

THE VAISĒṢIKA VĀKYA AND BHĀṢYA¹

By

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

1. A long period of time separates Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmaśāstra-graha 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 Dvādaśāra Nayacakra, a Jaina work, refers on two occasions to a Vaiśeṣika vākya 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 :

yad api cōktam :

K 1 “ vikalpatrayānāśrayād vikalpāntarāśrayaṇāc ca ‘ vikalpānupapattēḥ ’ iti na doṣaḥ,

vk 1 *niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt /*

niṣṭhā kārāṇasāmagryavyāpārakālaḥ prāgasato vastubhāvaḥ niṣṭhā-nām samāptiḥ ... / sambandhaḥ svakārāṇasattāsamavāyaḥ / tayoṛ ekakālatvam, svakārāṇasattāsambandha eva niṣṭhākālaḥ, kutaḥ ? samavāyasyaikatvāt, yasminn eva kāle pariniṣṭhām gacchat kāryam kārāṇaiḥ sambadhyate. samavāyasambandhena ayutasiddhihetunā tasminn eva kāle sattādibhir api, tasmād apravibhāgāt prāk kāryot-patter asataḥ sadādir anāspado vikalpaḥ / ” etad api na ...

asatsambandhaparihārārtham ca niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt ity etad eva vākyaṁ sabhāṣyaṁ praśasto ’ nyathā vyācaṣṭe :

T 1 “ sambandhaś ca sambandhaś ca sambandhau, niṣṭhāyāḥ sambandhau niṣṭhāsambandhau, tayoṛ ekakālatvāt / niṣṭhitam niṣṭhā, kārā-

¹ I would like to thank A. Wezler and J. Houben, who read an earlier version of this article and made valuable suggestions.

kapariṣpandād vastubhāvam āpannam avyapadeśyādhāram kāryam
 niṣṭhitam niṣṭhā ity ucyate, tasya svakāraṇaiḥ sattayā ca yugapat
 sambandhau bhavataḥ / bhāṣyam api pariniṣṭhām gacchad gatam
 ity etam artham darśayati, vartamānasāmlpye vartamānavad vā
 (P. 3. 3. 131) iti / yathā kārakāntaram utpadyamānam dṛṣṭam kāra-
 kavyāpārād vastubhāvam āpannam avyapadeśyādhāram nirvṛttam
 sat svakāraṇaiḥ sattayā ca sambadhyate tathā paṭākhyam / ” tad
 api na ...

The phrase niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt is here called a ‘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.² 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 Padārthadharmaśaṅgraha. All of these names, and various others, have been used by different authors to refer to the author of the Padārthadharmaśaṅgraha.³ 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 Chemparathy, 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 Nayacakra that mentions the vākya and the bhāṣya reads (p. 516-17) :

vastūtpattikāle eva iti vākyakārābhiprāyo 'nusṛto bhāṣyakāraiḥ /
siddhasya vastunaḥ svakāraṇaiḥ svasattayā ca sambandha iti prāśa-
stamato 'bhiprāyaḥ /

This passage does not appear to quote either a vākya or from the bhāṣya. 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 bhāṣya had different authors. (The plural ending of bhāṣyakāraiḥ may express respect, and does not necessarily entail that there was more than one bhāṣyakāra.) 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 Prāśastamati, 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-Bhāṣya. 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 'Vārttika-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-Bhāṣya. Bhartṛhari, too, speaks about a Vākyakāra and a Bhāṣyakāra, 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 Bhāṣya.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 bhāṣya-passages, the Yuktidīpikā does so on one occasion; (ii) I-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*. Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* (ed. Rau, 1. 23) speaks, for example, of *bhāṣyas*, in the plural, and there can be no doubt that portions of the *Mahābhāṣya* are meant. Bhartṛhari's *Mahābhāṣya* *Dīpikā*, 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 Mallavādin, 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 Kaṇḍī, Praśastamati's *Ṭikā*, and a *Ṭikā* without further specification; sometimes Praśastamati is simply referred to as '*Ṭikākāra*' (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 Mallavādin and where the discussion concerns the differences or agreements between a *vākya* and its *bhāṣya*. Is it possible that the Kaṇḍī 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 (*pūrvapakṣita*) in the Kaṇḍī and in the *Ṭikā* (*kaṇḍyām ṭikāyām ca*). The juxtaposition of these two names creates the impression that the *Ṭikā* is a commentary on the Kaṇḍī. If here too the *Ṭikā* is Praśastapāda's *Ṭikā* – and there is no reason to believe otherwise – the Kaṇḍī 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 Kaṇḍī and its *Ṭikā*, and which is accepted by Mallavādin, is summarized by the latter in the following words (p. 459) : *tasṁād vikalpānupapatter na sattāsambandho 'bhidhānapratyayahetuḥ*. It is precisely this *pūrvapakṣa* that is answered in K 1, the only passage that is explicitly attributed to the *Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya* by Mallavādin and Simhasūri. The introductory sentence of K 1, it will be recalled, reads : *vikalpatrayānāśrayaṇāc ca 'vikalpānupapatteḥ' iti na doṣaḥ*.

Simhasūri ascribes another passage to the Kaṇḍī 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 Kaṇḍī. Together they read :

K 2

DNC p. 490-491 :

yad ucyate saiddhārthīyaiḥ 'upādānaniyamadarśanāt sat kāryam tilatāilavat tat kriyādyasattvadarśanād asat, dr̥ṣṭam tāvat [paṭārthitāyām tantūnām evopādānam na tu pāmsvādīnām, evam paṭārthaś ca kuvindasya vyāpāro dr̥ṣṭaḥ,]⁷ itarathā tantupāmsvādiṣv aviśeṣaḥ prāg īpi vyāpārābhāvaś ca syāt, dr̥ṣṭā tu kriyā [paṭārthā kuvindasya tantūnām eva copādānam; tasmād upādānaniyamata-darśanavyāpārābhyām sadasat kāryam,] ubhayaikānte doṣadarśanāt sad evāsad eva veti cāyukta ekāntaḥ, sadasadātmakatvāt kāryasya upādānaniyamāḥ kriyā ca yujyate ' iti, tan

vk 2 na, vikalpānupapatteḥ / [kim yenaivātmanā sat tenaiva asat, āhosvit āpekṣikam sadasattvam anyenātmanā mṛdādīnā prāk sad ghaṭādi-kāryam] ghaṭātmanā cāsāt? na tāvad [yenaivātmanā sat tenaivātmanā asat, sadasator vaidharmyāt / yad uktam sadasator vaidhar-myāt kārye sadasattā na (VS 9.12), sattvapratipakṣo 'sattvam] asattvapratipakṣaś ca sattvam / sat sopākhyam aśan nirupākhyam, [taylor vaidharmyāt ekasmin kārye] sadasattvam na bhavatīty arthaḥ /

DNC p. 499 :

āpekṣikam sadasattvam, prāg utpatteḥ mṛdātmanā sat kāryam ghaṭātmanā cāsāt, niṣpanne 'pi ghaṭe mṛttvadarśanād mṛdupādā-nopapattīḥ, ghaṭātmanā cāsattvād ghaṭārthakriyopapattir ity evam kila ārhata āha / atrottaram

vk 3 na, asatkāryatvasiddheḥ / ⁸evam tarhi mṛdātmanāḥ kartavyatvā-bhāvād ghaṭātmanāḥ kartavyatvād asat 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 Kaṇḍī is indeed identical with the 'Vākya-cum-Bhāṣya'. One final quotation in the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra that is attributed to the Kaṇḍī 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 Nayacakra, square hooks enclose tentative phrases proposed by the editor in footnotes to fill lacunae in the text.

⁸ What follows is vyākhyā according to Sīmhasūri.

K 3

DNC p. 498-499 :

sadasator vaidharmyāt kārye sadasattā na (VS 9. 12),
sadasacchabdārthayor virodhād ekasminh eva kārye sadasacchab-
dayor ekādhikaraṇabhāvena prayogo nāsti, 'sad evāsat' ity
anusandhānam nāsty ekādhikaraṇabhāvena 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 Siṃhasūri, belong to the Kaṇḍī or to the Tīkā written on it by Praśastapāda. The Kaṇḍī, 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 Kaṇḍī 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 Kaṇḍī. This latter assumption, however, has to be treated with much caution, for the following reason :

We have been able to identify one passage from Praśastapāda's Tīkā in T 1, above. Mallavādin rejects the opinion expressed in that passage, saying (p. 513) :

tad api na, samavāyikāraṇatvavirodhāt svavacanābhyupagamaviro-
dhau /

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

T 2

DNC p. 514 :

(samavāyikāraṇatvanivṛttir iti cet) na, anyatrāsamavāyāt / ⁹yadi
tasya [anyatra samavāyo 'bhyupagamyaeta syād ayam doṣaḥ, na tu
tathābhyupagamyaeta,] tasmād adoṣaḥ /

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

⁹ Siṃhasūri introduces the explanation with the words ; tadvyākhyānam

kim ca, niṣṭhitasya kāryasya kāraṇaiḥ sattayā ca sambandho yuta-
siddhasambandhaḥ, kāryasya kāraṇebhyo 'nyatra pariniṣṭhitatvāt /

This objection, too, must have been taken from Praśastapāda's commentary, for it is answered in the following quoted passage :

† 3

DNC p. 516 :

na, asyāsaṁyogāt / ¹⁰na hi kāraṇasambandhibhiḥ kāryasya saṁyogo
'sti /

As is clear from these two quotations, it looks as if Praśastapāda's Tīkā, too, contained vākyas. In fact, there is no reason to assume that his Tīkā 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 Kaṇḍikāra 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 Kaṇḍī – 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 Kaṇḍī if both its objection(s) and answer(s) take the form of a vākya plus explanation.

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

K 4

DNC p. 486 :

athavā viśeṣaṇasambandham antareṇāpi vastumātrāṇām parasparā-
tiśayo 'sti tena
viśeṣaṇasambandhaniyamasiddhiḥ /

¹⁰ Sīmhasūri introduces the explanation with the words : tad vyācāṣṭe.

- vk 4 *katham paraspārātiśaya iti cet / katham prāk [sattāsambandhād dravyaguṇakarmanām paraspārato] atīśayaḥ syāt /*
- vk 5 *na, drṣṭāntāt / yathā parapakṣe [sattāsambandhād rte 'pi sattva-rajastamasām paraspārato] atīśayas tatthehāpi syāt /*
- vk 6 *sāmānyādivad vā / [yathā sāmānyādi svata evāsti arthāntarasam-bandhanirapekṣam tathā dravyādy api] svata eva syāt /*

Simhasūri ascribes the following lines to Praśastamati :

T 4

DNC p. 462-463 :

na ca tad api nirātmakam śaśaviśāṇavat, sattāsambandhād rte 'pi yathā parapakṣe pradhānādīnām sātmakatvam tatthehāpi syāt / (tvatpakṣe drṣṭāntābhāva iti cet,) sāmānyādivad vā, ... sāmānyādivad eva sātmakam na ghaṭādivat sātmakam /

Note that vk 6 is repeated in this passage.

The next passage that appears to have been quoted from the Kaṇḍī 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 Kaṇḍī. In this debate a passage occurs which, even though it has Mallavādin's agreement, is written in the 'full' Vārtika-style. This should not confuse us. Mallavādin agrees at times with the pūrvapakṣa of the Kaṇḍī (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 karāṇe 'dhikāraparigrahāt sa iti cet / samarthasyaiva kāryakriyāyām [adhikāraparigrahād upādānaniyamah, tasmād] asad eva kāryam /*
- vk 8 *ekībhāvatārthasya samarthatvāt satkāryatvam eva / atha katham tantuturyāder eva kāraṇatvenopādānam paṇanirvṛttau, na pāmśuvāsyādeḥ ?¹¹ tasyaiva samarthatvāt tathā tathā paṇādikāryam tantuṣu*

¹¹ The editor thinks that something is wrong with this sentence and proposes, in a note, the following alternative: atha katham tantuturyādi eva paṇanirvṛttau kāraṇam, na pāmśuvāsyādi.

vartate tathā amśuṣu tathā pakṣmatīṭireṇuparamānuṣu tathā turyā-
diṣv api, pāmsvādiṣv api ca, kāraṇakāraṇatvād anuvat /

Summing up our findings of this section, it can be stated that the seventh Ara of the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra appears to contain a long discussion with a Vaiśeṣika text called Kaṭandī and with its commentary, the Tīkā by Praśastapāda. No other Vaiśeṣika works would seem to be referred to. The Kaṭandī, 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 (bhāṣyas) play a predominant role. Mallavādin, in his discussion with the Kaṭandī and its commentary, quotes frequently from these two texts. Simhasūri's comments, as well as the recognizable style of the Kaṭandī, 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 Kaṭandī and the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, it will be useful to list here the vākya referred to by Vyomaśiva in his Vyomavatī (p. 35 v. 1. 27-28), to which attention was drawn by H. Isaacson (1990 : 85) :

vk 9 *pūrvāparādipratyayānāṃ kāraṇe digākhyā*

2. We have seen that Praśastapāda wrote a Tīkā on the Kaṭandī. This Tīkā, like the work on which it commented, is now lost. Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, on the other hand, has survived, and is indeed considered to contain the classical exposition of the Vaiśeṣika system. It seems no more than reasonable to believe that the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha was profoundly influenced by the Kaṭandī. 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 Dvādaśāra 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 Kaṭandī or to the Tīkā, but either way our expectation is strengthened that the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha may owe a great deal to the now lost Kaṭandī.

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

¹² See Jambuvijaya's edition of the Dvādaśāra Nayacakra p. 524 n. 3.

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 Kaṇḍī will be enumerated and, where necessary, briefly discussed.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 Kaṇḍī.

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

N p. 69 ; Ki p. 84 ; tr. Jhā p. 152

ātmavābhisambandhād ātmā / tasya sauṣmyād apratyakṣatve sati
karaṇaiḥ śabdādyupalabdhyānumitaiḥ śrotrādibhiḥ samadhigamaḥ
kriyate / vāsyādīnām iva karaṇānām kartṛprayojyatvadarśanāt /
śabdādiṣu prasiddhyā ca prasādhako 'numiyate /

K 6

vk 10 na, śarīrendriyamanasām ajñatvāt /¹⁴ na śarīrasya caitanyam gha-
ṭādivad bhūtakāryatvān mṛte cāsambhavāt / nendriyāṇām karaṇa-
tvāt upahateṣu viśayāsānnidhye cānusmṛtidarśanāt / nāpi manasaḥ
karaṇāntarānapekṣitve yugapad ālocanasamṛtiprasaṅgāt svayam kara-
ṇabhāvāc ca / pariśeṣād ātmakāryatvād ātmā samadhigamyate /

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

¹³ The Padārthadharmasaṅgraha appears to contain one *acknowledged* quotation from the Kaṇḍī, which will be discussed below.

¹⁴ Many commentators (Vyomaśīva, Udayana, Śrīdhara, Padmanābha Miśra) try to make sense of this vākya by supplying the word caitanyam from the following sentence for its interpretation.

K 7

N p. 112–113; Ki p. 133–135; tr. Jhā p. 243–245

śobhanam etad vidhānam vadyaghātakapakṣe / sahānavasthānala-
kṣaṇe tu virodhe dravyajñānānutpatti-prasaṅgaḥ / katham / guṇa-
buddhisamakālam apekṣābuddhivināśād dvitvavināśe tadapekṣasya
dve dravye iti dravyajñānāsyānutpatti-prasaṅga iti /

vk 11 *laiṅgikavaj jñānamātrād iti cet* / syān matam yathā ‘abhūtam
bhūtasya’ (VS 3. 1. 8) ity atra liṅgābhāve ‘pi jñānamātrād anumā-
nam tathā guṇavināśe ‘pi guṇabuddhimātrād dravyapratyayaḥ
syād iti /

vk 12 *na, viśeṣyajñānatvāt* / na hi viśeṣyajñānam sārūpyād viśeṣaṇasam-
bandham antareṇa bhavitum arhati / tathā cāha sūtrakāraḥ sama-
vāyinaḥ śvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ śvete buddhis te kāryakāraṇa-
bhūte iti / na tu laiṅgikam jñānam abhedēnotpadyate tasmād viśamo
‘yam upanyāsaḥ / na āsūtpatteḥ yathā śabdavad ākāśam iti atra
trīṇi jñānāny āsūtpadyante tathā dvitvādirjñānotpattāv ity adoṣaḥ /

vk 13 *vadyaghātakapakṣe ‘pi samāno doṣa iti cet* / syān matam / nanu
vadyaghātakapakṣe ‘pi tarhi dravyajñānānutpatti-prasaṅgaḥ /
katham / dvitvasāmānyabuddhisamakālam saṁskārād apekṣā-
buddhivināśād iti /

vk 14 *na, samūhajñānasya saṁskārahetutvāt* / samūhajñānam eva saṁs-
kāra-kāraṇam nālocanajñānam ity adoṣaḥ /

vk 15 *jñānayaugapadyaprasaṅga iti cet* / syān matam / nanu jñānānām
vadyaghātakavirodhe jñānayaugapadyaprasaṅga iti /

vk 16 *na, avinaśyator avasthānapratiśēdhiāt* / jñānāyugapadyavacanena
jñānāyogayugapad utpattir avinaśyatoś ca yugapad avasthānam
pratiśēdhyate / na hi vadyaghātakavirodhe jñānāyogayugapad utpa-
ttir avinaśyatoś ca yugapad avasthānam astīti /

K 8

N p. 292–94; Ki p. 263–65; tr. Jhā p. 620–623

vk 17 *karmanām jātīpañcakatvam ayuktam gamanāviśeṣāt* / sarvam hi
kṣaṇikam karma gamanamātram utpannam svāśrayasyordhvam
adhas tiryag vāpy anumātraiḥ pradeśaiḥ saṁyogavibhāgān karoti /
sarvatra gamanapratyayo ‘viśiṣṭaḥ / tasmād gamanam eva sarvam
iti /

- vk 18 *na, vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttidarśanāt / ihotkṣepaṇam para-
trāpakṣepaṇam ity evamādi sarvatra vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyā-
vṛtti dṛṣṭe / taddhetuḥ sāmānyaviśeṣabhedo 'vagamyate / teṣāṃ
udādyupasargaviśeṣāt pratiniyatadigviśiṣṭakāryārambhatvād upala-
kṣaṇabhedo 'pi siddhaḥ /*
- vk 19 *evam api pañcaivety avadhāraṇānupapattiḥ / niṣkramaṇapraveśanā-
diṣv api vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttidarśanāt / yady utkṣepaṇā-
diṣu sarvatra vargaśaḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttidarśanāj jātibheda
iṣyate evam ca niṣkramaṇapraveśanādiṣv api / kāryabhedāt teṣu
pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛtti iti cet / na, utkṣepaṇādiṣv api kāryabhedād
eva pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttiprasaṅgaḥ / aṭha samāne vargaśaḥ pra-
tyayānuvṛttivyāvṛttisadbhāve utkṣepaṇādīnām eva jātibhedo na niṣ-
kramaṇādīnām ity atra viśeṣahetur astīti /*
- vk 20 *na, jātisaṅkaraprasaṅgāt / niṣkramaṇādīnām jātibhedāt pratyayā-
nuvṛttivyāvṛttau jātisaṅkaraḥ prasajyate / katham / dvayor draṣṭror
ekasmād apavarakād apavarakāntaram gacchato yugapan niṣkrama-
ṇapraveśanapratyayau dṛṣṭau tathā dvārapradeśe praviśati niṣkrāma-
tīti ca / yadā tu pratisīrādy apanītam bhavati tadā na praveśanapra-
tyayo nāpi niṣkramaṇapratyayaḥ kintu gamanapratyaya eva bhavati /
tathā nālikāyām vanīśapatrādau patati bahūnām draṣṭṛṇām yuga-
pad bhramaṇapatanapraveśanapratyayā dṛṣṭā iti jātisaṅkaraprasa-
ṅgaḥ / na caivam utkṣepaṇādiṣu pratyayasaṅkaro dṛṣṭaḥ / tasmād
utkṣepaṇādīnām eva jātibhedāḥ pratyayānuvṛttivyāvṛtti niṣkrama-
ṇādīnām tu kāryabhedād iti /*
- vk 21 *katham yugapat pratyayabheda iti cet / aṭha matam / yathā jātisaṅ-
karo nāsti evam anekakarmasamāveśo 'pi nāstīty ekasmin karmaṇi
yugapad draṣṭṛṇām bhramaṇapatanapraveśanapratyayāḥ katham
bhavantīti / atra brūmaḥ /*
- vk 22 *na, avayavāvayavinor digviśiṣṭasamīyogavibhāgūnām bhedaḥ / yo hi
draṣṭā avayavānām pārśvataḥ paryāyeṇa dikpradeśaiḥ samīyogavi-
bhāgān paśyati tasya bhramaṇapratyayo bhavati / yo hy avayavina
ūrdhvapradeśair vibhāgam ādhaḥ samīyogam cāvekṣate tasya patana-
pratyayo bhavati / yaḥ punar nālikāntardeśe samīyogam bahirdeśe
ca vibhāgam paśyati tasya praveśanapratyayo bhavatīti siddhaḥ
kāryabhedān niṣkramaṇādīnām pratyayabheda iti /*

K 9

N p. 140-41 ; Ki p. 1-8 ; tr. Jhā p. 303-304

vk 23 *nāsty ajaḥ samīyogo nityaparimaṇḍalavat pṛthag anabhidhānāt /*

yathā caturvidham parimāṇam utpādyam uktvāha nityam parimāṇ-
dālam ity evam anyatarakarmajādisamyogam utpādyam uktvā prthaṇ
nityam brūyāt / na tv evam abravīt / tasmān nāsty ajaḥ samyogaḥ /

Before we turn to the last and most important unacknowledged quo-
tation from the Kaṇḍī, we briefly consider what may be the only *acknow-
ledged* quotation from that work in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. It is contain-
ed in the following passage (Ki p. 235, N p. 239, tr. Jhā p. 509–510) :

nanu cāyam viśeṣaḥ saṁśayaḥetur abhihitāḥ śāstre ‘tulyajātiyeṣv
arthāntarabhūteṣu (ca) viśeṣasyobhayathā dṛṣṭatvād’ (VS 2. 2. 26)
iti / na, anyārthatvāt /

K 10 *śabde viśeṣadarśanāt saṁśayānutpattir ity ukte, nāyam dravyāḍīnām
anyatamaṣya viśeṣaḥ syāc chrāvaṇatvam kintū sāmānyam eva sampa-
dyate / kasmāt / tulyajātiyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu dravyāḍibhedānām
ekaikaśo viśeṣasyobhayathā dṛṣṭatvād ity uktam (v. 1. ukte), na
saṁśayakāraṇam / anyathā śiṣṭsv api padārtheṣu saṁśayaprasaṅgāt /
tasmāt sāmānyapratyakṣād (v. 1. – pratyayād) eva saṁśayaḥ 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,]¹⁵
because its specific feature (viz., audibility) is found both in [obje-
cts] that have the same universal, and in other objects.’

[*Réply* :] [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 ari-
ses 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 dravyam karma guṇa iti saṁśayaḥ.

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 Kaṇḍī.

A confirmation that this passage does indeed derive from the Kaṇḍī is provided by the fact that Dignāga knows the opinion according to which the specific feature (viśeṣa) audibility is really a common feature (sāmānya). In his Pramāṇasamuccaya he cites and refutes those who say : viśeṣa ubhayatra dṛṣṭatvād ūrdhvatvādivat sāmānyam eva.¹⁶ 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 Kaṇḍī.

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 Kaṇḍī. The verses, along with their explanations, read :

K 11

N p. 200-04; Ki p. 193-95; tr. Jhā p. 421-431

liṅgam punaḥ yad

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

(st. ii) viparītam ato yat syād
ekena dvitayena vā |
viruddhāsiddhasandigdham
aliṅgam kāśyapo 'bravīt ||

yad anumeyenārthena deśaviśeṣe kālaviśeṣe vā sahacaritam anumeya-
dharmānvite cānyatra sarvasminn ekadeśe vā prasiddham anumeya-
viparīte ca sarvasmin pramāṇato 'sad eva tad aprasiddhārtha-
syānumāpakam liṅgam bhavatīti /

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 bzhin du sphyi kho na yin no; and (2) bye brag gnyis ka la mthong pa'i phyir de sphyi nyid yin te.

yat tu yathoktāt tritūpāl līṅgād ekena dharmēṇa dvābhyām vā
viparītaṁ tad anumeyasyādhigame līṅgaṁ na bhavatīty etad evāha
sūtrakāraḥ 'aprasiddho 'napadeśo 'san sandigdhaś 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*.¹⁷ Is it possible that either *Prāśastapāda* 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. *Prāśastapāda*, 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 : *līṅgaṁ sādhyena sambaddham* is possible ; or, with the relative pronoun *yat* : *yac ca sādhyena 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 *Kaṇḍī* 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 (*līṅga*) must satisfy. These conditions were laid down in Vasubandhu's *Vādaividhi*¹⁸ and *Vādaividhāna*,¹⁹ and in the anonymous *Tarkaśāstra*,²⁰ which too may have been written by Vasubandhu. We may assume

¹⁷ This was already observed by the commentator Udayana.

¹⁸ Frauwallner, 1957 : 16-17 (730-731,) 33-34 (747-748).

¹⁹ Frauwallner, 1933 : 301 (480) Fragment 7a.

²⁰ T. 1633, vol. 32, p. 30c l. 20-21, p. 31a l. 11 f. ; Sanskrit translation in Tucci, 1929 : p. 13 l. 16-17, p. 14 l. 20 f.

that the Kaṭandī borrowed these conditions from these Buddhist logical texts. Borrowing in the opposite direction is harder to accept. The Tarkaśāstra, Vādaividhi and Vādaividhāna were works in which the discussion of logical issues occupied a central place; the Kaṭandī, on the other hand, was primarily a commentary on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra, in which logical questions could not but play a secondary role.²¹

The dependence of the Kaṭandī upon the Buddhist logicians seems confirmed by the second verse. This verse enumerates three fallacious reasons (aliṅga) : 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 Kaṭandī find the terms viruddha and asiddha? They occur, together with the third term anaikāntika, in the Tarkaśāstra,²² and in the Vādaividhi.²³ The second verse and its explanation suggest that the author of the Kaṭandī 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 Kaṭandī 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 Kaṭandī? We have seen that in at least one case Dignāga was acquainted with an opinion which we had reason to ascribe to the Kaṭandī (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) :

K 12 sādhyābhidhānam pratijñā /
 tadvaddharmasya hetuḥ /
 ubhayaprasiddho dṛṣṭāntaḥ /

²¹ See further Frauwallner, 1955 : 71 (208) f.

²² T. 1633, vol. 32, p. 36a 1. 7-16; tr. Tucci, 1929; p. 40 1. 10-22.

²³ 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 *Vādaividhi* (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 Kaṭandī. What is more, it supports the idea that the work from which Dignāga quotes is the Kaṭandī.

Further supporting evidence is obtained as follows. The fact that, in matters logical, the Kaṭandī 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 Kaṭandī 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 Kaṭandī 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 :²⁴ (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 *Vādaividhi* defines the proposition (*pratijñā*) as : *sādhyaḥbhidhānam pratijñā*. (ii) The Kaṭandī, 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 held on to the Vaiśeṣika term *sandigdha* 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 (*viṣāṇī tasmād aśvo ...*) — is *viruddha*. *Sandigdha*, finally, covers according to Dignāga only what he calls *sādhāraṇānaikāntika*, whereas *aśādhāraṇa* and *viruddhāvyabhicārin* are not mentioned by the Vaiśeṣikas. (Note that *Praśastapāda* introduces a fourth fallacious reason, *anadhyavasita*, to cover these two cases.)

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

²⁴ For a detailed discussion, see Hattori, 1972. For a Sanskrit translation of Dignāga's criticism of the Vaiśeṣikas, see Jambuvijaya, 1961 : 197 f.

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 Kaṇḍī.

Dignāga characterizes perception as "the simple presentation of the object (viśayālocanamātra", which is not "preceded by conceptual constructions (vikalpapūrvaka)".²⁵ The former of these two expressions (to be precise, the part ālocanamātra) occurs in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, in the context of what the commentators call nirvikalpaka perception.²⁶ This does not, as Hattori (1968 : 136 n. 4. 10) rightly pointed out, allow us to infer that Dignāga knew the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. It does, however, lend additional support to the idea that Dignāga knew Praśastapāda's main source, the Kaṇḍī.

We may conclude that a number of different factors—the date of the Kaṇḍī (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 Kaṇḍī.

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 (1968 : 42) .²⁷:

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

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

²⁵ Hattori, 1968 : 42 ; Jambuvijaya, 1961 : 170.

²⁶ See Schmithausen, 1970.

²⁷ The Tibetan reads : (1) kha cig ni tshad ma las don gzhan 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. gzhan dag ni gtso 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 gzhan 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. gzhan dag ni gtso bo yin pa'i phyir bdag dang yid du 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 Śrāyaska and others, the second one to Rāvaṇa and others.⁸ The name Śrāyaska 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) :

sāmānyaviśeṣadravyaguṇakarmaviśeṣaṇāpekṣād ātmamaṇḥsannikarṣāt pratyakṣam utpadyate sad dravyam prthivī viśāṇī śuklo gaur gacchatīti /

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-panḍita. The Bhāṣya mentioned in Udayana's commentary Kiraṇāvalī 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.²⁹

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

²⁸ See Hattori, 1968 : 135 ; Jambuvijaya, 1961 : 174.

²⁹ See Jambuvijaya, 1961 : 150 n. 1, and Thakur, 1961 : 12 f.

would try to extract sūtras from manuscripts of the Kaṇḍī – 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 Kaṇḍī. 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.³⁰ 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 Kaṇḍī. 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. dharmaviśeṣaprasūtād dravyaguṇākarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām padārthānām sādharṇyavaidharṇyābhyām tattvajñānān 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 Kaṇḍī? The resemblance of ‘sūtra 4’ to a portion of the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha may constitute such a reason. The following passage from the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha expresses almost the same contents in but slightly differing words (N p. 6–7 : Ki p. 4) :

³⁰ 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.

dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām padārthānām sādha-
rmyavaidharmyatattvajñānam niḥśreyasaheṭuḥ / tac ceśvaracodanā-
bhivyaktād dharmād eva /

It is more than likely to conclude that the 'fourth sūtra' was known to Praśastapāda, and was therefore in all probability part of the Kaṇḍī.

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 Padārthadharmasaṅgraha.³¹ 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 Padārthadharmasaṅgraha : the latter adds God (Īśvara). God played henceforth a central role in the Vaiśeṣika system.³² The fact that 'the fourth sūtra' – like all the other Vaiśeṣika 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 Padārthadharmasaṅgraha.³³

There is a second indication that the surviving versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra may derive from the Kaṇḍī. 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 Aṣṭādhyāyī, 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 Vaiśeṣika 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.³⁴ Nothing seems more natural than to assume that this division, here too, is secondary, and derives from the Kaṇḍī, just as the three versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra themselves derive from the Kaṇḍī.

³¹ This was Frauwallner's opinion (1984 : 39-40).

³² See Thakur, 1957 : (16).

³³ On the provenance of God in the Vaiśeṣika system, see my forthcoming article "God's arrival in the Vaiśeṣika system".

³⁴ Adhyāyas 8, 9 and 10 are not divided in āhnikas in the version known to Candrānanda, and in that known to the author of the Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha (Thakur, 1961 : 21). Also the version of Adhyāyas 9 and 10 found and discussed by Thakur (1966) does not divide these Adhyāyas into āhnikas. The other versions do.

Is it conceivable that all non-authentic sūtras in the surviving versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra derive from the Kaṇḍī? Or do we have to assume also other sources of inauthentic sūtras? It is difficult to answer this question, because the Kaṇḍī 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 Kaṇḍī. 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 Kaṇḍī. It will now help us to show that at least some sūtras were added to the text of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra before the Kaṇḍī.³⁵

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 *viśeṣato drṣṭa* and *sāmānyato drṣṭa*, current in Sāṃkhya, and introduced by the Sāṃkhya teacher Vindhyavāsin.³⁶ Vindhyavāsin lived around 400 C. E. (Bronkhorst, 1985 : 171). These sūtras, therefore, appear to have been inserted after that date, but before the Kaṇḍī which represents the next stage in the development of logic within the Vaiśeṣika school.

References

- Bhartṛhari : *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*. 1) Edited by K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1970. (Post-Graduate and Research Department- Series No. 8.) 2) Partly edited by V. Swaminathan under the title *Mahābhāṣya Tīkā*. Varanasi : Banaras Hindu University. 1965. (Hindu Vishvavidyalaya Nepal Rajya Sanskrit Series Vol. 11.) 3) Manuscript reproduced. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1980. 4) 'Critical edition'. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Āhnika 1, edited and translated by Johannes Bronkhorst, 1987; Āhnika 2, by G. B. Palsule, 1988; Āhnika 3, by G. B. Palsule, 1983; Āhnika 4, by G. V. Devasthali and G. B. Palsule, 1989; Āhnika 5, by V. P. Limaye, G. B. Palsule and V. B. Bhagavat, 1984; Āhnika 6 part 1, by V. B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate, 1986; Āhnika 6 part 2, by V. B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate, 1990; Āhnika 7, by G. B. Palsule and V. B. Bhagavat, 1991.

³⁵ What follows is essentially based on Frauwallner, 1955 : 75 (212) f., esp. 79 (216) n. 30.

³⁶ According to Kumāṛila's *Śloka-vārttika* 8 (*Anumānapariccheda*), v. 143.

Bhartṛhari : Vākya-pāṭi. Critical edition by Wilhelm Rau. Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner, 1977. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XLII, 4.)

Bronkhorst, Johannes (1985) : "On the chronology of the Tattvārtha Sūtra and some early commentaries." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 29, 155-184.

Bronkhorst, Johannes (1985a) : "Patañjali and the Yoga sūtras." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1984), 191-212.

Bronkhorst, Johannes (1988) : "Études sur Bhartṛhari, I. L'auteur et la date de la Vṛtti." *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 6, 105-143.

Bronkhorst, Johannes (1990) : "Vārttika." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 34, 123-146.

Chemparathy, George (1970) : "Prašastapāda and his other names." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 12, 241-254.

Frauwallner, Erich (1933) : "Zu den Fragmenten buddhistischer Logiker im Nyāyavārttikam." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 40, 281-304. Reprint : *Kleine Schriften* (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1982) pp. 460-483.

Frauwallner, Erich (1955) : "Candramati und sein Daśapadārtha-śāstram." *Studia Indologica. Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel*. Bonn. (Bonner Orientalistische Studien, 3.). Pp. 65-85. Reprint : *Kleine Schriften* (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1982) pp. 202-222.

Frauwallner, Erich (1957) : "Vasubandhu's Vāda-vādi." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 1, 104-146. *Kleine Schriften* (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1982) pp. 716-758.

Frauwallner, Erich (1984) : Nachgelassene Werke. I. Aufsätze. Beiträge, Skizzen. Herausgegeben von Ernst Steinkellner. Wien : Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 438. Band. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 19.)

Halbfass, Wilhelm (1986) : "Mallavādin and early Vaiśeṣika ontology." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 50 (Golden Jubilee Volume), 271-286.

Hattori, Masaaki (1968) : *Dignāga, On Perception, being the pratyakṣapariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya*. From the Sanskrit frag-

ments and the Tibetan versions translated and annotated. Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press.

Hattori, Masaaki (1972) : "Praśastapāda and Dignāga : a note on the development of the Vaiśeṣika theory of anumāna." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 16, 169-180.

Isaacson, H. (1990) : *A study of early Vaiśeṣika. The teachings on perception.* Groningen : Unpublished thesis.

Jambuvijaya, Muni (ed.) (1961) : *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda, with the commentary of Candrānanda*, Baroda : Oriental Institute. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 136.)

Jhā, Gaṅgānātha (tr.) (1915) : *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha of Praśastapāda, with the Nyāyakandali of Śrīdhara*. Varanasi - Delhi : Chaukhambha Orientalia. (Chaukhambha Oriental Studies, 4.) 1982.

Lang, Karen (1988) : "On Āryadeva's citation of Nyāya texts in the *Śataka." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 32, 131-140.

Mallavādin : *Dvādaśāra Nayacakra*. Edited, with the commentary *Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī* of Simhasūri, by Muni Jambuvijaya. Bhavnagar : Sri Jain Atmanand Sabha. 3 volumes. (Śrī Ātmānanda Jaina Granthamālā Serial No. 92, 94, 95.) 1966, 1976, 1988.

Mesquita, Roque (1980) : "Yāmuna's Vedānta and Pāñcarātra : a review." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 24, 199-224.

Nozawa, Masanobu (1976) : "The Vaiśeṣikasūtra referred to in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha." *Journal of the Buddhist Studies* 24, (32)-(38) (=1006-1000).

Praśastapāda : *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha*. 1) Edited, with the commentary *Kiraṇāvalī* of Udayanācārya, by Jitendra S. Jetly. Baroda : Oriental Institute. 1971. 2) Edited, with the commentary *Nyāyakandali* of Śrīdhara, by Vindhyesvari Prasad Dvivedin. Reprint. Delhi : Sri Satguru Publications. (Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series, 13.) 1984. 3) Edited, with the commentaries *Sūkti*, *Setu*, and *Vyomavatī*, by Gopīnath Kavirāj and Dhundhirāj Shāstri. Second edition. Varanasi : Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 61.) 1983.

Schmithausen, Lambert (1970) : "Zur Lehre von der vorstellungsfreien Wahrnehmung bei Praśastapāda." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 14, 125-129.

Sucaritamīśra : Kāśikā. In : The *Mīmāṃsāślokavārttika* with the commentary *Kāśikā* of Sucaritamiśra, edited by K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstri. Trivandrum 1926 ff. (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 90, 99, 150.)

Thakur, Anantalal (ed.) (1957) : *Vaiśeṣikadarśana* of Kaṇāda, with an anonymous commentary. Darbhanga : Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

Thakur, Anantalal (1961) : "Introduction." = Jambuvijaya, 1961 : 1-23.

Thakur, Anantalal (1966) : "Studies in a fragmentary *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*-vṛtti." *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, 14 (1965/66), 330-335.

Tucci, Giuseppe (1929) : *Pre-Diṇṇāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*. Second edition. Madras : Vesta. 1981.

Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. Edited by Muni Jambuvijaya. Baroda : Oriental Institute. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 136.) 1961.

Windisch, Ernst (1888) : *Über das Nyāyabhāṣya*. Leipzig : Alexander Edelman.

Abbreviations

AL	Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartṛhari, ed. Abhyankar / Limaye
CE	Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartṛhari, 'critical edition'
DNC	Dvādaśāra Nayacakra of Mallavādin
K	presumed passage from the Kaṇandī
Ki	Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, ed. Jetly
Ms	Manuscript of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā
N	Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, ed. Dvivedin
P	Pāṇinian sūtra
Sw	Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartṛhari, ed. Swaminathan
T.	Taisho edition of Buddhist canon in Chinese
Ṭ	presumed passage from Praśastapāda's Ṭikā on Kaṇandī
Vk	vākya
VS	Vaiśeṣika Sūtra.