

ON THE DATES AND WORKS OF ŚAṆKARANANDANA

Professor Gnoli was the first and only expert not to date Śaṅkaranandana (in short: Ś.) on the basis of Tibetan tradition but to use textual sources. He was also the first to consider Ś.'s conversion from Buddhism to Śaivism¹. Since almost 40 years have passed since Gnoli's investigations, in the following I should like, on the basis of his results, to take into account more recent material and examine once again Ś.'s lifetime and the problem of his conversion, as well as to present a list of his works. To begin with, we must clarify the issue of his name – Śaṅkarānanda or Śaṅkaranandana.

Frauwallner (1933: 241) already pointed out that the form of the name 'Śaṅkaranandana', recorded in Vāḍidevasūri's *Syādvādaratnākara*² and in Abhinavagupta's *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī*³, is to be preferred to the alternative 'Śaṅkarānanda', found in the secondary literature⁴ and also in Tibetan texts⁵. Since the form of the name found in the SVR and in the ĪPVV is also to be found in the *Mālinīvijayavārttika* (see below, n. 58), in the *Tan-*

¹ See below, pp. 484.

² *iad āha śaṅkaranandanah* | SVR 783,20; see also the references mentioned below pp. 484 and note 14.

³ *iathā hi bhaggaśaṅkaranandanah ...* ĪPVV I 236,1; *tena yad āha bhaggaśaṅkaranandanah ...* ĪPVV II 16,10; see also below, note 25.

⁴ The form 'Śaṅkarānanda' can be found with variations in transliteration in, for instance, Vidyābhūṣaṇa 1920: 344f, 349; Obermiller 1932: 155; Stcherbatsky 1932: 42, 45f, 247; Gnoli 1960: xxiiiif; Naudou 1980: 14, 121-127, 180, 229, 231; and Kuji 1983 (see below, note 35).

⁵ Cf. for instance the colophon of Ś.'s *Anyāpohasiddhi*: *gzan sel ba grub pa dge bsñen dam pa l mkhas pa chen po śam ka rānandas mdzad pa rdzogs so* || AAS 302a7. Likewise the colophon of the *Sambandhaparīkṣānusāra* reads: *'brel pa brtag pa'i 'grel pa bram ze śam ka rā nandas mdzad pa rdzogs so* || SPA 35a3. In addition there are the alternatives *śaṅkananda*, *śam kar nan ta* (see below, note 30), and *śaṅ kar nanta* (see below, note 31).

In the Tibetan translation of the name, bDe byed dga' ba, dga' ba can translate both *ānanda* and *nandana*; see Frauwallner 1933: 241.

*trālokaivēka*⁶, in the *Dravyālaṅkāraṭīkā*⁷ and in the colophon of Ś.'s *Īśvarāpākaraṇasaṅkṣepa*⁸, in other words since the form 'Śaṅkaraṇaṇaṇa' is the only form in all the Sanskrit sources, preference must be given to it.

In addition to the Tibetan translation of his name, bDe byed dga' ba, Ś. is often referred to as Bram ze or Bram ze chen po, the (great) Brahmin.

WORKS

Ś.'s works are described in Bühnemann 1980, in Much 1988: 16, 21, 27f and, in most detail, in Steinkellner and Much 1995: 80–84, who also take into account the previous findings on Ś. and his writings. For this reason, we can limit ourselves here to a list of his works and a few comments and additions. The sequence reflects the relative chronology as shown in the Table on [p. 508], whereby I assume that the commentaries were written at the same time as the basic texts. For reasons of clarity, I have listed together below larger (*brhat*) and smaller (*sūkṣma*) works that belong together, although their chronological classification is by no means certain. Although the *kārikās* of his *miśra*ka works have also survived separately, I treat these texts as one work, since as yet there is no indication that Ś. wrote the basic texts and the corresponding commentaries separately. It should be noted beforehand that the works of which only the *kārikās* have survived may also have been *miśra*ka texts. However, there can be no final certainty on this point until these are found or new fragments discovered:

1. *Prajñālaṅkāraṅkārikā*
Commentary on *Prajñālaṅkāraṅkārikā*
2. *Dharmālaṅkāraṅkārikā*
Commentary on *Dharmālaṅkāraṅkārikā*
3. *Brhatprāmāṇyakārikā*
4. *Madhyapramāṇyakārikā*
5. *Sūksmapramāṇyakārikā*
6. *Anyāpohasiddhikārikā*
Commentary on *Anyāpohasiddhikārikā*

7. *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā*
Commentary on *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā*
8. *Laghupratibandhasiddhikārikā*
9. *Īśvarāpākaraṇakārikā*
Commentary on *Īśvarāpākaraṇakārikā*
10. *Saṅkṣipteśvarāpākaraṇakārikā*
Īśvarāpākaraṇasaṅkṣepa (Commentary on *Saṅkṣipteśvarāpākaraṇakārikā*; includes the *kārikās*)⁹
11. Commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Vādanyāya*
12. *Sambandhaparīkṣānusāra* (Commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Sambandhaparīkṣā*)
13. *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* (incomplete commentary on Dharmakīrti's PV I and PVSU up to k. 130)
14. *Sarvajñasiddhikārikā*
Commentary on *Sarvajñasiddhikārikā*
15. *Svalpasarvajñasiddhikārikā*
Commentary on *Svalpasarvajñasiddhikārikā*
16. *Āgasiddhikārikā*
Commentary on *Āgasiddhikārikā*

This list includes a further four in addition to the 22 works¹⁰ enumerated to in Steinkellner and Much (1995: 80):

1. Commentary on *Prajñālaṅkāraṅkārikā*
2. Commentary on *Dharmālaṅkāraṅkārikā*
7. Commentary on *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā*
11. Commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Vādanyāya*

On 1.) From the *Prajñālaṅkāra*, prose quotations have survived that could only come from the commentary to *Prajñālaṅkāraṅkārikā*:

yat *prajñālaṅkāraṅ* –
praroḥo 'syāḥ saṃvidāḥ paṭīyastvaṃ sa eva saṃskāro vācyā iti ĪPVV I 234,12f¹¹

⁹ The two works mentioned separately in Steinkellner and Much (1995: 80) "17. Kommentar zur Saṅkṣipteśvarāpākaraṇakārikā" and "18. Īśvarāpākaraṇasaṅkṣepa" are no doubt a single work, if we do not wish to assume that Ś. wrote two Commentaries on the *Saṅkṣipteśvarāpākaraṇakārikā*.

¹⁰ The larger number of works in Steinkellner and Much is a result of their counting *kārikās* and Commentaries separately.

¹¹ Cf. Gnoli 1960: xxiii f³; Bühnemann 1980: 196.

⁶ *saṅkaraṇaṇaṇa-sadyojyotiḥ-devabala-kaṇabhūgādimaṇi* TĀV Vol. IV 1884,5.

⁷ *saṅkaraṇaṇaṇa* tv āha, *Dravyālaṅkāraṭīkā* 2nd chapter fol. 112 = Jambūvijaya 1981: 137.

⁸ *saṅkaraṇaṇaṇa* tv āha, *Dravyālaṅkāraṭīkā* 3rd chapter fol. 79 = Jambūvijaya 1981: 143.

⁹ *Īśvarāpākaraṇasaṅkṣepaḥ sampūrṇaḥ kṛtīr bhāṭṭaśaṅkaraṇaṇaṇasya*. ĪAS_{ms} 8,1f.

yad uktam prajñālamkāre –

evam tarhi jagad ekasyaiva kasyacid ananśasya yathoktavidhinā rūpam
astu kiṃ naḥ kṣīyate TĀV II 406, 8-10¹²

On 2.) Alongside the quotations from the *Dharmālaṅkārikā* mentioned in Bühnemann (1980: 194), Jayaratha's commentary *Tantrāloka* on Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka* contains two more quotations in prose:

yad dharmālamkārah –

tatra sāmārthyam hi tasya janakatvam, tac ca yadi tasmin sati nā bhavati
katham nāma tatsāmārthyam, atha bhavati katham sāmārthyam
syād iti TĀV IV 1652,2-5

yad dharmālamkārah –

tad evam ayaṃ vastusvabhāva eva kāryakāraṇabhāvaḥ, na tu vyavahā-
ramātrasiddhir iti TĀV IV 1654,17-1655,3

Likewise, in the SVR Vāḍidevasūri adds to a stanza¹³ quoted from the *Dharmālaṅkārikā* a further explanation concluded by *iti*, which we can without doubt regard as a commentary by Ś. to his *kārikās*. The text is preceded by a refutation in which Vāḍidevasūri shows that the fact of being caused is not a conclusive logical reason for the transience of things (... *ity anaikāntikam eva kṛtakatvam iti* SVR 787,11f). He then continues that this also refutes what was said in the previously (SVR 783,21f) mentioned *kārikā* by Ś.¹⁴ The text now reads¹⁵:

yad api śaṅkaranandana eva vyākaroti –

na hi svahetuḥ nāśo nāśināṃ naśvarātmatā |

nāśāyaiṣāṃ bhavantas te bhūtvaiḥ na bhavanti tat ||

nāśināṃ naśvarātmataiva nāśārthaḥ, na tu vināśahetuḥ vināśo nā-
śārthaḥ. tato yathā bhāvaviśeṣaḥ svahetor ghaṭātmako bhavan ghaṭa
eva bhavati, ghaṭajanakād bhāvād aghaṭātmatāyā asaṃbhavāt, tathā
vinaśvaro bhavan vinaśvara eva bhavati, bhūtvaiḥ samanantaram
nāśāt. nānyathā naśvaraḥ syāt. naśvarātmatayātmalābhasamanantara-
nāśaiva kṣaṇikatvam iti. [tatrocya ...] SVR 787,13-21

¹² Cf. Gnoli 1960: xxiii³ and xxv³; by Bühnemann 1980: 196 identified in Ms 22a5-6.

¹³ Identified in Bühnemann 1980: 194. The following prose was not interpreted as being Ś.'s declaration.

¹⁴ *etena śaṅkaranandanoktakārikāyāṃ yad (*kāyāṃ yad conj. : *kāṃ yāvad) uktam
apāstam* SVR 787,12. The text cannot be construed without correction.

¹⁵ On the translation, see ~~above, p. 101~~

below, p. 503.

On 7.) According to Bu ston's Chos 'byuñ rNog lotsāba Blo Idan śes rab (1059-1109) wrote a summary (*bsdus don*) not only of Ś.'s *Anyāpohasiddhi* but also of his *Pratibandhasiddhi*¹⁶. Since it cannot be assumed that rNog lotsāba summarised the 22 *kārikās* of the *Pratibandhasiddhi* – Ś. already presents a summary of these in the *Laghupratibandhasiddhikārikā* – we can assume that Ś. wrote a commentary both to the *Anyāpohasiddhikārikā* and to the *Pratibandhasiddhi*, which forms the basis for rNog lotsāba's summary.

On 11.) See below, note 36.

According to Bühnemann (1980: 192) the *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā* occupies the position of fol. 1b1-2a1 in the manuscript of the Bihar Research Society, Patna. In this, when counting the folios, wherever the folio reference is illegible she has used the sequence in the photos made by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana. Each photo shows 5 or more folio pages, *recto* or *verso*, in ascending sequence one beneath the other. Sāṅkrtyāyana exchanged folio pages 2a and 2b, so that the sequence on the first photo is 1b → 2a → 3b → 4b → 5b, and in the second photo 2b → 3a → 4a → 5a → 6a. Consequently, the correct folio reference for the *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā* is 1b1-2b1. The manuscript also contains a numeric reference, which is, however, illegible. According to the Tibetan translation, there are 22 stanzas.

Accordingly, the folio references of the two following works in the manuscript must be changed. The *Laghupratibandhasiddhikārikā*, which directly follows the *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā*, does not start from 2a1-2a5, but from 2b1-2b5, and the *Sūkṣmaprāmāṇyakārikā* does not begin in 2a5, but in 2b5. The numeric reference for the *Sūkṣmaprāmāṇyakārikā* in the manuscript is 10.

Consequently, the entry for the first three works mentioned in Bühnemann (1980: 192) should read¹⁷:

Title	Numeric reference in the manuscript	Folio
1. <i>Pratibandhasiddhikārikā</i> (PSK) (= P 5755)	22 (?)	1b1-2b1
2. <i>Laghupratibandhasiddhikārikā</i> (LPSK)	8	2b1-2b5
3. <i>Sūkṣmaprāmāṇyakārikā</i> (SPK)	10	2b5-3a5

¹⁶ See Jackson 1987: 127 (references on p. 147³).

¹⁷ The details in Steinkellner and Much 1995: 80f must also be corrected accordingly.

In his introduction to the text edition of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇa-vārttikasvavṛtti*, Raniero Gnoli corrected the lifetime of Ś. claimed by Vidyābhūṣaṇa and Stcherbatsky as being "about 1050 AD."¹⁸ and "XIth century A. D."¹⁹ to "9th or 10th century"²⁰. In justification of this subsequently generally accepted dating²¹, Gnoli notes that Ś. is frequently quoted by Abhinavagupta (950–ca.1020) and that he, according to Abhinavagupta, refuted Dharmottara (740–800)²², and thus must have been active between these two²³. In addition, Gnoli refers to a legend handed down by Tāranātha and dPag bsam ljon bzañ, according to which Ś., as he was about to write a refutation of Dharmakīrti's *pramāṇa* theories, received a vision of Mañjuśrī in a dream, who convinced him that Dharmakīrti's views were correct²⁴. As a result, Ś. did not write a criticism but rather a commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Svavṛtti*. From this, and from the fact that Ś. is quoted with copious praise by Abhinavagupta and, on the other hand, wrote works obviously based on Buddhist systematic preconditions, such as his *PVṬi*, Gnoli assumes that Ś. converted to Śaivism. However, while the Tibetan tradition suggests that Ś. converted to Buddhism, Gnoli is of a different opinion: "Things may well have gone another way, however, and this is suggested by an eulogising epithet that Abhinavagupta gives to Śaṅkarānanda, of whom he says that 'he recovered illumination thanks to the force of asceticism and to a constant exercise of thought on consciousness, owed to the maturation of his good actions carried out earlier'²⁵." The rendition of *pratīlabdhonmeṣa*²⁶ by 'he recovered illumination' in the sense of a conversion from Buddhism to

¹⁸ Vidyābhūṣaṇa 1920: 344.

¹⁹ Stcherbatsky 1932: 45.

²⁰ Gnoli 1960: xxiii f.

²¹ E.g. Bühnemann 1980: 191, Tsukamoto *et al.* 1990: 458 and Steinkellner and Much 1995: 80.

²² On the dating see Krasser 1991.

²³ References can be found in Gnoli 1960: xxiii f. and xxiv f.

²⁴ See the translation of Tāranātha by Schiefner 1869: 247 f.

²⁵ Gnoli 1960: xxvi. The Sanskrit text reproduced by Gnoli in note 2 reads: *prāktana-kūśalavipākapravartitasamvitparāmarśābhyāsatapaḥprabhāvapratīlabdhonmeṣeṇa bhāṭṭa-śaṅkaranandanenāpi ...* ĪPVV II 199,16–18. The quotation that follows (*siddham siddhata-yā rūpam nirūpyam na tathā tathā*) comes from Ś.'s *Prajñālaṅkāra* and is identified in Bühnemann 1980: 196.

²⁶ The basic meaning of *unmeṣa* is 'the opening of the eyes', 'the opening of the flowers/blossoms'. The correlate is *nimeṣa*, 'the closing of the eyes', 'the closing of the

Śaivism is certainly an overinterpretation, since then the statement 'he recovered illumination' would imply that Ś. had previously already acquired illumination and had lost it by converting to Buddhism or in some other way. However, also Gnoli does not assume this, and there is no other indication that Ś. acquired illumination more than once, or changed faith more than once. Thus the point referred to by Gnoli cannot be used to clarify the direction of Ś.'s conversion and *pratīlabdhonmeṣa* is better understood as 'he obtained illumination'.

Another of Gnoli's arguments is "that Śaṅkarānanda, among various other works of Buddhist nature, wrote at least one that wanders far from Buddhist orthodoxy or that is frankly contrary to the Buddhist logic and gnoseology commonly accepted. This work... is the *Prajñālaṅkāra*, which obviously is not included in the Tibetan canon. This work is held in high esteem by Abhinavagupta, who constantly gives Śaṅkarānanda the title of *bhāṭṭa* and once even of *guru*, and recognises in him a true precursor of the doctrine of knowledge adopted by his school."²⁷ Gnoli derives this from the fact that, when introducing a quotation from Ś.'s *Prajñālaṅkāra*, Abhinavagupta refers to him as one who has acquired

flowers/blossoms'. By analogy, the two terms are connected in Śaivism with the unfolding and dissolution of the empirical world. In the first stanza of Vasugupta's *Spandakārikā* the unfolding and dissolution of the world follow the opening and closing of the eyes of the highest godhead: "We laud that Śaṅkara, who is the source of the power of the wheel of the energies, by whose opening and closing of the eyes there is the appearance and dissolution of the world: *yasyonmeṣanimesābhyām jagataḥ pralayodayau*" (Padoux 1992: 250⁷²). According to Abhinavagupta's *Parātrimśikāvivaraṇa* *unmeṣa* is the state in which, when Śiva's power of perception unfolds, all objects desired by him have unfolded (see Padoux 1992: 251 and note 75: "PTV, p. 168: *unmiśanti tu jñānaśaktir iṣyamāṇasakalabhāvon-meṣamayī u iti.*"). In addition, he equates *unmeṣa* with the highest level of consciousness (*saṃvid*), of which he says: "This consciousness which the Āgamas celebrate under the name of insight (*pratibhā*), unfolding (*unmeṣa*), and so forth, abides in the interval between two dualistic cognitions, when one ceases and the other appears. It is undifferentiated [or devoid of thought-construct: *avikalpakam*]. It precedes as such all differentiated thought-construct such as the notion of blue, and so forth, which are mutually exclusive [since linked to duality]. As such it is inseparable from the infinite diversity of appearances [constituting the world]. That there is such an interval between two cognitions cannot be denied, because [cognitions] cannot but be different; and this interval is made of pure consciousness. ..." (Padoux 1992: 181 f and 182³⁹: "*bhavaṭi cedam astamitodeśyadubhaya-vikalpajñānāntaratāvatī unmeṣapratibhādiśabdāgamagatam nirvikalpakam sasamvāda-viruddhābhimātānīlādīvikalpapūrvabhāvi | tasmāt tad anantāvabhāsāvibhāgamayam eveti | ubhayaś ca jñānāyor antarālam anapahvanīyam jñānāyor bheda eva | tac ca saṃvidātma-kam eva...*").

²⁷ Gnoli 1960: xxiv.

illumination²⁸. Since Abhinavagupta himself quotes a stanza from the *Prajñālaṅkāra* in his *Tantrāloka*, and interprets this as Buddhist doctrine (*uktam ca ... iti saugataih*; see below [p. 504 and note 59]), it is difficult to interpret the *Prajñālaṅkāra* as a work that is entirely Śaivite and opposed to Buddhist doctrine²⁹.

On the other hand, the notion of an abandonment of Śaivism and a move towards Buddhism is supported by the fact that Ś. plays a very major role in Tibetan tradition. This is reported not only by the legends passed on by Tāranātha and others³⁰, but also follows from statements in the texts by

²⁸ See above, note 25.

²⁹ See also Gnoli's own comment on the reference quoted from his introduction to PVS: "The scanty fragments of this work hardly permit us to get an idea of its content." (Gnoli 1960: xxiv³)

³⁰ A further hagiography to which Kuijp (1994a: 381¹⁸) refers survives in *Glo bo mkhan chen*:

... 'di'i [=bde byed dga' ba'i] gam ni l *kha che groñ khver chen po dpe med du mu* stegs kyi pañḍi ta chen po bram ze *śaṅkananda* ([A]; *śam kar nan ta* [B]) 'jes bya ba blo gros phun sum tshogs pa dan ldan pa byuñ ste l de yañ 'dod pa la sred pas chan 'tshoñ ([B] : tshoñ [A]) ma 'zig ([A] : gcig [B]) dan yid gcugs śiñ l de'i gnas su yañ yañ 'gro ba 'zig yod pa de l de'i nañ pa'i dge bñen gcig ([B] : cig [A]) kyañ de'i sar 'gro ba na l de'i dpe sañs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la *tshañs pa* dan *dbañ phyug* la sogs pa las *khvad par du* 'phags par bstod pa l mtho btsun grub rjes mdzad pa yod pa de las nas l de *śaṅkanandas* ([A]; *śam kar nan tas* [B]) mthoñ la de'i don bden par rtogs nas sañs rgyas la śiñ tu dad de l bram ze rñams kyi ([B] : kyi [A]) gus par bya ba'i tshañs skud kyi dge 'dun gyi mchil lhwam ([A]; lham [B]) 'gel ba'i srad bu byas nas sañs rgyas kyi bstan pa la 'zugs te l de nas rtog ge'i ([A] : ge [B]) tshad ma'i bstan bcos kyañ brtsams ([B] : brtsam [A]) par b'zed de l ... mKhas 'jug rñam bśad [A] 342,1–5 = [B] 507,3–508,2.

The legend about him [i.e. Śaṅkaranandana] is as follows: In the big Kashmiri town of Anupamamahāpura^a lived a great heretical scholar, a Brahmin by the name of Śaṅkananda, whose intellect was excellent. Since he craved (*sred pa*) love ('*dod pa*'), he took pleasure (*yid gcugs*) in a spirits vendor (*chan 'tshoñ ma*). He visited her again and again in her house (*gnas*). When also a Buddhist Upāsaka of that [town] came to her place (*de'i sar*) he left (*las* [pa = lus pa]) his book [called *Viśeṣastava* (*Khvad par du 'phags*)]^b there, which praised Buddha as particularly exulted ('*phags pa*) over Brahman and Īśvara and which was written by Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin (mTho btsun grub rje). When Śaṅkananda then saw that [book] and recognised its contents (*don*) as true, he conceived an extremely devout trust in Buddha. After he had made a line (*srad bu*) of the Brahmin string (*tshañs skud*) highly revered by the Brahmins for hanging up ('*gel ba*) the monk's (*dge 'dun*) sandals (*mchil lhwam*), he entered the Buddhist doctrine. Thereupon he also wrote *pramāṇasāstras*. [Thus] it is said (*b'zed*).

Following this point, *Glo bo mkhan chen* reports a similar story as transmitted by Tāranātha, according to which Ś. was persuaded by Mañjuśrī (see above, note 24).

the Tibetan authors themselves. As one of many instances originating from no less than Sa skya Pañḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182–1251), the following extract from his commentary on *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* should be sufficient to illustrate this point. The explanations and translation are from Kuijp (1983: 5f):

The case in point is a passage that occurs in the ninth chapter where Sa-skya Pañḍita submits immediate referential awareness (*yid-kyi mngon-sum*, *mānasapratyakṣa*) to a fairly detailed analysis. Having given a survey of the opinions of Prajñākara Gupta and Dharmottara, he closes his preliminary discussion by attributing a view to Śaṅkarānanda (ca. 1000?) on the basis of oral transmission; in his words:

"Only this, the intent of Śaṅkarānanda which was obtained from our abbot, I perceive as correct."³¹

The 'abbot' of course refers to the Kashmiri Śākyaśrībhadrā (1127–1225) who functioned as the abbot (*mkhan-po*) when Sa-skya Pañḍita was ordained as monk in 1208 ...³²

Ś.'s important position in the Tibetan epistemological tradition also follows from the fact that Sa skya Pañḍita followed him in the line of transmission of the *Pramāṇavārttika* interpretation. Several texts report that Ś.'s pupil, whose name has been handed down as 'Vagindra Pañḍita', 'Vaṅgu Pañḍita' or 'Paṇ chen Mewaṅgu' was the teacher of the influential Śākyaśrībhadrā³³, who in turn was Sa skya Pañḍita's teacher³⁴. In addition, according to Go ram pa bSod nams señ ge, Sa skya Pañḍita is said to have been involved in the translation of Ś.'s *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā*, the translators

^a On Anupamamahāpura, also known as Anupamapura and Kaśmīrapura, see Naudou 1980: 208f.

^b The text has been recently published: Johannes Schneider, *Der Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha. Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmins Viśeṣastava mit Prajñāvarmans Kommentar*. Bonn 1993.

³¹ Kuijp 1983: 258¹² quotes the following text: "See the *TMRGRG* fol. 110a/4: *shangkar-nan-ta'i dgongs-pa kho-bo'i mkhan-po-las rnyed-pa 'di kho-na 'thad-par mthong-ngo ll*"

³² 'Jam dbyaṅs b'zad pa's summary of Ś.'s view on *mānasapratyakṣa* is translated in Stecherbatsky 1930: 324. On 'Jam dbyaṅs b'zad pa's analysis thereof, see Stecherbatsky 1930: 327–330.

³³ On a biography of Śākyaśrībhadrā, see Jackson 1990 and the detailed discussion thereof in Kuijp 1994b.

³⁴ Cf. Kuijp 1983: 6 and 258f¹²; also Mejer 1991: 176 (where the name reads 'Waṅku Pañḍita').

of which are not mentioned in bsTan 'gyur³⁵. Likewise, he is alleged to have translated a commentary written by Ś. on Dharmakīrti's *Vādanāyā*, which, however, has survived neither in the original nor in translation³⁶.

These reasons are without doubt sufficient to establish Ś.'s significance for the Tibetan tradition. It is therefore clear that Ś. was not only according to legend fully integrated in the tradition, but was also thus in practice, and was regarded by Sa skya Paṇḍita and other Tibetans as one of their own. For there can be no doubt that Sa skya Paṇḍita would not have adopted the doctrines of a predecessor who himself dismissed these doctrines as false.

A further indication that Ś. irrevocably turned his back on Śaivism can be seen in the bitterness expressed in the final stanza of his ĪAS:

What could one experienced in the countless (*viparyāsu*), widely disseminated (*prarūdhāsu*) [and] immeasurable doctrines (*drṣṭiṣu*), even if he is well prepared (*prayato 'pi*), do for a world of little understanding³⁷?

That Ś. is referring to himself as experienced in countless, widely disseminated and immeasurable doctrines indicates that he had already pursued a career with a variety of doctrinal traditions and was at an advanced age.

A further indication can be found in the Tibetan colophon to his *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā*. This colophon may be a translation of an addition marked in the margin of the Sanskrit manuscript. The addition is made to the first word in line 1 of fol. 2b³⁸ (*siddhikārikās* II), and indicated by the writer as belonging to the latter by means of a *kākapada*, a small apostrophe above the two *daṇḍas*. The text, which is inserted above the

³⁵ See Kuiper 1983: 104: "He [=Sa-skya Paṇḍita] also embarked on the translation of the *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* by Śaṅkarānanda in which he collaborated with Saṃghaśrībhadra, a member of Śākyaśrī's entourage." The relevant text, to which van der Kuiper, p. 303²⁹² refers, reads: ... *bram ze'i 'grel ba dan bcas pa gsan nas bsgyur* I (Go ram pa bSod nams seṅ ge, *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi dka' ba'i gnas rnam par bśad pa sde bdun rab gsal*, in *The Complete Works of Go ram bSod nams seng ge*, compiled by bSod nams rgya mtsho. [The Complete Works of the Great Masters of the Sa skya Sect of the Tibetan Buddhism 12] Tokyo 1969: fol. 5b4).

³⁶ Cf. Jackson 1987: 113 and Much 1991, Part I, p. xxvii²⁴.

³⁷ *viparyāsu prarūdhāsu kim apārāsu drṣṭiṣu* I *jagaty alpamatau kuryāt prayato 'pi viśāradaḥ* II 10 II ĪAS_{ms} 7.19f. A critical edition together with a translation is in preparation.

³⁸ The *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā* starts in the manuscript from fol. 1b1–2b1; cf. above, [p. 492]: p. 4 p3.

line in a script smaller than that of the manuscript and extends beyond the end of the line, is illegible due to the poor quality of the photograph, but probably corresponds roughly in length with the Tibetan translation. This colophon states inter alia that Ś. highly appreciated the doctrines of the Sugata:

'brel pa grub pa slob dpon mkhas pa chen po bram ze'i rigs su sku 'khrun pa chos kyi grag pa gñis pa žes 'jig rten na gnam (D : *gtan Q*) *du grags śin rtog ge pa phal pa'i gžun 'jig pa dan ll thogs pa med pa don gyi de kho na rnam par 'jog* (Q : 'jig D) *pa'i blo'i mthu stobs kyi* (Q : *kyi D*) *'gran zla dan bral pa ll bde bar gśegs pa'i bstan pa la gces spras* (D : *spas Q*) *su 'dzin pas legs par bśad pa'i ro myaṅ ba la sems rtse* (rtse D; lacks Q) *gcig tu gžol ba dge bsñen dam pa śaṅka rā nandas* (Q; *śaṅka rānan das* D) *mdzad pa rdzogs so ll* PrSi D 303a5–7 = Q 326a6–8.

The *Pratibandhasiddhi* written by the teacher (*slob dpon*, **ācārya*), the great scholar (*mkhas pa chen po*, **mahāpaṇḍita*), the honourable (*dam pa*) Upāsaka Śaṅkarānanda has been completed. [Namely by the teacher Śaṅkarānanda], born to the Brahmin caste (and) celebrated by the people (*'jig rten na gnam du*) as a "second Dharmakīrti", who destroyed the doctrines (*gžun*) of the ordinary logicians, who is invincible (*'gran zla med pa*, **asapatna*) thanks to his unmatched (*thogs pa med pa*) spirit, which recognises how things really are (*don gyi de kho na*, **arthatattva*), and who, since he highly appreciates (*gces spras su 'dzin pa*) the teachings of the Sugata, persists with his spirit (*sems*) in concentration on the enjoyment (*ro myaṅ ba*, **āsvāda*) of [his] exquisite utterances.

That the author of the colophon felt it necessary to add extra emphasis to the circumstance that Ś. was born to a Brahmin family and highly appreciated the teachings of the Buddha etc., can only be explained by the fact that as one born to a Brahmin family and educated in the Śaiva tradition, he flirted with the Buddhist doctrines. For there would be no particular need to mention that someone who had always been a Buddhist appreciated the teachings of Buddha.

It follows from the arguments put forward that Ś. was first a Śaiva, and had appreciated Buddhist teachings from the very beginning, and that he later abandoned Śaivism, for there must have been a breach with Śaivism, since the teaching of the non-existence of God contained in the *Īśvarāpākaraṇakārikā* together with its commentary, in the *Īśvarāpākaraṇa-*

saṅkṣepa and in the *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā*³⁹ is incompatible with Śaivism. From this it then follows that it was only after the completion of Abhinavagupta's ĪPVV, which according to an oral communication by Prof. Raffaele Torella (November 18, 1994) was probably his last philosophical work⁴⁰, and which gives the year 1014/15 in the colophon as the time of completion, that he must have made the break with Śaivism and written a number of works setting out his Buddhist point of view. It cannot be stated with certainty which of his works are to be located in the period after his renunciation of Śaivism. For, as the example of the *Anyāpohasiddhi* shows, neither the title nor the fact that a work was translated into Tibetan are conclusive criteria for determining the time of writing. Nevertheless, his works refuting the proof of God and his *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* can certainly be placed in the time after the completion of the ĪPVV as can probably be his commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Sam-*

³⁹ Cf. Ś.'s explanation of *arthānārtha*^o (PVSV 1,8): *don ni don dam par yod pa'i rto bo'o ll don ma yin pa ni de las bzlog pa ste l gzugs la sogs pa kun rdzob tu yod pa'am l gso bo dan dbaṅ phyug dan ri boṅ gi rwa la sogs pa med pa ṅid do ll PVṬI 4a5f* = "artha is the absolutely really existing thing. *Anārtha* is what is different from that. It is either the conventionally existing such as material (**rūpa*) or it is something completely (**eva*) non-existing such as primordial matter (**pradhāna*), God (**īśvara*) or a hare's horn."^a In addition: ... 'gro ba mtha' dag byed pa po'i dbaṅ phyug gcig ni mi srid do ll PVṬI 95b6 = "... a unique God, who is the creator of all being, is not possible."

^a The identification of *artha* and *anārtha* with *paramārtha* and *saṃvṛti* was already known to Kaṇvakagomin, who considered this interpretation as the last of six possibilities: *yadvārthaḥ paramārthasatyam anārthaḥ saṃvṛtisatyam ...* (PVSV 7,27f). The various possibilities of interpretation are dealt with in the translation of the logical sections in Dharmakīrti's PVSV, prepared by Ernst Steinkellner (note on *artha* and *anārtha*).

⁴⁰ In any event the ĪPVV is the last of the works containing references to Ś.; these include also the *Tantrāloka*^a and the *Mālinīvijayavārttika* (see Gnoli 1960: xxiii^f; Bühnemann 1980). For the *Īśvarapratyabhijñānavivṛti* contains a reference to the *Tantrāloka* (*yathokte mayeva ... tantrāloke* ĪPVV I 33,23), while the latter knows the *Mālinīvijayavārttika* (... *mālinīślokaṇvārttike* TĀ 37th chapter k. 30 in TĀV VIII 3691,17; Pandey 1963: 30 refers to this passage).

^a The *Tantrāloka* contains no direct references to Ś., but for instance TĀ, 2nd chapter, k. 54, according to Jayaratha's Commentary, presupposes statements of the *Prajñālaṅkārikā*:

*nijadharmāprahāṇena pararūpānukāritā l
pratibimbāmatā sokitā khaṅgādarśatalādovai ll*

iti prajñālaṅkārikākārikā *arthagarbhikāreṇa lakṣaṇam āha* [... k. 54] TĀV II 414,13–15 (cf. Gnoli 1960: xxiii^f; Bühnemann 1980: 196).

bandhaparikṣā and *Vādanyāya*⁴¹. The last three were translated into Tibetan, although the Commentary to the *Vādanyāya*, as already mentioned, has not survived. Of the other two works available in Tibetan translation, the *Anyāpohasiddhi* must be assigned to the period before Abhinavagupta's ĪPVV, since the latter cites it. The same applies to the placing of the *Pratibandhasiddhikārikā*, if we follow the above-mentioned (p. 8) colophon. Likewise, the *Laghupratibandhasiddhikārikā* is also probably to be assigned to this period. With the exception of the *Bṛhatprāmāṇyaparikṣā* and the *Prajñālaṅkārikā*, both quoted by Abhinavagupta⁴², and the *Dharmālaṅkārikā* and commentary, which according to Jayaratha's commentary *Tantrālokaṇviveka* is presupposed by Abhinavagupta in his *Tantrāloka*⁴³, his other known works cannot be ascribed to either of the two periods.

A further fact that must be taken into account when narrowing down Ś.'s period of activity is that according to the testimony of Abhinavagupta, Utpaladeva, in his *Īśvarapratyabhijñānavivṛti*, criticises a statement made by Ś. The reference in the ĪPVV, the source of which is not identified⁴⁴, reads:

yad āha bhagavān

*kāryaucityāt prāk svasaṃvidasamvitsmaraṇāntare l
iti l etan na sahate tadetat iti* ĪPVV II 369,12–14⁴⁵

The relative chronology of the works of Utpaladeva, Abhinavagupta and Ś. determined in the above discussion is set out in the Table on p. 15 for greater clarity. Concerning Ś.'s period of activity, it follows that at least one of his works must have been written before Utpaladeva's *Īśvarapratyabhijñānavivṛti*, and that several were written after Abhinavagupta's ĪPVV (completed in 1014/15). The year in which the *Īśvarapratyabhijñānavivṛti* was written is not known. However, it is certainly a late work by Utpaladeva, whose dates are given as 900/25–950/75⁴⁶. According to Torella (1994:

⁴¹ His commentaries on these works by Dharmakīrti cannot be ascribed with certainty since Ś. could have written these before his final break with Śaivism. For the *Anyāpohasiddhi* is also a Buddhist work. In addition, other cases are known in which non-Buddhists have written commentaries to Buddhist works (see Funayama 1994: 372f).

⁴² See Gnoli 1960: xxiii^f and Bühnemann 1980: 193f.

⁴³ Cf. below, note 60: ... *yad dharmālaṅkārikā... ity āśaṅkhyāha...*

⁴⁴ Since the earliest of Ś.'s works quoted by Abhinavagupta is the *Prajñālaṅkārikā*, this must also be assumed to be the source of the passage against which the Utpaladeva is directed. However, the quotation cannot be identified in the manuscript of the *Prajñālaṅkārikā* as a result of illegibility.

⁴⁵ See Gnoli 1960: xxiii^f and Bühnemann 1980: 197.

⁴⁶ Torella 1994: xx.

xli), Utpaladeva wrote the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāṅkārikā* and the *Vṛtti* at the same time, and then wrote the *Vivṛti* or *Ṭīkā* on both of these later⁴⁷. A considerable period of time must have passed between the writing of the first two works and the *Vivṛti*, for “In the *ṭīkā*, that was composed later on, we already find multiple interpretations of the same stanza, all considered equally possible but evidently being the outcome of further reflections” (Torella 1994: xlii). If we assume the later dates for Utpaladeva, i.e. 925–975, and assume that the work presupposed by the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛti* was a work from Ś.ʼs youth, we arrive at a period of activity of approx. 970–1020/30. I should therefore like to propose as a working hypothesis a lifetime of approx. 940/50–1020/30⁴⁸.

From the data obtained so far, it follows that Ś. must have been very strongly under Buddhist influence even in his youth. Thus in the *Anyā-pohasiddhi* he dedicated the introductory stanza of reverence to the all-knowing⁴⁹, and that in the *Pratibandhasiddhi* to the Sugata⁵⁰. In addition to the *śloka* of reverence of the latter, he refers to the Sugata (*bde bar gśegs pa*) as one who has eliminated either the matter (*don*) or the misery (*ñan*) of the heretics (*mu stegs can*)⁵¹. And Gnoli (1960: xxv³) already pointed out that

⁴⁷ Cf. also Torella 1988: 137–142.

⁴⁸ The Tibetan tradition according to which Ś.ʼs pupil ‘Vagindra Paṇḍita’, ‘Vaṅgu Paṇḍita’ or ‘Paṅ chen Mewangu’ (see above, [p. 7]) was the teacher of Śākyaśrībhadra, agrees neither with Gnoliʼs earlier dating nor with that proposed here. It is assumed that Śākyaśrībhadra lived from 1127 or approx. 1140 to 1225 (see Jackson 1990: Introd. p. 1 and 18¹). Even according to Ś.ʼs later dating, ‘Vagindra Paṇḍita’ would have had to have lived from approx. 1000 to 1140/60. Perhaps the different names also conceal two different persons, which may have given rise to the confusion of the names (for another possible explanation cf. Kuji 1983: 213¹²).

⁴⁹ *kun mkhyen ‘khrul bral dus gsum gnas pa yi ll don rnam ji bzin gzig pa la btud de ll AAS 281a6f* = “I bow before the all-knowing, before the one free of error, the one who sees things in all three times as they [really] are.” That Ś. was referring to Buddha and not Śīva with the word “all-knowing” is shown by the fact that he also uses this epithet in his *Sambandhapariṅśānūsāra* (*kun mkhyen de la phyag ‘tshal lo ll SPA 21b5*).

⁵⁰ *bde bar gśegs pa de la ... phyag ‘tshal lo ll PrSi D 302b2* = “Reverence to the Sugata”.

⁵¹ Since I do not entirely understand the stanza of reverence, I shall not attempt to translate it. The passage to which I refer, *mu stegs can don/ñan bsal bas*, reads *don* in the Peking edition and *ñan* in the Derge edition, with both alternatives being possible:

de ñid śes tshul don des mñon sum mtshan la de lam rjes žugs kyis ll mu stegs can don (don Q; ñan D) bsal bas rgyal phyir gañ gi rgyal rña rgyal chen nam ll dam paʼi tshul lugs brjod paʼi bdag ‘di gnod med ñes par rab bsgrags pa ll bde bar gśegs pa de la rtag tu rtse gcig blos ni phyag ‘tshal lo ll PrSi Q 325a8–325b2 = D 302b1–2.

according to Abhinavagupta in the *Prajñālaṅkāra* and other works not mentioned by name, he adopted a position similar to that of Vasubandhu and Dignāga with respect to the reality of the external world⁵². That the *Dharmālaṅkāra* also contains Buddhist ideas is shown by the reference quoted from the SVR, where Ś., like Dharmakīrti, argues that things are transient by virtue of their nature and that their transience is not due to causes⁵³:

For the perishing of transient things does not arise from a cause. For their perishing, they are of a transient nature. If they are, they are no more as soon as they come into existence. That [is momentariness]⁵⁴. The meaning of ‘perishing’ is only that transient things are of a transient nature. It is not, however, the meaning of ‘perishing’ that perishing arises from a cause for the perishing. Just as a particular thing, if it arises as having the nature of a pot from its cause, is simply a pot, since the [characteristic] of not being of the nature of a pot is not possible from a thing that creates a pot, likewise, something that arises as transient is simply transient, since immediately after its arising it perishes. Otherwise it would not be transient. It is precisely this perishing immediately after coming into existence (*ātmalābha*) as of a transient nature that is momentariness.

In the *Brhatpramāṇyakārikā*⁵⁵ cited by Abhinavagupta, Ś. also attests reverence to the Buddha⁵⁶.

This however means that all Ś.ʼs works cited by or preceding Abhinavagupta already contain strong Buddhist tendencies or exclusively Buddhist ideas, and that Abhinavagupta did not know any purely Śaivite works by him to which he could have referred in his writings. That he nevertheless mentions Ś. with such praise (see above, p. 494 with note 25),

⁵² Gnoli refers to ĪPVV II 144,11–13: *ālambanaparīkṣāḍau daināge, vijñaptimātrā-disiddhau vāsubandhavvyām* (conj.: °siddhāvāsabandhanyām), *prajñālamkāraḍiṣu bhāṭṭa-darśaneṣu tatra tatra cānyatra vitatyāyam artha ukta iti* |

⁵³ On the Sanskrit text, see above, [p. 4]. P. 492

⁵⁴ *īti* cannot be construed within the stanza. Perhaps it should be read with the following stanza. According to the final sentence in the commentary, it could mean momentariness.

⁵⁵ Cf. *yai punaḥ pramāṇyaparīkṣāyai bhāṭṭena uktam –*

vyaktāḥ prakāśaḥ svārthārthaṁ saṃskārapratibodhakaḥ |

nānyathā syād vikalpe ‘pi tatpravṛttir apīṣyatām ||

īti ĪPVV II 221,4–7 (see Gnoli 1960: xxiii³; identified in Bühnemann 1980: 193 in manuscript 5b1 [she also indicates textual alternatives]).

⁵⁶ *buddham... prañāmya...* Ms 4a1f.

can in my opinion only be explained by the fact that the two were contemporaries who knew each other, and that Ś. was integrated as a respected personality in the Śaivite community in Kashmir⁵⁷. It is also probably due to Ś.'s influence that Abhinavagupta integrated Dharmakīrti's logic, as far as compatible with his system, in his ĪPVV.

It remains to be noted that Ś.'s ambivalent relationship to Śaivism from the very beginning is also reflected in Abhinavagupta's works. In the MVV he refers to him by name and calls him a *guru* in the introduction to a quotation from the *Prajñālaṅkāra*⁵⁸. In contrast, he no longer mentions him by name in the *Tantrāloka*, but quotes a stanza from the *Prajñālaṅkāra* and expressly refers to the opinion it contains as Buddhist: *uktam ca... iti saugatai*⁵⁹. The ĪPVV, as already noted (see above, [p. 5] with note 25), speaks very highly of Ś. In his *Tantrāloka*, Jayaratha also clearly reveals that Ś. wrote Buddhist works as a Śaiva. According to Jayaratha, TĀ IX k. 11 presupposes a Buddhist objection in which the Buddhist refers to a section in Ś.'s *Dharmālaṅkāra* to reinforce his own position⁶⁰.

⁵⁷ According to the hagiography recorded in *Glo bo mkhan chen*, Ś. was born in the Kashmiri town of Anupamamahāpura; cf. above, note 30.

⁵⁸ ... *tathā cāha guruḥ śāṅkaranandanah* –

na mānatvāt tato 'nyatvān na bādhād asthiteḥ sthitiḥ || MVV I 431

⁵⁹ TĀ chapter III k.55: *uktam ca – satī bāhye 'pi dhīr ekānekavedanāt | anekasadrśākārā na tv aneketi saugataiḥ*. Jayaratha comments: *uktam iti prajñālaṅkāradau tad uktam tatra –*

īasmāt saty apī bāhye 'rthe dhīr ekānekavedanāt | anekasadrśākārā nānekaiva (PAK, TĀV II: *nānekeva* TĀV III) *prasajyate* || iū TĀV II 416,6–9.

Gnoli 1960: xxiii³ refers to the passage; identified in Bühnemann 1980: 196 in manuscript PAK 22a5–6. The stanza from PAK is also quoted in TĀV III 1308,4–5 with the introduction *yad āhuh*.

⁶⁰ *nanu... iti sthita eva bījāṅkurādau bhāve bhāvātmā kāryakāraṇabhāva iti yad dharmālaṅkārah* –

bhāva eva^a parasyeha kāryatābhāva^b ... I*

iii,

svabhāvo janako 'rthānām abhūtākārabhāvakah ||*

iti ca. na ca svabhāvam utsrjya bhāvānām anyat kimcid apekṣaṇīyam iti kim atra cetanānupraveśanenety āśaṅkyāha ... [followed by TĀ IX k.11] TĀV IV 1648,13–1649,6 = "[Buddhist:] ... Hence it is certain that with things (*bhāva*) such as seed and shoot there is the fact of an effect and a cause, that is in the nature [of these] things. As (*yad*) the *Dharmālaṅkāra* [says]:

'Only the being (*bhāva*) of the later is here [in this case/in our system] the being [of this later] that exists in being the effect'

and

'The creative nature of the things produces something that is of the nature that it previously did not exist'.

However, this is only possible if Ś. is a Śaiva. For a reference to a Buddhist is hardly likely to be of much effect in a dispute with a Śaiva. However, in the same context of discussion, Jayaratha presents Ś. as a Buddhist when he says that the Buddhist would, under certain circumstances, undermine his own tenets (*svasiddhānta*), relying for this tenet on a quotation from Ś.'s *Dharmālaṅkāra*⁶¹.

Thus in summary it can be said that Śāṅkaranandana originated from a Kashmiri Brahmin family, lived in Anupamamahāpura and grew up in the Śaiva tradition. However, from the very beginning he was attracted not only by the Śaiva tradition but also, as an Upāsaka, to a great extent by the Buddhist tradition. After Abhinavagupta's ĪPVV (completed in 1014/15) he abandoned Śaivism entirely and wrote a number of further works in which he denies the existence of God. From this, and from the fact that one of his works was already known to Utpaladeva, we can conclude a period of activity from approx. 970–1020/30 and a lifetime from approx. 940/50–1020/30.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts

AAS	<i>Anyāpohasiddhi</i> (Śāṅkaranandana): Derge Tshad ma Vol. 17, No. 4256, 281a6-302b1.
ĪAS _{ms}	<i>Īśvarāpākaraṇasāṅkṣepa</i> (Śāṅkaranandana): Manuscript of the Library of the Benares Hindu University: S. No. 3E/2700, Acc. No. C493.
ĪPVV	<i>Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivismarśinī</i> : <i>The Īśvarapratyabhijñā Vivṛitivismarśinī</i> by Abhinavagupta, edited by Madhusūdan

And nothing else should be taken into account while abandoning the nature of the things. Why in such a case do we need to seek for a conscious being (*cetana*) [namely God as author]? Fearing [this Abhinavagupta] says ..."

* The quotations are identified in Bühnemann 1980: 194 in DAK, Ms 14b4 and 14b6.

^a *eva* TĀV: *evā* DAK. ^b *eva* ca to be complemented with DAK.

⁶¹ *vyavahāramātrasiddhaive vā tasya kāryakāraṇabhāvo 'pi evaṃ syād iti svasiddhāntabhaṅgaḥ – kāryakāraṇabhāvasya vastusvabhāvatvenābhyupagamāt, yad dharmālaṅkārah tad evaṃ ayaṃ vastusvabhāva eva kāryakāraṇabhāvo na tu vyavahāramātrasiddhaḥ* | *iti* TĀV IV 1654,15–1655,3 = "Or if this [being previous etc.] is only proven according to everyday use, [then] the being an effect and cause is also thus. [And] this [would be] the ruin of your own teaching, because you assume the being an effect and cause to be the nature of the thing. As (*yad*) the *Dharmālaṅkāra* [teaches]:

Thus in this way the being an effect and cause is indeed the nature of the things, it is not merely proved according to everyday use".

- Kaul Shāstrī, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies lx, lxii, lxv, Bombay 1938-43 (repr. Delhi 1987).
- mKhas 'jug rnam bśad [A] Glo bo mkhan chen bSod nams lhun grub, *mKhas pa rnam 'jug pa'i sgo yi rnam par bśad pa rig gnas gsal byed 'phrul gyi me lon*. In: *Selected Writings of Glo-bo mKhan-chen bSod-nams lhun-grub*, Vol. 3, Manduwalla/Dehra dun: Pal Evam Chodan Ngorpa Centre, 1985.
- mKhas 'jug rnam bśad [B] *ibid.* [Glo bo sMon than Ms.] New Delhi 1979.
- TĀ *Tantrāloka* (Abhinavagupta): see TĀV
- TĀV *Tantrāloka* (Jayaratha): *The Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the Commentary of Jayaratha*, edited by R.C. Dwivedi and N. Rastogi, Delhi 1987.
- PrSi *Pratibandhasiddhi* (Śāṅkaranandana): Peking (abbr. Q) Vol. 138, No. 5755, 325a7-326b1, Derge (abbr. D) Tshad ma Vol. 17, No. 4257, 302b1-303a7.
- PVṬī *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* (Śāṅkaranandana): Derge Tshad ma Vol. 9, No. 4223, Pe 1b1-293a7.
- MVV *Mālinivijayavārttika* (Abhinavagupta): *Śrī Mālinivijayavārttikam of Abhinava Gupta*, ed by. Madhūsudan Kaul Shāstrī, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies xxxii, Srinagar 1921.
- SPA *Sambandhaparikṣānusāra* (Śāṅkaranandana): Derge Tshad ma Vol. 17, No. 4237, 21b4-35a3.
- SVR *Syādvādaratnākara* (Vālidevasūri): *Śrīmad-Vālidevasūrivira-cīaḥ Pramāṇanayataivālokālaṅkāraḥ tadvyākhyā ca Syādvādaratnākaraḥ*. Ed. L. Motīlāl. [5 vols.] Poona 1926-1930.
- PVSV *Pramāṇavārttikasavvrtti* (Dharmakīrti): Raniero Gnoli (ed.), *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti. The First Chapter with the Autocommentary. Text and Critical Notes*. Roma 1960.

Translations and studies

- Bühnemann, G. (1980) "Identifizierung von Sanskrittexten Śāṅkaranandanas". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 24: 191-198.
- Frauwallner, E. (1933) "Dignāga and anderes". In: *Festschrift für Moriz Winternitz*. Leipzig, pp. 237-242 [= Kleine Schriften pp. 484-489].
- Funayama, T. (1994) "Remarks on Religious Predominance in Kashmir. Hindu or Buddhist?" In: Ikari, Y. (Ed.) *A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir*. Kyoto, pp. 367-375.
- Gnoli (1960) "Introduction" to PVSV.
- Jackson, D.P. (1987) *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III). Sa-skya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate*. Vienna.
- Jackson, D.P. (1990) *Two Biographies of Śākyasrībhadra*. Stuttgart.
- Jambūvijaya, Muni (1981) "Jainācārya-Śrī-Hemacandrasūri-mukhyasīṣyābhyām ācārya-Rāmacandra-Guṇacandrābhyām viracitāyām Dravyālaṅkāra-svopajña-tīkāyām Bauddhagranthebhyā uddhṛtāḥ pāthāḥ". In: Bruhn, K., Wezler, A. (Eds.) *Studien zum Jainismus und*

- Buddhismus. Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*. Wiesbaden, pp. 129-149.
- Krasser, H. (1991) "On the Relationship between Dharmottara, Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla". In: Ihara, S., Yamaguchi, Z. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Tibetan Studies, Narita August 27th - September 2nd, 1989*. Tokyo, pp. 151-158.
- Kuijp, L.W.J. van der (1983) *Contributions to the Development of Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology. From the eleventh to the thirteenth century*. Wiesbaden.
- Kuijp, L.W.J. van der (1994a) "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History IV: The Tshad ma'i byung tshul 'chad nyan gyi rgyan. A Tibetan History of Indian Buddhist Pramāṇavāda". In: Balbir, N., Bautze, J.K. (Eds.) *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*. Reinbek, pp. 375-402.
- Kuijp, L.W.J. van der (1994b) "On the Lives of Śākyasrībhadra (?-?1225)". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114/4: 599-616 (review of Jackson 1990).
- Mejor, M. (1991) "On the Date of the Tibetan Translation of the Pramāṇasamuccaya and the Pramāṇavārttika". In: Steinkellner, E. (Ed.) *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Traditions. Proceedings of the 2nd International Dharmakīrti Conference*. Vienna, pp. 175-197.
- Much, M.T. (1988) *A visit to Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāna's collection of negatives at the Bihar Research Society school. Texts from the Buddhist epistemological school*. Wien.
- Much, M.T. (1991) *Dharmakīrtis Vādanyāyaḥ. Teil I. Sanskrit-Text. Teil II. Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. Vienna.
- Naudou, J. (1980) *Buddhists of Kāśmīr*. Transl. from French by Brereton and Picron. Delhi.
- Obermiller, E. (1932) *The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet by Bu-ston*. Translated from Tibetan. Heidelberg (repr. Delhi 1986).
- Padoux, A. (1992) *Vāc. The Concept of the Word In Selected Hindu Tantras*. Translated by Jacques Gontier. Albany.
- Pandey, K.C. (1963) *Abhinavagupta. An Historical and Philosophical Study*. Varanasi.
- Schiefner, A. (1869) *Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien. Aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt*. St. Petersburg.
- Stcherbatsky, Th. (1932, 1930) *Buddhist Logic*. Vols. I-II. Leningrad.
- Steinkellner, E., Much, M.T. (1995) *Texte der erkenntnistheoretischen Schule des Buddhismus*. Göttingen.
- Torella, R. (1988) "A Fragment of Utpaladeva's Īśvarapratyabhijñā-vivṛti". *East and West* 38/1-4: 137-174.
- Torella, R. (1994) *The Īśvarapratyabhijñā-kārikā of Utpaladeva with the Author's Vṛtti. Critical edition and annotated translation*. Roma.
- Tsukamoto, K. et al. (1990) *A descriptive bibliography of the Sanskrit Buddhist literature. Vol III. Abhidharma, Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, Buddhist epistemology and logic*. Kyoto.
- Vidyābhūṣaṇa, S.C. (1920) *A History of Indian Logic*. Calcutta (repr. Delhi 1988).

Utpaladeva	Abhinavagupta				Not ascribed
Before <i>Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛti</i>	Before MVV	Before TĀ	Before ĪPVV	After ĪPVV	
<p>yad āha <i>bhattah</i> <i>kāryaucityāt prāk svasaṃ-</i> <i>vidasaṃvitsmaranāntare</i> <i>l iti</i> quoted in ĪPVV II 369,12–14; Source unknown</p>	<p><i>Prajñālaṅkāra-</i> <i>kārikā</i></p>	<p><i>Dharmālaṅkāra-</i> <i>kārikā</i> with commentary</p>	<p><i>Bṛhatprāmāṇya-</i> <i>kārikā</i> ? <i>Sūkṣmaprāmāṇya-</i> <i>kārikā</i> ? <i>Madhyapramāṇya-</i> <i>kārikā</i> <i>Anyāpohasiddhi-</i> <i>kārikā</i> with commentary <i>Pratibandhasiddhi-</i> <i>kārikā</i> ? <i>Laghupratibandhasiddhi-</i> <i>kārikā</i></p>	<p><i>Īśvarāpākaraṇasaṅ-</i> <i>kṣepa</i> <i>(includes Saṅkṣipteśva-</i> <i>rāpākaraṇakārikā)</i> <i>Īśvarāpākaraṇa-</i> <i>kārikā</i> with commentary <i>Vādanyāya</i> Commentary <i>Sambandhaparī-</i> <i>kṣānusāra</i> <i>Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā</i></p>	<p><i>Sarvajñasiddhi-</i> <i>kārikā</i> with commentary <i>Svalpasarvajñasiddhi-</i> <i>kārikā</i> with commentary <i>Āgasiddhi-</i> <i>kārikā</i> with commentary</p>

Śāṅkaranandana's works in relation to the writings of Utpaladeva and Abhinavagupta