

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE UTPĀDĀDISIDDHIṬĪKĀ AND THE HETUBINDUṬĪKĀ

*By Jaina Muni Jambuvijaya, Bhāvnagar*

During my study of the Jaina logical and philosophical literature I could find one remarkable thing, viz., that while propagating their own views or criticizing the views of other philosophical schools the Jaina Ācāryas of old have freely utilized the works of the Vaiśeṣika, the Naiyāyika and the Buddhist systems. This can be said more specifically about the Buddhist logical works. The old Jaina authors have often quoted a number of long or short passages word for word from Buddhist works. We often see that in support of their own views they have even incorporated in their works many portions literally word to word from the works of other philosophical systems, more especially from the Buddhist logical works.

Generally this helps very much the study of various points in Indian philosophy. Both students and scholars interested in Buddhist logical literature or doing research work in this field will stand to gain substantially by a close study of Jaina logical works<sup>1</sup>. Let us see how Jaina works help the study of Buddhist works.

A large number of the Buddhist works which were originally written in Sanskrit is lost in its original language. However, a great part of it is still preserved in the form of Chinese and Tibetan translations made several hundred years ago. The Chinese versions are not word to word translations. They preserve the meaning of the original texts. Moreover, very few logical works have been translated into the Chinese language while the Tibetan literature is very rich in this respect. A vast number of Buddhist logical works has been translated into Tibetan which represents almost a word to word interpretation of the original works. For this reason the Tibetan translations are of great value not only to those who are interested in Buddhist literature but also to all students of Indian philosophy since nearly all the Indian philosophical works are more or less interrelated.

There is however one great difficulty to be overcome. Sanskrit being a much more rich and systematic language than the Tibetan, though the Tibetan

---

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Prof. FRAUWALLNER has restored nearly the whole of the Sambandhapariṅśā of Dharmakīrti (which is lost in Sanskrit) with the help of the Syādvādaratnākara of the Jaina Ācārya Vāḍidevasūri (Dharmakīrtis Sambandhapariṅśā. Text und Übersetzung. WZKM 41, 1934, pp. 261—300).

translators had evolved many devices and established many rules and regulations for translating Sanskrit works into Tibetan, it is often found extremely difficult to understand the precise meaning of the Tibetan translations even independently by the learned Tibetan scholars of the present day. Moreover, there are so many places where the Tibetan interpretations are wrong either due to the incorrectness of the original ms. or to the lack of proper understanding of its real meaning on the part of the translators. In such cases if we get some help from Sanskrit works the task becomes much easier. From this point of view I have here made an effort to reconstruct a lost portion of the Hetubinduṭīkā with the help of the Utpādādisiddhiṭīkā, a Jaina logical treatise, and the Tibetan version of the Hetubinduṭīkā.

The Hetubindu is a work of Dharmakīrti, who is well-known as a great Buddhist logician and author. It is now lost in Sanskrit and is preserved only in its Tibetan translation<sup>2</sup>. Two commentaries of it are known: one by Vinītadeva and the other by Arcaṭa. The former is a short one and is lost in Sanskrit, its Tibetan translation alone being available. The commentary by Arcaṭa is much more extensive and well-known. It is already published in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. CXIII, by the Oriental Institute (Baroda, 1949), from a single palm-leaf ms. preserved in an old Jaina collection of palm-leaf mss. at Pātan (Gujarat State, India). The Āloka is a sub-commentary of the Hetubinduṭīkā of Arcaṭa. Its author is Durvekamiśra who seems to have flourished during the last quarter of the 10th century and the first half of the 11th century A. D. This sub-commentary is also published along with the Hetubinduṭīkā in the same volume.

The Utpādādisiddhi<sup>3</sup> is a logical treatise by Candrasena, a Jaina Ācārya who also wrote a very extensive commentary on it in the 13th century of the Vikrama era.<sup>4</sup> In this commentary the author has given copious excerpts, very long as well as short ones, from the Hetubindu and its commentary by Arcaṭa. Surprisingly, this helps very much in reconstructing many portions of the Hetubindu, lost in Sanskrit. The extracts of the Hetubinduṭīkā are also

<sup>2</sup> A reconstruction of the Sanskrit text has been done recently by E. STEINKELLNER, Dharmakīrti's Hetubinduḥ, Teil I and II, Wien 1967.

<sup>3</sup> Jainānanda Pustakālaya, Gopipura, Surat 1936.

<sup>4</sup> At the end of the commentary the author has given the date of its composition in a stanza as follows:

*dvādaśavarṣaśateṣu śrīvikramato gateṣu muni(muni)bhīḥ |  
cāitre saṃpannam idaṃ sāhāyaṃ cātra me nemeh ||* U p. 233, 7.

In this verse some letters are omitted in the ms. which are shown in bracket by the editor using his own imagination. According to him the date may be 1277. Without being sure of this proposed date we may say that it was composed in the 13th century of the Vikrama era. Perhaps the discovery of another dated ms. of this text might decide the exact date of its composition. Pradyumnasūri, the guru of Ācārya Candrasena, was a co-disciple (*gurubandhu*) of Ācārya Hemacandra, the well-known Jaina scholar who flourished during the last half of the 12th century and the first half of the 13th century of the Vikrama era.

very helpful in correcting some readings of it since, as already mentioned, its edition is based on a single palm-leaf ms.

Folio no. 52 is missing in the palm-leaf ms. of HBT <sup>5</sup>. Therefore, we can see on p. 48 of the printed HBT, that an important portion is lost between *tadbhāvaś ca sambandha ucyate* and *janyatāyām vā yadi samagrāḥ svarūpata eva tāṃ janayanti kārye ka eṣāṃ śaktivyāghāto yato 'nyatra kalpyate*.

On pp. 93—95 U contains a very long portion from HBT <sup>6</sup>. Its concluding part is as follows <sup>7</sup>: *tadbhāvaś ca sambandha ucyate. kāryakāraṇayoś cāsahabhāvitvāt kuto 'sya dviṣṭhatā ? tasyāṃ cāsatyāṃ katham sambandhitā ? akṣaṇikatve 'pi kāryakāraṇayos tajjananāt prāgapratipannatadādhārābhāvayoh paścād api svabhāvāparāvṛtter atadāśrayatvam. anāśritam ca katham tadbhāvaḥ pratyayahe-tur vā ? samavāyikāraṇasyaiva kāryasamavāyikāraṇatvam na nimittāsamavāyikāraṇayoh, kāryasya vā tatsamavāyāt kāryatvam, asya ca sarvatrāviśeṣāt tat sarvaṃ vastu parasparaṃ kāryakāraṇarūpaṃ syāt. pūrvottarābhāvābhāvaviśeṣaṇatā cāsyā tadasambandhād ayuktā niratīśayasya tadayogāc ca tayo eva cātadviśe-ṣaṇayos tallakṣaṇatā 'stv ity abhiprāyavataiva dharmakīrtinoktam tadbhāve bhāvas tadābhāve 'bhāvaś ca kāryakāraṇābhāva iti*.

With the help of the above quotation, T and HBTA, we can easily and exactly restore the lost portion up to *kāryakāraṇābhāva iti*. For the Sanskrit retranslation of the remaining portion I have utilized T and HBTA <sup>8</sup>. Thus the reconstruction of the lost portion in the missing folio no. 52, as I have made it, is as follows:

T. (f. 260b6—261b8) <sup>9</sup>

S.

de<sup>c</sup>i dños po yañ 'brel par brjod na |  
rgyu dan 'bras bu ni than cig mi  
'byuñ ba<sup>c</sup>i phyir gñis la gnas par ga  
la 'gyur de med na ji ltar 'brel pa yin |

*tadbhāvaś ca sambandha ucyate.*  
*kāryakāraṇayoś cāsahabhāvitvāt kuto*  
*'sya dviṣṭhatā ? tasyāṃ cāsatyāṃ katham*  
*sambandhitā ?*

skād cig ma ma yin pa ñid kyañ  
rgyu dan 'bras bu dag skyes pa las  
sñar de rten la yod pa ma gtogs pa dag

*akṣaṇikatve 'pi kāryakāraṇayos taj-*  
*jananāt prāgapratipannatadādhārābhā-*  
*vayoh paścād api svabhāvāparāvṛtter*

<sup>5</sup> For the sake of convenience, HBT, HBTA, S, T and U will mean here Hetubinduṭīkā, Hetubinduṭīkā-āloka, Sanskrit, Tibetan translation of the Hetubinduṭīkā and Utpādādisiddhīkā respectively.

<sup>6</sup> Vide HBT p. 46, 23 — p. 48, 16.

<sup>7</sup> On page 93, 10 of U: *anyo bhavan svabhāvato* etc. is the beginning of this.

<sup>8</sup> The slight difference in the readings in some places seems to be due to the different mss. of HBT, utilized by the authors of the U, HBTA and T, and also the writer of the present S. ms. of HBT. We have mostly followed here T, where it is supported by HBTA.

<sup>9</sup> Bstan-<sup>c</sup>gyur, Mdo CXI, she. We have utilized here the Peking photographic edition published by the Tibetan Tripiṭaka Research Institute, Tokyo, Vol. 137, No. 5734, p. 250.

phyi nas kyañ rañ bzin gzan la 'jug pas  
de ma yin pa lu rten pa ñid dan rten  
med pas de dños po'ci rkyen nam rgyu  
ma yin no ||

yañ na 'du ba'ci rgyu mtshan ñid  
kyis rgyu dan 'bras bur brjod pa dan  
śes pa dag yin | de'ci tshe 'du ba can  
gyi rgyu ñid kyi 'bras bu ni 'du ba  
las rgyu ñid du 'gyur | rgyu mtshan  
dan 'du ba med pa'ci rgyu dan ma  
yin te | 'bras bu ni de 'du ba'ci 'bras  
bu ñid do || de yañ thams cad la bye  
brag med pas dños po thams cad phan  
tshun rgyu dan 'bras bu'ci no bor 'gyur  
ro || śha ma dan phyi ma yod pa dan  
med pa'ci bye brag gis de yañ 'dir de  
ni 'brel pa med par mi rigs pas bogs  
dbyuñ du med pa la de mi rigs so || de  
dag ñid dam de'ci khyad par dag de'ci  
mtshan ñid yin no źes dgoñs nas de  
yod na ni yod la de med na ni med pas  
rgyu dan 'bras bu'ci no bo źes bśad do ||

de ltar re zig mi dmigs pa dan  
lhan cig pa'ci mñon sum dag gis rgyu  
dan 'bras bu dag yod na yod pa'ci yul  
la rgyu dan 'bras bu yod pa yin te | de  
yod na ni yod la de med na ni med pa  
mtshan ñid sgrub par byed pa bśad do ||  
res 'ga' zig mi dmigs pa'am mñon sum  
śhon pas rgyu dan 'bras bu sgrub pa'ci  
phyir de'ci yul re zig bstan pa ni | rgyu  
gzan rñams yod kyañ źes bya ba smos  
te |

atadāśrayatvam. anāśritam ca na <sup>10</sup>  
tadbhāvaḥ pratyayahetur vā.

[atha samavāyanimittatvena kārya-  
kāraṇābhīdhānapratyayaḥ tadā] <sup>11</sup> sa-  
mavāyikāraṇasyaiva ca <sup>12</sup> kāryasama-  
vāyikāraṇatvam, na nimittasamavāyī-  
kāraṇayoḥ, kāryasya vā tatsamavāyāḥ <sup>13</sup>  
kāryatvam. tasyā <sup>14</sup> ca sarvatrāviśeṣāt  
tat sarvaṃ vastu parasparaṃ kāryakā-  
raṇarūpaṃ syāt. pūrvoctarabhāvābhāva-  
viśeṣaṇatā cāsyā tadasambandhād ayuk-  
tā. niratīśayasya tadayogāc ca. tayoṛ  
eva vā tadviśeṣaṇayos tallakṣaṇatā astu  
ity abhiprāyavatoktam <sup>15</sup> tadbhāve bhā-  
vas tadabhāve 'bhāvas ca kāryakāraṇa-  
bhāva iti.

evaṃ tāvad anupalambhasahāya pra-  
tyakṣeṇa kāryakāraṇayor bhāve bhāva-  
viśeṣasya kāryakāraṇabhāvasya tadbhā-  
vabhāvatadabhāvābhāvalakṣaṇasya si-  
dhir uktā. kvacid anupalabdhyāpi pra-  
tyakṣapūrvikayā kāryakāraṇabhāvasi-  
dhes tadviśayaṃ tāvad darśayanā āha  
satsv apy anyeṣu hetuṣv iti.

<sup>10</sup> kaṭham U; cf. pratyayahetuḥ kāryakāraṇabuddhihetur vā, neti vartate (HBTA p. 302, 21—22).

<sup>11</sup> The reading in the bracket does not appear in U. The Tibetan translators seem to have added this for the easy understanding of the meaning of the next passage.

<sup>12</sup> ca HBTA only.

<sup>13</sup> tatsamavāyāt U.

<sup>14</sup> asya U.

<sup>15</sup> ity abhiprāyavataiva dharmakīrtinoktam U. Cf. abhiprāyavatā, vārtikakṛteti prakaraṇāt (HBTA p. 304, 20).

du ba la sogs pa<sup>ci</sup> 'bras bu me dan  
 bud śiñ la sogs pa<sup>ci</sup> tshogs pa can dag  
 ni tshogs pa las gzan ma yin te | tshogs  
 pa rnams rgyu med pa ñid du thal bar  
 'gyur ro || 'bras bu de la bltos pa ma  
 yin na dños po med par thal bar  
 'gyur ro || gal te de dan 'brel pas de la  
 bltos pa yin no ze na | 'dir su zig  
 skyed par byed pa ma yin na don  
 gzan dan 'brel pas yin skyed par byed  
 na yañ tshogs pa<sup>ci</sup> ran gi ño bo kho nas  
 skyed par byed pa yin te | 'bras bu gcig  
 byed pa la 'di dag nus pa med dam gañ  
 gis na gzan zig brtag par bya |

na ca <sup>16</sup> dhūmādikāryasyāgnīndha-  
 nādisāmagrī samagrebhyo 'nyā sama-  
 grāṇām akāranatvaprasaṅgāt. kāryasya  
 tadanapekṣāyām avastutvaprasaṅgāt. ta-  
 tsambandhāt tadapekṣā iti cet, atrā-  
 janyatāyām kasyārthāntareṇa samban-  
 dhaḥ. janyatāyām vā yadi samagrāḥ  
 svarūpata eva tām janayanti, kārye ka  
 eṣām śaktivyāghāto yato 'nyatra kalpya-  
 te.

If we try, we may discover many such portions in the Jaina and other literature, which could help us in the study of Buddhist works.

In conclusion I would like to say this. When I received an invitation from professor OBERHAMMER to contribute an article to the Festschrift for professor FRAUWALLNER in honour of his 70th birthday, I at once accepted it for two reasons. Firstly, because I am in close contact with professor FRAUWALLNER since the last ten years and I have great respect for his vast study of so many aspects of Indian philosophy. It compelled me to write something. Secondly, when I was editing the Dvādaśāranayacakra and preparing a Sanskrit re-translation from the Tibetan versions of some portions of the Pramāṇasamuccaya and its commentaries for the appendix, I received much help from him in many ways. Therefore, I felt it as my special and sacred duty to write something on this auspicious occasion. I congratulate him wholeheartedly as a friend and as an admirer of the great services rendered by him to the cause of Indian philosophy.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *bhinnasāmagrivādiṇo matam āśaṅkya tan nirākurvann āha na ceti*. HBTA p. 304, 21—22.