ON THE DATES AND WORKS OF ŚĀṆKARANANDANA

Professor Gnoni was the first and only expert not to date Śāṅkaranandana (in short: Š.) on the basis of Tibetan tradition but to use textual sources. He was also the first to consider Š.'s conversion from Buddhism to Śaivism\(^1\). Since almost 40 years have passed since Gnoni'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 Š.'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 – Śāṅkarānanda or Śāṅkaranandana.

Frawuallner (1933: 241) already pointed out that the form of the name ‘Śāṅkaranandana’, recorded in Vādidevasūri's Sūvyādāranākara\(^2\) and in Abhinavagupta’s Iśvarapratyabhijñāvivrtiśīrmaśīn\(^3\), is to be preferred to the alternative ‘Śāṅkarānanda’, found in the secondary literature\(^4\) and also in Tibetan texts\(^5\). Since the form of the name found in the SVR and in the ĪPVV is also to be found in the Mālinīvīyajāvārttika (see below, n. 58), in the Tān-

---

1 See below, pp. Ρ. ff.
2 tadh āha śāṅkarānandanaḥ I SVR 783,20; see also the references mentioned below pp. Ρ. ff and note 14.
3 sūbhā ṛh bhṛttatākaranāndanaḥ ... ĪPVV I 236,1; tena yad āha bhṛttatāka-
ranāndanaḥ ... ĪPVV II 16,10; see also below, note 25.
4 The form ‘Śāṅkarānanda’ can be found with variations in transliteration in, for instance, Vidyabhūṣaṇa 1920: 344f, 349; Obermiller 1932: 155; Stcherbatsky 1932: 42, 45f, 247; Gnoni 1960: xxiiif; Naudou 1980: 14, 121-127, 180, 229, 231; and Kuiper 1983 (see below, note 35).
5 Cf. for instance the colophon of Š.'s Anyāpohāsiddhi: eñam seṃ ba erya pa de ba bṣrṇṃ dam pa l mhi ga pa chen po šāṃ ka rānandas mṭad pa rdo rgs so II AAS 302a7. Likewise the colophon of the Sambandhiparikṣānusūtra reads: 'brel pa brtag pa'i 'brel pa bram te šāṃ ka rā nandas mṭad pa rdo rgs so II SPA 35a3. In addition there are the alternatives śāṅkananda, šāṃ kar nan ta (see below, note 30), and šāṃ kar nang (see below, note 31).

In the Tibetan translation of the name, bDe byed dga’ ba, dga’ ba can translate both ānanda and nandana; see Frawuallner 1933: 241.
trālokaviveka⁶, in the Dravyālankārakārika⁷ and in the colophon of Ś.'s Īśvarāpākaraṇasankṣepa⁸, in other words since the form ‹Śaṅkaraṇanda› 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 (sāksma) works that belong together, although their chronological classification is by no means certain. Although the kārikās of his miśraka 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 miśraka texts. However, there can be no final certainty on this point until these are found or new fragments discovered:

1. Prajñālankārakārika
   Commentary on Prajñālankārakārika
2. Dharmalankārakārika
   Commentary on Dharmalankārakārika
3. Brhatprāmānyaśākakārika
4. Madhyaprāmānyaśākakārika
5. Sāksmaprāmānyaśākakārika
6. Anyāpohasiddhīkārika
   Commentary on Anyāpohasiddhīkārika
7. Pratibandhasiddhīkārika
   Commentary on Pratibandhasiddhīkārika
8. Laghupratibandhasiddhīkārika
9. Īśvarāpākaraṇakārika
   Commentary on Īśvarāpākaraṇakārika
10. Sankṣiptesvarāpākaraṇakārika
    Īśvarāpākaraṇasankṣepa (Commentary on Sankṣiptesvarāpākaraṇakārika; includes the kārikās)⁹
11. Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Vāḍānyaṇa
12. Sambhālaparikṣāṇasūra (Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Sambhālaparikṣāṇa)
13. Pramāṇavaritikātiṅka (incomplete commentary on Dharmakīrti's PV I and PV SV up to k. 130)
14. Sarvajñāsiddhīkārika
   Commentary on Sarvajñāsiddhīkārika
15. Svalpasarvajñāsiddhīkārika
   Commentary on Svalpasarvajñāsiddhīkārika
16. Āgamasiddhīkārika
   Commentary on Āgamasiddhīkārika

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

1. Commentary on Prajñālankārakārika
2. Commentary on Dharmalankārakārika
7. Commentary on Pratibandhasiddhīkārika
11. Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Vāḍānyaṇa

On 1.) From the Prajñālankārika, prose quotations have survived that could only come from the commentary to Prajñālankārakārika:

yat praśūlāmān—we:
praroḥo 'syāh samvidah paśyāvam sa eva samśkāro vauya iti IPVV I 234,12f

⁹ The two works mentioned separately in Steinkellner and Much (1995: 80) “17. Commentar zur Sankṣiptesvarāpākaraṇakārika” and “18. Īśvarāpākaraṇasankṣepa” are no doubt a single work, if we do not wish to assume that Ś. wrote two Commentaries on the Sankṣiptesvarāpākaraṇakārika.

On 2.) Alongside the quotations from the Dharmālankārakārikā mentioned in Bühhemann (1980: 194), Jayaratha’s commentary Tantralokaviveka on Abhinavagupta’s Tantraloka contains two more quotations in prose:

“yad dharmālankārāḥ

- tatra sāmarthyaṃ hi tasya janakataṃ, tac ca yadi tasmin sati na bhavaī kim kathaṃ pāthānaṃ samarthyaṃ, atha bhavaī kathaṃ sāmarthyaṃ syā iti TĀV IV 1652,2–5

On 11.) See below, note 36.

According to Bühhemann (1980: 192) the Pratibandhasiddhikārika 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 Sāṅkṛtyāyana. Each photo shows 5 or more folio pages, recto or verso, in ascending sequence one beneath the other. Sāṅkṛtyāyana 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 Pratibandhasiddhikārika 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 Laghupratibandhasiddhikārika, which directly follows the Pratibandhasiddhikārika, does not start from 2a1–2a5, but from 2b1–2b5, and the Sūkṣma-prāmadevaśāyikārika does not begin in 2a5, but in 2b5. The numeric reference for the Sūkṣma-prāmadevaśāyikārika in the manuscript is 10.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Numeric reference in the manuscript</th>
<th>Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pratibandhasiddhikārika (PSK) (≡ P 5755)</td>
<td>22 (?)</td>
<td>1b1–2b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Laghupratibandhasiddhikārika (LPSK)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2b1–2b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sūkṣma-prāmadevaśāyikārika (SPK)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2b5–3a5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 Identified in Bühemann 1980: 194. The following prose was not interpreted as being Ś.’s declaration.
14 e ij a fa awa d a kā a kā[yām yad (“kāyam yad conj. : “kām yudd) uktaṃ apāstum TĀV 787,12. The text cannot be construed without correction.
15 On the translation, see below, p. 503.
16 See Jackson 1987: 127 (references on p. 147).
17 The details in Steinkeller and Much 1995: 80′ must also be corrected accordingly.
TIME OF ACTIVITY

In his introduction to the text edition of Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti, Raniero Gnoli corrected the lifetime of Ś. claimed by Vidyābhūṣāna and Scherbatsky as being “about 1050 AD.”18 and “XIIth 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 Dhamottara (740–800)22, and thus must have been active between these two23. In addition, Gnoli refers to a legend handed down by Tāranātha and DPaṅ bsm baṅ bzan, according to which Ś., as he was about to write a commentary on 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 pratilabdhyomṛṣa26 by ‘he recovered illumination’ in the sense of a conversion from Buddhism to 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 pratilabdhyomṛṣa 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 gnosology commonly accepted. This work... is the Prajñālāṅkāra, 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 bhāṣṭa 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 Prajñālāṅkāra, 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 Spandaśākāra 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: yasyonnesanimesaḥḥyām jagataḥ pralayodayau (“Padoux 1992: 250”). According to Abhinavagupta’s Parāśākāvatāramana unmesa 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: unmiṣant tu jñānasatikārasyaṃkṣaraḥvānapradaṃvṛttiṃ ṣaṃvitamaṃ uṣṭaita”). In addition, he equates unmesa with the highest level of consciousness (saṃvīda), of which he says: “This consciousness which the Āgamas celebrate under the name of insight (pratibhā), unfolding (unmesa), 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: 181f and 182c)”. “bhavati cedam asatojjayataḥvāvakalpajñānaś sansvaratārdvārdvārdvārgastutiaṃvṛttīsampraptaḥpratibhāḥlabdgo maṃ niṣvālapakam saṃsvād-vīrddharmaśatīḥatīndrāvikalpavahvāhī 1 amātaa tād amandvābhādabhādabhādaghāvavān eva 1 ubhayāya cā jñānayo antarālām anapahvavān yām jñānayo bhedād eva 1 tāc ca saṃvidātma-kam eva…”.”

22 Gnoli 1960: xxiv.

18 Vidyābhūṣāna 1920: 344.
19 Scherbatsky 1932: 45.
20 Gnoli 1960: xxiiif.
22 On the dating see Krasser 1991.
23 References can be found in Gnoli 1960: xxiiif2 and xxivf2.
24 See the translation of Tāranātha by Schieffer 1869: 247f.
26 The basic meaning of unmesa is ‘the opening of the eyes’, ‘the opening of the flowers/blossoms’. The correlate is nimesa, ‘the closing of the eyes’, ‘the closing of the
illuminated. Since Abhinavagupta himself quotes a stanza from the Prajñālankāra in his Tantrālokā, and interprets this as Buddhist doctrine (ākṣata ca ... iti saṃgataḥ; see below [p. 504 and note 59]), it is difficult to interpret the Prajñālankāra as a work that is entirely Śaivite and opposed to Buddhist doctrine.

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 others, but also follows from statements in the texts by

---

28 See above, note 25.

29 See also Gomé’s own comment on the reference quoted from his introduction to PVSV: “The scanty fragments of this work hardly permit us to get an idea of its content.” (Gomé 1960: xxiv)

30 A further hagiography to which Kuip (1994a: 38) refers survives in Glo bo mchab chen:

... ’di i =bde ’byed dga’ ba’i’ grum ni l kha che gron klzer chen po dge med du n mi stegs kyi padri ta chen po bram ze šaṅkarāṇanda ([A]: ’sun kar nam tu [B]) ’ses bya ba blo gros phun sum tshogs pa don ldan pa byun ste de mi džad po la sred pas chen ’thon ([B]: tshon [A]) ma žig ([A]: geig [B]) dan yig gcig sin de i’ gnas su yun yan ’gro ba žig yod po de de’i na pa’i dge stsen gcig ([B]: ceg [A]) kyang de’i sar ‘gro ba na i de’i dpe sans rgyas bcom ldan ’das la tshangs pa don dkan phogs la sogs pa las khyod par du phogs par byod po la mtho btse gnub grub rigz mdzad pa yod po de las nas de šaṅkarāṇanda ([A]: ’sun kar nam tu [B]) mthong la de’i don bden par rjogs nas sans rgyas la šins tu dad de’i bram ze rnam kyi ([B]: kyi [A]) gus par bya ba’i tshangs skud kyi dge’i ḍun gyi meti lhwaṃ ([A]: lhun [B]) ’gel ba’i srad bu byas nas sans rgyas kyi bstan pa la žigs te de nas rjog ge’i ([A]: ge [B]) tshad ma’i bstan bcos kyang brisams ([B]: brisam [A]) par b’zhad de la ’... mKhás ’jug rnam bḥad [A] 342,1–5 = [B] 507,3–508,2.

The legend about him [i.e. Śaṅkarāṇanda] is as follows: In the big Kashmiri town of Anupamahāpurā, lived a great heretical scholar, a Brahmīn by the name of Śaṅkarāṇanda, whose intellect was excellent. Since he craved (sred pa) love (’død pa), he took pleasure (yid gcigs) in a spirits vendor (chen ’ton 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 (Khyod par du ’phogs)] there, which praised Buddha as particularly exulted (’phogs pa) over Brahmīn and Śiva and which was written by Udhatasiddhāvāmin (mTho btse gnub grub rje). When Śaṅkarāṇanda 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 (tshangs skud) highly revered by the Brahmīns for hanging up (’gel ba) the monk’s (dge don) sandals (meti lhwaṃ), he entered the Buddhist doctrine. Thereupon he also wrote pramāṇaśāstras. [Thus] it is said (b’zhad).

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

---

31 The ‘abbot’ of course refers to the Kashmiri Śākyārībhadra (1127–1225) who functioned as the abbot (mkhan-po) when Sa-skya Paṇḍita was ordained as monk in 1208...

Ś. ’s important position in the Tibetan epistemological tradition also follows from the fact that Sa-skya Paṇḍita 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 Paṇḍita’, ‘Vaṅgu Paṇḍita’ or ‘Pa’n chen Mewangu’ was the teacher of the influential Śākyārībhadra, who in turn was Sa-skya Paṇḍita’s teacher.

32 In addition, according to Go ram pa bSod nams sEn ge, Sa-skya Paṇḍita is said to have been involved in the translation of Ś. ’s Pramāṇavārttikājīka, the translators

---

33 On Anupamamahāpurā, also known as Anupamapura and Kaśmirapura, see Naudou 1980: 208f.

34 The text has been recently published: Johannes Schneider, Der Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha. Udbhataśiddhāvanīs Viśeṣastava mit Prajñāvārmāns Kommentar. Bonn 1993.

35 Kuip 1983: 258 notes the following text: “See the TMRGRG fol. 110a4: chung kar-nan’ai gyorges-pa kho-bris mkhan-po-las rnyed-pa ’di kha-na ‘thub-par mthong-ngo.”


37 On a biography of Śākyārībhadra, see Jackson 1990 and the detailed discussion thereof in Kuip 1994b.

38 Cf. Kuip 1983: 6 and 258; also Mejor 1991: 176 (where the name reads ‘Wamkha Paṇḍita’).
of which are not mentioned in bstan ’gyur 35. Likewise, he is alleged to have translated a commentary written by Ś. on Dharmakīrti’s Vādanyāya, which, however, has survived neither in the original nor in translation 36.

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 in practice, and was regarded by Sa skyā Paṇḍita and other Tibetans as one of their own. For there can be no doubt that Sa skyā Paṇḍita would not have adopted the doctrines of a predecessor who himself dismissed these doctrines as false.

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

What could one experienced in the countless (viparyāṣu), widely disseminated (prādīhāṣu) [and] immeasurable doctrines (ṛṣṣu), even if he is well prepared (prayato ’pi), do for a world of little understanding 37?

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 Prati-bandhasiddhiārikā. 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. 2b 38 (siddhiārikās I), and indicated by the writer as belonging to the latter by means of a kākapada, a small apostrophe above the two danda. The text, which is inserted above the 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 Sugūta:

‘brel pa grub pa slob dpon mkhas pa chen po bram ze ’i riggs su sku ’khruns pa chos kyi grag pa gnis pa ’zes ’jig rten na gsam (D : gan Q) du grags šin rtog ge pa phal pa’i gṣun ’jig pa dān II thogs pa med pa don gyi de kho na rnam par ’jog (Q : ’jig D) pa’i blo’i mthu stobs kyiṣ (Q : kyi D) ’gras zla dan bral pa II bde bar gṣog pa’i bstan pa la gca spras (D : spas Q) su’i dzin par legs pa bsad pa’i ro myan ba la smlas rtse (rtse D; lacks Q) geig tu gṣol ba dge bsren dam pa šanka ra’i ndas (Q : šanka rāṇan das D) mdzad pa rdzogs so II PrŚi D 303a5–7 = Q 326a6–8.

The Prati-bandhasiddhi written by the teacher (slob dpon, *dacārya), the great scholar (mkhas pa chen po, *mahāpaṇḍita), the honourable (dam pa) Upāsaka Śāṅkarāṇanda has been completed. [Namely by the teacher Śāṅkarāṇanda], born to the Brahmin caste (and) celebrated by the people (’jig rten na gsam du) as a “second Dharmakīrti”, who destroyed the doctrines (gṣun) 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 (gca spras su’i dzin pa) the teachings of the Sugūta, persists with his spirit (sems) in concentration on the enjoyment (ro myan 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 Īśvarapā-karaṇakārikā together with its commentary, in the Īśvarapā-karaṇa-

35 See Kuip 1983: 104: “He [=Sa skyā Paṇḍita] also embarked on the translation of the Pramāṇavīrtīkaṭkā by Śāṅkarāṇanda in which he collaborated with Saṃghabhirāhada, a member of Śākyarāṇa’s entourage.” The relevant text, to which van der Kuip, p. 303 39, refers, reads: ... bram ze ’i ’grel ba dan bca pa gsum nas bsgyur I (Go ram pa bSod nams sen ge, Tshad ma rigs pa’i gser gyi dka’ ba’i gnas rnam par bsad pa sde dbun rab gsal, in The Complete Works of Go ram bSod nams seng ge, compiled by bSod nams rgya mtha’o. [The Complete Works of the Great Masters of the Sa skyā Sect of the Tibetan Buddhism 12] Tokyo 1969: fol. 584).


37 viparyāṣu prādīhāṣu kim aprādāṣu dṛṣṭīṣu I jagaty olpamatau kuryāt prayato ’pi visāradha I II IASm 7.19I. A critical edition together with a translation is in preparation.

38 The Prati-bandhasiddhiārikā starts in the manuscript from fol. 1b1–2b1; cf. above, 497a3 (§ 3).
sankṣepa and in the Pramāṇavārttikā is incompatible with Śaivism. From this it then follows that it was only after the completion of Abhinavagupta’s IPVV, which according to an oral communication by Prof. Raffaele Torella (November 18, 1994) was probably his last philosophical work, 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 Pramāṇavārttikā can certainly be placed in the time after the completion of the IPVV as can probably be his commentary on Dharmaśīri’s Sam-

\[39\] Cf. Ś.’s explanation of artha: “a thing, a fact, a state of being, an entity” (PVS 1, 8): “a thing that is not the same thing as another thing,” (PVS 1, 8). Artha is a concept that is different from that. It is either the conventionally existing such as material (*phāsa), or it is something completely non-existing such as primordial matter (*pradhāna), God (*tīrtha), or a hare’s horn.” In addition: “...gca bo mthug byed pa po’i dbang phyug gcig ni mi srid do 11 PTI 112856 = “...a unique God, who is the creator of all being, is not possible.”

\[30\] In any event the IPVV is the last of the works containing references to Ś.; these include also the Tantrāloka and the Mālinīvijayavārttikā (see Note 30; Bühnemann 1980). For the Īśvaraprayāhījñāvivrtti contains a reference to the Tantrāloka (yathākeśa māyeva ... tantrāloke IPVV 133,23), while the latter knows the Mālinīvijayavārttikā (... mālinīślokovārttikā TĀ 37th chapter k. 30 in TĀ VIII 369117; Panétya 1963: 30 refers to this passage).

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 Prajñālankāra-kārikā: nijadharmāprayāhena pariśākhunākārikā I praśāstibhaktivāt kākṣaḥ kārdgādārśaśailādāvat II iti prajñālankārākārikā śravagāmikāraṇa laśonam āha [... k. 54] TĀV II 141,13–15 (cf. Giolo 1960: xvxii; Bühnemann 1980: 196).

The relative chronology of the works of Utpaladeva, Abhinavagupta and Ś. determined in the above discussion is set out in the Table on p. 378 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 Īśvaraprayāhījñāvivrtti, and that several were written after Abhinavagupta’s IPVV (completed in 1014/15). The year in which the Īśvaraprayāhījñāvivrtti was written is not known. However, it is certainly a late work by Utpaladeva, whose dates are given as 900/25–950/75. According to Torella (1994: 41) His commentaries on these works by Dharmaśīri 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).


Cf. below, note 60: ... yad dhrāmālankāraḥ ihyāśāntākhyāna...

Since the earliest of Ś.’s works quoted by Abhinavagupta is the Prajñālankārākārikā, 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 Prajñālankāra as a result of illegibility.

See Giolo 1960: xxvii; and Bühnemann 1980: 197.

xli), Utpaladeva wrote the Īśvarapratyabhijñākārīka and the Vṛtti at the same time, and then wrote the Vivṛtti or Tikā on both of these later. A considerable period of time must have passed between the writing of the first two works and the Vivṛtti, for “In the tikā, 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 Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtti was a work from Ś’s 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. 940/50–1020/30.

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 Anyāpohasiddhi he dedicated the introductory stanza of reverence to the all-knowing, and that in the Pratibandhasiddhi to the Sugata. In addition to the śloka of reverence of the latter, he refers to the Sugata (bde bar gšigs pa) as one who has eliminated either the matter (don) or the misery (nan) of the heretics (mu stegs can). And Gnorl (1960: xxv) already pointed out that

47 Cf. also Torella 1988: 137–142.

48 The Tibetan tradition according to which Ś.’s pupil ‘Vaginda Pandita’, ‘Vang Chen Mewa’gu’ (see above, p. 77) was the teacher of Śākyasūryabhāda, agrees neither with Gnorl’s earlier dating nor with that proposed here. It is assumed that Śākyasūryabhāda lived from 1127 or approx. 1140 to 1225 (see Jackson 1990: Introd. p. 1 and 181). Even according to Ś.’s later dating, ‘Vaginda Pandita’ 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. Kujip 1983: 213).

49 kun mkhyen ’khrul bral dus gsum gnas pa yi il don rnam ji bzin gšigs pa la bsdud de II AAS 2814 = “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 Śivā with the word “all-knowing” is shown by the fact that he also uses this epithet in his Sambandhaparikṣānasūtra (kun mkhyen de la phyag ’tshal lo II SPA 218b).

50 bde bar gšigs pa de la ... phyag ’tshal lo II PhSh D 302b2 = “Reverence to the Sugata.”

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

de ’nā sbyin la don des mnyon sum mshar la de lam rjes stegs ’kyi ... bde bar gšigs pa la ... phyag ’tshal lo II PhSh Q 325a8–325b2 = D 302b1–2.

52 According to Abhinavagupta in the Prajñālankāra 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 world. That the Dharmānīkāraka 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 causes. 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]

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 (ātmalabhā) as of a transient nature that is momentariness.

In the Brhatprāmāṇyakārīka cited by Abhinavagupta, Ś. also attests reverence to the Buddha.

This however means that all Ś.’s 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).

53 Gnorl refers to IPV II 144,11–13: dlamglanggrangka brgyud dain na sngags vjñaptimatebrgyud stvabhāvanam (conj.: “siddhāvāsabhāvanam”), prajñālankārakānun bhotita, dmar dcan she tra tra cnyen tra vjñaptimate tra artha ukti iti i1

54 On the Sanskrit text, see above, p. 4f, p. 4f.2.

55 tar 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.

56 Cf. yat punah prāmāṇyaparikṣāvai bhūttena uktam – vyaktoḥ prakāśaḥ svārthārtham samākāra pratibodhakāḥ i nānyātur syād vikalpe ’pi tatravṛtī apiṣṭyād iti IPV II 221,4–7 (see Gnorl 1960: xxiiif, identified in Bühnemann 1980: 193 in manuscript Sbl [she also indicates textual alternatives]).

57 buddham... praṇama... Ms 4a11.
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 Śaivaite community in Kashmir. It is also probably due to Ś.'s influence that Abhinavagupta integrated Dharmakīrti's logic, as far as compatible with his system, in his IPVV.

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 Prajñālankārā. In contrast, he no longer mentions him by name in the Tantrāloka, but quotes a stanza from the Prajñālankārā and expressly refers to the opinion it contains as Buddhist: ukham ca... iti saugataī. The IPVV, as already noted (see above, [p. 45] with note 25), speaks very highly of Ś. In his Tantrālokaviveka, Jayaratha also clearly reveals that Ś. wrote Buddhist works as a Śaiva. According to Jayaratha, TĀ IX 11 presupposes a Buddhist object in which the Buddhist refers to a section in Ś.'s Dharmālankārā to reinforce his own position.

57 According to the hagiography recorded in Gō bo mghān chen, Ś. was born in the Kashmiri town of Anuṇaśāmāhāṃpurā; cf. above, note 30.

58 ... uṣṭha ca ca guruṇa śāṅkaraṇānandaśaṃ – nā mūrtiṇādi tātati māyāvān na bādhād asthitāḥ sūryāḥ II MVV I 431

59 Ta IV. III 55: ukham ca – sati bhāye ‘pi dhīr ekānekavedanāt i anekasadrśākārā na iv aneketi saugataī. Jayaratha comments: ukham iti prajñālankārādau. tad ukham tatr –

īsāmāti saty api bhāye ‘rihe dhīr ekānekavedanāt i anekasadrśākārā nānekaiva (PAK, TĀ II: nānekeva TĀ III) prasajyate II iī TĀ II 416,6–9.

Gnoli 1960: xxiii refers to the passage; identified in Bāhūnnemann 1980: 196 in manuscript PAK 22a5–6. The stanza from PAK is also quoted in TĀ III 1308,4–5 with the introduction yad dhātu.

60 janma... iti sātī eva bijāṅkṛūḍdau bhāve bhāvāmām kāryakāramābhāva iti yad dharmālankārā – bhāva eva parasyeṣa kāryaṁbhāva ... 1* iti,

svabhāva janaka ‘rthaṁ abhūtaṁ abhyārāhavāhāh iti

iti ca. na ca svabhāvaṁ uśnitaṁ bhāvānām anyat kiṃcid apekṣaṇīyam iti kim atra cetaṇāvaprabhāsanetāḥ āśaṅkyaḥ ... [followed by TĀ IX 11] TĀ 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 Dharmālankārā says:[109]

‘The only 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 (svaśiddhānta), relying for this tenet on a quotation from Ś.'s Dharmālankārā.

Thus in summary it can be said that Śāṅkaraṇānanda originated from a Kashmiri Brahmin family, lived in Anuṇaśāmāhāṃpura 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 IPVV (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.
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