has done, it generally has not been so interpreted. And there is no reason to do so, unless someone produces a more authentic text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* based on manuscripts which have been critically edited. However, even if there were to be such a text, it will only prove our main point that not only the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras* has been repeatedly sought to be fixed by eminent Naiyāyikas in the past without having given sufficient grounds for their choice, but that the practice continues in the present with the added anomaly that the present scholars do not seem to be aware of each other's works or even of the implication of their statements.

The scholar who takes the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* seriously for the first time is, perhaps, Pandit Sri Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla who, in his edition of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *Nyāyamañjarī* has not only printed the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* at the end of the work but also compared it with other renderings of the *Sūtras* or their existence or non-existence in other standard texts on the subject. It is perhaps the most comprehensive statement of the *Nyāya Sūtras*

as rendered by different texts.<sup>19</sup> However, as the appendix is neither listed in the table of contents of the book nor discussed by the author in his Preface, it seems to have escaped the attention of most scholars of the subject. This could also be the reason why Potter, though mentioning it in the Bibliographical section on Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, fails to include it under the bibliographical references on Gautama's *Nyāya Sūtras*.

In fact, even earlier, Rāma Bhavana Upādhyāya had published the variant readings along with the deletions and additions of the *Sūtras* in an article in the *Pandit New Series*.<sup>20</sup> However, it had confined itself only to the text of Viśwanātha's *Vṛtti* on the *Nyāya-Sūtras* as found in the Sarasvati Bhavan Library Manuscript on a *tāḍapatra*, referred to in his article as अ०वृ०, an edition of the same as edited by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara and published in Varanasi, referred to as मु०कृ० and as given in Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya* published in the *Pandit Series* itself referred to as मु०भा० along with the *sūtras* as given in the published text of the *Nyāya Vārttika* edited by Pt. Vindhyeshwari Prasad Shastrī in 1888 A.D. referred to as मु०भा०. Thus the article compares the *sūtras* as given in the manuscript of Viśwanātha's *Vṛtti* found in the Sarasvati Bhavan Library with the published version of the text edited by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara, along with the *Bhāṣya* and the *Vārttika* published earlier.

However, though the article was written around 1922, the author who himself edited and published Viśwanātha's *Vṛtti* on the *Nyāya Sūtras*, did not refer either to the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* or the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, the two known texts which earlier had tried authoritatively to fix the text of the *Sūtras*. In fact, there seems to be an extreme arbitrariness amongst scholars regarding what shall be accepted as the source of *pramāṇa* for the *sūtratva* of a *sūtra* in the *Nyāya* tradition. If we take, for example, the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* as first published by Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailaṅga in 1896 as a text of the *Nyāya Sūtras* with Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya* in the Vizianagaram Sanskrit series, Vol.

IX, we find that, according to him, no *pramāṇa* is available for as many as 184 sūtras out of a total of 531 sūtras given in the text. That this is a surprisingly large number needs to be emphasized. Yet, what is perhaps even stranger is the fact that the learned editor of the text is not bothered about it nor, for that matter, is anyone else. The situation becomes even more intriguing if one remembers that there is not a single *sūtra* out of the first chapter whose *pramāṇatva* has been questioned by him, and as the whole of the second part of the fifth chapter is problematic in a special sense, the real proportion of the non-*prāmāṇika* sūtras is found amongst Chapters 2 to 5.1, that is, the first *āhnikā* of Chapter V. Even amongst these the distribution of the non-*prāmāṇika* sūtras varies as will be evident from the following list:

Chapter	Total No. of sūtras	The number of non- <i>prāmāṇika</i> sūtras
2.1	68	17
2.2	66	19
3.1	73	20
3.2	77	32
4.1	68	38
4.2	51	30
5.1	43	27

It is obvious from the above that in Chapter 4.1, 4.2 and 5.1 the proportion of the non-*prāmāṇika* sūtras is above 50%, while in Chapter 3.2, it is not very far from it. How could any text have been taken seriously in such a situation, and why did Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailang waste so much time over it, and publish it in the beginning of his scholarly edition of the *Nyāya-Sūtras* in 1896? What is, however, even more surprising is the fact that in spite of his considering so many of the *sūtras* as un-*prāmāṇika*, he treats them as a part of the *Nyāya Sūtras* in the main body of the text. All the 183 sūtras about each of which he writes 'nopalabhyate asya pramāṇam' are reproduced in the

main body of the published text without giving any reason as to why, if there is no authentic foundation for treating them as genuine sūtras, as he has explicitly stated, they should be treated as the sūtras on which Vātsyāyana had written his *Bhāṣya*. And in case the latter is treated as a *Bhāṣya* on those sūtras, then is it not sufficient ground for treating them as genuine? The lack of any discussion on the part of the learned Pandit makes it difficult to answer these questions. In fact, even when he departs from the reading of the *Sūtra* as given in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* text published by him in the main body of the work, as he does in the case of sūtras 5.1.17 and 5.1.34, he does not give any reasons for the change, or why he prefers the variant version, and on what basis.<sup>21</sup>

The problem is even more complicated by the fact that when Pandit Śrī Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla tries to find the *pramāṇas* for those sūtras, he finds them either in *Nyāyatattvāloka* *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* or *Anvikaṣānayatatattvabodhaḥ*. While one may accept the possibility of Pandit Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailang not being aware of *Nyāyatattvāloka*, as the only known copy of it was in the India Office Library in London, and that too in incomplete form,<sup>22</sup> it is inconceivable that he did not know of *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* which is the most well-known compilation of the *Nyāya Sūtras* done by Vācaspati Miśra I who had himself written the famous *Nyāya-Vārttika-Tātparyāṭikā*, or of *Anvikaṣānayatatattvabodhaḥ* about which, according to the entry in *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, mention had been made in the Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavan Studies, III, p. 133–34.<sup>23</sup> Even if it is assumed that the latter work was not known to Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailang, the neglect of *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* remains a problem which can only be solved by assuming that he did not accept its *prāmāṇika* character. But as he does accept Vācaspati Miśra's *Tātparyāṭikā* as *prāmāṇika*, it is surprising why he should not have accepted the *pramāṇic* character of his *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* also, particularly when it was ostensibly written to fix the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras*, and classify them

according to the topics dealt within. The only way this anomaly could be dealt with would be to assume that, in his opinion, these two texts were not written by the same person or, in other words, that the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and the *Tātparyāṭikā* were written by two different persons. This, however, will be an even more radical position to take, and one would have to explicitly justify it on cogent grounds rather than just assume it, as seems to have been done by Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailaṅg.

But if one does accept the identity of the authors of the two texts, as most authorities do, then it is incomprehensible as to how one can cite them as *independent pramāṇa* for the *sūtratva* of a *sūtra*. But that is just what Pandit Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla does in his attempt to find *pramāṇa* for the *sūtras* given in the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. He gives both *Tātparyāṭikā* and *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* as *pramāṇa* for the *sūtratva* of a *sūtra*, forgetting that as they are written by the same person they cannot be independent *pramāṇas*. In fact, it is not clear why, if one of these texts provides a basis for the authenticity of a *sūtra*, the other would not do the same unless one were to assume that there was variation in what are counted as *sūtras* in the two texts. However, if one were to assume this, one would have the problem of explaining how the two could then have been written by the same person.

In fact, Pandit Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla not only cites both *Tātparyāṭikā* and *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* as sources for the authenticity of the *sūtras* as given in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, but also *Tattvāloka* which is supposed to be a work written by the author of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* itself. But this he could have done only if he did not know the identity of the authorship of the two texts. But to have known the text and not to have known the author would be strange indeed, particularly as it is not considered to be an anonymous work. There is, of course, the further problem as to how Pt. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla could have seen the work in such detail as the only manuscript of the work, according to the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, is in the India Office Library.<sup>24</sup> He, of

course, could have got a photocopy of the manuscript, but considering the facilities available in the early thirties, it is extremely unlikely that it was so. There was perhaps, a manuscript of the *Tattvāloka* in the Saraswati Bhavan Library at Benaras, not known to the compilers of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*.

In any case, it is baffling as to why Pt. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla had to go to unpublished sources for establishing the *pramāṇatva* of the *sūtras*, when most of them could have been easily found in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. To give but one example, the *pramāṇa* for *sūtras* 2.1.47 and 2.1.48 is given as *Tattvāloka* on p. 7 of the Appendix to his edition of the *Nyāyamañjarī*. But both 2.1.47 and 2.1.48 can be found in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*, the former with a little modification and the latter with none. The *sūtrapāṭha* in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* is ‘*nāpratyakṣe gavaye pramāṇārthamupamānasya paśyāmaḥ*’ (2.1.47) and ‘*tathetyupasaṃhārādupamānasiddhenāviśeṣaḥ*’ (2.1.48). In the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* they are given as ‘*nāpratyakṣe gavaye pramāṇārthamupamānasya paśyāmaḥ iti*’ and ‘*tathetyupasaṃhārādupamānasiddhenāviśeṣaḥ*’ (12–13). Of course, the numbering of the *sūtras* in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* is not 2.1.47 and 2.1.48, but 2.1.48 and 2.1.49 respectively. But that hardly matters, and is easily explained by the fact that while there are only 68 *sūtras* in the first *āhnika* of the second *adhyāya* in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, the corresponding number of *sūtras* is 69 in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. In fact the situation is the same even with the remaining ones where *Tattvāloka* alone is given as a *pramāṇa*. Why this has been done and what purpose it serves is beyond all comprehension. The situation is even more baffling if one remembers that the author has given in the case of many *sūtras* more than one source of authentication. *Sūtras* 2.1.59 to 2.1.64, for instance, provide one such example where both *Tattvāloka* and *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* are cited as *pramāṇa* for the *sūtratva* of these *sūtras*.

In fact, as only 10 *sūtras*<sup>25</sup> of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* are missing from the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*, all the rest may be

authenticated from *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* if its *prāmāṇika* character is accepted by a thinker. In case variant readings are also taken into account, about eleven *sūtras*<sup>26</sup> in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* have a variant reading (including additions, deletions, etc.) from the one found in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. Hence, all in all, we would have only a problem of about 21 *sūtras* if we confine our attention to these two texts alone. On the other hand, if we take the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* as our base, we find 8 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* missing in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*.<sup>27</sup> Thus, there is a discrepancy of 18 *sūtras* between the two texts. In case we include the variant readings also, it would all come to 29 *sūtras*.

However, the story does not end with these two texts alone. If we forget the pre-*Nyāyasūcīnibandha* attempts to fix the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras*,<sup>28</sup> there are a number of post-*Nyāyasūtroddhāra* attempts which cannot be ignored. The most prestigious of these is, of course, the *Vṛtti* of Viśvanātha Bhaṭṭācārya, originally published in 1922 in *Pandit New Series* 2.2. edited by Rāma Bhavana Upādhyāya and reprinted in 1985 in the Anandashram Sanskrit Series, No. 91. If we take the *sūtra-pāṭha* as given in the appendix to the work as the base, we find that 11 *sūtras* of the *Vṛtti* are missing in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and 6 *sūtras* in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*.<sup>29</sup> Conversely, we find 3 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* missing in the *Vṛtti* (2.1.20, 2.2.43 and 3.1.73). As for the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, it appears that none of its *sūtras* is missing in the *Vṛtti*. If we take the *sūtras* with the variant readings from the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* (with additions etc.) their number comes to about 16.<sup>30</sup> If we take them from the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, the variant reading in the *Vṛtti* are also around 16, though this time they relate to different *sūtras*.<sup>31</sup> Thus, in all, Viśvanātha's *Vṛtti* has a difference in about 30 *sūtras* (missing or variant reading with additions, etc.) from the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and of about 22 *sūtras* from the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*.

Viśvanātha's *Vṛtti* is a well-known work and the discrepancies in the *sūtra-pāṭha* from both the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and the

*Nyāyasūtroddhāra* may be deemed to be important. The same can hardly be said about the *Nyāya Sūtra* text given by Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhaṭṭācārya published in the *Pandit New Series*, 23, 24, and 25 in 1901, 1902 and 1903 along with his commentary on them entitled *Vivaraṇa* by S. T. G. Bhattacharya.<sup>32</sup> Though it was brought to the notice of the scholarly world at the very beginning of the century, it has been little discussed in any significant way by the scholarly community. In this respect, it seems to have had the same fate as the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* which was published only a little earlier, in 1896. However, if the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* had the good fortune of having caught the attention of Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstri Tailang and Pt. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla whose work we have discussed earlier, the text of Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī has had the good fortune of finding an advocate in Śri T. K. Gopalswamy Aiyangar who has written a couple of articles trying to draw attention to its importance in the context of the question as to what exactly is the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras*. In his article entitled *A Critique of the Nyāya-Sūtra Text* (as interpreted in the *Nyāya-Sūtra Vivaraṇam*),<sup>33</sup> he has given in the Appendix to the article a detailed comparison of the readings of the *sūtras* between the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* where the two differ. According to him, seven *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* are missing in the *Vivaraṇa* and six *sūtras* of the *Vivaraṇa* are missing in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*.<sup>34</sup> The variant readings between the two texts, on the other hand, seem to be unbelievably large. If we take *Vivaraṇa* as the base of comparison, then the *sūtras* that have a variant reading come to about 85, while if we make the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* as the base, they come to about 87. These are rather large discrepancies, and should have been the subject of intensive discussion and investigation by scholars interested in Nyāya philosophy in the country. But, as far as I know, nothing of the kind seems to have taken place even after the publication of Gopalswamy Aiyangar's article.

However, Gopalswamy Aiyangar compared the *Vivaraṇa* text only with the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and not with the

*Nyāyasūtroddhāra* or with Viśvanātha's *Vṛtti*, though he does mention both in the list of editions of the *Nyāya Sūtras* which were available at that time. One reason for this seems to be his belief that both the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* were written by the same Vācaspati Miśra, an opinion he derives from Pt. Hara Prasad Sastri whom he quotes to this effect. But while there might have been some justification for Pt. Hara Prasad Sastri to have made the mistake in 1905, there could have been none in Aiyangar's case in the year 1947. Surprisingly, he does not even know of the *Nyāyatattvāloka* and thinks that the references to it by the editor of *Vivaraṇa* is the result of some confusion. He writes: "I wish to draw the attention of the readers to the fact that the editor of the *Nyāya-Sūtra-Vivaraṇam* refers to a *Nyāya-Sūtra* text known as *Nyāyatattvāloka* as being ascribed to Vācaspati Miśra . . . and very frequently refers to the book to point out the variations in the reading with reference to *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. He does not refer to *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* at all. So it is doubtful whether the editor identifies *Nyāyatattvāloka* with *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* or refers to a separate work of Vācaspati Miśra. Perhaps, *Nyāyatattvāloka* is an outcome of a third attempt of Vācaspati Miśra in collecting the *Nyāya-Sūtras*. Anyhow no such work is available."<sup>35</sup> It is obvious that he has not seen the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* text published by Pt. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla in the text of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, which he edited and published in 1936. Otherwise, it would have been obvious to him that *Tattvāloka* was not only a different work from the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, but also that it was well known to scholars in Kashi. However, the fact that the editor of the *Nyāyasūtravivaraṇa* made a reference to it in 1901 suggests that the information given about *Tattvāloka* in both the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* and the *Darśanamañjarī* is incomplete as some other manuscript of it, besides the one in the India Office Library at London, must have been available at Banaras. As for the information in Potter's *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol. I, it is doubly wrong as it not only identifies *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*

with *Tattvāloka*, but assumes that it is available only in manuscript form, and that too only partly.<sup>36</sup> In a sense, it appears that Gopalswamy Aiyangar has not even carefully seen Dr. Gaṅgādhara Śāstri's text in the Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, No. 9 to which he refers in the article mentioned above. For, had he done so, it is unbelievable that he would not have been struck by the fact that according to the learned editor no *pramāṇa* was available for so many *sūtras* in the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* which he had published therein. His reference to *Nyāya Koṣa* seems even more otiose as there is no discussion about the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras* in it except for stating that there are in all five *adhyāyas* in the *Nyāya Sūtras* each consisting of two *āhnikas*, and the total number of *sūtras* being 537.<sup>37</sup> Surprisingly, in his article on the same subject published 23 years later, he does not show any awareness of the gross confusions and downright mistakes of which he is guilty in this article.<sup>38</sup>

The two subsequent works that surprisingly show a self-conscious awareness of the problem are the *Gautamiya-Sūtra-prakāśaḥ* of Keśava Miśra and the *Nyāya-Tātparyā-Dīpikā* of Bhaṭṭa Vāgīśvara, both edited by Dr. Kishore Nātha Jhā and published by Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, Prayaga, in 1978 and 1979 respectively. In his Introduction to the first volume, Dr. Kishore Nath Jha quite clearly states that in any discussion about the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras*, one would have to take into consideration besides the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* of the elder and the younger Vācaspati Miśra, the *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā* of Aniruddha, the *Parīśuddhi* of Udayana, the *Prakāśa* of Keśava Miśra, the *Vṛtti* of Viśvanātha Pañcānana, the *Khadyota* of Gaṅgānātha Jhā, the corrected *Bhāṣya* of Phaṇibhūṣaṇa Tarakavāgīśa, the *Nyāya-Bhūṣaṇa* of Bhāsarvajña, the *Nyāyamañjarī* of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and other relevant works where the *Nyāya Sūtras* have been explicitly stated and counted. It is not quite clear why he has not included Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhaṭṭācārya's *Vivaraṇa* in it, as it is unlikely that he is unaware of it, or of *Tattvāloka*, specially when



so much had already been written about them. In any case, Dr. Jha has shown a considerable degree of awareness about the complexity of the problem, and he is perhaps the first person who has taken into account a work written in a language other than Sanskrit, that is, the outstanding work of Pt. Phanibhūṣaṇa Tarkavāgīśa in Bengali.

But though he has indicated the enormity of the task, he has confined himself to noting the problems raised for the *sūtrapāṭha* only by the text he is editing, that is, the *Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ* of Keśava Miśra Tarkācārya.<sup>39</sup> Pt. Ānanta Lal Thakur, on the other hand, says in his Introduction to the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā* that for determining the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras* it would be best to take the *Nyāya-Tattvāloka* of the younger Vācaspati, the *Nyāyasūtravṛtti* of Vamśīdhara, the *Gautmiyasūtraprakāśa* of Keśava Miśra and the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpika* of Bhaṭṭa Vāgīśvara.<sup>40</sup> It is not quite clear if the learned pandit is once again confusing *Tattvāloka* with *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* of Vācaspati Miśra II for, if he is talking of the *Tattvāloka* whose manuscript is supposed to be in the India Office Library, London, then it can hardly serve as the basis for establishing the text of the *Nyāya-Sūtras* as it is supposed to be incomplete. And, pray, why not the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* of Vācaspati Miśra I which, as far as we know, is the earliest known attempt at fixing the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras*? In any case, the self-consciousness of these two scholars about the problem as displayed in their Introduction to these two recently edited works is a welcome change and needs to be pursued more systematically by others.\*

If we compare the *sūtrapāṭha* given in these two recently edited texts, we find that 13 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* are missing in the *Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśa* and 39 *sūtras* in the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā* of Keśava Miśra and Bhaṭṭa Vāgīśvara

\* The *Nyāyatattvāloka* of Vācaspati Miśra II was published in 1992 by Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Prayāga under the Editorship of Dr. Kishore Natha Jha after this article was first published in the Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research, Vol. VII No. 2, January-April, 1990.

respectively. Conversely, 5 *sūtras* of *Prakāśa* and 29 *sūtras* of *Dīpikā* are missing from the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. The variant readings between the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* and the *Prakāśa* are roughly about 14, while those between the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* and the *Dīpikā* are about 53. Thus the total *sūtras* missing between the *Dīpikā* and the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* comes to 60, while that between the *Prakāśa* and the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* comes to 18. The comparison of these two texts with the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* reveals that 40 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* are missing in the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā* and 8 *sūtras* in the *Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśa* of Keśava Miśra. On the other hand, 25 *sūtras* from the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā* are missing in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*, while only 3 *sūtras* from the *Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśa* are not found therein. The variant readings between the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* and the two texts is about 31 and 12 respectively. (For details see Appendices I, II, III and IV).

The comparative situation between the six texts that we have examined up till now may be summarized thus :

1. 8 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* are not found in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*.
2. 10 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* are not found in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*. (Total 18.)
3. The variant reading in the existing *sūtras* between the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* and the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* occurs in the case of about 11 *sūtras* only.
4. 3 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* are not found in the *Vṛtti* of Viśvanātha.
5. 11 *sūtras* of the *Vṛtti* are not found in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*. (Total 14.)
6. No *sūtra* of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* seems to be missing in the *Vṛtti*.
7. 6 *sūtras* of the *Vṛtti* are missing in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. (Total 6.)
8. The *Vṛtti* has about 16 *sūtras* which have a variant reading from that of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*.

9. The *Vṛtti* has variant readings from the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* in about 16 *sūtras* also, though they are not the same as have the variant reading when compared with the *sūtras* in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*.

10. 7 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* are missing in the *Vivaraṇa*.

11. 6 *sūtras* of the *Vivaraṇa* are missing in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*. (Total 13.)

12. The variant readings between the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* seem to range between 85 and 87.

13. 13 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* are not to be found in the *Gautamīya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ*.

14. 5 *sūtra* of the *Gautamīya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ* are not found in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*.

15. The variant readings between the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* and the *Gautamīya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ* are roughly about 14.

16. 8 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* are missing in the *Gautamīya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ*.

17. 3 *sūtras* of the *Gautamīya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ* are missing in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*. (Total. 11)

18. The number of variant readings between the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* and the *Gautamīya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ* comes to about 12.

19. 31 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* are not to be found in the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā*.

20. 29 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyatātparyadīpikā* are not to be found in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* (Total. 60)

21. The variant readings between the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* and the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā* come to about 53.

22. 40 *sūtras* of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* are missing in the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā*.

23. 25 *sūtras* of the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā* are missing in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*. (Total 65).

24. The variant readings of the *sūtras* in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*

and the *Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā* occur in about 32 *sūtras* of the two texts.

If we treat the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* as the reference point, we find the following situation obtaining in respect of the texts we have examined in the article:\*

	NST	Vṛtti	Vivaraṇa	Prakāśa	Dīpikā
Missing total	18	14	13	11	65
Variant Readings	11	16	85 to 87	12	32

On the other hand, if we take the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* as our base, we find the following situation:

	NS	Vṛtti	Vivaraṇa	Prakāśa	Dīpikā
Missing total	18	6	—	18	60
Variant Readings	11	16	—	15	53

Note: The comparison of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* with the *Vivaraṇa* has not been done as we have not been able to procure a copy of the latter.

The two tables reveal that the most radical situation obtains in the case of the *Dīpikā* and the *Vivaraṇa* which seem to be very unorthodox in their approach to the text of the *sūtras*. The *Dīpikā* has a difference of as many as 65 *sūtras* from the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* and of 60 from the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. Even if we take into account the editor's contention that many of these additional *sūtras* are statements taken from the *Bhāṣya* and elevated to the status of the *sūtras*, the difference still remains substantial as the total number of what may be called the *Bhāṣya-Sūtras* is only 13. So, even if we ignore them, the total difference will still amount to 52 and 47 respectively. The variant readings

\* The abbreviations stand for the following texts:

(i) NS - *Nyāyasūcinibandha* (ii) NST = *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, (iii) Vṛtti = Viśvanātha Bhaṭṭācārya's *Vṛtti* on Gautama's *Nyāya Sūtra* (iv) *Vivaraṇa* = *Nyāyasūtra-Vivaraṇa* of Rādhāmohana Gosvāmi Bhaṭṭācārya, (v) *Prakāśa* = *Gautamīyasūtraprakāśaḥ* of Keśava Miśra and (vi) *Dīpikā* = *Nyāyatātparyadīpikā* of Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara.

in the case of the *Dīpikā* are also unusually high: they run to around 32 when compared with the text of the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*, and to about 53 when compared with the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. The only comparable situation is found in the case of the *Vivaraṇa* where the variant readings come to about 85 or 87. This is almost the combined variant readings of the *Dīpikā* with respect to both the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. Surprisingly, the total number of missing *sūtras* in the *Vivaraṇa* is only 13, though we should remember that it is perhaps only a one-way comparison between the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and the *Vivaraṇa*, and does not include the reverse comparison which is necessary to get a complete picture of the situation.

The author of the *Dīpikā*, according to Pt. Ananta Lal Thakur, seems to belong to a period before Udayana and is in the tradition of older Nyāya.<sup>41</sup> As for the author of the *Vivaraṇa* he is supposed to belong to the seventeenth century and is well-versed in Navya-Nyāya, according to T. K. Gopalswamy Aiyangar.<sup>42</sup> From the tenth century (if we accept Udayana's date as eleventh century)<sup>43</sup> to the seventeenth century is a long period, and yet the freedom with respect to what to accept or not as a *sūtra*, or which reading of the *sūtra* to adopt, seems to remain the same. It is not as if the older author is more concerned with accepting the so-called authority of the venerable elders than the younger—a situation one would have normally expected given the way the Indian intellectual tradition is usually presented to us in the text-books on the subject. It is instead the elder who seems more independent, as he does not hide what he accepts or rejects or modifies under the guise of finding a new manuscript of the text.

Keśava Miśra Tarkācārya's *Prakāśa* comes in between the two as, according to Potter's *Bibliography*, he flourished around 1525.<sup>44</sup> *Prakāśa*'s variant readings or the missing *sūtras* are not very different in number from those in the other texts, though it seems closer to the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* than to the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, at least in numerical terms. Viśvanātha

Pañcānana's *Vṛtti* belongs to a slightly later period than Keśava Miśra as the former is supposed to have flourished around 1540, according to the same source.<sup>45</sup> If we accept the date of Vācaspati Miśra II, the author of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, as 1450 A.D.<sup>46</sup>; and of Vācaspati Miśra I as 960 A.D.,<sup>47</sup> then the chronological order of the six texts we have considered would be the following:

- (1) *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*,
- (2) *Nyāyatātaparya-Dīpikā*,
- (3) *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*
- (4) *Gautamīyasūtraprakāśaḥ*,
- (5) *Viśvanātha's Vṛtti* and
- (6) Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī.

Bhāṭṭācārya's *Vivaraṇa*.

It should, however, be remembered that the *Dīpikā* is a text only recently discovered and edited, and that its author's date is only conjecturally suggested by Pt. Ananta Lal Thakur in his Introduction to the text on the basis of internal evidence. In fact, the text is not listed either in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* or in Potter's *Bibliography* or Thangaswami Sarma's *Darśanamañjarī*. The only work referred to by that name both in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* and the *Darśanamañjarī* is one by Jayasimhasūrī, being a commentary on Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyasāra*.<sup>48</sup> As for *Vivaraṇa*, it is primarily a commentary on a *Nyāya Sūtra* text supposed to have been found by Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhāṭṭācārya, and as no one else seems to have seen the original text, neither its dating nor its author is known. In fact, if the authenticity of that text is accepted, then one would have to believe that in some essential respects the Nyāya tradition from Vātsyāyana onwards has been essentially mistaken. In T. K. Gopalswamy Aiyangar's words, "So in the light of a clear deviation of the readings of many *sūtras*, and of the disclosure of some new *Nyāya-Sūtras* unknown as yet to the world of the Nyāya scholars, and of the unflinching fidelity on the part of the commentator to a different text, it can be admitted that the *Nyāya-Sūtra* text as found edited in the *Nyāya-Sūtra-Vivaraṇa* belongs

to a different recension of the *Nyāya-Sūtras* unknown either to the Bhāṣyakāra, Vārttikakāra, or Vācaspati Miśra or Udayana.<sup>49</sup> He is, of course, aware that “most of the critics may contend that Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhaṭṭācārya, who flourished somewhere in the seventeenth century A.D. even perhaps subsequent to Viśvanātha Pañcānana might have interpolated some into the body of the text to suit his line of Nyāya conception.”<sup>50</sup>

He rejects this possibility, but does not explore or even show any awareness of the problems raised by such a situation. If Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī has not interpolated the *sūtras* and the variant readings, then either the writer of the manuscript did, or we would have to hold Vātsyāyana guilty of deleting, modifying and interpolating the *sūtras*, and the *sūtra*-variations in his text. The other alternative of two recensions with such divergent readings would only push the problem still further back, and also raise the question as to why there is no prior evidence of the other recension till Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhaṭṭācārya in the seventeenth century. Furthermore, the whole notion of ‘recension’ is so loosely applied in scholarly writings relating to classical Indian studies that one is usually unaware of the many problems hidden under this rubric.<sup>51</sup>

However, the question of the missing *sūtras* or the variant readings is, as we have already seen, and as T. K. Gopaldaswamy Aiyangar should have known, not confined to Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhaṭṭācārya’s *Vivaraṇa* alone. The only unique thing about his additions, omissions and variations is their supposedly radical difference from the accepted Nyāya position, but even that would have to be established by a comparative study of the other additions, omissions and variations found in different texts; only some of which we have noted in the course of this essay. Why, for example, are the omissions, additions and variations in the *Dīpikā*, which are far greater in number than in the *Vivaraṇa*, considered to be of less significance, is not clear. Unfortunately, the editor of the *Dīpikā* has not even referred to the work of Rādhāmohana, let alone compared it with the *Dīpikā*.

In fact, the lackadaisical manner in which classical scholarship in this field has functioned is truly unbelievable. How could one possibly account for the fact that Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailang, who perhaps was the first person to edit and publish the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, has nothing to say about how he found the manuscript, where it was located, what problems it raised for the text of the *Nyāya Sūtras*, what variations it has and what are their philosophical importance. The only thing he says is that he has separately given the *sūtra-pāṭha* of a text named *Sūtroddhāra* written by Vācaspati Miśra found in a not very ancient book written in Bengali script after having critically edited it.<sup>52</sup> This is perhaps the same-text about which Hara Prasāda Śāstrī had written in 1905: “Manuscripts giving the *sūtra* only are extremely rare. I got one from Midnapore and gave a copy of it to my friend Dr. Venis, and it was published at Benaras. It is known, as the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*.” If the two works are the same, as is most likely, then it is surprising that even after nine years of its publication, the learned pandit does not know that this is not the work of the author of the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* with whom he confuses him. Not only this, he does not even care to compare the two texts and discuss the differences therein. And though he refers to Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī in the article, he not only places him in the nineteenth century, but also shows no awareness of those supposed radical variations in the readings of the *sūtras* or of those new *sūtras* which are alleged by T. K. Gopaldaswamy Aiyangar to lead to the postulation of a totally different recension of the *Nyāya Sūtras*, even though the *Vivaraṇa* commentary had been published in the *Pandit New Series* 23 (1901), 24 (1902) and 25 (1903).<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, surprisingly if the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* entry under *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*<sup>55</sup> is to be believed, he has entered it as a commentary, and that too incomplete, assuming, of course, that he is the author of the *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Second Series*, published in 4 volumes by the Government of Bengal, Calcutta in 1900, 1904, 1907 and 1911. The anomaly is even more incomprehensible if we remember

that while the article was published in 1905, the relevant notice of the manuscript of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* is supposed to be in Vol. II of the *Notices* which was published in 1904. This is perhaps a different manuscript from the one claimed to have been given by Pt. Hara Prasad Sastri to Dr. Venis.\* In any case, what is surprising is that no one has tried to check the veracity of the statements of Pt. Hara Prasad Sastri made in his article of 1905, or the correctness of the entry in the *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Vol. II, published in 1904 or that of the entry in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* published in 1978.

The problems relating to the works of Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailaṅga, Pt. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla, and Shri T. K. Gopaldaswamy Aiyangar in this connection have already been referred to earlier. So also have been those arising from the Introduction by Pt. Gapinātha Kavirāja.<sup>56</sup> One may say that the traditional Indian pandit did not have much interest in textual or historical matters. He was primarily concerned with the philosophical issues, and only secondarily with historical questions relating to the authenticity of the text. In fact, it may be urged that it was the intrusion of the western way of looking at the texts and their tradition that, in a sense, forced Indian scholars in this century to work in this field and as their heart was not in it, they produced the kind of inexcusably shoddy work we have seen them doing.

But, then, what about the modern scholars? They do not seem to show any awareness of the problem either. Instead, they seem to be blind to things before their eyes, which perhaps is even more inexcusable than that of the pandits. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, for example, seems completely unaware of the falsity of the statements made by Hara Prasad Sastri in his article 'An Examination of the Nyāya -Sūtras' which he has included not only in the second volume of *Studies in the History of Indian Philosophy* edited by him and published in 1978, but also referred to approvingly in his long Introduction to Mrinal Kanti Gango-

\* I say 'claimed', as Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailaṅga has made no mention of this fact in his *Introduction* to the V.S.S. 9 publication of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*.

padhyaya's translation of the *Nyāya Sūtra* with Vātsyāyana's commentary published in 1982. Similarly, Matilal in his discussion of the *Sūtras* in his recent work, *Perception*, shows hardly any awareness of the problem. Not only this, though he refers to Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī*, edited by Sūryanārāyaṇa Śukla and published by Chowkhamba from Banaras in 1936 he does not seem to have seen the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* published therein, or noted the problems we have referred to in our discussion of it earlier.<sup>57</sup>

Thus the traditional and the modern scholars both seem to be either uninterested or unaware of the problems that we have tried to highlight in this essay. And the situation with respect to one of the most ratiocinative, argument-oriented schools of Indian philosophy today is that there is no standard, authoritative edition of its basic work, that is, the *Nyāya Sūtras* giving all the additions, deletions and variant readings with an assessment of their philosophical significance, if any. Even such a prestigious publisher of classical works of Indian philosophy as Motilal Banarasi Dass has not taken the opportunity to ask an outstanding scholar in the field to survey the problems relating to the text when recently reprinting Gaṅgānātha Jhā's well-known work, *The Nyāya Sūtras of Gautama*. Perhaps, the Indian Council of Philosophical Research and the Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan could undertake this work jointly with the help and collaboration of the well-known Nyāya scholars in the country.

Any such work, however, will first have to come to terms with the following:

1. What is the manuscript on the basis of which Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailaṅga published his version of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* in V.S.S. 9?
2. What is the exact nature of the entry under *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* in the second volume of *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts* by Hara Prasad Sastri and published by the Government of Bengal in 1904?

3. Where is the manuscript of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* referred to under this entry?
4. Is this the same as has been published in VSS, volume, IX or is it a commentary as mentioned in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*?
5. What are the grounds for the assertion that the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* is the work of Vācaspati Miśra II, and not of Vācaspati Miśra I?
6. What is the manuscript of the *Nyāyatattvāloka* said to be in the India Office Library, London, about? Is it the same as the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, as is asserted by Potter in his *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, vol. I? In case it is different, what are the grounds for believing it to be the work of Vācaspati Miśra II?
7. What could be the grounds for Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstri Tailaṅg's denying the *prāmāṇikatva* of so many *sūtras* in the footnotes to the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* as given in V.S.S. 9?
8. What could be the possible reasons for his accepting almost all the *sūtras* whose *pramāṇatva* he could not discover, as genuine *sūtras* in the main body of the text?
9. What could be the possible reasons for Pt. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla giving *Tattvāloka* as a *pramāṇa* for *sūtras* in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* in his 1936 edition of *Nyāyamañjarī*, when the two are usually supposed to be works by the same person?
10. Where is the manuscript on the basis of which Shri S.T.G. Bhattaccarya edited and published Rādhāmohana Gosvāmī Bhaṭṭācārya's *Vivaraṇa* on the *Nyāya-Sūtras* in *Pandit New Series* 23, 24 and 25 in 1901, 1902 and 1903 (according to Potter in the Vol. I of his *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*?)
11. Did Shri S.T.G. Bhattaccarya write any editorial note giving information about the manuscript he had found, and the radical character of the additions, omissions and variant readings pointed out later by T.K. Gopalswamy Aiyangar?

12. Why are *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and *Nyāya-Vārttika-Tātparyāṭikā* mentioned separately as authoritative sources when they are supposed to be the works of the same person, that is, Vācaspati Miśra I?
13. If Vācaspati Miśra I's *Nyāya-Vārttika-Tātparyāṭikā* is supposed to be a *ṭikā* on Uddyotakara's *Nyāyavārttika* then how can it reject the *sūtratva* of those *sūtras* which have been accepted as such in the *Vārttika*?
14. The problem of something occurring in Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya* being taken as a *sūtra* should be distinguished from someone accepting as a *sūtra* something which does not occur in the *Bhāṣya*.
15. The variant readings should be divided into those which are philosophically significant from those that are only linguistic in character, or where *sūtra-pāṭha* has been separated or combined to make one *sūtra* read as two *sūtras*, or two *sūtras* as one. Special attention should be paid to *sūtras* where the variant readings include or exclude the negative prefix, which makes its sense totally different.

## Notes

1. Baccaā Jhā, 1860.
2. Perhaps, the most outstanding *Naiyāyika* in 20th Century India. He recently passed away. Sometime back he had propounded the theory of *Dehātmanvāda* within the Nyāya framework at a gathering of more than a hundred Nyāya scholars at Sarnath, Banaras. The text of the lecture along with his reply to the objections raised is proposed to be published by the Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi. An English translation by Dr. Mukund Lath has been published in JICPR, Vol. V, No. 3, 1988.
3. Karl H. Potter, (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika upto Gaṅgeśa* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977), p. 239.
4. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (ed.), *Studies in the History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. II (Calcutta: K.P. Bagchi & Co., 1978), p. 88.
5. Ganganatha Jha, *The Nyāya-Sūtras of Gautama*, Vol. I, Preface (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, Reprint (1984), Originally published in *Indian Thought from 1912-1919*.

6. *Ibid.*, p. ix.
7. *Ibid.*, p. xvi.
8. Kral H. Potter (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol. I: Bibliography (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, Second Revised Edition, 1983), p. 46-47.
9. Ganganath Jha, p. xii, xv.
10. Ganganath Jha, p. xii, xv.
11. Gopinatha Kaviraja, *Gleanings from the History and Bibliography of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Literature*, in *Indian Studies: Past and Present* (Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyaya, 1962), p. 46. Originally published in Princess of Wales, Saraswati Bhawan Studies, Banaras from 1924 to 1927 in Vols. 3, 4, 5, & 7.
12. Debiprasad Chattopadhyays, p. 88.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
14. Potter, Vol. I. p. 234. Potter's reference to *History of Navya-Nyāya* in Mithila by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya does not exactly corroborate what he has written, as nowhere on p. 147 is it said that the text is partly in ms. It only says "It appears that the late Mahamahopadhyaya V.B. Dwivedi has access to a ms of this work copied in Caitra 1418." Reference under DB on p. x also needs correction for the year of publication; it is 1958 and not 1959 given in Potter's *Encyclopedia*.
15. Potter Vol. II on *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, p. 684.
16. Potter, Vol. I, p. 43, No. (788).
17. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya, *History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithila* (Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post- Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1958) p. 147.
18. *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute*, Vol. IV, 1947, p. 300
19. Sri Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla (ed.), *The Nyāyamañjarī* of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, (Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 106, Chowkhamba, Benaras, 1936); p. 1-28 (the end of the work).
20. Ram Bhavan Upadhyaya, Pan-Ns. 2-1, 1922. I owe this reference to Pt. Thangawami Sarma, the outstanding scholar who has compiled perhaps the most exhaustive reference bibliography on Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika published under the title *Darśanamañjarī*, Part I by the University of Madras in 1985.
21. 5.1.17 reads in the main body of the text as: *pratipakaṣātparakaraṇasiddheḥ pratīśedhānupapattiḥ pratipakṣopapatteḥ* (p. 240), while in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* it reads as: *pratipakṣātparakaraṇasiddheḥ pratīśedhānupapattiḥ* (p. 25). Similarly 5.1.34 reads in the main body of the text as: *dr̥ṣṭānte ca sādhyasādhanabhāvena prajñātasya dharmasya hetuvāttasya cobhayathābhāvāna viśeṣaḥ* (p. 253) while in the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* it reads as: *dr̥ṣṭānte ca sādhyasādhanabhāvena dharmasya hetuvāttasya cobhayathābhāvāna viśeṣaḥ*. (p. 26).

22. R. Thangaswami Sarma, *Darśanamañjarī*. Pt. I. p. 34.
23. V. Raghavan, *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (University of Madras, 1968, Vol. I), p. 242.
24. See *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, Vol. X. p. 247. The entry mentions, 'in 2 chs. by Vācaspati Miśra. IO 1868'. First, it may be pointed out that according to the detailed indication regarding the abbreviation IO on p. ix of the first volume there is no such catalogue published in 1868. It specifically says 'A catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit manuscripts in the India Office Library. By Julius Eggeling. 2. parts (London, 1887, 1896) and Vol. II in 2 parts by A. B. Keith, with a supplement—Buddhist Manuscripts—By F.W. Thomas, London, 1935. This may be regarded as printing mistake, but it is inexcusable on the part of the Editor not to have indicated whether it was Vācaspati Miśra II who is supposed to be the author of the work. By the year 1978, when the tenth volume was published, it was generally accepted that there were two different Vācaspati Miśras and that the *Tattvāloka* is the work of the later one. It is not that the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* does not know of the fact as it refers to the author of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* as 'Vācaspati Miśra (Junior) of Mithila (15 cent.)'. (p. 280). But even here the entry is wrong in two respects. One, it classifies the text as a commentary, which it certainly is not. Secondly, it mentions it as incomplete which also is mistaken. The editor relies on what is written by Hara Prasad Sastri in his *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Second Series, published in 4 volumes by the Govt. of Bengal, Calcutta in 1900, 1904, 1907 and 1911 which is cited as the authority for the statement. But the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*, as we know, had already been published by Pt. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailang in 1896, a fact, which does not seem to be known either to Hara Prasad Sastri in 1904 or to Prof. Kunjuni Raja, the editor of Vol. X of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* in 1970. If we remember that the text of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* had once again been published in between by Pt. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla in 1936 with new footnotes, the situation is unbelievable indeed. Or, is there another *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* which is a commentary on the Nyāya Sūtras to which Hara Prasad Sastri refers to in his *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts* published in 1904. Strangely, even Pt. Thangaswami Sarma who in his *Darśanamañjarī*, Part I, published in 1985, mentions the 1896 publication of *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* in VSS 9, does not question the correctness of its classification as a commentary in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*.
25. The missing sūtras of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha* are 3.1.15, 3.1.38, 3.1.63 3.1.69, 3.1.70, 3.2.34, 3.2.38, 3.2.47, 3.2.69 and 3.2.70.
26. The following sūtras of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* have variant readings (with additions etc.) in the *Nyāyasūcinibandha*: 2.1.47, 2.2.17, 2.2.52, 3.2.14, 3.2.26, 3.2.48, 5.1.17, 5.1.18, 5.1.19, 5.1.20 and 5.1.24.

27. The missing sūtras of the Nyāyasūcinibandha in the Nyāyasūtroddhāra are 2.1.20, 2.2.28, 2.2.43, 2.2.49, 3.1.29, 3.1.30 and 3.1.73.
28. Prof. Thangaswami Sarma informs me in a personal communication that even Uddyotakara's Nyāyavāttika tries to do this to some extent.
29. The sūtras in the Vṛtti missing in the Nyāyasūcinibandha are 3.1.15, 3.1.38, 3.1.53, 3.1.63, 3.1.69, 3.1.70, 3.2.40, 3.2.44, 3.2.47, 3.2.70. The sūtras missing in the Nyāyasūtroddhāra are: 3.1.29, 3.1.30, 3.1.31, 3.1.53, 3.2.10 and 3.2.44.
30. The list of the sūtras in the Vṛtti which have a variant reading (with additions, etc.) from the Nyāyasūcinibandha are: 2.1.25, 2.2.13, 2.2.17, 2.2.48, 2.2.49, 2.2.52, 2.2.61, 3.1.62, 3.2.10, 3.2.14, 3.2.25, 4.1.49, 4.1.61, 4.2.10 and 5.2.15.
31. The variant readings in the Vṛtti and the Nyāyasūtroddhāra relate to the following sūtras: 2.1.25, 2.1.44, 2.1.53, 2.2.13, 2.2.48, 2.2.61, 3.1.62, 3.2.10, 3.2.14, 4.1.49, 4.1.61, 4.2.10, 5.1.18, 5.1.19, 5.1.20, 5.1.24 and 5.2.15.
32. Potter, *Encyclopedia*. Vol. I, p. 43, entry 790.
33. T.K. Gopaldaswami Aiyangar, *Journal of Shri Venkatesvara Oriental Research Institute, Tirupati*, Vol. VIII, 1947, p. 34-47.
34. The sūtras of the Nyāyasūcinibandha missing in the Vivaraṇa are 2.1.20, 2.2.37, 2.2.43, 3.1.38, 3.1.55, 4.2.7, and 4.2.8. The sūtras of the Vivaraṇa which are not to be found in the Nyāyasūcinibandha are: 3.1.15, 3.2.10, 4.1.45, 4.1.49, 4.2.50m and 5.2.20.
35. T.K. Gopaldaswami Aiyangar, Footnote. p 35. Italics mine.
36. Potter. p. 334.
37. Bhīmācārya, Nyāyakośaḥ (Poona: Bhandarkara Orients Research Institute, 1978), p. 2.
38. T.K. Gopaldaswami Aiyangar. 'Lost Nyāya-Sūtras' as restored by Radhamōhana Gosvami Bhattaccarya'. *The Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute*, Vol. XXVI, No. 14., (Oct. 1970), pp. 41-44.
39. Though the editor has not added 'Tarkācārya' to his name it is necessary to do so to distinguish him from Keśava Miśra, the author of the Tarkabhāṣā.
40. Kishore Nath Jha (ed.), Nyāyatāparyadīpikā by Vāgīśvara Bhaṭṭa (Allahabad: Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, 1979), p. tha. da.
41. Kishore Nath Jha, p. 2.
42. T.K. Gopaldaswami Aiyangar, 'Lost Nyāya-Sūtras' as restored by Radhamōhana Gosvami Bhattaccarya'. *The Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute*, Allahbad, Vol. XXVI, No. 4 (Oct. 1970), p. 41.
43. On Udayana's date, see Potter (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol. II (Delhi: Moti Lal Banarsidass, 1977), p. 523.
44. Potter, p. 345.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 411.
46. Potter, p. 334.
47. Potter, p. 205.
48. *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, Vol. X, p. 248. Also, *Darśanamanjarī*, p. 74.
49. T.K. Gopaldaswami Aiyangar, 'A Critique of the Nyāya-Sūtras Text', p. 41.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
51. See for a further illustration and discussion of this point my article 'The Vedic Corpus: Some questions' JICPR, Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1985.
52. The only thing he says about it is 'prthak sūtra-pāṭhaśca-vācasptvimīśrakṛtasūtroddhāranāmakam vaṅgākṣaralikhitamekam pustakamālocya samyojitah'.
53. H.P. Sastri, p. 88.
54. There does not seem to be any mention of these in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*.
55. Vol. X. p. 280.
56. Interestingly Ganganatha Jha refers to three different manuscripts consisting of the Sūtra-pāṭha only. These are (i) A palm-leaf manuscript of the sūtra only, (ii) Paper manuscript of the sūtra only belonging to Jagadish Mishra, and (iii) Paper manuscript of the sūtra only belonging to Babu Govindadas.' (p. ix of the Preface). This is in contrast to the statement by Hara Prasad Sastri in the 1905 article already referred to. *The New Catalogus Catalogorum* seems to refer to a number of manuscripts without commentaries (Vol. X. p. 276) but none seems to have collated or checked the standard reading of the sūtras with them.
57. Bimal Krishna Matilal, *Perception: An Essay on Classical Indian Theories of Knowledge* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 429.



## Sub-Appendices to Appendix 1

(i)

A

Sūtras in the Nyāyasūtroddhāra missing in the Nyāya-Tātparyā-Dīpikā of Bhaṭṭa Vāgīśvara

1. 2.1.61	21. 4.2.11
2. 3.1.15	22. 4.2.12
3. 3.1.18	23. 4.2.14
4. 3.1.54	24. 4.2.17
5. 3.1.71	25. 4.2.20
6. 3.2.14	26. 4.2.21
7. 3.2.16	27. 4.2.22
8. 3.2.21	28. 4.2.25
9. 3.2.34	29. 4.2.27
10. 3.2.37	30. 4.2.28
11. 3.2.38	31. 4.2.29
12. 3.2.39	32. 4.2.30
13. 3.2.46	33. 4.2.32
14. 3.2.47	34. 4.2.33
15. 4.1.15	35. 4.2.34
16. 4.1.16	36. 4.2.37
17. 4.1.33	37. 4.2.42
18. 4.1.49	38. 5.1.20
19. 4.1.60	39. 5.1.34
20. 4.2.6	

Total: 39

B

Sūtras in the Nyāya-Dīpikā of Bhaṭṭa Vāgīśvara missing in the Nyāyasūtroddhāra.

1. 2.1.20
2. 2.1.21

3. 2.1.27	17. 3.1.30
4. 2.1.34	18. 3.1.31
5. 2.1.56	19. 3.1.32
6. 2.1.60	20. 3.1.41
7. 2.1.64	21. 3.2.16
8. 2.2.7	22. 3.2.19
9. 2.2.10	23. 3.2.20
10. 2.2.11	24. 3.2.22
11. 2.2.50	25. 3.2.37
12. 2.2.51	26. 3.2.42
13. 2.2.52	27. 3.2.60
14. 3.1.1	28. 4.2.22
15. 3.1.18	29.4.2.30
16. 3.1.28	

Total: 29

C

Variant readings of the sūtras in the Nyāyasūtroddhāra and the Nyāya-Tātparyā-Dīpikā of Bhaṭṭa Vāgīśvara.

1. 1.1.28	28. 3.2.24
2. 1.1.40	29. 3.2.29
3. 1.2.17	30. 3.2.45
4. 2.1.1	31. 3.2.48 (Variant reading with ँ)
5. 2.1.24	32. 3.2.54 (Variant reading with ँ)
6. 2.1.25	33. 3.2.65 (Variant reading with ँ)
7. 2.1.48	34. 3.2.74
8. 2.1.44	35. 3.2.76
9. 2.1.46	36. 4.1.4
10. 2.1.55 (variant reading with ँ)	37. 4.1.7
11. 2.2.7	38. 4.1.10

12. 2.2.8	39. 4.1.36
13. 2.2.9	40. 4.1.39
14. 2.2.11	41. 4.1.40
15. 2.2.15	42. 4.1.47
16. 2.2.17	43. 4.1.62
17. 2.2.31 (Variant reading with अ)	44. 4.2.10
18. 2.2.56	45. 4.2.15
19. 3.1.13 (Variant reading with न)	46. 4.2.23
20. 3.1.16 (Variant reading without न)	47. 4.2.35
21. 3.1.28	48. 4.2.47
22. 3.1.34	49. 4.2.49
23. 3.1.38	50. 5.1.17
24. 3.1.46	51. 5.1.38
25. 3.1.53	52. 5.2.3
26. 3.1.65	53. 5.2.15
27. 3.1.12 (Variant reading with अनुपलब्धि)	Total: 53

(ii)

A

Sūtras of the Nyāyasūtroddhāra missing in the Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ of Keśava Miśra.

1. 1.1.8	9. 3.2.47
2. 2.1.25	10.3.2.71
3. 3.1.15	11.3.2.73
4. 3.1.54	12.4.2.7
5. 3.1.60	13.4.2.8
6. 3.1.65	
7. 3.1.71	Total: 13
8.3.2.38	

B

Sūtras of the Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ missing in the Nyāyasūtroddhāra.

1. 2.1.20
2. 3.1.28
3. 3.1.29
4. 3.1.30
5. 3.2.10

Total: 5

C

Variant readings of the sūtras in the Nyāyasūtroddhāra and the Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ.

1. 2.1.55 (Variant reading with न)	8.3.2.54 (Variant reading with न)
2. 3.1.6 (Variant reading with न)	9. 4.1.7
3. 3.1.30	10. 4.1.24
4. 3.1.36	11. 4.2.44
5. 3.1.38	12. 4.2.45
6. 3.1.50	13.5.1.17
7. 3.1.53	14. 5.1.20

Total: 14

(iii)

A

Sūtras in the Nyāyasūcīnibanda missing in the Nyāya-Tātparyā-Dīpikā of Bhaṭṭa-Vāgīśvara.

1. 2.1.25
2. 2.1.46
3. 2.1.61
4. 2.2.28

5. 2.2.43	23. 4.2.12
6. 2.2.51	24. 4.2.14
7. 2.2.52	25. 4.2.17
8. 3.1.17	26. 4.2.20
9. 3.1.38	27. 4.2.21
10. 3.1.55	28.4.2.22
11. 3.1.71	29. 4.2.25
12. 3.2.14	30. 4.2.27
13. 3.2.16	31. 4.2.28
14. 3.2.35	32. 4.2.29
15. 3.2.44	33. 4.2.30
16. 4.1.15	34. 4.2.32
17. 4.1.16	35. 4.2.33
18. 4.1.33	36. 4.2.34
19. 4.1.48	37. 4.2.37
20. 4.1.59	38. 4.2.42
21. 4.2.6	39. 5.1.20
22. 4.2.11	40. 5.1.34

Total: 40

## B

Sūtras in the Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā of Bhaṭṭa Vāgīśvara missing in the Nyāyasūcīnibandha.

1. 2.1.21	14. 3.1.41
2. 2.1.27	15. 3.1.42
3. 2.1.34	16. 3.1.68
4. 2.1.35	17. 3.2.16
5. 2.1.49	18. 3.2.19
6. 2.1.56	19. 3.2.20
7. 2.1.60	20.3.2.42
8. 2.1.64	21.3.2.60
9. 2.2.7	22. 3.2.69
10. 2.2.15	23. 4.1.42
11. 3.1.1	24. 4.2.22
12. 3.1.18	25. 4.2.30
13. 3.1.28	

Total: 25

## C

Sūtras with variant reading in the Nyāyasūcīnibandha and the Nyāya-Tātparya-Dīpikā of Bhaṭṭa Vāgīśvara.

1. 1.2.8	17. 3.2.22
2. 1.2.17	18. 3.2.30
3. 2.1.26 (A mixture of 2.1.25 and 2.1.26)	19. 3.2.47
4. 2.1.46	20. 3.2.63 (Variant reading with ऋ)
5. 2.1.58	21. 3.2.71
6. 2.2.8	22. 4.1.4
7. 2.2.10 & 11 (combined into 2.2.9)	23. 4.1.7
8. 2.2.18	24. 4.1.36
9. 2.2.34 (Variant reading without अ)	25. 4.1.37
10. 2.2.55	26. 4.1.38
11. 2.2.57	27. 4. 1.44
12. 3.1.14 (Variant reading with ऋ)	28. 4.2.9
13. 3.1.29	29. 4.2.34
14. 3.1.38	31. 5.1.18
15. 3.1.50	
16. 3.1.63	Total: 31

## (iv)

## A

Sūtras in the Nyāyasūcīnibandha which are missing in the Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ of Keśava Mīśra.

1. 1.1.8
2. 2.1.26

3. 3.1.38  
4. 3.1.55  
5. 3.1.61  
6. 3.1.71  
7. 4.2.7  
8. 4.2.8

Total: 8

## B

Sūtras in the *Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ* of Keśava Miśra missing in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*.

1. 2.1.32  
2.3.2.10  
3.4.1.45

Total: 3

## C

Variant reading of the sūtras in the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* and the *Gautamiya-Sūtra-Prakāśaḥ* of Keśava Miśra.

1. 1.1.27                      7.4.1.36  
2. 3.1.32                      8.4.2.42  
3. 3.2.46. (Variant reading  
with न्)                      9. 4.2.43  
4. 3.2.48                      10. 5.1.33  
5. 4.1.17                      11. 5.2.11  
6. 4.1.24 (Variant reading  
with अ)                      12. 5.2.15

Total: 12

## Appendix 2

## Topics Dealt with in the Nyāya Sūtras

The topics or the prakaraṇas in the Nyāya Sūtras according to the author of the Nyāya Sūcīnibandha number eighty two. Of these, the topics in each adhyāya are:

Adhyāya	Prakaraṇas/Topics
1.1	7
1.2	4
2.1	9
2.2	4
3.1	9
3.2	7
4.1	14
4.2	6
5.1	15
5.2	7

In adhyāya one, the total number of prakaraṇas is eleven, in the adhyāya two total number is thirteen adhyāya three has 16, four has 20 and five has 22.

The number of sūtras in each prakaraṇa are the following:

Prakaraṇa	Number of Sūtras
N.S. 1.1	
(1) प्रयोजन	2
(2) प्रमाण	6
(3) प्रमेय	14
(4) पूर्वागलक्षण	3
(5) आश्रय सिद्धान्त	6