Svabhāvapratibandha

Shiro Matsumoto

[Abbreviations used are the same as those in E. Steinkellner (1979): *Dharmakīrti's Pramānaviniścayaḥ*, *Zweites Kapitel: Svārthanumanam*, II, *Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Wien, pp. 9–16]

The aim of this paper is to make clear the meaning of the term *svabhāva-pratibandha*, which is the basis of the inevitable relation between reason (*hetu*) and result (*sādhya*) in the logic of Dharmakīrti (*svabhāvapratibandhe hi saty artho 'rthaṃ na vyabhicarati*/ PVSV 2, 19–20).

I. E. Steinkellner translates the word *svabhāvapratibandha* as “eine Verknüpfung durch den Svabhāva (or durch das Wesen)”, relying on the interpretation of Dharmottara¹⁾, who interpreted the compound “*svabhāva-pratibandhaḥ*” as an instrumental-tatpuruṣa, i. e. “*svabhāvena pratibandhaḥ*” (connection by *svabhāva*), as is clear from the following explanation:

- [1] *kāraṇe svabhāve ca sādhye svabhāvena pratibandhaḥ kāryasvabhāvayor aviśiṣṭa*
(NBT 110, 2–3)

Because Dharmottara equated “*svabhāva-pratibandhaḥ*” with “*pratibaddha-svabhāvatvam*” (NBT 110, 2), in this case the *svabhāva* by which reason is connected with result must be construed as the *svabhāva* of the reason²⁾.

On the other hand, Śākyabuddhi, the oldest commentator of PVSV, interpreted the compound in question as a locative-tatpuruṣa, i. e. “*svabhāve pratibandhaḥ*” (connection with *svabhāva*), and regarded *svabhāva*, the first component of the compound, as the *svabhāva* of the result, or strictly speaking, as the real object (*vastu*) of the result, as is seen from the following explanations:

- [2] *yañ cis te dños po bsgrub pa gñis kho na yin she na| rañ bshin dan ḥbrel pa*
(*svabhāva-pratibandhe* PVSV 2, 19–20) *shes bya ba la sogs pa smos te| rañ*
bshin bsgrub par bya baḥi dños po (sādhya-vastu) dan ḥbrel pa ni de la rag las
pa ñid (āyatatva)³⁾ de de yod naḥo|| (PVT je, 12a8–b1)
- [3] *yata evan tasmāt svabhāvapratibandhād eva sādhyaḥ* *abhimate vastuni pratibaddha-*

(11)

Svabhāvapratibandha (S. Matsumoto)

tvaḍ eva hetuḥ svasādhyaṅ gamayati (PVSVT 76, 9-10=PVT je, 47b5-6; underlined: PVSV 17, 12)⁴⁾

However, the interpretations by these two commentators are inadequate, as will be made clear in this paper.

II. There are two modes of *svabhāvapratibandha*, according to the two kinds of reason, i. e. *svabhāvahetu* and *kāryahetu*⁵⁾. Because the two kinds of reason do not deviate from the results only when there is *svabhāvapratibandha*, it can be assumed that the two modes of *svabhāvapratibandha* will no doubt be indicated in the following definitions of the two kinds of reason:

[4] *kāryaṃ svabhāvair yāvadbhir avinābhāvi kārāṇe*
hetuḥ svabhāve bhāvo 'pi bhāvamātrānurodhini (PV I k. 2)

The definition of *kāryahetu* in this verse is commented on in PVSV as follows;

[5] *kāryaṃ svabhāvair yāvadbhir avinābhāvi kārāṇe* *teṣāṃ hetuḥ tatkāryatvaniyamāt*
tair eva dharmair ye tair vinā na bhavanti (PVSV 3, 13-16; underlined: PV I k. 2)

(tr.) The effect is, only by as many properties (particular properties) as do not arise without the properties (general properties) in the cause, the reason for the properties (general properties) in the cause, because they (the particular properties in the effect) are necessarily the effect of them (the general properties in the cause)⁶⁾.

Here Dharmakīrti asserts that only the particular properties in the effect are the reason for only the general properties in the cause⁷⁾, because the former are necessarily the effect of the latter⁸⁾. In that case, how is the *svabhāvapratibandha* indicated in the definition of *kāryahetu*? The answer is given in the following passage:

[6] *siddhas tu kāryakāraṇabhāvaḥ svabhāvaṃ niyamayatīty ubhayatha svabhāva-*
pratibandhād eva nivṛtīḥ (PVSV 17, 6-7)

(tr.) But the relation between effect and cause, when it is established, limits *svabhāva*⁹⁾ [of the effect]. Therefore in both cases [i. e. *svabhāvahetu* and *kāryahetu*], the absence [of reason in the case of the absence of result] is caused only by *svabhāvapratibandha*.

Here, because it is clear that the phrase “*svabhāvaṃ niyamayati*” explains the meaning of the word *svabhāvapratibandha* in the case of *kāryahetu*, “*svabhāva-pratibandhaḥ*” must in this case be construed as “*svabhāvasya pratibandhaḥ*” (limitation of *svabhāva*). What then is the limitation of *svabhāva* which results from the establishment of the causal relation? The present writer thinks that it is the limitation of the properties in the effect to only the particular properties, which alone are the reason for the general properties in the cause, as is stated in the definition of *kāryahetu*. Thus the *svabhāvapratibandha* (limitation of properties) of *kāryahetu* is expressed by the phrases “*svabhāvair yāvadbhir*” in PV I k. 2 and “*tair eva*” in Passage [5], where the limitation itself is indicated by the words “*yāvadbhir*” and “*eva*”.

The definition of *svabhāvahetu* in PV I k. 2cd can be translated as follows:

(tr.) *Bhāva* also is the reason for the *svabhāva* which follows only that *bhāva*.

The *svabhāvapratibandha* which is indicated in this definition is explained in the following passage:

[7] *tasmāt tanmātrasaṃbandhaḥ svabhāvo bhāvaṃ eva vā| nivartayet|* (PV I k. 23 abc)*svaṃ ca svabhāvaṃ parityajya kathaṃ bhāvo bhāve| svabhāvasyaiva bhāvatvad iti tasya svabhāvapratibandhād avyabhicārah|* (PVSV 16, 28-17, 3)

(tr.) Therefore the *svabhāva*, which connects with (follows) *bhāva* only, when it is absent, makes only the *bhāva* absent.*Bhāva* cannot exist without its own *svabhāva* because only *svabhāva* is *bhāva*. Therefore that (*bhāva*, reason) does not deviate (from its *svabhāva* or result) because of its connection with the *svabhāva*.

The word “*svabhāva-pratibandhaḥ*” here must be construed not as “*svabhāvena pratibandhaḥ*” but as “*svabhāve pratibandhaḥ*” (connection with *svabhāva*), as is commented on by Śākyabuddhi¹⁰), because the meaning of the word “*pratibandha*” is here, strictly speaking, “counter-connection”. The connection (*saṃbandha*) between *bhāva* and *svabhāva* has two directions. The connection of *svabhāva* with *bhāva* (*svabhāva*→*bhāva* connection) is *anubandha*¹¹) (connection, following), while the connection of *bhāva* with *svabhāva* (*bhāva*→*svabhāva* connection) is *pratibandha* (counter-connection, followedness). The meaning of the term *anubandha* in this case is fully explained by the phrase “*svabhāvasyaiva*

bhāvatvād”, which seems to be a comment on the phrase “*tanmātrasaṃbandhaḥ*” in PV I k. 23a, as “inevitable following of *svabhāva* to *bhāva*”, i. e. “inevitable occurrence of *svabhāva* in the case of the occurrence of *bhāva*”. In the definition of *svabhāvahetu*, by stating that the connection of *svabhāva* with *bhāva* is *anubandha* (lit. *anurodha*), the connection of *bhāva* with *svabhāva* is defined as *pratibandha*.

Svabhāva is the “essence” (*ātman*) of *bhāva*, as is clear from Passage [7]. Therefore, in the logical context, the relation of *bhāva* to *svabhāva* is *tadātmya*¹²⁾ (having that [=result] as its essence), while the relation of *svabhāva* to *bhāva* is *tadbhāvatā*¹³⁾ (having that [=reason] as its *bhāva* or essence-possessor). Thus the term *tadātmya* must not be translated, as is done by Steinkellner¹⁴⁾, by “identity”, if otherwise the limiting word “*eva*” in the phrase “*svabhāva-syaiva bhāvatvād*” can mean nothing.

The conclusion of this paper is shown in the following table¹⁵⁾.

kāryasya	svabhāvasya	pratibandhaḥ	(limitation of its properties)
bhāvasya	svabhāve	pratibandhaḥ	(counter-connection with its essence)

- 1) Cf. E. Steinkellner (1971): Wirklichkeit und Begriff bei Dharmakīrti, WZKS 15, p. 202, n. 87; do. (1979), p. 44, n. 111.
- 2) Cf. Steinkellner's statement “Nur diese beiden Gründe sind nämlich durch ihren Svabhāva mit der entsprechenden Folge verbunden.” (E. Steinkellner (1971), p. 205).
- 3) Cf. PVT je, 31b4-5 (=tatpratibandhād/ tatra kārṇe āyattatvād/ PVSVT 55, 8-9). For Dharmottara also, the connection of reason with result is “*āyattatva*” (dependence), while, for Dharmakīrti, the term is employed to express the connection of the result with the reason called *svabhāva*, i. e. *svabhāvahetu*. Cf. NBT 112, 1-2; PVSV 4, 3.
- 4) Karṇakagomin is later than Śākyabuddhi and Dharmottara, because their passages (PVT je, 15a3-4; Dh dse, 308b6-309a1) are quoted by him (PVSV 28, 20; 28, 21-24).
- 5) Cf. *sa ca tadātmatvat/* (PVSV 2, 20-21); *kāryasyāpi svabhāvapratibandhaḥ/ tatsva-bhāvasya tadutpatter iti/* (PVSV 3, 3-4).
- 6) This translation is based mainly on the explanation in HBT (151, 7-13; 151, 20-152, 1).
- 7) This assertion is already made by Dignāga in PS II kk. 18-19 (ce, 5a3-4).
- 8) Cf. *tad evaṃ kārṇasya sāmānyadharmā eva gamyā na viśeṣadharmāḥ, kārya-syāpi viśeṣadharmā eva gamakā na sāmānyadharmāḥ, tatkāryatvaniyamāt/* (HBT

152, 1-4).

- 9) This translation does not seem to contradict Śākyabuddhi's comment "*kāryasya svabhāvaṃ kāraṇe niyamayati*" (PVSVT 75, 22=PVT je, 47b1-2), because the property of the effect is fixed on the cause by limiting the properties of the effect.
 - 10) Cf. *tasyātmabhūtasya sādhanasya śiṃśapādeḥ svabhāvapratibandhād eva svabhāve sādhyabhimate vrkṣādau yathoktena prakāreṇa pratibandhād evāvyabhicārah* (PVS VT 75, 14-15=PVT je, 47a6-7; underlined: PVS 17, 2-3).
 - 11) Cf. *yathasamñihātān nānyam apekṣata iti tanmatrānubandhi svabhāvo bhāvasya* (PVS 6, 26-27). It is declared in PS II k. 13 (4b7-8) that whatever follows a particular thing is obtained through *anyāpoha*. Therefore *svabhāva* which follows *bhāva*, being the result of *anyāpoha*, cannot be real.
 - 12) Cf. *tadātmyaṃ hy arthasya tanmatrānurodhiny eva nānyāyatte* (PVS 4, 2-3). The present writer does not accept Steinkellner's interpretation that the word "*tadātman*" from which the abstract noun "*tadātmya*" is derived is a tatpuruṣa-compound, but rather Dharmottara's interpretation that the word is a bahuvrīhi-compound meaning "what has that as its *ātman* or *svabhāva*". Cf. *sa sādhyo 'rīha atma svabhāvo yasya tat tadātma* | *tasya bhāvas tadātmya* | (NBT 113, 3-4); E. Steinkellner (1974): On the interpretation of the *svabhāva*hetuḥ, WZKS 18, p. 118, n. 2. Steinkellner's opinion might rest on the following passages: *tasmin sādhye yo hetuḥ sa svabhāvaḥ tasya sādhyasya nānyaḥ* | (NBT 106, 6-7), *sādhyadharmaṣya śrutatvāt tasyaiva svabhāva iti gamyate* | (HBT 57, 6-7). However, because such expressions were merely contrived by the commentators owing to the fact that *svabhāva*hetu is called *svabhāva* by Dharmakīrti himself, it is not proper to use them in determining the meaning of such important term as *tadātmya*. As for the compound "*lingi-svabhāva*" in "*lingi-svabhāva eva hetuḥ*" (HB 39, 12; read according to Tib.), in spite of the interpretation by Arcaṭa, which is accepted by Steinkellner, that it is a tatpuruṣa-compound (HBT 57, 6-7, 11-12), the present writer considers it to be a bahuvrīhi-compound, because the meanings of the words "*svabhāva*" in the compound and in the sentence "*pare hy arthāntaranimittam atadbhāvaṃ tanmatrānvayinam api dharmaṃ svabhāvaṃ icchanti*" (HB 39, 14-15) must be the same. Cf. E. Steinkellner (1974), p. 126.
 - 13) Cf. *sādhyadharmaṣya vastutas tadbhāvataya* (HB 37, 3-4).
 - 14) Cf. E. Steinkellner (1974), p. 118.
 - 15) It is not clear whether the present writer's interpretation agrees in its content with that of the commentators who, prior to Dharmottara, construed the compound "*svabhāvapratibandhaḥ*" as a genitive-tatpuruṣa in the case of *kārya*hetu, and as a locative-tatpuruṣa in the case of *svabhāva*hetu. Cf. DhPr 110, 17-19; E. Steinkellner (1979), p. 44, n. 111.
- * My thanks is due to Mr. Keiichi Miyamoto, Mr. Atsushi Kanazawa, Mr. Hiroshi Marui and Mr. Yoichi Fukuda, whose suggestions were very useful in writing this paper.

(Lecturer, Tokai University)