

BHĀVIVEKA VS. CANDRĀNANDA

HUANHUAN HE

School of Humanities, Zhejiang University
No. 148 Tianmushan, Hangzhou, China 310028
e-mail: pkuhhh@gmail.com

This essay offers an analysis of “the two-finger” illustration which Bhāviveka discusses in the *Vaiśeṣikatattvaviniścaya* chapter of the *Tarkajvālā*, the auto-commentary on his *Madhyamakahrdaya* [*kārikā*], wherein he introduces and criticises the theories of the Vaiśeṣika school. Going through the early Vaiśeṣika literature, I have noticed that these two-finger (*dvyāṅgula*, two fingers in a unit form, or *finger-pair*) illustrations only occur in Candrānanda’s *Vṛtti*, and in a very clear and straightforward manner. As I will point out, it is a mystery and indeed somewhat perplexing that the references to this illustration in the *Tarkajvālā* are not at all immediately intelligible. This circumstance will be addressed in this essay, where also an interpretation and a solution will be offered. In addition, the relative chronology of Bhāviveka and Candrānanda as well as their contemporaries in around 6th-century India will also be discussed.

Key words: Bhāviveka, Candrānanda, *Tarkajvālā*, *Candrānandavṛtti*, *dvyāṅgula*, two-finger illustration.

1. Preliminaries

The study of the confrontation of the Indian Buddhist schools of thought with other Indian philosophical traditions such as Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta has had a long history. In spite of this, many of its details are still unclear and thus still await resolution. As is well known, the polemical writings of the 6th-century Madhyamaka-Buddhist intellectual Bhāviveka provide an excellent point of departure for such studies. An inquiry into the sources with which he was working will further our understanding of this important scholar’s intellectual biography. It is also relevant for the much larger issues that bear on India’s intellectual history as such. In addition, Bhāviveka’s encounter with these other traditions has a direct bearing on the way in which his oeuvre should be studied and understood. It is of course true

that a fair number of in-depth discussions of issues relating to Bhāviveka's place in Indian intellectual history have already been published. But there is still much to be done. That being said, it goes without saying that we all build on the results obtained by our precursors and my present essay is certainly no exception.

For my present purpose, I will not deal with Bhāviveka's understanding of Vaiśeṣika philosophy as discussed in his **Hastaratna*, which is only available in the Chinese translation by Xuanzang 玄奘 (600/602–664), the *Dasheng zhangzhen lun* 大乘掌珍論, and his *Prajñāpradīpa* commentary on Nāgārjuna's (2nd century) *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. This will be reserved for another occasion.¹ I propose here to examine “the two-finger” (*dvyaṅgula*) illustration which Bhāviveka mentions in the *Vaiśeṣikatattvaviniścaya* chapter of his *Tarkajvālā* [hereafter TJ-V]. Only extant in a Tibetan translation, the latter is the auto-commentary on his seminal *Madhyamakahṛdaya* [hereafter MH-V] which is available in Sanskrit and in a Tibetan translation. Reading through the early Vaiśeṣika literature, the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* and its commentaries such as the *Candrānandavṛtti*, *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha*, etc., I noticed that this illustration only occurred in Candrānanda's *Vṛtti*-commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* and that it did so several times and in a very lucid and unambiguous manner. This has led me to re-examine the data on which basis some tentative conclusions were reached; they add additional pieces to the puzzle of the relative chronology of Candrānanda and Bhāviveka, pieces that, I believe, have so far not played an adequate role in the various proposals known to me.²

Not as “well known” (*kīrti*) as the Madhyamaka philosopher Candrakīrti (6th century), but “delightful” (*ānanda*) in his own way, Candrānanda is the author of the earliest commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* that has come down to us. His work is thus called the *Candrānandavṛtti* [hereafter CV]. There, his name is a *śleṣa*-like part of its closing verse reading as follows (Jambuvijaya 1961, p. 76):

jaḡato 'syānandakaraṃ vidyāsavayāḥ³ sadaiva yaś candram /
ānandayati sa vṛtṭiṃ candrānando vyadhād etām //

Candrānanda, who continuously pleases the moon bringing pleasure to the world being his friend in knowledge, created this commentary.

¹ Among the latest discussions of Bhāviveka's oeuvre with rather informative bibliographies are Heitmann (2004, pp. xv–xviii), Saitō (2005, pp. 167–173), Eckel (2008, pp. 17–27), Krasser (2011, pp. 49–76) and (2012, pp. 535–594), and He–van der Kuijp (2014). In addition, Nishikawa (1983) deals with the Vaiśeṣika school's theory of time (*kāla*) in the nineteenth chapter of the *Prajñāpradīpa* in detail.

² I very briefly discussed the possible relative chronology of Candrānanda and Bhāviveka in He (2011; and 2013, pp. 150–152).

³ Jambuvijaya's edition reads *vidyāśarvayā*, while *vidyāsavayāḥ* is suggested by Ruzsa (2004/2012, p. 89), since the former is metrically impossible (two morae long). Accordingly, the text could be translated as follows: “Candrānanda, who rejoiced in the moon bringing pleasure to the world at all times in the bright starry night, created this commentary.”

Muni Śrī Puṇyavijaya was probably the first to have recovered the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Candrānandavṛtti* in the Jaisalmer Bhandar, in around 1874. In his 1917 dissertation, H. Ui wrote that “Candrananda’s [*sic*] *Bhāṣya* is said by L. F. Kielhorn to be complete” (Ui 1917, p. 13). He never mentioned the *Candrānandavṛtti* in his later works, so that I take this to indicate that while he knew of its existence, he unfortunately never gained access to it. In fact, the Jaina monk Jambuvijaya’s 1961 (second edition in 1982) outstanding publication of the *Candrānandavṛtti* was the very first critical edition based on two complete Sanskrit manuscripts: (1) the text of the Puṇyavijaya’s collection of manuscripts that are now preserved in the L. D. Institute of Ahmedabad, in Jaina Devanāgarī script, transcribed in around the 13th or 14th century; and (2) the manuscript under no. 1831(h) of the collection in the Oriental Institute, Baroda, in Śāradā script. The date on which it was copied is not given, but A. Thakur suggested that it was not very old.⁴ It is because of Jambuvijaya’s labours that Candrānanda’s name and his *Vṛtti* spread throughout the realm of Indological scholarship. E. Frauwallner remarked with unreserved praise in his 1962 review that Jambuvijaya’s edition of the text must be used in all future work on the early Vaiśeṣika.⁵ In 2012 (prepared in 2004), F. Ruzsa uploaded an “unfinished work” to the website academia.edu, *Candrānanda’s Commentary on the Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra*, which is a critical version of the text that is based on a collation of all manuscripts known to him, namely, all the manuscripts H. Isaacson has used, i.e. all the five manuscripts that are known to date (Ruzsa 2004/2012).

⁴ See A. Thakur’s introduction in Jambuvijaya (1961, p. 1). Furthermore, Isaacson (1995, pp. 146–147) reported the existence of three other paper manuscripts of the *Candrāndavṛtti*: (1) a manuscript in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, no. 99 of 1873–1874, Jaina Devanāgarī script, 20 folios, copied in 1874 A.D.; (2) a manuscript in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, no. 503 of 1875–1876, Śāradā script, 33 folios, undated; (3) a manuscript in the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain, no. 4635, Śāradā script, probably copied in 1888 A.D. These three manuscripts were not used by Jambuvijaya. For the relationship among these manuscripts, see Isaacson (1995, pp. 148–151) and Ruzsa (2010).

⁵ Frauwallner (1962). Isaacson (1995, p. 143, n. 13) rightly pointed out that: “Unfortunately, even more than a quarter-century after the publication of Jambuvijaya’s edition, articles and books continue to appear which base their statements and conclusions about the early Vaiśeṣika on the text of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* as commented on by Śāṅkara Mīśra, and do not refer to, or even appear to be aware of, Candrānanda’s commentary and the *sūtrapāṭha* it contains. A striking example is formed by a book by Veena Gajendragadkar, *Kaṇāda’s Doctrine of the Padārthas i.e. the Categories*, Delhi, 1988.” The situation is better since Isaacson’s writing, but there is still only one translation of the entire *Candrāndavṛtti*, namely, the Japanese translation in Miyamoto (2009), and several partial English translations in Isaacson (1990: cv *ad* vs 3.1.13, 3.2.1, 4.1.6~14, and Adhyāya 8), Nozawa (1993: Adhyāya 1 and Adhyāya 2), Halbfass (1992: cv *ad* vs 1.2.1~18, 9.1~12), and Thakur (2003, selected translation, pp. 24–121). Kanakura (1971, pp. 47–94) translated all the *sūtrapāṭhas* from the *Candrāndavṛtti* into Japanese while only using the *Vṛtti* for references. Nakamura (1977–1978) also referred to it while translating the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* into Japanese. It is said that M. Nozawa made a full English translation of it for his M. Phil. thesis which he submitted to the Department of Sanskrit of Madras University, but I have not been able to see this unpublished thesis. The Ph.D. dissertation of Isaacson (1995) contains only a critical Sanskrit edition of the first chapter (i.e. Adhyāya 1, Āhnika 1 & 2) and half of the second chapter (i.e. Adhyāya 2, Āhnika 1) with translations of but very few pieces. I have prepared a Chinese translation of the entire text, which will be published in 2017 with Zhejiang University Press, Hangzhou.

Although much effort has been expended on this important Vaiśeṣika scholar and his *Vṛtti*, nothing is really known aside from his name “Candrānanda”. We do not know when Candrānanda may have lived, but there is one single hint that has drawn the attention of many scholars, namely, that Candrānanda quoted *Nyāyavārttika*, 1.1.10, together with mentioning the author’s name Uddyotakara, in CV *ad* vs 3.2.4.⁶ If we take at face value an Indian tradition asserted by Dharmottara (late 8th century) to the effect that the famous Naiyāyika intellectual Uddyotakara was a contemporary of Dharmakīrti, who himself may have flourished in the 6th or 7th century (see Steinkellner 1979, p. 39, note 93), then it is reasonable to hold that Candrānanda should be posterior to him. In addition, Candrānanda mentions a mysterious *Vṛttikāra* in the ninth chapter twice, but his identity has yet to be ascertained.⁷

With regard to Candrānanda’s date, B. J. Sandesara wrote in the foreword to Jambuvijaya’s edition that “this commentary must have been written sometime after the 6th century, very probably during the 7th century” (Jambuvijaya 1961, p. viii). In the introduction to this same edition, A. Thakur argued that “Candrānanda’s *Vṛtti* did not receive the circulation it deserves and we find no mention of him in the later Vaiśeṣika literature” (Jambuvijaya 1961, p. 23).⁸ Subsequently, in his paper on Candrānanda’s date, A. Aklujkar pointed out that *sūtrapāṭhas* of CV *ad* vs 2.2.14, 2.2.16, 2.2.17, and 2.2.18 are *obviously* quoted by the famous philosopher and poet Helārāja (10th century) in his commentary on Bhartṛhari’s (6th century) *Vākyapadīya*. Thus he concluded that Candrānanda flourished somewhere between the 5th/6th and the 10th centuries (Aklujkar 1970, p. 340).⁹ This long period is somewhat unhelpful, if not meaningless. K. H. Potter ranked Candrānanda among a group of “a few undatable writers”, and suggested that he flourished sometime between the 7th and the 14th or 15th centuries.¹⁰ H. Isaacson, one of the latest authors to have carefully studied the *Candrānandavṛtti*, stated in agreement with Chemparathy that “judging from the

⁶ CV *ad* vs 3.2.4: *devadattasya rūparasagandhasparśapratyayā ekānekanimittāḥ mayeti pratyayena pratisandhānāt kṛtasanketānām bahūnām ekasmin nartakībhrūkṣepe yugapad anekapratyayavat iti uddyotakarah/*. The text of the *Candrānandavṛtti* (vs-C, CV *ad* vs) that is taken from Jambuvijaya (1961) is numbered according to the *sūtrapāṭhas*, so that I will not repeat the page numbers of Jambuvijaya (1961). See also *Nyāyavārttika*, 1.1.10: *devadattasya rūparasasparśapratyayāḥ ekānekanimittāḥ smrtyā saha mayeti pratisandhānāt kṛtasanketānām bahūnām ekasmin nartakībhrūkṣepe yugapad anekapratyayavat/*; cf. Tarkatīrtha(s) (1982, p. 192) and Jhā (1983, p. 231).

⁷ CV *ad* vs 9.18: *tatra evaṃvidhprasiddhasambandhasyārthaikadeśam asandigdham paśyataḥ śeṣānuvyavasāyo yaḥ sa liṅgadarśanāt sañjāyamāno laiṅgikam iti vṛttikārah/*; CV *ad* vs 9.21: *yathā abhinayāder api arthaṃ pratipadyante laukikā evaṃ śabdo rthasya saṅketavaśena vyañjakatvāt kāraṇam iti vṛttikārah/*. Matilal (1977, p. 75) suggested that these two *Vṛttikāras* are also Uddyotakara.

⁸ A. Thakur did not give any date for Candrānanda in his latest work, see Thakur (2003, p. 131).

⁹ Nozawa (1993, p. 97) agreed with Aklujkar that “the lower limit of Candrānanda’s date is fixed as the 10th century when Helārāja is supposed to have flourished”.

¹⁰ Potter (1977, p. 685) wrote: “Finally, we come to Candrānanda. His *Vṛtti* on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* is now available, but estimates of his date differ widely. Sandesara suggests the 7th century, but M. Hattori thinks it is much later, possible after our period altogether.” Although Hattori (1966 and 1994) did use the *Candrānandavṛtti*, Potter (1977) did not provide a source for M. Hattori’s speculation and I did not find any publication where M. Hattori discussed Candrānanda’s date.

contents and the style of his work I *feel* strongly inclined to place this commentary before the 10th century, probably in the 7th or 8th century, this latter precision being hypothetical” (Isaacson 1995, p. 141; Chemparathy 1970, p. 48). K. Miyamoto, the Japanese translator of the entire Sanskrit text of Jambuvijaya’s 1961 edition considered that the *Candrānandavṛtti* was composed in the 7th century (Miyamoto 2009, p. 3). And, finally, W. Halbfass suggested its date to around 900 (Halbfass 1992, p. 237). This should suffice. There is no need to add further speculations on Candrānanda’s date; there is no hard evidence for his *terminus ante quem*. But the evidence of his knowledge of Uddyotakara does suggest that his *terminus post quem* would fall in the 6th or 7th century.

2. The Two-finger Illustration

2.1. The Two-finger Illustration in the Introductory Portion of the Tarkajvālā’s Vaiśeṣika Chapter

Bhāviveka appears to be the very first Buddhist intellectual to have very systematically criticised the Vaiśeṣika in the seventh chapter of his *Madhyamakahr̥daya* [MH-V] and the *Tarkajvālā* auto-commentary [TJ-V]. This chapter of the *Madhyamakahr̥daya* consists of a total of twenty-nine *kārikā*-verses and, in the *Tarkajvālā*, he comments on each verse to various degrees of detail.¹¹ Unfortunately, only the last two verses, i.e. MH-V 28–29, are extant on fol. 19a of the presently available Sanskrit manuscript. This is due to the fact that the manuscript of the *Madhyamakahr̥daya* that has so far been available lacks the corresponding folio 18 which must have contained all the other 27 verses of this chapter.¹²

Before embarking on my discussion of the two-finger illustration, let me briefly reiterate the structure and content of the TJ-V (cf. He 2011, p. 23): the chapter starts with a lengthy introductory remark in prose in which Bhāviveka surveys the theories of the Vaiśeṣika by focusing on the characteristics of the *ātman*, the six *padārthas* and liberation (*mokṣa*). This is followed by the *pūrvapakṣa* which consists of but one verse, MH-V 1, which only covers the Vaiśeṣika theory of liberation and is almost free of any Buddhist colouring. MH-V 2–28, form the *uttarapakṣa* part, that is, Bhāviveka’s critique, and mainly focuses on the problems surrounding the relationship between the qualities or attributes (*guṇas*), the mind (*manas*) and the *ātman* [MH-V 2–14], the existence of the *ātman per se* [MH-V 15–22], and liberation [MH-V 23–28]. MH-V 29, concludes that the Vaiśeṣika view is erroneous.

The two-finger illustration or example occurs a total of five times in the TJ-V, once in the introductory portion of the text, and four times in the concluding part at the end of the chapter. It is worth mentioning that the two-finger illustration does not

¹¹ For the Tibetan texts of MH-V and TJ-V, see He (2013, pp. 536–601).

¹² For the Sanskrit manuscript, see Jiang (1991) and Bahulkar (1994).

appear in Bhāviveka's other works, that is, not in the *Prajñāpradīpa* or in the **Hastaratna*. We first come across this illustration in the introductory portion of TJ-V; there we read (cf. He 2013, p. 542):

rdzas [rnams] ni rdzas kyi bya ba ste / ji ltar sor mo gnyis bzhin no //

Substances are the effect of substance[s], just like the two-finger.¹³

Although he did rightly translate the *sor mo gnyis* as 二指 in Japanese, Y. Miyasaka, the first translator of the TJ-V in its entirety, only mentioned that this illustration was not found in the text of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* that was available to him (see Miyasaka 1954; 1958). Of course, it is a pity that Candrānanda's *Vṛtti* was as yet unpublished and that, for the text of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, he could only refer to Śaṅkara Mīśra's (14th–15th century) *Upaskāra*.¹⁴ At the same time, he suggested that the first half phrase *rdzas [rnams] ni rdzas kyi bya ba ste* was a quotation from VS-U 1.1.10:

dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante guṇāś ca guṇāntaram//

Substances form another substance, and qualities form another quality.

Meanwhile, Y. Miyasaka also mentioned VS-U 1.1.23, 1.1.9, and 1.1.8, as references for this Tibetan sentence.¹⁵

In fact, VS-U 1.1.10, corresponds to two *sūtrapāṭhas* in the *Candrānandavṛtti*, i.e. VS-C 1.1.8 and 1.1.9, where read:

VS-C 1.1.8: *dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante//*

Substances form another substance.

VS-C 1.1.9: *guṇāś ca guṇāntaram//*

And qualities [form] another quality.

Candrānanda's commentary on VS-C 1.1.8, is quite illuminating, but he does not give any illustration or simile / metaphor to further explain the theory of *dravya*'s

¹³ Miyasaka (1958, p. 63): もろもろの実体は、実体の原因である。たとえば、二指の如きである。Y. Miyasaka seems to have changed Tibetan *bya ba*, “effect”, into *byed pa*, “cause” (原因). Strictly speaking, the Tibetan meaning of “substances are the effect of a substance” does not match the Vaiśeṣika's *dravya* theory which must be that “a substance is the effect of substances”, or as Y. Miyasaka translated “substances are the cause of a substance”. This probably is the reason why Y. Miyasaka changed the text and gave an understandable translation. However, if we delete the impossible *rnams*, we would get a perfect Tibetan *quatrain* of 4×7 syllables.

¹⁴ For the *Upaskāra*, see Panchānana (1861), Gough (1873) and Sinha (1923). The text of the *Upaskāra* (VS-U) that is taken from Sinha (1923) is numbered according to the *sūtrapāṭhas*, so that I will not repeat the page numbers of Sinha (1923).

¹⁵ VS-U 1.1.23: *dravyāṇām dravyaṃ kāryaṃ sāmānyam //* [= VS-C 1.1.22]; VS-U 1.1.9: *dravyaguṇayoḥ sajjātīyārambhakatvaṃ sādharmyam//* [absent in VS-C]; VS-U 1.1.8: *sad anityaṃ dravyavat kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravyaguṇakarmanām aviśeṣaḥ//* [= VS-C 1.1.7].

origination.¹⁶ Moreover, the quoted Tibetan sentence in the TJ-V seems to be closer to VS-C 1.1.8, than to VS-U 1.1.10, which refers to both *dravya* and *guṇa*, for the theory of *guṇa*'s origination and its descriptive illustration are given in the succeeding phrase of TJ-V. The first half of the latter phrase is in fact a verse-paraphrase of VS-C 1.1.9; it reads:

yon tan las yon tan 'byung ste //
ji ltar gzugs las gzugs bzhin no //

Quality [or: Qualities] arise from quality [or: qualities],
Just like color[s] from color[s].

On the other hand, M. Hattori suggested that *rdzas [rnams] ni rdzas kyi bya ba ste* was a quotation of VS-C 1.1.22 (Hattori 1994, p. 702).¹⁷

dravyāṅām dravyaṃ kāryaṃ sāmānyam//

A substance is the collective effect of substances.

VS-C 1.1.22, is commented on by Candrānanda as:

CV ad VS 1.1.22: sajjātīyānām dvayor babhūnām vā dravyāṅām dravyaṃ
tantūnām iva paṭaḥ samānaṃ kāryam/

A substance is the collective effect of two or many substances that belong to the same genus, just like one cloth is the collective effect of threads.

Without the word *sāmānyam*, VS-C 1.1.22 would match perfectly with the Tibetan *rdzas [rnams] ni rdzas kyi bya ba ste*. Regrettably, M. Hattori did not point out (or may not have been aware) that it occurs there together with a rather opaque and inscrutable illustration, i.e., as *dvyāṅgula* or, in Tibetan garb, as *sor mo gnyis*.

This two-finger illustration in the TJ-V is not really understandable by the above references and Y. Miyasaka and M. Hattori seem to have ignored it. In this connection, I located two passages that contain the term / illustration *dvyāṅgula* in Candrānanda's *Vṛtti* that should now be taken into consideration in order not only to understand the unexpected *sor mo gnyis*, but also the theory of origination of *dravya* and *guṇa* as recorded in the TJ-V. In the Vaiśeṣika theory of *dravya* if you press together two fingers (i.e. substances), the result is considered to be a new substance, namely, a *two-finger*. We read:

VS-C 1.1.11: *kāryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṅāvirodhi ca//*

A substance is not incompatible with its effect, nor it is incompatible with its cause.

¹⁶ See CV ad VS 1.1.8: *drvaye ca dravyāni ceti vighrahād ekamanārambhakam/ samavāyī-kāraṅāni dravyāni svāmavyatiriktaṃ kāryadravyam ārabhante/ ākāśādy antyāvayavidravyāni tu dravyaṃ nārabhante/ tulyajātīyānāṃ mūrtikriyārūpādīmatāṃ dvayor bahūnām vā kāraṅānām kāryārambhakatvāt/ na caivaṃvidhānyākāśādīni/ manaso 'sparśavattvād dravyākāraṅatvam antyāvayavidravyāṅām cādṛṣṭatvāt/*

¹⁷ The corresponding VS-U 1.1.23 presents the exact same Sanskrit.

CV *ad* VS 1.1.11: ...*tathāhy aṅgulidravyaṃ kāryaṃ dvyāṅgulaṃ janayi-
ṣyat tadarthena karmaṇā tatkrtena saṃyogena tato jātena dvyāṅgulena
na virudhyate nāpi samavāyiasamavāyikāraṇābhyāṃ parvatatsaṃyo-
gābhyāṃ vā/...*

...For instance, when the substance finger is about to produce the effect two-finger, it is not annihilated by the appropriate movement, nor by the connection [of the two fingers] resulting from it, nor by two-finger produced by that; neither is [the finger incompatible] with its material and non-material cause, i.e. its phalanges and their connection...

VS-C 7.1.16: *kāraṇabahutvāt kāraṇamahattvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat //*

Because of the multiples of cause, the greatness of cause, and the special accumulation, the great (size of a thing) [originates].

CV *ad* VS 7.1.16: *dvyāṅgule kāraṇāṅgulimahattvaṃ mahattvaṃ karoti/*

...In the **two-finger**, the greatness of each [single] finger as the cause produces the greatness [of the two-finger].

Be that as it may, Bhāviveka adopted the expression *dvyāṅgula* of CV *ad* VS 1.1.11, to explain the genesis of *dravya*, i.e. *rdzas* [rnames] *ni rdzas kyi bya ba ste*. Thus, the illustration that follows, namely, *ji ltar sor mo gnyis bzhin no*, could be understood as follows: A substance is the effect of substances, just like the *two-finger* [i.e. a new substance] is the effect of two single fingers [i.e. substances].

In other words, the two-finger (*dvyāṅgula*, *sor mo gnyis*) indicates an independent substance that is generated by two different single fingers. It is of course true that the illustration of cloth and threads given in CV *ad* VS 1.1.22 is more helpful in understanding the proposition: “A substance is the [collective] effect of substances, just like one cloth is the [collective] effect of threads”. Besides, according to CV *ad* VS 1.1.11, each single finger is the inherent or material cause for producing the effect of the two-finger, namely, the fingers or phalanges are the material cause of the new two-finger.

It is noteworthy that prior to the phrase *rdzas* [rnames] *ni rdzas kyi bya ba ste*, the TJ-V contains nine continuous sentences directly quoting or paraphrasing the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, that is, the nine Tibetan phrases perfectly match VS-C 1.1.8~12, 14~17,¹⁸ by which the theory of six *padārtha*, especially the different characteristics (*vai-dharmya*) of *dravya*, *guṇa* and *karma* are introduced. Among them, VS-C 1.1.8~9 is cited and rendered into Tibetan as:

*de bzhin du rdzas kyis ni rdzas gzhan rtsom par byed la yon tan gyis
kyang yon tan gzhan rtsom par byed do //*

Likewise, substance[s] create[s] another substance, and quality [quali-
ties] create[s] another quality.

¹⁸ These parallel passages have been pointed out by Miyasaka (1954), Hattori (1994), and He (2013, pp. 145–157) to different degrees.

Since it is unlikely that the same *sūtrapāṭha* is quoted in one short passage, I am inclined to suggest that Tibetan *rdzas [rnam] ni rdzas kyi bya ba ste* is derived from VS-C 1.1.22, and not from 1.1.8. Thus, I would agree with M. Hattori, although, indeed, absence of the term *sāmānyam* seems to be a bit awkward here.

Some additional remarks should be made on the colour illustration that is used to describe the origination of *guṇa – ji ltar gzugs las gzugs bzhin no –*, which is close to the theory that Candrānanda provides in VS-C 1.1.9 (*guṇāś ca guṇāntaram*) as follows:

CV *ad* VS 1.1.9: ...*yathā tanturūpādayaḥ svāśrayasamavete paṭadravye rūpādiguṇān ātmavyatiriktān ārabhante/*

...For example, colours etc. [qualities] of threads cause colours etc. qualities which are different from themselves in the cloth-substance which is inherent in their substratum.

Taking VS-C 1.1.9, together with Candrānanda's *Vṛtti* on it, it is reasonable to consider that they are the source of the theory of origination of *guṇa* that is reported by Bhāviveka in the TJ-V as *yon tan las yon tan 'byung ste / ji ltar gzugs las gzugs bzhin no//*. In other words, this colour illustration in the TJ-V is a nod in the direction of the *Candrānandavṛtti* just like the case of the two-finger illustration. Indeed, this kind of colour illustration is absent from Praśastapāda's *Padārthadharmasamgraha* and the **Daśapadārthī*, which is only available in a Chinese translation *Shengzong shijuyi lun* 勝宗十句義論, both of which were most probably composed before the TJ-V;¹⁹ the date of TJ-V will be discussed later in this essay.

Active some nine to ten centuries after Bhāviveka's *floruit*, Śaṅkara Mīśra seems to be unaware of the term *dvyāṅgula* when he was compiling and writing his *Upaskāra*. Quite mindful that there was no commentary of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* at his disposal and that the *sūtra in toto* was often flawed and defective – we learn this from his introductory verse – Śaṅkara Mīśra complained about the problems of studying the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* in the 15th century (see Sinha 1923, p. 1). True, the term *dvyāṅgula* (two-atom / the diad) does occur in the above-mentioned available Vaiśeṣika works, that is, the *Candrānandavṛtti*, the *Padārthadharmasamgraha*, the **Daśapadārthī*, and Bhaṭṭavādīndra's *Bhāṣya* etc., let alone huge numbers of commentaries and sub-commentaries on the *Padārthadharmasamgraha*, but all instances of *dvyāṅgulas* are definitely used in quite dissimilar ways from the term *dvyāṅgula*. Since the notion of *dvyāṅgula* (two-finger) in the theory of *dravya*'s ontogenesis is not found in other Vaiśeṣika works known to me, it seems clear that its use as an illustration began and ended with Candrānanda. This leads me to conjecture that Bhāviveka understood the two-finger illustration as part and parcel of the Vaiśeṣika theory of *dravya* [and *guṇa*], which he appears to have arrived at by summing up several of Candrānanda's comments on the relevant *sūtrapāṭhas*, such as VS-C and CV *ad* VS 1.1.8–9, 1.1.11 and 1.1.22, etc.

¹⁹ For the *Padārthadharmasamgraha*, see Dube (1919), Kavirāj–Shāstri (1930), Jetly (1971), Jhā (1982), and Dvivedin (1984); for the **Daśapadārthī*, see Miyamoto (1996; 2007).

2.2. The Two-finger Illustration in the Closing Verses of TJ-V

The final portion of TJ-V consists of fifteen closing verses that do not explicitly comment on MH-V 29, or on MH-V in general. These verses in fact once again represent and counter-argue the theories of the Vaiśeṣika in general, but the Tibetan text is often not altogether intelligible. There are indeed a lot of problems with these verses, and here I am focusing on the two that contain the two-finger illustration, even if Bhāviveka once again has nothing special or particularly informative to say about this expression in his comments.

In the context of this closing part that ends up the entire chapter TJ-V, the two-finger seems to be better called a metaphor, but not an illustration, because of its ambiguity; the quoted verses state:

sor mo gnyis las gzhan gyur pa'i //
sor gnyis zhes bya gzhan yod na //
ngos na gnas pa gcig nyid las //
gzhan pa'i sor mo gnyis mi dmigs //

de yi phyed ni der yod pa //
ma yin yin na phyed gnyis¹⁾ 'gyur //
sor mo de gnyis²⁾ kyi phyed bas³⁾ //
des na phyed sor⁴⁾ 'jug ma yin //

¹⁾ DC: ins. *mi*; ²⁾ PNG: *nyid*; ³⁾ PNG: *pas*; ⁴⁾ PNG: *por*.

It is true that I did not understand the Tibetan expressions *sor mo gnyis*, *sor gnyis*, and *sor mo de gnyis* for a long time. Having conducted a search in the searchable texts of tbc.org,²⁰ they often occur in the Tibetan canonical literature, but not once in the same context of Vaiśeṣika theory. Before making an attempt at translating these verses, let us first attend to the text of Candrānanda's *Vṛtti* in which the *dvyāṅgula* (two-finger) is discussed.

The other three passages in the *Candrānandavṛtti* that contain *dvyāṅgula* are the following:

VS-C 1.1.15: *dravyāśrayy aguṇavān saṃyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam ana-pekṣa iti guṇalakṣaṇam //*

The defining features of quality: its substrate is a substance, has no quality, and independently is not the cause of conjunction or separation.

CV ad VS 1.1.15: ...*tathāhi / aṅgulyor ākāśasaṃyogo dvyāṅgulākāśa-saṃyoge kartavye dvyāṅguloṭpattim apekṣate/ aṅgulyoḥ parasparavibhāgo dvyāṅgulākāśavibhāgam prati kāryavināśam apekṣate /...*

²⁰ I would like to express here my appreciation to the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center (tbc.org) for the searchable *Bka'* 'gyur [*dpe bsdur ma*] and *Bstan* 'gyur [*dpe bsdur ma*].

...For instance, the conjunction of two fingers with space depends on the occurrence of the **two-finger**, when the conjunction between the **two-finger** and space occurs. The separation between two fingers depends on the destruction of the effect [i.e. the two-finger], when the separation between the **two-finger** and space occurs

VS-C 7.2.10: *anyatarakarmaja ubhayakarmajaḥ saṃyogajaś ca saṃyogah//*

Conjunction is originated from the movement of either one, originated from the movement of both, and originated from conjunction.

CV ad VS 7.2.10: *...saṃyogajaḥ kāraṇākāraṇayoḥ saṃyogāt kāryākāryagataḥ yathāṅgulyākāśasaṃyogābhyām dvyāṅgulākāśasaṃyogah//*

...[Conjunction] that originated from conjunction is between an effect and a non-effect [i.e. unchanging substance], because of the conjunction of the cause and the non-cause [i.e. the unchanging substance], just like the conjunction of the **two-finger** and space, because of the conjunction of each [single] finger (i.e. two fingers) and space....

VS-C 7.2.11: *etena vibhāgo vyākhyātaḥ//*

Separation is explained by it [i.e. VS-C 7.2.10].

CV ad VS 7.2.11: *...vibhāgajas tu āṅgulyor anyonyavibhāgād vinaṣṭamātre dvyāṅgule 'ṅgulyākāśavibhāgaḥ kāraṇākāraṇayor vā hastākāśayor vibhāgāc charīrākāśavibhāgaḥ//²¹*

...On the other hand, [separation] that originated from separation is that because of two fingers' separation between each other, when the **two-finger** has just been destructed, there is the separation of each [single] finger and space. Or because of [the separation] of the cause and the non-cause, i.e. hand and space, there is the separation of the body and space.

According to the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* etc. and the classical literature, many relations are considered qualities (*guṇas*), for instance, in VS-C 1.1.5,²² conjunction (*saṃyoga*) and separation (*vibhāga*) are two of seventeen different kinds of *guṇas*. Also the pervasive substances (such as space, time and soul) are said to be in contact with spatially limited substances. One characteristic of a *dravya* is that it has *guṇa*(s), while *guṇa* and *karma* cannot have *guṇa* as their characteristics.²³ Therefore, both conjunction

²¹ It is noteworthy that *Padārthadharmasamgraha* contains a phrase that reads: *āṅgulyākāśavibhāgāc charīrākāśavibhāgavat /*, see Bronkhorst – Ramseier (1994, p. 35).

²² VS-C 1.1.5: *rūparasagandhasparśāḥ saṅkhāḥ parimānāni prthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve buddhayaḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnāś ca guṇāḥ//* [= VS-U 1.1.6]

²³ Cf. VS-C 1.1.14~16: *kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāraṇam iti dravyalakṣaṇam// dravyaśrayaḥ agūṇavān saṃyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam anapekṣa iti guṇalakṣaṇam// ekadravyam agūṇam saṃyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣaṃ kāraṇam iti karmalakṣaṇam//* [= VS-U 1.1.15~17]

and separation are *guṇas* that belong to the category *dravya*, that is, they belong to or are inherent in the *two-finger* (i.e. two fingers in a unit form) and/or each *single finger* (i.e. two fingers in separate forms) as different substances.

On the other hand, although CV *ad* vs 1.1.15, lists three characteristics of the *guṇa*, the illustration is used only to explain the third characteristic: *saṃyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam anapekṣa*, that is, “independently [*guṇa*] is not the cause of conjunction or separation”. In this connection, the illustration is placed in the context of *saṃyoga* and *vibhāga* that are, in fact, explained separately in CV *ad* vs 7.2.10 and 7.2.11.²⁴ Thus, these three illustrations are used in the similar origination theory of *dravya* as was reported in VS-C 1.1.11, 7.1.16, and the introductory portion of TJ-V, which have been discussed previously.

Undoubtedly, VS-C 1.1.11, 1.1.15, 7.2.10~11, 7.1.16, as the only sources that are available to us should be helpful to understand the curious Tibetan phrases *sor mo gnyis*, *sor gnyis*, and *sor mo de gnyis* in the closing verses of TJ-V. Bearing this in mind, I only *very* tentatively render the two previously noted, very cryptic Tibetan verses as follows:²⁵

Other than two [single] fingers,
The so-called “two-finger” exists.
But for the state of oneness,
Another two-finger is not admitted.²⁶

That [two-finger]’s part is the existence of that [i.e. each single finger],
As soon as [two-finger] does not [exist], [it] becomes two parts [i.e. two
single fingers],
Because of that [two-]finger’s two parts [i.e. each single finger],
Therefore, half of the [two-]finger does not exist.²⁷

It seems that these Tibetan verses refute (i.e. Bhāviveka’s critique on Vaiśeṣika theory) the idea of an *avayavin*, namely, a “whole is different from its parts”, referring to the theory of its origin through *saṃyoga* and destruction through *vibhāga* – by using *dvyāṅgula* as an example.

²⁴ The explanations of conjunction (*saṃyoga*) and separation (*vibhāga*) in the *Padārthadharmasamgraha* are more detailed, but in another way. Cf. Bronkhorst–Ramseier (1994, pp. 28–35), Kanakura (1971, pp. 150–160), and Halbfass (1992, index).

²⁵ The Japanese translation in Miyasaka (1958, p. 80) reads: 二指より他のものとなるどころの二指と名づけられる他のものがあるとき、片方にある一性〔の二指〕より他の二指は、認められない。その半分は、そこに存しない。もし、存するならば、半分のもの〔＝二指〕は二つとなる。なぜなら、その指は二つの半分だから。だからして〔二指より他の〕半分の指は認められない。 This translation is not very comprehensible for me.

²⁶ Meaning that if there were another new substance of two-finger different from the two fingers, then the two fingers on the two sides – different from the two-finger unit – would not be perceived.

²⁷ Meaning that if a *dvyāṅgula* (two-finger) would be a new substance, then by separating our fingers we would get two half-*dvyāṅgulas* (half-two-fingers), not two (single) fingers. Therefore, *dvyāṅgula* (two-finger) cannot be admitted as a new substance different from the fingers.

We may assume that these two verses also convey the theory of conjunction and separation in relation to substance (*dravya*) as in the *Candrānandavṛtti*, though the meaning of the Tibetan texts is to be sure not as clear as Candrānanda's exposition. However, it is certain that the *dvyanḡula* (*sor mo gnyis*) is not a scribal error for *dvyanūka* (*phra rab gnyis*). It is thus arguably the case again that Bhāviveka was well aware of the two-finger illustration, which, again, only occurs in the *Candrānandavṛtti* among the few extant Vaiśeṣika works of his period.

3. On the Relative Chronology of Candrānanda and Bhāviveka

M. Hattori presented the Tibetan text of the introductory portion of TJ-V, with the Sanskrit text of the quoted *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* in the footnotes. He compared three versions of *sūtra* that had been handed down: (1) the *sūtrapāṭhas* with the *Candrānandavṛtti*, (2) Vādīndra's *Vyākhyā*, and (3) Śaṅkara Mīśra's *Upaskāra*.²⁸ He then rightly drew the conclusion that "the *sūtras* quoted in TJ-V are close to those given in VS₁ (i.e. the *Candrānandavṛtti*)" (Hattori 1994, p. 699). At the same time, however, M. Hattori based his own translation of "the Vaiśeṣika view on liberation" on the last part of the introductory portion of TJ-V, i.e. D 243b.4–244a.6 / P 274a.3–274b.6,²⁹ and then suggested a relative chronology in which he assigned Praśastapāda to be prior to Bhāviveka, that is, to sometime between 500 and 560. It is true that, as he has pointed out, there are similar theories found in the TJ-V and the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha*, one of which is, for instance, the idea that the apprehension of the six *padārthas* will lead to liberation. But this idea is not exclusive to the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha*, for it already appeared in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* as such. Not only did M. Hattori himself write that "it could be ascribed to a pre-Praśastapāda Vaiśeṣika, since a similar idea is already propounded in the *Nyāyasūtra*..." (Hattori 1994, p. 706), but I also argued in one of my essays on the TJ-V that Bhāviveka's understanding of the Vaiśeṣika theory of liberation was mainly derived from VS-C 5.2.20, 6.2.2~3, 6.2.12~18, which is similar or identical to VS-U 5.2.18, 6.2.2~3, 6.2.10~15, with slight differences – VS-C 6.2.14 has no parallel *sūtra* in VS-U –, which covers most of the verses related to *mokṣa* in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*. In other words, Bhāviveka did not adopt the detailed and clear explanation of *dharma* and *adharmā* that we find in the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha*,

²⁸ Vādīndra's *Vyākhyā* is now usually called the *Bhāṭṭavādīndra-bhāṣya* or *Tarkasāgara*; see Thakur (1957; 1960 and 1985); also see Isaacson (1995, pp. 11–22). The basic and main differences of *sūtrapāṭhas* in *Candrānandavṛtti*, *Bhāṭṭavādīndra-bhāṣya* (*Tarkasāgara*), and Śaṅkara Mīśra's *Upaskāra* can also be found in A. Thakur's introduction to Jambuvijaya (1961) and the appendices therein, and in Kanakura's studies as well, for which, see Kanakura (1971, pp. 51–52); and see also Honda (1984).

²⁹ Hattori (1994, pp. 705–706) commented on Miyasaka (1958): "...the translation (?) is quite unintelligible to me, and I could not derive any help from it for my understanding of the text." Thus, M. Hattori once more translated the last part of the introductory portion of TJ-V, i.e. the passage of the Vaiśeṣika view on liberation. Regrettably, the most difficult part of the text (i.e. D 244a.1–3 / P 274a.7–b.2) was omitted in his translation, see Hattori (1994, p. 705).

but rather he picked the less systematic expressions from the *Vaiṣeṣikasūtra*. Bhāviveka's primary aim was to criticise the theory of liberation by refuting the ontology of the *ātman* and the six *padārthas* as propounded in the writings of the Vaiṣeṣika. Hence, it is not the case that only the introductory portion of TJ-V deals with the issue of *mokṣa*. Rather, the entire chapter does so. An additional piece of evidence is that Bhāviveka's understanding of the Vaiṣeṣika is that for them the *manas* plays a crucial factor in the process of liberation. This is only attested in the *Candrānandavṛtti* and is entirely absent from the *Padārthadharmasamgraha* (see He 2011).

Further, Y. Miyasaka signalled long ago the existence of many parallel passages in the introductory part of TJ-V and the *sūtrapāṭhas* of the *Upaskāra*. It is worth our while to locate and compare the entire TJ-V with the *sūtrapāṭhas* from the *Candrānandavṛtti* that was not available to Y. Miyasaka in the 1950s (see Miyasaka 1954, pp. 35–36). The numbers in the following are taken from the edition in Jambuvijaya (1961); “○” means that the very *sūtrapāṭha* from the *Candrānandavṛtti* is most probably quoted exactly in the TJ-V; “Δ” indicates that the *sūtrapāṭha* is probably quoted in part by Bhāviveka or is cited by him with some changes (cf. He 2013, pp. 343, 536–601; Hattori 1994, pp. 700–702, notes 1–27):

1.1.4 ○	1.1.5 ○	1.1.6 ○	1.1.7 ○	1.1.8 ○
1.1.9 ○	1.1.10 ○	1.1.11 ○	1.1.12 ○	1.1.14 ○
1.1.15 ○	1.1.16 ○	1.1.17 ○	1.1.18 Δ	1.1.19 Δ
1.1.22 Δ	1.1.26 Δ	1.2.4 Δ	1.2.7 ○	1.2.8 Δ
2.1.1 ○	2.1.2 ○	2.1.3 ○	2.1.4 ○	2.1.10 Δ
2.1.27 ○	2.2.6 ○	2.2.12 ○	2.2.16 ○	2.2.17 ○
3.2.1 Δ	3.2.4 Δ	3.2.5 Δ	5.2.19 Δ	5.2.20 ○
5.2.23 ○	6.2.2 ○	6.2.3 Δ	6.2.12 Δ	6.2.13 Δ
6.2.14 Δ	6.2.15 Δ	6.2.16 Δ	6.2.17 Δ	6.2.18 Δ
7.1.4 Δ	7.1.8 Δ	7.1.28 ○	7.1.29 ○	7.1.31 Δ
7.1.32 Δ	7.2.2 Δ	7.2.29 Δ		

It is quite conceivable that the Vaiṣeṣika theories reported in the TJ-V closely agree with those of the *sūtrapāṭhas* of the *Candrānandavṛtti*, the oldest *Vaiṣeṣikasūtra* commentary. Or at least, it is more safe to say that Bhāviveka used as his source some unknown early *sūtrapāṭhas* that are uncannily similar to those in the *Candrānandavṛtti*. In fact, the influence of the *Candrānandavṛtti* on Bhāviveka can be discerned from the two-finger illustration that I briefly, if all too incompletely, discussed earlier.

Although the *Padārthadharmasamgraha* had a far-reaching influence on later Vaiṣeṣika thought and is much better known than the *Vaiṣeṣikasūtra* as such, it is not

always appropriate to trace the source of the TJ-V to the *Padārthadharmasamgraha* by skipping over the *sūtrapāṭhas* that are contained in such older commentaries as the one that issued from Candrānanda's pen. If M. Hattori could use the phrase "that the state of perfect deliverance is described in TJ-V with the expression 'just like the fire of which the fuel is burnt out' (*shi zad yi me bzhin = dagdhendhanānalavat*), which is found in Praśastapāda's description of the state of liberation", regardless of the similarity between the TJ-V and the VS-C, to determine that Bhāviveka was familiar with Praśastapāda's work (Hattori 1994, p. 706), then, my conjecture with respect to the two-finger illustration that indicates the probability of Bhāviveka's familiarity with Candrānanda's *Vṛtti*, is perhaps more reliable.

On the other hand, much earlier, Y. Ejima had argued that a distinction had to be made between an original **Tarkajvālā* and the text that we now have of it. The latter is only available in the Tibetan translation that came from the pens of Atiśa (982–1054) and Lo tsā ba Tshul khriṃs rgyal ba (1011–ca. 1070) (see Ejima 1980, pp. 1–38; and 1990; Lindtner 1982, p. 183).³⁰ The author of the *Tarkajvālā*, then, must be distinguished from the one who wrote the **Tarkajvālā*, the *Prajñāpradīpa*, and the **Hastaratna*. Y. Ejima's hypothesis is that this Bhāviveka was also the author of the *Madhyamakārthasamgraha*, and the *Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna* – essentially a reproduction of the *Tarkajvālā ad Madhyamakahrdaya*, IV – and for him this individual flourished in the 8th century [or perhaps even later]. H. Krasser most recently re-examined the issues in connection with the *Tarkajvālā* and the *Madhyamakārthasamgraha*. He concluded that the latter contains several terms and concepts that are closely linked to Dharmakīrti, whose *floruit* is generally accepted as of the 7th century, even if Krasser has most recently argued for pushing his dates back by several decades into the 6th century. The main issue with the text of the *Tarkajvālā* as it is constituted in the Tibetan translation is that it contains a number of very pedestrian remarks concerning the logical structure of an argument that is presented in the verses of the *Madhyamakahrdaya*, and that it on occasion clashes with the Tibetan translation (see Krasser 2011, esp. pp. 60–71; and 2012, esp. pp. 554–556, 569ff.; and Eltschinger 1998). Weighing the evidence, Krasser quite ingeniously suggested that these could best be explained by the fact that the text of which the *Tarkajvālā* is a translation was compiled by a relative beginner and that this beginner possibly was a student of the author of the *Madhyamakahrdaya*. This obviously complicates the date of the *Tarkajvālā*, but even if we accepted that it was written by one or some of Bhāviveka's student(s), the text would not be much later than Bhāviveka's *floruit*, i.e. the 6th to the early 7th centuries.

³⁰ Many of us now eagerly await the retrieval and the eventual publication of the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Madhyamakahrdaya* that has been located in the Potala. This manuscript possibly contains the complete chapter of the *Vaiśeṣikatattvaviniścaya*. As stated, the present copies of a manuscript of the *Madhyamakahrdaya*, first photocopied by Rāhula Sāṅkrītyāyana and then hand copied by V. V. Gokhale, have been used for almost one hundred years. The complete manuscript of the Potala may very well shed more light on Bhāviveka and his study of the Vaiśeṣika school.

4. Concluding Remarks

What can be concluded, if anything, from the foregoing? I began this essay with the two-finger illustration found in the TJ-V of the 6th-century Indian intellectual Bhāviveka, where he introduces and criticises a number of Vaiśeṣika positions. On the other hand, the same or at least similar two-finger illustrations only occur in Candrānanda's *Vṛtti*, where, contrary to their use in the TJ-V, the intent is quite clear and understandable. Curiously, Bhāviveka nowhere mentions this illustration in his other writings. Furthermore, there are some alleged Vaiśeṣika quotations in the *Tarkajvālā* and the **Hastarāna* that in fact cannot be properly traced back to the *sūtrapāṭhas* or other available Vaiśeṣika texts. There are also several places where Bhāviveka's understanding of Vaiśeṣika thought does not altogether sit well with the early system of this school.³¹ Therefore my hypothesis is that Bhāviveka had written down his understanding of the theories of the Vaiśeṣika at least in the following two ways:

(1) Bhāviveka quoted strictly and directly from the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, more likely from the most ancient text, i.e. *sūtrapāṭhas* of the *Candrānandavṛtti*, such as VS-C 1.1.8~12, etc.

(2) Bhāviveka made some changes or additions to the *sūtrapāṭhas* in order to satisfy his own requirements for his arguments and critiques.³² The two-finger illustration is such a case. We also notice that Bhāviveka appears to mix the Candrānanda's *Vṛtti* text with the *sūtrapāṭhas per se*.

Regardless of how Bhāviveka acquired his knowledge of the theories of the Vaiśeṣika, his exposition should be considered one of the earliest attestations of a number of Vaiśeṣika theories that prevailed among the Buddhists in around 6th-century India. The *Tarkajvālā* and the **Hastaratna* had a definite impact on the ways in which Tibetan, Chinese, Japanese and Korean scholarship viewed non-Buddhist Indian intellectual history, and it is equally undeniable that these works exerted a fair amount of influence on how the Indian Madhayamaka tradition came to be understood in Tibet and East Asia.

To be sure, it is no easy matter to determine where we should place Candrānanda and his *Vṛtti* in the history of Indian philosophy and the relationship of the *Candrānandavṛtti* and Bhāviveka's writings. It will be important to compare this issue more with Bhāviveka's other major writings, especially the *Prajñāpradīpa* and the **Hastaratna*, which is a project that must be reserved for another occasion. But it is true that many expressions in the introductory portion of the TJ-V are directly or indirectly quoted from the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, preferably, from the presently oldest text, i.e. *Candrānandavṛtti*. From these data, we may conjecture that Bhāviveka or one of his students may have known the *Candrānandavṛtti* when he was writing the *Tarkajvālā*.

³¹ For additional evidence that Bhāviveka is indebted to Vaiśeṣika ideas in the **Hastarāna*, see my "Bhāviveka's **Hastarāna* on the Vaiśeṣika Argument of Sound being Impermanent", which is forthcoming.

³² See *sūtrapāṭhas* marked with Δ in the previous box; see also He (2011).

Before more hard evidence emerges in support of Krasser's well-known hypothesis that the *Tarkajvālā* might have been in part written by Bhāviveka's (grand-) disciples, I would like to follow the tradition that its author was the same Bhāviveka as the author of the *Madhyamakahr̥daya*, the **Hastaratna*, and the *Prajñāpradīpa*. Thus, if this proves to be correct, then the Vaiśeṣika scholar Candrānanda should be placed around 500–550, that is, he would be a junior contemporary of Dignāga and senior to Bhāviveka. In this regard, Uddyotakara and Dharmakīrti might well be considered to be contemporaneous in a broad sense as well, as was suggested by Dharmottara. My working hypothesis then is that Dignāga and Dharmakīrti are at both ends of the spectrum. Between them we have, in this order, Uddyotakara, Candrānanda and Bhāviveka. But make no mistake, this is a working hypothesis.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express here my appreciation to the peer reviewer(s) for having read ever so carefully through this essay and for having kindly indicated a number of oversights and errors that have now been corrected. Any that remain are, of course, my responsibility.

Bibliographic Abbreviations

CV ad VS	Commentary of the <i>Candrānandavṛtti</i>
MH-V	<i>Madhyamakahr̥daya</i> [<i>kārikā</i>] text of the <i>Vaiśeṣikatattvaviniścaya</i>
TJ-V	<i>Tarkajvālā</i> text of the <i>Vaiśeṣikatattvaviniścaya</i>
U ad VS	Commentary of the <i>Upaskāra</i>
VS	<i>Vaiśeṣikasūtra</i>
VS-C	<i>Sūtrapāṭha</i> of the <i>Candrānandavṛtti</i>
VS-U	<i>Sūtrapāṭha</i> of the <i>Upaskāra</i>

Sanskrit Sources

- Bahulkar, S. S. (1994): The *Madhyamaka-Hr̥daya-Kārikā* of Bhāviveka: A Photographic Reproduction of Prof. V. V. Gokhale's Copy. *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā* Vol. 15, pp. i–iv, 1–49.
- Bronkhorst, J. – Ramseier, Y. (1994): *Word Index to the Praśastapādabhāṣya: A Complete Word Index to the Printed Editions of the Praśastapādabhāṣya*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Dube, V. P. (ed.) (1919): *The Aphorisms of the Vaiśeṣika Philosophy by Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Praśastapāda, and the Gloss of Udayanācārya*. Benares, Braj Bhushan Das & Co.
- Dvivedin, V. P. (ed.) (1984): *The Praśastapāda Bhāṣya: with Commentary Nyāyakandalī of Śrīdhara*. Delhi, Sri Satguru Publications. (First printed in 1895.)
- Gough, A. E. (tr.) (1873): *The Vaiśeṣika Aphorisms of Kaṇāda, with Comments from the Upaskāra of Śankara-miśra and the Vivṛtti of Jaya-Nārāyaṇa-Tarkapañchānaya*. London, Trübner & Co.

- Jambuvijaya (ed.) (1961): *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda*. Baroda, Oriental Institute. (Reprinted in 1982.)
- Jetly, J. S. (ed.) (1971): *Praśastapādabhāṣyam: with the Commentary Kiraṇāvalī of Udayanācārya*. Baroda, Oriental Institute.
- Jhā, G. (tr.) (1982): *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha of Praśastapāda: with the Nyāyakandalī of Śrīdhara*. Varanasi, Chaukhamba Orientalia.
- Jhā, G. (tr.) (1983): *The Nyāyasūtras of Gautama, with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya and Uddyotakara's Vārttika*. Kyoto, Rinsen Book.
- Jiang, Zh. (1991): Fanwen “Sizyanjing” chaoben yingyinban 梵文《思擇焰經》抄本影印版 [A facsimile edition of the Sanskrit text of *Tarkajvālāsūtra*]. In: Li Zheng 李錚–Jiang Zhongxin 蔣忠新–Duan Qing 段晴–Qian Wenzhong 錢文忠 (eds): *Ji Xianlin jiaoshou bashi huadan jinian lunwenji* 季羨林教授八十華誕紀念論文集 [Papers in honour of Prof. Ji Xianlin on the occasion of his 80th birthday]. Nanchan, Jiangxi chubanshe 江西出版社, pp. 111–118.
- Kavirāj, G. N.–Shāstri, D. (eds) (1930): *The Praśastapādabhāṣyam by Praśastadevācārya with Commentaries (up to dravya), Sūkti by Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra, Setu by Padmanābha Miśra, and Vyomavaṭī by Vyomaśivācārya (to the end)*. Benares, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Panchānana, J. T. (ed.) (1861): *The Vaiśeṣika Darśana, with the Commentaries of Śaṅkara Miśra and Jayanārāyaṇa Panchānana*. Calcutta.
- Ruzsa, F. (ed.) (2004/2012): *Candrānanda's Commentary on the Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra*. https://www.academia.edu/3102869/Candrānanda_s_Commentary_on_the_Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra.
- Sinha, N. (1923): *The Vaiśeṣika Sūtras of Kaṇāda: with the Commentary of Śaṅkara Miśra and Extracts from the Gloss of Jayanarayana*. Allahabad, Pāṇini Office. (Second, revised and enlarged edition.)
- Steinkellner, E. (1979): *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ: Zweites Kapitel: Svārthānumāna*. Wien, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (VKSKSO, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens 15.)
- Tarkatirtha, T. N.–Tarkatirtha, A.–Tarkatirtha, H. (eds) (1982): *Nyāyadarśanam: with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotakara's Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyatikā & Viśvanātha's Vṛtti*. Kyoto, Rinsen Book.
- Thakur, A. (ed.) (1957): *Vaiśeṣikadarśana of Kaṇāda with an Anonymous Commentary*. Darbhanga, Mithila Institute.
- Thakur, A. (ed.) (1985): *Vaiśeṣika-darśanam: Bhaṭṭavādīndraracita-Vaiśeṣikavārttika-Kṛṣṇabhūpālaracita-Trisūtrīprakāśā'jñātakartṛkavṛttibhir vilasitam maharṣi-kaṇāda-praṇītam*. Darbhanga, Mithila Institute.

References

- Aklujkar, A. (1970): *Candrānanda's Date*. *Journal of the Oriental Institute* Vol. 19, pp. 340–341.
- Chemparathy, G. (1970): *The Īśvara Doctrine of the Vaiśeṣika Commentator Candrānanda*. *Ītam* Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 47–52.
- Eckel, M. D. (2008): *Bhāviveka and His Buddhist Opponents*. Cambridge, Harvard University (Harvard Oriental Series 70).
- Ejima, Y. (1980): *Chūgan shisō no tenkai – Bhāvaviveka kenkyū* 中觀思想の展開 : Bhāvaviveka 研究 [An exposition of Madhyamaka thought: a study of Bhāvaviveka]. Tokyo, Shunjūsha 春秋社.

- Ejima, Y. (1990): Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya/Bhāviveka. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist studies] Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 98–106.
- Eltschinger, V. (1998): Bhāvaviveka et Dharmakīrti sur *āgama* et contre la Mīmāṃsā. *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* Vol. 52, pp. 57–84.
- Frauwallner, E. (1962): Review of Muni Śrī Jambūvijayajī (ed.): *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda*. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- (und Ost-) Asiens* Vol. 6, pp. 184–185.
- Halbfass, W. (1992): *On Being and What There Is: Classical Vaiśeṣika and the History of Indian Ontology*. Albany, State University of New York Press.
- Hattori, M. (1966): Studies of the Vaiśeṣikadarśana (I), On the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* III, i, 13. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist studies] Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 95–107.
- Hattori, M. (1994): The *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* as Referred to by Bhāvaviveka in his *Tarkajvālā*. *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 699–706.
- He, H. (2011): Bhavya's Critique of Vaiśeṣika Theory of Liberation in the *Tarkajvālā*. *Studies in Indian Philosophy and Buddhism* Vol. 18, pp. 23–37.
- He, H. (2013): *Zhongguan xinlun jiqi guzhu sizayan yanjiu* 《中觀心論》及其古注《思擇焰》研究 [A study of the *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā* and the *Tarkajvālā*]. Beijing, China Social Sciences Press 中國社會科學出版社.
- He, H. – van der Kuijp, L. (2014): Further Notes on Bhāviveka's Principal Oeuvre. *Indo-Iranian Journal* Vol. 57, No. 4, pp. 299–352.
- Heitmann, A. L. (2004): *Nektar der Erkenntnis, Buddhistische Philosophie des 6. Jh.: Bhavyas Tarkajvālā I–III*. 26. Aachen, Shaker Verlag.
- Honda, M. (1984): Vaiśeṣika-sūtra genkei e no ikkōsatsu ヲアイシェーシカ・ストラ原型への一考察 [An observation on the original form of Vaiśeṣika-sūtra]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist studies] Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 37–43.
- Isaacson, H. (1990): A Study of Early Vaiśeṣika: the Teachings on Perception. Unpublished M.A. dissertation. Groningen, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Isaacson, H. (1995): Materials for the Study of the Vaiśeṣika System. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Leiden, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden.
- Kanakura, E. (1971): *Indo no shizan tetsugaku* インドの自然哲学 [Indian natural philosophy]. Kyoto, Heirakuji shoten 平樂寺書店.
- Krasser, H. (2011): How to Teach a Buddhist Monk to Refute the Outsiders – Text Critical Remarks on Some Works by Bhāviveka. *Dhīh* Vol. 51, pp. 49–76.
- Krasser, H. (2012): Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumārila. In: Voegeli, F. et al. (eds): *Devadattīyam: Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*. Bern, Peter Lang, pp. 535–594.
- Lindtner, Ch. (1982): Adversaria Buddhica. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* Vol. XXVI, pp. 167–194.
- Matilal, B. K. (1977): *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*. In: Gonda, J. (ed.): *A History of Indian Literature*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.
- Miyamoto, K. (1996): *The Metaphysics and Epistemology of the Early Vaiśeṣikas: with an Appendix Daśapadārthī of Candramati (a translation with a reconstructed Sanskrit text, notes and a critical edition of the Chinese version)*. Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Miyamoto, K. (2007): *Daśapadārthī: An Ancient Indian Literature of Thoroughly Metaphysical Realism*. Kyoto, Rinsen Book 臨川書店.

- Miyamoto, K. (2009): *Vaiṣeṣika-sūtra – Kodai Indo no bunsekishugi teki jitsuzairon tetsugaku* ヴァイシェーシカ・スートラ——古代インドの分析主義的実在論哲学 [*Vaiṣeṣika-sūtra – analytical realistic philosophy of ancient India*]. Kyoto, Rinsen Book 臨川書店.
- Miyasaka, Y. (1954): Shyōben inyō no Vaiṣeṣika tetsugaku setsu 清辨引用のヴァイシェーシカ哲学説 [The Vaiṣeṣika philosophy quoted by Bhāviveka]. *Bunka* 文化 [Culture] Vol. 18, No.3, pp. 24–40.
- Miyasaka, Y. (1958): Ronri no en niokeru Vaiṣeṣika tetsugaku 論理の炎におけるヴァイシェーシカ哲学 [The Vaiṣeṣika philosophy in the *Tarkajvāla*]. *Kōyasan daigaku ronsō* 高野山大学論叢 [Journal of Kōyasan University] Vol. 1, pp. 51–87.
- Nakamura, H. (1977–1978): Vaiṣeṣika gakuha no genten ヴァシェーシカ学派の原典 [The classics of the Vaiṣeṣika School]. *Sankō bunka kenkyūjo nenpō* 三康文化研究所年報 [Annual report of the Sankō Research Institute for the Study of Buddhism] Vols 10–11, pp. 1–156.
- Nishikawa, T. (1983): Bhāvaviveka to Vaiṣeṣika – *Prajñāpradīpa* dai 19 shō nitsuite Bhāvaviveka to Vaiṣeṣika – *Prajñāpradīpa* 第19章について [Bhāvaviveka and Vaiṣeṣika – On the 19th Chapter of *Prajñāpradīpa*]. *Komazawa daigaku daigakuin bukkyōgaku kenkyūkai nenpō* 駒沢大学大学院仏教学研究會年報 [Annual report of studies of Buddhism, Graduate School of Komazawa University] Vol. 16, pp. 8–15.
- Nozawa, M. (1993): The *Vaiṣeṣikasūtra* with Candrānanda’s Commentary (1). *Numazu kōgyō kōtō senmon gakkō kenkyū hōkoku* 沼津工業高等専門学校研究報告 [Research reports of Numazu Technical College] Vol. 27, pp. 97–116.
- Potter, K. H. (ed.) (1977): *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies – Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass.
- Ruzsa, F. (2010): Two MSS of Candrānanda’s *Vṛtti* on the *Vaiṣeṣikasūtra* and the Errors of the Copyists. In: Bronkhorst, J. – Preisendanz, K. (eds): *From Vasubandhu to Caitanya – Studies in Indian Philosophy and Its Textual History*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, pp. 173–183.
- Saitō, A. (2005): “Chūgan shinron” no shōmei to seiritsu o meguru shōmondai 『中観心論』の書名と成立をめぐる諸問題 [Some problems with the title and formation of the *Madhyama-kahṛdayaśāstra*]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist studies] Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 167–173.
- Thakur, A. (1960): Bhaṭṭavāḍīndra – The Vaiṣeṣika. *Journal of the Oriental Institute* Vol. 10, pp. 22–31.
- Thakur, A. (ed.) (2003): *Origin and Development of the Vaiṣeṣika System*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass (History of Science, Philosophy and Culture in Indian Civilization, Volume II, Part 4).
- Ui, H. (1917): *The Vaiṣeṣika Philosophy according to the Daśapadārthaśāstra: Chinese Text with Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. London, Royal Asiatic Society. (Second edition in 1962.)