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 Sāṅkṣṭyāyana 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 Pramāṇavārttikā (ed. 1938) and Vādanyāya (ed. 1935-36), and some important commentaries, e.g. Karṇakagomin's subcommentary on the Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti (ed. 1943), Prajñākaragupta's Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya (ed. 1953), Śāntarakṣita's Vādanyāyaṭīkā (ed. 1935-36) and Manorathandin'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 Pramāṇaviniścaya, and the oldest commentaries on the Pramāṇavārttika, by Devendrabuddhi and Śākyamati, and on the Pramāṇaviniścaya, 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 original. 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 Viśālāmalavatti (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 Manorathānandin’s Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti (PVV) 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 manuscript which have been added to the edition of the PVV, too, but also personal remarks and scholarly notes at the end of the manuscript. The literary character of these scholarly notes is not yet clear to me in every detail. One piece is definitely copied from another commentary, the others contain a great amount of textual material from commentaries—mainly the Pramāṇavārttikaṭikā, 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. Dīgnāga’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 logic. And the Sanskrit fragments from Jinendrabuddhi’s explanation of these Dīgnāga-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. 4b5\(^{18}\). 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 translation\(^{18}\). 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 comparison\(^{14}\), 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."\(^{16}\)

fragment 1 (PVV, Appendix, p. 518, 29-519, 4 = PST f. 2b4-7) : yathā pratyakṣādīprimāṇaṃ puruṣārthropayogino ’nadhi-gatasyārthasya prakāśakaṃ saṁvādakaṇ ca tathā bhagavān api yatrotkṛṣṭaḥ puruṣārthah pratibaddhaḥ caturāryasatyalakṣaṇe tattve tadviṣayaḥ hi jñānam āśādya mokṣārthiṁāṇi [mokṣādhigamāḥ]. tasya [hy] anadhi-gatasya prakāśako’visamvādakaṇ ca [bhagavāṇ nānyaiḥ] iti pramāṇasādharmyāt pramāṇam/ bhūta uppannāḥ...\(^{16}\) bhūtavacanam aprajātasyeśvarādeḥ...\(^{17}\) paraparikalpita—\(^{16}\) nityasya pratiṣedhārtham/ [ ]\(^{10}\) pramāṇaṇaḥ cāsau bhūtaḥ ceti pramāṇabhūtāḥ/ 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 (śāstraṇaṃ praṇamyā); 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. 2b6-3a2):
prārthanādhyavāsāya[ādi]kriyaya21 prāptum iṣṭatamatvāl labdhaka-
karmavyapadeśayā praṇatikriyayāḥ bhipreyamānasya22 saṃpradā-
natvāvivakṣayām atra23 caturtih...24/
PST f. 3a2f. : "As in the case (of the phrase) 'she lies down
to the husband' (patye se te 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,
too25. Therefore there is no fault."20

fragment 3 (PVV, Appendix, p. 519, 23-27 = PST f. 3a3-6):
jagaddhitaiśīne iti jagadhitam sahapaśa27 heyopādeyayor ātyant-
tike hāno28 pādāne tadeṣaṇaśilāyā praṇamiya <iti>29 kāyavā-
manobhiḥ praṇāmaṃ kṛtvā...30 samuccayatah kariṣyate iti
<tena>31 sambandhaḥ, etena praṇāmatah pūjā vihitāḥ sāstre
iti...32 trīṭcāu saṃsikṣadādibhyāḥ saṃjñāyāṃ cānītau33 <
balulam anyatṛāpi>34 ity [auṇādika itpratisedhah]f. duḥkhha-
ksayopāyopadeśah śāsanamf.
PST f. 3a6 : "The author of this (instruction) is called
'teacher'(*śāsty) 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 instruc-
tion."35

fragment 4 (PVV, Appendix, p. 519, 28-29 = PST f. 3a6-7):
tac chāsanaṃ kurvaṃ bhagaṃvā bodhispattvāvasthāyāṃ śāstrā-
badenoktaḥf.

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

fragment 6 (PVV, Appendix, p. 520, 29-31 = PST f. 3a8):
tāyine iti[. tāyate'neneti tāyah...27 sva38 dṛṣṭamārgopadesahf.
so'syāstiti tāyif. pṛekṣāvadārambhāṇāṃ...39 prayojanena
vyāptatvāt:
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 [idaṁ] pramāṇasiddher nyāyamukhādi...48 eva sādhgitavāt.yat sadhitam tad...49..., yathā siddha odanaḥ [iti],...44 vyāpakavirodham...45...46 āha svamatād viprasṭād itiḥ. hetau pañcamī. <vistṛtah prakīrṇo viprakīrṇa ity ārthah>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.


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 Ṭikā (Mysore 1930), or they may be superficially executed as Mrinalkanti Gangopadhyaya’s “reconstruction” of Vinitadeva’s Nyāyabindoṣikā (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 Jambuvijayaṭi, 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 Ṭikā (cf. Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇḍāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda. Baroda 1961, Appendix VII, pp. 169-219; Dvādaśāraṇa Nayacakram. Part 1. Bhavnagar 1966, Appendix, pp. 95-140; Part II, 1976, in various footnotes).


7. Cf. Rāhulaṭi’s preface p. 1; 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).
10. Nr. 1 (p. 515) e.g. is a commentary of the second maṅgala-verse of the svārthānumāṇa-chapter of the Pramāṇavārttika and has been copied with some omissions from Śākyamati’s Pramāṇavārttiṭikā (Peking ed., f. 4a 7-5b 2), a text which has also been used by Karṇakagomīn in composing his Svavṛttīṭikā (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 Pratyākṣa-pariccheda of Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccaya from the Sanskrit fragments and the Tibetan versions. Cambridge, Mass., 1968, p. 23f. and 73-76).
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 sgröl byed dam pa’o z’es pa ’di ’dra ba’i sgra sbyar ba med pa yan de’i don rtogs pa de ldar ’dir yan no z’es pas tshad ma dan ’dra bas bcom ldan ’das tshad ma’o ||
16. omitted: “that means ‘produced’” (*byun ba ces pa’i don to ||). byun ba may correspond to praṇurbhūta (cf. PVV, Appendix, p. 521, 27: praṇurbhāvārthaḥ) or to prajāta(cf. the immediately following apra- jātasya which is rendered by ma byun 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 Tīkā, Peking ed., II, f. 86b 5: *tshad ma rtog par rtog pa bṣal 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 nityasyeśvarā- dipramāṇasya parapurakalpitasya pratīṣedhārtham*.
19. Gloss: *iṃvārthas tu sāmarthya-gata iti na tadartham etad iti vakṣyate/
20. ‘o na ’dir ji litar ’di niḍ kyi ’grel par ’di lta bu’i yon tan can gyi ston pa la phyag ’tshal nas z’es pa litar gnis pa ’byun ba ma yin nam (D: yinam P) z’e na’lden te brjod ’dod ’di ni mchog gi sbyor ba’i rjes su ’braṅ ba niḍ kyi phyir gaṅ gi tshe las kyi byed pa brjod par ’dod la’gaṅ gi tshe...
For the objection cf. PVV, Appendix, p. 519, 5-8. The interpretation of the dative used here with prañamya 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 (?).


23. de’i tshe las la. de’i tshe has been omitted, because the quotation does not have the corresponding gāṅ gi tshe at the beginning of the sentence and las la (*karma) has been substituted by atra.

24. bz’i pa śid rig te (“the fourth alone is correct”).

25. Jinendrabuddhi refers to Mahābhāṣya (ed. F. Kiellhorn, Bombay 1892 ff.) I. p. 330, 18 ff. on kriyāgraḥanam 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 thob pa’i las kyi miṅ can ṇal bas miṅan par ’dod par bya ba śid kyi phyir bdag po ched du bya bar brjod po ’dod pa na bdag po la ṇal lo z’es pa ’dir bz’i pa kho nar ’gyur ba de bz’in du ’dir yah no // ces pas skyon med do //

27. corrected: sā hyapāya—.

28. corrected: dānu—.

29. phyag ’tshal nas z’es pa.

30. ’di yah,.

31. ’di daṅ brel (: sbrel P) lo //

32. ’dir it med de (D : te P)......z’ed bṣad pa’i phyir ro // (“in this case anit, for it is said: ......’).”

33. Unādisūtra 2.94 (ed. T. R. Chintamani, Madras 1933).

34. Jinendrabuddhi includes Unādisūtra 2.95 (...g’zan du yah mah por ro // ). The word śāstrī is also explained by Yaśomitra (loc. cit. p. 7, 14-21) referring to Unādisūtra 2.94.

35. de’i byed pa po ston pa z’es brjod de ’bras bu’i gnas skabs su’o // ’dir ni bstan pa de śid kyi rgyu lam gom’s par byed pa la ’bras bu ne bar btags pa’i phyir bstan pa’i sgra ’jug go //

36. sṗṅs pas bde bar gšegs pa’o //

37. de yah,.

38. sva-(rāṅ gis): su—.

39. thams cad kyi.

40. After some lines on the purpose (PST f. 3a8-3b4) which have not been incorporated into Vīhūticandra’s text the last fragment found starts with an objection.

41. gala te de’i don du ’di brtsam par bya ba yin na /
Some Sanskrit fragments

42. rañ gūn gis khyod kyis śñar (“already earlier by you through your own theories/treatises, e.g.”).

43. tatra śādyate, 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 bṣgrubs 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... .