The Indian Philosophers mainly conveyed philosophical knowledge in the form of commentary on an original text from generation to generation. To take an example from the Vaiśeṣika of medieval India, we know the Vyomaśati (Vy) of Vyoṣaśiva (ca. 900–960), the Nyāyakandalī (NK) of Śrīdhara (ca. 950–1000) and the Kiranāvaḷī (Kir) of Udayana (ca. 1050–1100), which are the commentary texts on the Padārthadharmasamgraha (PDhS) of Praṣṭapāda (ca. 550–600), as, together, an original text. As Hirano [2007] has already shown, when we apply “the configuration of texts” to the above texts of the Vaiśeṣika, the PDhS can be regarded as the S-text, and the commentary texts—the Vy, the NK, and the Kir—can be regarded as the Meta-text, which is the interpretation assigned to the S-Text. Bearing the relationship between the S-text and the meta-text in mind, Hirano [2009] presented an annotated translation of the “chapter of inherence’s (samavāya) definition” in the NK in order to show the mode of comment utilized therein. Strictly speaking, the portion of “the definition of inherence” in the PDhS is held to be the S-text, and the comment portion on it in the NK is considered to be the meta-text [Hirano, 2009].

This paper also holds the definition of inherence in the PDhS to be the S-text, while the comment portion on it in the Kir is considered the meta-text. The translation of the definition of inherence in the PDhS is as follows:

---

1 When I speak of “the original text,” I mean a text on which the commentary text makes comment.
2 On the dating of authors referred to in this paper, see Potter (ed.) [1995a (1970)] and [1995b (1977): 9–12]. When I have followed other sources for their dates, I have referred to the sources in the footnotes.
3 The configuration of texts consists of the S-text, pre-text, inter-text, and para-text besides the meta-text. The “pre-text” is a prerequisite for the S-Text’s existence. Plot, drafts, proofs and so on are elements of the pre-text. The “inter-text” stands for the whole text, which is related via quotation with the S-Text in a broad sense. The relationship between the S-Text and the inter-text, then, is called “inter-textuality.” Finally, the “para-text” is the collection of other texts by the same author. If only a portion of a text is regarded as the S-Text, the rest of the text is regarded as the para-text. On the concept of the constituents of the texts, see Matsuzawa [2003: 27–28] and Hirano [2007].
That which is the relation, being a cause of the idea “[this is] here (this is in that),” between entities that fix without being separate [from each other], which [stand as] the superstratum and the substratum, is inherence.4

(PDhŚ, no. 9: ayutasiddhānām ādhāryādharabhūtānāṃ yāḥ sambandha ihapratyayahetuḥ sa samacāvayah.)

In this paper I provide an annotated translation of the “definition of inherence” chapter in the Kir with the same purpose as Hirano [2009]. We have the following printed texts of the Kir:


I have edited Udayana’s text, using the above five editions. Of these five, I have used mainly the O edition. The passages from the other editions are given as variants in the footnotes. When a passage of another edition is used, the passage of the O edition is given as a variant. Based on the edited Udayana text, I make a translation of the “definition of inherence” chapter in the Kir. In translating it, I have also consulted three commentaries on the Kir: the Kirāṇācaliṭīkā of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra (ca. 1225), the Kirāṇācaliprakāśa of Vardhamāna (fl. 1350–1375), and the Kirāṇācalirahasya of

4 On the translation of inherence’s definition in the PDhŚ, Jhā [1982 (1915): 32] translates it as follows: “Inherence is the relationship subsisting among things that are inseparable, standing to one another in the character of the container and the contained—such relationship being the basis of the idea that ‘this is in that.’” Hirano [2009: 46] translates the inherence’s definition in the PDhŚ into “The relation, which is a cause of the idea [this is] here (this is in that),” between entities that are incapable of existing separately [and] that stand as the superstratum and the substratum, is inherence.” In this paper, the translation has been modified based on the understanding that the word, “ādhāryādharabhūtānāṃ,” modifies the word, “ayutasiddhānām,” Regarding the role of “-bhūta” as making attributive substantive in the compound, see Whitney [1997 (1924): 493] and Tubb and Boose [2007: 167–168].
Mathurānātha Tarkavāgiśa (fl. 1550–1590).5

The synopsis of the chapter of inherence’s definition in the Kir is supplied for convenient reference. This synopsis was made by myself, in consideration of the contents of the Kir, elucidating information that is often implied but not explicitly shown in the Sanskrit text itself.

In the translation, words enclosed by square brackets are words which I have supplied. And words enclosed by round brackets are added to clarify the meaning or significance of ambiguous words in the English translation, or are the original Sanskrit words.

Regarding translations, while no scholar has yet completely translated the chapter of inherence’s definition in the Kir into English, B. K. Matilal has offered a summary in Potter (ed.) [1995b (1977): 590]. Honda [2009] has provided a Japanese translation of the whole Kir.

The Synopsis of the Chapter of Inherence’s Definition in the Kirānāvalī

[1] Entities that fix without being separate [from each other] (ayutasiddha)

[1.1] Consideration of ayutasiddha

[1.2] The relation of conjunction (samyoga)

[2] Entities that [stand as] the superstratum and the substratum (ādhāryādхārabhūta)

[3] A cause of the idea “[this is] here” (ihapratyayahetu)

Following this classification in the above synopsis, I will present a translation of the chapter of inherence’s definition in the Kir.

[1] Entities that fix without being separate [from each other] (ayutasiddha)

[1.1] Consideration of ayutasiddha6

Since inherence is single, there is no division [among inherence]. Therefore, [Praśastapāda] describes the definition [of inherence, without mentioning its division, as] “between entities that fix without being separate [from each other].” Since these [entities] are not only inseparate (ayuta) [or] connected (prāpta), but also fixed

5 Regarding the commentaries on the Kir and the dating of the three commentators, see Thakur [2003: 295–298].

6 TEXT: samacāryasyaikaṛtvaḥ vibhāgo (1) nāstistī (2) laksanam āha ayutasiddhānām iti. ayutāh prāptā ca (2)te siddhiḥ cety (3) ayutasiddhā prāptā eva santi (3) na viyuktā (3) iti yācaḥ. teṣāṁ sambandhaḥ prāptilaksanāḥ samacāryaḥ.

VARIANTS: (1) S, na sambhavaḥiti; (2) A, G, S, siddhā iti; (3) A, G, nāprāptā.
The relation of conjunction is excluded by virtue of it (the word, ‘ayutasmaddhā’), since it (the relation of conjunction) is preceded by non-connection (aprāptī).

Accordingly, the definition that “inherence is eternal connection” is very suitable. [Praśastapādā] will state that there is no eternal conjunction. On the other hand, inherence is eternal.

7 Connection (prāptī) means direct relation; that is to say, where there is nothing in between two relata. On the concept of connection, to quote Shastri [1993: 146, n. 51], “Relation means getting into contact, and this implies direct relation. In other words, the two relata of which are not intervened by any other entities except the relation that is the direct relation. Both samyoṣa and samacāyya are direct relations, because nothing intervenes between the relata of the above two relations. In contrast to this the relation between the son and the farther may be cited. The two are related by the relation of jānyajanaka-bhāva [bhāca] (the son is off-spring and the farther is progenitor) but their relation is not the direct relation—time and space intervening between the two.”


9 The Kiraṇḍacalitrakāya (p. 88, 8–9) comments that tena indicates siddha in the word of ayutasiddha (siddhacāyasamaprabhavayanam āha tenneti. arthataḥ siddhacāyasamaprabhavaney arthah).

10 The PDhS (no. 168) defines conjunction as follows: “conjunction is connection of two entities that were not connected (aprāptayoh prāptih samyoṣah).” The Kir comments on this definition as follows: “connection (prāptih) means touching. And since it (connection) is also inherence, [the words] “of two entities that were not connected” is mentioned in [the PDhS]. However, inherence does not exist between two entities that were not connected, since the moment [one entity] emerges it is related to [the other entity]. A touch of two entities that exist and were not connected is conjunction, whereas inherence is not so. Therefore, it (inheritence) is excluded.” (Kir (O), 145, 3–6: prāptih samśeṣah. sa ca samacāyya ’pity ato uktaṃ aprāptayoh iti. samacāyyas tv aprāptayor na bhācato eva, jātah sambaddhatv ety evaṣākeratvāt vidyamanaṇy aprāptayoh samśeṣah samyoṣah. samacāyyasya tv nātum ity asya cyacchchedaḥ.) Moreover, the PDhS (no. 183) defines disjunction (vīhāga) as follows: “disjunction is non-connection which is preceded by connection among two entities” (prāptipravīhāka ‘prāptpravīhāga).

11 The PDhS (no. 178) denies unborn and eternal conjunction in the chapter of conjunction (nāsty ajāḥ sanyoṣy naityaparimāṇaṃ duraḥ prītaḥ naḥabhisādhanāt. yathā caturvidhām parimāṇaṃ utpādyam uktvāha nityaṃ parimāṇām ity evaḥ anyatarrakṣamajādisamyoṣam utpādyam uktvā prītaḥ nityaṃ brahman na tv evaḥ abracchī tasmin nāsty ajāḥ sanyoṣah).

12 Udayana admits that both inherence and conjunction are connection, but does not admit that conjunction is eternal. Therefore, adding the word ‘eternal’ to connection, conjunction can be distinguished from inherence. According to the statement in [1.1], we may say that the entities between which conjunction subsists are in the condition of inseparable or connected, but are not in the condition of fixed or firm since these entities are not constantly in the condition of inseparable or connected.
[2] Entities that [stand as] the superstratum and the substratum (ādhāryādhārabhūta)\textsuperscript{13}

[Inclusion of] the relation, which is characterized by the state of the denoted and the denoter etc., [in the concept of inherence] would not result by virtue of the very word of ‘connection’ (prāpti).\textsuperscript{14} In order to make this clear, [Praśastapāda says,] “between entities that [stand as] the superstratum and the substratum.” In other words, [the relation] of the superstratum and the substratum [occurs] naturally and not by accidental attribute.\textsuperscript{15}

[3] A cause of the idea “[this is] here” (ihapratyayahetu)\textsuperscript{16}

In this [definition, Praśastapāda] describes a means of getting valid cognitions (pramāṇa): a cause of the idea “[this is] here (this is in that).” It means that such ideas as “the cloth is in the threads,” “whiteness is in the cloth,” “cowness is in the cow,” and so forth, which do not occur by virtue of something other than relation, prove [the real existence of] it (inherence).\textsuperscript{17}
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