

**Birgit Kellner**

## **Towards a Critical Edition of Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika\***

Dharmakīrti's (ca. 600-660 CE)<sup>1</sup> Pramāṇavārttika (henceforth PV) is widely recognized as one of the most influential works of the Buddhist logico-epistemological tradition. With its four chapters and approximately 1,457 stanzas,<sup>2</sup> it is the most extensive work of this second giant (the first, of course, Dignāga, ca. 480-540) of the Buddhist *pramāṇa* tradition, but in spite of its impressive size is probably incomplete.<sup>3</sup> Following Erich Frauwallner's chronology of Dharmakīrti's works (Frauwallner 1954), the PV can be considered as the earliest among his treatises that are chiefly concerned with logic and epistemology. Traditionally regarded as a commentary on Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya, the PV is in fact highly independent in argument and language. It can be considered a commentary only insofar as it very broadly follows the thematic sequence of the basic text and moves within the general parameters of Dignāga's conceptual framework, while only rarely picking up and explaining terms from Dignāga's text. Within these liberally conceived boundaries, Dharmakīrti expands, digresses and elaborates to such an extent that his reference to Dignāga appears more as an act of a fairly formal adherence to convention than as a sign of a commentator's self-conscious humility. In his next great work, the Pramāṇaviniścaya

---

\* Research on this paper was carried out within the project "The awareness of the mental in Buddhist philosophical analysis – theories of *svasamvedana* in Buddhist *pramāṇavāda*" (July 2006 – June 2010), funded by the Austrian Science Fund (P 18758-G03). I gratefully acknowledge the assistance and creative input of Shinya Moriyama and Markus Viehbeck, who collaborated within this research project during its first year. I also would like to thank Karin Preisendanz for invaluable comments on the case-studies of textual variation in this paper, which led me to substantially revise some of my conclusions.

<sup>1</sup> Unless stated otherwise, the dates of South Asian Buddhist epistemologists are given in accordance with Steinkellner – Much 1995.

<sup>2</sup> The stanza count differs slightly in the various editions, cf. Vetter 1964: 117f. for a survey table of the editions available at the time and Kellner – Sferra 2008: 242ff. for an updated discussion; 1,457 is the total number of stanzas on the basis of Vetter's counting.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Frauwallner 1954: 148ff. For a hypothesis that explains the non-completion of the *parārthānumāna* chapter through the development of Dharmakīrti's proof of momentariness, see Ono 1999.

(henceforth PVin), Dharmakīrti not surprisingly abandoned the commentator's hat altogether.

In my recent investigations into the interplay of realist and idealist epistemological theories in Dharmakīrti's thought – also sometimes labelled as Sautrāntika and Yogācāra/Vijñānavāda respectively –, I concentrated on PV 3.301-366,<sup>4</sup> the section dealing with the means of valid cognition (*pramāṇa*) and its result (*phala*) from the chapter on perception (*pratyakṣa*); further text-critical studies of PV 3.367-539 and 249-280 are currently being carried out within a research project on Dharmakīrti's theory of self-awareness (*svasaṃvedana*).<sup>5</sup> It soon became obvious that the available editions of the PV are far from satisfactory from a philological point of view, and that the situation could be much improved by consulting textual witnesses that have become accessible since these editions were produced. In the larger context of editorial methodology within Indology, the main challenges presented by this project can be said to lie in determining whether and how certain commentaries can be used for critically establishing the basic text, and in assessing their role in its transmission.

In relation to the historical importance of the PV, the amount of text-critical attention that it has received thus far is surprisingly limited. The Sanskrit text became known in the West when the Indian *mahāpāṇḍita* Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana (1893-1963) with breathtaking speed produced his pioneering editions of the PV and its voluminous commentaries by Prajñākaragupta (ca. 750-810),<sup>6</sup> Karṇakagomin (ca. 800) and Manorathanandin (probably the second half of the eleventh century) on the basis of manuscripts that he had discovered in Tibet in 1934 and, for most of them, in 1936. A partial edition of Prajñākaragupta's *Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkārahāṣya*<sup>7</sup> was published in 1935 (Pr<sub>1</sub>), followed by the *editio prin-*

<sup>4</sup> The chapter numbering in this article follows the intended original sequence: (1) *svārthānumāna*, (2) *pramāṇasiddhi*, (3) *pratyakṣa* and (4) *parārthānumāna*, also for the commentaries of Prajñākaragupta and Manorathanandin, where the *pramāṇasiddhi* chapter is placed first. For traditional controversies about the chapter sequence, see Ono 1997 (with further references) and Kellner 2004. That the initial position of the *svārthānumāna* chapter was intended by Dharmakīrti is confirmed by his referring ahead to other chapters with verbs in the future tense (cf. Gnoli, introduction to PVS<sub>2</sub>, p. XVI, as well as Malvania, introduction to PVS<sub>1</sub>, p. 5). Frauwallner (1954) argued for the authenticity of this sequence on the grounds that it is attested in the earliest commentaries and that it suits the developmental logic of Dharmakīrti's works at large.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. note \* above.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Ono 2000.

<sup>7</sup> This title is given in the colophon of the manuscript Pr<sub>B</sub> at 314b7 (cf. Ono 2000: xii); the work is also known as *Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāra*.

*ceps* of the Pramāṇavārttika itself in 1938 (PV<sub>1</sub>). Sāṅkṛtyāyana's edition of Manorathanandin's Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti on all four chapters (M<sub>1</sub>) appeared as an appendix to *JBORS* 1938-1940, and his edition of Karṇakagomin's *ṭīkā* was published in 1943 (K<sub>1</sub>). As preserved, the latter work comments only on the first chapter,<sup>8</sup> which alone among the four chapters is accompanied by Dharmakīrti's own prose, also separately transmitted together with the stanzas as the Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti (henceforth PVSV). Finally, Sāṅkṛtyāyana's edition of the complete text of Prajñākaragupta's commentary on chapters 2-4 appeared in 1953 (Pr<sub>2</sub>).

In 1955, Giuseppe Tucci and Erich Frauwallner developed an ambitious plan to reedit and translate the entire PV.<sup>9</sup> For unknown reasons, this plan was never fully realized; its only material outcome was Raniero Gnoli's edition of the PVSV (1960, PVSV<sub>2</sub>), produced independent of the near-contemporaneous edition by Dalsukhbhai Malvania (1959, PVSV<sub>1</sub>). For the PV itself, including the stanzas of the first chapter, the most widely used editions are Swami Dvarikadas Shastri's 1968 edition (henceforth PV<sub>2</sub>), which also includes M, Miyasaka Yūsho's 1972 edition of the Sanskrit text with the canonical Tibetan translation PV<sub>t</sub> (henceforth PV<sub>3</sub>), and Ram Chandra Pandeya's 1989 edition of the Sanskrit text with M and the PVSV (henceforth PV<sub>5</sub>). For the *pratyakṣa* chapter, the best edition of the Sanskrit text to date is contained in Tosaki Hiromasa's two-volumed *Bukkyō-ninshikiron* (1979-1985; henceforth PV<sub>4</sub>), a richly annotated Japanese translation and study of the entire third chapter.<sup>10</sup> In addition to Sāṅkṛtyāyana's editions of the PV, M and Pr, Tosaki also takes into consideration the PV<sub>t</sub> and, more importantly, commentaries that are preserved only in Tibetan translation and that Sāṅkṛtyāyana had not used: Devendrabuddhi's (ca. 630-690) Pramāṇavārttikapañjikā (henceforth De), Śākyabuddhi's (ca. 660-720) Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā and the Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti by Ravigupta (henceforth R), a student of Prajñākaragupta. For his translation and analysis, Tosaki further relies on a wide array of philosophical literature, both Buddhist and beyond, which makes his work an invaluable source of information even for those who do not read Japanese. However, Tosaki

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Krasser 2003: 175, n. 20, for passages where Karṇakagomin states that he is going to explain certain topics in the second, third and fourth chapters of his work. He must at least have intended to comment on the remaining chapters, but whether he actually did so remains uncertain.

<sup>9</sup> This is documented in their correspondence, preserved in the Department of South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna, nos. 3779-3792.

<sup>10</sup> Pandeya evidently did not know PV<sub>4</sub> when he produced PV<sub>5</sub>.

did not use manuscripts, and the text-critical implications of his sources – especially of the commentaries – are frequently not fully drawn out.

In fact, while Malvania and Gnoli were able to use additional manuscripts from Gujarat and Nepal for their editions of the PVSV, no editor after Sāṅkṛtyāyana re-examined the manuscript basis of his editions or attempted to determine his editorial method. Readers of the PV in any of these editions are therefore still relying on Sāṅkṛtyāyana's work to a greater degree than they might be aware.

Given this overall situation, the present paper pursues two main goals: to arrive at a better assessment of Sāṅkṛtyāyana's editions by examining their genesis, and to suggest how the philological situation can be improved. To accomplish the latter objective, I am going to examine and classify the main witnesses in view of their use in a critical edition of the PV text, and to discuss in greater detail three significant cases of substantial variation from PV 3.301-366 in connection with further collation data from my ongoing editorial projects. These studies suggest that parallels in Dharmakīrti's PVin influenced the transmission of the PV text, and throw the spotlight on Prajñākaragupta's commentary as a source of new readings, or at least as attempting to rationalize readings that had already been present in the text tradition that he knew.

A critical edition of the entire PV would be a huge enterprise. It would not only demand full attention to extensive and in themselves philologically problematic commentaries. It would also require considerable effort to understand the work, which is highly laconic in style as well as extremely condensed and philosophically sophisticated in argument. Even an edition of the *pratyakṣa* chapter alone, with its 539 stanzas,<sup>11</sup> is a challenging task. As future editorial projects will therefore likely limit themselves to shorter sections, concerted efforts that include a continuous revision of hypotheses about characteristic features of the text transmission will be necessary, as well as ongoing refinement of text-critical methodology in relation to the PV. The following remarks are on this background intended as a first step towards developing suitable editorial methods for this particular work. In view of this volume's

---

<sup>11</sup> The stanza count for the *pratyakṣa* chapter differs in the individual editions between 539 (PV<sub>4</sub>) and 541 (PV<sub>1</sub>-PV<sub>3</sub>, PV<sub>5</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>, M<sub>1</sub>); for Sāṅkṛtyāyana had counted two stanzas that belong to Prajñākaragupta's commentary as stanzas from the basic text. In his editions, these are st. 342 and 511. These stanzas are absent from the Tibetan translation PV<sub>t</sub> and from R, and they are not commented upon in De and M (PV<sub>H</sub> has lacunae). Cf. PV<sub>4</sub>, vol. 2, p. 27 and 192.

overall topic of text genealogy, textual criticism and editorial methodology in Indology, some methodological reflections of a more general kind will also be offered.

RĀHULA SĀṆKRṬYĀYANA'S DISCOVERY OF SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS  
RELATING TO THE PRAMĀṆAVĀRTTIKA

It can probably be said for most, if not all, editions of Sanskrit texts up to the middle of the twentieth century, and even thereafter, that considerations of the theory of critical editing are conspicuous mostly by their absence. In order to understand the editorial process, as well as the criteria that guided editorial decisions, one is frequently left to draw inferences on the basis of the usually scarce or scarcely populated critical apparatus. In the case of Sāṅkrṭyāyana's editions relating to the PV, we are in the comparably fortunate position of having his fairly detailed reports on his travels to Tibet in 1934, 1936 and 1938, during which he found a number of manuscripts of high importance especially for our knowledge of the *pramāṇa* tradition.<sup>12</sup> A closer look at these travelogues first of all makes one appreciate the extraordinary achievements of Sāṅkrṭyāyana and his frequently overlooked co-workers, in particular the Tibetan scholar dGe 'dun chos 'phel (probably 1903-1951). In addition to natural obstacles, they also had to overcome practical hurdles – procuring pack animals was always a problem – and bureaucratic impediments, for the monastic authorities were usually reluctant to grant Sāṅkrṭyāyana's requests to see Sanskrit manuscripts; his patience was tested to the extreme. As far as the PV is concerned, combining an assessment of the *editio princeps* PV<sub>1</sub> with the information about Sāṅkrṭyāyana's discoveries and working methods that his travelogues provide improves our understanding of the editorial process and also of the problems that the edition presents.

In 1930, Sāṅkrṭyāyana returned from his first and longest journey to Tibet, which had lasted approximately one and a half years. He brought back a large number of cultural artefacts ranging from blockprints and

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the English reports from the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* (Sāṅkrṭyāyana 1935, 1937 and 1938), and the more extensive and detailed Hindi travelogues contained in the second volume of his autobiography (*MJY* 2, p. 230-297 for the journey in 1934, p. 383-412 for 1936, and p. 483-493 for 1938); cf. also the entries about Hemrāj Śarmā and dGe 'dun chos 'phel in *JMK*. I am indebted to Gautam Liu for translating these materials from Hindi into German. The introductions to the editions PV<sub>1</sub> (in English), M<sub>1</sub> (in English) and Pr<sub>2</sub> (in English and in Sanskrit) supplement this information.

Tibetan manuscripts to thangkas, which would eventually be deposited with the Bihar and Orissa Research Society in Patna. He then began restoring works from Tibetan into Sanskrit – in particular the PV, a work in which he had become extremely interested. When his friend Jaycandra Vidyālaṃkāra informed him that the Nepalese Royal Preceptor (*rājaguru*) Paṇḍit Hemrāj Śarmā had come across a Sanskrit manuscript of the work (henceforth PV<sub>H</sub>), Sāṅkṛtyāyana suspected that there might also be further Sanskrit manuscripts in Tibet. He therefore decided to undertake a second journey to Tibet in 1934, in order to avoid the unnecessary labour of reconstructing a Sanskrit text for which manuscripts might still exist.<sup>13</sup>

In the sGo rum lha khang of Sa skya monastery, his travel companion dGe 'dun chos 'phel, whom Sāṅkṛtyāyana had befriended while in Lhasa during the summer, came across an incomplete paper manuscript of Prajñākaragupta's Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkārabhāṣya (henceforth Pr<sub>A</sub>) that extends from the commentary on PV 3.302 (Pr<sub>2</sub> 341,14) to the end of the work, thus covering the latter part of the *pratyakṣa* chapter and the chapter on *parāthānumāna*, for Prajñākaragupta does not comment on the *svāthānumāna* chapter. In the Sanskrit preface to Pr<sub>2</sub>, Sāṅkṛtyāyana reports that the manuscript is written in Kuṭilā (Vartulā) script and comprises fifty-nine leaves of ten to nineteen lines each that measure 68.58 x 10.16 cm.

According to the scribal colophon, Pr<sub>A</sub> was written “in the north” (*uttarasyām*) by Vibhūticandra (twelfth to thirteenth c.). A member of a group of nine younger *paṇḍitas* who accompanied the famous Kashmiri master Śākyaśrībhadrā (1140s-1225)<sup>14</sup> from Bengal to Tibet, Vibhūticandra arrived in Tibet in 1204, left for Nepal in 1214, and later went back and forth between Tibet and Nepal several times.<sup>15</sup> Assuming that a scholar of such great standing as Vibhūticandra would hardly occupy himself in his later years with such menial tasks as copying manuscripts, we may tentatively suppose that Vibhūticandra wrote Pr<sub>A</sub> in Tibet between 1204 and 1214.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Kellner – Sferra 2008 for a more detailed account of the historical events.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Jackson 1990: 18, n. 1 for Śākyaśrībhadrā's problematic birth year.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Stearns 1996 for further information on his life.

<sup>16</sup> Sāṅkṛtyāyana also assumes that Pr<sub>A</sub> was written in Tibet (introduction to PV<sub>1</sub>); cf. further Steinkellner 2004: 11f., where Vibhūticandra's scribal activities are likewise, though without any accompanying reasoning, attributed to his youth. — It cannot be ruled out that Vibhūticandra wrote Pr<sub>A</sub> in Nepal, which is conceivably also a region “in the north”. Trier (1972: 132) reports the oldest dated Nepalese paper ms. as a Pañcarakṣā ms. of 1105 CE (N.S. 225), which would be even earlier than the oldest dated Indian

In the short period of time before the approach of winter in Tibet, Sāṅkrītyāyana managed to transcribe the *pratyakṣa* chapter of Pr<sub>A</sub>.<sup>17</sup> A modern transcript, henceforth Pr<sub>A</sub>', was microfilmed on May 3, 1987, by the Nepal–German Manuscript Preservation Project in Kathmandu (reel no. A1219/26). It covers the same part of the *pratyakṣa* chapter that Sāṅkrītyāyana – according to his own report – transcribed in 1934, the scribal colophon at the end of the work, and a few folios near the end of the *parārthānumāna* chapter. The manuscript Pr<sub>A</sub> was last seen by Ernst Steinkellner in 1999 in Sa skya (Steinkellner 2004: 12).

In November 1934, Sāṅkrītyāyana and dGe 'dun chos 'phel arrived in Kathmandu, where they had the opportunity to work with photographs of the much desired, but incomplete and quite damaged manuscript PV<sub>H</sub>. Hemrāj Śarmā had lent the original manuscript to Giuseppe Tucci in 1931, and may have given it to him during one of Tucci's journeys to Nepal during the 1950s. Raniero Gnoli used PV<sub>H</sub> for his edition of the PVS<sub>V</sub>, where it features under the siglum "Z". He was not aware that this was the same manuscript that Sāṅkrītyāyana had used.<sup>18</sup> In his preliminary index of Tucci's collection of manuscripts and manuscript photographs, Francesco Sferra reported the existence of photographs of a PV manuscript;<sup>19</sup> these turned out to be photographs of PV<sub>H</sub>. In the summer of 2008, he luckily managed to find the original palm leaves in a private collection in Italy, the owner of which wishes to remain unnamed. The owner kindly allowed Sferra to take new photographs, which were published, together with a tentative manuscript description and a documentation of its modern discovery and use, in Kellner –

---

paper ms. I am aware of, the Karmagranthaṭippanaka (Jaisalmer) from 1198 CE (Alsdorf 1951: 62). At the very least, this demonstrates that paper was used (and produced?) in Nepal well before Vibhūticandra's lifetime. — Some stanzas by Vibhūticandra on a single palm leaf found together with his paper manuscript M<sub>A</sub> of Manorathanandin's commentary (on which cf. below) were definitely written in Tibet (cf. Sāṅkrītyāyana 1937: 11–14 for a transcription, and Watanabe 1998b: 33 for the palm leaf in facsimile), but, contrary to what seems to be assumed in Steinkellner 2004: 12, this does not guarantee that Vibhūticandra's numerous marginal notes on M<sub>A</sub> were written in Tibet – or even, for that matter, the manuscript itself.

<sup>17</sup> That he transcribed this ms. is not mentioned in the English report (Sāṅkrītyāyana 1935, cf. Much 1988: 24), but it is in *MJY* 2/281ff.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Gnoli, introduction to PVS<sub>2</sub>, p. XXVIII, n. 1. Gnoli cites Sāṅkrītyāyana's description of PV<sub>H</sub> from the latter's *editio princeps* as if it were of a manuscript other than his own "Z". However, photograph no. 3 that is reproduced in the beginning of Gnoli's edition, said to represent a folio of "Z", unmistakably shows folio 10a of PV<sub>H</sub> with the text of PV 1.214b–228a. For further details, cf. Kellner – Sferra 2008: 234.

<sup>19</sup> Sferra 2000: 409.

Sferra 2008. The photographs that Sāṅkrṭyāyana used in 1934 have so far not been found. The manuscript is written in what can be termed early old Bengali script.<sup>20</sup> It originally comprised fifty-one folios, of which ten have been missing at least since Hemrāj Śarmā lent the ms. to Tucci in 1931. The folios are on average 3.6 cm high and contain five to seven lines of writing. Their original length is difficult to determine because all folios have broken-off margins.<sup>21</sup>

PV<sub>H</sub> came to be the main basis for the *editio princeps* PV<sub>1</sub>, which bears the imprint of 1938, but this was not the first edition for which it was used. Assisted by the transcript of Pr<sub>A</sub> and dGe 'dun chos 'phel's masterful recall of the Tibetan translation of the PV, in 1934 Sāṅkrṭyāyana and his Tibetan friend managed to arrange the Sanskrit *kārikās* in their proper sequence, for the photographs of PV<sub>H</sub> were out of order, and the leaves partly lacked folio numbers due to broken off margins. Bearing the imprint of 1935, and mainly based on the transcript of Pr<sub>A</sub>, Sāṅkrṭyāyana's first partial edition of Prajñākaragupta's commentary appeared as an appendix to the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* (= Pr<sub>1</sub>); variant readings of the PV text ascribed to "He" in the footnotes refer to PV<sub>H</sub>. This is also the first edition of a sizable portion of the PV in Sanskrit, though the reader has difficulties distinguishing the basic text from the commentary: there are no stanza numbers, and not all of the PV stanzas are printed in the larger typeface that Sāṅkrṭyāyana usually used for the basic text, suggesting that he himself had problems distinguishing the basic text from the stanzas in the commentary composed by Prajñākaragupta, many of which are likewise written in *anuṣṭubh* metre.

Pr<sub>1</sub> is clearly based on the transcript Pr<sub>A</sub>'. The edition and the transcript share specific uncertain and nonsensical readings, as well as layout conventions. They evidence common difficulties in distinguishing the PV stanzas from the stanzas of Prajñākaragupta's commentary. Quotations from Kumārila's Śloka-vārttika are identified both in the margins of Pr<sub>A</sub>' and in the margins of Pr<sub>1</sub>. At least in parts, Pr<sub>A</sub>' must be Sāṅkrṭyāyana's

<sup>20</sup> I am indebted to Dragomir Dimitrov for a first palaeographical assessment. The tentative characterization of the script as "early old Bengali" is intended to accentuate that the script differs both from proto-Bengali and from developed old Bengali, on which cf. Dimitrov 2002. The terminology is tentative because more detailed palaeographical studies, especially of dated manuscripts, are needed for a more firmly substantiated distinction among Bengali script varieties prior to the fifteenth century.

<sup>21</sup> Kellner – Sferra 2008: 235, n. 25.



own transcript from 1934.<sup>22</sup> At the time of writing, Pr<sub>A</sub>' is the only transcript of Sāṅkṛtyāyana's that is known to still exist.

During his next journey to Tibet in 1936, Sāṅkṛtyāyana discovered further manuscripts of the PV and its commentaries. In Sa skya, he found an incomplete palm-leaf manuscript of the PVSV (henceforth PVSV<sub>A</sub>).<sup>23</sup> He also transcribed the *parāṛthānumāna* chapter of Pr<sub>A</sub> and thus completed the transcription of this manuscript. On May 26, he came across a complete palm-leaf manuscript of Prajñākaragupta's commentary in the Phyag dpe lha khañ of the Lha khañ chen mo that had belonged to Dānaśīla (henceforth Pr<sub>B</sub>) and might at least in parts also have been copied by him;<sup>24</sup> like Vibhūticandra, Dānaśīla was a younger *paṇḍita* in Śākyaśrībhadrā's entourage. The writing material – palm leaf – suggests that the manuscript was written in India or Nepal, and not in Tibet. Pr<sub>B</sub> is therefore most probably slightly older than Pr<sub>A</sub>. Sāṅkṛtyāyana transcribed both Pr<sub>B</sub> and a manuscript of Karṇakagomin's *tīkā* on the Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti (henceforth K<sub>A</sub>), that is, altogether 529 folios, until June 28, together with his assistant, a Singhalese individual by the name of Abhayasingh Perera.<sup>25</sup> He then checked the transcripts once more against the manuscripts. These transcripts have not been found, but both manuscripts Pr<sub>B</sub> and K<sub>A</sub> were photographed, in all likelihood in 1938 by Pheni Mukarji,<sup>26</sup> a young photographer from Calcutta who

<sup>22</sup> Sāṅkṛtyāyana does not mention the transcription of the colophon in his account of 1934, but he must have transcribed it, for it is contained in Pr<sub>1</sub>. He also does not mention the transcription of the few folios from the end of the *parāṛthānumāna* chapter, but these can be explained as a by-product of his search for the colophon. — Some parts of Pr<sub>A</sub>' might have been written by assistants or be secondary transcripts. The handwriting of the transcript varies, and in 1934, when it must have been written, Sāṅkṛtyāyana according to his own reports did not have any travel companions schooled in the transcription of Sanskrit manuscripts. Furthermore, Sāṅkṛtyāyana must have added some marginal notes after the transcription in Tibet in 1934, e.g., the one on Pr<sub>A</sub>' 44, describing the differences from PV<sub>H</sub> in PV 3.349 (cf. below, n. 109).

<sup>23</sup> No. 180 in Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937: 21; eleven leaves of seven to eight lines each in Māgadhī script, 56.51 x 5.4 cm (so also the introduction to PV<sub>1</sub>; cf. further the introduction to Ihara 1998).

<sup>24</sup> No. 183 in Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937: 21. Early old Bengali script (cf. n. 20), 314 leaves, six to eight lines. Size: 55.88 x 5.11 cm (cf. also the Sanskrit introduction to Pr<sub>2</sub>). The name Dānaśīla is written in early old Bengali script on the flyleaf and in several folio margins (Watanabe 1998a: v, n. 11). The ms. is written by different scribes: 1b-47b, 48a-83b, 84a-314b, with the first and third part perhaps written by the same scribe. Without giving any reasons, Sāṅkṛtyāyana assumes that Dānaśīla was the scribe of the middle part (Sanskrit introduction to Pr<sub>2</sub>, p. *da*). Ono (2000: xiv) mentions Dānaśīla as "the" copyist of the entire manuscript, but likewise without adducing any reasons.

<sup>25</sup> Spelling variants: Abhayasiṃha / Abhay Singh Parera/Pereira.

<sup>26</sup> Spelling variants: Fany/Feni Mookerjee/Mockerjee/Mukerjee.

accompanied Sāṅkṛtyāyana on his last journey to Tibet.<sup>27</sup> Pr<sub>B</sub> was published in facsimile in 1998 (Watanabe 1998a), as was K<sub>A</sub> (Ihara 1998). Prints from Sāṅkṛtyāyana's photographs are also preserved in the *Nieder-sächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek* in Göttingen.<sup>28</sup> For Pr<sub>B</sub>, the quality of these prints is at times superior to that of the facsimile edition, especially for the photographs that are overexposed.<sup>29</sup>

On July 28, 1936, Sāṅkṛtyāyana found a paper manuscript of Manorathanandin's *Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti* in the hermitage Zha lu ri phug, written by Vibhūticandra (henceforth M<sub>A</sub>) as Pr<sub>A</sub> was. Written in early old Bengali script (cf. n. 20), the manuscript comprises 105 leaves of seven lines each that according to Sāṅkṛtyāyana measure 67.31 x 5.80 cm.<sup>30</sup> On the same grounds as Pr<sub>A</sub>, M<sub>A</sub> can be tentatively dated between 1204 and 1214 (cf. above, p. 166). The transcript that Sāṅkṛtyāyana mentions having made at the time has not been found; the manuscript was photographed for him, probably in 1936 by a Nepalese photographer by the name of Tej Ratna, a resident of Shigatse. M<sub>A</sub> was – like Pr<sub>B</sub> and K<sub>A</sub> – published in facsimile in 1998 (Watanabe 1998b), on the basis of these glass negatives; prints can also be found in the Göttingen collection.<sup>31</sup> Sāṅkṛtyāyana would later publish his edition of M (M<sub>1</sub>) as an appendix to the JBORS issue of 1938-1940.

On the same day that Sāṅkṛtyāyana found M<sub>A</sub>, he also found in Zha lu ri phug a manuscript of the PV that covered chapters 2-4 (henceforth PV<sub>Zh</sub>). From his English report one might at first sight suspect that PV<sub>Zh</sub> was photographed. But Sāṅkṛtyāyana subsequently describes problems with the photography in general; the Hindi and English reports differ in blaming the bad quality of the glass plates and the incompetence of

<sup>27</sup> From Sāṅkṛtyāyana's travelogues in English and Hindi, it is not entirely clear when these manuscripts were photographed. The cumulative evidence presented in Bandurski 1994: 13 renders it highly probable that glass negatives in the Patna collection date from the journey in 1936, whereas film negatives can be assigned to that of 1938. Both Pr<sub>B</sub> and K<sub>A</sub> are preserved on film.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Bandurski 1994: 15 (for Pr<sub>B</sub>) and 35 (for K<sub>A</sub>).

<sup>29</sup> Sāṅkṛtyāyana found three further incomplete manuscripts that do not cover the sections from the *pratyakṣa* chapter under consideration; cf. the preface in Watanabe 1998a, where one of them (E), not mentioned by Sāṅkṛtyāyana and only identified by Watanabe, is also published in facsimile. The two manuscripts that Watanabe labels C and D are likewise not mentioned in the narrative of Sāṅkṛtyāyana's travelogues, but they feature in the list of mss. found that is appended to Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937.

<sup>30</sup> No. 237 in Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937: 33; Sāṅkṛtyāyana refers to the script as Kuṭilā.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937: 10, and *MJY* 2/402; on the transcript cf. also *MJY* 2/400. Watanabe (1998b: iii) considers it more likely that M<sub>A</sub> was photographed in 1938, but cf. above, n. 27.

Tej Ratna.<sup>32</sup> PV<sub>Zh</sub> is not mentioned in any of the later accounts of photography or transcription, and no reproductions of it have surfaced so far, yet it was prominently used for the *editio princeps* PV<sub>1</sub>, where the introduction to the edition describes it as written in “Kuṭilā of the 12th century”.<sup>33</sup> This situation can only mean one of two things: either Sāṅkṛtyāyana worked the readings of PV<sub>Zh</sub> into his edition-in-progress on the spot in Zha lu ri phug – seemingly improbable given how little time he had, but not impossible given how quickly he worked with manuscripts –, or he managed to produce reproductions, but forgot to mention them in his reports, and they were subsequently lost. As the PV was extremely important to Sāṅkṛtyāyana, forgetfulness in this respect is, however, less probable.

Sāṅkṛtyāyana considered his discoveries of materials relating to Dharmakīrti's PV to be of historical importance and reported them from Tibet to the world at large. According to his autobiography, he sent a letter to his friend K.P. Jayaswal in Patna, who then informed the Associated Press Agency, which spread the news among Indian newspapers. He also wrote to Theodor Stecherbatsky in Leningrad, whose highly enthusiastic response he received while still in Gyantse in early September of 1936. To highlight the historical significance of Sāṅkṛtyāyana's discoveries, Stecherbatsky construes a hypothetical example: This is as if the works of Plato and Aristotle were suddenly rediscovered in their original language after they had been lost and the views of these philosophers had for centuries been accessible only through translations and commentaries.<sup>34</sup>

While acknowledging Sāṅkṛtyāyana's enthusiasm, energy, perseverance and speed, which after all enabled him to provide the modern world with *some* versions of highly important treatises in an astonishingly short period of time, we should not be blind to the objective flaws of his editions. A number of obvious errors in PV<sub>1</sub> were corrected in the subsequent editions PV<sub>2</sub> to PV<sub>5</sub>. Moreover, Erich Frauwallner highlighted inconsistencies among the variant reports in the editions PV<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>1</sub> and Pr<sub>2</sub> in his review of Pr<sub>2</sub> (Frauwallner 1957); further inconsistencies of this kind can be observed within PV 3.301-539. Frauwallner also criticized Sāṅkṛtyāyana for using readings from commentaries, especially from M, where the manuscript M<sub>A</sub> does not contain the entire basic text,

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937: 14f. (also Much 1988: 21), and *MJY* 2/406.

<sup>33</sup> PV<sub>Zh</sub> is listed as no. 239 in Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937: 33; it comprises thirty-one leaves of seven lines each. The folio size is reported as 31.75 x 4.45 cm.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *MJY* 2/407.

which has been separated into individual stanzas or groups of stanzas. His arguments, however, are unconvincing, as will be shown further below.

However, PV<sub>1</sub> is also beset by more fundamental problems of editorial method. According to Sāṅkrṭyāyana's introduction, the edition relies on PV<sub>H</sub> as its "main manuscript". The edition is further based on Pr<sub>A</sub>, Pr<sub>B</sub>, PV<sub>Zh</sub>, M<sub>A</sub> and on the canonical Tibetan translation PV<sub>t</sub>, for which, as stated in the introduction, a xylograph from Sa skya was used.<sup>35</sup> Whenever PV<sub>H</sub> has one of its many lacunae, Sāṅkrṭyāyana switches to another "main manuscript" – this can only be PV<sub>Zh</sub> or one of the Prajñākaragupta manuscripts Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub> –, but at the same time, judging from the nature of the variant reports, also involves his own editorial judgement to a greater extent than in sections where PV<sub>H</sub> is available. Relying on editorial judgement to determine the better text in individual instances of variation may prove to be the most suitable method for editing the PV in the end, but it raises the question of why a "main manuscript" was decided upon from the start. Furthermore, why, of all the manuscripts, was PV<sub>H</sub> selected as the "main" one? After all, this is the most badly damaged of the manuscripts that Sāṅkrṭyāyana ended up having at his disposal. This problematic choice can only be explained through the historical coincidence that PV<sub>H</sub> was the first Pramāṇavārttika manuscript that Sāṅkrṭyāyana managed to obtain and through his own impatience and enthusiasm, which caused him to start editing right away and thus to privilege witnesses he found earlier over those which were discovered later, i.e., in 1936.

Further problems arise from the nature of the critical apparatus in PV<sub>1</sub>. Being a negative apparatus, it gives only the readings of witnesses that depart from the main manuscript, but does not note the witnesses that agree with it. This is especially problematic for PV<sub>Zh</sub>, which Sāṅkrṭyāyana may have collated on the spot in Zha lu ri phug in 1936: when variant

---

<sup>35</sup> For the *svārthānumāna* chapter, PVS<sub>V</sub><sub>A</sub> was also used. When this edition was actually printed is unknown; it is therefore difficult to know exactly how long Sāṅkrṭyāyana worked on it. At the beginning of Sāṅkrṭyāyana 1937, the English report of his journey to Tibet in 1936, Sāṅkrṭyāyana remarks that "the Pramāṇa-vārttika-text was already in the press". Since PV<sub>1</sub> uses manuscript material that he found only during that journey, he might have prematurely announced the publication in order to convince the Bihar and Orissa Research Society to financially support his further work. — As for the Tibetan translation, this may have been xylograph no. 1507-1 in Jackson's catalogue of the "Miscellaneous Series" of Tibetan texts in the Bihar Research Society in Patna (Jackson 1989: 223). According to Jackson, this text may have been used by Sāṅkrṭyāyana since it has stanza numbers in Arabic numerals noted on it. No. 1506 (from Se ra Byes), also a translation of the PV, might for the same reason have been used by Sāṅkrṭyāyana.

readings of other witnesses, such as Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub>, are reported, but no mention is made of a reading in PV<sub>Zh</sub>, this implies that PV<sub>Zh</sub> has the reading adopted in the edition. But if Sāṅkṛtyāyana found variants in his reproductions of Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub> after 1936, what did he do, if indeed he had no transcript or photographs of PV<sub>Zh</sub> at his disposal in order to recheck the latter's readings? For all these reasons, Sāṅkṛtyāyana's *editio princeps* is but a first step towards a critical edition of the Pramāṇavārttika.

#### A CLASSIFICATION OF THE MAIN WITNESSES FOR AN EDITION OF PRAMĀṆAVĀRTTIKA 3.301-539

For the sections under consideration, which roughly correspond to the latter half of the *pratyakṣa* chapter, the number of witnesses is small, but their character is varied. Not much can be said about the Sanskrit manuscripts of the verse text itself. From among the two manuscripts of the verse text that were used in Sāṅkṛtyāyana's PV<sub>1</sub>, i.e., PV<sub>H</sub> and PV<sub>Zh</sub>, only PV<sub>H</sub> is currently accessible. The quality of the text borne by PV<sub>H</sub> remains to be assessed. That being the case, PV<sub>H</sub> should not from the start be accorded special testimonial value merely because it is a manuscript of the PV text on its own, for we cannot rule out that such manuscripts were influenced by the basic text that was transmitted within and possibly transformed by commentaries. The remaining witnesses comprise Sanskrit manuscripts of commentaries that contain the basic text entirely and/or partially embed it within the commentarial prose, as well as Tibetan translations of the PV and its commentaries.

#### Sanskrit Manuscripts of Commentaries on the Pramāṇavārttika

Commentaries can attest the wording of the basic text in different ways. Some commentaries contain the entire basic text, typically presented as individual stanzas or sets of stanzas. Continuous commentaries also testify to the basic text by embedding its individual words or phrases – which, for want of a traditional Sanskrit term that covers this form of intertextuality in its entirety,<sup>36</sup> can be called “lemmata” – that are subsequently glossed or otherwise explained; paraphrases may likewise

---

<sup>36</sup> The word *pratīka* is in modern research literature not infrequently used as a generic term for words from a basic text taken up in a commentary (cf. e.g., Franco 1997, Kellner 2007 and Wezler 1983). As Oskar von Hinüber kindly pointed out to me after I presented a shorter version of this paper at the Deutsche Orientalistentag in Freiburg in 2007 where I also used *pratīka* in this general sense, this is misleading, for the term is

provide to some extent evidence for the wording of the basic text and thus on occasion can be said to presuppose a form of it, which is sometimes more, sometimes less recognizable. We can in this way distinguish not so much between types of commentaries, but rather between different testimonial functions that commentaries fulfil with respect to the basic text. One and the same commentary may contain the full basic text stanzas, embed lemmata of it, and presuppose it through paraphrases or even less direct reflexes of its wording.

Devendrabuddhi's *Pramāṇavārttikapañjikā* is the oldest extant commentary, traditionally held to be composed by a direct disciple of Dharmakīrti; it is preserved only in the Tibetan translation *De<sub>t</sub>* made by Subhūtiśrīśānti and rMa dGe ba'i blo gros (fl. mid-eleventh century). In this translation, the commentary does not present the basic text in complete stanzas, yet amply testifies to it through lemmata and paraphrases.<sup>37</sup> The same holds good for Manorathanandin's probably late-eleventh century *Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti*, preserved only in the Sanskrit manuscript *M<sub>A</sub>*. Furthermore, *M* also incorporates numerous sentences from *De*, sometimes more, sometimes less literally. It can therefore be helpful for determining the basic text that Devendrabuddhi knew. The entire (or nearly entire)<sup>38</sup> text of the PV is contained in Ravigupta's *Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti* on chapters two and three, which is preserved only in an undated and anonymous Tibetan translation (*R<sub>c</sub>*; cf. below). More importantly, it is also contained in Prajñākaragupta's own *Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkārabhāṣya*, whose *pratyakṣa* chapter is preserved in the two Sanskrit manuscripts *Pr<sub>A</sub>* (incomplete) and *Pr<sub>B</sub>* (complete). The Tibetan translation *Pr<sub>t</sub>* was prepared by rÑog Blo ldan śes rab (1059-1109) with sKal ldan rgyal po (\*Bhavyarāja) and revised by Kumāraśrī and 'Phags pa'i śes rab or Sumati(kīrti) and Blo ldan śes rab.<sup>39</sup> It is worth noting

---

traditionally limited to only the first word(s) of a passage that is/are taken up in a commentary, as is in fact also attested in the dictionaries.

<sup>37</sup> Śākyabuddhi's *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* is in chapters 2-4 a sub-commentary on *De*; it is available only in a Tibetan translation (D 4220, P 5718) produced by the same team that translated *De*. As it contains little material from the PV, and since what it contains is not surprisingly identical to what is embedded in *De*, it can be left out of consideration. There is reportedly a Jaina sub-commentary to Śākyabuddhi's *ṭīkā* by a certain Kalyāṇacandra (cf. Steinkellner – Much 1995: 119, Appendix B.3), but no manuscript of it has been found so far.

<sup>38</sup> Individual stanzas, or smaller parts thereof, are occasionally missing both from Ravigupta's and Prajñākaragupta's commentaries, but these do not cast doubt on the overall intention (on the part of the commentator or a later scribe) to include the entire basic text.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Mejer 1991 for a discussion of the complex colophon.

that, as the revised version must have been produced near the end of the eleventh century,<sup>40</sup> the Tibetan translation Pr<sub>t</sub> considerably predates the Sanskrit manuscripts Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub> of this commentary.

We do not know whether the basic text was always a part of Prajñākaragupta's commentary or only added at some stage of its transmission before Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub> were written. But even if the stanzas were always a part of the commentary, we must reckon with the possibility that the basic text contained in the commentary is not exactly identical to the text that Prajñākaragupta knew, for scribes who knew the basic text from another source could easily have inserted more familiar readings into the PV text while copying the commentary. Conversely, a copyist who read Prajñākaragupta's commentary attentively might have judged readings of the PV text that were in his opinion contradicted by the wording of paraphrases in the commentary to be errors, and have corrected them in the stanzas of the basic text contained in the commentary. It is consequently important to consider the PV stanzas in the manuscripts Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub> separately from the basic text that the commentator knew. The same applies to the commentary of Ravigupta.

In their testimonial function of embedding lemmata or presupposing a form of the basic text through paraphrases, commentarial witnesses naturally provide less information than they do when they contain the full basic text stanzas. Lemmata from the basic text are often recognizable by their being followed by the particle *iti*, by their position immediately prior to a gloss or explanation, or through the way the commentator incorporates them into his own text. There are however cases where commentators do not repeat words from the basic text in their commentary, but place their own gloss where the words of the basic text would be expected had they repeated them.<sup>41</sup> Especially when the gloss is syntactically and metrically equivalent to the lemma of a basic text written in verse, it can easily be mistaken for a part of the latter; it is quite possible that variants in the transmission of a basic text arise precisely because copyists mistake such deceptive glosses for lemmata. This possibility has to be taken into account when it comes to determining the basic text that a commentator knew, and also as potential causes for textual change. Still, these are problems that demand the application of specific procedures, but not problems of principle that exclude

---

<sup>40</sup> From his discussion of the colophon, Mejer tentatively concludes that the revision took place in the last decade of the eleventh century (Mejer 1991: 185).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Tubb – Boose 2007: 155.

commentarial witnesses from text-critical work on the basic text in general. This is worth emphasizing in view of Frauwallner's categorical dismissal of the testimony of commentaries, which he formulated when he criticized Sāṅkrtyāyana for using readings from M in his editions PV<sub>1</sub> and Pr<sub>2</sub>.<sup>42</sup>

... readings drawn from commentaries should never be treated on the same level as readings in the manuscripts of the text, for Indian commentators always tend to change the wording of the text.

It would be interesting to know which examples for such changes Frauwallner had in mind, but unfortunately he does not mention any. In any case, if Indian commentators indeed tend to change the wording of a text, consciously or unconsciously, we also have to reckon with the possibility that similar changes eventually influence the transmission of the independent basic text – that a copyist of a PV manuscript introduces changes into the transmission under the influence of a commentary. As soon as the possibility of such influence is acknowledged, there is no basis for privileging PV manuscripts over commentary witnesses as a matter of principle. Frauwallner's argument is here based on the unfounded silent assumption that the unidirectional dependence of a commentary on its basic text is mirrored in a one-way dependence of commentary manuscripts on manuscripts of the basic text. In fact, one might well be justified in reversing the hierarchy that Frauwallner wants to establish. The basic text that is broken up into smaller units and embedded in a commentary is far less likely to undergo "correction" aimed at the basic text itself – it is simply harder to change specific readings of a Pramāṇavārttika stanza when its words are spread across a paragraph in a commentary, and especially in cases where the verbal shape of these lemmata itself is what is explained. Lemmata, and to a lesser extent close paraphrases, could therefore even be accorded greater weight than stanzas contained in commentaries as full units.<sup>43</sup>

### Tibetan Translations of the PV

The relationships between the preserved Tibetan translations of the PV have additional ramifications for their use in an edition of the Sanskrit text, over and above generic limitations that govern the use of Tibetan

<sup>42</sup> Frauwallner 1957: 60.

<sup>43</sup> For more general remarks about the value of commentaries for establishing the basic text, occasioned by the specific case of the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa, cf. Wezler 1983: 32f.



translations in text-critical efforts directed at their Sanskrit source. As Mejer and Franco have already dealt with these translations of the PV at some length,<sup>44</sup> I am going to limit myself to the essentials of their historical background here. The canonical translation PV<sub>t</sub> was produced between 1208 and 1213<sup>45</sup> by Sa skya paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182-1251), together with Śākyaśrībhadra and others. It is a retranslation or revision<sup>46</sup> of an earlier, now lost translation by rNog Blo ldan śes rab and sKal ldan rgyal po (\*Bhavyarāja), probably produced between 1076 and 1093.<sup>47</sup> This latter translation is in turn a revision of a translation by Subhūtiśrīśānti and rMa dGe ba'i blo gros, a xylograph of which might still exist in the People's Republic of China.<sup>48</sup> Because the same team also translated Devendrabuddhi's commentary, De<sub>t</sub> provides us, though only through lemmata and paraphrases, with the earliest completed<sup>49</sup> translation of the PV, which can be extracted from the commentarial prose. PV<sub>t</sub> indirectly depends on this earliest translation. In addition, there is a translation of the PV text contained in the undated and anonymous translation of Ravigupta's commentary, R<sub>t</sub>. The Tibetan translation Pr<sub>t</sub> of Prajñākaragupta's commentary contains a translation of the PV that is practically identical to PV<sub>t</sub> and seems to have been inserted after PV<sub>t</sub> had gained wide acceptance;<sup>50</sup> it can therefore be left out of consideration for determining variants.

The extent and character of differences between the translation PV<sub>t</sub>, the translation contained in R<sub>t</sub> and that embedded and presupposed in De<sub>t</sub> has been discussed in Franco 1997, based on a selection of approxi-

<sup>44</sup> See Mejer 1991 (with references to earlier discussions) and Franco 1997.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Jackson (1987: 123, n. 59), who further suggests more specifically the year 1210 as the translation's date.

<sup>46</sup> Jackson refers to it as a "retranslation" (Jackson 1987: 112), Mejer leaves matters open (Mejer 1991: 185: "revised anew [translated?]",) and Franco speaks of a "revision" of the earlier translation by rNog Blo ldan śes rab and sKal ldan rgyal po (Franco 1997: 280).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Mejer 1991: 182.

<sup>48</sup> Van der Kuijp (1994: 4) lists a Tibetan translation of the PV in the Tibetan library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing (CPN no. 004806[5]), covering 45 folios, and according to the colophon prepared by Subhūtiśrīśānti and rMa dGe ba'i blo gros at the order of Lha btsun Byaṅ chub 'od.

<sup>49</sup> In the 'Phaṅ thaṅ ma and Lhan dkar ma catalogues, a translation of the Pramāṇavārttika is listed as a work in progress (*sgyur 'phro*; cf. no. 733 in Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 408). Most probably prior to the production of De<sub>t</sub>, Atiśa (982-1054) and Byaṅ chub śes rab translated Jayanta's Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāraṭīkā, a commentary on Pr (cf. van der Kuijp 1989: 10). This sub-commentary contains only few stanzas from the PV itself; these remain to be evaluated.

<sup>50</sup> This was first suggested in Franco 1997.

mately 100 stanzas from chapter 2 (*pramāṇasiddhi*). In the effort to establish an edition of the Sanskrit text, the main question is whether differences between these translations may in individual cases be explained by differences between the Sanskrit versions on which they are based. I tentatively follow Franco's suggestion that the PV translation in  $R_t$  and the translation  $PV_t$  were produced independent of each other, but that both knew  $De_t$  – or, more precisely, that they directly or indirectly depended on the PV translation that is embedded and presupposed in  $De_t$ . What does this dependence mean for  $PV_t$  and  $R_t$  respectively? When  $PV_t$  diverges from the translation attested in  $De_t$  in such a way as to indicate a difference in a Sanskrit source, this indicates that somewhere in the genealogy of  $PV_t$  a Sanskrit source different from that relied upon for  $De_t$  was used – either by Sa skya paṇḍita and Śākyaśrībhadrā, or even earlier by Blo ldan śes rab and \*Bhavyarāja. We cannot get more specific, for  $PV_t$  after all depends on the translation in  $De_t$  only indirectly, through the intermediary of Blo ldan śes rab's lost revision. In the case of  $R_t$ , we strictly speaking do not know whether it directly or, again, through revisions as intermediate stages, indirectly depends on the  $De_t$  translation. But to be on the safe side, here, too, divergences which indicate different Sanskrit sources are best interpreted to show that different Sanskrit sources were used somewhere in the earlier history of  $R_t$ , but not necessarily by the translator(s) of  $R_t$  himself/themselves.

To use  $De_t$  as a witness for editing the PV, one has to extract the PV translation by rMa dGe ba'i blo gros and Subhūtiśrīśānti from the commentary. Franco stipulates that at least one out of the two following conditions has to be fulfilled for a reasonably certain extraction of material stemming from the basic text: (1) the seven syllables of a Tibetan *pāda* have to appear *en bloc*, (2) the *pāda* has to be conserved without a change in at least one of the two other versions  $PV_t$  and  $R_t$  (Franco 1997: 282). In view of the evidence from PV 3.301-539, however, these conditions are in need of revision. The first condition is too narrow given that in some cases at least,  $De_t$  preserves a *pāda* in metrical form in one canonical edition, while another preserves it in prose. For example, PV 3.466c *jñātatvenāparicchinnam* is translated in metrical form in Peking (*śes ñid yoṅs bcad med pa yaṅ*, P 299a5), but “prosified” in Derge (*śes pa ñid yoṅs su bcad pa med par yaṅ*, D 252a5). One should not rule out that in some cases all editions of  $De_t$  may contain “prosified” *pādas*. Franco's seven-syllable condition should therefore be qualified to allow for cases where a prose phrase can be regarded as a translation of a Sanskrit *pāda* considering that after the translation of  $De_t$  had been

produced, an editor attempted to revert the contractions and omissions that are typically applied by translators for achieving trochaic units in Tibetan. Admittedly, some uncertainty concerning which particles have been added through such “prosification” processes may remain, but those parts that can be reconstructed with certainty may nevertheless be significant in text-critical terms, and there is no reason to sacrifice potentially valuable material for purely formal reasons. As for Franco's second condition, it is worth noting that smaller segments of *pādas* can often be recognized without involving a consideration of  $R_t$  or  $PV_t$ , simply on the basis of the Sanskrit witnesses and the character and structure of the commentary. The most obvious example for this is when Devendrabuddhi quotes from a stanza using *\*iti*, e.g., D 126a1 = P 253a6 ***bya ba ni sgrub byed ces bya ba la sogs pas 'chad par byed do***, quoting *kriyāsādhanaṃ* from PV 3.301. But even passages without quotation can be relied upon for the extraction of material of the basic text when they closely paraphrase a stanza and in so doing take up lemmata and gloss them, as e.g., in D 126a4 = P 253b2f. on PV 3.302 (material from the basic text is printed in bold):

*de la ṅams myoṅ tsam du ni | śes pa 'dra ba'i bdag ṅid can | bdag ṅid des  
byed pa'i raṅ bzin des | 'gyur na gaṅ gis |<sup>51</sup> las so so la ste don so so la rnam  
'byed 'gyur |*

The first two *pādas* of PV 3.302 (*tatrānubhavamātreṇa jñānasya sadṛśātmanah*) are preserved as seven-syllable units. As for 302cd, viz. *bhāvyaṃ tenātmanā yena pratikarma vibhajyate*, the syntagma *tenātmanā* can be identified in *bdag ṅid des*, for the latter is glossed with *byed pa'i raṅ bzin des* (something like *\*tena karaṇasvabhāvena*), just as *las so so la* can be identified as a translation of *pratikarma*, glossed with *don so so la* (*\*pratyartham*). The words *'gyur na gaṅ gis* translate *bhāvyaṃ ... yena*, and the final *rnam 'byed 'gyur*, contracted and thus recognizable as part of a stanza, translates *vibhajyate*. While a look at the virtually identical translation contained in  $R_t$  D 116a1 = P 140a1f.<sup>52</sup> would have made it easier to extract the individual parts of the basic text, their identity with the text in  $R_t$  is not a necessary condition for their identification. Examining Devendrabuddhi's commentary in terms of how it deals with material from the basic text can consequently enhance the material basis for editing the PV, also in cases where the relationship to the text in  $R_t$  is looser than Franco's second condition would permit.

<sup>51</sup> P omits the *śad*.

<sup>52</sup> The sole difference is *bdag ṅid der* in  $R_t$ , where  $De_t$  has *bdag ṅid des*.

In general, the three Tibetan translations of the PV contained in  $R_t$ ,  $PV_t$  and  $De_t$  may help, first of all, in determining the side to which a translation leans when substantial variation in the Sanskrit is attested. When this issue can be decided beyond reasonable doubt, the resulting proposal of a correlation involves claims to text genealogy – that this Tibetan text derives from that Sanskrit text.<sup>53</sup> Second, when no substantial variation is attested in the Sanskrit, or when the translation does not unequivocally correspond to one attested Sanskrit variant, might it possibly derive from a thus far unattested Sanskrit version? As Tibetan translations can derive from a potentially large number of Sanskrit lexical equivalents, this quest for the otherwise unattested should not be taken to the extreme, but unusual translations that may indicate an unknown version of the Sanskrit deserve to be reported nevertheless.

The main witnesses can be summarily presented as follows:

1. Sanskrit manuscripts of the PV text:  $PV_H$ ,  $PV_{Zh}$  (not accessible, but used in  $PV_t$ )
2. Commentarial witnesses
  1. Commentaries that contain the full basic text:
    1. Sanskrit manuscripts:  $Pr_A$  (transcript  $Pr_A'$  available),  $Pr_B$
    2. Tibetan translations:  $Pr_t$  (contains basic text practically identical to  $PV_t$ ),  $R_t$
  2. Commentaries that do not contain the full basic text:
    1. Sanskrit manuscripts:  $M_A$
    2. Tibetan translations:  $De_t$
3. Tibetan translations of the PV text
  1.  $PV_t$ ,  $R_t$  (contained in Ravigupta's commentary), earlier translation by *Su-bhūtiśrīśānti* and *rMa dge ba'i blo gros* embedded and presupposed in  $De_t$

Table 1: The main witnesses<sup>54</sup> for PV 3.301-539, arranged by type

<sup>53</sup> While texts do not exist independent of witnesses, still, such stipulations of text genealogy should not be taken to imply claims of witness genealogy in the narrower sense, in other words, that this Tibetan translation was made on the basis of that particular Sanskrit manuscript; the Tibetan translation could also have been derived from another, unpreserved manuscript in the Sanskrit manuscript's lineage.

<sup>54</sup> Quotations or paraphrases of material from the PV in other works may provide additional testimony. The case of PV 3.434, for instance, suggests some fluidity of the PV text in its reception outside the Buddhist tradition. In commentaries on Kumāṛila's Śloka-vārttika *śūnyavāda* 20, the stanza is cited with, in comparison to the PV witnesses, reversed halves: *ekadeśena sārūpye sarvaḥ syāt sarvavedakaḥ | sarvātmanā tu sārūpye jñānam ajñānatām vrajet ||* (ŚVv 246,9f., ŚVK 101,10f. and NR 196,18f.). Cf. below, p. 200 for a discussion of the PV witnesses on this stanza, which contain interesting variants but have not been influenced by the positional changes in this external version. I have not yet come across a case where substantial variation outside the main PV witnesses affected the transmission of the text within this group.

## METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Thus far, I have argued for, and recommended, specific methods for making use of the various types of witnesses at our disposal. In view of the overarching concern of the present volume, it will be useful to take a step back and briefly reflect on editorial goals and methods in more general terms.

Like Latinists and many other Sanskritists, editors of *pramāṇa* literature usually have to work with witnesses that are separated from the respective author's lifetime by several hundred years. This also applies to the PV and its commentaries. Among the witnesses of the PV on its own, the date of the inaccessible PV<sub>Zh</sub> is unknown. PV<sub>H</sub> is written in early old Bengali script. A dating solely on palaeographical grounds is too risky, but in all likelihood it is more recent than all other roughly datable witnesses. Bearing in mind the tentative nature of all the manuscript datings, the overall situation thus presents itself as follows:

Author and presumed lifetime	Witness	Date of textual witness
Devendrabuddhi (ca. 630-690)	De <sub>t</sub>	Mid-eleventh century
Prajñākaragupta (ca. 750-810)	Pr <sub>t</sub>	Last quarter of eleventh century
	Pr <sub>B</sub>	End of twelfth / beginning of thirteenth century
	Pr <sub>A</sub>	Early thirteenth century
Manorathanandin (second half of eleventh century)	M <sub>A</sub>	Early thirteenth century
Dharmakīrti (ca. 600-660)	PV <sub>t</sub>	Early thirteenth century
	PV <sub>H</sub>	Between (?) thirteenth and fifteenth century
Ravigupta (late eighth / early ninth century)	R <sub>t</sub>	Date unassigned

Table 2: Dates of authors and preserved textual witnesses

Unlike classicists, however, editors of *pramāṇa* texts typically have only a small number of manuscripts at their disposal, often only a *codex unicus* or a single Tibetan translation, as is the case for the PV commentaries by Devendrabuddhi, Manorathanandin and Ravigupta. Broadly speaking, an editor may aim to reconstruct the author's original text, which also still seems to be a premise in classicist scholarship, or to establish only a specific version of the text in the course of its reception. Is one of these two approaches for the PV intrinsically preferable over the other?

First of all, the great temporal distance between work and witness(es) cannot be used as an argument of principle against aiming at the recon-

struction of an author's original, however this "original" may be understood. To be sure, the more removed a manuscript is from the author's presumed lifetime, the more likely it is to contain a larger number of scribal errors, for a manuscript will probably be copied more often over, say, 300 years than over 100 years. Yet, bearing in mind Pasquali's famous dictum *recentiores, non deteriores*,<sup>55</sup> older witnesses are not necessarily more reliable than younger ones.

The small number of available witnesses has led recent editors of *pramāṇa* literature to be cautious and conservative in their procedure. Minor individual differences in method and approach notwithstanding, these editors have all aimed to enhance their material basis by meticulously searching for parallel formulations by the author of the work they wish to edit, as well as for quotations, paraphrases and other, less direct textual reflexes of his work throughout the Sanskrit religio-philosophical literature that postdates it – an undertaking that is greatly facilitated by the high degree of intertextuality that characterizes this literature in general.<sup>56</sup>

Limiting oneself to a received version of a work as a matter of principle is the method of choice in cases where great divergences between recensions of a work have arisen in the course of its transmission. The causes for these divergences are manifold and depend on historically, culturally or regionally specific practices of textual production and transmission. In European medieval literature, for instance, scribes actively and creatively intervened in the shaping of the text. In modern literature, on the other hand, the published and disseminated work takes on a social existence of its own, independent of the autograph, and becomes an

---

<sup>55</sup> Cf. West 1973: 50.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Steinkellner 1988: 106, in connection with the proposal of a typology of such testimonia. — Editions of *pramāṇa* works that exemplify this combination of cautious conservatism and reliance on additional materials include, in chronological order, Michael Torsten Much's edition of Dharmakīrti's *Vādanyāya* (Much 1991), Motoi Ono's edition of Prajñākaragupta's commentary on PV 2.1-7 (Ono 2000), Horst Lasic's editions of Jñānaśrīmitra's *Vyāpticarcā* (Lasic 2000a) and Ratnakīrti's *Vyāptinirṇaya* (Lasic 2000b), Helmut Krasser's edition of Śaṅkaranandana's *Īśvarāpākaraṇasaṅkṣepa* (Krasser 2002), Taiken Kyūma's edition of the *paṅśadharmatādhikāra* of Jñānaśrīmitra's *Kṣaṇabhaṅgādhyāya* (Kyūma 2005), the edition of the first chapter of Jinendrabuddhi's *Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā* (Steinkellner et al. 2005), Steinkellner's edition of the first and second chapters of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* (PVin 1) and my own edition of Jñānaśrīmitra's *Anupalabdhirahasya* and *Sarvaśabdābhāvacarā* (Kellner 2007). Shinya Moriyama's edition of Prajñākaragupta's commentary on PV 2.8-10 and 29-33, part of his University of Vienna doctoral dissertation (Moriyama 2006), likewise deserves to be mentioned here.

object worthy of consideration in literary criticism.<sup>57</sup> Regional recensions of widespread works of literature, such as the great Sanskrit epics, can be added as one manifestation of such divergence in ancient India. Further, anonymous literature that was compiled, expanded and modified over a considerable stretch of time can likewise not be meaningfully edited with a unifying authorial intention as a court of appeal for editorial decisions, as is the case with the Pāli *tipiṭaka* or the epics.

By contrast, the PV is held to be the careful and well-structured composition of one individual named “Dharmakīrti” who has a distinct place in Indian intellectual history; it is not a heterogeneous compilation. Greatly divergent regional recensions of it are not known to have existed. While the number of stanzas in the individual chapters varies, owing to interpolations and omissions of – as currently known – a few stanzas in certain witnesses,<sup>58</sup> there is no indication at present that this fluctuation reached a scale that would render the stipulation of distinct recensions meaningful. Considerations of genre or the transmission situation therefore in this case do not force an editor to remain strictly limited to one particular received version. This does not rule out, depending on specific scholarly interests in the thought of Devendrabuddhi or Prajñākaragupta, a focusing on the basic text as it was known to these commentators, but an edition of the PV *per se* need not be exclusively limited in this fashion.

Assuming, as a matter of course, that the historical Dharmakīrti occupies a place in India's intellectual history, editions of his works should attempt to determine their verbal shape as it was most likely intended by their author, given the available evidence. If this goal is granted, a solution to a textual problem will have to fulfil certain requirements that West (1973: 48) has nicely summarized as follows:

1. It must correspond in sense to what the author intended to say, so far as this can be determined from the context.
2. It must correspond in language, style, and any relevant technical points (metre, prose rhythm, avoidance of hiatus, etc.) to a way in which the author might naturally have expressed the sense.

---

<sup>57</sup> Accordingly, fervent arguments have been exchanged about whether or not the autograph should be privileged in editions of contemporary literature; given that autographs generally do not exist for classical Sanskrit works, this issue is of little relevance here, as are the problems generated by the existence of multiple authorial revisions of a literary work.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. further below, as well as the discussion of the number of stanzas in the individual chapters in Kellner – Sferri 2008.

3. It must be fully compatible with the fact that the surviving sources give what they do; in other words it must be clear how the presumed original reading could have been corrupted into any different reading that is transmitted.<sup>59</sup>

It is hard to imagine reasons that could discredit the applicability of these criteria to cases such as the PV as a matter of principle, especially as there is hardly a real methodological alternative. However, caution is in place with respect to the interpretation of the results of this procedure. As West rightly adds, the fulfilment of all three conditions does not logically guarantee that a true solution has been found, and there may be several candidates that equally fulfil all of them; these complexities are, in fact, nicely illustrated in the case-studies of the PV presented further below. Moreover, the small number of available witnesses makes the construction of a genealogy of readings in this case more simplistic and hypothetical because intermediate stages of textual change are likely to be undocumented. Since the *pramāṇa* works are usually preserved in a small number of witnesses, it may therefore not be entirely coincidental that editors in this field tend to omit genealogical explanations of readings altogether and regard them as too speculative. On the other hand, since the construction of such genealogies is an integral part of many editorial decisions, especially partial editions of larger works should preferably document even these hypotheses, in order to make their arguments transparent to later editors of other sections or chapters, and to thus facilitate methodological coherence.

West's second condition, on the other hand, includes normative expectations that render the "original", as an outcome of the editorial process, an idealized product, for to a certain extent it excludes that the author might have committed, in a lapse of mind, stylistic blunders or other language mistakes. Furthermore, when we aim at an authorial original, what stage precisely in the text's history do we refer to? Little, if anything, seems to be known about the material and social processes whereby ancient Indian treatises moved from being private to public entities, and how they were distributed. We do not know whether any agencies of editorial control or redaction intervened between the author's composition and the text that then somehow became disseminated among disciples or among a wider audience. We do not even know whether erudite scholars such as Dharmakīrti physically wrote their own works or dictated them to others. Under such conditions it becomes meaningless

---

<sup>59</sup> In Indological literature this topic has recently been taken up in Maas 2006: 167.



to distinguish an authorial original as the author's sanctioned version that potentially differs from what editors made of it. The contribution that agents of editorial or redactional control might have made to the text's shape is simply beyond our grasp. For this reason, it is not possible to distinguish the author's composition from its oldest historically effective version as it can be reconstructed from the extant witnesses. For all these reasons, the "authorial original" may be more of an abstraction than it is in cases of textual transmission that are better documented both in terms of the number of witnesses and in terms of external information about relevant historical and cultural parameters: the "authorial original" is the linguistically standardized text that stood at the beginning of its dissemination. By a leap of faith, we further regard it as composed by a historical personality named Dharmakīrti.

### THREE CASES OF SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION FROM PRAMĀṆAVĀRTTIKA 3.301-366

An enquiry into the genesis of some of the substantial variants found in PV 3.301-366 shows that parallels in Dharmakīrti's second great work, the PVin, caused changes in the transmission of the PV text. None of the variations discussed below have been noted so far in Sāṅkṛtyāyana's editions Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub> and M<sub>1</sub>, or in PV<sub>2</sub> (Shastri). Sāṅkṛtyāyana's PV<sub>1</sub> notes some of the variant readings and PV<sub>3</sub> (Miyasaka), which is based on PV<sub>1</sub>, a few of them. Tosaki, in PV<sub>4</sub>, notes variants found in the earlier editions of PV, in Pr<sub>2</sub> and in M<sub>1</sub>; the latter is problematic because M<sub>A</sub> does not contain the basic text, but one might think it did, as Tosaki misleadingly lists variants from M<sub>1</sub> side by side with readings from other editions. Furthermore, Tosaki generally does not involve information from the commentaries De, M and Pr in the determination of variants and his selection among them to the extent that it would be possible. Pandeya's PV<sub>5</sub> is based on PV<sub>2</sub> and reports no variants whatsoever for the *pratyakṣa* chapter.

As my main concern here is with text-critical matters, considerations of content will in the following have to remain fairly rough; discussions of alternative translation possibilities that are irrelevant to text-critical decisions and references to earlier studies are omitted. Yet some introduction into the context is required in order to make reasonings that rely on meaning and context intelligible. The section PV 3.301-366 is *prima facie* concerned with the means of valid cognition (*pramāṇa*) and its result (*pramāṇaphala*) in the case of sense-perception, in this section referred to simply as perception (*pratyakṣa*) or even with the more gen-

eral term “cognition” (*jñāna*). As traditional accounts have it, Naiyāyikas and Bhaṭṭa-Mīmāṃsakas claim that means and result have to be different from each other, whereas Buddhists argue that they are different merely in conceptual terms, but not as real entities.<sup>60</sup> PV 3.301-366, which parallels Dignāga’s *Pramāṇasamuccaya* 1.8-10 with the author’s own *Vṛtti*, argues for the identity of means and result. Within the PV, this is one of the sections that has very close parallels in Dharmakīrti’s *PVin* (*PVin* 1.34-57 with the accompanying prose), the Sanskrit of which only recently became available through photocopies of three manuscripts from the People’s Republic of China and has since been critically edited by Ernst Steinkellner.

In the first part of the section, PV 3.301-319, Dharmakīrti proposes the “resemblance” of a perceptual cognition to its external object (*arthasārūpya*) as the means of valid cognition, and the understanding of the object (*arthādhigati*) as the result. Since both are aspects of one and the same mental state, means and result are not different. In less overtly technical and more philosophical terms, Dharmakīrti here pursues the problem of accounting for why a perceptual cognition is of a specific intentional object: Why is a perception one of blue rather than one of yellow? Cognition’s resemblance to its object, or the fact that, arising from the external object, it has that object’s form (*artharūpatā*), answers precisely this question. With its articulation and justification of cognition’s “form-possession”, PV 3.301-319 is a main source for the well-known debate between *sākārajñānavāda* and *nirākārajñānavāda* in Indian philosophy.

On the background of the above methodological considerations, the reader is advised to bear the following conventions in mind in order to “decode” text-critical annotation in the following case-studies:

1. Printed editions that accept a reading as part of their text are listed after the witnesses and in brackets, for documentary purposes.  $PV_2$  and  $PV_3$  are not included because they copy the PV text contained in  $M_1$ .
2. When Tibetan translations are listed as witnesses for Sanskrit readings, this means that from among the variant readings attested in the Sanskrit, they correspond most closely to one in particular. If they have a genealogical relationship to any of the attested Sanskrit variants at all, it concerns that variant, but only in a broad sense, without any direct dependence on a particular witness.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Bandyopadhyay 1979 for a general account of this controversy that relies prominently on Dharmottara’s (ca. 740-800) *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*.

3. Readings from the transcript Pr<sub>A</sub>' are tentatively treated as readings from the manuscript Pr<sub>A</sub>, but in their evaluation the probability of transcription errors is always considered.
4. Readings from PV<sub>Zh</sub> are reported on the basis of Sāṅkṛtyāyana's annotation in PV<sub>t</sub> and to be treated with caution, especially given that Sāṅkṛtyāyana's apparatus is not positive. When Sāṅkṛtyāyana does not give a variant from PV<sub>Zh</sub>, which reportedly has no lacunae, this should mean that the text of PV<sub>Zh</sub> conforms to the text adopted in PV<sub>1</sub> – provided that Sāṅkṛtyāyana follows his own editorial policy. To distinguish such inferred readings from readings that he actually reports, the siglum of the former is preceded by a tilde (~).
5. To inform the reader when readings have been extracted from a commentary, sigla for the respective commentaries are preceded by a plus-sign (+). If there is only one witness for a commentary, the witness siglum is used (e.g., +De<sub>v</sub>, +M<sub>A</sub>); if there are more witnesses and all of them agree, the siglum for the commentary is used: "+Pr" means that Pr<sub>A</sub>', Pr<sub>B</sub> and Pr<sub>t</sub> all share this reading.
6. For witnesses of Pr and R, which contain the entire basic text in stanzas, two entries are found in the apparatus: one for that very basic text, and another for the basic text that the commentary attests through lemmata or paraphrases.
7. When a commentary does not contain lemmata or paraphrases that permit the determination of which one among the otherwise attested substantial readings it presupposes, the siglum for that commentary is added after all readings, preceded by a minus-sign (-Pr, -De).
8. In text and translation from commentaries, bold type indicates lemmata from the basic text that are embedded in the commentary.

PV 3.305: *svabhedāj|svabhāvo*

For PV 3.305, the witnesses attest an interesting variation in *pāda* c:

*arthena ghaṭayaty enām na hi muktvārtharūpatām* <sup>[61]</sup>  
*anyah svabhedāj|svabhāvo jñānasya bhedako 'pi kathañcana* ||

[Lacuna in PV<sub>H</sub>]

<sup>61</sup> For *muktvā*- attested by all other witnesses, Pr<sub>A</sub>' has *śakyā*, marked for correction. Pr<sub>1</sub> *svakāvā*[? *na sva bhāṣā*] shows that Sāṅkṛtyāyana had difficulties deciphering the manuscript here.

*anyah svabhedāj jñānasya* +De<sub>t</sub>,<sup>62</sup> +M<sub>A</sub><sup>63</sup> (Pr<sub>2</sub>, PV<sub>3</sub>, PV<sub>4</sub>) : *anyat svabhedo jñānasya* PV<sub>Zh</sub> (PV<sub>1</sub>)<sup>64</sup> : *anyah svabhāvo jñānasya* Pr<sub>B</sub>, +Pr, PV<sub>t</sub> (*rañ bẓin ni*), R<sub>t</sub> (*rañ bẓin ni* {*ni* em.: *gyis* DP}), +R<sub>t</sub> : *arthasvabhāvo (vi)jñānasya* Pr<sub>A</sub>' (Pr<sub>1</sub>)

All of the transmitted variants, viz. *svabhedāj*, *svabhāvo* and – if we tentatively accept that the reading of PV<sub>Zh</sub> is correctly reported in PV<sub>1</sub> – *svabhedo*, are metrically possible.<sup>65</sup> The reading *svabhāvo* is exclusively transmitted in the two manuscripts Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub> and also reflected in R<sub>t</sub>.<sup>66</sup> PV<sub>t</sub> likewise presupposes *svabhāvo*.<sup>67</sup> The reading *svabhedāj* is presupposed in the commentaries De and M and lexically reflected in PV<sub>Zh</sub> *svabhedo*.

Dharmakīrti used PV 3.305ab in the PVin as 1.34ab, but there combined it with PV 3.306ab (*tasmāt prameyādhigateḥ pramānaṃ meyarūpatā*) to form a new stanza. The prose that follows after PVin 1.34 parallels PV 3.301-305. In the place where a parallel to st. 305 is expected (PVin 1 31,12), we find the following argument:

*na ceyam arthaghaṭanārthasārūpyād anyato jñānasya sambhavati. na hi pa-*  
*tumandatādibhiḥ svabhedair bhedakam apīndriyādy arthenaitad ghaṭayati ...*

<sup>62</sup> De<sub>t</sub>: *dbañ po la sogs pa ni mi gsal ba la sogs pa'i rañ gi gnas pa tha dad pa las rnam par śes pa mi gsal ba'i ño bo ñid kyi rgyur gyur pa de* {*de* D : om. P} *tha dad pa byed pa yin na yañ* .... For the location of this passage in De<sub>t</sub>, as well as of the passages in the other main witnesses discussed below, cf. Appendix I.

<sup>63</sup> M (M<sub>1</sub> 210,1f.): ... *na hy anyah kaścid indriyādiḥ svabhedāt kathañcana kenāpi prakāreṇa jñānasya bhedako 'py arthena jñeyena ghaṭayati yojayati*. Cf. also the introduction to the commentary on st. 305 (M<sub>1</sub> 209,23f.): *syād etat. indriyādir eva svabhedād bhedako jñānasya prativiṣayam adhigater niyāmakaḥ. tataś cānubhavātmavād aviṣaya evāsiddha ity āha* ....

<sup>64</sup> In PV<sub>3</sub>, Miyasaka wrongly reports *anya svabhedo* for M<sub>A</sub> and PV<sub>Zh</sub> (on the basis of PV<sub>1</sub>).

<sup>65</sup> In any case, *pāda* c forms a *ma-vipulā* (for which cf. Steiner 1996: 248, as well as the English translation in MacDonald 2007: 52). Syllables 5-7 are long (*-dāj jñāna/-vo jñāna-*; *-na-* is lengthened by the following consonant cluster *-sya-*), syllables 2-4 are long-short-long and thus form a *ra-gaṇa* (*-nyah svabhe/-nyah svabhā-*), and there is a caesura after the fifth syllable (*-dāj/-vo*).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. R<sub>t</sub>, which completely differs from both De<sub>t</sub> and PV<sub>t</sub>: | *don gyi rnam pa ma gtogs par* | *don dañ de ru sbyor byed pa* || *śes pa gẓan gyi rañ bẓin ni* {*ni* em. : *gyis* DP} | *ji lla bur yañ 'byed pa min* |. The emendation to *ni* is based on the paraphrase in the commentary: *gañ gi phyir rig pa de dañ don lhan cig sbyor bar byed pa ni don gyi rnam pa ma gtogs* {*gtogs* em. : *rtogs* DP} *par gẓan gyi rañ bẓin ni rtogs pa'i rnam pa ñid kyi* (?) *tha dad par byed pa po ma yin pa* ....

<sup>67</sup> PV<sub>t</sub>: | *rnam 'yas śes pa'i rañ bẓin ni* || *tha dad par ni byed na yañ* || *'di ni don dañ 'brel byed pa* || *don gyi ño bo las gẓan min* |. Note also the peculiar syntax, with *anyah* (or *anyat*? Cf. PV<sub>Zh</sub>!) as the predicate of the main clause. Cf. also n. 74.

... and this connection of cognition with [its] object is not possible on the basis of anything other than [its] resemblance to the object, for the senses and other [causes for a cognition] do not connect the [cognition] with [its specific] object, even though they differentiate [the cognition] through *their own distinctive characteristics (svabhedaiḥ)*, such as being sharp or dull.

When the senses causing a perception are sharp or dull, the resulting perception differs accordingly and presents the object in a sharp or dull manner. But while such distinctive characteristics of perception's causes are responsible for some difference in the resulting cognition, they are not responsible for its specificity according to the intentional object.

Devendrabuddhi and Manorathanandin interpret PV 3.305 exactly along these lines; the stanza can from this perspective, and with the reading *svabhedāj* in *pāda* c, be translated as follows:

Something other<sup>68</sup> than [cognition's] having the form of the [external] object does not connect this [object-understanding]<sup>69</sup> with the object, even though it differentiates cognition in some [other] way, based on a distinctive characteristic [belonging to] itself.

Prajñākaragupta has a different understanding of what "other" notion is excluded from connecting cognition with its object.<sup>70</sup> He engages with the counter-position that a cognition is of a particular object on the basis of a property called "direct realization" (*sākṣātkaraṇa*). Three alternatives are refuted: that direct realization is to fulfil its function (1) as the nature (*svarūpa*, *svabhāva*) of cognition,<sup>71</sup> (2) as the nature of the external object, or (3) as something else entirely. The refutation concludes with the following sentence that can only have been intended to paraphrase st. 305:

Pr<sub>2</sub> 343,11f.: *nānyāḥ svabhāvo bhedako 'pi*<sup>72</sup> *jñānasyārthena ghatayati.*

<sup>68</sup> This translation of *anyāḥ* follows Manorathanandin's gloss *kaścit*. The masculine gender of *anyā* is awkward; no suitable referent for *anyāḥ* can be found either in this stanza or in the preceding ones. The variant reading *anyat*, in PV<sub>1</sub> attributed to PV<sub>Zh</sub>, could reflect an attempt to resolve this problem, even though its combination with *svabhedo* is syntactically impossible.

<sup>69</sup> The feminine pronoun *enām* refers back to *adhigati* in PV 3.304b. This "understanding" of the object is in this section the result of the means of the valid cognition.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Pr<sub>A</sub>' 1,30-2,6, Pr<sub>B</sub> 173a7-b4, Pr<sub>1</sub> D 12b7-13a7 = P 15b2-16a4; Pr<sub>1</sub> 2,28-3,13, Pr<sub>2</sub> 342,27-343,12.

<sup>71</sup> In some places of his argumentation, Prajñākaragupta alternatively speaks of *rūpa* or *dharma* instead.

<sup>72</sup> For *bhedako pi* Pr<sub>B</sub> (cf. *tha dad par byed pa yin yañ* Pr<sub>1</sub> D 13a7 = P 16a4, and also *bhedako 'pi* in all witnesses for PV 3.305) see *bhedako vi-* Pr<sub>A</sub>', taken over into Pr<sub>1</sub> and Pr<sub>2</sub>.

The other essential property (i.e., *sākṣātkaraṇa*), even though it differentiates cognition [in some other way],<sup>73</sup> does not connect [the object-understanding] with the object.<sup>74</sup>

There is no trace of the reading *svabhedāj* in Prajñākaragupta's commentary on this stanza, so we can presume he knew the basic text with the reading *svabhāvo*. R<sub>t</sub> has the reading *svabhāvo* in the PV translation that it contains and also presupposes it in the commentary (R<sub>t</sub> D 116b4 = P 140b7); the lexeme *svabhāva-* is also presupposed, unlike in De<sub>t</sub>, in PV<sub>t</sub>.

In the context of Dharmakīrti's argumentation, both readings, *svabhāvo* and *svabhedāj*, can be made plausible. The resultant arguments naturally differ from each other, but not substantially. In the preceding stanzas PV 3.302-304, Dharmakīrti argues that what differentiates a cognition according to its object must be a "distinctive characteristic belonging to [cognition] itself" (*ātmabheda*, st. 304); it cannot be a characteristic of any of cognition's causes, such as the sense-faculty (st. 303). With the reading *svabhāvo*, PV 3.305 can be taken to build on this argument. Having clarified earlier that whatever connects the object-understanding with the object is an essential feature of cognition, Dharmakīrti now adds that no other such feature apart from cognition's possessing the form of the object can accomplish this task; the "direct realization" (*sākṣātkaraṇa*) which Prajñākaragupta introduces here can count as such an essential property of (perceptual) cognition that is thereby excluded. With the reading *svabhedāj*, on the other hand, PV 3.305 provides a separate argument that includes a reference back to a claim Dharmakīrti made earlier in st. 303: nothing apart from cognition's possessing the object's form connects the object-understanding with the object, even though the senses and other causes of perception somehow differentiate cognition on account of their own distinctive characteristics. This argument is also advanced in the PVin parallel.

We are therefore left with two possibilities: First, Dharmakīrti could have formulated the same argument in the PV and in the PVin; De<sub>t</sub>, M<sub>A</sub> and (partially) perhaps also PV<sub>zh</sub> preserve the original text with the reading *svabhedāj*. The text was changed to read *svabhāvo*, possibly as the result of a series of scribal interventions initiated by one copyist's expectation that the noun after *anyah* is its otherwise lacking referent.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *kathañcana* in PV 3.305.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Pr<sub>t</sub> D 13a7 = P 16a4f.: *gzan ni śes pa'i rañ gi no bo tha dad par byed pa yin yañ don dan 'brel par byed pa ma yin no* ||. The translators interpreted *svabhāvaḥ* as a commentarial gloss on *anyah* from the stanza ("the other, that is, the nature of cognition [consisting in *sākṣātkaraṇa*]"); cf. also PV<sub>t</sub> cited above in n. 67.

Thus, *svabhedāj* could have been changed to *svabhedo* (according to PV<sub>1</sub> found in PV<sub>Zh</sub>), and this could have been substituted by *svabhāvo*. Second, Dharmakīrti might have formulated a slightly different argument in the PV, but already in Devendrabuddhi's commentary the argument became assimilated to the one in the PVin, resulting in the textual change of the original *svabhāvo* to *svabhedāj*; Prajñākaragupta's text would therefore preserve the original reading. On the basis of the evidence considered here, it is not possible to decide between these two possibilities, and the matter is therefore left open.

PV 3.312: *abhinnasya tasyedam | atadrūpasyaśyedam*

PV 3.312 is placed in a context where the means of valid cognition (*pramāṇa*) is conceptualized as an instrument in the grammatical sense, i.e., as the most efficient among the factors involved in accomplishing the action denoted by a verbal root, based on Pāṇini's specification of the function of the instrumental in Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.4.42 (*sādhakatamaṃ karaṇam*). In PV 3.311, Dharmakīrti accordingly argues that among the various factors contributing to an action (*kāraka*) only the one that is its ultimately distinguishing factor (*antyaṃ bhedakam*) is the most efficient one. Building up on this general argument, PV 3.312 makes the specific point that the senses are not suitable as the “most efficient factor” that accomplishes the cognition of a specific object. In this stanza, we encounter interesting variation in the second half:

*sarvasāmānyahetuvād akṣāṇām asti nedṛśam |*

*tadbhede 'pi hy abhinnasya tasyedam | atadrūpasyaśyedam iti tat kutaḥ ||*<sup>75</sup>

[Lacuna in PV<sub>H</sub>]

*atadrūpasyaśyedam* PV<sub>Zh</sub>, +De<sub>t</sub>,<sup>76</sup> +M<sub>A</sub>,<sup>77</sup> (PV<sub>4</sub>) : *abhinnasya tasyedam* Pr<sub>A</sub>', Pr<sub>B</sub>, +Pr, PV<sub>t</sub>, R<sub>t</sub>, +R<sub>t</sub> (PV<sub>1</sub>, PV<sub>3</sub>, Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>)

Both variants are metrically possible.<sup>78</sup> With the second reading, and broadly following the commentaries by Devendrabuddhi and Mano-

<sup>75</sup> For *kutaḥ* attested in all other witnesses, Pr<sub>A</sub>' reads *kramaḥ* (most probably a transcription error); cf. also n. 89 below.

<sup>76</sup> De<sub>t</sub>: *de tha dad kyaṅ | dbaṅ po mi gsal ba la sogs pa'i khyad par gyis tha dad na yaṅ śes pa de dños can min pa yul daṅ 'dra ba daṅ bral ba'i śes pa (?) don 'di śes pa 'di'i { 'di'i D, 'di P} yaṅ zes nes pas tha sñad du byed pa gaṅ yin pa de gaṅ las ma yin pa ñid do ||*.

<sup>77</sup> M (M<sub>1</sub> 212,8-10): *teṣām indriyāṇām pramādāvilatvādibhede 'pi jñānasyātadrūpasya viṣayasārūpyarahitasyedam asya grāhakaṃ iti grāhakatvaṃ yad iṣyate tat kutaḥ?* On the term *āvila* in this context, cf. the introduction to PST 1, p. li, n. 83.

<sup>78</sup> With the reading *atadrūpasyaśyedam*, the *pāda* boundary in this *pathyā*-verse would occur right before the genitive case-ending of *rūpasya*. This may appear odd, but

rathanandin that presuppose it, the stanza can be translated as follows:

Because the [individual] senses are a common cause for all [the sense-perceptions that they produce], they are not such [i.e., they are not its ultimately differentiating factor].<sup>79</sup> To wit, even if the [senses] are distinctively characterized [e.g., by being sharp or dull], on what basis [could one determine] for [a cognition] *that does not have that [object's] form (atadrūpasya)* that “this [is a cognition] of that [specific object]” (*asyedam*)?

To paraphrase 312cd: Even if the senses are sharp or dull, on what basis could one determine that a cognition is of a particular object unless it had that object's form? Such distinctive characteristics of the senses are immaterial for the object-specificity of cognition, which, however, is supposed to be due to the means of valid cognition. The expression *atadrūpa*, also reflected in the abstract noun *atādrūpye* in PV 3.313, takes up the notion that cognition has the object's form, or resembles it, which has been put forward as the means of valid cognition in PV 3.305 and 306. On the other hand, the alternative reading *abhinnasyāsyedam* can also be translated in such a way that the resulting statement fits into the context:

... on what basis [could one determine] for the *undifferentiated (abhinnasya)* [cognition] that “this [is a cognition] of that [specific object]” (*tasyedam*)?<sup>80</sup>

A cognition that is undifferentiated insofar as it has the nature of “experiencing” (cf. *anubhavamātreṇa jñānasya sadṛśātmanah*, PV 3.302a<sup>2</sup>b) cannot be connected with a particular object through the sense that causes it, irrespective of the sense's individual characteristics. Contextually, *abhinnasya* can be further supported by PV 3.303, where Dharmakīrti propounded that a distinctive characteristic of a cause of cognition can-

---

within PV 3.301-366, there are four further such occurrences (“^” indicates *pāda* boundary; variant readings that do not affect this situation are not reported): PV 3.308cd = PVin 1.36 ... *ātma^ny arthādhi-* (*pathyā*), PV 3.319cd ... *bhinnābhimate^ṣv apy* ... (*bhavipulā*), PV 3.335ab ... *-rahita^syāgrahāt* ... (*na-vipulā*), PV 3.337cd ... *-obhayākāra^syāsya* ... (*pathyā*).

<sup>79</sup> The expression *īdṛśam* is here taken to refer back to *bhedakam* (or, more precisely: *antyaṃ bhedakam*) in the preceding stanza 311, cf. also Pr<sub>2</sub> 345,15: *akṣaṃ na bhedakam*. Devendrabuddhi and Manorathanandin understand *īdṛśam* to take up the notion of *sādhakatama* from 311, cf. De, *sgrub par byed pa dam pa* and M<sub>1</sub> 212,7 *īdṛśam sādhakatamatvam*. The former interpretation has the advantage of producing a more straightforward argument.

<sup>80</sup> This interpretation can also be found in Ravigupta's commentary, cf. n. 96 below.



not determine the undifferentiated (*abhinnasya*) cognition as different with respect to different objects.<sup>81</sup> Thus, considerations of meaning and argument within the basic text once more do not permit a decision for one or the other reading.

In his commentary (Pr<sub>A</sub>' 3,16-22, Pr<sub>B</sub> 174b5-7, Pr<sub>i</sub> D 15a7-b3 = P 18b3-7, Pr<sub>1</sub> 5,30-6,5, Pr<sub>2</sub> 345,18-23), Prajñākaragupta refutes the counterposition that the specific direction (*ābhimukhya*, *ābhimukhatā*) of a sense towards the perceived object varies according to the object, and thus links cognition with its individual object. Couched in the framework of his refutation, he provides two alternative paraphrases of 312cd:

*tad asat, ābhimukhyasya hi*<sup>82</sup> *viśeṣasyākārabhedam*<sup>83</sup> *antareṇa pratipattum aśakyatvāt. tatas*<sup>84</sup> *tadbhede 'py ākārahītasyaśyēdam*<sup>85</sup> *ābhimukhyaṃ nīlapītādīviśayam itī kutah?* *na hi nīlapītādīviśeṣapratipattim*<sup>86</sup> *antareṇābhimukhyaviśeṣapratipattih, sā ced asti kim idāntm ābhimukhyaprakhyāne-na?*

[Refutation:] This is incorrect, for it is not possible to know that specifying feature [of the sense] which [according to you is its] direction, without [the object's] form (*ākāra*) as [cognition's] distinctive characteristic. Therefore, *even if this* [sense] *is distinctively characterized, on what basis [could one determine]* for this [sense] (*asya*), which is devoid of [the object's] form (*ākārahītasya*), that *this* direction applies to blue, yellow, etc.? For without knowing [cognition's] specifying feature, [i.e.] blue, yellow, etc., one cannot know the [sense's] specifying feature, [i.e. its] direction; [but] if [blue, yellow, etc.] are known, what purpose is then served by speaking of the [sense's] direction?

*athavā tadbhede*<sup>87</sup> *'py abhinnasyeti. tasya*<sup>88</sup> *nīlapītādīvedanasya bhede 'py abhinnasyendriyasyaśyēdam karanam itī tat kutah?*<sup>89</sup> *ābhimukhyaviśeṣād*

<sup>81</sup> PV 3.303: *anātmabhūto bhedo 'sya vidyamāno 'pi hetuṣu | bhinne karmanṃ abhinnasya na bhedenā niyāmakāḥ ||*.

<sup>82</sup> *hi* Pr<sub>B</sub> : om. Pr<sub>A</sub>' (Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>); cf. *ni* Pr<sub>i</sub>.

<sup>83</sup> *viśeṣasyā-* em. : *viśeṣaṇā-* Pr<sub>A</sub>' , Pr<sub>B</sub> (Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>); cf. Pr<sub>i</sub>: *mñon du phyogs pa'i khyad par ni rnam pa tha dad pa med par rtogs par mi nus pa'i phyir ro ||*.

<sup>84</sup> *tatas* Pr<sub>B</sub> (*des na* Pr<sub>i</sub>) : om. Pr<sub>A</sub>' (Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>).

<sup>85</sup> *idam* om. Pr<sub>i</sub>.

<sup>86</sup> *nīlapītādi-* Pr<sub>B</sub> : *nīlādi-* Pr<sub>A</sub>' (Pr<sub>i</sub>).

<sup>87</sup> Pr<sub>i</sub> *de thams cad kyañ* should be corrected to *de tha dad kyañ*.

<sup>88</sup> *abhinnasyeti tasya* Pr<sub>A</sub>' : *abhinnasya* Pr<sub>B</sub>; cf. *tha dad pa med ces bya ba ni* Pr<sub>i</sub>. All three variants are acceptable.

<sup>89</sup> *tat kutah* Pr<sub>B</sub> (Pr<sub>2</sub>) : *kramah* Pr<sub>A</sub>' (Pr<sub>1</sub>); the variation between *kutah* (all other witnesses) and *kramah* Pr<sub>A</sub>' also occurs in PV 3.312d – this much can be assumed to be a transcriptional error. Like Pr<sub>A</sub>' , Pr<sub>i</sub> *zes bya ba ga* {*ga* D : *gañ* P} *las yin* omits *tat*. Cf. also n. 75 above.

*viśeṣa iti cet,*<sup>90</sup> *na, ābhimukhyasyākāraviśeṣapratipattim*<sup>91</sup> *antareṇa viśeṣe-  
ṇa*<sup>92</sup> *pratipattum aśakyatvād ity uktam. tata ākāraviśeṣa eva prārthanīyah.  
sa ced asti kim apareṇa?*

Or rather (*athavā*): “*tadbhede ’py abhinnasya*”. Even if this, [i.e.] the cog-  
nition of blue, yellow, etc., is differentiated, on what basis [could one de-  
termine] this, [i.e.] for the undifferentiated (*abhinnasya*) sense, that it  
(*idam*) is an instrument for that [cognition] (*asya*)?<sup>93</sup> If [the opponent  
holds] that the [sense] is specifically characterized based on [its] direction  
[towards the object] as a specifying feature, [we say] no, for it was already  
said [just earlier] that without knowing the [object’s] form [as cog-  
nition’s] specifying feature, [the sense’s] direction cannot be known spe-  
cifically. Therefore, the [object’s] form alone as a specifying feature is to  
be sought for; if that exists, what purpose is served by anything else?

The second paraphrase is introduced by *athavā*, “or rather”, which first  
of all suggests that the author prefers it; why and in what terms need  
not be elaborated here. This paraphrase begins with “*tadbhede ’py abhin-  
nasya*”, which takes up st. 312ed (without *hi*) in this particular variant  
reading. The remainder of the paraphrase is, interestingly, influenced by  
a prose passage from PVin 1.32,14f., whose predicate *karaṇam* Prajñāka-  
ragupta introduces into the phrasing of st. 312cd.

*satsv apīndriyādiṣv abhinnasya prativiśayaṃ bhedakam asya karaṇam iti.  
na hīndriyāṇi bhedakāni, sarvajñānahetuvāt.*

Even if the senses, etc., exist, [only] that which differentiates the undif-  
ferentiated [cognition] according to [its] object is [determined] to be (*iti*)  
its<sup>94</sup> instrument. That is to say, the senses do not differentiate [cognition  
according to its object] because they are the causes of all [sensory] cog-  
nitions.

The phrase *tasyedam/asyedam* is here not, as e.g., in Manorathanandin’s  
commentary, taken to mean “this [is a cognition] of that [particular ob-  
ject]”, but rather interpreted as “this [is an instrument] of that [action,  
i.e., object-cognition]”. Prajñākaragupta’s first paraphrase lacks a refer-

<sup>90</sup> *viśeṣa iti cet* Pr<sub>B</sub> (*khyad par yod do že na* Pr<sub>i</sub>) (Pr<sub>2</sub>) : *viśeṣatvaṃ hi cet* Pr<sub>A</sub>’ (Pr<sub>1</sub>).

<sup>91</sup> For *ābhimukhyasyā-* Pr<sub>A</sub>’, Pr<sub>B</sub> (*mñon du phyogs pa* Pr<sub>i</sub>), see *ābhimukhyatvasyā-* Pr<sub>1</sub>,  
Pr<sub>2</sub>; *-ākāra* Pr<sub>B</sub> (*rnam pa’i* Pr<sub>i</sub> D) : *-ākāraṇa-* Pr<sub>A</sub>’ (Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>); om. Pr<sub>i</sub> P; *-pratipattim* om.  
Pr<sub>1</sub>.

<sup>92</sup> *viśeṣeṇa* em. (*khyad par du* Pr<sub>i</sub>) (following Pr<sub>2</sub>) : *viśeṣaṇam* Pr<sub>A</sub>’ : *viśeṣasya* Pr<sub>B</sub>; see  
*viśeṣaṇam* [? *ṣeṇa*] Pr<sub>1</sub>.

<sup>93</sup> For the syntax, cf. also Pr<sub>i</sub>: *tha dad med pa’i dbaṅ po la | ’di’i byed pa ni ’di yin  
žes* ....

<sup>94</sup> As for *asya*, it is construed with *bhedakam* (‘*di’i bye brag tu byed pa po ni*) in PVin<sub>1</sub>  
82,6. The syntax of this sentence in the translation is on the whole so significantly dif-  
ferent that one would never think of construing the passage in the Sanskrit accord-  
ingly.

ence to *abhinnasya*, but has the expression *ākārahitasya* (“devoid of [the object’s] form”) – which is practically synonymous with *atadrūpasya* – in the place where one would expect *abhinnasya*.

As in st. 305, Ravigupta’s commentary follows Prajñākaragupta both in terms of argumentative structure and in terms of the basic text. Interestingly enough, in the first paraphrase, Ravigupta’s commentary has \**abhinnasya* as a lemma from the basic text before Prajñākaragupta’s *ākārahitasya*.<sup>95</sup> This could indicate that Prajñākaragupta’s commentary here too originally contained the lemma *abhinnasya*, which then became lost in the course of transmission. This might have been the result of eyeskip ahead from *-pya-* to the first *-syā-* in the string *tadbhede ’py abhinnasyākārahitasyāsyedam*. On the other hand, the lemma could also have been inserted by Ravigupta (or the translators of his commentary) who, familiar with the basic text with the reading *abhinnasya*, put an expected word in its expected place.<sup>96</sup> Nevertheless, even if Prajñākaragupta’s text originally contained *abhinnasya* as a lemma, his choice to then gloss it with *ākārahitasya* suggests he may have also been familiar with the alternative reading *atadrūpasya*. It is, then, not inconceivable that in a situation where both readings were known, Prajñākaragupta with his second paraphrase which draws on the PVin parallel not only expressed his preference for a better explanation of the stanza, but also marked a preference for the reading *abhinnasya*.

Which reading should be adopted for the critical text of the PV? First of all, a change in either direction cannot be explained through mechanical scribal errors. A change from *atadrūpasya* to *abhinnasya* can be easily explained as an attempt to harmonize the stanza with an idiomatically close parallel passage in the PVin. This change would have occurred prior to the composition of Prajñākaragupta’s commentary; the rationale behind this step is also reflected in his second paraphrase. By comparison, a change of *abhinnasya* to *atadrūpasya* cannot be explained on the same ground, for no idioms that are as close to the formulation in PV 3.312cd as the PVin parallel can be found in a relevant context elsewhere in the PV or in the PVin. The expression *atādrūpye* in PV 3.313, which could be considered a trigger of textual change in this

<sup>95</sup> R<sub>1</sub> D 118a4 = P 142b4f.: *tha dad med pa ste | rnam pa dañ bral ba’i dbañ po ’di sñon po dañ ser po la sogs pa’i yul la mñon du phyogs pa ’di gañ las yin te |*.

<sup>96</sup> Note that Ravigupta’s interpretation of the second paraphrase departs from Prajñākaragupta’s intention and conforms to the translation of st. 312cd I provided above on p. 192. R<sub>1</sub> D 118a5f. = P 142b5f.: *yañ na dbañ po la sogs pa de tha dad kyañ don so so tha mi dad par rig pa de don so sor ñes {ñes P : ñas D} pa ñid kyi {kyi P : kya D} sñon po ’di’i rig pa ’di yin na źes ji ltar źes |*.

direction, would not have much force because it is not part of an argument that is phrased in such a deceptively similar fashion. For these reasons, the reading *atadrūpasya tasyedam* is adopted for the critical text of the PV.

The distribution of variants among the witnesses for st. 312 is the same as for st. 305: Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub> and the two translations PV<sub>t</sub> and R<sub>t</sub> read against De<sub>t</sub>, M<sub>A</sub> and, if we believe Sāṅkṛtyāyana's variant reports, PV<sub>Zh</sub>. It is not surprising to see here that the basic text contained and presupposed in Ravigupta's commentary depends on his teacher Prajñākara-gupta's work. The suggested dependence of the canonical translation PV<sub>t</sub> on a PV text that our witnesses show to be peculiar to Prajñākara-gupta's commentary, on the other hand, is worthy of note, especially because Sa skya paṇḍita also studied Devendrabuddhi's commentary and, on the *pratyakṣa* chapter, Manorathanandin's, together with Śākya-śrībhadrā.<sup>97</sup>

PV 3.327: *tat svayaṃ tat prakāśate | svayaṃ saiva prakāśate*

Starting with PV 3.320, Dharmakīrti criticizes the realist epistemic model that he had tacitly presupposed in the preceding section PV 3.301-319, and that assumes cognition to be of an external object. PV 3.327 concludes this criticism as follows:

*nānyo 'nubhāvya*<sup>98</sup> *tenāsti|buddhyāsti tasya|tasyā nānubhavo 'paraḥ |*  
*tasyāpi tulyacodyatvāt tat svayaṃ tat prakāśate | svayaṃ saiva prakāśate ||*

[Lacuna in PV<sub>H</sub>]

327a *tenā-* De<sub>t</sub>, PV<sub>t</sub>, Pr<sub>A</sub>', Pr<sub>B</sub> (PV<sub>1</sub>, PV<sub>3</sub>, PV<sub>4</sub>, Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>) : *buddhyā-* +Pr, PV<sub>Zh</sub>, R<sub>t</sub>, +R<sub>t</sub>; M<sub>A</sub> contains *buddhyā*, but probably as part of the commentary.

327b *tasya* M<sub>A</sub>, PV<sub>Zh</sub> (PV<sub>3</sub>, PV<sub>4</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>) : *tasyā* Pr<sub>A</sub>', Pr<sub>B</sub>, +Pr (Pr<sub>1</sub>, PV<sub>1</sub>); the Tibetan translations are inconclusive due to lack of gender differentiation.

327d: *tat svayaṃ tat prakāśate* M<sub>A</sub>,<sup>99</sup> PV<sub>Zh</sub>, R<sub>t</sub> (*de phyir de ni rañ ñid gsal*), +R<sub>t</sub>, probably also De<sub>t</sub> (cf. below) : *svayaṃ saiva prakāśate* Pr<sub>A</sub>', Pr<sub>B</sub>, +Pr, PV<sub>t</sub> (*de ni rañ ñid gsal ba yin*) (PV<sub>1</sub>, PV<sub>3</sub>, PV<sub>4</sub>, Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>)

<sup>97</sup> Jackson 1987: 109.

<sup>98</sup> For *anubhāvya* in all other witnesses, Pr<sub>A</sub>' reads *anubhāva* (?).

<sup>99</sup> M (M<sub>1</sub> 217.15-18): *yathā ca svarūpād anyo buddhyānubhāvyo nāsti, tathā tasya jñānasya cāparo 'nubhavo nāsti, tasya jñānagrahaṇasyāpi tulyā'thacodyatvāt. sa hy anyatva-nibandhano {anyatva- em., following M<sub>1</sub> : anya- M<sub>A</sub>} grāhyagrāhakabhāvaḥ. tac cānupapannam ity uktam. tat tasmāt taj jñānam aparokṣatayotpannam svayaṃ prakāśate, nānyena prakāśyate.*

The translation of st. 327 itself is unproblematic; the sole relevant semantic difference lies in the reading presupposed in 327d:

Through this (*tena*) [cognition] / through cognition (*buddhyā*), no other [object] is to be experienced. [Moreover,] of that [cognition as an object] (*tasya/tasyāḥ*), no further experiencing is there [either], since that [experiencing of a cognition] would be subject to the same reproach.

*tat svayaṃ tat prakāśate*: Therefore (*tat*), this [cognition] shines forth by itself.

*svayaṃ saiva prakāśate*: It is this (*sā*) very [cognition] that shines forth by itself.

The stanza was taken over as P<sub>Vin</sub> 1.38, with changes that are significant in view of the variation for PV 3.327:

*nānyo 'nubhāvyo buddhyāsti tasyā nānubhavo 'paraḥ |*  
*grāhyagrāhakavaidhuryāt svayaṃ saiva<sup>100</sup> prakāśate ||*

In *pāda* c, *tasyāpi tulyacodyatvāt*, found in all versions of the PV, has been replaced by the more specific reasoning *grāhyagrāhakavaidhuryāt*. This authorial change did not affect the transmission of the PV, even though it is reflected in all explanations of 327c in the PV commentaries.

The form of *pāda* d in the P<sub>Vin</sub> is exactly what we find in Pr<sub>A</sub>', Pr<sub>B</sub> and PV<sub>t</sub>. In P<sub>Vin</sub> 1.38, the feminine pronoun *sā* refers back to *buddhyā* in *pāda* a, which is also the referent of *tasyāḥ* in *pāda* b. The textual environment in the PV, on the other hand, does not refer to cognition with a feminine noun. Instead, we find throughout the entire section the neuter noun *jñāna*, which establishes the neuter gender throughout the stanza, and the reading *tat svayaṃ tat prakāśate* for 327d. The various versions for 327ab, which all show a “feminization” to some extent,<sup>101</sup> can be explained through selective influence from P<sub>Vin</sub> 1.38. In Prajñākaragupta's brief commentary on st. 327, we also find exclusively feminine forms.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>100</sup> *saiva* P<sub>Vin</sub><sub>BC</sub> : *saivaṃ* P<sub>Vin</sub><sub>A</sub> (also P<sub>Vin</sub><sub>t</sub>).

<sup>101</sup> The variation *tasya/tasyā* in 327b may of course also have resulted from a simple scribal error, but this is less likely given that Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub>, which have *tasyā* (for *tasyāḥ*), also read 327d as *svayaṃ saiva prakāśate*.

<sup>102</sup> Pr<sub>2</sub> 352.31-34 = Pr<sub>1</sub> 14.6-10 = Pr<sub>B</sub> 178a7-b1 = Pr<sub>A</sub>' 9.28-10.2 = Pr<sub>t</sub> D 22a6-b1 = P 26b4-6: *buddhyā yo 'nubhūyate so {so Pr<sub>B</sub><sup>PC</sup> : sa Pr<sub>B</sub><sup>AC</sup>, Pr<sub>A</sub>' (Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>)} nāsti paraḥ. ya-thānyo 'nubhāvyo nāsti {nāsti Pr<sub>A</sub>' (Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>, med par Pr<sub>t</sub>) : na bhavati Pr<sub>B</sub>}, tathā niveditam. tasyās tarhi paro 'nubhavaḥ. anubhavo {nubhavaḥ. anubhavo em. : nubhavo nubhava Pr<sub>B</sub> (Pr<sub>t</sub>) : nubhavo Pr<sub>A</sub>' (Pr<sub>1</sub>, Pr<sub>2</sub>)} buddher astu. na, tatrāpi grāhyagrāhakakalakṣaṇābhāvaḥ ... talhā ca svayaṃ saiva prakāśate na tataḥ para iti sthītam. For *prakāśate*, Pr<sub>B</sub> has *praśate* (folio 178b1 begins with *-śa-*). The part beginning with *-starhi paro nubhavo* was added*

In Devendrabuddhi's commentary, 327d is explained with *gaṇ gi phyir de lta yin pa de'i phyir | de bdag {D; bag P} śes pa raṇ gsal 'gyur |*. The final *raṇ gsal 'gyur* translates *svayam prakāśate*. Since there is no equivalent for *śes pa* in any Sanskrit version of 327d, we can exclude that *śes pa* is quoted here as part of the basic text. The gloss of the demonstrative pronoun *de* with *śes pa*, corresponding to Sanskrit *jñāna*, then shows that Devendrabuddhi had a neuter demonstrative before him (*tat*), for a feminine *sā* would have been glossed with *blo*, the translation that is consistently used for *buddhi* in subsequent stanzas of the PV. With *tat*, *svayam* and *prakāśate* thus secured, we can assume that Devendrabuddhi knew 327d in the same form as Manorathanandin: *tat svayam tat prakāśate*. The remaining *tat*, provided with a causal function (*tasmāt*) by Manorathanandin, is indirectly confirmed by Devendrabuddhi's introduction to his paraphrase of 327d which also clarifies the causal relationship to the statement of the preceding *pāda* with *de'i phyir*.

The distribution of variants among the witnesses that results from these considerations confirms the division into the two groups  $De_t/M_\Delta/PV_{Zh}$  and  $Pr_A'/Pr_B/PV_t$ , but  $R_t$  here agrees with the first group, both in the text it contains and in the text it presupposes.<sup>103</sup> The latter indicates that this difference represents the situation in  $R_t$ 's Sanskrit source and is not a result of  $R_t$ 's dependence on the Tibetan stanza translation from  $De_t$ .

---

in the lower margin of  $Pr_A'$ , with a correction sign within the line. — The translators of  $Pr_t$  clearly had a Sanskrit text before them with *'nubhavo nubhava* as found in  $Pr_B$ , and attempted to make sense of it: *'o na de myoṅ bar byed pa gzan myoṅ ba'i blor 'gyur ro ze na |*. This suggests that they understood “Then, let there be another experience of this, [that is] of the cognition which is an experience”, with the compound *anubhavabuddheḥ* as a (curiously somewhat removed) gloss on *tasyāḥ* of the basic text. Given the wording of PV 3.327b (*tasyā nānubhavo 'paraḥ*), it seems however more plausible that we are dealing with two sentences, the first taking up the (negated) proposition of 327b, and the second providing an explanation of it: “**Of this, then,** [there is] another **experience**. [To explain:] Let there be an experience of cognition.” This requires an emendation of the *anubhava* to *anubhavaḥ* or *anubhavo*, and the assumption that a scribe did not understand that he was dealing with two sentences. Alternatively, the reading of  $Pr_B$  could be judged a dittography, but the scribe then would have mistakenly repeated *anubhavaḥ* or *anubhavo* as *anubhava*, which is rather improbable. Furthermore, if Prajñākara Gupta had intended to gloss *tasyāḥ* with *buddheḥ* in the same sentence, as the assumption of a dittography entails, one would expect him to have placed the gloss right after its explanandum.

<sup>103</sup> For the latter, cf.  $R_t$  D 123a1 = P 148a5f.: *de'i phyir śes pa de ni raṇ ñid kho nas gsal bar 'gyur ro |*. As in  $De_t$ , the word *śes pa* (\**jñāna*) is decisive here.

## FURTHER EVIDENCE FROM COLLATION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

A collation extending over PV 3.303-539 provides further evidence that, as far as the basic text is concerned, the two Sanskrit manuscripts Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub> are more closely related to each other than each of them is related to any other witness. In several places, Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub> omit stanzas and parts of stanzas against all other witnesses. Within PV 3.303-366, moreover, there are shared transmissional errors and peculiar variant readings of these two witnesses against all other witnesses, with some notable exceptions in PV<sub>t</sub> and R<sub>t</sub>.<sup>104</sup>

1. PV 3.315b *dhiyo*: Pr<sub>B</sub> reads {*dhiyo*}*dhiyo*, Pr<sub>A</sub>' *vayavayo*; a shared dittography (with *-dhi-* in Pr<sub>A</sub> erroneously transcribed as the quite similar *-vi-* and "emended" in Pr<sub>A</sub>') that was corrected in Pr<sub>B</sub>; lacuna PV<sub>H</sub>.
2. PV 3.317ab: missing in Pr<sub>A</sub>', supplied in the margin in Pr<sub>B</sub>, present in Pr<sub>t</sub> D 18a3 = P 21b6.
3. PV 3.325b: *sādhanam* Pr<sub>A</sub>', Pr<sub>B</sub>, PV<sub>t</sub>: *darśanam* +De<sub>t</sub>, +M<sub>A</sub>, PV<sub>Zh</sub>, R<sub>t</sub>, +R<sub>t</sub>; lacuna PV<sub>H</sub>; -Pr.
4. PV 3.340a: *ātmā syād* Pr<sub>A</sub>', Pr<sub>B</sub>, ~PV<sub>Zh</sub>: *ātmāsyā* (i.e., *ātmā* + *asyāḥ*) +De<sub>t</sub> (*blo 'di*, i.e., construed with *\*buddheḥ*), +M<sub>A</sub> (*asyā buddheḥ*): *ātmāsyā* +Pr,<sup>105</sup> +R<sub>t</sub>.<sup>106</sup> PV<sub>t</sub> contains a demonstrative *'di* that could represent *asyā* or *asyā*; lacuna PV<sub>H</sub>; R<sub>t</sub> is inconclusive.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>104</sup> As for omissions, I am in the following also adding information about the Tibetan translation Pr<sub>t</sub>, but readings from Pr<sub>t</sub> are omitted when it comes to variants, given that this PV translation is practically identical with PV<sub>t</sub>. Note that stanza numbers in this list refer to Tosaki's edition (PV<sub>4</sub>); the numbering in Pr<sub>2</sub> is slightly different, cf. above, n. 11.

<sup>105</sup> In the paraphrase in the commentary, Pr<sub>A</sub> reads *ātmāsyā*, cf. also *śes pa 'di* Pr<sub>t</sub> D 59b4 = P 69a8 (better: *'di*). Prajñākaragupta glosses the demonstrative pronoun with *jñānasya* (followed by Ravigupta) and can therefore be assumed to have known the stanza reading *ātmāsyā*. In Pr<sub>B</sub>, however, the commentary's paraphrase has a long vowel and could be read alternatively as *ātmā syāj jñānasya* or as *ātmāsyā jñānasya*, for the *akṣaras jñā* and *jñā* are homographs. Conceivably, the erroneous PV reading *ātmā syād* contained in Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub> may have occurred because a scribe had Prajñākaragupta's commentary in the Pr<sub>B</sub> version before him, but understandably did not read *ātmāsyā jñānasya*, rather *syāj jñānasya*.

<sup>106</sup> Like Pr, R<sub>t</sub> has *śes pa 'i* (*\*jñānasya*) in the paraphrase in the commentary and can therefore be assumed to have read *ātmāsyā*.

<sup>107</sup> The translation in R<sub>t</sub> has neither an equivalent for *syāt* nor one for a demonstrative pronoun.

5. PV 3.342b: *adr̥ṣṭāvāraṇān no cen* Pr<sub>A</sub>' , Pr<sub>B</sub>; PV<sub>t</sub> : *adr̥ṣṭāvāraṇāt syāc cen* +De<sub>t</sub>, +M<sub>A</sub>, PV<sub>Zh</sub>, R<sub>t</sub>,<sup>108</sup> +R<sub>t</sub>; lacuna PV<sub>H</sub>.
6. PV 3.347d: *ātmasaṃvidah* is given twice in succession in Pr<sub>B</sub> 199a2 and Pr<sub>A</sub>' 44,17f.: *tad evāha | ātmasaṃvidah | yata ātmasaṃvidah* (The first *daṇḍa* is absent in Pr<sub>A</sub>'). In Pr<sub>t</sub> D 61a2 = P 71a4, it occurs only once.
7. PV 3.349ab: missing in Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub>, supplied in the margin in Pr<sub>B</sub> with 349b as *yataḥ sā prathate tathā*, which is also found in M<sub>A</sub> and PV<sub>Zh</sub>; lacuna PV<sub>H</sub>;<sup>109</sup> present in Pr<sub>t</sub> D 61a4 = P 71a6.<sup>110</sup>
8. PV 3.349cd: the sequence of the two *pādas* is reversed in Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub>, but not in Pr<sub>t</sub> D 61a4 and a5 = P 71a6 and a8, whose sequence agrees with that in +De<sub>t</sub>, +M<sub>A</sub>, PV<sub>H</sub> 36a2f., PV<sub>t</sub>, PV<sub>Zh</sub> and R<sub>t</sub>.
9. PV 3.363d: *matam* Pr<sub>A</sub>' , Pr<sub>B</sub> : *tataḥ* +De<sub>t</sub>, +M<sub>A</sub>, PV<sub>H</sub> 36b3, PV<sub>t</sub>, PV<sub>Zh</sub>, R<sub>t</sub>, +R<sub>t</sub>; -Pr.
10. PV 3.366: missing in Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub>, and also in Pr<sub>t</sub> D 67b6 = P 79a4f.; not commented upon in Pr. It is therefore questionable whether Pr ever contained this stanza, or whether Prajñākaragupta knew it. Sāṅkṛtyāyana supplies it in Pr<sub>1</sub> and Pr<sub>2</sub> on the basis of PV<sub>H</sub> 36b4. This situation is described in a note in Sanskrit in the top margin of Pr<sub>A</sub>' , p. 52, and also found in Pr<sub>1</sub> and in Pr<sub>2</sub>, which in the editions appropriately concludes with *cintyam etat (vicāraṇīyam etat Pr<sub>A</sub>')*.
11. PV 3.434ab: *sarvātmanā hi sārūpye jñānam ajñānatām vrajet* Pr<sub>A</sub>' , Pr<sub>B</sub>, PV<sub>t</sub> : *na ca sarvātmanā sāmīyam ajñānatvaprasaṅgataḥ* +De<sub>t</sub>, +M<sub>A</sub>, PV<sub>Zh</sub>, R<sub>t</sub>, +R<sub>t</sub>,<sup>111</sup> lacuna PV<sub>H</sub>.

<sup>108</sup> R<sub>t</sub> *gal te mthoṅ bas bsgrībs pa na* lacks the negation in *adr̥ṣṭa-*. Still, as there is also no equivalent for Sanskrit *no*, and considering that the commentary does not construe a negation here, but has the correct *ma mthoṅ ba* for \**adr̥ṣṭa*, R<sub>t</sub> is closer to the reading *syāc cet*.

<sup>109</sup> The text *tathā hi sa prakāśate* for 349b in Pr<sub>1</sub> and Pr<sub>2</sub>, and *jñāne tadvad prakāśate* in PV<sub>1</sub> is not found in any Sanskrit source and must therefore be a reconstruction by Sāṅkṛtyāyana; the correct text *yataḥ sā prathate tathā* is also given in M<sub>1</sub>. Interestingly, in the top margin of p. 44 of Pr<sub>A</sub>' , there is a note in Sanskrit describing that 349a exists, whereas 349b is missing in the palm-leaf manuscript (*tāḍapustaka*). This can only refer to PV<sub>H</sub>.

<sup>110</sup> Note that Pr<sub>t</sub>, unlike the Sanskrit manuscripts of Pr, has PV 3.349 immediately after 348cd, and 349cd again a few lines later, where Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub> also have it.

<sup>111</sup> The pertinent passage in De<sub>t</sub> reads as follows: *bdaḡ ñīd kun ggyis {ggyis P : ggyi D } mtshuṅs pa mīn {mīn em. : yin DP; alternatively, emend to mtshuṅs ma yin} | śes pa ñīd mīn thal bar 'gyur ro |*. The emendation of a negation in the first sentence is based on the absence of a conditional construction along the lines of *sārūpye* in Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub> in the commentary. — 434a is directly followed by the question *ci'i phyir že na*, answered by 434b. For 434b, an ablative *-prasaṅgataḥ* can be assumed given this introductory



These variants will be discussed in greater detail in my critical edition of PV 3.301-366 that is currently being prepared. Still, the combined evidence as given in this list shows that the basic text contained within both Prajñākaragupta manuscripts goes back to a common source<sup>112</sup> that differs from the text represented in De<sub>t</sub>, M<sub>A</sub> and, with one possible exception,<sup>113</sup> also in PV<sub>Zh</sub>. The text was later corrected in Pr<sub>B</sub> on the basis of other sources, but this correction was incomplete or not entirely successful. The omission of stanzas and parts of stanzas deserves further consideration, in particular in cases such as PV 3.366 where Prajñākaragupta also does not comment on the stanza; this confirms that the versions of the PV that were available to different commentators were not entirely identical as far as the existence or absence of individual stanzas is concerned.<sup>114</sup> Within the group of our witnesses, it may furthermore be significant that some substantial variants are exclusively attested in commentaries that contain the entire basic text in stanzas (Pr, R), and that they cannot be found in commentaries that merely embed it (De, M). While this structural feature of the transmission of individual commentaries certainly did not cause the variants in question, this distribution of substantial variants confirms that the basic text contained in stanzas in commentaries is less stable and more prone to change than the text preserved in lemmata or paraphrases.

---

question and the presence of *thal*, a well-attested translation equivalent for *-prasaṅga*, which is not attested as an equivalent for derivations of the root *vraj*. In PV 3.531b (*grāhyam agrāhyatām vrajet*), the paraphrase De<sub>t</sub> D 266a6f. = P 316a8-b1 has *gzun med ñid du 'gyur ro*; the combination of the abstract noun in the accusative plus *vrajet* is translated as ... *ñid du 'gyur* also in PV<sub>t</sub> for st. 434, and in PV<sub>t</sub> (D 138b7 = P 238a6) and R<sub>t</sub> (D 172a5f. = P 206a1f.) for st. 531. — For 434c, all witnesses except M<sub>A</sub> (cf. below) support *sāmye kenacid aṃśena*. For 434d, Pr<sub>A</sub>' and Pr<sub>B</sub> read *syāt sarvaṃ sarvavedanam*. PV<sub>Zh</sub> differs slightly (*sarvaṃ sarvasya vedanam*). M<sub>A</sub> (M<sub>1</sub> 248,9-11) reads: ***na ca jadayor grāhyagrāhakabhāvaḥ kenacid aṃśena vastutvanīlatvādinā sarvaṃ jñānaṃ sarvasyārthasya saṃvedanaṃ syāt. sarvaṃ vā nīlajñānaṃ sarvasya nīlasya vedanaṃ syāt.*** This suggests *na ca kenacid aṃśena syāt sarvaṃ* (or the metrically equivalent *sarvaṃ syāt*) *sarvavedanam* as the presupposed 434cd. The Tibetan translation in R<sub>t</sub> and PV<sub>t</sub>, *thams cad thams cad kyiś myoñ 'gyur*, which is also embedded in De<sub>t</sub>, is inconclusive.

<sup>112</sup> Within PV 3.301-366, there also exists a comparably large number of variants between Pr<sub>A</sub> and Pr<sub>B</sub> for the PV stanzas, but these can all be explained as individual scribal errors.

<sup>113</sup> This is PV 3.340a, where the reading *ātmā syād* is, however, not expressly reported for PV<sub>Zh</sub> in PV<sub>1</sub>, but inferred from Sāṅkrtyāyana's silence. PV<sub>1</sub> reports no variation here at all, even though M<sub>A</sub> clearly presupposes *ātmāsyā(h)*.

<sup>114</sup> In PVS<sub>V</sub>, the combination of the PV stanzas with prose in the author's hand creates additional problems for the PV text: prose passages may be slightly rearranged to conform to the *anuṣṭubh* metre and then be elevated to stanzas; cf. p. XXXII in Gnoli's introduction to PVS<sub>V</sub><sub>2</sub> for two examples.

Finally, it is worth noting that the text of the canonical translation  $PV_t$  corresponds to that of the Prajñākaragupta manuscripts  $Pr_A$  and  $Pr_B$  in several instances, but not always – as does, in fact,  $R_t$ . The division of the extant witnesses into the two groups  $De_t/M_A$  and  $Pr_A'/Pr_B/PV_t$  (with  $PV_{Zhi}$  closer to the first and  $R_t$  closer to the second group) that the case-studies above suggested should therefore not be prematurely generalized. Further studies are needed to determine whether this clear-cut division is limited, for instance, to certain sections of the PV, or to particular kinds of variation.

The character and extent of variation that I have encountered thus far does not suggest that there existed “recensions” of the PV that greatly differed from each other. Apart from mechanical or psychological errors on the part of scribes that are limited to individual manuscripts, we encounter selective textual changes; whether these follow any regular patterns remains to be determined across larger sections of the PV. Not surprisingly, we are thus faced with a complex transmission situation where editorial decisions have to be made on a case-by-case basis.

#### APPENDIX I: LOCATION OF THE DISCUSSED MATERIAL IN THE MAIN WITNESSES

1. For the commentaries De and M that do not contain the basic text, the location information applies to the most directly relevant passages in their commentaries.
2.  $Pr_A'$  has no continuous pagination; see Appendix II for a concordance of the conventionally assigned page numbers used in this article with the first words on the respective page of the transcript.
3. When stanzas or verses are lacking in Pr, their expected location is indicated on the basis of  $Pr_t$  and the structure of the commentary.
4. In Ravigupta’s commentary  $R_t$ , stanzas are occasionally separated into smaller units. In such cases, the location for a stanza covers the beginning of *pāda* a until the end of *pāda* d, which may include interspersed commentary.
5. For  $PV_t$ , only locations for D and P are given, though in this case Co ne and sNar than were also collated. Miyasaka’s annotation to his edition of the Tibetan text in  $PV_4$  proved to contain so many erroneous variant reports that this edition was not used.

Stanza	Pr <sub>A</sub> '	Pr <sub>B</sub>	M <sub>A</sub>	De <sub>c</sub>	R <sub>c</sub>	PV <sub>i</sub>
305	1,28f.	173a6	41a5f.	D 216b2-6 = P 254a2-7	D 116b3 = P 140b5f.	D 130a4 = P 228b2f.
312	3,14f.	174b4f.	41b4f.	D 217b2-4 = P 255a4-7	D 118a1f. = P 142a8	D 130b1 = P 228b7f.
315	5,3f.	175b6	42a1	D 218a6-b3 = P 256a2-5	D 118b6f. = P 143a7-b1	D 130b2f. = P 229a1f.
317	om. ab (5,29); 5,32 (cd)	176a4 (ab, <i>in mar- gine</i> ), 176a6 (cd)	42a2	D 218b1-219a2 = P 256b6f.	D 119b2f. = P 144a5f.	D 130b3f. = P 229a3
325	8,17	177b3	42b3	D 220b6f. = P 258b2- 259a3	D 122a1f. = P 147a4	D 130b7-131a1 = P 229a8
327	9,26f.	178a6f.	42b4f.	D 221a2-5 = P 259a6-b1	D 122b5 = P 148a2f.	D 131a1f. = P 229b1f.
340	42,31f.	198a5	43b1	D 223b6f. = P 262b3f.	D 126b1f. = P 152a6f.	D 131b1f. = P 230a2f.
342	43,10 (ab), 43,14 (cd)	198b2 (ab), 198b3 (cd)	43b2	D 224af. = P 262b3- 263a4	D 126b7-127a2 = P 152b5-153a1	D 131b2f. = P 230a3f.
349	44,24 (cd)	199a4	43b6	D 225a6f. = P 264a1-b2	D 128b2-4 = P 154b4-6	D 131b6 = P 230a8-b1
363	51,2f.	202b1	44b2	D 227b6f. = P 267a1-b2	D 132a4f. = P 158b7	D 132a6f. = P 231a1f.
366	om. (51,19)	om. (202b5)	44b4	D 228a1-b2 = P 268a5f.	D 132b7 = P 159b4f.	D 132b1 = P 231a4
434	78,17f.	217b6	48b5	D 244b4f. = P 289b3f.	D 152a4 = P 182a1f.	D 135a2 = P 234a2

APPENDIX II:  
ASSIGNED PAGE NUMBERS OF THE TRANSCRIPT PR<sub>A</sub>'

Page no.	First words on the page	Pr <sub>1</sub>	Pr <sub>2</sub>
1	<i>tadrūpasākṣātkaraṇād</i>	1,4	341,13
3	<i>yad antya&lt;ṃ&gt; bhēdakam tasmāt = PV 3.311c</i>	5,5	344,28
5	<i>spara&lt;ṃ&gt; kriyāsādhanabhāvaḥ</i>	8,1	347,1
8	<i>na syāt   tato na tena bhavati</i>	11,23	350,29
9	<i>ātmā sa tasyānubhavaḥ = PV 3.326a</i>	13,2	352,2
42	<i>tataḥ samvādād aparāḥ samvāda iti</i>	67,29	391,13
43	<i>na hi vijñānavādo- (Pr<sub>2</sub>: na hi vijñānavāde)</i>	69,16	392,26
44	<i>ato bāhye py arthe</i>	70,22	393,26
51	<i>atrocitate, ll. 2-3 = PV 3.363 (tatra buddheḥ ... sādhanam matam)</i>	80,25	401,10
52	<i>nanu sākāram vijñānam</i>	82,15	402,18
85	<i>yady evam  </i>	130,17	440,8
86	<i>na cāsāv arthaḥ</i>	132,1	441,19
97	<i>samvedanena cintyeta bhedaḥ  </i>	148,16	455,7

## 1. Abbreviations

BKGA	<i>Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens</i>
D	<i>Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Sde dge edition, Bstan Hgyur, preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo. Tshad ma 1-21.</i> Ed. by J. Takasaki, Z. Yamaguchi and Y. Ejima. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kanko Kyokai Co., Ltd., for the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo, 1981-1984.
JBORS	<i>Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society</i>
P	<i>The Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Peking Edition.</i> Ed. by D.T. Suzuki. Tokyo – Kyoto 1955-1961.
st.	stanza(s)
VÖAW	Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
WSTB	<i>Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde</i>

## 2. Primary sources

K	Karṇakagomin's Pramānavārttikasvarttikā
K <sub>A</sub>	Sanskrit ms. of K (cf. above, p. 169).
K <sub>1</sub>	<i>Ācārya-Dharmakīrteḥ Pramānavārttikam (svārthānumānaparicchedaḥ) svopajñavṛtṭyā, Karṇakagomivivacitayā tattīyakā ca sahitam.</i> Ed. by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana. Ilāhābād: Kitāb Mahāl, 1943.
De	Devendrabuddhi's Pramānavārttikapañjikā

- De<sub>t</sub> *Tshad marnam 'grel gyidka' 'grel*, translated by Subhūtiśrī(śānti) and (rMa) dGe ba'i blo gros. D 4217 Che 1-326b4, P 5717b Che 1-390a8.
- NR *Ślokovārttika of Śrī Kumārila Bhaṭṭa with the Commentary Nyāyaratnākara of Śrī Pārthasārathi Miśra*. Ed. by Svami Dwari-kadas Sastri. [Prachyabharati Series 10]. Varanasi: Tara Publications, 1978.
- Pr  
Pr<sub>A</sub>  
Pr<sub>A</sub>'  
Pr<sub>B</sub>  
Pr<sub>t</sub> Prajñākaragupta's Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkārabhāṣya  
Incomplete Sa skya ms. of Pr (cf. above, p. 166).  
Modern transcript of Pr<sub>A</sub> (cf. above, p. 167 and 168).  
Complete Sa skya Sanskrit ms. of Pr (cf. above, p. 169).  
*Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi rgyan*, translated by \*Bhavyarāja (sKal ldan rgyal po) and (rÑog) Blo ldan śes rab, revised by Kumāraśrī and 'Phags pa ſen (= śes rab) or by Sumati(kīrti) and (rÑog) Blo ldan śes rab. D 4221 Te 1-The 282a7, P 5719 Te 1-The 344a6.
- Pr<sub>1</sub> *Dharmakīrtiḥ pramāṇavārttikasya bhāṣyaṃ vārtikālaṅkārah prajñākaraguptasya*. Ed. by Rāhula Sāṅkrīyāyana. Appendix to *JBORS* 21 (1935) 1-158.
- Pr<sub>2</sub> *Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣyam or Vārtikālaṅkārah of Prajñākaragup-ta (Being a Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttikam)*. Ed. by Rāhula Sāṅkrīyāyana. [Tibetan Sanskrit Work Series 1]. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1953.
- PV  
PV<sub>H</sub>  
PV<sub>Zh</sub>  
PV<sub>t</sub> Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika  
Ms. of PV kept by Hemrāj Śarmā (cf. above, p. 167).  
Zha lu ri phug ms. of PV (cf. above, p. 170).  
*Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi tshig le'ur byas pa*, translated by Subhū-tiśrīśānti and (rMa) dGe ba'i blo gros, revised by \*Bhavyarāja (sKal ldan rgyal po) and (rÑog) Blo ldan śes rab, retranslated or revised by Śākyaśrībhadra and Sa skya paṇḍita (cf. above, p. 177). D 4210 Ce 94b1-151a7, P 5709 Ce 190a4-250b6.
- PV<sub>1</sub> *Pramāṇavārttikam by Ācārya Dharmakīrti*. Ed. by Rāhula Sāṅkrīyāyana. Appendix to *JBORS* 24 (1938).
- PV<sub>2</sub> *Pramāṇavārttika of Ācārya Dharmakīrti with the Commentary 'Vritti' of Acharya Manorathanandin*. Ed. by Swami Dwarika-das Shastri. [Bauddha Bharati Series 3]. Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati, 1968.
- PV<sub>3</sub> Pramāṇavārttika-Kārikā (Sanskrit and Tibetan). Ed. by Yū-sho Miyasaka. *Acta Indologica* 2 (1971-1972) 1-206.
- PV<sub>4</sub> Hiromasa Tosaki, *Bukkyō-ninshikiron no kenkyū* ("Studies in Buddhist epistemology"). 2 vols. Tōkyō: Daitōshuppansha, 1979-1985.

- PV<sub>5</sub> *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Ācārya Dharmakīrti with the Commentaries Svopajñāvṛtti of the Author and Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti of Manorathanandin.* Ed. by Ram Chandra Pandeya. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.
- PVSV Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti
- PVSV<sub>A</sub> Incomplete ms. of PVSV (cf. above, p. 169).
- PVSV<sub>1</sub> *Svārthānumāna-parichchheda by Dharmakīrti.* Ed. by Dalsukhbhai Malvania. [Hindu Vishavavidyalaya Nepal Rajya Sanskrit Series 2]. Varanasi: Hindu Vishavavidyalaya Skt. Publ. Board, 1959.
- PVSV<sub>2</sub> *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti. The First Chapter with the Autocommentary.* Ed. by Raniero Gnoli. [Serie Orientale Roma 23]. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1960.
- PVin Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya
- PVin<sub>A</sub>, PVin<sub>B</sub>, PVin<sub>C</sub> Sanskrit manuscripts of Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya used in PVin 1; cf. *ibid.*, p. xvi-xxiii.
- PVin<sub>t</sub> Tilmann Vetter, *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ*. 1. Kapitel: *Pratyakṣam. Einleitung, Text der tibetischen Übersetzung, Sanskritfragmente, deutsche Übersetzung.* [Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 3]. Wien: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1966.
- PVin 1 *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya.* Chapters 1 and 2. Ed. by Ernst Steinkellner. [Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 2]. Beijing – Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House – Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2007. For Corrigenda, cf. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 51 (2007-2008) 207-208, as well as [http://ikga.oeaw.ac.at/Mat/steinkellner07\\_corrigena.pdf](http://ikga.oeaw.ac.at/Mat/steinkellner07_corrigena.pdf) (last visited 14 January 2009).
- PST 1 Jinendrabuddhi's Pramāṇasamuccayaṭikā, *pratyakṣa* chapter. See Steinkellner et al. 2005.
- M Manorathanandin's Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti
- M<sub>A</sub> Sanskrit ms. of M (cf. above, p. 170).
- M<sub>1</sub> *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika with a Commentary by Manorathanandin.* Ed. by Rāhula Sāṅkrītyāyana. Appendix to *JBORS* 24-26 (1938-1940).
- R Ravigupta's Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti
- R<sub>t</sub> *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi 'grel pa las le'u gsum pa.* D 4225, Phe 1-174a7; P 5722, Phe 1-208a7. Translators unknown.
- ŚVK *The Mīmāṃsāślokaivārttika with the Commentary Kāśikā of Su-caritamiśra.* Ed. by K. Sāmbhaśiva Śāstrī. Pt. II. [Trivandrum

*Sanskrit Series 99, Śrī Setu Lakṣmī Prasādamālā*]. Trivandrum 1939.

ŚVV

*Ślokarvārtikavyākhyā (Tātparyaṭīkā) of Bhaṭṭombeka*. Ed. by S. K. Ramanatha Sastri. [*Madras University Sanskrit Series 13*]. Madras: University of Madras, 1940.

### 3. Secondary sources

Alsdorf 1951

Ludwig Alsdorf, Neues von alten Jaina-Bibliotheken. In: *Beiträge zur indischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*. Walter Schubring zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von der deutschen Indologie. [*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 7*]. Hamburg: De Gruyter, 1951, p. 59-65.

Bandurski 1994

Frank Bandurski, Übersicht über die Göttinger Sammlungen der von Rāhula Śāṅkrtyāyana in Tibet aufgefundenen buddhistischen Sanskrit-Texte (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften III). In: *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*. Ed. by Heinz Bechert. [*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, Beiheft 5]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994, p. 9-126.

Bandyopadhyay 1979

Nandita Bandyopadhyay, The Buddhist Theory of Relation between *pramā* and *pramāṇa*. *Journal of Indian Philosophy 7* (1979) 43-78.

Dimitrov 2002

Dragomir Dimitrov, Tables of the Old Bengali Script (on the Basis of a Nepalese Manuscript of Daṇḍin's Kāvya-darśa). In: *Śikhisamuccayaḥ. Indian and Tibetan Studies (Collectanea Marpurgensia Indologica et Tibetologica)*. Ed. by Dragomir Dimitrov, Ulrike Roesler and Roland Steiner. [*WSTB 53*]. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2002, p. 28-78.

Franco 1997

Eli Franco, The Tibetan Translation of the Pramāṇavārttika and the Development of Translation Methods from Sanskrit to Tibetan. In: *Tibetan Studies*. Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995. Volume 1. Ed. by Helmut Krasser, Michael Torsten Much, Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher. [*BKGA 21*]. Wien: VÖAW, 1997, p. 277-288.

Frauwallner 1954

Erich Frauwallner, Die Reihenfolge und Entstehung der Werke Dharmakīrti's. In: *Asiatica (Festschrift Friedrich Weller)*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1954, p. 142-154.

Frauwallner 1957

Id., Review of: Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣyam or Vārttikālaṅkāraḥ of Prajñākaragupta (Being a Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika). Deciphered and edited by Tripiṭakācharya Rāhula Śāṅkrtyāyana, Patna 1953. *Journal of the American Oriental Society 77* (1957) 58-60.

Herrmann-Pfandt 2008

Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, *Die lHan kar ma*. Ein früherer Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte. Kri-

- tische Neuausgabe mit Einleitung und Materialien. [BKGa 59]. Wien: VÖAW, 2008.
- Ihara 1998 *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Karṇakagomin's Pramāṇavārttika(sva) vṛttiṭīkā*. Facsimile Edition. Ed. by Shōren Ihara. [The Sanskrit Commentaries on the Pramāṇavārttikam from the Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana's collection of Negatives 2]. Patna – Narita: Bihar Research Society – Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1998.
- Jackson 1987 David Jackson, *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III)*. Sa-skya paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate. Vol. I. [WSTB 17,1]. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1987.
- Jackson 1989 Id., *The 'Miscellaneous Series' of Tibetan Texts in the Bihar Research Society, Patna*. A Handlist. [Tibetan and Indo-Tibetan Studies 2]. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1989.
- Jackson 1990 Id., *Two Biographies of Śākyasrībhadrā: The Eulogy by Khrophu Lo-tsa-ba and its "Commentary" by bSod-nams-dpal-bzang-po*. Texts and Variants from Two Rare Exemplars Preserved in the Bihar Research Society, Patna. [Tibetan and Indo-Tibetan Studies 4]. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1990.
- JMK Rāhul Sāṅkṛtyāyan, *Jinā maim kṛtajña*. Ilāhābād: Kitāb Mahāl, 1957.
- Kellner 2004 Birgit Kellner, First Logic, Then the Buddha? Remarks on the Chapter Sequence of Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika. *Hōrin* 11 (2004) 147-167.
- Kellner 2007 Id., *Jñānaśrīmitra's Anupalabdhirahasya and Sarvaśabdābhāvacarā: A Critical Edition with a Survey of his Anupalabdhi-Theory*. [WSTB 67]. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2007.
- Kellner – Sferra 2008 Id. – Francesco Sferra, A Palm-leaf Manuscript of Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika from the Collection kept by the Nepalese rājaguru Hemarāja Śarman. In: *Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection*. Part I. Ed. by Francesco Sferra. [Manuscripta Buddhica 1]. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2008, p. 229-248.
- Krasser 2002 Helmut Krasser, *Śaṅkaranandanas Īśvarāpākaraṇasaṅkṣepa*. Mit einem anonymen Kommentar und weiteren Materialien zur buddhistischen Gottespolemik. Teil 1: *Texte*. Teil 2: *Annotierte Übersetzungen und Studie zur Auseinandersetzung über die Existenz Gottes*. [BKGa 39]. Wien: VÖAW, 2002.
- Krasser 2003 Id., On the Ascertainment of Validity in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 31 (2003) 161-184.
- Kyuma 2005 Taiken Kyuma, *Sein und Wirklichkeit in der Augenblicklichkeitslehre Jñānaśrīmitras. Kṣaṇabhaṅgādhyāya 1: Pakṣadhar-*



- matādhikāra. Sanskrittext und Übersetzung. [WSTB 62].* Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2005.
- Lasic 2000a Horst Lasic, *Jñānaśrīmitras Vyāpticarcā*. Sanskrittext, Übersetzung, Analyse. [WSTB 48]. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2000.
- Lasic 2000b Id., *Ratnakīrtis Vyāptinirṇaya*. Sanskrittext, Übersetzung, Analyse. [WSTB 49]. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2000.
- Maas 2006 Philipp André Maas, *Samādhīpāda*. Das erste Kapitel des Pātañjalayogaśāstra zum ersten Mal kritisch ediert. [Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis, Geisteskultur Indiens: Texte und Studien 9]. Aachen: Shaker, 2006.
- MacDonald 2007 Anne MacDonald, Revisiting the Mūlamadhyamakārikā: Text-Critical Proposals and Problems. *Indotetsugaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 14 (2007) 25-55.
- Mejor 1991 Marek Mejor, On the Date of the Tibetan Translations of the Pramāṇasamuccaya and the Pramāṇavārttika. In: *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition*. Ed. by Ernst Steinkellner. [BKG 8]. Wien: VÖAW, 1991, p. 175-197.
- MJY 2 Rāhul Sāṃkṛtyāyan, *Merī jīvan yātrā*. Vol. 2. Īlāhabād: Kitāb Mahāl, 1950.
- Moriyama 2006 Shinya Moriyama, *Omniscience and Religious Authority. Prajñākaragupta's Commentary on Pramāṇavārttika II 8-10 and 29-33*. Part I: Introduction and Critical Edition. Part II: Annotated Translation. Wien: PhD dissertation, 2006.
- Much 1988 Michael Torsten Much, *A Visit to Rāhula Sāṃkṛtyāyana's Collection of Negatives at the Bihar Research Society: Texts from the Buddhist Epistemological School*. [WSTB 18]. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1988.
- Much 1991 Id., *Dharmakīrtis Vādanyāya*. Teil I: Sanskrit-Text. Teil II: Übersetzung und Anmerkungen. [Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 25]. Wien: VÖAW, 1991.
- Ono 1997 Motoi Ono, A Reconsideration of the Controversy about the Order of the Chapters of the Pramāṇavārttika – the Argument by Indian Commentators of Dharmakīrti. In: *Tibetan Studies*. Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995. Volume 1. Ed. by Helmut Krasser, Michael Torsten Much, Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher. [BKG 21]. Wien: VÖAW, 1997, p. 701-716.
- Ono 1999 Id., Dharmakīrti on Asādhāraṇānaikāntika. In: *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy*. Proceedings of the Dharmakīrti Conference Hiroshima, Novem-

- ber 4-6, 1997. Ed. by Shōryū Katsura. [BKG 32]. Wien: VÖAW, 1999, p. 301-315.
- Ono 2000 Id., *Prajñākaraguptas Erklärung der Definition gültiger Erkenntnis. Pramāṇavārttikālakṣāra zu Pramāṇavārttika II 1-7*. [BKG 34]. Wien: VÖAW, 2000.
- Sāṅkṛityāyana 1935 Rāhula Sāṅkṛityāyana, Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet. *JBORS* 21,1 (1935) 21-43.
- Sāṅkṛityāyana 1937 Id., Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet. *JBORS* 23,1 (1937) 1-57.
- Sāṅkṛityāyana 1938 Id., Search for Sanskrit Mss. in Tibet. *JBORS* 24,4 (1938) 137-162.
- Sferra 2000 Francesco Sferra, Sanskrit Manuscripts and Photos of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Giuseppe Tucci's Collection. A Preliminary Report. In: *On the Understanding of Other Cultures. Proceedings of the International Conference on Sanskrit and Related Studies to Commemorate the Centenary of the Birth of Stanislaw Schayer (1899-1941)*. Warsaw University, Poland, October 7-10, 1999. Ed. by Piotr Balcerowicz and Marek Mejer. [*Studia Indologiczne* 7]. Warsaw: Oriental Institute Warsaw University 2000, p. 397-447.
- Stearns 1996 Cyrus Stearns, The Life and Tibetan Legacy of the Indian Mahāpaṇḍita Vibhūticandra. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19,1 (1996) 127-171.
- Steiner 1996 Roland Steiner, Die Lehre der Anuṣṭubh bei den indischen Metrikern. In: *Suhrllekhāḥ*. Festgabe für Helmut Eimer. Ed. by Michael Hahn et al. [*Indica et Tibetica* 28]. Swisttal-Odenrod: Indica et Tibetica, 1996, p. 227-248.
- Steinkellner 1988 Ernst Steinkellner, Methodological Remarks on the Constitution of Sanskrit Texts from the Buddhist *pramāṇa*-Tradition. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 32 (1988) 103-129.
- Steinkellner 2004 Id., *A Tale of Leaves*. On Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibet, their Past and their Future. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2004.
- Steinkellner et al. 2005 Id. – Helmut Krasser – Horst Lasic, *Jinendrabuddhi's Viśātāmalavāṭī Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā, Chapter 1*. Part I: *Critical Edition*, Part II: *Diplomatic Edition*. [*Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region* 1]. Beijing – Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House – Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2005.
- Steinkellner – Much 1995 Id. – Michael Torsten Much, *Systematischer Überblick über die Literatur der erkenntnistheoretisch-logischen Schule des Buddhismus*. [*Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur* 2]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1995.
- Trier 1972 Jesper Trier, *Ancient Paper of Nepal*. Results of Ethno-Technological Field-work on its Manufacture, Uses and History – with Technical Analyses of Bast, Paper and Manuscripts.

- [*Jutland Archaeological Society Publications* 10]. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1972.
- Tubb – Boose 2007 Gary A. Tubb – Emery R. Boose, *Scholastic Sanskrit*. A Manual for Students. New York: The American Institute of Buddhist Studies at Columbia University in the City of New York, 2007.
- van der Kuijp 1989 Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, *An Introduction to gTsañ nag pa's Tshad-ma rnam-par ñes-pa'i ñi-ka legs-bshad bsduṣ pa*. An Ancient Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavinīśaya. [*Otani University Tibetan Works Series*]. Kyōto: Rinsen, 1989.
- van der Kuijp 1994 Id., On Some Early Tibetan Pramāṇavāda Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing. *Journal of Buddhist and Tibetan Studies* 1 (1994) 1-30.
- Vetter 1964 Tilmann Vetter, *Erkenntnisprobleme bei Dharmakīrti*. [*Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens* 1]. Wien: VÖAW, 1964.
- Watanabe 1998a *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Prajñākaragupta's Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣyam*. Facsimile Edition. Ed. by Shigeaki Watanabe. [*The Sanskrit Commentaries on the Pramāṇavārttikam from the Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana's Collection of Negatives* 2]. Patna – Narita: Bihar Research Society – Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1998.
- Watanabe 1998b *A Sanskrit Manuscript of Manorathanandin's Pramāṇavārttikavṛttiḥ*. Facsimile Edition. Ed. by Shigeaki Watanabe. [*The Sanskrit Commentaries on the Pramāṇavārttikam from the Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana's Collection of Negatives* 3]. Patna – Narita: Bihar Research Society – Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1998.
- West 1973 Martin L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*. Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973.
- Wezler 1983 Albrecht Wezler, Philological Observations on the so-called Pātañjalayogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa (Studies in the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa I). *Indo-Iranian Journal* 25 (1983) 17-40.

