ABSTRACT

1. The Background

It is well known that the Sambandhaparīkṣā (that is to say, the Sambandhaparīkṣāprakaraṇa) written by Dharmakirti (circa AD the 7th century) is found in the Sambandhasadbhāvavāda in the Prameyakalamārāṇḍa by Prabhācandra (Digambara sect, circa AD the 10th-11th century), which is the commentary on the Parīkṣāmukhasūtra by Māṇikyanandin (Digambara sect, circa AD the 9th-10th century) who condensed the subject in the form of aphorisms by taking materials from Akalāṅka’s works (who is a very famous Jaina logician in the Digambara sect in the 8th century).

The beginning of the research on the Sambandhaparīkṣā by Dharmakirti can be traced back to Professor Frauwalbier’s research, who found the Sambandhaparīkṣā quoted in the Syādvādaratnākara by Vāḍidevaśūri (Śvetāmbara sect, circa AD the 11th-12th century) which was including 22 kārikās (from the 1st to the 22nd of the Sambandhaparīkṣā): “Dharmakīrtis Sambandhaparīkṣā, Text und Übersetzung” (Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes No. 41.). According to the literature on the Sambandhaparīkṣā in Tibetan, it has 25 kārikās (from the 1st to the 25th) with some commentaries: the Vṛtti by Dharmakirti, the Anusāra by Śaṅkarāṇanda (circa AD the 9th-10th century) and the Tikā by Vinitadeva (circa AD the 8th century). We can get two Tibetan translations of the verses of the Sambandhaparīkṣā, because the translator of the Sambandhaparīkṣā and the Vṛtti into Tibetan differs from that of the Sambandhaparīkṣā and the Anusāra into Tibetan. Professor E. Frauwallner translated the Sambandhaparīkṣā with the Vṛtti, which is the Tibetan literature, into German, and revised it with referring to the Syādvādaratnākara by Vāḍidevaśūri in 1934. Professor Frauwallner in his research
chose and investigated the different translation of the *Sambandhaparikṣā* in the *Anusāra*, and he published it. And, the translator of the *Sambandhaparikṣā* and the *Vṛtti* in Tibetan is the same who translated the *Sambandhaparikṣā* and the *Ṭikā* into Tibetan; moreover, we can notice that Vādidevasūri, roughly speaking, gives his commentary on the *Sambandhaparikṣā* in his *Syādvādaratnākara*, V, 8 in accordance with the *Vṛtti* by Dharmakīrti. Professor Frauwallner in his research uses these materials mentioned above in his German translation of the *Sambandhaparikṣā* and the *Vṛtti*.

With this as a turning point, in Japan Prof. E. Kanakura translated the *Sambandhaparikṣā* with the *Vṛtti* into Japanese and Mr. Y. Shimizu also did it, and many scholars researched it, but all these studies on the *Sambandhaparikṣā* often fail to grasp the theme because researches were based on the Tibetan literature; besides, we can see some scholars in their researches mistake the part of the *Sambandhaparikṣā* in the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* for all the *Pūrvapakṣa* in it, so that we cannot say that the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* in the *Prameyakamalamārtanda* has been researched in detail. It is not too far from the truth to say that there is no research on the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* in the *Prameyakamalamārtanda*.

Professor V. N. Jha translated the *Sambandhaparikṣā* in the *Prameyakamalamārtanda* by Prabhācandra into English, and published it in 1990. He treats it in his research (*The Philosophy of Relations*, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series No. 66) as a Sanskrit literature by Dharmakīrti. It is very important because the original of the *Sambandhaparikṣā* by Dharmakīrti was written in Sanskrit. Moreover Professor V. N. Jha explains in it the theory of the relation (*sambandha*), comparing the realism with the idealism in the Indian philosophy. His explanation is very useful for us to understand the basic theory of the relation (*sambandha*),
and Indian logic and epistemology. In Japan also, Dr. H. Yaita in his recent survey on the Tarkaraḥasya has taken some important steps in this direction. In this text (Tarkaraḥasya) he found out the missing kārikās (from the 23rd to the 25th) of the Sambandhaparikṣā in the Sanskrit literatures. His research is done on the basis of a careful observation according to the Buddhist’s idea. These two scholars’ achievements were roughly contemporary with each other.

The present thesis intends to present the translation of the Sambandhasadbhāvavāda, including both, the Pūrvaḥpakaṣa and the Uttarapakṣa, in the Prameya-kamalamārtandā by Prabhācandra into English. Although a great deal of effort has been made on the research on the Sambandhaparikṣā, what seems to be lacking, however, is the research on the Jaina theory of relation (sambandha). However, we should not overlook Dr. Satkari Mookerjee’s research, he published the results of his research work on the relations (sambandha) in the Jainism: see the chapter VII in his The Jaina Philosophy of Non-Absolutism. He gives an outline of the Jaina theory of the relations, referring to the Pūrvaḥpakaṣa and Uttarapakṣa in the Sambandhasadbhāvavāda in the Prameya-kamalamārtandā and the Nyāyakumudacandra. This research is very good and wonderful, but, unfortunately, it does not include the translation of the Sambandhasadbhāvavāda in the Prameya-kamalamārtandā.

For this reason, I have taken up an exhaustive study of the Sambandhasadbhāvavāda in the Prameya-kamalamārtandā along with the English translation of the text.

2. The Material for the Study

The primary texts which I have used are the following:
3. The Contents of the Thesis

Dharmakirti wrote the *Sambandhapariksā* in order to refute all relations. It was necessary for him because he was an idealist. In absolute idealism relation cannot be accepted to be real, because in that case the relata will become real thereby demolishing the very basis of idealism. Acceptance and non-acceptance of Relations amount to acceptance of Realism and Idealism respectively.

Prabhācandra Sūri, the author of the *Prameyakalamārtanda*, examined the refutation of Relation by Dharmakirti in his *Sambandhapariksā* and refuted his arguments and established the reality of all philosophical relations. It is a very important development in the history of Indian logic and philosophy. The present study, therefore, aims at examining the arguments of Prabhācandra in the context of Realism of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school of thought, the Realism of the Jaina thought and the Idealism of the Buddhist thought.

The study is presented in two parts, Part II contains the Sanskrit text of
Prabhācandra (along with the Sanskrit text of Dharmakirti) with English translation and exhaustive notes. Part I presents the entire critical study and conclusions.

The brief outlines of the contents is as follows:

Part I:

Chapter I: Introduction

This presents a summary of researches already done on the related issues and identified the exact issues to be treated in this thesis, especially, the introduction to the *Sambandhaparikṣā*, the *Prameyakamalamārtanda*, the *Syādvādaratnākara*, and so on.

Chapter II: Indian Realism and Idealism

The Indian notion of Reality is discussed and elaborated in this chapter, especially, according to the notion of the *sākārajñānavāda* and the *nirākārajñānavāda*. What is knowledge? About this question, there is a viewpoint whether the knowledge is possessed of the form (ākāra) or not, that is to say, in this case, the former points to *sākārajñānavāda* and the latter does to *nirākārajñānavāda*. With reference to these ideas by the Indian philosophical schools including the Buddhism, the Naiyāyikas, the Vaiśeṣikas, and others, this chapter gives a summary of the Indian realism and the idealism.

Chapter III: Jainism

The philosophical frame-work of the Jainism is discussed here and their notion of Reality is presented. The development of the Jaina theory of knowledge extends over a long period of 2600 years. The idea of knowledge and its various types can be traced as early as the history of the Jainism begins, as is well known. Therefore,
especially, the fundamentals of the philosophical theory, the metaphysical notion of the substance (jīva and ajīva), the theory of naya, the placement of perception (pratvākṣa), some aspects of sensation (avagraha) in the process of cognition in the Jainism in the late period, and so on are discussed in this chapter.

Chapter IV: Notion of a Relation

The notion of relation (sambandha) in general and particular relations is presented here along with the role played by the relation in generating and characterizing a cognition, in the Indian philosophy, especially in the Naiyayikas, the Vaiśeṣikas, and so on. Here, the basic notion of a relation is discussed.

Chapter V: Summary of Dharmakirti’s Arguments

Dharmakirti’s grounds for refuting relations (sambandha) in the Sambandhasadbhāvatva in the Prameyakamalamārtanda are summarized here. We can see here that it is concluded by the Buddhist that relation is only our way of looking at things and is not an objective entity.

Chapter VI: Summary of Prabhācandra’s Arguments

Prabhācandra’s arguments for refuting Dharmakirti’s theory of relation (sambandha) in the Sambandhasadbhāvatva in the Prameyakamalamārtanda are summarized here. We can see that he refutes Dharmakirti’s theory of relation on the basis of the Jaina theory of reality and the theory of pramāṇa: prayākṣa and parokṣa in the Jainism in the late period.
Chapter VII: Analysis and Conclusions

Arguments of both (Dharmakirti’s theory of relation and Prabhācandra’s theory of relation) in the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* in the *Prameyakalamārtanḍa* are analyzed and conclusions are drawn. We can see here that though the Jaina logicians are very influenced of the logicians in the other schools: the Naiyāyikas, the Vaiśeśikas, the Bauddhas, and so on, they carry out their long-cherished idea, the non-absolutism (*anekāntavāda*).

Part II:

This part deals with the translation of the *Pūrvapakṣa* and the *Uttarapakṣa* of the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* in the *Prameyakalamārtanḍa* by Prabhācandra, in the *Pūrvapakṣa* we can find the *Sambandhaparikṣā* by Dharmakirti, as is well known. This research was achieved by many scholars in the world. But we can also see some scholars in their researches mistake the part of the *Sambandhaparikṣā* in the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* for all the *Pūrvapakṣa* in it, so that we cannot say that the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* in the *Prameyakalamārtanḍa* has been researched in detail. Moreover, there is no translation of the *Uttarapakṣa* in the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda*. Therefore, there was a need to study the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* again, and that desideratum is fulfilled, at least partially, by presenting the English translation of the *Sambandhasadbhāvavāda* in the *Prameyakalamārtanḍa*.