

# A Study of the *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā*

—An Incomplete Work on Jaina Logic—

Hojun Nagasaki

## I

The *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā*<sup>(1)</sup> (Pm.) is an important work on Jaina logic and epistemology by the great Jaina monk, Hemacandra (1088-1171 A. D.) who is given the title *Kalikālasarvajña* (the Omniscient of the Kali age). It is believed that this was probably his last work for the reason that it was left incomplete<sup>(2)</sup>, though in the beginning the author puts forward the plan that he would complete the work in five chapters. The fact that the work is incomplete does not always mean to be the last work of an author. We may suppose that he could not afford to complete the work for some reasons and that the manuscript was not properly handed down up to now. Our intention is to find out the authentic conclusion after examining the style, frame and contents of Pm. in comparison with those of works belonging to other schools.

## II

In the beginning of Pm. the author illustrates the style of the work he follows.

“If that be the case, why is it that you do not set out to compose a discursive treatise (*prakaraṇa*) following (the example of) Akalaṅka, Dharmakīrti and the like? Why do you assume the role

---

(1) A manuscript of the work and its commentary by the author himself has been first noticed by Peterson in his Fifth Report on Sanskrit MSS. pp. 147-148 and edited by scholars (Ārhatamata-prabhākara edition, Sañcālaka Siṅghī Jaina Granthamālā, 1939). The English translation of this work was published by Dr. S. Mookerjee in collaboration with Dr. N. Tatia (Bhāratī Mahāvidyālaya Publications, Jaina Series No. 5, 1946).

(2) Introduction (English translation of Pm.) p. 6.

of a writer of aphorisms—a vainglorious pose (in all conscience)? Don't be censorious. The present writer follows his own taste and there is neither public (opinion) nor a royal command to put a restraint upon the free exercise of his will. So your contention is a frivolous trifle.”<sup>(3)</sup>

Hemacandra follows the *sūtra* or aphoristic style, on his own taste, in composing this work without following the *prakaraṇa* or discursive method of Akalaṅka, Dharmakīrti and the like to whom he is deeply indebted in logic and epistemology. The *sūtra* or aphoristic style which Hemacandra follows was as, for instance, in the *Nyāyasūtra* and so on,<sup>(4)</sup> used by authors of the Brahmanical schools. Even in the Jaina school this style was adopted by Umāsvāti in expressing the Jaina doctrine in his *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra*. It is, therefore, clear from this that Hemacandra followed the style of these writers.

As for the frame of the work we can find the following statement in Pm.

“The Master has composed this *śāstra* in five *adhyāyas* (Books), each consisting of a group of *āhnikas* (Lectures); of the latter again each consists of a number of *prakaraṇas* (discourses); each *prakaraṇa* is made of a group of *sūtras* (aphorisms); each *sūtra* consists of a number of *padas* (inflected words) each of which in its turn is composed of a number of *varṇas* (syllables).”<sup>(5)</sup>

The *Nyāyabhāṣya* by Vātsyāyana is divided into five *adhyāyas*, each consisting of two *āhnikas* after the plan of the *Nyāyasūtra*. It is to be noticed that the same plan in almost the same words is found in the *Nyāyavārttika* by Uddyotakara. It runs as follows.

“This *śāstra* which consists of a group of sentences such as

---

(3) Pm. 1. 1. 2.

(4) Louis Renou: Histoire de la langue sanskrite p. 55, 大地原豊助教授「イン  
ド土着文法學における比喩的論證」——Mahābhāṣya 1. 1. 56. の事例——(關西大學  
東西學術研究所論叢四十七) p. 1.

(5) Pm. 1. 1. 3.

inference and the like has been composed in five *adhyāyas*, each consisting of a group of *āhnikas*; of the latter again each consists of a number of *prakaraṇas*; each *prakaraṇa* is made of a group of *sūtras*; each *sūtra* consists of a number of *padas* each of which in its turn is composed of a number of *varṇas*.<sup>(6)</sup>

The fact that many quotations from the *Nyāyasūtra*, the *Nyāyabhāṣya* and the *Nyāyavārttika* are found in Pm. implies that Hemacandra is deeply indebted to these works. It is plain that Hemacandra was much influenced by these works of the Nyāya, when he wrote his work, and that he has borrowed the plan of the frame from the *Nyāyavārttika*. We can therefore maintain from what has been stated above that Hemacandra follows, in the style and the frame of his work, the example of the commentators on the *Nyāyasūtra* and the talented writers as Umāsvāti of his own school.

In the present text, however, whole *adhyāyas* are not available, although, as we have mentioned, Hemacandra intended to compose the work divided into five *adhyāyas*, each consisting of a group of *āhnikas* and so on. The first *adhyāya* is divided into two *āhnikas*. The first *āhnika* consists of 42 *sūtras*, while the second *āhnika* 23 *sūtras*. The present work abruptly ends in the middle of the course while proposing to define the epistolary style of debate in III *prakaraṇa*, the 1st *āhnika* of the 2nd *adhyāya*, after having stated and criticised the Buddhist view of an occasion of censure (*nigrahasthāna*) in the preceding *prakaraṇas*.

The *Nyāyabhāṣya* and the *Nyāyavārttika* are divided into five *adhyāyas*, each consisting of two *āhnikas*. As for Pm. following the plan of these works, its first *adhyāya* consists of two *āhnikas* as already mentioned. Assuming that each of the five *adhyāyas* of Pm. consisted of two *āhnikas* as in the *Nyāyabhāṣya* and the *Nyāyavārttika*, we may easily perceive that the work available is only a little more than one fourth of the whole work intended. Since the work extant is a little more than one fourth of the work

---

(6) *Nyāyavārttika* p. 1.

planned, its contents and subject-matters might be also a little more than one fourth of the whole to be discussed and consequently the present work must be absolutely imperfect. Let us therefore glance at the contents of the work in order to examine how far the subject-matters of logic and epistemology are dealt with in it, in comparison with that of the standard works in the Nyāya.

### ADHYĀYA I

#### ĀHNIKA-I

The meaning of *pramāṇa* and *mīmāṃsā*.

General definition of *pramāṇa*.

Definition of *nirṇaya*.

Definition of *saṁśaya*, *anadhyavasāya*, *viparyaya*.

Problem whether *pramāṇya* (validity) of an organ of knowledge is self-determined or determined by another.

The classification of *pramāṇa*.

Two kinds of *pramāṇa*—*pratyakṣa* (perceptual) and *parokṣa* (non-perceptual).

Statement of *pramāṇa* accepted by other schools.

The specific definition of *pramāṇa*.

Definition of *pratyakṣa*.

Twofold division of *pratyakṣa*—*mukhya* (transcendent) and *sāṁvya-vahārika* (empirical).

Other varieties of transcendent intuition—*avadhi* (visual intuition, clairvoyance) and *manah-paryāya* (intuition of modes of other minds).

*Sāṁvyavahārika* intuition conditioned by a sense and the mind and being of the nature of *avagraha*, *īha*, *avāya* and *dhāraṇa*.

Definition of *pratyakṣa* in other schools.

*Pramāṇasya viśaya* (the objective knowledge), *phala* (resultant), *pramātrī* (subject)

#### ĀHNIKA-II

*parokṣa-pramāṇa* (non-perceptual organ of knowledge)—its subdivi-

sions (*smṛti*, *pratyabhijñāna*, *ūha*, *anumāna*, *āgama*).

*Vyāpti* (necessary concomitance).

*Svārtha-anumāna* (subjective inference) and *parārtha-anumāna* (syllogistic inference)

The Buddhist theory of *trairūpya* (triple characteristic) of a valid probans and the Naiyāyika's *pañcarūpya* (quantuple characteristic) refuted.

Five types of probantia (*svabhāva*, *kārana*, *kārya*, *ekārthasamavāya*, *virodha*).

*Sādhya* (probandum).

Six types of *bādha* (contradiction).

The question whether *dṛṣṭānta* is a necessary factor of inference or not.

*Sādharmya* and *vaidharmya*.

## ADHYĀYA II

### ĀHNIKA-I

*parārthānumāna* (syllogistic inference).

Constitution of a syllogism and five members of syllogism.

*Ābhāsa* (sham simulant).

*Asiddha*, *viruddha* and *anaikāntika*.

Sixteen types of *dṛṣṭāntābhāsa* (false example).

*Dāṣaṇa* (confutation).

*Jāti* (false confutation or sophism).

*Chala* (casuistry).

*Vada* (legitimate discourse)—*Jalpa* (disputation).

*Vitaṇḍa* (wrangling).

*Jaya* (victory) and *parājaya* (defect).

*Nigrahassthāna* (occasions of censure).

*Patra* (epistle).

.....The rest is not available.....

Since Pm., in its style and frame, is under influence of the Nyāya,

it is adequate to compare the contents of Pm. with those of the Nyāya. The sixteen categories of the Nyāya school, elucidated in the *Nyāyasūtra*<sup>(7)</sup> and so on, expounds the fundamental subject-matters of logic.

In comparison with the categories of the *Nyāyasūtra*, we can find that the subject-matters which accord with the sixteen categories of the Nyāya are almost discussed in Pm. Consequently it shows that Pm. is almost a complete work with important subject-matters discussed, if we observe it through the sixteen categories of the Nyāya. It is, however, not proper to suppose that Hemacandra has sufficed with the subject-matters which accord with the categories of the Nyāya, since even in *adhyāya* II, III and IV of the *Nyāyasūtra* the subject-matters other than the sixteen categories are discussed. He is, having been conversant with philosophies of all schools, supposed to have developed the subject-matters and contributed something to Jaina logic in *adhyāya* III, IV and V of Pm.

Dharmakīrti is bitterly criticised in Pm., although Hemacandra is indebted much to the thought of Dharmakīrti. What reminds us in this connection is this. The Jaina doctrine is, on the ground of *apoha*, confuted in four *gāthas* from 181 to 184 of the *Pramāṇavārttika* as pointed out by Dr. E. Kanakura.<sup>(8)</sup> We can easily perceive that Hemacandra most probably intended, in the rest of the *adhyāyas* which remain blank for the present, to meet the criticism of Dharmakīrti and criticise the doctrine of *apoha* which occupies an important position in the *Pramāṇavārttika*, since Pm. is either deeply indebted to Dharmakīrti or is criticising his position. It also proves that Pm. does not include the whole subject-matters intended by Hemacandra. It is a great loss for us not to be able to know the whole subject-matters intended, although the work is not vitiated inasmuch as the whole subject-matter in logic and epistemology summed up in the categories of the Nyāya school is almost elucidated in it.

---

(7) *Nyāyasūtra* 1. 1. 1.

(8) 金倉圓照博士著「印度精神文化の研究」pp. 392~395.

## III

The all available manuscripts of Pm. abruptly end in the same place does not fail to attract our attention. As far as the tradition of renowned Jaina monk, Hemacandra is concerned, it is scarcely maintained that the complete work of Pm. was not handed down properly to deciples. It is also absolutely impossible to think that Hemacandra, the most versatile and prolific writer, did not complete the work without any special reason. The most credible supposition is that it was his last work and he died before he could complete it.

The gloss on Pm.<sup>(9)</sup> illustrates the meanings of *atha* in aphorism I, “*atha pramāṇamīmāṃsā*”. *Atha* means commencement (*adhikāra*) according to the first interpretation. As regards the second interpretation of *atha*, it runs as follows :

“Or, let the word *atha* stand for the idea of sequence. The meaning would thus become : organ of knowledge is being discussed subsequent to the treatment of Grammar (*śabda*), Poetics (*kāvya*) and Prosody (*chandas*). Understood in this sense the word (*atha*) serves to signify that this (work) is the product of the same author as that of Grammar, etc.”

It indicates that the same author, i. e. Hemacandra has composed Pm. subsequent to the treatment of grammar, poetics and prosody. As we know, he was one of the most many-sided writers, both as a poet and as a scholar. He has, under the reign of Siddharāja, written the *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana*, one of the best grammar with its practical arrangement and terminology. As for the treatment of poetics by him, we have the *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* (or *Dvyāśraya*) accompanied by his own commentary (*Alaṃkāracūḍāmaṇi*). As an example of prosody, mention may be made of his *Chandonuśāsana* with his *vṛtti*. His literary activity also extended to logic and philosophy after having composed the works on grammar, poetics and prosody.

---

(9) Pm. 1. 1. 4.

Hemacandra has also, in his last period, written the works on biography. The *Yogaśāstra* and the *Vitarāgastuti* are, for instance, reported to have composed after he was seventy years old.<sup>(10)</sup> The *Vitarāgastuti* consists of a group of the songs of praise among which the *Ayogavyavacchedikā* and the *Anyayogavyavacchedikā* are well-known. The former is devoted to a defence of the Jaina system, and the other to criticism of other schools. Pm. can be evidently proved to have been composed after the *Ayogavyavacchedikā* from the fact that the latter is quoted three times in Pm.<sup>(11)</sup> It stands to reason to suppose that Pm. belongs to the last period of his activity.

We can therefore firmly conclude from what has been stated above that Pm. was the last work by Hemacandra and that he was prevented by death to continue to write the remaining chapters of his work.

---

(10) G. Bühler's 'The life of Hemacandrācārya', p. 39.

(11) Pm. 1. 1. 57 (Ay. 21), Pm. 1. 1. 58 (Ay. 25), Pm. 1. 1. 58 (Ay. 31).

### New Publication

## SUKHĀVATĪVYŪHA

*édité par*

Atsuuji ASIKAGA

Professeur à la Université de Kyoto

B 5 pp. 65, ¥ 1,800

Librairie Hōzōkan, Kyoto, 1965.