

# THE THEORY OF INFERENCE IN THE *VAIŚEŚIKASŪTRA*: INTERPRETED IN CANDRĀNANDA'S *VR̥TTI* AND THE *UPASKĀRA*\*

Takanori SUZUKI

## 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 Śāṅkaramiśra'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.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, it seems that some problems remain, especially with respect to the reason why those variants occurred in the Vaiśeṣika history.<sup>2</sup> 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 Kenkyū (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 *VS*s were neglected by scholars and Śāṅkaramiśra could not obtain good commentaries to interpret the sūtras. His verse "sūtramātrāvalambena nirālambe 'pi gacchatah/ khe khelavan mamāpi atra sāhasaṃ siddhim eṣyati!" (*VS(U)*, p. 1,8) proves that he was obliged to compose the *Upaskāra* under this poor situation.

*VS(C)* 9.18: *asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sambandhi ekārtha-samavāyi virodhi ceti laiṅgikam.*

*VS(U)* 9.2.1: *asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ saṃyogi samavāyi virodhi ceti laiṅgikam.*

Attention should be paid to the word “*sambandhi*” (a thing which is related with) in the *VS(C)* 9.18, which appears as “*saṃyogi*” (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 “*saṃyogi*” and he subsequently confirms this point by referring to another sūtra.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, the three main commentaries of the *Padārthadharmasamgraha* (*PDhS*, 6c), the *Vyomavatī*, the *Nyāyakandalī*, and the *Kiraṇāvalī* (*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 four relationships which make up the ground of inferential cognition, one of which includes “*saṃyoga*” (contact), are only examples. The *PDhS* also states that relationships not included in these four, such as “*candrodayasya samudravṛttiḥ*”, the relationship between the moon-rising and high tide, are referred to by the word “*asyedaṃ*” in the beginning of the sūtra, where the sixth case-ending of the word “*asya*” signifies relationships in general (*sambandhamātra*). This interpretation is based on the following statement in the *PDhS*.

*śāstre kāryādigrahaṇam nidarśanārtham kṛtam nāvadhāraṇārtham; kasmād? vyatirekadarśanāt. tad yathā advaryuḥ oṃ śrāvayan vyavahitasya hotur liṅgam, candrodayaḥ samudravṛddheḥ kumudavikāsasya ca; śaradi jalaprasādo ’gastyodayasyety evamādi tat sarvam asyedaṃ iti sambandhamātravacanāt siddham. (PDhS, p. 202,12-17)*

<sup>3</sup> *VS(C)* 3.1.8: *saṃyogi samavāyi ekārthasamavāyi 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 *Daśapadārthī* uses "相属", which corresponds to "sambandhi" or "sambandha" in Sanskrit, in the definitions of *sāmānyato dr̥ṣṭam*, inference based on generic property. As for Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccayavṛtti* (*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 "saṃyogī" (*ldan pa*) and "samavāyī" ('du pa).<sup>5</sup> Śālikanātha's *R̥jvimālā* (*RV*) and *Prakaranapañcikā* (*PrP*), on the other hand, use the words "saṃyogī" or "saṃyoga".<sup>6</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup> As we will see later, the sūtra was presumably known in the form of *VS(C)* 9.18 at the early stage.

<sup>5</sup> *PSV(V)*, p. XIX,16(L); *PSV(K)*, p. XIX,17(R).

<sup>6</sup> 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 *Nyāyavārttikatātparyatīkā* (*NVTT*) and the *Nyāyaratnamālā* (*NRM*) quote the *VS(C)* 9.18 and criticize its inconsistency in using the word “*sambandhi*”.<sup>7</sup>

① Texts with the passage including “*sambandhi*”

- *Daśapadārthī* (勝宗十句義論) (Candramati 慧月, A.D. 4-5 c.)  
 不見同故比者、謂見因果相屬一義和合相違故、待彼相屬念故我意合故 … (Taisho Daizo 54:1263)
- *PSV* (Dignāga, A.D. 5 c.)  
*bye brag pa nams na re 'di ni 'di'i 'bras bu dan rgyu dan 'brel pa dan don gcig la 'du pa dan 'gal pa can no zhes bya ba de dag ni rtags las byuñ pa'o zhes zer rol//* (*PSV(V)*, p. XIX, 4-9(L))  
*bye brag pa nams kyañ 'di ni 'di'i rgyu dan/ 'bras bu dan 'brel pa dan/ don gcig la 'du pa dan/ 'gal pa nams ni rtags can gyi'o zhes zer rol//* (*PSV(K)*, p. XIX, 4-9(R))

② Texts with the passage including “*saṃyogī*”

- *RV* (Śālikanātha, A.D. 9 c.)  
*etena ye 'pi samavāyasamयोगaikārthasamavāyakāryakāraṇabhāvavirodhākhyān pañca sambandhānumānāngam āhuh te 'pi nirākṛtāḥ.* (*RV*, p. 73, 14-16)
- *PrP* (Śālikanātha)  
*etenaiva nyāyena ye 'pi kāryakāraṇabhāvasamयोगasamavāyaikārthasamavāyavirodhākhyān pañca sambandhān asyedam kāryam, kāraṇam, saṃyogi, samavāyi, ekārthasamavāyi, virodhi ceti laiṅgikam ity anumānakāraṇam āhuh, te 'pi nirākṛtāḥ.*<sup>8</sup> (*PrP*, p. 201,19-202,2)

③ Criticism of the *VS(C)* 9.18

- *NVTT* (Vācaspatimiśra, A.D. 10 c.)

<sup>7</sup> In the *Nyāyavārttika*, Uddyotakara mentions the relationships forming the ground for inferential cognition and enumerates them as *kāryakāraṇabhāva*, *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.

<sup>8</sup> *PrP(M)* reads the passage “*asyedam kāryam, kāraṇam, saṃyogi, samavāyi, ekārthasamavāyi, virodhi ceti laiṅgikam*” as “*asyedam kāraṇam kāryam sambandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laiṅgikam*” (*PrP(M)*, p. 68,2), which is completely the same as the *PSV(K)*. It is interesting that the words “*saṃyoga*” 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.

Refer to section 4, this essay.

- *NRM* (Pārthasārathimiśra, A.D. 11-12 c.)

*svarūpatas tāvat kāryakāraṇabhāvasamyogasamavāyaikārtha-virodhān laiṅgikaśabdanirdiṣṭānumānakāraṇatvena kāṇādāḥ saṅgirante — ‘asyedaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāryaṃ sambandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laiṅgikaṃ’ iti. ... . na ca sambandhigrahaṇena sarvasaṃgrahaḥ. tasya saṃyoga-samavāyamātraparatvāt. sarvaparatve ca kāryakāraṇabhāvā-dīnām api tata eva siddheḥ pṛthagabhidhānānarthakyaṃ.* (*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*.<sup>9</sup> However, at the time of Praśastapāda, who was aware of the redundancy in the sūtra, the meaning of the word “*asyedaṃ*” 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 *PDhS* 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. *NVTṬ*'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 *NVTṬ* is quoted in the *Kir* with some modifications. This can be seen in the following:

[*yaś ca vaiśeṣikaiḥ catusprakāraḥ sambandha ucyate, asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sambandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laiṅgikaṃ iti,*] *atrāpi sambandhipadena (tathā hy asyedaṃ iti sambandhapratipādakenaiva) sarvopasaṃgrahāt śeṣābhidhānaṃ vyartham. na ca sambandhi-(sambandha-)padopāttasyātiprasaktiḥ śeṣapadair nivāryate. tathā sati śeṣapadāny eva santu kṛtaṃ sambandhipadena, tebhya (asyeti padena tasmāt) eva sambandhi-(sambandha-)bhedānām adhigateḥ, na caivaṃ*

<sup>9</sup> Nozawa [1983: 145-147] also holds that the *VS(C)* 9.18 preserves the old form of the sūtra.

cāturvidhyam sambandhasyānumānāṅgasya (saty anumity aṅga-  
sya sambandhasya cāturvidhyam api) ... (NVTT, p. 134,16; Kir, p.  
202,21, the description in the square brackets appears only in the  
NVTT. The underlined descriptions are the variant readings  
between the NVTT and the Kir, and the ones in round brackets are  
that of the Kir.)

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 “sambandhamātra”, signified by “asyedam”, in order to refute it.<sup>10</sup> 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,<sup>11</sup> 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 “sambandhamātra”, relationships in general. The PDhS also regards “kāryādigrahaṇam”,

<sup>10</sup> See section 2 of this paper.

<sup>11</sup> 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 kāryaṃ kāraṇam iti ekaḥ sambandhaḥ.*)

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 Vyomaśiva 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 Vācaspati 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.

#### ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

##### PRIMARY SOURCES:

- D(M)*: *Daśapadārthī* (Chinese version) of Candramati. Critically edited by Keiichi Miyamoto. Included in *The Metaphysics and Epistemology of the Early Vaiśeṣikas*. See Miyamoto [1996].
- Kir*: *Kiraṇāvalī* of Udayana. Edited with *Praśastapādabhāṣya* by Jitendra S. Jetly. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1971 (rpt.1991) .
- NRA*: *Nyāyaranāikā* of Pārthasārthimīśra. Edited with *Ślokaṅkā* of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. Varanasi: Ratna Publications, 1993.
- NRM*: *Nyāyaratnamālā* of Pārthasārthimīśra. Edited with *Nayakarātna* of Rāmānujācārya by K.S. Ramaswami Śāstri Śiromaṇi. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1937.
- NV*: *Nyāyabhāṣyavārttika* of Bhāradvāja Uddyotakara. Edited by Anantalal Thakur. Nyāyaturgranthikā Vol. 2, Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, 1997.
- NVTT*: *Nyāyavārttikatātparyatikā* of Vācaspati Mīśra. Edited by Anantalal Thakur. Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, 1996.
- PDhS*: *Padārthadharmasamgraha: Praśastapādabhāṣya*. See *Kir*.
- PrP*: *Prakaranapañcikā* of Śālikanāthamīśra. Edited with *Nyāyasiddhi* of Jaipuri Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa by Subrahmanya Śāstri. Benares: Benares Hindu University, 1961.
- PrP(M)*: *Prakaranapañcikā* of Śālikanāthamīśra. Edited by Mukunda Śāstri. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Book Office, 1903.
- PSV(K)*: *Pramāṇasamuccayavṛtti* of Dignāga (Kanakavarman's translation). Included in the appendix of *VS(C)*.
- PSV(V)*: *Pramāṇasamuccayavṛtti* of Dignāga (Vasudhararakṣita's translation). Included in the appendix of *VS(C)*.
- RV*: *Rjvimālā* of Śālikanāthamīśra. Edited with *Brhatī* of Prabhākaramīśra by Chinnaswami Shastri. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1929.
- VS(C)*: *Vaiśeṣikasātra* of Kaṇāda. Edited with the commentary of Candrānanda by Jambuvijayaji. Vadodara: Oriental Institute, 1982.

- VS(U): Vaiśeṣikasūtra* of Kaṇāda. Edited with *Upaskāra* of Śaṅkaramiśra and *Prāśastapāda-bhāṣya* of Prāśastapāda, by Duṅḍhirāja Śāstri. Varanasi: 1923.  
*Vy: Vyomavati* of Vyomaśivācārya. Edited with the *Prāśastapādabhāṣya* by Gaurinath Śāstri. Varanasi: Sampurnand Sanskrit University, 1963.  
勝宗十句義論, 慧月造玄奘訳, 大正大藏經54卷1262頁上-1265頁下。

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Frauwallner, Erich

- 1955 "Candramati und sein Daśapadārthaśāstram", *Studia Indologica: Festschrift für W. Krifel* (Bonner Orientalische Studien), pp. 65-85.

Honda, Megumu

- 1984 "Vaisheshika-suutora Genkei heno Ichikousatsu" (Some Correct Readings of Vaiśeṣika-sūtra), *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 65: 37-43 (L). (in Japanese)

Miyamoto, Keiichi

- 1996 *The Metaphysics and Epistemology of the Early Vaiśeṣikas: With an Appendix Daśapadārthi of Candramati*, Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Nozawa, Masanobu

- 1976 "The Vaiśeṣikasūtra referred to in the Padārthadharmasamgraha", *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 48: 32-38 (L).

- 1983 "Vaisheshika-gakuha no Suirosetsu" (Vaiśeṣika Theory of Inference), *Numazu Kougyou Koutou Senmongakkou Kenkyuu Houkoku (Journal of Numazu National College of Technology)* 18: 139-149. (in Japanese)

- 1991 "Inferential Marks in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*", *Samhāṣā* 12: 25-38.

Okazaki, Yasuhiro

- 2005 *Uddyotakara no Ronrigaku: Bukkyo Ronrigaku tono Soukoku to sono Toutatsuten* (Logic of Uddyotakara: Its Conflict with the Buddhist Logic and Arrival Points), Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten. (in Japanese)

Schuster, Nancy

- 1972 "Inference in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras*", *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 1: 342-395.

Thakur, Anantalal

- 2003 *History of Science, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilization Vol. 2, Pt. 4: Origin and Development of the Vaiśeṣika System*, Delhi: Centre for Studies in Civilizations.

Ui, Hakuju

- 1999(1917) *The Vaiśeshika Philosophy: According to the Daśapadārtha-śāstra* (Chinese text with Introduction, Translation, and Notes), London: Royal Asiatic Society.

*Visiting Lecturer*  
*Aichi Bunkyo University*  
*Komaki, Japan*