THE VĀDAVIDHI AND THE VĀDAVIDHĀNA
OF VASUBANDHU

BY H. R. R. IVENGAH

(Oriental Research Institute, Mysore)

UDYOTAKARA mentions in his Vārtika titles of three works without the author's name: a "Vādavidhi," while examining the definitions of Pratijñā,¹ a "Vādaavidhāna" in connection with the refutation of the definition of Vāda,² and a "Vādaavidhānatīkā," while discussing the definitions of Pakṣa.³ Dr. Satischandra Vidyābhūshana assumed "Vādaavidhāna" to be a different title of "Vādavidhi" and ascribed it to Dharmakīrti, taking it to be identical with the "Vādanyāya." He, further, assumed "Vādaavidhānatīkā" to be identical with the "Vādanyāyatika" of Vinītadēva⁴. In my article "Vādavidhi," contributed to JBORS⁵, I contradicted his view and set forth evidences to support my view that "Vādavidhi" was a work of Ācārya Vasubandhu, quite different from the "Vādanyāya" of Dharmakīrti. Prof. H. Jacobi, to whom I had sent an offprint of my article, wrote to me that he "perfectly agreed with me that Udyotakara was much earlier than Dharmakīrti."

¹ NV. p. 117, on NSI. i. 33.
² NV. p. 154-55 on NSI. ii. 1.
³ NV. p. 117 on NSI. i. 33.
⁴ HIL. p. 320; JRAS 1914. p. 601-606. Introduction to the Bilingual
Index to the Nyāyabindu, pp. ix-x.
But Dr. Keith, who also read my article, wrote to me as follows: "I have now had time to investigate the question and there are certain difficulties in your view which have occurred to me, though, in itself, it is attractive. I think that it is satisfactory that the matter should be re-examined, though I have been unable to arrive at decisive results." He wrote an article, under the caption, "Vasubandhu and the Vādavidhi" to IHQ. Therein he examined the question in detail and arrived at the conclusion that "evidences were inadequate to overthrow the view of Vidyābhūshana, though, unquestionably on chronological grounds, there is reason to doubt the use by Udyotakara of Vinītadēva. But, if the matter has to be established in any other sense new evidence must be adduced."

Prof. G. Tucci contributed an article under the title, "Vādavidhi," to IHQ and defended my view by adducing further evidences from the Chinese sources. I, too, wrote an article, "Vasubandhu and the Vādavidhi," as a rejoinder to Dr. Keith and explained why "Vādavidhi" should be regarded as a work of Vasubandhu, and "Vādavidhānatīkā" could not be considered as identical with "Vādanyāyatīkā" of Vinītadēva. This conclusion has, no doubt, been drawn on the strength of the evidences available from the Tibetan sources, particularly the statements of Diḥnāga. It is quite strange that Udyotakara, who has cited several fragments of the "Vādavidhi" should refer to the work only once. It is still more so that Vācaspati, in his tīkā, should ascribe only the definition of Pratyakṣa to Vasubandhu and remark in the case of other fragments either 'Pareśām laksṇam' or 'laksapātaram', without referring either to the text or its author. He does not, further, make any comment either on the definition of Pratijñā ascribed by

---

1 Vasubandhu and the Vādavidhi—IHQ Vol. IV. 221.
2 Ibid., V. 81-86.
3 Ibid. p. 82.
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Udyotakara to “Vādavidhi,” on the “Vādaviddhāna,” or on the “Vādaviddhānatīkā” mentioned by Udyotakara. Thus the evidences from the Sanskrit sources are apparently not sufficient to ascribe “Vādavidhi” to Vasubandhu.

But, fortunately, new works, Buddhist and Jainī, which have been discovered and published, throw considerable light on the problem. They contain statements which prove beyond doubt Vasubandhu’s authorship of the Vādavidhi and suggest the possibility of regarding “Vādaviddhāna” as a different work by Vasubandhu. This article is written to bring together these statements and explain how they help to solve the problem.

Udyotakara examines the definition of Pratijñā of the “Vādavidhi” and rejects it as being defective. His comments run as follows:—यदापि वादविधी साध्याभिधानं प्रतिज्ञाथवक्ष्य भुक्तम्। तत्तद्यथादेशाच्च युक्तम्। कथमिति। यदि तावत् पूर्वप्रक्ष्यमपेक्ष्य-माणेदेनरुपं साध्याभिधानं प्रतिज्ञाति तदा साध्यग्रहणानवैक्यम्। प्रकृतः पक्षः तत्प्रमेयसम्बन्धत इति तदभिधानं प्रतिज्ञाति वक्तृत्यम्। अथ पक्षानुपेक्षा स्वतन्त्रेतत्त्ववचनं तथापि यो नेत्रायिकप्रतिज्ञायां दोष उक्तः। स इह प्रकृतः। (No doubt, Pratijñā is defined in the “Vādavidhi” as “mention of the ‘Sādhya.’” But it is open to objection in whatever way it is interpreted. How? If this is said in reference to Pakṣa which has been previously spoken of, then the word, ‘Sādhya’ becomes superfluous, as the ‘pakṣa’ could be referred to simply by the word ‘tat.’ The definition would then be तदभिधानं प्रतिज्ञा। If, on the other hand, the definition has no reference to the ‘pakṣa,’ then all the defects pointed out by you in the Nyāya definition could equally be attributed to your definition).

It is interesting to compare this with what Dīnāga has said in respect to the same definition. In the beginning of
the third chapter of the "Pramāṇasamuccaya," Diinnāga first criticises the definition 'pratijñā' of the Nyāya Sūtra, as being defective, since by Sādhya, only Siddha is excluded, the statements of Heteu and Drṣṭānta which are not siddha will have to be regarded as pratijñā. In the next Kārikā he attributes the same defect to the definition sādhya-bhūmam as ēva sādhya-bhūmapi. His comment,

1 PS III 3:—bsgrub bya bstān pa zhes bya ḡdir grub pa med la don byas ḏid de ltar na yāṅ dpe daṅ rtags ma grub byod pa thal bar ḡyur.

saṭṭha-bhūma ṇa ḡcā ḡghari ḡsa’ ।

PSV—Rigs pa can rnaurs nare l bsgrub bya bstān pa zhes bya ba yiu no l bsgrub bya smros pal ni grub pa log pa tsan bstān pāḥi phyir bsgrub byāi bye brag fiid ni ma yur par gnas so l dper na sgra rtag stel reg par bya ba ma yur pahi phyir blo bzhin no zhes bya ba dan l de bzhin du miggi grhuṅ bya yin pahi phyir mi rtag zhes bya ba ḡdi yāṅ bsgrub bya bstān pāhi phyir dan bcaḥ bar thal bar ḡyur ro l

N. B:—These sentences are repeated by Udyotakara on p. 110.

Cf: PVT (’tṛ̥māṇaḥavartikaṭā) p. 469—

nun sāṭṭha-bhūma: pratijñāti pāśkaśaṃ naiyavākṣanaṃ । tātra kiṃ dōṭ: ? l

also cf. PSV on III-4 and PVT p. 473.

2 PS. III 5: de bzhin bsgrub byed brjod pa hlaṅ phyogs na lhag phyir nir srid do l rnaur par dpyod pahi hdod pa ḡdi mi hdod pa las log pa tsam l

āsiddhvānadhariṇaṃ pāśkaśaṃ ।

ēva sāṭṭha-bhūmaṇeṇaṃ pāśkaśaṃkaraṇeṇ mahā ।

vibhāṣyāṇamihdṛsasamhitam niḥśriṃ ।

de bzhin du rig s pa can rnam la skyon brjod pa de bzhin du rtos s pa bsgrub pa la yāṅ l rtags bsgrub par bya ba daṅ l dpe ltar snaṅ ba brjed par yāṅ dam bcaḥ par thal bar ḡyur ro l

rtos s pa sgrub par ni bsgrub par brjod pa tsam dam bcaḥ bar ḡyur pa ma yin gyi l hona kyaṅ phyogs kyi chos bsgrub byaho l phyogs de ci cig rnam par dpyed pahi hdod pahi don te l de phyogs yio pas bsgrub bya sman de rtogs ma grub pa la sogs par brjod pa yāṅ dam bcaḥ par ḡyur ro zhes pahi skyon no med do zhe na l skyon ji ltar na med de l de la yāṅ l de ni mi hdod pa ldoṅ pa la l don byas pa yin na l ji ltar bsgrub byāi skyād par go bar byed i glāṅ tshig
in his Vritti, which is in Tibetan, may be rendered into, ‘नैयायिकेषु यथा दोष उक्तः एवं वादविचारम्। हेतुद्धात्मात्मासाधारणम् प्रतिष्ठा प्रस्तुते।’ Then the defect attributed to the Nyāya definition is equally attributable to the definition of the “Vādavidhi.” It cannot be avoided, says he, by assuming the definition to be पक्षप्रमाणात्मासाधारणम्, for पक्ष is defined in the Vādavidhi, as विचारणायमित्रोपथः; or the thing that is desired in an enquiry, and the word, इत्य षु which denotes only one thing, cannot both exclude the अनिष्ट and indicate the साध्यविशेष. Evidently then, both Diṅnāga and Udyotakara¹ are citing the definition from the same work Vādavidhi. But, while Diṅnāga ascribes the work to Vasubandhu, Udyotakara and Vācaspati remain silent.

The definition of Pratyakṣa, ‘तत्तत्त्वाध्यादित्त्रान्त प्रयत्नम्’, is a citation from the “Vādavidhi” according to Diṅnāga². Udyotakara quotes and criticises this in his Vārtika,³ as ‘अपरे पुनर्ज्ञायति तत्तत्त्वाध्यादित्त्रान्त प्रयत्नमिति। तत्।’ He does not state, from what work it is cited as he has done in respect to the definition of Pratijñā. But Vācaspati in his tīkā⁴ ascribes
daṅ glaṅ tshigs ma yin par rnam par dpyad par hdod par fiḍ ni mig gis gzhun bya fiḍ bsgrub par bya ba la yān brjod par nus pa yin no.

यथा नैयायिकेषु व्रेत उक्त: एवं वादविचारम्। हेतुसाध्यव्रेत्तमात्मासाधारणम् प्रतिष्ठात्सप्रयत्नः। वादविचारेन केवल साध्यविशेष्यां प्रतिष्ठा। अष्टे पक्षप्रमाणात्मासाधारणस्य: कः पक्षः? बिचारणायमित्रोपथः। तत्र पक्षः साध्य एव। तेन हेतुद्धात्मान्त्योथिकविशेष्यापि प्रयत्नः। इति दोषत्वं नास्तीति चेतु। कव्य साध्यविषेषस्य गमकः? हेतुहेतुविचारणायमित्रोपथः। बहुः सत्त्वम्।

¹ NV. p. 106. ² पक्षः बिचारणायमित्रोपथः। इति चाविचारीयते। अविचारणीयशः। पक्षप्रमाणात्मात्तित्तितिशम्।

² NV. p. 115. एवं बिचारणायमित्रोपथः। पक्षः इत्यात्मापि। हेतुद्धात्मान्त्यमन्तः।

³ PSVI. 15—rtsod pa bsgrub par ni don de las skyes ryan pa s’es pa māon sum yin zhes lya ba.

⁴ NV. p. 40. ⁵ NV. p. 99.
it to Vasubandhu "तदैव प्रत्यक्षक्षणं समथ्यव वासुबन्धवं तावत प्रत्यक्ष- 
क्षणं विकल्पयित्वमुपपत्त्यस्यस्यति-अपरे पुनर्गतिः। क्षणं भ्राच्छे-ततोद्वयिति।"

The Jaina writer Mallavādin, author of the Nayacakraṇa, too, regards it as the definition of Vasubandhu. "यदिदानां वशु- 
बन्धोः स्वपुरोस्ततोऽध्विनिन्त्रां प्रत्यक्षसमासां नात्यमयस्यस्य- 
मतविषय्यं गत: परमायमलयितीतं तत्त्वपरिशास्तिः..." It may, thus, be concluded, by 
putting together the evidences from the Tibetan and the Sanskrit sources, that Vādavidhi is a work of Vasubandhu.

This conclusion is further confirmed by Arcata and 
Durvekamisra in their statements in respect to the definition 
of Inference. In his Vārtika, Udyotakara cites and criticises 
the definition, "नान्तरिक्षायद्विविधानं तत्त्वमोक्षात।" Vācaspati 
prefaces it by "स्वतः क्षणं समायय परेषानुमानात्वक्षणं दृष्यतुपपत्त्य- 
स्यस्य।" It means that, having established his definition, 
Udyotakara proceeds to refute the definition of others that 
anumāna is the experience of a thing which is inseparably 
connected with another for one who knows the said 
concomitance. His later statements in this context, "न हि 
किष्किय्यद्विविधतृ स्वतः यज्ञान्तरिक्षायं स्यस्यस्य | तदनेन द्विविद्विन्दुक्षणं 
दृष्यतुमलो अन्येऽथ क्षणं दृष्यवपम। सप्रति द्विविद्विन्दुक्षणात्व 
प्रवृत्तार्थ वाच्यं, "अनुमेयेथ तत्त्वले॥" इत्यायपपत्त्यस्य दृष्यति।"
attribute the definition to Diinnāga. But it is clear from the 
"Pramaṇasamuccaya" and its Vṛtti that it is a citation from 
the Vādavidhi. The phrase, 'अनुमेयेथ तत्त्वले,' to which he 
refers and which has been quoted in full by Udyotakara as

1 NCA p. 50. 2 NV. p. 54. 3 NVT. p. 126. 4 NVT. p. 126-27.
5 PSV. II. 27. rstd pa sgrub pa nas ni med na mi hbyun bahi don 
mtho ni da de rig pa rjes su dpag paho zhes brjod do.
6 NV. p. 55. The definition of hetu, "तांगविनामाविशिष्टं देवतम्," 
which is cited and criticised by Udyotakara immediately after it is also a frag-
ment of the Vādavidhi. Cf. PSV. III. 36. ve zhih rised pa sgrub par ni de ita 
bahi med na mi hbyun bahi chos fie bar bstân pa ni glan tshigs so zhes bya ba |
'अनुमेयितः ततुल्ये सदृश्यो नासिलेता सति' is a half Couplet in the Pramāṇasamuccaya meant to explain the nature of the 'विद्या' of the 'लिङ्ग' or 'हेतु' involved in Diṇḍāga's definition of the Inference for one's self as 'निरूपार्थिवतंत्रस्तत्तार्थं' stated by him in the first Kārikā of the second chapter of his work. It is, therefore, by confusion that Vācaspati has attributed this definition to Diṇḍāga.

Arcata, in his "Hētubindutikā," as commentary on the "Hētubindu" of Dharmakīrti, cites this definition of स्वार्थपुनान. It is unnecessary, he argues, to know the use of Pakṣa etc. to draw an inference. It is enough, if one knows the nature of the reason (गमध्रूप). He cites in support of his contention the view of an Ācārya: "पक्षस्थानितस्यादितपरिज्ञानेनैव न किब्बित प्रणयः। भव एव आचार्यपादे: नान्तरकाथायं दशीनं तद्विदेशनामान्यिते गमध्रूपमान्येव पक्षादितपरिज्ञानेन प्रतिपादितम । स्वप्राप्ताराध्यतु तथापि कैविर्द्वस्तं एव दोषाः: प्रक्रीत्यन्तं इति किमत्र भूम:।" In commenting on this passage Durvēkamisra in his "Āloka" on the "Hētubindutikā" attributes this view to Ācārya Vasubandhu: (आचार्यपादेरित्याचार्यसंवदन्युवमिश्रनयाय उक्तम्) and states that it has been expounded by him in his "Vādavidhi:" "गमध्रूपमात्रस्य स्वरूपं द्वार्थयथ वादविधिसंकल्पे प्रकरणे." He further feels sorry that great thinkers, like Udyotakara, revel in finding

1PS. and PSV. II. 5: rjes dpag bya dañ de mtsuñs la yod dañ med la med la med pūñ sā pāo।
अनुमेयितः ततुल्ये सदृश्यो नासिलेता सति।
PSV.—tshal gsum pāñi rtags zhes gañ byod pa de brjod par bya ste।
श्रवन्तः लक्षितस्य युः कः न्द्रायम्।
3PS. II. 1. rjes su dpag ryang gñes rañ doññi tshul gsum rtags las don mtsuñ pāo।
अनुमानान्द्रिता स्वार्थं निरूपार्थिवतंत्रस्तत्तार्थं।
4HBT. p. 69 [Hētubindutikā with the Aloka of Durvēkamsra—Published by the Oriental Institute, Baroda.]
5HBT. p. 317-19।
defects due to their own ignorance, in a definition which is free from defects and quotes verbatim the entire Vārtika of Udyotakara on this fragment of the “Vādavidhi.” No further proof is needed then to regard “Vādavidhi” as a work of Vasubandhu.

The correct title of the work, from which Diṅnāga and Udyotakara quote, is “Vādavidhi.” It has been so stated by Durvekamisra in his “Āloka.” Manorathamandin, author of the “Pramaṇavārtikatikā,” too, regards “Vādavidhi” as a ‘Prakaraṇa.’ The Tibetan title of the work “rtsod bsgrub pa” in the Pramāṇasamuccaya, should therefore be rendered into “Vādavidhi.” It can no longer be identified either with the “Vādavidhāna” or with the “Vādanyāya.” If it were identical with the former is it not strange that Udyotakara should refer to the same work under different titles? The “Vādanyāya” of Dharmakīrti with which it has been identified by Vidyābhūṣana has been published. It is concerned with the exposition of Nigrahasthānas and does not contain any of the definitions cited by Udyotakara. The definition of Pratijñā

1 HBTp. p. 317.
2 PVT. p. 207. चाद्विविषयरचनां निधियानवायम्य प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरे विचार्यात्मा मानव्य विशुद्ध्यन इशावासेचे कीर्तेयः प्रस्तावः प्रेषन्त्य सदृशुरिविन्यः सुभवैः।
3 Vādanyāya with the Vipaścitārtha of Sāntarakṣita—Ed. Rahula Sankṛtyāyana 1936.
from which he deduced its identity with the "Vāda-vīdhi" is rendered into Tibetan as 'dam bcah ba yaṅ bsgrub bya bstan paiphyir.' It corresponds to 'pratijñā ca sādhyānirdēsāt' and is quite different from the definition, 'Sādhyābhidhānam pratijñā,' which is rendered into Tibetan as 'bsgrub bya bvjod pa ni dam bcah.' The former definition is of the Nyāyasūtra. It has been distinguished from the definition of the "Vāda-vīdhi" by using in the Tibetan rendering, 'bstanpa,' and 'bjud pa.' How can the "Vādanyāya," then, be identified with the "Vāda-vīdhi" cited by Udyotakara?

The "Vāda-vīdhi" to which Udyotakara refers and which he regards as a 'śāstra,' should, therefore, be regarded as a different work. It is not improbable that the definition of 'Vāda' cited by Udyotakara¹ and ascribed by Vācaspati to Vasubandhu² is a fragment of the "Vāda-vīdhi." According to Chinese sources³, we know that Vasubandhu wrote three works, "Lun Shih" or Vāda-vīdhi, "Lun sin" or "Vāda-hṛdaya" and "Lun Kuei" or "Vāda-viṣṇudhana" and the writers Shen Tai and Kueichi have ascribed the "Vāda-vīdhi" and the "Vāda-vīdha" to Vasubandhu. This ascription to Vasubandhu has further been corroborated by the following statement of Sāntarakṣita at the end of his tīkā on the "Vādanyāya"⁴ of Dharmakīrti: नन्दू चार्य वादन्यायायामः सक्तवत्किविन्धनबन्धने वादविधानादातायंवसुचन्त्रे महाराजपूर्वकृतः। कः पुरसो अतििशासिको यो महानागः: क्षणं पन्थां रोहुमीहते इत्याद। दुवैद्वधः। सन्यक् बिवेकचित्तव्य जनोयं उत्तप्तप्रतिचन्द्रः। विविद्वप्राप्तः। The Vāda-vīdhi must then, be another work of Vasubandhu.

¹ NV. p. 150.
² NVT. p. 218. तदवें स्वाभिमल वादक्षण्य स्वाॅद्याय वासुवनष्वं लक्ष्यं दूष-धितुलस्वफ्त्यद्वितः।
³ See "Vāda-vīdhi" by Tucci IHQ. IV. 630-636.
⁴ Vādanyāyatikā, p. 142.
Very little is known about the “Vādavidhānatīkā.” It can be inferred from its title that it is the commentary of the ‘mūla’ or the original text, “Vādavidhāna.” Udyotakara makes a casual reference to it when he refutes the definitions of Pakṣa¹ according to Diṇṇāga and Vasubandhu. The definition of Pakṣa is not essential to Diṇṇāga, since according to him, the statement of Pakṣa *i.e.*, ‘pratijñā’ does not form an integral part of his syllogism. Yet, following others, he defines it in his “Nyāyamukha” and “Pramāṇasamuccaya.” It is defined in the “Nyāyamukha”² as “साध्यात्मनेविन्ध्यितः पक्षः विक्षर्यानिराकृतः” to which Udyotakara refers and which is considered as a definition of Bhadanta or Diṇṇāga by Vācaspati. In the “Pramāṇasamuccaya”³ it is defined as “साध्यात्मनेव स्वयमित्रः प्रक्षेपातुनानागामार्थानिराकृतः.” Vasubandhu, too, seems to have defined it in one of his works, as “विचारणामार्थेश्च” and in another as “पक्षो योः साध्ययत्तिमित्रः.” The main contention is whether the qualifying word “स्वयम्” should form an integral part of the definition. We know from Diṇṇāga that the former definition of Vasubandhu belongs to the “Vādavidhi.” The latter definition is ascribed to Vasubandhu

¹NV. p. 117.
²NV. p. 116. Cf. PVT. p. 443. क्षणसंस्करे साध्यतनेव ईन्धितः पक्षः विक्षर्यानिराकृतः इति पक्षस्य प्रकृतः।
³Cf. NP (Nyāyapravesa). तत्र पक्षः प्रतिस्वर्ण वर्णी प्रस्वर्णविवेचनविविधत्वः स्वयम् साध्यतनेविन्धितः। प्रक्षेपानिराकृतः इति वाक्यक्षेपः।
⁴PS.—ran gi ňo bo kho ha bstăn bdod raň gi chos lan la mňon sum don daň rjesdpag daň yid ches grays pas ma bsal pah l.
⁵स्वयमित्रः स्वयमित्रः समाधिः। प्रक्षेपानिराकृतः इति साध्यतनेविन्धितः।
⁶Cf. PVT.—p. 424.
by Vācaspati\textsuperscript{1}. It may, in all probability, be a fragment of the "Vādavidhāna." It is appropriate, therefore, that this definition should be discussed in its tīkā.

Thus a re-examination of the whole problem, in the light of the new evidences from Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese sources, has resulted in suggesting the "Vādavidhi" and the "Vādavidhāna" as two different works of Vasubandhu and the "Vādavidhānatīkā" as a commentary of the "Vādavidhāna."

\textsuperscript{1}NVT. p. 186. तथा पक्षो यः साधविजुमित्त इत्यत्रापि वसुबंधुलस्यो विद्वानार्थनिराकृतमेव कर्तव्यम्। एतद्विषं भवति। न केवलमहाकां एतद्विद्वानार्थनिराकृतमेव मनवयं प्रतिभाति। समानार्थानामस्य तथा विभातिः प्रतस्तैन्यपात्मिथि। अतएव बफुव्यं पक्षो यः साधविजुमित्त इति।