

VIDYĀNANDA AND PĀTRAKĒSARI ARE THEY IDENTICAL?

By H. R. Rangaswami Iyengar

In a lengthy article entitled, Bhartṛhari and Kumārila, contributed to the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Vol. XVIII pp. 213-38, Mr. Pathak has tried to establish that Vidyānanda, author of the Tattvārtha śloka-vārtika is identical with Pātrakesari, a great teacher of the Jains, who is said to have written a work probably known as *Trilakṣaṇakadāṛthana* in refutation of the Buddhist doctrine of Trilakṣaṇahetu,¹ according to which the hetu or reason is defined to have three lakṣaṇas or characteristics, i. e. fulfil three essential conditions, viz, that it should be in the pakṣa, that it should be found in similar instances (Sapakṣa) and absent in dissimilar instances (Vipakṣa). He has based his conclusions on two statements one, occurring in a work known as *Samyaktvaprakāśa* and the other, in a palm-leaf manuscript of *Ādipurāṇa* owned by a Pandit at Śravaṇabel-gola. The statement in the Samyaktvaprakāśa, according to Mr. Pathak is as follows (P. 222). :—

1. (a) Cf. Nyāyabindu :—

Anumānam dvidhā svārtham parārtham ceti / tatra svārtham trirūpallīng-
ādyadanumeye jñānam tadanumānam. / traīrūpyam punaḥ līngasyā-
numeye satvameva / sapakṣe satvameva / asapakṣe asatvameva niścitam //

(b) Pramāṇasamuccaya II—1 :

(i) Rjes dpag rnam gñis rān don ni
'Tshul gsum rtags las don mthoñ pa'o
, bras bu snar bz'iu 'di gñis kyi /

This may be restored to Sanskrit as,

Anumānam dvidhā svārtham
Trirūpallīngato rtha dṛk /
Phalam pūrvavadanayoḥ

(ii) Ibid II 5b :

Rjes dpag bya dān d de mtshuñs la
Yod dān med la med pa'o /

which, when restored into Sanskrit, will be anumēyetha
tattulye sadbhāvo nāstitāsati

(c) Tattvārthaśloka-vārtika. Nirnayasagara Edition. p. 203
verse 178.

Tathā Ślokavārtike²- Vidyānandāpara' Pātrakesari Sv ā m i n ā
Yaduktam tacca likhyate tattvārthaśraddhānam samyagdarśanam /

According to it, the author of the work declares that he is writing down what has been said by Pātrakesari, known also as Vidyānanda, in his Ślokavārtika. It amounts to saying that Pātrakesari had written the work Ślokavārtika and had the other name Vidyānanda. The Ślokavārtika, which is now available in print and ascribed to Vidyānanda, contains the passage quoted by the author of Samyaktvaprakāśa. It is, therefore, to be concluded that Pātrakesari is identical with Vidyānanda.

This identification, Mr. Pathak argues, is confirmed by the note in the manuscript copy of Ādipurāṇa owned by the Jaina Pandit at Śravaṇabelgola. It is recorded in the manuscript that Pātrakesari had also the name, Vidyānanda. It leads us to conclude that Pātrakesari is no other than Vidyānanda, the author of Ślokavārtika.

But, on a critical examination of the arguments advanced by Mr. Pathak in support of his conclusion, in the light of the new evidences, literary and inscriptional, that are now available, it becomes clear that the view held by Mr. Pathak is unacceptable.

The Samyaktvaprakāśa from which Mr. Pathak has quoted to support this identification is, unfortunately, not available with us either in print or in manuscript to verify the statement and to examine critically the context in which the passage appears. It ascribes the Ślokavārtika to Pātrakesari. But we have not met with a single reference to this name in any part of the Ślokavārtika, nor do we find mentioned either in the works of Vidyānanda or of Pātrakesari that Vidyānanda was also known as Pātrakesari or that Pātrakesari had also the name, Vidyānanda. Besides the Ślokavārtika, works such as Aṣṭasāhasrī, Pramāṇa Parikṣa, Yuktyanuśāsana and Āptaparikṣā are ascribed to Vidyānanda. He has been known to be a great thinker and a versatile writer. But neither any one of his works nor any work of others which has

2. Ibid—P. 83, (I. ii 2)

Atha, samyagdarśana vipratipatti nivṛtyartham
Aha tattvārtha śraddhānam samyagdarśanamiti

occasion to refer to him contains any reference to his other name, Pātrakesari. All these make us doubt the veracity of the statement in the Samyaktvaprakāśa.

The note in the manuscript of Ādipurāṇa under reference does not take us too far. It is a note made either by the scribe or by the owner of the manuscript. It is unsafe to draw conclusions depending on such a note, the authenticity of which itself is questionable. Even granting that it is authentic, it does not prove the identity of the author of the Śloka-vārtika and Pātrakesari. The note only suggests that Pātrakesari had another name Vidyānanda. It may be that Pātrakesari had the title "Vidyānanda". But this is not enough to prove that Pātrakesari was identical with Vidyānanda, the author of Śloka-vārtika.

We know from inscriptions as well as from Buddhist and Jaina literatures that Pātrakesari was a great teacher who contributed largely to the development and systematization of Jaina Logic and Philosophy. According to the story in the Kathakośa, which Mr. Pathak has quoted in full in his article, "Dharmakīrti's Trilakṣaṇahetu",³ Pātrakesari, assisted by Goddess Padmāvatī refuted the Trilakṣaṇa doctrine in the well-known verse,

Anyathānupapannatvam yatra tatra trayeṇa kim /

Nānyathānupapannatvam yatra tatra trayeṇa kim /

This story is further alluded to in the Śravaṇabelgoḷa inscriptions⁴ dated S. S. 1050 as follows

Mahimā sa Pātrakesari guroḥ param bhavati yasya bhaktyā-sīt Padmāvatīśahāyā trilakṣaṇa kadhathanam kartum /

"Exceedingly great indeed is the glory of Pātrakesari, who owing to his devotion, was assisted by Goddess Padmāvatī in refuting the doctrine of Trilakṣaṇa." The verse, beginning with "anyathānupapannatvam" which is considered to express the refutation of the Buddhist doctrine by Pātrakesari is found quoted in the Pramāṇa-parīkṣā and Śloka-vārtika of Vidyānanda while criticising in detail the doctrine of Trilakṣaṇa defended by Dharmakīrti in his Nyāyabindu and the Pramāṇa-vārtika, which is

3. Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XII part I pp. 71-80.

4. Śravaṇabelgoḷa Inscriptions—No. 67.

a gloss on the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* of *Diñnāga*. In quoting this verse, *Vidyānanda* prefaces it with "tathoktam⁵" in the *Pramāṇa-parīkṣā* and with "vārtikakāreṇoktam⁶" in the *Śloka-vārtika*. If *Pātrakesari* was *Vidyānanda* there was no need for *Vidyānanda* to preface the verse attributed to *Pātrakesari* with "Vartikakāreṇa etc." Evidently *Vidyānanda* is referring to a 'Vartikakāra' who is different from him. The view that *Pātrakesari* is *Vidyānanda*, the author of *Śloka-vārtika*, is not maintainable.

The fact that the verse, *anyathānupapannatvam* etc., was by *Pātrakesari* is further corroborated by its mention in the *Tattvasaṅgraha*⁷ of the Buddhist writer, *Śāntarakṣita* while criticising the view of *Pātrasvāmin* in the chapter on "Anumāna." *Śāntarakṣita* begins with a statement of the definition and division of *Anumāna* or inference according to Buddhist Logicians like *Diñnāga* and *Dharmakīrti*. The two opening verses of the chapter appear to be more or less identical with the relevant *Kārikas* in the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* of *Diñnāga*⁸ which is still extant only in Tibetan translations. *Śāntarakṣita* seems to refer, therefore, to the writings of *Diñnāga*. This is confirmed by the comments of *Kamalaśīla*; for *Kamalaśīla* has repeated the very words of *Diñnāga*'s texts and quoted the words relating to the fallacies which is found in the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* and the *Hetucakra* of

5. *Pramāṇaparīkṣā* p. 72 (Kāśī Edition).

6. *Śloka-vārtika* p. 205 :—*Hetu lakṣaṇam Vārtikakāreṇa evamuktam, anyathānupapannatvam yatra tatra trayeṇa kim iti.*

7. *Tattvasaṅgraha* (Gocs) pp. 405 ff:—
anyathētyādinā pātrāsvāmi matamāsāṅkate

8. *Tattvasaṅgraha* p. 404.
Svārtham trirūpatolingādanumeyārthā darśanam
Trirūpalingavacanam parārtham punarucyate /
Ekaikaḍvidvirūportho līṅgabhāsaṭato mataḥ

Cf *Pramāṇasamuccaya*

(1) rjes dpag rnam gñis rañ don ni
Tshul gsum rtags laṣ dan mthon pāo. II (1)
(2) gz'an gyi. don. gyi rjes dpag ni
rañ gis mthon dan gsal byed yin // III (1)
(3) tshul ni re. re 'am gñis gñis. kyi
rtags ni don. gyi dan byed min. // II (6cd)

Diñnaga.⁹ Śāntarakṣita expounds next, the views of a teacher of a rival school, who according to Kamalaśīla, is Pātraswāmin. Here also, Śāntarakṣita quotes the verse "anyathānupapannatvam"¹⁰ etc., which, we know, is the Vārtika of Pātrakesari. Hence, Pātraswāmin must be regarded as the shortened form of Pātrakesari.¹¹ Dr. Bhattacharya, the general editor of the series in which the Tattvasaṅgraha has been published, has assigned Śāntarakṣita, to the beginning of the 8th century A. D.¹² Pātrakesari should, therefore, be considered to have lived long before Śāntarakṣita. He cannot be identical with Vidyānanda, the author of the Śloka-vārtika, who is assigned to the 9th century A. D.

It is interesting to note, in this connection, that Jinendra-buddhi in his tikā, Viśālāmalavati, on the Pramāna-samuccaya-Vritti of Diñnaga states the views of a teacher by name, 'Ahrika while offering his comments on the definition of Svārthānumāna or "Inference for oneself" by Diñnaga. In this context are found two Kārikas attributed to "Ahrika" which when restored into Sanskrit from Tibetan, will be found to be identical with a verse found¹³ in the Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntirakṣita and another

9. Cf the Pañjikā of Kamalaśīla :—

Anumānam svārtha parārtha bhedenā dividham / Tatra svartham yatri rūpāllingāt pakṣadharmatvam sapakṣe satvam vipakṣācca sarvato vyāvṛtti rityevam lakṣaṇādanumeyārtha viśayam jñānam tadātmakam boddhavyam / parārtham tu yathokta trirūpa lingaprakāśaka vacanātmakam draṣṭavyam / taduktam :—

Kṛtākatvāt dhvanirnityo mūrtatvādprameyataḥ / amūrtāsrāvaṇatvābh-
yāmanityam cākṣuṣatvataḥ cf. Pramāṇasamuccaya II. 7.

byas, phyir sgra na rtag pa āaṇ

lus. can phyir daṇ gz'an min phyir,

lus min phyir daṇ mñam bya las

ni rtag mig gis gzun byai phyir //

This Kārika is repeated in the Hetucakra

10. Cf. Tattvasaṅgraha. p. 405

11. Cf. Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute XII i p. 76.

12. Cf. Introduction to Tattvasaṅgraha ppxci. (Gaekwad Oriental Series)

13. Viśālāmalatikā. Mdo. re. folio 94ff :—

tshul gsum ma yin pa. yin'ga zig, rtags lu 'dod de/ des na-dēi logsa

with the one in the Pañjikā of Kamalāśīla in¹⁴ the very context in which the views of Pātrakesari are stated and criticised in those works. This will prove that Pātrasvāmin was also known as "Ahrīka".¹⁵ But no one, with a sense of self-respect, will agree to call himself "Ahrīka or shameless". It appears, therefore, to be a nickname given to a person or to a school by those be-

pai rtogs pa bzlog, pai ched du gsum pa smos, so / de la *dzem med pas-*
smas pa /

gañ z'ig, gi, snam pa gz'a / du min thad pa ñid

di gtan tshigs, su, 'dod, de / mshan ñid

gcig pa, can, kho, na yin pa des ni don

mtshan ñid z'i can kho nāo z'es te /

rnam par, gz'an, du, / es pa bsgrub par, bya ba med par z'es pai
don to /

(Sanskrit restoration :—*Vipā trirūpam kvacillīgam iṣyate / tan-*

mihtyadrstīnīṣṭyvartham trirūpamīti / tatra ahrī keṇa uktam :—

Anyathā nupapannatvam yasyāsau heturīṣyate

Ekalakṣaṇakh sortha scaturlakṣaṇakothava //

Anyatha sadhyeṇa vina ityarthah /

14. Cf. Pañjika 409.

Atha sādhyadharmiṇyeva sadhyāvinābhāvitvam hetoryattadeva hetu-
lakṣaṇam Yathāha, —

Vinā sādhyādadṛṣṭasya Dṛṣṭānte hetuteṣyate

Parāirmayā punardharmiṇyasambhuṣṇervināmūnā //

Cf. Viśālamalaṭikā, Mdo, folio 94ff.

O', na, 'di med na, mi byuñ ba kho, na 'gyur, z'e, na, ma, yin,
no, z'es, 'dzem med pa, ste / med na mi 'byuñ ba, ñid nibsgrub
par, bya ba, las, phyirol du 'dod / rnam pa, gz'an, du mi thad la
ñid ni chos can kho, na, la bsgrub par bya bāo z'es pāo tshigs bcad
pa, yan smras pa /

dpe la bsgrubs bya, med pai aṅ

rtags ñid ma mthoñ gz'an, gyis 'dod

bdag, gis 'di, ni, med, par, yañ

chos can, la, ni mi, srid pāo /

Tarhi-avinābhāva eva syāditi cennetya *hrikah* / avinābhāvohi sādhyā-
bahirbhutah, / anyathānupapannatvam tu sādhyā dharmiṇyeva / kārīkā
coktā :

Vinā sādhyādadṛṣṭasya dṛṣṭānte hetuteṣyate

Parāirmayā / punardharmiṇyasambhuṣṇer vināmūna

15. Śāntarakṣita refers to the views of Ahrīkā in another connection.—
See, Tattvasaṅgraha p. 486.—tādatra *ahrikā* dayscodayanti Yathākramam
ahrikah prayogadvayamāha

longing to a rival school of thought, which is quite common in the philosophical literature of India. By "Ahrīka" other Buddhist writers may here refer to the Digambara school. The identification of the Kārikas found in the Viśālāmalavati tikā with those found in the works of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla suggests that Pātrasvāmin or Pātrakesari was a teacher of the Digambara school of the Jains who attained glory by the refutation of the Trilakṣaṇa doctrine of Hetu, known to have been well established by Diñnāga. This pushes the date of Pātrakesari further back and suggests that Pātrakesari must have lived sometime after Diñnāga and before Dharmakīrti. It is far from truth to say that Pātrakesari is identical with Vidyānanda, the author of Ślokavārtika, who actually quotes from the works of Dharmakīrti and is assigned to 9th Century A.D.
