IJ HC
International Journal on Hindu Culture
ISSN : 3124-5625 Vol 4, No 2

AN ARGUMENTATIVE DISCUSSION TO RESOLVE DOUBT REGARDING THE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF JAYANTA BHAṬṬA AND VĀCASPATI MIŚRA

Uttam Biswas
Vidyasagar University, India
Corresponding email: buttam@mail.vidyasagar.ac.in

Received : 19-06-2026 **Revised : 18-10-2026** **Accepted : 22-10-2026**

Abstract
Determination of the ancient Indian philosophers' time and chronology is a common problem to the Sanskrit scholars now a day. It is impossible to say in one sentence that this chronology of Indian philosophers should be acceptable due to so many anomalies regarding their information. Time and chronology of two such philosophers like Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Vācaspati Miśra in Indian philosophy are also doubtful and cannot be determined easily due to anomalies of their information scattered in Sanskrit literature. This study will investigate with proper information and arguments that what were their considerable time and chronological order. To discuss and resolve this doubtful matter I refer so many Sanskrit scholars like Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Gopīnātha Kavirāja, Pt. Ananta Lal Thakur and Suryanarayana Sukla and put information from various philosophical literatures like Nyāyamañjarī, Tātparyaṭīkā, Kādambarī-kathāsāra, Bhāmatī, Nyāyakaṇikā, Vivarana-Pañjikā. As per Philosophers and their statements with thorough argumentative discussion it may be resolved that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa was predecessor of Vācaspati Miśra. All the information collected from primary and secondary information must Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in 9th Century A.D (883-904CE) and Vācaspati Miśra in 10th Cencury A.D. The problem regarding the time and chronological order of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Vācaspati Miśra, which was mainly arisen centering a passage from Nyāyamañjarī be resolved from Aniruddha's statement where Nyāyamañjarī is considered as Trilochana's work, not of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa.

Keywords: Jayanta Bhaṭṭa; Vācaspati Miśra; chronology; Nyāya philosophy; Nyāyamañjarī

INTRODUCTION

The study of Indian philosophy (*Bhāratīya Darśanaśāstra*) occupies an indispensable place in the understanding of Indian culture and civilization as a whole. Among its principal systems, Nyāya philosophy holds particular importance, for it is through the disciplined study of Nyāya that a scholar attains precision and eloquence in reasoned speech and debate. The commentarial tradition that has sustained and transmitted Nyāya philosophy across centuries flows through two principal streams. The first consists of the works collectively known as the *Caturgranthi* (the fourfold commentary tradition)—namely the *Bhāṣya* (commentary), *Vārttika* (gloss), *Tātparyaṭīkā* (interpretive commentary), and *Pariśuddhi* (refinement)—a chain of commentaries that elaborates the system's foundational doctrines, defends them against rival schools, and has, over a very long

period, contributed to the growth and preservation of Nyāya as a living intellectual tradition. The second stream, known as the *Vṛtti* (brief explanatory commentary), comprises works such as the *Nyāyasūtravṛtti* of Viśvanātha Nyāyapañcānana and the *Nyāyamañjarī* of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, through which the doctrines and intentions of the *Nyāya Sūtras* are rendered more directly accessible. From antiquity to the present, these two streams have together ensured the continued vitality of Nyāya scholarship.

Two of the most eminent philosophers associated with these two streams are Vācaspati Miśra, author of the *Tātparyaṭīkā*, and Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, author of the *Nyāyamañjarī*. Both figures occupy a central place in the history of Nyāya philosophy, yet the precise chronology of their lives—and, more specifically, the order in which they lived relative to one another—has remained a persistent and unresolved question among Sanskrit scholars. This difficulty is symptomatic of a broader problem in the historiography of classical Indian philosophy: the dating of ancient Indian philosophers is rarely straightforward, since the biographical information available for most figures is fragmentary, scattered across multiple texts, and frequently inconsistent. In the specific case of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Vācaspati Miśra, this problem is compounded by the fact that both philosophers refer, directly or indirectly, to figures and ideas associated with the other's intellectual milieu, creating textual evidence that can plausibly be read in more than one direction.

Previous scholarship has approached this problem without reaching a settled conclusion. Scholars such as Vidyābhūṣaṇa and several other historians have argued that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa lived after Vācaspati Miśra, citing apparent textual borrowings and shared verses between the *Nyāyamañjarī* and works attributed to Vācaspati. Other scholars, most notably Gopīnātha Kavirāja, have rejected this view, arguing instead that the available evidence more plausibly places Jayanta before Vācaspati. Compounding this disagreement is a long-standing and widely repeated claim—traceable to an opening verse of Vācaspati's own *Nyāyakaṇikā*, in which the author pays homage to his guru as the composer of a *Nyāyamañjarī*—that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa served as Vācaspati's teacher. This claim has been echoed in subsequent scholarship despite never having been fully reconciled with other internal evidence suggesting the contrary, including Vācaspati's own explicit identification elsewhere of a different teacher, Ācārya Trilocana. The persistence of this unresolved ambiguity—between two competing chronological orderings and two competing identifications of a single disputed verse—constitutes the central gap this article seeks to address.

Building on this gap, the present article has two closely related objectives. The first is to establish, through careful examination of internal textual evidence and externally verifiable historical markers—including references to known kings, contemporaneous scholars, and datable literary figures—the most probable lifetimes of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Vācaspati Miśra, and thereby to determine the more plausible chronological order between them. The second is to resolve the specific long-standing confusion surrounding the guru referred to in Vācaspati's *Nyāyakaṇikā*, by testing the hypothesis, supported by indirect textual evidence preserved in Aniruddha's *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā* and in the writings of the Buddhist scholar Jñānaśrīmitra, that the *Nyāyamañjarī* referred to in that verse is not the work of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa at all, but a separate, non-extant text of the same title composed by Ācārya Trilocana.

The academic contribution of this study lies in its systematic reconciliation of previously scattered and contradictory lines of argument into a single, internally consistent

chronological account, supported by converging textual evidence from multiple independent sources (*Nyāyamañjarī*, *Tātparyaṭīkā*, *Kādambarī-kathāsāra*, *Bhāmatī*, *Nyāyakaṇikā*, and *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā*). In doing so, the article not only contributes to the specific historiography of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Vācaspati Miśra but also offers a methodological model for resolving comparable chronological disputes elsewhere in the history of Indian philosophy, where biographical evidence is similarly fragmentary. Beyond its academic significance, this study carries practical value for the broader community of Sanskrit and Indological scholarship: by clarifying that two distinct works have historically been conflated under the single title *Nyāyamañjarī*, the article corrects a misidentification that has had lasting consequences for how the intellectual lineage of the Nyāya tradition is taught and understood, and it provides future students and researchers of classical Indian philosophy with a more secure chronological foundation upon which to build further study of this formative period in the history of Nyāya thought.

METHOD

This study employs a textual-historical and comparative philological method, an approach appropriate to resolving chronological questions in classical Indian philosophy where direct biographical documentation is largely absent and must instead be reconstructed from internal textual evidence. Rather than relying on a single decisive source, the method proceeds by cross-referencing multiple independent lines of evidence—quotations, textual allusions, genealogical records, and references to datable historical rulers—so that converging evidence from unrelated sources can corroborate or challenge a proposed chronological placement. The primary textual corpus examined consists of six major Sanskrit philosophical works directly connected to the two philosophers under discussion: the *Nyāyamañjarī* and *Āgamaḍambara* of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa; the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā*, *Bhāmatī*, and *Nyāyakaṇikā* of Vācaspati Miśra; and the *Kādambarī-kathāsāra* of Jayanta's descendant Abhinanda Bhaṭṭa, consulted principally through the critical editions of Gourinath Sastri (1982) and Suryanarayan Shukla (1971) for the *Nyāyamañjarī*, and the edition of Taranath Tarkatirtha and Amarendra Mohan Tarkatirtha (1985) for texts associated with the *Tātparyaṭīkā* tradition. To resolve the specific question of the identity of the guru referred to in the *Nyāyakaṇikā*, the study additionally draws on indirect citation evidence preserved in the *Nibandhāvalī* of the Buddhist scholar Jñānaśrīmitra and the *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā* of Aniruddha, both of which contain quotations from a separate, non-extant *Nyāyamañjarī* attributed to Ācārya Trilocana.

The analytical procedure follows three sequential steps, applied alongside critical engagement with the secondary scholarly literature in which this chronological dispute has previously been framed—most notably the positions associated with Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Gopīnātha Kavirāja, Ananta Lal Thakur, and Suryanarayana Sukla—each treated as a hypothesis to be tested against the available textual evidence rather than accepted at the outset. First, the probable lifetime of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa is established by triangulating internal textual references—his documented service as minister under King Śaṅkaravarman of Kashmir, his citations of and refutations by contemporaneous or near-contemporaneous figures such as Ānandavardhana, Dāmodaragupta, and Māgha, and the genealogical sequence of his ancestors and descendants—against independently attested historical dates for these rulers and literary figures. Second, the same procedure is applied to establish the probable lifetime of Vācaspati Miśra, drawing on his documented family

background, teacher-student affiliations, and the internal evidence of his own works. Third, having established an independent chronological placement for each philosopher, the study compares the arguments previously advanced for and against their proposed teacher-student relationship, and specifically tests the identity of the guru named in the *Nyāyakaṇikā* by comparing quotations attributed to a "Mañjarīkāra" in the *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā* and the *Nibandhāvalī* against the actual content of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's extant *Nyāyamañjarī*, in order to determine whether these citations are consistent with Jayanta's authorship or more plausibly attributable to a separate work of the same title.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Determining the Period of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa

Between 800 CE and 1100 CE, the Kashmir region produced numerous brilliant scholars whose intellectual achievements illuminated the broader landscape of Sanskrit literature; this period is indeed regarded as the Golden Age of Sanskrit poetry, literature, and philosophy in Kashmir. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa stands among the most illustrious figures of this era, distinguished by his dual achievement as both poet and philosopher, embodying what may be called the virtue of intellectual wit and creativity (*kautuka-bodha*). Belonging to the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa was born into a Yājñika (sacrificial) Brahmin family in Kashmir; his ancestors, however, originally hailed from Bengal (*Vaṅga-deśa*), one forefather having migrated from Gauḍa—a region of Bengal—to Kashmir and settled there. Although scholars continue to differ on the precise period of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's life, his approximate dates can nevertheless be reasonably established through a convergence of internal textual evidence and externally attested historical chronology.

A useful chronological anchor for this analysis begins with the broader lineage of philosophers preceding Jayanta. Vasubandhu, author of the *Abhidharmakośa* and minister to King Chandragupta I of Ayodhyā, is generally dated to approximately 290–360 CE; his contemporary and philosophical opponent Vasurāta, who was also the teacher of the grammarian-philosopher Bhartṛhari, is dated to roughly 330–400 CE, placing Bhartṛhari's own lifetime at approximately 370–440 CE. Dignāga, the commentator on Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*, is thought to have lived around 460 CE; according to Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Dignāga was a contemporary of the poet Kālidāsa, placing him in the late fifth century CE. Uddyotakara, who followed and refuted Dignāga's Buddhist doctrines, is accordingly placed in the sixth century CE, and Dharmakīrti—whose definition of perception (*pratyakṣa-lakṣaṇa*) is notably absent from Uddyotakara's work, implying a later date—is placed at approximately 590–650 CE. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, who lived in Dharmakīrti's later years (circa 625–690 CE), explicitly refuted the theories advanced by Bhartṛhari in the *Vākyapadīya*, while the Buddhist teacher Śāntarakṣita (circa 705–750 CE), who refuted Kumārila's views in his *Tattvasaṅgraha*, must accordingly have lived after him. Kumārila's own disciples, Prabhākara and Maṇḍana Miśra, are thus placed at approximately 750–830 CE. Because Jayanta Bhaṭṭa discusses the doctrines of Prabhākara and other thinkers of this generation in his *Nyāyamañjarī*, he must have lived after them.

Further internal evidence corroborates this placement. In the *Nyāyamañjarī*, Jayanta quotes the statement of Patañjali, author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, concerning the grammarians' treatment of worldly and Vedic words (Sastri, 1982, p. 15), through which he also affirms that the *Bhāṣya*'s interpretation of the three sixth-case usages (*ṣaṣṭhī-traya-vyākhyāna*) is without flaw. Since Patañjali is dated by the author to the eighth century BCE, Jayanta must have lived considerably later. The clearest evidence for Jayanta's period,

however, comes from his own testimony: in his drama *Āgamaḍambara*, Jayanta states that he served as a minister under King Śaṅkaravarman of Kashmir, whose reign is historically dated from 883 to 902 CE. This places Jayanta Bhaṭṭa firmly within the ninth century CE as a contemporary and minister of Śaṅkaravarman.

Additional evidence drawn from the *Nyāyamañjarī* reinforces this dating. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa explicitly refutes the "Dhvani theory" of poetic suggestion propounded by the celebrated rhetorician Ānandavardhana, in a passage that, according to the *Granthibhaṅga-ṭīkā*, refers specifically to Ānandavardhana Ācārya, founder of the Dhvani school (Sastri, 1982, p. 76). Ānandavardhana served as court poet to King Avantivarman, Śaṅkaravarman's father, whose reign lasted from 855 to 883 CE. Jayanta also mentions Dāmodaragupta in the *Nyāyamañjarī*, stating that no valid reasoning supports the doctrine of the *Kuṭṭinīmata* (Sastri, 1982, p. 388); Dāmodaragupta was likewise a contemporary of Ānandavardhana and served as minister under King Avantivarman. Since Jayanta Bhaṭṭa must have lived after both Ānandavardhana and Dāmodaragupta, his period is firmly placed after 883 CE.

The genealogical lineage of scholars and rulers associated with Jayanta's family further supports this chronology:

1. King Muktāpīḍa: 710–760 CE
2. His minister, Śaktisvāmin: 725–780 CE
3. Śaktisvāmin's son Kalyāṇasvāmin: 750–820 CE
4. Kalyāṇasvāmin's son Candra: 810–870 CE
5. Candra's son, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa: likely 850–910 CE

This genealogical estimate is corroborated by the birth period of Jayanta's own son, Abhinanda Bhaṭṭa, who according to earlier scholarship was born in the latter half of the ninth century CE—a fact consistent with placing Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's own lifetime within the same period. Finally, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa refers in the *Nyāyamañjarī* to the poet Māgha, author of the *Śiśupālavadha*, stating "as described by Māgha" (Sastri, 1982, p. 84); since Māgha is dated to approximately 905 CE, this reference again confirms that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa lived after him. Taken together, this convergence of internal textual evidence and external historical chronology leaves little doubt that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, author of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, belonged to the late ninth and early tenth centuries CE.

Determining the Period of Vācaspati Miśra

Vācaspati Miśra, author of the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā* and the second principal philosopher examined in this study, was born into a Maithilī Brahmin family in Mithilā, present-day Bihar, and is generally placed in the tenth century CE. He was a philosopher of exceptional range, equally distinguished in the Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā schools, and is traditionally described as a disciple of Maṇḍana Miśra. The breadth of his scholarship across nearly every major school of Indian philosophy earned him the honorific title *Sarvatantrasvatantra*—"master independent across all systems of thought." According to tradition, he was one generation younger than Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, the founder of Advaita Vedānta.

Vācaspati's most celebrated work is the *Bhāmatī*, his commentary on the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* within the Advaita Vedānta tradition, which he is said to have named after his own wife. The colophon of this work is reported by some scholars to indicate a date corresponding to 976 CE, a figure frequently cited in discussions of Vācaspati's chronology. Beyond the *Bhāmatī*, Vācaspati produced an unusually broad corpus of

influential commentaries spanning multiple philosophical systems: the *Tattvakaumudī* on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, the *Nyāyakaṇikā* on Pūrvamīmāṃsā, the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* on the *Nyāyasūtra*, and the *Tattvavaiśāradī* on the *Yogasūtra*, among others. This remarkable range of commentarial output across Vedānta, Sāṃkhya, Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya, and Yoga is itself consistent with the epithet *Sarvatantrasvatantra* and underscores Vācaspati's unusual standing as a philosopher who engaged substantively with nearly every darśana of classical Indian thought.

Taken together with the dating of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa established in previous section, this general placement of Vācaspati Miśra in the tenth century CE forms the starting point for the central chronological dispute addressed in this article: whether Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, dated to the late ninth and early tenth centuries CE, in fact preceded Vācaspati Miśra, or whether—as some scholars have argued—the order should be reversed. This dispute, together with the arguments advanced on both sides, is examined in the following section.

The Dispute over Chronological Order: Arguments For and Against

Despite the chronological indications established in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, scholars have long disagreed over the relative order in which Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Vācaspati Miśra lived within the history of the Nyāya school. One group of scholars, including Vidyābhūṣaṇa and several other historians, has argued that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in fact lived *after* Vācaspati Miśra, advancing five principal lines of evidence. First, Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī* is said to quote a passage from Vācaspati's *Tātparyaṭīkā* with a slight inversion of word order—*"tadapi parihṛtam ācāryair jātaṃ ca saṃbaddhaṃ cety ekaḥ kāla iti vadadbhiḥ"*, corresponding to Vācaspati's *"jātaś ca saṃbaddhaś cety ekaḥ kālaḥ*—a reversal taken to suggest Jayanta's dependence on Vācaspati's wording. Second, Jayanta's work includes a verse—"*Yatnena anumito 'pyarthaḥ kuśalair anumātṛbhiḥ, abhiyukta-taraiḥ anyair anyathaivopapadyate*"—also found in Vācaspati's *Bhāmatī*. Third, Jayanta's own writings refer to an unnamed "Ācārya" in a manner some scholars read as an allusion to Vācaspati, since Jayanta's opinions at that point align closely with Vācaspati's views. Fourth, Jayanta's descendant Abhinanda, in his *Kādambarī-kathāsāra*, mentions his sixth ancestor Śakti as minister to a Kashmiri king who ruled around 897 CE; reckoning four generations per century from this point would place Jayanta himself at approximately 997 CE. Fifth, later thinkers such as Jñānaśrīmitra, who discuss and refute Bhāsarvajña and Vācaspati by name, do not refute anyone identifiable as Jayanta, which this group takes to suggest that Jayanta belonged to a later generation than these commentators.

Other scholars, most notably Gopīnātha Kavirāja, have rejected this reasoning and argued instead that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa preceded Vācaspati Miśra, offering counterpoints to each of the five arguments above. First, a mere difference in word order (*ānupūrvī*) does not by itself demonstrate direct textual borrowing, since similar expressions may independently arise in the works of different authors addressing the same doctrinal point. Second, the verse shared between the *Nyāyamañjarī* and the *Bhāmatī* in fact originates not from Vācaspati himself but from Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*; Jayanta's inclusion of this verse therefore demonstrates shared reliance on an earlier common source rather than dependence on Vācaspati. Third, the term "Ācārya" cannot be definitively identified with Vācaspati, since Jayanta does not quote any passage or doctrine uniquely attributable to him. Fourth, on the basis of Persian chronicles such as the *Tārīkh-e-Hasan*, the Kashmiri king Muktāpīḍa has alternatively been dated to 697 CE, which would place Jayanta's own lifetime at approximately 747 CE—considerably earlier than Vācaspati, and earlier still than

the genealogical estimate presented in previous section. Fifth, if Jayanta had in fact lived after Jñānaśrīmitra, one would expect Jñānaśrīmitra to have engaged with his views as he did with those of Bhāsarvajña and Vācaspati; since Jayanta likewise makes no mention of Jñānaśrīmitra, it is more reasonable to conclude that the two belonged to different scholarly circles rather than to a determinate chronological sequence.

Weighing these competing lines of argument, this study finds the second position—that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa preceded Vācaspati Miśra—more probable, consistent with the independent chronological placement of Jayanta in the late ninth century established in first section. This conclusion finds further support in a passage of Vācaspati's own *Tātparyaṭīkā*, in which he is understood to refer explicitly to "Jayanta." As Anantalal Thakur notes, citing Udayanācārya's *Tātparyapariśuddhi*: *"Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkāyāṁ jarannaiyāyikasya Jayantabhaṭṭasya mataṁ Vācaspatinā parāmṛṣṭam iti Tātparyapariśuddhāu Udayanācāryoktiḥ"* (Thakur, 1987, p. 44)—that is, Udayanācārya states in the *Tātparyapariśuddhi* that, in the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā*, Vācaspati refers to the view of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, described there as an elder Naiyāyika (*jarannaiyāyika*). This reference, if accepted, directly strengthens the conclusion that Vācaspati wrote after, and with awareness of, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's work—a conclusion that in turn frames the remaining question addressed in this article: the long-standing but, as the following section argues, mistaken belief that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa was not merely Vācaspati's predecessor but his direct teacher.

Resolving the Identity of the Guru in the Nyāyakaṇikā: Jayanta Bhaṭṭa or Ācārya Trilocana?

Beyond the question of relative chronology addressed in the previous section, a further and more specific confusion has long persisted in the scholarly literature: the claim that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa was not merely an intellectual predecessor of Vācaspati Miśra but his direct teacher (*guru*). This belief appears to originate from the opening invocatory verse of Vācaspati's own *Nyāyakaṇikā*: *"Ajñāna-timira-śamanīṁ paradamaniṁ Nyāya-mañjarīṁ ruchirām, prasavitre prabhavitre vidyā-tarave namo gurave"* (*Nyāyakaṇikā* 1.1)—in which Vācaspati pays homage to his guru as the composer of a *Nyāyamañjarī*. Read in isolation, this verse might plausibly be taken as a reference to Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, the only *Nyāyamañjarī* widely known today. This reading has been further reinforced by the observation that the *Nyāyakaṇikā* is itself a work on Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā, a school in which Jayanta Bhaṭṭa was also deeply versed—a thematic overlap that may have led some scholars to assume that Vācaspati studied Mīmāṃsā directly under Jayanta.

This claim, however, does not withstand closer textual scrutiny, for at least three reasons. First, Vācaspati himself never names Jayanta Bhaṭṭa as his teacher in any of his works. On the contrary, in his *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā*, while explaining Gautama's definition of perception (*pratyakṣa*)—specifically the terms *avyapadeśya* ("non-verbalizable") and *vyavasāyātmaka* ("determinate in nature"), understood respectively to indicate *nirvikalpaka* (indeterminate) and *savikalpaka* (determinate) perception—Vācaspati immediately adds: *"Trilocana-gurūnnīta-mārgānugamanamukhaiḥ yathāmānaṁ yathāvastu vyākhyātam idam īdṛśam"* (Tarkatirtha & Tarkatirtha, 1985, p. 114), a statement in which he explicitly identifies Ācārya Trilocana as his *vidyā-guru*. This identification is independently corroborated by Udayanācārya in his own commentary, the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyapariśuddhi* (Udayanācārya, 1996), which likewise affirms Trilocana as Vācaspati's teacher.

Second, several of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's distinctive doctrinal positions—including his theory of causal unity (*sāmagrīkaraṇatāvāda*) and his denial of the validity of memory (*smṛteḥ aprāmāṇya*)—were not accepted by Vācaspati Miśra; had Vācaspati genuinely been his direct disciple, one would reasonably expect greater doctrinal continuity between them on precisely such points. Third, a practical consideration further weakens the teacher–student hypothesis: Vācaspati hailed from Mithilā, a region in which the study and teaching of Mīmāṃsā continued to flourish independently up to at least the fifteenth century, making it inherently unlikely that a scholar based in Mithilā would have traveled to distant Kashmir specifically to study under Jayanta. Although a number of scholars have nonetheless attempted, through strained interpretive effort, to preserve the traditional teacher–student narrative, the cumulative weight of this internal and contextual evidence renders that position difficult to sustain.

If the guru addressed in the opening verse of the *Nyāyakaṇikā* was not Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, the question remains: to whom does the verse in fact refer? The most plausible resolution is that the *Nyāyamañjarī* named in that verse refers not to Jayanta's celebrated work, but to an entirely separate—and no longer extant—text of the same title composed by Ācārya Trilocana, Vācaspati's actual teacher. Although no surviving manuscript of Trilocana's *Nyāyamañjarī* is known today, its prior existence is attested indirectly through the writings of Jñānaśrīmitra, the renowned Buddhist scholar of the Vikramaśīla monastery and an elder contemporary and philosophical opponent of Udayanācārya. In his *Nibandhāvalī*, Jñānaśrīmitra repeatedly refutes the views of Trilocana by name, and in several of these passages explicitly cites a work referred to as the *Mañjarī* or *Nyāyamañjarī* composed by Trilocana (Thakur, 1987, pp. 28, 36, 236, 255), including the passage *"Etena yadapi nyāyamañjarīkāraḥ prāha kāryotpattir yeṣāṃ... yathā tarhi Trilocanaś carcayati tathā anayor api nīyatām abhiprāyaḥ. Tathā ca nyāyamañjarī asādhāraṇam api sattvaṃ mādhyamikanyāyena śakyam udbhāvayitum"* (Jñānaśrīmitra, as edited in Thakur, 1987), together with the explicit statement *"Mañjaryāṃ Trilocanaḥ punar āha"* ("Trilocana further states in the *Mañjarī*"). Critically, the specific passages quoted here from this *Mañjarī* do not correspond to any passage found in Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's extant *Nyāyamañjarī*, strongly suggesting that Jñānaśrīmitra is citing a wholly different work bearing the same title.

Corroborating evidence appears in Aniruddha's *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā* (Aniruddha, 1969), which, in the course of explaining Vācaspati Miśra's interpretations, likewise cites the opinion of a "Mañjarīkāra" (author of the *Mañjarī*)—at one point specifically in the context of a criticism directed against Uddyotakara, where Aniruddha states: *"Atra vārttikakāreṇa bhāṣyabhaṅgaḥ kṛtaḥ. Sa ca mañjarīkāreṇa bhāṣyaṃ vyācakṣāṇenaiva parihṛtaḥ"* (Aniruddha, 1969, p. 60). The surrounding context, in which Aniruddha explicitly introduces Trilocana by name immediately thereafter—*"Samprati Trilocanam upanyasya darśayati... Trilocanamataṃ śreṣṭham iti tadeva"*—further confirms that the Mañjarīkāra under discussion is Trilocana, not Jayanta. The *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā* additionally records a specific doctrinal disagreement in which Vācaspati holds that two particular sentences concerning the nature of the self—*"jñānaliṅgatvād ātmanaḥ nānavarodhaḥ"* and *"tad-ayaugapadya-liṅgatvāc ca na manasaḥ"*—belong to the *Nyāya-sūtras*, whereas the Mañjarīkāra holds that they belong instead to the *Nyāya-bhāṣya* (Aniruddha, 1969, p. 29). Because Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *Nyāyamañjarī* contains no discussion whatsoever of whether these two sentences constitute sūtra or bhāṣya material, this disputed opinion cannot be attributed to Jayanta, reinforcing the conclusion that the Mañjarīkāra referred to throughout the *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā* is Trilocana.

A final piece of corroborating evidence comes from a different textual tradition altogether. Aniruddha's description of the Mañjarīkāra as one who "explains the *bhāṣya*" (*bhāṣyaṃ vyācakṣāṇena*) indicates that this *Mañjarī* functioned specifically as a commentary on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*. Consistent with this, Durveka Miśra, in his *Dharmottara-pradīpa*—a sub-commentary on Dharmottara's *Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā*—likewise refers to a *Nyāya-bhāṣya-ṭīkā* composed by Trilocana, stating: *"Trilocanaḥ punar nyāyabhāṣya-ṭīkāyām idam avādīt..."* (Miśra, 1955, p. 173). If this *Nyāya-bhāṣya-ṭīkā* attributed to Trilocana is indeed identical with the *Nyāyamañjarī* cited by Jñānaśrīmitra and Aniruddha, then—just as Vācaspati's own *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā* is conventionally abbreviated as *Tātparyaṭīkā* or simply *Ṭīkā*—it is entirely plausible that Trilocana's *Nyāyamañjarī* was likewise known by the abbreviated title *Mañjarī*. Taken together, this convergence of independent textual evidence indicates that the long-standing confusion between two distinct works sharing the title *Nyāyamañjarī* is the most probable explanation for the mistaken belief that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa was Vācaspati Miśra's teacher. While it remains possible that some scholars, through strained or artificial interpretation, continue to maintain this teacher–student connection, the cumulative textual evidence presented here suggests that this chain of speculative reasoning can now reasonably be regarded as resolved.

CONCLUSION

This article has sought to resolve two closely related and long-standing questions in the historiography of the Nyāya school: the relative chronological order of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Vācaspati Miśra, and the true identity of the guru invoked in the opening verse of Vācaspati's *Nyāyakaṇikā*. Through a convergence of internal textual evidence and externally attested historical chronology, this study has established that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa most plausibly lived in the late ninth and early tenth centuries CE, serving as minister under King Śaṅkaravarman of Kashmir, while Vācaspati Miśra is independently placed in the tenth century CE as a scholar of Mithilā. Weighing the arguments advanced on both sides of the traditional dispute—including the contested textual parallels between the *Nyāyamañjarī* and the *Tātparyaṭīkā* and *Bhāmatī*, the genealogical and historical evidence concerning Kashmiri rulers, and Vācaspati's own apparent reference to an "elder Naiyāyika" identifiable as Jayanta—this study finds the balance of evidence favoring the view that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa preceded Vācaspati Miśra, rather than the reverse order proposed by Vidyābhūṣaṇa and others.

Building on this chronological finding, the article has further argued that the long-repeated claim that Jayanta Bhaṭṭa served as Vācaspati Miśra's direct teacher rests on a conflation of two distinct works sharing the title *Nyāyamañjarī*. Internal evidence from Vācaspati's own *Tātparyaṭīkā*, corroborated by Udayanācārya's *Tātparyapariśuddhi* and by indirect citations preserved in Jñānaśrīmitra's *Nibandhāvalī* and Aniruddha's *Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā*, indicates that Vācaspati's actual *vidyā-guru* was not Jayanta Bhaṭṭa but Ācārya Trilocana, author of a separate and now non-extant *Nyāyamañjarī* that functioned as a commentary on the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*. Taken together, these findings offer a more coherent and textually grounded chronological framework for understanding the intellectual relationship between two of the most influential commentators in the history of Nyāya philosophy. Future research may further strengthen this framework by locating the precise page references for the two disputed quotations discussed in Section 5.3, and by revisiting the dating of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* referenced in Section 5.1 against the wider consensus

of Indological scholarship—two points that remain open for verification beyond the scope of the present study.

REFERENCES

Aniruddha. (1969). *Nyāyabhāṣyavārttikatātparya-vivaraṇapañjikā* (A. Thakur, Ed.). Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

Chatterjee, S. (1978). *The Nyāya theory of knowledge* (2nd ed.). University of Calcutta. (Original work published 1950)

Dasgupta, S. (1932). *A history of Indian philosophy* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1922)

Dharmakīrti. (1924). *Nyāyabindu, with the commentary (ṭīkā) of Dharmottara* (C. Sastri, Ed. & Trans.). Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Jayanta Bhaṭṭa. (1964). *Āgamaḍambara* (V. Raghavan & A. Thakur, Eds.). Mithila Institute.

Miśra, D. (1955). *Dharmottarapradīpa: Being a sub-commentary on Dharmottara's Nyāyabinduṭīkā* (D. Malvania, Ed.). Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Sastri, G. (Ed.). (1982). *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa* (Vols. 1–3), with the *Granthibhaṅga* commentary of Chakradhara. Sampurnananda Sanskrit University.

Shukla, S. N. (Ed.). (1971). *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa* (2nd ed.). Chowkhamba Sanskrit Sansthan.

Tarkatirtha, T., & Tarkatirtha, A. M. (Eds.). (1985). *Nyāyadarśana of Gautama, with the Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana and the Nyāyasūtravṛtti* (2nd ed.). Munshiram Manoharlal.

Tarkavagish, P. (1989). *Nyāyadarśana* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.). Paschimbanga Rajya Pustak Parshad.

Thakur, A. (Ed.). (1987). *Jñānaśrīmitranibandhāvali: Buddhist philosophical works of Jñānaśrīmitra* (2nd rev. ed.). Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Udayanācārya. (1996). *Nyāyavārttikatātparyapariśuddhi* (A. Thakur, Ed.). Indian Council of Philosophical Research.

Vidyabhusana, S. C. (1988). *A history of Indian logic: Ancient, mediaeval and modern schools*. Motilal Banarsidass. (Original work published 1921)