

Distinguishing the Two Siddhasenas

FUJINAGA Sin

Sometimes different philosophers in the same tradition share the same name. For example, Dr. E. Frauwallner points out that there are two Buddhist philosophers who bear the name Vasubandhu.¹⁾ Both of these philosophers are believed to have written important works that are attributed to that name.

A similar situation can sometimes be found in the Jaina tradition, and sometimes the situation arises even when the philosophers are in different traditions. For example, there are two Indian philosophers who are called Haribhadra, one in the Jain tradition, and one in the Buddhist tradition.

This paper will argue that one philosopher named Siddhasena, the author of the famous Jaina work, the *Sammatitarka*, should be distinguished from another philosopher with the same name, the author of the *Nyāyāvātāra*, a work which occupies an equally important position in Jaina philosophy.²⁾

One reason to argue that the authors of these works are two different persons is that the works are written in two different languages : the *Sammatitarka* in Prakrit ; the *Nyāyāvātāra* in Sanskrit. In the Jaina tradition, it is extremely unusual for the same author to write philosophical works in different languages, the usual languages being either Prakrit or Sanskrit, but not both. Of course, the possibility of one author using two languages cannot be completely eliminated. For example, the Jaina philosopher Haribhadra uses both Prakrit and Sanskrit. But even Haribhadra limits himself to one language when writing a philosophical work : his philosophical works are all written in Sanskrit, and he uses Prakrit for all of his non-philosophical works.

Similarly, Jinabhadra Gaṇi, of the Śvetāmbara tradition, wrote a philosophical work called *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* in Prakrit, and wrote his commentaries on the work in Sanskrit. Jinabhadra Gaṇi's case, however, can be regarded as an exception especially since the commentary should be regarded as a part of main works. Just

the same, it cannot be denied that as a general rule, the Jains have used Prakrit for their philosophical writings. A typical example is Kundakunda, a famous Jaina philosopher who has written many philosophical works in the Prakrit language but who has never written a work in Sanskrit. It seems rather likely, then, that the author of the *Sammatitarka*, which was written in Prakrit, is a different person than the author of the *Nyāyāvatāra*, which was written in Sanskrit.

A second reason for arguing that there were two separate Siddhasenas is that the epistemological views of the two works are quite different. The author of the *Nyāyāvatāra* clearly argues that there are two kinds of valid knowledge (paramāṇa) : direct knowledge (pratyakṣa) and indirect knowledge (parokṣa).³⁾ The author of the *Sammatitarka*, on the other hand, less clearly presents his epistemological ideas, but it is certain that he distinguishes five varieties of knowledge : sensual knowledge (mati), scriptural knowledge (śruta), telepathy (manahpariyaya), clairvoyance (avadhi), and omniscience (kevala).⁴⁾ Using these five terms, the author distinguishes between omniscience and the other four kinds of knowledge.⁵⁾ In the *Nyāyāvatāra*, however, these five kinds of knowledge are never mentioned. Similarly, the author of the *Sammatitarka* does not refer to the kinds of paramāṇa.

Historically speaking, the argument that there are five kinds of knowledge is a rather archaic one within the Jaina tradition, and the argument that there are only two kinds of knowledge seems to be a much later development in the Jaina epistemology. In this connection, it should be noted that in the Jaina compendium *Tattvārtha Sūtra*, which was written in Sanskrit, Umāsvāti refers to these two theories and attempts to combine them.⁶⁾

The author of the *Nyāyāvatāra* and the author of the *Sammatitarka* also show quite different attitudes concerning the concept of viewpoint (naya), a concept which is peculiar to Jaina philosophy. The author of the *Sammatitarka* discusses the topic extensively in the very first chapter, pointing out the various types of naya and explaining them one by one. And in the third chapter, he goes on to apply the concept of naya to the thoughts of other schools. It is clearly an important concept that is central to his epistemology. The author of the *Nyāyāvatāra*, to the contrary, does not refer to the concept, and does not seem to see it as being important. The fact that this work, too, deals with epistemological topics suggests that its author has a

very different attitude towards the concept. These two major differences in the epistemology of the *Nyāyāvātāra* and the epistemology of the *Sammatitarka* strongly suggest that the works were written by two different authors.

In spite of this evidence, there are no scholars who have forcefully argued that the two Siddhasenas should be distinguished. The great scholars S. Saṅghavī and B. Doshi, who edited the *Sammatitarka* and translated it into Gujarati, have taken it for granted that the two works were written by the same person.⁷⁾ M.K. Jain, another great scholar, however, implies that the *Sammatitarka* and the *Nyāyāvātāra* might have been written by two different authors. He believes that the author of the *Sammatitarka* was a Digambara monk who lived during the fourth or fifth century of the Vikrama era.⁸⁾ And he believes that the author of the *Nyāyāvātāra* was a philosopher in the Śvetāmbara tradition who lived during the fifth or sixth century of Vikrama era.⁹⁾ Although M.K. Jain does not give reasons for distinguishing the two authors in this way, it is clear that he believed that they were two different persons.

Other scholarly arguments have also implied that there were two different authors. A. N. Upadhyā, for example, argues that Siddhasena belonged to the Yāpaniya saṅgha, which is known as “the third sect in the Jaina tradition.” The argument is limited to evidence that is only found in the *Sammatitarka*, in particular, ideas concerning kelava jñāna and darśana (omniscience and omniperception). The author of the *Sammatitarka* proclaims that for omniscient beings there is no distinction between darśana and jñāna. The Digambaras, though, maintain that they occur simultaneously, and the Śvetāmbaras argue that they occur one after another. This idea is not expressed in the *Nyāyāvātāra* however, and no scholar has maintained that its author belonged to the third sect. This implies that the two authors belonged to different sects and that they were therefore two different persons. In spite of this implication, Prof. Upadhye does not explicitly state that the two works were written by different authors. Instead, he merely raises questions about the authorship and date of the *Nyāyāvātāra*: “Its authorship by Siddhasena... and consequently its date have to remain open questions for a number of reasons.”¹⁰⁾

Various opinions concerning when Siddhasena lived also imply that there were two different Siddhasenas. H. Jacobi and his followers believe that Siddhasena lived

after Dharmakīrti, which means after A. D. 650.¹¹⁾ This argument seems to depend upon evidence found in the *Nyāyāvātāra*. On the other hand, Saṅghavī and other scholars who base their arguments on evidence found in the *Sammatitarka*, conclude that Siddhasena lived during the fifth century of the Vikrama era, or about the fifth or sixth century A. D.¹²⁾ This difference in opinion, which is the result of arguments based on different works, suggests that the two works were composed by two different persons. It is generally assumed that ancient Jaina philosophers composed their works in Prakrit, and that later Jaina scholars wrote their philosophical works in Sanskrit. Based on this strong belief, one can assume that Kundakunda, who wrote in Prakrit, lived before Samantabhadra, who wrote all his works in Sanskrit. Similarly, it can be concluded that the author of the *Sammatitarka* lived well before the author of the *Nyāyāvātāra*.

A recognition that the *Sammatitarka* and the *Nyāyāvātāra* were written by two different persons, and that the author of the former work lived before the author of the later, has considerable merit because it resolves two enigmas in the history of Jaina philosophy that have confused scholars for quite sometime.

One issue that is resolved is the chronological relationship between Samantabhadra and Siddhasena. The ninth verse of the *Nyāyāvātāra* and, the fifth verse of Samantabhadra's *Ratnakaraṇḍakaśrāvākācāra* are identical.¹³⁾ It is unlikely that the two verses were quoted from a common source, so it seems certain that one must have been quoted from the other. If one recognized that there were two Siddhasenas, however, one can conclude that the author of the *Nyāyāvātāra* quoted the verse of Samantabhadra, who is believed to have lived during the sixth century A. D.

Another problem that is easily solved by recognizing that there were two Siddhasenas concerns the theory of *antarvyāpti*.¹⁴⁾ The Jains are believed to have coined and developed this theory in Indian logic, and some scholars argue that the 20th verse in the *Nyāyāvātāra* is the first reference to this theory.¹⁵⁾ As K. Mimaki points out, however, there must have been some Jaina philosopher who developed this theory before the author of the *Nyāyāvātāra*.¹⁶⁾ On the other hand, Samantabhadra seems at least unconsciously aware of the theory when he tries to establish by inference that only the Jaina saviors (tīrthaṅkaras) must be omniscient in his *Āptamīmāṃsā* verse 6.¹⁷⁾ Vasunandin, a Jaina who commented on the *Āptamīmāṃsā* for

the first time, argues forcefully that Samantabhadra uses the theory of *antarvyāpti* in making his inference.¹⁸⁾ Vasunandin, in turn, must have lived before Akalaṅka, who refers to the theory of *antarvyāpti* and mentions both Samantabhadra and Siddhasena in his *Pramāṇasaṃgraha*.¹⁹⁾ Such being the case, it is natural to assume that the author of the *Nyāyāvatāra* lives after Samantabhadra and that he learned of the idea of *antarvyāpti* from Samantabhadra's work, the *Āptamīmāṃsā*. Akalaṅka, who is believed to have from A. D. 720 to A. D. 780,²⁰⁾ would have lived after the author of the *Nyāyāvatāra*. The Siddhasena who wrote the *Nyāyāvatāra*, then, must have lived in seventh century.²¹⁾ This corresponds to the date suggested by H. Jacobi.

All of this leads to the conclusion that the author of the *Sammatitarka* is a different person than the author of the *Nyāyāvatāra* and that the *Nyāyāvatāra* was written after Samantabhadra and before Akalaṅka. Such a conclusion should benefit scholars in more closely understanding the development of the Jaina epistemology, especially the theory of *antarvyāpti*, a theory which must have been hinted at by Samantabhadra for the first time, and more explicitly mentioned by the author of *Nyāyāvatāra*, who used it in a syllogism.

Determining the period that the Siddhasena who wrote the *Sammatitarka* is more difficult. However, given that he subscribed to the theory that there are five kinds of knowledge and that he wrote his work in Prakrit, one can assume that he lived prior to Umāsvāti, who wrote in Sanskrit and who referred to both that theory of knowledge and the newer theory that there are two kinds of knowledge. Other works in the *Dvātrimśikās* and the *Sammatitarka* should also be carefully studied to help confirm the existence of two Siddhasenas.

-
- 1) "On the Date of the Buddhist Master of Law Vasubandhu." (Serie Orientale Roma III, 1951).
 - 2) Traditionally, the *Nyāyāvatāra* has been said to be a part of the *Dvātrimśikās*, which was written by Siddhasena and includes 32 works. This paper will not concern itself with the other 31 works.
 - 3) *Nyāyāvatāra* (in *Siddhasena's Nyāyāvatāra and other Works* by A. N. Upādhye, Bombay 1971) I reads :
 pramāṇaṃ svaparābhāsi jñānaṃ bādhavivarjitaṃ/
 pratyakṣaṃ ca paroḥkṣaṃ ca dvidhā meyaviniścayāt//
 - 4) For example, in the *Sammatitarka*, he refers to śruta, avadhī, and manahparyaya in II-16, kevala in II-17, and mati in II-27. See *Sammatitarka* edited by S. Saṅghavī and B. Doshi

(Ahmedabad 1932).

- 5) See *Sammatitarka*, II-17.
- 6) *Tattvārtha Sūtra* I-9~12 reads : matiśrutāvadhimanahparyayaivevalāni jñanam. tat pramāṇe. ādye paroḥsam. pratyakṣam anyat.
- 7) See the introduction to the *Sammatitarka*.
- 8) See *Jain Darśan* (Vārāṇasī 1955) p. 578.
- 9) See op. cit. p. 584.
- 10) *Siddhasena's Nyāyāvatāra and Other Works*, ed. by A.N.Upadhye (Bombay 1971) p. xxiii-xxiv.
- 11) See H. Jacobi's introduction to *Samarāicca Kahā* (Calcutta 1975) p. 3. The present author is not in the position to be able to see the introduction. Thus, the date is quoted from the introduction to the *Sammatitarka* pp. 11-12.
- 12) See the introduction to the *Sammatitarka*, p. 10.
- 13) āptenopajñam anullāṅghyaṃ adṛṣṭeṣṭavirodhakam/
tattvopdeśakṛtsārvaṃ śāstram kāpathaghaṭṭanam//
- 14) For a detailed discussion of this concept, see Atushi Uno's *Indo Ronri-gaku [Indian Logic]* (Kyoto 1996) p. 273-4.
- 15) Antaryvāptyaiva sādhyasya siddher bahirudāhṛtiḥ/
vyarthā syāt tadasadbhāve 'py evaṃ nyāyavido viduḥ//
For the importance of this verse in the history of antaryāpti, see Uno op. cit.
- 16) See Mimaki's "Setuna-metu Ronsyo (on kṣaṇabhanga)" in *Kouza Daijyo Bukkyou [Studies on Mahayana Buddhism]*, vol. 9 (Tokyo 1984).
- 17) *Āptamīmāṃsā* verse 6 (Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā 10, Varanasi 1914, p. 5)
ab ; sa tvam evāsi nirdoṣo yuktisāstrāvirodhivāk/
- 18) See Vṛtti on the *Āptamīmāṃsā* ; bahirvyāptim antareṇāntaryvāptyā siddham.
- 19) *Pramānasamgraha* in *Akalaṅkagranthatraya* ed. by M. K. Jain (Ahmedabad, Calcutta 1939), p. 114 :
asiddhaḥ siddhasenasya viruddho devanandina/
dvedhā samantabhadrasya sattvādir acalātmani//
- 20) See *Akalaṅkagranthātrayā* prasthāvanā p. 32.
- 21) There is not enough evidence to determine whether the author of the *Nyāyāvatāra* lived before or after Vasunadin.

(Key Words) *Sammati*, *Nyāyāvatāra*, *Antaryvāpti*

(Miyakonojo National College of Technology, Associate Professor)