THE VAIŚEŠIKA VÄKYA AND BHÄŚYA¹
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1. A long period of time separates Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasāṅgraha from the oldest kernel of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra whose system of thought it aims to explain. Vaiśeṣika works were composed in the intervening period, but they have not survived, with the possible exception of Candramati's *Daśapadārthaśāstra*, which survives only in Chinese translation.

Mallavādin's Dvādasāra Nayacakra, a Jaina work, refers on two occasions to a Vaiśeṣika vākyā and bhāṣya, that were apparently known to Praśastapāda. The first and most important passage that contains information about these two reads, in the admirable reconstruction of Muni Jambuvijaya:

DNC p. 508-09 and 512-13:

yat api coktam:

K 1 "vikalpatrayāṇāśrayād vikalpāntarāśrayaṇāc ca 'vikalpānupapa
tteḥ" iti na doṣaḥ,

vk 1 niṣṭhāsambhandhayaḥ ekakālātvaḥ / niṣṭhā kāraṇaśaṃgavyāpāraśakalaḥ prāgasato vastubhāvaḥ niṣṭhā-
naṁ samāptiḥ ... / sambhandhāḥ svakāraṇaśattāsamaṃvāyaḥ / tayor ekakālātvam, svakāraṇaśattāsambandha eva niṣṭhākālaḥ, kutaḥ?
samavāyaśaṅkavat, yasminn eva kāle pariniṣṭhāṁ gacchat kāryam kāraṇaḥ sambadhyate, samavāyasambandhena ayutasiddhihetuṇā
trasminn eva kāle sattādibhir api, tasmād apravibhāgat prāk kāryot-
pattar asataḥ sadādīr anāspado vikalpaḥ / ’’ etad api na ...

... ...

asatsambhandhaparihārīrthaṁ ca niṣṭhāsambhandhayaḥ ekakālātxtvāt
ity etad eva vākyam sabhāśyaṁ praśasto 'nyathā vyācaṣe :

T 1 "sambandhaḥ ca sambandhaḥ ca sambandhau, niṣṭhāyāḥ samban-
dhuḥ niṣṭhāsambandhau, tayor ekakālātvāt / niṣṭhātam niṣṭhā, kāra-

¹ I would like to thank A. Wezler and J. Houben, who read an earlier version of this article and made valuable suggestions.
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"The phrase niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt is here called 'vākya'. This vākya is twice explained, in the first and in the second half of the above passage respectively. The second explanation (T 1) is, Mallavādin tells us, a reinterpretation of the vākya and its bhāṣya by Praśasta: The first explanation (K 1) must therefore be its bhāṣya. And indeed, T 1 quotes the words pariniṣṭhām gacchad from the first explanation, and states that it belongs to the bhāṣya.

There is no reason to doubt that Praśasta—or Praśastamati, as Mallavādin and his commentator Simhasūri call him elsewhere (see below)—is the same person as Praśastapāda, the author of the Padārthadharmasāṅgraha. All of these names, and various others, have been used by different authors to refer to the author of the Padārthadharmasāṅgraha. This Praśasta, it is plausible to conclude from the above passage (and the following passage to be considered confirms this), commented both upon the vākya and upon the bhāṣya, which we will jointly refer to as 'Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya'. As Mallavādin points out, Praśasta felt free, where necessary, to interpret this 'Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya' the way he considered correct. The quotation from his commentary (T 1) makes also clear that he would none-the-less try to show that his interpretation agreed with the bhāṣya.

Passage K 1 throws some light on the nature of the bhāṣya. It apparently contained and commented upon individual vākyas. A vākya is here—judging by the one vākya we now know—a short nominal sentence, which is explained in the Bhāṣya in normal Sanskrit. This is in no way surprising. Several works of a similar nature—written in the so-called 'Vārttika-style'—are known from the period round the middle of the first millennium C. E., and the term 'vākya' used to refer to the sūtra-like phrases in them is quite

---

2 The sentence preceding the vākya may be no more than Mallavādin's restatement of what precedes in the Bhāṣya, and may not be a literal quotation.

3 See Chempurath, 1970.
common. The example of these works appears to have been the (Vyākaraṇa–) Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. We shall return to this subject below.

The second passage in the Dvādaśāra Nayacakṣa that mentions the vākya and the bhaṣya reads (p. 516–17):

vastūtpattikāle eva iti vākyakārabhiprayo 'nusrto bhaṣyakāraiḥ / siddhāsyavastunāḥ svakāraṇaīḥ svasattayā ca sambandha iti prāṣastamato 'bhiprāyaiḥ /

This passage does not appear to quote either a vākya or from the bhaṣya. It rather sums up the positions expressed in K 1 and T 1. The passage suggests at first sight that in Mallavādin’s opinion vākya and bhaṣya had different authors. (The plural ending of bhaṣyakāraiḥ may express respect, and does not necessarily entail that there was more than one bhaṣyakāra.) Both these authors held that connection with the universal ‘existence’ (sattāsam-bandha) occurs simultaneously with the origination of the thing. This view is contrasted with the one of Praśastamati, who thought that both ‘connection with existence’ and ‘connection with the own causes’ take place when the thing is already there.4 But is Mallavādin correct in thinking that there were two authors? Or perhaps: do we understand him correctly?

It would be surprising if there actually were two (or more) authors of the Vākya–cum–Bhaṣya. As stated above, several works are known that date from around the middle of the first millennium C. E. and that consist of vākyas and their explanations. All known examples, however, have one single author. Indeed, works that display this so-called ‘Vārttikā-style’ appear to owe their inspiration to the (Vyākaraṇa–) Mahābhāṣya, about the authorship of which very different ideas reigned from today.5

The evidence from Bhartṛhari’s commentary on the Mahābhāṣya shows that we do not of necessity have to interpret Mallavādin’s statement to mean that he believed in two or more authors of the Vākya–cum–Bhaṣya. Bhartṛhari, too, speaks about a Vākyakāra and a Bhaṣyakāra, be it that he does so while referring to the Mahābhāṣya. Yet he appears to have thought that the vākyas of the Mahābhāṣya (i.e., its ‘vārttikas’) were written by the very person who also explained them in the Bhaṣya.6

---

4 See also Halbfass, 1986: 281 f.
5 See Bronkhorst, 1990; also Lang, 1988.
6 This is argued at length in Bronkhorst, 1990. The main evidence can be summarized as follows: (i) Bhartṛhari regularly uses the word ‘vārttika’ to refer to bhaṣya-passages, the Yuktīdīpikā does so on one occasion; (ii) 1-ching gives evidence that no distinction was made between vārttikas and the Mahābhāṣya (this had already been pointed out by J. Brough).
It is further important to realize that the terms vākya and bhāṣya are not necessarily titles of works, especially not in a work that drew its inspiration from the Mahābhāṣya. Bhartrhari’s Vākyapadiya (ed. Rau, I. 23) speaks, for example, of bhāṣyas, in the plural, and there can be no doubt that portions of the Mahābhāṣya are meant. Bhartrhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dipikā, moreover, speaks twice of ‘this bhāṣya’, meaning ‘this portion of the Mahābhāṣya’ (Ms 9d7, AL 29. 11, Sw 35. 3, CE I. 24. 15–16; Ms 97a8, AL 278. 19) and once of ‘this whole bhāṣya’ (sarvam idam bhāṣyam; Ms 44d2, AL 135. 22–23, Sw 158. 5, CE IV. 22. 7) in the same sense. It is conceivable that Mallavadin, too, when mentioning a vākya and a bhāṣya, meant portions of a work that, as a whole, carried a different name.

Simhasūri mentions two, or perhaps three, Vaiśeṣika works: the Kaṭandī, Praśastamati’s Tikā, and a Tikā without further specification; sometimes Praśastamati is simply referred to as ‘Tikākara’ (p. 516, 517). The Vākya–cum–Bhāṣya, or any other Vaiśeṣika Bhāṣya, is never mentioned by Simhasūri, except in the context of the two passages discussed above, where he follows Mallavadin and where the discussion concerns the differences or agreements between a vākya and its bhāṣya. Is it possible that the Kaṭandī is the same work as the one we call Vākya–cum–Bhāṣya? Several indications support this supposition.

On p. 458 we learn about an opinion that has been rejected (pūrvapakṣa) in the Kaṭandī and in the Tikā (kaṭandyāṁ tikāyāṁ ca). The juxtaposition of these two names creates the impression that the Tikā is a commentary on the Kaṭandī. If here too the Tikā is Praśastapāda’s Tikā – and there is no reason to believe otherwise – the Kaṭandī can hardly be anything but our Vākya–cum–Bhāṣya.

This conclusion is confirmed by the following. The opinion which, according to Simhasūri, figured as pūrvapakṣa in the Kaṭandī and its Tikā, and which is accepted by Mallavadin, is summarized by the latter in the following words (p. 459): tasmād vikalpānapapatte na satāśambandho ‘bhidhānapratyayahetūḥ. It is precisely this pūrvapakṣa that is answered in K 1, the only passage that is explicitly attributed to the Vākya–cum–Bhāṣya by Mallavadin and Simhasūri. The introductory sentence of K 1, it will be recalled, reads: vikalpatrayāṁśrāyaṇāṁ ca ‘vikalpānapapatteḥ iti na doṣaḥ.

Simhasūri ascribes another passage to the Kaṭandī on p. 499. Since this passage rejects the second alternative introduced in a quoted passage on p. 490–491 and thus fills a lacuna left open in the earlier passage, it seems reasonable to assume that both belong together and formed part of the Kaṭandī. Together they read:
K 2

DNC p. 490–491:

yad. uc yate saiddhārthīyaḥ 'upādānaniyamadaraśānāt sat kāryam
tilatailavat tatkriyādyaśattvadaraśānād asat, drṣṭam tāvat [ paṭārthi-
tīyāṁ tāntūnām evopādānām na tu pāṃsvādīnām, evam paṭārthāś
cā kuvaṃdaśya vyāpāro drṣṭāḥ, ]' itarathā tantupāṃsvādiśv avīśeṣaḥ
prāg api vyāpārabhāvaś ca syāt, drṣṭā tu kriyā [ paṭārthāḥ kuvind-
sya tāntūnām eva copādānam; tasmād upādānaniyamadartavyā-
pārabhāyaḥ sadasat kāryam, ] ubhayaikānte doṣadarśānāt sad evāsas
eva vēti cāyuṭka ekāntaḥ, sadasadātmakavāt kāryasya upādāna-
niyamaḥ kriyā ca yujyate ' iti, tān

vk 2 na, vikalpaśuṇo patteḥ / [ kīm yenaivātmanā sat tenniva asat, 'ahosvit
āpekṣikam sadasattvam anyenātmanā mrđādinā prāk sad ghaṭaṇī
cāśayo ] ghaṭānmanā cāsat? na tāvad [ yenaivātmanā sat tenniva-
tmanā asat, sadasato vaidharmyāt / yad uktaṃ sadasato vaidharma-
myāt kārye sadasattā na ( VS 9.12 ), sattvapratipakṣo 'sattvam
] asattvapratipakṣaḥ ca sattvam / sat sopākhyam asan nirupākhyam,
[ tayor vaidharmyāt ekasmin kārye ] sadasattvam ' na bhavālī
tathāḥ /

DNC p. 499:

āpekṣikam sadasattvam, prāg utpatteḥ mṛḍātmanā sat kāryam
ghaṭāṇamanā cāsat, niśpanne 'pi ghaṭe mṛttvadaraśānād mṛḍupāda-
nopattāḥ, ghaṭāṇama cāsattvād ghaṭārthakriyopattīr ity evam
cīta śṛṇataaḥ āḥa / atrottaraṃ

vk 3 na, asatkārayatvasiddheḥ / 8evam tariḥ mṛḍātmanāḥ kartavyatvā-
bhāvād ghaṭātmanāḥ kartavyatvād asad eva kāryam / tasmān na
prāg utpatteḥ sadasat kāryam /

The second half of this quotation is found again on p. 503.

The Vārttika-style which characterizes also this passage confirms us in
our idea that the Kaṭandī is indeed identical with the ' Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya '.
One final quotation in the Dvādaśāra Nayacakrā that is attributed to the
Kaṭandī shows that this work did not consist exclusively of vākyas and their
explanations. This third passage explains a Vaiśeṣika sūtra:

7 Here and in following quotations from the Nayacakrā, square hooks enclose tentative
phrases proposed by the editor in footnotes to fill lacunae in the text.
8 What follows is vyākhyā according to Srināsāri.
K 3

DNC p. 498-499:

sadasator vaidharmyāt kārye sadasattā na (VS 9.12),
sadasacchabdārthayor virodhād ekasmin eva kārye sadasacchab-
dayor ekādhikaraṇaḥbhāvena prayogo nāsti, ‘sad evāsat’ ity
anuṣandhānam nāṣty ekādhikaraṇaḥbhāvena iti saptamyabhidhānena
darśayati /

If the reasoning presented thus far is correct, it follows that all the
quotations from Vaiśeṣika works that are identified by Mallavādin or by his
commentator Simhasūri, belong to the Kaṭandī or to the Tīkā written on it
by Praṣastapāda. The Kaṭandī, furthermore, was then at least partly written
in the Vārttika-style, which contains vākyas and bhāṣyas.

It seems reasonable to assume that more quotations from the Kaṭandī
and from its Tīkā occur in the seventh Ara of the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra. We
might furthermore be tempted to think that all quotations that clearly derive
from a Vaiśeṣika work and that exhibit the Vārttika-style, are quotations from
the Kaṭandī. This latter assumption, however, has to be treated with much
caution, for the following reason:

We have been able to identify one passage from Praṣastapāda’s Tīkā
in T 1, above. Mallavādin rejects the opinion expressed in that passage, say-
ing (p. 513):

tad api na, samavāyikāraṇaṁvārodhāt svavacanābhyaupagamaviro-
dhau /

It appears that this objection had been foreseen by Praṣastapāda, for
Mallavādin quotes the following reply, which must, therefore, belong to
Praṣastapāda’s Tīkā:

T 2

DNC p. 514:

( samavāyikāraṇaṁvaniṁṝt̄t̄īr iti cet ) na, anyatrasamavāyāt / ʾyadi
tasya [ anyatra samavāyo 'bhyaupagamyeta syād ayaṁ doṣaḥ, na tu
tathābhyaupagamyate, ] tasmād adoṣaḥ /

Another objection raised by Mallavādin runs (p. 513):

---

9 Simhasūri introduces the explanation with the words: tadvyākhyaṇam
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This objection, too, must have been taken from Praṣastapāda’s commentary, for it is answered in the following quoted passage:

T 3
DNC p. 516:

na, asyāsaṃyogāt / 10 na hi kāraṇasambandhibhiḥ kāryasya saṃyogo 'sti /

As is clear from these two quotations, it looks as if Praṣastapāda’s Žīkā, too, contained vākyas. In fact, there is no reason to assume that his Žīkā was written in the Vārttika-style. The two vākyas which occur in the above two quotations from his work answer objections, and a short nominal phrase, subsequently explained, in such a position is not to be confused with the consistently used Vārttika-style. The latter does not only express the answers to objections in subsequently explained vākyas, but normally also the objections themselves. We do not know whether the Kaṭandikāra used this style consistently in each and every case (the above quotations from his work suggest he didn’t), yet the way Mallavādin refers to him allows us, at least tentatively, to assign any quotation in ‘full’ Vārttika-style to his work. In the context of our purpose – identifying quoted portions from the Kaṭandī – this means that there where we have no other indications but the style, we can only be reasonably sure that a passage belonged to the Kaṭandī if both its objection(s) and answer(s) take the form of a vākyā plus explanation.

In the case of one such passage we have independent evidence which confirms our belief that it must belong to the Kaṭandī. The passage fulfills our primary requirement that the objection too be expressed in a vākyā that is then explained. The extra reason to believe that it derives from the Kaṭandī is that elsewhere in the seventh Ara Mallavādin appears to quote Praṣastapāda’s commentary, or a paraphrase thereof, on at least part of this quoted portion. The passage reads:

K 4
DNC p. 486:

athavā viśeṣāsaṃbandham antareṇaḥ āntumātrāṅgāṃ parasparātiśayo 'sti tena viśeṣāsaṃbandhīnayamāsiddhiḥ /

10 Śimhasūri introduces the explanation with the words: tad vyācaṣṭe.
katham parasparātiṣaya iti cet / katham prak [sattāsambandhād dravyagūkakarmaṇāmi parasparato] atiṣayaḥ syāt /
vk 5 na, drśīntāt / yathā parapakṣe [sattāsambandhād ṛte 'pi sattvārajahastamasām parasparato] atiṣayas tatṛheṣi syāt /
vk 6 sāmānyādivad vā / [yathā sāmānyādi svata evāsti arthāntarasam bandhanirapekṣām tathā dravyādy api] svata eva syāt /

Śūnhasūri ascribes the following lines to Praśastamati:

T 4
DNC p. 462-463:

na ca tad api nirātmakaṁ śāsavāsaṇavat, sattāsambandhād ṛte 'pi yathā parapakṣe pradhānaṁdinnāṁ sātmakaṁvatati tṛheṣi syāt /
( tvapakṣe drśīntātahāva iti cet,) sāmānyādivad vā, ... sāmānyādi-
ved eva sātmakaṁ na ghaṭādivat sātmakaṁ /

Note that vk 6 is repeated in this passage.

The next passage that appears to have been quoted from the Kaṭāndi needs some introductory remarks. It was stated above that vk 3 and its explanation are repeated, and refuted, on p. 503. This page, and the ones following it, contain a debate -between Mallavādin and an opponent who is, apparently, the author of the Kaṭāndi. In this debate a passage occurs which, even though it has Mallavādin's agreement, is written in the 'full' Vārttika-style. This should not confuse us. Mallavādin agrees at times with the pūrvapakṣa of the Kaṭāndi (see above), and this latter text contained evidently elaborate arguments. It is at least conceivable that Mallavādin borrowed here too a pūrvapakṣa of his opponent and presented it as his own view. The passage reads:

K 5
DNC p. 504-505

vk 7 samarthasya karaṇe 'dhikārāparigrahāt sa iti cet / samarthasyaiva kāryakriyāyām [adhikārāparigrahād upādānaniyamaḥ, tasmād] asad eva kāryam /

vk 8 ekīkābhāvagatārthasya samarthatvāt satkāryatvam eva / atha katham tuntuturyāder eva kārṇaviṇādānaṁ paṭanirvṛttau, na pāmāuvās-
yādeḥ?11 tasyaiva samarthatvāt tathā tathā paṭādkāryam tantuṣu

11 The editor thinks that something is wrong with this sentence and proposes, in a note, the following alternative: atha katham tuntuturyādi eva paṭanirvṛttau karaṇam, na pāmāuvāsyādi.
vartate tathā aṃśuḥ tathā pākṣmatiṣṭheṣu paramāṅguṣu tathā turyādiṣv api, pāṃśvādiṣv api ca, kāraṇākāraṇatvād anuvat /

Summing up our findings of this section, it can be stated that the seventh Ara of the Dvādasāra Nayacakra appears to contain a long discussion with a Vaiṣeṣika text called Kotaṇḍi and with its commentary, the Tīkā by Praṣastapāda. No other Vaiṣeṣika works would seem to be referred to. The Kotaṇḍi, which had a single author whose name is not mentioned, was written in the Vārttika-style that characterizes a number of works of around the middle of the first millennium C. E., a style in which vākyas and their explanations (bhāṣyās) play a predominant role. Mallavādin, in his discussion with the Kotaṇḍi and its commentary, quotes frequently from these two texts. Simhasūri’s comments, as well as the recognizable style of the Kotaṇḍi, allow us to identify a number of its quoted passages. The fact that Mallavādin left, at least in some cases, the Vārttika-style unchanged, suggests that he, if he changed his quotations at all, did so to a but limited extent.

Before we turn to the next section, which will study the possible link between the Kotaṇḍi and the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, it will be useful to list here the vākyas referred to by Vyomaśiva in his Vyomavatī (p. 35, 1. 27–28), to which attention was drawn by H. Isaacson (1990: 85):

\[pārśvanirādayānāṃ kāraṇe’dīgākhyā\]

2. We have seen that Praṣastapāda wrote a Tīkā on the Kotaṇḍi. This Tīkā, like the work on which it commented, is now lost. Praṣastapāda’s Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, on the other hand, has survived, and is indeed considered to contain the classical exposition of the Vaiṣeṣika system. It seems no more than reasonable to believe that the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha was profoundly influenced by the Kotaṇḍi. The question to be posed in this section is whether traces of this influence can actually be found in the text.

Note first that the seventh Ara of the Dvādasāra Nayacakra contains at least one quotation which corresponds almost word for word to a passage of the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha.12: Our criteria do not permit us to determine whether this quotation originally belonged to the Kotaṇḍi or to the Tīkā, but either way our expectation is strengthened that the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha may owe a great deal to the now lost Kotaṇḍi.

In the case of the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha our main criterion for identifying a passage as a quotation from the Kotaṇḍi, is the Vārttika-style.

---

12 See Jambuvijaya’s edition of the Dvādasāra Nayacakra p. 524 n. 3.
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The Padārthadharmasaṅgraha as a whole is not written in this style, but some passages, usually dealing with the elaboration of rather obscure points of doctrine, are. Those that seem to be unacknowledged quotations from the Kaṭandī will be enumerated and, where necessary, briefly discussed.\(^\text{13}\)

The first of these is in a certain way also the most remarkable. It is a vākya along with its explanation. The vākya appears to counter a preceding proposition, which, however, is not found in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. The vākya therefore hangs in the air. Its explanation, on the other hand, can be read as a continuation of the exposition that started before the vākya. The only explanation of this extraordinarily strange state of affairs appears to be that Praśastapāda borrowed an appropriate passage from another text, but quoted along with it its introductory vākya, even though that vākya was out of place in its new surroundings. There is no reason to doubt that this other text was the Kaṭandī.

I reproduce first the preceding passage of the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, followed by the presumed quotation from the Kaṭandī:

N p. 69; Ki p. 84; tr. Jhā p. 152

\[
\text{ātmatvābhīṣambandhād ātmā / tasya saukṣmyād apratyakṣatve śatī}
\]
\[
\text{karaṇaṁ śabdādyupalabdhyanumitaṁ śrotādibhiḥ samadhirgamaṅ kriyate / vāsyādinām i va karaṇanāṁ kartṛprayojyatvadarśaṅcat /}
\]
\[
\text{śabdādiṣu prasiddhyā ca prasādhako 'numlyate /}
\]

K 6

\text{vk 10 \(na, śaṅreṇḍriyamanasāṁ ajñātvāt^{14}\) na śarīrasya caityanāṁ gha-
\text{tādivad bhūtakāryatvān mṛte cāsambhavāt / nendriyānāṁ karaṇa-
\text{tvāt upahāteṣu vīṣayāsāṁnidyhe cānumśītadarśaṅcat / nāpi manasāṁ}
\text{karaṇāntarānpekṣīte yugapad ālocanasāṁtīprasaṅgat svayaṁ kara-
\text{nābhāvāc ca / pariṣeṣād ātmakāryatvād ātmā samadhigamyate /}
}

The following passages presumably quoted from the Kaṭandī are identified exclusively by their style:

\(^{13}\) The Padārthadharmasaṅgraha appears to contain one acknowledged quotation from the Kaṭandī, which will be discussed below.

\(^{14}\) Many commentators (Vyomaśīva, Udayana, Śridhara, Padmanābha Miśra) try to make sense of this vākya by supplying the word caityanāṁ from the following sentence for its interpretation.
śobhanam etad viḍhānaṁ vadhyaḥgātakapakṣe / saḥānavasthānala-
kṣane tu virodhe drayajñānāṇaṁ nupattiprasaṅgaḥ / kathām / guṇa-
buddhisamakālam apekṣā buddhavināśadh dvitvavināśade tabapecakṣasya
dve draye iti drayajñānāsya nupattiprasaṅga iti /

vak 11 laṅgikavaj jñānamātrād iti cet / syān matam yathā ‘abhūtaṁ bhūtasya’. (VS 3.1.8) ity atra liṅgabhaṁe 'pi jñānamātrād anumā-
naṁ tathā guptaṁvināse 'pi guṇabuddhimaṁtrād drayapratyayaṁ syād iti /

vak 12 na, viṣeṣayājñānatvāt / na hi viṣeṣayājñānam sūryāpyaḥ viṣeṣāntasam-
bandham antareṇa bhavitum arhati / tathā cāha śūtrakāraṁ sama-
vāyināḥ śātyāc chvāitya-buddheḥ śvete buddhiṁ te kāryakāraṁ-
bhūte iti / na tu laṅgikam jñānam abheṣaṇotpadaye tasmād viṣāmo
'yaṁ upaniṣāṣaḥ / na āśūtpatteḥ yathā šabdavad ākāśam iti atra
triṇī jñāṇāny āśūtpadyante tathā dvitvādijñāṇotpattīṁ ity adhaṁ /

vak 13 vadhyaḥgātakapakṣe 'pi samāna doṣa iti cet / syān matam / nanu
vadhyaḥgātakapakṣe 'pi tarhi drayajñānāṇaṁ nupattiprasaṅgaḥ /
kathām / dvitvasāmānyabuddhisamakālam samśkāraṇaṁ apekṣā-
buddhavināśadh iti /

vak 14 na, samāhajñānasya samaraḥhetuṁ / samūhajñānam eva samś-
kārakāraṇaṁ nālocana jñānam ity adhaṁ /

vak 15 jñānayaugapadypaprāsaṅga iti cet / syān matam / nanu jñānāṁ
vadhyaḥgātakavirodh jñānayaugapadyaprāsaṅga iti /

vak 16 na, avinaśyator avasthānapratīśedāt / jñānānyayaugapadypavrāca
na jñānayor yugapad upattitr āvinaśyatośa ca yugapad avasthānaṁ
pratiṣēdhyate / na hi vadhyaḥgātakavirodh jñānayor yugapad upat-
titr āvinaśyatośa ca yugapad avasthānaṁ astiti /
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vak 17 karmanāṁ jāttipācakatvam ayuktam gamanāvīśeṣāt / sarvam hi
kṣaṇikam karma gamanamātram utpannam svāśrayasyordhvaṁ
adhās tiryag vāpyaṣaḥmātraḥ pradeśaṁ saṁyogabhāgaṁ karoti /
sarvatra gamanapratyayo 'viśeṣāḥ / tasmād gamanam eva sarvam
iti /
na, vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttidarśanāt / ihotkṣepaṇaṁ para-trāpakṣepaṇaṁ ity evamādi sarva-traḥ vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛtti dvṛṣṭe / taddhethūḥ sāmānyaviśeṣabhedo 'vagamyate / teṣāṁ udādyupasargavīśeṣāt pratiniyatadigvīśaḥkāryārmbhavatvād upalaksabhedo 'pi siddhaḥ /

vak 19 evam api pāncaivety avadhāraṇāmupapatiḥ / niṣkramaṇapurasyanādiśīv api vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttidarśanāt / yady utkṣepaṇādīśu sarvatra vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttidarśanāḥ jātibheda iṣyate evaṁ ca niṣkramaṇapurasyanādiśīv api / kāryabhedāt teṣu pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttī itī cet / na, utkṣepaṇādīśv api kāryabhedād eva pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttipraṣaṅgāḥ / atha suṁeṇa vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttisadbhāve utkṣepaṇādīnaṁ eva jātibheda na niṣkramaṇādīnaṁ ity atra viśeṣahetur astiti /

vak 20 na, jātisāṅkara-prapaṇaṁ / niṣkramaṇādīnaṁ jātibhedaḥ pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttau jātisāṅkaraḥ prasajyate / kathām / dvayor draṣṭor ekasmd apavaraścād apavaraścāntaram gacchato yugap niṣkramaṇapurasyaya ca dvāra-prapadeśe praviśati niṣkramaṇati ca / yuṭā tu pratirūpānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttaḥ tathā dvārapadeśe praviśati niṣkramaṇati ca / yuṭā tu pratirūpāna vapisamū phāvati tadā na praveṣanapravyayo nāpi niṣkramaṇapurasyaya kintu gamanapravyayo eva bhavati / tathā nālikāyam vanīsamānatvānu nītāni bhuvannām Draṣṭṝgām yugapad bhramaṇapatanapravesanapravyaya dvṛṣṭā iti jātisāṅkara-prapaṇaṁ / na caivaṃ utkṣepaṇādīva pratyayāsaṅkara dvṛṣṭaḥ / tasmād utkṣepaṇādīnaṁ eva jātibhedaḥ pratyayānuvṛtti-vyāvṛttī niṣkramaṇādīnaṁ tu kāryabhedād iti /

vak 21 kathāṁ yugapad pratyayabheda iti cet / atha matam / yathā jātisāṅkaro nāsti evaṃ anekakarmasamāveśo 'pi nāstiīry ekasmd karṇaṇi yugapad draṣṭṝgāṁ bhramaṇapatanapravesanapravyayaḥ kathām bhavantīti / atra brūmaḥ /

vak 22 na, avayavaiṣaḥ sanīyogavibhāgaṁ bhṛddet / yo hi draṣṭā avayavāṇām pārśvataḥ paryayega dikpradeśāḥ sanīyogavibhāgaṁ paśayati tasā bhramaṇapravyayo bhavati / yo hy avayavina ārdhva-pradeśaṁ vibhāgam adhāḥ sanīyoṁ cāvekṣate tasā pratamapravyayo bhavati / yāḥ punaṁ nālikāntardṛśe sanīyoṁ bahrain pravṛttī vibhāgam paśayati tasā praveśanapravyayo bhavatīti siddhaḥ kāryabhedān niṣkramaṇādīnaṁ pratyayabheda iti /
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vak 23 nāṣṭa aiḥ sanīyoṁ nītyaparimalaḥ prathag anabhūdhānāt /
Before we turn to the last and most important unacknowledged quotation from the Kaṭandī, we briefly consider what may be the only acknowledged quotation from that work in the Padārthadharmsaṅgraha. It is contained in the following passage (Ki p. 235, N p. 239, tr. Jhā p. 509–510):

...纳米 caityām viśeṣaḥ samāyahetur abhihitāḥ Śāstre 'tulyajātīyasy arthāntaraabhūtesu (ca) viśeṣasyobhayathā dṛṣṭatvād' (VS 2.2.26) iti / na, anyārthatvāt /
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śabde viśeṣadarśanāt samāyahānupattir ity ukte, nāyam dravyādīnām anyatamsasya viśeṣaḥ syāc chṛvaṣatvām kintu sāmānya eva sampadyate / kasmāt / tulyajātīyasy arthāntaraabhūtesu dravyādīdhiḥkānām ekaikāśo viśeṣasyobhayathā dṛṣṭatvād ity uktaṁ (v. 1. ukte), na samāyakāraṇam / anyathā ṣaṭkṣv api padārthchā su samāyaprasyāṅgat / tasmāt sāmānyapratyakṣād (v. 1. – pratyayād) cava samāyāya iti /

Objection: A specific feature (viśeṣa) is stated to be a cause of doubt in the Śāstra (in sūtra 2.2.26): '[With regard to sound there is doubt whether it is a substance, an action, or a quality,]' because its specific feature (viz., audibility) is found both in [objects] that have the same universal, and in other objects.'

[Reply:] [This is not correct. For the sūtra has to be interpreted differently. A specific feature can not be a cause of doubt, for the following reason:] Having stated: No doubt arises in the case of sound, for we know its specific feature, it is then stated: Audibility is not the specific feature of any one of [the categories] substance etc. It is, on the contrary, common [to these]. Why? Because in each of [the categories] substance etc., we find the specific feature, both in [objects] that have the same universal and in other objects. If it were otherwise, there would be doubt even in the case of the six categories. For this reason doubt can come about on the basis of perception of a general feature only.

It is conceivable that Praśastapāda quotes here from another work the words reproduced in italics, and perhaps also the two concluding sentences of this

---

15 This translates the preceding sūtra 2.2.25: tasmin dravyaḥ karma guṇa iti samāyāyaḥ.
passage. It is true that the quoted passage does not contain the features of the Vārttika-style, but we have seen that this by itself constitutes no reason to believe it did not form part of the Kaṭandī.

A confirmation that this passage does indeed derive from the Kaṭandī is provided by the fact that Dignāga knows the opinion according to which the specific feature (viśeṣa) audibility is really a common feature (sāmānyā). In his Pramāṇasamuccaya he cites and refutes those who say: viśeṣa ubha-yata draśṭatvād ūrdhvatvādīvat sāmānyam eva. His commentator Jinendra-buddhi specifies that the reference is to some Vaiśeṣika(s). We shall see below that there is reason to believe that Dignāga knew the Kaṭandī.

One case remains to be considered. It differs from the preceding ones in that the lines followed by a more elaborate explanation are not vākyas, but verses, the only two verses that occur in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. We shall see that there are independent reasons for believing that these verses were quoted from an earlier work, and the fact that they are explained the way the vākyas are explained makes it reasonable to assume that they too derive from the Kaṭandī. The verses, along with their explanations, read:
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liṅgam punah yad

(st. i) anumeyena sambaddham
    prasiddham ca tadanvite /
    tadbhāve ca nāsty eva
    tal liṅgam anumāpakam ||

(st. ii) viparītam ato yat syād
    ekena dvitayena vā /
    viruddhasiddhasandigdham
    aliṅgam kāśyapo 'bravi t ||

yad anumeyenāthena deśaviśeṣe kālavigne vā sahacaritam anumeyadharmanvite ca nyatra sarvasmin ekadeśe vā prasiddham anumeyaviparite ca sarvasmin pramāṇato 'sad eva tad aprasiddhārtha-
syānumāpakam liṅgam bhavati /

16 This is Jambuvijaya’s Sanskrit rendering (1961: 199) of the Tibetan translation, which reads, in its two versions: (1) khyad par ni gnyi ga la mthong pa'i phyir 'bred ba bzhiin du sphyi khyi na yin no; and (2) bye brag gnyis ka la mthong pa'i phyir de sphyi nyid yin te.
yat tu yathoktāt trirūpāl liṅgād ekena dharmeṇa dvābhyāṁ vā viparītaṁ tad anumeyasyādhigame liṅgān na bhavatīty etad evāha sūtrakāraḥ 'aprasiddho 'napadeśo 'san sandigdhaḥ ca' (VS 3.1, 10–11) iti /

There is an obvious problem connected with the first of these two verses: it requires, but does not contain, the relative pronoun yad. Is it possible that either Praśastapāda or someone before him changed the verse, most probably in order to make it agree with his own views? Some observations support this supposition:

The first pāda of the verse reads: anumeyena sambaddham. Regarding the word anumeya, Masaaki Hattori (1972) has made some interesting observations. Dignāga, he points out, criticizes in his Pramāṇasamuccaya the word sādhya in the context of inference, which he finds used in some unspecified Vaiśeṣika text, and proposes anumeya instead. Praśastapāda, most probably under the influence of Dignāga, uses the word anumeya throughout.

This piece of information may provide us with the solution of the riddle of the first verse quoted in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. It contains the word anumeya in its problematic part, and we may hazard the guess that in its original version it contained the word sādhya instead. Metrically acceptable reconstructions are not difficult to find: liṅgāṁ sādhhyena sambaddham is possible; or, with the relative pronoun yat: yac ca sādhhyena sambaddham or the like. Both these reconstructed readings give a satisfactory meaning, as may other reconstructions. It is not, in the present context, necessary to choose the correct reconstruction. The main point is that an original reading may have been changed in order to replace original sādhya with anumeya.

If this reasoning is correct, the Kaṭandl must have been written before Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccaya. Is it possible to find out more about its date?

The first of the two quoted verses—also in its supposedly original form, with sādhya instead of anumeya—enumerates the three conditions that an inferential mark (liṅga) must satisfy. These conditions were laid down in Vasubandhu’s Vādavidhi and Vādavidhāna, and in the anonymous Tarkaśāstra, which too may have been written by Vasubandhu. We may assume

---

17 This was already observed by the commentator Udayana.
19 Frauwalner, 1933: 301 (480) Fragment 7a.
that the Kaṭāndī borrowed these conditions from these Buddhist logical texts. Borrowing in the opposite direction is harder to accept. The Tarkaśāstra, Vādavidhi and Vādavidhāṇa were works in which the discussion of logical issues occupied a central place; the Kaṭāndī, on the other hand, was primarily a commentary on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra, in which logical questions could not but play a secondary role.\textsuperscript{31}

The dependence of the Kaṭāndī upon the Buddhist logicians seems confirmed by the second verse. This verse enumerates three fallacious reasons (āliṅga): viruddha, asiddha and sandigdha. The explanation of the verse, on the other hand, mentions aprasiddha, asat and sandigdha, terms which occur in, and are here quoted in the context of, VS 3.1.10–11. Where did the author of the Kaṭāndī find the terms viruddha and asiddha? They occur, together with the third term anākāntika, in the Tarkaśāstra,\textsuperscript{48} and in the Vādavidhi.\textsuperscript{83} The second verse and its explanation suggest that the author of the Kaṭāndī borrowed the two types of fallacious reason called viruddha and asiddha from the Buddhist logicians, but hid this fact by identifying them with ideas already found in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. Had the new fallacious reasons constituted a development within Vaiśeṣika, without influence from without, the terms found in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra would most probably have been maintained.

It would appear, then, that the Kaṭāndī was written sometime in the period before Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccaya, but after the discovery of the three conditions of the inferential mark, which was perhaps made by Vasubandhu, and which it borrowed without acknowledgment.

3. Did Dignāga know the Kaṭāndī? We have seen that in at least one case Dignāga was acquainted with an opinion which we had reason to ascribe to the Kaṭāndī (K 10). But there is more, and more convincing evidence. On a few occasions Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccaya Vṛtti quotes directly from a Vaiśeṣika work different from the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. From the beginnings of the third and fourth Paricchedas it is clear that Dignāga knew the following lines (Jambuvijaya, 1961 : 197, 201, 207; Hattori, 1972 : 169–170):

\begin{verbatim}
K 12 sadhyabhidhanam pratyijñā /
tadvadharmasya hetuḥ /
ubhayaprasiddhottṛṣṭaṇtaḥ /
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{31} See further Frauwallner, 1955 : 71 (208) f.
\textsuperscript{48} T. 1633, vol. 32, p. 36a 1. 7–16; tr. Tucci, 1929 : p. 40 1. 10–22.
\textsuperscript{83} Frauwallner, 1957 : 17 (731), 34–35 (748–749) n. 7.
These sentences define some parts of an inference. The first one is also found in Vasubandhu’s Vādavidhi (Hattori, 1972: 172), and this is of course most easily explained if we assume that this Vaiśeṣika work had borrowed from Vasubandhu, as had the Kāṭandī. What is more, it supports the idea that the work from which Dignāga quotes is the Kāṭandī.

Further supporting evidence is obtained as follows. The fact that, in matters logical, the Kāṭandī was strongly influenced by the Buddhist logicians, did not leave much for Dignāga to criticize in it; for he himself continued and enriched the tradition of Buddhist logicians. If Dignāga were to criticize the logical ideas of the Kāṭandī at all, we might expect this criticism to be directed against two aspects in particular: (i) points in which Dignāga deviates from his Buddhist predecessors; (ii) points in which the Kāṭandī tries to hold on to Vaiśeṣika traditions. Both these aspects are represented in K 11, and part of Dignāga’s critique might very well be directed against this very passage. The one respect in which K 11 agrees with Dignāga—the three conditions of the inferential mark—he passes over in silence, as was to be expected. Let us now look more closely at his points of criticism:

(i) Dignāga’s criticism of the use of the word sādhya is directed as much against his Buddhist predecessors as against the Vaiśeṣikas. As we have seen, the Vādavidhi defines the proposition (pratijñā) as: sādhyābhidhānana pratijñā. (ii) The Kāṭandī, as we have seen, borrowed the fallacious reasons viruddha and asiddha from the Buddhists, but claimed that they are the same as the ones called asat and aprasiddha in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. It did not borrow the term anaikāntika, but he’d on to the Vaiśeṣika term sandidhā instead. By doing so, it invited criticism directed against the types of fallacious reason enumerated—or presumed enumerated—in VS 3.1.10-11. Such criticism is indeed found in Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccaya. This text cites the sūtras concerned, then points out that none of the possible interpretations of aprasiddha are suitable to denote a fallacious reason. The designation asat is not acceptable either; the correct term—in view of the example in VS 3.1.12 (viṣāñ c tasmād ośvo... )—is viruddha. Sandidhā, finally, covers according to Dignāga only what he calls sādharaṇānaikāntika, whereas asādhāraṇa and viruddhāvyabhicārin are not mentioned by the Vaiśeṣikas. (Note that Praśastapāda introduces a fourth fallacious reason, anadhivyāvasita, to cover these two cases.)

It can be seen that Dignāga cites and criticizes the Vaiśeṣikas in the context of logical theory where the Kāṭandī appears to be susceptible to such

---

21 For a detailed discussion, see Hattori, 1972. For a Sanskrit translation of Dignāga’s criticism of the Vaiśeṣikas, see Jambuvijaya, 1961: 197 ff.
21 Annals BORI [A. M.]
criticism. His criticism, moreover, is confined to these points. We can with certainty conclude from this that Dignāga's Vaiśeṣika opponent agreed with him on certain essential points, most notably on the three conditions of an inferential mark, also mentioned in the Kaṭandl.

Dignāga characterizes perception as “the simple presentation of the object (viṣayālocaṇamātra)”, which is not “preceded by conceptual constructions (vikālapūrvaka)”. The former of these two expressions (to be precise, the part ālocaṇamātra) occurs in the Padārthadharmaśāngraha, in the context of what the commentators call nirvikalpaka perception. This does not, as Hattori (1968: 136 n. 4. 10) rightly pointed out, allow us to infer that Dignāga knew the Padārthadharmaśāngraha. It does, however, lend additional support to the idea that Dignāga knew Praśastapāda's main source, the Kaṭandl.

We may conclude that a number of different factors—the date of the Kaṭandl (considered above), the direct quotations in the Pramāṇasamuccaya Vṛtti, the nature of Dignāga's criticism of the Vaiśeṣikas—all support the conclusion that Dignāga knew and reacted against the Kaṭandl.

At one point the Pramāṇasamuccaya Vṛtti distinguishes two contradictory opinions, both of which were apparently held by certain Vaiśeṣikas. The passage reads, in Hattori's translation (19.8: 42):5

Some [of the Vaiśeṣikas] consider that [the cognition as] a resolute (phala) is distinct from the pramāṇa, the means of cognition. They claim that the contact between sense and object (indriyārtha-saṁnikarṣa) is the means of cognition since it is the specific cause (asādhiṣṭaśākāra). [of perceptual cognition]. But there are others [of the Vaiśeṣikas] who hold that the contact between soul and mind (ātmamaṇḍaḥsaṁnikarṣa) is the means of cognition since it is the predominant [cause] (pradhāna).

This passage occurs in the section of the Pratyakṣa pariccheda which deals with the Vaiśeṣika view of perception; there can therefore be little doubt that

---

57 The Tibetan reads: (1) kha cig ni tshad ma las don gshan du 'dod de, thun mong ma yin pa'i rgyu pa'i phyir dbang po dang don du phrad pa tshad mar rtog par byed do. gshan dag ni gtsos bo yin pa'i phyir bdag dang yid du phrad pa tshad ma'o zhes zer ro. (2) kha cig ni tshad ma las 'bras du don gshan du 'dod de, thun mong ma yin pa'i rgyu yin pa'i phyir dbang dang don phrad pa tshad mas rtogs par bya'o zhe'o. gshan dag ni gtsos bo yin pa'i phyir bdag dang yid phrad pa tshad ma yin no zher ro,
indeed different representatives of the Vaiśeṣika philosophy are here referred to. This in its turn justifies the conclusion that Dignāga knew several Vaiśeṣika works, or, at the very least, that the Vaiśeṣika work he used contained references to alternative (Vaiśeṣika) views.

Dignāga’s commentator Jinendrabuddhi ascribes the two views expressed in the above passage to different authors: the first one to Śrāvāsaka and others, the second one to Rāvaṇa and others.⁸ The name Śrāvāsaka appears to be unattested elsewhere. Hattori points out, however, that the view here ascribed to him is found in the Nyāya Sūtra and Bhāṣya (1.1.4; 2.1.25-26).

The second view — ascribed to Rāvaṇa by Jinendrabuddhi — is more interesting in the present context, for it occurs in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha (Ki p. 184, N p. 186):

sāmānyaviśeṣadravyagunakarmaviśeṣanāpekṣād atmanāhaṁsamni-karṣāṁ pratyakṣam utpadyate sad dravyam prthivi viṣāṇi śuklo gaur gacchatītī/

Since we have come to think that the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha is heavily indebted to the Kaṭandī, and that Dignāga knew the Kaṭandī, it is tempting to think that ‘Rāvaṇa’ is the name of the author of the Kaṭandī.

This supposition is strengthened by the fact that later sources describe Rāvaṇa as the author of the, or a, Bhāṣya on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. In Murāri’s play Anargharāghava the character Rāvaṇa describes himself as Vaiśeṣika-Kaṭandī-paṇḍita. The Bhāṣya mentioned in Udayana’s commentary Kiraṇāvali on the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha is ascribed to Rāvaṇa by Udayana’s subcommentator Padmanābha Miśra. Govindānanda, in his subcommentary on Śaṅkara’s Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya, mentions a Bhāṣya of Rāvaṇa in the context of the Vaiśeṣika philosophy.⁹⁹

4. The preceding two sections have given us reasons to think that the now lost Kaṭandī profoundly influenced the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. This is hardly to be wondered at, in view of the fact that Praśastapāda himself appears to have written a commentary on that combined text. By way of conclusion we must mention the possibility that the Kaṭandī, or rather its vākyas, may also have influenced the surviving texts of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. Vākyas are hard to distinguish from sūtras – both are short nominal phrases – and the Kaṭandī constituted a commentary on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. Someone who

would try to extract sūtras from manuscripts of the Kaṭāndi – which contained sūtras, vākyas, and bhāṣyas – would be in danger of mistakenly including some vākyas.

Of course, it would be hard, perhaps impossible, to prove definitely that the three surviving versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra derive from a common source which is the Kaṭāndi. It must however be recalled that cases of early Indian texts that have at some time of their history been ‘peeled’ out of a commentary are known.39 All we can do in the remainder of this article is briefly consider two points which, to say the least, do not contradict the assumption that our versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra do indeed derive from the Kaṭāndi. A close study of the available evidence may further support, or disprove, the above assumption. Such a study is however beyond the scope of the present article.

VS 1. 1. 4, in the version of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra commented upon by Śaṅkara Miśra, reads:

4. dharmaviśeṣataprasūtād dravyagunākarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām
   padārthānām sādharmyāvaidharmyābhyyām tattvajñānānām niḥśreyasam

An enumeration of the six categories at the beginning of the Sūtra-text seems, as Frauwallner (1984: 37 n. 5) observed, essential. Yet this ‘fourth sūtra’ is absent from the other two surviving versions of the text. How to explain this? The easiest solution seems to be that it was there, but was not recognized as a sūtra. This, of course, is only possible if the sūtras were extracted from a work that contained more than only sūtras, most probably from a commentary. The fact that ‘sūtra 4’ is much longer than sūtras 1–3 may explain that it was not so easily recognized as such.

Supposing now that the sūtras were all taken from a commentary on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra, is there any reason to think that this commentary was the Kaṭāndi? The resemblance of ‘sūtra 4’ to a portion of the Padārthadharmaśāṅgraha may constitute such a reason. The following passage from the Padārthadharmaśāṅgraha expresses almost the same contents in but slightly differing words (N p. 6–7; Ki p. 4):

39 See Bronkhorst, 1988: 121 f., where it is shown that the first two Kāṇḍas of Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapadīya were ‘peeled’ out of the Vṛtti, a commentary whose author—different from Bhartṛhari—is not known. It seems, moreover, that the Yoga sūtras were collected by their first commentator, the author of the Yoga Bhāṣya; see Bronkhorst, 1985a.
It is more than likely to conclude that the ‘fourth sūtra’ was known to Praśastapāda, and was therefore in all probability part of the Kaṭandī.

The opinion has been expressed that the above cited ‘fourth sūtra’ was not created before, but rather under the influence of, and therefore after, the Padārthadharmaśāngraha. In response to this objection it could be pointed out that there is one major difference between ‘the fourth sūtra’ and its corresponding passage in the Padārthadharmaśāngraha: the latter adds God (Īśvara). God played henceforth a central role in the Viśeṣika system. The fact that ‘the fourth sūtra’—like all the other Viśeṣika sūtras—ignores God, can be taken as an indication that ‘the fourth sūtra’ is older than Praśastapāda, and was not composed under the influence of his Padārthadharmaśāngraha.

There is a second indication that the surviving versions of the Viśeṣika Sūtra may derive from the Kaṭandī. It is the use of the term Āhnika to designate the sections into which the Sūtra-text is divided. This term—which means ‘daily’, hence ‘what may be studied on one day’—is primarily used to designate the subdivisions of the Mahābhāṣya. As such it has nothing to do with the sūtras of the Āstādhyāyī, on which the Mahābhāṣya comments. Works that imitate the style of the Mahābhāṣya may also imitate its division into Āhnikas. And indeed, the Nyāya Bhāṣya, which is partly written in Vārttika style (Windisch, 1888: 15 f.), is divided into Āhnikas. Also the Nyāya Sūtra is divided into Āhnikas, but this division is obviously secondary and derives from the Bhāṣya. In the case of the Viśeṣika Sūtra we have come to think that it had a commentary that imitated the style of the Mahābhāṣya. We also know that the Sūtra is divided into Āhnikas, in each of its three surviving versions. Nothing seems more natural than to assume that this division, here too, is secondary, and derives from the Kaṭandī, just as the three versions of the Viśeṣika Sūtra themselves derive from the Kaṭandī.
Is it conceivable that all non-authentic sūtras in the surviving versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra derive from the Kaṭandā? Or do we have to assume also other sources of inauthentic sūtras? It is difficult to answer this question, because the Kaṭandā is almost completely unknown to us. Nor do we know the original contexts of inauthentic sūtras, even if we suppose that we are at all able to recognize them as such.

We do, however, know some things about the Kaṭandā. We have seen, for example, that its logic stood most probably under the influence of a Buddhist logician, most probably Vasubandhu, but not yet under that of Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccaya. This helped us in determining the approximate date of the Kaṭandā. It will now help us to show that at least some sūtras were added to the text of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra before the Kaṭandā.\(^{35}\)

\[\text{VS 2.1.15–16 and 3.2.6–7 distinguish two kinds of inference: that based on something seen (drṣṭa), and that based on something seen in general (sāmānyato drṣṭa). This cannot but be the same distinction as that between višeṣato drṣṭa and sāmānyato drṣṭa, current in Sāṅkhya, and introduced by the Sāṅkhya teacher Vidyāvāsin.}^{36}\] Vidyāvāsin lived around 400 C. E. (Bronkhorst, 1985: 171). These sūtras, therefore, appear to have been inserted after that date, but before the Kaṭandā which represents the next stage in the development of logic within the Vaiśeṣika school.
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Abbreviations

AL Mahābhāṣyadipikā of Bhartṛhari, ed. Abhyankar / Limaye
CE Mahābhāṣyadipikā of Bhartṛhari, ‘critical edition’
DNC Dvādaśāra Nayacakra of Mallavādin
K presumed passage from the Kaṭandī
Ki Padārthadharmasāṅgraha, ed. Jetly
Ms Manuscript of Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣyadipikā
N Padārthadharmasāṅgraha, ed. Dvivedin
P Pāṇinian sūtra
Sw Mahābhāṣyadipikā of Bhartṛhari, ed. Swaminathan
T. Taisho edition of Buddhist canon in Chinese
Ţ presumed passage from Praṣastapāda’s Ēkā on Kaṭandī
Vk vākyā
VS Vaiśeṣika Sūtra.
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