PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS ON ŚĀKYAMATI’S PRAMĀṆAVĀRTTIKATIKA

I.

The literature of the Buddhist epistemological tradition in sheer volume consists mainly of direct or indirect commentaries on the different works of Dharmakīrti. As often observed in the philosophical literature of India, in this Buddhist tradition, too, the doctrinal developments take place for a great part within the frame-work of commentaries and sequences of commentaries. The historian’s interest in these commentaries, therefore, is usually multiplex: On the one hand it is necessary to use those explanations which prove to be useful for an understanding of the basic text, and to distinguish these explanations according to their degree of authority. And on the other hand the extensions and digressions are to be examined with regard to their value as a testimony for a development of the doctrine. Finally, if such development is to be met with, we have to pay attention to what extent this development has influenced the plain explanatory parts of the comments, too.

The two oldest commentaries on the Pramāṇavārttikam (PV) have been written by a direct pupil of Dharmakīrti, Devendrabuddhi, and by a pupil of the latter, Śākyamati. While Devendrabuddhi wrote his commentary on PV, chapters II–IV – in continuation of Dharmakīrti’s own commentary (svavrttiḥ) on chapter I –, Śākyamati composed his text as a sub-commentary on these earlier explanations, covering all four chapters of the PV. Both commentaries are essentially philological commentaries, that offer primarily explanations of the direct meaning of Dharmakīrti’s words without commenting on the philosophical implications and structures of his system in the manner of the later ones.

Such explanations looking beneath the surface and fully appreciating Dharmakīrti’s thought, do not begin to appear before the second half of the eighth century, but culminate soon in the detailed and thorough productions of Dharmottara (ca. 750–810 A.D.) and Prajñākaragupta (ca. 800 A.D.), which bear witness to their authors comprehension of Dharmakīrti’s teaching as well as to their independence as philosophers.

Tibetan tradition records, that Dharmakīrti had no great esteem for the commentary of his pupil Devendrabuddhi, for the very reason that he had concerned himself with the direct meaning only. Nevertheless we have to consider his expla-

1 From among the twenty tshad ma-volumes of the Peking edition (Ce-Ye) the commentaries on Dharmakīrti’s principal works occupy more than fourteen, over twelve volumes dealing with the PV and two with the PVin.
2 Frauwallner 1960, 119; 1961, 145 (ca. 630–690 A.D.)
3 Frauwallner 1933, 238 f.; 1961, 145 (ca. 660–720 A.D.)
4 Cf. Stcherbatsky 1932, I, 39 f.
5 Frauwallner 1960, 119; the disparaging judgement on Devendrabuddhi’s accomplishments derives from the lineage of Prajñākaragupta (cf. Stcherbatsky 1932, I, 44).
nations as "authentic in accordance with Dharmakirti". Yet it is strange, that neither within the literature of the school nor within that of its opponents does this oldest commentary seem to have been made particular use of, but rather that the commentary of Śākyamati has been considered to be of greater interest. Of course, Śākyamati’s commentary has gained value by the fact that Dharmakirti explained the first chapter of the PV himself, for with regard to this first chapter Śākyamati is the oldest commentator extant. And this might have been the reason — because of this chapter’s import for the doctrinal history of the school — for the fact that attention has also been paid later on to his sub-commentary on the chapters II—IV. The exceptional position of the first chapter with its commentary as a literary document has brought about the consequence, that commentaries have been composed solely for this chapter and others on chapters II—IV. Only of Śākyamati and the late Manorathānandin do we know for sure — since they are extant — that they have commented upon all four chapters. That this literary polarization is present within Śākyamati’s work, too, can be seen from the relative proportion of volume: compared with the 487 folios on the first chapter we have only 251 folios on the rest. This, of course, is due to the fact, that in the case of the first chapter the commentary of Dharmakirti, too, had to be explained in full, while in case of the other chapters what mattered were the basic verses, and Devendra-buddhi’s commentary did not have to be explained in every detail.

That Śākyamati’s explanation of the first chapter with its commentary is older than that of Karṇākagomin has finally been clarified. And that his explanations have been used by other Buddhist and non-Buddhist authors when dealing with Dharmakirti, has been shown by E. FRAUWALLNER even before a number of works of the school became available in the Sanskrit original through the rich manuscript finds by R. SĀNKṚTYĀYANA. Only today, with the help of these newly found Sanskrit materials and the much more easily accessible Tibetan translations, it becomes evident, that FRAUWALLNER’s findings were not accidental, but rather, due to the fact that the tradition of the school has indeed valued the commentary of Śākyamati as the authoritative philological explanation of the Prāṇavārttikam.

Just in what way the explanations of Śākyamati have been used, is most clearly exemplified in the case of Karṇākagomin’s sub-commentary on the first chapter of

6 Frauwaller 1960, 120.
7 Regarding Karṇākagomin cf. below; as to the possibility of other old commentatorial traditions cf. note 16.
8 Cf. Frauwaller 1954, 152.
9 As Frauwaller 1954, 147 f. demonstrated, it was originally an independent treatise consisting of verses and a commentary which Frauwaller hypothetically calls the "Hetuprakāram" (152). My impression is, however, that we do not actually have a verse-text with a commentary before us, but rather a treatise that has been composed as a unity, and where the parts in prose have sometimes a commentatorial and sometimes a developing function.
10 Steinkellner 1979.
11 Kamalakesa (Frawallner 1933, 238 f.), and the Jainas Haribhadra (Frawallner 1937, 65–74) and Kalyāṇacandra (Frawallner 1933, 239 f.) have used the PVT.
the PV together with its commentary. GNOLI has already pointed out, that the word-explanations\textsuperscript{12} of Karṇakagomin are identical with those of Sākyamati\textsuperscript{13}. But his conclusion, that Sākyamati had taken these parts from Karṇakagomin's text, is wrong. The relationship of the two is just the reverse: Karṇakagomin has simply used Sākyamati's word-explanation for his own word-explanation, and has expanded these by smaller glosses, by paying attention to and introducing other word-explanations, but above all by adding large digressions, polemics and systematical explanations, the latter of which must be considered as Karṇakagomin's original contribution.

Another kind of utilization of the PVT is to be found in the textual material gathered in the appendix to the edition of Manorathanandin's PVV: a re-writing of word-explanations by using Sākyamati's commentary, thus creating a new commentary into which Sākyamati's words and often long passages have been incorporated. Instances of this kind of secondary utilization of the Sākyamati-text are naturally difficult to trace. I can offer only a few examples for the commentary on chapters II–IV of the PV, but I would expect that material of this kind can be enlarged in time.

There are two reasons that make it desirable to prepare a reconstruction of Sākyamati's commentary, which on the basis of the extant materials in Sanskrit would be possible for almost the whole of the first chapter and some interesting parts of the other chapters. In the first place an observation of his commentary's secondary utilization would allow for an easy delimitation of the creative sections in the new commentaries and, thus, the determination of the development of the Dharmakīrti-exegesis. And in the second place, by regaining the original this commentary which is still very near to Dharmakīrti would be re-established in its authoritative value with respect to the forms and peculiarities of its language, too, since the Tibetan translation in spite of its general accuracy often remains ambiguous as to details of expression.

Considering the fact, however, that many important texts of the school still remain untreated, it would not be expedient at this time to attempt a reconstruction of Sākyamati's commentary as a whole. Yet it seems appropriate to point to the fact, that we are already in possession – if only in crude form – of the original text of this authoritative explanation at least for the first chapter. And it is also evident, that on the other hand the Tibetan translation of the PVT provides us with an instance of control for large parts of Karṇakagomin's commentary which has not been translated into Tibetan itself, but stands in need of such control considering its occasional gross corruption. In the following I would like to show, using a few examples, the prospects for regaining this important commentary as they present themselves on the basis of the material known so far.

\textsuperscript{12} I use the term „word-explanation“ for such explanations that are concerned only with the direct meaning, grammatical analyses etc. of a text, as opposed to systematical explanations that are mainly concerned with the philosophical meaning.

\textsuperscript{13} Gnoli 1960, XXI.
II.

Praṃṇavārttikaṭikā I (svārtānumānam):

Since Karṇākagomin incorporates the commentary of Śākyamati into his own with very few changes, and uses it there for that part of his own commentary that gives the word-explanation, his PVST must be considered as the main-source for the first chapter of Śākyamati's PVT. In this circumstance the original text of the PVT is preserved almost entirely. I have already presented some observations on the method of Karṇākagomin's utilization of the PVT: it is evident, on closer inspection, that Karṇākagomin has not been copying these explanations mechanically, but with a critical consideration of their value, as on occasion he discards them in favour of other explanations.

The following synopsis for the beginning of the two texts serves as a good example for both the reconstructability of the PVT and the commentarial technique of the PVST. Identical texts (with only minor omissions or glosses) are printed in italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV I, PVSV</th>
<th>PVT</th>
<th>PVST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maṅgala (v.1) and Introduction (v.2)</td>
<td>1bl–2b2</td>
<td>1,6–18\textsuperscript{15}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b2–4a2</td>
<td>1,19–3,14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a2–5</td>
<td>3,16–19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a5–5b2</td>
<td>3,20–4,27\textsuperscript{16}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introductory sentence (PVST 1,8–9)</td>
<td>5b2–7a1</td>
<td>4,28–6,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,6–8,12\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a2–3</td>
<td>8,14–16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a3–5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definition of hetu (v.3)</td>
<td>7a5–6</td>
<td>8,17–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,20–23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a6–7b1</td>
<td>8,24–29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,1–12,15\textsuperscript{18}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} Steinkellner 1979, 149.

\textsuperscript{15} Different Maṅgala-verses and introductory words in both texts.

\textsuperscript{16} PVST 4a7–5b2 (= PVST 3,25–4,27) is also extant, although with gross corruptions and long omissions in PVV, Appendix 1, 515,3–23. On this Appendix cf. below p. 288. This piece of text contains an alternative interpretation of Dharmakīrti’s second introductory verse within the frame: anye tv anyatha . . . . . iti; Śākyamati, therefore, has already been able to refer to another, possibly earlier, commentatorial tradition on the first chapter.

\textsuperscript{17} Contains further discussion of various interpretations of PVSV 1,8f.

\textsuperscript{18} Contains further discussion of the hetu-definition and polemics against Jaina- and Mīmāṃsā-positions.
The relationship of the two texts remains much the same to the end. There are, however, passages where Karnakagomin does not take over Śākyamati’s commentary but offers other explanations instead. These alternative word-explanations, too, are not his own, but are taken from commentaries on other works of Dharmakirti. For Dharmakirti has transferred shorter and longer texts from his PV and PVSV to two of his other works, to the Hetubinduḥ, and in particular to the Pramāṇavārttikāyaḥ. The polemics against Īśvarasena e.g. from his commentary on PV I v. I (= 3) (PVSV 1,12–2,10) is to be found again in HB I*1,6–2*5, and the second chapter of the PV in abounds in such texts 19. In these cases the Hetubinduṭikā of Arcaṭa 20 and the Pramāṇavārttikāyaṭikā of Dharmottara 21 have been used by Karnakagomin in addition to Śākyamati’s Ṭikā or instead of it. When these other explanations deviate from Śākyamati’s commentary he often reports both explanations 22. Karnakagomin, of course, has probably been the first commentator of the tradition who was able to make such eclectic use of the whole commentatorial literature available to him 23.

To sum up: the first chapter of Śākyamati’s PVT can be reconstructed more or less completely with the help of the material to be gained from Kamalasila’s Tattvasaṅgrahaṇaṭikā, Haribhadra’s Anekāntajayapatākavyākhyā, Arcaṭa’s Hetubinduṭikā and, above all, Karnakagomin’s Pramāṇavārttikā (sva)ṛtiṭikā, since these authors have used his word-explanations for composing their own commentarial texts. For the time being this oldest commentary on one of the most important texts of the whole tradition can be easily read in its original Sanskrit wording by looking up Karnakagomin’s comments and comparing them with the respective passages of the Tibetan translation of the PVT.

III.

With regard to Śākyamati’s commentary on the chapters II–IV of the PV we have to be aware of the fact that he does not directly explain Dharmakirti’s verses, but the commentary of Devendrabuddhi 24. The following materials come from the

19 Cf. the “parallel texts” in my edition of the PVin II.
20 E.g. PVSVT 13,19 ff., where he made use of HBT 12,26 ff., or PVSVT 27,6 ff. of ḠIBT 150, 17 ff. There are identical pieces of the text in PVT, PVSVT and HBT; but a passage like PVT 8a7–8b4 has been substituted in PVSVT 13,22–14,7 with the explanation of ḠIBT 13,2–17. Thus it is clear that Karnakagomin has used the HBT, but that Arcaṭa, too, has made use of Śākyamati’s PVT.
21 E.g. PVSVT 69,29 ff. uses PVinT 337a3 ff.; PVSVT 90,16–22 uses PVinT 319b7–320a3, and for the composition of PVSVT 374,25–376,29 cf. Steinkellner 1979, 142–147.
22 Cf. Steinkellner 1979, 143 ff. and 145 ff.
24 A fact which is sometimes overlooked (e.g. Gnoli in his schema 1960, XXVII; R. Sāṅkṣyāyaṇa in his introduction to PV Bh, th). – Some pages of the original of this commentary have been found by G. Tucci in Nepal: „From Nepal I brought also a leaf only of the beginning of the Pramāṇavārttika of Dharmakirti, containing the beginning of the first Pariccheda,
interesting Appendix I (515–531) in R. SĀṆKRTYAṆĀṆA's edition of Manorathandin's Pramāṇavārttika vyuttih. This appendix contains shorter and longer unconnected pieces of texts of commentarial character. Vibhūticandra, the copyist of the manuscript, has not only added numerous footnotes to the manuscript, but also personal remarks and scholarly notes at the end of the manuscript. I have not been able so far to find the original source for all of these texts. No. 1 (App 515) is a badly corrupted text from the beginning of Śākyamati's PVT. The other texts — on the whole of unidentified origin — have incorporated, however, some texts from Jinendrabuddhi's Viśālāmalavati and a great number of texts from Śākyamati's PVT on the second, third and fourth chapter.

Pramāṇavārttikaṭikā II (pramāṇasiddhi):

From the beginning of the second chapter which has a section of interest regarding the problem of the sequence of chapters in the PV (PVT 85b3–86b3), and corroborates, just by virtue of its giving an explanation, the sequence svārthānunāna as the first and pramāṇasiddhi as the second chapter, we find extracts in the texts no. 2 and 3 of the appendix. Because of the import of this text I present it as a whole and, since the text cannot be completely recovered from these fragments, I add the Tibetan translation in the version of Peking in order to fill the gaps. The pratikas from Devendrabuddhi's commentary are identified. Words without correspondence in the Tibetan translation are not in italics and additional words in the translation are added in brackets.

[PVT 85b3 (C 71a7f.):] rgol ba daṅ lan bst'an pa'i zur gyis le'u daṅ po daṅ gnis pa'i 'brel pa bst'an pa'i phyir / [fragment 1: App 516,31–517,3 = PVT 85b3–5:] āha: ācāryiyetvāt (PVP 1b2) iyaṅ cātraṁaṅkā: yady ācāryadhardhamakirtinā ('di bst'an bcos) pramāṇasamuccayo vyākhyaṭṭum prastutas, tadā sa eva vyākhyaṭṭatāṃ; kimity ādāv utkramyaśūnumānakṣaṇam vyākhyaṭṭavān iti. asya parihaṛaḥ: ācārya (tshad ma'i mtshan ņid kyi bst'an bcos bśad pa'i) ityādi. acaryo 'tra dignaḥ ('dod de).

and some pages of the commentary upon the same work by Devendrabuddhi... " (On some aspects of the doctrine of Maitreya[nātha] and Asaṅga. Calcutta 1930, 39). The chapter in question is probably the second (pramāṇasiddhi). Prof. Tucci has confirmed the existence of these pages, but due to a reorganisation of the ISMEO-library they are not available at the moment.

25 Cf. PVV 513,4.
26 Cf. R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana's preface to the PVV, I; E. Frauwaller has studied these notes and shown that many have been taken from Devendrabuddhi's commentary on the PV (1960, 119–123).
28 Cf. PVV, Appendix, 515, note 1: pustakānte kargadapatresu vibhūticandretaiva likhitam.
29 Cf. note 16.
31 Compared with the version of Cone, where our text is found in Vol. Še, 71a6 ff.
32 ādāv utkramya ("neglecting the first [chapter]") has been misunderstood and translated by daṅ por raṅ daṅ gis ("at first on his own account").
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[PVT 85b6–86a1 (C 71b1–4):]33 de’i bstn bcos bsd par ‘gyur ba ŋid yin pa’i phyir ro // de’i ‘di ni slob dpon gyi’o // bstan bcos gaṅ gis miñon sum daṅ rjes su dpag pa’i tshad ma mtshan par byed pa de ni // tshad ma’i mtshan ŋid kyi bstan bcos te // tshad ma kun las btus pa’i ŋes bya ba’o // mu stegs kyi dgra ‘chos širi ni šes pa las skyob pa’i phyir ŋes pa’i tshig gi tshul gys bstan bcos so // slob dpon gyi yaṅ de yin la tshad ma’i mtshan ŋid kyi bstan bcos kyāṅ yin pas ŋes bya ba ni khyad par gyi bsdu ba’o // slob dpon gyi ‘dul ba’i tīkā34 la sogs pa yod mod kyi // tshad ma’i mtshan ŋid kyi bstan bcos ma yin no // de las gzan pas byas pa’i tshad ma’i mtshan ŋid kyi bstan bcos yod mod kyi // slob dpon gyi ma yin no // de bas na giṅ gi smos so // [fragment 2: App 517,5–6 = PVT 86a1–2:] (de’i) pūrvatikākārāsadyāḥvyākhyāṁ35 tirthikavimāni cāpanīya yathāvasthitā36 vyākhyānān vyākhyā, āsya ni-bandhanam anumāṇam. [PVT 86a2–6 (C 71b4–7):] de ltar na don daṅ don ma yin par rnam par ‘byed pa’i mtshan ŋid can ni bsd pa yin no // de’i yoṅ rjes su dpag pa rten yin te rnam par rtog pa daṅ bcos (: bcos C) pa ŋid kyi phyir ro // de bas na thabs su gyur ba ŋid kyi phyir de ŋid dah por rnam par bṣag pa yin no // gal te slob dpon phyogs kyi glaṅ pos rjes su dpag pa’i mtshan ŋid mzdad pa de lta na yāṅ rgyas par rnam par dkrugs nas rnam ma par bṣag pa de lta na skyon yod pa ma yin no //

tshad ma rnam ’grel gyi le’u daṅ por tshad ma kun las btus pa’i rahn gi don gyi rjes su dpag pa’i le’u rtsod ’nān lan btab pa’i sgo nas don gyis (: gyi P) rnam par bṣad nas // de la ci’i phyir ōm pa las bṛgala (: rgal C) nas mzdad ces bya ba’i rtsod pa ‘di la // de’i phyir slob dpon gyi (PVP 1b2) Žes bya ba la sogs pa smos te // [fragment 3: App 517,29–518,2 = PVT 86a6–7:] lakṣyante skandhāḥvāyanāṇī yena śāṣtreṇa tal lakṣaṇaśāstraṃ tripiṭakam. pramāṇaḥ ca tad, avisaṇyāditvāt, lakṣaṇaśāstraṃ ceti pramāṇalakṣaṇaśāstraṃ bhagavatpravacanam . . . iti bhāvāḥ. [PVT 86a7–86b3 (C 72a1–3):] de’i bsd pa’i rgyu ni tshad ma’i mtshan ŋid kyi (: phyir C) bstan bcos bsd pa’i rgyu’o // slob dpon gyi yaṅ de yin la (: pa P) tshad ma’i mtshan ŋid kyi bstan bcos bsd pa’i rgyu yaṅ de yin pas na ŋes bya ba ni las ’dzin pa’o // de gaṅ že na / rjes su dpag pa st / rjes su dpag pa ston pa’i phyir tshad ma kun las btus pa’i rahn gi don gyi rjes su dpag pa’i le’u ni rjes su dpag pa’o // de skad du gaṅ gi phyir rjes su dpag pa la bṛten nas bcom ldan ’das kyi bka’ riggs pa daṅ ldan pa yin gyi / gzan ma stegs pa dag gi ni ma yin no ŋes bya bstan par ‘gyur ro // de skad du bṣad pa ni rnam pa gzan yin no // rjes su dpag pa de yāṅ rahn gi don gyi rjes su dpag pa’i le’u rnam par phype (: bye C) ha de bas na tshad ma kun las btus pa’i rahn gi don gyi rjes su dpag pa’i le’u de ŋid rtsod ’nān lan btab pa’i sgo nas shar rnam par bṣad pa ŋid yin no //

After these introductory remarks Śākyamati comments upon Devendrabuddhi’s

33 This explanation of the compound aćāryapraṇītapramāṇalakṣaṇaśāstra has been stripped of its grammatical character and formulated in the appendix in the following way: tena pranītām yat pramāṇalakṣaṇaśāstraṃ pratyakṣaḥnirmanasvarūpaprakāśakam pramāṇanirmanacayāḥpyam tanntiter evodyotayitum prastutatvāt tasya vividhapraṇāram vīdeṣaṇa ca vārttikā-rūpena . . . (App 517,3–5).

34 Has Dignāga’s Guṇpāryantastotraṭīkā (P 2045) been referred to as *Vinayaṭīkā?

35 The pūrvatikākāra must be Īśvarasena.

36 Tib.: khyad pa du.
explanation of Dharmakirti’s *pramāṇa*-definition (PV II v. 1a: *pramāṇam avisaṃvā- 
di jñānam*). The later part of text no. 3 of the appendix contains a number of pas-
sages from this commentary.

Fragment 4 (App 521, 26–27 = PVT 86b4–5): *tad atra vṛttikāraḥ*37 *ślokāpātini-
kaṁ / grel pa* kurvan *pramāṇabhūtiyevy (PS I 1a) etat svayaṁ vyācaśe. pramāṇam 
ūtā iti (PVP 2a1) bhūtasabdā prādurbhāvārthah*38.

Fragment 5 (App 522,1–5 = PVT 86b6–87a2): *nānā bhāvanābalanspa-
nirmalāvιkālāprabhūnta*39–jñānātmatakavād bhagavataḥ pratyakṣapramāṇasvabhāvata 
sākṣaṁ asty eva kim upacārāśrayeṇa cet, adoṣo ‘yam, savikalpaśījaṁvsthāśraye-
ñābhidhānād ity eke. idaṁ tv atra yuktam40; yady api yathoktrapramāṇātmakah 
sadā bhagavān, tathāpy asaṁvyavahāriko ‘sau ‘vastābhṛdeha, tataḥ saṁvyavahārika-
pramāṇenopamiyate (ēs bya ba).

Fragment 6 (App 522,9–10 = PVT 87a2): *pramāṇam avisaṃvādi jñānam iti (PV 
II 1a) avisaṃvāditvam jñānatavaḥ ca (m宣讲 ít) anūdyā prāmāṇyaṁ vidhiyate41.

Fragment 7 (App 522,23–26 = PVT 87a4–5): *tad evam viṣayadharmasyāpi 
saṁvādasya sambhavāś jñānagrahaṇam kṛtam ity etat kathayaḥ: sa punar 
artham paricchedvyādi (PVP 2a5f.)42. sa punas saṁvādo viṣayadharmya ity (PVP 
2b1) anena sambandhah. kadā punar asau bhavatīty āha: arthasya vicchidyā pra-
vṛtīvī iti (PVP 2a6).

Fragment 8 (App 522,27–30 = PVT 87a6–8): *pratyakṣāvikalpakatvān na niśca-
yah, kintu tadābhāsotpaṭṭāmātram*43. anumāne tu niścaya eva. yady evam, prat-
yakṣaṇāvikalpena (saṭyamithyājalaśīnyām)44 vivekasya kartum45 asaktyatvāḥ katham 
tato ‘ṛthām paricchedhyā pravṛttīr iti cet, ucyate: dvidhaḥ pratyakṣāśrayaḥ pravṛttīr 
ādyābhikāśavat ca.

Fragment 9 (App 523,6–14 = PVT 87b4–88a1): *kathām tarhi paricchedyeti46 
vacanam etanmatena (?)*47 iti cet, uktam atra tadākārōtpaṭṭāmātreṇa tathā vyapa-
desa iti. saṁśaya praṇavartamaṇāḥ kathām pekṣāpūrvavakāriti cet, ko vroddho ‘tra, 
na hi ya eva niścaya praṇavartate, sa eva pekṣāpūrvavakāri. tathā hi pravrttau 
hetudvayam arthasamśayo ‘ṛthaniścayaḥ ca, niyṛtṛvā api dvayam evānarthaniścayo 
‘harthasamśayaḥ ca. tattvādyena hetudvayena yaḥ pravartate nivartate ca paścād
yena\textsuperscript{48}, sa prekṣaṇāyukārī bhānyate loke. yadi ca nisheyenaiva pravṛttāḥ\textsuperscript{49}, tadā kṛṣṇavādāṁ kṛṣṇādyāv apravṛttāḥ. na hi teṣām anāgataśasyādinyāśpatau nisçāyakaṁ premāṇam asti.

kimśupō 'sau visaẏadhamāṁ saṁvāda ity āha: yathā samihitetyādi (PVP 2a6)\textsuperscript{50}. yathā yena rūpeṇa sa...\textsuperscript{51}

Pramāṇavārttikaīī III (pratyakṣam):

A long fragment from Śākyamati's commentary on PVP on PV III 57 is contained in text no. 11 of the appendix. This verse offers the example of the shine of a lamp or a jewel in order to show that the validity of cognition results from practical efficiency.

fragment 1 (App 528,17–529,14 = PVT 205b7–207a3): tadā\textsuperscript{52} pratyakṣānumānaviśāntaṁ tṛtiyaṁ idam premāṇaṁ āpātatam. tathā hi mani-prabhāyaṁ maṇi-buddher na pratyakṣaṁ, bhūrāntvyāñcāvikalpakatvāc ca. pratyakṣatvaṁ tv etadviparītāṁ\textsuperscript{53}. nāpy anumāṇaṁ, alingajātvāt. na cāpramāṇaṁ\textsuperscript{64}. vastusamvāḍāt (ṣe na). atrocyate: anumāṇam evaitat\textsuperscript{55}. tathā hy anumāṇasya sāmānyalakṣaṇaṁ\textsuperscript{56} anantaṁ sthāpayitisate: parokṣārthasya anysambandhāṁ pratipattir anumāṇam iti\textsuperscript{57} ita ca manaḥ mani-prabhāsambandhāṁ\textsuperscript{58} tatākhyatvāt tasyāṁ (mani)prabhāyaṁ\textsuperscript{59} maṇi-bhrāntiṁ utpadyate. tathā kāryalingajātvād anumāṇam eva. tathā hi maṇiprabhāyaṁ ādāv abhāvītām eva caṅsviṣṇūṇāṁ upajāyate; tena ca kāryalingasa-viśāṇam adhigataṁ, yataḥ svalaksanāṁ eva śīlām...\textsuperscript{60} na ca kalpitārūpasyānyatvāṁ tadātmyatadupātī vā stāḥ\textsuperscript{61}.

kathām svalaksanenānāya iti cet, na brūmas tenaiveti, kin tu jātātyena svalaksanāntaraṇaṁ. tathā coktam: tajjātiyo 'pi hi nāmābhedavivākṣāyāṁ sa eveti\textsuperscript{62}.

\textsuperscript{48} Tib. adds: bhad pa gnis kyis.
\textsuperscript{49} Tib. adds: nö mthar.
\textsuperscript{50} Tib. gives the full pratika: ji ltar 'dod pa'i don de lta bu'i ho bo'i.
\textsuperscript{51} Tib.: ji ltar ho bo gaṅ gis don du gter ba'i me la sos pa ni ji ltar 'dod pa ste.
\textsuperscript{52} According to Tib. the objection starts here: gal te de lta na ni...
\textsuperscript{53} Tib. adds a third reason: ... daṅ... bziṅ po thid yin pa'i phyir ro.
\textsuperscript{54} Tib. tshad ma thid ma yin pa.
\textsuperscript{55} Tib.: tshad ma gzhan du thal ba ha yin te / rjes su dpag pa thid kyi naḥ du 'du ba'i phyir ro //
\textsuperscript{56} According to Tib. rjes su (dpag) pa'i spyi'i mthun thid: sāmānya anumāṇasya laksanam App.
\textsuperscript{57} According to Tib.: lkg tu gyur pa'i don gzhan 'brel pa las rtogs pa ni rjes su dpag pa yin no žes (PVT 206a3). The text of the appendix is badly corrupted: parokṣasyāpī anyataḥ sambandhāpratipattir anumāṇam iti,
\textsuperscript{58} Tib. 'brel pa (?)
\textsuperscript{59} According to Tib. nor bu'i 'od de la: tasyāt ca prabhāyaṁ App.
\textsuperscript{60} The following reference has been dropped: ji skad du don gyis don rtogs pa'i phyir ro // phyogs daṅ gzhan tshigs broid pa'i nus pa don ma yin no žes gsuṅs bta bu'o // de lta na... (PVT 206a5f.)
\textsuperscript{61} This sentence is corrupted. Tib. has: gnas kyi kun tu btags pa'i rtogs de'i bdag thid daṅ de las 'byung ba'i don thid du 'gyur ba ma yin no. The original ran perhaps: *na ca sthitakalpitālīgam tadātmāyadadupātītvādām.
\textsuperscript{62} Source unknown; Tib. differs in the beginning: de'i rigs can žes bya ba yāṅ khyad par du...
Pramāṇavārttikaṭkā IV (parārthānumānam):

Text no. 9 of the appendix contains two fragments of Śākyamati’s commentary on PVP 329a2ff., commenting on PV IV 34ff., where Dharmakīrti refutes a sadvitīyaprayoga of the Cārvākas. That prayoga is quoted in PVP 329a3ff. and extant in one of its forms in the original due to quotations in PVV 427,7 and PVBh 496, 31ff.: abhihīyakatacayasaṣṭaralakṣanapravarsaṣaghāṣṭānyatārena sadvitiyō ghaṭāḥ, anut-
palatvāt, kuḍyavat. The following fragment is interesting for it begins with a reference to a Cārvāka-explanation of this prayogas.

fragment 1 (App 526, 10–20 = PVT 316a5–316b5): mahābhūtanām evabhīvyaktiviseva madasaaktivac caityanam iti. abhīvyaktam caityanām yaśnin dehe\(^{80}\) sa (mion par bsal ba sms yod pa can ntid do // de dag kyai de yin la lus can yin pas na zes bya ba las ’dzin par bya’o //) tathābhūto dehaḥ svabhāvo yaśya puruṣasya sa tathaḥ. pasčā\(^{81}\) ghaṭaśabdena dvandvah. nirdhāraṇe śaṣṭhyāḥ saptamyāḥ vā dvicacanam etad avayavavayavivambhandhe vā śaśthi. tayor anyatareṇa ghaṭena puruṣena vā saha dvitiyena varṣata iti ca dvitiyāḥ\(^{82}\) asti hi dṛśṭānte ’nutpatāmakasya\(^{83}\) kuḍayaśanyatareṇa ghaṭena sadvityavat; ekenāpi sadvityatve\(^{84}\) nyatareṇa sadvityavatāṃ sāmānyena siddham iti na sādhnyaṇaḥ sīranvayataḥ\(^{85}\) tathā ghaṭasyāpi sādhyaḍharmino ’śesaghaṭapakṣikaranātenaiva sadvityavatam ayuktam iti sāmānyenāpi sādhane tathābhūtena puruṣena sadvityavatvāṃ pariśeṣyāt sīdhyatiti (anyo)\(^{86}\) manyate. atreyādī (PVP 329a4)\(^{87}\) (’gog par byed do). tāḍṭāṣyasā puruṣasya (gnis pa dan bca’s pa) anuktāv api icchāvyāptasya sādhyaṭvāt tasya cāsiddhatvād dṛśṭānte ‘’nānvaṭadoṣaḥ.

fragment 2 (App 527, 2–13 = PVT 317a2–317b1): . . . (bum pa tha dad par rtog pa ni) ghaṭānityatvam\(^{88}\) sabdam pratijñāyate tadbhhyupetavirodhah. sabhe ghaṭānityatvasyāṁabhāryapagamāt. ādiśabdāḥ (PVP 329b5) anumānavirodhah ’pi (gzuṅ ste), anyadharmasyānyatra sāḍhya₉₉–mṛnātāvi. sādhabdheṇa ca kalpane sāḍhyavikalatadṛśante\(^{90}\). sāḍhyāṇa\(^{91}\) vināśeneti (PVP 36c) dharmavivēṣāparivṛtiḥ eṇa vināśaśāmānyasya\(^{92}\) sāḍhavatāv. tardvata iti vināśavataḥ. anyenaiva prakāreṇa sadvityatvapravogyo ’nvaṭaikalāyādikam asmābhūr uktaṃ, tvaya\(^{93}\) tv anyathaiva parikalpya tūlyaḍoṣatāpādanam\(^{94}\) kṛtam ity etat kathayitum āha: na hīrīyādī (PVP 329b7).\(^{95}\) anyataṛārthāntaratvāṃ sāmānyam\(^{96}\) ghaṭe sāḍhyadharmini kuḍye ca dṛśṭāntadharminī upanitam iti pratikṣiptam sāḍhyam istam parasya (so sor gnas pa ma yin pa ne bar ’god pa) sāḍhyadharmitam vanyatarārthāntaratvam sāḍhyam, dṛśṭāntaḥ dharmitam vety yāvat. na hy astrānyatarārthāntaratvam kuḍyadharmo ghaṭe ’sti

---

80 Tib.: gah la yod pa.
81 Tib.: de nas.
82 App inserts: vyājena ca mahābhūtāvyatīraitkam caityanām prayogena sāḍhyat.
83 ‘nutpatāmakasya’ App.
84 Tib.: gnis pa yin na.
85 According to Tib. rjes su ’gro ba med pa fild: -anvitaṃ nidρāsāṇam App.
86 According to Tib. gnān dag: mano App.
87 Tib.: ’di la rjes su ’gro ba žes bya ba la sogs pas . . .
88 Tib.: bum pa la yod pa ’mi rtog pa fild.
89 bāḍhya- App.
90 Tib.: ston pa yin no.
91 asiddhena App.
92 correct phyi for cl P.
93 tayā App.
94 Tib.: ston par.
95 I have difficulty interpreting the following sentence; except for the words without correspondence in Tib. the word-order, too, is different in the beginning.
96 Tib.: de spyi’i.
sādhyām nāpi ghāṭadharmaḥ kuḍye sādhyam iṣṭam anvetītī 97 sādhyavāikalyādikam 98 brūmāḥ, yena 99 tulyadōṣātā syāt. 99 sādhyadharmā eva tādṛśa iti (PVP 329b 8) yathoktapuruṣaḥguṭpēkṣānyatārārthāntarabhāvalakṣāṇaḥ (śhar bṣad pa'i tshul gyis) nirūpyamāṇo na sādhu ʾṣṭi.

fragment 3 (App 527,30 = PVT 317b1f.): tadvān kumbha 100 ity (PV IV 37b) asya vīvaraṇam anyataraṣadvitīyaghaṇa iti (PVP 330a2), . . .
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97 Tib. differs considerably: de yain ji skad du hrid pa'i chos can tha dad pas ne bar bkod pa ga'n yain rui ba sna tshogs pa'i rgyu ri'i kyis brgyud pas rjes su 'gro ba med pa'i phyir kha bo bo cag . . . (PVT 317a7f.)
98 Tib.: ston pa la sogs pa' yin par.
99 Tib.: de skad du brjod na skyon mtshuhs par bstan par 'gyur ro.
100 Tib.: de ldan pa yah.
101 It has recently been studied by Watanabe Shigeaki: Sadvitṛayogadharma – Indo ronrigaku no ichi dammien. Mikkyōgaku 13–14 (Tsukai Ryūshū kanreki kinengō), 1977, 194–209.