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 Naïyāyika 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 works¹. 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

¹ E. g. Prof. Frauwaller has restored nearly the whole of the Sambandhaparikṣā of Dharmakirti (which is lost in Sanskrit) with the help of the Syādvādaratnākara of the Jaina Ācārya Vādidevasūri (Dharmakirtis Sambandhaparikṣā. 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 Dharmakirti, 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. Two commentaries of it are known: one by Vinitadeva 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 Durvekamīśra 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 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. 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

---

2 A reconstruction of the Sanskrit text has been done recently by E. Stein-Kellner, Dharmakirti’s Hetubinduh, Teil I and II, Wien 1967.
3 Jainānanda Pustakālaya, Gopipura, Surat 1936.
4 At the end of the commentary the author has given the date of its composition in a stanza as follows:
   dvādaśapravacateṣu śrīvikramato gātesu muni(muni)bhiḥ |
   catre sāmpannam uḍām sādhyaṃ catra me nemiḥ || 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. Pradyummasūri, the guru of Ācārya Candrasena, was a co-disciple (guruṇandhu) 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. Therefore, we can see on p. 48 of the printed HBT, that an important portion is lost between tadbhāvaṣ ca sambandha ucyate and janyatāyāṁ vā yadi samagrāḥ svarūpata eva tāṁ janayanti kārye ka ēṣāṁ saktivāyāṁyaṁ yato nyatra kalpayate.

On pp. 93—95 U contains a very long portion from HBT. Its concluding part is as follows: tadbhāvaṣ ca sambandha ucyate. kāryakāraṇyayoś cāsaha-bhāvītvāt kuto 'sya dviṣṭhatā? tasyāṁ cāsatyāṁ kathaṁ sambandhitā? aksanikatve 'pi kāryakāraṇayoṣ tajjananāt prāgapratipannatadādādhrabhāvayoḥ paścād api svabhāvāparāvṛttā atadādhrayatvam. anādāritam ca kathāṁ tadbhāvaḥ pratyayahe-tur vā? samavāyikāraṇasyaiva kāryasamavāyikāraṇatvaṁ na nimitātanasamavyikāraṇayoḥ, kāryasya vā tatasamavyāyāt kāryatvam, asya ca sarvātravidegūt tat sarvaṁ vastu parasparam kāryakāraṇarūpam syāt. pūrvottarabhāvabhāvaniśeṣanatā cāsyā tadasambandhād ayuktā niratisasyasyā tadayogāc ca tayor eva cātadvive-śaṇayos tallakṣaṇatā 'st ity abhiṣekavantaiva dharmaṃkīrtinoktam tadbhāve bhāvas tadabhāve 'bhāvaṣ ca kāryakāraṇabhāva iti.

With the help of the above quotation, T and HBTA, we can easily and exactly restore the lost portion up to kāryakāraṇabhāva iti. For the Sanskrit retranslation of the remaining portion I have utilized T and HBTA. 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) ⁹

| deçi dnos po yan 'brel par brjod na | tadbhāvaṣ ca sambandha ucyate. |
| rgyu dan 'bras bu ni lhan cig mi | kāryakāraṇyayoś cāsahabhāvitvat kuto | 'sya dviṣṭhatatā? tasyāṁ cāsatyāṁ kathāṃ | sambandhitatā? |
| 'byun ba'i phyir gnis la gnas par ga | aksanikatve 'pi kāryakāraṇyayoṣ tajjanaṇat prāgapratipannatadādādhrabhāvayoḥ paścād api svabhāvāparāvṛttat |
| la 'gyur de na ji ltar 'brel pa yan | skad cig ma ma yan pa nūd kyan | |
| rgyu dan 'bras, bu dag skyes pa las | skad de rten la yod pa ma gto'gs pa dag |

---

⁵ For the sake of convenience, HBT, HBTA, S, T and U will mean here Hétiñduñikā, Hetubindutikā-āloka, Sanskrit, Tibetan translation of the Hetubindutikā and Utpadādisiddhiñikā respectively.

⁶ Vide HBT p. 46, 23 — p. 48, 16.

⁷ On page 93, 10 of U: anyo bhavan svabhavato etc. is the beginning of this.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Betan-'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 kyaṅ raṅ bēin gān la cjud pas de ma yin pa la rten pa niṅ daṅ rten med pas de dños poṅi rkyen nam rgyu ma yin no

yan na cdu baṅi rgyu mtsan niṅ kyis rgyu daṅ cbras bu brjod pa daṅ kṣes pa dag yin | deṅi tshe cdu ba can gyi rgyu niṅ kyi cbras bu ni cdu ba las rgyu niṅ du cgyur | rgyu mtsan daṅ cdu ba med paṅi rgyu daṅ ma yin te | cbras bu ni de cdu baṅi cbras bu niṅ do | de yāṅ thams cad la bye brag med pas dños po thams cad phan tshun rgyu daṅ cbras buṅ no bor cgyur ro || sha ma daṅ phyi ma yod pa daṅ med paṅi bye brag gis de yan cdir de ni cbrel pa med par mi rigs pas bogs dbyuṅ du ma de la de mi rigs so || de dag niṅ dam deṅi khyad par dag deṅi mtsan niṅ yin no zes dwon nas de yod na ni yod la de med na ni med pas rgyu daṅ cbras buṅ no bo zes bṣad do ||

del dr re śig mi dmigs pa daṅ lhan cig paṅi mṛon sum dag gis rgyu daṅ cbras bu dag yod na yod paṅi yul la rgyu daṅ cbras bu yod pa yin te | de yod na ni yod la de med na ni med pa mtsan niṅ sgrub par byed pa bṣad do || res laṅ śig mi dmigs paṅi mṛon sum śnons pas rgyu daṅ cbras bu sgrub paṅi phyir deṅi yul re śig bstan pa ni | rgyu gān rnamz yod kyaṅ žes bya ba smos te

[atha samāvāyanimittavena kārya- kāraṇābhidhānapratyayau tada]¹¹ samāvāyikāraṇasyaiva ca ¹² kāryasama- vāyikāraṇatvam, na nimitāsamaṇvāy- kāraṇayoḥ, kāryasya va tatsamaṇvāyaḥ¹³ kāryatvam. tasyā ca sarvatruviśeṣāt tatkṣaryān vastu pariparam kāryakā- rāṇarūpam syāt. pūrvottarabhāvabhāva- viśeṣaṇatā cāsas tadasambandhādy avuktā. nirātiṣayasya tadayoṣe ca. tayor eva va tadviśeṣanayos tallaṅkaṇatā astu ity abhiprayavatoktam¹⁵ tadbhāve bhā- vas tadabhāve 'bhāvas ca kāryakāraṇa- bhāva iti.

evan tāvad anupalambhasahāya pra- tyakṣena kāryakāraṇayor bhāve bhāva- viśeṣaṇaya kāryakāraṇabhāvasya tadbhā- vabhāvatadabhāvabhāvalaṅkaṇaya sid- dhir ukta. kvacid anupalabdhyāpī pra- tyakṣapūrvikā kāryakāraṇabhāvasid- dhes tadviśeṣaṇaḥ tāvad dārṣayannāḥ aha satv apy anyesu hetusv iti.

¹⁰ katham U; cf. pratyayahetuh kāryakāraṇaḥ bhādhiḥ hetuḥ va, neti vartate (HBTA p. 302, 21–22).
¹¹ 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.
¹² ca HBTA only.
¹³ tatsamaṇvāyaḥ U.
¹⁴ asya U.
¹⁵ ity abhiprayavatva dharmakirtinoke U. Cf. abhiprayavatā, vārtikakṛte prakaraṇat (HBTA p. 304, 20).
du ba la sogs pa'i 'bras bu me dañ bud šin la sogs pa'i tshogs pa can dag ni tshogs pa las gzan ma yin te | tshogs pa rnam rgyu med pa 'nídu thal bar gyur ro || 'bras bu de la bitos pa ma yin na dön po med par thal bar gyur ro || gal te de dañ 'brel pas de la bitos pa yin no že na || dir su žig skyed par byed pa ma yin na don gzan dañ 'brel pas yin skyed par byed na yin tshogs pa'i rañ gi no bo kho nas skyed par byed pa yin te | 'bras bu geig byed pa la 'di dag nus pa med dam gañ gis na gzan žig brtag par bya |

na ca na dhūmādikāryasyāgniśindhānādisamagrī samagrebhya 'nyā sama-grānām akāraṇatvaprasaṅgāt. kāryasya tadanapekṣāyām avastuvaprasaṅgāt. ta-tsambandhāt tadapekṣā iti cet, atrā-janyatāyāṁ kasyārthāntareṇa sambandhaḥ. janyatāyāṁ vā yadi samagrāḥ svarūpata eva tāṁ janayanti, kārye ka eśāṁ saktivyāghāto 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 Dvādaśāyānayacakra 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.

16 Cf. bhinnasāmagrīvāding matam āśaṅkya tan nirākurvann āha na ceti. HBTA p. 304, 21–22.