

ON A NEWLY IDENTIFIED MANUSCRIPT OF THE  
HETUBINDUṬĪKĀ IN THE ASIATIC  
SOCIETY OF BENGAL

ERNST STEINKELLNER

Arcaṭa's Hetubinduṭīkā ( HBT ) has been edited by the Pandit Sukhlalji Sanghavi and the Muni Shri Jinavijayaji<sup>1</sup> on the basis of a single palm-leaf manuscript from a Jaina collection at Pātan. This manuscript of the 11th or 12th century, written in "a very old form of the eastern Devanāgarī of the Nevārī type",<sup>2</sup> is incomplete, six folios having been "completely destroyed".<sup>3</sup> The resulting gaps in the printed text have been made up for, to some extent, by the substitution of the Tibetan translation in my edition of Dharmakīrti's Hetubindu ( HB ).<sup>4</sup> But the pandit has already shown the possibility of improving upon this textual situation by pointing to a number of authors from the epistemological tradition of the Jainas who made Arcaṭa's comments "a special subject of their study" and, thus, incorporated short and longer quotations from his Ṭīkā in their texts.<sup>5</sup> The Muni Jambuvijayaji was the first to investigate these possibilities. In his contribution to the felicitation volume for Professor Frauwallner<sup>6</sup> he was able to restore the original Sanskrit text corresponding to the missing folio 52 of the Pātan-manuscript on the basis of the Tibetan translation and a long quotation from the HBT he found in Candrasena's Utpādādisiddhiṭīkā. In this way about half of HBT 48,17ff.<sup>7</sup> was filled by regaining the strictly speaking,<sup>8</sup> original text.

Thanks to the untiring vigilance of Elliot Stern, Philadelphia, and thanks to his spirit of scholarly solidarity we are able to now fill another of these gaps with most of its original text, and, beyond that, we have a second manuscript—at least for a great part of the text—for the purpose of future editorial work or accurate philological interest. In his letter of June 26, 1980, Stern provided me with the following information: "An incomplete mss. of Arcaṭa's Hetubinduṭīkā has been lying many years in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, awaiting identification. I happened to see the entry, no. 33 on pp. 80-82 of A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanscrit

Mss. in the Govt. Collection under the Care of the ASB, vol. 1 : Buddhist mss., Calcutta 1917. The passage giving Ívarasena's views looked awfully familiar ; all the extracts may be traced to the section on *anupalabdhihetuh*, except 'folio 25A' which has text from the end of *svabhāvahetunirūpaṇam* and beginning of *kāryahetunirūpaṇam*. Unfortunately, the ends of the palm leaves have been cut—some text is lost on each line". When in 1981-82 Dr. Stern visited Vienna and travelled through India in search of manuscript materials for his forthcoming critical edition of the Vidhiviveka and Nyāyakaṇikā, he kindly procured a microfilm-copy of this manuscript and brought it to Vienna.<sup>9</sup>

Since the catalogue<sup>10</sup> is difficult to locate, I quote the description of the manuscript in full : "Substance, seasoned palm-leaf. 12½×2 inches. Folio ( by counting ) 51. Lines, 6 on a page. Written in the Bengali character of the latter part of the XIIth century, which well agrees with that of the last photograph of the third plate in Bendall's Cam. Cat.

"It appears that the leaves were much longer than 12¼ inches, because it is clean cut at both the ends, cutting even the writing. When the leaves were entire, there seems to have been two holes for the strings, one to the right and one to the left of the centre. The leaves have been so cut that the portions of the right-hand holes are still visible and a portion of the blank space round the hole is visible in every leaf. Under the circumstances, it is difficult to describe the MSS., which has no beginning, no end, no colophons and no leaf marks. I have left the leaves as I found them and to preserve the present arrangement, I have put down, in the blank round the left-hand hole, Bengali numerals from 1-51.

"That the book is a Buddhist Nyāya tract is apparent."<sup>11</sup>

In order to identify the folios I have kept Hara Prasad Shastri's pagination, which does not indicate the original page—sequence, but had the purpose of providing an inventory only. The page which carries the number has been defined as reverse ( "b" ), here.

Due to the great amount of text available it is possible—irrespective of the mutilated shape of the leaves—to fill another of the hitherto unique manuscript's gaps : About two-thirds of the lacuna of HBT 187, 21ff.<sup>12</sup> can be restored with the help of the new Calcutta manuscript (=C) and the Tibetan translation (=P). In order to provide for a clear conception of the newly gained text and the still remaining lacunae, I have added to the following

restoration of the Tibetan translation in round brackets where the last part of the lines is not available in the manuscript. Words from the Hetubindu are in italics.

HBT 187,21 : (C, f. 7a6)...āha/*abhāvas tu pratiyogino yaḥ sādhyāḥ* so<sup>13</sup> <'> *nyabhāvena* na virudhyata iti/kuta (še na/lhan cig gnas pa'i phyir ro // zla'o dños po med pa dañ gz'an yod pa dag lhan cig gnas pa'i phyir ro // 'di yaḥ gz'an gyi 'dod pa la bltos nas brjod pa yin gyi de lta ma yin na gañ kho na'i phyogs) (C f. 30b1) °kaivalyaṃ<sup>14</sup> sa eva ghatābhāva iti pratipādanāt kasya kinsahāvasthānaṃ bhavet/*tasminn* anyabhāvena saḥāvasthāyini tadabhāve *prameye katham liṅgaliṅginor virodhaḥ/na*<sup>15</sup> kathañcid iti </> asambandha eva tayo <r> (yin pa'i phyir ro // 'dir yaḥ 'gal pa'i 'brel pa la bltos nas gz'an yod pa ni rtags yin pa'i phyir/gz'an pa'i chos can misrid pas spyi med pa sgrub par byed pa'i gnas skabs la gañ) (C f. 30b2) prāg iti tadabhāve doṣo (?)<sup>16</sup> 'parihārya eveti/evaṃ sambandhābhābe <'> parasyāvasthāpīte 'nyabhāvagatyā tadabhāvagatyasambhavaṃ siddhāntavādīnaḥ paro darśayitum āha/*nanv asati sambandha* ityādi/anyabhāvaga <ti> (ñid de med par rtogs pa'i phyir rtags dañ rtags can gyi dños po rnam par 'byed pa ni gañ dañ gañ gz'an yod par rtogs pa las de med par rtogs par sñar bśad pa de yaḥ gz'an yod pas) (C f. 30b3) °yāv (?) asati sambandhena syāt<sup>17</sup>/na kevalaṃ liṅgaliṅgibhāvāḥ<sup>18</sup> </> tasmād avāśyaṃ tvayā kaścit tayoh sambandha eṣṭavyaḥ </> sa eva mamāpi bhaviṣyati/siddhāntavādy āha/*na vai* naiva *kutaścit samba* <ndhāt> (cuñ zad cig 'bral pa la rten pa gz'an yod pas de med pa šes par byed par mi 'dod kyi/'on kyañ kho bo ni gz'an phyogs 'ba' z'ig yod pa) (C f. 30b4) eva tadanyasya ghatāder abhāvāḥ </> anya<sup>19</sup>-bhāvasya parabhāvena tuccharūpatvād <iti/> <sup>20</sup> etac ca prāg evoktam </> anyabhāvo 'pi tadabhāva iti vyapadiśyata ity<sup>21</sup> atra naiyāyikān nirasyati<sup>22</sup>/yadā (de lta yin pa de'i tshe de gz'an yod pa dag gz'an bum pa la sogs pa dañ ma 'dres pa ni lhan cig pa'i ño bo gañ yin pa de ltar ni ma yin no // gz'an ma yin pa dañ 'dre ba'i ño bo 'di dag ñid ston pa ni) (C f. 30b5) <keva> lasyeti<sup>23</sup>/kaivalyaṃ vacyaveṣṭe (?)<sup>24</sup>/*ekātmany* ekaśminn ananyasahite ātmani abhāve *vyavasthitasyeti tenā*<sup>25</sup>*tmanā* </> <sup>26</sup> tatsāmarthyabhāvirūpā (?)<sup>27</sup> tad rūpam evānukurvva° (pa'i mñon sum gyis yoñs su gcod pa de ñid gz'an bum pa la sogs pa de la yod pa rnam par gcod do // rnam par mi gcod par med pa rtogs pa yin na ni gañ gis na gz'an) (C f. 30b6) <anya> bhāvatadabhā-

vayor<sup>28</sup> gamyagamakabhāvo yatas tayoḥ sambandho mayeṣyata iti kumārīlas tu manyate/bhāvāṃśāt pṛthag evāyam...(HBT 187,27).

As to the textual quality of the Calcutta-manuscript in general : To judge from several samples investigated, it seems to be worse than that of the Pātan-manscript ; nevertheless, there are better readings to be found, too.

There is only one consequence to be drawn from this text for the text of the Hetubindu : The words *anyabhāvataadabhāvayoḥ* in HB 24, 24 have to be deleted because the pratīka quoted in C f. 30b2 clearly shows that the Tibetan correspondence to these retranslated words must be considered to be a gloss.

Since the original sequence of the folios has been seriously disturbed and I had to identify, therefore, every folio in my search for additional texts, the following concordance between the edition of the Hetubinduṭīkā and the Calcutta-manuscript may facilitate any future work with this manuscript, or at least complement Hara Prasad Shāstri's description. Here I would like to express my gratitude to the late Pandit Sukhlalji Sanghavi for the very detailed terminological index he added to his edition of the Ṭīkā, for without this index I would not have been able to locate the text of these folios so easily.

Calcutta-Ms (folio)	HBT (ed.) (page)	Calcutta-Ms (folio)	HBT (ed.) (page)
46a	111, 18-112, 20	49a	134, 28-135, 24
46b	112, 23-113, 25	49b	135, 26-136, 26
45b	119, 25-120, 25	51b	136, 28-137, 27
45a	120, 27-122, 1	51a	137, 29-139, 1
19a	122, 3-123, 4	17a	139, 3-140, 3
19b	123, 6-124, 8	17b	140, 5-141, 6
8a	124, 10-125, 9	27b	141, 8-142, 6
8b	125, 11-126, 12	27a	142, 9-143, 11
44a	126, 14-127, 14	28a	143, 13-144, 19
44b	127, 16-128, 16	28b	144, 21-145, 23
47a	128, 19-129, 17	26b	145, 26-146, 25
47b	129, 19-130, 19	26a	147, 7-148, 6
48a	130, 22-131, 21	25a	148, 7-150, 3
48b	131, 23-132, 19	55b	150, 5-252, 4
50a	132, 21-133, 25	24a	151, 6-152, 6
50b	133, 27-134, 26	24b	152, 11-153, 10

Calcutta-Ms (folio)	HBT (ed.) (page)	Calcutta-Ms (folio)	HBT (ed.) (page)
22a	153, 12-154, 14	6a	190, 5-191, 3
22b	154, 16-155, 15	5a	191, 5-192, 3
21a	155, 17-156, 18	5b	192, 5-193, 5
21b	156, 20-157, 18	4b	193, 7-194, 8
20b	157, 20-158, 21	4a	194, 10-195, 10
20a	158, 23-159, 20	3b	195, 12-196, 13
11b	159, 22-160, 23	3a	196, 15-197, 17
11a	160, 26-161, 26	2a	197, 19-198, 21
12b	161, 28-163, 2	2b	198, 24-199, 24
12a	163, 4-164, 3	31a	199, 26-200, 23
13a	164, 6-165, 6	31b	200, 25-201, 25
13b	165, 8-166, 7	34b	201, 26-202, 21
14a	166, 9-167, 24	34a	202, 23-203, 17
14b	167, 26-168, 23	32a	203, 19-204, 20
15b	168, 25-169, 24	32b	204, 22-205, 24
15a	169, 26-170, 26	33a	205, 26-206, 28
16a	170, 28-171, 26	33b	207, 2-208, 7
16b	171, 28-172, 25	35b	208, 9-209, 10
9a	172, 27-173, 24	35a	209, 13-210, 13
6b	173, 26-174, 25	36b	210, 16-211, 11
1b	174, 27-175, 26	36a	211, 14-212, 9
1a	175, 28-176, 28	37a	212, 11-213, 10
29a	177, 2-28	37b	213, 13-214, 16
29b	177, 30-178, 26	38b	214, 18-215, 18
18a	178, 28-179, 27	38a	215, 20-216, 19
18b	179, 29-180, 26	42a	216, 21-217, 17
10a	181, 1-182, 8	42b	217, 19-218, 14
10b	182, 10-183, 15	39b	218, 16-219, 13
23a	183, 18-184, 18	39a	219, 15-220, 11
23b	184, 21-185, 21	41a	220, 13-221, 7
7b	185, 23-186, 21	41b	221, 9-222, 13
7a	186, 22-	40b	222, 15-223, 7
30b	-187, 28	40a	223, 10-224, 9
30a	188, 1-189, 2	43b	224, 11-225, 11
6b	189, 5-190, 3	43a	225, 14-226, 9

## Notes

1. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 113, Baroda 1949.
2. *ibid.*, II.
3. *ibid.*, I.
4. Wien 1967, appendix (109-115).
5. Cf. XXIX of his introduction and the texts mentioned in the footnotes.
6. A Comparative Study of the Utpādādisiddhiṭīkā and the Hetubinduṭīkā. WZKS 12/13, 1968, 187-191.
7. This part of the restoration with the help of the quotation in the Utpādādisiddhiṭīkā corresponds to f. 260b6-261a4 of the Peking edition (cf. HB, appendix 112,6-22).
8. The remaining portion was filled with a "Sanskrit retranslation" on the basis of the Tibetan translation and Durvekamiśra's Āloka. It may be useful to emphasize here that the learned Muni differentiates clearly between "restoration" and "Sanskrit retranslation" (189), and that his methodological example should be followed in comparable philological enterprises, too.
9. This copy now belongs to the collection of the Institute of Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna.
10. Hara Prasad Shastri: A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection Under the Care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Vol. I. Buddhist Manuscripts. Calcutta 1917.
11. This description (*ibid.*, 30) is followed by textual specimens (30-32).
12. Corresponding to f. 368b7-369b5 of the Peking edition (cf. HB appendix, 114f.).
13. The translators seem to have been irritated and gave a *pratīka*-statement, and the remaining part, up to *de dañ*, allows no meaningful construction.
14. P has only 'ba' zig.
15. *virodho na C*.
16. P has *śīar gyi skyon de dañ der byuñ ba so na 'dug ste* which is difficult to relate to the Sanskrit.
17. P has *de med pa dag la 'brel pa yod par gyur na yin gyi*
18. -*bhāvas C* has no correspondence in P, while the instrumental in *pas* is not reflected in the Sanskrit.
19. *abhāvo 'nya—C*.
20. According to P...*yin pa'i phyir 'zes...*
21. P has *'zes tha śkad btags pa ni (!)*.
22. *niryasyateti C*.
23. According to P 'ba' zig pa 'zes bya ba ni.
24. P has *ñi tše ba ñid du brjod do||*
25. C has between the akṣaras *te* and *nā* nine further akṣaras of slightly smaller size, and seemingly squeezed in. They are almost illegible, probably: *nātma (?) nānanyasahedhata*, and seem to have been crossed out. From the monochromatic film at my disposal it is impossible to say more.
26. The Tibetan for this sentence seems to correspond only in parts.
27. -*rūpā* has no correspondence in P.
28. -*tadābhāvayor C*.