

THE SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPT OF DHARMAKĪRTI'S PRAMĀṆAVINIŚCAYA

(Report on a Single Folio Fragment
from the National Archives Collection, Kathmandu)

By Kazunobu Matsuda, Kyoto and Ernst Steinkellner, Vienna

1. INTRODUCTION

The identification of the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscript fragments preserved in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu, has been the ongoing work of K. Matsuda, one of the collaborators in this study¹. The main portion of these fragments was first examined by Cecil Bendall about a century ago². After Bendall's death, the photographs of these fragments passed into the hands of Louis de La Vallée Poussin who published studies on several of the fragments³. A few studies by

¹ Kazunobu Matsuda would like to acknowledge his debt of gratitude to Professör Balram D. Dangol of the National Archives for his unstinting co-operation in providing the microfilms needed and arranging for permission to publish the study and the related folios.

² C. BENDALL spent a four month period from November 1898 to March 1899 in India and Nepal, during which time he visited the Durbar Library (present National Archives) where he discovered the cache of old manuscript fragments which he borrowed and photographed. For his reports, see: Remarks on the Results of Bendall's Recent Journey to Nepal in Search of Sanskrit Mss. and Inscriptions. Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal 2 (Feb. 1899) 30-35; Pāli MSS. in Nepal. JRAS 1899, 422; Outline-Report on a Tour in Northern India in the Winter 1898-9. JRAS 1900, 162-164; Nepal MSS. JRAS 1900, 345-347; Śikṣāsamuccaya ([Bibliotheca Buddhica I] Petersburg 1897-1902), p. 291, n. 7 and frontispiece; Fragment of a Buddhist Ordination-Ritual in Sanskrit. Album Kern (Leiden 1903), p. 373-376; Subhāṣita-Saṃgraha. Le Muséon 1903, 375-402 and 1904, 5-46 and 245-274, esp. p. 375-377; Note on the History of the Pāli Canon in Northern India. Verhandlungen des XIII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses, Hamburg Sept. 1902 (Leiden 1904) 58-60. - Some of the fragments examined by Bendall are entered in H. P. ŚĀSTRĪ's A Catalogue of Palm-Leaf & Selected Paper Mss. Belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal, Vol. II (Calcutta 1915), p. 246-248 (rep. Stuttgart 1989 as VOHD-Supplementband 31, with microfilm concordance by R. GRÜNENDAHL), where they are among the particular group of manuscripts in the Library's collection referred to as 'Bendall's Puka'.

³ See DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN's Mss. Cecil Bendall. JRAS 1907, 375-379; Mss. Cecil Bendall II. Fragments en écriture Gupta du Nord. JRAS 1908, 45-53

other scholars have also appeared⁴. A number of the folios, however, have remained unidentified. Overlooked by scholars for decades, the originals of these fragments have slumbered unnoticed in Kathmandu until now.

Among the folios so far examined by Matsuda, there is a manuscript set entitled *Bauddhaśāstriyapattrāṇi* (Manuscript No. I-1697 Vi *Baud-dhadarśana* 64 Ka)⁵, which is an unusual compilation comprised of one folio taken from eight different manuscripts. These eight folios written on palm leaves are, with the exception of one, written in Gilgit/*Bāmiyān* Type II (G/B-II) script⁶ or in Early *Nepālī* script, a fact indicating that they are among the oldest extant manuscripts from the Nepal region. Of these eight, only one of them has been previously published by Bendall⁷. Matsuda has succeeded in identifying the other folios as follows⁸:

and Bouddhisme. Etudes et Matériaux—Théorie des douze Causes (London 1913), p. 115f.

⁴ For example, S. LÉVI, *Mss. sanskrits découverts au Nepal*. JA 1923–II, 359; Notes Indiennes. JA 206 (1925) 17–69, esp. p. 26–35; M. P. MASSON-OURSSEL, *Les Trois Corps du Bouddha*—Appendice (Manuscrit de la Collection Bendall). JA 1913–I, 598–618; P. V. BAPAT, A *Pāli* Manuscript in an Indian Script. ABORI 33 (1952 [53]) 197–210; Z. NAKAMURA, On the Four Sheets of Gilgit Manuscripts of *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* in the Bill (!Bir) Library. *Añjali* (Peradeniya 1970), p. 63–74 and Gilgit Manuscript of the *Mahāsannipātaratnaketusūtra* kept in the National Archives, Kathmandu. *Hokke-Bunka Kenkyū* 1 (Tokyo 1975) 13–37. — Regarding to two articles by NAKAMURA, his 1975 article successfully identified the 5 folios of which 4 had been previously published by POUSSIN in JRAS 1908 as the *Ratnaketuparivarta*. Unfortunately, at that time Nakamura was unaware of Poussin's publication, and had further considered these folios (as well as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* folios in his 1970 article) written in Gilgit/*Bāmiyān* Type I script, i. e., Round Gupta script, as belonging to the famous Gilgit manuscripts discovered by M. A. Stein in 1931. But this is incorrect. These folios, although written in the same script as the Gilgit manuscripts, should be regarded as one of the Nepalese manuscripts which are deposited in Kathmandu and were earlier examined by Bendall in 1899 (see BENDALL, JRAS 1900, 345ff.).

⁵ This manuscript set is catalogued in *Bṛhatsūcīpattrā VII-2 'Bauddhaviśayaka'* (Kathmandu 1966), p. 37.

⁶ According to LORE SANDER's *Paläographisches* (Wiesbaden 1968, VOHD-Supplementband 8), G/B-II script, i. e., Proto-*Śāradā* script, was used after the sixth century. This script had reached China and Japan via the Silk Road, where it was known as the *Siddhamātrkā* script.

⁷ See BENDALL 1903, which corresponds to fragment No. 6 in the list below.

⁸ The order of the fragments below corresponds to the order in which they appear in the microfilm provided by the Nepal/German Manuscript Preservation Project (Real No. A39/3, taken on Sept. 23, 1970).

- 1 *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* Section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*⁹ [G/B-II script]
- 2 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*¹⁰ [G/B-II script]
- 3 *Pramāṇavinīścaya* [Early Nepālī script]
- 4 An Unknown Commentary on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*¹¹ [G/B-II script]
- 5 *Gauḍapādīyakārikābhāṣya*¹² [Nepālī script]
- 6 *Bhikṣuṇīkarmavācānā*¹³ [G/B-II script]
- 7 *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*¹⁴ [G/B-II script]
- 8 *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī* Section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*¹⁵ [G/B-II script]

Although Matsuda intends to publish detailed findings on these folios in the near future, this paper represents the initial results of a collaborative study on the folio identified as Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavinīścaya*. The *Pramāṇavinīścaya* is an important text in the Indian school of Buddhist logic systematized by Dharmakīrti, of which the

⁹ Corresponding to Tibetan tr., Peking ed., No. 5539, Hi 87b7-92a3; and Chinese tr., Taisho Vol. 30, p. 728c16-730b21. Cited herein are passages from the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*, Tibetan tr., Peking ed., No. 774, Nu 42a5-46a1; and LAMOTTE ed., VIII.39-IX.7. For a report on other manuscript fragments of the same text, see MATSUDA, On Leningrad Ms. Ind. VII.23 presented by the 13th Dalai Lama. The Identification of the Sanskrit Manuscript of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* Section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Report of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies 34 (1988) 16-20.

¹⁰ Corresponding to KERN/NANJIO ed., p. 15.1-18.4. Matsuda noticed that another four folios belonging to the same manuscript were in another manuscript set of the Archives examined by Bendall; for his forthcoming paper done in collaboration with Prof. H. Toda, see Three Sanskrit Fragments of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* from the Cecil Bendall Manuscript Collection in the National Archives, Kathmandu. Memoirs of the Department of Ethics, College of General Education, The University of Tokushima 20 (1991).

¹¹ A fragment from a large hitherto unknown commentary on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, chapter I, corresponding to PRADHAN's first ed., p. 7.10-8.4. In content it is completely unlike Yaśomitra's commentary (WOGIHARA ed., p. 27.18f.), nor does it match those by Sthiramati (Tib. tr., Peking ed., No. 5857, To 57a2f) and *Pūrṇavardhana (Tib. tr., Peking ed., No. 5594, Ju 34b3f) which it resembles. It is speculated that this fragment is from a commentary either by Guṇamati or Vasumitra, neither of which exists today.

¹² Written in ordinary Nepālī script, it covers chapter II.7-13 of a *Vedānta* text attributed to Śaṅkara. This fragment is the only one that is out of place in this otherwise Buddhist manuscript set.

¹³ See note 7 above.

¹⁴ Corresponding to Chinese tr. by Hsuan-tsang, Taisho Vol. 5, p. 516-517.

¹⁵ Corresponding to Tibetan tr., Peking ed., No. 5542, Yi 47b7-49b7; and Chinese tr., Taisho Vol. 30, p. 768c20-769c9.

original Sanskrit manuscript has long been believed lost. This folio, numbered on the verso side as folio “87”, belongs to the latter portion of chapter III, Parārthānumāna, in the Tibetan translation, which corresponds to Ce 323b7–324b5 of the Peking edition No. 5710 and to Ce 225a2–b6 of the Sde dge (Derge) edition No. 4211. There is a rumor among scholars that the complete Sanskrit manuscript of the present text exists somewhere in China¹⁶, but up to now there is no solid evidence to support this contention. If, in some future age, such a manuscript should appear it will no doubt be of great interest to scholars. In the meantime, scholars in the field, who are acquainted with the text only through citations in other works, will have to be content with this ‘tantalizing whiff’ of the original Sanskrit text which the present folio affords.

2. TRANSCRIPTION

The transcription below is that done by Matsuda¹⁷, following which is the constitution of the text, based on the transcription, as done by E. Steinkellner.

Symbols used: [] damaged letter; () restored letter; < > cancelled letter; < > superfluous letter; * Virāma; (!) *sic*.

recto

- 1 = d anvaṃyāṃ āpādayati | pratiṣedhaniṣedhasya vi[dhā]narūpatvāt*
| asataḥ sapakṣān na nivṛttir ity asapakṣa eva nāstīti cet* | neti < >
saiva nivṛtter nivṛttir asataḥ katham iṣṭā | abhāvapraṭiṣedho hi
bhāvo '=
- 2 = saty apy asti | bhāvapraṭiṣedhas tu na sambhavatīty aśkhalita-
prajño devānāmpriyo yas tadviśayaṃ pratiṣedhaṃ necchati | asad
abhāva iti ca vyavaharati | nirloṭhitaś cāyam artho 'sati nā=
- 3 = stitety arthāntare | tena neha pratanyate | na cāsann ātmā sattā-
sādhanaṃvṛtteḥ sandigdhaḥ syāt* | na ce(!) pareṇa tathopagata iti ||
apramāṇād abhyupagamāt tathaiva bhavati | atiprasa =
- 4 = ṅgāt* | na copagamabalena sapakṣāpakṣau vyavasthāpya pramā-
ṇapravarttanam yuktaṃ* | evaṃ hy āgamasiddha ātmā syāt* |
nānumānasiddhaḥ | tasmād avyatiṛeke (')py asataḥ | sapakṣa(!) vya-
tīrekaḥ sa =

¹⁶ A private correspondence from Dr. Chr. Lindtner of last year indicated to Matsuda that there are at least three more or less complete Pramāṇaviniścaya manuscripts available from Lhasa.

¹⁷ Matsuda also wishes to acknowledge his debt of gratitude to Professors T. E. Vetter, T. Tani and T. Iwata for their helpful comments to his draft transcription.

5 = ndigdhaḥ syāt* prāṇādīnām | ātmanaḥ sandehāt* | ata eva vipak-
ṣād api (!) ekatra hi niyame siddhe 'nyanivarttanam

verso

- 1 sidhyet* | anyathā kvacid drṣṭe 'bhāvasiddhāv api syād evādrṣṭe
saṃśayaḥ | tathā hy asakala(bhe)vyaktibhedavyāpino hy(!) arthāḥ
keci(t) tadjātisambhavino drṣṭāḥ pāṛthivālohaḥkhyavat* | virodha-
sya cādrṣṭe(h) saṃ =
- 2 = deha eva | nairātmyena prāṇādīnām «|» uktalakṣaṇasya virodha-
syāsiddheḥ | sandigdho nairātmyād vyatirekaḥ | ātmapratīniyame hi
tatkāryātmatayā prāṇādīnām nairātmyena saha virodhaḥ
- 3 syāt* | sa ca na sidhyatīty uktam* | astu nāma nairātmakebhyo
vyatirekaḥ «|» prāṇādīnām tadbhāve ca nairātmyavyāvṛttiḥ | ta-
thāpi nānairātmyād ātmāj(!) jīvaccharīre sidhyati | yenāyam na
vya =
- 4 = tirekaṣyābhāvaṃ bhāvaṃ icchati | yathā vyatirekābhāve (')pi
sapakṣe prāṇādir neṣṭaḥ | sapakṣāvyatirekī ced dhetur hetur ato
(')nvayī | nānvayī |(!) avyatirekī ced anairātmyam na sātmakeḥ | iti
saṃgra =
- 5 = haślokaḥ | na prāṇādisambhavena nai[rātmyavy]āvarttanād āt-
magatiḥ | kin tarhi vidhimukhenaiva prāṇādayaḥ

3. CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT

The fragment identified and transcribed above by Matsuda and edited below belongs to the section of the third chapter of the Pramāṇavinīścaya which deals with the theory of apparent logical reasons (*hetvābhāsa*). This section covers PVin III vv. 68–85b (f. 313a3–327a8) and has no direct correspondence with a parallel section in the fourth chapter of the Pramāṇavārttika where a similar coherent treatment of this topic is lacking¹⁸. As Prof. Frauwallner demonstrated, this part of the last chapter of the Pramāṇavinīścaya is essentially new, both in structure as well as in content, although materials from relevant parts of the Pramāṇavārttika have been exploited¹⁹.

After an explanation of the unproved (*asiddha*), indecisive (*anaikāntika*) and contradictory (*viruddha*) reasons, Dharmakīrti refutes

¹⁸ Steinkellner was able to use the analytical descriptions of PV IV and PVin III that were prepared by Tom J. F. Tillemans, Lausanne, and T. Iwata, Tokyo, respectively for the Mahāyāna Buddhism volume of the Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy edited by K. Potter, and would like to thank both colleagues on this occasion for making these surveys available to him.

¹⁹ Cf. E. FRAUWALLNER, Die Reihenfolge und Entstehung der Werke Dharmakīrti's in Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller, Leipzig 1954, p. 148f.

(322a5–324b7) the Naiyāyika Uddyotakara's theorem of the *kevalavyatirekin hetu*, i. e. the idea that the reason can be valid when only the condition of its common absence with the inferred property (*sādhya*) is satisfied, i. e. when only the contrapositive pervasion (*vyatirekavyāpti*) can be adduced²⁰. This is, for example, the case when the existence of a self (*ātman*) is inferred in living bodies (*jīvaccharīra*) from their having breath etc. (*prāṇādimattva*)²¹. The fragment begins near the end of Dharmakīrti's demonstration that if the Naiyāyika insists on his idea that the logical reason "having breath etc." (*prāṇādimattva*) does not occur only in dissimilar instances (*vipakṣa*), this would oblige him to approve of a positive pervasion (*anvaya*) for this reason, too. And this, in turn, would contradict his theorem of a "reason with only contrapositive concomitance" (*kevalavyatirekin*), "because the negation of a negation is an affirmation" (lines 1f.).

This is followed by a short résumé of his more elaborate explanation of affirmation (*vidhi*) and negation (*pratiśedha*) in PVin II 8, 1–10, 1 (lines 3–8). Then Dharmakīrti answers the question as to how similar instances (*sapakṣa*) could be implied in this case, since a Buddhist does not accept the existence of a self (*ātman*) at all (lines 9–31).

After the summarizing verse 84, the fragment ends within a final objection. A short answer is terminated by Dharmakīrti's own classification of the crucial reason "(having) breath etc.": it is a case of the "indecisive uncommon" (*asādhāraṇānaikāntika*) reason (P 324b7).

Since most of the contents of this fragment from the *hetvābhāsa* section have been treated by Dharmakīrti more elaborately in PV IV and PVin II, they are presented here in an extremely concentrated form – although sometimes the dissolution of the *Pramāṇavārttika* verses into prose is helpful too. My attempt at translating this fragment has therefore also been added in order to present additional reasons for the text's constitution.

Numbers in square brackets refer for the following passage to parallel texts of the *Pramāṇavārttika*. Mistakes in these texts are corrected without comment.

... d^a *anvayam āpādayati*, [1] *pratiśedhaniṣedhasya*^b *vidhānarūpatvāt*^c.

^a read (*balā*)d (cf. *nan gyis* P).

^b Ms.: *de dgag pa bkag pa'i ṅo bo ni* P.

^c Ms.: *sgrub pa'i rañ bžin yin pa'i phyir ro* P.

²⁰ In this section Dharmakīrti draws on materials from the context of the discussion of the *asādhāraṇānaikāntikahetu* in PV IV, in particular vv. 205–212, 216–222, and 237–244.

²¹ Nyāyavārttika (ed. Calcutta 1936–1944) 145, 2–4.

[2] *asataḥ sapakṣān na^d nivṛttir ity asapakṣa eva nāstīti cet, neti saiva nivṛtter nivṛttir asataḥ katham iṣṭā.* [3] *abhāvapratiśedho hi bhāvo 'saty apy asti, bhāvapratiśedhas tu na sambhavaṭīty askhalitaprajño devānāṃpriyo yas tadviṣayam^e pratiśedham necchaty asad abhāva iti^f ca vyavaharati. nirloṭhitas cāyam artho 'sati nāstīteत्य arthāntare^g. tena neha pratanyate.*

[4] *na cāsann ātmā sattāsādhkanavṛtteḥ sandigdhaḥ syāt. na ca^h pareṇa tathopagata ityⁱ apramāṇād abhyupagamāt tathaiva^j bhavati, atiprasaṅgāt. na copagamabalena sapakṣāsapakṣau^k vyavasthāpya pramāṇapravartanam yuktam. evam hy āgamasiddha ātmā syāt, nānumānasiddhaḥ.* [5] *tasmād avyātreke 'py asataḥ sapakṣād^l vyātrekaḥ sandigdhaḥ syāt prāṇādīnām ātmanah sandehāt. ata eva vipakṣād^m apiⁿ.* [6] *ekatra hi niyame siddhe 'nyanivartanam sidhyet. anyathā kvacid dṛṣṭe 'bhāvasiddhā eva syād evādṛṣṭeⁿ saṃśayaḥ.* [7] *tathā hy asakalavyaktibhedavyāpino 'py^o arthāḥ kecit tajjāṭisambhavo dṛṣṭāḥ pāṭhivālohalekhyavat.* [8] *virodhasya cādṛṣṭeḥ sandeha eva. nairātmyena prāṇādīnām uktalakṣaṇasya virodhasyāsiddheḥ* [9] *sandigdho nairātmyād vyātrekaḥ.* [10] *ātmapratīnīyame hi tatkāryāt-matayā prāṇādīnām nairātmyena saha virodhaḥ syāt, sa ca na sidhyatīty uktam.*

[11] *astu nāma nairātmakebhyo vyātrekaḥ prāṇādīnām tadbhāve ca nairātmyavyāvṛttiḥ, tathāpi nānairātmyād ātmā^p jīvaccharire sidhyati,* [12] *yenāyam^q na vyātrekasyābhāvam bhāvam icchati yathā vyātrekābhāve 'pi sapakṣe prāṇādir neṣṭaḥ.*

[13] *sapakṣāvyātrekī ced dhetur hetur ato 'nvayī / nānvayavyātrekī ced anairātmyam na sātmapam || v. 84 || iti saṅgrahaślokaḥ.*

na prāṇādisambhavana nairātmyavyāvartanād ātmagatiḥ. kin tarhi. vidhimukhenaiva prāṇādayaḥ ...^r

^d na without equivalent in Tib.

^e tadviṣayam Ms.: yul de la P.

^f Tib. adds de lta bu la sogs pa.

^g arthāntare Ms.: de'i nañ du P.

^h ca : ce Ms.

ⁱ *opagata iti Ms.: khas blañs pa'i phyir ro ze na P.

^j eva without equivalent in Tib.

^k āsapakṣau (cf. mi mthun pa'i phyogs P): āpakṣau Ms.

^l sapakṣād (cf. mthun pa'i phyogs ... las P): sapakṣa Ms.

^m Tib. adds ldog pa the tshom za ste.

ⁿ ādṛṣṭe Ms.: ma mthoñ ba rñams la P.

^o 'py (cf. don yañ P) : hy Ms.

^p ātmā : ātmāj Ms. (: Tib. gson po'i lus bdag dan bcas par seems to translate 'ātmavaj jīvaccharīram).

^q yenāyam Ms.: gañ gis na bdag med pa med pas bdag yod par 'gyur bas 'di P (probably a gloss).

^r bdag rtogs par byed pa yin no ze na P.

4. PARALLEL TEXTS

- [1] Cf.: *pratiṣedhaniṣedhaś ca vidhānāt kīdrśo 'paraḥ* // (PV IV 221cd)
 [2] Cf.: *nivṛttir nāsataḥ sādhyād asādhyeṣv eva no tataḥ* |
neti saiva nivṛtṭiḥ kiṃ nivṛtter asato matā // (PV IV 222)
 [3] Cf.: *nivṛtṭyabhāvas tu vidhir vastubhāvo 'sato 'pi san* |
vastvabhāvas tu nāstīti ... (PV IV 223a–c = PVin II 15a–c)
 [4] Cf.: *sattāsādhanavṛtteś ca sandigdhaḥ syād asan na saḥ* |
asattvañ cābhyupagamād apramāṇān na yujyate // (PV IV 237)
 [5] Cf.: *asato 'vyatireke 'pi sapakṣād vinivartanam* |
sandigdham tasya sandehād vipakṣād vinivartanam // (PV IV 238)
 [6] Cf.: *ekatra niyame siddhe sidhyaty anyanivartanam* |
dvairāśye saty adṛṣṭe 'pi syād adṛṣṭeṣu saṃśayaḥ // (PV IV 239)
 [7] Cf.: *avyaktivyāpino 'py arthāḥ santi tajjātibhāvinah* |
kvacin na niyamo 'dṛṣṭyā pāṛthivālohalekhyavat // (PV IV 240)
 [8] Cf.: *bhāve virodhasyādṛṣṭau kaḥ sandehaṃ nivartayet* | (PV IV 241ab)
 [9] Cf.: *nairātmyād api tenāsya sandigdham vinivartanam* | (PV IV 242ab)
 [10] Cf.: *kvacid viniyamāt ko 'nyas tatkāryātmatayā sa ca* // (PV IV 241cd)
 [11] Cf.: *astu nāma tathāpy ātmā nānairātmyāt prasidhyati* // (PV IV 242cd)
 [12] Cf.: *yenāsau vyatirekasya nābhāvam bhāvam icchati* |
yathā nāvyatireke 'pi prānādir na sapakṣataḥ // (PV IV 243)
 [13] = PV IV 244

5. TRANSLATION

⟨Therefore by implication of (? the respective forms of the reason?)
 “occurrence in only the similar instances and non-occurrence in only²²
 the dissimilar instances” either of the two examples is said to indicate
 both (forms)²³.

Thus a non-deviating concomitance in difference of this type is not
 established in the case of (a reason) which does not have a concomitance
 in agreement (*ananvayin*)²⁴. If established²⁵ it procures by force the
 concomitance in agreement, because the negation of a negation has the
 form of an affirmation²⁶.

²² Wrong for “only non-occurrence in ...”.

²³ Cf. PV IV (220cd): *arthāpattyāta evoktam ekenobhayadarśanam* // Cf. PVin II 7,7–12, 29–32 and PVin IIa: 37, 38f. and note 92.

²⁴ Cf. PV IV 221ab: *īdrṅavyabhicāro 'to 'nanvayiṣu na sidhyati* |.

²⁵ P 323b6f.: *de 'ñid kyī phyir mthun pa 'i phyogs 'ñid la yod pa dan mthun pa 'i phyogs ma yin pa 'ñid la med pa zes don go bas dpe gñis las gañ yañ ruñ ba gñi ga bstan par brjod do || de 'i phyir ldog pa mi 'khrul pa 'di 'dra ba ni rjes su 'gro ba med par mi grub bo || grub na ni* ...

²⁶ Following the Tibetan: “because the form of the negation of a negation of that is essentially an affirmation”.

If (it is said): "There is no non-occurrence [of the reason] in similar instances that do not exist. Therefore [the reason] does not occur only in what is not a similar instance (*asapakṣe*)"²⁷, (we answer): When (you say) "(there is) no (non-occurrence)", why do you assume just this non-occurrence of an non-occurrence in (similar instances) that do not exist?²⁸ "The negation of non-occurrence as occurrence is well extant even in (the similar instance) that does not exist; the negation of occurrence, however, is not possible." He is (indeed) a beloved of the gods with unshaken intelligence, who does not accept a negation referring to something and (at the same time) uses words like "non-existent, non-occurrence". We further treated this subject extensively in another circumstance²⁹ (*arthāntare*), [i. e. the section beginning with the words] "non-occurrence at the non-occurrence"³⁰. Therefore it is not spread out here.

Furthermore, a self is not non-existent because of the (actual) function of a proof for (its) existence, (but) would be doubtful (only). And it is certainly neither³¹ so [i. e. non-existent] on account of an inauthenticated assumption in form of (the statement) "The opponent assumes [the self to be] so [i. e. non-existent]"³², because of undesired consequences. Nor³¹ is the use of a valid cognition appropriate when similar and dissimilar instances are established (merely) by force of an assumption. For in this case the self would be proven by scripture, it (would) not be proven by inference. Therefore, because this (self) is doubtful, the exclusion (*vyatireka*) of breath etc. [from the similar instances] would be doubtful even if [according to the Naiyāyika] (the reason) is not excluded from non-existent similar instances. For the same reason [the exclusion is doubtful] from the dissimilar instances too. For, if the necessary occurrence in the one case [i. e. the similar instances] is established, the non-occurrence in the other [i. e. the dissimilar instances] would follow; else a doubt would surely occur with regard to [occurrence in] an invisible (case), even if in a certain visible case non-occurrence is established. To wit: we find that certain proper-

²⁷ Cf. PV IV 222ab and PVin II 8, 1f. (cf. PVin IIa: 39).

²⁸ Cf. PV IV 222cd and PVin II 8, 13f. (cf. PVin IIa: 40 with note 99).

²⁹ I. e. PVin II 8, 1–10. 1.

³⁰ Cf. PVin II 8, 1; ... *med pa la med pa ñid* ... The final source for the beginning of this section is NV 166, 2f.: *asati nāstīti cāsampradhārya prokṭam* ...

³¹ It seems that the two *na ca* sentences are connected, which would corroborate the emendation of *na ca* in line 9.

³² This is only an attempt. The Tibetan says: "If (it is said): 'Because the opponent assumes (it to be) so'".

ties (*artha*) belong to the same genus, although they do not occur in all the different individual things, e.g. [the property "scratchable by iron"] in case of the earthen (diamond) which cannot be scratched by iron. And if the contradiction [between "having breath etc." and "being without self"] is not cognized, there (remains) only doubt. Since a contradiction as defined³³ between breath etc. and selflessness is not established, the exclusion [of breath etc.] from selflessness is doubtful. For a contradiction with selflessness would (only) be extant if breath etc. were restricted to (the occurrence of) a self by being an effect or the essence of that (self). And this (contradiction) is not the case, as has been said (before).

But let there be an exclusion of breath etc. from selfless (things) and an absence of selflessness when these (i.e. breath etc.) occur. A self is nevertheless not established in a living body because of a non-selflessness on account of which³⁴ this (opponent) does not accept the absence of an exclusion to be a presence (in the same way) as he does not accept [an occurrence of] breath etc. in similar instances, although the counter-positive (*vyatireka*) is absent [therein].

If what is not excluded (*avyatirekin*) from the similar instances is [accepted as] the reason, then the reason would be concomitant in agreement (*anvayin*). If (a reason) which is not excluded [from the similar instances] is not [accepted as] concomitant in agreement, something non-selfless (would) not have a self. (v. 84)

This is the summarizing verse.

If (the opponent says:) "The self is not cognized on account of an exclusion of selflessness because of an occurrence of breath etc. How then? Breath etc. (cause the cognition of a self) only by way of affirmation."

Abbreviations

NV	Nyāyavārttika. Ed. in two vols., Calcutta 1936-1944.
P	Peking edition. Ed. D.T. SUZUKI, Tokyo-Kyoto 1955-1961.
PV	Pramāṇavārttika. Ed. Y. MIYASAKA, Acta Indologica 2 (1971-72) 1-206.
PVin H	Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapter II. Ed. E. STEINKELLNER, Wien 1973.
PVin IIa	Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapter II. Transl. E. STEINKELLNER, Wien 1979.
PVin III	Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapter III. P 5710 (Tshad ma, Ce, 285a7-329a7).

³³ Cf. perhaps PVin II 13, 2-4 and 5f.

³⁴ Tib. adds the gloss (?): "since the self would be existent because of non-selflessness".

An Historical Postscript

On 4 March 1991, during a research tour to Europe, I had an opportunity to make a firsthand examination of the photographs taken by Cecil Bendall, through the kindness of my friends Dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Dr. Klaus Wille of the University of Göttingen. These photographs were passed from the hands of de La Vallée Poussin to Étienne Lamotte, and are now deposited at Göttingen. Among them, I was surprised to find a photograph of the very folio discussed here. I was even more surprised to find on the back of the photograph the correct ascription, 'Pramāṇaviniścaya', written in what is apparently the hand of de La Vallée Poussin, as well as the page numbers for the corresponding Tibetan translation. In other words, the credit for first identification should go to de La Vallée Poussin, although his discovery has gone unpublished and unnoticed until now. (K. Matsuda, 19 March 1991).