

# ARCHIV FÜR INDISCHE PHILOSOPHIE

## ON THE DATE AND WORKS OF THE NAIYĀYIKA ŚĀṆKARASVĀMIN

*By Ernst Steinkellner, Wien*

### I

After I had dealt with Śāṅkarasvāmin in a survey of the authors of the old Nyāya school<sup>1</sup>, I studied his fragments more closely in my dissertation<sup>2</sup>. This study has brought about, besides its main object, some additional arguments for a determination of Śāṅkarasvāmin's time and literary activity. A note on his "Sthirasiddhiḥ" in KATSUMI MIMAKI's recent book<sup>3</sup> is the reason why I present here some new arguments for Śāṅkarasvāmin's time and works based on my dissertation and further observations<sup>4</sup>.

Śāṅkarasvāmin's fragments<sup>5</sup> can be divided into three groups:

1. fragments whose content covers the whole thematic range of Nyāya epistemology and natural science. These are to be found mainly in the *Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā*, f. i. on *pratyakṣa*-, *ātman*-, *avayavin*-, *sāmānya*-, and in various other works, f. i. on *vākya*-, *samavāya*-, the nature of god, *avayava*-, etc.,

2. fragments centred around the proof of the existence of god ("īśvarasiddhi-"),

3. fragments centred around the refutation of the Buddhist proof of momentariness ("*kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhidūṣaṇa*-") and the proof of permanence ("*sthirasiddhi*-").

<sup>1</sup> Die Literatur des älteren Nyāya. WZKS 5 (1961) 149—162.

<sup>2</sup> Augenblicklichkeitsbeweis und Gottesbeweis bei Śāṅkarasvāmin. Dissertation (unpublished), Wien 1963.

<sup>3</sup> La réfutation bouddhique de la permanence des choses (sthirasiddhi-dūṣaṇa) et la preuve de la momentanéité des choses (kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi). Paris 1976, note 324.

<sup>4</sup> I hope to publish the main bulk of my dissertation within the larger frame-work of an edition and interpretation of the fragments of the old Nyāya in the future.

<sup>5</sup> Since for our purpose it is not necessary to distinguish between literal and condensed quotations and reports, I consider at this time all passages which seem to convey the original meaning as "fragments". A differentiation will be necessary, of course, when we deal with the texts themselves.

The decisive difference between the fragments of the first and those of the second and third group is this: those of the first group seem to come from a work which deals with the *pramāṇas* and *prameyas* in the sense of the categories of the Nyāya- as well as of the Vaiśeṣika-system and has probably been his commentary (*ṭīkā*) on the Nyāyabhāṣyam<sup>6</sup>, while the others come from essays, probably independent<sup>7</sup>, on the respective proofs. These fragments differ from those of the first group not only with regard to their content, but also with regard to the place, where they are to be found. They are to be found in the works of Kaṇṇakagomin, Jñānaśrīmitra, Ratnakīrti and Durvekamiśra, and they are, without exception, not to be found with Kamalaśīla. And I consider these circumstances an important and definite clue in determining Śaṅkarasvāmin's date more exactly than I could in my first paper<sup>8</sup>.

I have demonstrated in my dissertation<sup>9</sup> in detail with regard to those fragments which deal with the Buddhist proof of momentariness<sup>10</sup> that they show the structure and the character of the remains of a systematic essay. This essay<sup>11</sup> gives testimony to the fact that Śaṅkarasvāmin was the first known Naiyāyika to examine the Buddhist arguments systematically and that by virtue of his argumentation and above all

<sup>6</sup> A. WEZLER (Zur Identität der "ācāryāḥ" und der "vyākhyātārāḥ" in Jayantabhaṭṭas Nyāyamañjarī. WZKS 19, 1975, note 22) points to Cakradhara's designation of Śaṅkarasvāmin as Nyāyabhāṣyaṭīkāḥ (Cakradhara's Nyāyamañjarigranthibhaṅga. Ed. NAGIN J. SHAH, Ahmedabad 1972, 167, 1f.).

<sup>7</sup> Because at least those of the third group are too many to be taken as fragments of an excursus.

<sup>8</sup> WZKS 5 (1961) 156: in the later part of the period between Dharmakīrti (ca. 600—660) and Śāntarakṣita (ca. 725—788) (cf. E. FRAUWALLNER, Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic. WZKS 5, 1961, 125—148).

<sup>9</sup> loc. cit., 57—81.

<sup>10</sup> Whether Śaṅkarasvāmin's fragments of the proof of the existence of god also come from an independent essay, which is my impression, is difficult to prove because there are only a few of them. My main argument is: if it would not have been an independent treatise, the fragments could have come from his commentary on the Bhāṣyam on NSū IV 1, 21, where he could have written a lengthy excursus similar to the one in Uddyotakara's Nyāyavārttikam. In that case his arguments against Dharmakīrti could not have been neglected by Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla who knew of the Ṭīkā. Therefore, it can be assumed that they come from a work other than the Ṭīkā and as unknown to both as the \*Kṣaṇabhāṅgasiddhidūṣaṇam. And such a work might just as well have been his \*Īśvarasiddhiḥ.

<sup>11</sup> Its hypothetical structure is the following (cf. loc. cit., 81):

I. Against destruction without cause (*ahetukavināśa*): J 131, 17—19; 134, 16—20; PSVT 515, 8—14 (PVV 387, 9—15); J 120, 1—2

the logically well-arranged character of his polemics he has been the starting-point of all respective work in the last period of the old Nyāya-school. I have hypothetically called this essay a \*Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi-dūṣaṇam, because the structure and quantitative distribution of the fragments intimate that the main part of the work has been dedicated to a refutation of the Buddhist, i. e. Dharmakīrti's, proofs. Within this part we come across positive theories mainly within the theme of the co-operative causes (*sahakārin*-). Only a small part of the fragments which probably belong to the final section of the essay is dedicated to the positive proof of permanence (*sthīrasiddhi*-).

In my first paper I assumed that Jñānaśrīmitra and Ratnakīrti mention a Sthīrasiddhiḥ as one of Śaṅkarasvāmin's works<sup>12</sup>. After I had gotten access to Jñānaśrīmitra's works and my examination of the respective fragments had shown the character of Śaṅkarasvāmin's work to be basically that of negative polemics I withdrew this assumption and took *sthīrasiddhiḥ* (J 23, 1 and R 108, 16) simply to mean "to prove permanence"<sup>13</sup>.

I, therefore, think that we can take Śaṅkarasvāmin today to have been the author of the following three different works: A Nyāyabhā-

## II. Against the inference from existence (*sattvānumāna*-):

1. the *hetuḥ* is inconclusive (*anaikāntika*-):
  - a) because a *vipakṣa*- cannot be brought about: J 87, 11—20
  - b) because, if the pervasion is based on the incompatibility (*virodha*-) of causal efficiency and non-momentariness, the contrary, i. e. non-momentariness exists: HBTĀ 370, 17—19; J 87, 1—4; 92, 9; 96, 20—22
  - c) because the pervasion is not absolute since there is a third kind of efficiency: J 65, 16
2. unwarrantable consequences if momentariness is accepted: J 66, 22—67, 16 (R 65, 24—28; PVSVT 79, 27—80, 2); 79, 24—80, 1 (R 65, 28—29; 119, 28)
3. efficiency is possible with permanent things, too; theory of co-operative causes: J 18, 20—24 (R 79, 17—19; 69, 8—12); 21, 18—22; 30, 10—12; 32, 4—5; 33, 20—34, 13

## III. Proving the permanence of things:

1. through perception: J 11, 11; 11, 11—12
2. through inference: J 23, 1—5 (R 108, 17); 23, 8—9

<sup>12</sup> This assumption was based on R 108, 16f. and remarks of A. THAKUR (Some lost Nyāya Works and Authors. 17th AIOC, Ahmedabad 1953, 390 and note 8) who had already drawn from his knowledge of Jñānaśrīmitra's works at that time.

<sup>13</sup> Or "in (his) proof of permanence/permanent (things)." The same is suggested by K. MIMAKI (loc. cit., note 324).

śyaṭikā, a \*Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhidūṣaṇam and an \*Īśvarasiddhiḥ<sup>14</sup>, the last two being the first known attempt of the Nyāya-school to answer Dharmakīrti's criticisms directly.

## II

The evident supposition that a Buddhist author in Dharmakīrti's tradition knowing the works of Śaṅkarasvāmin would not pass over the latter's polemics against Dharmakīrti in total silence helps us in this particular case to determine Śaṅkarasvāmin's date quite precisely. Although in commenting on Śāntarakṣita's verses Kamalaśīla offers a large number of quotations from Śaṅkarasvāmin which from their contents we can take as fragments of his Nyāyabhāṣyaṭikā, he does not quote even once, in the Īśvaraparīkṣā or the Sthirabhāvaparīkṣā or elsewhere, any of the arguments or criticisms we know from Śaṅkarasvāmin's \*Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhidūṣaṇam or \*Īśvarasiddhiḥ.

The material Śāntarakṣita compiles for the Pūrvapakṣa of his Īśvaraparīkṣā is from authors who predate Dharmakīrti<sup>15</sup>. The signature of his refutation is completely Dharmakīrti. And nowhere a hint of Śaṅkarasvāmin's counter-attacks. The same is true of the Sthirabhāvaparīkṣā: as far as the Nyāya is concerned there is only material from the period before Dharmakīrti<sup>16</sup>. In both cases no new, post-Dharmakīrtian sources are referred to. Considering the depth and care of Śāntarakṣita's presentation and the minuteness of Kamalaśīla's comments I think we may safely conclude that both did not refer to these two works of Śaṅkarasvāmin, simply because they did not know of them. That means that Śaṅkarasvāmin must have been a contemporary of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla and that his commentary on the Nyāyabhāṣyam was drawn upon by both as a recent production. As the Tattvasaṅgrahaḥ was written with a good reference-library, i. e. in all probability before Śāntarakṣita left for Tibet in 763<sup>17</sup>, Śaṅkarasvāmin's Nyāyabhāṣyaṭikā must have been written before 760.

The time of Kamalaśīla's finishing his commentary could serve as terminus post quem for Śaṅkarasvāmin's \*Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhidūṣaṇam and \*Īśvarasiddhiḥ. For we know of at least one case where Kamalaśīla

<sup>14</sup> Source of the following fragments: J 234, 1—15; R 46, 27—30; J 298, 19—24; J 236, 1—2 + 298, 25—26; J 298, 26—299, 1; J 239, 3—5 + 234, 16—17 + 299, 1—5; R 35, 10—16; J 278, 3; J 278, 4.

<sup>15</sup> Aviddhakarna, Uddiyotakara, Praśastamati.

<sup>16</sup> Uddiyotakara, Bhāvivikta.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. E. FRAUWALLNER, loc. cit., 143.

refers to an author of topical interest who was not yet known to Śāntarākṣita, i. e. his appendix to the *Svataḥprāmāṇyaparīkṣā* where he refers to Umbeka<sup>18</sup>.

We do not know exactly when Kamalaśīla has finished his work. It is, however, clear that he could not possibly have written it after his departure for Tibet around 790<sup>19</sup>. The great accuracy of his commentary which interprets his teacher's text with consummate precision gives the impression that he worked on it for the most part under supervision of his teacher and only put on the finishing touch—by including some new literature—after his teacher's departure. I, therefore, think that it was written before ca. 765 and Śāṅkarasvāmin's essays would have to have been written after that time. Thus Śāṅkarasvāmin's literary activity can be determined as between 750 and 770 or 790 at the latest, and his life-time as ca. 720/730—780/790.

Only the fact that his \**Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhidūṣaṇam* has been quoted or referred to by Karṇakagomin<sup>20</sup> would speak against such a relatively late date. But R. GNOLI's proposition of the middle of the 7th century for Karṇakagomin's life<sup>21</sup> cannot be maintained. His main argument—that Śākyamati's commentary depends on his—is a perversion of the more reasonable historical probability that the purely philological commentary of Śākyamati was used as the basis for a commentary enlarged with digressions and appendices which are motivated by the better and later understanding of Dharmakīrti's philosophical positions and problems<sup>22</sup>. Moreover Karṇakagomin, too, quotes Umbeka<sup>23</sup>.

In spite of some as yet unanswered questions regarding the dates of important authors of Dharmakīrti's tradition, f. i. Prajñākara-gupta<sup>24</sup>, I think that it is necessary to assume that Dharmakīrti's

<sup>18</sup> TSP 981, 22ff.; cf. L. SCHMITHAUSEN, *Maṇḍanamisra's Vibhramavivekaḥ mit einer Studie zur Entwicklung der indischen Irrtumslehre*. Wien 1965, 216, note 150; K. KUNJUNNI RAJA, Preface in: *Śloka-vārtikavyākhyā Tātparyatīkā*. Madras 1971, VIII ff.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. E. FRAUWALLNER, loc. cit., 143f.

<sup>20</sup> PVSVT 515, 8—14 and 79, 27—80, 2 (which is a free report of the first part of a fragment found in J 66, 22ff.).

<sup>21</sup> R. GNOLI, *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti, the First Chapter with the Autocommentary*. Roma 1960, Introduction, XXII; followed by E. FRAUWALLNER, loc. cit., 145f.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. my remarks in HB II, 87, where I suggested ca. 750—810 for Karṇakagomin, thus a contemporary of Dharmottara.

<sup>23</sup> PVSVT 21, 2—13; 497, 19—25; K. KUNJUNNI RAJA, loc. cit., X f.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. MAHENDRAKUMAR JAIN, *Siddhivinīścayaṭīkā I*. Benares 1959. Introduction, 43f.; R. GNOLI, loc. cit., XXII.

philosophical work took considerable time to establish itself and be commented upon in its philosophical dimensions. For his immediate followers it seems sure that they were not capable of producing more than philological commentaries<sup>25</sup>. His own tradition seems to have worked its way through to a philosophical interpretation of his thought only slowly. And the results of this effort did not begin to be fully effective until the second half of the 8th century. Under these circumstances it would not be astonishing to see that the answer to Dharmakīrti from the leading opposition, the Nyāya-school, has come rather late, too<sup>26</sup>.

#### Abbreviations:

- J Jñānaśrimitranibandhāvali, Buddhist Philosophical Works of Jñānaśrimitra. Ed. A. THAKUR. Patna 1959.
- TSP Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā: Tattvasaṅgrahaḥ I, II. Ed. DVĀRIKĀDĀSAŚĀSTRĪ. Vārāṇasī 1968.
- NSū Nyāyasūtram
- PVV Pramāṇavārttikavṛttiḥ: Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika with a commentary by Manorathanandin. Ed. R. SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA. Patna 1938—1940.
- PVSVT Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛttiḥ: Ācārya-Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttikam (Svārthānumānaparicchedaḥ) svopajñāvṛtṭyā Kārṇakagomi-viracitayā taṭṭikayā ca sahitam. Ed. R. SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA. Allahabad 1943.
- R Ratnakīrti-Nibandhāvali, Buddhist Nyāya Works of Ratnakīrti. Ed. A. THAKUR. Patna 1957.
- HB II Dharmakīrti's Hetubinduḥ, Teil II: Übersetzung und Anmerkungen. Von E. STEINKELLNER. Wien 1967.
- HBTĀ Hetubinduṭīkālokaḥ: Hetubinduṭīkā of Bhaṭṭa Arcata with the Sub-Commentary entitled Āloka of Durveka Miśra. Ed. S. SANGHAVI, Muni JINAVIJAYAJI. Baroda 1949.

<sup>25</sup> E. FRAUWALLNER, Die Reihenfolge und Entstehung der Werke Dharmakīrti's. Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller, Leipzig 1954, 153f.

<sup>26</sup> The same would be the case with the Jaina epistemological school since the date of Akalaṅka (ca. 720—780) seems to be settled (cf. MAHENDRAKUMAR JAIN, loc. cit., 21—31; NAGIN J. SHAH, Akalaṅka's Criticism of Dharmakīrti's Philosophy. Ahmedabad 1967). The many references Akalaṅka's commentators find in his texts to commentators of Dharmakīrti, f. i. Prajñākaragupta, Dharmottara etc., have already been questioned by Pt. KAILAŚACANDRA (MAHENDRAKUMAR JAIN, loc. cit., 47 and Hindi Introduction 36). They definitely are in need of further consideration and seem highly doubtful.