SÄKYABUDDHI'S COMMENTARY ON PRAMĀṆAVĀRTTIKA
I 3 AND ITS VṛTTI*

By Ernst Steinkellner, Vienna

After introducing the three kinds of logical reasons (PVŚV 2,14–19) Dharmakīrtī presents the essentials of the third kind, non-perception (anupalabdhi), in PV I 3 (=5 [PVŚV 4,5–5,6]) for the first time. These brief formulaic statements are difficult and sometimes misunderstood1. Although Dharmakīrtī treats the topic in greater detail later on2 and in subsequent works3, making the earliest commentary on this passage accessible may therefore be useful for a better assessment of its meaning. For here Dharmakīrtī not only introduces his ideas on negative cognition, but also indicates many of its aspects that are elaborated only later.

It is unfortunate that the manuscript of the only commentary on this crucial first formulation of Dharmakīrtī’s theory extant in Sanskrit, namely that by Karnakagomin, should be lacking a folio (PVŚVT 30,11ff.). Thus, the original Sanskrit of Śākyabuddhi’s4 commentary

* Dr. Ono Motoi read this paper and his good suggestions are gratefully acknowledged.


3 Cf. PV in II 11,12ff. and III 40ff., HB 21,18ff. and VN 4,20ff.

4 Following Prof. Frauwallner, I have hitherto used the form Śākyamati as the name of the author of the Pramāṇavārttikāṭākā and pupil of Devendrabuddhi. FRAUWALLNER originally used the name Śākyabuddhi (Festschrift für Moriz Winternitz. Leipzig 1933, p. 238ff. = Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1982,
which has regularly been incorporated into Kārnākagomin’s explanations, is also not extant, although particularly in this case a knowledge of the original phrasing would be most desirable. Only a few Sanskrit fragments have been transmitted in the margins of the manuscript of Manorathananandin’s Pramāṇavārttikārtīti.

The following is a critical edition with a translation of the Tibetan translation of Śākyabuddhi’s Pramāṇavārttikā (PVT) on the passage PVSV 4.5–17 for which Kārnākagomin’s explanation is missing. The edition is based on:

N – Edition of Narthang, mDo ’grel Je (No. 3710), f. 15a7–17a3

Only significant variants are indicated. The orthographical variants given are those of the Peking edition. Words and phrases in italics are those of the explained text.

**Critical Edition**

(P15b5 [N15a7, D13a1]) *mi dmigs pa’i dbaṅ du byas (6) nas
tshad ma rnams ni mi (N15b) ’jug pa (PV I 3[= 5]a)
žes bya ba la sogs pa smos te | gaṅ dag mi ’jug pa yin že na | tshad ma
rnams so || maṅ po’i tshig smos pa ni b’gsal ba’i bye brag gis8 tshad ma,
rnams maṅ9 pa’i phyir ro || (7) yan na luṅ las bltos pa’i yin te | ’di skad
du ’og nas kyaṅ luṅ log pa yan dnos po med pa sgrub par byed pa ma
yin no žes ’byuṅ no || tshad ma rnams Idog pa’i mi dmigs pa de ŋid
med la mi ’jug ’bras bu can (PV I 3[=5]b)

p. 485ff.) and later proposed *Śākyamati to be the correct equivalent of Śākya
blo which he assumed to be an abbreviated form of Śākya blo gros (WZKM 44
[1937] 69[= Kleine Schriften, p. 576]n. 1). I regret having been unaware for
a long time of the fact that the name occurs in the Mahāvyutpatti (new edition
No. 3487). Thus his name is definitely Śākyabuddhi.

5 Cf. E. Steinke, Philosophical remarks on Śākyamati’s Pramāṇa-
vārttikātīka, in: Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus. Gedenkschrift für
6 PVV 284, second part of n. 4, and 285, n. 1 and 4, contain sentences
that can be related to PVT.
7 I would like to thank Prof. Shigeaki Watanabe for copies of the relevant
pages in the Narthang edition from the collection of Naritasan sent some years
ago.
8 bye brag gis corr. (cf. śbhedena): bye brag gi NPD.
9 maṅ D: yin NP.
te | yul la sogs pas bskal pa'i dnos po ni yod par tha sñad gdags pa las med pa'i phyir med pa žes bya'o || (P16a1) mi 'jug 'bras bu can ces bya ba ni yod pa'i žes pa dañ sgra dañ tha sñad rnam s ni 'jug pa'o || de bkag pa ni mi 'jug pa ste | gañ la 'bras bu de yod pa la de (2) skad ces bya'o || de bstan pa'i phyir yod pa'i žes pa dañ sgra dañ tha sñad dgag pa'i 'bras bu can yin te žes bya ba smos te | tha sñad ni sgrub pa'o || ci'i phyir ze na | yod pa'i žes pa la (3) sogs pa de dag ni dmigs pa sion du 'gro ba can yin pa'i phyir ro || de bas na rgyu med na 'bras bu yañ med do sñam du bsam pa yin no ||

yod pa'i žes pa la sogs pa¹⁰ dgag pa'i 'bras bu (4) ŋid 'di ni 'dra ba'i no bo yin te žes bya bar sbyar ro || yod pa'i žes pa la sogs pa ni yod pa žes bya ba'i sgrar brjod do || med pa'i žes pa la sogs pa ni med'pa žes bya ba'i sgrar brjod do || (5) yod pa dañ med pa ni yod pa dañ med pa dag go || de gnis go rings bzin du dgag pa dañ sgrub pa ni yod pa dañ med pa dgag pa dañ sgrub pa ste || de gnis kyi gan tshigs dag go || yod pa (6) dgag pa'i gan tshigs ni bltar¹¹ mi (N16a) ruñ ba mi dmigs pa'o || med pa sgrub pa'i gan tshigs ni dmigs pa'i mtshan ŋid kyir gyur pa mi dmigs pa'o || de dag gi¹² 'dra ba'i no bo yin te || 'di ltar (7) dmigs pa'i mtshan ŋid (D13b) kyir gyur pa mi dmigs pa yañ yod pa'i žes pa la sogs pa dgag pa sgrub par byed pa kho na yin no ||

ji ltar mi dmigs pa gni ga yod pa'i tha sñad dgag pa'i 'bras (8) bu ņid can yin par 'dra ba de bzin du yañ bstan pa'i phyir 'di ltar žes bya ba la sogs pa smos so || "dmigs pa ņid yod pa yin⁵ la de yañ gnis te || "re žig gañ gi tshe las la yod pa'i (P16b1) bya ba yin par brjod pa de'i tshe ni dmigs pa dnos po run ba'i mtshan ņid¹³ yin te⁴ || gañ la mtshan ņid dnos po run ba'i mtshan ņid yod pa de la de skad ces bya'o || "gañ gi tshe byed pa po la yod (2) pa'i bya ba yin pa'i phyogs de la ni de'i rten can gyi žes pa 'jug pa yin te⁴ || žes pa 'jug pa gañ la rten dnos po ruñ ba de yod pa de la de skad ces bya'o ||

de de ni ņe bar btags pa'i phyir yod (3) pa žes bya'o || ci'i phyir ze na || de las yod pa'i žes pa dañ sgra dañ tha sñad dag 'jug pa'i phyir te || de las žes bya ba ni dmigs pa las so || "mi dmigs pa ni med pa rnam s kyi med pa (4) yin no⁶ žes bya ba ni mi dmigs pa ni de ltar dnos dañ ņe bar btags pa'i bye brag gis dnos po yod pa'i mtshan ŋid kyi¹⁴ dmigs pa las bzlog pa yin te || bum pa la sogs pas dben pa'i (5) sa gzi'i mtshan ņid dam de žes pa'i mtshan ņid yin no || de ni med pa rnam s kyi med pa yin no || de ltar na 'bltar ruñ ba mi dmigs na || dnos po'i dbañ gis yod pa log pa¹⁵ rañ gi (6) rgyu mtshan can gyi žes pa dañ sgra la sogs pa bzlog

¹⁰ sogs pa NP: sogs D.
¹¹ bltar ND: ltar P.
¹² gi NP: ni D.
¹³ mtshan ņid D: mtshan ma ņid NP.
¹⁴ kyi D: kyi's NP.
¹⁵ log pa ND: la log P.
par byed pas¹ dmigs pa’i mtshan ñid kyir gyur pa dag mi dmigs pa (N16b) kho na med pa rnams kyi med pa yin par rigs na | rañ bžin gyis (7) bskal pa dag go ||
jí ltañ te | the tshom yod pa’i phyir de dag ni dmigs su zin kyan med pa yin no že na | de ni bden¹⁶ mod kyì ’on kyan rtoogs par byed pa’i dbaṅ gis med pa žes brjod kyi dnos (8) po’i dbaṅ gis ni ma yin te | rtoogs par byed pa ni ṣmi dmigs pa mñon¹⁷ par ’od pa’i don mi byed pa’i phyir yod kyan med pa dañ ’dra bar sems sox | de bas na don ni ’di yin te | med pa (P17a) dañ ’dra ba’i med par rañ bžin gyis¹⁸ bskal pa (D14a) dag mi dmigs pa ni med pa yin pas de’i phyir ’di la yañ brtoogs par byed pa’i bsam pa’i dañ gis yod pa log pa rañ gi rgyu mtshan can¹⁹ (2) gyi yod pa’i ñes pa la sog pa zlog²⁰ par byed doḥ žes bya ba yin no ||
gtan tshigs bye brag la blos nas |
| la la med ñes ’bras bu can | (PV I 3(5)cd)
žes bya ba la sog pa la gتان tshigs ni mi (3) dmigs pa’o || de’i khyad par ni gتان tshigs bye brag ste de la blos pa < |= des na mi dmigs pa la la med pa’i²¹ ñes pa’i ’bras bu can yin te | ñes pa žes smos pa ni ṣne bar mtshan pa yin pas (4) med pa ñes pa la sog pa’i ’bras bu can yin no žes bya ba’i tha tshig go || la la žes bya ba ni bltar run ba ma dmigs pa’o || yaṅ gتان tshigs ni gaṅ yin de’i bye brag ni ci žig ce (5) na < |= gتان tshigs ni žes bya ba la sog pa smos so || mi dmigs pa de’i bye brag ni khyad par ro || de yaṅ dmigs pa’i mtshan ñid kyir gyur pa’i yod pa can yin te | dmigs pa’i mtshan (6) ñid kyir gyur pa’i yod pa can mi dmigs pa’i phyir žes khyad par du byed pa’i phyir ro ||
yañ ci ste mi dmigs pas med pa’i ñes pa la sog pa bsgrub kyi | med pa kho na ni ma yin že na | (7) mi dmigs pa’i rtoogs kyis žes bya ba la sog pa (N17a) smos so || med pa bsgrub par bya ba yin par khas len na’yuṅ gaṅ žig med par sgrub par byed pa de dmigs pa med pa yaṅ mi (8) dmigs pa gzan gyis²² sgrub par byed dgos par ’gyur te | de yañ med pa’i ŋo bo ñid yin pa’i phyir ro || ji ltañ don dmigs pa med pa ma dmigs pa gzan gyis sgrub par byed pa de (P17b) bžin du dmigs pa dmigs pa med pa yaṅ mi dmigs pa gzan gyis bsgrub par bya dgos pas thug pa med par thal bar ’gyur ’ba’i phyir rtoogs par byed pa ma yin par ’gyur ro || ’on te ñes (2) pa der gyur na mi run žes te | dmigs pa med pa ni mi dmigs pa med par raṅ kho nas ’grub par ’gyur ro že na ||

¹⁶ bden ND: dben P.
¹⁷ mñon corr. (cf. abhīsta²): brjod NPD.
¹⁸ gyis D: gyi NP.
¹⁹ rgyu mtshan can corr. (cf. °nibandhanam): rgyu can NPD.
²⁰ pa zlog D: bzlog NP.
²¹ la la med pa’i D: la la NP.
SANSKRT MATERIALS

Small index letters indicate the beginning and the end of a correspondence in the edited text. For the meaning of the signs characterizing the different kinds of textual remains cf. E. STEINKELLNER, Methodological Remarks on the Constitution of Sanskrit Texts from the Buddhist pramāṇa-Tradition. WZKS 32 (1988) 103–129. An addition to the signs given there (p. [116–]118) is:

T'r textus usus secundarii modo referendi, a text used secondarily by way of reference.

padas in bold type and italics are considered to belong to the original text; paddas in italics belong to that text but have been changed with regard to form or syntactical position; other word-forms do not belong to the original text but to the witness text,

(a) T' - anupala.....ity āha apravṛttir ityādi | keśām apravṛttiḥ | pramāṇanām | bhuvacanan vyaktibhedana pramāṇanām bhuhvate | āgamanēkṣa... (PVSVT 29,26–30,11)
(b) T' - vyaktibhedana mānabahuvate | āgamanēkṣayā vā ...... āgama-masyāpi niśrtir nābhāvana sādhayatati vakṣyate | (PVV 284, n. 4, §2)
(c) T' - upalabdhiḥ sattvam eva | (PVV 285, n. 1, l. 1f. [≡ PVSV 4,10])
(d) T'r - upalabdhiḥ karmadharmas ced vastuṣyogyatā kārtrdharmas cej jñānam | (PVV 285, n. 1, l. 1)
(e) T' - asatān cānupalabdhir asattvam | (PVV 285, n. 1, l. 2 [≡ PVSV 4,11f.])
(f) T' - drāyānapalabdhu vastuṣvaśān niśrttāṃ sattvām svanīmittaṃ jñāna...ādi nivartayati | (PVV 285, n. 1, l. 3f.)
(g) T' - adrṣye 'py abhiṣṭakāryakaranād asatkalpe | (PVV 285, n. 1, l. 4)
(h) T' - pratipattyadhyavasāṭyān niśrttāṃ sattvāṃ svanībandhanam ... nivartayati | (PVV 285, n. 1, l. 4f.)
(i) T' - yasya visayasyābhāvāk sādhyaṃ tadupalabdher apy abhāvo nyānapalabdhyā tasyāpy anyayā | (PVV 285, n. 4)

TRANSLATION

Referring to non-perception, he says

“non-activity of valid cognitions”\textsuperscript{22},

etc. (Question:) “Whose non-activity?” (Answer:) Of the valid cognitions\textsuperscript{23}. He gives the plural, because in terms of the different individual

\textsuperscript{22} PV I 3 (= 5) a apravṛttih pramāṇanām.
\textsuperscript{23} In the Sanskrit original, the pratīka states only “non-activity” (cf. [a]).
cases there are many valid cognitions. Or (rather) in reference to authoritative tradition (āgama); accordingly he will later also say: “Absence of authoritative tradition, too, does not prove non-existence”\(^{24}\). Only this non-perception which consists of an absence of valid cognitions

*results in non-activity towards that which is not existent*\(^{25}\).

Since with reference to something that is distant in (terms of) place etc. a designation as existent is absent, it is (called) “non-existent”. “Results in non-activity”: cognizing, naming or handling (something) as existent\(^{26}\) is activity. Its negation is non-activity. Wherein this result occurs, (that) is so called. To explain this, he says: “results in the negation of cognizing, naming or handling (something) as existent”. Handling (vyavahāra) is effectively dealing (with it [*sādhana*]). Why [does he say so]? Because these, cognizing etc. (something) as existent, presuppose perception. Therefore (his) intention is, that if the cause does not occur, neither the effect does occur.

*This* resulting in the negation of cognizing etc. (something) as existent “is a like character”, that is the context. Cognizing etc. (something) as existent is expressed in form of the word “existent”; cognizing etc. (something) as non-existent is expressed in form of the word “non-existent”. (Something) existent and non-existent are the two (something) existent and non-existent. Negation and affirmation respectively of these two are negation and affirmation of something existent and non-existent. In both logical reasons for these two. Logical reason for a negation of something existent is a non-perception of something imperceptible. Logical reason for an affirmation of something non-existent is a non-perception of something which meets the conditions for perception. In both these (reasons) there is a like character. In this way also a non-perception of something which meets the conditions for perception certainly proves the negation of cognizing etc. (something) as existent.

In order to explain further the manner how the two non-perceptions are like in (their) resulting in a negation of behaviour towards something existent (*sadyavahārapratisedhaphala*), he says “to be precise”, etc. *Existence is perception, indeed.* And this is (of) two (kinds). In the first place, when it is said to be a predication of existence (*sattvakriyā*) with regard to the object (karman), then perception is characterized as [or: a name for] the capacity of something real. In what there is the character, [i. e.] the character of the capacity of something real, that is so called. When [however] a predication of existence with regard to an

---

\(^{24}\) A paraphrase of PVS 102,1f.: *tatra na śāstraniyāttir abhāvasādhani*.

\(^{25}\) PV 1 3(= 5)b *apravṛtītiphalasati*.

\(^{26}\) Here and in the following phrased with the genitive particle (*yod pa’i*).
agent (*kartr) is proposed, in that case (perception) is the occurrence of a cognition based on that. The occurrence of a cognition which has that basis, (i. e.) the capacity of something real, that is so called.

This (latter perception) is (called) “existence” on account of a (metaphorical) usage. Why? Because cognizing, naming or handling (something) as existent occur on account of this. “On account of this”, (i. e.) on account of perception. “And the non-existence of non-existing (things) is non-perception”: (i. e.) non-perception is contrary to perception which in this way is defined as real existence (*vastusatva) in terms of the difference of [being both] reality and metaphorical usage. [i. e.] it is either defined as the place which is without a pot etc., or defined as the cognition of that (place). This is the non-existence of non-existing (things). If in this way a perceptible is not perceived, existence as excluded by virtue of reality (*vastuvasat) excludes cognizing, naming etc. which are conditioned by the same. Therefore it is correct that only non-perception of something which meets the conditions of perception is the non-existence of non-existing (things), namely of such (things) that are distant in terms of essence (*svabhavaviprakrta). (Question): “Since it is doubtful, how (can) these [perceptibles] be non-existent, although they have [at least once] been perceived?” (Answer): That is true! However, they are called “non-existent” by virtue of the cognizing act (*pratipattivasat), not by virtue of reality. For in respect of the cognizing act (pratipatti), non-perceived (things), although existent, are considered as if non-existent, because they are not effective of an intended purpose (abhikarayakaranat). Then the meaning is the following: Since a non-perception of (things) distant in terms of essence as non-existent as if (really) non-existent is non-existence, therefore, in the present case, too, existence as excluded by virtue of cognitional determination (pratipattyadhyavasayat) excludes cognizing etc. (something) as existent which is conditioned by the same.

In (the verse)

“A certain kind (of non-occurrence of valid cognitions), because it depends on a peculiarity of the reason (hetu), results in the cognition (of something) as non-existent”

---

27 This means that only the capacity of something real, namely to be perceived etc., is the primary meaning of “perception”. But since cognizing etc. something as existent occurs on account of perception in its cognitional aspect, it is metaphorically called “existence”, too.

28 I owe the decisive idea for interpreting this sentence to my student Birgit Kellner.

29 In all these cases hetu is interpreted by the translation gtan tshigs as meaning “logical reason”.

30 PV I 3 (= 5)cd asajjanaaphalā kā cid dhetaubhedavyapekṣayā //.
etc., reason (hetu²⁹) is non-perception. A qualification of this (non-perception) is the reason’s²⁹ peculiarity; a dependence on this (peculiarity). Therefore, a certain kind of non-perception results in the cognition (of something) as non-existent. Since the word “cognition” is a synecdoche (*upalakṣaṇa), the meaning is that it results in the cognizing etc. of something non-existent. “A certain kind” is non-perception of something perceptible.

When (asked): “And concerning the reason (hetu²⁹), what is its peculiarity?”, he says “the reason” (hetu²⁹) etc. The peculiarity of this non-perception is a qualification. And this (qualification) is that which has existence (yod pa con) that meets the conditions for perception. For (it) is qualified in the form “because something which has existence that meets the conditions for perception is not perceived”³¹.

If (it be asked): “Why does a non-perception prove the cognizing etc. of something as non-existent, but not non-existence itself?” he says: “through the sign of non-perception” etc. (I.e.) If one assumed non-existence [itself] to be proved, (then) also the non-existence of the perception of that (non-perception) which proves some object to be non-existent would have to be proved by (yet) another non-perception. For this (proving) non-perception, too, is essentially a non-existence. In the same way, (then), as the non-perception of a thing were proved by another non-perception, non-perception of perception, too, needed to be proved by another non-perception. Since in this way an infinite regression would follow, there could be no (definite) cognition.

(Objection:) “If this fault ensues, [cognition of non-existence] would (indeed) be out of the question. Non-perception (then) could be proved without non-perception through nothing but itself (*svata eva).” (Answer:) In this way existence would be also non-existence³².

Abbreviations


³¹ Cf. PVSV 2,16f.
³² For this and the following cf. PVSVT 30,19ff. which again incorporates Śākyabuddhi’s explanations.
PVṬ Pṛamāṇavārttikātikā
PVV Pṛamāṇavārttikavṛtti: Dharmakīrti's Pṛamāṇavārttika with a commentary by Manorathanandin, ed. R. Sāṅkṛityāyana. Patna 1938–1940.
PVSV Pṛamāṇavārttika(sva)vṛtti (cf. PV I)
PVSVṬ Pṛamāṇavārttika(sva)vṛttiṭikā: ĀcāryaDharmakīrtiḥ Pṛamāṇavārttikam (svārthānunāmānaparicchedahaḥ) svopajñavṛtttyā Karṇakagomīviracitaya taṭṭikayā ca sahitam, ed. R. Sāṅkṛityāyana. Allahabad 1943.
