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1. Introduction

It is well-known that the Vaiśeṣikasūtras have some different readings among the sūtras preserved in the three commentaries: Candrānanda’s Vṛtti (A.D. 6 c.), the anonymous Vyākhyā (A.D. 10 c.), and Śaṅkaramiśra’s Upaskāra (A.D. 15 c.). Some scholars have dealt with these variants and quotations in other texts in order to investigate the original form of the sūtras.1 Nevertheless, it seems that some problems remain, especially with respect to the reason why those variants occurred in the Vaiśeṣika history.2 This paper focuses on the VS(C) 9.18 and the VS(U) 9.2.1, which mention the reason for inferential cognition, and aims to suggest their historical development through the investigation of the relevant texts.

2. VS(C) 9.18 and VS(U) 9.2.1

The sūtra is described in the following manner in each commentary:

* This paper is an enlarged version of my previous Japanese essay, “Upaskāra no Tsutaeru Vaiśeṣikasūtra 9.2.1 ni tsuite” (Vaiśeṣikasūtra 9.2.1 preserved in the Upaskāra), Indogaku Bukkyougaku Kenkyu (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies) 53(1): 66-71. I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. M. Pelowski for correcting my English.

1 For example, Nozawa [1976] [1983], Honda [1984].

2 On this matter, Thakur [2003: 144; 165] points out the following: The original VSs were neglected by scholars and Śaṅkaramiśra could not obtain good commentaries to interpret the sūtras. His verse "sūtramātāvalambena nirālambe 'pi gacchatah/ khe kheīvan mamāpi atra sāhasām siddhim evyālī/
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VS(C) 9.18: asyedam kāryam kāraṇam sambandhi ekārtha-
samavāyī virodhi ceti laṅgikam.
VS(U) 9.2.1: asyedam kāryam kāraṇam saṁyogī samavāyī virodhi
ceti laṅgikam.

Attention should be paid to the word “sambandhi” (a thing which is
related with) in the VS(C) 9.18, which appears as “saṁyogī” (a thing
which is contacted with) in the VS(U) 9.2.1. Candrānanda points out
that the word “sambandhi” in the VS(C) 9.18 signifies “saṁyogī” and
he subsequently confirms this point by referring to another sūtra.3 On
the other hand, the three main commentaries of the Padārthadharma-
samgraha (PDhS, 6c), the Vyomavatī, the Nyāyakandali, and the
Kiraṇāvali (Kir), quote not VS(C) 9.18 but some, yet undiscovered,
sūtra which already uses the later VS(U) 9.2.1’s word choice. Let us
call this undiscovered sūtra, which these three texts are assumed to
refer to, the sūtra type-U. The fact that three commentaries quote, not
the VS(C) 9.18, but the sūtra type-U shows either that the authors
knew only the latter and not the former, or that they were motivated to
use the latter and neglect the former.

3. The sūtra in the PDhS and its commentary

In quoting the sūtra type-U, the PDhS commentaries states that the
door relationships which make up the ground of inferential cognition,
one of which includes “saṁyoga” (contact), are only examples. The
PDhS also states that relationships not included in these four, such as
“candrodhayasya samudravrddhiḥ”, the relationship between the moon-
rising and high tide, are referred to by the word “asyedam” in the
beginning of the sūtra, where the sixth case-ending of the word “asya”
signifies relationships in general (sambandhamātra). This inter-
pretation is based on the following statement in the PDhS.

śāstre kāryādigrahaṇam nidarasārtham kṛtam nāvadhāraṇārthaḥ;
kasmād? vyatirekadarśanāt. tad yathā advaryuh om
śrāvayan vyavahitasya hotur lingam, candrodhayah samudra-
vrddheḥ kumudavikāsasya ca; śarādi jalaprasādō
gastyodayasyety evamādi tat sarvam asyedam iti
sambandhamātravacanāt siddhām. (PDhS, p. 202,12-17)

3 VS(C) 3.1.8: saṁyogī samavāyī ekārthasamavāyī virodhi ca.
As is shown by the underlines in the above passage, Praśastapāda refers to only the words used in both the VS(C) 9.18 and the VS(U) 9.2.1. Therefore, it is impossible to determine which sūtra he took these words from. Nevertheless, it is likely that Praśastapāda, who is considered to be a predecessor of Candrānanda, was not aware of the sūtra type-U, but rather a sūtra which contains the VS(C) 9.18’s word choice, and found the description of the latter redundant. The word “asyedam” in the VS(C) 9.18 suffers from a redundancy, shared with the word “sambandhi”, where both signify “sambandhamātra”, relationships in general. It is, at the same time, also difficult to conclude that the word “sambandhi” is just one of the several examples of relationships. Therefore, it does not seem illogical to suppose that Praśastapāda intentionally omitted the words after “kāraṇam” in the sūtra. Three subsequent PDhS’s commentaries seem to have mirrored Praśastapāda’s opinion and used the sūtra type-U to remove the redundancy in the VS(C) 9.18. They also confirmed his opinion that “asyedam” signifies relationships in general and that the other words followed by “kārya” refer to examples of relationships.

4. The sūtra in other texts

While the above historical development can be observed among the Candrānanda’s Vṛtti, the PDhS, and three PDhS’s commentaries, the descriptions related to this sūtra can be seen also in some other texts.

The Daśapadārthi uses “相属”, which corresponds to “sambandhi” or “sambandha” in Sanskrit, in the definitions of sāmānyato drṣṭam, inference based on generic property. As for Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccayavruttī (PSV), it quotes a sūtra that resembles the VS(C) 9.18 in order to criticize it. He divides the word “sambandhi” (’brel pa) into “samyogi” (ldan pa) and “samavyi” (’du pa). Śālikanātha’s Rjvimāla (RV) and Prakaraṇapañcikā (PrP), on the other hand, use the words “samyogi” or “samyoga”. It is interesting to note that here the relationships forming the ground of inference are considered to be five. However, for the present discussion it is more

---

4 As we will see later, the sūtra was presumably known in the form of VS(C) 9.18 at the early stage.
5 PSV(V), p. XIX,16(L); PSV(K), p. XIX,17(R).
6 On the close relationship between Śālikanātha and the Vaiśeṣika, see Thakur [2003: 251-256]. Thakur gives the Śālikanātha’s quotations from the VS and the similar passages in the VS and the PDhS. He concludes that Śālikanātha had a thorough knowledge of those texts.
important that those texts develop their arguments based on the interpretation of a VS(U) 9.2.1-like sūtra. Apart from these two cases, the Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikā (NVTT) and the Nyāyaratnamālā (NRM) quote the VS(C) 9.18 and criticize its inconsistency in using the word “sambandhi”.

1 Texts with the passage including “sambandhi”
   • Daśapadārthi (勝宗十句義論) (Candramati 慧月, A.D. 4-5 c.)
     不見同故比者、謂見因果相属一義和合相違故、待彼相属念故我意合故… (Taisho Daizo 54:1263)
   • PSV (Dignāga, A.D. 5 c.)
     bye brag pa nams na re ’di ni ’di’i ’bras bu daň rgyu daň ’brel pa daň don gcig la ’du pa daň ’gal pa can no zhes bya ba de dag ni rtags las byun pa’o zhes zer rol/ (PSV(V), p. XIX, 4-9(L))
     bye brag pa nams kyan ’di ni ’di’i rgyu daň/ ’bras bu daň ’brel pa daň/ don gcig la ’du pa daň/ ’gal pa nams ni rtags can gyi’o zhes zer rol/ (PSV(K), p. XIX, 4-9(R))

2 Texts with the passage including “samyogi”
   • RV (Śālikanātha, A.D. 9 c.)
     etena ye ’pi samavāyasamyogaikārthasamavāyakāryakārana-bhāvavirodhākhvān pañca sambandhänumānāṅgam āḥuḥ te ’pi nirākrtaḥ. (RV, p. 73, 14-16)
   • PrP (Śālikanātha)
     etenaiva nyāyena ye ’pi kāryakāreñabkhāvasamyogasamavāyaikārthasamavāyavirodhākhvān pañca sambandhān asyedam kāryaṁ, kāraṇaṁ, samyogi, samavāyi, ekārthasamavāyi, virodhi ceti laṅgikam ity anumānakāraṇaṁ āḥuḥ, te ’pi nirākrtaḥ. (PrP, p. 201,19-202,2)

3 Criticism of the VS(C) 9.18
   • NVTT (Vācaspatimiśra, A.D. 10 c.)

---

7 In the Nyāyavārttika, Uddvotakara mentions the relationships forming the ground for inferential cognition and enumerates them as kāryakārañabhāva, ekārthasamavāya, and sambandhamātra (NV, p. 47,13-15). This enumeration leads us to believe that his commentary was based on the description of the VS(C) 9.18, but he himself does not clearly refer to it.

8 PrP(M) reads the passage “asyedam kāryaṁ, kāraṇaṁ, samyogi, samavāyi, ekārthasamavāyi, virodhi ceti laṅgikam” as “asyedam kāraṇaṁ kāryaṁ sambandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laṅgikam” (PrP(M), p. 68,2), which is completely the same as the PSV(K). It is interesting that the words “samyoga” and “samavāya” are in sequence in the RV and the PrP(M), the Mīmāṃsā texts. It seems that they divided the word “sambandhi” into these two words following Dignāga’s approach. The NRM as well shows the same interpretation.
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Refer to section 4, this essay.

NRM (Pārthasārathīmśra, A.D. 11-12 c.)

svarūpatas tāvat kāryakāraṇabhāvasanyogasamavāyika-kāṛthanka-virodhān laṅgikaṣabdanirdiṣṭānumānakāraṇatvena kāṇādāh saṅgirante — 'asyedām kāraṇām kāryam sambhandhy ekāṛthasamavāyī virodhi ceti laṅgikam’ iti. ... na ca sambandhigrahanena sarvasamgrahah. tasya samyogasamavāyamātraparāpatvāt. sarvaparātve ca kāryakāraṇabhāvā-dīnām api tata eva siddheḥ prthagabhidhānānarthakhyam.

(NRM, p. 325,4-16)

Although the number of materials is limited, we can conclude the following: In the early stage of the Vaiśeṣika, the sūtra under scrutiny existed in the form of the VS(C) 9.18, as we can see in the Daśapadārthī and the PSV. However, at the time of Praśastapāda, who was aware of the redundancy in the sūtra, the meaning of the word “asyedam” came to be regarded as relationships in general, while the words preceded by “kārya” came to be regarded as specific examples. The sūtra type-U, which we might call the prototype of the VS(U) 9.2.1, then emerged and prevailed in the Vaiśeṣika school. The commentators on the PDḥS probably chose to neglect the VS(C) 9.18 because the sūtra type-U was regarded as more authoritative than the VS(C) 9.18 in the Vaiśeṣika school at that time.

5. NVTT’s criticism and its modified quotation in the Kir

Regarding the above quotations, what is interesting is that the criticism against the VS(C) 9.18 in the NVTT is quoted in the Kir with some modifications. This can be seen in the following:

[yāś ca vaiśeṣikaiḥ catusprākāraḥ sambandha ucyate, asyedām kāryam kāraṇam sambhandhy ekāṛthasamavāyī virodhi ceti laṅgikam iti,] atrāpi sambandhipadena (tathā hy asyedam iti sambhandhapratipādapadakaivyā) sarvopasamgrahāt śesābhidhānaṁ vyartham. na ca sambhandhi-(sambandha-)padopātasyātipra-saktih śesapadair nīvāryate. tathā satī śesapadānī eva santu kṛtam sambandhipadena, tebhya (asyeti padena tasmāt) eva sambandhi-(sambandha-)bhedānāṁ adhigāteḥ, na caivaṁ

Nozawa [1983: 145-147] also holds that the VS(C) 9.18 preserves the old form of the sūtra.
As is shown by the underlines in the above passage, the description in the *NVTT* is similar to the *Kir*, with the modification where the word “sambandhi” is changed into “sambandha”. The word “sambandhi” in the *NVTT* refers back to the *VS(C)* 9.18, while “sambandha” refers to the *PDhS*. Udayana used the word “sambandha”, mainly because he was stating the assumed opposing opinion against the *PDhS*’s passage about the word “sambandhamāṭra”, signified by "asyedam", in order to refute it. However, if he just intended to present an opposing opinion, he did not need to quote the passage in the *NVTT*. Udayana, who wrote the *NVTP*, the commentary on the *NVTT*, must have known the passage of the *NVTT*. He intentionally used and modified it in the *Kir*. In a word, Udayana not only neglected the *VS(C)* 9.18 as the preceded two commentaries did, but, by specifically quoting a text which had incorporated the *VS(C)* 9.18 and then modifying that text, he also explicitly tried to set the *VS(C)* 9.18 aside from the main stream of the Vaiśeṣika school.

6. Conclusion

We have investigated how the *VS(C)* 9.18 and the sūtra type-U are dealt with among the relevant texts. In this conclusion, the following will be pointed out:

The accepted view among the Vaiśeṣika regarding the reason for inferential cognition was known from the beginning in the form of the *VS(C)* 9.18. However, after some time, the redundancy of using the word “sambandhi” came to be realized, as we see in the *PDhS*’s description which makes “asyedam” mean “sambandhamāṭra”, relationships in general. The *PDhS* also regards “kāṛyādigrahaṇam”,

---

10 See section 2 of this paper.
11 In the *NVTP*, on the contrary, Udayana completely neglects the Vācaspati’s criticism. He avoids showing the whole sūtra, like Praśastapāda, and quotes up to the word kāraṇam. (*NVTP*, p. 187,18: asyedam kāṛyām kāraṇam iti ekah sambandhaḥ.)
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the words preceded by "kārya", as nothing but examples. Then the sūtra type-U, which may be called the prototype of the VS(U) 9.2.1, emerged and became well-known at least by the time of Vyomāśīva or Śālikanātha. However, at the same time, the VS(C) 9.18 was also known and was the target of criticism as is typically seen in the NVTT and the NRM.

In the Kir, the NVTT is obviously quoted, with the modification that the word “sambandhi” is changed into “sambandha”. The word “sambandhi”, taken from the VS(C) 9.18, was used by Vācaspāti to point out its redundancy. While the word “sambandha” was taken from the PDhS by Udayana, who showed an accusation from an estimated opponent. This means that Udayana intended to shift the criticism in the NVTT, regarding the VS(C) 9.18 towards the PDhS in a rather cynical manner. It is possible to interpret these facts to mean that Udayana was trying to cover up the existence of the VS(C) 9.18. Before that time, the sūtra type-U, the prototype of the VS(U) 9.2.1, emerged under the influence of the PDhS’s description, and, at the time of Udayana, became fixed as the accepted sūtra.
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