




# Complete without Impediment: *maṅgala* in the Eyes of the Vaiśeṣikas from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> Century CE

Ge Ge\*

**Abstract:** This article revisits the discussion on invocation (*maṅgala*) as found in the major Vaiśeṣika commentaries dating from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> centuries. There are two different opinions regarding the purpose of performing a *maṅgala* before one starts to compose a scholarly work. One group of commentators argues that writing a *maṅgala* to pay homage to a certain deity or one's teacher will ensure the completion of that work, while the other group believes that performing a *maṅgala* will only remove obstacles from the path to completion. Varadachari (1962) has termed these two groups the “ancient school” and the “modern school” respectively. However, his observation does not include the opinion of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra (13<sup>th</sup> century CE), another commentator on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*. Through a detailed examination of selected Vaiśeṣika commentaries, this article argues that the so-called dichotomy between the two groups reflects only a partial glimpse of opinions on the function/role of *maṅgalas* in the Vaiśeṣika commentarial tradition, thereby supplementing and rethinking the arguments proposed by Varadachari based on selected Vaiśeṣika literature.

**Keywords:** Vaiśeṣika, *maṅgala*, invocation, function

---

\*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1237-3966>. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the organizational committee of the twelfth IIGRS, especially to Vitus Angermeier and Christian Ferstl for their meticulous comments on this paper. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewer for many valuable remarks. Special thanks go to A. Calahan Morse for polishing up my writing and giving me insightful suggestions.

## 1. Introduction

As a kind of front matter, we often see a dedication at the beginning of a book before its preface and main content. Similarly, there are usually *maṅgala* verses dedicated to, for instance, deities, at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of Sanskrit texts written centuries ago. This invocation or benediction is referred to as *maṅgalaśloka* or *maṅgalācaraṇa*.<sup>1</sup> It often consists of several verses and sometimes only a single word to convey an auspicious meaning.

The word *maṅgala* is commonly used for expressing auspiciousness in Indian literature. For instance, it is used as a euphemistic epithet for Mars (*maṅgāraka*) in Indian astrology, meaning “The Auspicious One” (Gansten 2009, 649). Besides, the term *maṅgalasūtra* refers to a sacred wedding necklace. Most frequently, however, *maṅgala*<sup>2</sup> serves as a salutation (*namaskāra*) in Indian scholastic corpora, especially at the beginning of a text.

It is hard to determine when the *maṅgala* stanza appeared, since different traditions such as the astrological tradition (*jyotiḥśāstra*), the rhetorical tradition (*alaṃkāraśāstra*), the grammatical tradition (*vyākaraṇa*), the philosophical traditions like Mīmāṃsā, the Buddhist tradition, and so on began to compose such stanzas at various times (Minkowski 2008, 5–10). Before the middle of the first millennium, it was not common to start a treatise with an invocation or a certain word such as *om* that conveys auspicious purpose. For instance, there is no *maṅgala* stanza in the *Nyāyabhāṣya* by Vātsyāyana. Moreover, one cannot find any Vedic source about composing *maṅgalas* at the beginning of a work. This has been noted by Udayana in the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyapariśuddhi* (NVTP), where he says, “And there is no Vedic statement (*śruti*) such as ‘He who desires to complete the work he has started should make a salutation to the deity’, comparable to [the Vedic statement] ‘He who desires rain should perform the Karīrī [sacrifice].’”<sup>3</sup> Therefore, commentators who

1 “Not translating too literally, at least not yet, ‘*maṅgalācaraṇa*’ means the recitation of an auspicious verse that invokes a deity” (Minkowski 2008, 2–3).

2 I will use “*maṅgala*”, “*maṅgala* stanza/verse” and “invocation” interchangeably to refer to the opening verses that convey auspiciousness.

3 NVTP p. 7, 16–18: *na cātra vṛṣṭikāmaḥ kārīriṃ nirvapet itivat prārabdhapari-samāptikāmo devatām namaskuryād iti śrutir asti.*

later started their works with *maṅgala* stanzas had to provide reasons for composing these stanzas. Also, they needed to explain the absence of *maṅgala* in the earlier works they commented upon.

In this regard, two major questions need to be answered:

1. From where did people obtain the tradition of composing *maṅgalas*?
2. What motivated them to compose *maṅgalas*?

The most common answer to the first question is that this tradition derived from the conduct of learned people (*śiṣṭācāra*).<sup>4</sup> For example, Vācaspatimiśra interprets the salutation to the desired deity as “something obtained through generations from the conduct of learned ones who are consistent” (*avigītaśiṣṭācāraparamparāprāptaḥ*) in the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā* (NVT).<sup>5</sup> The conduct of learned people is also acknowledged to be a source of *dharma* (Freschi 2014, 156–157). Therefore, the latter commentators and authors have a solid reason to observe the tradition of composing *maṅgalas*.

As it is widely accepted that a wise person does not do something fruitlessly,<sup>6</sup> people who composed *maṅgalas* naturally wondered about the possible result of paying homage to the deity. The result must have been positive, otherwise composing *maṅgalas* would have been useless. In this regard, commentators are divided into two schools according to Varadachari’s observation (1962). Among these two schools, the “ancient school” argues that the result of having a *maṅgala* is the completion of a work undertaken, while the “modern school” led by Gaṅgeśa (14<sup>th</sup> century CE) accepts the removal of impediments as the result thereof. It is note-

4 An encompassing observation on *śiṣṭa* is provided in Bowles (2007, 337ff).

5 NVT p. 2, 17.

6 This statement is akin to a kind of stereotyped opening in the Buddhist logico-epistemological tradition, when the commentator introduces the aim of the treatise being commented upon, “Since the wise (*prekṣāvāt*) do not start learning treatises without an aim” (Funayama, 1995, 1). It has been mentioned by the Vaiśeṣika commentators discussed in this article as well. For example, in the *Nyāyakandalī* by Śrīdhara, it is said that the salutation performed by wise men is not fruitless (p. 1, 10–11): ... *na tāvad ayam aphalaḥ, prekṣāvadbhir anuṣṭheyatvāt, “... to start with, this is not fruitless, since [salutation] is performed by wise men.”*

worthy that this division is not totally chronologically arranged. There are authors prior to Gaṅgeśa from other traditions such as Mīmāṃsā, Jainism, etc. who have held the “modern” view (Varadachari 1962, 32–34). Thus, Gaṅgeśa should not be regarded as the inventor of this idea but only as a major proponent, who has extensively propounded this view. Also, this modern view is not unanimously accepted by authors postdating Gaṅgeśa, for example, Śaṅkara Miśra (15<sup>th</sup> century CE).

This present article will examine the discussion of *maṅgala* preserved in the selected Vaiśeṣika commentaries including the ones that have been discussed by Varadachari such as the *Vyomavati*, as well as two commentaries on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* attributed to Bhaṭṭa Vādindra (13<sup>th</sup> century), which were not considered by Varadachari sixty years ago. In addition, although Śrīdhara clearly expresses that the result of salutation is the cessation of impediments, he implies that the intended completion is expected to be brought out without impediment. Hence, the stance of Śrīdhara as an advocator of the “modern view” introduced by Varadachari (1962, 31) is debatable. Accordingly, I will consider the positions of these Vaiśeṣika commentators within the framework proposed by Varadachari, thereby re-assessing and improving this dichotomy of the “ancient” and “modern” schools of *maṅgala* in light of a broader examination of Vaiśeṣika literature.

## 2. Discussion of *maṅgala* in Vaiśeṣika literature

Neither the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (VS) by itself nor its earliest existing commentary, the *Candrānandavṛtti* (CV) by Candrānanda around the 9<sup>th</sup> century CE (Preisendanz 2011, 706), contains a *maṅgala* stanza. Indeed, Candrānanda did not even discuss the issue of *maṅgala* in the opening of his commentary.<sup>7</sup> In the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century CE, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra composed an extensive commentary called *Tarkasāgara* (TS) on

7 According to He’s working hypothesis, Candrānanda should be placed around the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century CE (He 2017, 17). Even if we take this hypothesis into consideration, the *Praśastabhāṣya* composed in the same period already contains a *maṅgala* stanza. Additionally, Candrānanda should be aware of the *maṅgala* stanza at the beginning of the *Nyāyavārttika* composed by Uddyotakara, if he has knowledge of Uddyotakara (He 2017, 5). Either way, Candrānanda should not be totally ignorant of the composing of *maṅgalas*.

the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* with two *maṅgala* stanzas at the opening of the text.<sup>8</sup> The abridged version of the TS<sup>9</sup> does not have a *maṅgala* at the beginning of the text. These two commentaries both take the word *atha* (“now”) in VS 1.1.1 to indicate that salutation happens before the start of the *sūtra*. By the time of Śaṅkara Miśra (15<sup>th</sup> century CE), Gaṅgeśa’s theory of *maṅgala* already acquired fame. Nevertheless, Śaṅkara Miśra did not follow the theory of this giant figure. After composing three *maṅgala* stanzas at the beginning of the *Upaskāra*,<sup>10</sup> another commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, Śaṅkara Miśra penned copious interpretations of *maṅgala* and relevant issues thereof.

For the commentaries on Praśastapāda’s stand-alone exegesis of the Vaiśeṣika teachings, which is called the *Padārthadharmasamgraha* (PDhS), the expositions regarding a *maṅgala* are of necessity, since the opening verse in the PDhS is dedicated to the deity and the sage

- 
- 8 TS p. 1, 3–8: *praṇamya gaurīśam acintyaśaktim sarvajñam ajñānatamahpradīpam / kānādasūtrasya mayā nibandho vidhīyate śaṅkarakiṅkareṇa // mahādevopadiṣṭasya sūtrasyaitan nibandhanam / sevyatām sakalair arthayathārthajñānahetave //* “Having paid homage to the lord of Gaurī (i.e., Śiva), who has incredible power, who is omniscient, who is the light against the darkness [caused] by ignorance, the composing of the *sūtra* attributed to Kaṇāda is arranged by me, a servant of Śiva. Let the composition of the *sūtra* instructed by the great deity (*mahādeva*) be utilized by all for the purpose of achieving the goal (*artha*) and the knowledge relevant for this goal (*yathārthajñāna*).”
- 9 The authorship of this abridged version of the *Tarkasāgara* is undecided. This abridged commentary might be composed by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra or his followers (Isaacson 1995, 20–21; Thakur 2003, 132–37; Preisendanz 2011, 702).
- 10 Upa p. 1, 3–8: *ūrdhvbaddhajaṭājūtakraḍakrīḍatsurāpagam / namāmi yāminīkāntakāntabhālasthalam haram // yābhyām vaiśeṣike tanre samyag vyutpādito ’smy aham / kaṇādabhavanāthābhyām tābhyām mama namaḥ sadā // sūtramātrāvalambena nirālambe ’pi gacchataḥ / khe khelavan mamāpy atra sāhasam sidhim eṣyati /* “I salute Śiva (*hara*), who has the river of God (i.e., the Ganges) playing on the lap of [him, who has] a mass of matted hair bound upwards, who has a place on [his] forehead endeared by the beloved of the night (i.e., the moon). My salutation is always to both Kaṇāda and Bhavanātha, from whom I have become perfectly erudite regarding the Vaiśeṣika corpus. I, for my part, am walking like a trembling man by relying on the mere rope (i.e., the *sūtra*) in the sky, where there is no support; my boldness will reach success even in this situation.”

Kaṇāda, the legendary founder of the Vaiśeṣika tradition.<sup>11</sup> Subsequent commentators consequently commented on this *maṅgala* stanza by adding their understandings. Among these major Vaiśeṣika commentators, Vyomaśiva (9<sup>th</sup> century CE) is the first one who designated the word *atha* as an implication of salutation. Śrīdhara (10<sup>th</sup> century CE) claimed that salutation led to the removal of impediments, which was required by completion. Moreover, as the founder of the Navya-Nyāya tradition, Udayana (11<sup>th</sup> century CE) refined his explanation of *maṅgala* by adding a logical flair.

The aforementioned Vaiśeṣika commentators, except Candrānanda, discussed three major topics, though not every commentator treated all of them:

1. The absence of *maṅgala* in the VS 1.1.1: *atha* conveys the meaning of *maṅgala*.<sup>12</sup>
2. The result and purpose of paying homage to deities.
3. Paradoxical situations: (1) complete work without paying homage to deities (the “missing *maṅgala*”); (2) incomplete work with a salutation to deities (the “futile *maṅgala*”).

To sum up, except Candrānanda, all major Vaiśeṣika commentators between the 9<sup>th</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> century CE contributed to the discussion of *maṅgala*. Their opinions will be introduced respectively in the following discussion.

## 2.1 Vyomaśiva

In his examination of *maṅgala*, Vyomaśiva says that the word *atha* in VS 1.1.1 can only mean “being immediately after” (*ānantarya*). To be specific,

11 PDhS p. 1, 1–2: *praṇamya hetum īsvaram muniṃ kaṇādam anvataḥ / padārthadharmasaṅgrahaḥ pravakṣyate mahodayaḥ //* “Having paid homage to the cause [that is] the Lord, afterwards to the sage Kaṇāda, the compendium of the properties of the categories will be proclaimed as being of great prosperity.”

12 Candrānanda only understood *atha* in the sense of “the declaration of explaining Dharma immediately after these inquiries” (CV p. 1, 7–8: *ataḥ ebhyaḥ praśnebhyo ’nantaram dharmavyākhyānapratijñāyām athaśabda ānantaryam abhidhatte*, “Therefore, immediately after these inquiries, the word “now” refers to “the [state of being] immediately after” regarding the declaration of explaining Dharma”).

it stands for being immediately after the salutation but nothing else.<sup>13</sup> The word *atha* implies that the composer has already saluted the deity before starting the present work. In this regard, Vyomaśiva explains that the author of the commentary, i.e., Praśastapāda, first paid homage intended (*abhimata*) by the author of the *sūtra*, i.e., Kaṇāda, to the deity and then to Kaṇāda. This salutation is not made by Kaṇāda because it would be contradictory if he paid homage to himself.<sup>14</sup> Vyomaśiva then concludes: “Thus, in this manner, the completion of the treatise only takes place without impediment provided (1) there exists a specific merit (*dharma*), depending on the salutation of the higher and lower teachers, and (2) in the absence of the effects of demerit due to the blocking of it.”<sup>15</sup> Hence we can see that the completion of a treatise relies on salutation, which produces merit to remove impediments caused by demerit on the way to completion. However, Vyomaśiva has been challenged by a certain opponent who disagrees: “And this is illogical, since regarding [works] such as the *Kādambarī*<sup>16</sup> and so on, that treatise is not seen as

13 Vyo p. 12, 2–6: *athāto dharmam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ* (VS 1.1.1), *yato 'bhyudayaniḥ-śreyasasiddhiḥ sa dharmam* (VS 1.1.2) *iti [pūrva]sūtre athaśabdo 'py ānantarye var-tata ity anyasyāsambhavān namaskārānantaram iti labhyate*. “Now, therefore, we will explain Dharma (VS 1.1.1); Dharma is from which there is the accomplishment of prosperity and final liberation (VS 1.1.2).’ In the [previous] *sūtra*, the word ‘now’, however, functions as ‘being immediately after’. Since it is impossible to be something else, [the meaning] is understood to be ‘immediately after saluting [the deities etc.]’.”

14 Vyo p. 12, 6–7: *bhāṣyakāraś ca sūtrakārābhimataṃ parasya guror namaskāram anūdyāparasya namaskāram karotīti vyākhyeyaṃ, na tu kaṇāda eva, svātmani kriyāvirodhāt*. This also explains the absence of salutation in the VS by Kaṇāda. As Vyomaśiva explained here, Kaṇāda intended or admitted that the higher teacher should be paid homage to, although he did not compose any *maṅgala* in the VS.

15 Vyo p. 13, 8–9: *tad evaṃ parāparagurunamaskārāpekṣadharmaviśeṣe 'dharma-pratibandhāt tattatkāryāṅam abhāve bhavaty evāvighnataḥ śāstraparīsamāptir iti*. Regarding the understanding of *parāparaguru*, Udayana offers a relevant interpretation in the *Kiraṇāvalī*, p. 30, 7: *... gurutamagurutaragurukrameṇa praṇāmaḥ kriyata iti ...*, “... salutation is made in sequence to the most important and the more important teacher ...” The higher or the most important teacher refers to the Lord (*īśvara*), the lower or the more important teacher refers to Kaṇāda.

16 The *Kādambarī* is an unfinished *kāvya* work by the Sanskrit poet Bāṇa from the 7<sup>th</sup> century CE. Although the author has paid homage to and praised the deities

completed even if salutation (*namaskāra*) exists. While for [works] such as the one starting with ‘in the case of knowing a thing through means of knowledge’ (i.e., *Nyāyabhāṣya* 1.1.1), even if [salutation] does not exist, [completion of that treatise] is experienced.”<sup>17</sup> This is exactly the problem of the “futile *maṅgala*”: The eventual completion of a certain work does not necessarily depend on *maṅgala* stanzas. How could one justify the existence of *maṅgala*? In this regard, Vyomaśiva answers: “Right. It is said that a cause is of necessity because the completion of a treatise is the result. Since nothing else can be [this cause], a specific merit is the cause. Some people think that this [specific merit] can either be [derived] from salutation or something else, [because] it is not fixed. Whereas other people [say that the specific merit] is specified by a specific means of obtaining. [But I think,] the specific merit as the cause is derived from nothing but salutation.”<sup>18</sup>

Vyomaśiva’s reply to the “futile *maṅgala*” is not very convincing, since he does not explain the reason for taking salutation as the only source of this specific merit. This answer is also least straightforward, one can only tentatively assume that the “futile *maṅgala*” does not produce any specific merit. A few lines later, he only adds vaguely: “And according to the transmitted tradition, it is commonly known that merit is produced by salutation.”<sup>19</sup> Apparently, the opponents are not satisfied. They remind Vyomaśiva by asking: “Then, how could a treatise be finished if there is no salutation?”<sup>20</sup> As mentioned before, the *Nyāyabhāṣya* is complete without any *maṅgala* stanza. To explain the problem of “missing *maṅgala*”, Vyomaśiva answers: “No, because even in this case, the existence of a cause is established through an existing result (i.e., the

---

in the opening stanzas, the *Kādambarī* was only completed by his son Bhūṣaṇa after his death (Smith: 2009, xv).

17 Vyo p. 13, 9–11: *nanu cāyuktam etat. saty api namaskāre śāstrāparisamāpter adarśanāt kādambarīyādau. asaty api darśanāt pramāṇato ’rthapratipattau (Nyā. Bhā. 1.1.1) ity evam ādau.*

18 Vyo p. 13, 12–14: *satyam. śāstrāparisamāpteḥ kāryatvād, avaśyaṃ kāraṇaṃ vācyam ity, anyasyāsambhavād dharmaviśeṣaḥ kāraṇam iti. sa ca namaskārād anyasmād vā bhavatu, na niyamyata ity eke. anye tu sādhanaviśeṣād viśiṣyata iti namaskārād evopajāyate dharmaviśeṣaḥ kāraṇam iti.*

19 Vyo p. 13, 20: *namaskārāc ca dharmāḥ sampadyata ity āgamād vyāptigrahaṇam.*

20 Vyo p. 13, 15: *atha namaskārābhāve tarhi kathaṃ śāstrāparisamāptir iti?*



completion). Although there is no verbal salutation, the mental salutation is acknowledged.<sup>21</sup> Regarding the relationship between the mental salutation and the verbal one, Vyomaśiva supplements, “In this manner, the verbal salutation abounded with mental salutation is accepted to be the cause of completion, whereas the mental one is peculiar.”<sup>22</sup> This indicates that salutation expressed in words is filled with mental thoughts. Mental salutation is even more important than the verbal one, because it is the foundation of the verbally expressed salutation. Therefore, it can also be the case that a “futile *maṅgala*” is due to the absence of mental salutation.<sup>23</sup> This reply goes back to the previous paradoxical situation, for which Vyomaśiva does not provide a very plausible and well-grounded explanation.

What has happened after paying homage to the Lord and the sage Kaṇāda in the PDhS? Vyomaśiva says: “Thus in this way, after the salutation made for the higher and lower teachers, because either no obstruction is [caused] by hinderance or a student is endowed with mentioned characteristics, therefore, the PDhS not hindered by counteraction will be proclaimed precisely after.”<sup>24</sup> The inclusion of “characteristics of a student” implies that the practice of *maṅgala* is required for someone who wants to learn the PDhS.<sup>25</sup> Vyomaśiva is clear that the eventual outcome

21 Vyo p. 13, 15–16: *na, tatrāpi kāryasadbhāvena kāraṇasadbhāvasiddheḥ. vācikanamaskārābhāve 'pi mānaso namaskāro jñāyata iti.*

22 Vyo p. 13, 17–18: *tathā hi mānasanamaskāropacito vāciko namaskāraḥ parisamāpteḥ kāraṇam iṣyate, mānaso tu kevalo 'pīti.*

23 Vyo p. 13, 18–20: *ata eva kvacid vācikasadbhāve 'pi mānasanamaskārābhāvād aparisamāptir yukteti. tasya cābhāvaḥ kāryānutpādenaiva jñāyata iti.* “Only because of this, even if a verbal [salutation] exists somewhere, incompleteness [of a work] is reasonable due to the absence of mental salutation – its absence is only known by the non-coming into being of the result (i.e., completion).”

24 Vyo p. 13, 26–27: *tad evaṃ parāparagurunamaskārād yato 'ntarāyapradhvamso yato vā antevāsī yathoktalakṣaṇasampannaḥ, ato 'nantaram eva pratīpakṣakriyānantaritaḥ padārthadharmasamgrahaḥ pravakṣyata iti.*

25 “The student is endowed with stated characteristics” implies the common understanding that only a qualified student is eligible to study. For instance, in Candrānanda’s commentary on the VS 1.1.1 (p. 1, 10–11), it is said a student who has been equipped with advancement of good virtues can learn Dharma taught in the sūtra (*yasmād ayam śiṣyo guṇasampadā yuktas tato 'smai praśnebhyo 'nantaram dharmam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*). Besides, the “mentioned characteristics”

of salutation is obtained through the removal of impediments by virtue of a specific merit produced by salutation. However, Vyomaśiva does not provide solid arguments for the problem of the “futile *maṅgala*” in the first place and thus leaves room for potential objections and further improvements.

## 2.2 Śrīdhara

Śrīdhara (10<sup>th</sup> century CE) composed two *maṅgala* stanzas at the beginning of the *Nyāyakandalī* (NK) on the PDhS.<sup>26</sup> He then explained that the homage paid to the deity and the teacher Kaṇāda in the PDhS followed the conduct of learned people (*śiṣṭācāra*). It is notable that this more detailed expression was not used by Vyomaśiva, who merely said merit produced by salutation is known from the transmitted tradition (see 2.1). Moreover, according to Varadachari’s analysis, Śrīdhara belongs to the modern school since he takes the removal of impediments to be the result of *maṅgala* (Varadachari 1962, 31). However, this assertion is not very conclusive, since Śrīdhara does not specifically deny that completion could be the result. Śrīdhara argues in the NK: “And the fruit of salutation is the cessation of impediments; firstly because [salutation] is performed by wise men, this [salutation] is not something fruitless; moreover, [something that has] another fruit [different from the cessation of impediments] would not be necessarily performed at the beginning of an undertaking,

---

of a qualified student here can be the characteristics listed in the preserved beginning of the Vyo (p. 1, 7–8): ... *upajātaṃ śuśrūṣāśravaṇagrahaṇadhāraṇohā pohaṭattvābhiniveśavadantevāsinam āheti*, “... he talks to the student naturally endowed with ardent desire for the wish to study, listening, grasping, holding [the knowledge], the dialectic skills (*pros* and *cons*), [and] the truth (*tattva*).”

- 26 NK p. 1, 6–9: *anādinidhanam devam jagatkāraṇam īśvaram / prapadye satya-saṅkalpaṃ nityatrijñānavigrahaṃ // dhyānaikatānamanaso vīgatapracārāḥ paśyanti yaṃ kam api nirmalam advitīyam / jñānātmane vighaṭitākhilabandhanāya tasmai namo bhagavato puruṣottamāya //* “I resort to the deity who has no beginning and end, who is the cause of the world, who is the Lord, who has volition of the truth, who is in the form of threefold eternal knowledge. Those whose minds are fixed at one place through meditation, inasmuch as they are devoid of any movement see that one (i.e., the deity) who is completely pure [and] unique. There is the salutation to him whose nature is knowledge, who has been separated from all bondage, who is respectful, who is the best of men.”

because something with a different fruit is not aimed at; the intended full completion without impediment is then to be expected.<sup>27</sup> Then he refutes the idea that challenges the necessity of taking salutation as the means to conquer impediments.<sup>28</sup> Besides, Śrīdhara reaffirms that the cessation of impediments derives only from the salutation made at the beginning of the work by good people, since it is perceived that impediments are ceased.<sup>29</sup> In addition, he argues that nothing but the salutation, which is the producer of merit, suppresses the seed of obstacles.<sup>30</sup>

Doubtlessly, Śrīdhara is convinced that the cessation of impediments is the result of salutation. In this way, it is understandable that Varadachari has taken Śrīdhara to be one of the upholders of the modern view, like Gaṅgeśa. However, this does not mean that Śrīdhara is explicitly against the idea that completion could be the result of salutation, especially since he mentions that the very completion is desired if impediments are removed. For instance, Śaṅkara Mīśra briefly explains that the invocation is made for the deity in the *Nyāyalilāvātikaṅṭhābharāṇa* (NLK): “To teach students, he (i.e., Vallabha) composes the *maṅgala* stanza [beginning with] ‘master’, made by the desire to remove impediments regarding the thing that should be done. The salutation is to the ‘best of men’.”<sup>31</sup> Śaṅkara Mīśra does not claim that completion is the result

27 NK p. 1, 12–15: *phalaṃ ca namaskārasya vighnopaśamo na tāvad ayam aphalaḥ prekṣāvadbhir anuṣṭheyatvāt, anyaphalo 'pi na karmārambhe niyamenānuṣṭhiyeta avighnena prāripsitaparisaṃāptes tadānīm apekṣitatvāt, phalāntarasyānabhisamhitatvāt.*

28 NK p. 1, 15–17: *nanu kiṃ namaskārād eva vighnopaśama utānyasmād api bhavati? na tāvan namaskārād evety asti niyamaḥ, asaty api namaskāre nyāyamīmāṃsābhāṣyayoḥ parisamāptatvāt, yadā cānyasmād api tadā niyamenopādānaṃ nirupapattikam.* [Objection:] “Does the cessation of impediment only come from salutation or also from something else? [Reply:] First, there is no injunction that states “only from the salutation”. Also, since the *Nyāyabhāṣya* and the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* are complete even without salutation, then if [the cessation of impediments] is entirely derived from salutation, then the necessary perception [of this salutation] does not fit [in this case].”

29 NK p. 1, 18–19: *namaskārād eva vighnopaśamaḥ karmārambhe sadbhir niyamena tasyopādānāt.*

30 NK p. 2, 4: *sa hi dharmotpādakas tirayaty antarāyabījaṃ nāparaḥ.*

31 NLK p. 1, 7–8: *kartavyavighnanirācīkīrṣayā kṛtaṃ maṅgalaṃ śiṣyaśikṣāyai nibadhnāti nātha iti. tasmai puruṣottamāya namaḥ.*

or purpose of salutation evidently in this short explanation. He just explains that the salutation is made to remove impediments. This clearly contradicts Śaṅkara Mīśra's understanding of the same issue expressed in the *Upaskāra* (see 2.5). We can also take Śaṅkara Mīśra as a proponent of the modern view according to Varadachari's binary distinction based on this concise explanation in the NLK. On the other hand, we should also be cautious that this brief interpretation of the *maṅgala* verse in the NLK is not elaborated in detail. Hence it might be partial and not the complete intention of Śaṅkara Mīśra. In the same way, even though Śrīdhara clearly states that the result of salutation is the removal of impediments, he still implies completion is the desired outcome of the removal of impediments. Thus, whether Śrīdhara belongs to the modern school would be open to consideration given that completion is not entirely excluded from being the result of salutation.

With regard to the “missing *maṅgala*”, Śrīdhara explains that the salutation is performed but not written down in the text. He argues that even a clever barbarian (*mleccha*) would not start a work without saluting the chosen deity. Thus, the eminent Pakṣila Svāmin and Śabara Svāmin, who are knowledgeable or at least incomparable (*apara*), must have paid homage too.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, we can infer that these authors have composed *maṅgalas*, though we do not witness them in the treatises. As for the “futile *maṅgala*”, Śrīdhara ascribes the incompleteness to the absence of a distinguished salutation (*viśiṣṭanamaskāra*). The salutation performed in such works is not a specific one. Otherwise, these works would have been complete.<sup>33</sup> Śrīdhara does not specify the distinction of the salutation that brings a work to its end. Neither does he explain the assumed inadequacy of the salutation made in works like the

32 NK p. 1, 19–20, p. 2, 1–3: *na ca nyāyamīmāṃsābhāṣyakārābhyaṃ na kṛto namaskāraḥ kiṃ tu tac cānupanibaddhaḥ. katham eṣā pratītir iti cet. kartuḥ śiṣṭatayaiva astu vā tāvad aparāḥ prekṣāvān mleccho 'pi tāvad gurvārambhe karmaṇi na pravartate yāvad iṣṭān na namsyati yad imau paramāstikau pakṣiḥ śabarasvāminau nānutiṣṭhata ity asambhāvanam idam.* An English translation of this part with a discussion on the “missing *maṅgalaśloka*” has been published by Pascale Haag (2011, 228). See also Minkowski 2008, 14.

33 NK p. 2, 5–6: *ata eva kṛtanamaskārasyaṅpi kādambariṅyāder aparisaṃmāptir viśiṣṭanamaskārābhāvāt tadavaiśiṣṭyasya kāryagamyatvāt.*

*Kādambarī*. Like Vyomaśiva, his explanation for the “futile *maṅgala*” is not clearly expressed.

### 2.3 Udayana

Udayana (11<sup>th</sup> century CE) brought the development of logic in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika tradition to the next stage. His commentary on the PDhS is called *Kiraṇāvalī* (Kir), in which we find four *maṅgala* stanzas at the beginning and a brief discussion about these *maṅgala* stanzas.<sup>34</sup> Udayana’s expositions of *maṅgala* are succinct but in-depth with many new thoughts. First, he introduces the purpose of the invocation in the PDhS: “At the beginning of the treatise, he (i.e., Praśastapāda) first composes the *maṅgala* stanza [dedicated to] the higher and lower teachers (i.e., the Lord and the sage), inasmuch as it has been made physically, verbally and mentally obtained through generations of disciplined people (*sadācara*), to teach students.”<sup>35</sup> Udayana adds bodily performed salutation to the list of salutations, which is not found in the commentaries by Vyomaśiva and Śrīdhara. However, this added type of salutation conforms to the traditional practices such as bowing to someone or saluting someone with the hands folded together. The inclusion of physical and mental salutation implicitly solves the problem of a “missing *maṅgala*” regarding works that are complete without a *maṅgala*. If one does not see any invocation in a complete treatise, then the salutation has been done either physically or mentally by the author.

Except the newly added type of salutation, Udayana also regards the reinforcement of a treatise as one of the results of salutation, which is again new to Vyomaśiva or Śrīdhara. According to Udayana, the saluta-

34 Minkowski (2008, 16) claims: “Meanwhile there were other works without *maṅgalas* that nevertheless were complete, for instance Udayana’s tenth-century text on logic, the *Kiraṇāvalī*.” However, there are four *maṅgala* stanzas in this text (Kir p. 1–7). Among them, the first stanza is identical to the concluding stanza in Udayana’s *Lakṣaṇāvalī*. In this stanza, Udayana salutes the arising one, which symbolizes the sun or the rising deity who repels the darkness brought by ignorance. An English translation and a general introduction of this introductory part can be found in Tachikawa 2001. The following translations in the present article are mine.

35 Kir p. 8, 1–2, p. 9, 1: *śāstrārambhe sadācāraparamparāpariprāptatayā kāyavānmanobhiḥ kṛtaṃ parāparaḡurunamaskāraṃ śiṣyān śikṣayitum ādau nibadhnāti*.

tion to the supreme deity yields *maṅgala*. By virtue of the composed *maṅgala*, the commenced work without impediment is completed (*parisamāpyate*) and strengthened (*pracīyate*).<sup>36</sup> Therefore, the work is not only complete but also reinforced. Moreover, Udayana penned the reasons for the “futile *maṅgala*” such as in the case of the *Kādambarī*. In this regard, Udayana explains: “Since [salutation] has its root in the transmitted tradition (*āgama*), the deviation of its aim (*artha*) is not considered a fault. The reason [behind this situation is] that [salutation] is caused by a defective action, a defective agent, [or] a defective method.”<sup>37</sup> In this manner, a *maṅgala* must achieve those two results mentioned before, insofar as it is not impaired by defective factors which are the action, the agent and the method. A similar account is found in the *Nyāyasūtra* (NS) 2.1.58, when Gautama refutes the opponent who has questioned the validity of the Veda by illustrating three faults (NS 2.1.57).<sup>38</sup> The defect of action, agent or method is applied in the refutation to the first suggested fault, deception, mentioned in NS 2.1.57. In the case of the “futile *maṅgala*” in the *Kādambarī*, Udayana applied the same strategy to explain it: salutation is not futile, but there is something wrong with the other involved parts. This is also a new solution different from those of Vyomaśiva and Śrīdhara. Vyomaśiva does not clarify this “futile *maṅgala*” in detail, while Śrīdhara merely says that a distinguished salutation is missing.

For the “futile *maṅgala*” with unimpaired components, Udayana explains in the following way: “Even if [the action and the other two factors are] in good qualities, [the work is still incomplete,] because the cause of impediments is stronger. Then in this way, ‘what is the use [of *maṅgala*]’ should not be said, since the accumulated [salutation] is the cause to

36 Kir p. 20, 1–3: *tathābhūtā hi parameśvaranatir maṅgalam āvahati. kṛtamaṅgalena cārabdhaṃ karma nirvighnaṃ parisamāpyate pracīyate ca.*

37 Kir p. 20, 3–4: *āgamamūlatvāc cāsyārthasya vyabhicāro na doṣāya. tasya karma kartṛsādhanavaigunyaḥetukatvāt.* The same statement of “being rooted in the transmitted tradition” is found in the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* (TC, p. 72, 3–4: *tad uktam āgamamūlatvāc cāsyārthasya vyabhicāro na doṣāyeti*), p. 72, 13 when Gaṅgeśa refutes the objection related to the issue of *āgama*.

38 NS p. 90, 9: *tadaprāmāṇyam anṛtavyāghātapanaruktadoṣebhyaḥ* (2.1.57). NS p. 91, 11: *na, karmakartṛsādhanavaigunyāt* (2.1.58).

ward off impediments [produced] by something more powerful.”<sup>39</sup> For instance, a blade of grass is unable to ward off the rain, but a huge bundle of the same kind of grass can achieve this aim.<sup>40</sup> If the opponent is dissatisfied with this reply and keeps questioning the existence of the cause of impediments, salutation still wards off that cause of impediments, which is perceived by default. Let’s take the king and his elephant troops as an example. If a king is not surrounded by enemies, he might not show respect to the chief of the elephants. But this is dangerous, because the enemies can show up anytime and the king needs the elephants to fight on the battlefield. Therefore, he must always maintain good relationship with the elephant troops, even if there is no enemy nearby.<sup>41</sup> Hence one must perform *maṅgala* to remove the impediments, even if they are not seen at the moment. Although Udayana’s exposition regarding the case of “futile *maṅgala*” is condensed, he offered his successors a deliberate solution to resolve this thorny problem. As we will see in the following, both Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra (in 2.4) and Śāṅkara Mīśra (in 2.5) are deeply influenced by Udayana.

## 2.4 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

### 2.4.1 *Tarkasāgara*

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra (13<sup>th</sup> century CE) is the author of *Tarkasāgara* (TS)<sup>42</sup>, a commentary on the VS accompanied by extensive expositions on other relevant topics. The discussion of *maṅgala* starts at the beginning of

39 Kir p. 24, 1–3: *sādguṇye ’pi vighnahetūnām baliyastvāt na caivaṃ kim aneneti vācyam. pracitasyaśyaiva balavattaravighnavāraṇe ’pi kāraṇatvāt.*

40 Kir p. 25, 1–3: *na hi ghanavimuktam udakam ekas tṛṇastambo vārayitum na samartha iti tadarthaṃ nopādīyate sajātiyapracayasambalitasya tasya śaktatvāt.*

41 Kir p. 26, 1–4: *na ca vighnahetusadbhāvaniścayābhāvāt tadvāraṇe kāraṇam anupādeyam. yatas tatsandehe ’pi tadupādānasya nyāyyatvāt. anyathānupa-  
sthitaparipanthibhiḥ pāṛthivair dviradayūthapatayo nādriyeran iti.*

42 Isaacson (1995, 12–13) has thoroughly discussed the title of this commentary. Moreover, it is notable that the *Tarkasāgara* has been mentioned by Bhaṭṭa Rāghava, the disciple of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and the author of the *Nyāyasāravīcāra* (NSV, edited by Jha 1979). In the concluding stanza of the NSV, Bhaṭṭa Rāghava paid homage to his teacher Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and mentioned the name of this commentary (NSV p. 148: *tadvādīndrakṛtau tarkasāgare*).

the commentary after two *maṅgala* stanzas composed by the commentator himself.<sup>43</sup> Like the aforementioned interpretation of the first word in VS 1.1.1 given by Vyomaśiva, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra has followed the understanding of *atha* as “immediately after the salutation to the Lord” (*īśvarapraṇāmānantaryapara ity uktam*). Apart from that, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra tacitly understands the purpose of performing *maṅgala* to be the successful completion of a work in refuting the idea that the expression (*kathana*), that is, being immediately after the salutation to the deity, does not apply to the exposition of Dharma, which is vital to the VS, because the salutation to the deity is only for the very completion of the treatise.<sup>44</sup> How can one relate the teaching of Dharma to salutation? Bhaṭṭa Vādindra replies: “... because students are taught that the start of a treatise and so on should only be made immediately after the salutation to the chosen deity. Otherwise, students who start a treatise without saluting the chosen deity will be ones who start something fruitless. Since [they are] devoid of the assistance [named as] merit produced by salutation, which is the cause of completion (*parisamāpti*) and reinforcement (*pracaya*) of a treatise.”<sup>45</sup> Same as Udayana, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra also takes reinforcement to be a result of salutation and the salutation at the beginning of a treatise is made to educate students. In fact, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra must have been aware of Udayana’s work, since he also composed commentaries on Udayana’s *Kiraṇāvalī* and the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* respectively.<sup>46</sup> Hence, it is not very surprising that he is frequently in concurrence with Udayana.

Bhaṭṭa Vādindra continues to rationalize the salutation as the cause for the completion and the reinforcement of the treatise. First, the Veda etc. inferred from the conducts of learned people who are consistent is a means of knowledge.<sup>47</sup> Therefore, salutation derived from the same

43 See footnote 8.

44 TS p. 1, 12–14: *na ca dharmavyākhyānasyeśvarapraṇāmānantaryakathanam anupayogī, īśvarapraṇāmād eva granthaparisamāptisiddher iti yuktam.*

45 TS p. 1, 14–16: *iṣṭadevatānamaskārānantaram eva granthādyārambhaḥ kartavya itī śiṣyajñāpanārthatvāt, anyathā hi iṣṭadevatāpraṇāmam antareṇa grantham ārabhamāñāḥ śiṣyā granthaparisamāptipracayahetunamaskārajanyadharmākhyasahakārivirahāt viphalārambhā bhaveyuh.*

46 A detailed discussion of these two works is introduced by Isaacson (1995, 6–9).

47 TS p. 1, 17–18: *avigītaśiṣṭācārānumitavedādes tatra pramāṇatvāt.* The “inferred Veda (*anumitaveda*)”, which can be inferred from either the non-authoritative



source is justifiable. He then clarifies the “futile *maṅgala*” in a similar but more precise manner compared to Udayana. Bhaṭṭa Vādindra ascribes the incompleteness of the *Kādambarī* etc. to the imperfections of the body and so on of the agent, because the agent is one of the causes of completion as well. Therefore, even if the *maṅgala* stanza has produced merit that is conducive to the completion of the work, since the agent is hindered by physical problems or other imperfections, the work is eventually incomplete.<sup>48</sup> Bhaṭṭa Vādindra continues: “Since we not only think the merit produced by salutation is the cause of the completion of the treatise, but also [something] like the destruction of the physical imperfections of the agent [is the other cause of the completion], because the imperfections of the body etc. of the agent are truly destroyed by something invisible etc.”<sup>49</sup>

Hence, by examining the case of “futile *maṅgala*”, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra arrives at two essential causes for achieving the expected completion – the merit produced by the salutation and the destruction of the bodily imperfections etc. Even if a treatise, whose author is in good condition, is complete, the merit produced by the salutation remains to be a cause

---

Vedic sources or the conduct of learned people, is contrary to the “perceived Veda” as stated by the Mīmāṃsakas (Brick 2006: 288). Regarding the salutation composed at the beginning of the text, although it is not seen in any “perceived Veda”, it is established through the “inferred Veda”. As I have already pointed out in the introduction, Vācaspatimīśra has also adopted a very similar description of the source of *maṅgala*, like this one made by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra, in the NVT (p. 2, 17, *avigītaśiṣṭācāraparamparāprāptaḥ*). However, he does not mention the Veda etc. but only something obtained from one generation to another. Udayana’s elaboration of this expression is not very helpful. He argues that the conduct of learned people is also just a means of knowledge, like perception, regarding the existence of the revelation. The reason is that the conduct of learned people must be rooted in something. Something that is not rooted in a means of knowledge is inapplicable to detach [itself] from the contradiction with something authoritative (NVTP, p. 7, 21 – p. 8, 1–2: *pratyakṣam ivāvigītaśiṣṭācāro ’pi śrutisadbhāve pramāṇam eva, nirmūlasya ca śiṣṭācārasyāsambhavāt. apramāṇamūlakasya ca pramāṇikavigānavirahānupapatteh.*).

48 TS p. 1, 18–19: *na, namaskārajanyadharmasattve [’pi] granthasamāptihetukarṭṭhadehādivaikalyāt.*

49 TS p. 1, 20–21: *na hy asmākaṃ namaskārajadharmamātram granthasamāptihetuh, api tu karṭṭhadehaviḅḅnanāśādir api karṭṭhadehādivaikalyasya ca bhāvenādrṣṭādivināśāt.*

of the completion of the treatise.<sup>50</sup> The point is, both causes are always necessary for the completion of the treatise. As for the problem of the “missing *maṅgala*”, such as in the case of the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra explains in the same manner as Śrīdhara, “Also in this case, the absent salutation that is [performed] mentally, inasmuch as it is established by the Veda inferred from the conduct of learned people, is not ascertained in the case of being separated from the non-perception of something fit [to be perceived] (*yogyānupalambha*).”<sup>51</sup> Once again, even though one does not find any *maṅgala* stanzas in those complete works, it is only because he is unable to perceive the mental salutation.

#### 2.4.2 The abridged version of the TS

The *editio princeps* of the abridged commentary on the VS was entitled *Vyākhyā* (TSV) by Thakur and published in 1957. At that time, this commentary remained anonymous. Apart from the *editio princeps*, Isaacson prepared a new edition of its sixth and seventh Adhyāya with translations thereof in his unpublished thesis (Isaacson 1995, 57–139). In comparison with the TS, the discussion of *maṅgala* in this abridged version only partially summarizes the content that appears in the TS. The main body of the discussion largely conforms to the text documented in the Kir (see section 2.3). Whether the author of this abridged version is Bhaṭṭa Vādindra or not, this person demonstrates a good command of Udayana’s work.<sup>52</sup>

50 TS p. 1, 21–22: *na ca ta[rhi] karṭṛ[dr̥ṣṭa]hetusākalye granthasamāpter avyati rekadarśanāt na namaskārajanadharmasya granthasamāptihetutvam iti yuktam.*

51 TS p. 2, 1–2: *tatrāpi śiṣṭācārānumitavedapramāṇakamānasābhinamaskārābhāvasya yogyānupalambhavirahe niścetum aśakyatvāt.* The “non-perception of something fit to be perceived”, more frequently encountered as *yogyānupalabdhi*, is a means to cognize something that should be cognized. Preisendanz (1994, 417–422) has made a comprehensive observation on this term, in which we find that both Śrīdhara and Udayana discussed it in their works.

52 It would be helpful if we could investigate Bhaṭṭa Vādindra’s commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* to see his explanation of the *maṅgala* stanzas. Unfortunately, only two sections of his commentary thereon are available to us, see Isaacson 1995, 6–8.

To start with, the abridged version briefly repeats what has been stated in the TS.<sup>53</sup> Then, the text is parallel to the Kir (p. 20, 1–3, p. 24, 1–3, p. 25, 1–3, p. 26, 1–4) with a few variant readings.<sup>54</sup> However, these variant readings do not change the meaning of the text (see 2.3). Since the *editio princeps* is the only available edition where we can find a short discussion of *maṅgala*, it is difficult to decide if this part of the commentary is an interpolation or a reuse of the text. In short, as its content is only a combination of what has been addressed in the TS and the Kir, we do not find any new information about the understanding of *maṅgala*.

## 2.5 Śaṅkara Mīśra

As the latest Navya-Naiyāyika in the current list of commentators, Śaṅkara Mīśra (15<sup>th</sup> century CE) demonstrated some more intricate and technical lines of argumentation in his *Upaskāra*. In fact, according to Minkowski (2008, 15), it is Gaṅgeśa who brought the discussion and

53 TSV p. 1, 5–9: *athaśabda ānantarye. ānantaryamātravacanenāpy anena yat kiñcit pūrvavṛttaṃ [na] samarpaṇīyam, tasya dharmavyākhyānānupayogāt. kiṃ tv iśvarapraṇāmaḥ pūrvavṛttatayā samarpaṇīyaḥ, iśvarapraṇāmād eva cikirṣitakāryaparipūraṇopapatteh. na tadānantaryam vacanīyam iti cet? śiṣyaśikṣārthatvāt. iṣṭadevatānamaskārānantaram eva granthādyārambhaḥ kartavya iti.* “The word *atha* is used in the sense of ‘being immediately after’. Because it (i.e., *atha*) is inappropriate for explaining Dharma, whatever has happened previously should not be addressed by this word that merely [means] ‘being immediately after’ too. Rather, the salutation to the Lord should be addressed as the previous happening, since the salutation to the Lord brings out the fulfillment of the desired result. [Objection:] The state of being immediately after that [salutation] need not be said. [Reply: No, it should be there.] because [it is] for teaching students. The commencement of a treatise and so on should be made only immediately after the salutation to the chosen deity.”

54 The variant readings are marked in bold or added in brackets: TSV p. 1, 9–15: *kṛtamaṅgalenārabdhaṃ karma samāpyate pracīyate ca. āgamamūlatvāc cāsyārthasya vyabhicāro na doṣāya. tasya karmakartṛsādhanavaigūnyahetukatvāt. sādgūnye 'pi vighnahetūnāṃ balīyastvāt. na caivaṃ sati kim aneneti vācyam. na hi ghanamuktam (Kir: ghanavimuktam) udakam ekas tṛṇakadambo (Kir: stambo) vārayituṃ na samartha iti tadarthaṃ nopādīyate. sa-jātyapracayasamvalitasya tasya śaktatvāt. na ca vighnanahetusadbhāvaniścayābhāvād vāraṇakāraṇam (Kir: tadvāraṇe kāraṇam) anupādeyam. (Kir: yatas) tatsamdehe 'pi tadupādānasya nyāyyatvāt. anyathānupasthitaparipanthibhiḥ pārthivair dviradayūthapatayo nādriyeran (Kir: iti).*

analysis of *maṅgala* to a more advanced and philosophical level, since the controversial problems regarding *maṅgala* became pressing. In the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* (TC), the first section titled *Maṅgalavāda* is solely devoted to the discussion of *maṅgala*.<sup>55</sup> As a leading and prominent figure in the heyday of Navya-Nyāya, Gaṅgeśa greatly influenced subsequent scholars, including Śaṅkara Miśra. Nevertheless, Śaṅkara Miśra did not follow Gaṅgeśa's understanding of *maṅgala*. He adhered to the ancient view upheld by his Vaiśeṣika predecessors. In contrast to Bhaṭṭa Vādiṅdra, who first examined the word *atha* that conveys the meaning of *maṅgala* and then depicted the scene when Kaṇāda received the knowledge taught by Śiva in the disguise of an owl,<sup>56</sup> Śaṅkara Miśra developed his argumentation in reverse order. After presenting the scene of how suffering students came to the sage Kaṇāda and the sage taught them the knowledge to answer their inquiry (Upa p. 2, 1–7, p.3, 3–4), Śaṅkara Miśra then started to explain the alternative meaning of *atha* in the sense of *maṅgala* at length.<sup>57</sup>

First, Śaṅkara Miśra argues that there must be a *maṅgala* in the Vaiśeṣika treatise because composing a *maṅgala* is part of the tradition handed down from people who are of good conduct (*sadācāra*). The composer of the treatise, who is a great sage, must have followed the tradition.<sup>58</sup> Then, Śaṅkara Miśra delves into the two controversial problems of the “missing” and the “futile” *maṅgala*, which had been hovering in the minds of the commentators for centuries. According to his explanation, people must practice *maṅgala* regardless of the fact that there are paradoxical cases. In the case of the “missing *maṅgala*”, the salutation

55 However, whether this section is originally a part of the TC remains controversial. See Śāstrī 1979, 23–24.

56 TS p. 2, 8–10: *upadiśanti hi [sāmpradāyikāḥ] kaṇādo munir ulūkaṅgeśadhāriṇaḥ parameśvarād dharmādisākṣātkāradharmopadeśaniyogam āsādyā vaiśeṣikasūtram aśūtrayad iti*. “Since [people who have preserved the tradition] teach [the following:] After the sage Kaṇāda received the injunction to teach Dharma made evident [in the form of] Dharma and so on (i.e., the categories introduced in the VS) by the Supreme Lord in the disguise of an owl, he composed the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*.”

57 Upa p. 3, 8: *yad vā athaśabdo maṅgalārthaḥ*. “Alternatively, the word ‘now’ has the purpose of *maṅgala*.”

58 Upa p. 3, 11–13: *katham anyathā sadācāraparamparāpariprāptakarttavayatākasya maṅgalasya vaiśeṣikaśāstram praṇayato mahāmuner anācaraṇaṃ sambhāvya*.

is conceived to be done in another life (*janmāntarīya*). In the case of the “futile *maṅgala*”, Śaṅkara Mīśra holds the same view as Udayana and Bhaṭṭa Vādindra: the component of that salutation is conceived to be defective (*aṅgavaiguṇya*).<sup>59</sup> Moreover, Śaṅkara Mīśra proposes another possible situation: if the result is not seen in this life, it can occur in another life, just like the sacrifice performed in want of a son (*putreṣṭi*) in contrast to the Karīrī sacrifice, whose result happens only in this life.<sup>60</sup> Śaṅkara Mīśra then states that the destruction of impediments for one who desires completion is like the unprecedented (*apūrva*) for one who desires heaven, because one wishes to work without impediment.<sup>61</sup>

59 Upa p. 3, 14–15, p. 4, 1–3: *na ca kṛtamaṅgalasyāpi phalādarśanād akṛtamaṅgalasyāpi phaladarśanād ananuṣṭhānaṃ na hi niṣphale prekṣāvān pravarttata iti vācyam. akaraṇasthale janmāntarīyasya karaṇasthale cāṅgavaiguṇyasya kalpanayā saphalatvaniścayāt.* Here, the explanation of “missing” and “futile” state of *maṅgala* is similar to Udayana’s in the NVTP p. 8, 2–3: *tathā ca saty abhāvaḥ karmakartṛsādhanavaiguṇyam avalambate. asati ca bhāvo janmāntarīyasukṛtasampattim.* “And thus, if there is [an auspicious practice like the salutation of deities], the absence [of completion] depends on the imperfection of action, agent, and means of obtaining, and if there is no [such practice], the presence [of completion] depends on the perfection of merit [produced] in another (i.e., earlier) life.” I thank Lidia Wojtczak and Karin Preisendanz for discussing this translation with me.

60 Upa p. 4, 4–7: *na caihikamātraphalakatvān na janmāntarīyānumānaṃ, putreṣṭivad aihikamātraphalakatvānupapatteḥ. kārīryyādau tu tathākāmanayaivānuṣṭhānād aihikamātraphalakatvam.* “And it is not correct [to say that], because there is a fruit precisely in this life, one cannot infer [the performance of a *maṅgala*] in another life, since being [endowed with] fruit merely [happens] in this life. Just like the sacrifice performed in want of a son, [this] is inapplicable to the fact of bearing fruit only in this life. By contrast, in the case of the Karīrī ritual etc., since the performance [of these rituals] is merely [carried out] by desire accordingly, there is the fact of bearing fruit only in this life.” In the summary of the *Upaskāra* by Karl H. Potter (Potter and Bhattacharyya 1993, 42), he translates: “No; for example, one performs a sacrifice for the rain, or the birth of a son, in this life, not the next, since that is the temporal reference of this desire; ...” This summarized interpretation seems to be misleading.

61 Upa p. 7–10: *atra ca samāptikāmo ’dhikārī svargakāma iva yāge tatrāpūrvaṃ dvāram iha tu vighnadhvaṃsa iti viśeṣaḥ. nirvighnam ārabdhaṃ samāpyatām iti kāmanayā pravṛtteḥ.* Gaṅgeśa has also described a group of opponents who hold an opinion akin to Śaṅkara Mīśra’s statement. Gaṅgeśa says: “By contrast, the others [think] the salutation is the primary thing; the completion of a com-

Next, Śāṅkara Mīśra excludes two other possible results of the *maṅgala*. The first one is the removal of impediments; the other is the destruction of sins (*durita*). For the first optional result, Śāṅkara Mīśra explains that the removal of impediments itself is not the aim pursued by men. Whereas the completion at hand is the aim of men, inasmuch as it is a means to obtain happiness.<sup>62</sup> In this regard, the removal of impediments is only an intermediate factor but not the eventual result of the *maṅgala*. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the refutation to the removal of sins, which is relevant to religious practices, has not been mentioned by the other Vaiśeṣika commentators. According to Śāṅkara Mīśra, there are three reasons to reject the removal of sins as the result of salutation:<sup>63</sup>

1. This is achieved by ritual penance (*prāyaścitta*) etc., but not through *maṅgala*.
2. If this were the result that leads to the completion, then the completion should be the result.
3. Moreover, the sins are removed by oblation of gold etc. However, it is rash to address these religious practices as *maṅgala*.

To sum up, *maṅgala* is irrelevant to the removal of sins. We can now safely conclude that *maṅgala* is the cause of completion. Up to this point, Śāṅkara Mīśra has covered all the issues that have been discussed rigorously by his predecessors in the Vaiśeṣika tradition together with his own elaboration and observation. And he is clearly an upholder of the ancient view, who accepts completion to be the result of salutation.<sup>64</sup>

---

menced [ritual] action is the result by way of the unseen (*adr̥ṣṭa*). The one who is qualified is the one who has the desire for that [completion].” (TC p. 60, 2 – p. 61, 1: *anye tu maṅgalaṃ pradhānam, adr̥ṣṭadvārā ārabdhakarmasamāptiḥ phalam, tatkāmo ’dhikāri*.)

62 Upa p. 4, 10–12: *tasya svato ’puruṣārthatvāt samāptes tu sukhasāadhanatayā puruṣārthatvāt upasthitatvāc ca*.

63 Upa p. 4, 12–14, p. 5, 1–3: *kiñ ca duritadhvaṃsamātraṃ na phalaṃ tasya prāyaścittakīrtanakarmanāśāpāragamanādisādhyatayā vyabhicārāt, prārabdhaparīsamāptipratibandhakaduritadhvaṃsatvena phalatve samāpter eva phalatvocatvāt. tatrāpi ca hiraṇyadānaprayāgāsānādijanyatvena vyabhicārāt teṣāṃ api maṅgala-tvābhīdhānaṃ sāhasam*.

64 Upa p. 5, 3–4: *kiṃ ca maṅgale sati samāpter avāśyakatvam ity evaṃ maṅgalasya kāraṇatā*.

### 3. Conclusion

Varadachari's sketch of the understandings of *maṅgala* is appealing. He provides us with an overall summary of several significant Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika authors introduced in his article who have shared their thoughts on the topic of *maṅgala*. However, since the dichotomy between the "ancient" and "modern" schools cannot be organized chronologically, it would be meaningful to focus more on the structure and aspects incorporated in each discussion given by different authors on this topic. The chart below presents a brief comparison of the major topics discussed by the Vaiśeṣika commentators in section 2:

	<b><i>atha</i> in VS 1.1.1 as the indication of salutation</b>	<b>The result of salutation</b>	<b>The "futile <i>maṅgala</i>"</b>	<b>The "missing <i>maṅgala</i>"</b>
Vyomaśiva	Discussed.	Completion.	(1) Implied lack of a specific merit produced by salutation; (2) salutation is not performed mentally.	Performed mentally.
Śrīdhara	Not discussed.	Removal of impediments. Completion is expected.	Lack of a specific salutation.	Performed but not written down.
Udayana	Not discussed.	Completion.	(1) Imperfection; (2) if no imperfection, the cause of impediments is stronger.	Not discussed in the NK.
Bhaṭṭa Vādindra	Discussed.	Completion.	Imperfection.	Done mentally.
Śaṅkara Mīśra	Discussed.	Completion.	Imperfection.	Done in another life.

In conclusion, almost all of these Vaiśeṣika commentators discussed in this article could be considered members of the ancient school defined by Varadachari, except for Śrīdhara, whose stance, which is still open to debate, appears to be that of the modern school. However, as I have

shown, the discussion of *maṅgala* in the history of Vaiśeṣika goes beyond a mere disagreement about the result of salutation. While the opinions of these commentators can be categorized into the dichotomy proposed by Varadachari, we also see that the individual interpretations of the purpose of *maṅgala* have been notably enriched and developed over the course of time spanning from Vyomaśiva to Śaṅkara Miśra. These commentators contributed their own thoughts and elaborations to the topic to counter the objections that continue to arise. For instance, we see that they gradually developed a better and more conclusive way to explain the precarious problem of the “futile *maṅgala*”, which raises a threat against whether it is even proper to compose a *maṅgala* in the first place. Moreover, new questions asked and answered in each discussion deepened our understanding of *maṅgala*. In their deliberation on the major issues pertinent to *maṅgalas*, these commentators have not only enabled the idea of composing *maṅgala* to be reflected upon in greater depth, but also enabled modern scholars to reach a more nuanced understanding of historical Vaiśeṣika attitudes on the function and purpose of *maṅgala* in the composition of a treatise.

### Primary sources

- CV *Candrānandavṛtti* by Candrānanda. Edited by Muni Śrī Jambūvijaya. 1961. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda. With the Commentary of Candrānanda*. Gaekwad’s Oriental Series 136. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Kir *Kiraṇāvalī* by Udayana. Edited by Dube, Vindhyaśvarī Prasāda. 1885. *The Aphorisms of the Vaiśeṣika Philosophy by Kaṇāda. With the Commentary of Praśastapāda, and the Gloss of Udayanāchārya*. Fasc. 1. Benares: Messrs. Braj B. Das & Co.
- NK *Nyāyakandalī* by Śrīdhara. Edited by Dvivedin, Vindhyaśvarī Prasad. 1984. *The Praśastapāda Bhāṣya with Commentary Nyāyakandalī of Sridhara*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications. Second edition.
- NLK *Nyāyalīlāvatiḥaṅgābhāṣya* by Śaṅkara Miśra. Edited by Śastri, Harihara. 1934. *The Nyāya Līlāvati by Vallabhāchārya. With the Commentaries of Vardhmānopādhyāya, Śaṅkara Miśra and Bhagīratha Thakkura*. Benares: Jai Krishnadās Haridās Gupta.
- NS *Nyāyasūtra* by Gautama. Edited by Thakur, Anantalal. 1997. *Gautamīyanyāyadarśana with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research.



- NSV *Nyāyasāravacāra* by Bhaṭṭa Rāghava. Edited by Jha, Umā Ramaṇa. 1979. *Nyāyasāravacāra of Bhaṭṭa Rāghava*. Jammu: Sri Ranabir Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha.
- NVT *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikā* by Vācaspatimiśra. Edited by Thakur, Anantalal. 1996. *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikā of Vācaspatimiśra*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research.
- NVTP *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāparisūddhi* by Udayana. Edited by Thakur, Anantalal. 1996. *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāparisūddhi of Udayanācārya*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research.
- PDhS *Padārthadharmasamgraha* by Praśastapāda. See in *Nyāyakandalī* (NK).
- TC *Tattvacintāmaṇi* by Gaṅgeśa. Edited by Tarkavagish, Kamakhyanath. 1990. *The Tattvacintāmaṇi of Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya Pratyakṣa Khaṇḍa. With extracts from the Commentaries of Shri Mathuranatha Tarkavagisha & Shri Jayadeva Mishra*. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan. Reprint edition, Vol. 1.
- TS *Tarkasāgara* by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra. Edited by Thakur, Anantalal. 1985. *Bhaṭṭavādindraracita-Vaiśeṣikavārtika-Kṛṣṇabhūpālaracita-Trisūtrīprakāśājñātakartṛkavṛttibhir Vilasitam Maharṣikaṇāda-Praṇītam Vaiśeṣika-Darśanam*. Darbhanga: Kāmeśvarasiṃha-Darabhāṅgā-Saṃskṛta-Viśvavidyālaya.
- TSV *Tarkasāgaravyākhyā* by anonymous author. Edited by Thakur, Anantalal. 1957. *Vaiśeṣikadarśana of Kaṇāda: With an Anonymous Commentary*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Upa *Upaskāra* by Śaṅkara Miśra. Edited by Panchānana, Jayanārāyana Tarka. 1861. *The Vaiśeṣika Darśana, with the Commentaries of Śaṅkara Miśra and Jayanārāyana Tarka Panchānana*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- VS *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* by Kaṇāda. See in CV.
- Vyo *Vyomavatī* by Vyomaśiva. Edited by Śāstrī, Gaurinath. 1983. *Vyomavatī of Vyomaśivācārya*. Varanasi.

## Secondary sources

- Bowles, Adam. 2007. *Dharma, Disorder and the Political in Ancient India: The Āpaddharmaparvan of the Mahābhārata*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. DOI: 10.1163/ej.9789004158153.i-432.
- Brick, David. 2006. "Transforming Tradition Into Texts: The Early Development of *smṛti*." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 34(3): 287–302. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23497364>.
- Funayama, Toru. 1995. "Arcaṭa, Śāntarakṣita, Jinendrabuddhi, and Kamalaśīla on the Aim of a Treatise (*prayojana*)." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 39: 181–201. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24007817>.
- Freschi, Elisa. 2014. "Freedom Because of Duty: The Problem of Agency in Mīmāṃsā." In *Free Will, Agency, and Selfhood in Indian Philosophy*, edited by Matthew R. Dasti, & Edwin F. Bryant, 137–163. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199922734.003.0007
- Gansen, Martin. 2009. "Navagraha." In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism. Volume One: Regions, Pilgrimage, Deities*, edited by Knut A. Jacobsen, Helene Basu, Angelika Malinar, and Vasudha Narayanan, 647–53. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Haag, Pascale. 2011. "Paratextual Elements in Indian Manuscripts: The Copyists' Invocations and the Incipit of the Kāśikāvṛtti." In *Studies in the Kāśikāvṛtti: The Section on Pratyāhāras Critical Edition, Translation and Other Contributions*, edited by Pascale Haag and Vincenzo Vergiani, 215–42. Cambridge: Anthem Press. DOI: 10.7135/UPO9781843318927.012
- He, Huanhuan, 2017. "Bhāviveka vs. Candrānanda." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 70(1), 1–20. DOI: 10.1556/062.2017.70.1.1
- Isaacson, Harunaga. 1995. Materials for the Study of the Vaiśeṣika System. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Leiden, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden.
- Minkowski, Christopher. 2008. "Why Should We Read the Maṅgala Verses." In *Śāstrārambha: Inquiries into the Preamble in Sanskrit*, edited by Walter Slaje, 1–24. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Potter, Karl H., and Sibajiban Bhattacharyya, eds. 1993. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies Volume VI: Indian Philosophical Analysis Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika from Gaṅgeśa to Raghunātha Śīromaṇi*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Preisendanz, Karin. 1994. *Studien zu Nyāyasūtra III.1 mit dem Nyāyatattvāloka Vācaspati Mīśras II*, Teil 2. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 46,2, herausgegeben vom Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- . 2011. "Vaiśeṣika." In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism*, edited by Knut A. Jacobsen, 3: 699–718. Leiden: Brill.
- Śāstrī, Gaurinath, 1979. *Maṅgalavāda by Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya*. With an original Sanskrit commentary, *Prabhā*. Bibliotheca Indica 308. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.

- Smith, David, 2009. *Princess Kādambarī: Volume one, by Bāṇa*. New York: New York University Press, JJC Foundation.
- Tachikawa, Musashi. 2001. "The Introductory Part of the 'Kiraṇāvali'." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29 (1/2): 275–91. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23496875>.
- Thakur, Anantalal. 2003. *Origin and Development of the Vaiśeṣika System*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Varadachari, V. 1962. "A Note on the Maṅgalavāda of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika School." *The Adyar Library Bulletin* 26 (1–2): 29–35.

