

Dharmakīrti on False Rejoinders (*jāti*)

WATANABE Toshikazu

0. In his *Pramāṇavārttika* 2.14, Dharmakīrti gives the definition of one of the *jātis* (false rejoinders)¹⁾ called *kāryasama* ([the *jāti* whose reason is] similar [to the reason being refuted] with respect to [being] an effect),²⁾ and explains that his refutation of the existence of God proposed in PV 2.12-13 should not be regarded as this kind of *jāti*. The same verses are repeated in the same order in his later work, i.e., *Pramāṇaviniścaya* 3.70-72 (D217a1-3, P314b6-8) in the context of discussing unproved reasons (*asiddha*). Taking Dharmakīrti's view of *jātis* into consideration, however, it is legitimate to assume that he had another purpose in defining *kāryasama* in PV 2.14 = PVin 3.72. Kitagawa [1965: 300-305, 338-342], relying on Uddyotakara's *Nyāyavārttika*, pointed out that the explanation of *kāryasama* in *Nyāyasūtra* 5.1.37, as well as the one in the *Nyāyabhāṣya* on this passage, do not correspond to the explanation of *kāryasama* given by Dignāga, but rather to Dignāga's explanation of *saṃśayasama*. In addition, Krasser [2002: 42-53] has pointed out that Dharmakīrti's definition of *kāryasama* corresponds to Dignāga's explanation but not to the definition found in the *Nyāyasūtra*. Therefore, it may seem to be the case that Dharmakīrti defines *kāryasama* in order to refute the explanation in the NS and NBh. However, a close look at these materials reveals that Dharmakīrti gives the definition of *kāryasama* in response to Uddyotakara's interpretation which plays an important role in the controversy between the Buddhist and the Nyāya understanding of *kāryasama*. In this paper I will examine Dharmakīrti's view of *jātis*, and then try to clarify the historical background of his definition of *kāryasama*.

1. Dharmakīrti does not devote much space to the topic of *jāti*. He summarizes his view of *jātis* in PVin 3.85:

Refutation (*dūṣaṇa*) consists in referring to the lack [of any of the three characteristics of a valid reason (*trirūpa*)]³⁾ and so on.⁴⁾ On the contrary, *jātis* are what are seemingly like them (*tadābhāsa*). Because false ripostes (*mithyottara*, i.e., *jāti*) are infinite [in number], they are not demon-

strated here (i.e., in PVin).⁵⁾

After defining *jātis* in general, Dharmakīrti clearly states that there is no need to give an explanation of the respective kinds of *jātis* because it is possible to conceive new kinds of *jātis* without limit. Previous Buddhist logical treatises, however, enumerate 16 or 14 kinds of *jātis*, and even though Dignāga refers to their infinite numbers due to various formulations (*prayoga*),⁶⁾ he, too, refers to 14 kinds of *jātis*. In his *Nyāyavārttika* on NS 5.1.6, Uddyotakara criticizes Dignāga's view in this regard. Even though Uddyotakara also accepts that there are an infinite number of *jātis* if the various formulations are taken into consideration, he insists that there is no reason for either rejecting the Nyāya's classification into 24 kinds, or for proving Dignāga's classification.⁷⁾ As a response to this objection, Dharmakīrti discards the classification of *jātis* and adopts only the infinity of their number from Dignāga's theory.

2. Nevertheless, Dharmakīrti defines *kāryasama* in PV 2.14 = PVin 3.72. It is thus likely that there is another purpose for this verse in addition to showing the appropriateness of his criticism of the proof of the existence of God, because these arguments could be supported without defining *kāryasama*. To clarify the additional purpose, it is necessary to compare the explanation of *kāryasama* and *saṃśayasama* according to the Buddhist and Nyāya views.

2.1. In the case of *saṃśayasama*, the following arguments are presupposed:

Sound is impermanent, because it exists immediately after an effort, such as a pot. (*anityaḥ śabdah, prayatnānantarīyakatvāt, ghaṭavat.*)

In NS 5.1.14, *saṃśayasama* is defined as follows:

saṃśayasama [is adduced by the opponent] based on the similarity [of the subject of the thesis (*pakṣadharmīn*), i.e., sound] with both a permanent and an impermanent object when perceptibility is common to both, a universal (*sāmānya*) [as a permanent object, i.e., *vaidharmyadr̥ṣṭānta*] and the example [put forward by the proponent as an impermanent object, e.g. a pot, i.e., *sād-harmyadr̥ṣṭānta*].⁸⁾

On the other hand, Dignāga defines it in PS (V) 6.18ab as follows:

To cast a doubt on [the validity] of the reason by [assuming] a different meaning [from what is intended by the proponent] is [the *jāti*] called *saṃśaya* [*sama*]. (PS 6.18ab)

[The opponent would say that] the reason [put forward by the proponent] is doubtful because,

when the [different] meaning of the thesis or the [different] meaning of the reason is assumed, the reason [put forward by the proponent] would deviate [from what is to be proved].⁹⁾

According to Dignāga, in the case of *saṃśayasama* the doubts are raised by assuming (**kalpanā*) a different meaning with regard to the thesis (*pratijñā*) or with regard to the reason (*hetu*). By comparing these two explanations of *saṃśayasama*, the following difference can be pointed out: In the case of Akṣapāda's definition of *saṃśayasama*, the opponent raises the objection based on the similarity of the *paṅśadharmin* with both the *sādharmyadr̥ṣṭānta* and the *vaidharmyadr̥ṣṭānta*, while in the case of Dignāga's definition of *saṃśayasama* the opponent raises the objection based on assuming a different meaning of the thesis or the reason.

2.2. Next, we turn to the explanation of *kāryasama*. In this case, the arguments presupposed by the Nyāya and Buddhists are as follows:

Nyāya: Sound is impermanent, because it exists immediately after an effort, such as a pot. (*anityaḥ śabdah, prayatnānantariyakatvāt, ghaṭavat.*)

Buddhist: Sound is impermanent, because it is an effect, such as a pot. (*anityaḥ śabdah, kāryatvāt (or kṛtakatvāt), ghaṭavat.*)

The definition of *kāryasama* in NS 5.1.37 is as follows:

kāryasama [is adduced by the opponent] based on the variety of the effects of efforts.

Vātsyāyana gives a more detailed information about the objection raised by the opponent.

Production immediately after an effort is seen among pots, etc. On the other hand, manifestation [immediately after an effort is seen] among concealed things when their obstacles are removed. Therefore, there is no particular reason [to decide] whether sound is produced immediately after an effort, or [whether it is] manifested [immediately after an effort].¹⁰⁾

In his PS (V) 6.7abc, Dignāga gives the following explanation of *kāryasama*:

kāryasama consists in showing that what is to be proved is not established based on the slight difference between being an effect [of sound and that of a pot]. (PS 6.7abc)¹¹⁾

If [the following argument] is made [by the proponent, namely, that] sound is impermanent because it is produced like a pot, [the opponent would make the following objection:] If the effect, which proves the impermanence of the pot [in the example] is different [from that of sound], how then could sound be [impermanent]? [This objection is the *jāti* called *kāryasama*.]¹²⁾

According to this explanation, in the PS he distinguishes between *kāryasama* and *saṃśayasama* with the following point: While in the latter case, the meaning of the thesis or the reason is interpreted differently based on an assumption of the opponent, in the former case

the meaning of the reason is interpreted differently based on the difference between sound (*pakṣadharmīn*) and a pot (*drṣṭāntadharmīn*). There is no decisive difference between Dignāga's explanation of *kāryasama* and that of the NS and NBh.

2.3. However, in explaining the *kāryasama* of the NS, Uddyotakara offers the following discussion,

[Objection:] *saṃśayasama* is not distinguished from it (i.e., *kāryasama*).

[Answer:] *saṃśayasama* is based on the similarity [of the *pakṣadharmīn*, i.e., sound] with both (i.e., *sapakṣa* e.g. a pot and *vipakṣa* e.g. universal)¹³, but this (i.e., *kāryasama*) is not so. Therefore, [*saṃśayasama*] is distinguished [from *kāryasama*].

[Objection:] *sādharmyasama* is not distinguished from it (i.e., *kāryasama*).

[Answer:] This is not correct because [in the case of *kāryasama*, a different meaning of] the reason is superimposed (*adhyāropa*). *sādharmyasama* does not occur through superimposing [a different meaning of] the reason, but this (i.e., *kāryasama*) occurs [by superimposing] a different aspect (*anyathākāra*) upon the reason expressed [by the proponent with a] different [meaning than that of the opponent].¹⁴

Here, in differentiating *kāryasama* from *saṃśayasama* and *sādharmyasama*, he mentions the characteristics of *kāryasama*. Of these, the superimposition of the meaning of the reason draws our attention. Even though this characteristic is mentioned in order to differentiate *kāryasama* from *sādharmyasama*, it seems that both *sādharmyasama* and *saṃśayasama* do not possess this characteristic, because when he explains the differences between these two *jāti*s in his commentary on NS 5.1.14, this characteristic is not mentioned. As we have seen above, on the other hand, Dignāga explains that in the case of *saṃśayasama* in the PS, the proponent's original meaning of the thesis or the reason is interpreted differently by the opponent based on an assumption. Considering the case where the meaning of the reason is assumed differently, there is a similarity between Dignāga's characterization of *saṃśayasama* and Uddyotakara's characterization of *kāryasama*.¹⁵ According to Uddyotakara, therefore, it can be said that Dignāga erroneously attributes the characteristic of *kāryasama* to *saṃśayasama*, namely, that Dignāga does not differentiate between *saṃśayasama* and *kāryasama*. And so it may be possible to consider the opponent in Uddyotakara's argument cited above as being Dignāga.

2.4. For Dignāga, however, unlike Uddyotakara, the distinctive feature of *kāryasama* does not lie in the superimposition of a different meaning on the reason. Emphasizing this point, Dharmakīrti responds to Uddyotakara's criticism by saying:

When the effect is [regarded as] a proving property (*sādhana*) based on the concomitance with what is to be proved and also as being in common [between *pakṣadharmin* and *dr̥ṣṭāntadharmin*], [if] the difference [of the effect of sound from that of a pot] is mentioned [by the opponent] based on the difference between the relata (i.e., sound and a pot), [then it is] accepted as the fault [called] *kāryasama*. (PVin 3.72 = PV 2.14)¹⁶⁾

Here, following the explanation of Dignāga, Dharmakīrti again makes the point clear that in the case of *kāryasama* the meaning of the reason is interpreted differently based on the difference between *pakṣadharmin* and *dr̥ṣṭāntadharmin*. In stating this, he tries to do away with Uddyotakara's interpretation of *kāryasama*.

3. Dharmakīrti states that it is not possible to define all *jāti*s individually because they are infinite in number. Considering this view of *jāti*s, it is clear that there must be another purpose in his defining *kāryasama* in PV 2.14 = PVin 3.72. It seems that his reason for defining the term is related to the disagreement between Dignāga and Uddyotakara about the interpretation of *kāryasama* and *saṁśayasama*. As the characteristic of *saṁśayasama*, Dignāga introduces the theory that a doubt is cast on the validity of the reason because of the assumption (**kalpanā*) of the different meaning with regard to the thesis or the reason. As the characteristic of *kāryasama*, however, Uddyotakara advocates a similar albeit different theory, namely, that a doubt is cast on the validity of the reason because of the superimposition (*adhyāropa*) of a different meaning on the meaning which was originally intended. In order to exclude this characteristic from the explanation of *kāryasama*, Dharmakīrti defines the term in accordance with Dignāga's explanation.

*I would like to thank Dr. Ernst Prets for valuable suggestions. I would also like to thank Ms. Peck-Kubaczek and Patrick Mc Allister for correcting my English.

Notes: 1) Vasubandhu, Dignāga and Dharmakīrti paraphrase '*jāti*' as '*dūṣaṇābhāsa*,' or '*mithyot-tara*'. 2) On the translation of '*-sama*,' see Kang [2009: 91]. 3) See PVin 3 on k.5 (D190a6-7, P288a7) : *tenānukītvā api pakṣasya siddher apratibandhāt triṣv anyatamarūpasyaivānukītir nyūnatā sādhanadoṣa ity uktam veditavyam* / Cf. PSV 3.1ab: *atra cānyatamarūpānukītir nyūnatety uktam bhavati* / My thanks to Dr. Pascale Hugon for providing me the Sanskrit text of PVin 3, the critical edition of which is under preparation. 4) According to Dharmottara, '*nyūnatādi*' means *asiddha*, *viruddha* and *anaikāntika*. See NBṬ 254,8. 5) *dūṣaṇā nyūnatādy-uktiḥ tadābhāsās tu jātayah* / *mithyottarāṇām ānanyāt pratanyante na tā iha* // D229a7 = P328a8 (*pāda a*), D229b4 = P328b5-6 (*pāda b*), D229b5 = P328b6 (*pāda cd*). Cf. NB 3.137, 139 and

NMu k.19ab (Katsura [1982: 97-99]). 6) See NMu § 11 (Katsura [1987: 63-64]) and PSV 6.20d (Kitagawa [1965: 348]). 7) See NV 501, 10-19 on NS 5.1.6. 8) Cf. Kang [2009: 91, fn.58]. 9) K (P137b6-7), V (D82b5, P89b2). See NMu § 10.6 (Katsura [1984: 60-61]). 10) NBh 303, 17-304,1. See TPhSI 2 [78b-79a]. 11) See Krasser [2002: 44-45]. 12) My translation of this PSV is based on the Tibetan translation of PVA (D39a5, P46a3). This part lacks corresponding Sanskrit text in both Sāṅkṛtyāyana's edition and Ms B of the PVA. However, Yamāri (D30a7ff, P37b2ff) comments on this part. Moreover, this part of the Tibetan translation of the PVA is well accorded with *pratīkas* found in PŚT (D298b2ff, P336a7ff). Therefore, it is highly possible that this section was originally part of the PVA and that Prajñākaragupta is citing it from PSV 6.7. For the text of the Tibetan translation of the PSV and PVA, see Krasser [2002: 45-46, fn.58-59]. In addition, PVA 45,2-4 is a citation from PS (V) 6.12ab'. And note that '*kāryatvacākṣuṣatvādīnā*' in the edition (PVA 45,3) should be emended to '*pākyatvacākṣuṣatvādīnā*' according to the Ms B (17b4). 13) See NBh 291,6-7 on NS 5.1.14. 14) NV 515,17-516,2. See Kitagawa [1965: 305] and TPhSI 3 [216a]. 15) See Kitagawa [1965: 305]. 16) See Krasser [2002: 26-27].

Abbreviations: K: PS (V) tr. by Kaṇakavarman and Dad pa'i shes rab, P5702. Ms B: Manuscript B of PVA. S.Watanabe ed. Patna-Narita 1998. NB: *Nyāyabindu*. D. Malvania ed. TSWS 2, 2nd ed. Patna 1971. NBh: *Nyāyabhāṣya*. A.Thakur ed. New Delhi, 1997. NBT: *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*. See NB. NMu: *Nyāyamukha* See Katsura [1982], [1984], [1987]. NV: *Nyāyavārttika*. A. Thakur ed. New Delhi, 1997. PS (V) : *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (*vṛtti*). See K and V. PŚT: *Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā*. D4268, P5766. PV 2: *Pramāṇavārttika* chapter 2 (*pramāṇasiddhi*). See Krasser [2002]. PVA: *Pramāṇavārttikāṅkāra*. Sāṅkṛtyāyana ed. Patna, 1953. PVin 3: *Pramāṇaviniścaya* chapter 3. D4211, P5710. V: PS (V) tr. by Vasudhararakṣita and Seng rgyal, D4204, P5701. Kang, Sung Yong 2009: What Does *-sama* Mean? - On the Uniform Ending of the Names of the *jāti*-s in the *Nyāyasūtra*. JIPh 37: 75-96. Katsura, Shoryu 1982, 1984, 1987: A Study of the *Nyāyamukha* (5), (6), (7). *Hiroshimadaigaku Bungakubu Kiyo* 42: 82-99; 44: 43-74; 46: 46-65. Kitagawa, Hidenori 1965: *Indo Koten Ronrigaku no Kenkyu*. Tokyo. Krasser, Helmut 2002: *Śāṅkaranandanānās Īśvarapākarāṇasankṣepa mit einem anonymen Kommentar und weiteren materialien zur buddhistischen Gottespolemik*. Wien. Matilal, Bimal Krishna 1998: *The Character of Logic in India*. Albany, 1998. TPhSI 2, 3: *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien* Bd. 2 (1996), 3 (2006), Wien.

(Work on this paper has been generously supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) in the framework of the FWF project P21050-G15 "Tradition und Wandel in der indischen buddhistischen Logik".)

⟨Key words⟩ Dharmakīrti, Uddyotakara, Dignāga, *jāti*, *kāryasama*, *saṃśayasama*

(Research Fellow, the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Sciences)