

SOME SANSKRIT-FRAGMENTS OF JINENDRABUDDHI'S VIŚĀLĀMALAVATĪ

Ernst Steinkellner

I

A thorough and comprehensive study of the Buddhist tradition of epistemology and logic has been impeded to some extent by the fact, that only a few works of the school have been transmitted in their original language, Sanskrit. While in the early days of research one dealt practically with Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* and Dharmottara's commentary¹ alone², the fortunate finds of Sanskrit manuscripts in the vaults of some Tibetan monasteries made by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana during his journeys in 1929, 1934, 1936 and 1938³ considerably enhanced the material in the original language. Some of the major works of the school, e.g. Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* (ed. 1938) and *Vādanyāya* (ed. 1935-36), and some important commentaries, e.g. Kaṇvakagomin's subcommentary on the *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti* (ed. 1943), Prajñākaragupta's *Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya* (ed. 1953), Śāntarakṣita's *Vādanyāyaṭīkā* (ed. 1935-36) and Manorathanandin's *Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti* (ed. 1938-40), being available since put our knowledge of the school's literature and ideas on a firm basis.

At the same time the Tibetan translations of these and many other works⁴ prove, nevertheless, to be indispensable. For, where we have the original text, they are a reliable testimony for the condition of the extant text and a decisive help in any emendatory work, and where the original is lost, they are our only source. The latter is the case, e.g., not only with Dharmakīrti's second major work, the *Pramāṇavinīścaya*, and the oldest commentaries on the *Pramāṇavārttika*, by Devendrabuddhi and Śākyamati, and on the *Pramāṇavinīścaya*, by Dharmottara, but also with Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*

and Vṛtti, the foundation-stone of the whole tradition, and the only commentary on it known, Jinendrabuddhi's Viśālāmalavati, to mention but a few works of major importance. Besides this host of works, transmitted in their Tibetan translation only, we find a great number of Sanskrit fragments, partly in Buddhist works, partly in Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika works and above all in works of the epistemological and logical tradition of the Jainas. And in the same way as the Tibetan translations can be used to improve upon the condition of the Sanskrit texts, these Sanskrit fragments can be used to enhance the source-value of the Tibetan translations.

In this respect there are some good and obvious reasons for collecting the Sanskrit fragments of works extant in their Tibetan translation only : In general, they may or may not confirm the quality of the translations and their value as reliable sources. And in particular, their dignity as original phrases and statements is unsurpassable even by the usually very neat and scrupulous Tibetan translations of the epistemological literature. For, due to the schematic and concept-orientated simplified wording, these translations are paradoxically quite often ambiguous, lacking the conceptual colours of the corresponding Sanskrit expression in the originals. And finally, depending on the amount of material that can be collected it is possible to regain some texts and text-pieces in their original. Here even fragmentary recovery would be particularly useful, for the fragments such text-pieces would consist of, have been transmitted as quotations in other works, and by having been quoted at all these texts prove to be valuable as carrying an interesting contribution of their author to a philological or systematical issue. And as such they are textual marks for our research into the development of the school.

Re-translations into Sanskrit, often mistakenly and misleadingly published under the style of "reconstruction", are no substitute for the original or fragments of the original⁶. The

great accuracy and consistency of most Tibetan translations of works from this school and our generally increasing knowledge of the Tibetan translation—techniques usually allow a good idea of what the original Sanskrit might have looked like, but there is no critical certainty in this and with regard to the details of phraseology and syntactical arrangement we can never reach such a standard of probability that a re-translation can be considered as a real substitute of the original text.

These re-translations have the same distance to the original as e.g. English or German translations from the Tibetan, although this distance is deceptively minimized by the seeming identity of the language used with the language of the original. They have to be considered, therefore, as modern translations into Sanskrit, and not as restorations or reconstructions of the Sanskrit original. The merit of re-translations consists only in that they render intelligible the Tibetan translations to the traditional Indian scholar or Indologist who does not read Tibetan, and thus present him with an impression of a lost literary treasure of the Indian tradition. Since it is tempting to consider such translations into Sanskrit as the original and at the same time evident that such a conception can lead further on towards misinterpretation, one cannot caution too strongly against this kind of error. To be sure, from such re-translations we have to distinguish authentic reconstructions which are possible, however, only to that extent to which fragments of the original and Sanskrit-commentaries extant have transmitted the language-material of the text, which then can be checked and arranged by means of comparing them with the Tibetan translations.

II

The following group of fragments from Jinendrabuddhi's *Viśālāmalavati* (PST), the only real commentary on Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and -*vṛtti* existing, is a small example of the often surprising possibilities we have in gathering these valuable textual remains.

They come from the rather curious Appendix I (pp. 515-531) in Rāhulaji's edition of Manorathanandin's *Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti* (PVV)⁶ containing shorter and larger unconnected pieces of texts with clearly commentatorial character. Vibhūticandra, who was the copyist of the whole manuscript (cf. PVV p. 513, 4), has not only added numerous foot-notes to the manuscript⁷ which have been added to the edition of the PVV, too, but also personal remarks⁸ and scholarly notes at the end of the manuscript⁹. The literary character of these scholarly notes is not yet clear to me in every detail. One piece is definitely copied from another commentary¹⁰, the others contain a great amount of textual material from commentaries—mainly the *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā*, but also the *Viśālāmalavati*-, but I have not been able to trace these other pieces as a whole in the earlier literature of the school. They may be either copied by Vibhūticandra from other commentaries, not yet determined, who have made use of other commentaries already, or they may have been written by Vibhūticandra himself, incorporating pieces of older literature.

The texts nr. 2 (p. 516f.) and nr. 3 (p. 517-523) of this appendix are concerned with the question of the sequence of chapters in the *Pramāṇavārttika* and with the beginning of the *pramāṇa*-chapter. Since this *pramāṇa*-chapter is an extended "commentary" on the *maṅgala*-verse of the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*, this verse is quoted (p. 518, 26f.) and a lengthy commentary follows (p. 518, 29-521, 20). This commentary, highly interesting in itself, but so far of unclear origin, obviously contains pieces of Jinendrabuddhi's comments on the same verse. Dignāga's *maṅgala*-verse is of considerable importance functioning somewhat as a key for an interpretation of the spiritual and cultural meaning of a Buddhist tradition of epistemology and logic¹¹. And the Sanskrit fragments from Jinendrabuddhi's explanation of these Dignāga-words we can extract from this text will help to understand and emphasize the leading character attributed to it by the tradition in its approach towards reflecting its own religious and cultural value.

Jinendrabuddhi's comments on the maṅgala-verse itself run from f. 2b4 to f. 4b5¹³. The following fragments 1-6 comment upon the important first two pādas of the verse and taken together represent the Sanskrit original of the greater part of Jinendrabuddhi's words on these two pādas (f. 2b3-3a8). The last words of fragment 6 and fragment 7 comment upon the second line of the verse. To make up for those parts of the text not accounted for in the fragments, I have added an English translation of the Tibetan translation¹³. Short Sanskrit words and phrases without correspondence in the Tibetan translation and apparent glosses are put between square brackets, larger glosses are given in the notes. Omissions are marked by dots and supplied in the notes or in brackets. Possible corruptions are printed with normal letters.

III

PST f. 2b3f. : "Although (a phrase like) 'You are the real saviour' does not use a word of comparison¹⁴, its meaning is understood. The same is the case in this (verse). Thus the Venerable one is a means of cognition, because he is like a means of cognition."¹⁵

fragment 1 (PVV, Appendix, p. 518, 29-519, 4 = PST f. 2b4-7) : *yathā pratyakṣādīpramāṇaṃ puruṣārthopayogino 'nadhigatasārthasya prakāśakaṃ saṃvādakaṃ ca tathā bhagavān api yatrotkṛṣṭaḥ puruṣārthaḥ pratibaddhaś caturāryasatyalakṣaṇe tattve tadviśayaṃ hi jñānam āsādy mokṣārthīnāṃ [mokṣādhi-gamāt]. tasya [hy] anadhigatasya prakāśako'visamvādakaś ca [bhagavān nānyaḥ] iti pramāṇasādharmyāt pramāṇam/ bhūta utpannaḥ...¹⁶. bhūtavacanam aprajātasyeśvarādeḥ...¹⁷ paraparikalpita—¹⁸ nityasya pratiśedhārtham/ []¹⁹ pramāṇaṃ cāsau bhūtaś ceti pramāṇabhūtaḥ/ tasmai pramāṇabhūtāya/*

PST f. 2b7-8 : "(Objection:) 'Why has the accusative not been used here in explaining just that, as e.g. : "having saluted the teacher (śāstaraṃ praṇamya) ; who has virtues of such a kind.' ?" (Answer:) Right. For the intention of speech is followed by the best (word-) relation (*mchog gi sbyor ba* ?, i.e.

the accusative ?), when one wishes to express the object-government (**karmakāraka*), and when..."²⁰

fragment 2 (PVV, Appendix, p. 519, 10-12 = PST f. 2b8-3a2) :
prārthanādhyavasāya[ādi]kriyayā²¹ prāptum iṣṭatamatvāl labdhakarmavyapadeśayā prāṇatikriyayā²² bhipreyamānasya²³ saṃpradānatvavivakṣāyām atra²⁴ caturthī...²⁵ /

PST f. 3a2f. : "As in the case (of the phrase) 'she lies down to the husband' (*patye śete iti*), when one wishes to express the action for the benefit of the husband,—because (this) one thinks of by lying down,—by that which denominates the obtained object, there is only the dative ; in the same way here, too"²⁶. Therefore there is no fault."²⁰

fragment 3 (PVV, Appendix, p. 519, 23-27 = PST f. 3a3-6) :
jagaddhitaiṣiṇe iti jagaddhitam sahopāya²⁷ heyopādeyāyor ātyantike hāno²⁸ pādāne tadeśanaśilāya / praṇamya <iti>²⁹ kāyavāñmanobhiḥ praṇāman kṛtvā...³⁰ samuccayaḥ kariṣyate iti <tena>³¹ sambandhaḥ. etena praṇāmataḥ pūjā vihitāḥ śāstre iti...³² tṛṇtṛcau śaṇṣikṣadādibhyaḥ saṇṣjñāyām cāṇṭu³³ <bahulam anyatrāpi>³⁴ ity [auṇādika iṣṭapṛatīṣedhaḥ]ḥ duḥkha-kṣayopāyopadeśaḥ śāsanamḥ.

PST f. 3a6 : "The author of this (instruction) is called 'teacher' (**śāstr*) with reference to the state of effect. Here the word 'instruction' is used because of a metaphorical usage of the effect for the practise of the cause-path of this very instruction."³⁵

fragment 4 (PVV, Appendix, p. 519, 28-29 = PST f. 3a6-7) :
tac chāsanam kurvan bhagavān bodhisattvāvasthāyām śāstrśābdenoktaḥ.

fragment 5 (PVV, Appendix, p. 520, 26 = PST f. 3a7) :
sugatāyeti suṣṭhu gataḥ prāptaḥ sarvaheyaprahāṇ <āt sugataḥ>³⁶.

fragment 6 (PVV, Appendix, p. 520, 29-31 = PST f. 3a8) :
tāyine itiḥ tāyate'neneti tāyaḥ...³⁷ sva³⁸ dṛṣṭamārgopadeśaḥ. so'syāstiti tāyīḥ. prekṣāvadārambhāṇām...³⁹ prayojanena vyāptatvātḥ.

PST f. 3b4 :⁴⁰ "If this must be taken up for this purpose,"⁴¹

fragment 7 (PVV, Appendix, p. 521, 1-3 = PST f. 3b4-6) :

*nārabdhavyam [idaṃ] pramāṇasiddher nyāyamukhādi...⁴³ eva
sādhitatvāt. yat sādhitam tad⁴⁴..., yathā siddha odanaḥ [iti],...⁴⁴
vyāpakavirodham...⁴⁵...⁴⁶ āha svamatād viprasṛtād iti. hetau
pañcamī, <viśṛtaḥ prakīrṇo viprakīrṇa ity ārthaḥ>⁴⁷.*

NOTES

1. Ed. by P. Peterson, Calcutta 1889, from manuscripts in Jaina collections and transmitted in India due to the interest of the Jaina epistemologists in the kindred tradition of the Buddhists.
2. This state of things remained basically unchanged until Th. Stcherbatsky published a systematic account of the school's theories together with a translation of Dharmottara's commentary in the two volumes of his "Buddhist Logic", Leningrad 1930-32.
3. Reports and manuscript-lists are to be found in : Sanskrit Palm-Leaf MSS. in Tibet (JBORS 21, 1935, pp. 21-43), Appendix F of his edition of the Vādanyāyah (JBORS 22, 1936, Pt. I, pp. XIV-XIX), Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-Leaf MSS. in Tibet (JBORS 23, 1937, pp. 1-57), Search for Sanskrit MSS. in Tibet (JBORS 24, 1938, pp. 137-163).
4. The works of our school are collected in the Tshad ma-section of the Tanjur and add up to twenty volumes of the Peking edition (Nrs. 5700-5766 in Vols. 130-139 of the Japanese reprint).
5. They may have the quality of pioneers' works as H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar's "reconstruction" into Sanskrit of the first chapter of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya with selections from the Vṛtti and the Tīkā (Mysore 1930), or they may be superficially executed as Mrinal-kanti Gangopadhyaya's "reconstruction" of Vinītadeva's Nyāyabinduṭīkā (Calcutta 1971), which in addition is translated into English, thus offering a translation of a translation of a translation. They may also be made carefully, with critical consciousness and approach and with the peculiar empathy of the traditional paṇḍit, as the ones by the Jaina Muni Jambuvijayajī, who seems to be one of the few to use the correct term "translation" (*anuvāda*) for what he does and has translated into Sanskrit parts of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya with Vṛtti and Tīkā (cf. Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda. Baroda 1961, Appendix VII, pp. 169-219 ; Dvādaśāraṇa Nayacakram. Part I. Bhavnagar 1966, Appendix, pp. 95-140 ; Part II, 1976, in various footnotes).
6. Ed. in the Appendix to JBORS 24(1938), 25(1939), 26(1940).
7. Cf. Rāhulajī's preface p. I ; E. Frauwallner has studied these notes and shown that many have been taken from Devendrabuddhi's commentary on the Pramāṇavārttika in his article : Devendrabuddhi (WZKS 4, 1960, pp. 119-123).

8. Cf. R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Sanskrit Palm-Leaf MSS. in Tibet. JBORS 21, 1935, p. 11-13.
9. Cf. PVV, Appendix, p. 515, note 1 : *pustakānte kargadapatreṣu vibhā-ticandreṇaiva likhitam*
10. Nr. 1 (p. 515) e.g. is a commentary of the second maṅgala-verse of the *svārthānumāna*-chapter of the *Pramāṇavārttika* and has been copied with some omissions from Śākyamati's *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* (Peking ed., f. 4a 7-5b 2), a text which has also been used by Kaṇvakagomin in composing his *Svavṛttiṭīkā* (ed. 1943), where it corresponds to p. 3, 25-4, 27.
11. It has been translated with the *Vṛtti* and commented upon by M. Hattori (Dignāga, On Perception, being the *Pratyakṣa-pariccheda* of Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* from the Sanskrit fragments and the Tibetan versions. Cambridge, Mass., 1968, p. 23f. and 73-76).
12. I refer to the Japanese reprint (ed. D. T. Suzuki, Tokyo-Kyoto 1957, Vol. 139, Nr. 5766) of the Peking edition.
13. The Peking version (P) has been compared with the version of Derge (D) (Tshad ma, Vol. Ye, f. 1ff.).
14. lit. : "the word 'of such kind'" ('di 'dra ba'i sgra).
15. *khyod ni sgrol byed dam pa'o z'es pa 'di 'dra ba'i sgra sbyar ba med pa yañ de'i don rtogs pa de lāar 'dir yañ ño z'es pas tshad ma dañ 'dra bas bcom ldan 'das tshad ma'o ||*
16. omitted : "that means 'produced' " (*byuñ ba ces pa'i don to ||*). *byuñ ba* may correspond to *prādurbhūta* (cf. PVV, Appendix, p. 521, 27 : *prādurbhāvārtha*) or to *prajāta* (cf. the immediately following *aprajātasya* which is rendered by *ma byuñ ba*).
17. omitted : *tshad ma*.
18. The whole line seems to have been wrongly corrected after the omission of the word *pramāṇam*. Since *bhūta* is an attribute of the Bhagavān, it is said here that it is used to exclude Īśvara a.o., who are conceived as eternal by others. But the real meaning is, that the Bhagavān is said "to have become" (*bhūta*) a *pramāṇa* in order to exclude the eternal *pramāṇa* of e.g. an Īśvara as conceived by others (cf. Śākyamati's *Ṭīkā*, Peking ed., II, f. 86b 5 : *tshad ma rtag par rtog pa bsal ba yin no ||*). For Īśvara, being eternal, cannot "become" a *pramāṇa*. According to the Tibetan translation the sentence originally looked probably like this : **bhūtavacanam aprajātasya nityasyeśvara-dipramāṇasya paraparikalpitasya pratiśedhārtham*.
19. Gloss : *ivārthas tu sāmārthyagata iti na tadartham etad iti vakṣyate*
20. 'o na 'dir ji ltar 'di ñid kyi 'grel par 'di lta bu'i yon tan can gyi ston pa la phyag 'tshal nas z'es pa ltar gñis pa 'byuñ ba ma yin nam (D : yinam P) z'e na/bden te brjod 'dod 'di ni mchog gi sbyor ba'i rjes su 'brañ bā ñid kyi phyir gañ gi tshe las kyi byed pa brjod par 'dod la/gañ gi tshe...

For the objection cf. PVV, Appendix, p. 519, 5-8. The interpretation of the dative used here with *praṇamya* is also discussed at length by Yaśomitra in his *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932-36) p. 6, 16-7, 12, where he refers to Dignāga's maṅgala-verse, too (p. 7, 5f.).

21. *bya ba 'di dag gi (?)*.
22. Corrected : *abhipriyamāṇasya* (cf. *Padamañjarī* I, p. 549, 11 and *Nyāsaḥ* I, p. 548, 31 ; both ed. by Dvārikādāsa Śāstrī, Vārāṇasī 1965ff.).
23. *de'i tshe las la. de'i tshe* has been omitted, because the quotation does not have the corresponding *gañ gi tshe* at the beginning of the sentence and *las la* (**karmaṇi*) has been substituted by *atra*.
24. *bz'i pa ñid rigs te* ("the fourth alone is correct").
25. Jinendrabuddhi refers to *Mahābhāṣya* (ed. F. Kielhorn, Bombay 1892ff.) I. p. 330, 18ff. on *kriyāgrahaṇam api kartavyam*, which is taken as a *Vārttika* in our context (cf. PVV, Appendix, p. 519, 9). My translation is just an attempt.
26. *ji ltar de kho nar theb pa'i las kyi miñ can ñal bas mñon par 'dod par bya ba ñid kyi phyir bdag po ched du bya bar brjod par 'dod pa na bdag po la ñal lo z'es pa 'dir bz'i pa kho nar 'gyur ba de bz'in du 'dir yañ ño || ces pas skyon med do ||*
27. corrected : *sā hyapāya—*.
28. corrected : *dūno—*.
29. *phyag 'tshal nas z'es pa.*
30. *'di yañ.*
31. *'di dan brel (: sbrel P) lo ||*
32. *'dir it med de (D : te P).....z'ed bñad pa'i phyir ro ||* ("in this case *aniñ*, for it is said :").
33. *Uṇādisūtra* 2.94 (ed. T. R. Chintamani, Madras 1933).
34. Jinendrabuddhi includes *Uṇādisūtra* 2.95 (...*gz'an du yañ mañ por ro ||*). The word *ñāstr* is also explained by Yaśomitra (loc. cit. p. 7, 14-21) referring to *Uṇādisūtra* 2.94..
35. *de'i byed pa po ston pa z'es brjod de 'bras bu'i gnas skabs su'o || 'dir ni bñtan pa de ñid kyi rgyu lam goms par byed pa la 'bras bu ñe bar bñags pa'i phyir bñtan pa'i sgra 'jug go ||*
36. *spañs pas bde bar gñegs pa'o ||*
37. *de yañ.*
38. *sva-(rañ gis) : su—*.
39. *thams cad kyi.*
40. After some lines on the purpose (PST f. 3a8-3b4) which have not been incorporated into Vibhūticandra's text the last fragment found starts with an objection.
41. *gal te de'i don du 'di brtsam par bya ba yin na |*

42. *rañ gz'uñ gis khyod kyis sñar* ("[already] earlier by you through your own theories/treatises, e.g..")
43. *tatra sādhyate*, corrupted for : *de ni sgrub pa'i ched du rtogs pa dañ ldan pas brtsams par bya ba ma yin te* / ("that should not be taken up by an intelligent person in order to prove it.")
44. *tshad ma sgrub pa yañ b,grubs zin pa yin no* // ("and the proof of the means of cognition is already established.")
45. *z'e na*.
46. instead of *āśaṅkya* : *'di bsal ba'i ched du* ("in order to refute this").
47. According to *rnam par 'thor ba ni rab tu bkram pa ste* / *rnam par bkram pa'o z'es pa'i tha tshig go* // and the beginning of the following sentence of Vibhūticandra : *vistṛtaprakaraṇatārtho...* .