A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE UTPĀDĀDISIDDHĪTĪKĀ 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. 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. FRAUWALLNER has restored nearly the whole of the Sambandhaparikṣā of Dharmakīrti (which is lost in Sanskrit) with the help of the Syādvādaratnākara of the Jaina Ācārya Vādidevasūri (Dharmakīrtīs 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 Dharmakīrti, who is well-known as a great Buddhist locigian 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 ms. at Pātān (Gujarat State, India). The Āloka is a sub-commentary of the Hetubinduṭīkā of Arcaṭa. Its author is Durvēkamiśra 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, Dharmakīrti’s Hetubinduḥ, Teil I and II, Wien 1967.
3 Jainānanda Pustakālāya, Gopipura, Surat 1936.
4 At the end of the commentary the author has given the date of its composition in a stanza as follows:

\[ \text{dvādaśavoṣṭaṇateśu śrīvikramaṃ gateśu muni(muni)bhiḥ |} \\
\text{caire saṃpattam idam sāhathyam cātra me nemeḥ} \] // 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. Therefore, we can see on p. 48 of the printed HBT, that an important portion is lost between tadbhāvaḥ ca sambandha ucyate and janyatāyāṁ vā yadi samagrāḥ svarūpata eva tām janayanti kārye ka eṣāṁ śaktivyāghaṁ yato 'nyatra kalpyate.

On pp. 93—95 U contains a very long portion from HBT. Its concluding part is as follows: tadbhāvaḥ ca sambandha ucyate. kāryakāraṇayoṣ cāsahābhāvivāt kuto 'syā dviśṭhātā? tasyāṁ cāsatyāṁ kathāṁ sambandhitā? aksaṇikatvē 'pi kāryakāraṇayoṣ tajjananāt prāga-pratipatantonadāhārabhāvayoḥ paścād api svabhāvaparārytār atadāśrayatavā. anāśritoṁ ca kathāṁ tadbhāvaḥ pratyayavetur vā? samavāyikāraṇasyāiva kārṇaśamavāyikāraṇatvān na nimitāsamaṃvāyikāraṇayoḥ, kāryasya vā talsamavāyāt kāryatavam, asya ca sarvatravisēṣāt tā sarvāṃ vastu parasparām kārṇaśaṃkāraṇarūpāṃ syāt. pūrvottarābhāvabhāvaviseṣānāt tā cāsya tadasambandhād ayuktā niratīśaṣāya tadāyagac ca tayor eva cātadvisēṣāyoḥ tāllakṣanātā 'stv ity abhiṣprāya-vataiva dharmakirtinoktaṁ tadbhāve bhāvas tadbhāve 'bhāvaḥ 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

deśi dños po yaṅ ćrel par brjod na | 
rgyu dañ ćbras bu ni lhan cīg mi | 
'byun ba'i phyir gīn la gnas par ga |
la ćgyur de med na ji llar ćrel pa yin |
skād cīg ma ma yin pa ṅid keyaṅ |
rgyu dañ ćbras bu dag skyes pa las |
s harness de rten la yod pa ma gtogs pa dag |
tadbhāvaḥ ca sambandha ucyate. 
kāryakāraṇayoṣ cāsahābhāvivāt kuto 
'syā dviśṭhātā? tasyāṁ cāsatyāṁ kathāṁ 
sambandhitā?

aksanikatvē 'pi kāryakāraṇayoṣ taj-
jananāt prāga-pratipatantomadāhārabhā-
vayoḥ paścād api svabhāvaparārytār

---

5 For the sake of convenience, HBT, HBTA, S, T and U will mean here Hetubinduṭikā, Hetubinduṭikā-āloka, Sanskrit, Tibetan translation of the Hetubinduṭikā and Utpādādisiddhiṭikā respectively.
6 Vide HBT p. 46, 23 — p. 48, 16.
7 On page 93, 10 of U: anyo bhavan svabhāvato 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 Bstan-'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 bžin ḡan la ḡjug pas de ma yin pa la rten pa ḡid dañ rten med pas de dnos po’i ḡkyen nam ḡgyu ma yin no ||

yaṅ na ḡdu ba’i ḡgyu mtshan ḡid kyis ḡgyu dañ ḡbras bur brjod pa dañ ḡes pa dag yin | ḡde’i ḡshe’i ḡdu ba can gyi ḡgyu ḡid kyi ḡbras bu ni ḡdu ba las ḡgyu ḡid du ḡgyur | ḡgyu mtshan dañ ḡdu ba med pa’i ḡgyu dañ ma yin te | ḡbras bu ni de’i ḡdu ba’i ḡbras bu ḡid do || ḡde’i ḡyañ thams cab la bye brag med pas dnos po thams cad phan tshun ḡgyu dañ ḡbras bu’i no bo ḡgyur ro || ḡsña ma dañ phyi ma yod pa dañ med pa’i bye brag gis de yaṅ ḡdir de ni ḡbral pa med pas ma ḡrigs pas bgo ḡdyuñ du med pa la de mi ḡrigs so || de dag ḡid dam de’i ḡkyad par dag de’i ḡmtshan ḡid yin no ḡzes ḡgoṅs nas de yod na ni yod la de med na ni med pas ḡgyu dañ ḡbras bu’i no bo ḡzes bṣad do ||

de ḡlar re ḡiṅ mi ḡdmigs pa dañ than ḡcig pa’i mṅon sum dag gis ḡgyu dañ ḡbras bu dag yod na yod pa’i yul la ḡgyu dañ ḡbras bu yod pa yin te | ḡde’i yod na ni yod la de med na ni med pa ḡmtshan ḡid ḡsgrub par byed pa bṣad do || ḡres’i ḡiṅ mi ḡdmigs pa’i mṅon sum mṅon sum ḡsṅon pas ḡgyu dañ ḡbras bu ḡsgrub pa’i ḡphyir de’i yul re ḡiṅ bstan pa ni | ḡgyu ḡzän ḡrnams yod kyaṅ ḡzès bya ba smos te ||

atadāśrayatavam. anāśritam ca na 10 tadbhāvaḥ pratyayahetur vā.


evaṃ tāvad anupalambhasahāya pratyakṣena kāryakāraṇayor bhāve bhāv-visayaṃ kāryakāraṇabhāvavyasaṃ tadbhāvabhāva-vataddhāvabhāvalakṣaṇasya siddhir uktā. kvacic anupalabdhāyāṃ pratyakṣapūrvikāya kāryakāraṇabhāvasid- dhēs tadbhāyam tāvad darsyaṃ aha satv aṣya anyesu hetuṣuṣu iti.

10 katham U; cf. pratyayahetuh kāryakāraṇabuddhiḥetur vā, 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 tatsamavāyāt U.
14 asya U.
15 ity abhiprāyavatoktaṃ dharmakīrtinoktam U. Cf. abhiprāyavatā, vārtikakṛtteti prakaraṇāt (HBTA p. 304, 20).
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 Frawallner in honour of his 70th birthday, I at once accepted it for two reasons. Firstly, because I am in close contact with professor Frawallner 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 Dvādaśāraṇayacakra and preparing a Sanskrit retranslation 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.