Some Observations on the Manuscript Transmission of the Nyāyabhbhaṣya
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1. Introduction

Since the editio princeps of the NBh was published by Jayanārāyaṇa Tarkapaṇcānana in the Bibliotheca Indica Series (No. 50) in Calcutta during the years of 1864–1865, more than twenty-five editions of this text have been published, apart from some not yet identified editions. In spite of this large number of editions, many of them are of doubtful value because

---
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1For unidentified editions, cf., for example, the “kṛpārūma Ed.” mentioned in Sowani 1920: 88, fn. 12.
they clearly have not been critically edited on the basis of manuscript materials. There is, however, one edition that calls for our special attention from the viewpoint of the transmission of the text of the NBh composed by Vātsyāyana or Pāṇīlaśvāmin, namely, the one that was published as “a specimen volume” for the first adhyāya of the NS by Anantalal Thakur in 1967 in the Mithila Institute Series (hereafter EM). It contains not only the NBh, but also Uddyotakara’s NV, Vācaspati Miśra’s NVTṬ and Udayana’s NVTP, collectively called the Nyāyacaturgranthikā (“the four famous commentaries on the system of Aksāpāda”). After the finalization of the editorial work in 1988, the monumental enterprise was completed in the year 1997 with the publication of the NBh by the Indian Council of Philosophical Research, Delhi (hereafter EP).

During the interval of some thirty years between the edition of the first adhyāya and the final edition, several newly discovered commentaries relating to the NS, based upon manuscripts preserved in the invaluable Jaisalmer collection, came into the scholarly world owing to the efforts of the same eminent editor: Aniruddha’s NVP (Darbhanga 1969), Abhayatilaka’s NA, edited together with J. S. Jetly (Baroda 1981), and Śrīkaṇṭha’s ŠṬ (Calcutta 1986). In addition to these rediscovered Nyāya works, mention should also be made of Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara’s NTD edited by Kishor Nath Jha (Allahabad 1979) on the basis of a South Indian manuscript.

These editions of direct and indirect commentaries on the NS not only provide access to more abundant information about the varied interpretation of the NS in their exegetical discussions, but also enhance the possibility of

---


3 Cf. Thakur’s Preface to EM: vii.

4 Cf. Thakur’s Preface to the NVTT and the NVTP: vii (respectively).

5 The manuscript which has been used by the editor is GOML(2). Cf. also Jha’s introductory note (prāṣṭāṅkaṃ kṣiṃcit) to the NTD: ka-kha. For the basic information on the manuscript, cf. Kuppuswami Sastri 1927: 5080–5081: “Transcribed in 1920–21 from a MS. of M.R.Ry. Paliyattu-Acchan, Chennamangalam, Parur post, Cochin State.” Basically the same information is given in the colophon (cf. p. 98) of GOML(2). Reference to passages in GOML(2) is made according to the page numbering. “M.R.Ry.” is the abbreviation for mahārājaṃ gosāri (cf. Grünendahl 2001: 52). On other manuscripts in the Paliyam manuscript library, cf. Winternitz 1928, where “Paliyath Valia Acchan” is introduced as the owner of the collection and also as the uncle of P. Anujan Achan whom Winternitz regarded as one of his best students in Santiniketan. The recent research by Preisendanz in February 2006 confirms that a manuscript of the NTD, i.e. ORIML(5), preserved at the Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum, was previously in the possession by the Paliyam family (cf. footnote 9 below). In all probability, the transcript written in Devanāgarī script and preserved at GOML is a transcript of this palm-leaf manuscript written in Malayalam script, unless the family possessed another manuscript of the work. My present collation does not provide any negative evidence as regards this identification.

6 For the controversies on theoretical issues among the Nyāya commentators such as
reconstructing the historical development of the transmission of the NS in a more concrete way than ever, and of discovering fragments of lost Nyāya works. At the same time, from the text-critical viewpoint, the frequent mention of pratīka-s extracted from those commentaries relating to the NS, or the innumerable direct and indirect references to earlier works are of great importance for the reconstruction of the original reading of the concerned text. They allow us to compare the printed texts or available transmitted manuscripts with the text upon which the commentators relied.\textsuperscript{7} By way of the above-mentioned series of publications by Thakur and Jha we have therefore come to be faced with the crucial issue of the history of the textual transmission of the classical commentaries on the NS and also with the task of reconstructing the original text of these commentaries. In particular with regard to the NBh, this task will surely require much time and the careful study of the available texts on the basis of manuscript material. A first step towards such a reconstruction is the philological analysis of primary and secondary testimonies as well as of the variants recorded in the printed editions, especially the variants given in Thakur’s two editions, because of their diversity and distinction in quality and quantity.

Together with Sung Yong Kang, the present author is currently engaged in a project on the NBh organized by Karin Preisendanz at the University of Vienna, Austria, which aims at preparing a critical edition of the work on a broad material basis. In the following examination, a preliminary attempt will be made to introduce the Trivandrum manuscript of the NBh, which appears not to have been utilized for any editions known to me, and to consider the value of this manuscript as a primary witness. This contribution focuses on clarifying the history of the transmission of the NBh by means of the comparison of the variant readings of the Trivandrum manuscript with readings in other sources such as the manuscripts of the NBh available to the project, printed editions of the NBh, and secondary or independent testimonies; it does not represent an exhaustive examination of the individual variant readings, simply because the collation of the approximately forty-five manuscripts is still in progress. Thus only a few aspects relevant to the mentioned purpose and demonstrated by the Trivandrum manuscript are being introduced. For practical reasons, the evidence of the trisūtrībhāṣya, i.e., the commentary on the first three sūtra-s of the NS, will be the primary

\textsuperscript{7}For a recent example of the practice of this renewed methodology in studying the Nyāya commentarial works, especially concerning the critical consideration of the readings of the NBh as recorded in the printed editions, cf. Preisendanz 2000, which collates at least six printed editions. For other examples of a critical approach to the text of the NBh, cf., e.g., Ganganatha Jha’s two editions of the NBh and the footnotes to his translation, Sudarśanācārya’s Prasannapadā, Preisendanz 1994 (e.g., pp. 701–702) and Okazaki 2005. Nagasaki (1968) examines the textual transmission of the NBh that is reflected in Hemacandra’s Pramāṇamāṃsā and points out its difference from that of a printed edition of the NBh.
focus for the present article.

2. The Trivandrum manuscript, alias the Paliyam manuscript

The Trivandrum manuscript is preserved in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala, Trivandrum. I was able to obtain copies of the ms. in January 2003, following research in November 2002 at the institution. The presence of the ms. in this Library was made known in 1995 by the publication of the sixth volume of the mss. catalogue of the institution.\(^6\) Recent field research by Preisendanz in February 2006 has shown that like the ms. of the NTD, the ms. was originally kept in the possession of the Paliyam family in Chennamangalam, Kerala.\(^9\) This fact, in its turn, confirmed our previous assumption regarding the identity of the original of a transcript of a NBh ms. preserved at GOML, also available to the project (see below).

The palm-leaf ms. (hereafter designated as T), which bears the ms. number 14980A, is part of a composite ms.; the text of the NBh is followed by a list of the prakaraṇa-s of the NS,\(^10\) the text of Udayana’s Nyāyaparāśīta (ms. no. 14980B) and that of Vāmeśvaradhvaja’s Pañcikā (ms. no. 14980C).

Let me briefly describe T. It is written in Malayālam script, most probably by a single hand, and is undated. The leaves are in bad condition due to damage of the material, such as innumerable worm-holes, and are sometimes broken off at the edges. They are numbered with letter-numerals in Malayālam script according to the so-called nannādi system, which are placed in the middle of the left hand margin of each recto side. However the first leaf is marked with śṛṇ,\(^11\) the second with na, and so forth,\(^12\) which does not reflect the common nannādi system (cf. Grünendahl 2001: 94); according to the common system, it would start with na already on the

\(^6\)Alphabetical Index of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library. Eds. K. Vijayan, P. Visalakshy and R. Girija. Vol. VI. Trivandrum 1995. This ms. is considered identical with the ms. of the NBh corresponding to the entry “Paliyam 257(a)” that is already reported in Kunjunni Raja (1978: 279, left column).

\(^5\)According to the Register of the institution, the ms. of the NBh was donated by the Paliyam family in 1951, and the ms. of the NTD in 1969. I owe this information to Prof. Preisendanz. Cf. also footnote 5 above.

\(^10\)This list of prakaraṇa-s is identical with the list that is printed in the edition of the Nyāyaparāśīta. The editor identifies its source as the Madras ms. “ma” and regards it as an “additional part having the form of a summary of contents” (viṣayasaṅgāraḥarūpo ‘dhikō bhāgaḥ). Cf. NP 1–2, fn. 1. It is evident from the information in the catalogue (cf. Kuppuswami Sastri 1927: 5038–5039 under “Beginning”) that the list was part of the ms. of the NP. The Madras ms. is also a transcript of a Paliyam ms.: “Transcribed in 1920–21 from a MS. of the Paliyattu Valiya Accan, Chennamangalam, Cochin State.” Cf. Kuppuswami Sastri 1927: 5038–5041 under R. No. 3377.

\(^11\)For some examples of this type of pagination, cf. Ikari 1995: 10, fn. 30; cf. also Ikari 1996: 150, fn. 10.

\(^12\)For practical purposes, when referring to the text of T, I will refer to the leaf marked with śṛṇ as “f. 1” and to the leaf marked with na as “f. 2.”
first leaf. T covers the whole text of the NBh, and ends with folio 99r 9. Individual sūtra-s are not numbered, but they are marked with two kinds of punctuation marks, placed before and after a sūtra. The mark put before a sūtra has an ornamental, stylized form; the mark put after a sūtra is a small dot in the middle of the line, and in some cases looks similar to a semicircle. The former punctuation could possibly be related to the “ornamental flourishes” mentioned by Burnell (1878), which, however, normally appear in colophons. As rightly observed by Isaacson (1995: 44), the function of the signs that are “occasional middle dots” in his exemplar, and “placed before or after a sūtra,” appears to “distinguish the mūla text from the commentary” in a more exact way. There are a few exceptional cases where the scribe appears to have omitted them and also unclear cases as regards the function of the sign. The punctuation with the ornamental signs is also used at the end of daily lessons (ādnika) and books/chapters (adhyāya), as well as in colophons. As concerns the features of the sandhi or conjoint forms of aksara-s, Ikari (1996: 13–17) provides various pertinent observations. In this connection, a notable feature in T is the very rare usage of the avagrāha, which occurs thrice in the first book of the NBh.

In relation to T, I should like to refer to another ms. of the NBh, written in Devanāgarī script on lined modern paper with pagination in Arabic numerals on every page. It is preserved in the Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras (hereafter designated as GOML(1)). The basic description by Kuppuswami Sastri (1927: 5513) states that it was transcribed in 1921–22 from a Paliya ms. As mentioned before, GOML(1) was assumed to be
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13 Burnell (1878: 82) regards the mark as “various forms of the word ‘Qri.’” Isaacson (1995: 44) follows this identification in recording the marks used in his exemplar written in Malayālam script. Ikari (1995: 17) also mentions the “peculiar sign(s)” in Malayālam manuscripts. He remarks that “[t]he mark generally looks to be just a sign without any meaning, although that of N₂ looks like a script of om in Malayālam.” Maas (2004: bxviii) regards it as om, following Grünendahl (2001: 52, 92); cf. also his forthcoming edition of the first chapter of the Yogabhāṣya (Philipp André Maas. Samādhīpāda. Das erste Kapitel des Pāṭaṇjalayogaśāstra zum ersten Mal kritisch editiert. The First Chapter of the Pāṭaṇjalayogaśāstra for the First Time Critically Edited. Aachen: Shaker, 2006). On this occasion I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Ikari and Dr. Maas for the discussions relating to this issue, and for sending digital pictures of the ms. where the sign in question appears. Because of their more or less different appearances, the question remains whether the signs described by them can be regarded as identical with the one used in T, even if the sign in question also appears in the colophons of T. One may say that they are utilized with the same function in spite of their apparent variations. I do not call them śrī or om in the present article, mainly because the scribe of T uses substantially different aksara-s to denote śrī and om. I owe this present decision to the discussion with Prof. Ikari. My cordial thanks are also due to Dr. Ram Manohar and Prof. Tsutomu Yamashita for their comments on this ms.

14 This contradicts the common observation that ms. written in Malayālam script do not at all employ the avagrāha sign. Cf. Ikari 1996: 16; Grünendahl 2001: 92.

a transcript of T, on the basis of the English colophon, the consistent coincidence of scribal errors and other variants, the places of lacunae marked by series of dots, and the selection of individual sūtra-s marked by new paragraphs and preceded by “śu” accompanied by double daṇḍa. Given that GOML(1) has now been confirmed to be most probably a direct copy from T, the ms. is very useful when it comes to restoring lost or damaged portions of T, whose condition has deteriorated after more than three quarters of a century.

3. Sūtra-s in the Trivandrum manuscript

In the following, I would first like to refer to the wording and the selection of sūtra-s in three cases: NS 1.1.2, NS 1.1.5 and a passage normally regarded as part of the commentary on NS 1.1.5. (In the following, the abbreviation “NS” is not always added to the corresponding number of the sūtra in question.) In treating the signs introducing a sūtra in this section, I start from the hypothesis that the phrases or sentences marked as such in T were regarded as sūtra-s in a certain tradition of the ms. transmission of the NBh or in a specific historical or regional Nyāya tradition. In other words, I will tentatively accept those texts marked as sūtra-s as such. But the question of whether some of them could be classified into types of text other than sūtra-s, for example, grahaṇa-kavya, remains for future study and will not be discussed in the present article. Another question which has to be borne in mind is whether the marking of sūtra-s in T can be traced back to the original exemplar from which the ms. was copied, or whether a pair of specific marks were additionally placed before and after certain sentences for the first time by the scribe of T. This question is under my examination, but will not be taken into account here.

As regards the conventions for transcribing the text of mss. which will be treated below, I add word divisions, ignore string-holes, report the text diplomatically with its sandhi, and introduce some symbols for the practical indication of aksara-s or signs: a virāma or a special halanta form is marked by an asterisk after the aksara in question, an ornamental sign placed before a sūtra by ‘⊕,’ a sign placed at its end by ‘ⓡ,’ and a missing or damaged aksara or part of an aksara by ‘+’; otherwise I have made no further changes or additions to the ms. evidence.

3.1 NS 1.1.2

T has a substantially different reading for NS 1.1.2 than the common one which reads (cf. EM 150,3-4):
dukkhaṇaṁmapuṇāṅkitīṁtiṁdviṁśatīṁdviṁśatīṁdviṁśatīṁdviṁśatīṁdviṁśatīṁdviṁśatīṁ
colophon of GOML(1): p. 220. Reference to passages in this ms. is made according to the page numbering.
uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvād apavargah. T reads (I also cite the introductory part before 1.1.2; cf. f. 3r 6–7): kin tarhi tatvaśānāt* + duḥkha- janmapratīttidosamityāyāyānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvāt* o niśreyasādhiṣṭhama ti. The sign ‘o’ shows that the sūtra ends with tadanantarābhāvāt. This ending disagrees with the commonly accepted text of 1.1.2 where apavargah, as cited above, should be the concluding word after "bhāvāt." The reading of T may also suggest that an original niśreyasādhiṣṭhama was replaced by apavargah for some reason, or vice versa. However, it should be emphasized that T excludes the word from the sūtra. As for this exclusion, none of the mss. of the NBh available to us supports such a version of 1.1.2, nor do they place any sign of punctuation, such as a daṇḍa, before the uniformly accepted apavargah. T’s termination of 1.1.2 with "bhāvāt, on the other hand, is supported by several independent testimonies, such as the NM, the three sūtrapātha mss. written in Malayālam script, and a direct commentary on the NS, namely the NTD. Further-

16For observations on the “original” text of the NS that ends with the ablative and also on its relation to the part of the NBh introducing a sūtra, see Preissendanz 1994: 412–414, 610–611.

17This variant of T reminds us of a critical note in ES: "ntarāpāyān niśreyasādhiṣṭhama tis bahutra" (cf. ES 150, fn. 3). This mysterious remark indicates that the variant, which is different from tadanantarābhāvād apavargah adopted by Thakur, is common in many texts (bahutra); however, this variant niśreyasādhiṣṭhama instead of apavargah is by no means attested in the printed editions of the NBh. This critical note is not reported in Thakur’s recent edition of the NBh, but instead moved to NVTP 102, fn. 5; Thakur informs us elsewhere that "[n]one of the MSS used here [i.e., in his edition of the NVTP] contains the sūtra texts" (supplement by me; cf. Thakur’s Preface to the NVTP: x). Thus it is evident that the variant is not related to the mss. of the NVTP used by him, but most probably to those of the NBh. As Thakur mostly reports the variants which deviate from the text as constituted in his editions, it is possible that niśreyasādhiṣṭhama is a variant of the Jaisalmer ms. of the NBh used by him; Thakur does not report that he consulted other mss. of the NBh for his editions. Concerning the originality of tadanantarāpāyāt, K. N. Jha, providing many independent testimonies, maintained the position that "pāyāt is better and the original; for his discussions, cf. NTĀ 495–497, where most of the parallels are given. He also used a sūtrapātha ms. from ORIML, but did not provide information on which ms. he consulted, nor on the absence of apavargah.

18Cf. NM(V) 513,3–6: uktam eva bhagavatā sūtrakāreṇa — duḥkhajanmapratīttidosamityāyāyānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvād iti. The absence of apavargah after "bhāvāt is supported by the mss. of the NM; cf. BHU(1) f. 55v 14 and MORI(1) f. 224v 16–225r 1 (the latter with the corrupt reading "rābhāvādī"). The Mysore edition of the NM reads tadanantarāpāyād apavargah. The presence of apavargah here may be a silent emendation of the editor’s for the sake of adapting the sūtra to the common reading, further by replacing "bhāvād with "pāyād, and omitting it; no variant has been recorded here by him (cf. NM(M) II 440,3–5).

19Cf. ORIML(1) f. 1r 4, ORIML(2) f. 1r 2 and ORIML(3) f. 1r 3; only ORIML(2) reads "pāyāt" for "bhāvāt.

20The NTD reads duḥkhajanmapratīttidosamityāyāyānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvāt. Cf. NTD 2,12. However, the printed edition adds the common version of 1.1.2 in bold face before the text of this commentary; cf. NTD 2,10–11. This addition has to be considered as an editorial change, since neither the transcript GOML(2) utilized by the editor nor its original ms. ORIML(5) has this passage. Jha remarks on the absence of
more, these testimonies do not affirm that the text of the NBh ends with 

\[ \text{nihśreyasādhiṣhagamah} \] after \[ \text{bhāvāt} \].

As regards the supplementation of the sūtra with \[ \text{nihśreyasādhiṣhagamah} \], Gambhiravamaśa’s \[ \text{Nyāyasūtraśvaravaraṇa} \] (hereafter NSV(G)), is worthy of our attention.21 The ms. of the NSV(G) written in Grantha script reads tatTVajñāṇaḥ iti o duhkhajanmapravrttidosamithyajñāṇaṇīm uttara-
tarāpyā++nantarāpyāyā iti nihśreyasādhiṣhagama iti tena sambandhaḥ.22 The last phrases \[ \text{nihśreyasādhiṣhagama iti tena sambandhaḥ} \] may indicate that 1.1.2 should be connected with the last word of 1.1.1, i.e., \[ \text{nihśreyasādhiṣhagamah} \].23 A further testimony for the reading in question, namely, \[ \text{nihśreyasādhiṣhagamah} \] in place of \[ \text{apavargah} \], is Akalanka’s \[ \text{Tatvārthavārttika} \].24

How was the wording of 1.1.2 treated by the commentators on the NS in the medieval period, and how was the question of whether 1.1.2 ends with \[ \text{bhāvāt} \] or \[ \text{apavargah} \] discussed by them? Vācaspati Miśra I inserts a brief, noteworthy digression occasioned by anonymous opponents in the

---

21 This text was first published in 1992 by Anandateertha V. Nagasampige. According to the editor, the author’s date is unknown (cf. his preface to the NSV(G): xv–xvi); in the \[ \text{maṅgalaśloka} \], the work is called “Nyāyavārttikasamgraha” by the author himself. The NSV(G), or probably more correctly the Nyāyavārttikasamgraha, is rich in quotations from both the NBh and the NV.

22 Cf. ORIML(4) f. 1v 9–11. I take the reading provided by ORIML(4) as better than the text of the printed edition. This ms. was not utilized by the editor of the work, A. V. Nagasampige, although the presence of the ms. is noted in R. G. Mālagi’s Introduction (prastāvānā); cf. his Introduction to the NSV(G); v. fn. 1. As for the basis of his printed edition (cf. his prāṇīnvedanam “prior announcement”), Nagasampige has mentioned two ms. written in Grantha and Kannada scripts respectively, and preserved at the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore (ms. nos. P. 4071/B and A. 743/2 respectively; the former is a palm-leaf ms.). Cf. also R. S. Shivaganesa Murthy’s Preface to the NSV(G) (p. ii), which states that the edition is based upon a single ms., most probably the former one.

As for the reading of the printed edition, cf. NSV(G) 8.10–13, which, probably on the basis of the ms. mentioned above, reads: duhkhajanmapravrttidosamithyajñāṇānām uttara-tattāpyā iti nihśreyasādhiṣhagama iti sūṭreṇa gatena sambandhaḥ. I find it difficult to construe \[ \text{nihśreyasādhiṣhagama iti sūṭreṇa gatena sambandhaḥ} \], which may literally be understood as “a connection [of 1.1.2] with the elapse of its running” the attainment of the highest good [should be effected].”

23 Cf. NS 1.1.1: pramāṇapramāṇeyasamśayaapravṛtyayojanadṛṣṭāntasiddhāntaṇyayavatarkanavayavādayapravīdantahdētvābhāsacchalejātātmvedhāsbhāsacchalejātātmvedhā (cf. Ep 2.7–9).

24 Cf. TAV 12.8–9: duhkhajanmapravrttidosamithyajñāṇānām uttara-tattāpyā iti nihśreyasādhiṣhagama iti anyesām darśanam. Akalanka’s reference to “the view of others” (anyesām darśanam) does not make clear whether this view is concerned with the sūtra only, or whether it relates to its text as embedded in the NBh. Obviously he does not presuppose the commonly accepted text of 1.1.2. A further independent testimony is ASTV II 628.2–3, which runs \[ \text{yat uktam pareṇa duḥkhaḥ} \] ... \[ \text{tadanantarābhaḥvān nihśreyasaḥ iti} \] (ellipsis by me). I owe this reference to Mr. Himal Trikha, M.A.
beginning part of his commentary on 1.1.2. Opponents whom he calls “some [scholars or commentators?]” (kecit) assert that the sūtra should be divided into two parts by virtue of “division of a rule” (yogavībhāga) or “division of a coherent connection.” The first “rule” or coherent connection runs duḥkhajanmapraṇāṭīdōsamithyājñānānām, the second uttarottarāyāge tadanantarābhāvād apavargāḥ. The former states the causal relationship (kāryakāraṇabhāva) among the five soteriologically relevant elements which are mentioned next to each other, e.g., pain (duḥkha) is an effect and birth (janma) its cause. The “mutual connection” (ītaretarayoga) of the five elements, as expressed by means of a type of dvandva-compound, implies the relation of cause and effect by virtue of “suitability” or “appropriateness” (yogyatā). This first coherent connection makes logically possible the second that illustrates the gradual annihilation of the mentioned elements in reverse order. This second connection is made comprehensible because the causality relating to these elements has already been established by the preceding coherent connection. Thus the annihilation of each following element (as cause) brings forth that of each immediately preceding element (as effect); for example, false knowledge (mithyājñāna) as a cause vanishes and then the faults (doṣa) as its effect also vanish. The opponents’ view is

---

26 Cf. NVTṬ 62,21: atra kecit yogavībhāgam icchanti. On yogavībhāga in the grammatical tradition, cf. Abhyankar (1986: 318r) and Renou (1957: 256–257). Cf. also Apte (1957: 1318, s.v.): “separation of that which is usually combined together into one; especially, the separation of the words of a Sūtra, the splitting of one rule into two or more.” It is remarkably unusual for a commentary on the NS to apply the grammatical terminology yogavībhāga to the exegetical procedure for the interpretation of the NS. As the sūtra-s in the Nyāya tradition are not normally treated as laying down a yoga ‘rule’ (cf., e.g., Abhyankar 1986: 318l), it may not be reasonable to construe yoga as a rule. NS 1.1.2 describes the ordered sequence of soteriologically relevant elements and their annihilation leading to liberation. They constitute a single coherent totality as a statement. Thus yoga, literally “connection” or “what is connected or united together,” as it is terminologically employed in this discussion, is to be understood as the coherent connection that involves soteriologically relevant elements whose annihilation leads to the liberation. I tentatively employ the English equivalent “coherent connection” for yoga, and “division of a coherent connection” for yogavībhāga.
27 As regards the reading “bhānād,” I follow E Ṛ (157,17), which is supported by the Jaisalmer ms., whereas NVTṬ (63,3–4) reads tadanantarāpāyād instead of tadanantarābhāvād. Cf. also footnote 29 below.
29 Cf. NVTṬ 63,3–5 = E Ṛ 157,17–18: atāḥ Siddhe kāryakāraṇabhāva uttarottarāyāge tadanantarābhāvād* apavargā īty anena yogena kāraṇocchedakramena kāryocchedakrama-pratipādaṇāpaṇavargāḥ pratipadaye. (∗“bhāvād” “J” in E Ṛ, E Ṛ; īyāyād NVTṬ.) In Śrīkāntṛa’s ŚṬ, the second coherent connection as presented by the opponents is not identical with that adduced in the NVTṬ. Śrīkāntṛa seems to presuppose that it ends with “bhāvād,” and thus his analysis is considerably different from Vācaspati’s: uttarottarāyāge tadanantarābhāvād īty asmin* dośīyā yogyā ... duḥkhajanmapraṇāṭīdōsamithyājñānānām īty asmin* pratiharmayoṣe (ellipse by me). Cf. LDI(1) f. 42r 6–7, a passage which is
dismissed by Vācaspati who appeals to Uddyotakara’s explicit mention of the sūtra in the singular as invalidating evidence. It should be noted that in this digression both the opponents and Vācaspati appear to regard 1.1.2 as ending with apavargaḥ, the reading which represents the generally accepted text. If this reconstruction is accepted, it has to be assumed that Vācaspati actually commented upon a version of 1.1.2 different from that of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and other commentators.

There are some places where Vātsyāyana refers to 1.1.2. His mention of the sūtra in his commentary on 4.2.1 can be adduced as internal, problematric evidence which speaks against the T version of 1.1.2. In the context of discussing the faults (doṣa), which are the three elements causing karma

not available in Thakur’s edition according to ŚṬ 69,20, since “one complete folio escaped the camera” (cf. Thakur’s Preface to the ŚṬ). Furthermore, it can suggest that Śrīkṛṣṇa regards 1.1.2 as ending with ³bhāvād, but this assumption evidently contradicts the discussion adduced by Vācaspati which Śrīkṛṣṇa supposedly comments upon. In fact, Śrīkṛṣṇa’s mention of these two yoga-s is placed in the part of his commentary on Udayana’s corresponding discussion (cf. LDI(1) f. 42r 6: “uneabbreviation “Udayane”). It is totally unclear how he could keep silent about the possibility of the charge of contradicting the NVTT.

30Cf. NVTT 63,7–8 = EM 157,20–21: tam imam sātravibhāgaṃ amṛtyumāyino vārttiyakād āhā — idam sūtram ekavacanena bhedam vāvartayaḥ. Vācaspati further adduces as the argument against the theory of yogyavibhāga the fault of the “splitting of a statement” in 1.1.2 (cf. vākyabheda). Cf. NVTT 63,8–9 = EM 157,21–22: na hi samucchadakramaptiśātanāpavargaparayatayavākyatve sambhavati vākyabheda nyāgāyaḥ. (“The splitting of a statement, indeed, cannot be reasonable, because [sūtra 1.1.2] constitutes a single statement inasmuch as it is devoted to [the explanation of] liberation by means of demonstrating the order of the complete destruction of [pain and the others].”) In Vācaspati’s view, the sūtra constitutes a single statement (ekavākyatva), insofar as 1.1.2 has “liberation” as its main objective to be presented (apavargaparayataya). Cf. NVTT 63,8–9 = EM 157,21–22; NVTP 108,7–9 = EM 173,22–24. For ekavākyatva, see Freisendanz 1994: 204–207; Kane 1962: 1297–1298. For vākyabheda, see Kane 1962: 1299–1303.

31For another problematic instance, cf. SDS(BI) 115,8–10: kintu tattvajñānād dhukha⁵ bhāvaḥ sti, which seems to silently quote the corresponding portion of the NBh. There is also an explicit reference to 1.1.2 in the same compendium ascribed to Mādhava; cf. SDS(BI) 116,9–11: tathā ca pāramārtham sūtram dukkhejanam" ... "bhāvād apavarga sti (ellipsis by me). Abhayankar’s edition, however, provides a different reading in both places, namely, the one ending with ⁶pāyād apavargaḥ. Cf. SDS 245,7–9 and 246,16–18.

32NBhūs 72,15–17 (= HJJM(1) f. 16r 7–8), which runs parallel to the introductory part of the NB on 1.1.2, does not support niḥśreyasaḥdhiṣṭham of the T version: tat khalu vai tattvajñānaṃ kim ātmālābhānantaram eva niḥśreyasam sampādayati. ucyate — na, kim tāṃ tattvajñānād dukkhejanamprayātadviṣamītyatījanātānām uttaratārāpye tadanantārābhāvādy bhuvavrgo bhavatītāti vākyāṣesah. (* bhāvād HJJM(1); ⁶pāyād NBhūs, where the editor seems to have corrected the text of 1.1.2 to the common one.) With regard to the question whether Bhāsarvajña regarded 1.1.2 as ending with bhavat or with apavargaḥ, it depends on the interpretation of “the rest of the sentence” (vākyāṣesah). Yogindrāṇanda, the editor, places a danda after apavargaḥ, which indicates that he regards bhavati as the rest of the sentence. However it is also possible to assume that the words apavarga bhavat are intended as that which is to be supplied. The latter assumption entails that Bhāsarvajña regarded 1.1.2 as ending with ³bhāvāt. On Bhāsarvajña’s discussions on NS 1.1.2, cf. Yamakami 2001: 13–18.
such as attachment (rāga), aversion (dveṣa) and delusion (moha), he refers to the previous discussion, stating evaṁ ca kṛtvā tattvajñānād duḥkhahajanavigṛhitaṁ dvāraṁ uttarottarāpāyaṁ tadanantarāpāyād apavarga iti vyākhyātāṁ iti.33 As Thakur typographically marked the text duḥkhahajanaṁ... pāyād apavargaḥ by inserting a new paragraph for it, one might consider that NS 1.1.2 is directly quoted by the oldest commentator. However, attention should be paid to the words iti vyākhyātāṁ: in a commentarial text, the verb vyā-khyā normally designates the commentator’s own activity, and does not refer to the basic text upon which commentary is provided.34 Under this assumption it is conceivable that Vātsyāyana does not directly refer to 1.1.2, but to his own previous commentary on it. In this connection, there would be at least two possibilities to be considered. (1) If Vātsyāyana would have supplied niḥśreyasādhiyamaḥ after ṛṣiāvati in his commentary on 1.1.2, he would have given a reformulated text in his commentary on 4.2.1; (2) if he would have read the commonly accepted text in 1.1.2, he would merely have repeated the passage in 4.2.1. The resolving of this issue depends, to some extent, upon a stylistic analysis of his technique of composition. I would like to leave the issue open to question in the present article.

This second sūtra has repeatedly attracted the attention of scholars and has been the focus of recurrent discussions with regard to its philosophical and soteriological implications, the literal understanding of the sūtra, and its relation to the first and ninth sūtra-s, the so-called prameyasūtra, or to other sections of the NS.35 Amongst scholars who have discussed the sūtra, Slaje (1986) points out the unique occurrence of the expression niḥśreyasa in the NS as well as the remarkable terminological inconsistence (“auffällige terminologische Inkonsequenz”) and the alleged synonymity of niḥśreyasa in 1.1.1 and apavarga in 1.1.2.36 Under the supposition that the T version of 1.1.2 and the supplementation with niḥśreyasādhiyamaḥ in the NBh are original,37 such an apparent terminological inconsistency would have to be considered irrelevant because there is no immediate connection of apavargaḥ to 1.1.2. The T version suggests, furthermore, a possible inter-

---

33Cf. Ed 221,12–15. Further alleged references to 1.1.2 in the NBh that need to be carefully examined are Ed 248,17–21 on 4.1.59 = (Ruben) 4.1.55, and Ed 259,7–10 on 4.2.1.
34The vyā-khyā and its derivatives do not occur in the NS, as opposed to the VS(C), e.g., 1.1: athātā dharmam vyākhyāṣayāmaḥ. The style of Vātsyāyana’s references to sūtra-s requires a comprehensive study.
37It remains unclear how the iti appearing after niḥśreyasādhiyamaḥ in T functions, especially in relation to the sūtra.
pretation of Vātsāyana’s previous statement in the commentary on 1.1.1: ātmādeh khalu prameyasya tattva-jñānān niḥśreyasyādhitamah, tac caitad uttarasūtreṇānudyate (“To be sure, the attainment of the highest good [arises] due to the adequate knowledge of the [twelve] objects of valid cognition beginning with the soul [as enumerated in 1.1.9]. And this is restated by means of a posterior sūtra.”). It may be supposed that in the following Vātsāyana actually introduces 1.1.2 by adding the two phrases tattva-jñānāt and niḥśreyasyādhitamah in accordance with his own previous announcement. If this were the case, the T version of 1.1.2 could be understood to be [tattva-jñānād 1.1.1] duḥkha-yāna-pravṛtti-dosamithyajñānānām uttarat-tarāpya tadantarābhāvād [niḥśreyasyādhitamah 1.1.1]. It may also be observed that Uddyotakara provides his second theory on the classification of niḥśreyasa, namely, into a higher (1.1.2) and a lower niḥśreyasa (1.1.1), just before introducing 1.1.2. Under the above assumption, this would have the effect to withdraw the focus from the term apavarga and put it on niḥśreyasa as the term to be supplied in 1.1.2, or of demonstrating the clear distinction between the two types of niḥśreyasa which he discerns as intended in 1.1.1 and 1.1.2.

3.2 The atha in NS 1.1.5

As is well known, the generally accepted text of NS 1.1.5 begins with atha tatpurvakam anumānam. In his critical notes on the NTĀ, Jha has rightly observed that some secondary testimonies do not read atha before tatpurvakam in 1.1.5, but he leaves the issue open whether atha was originally contained in 1.1.5 or not. In the T version, too, the text does not contain atha at the beginning of 1.1.5. Instead, it reads (cf. f. 5v 7–8): athānumānam* @ tat*pūrvakam trividham anumānam*. Here, atha is part

---

38 For translations of this passage, cf., for example, Perry 1995: 33, 75, 186, etc.


40 Cf. NV 10,19 = EM 152,6: niḥśreyasasya parāparahedā, which is to be compared with his first theory on the classification of niḥśreyasa. Cf. NV 2,2–3 = EM 6,14: tac chreyo bhidāmānam dvedhā vyasvātsthate dhraśātyādheda. Cf. also NV 10,19 = EM 13,14: niḥśreyasam punar dhraśātyādhedād dvedhā bhavati.

41 NS 1.1.5: atha tatpurvakam trividham anumānam pūrvavac chesavat sāmaṁyato dhraśām ca. Cf. E D 12,2.

42 Most of the relevant testimonies citing 1.1.5, some of which I mention in the following, are already given in NTĀ 488 on 1.1.5. Ruben (1928) does not mention the absence of atha in some testimonies.
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of the NBh, i.e., the sūtra is preceded by Vātsyāyana’s introductory words atha-anumānam (‘[After the characterization of perception,] now inference [is characterized].’). 1.1.5 thus begins only withtatpurvakaṁ. The text of 1.1.5 lacking atha is not supported by other mss. available to us, nor by any printed edition, but is supported by some secondary testimonies such as Dignāga’s PSV,43 Jinendrabuddhi’s PST,44 the NM (adding an enclitic ca which can be ignored in the present discussion),45 the NBHuś,46 the NTD,47 and all three mss. of the sūtrapātha from Trivandrum.48

Uddyotakara’s introductory commentary to 1.1.5 does not allow us to determine the status of atha as he perceived it, or whether he had before him an introductory sentence of the NBh as found in the T version of this text. Uddyotakara begins to comment upon 1.1.5 with the following words: atha tatpūrvakaṁ trividham anumānam iti. athety ānantaraye. anumānāviveṣanārthah sūtram.49 Uddyotakara does not explicitly specify

43 Cf. PSV(V) 33b5–6: rīg paj ca nams na re de siron du so yā ba can gī rjes su dpag pa ni rnam pa gsum stel sa ma dān idan dān, lha ma dān idan pa dān, spyi mthon ba can no ņes zem ro; PSV(K) 115a3–4: rīg paj ca nams ni de siron du ‘gro ba can gī rjes su dpag par ni rnam pa gsum ste. sa ma dān idan idan pa dān, lha ma dān idan dān pa dān spyi mthon ba o ņes zem ro. (Cf. also Kitagawa 1965: 563); VS(C) 215,9–10 (reconstruction): nayāgyānām api tatpūrvakaṁ trividham anumānam pūrvavac cheṣavat sāmānyato dṛṣṭam ceti.

44 PST Ms.(B) f. 75v 3: nayāgyānām[!] iṣṭyādi pratyakṣānumānānāvapamāṇaśabādhyā pramāṇāntaḥ uṣāṭāḥ pratyakṣakalakṣaṇaḥ bhūte tadānantaram prāptāvasaram anumānākṣaṇaṁ āhā | tatpūrvakaṁ iṣṭyādi. I owe this reference to Prof. Steinkellner and his seminar. The relevant part in Ms.(B) of Jinendrabuddhi’s PST is currently being critically edited at the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia, Austrian Academy of Sciences. Cf. Steinkellner/Krasser/Lasic 2005.

45 Cf. NM(V) 109,21–22 = NM(M) I 292,6–7: tatpūrvakaṁ ca trividham anumānam pūrvavac cheṣavat sāmānyato dṛṣṭam ca.

46 Cf. NBHuś 189,3–5: athedaṁ anumānaśvārimāṃ vināyate — tatpūrvakaṁ trividham anumānam pūrvavac cheṣavat sāmānyato dṛṣṭam ceti sūtram.

47 Cf. NTD 3,19: tatpūrvakaṁ trividham anumānam pūrvavac cheṣavat sāmānyato dṛṣṭam ca. Jha suggests the supplementation of atha before tatpūrvakaṁ, but GOML(2) (p. 5,1) does not have atha. Thus, the absence of atha is to be favoured as original.

48 ORIML(1) f. 1r 3; ORIML(2) f. 1r 4; ORIML(3) f. 1r 7.

49 “After [the characterization of perception follows] inference, which is preceded by that (i.e., perception and others), [and] of three kinds. [As regards this phrase, the word] ‘atha’ [is used] in the sense of an immediate sequence. The sūtra has the purpose of specifying inference.” Cf. NV 41,3–4 = EM 292,11–12. The translation is tentative, because the inclusion of atha in 1.1.5 affects it, whereas the other sūtra-s defining the means of valid cognition, i.e., 1.1.4, 1.1.6, and 1.1.7, do not pose structural problems. As for the translation of the commonly accepted version of 1.1.5, I have difficulty in following some previous translations that construe tatpūrvakaṁ and trividham as attributes of anumānam; cf. for example, Ruben (1928: 3). “Darauf folgt die auf der (Wahrnehmung) beruhende dreifache Folgerung,” a translation followed by, e.g., Oberhammer/Prets/Prandstetter (1991: 43r). I would prefer to construe tatpūrvakaṁ as a predicate of anumānam, since the former is the definiens and the latter the definiendum. Cf. NVTT 127,14 = EM 303,4–5: lakṣyam pramānabhedam anumānam anādiya tatpūrvakaṁ iti lakṣanam vidhate. Jha (1915: 153) puts tatpūrvakaṁ in a relative clause specifying anumānam: “After Perception comes Inferential Cognition, which is led up to by Perception; it is of three kinds.”
here whether *atha* is contained in the NS or part of the NBh. Thus the question remains open whether Uddyotakara regarded *atha* as part of 1.1.5 or not. It should be noted that *atha* and *tatpūrvakam* immediately follow upon each other, and that there is no specification of *atha* by a phrase such as *iti bhāṣyam*. What about Uddyotakara’s subsequent commentary on the definitions of the other two means of valid cognition, namely, analogy (1.1.6) and verbal testimony (1.1.7)? In these places, he silently quotes the introductory phrases of the NBh, namely *athopamāṇam* (NV 53,19 = EM 356,1) and *atha sañca iti bhāṣyam* (NV 54,16 = EM 365,18), in clear contrast to the case of 1.1.5. It leaves a general impression that Uddyotakara did not have before him the T version of the introductory phrase in the NBh, and that he took *atha* as part of 1.1.5.50

As regards the two introductory phrases of the NBh on 1.1.6 and 1.1.7, Vācaspati explicitly specifies the texts as pertaining to the NBh: *athopamāṇam iti bhāṣyam* (NVTT 161,21 = EM 356,18) and *atha sañca iti bhāṣyam* (NVTT 166,5 = EM 367,21). In the case of 1.1.5, however, the *pratīka* of the beginning part of the *sūtra* adduced by him confirms that he regards the *sūtra* as beginning with *atha*, and thus reflects the commonly accepted text; most probably *athānūmāṇam* in the T version was unfamiliar to him. He introduces 1.1.5 with *pratīkṣaśākṣaśāntaram anumānaśākṣaśāntaram sūtraṃ pañcāti — atha tatpūrvakam śivvidham anumāṇam iti*51: “He52 recites (i.e., repeats) the *sūtra* which is devoted to the characterization of inference subsequent to [his recitation of] the characterization of perception, saying “After [the characterization of perception follows] inference which is preceded by that (i.e., perception), [and] of three kinds.” Vācaspati even interprets *atha* as implying that “perception is the cause of inference,” and

50NSV(G) has *atha* as part of 1.1.5. The author also quotes the corresponding passage of the NV, in contradistinction to the case of 1.1.2, where his commentary is literally based on the NBh. Cf. NSV(G) 16,10–12: *athaś ānantarye. anumānaśākṣtaḥ sūtram. Gambhirāṃśa’s commentary on 1.1.5 is evidently based on the NV.

51Cf. NVTT 127,4–5 = EM 302,20–21.

52It is understandable that one is inclined to take the subject of *pañcāti* ‘read, recite’ as the author of the NS, Gautama/Gotama. But it is also possible to take it as one of the authors of the commentaries upon which Vācaspati provides his commentary, namely Vātsyāyana or Uddyotakara. For Vātsyāyana as the subject of *pañcāti*, cf. NVTT 424,14 on 2.2.53 = (Ruben) 2.2.51: *bhāṣyakāro ‘tattārthe sūtraṃ pañcāti*; for Uddyotakara as the subject, cf. NVTT 327,19 on 2.1.22 = (Ruben) 2.1.22: *tad etad vārttikakāro bhāṣyam anubhāṣya pūrvapakṣasūtraṃ pañcāti*. Udyana comments on *sūtraṃ pañcāti* that appears in the NVTT on 1.1.5 (cf. NVTT 127,4 = EM 302,20), and suggests the supplementation of “in order to expound [it]” (*vyākhyaṃ*). Cf. NVTP 184,3 = EM 331,14: *sūtraṃ pañcāti. vyākhyaṃ iti śṛṅgah*. In the above translation, one can take the subject as either Vātsyāyana or Uddyotakara. It may also be noted that if the subject of *pañcāti* is Uddyotakara, it is still conceivable that Vācaspati could have had the T version of the introductory phrase in the NBh before him. In this case one has to assume that Vācaspati included *atha* in *sūtra* 1.1.5, just as Uddyotakara did, not following Vātsyāyana, and without making mention of the different wording of 1.1.5 as possibly presupposed by Vātsyāyana.
states that “now then (athedānīm) inference is explained as possessing a cause (i.e., perception)” is meant.\footnote{Cf. NVTT 127,15–16 = EM 303,5–6: athety ānantarge, uktaṃ prayāksam anumāṇasya hetuh, athedānīm anumāṇam hetumad vyaṭpādyata iti arthaḥ.} This fact that atha is firmly established as part of 1.1.5 by Vācaspatai is clearly contradictory to T and the other secondary testimonies adduced above. It may safely be said that the inclusion of atha in 1.1.5 had already been established by the time of Vācaspatai Miśra I, or in the commentarial tradition to which he belonged. It can also be hypothetically assumed that the presence of atha in 1.1.5 would have been accepted by the commentators on the NS following the NVTT or its commentarial tradition. For example, in the NTĀ of Vācaspatai Miśra II, who clearly incorporates atha into 1.1.5, atha is glossed as denoting the causal relationship between perception and inference, just as in the NVTT.\footnote{Cf. NTĀ 69,22–23: athoddeśakramasaṃśātyānumāṇālakṣaṇāya sūtram. atha tatpāryavakam triśudham anumāṇam. Cf. also NTĀ 69,25: athety hetuḥhetumadbhāvasiṣcitāna; GSP 5,25: athety hetuḥhetumadbhāvapratipādaṇārtham.} Should the introductory part of the T version be original, it would have to be supposed that the direct or indirect influence of Vācaspatai would have caused scribes or later Naiyāyikas to correct the transmitted text of the NS, either on purpose or inadvertently. It remains open whether the introductory part, i.e., athānumāṇam, which only T has, was also accordingly corrected in the transmission of the text of the NBh. Vācaspatai’s explicit mention of the words and phrases to be commented upon could have directly or indirectly influenced the textual transmission of the NS and the NBh, as may also be reflected in the case of 1.1.2.

Further mention should be made of Keśavamiśra’s brief reference in his GSP to a (fictive?) opponent who suspects that “[the word] atha is placed outside the sūtra,” and points out the “contradiction among Bhāṣya, Vārttika and Tīkā.”\footnote{Cf. GSP 5,25–26: navu athety sūtrabahirbhūtam, bhāṣya vārttikāṣaṃśātraṇrodhāt.} Keśavamiśra does not go into the issue and therefore the issue remains vague. Udayana and others are silent on the issue.\footnote{There is no corresponding pratiṣṭha or explanation in the NVTP, or in the NNP. The text of NS 1.1.5, inclusive of atha, printed in the editio princeps of the NVTP (cf. NVTP(BI) 654,1–2), seems to be an editorial supplement. Cf. also footnote 17 above.}

### 3.3 Traikālyaagrahaṇāṭ in NS 1.1.5

The signs used in T to regularly distinguish a sūtra from the commentary point at possible further sūtra-s embedded in the text of the NBh. For example, in the commentary on 1.1.5, T reads (cf. f. 6r 7): \(\Theta\) traikālyaagrahaṇāṭ\footnote{Cf. NVTT 127,15–16 = EM 303,5–6: athety ānantarge, uktaṃ prayāksam anumāṇasya hetuh, athedānīm anumāṇam hetumad vyaṭpādyata iti arthaḥ.}
of the time to which their objects pertain.\textsuperscript{57} Neither Ruben’s critical edition nor any other edition mentions even the possibility that this phrase could be regarded as a \textit{sūtra}. Moreover, it is to be noted that neither Uddyotakara nor Vācaspati specifies it as a \textit{sūtra}.\textsuperscript{58} The selection of the phrase as a \textit{sūtra}, on the other hand, is supported by a ms. of the \textit{sūtrapātha} from Kolkata and the three mss. of the \textit{sūtrapātha} from Trivandrum.\textsuperscript{59}

As to the possibility that it can be regarded as a \textit{sūtra}, Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara’s NTD provides intriguing evidence:

\begin{quote}
\textit{traikālīyagrahaṇāt. na kevalaṁ lakṣaṇatah, kim tarhi viśayaḥ bhūdāy apy anumāṇaṁ pratyakṣaṁbhinnaṁ, trikālaviśayaatvā. vartamānaṁkaviśayaṁ pratyakṣaṁ trikālaviśayaṁ anumāṇaṁ iti sūtrārthaḥ.}\textsuperscript{60}
\end{quote}

[Inference is distinct from perception] because [the objects] belonging to the three phases of time are apprehended [by means of it]. [That is to say,] inference is distinct from perception, not solely from [the point of view of their] definitions [in 1.1.4 and 1.1.5], but also due to the distinction of the objects [apprehended by them], because inference has as its objects [things] in the three phases of time. Perception has as its objects only [things] which are present; inference has as its object [things] in the three phases of time.\textsuperscript{61} This is the meaning of the \textit{sūtra}.

It is evident that Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara’s treatment of \textit{traikālīyagrahaṇāt} basically follows Vātsyāyana’s intention to differentiate inference from perception from the temporal perspective.\textsuperscript{62} Although the printed edition of the NTD does not formally acknowledge the phrase in question as a \textit{sūtra}, the last phrase \textit{iti sūtrārthaḥ} can hardly refer to 1.1.5, since the content of the


\textsuperscript{58} For the elaborate explanation of the corresponding passages in the NV, cf. Okazaki 2005: 168–174.

\textsuperscript{59} ASC(1) f. 1r 5; ORIML(1) f. 1v 4–5; ORIML(2) f. 1r 5; ORIML(3) f. 1r 8.

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. NTD 4.17–19 = GOML(2) p. 6.8–10. For unknown reasons, the edition places the word \textit{pratyakṣaṁ} in square brackets. In the transcript, \textit{traikālīyagrahaṇāt}\textsuperscript{*} appears in a new line and is put between double \textit{danḍa}-s, which suggests that the phrase is regarded as a \textit{sūtra} by the scribe of the transcript. The original ms. ORIML(5) has a short \textit{danḍa} before and after the phrase; but these \textit{danḍa}-s seem to be added secondarily by the scribe himself or, more probably, by another hand, and the color of ink used for the \textit{danḍa}-s is different from that of the text.

\textsuperscript{61} Cf. also NVTī 152.5–6 = EM 323,17–18: \textit{pratyakṣaṁ hi laukikāṁ vartamānaṁ viṣayaṁ eva. anumāṇaṁ tu traikālīyaviṣayaṁ.}

\textsuperscript{62} Cf. footnote 57 above. For a similar explanation that the distinction of inference from perception is due not only to the distinction of their definitions, but also the distinction of their objects, cf. NVTī 152.3–4 = EM 323,15–16: \textit{evam tāvat lakṣaṇabhedaḥ anumāṇam\textsuperscript{*} bhinnam pratyakṣaṁ darśitam. bhāṣyakāraṁ tu viṣayaḥ bhūdāy api bhedam āha. (\textsuperscript{*} lakṣaṇabhedaḥ anumāṇaṁ NVTī; lakṣaṇabhedānumāṇaṁ EM, which seems to be a misprint.)}
iti-clause, as clearly formulated by Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara, relates to the distinction of inference from perception, which is not addressed in 1.1.5. It rather seems likely that the word sūtra- in the compound sūrṭūrthāḥ refers to the phrase trākāliyağaṇhaṇāt, which corroborates its formal treatment as a sūtra in T.

Vācaspati refers to the same idea as Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara does, although without explicit mention of the phrase trākāliyağaṇhaṇāt, and he clearly ascribes the idea to Vātsyāyana. Jayanta, on the other hand, directly quotes the expression in question, but does not specify it as a sūtra.

A further occurrence of the phrase may be noted. In the second chapter of his PSV, Dignāga takes up the phrase *trākāliyağaṇhaṇāt (V: dus gsum la 'dzin pa'i phyir) when criticizing the Naiyāyikas' definition of inference presented in 1.1.5. However, the Naiyāyika referred to by Dignāga does not appeal to the phrase trākāliyağaṇhaṇāt in order to distinguish inference from perception as Vātsyāyana does, rather to justify the qualifying element trividham in 1.1.5 and to give additional grounds for the threefold division of inference. In his Japanese translation and exposition of the relevant phrase in the PSV, Kitagawa (1965: 378) makes the assumption that Vātsyāyana does not seem to have been aware of the theory of the threefold classification of inference according to the three phases of time, i.e., a classification implied by the phrase trividham.

As briefly shown above, the interpretation of trākāliyağerahaṇāt as additionally corroborating the threefold classification of inference is not justified in the extant Nyāya commentaries on 1.1.5, and at the same time the original

63See footnote 62 above.
64NM I 359.5-6: tad ucyate — trākāliyağiṣayam anumānam iti. kasmāt. trākāliyağerahaṇāt. trākāliyağiṣayam arthā anumānaṃ gṛhyante. For similar formulation, cf. NV 239.3 on 2.1.39 = (Ruben) 2.1.37: trākāliyağiṣayam anumānam, trākāliyağerahaṇāt ity uktaṃ, where it remains obscure whether Uddyotakara quotes a sūtra or the NBh with ity uktaṃ. For a parallel to the relevant passage of the NBh (cf. footnote 57 above), cf. further NSVG (18.11-12: sadāvijayam ca pratvayakṣam. sadasādviṣayam anumānam. kasmāt. trākāliyağerahaṇāt.
65On Dignāga's refutation of NS 1.1.5, cf. Wezler 1969a, in which the discussion in question is not taken into consideration. A further contribution announced by Wezler (1969a: 836, fn. 1) has not yet been published.
66Cf. PSV(K) 116a6-7: gaṇa yaṇaśa ma daṇi ldan pa kho na rnam pa gsum yin te dus gsum du 'dzin pa'i phyir ro, nes par gezi ba de ni mi rigs te gaṇa gi phyir ro.; PSV (V) 34b8-35a1: gaṇa yaṇaśa ma daṇi ldan pa'i rjes su dpag pa kho na rnam pa gsum du 'gyur te, dus gsum la 'dzin pa'i phyir ro žes pa'i nes par gezi ba de yaṇi rigs pa ma yin te. (cf. also Kitagawa 1965: 567-568); VS(C) 217.10-11 (reconstruction): yac ca pūrvavad [V: anumānam] eva trividham trākāliyağerahaṇād ity avadārhaṇam. tad [V: api] na yuktam, yasmāt sarvam trākāliyağiṣayam. The phrase trākāliyağerahaṇāt, translated into Sanskrit by Muni Jambūvījaya, is attested by way of indirect mention by Jīnendrabuddhi in his PST (MsB) f. 78v 5: ayaṃ eva trākāliyağerahaṇād iti.
67In the context of the interpretation of NS (Ruben) 2.1.35-36 = NS (E_D) 2.1.37-38 = NS (E_3) 2.1.38-39, a similar assumption has been made; for modern secondary literature, cf. Wezler 1969b: 192, fn. 10. Cf. also Hattori 1979: 351, fn. (7).
work of the unnamed early Naiyāyika consulted by Dignāga is deplorably lost to us. However, in spite of the “strong doubt” expressed by Wezler (1969b), the fact that the expression traiṣākyagrahaṇāt is explicitly mentioned by Dignāga as a Naiyāyika’s statement additionally supporting the qualification trividham in 1.1.5\(^{68}\) may lead us again to consider whether the expression as such played a certain, possibly supplementary, role in relation to 1.1.5 in the early history of the Nyāya school.\(^{69}\) The question also remains whether an additional sūtra was adduced here as such by Vātsyāyana, as most probably selected by Bhāṭṭavāgīśvara, whether the phrase is a kind of grahaṇakavākya of the NBh, or whether the selection of this expression as a sūtra was secondarily developed in a certain Nyāya tradition.

4. Text of the NBh according to the Trivandrum manuscript

As is well known, Thakur’s editions of the Nyāyacaturgranthikā are substantially distinguished from other editions of the four works due to the fact that he was able to gain access to the mss. preserved at the Jaisalmer Jain Bhandar in the form of “complete photographic copies”; in the case of the NVTP it included the extended critical edition up to the first adhyāya when published in 1967, and was succeeded by the monumental publication of the edition of whole work in 1996. In his preface to EM, Thakur states that those “manuscripts offered better readings, filled up lacunae and supplied long passages left out in the published editions,” so that he “could solve a number of textual problems.”\(^{70}\) Unfortunately, Thakur provides only scant information concerning the Jaisalmer mss. utilized for editing the Nyāyacaturgranthikā; it is therefore not easy to identify the materials used by him with the mss. known from the published catalogues. It is by no means sure whether he consulted all the mss. of the Nyāya works concerned that are preserved at the renowned Bhandar, or only some of them. However, it can be presumed that his collation of the text of the four classical commentaries on the NS was undertaken on the basis of a single Jaisalmer ms. respectively, if the following statement that was presented in Thakur (1968) with regard to the mss. concerned can be applied to his recent editions: “[T]hey were copied by the same scribe in or around Śaṃvat 1501, the date given at the end of the

---

\(^{68}\) The assumption of a corroborative function of the expression presented by the Naiyāyika in the PSV should be differentiated from the position that trividham originally intends the threefold division of inference according to the three phases of time, in regard to which Wezler (1969b: esp. 192–194, 196) raises doubt.

\(^{69}\) For the suggestion that the original meaning of 1.1.5 be related to the threefold division of time, cf., e.g., Ruben 1928: 188, n. 127; Randle 1930: 152; Schuster 1972: 354; Hattori 1979: 350, 351, fn. (7).

\(^{70}\) Cf. Thakur’s Preface to EM, vii. For a similar remark on his edition of the NV, cf. Thakur (1968: 380): “My collation of the readings has enabled me to fill up many a blank and to restore the original words of the Vārtika in places of the imaginary ones that crept into the text.”
Tātparyatīkā MS.” It can therefore be surmised that other relevant Nyāya mss. remained unused. In the following discussion, the variant readings designated as “J” in Thakur’s editions E_D and E_M are abbreviated to J_D and J_M respectively. Under the above presumption, which still has to be confirmed, I tentatively refer to the variants as being found in one Jaisalmer ms. only, and do not discuss the other scenario, namely, that the variants have been recorded from more than one Jaisalmer ms.

4.1 A different transmission of the text of the NBh

Our present collation of the trisūtrībhāṣya tentatively suggests that most of the mss. of the NBh available to us, apart from T as well as the Jaisalmer ms. in the form of the variant readings recorded by Thakur, can be divided into two major groups. In the following they are called groups A and B (hereafter designated as MSS_A and MSS_B respectively). Attention cannot be paid to the various subdivisions of each group and the relation between these subdivisions, since this would be beyond the scope of the present article. Thus, the relation between groups A and B, ms. T and the variants of the Jaisalmer ms. reported in J_M and J_D will briefly be treated.

In comparing these variants with those of the printed editions, the following four editions, besides E_M and E_D, have been utilized: the editions by Gangadhara Shastri Tailanga (Varanasi 1896), Phanibhusana Tarkavagisha (Calcutta 1917–1929), Ganganatha Jha (Poona 1936–1945) and Taranatha Nyayatirtha who was responsible for the first ahnikā of the first adhyāya of the NBh (Calcutta 1936), respectively designated as ‘E_G’, ‘E_PH’, ‘E_J’ and ‘E_T’. I do not provide the corresponding page and line numbers in these printed editions; variant readings found in the mss. collectively designated as MSS_A and MSS_B are not reported diplomatically; minor distinctions, such as sandhi variants, scribal errors or corruptions in individual readings of the

71Cf. Thakur 1968: 380. For the mention of the Jaisalmer material in a singular form, cf. Thakur’s Preface to E_D: xiii: “[In the preparation of the present edition of the Nyāyadarśana and Nyāyabhāṣya, I mainly depended on the photocopy of the manuscript received through my late lamented friend Dr. J.S. Jetly.”

72It is probable that the mss. utilized by Thakur correspond to Pothi 5, serial no. 67 for the NBh (57 fols.), serial no. 68 for the NV (142 fols.), Pothi 6, serial no. 69 for the NVTT (201 fols.) and serial no. 70 for the NVTP (165 fols.). Cf. Punyavijayaji 1972: 188–189; Jambuvijayaji 2000: 50. Concerning the NBh, another possibly untapped ms. would be the ms. Pothi 65, serial no. 1274(3) (70 fols.), dated samvat 1279. Cf. Punyavijayaji 1972: 356; Jambuvijayaji 2000: 110.

73There are a few mss. whose readings are difficult to classify on the basis of the “test passage.” They are excluded from examination in the present article because they are not of high relevance for determining the relationship of the Trivandrum ms. with other mss. of the NBh.

74This selection of the printed editions is partially based on the results of the collation of a larger number of printed editions of the NBh prepared by Mr. Christian Fehst, Ms. Heidrun Jäger and Mr. Gautam Liu, M.A., and also based on their comments on it.
mss., and the readings pertaining to the subgroups, are not, in principle, taken into account. Accordingly the readings provided below are generalized, unless the reading of a particular ms. or edition is discussed, especially of T.

1. Concerning E_D 1,15 on NS 1.1.1, *cataṣṭru caivaṁvidhāsū tattvam pari-
samāpyate* ("And in these four kinds [such as pramāṇa and so forth] the true nature is accomplished.”), MSS_A and T read *tattvam*, agreeing with E_M. E_PH reads closely to MSS_A: *cataṣṭru evamvidhāsū tattvam pari-
samāpyate*. MSS_B read *arthattattvam*, agreeing with E_G, E_J and
E_T. In corroboration of *tattvam*, Thakur refers to Prajñākaragupta’s
PV_Bh. The reading *tattvam* is also supported by the NM, though
not in an exact quotation, and by the NBhūṣ. J_M and T read *cedam*
for *caivaṁ*, which is supported by the NBhūṣ; the variant of J_M is
not adopted in E_D. In this case, *idad* would have to be construed
with the following, but separated *tattvam*; such a construal is syntactically
unusual. As regards *arthattattva*, the first member *artha-*
appears to be an extension; the reading lacking *artha-* is also corrobated by
the immediately following question "What is then the true nature?" (*kim
punas tattvam?*).

2. In the case of E_D 4,6–7 on 1.1.1, *nāśikaś ca dṛṣṭāntam abhyupagacchan
nāśikatvam jahāti* ("And a nihilist, inasmuch as he admits a [generally
accepted] example, abandons [his] nihilism (or ‘the state of being
a nihilist’?).”), the text adopted in E_D agrees with MSS_B and the
five printed editions mentioned above, whereas MSS_A read *nāśikaś ca
dṛṣṭāntam abhyupayan nāśikatvam* (or *nāśikatām*) *jahyāt*. The readings
abhyupayan and *jahyāt* in MSS_A are supported by J_M and J_D.
T (f. 2r 10) agrees with MSS_A except for *nāśikatvam: nāśikaś ca
dṛṣṭāntam abhyupayan nāśikyān jahyāt*.” Interestingly, the
NBhūṣ preserves a clarified text of MSS_A and MSS_B: It supports
*jahyāt* as found in MSS_A and *abhyupagacchan* as in MSS_B. The optative form

---

75 *parisamāpyate* in E_PH 12,1–2 has to be corrected to *parisamāpyate*.
76 *Pramāṇavārttikābhidhāya* 401,19–20: *cataṣṭru caivaṁvidhāsū tattvam pari-
samāpyate — pramāṇa prameyam pramāṇam pramitir iti*. Cf. E_D 1, fn. 5 and E_M 1, fn. 6; cf. also E_PH
12, n. *.
77 Cf. NM I 32,6–7: *evam ca yad ucyate — pramāṇā pramāṇam prameyam pramitir iti
cataṣṭru vidhāsū tattvam parisamāpyata iti, tad vyāhanya te*. Cf. also NBhūṣ 580,18–19 =
HJJM(1) f. 145v 2: *pramāṇopapattau pramātrādibhadassiddhiḥ. tathā coktaṁ — cataṣṭru
cedam vidhāsū tattvam parisamāpyata iti*.
78 *E_D 1,16 = E_M 1,13.
79 For evidence for the secondary derivative "nāṣṭikya" formed with the *ṣyaṛ*-suffix (-ṣya),
cf. E_P 7,3–4 = E_M 150,19–20, where *nāṣṭikyam* "anti-Vedic heterodoxy" (cf. Halbfass
1991: 73) is mentioned as a type of bad mental deeds or activities (pāpaṁśikā pravṛttiḥ)
causing demerit (*adharmā*). The instance of *nāṣṭikatva* adduced above is the only occur-
rence in the NBh.
80 Cf. NBhūṣ 64,21–65,1 = HJJM(1) f. 14r 9: *nāṣikaś ca dṛṣṭāntam abhyupagacchan*
of hā ‘abandon’ (3rd sg.) is paralleled by the corresponding verbal predicate upālabheta that is also in the optative form, more specifically, in a potential sense.\footnote{The reading abhyupayan is the lectio difficilior\footnote{The reading abhyupayan is the lectio difficilior\footnotemark[ef{fn:footnote}].}; the two variants jahyāt and nāstikyan that contain the more difficult conjunct letters hyā and kya, in contradistinction to simpler hā and ka in MSS\textsubscript{B}, may not be regarded as corrupt.}

3. In the case of E\textsubscript{D} 4,13–14 on 1.1.1, tasya pañcāvayavāḥ pratijñādayah, samāhām apekṣyāvavāḥ ucyante (“To this [aggregate of statements (śabdasamāh)] pertain the five members, [namely,] the thesis and so forth, [and they] are called “members” in correlation with the aggregate.”), the text given by Thakur agrees with MSS\textsubscript{B} and all the editions mentioned, whereas MSS\textsubscript{A} read samāhām abhyupetyāvavā ity ucyante. The reading \textit{iti} in MSS\textsubscript{A} is supported by J\textsubscript{M}, though the variant of the Jaisalmer ms. is not adopted in E\textsubscript{D}. \textit{Abhyupetya} ‘after having admitted’ seems to be a secondary modification (the motive is unclear, unless it is differently rendered); it is difficult to construe the absolutive with its subject, namely pañcāvavāḥ or pratijñādayah. \textit{Iti} seems to serve as syntactical clarification and should probably be regarded as an addition.

T (f. 2v 2) reads vākyasamāhām apekṣyāvavāḥ ucyante, agreeing with MSS\textsubscript{B} on two points, apekṣya and the lack of \textit{iti}. The first member vākyas- of the compound vākyasamāha ‘aggregate [of parts] that constitutes a statement’\footnote{The reading abhyupayan in the NBhus agrees with MSS\textsubscript{A}, J\textsubscript{D} and J\textsubscript{M}.} should be regarded as an extension; vākyasamāha (“aggregate of statements”) is the term employed in Vātsyāyana\textquotesingle s exposition of \textit{vītandā} (“contentious debate”) and \textit{vāda} (“amicable debate”).\footnote{If he does not admit [any generally accepted] example, through what means could he refute an opponent?”}

4. In the concluding part of the commentary on 1.1.1 which contains a verse allegedly adopted in modified form from Kautilya\textquotesingle s \textit{Arthaśāstra},\footnote{Here the reading \textit{abhyupagacchan} instead of \textit{abhyupayan} found in MSS\textsubscript{B}. Cf. NV 14,18 = EM 16,18: nāstikasya ca vyāghato bhuyapagame ’abhyupagame va. tad uktam bhāya iti.} E\textsubscript{D} (5,18–6,3) reads\footnote{However, in his gloss on this passage, Uddyotakara employs the nominal form \textit{abhyupagama} derived from \textit{abhuyupa-gam}, which, one may assume, tends to verify the reading \textit{abhyupagacchan} found in MSS\textsubscript{B}. Cf. NF 14,18 = EM 16,18: nāstikasya ca vyāghato bhuyapagame ’abhyupagame vā. tad uktam bhāya iti.} seyam ānvikṣikī ... prakrītītā — iti. tad idāṁ tattvajñānāṁ niḥśreyasādīghaṁ ca yathāvidyaṁ veditavyam. iha tv

\footnote{Cf. Preisendanz 2000: 226–227 and 228, fn. 31. For the translation of the verse as found in the NBh, cf., e.g., Preisendanz 2000: 227–228. For the translation of the verse as it appears in the \textit{Arthaśāstra}, cf., e.g., Halbfass 1991: 27.}
adhyātma-vidyāyām ātma-dījñānāṁ tat-tva-jñānām, niḥśreyasādhigamo 'pavargaprāptir iti” (“Therefore this investigative science has been proclaimed (or ‘praised’) as ...]. Therefore this [above-mentioned] adequate knowledge as well as the attainment of the highest good has to be understood according to the specific science. But here in [this] science concerned with the Self, adequate knowledge consists in the knowledge of the Self and so forth. The attainment of the highest good consists in the attainment of liberation.”). Apart from the final iti after apavargaprāptih, this text is supported by MSSA, agreeing with EPPh and EM. MSSB, on the other hand, read: ... prakīrtī. tad idam tat-tva-jñānam niḥśreyasādhigamārtham yathāvidyam veditavyam. iha tv adhyātma-vidyāyām ātma-dījñānam niḥśreyasādhigamo 'pavargaprāptih, a text which is represented by EG. MSSB disagree with MSSA on three points: MSSB lack iti after prakīrtī; they read niḥśreyasādhigamārtham instead of niḥśreyasādhigamāsa ca87; and they read ātmādi instead of ātma-dījñānam, compounding it with tat-tva-jñānam.88 In EJ and ET, the first two readings of MSSB are preferred. Concerning the problematic last reading, EJ reads ātma-dījñānam tat-tva-jñānam, but this reading does not have any support from the mss. available to us89. ET favors the version of MSSA, and thus has a conflated text. The iti concluding the commentary on 1.1.1 is favoured only by EPPh and EM.90

The MSSA version is evidently supported by the two unmarked quotations in the NV: tad idam tat-tva-jñānam niḥśreyasādhigama ća yathāvidyam veditavyam (cf. NV 20,12 = EM 21,9; cf. also NVTT 59,1–2 = EM 68,9) and iha tv adhyātma-vidyāyām ātma-dījñānam tat-tva-jñānam niḥśreyasādhigama 'pavargaprāptir iti (cf. NV 20,20–21 = EM 21,16–17). The coordinate structure of tat-tva-jñāna and niḥśreyasādhigama is

---

86 For the exposition and the analysis of this passage, cf., e.g., Preisdanz 2000: 226–229. For another plausible understanding of the structure of the second sentence, cf. Preisdanz 2000: 228, fn. 34: “The following, namely, ... and ..., is to be understood ‘...’.”

87 For the syntactical analysis (and difficulty) of the sentence containing the relevant expressions, cf. Preisdanz 2000: 228, fn. 34.


89 Cf. Preisdanz 2000: 229, fn. 36. In his edition of the NBh, Laksmana Sastri Jatapathi gives this text using parentheses: “ātma-dījñānam (tat-tva-jñānam)” (cf. NBh(KSS) 7), with a footnote, implying that the text in parentheses has no basis (in the mss.?): “( ētcacīnāmadhyāstapātho nāsti.”

90 Cf. EPPh 60, fn. 4. PhaniBhusana argues that iti is necessary to denote the completion of a sūtra (samāptiśūcak), referring to Vācaspati’s gloss on iti. Cf. NVTT 59,14: ētih sūtramādānti. iti clearly appears in the corresponding commentary in the NV where the unmarked quotation of, or implicit reference to, the last part of the NBh, i.e., iha tv adhyātma-vidyāyām ... ‘pavargaprāptir iti (ellipsis by me), is made (cf. NV 20,20–21). ED (cf. 6, fn. 2: “itti Om C”) and EM (cf. 5, fn. 13: “itti nāsti C”) refer to the lack of iti in ET. This explicit mention of ET implies that JD, JM and EPPh also have iti.
evidently better than the MSSB version, considering the significant role both terms play in 1.1.1 and also indirectly in 1.1.2; the MSSA version should thus be regarded as original. The reading dhigamaśca may have caused a syntactical difficulty in the ms. transmission; for example, disagreement in the grammatical gender, as a result of construing a neuter noun jñānam and a masculine dhigaman with a neuter predicate veditavyam. The text ātmādīttavajñānam of MSSB may be the result of an omission of jñānam after ātmādi, due to eyeskip.

T (f. 3r 4–5) reads in partial agreement with MSSA: ... parikṣiteti tad idan tatvajñānam nīśreyasādhiḥgamā ca yathāvidyam veditavyam iha tv ātmavidyāyān tatvajñānam ātmādiyānām nīśreyasādhiḥgamo pavargaprāpti+. The distinctive reading parikṣitā instead of prakīrttā will be addressed below in relation to the Jaisalmer ms. Besides, the reading ātmavidyāyān instead of adhyātmavidyāyām and the different word sequence of tatvajñānam ātmādiyānām are unique to T and in contrast to the evidence of the NV. As regards the reading adhyātmavidyāyām instead of ātmavidyāyām, it may possibly be regarded as the standardized form on the basis of the corresponding unmarked reference given in the NV; however, the possibility of the loss of adhy- due to eyeskip cannot be ruled out. According to the text transmitted to T, Vatsyāyana again uses the term ātmavidyā in his commentary on NS (Ruben) 4.2.46 = ET 4.2.47.

5. For Ed 7,1–2 on 1.1.2, rāgadvēsdhikārūc cāsatyergyāsūgyāmānalobhāda-

51Cf. Speijer 1886: § 28, b.), Rem. Cf. also footnote 86 above.
52Cf. no. 4 on page 50 below.
53The inverse order of words in T amounts to a syntactical distinction from the version in MSSA and the NV: In the T version, the subject (tatvajñānam) comes first and then the predicate (ātmādiyānām); the same sequence can subsequently be observed with nīśreyasādhiḥgama as subject and apavargaprāptiḥ as predicate (i.e., <P+S P+S>). In contradistinction, in MSSA and in Uddyotakara’s version, there is the sequence <P+S S+P>. In order to determine the original reading, a more extensive syntactical analysis of Vatsyāyana’s text is required.
54The former term adhyātmavidyā is used by Vatsyāyana in a preceding passage where it refers to the Upaniṣads (cf. Ed 2.20–3.1 = Em 2.17–18). It is not clear to what extent there is a difference between ātmavidyā “science of the self” (cf. Halbfass 1991: 24) and adhyātmavidyā “science concerned with the Self” (cf. Preissendanz 2000: 229). The use of ātmavidyā would be in opposition to Uddyotakara’s explicit mention of adhyātmavidyā in the present context.
55Cf. T f. 89r 3: ātmavidyādhyātmāśastram, which comprises the two phrases ātmavidyā (f., nom.sg.) and adhyātmāśastram (n., nom.sg.). At the same place, although it reads closely with T, Ed (cf. 280,11 on 4.2.47) has adhyātmavidyā-adhyātmāśastram, presumably a reading of the Jaisalmer ms., because the omission of this reading in ET and EHN is reported in the corresponding critical note of Ed. It is evident that there is no occurrence of ātmavidyā lacking the prefix adhi in Ed and Em, whereas in T there are two instances where the expression ātmavidyā is used to designate the Nyāya system. For the variant ātmavidyādhyātmāśastram in compound form, cf. ET 1097,3 on 4.2.47, which is also supported by some mss. checked by me.
yo doṣā bhavantī (“And due to the governance of attachment and aversion, the faults, such as falsehood, envy, deception, greed, etc., arise.”), the majority of MSS_B reads rāgadesadvikārāc cāsuyērsyā-
māyālo bhādayo doṣā bhavantī.96 rāgadesadvikārāc is adopted in all printed editions. As for the enumeration of the doṣa-s, the text of MSS_B is also found in E₃; E₄, E₆ and E₇ read cāsuyērsyāmāyā-
lo bhādayo.97 The text adopted by Thakur is supported neither by the mss. available to us nor by other printed editions. MSS₄, on the other hand, read rāgadesadvikaranāc cāsuyērsyāmānalo bhādayo doṣā bhavantī; the reading "dhikaranāh (m., nom.pl.) is supported by the Jaisalmer ms. (cf. J₄ and J₅).98 A further distinction of MSS₄ from MSS_B is "māna" instead of "māyā" in MSS_B. Though the reading "māyā" is predominantly found in MSS_B and accepted by all printed editions except for E₄ and E₆, the reading "māna" is compatible with the list of various delusions (moha) given by Vātsyāyana in his commentary on 4.1.3, where māyā is not referred to.99 According to Vātsyāyana, false knowledge (mithyājñāna) is contained in the subdivision of moha, which brings forth both of the psychological elements tāga and dveṣa (cf. footnote 101 below).

T reads differently: rāgadesañ-ikarāc dveṣyāsūyāmānānamadamsar-
lo bhādayo doṣāh prādurbhavantī. dveṣyā90 should be a corruption, which can be corrected, for example, to ścereṣyā90. The beginning part of the emended text, i.e., ścereṣyāsūyāmāna-, corresponds to the reconstructed reading of the Jaisalmer ms. (cf. footnote 98 above). The text of T seems to be an extended enumeration with a view to patterning the doṣa-s in pairs of two concrete elements for each “ag-

96 Chattopadhyaya/Gangopadhyaya (1967: 28) render rāgadesadvikārāt as “[u]nder the influence of attraction and repulsion,” and māyā as “deception.” Sudarśanācarya paraphrases adhikārāt as “due to the predominance” (udrekāt) in his Prasannapadā (cf. NBh(BBS) 14,36), whereas Jha glosses it with “by their virtue” (tadvaśāt). Cf. E₃ 8, fn. 3.

97 The reading of E₄ as it might be reconstructed from the relevant critical note in E₆ (“māyā for māna TC”) is “cāsuyērsyāsūyāmāyālo bhādayo”; in fact, this is not found in E₆. However, the reading that can be constructed from the corresponding note in E₄ (“māyā for māna CT”) is identical with that of E₄. Accordingly, the critical note “asūyā Om C” in E₆ (cf. p. 7, fn. 2) has to be corrected, for example, to “asūyā Om CT”.

98 The variant cēryāsūyāmānalo bhādayo, which is reconstructible as the text of the Jaisalmer ms. from J₄ ("dhikaranāc cēryā") is not attested by any of the mss. available to us.

99 For māna as a subtype of moha, cf. E₄ 220,7–8 (cited in footnote 100 below). It should be noted that in Viśvanātha’s Nyāyasātravṛtti māyā is classified into the “attachment side” (rāgopakṣa). Cf. E₇ 925,30 on 4.1.3, which enumerates the subtypes of attachment more extensively than the NBh. Cf. also Sinha 1961: 92. Viśvanātha’s classification would allow for the presence of māyā in the enumeration of faults in a textual transmission of the NBh, namely, MSS₄.
gregate.”

The reading rāgadvesādhikaranā of MSSA is supported not only by the Jaisalmer ms., but also by T. As a secondary testimony for it, the pratika and following gloss in Abhayatilaka’s NA should be noted: rāgadvesādhikaranā iti na tadāśrayatvaṁ tadadāśhairānaṁ ita vivakṣitam, api tu tadahhinnatvaṁ. “The faults ‘having attachment and aversion as their locus’: It is not intended here that the state of having them as locus is the state of having them as substrate, but rather the state of being identical with them.”

---

100 For another enumeration of doṣa-s, cf. EP 220,3–4 on 4.1.3: tathā ceme mānṃshyaśāyāvicikitsānamatsarādayayā. The variant of T enumerates the various faults according to a discernible order, with the exception of mada: (1) śṛgur (“envy”) and asūya (“malice, jealousy”), belonging to the dveśapāka (“aversion side”); (2) māna (“self-conceit, pride”) belonging to the mohapāka (“delusion side”), and mada (“conceit”), although it is not referred to in the NB (see below); (3) matsara (“selfishness, jealousy”) and lobha (“greed”), belonging to the rāgapāka (“attachment side”). According to Vātsyāyana’s programmatic scheme, faults that are the eighth object of valid cognition (cf. NS 1.1.9) can be allocated to three types of “aggregate” (trayo rāṣṭrayāḥ) or “sides, wings” (pakṣāḥ) of psychological, karmically effective states and attitudes, namely, attachment, aversion and delusion. This allocation or distribution of doṣa-s is reflected in the nominal enumeration in the passage above. On the threefold classification (trairāṣṭra), cf. EP 220,6–8 on NS 4.1.3: teṣāṃ doṣaṅgam trayo rāṣṭrayās travyāḥ paksāḥ. tatra rāgapakṣaḥ — kāma matsaraḥ sṛpṛ ṣṛgur lobha iti. dveśapakṣaḥ — krodha śṛgur asūya dhroho ‘marṣa iti. mohapakṣaḥ — mithyājñānaṃ vicikitsā mānaḥ pramāda iti. For an unmarked parallel passage in the NV, cf. NV 424,10–12 on 4.1.3. Cf. also NSVG (G) 195,2–3, which classifies mada into the mohapakṣa and which, in this regard, corroborates the T version of the enumeration. For a further discussion, cf. footnote 101 below. Cf. also Sinha 1961: 91–94; Junankar 1978: 426.

101 Cf. NA 40,23–24. In his commentary on 1.1.2 (cf. EP 7,1–2), Vātsyāyana singles out twofold doṣa-s, namely, attachment (rāga) and aversion (dveśa) that are a fixed pair causally preceded by mithyājñāna; cf. EP 7,1: etasmān mithyājñānad ... rāgah ... ca dvešah (ellipsis by me). On the other hand, in Vātsyāyana’s commentary on 4.1.3 false knowledge (mithyājñāna) is regarded as a type of mohā, namely, the third “aggregate” that is evenly correlated with attachment and aversion (cf. also footnote 100 above). He also states that attachment and aversion have delusion as their source (yoniḥ) (cf. EP 221,11), which is associated with his soteriological thought in 1.1.2: tāv imau mohayonāḥ rāgadevaśāv iti. Furthermore, both items as a fixed pair are mentioned in his commentary on 1.1.18 where doṣa is defined (cf. EP 20,3–4): jñātāraṇaḥ hi rāgadayaḥ pravartayananti punye pāpe vā yatra mithyājñānaṁ tatra rāgadevaśāv iti. (“Indeed, attachment and the others make the agent of knowledge become active towards good or bad [deeds]” (cf. EP 7,2–6; 19,13–14). Where there is false knowledge, there is attachment and aversion.”) Here Thakur suggests the emendation of rāgadevaśamohā iti instead of the reading rāgadevaśāv iti (cf. EP 20, fn. 3). If one takes into account Vātsyāyana’s analysis of the causal relationship of the three fundamental doṣa-s as pointed out above, such an emendation is unnecessary. Vātsyāyana’s exposition in 1.1.2 appears to presuppose that fundamental attachment and aversion, for their part, are the basis (cf. adhikarana) for their own concrete varieties and for the concrete varieties of delusion.
somewhat convincing evidence for accepting the reading of MSS_A, T and the Jaisalmer ms.; moreover, the optical confusion of śca with cca (for example, in Śāradā script) should be regarded as one of the major causes for the textual corruption in MSS_B. However, further examination of Vātsyāyana’s usage of adhikaraṇa and adhikāra is required.

The divergent readings adduced and discussed above as representative of the two groups of mss. are only samples of other instances known to us. As already mentioned, the discussion of further variants found in the two traditions of transmission is beyond the scope of the present overview. Although it can be said that in general MSS_A and MSS_B read rather closely, there are some noteworthy cases where their divergence does not concern trifling variants, but rather affect the basic understanding of the text, as seen especially in the fourth and fifth examples presented above. These instances indicate that the transmission of the text in MSS_A enjoys more support from secondary testimonies as well as from the Jaisalmer and Trivandrum mss. than the transmission in MSS_B. The designating of MSS_A as the “better” group that preserves more original readings is, in my opinion, premature. In the above I have merely adduced some evidence which suggests that these two groups may reflect two separate streams of the textual transmission of the NBh. Further examination beyond the trisūtrībhāṣya is required. It is furthermore to be noted that MSS_A play a significant role in evaluating the variant readings found in the Jaisalmer ms. and often support them.¹⁰²

4.2 The relation of the Jaisalmer and Trivandrum manuscripts

In the previous section, a substantially positive aspect of Thakur’s two editions has been brought out, namely, that they allow us to show that the phenomenon of the striking deviations of the Jaisalmer ms. from the printed editions should not be understood as mere evidence for the ms.’s peculiar identity, and that the only apparently isolated variants of this ms. are indeed shared by a whole group of primary testimonies that have not been considered until now, namely MSS_A.

In this section, attention will be paid to another aspect of the Jaisalmer tradition, and instances provided which show that some deviations of the Jaisalmer ms., as reported in Thakur’s two editions, find, from among the primary witnesses, their only support in the Trivandrum ms. Such instances of mutual agreement, complete or partial, can frequently be noticed in the Trivandrum ms. Although they cannot exhaustively be mentioned within the scope of the present article, a few instances of this agreement should suffice to demonstrate the point.

¹⁰²Another tendency that has been observed so far may be pointed out, namely, that the transmission of MSS_B is closely reflected in the readings in the printed editions. It is rather probable that most of the printed editions are based upon the mss. pertaining to the recension of MSS_B.
1. In the introductory part of the commentary on 1.1.1, there is a salient deviation of J_M and J_D from the commonly accepted text: so 'yamaṃ prāṇābhrnātasmā vyāvahārahā, pramāṇenārtham upalabhāmānas tam artham īpsan (or abhīpsan J_D) vā jihāsan vā samāhāmānas tam artham āṇoti vā jahāti vā. This text as an additional passage is placed between duḥkhaḥetuss ca and so 'yamaṃ pramāṇārthah. T (f. 1r 3–4) has similar additional text at the same place: so yam prāṇābhṛnātasmā vyavahāraḥ pramāṇe+ārtham upalabhāmānas samartham īpsan jihāsan vā samāhāmānas tam artham āṇoti jahāti veta. This passage concerning the “everyday practice of all [creatures] who breathe” (prāṇābhṛnātasmā vyavahāraḥ) is located in Vātsyāyana’s own exposition of the very first statement (ādvākya) of his work. It may be noted that Uddotakara also briefly refers to the “everyday activity” (lokavṛttā) in connection with the same first statement. Uddotakara’s mention of the everyday activity can also allude, to a degree, to the relevancy of the discussion in the same context. The possibility of loss of text due to homoearchy, namely the similarity of the beginning part so ‘yamaṃ prāḥ/prāḥ cannot be ruled out. Yet this does not constitute convincing evidence for the additional passage in J_D, J_M, and T. Even if it represents an original text, the cataphoric usage of the demonstrative pronoun ayaṃ in so ‘yamaṃ prāṇābhṛnātasmā vyavahāraḥ (“Therefore this [following] is the everyday practice of all living beings”) seems unusual, and it is difficult to correlate it with the preceding passage as to the fourfold objects/objectives (unless it is differently construed). The passage in question should tend to be regarded as an insertion of a marginal or interlinear gloss.

2. As compared to E_D 1.14 on 1.1.1, sa yenārthan pramāṇoti vijānāti ... yo ’rthaḥ pramāṇyate jñāyate (ellipsis by me), other printed editions such as E_P, E_G, E_J and E_T do not have vijānāti and jñāyate. In E_D and E_M, only vijānāti is recorded as being in J_D and J_M, but jñāyate, too, is assumed to be a variant of the Jaisalmer ms. T (f. 1r 6) also reads very closely to it: sa yenārthan pramāṇoti vijānāti ... yo

103 Cf. E_D 1, fn. 3 and E_M 1, fn. 3.
104 Cf. E_D 1,10 = E_M 1,6.
105 On the designation “ādvākya,” cf. NVṬ 3,16, etc.
106 Cf. NV 3,16–17: lokavṛttānusādo vā. sarvah pramāṇā pramāṇenārtham avadhārya pravartamānaḥ phalam upalabhāta iti lokavṛttān tadvāykenānādyata iti. (“Or the purpose of the first statement is the confirmation of everyday activity. [That is,] every agent of cognition, inasmuch as he takes action after having determined an object by way of a means of cognition, obtains a result. Thus everyday activity is confirmed by this statement.”) Perry (1995: 129, fn. 31) considers this gloss by Uddotakara as probably “recording interpretations of other commentators on the Bhāṣya.”
107 Cf. E_D 1,10–11: so ‘yam pramāṇārtho ’parisasamkhyaḥ.
108 Cf. E_D 1,10 = E_M 1,5–6: arthas tu sukham sukhaḥetuss ca duḥkhām duḥkhahetuss ca.
109 Cf. also E_M 1,10–11.
rtthaḥ pramāyate vijnāyate (ellipsis by me). The reading of T and the Jaisalmer ms. suggests the synonymity between āra-mā and vi-jnā.110 This paraphrase of āra-mā with vi-jnā and the idea of their equivalence are also reflected in Vātsyāyana’s gloss which states that pramīta ("the result of cognition") is equivalent to arthavijñāna ("the cognition of object"), cognition in the sense of nomen acti.111

3. In comparison to E D 4,13–14 on 1.1.1, tasya paścaśayavāvah pratijñādayah ("To this [collection of statements (śabdasamāha)] pertain the five members, [i.e.,] the thesis and so forth.") T (f. 2v 2) reads: paśca bhāgah pratijñādaya. The reading paśca bhāgaḥ instead of paśca-vayavāvah agrees with J M and J D. Cf. also NV 15,6 = EM 17,2–3: tasya (scil. vākyasya) bhāga ekadesa iti. Uddyotakara’s paraphrase indicates that he commented upon the expression bhāgaḥ.

4. As mentioned before (cf. no. 4 on page 45 above), in the d-pāda of the verse (cf. E D 5,19–20 on 1.1.1) allegedly adopted from the Arthaśāstra, T (f. 3r 4–5) reads parisaktā instead of prakṛtītā. This reading agrees with J M, whereas the variant in J M is not adopted in E D. Discussing the two readings, Preisendanz (2000) adopts the reading parisaktā "with some hesitation." T’s variant corroborates her suggestion.112 Uddyotakara, Vācaspati and Udayana are silent on the word in question. It has to be noted that Vācaspati Miśra II quotes the verse in question ending with prakṛtītā, instead of parisaktā.113 If this reading is original in the NTA, then it has to be supposed that the text of the NBh known to Vācaspati Miśra II or the verse as a well-known saying recollected by him or others would already have had prakṛtītā instead of parisaktā by his time, namely by the 15th century.114

4.2.1 The case of adhigantavyaḥ in the NBh on NS 1.1.1

There is a passage in Vātsyāyana’s commentary on 1.1.1 that poses considerable problems regarding its coherence. After explaining the structure and literal meaning of the first sūtra, Vātsyāyana presents the soteriological interpretation of the “attainment of the highest good”: heyam tasya nirvartakam hānam ātyantikam tasyopāyo ’dhigantavya ity etāni khalu115

---

111 Cf. E D 1,15 and E M 1,11: yat tadarthavijñānam sā pramātr iti. tad after yat and the final iti find no support in the msa. available to us; the former does not seem to be necessary, whereas the latter is problematic. (I do not go into this problem here.)
112 For her discussion and other relevant parallels, cf. Preisendanz 2000: 227, fn. 29.
113 Cf. NTA 32,10–11.
115 MSSB omit khalu, as do the printed editions such as E G, E PH, E J and E T.
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catvāry arthapadānī samyag buddhā ṅihṣreyasam adhigacchati ("One attains the highest good, after having rightly comprehended these four arthapa-
das which one should know, namely, heyam ...").[116] What is problematic here is the enumeration before itti. MSSA and MSSB agree with all printed editions in reading this part as quoted above and do not indicate any textual problem. Jha (1915: 37–38), for example, translates the corresponding part in the following way: "(a) that which is fit to be discarded (e.g. pain) along with its causes, (i.e., ignorance and desire, merit and demerit), (b) that which is absolutely destructive (of pain, i.e., true knowledge), (c) the means of its destruction (i.e., the scientific treatises), and (d) the goal to be attained (i.e., Highest Good)." As Jha clearly suggests, the "soteriologically significant topics" are divided into four by connecting the second element tasya nirvartakam to the first heyam,[117] even though they, at first glance, consist of five elements. On the other hand, Uddyotakara explicitly refers to the four significant topics (catvāry arthapadāni) by virtue of the truly fourfold distinctions such as heyam, hānām, upāyah and adhigantavyah (m.),[118] seemingly bracketing the second element tasya nirvartakam.[119] However, he includes it, just as Vātsyāyana does, in his following paraphrase after the first element.[120]

Concerning the possible discrepancy between Vātsyāyana and Uddyotaka-
ra as to the interpretation of the four relevant matters, Wezler (1984) refers to Vātsyāyana's equation of tattvaññāna with tasyādhipama-upāyah ("a means to the attainment of this [liberation]") in his commentary on NS 4.2.1.[121] He then points out Uddyotakara's "contradiction to this statement of the Bhāṣyakāra's" (325), namely, his equation of tattvaññāna with hāna

[117] Cf. also Chattapadhyaya/Gangopadhyaya (1967: 8).
[119] Cf. Perry (1995: 187, fn. 7): "Pakṣīlasvāmin seems here ... to mention a fifth arthapada, ‘that which produces it’ ..., unless this is to be taken parenthetically” (ellipsis by me).
[120] Cf. NV 11,11–12 = E_M 14,2–3: heyam iti. heyam dukkham. tasya nirvartakam anidhyātyr̥ne dharmādharmān eva iti.
and of upāya with śāstra.\textsuperscript{122} As a structural understanding of the itti-clause in the NBh (not in the NV), Wezler (1984) proposes that adhigantavyaḥ should not be understood as an independent element in the enumeration of the “four right statements” (catvāry arthapadāni) starting with heyam, but rather as a nominal predicate relating to four grammatical subjects.\textsuperscript{123} Furthermore, as a “necessary correction of Uddyotakara’s interpretation,” Wezler (1984: 326) suggests that “what is meant by the expression hāna here is not ‘means of avoidance,’ but ‘avoidance’ itself.” His suggestion seems to presuppose the twofold interpretation of the ṭṛu-suffix (-ana) added to the verb hā.\textsuperscript{124} The suffix serves to denote an action (bhāva) and also an instrument (karaṇa), forming a nomen actionis and a nomen instrumenti respectively (cf. Āṣṭādhyāyī 3.3.115 and 3.3.117). In his NVTP, in fact, Udayana presents the twofold interpretation of hāna, namely, the equation of hāna “means of abandonment” with tattvajñāna, on one hand, and of hāna “[absolute] abandonment” with apavarga, on the other, obviously in order to reconcile the interpretational discrepancy.\textsuperscript{125}

The exclusion of adhigantavyaḥ from the enumeration of the four important topics (arthapada), as maintained by Wezler (1984), is also corroborated by the explanation in Bhāsarvajña’s NBhūs.\textsuperscript{126} It should be noted, furthermore, that the word is omitted in Jp and Jm. This resulting reading in the Jaisalmer tradition is again supported only by T among the available mss. of the NBh, and most probably by evidence of the NBhūs.\textsuperscript{127}

Further extremely interesting evidence for the omission of adhigantavyaḥ is provided by Śrīkaṇṭha, a commentator chronologically located between Udayana and Abhayatilaka\textsuperscript{128}; his comments actually illustrate the textual criticism as developed in the medieval Nyāya tradition.


\textsuperscript{123} The translation Wezler (1984: 325) suggests is as follows: “One has to understand that which is to be avoided, that which brings it forth, [its] absolute avoidance [and the means [leading to it].” Regarding the passage in question in the NBh, Wezler (1984) does not go so far as to explicitly equate hānam ātyantikam with mokṣa. Cf. also Wezler 1984: 293, 302, Table.

\textsuperscript{124} Cf. Werba (1997: 331, no. 374): ‘ver/zurücklassen’ and ‘aufgeben.’


\textsuperscript{127} Cf. footnote 126 above.

\textsuperscript{128} Cf. Thakur’s Introduction to the ST (cf. xiii): “[H]e flourished in western India between Udayanācārya (c. 1070–80 A.D.) and Abhayatilaka Upādhyāya (1263 A.D.).]"
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une. atra ca heyam ityādi. heyam duḥkham tasya nirvartakam avidyā-
trṣne ityādi vārttikāṃ keśu cit pustakesu na dṛṣyate. tato na bhavaty
eveti a nāśanakaniyam, ṭikārtā heyam iti utekhena gṛhṇatā siddhavat
upasthāpitavāt. ayathābhāṣyetyādi. heyam ityādau bhaṣyey ‘dhiganta-
vāvārtāpi na śrūyate. vārttike tv adhigantavya mokṣa ity uktam. ato
yathābhāṣyatā vārttikasya. b iyam ca kutah. ucyate. arthānuvādatvāt.
bhaṣya paramārtha evāyaṃ vārttikakārtā ‘nūditah, ananubhāṣyākṣaravyā-
khyaṃ kṛtam ity arthāḥ. 129

(* eveti LDI(1); eva ŚṬ. b ‘yathābhāṣyatā vārttikasya LDI(1); ‘yathābhā-
ṣyavārttikasya ŚṬ.)

In Udayana’s NVTP (72,8–9) it is said, “and here what is to be aban-
donned” and so forth. [Opponent:] The [passage in] the Vārttika [(NV
11,11–12)] beginning, “what is to be abandoned is pain; what brings
forth this [pain] is both nescience and desire,” is not found in some
manuscripts (pustakesu). Therefore [the passage] is definitely not present
[in the NV]. [Reply:] [This] should not be suspected, because [the pas-
sage in the NV] is presented 130 as established by the author of the Tīkā,
insomuch as he employs the expression “what is to be abandoned” as
an allusion [to this passage in his NVṬ (32,21)].

[In his NVṬ (72,10) Udayana says,] “[there is] nonconformity to the
Bhāṣya” and so forth. [To explain:] In the Bhāṣya beginning with “what
is to be abandoned,” there is no mention of (lit.: talk about) “what is
to be attained.” In the Vārttika, however, it is said that “what is to be
attained is liberation.” Hence [one may suppose that] the Vārttika
is not conformable to the Bhāṣya. And whence this [nonconformity]?
[In answer to this question:] It is said: Because [the passage in the NV
(11,13)] is a restatement of the meaning [intended in the NBh]. This
ultimate meaning of the Bhāṣya only has been restated by the author of
the Vārttika. [Thus] an explanation of a word not following the Bhāṣya
has been given. This is the meaning [of Udayana’s remark].

In the quoted passage, Śrīkaṇṭha makes two text-critical remarks: first
the alleged lacuna in some manuscript(s) of the NV, and secondly Uddiyota-
kara’s nonconformity to the NBh. Concerning the first point, Śrīkaṇṭha
briefly expounds Udayana’s pithy statement, in which it is stated that one
should not suspect that the passage beginning with heyam is actually ab-
sent in the NV. Udayana makes mention of the possibility (upapatti) of the
“absence of [some] writing” (lipyabhāva) and ascribes it to the “fault of a
scribe” (lekhaṅkadoṣa) of some NV manuscript(s). Even though he considers
this possibility (upapatti), he affirms the existence of the relevant passage
in the NV, turning to Vācaspati’s authority as a direct commentator of the

129Cf. ŚṬ 39,9–12 = LDI(1) f. 23r 3–5.
130In place of Śrīkaṇṭha’s upasthāpitavāt, the NVTP has utthāpitavāt. Cf. footnote 131
below.
work. Σρίκαν्त्हα elaborates on suspicion referred to by Udayana and his refutation of it: The phrases constituting the important topics beginning with “what is to be eliminated is pain” are not found in certain mss. (κेशु pustakesu, pl.), i.e., the “absence of [some] writing” mentioned by Udayana refers to a lacuna in part of the ms. transmission of the NV. If this interpretation by Σρίκαν्त्हα is accepted, it adds evidence for the fact that Udayana appears to have had access to some manuscript(s) of the NV which contained a lacuna at this point.

Secondly, with regard to Uddyotakara’s “nonconformity to the NBh” (ayathabhāṣyatā), Udayana does not provide any concrete explanation apart from the vague reference to “restatement of the meaning [intended in the NBh].” It remains unclear how unconformable the NV is to the NBh and which precise phrase(s) are concerned. Σρίκαन्त्हα clarifies the situation and does not hesitate to point out the problem involved. According to his gloss, Uddyotakara’s nonconformity to the NBh consists in the additional statement of “what is to be attained” (adhīganta-vyāh). Σρίκαν्त्हα thus clearly presupposes that the word adhīganta-vyāh is not present in the NBh, but

131) NVTP 72,9–10 = EM 125,25–126,1 = NVTP(BI) 238,7–8 = LDI(2) f. 26v 6–7: atra ca heyam ityādy* “anuvādavārttikam nāsti eveti nāśānkanikhyam,” tākörtā sidhāvad utthāpatvāt, kvačil āpyabhāvaya lekhaka-dosenaḥ upapatteḥ. (b heyam ityādy LDI(2); heyatvādy NVTP, EM; heyetyādy NVTP(BI). b eveti nāśānkanikhyam LDI(2); evety anāśānkanikhyam NVTP, EM, NVTP(BI).) The variants of LDI(2) are not reported in Thakur’s two editions of the NVTP. Although Thakur did not specify the ms. “Ahmedabad (A)” (cf. his Preface to NVTP: vii) and the “Ahmedabad Palm-leaf MS” (cf. Abbreviations in EM) utilized for his editions of the NVTP, I currently assume that LDI(2) is identical with his exemplar that is assigned the siglum “A”.

132) All three editions of the NVTP read anyathā bhāṣyatāpyāryarthānvadādatvāt with no variants recorded (cf. NVTP 72,10 = EM 126,1 = NVTP (BI) 238,3–4); this reading is also supported by the ms. (ms. no. PM 1491: f. 49r 1–2) preserved at the Adyar Library, Chennai, which is assigned the siglum “M” in Thakur’s editions. I owe this information about the reading as found in the Adyar Library ms. to Prof. Preisendanz. Against the text adopted in the printed editions and recorded in the Adyar Library ms., I read ayathabhāṣyatā te arthānvadādatvāt, based upon the reading of LDI(2) (f. 26v 7), which is supported by some secondary testimonia: ŚT 39,11–12: ayathabhāṣyetyād; NA 31,23: ayathabhāṣyatā te ityādi. As an indirect reference to the phrase in Vardhamāna’s commentary on the NVTP, cf. NNP 238,7–8: atra bhāṣyānvadādatyām ayathabhāṣyatā na yujyata iti vārttikam evaśtan nāstīty āṇikyāha — atra ceti. Vardhamāna’s (fictive) opponent appears to argue in favor of the absence of the corresponding passage in the NV. This argument implies that the opponent justifies the absence of the passage on the ground of Uddyotakara’s nonconformity to the NBh, inasmuch as he does not “restate” and confirm the NBh (cf. bhāṣyānvadātā). It could also imply that there was a (historically preceding?) editorial movement toward, or a controversy relating to, intentionally adapting the text of the NV to that of the NBh lacking adhīganta-vyāh, namely, removing the relevant phrases, inclusive of adhīganta-vyāh, from the NV. This presumable movement might have been reflected in the lacuna in some manuscript(s) of the NV reported in the NVTP. Furthermore, Udayana’s argument that Uddyotakara “restates” the intention of the NBh (cf. arthānvadātu), not the NBh itself, might have been effective in invalidating the opponent’s argument and securing the presence of the phrase in the NV as it is.
only occurs in the NV.\textsuperscript{133} This statement by Śrikanṭha is in contradiction with the bare fact that most of the NBh mss. available to us transmit the term as part of the four important topics. If Śrikanṭha's gloss on the term correctly reflects the problem Udayana was facing, and if Udayana was aware of the textual discrepancy in the sense conveyed by Śrikanṭha, we may infer that the evidence of the Trivandrum and Jaisalmer mss., as well as of Bhāsarvajña's indirect reference, provides us in this case with a text of the NBh as it was still existing in the period of Udayana. The additional expression adhitantavyah would have crept into the text of the NBh some time after Udayana, or even Śrikanṭha, most probably under the influence of Uddyotakara's philosophically motivated re-interpretation and modification of the words of his predecessor, Vātsyāyana.

5. Consideration of the textual transmission of the NBh

To conclude the present examination, I would like to offer a summary with some additional remarks. This article is meant to introduce the unique features of the Trivandrum ms. of the NBh, previously in the Paliyam collection, or of what we may call the Kerala tradition of the text of the NBh. In this introductory attempt I have not been able to fully discuss the textual problems of the variant readings and their historical implications; of course, some of them require further analysis and deliberation. However, fundamental text-critical observations show that the Trivandrum ms. often preserves original readings not found in the majority of mss. available to us, or readings which are closer to the original than those provided by them. Furthermore, as shown in Sections 4.2 and 4.2.1, the close affinity of the Kerala tradition to the Jaisalmer ms., together with the support of some of their substantial readings by earlier secondary and independent testimonies allows the hypothesis that the Paliyam ms. and the Jaisalmer ms. belong to a state of the ms. transmission of the NBh which is closer to the original text than the other available mss. Among the latter, MSS\textsubscript{A} stand out through their frequent agreement with the evidence of the Trivandrum and Jaisalmer mss., and thus, compared with MSS\textsubscript{B} (and all printed editions except Thakur's), also preserve more original readings of the text. Because of the reasons stated above (cf. pages 25-26), this hypothesis must currently be limited to the transmission of the trisūtrībhāṣya.

Apart from the above, the examination of variant readings, as presented in Sections 3.2 and 4.2.1, shows that the text of the NV or Uddyotakara's ideas consequently influenced the textual transmission of the NBh and probably provided some motivation for "correcting" its text, purposely or unintentionally, if the copyist was somehow familiar with the text of the NV. This is why, in my opinion, wherever there are divergent readings in the mss., one

\textsuperscript{133}This is corroborated by Abhayatilaka. Cf. NA 31,23–25.
should consider cases of identical wording in the text of the NBh and the NV with caution, bearing this possible influence in mind. Cases of identical wording should therefore be treated differently than explicit references to the NBh or pratiṣṭhāṇa-s in the NV.

Furthermore, as shown in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, the divergency of the text of the NS in the Kerala tradition from the one represented by Vācaspāti Miśra I suggests that the transmission of the text of the NS appears to have undergone some modifications already by his time. This naturally causes the suspicion that the text of the NBh utilized by him might also have already become to some extent divergent from the original text. Uddyotakara and Vācaspāti often refer to the text of the NBh; their treatment of it should also be investigated with a view to determining their attitude towards divergent commentarial and philosophical traditions which may still be available or lost to us. Careful consideration of their treatment of the text of the NBh is especially important when there are substantial variants in the mss., in independent testimonies and in the texts of the NV and NVṬT referring to the NBh, as shown in Section 4.2.1, where one may suspect that the two philosophers’ complete silence on their deviation from Vātsyāyana gave rise to confusion in the transmission of the text of the NBh.
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