

## NEW SANSKRIT-FRAGMENTS OF PRAMĀNAVINIŚCAYAH, FIRST CHAPTER

By Ernst Steinkellner, Vienna

TILMANN VETTER has published in 1966 an edition of the Tibetan translation together with the known Sanskrit-fragments and a German translation of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścayah*, its first chapter on *pratyaksam*<sup>1</sup>. Only two years later the long and somewhat mysteriously delayed edition of Bhāsarvajīna's *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam* has been welcomed<sup>2</sup>.

We have known for a long time of the great importance of Bhāsarvajīna's own commentary for the history of the older Nyāya from his short *Nyāyasāraḥ*, from several later commentaries already published<sup>3</sup>, from numerous references to and quotations from the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam* in later Jinistic, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Vedāntic philosophical texts and above all from a considerable number of quotations in polemical passages of Jñānaśrīmitra's and Ratnakīrti's works<sup>4</sup>. But the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam* deserves interest not only for the philosophical qualities of its author and the very personal and to some extent "heterodox" character of his Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika<sup>5</sup>, it is also an inestimable mine of

<sup>1</sup> TILMANN VETTER, Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścayah*, 1. Kapitel: Pratyaksam; Einleitung, Text der tibetischen Übersetzung, Sanskrit-fragmente, deutsche Übersetzung. Öst. Ak. Phil.-hist. Kl. 250/3, Wien 1966 (abbreviated PVin I).

I have used the abbreviations of VETTER's edition. Tib. refers to the Tibetan translation.

<sup>2</sup> Śrimadācārya-Bhāsarvajīna-praṇītasya Nyāyasārasya svopajñam vyākhyānam Nyāyabhūṣaṇam. SVĀMĪ YOGINDRĀNANDAḥ ... samp., Śaḍdarśanaprakāśanagranthamālā 1, Vārāṇasi 1968 (abbreviated NBhūṣ).

<sup>3</sup> Vāsudeva's Nyāyasārapadapañcikā (ed. by V. ABHYANKAR and C. R. DEVADHAR, Poona 1922), Aparārkadeva's Nyāyamuktāvalī, Ānandā-nubhavācārya's Nyāyakalānidhiḥ (ed. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI and V. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, Madras 1961 = Madras Gov. Or. Ser. 167).

<sup>4</sup> Ed. by A. THAKUR, Patna 1959, 1957 = Tib. Skt. Works Ser. 5, 3.

<sup>5</sup> Due to the fragmentary tradition we still do not know very much about the real width and possibilities of early Nyāya-thought. For practical

information for the earlier Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika as well as for rival philosophical schools<sup>6</sup>. Future research will certainly profit a great deal by taking notice of the numerous and sometimes extensive quotations from a respectable host of sources, only a part of which has been preserved. The following materials are only a limited example of the historical value of this text.

Within the Buddhist tradition of epistemology and logic Bhāsarvajña's main polemical targets are the theories of Dharmakīrti and Prajñākaragupta. He knows both philosophers especially well—he seems to have used even some other commentaries on Dharmakīrti's works too—and throughout his work he refers to their teachings whenever possible. Amongst the works of Dharmakīrti Bhāsarvajña quotes copiously from the Pramāṇavārttikam and the Vādanyāyāḥ, a fact which has already been noted by the editor. A few sentences from the Hetubinduḥ may not necessarily have been taken directly as they do not go beyond some widely known statements. What has not been seen by the editor is that quite a few of the verses he traces back to the Pramāṇavārttikam have not been quoted from that work but from the Pramāṇaviniścayāḥ. This can easily be shown in most cases as Bhāsarvajña makes extensive use of the PVin quoting its verses as well as prose-passages. It will be seen from the following collection of fragments that the extent of the quotations surpasses any reasonable expectation and thereby contributes enormously to improving the textual tradition of the PVin. I shall, however, restrict myself to the quotations from the first chapter, as they form a valuable supplement to VETTER's edition<sup>7</sup>.

I refrain from taking up into this collection a quantitatively ever increasing group of quotations in various philosophical texts that have not been mentioned in VETTER's edition because—as far as I can see—they do not bring any new Sanskrit text or variants. The fragments are given in their sequence within the PVin. Any wording that not only deviates from the Tibetan translation but must be considered as a product of Bhāsarvajña's intervention is not printed in italics. Bhāsarvajña usually quotes literally but sometimes he is inclined to make small changes or even free transformations without, however, shifting the sense. Omissions are marked by dots.

---

purposes we may, however, call those teachings „orthodox“ which are in line with the extant commentaries.

<sup>6</sup> SVĀMĪ YOGINDRĀNANDA has given a first compilation of the sources referred to by Bhāsarvajña in his introduction pp. 7—20.

<sup>7</sup> There are also quotations from the second chapter, which will be incorporated into an edition under preparation. There may be some from the third chapter too, but I have not yet traced any.

PVin I 32, 1—13 = NBhūś 381, 8—13:

*dvividha evārthah prat�akṣah parokṣaś ca. tatra yo jñānapratibhāsam anvayavyatirekāv ātmāno 'nukārayati, sa prat�akṣah. tad asādhāraṇam vasturūpaṁ svalakṣaṇam. anyas tu . . .<sup>8</sup> sākṣāt svabhāvopadhānasām-arthyarahito 'yuktapratipattir eva. na cānyadarśane 'nyakalpanā yuktā, atiprasaṅgāt. tasya nāntariyakatayā syāt. sa hi pratibaddhasvabhāvo yathāvidhasiddhas tathāvidhasannidhānam sūcayati. sāmānyena ca svā-sambandhino 'rthasya pratipattir anumānam iti dva eva pramāṇe, anyathā pratipattyayogāt.*

PVin I 40, 2—5 = NBhūś 177, 4; 178, 3f.:

*pratyakṣam kalpanāpoḍham abhrāntam (v. 4ab|) timirāśubhramaṇanāuyānaṣaṅkṣobhādyanāhitavibhramam avikalpakam jñānam prat�akṣam.*

PVin I 40, 6—8 = NBhūś 176, 19f.:

*abhilāpiṇī | pratitih kalpanā (v. 4|bc|) abhilāpasamsargayogyapratibhāsā pratitih kalpanā.*

PVin I 40, 10—18 = NBhūś 178, 19—179, 1:

*arthaśaya sāmarthyena samudbhavāt || (v. 4|cd)*  
*. . .<sup>9</sup> arthaśāmarthyenotpadyamānaṁ tadrūpam evānukuryāt. na hy arthe śabdāḥ santi tadātmano vā, yena tasmin pratibhāsamāne . . .<sup>10</sup> pratibhāseran. na cāyam arthaśāmsparśī<sup>11</sup> saṃvedanadharmaḥ<sup>12</sup>, artheṣu tanniyojanāt, tato 'rthānām apratitiprasāṅgāt. tasmād ayam upaniyatya vijñānam janayan . . .<sup>13</sup>.*

PVin I 40, 20—42, 30 = NBhūś 179, 2—17

*nāpi tadbalenodiyamānaṁ vijñānam arthāntaram anusartum yuktaṁ<sup>14</sup>, rasādiijñānavat. sato 'pi tadātmana indriyāntarajñānotpattāv asāmarthyād atiprasaṅgāc ca<sup>15</sup> vikalpakam tu manovijñānam. artha<sup>15</sup>sannidhānāna-peṣaṇam vikalpavāsanothāpitam aniyatendriyārthagrāhi kutaścid anubhava-sambandhāt saha prthag vā grhṇiyāt. api ca*

*arthopayoge 'pi 'punah smārtam śabdānuyojanam |  
aksadhir yady apekṣeta so 'rtho vyavahito bhavet || (v. 5)*

<sup>8</sup> buddhau NVTT, Tib.

<sup>9</sup> tad dhy SVT.

<sup>10</sup> te 'pi SVT.

<sup>11</sup> -sparśā- NBhūś.

<sup>12</sup> -dharma NBhūś.

<sup>13</sup> Bhāsarvajña concludes the sentence in his own words.

<sup>14</sup> Tib. rjes su cbraṇ ba ma yin te.

<sup>15</sup> Tib. don gyi nus pa would be \*arthabala-.

*na hi sañketakālabhāvinam abhilāpasāmānyam asmaratas tadyojanā sambhavati, śabdāntaravat. na cārthābhīpātakrte 'saty āntare vikāre śabdaviśeṣe smṛtir yuktā, tasyātatkṛtavē tannāmā<sup>16</sup> grahaṇaprasaṅgāt. tat smṛtyā vyavadhānān nārthopayogo 'nantaravvāpāraphalaḥ syāt. tataś ca yaḥ prāg ajanako buddher upayogāviśeṣataḥ |  
sa paścād api  
syāt. ātmābhedenā sāmarthyāviśeṣān naikasyaikatra kriyākriye sambhavataḥ.  
tena syād arthāpāye 'pi netradhiḥ || (v. 6)  
arthasya sākṣād buddhāv anupayogāt smṛtiprabddhe copayuktatvān nāsyānupakāriṇo buddhir bhāvam apekṣeta. arthābhīpātakṛte ca buddhi-janmany abhilāpasmṛtyantarābhāvāt.*

PVin I 44, 2—46, 20 = NBhūś 179, 19—180, 14:

*viśeṣaṇām viśeṣyām ca sambandham laukikim sthitim |  
gṛhītvā saṅkalayyaitat tathā pratyeti nānyathā || (v. 7)  
kiṃcit kenacid viśiṣṭām gṛhyamāṇām viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyatatsambandhalokavyavasthāpratitau tatsaṅkalanena gṛhyate dandyā<sup>17</sup>divat. nānyathā, arthaśambandhābhidhānavavasthāparijñānē 'bhāvāt. jātiguṇakriyāvatām etan na sambhavaty eva, rūpavivekasambandhayor apratibhāsanena ghaṭanāyogāt, kṣirodakavad atadvedini. yatrāpi vivekapratipattir asti, tasyāpi grahaṇam.  
saṅketasmaraṇopāyam dṛṣṭasaṅkalanātmakam |  
pūrvāparaparāmarśāśūnye tac cākṣuse katham || (v. 8)  
na hīdam iyato vyāpārāt kartum samarthat, samnihitaviśaya<sup>18</sup>bale-notpanne 'vicārakatvāt, vicārakatve cendriyamanojñānayor abhedaprasaṅgāt. abhede cātānāgatavastuprabhedagrahanāgrahaṇohānūhārthabhāvāpeksānapekeśādiprashaṅgaḥ. manovijñānābhisaṃskṛtam indriyajñānam pratyetiti cet, na, yathoktāgrāhiṇas tathāpravṛttī<sup>19</sup>ayogāt, aviśaye 'pravṛtteḥ, jātyādisambandhātitaśabdavyavahārādinām indriyajñānā<sup>20</sup>. viśayatvāt. tasmān nendriyajñānam arthaśamyojanām kalpanām āviśati.  
vikalpotthāpitā sā ca ni<sup>21</sup>varteteccchayā matiḥ. |  
nārthasamnīdhim ikṣeta. (v. 9a—c)  
api ceyam viśeṣaṇādivikalpotthāpitā sati pravṛttāpi samagrasāmagri kasya punar<sup>22</sup> icchayā nivarteta tadanyavikalpavat. śakyante hi kalpanāḥ*

<sup>16</sup> -nāma- NBhūś.

<sup>17</sup> dandyā- NBhūś.

<sup>18</sup> The variant of the pratika *yul ūe bači* (Dh 65b6) thus is to be preferred to Tib. *yul gyi don ūe bači*.

<sup>19</sup> Tib. *rtogs pa* wrongly translates -pratipatti-.

<sup>20</sup> -jñāna- NBhūś.

<sup>21</sup> na NBhūś.

<sup>22</sup> kasya punar has no equivalent in Tib.

*pratisaṅkhyānena<sup>23</sup> nivārayitum, nendriyabuddhayah. sāmagrīsākalye vinivartya gobuddhim aśvam api kalpayato godarśanāt. nāpiyam artha-saṃnidhim iks̄eta, na hi gavādīvikalpo 'rthasaṃnidhāv eva bhavati.*

PVin I 60, 1—4: The definition of the *mānasam* *pratyakṣam* is freely rendered in NBhūś 101, 6f.:

*svavisayānantaravisiyayasahakārinendriyajñānena . . . janitam jñānam mānasam . . . pratyakṣam.*

PVin I 62, 7—10 = NBhūś 101, 7—102, 3:

*sukhādinām svasaṃvedanam || (v. 19d)  
. . . sukhādigrahaṇam spaṣṭasaṃvedanapradarśanārtham. sarvajñānānām api svasaṃvedanam.*

PVin I 72, 26—74, 4 = NBhūś 171, 12—16:

*bhāvanābalataḥ<sup>24</sup> spaṣṭam bhayādāv iva bhāsate |  
yaj jñānam avisamvādī tat pramāṇam<sup>25</sup> akalpakam || (v. 28)  
yoginām api praśrutamayena jñānenārthān gr̄hitvā yukticintāmayena vyavasthāpya bhāvayatām tanniṣpattau yat spaṣṭāvabhāsi jñānam tat pratyakṣam. tac cāvisamvāditvāt pramāṇam, spaṣṭābhātvād avikalpakam, bhayādāv iva<sup>26</sup>.*

PVin I 74, 24f. (v. 32a b) = NBhūś 178, 6<sup>27</sup>.

PVin I 76, 26—78, 9 = NBhūś 177, 5f.; 8—11; 12; 13:

*naiva dvicandrādibhrāntir indriyajā ity eke. tan na, indriya<sup>28</sup> bhāvābhāvā-nurodhasya tattvaprayojakatvāt<sup>29</sup> tasyehāpi tulyatvāt; indriyavikāre ca vikārāt, tannibandhanatvāc cāśrayasthiteḥ; sarpādibhrāntivan manobhrānter aksavikṛtāv api nivṛtti-prasaṅgāt, tathākṣavikāranivṛttāv apy*

<sup>23</sup> so sor brtags pas Tib. and NVV: *prasaṅkhyānena* NBhūś.

<sup>24</sup> -valata- NBhūś.

<sup>25</sup> Tib. *mñon sum* would be \**pratyakṣam*, but the explanatory prose would suggest *pramāṇam* too. Moreover the attribute *akalpakam* would make sense with *pramāṇam* but be tautological with *pratyakṣam*.

<sup>26</sup> The Tibetan translation differs from *yat spaṣṭāvabhāsi* in construction, although not in content. I cannot decide whether Bhāsarvajña's or the translation's construction should be preferred. The more lucid unfolding of the thought in Bhāsarvajña's version may be a reason for considering it as being closer to the original.

<sup>27</sup> The verse has been quoted from PVin, for Bhāsarvajña continues with the words *tathānyatrāpy uktam* and then starts quoting from the *Pramāṇavārttikam*.

<sup>28</sup> *indriya-* may be preferred to Tib. *dbaṇ po las byun ba la*.

<sup>29</sup> Tib. has a paraphrased translation.

*anivṛttiprasaṅgāt. tasmād indriyajam apy etad bhrānter<sup>30</sup> apratyakṣam. ata eva . . . vikalpavargāt pṛthak<sup>31</sup> timiropalakṣitam viplavam pratyakṣābhāsam āha.*

PVin I 78, 16—80, 17 = NBhūś 46, 15—47, 12:

*arthena ghaṭayaty enām na hi muktvārthaṇīpatām |  
tasmāt prameyādhigatēḥ pramāṇam meyarūpatā || (v. 34)*

*na hi kriyāyāḥ sādhanam ity eva sarvam̄ sarvasyāḥ sādhanam, kin tu yā  
yataḥ prasiddhim upayāti. tatrānubhavamātreṇa saḍrśātmano jñānasya  
sarvatra karmaṇi tenātmanā bhavitavyam, yenāsyedam iti pratikarma  
vibhajyate. anātmabhūtaś cāsyendriyārthaṇīkāraṇatvāt<sup>32</sup>. hetusu vidya-  
māno 'pi bhedo bhinne karmaṇy abhinnātmano na<sup>33</sup> bhedena niyāmakāḥ,  
kriyānibandhatvāt karaṇatvasya, tadavišeṣe tasyā api viśeṣāsiddheḥ<sup>34</sup>  
sato 'pi vā viśeṣasya<sup>35</sup> tadānāgatayākāraṇatvāt<sup>36</sup>. tasmād yato 'syātma-  
bhedād asyeyam adhigatir ity ayam asyāḥ karmaṇi niyamah, tat sādhanam.  
na ceyam arthaghaṭanā arthaṇīrūpyād anyato jñānasya sambhavati. na hi  
paṭumandatādibhiḥ<sup>37</sup> svabhedair bhedakam apindriyādy arthenaitad<sup>38</sup>  
ghaṭayati, tatra pratyāsattinibandhanābhāvāt. asty anubhavavavišeṣo 'rtha-  
kṛto yata iyam pratītir na sārūpyād<sup>39</sup> iti cet, atha kim idānīm sato 'pi  
rūpam na nirdiṣyate. nedam idantayā śakyam vyapadeśum. anirūpi-  
tenāyam ātmanā bhāvān vyavasthāpayatidam asyedam neti suvyavasthitā  
bhāvāḥ<sup>40</sup>.*

*tasmāt prameyādhigatēḥ sādhanam̄ meyarūpatā | (v. 35 a b)*

PVin I 80, 18—27 (vv. 35 cd—37) = NBhūś 49, 15—19<sup>41</sup>.

PVin I 84, 18—86, 9 = NBhūś 104, 8—16<sup>42</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> Tib. ḷkhrul pa ḷdi ni dbaṇ po las skyes kyan would be equivalent to \*indriyajāpy sā bhrāntir . . . , but NBhūś has the lectio difficilior.

<sup>31</sup> Tib. rnam par bcad has no equivalent in Sanskrit.

<sup>32</sup> No equivalent for Tib. śes pa.

<sup>33</sup> -siddhe NBhūś, but cf. 48, 19.

<sup>34</sup> viśeṣasya has no equivalent in Tib. and is very probably a gloss.

<sup>35</sup> Tib. deṇi byed pa ma yin paci phyir.

<sup>36</sup> paṭumandākṣādibhiḥ NBhūś 47, 8; but cf. 48, 26 and Tib.

<sup>37</sup> Tib. de ltar would be \*evam.

<sup>38</sup> Tib. don daṇ ḷdra ba las would be \*arthaṇīrūpyāt.

<sup>39</sup> bhāvāḥ without equivalent in Tib., where the sentence is a bit shortened.

<sup>40</sup> These verses too are apparently quoted from PVin, not from PV, for they are the immediate continuation of the quotation above.

<sup>41</sup> For the discovery of this fragment I am much obliged to Dr. OTTO GROHMA who thereby aroused my curiosity to search for other fragments. He has also called my attention to the parallel passages of the Nyāyavārtika-

*na tāvad eko 'vayavī<sup>42</sup>, tathā sati tasya<sup>43</sup> pānyādi<sup>44</sup> kampe sarvakampa-prāpteh, akampe vā calācalayoh pṛthaksiddhiprasaṅgāt, vastrodakavat. ekasya cāvaraṇe sarvasyāvaraṇaprasaṅgāt, abhedāt. na vā kasyacit āvaraṇam ity avikalpaṁ dr̄ṣyeta. avayavasvāvaraṇam nāvayavina iti cet<sup>45</sup>, ardhāvaraṇe 'py anāvṛtatvāt prāg ivāya darśanaprasaṅgah. avayava-darśanadvāreṇa taddarśanād adṛṣṭāvayavasya tasyāpratipattir iti cet, na, sarvathāpratipattiprasaṅgāt<sup>46</sup>. sarvāvayavānām<sup>47</sup> draṣṭum aśakyatvāt, . . .<sup>48</sup>. katipayāvayavadarśane tu<sup>49</sup> avayavi<sup>50</sup>darśane tadvad<sup>51</sup> alpā<sup>52</sup>. vayavadarśane 'pi sthūlopalambhaprasaṅgah<sup>53</sup>. rakte caikasmīn avayave*

tātparyatikā (Calcutta Sanskrit Series XVIII, Calcutta 1936. Abbreviated NVTT). These parallel passages of the NVTT are interwoven in a *pūrvapakṣah* (NVTT 473, 23—474, 21), that sets out with a formal proof against NVTT. These parallel passages of the NVTT are interwoven in a *pūrvapakṣah* (NVTT 473, 23—474, 21), that sets out with a formal proof against the existence of complex reals and in developing the argument uses the three reasons of Dharmakīrti as given in the PVin. It would be natural to think of Dharmottara's Tikā as the source of this *pūrvapakṣah*, but the relevant passage (Peking edition, Tshad-ma, Dse, f. 167a 2ff.) shows a different text. Vācaspati may, however, have changed and shortened the text to give just the gist of the argument. I cannot decide this question, but the few sentences and words from the PVin interspersed in this text are of great help in correcting the fragment as presented by Bhāsarvajñā.

<sup>42</sup> Tib. *yul rags pa* would be \**sthūlavīśayam* and there is no Sanskrit equivalent for Tib. *snān ba yan*.

<sup>43</sup> No Tib. equivalent for *tathā sati tasya*. The whole introductory part seems to be slightly changed by Bhāsarvajñā.

<sup>44</sup> No Sanskrit equivalent for Tib. *gcig* (\*-eka-).

<sup>45</sup> *iti cet* NVTT 474, 12 und Tib. (*že na*): *ity abhyupagame 'pi* NBhūś.

<sup>46</sup> *avayavadarśanadvāreṇāvayavividarśanam* ity asminn api pakṣe sarva-thāvayavino 'pratipattiprasaṅgah NBhūś. Here Bhāsarvajñā seems to have made some transformations. The original sentence can be reconstructed with the help of NVTT 474, 15f. (*avayavadarśanadvāreṇāvayavividarśanād adṛṣṭāvayavasyāvayavino 'pratipattir iti cet, na.*) and Tib. (Tib. would be equivalent to \**avayavadvāreṇa* in the beginning and gives as a reason for the answer additionally *tha dax pa med pas*).

<sup>47</sup> No Sanskrit equivalent for Tib. *kyan* and *cig car*.

<sup>48</sup> In the NBhūś this sentence is a reason for the preceding one. According to Tib. it is part of a new argument, whose main part (*thams cad kyi tshe cdi mi mthoṇ bar thal lo*) would be without any equivalent in the NBhūś.

<sup>49</sup> Tib. *mthoṇ ba na yan* (Ergänzung nach Dh 168b1), -*darśane tu* NVTT 474, 19: -*darśanād* NBhūś.

<sup>50</sup> No Tib. equivalent for *avayavi-*.

<sup>51</sup> Tib. *de bzin du: yadvad* NBhūś.

<sup>52</sup> Tib. *cuṇ zad gcig, alpa-* NVTT 474, 19: *atra-* NBhūś.

<sup>53</sup> Tib. *rags pa mthoṇ bar ṣgyur ro, sthūlopalambhaprasaṅgah* NVTT 474, 19: *tathābhūtasyaiva darśanaprasaṅgah* NBhūś.

yady avayavī raktaḥ, tadānyāvayavastho 'pi rakta eva dṛṣyeta. no cet,  
tadā sarvāvayavarāge 'py avayavy arakta evopalabhyeta<sup>54</sup>.

PVin I 94, 17—25 = NBhūś 107, 7—108, 3

*api ca*

*sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nīlataddhiyoh | (v. 55 a b)*  
*na hi bhinnāvabhāsītve 'pý arthāntaram eva<sup>55</sup> rūpam nīlasyānubhavāt,*  
*tayoh sahopalambhaniyamāt, dvicandrādivat. na hy anayor ekānupalambhe*  
*'nyopalambho 'sti na caitat svabhāvabhede yuktam, pratibandhakāraṇā-*  
*bhāvāt.*

PVin I 96, 10—17 = NBhūś 108, 5—9

*apratyakṣopalambhasya nārthadr̥ṣṭih prasidhyati || (v. 55 c d)*  
*na hi viṣayasattayā viṣayopalambhaḥ. kim tarhi<sup>56</sup>. tadupalambhasattayā.*  
*sā cāprāmāṇikī na sattānibandhanāms tad<sup>57</sup> vyavahārān anurunaddhi.*  
*tadaprasiddhau viṣayasyāpy aprasiddhir iti sadvyavahāro<sup>58</sup> cchedaḥ syāt.*  
*na hi<sup>59</sup> sad apy anupalabhyamānam sad iti vyavahartum śakyate<sup>59</sup>.*

PVin I 96, 23—98, 5 = NBhūś 108, 10—14

*atha arthaśamvedanam anyena samvedanena samvedyate, tad api*  
*śamvedanam asiddhasattākam asatkālpam katham anyasya sādhakam*  
*syāt. tatrāpi samvedanāntarānveṣaṇe 'navasthā syāt. tathā ca na*  
*kasyacid arthasya siddhir iti<sup>60</sup> andhamūkam jagat syāt. kvacin niṣṭhā-*  
*bhyupagame ca svayam ātmānam viṣayākāram yugapad upalabhatā iti*  
*tadanye 'pi tathā bhavantu, viṣeṣahetvabhāvāt. tat siddhaḥ sahopalambhaḥ.*

<sup>54</sup> The last sentence has been rewritten by Bhāsarvajñā.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. TBV 364, 13: evam NBhūś.

<sup>56</sup> Tib. has . . . gyi / con kyan . . . .

<sup>57</sup> No Tib. equivalent for *tad*.

<sup>58</sup> Tib. has only *thams cad*.

<sup>59</sup> Tib. *tha sñad mi dmigs pa ei phyir*.

<sup>60</sup> Bhāsarvajñā has rewritten the first part of the fragment and even made some glosses in the first sentence with a view to making it more lucid.