

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

THE VAIŚEŚIKA VĀKYA AND BHĀŚYA¹

(published in: *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72-73 [for the years 1991 and 1992 (Amṛtamahotsava (1917-1992) Volume)], 1993, pp. 145-169)

1. A long period of time separates Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasaṅgraha from the oldest kernel of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra whose system of thought it aims to explain. Vaiśeṣika works were composed in the intervening period, but they have not survived, with the possible exception of Candramati's *Daśapadārthasāstra, which survives only in Chinese translation.

Mallavādin's Dvādaśāra Nayacakra, a Jaina work, refers on two occasions to a Vaiśeṣika vākya and bhāṣya, that were apparently known to Praśastapāda. The first and most important passage that contains information about these two reads, in the admirable reconstruction of Muni Jambuvijaya:

DNC p. 508-09 and 512-13:

yad api coktam:

K 1 “vikalpatrayānāśrayād vikalpāntarāśrayaṅc ca ‘vikalānupapatteḥ’ iti na doṣaḥ,

vk 1 *niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt/*

niṣṭhā kāraṇasāmagryavyāpārakālah prāg asato vastubhāvaḥ niṣṭhānām samāptiḥ .../
sambandhaḥ svakāraṇasattāsamavāyāḥ/ tayor ekakālatvam, svakāraṇasattāsambandha
eva niṣṭhākālah, kutaḥ? samavāyasyaikatvāt, yasminn eva kāle pariniṣṭhām gacchat
kāryam kāraṇaiḥ sambadhyate samavāyasambandhena ayutasiddhihetunā tasminn eva
kāle sattādibhir api, tasmād apravibhāgāt prāk kāryotpatter asataḥ sadādir anāspado
vikalpaḥ/”

etad api na ...

... ..

asatsambandhaparihārārthaḥ ca *niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt* ity etad eva **vākyaṃ
sabhāṣyaṃ praśasto** ‘nyathā vyācaṣṭe:

T 1 “sambandhaś ca sambandhaś ca sambandhau, niṣṭhāyāḥ sambandhau

niṣṭhāsambandhau, tayor ekakālatvāt/ niṣṭhitam niṣṭhā, kāra-[146]kparispandād
vastubhāvam āpannam avyapadeśyādhāram kāryam niṣṭhitam niṣṭhā ity ucyate, tasya
svakāraṇaiḥ sattayā ca yugapat sambandhau bhavataḥ/ bhāṣyam api pariniṣṭhām
gacchad gatam ity etam arthaṃ darśayati, vartamānasāmīpye vartamānavad vā (P.
3.3.131) iti/ yathā kārakāntaram utpadyamānam dṛṣṭam kāravāpārād vastubhāvam
āpannam avyapadeśyādhāram nirvṛtṭam sat svakāraṇaiḥ sattayā ca sambadhyate tathā
paṭākhyam/”

¹ I would like to thank A. Wezler and J. Houben, who read an earlier version of this article and made valuable suggestions.

tad api na ...

The phrase *niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt* is here called a ‘vākya’. This vākya is twice explained, in the first and in the second half of the above passage respectively. The second explanation (Ṭ 1) is, Mallavādin tells us, a reinterpretation of the vākya and its bhāṣya by Praśasta. The first explanation (K 1) must therefore be its bhāṣya.² And indeed, Ṭ 1 quotes the words *pariniṣṭhāṃ gacchad* from the first explanation, and states that it belongs to the bhāṣya.

There is no reason to doubt that Praśasta — or Praśastamati, as Mallavādin and his commentator Siṃhasūri call him elsewhere (see below) — is the same person as Praśastapāda, the author of the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha*. All of these names, and various others, have been used by different authors to refer to the author of the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha*.³ This Praśasta, it is plausible to conclude from the above passage (and the following passage to be considered confirms this), commented both upon the vākya and upon the bhāṣya, which we will jointly refer to as ‘Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya’. As Mallavādin points out, Praśasta felt free, where necessary, to interpret this ‘Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya’ the way he considered correct. The quotation from his commentary (Ṭ 1) makes also clear that he would none-the-less try to show that his interpretation agreed with the bhāṣya.

Passage K 1 throws some light on the nature of the bhāṣya. It apparently contained and commented upon individual vākyas. A vākya is here — judging by the one vākya we now know — a short nominal sentence, which is explained in the Bhāṣya in normal Sanskrit. This is in no way surprising. Several works of a similar nature — written in the so-called ‘Vārtika-style’ — are known from the period round the middle of the first millennium C.E., and the term ‘vākya’ used to refer to the sūtra-like phrases in them is quite [147] common. The example of these works appears to have been the (Vyākaraṇa-)Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. We shall return to this subject below.

The second passage in the *Dvādaśāra Nayacakra* that mentions the vākya and the bhāṣya reads (p. 516-17):

vastūtpattikāle eva iti vākyakārābhiprāyo ‘nusṛto bhāṣyakārāḥ/ siddhasya vastunaḥ
svakāraṇaiḥ svasattayā ca sambandha iti prāśastamato ‘bhiprāyaḥ/

This passage does not appear to quote either a vākya or from the bhāṣya. It rather sums up the positions expressed in K 1 and Ṭ 1. The passage suggests at first sight that in Mallavādin’s opinion vākya and bhāṣya had different authors. (The plural ending of *bhāṣyakārāḥ* may express respect, and does not necessarily entail that there was more than one *bhāṣyakāra*.) Both these authors held that connection with the universal ‘existence’ (*sattāsambandha*) occurs simultaneously with the origination of the thing. This view is contrasted with the one

² The sentence preceding the vākya may be no more than Mallavādin’s restatement of what precedes in the Bhāṣya, and may not be a literal quotation.

³ See Chemparathy, 1970.

of Praśastamati, who thought that both ‘connection with existence’ and ‘connection with the own causes’ take place when the thing is already there.⁴ But is Mallavādin correct in thinking that there were two authors? Or perhaps: do we understand him correctly?

It would be surprising if there actually were two (or more) authors of the Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya. As stated above, several works are known that date from around the middle of the first millennium C.E. and that consist of vākyas and their explanations. All known examples, however, have one single author. Indeed, works that display this so-called ‘Vārttika-style’ appear to owe their inspiration to the (Vyākaraṇa-)Mahābhāṣya, about the authorship of which very different ideas reigned from today.⁵

The evidence from Bhartṛhari’s commentary on the Mahābhāṣya shows that we do not of necessity have to interpret Mallavādin’s statement to mean that he believed in two or more authors of the Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya. Bhartṛhari, too, speaks about a Vākyakāra and a Bhāṣyakāra, be it that he does so while referring to the Mahābhāṣya. Yet he appears to have thought that the vākyas of the Mahābhāṣya (i.e., its ‘vārttikas’) were written by the very person who also explained them in the Bhāṣya.⁶

[148]

It is further important to realize that the terms vākya and bhāṣya are not necessarily titles of works, especially not in a work that drew its inspiration from the Mahābhāṣya. Bhartṛhari’s Vākya-padīya (ed. Rau, 1.23) speaks, for example, of bhāṣyas, in the plural, and there can be no doubt that portions of the Mahābhāṣya are meant. Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā, moreover, speaks twice of ‘this bhāṣya’, meaning ‘this portion of the Mahābhāṣya’ (Ms 9d7, AL 29.11, Sw 35.3, CE I.24.15-16; Ms 97a8, AL 278.19) and once of ‘this whole bhāṣya’ (sarvam idaṃ bhāṣyam; Ms 44d2, AL 135.22-23, Sw 158.5, CE IV.22.7) in the same sense. It is conceivable that Mallavādin, too, when mentioning a vākya and a bhāṣya, meant portions of a work that, as a whole, carried a different name.

Siṃhasūri mentions two, or perhaps three, Vaiśeṣika works: the Kaṇḍī, Praśastamati’s Ṭikā, and a Ṭikā without further specification; sometimes Praśastamati is simply referred to as ‘Ṭikākāra’ (p. 516, 517). The Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya, or any other Vaiśeṣika Bhāṣya, is never mentioned by Siṃhasūri, except in the context of the two passages discussed above, where he follows Mallavādin and where the discussion concerns the differences or agreements between a vākya and its bhāṣya. Is it possible that the Kaṇḍī is the same work as the one we call Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya? Several indications support this supposition.

On p. 458 we learn about an opinion that has been rejected (pūrvapakṣita) in the Kaṇḍī and in the Ṭikā (kaṇḍyāṃ ṭikāyāṃ ca). The juxtaposition of these two names creates the impression that the Ṭikā is a commentary on the Kaṇḍī. If here too the Ṭikā is

⁴ See also Halbfass, 1986: 281 f.

⁵ See Bronkhorst, 1990; also Lang, 1988.

⁶ This is argued at length in Bronkhorst, 1990. The main evidence can be summarized as follows: (i) Bhartṛhari regularly uses the word ‘vārttika’ to refer to the bhāṣya-passages, the Yuktidīpikā does so on one occasion; (ii) Iching gives evidence that no distinction was made between vārttikas and the Mahābhāṣya (this had already been pointed out by J. Brough).

Praśastapāda's Ṭīkā — and there is no reason to believe otherwise — the Kaṭandī can hardly be anything but our Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya.

This conclusion is confirmed by the following. The opinion which, according to Siṃhasūri, figured as pūrvapakṣa in the Kaṭandī and its Ṭīkā, and which is accepted by Mallavādin, is summarized by the latter in the following words (p. 459): tasmād vikalpānupapatter na sattāsambandho 'bhidhānapratyayahetuḥ. It is precisely this pūrvapakṣa that is answered in K 1, the only passage that is explicitly attributed to the Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya by Mallavādin and Siṃhasūri. The introductory sentence of K 1, it will be recalled, reads: vikalpatrayānāśrayaṇāc ca 'vikalpānupapatteḥ' iti na doṣaḥ.

Siṃhasūri ascribes another passage to the Kaṭandī on p. 499. Since this passage rejects the second alternative introduced in a quoted passage on p. 490-491 and thus fills a lacuna left open in the earlier passage, it seems reasonable to assume that both belong together and formed part of the Kaṭandī. Together they read:

[149]

K 2

DNC p. 490-491:

yad ucyata saiddhārthīyaiḥ 'upādānaniyamadarśanāt sat kāryaṃ tilatālavat
tatkriyādyasattvadarśanād asat, dṛṣṭaṃ tāvat [paṭārthitāyāṃ tantūnām evopādānaṃ na
tu pāṃsvādīnām, evaṃ paṭārthaś ca kuvindasya vyāpāro dṛṣṭaḥ,]⁷ itarathā
tantupāṃsvādiṣv aviśeṣaḥ prāg api vyāpārābhāvaś ca syāt, dṛṣṭā tu kriyā [paṭārthā
kuvindasya tantūnām eva copādānaṃ; tasmād upādānaniyamadarśanāthavyāpārābhyāṃ
sadasat kāryaṃ,] ubhayaikānte doṣadarśanāt sad evāsad eva veti cāyukta ekāntaḥ,
sadasadātmakatvāt kāryasya upādānaniyamaḥ kriyā ca yujyate' iti, tan

vk 2 *na, vikalpānupapatteḥ*/[kiṃ yenaivātmanā sat tenaiva asat, āhosvit āpekṣikaṃ
sadasattvam anyenātmanā mṛdādīnā prāk sad ghaṭādi kāryaṃ] ghaṭātmanā cāsat? na
tāvad [yenaivātmanā sat tenaivātmanā asat, sadasator vaidharmyāt/ yad uktam
sadasator vaidharmyāt kārye sadasattā na (VS 9.12), sattvapratipakṣo 'sattvam]
asattvapratipakṣaś ca sattvam/ sat sopākhyam asan nirupākhyam, [taylor vaidharmyāt
ekasmin kārye] sadasattvaṃ na bhavatīty arthaḥ/

DNC p. 499:

āpekṣikaṃ sadasattvam, prāg utpatteḥ mṛdātmanā sat kāryaṃ ghaṭātmanā cāsat,
niṣpanne 'pi ghaṭe mṛttvadarśanād mṛdupādānopapattiḥ, ghaṭātmanā cāsattvād
ghaṭārthakriyopapattir ity evaṃ kila ārhata āha/ atrottaram

vk 3 *na, asatkāryatvasiddheḥ*/⁸evaṃ tarhi mṛdātmanāḥ kartavyatvābhāvād ghaṭātmanāḥ
kartavyatvād asat eva kāryaṃ/ tasmān na prāg utpatteḥ sadasat kāryaṃ/

The second half of this quotation is found again on p. 503.

⁷ Here and in following quotations from the Nayacakra, square hooks enclose tentative phrases proposed by the editor in footnotes to fill lacunae in the text.

⁸ What follows is vyākhyā according to Siṃhasūri.

The Vārttika-style which characterizes also this passage confirms us in our idea that the Kaṭandī is indeed identical with the ‘Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya’. One final quotation in the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra that is attributed to the Kaṭandī shows that this work did not consist exclusively of vākyas and their explanations. This third passage explains a Vaiśeṣika sūtra:
[150]

K 3

DNC p. 498-499:

sadasator vaidharmyāt kārye sadasattā na (VS 9.12), *sadasacchabdārthayor virodhād ekasminn eva kārye sadasacchabdayor ekādhikaraṇabhāvena prayogo nāsti, ‘sad evāsat’ ity anusandhānaṃ nāsty ekādhikaraṇabhāvena iti saptamyabhidhānena darśayati/*

If the reasoning presented thus far is correct, it follows that all the quotations from Vaiśeṣika works that are identified by Mallavādin or by his commentator Siṃhasūri, belong to the Kaṭandī or to the Ṭikā written on it by Praśastapāda. The Kaṭandī, furthermore, was then at least partly written in the Vārttika-style, which contains vākyas and bhāṣyas.

It seems reasonable to assume that more quotations from the Kaṭandī and from its Ṭikā occur in the seventh Ara of the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra. We might furthermore be tempted to think that all quotations that clearly derive from a Vaiśeṣika work and that exhibit the Vārttika-style, are quotations from the Kaṭandī. This latter assumption, however, has to be treated with much caution, for the following reason:

We have been able to identify one passage from Praśastapāda’s Ṭikā in Ṭ 1, above. Mallavādin rejects the opinion expressed in that passage, saying (p. 513):

tad api na, samavāyikāraṇatvavirodhāt svavacanābhyupagamavirodhau/

It appears that this objection had been foreseen by Praśastapāda, for Mallavādin quotes the following reply, which must, therefore, belong to Praśastapāda’s Ṭikā:

Ṭ 2

DNC p. 514:

(samavāyikāraṇatvanivṛttir iti cet) na, anyatrāsamavāyāt⁹yadi tasya [anyatra samavāyo ‘bhyupagamyeta syād ayaṃ doṣaḥ, na tu tathābhyupagamyate,] tasmād adoṣaḥ/

Another objection raised by Mallavādin runs (p. 513):

[151]

⁹ Siṃhasūri introduces the explanation with the words: *tadvyākhyānam.*

kiṃ ca, niṣṭhitasya kāryasya kāraṇaiḥ sattayā ca sambandho yutasiddhasambandhaḥ,
kāryasya kāraṇebhyo 'nyatra pariniṣṭhitatvāt/

This objection, too, must have been taken from Praśastapāda's commentary, for it is answered in the following quoted passage:

Ṭ 3

DNC p. 516

*na, asyāsaṃyogāt*¹⁰na hi kāraṇasambandhibhiḥ kāryasya saṃyogo 'sti/

As is clear from these two quotations, it looks as if Praśastapāda's Ṭīkā, too, contained vākyas. In fact, there is no reason to assume that his Ṭīkā was written in the Vārttika-style. The two vākyas which occur in the above two quotations from his work answer objections, and a short nominal phrase, subsequently explained, in such a position is not to be confused with the consistently used Vārttika-style. The latter does not only express the answers to objections in subsequently explained vākyas, but normally also the objections themselves. We do not know whether the Kaṇḍikāra used this style consistently in each and every case (the above quotations from his work suggest he didn't), yet the way Mallavādin refers to him allows us, at least tentatively, to assign any quotation in 'full' Vārttika-style to his work. In the context of our purpose — identifying quoted portions from the Kaṇḍī — this means that there where we have no other indications but the style, we can only be reasonably sure that a passage belonged to the Kaṇḍī if both its objection(s) and answer(s) take the form of a vākyā plus explanation.

In the case of one such passage we have independent evidence which confirms our belief that it must belong to the Kaṇḍī. The passage fulfils our primary requirement that the objection too be expressed in a vākyā that is then explained. The extra reason to believe that it derives from the Kaṇḍī is that elsewhere in the seventh Ara Mallavādin appears to quote Praśastapāda's commentary, or a paraphrase thereof, on at least part of this quoted portion. The passage reads:

K 4

DNC p. 486:

athavā viśeṣaṇasambandham antareṇāpi vastumātrāṇām parasparātiśayo 'sti tena
viśeṣaṇasambandhaniyamasiddhiḥ/

[152]

vk 4 *katham parasparātiśaya iti cet*/katham prāk [sattāsambandhād dravyaguṇakarmanām
parasparato] atiśayaḥ syāt/

¹⁰ Siṃhasūri introduces the explanation with the words: tad vyācaṣṭe.

- vk 5** *na, dṛṣṭāntāt/* yathā parapakṣe [sattāsambandhād ṛte ‘pi sattvarajastamasām parasparato] atīsayas tathehāpi syāt/
vk 6 *sāmānyādivad vā/* [yathā sāmānyādi svata evāsti arthāntarasambandhanirapekṣam tathā dravyādy api] svata eva syāt/

Siṃhasūri ascribes the following lines to Praśastamati:

Ṭ 4

DNC p. 462-463:

na ca tad api nirātmakam śaśaviṣṇāvat, sattāsambandhād ṛte ‘pi yathā parapakṣe pradhānādīnām sātmatvam tathehāpi syāt/ (tvatpakṣe dṛṣṭāntābhāva iti cet,) *sāmānyādiva vā*, ... *sāmānyādivad eva sātmakam na ghaṭādivat sātmakam/*

Note that vk 6 is repeated in this passage.

The next passage that appears to have been quoted from the Kaṭandī needs some introductory remarks. It was stated above that vk 3 and its explanation are repeated, and refuted, on p. 503. This page, and the ones following it, contain a debate between Mallavādin and an opponent who is, apparently, the author of the Kaṭandī. In this debate a passage occurs which, even though it has Mallavādin’s agreement, is written in the ‘full’ Vārttika-style. This should not confuse us. Mallavādin agrees at times with the pūrvapakṣa of the Kaṭandī (see above), and this latter text contained evidently elaborate arguments. It is at least conceivable that Mallavādin borrowed here too a pūrvapakṣa of his opponent and presented it as his own view. The passage reads:

K 5

DNC p. 504-505

- vk 7** *samarthasya karaṇe ‘dhikāraparigrahāt sa iti cet/* samarthasyaive kāryakriyāyām [adhikāraparigrahād upādānaniyamah, tasmād] asad eva kāryam/
vk 8 *ekībhāvagatārthasya samarthatvāt satkāryatvam eva/* atha katham tantuturyāder eve kāraṇatvenopādānam paṭanirvṛttau, na pāṃśuvāsyādeḥ?¹¹ tasyaiva samarthatvāt tathā tathā paṭādikāryam tantuṣu [153] vartate tathā aṃśuṣu tathā pakṣmatitireṇuparamāṇuṣu tathā turyādiṣv api, pāṃśvādiṣv api ca, kāraṇakāraṇatvād aṇuvat/

Summing up our findings of this section, it can be stated that the seventh Ara of the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra appears to contain a long discussion with a Vaiśeṣika text called Kaṭandī and with its commentary, the Ṭikā by Praśastapāda. No other Vaiśeṣika works would seem to be referred to. The Kaṭandī, which had a single author whose name is not mentioned, was written

¹¹ The editor thinks that something is wrong with this sentence and proposes, in a note, the following alternative: atha katham tantuturyādi eva paṭanirvṛttau kāraṇam, na pāṃśuvāsyādi.

in the Vārttika-style that characterizes a number of works of around the middle of the first millennium C.E., a style in which vākya and their explanations (bhāṣyas) play a predominant role. Mallavādin, in his discussion with the Kaṇḍī and its commentary, quotes frequently from these two texts. Siṃhasūri's comments, as well as the recognizable style of the Kaṇḍī, allow us to identify a number of quoted passages. The fact that Mallavādin left, at least in some cases, the Vārttika-style unchanged, suggests that he, if he changed his quotations at all, did so to a but limited extent.

Before we turn to the next section, which will study the possible link between the Kaṇḍī and the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, it will be useful to list here the vākya referred to by Vyomaśiva in his Vyomavatī (p. 358 l. 27-28), to which attention was drawn by H. Isaacson (1990: 85):

vk 9 *pūrvāparādipratyayānām kāraṇe digākhyā*

2. We have seen that Praśastapāda wrote a Ṭikā on the Kaṇḍī. This Ṭikā, like the work on which it commented, is now lost. Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, on the other hand, has survived, and is indeed considered to contain the classical exposition of the Vaiśeṣika system. It seems no more than reasonable to believe that the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha was profoundly influenced by the Kaṇḍī. The question to be posed in this section is whether traces of this influence can actually be found in the text.

Note first that the seventh Ara of the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra contains at least one quotation which corresponds almost word for word to a passage of the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha.¹² Our criteria do not permit us to determine whether this quotation originally belonged to the Kaṇḍī or to the Ṭikā, but either way our expectation is strengthened that the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha may owe a great deal to the now lost Kaṇḍī.

In the case of the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha our main criterion for identifying a passage as a quotation from the Kaṇḍī, is the Vārttika-style. [154] The Padārthadharmasaṅgraha as a whole is not written in this style, but some passages, usually dealing with the elaboration of rather obscure points of doctrine, are. Those that seem to be unacknowledged quotations from the Kaṇḍī will be enumerated and, where necessary, briefly discussed.¹³

The first of these is in a certain way also the most remarkable. It is a vākya along with its explanation. The vākya appears to counter a preceding proposition, which, however, is not found in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. The vākya therefore hangs in the air. Its explanation, on the other hand, can be read as a continuation of the exposition that started before the vākya. The only explanation of this extraordinarily strange state of affairs appears to be that Praśastapāda borrowed an appropriate passage from another text, but quoted along with it its

¹² See Jambuvijaya's edition of the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra p. 524 n. 3.

¹³ The Padārthadharmasaṅgraha appears to contain one *acknowledged* quotation from the Kaṇḍī, which will be discussed below.

introductory vākya, even though that vākya was out of place in its new surroundings. There is no reason to doubt that this other text was the Kaṭandī.

I reproduce first the preceding passage of the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, followed by the presumed quotation from the Kaṭandī:

N p. 69; Ki p. 84; tr. Jhā p. 152

ātmavābhisambandhād ātmā/ tasya saukṣmyād apratyakṣatve sati karaṇaiḥ
śabdādyupalabdhy anumitaiḥ śrotrādibhiḥ samadhigamaḥ kriyate/ vāsyādīnām iva
karaṇānām kartṛprajyotvadārśanāt/ śabdādiṣu prasiddhyā ca prasādhako
'numīyate/

K 6

vk 10 *na, śarīrendriyamanasām ajñātvāt*¹⁴ na śarīrasya caitanyaṃ ghaṭādivad
bhūtakāryatvān mṛte cāsambhavāt/ nendriyāṇām karaṇatvāt upahateṣu
viṣayāsānnidhye cānusr̥tidārśanāt/ nāpi manasaḥ karaṇāntarānapekṣitve yugapad
ālocananasr̥tiprasaṅgāt svayaṃ karaṇabhāvāc ca/ pariśeṣād ātmakāryatvād ātmā
samadhigamyate/

The following passages presumably quoted from the Kaṭandī are identified exclusively by their style:

[155]

K 7

N p. 112-113; Ki p. 133-135; tr. Jhā p. 243-245

śobhanam etad vidhānaṃ vadhyaghātakapakṣe/ sahānavasthānalakṣaṇe tu virodhe
dravyajñānānutpattiprasaṅgaḥ/ katham/ guṇabuddhisamakālam apekṣābuddhivināśād
dvitvavināśe tadapekṣasya dve dravye iti dravyajñānasyānutpattiprasaṅga iti/

vk 11 *laiṅgikavaj jñānamātrād iti cet/syān* matam yathā 'abhūtaṃ bhūtasya' (VS 3.1.8) ity
atra liṅgābhāve 'pi jñānamātrād anumānaṃ tathā guṇavināśe 'pi guṇabuddhimātrād
dravyapratyayaḥ syād iti/

vk 12 *na, viśeṣyajñānatvāt/* na hi viśeṣyajñānaṃ sārūpyād viśeṣaṇasambandham antareṇa
bhavitum arhati/ tathā cāha sūtrakāraḥ samavāyinaḥ śvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ śvete
buddhis te kāryakāraṇabhūte iti/ na tu laiṅgikaṃ jñānam abhednotpadyate tasmād
viṣamo 'yam upanyāsaḥ/ na āsūtpatteḥ yathā śabdavad ākāśam iti atra trīṇi jñānāny
āsūtpadyante tathā dvitvādijñānotpattāv ity adoṣaḥ/

vk 13 *vadhyaghātakapakṣe 'pi samāno doṣa iti cet/syān* matam/ nanu vadhyaghātakapakṣe
'pi tarhi dravyajñānotpattiprasaṅgaḥ/ katham/ dvitvasāmānyabuddhisamakālam
saṃskārād apekṣābuddhivināśād iti/

¹⁴ Many commentators (Vyomaśiva, Udayana, Śrīdhara, Padmanābha Miśra) try to make sense of this vākya by supplying the word caitanyam from the following sentence for its interpretation.

- vk 14** *na, samūhajjñānasya saṃskārahetutvāt/* samūhajjñānam eva saṃskārakāraṇaṃ nālocanajñānam ity adoṣaḥ/
- vk 15** *jñānayaugapadyaprasaṅga iti cet/* syān matam/ nanu jñānānām vadhyaghātakavirodhe jñānayaugapadyaprasaṅga iti/
- vk 16** *na, avinaśyator avasthānapraṭiṣedhāt/* jñānāyaugapadyavacanena jñānāyor yugapad utpattir avinaśyatoś ca yugapad avasthānaṃ praṭiṣidhyate/ na hi vadhyaghātakavirodhe jñānāyor yugapad utpattir avinaśyatoś ca yugapad avasthānam astīti/

K 8

N p. 292-94; Ki p. 263-64; tr. Jhā p. 620-623

- vk 17** *karmanām jātipañcakatvam ayuktaṃ gamanāviśeṣāt/* sarvaṃ hi kṣaṇikaṃ karma gamanamātram utpannaṃ svāśrayasyordhvam adhas tiryag vāpy aṇumātraiḥ pradeśaiḥ saṃyogavibhāgān karoti/ sarvatra gamanapratyayo ‘viśiṣṭaḥ/ tasmād gamanam eva sarvaṃ iti/

[156]

- vk 18** *na, vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttidarśanāt/* ihotkṣepaṇaṃ paratrāpakṣepaṇam ity evamādi sarvatra vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛtti drṣṭe/ taddhetuḥ sāmānyaviśeṣabhedo ‘vagamyate/ teṣāṃ adādyupasargaviśeṣāt pratiniyatadigviśiṣṭakāryārambhatvād upalakṣaṇabhedo ‘pi siddhaḥ/
- vk 19** *evam api pañcaity avadhāraṇānupapattiḥ/ niṣkramaṇapraveśanādiṣv api vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttidarśanāt/* yady utkṣepaṇādiṣu sarvatra vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttidarśanāj jātibheda iṣyate evaṃ ca niṣkramaṇapraveśanādiṣv api/ kāryabhedāt teṣu pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛtti iti cet/ na, utkṣepaṇādiṣv api kāryabhedād eva pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttiprasaṅgaḥ/ atha samāne vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttisadbhāve utkṣepaṇādīnām eva jātibhedo na niṣkramaṇādīnām ity atra viśeṣahetur astīti/
- vk 20** *na, jātiśaṅkaraprasaṅgāt/* niṣkramaṇādīnām jātibhedāt pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛtttau jātiśaṅkaraḥ prasajyate/ katham/ dvayor draṣṭror ekasmād apavarakād apavarakāntaraṃ gacchato yugapan niṣkramaṇapraveśanapratyayau drṣṭau tathā dvārapradeśe praviśati niṣkrāmatīti ca/ yadā tu pratisirādy apanītaṃ bhavati tadā na praveśanapratyayo nāpi niṣkramaṇapratyayaḥ kintu gamanapratyaya eva bhavati/ tathā nālikāyām vaṃśapatrādaḥ patati bahūnām draṣṭṛṇām yugapad bhramaṇapatanapraveśanapratyayā drṣṭā iti jātiśaṅkaraprasaṅgaḥ/ na caivam utkṣepaṇādiṣu pratyayasāṅkaro drṣṭaḥ/ tasmād utkṣepaṇādīnām eva jātibhedāt pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛtti niṣkramaṇādīnām tu kāryabhedād iti/
- vk 21** *kathaṃ yugapat pratyayabheda iti cet/* atha matam/ yathā jātiśaṅkaro nāsti evam anekakarmasamāveśo ‘pi nāstīty ekasmin karmaṇi yugapad draṣṭṛṇām bhramaṇapatanapraveśanapratyayāḥ kathaṃ bhavantīti/ atra brūmaḥ/

vk 22 *na, avayavāvayavinor digviśiṣṭasaṃyogavibhāgānām bhedāt/yo hi draṣṭā avayavānām pārśvataḥ paryāyeṇa dikpradeśaiḥ saṃyogavibhāgān paśyati tasya bhramaṇapratyayo bhavati/ yo hy avayavina ūrdhvapradeśair vibhāgam adhaḥ saṃyogaṃ cāvekṣate tasya patanapratyayo bhavati/ yaḥ punar nālikāntardeśe saṃyogaṃ bahirdeśe ca vibhāgaṃ paśyati tasya praveśanapratyayo bhavātīti siddhaḥ kāryabhedān niṣkramaṇādīnām pratyayabheda iti/*

K 9

N p. 140-41; Ki p. 148; tr. Jhā p. 303-304

vk 23 *nāsty ajaḥ saṃyogo nityaparimaṇḍalavat pṛthag anabhidhānāt/[157] yathā caturvidhaṃ parimāṇam utpādyam ukvāha nityaṃ parimaṇḍalam ity evam anyatarakarmajādisaṃyogaṃ utpādyam ukvā pṛthān nityaṃ brūyāt/ na tv evam abravīt/ tasmān nāsty ajaḥ saṃyogaḥ/*

Before we turn to the last and most important unacknowledged quotation from the Kaṇḍī, we briefly consider what may be the only *acknowledged* quotation from that work in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. It is contained in the following passage (Ki p. 235; N p. 239; tr. Jhā p. 509-510):

nanu cāyaṃ viśeṣaḥ saṃśayahetur abhihitaḥ śāstre ‘tulyajātīyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu (ca) viśeṣasyobhayathā dṛṣṭatvād’ (VS 2.2.26) iti/ na, anyārthatvāt/

K 10 *śabde viśeṣadarśanāt saṃśayānutpattir ity ukte, nāyaṃ dravyādīnām anyatamasya viśeṣaḥ syāc chrāvaṇatvaṃ kintu sāmānyaṃ eva sampadyate/ kasmāt/ tulyajātīyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu dravyādibhedānām ekaikaśo viśeṣasyobhayathā dṛṣṭatvād ity uktaṃ (v.l. ukte), na saṃśayakāraṇam/ anyathā ṣaṭsv api padārtheṣu saṃśayaprasaṅgāt/ tasmāt sāmānyapratyakṣād (v.l. °pratyayād) eva saṃśaya iti/*

Objection: A specific feature (viśeṣa) is stated to be a cause of doubt in the Śāstra (in sūtra 2.2.26): ‘[With regard to sound there is doubt whether it is a substance, an action, or a quality,]¹⁵ because its specific feature (viz., audibility) is found both in [objects] that have the same universal, and in other objects.’

[Reply:] [This is] not [correct], for [the sūtra] has to be interpreted differently. [A specific feature can] not be a cause of doubt, [for the following reason:] Having stated: *No doubt arises in the case of sound, for we know its specific feature*, it is then stated: *Audibility is not the specific feature of any one of [the categories] substance etc. It is, on the contrary, common [to these]. Why? Because in each of [the categories] substance etc., we find the specific feature, both in [objects] that have the same universal and in other objects.* If it were otherwise, there would be doubt even in the

¹⁵ This translates the preceding sūtra 2.2.25: tasmin dravyaṃ karma guṇa iti saṃśayaḥ.

case of the six categories. For this reason doubt can come about on the basis of perception of a general feature only.

It is conceivable that Praśastapāda quotes here from another work the words reproduced in italics, and perhaps also the two concluding sentences of this [158] passage. It is true that the quoted passage does not contain the features of the Vārttika-style, but we have seen that this by itself constitutes no reason to believe it did not form part of the Kaṭandī.

A confirmation that this passage does indeed derive from the Kaṭandī is provided by the fact that Dignāga knows the opinion according which the specific feature (viśeṣa) audibility is really a common feature (sāmānya). In his Pramāṇasamuccaya he cites and refutes those who say: viśeṣa ubhayatra dṛṣṭatvād ūrdhvatvādivat sāmānyam eva.¹⁶ His commentator Jinendrabuddhi specifies that the reference is to some Vaiśeṣika(s). We shall see below that there is reason to believe that Dignāga knew the Kaṭandī.

One case remains to be considered. It differs from the preceding ones in that the lines followed by a more elaborate explanation are not vākyas, but verses, the only two verses that occur in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. We shall see that there are independent reasons for believing that these verses were quoted from an earlier work, and the fact that they are explained the way the vākyas are explained makes it reasonable to assume that they too derive from the Kaṭandī. The verses, along with their explanations, read:

K 11

N p. 200-04; Ki p. 193-95; tr. Jhā p. 421-431

liṅgaṃ punaḥ yad

(st. i) *anumeyena sambaddhaṃ*

prasiddhaṃ ca tadanvite/

tadabhāve ca nāsty eva

tal liṅgam anumāpakam//

(st. ii) *viparītam ato yat syād*

ekena dvitayena vā/

viruddhāsiddhasandigdham

aliṅgaṃ kāśyapo 'bravīt//

yad anumeyenārthena deśaviśeṣe kālavīśeṣe vā sahacaritam anumeyadharmānvite

cānyatra sarvasminn ekadeśe vā prasiddham anumeyaviparīte ca sarvasmin

pramāṇato 'sad eva tad aprasiddhārthasyānumāpakam liṅgaṃ bhavatīti/

[159]

¹⁶ This is Jambuvijaya's Sanskrit rendering (1961: 199) of the Tibetan translation, which reads, in its two versions: (1) khyad par ni gnyi ga la mthong pa'i phyir 'bred ba bzhin du sphyi kho na yin no; and (2) bye brag bnyis ka la mthong pa'i phyir de sphyi nyid yin te.

yat tu yathoktāt trirūpāl līngād ekena dharmeṇa dvābhyāṃ vā viparītaṃ tad
anumeyasyādhigame līngaṃ na bhavatīty etad evāha sūtrakāraḥ ‘aprasiddho
‘napadeśo ‘san sandigdhaś ca’ (VS 3.1.10-11) iti/

There is an obvious problem connected with the first of these two verses: it requires, but does not contain, the relative pronoun *yad*.¹⁷ Is it possible that either Praśastapāda or someone else before him changed the verse, most probably in order to make it agree with his own views? Some observations support this supposition:

The first pāda of the verse reads: *anumeyena sambaddhaṃ*. Regarding the word *anumeya* Masaaki Hattori (1972) has made some interesting observations. Dignāga, he points out, criticizes in his *Pramāṇasamuccaya* the word *sādhya* in the context of inference, which he finds used in some unspecified Vaiśeṣika text, and proposes *anumeya* instead. Praśastapāda, most probably under the influence of Dignāga, uses the word *anumeya* throughout.

This piece of information may provide us with the solution of the riddle of the first verse quoted in the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha*. It contains the word *anumeya* in its problematic part, and we may hazard the guess that in its original version it contained the word *sādhya* instead. Metrically acceptable reconstructions are not difficult to find: *līngaṃ sādhyaena sambaddhaṃ* is possible; or, with the relative pronoun *yat*: *yac ca sādhyaena sambaddhaṃ* or the like. Both these reconstructed readings give a satisfactory meaning, as may other reconstructions. It is not, in the present context, necessary to choose the correct reconstruction. The main point is that an original reading may have been changed in order to replace original *sādhya* with *anumeya*.

If this reasoning is correct, the *Kaṭandī* must have been written before Dignāga’s *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. Is it possible to find out more about its date?

The first of the two quoted verses — also in its supposedly original form, with *sādhya* instead of *anumeya* — enumerates the three conditions that an inferential mark (*liṅga*) must satisfy. These conditions were laid down in Vasubandhu’s *Vādaividhi*¹⁸ and *Vādaividhāna*,¹⁹ and in the anonymous *Tarkaśāstra*,²⁰ which too may have been written by Vasubandhu. We may assume [160] that the *Kaṭandī* borrowed these conditions from these Buddhist logical texts. Borrowing in the opposite direction is harder to accept. The *Tarkaśāstra*, *Vādaividhi* and *Vādaividhāna* were works in which the discussion of logical issues occupied a central place; the *Kaṭandī*, on the other hand, was primarily a commentary on the *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra*, in which logical questions could not but play a secondary role.²¹

The dependence of the *Kaṭandī* upon the Buddhist logicians seems confirmed by the second verse. This verse enumerates three fallacious reasons (*aliṅga*): *viruddha*, *asiddha* and

¹⁷ This was already observed by the commentator Udayana.

¹⁸ Frauwallner, 1957: 16-17 (730-731), 33-34 (747-748).

¹⁹ Frauwallner, 1933: 301 (480) Fragment 7a.

²⁰ T. 1633, vol. 32, p. 30c l. 20-21, p. 31a l. 11 f.; Sanskrit translation in Tucci, 1929: p. 13 l. 16-17, p. 14 l. 20 f.

²¹ See further Frauwallner, 1955: 71 (208) f.

sandigdha. The explanation of the verse, on the other hand, mentions aprasiddha, asat and sandigdha, terms which occur in, and are here quoted in the context of, VS 3.1.10-11. Where did the author of the Kaṭandī find the terms viruddha and asiddha? They occur, together with the third term anaikāntika, in the Tarkaśāstra²² and in the Vādaividhi.²³ The second verse and its explanation suggest that the author of the Kaṭandī borrowed the two types of fallacious reason called viruddha and asiddha from the Buddhist logicians, but hid this fact by identifying them with ideas already found in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. Had the new fallacious reasons constituted a development within Vaiśeṣika, without influence from without, the terms found in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra would most probably have been maintained.

It would appear, then, that the Kaṭandī was written sometime in the period before Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya, but after the discovery of the three conditions of the inferential mark, which was perhaps made by Vasubandhu, and which it borrowed without acknowledgment.

3. Did Dignāga know the Kaṭandī? We have seen that in at least one case Dignāga was acquainted with an opinion which we had reason to ascribe to the Kaṭandī (K 10). But there is more, and more convincing evidence. On a few occasions Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya Vṛtti quotes directly from a Vaiśeṣika work different from the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. From the beginnings of the third and fourth Paricchedas it is clear that Dignāga knew the following lines (Jambuvijaya, 1961: 197, 201, 207; Hattori, 1972: 169-170):

K 12 sādhyābhidhānaṃ pratijñā/
tadvaddharmasya hetuḥ/
ubhayaprasiddho dṛṣṭāntaḥ/

[161]

These sentences define some parts of an inference. The first one is also found in Vasubandhu's Vādaividhi (Hattori, 1972: 172), and this is of course most easily explained if we assume that this Vaiśeṣika work had borrowed from Vasubandhu, as had the Kaṭandī. What is more, it supports the idea that the work from which Dignāga quotes is the Kaṭandī.

Further supporting evidence is obtained as followed. The fact that, in matters logical, the Kaṭandī was strongly influenced by the Buddhist logicians, did not leave much for Dignāga to criticize in it, for he himself continued and enriched the tradition of Buddhist logicians. If Dignāga were to criticize the logical ideas of the Kaṭandī at all, we might expect this criticism to be directed against two aspects in particular: (i) points in which Dignāga deviates from his Buddhist predecessors; (ii) points in which the Kaṭandī tries to hold on to Vaiśeṣika traditions. Both these aspects are represented in K 11, and part of Dignāga's critique

²² T. 1633, vol. 32, p. 36a l. 7-16; tr. Tucci, 1929: p. 40 l. 10-22.

²³ Frauwallner, 1957: 17 (731), 34-35 (748-749) n. 7.

might very well be directed against this very passage. The one respect in which K 11 agrees with Dignāga — the three conditions of the inferential mark — he passes over in silence, as was to be expected. Let us now look more closely at his point of criticism:²⁴ (i) Dignāga's criticism of the use of the word *sādhya* is directed as much against his Buddhist predecessors as against the Vaiśeṣikas. As we have seen, the *Vādaividhi* defines the proposition (*pratijñā*) as: *sādhyaḥ bhidhānam pratijñā*. (ii) The *Kaṭandī*, as we have seen, borrowed the fallacious reasons *viruddha* and *asiddha* from the Buddhists, but claimed that they are the same as the ones called *asat* and *aprasiddha* in the *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra*. It did not borrow the term *anaikāntika*, but held on to the Vaiśeṣika term *sandigdha* instead. By doing to, it invited criticism directed against the types of fallacious reason enumerated — or presumed enumerated — in VS 3.1.10-11. Such criticism is indeed found in Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. This text cites the *sūtras* concerned, then points out that none of the possible interpretations of *aprasiddha* are suitable to denote a fallacious reason. The designation *asat* is not acceptable either; the correct term — in view of the example in VS 3.1.12 (*viṣāṇī tasmād aśvo ...*) — is *viruddha*. *Sandigdha*, finally, covers according to Dignāga only what he calls *sādhāraṇānaikāntika*, whereas *asādhāraṇa* and *viruddhāvyaḥcārīn* are not mentioned by the Vaiśeṣikas. (Note that *Praśastapāda* introduces a fourth fallacious reason, *anadhyavasita*, to cover these two cases.)

It can be seen that Dignāga cites and criticizes the Vaiśeṣikas in the context of logical theory where the *Kaṭandī* appears to be susceptible to such [162] criticism. His criticism, moreover, is confined to these points. We can with certainty conclude from this that Dignāga's Vaiśeṣika opponent agreed with him on certain essential points, most notably on the three conditions of an inferential mark, also mentioned in the *Kaṭandī*.

Dignāga characterizes perception as “the simple presentation of the object (*viṣayālocanamātra*)”, which is not “preceded by conceptual constructions (*vikalpapūrvaka*)”.²⁵ The former of these two expressions (to be precise, the part *ālocanamātra*) occurs in the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha*, in the context of what the commentators call *nirvikalpaka* perception.²⁶ This does not, as Hattori (1968: 136 n. 4.10) rightly pointed out, allow us to infer that Dignāga knew the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha*. It does, however, lend additional support to the idea that Dignāga knew *Praśastapāda*'s main source, the *Kaṭandī*.

We may conclude that a number of different factors — the date of the *Kaṭandī* (considered above), the direct quotation in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya Vṛtti*, the nature of Dignāga's criticism of the Vaiśeṣikas — all support the conclusion that Dignāga knew and reacted against the *Kaṭandī*.

²⁴ For a detailed discussion, see Hattori, 1972. For a Sanskrit translation of Dignāga's criticism of the Vaiśeṣikas, see Jambuvijaya, 1961: 197 f.

²⁵ Hattori, 1968: 42; Jambuvijaya, 1961: 170.

²⁶ See Schmithausen, 1970.

At one point the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* *Vṛtti* distinguishes two contradictory opinions, both of which were apparently held by certain *Vaiśeṣikas*. The passage reads, in Hattori's translation (1968: 42):²⁷

Some [of the *Vaiśeṣikas*] consider that [the cognition as] a result (*phala*) is distinct from the *pramāṇa*, the means of cognition. They claim that the contact between sense and object (*indriyārthasamnikarṣa*) is the means of cognition since it is the specific cause (*asādhāraṇakāraṇa*) [of perceptual cognition]. But there are others [of the *Vaiśeṣikas*] who hold that the contact between soul and mind (*ātmamanaḥsamnikarṣa*) is the means of cognition since it is the predominant [cause] (*pradhāna*).

This passage occurs in the section of the *Pratyakṣapariccheda* which deals with the *Vaiśeṣika* view of perception; there can therefore be little doubt that [163] indeed different representatives of the *Vaiśeṣika* philosophy are here referred to. This in its turn justifies the conclusion that *Dignāga* knew several *Vaiśeṣika* works, or, at the very least, that the *Vaiśeṣika* work he used contained references to alternative (*Vaiśeṣika*) views.

Dignāga's commentator *Jinendrabuddhi* ascribes the two views expressed in the above passage to different authors: the first one to *Śrāyaska* and others, the second one to *Rāvaṇa* and others.²⁸ The name *Śrāyaska* appears to be unattested elsewhere. Hattori points out, however, that the view here ascribed to him is found in the *Nyāya Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya* (1.1.4; 2.1.25-26).

The second view — ascribed to *Rāvaṇa* by *Jinendrabuddhi* — is more interesting in the present context, for it occurs in the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha* (Ki p. 184, N p. 186):

sāmānyaviśeṣadravyaguṇakarmaviśeṣaṇāpekṣād ātmamanaḥsamnikarṣāt pratyakṣam utpadyate sad dravyaṃ pṛthivī viśāṇī śuklo gaur gacchatī/

Since we have come to think that the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha* is heavily indebted to the *Kaṭandī*, and that *Dignāga* knew the *Kaṭandī*, it is tempting to think that 'Rāvaṇa' is the name of the author of the *Kaṭandī*.

This supposition is strengthened by the fact that later sources describe *Rāvaṇa* as the author of the, or a, *Bhāṣya* on the *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra*. In *Murāri*'s play *Anargharāghava* the character *Rāvaṇa* describes himself as *Vaiśeṣika-Kaṭandī-pañḍita*. The *Bhāṣya* mentioned in *Udayana*'s commentary *Kiraṇāvalī* on the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha* is ascribed to *Rāvaṇa* by *Udayana*'s subcommentator *Padmanābha Mīśra*. *Govindānanda*, in his subcommentary on

²⁷ The Tibetan reads: (1) *kha cig ni tshad ma las don gzhan du 'dod de, thun mong ma yin pa'i rgyu pa'i phyir dbang po dang don du phrad pa tshad mar rtog par byed do. gzhan dag ni gtso bo yin pa'i phyir bdag dang yid du phrad pa tshad ma'o zhes zer ro.* (2) *kha cig ni tshad ma las 'bras du don gzhan du 'dod de, thun mong ma yin pa'irgyu yin pa'i phyir dbang dang don phrad pa tshad mas rtogs par bya'o zhe'o. gzhan dag ni gtso bo yin pa'i phyir bdag dang yid phrad pa tshad ma yin no zher ro.*

²⁸ See Hattori, 1968: 135; *Jambuvijaya*, 1961: 174.

Śaṅkara's Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya, mentions a Bhāṣya of Rāvaṇa in the context of the Vaiśeṣika philosophy.²⁹

4. The preceding two sections have given us reasons to think that the now lost Kaṇḍī profoundly influenced the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. This is hardly to be wondered at, in view of the fact that Praśastapāda himself appears to have written a commentary on that combined text. By way of conclusion we must mention the possibility that the Kaṇḍī, or rather its vākyas, may also have influenced the surviving texts of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. Vākyas are hard to distinguish from sūtras — both are short nominal phrases — and the Kaṇḍī constituted a commentary on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. Someone who [164] would try to extract sūtras from manuscripts of the Kaṇḍī — which contained sūtras, vākyas, and bhāṣyas — would be in danger of mistakenly including some vākyas.

Of course, it would be hard, perhaps impossible, to prove definitely that the three surviving versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra derive from a common source which is the Kaṇḍī. It must however be recalled that cases of early Indian texts that have at some time of their history been 'peeled' out of a commentary are known.³⁰ All we can do in the remainder of this article is briefly consider two points which, to say the least, do not contradict the assumption that our versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra do indeed derive from the Kaṇḍī. A close study of the available evidence may further support, or disprove, the above assumption. Such a study is however beyond the scope of the present article.

VS 1.1.4, in the version of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra commented upon by Śaṅkara Miśra, reads:

1.1.4 dharmaviśeṣaprasūtād dravyaguṇkarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām padārthānām
sādharmyavaidharmyābhyām tattvajñānān niḥśreyasam

An enumeration of the six categories at the beginning of the Sūtra-text seems, as Frauwallner (1984: 37 n. 5) observed, essential. Yet this 'fourth sūtra' is absent from the other two surviving versions of the text. How to explain this? The easiest solution seems to be that it was there, but was not recognized as a sūtra. This, of course, is only possible if the sūtras were extracted from a work that contained more than only sūtras, most probably from a commentary. The fact that 'sūtra 4' is much longer than sūtras 1-3 may explain that it was not so easily recognized as such.

²⁹ See Jambuvijaya, 1961: 150 n. 1, and Thakur, 1961: 12 f.

³⁰ See Bronkhorst, 1988: 121 f., where it is shown that the first two Kāṇḍas of Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya were 'peeled' out of the Vṛtti, a commentator whose author — different from Bhartṛhari — is not known. It seems, moreover, that the Yoga sūtras were collected by their first commentator, the author of the Yoga Bhāṣya; see Bronkhorst, 1985a.

Supposing now that the sūtras were all taken from a commentary on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra, is there any reason to think that this commentary was the Kaṭandī? The resemblance of ‘sūtra 4’ to a portion of the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha may constitute such a reason. The following passage from the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha expresses almost the same contents in but slightly differing words (N p. 6-7; Ki p. 4):

[165]

dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām padārthānām
sādharmyavaidharmyatattvajñānam niḥśreyasahetuḥ/ tac ceśvaracodanābhiviyaktād
dharmād eva/

It is more than likely to conclude that the ‘fourth sūtra’ was known to Praśastapāda, and was therefore in all probability part of the Kaṭandī.

The opinion has been expressed that the above cited ‘fourth sūtra’ was not created before, but rather under the influence of, and therefore after, the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha.³¹ In response to this objection it could be pointed out that there is one major difference between the ‘fourth sūtra’ and its corresponding passage in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha: the latter adds God (īśvara). God played henceforth a central role in the Vaiśeṣika system.³² The fact that ‘the fourth sūtra’ — like all the other Vaiśeṣika sūtras — ignores God, can be taken as an indication that ‘the fourth sūtra’ is older than Praśastapāda, and was not composed under the influence of his Padārthadharmasaṅgraha.³³

There is a second indication that the surviving versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra may derive from the Kaṭandī. It is the use of the term Āhnikā to designate the sections into which the Sūtra-text is divided. This term — which means ‘daily’, hence ‘what may be studied on one day’ — is primarily used to designate the subdivisions of the Mahābhāṣya. As such it has nothing to do with the sūtras of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, on which the Mahābhāṣya comments. Works that imitate the style of the Mahābhāṣya may also imitate its division into Āhnikas. And indeed, the Nyāya Bhāṣya, which is partly written in Vārttika style (Windisch, 1888: 15 f.), is divided into Āhnikas. Also the Nyāya Sūtra is divided into Āhnikas, but this division is obviously secondary and derives from the Bhāṣya. In the case of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra we have come to think that it had a commentary that imitated the style of the Mahābhāṣya. We also know that the Sūtra is divided into Āhnikas, in each of its three surviving versions.³⁴ Nothing seems more natural than to assume that this division, here too, is secondary, and derives from the Kaṭandī, just as the three versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra themselves derive from the Kaṭandī.

[166]

³¹ This was Frauwallner’s opinion (1984: 39-40).

³² See Thakur, 1957: (16).

³³ On the provenance of God in the Vaiśeṣika system, see Bronkhorst, 1996.

³⁴ Adhyāyas 8, 9 and 10 are not divided in Āhnikas in the version known to Candrānanda, and in that known to the author of the Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha (Thakur, 1961: 21). Also the version of Adhyāyas 9 and 10 found and discussed by Thakur (1966) does not divide these Adhyāyas into Āhnikas. The other versions do.

Is it conceivable that **all** non-authentic sūtras in the surviving versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra derive from the Kaṇḍī? Or do we have to assume also other sources of inauthentic sūtras? It is difficult to answer this question, because the Kaṇḍī is almost completely unknown to us. Nor do we know the original contexts of inauthentic sūtras, even if we suppose that we are at all able to recognize them as such.

We do, however, know some things about the Kaṇḍī. We have seen, for example, that its logic stood most probably under the influence of a Buddhist logician, most probably Vasubandhu, but not yet under that of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya. This helped us in determining the approximate date of the Kaṇḍī. It will now help us to show that at least some sūtras were added to the text of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra before the Kaṇḍī.³⁵

VS 2.1.15-16 and 3.2.6-7 distinguish two kinds of inference: that based on something seen (dṛṣṭa), and that based on something seen in general (sāmānyato dṛṣṭa). This cannot but be the same distinction as that between viśeṣato dṛṣṭa and sāmānyato dṛṣṭa, current in Sāṃkhya, and introduced by the Sāṃkhya teacher Vindhyavāsin.³⁶ Vindhyavāsin lived around 400 C.E. (Bronkhorst, 1985: 171). These sūtras, therefore, appear to have been inserted after that date, but before the Kaṇḍī which represents the next stage in the development of logic within the Vaiśeṣika school.

References

- Bhartr̥hari: Mahābhāṣyadīpikā. 1) Edited by K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1970. (Post-Graduate and Research Department Series No. 8.) 2) Partly edited by V. Swaninathan under the title Mahābhāṣya Ṭīkā. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University. 1965. (Hindu Vishvavidyalaya Nepal Rajya Sanskrit Series Vol. 11.) 3) Manuscript reproduced. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1980. 4) 'Critical edition'. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Āhnika 1, edited and translated by Johannes Bronkhorst, 1987; Āhnika 2, by G. B. Palsule, 1988; Āhnika 3, by G. B. Palsule, 1983; Āhnika 4, by G. V. Devasthali and G. B. Palsule, 1989; Āhnika 5, by V. P. Limaye, G. B. Palsule and V. B. Bhagavat, 1984; Āhnika 6 part 1, by V. B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate, 1986; Āhnika 6 part 2, by V. B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate, 1990; Āhnika 7, by G. B. Palsule and V. B. Bhagavat, 1991.
- [167]
- Bhartr̥hari: Vākyapadīya. Critical edition by Wilhelm Rau. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 1977. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XLII, 4.)
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1985): "On the chronology of the Tattvārtha Sūtra and some early commentaries." Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 29, 155-184.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1985a): "Patañjali and the Yoga sūtras." Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik 10 (1984), 191-212.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1988): "Études sur Bhartr̥hari, 1: L'auteur et la date de la Vṛtti." Bulletin d'Études Indiennes 6, 105-143.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1990): "Vārttika." Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 34, 123-146.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1996): "God's arrival in the Vaiśeṣika system." Journal of Indian Philosophy 24(3), 1996, 281-294.

³⁵ What follows is essentially based on Frauwallner, 1955: 75 (212) f., esp. 79 (216) n. 30.

³⁶ According to Kumārila's Ślokavārttika 8 (Anumānapariccheda), v. 143.

- Chemparathy, George (1970): "Praśastapāda and his other names." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 12, 241-254.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1933): "Zu den Fragmenten buddhistischer Logiker im Nyāyavārttikam." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 40, 281-304. Reprint: *Kleine Schriften* (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1982) pp. 460-483.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1955): "Candramati und sein Daśapadārthaśāstram." *Studia Indologica. Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel. Bonn. (Bonner Orientalistische Studien, 3.)* Pp. 65-85. Reprint: *Kleine Schriften* (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1982) pp. 202-222.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1957): "Vasubandhu's Vādaividhi." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 1, 104-146. Reprint: *Kleine Schriften* (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1982) pp. 716-758.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1984): *Nachgelassene Werke. I. Aufsätze, Beiträge, Skizzen.* Herausgegeben von Ernst Steinkellner. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 438. Band. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 19.)
- Halbfass, Wilhelm (1986): "Mallavādin and early Vaiśeṣika ontology." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 50 (Golden Jubilee Volume), 271-286.
- Hattori, Masaaki (1968): *Dignāga, On Perception, being the Pratyakṣapariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya.* From the Sanskrit frag-[168]ments and the Tibetan versions translated and annotated. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Hattori, Masaaki (1972): "Praśastapāda and Dignāga: a note on the development of the Vaiśeṣika theory of anumāna." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 16, 169-180.
- Isaacson, H. (1990): *A study of early Vaiśeṣika. The teachings on perception.* Groningen: Unpublished thesis.
- Jambuvijaya, Muni (ed.)(1961): *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda, with the commentary of Candrānanda.* Baroda: Oriental Institute. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 136.)
- Jhā, Gaṅgānātha (tr.)(1915): *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha of Praśastapāda, with the Nyāyakandalī of Śrīdhara.* Varanasi - Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia. (Chaukhambha Oriental Studies, 4.) 1982.
- Lang, Karen (1988): "On Āryadeva's citation of Nyāya texts in the *Śataka." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 32, 131-140.
- Mallavādin: *Dvādaśāra Nayacakra.* Edited, with the commentary *Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī of Simhasūri*, by Muni Jambuvijaya. Bhavnagar: Sri Jain Atmanand Sabha. 3 volumes. (Śrī Ātmānanda Jaina Granthamālā Serial No. 92, 94, 95.) 1966, 1976, 1988.
- Mesquita, Roque (1980): "Yāmuna's Vedānta and Pāñcarātra: a review." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 24, 199-224.
- Nozawa, Masanobu (1976): "The Vaiśeṣikasūtra referred to in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha." *Journal of the Buddhist Studies* 24, (32)-(38) [= 1006-1000].
- Praśastapāda: *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha.* 1) Edited, with the commentary *Kiraṇāvalī of Udayanācārya*, by Jitendra S. Jetly. Baroda: Oriental Institute. 1971. 2) Edited, with the commentary *Nyāyakandalī of Śrīdhara*, by Vindhyaesvari Prasad Dvivedin. Reprint. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications. (Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series, 13.) 1984. 3) Edited, with the commentaries *Sūkti, Setu, and Vyomavatī*, by Gopinath Kavirāj and Dhundhirāj Shāstri. Second edition. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan. (Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, 61.) 1983.
- Schmithausen, Lambert (1970): "Zur Lehre von der vorstellungsfreien Wahrnehmung bei Praśastapāda." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 14, 125-129.
- [169]
- Sucaritamiśra: *Kāśikā.* In: *The Mīmāṃsāsīlokavārttika with the commentary Kāśikā of Sucaritamiśra*, edited by K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstri. Trivandrum 1926 ff. (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 90, 99, 150.)
- Thakur, Anantalal (ed.)(1957): *Vaiśeṣikadarśana of Kaṇāda, with an anonymous commentary.* Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Thakur, Anantalal (1961): "Introduction." = Jambuvijaya, 1961: 1-23.

- Thakur, Anantalal (1966): “Studies in a fragmentary Vaiśeṣikasūtravṛtti.” *Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda*, 14 (1965/66), 330-335.
- Tucci, Giuseppe (1929): *Pre-Diñnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*. Second edition. Madras: Vesta. 1981.
- Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. Edited by Muni Jambuvijaya. Baroda: Oriental Institute. (Gaekwad’s Oriental Series, 136.) 1961.
- Windisch, Ernst (1888): *Über das Nyāyabhāṣya*. Leipzig: Alexander Edelmann.

Abbreviations

| | |
|-----|--|
| AL | Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartrhari, ed. Abhyankar / Limaye |
| CE | Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartrhari, ‘critical edition’ |
| DNC | Dvādaśāra Nayacakra of Mallavādin |
| K | presumed passage from the Kaṇḍī |
| Ki | Padārthadarmasaṅgraha, ed. Jetly |
| Ms | Manuscript of Bhartrhari’s Mahābhāṣyadīpikā |
| N | Padārthadarmasaṅgraha, ed. Dvivedin |
| P | Pāṇinian sūtra |
| Sw | Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartrhari, ed. Swaminathan |
| T. | Taisho edition of Buddhist canon in Chinese |
| Ṭ | presumed passage from Praśastapāda’s Ṭikā on Kaṇḍī |
| vk | vākya |
| VS | Vaiśeṣika Sūtra |